HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

I

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume I

FROM THE APOSTOLIC COMMUNITY TO CONSTANTINE

by

KARL BAUS

With a

General Introduction to Church History

by

HUBERT JEDIN

CROSSROAD · NEW YORK

1982
The Crossroad Publishing Company
575 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* edited by Hubert Jedin
Vol. I: *Von der Urgemeinde zur frühchristlichen Grosskirche,* 3rd ed.
© Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1962

English translation © 1965 Herder KG

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by
any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. English.
History of the church.

Translation of: Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.
Vols. previously issued under title: Handbook of
church history.
Includes bibliographies and indexes.
Contents: v. 1. From the apostolic community to
Constantine / by Karl Baus — — v. 3. The church in
the age of feudalism / by Friedrich Kempf . . . [et al.] —
v. 4. From the High Middle Ages to the eve of the Reformation / by Hans-George Beck . . . [et al.]
1. Church history—Collected works. I. Jedin, Hubert,
1900- . II. Dolan, John Patrick. III. Title.
BR145.2.H3613 1982 270 82-5037
ISBN 0-8245-0314-7 AACR2

CONTENTS

Preface ix
Preface to the English Edition xi
List of Abbreviations . . . . xiii–xxiii

General Introduction To Church History 1

I. The Subject Matter, Methods, Ancillary Sciences, and Divisions of Church History, and its Relevance for Today 1

II. The Writing and Study of Church History 11
  The Writing of Church History: Its Beginning in Antiquity 11
  The Writing of History in the Middle Ages:
  Christian History, not Church History 15
  The Flowering of Church History from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century 23
  Church History as a Theological Discipline 32
  Church History as an Historical and Theological Science in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries 35
  Church History in England and America in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries 47

PART ONE: THE BEGINNINGS

Section One: Jewish Christianity 59

Chapter 1: Judaism in the Time of Jesus 59
  The Religious Situation among Palestinian Jewry 60
  The Qumran Community 63
  The Jewish Diaspora 66

Chapter 2: Jesus of Nazareth and the Church 70

Chapter 3: The Primitive Church at Jerusalem 74
  The External Events and Early Environment 74
  Organization, Belief, and Piety 77

Section Two: The Way Into The Pagan World 86

Chapter 4: The Religious Situation in the Graeco-Roman World at the Time of its Encounter with Christianity 86

Decline of the Ancient Greek and Roman Religions 86
The Emperor Cult 88
The Eastern Mystery Cults 90
Popular Religion 94

Chapter 5: The Apostle Paul and the Structure of the Pauline Congregations . . 98
The Religious History of the Apostle Paul 99
The Mission of Paul 100
Organization of the Pauline Congregations 105
Religious Life in the Pauline Congregations 108

Chapter 6: Peter's Missionary Activity and his Sojourn and Death in Rome . . 111
Extra-Pauline Gentile Christianity 111
Sojourn and Death of the Apostle Peter at Rome 112
The Tomb of Peter 115

Chapter 7: The Christianity of the Johannine Writings 119

SECTION THREE: THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE 124

Chapter 8: The Conflict between Christianity and the Roman State Power . . 125
The Beginnings of the Conflict 125
The Persecutions under Nero and Domitian 128
The Court Trials of Christians under Trajan and Hadrian 132

Chapter 9: The Religious World of the Post-Apostolic Age as Mirrored in its Writings 137

Chapter 10: The Development of the Church's Organization 146

Chapter 11: Heterodox Jewish-Christian Currents 153

SECTION FOUR: THE CHURCH IN THE SECOND CENTURY 159

Chapter 12: The Position of the Church under the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. Martyrdom of the Congregations of Lyons and Vienne 159

Chapter 13: Literary Polemic against Christianity 164
Celsus 167

Chapter 14: The Early Christian Apologists of the Second Century 171

Chapter 15: The Dispute with Gnosticism 181
Basic Ideas of Gnosticism 183
The Principal Manifestations of Gnosticism 187
Marcion 190
The Church's Self-Defence and the Importance of the Christian Victory . . 192

Chapter 16: The Rise of Montanism and the Church's Defence against it . . . 199

Chapter 17: The Expansion of Christianity down to the End of the Second Century 205

PART TWO: THE GREAT CHURCH OF EARLY CHRISTIAN TIMES
(*c.* A.D. 180–324)

Introduction 215

SECTION ONE: THE INNER CONSOLIDATION OF THE CHURCH IN THE THIRD CENTURY 217

Chapter 18: The Attack of the Pagan State on the Church 217
The Persecutions under Septimius Severus 217
The Persecution under Decius 222
Valerian and Gallienus 226

Chapter 19: Further Development of Christian Literature in the East in the Third Century 229
The Beginnings of the Theological School of Alexandria 229
Christian Schools in the East 230
Clement of Alexandria 231
Origen 234
Dionysius of Alexandria; Methodius; Lucian of Antioch and his School . . . 240

Chapter 20: The Development of Christian Literature in the West in the Third Century 243
The Rise of Early Christian Latin and the Beginning of a Christian Literature in Latin. Minucius Felix 243
Hippolytus 244
Novatian 247
Tertullian 248
Cyprian 252

Chapter 21: The First Christological and Trinitarian Controversies 254
Modalist Monarchianism 256

Chapter 22: Manichaeism 261

Chapter 23: Further Development of the Liturgy 268
Easter and the Easter Controversy 268
Catechumenate and Baptism 275
The Celebration of the Eucharist 281
The Beginnings of Christian Art 285

Chapter 24: Spiritual Life and Morality in the Communities of the Third Century 288
Baptismal Sprituality 288
Devotion to Martyrdom 292
The Asceticism of the Third Century 295
Prayer and Fasting in Early Christian Spirituality 299
Early Christian Morals 306
Marriage and the Family 307
Early Christian Works of Mercy 308
The Attitude of Early Christianity to Secular Civilization and Culture . . . 313
The Early Christian Church and the Pagan State 316

Chapter 25: The Holiness of the Christian and his Church 318
Penance in the Shepherd of Hermas 321
Tertullian's Two Views of Penance 324
Penitential Discipline in North Africa in Cyprian's Time 330
The Roman Controversy on Penance and the Schism of Novatian 334
Doctrine and Practice of Penance in the East in the Third Century 338
Disputes Concerning Penance after the Persecution of Diocletian 344

Chapter 26: The Development of the Church's Constitution in the Third Century 346
The Clergy 346
The Bishop and his Church 352
Forms of Organization Larger than the Local Community 353
The Pre-eminent Position of Rome and its Bishop 355
The Controversy about Heretical Baptism 360
Devotion to the Church in the Third Century 365

Chapter 27: The Extent of Christianity prior to the Diocletian Persecution . . . 367
The East 369
The West 379

SECTION TWO: THE LAST ATTACK OF PAGANISM AND THE FINAL VICTORY OF THE CHURCH 389

Chapter 28: The Intellectual Struggle against Christianity at the End of the Third Century 389

Chapter 29: Outbreak and Course of the Diocletian Persecution down to Galerius' Edict of Toleration 311 396

Chapter 30: The Definitive Turning-Point under Constantine the Great . . . 405
Reverse under Maximinus Daia 405
Constantine's "Conversion" to Christianity 407
From the Convention of Milan, 313, to the Beginning of Sole Rule, 324 . . . 416

Chapter 31: The Causes of the Victory of the Christian Religion. The Scope and Import of the "Constantinian Turning-Point" 426

BIBLIOGRAPHY 433

Bibliography to the General Introduction 435
General Bibliography to Volumes I and II 447
Bibliography to Individual Chapters 459

GENERAL INDEX TO VOLUME I 507

PREFACE

As any historical work of this kind must do, the handbook seeks first of all to give a reliable account of the principal events and leading figures in Church history. In the second place — and here it is distinguished from most previous manuals — it examines not only the Church's external career in the world but also her inner life, the development of her doctrine and preaching, her ritual and devotion. Our presentation does not follow the usual lines but attempts to evoke the fruitful plenitude of the mystery which is the Church by shedding light on the interaction between her outward vicissitudes and her inner life. With this end in view (and in order to avoid duplication as far as possible) the collaborators drew up a complete table of contents in 1958, and at their last meeting in Trier, in 1960, submitted specimen chapters which indicated the arrangement and orientation of the book. We discovered in the course of this work how difficult it is to give the most comprehensive possible account of the facts in a readable style. Each collaborator has had to wrestle with this problem; with what success, we must leave the critics to judge.

No less difficult was the problem of sources and literature. The handbook must after all provide an introduction to these if it is to be useful not only at university level but also for religious instruction in secondary schools and for adult education. Now bibliographies of every sort abound. But who is in a position to collect the material there cited — scattered as it is all over the world —, to read it, and to sift the important information from the unimportant? We had to content ourselves with a limited bibliography relevant to our purpose and selected on the following principles: we must indicate the most important sources and such of the older literature as is still indispensable, and cite the most recent books and articles in which further bibliography can be found. The Bibliography at the back of the book contains a section for each chapter. Reference to sources and literature on special subjects, as well as some biographical material in the sections on modern times, are given in the footnotes, which we have purposely kept to a minimum.

The chief editor, Professor Jedin, has attempted in the General Introduction to Church History to point out the basic method of this discipline and to show in more detail than has been done hitherto how the Church's consciousness of her history evolved into an academic study. It is a first attempt and the writer is by no means unaware of its shortcomings.

The author of this volume on the pre-Constantinian Church, Professor Baus, was only entrusted with his task in 1958. Some of his decisions regarding choice of material and the scope of particular chapters were taken in view of the following considerations: The apostolic age might have been given much fuller treatment on the basis of the history of New Testament times, but the volume would then have far exceeded the size proposed. The author has therefore tried to summarize those features of the early Church which continue to characterize her during her subsequent history. The bibliography for this period sufficiently indicates his indebtedness to special studies. In contrast with most textbooks, considerable space is here devoted to the development of Christian literature, a factor of such importance for the Church's inner life that its neglect would seriously distort the general picture. Finally, the special aims of the handbook made it necessary to include comparatively detailed chapters on the growth of early Christian liturgy, on the sacrament of penance, and on the life of the Christian community, which in certain respects — for example the spirituality of baptism and martyrdom — are still an almost untouched field.

In the course of preparing this volume the author received help from many quarters, help which was most welcome when it took the form of criticism. He is indebted in the first place to the other collaborators, but particularly so to the general editor, Hubert Jedin, to his former teacher J. A. Jungmann, and to Oskar Köhler, head of the Lexicographical Institute at the publishing house of Herder. A special word of thanks is also due to the staff of the library of the Theological Faculty at Trier, who showed such zeal in finding important literature.

This first volume of the handbook appears during the deliberations of the Second Vatican Council. The authors hope that their work may contribute in some measure to a deeper understanding of the Church and a greater love for her.

Hubert Jedin, Karl Baus

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

It is sincerely hoped that the appearance of the English version of the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* so soon after the original German edition will fill a long neglected need in this area of study. Over half a century, unparalleled in productive historical research, has passed since the publication in English of Funk's *Manual of Church History*. Similar works available in translation have, for the most part, failed to utilize much of the post-war scholarship in scriptural and patristical studies. Unlike traditional manuals of this type, with their skeletal outlines and perfunctory narrative, the present work combines a wealth of current and scholarly research with an accompanying text that is equally scholarly in presentation and interpretation. The *Handbuch* not only offers the student precise information on the important events and personalities in the history of the Church, it also focuses considerable attention on all that expresses or reflects its internal life — the development of dogma, liturgy, ecclesiastical organization, the spiritual and moral life, and the literary activity of the Christian communities.

The ample treatment given the Dead Sea scrolls and the discoveries at Nag Hammadi is extremely relevant as theologians continue to rethink the attitude of the primitive Church toward Judaism and to examine the syncretistic aspects of early Christianity and its reaction to the ancient mythological image of the world. The international and non-sectarian composition of the secondary source material gives the book an ecumenical dimension, while the objective treatment of such problems as the Vatican excavations and the political turn of Constantine to Christianity are representative of its avoidance of the polemic and confessional partisanship often latent in Church histories.

Professor Jedin's masterful introductory essay on the historical development of Church history from Christian antiquity to the present day is a forthright declaration of the serious academic nature of ecclesiastical history and may well prove a literary landmark in the final emancipation of that discipline from the lingering effects of the rationalistic attack on the theological interpretation of history. It confronts the anti-historical mentality, so dominant since Trent — with its tendency to isolate dogma from the living fabric of history —, with a bold affirmation of the need for examining the Church in its concrete and contingent development. The neglect of the study of Church history in seminaries and the curious lack of chairs of ecclesiastical history in Catholic universities point only too clearly to a need for some kind of reappraisal.

Above all the *Handbuch* aims at implementing the conviction that theology is an activity within the historic organism of the Church, and that Church history must not only provide the necessary framework and documentary material for this activity, it must also communicate the life and the mind of the Church as well.

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAB	*Abhandlungen der Deutschen* (till 1944: *Preussischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1815 seqq.
AAG	*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (down to Series III, 26, 1940: *AGG*), Göttingen 1949 seqq.
AAH	*Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Heidelberg 1913 seqq.
AAM	*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Munich 1835 seqq.
Abel HP	F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe,* I–II, Paris 1952.
ACO	*Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum,* ed. by E. Schwartz, Berlin 1914 seqq.
ActaSS	*Acta Sanctorum,* ed. Bollandus etc. (Antwerp, Brussels, Tongerloo) Paris 1643 seqq., Venice 1734 seqq., Paris 1863 seqq.
ACW	*Ancient Christian Writers,* ed. by J. Quasten and J. C. Plumpe, Westminster, Md. – London 1946 seqq.
ADipl	*Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde,* Münster – Cologne 1955 seqq.
Aegyptus	*Aegyptus, Rivista Italiana di Egittologia e Papirologia,* Milan 1920 seqq.
AElsKG	*Archiv für elsässische Kirchengeschichte,* publ. by the Gesellschaft für elsässische Kirchengeschichte, ed. by J. Brauner, Rixheim im Oberelsass 1926 seqq.; since 1946 ed. by A. M. Burg, Strasbourg.
AGG	*Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (after Series III, 27, 1942: *AAG*), Göttingen 1843 seqq.
AH	*Analecta Hymnica,* ed. by G. Dreves and C. Blume, 55 vols., Leipzig 1886–1922.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855 seqq.
AkathKR	*Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857 seqq.
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Münster and Cologne 1903 seqq.
Altaner	B. Altaner, *Patrology,* Freiburg – London – New York, 2nd imp. 1960.
ALW	*Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* (formerly *JLW*), Regensburg 1950 seqq.
AnBoll	*Analecta Bollandiana,* Brussels 1882 seqq.
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Buffalo Collection) 1804–86.
AnGr	*Analecta Gregoriana cura Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae edita,* Rome 1930 seqq.

ANL	*Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (Edinburgh Collection) 1866–72.
AnzAW	*Anzeiger der Oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna 1864 seqq.
AÖG	*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, Vienna 1865 seqq.
APhilHistOS	*Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, Brussels 1932 seqq.
APraem	*Analecta Praemonstratensia*, Tongerloo 1925 seqq.
ArSKG	*Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte*, publ. by K. Englebert, I–VI, Breslau 1936–41, VII ff., Hildesheim 1949 seqq.
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (Freiburg i. Br., Tübingen), Leipzig 1898 seqq.
AST	*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, Barcelona 1925 seqq.
ATh	*L'année théologique*, Paris 1940 seqq.
AttiPontAc	*Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, Rome 1923 seqq.
AuC	F. J. Dölger, *Antike und Christentum*, I–VI and supplementary vol., Münster 1929–50.
AUF	*Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, Berlin 1908 seqq.
Augustiniana	*Augustiniana. Tijdschrift vor de studie van Sint Augustinus en de Augustijneorde*, Louvain 1951 seqq.
AZ	*Archivalische Zeitschrift*, Munich 1876 seqq.
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist*, New Haven, Conn. 1938 seqq.
BAC	*Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos*, Madrid 1945 seqq. (138 vols. so far issued).
Bächtold-Stäubli	H. Bächtold-Stäubli, *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, 10 vols., Berlin–Leipzig 1927 seqq.
Bardenhewer	O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 5 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1902 seqq.
Bauer	W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin, 5th ed. 1957.
Bauerreiss	R. Bauerreiss, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns*, I–V, St. Ottilien 1949–55.
Baumstark	A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluß der christlich-palästinensischen Texte*, Bonn 1922.
BECh	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartres*, Paris 1839 seqq.
Beck	H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959.
Bedjan	*Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (syriace), ed. by P. Bedjan, 7 vols., Paris 1890–7.
BHG	*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, ed. socii Bollandiani, Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957.
BHL	*Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*, ed. socii Bollandiani, 2 vols., Brussels 1898–1901; Suppl. editio altera, Brussels 1911.
BHO	*Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis*, ed. by P. Peeters, Brussels 1910.
Bibl	*Biblica*, Rome 1920 seqq.
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale*, Cairo 1901 seqq.
Bijdragen	*Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie*, Nijmegen 1938 seqq.
BJ	*Bursians Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Leipzig 1873 seqq.
BJRL	*The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Manchester 1903 seqq.
BKV	*Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, ed. by O. Bardenhewer, T. Schermann (after vol. 35, J. Zellinger) and C. Weymann, 83 vols., Kempten 1911 seqq.
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Toulouse 1899 seqq.
BollAC	*Bollettino di archeologia cristiana*, ed. by G. B. de Rossi, Rome 1863–94.

Bréhier	L. Bréhier, *Le monde byzantin,* I–III, Paris 1947–50.
BThAM	*Bulletin de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale,* Louvain 1929 seqq.
ByZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* Leipzig–Munich 1892 seqq.
Byz(B)	*Byzantion,* Brussels 1924 seqq.
ByzNGrJb	*Byzantinische-Neugriechische Jahrbücher,* Athens–Berlin 1920 seqq.
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Freiburg i. Br. 1903–24; Paderborn 1931–9, 1957 seqq.
BZThS	*Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie u. Seelsorge,* Düsseldorf 1924–31.

CahArch	*Cahiers Archéologiques. Fin de l'Antiquité et Moyen-âge,* Paris 1945 seqq.
Cath	*Catholica. Jahrbuch für Kontroverstheologie,* (Paderborn) Münster 1932 seqq.
CathEnc	*The Catholic Encyclopedia,* ed. by C. Herbermann et al. 15 vols., New York 1907–12; index vol. 1914, supplementary vol. 1922.
Catholicisme	*Catholicisme, Hier — Aujourd'hui — Demain,* ed. by G. Jacquemet, Paris 1948 seqq.
CBQ	*The Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Washington 1939 seqq.
CChr	*Corpus Christianorum, seu nova Patrum collectio,* Turnhout–Paris 1953 seqq.
CH	*Church History,* New York–Chicago 1932 seqq.
Chalkedon	*Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte u. Gegenwart,* ed. by A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, I–III, Würzburg 1951–4.
ChQR	*The Church Quarterly Review,* London 1875 seqq.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915 seqq.
CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum,* begun by A. Boeckh, continued by J. Franz, E. Curtius and A. Kirchhoff, 4 vols., Berlin 1825–77.
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum,* ed. by the Berlin Academy, Berlin 1863 seqq.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850 seqq. (1871–87 Florence).
ClP	*Clavis Patrum Latinorum,* ed. by E. Dekkers, Steenbrugge, 2nd ed. 1961.
COH	*Het Christelijk Oosten en Hereniging,* Nijmegen 1949 seqq.
CSCO	*Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium,* Paris 1903 seqq.
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum,* Vienna 1866 seqq.
CSL	*Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum,* Turin.
CT	*Concilium Tridentinum.* Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatuum nova Collectio, edidit Societas Goerresiana promovendis inter Catholicos Germaniae Litterarum Studiis, 13 vols. so far, Freiburg i. Br. 1901 seqq.

Denzinger	H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* Freiburg i. Br., 31st ed. 1960.
DA	*Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* (1937–43: *für Geschichte des Mittelalters,* Weimar), Cologne–Graz 1950 seqq. (cf. *NA*).
DACL	*Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* ed. by F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, Paris 1924 seqq.
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément,* ed. by L. Pirot, cont. by A. Robert, Paris 1928 seqq.
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* ed. by R. Naz, Paris 1935 seqq.
Delehaye OC	H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs,* Brussels, 2nd ed. 1933.
Delehaye PM	H. Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires,* Brussels 1921.
Delehaye S	H. Delehaye, *Sanctus. Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité,* Brussels, 2nd ed. 1954.
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* ed. by A. Baudrillart et al., Paris 1912 seqq.

Diehl	E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones christianae latinae veteres,* 3 vols., Berlin, 2nd ed. 1961.
Dölger Reg	*Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Reihe A, Abt. 1: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches,* ed. by F. Dölger.
DomSt	*Dominican Studies,* Oxford 1948 seqq.
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* ed. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1941 seqq.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* ed. by M. Viller, Paris 1932 seqq.
DTh	*Divus Thomas* (before 1914: *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie;* from 1954 *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie),* Fribourg.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* ed. by A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, cont. by E. Amann, Paris 1930 seqq.
Duchesne LP	*Liber Pontificalis,* ed. by L. Duchesne, 2 vols., Paris 1886–92.
DVfLG	*Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* Halle 1923 seqq.

ECatt	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* Rome 1949 seqq.
EE	*Estudios ecclesiásticos,* Madrid 1922–36, 1942 seqq.
Ehrhard	A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jh.* (*TU* 50–52), I–III, Leipzig 1937–52.
ELit	*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Rome 1887 seqq.
EO	*Échos d'Orient,* Paris 1897 seqq. (from 1946 *RÉB*).
Eranos	*Eranos-Jahrbuch,* Zürich 1933 seqq.
EstB	*Estudios Bíblicos,* Madrid 1941 seqq.
EtB	*Études Bibliques,* Paris 1907 seqq.
EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* Bruges 1924 seqq.
Euseb. HE	Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (to 324) ed. by E. Schwartz (*GCS* 9, 1–3) Berlin 1903–9.
Evagrius HE	Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (431–594), ed. by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London 1898.

FC	*The Fathers of the Church,* New York 1947 seqq.
FF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte,* Berlin 1925 seqq.
FKDG	*Forschungen zu Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte,* Göttingen 1953 seqq.
Fliche–Martin	*Histoire de l'eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin, Paris 1935 seqq.
FlorPatr	*Florilegium Patristicum,* ed. by J. Zellinger und B. Geyer, Bonn 1904 seqq.

Gams	P. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae,* Regensburg 1873; supplement ibid. 1879–86.
García–Villada	Z. García–Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España,* 2 vols., Madrid 1929.
GCS	*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte,* Leipzig 1897 seqq.
Gelas.HE	Gelasius, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* ed. by G. Loeschke und M. Heinemann (*GCS* 28) Berlin 1918.
GhellinckP	J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Age. Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale,* I, Paris, 2nd ed. 1949, II–III, Brussels 1947–8.

Gn	*Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft* (Berlin) Munich 1925 seqq.
Gr	*Gregorianum,* Rome 1920 seqq.
Grumel Reg	V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople,* Kadiköi–Bucharest I/1 1932, I/2 1936, I/3 1947.
GuL	*Geist und Leben. Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (to 1947, *ZAM*), Würzburg 1947 seqq.

Hanssens	J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus,* I–V, Rome 1930 seqq.
Harnack DG	A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* 3 vols., Tübingen, 4th ed. 1909 seq. (photographic reprint, Tübingen, 5th ed. 1931 seq.).
Harnack Lit	A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* 3 vols., Leipzig 1893–1904.
Harnack Miss	A. von Harnack, *Die Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten,* 2 vols., Leipzig, 4th ed. 1924.
Hauck	A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands,* I–IV, Leipzig 1906–14, V 1929, I–V, Berlin–Leipzig 8th ed. 1954.
HAW	*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft,* founded by I. von Müller, newly ed. by W. Otto, Munich 1929 seqq.; new ed. 1955 seqq.
HDG	*Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* ed. by M. Schmaus, J. Geiselmann, A. Grillmeier, Freiburg i. Br. 1951 seqq.
HE	*Historia Ecclesiastica.*
Hefele–Leclercq	*Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux,* by C. J. Hefele, translated by H. Leclercq, I–IX, Paris 1907 seqq.
Hennecke–Schneemelcher	*Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung,* Founded by E. Hennecke, ed. by W. Schneemelcher, I–II, Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1959–64.
Hermes	*Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie,* Berlin 1866 seqq.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* (Cologne 1880 seqq.), Munich 1950 seqq.
HNT	*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament,* founded by H. Lietzmann (now ed. by G. Bornkamm), 23 parts, Tübingen 1906 seqq.
HO	*Handbuch der Orientalistik,* ed. by B. Spuler, Leiden 1948 seqq.
HThR	*The Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge, Mass. 1908 seqq.
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1859 seqq.

IER	*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* Dublin 1864 seqq.
IKZ	*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Berne 1911 seqq.
IThQ	*The Irish Theological Quarterly,* Dublin 1864 seqq.

JA	*Journal Asiatique,* Paris 1822 seqq.
JbAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum,* Münster 1858 seqq.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature,* published by the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, Boston 1881 seqq.
JdI	*Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts,* Berlin 1886 seqq.
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* London 1950 seqq.
Jerphanion	G. de Jerphanion, *La voix des monuments,* I–II, Paris 1932–8.
JLH	*Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie,* Kassel 1955 seqq.
JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41 (now *ALW*).
JÖByzG	*Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft,* Vienna 1951 seqq.

JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia 1888 seqq.
JRS	*The Journal of Roman Studies*, London 1910 seqq.
JSOR	*Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, Chicago 1917–32.
JThS	*The Journal of Theological Studies*, London 1899 seqq.
Jugie	M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium*, I–V, Paris 1926–35.

K	C. Kirch – L. Ueding, *Enchiridion fontium historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae*, Freiburg i. Br., 8th ed. 1960.
Karst G	J. Karst, *Littérature géorgienne chrétienne*, Paris 1934.
Katholik	*Der Katholik*, Mainz 1821 seqq. (General index for 1821–89).
KlT	*Kleine Texte*, ed. by H. Lietzmann, Berlin 1902 seqq.
König H	*Christus u. die Religionen der Erde. Handbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, ed. by F. König, I–III, Vienna, 2nd ed. 1956.
Kraus RE	F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyclopädie der Christlichen Altertümer*, 2 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1882–6.
Krumbacher	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantischen Literatur*, Munich 1890; 2nd ed. by A. Ehrhard and H. Gelzer, Munich 1897.
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma*, Göttingen 1955 seqq.
Künstle	K. Künstle, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*, I, Freiburg i. Br. 1928; II, Freiburg i. Br. 1926.

Lanzoni	F. Lanzoni, *Le Diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII*, 2 vols., Faenza, 2nd ed. 1927.
Lebreton	J. Lebreton, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité*, I–II, Paris, 4th ed. 1928.
Lietzmann	H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, I, Berlin 2nd ed. 1937 (3rd ed. 1953), II–IV 1936–44 (2nd ed. 1953).
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, Münster 1951 seqq.
LNPF	*A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Buffalo and New York 1886–90).
LQ	*Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen*, Münster 1918 seqq.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. by J. Höfer and K. Rahner, Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1957 seqq.
LuM	*Liturgie und Mönchtum. Laacher Hefte*, (Freiburg i. Br.) Maria Laach 1948 seqq.

MAH	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, Paris 1880 seqq.
Mai B	*Nova Patrum bibliotheca*, I–VII by A. Mai, Rome 1852–7; VIII–X by J. Cozza-Luzi, Rome 1871–1905.
Mai C	A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e vaticanis codicibus edita*, 10 vols., Rome 1815–38.
Mai S	A. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, 10 vols., Rome 1839–44.
MAMA	*Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Publications of the American Society for Archeological Research in Asia Minor, 7 vols., Manchester 1928–56.
Manitius	M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Munich, I 1911, II 1923, III 1931.
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols., Florence – Venice 1757–98; new impression and continuation ed. by L. Petit and J. B. Martin in 60 vols., Paris 1899—1927.
MartHieron	*Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, ed. by H. Quentin and H. Delehaye (*ActaSS* Nov. II, 2), Brussels 1931.

MartRom	*Martyrologium Romanum*, ed. by H. Delehaye, Brussels 1940.
MCom	*Miscelánea Comillas*, Comillas – Santander 1943 seqq.
MD	*Maison-Dieu*, Paris 1945 seqq.
MF	*Miscellanea francescana*, Rome 1886 seqq.
MG	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica inde ab a. C. 500 usque ad a. 1500;* indexes by O. Holder-Egger and K. Zeumer, Hanover – Berlin 1826 seqq. Sections:
MGAuctant	*Auctores antiquissimi.*
MGSS	*Scriptores.*
MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, 6 vols., Rome 1946.
MiscMohlberg	*Miscellanea Liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti Mohlberg*, Rome 1948.
Moricca	U. Moricca, *Storia della Letteratura latina cristiana*, 3 vols. in 5 tomes, Turin 1924–34.
MSR	*Mélanges de science religieuse*, Lille 1944 seqq.
MThZ	*Münchener theologische Zeitschrift*, Munich 1950 seqq.
Muratori	L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores ab anno aerae christianae 500 ad 1500*, 28 vols., Milan 1723–51; continuation by Tartini 1748–70. and N. G. Mittarelli 1771; new ed. by G. Carducci and V. Fiorini, Città di Castello 1900 seqq.
Muséon	*Le Muséon*, Louvain 1881 seqq.

NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Hanover 1876 seqq. (from 1937, *DA*).
NAG	*Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (till 1940, *NGG*), Göttingen 1941 seqq.
NBollAC	*Nuovo Bollettino di archeologia cristiana*, Rome 1895–1923 (Continuation of *BollAC*).
NC	*Nouvelle Clio. Revue mensuelle de la découverte historique*, Brussels 1947 seqq.
Nilles	N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis*, 2 vols., Innsbruck, 2nd ed. 1896 seq.
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*, Leiden 1956 seqq.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Tournai – Louvain – Paris, 1879 seqq.
NTS	*New Testament Studies*, Cambridge – Washington 1954 seqq.
NZSTh	*Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie*, Berlin 1959 seqq.

OrChr	*Oriens Christianus*, (Leipzig) Wiesbaden 1901 seqq.
OrChrA	*Orientalia Christiana (Analecta)*, Rome (1923–34: *Orientalia Christiana;* 1935 seqq: *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*).
OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Rome 1935 seqq.
OrSyr	*L'Orient Syrien*, Paris 1956 seqq.
OstKSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien*, Würzburg 1951 seqq.
OxP	*The Oxyrhynchos Papyri*, London 1898 seqq.

Pauly-Wissowa	*Paulys Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, new ed. by G. Wissowa and W. Kroll (with K. Mittelhaus), Stuttgart 1893 seqq.
PG	*Patrologia Graeca*, ed by J.-P. Migne, 161 vols., Paris 1857–66.
Philostorgius HE	Philostorgius, *Church History* (down to 425), ed. by J. Bidez (*GCS* 2), Berlin 1913.

PhJ	*Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* Fulda 1888 seqq.
Pitra A	J. B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata,* 8 vols., Paris 1876–91.
Pitra S	J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense,* 4 vols., Paris 1852–8.
PL	*Patrologia Latina,* ed. by J.-P. Migne, 217 vols. and 4 index vols., Paris 1878–90.
POR	*Patrologia Orientalis,* ed. by J. Graffin and F. Nau, Paris 1903 seqq.
PrOrChr	*Le Proche-Orient chrétien,* Jerusalem 1951 seqq.
PS	*Patrologia Syriaca,* ed. by R. Graffin, 3 vols., Paris 1894–1926.
PSI	*Papiri greci e latini della Società Italiana,* Florence 1912 seqq.
QFIAB	*Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken,* Rome 1897 seqq.
Quasten P	J. Quasten, *Patrology,* Utrecht–Brussels, I 1950, II 1953, III 1960.
R	M. J. Rouët de Journel, *Enchiridion Patristicum,* Freiburg i. Br., 19th ed.
Raby Chr	F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry,* Oxford, 2nd ed. 1953.
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. by T. Klauser, Stuttgart 1941 (1950) seqq.
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920 seqq.
RB	*Revue biblique,* Paris 1892 seqq.; new series since 1914.
RBén	*Revue bénédictine,* Maredsous 1884 seqq.
RD	M. J. Rouët de Journal and J. Dutilleul, *Enchiridion asceticum,* Freiburg i. Br., 5th ed. 1958.
RÉA	*Revue des Études Anciennes,* Bordeaux 1899 seqq.
RÉB	*Revue des Études byzantines* (Continuation of *ÉO*), Paris 1946 seqq.
RÉG	*Revue des Études Grecques,* Paris 1888 seqq.
RÉL	*Revue des Études latines,* Paris 1923 seqq.
RET	*Revista Española de teología,* Madrid 1941 seqq.
RevÉAug	*Revue des Études Augustiniennes* (Continuation of *L'Année Théologique Augustinienne),* Paris 1955 seqq.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921 seqq.
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* Tübingen 1909–13; 2nd ed. 1927–32; 3rd ed. 1956 seqq.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876 seqq.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900 seqq.
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'église de France,* Paris 1910 seqq.
RHLR	*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses,* Paris 1896–1907.
RhMus	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie,* Bonn 1833 seqq.
RHPhR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921 seqq.
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Paris 1880 seqq.
RicRel	*Ricerche Religiose,* Rome 1925 seqq.
Righetti	M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica,* Milan, I: Introduzione generale, 2nd ed. 1950; II: L'anno liturgico. Il Breviario, 2nd ed. 1955; III: L'Eucaristica sacrificio e sacramento, 1949; IV: Sacramenti — Sacramentali, 1953.
RivAC	*Rivista di archeologia cristiana,* Rome 1924 seqq.
RM	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäelogischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung,* Rome 1886.
ROC	*Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* Paris 1896 seqq.
RPAA	*Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia,* Rome 1923 seqq.

RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte*, Freiburg i. Br. 1887 seqq.
RQum	*Revue de Qumran*, Paris 1958 seqq.
RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali*, Rome 1908 seqq.
RSPhTh	*Revue de sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, Paris 1907 seqq.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse*, Paris 1910 seqq.
RSTI	*Rivista della storia della chiesa in Italia*, Rome 1947 seqq.
RThAM	*Recherches de Théologie anciennne et médiévale*, Louvain 1929 seqq.
Rufin. HE	Rufinus of Aquileia, Translation of Eusebius's *Church History*, ed. by T. Mommsen in *GCS* 9, Berlin 1909.

SA	*Studia Anselmiana*, Rome 1933 seqq.
SAB	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen* (till 1944: *Preussischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.* Phil-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1882 seqq.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte*, Freiburg i. Br. 1950 seqq.
SAH	*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Heidelberg 1910 seqq.
SAM	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Abt., Munich 1871 seqq.
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der* (after 225, 1, 1947: *Österreichischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Vienna 1831 seqq.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica*, Milan 1873 seqq.
SCpr	*Scriptores christiani primaevi*, The Hague 1946 seqq.
SE	*Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschapen*, Bruges 1948 seqq.
Seeberg	R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Leipzig, I–II, 3rd ed. 1922 seqq.; III, 4th ed. 1930; IV, 1, 4th ed. 1933; IV, 2, 3rd ed. 1920 (I–IV new impression, Basle 1953–4).
SO	*Symbolae Osloenses*, ed. by the Societas Graeco-Latina, Oslo 1922 seqq.
Socrates HE	Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (305–439), ed. by R. Hussey, 3 vols., Oxford 1853.
SourcesChr	*Sources chrétiennes*, ed. by H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, Paris 1941 seqq.
Sozom. HE	Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (324–425), ed. by J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen in *GCS* 50, Berlin 1960.
Speculum	*Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies*, Cambridge, Mass. 1926 seqq.
SQS	*Sammlung ausgewählter Kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften*, Tübingen 1893 seqq.
StC	*Studia Catholica*, Roermund 1924 seqq.
SteT	*Studi e Testi*, Rome 1900 seqq.
StrP	*Stromata Patristica et Medievalia*, ed. by C. Mohrmann and J. Quasten, Utrecht 1950 seqq.
StTh	*Studia Theologica, cura Ordinum Theologicorum Scandinavicorum edita*, Lund 1948 seqq.
StudiBiz	*Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici*, Rome 1925 seqq.
StudGen	*Studium Generale. Zeitschrift für die Einheit der Wissenschaften im Zusammenhang ihrer Begriffsbildung und Forschungsmethoden*, Berlin–Göttingen–Heidelberg 1948 seqq.
Sulp.Sev.Chron	Sulpicius Severus, *World Chronicle* (to 400), ed. by C. Halm (*CSEL* 1), Vienna 1866.

TD	*Textus et Documenta, Series Theologica*, Rome 1933–5.
ThBl	*Theologische Blätter*, Leipzig 1922 seqq.

Theodoret HE	Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* ed. by L. Parmentier, 2nd ed. by F. Scheidweiler *GCS* 44 (19) Berlin 1954.
ThJ	*Theologische Jahrbücher,* Leipzig 1842 seqq.
ThLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,* Leipzig 1900 seqq.
ThLz	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig 1878 seqq.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819 seqq.; Stuttgart 1946 seqq.
ThR	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen 1897 seqq.
ThRv	*Theologische Revue,* Münster 1902 seqq.
ThSt	*Theological Studies,* Baltimore 1940 seqq.
ThW	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* ed. by G. Kittel, cont. by G. Friedrich, Stuttgart 1933 seqq.
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basle 1945 seqq.
Tixeront	L. J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne,* 3 vols., Paris, 11th ed. 1930.
Tr	*Traditio,* New York 1943 seqq.
TSt	*Texts and Studies,* ed. Armitage Robinson, Cambridge 1891.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (till 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888 seqq.
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Archiv für die griechisch-christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte,* Leipzig – Berlin 1882 seqq.
Tüchle	H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte Schwabens,* I–II, Stuttgart 1950–4.
Ueberweg	F. Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* Berlin, I, 12th ed. 1926 by K. Praechter; II, 11th ed. 1928 by B. Geyer; III, 12th ed. 1924 by M. Frischeisen-Köhler and W. Moog; IV, 12th ed. by K. Österreich 1923; V, 12th ed. by K. Oesterreich 1928.
VigChr	*Vigiliae Christianae,* Amsterdam 1947 seqq.
ViVr	Βυζαντινὰ Χρονικά. *Vizantiyskiy Vremennik,* St Petersburg 1894 seqq.
VS	*La Vie Spirituelle,* (Ligugé, Juvisy) Paris 1869 seqq.
Wattenbach – Levison	W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, Vorzeit und Karolinger,* vols. I–III ed. by W. Levison and H. Löwe, Weimar 1952–7.
Wilpert	G. Wilpert, *I Sarcofagi cristiani antichi,* 3 vols., Rome 1929–36.
Zacharias Rhetor	Zacharias Rhetor, *Church History* (*circa* 450–540), ed. by E. W. Brooks, *CSCO* 83–84, Paris 1919–21.
ZAM	*Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (from 1947 *GuL*), (Innsbruck, Munich) Würzburg 1926 seqq.
ZBlB	*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen,* Leipzig 1884 seqq.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landgeschichte,* Munich 1928 seqq.
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig 1847 seqq.
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins,* Leipzig 1878 seqq.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1878 seqq.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* (Innsbruck) Vienna 1877 seqq.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* vols. 34 ff. Münster 1950 seqq. (*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 1–17, Münster 1911–27; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 18–25, Münster 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 26–27, Münster 1935–7; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 28–33, Münster 1938–41, 1947–9).

ZMkRd	*Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, Berlin 1884 seqq.
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, Giessen 1900 seqq., Berlin 1934 seqq.
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, Marburg 1948 seqq.
ZSavRGkan	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung*, Weimar 1911 seqq.
ZSavRGrom	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Romanistische Abteilung*, Weimar 1880 seqq.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für Schweizer Kirchengeschichte*, Fribourg 1907 seqq.
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, Tübingen 1891 seqq.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO CHURCH HISTORY

I. The Subject Matter, Methods, Ancillary Sciences, and Divisions of Church History, and its Relevance for Today

The Subject Matter

CHURCH history treats of the growth in time and space of the Church founded by Christ. Inasmuch as its subject matter is derived from and rooted in the Faith, it is a theological discipline; and in this respect it differs from a history of Christianity. Its theological point of departure, the idea of the Church, must not however be understood as though it were based on the structure of the Church as revealed in her dogma: a kind of preconceived pattern which history must follow and demonstrate, limiting or hindering the empirical establishment of facts based on historical sources. It refers solely to the Church's divine origin through Jesus Christ, to the hierarchic and sacramental order founded by Him, to the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit and to the eschatological consummation at the end of the world: the very elements, in fact, in which her essential identity consists, namely her continuity in spite of changing outward forms. The image of the "ship of the Church", sailing fully rigged and unchanged over the ocean of the centuries, is less apt than the comparison made by Vincent of Lerins wherein he compares it with the growth of the human body and of the seed which is sown, a growth "which involves no injury to its peculiar qualities nor alteration of its being" (*Commonitorium*, c. 29). As the grain of wheat germinates and sprouts, produces stalk and ear, yet always remains wheat, so does the Church's nature manifest itself in changing forms during the course of history, but remains always true to itself.

The historical character of the Church rests ultimately on the Incarnation of the Logos and Its entry into human history. It rests, above all, on the fact that Christ willed his Church to be a society of human beings, the "people of God" under the leadership of men: the apostolic college, the episcopate and the papacy. Thus He made her dependent on human actions and human weakness; but He has not left her entirely to her own devices. Her suprahistorical, transcendent entelechy is the Holy Spirit, who preserves her from error, produces and maintains holiness within her, and can testify to His presence by the performance of miracles. His presence and working in the Church, like those of grace in the individual soul, can be inferred from historically comprehensible effects, but belief in them is also necessary; and it is in the co-operation of these divine and human factors in time and space that Church history has its origin.

The understanding and interpretation of Church history depend then ultimately on the notion which a writer holds of the Church. To the philosophers of the Enlightenment, the Church appeared as a "natural society which exists alongside many others in the State";[1] according to their view the Church is indeed "founded by God, but God's spirit did not dwell in her": rather is she dominated by men. J. Möhler[2] opposed this anthropocentric conception with his own theocentric view, and defined Church history as "the series of developments of the principle of light and life imparted to men by Christ, in order to unite them once more with God and to make them fit to glorify him". Later, at the close of the nineteenth century, the fashion in historical writing required that Church history should be merged in secular history, that the ecclesiastical historian should become a profane historian,[3] and Albert Ehrhard then introduced the term "historical theology". He defined the task of the general Church historian as "the investigation and presentation of the actual course of the history of Christianity, in its organized manifestation as a Church, through all the centuries of its past, in the whole of its duration in time and in all aspects of its life".[4]

The beginning and end of Church history rest on a theological basis. It does not begin with the Incarnation, or even the choosing and sending forth of the apostles, but with the descent of the Holy Spirit on the primitive community at the first Pentecost;[5] and it ends with the Second Coming of our Lord. Within these chronological limits it has for its subject all the manifestations of the Church's life. These may be divided into external and internal factors: the former being the spread of the Church through the whole world, her relations with the non-Christian religions and the separated Christian communions and her relations with the State and society; the latter being the development and establishing of her dogma in the struggle against heresy, aided by the science of theology, the proclaiming of the Faith by preaching and teaching. To these internal activities must be added the fulfilling of her sacramental nature by the celebration of the liturgy and the administration of the sacraments, together with the preparation for these by pastoral care and their effect in works of Christian charity. Finally, there is the development of the Church's organization as a supporting framework for the fulfilment of the offices of priest and teacher, as well as the irradiation by the Church's work of every sphere of cultural and social life.

---

[1] E. Säger, *Die Vertretung der Kirchengeschichte in Freiburg* (Freiburg i. Br. 1952), 68.

[2] J. A. Möhler, *Ges. Schriften und Aufsätze*, ed. J. J. I. Döllinger, II (Regensburg 1840), 272.

[3] R. Fester, "Die Säkularisation der Historie", *HV* 11 (1908), 441–59.

[4] *Festschrift S. Merkle* (Düsseldorf 1922), 122.

[5] H. Zimmermann, "Über das Anfangsdatum der Kirchengeschichte" in *AKG* 41 (1959), 1–34.

That the conception of the Church is fundamental for the definition of the subject and purpose of Church history is clear if we compare the notions of the Church as defined by non-Catholic ecclesiastical historians. Church history cannot be conceived in the Hegelian sense as the dialectical movement of an idea (F. C. Baur), for the Church is not only a divine idea but also an historical fact. Its subject is not merely the "Church of the Word" (W. von Loewenich), the "history of the interpretation of Holy Scripture" (G. Ebeling), "the history of the Gospel and its effects in the world" (H. Bornkamm), or the Church as we find it in the New Testament (W. Delius): all these definitions being derived from the Protestant idea of the Church. Of the more recent definitions by Protestant historians the nearest to ours are those of K. D. Schmidt, for whom the Church is "Christ continuing to work in the world, His Body which is led by the Holy Spirit to all truth and whose history is wholly God's work, but also wholly man's", and of J. Chambon, who speaks of "the history of the Kingdom of God on earth". These later definitions safeguard the character in Church history as a theological discipline, but they are still influenced by the underlying Protestant conception of the Church, inasmuch as this is determined in the case of Schmidt by the writings of Luther, and in that of Chambon by the Calvinist doctrine of the Church.

The Methods of Church History

In fulfilling its task, Church history makes use of the historical method, whose application to the subject as defined above, namely the Church of faith which is also the visible Church, suffers no limitations arising from the subject itself. But it can sometimes lead to tensions between faith or theological postulates (which are identified with faith), on the one hand, and positively or apparently established historical fact, on the other; and this may confront the ecclesiastical historian with difficult decisions. The scientific honesty of Church history is not thereby affected: it is both theology and historical science in the strict sense; and the application of the historical method to it is carried out in three stages.

Firstly, like all history, Church history is bound by its sources. It can reveal about events and conditions in the past only what it finds in its sources, correctly interpreted: so much and no more. The sources (monumental and written remains, literary sources) must be sought out, tested for their genuineness, edited in accurate texts and investigated for their historical content. The first object of historical research thus conducted is the establishment of dates and facts which form the framework of all history. Without the knowledge of these, every further step (the tracing of origins, the determining of intellectual relationships and the evaluation of information) becomes unreliable or sinks to the level of mere conjecture. Only through the accessibility of the sources and by their critical study has Church history since the seventeenth century developed into a science. On this level of research, Church history is indebted for many important results to scholars outside the Church who do not acknowledge its character as a theological discipline. Even the denominational point of view is hardly noticeable here.

But, in the second stage, the causal connexion of the facts related, research into the motives of individuals and consequent judgments on ecclesiastical personalities, the assessment of spiritual and religious movements and of whole periods: all these go beyond the mere establishment of facts, and are based on presuppositions and standards of value which cannot be derived from history itself, yet cannot be separated from it. The recognition of human freedom of decision prevents the creation of determinist historical laws. Historical causality must remain open to the intervention and co-operation of transcendent factors; the possibility of extraordinary phenomena (such as mystical phenomena and miracles) must not be excluded *a priori*. The concepts which Church history has created or adopted for grouping together facts and religious or intellectual currents are based on judgments of value, especially when terms such as "Golden Age", "Decline", "Abuse" or "Reform" are used. The standards for judging persons and events must not be those of our own time, but must be adapted to the period in the Church's historical development with which we are dealing. Human failure and human sin are not in this way made relative, nor is human responsibility removed. There are historical guilt and historical merit; but the judgment of history is not a sentence pronounced upon the Church's past.

The historian's philosophical and religious point of view will demand respect at this second stage, that of historical presentation, if he is at pains to achieve the highest degree of objectivity and impartiality. Conflicts with philosophical systems, such as historical materialism, Spengler's biological view of history, or sociological schools of historical writing, are not part of the Church historian's task. It is, however, inevitable that these will influence not only judgments but also the selection of material and the literary form. The forms of presentation most frequently used today are the biography, the monograph and the essay. The biography seeks to understand a person of historical significance both as an individual and as a point of intersection of the forces at work in his period; if it is to achieve anything more than a statement of the bare facts and dates, personal utterances must also be included, derived from such sources as letters and diaries. The monograph, confined to a particular time and place, may deal with a period (as Duchesne and Lietzmann treated of the primitive Church, and H. von Schubert of the early Middle Ages), a single country (as Hauck wrote on the Church history of Germany, G. Villada on that of Spain, and Tomek on that of Austria) or a diocese; with institutions such as the papacy and the religious orders, events such as the General Councils, or religious and intellectual movements (as Borst wrote on the Cathari, and Maass on Josephinism). Alongside the strictly scientific monograph, the essay has in recent times become of increasing importance. It aims in the most concise and perfect literary form to interpret the essential character of historical persons and events, and to make this knowledge available to a wider reading public, but dispenses with sources and bibliographical references.

Yet, in the third and final stage, Church history as a whole can be understood only as the history of salvation: its ultimate meaning can be apprehended only by the eye of faith. It is the abiding presence of the Logos in the world and the fulfilment, in the "people of God", of Christ's community, in which ministry and grace work together. It is the growth of the Body of Christ: not a continuous falling away from the ideal of the early Church, as some would have us believe; nor yet a continuous progress, as the men of the Enlightenment imagined. The growth of the Church is sometimes hindered through internal or external causes; she suffers sickness, and experiences both reverses and periods of renewed vitality. She does not appear as the Bride without spot or stain, as those who believe in a purely "spiritual" Church in all ages have fondly thought her to be, but covered with the dust of centuries, suffering through the failures of men and persecuted by her enemies. Church history is therefore the theology of the Cross. Without injury to her essential holiness, the Church is not perfect: *semper reformanda,* she is in constant need of renewal. Although she is never to be superseded in the world of space and time by a "spiritual" church, she retains a provisional character and awaits perfection. When that goal is attained, in the Parousia, the path she has travelled during the course of history will be fully illuminated, the true meaning of all events will be understood and the finally valid judgments of human guilt and merit will be made. Only at the end of the world will the history of the Church, profane history and the history of salvation merge into one.

Ancillary Sciences of Church History

Church history makes use of the same ancillary sciences as general history, just as it makes use of the same methods. Chronology, epigraphy, palaeography, diplomatics, the use of archives and libraries, heraldry: all these are of practical importance; and so too in a wider sense are geography, cartography, and statistics. For a detailed treatment of these sciences, see the bibliography at the back of the book.

The Divisions of Church History

The divisions of Church history cannot be based on abstract historico-philosophical categories, any more than on the divine plan of salvation, whose details remain unknown, though its outlines are given in Revelation. They cannot be dependent on the relationship between the Church and her milieu, for "the Catholic Church is not identified with any civilization".[6] Any division into periods which corresponds with the facts and facilitates our understanding of them must take into consideration this truth: the inward and outward growth of the Church, brought about by the Holy Spirit in co-operation with human free will, is achieved by her constantly coming to terms with civilization. In her spreading over the whole earth and in her penetration of mankind and civilizations, peoples and societies, the Church makes use of the historical circumstances and she adapts herself to them: Church history is something midway between universal history and history of salvation.[7]

Division into periods became a problem only when the patterns of medieval historiography and the annalistic method of the Centuriators and Baronius had been superseded. The usual threefold division into Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and Modern Times, popularized since the seventeenth century by Cellarius (Christoph Keller), was adopted comparatively recently, by Möhler,[8] and has never become universal. A division that is convincing in all respects and generally accepted has not yet been found. If one considers primarily the unity of the Church and regards as epoch-making the breaking away of sects which followed the councils of the fifth century, the Greek Schism, and the Protestant Reformation, one ignores no less important events inside the Church, her expansion and her relations with civilization. The end of the old Canon Law (discussed by R. Sohm) and the rise of the papacy after the eleventh century are, from the constitutional point of view, the great dividing line; but all other viewpoints cannot be left out of account. The fourfold division adopted in this book seems to embrace the whole phenomenon of the Church throughout the changing ages, and to take into consideration both internal and external factors of development.

---

[6] "The Catholic Church does not identify herself with any civilization": Pius XII in his address to the Tenth International Congress of Historians on 7 September 1955.

[7] O. Köhler in *HJ* 77 (1958), 257.

[8] K. Heussi, *Altertum, Mittelalter und Neuzeit in der Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen 1921), 18 f.

1. The expansion and formation of the Church in the Hellenistic Roman world.

Growing outward from her native Jewish soil, the Church spread within the area of Hellenistic-Roman civilization over the whole Roman Empire and beyond its frontiers in the East, officially unrecognized and repeatedly persecuted until the time of Constantine, and then during the fourth century as the Church of the Empire. Her hierarchical system of government was organized with reference to the divisions of the Empire, the ecumenical councils were imperial councils; the primacy of the bishop of Rome did not infringe the extensive autonomy of the eastern patriarchates. After the rise of the Greek apologists in the second century, Christianity came to terms with the culture and religion of the East and the Hellenistic world, made use of Greek philosophy at the first four councils in the formulation of her trinitarian and christological dogmas, and employed forms of expression taken from Antiquity in her worship and art. As a consequence of the christological disputes, the national churches beyond the eastern frontiers of the Empire separated themselves from the imperial Byzantine church, while Germanic Christian kingdoms of both Arian (Ostrogothic and Visigothic) and Roman (Frankish) observance were formed in the western Empire. The rise of the specifically Roman Church of Gregory the Great and the Arab invasions of the seventh century marked the turning-point: the flourishing churches of North Africa and Syria withered away, and the Germano-Roman West became estranged from Byzantium.

2. The Church as the entelechy of the Christian nations of the West: A.D. 700–1300.

While the Greek church concentrated on the preservation of the traditions of primitive Christianity, the acceptance of the Catholic faith of the Roman Church by the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons, the consequent "germanizing" of Christianity and the alliance of the papacy with the Frankish empire in the eighth century created the only possibility of permeating with the Christian spirit the Germano-Roman nations (to the community of which were now added the converted western Slavs), encircled as they were by Islam and only loosely connected with Byzantium, and of passing on to them the treasures of ancient civilization.

The prevailing form of government in the feudal structure of society, which the Church found already existing and did not itself create, was the theocratic kingship of the renewed Western Empire, until, from the mid-eleventh century, the papacy, revitalized by the Gregorian reforms, rose through repeated conflicts with the secular power (most notably in the Investiture Controversy and in the struggles with the Hohenstaufen emperors Frederick I and Frederick II) to a position of dominating power and arbiter of the West, creating the Roman Curia as the instrument of the Church's central government. But the Church, as a result, became increasingly involved in power-politics and thus entangled with "the World". A more individual and highly subjective piety drove liturgical, objective devotion into the background; scholastic philosophy and Canon Law projected a Christian system of thought and order, not uniform indeed, but complete in its main outlines, which was developed at the universities.The mendicant orders of the thirteenth century took up the idea of poverty and devoted themselves principally to pastoral work in towns. Russia's attachment to Byzantium, as well as the Eastern Schism, increased the isolation of the West; the Crusades enlarged its horizons; the Mongol invasion made possible a temporary breach in the encircling wall of Islam and missionary attempts in the Far East. Boniface VIII, in conflict with Philip the Fair, formulated a theory of the papacy that was conditioned by the times, but was defeated by the catastrophe of Anagni.

3. The break-up of the western Christian world; reforms and Reformation; the transition to world-wide missionary activity.

The universalism of the two highest powers faded before the rise of the national states of western Europe. The unity of the Church, threatened by the Schism, was restored at the Council of Constance. Philosophical unity was lost through Nominalism, and the Church's monopoly of education through the spread of Humanism. Within the feudal social order the bourgeois culture of the cities and the beginnings of Capitalism confronted the Church with new problems which were never satisfactorily solved. The Church, so much in need of reform, became herself a problem, as the writings of Marsiglio of Padua and Wycliffe and the Conciliar Movement bear witness. The "Reformers", Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, claimed to bring at last the long-demanded reform, and separated all northern Europe and part of central Europe from the papacy. After the Council of Trent the Church opposed the Protestant Reformation with a Catholic Reform, renewed her religious life and was even able in the Counter-Reformation to win back lost territory. Missions in newly-discovered America and Asia enlarged the sphere of her activities. With the dying-down of denominational conflicts the secularization of the

European mind began; the papacy was unable to assert itself against the absolutist states. Western thought was no longer guided by the Church in the period of the so-called Enlightenment; and Revolution and secularization broke the external forms inherited from feudal times.

4. The world-wide Church in the industrial age.

The development of the Church in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries shows three recognizable tendencies. One trend involves the separation of the Church from the laicized State, the accentuation of the contrast between Christian and modern thought, together with an evolution to constitutional and democratic forms of government, the encouragement of lay activity at all social levels by means of modern methods of influencing the masses (as through trades-unionism and the press) and the taking up of the social question by the Church. A further tendency is seen in the intensification of religious life by means of the liturgical movement, the lay apostolate and new forms of pastoral work, and new religious orders. And, in a third context, the definitions of the First Vatican Council concerning the primatial power of the pope assured the latter's position within the Church, while the loss of the Temporal Power marked the beginning of an increase in his religious and moral authority over the Church's members. Through the world-wide missionary activity, which in the nineteenth century followed colonial expansion and in the twentieth began to detach itself from colonialism and European connexions, the Church became in fact a world religion and was forced to come to terms with the others (most notably with Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam) and with atheistic Communism. At the same time she began to encourage efforts towards the re-establishment of Christian unity.

The Relevance of Church History for Today

Church history is not the Church's cabinet of antiquities; it is her understanding of herself and therefore an integral part of ecclesiology. He who studies the development and growth of the Church in the light of faith enters into her divine-human nature, understands her as she is, not as she ought to be, learns to know the laws by which she lives and himself gains a clear view of her from within; his *sentire Ecclesiam* becomes *sentire cum Ecclesia,* and he will stand fast in every crisis. A prerequisite of this pragmatic way of writing Church history must of course be a strictly scientific investigation and an impartial presentation of the facts. If these tasks are carried out, Church history can and must draw conclusions that will be important for the understanding of the present day and modern problems. The history of the general councils throws light upon the present council, for this is but the most recent link in a long chain. The student of earlier attempts at reunion gains a view of ecumenical strivings which is balanced and free from illusions. The history of religious orders is more than the history of individual orders: these are branches on the tree of the Church, witnesses to the element of grace that is active within her and responses to the questions that face her in every age. When missionary history is concerned with the problems of adaptation and europeanization, it is making an important contribution towards a definition of the relations between civilization and the Church. Church history makes clear the original meaning of ecclesiastical institutions and opens the eyes to the need for reform: the question of the liturgy is an example of this.

In any case: "We cannot understand the Church at the present day if we have not first understood the *whole* of the Christian past."[9] To limit Church history to what is at present alive in the Church, or what is thought to be so, would be a form of pragmatism which, though indispensable as a principle of teaching, is unacceptable as a foundation for research and for the presentation of facts, inasmuch as it would endanger the scientific character of historical writing. Nevertheless, Church history is constantly being faced with the problems of the present day, as in the discussions about an ecumenical council or in the questions raised by the ecumenical movement. The value of Church history for religious education lies in the fact that it opens up the rich possibilities of the Christian life, and faces squarely the problems of the human element in the Church, of power, of sin and failure. But it can only achieve its object if it is presented in its entirety, not merely in summaries of religious history or in extracts of an apologetic nature. In its completeness it is the Church's most effective apologia; without it a purified love of the visible Church is hardly conceivable.

The ecclesiastical historian must have not only, like every historian, "a love of history" (J. G. Droysen), he must also bring to his task "Christian feeling and a Christian spirit";[10] that is, he must first have the Faith in order to explain it, and then he becomes "the interpreter of the working of the Holy Ghost upon earth".[11] He does not passively let the Church's past move before his eyes like a cinema film, because he is conscious that, as its interpreter, he is taking an active part in it. His relation to Church history is determined by his point of view within the Church; his faith is not prejudicial to his inner freedom in the search for truth and his will to judge impartially men and events. His metahistorical standard excludes relativist writing, but not the writing of true history.

---

[9] J. A. Möhler, *op. cit.* II, 287. [10] J. A. Möhler, *op. cit.* II, 282.

[11] J. Spörl, *Grundformen hochmittelalterlicher Geschichtsanschauungen* (Munich 1935), 20.

II. The Writing and Study of Church History

The Writing of Church History: its Beginning in Antiquity

"THE sense of history, which was comparatively active when the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles described the work of Christ and his apostles, remained almost without expression in the period when the Church was developing out of Christ's revelation and was acquiring its historical character, in the midst of struggles and persecutions" (Altaner). Amid a flood of apocryphal writings and legends, the genuine and ancient Acts of the Martyrs bear witness to this historical sense, in such sources as the *Martyrium Polycarpi,* the Acts of St Justin Martyr and of the Scillitani. So also do the historical accounts which the apologists, like Hegesippus and Irenaeus, inserted to support their proofs of Christianity. Somewhat later, attempts were made in the "World Chronicles" of Sextus Julius Africanus[1] († post 240) and Hippolytus of Rome[2] († 235) to fit the historical facts of the Incarnation and the rise and growth of the Church into profane and Old Testament history. The *World Chronicle* of Eusebius of Caesarea († 339), published in 303, was, in the free Latin version by Jerome, to set the pattern of this type of Christian historiography for more than a thousand years.

But it was Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* ('Εκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία) which made him the "Father of Church History". Published in its original form in seven books before the Diocletian persecution, it was afterwards continued down to 324 to include later events and enlarged to ten books. At the outset the author states his plan as follows: "I have decided to give an account in writing of the successors of the holy apostles and of the times that have gone by from the days of our Redeemer to ours; of the great and numerous events in the history of the Church, of all the excellent leaders and heads of the most respected congregations, of all those who have served the Word of God whether by speaking or writing; of the number and the times of those persons who, out of a desire for novelty, have allowed themselves to be led astray by the worst of errors, and have then proclaimed themselves as guides to a new wisdom which is no wisdom, like ravening wolves who rush without pity on Christ's flock; furthermore, of the fate that befell the Jewish people after their crime against our Saviour, and of the numerous grievous attacks to which the Word of God was exposed at the hands of the pagans; of the heroes who again and again fought for the Faith amid tortures and bloodshed, and finally of the witnesses to the Faith in our own days and of the ever-gracious, ever-loving mercy of our Redeemer."

---

[1] The surviving fragments are in *PG* 10, 63–94.

[2] The World Chronicle has been ed. by A. Bauer and R. Helm (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1955) *GCS* 46; cf. *LThK* V, 379 f.

In accordance with this programme (and making use also of the uncanonical sources Philo and Flavius Josephus), Eusebius describes in roughly chronological order the activities of Jesus and the apostles as well as the post-apostolic period: these matters are dealt with in Books I–III. Following these, Books IV—VII contain lists of bishops of the apostolic churches of Rome, Antioch and Jerusalem; but they also give an account of the heresies that arose, of the great ecclesiastical writers, and of persecutions by Jews and pagans. Books VIII and IX are devoted to "the persecution of our days"; and Book X to the victory of Christianity under Constantine. This last part has a supplementary account of the martyrs of Palestine and the laudatory life of Constantine by the same author. Eusebius in his history of the Church was "still unable to give an account that showed clearly the relation of cause and effect" (Altaner). However, by getting away from the eschatological viewpoint, he was the first to venture on a "solitary and untrodden path", to demonstrate in the history of Christ's chosen "people of God" the victory of God over the Devil and to "edify his readers" (III, 24). Because of his transcription of numerous documents and the excerpts he gives from writings now lost (such as those of Papias), Eusebius's work is by far the most important historical source for the first three centuries. The documents and the lists of bishops are fitted into the chronological framework of the emperors' reigns; the literary form follows the example of profane history, but it is written with "no mean skill" (E. Schwartz); its original contribution is its metaphysical basis.

Eusebius was followed by three continuators who all treat more or less of a common period. Socrates († 439), a lawyer of Constantinople, groups the ecclesiastical events of the years 305–439 around the great emperors; he uses good sources, is less involved than his predecessor in theological conflicts, and is therefore more impartial; above all, he is more lenient towards heretics. Sozomen, who was also a lawyer of Constantinople and who knew Socrates, was superior to the latter in literary skill but not in reliability or critical powers; in his presentation of events in the period 324–425 (dealt with in detail only to 421), his own point of view is kept entirely in the background. Theodoret of Cyrus, on the other hand, writes as a supporter of the Antiochian school and is often silent about the defects of his heroes; but, a versatile writer, he could describe events perceptively and vividly. In his account of the years 323–428 he has included many synodal decisions and letters, as well as other documents, though he is sometimes cursory and inexact in his chronology. Evagrius Scholasticus († 600), with his *Ecclesiastical History*, is the successor to the three continuators of Eusebius already mentioned.

He relates from a strictly orthodox but truthloving point of view the christological disputes of the period 432–594.

The three continuations in Greek of Eusebius's History were put together and extended to 527 by Theodorus Lector, whose work, however, only survives in an epitome. The later Byzantine chroniclers (such as Theophanes Confessor and Xantopulos) borrowed from his work. The chronicle written by the Monophysite John of Nikiu is important for the seventh century; it is written in Coptic but survives only in Ethiopian. The later Byzantine historiographers, although in the first place treating of State history, also recorded the theological disputes, particularly Georgios Pachymeres († 1310) and Nikephoros Gregoras († 1359–60).

The Latin Church meanwhile took over from the Greek historians. A Latin version of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* was made in 403 by Rufinus of Aquileia, who added two more books, for which perhaps (according to Heseler) the lost history of the Church by Gelasius of Caesarea served as a pattern. Cassiodorus arranged for the monk Epiphanius to translate into Latin the three continuators of Eusebius and, on the model of an already-existing Greek work by Theodorus Lector, to combine them into an *Historia tripartita.* Rufinus's version and the *Historia tripartita* became the basic ecclesiastical histories of the Middle Ages. The various subjects dealt with by Eusebius soon came to be treated separately. Between 374 and 377 Epiphanius of Salamis collected together eighty heresies in his "Medicine Chest" (Πανάριον).[3] In 392 Jerome published the first catalogue of Christian writers, comprising 135 names, which was augmented *c.* 480 by the semi-Pelagian Gennadius, and in the seventh century by Isidore of Seville and Ildefonsus of Toledo.[4] In the fourth century, lists of bishops began to be compiled, not with traditional dates but with regnal years worked out by reckoning backwards: such were the list of bishops of Jerusalem given by Epiphanius (66, 19f.) and the catalogue of Roman bishops in the chronicle of 354;[5] the earliest version of the *Liber Pontificalis* (down to Felix IV, 526–30) dates from the sixth century.

In both East and West the collecting of synodal canons concerning ecclesiastical discipline began in the second half of the fourth century. The oldest extant Greek collection is the systematically arranged collection of Johannes Scholasticus, compiled *c.* 550. In the West, that of Dionysius Exiguus dates from 500, and was the first of a long series of similar collections.[6] The oldest Acts of an ecumenical council to be preserved are those of Ephesus (431). Optatus of Mileve, between 330 and 347, collected documents to serve as a history of the Donatist heresy; and in 417 Augustine edited an account of the origins of the Pelagian dispute. To the second half of the sixth century belongs a collection made at Rome of letters of popes and emperors, which is known as the *Collectio Avellana* from the place where it was found.

---

[3] Ed. K. Holl, 3 vols. (Berlin 1915, 1921, 1933) *GCS* 25, 31, 37; *Altaner* 367f.

[4] *De viris illustribus, PL,* 23, 631–760; the new ed. by G. Herding (Leipzig 1924) also contains the continuation of Gennadius. For Isidore of Seville, see *PL,* 83, 1081–106; for Ildephonsus of Toledo, *PL,* 96, 195–206; cf. *Altaner* 10.

[5] Ed. by T. Mommsen, *MGAuctant* IX, 13–196; for list of Roman bishops, ibid., 73–76; cf. *RAC* II, 407–15 (L. Koep).

Christian biography of the pre-Constantinian period was aimed primarily at edification. Examples of this kind are the Life of Cyprian by Pontius, that of Antony by Athanasius, that of Macrina by Gregory of Nyssa, the *Vita Ambrosii* by Paulinus and the *Vita Augustini* by Possidius. In the monastic biographies of Palladius which appeared in the East and in the *Historia Lausiaca,* the historical account is overshadowed by demonism and miracle seeking.

The influence which Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* exercised on later histories of the Church through Rufinus' version and the *Historia tripartita* has been noted above. In a similar fashion Eusebius' *World Chronicle,* in Jerome's version, influenced later histories of the world and of salvation. Of less worth were the short "World Chronicles" of Sulpicius Severus (down to 400) and Prosper of Aquitaine (to 455); the *Chronicon* of Isidore of Seville (to 615) attained a higher reputation. But far more important for the historical thought of the Middle Ages than these collections was Augustine's *De civitate Dei* in twenty-four books, written in the period 413–26. Herein, the City of God, equated with the Church as a sacramental fellowship, is in incessant conflict with the *Civitas terrena,* which is not identified with any particular State, not even the Roman. The struggle between faith and disbelief is in this context the main theme of world history, conceived as the history of man's salvation. Like Augustine's *De civitate Dei,* the almost contemporaneous *Historiae adversus paganos* of Paulus Orosius provide an apologia for Christianity; he seeks to prove that Christianity is not responsible for the disasters of the age.

The history of the world and of salvation is usually divided according to one of two basic plans, though these show many variations. With reference to Psalm 89:4, which says that a thousand years are as a day in God's sight, and by analogy with the six days of Creation, history had been divided in Jewish Messianic writings into six millenia, which the Messianic kingdom was to follow as the seventh. Justin Martyr and Irenaeus had taken over this division and interpreted it chiliastically: the world will be consummated in as many "days" as were spent in its creation; after the year 6000 the thousand-year reign of Christ on earth will follow. Hippolytus and Lactantius converted the eschatological schema into a chronological one, which forms the basis of Jerome's *World Chronicle* and was also known to Augustine. Here, moreover, we find a parallel with the six ages of man (*infantia, pueritia, adolescentia, juventus, gravitas,* and *senectus*) and the threefold division from the viewpoint of human salvation: *ante legem, sub lege,* and *sub gratia.* The doctrine of the six ages of the world *(aetates mundi)* was bequeathed to the Middle Ages by Jerome and Augustine via Isidore of Seville and Bede's *De sex aetatibus mundi.*

---

[6] *PL,* 67, 139–316; for all older collections, C. Turner's *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta juris antiquissimi,* 3 vols. (Oxford 1899–1913) is still fundamental; cf. also E. Schwartz, "Die Kanonessammlungen der alten Reichskirche" in *ZSavRGkan* 25 (1936), 1–114.

The second schema divides world history according to the four empires: the Assyrian-Babylonian, the Persian, the empire of Alexander and the Roman Empire. This schema also is of non-Christian origin (it was used in the time of Augustus by Pompeius Trogus); but it was incorporated into Christian thought by Jerome with reference to the prophet Daniel (2:36ff.): the christianized Roman Empire will, as the last of the world-empires, remain until the end of the world. Sleidan clung to this view as late as the sixteenth century.

The Writing of History in the Middle Ages:
Christian History, not Church History

Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* found no imitators throughout the Middle Ages, even though the expression "Church history" occurs occasionally from the twelfth century onwards. During the transitional period the subjects of Christian historical writings are not the Church as such, but the christianized Germanic peoples and, later, monasteries, bishoprics, and saints. The medieval chronicler and annalist, in so far as he is not continuing the chronicle of Jerome, usually augments his account of contemporary events with information taken over uncritically from earlier authors, intended to serve as general historical background. He is concerned with world history and religious history, but not Church history. Three historians of the transitional period stand out: the Roman Gregory of Tours († 594) with his *History of the Franks* (to which is appended a short history of the bishops of Tours), the history of that people being regarded as the victory of the True Faith;[7] the Visigoth Isidore of Seville († 636),[8] with his *Chronica Majora* down to 615 (and in a second version to 625), famous also for his literary history, the

---

[7] *Historiarum libri X,* ed. R. Buchner, 2 vols. (Darmstadt 1955); *Wattenbach-Levison,* I, 99–108.

[8] *MGAuctant* XI, 391–506; *Wattenbach-Levison,* I, 86ff.

Etymologies, and his *History of the Visigoths;* the Anglo-Saxon Bede the Venerable († 735) with his *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, in which he shows how his people "became the Church of Christ".[9] Through his *De sex aetatibus mundi* and his method of calculating Easter, Bede became "the teacher of the whole of the Middle Ages" (Levison).

The "Christian era" established by Dionysius Exiguus in the Easter table of 532, which fixed Christ's birth in the year 754 *ab urbe condita* as the central point of time, marks in the field of chronology the triumph of the school which saw human history as the history of salvation. World history begins with man's creation by God, follows the human race in its God-directed course under the Old and New Covenants, and finally relates the history of the Kingdom of Christ on earth, in which the Christian State and the Church form one body containing both good and evil men, until at the end of time the Lord will separate the former from the latter and the New Jerusalem will become a reality. The amalgamation of the concept of the Kingdom of God with the Church had for its result that the Middle Ages did indeed produce Christian history, but not Church history in the modern sense of the term: "Ecclesiastical historiography takes up the whole historical field" (Zimmermann). By the climax of the Middle Ages this kind of historical writing had developed three literary forms: the world chronicle, annals, and biography.

The numerous world chronicles not only draw their material about early periods from the chronicles of Eusebius and Jerome, and their continuators, but also retain the view of history established in the post-Constantinian "imperial" Church: the regnal years of the emperors form the chronological framework into which the succession of popes and other secular or ecclesiastical events are fitted. The closer they come to the author's own period, the more frequent are the events narrated from personal knowledge and the higher the value of the chronicles as sources. The *Chronicon* of Regino of Prüm provides a typical example:[10] starting from the birth of Christ, it is a mere compilation to the reign of Louis the Pious; but from there till its conclusion in 906 it becomes a good source for the late Carolingian period. The *Chronicon Augiense* of Hermann the Lame of Reichenau († 1054),[11] which reflects the many-sided knowledge of its author, is pre-eminent for its careful use of older models; and in its later part it develops into a history of the Empire. Sigebert of Gembloux takes pains in his prosaic and summary chronicle (finished before 1105) to arrange the events of imperial and ecclesiastical history in correct chronological order, and bases his work on a wealth of source material.[12] Frutolf of Michelsberg and Ekkehard of Aura make use of him in their chronicle, one of the masterpieces of medieval historiography, which extends to 1106 and 1125, and contains valuable information on the Investiture Dispute. Otto of Freising († 1185), the greatest German historian of the Middle Ages, does indeed indicate in the title of his work[13] that Augustine, not Eusebius through Jerome, was his master. For him the Empire is only "the shadow of a great name"; he believes in the realization of the *Civitas Dei* in a Christian empire, and addresses himself with his eschatological outlook more to the religious reader than to the enquiring historian.[14]

---

[9] Ed. C. Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford 1896), I, 73: "nostrum gentem ... Christi fecit Ecclesiam"; W. Levison: "Bede as Historian" in *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit* (Düsseldorf 1948), 347–82.

[10] Ed. F. Kurze (Hanover 1890); H. Löwe, "Regino von Prüm und das historische Weltbild der Karolingerzeit" in *Rhein. Vierteljahresblätter* 17 (1952), 151–79, new offprint in Lammers (ed.), *Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Arbeiten aus den Jahren 1933–1959* (Darmstadt 1961), 91–134.

[11] *MGSS* V, 67–133; R. Buchner, "Geschichtsbild und Reichsbegriff bei H. von R. in *AKG* 42 (1960), 27–60.

The primary concern of the annalists, when they were not officially employed in writing State annals, was the recording of events, whether known by tradition or from personal experience, which affected their own diocese or abbey. If through family or personal relationships they were involved in matters of more general importance, their range of vision was widened, as in the case of Thietmar of Merseburg († 1018). Diocesan annals were compiled in episcopal cities which, through their schools, took part in the flourishing intellectual life of the age of the Saxon and Salian emperors, as did Hildesheim, Magdeburg, Liège, and Trier. But few of these can be ranked as histories, save perhaps the history of the church of Rheims by Flodoard († *c.* 966) and the *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum* by Adam of Bremen († 1081), the best part of which is the biography of Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen.[15] Obit books and necrologies, in which dates of death are noted in the calendar, owe their origin to the desire to include founders and benefactors in the community of prayer and sacrifice; and the lists kept in many monasteries, such as Fulda and St Blasien, show a continuous record of the deaths of inmates and benefactors.

---

[12] *MGSS* VI, 300–74; *Manitius* III, 344 ff.

[13] *Chronicon sive Historia de duabus civitatibus,* ed. A. Hofmeister (Hanover-Berlin, 2nd ed. 1912); *Manitius* III, 376–88; H. M. Klinkenberg, "Der Sinn der Chronik Ottos von Freising", *Festschrift G. Kallen* (Bonn 1957), 63–76; E. Meuthen, "Der ethische Charakter der civitates bei Augustinus und ihre platonische Fehldeutung", ibid., 43–62; J. Koch, "Die Grundlagen der Geschichtsphilosophie Ottos von Freising" in *MThZ* 4 (1953), 79–94, reprinted in Lammers, *op. cit.* 321–49; *O. von Fr., Gedenkgabe zu seinem 800. Todesjahr* (Freiburg i. Br. 1958), with contributions by J. Spörl, J. Staber etc.

[14] "Sic de utraque dicere proposuimus, ut tenorem hystoriae non omittamus, quatinus et religiosus auditor, quid in mundanis rebus ob innumeras mutationum miserias abhorrendum sit, animadvertat ac studiosus seu curiosus indagator non confusam rerum preteritarum seriem inveniat": Hofmeister's ed., 9.

[15] Flodoard, *MGSS* XIII, 404–599. Adam of Bremen: B. Schmeidler (Hanover–Berlin, 3rd ed. 1917); there is a rather unsatisfactory interpretation in M. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie* (Frankfurt 1955–62), III, 1, 251–61.

In the *Vita* or biography, which is usually but not invariably the life of a saint, the main purpose is edification. The *Vitae* of extraordinary men are designed to serve as examples of virtue, and their nearness to God is demonstrated by miracles. Virtues and miracles are therefore their main theme. This tendency, together with the use made of classical or Christian models (including Suetonius, Sallust, and Sulpicius Severus), by no means excludes concrete facts with definite literary intentions. Ruotger, in his Life of Bruno of Cologne (written in 967–9), portrays a bishop of the Empire as he ought to be;[16] abbot Norbert of Iburg, in his Life of Bishop Benno of Osnabrück (written between 1090 and 1108), does not conceal his subject's human weaknesses, so that the reader may therefore pray for the soul of the abbey's founder. The Life of Anselm of Canterbury by Eadmer (composed soon after the saint's death in 1109) is based on information supplied by Anselm himself and on an intimate knowledge of his personality: his holiness is illustrated not by miracles, but by his constant fidelity to the monastic ideal. From the thirteenth century, hagiographical literature came under the influence of the collections of *exempla* compiled with a view to preaching. Such is the Life of Engelbert of Cologne by the Cistercian Caesarius of Heisterbach, which shows a clear relationship with the same author's collections of *exempla.*[17] The *Vitae* of the great founders of orders, such as St Francis of Assisi, owe their origin to the desire of the orders to possess a model picture of their founders.

The reform movement of the eleventh century and the Investiture Dispute seem to have provided a new impulse to the writing of Church history, perhaps even to mark a turning-point. The struggle for the independence of the spiritual power, against lay domination, once more made the Church as such a subject for historiography. In the literature of reform the primitive Church appears as the ideal towards which the Church of the present, her clergy and monks, must strive: that is, not merely the primitive Church of apostolic times, but the "ancient Church"; and even the phrase "Church history" reappears. In the prologue to his *Historia ecclesiastica,* the second version of which was finished in 1110, Hugh of Fleury promises to lead the reader to the hidden secrets of the Church concealed in history; but his title hides merely a further compilation of sacred and profane history.[18] Neither does the work of Ordericus Vitalis, bearing the same title and ending with the year 1141, by any means fulfill its author's claims, in spite of its originality: *Ecclesia Dei* means for him both the whole Church and individual churches; the *gesta Dei* happen in her and to her, not through her.[19] For John of Salisbury († 1180), the keenly observant secretary of Thomas Becket and later Bishop of Chartres, the history of the Church, whose beginnings are related in the Acts of the Apostles and whose growth Eusebius has described, is already a history of the priesthood and thus of the papacy,[20] as it was also for the Dominican Bartholomew of Lucca († 1326) writing two centuries later. The latter's *Historia ecclesiastica nova*[21] identifies the kingdom of Christ with the reign of the Roman pontiffs: for the contemporary of Boniface VIII and John XXII the dualism of the two kingdoms no longer existed. But Bartholomew's work, again, was no real Church history.

---

[16] Ed. I. Ott (Weimar 1951, new impression 1958); F. Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis des Ruotger* (Bonn 1958). A new impression of H. Bresslau's ed. of the genuine *Vita Bennonis* (1902) also appeared in 1956. For Eadmer see M. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie,* (Frankfurt 1955–62), III, 1, 215–61.

[17] The old ed. of the *Dialogus miraculorum* by J. Strange (2 vols., Cologne 1851) has been supplied with an index in the new impression (1922), but has not been replaced by a new ed.; the Life of Engelbert has been edited by F. Zschaeck: *Die Wundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach,* III (Bonn 1937), 225–328. For a general survey of medieval exempla literature, see A. Hilka, ibid., I (Bonn 1933).

The germ of a new method of writing Church history which appeared in the creative twelfth century never in fact developed. On the contrary, the Church became at that time the subject of "historical theology". Rupert of Deutz († 1129) associates creation, redemption, and sanctification with the three persons of the Trinity; sanctification occurs through the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, who works in the Church.[22] Like Rupert, Gerhoh of Reichersperg, who followed in his wake, is not interested in reporting facts but in interpreting them and finding their symbolic relationships.[23] Anselm of Havelberg († 1158) developed an interpretation of the Apocalypse which he found already existing. He divided the history of the Church into seven parts: the white horse of the Apocalypse is the primitive Church, the red horse the age of persecutions, the black horse the attacks of heretics, the pale horse signifies the false brethren, rendered harmless by the monks; the subsequent periods belong to the final age which will precede the end of the world. The Holy Spirit renews the world by means of the monks. He is the principle of progress in the Church.[24] From Anselm it is but a step to Joachim of Floris († 1202), the Calabrian Cistercian abbot, who in his commentary on the Apocalypse divides the history of salvation into three periods: the age of the Father, or the Old Testament, in which the Law ruled; the age of the Son, or the New Testament, in which faith and grace rule, and the imperfections of which will be removed in the third age: the approaching age of the Holy Spirit, who will bring the fullness of grace and the dominion of love. Instead of the present, imperfect, Petrine Church there will appear at a time which can be calculated from Holy Scripture (about the year 1260) the perfect Johannine Church of the Spirit, in which the eternal gospel will be proclaimed.[25] The Church of the present is not the final form of Christ's Church; it can and will be superseded by a church of the Spirit.

---

[18] *MGSS* IX, 349–64 (little more than the prologues); *PL,* 163, 821–54; cf. *Manitius* III, 518 ff. The words referred to in the Prologue are: "Praeterea hujus historiae liber nimis profunda latenter continet ecclesiae sacramenta" (350).

[19] *PL* 188, 15–984. In the Prologue, Ordericus justifies this title: he writes "de rebus ecclesiasticis ut simplex ecclesiae filius ... unde praesens opusculum ecclesiasticam historiam appellari affecto" (16). Cf. H. Wolter, *Ordericus Vitalis. Ein Beitrag zur kluniazensischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden 1955); see also T. Schieffer, *ZKG* 62 (1955–6), 336 ff.

[20] *Historia Pontificalis,* ed. M. Chibnall (London 1956); H. Hohenleutner, "John of Salisbury in der Literatur der letzten zehn Jahre" in *HJ 77* (1958), 493 ff. A history of the popes preserved in a MS at the abbey of Zwettl also dates from the twelfth century: cf. K. Ross, *Die Historia Pontificum Romanorum aus Zwettl* (Greifswald 1932).

[21] *Muratori* XI, 753–1216: cf. M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben* I, 354 ff.

[22] *PL,* 167–170. For the critical ed. now in preparation, cf. R. Haacke, "Die Überlieferung der Rupertus-Schriften" in *DA* 16 (1960), 397–436; W. Kahles, *Geschichte als Liturgie. Die Geschichtstheologie des Rupertus von Deutz* (Münster 1960): the attitude is unhistorical.

Joachim's view of history determined not only the historical interpretation of the Franciscan spiritual writers such as Ubertino of Casale and Peter John Olivi,[26] who saw in Francis of Assisi the proclaimer or at least the precursor of the "eternal gospel"; his influence is traceable even in such a lively historian as Salimbene of Parma. And for Bonaventure himself the actual purpose of studying history is "not the understanding of the past, but prophecy about what is to come".[27] Late medieval studies of the Apocalypse frequently follow Joachim's lines of thought.[28] Nicholas of Cusa draws a parallel between the historical life of Jesus and that of His mystical body the Church: to every year of our Lord's life corresponds a period of fifty years in the history of the Church. As the Precursor appeared in Jesus's twenty-ninth year, so will the Holy Spirit awake in the Church about the year 1450, and the kingdom of God will be spread by saints throughout the world; but then, corresponding to the thirtieth year of our Lord's age, will begin the passion of the Church and her persecution by Antichrist.

---

[23] *PL,* 193 and 194; *Opera inedita,* ed. P. Classen, I (Rome 1955); E. Meuthen, *Kirche und Heilsgeschehen bei G. von R.* (Cologne 1959); P. Classen, *G. von R., Eine Biographie* (Wiesbaden 1960); H. Hürten in *HJ* 80 (1961), 265–9.

[24] *PL* 188, W. Kamlah, *Apokalypse und Geschichtstheologie* (Berlin 1935); K. Fina, "Anselm von Havelberg", *APraem* 32 (1956), 69–101 and 193–227; W. Berges, *Jahrbuch für Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands* 5 (1956), 39 ff.

[25] The collected ed. by E. Buonaiuti, for the *Fonti per la storia d'Italia,* is not yet complete. Cf. H. Grundmann, *Studien über J. von F.* (Leipzig 1927); idem, *Neue Forschungen über J. von F.* (Marburg 1950); M. W. Bloomfield, "J. of F., a Critical Survey" in *Tr* 13 (1957), 249–311.

[26] R. Manselli, *La Lectura super apocalypsim di P. G. Olivi* (Rome 1955); also important is Alexander Minorita, *Expositio in Apocalypsim,* ed. A. Wachtel (Weimar 1955).

[27] J. Ratzinger, *Die Geschichtstheologie des hl. Bonaventura* (Munich 1959), 22; Salimbene's *Chronica,* ed. F. Bernini, 2 vols. (Bari 1942); N. Scivoletto, *Fra Salimbene da Parma e la storia politica e religiosa del secolo XIII* (Bari 1950).

These systems of historical theology had their origin in the unsatisfactory condition of the Church of the time, which was so much in need of reform; and, with the Church's past in mind, they developed into the so-called theory of decadence: namely, that the history of the Church is that of a continuous falling away from the ideal state of the primitive Church.[29] Sometimes this theory is expressed in the form of a division into periods: the Golden Age of the martyrs was succeeded by the Silver Age of the great Fathers of the Church, the Bronze Age of the monks and finally by the contemporary Iron Age, in which moral decay provokes the judgment of God. The theory of decadence does not, like the theologies of history and the apocalyptic interpretations, involve the undervaluing of historical facts; apart from reforming works, it is to be found in the writings of such important historians as Dietrich of Niem and Thomas Ebendorfer.[30] But knowledge of the Church's historical past was hardly increased between the thirteenth century and the end of the fifteenth. Writers were content to recapitulate what already existed, as did Vincent of Beauvais († 1264) in his *Speculum historiale,*[31] or to reduce it to synoptic form, as did Martin of Troppau († 1278) in his tabular chronicle of emperors and popes, which had many continuators and was translated into several languages.[32] These two, as well as Bernard Gui

---

[28] J. Rohr's "Die Prophetie im letzten Jahrhundert vor der Reformation als Geschichtsquelle und Geschichtsfaktor" in *HJ* 19 (1898), 22–56 and 447–66, has not yet been superseded; cf. ibid., 32 f., concerning the work *De eversione Europae,* falsely ascribed to St Vincent Ferrer; N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium* (London 1957), concerns mainly the earlier Middle Ages. For the Franciscan J. Hilten (c. 1500) and his commentary on Daniel and the Apocalypse, see H. Volz in *ZKG* 67 (1955–6), 111–15.

[29] No thorough research on this subject has yet been done; cf. E. Seeberg, *Gottfried Arnold* (Meerane 1923), 285 ff.

[30] Thomas Ebendorfer's *Schismentraktat,* ed. H. Zimmermann in *AÖG* 120 (1954), 45–147; A. Lhotsky, *T. Ebendorfer* (Stuttgart 1957), 109 f. and 125 f..

[31] Cf. K. Young, "The Speculum Majus of V. of B.", *The Yale University Library Gazette* 5 (1930), 1–13; B. L. Ullmann, "A Project for a new Edition of V. of B.", *Speculum* 8 (1933), 212–26.

[32] *MGSS* XXII, 377–475. For continuations, see H. Schmidinger, "Das Papstbild in der Geschichtsschreibung des späten Mittelalters", *Röm. Hist. Mitteilungen* 1 (1958), 106–29

(† 1331)[33] and Antoninus of Florence († 1459), belonged to the Dominican order. The latter's chronicle had for its purpose the promotion of virtuous actions by historical examples.[34] The numerous compendia of papal history show new and individual characteristics specifically for the popes of the period.[35] The strong nationalistic tones, already audible in Matthew Paris[36] and Alexander of Roes[37] grow louder in the French biographies of the popes of the Avignon epoch and the years of the Great Schism. Catalogues of bishops and abbots were compiled, and the great orders wrote their chronicles.

The literary history of the Church, whose ancient standard works (by Jerome, Gennadius and Isidore of Seville) had been continued in the twelfth century by Sigebert of Gembloux and Honorius of Autun, was little advanced by the catalogue of Henry of Brussels (formerly ascribed to Henry of Ghent) or by that of Arnold Geylhoven of Rotterdam († 1442) more than a century later, or by other works of that kind.[38] Only the list of writers compiled by the Benedictine abbot Johannes Trithemius († 1516) is based on extensive researches, but it is disfigured by many errors and confusions.[39]

---

esp. 113 f. and 120. One of the few critical editions of late medieval papal and imperial chronicles is that of Andreas of Regensburg: *Chronica Pontificum et Imperatorum Romanorum*, ed. G. Leidinger (Munich 1903).

[33] For Gui's *Flores chronicorum*, the *Catalogus brevis Pont. Rom. et Imperatorum* and the *Tractatus de temporibus et annis generalium et particularium conciliorum*, all written in the second decade of the fourteenth century, cf. *HistLittFrance* XXXV, 139–232; *DHGE* VIII, 667 ff. (G. Mollat).

[34] R. Morçay, *St Antonin* (Tours-Paris 1914), 322 ff.; B. Walker, *The Chronicles of St Antonin* (Washington 1933).

[35] Excerpts from the *Actus Romanorum Pontificum* of Amalricus Augerii are in Baluze and Mollat, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, I 89 ff., 183 ff., and 405 ff.; for Ebendorfer's *Chronica Pont. Rom.*, see Lhotsky, *op. cit.* 59 ff.

[36] *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, 7 vols. (London 1872–84); R. Vaughan, *Matthew of Paris* (Cambridge 1958).

[37] A. von R., *Schriften* ed. and trans., H. Grundmann and H. Heimpel (Weimar 1949); Heimpel, "A. von R. und das deutsche Selbstbewußtsein des 13. Jh." in *AKG* 26 (1935), 19 ff.; idem, "Über den Pavo des A. von R." in *DA* 13 (1957), 171–227, reprinted in Lammers, *op. cit.* 350–417.

[38] P. Lehmann, "Literaturgeschichte im Mittelalter", *Erforschung des MA* I, (Stuttgart 1941), 82 ff.; F. Pelster, "Der Heinrich von Gent zugeschriebene Catalogus Virorum Illustrium und sein wirklicher Verfasser" in *HJ* 39 (1919), 234–64; Lehmann, "Der Schriftstellerkatalog des A. G. von Rotterdam" in *Erforschung des MA* (Stuttgart 1961), 216–36; A. Auer, *Ein neugefundener Katalog der Dominikanerschriftsteller* (Paris 1933); T. F. Bonmann, *Die literaturkundlichen Quellen des Franziskanerordens im MA* (Fulda 1937).

[39] *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, completed in 1494 and printed in the same year at Mainz; for the sources, see I. Silbernagl, *J. Trithemius* (Regensburg 1885), 61 ff.; H. Jedin, "Fra contemporanei del Tritemio" in *Benedictina* (1948), 231–6.

The great events of ecclesiastical history did of course find their historians. Dietrich of Niem, Ludolf of Sagan, and Martin of Alpartil wrote of the Schism[40] and John of Segovia of the Council of Basle.[41] But for the period after the thirteenth century the scope and value of their work are swallowed up by the rapidly swelling stream of documents, letters, deeds, and other records of the most varied kinds, as well as liturgical books and rubrics. The papal registers have been preserved from 1198 onwards, albeit with some gaps; the register of petitions, which begins with Clement VI, comprises 7,365 volumes, down to the pontificate of Leo XIII. The collections of documents and *regesta* of the German bishoprics and provinces, as well as of the cities that were ever increasing in importance, became more and more extensive,[42] and are augmented by lists of property, copies of deeds, account-books, and tax-lists. Letters and collections of letters make possible the writing of genuine, vivid biographies; and the admittedly still sporadic reports of ambassadors (like those of the Aragonese ambassadors at the Curia and of the participants in the Councils of Basle and Constance), and the acts of the councils and imperial diets give us a glimpse into the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs.

The Flowering of Church History from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century

The contribution of Humanism to the revival of Church history was the result of the Humanists' cry: "Ad fontes!" By making the sources (and first of all those for the history of the early Church) flow again, they broke the drought of the late medieval compendia. As regards the earlier period, the papal biographies of Bartolomeo Platina († 1481) were no more than a stylistic rewriting of the *Liber Pontificalis.*[43] Lorenzo Valla's criticism of the Donation of Constantine[44] marked a new beginning, which could however be further developed only when the art of printing had begun not only to multiply single works by the Fathers and by later ecclesiastical writers, but also to produce collected editions. In the preliminary work of this kind questions of authenticity arose, the feeling for literary form was awakened, authors began to enter into the language and spirit of the early Church and learnt to know her institutions. Although Erasmus was by nature a philologist, not an historian, we cannot leave him out of account in connexion with the revival of the historical sense. It was from his circle that the earliest editions of the ancient Christian histories issued. Beatus Rhenanus edited in 1523 the Latin version of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Historia tripartita;*[45] in 1544 the works of Eusebius and Theodoret were published in the original Greek. About the same time there appeared the still very imperfect editions of the councils by Merlin and Crabbe. Sources which had hitherto been employed only in derivative form and at second hand (such as Gratian's *Decretum*) were now directly accessible. That they were used for the writing of a history of the Church was, it must be admitted, a result of the Reformation.

---

[40] Dietrich of Niem, *De Schismate,* ed. G. Erler (Leipzig 1890); cf. Heimpel, *Dietrich von Niem* (Münster 1932), 181–268; Ludolf of Sagan: *De Longevo Schismate,* ed. G. Loserth in *AÖG* 60 (1880), 411 ff.; Martin of Alpartil: *Chronica actitatorum temporibus D. Benedicti XIII,* ed. by F. Ehrle (Paderborn 1906).

[41] *Historia gestorum generalis synodi Basiliensis,* in *Monumenta Conc. gen. saeculi XV,* II–IV (Vienna-Basle 1873–1935); cf. U. Fromherz, *Johann von Segovia als Geschichtsschreiber des Konzils von Basel* (Basle 1960).

[42] For a general survey of narrative sources for the history of German bishoprics and cities, see Jacob and Weden, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte im MA* (5th ed. Berlin 1952), III, 128–142. The marked lack of information on sources for Church history from this time forward has been partly remedied for Germany by G. Wolf in *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte,* 2 vols. (Gotha 1915–22).

[43] The *Liber de vita Christi et pontificum* (Venice 1479) ends at 1474, but numerous later editions and continuations take it beyond that date.

[44] L. Valla, *De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio,* written 1440,

Luther's historical view of the Church was determined by his conviction that the true, biblical, doctrine of salvation had been falsified through the guilt of the papacy and by Aristotelean scholasticism, and that a thorough reform of the Church was possible only by a return to that doctrine of salvation and a laying aside of "human ordinances". This view, which gave quite a new turn to the theory of decadence, demanded a Church history that would justify it. The *Historia ecclesiastica,*[46] written by the strict Lutheran Matthias Flacius (actually Vlačich, 1520–75) with the help of Johannes Wigand and other collaborators, and generally known because of its divisions and place of origin as the *Magdeburg Centuries,* sought to prove by a wealth of systematically arranged references to sources that Lutheranism, and not the papal Church, was in agreement with the doctrine of the early Church. In 1556 this work was preceded by a catalogue of witnesses to evangelical truth in papal times. This powerful attack at once provoked a series of replies, partly inadequate

ed. W. Schwalm (Leipzig 1928). For later medieval discussions of its authenticity, see D. Laehr, "Die Konstantinische Schenkung in der abendländischen Literatur des ausgehenden MA" in *QFIAB* 23 (1931–2), 120–81; Jedin, *Studien über Domenico de Domenichi* (Wiesbaden 1958), 264–8.

[45] *Auctores historiae ecclesiasticae* (Basle 1523) contains only the Latin versions of Eusebius' Church History by Rufinus, the *Historia Tripartita* and texts from Theodoret; a new and improved ed. was published at Basle in 1544.

[46] Fourteen vols. (Basle 1559–74): the last, incomplete, ed. was published at Nuremberg 1757–65; W. Preger, *M. Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit,* 2 vols. (Erlangen 1859–61); P. Polman, "Flacius Illyricus, Historien de l'Eglise" in *RHE* 27 (1931), 27–73; M. Mirkovič, *Matia Vlačič Ilirik* (Zagreb 1960).

and partly unfinished, (by Conrad Braun, Wilhelm Eisengrein and Peter Canisius);[47] then came Bigne's systematically arranged collection of early ecclesiastical writers,[48] and finally the epoch-making *Annales ecclesiastici* of the Oratorian Caesar Baronius († 1607), based on lectures delivered by him in the Oratory of Philip Neri, and giving in twelve volumes the history of the Church down to Innocent III. He makes use of a vast amount of source material, some of it quoted verbatim, but makes no attempt at a division into periods.[49] Baronius was fully aware that he was producing something new; he wrote his *Annales* with an apologetic purpose: "in defence of the antiquity of hallowed traditions and of the authority of the Holy Roman Church, especially against the innovators of our time".[50] His work was continued down to Pius V by the Pole Abraham Bzovius († 1637), further and better continued by the Oratorians Odoricus Raynaldus († 1671) and Jacob Laderchi († 1738), and remained till the nineteenth century the standard text of Catholic ecclesiastical history, which somewhat unjustly overshadowed other not less important achievements in the field of historical research.

A decisive factor in dissociating Church history from profane and from purely religious history was the disruption of Christian unity, which led to a more sharply defined understanding of the idea of the Church. The true Church of Christ, recognizable by certain signs, was opposed by a false church;[51] but she must be historically proved to be the true Church. The apostolicity of her doctrine, the continuity of her teaching office and the antiquity of her institutions must be demonstrated by reference to genuine sources. Thus, controversial theology had from the beginning an emphasis on tradition and history.[52] Evidence was sought and found in the Fathers and in the ancient liturgies for the sacrifice of the Mass and the Real Presence, for the papal primacy and the authority of councils; original texts were published, sometimes for the first time, with a definitely apologetic purpose.[53] Guglielmo Sirleto († 1584) provided the legates at the Council of Trent, Cervini and Seripando, with patristic material to serve as a basis for the Tridentine definitions,[54] the Augustinian Hermit, Onofrio Panvinio († 1569) collected material for the history of the popes, the college of cardinals and the churches of Rome.[55] After the rediscovery of the catacombs in the pontificate of Gregory XIII, Antonio Bosio († 1629) founded Christian archaeology.[56] The need for information about theological writers of ancient and modern times gave a new impetus to the study of ecclesiastical literary history. The printing of the ancient catalogues of authors by Suffridus Petri (1580) was followed at short intervals by the *Epitome* of Angelo Rocca (1594), the comprehensive *Apparatus sacer* of Antonio Possevino (1606) and Bellarmine's booklet *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (1613), destined to serve practical ends; the Belgian Albert le Mire († 1640) extended the catalogue of Trithemius. At the end of the seventeenth century the Jansenist Louis-Ellies du Pin produced the *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (1684–91), which with its continuations formed by far the most complete work of reference for the history of ecclesiastical literature; the *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques* (23 vols., 1729–33) by the Benedictine Remi Ceillier concludes with the thirteenth century.

---

[47] On C. Braun, *Admonitio Catholica* (Dillingen 1565), see N. Paulus in *HJ* 14 (1893) 544 f. On W. Eisengrein, *Descriptionis rerum in orthodoxa et apostolica Christi ecclesia gestarum* (Ingolstadt 1566), see L. Pfleger, "W. Eisengrein, ein Gegner des Flacius Illyr.", *HJ* 25 (1904), 774–92; the commission of the Jesuit General Borgia to Canisius is in his *Epistolae et Acta,* ed. O. Braunsberger, V (Freiburg i. Br. 1910) 480 f. (31 March 1567).

[48] *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum,* 9 vols. (Paris 1575–9).

[49] Vols. I–XII (Rome 1588–1605); Vols. XIII–XXI (Rome 1646–77), by O. Raynaldus, to 1564; Vols. XXII—XXIV (Rome 1728–37), by J. Laderchi, to 1571; for the continuation by A. Theiner (Rome 1856) and other eds., see *LThK* I, 1271 f. An unsatisfactory but still unsuperseded biography is G. Calenzio's *La vita e gli scritti del Card. C. Baronio* (Rome 1907); G. Mercati, "Per la storia della Biblioteca Vaticana, bibliotecario C. B.", *Opere minori,* III (Vatican City 1937) 201–74; A. Walz, *Studi historiografici* (Rome 1940), 5–27: the bibliography given there is enlarged in the new imp. by G. De Luca of A. Roncalli's, *Il Card. C. Baronio* (Rome 1961), 47 ff.

[50] In the Preface addressed to Sixtus V: "Praesertim contra novatores nostri temporis, pro sacrarum traditionum antiquitate ac S. Romanae Ecclesiae potestate."

[51] Thus Michael Buchinger's *Historia ecclesiastica nova* (Mainz 1560) was significantly a revised version of the work *De ecclesia* which appeared in 1556. Cf. Paulus, "M. B., ein Colmarer Schriftsteller und Prediger des 16. Jh." in *AElsKG* 5 (1930), 199 ff. For the doctrine of the marks of the true Church, see G. Thils, *Les notes de l'église dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la Réforme* (Gembloux 1937).

Although the predominantly apologetic tendency of the period sometimes prevented the acceptance even of results definitely established by

---

[52] P. Polman, *L'élément historique* 284ff. Melchior Cano states *(De locis theologicis,* XI 2): Quod autem in dissertatione adversum fidei Christianae inimicos rerum gestarum monumenta theologo peropportuna sint, clarissimorum virorum usus aperte confirmat. G. Gieraths, "M. Cano und die Geschichtswissenschaft" in *FZThPh* 9 (1962), 3–29.

[53] Thus the controversial theologian J. Cochlaeus prepared eds. of Cyprian, Optatus of Mileve, Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom, and in 1525 published the decrees of the ancient councils: cf. bibliography in M. Spahn, *J. Cochlaeus* (Berlin 1898), 341–72. In 1546 Georg Witzel edited the *Liturgia S. Basilii nuper e tenebris eruta;* and Franciscus Torres published the Apostolic Constitutions for the first time in 1563.

[54] Excerpts from the letters to Cervini (1545–7) are in *CT* X, 929–55; cf. S. Merkel, "Ein patristischer Gewährsmann des Tridentinums," in *Festgabe A. Ehrhard* (Bonn 1922), 342–58. The letters to Seripando (1562–43) have not yet been published; cf. Jedin, *G. Seripando,* II (Würzburg 1937) 300ff.

[55] D. A. Perini, *O. Panvinio e le sue opere* (Rome 1899); there is no adequate modern biography.

[56] *Pastor,* IX, 194ff., Eng. tr. vol. XIX, 269ff.

Protestant criticism (as with the proof adduced by Blondel of the forgery of the *Pseudo-Isidore*), the publication of extensive groups of sources led inevitably to the improvement of the historico-critical method, and so to the establishment of Church history as a science. The earlier histories of the councils had already taken their material from sources anterior to the medieval collections of canons, and now the *Editio Romana* (1608–12) for the first time published Greek texts. Subsequently the Jesuit Hardouin († 1729) produced the best, and J. D. Mansi († 1769) the most comprehensive, edition of the general and many provincial councils. These works were paralleled by the collections of national councils made by Sirmond for France, Aguirre for Spain, Hartzheim for Germany, and Wilkins for England.[57]

The collections of saints' Lives, the publication of which was intended to stimulate and defend the worship of saints, followed a comparable line of development from an initially uncritical accumulation of material to a critical outlook. Luigi Lippomani († 1559), supported by G. Hervet and G. Sirleto, wrote a preliminary compilation; and the Carthusian Laurentius Surius († 1578), basing his work on this but far surpassing it, published "authenticated lives of the saints";[58] then the Jesuit Heribert Rosweyde drew up in 1607 a project of publishing the ancient *Vitae Sanctorum* in their authentic texts, not as rewritten by the Humanists, nor based on manuscripts accidentally discovered but on manuscripts systematically sought out. In spite of Bellarmine's warning, Rosweyde's fellow-Jesuits Johannes Bolland († 1665) and Gottfried Henskens († 1681) began to carry out this plan in 1643, arranging the *Acta Sanctorum* according to the calendar.[59] Against literary attacks and the Spanish Inquisition,

---

[57] Details of the great eds. of the councils are in Quentin, *J.-D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris 1960); see also S. Kuttner, *L'Édition romaine des conciles généraux et les actes du premier Concile de Lyon* (Rome 1940). The most important national collections are: *Concilia antiqua Galliae*, ed. J. Sermond, 3 vols. (Paris 1629), with supplement by P. Dalande (Paris 1666); *Collectio maxima conciliorum omnium Hispaniae et novi orbis*, ed. J. Sáenz de Aguirre, 4 vols. (Rome 1693): 2nd ed., J. Catalanus, 6 vols. (Rome 1753–5); *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, ed. D. Wilkins, 4 vols. (London 1737); *Concilia Germaniae*, ed. J. F. Schannat and J. Hartzheim, 11 vols. (Cologne 1759–90). For the collection of decrees and canons of the general and provincial councils ed. by the Augustinian C. de Wulf, of Louvain (Louvain 1665, Brussels 1673), cf. A. Legrand and L. Ceyssens *Augustiniana* 8 (1958), 200–36 and 328–55.

[58] P. Holt, "Die Sammlung von Heiligenleben des L. Surius" in *NA* 44 (1922), 341–64.

[59] The first two vols. of the *Acta Sanctorum*, covering the month of January, bore the title: "Acta Sanctorum, quotquot toto orbe coluntur vel a catholicis scriptoribus celebrantur, quae ex antiquis monumentis latinis, graecis aliarumque gentium collegit, digessit, notis illustravit Johannes Bollandus; operam et studium contulit Godefridus Henschenius." For the whole work, cf. Peeters, *L'Œuvre des Bollandistes* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1961).

Daniel Papebroch († 1714), Bolland's outstanding successor, defended the method employed by the Bollandists in his *Responsia* of 1696–7. Fifty-two folio volumes issued from the Museum Bollandianum in Antwerp down to the time of its suppression in 1788.

Working concurrently with the Bollandists as critical investigators of ecclesiastical sources were the Maurists: the Benedictines of the French congregation of St Maur. They also continued what had been begun in the sixteenth century: replacing the editions of the Fathers, which had become largely a Protestant monopoly, with Catholic editions printed at Rome, Louvain, and elsewhere.[60] After the turn of the century there followed at short intervals bilingual editions of the Greek Fathers, mostly printed at Paris.[61] The Jesuit Dionysius Petavius (Denis Petau, † 1652), himself the editor of Epiphanius of Salamis, opened the way to historical proof in systematic theology, and was the founder of scientific chronolgy.[62] These not insignificant achievements were however far surpassed by the Maurist editions, the fruit of exemplary co-operation: especially the edition of Augustine by Thomas Blampin († 1710) and Pierre Coustant (1721), which appeared in the years 1679–1700; and that of Chrysostom by Bernard Montfaucon († 1741), which had been preceded in 1667 by an edition of the works of Bernard of Clairvaux by the greatest of the Maurist scholars and the founder of palaeography, Jean Mabillon († 1707). Mabillon and his pupil Edmond Martène († 1739) became the initiators of the scientific study of the liturgy with their *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (1700–2). The extensive journeys undertaken by the Maurists to visit libraries in France, Belgium, Germany, and Italy led to the discovery of numerous hitherto unpublished sources.[63]

To the Bollandists and Maurists Church history owes the principle that every historical statement must be based upon authentic sources, edited according to the strict rules of philological criticism. All historical research stands upon their shoulders, and the texts which they produced are to some extent still in use. They share this distinction with the great editions of early texts made by Italian scholars of the eighteenth century, such as L. A. Muratori († 1750), the incomparable editor of medieval Italian sources, and the brothers Pietro and Girolamo Ballerini. Besides these there are the authors of the great statistical works on papal and diocesan history and on that of the religious orders, which appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Dominican Alphonse Chacon (Giaconius, † 1599) in his posthumously printed *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium* (1601–2) created the first reference work on papal history, subsequently continued by Agostino Oldoini.[64] The *Italia sacra* of the Cistercian Ferdinando Ughelli († 1670), a collection of lists of bishops of the Italian dioceses,[65] admittedly uncritical as regards the earlier period, was the model for the *Gallia Christiana* of the brothers St Marthe, which far surpassed it. Martène and his collaborators were commissioned by the assembly of the French clergy in 1710 to revise this work,[66] which in turn encouraged the Spanish Augustinian Enrico Flórez to compile his *España Sagrada,*[67] the Jesuit Farlati to compile his *Illyricum sacrum,*[68] and abbot Gerbert of St Blasien to resume earlier projects for a *Germania Sacra.*[69] Like the latter, the project of an *Orbis christianus,* embracing the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, conceived by the prefect of the Vatican Archives, Giuseppe Garampi († 1792), did not get beyond the preliminary stages.[70]

---

[60] An ed. of Augustine appeared at Louvain in 1577, of Jerome at Rome in 1565–72, and of Ambrose also at Rome in 1579–87.

[61] Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius of Salamis, and Chrysostom; further details will be given later, in Volume IV.

[62] P. di Rosa, "*Denis Petau e la cronologia*" in *AHSI* 29 (1960), 3–54.

[63] The first of these collections of unpublished works, so characteristic of the period, was J.-L. d'Achéry's *Spicilegium* (Paris 1655–77). This was followed by the Martène-Durand *Thesaurus anecdotorum* (Paris 1717) and *Amplissima collectio* (Paris 1724–33). Equally excellent were the accounts of journeys: e.g., Montfaucon's *Diarium Italicum* (Paris 1702; new imp. 1962).

More perhaps was done for the history of the religious orders. The *Annales ordinis Minorum* of the Irish Franciscan Luke Wadding († 1657),[71] and the supplementary catalogue of Franciscan authors prompted other orders to bring out similar comprehensive historical works,[72] foremost among them being Mabillon's *Annales OSB,* which were preceded by the *Acta Sanctorum OSB.* The Dominicans received from the hands of J. Quétif and J. Echard the best catalogue of their authors, and from P. Ripoll and A. Brémond the most comprehensive bullarium. The Franciscan Helyot attempted for the first time a general history of the religious orders.[73] When one further considers that at the same time many dioceses and monasteries were producing well-documented histories,[74] and that reference works, excellent in many respects, were being written, especially in Italy,[75] as a contribution to the biography of ecclesiastical personages, one cannot but ask the question: what use did historiography make of all these sources and aids to historical research which were accumulated during the course of two centuries?

---

[64] The 3rd ed., prepared by Oldoini, comprised 4 vols.; the 4th (1751), 6 vols.

[65] Nine vols. (Rome 1643–62); the 2nd ed., by N. Coleti, was in 10 vols. (Venice 1717–22).

[66] *Gallia Christiana (nova),* 13 vols. (Paris 1715–85); cf. *LThK* IV, 497.

[67] *España Sagrada. Teatro geográfico-histórico de la Iglesia de la España,* 51 vols. (Madrid 1754–1879).

[68] Eight vols.; V–VIII by J. Coleti (Venice 1751–1819).

[69] G. Pfeilschifter, *Die St Blasianische Germania Sacra* (Munich 1921); for the extraordinarily interesting ed. of Gerbert's correspondence by Pfeilschifter and W. Müller, see *LThK* IV, 710 f.

[70] P. Dengel, "Sull' Orbis christianus di G. Garampi", *Atti del II Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* (Rome 1931), 497 ff.

[71] *Father Luke Wadding: Commemorative Volume* (Dublin 1957); for the "Wadding Papers 1614–38", ed. B. Jennings (Dublin 1953), cf. *Irish Historical Studies* 10 (1956), 228–36 (F. X. Martin); C. Mooney, "The Letters of L. W." in *IER* 88 (1957), 396–409.

[72] F. Roth, "Augustinian Historians of the XVIIth Century" in *Augustiniana* 6 (1956), 635–58.

[73] For further details see my article: "Ordensgeschichte" in *LThK* VII, 1201–4.

Writers of Church history were not in a position to keep pace with this widening horizon and improvement in methods of research. The attitude which regarded Church history as equivalent to the history of man's salvation, which still persisted and found its last classic expression in Bossuet's *Discours,*[76] need not have been an impediment. On the other hand, it is undeniable that on the Protestant side the separation of ecclesiastical from profane history, first made by Melanchthon, unintentionally promoted its secularization while contributing to its independence. The Pietist viewpoint represented in Gottfried Arnold's *Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie* (2 vols., 1699–1700), namely that personal piety, not dogmas and institutions, was the real subject of Church history, seems hardly to have any effect on Catholic writing. Even after the end of the wars of religion, when eirenic tendencies were gaining ground, the dispute with Protestantism went on: the monographs of the Jesuit Louis Maimbourg provide an example of this tradition.[77] The history of the Council of Trent by the Servite Paolo Sarpi attracted far more attention than any controversial work, because under the appearance of a sober, factual account it was a large-scale attack on the post-Tridentine papacy. The reply of the Jesuit Pietro Sforza Pallavicino, based on far better sources and skilfully written, was intended as an historical apologia.[78]

The impulse to comprehend and organize Church history as a whole was lacking in the education of the time. The same Jesuit general Aquaviva, who in 1609 was considering a plan [79] to establish courses for advanced students in ecclesiastical history, especially the history of the councils, had excluded the subject from the normal curriculum in his *Ratio Studiorum,* which dominated higher education for two hundred years. At Rome, Church history was indeed studied in private circles,[80] but only in 1714 was a chair of ecclesiastical history founded at the Roman College.[81] The works dealing with the subject which had been appearing since the middle of the seventeenth century in France, the dominating country at that time in intellectual matters, were not the product of instruction: They served more or less to justify Gallican ideas of the Church. By far the best achievement were the *Selecta historiae ecclesiasticae capita et ... dissertationes,* by the Dominican Alexander Natalis († 1724): a collection of 230 topics, mainly on points of doctrine and arranged according to centuries.[82] These were placed on the Index on account of their Gallican views, but were nevertheless republished in 1699 without significant corrections, under the title *Historia ecclesiastica veteris novique Testamenti,* and there were eight subsequent editions. The *Mémoires* of L. S. Lenain de Tillemont († 1698), pieced together like a mosaic of selections from early sources, were confined to Church history down to the year 513; Claude Fleury († 1723) brought his twenty-volume *Histoire ecclésiastique* (1691–1720) down to the Council of Constance.[83] Its critical acumen and pleasing style assured the success of the work, but its Gallican tendencies called forth a reply from the Dominican G. A. Orsi, whose *Istoria ecclesiastica* (1747–62) covered only the first six centuries. Nevertheless, it had many continuators and was still being reprinted in the nineteenth century.[84] To these many-volumed works the *Breviarium historiae ecclesiasticae usibus academicis accommodatum* by the Augustinian Gianlorenzo Berti († 1766) formed a modest exception: yet it marks a turning-point because it was intended for instruction.[85]

---

[74] E.g., N. Hontheim, *Historia Trevirensis,* 3 vols. (Augsburg 1750); S. H. Würdtwein, *Dioecesis Moguntia,* 5 vols. (Mannheim 1768–90); also the letters published by H. Raab in *AHVNrh* 153–4 (1953), 170–200.

[75] E.g., the index of authors published by G. Fantuzzi for Bologna: by G. Agnostini for Venice; and, surpassing all others, Tiraboschi's classic *Storia della letteratura Italiana.*

[76] In the *Discours sur l'histoire universelle* (1618), as W. Kaegi and others have shown, the old outlook is permeated and transformed by new ideas; cf. O. Brunner in Lammers *op. cit.* 444 f.

[77] *Histoire du Grand Schisme d'Occident* (Paris 1676); *Histoire du Luthéranisme* (Paris 1680); *Histoire du Calvinisme* (Paris 1682); the first two have indexes.

[78] Jedin, *Der Quellenapparat der Konzilsgeschichte Pallavicinos* (Rome 1940); followed by a general survey, 61–118.

[79] P. de Leturia, "L'insegnamento della storia ecclesiastica nella Roma dell'Umanesimo e del Barocco" in *CivCatt* (1945), IV 393–402.

---

[80] P. Paschini, "La Conferenza dei Concili a Propaganda Fide" in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 371–82.

[81] P. de Leturia, "El P. Filippo Bebei y la fondación de la cátedra de historia eclesiástica en el Colegio Romano 1741" in *Gr* 30 (1949), 158–92. The chair of ecclesiastical history founded by Alexander VII in 1657 at the Roman Sapienza had no influence on the education of the clergy; those established after 1725 at Madrid, Barcelona, and Calatayud, were in colleges conducted by the Jesuits for the nobility.

[82] Twenty six vols. (Paris 1676–86); there is a list of later eds. in A. Hänggi, *Der Kirchenhistoriker Natalis Alexander* (Fribourg 1955), 189. According to its preface, the work was intended "for the benefit and advantage of those who study sacred antiquity and positive theology".

[83] F. Gaquère, *La vie et les œuvres de C. Fleury* (Paris 1925).

[84] Fifty vols. (Rome 1838).

[85] B. van Luijk, "Gianlorenzo Berti Agostiniano" in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 235–62 and 383–410.

The introduction of Church history into the curriculum of the universities had begun in Protestant Germany. During the period of reconstruction after the Thirty Years' War, the University of Helmstedt had received its own chair of ecclesiastical history in 1650, and nearly all the other Protestant universities of Germany had followed suit. In the numerous textbooks of Church history written for academic instruction,[86] biblical history, especially that of the Old Testament, was gradually superseded by specifically Church history. Slowly, too, the division into centuries yielded to one based on periods. The pedagogic aim and the polemic attitude remained: the latter found expression mainly in dealing with and passing judgments on the Middle Ages. The *Compendium Gothanum,* designed for instruction at the grammer school (or Gymnasium) in Gotha, was published in 1666 by Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff, who, like his later continuators E. S. Cyprian and C. W. F. Walch, was outstanding as an historian of the Reformation. One-third of this work was still devoted to the Old Testament, and the division by centuries was likewise retained; but the beginnings of a division into periods is also discernible: the Primitive Church is treated as one period, and further divisions are made at the times of Constantine, Charlemagne, and Luther. The *Summarium historiae ecclesiasticae* (1697) of the Leipzig professor Adam Rechenberg distinguished five periods corresponding with phases of the Church: *Ecclesia plantata,* from the first to the third century; *Ecclesia libertate gaudens,* from the fourth to the sixth century; *Ecclesia pressa et obscurata,* from the seventh to the tenth century; *Ecclesia gemens et lamentans,* from the eleventh to the fifteenth century; and *Ecclesia repurgata et liberata,* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

But it was Johann Lorenz Mosheim († 1755), the "father of Protestant Church history",[87] who paved the way for a scientific view of Church history as a whole. In his *Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae antiquioris* (1737), he defined it as "the careful and true narration of all external and internal events in the society of men which takes its name from Christ, for the purpose of recognizing the workings of Divine Providence through the connexion of cause and effect in its foundation and preservation, in order that we may learn piety and wisdom". Without excluding God's action in the history of the Church, man is placed at its centre, and the Church is examined in its development as a human community, according to laws valid for history in general. Mosheim's view of history and his marked pragmatism lead on to the Enlightenment, which makes its appearance in the *Historia religionis et ecclesiae Christianae* (1777) by his pupil Johann Schröckh.[88] And in this "enlightened" form Church history was transplanted to the Catholic universities, after the mid-eighteenth century, firstly to those in the Habsburg empire.

---

[86] The titles of the works mentioned here are in E. C. Scherer, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten* (Freiburg 1927), 493–9.

[87] K. Heussi, *Johann Lorenz Mosheim* (Tübingen 1906); for more recent discussion, cf. *RGG,* 3rd ed. IV, 1157 f. (M. Schmidt).

The curriculum prescribed by the empress Maria Theresa in 1752, which had been drawn up by the Jesuit Gerhard van Swieten, regarded "spiritual history" as a compulsory subject. In what spirit instruction was to be imparted appears from the directive to teachers inspired by abbot Rautenstrauch (1775): it was to be pragmatical, that is "useful and profitable for practical application"; it was to show "the true limits of the spiritual and temporal powers" (in a sense, of course, that gave supremacy to the State), and to deal mainly with the early centuries and with more recent times (but not with the Middle Ages); the teacher was to "discuss" ecclesiastical matters, in order thus to sharpen his pupils' judgment and to influence them morally.[89]

Other German Catholic universities followed the Austrian example: Ingolstadt, Heidelberg, Mainz, and Bonn. Since Berti's *Breviarium* did not follow the prevailing autocratic tendency, anti-Roman and "enlightened," Joseph II introduced the Protestant textbook by Schröckh. Later, after Archbishop Magazzi of Vienna had protested, this was replaced in 1788 by the *Institutiones historiae ecclesiasticae Novi Testamenti* by the Swabian Matthias Dannenmayr which appeared in a German edition as *Leitfaden in der Kirchengeschichte* (4 vols., 1790). Dannenmayr's book was moderately "enlightened", but decidedly anti-Roman. It divided Church history into five epochs, the divisions being made at the reigns of Constantine, Charlemagne, and Gregory VII, and at the time of Luther, and dealt with each according to a uniform scheme: expansion, organization, authors, doctrine, heresies, liturgy, discipline, and councils. If one ignores the basic attitude due to Schröckh's influence, the author's attempt at an intellectual mastery of the subject and the boldness of his frequently quite acute judgment must be acknowledged. Similar "guides" and "introductions" for students were produced under different titles by Alioz (1791), Aschenbrenner (1789), Batz (1797), Becker (1782), Gmeiner (1787), Gollowitz (1791), Jung (1776), Lumper (1788), Pelka (1793), Pronat (1779), Sappel (1783), Schmalfuß (1792–3), Schneller (1777), Wiesner (1788) and Wolf (1793–1803). The *Christliche Religions- und Kirchengeschichte* (4 vols., 1789–95) by Kaspar Royko and the *Geschichte der Christlichen Religion und Kirche* (2 vols., 1792–3) by Milbiller, the latter of which appeared anonymously, were decidedly rationalistic. More moderate successors with an "enlightened" point of view continued to write in the nineteenth century: thus, *Die großen Kirchenversammlungen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts* by J. H. von Wessenberg appeared as late as 1840. In England J. Milner and in America the Unitarian J. A. Priestley turned away from the Enlightenment history, the former with his *History of the Church of Christ* (1794–1809), the latter in his *General History of the Christian Church* (1802–3).

---

[88] Schröckh's principal work is the intolerably prolix *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*, 45 vols. (Leipzig 1768–1813); see *RGG*, 3rd ed. V. 1545 ff.

[89] E. C. Scherer, *op. cit.* 400 ff.; for Dannenmayr, cf. ibid. 408–15.

However dangerous the intrusion of the Enlightenment was, and even of Rationalism, the introduction of Church History into theological instruction and the consequent need of many new textbooks contributed to the opening up of a new view of Church history, under new auspices indeed and on a different basis. In marked reaction against the Enlightenment with its delight in passing judgments, its Caesaropapism and its contempt for the Middle Ages, Romantic writers strove to feel their way lovingly and with faith into the Church's great past, especially in the hitherto-despised Middle Ages, and they discovered the greatness of the papacy. Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme* (1802), and Joseph de Maistre's *Du Pape* (1819), however uncritical they were in their reporting of facts,[90] opened the eyes of contemporaries to the great religious tradition and the cultural achievements of the Church, to which Rationalism and the anti-Romanism of the age of Enlightenment had blinded them. In England Sharon Turner in his *History of England from the Norman Conquest to 1509* (1814) could speak of the Middle Ages as that period "in which our religion, literature, language, manners, laws, and constitution have been chiefly formed". Friedrich Leopold, Count Stolberg († 1819), in his *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* (15 vols., 1806–18) revived the opinions of Augustine and Bossuet, to whom the history of the Church meant that of man's salvation. He even returned to pure chronography, renouncing any division into periods: he was writing a history of the religion of Christ, not of the Church. But since he recognized its ultimate significance to be the "firmer grounding of the Faith by the help of history",[91] his book became "an epoch-making work for the reawakening of the serious study of Church history and especially for the revival of Christian feeling" (Janssen). Stolberg's basic religious attitude was shared by Theodor Katerkamp, a member of the Münster circle, in his *Kirchengeschichte* (5 vols., 1823–4); but he had more regard than the former for the natural causes of events. The historical writers of the Enlightenment had looked upon the Church as an institution useful to the State in raising the standard of morality and popular education; now her transcendent, supernatural essence, her independence from the State and her universality were being rediscovered.

---

[90] S. Merkle, "Die Anfänge französischer Laientheologie im 19. Jh.", *Festgabe Karl Muth* (Munich 1927), 325–57.

[91] L. Scheffczyk, *F. L. zu Stolbergs Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* (Munich 1952), 133.

Church History as an Historical and Theological Science in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

The re-establishment of Church history as a theological and historical science was the work of Johann Adam Möhler (1796–1838). Under the influence of the "pectoral theologian" Neander in Berlin, and even more under that of Johann Sebastian Drey († 1853), the dogmatician of the Tübingen school, and in opposition to the German idealism of such writers as Hegel and F. C. Baur, Möhler discovered the essential historicity of Christianity as an organic development from supernatural revelation. He forsook the "spiritual" idea of the Church expressed in his early work *Die Einheit der Kirche* (1825); and by his definition of the Church (discussed in Section I, above), he restored to Church history its universality,which it had lost through the Enlightenment and Josephinism. The scientific work of this author, who died so young, was certainly fragmentary; but his successor at Tübingen, Carl Joseph Hefele (1809–93), completed in his *Conciliengeschichte* (7 vols., 1855–74) the most lasting achievement of German historical science in the ecclesiastical field. Though now outdated in many details, Hefele's work has not yet been superseded;[92] and his successor, F. X. Funk († 1907), showed himself by his researches into early Church history to be the keenest critic produced by the Tübingen school.[93]

Whereas Möhler had treated of the general history of the Church only in lectures, published posthumously by P. Grams in 1867–8, Johann Joseph Döllinger (1799–1890) made three attempts to write a general Church history: the first was his version of Hortig's *Handbuch der Christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (1828); the second a *Lehrbuch* (1836) of his own conception; and the third his two large-scale monographs, *Heidentum und Judentum als Vorhalle des Christentums* (1857) and *Christentum und Kirche in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (1860): but neither of these were finished. Denominational differences, which had been blurred by the Enlightenment and more sharply emphasized again in Möhler's *Symbolik*, inspired Döllinger's *Reformation* (1846–8). At the height of his activity he was indisputably the most learned ecclesiastical historian of his time, surpassed in depth of thought only by John Henry Newman. The influence of his school at Munich reached beyond Germany to France and England (to such as Lord Acton); but he came into conflict both with neo-Scholasticism and with the Roman Curia: first on the question of the Temporal Power, and then on the doctrine of Infallibility. Failing to submit on this issue to the Vatican Council, he was excommunicated.

---

[92] S. Lösch, *ThQ* 119 (1939), 3–59; A. Hagen, *Gestalten aus dem schwäbischen Katholizismus* II, 7–58.

[93] *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*, 3 vols. (Paderborn 1897 to 1907).

This catastrophe resulted in a severe setback for historical studies in Germany, but it could not in the long run prevent their further progress. The theological foundations were laid, and constructive work continued with the opening up of new sources and with specialized research, both closely connected with the mighty flowering of historical science in the nineteenth century. The first step was to make the great editorial achievements of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries more accessible. The enterprising abbé Migne († 1875) reproduced in his two patrological series only the texts already available at the time; A. Tomasetti's new edition of the *Bullarium Romanum* (named *Taurinense* after Turin, its place of publication, 1857–72) was but a re-impression of Cocqueline's work (1739–44). The Viennese Academy of Sciences in the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (from 1860) and the Berlin Academy in *Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (from 1897) produced new texts of the Fathers on improved philological principles. The editing of medieval and more recent historical sources in the best texts attainable, a task recognized and promoted as a national obligation, was to the advantage of Church historians. In the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (founded in 1819 and taken over by the Imperial goverment in 1874) there appeared such important documents as the Letters of Gregory the Great and St Boniface, the *Libri Carolini*, the Register of Gregory VII and the Chronicle of Otto of Freising. Textual and literary criticism, initiated by the Bollandists and the Maurists, were vastly improved by the collaborators in the *Monumenta.* In documentary research Theodor Sickel took over and improved the methods of Delisle and his *École des chartes;* M. Tangl, E. von Ottenthal and Paul Kehr, above all the last named, applied them to the study of papal documents.

For more recent times there was an enormous increase of source-material from the great national collections, as a result of the opening of state archives following the July and March revolutions: the *Collection des Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France* (from 1835), the *Colección de documentos inéditos* (from 1842) and the *Calendar of State Papers* (from 1856). At the same time the Vatican archivist Augustin Theiner († 1874) began to edit, in extensive *Monumenta,* sources for the history of the Papal States, Ireland, and the western and southern Slavonic peoples; and the convert Hugo Laemmer († 1918) gave some idea of the riches of the

Roman archives and libraries for the history of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation.[94] The throwing open of the Vatican archives for research, by Pope Leo XIII (in the *Regolamento* of 1 May 1884), marked a new epoch and led to the foundation of numerous national institutes of history at Rome.[95] It also made possible such large-scale undertakings as the publishing of nuncios' reports from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the *Concilium Tridentinum* of the Görres Society, the pioneering researches of the Dominican H. Denifle († 1905)[96] and the Jesuit Franz Ehrle († 1934),[97] and finally the *Geschichte der Päpste* of Ludwig von Pastor († 1928), the most detailed work of Church history produced in the past century.[98] Like the *Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes* by his teacher Johann Janssen († 1891), Pastor's work was the outcome of the defensive attitude into which German Catholicism had been driven since the outbreak of the Kulturkampf.

The rapid increase of source material, the constant improvement in methods and aids, and the growing number of scientific monographs and separate investigations did not discourage the work of synthesis in the nineteenth century, as they had in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, if only because academic instruction required textbooks and manuals of Church history.

The many-volumed *Histoire universelle de l'Église catholique* by R. F. Rohrbacher (29 vols., 1842–9) was intended for a wider public, but the academic historians were obliged both to keep pace with research and to compete with the numerous and in some respects excellent Protestant works of this kind: the Church histories of J. K. L. Gieseler (5 vols., 1824–57), F. C. Baur (5 vols., 1853–63), K. R. Hagenbach (7 vols., 1869–72), and W. Möller and G. Kawerau (3 vols., 1889–1907). The earlier editions of the *Handbuch* of J. J. Ritter († 1857) were still composed under the influence of G. Hermes (3 vols., 1826–35); the leading work of the middle of the century, Johann Alzog's († 1878) *Universalgeschichte der Christlichen Kirche,* was based on Möhler's lectures. After the first Vatican Council Alzog's study was superseded by the *Handbuch der*

---

[94] For A. Theiner and the authors Ritter and Alzog of textbooks mentioned below, see Jedin, "Kirchenhistoriker aus Schlesien in der Ferne" in *ArSKG* 11 (1953), 243–59; for Laemmer, see J. Schweter, *H. Laemmer* (Glaz 1926): an inadequate study; for principal works, *LThK* VI, 767 f.

[95] K. A. Fink, *Das Vatikanische Archiv* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1951), 155–67.

[96] A. Walz, *Analecta Denifleana* (Rome 1955); for principal works in *LThK* III, 227.

[97] Obituaries by H. Finke, *HJ* 54 (1934), 289–93; K. Christ, *ZblB* 52 (1935), 1–47; M. Grabmann, *PhJ* 56 (1946), 9–26; bibliography in *Miscellanea F. Ehrle,* I (Rome 1924), 17–28.

[98] Diaries, letters and memoirs, ed. W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950); also A. Schnütgen, *AHVNrh* 151–2 (1952), 435–45; A. Pelzer in *RHE* 46 (1951), 192–201; obituary by P. Dengel, *HJ* 49 (1929), 1–32.

Allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte by Joseph Hergenröther († 1890), who was raised to the cardinalate in 1879. Passing through several revisions, the last complete edition being published by J. P. Kirsch (4 vols., 1911–17), this work survived into the twentieth century. Specially written for academic use were the textbooks, first published in 1872–5, of F. X. Kraus,[99] who was also important as an art historian and archaeologist, and of Alois Knöpfler (1895), and F. X. Funk (1866). Both these scholars were of the Tübingen school, though the former taught in Munich. Their books went through many editions and were the most useful textbooks of their time; but they were very insistent in a critico-positivist way on the exact reporting of facts. In this respect the instructional works of Heinrich Brück (1874), of the Mainz school, and of Jacob Marx (1903), a professor at Trier, show a marked contrast in their strict ecclesiasticism. At present, the *Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols., 12th ed. 1951, 1948, and 1956) of Karl Bihlmeyer († 1942), based on Funk and revised since his death by H. Tüchle, is the best general account of moderate size, distinguished by its concise formulation and its wealth of bibliographies. There is also an Italian edition by J. Rogger in four volumes. The second volume in English appeared in 1963 translated by V. Mills and F. Muller. Like most of the preceding textbooks, Bihlmeyer's work took over from profane history the customary threefold division into Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Modern Age, although this in comparison with many textbooks of the Enlightenment represents a backward step. *Die Katholische Kirche im Wandel der Zeiten und Völker* by A. Ehrhard[100] and W. Neuss (4 vols., 1959) and the *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung* by J. Lortz (21st ed., 1962–4) are aimed at a wider public. The *Geschichte der Päpste* (6 vols., 2nd ed., by G. Schwaiger since 1954) by F. X. Seppelt spans the whole of Church history, as does the same author's one-volume *Papstgeschichte.*

Only after the turn of the century, when Church history in France had received a new impetus, especially from the fundamental researches and publications of Louis Duchesne († 1922) and Pierre Batiffol († 1929) on Christian antiquity, did there appear in that country also textbooks on the German model, such as those of L. Marion and V. Lacombe (1905) and of C. Poulet (1926), and comprehensive manuals, like F. Mourret's *Histoire générale de l'Église* (9 vols. 1909 21) or the *Histoire de l'Église* under the editorship of A. Fliche and V. Martin, planned in twenty-four volumes but not yet completed (since 1935). An Italian version of this project was begun in 1938. The English version is published in four volumes (1942–8). In Italy textbooks have been written by L. Todesco (6 vols., 1922–30), A. Saba (3 vols., 1938–43), and P. Paschini (3 vols., 1931); and in England by Philip Hughes (3 vols., 1934–47).

---

[99] F. X. Kraus, *Tagebücher,* ed. H. Schiel (Cologne 1957); with a remarkably complete bibliography, 765–88.

[100] A. Dempf, *Albert Ehrhard* (Colmar 1944); J. M. Hoeck, "Der Nachlaß Albert Ehrhards und seine Bedeutung für die Byzantinistik" in *ByZ* 21 (1951), 171–8.

In the many textbooks and general accounts, which it would be both impossible and unnecessary to enumerate in full, we can see that the idea of the Church's historical character has been generally accepted and that Church history has been recognized as a theological discipline. Having become a science, it is subject to those tendencies which are commonly observable in the science of our time. The pre-eminence of research has led to the founding of numerous periodicals and series of publications dealing with ecclesiastical history, to the collecting of the results of work in institutes and the training in seminars of future researchers. Progressive specialization has resulted in the separation of large fields of study from general Church history and in their becoming independent. As a reaction against specialization and also against the positivism of the nineteenth century, there has been since the second world war a marked tendency towards a theology of history and ecclesiology.

The upsurge of research made the foundation of special periodicals and series of publications necessary.[101] The *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* founded by the Protestant theologian T. Brieger in 1876, which at first concerned itself mainly with researches on the Reformation period, was joined in 1887 by the *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Archäologie und Kirchengeschichte,* which published work on Roman archaeology and newly-discovered source-material in the Vatican archives, under the direction of Anton de Waal († 1917), H. Finke and S. Ehses. The *Historisches Jahrbuch* of the Görres Society also contained numerous contributions to Church History. The *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* founded at Louvain by Alfred Cauchie in 1900, became an indispensable organ of research, since, besides containing essays and critiques, it also published a complete bibliography of all the works important for the study of Church history. In Italy, in spite of the collaboration of such eminent scholars as G. Mercati and P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, the *Miscellanea di Storia Ecclesiastica* (1902) and the *Rivista storico-critica delle Scienze teologiche* (1904) had to close down as a consequence of the Modernist Dispute. On the other hand, the *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* (1907) and the *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* (1910) continued to appear, playing an influential part in the growth of historical studies of the Church in Switzerland and France. In North America, P. Guilday, who had been trained at Louvain, founded the

---

[101] R. Aubert, "Un demi-siècle de revues d'histoire ecclésiastique" in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 173–202.

Catholic Historical Review (1917); and Holland had possessed the *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* since 1900. Periodicals for diocesan history had been established in Germany since the nineteenth century, like the *Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, bes. das alte Erzbistum Köln* (1855) and the *Freiburger Diözesanarchiv* (1865); and the number of these increased in the twentieth century, as by the *Archiv für Elsässische Kirchengeschichte* (1926), the *Archiv für Schlesische Kirchengeschichte* (1936) and the *Archiv für Mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* (1949). Even before the first world war, several of the greatest orders had started periodicals for the study of their own history: Among these were the *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden* (1880), the *Revue Mabillon* and the *Analectes de l'ordre de Prémontré* (both 1905), the *Archivum Franciscanum historicum* (1908), and the *Archivo Ibero-Americano* (1914).

The results of research which were too extensive for the periodicals were published in series: H. Schrörs and M. Sdralek had been editing their *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien* since 1891; and from these Sdralek branched out into his *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen.* The *Veröffentlichungen des Kirchenhistorischen Seminars München* (1899) and the *Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte* (1900), edited by A. Knöpfler, were of a similar character; the latter included A. Ehrhard as one of its editors. The preponderance of Reformation history at that time found simultaneous expression in the founding of three series of publications: *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes* (1898) by L. Pastor, *Vorreformationsgeschichtliche Forschungen* (1900) by H. Finke, and *Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte* (1905) by J. Greving.[102] These had been preceded by Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* (1882). In addition to the periodicals, numerous series of publications edited by ecclesiastical universities, faculties and religious orders assembled the results of research in the field of Church history.

These developments were made easier by the steady improvement of scientific aids. While the *Series episcoporum* (1873) of the Benedictine B. Gams was based only on printed sources, the *Hierarchia catholica* (from 1898) of the Franciscan Conrad Eubel and his successors drew upon the newly opened Vatican archives for their historical statistics of the episcopate.[103] The *Nomenclator litterarius* of the Jesuit Hugo Hurter (5 vols., 3rd ed., 1903–13) was unable to replace the old lexica of writers of the religious orders, but went beyond du Pin and Ceillier. Works of such exhaustive learning as U. Chevalier's *Répertoire* (first published 1877–86), his *Topo-Bibliographie* (1894–1903) and P. Jaffe's *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (1851, 2nd ed. 1885–8) had not been at the disposal of earlier generations of students. Excellent bibliographies, such as Dahlmann-Waitz's *Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte* (9th ed., 1931) for Germany, made information about early works readily available. The historical content of theological encyclopedias was continually being augmented, as can be seen if we compare the second edition of Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* (1822–1901) with M. Buchberger's *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (1904–12) and the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (1930–8, 2nd ed. from 1957). On the Protestant side, the copiousness and completeness of the *Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (3rd ed. by A. Hauck, 1896–1913) have not been surpassed, even by the excellent but differently planned *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3rd ed. from 1957). The *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (1902–50) has been joined by the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (1924–53) and the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* (begun in 1912 but not yet completed).

---

[102] Jedin, *Joseph Greving* (Münster 1954).

[103] Jedin, "Die Hierarchia Catholica als universalgeschichtliche Aufgabe", in *Saeculum* 12 (1961), 169–80.

The rise of Modernism and the circumstances of the first world war hindered but did not interrupt the growth of historical enquiry. Hitherto, Germany, France, and Belgium had been the foremost countries in promoting its advance; now the reorganization of ecclesiastical studies by Pope Pius XI was of great importance in extending its influence beyond their frontiers. The constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* of 24 May 1931 enjoined theological faculties and ecclesiastical colleges to establish seminars for the provision of methodical training.[104] At the Gregorian University a faculty of Church history was set up in 1934 to train teachers and archivists, especially for Italy, Spain, and Latin America. About the same time the Jesuits, Dominicans, Augustinians, and Capuchins established institutes for the study of the history of their orders, to which were entrusted the editing of sources and the publication of periodicals. Several new periodicals have appeared during and since the end of the second world war: *Traditio* (from 1943) in America; the *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* (from 1947) in Italy; *Hispania Sacra* (from 1948) in Spain; and the interdenominational *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (from 1950) in England.[105]

The specialization of research has led to the independence of certain disciplines and their separation from general Church history, as is shown by the establishment of special professional chairs and periodicals and the writing of specialized textbooks. History of ecclesiastical literature, which had been incorporated in the theological curriculum along with Church history in the eighteenth century, has been deepened in method and narrowed down in time to patrology, in the study of which the German Protestant school, represented by Adolf von Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* (from 1882), has distinguished itself, the results of its work being collected in textbooks and manuals. In Germany the lead was taken by Otto Bardenhewer's *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur* (5 vols., 1913–32) and B. Altaner's *Patrologie* (6th ed. 1960, Eng. tr. *Patrology*, 1960); in France by the *Patrologie* of F. Cayre (3 vols., 3rd ed. 1945–55), to which is attached a history of theology (Eng. tr. *A Manual of Patrology*), and in the English-speaking world by J. Quasten's *Patrology* (3 vols., 1950–60). The *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature* of the *Revue bénédictine* gave information about new publications, as from 1959 onwards did the *Bibliographia patristica*, based on international co-operation; the *Vigiliae Christianae* (from 1947) are devoted mainly to linguistic research. The history of medieval theological literature became partly the province of Middle Latin philology (as in the work of L. Traube, M. Manitius, P. Lehmann, and E. R. Curtius) and partly that of Scholastic research, flourishing since the turn of the century (as exemplified in the work of H. Denifle, F. Ehrle, C. Baeumker, M. Grabmann, B. Geyer, and A. Landgraf). For such extensive fields as that of medieval biblical interpretation and the history of preaching, research is still only at the beginning; and for this aspect the contribution of F. Stegmüller should be noted. A concise but comprehensive *Geschichte der Theologie seit der Väterzeit* (1933) has been written by M. Grabmann.

---

[104] *AAS* 29 (1931), 254.

[105] Jedin, "Drei neue Zeitschriften für Kirschengeschichte in Italien, Spanien, und England" in *ZKG* 63 (1950–1), 201–4. K. Aland, "Der Stand der patristischen Forschung in Deutschland", *Misc. hist. eccl.* (Louvain 1961), 119–36.

By a process similar to that which has taken place in the case of history of Christian Literature, Christian archaeology has detached itself from classical archeology. Gianbattista de Rossi († 1894) raised it to the rank of a science and made it his object to render monuments, inscriptions, and patristic texts available to students of early Christian life. At first the area of interest of this kind was exclusively Roman, as in the extensive and important works of Joseph Wilpert († 1940) on the paintings in the Catacombs and on Christian sarcophagi and mosaics. But the situation has now been remedied as a result of excavations in the Christian East by J. Strzygowski, C. M. Kaufmann, and others, and by a detailed study of the relations between Classical antiquitiy and Christianity, in the work of F. J. Dölger († 1940)[106] and T. Klauser's *Reallexikon für Antike und*

---

[106] T. Klauser, *F. J. Dölger, Leben und Werk* (Münster 1956); with bibliography by K. Baus.

Christentum (from 1941). The *Bollettino di archeologia cristiana,* founded by de Rossi in 1863, became in 1924 the *Rivista di archeologia cristiana.* At the same time Pius XI established the Pontifical Institute for Christian Archaeology, of which J. P. Kirsch († 1941) became the first director.

The College of Bollandists, refounded in 1837, flourished again under three outstanding directors: Charles de Smedt († 1911), Hippolyte Delehaye († 1941) and Paul Peeters († 1950). Hagiography acquired its leading periodical in the three "libraries": the *Bibliotheca hagiographica: graeca, latina,* and *orientalis.*[107]

Patrology, Christian archaeology, and hagiography were the offspring of ecclesiastical history. A number of other special disciplines arose through reciprocal action with other sciences, especially when these had an historical orientation and therefore concerned themselves with certain spheres of the Church's activity. On the Catholic side, the history of dogma has been least able to detach itself from dogmatic theology. The incomplete essays of H. Klee, J. Schwane, and J. Bach in the nineteenth century have indeed been followed by many not insignificant individual researches and in 1905–12 by a history of dogma in the ancient Church by L. J. Tixeront; but there has been no general account comparable to the Protestant histories of dogma by A. von Harnack, R. Seeberg, and F. Loofs. The *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* of M. Schmaus and A. Grillmeier (from 1951, Eng. tr. *Herder History of Dogma,* from 1964) is concerned with the history of individual dogmas only.

In the study of Greek Orthodox literature and liturgy, Leo Allatius († 1669), Joseph Assemani († 1768) and his nephew of the same name, followed in the nineteenth century by cardinals Angelo Mai († 1854) and J. B. Pitra († 1889), all did meritorious work. But only after Karl Krumbacher († 1909) had established Byzantine studies as an independent discipline did Albert Ehrhard write, at Krumbacher's instigation, the first history of theological literature in the Byzantine Empire (1897); and this was superseded only in 1959 by H. G. Beck's *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich.* During the pontificate of Leo XIII, who was himself interested in questions concerning the Eastern Church, were founded the first periodicals dealing with the history of other Eastern churches as well as the Byzantine: the *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* (1896), *Echos d'Orient* (1897) and *Oriens Christianus* (1901). The latter was founded by Anton Baumstark († 1948), whose *Geschichte der Syrischen Literatur* (1922) together with the *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur* (5 vols., 1944–53) by Georg Graf became the standard works on Eastern Christian studies. The Pontifical Oriental Institute established in 1917 has been publishing *Orientalia Christiana periodica* since 1935; and since 1951 the *Ostkirchliche Studien* have been appearing in Würzburg.

---

[107] Peeters, *L'Œuvre des Bollandistes,* 77–208; R. Aigrain, *L'Hagiographie, ses sources, ses methodes, son histoire* (Paris 1953).

In liturgical studies, the publication of sources by E. Martène, Eusebius Renaudot's *Collectio liturgiarum Orientalium* (1716), and L. A. Muratori's *Liturgia Romana vetus* (1748) had paved the way towards overcoming the symbolic explanation of the liturgy. The Enlightenment's desire for liturgical reform was unfavourable to liturgical history; even more so was the nineteenth-century degeneration of liturgical study to that of mere rubrics. Only by the pioneering researches of L. Duchesne, P. Batiffol, S. Baeumer, E. Bishop, A. Franz, J. Braun, C. Mohlberg, and J. Jungmann did the historical view of the liturgy prevail, while at the same time the source-material was extended by the Bradshaw Society (from 1890), the *Analecta hymnica* (from 1886) of M. Dreves and C. Blume, which were later followed by the editions of the *Ordines Romani* and the *Pontificale Romanum* by M. Andrieu († 1956), and the survey of the French liturgical manuscripts by V. M. Leroquais († 1946). The *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* founded in 1291 by Odo Casel, and renamed the *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* since 1950, gave its annual reports an almost complete survey of new works in this field. At the University of Notre Dame a programme of liturgical studies was introduced in 1947 which has produced a series of scholarly volumes entitled *Liturgical Studies* to which L. Bouyer, J. Daniélou, and J. Jungmann have contributed. In other liturgical periodicals, such as *Ephemerides liturgicae* (from 1887), the historical viewpoint now dominates. This has had considerable influence on the development of the liturgical movement, in consequence of which liturgical science has now become an independent theological discipline.

In the study of Canon Law history, development was otherwise. This subject could build on the great achievements by Thomassin and Benedict XIV; in the nineteenth century it was aided by the school of legal history and reached its peak in the Protestant canonist Paul Hinschius († 1889) and his pupil Ulrich Stutz († 1938), who founded in 1908 the leading organ of the history of canon law: the canonistic section of the *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte.* For the history of the sources and literature of canon law Johann Friedrich von Schulte († 1914) wrote what is still in spite of many defects an indispensable work of reference: *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (3 vols., 1875–80). This branch of study was promoted at the same time by Friedrich Maassen († 1900), later by Paul Fournier († 1935), and most recently by Stephen Kuttner, who founded an institute for the history of medieval Church law at Washington in 1955. Among systematic studies of canon law, besides the classic *Kirchenrecht* (6 vols., 1869–97; new impression, Graz, 1959) by Hinschius, the textbook by the Tübingen canonist

J. B. Sägmüller († 1942) is noteworthy for its painstaking regard for legal history: the final complete version of this work was the third edition in 1914; the fourth edition remained unfinished after the promulgation of the new *Codex Juris Canonici.* Still unsurpassed is the *Verfassungsgeschichte der Deutschen Kirche im Mittelalter* by Albert Werminghoff (2nd ed., 1913). The outlines by A. M. Königer (1926), I. Zeiger (1940–7), and Bertrand Kurtscheid (1941–3) were intended for academic instruction; the best general accounts in German are by H. E. Feine, a pupil of Stutz, (4th ed., 1964) and W. M. Plöchl (Vienna, I 2nd ed., 1960; II 2nd ed., Vienna 1962; III 1st ed., Vienna 1959).

The history of Missions became an independent study only after missionary science had been born. In Protestant Germany the way was prepared by Gustav Warneck († 1910). The first occupant of a Catholic chair for missionary science (1914) was the Church historian Joseph Schmidlin († 1944), who occupied himself from the beginning with missionary history in the *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* (1911) and in the series *Missionswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen und Texte,* which he founded. His *Katholische Missionsgeschichte* (1925) was the first convenient textbook on the subject. The establishment of further chairs and of a missiological faculty at the Gregorian University in 1932 by Pius XI was followed by the appearance of other textbooks: by P. Lesourd (1937), F. J. Montalbán (2nd ed. 1952), T. Ohm's *Wichtige Daten der Missionsgeschichte* (2nd ed. 1961), and A. Mulders's *Missionsgeschichte* (1960); and by longer works: the *Histoire universelle des Missions catholiques* (4 vols., *s. d.),* edited by S. Delacroix, and K. S. Latourette's *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (7 vols., 1937–47). In the *Bibliotheca Missionum* (22 vols. so far since 1916), founded by R. Streit, missionary history received an almost complete bibliography, which has been supplemented since 1935 by the current *Bibliografia missionaria* of J. Rommerskirchen and others. Numerous periodicals, such as the *Revue d'historie des Missions* (1924) and the *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* (1946), and series of publications like the *Studia missionalia* (1943) of the Gregorian University, all these help research, which is always facing new problems arising from missionary methods: baptismal practice, the question of the vernacular, adaptation to native customs, and a native clergy.

How important the introduction of a new discipline into the theological curriculum can be for the development of a special science related to Church history is demonstrated by the history of asceticism and mysticism which has been built up during recent decades. Ascetic and mystical theology was made a subject on instruction by the constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* (1931); a corresponding chair at the Gregorian University had already been established in 1919. In the meantime there had appeared H. Brémond's *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France* (12 vols., 1916–38) and P. Pourrat's *La spiritualité chrétienne* (4 vols., 1918–28). Periodicals treating the subject from an historical angle were founded: such as the *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* (1920) and the *Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (1926; since 1947 under the title *Geist und Leben);* from their beginnings, such periodicals as these dealt with the subject historically, but other and older publications to an increasing degree treated the subject in a similar way: an example of this kind is the *Etudes carmélitaines* (from 1913). The *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* has been since 1937 an excellent work of reference. The great religious orders are working on their own traditions of asceticism, producing editions of their classics such as the writings of Ignatius or Teresa of Avila, publishing these works both in monographs and in general accounts, as in J. de Guibert's *La spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus* (1953). Much preliminary work has to be done towards carrying out the task of writing a general history of Catholic piety; in this connexion may be mentioned the study of religious folklore by L. A. Veit († 1939), G. Schreiber, and others.

Although the specialized sciences mentioned above have become independent and belong at the same time both to neighbouring theological disciplines and to other branches of learning (as do also the history of Christian art and that of Church music, which we have not touched upon), dogma, law, liturgy, and Missions belong particularly to the realm of general Church history. The latter must continue to study and write about these if it is to fulfill its task. It is the mother-science; they the daughters; together they constitute historical theology.

As in all branches of science, the progress of knowledge in Church history is effected by special research, which has become so extensive that no scholar is in a position to survey the whole field. General accounts such as that in the Fliche and Martin series and in the present manual had therefore to be shared out among several authors. If we talk about a "reaction" to this development, we do not mean that special research could or should be abandoned. The "reaction" is not directed against research, but aims beyond it. It seeks to escape from the practical positivism which predominated at the turn of the century, and to offer more than merely an exact exposition and interrelation of facts. It tends towards pragmatism inasmuch as it judges events ecclesiologically, as by Y. Congar, H. Lubac, J. Daniélou, and K. and H. Rahner, or ecumenically as by J. Lortz. It tends towards a theology of history inasmuch as it relates the history of the Church to that of man's salvation, and thus leads back to the attitude which prevailed till the seventeenth century, but has since been pushed into the background by research into sources and narration of the course of history. Finally, it discusses the problems in the writing of history which have been raised by E. Troeltsch and F. Meinecke and the historicity of the Church as such. Only the future will tell if, and how much, these new ways of looking at things broaden and deepen our knowledge of the history of the Church.

Church History in England and America in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries[108]

In England as on the continent the status of ecclesiastical history in the nineteenth century was largely determined by the reactions of the Romantic movement to the rationalism of the Enlightenment. Enlightened historians of the eighteenth century, Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon, studied and wrote history because they found it a useful teacher of private virtue and correct public policy. Hume in *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688* (1761) conceived the medieval Church as a corrupt political monolith, and consequently interpreted the dissolution of the Church in the sixteenth century as something politically and economically advantageous to the State. Gibbon regarded his classic *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776–88) as a chronicle of the triumph of superstition and barbarism and described the Church as the great obstacle to progress and the advance of learning during the Middle Ages. Yet in spite of his rationalism he was the first of the English historians to appreciate fully the importance of the element of continuity in history.

The romantic historians, on the other hand, cultivated an appreciation for the Church's past by approaching its history in unprejudiced fashion and attempting to judge it according to its own standards. As a result their work was characterized by an enthusiasm for the past and a concern for historical continuity. By seeking the roots for the social organization of modern England, they succeeded in making the Middle Ages a respectable period of investigation and thus prepared the way for the scientific study of ecclesiastical history. The publication of source material was supported by Parliament. In the late eighteenth century the House of Commons established the Records Commission to calendar, restore, and publish manuscripts. In 1822, under the editorship of Henry Petrie, keeper of the records in the Tower of London, work began on the *Monumenta Britannica Historica* which was to collect the medieval sources of national history but the first volumes did not appear until 1848. Nine years later the Treasury approved the Master of the Roll's proposal to publish critical editions of the rare and valuable sources of British history from the invasion of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII.

---

[108] Additional part written by the editor of the English edition.

Probably the most widely read ecclesiastical history in the first half of the nineteenth century was Joseph Milner's (1744–97) *History of the Church of Christ* (1794–1809). Newman said in his *Apologia pro vita sua* that reading Milner's Church history awakened his interest in patristic Christianity. Milner's intention was to provide an antidote for histories of the Church like Mosheim's which he thought too much concerned with recording its failures, heresies, and disputes. "The terms 'church' and 'Christian,'" said Milner, "in their natural sense respect only good men. Such a succession of pious men in all ages existed, and it will be no contemptible use of such a history as this if it proves that in every age there have been *real* followers of Christ." The Bible, which gave man a glimpse of himself as he really is—a creature fallen but retaining elements of his original glory—opened the meaning of history for Milner. As an Evangelical vicar he knew through the experience of conversion what the Fall and Redemption meant, and, consequently, he could appreciate the significance of continued failure in the world. If the Fall of man was apparent in secular history, the Redemption of man was equally apparent in Church history: God is operative among His people. The guide-line which enabled Milner to cut neatly through Christian Church history was the fact that he wrote about no special institution, but about the invisible collectivity of believers which Evangelicals recognized as the Church. Milner's principle of including only those believers who accepted the doctrine of justification by faith alone as Evangelicals understood it turned the book into a polemical rewriting of ecclesiastical history. But although the *History of the Church of Christ* was intended to provide an interpretation satisfactory to Evangelicals, Milner was not averse to praising good in the Roman Church when he saw it.

Joseph Strutt (1749–1802) is typical of the growing interest in ecclesiastical history that was fostered by romanticism and nationalism. More interested in social antiquities than political theories, he delved into the Anglo-Saxon medieval past, examining in great detail the religious and cultural aspects of early English ecclesiastical history. His *The Regal and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of England from Edward the Confessor to Henry the Eighth* provided a font of information that was to stimulate a more critical interest among later historians. During the 1830's and 1840's this interest bore fruit in the appearance of the Caxton Society, the English Historical Society, and the Camden Society. At Cambridge the work of the "Ecclesiologists" gave an impetus to the study of church architecture and hymnology and laid the groundwork for the English liturgical revival. The publication of *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments* by J. Neale and W. Webb in 1843, a translation in part of the *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* of William Durandus with selections from Hugh of Saint Victor, was a milestone in the increasing interest in the history of the liturgy. Neale was also the first English historian to produce important works on the eastern churches.

August Pugin (1812–52), a convert to Catholicism, was probably the most well known of the gothic revivalists. In 1850 as Professor of Architecture and Ecclesiastical Antiquities at Oscott College, he published *An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of Ancient Plain Song* which voiced an appeal for a return to historical sources similar to the works of Chateaubriand and Görres. He constantly berated his co-religionists for their lack of historical perspective and was appalled by the parodies of the liturgy he witnessed in Rome and Cologne. An interest in the historical origins of the liturgy continued throughout the nineteenth century in the editions of Feltoe, Wilson, and Bradshaw.

Easily the most significant English Church historian in the first half of the nineteenth century was John Lingard (1771–1851). The *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (1806), which Lingard intended to be an apologia for the Roman Catholic Church in England, was a pioneer accomplishment in scientific history. It was the product of extensive research in and careful exegesis of Latin and Anglo-Saxon sources, a remarkable achievement in itself, since neither the Rolls Series nor any other printed collections were then in existence. Lingard recounted the birth of Christianity in Britain, gave a detailed survey of the life and practices of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and concluded with an account of the Danish invasions, the consequent decay and later revival of Church discipline, and a final, somewhat unsatisfactory section of the Anglo-Saxon missions. In order not to offend non-Catholics, Lingard avoided direct reference to the Mass, referred to the Pope as the Bishop of Rome and to priests as presbyters. Throughout he dismissed evidences of the miraculous in the Anglo-Saxon Church as lately-acquired popularizations and he refrained from canonizing anyone.

In 1819, when the first three volumes of Lingard's *History of England* were published, many Protestants were attracted to this Roman Catholic priest who could write history with such candour and truth. Lingard did not share the romantic fervour of his co-religionists for things medieval and was hardly of a "pro-Catholic" predisposition. As could be expected, Catholics rankled when they read about St Joan of Arc's "mental delusion".

His treatment of the Reformation was aimed at dispelling misconceptions and commonly accepted misstatements. He admitted the need for reform in head and members during the fifteenth century and made no apologies for the wordly popes of the Renaissance. He frankly stated in his interpretation of the Reformation, founded on a careful examination of the sources, that it was a revolution based in contemporary political upheaval. The secular power in England triumphed over the spiritual power at the expense of civil liberties. Because Lingard found the roots of the Reformation more directly in Luther and Calvin than in a calm reading of Scripture and Church history, he asserted that it had broken the historical tradition of English institutions.

Although Newman (1801–90) cannot be strictly regarded as an historian, he, nevertheless, as the greatest figure in the Oxford Movement, contributed to the study of ecclesiastical history in England. He found the neglect of ecclesiastical history in England, even among Anglican divines, a sign that Protestants must realize that they were not representative of the Christianity of History. "It is a melancholy to say it", he wrote, "but the chief, perhaps the only English writer who has any claim to be considered an ecclesiastical historian, is the unbeliever Gibbon."[109] He spoke equally well of the Romanticist, Walter Scott, as a writer who "has contributed by his works in prose and verse, to prepare men for some closer and more practical approximation to Catholic truth." The subject of ecclesiastical history was in fact a field that in a certain sense projected him into the public eye in England. Patristical studies, especially the Alexandrians, formed the background of all his theological thinking. His first important work was to have been a history of the councils. But he "lost himself in a task for which a lifetime had been insufficient". The result of this effort was his *Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833) which however gives sparse notice to the councils. Yet the main thesis of the work, that Antioch rather than Alexandria was the source of Arianism and that its underlying philosophy was Aristotelian rather than Platonic, evoked the praise of Döllinger. He reached conclusions through conjecture and without critical apparatus that were later arrived at by continental scholars, notably Neander.

Newman's contribution to the *Library of the Fathers,* a pioneering effort in patristics, was the *Select Treatise of St Athanasius* and has been described as among the richest treatises of English patristic literature. He also published in the *British Magazine* between 1833 and 1836 a series of essays entitled *Church of the Fathers* which appeared in 1840 as a one-volume work. It was a most effective instrument in the propagation of Tractarian opinions. A further historical project that was never completed was a series of essays on the three periods of Christian education, ancient medieval, and modern, represented by the three great founders of religious orders, Benedict, Dominic, and Ignatius, and subtitled the poetic, the scientific, and the practical eras. It was, however, in his famous *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845) that Newman presented his theory of antecedent probability and confirmed his philosophy of history as an attempt to grasp the sacred meaning of the promise of Christ "I am with you all the days even to the consummation of the world."

---

[109] J. Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London 1846), 5.

Henry Hart Milman (1791–1868) gave nineteenth century Englishmen their best look at the medieval history of the Church. *The History of Christianity under the Empire* (1840), which cautious clergymen made it a point to ignore, served as an introduction to Milman's later compact survey of the medieval Church from Theodosius down to the eve of the Reformation. *The History of Latin Christianity down to the death of Pope Nicholas V* (1854–5) is a masterpiece of Victorian literature. The author traces the modifications of Christianity, by which it accommodated itself to the spirit of successive ages and portrays the genius of the Christianity of each successive age, demonstrating the reciprocal influence of civilization. The same attitude through which Milman de-emphasized the miraculous in his *History of the Jews* (1829) led him to focus attention on the secular activity and life of the Church in his later works. He was not interested in theological controversy, and as a consequence he avoided the anti-Catholic polemic so common among Protestant scholars of his time. Froude termed the *History of Latin Christianity* "the finest historical work in the English language" and Gooch praised him as an historian who did not write for the edification of his readers but portrayed the Church as an institution rather than as an influence.[110]

Along with Milman, William Stubbs (1825–1901) is accredited with the introduction of German historical methodology in England. He made his first important contribution to the study of Church history in the *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* which traced the succession of bishops through the centuries. In 1863 Stubbs, who had criticized the Records Commission for publishing too many sources of only secondary importance, was commissioned as an editor for the Rolls series. Through the magnificent contributions he made during the next twenty-five years, he inaugurated the critical study of medieval sources in England. His classic, the *Constitutional History of England down to 1485* (1873–8) had a wider range than the title indicated. It was, in effect, a history of England from Julius Caesar down to the accession of the Tudors.

In 1866 Stubbs became professor of Modern History at Oxford. His inaugural lecture indicates his efforts to emanicipate "the history of the Church as a whole" from its theological heritage. By this Stubbs meant that Church history was beginning to be considered as a discipline independent from theology. Ecclesiastical history was broadened to a more universal study, and freed from its former restriction to the first Christian centuries and the general councils. It became 'the study of the Church as a whole . . . as the life of the Christian Church itself, the whole history of the body of which the modern nations claim in their spiritual character to be members". Stubbs considered this study of universal Church history as one with the study of Modern History:

---

[110] G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (Boston 1962), 499.

"The study of Modern History is, next to theology itself . . . the most thoroughly religious training the mind can receive. It is no paradox to say that Modern History, including Medieval History in the term, is co-extensive in its field of view, in its habits of criticism, in the persons of its most famous students, with Ecclesiastical History. We may call them sister studies, but if they are not really one and the same, they are twin sisters, so much alike that there is no distinguishing between them."[111]

Lord Acton (1834–1902), the first Catholic to hold the chair of Modern History at Cambridge, with Stubbs would not separate ecclesiastical and profane history, but for different reasons. Acton perceived that the only unifying element in history was the conception of freedom and his fondest plan, which he never realized, was to write a universal history of human liberty. The Church, in Acton's vision of world history, cannot withdraw from the confusion of modern politics with the excuse that its kingdom is not of this world. The Church is incarnate in the temporal, political order, so that its history is a part of this world's experience. "Religion", wrote Acton, "had to transform the public as well as the private life of nations, to effect a system of public right corresponding with private morality and without which it is imperfect and insecure." The Church's role in history binds her to work on and influence temporal order, and as a consequence, her history has universal significance.

In Acton's political theory the Church is a guardian of free conscience and a barrier against political despotism in any shape, whether it be absolute monarchy or rationalist democracy. The Church was the only force powerful enough to ensure human freedom against the rise of omnipotent States. Acton was critical of theReformation and the establishment of Protestant States because it weakened the institution whose mission included the preservation of human freedom.

The other side of the coin — the tendency of churchmen in authority to curtail freedom of conscience — was impressed upon Acton through bitter personal experience. In 1859 at the age of twenty-five Acton became the editor of the *Rambler,* a liberal Catholic journal which insisted thematically in every issue that scientific truth could not but vindicate the true religion. If unsavoury truths in the history of the Church are covered up, Acton said, the authority of the Church confuses its heavenly goal with a perverse attachment to earthly power and property. When it became apparent thet the *Rambler* was about to be suppressed, in 1862

---

[111] B. W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History* (Oxford 1887), 10.

Acton began publishing it under a new name, *The Home and Foreign Review,* but he did not change the editorial policy. The journal collided head on with the hierarchy in 1863 by supporting Döllinger, Acton's mentor, in his plea made at a Munich Catholic Congress for the Church to end its hostility to historical criticism. The Pope's response was a demand for prior censorship of Catholic writing in Germany. With disaster portending for the *Home and Foreign Review,* Acton closed it in April, 1864, rather than provoke a showdown with the hierarchy in which he would either have to suspend his principles or disobey authority.

Acton never wrote his *History of Liberty* or any other complete, systematic work, but his vision of history in general and his appreciation of truth and free conscience in particular commend themselves as standards to the writer of ecclesiastical history. "It is the duty of the historian", wrote Acton in an appendix to a letter to Mandell Creighton, "to extricate himself from the influence of social groups, political parties, Church, and the like, which tend to interfere with conscience." This is an accurate summary of Acton's opinion on his own situation. The condemnation of the final heresy by Pius IX in the *Syllabus of Errors,* reads like a declaration of Acton's principles: "The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and recent civilization."

The attitude towards the historical interpretation of the papacy was the point of difference between Acton and Mandell Creighton (1843–1901). As a curate of Bishop Lightfoot in the Northumberland village of Embleton, he began to write *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome* (1887–94). "It would fill a void", said Creighton of his book, "between Milman, which becomes very scrappy towards its close, and Ranke's 'Popes', and my object is to combine the picturesqueness of the one with the broad political views of the other."[112] Creighton's interest in political and diplomatic technique gave the *History of the Papacy* a broader scope than the title indicates, for he used the papacy as a focal point to study the changes in European history during the sixteenth century. On Creighton's request Lord Acton reviewed the first two volumes which appeared in 1882 and praised Creighton for his "sovereign impartiality". What Acton found lacking was concern for the force of ideas in history, and what he objected most to was the favourable verdict on conciliarism. Creighton finished the next two volumes in 1887, three years after he was appointed first Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge and two years after he became the first editor of the *English Historical Review.* Again he requested Acton's review and when Acton responded with a severe critique, naked of all the usual, softening academic amenities, he found himself in the unenviable position of an editor who requested, received, and was about to publish a condemnation of his own work. Acton's objections were two. In the first place he criticized Creighton's evading moral judgments on the papacy, and secondly, he thought Creighton's attention to life and action was a superficial substitute for thought and law. He was also critical of Creighton's remarks in the preface, indicating his willingness to explain away the questionable activities of the popes. Neither Acton nor Creighton were surprised with evil when they found it in history, but Creighton was more tolerant of weakness and less quick to judge. For example, he did not cover up the vices of Pope Alexander VI, but he salvaged what he could of the Pope's reputation by praising him for not adding hypocrisy to his sins. Acton would not yield his stand that the office could not absolve the man; the exchange of letters between him and Creighton concerning Acton's review occasioned Acton's famous dictum "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Acton toned down the language but did not alter the content of his article.

---

[112] Quoted in Gooch, *op. cit.* pp. 349, 350.

Downside Abbey has given England a number of ecclesiastical historians. William Bernard Ullathorne (1806–89), monk of Downside and Bishop of Birmingham for thirty-eight years, wrote a small octavo *History of the Restoration of the English Hierarchy* which he published in 1871. The first of several abbots of Downside who made significant contributions to the study of Church history was Francis Neil Gasquet (1846–1929). Gasquet was forty years old when he began to research the history of monasticism in England during the Tudor period. He was the first scholar to treat the papers of Cromwell methodically and the first to use the records of the Court of Augmentations and the pension list of Cardinal Pole. Working seven or eight hours daily in the British Museum, the Public Records Office, and with private collections, in three years he produced *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries. Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* followed in 1890.

In 1900 Gasquet published *The Eve of the Reformation* which grew out of the article he had submitted to Lord Acton for the *Cambridge Modern History*. Acton returned the article because Gasquet's standard of impartiality was somewhat different from his and the difference was never settled. Although he was a gifted antiquary credited with many discoveries and with recognizing the value of wills, library records, inventories, and bishops' registers for historical interpretation, Gasquet was not only a careless scholar, but he also lacked the fidelity demanded of an editor. "Towards the end of his life, indeed," observed David Knowles, "Gasquet's capacity for carelessness amounted almost to genius." "In his transcription of the Acton correspondence . . . Gasquet consistently omitted or even altered without indication passages of phrases which might . . . cause personal offence or exhibit Acton's critical or petulant attitude toward venerable ecclesiastics. Thus he would print 'Newman' where Acton had written 'old Noggs', and the forthright remark 'Pius IV was an ass' appears in the anodyne form 'Pius IV was no good'."[113]

Because of his friendship with Gasquet, Edmund Bishop (1846–1917), although not one of its sons, will always have his name associated with Downside Abbey. Before Bishop became a Catholic in 1867 he had served a year as literary secretary to Thomas Carlyle (1864). He demonstrated his gift for scholarship in his discovery, transcription, and analysis of the *Collectio Britannica* which consisted in some three hundred papal briefs from the fifth to the twelfth centuries previously unknown. Bishop, unable to have them published in England, edited them for the *Monumenta Germanica Historica* and won praise from Mommsen himself. He was a student of early and medieval Church history and his knowledge of the western liturgies far surpassed that of any of his contemporaries. His interest in liturgical studies went beyond the textual and ritual to a much broader dimension. He was, in effect, an historian of Christian social and religious life. His natural equipment for research, especially his vast memory, helped him make his works a treasure-house for other scholars, including his friend Gasquet. Some of these works were collected and published in 1918 under the title *Liturgica Historica.*

In 1919, Dom Cuthbert Butler, another abbot of Downside, published *Benedictine Monachism,* which was not merely a history, but a fully appreciative mystical, ascetical and constitutional study of the Benedictine spirit. In his discussion on Cassian's *Conference on Prayer* and the chapter "Is Benedictine Life Contemplative?", he raised the question which became the topic for his next book, *Western Mysticism* which appeared in 1922. In 1930 Butler published the *History of the Vatican Council* which has not made so favourable an impression. The book's weakness has two sources. On one hand, it grew out of Ullathorne's letters, which are not of first importance because the Bishop, not one for theological or diplomatic warfare, was not attuned to subtle undertones or overtones in the council wrangling. Moreover, he was not by training an historian of political and intellectual life and could not deal adequately with the complex cross-currents of the mid-nineteenth century. It remains, however, the only satisfactory history of the Council in English.

Dom David Knowles, former Professor of Medieval and Modern History at Cambridge is the finest scholar of Downside. *The Monastic Order in England* which he published in 1940 begins amid the tenth century, because it was then that St Dunstan founded anew Anglo-Saxon monasticism which disappeared during the Danish invasions. In the first half of the book Knowles studies the influence of various continental houses on monastic foundations and reforms in England, noting especially the distinctions between Cluniac attitudes of withdrawal from the world and the tendency of Norman monasticism to fit itself into society. The second half studied the internal life and structure of the monasteries. In the first two volumes of the *Religious Orders of England* Knowles continued the history of the Benedictine revival down to the end of the Wars of the Roses. Volume III, *The Tudor Age,* appeared in 1959, thirty years after he began his initial research. It is the history of the decline and deep-rooted decay of monasticism in England before the destruction by Henry VIII. Mention must also be made of two other contemporary English Church historians, H. O. Evenett, whose study on Charles Guise, *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent* is a substantial contribution to the Counter-Reformation period, and Philip Hughes. The latter's *History of the Church,* 3 vols. (1934–47) and his *The Reformation in England,* 3 vols. (1950–4) are standard works in English-speaking lands.

---

[113] D. Knowles, *The Historian and Character* (Cambridge 1963), 256.

The first history of the Church to be written and published in the United States was the six-volume *A General History of the Christian Church* (1802–3) by the Unitarian J. A. Priestley. The author held high regard for Fleury whom he used extensively and for Mosheim although he criticized the latter for his "artificial and unnatural" division by centuries. He particularly deplored the artful insinuations of Gibbon. Milner and Mosheim continued to be read by American Protestants but were gradually replaced by translations of Gieseler and Neander. P. Schaff's *History of the Christian Church* (1882–1910) is typical of the strong German influence on American Protestant historiography during the later nineteenth century.

The layman, John G. Shea (1824–92), may be regarded as the foremost Catholic Church historian of the nineteenth century in America. Although lacking in formal professional training, he nevertheless produced work of a highly scientific nature. His four-volume *History of the Catholic Church in America* (1886–92) was the first comprehensive work of this kind. Since most of the documentary material relating to the early Church in America, deposited in the archives of the Propaganda de Fide, has not been utilized, there is as yet no adequate "History of the Church in America". Peter Guilday (1884–1947), who studied under A. Cauchie at Louvain, directed most of his research into the colonial period. The *Life and Times of John Carroll Archbishop of Baltimore* (1922) set the pattern for subsequent Catholic historians in America who have concentrated for the most part in writing biographies of the hierarchy. Guilday's *An Introduction to Church History* (1925) and *Church Historians* (1926), the latter a collection of essays on Eusebius, Orosius, Möhler, Lingard, Pastor, and others, were the first attempts to stimulate an interest in the serious study of ecclesiastical history among American Catholics.

PART ONE

The Beginnings

SECTION ONE

Jewish Christianity

CHAPTER 1

Judaism in the Time of Jesus

THE New Testament account of salvation history tells us that Jesus Christ came into this world "when the fullness of time was come" (Gal 4:4, Mk 1:14). A longing for the promised Messiah was certainly alive in Jewry at that time, but it was more generally rooted in the political distress of the people than in religious motives. For more than half a century the Jewish people had lived under Roman domination, which was all the more hated because it was exercised by a man who had deeply offended their most sacred national and religious feelings. Herod the Great, the son of Caesar's friend Antipater — an Idumaean and therefore a foreigner — had contrived to obtain from the Roman Senate the title of King of the Jews, in return for which he had to pledge himself to protect Roman interests in the politically important Near East, especially against the dangerous Parthians.

He had first to conquer his kingdom by force of arms, and from the moment that he first trod upon Palestinian soil he was met by the hatred of the people, who under the leadership of the Hasmonaean prince Antigonus offered violent resistance to him. Herod overcame this with Roman assistance and took Jerusalem in 37 B.C. He ruthlessly exterminated the Hasmonaean dynasty, which more than a century earlier, under Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers, had defended Jewish religious freedom in an heroic struggle against Syrian overlordship. Herod managed to hold in check the seething fury of the people, but in his efforts to win the hearts of his subjects by rebuilding the Temple, founding new cities, and promoting the economic and cultural life of his kingdom, he failed. In his will he divided the kingdom among his three younger sons: the central part, Judaea, with Samaria and Idumaea, was left to Archelaus, who was also to inherit the royal title. The adjacent territory to the north went to Herod Antipas, the provinces of Batanaea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis in the north-east, to Philip.

However, the change of ruler led in Judaea to serious disturbances, which could be put down only with the help of the Roman army. The Romans, seeing that Archelaus was unable to guarantee peace and security, deposed him in 6 B.C. Augustus gave the country a new administration in the person of a Roman procurator who had Caesarea as his official residence and who was responsible, in association with the Roman governor in Syria, for the military security and economic control of the region, while the Sanhedrin, a purely Jewish body under the presidency of the high priest, was made competent for Jewish internal affairs. But even this arrangement failed to bring the awaited civil peace. For the Jews, it was a grave affront to their national consciousness that a Roman cohort was always stationed in Jerusalem and that their taxes were fixed by Romans. Many a procurator overplayed his role as representative of the Roman master-race with too much emphasis and so fed the flames of hatred against foreign domination. The root cause of the continued strained relations between political overlords and subject people is, however, to be found in the latter's unique intellectual and spiritual character, for which a Roman could hardly have had much understanding.

The Religious Situation among Palestinian Jewry

The Jewish people was, in the eyes of surrounding nations, characterized above all by the peculiarity of its religious convictions, which it sought to defend in the midst of utterly different currents of thought and forms of worship. While not avoiding contact with this surrounding world in every-day life, the Jews had held fast to the essential features of their faith and religious life with remarkable persistence, even when it cost them heavy sacrifices and resulted in isolation from other peoples. The central point of the Jewish religion was its monotheism; the Jews were conscious of being led, throughout all the phases of their history, by the one true God, Jahweh, for he had often revealed himself to them as their only Lord by his immediate intervention or by the word of his prophets. This belief in the guidance of a just and faithful God might, indeed, waver in its degree of intensity and immediacy, and it might in later times be exposed through the speculations of many rabbis to the danger of a certain rigidity, yet the people never lost it. The pious Jew planned his daily life out of his belief in God's faithful and merciful guidance: the people as a whole knew themselves to have been chosen before all the nations of the world by the Covenant which he had made with them, so that one day salvation for all men might go forth from them. This faith was nourished by the hope in a future Saviour and Redeemer, whom the prophets had unwearyingly proclaimed as the Messiah. This hope constantly raised up again both individuals and people. The Messiah was to spring from among them and to establish in Israel the kingdom of God, thus raising Israel above all the kingdoms of the world, and he was to be king over them.

This expectation of the Messiah and of the kingdom of God was, in times of grave peril for the religious and political freedom of the people, their chief source of strength. With merging of religious and political life, the idea of the Messiah easily took on an all too earthly tinge, coloured by the daily distresses of the Jewish people, so that many saw in the Messiah predominantly the saviour from worldly tribulations, or later, quite concretely, the liberator from the hated Roman yoke.

But there were also in contemporary Jewry circles which did not lose sight of the essentially religious mission of the Messiah, as foretold by the prophets, and who awaited in him the king of David's stock who would make Jerusalem all pure and holy, who would tolerate no injustice, no evil, who would reign over a holy people in a holy kingdom (cf. Dan 7:9, 13, 27). Out of such a glowing hope were born those religious canticles which are called the psalms of Solomon,[1] and which, following the pattern of the biblical psalms, express in living and convincing accents the longing for the promised Saviour, as for instance the seventeenth psalm: "Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David, at the time in the which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant. Gird him with strength, that he may cast down the lord of wickedness; cleanse Jerusalem from the heathen who so pitifully oppress her... Then shall he gather together a holy people which he shall rule with justice, and he shall raise up the tribes of the people which the Lord his God hath blessed... He shall keep the Gentiles under his yoke, that they may serve him; he shall glorify the Lord before all the world. He shall make Jerusalem all holy and all pure, as it was in the beginning... Injustice shall be done no more among them in his time, for all shall be holy and the Lord's anointed shall now be their king... Blessed is he who shall live in those days! O God, let his grace soon appear over Israel: let him save us from defilement by unholy enemies. The Lord is Himself our king for ever and ever."

Besides belief in one God and the expectation of the Messiah, the Law was of decisive importance in Judaism at that time. To observe the Law was the daily task of every pious Jew, and its fulfilment was his most serious endeavour; if he transgressed against it, even unwittingly, he must make atonement. His fidelity to the Law had its reward, even in this life, in those blessings of modest well-being which the Lord gives; but its true reward would come when the Last Judgment confirmed that upon earth he had been just and could enter into eternal life. The Law was given to every Jew in the Holy Scriptures, into the spirit of which he was initiated in early childhood by his parents and which he was later taught in special schools. Participation in divine worship in the Temple, or in a synagogue such as were to be found in all the principal towns of Palestine, kept alive his knowledge of the Scriptures which were expounded there in sermons. As the Law did not provide ready-made answers that covered every situation in life, its interpretation was entrusted to special scholars (known as Scribes) who became an important institution in the religious life of the Jews.

---

[1] Eighteen of these psalms have been preserved in a Greek translation; text in A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, II, 471–89; English translation in Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1913), II, 631–52,

In their fundamental reverence for the Law all Jews were agreed; yet the Law itself became the occasion of a division of the people into several parties, based upon the differing degrees of importance that they attached to its influence on the whole of life. Even before the beginning of the Maccabaean wars there had arisen the movement of the Hassidim or Hasideans, a community of serious-minded men who, for their religious life, sought the ultimate will of God that lay behind the Law. This will of God seemed to them so sublime that they wanted to build "a fence around the Law", so as to make every transgression, even involuntary, impossible.[2] They wished to serve the Law with an unconditional obedience even unto death, and thus they helped to create that attitude of heroic sacrifice which distinguished the people in the time of the Maccabees. The Hasideans, however, did not gain a universal following; in particular, the noble families and the leading priests held aloof from them. These were the circles which are called Sadducees in the New Testament; they subscribed to a sort of rationalism which rejected belief in angels and spirits and ridiculed the idea of the resurrection of the dead. For them, the five books of Moses, the *Tora* proper, were the principal authority. In political questions they inclined towards an opportunistic attitude in dealing with their overlords. They were a minority, though an influential one.[3]

The most considerable religious party at the beginning of the first Christian century, not in numbers but in the esteem in which it was held by the people, was that of the Pharisees. Although their name signifies "the separated ones", they sought consciously to influence the whole people and to spread their opinions, an attempt in which they largely succeeded. They regarded themselves as the representatives of orthodox Judaism, and their conception of the Law and its observance was at that time the typical expression of Jewish religion. They took over from the Hasideans the basic idea of the overriding importance of the Law in the life of the individual as well as of the people as a whole, and in this respect the Pharisees may be regarded as their successors. But they made the "fence around the Law" even more impenetrable in as much as they wished to lay down the line of conduct required by the Law for every situation in life. This detailed interpretation of the Law found expression in the *Mishna* and the *Talmud,* in which great importance was attached to the opinions of earlier teachers, so that, in succeeding times, tradition played a predominant part in the study of the Law. The attempt to apply the Law to every conceivable situation of daily life led to an exegesis in which every particle was of great moment, and which could draw the most abstruse conclusions from incidentals.

---

[2] Cf. W. Foerster, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte,* I, 2 (Hamburg 1956), 45 ff.

[3] E. M. Smallwood, "High Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine" in *JTS* 13 (1962), 13–34.

More fateful was the consequent casuistic attitude in all moral questions, which either rendered free moral decision on the part of the individual impossible or gave it a spurious basis. At the same time the Pharisaic Scribes were induced in particular cases to make concessions which contradicted their own principles, since they had after all to make decisions which could be followed by the whole people. With such a casuistic attitude, differences of opinion among the Scribes were unavoidable, and schools of interpretation grew up as for example the school of Shammai or the school of Hillel. In public life the Pharisees were at pains to serve as living models for the fulfilment of the Law, and accepted certain honours in return, such as the title Rabbi or the first places in the synagogues. Sometimes there is traceable, even in their personal piety, a vain self-complacency on account of their fidelity to the Law, which looked down with a mixure of pity and contempt on sinners and on "the multitude that knoweth not the Law" (Jn 7:49). In the face of such an attitude, the great fundamental idea of the God of Israel as the Lord of History, to whose will men had to bow down in humility and trust and whose mercy they might implore in hopeful prayers, receded into the background.

The Pharisees did not, however, succeed in permeating the whole of contemporary Judaism with their religious opinions. The group known as the Zealots likewise wished to observe the Law faithfully, but their attitude was markedly warlike, ready for martyrdom. They actively rejected all that was pagan and refused to pay tribute to Caesar; they even called for open resistance to heathen domination, because they considered that obedience to the Law demanded such a holy war.[4]

The Qumran Community

Fidelity to the Law and zeal for its complete and pure fulfilment drove another group of the Jewish people, the Essenes, out of public life into the wilderness. The numerous literary and archaeological discoveries which have been made since 1947 among the ruins of Hirbet Qumran, west of the Dead Sea (a centre of this sect), have greatly enriched the picture which Pliny[5] and Flavius Josephus drew of them. Their beginnings go back to the time of the Maccabees and they flourished about the year 100 B.C.

---

[4] M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten, Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 n. Chr.* (Leiden - Cologne 1961), esp. 235–92; N. Oswald, "Grundgedanken zu einer pharisäischen rabbinischen Theologie" in *Kairos* 5 (1963), 40–59.

The Essenes believed that Belial, as Satan was usually called in Qumran, had spread three nets over Israel: unchastity, ill-gotten riches, and pollution of the Temple.[6] They meant by this the enrichment of the leaders of the people with heathen booty and the very lax way in which some of them interpreted the marriage laws (Lev 18:13). To the Essenes it seemed that the service of the Temple could no longer be carried out without defilement by priests holding such lax views; and, when their representations were not followed by removal of the evil, they ceased to attend the Temple or to take part in its services, renouncing all communion with "the men of corruption". In practice this meant a schism of the Hasideans into the party of the Pharisees and the numerically smaller group of the Essenes, who now felt themselves to be the "holy remnant" of the true Israel. Their leadership was assumed by a person who, in the Qumran texts, is called the "Teacher of Righteousness" and to whom the first organization of their community is attributed. This teacher proclaimed a new interpretation of the Law which consisted in the total fulfilment of the will of God, as expressed in it. Here there were no half-measures: one could only love God entirely or reject him utterly, walk in his ways or consciously persist in the obstinacy of one's own heart. He who did not join the Essenes in their unconditional obedience to the Law as understood by them was of necessity godless. The will to observe the Law completely led to such concrete results as the reform by the Essenes of the Jewish calendar, so that the feasts might be kept annually on the same day of the week.

The Teacher of Righteousness further proclaimed a new interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies. The last age foretold by them had already begun; the final struggle between the sons of light and the children of darkness was at hand, and its outcome would bring, for the sons of light, the Essenes, the commencement of an eternity of peace and salvation. Two Messiahs were to play a part in this final combat, the high priest of the last age, the "*Anointed of Aaron*", and the prince of the last age, the "*Anointed of Israel*". The Essenes' consciousness of being specially chosen went with a reverent recognition of the divine omnipotence, which had sorted men out through a kind of predestination; some were given to the spirit of truth and light, some to the spirit of darkness and wickedness. The salvation of the children of light was an unmerited grace.

---

[5] J.-P. Audet, "Qumran et la notice de Pline sur les esséniens" in *RB* 68 (1961), 346–87.

[6] W. Foerster, *op. cit.* 58 f.

This radical doctrine and the practice based upon it led to an organized union of the Essenes, which, in the Qumran group, took on the character of a religious order. Here the community of God developed into a quasi-monastic brotherhood into which a man was received as a full member after a period of probation, a novitiate, whereupon he swore an oath to observe the rules of the order. The property of a new member became the property of the brotherhood. Meals and consultations in common brought the members together. On these occasions a rigid order of precedence prevailed, the priests taking a higher position. Special regulations governing ritual cleanliness required numerous and repeated washings; the brotherhood in Qumran was celibate, but in the neighbourhood of the settlement there lived married followers, and there must have been individual Essenes all over Palestine. There was no pity for the godless man; he was regarded with merciless hatred and the wrath of God was called down upon him.

The non-biblical writings which have been found at least in fragmentary form at Hirbet Qumran show the strong interest of the group in the so-called apocalyptic literature, the themes of which are the great events which are to take place at the end of the world: the final victory over evil, the resurrection of the dead, the Last Judgment and the glory of the everlasting age of salvation. Fragments of works of this kind already known, such as the Book of Jubilees, the Book of Enoch, and the Jewish prototype of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, suggest with great probability the Essene origin of those writings. Other fragments, such as that of a Book of Noah, a Book of Mysteries, and a manuscript on the New Jerusalem, confirm the supposition that the number of "apocalypses" was much larger than what now survives. Certain features of this apocalyptic literature of the Essenes indicate that a change took place in the community's views during the course of time. A more merciful attitude towards the godless and towards sinners appears; the hate theme recedes into the background and the duty of loving one's neighbour embraces those who do not belong to the community, even the enemy and the sinner. The age of salvation came later to be understood as a kind of return of Paradise on earth; no more than the Qumran texts of the earlier period do the apocalyptic texts point to a clearly defined Messiah-figure.

The literature so far known permits no complete reconstruction of the Essene movement. Only Josephus, writing after the destruction of Jerusalem[7] goes into detail. According to him, there was no far-reaching inner development among them; they maintained unshaken their demand for heroic fidelity to the Law, and Josephus also describes their charitable assistance even to non-members, though the duty of hating the godless remained. Whether the Essenes also took part in the fight against the Romans during the rebellion of A.D. 66–70, is not definitely stated, but it appears probable, since that conflict might easily have been interpreted by them as the final battle of the sons of light against those of darkness. Josephus is quite silent about their Messianic ideas at that time; he mentions neither John the Baptist nor Jesus of Nazareth in this connexion, so the most faithful to the Law of all Jewish groups probably knew hardly anything about the latter. Nor can a close relationship with or dependence of Jesus on the Qumran sect be proved.[8]

---

[7] Josephus, *Antiquitates*, 20, 5, 4, sect. 113–17.

The monastic centre of Qumran was destroyed by the Romans in A.D. 68; the remnant of the community was probably so decimated in the Bar Cochba rebellion (A.D. 132–5) that reorganization was impossible. The Essene movement has no importance in the subsequent history of the Jewish religion; the leading role passed to their great opponents, the Pharisees.

The Jewish Diaspora

Outside Palestine there dwelt large numbers of Jews who were to have a decisive influence on the expansion of Christianity in the Hellenistic world. Since the eighth century B.C. they had spread in repeated waves, of forced settlement or of voluntary emigration, over the Near East and the whole Mediterranean basin, and at the beginning of the Christian era they considerably outnumbered the inhabitants of Palestine. The great centres of Hellenistic culture had a special attraction for them; thus, for instance there were powerful Jewish colonies at Antioch, Rome, and especially Alexandria, where two of the five districts of the city were allotted to them. Their fellow-citizens saw in their strong community feeling an especially striking characteristic. Wherever their numbers allowed, they organized themselves into congregations, of which about one hundred and fifty are known to have existed in the coastal areas of the Mediterranean when the apostles first began their mission. The centre of each congregation was the synagogue, presided over by an archisynagogus as leader of their prayer-meetings, while a council of elders, with an archon at its head, concerned itself with civil matters.

The bond which held the Diaspora Jews together was their religious faith. It was this principally which prevented them from being contaminated in greater numbers by their pagan surroundings. They had skilfully contrived to win from the city or State authorities a great deal of special consideration, a number of exceptions and privileges which respected their religious opinions and manner of worship. This only emphasized all the more their peculiarity and their unique position in public life. They belonged mostly to the middle class; in Asia Minor and Egypt many of them were engaged in agriculture as workers on the land or as tenant farmers, but some were independent farmers or estate-owners. One trade had a special attraction for them, that of weaving and clothmaking. Inscriptions also mention the occupations of tax-collector, judge, even officer in the army, although such examples are rare. In the great city of Alexandria they early played a considerable role in banking; but here they did not enjoy the unqualified approval of their pagan neighbours.

---

[8] J. Carmignac, *Le docteur de justice et Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1955).

Their new milieu had in many respects exercised its influence on the Jews of the Diaspora without leading to actual infringement of the Law. Like all immigrants they gave up their mother-tongue after a while and adopted the international Greek language, the *koinê,* a fact which led to the use of this language in the worship of the synagogue. Here Egyptian Jewry had shown the way when it translated over a long period the individual books of the Old Testament into Greek and thus created the Septuagint, which was used throughout the Diaspora in the first century A.D. as the recognized translation of the Bible. The reading of the Scriptures in Greek was followed by prayers in Greek, of which some have been adopted by the Christian Church. It was even more necessary that the explanatory sermon should be in the new tongue. The use of Greek in the religious sphere inevitably exposed the Jews to the cultural influences of Hellenism in a wider sense, and in a narrower sense to the effect of Hellenistic religious currents.

Such influence was strongest in Alexandria, intellectually the most active centre of the Diaspora. This city was the home of the Jew Philo († *c.* 40 A.D.), whose extensive writings seem like the final echo of those inner conflicts which the intellectual world of Hellenism might have caused in the mind of an educated and intellectually alert Diaspora Jew. In his work, preserved for posterity by Christianity, we feel the effects of the different philosophical tendencies of his time. From the Stoics the Jews took over the allegorical method of scriptural interpretation which apparently was taught at a special school of exegetics for Jews in Alexandria. Without giving up the literal sense of the biblical description of events in the great Jewish past, the new teachers found a deeper secret meaning beneath it, which saw in Adam for instance the symbol of human reason, in Eve that of sensuality, and in the tree of life that of virtue. Paradise itself was an allegory of the wisdom of God, and the four rivers that flowed from it were the cardinal virtues. More even than the Stoics, the "most holy Plato" influenced the intellectual world of Philo, who took from him not only his philosophical terminology but also his high esteem for the intellect and his longing for a spiritualized life, as well as his idea of the imperfection of the material world. Philo's doctrine of creation has also a Platonic colouring, especially his notion of the "middle powers" which exist between a perfect God and the imperfect world; they are called "thoughts of God", and the highest of them is the Logos, Reason itself, which was to play such an important part in the theology of the first Christian centuries. Philo also explained the ritual laws of the Jews in an allegorical sense and developed from them, using the philosophical terminology of Hellenism, ethical principles, culminating in the demand for ascetic control of the life of instinct; only thus could the soul free itself from the prison of the body and become capable of that mystical rapture which unites it with God in "sober intoxication" and loving surrender.

Despite this enthusiasm for the Hellenistic philosophy of his time, Philo remained a convinced Jew by religion. What he took over from Hellenistic philosophy was after all, he believed, only an earlier gift from the Jews to the pagans, whose teacher, unknown to them, had been Moses. His God remains the eternal God of the Old Testament, whose name men cannot utter, to whose mercy and goodness they owe all, and on whose grace they depend. He is to be honoured by observance of the Sabbath and by the other precepts of the Law, upon which Israel's former greatness was based. Philo remained inwardly and outwardly united with the Jewish people; he shared their belief in a Messiah who would bring them victory over all the nations of the earth and give them a new Paradise.

If the faith of a Jew so receptive to Greek ideas as Philo, was not endangered in its innermost citadel, the loyalty of the average Diaspora Jew to the faith of his Fathers was even more secure. An essential part of it was the spiritual and practical attachment to the Palestinian homeland which he unwaveringly maintained. Jerusalem and its Temple were the focus of this attachment. In the consciousness of every adult Diaspora Jew the Temple was the supreme symbol of his religious origin, and with great conscientiousness he made his annual financial sacrifice, the Temple tax; it was his earnest desire to pray there one day with his Palestinian co-religionists at the time of the Pasch. A further support for his faith was the aforementioned close association of all the Diaspora Jews, which led to an exclusiveness often criticized by their pagan neighbours, and which played its part in causing those recurrent waves of anti-Semitism that swept over the Roman Empire.

But all the mockery and scorn, all the slights and persecutions which from time to time were the lot of the Diaspora Jews did not prevent them from carrying out enterprising and methodical propaganda for their convictions and their religion which met with considerable success. This propaganda was served by a not inconsiderable body of writings which, adapting itself to the literary tastes of the Hellenistic reader, sought to inform the latter that the orginal source of all culture, including religious culture, was to be found in Moses and his people. To this literature belonged, for example, the so-called Letter to Aristeas,[9] which by its skilfully told legend of the origin of the Septuagint directed the reader's interest to the sacred scriptures of the Jews and included an attractive description of Jerusalem, its temple and worship, and of the Jewish priesthood. Books Three to Five of the *Oracula Sibyllina* are also an advertisement for the Jewish religion. These praise monotheism and draw from the fulfilment of ancient prophecies in the history of the Jewish people an allegorical interpretation of history as a whole; with the prophecy of an approaching Last Judgment they endeavour to persuade the pagans to embrace the Jewish religion. Josephus's book *Contra Apionem* was openly apologetic in tone, painting an impressive picture of the history of the Jewish people with all its vicissitudes and describing in enthusiastic terms its great leaders, prophets and martyrs, religious laws and customs, with a view to winning converts to the Jewish faith. Its representation of Jewish theocracy, based upon unconditional monotheism, and its references to the undeniable effects of Jewish piety and ethics on the life of the people could not fail to make an impression on many a Hellenistic reader in search of religious truth.

The success of this propaganda, supplemented no doubt by the spoken word, is shown by the great number of pagans who entered into closer relations with the Jewish religion. Those who formally went over to the Jewish faith and by circumcision, ritual bath, and offering of sacrifice, became fully-fledged Jews, were known as proselytes and undertook all the obligations of the Jewish Law. Considerably larger was the number of the "God-fearing", who would not indeed accept circumcision — painful to pagan sensibilities — but could not resist the attraction of monotheistic belief and the services of the synagogue. They joined in the celebration of the Sabbath and many other religious exercises; their children usually took the final step of formal conversion. The sources give no information as to the precise numbers of either group, but they were no doubt represented in most Jewish congregations of the Diaspora.

The Jewish Diaspora has a significance for the early Christian Missions which cannot be overlooked. It performed an important preliminary work in this connexion, firstly by preparing the Septuagint, which at once became the Bible of the early Christians, secondly by preaching monotheism and the Commandments of Moses, which were also the foundation of Christian morality. Since the synagogues were often the starting-place of Christian missionaries, the latter found there, above all among the God-fearing and the proselytes, hearts ready to receive their message. In the conflict which soon ensued between Christian preachers and Diaspora Jews, the struggle to win the souls of these two groups was — along with the doctrinal differences — an essential factor. That the Christian met with greater success is shown not least by the reaction of the born Diaspora Jews, who now gave up the Septuagint and made other translations to replace it, because they saw their former Bible being employed so successfully by the Christians. They rejected too the allegorical method of writers like Philo, as the Christians had taken it over and used it in particular to dispute the claim of the Mosaic Law to continued validity. A rigid emphasis was placed on the *Tora*, the strict rabbinical interpretation of which now prevailed even among the Jews of the Diaspora. On the other hand, many features of the developing Christian liturgy, much in the worship and preaching of the primitive Christians, in early Christian literature, and in the text of prayers, is an inheritance from the world of the Diaspora, an inheritance which was sometimes taken over directly by the Christians to serve the purposes of anti-Jewish propaganda.

---

[9] Edition of the Greek text with French translation by A. Pelletier, *Sources chrétiennes* 84 (Paris 1962); English translation in Charles, *op. cit.* II, 83 ff. See also A. Pelletier, *Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la lettre d'Aristée* (1962).

CHAPTER 2

Jesus of Nazareth and the Church

THE history of the Church has its roots in Jesus of Nazareth, who was born into the intellectual and religious world of Palestinian Jewry which has just been described. His life and work, by which the Church was founded, are therefore a necessary preliminary to a history of the latter.

The sources which tell us of that life and its significance for the Church are of a quite exceptional nature. Apart from a few references in pagan and Jewish works, which are valuable because they place beyond discussion any attempt to deny the historical existence of Jesus, the main sources are the writings of the New Testament, especially the first three gospels, the Acts of the Apostles and some of the letters of St Paul. None of these was intended to be an historical biography of Jesus of Nazareth, to tell the story of his life from beginning to end with all the details we would like to know. The three synoptic gospels are the outcome of the apostolic preaching about Jesus and accordingly give the image of him which remained vivid in the minds and hearts of his first disciples when they proclaimed him after his ascension as the crucified and risen Messiah. That image is shaped by the requirements of the apostles' preaching and the faith which supported it. We are not on that account forced to adopt an attitude of radical scepticism when faced with the question whether such sources can ever lead us to a true picture of the "historical" Jesus.

True, an actual "Life of Jesus" cannot be obtained from them. But these New Testament writings are always going back to that Life, giving prominence to single facts and events, to actions and words of Jesus in his earthly life which have a special significance for the proclamation of the apostolic message, bearing witness to them at the same time as important historical facts of his life. The preaching of the apostles was expressly intended to prove that the earthly Jesus of Nazareth was the same Christ that they proclaimed, from whom came salvation for all men. Thus a series of individual facts and characteristics can, with all the scrupulous care that historical criticism demands, be built up from these sources and presented as a kind of outline of the life of Jesus.

Four or five years before the beginning of our era, Jesus of Nazareth was born in Bethlehem of the Virgin Mary. Forty days after circumcision the child was presented to the Lord in the Temple as a first-born son, in accordance with Jewish Law, on which occasion two pious Israelites, Simeon and Anna, spoke prophetically of his Messianic mission. Dangers which threatened the infant from King Herod forced his mother and his foster-father Joseph to sojourn for a long period in Egypt, until, after Herod's death, the family was able to settle at Nazareth in Galilee. The boy grew up in this quiet village, perhaps without ever attending a rabbinical school. Only once did something of his future greatness shine forth, when at twelve years of age he spoke with the Scribes in the Temple about religious questions, showing knowledge superior to theirs and excusing himself to his parents with the words: "I must be about my Father's business" (Lk 2:49).

About thirty years after his birth Jesus left his parental home and began his work among the people of his homeland. First he took a remarkable step, seeking out the great preacher of penance, John the Baptist[10] by the Jordan and accepting baptism from him, whereby God "anointed him with the Holy Spirit", who descended upon him in the form of a dove while the voice of the Father bore witness from Heaven that this was his "beloved Son" (Mt 3:13 f.). Conscious of his Messianic mission and his divine sonship, which he was able to confirm by numerous miracles, Jesus now proclaimed in word and deed that the kingdom of God was come, and that all men, not only Israelites, were called to the kingdom, provided they served God with true piety. The supreme law of the religion he preached was the unconditional love of God and a love of one's neighbour that embraced men of all nations. In clearly recognizable opposition to pharisaical practice[11] with its outwardly correct observance of the Law, he declared purity of mind and intention to be the basis of moral behaviour, thus giving to the individual conscience the decisive role in the sphere of religion. Jesus furthermore re-established the true priority of obligations, derived from that life of inward union with the Father which he preached as the ideal: more important than scrupulous observance of the Sabbath is a helpful action performed for our neighbour — of more value than the prescribed prayers recited in the Temple is silent converse with the Father in the solitude of one's own room. Shocking for many was his message that publicans and sinners, the poor and infirm, whom God seemed so obviously to have punished, had the first right to expect a welcome in the house of the Father. The self-righteousness of the Pharisees was deeply shaken by the news that there is more joy in Heaven over one sinner who does penance than over ninety-nine just men; they did not understand that in the coming kingdom of God all human actions count for nothing, that only he is just to whom the Father graciously grants it. The poor were called blessed, because they were free from earthly cares about possessions and riches, which all too easily take up in men's hearts the place that belongs to God alone.

---

[10] E. Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum, I: Johannes der Täufer* (Göttingen 1932); C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (New York 1951); H. W. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of the Ancient Scrolls" in *Interpretation* 9 (1955), 71–90; J. Steinmann, *St John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition* (New York 1963).

But consoling though his message was for those who had hitherto been despised and lowly among the people, great though the effects of his miraculous powers were upon those marked by lameness, blindness, leprosy, and spiritual diseases, no less strict were the conditions which Jesus imposed upon those who would enter the kingdom of God. The whole man was called upon to follow him without regard for previous friendships, family ties, or possessions; he who set his hand to the plough and looked back was unworthy of the kingdom (Lk 9:62). Such demands dispel any idea of a peaceful family idyll; his words cut like a sword through all existing social and familiar bonds. But the new and unique thing in his teaching was this above all: no man could come to the Father except through Jesus. He demanded a discipleship that was quite impossible without painful self-denial; the man who would truly be his disciple must be able to lay aside his own life (Lk 14:26).

All those, however, who made up their minds to follow him and were thus called to the kingdom formed a new community. Jesus' words and deeds tend unmistakably towards the creation and development of such a community. He proclaimed no kind of only individual piety or religion, but a message which binds together those who hear it and are filled by it as brothers in a religious family that prays together to the Father for the forgiveness of its sins. Jesus himself on one occasion called this community his Church, and he claimed that he was establishing it by his work (Mt 16:18). He carefully prepared the ground for the foundation of this religious society. If, at times, because of his miracles, great multitudes greeted him with loud acclamations, it was but a minority of the people who accepted to become his disciples. From this group he selected twelve men,[12] who occupied a special position among his followers; they were the object of his special attention: with them he discussed the special tasks for which he intended them in the community that was to be. They were to take up and continue the mission which the Father in Heaven had entrusted to him; "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you" (Jn 20:21). The Gospels emphasize again and again with unmistakable clarity the special position of the Twelve, who received the name of apostles, envoys.[13] The content of their mission was the proclamation of the kingdom of God; to fulfill it, the apostles were expressly appointed as teachers, whose word the nations must believe and trust like that of Jesus himself (Lk 10:16; Mt 28:20), to whose judgment they must submit as if it were a verdict of the Lord (Mt 18:18). Finally, to the Twelve, who were to carry out his own office of High Priest in the new community, Jesus gave priestly powers (Jn 17:19; Mt 20:28). They were to nourish and sanctify its members through a mysterious, sacramental life of grace. From the group Jesus chose Peter for a special task: he was appointed to be the rock foundation on which his Church should stand. With a singular form of words he was given the mission to feed the sheep and the lambs and to strengthen his brothers. (Mt 16:18; Jn 21:15).

---

[11] W. Beilner, *Christus und die Pharisäer* (Vienna 1959).

Thus the foundation prepared by Jesus before his resurrection received an organic framework, perceptible even from without, which would now grow in space and time, according to laws of growth implanted in it by its founder. Its purely supernatural basis lies indeed elsewhere: it is ultimately founded on the death of Jesus, through which alone salvation can be newly given to men, from which alone the new structure of the salvation community of the redeemed receives its mysterious life. With his death, which completed the work of atonement and redemption, and his resurrection, which gloriously confirmed that work, the founding of the

---

[12] B. Rigaux, "Die 'Zwölf' in Geschichte und Kerygma" in H. Ristow and K. Matthiae, *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus* (Berlin 1960), 468–86; G. Klein, *Die zwölf Apostel, Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee* (Göttingen 1961).

[13] K.H. Rengstorf in *ThW* IV, 406–46; Eng. tr.: K.H. Rengstorf, *Apostleship, Bible Key Words* 6 (London 1962); H. v. Campenhausen, "Der urchristliche Apostelbegriff" in *StTh* 1 (1947), 96– 130; E. M. Kredel, "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese" in *ZKTh* 78 (1956), 169–93, 257–305; K. H. Schelkle, *Jüngerschaft und Apostelamt* (Freiburg i. Br. 1957); J. Dupont, "Le nom d'apôtre a-t-il été donné aux Douze par Jésus?" in *OrSyr* 1 (1956), 267–90, 466–80; W. Schmithals, *Das kirchliche Apostelamt* (Göttingen 1961); P. Bläser, "Zum Problem des urchristlichen Apostolats: Unio-Christianorum" in *Festschrift L. Jaeger* (Paderborn 1962), 92–107.

Church was complete, and her historical existence began with the descent of the Spirit.

Jesus had to go to his death because the majority of his people closed their ears to his message. The religious leaders of Jewry decisively rejected his Messianic claims and persecuted him as a sedition-monger with ever-increasing hatred, which finally led them to plan his violent death. The Roman procurator allowed himself, albeit unwillingly, to be won over and he delivered Jesus into their hands to be crucified. The crucifixion took place on the fourteenth or fifteenth day of Nisan in a year between 30 and 33 of the Christian era.

So the labours of Jesus among his own people come to a sudden end, which in the eyes of those who did not believe in his mission meant too the end of the kingdom which he announced. But after three days he rose again from the dead as he had foretold, and during a period of forty days appeared to his disciples on many occasions, until he was taken up into heaven. Belief in his second coming, which was promised to the disciples by two angels at the time of his ascension, was one of the main supports of the young Church's now growing structure.

CHAPTER 3

The Primitive Church at Jerusalem

The External Events and Early Environment

THE most important source for the fortunes of the primitive Church immediately after the ascension of our Lord is the account given in the first seven chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. This does not indeed give a complete picture of events, because the author chose for his subject only what served his purpose, which was to show that the tidings of the Kingdom, though first addressed to the Jews, were then, in accordance with God's will, to be delivered to the Gentiles, and that the Jewish Christian Paul, with the approval of the apostles and commissioned by them, had become the legitimate missionary to the Gentiles. Therefore only about the first fifteen years of the origin and growth of the community are described; of its later history mention is made only in occasional references to Jerusalem.

It was the fact, at first hardly comprehensible, of the resurrection of the Crucified One that brought together the scattered disciples and united them in a community sharing the same belief and profession of faith. When the story of the Acts begins, a group of 120 believers has re-assembled. Firm in their belief that their Lord who has ascended into heaven will return, they are determined to carry out the instructions he gave them during the forty days between his resurrection and his ascension. First of all under Peter's leadership they hold an election to complete the apostolic college, the number twelve being considered as sacrosanct; the candidate must, like the others, be a reliable witness to the life and work of the Lord. The result of the election is entrusted in prayer to God, who makes his will known when the lot falls upon Matthias.[14]

The events of the first Pentecost,[15] when the promised Holy Spirit, to the accompaniment of extraordinary phenomena — a mighty wind and tongues of fire — descended upon the assembled believers, gave them a great access of strength and courage to bear witness in public. The enthusiasm of that day caused Peter to preach a sermon before the people in which he proclaimed the crucified and risen Jesus as the true Messiah. The external growth of the community reflected its inward strengthening: as a result of Peter's preaching about three thousand Jews professed their faith in Jesus. The healing of a man born lame by Peter and John, and another sermon by the former, brought further successes. Soon the number of members of the community had risen to five thousand (Acts 3–4:4).

Such success disturbed the Jewish authorities, who sent for the apostles to examine them. Peter was their spokesman, and here too he boldly proclaimed the message of the Crucified. A threatening warning to the apostles to keep silent for the future was rejected in the name of Jesus (Acts 4:5–22). When fresh miracles and repeated preaching further increased the number of the faithful, all the apostles were again arrested, whereupon they dared to say before the Sanhedrin that God must be obeyed rather than men (Acts 5:29). A first scourging with rods, to which the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem were sentenced, and renewed prohibition to speak in the name of Jesus, were preliminaries to the first persecution.

As the tasks to be carried out in the community increased with the number of members, some organization became necessary; the apostles must remain free to preach, and therefore seven men were appointed to serve the tables, to care for the poor and to help the apostles in their pastoral activities (Acts 6: 1–6). These were ordained for their work with prayer and the laying on of hands. The Greek names of these men indicate that the number of Hellenistic Jews from the Diaspora was not inconsiderable in the community. It is clear that tension arose between them and the Palestinian Jewish Christians. Among the Hellenistic Christians Stephen[16] was especially distinguished for his courage and skill in debate; but he suffered a martyr's death by stoning when he was bold enough to say to the Jews that through Christ's work the Old Testament had been superseded. The death of Stephen was the signal for a persecution, which fell most heavily upon the Hellenistic members of the Jerusalem community. While the apostles themselves remained in Jerusalem, many Christians evaded persecution by flight. However, they now took to preaching the Gospel in the countryside, especially in Judaea and Samaria.[17] The Samaritan mission of the Hellenist Philip was particularly successful.

---

[14] K. H. Rengstorf, "Die Zuwahl des Matthias" in *StTh* 15 (1961), 35–67.

[15] N. Adler, *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest* (Münster 1938); E. Lohse in *ThW* VI, 44–53; G. Kretschmar, "Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten" in *ZKG* 66 (1954), 209–53.

[16] Besides the commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles, cf. F. Büchsel in *ZNW* 30 (1931), 202 f., 33 (1934), 84–87; M. Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church* (London 1958); J. Bihler, "Der Stephanusbericht" in *BZ* 3 (1959), 252–70.

This spread of the faith outside the capital was the occasion for a journey of inspection by the apostles Peter and John to the newly won Christians in Samaria, upon whom they laid their hands that they might receive the Holy Spirit. The two apostles were also active as missionaries on this journey and preached in many places in Samaria. Later Peter paid another visit to the brethren outside Jerusalem — "the saints" as the Acts call them — and the presence of Jewish Christians in cities like Joppa and Lydda shows how strong the movement had become in the more remote parts of Palestine.

The peace that had followed the persecution was again threatened by Herod Agrippa, who caused the arrest of the leading apostles, Peter and James the Elder, and the execution of the latter (A.D. 42 or 43), in order to please the Jews of the capital (Acts 12:2).[18] Perhaps Peter would have shared the same fate if he had not then finally left Jerusalem and betaken himself to "another place" (Acts 12:17). The leadership of the congregation then passed to James the Younger.

The sudden death of Herod in 44 again brought more peaceful times for the Church and made possible a more widespread preaching of the Word. For about twenty years James was able to work in Jerusalem, surrounded by his congregation and highly respected by the other apostles — Paul calls him, together with Peter and John one of the "pillars" of the primitive Church (Gal 2:9). His strictly ascetic life and his loyalty to Jewish traditions earned him the name of "the Just". He was, however, also concerned for the Jewish Christian congregations outside the capital, to whom he wrote a letter which has been accepted into the canon of the New Testament.[19] His authority carried great weight at the so-called Council of the Apostles,[20] where he played the part of mediator (Acts

---

[17] O. Cullman, *Samaria and the Origins of the Christian Mission in the Early Church* (London 1956), 185–92.

[18] J. Blinzler, "Rechtsgeschichtliches zur Hinrichtung des Zebedaiden Jakobus" (Acts 12:2) in *NovT* 5 (1962), 191–206.

[19] H. v. Campenhausen, "Die Nachfolge des Jakobus" in *ZKG* 63 (1950), 133–44; P. Gächter, "Jakobus von Jerusalem" in *ZKTh* 76 (1954), 129–69.

[20] A. Lemmonyer, *DBS* II, 113–20; S. Giet in *Mél. Lebreton*, I (Paris 1951), 201–20;

15:13–21). He too met a martyr's death in 62, when the high priest Ananus was able to vent his hatred upon him, the post of Roman procurator being vacant owing to the death of Festus. They cast the old man from the pinnacle of the Temple, and, while he still lived, they stoned him and beat him to death. Following the example of his Lord he prayed for his enemies as he lay dying.

A few years later the independence of the Jerusalem congregation came to an end, when the rebellion against the Romans turned into a catastrophe for the whole nation. The Jewish Christians obviously did not wish to take part in this struggle and emigrated in 66–67 to the land east of the Jordan, where some of them settled in the city of Pella. The fortunes of the young Church took a new turn. Under Peter's leadership in Palestine there had already been individual conversions from paganism. Now Philip received the chamberlain of Queen Candace of Ethiopia into the Church by baptism, and Peter himself, by the reception of the pagan captain Cornelius, made it clear that the message of the Gospel was not for the Jews alone. Even while the original community was still in Jerusalem, a considerable number of former pagans had formed a Christian congregation in the Syrian capital of Antioch,[21] the care of which was entrusted to the Cypriot levite Barnabas. Here the designation Χριστιανοί was first applied to the followers of the new faith, although it is an open question as to whether this term was introduced by the local pagan authorities, was a popular slang word, or, which seems more likely, was an expression used by the Christians to distinguish themselves from official Judaism and from Jewish sects (see Acts 1:6–8 and Peter 4:16).[22]

The future of the young Church after the destruction of Jerusalem lay with the pagan nations of the eastern Mediterranean area, whose evangelization had already been successfully begun by the Jewish Christian Paul.

Organization, Belief, and Piety

"Sect of the Nazarenes", ἡ τῶν Ναζωραίων αἵρεσις, their Jewish opponents called the disciples of Jesus (Acts 24:5), who had formed themselves into a special community; "congregation, assembly", ἐκκλησία, is the name that the Jewish Christians had for this community of theirs

---

P. Gächter in *ZKTh* 76 (1954), 139–46; V. Kerich: *St Vladimir's Quarterly* 6 (1962), 108–17; P. Gächter in *ZKTh* 85 (1963), 339–54; T. Fahy in *IThQ* 30 (1963), 232–61.

[21] J. Kollwitz in *RAC* I, 461–9; H. Dieckmann, *Antiochien ein Mittelpunkt christlicher Missionstätigkeit* (Aachen 1920).

[22] E. Peterson, "Christianus" in *MiscMercati*, I (Rome 1946), 355–72; H. B. Mattingly "The Origin of the Name Christiani" in *JThS NS* 9 (1958), 26–37; B. Lifschitz, "L'origine du nom des chrétiens" in *VigChr* 16 (1962), 65–70.

(Acts 5:11; 8:1 etc.)[23] They were therefore not merely a group of Jews, who shared the conviction that Jesus was the true Messiah, but who otherwise led their own individual religious lives; rather did that conviction bring them together and cause them to organize themselves as a religious community.

This community was, from the beginning (as a glance at the Acts of the Apostles clearly shows), an hierarchically ordered society, in which not all were of equal rank. There were in it persons and groups of persons to whom special tasks and functions in the life of the community were assigned by higher authority. The first of such groups was the college of the apostles, disinguished in a unique way from all other members of the community; by them were carried out the special tasks which Jesus had given to the chosen Twelve before his ascension and for which he had trained them. The community felt the number twelve to be sacred, so that after the departure of Judas the complement had to be made up by an election at which Matthias was chosen. This election had, however, a purely religious character; it was begun with prayer, and God himself made the decision by means of lots, so that it became unequivocally clear that a man could be called to the office of an apostle only by the supreme authority of God. The principal task of an apostle was to bear witness to the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. Linked with this was the duty of leading the community in the solemnities of the cult, when it met together united in faith: to administer the baptism by which a man became a member of the community, to preside at the religious meal which symbolically expressed the sense of belonging together, to undertake the laying on of hands by which members were consecrated for special tasks — in a word, to be mediators between Christ and his Church through the exercise of priestly functions. Christ himself gave the apostles power to work signs and wonders in his name (Acts 2:42; 5:12). Bound up with that power was the right to rule with authority in the community, to ensure discipline and order and to found new congregations of believers (Acts 8:14f.; 15:2). Nevertheless, the apostle was not so much lord as rather servant and shepherd in the Church, which was firmly based upon the apostolic office (Mt 16:18; 24: 45; Acts 20:28).[24]

Among those holding the office of apostle, Peter displayed an activity which shows that he, in this turn, occupied a leading place among the Twelve, which could have been given him only by a higher authority. The account of the fortunes of the primitive Church clearly shows this special position: Peter conducts the election to the college of apostles, he composes the prayer recited on that occasion and he is the spokesman of the disciples at the first Pentecost (Acts 2:15ff.). He preaches after the healing of the man born lame (Acts 3:1). He is again the spokesman of the apostles before the Scribes and Elders (Acts 4:8). as well as before the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:20). He appears with judicial authority in the episodes of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:3) and with Simon Magus (Acts 8:19). His visits to the "saints" outside Jerusalem have the character of a visitation (Acts 9:32). His decision to admit the pagan Cornelius to baptism was of great significance for the future, because it authoritatively proclaimed that the Gospel was not addressed exclusively to "those of the circumcision" but also to the Gentiles and thus had a universal character. This step did indeed lead to a dispute with some of the Jewish Christians, but by that very fact it shows Peter to have been the responsible leader of the primitive Church.

---

[23] K. L. Schmidt in *ThW* III, 502–39; M. Goguel, *The Primitive Church* (London-New York 1964); J. M. Nielen, "Zur Grundlegung einer neutestamentlichen Ekklesiologie" in *Festschrift F. Tillmann* (Düsseldorf 1950), 370–97; H. Schlier, *Die Zeit der Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br., 3rd ed. 1962).

[24] See above, note 13 and E. M. Farrer, "The Ministry in the New Testament" in K. B. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry* (London, 2nd ed. 1957), 119–83.

The picture which the author of the Acts draws of Peter's position is significantly confirmed by Paul. The latter, after his flight from Damascus, went to Jerusalem "to visit Cephas" (Gal 1:18); obviously Paul's recognition by the community depended on him. Even though James, as local leader of the Jerusalem congregation, presided at the Council of the Apostles, Paul clearly gives us to understand that Peter's attitude was the deciding factor in the dispute as to whether the Gentile Christians were subject to the Mosaic Law or not. It cannot be objected that Peter on another occasion appears not to act with authority towards James; this was rather due to his hesitant character than to his official position. The whole of his work in the primitive Church up to the time when he finally left Jerusalem to engage actively in the mission to the Gentiles can be rightly understood only if one regards it as the fulfilment of the task given to him by his Master, of which not only Matthew but also Luke and John tell us when they write that Peter was called by the Lord to strengthen the brethren and to feed Christ's flock.[25]

There was another office in the primitive Church of which we learn from Acts 6:1–7. It was that of the above-mentioned seven men who were to assist the apostles in their labours and to take over the service of the tables among the poor of the community. The appointment of these seven did not take the form of an election, but it was done with prayer and laying on of hands by the apostles. In the Acts the work of the seven is repeatedly mentioned, and the accounts make it clear that it went far beyond purely charitable activities. One of them, Stephen, played a leading role in the theological dispute with the Jews about the mission of Christ and the validity of the old Law (Acts 6:8 ff.). and Philip was an active missionary; he preached among the Samaritans and in many other places (Acts 21:8). No special name is given to this group in the Acts of the Apostles, but their work is described by the verb "to serve" διακονεῖν (Acts 6:2). Whether they can be regarded as precursors of the deacons in the Pauline congregations is difficult to decide, for the work of the latter is not easily discernible. The duties of the seven were determined by the needs of the Church.[26]

---

[25] E. Stauffer, "Petrus und Jakobus in Jerusalem" in *Festschrift O. Karrer* (Frankfurt a. M., 2nd ed. 1960), 361–72.

The sphere of activity of a third group, whom the Acts call "Elders", πρεσβύτεροι, is not so clearly defined as that of the seven (Acts 11:30). The name was not newly coined by the Christians, for there had long been Elders, heads of Jewish patrician families, in the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, and Elders of the synagogues in the Jewish communities of Palestine. In the primitive Church of Jerusalem these "Elders" are always to be found in the company of the apostles or of James as leader of the congregation; they take part in the decisions of the apostolic Council (Acts 15:2 ff.). They were therefore assistants to the apostles or to the pastor of Jerusalem in the administration of the community.[27]

Only once in connexion with the Jerusalem community are "prophets" mentioned (Acts 15:32); these were Judas Barsabas and Silas, who were chosen and sent to Antioch that they might inform the Christians there of the decisions of the Council. Their task was not therefore one that belonged to a permanent office; they were selected because of their special gifts to carry out such a commission and to encourage and strengthen the brethren in Antioch.

The existence of such office-holders, the apostles, the Elders and the seven, shows clearly that there was already in the primitive Church a division among the members into groups, consecrated by a religious ceremony for special tasks, apart from the main body of the faithful. Even at that time, therefore, there existed clergy and laity, the division between whom, however, was not felt to be a separating gulf, because the Jews in the community were already familiar with an official priesthood which was highly respected, especially by the pious Jews who eagerly awaited the Messiah.

The new and revolutionary event that brought about the formation of the followers of Jesus into a community, the resurrection of the Lord, had been experienced as a fact by all those who had witnessed one of the appearances of the risen Christ. But it was also one of the fundamental elements of the religious faith by which the primitive Church lived, and it was the pivot upon which the apostolic message hinged.[28] It had therefore to be accepted by all who wished to follow the Gospel. Both as an historical event and as part of the faith the fact of the resurrection was confirmed by the descent of the Spirit at the first Pentecost (Acts 2:1 ff.), which gave its final clarity and direction to the apostolic message. From then on the apostles, in their preaching, emphasized the new element which separated them in their belief from their Jewish brethren. This was primarily the conviction that the Risen One whom they proclaimed was none other than the earthly Jesus of Nazareth, and from this identification all that Jesus taught by word and deed before his death derived its validity and its claim to be preached by them. Therefore they bore witness that it was Almighty God who had raised Jesus from the dead, as he had wrought miracles through him during his life on earth.

---

[26] T. Klauser in *RAC* III, 888–909; P. Gächter, *Petrus und seine Zeit* (Innsbruck 1958), 105–54; H. Zimmermann, "Die Wahl der Sieben" in *Festschrift für Kard. J. Frings* (Cologne 1960), 364–78.

[27] W. Michaelis, *Das Ältestenamt der christlichen Gemeinde im Lichte der Hl. Schrift* (Berne 1958), and P. Gächter in *ZKTh* 76 (1954), 226–31; H. v. Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen 1953).

Equally radical and new when compared with the beliefs till then held by the Jews was the conviction of the Christians that Jesus was the true and promised Messiah. That their Master was the Messiah could not be proved more clearly and compellingly to the apostles than by his resurrection. The belief that in Jesus they possessed the Messiah expressed itself in the various titles which the preaching of the apostles and the piety of the faithful bestowed on him. More and more he came to be called "the Christ", a designation that was used as a kind of surname to Jesus. The apostles preached "the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (Acts 5:42); it was "Jesus Christ" who healed through the apostles (Acts 9:34). Because Jesus was the Messiah he was called the *Kyrios*,[29] which he had been called by God himself (Acts 2:36); he belonged therefore at the right hand of God, and the title of *Kyrios* could be given to him as properly as to God (Acts 1:21; 7:59; 9:1, 10 ff., 42; 11:17). So the Church addressed the *Kyrios* in prayer with all confidence; from its midst came the cry "*Marana-tha*" Come, O Lord!" (1 Cor 16:22), a prayer preserved for us by Paul. To Stephen it was so natural to pray to "the Lord Jesus" that even in the hour of death the words came spontaneously to his lips (Acts 7:59). Other titles likewise place the risen Jesus close to God; in Acts 10:42 he is the judge of the living and the dead who now reigns in heaven but will come again at the end of the world (Acts 1:11; 3:20ff.). He is furthermore "the Holy and Righteous One" (Acts 3:14), the ἀρχηγός of life, who brings life and is the origin of life. The designation "Servant of God", familiar from its use in the Old Testament, was used by the early Christians in a connexion which suggests an increase and elevation of the dignity of the Messiah, for this Servant was, according to Peter (Acts 3:13), glorified by God and sent by him with the authority of a Messiah in order to bring redemption. He was "thy holy servant Jesus" against whom his enemies had banded together (Acts 4:27); the community hoped that miracles performed "in the name of thy holy Servant" would give, as it were, letters of credence to the ambassadors of the Gospel in their mission (Acts 4:30).

---

[28] J. Gewiess, *Die urapostolische Heilsverkündung nach der Apostelgeschichte* (Breslau 1939); M. Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* I (Münster 1950), 212–47; J. Schmitt, *Jésus resuscité dans la prédication apostolique* (Paris 1949), 175–248; F. X. Durwell, *La résurrection de Jésus* (Paris 1954); J. Sint, "Die Auferstehung Jesu in der Verkündigung der Urgemeinde" in *ZKTh* 84 (1962), 129–51; H. Grass, *Ostergeschehen und Osterberichte* (Göttingen, 2nd ed. 1962).

[29] W. Foerster, *ThW* III, 1038–98; J. Gewiess, *op. cit.* 57–70; I. Hermann, *Kyrios und Pneuma* (Munich 1960); S. Schulz, Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus" in *ZNW* 53 (1962), 125 to 144; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen 1963); W. Kramer, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn* (Zürich 1963).

Finally, the risen Jesus was the Saviour, Σωτήρ, called by God to bring salvation to men (Acts 5:31); the Christians believed that without him men could not attain salvation, and so their faith in him included all that had been given to mankind by redemption through Jesus Christ. The tidings of salvation were, following the example set by Jesus, called by the apostles in their preaching *evangelium* ("good news," "Gospel") (Acts 15:7; 20:24); the preaching of salvation is usually referred to with the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. The content of their message is either simply "Jesus Christ" (Acts 5:42; 8:35; 11:20) or "the Word of the Lord" (15:35), "peace by Jesus Christ" (10:36), "the promise" (13:32) or "the Kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ" (8:12).

The belief of the first Christians in salvation through Jesus Christ was expressed in the most exclusive terms: "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men, by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). Circumcision could not save, but only the grace of the Lord (15:1 11). The Gospel showed the way to this salvation, but a man could accept it or reject it; therefore Peter adjures his audience: "Save yourselves!" (2:40). The first step to salvation through Jesus was the forgiveness of sins which he had brought (2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38); he was sent to turn men away from sin (3:26). Penance and inner conversion were of course necessary for the removal of sins (3:19).

The reception of the Holy Spirit was for the primitive Church proof and confirmation that salvation had already begun for its members. After the first Pentecost the descent of the Spirit was continually repeated whenever new brethren professed faith in the living Christ, as in Samaria (Acts 8:1 ff.), at the baptism of Cornelius (10:44ff.), and even when the community gathered together for prayer (4:31). It was the Holy Spirit who according to their conviction gave that inner, supernatural strength which was effective in the individual believer (2:33), and was also the cause of the missionary zeal of the apostles and the other early messengers of the Gospel. They were "filled with the Holy Spirit", therefore they stepped forth boldly (4:8;

4:31). Stephen especially possessed this gift and so did Philip (6:5; 8:29), and it showed itself too in Barnabas and Paul (11:24; 16:6ff.). A man like Simon Magus misunderstood its essential nature (8:20); unbelief resisted it (7:51).

Other gifts which redemption by Jesus Christ brought to the faithful were (eternal) life and membership of the kingdom of God. The apostles, in their preaching, spoke of this life (Acts 5:20), which would be shared by pagans who professed belief in the risen Christ, whereas the Jews by their rejection of the Messiah rendered themselves unworthy of eternal life (13:46 48). The kingdom of God is a theme which constantly recurs in the preaching of the apostles, just as after the resurrection it was the subject of Jesus' conversation with them. The kingdom of God and eternal life, the community knew, were not yet fully realized; their realization would come only when the Lord came again, and therefore the first Christians were filled with an ardent hope in the approaching *parousia* of their master. This would bring about "the restitution of all things"; only with it would come "the times of refreshment" (3:20ff.). But they believed that the final age had already begun, they already possessed "peace by Jesus Christ" (10:36), they already partook of grace (4:33; 6:8; 15:11) and therefore lived "rejoicing" (5:41; 8:8; 13:48) in "gladness and simplicity of heart" (2:46).

The religious life of the community was based upon these convictions. Its members indeed lived wholly in the presence of the risen Lord, but they did not therefore feel that they had to give up their inherited forms of piety. So the first Christians, including their leaders Peter and John, continued to attend prayers in the Temple (Acts 2:46; 3:1). The Jewish hours of prayer were retained, as well as the gestures of worship and the customary forms of words, which were used in their common prayer together, especially the Psalms (3:1; 9:10; 9:40). Like James the Younger, the Jewish Christians of Palestine felt themselves bound to follow the religious and liturgical usages of their fathers. To the converts of the Diaspora these things obviously meant less, as Stephen's attitude makes clear. The discussions at the apostolic Council show that a universally held opinion as to the binding character of the Old Law did not exist in the primitive Church. The demands of the group that affirmed its obligatory force upon all believers were rejected; but in the so-called clauses of James a certain consideration was accorded to this group, to facilitate harmony in mixed congregations. It is noteworthy, however, that, in the preaching of the apostles, obedience to the Law as a condition of salvation is not stressed. Nevertheless, there was not in the primitive Church of Jerusalem any complete breaking away from the liturgical practices of Palestinian Jewry as a whole.

We can, however, observe certain tendencies that were later to lead to independent forms of piety and ritual. Such a new liturgical act was baptism itself,[30] which was the basis of membership in the community. It was by no means merely a matter of taking over the baptism of John, for the baptism of the Christians was unequivocally carried out "in the name of Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of your sins" (Acts 2:38). Jesus as a person was thus the centre of this liturgical act; from him it got its supernatural efficacy, namely the forgiveness of sins and entry into the community of the faithful. The reception of the Holy Spirit was also in some way bound up with baptism, although the connexion of ideas is not quite clear. Baptism was often followed by a laying on of hands, which was the means of imparting the Spirit; this rite could also take place at a later time, but baptism was felt to be a prerequisite for the reception of the Holy Spirit.

The author of the Acts of the Apostles says in his description of the life of the Jerusalem Christians that they were persevering in "the breaking of bread" (Acts 2:42). Although absolute certainty is hardly possible, many commentators[31] think this refers to the liturgical celebration in memory of the Last Supper of the Lord, and they see in the expression "breaking of bread" a designation that had already become a technical term for the eucharistic celebration, which could take place only in the houses of the faithful. This view is supported by a passage from Paul which is certainly impressive. In his description of the Lord's Supper he says that he is drawing on the tradition of the Jerusalem community. His reference to "the bread that we break" (1 Cor 10:16) is in a clearly eucharistic sense. Thus, such a semantic development of the expression "breaking of bread" is at least probable. The Acts later relate (20:7) how the Christians met "on the first day of the week" to break bread. The special mention of the day on which this celebration was held clearly indicates that the Lord's Supper is here referred to; a day was chosen which had no special significance in the worship of the Jews. In this case too, we note a liturgical development among the first Christians which marks a new departure; Sunday was the day on which the young community assembled for its own form of worship. Why Sunday was chosen it is not difficult to see, for it was the day of the Lord's resurrection, and with this fact was linked the expectation that he would come again on the same day of the week. In view of the growing tension between the early Church and the Jews, Sunday, as the special festival of the Christians, continually rose in importance as opposed to the Sabbath.[32]

Some new Christian religious practices are also indicated by the choice of new fast days, different from the Jewish ones held on Monday and Thursday. That the Christians preferred Friday is easily understood; it was the day on which the Lord died. The choice of Wednesday as the second fast day of the week follows the same line of thought; for it was on a Wednesday that he was taken prisoner and his Passion began. Already therefore the development of a liturgical week based upon Christian ways of thinking is apparent, emphasizing the growing contrast with Jewish practice.

---

[30] G. Schille, "Zur urchristlichen Tauflehre" in *ZNW* 49 (1958), 31–52; G. R. B. Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London 1962).

[31] Cf. e. g. C. Callewaert, "La synaxe eucharistique à Jérusalem" in *EThL* 15 (1938), 34–73; M. Meinertz, *op. cit.* 131 f.

[32] W. Rordorf, *Der Sonntag. Geschichte des Ruhe- und Gottesdiensttages im ältesten Christentum* (Zürich 1962).

The letter of James speaks of another Christian practice, the anointing of the sick, which was entrusted to the elders: "Is any one among you sick? Let him call for the elders (presbyters) of the Church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven" (James 5:14 ff.). Even if the letter was addressed to the Jewish Christians of the Diaspora, James would hardly have recommended to them a religious custom unknown to his own congregation.

The whole religious attitude of the primitive Church was rooted in a courageous enthusiasm, prepared for sacrifice, which manifested itself above all in works of active charity: "Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had everything in common" (Acts 4:32). The brotherly love engendered by the enthusiasm of the new faith made the individual believer easily and gladly renounce his private property in order to help the poor of the community. The voluntary principle makes it impossible to regard this early Christian community of goods as in any way equivalent to modern Communism. Such enthusiasm was no doubt largely nourished by the expectation among the Christians of the *parousia*[33] to which reference has already been made. The generous indifference to the goods of this world which it brought made them inwardly free, unselfish, and therefore capable of great deeds. This moral and religious strength, born of the faith and the eschatological outlook of the primitive Church, also gave its members the strength not to give up when the *parousia* failed to arrive, but instead, to open the way for Christianity into a greater future.

---

[33] J. Gewiess, *op. cit.* 31–38; O. Cullmann, "Parusie und Urchristentum" in *ThLZ* 83 (1958), 1–12; E. Käsemann, "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik" in *ZThK* 59 (1962), 257–84; R. Schnackenburg, *Eschatologische Heilsgemeinde — Mysterium der Kirche* I (Salzburg 1962), 138–42.

SECTION TWO

The Way into the Pagan World

CHAPTER 4

The Religious Situation in the Graeco-Roman World at the Time of its Encounter with Christianity

IN contrast with the political and cultural unity which prevailed in the Mediterranean area at the beginning of the Christian era, we are presented in the religious sphere, with a multiplicity of religions. In all her political conquests Rome had never sought to impose on subject peoples a single religious faith and a single form of worship, rather was it a principle of Roman policy to leave undisturbed all the religious convictions and practices of the tribes and nations included in the empire. A brief survey of the manifold religious currents at the end of the pre-Christian period of Hellenism will enable us to see clearly and to estimate the task with which Christianity was faced when it undertook to win the Graeco-Roman world for Christ.

Decline of the Ancient Greek and Roman Religions

The first characteristic of the general religious situation in the Hellenistic world of the first century B.C. is the decline both of the ancient Greek polytheism and of the old Roman religion. The causes for this development are various and differ for each. In Greece itself, rationalistic criticism of the gods, which had prevailed in the philosophical schools, and especially among Stoics and Epicurians, had had an adverse effect on traditional beliefs. In these circles belief in the Homeric gods had long since been given up. The monistic doctrine of the Stoics, which offered the doctrine of a divine providence (πρόνοια) and of the Logos as world-reason pervading and ordering the universe, did not lead to the acceptance of a personal, supernatural God; for even the Stoic world-reason was subject to the iron law of *Heimarmenē*, which watches over the course of earthly events as they revolve in an eternal circle, and thus deprives the Logos of freedom of action. Epicurus, for his part, did indeed reject the existence of such an inalterable fate, but his view of the world, following Democritus' doctrine of atomic laws, led only to a physically determined universe and likewise left no room for the mythical world of the gods or for a personal God directing all things. The attempt of the Greek Euhemeros to explain belief in the gods historically (Euhemerism), by saying that the gods were outstanding personalities of the past to whom, when glorified in the memory of men, divine honours had gradually come to be paid, only contributed further to the decay of the Greek belief in the gods. Those who held such ideas were indeed to be found at first only in "enlightened" upper-class circles, but their subsequent popularization through the writings of the Cynics and Stoics had a destructive effect on the faith of larger sections of the people.

Political developments in the eastern Mediterranean area also played their part in furthering the decline of the classical Greek religion. The period of the rule of the Diadochs involved in Greece itself the final dissolution of the old city-states, and this in turn was a death-blow to the religious cults which had been maintained by them or their associations of noble families. The newly founded Hellenistic cities in the East, with their commercial possibilities, enticed many Greeks to emigrate, so that the homeland grew poorer and many ancient sanctuaries fell into ruin. Of much more far-reaching effect was the exchange of religious ideas and their liturgical forms of expression, which was brought about by the hellenization of the East, an exchange in which the gods of Greece and the Orient were to a great extent assimilated to one another but lost many of their original attributes in the process. After a manner, of course, the religion of ancient Greece extended its influence; together with the externals of the way of life of the Greek *polis,* its forms of worship also reached the colonies of the East, and so there soon arose in them magnificent monuments of religious art in its characteristic Hellenistic form. But the spirit of the old religion was not to be found in them. On the other hand, oriental cults streamed into Greece and beyond to the western parts of the empire, effecting there a decline of old beliefs and, even in spite of new forms, a loss of religious content.

The ancient Roman religion was also subjected to the same process of dissolution. Since the Second Punic War there had been a steadily growing hellenization of Roman religion, which expressed itself in the erection in increasing numbers of temples and statues of Greek gods on Roman territory. While the Hellenistic gods were introduced mainly by way of the Greek cities of southern Italy and Sicily, it was the direct influence of Greek literature on the beginnings of Latin literature which very largely promoted the hellenization of religion. The stage, with its Latin versions of Greek comedies and other poetical works, also made the people familiar with the world of the Greek gods and mythology. In the face of such an invasion, the ancient gods and their festivals receded into the background, and this, in turn, led to a decline in influence of the colleges of priests who maintained the worship of the old Roman gods. When towards the end of the Second Punic War the Sibylline books demanded the introduction of the cult of Cybele from Asia Minor, the gods of the East began their triumphal entry into Rome and contributed to the disintegration of the ancient Roman faith. All attempts to stem the invasion on the part of the Senate and of those circles in Rome which viewed these developments with anxiety were in the long run unsuccessful.

The military conquests of the last century of the Republic made the Roman troops familiar with the cult of Mithras, and increasing contact with oriental civilization at last opened the gates of the capital to the worship of the Cappadocian Bellona and the Egyptian Isis. Even less could the penetration of Hellenistic philosophical ideas be prevented among the Roman upper class, to whom Stoic thought made a strong appeal; but with them came also a critical attitude towards the gods and a deterministic view of the universe. Especially in Rome itself the sceptical attitude of the leaders of society towards belief in the gods and the State religion could not remain concealed, and so the private family religion of the citizens was infected. The Roman populace still took a keen interest in the games, which were of religious origin; but they were a poor substitute, since their connexion with any religious function was no longer consciously felt.

Augustus on attaining the supreme power had attempted to call a halt to the threatened religious and moral breakdown of the people and introduced a comprehensive reconstruction of the State religion and of belief in it. It was this last that he could no longer recreate. The old colleges of priests were indeed reorganized, shrines were restored, forgotten feasts revived, and members of the leading families once more assumed religious offices and functions. But the inner spiritual content was already too little for the renewed cult to be performed with any real participation of the heart. This is especially apparent in Horace, whose *Carmen Saeculare*, written in 17 B.C. to celebrate the dawn of a new epoch in Rome, reflects his own scepticism by its lack of deep religious feeling. Even the fact that in 12 B.C. Augustus himself assumed the title of *pontifex maximus* and linked it for ever with the principate could not change the course of events.

The Emperor Cult

One feature of Augustus's religious policy was to have far-reaching consequences and to be of special significance when it encountered the growing power of Christianity, namely the adoption of the oriental cult of the ruler and the attempt to include it in his reorganization of the State religion under the modified form of the emperor cult. Religious veneration of the ruler had its origin in the East, where royal power was early regarded as having a religious basis. Alexander and his successors were able to build on this foundation when they added to it elements of Greek hero cult and Stoic ideas about the superiority of the wise man, and thus succeeded in introducing the religious cult of Hellenistic kingship. The first to adopt it were the diadochs of the Near East, and after them, without any special difficulty, the Ptolemies of Egypt, for in that country there already existed a willing priesthood. The example of the Ptolemies was soon followed by the Seleucides. The Hellenistic sovereigns received from the Greek cities of Asia Minor in return for favours and benefits, the title *Soter,* to which others of a religious character, such as *Epiphanes* and *Kyrios,* were later added. The idea increasingly prevailed that in the reigning king God visibly manifested himself. When the kingdoms of the diadochs were replaced by the Roman power, it was natural to transfer the cult of the ruler to those who embodied that power and to pay religious honours to them too. As the Roman Republic lacked a monarch, temples and statues were erected to Roma herself as a personification of Roman power. Even individual Roman generals, such as Anthony, permitted themselves without hesitation to be accorded divine honours when in the East.

It was easy for Augustus to take advantage of this veneration of the ruler in the eastern provinces of the empire, by having temples and shrines to himself set up alongside those of the goddess Roma and by not refusing religious honours, the offering of which was the responsibility of the municipal authorities or the provincial governments. To Augustus personally such honours were most willingly granted, because the *pax Augusta* had brought lasting peace to those territories, and he thus enjoyed unparalleled popularity.

In Rome and Italy the cult of the ruler had to be introduced more discreetly. There the Senate decided only after the emperor's death whether *consecratio,* inclusion among the gods, should be accorded to him because of his services to the State. In fact, the Senate had already placed Caesar as *Divus Julius* among the immortals, established a special cult for him with its own priesthood and thus introduced religious veneration of the Julian house. No doubt Eastern influences were at work here too. Octavian was able to assume the title Augustus, which was of a religious nature. Private citizens were to sacrifice to the *genius* of the emperor in their houses, for in him the divine was made manifest; men swore by the *genius* of the emperor, and the breaking of such an oath was regarded as high treason. When Vergil sings in his fourth Eclogue that in Augustus an old Etruscan prophecy has clearly been fulfilled, according to which a saviour should come into the world as a child and inaugurate a new Golden Age, we discern the same idea, namely the ascription of divine origin to the ruler.

In the course of the first century A.D. some of the Roman emperors gave up the prudent restraint of Augustus and demanded divine honours in Rome during their lifetime,[1] although their way of life and their performance as rulers of the empire hardly recommended them for deification; this had the effect of somewhat cheapening the emperor cult in Rome. Nevertheless there were even in the West private organizations which devoted themselves to promoting this cult. Since the cult of the Emperor was intimately linked with the power of the State, special importance was inevitably attached to it when Christianity, which rejected any form of divine honours paid to men, sooner or later came into conflict with that State.

The Eastern Mystery Cults

While the cult of the emperor as part of the State religion was becoming of universal significance both in East and West, though graduated in intensity in different parts of the empire, the oriental mystery-cults always retained their original private character, albeit their influence on all classes was considerable. The chief reason for their attraction is to be found in their claim to be able to give the individual a liberating answer to his questions about his fate in the next world. They claimed to show him how, by ordering his way of life in this world, he could assure his survival in the next; in a word, how he could find his eternal salvation, σωτηρία.

The oriental mystery-cults could begin their conquest of the East after Alexander's campaigns provided the opportunity. At first they groped their way slowly, gaining gradually a more certain foothold in the commercial and cultural centres, until by imperial times they reached the zenith of their influence. The Greeks on the coast of Asia Minor were the readiest to accept this new world of religious experience; and they were the principal means of its spreading to the West.

These cults were not strictly exclusive, but adopted from time to time elements of existing religious systems, permeated them, mingled characteristics of related divinities with those of their own objects of worship, and thus contributed to that religious syncretism which is typical of the Hellenistic age. Three oriental civilizations were the sources from which the new cults flowed into the Hellenistic world: those of Egypt, Asia Minor and Syria, to which may be added that of Iran, whence came the cult of Mithras which was of a rather different type.

In the centre of the Egyptian cult stood first of all the figures of Isis and Osiris, who are well known from the official religion of Egypt. The goddess Isis was honoured every year by a solemn procession, in which the outlandish and bizarre parade of shaven-headed, white-clad priests, of noisy musicians and other strange participants was the most noticeable feature. In the course of a long development, Isis had become a universal goddess who was believed to have brought morality and civilization to mankind. She was regarded as the inventor of agriculture and writing, as goddess of seafarers, as foundress of law and civil order, a protectress of the persecuted and liberator from every kind of distress.

---

[1] K. Scott, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians* (Stuttgart 1936).

In the secret cult of Isis, Osiris figured as her husband. He was the ancient Egyptian god of vegetation, who died and rose again, as the annual sowing and growth of the crops symbolically signify. His death was mourned by his worshippers, his resurrection celebrated with joy. In his dying, man saw his own death expressed; but like Osiris he would rise again to new life. That is the basic idea of these mysteries, to which the goddess Isis, in a dream, would herself call him who was found worthy. An impressive initiation ceremony[2] consecrated the chosen one to the service of the goddess; he had previously prepared himself by a bath of purification and a ten days' fast, and he was now led by the priest into the sanctuary of the temple of Isis, crossed the threshold of death, passed through all the elements and adored the sun and the gods. Clothed with the "mantle of Heaven", with a torch in his hand and a wreath on his head, he was then presented to the congregation as an image of the sun-god, celebrating the day on which he was born to a new life. Before the statue of the goddess he spoke an enthusiastic prayer of thanksgiving, pledging himself constantly to keep in mind her divine countenance and her holiness.

In the Ptolemaic period Osiris was pushed into the background by the new Egyptian god Sarapis (Serapis), a creation of Ptolemy I, who wished in this way to unite the Egyptians and the Greeks of his kingdom. Therefore Sarapis combined in himself features which appealed to all the king's subjects: he too is associated with Isis as a god of life and death, earth-god and sun-god. Not only did his image, with its Hellenistic beauty, radiate sublime tenderness and helpful humanity, reminding one of Zeus and Asclepios; but his whole being made him widely honoured as a helper in material and spiritual needs. He was the Lord of Fate who led the soul safely into the next world. Zealous propaganda spread his cult from his main sanctuary, the Sarapeion at Alexandria, over the whole Mediterranean world as far as Rome; everywhere resounded the cry of praise: "Sarapis is conqueror!" (Νικᾷ ὁ Σάραπις). It was he whom Emperor Julian was to praise in words which reveal the monotheistic tendency of the cult: "One is Zeus and Hades and Helios, One is Sarapis."[3]

Asia Minor was the home of the cult of the Great Mother, the fertility goddess Cybele, who was early known to the Greeks. In the Hellenistic age her worship spread quickly beyond her homeland and was introduced into Rome as early as 204 B.C. She too was connected with a male divinity, the Nature hero Attis, her lover. According to the myth (of which more than one version exists), Attis was unfaithful to her, wherefore he was cast into a frenzy, from the consequences of which he died. He was awakened to new life and reunited with the Great Mother. This myth became the basis of a wild and strange mystery cult, served by a special college of priests, the Galli. These, by ecstatic dancing and flagellation, brought on their own "mystical" frenzy, in which they were driven even to self-castration. In the rite of initiation, the candidate or *mysta* symbolically relived the fate of his god in death and resurrection; he was sprinkled with the blood of a bull and then entered the "bridal chamber", which he left as one reborn. At a sacred meal he made his profession as a *mysta* of Attis, and a priest proclaimed to the initiated the joyful tidings: "Be comforted, ye *mystae!* Salvation came to the god. So also shall we be partakers of salvation after tribulation."[4] Here, too, the promise of salvation was the deciding motive for joining the cult, the orgiastic features of which were not altogether foreign to a Greek, if he remembered the ways in which Dionysus had formerly been worshipped by his countrymen. The excesses of self-mutilation attendant upon the cult could, indeed, hardly have had much attraction for him; and Greek comedy did not spare with its mockery the itinerant priests of Cybele who travelled through the land propagating their religion.

---

[2] Cf. the description of the ritual in Apuleius, *Metam.* XI; see W. Wittmann, *Das Isisbuch des Apuleius von Madaura* (Stuttgart 1938).

[3] Julian, *Orat.* 4, 136 A.

A cult which originated at Byblos on the Syrian coast was marked by similar ecstatic features. Its divinities were the Mistress of Nature, Atargatis, akin to Cybele, and the beautiful youth Adonis, her husband. The latter was also a god of vegetation who died and rose again. According to the myth he was wounded by a boar while hunting and died of his wounds, but in the spring he would rise once more, a radiant god. The centre of the mystical celebration was the annual commemoration of Adonis' death, at which the women of Byblos abandoned themselves to unrestrained mourning, and interred an image of the youthful god amid loud lamentations. After a short time their mourning was turned to gladness, and the worshippers of the god joyfully proclaimed: "Adonis lives!" The symbolism of this cult, too, expressing sorrow at premature death and longing for a rejuvenating resurrection, was able to attract many people in the later Hellenistic period.

The three mystery cults have, in spite of differences of detail, one basic idea in common. The death and constant renewal observed in Nature were symbolically crystallized in the myth of a young god of vegetation, who is torn from the side of the goddess by a tragic death but rises again to new life. By this is represented the fate of man, whose strange and sometimes incomprehensibly tragic death weighed like a dark burden upon the thought and feeling of Antiquity. Should there not be for him also, as for the god in the myth, a resurrection into a mysterious hereafter? The mere possibility, hinted at in the myth, of such an eschatological hope was bound to appeal to Hellenistic man. Precisely because the old religions of Greece and Rome knew no encouraging answer to this exciting question, people turned to these new forms of religious faith, whose attraction was increased by the mysterious and outlandish nature of the initiation ceremonies, which seemed like an echo from beyond the grave. The hymns and prayers, with their intensity of feeling, caught in their spell many an anxious and excitable mind.

---

[4] Firmicus Maternus, *De Errore Prof. Rel.* 22: Θαρρεῖτε, μύσται, τοῦ Θεοῦ σεσωσμένου· ἔσται γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐκ πόνων σωτηρία.

The mystery cult of Mithras came also to be dominated by ideas of a future life, though indeed these did not come to the fore until Christianity was both inwardly and outwardly well established. This cult had its origins in the Iranian world, was developed, as to its outward form, mainly in Cappadocia, and then spread from East to West. At first it met with little success in the central provinces of Asia Minor and Egypt and found hardly any response in Greece, but it was all the more successful in the western parts of the empire, where Rome and its surroundings — in Ostia alone about fifteen sanctuaries of Mithras are known to have existed — and the northern frontier on the Rhine were the regions in which it was most prevalent. It was essentially a masculine cult, having most of its devotees among the soldiers of the Roman army. Its main figure was the Persian god Mithras, who stole a bull belonging to the moon and slew it on the orders of Apollo; the representation of this event is the central motif of the image which was set up in all Mithraic temples. The blood of a bull was sprinkled over the believers, who were thus initiated and became entitled to expect salvation. The candidate for initiation prepared himself by undergoing various tests of courage and ritual washings; after his reception he proceeded through seven grades to that of a full disciple of Mithras. As Mithras was taken up by the sun-god Helios in the chariot of the sun, so did the disciple hope to be raised up in glory in the next world. The members of the cult were also united in a sacred meal, which prefigured, to those who partook of it, a happy life together in the hereafter.

Our sources give no precise data enabling us to state the number of devotees of all these cults. Their expansion throughout the Hellenistic world and their relative density in the larger centres of population leads us to suppose that their membership was not inconsiderable. The educated upper classes were, no doubt, least represented; these rather sought fulfilment of their religious needs in the philosophical schools of the time.[5] All the more did the mystery cults appeal to the middle classes, whose religious feelings were not yet stifled by the material brilliance of Hellenistic civilization; they longed for actual contact with the divine and to find in rites appealing to the senses, an interpretation of life and a palpable guarantee of a better lot in the next world.

Popular Religion

Emperor cult and mystery religions did not, however, appeal to everyone in the Mediterranean world. The former was relatively seldom in evidence and it had moreover little contact with the rural population. As for the mystery cults, their esoteric character made them difficult of approach for many. The great mass of simple folk, therefore, turned towards the lower kinds of superstition, which in Hellenistic times especially were very widespread in numerous forms.

Chief of these, no doubt, was the belief in astrology, which ascribed to the stars a decisive influence on human destiny. The Graeco-Roman world first became more closely acquainted with it when Berossos, a priest of Baal from Babylon, the home of all astrology, set up a school on the island of Cos in 280 B.C. In the second century B.C. the priest Petosiris in Egypt wrote the fundamental astrological work on which later astrological literature repeatedly drew. A decisive factor was that Stoic philosophy was on the side of astrology, because it found therein confirmation of its doctrine that all things in this world were determined by the laws of destiny. The rejection of astrology by the Academic Carneades was far outweighed by the authority of Poseidonios, who gave to belief in astrology the appearance of a scientifically based system and gained for it such a degree of consideration that Roman emperors like Tiberius kept their own court astrologers, while others such as Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus erected, for the seven planetary gods, special buildings, the *septizonia,* which became centres of astrological activity. An extensive literature spread astrological knowledge among high and low and provided its readers with a belief in fate founded upon the stars; not only for important undertakings, but even in the simple and commonplace affairs of everyday life, they consulted the stars with an almost slavish fear. Whether one should go on a journey, accept an invitation to a party, take a bath — such matters depended on the words of an astrologer, who invariably found numerous believers in his wisdom. He was consulted especially to find out the position of the stars at the hour of birth, for that determined the whole of a person's life — whether he were destined for success or failure, sickness or health, above all for long life or early death. This particular question concerning the hour of death, the darkest of all hours in the life of man in Antiquity, drove him constantly into the arms of astrology. Even when its adherents asserted that through information obtained from astrologers, they had achieved certainty and so were delivered from care and anxiety, they deceived themselves and sooner or later fell victims to a gloomy fatalism, which found expression in many an epitaph of the time. If life was so inevitably subject to the fatal power of the stars, there was no point in praying to the gods, and so faith in the old religions fell into greater neglect than ever among devotees of astrology.

---

[5] W. Nestle, *Griechische Religiosität,* III (Berlin 1934), 86–98.

Magic offered an escape from the iron compulsion of astrological fate. It undertook by secret practices to bring into the service of man both the power of the stars and all the good and evil forces of the universe. This form of superstition had likewise made its way from the ancient East to the West and, especially in Egypt, had reached alarming depths of religious confusion during the Hellenistic period. The magical books of Antiquity and numerous magical papyri which have survived give an instructive glimpse into that world, in which primitive human instincts, fear of the obscure and incomprehensible in Nature and in human events, hatred of fellow-men, delight in sensation, the thrill of the uncanny all find unrestrained expression. Belief in magic presupposes that mighty fear of demons which, from the fourth century B.C. onwards in ever more fantastic forms, had spread in the imagination of Hellenistic man. According to this belief, the whole world was filled with δαίμονες, δυνάμεις, κυριότητες and ἄρχοντες, strange beings halfway between men and gods. Greater and greater became the number of evil demons who could and would harm mankind, but whose power could be held in check by magic. But in order that magic rites and magic words might be effective, one must first of all know the secret name of the god or demon and employ exactly the prescribed formula, however senseless its text might appear.

The professional magician, who was master of this secret science, could make the weather, set free captives, heal or induce sicknesses, calm the sea, sunder lovers or assure one of the love of another, deliver from diabolical possession, call up the dead and make them appear. The influence of such magic was supported and confirmed by certain philosophical currents, such as neo-Pythagoreanism and the neo-Platonic school, which, with their highly developed doctrine of demons, contributed largely to the extensive demonization of Hellenistic religion. A certain influence on contemporary magical literature must be ascribed to Judaism, in which magical practices and conjuring of spirits were quite usual (Acts 8:9–13).

Connected with magic were the belief in the secret meaning of dreams and the art of interpreting them which consequently developed. The latter was particulary successful in Egypt; special dream-books informed credulous readers about the meaning and import of things seen in dreams, and even the most bizarre interpretation found believers. No wonder that the ancient faith in the wisdom of oracles survived into Hellenistic times, only that, in this case too, a descent from a higher level to one of mere charlatanism is observable. Though the Delphic oracle of Apollo and that of the Egyptian Ammon were less respected, others gained in popularity, such as the oracle of Apollo near Miletus, that of Glycon at Abunoteichos in northern Asia Minor (which uttered about 60,000 pronouncements annually), or the oracle of Fortuna at Praeneste, to consult which the Romans made pilgrimages into the Campagna. At popular festivals professional soothsayers were regularly to be found, who with their oracular mirrors and sacred cocks were at the disposal of all classes of the population. A higher form of oracular soothsaying is exemplified by the Sibylline books, collections of which were numerous.[6]

Finally, the strong belief in miracles characteristic of the Hellenistic age belonged mainly to popular religion, even though it was shared by many among the educated classes. The miracle that was most ardently longed for was the restoration of lost health. For this, men prayed to the god Asclepios, who in the Hellenistic period was worshipped more than ever before. Originally a physician and demigod who healed the sick, he became the helper of mankind in distress, the "saviour of all". Where his principal temples stood, there soon developed places of pilgrimage, to which pilgrims streamed from far and near, in order that they might, after preparatory washings, be healed during sleep in or near the sanctuary, or that they might learn of the medicine that would take away their sickness. The great sanctuary of Asclepios (dating from the fourth century B.C.) at Epidauros in the Peloponnese was overshadowed in Hellenistic times by the magnificently laid out temple of the god at Pergamon,[7] this, in its turn, became the mother-house of numerous new foundations, of which about two hundred are now known to have existed.

Men expected of the saviour Asclepios that he would make the blind see, restore to the lame the use of their limbs and to the dumb their speech, and that he would heal lung diseases and dropsy. If the miraculous cure succeeded, thanks to the god were expressed by costly votive gifts, which often took the form of gold or silver images of the healed member, thus proclaiming to all who visited the temple the wonder-working power of Asclepios. In the second century A.D. the rhetor Aelius Aristides became the enthusiastic prophet of this saviour; and the emperor Julian in the fourth century sought to set him up again as the saviour of mankind in opposition to the Saviour of the Christians. Christianity itself waged a long and hard campaign against Asclepios' claim to be a saviour, the beginnings of which are already apparent in the New Testament writings of John, and which lasted into the fourth century.[8]

---

[6] A. Kurfess, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen* (Munich 1951).

[7] K. Kerényi, *Der göttliche Arzt. Studien über Asklepios und seine Kultstätte* (Basle, 2nd ed. 1952).

When one considers the general religious situation in the Hellenistic world at the beginning of the Christian era, the first impression is discouraging, if the missionary task of the early Church is seen in relation to it. The cult of the emperor was bound to prove a great obstacle to the peaceful expansion of the new faith, if only because the tidings of a Redeemer who had been executed upon the cross like a criminal were not likely to be readily accepted by a superficial society which had before its eyes the sacred figure on the imperial throne, surrounded by all the trappings of earthly glory. Moreover, the State could set all the machinery of power in motion if the adherents of the Gospel dared to disdain or attack this State cult, were it only with words alone. A further factor that would seem to prevent the acceptance of Christianity was the extreme licentiousness of the oriental mystery cults, the orgiastic features of which often led to serious moral deterioration. The reliance of these cults on outward demonstrations, calculated to affect the senses, was frequently due to a religious superficiality that was part of Hellenistic civilization, which was itself becoming more and more lacking in depth and inner feeling. The contemporary bold and disrespectful criticism of the gods, with its contempt for the beliefs and worship of the old religions, was another unfavourable factor, undermining as it did all reverence for what was sacred. The mocking irony with which educated circles greeted the preaching of Paul at Athens shows clearly what attitude the Christian missionary had to overcome there.

But, in opposition to these negative tendencies, we may discern also some positive features in the general picture of Hellenistic religion which may be regarded as starting-points for the preaching of the new faith. There was, for instance, the feeling of emptiness which had undeniably arisen among men of more thoughtful nature on account of the failure of the ancient religions. It was not too difficult to fill this emptiness with a message that proclaimed a high ideal of morality and thus appealed particularly to those who felt disgusted with their own previous lives. Certain features of the mystery cults show the presence of a deep desire of redemption in the men of that time which was bound to be quickened when eternal salvation was offered by a Saviour who, while stripped of all earthly greatness, was for that very reason superior to a helper who would bring only salvation in this world. Finally, the strong tendency to monotheism, so apparent in the religions of the Hellenistic period,[9] provided the Christian missionaries with an ideal bridgehead in the pagan lands, for the peoples of which — as for the Jews — " the fullness of time was come" (Gal 4:4).

---

[8] F. J. Dölger, "Der Heiland" in *AuC*, VI (1950), 241–72; K. H. Rengstorf, *Die Anfänge der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christusglaube und Asklepiosfrömmigkeit* (Münster 1953).

CHAPTER 5

The Apostle Paul and the Structure of the Pauline Congregations

ONLY through a series of shocks could Jewish Christianity arrive at the knowledge that it was under an obligation to carry the tidings of redemption through Jesus Christ into the Gentile world also; the after-effects of the Israelites' consciousness of being the Chosen People were too strong. The first reception of a pagan into the community of the faithful, the baptism of the Ethiopian chamberlain by Philip (Acts 8:26–39), appears to have given no cause for a fundamental change of attitude. All the more powerful was the effect created by the baptism of the pagan captain Cornelius of Caesarea and his family (Acts 10:1–11:18). Peter, who was responsible for this step, was formally called to account by the disturbed community, and only his reference to the commission given to him directly by God in a vision was able to reconcile the Jewish Christians in some measure to his action. However significant this was in principle, it had at first no immediate consequences in the way of increased missionary activity among the Gentiles.

The impulse which started such activity came from a group of Hellenistic Jewish Christians from Cyprus and Cyrenaica, who had had to leave Jerusalem after the persecution of Stephen and had first settled in Antioch. Here they "spoke to the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus" and "a great number that believed, turned to the Lord" (Acts 11:19ff.). Thus, the first numerically significant group of pagans that accepted Christianity came from the world of Hellenistic civilization, which showed that there the Christian faith need not expect to meet with uncompromising rejection. The success of this missionary expedition caused the Jerusalem congregation to send one of its members, the former levite Barnabas,[10] to Antioch, in order to appraise the situation. Barnabas, who himself came from the Jewish Diaspora in Cyprus, was sufficiently unprejudiced to be able to appreciate the importance of the events at Antioch. He approved the reception of the

---

[9] W. Weber, *Die Vereinheitlichung der religiösen Welt: Probleme der Spätantike* (Stuttgart 1930), 67–100.

[10] H. Bruns, *Barnabas* (Berlin 1937); J. B. Bruger, *Museum Helveticum* 3 (1946), 180–93.

Greeks into the Church and at the same time saw clearly what was to be of vast consequence for the history of the world: that for the preaching of the new faith in this place there were needed the courage and spirit of the man who, after his own remarkable conversion to Christ, had withdrawn to his Cilician home town: Paul (or Saul) of Tarsus. Barnabas succeeded in persuading him to work in the Syrian city, and after a year's labouring together, the existence of the first large Gentile community was assured. It was at Antioch that its members first received the name of "Christians" (Acts 11:22–26).

The Religious History of the Apostle Paul

Like his earliest collaborator, Barnabas, Paul also came from the Diaspora; his birthplace was Tarsus in Cilicia, where his father carried on the trade of saddler which the son also learnt. When the family settled there is uncertain; according to a late account, his ancestors came from Galilee. His father already possessed hereditary Roman citizenship, the privileges of which Paul could later invoke with effect in his trial before the Roman governor. It was a fortunate circumstance for Paul's missionary work in the great centres of Hellenistic culture that he had in his youth[11] become acquainted with all the manifold aspects of that culture in the fair-sized city of Tarsus with its lively transit traffic. Of even more consequence was the fact that the Greek *koinê,* the common tongue of the Mediterranean region, had become as familiar to him as his native Aramaic. His family had, with that firm loyalty often to be found in a Diaspora situation, remained true to the convictions and traditions of Judaism, all the more so as it followed the Pharisaic school in its strict observance of the Law.

It was probably not until after the death of Jesus that Paul went to Jerusalem to be trained as a teacher of the Law in the school of the Pharisee Gamaliel (Acts 22:3). When the disciples of Jesus began to attract the attention of the Jewish authorities, Paul joined zealously in persecuting them, especially after the martyrdom of the deacon Stephen (Acts 7:58; 8:3). The account in the Acts of the Apostles is impressively confirmed by his own witness: "I persecuted the Church of God violently and tried to destroy it; and I advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers" (Gal 1:13 f.; cf. 1 Cor 15:9).

The lightning and radical change which made the persecutor into an ardent disciple of Jesus and his Gospel was, according to the Acts (9:3–18;

---

[11] Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "Tarsus of Jerusalem de Stad van Paulus' Jeugd", *Mededelingen Koninkl. Nederl. Akad. Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde NR* 15, 5 (1952), 141–89; Eng. tr. *Tarsus or Jerusalem, the City of Paul's Youth* (London 1962).

22:3–16; 26:12–30), brought about by a direct apparition of Jesus which Paul encountered when he was on his way to Damascus to persecute the Christians there. Paul refers to this event only in restrained terms in his letters (cf. Gal 1:15; 1 Cor 15:9; Phil 3:4), but he makes it clear that in the apparition of the Lord he saw the supernatural call of grace that, by calling him to be an apostle, gave his life the final purpose which he was never to give up and in which he was never to falter.

Soon after being baptized and during a short stay in Nabataean Arabia, Paul began to proclaim in the synagogues of Damascus and later in Jerusalem the message of his life, that Jesus was "the Messiah and the Son of God" (Acts 9:20, 22, 26—29). At both places he met with such strong opposition that his life was in danger; he therefore withdrew to his native city of Tarsus (Acts 9:30); and here, no doubt, while he may have engaged in local missionary activity on a small scale, he attained certainty about the scope of his mission and the forms which his preaching of the Gospel was to take. When, after several years' silence, he resumed work in Antioch, he knew that he was to concern himself with the pagan world which, no less than the Jews, could find its salvation only in Jesus Christ (Gal 1:16; Rom 15:15 f.).

The Mission of Paul

Once Paul knew that he was called to preach to the pagans, the Roman Empire presented itself as the appointed mission field. Within its frontiers dwelt those to whom his message must be addressed; they shared the same civilization and (in the cities at least) the same language, the *koinê*. However much he felt himself to be immediately guided, even in detail, by the Spirit of God, it is nevertheless possible to speak of a plan to which he adhered. His journeys were mapped out at a kind of mission-base. For his first missionary period, up to the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, his base was the Syrian capital, Antioch. The Gentile Christian congregation, which had grown up there, was at once spur and bridle for the first large missionary undertaking that Paul began with two companions, Barnabas and the latter's kinsman, John Mark. The account of it which the Acts give us clearly shows the special character of Paul's method.

The starting-points for his missionary work were the synagogues of the cities in the Mediterranean provinces; here the Diaspora Jews held their religious meetings, and here were to be found former pagans who had joined the Jewish community as proselytes or "God-fearing ones". The missionaries first went to Cyprus, where they worked in the city of Salamis. From there the way led to the mainland of Asia Minor, where the cities of Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe in the province of Lycaonia, and Perge in Pamphylia were the scene of their labours. Everywhere Paul's preaching was addressed to both groups, Diaspora Jews and former pagans. Both discussed his sermons and in both he met with acceptance and rejection; it is possible that the discussions reached the ears of the occasional pagan, who then joined the band of disciples (cf. Acts 13:49).

The Acts leave us no room to doubt that the majority of the Diaspora Jews decidedly rejected the message of Paul. In many places, as for example at Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, and Lystra, excited discussions developed into tumults, in the course of which the missionaries were driven out, sometimes mishandled. The initiative on these occasions lay with the Jews, who occasionally goaded their pagan fellow-citizens into using violence — a characteristic trait which can be observed in many subsequent persecutions. Nevertheless the preaching of Paul and his assistants generally found some receptive hearts, especially among the former pagans, "God-fearing ones" and proselytes, and thus there arose in most cities visited on this first journey Christian congregations, to which suitable leaders were appointed. In this way there were established a number of cells of the faith amid pagan surroundings which became centres of further activity.[12] Clearly this was Paul's real object, for he never stayed very long in one place to work in depth, but aimed rather at making the Gospel known in as many places as possible in Asia Minor, leaving its further propagation to the newly-won disciples of Jesus. Paul certainly regarded the result of this first undertaking as a success, for his report to the congregation at the mission-base of Antioch reaches its culmination when he says how God "had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles" (Acts 14:26).

Paul, in conformity with his own conviction that belief in Christ implied the end of obligations under the Old Law, had not imposed either circumcision or the observance of other Jewish ritual prescriptions upon the Gentile Christian congregations of Asia Minor. This freedom from the Law for new converts, a central point of his message, was soon after his return decisively rejected by the extreme wing of Palestinian Jewish Christians, the so-called Judaizers, who demanded circumcision as an essential condition for attaining salvation (Acts 15:1–5). This was the occasion of that dispute between Paul and the Judaizers in the primitive Church, which reached its climax and its theoretical resolution at the Council of Jerusalem, but which was to hinder Paul's missionary work for a long time and compel him again and again to engage in a determined battle for his convictions.

The dispute began at Antioch, when "some from Judaea" demanded circumcision of the Gentile Christians in the local congregation. It was decided to send a delegation with Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to settle the question. Consultation led to the recognition in principle of the Pauline thesis that the Mosaic Law could have no binding force for Gentile Christians, and so the independence of the Pauline mission was acknowledged by the original apostles. Paul also undertook the task of collecting money in the congregations of his mission field for the poor of the Jerusalem community, symbolically testifying by this charitable act to the mutual bond between Gentile and Jewish Christians (Gal 2:1–10).[13]

---

[12] F. J. Schierse, *Zellen und Gruppenbildung im Urchristentum: Die Zelle in Kirche und Welt* (Graz-Vienna-Cologne 1960), 111–28.

The Acts also tell of the resolution to "lay no further burden" upon the newly converted pagans; nevertheless James proposed that they should be required to "abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication" (Acts 15:28 f.). Perhaps James intended this concession to Judaism to facilitate the living together in one community of Jewish and Gentile Christians. It is hard to reconcile this account with that of Paul in his letter to the Galatians; one is led to suppose that this point was only later brought into harmony with the resolutions of the assembly at Jerusalem. How difficult it was in practice to carry out the latter appears from the incident between Peter and Paul at Antioch mentioned in Galatians 2:14. Peter came to Syria probably soon after the Council of Jerusalem and took part in the communal meals of the congregation there; but he gave up doing so, "fearing them who were of the circumcision", Jewish Christians belonging to James' circle who had appeared in Antioch. His action signified a disparagement, if not a betrayal of the Gentile Christians by a leading personality of the primitive Church, which was in direct contradiction to the resolutions of the Council. Paul publicly criticized the inconsistent and cowardly behaviour of Peter and passionately proclaimed his conviction that "man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by faith in Jesus Christ" (Gal 2:16). Paul did not, however, succeed in winning over the Judaizers to his opinion; even though they no longer opposed him directly, they intrigued fanatically against him and tried to alienate his congregations from him, especially in Galatia.

The second phase of Paul's missionary work took him into a new field of activity, comprising principally the provinces of Macedonia, Achaea, and proconsular Asia. He was now in the very centre of Hellenistic civilization. The missionaries, who now included the cultivated Silas (instead of Barnabas) and later Timothy, made their way at first through Cilicia and Lycaonia — where no doubt they visited the congregations Paul had earlier founded — to the districts of Asia Minor whose cities offered possibilities of preaching. The Acts give no precise details of the length of their stay and the measure of their success; but the congregation to which the letter to the Galatians was addressed was probably founded at this time. They reached the coast in northern Troas, where Paul was called in a nocturnal vision to go to Macedonia (Acts 16:9). In Philippi the missionaries soon found adherents, who formed the nucleus of what was later to be a flourishing community (Acts 16:11–40).[14] In Greece, the cities were the centres of Paul's activity, which in essentials followed his previous methods. In Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens and Corinth, the synagogues were the scene of his preaching; in them he proclaimed Jesus as the Messiah (Acts 17:1–10). In the first two of these cities congregations were formed which consisted of Jews and Gentiles. The majority of the Jews there, however, rejected the message of the Kingdom and bitterly persecuted the missionaries. In Athens success was small; in Corinth only a few Jews accepted the Gospel (Acts 17:34; 18:8), but many pagans listened to it. Paul therefore stayed eighteen months in that city, which thus became one of his main centres.

---

[13] G. Klein, "Gal 2:6–9 und die Geschichte der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde" in *ZThK* 57 (1960), 275–95; W. Schmithals, *Paulus und Jakobus* (Göttingen 1963).

Only after the missionaries had laboured for some time did opposition arise on the part of the Jews, who accused the apostle before the Roman proconsul Gallio (Acts 18:12–17). A dated inscription bearing the latter's name and containing a message from the emperor Claudius to the city of Delphi allows us to date fairly accurately Paul's sojourn at Corinth and to place it in the years A.D. 51–52 or 52–53.[15] Gallio refused to listen to the Jews' accusation, and soon afterwards Paul, with the Jewish couple Aquila and Priscilla, who had greatly promoted his work in Corinth, betook himself to Ephesus in Asia Minor. There he began no intensive missionary labours, but shortly after returned to Palestine by sea.

Ephesus was nevertheless soon to become, as Paul no doubt had long intended, the centre of missionary activity on the west coast of Asia Minor. This began probably in the summer of 54. Setting out from Antioch, Paul had visited the Galatian and Phrygian congregations on the way (Acts 18:23). Paul's work in Ephesus, which lasted about two years, was filled with successes but also with difficulties and worries which were almost unavoidable in such a city (Acts 19). His zealous proclamation of the Gospel soon caused a congregation to grow up which detached itself from the synagogue; but its members had yet to be weaned from many remarkable superstitious ideas and customs. Difficulties came not only from the Jews but also from the pagans, as when Demetrius, owner of a business that made small silver models of the temple of Diana, saw his profits threatened by Paul's preaching and staged a demonstration against the missionaries.

The apostle's concern for his earlier foundations, especially those at Corinth and in Galatia, found expression in letters (letter to the Galatians and first letter to the Corinthians) which were written in Ephesus. About the autumn of 57 Paul left the city to go to Macedonia and Greece. After a short stay in Troas he visited Corinth again for a few months; here originated his letter to the Christian community of Rome, still personally unknown to him. In this he announced his intention of coming himself to the imperial capital before going to work in Spain (Rom 15:24 29). For the return journey to Jerusalem, Paul chose first the land route through Macedonia, where he celebrated the Pasch with his congregation in Philippi. Then he sailed to Troas and afterwards to Miletus, whither he had summoned the elders of the Ephesian congregation (Acts 20:1–17). In spite of his own dark forebodings, he felt obliged to return soon to Jerusalem, to hand over the money he had collected for the poor of the congregation there. After taking a sorrowful farewell of the elders of Ephesus, he travelled on with his companions through Tyre, Ptolemais, and Caesarea, visiting the Christians in each place and reaching Jerusalem about the time of Pentecost (Acts 21:1–17).

---

[14] O. Glombitza, "Der Schritt nach Europa" in *ZNW* 53 (1962), 77–82.

[15] L. Hennequin in *DBS*, II (1934), 355–73 (with bibliography).

In Jerusalem Paul's missionary work, in the form it had hitherto taken, came to an end. On a visit to the Temple he was recognized by some Diaspora Jews from Asia Minor. These tried to cause his death at the hands of the people. The Roman guard, however, took him into protective custody, and their commander sent him to the governor at Caesarea (Acts 21:27–23:35). From there a military escort took him to Rome, because Paul, to avoid a trial before the Jewish Sanhedrin, had appealed to the Emperor, so that the case had to be heard in the capital (Acts 27–28). As the lenient conditions of his custody permitted intercourse with the outside world, he resumed his missionary work in the only form possible; he addressed himself to the representatives of the Jewish community of Rome, "testifying to the kingdom of God and trying to convince them about Jesus . . . And some were convinced by what he said, while others disbelieved" (Acts 28:23 f.). With the statement that "this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen" (Acts 28:28), Luke concludes the last Pauline sermon in his book. And with it, too, the author's task is accomplished, namely to describe how the Gospel made its way from Jerusalem to the capital of the Roman Empire.

The Acts of the Apostles are silent about the subsequent events of Paul's life. There is much evidence that the trial ended with an acquittal and that he afterwards carried out his planned journey to Spain[16] and also visited the Hellenistic East once more. This hyphothesis alone can explain the pastoral letters which tell of events and situations that can only be fitted into such a final period of his life.[17] On this last missionary journey Paul was specially concerned with giving directions for the organization of his congregations and with warning them against the menace of false doctrines. A second imprisonment at Rome led to his martyrdom, which took place in the reign of Nero, even though it cannot with certainty be attributed to the actual Neronian persecution.

---

[16] This is suggested by 1 *Clem* 5:7. See E. Dubowy, *Klemens von Rom über die Reise Pauli nach Spanien* (Münster 1914).

[17] On the question of authenticity, cf. C. Spicq, *Les épîtres pastorales* (Paris 1947),

Organization of the Pauline Congregations

Every attempt to provide from historical sources an answer to the question of the organization or "constitution" of the Pauline congregations must reckon with the peculiar nature of those sources, which makes it impossible to give a picture that conveys all the facts. Not a single piece of writing originating in one of those congregations offers a description of its daily life or a clue to its organization. The Acts fail to give such a description, preferring to keep to their central theme, the route followed by Paul on his missionary journeys. The letters discuss matters of organization only on given occasions and therefore afford only casual indications, never principles or a complete system. Nevertheless, even these occasional utterances make it quite clear that an organization existed which regulated and established the congregations' religious life. It is indeed a special kind of organization, not to be compared, for instance, with the rules of a secular body, which are purely the work of man, based on human counsel and human judgment and therefore subject to alteration. But the organization of which we speak rests on a supernatural foundation, the same as that on which the Church herself is based, her Lord, who guides his Church through his Holy Spirit. The same Spirit which caused the young Church to grow (Acts 2:47; 6:7), directed Paul's missionary travels (Acts 16:9; 19:21) and crowned his work with success (Acts 19:11; 1 Cor 2:3 ff.; Rom 15:17 ff.), also created this organization for the life of the community (1 Cor 3:9 ff; 2 Cor 12:19; Eph 4:12–16).[18] When, therefore, members of the community were appointed to special tasks in the service of that organization, they were called by the Holy Spirit, whose organs they were (1 Cor 12:4 f.). Those who were called thus knew themselves to be in the service of the Lord and fulfilled their tasks in and for the community in a spirit of love such as Jesus had required from his disciples (Mark 10:42–45). So this organization was willingly accepted by the congregation and not felt to be in opposition to the free working of the Spirit in those charismatically gifted, for it was the same Spirit who called all.

---

introduction; H. Schlier, *Festschrift Gogarten* (Giessen 1948), 36–60; A. Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction* (Freiburg-New York-London, 3rd ed. 1963), 445–52.

[18] Cf. O. Michel in *ThW* V, 142—5; J. Pfammater, *Die Kirche als Bau. Zur Ekklesiologie der Paulusbriefe* (Rome 1960); K. H. Schelkle, "Kirche als Elite und Elite in der Kirche nach dem Neuen Testament" in *ThQ* 142 (1962), 257–82.

In the organization of the congregations their founder Paul occupied a unique place, ultimately based upon his direct vocation to be the Apostle of the Gentiles. He, indeed, felt himself to be the least of the servants of Jesus Christ and as such due to suffer every tribulation and humiliation (1 Cor 4:9–13; 2 Cor 6:4–10; Phil 2:17). But he was likewise fully persuaded that his office gave him full power and the authority he required for the "edification" or building up of his congregations (2 Cor 10:8; 13:10; 1 Cor 4:21). Conscious of this, he made decisions binding on them, as for instance when he cast out the incestuous adulterer from the congregation at Corinth (1 Cor 5:3 ff.), or gave directions for the worship of God (1 Cor 7:17; Tit 1:5) or for the moral behaviour of the faithful (1 Thess 4:11). Paul was, then, for all his congregations not only the highest teaching authority but also the chief judge and lawgiver, the apex of an hierarchical order.

In the individual congregations, other men were called to be members of this hierarchical order, particular tasks being assigned to them, care for the poor and the conducting of religious worship. For the exercise of their functions they had a right to give directions, to which the faithful according to Paul's explicit order had to submit (1 Cor 16:15 f.; 1 Thess 5:12; Rom 12:6 ff.). Paul stood behind these office-holders with his authority, their powers being similar but subordinate to and limited by his. Those entrusted with such duties were called (Acts 14:23) πρεσβύτεροι, presbyters or elders, whom Paul ordained with laying on of hands and prayer during his first missionary journey in Lystra, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch, before he left those cities to continue on his travels. One may assume that the elders of the congregation of Ephesus were called in a similar way; to them Paul said that the Holy Spirit had appointed them overseers (ἐπίσκοποι) to rule the Church of God as shepherds their sheep. Here it is obvious that the terms "presbyters" and "episcops" indicate the same group of persons, that the two expressions could be used for holders of the same office. At the beginning of the letter to the Philippians "deacons" are mentioned alongside "episcops" as having special duties in the congregation. The later pastoral letters make it clear that the sphere of activity allotted to them was distinct from that of the "presbyters" and "episcops" (1 Tim 1:1–10; 5:17 19; Tit 1:5–11). That the pastoral letters should give a clearer picture of the circumstances is due to the quite understandable development which brought the functions of those who had received ordination into greater prominence as the number of the faithful increased.[19] From the nature of things it is obvious that the office-holders were attached to local congregations; overseer-elders and deacons did not, like Paul and his closest collaborators, travel from city to city and province to province, but fulfilled their tasks within the framework of a particular congregation, from which of course further missionary activity might be carried on in the immediate vicinity. Their vocation can only be understood as a permanent one, if the work begun by Paul in each place was to endure; Paul knew himself to be called, like the other apostles, to continue the work of Jesus of Nazareth and to prepare the community of the final age. In this task those who by God's will occupied the lower rungs of the hierarchical ladder had to play their appointed part.

---

[19] H. Schlier, "Die Ordnung der Kirche nach den Pastoralbriefen" in *Die Zeit der Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br., 3rd ed. 1962), 129–47; H. W. Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Kirchenordnung in den Pastoralbriefen* (1963).

Besides the holders of authority, there were in the Pauline congregations the charismatically gifted, whose function was essentially different.[20] Their gifts, above all prophecy and the gift of tongues (glossolaly), came direct from the Holy Spirit, who imparted them to each as he wished; they were not therefore attached permanently to particular persons and were not necessary for the existence of the community. The charismatics appeared when the faithful assembled for worship, and, by their prophetic utterances and stirring prayer of thanksgiving, kept alive the lofty enthusiasm of the new faith; they were not guardians and guarantors of order. Here and there, indeed, order was endangered because of them, since the extraordinary and mysterious nature of their performances led many members of the congregation to overestimate their gifts — a danger against which Paul had to issue an admonition (1 Cor 14).

Finally, it was an essential feature of the structure of the congregations established by Paul that they did not regard themselves as independent communities which could go their own individual religious way. There was of course already a certain bond between them in the person of their founder who, even after his departure, remained for them the highest teaching and guiding authority. Paul had, besides, implanted in them a strong consciousness that they were closely linked with the community of Jerusalem, whence had gone forth the tidings of the Messiah and of the salvation wrought by him. To this connexion was due their charitable assistance to the poor of Jerusalem; Paul, in his letter to the Galatians, emphasized the duty of caring for "those who are of the household of faith" (Gal 6:10). By preaching unwearyingly that Christians of all congregations served one Lord (1 Cor 8:6), that they were members of one body (1 Cor 12:27), he kept alive the consciousness that all the baptized were "the Israel of God" (Gal 6:16), the Church of both Jews and Gentiles (Eph 2:13–17).[21] From the point of view of Church history, it was one of the greatest achievements of the Apostle of the Gentiles that this consciousness of being one Church which he awakened and encouraged in his congregations made possible the spread of Christianity in the pagan world. Otherwise the believers in Christ might have split into two separate communities, one of Jewish and one of pagan origin, so that, even by the end of the apostolic age two Christian "denominations" might have come into being.[22]

---

[20] See J. Brosch, *Charismen und Ämter in der Urkirche* (Bonn 1951) and the commentaries on 1 Cor 12 and 14, e. g. E. B. Allo (Paris 1934), 317—86.

[21] Cf. E. Peterson, *Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden* (Salzburg 1933), and the commentary on Ephesians by H. Schlier (Düsseldorf, 2nd ed. 1959); idem, *Zeit der Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br., 3rd ed. 1962), 159–86, 287–307.

Religious Life in the Pauline Congregations

The religious life of the Pauline congregations was centred on belief in the risen Lord, which gave a decisive character both to its worship and to its everyday life. This was in accordance with the preaching of Paul, in the centre of which Christ stands and must stand; for this reason he could endure that during his imprisonment others should seek to supplant him, "only that in every way ... Christ is proclaimed" (Phil 1:18). The message of Christ, Paul leaves us in no doubt, must be accepted with real faith: because "if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom 10:9). This belief in the Kyrios, the Lord raised up and glorified after the humiliation of the Cross (cf. Phil 2 5:11),[23] included the conviction that in him dwelt the fullness of deity (Col 2:9 f.), that he therefore as Son of God possessed the divine nature together with the Father and was himself "the power and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor 1:24).

Admission to the community of the faithful was to be gained by baptism, which for Paul, as for the original apostles, represented no mere external act of worship but made effective the death of Jesus, which he underwent for our sins (1 Cor 15:3). In his preaching, Paul was above all at pains to bring his hearers to the knowledge that baptism stands in a real relationship to Christ's death on the cross and to his resurrection. Only because the Christian is buried with Christ and so lets his former self ("the old man") die, does he, like Christ, rise from the dead to new life (Rom 6:2–8); through baptism and only through baptism can he win a share in salvation.[24] The profound conviction of the Pauline congregations that by baptism they were not only symbolically but in reality "born again"[25] to a new life, that would one day become one life with Christ's, gave this sacrament its pre-eminent rank in the religion of Pauline Christianity.

---

[22] R. Schnackenburg, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 71–77, Eng. tr. *The Church in the New Testament* (Freiburg-New York-London 1965).

[23] M. Meinertz, "Zum Verständnis des Christushymnus Phil 2:5–11" in *TThZ* 61 (1952), 186–92 and G. Strecker in *ZNW* 55 (1964), 63–78.

[24] R. Schnackenburg, *Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus* (Munich 1950); E. Klaar, *Die Taufe nach paulinischem Verständnis* (Munich 1961). H. Schlier, *Zeit der Kirche* 47–56, 107–29.

[25] Cf. J. Dey, *Palingenesia* (Münster 1937).

The worship of the congregations fitted into the larger framework of the assemblies at which the faithful regularly met together "on the first day of the week" (Acts 20:7). Even though no religious reason for the choice of this day and its preference over the other days of the week had been adduced, the giving up of the Sabbath clearly marked the beginning of a break with Jewish religion. Well-to-do members of the congregation placed their private houses at the disposal of the faithful for their communal act of worship (1 Cor 16–19; Rom 16:4; Col 4:15). Songs of praise, hymns and psalms introduced the celebration; these were to thank the Father for all things in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (Eph 5:18 ff.; Col 3:16).

The central point and climax of the service was the eucharistic celebration, the Lord's Supper.[26] Details of the way it was conducted are hardly to be found in Paul's writings. It was associated with a meal, no doubt intended to strengthen the solidarity of the faithful, but at which social distinctions among members were sometimes too much in evidence (1 Cor 11:17–27). Even more evident, however, is Paul's striving to convey a deeper theological understanding of the eucharistic act. The "breaking of bread" is unequivocally represented as a real participation in the body and blood of the Lord; this sacrifice is incomparably greater than those of the Old Law and quite different from those of the pagans: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? . . . You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons" (1 Cor 10:16 21). Because the blood and body of the Lord are truly received in wine and bread, whoever partakes unworthily of this fraternal eating and drinking makes himself guilty of betraying the Lord (1 Cor 11:27). Participation in this meal confirmed to the believer again and again his direct bond with the heavenly Lord. Therefore the congregation was filled with joy and thanks (Eph 5:20); it was a pledge of that final community with him which his second coming would bring about. Longing for this final consummation was expressed in the cry of the congregation at the eucharistic meal: "*Marana-tha* — Come, Lord Jesus!" (1 Cor 16:22; Apoc 22:30).[27] For the Pauline congregation the eucharistic celebration was the source which nourished and constantly reaffirmed its inner unity; as all its members had a share in the same bread, which was the body of Christ, all of them formed one body, the community of God (1 Cor 10:17). This sacramentally based unity must however show itself in self-sacrificing regard for all, that the kiss of brotherhood given in the assembly (1 Cor 16:20) might not be meaningless.

---

[26] P. Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl. Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung* (Munich 1960).

[27] K. G. Kuhn in *ThW* IV, 470–5; O. Cullmann, *Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen 1958), 214–22, Eng. tr. *The Christology of the New Testament* (London 1959).

The assembly of the congregation was also the place where "salvation was preached"; for not only was it the task of the travelling missionaries to proclaim the Gospel (Acts 20:7–11; Cor 1:17; 9:16f.), the congregation must continue to hear from its permanently appointed preacher "the message of reconciliation" with God (2 Cor 5:18–21). The sermon was an instruction in the apostles' doctrine of the crucified and risen Saviour; it referred to the passages in Scripture dealing with salvation and derived from them belief in Christ. In doing so, it stressed the duty of the faithful to praise the Father, to await with courage and good cheer the coming of the Lord and to serve one another in brotherly love (Acts 14:22; 1 Thess 2:2–12; 2 Cor 6:1–2; Phil 2:1–11). Preaching, as the proclamation of the Word, had therefore its assured place in the Pauline congregation and was of prime importance. Finally in the worship of the congregation the speeches of the "prophets" also had a part; they were confirmed by the "Amen" of the assembly (1 Cor 14:16).

The realization of the new religious ideal in everyday life faced the Gentile Christian communities of Paul's missionary field with no inconsiderable difficulties. The surrounding pagan world, with its customs, deep-rooted in family and business life and often utterly opposed to the demands of Christian morality, demanded of them a far greater effort at good conduct and self-discipline than was required of the original community at Jerusalem, whom monotheism and the Jewish moral law had raised to a considerably higher level. Paul's preaching incessantly emphasizes, not without grounds, the sharp contrast which Christianity had set up between Christ and Belial, light and darkness, spirit and flesh, between the "old man" of sin and the "new man" of freedom and truth. That there were in individual congregations members who failed to live up to this high ideal may be inferred from the apostle's unwearying admonitions, even though such glaring examples as that of the incestuous adulterer of Corinth may have been exceptional (1 Cor 5:1 9–13). Frequent references to the spirit of unity and peace among the brethren indicate offences against the commandment of brotherly love (1 Cor 1:10; Eph 4:2f.; 1 Thess 5:13). As is usually so in such cases, the lapses stand out more than the faithful observance of the moral law. In many congregations no doubt the light prevailed over the shadows. When the apostle could say of the Christians in Philippi and Thessalonica that they were his "joy and crown" (Phil 4:1; 1 Thess 2:19), such unreserved praise was assuredly to be highly valued. Those Christians were numerous whose help and selfless labours in the service of the saints Paul could remember with gratitude.

The strongest proof of the moral strength which the Gospel had developed in the Pauline mission field is to be seen in the continuance of his congregations in post-apostolic times and later. The seed that he had sown in his sermons about the power of God's grace and the happiness of being children of God in a pagan world, had sprung up marvellously. At the apostle's death the Hellenistic world was covered with a network of Christian cells, the viability of which ensured the further expansion of the Christian faith in the time to follow.

CHAPTER 6

Peter's Missionary Activity and his Sojourn and Death in Rome

Extra-Pauline Gentile Christianity

COMPARED with Paul's mission, which both in extent and depth was the most successful, the work of the other apostles who were active in the eastern or western parts of the empire is much less easy to follow. Paul himself is witness to the existence of such activity when he asserts that he made a point of not preaching the Gospel where the name of Christ was already known: he would not, as he says, "build on another man's foundation" (Rom 15:19–20). The existence of Gentile-Christian communities, whose origin was due to other missionaries, was therefore known to him; but he does not mention the names of the cities and provinces in which such communities had developed. The Acts of the Apostles refer only casually to extra-Pauline missions, as when it is stated that Barnabas, after his departure from Paul, travelled to Cyprus (Acts 15:40), clearly in order to do missionary work there. In another passage, the existence of a Christian congregation on Italian soil at Puteoli, near Naples, is taken for granted, when the Acts relate that Paul on his way to Rome met "brethren" at the port there who invited him to stay with them (Acts 28:14). Similarly, members of the Roman congregation came to meet him, being already informed of his arrival (Acts 18:15). The name of a Roman missionary is not mentioned. A reference to extra-Pauline mission fields may be found also in the opening of Peter's first letter, which is addressed to the Christians of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. If, as is probable, the Roman provinces of the East are here meant, three are named that did not actually belong to the area covered by the Apostle of the Gentiles: Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia. As the Acts (2:9 ff.) number Jews from Cappadocia and Pontus among those present at the first Christian Pentecost at Jerusalem, these may well be regarded as the earliest missionaries in those regions. That the new adherents of the

Christian faith in these provinces had formerly been pagans is quite clear from many passages in the First Epistle of Peter.[28]

The fragmentary nature of our sources for the history of early Christianity is especially apparent when one inquires about the labours or even the lives of the other apostles (with the exception of Peter, John, and James the Younger). It might be expected that their missionary activities would have been confined mainly to Palestine and the surrounding areas, but all the reliable sources are silent. Only in the second and third centuries did the so-called apocryphal "Acts of the Apostles" seek to fill these gaps,[29] giving more or less detailed accounts of the lives and deaths of several apostles. From a literary point of view these writings are related to the ancient novels and travel-books, the heroes of which are portrayed according to the models of profane aretology.[30]

In so far as they proceed from heretical, Gnostic circles, they were intended to procure increased respect for the doctrines of that sect by the use of a revered name. The apocryphal acts of non-heretical provenance or rewritten in orthodox versions rely upon the strong interest shown by the common people in picturesque detail from the lives of great figures of the Christian past, and to this they owed their success. Their value as sources lies in the glimpses they give of the world of religious ideas in the age that produced them; their information about the missionary activity and manner of death of the apostles, or about the places where they laboured, is quite incapable of being checked.[31] At the most it is conceivable that what these works relate of the countries or provinces where the apostles are said to have preached may be based upon genuine traditions; for curiously enough the mission field of the apostle Paul is hardly ever included. The persons named in the apocryphal acts as companions or assistants of the apostles can certainly be regarded as imaginary. Only for three leading members of the apostolic college, James, Peter and John, have we reliable sources of information which make it possible for us to know some facts about their activities. The last two will now be dealt with in more detail.

Sojourn and Death of the Apostle Peter in Rome

The Acts of the Apostles conclude their account of Peter's activity in the primitive Church of Jerusalem with the mysterious words: "He went to another place" (Acts 12:17). The motive for his departure is not known, nor is it apparent where he intended to go. The attempt to see in this vague form of expression a reliable piece of evidence for the apostle's early death[32] is as misleading as the thesis that Paul, in the Epistle to the Galatians, (2:6–19) bears incontrovertible witness that Peter was already dead when the chapter was written.[33] The tradition of Peter's sojourn at Rome and his martyrdom there is too strong to be brushed aside by such weakly grounded hypotheses. The route he followed to Rome, the time of his arrival in the imperial capital and the length of his stay (with interruptions perhaps) are matters on which no definite statement is possible. It is certain that Peter was present at the Council of Jerusalem, which must have taken place about the middle of the century, and that shortly afterwords he was staying at Antioch (Acts 15:7; Gal 2:11–14).

---

[28] Cf. K. H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* (Freiburg-Basle-Vienna 1961), 2.

[29] See the account (with bibliography) in *Quasten P,* I 128–43 and *Altaner* 72–79; J. Michl in *LThK* I, 747–54.

[30] L. Hertling, "Literarisches zu den apokryphen Apostelakten" in *ZKTh* 49 (1925), 219–43.

[31] E. v. d. Goltz, "Apostelgeschichten als Geschichtsquellen" in *Harnack-Ehrung* (Leipzig 1921), 149–58.

The basis of the Roman tradition concerning Peter is formed by three pieces of evidence, chronologically close to one another and forming together a statement so positive as practically to amount to historical certainty. The first is of Roman origin and is to be found in a letter written to Corinth by Clement in the name of his congregation. Therein he refers to cases in the recent past in which Christians had suffered ill-treatment and death "because of intrigues". Among them Peter and Paul stand out: "Peter, who because of unjust envy suffered tribulations not once or twice but many times, and thus became a witness and passed on to the place of glory which was his due."[34] With him a great number died a martyr's death, among them female Christians, who were executed dressed up as Danaïdes and Dirces. This points to the persecution of the Christians under Nero, to be described later,[35] and permits us to connect Peter's death with it and to date the latter event about the middle of the sixties. Clement says nothing of the manner and place of Peter's martyrdom; his omission of such details clearly presupposes in his readers a knowledge of the events; to himself they were no doubt known at first hand, having taken place in the city where he dwelt and within his own time.

The essential part of this evidence occurs again in a letter from the East addressed, about twenty years later, to the Roman congregation. The bishop of the Gentile Christian community that possessed the most traditions and which was most likely to be informed about the careers of the two leading apostles, Ignatius of Antioch, begs the Christians of Rome not to rob him of the martyr's crown he expected to receive there, by interceding with the pagan authorities. He qualifies his request with the respectful words: "I do not command you as Peter and Paul did."[36] These two, therefore, stood in a special relationship to the Roman congregation, which had given them a position of authority; that is, they had stayed there for a lengthy period as active members of the community, not temporarily as chance visitors. The weight of this evidence lies in the fact that the knowledge of the Roman congregation about the sojourn of Peter in their midst is unequivocally confirmed by a statement emanating from the distant Christian East.

---

[32] Thus D. F. Robinson in *JBL* 64 (1945), 255–67, and W. M. Schmaltz in *JBL* 71 (1952), 211–16.

[33] Especially K. Heussi, *Die römische Petrustradition in kritischer Sicht* (Tübingen 1955), 1–10; *H. Katzmann* also favours 55 as the year of Peter's death, *IKZ* 29 (1939), 85–93. Against such early estimates see esp. O. Cullmann, *Petrus, Jünger–Apostel–Märtyrer,* (Zurich, 2nd ed. 1960), 35f., Eng. tr. *Peter, Disciple–Apostle–Martyr* (London 1953), and K. Aland, *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 49–54.

[34] 1 *Clem* 5:1–4; 6:1–2.

[35] See below, chapter 8.

The third document may be placed alongside Ignatius' letter. Its value as evidence for Peter's residence and martyrdom at Rome has only recently been emphasized.[37] The *Ascensio Isaiae* (4:2–3), which in its Christian version dates from about the year 100,[38] says, in the style of prophecy, that the community founded by the twelve apostles will be persecuted by Belial, the murderer of his mother [Nero], and that one of the Twelve will be delivered into his hands. This prophetic statement is illuminated by a fragment of the "Apocalypse of Peter", which can also be ascribed to the beginning of the second century. Here it says: "See, Peter, to thee have I revealed and explained all things. Go then into the city of fornication and drink the chalice that I have foretold to thee.[39]

This combined text, with its knowledge of Peter's martyrdom at Rome under Nero, confirms and underlines the reliability of the Roman tradition considerably. To these three basic statements two further references can be added which complete the picture given by the tradition. The author of the last chapter of John's Gospel clearly alludes to Peter's death as a martyr and obviously knows of his execution upon the cross (Jn 21:18–19), but is silent about the place of his martyrdom. On the other hand, Rome is indicated as his place of abode in the final verses of the first epistle of Peter, which is stated to have been written at "Babylon"; this is most probably to be understood as meaning Rome, which corresponds to the equation of Babylon with Rome in the Apocalypse (14:8; 16ff.) and in Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinical literature.[40]

The tradition of Peter's residence at Rome continued unchallenged through the second century and was further confirmed by evidence from the most distant regions in which Christianity had been established, for instance by Bishop Dionysius of Corinth[41] in the East, by Irenaeus of Lyons[42] in the West, by Tertullian[43] in Africa. Even more important is the fact that this tradition was neither claimed for itself by any other Christian community nor opposed nor doubted by any contemporary voice. This almost amazing lack of any rival tradition is without doubt to be regarded as a deciding factor in the critical examination of the Roman tradition.[44]

---

[36] Ignatius, *Rom.* 4, 3.

[37] Cf. E. Peterson, "Das Martyrium des hl. Petrus nach der Petrusapokalypse" in *Miscellanea Belvederi* (Rome 1954–5), 181–5, reprinted in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959), 88–91, where the texts are also given.

[38] E. Peterson in *ByZ* 47 (1954), 70 f.

[39] Greek text in *JThS* 32 (1931), 270.

[40] Cf. K. H. Schelkle, *op. cit.* 135.

The Tomb of Peter

However positive the answer to the question of Peter's last residence and place of death may sound, the situation becomes surprisingly complicated when our inquiry has to do with the place of his burial and with the form it took. Here the literary evidence is joined by the weightier testimony of archaeological discovery. Both the excavations and the examination of the literary sources make it clear that in Rome itself the tradition concerning the location of Peter's tomb became divided in course of time. That the Vatican hill was the place of Peter's execution, as is implied by Tacitus' account[45] of Nero's persecution read in conjunction with Clement's first epistle, is confirmed and amplified by the testimony of Gaius, an educated and active member of the Roman congregation under Bishop Zephyrinus (199–217). Gaius was involved in a controversy with the leader of the Montanists in Rome, Proclus, which was concerned with proving the possession of apostolic graves as evidence for the authenticity of apostolic traditions. Just as, earlier, Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus[46] had asserted, in discussing the question of the date of Easter, that the tombs of apostles and bishops in Asia Minor guaranteed indisputably the eastern custom, so Proclus argued that the graves of the apostle Philip and his charismatically gifted daughters in Hierapolis proved the truth of Montanist opinions. Gaius outdid his opponent with the counter-argument: "But I can show you the *tropaia* of the apostles; for if you will go to the Vatican or on the road to Ostia, there you will find the triumphal tombs of those who founded this congregation."[47] So about the year 200 the conviction was held at Rome that Peter's tomb was on the Vatican hill; Gaius gives no indication that this conviction was not shared by the whole Roman community.

---

[41] *Euseb. HE* 2, 25, 8.

[42] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3, 1–3.

[43] Tertullian, *Praescr. haer.* 36, 3.

[44] Thus, following H. Lietzmannn, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1927), T. Klauser, *Die römische Petrustradition im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche* (Cologne-Opladen 1956), 16.

[45] Tacitus, *Annal.* 15, 44, 5.

[46] *Euseb. HE* 5, 1–8.

[47] Ibid, 2, 25, 7. See T. Klauser, *op. cit.* 20 f.

As opposed to this, an entry in the Roman liturgical calendar of 354, supplemented by the so-called *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (after 431), states that in 258, on June 29th, the memory of Peter was celebrated at the Vatican, that of Paul on the road to Ostia, and of both *in catacumbas;* there was therefore about the year 260 a shrine of the two princes of the apostles on the Via Appia under the basilica later known as St Sebastian's, which in the fourth century was still called *ecclesia apostolorum.*[48] An epitaph composed by Pope Damasus says that the two apostles had once "dwelt" there, which probably means that their bodies had once been buried there.[49] Excavations in 1917 proved the existence of such a shrine about the year 260, in which both apostles were honoured by *refrigeria,* memorial services, as the numerous *graffiti* on the walls testify. In these, visitors to the shrine invoke the intercession of the two apostles.[50]

Although the excavations brought to light no grave which could be regarded as the burial-place of the apostles, certain of the *graffiti* force us to the conclusion that the Christian visitors were convinced that here were the tombs of Peter and Paul. The discovery gave rise to a number of hypotheses, of which none has as yet decisively prevailed. Whereas the excavators maintained the view that the actual burial-place of both apostles was on the Via Appia, their bodies having been translated to Constantine's basilicas only after these were built,[51] others held that the relics had been brought to St Sebastian's for safety during Valerian's persecution and had remained there until their translation to the new basilicas.[52] A third opinion denies the possibility of such a translation to the Appian Way, in view of the Roman burial laws which strictly forbade the opening of graves; a substitute shrine may well have been set up here when the persecution of Valerian made visits to the real tombs impossible.[53] Or again, there may have been on the Appian Way a centre of veneration of the apostles belonging to some schismatic group, perhaps the Novatians,[54] who living in Rome itself, could not desist from such veneration.

Finally, it is said that the existence of two places in which the tomb of Peter was supposed to be proves that the Roman congregation in the third century no longer possessed any certain knowledge of the actual burial-place of the apostles; one group, represented by Gaius, thought Peter's grave was under the *tropaion* on the Vatican hill, another was convinced that it was on the Via Appia. The leaders of the congregation had to tolerate this double tradition till after the time of Constantine, for he himself erected basilicas in both places — on the Vatican hill that of Peter and on the Appian Way the *ecclesia apostolorum*, which only later received the title of St Sebastian's.[55] The date of June 29th given in the Calendar is usually linked with an early liturgical celebration on the Appian Way.

---

[48] J. P. Kirsch, *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalender* (Münster 1924), 20ff.

[49] A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana* (Rome 1942), 142.

[50] A. von Gerkan in H. Lietzmann, *op. cit.* 248–301; most recently in F. Tolotti, *Memorie degli apostoli in Catacumbas* (Vatican City 1953).

[51] P. Styger, *Römische Märtyrergrüfte* (Berlin 1935), 48.

[52] H. Lietzmann, *op. cit.* 122; E. Kirschbaum, *Die Gräber der Apostelfürsten* (Frankfurt, 2nd ed. 1959), 202f., Eng. tr. The Tombs of SS. Peter and Paul (New York 1959); A. v. Gerkan, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 158 (1958), 99.

[53] Esp. *Delehaye* OC 267 f.

[54] C. Mohlberg, "Historisch-kritische Bemerkungen zum Ursprung der sogenannten memoria apostolorum an der Appischen Straße" in *Colligere Fragmenta, Festschrift A. Dold* (Beuron 1952), 52–74.

The highly important excavations of 1940–9 under the Petrine basilica[56] led first to the discovery of a vast necropolis reached by a street of tombs ascending to the west, from which one arrived at numerous mausolea, many of them richly adorned. Among them there is one that is purely Christian, possessing very ancient mosaics which include a representation of Christ-Helios, a very valuable piece of early Christian iconography.[57] The mausolea were built in the period 130–200; but as the necropolis was only part of a larger cemetery, it is probable that graves were made there, especially towards the east, at an earlier date.

The ground immediately below and in front of the *confessio* of St Peter, where one might have expected to find evidence of Gaius' *tropaion*, proved to be a cemetery, unroofed before the building of Constantine's basilica and measuring approximately 7 × 4 metres (called P by the excavators), bounded on the west by a red wall erected about the year 160. In the east side of this wall there is a double niche (whether contemporary or later is uncertain), flanked by two small projecting columns, of which one was found *in situ*. It is not difficult to recognize this as an *aedicula* or tomb, not exceptionally ornate, which was regarded by the builders of Constantine's basilica as the monument in relation to which the new church, in spite of all the work involved — such as filling in the mausolea and difficulties caused by the ground level — had to be orientated. We are compelled to assume that they regarded the *aedicula*, built probably about 160, as the *tropaion* of Gaius with the tomb of Peter beneath.

In front of the lower niche a flat stone covered a space about 60 cm square, but set at an angle (approximately 11° less than a right angle) to the red wall. In the earth beneath this there were no actual remains of a grave, such as tiles; but there was here also a niche let into the lower edge of the red wall in which lay a little heap of bones from the skeleton of an elderly man. It is noteworthy that around this asymmetrically placed square four later graves ($\gamma, \eta, \vartheta, \iota$) were so arranged that they would not encroach upon it; one of them (ϑ) can be dated by a tile as being of the time of Vespasian. This leads us to presume that an already existing grave was intentionally left intact. As all the other graves of the area P show only earth burials, the excavators concluded that it contained none but Christian graves, although no other indications prove their Christian character. The carefully preserved square under the stone of the aedicula is, say the excavators, the place where Peter was buried, and they think that the grave was shortened when the red wall or the *aedicula* was built. The absence of anything that might identify the tomb can be explained by the conditions of emergency, in which Peter had to be buried; its defective state may be due to interference either at the time of a possible removal or on some other occasion of which we can know nothing.

---

[55] T. Klauser, *op. cit.* 73–75.

[56] The factual details are taken mainly from E. Kirschbaum, *op. cit.*

[57] See also O. Perler, *Die Mosaiken der Juliergruft im Vatikan* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953).

The assumption that Peter's tomb has been found must of course rest upon clues, the worth of which as evidence can be variously assessed. Their power to convince depends on how far they can explain the difficulties which still remain. Thus it does not appear to be proved that all the graves around the square under the stone of the *tropaion* are Christian; in the case of the child's grave (γ) with its libation vessels, the possibility, in the second century, seems to be excluded. Moreover, grave η does in fact encroach upon the alleged tomb of Peter, the situation of which would therefore appear not to have been exactly known when that grave was made. The "newly opened" tomb is not big enough for the burial of a man, and the hypotheses necessary to explain the shortening of the original grave are rather unconvincing. What remains regrettably unexplained is why the existing bones were not carefully placed in security either when the *aedicula* was built, or on the occasion of a translation, or after violation of the tomb. Finally, since all reliable information about the place of Peter's execution and burial is lacking, the possibilities concerning it continue to remain as so many open questions. The body might have been burnt or mutilated after execution, or buried in a common grave; or the authorities might have refused to hand it over to the Christians.

These difficulties taken together have not as yet been satisfactorily cleared up; they therefore make it impossible for the present to agree with the opinion that the excavations have with certainty brought to light the tomb of Peter or its original site. They have, however, led without doubt to some very important discoveries. The remains of the *tropaion* of Gaius have most probably been found; the Christians who had it erected certainly believed the apostle's burial-place to be on the Vatican hill. This conviction, shared by the builders of Constantine's basilica, excludes the likelihood of a translation of the bones into the new basilica, for then there would have been opportunities for reconstructing the tomb and orientating the new church which would surely not have been missed. In spite of all hypotheses, the shrine of the apostles on the Appian Way remains a great riddle, to be the subject of further researches in the future.

CHAPTER 7

The Christianity of the Johannine Writings

TOWARDS the end of the first century we encounter a group of Christian writings which tradition early ascribed — not entirely with one voice — to the apostle John, son of Zebedee and younger brother of James the elder. In these Johannine writings, which comprise a Gospel, a fairly long admonitory letter, two short letters and an apocalypse, we see a general picture of Christianity which unmistakably represents a unique stage in its development, in many respects more advanced than the primitive Church of Jerusalem and the Christianity of the Pauline congregations. Here we must note especially those features which are relevant from the point of view of Church history, those which emphasize features in the development of Christian belief and ecclesiastical life that shaped the future history of Christianity. Two in particular stand out: the image of Christ, which is projected in the fourth gospel especially, and the image of the Church, which in the Apocalypse acquires new characteristics.

Even if no generally accepted solution to the question of the authorship of the Johannine writings has been found — if, in particular, the assumption that the Gospel and the Apocalypse in their present form are the work of the same author involves serious difficulties — nevertheless, they can be dated to the end of the first century, and it can be stated with a high degree of probability that they originated among the Christian communities of the west coast of Asia Minor.[58] But there, at that period, the apostle John was the outstanding figure, so that the scriptures that bear his name come also from his spirit, even though they may have received their final form from his disciples.[59] The Gospel of John must have existed at the turn of the century, for Ignatius of Antioch very probably knew it,[60] and a papyrus fragment of a codex written in Egypt about 130[61] containing John 18:31 ff. presupposes such a date of origin. Evidence for an approximately contemporaneous origin for the first letter of John is the use made of it by Papias[62] and the fact that Polycarp of Smyrna quotes it in his letter to the Philippians (7:1). The Apocalypse, too, must have been written, as Irenaeus states,[63] in the last years of Domitian's reign, for the letters it contains to Asiatic churches imply a development of ecclesiastical life which had not taken place before the year 70. Its clear references to a clash between the Church and the State cult of the emperor, especially in the thirteenth chapter, are most easily understood if the work received its final form towards the end of the reign of Domitian.

---

[58] Besides the introductions to the N. T. see F.-M. Braun, *Jean le théologien* (Paris 1959), 301–64.

[59] J. Bonsirven, *Commentaire de l'Apocalypse* (Paris 1951), 69–75.

[60] C. Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (Zurich 1949).

[61] This is *P* 52, ed. by C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel* (Manchester 1935); see also *RB* 45 (1936), 269–72.

[62] *Euseb. HE* 3, 39, 17.

[63] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5, 30, 3.

The purpose which guided John when he wrote his Gospel is thus expressed by him at the end of the book: "But these [signs] are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name" (20:31). If the readers here addressed were all Christians, the Gospel was intended to confirm and deepen their faith in the Messiah and the divine sonship of Christ. Indeed, chapters 13–17 could have been written only for those whose belief in Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God was subject to no doubt. But we cannot exclude from the number of the evangelist's readers or hearers those groups who disputed or doubted Christ's claims. The author of the Gospel, writing in Greek, must have had in mind Jews of the Diaspora who were opposed to such ideas.[64] Not without asperity does he attack them, since they had not only denied that Jesus was the Son of God and of divine origin (John 5:18; 8:40–59), but also cast out of their synagogues those who believed in him (9:22; 12:42).[65] He wished to make clear to them that, with Jesus, the Jewish Law had lost its validity (2:1–22; 4:21 ff.), that grace and truth had come into the world with him (1:17), and that the Old Testament scriptures bore witness that he was the Messiah. In Ephesus itself a group of Jews was seeking to destroy belief in the true Messiah, because they considered he had already come in the person of John the Baptist.[66] To these disciples of John the fourth Gospel opposes the testimony of John himself, when it emphatically quotes him as saying that he was not the Messiah, nor the Prophet, nor the Light, but only a witness (1:6 ff. 20 ff.), only the friend of the bridegroom (3:28 ff.), only he who pointed to the Lamb who takes away the sins of the world (1:29).

The evangelist seeks to impart to his readers, believers as well as Jews, an understanding of Christ unique in its depth and grandeur, when he proclaims him as the Logos who has existed from all eternity, being himself divine, and who, when he took flesh, came into this world out of his pre-existence. This is the content of that majestic exordium of the Gospel which serves as a prologue. There is much to support the view that the evangelist was here making use of an already extant hymn to the Logos. It was not, however, the hymn of a Gnostic group in praise of John the Baptist, for John's disciples never worshipped him as the Logos. It may have originated in a Christian congregation of Asia Minor.[67] The idea of the Logos had already found there its inalterable and specifically Christian character, which the prologue endeavours to protect from misunderstanding by the insertion of certain phrases. However widespread the Logos-idea then was in different circles — it was known even to early Greek philosophers, to Philo, for whom the Logos was a middle being between God and the world, and to the Gnostics, for whom he was a redeemer, while Jewish wisdom speculation moved in a world of ideas related to that of the Logos — the very attributes given to the Logos by John — divine essence, personal subsistence and the Incarnation based thereon — are lacking in previous conceptions of it. The specifically Christian achievement consists in having taken over an idea already existing in many variations and in having given it an unmistakably Christian stamp.

---

[64] Cf. esp. W. C. van Unnik in *Studia Evangelica* (Berlin 1959), 406–10.

[65] See K. L. Caroll in *BJRL* 40 (1957), 334–49.

[66] R. Schnackenburg in *HJ* 77 (1958), 24 f.

The author of the prologue recognized with a sure instinct the significance of this christianized idea of the Logos and, by putting it into the fourth Gospel, he assured for it an effect that cannot easily be estimated. Whereever Jews or pagans met the Logos as represented in John's Gospel, they encountered the person of Jesus interpreted in a way that left no doubt as to his real Godhead. It was a formulation that was essentially in agreement with Pauline christology, but which, by its conceptual formulation, opened to the Gospel new spheres of influence. In spite of the fact that the evangelist was deeply rooted in Jewish thought, as the Qumran texts have again emphasized,[68] he was able, by taking over the idea of the Logos, to create an image of Christ which, without affecting the essential uniqueness of the message of the Gospel, created fresh possibilities of missionary expansion in the Graeco-Roman world.

To this image of Christ the evangelist joins a clear consciousness of the universal mission of Christianity and of its character as a world religion. This Logos is the light of men; with him came into the world the true light "that enlightens every man" (Jn 1:9); he is "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (1:29); he was sent that the world might be saved through him, so that every man that believed in him might have eternal life (3:16 f.). He gave his flesh for the life of the world, and he went to his death that he might unite the scattered children of God into one community (6:51; 11:52). This image of the divine Logos, who brings light and life and therewith salvation to all mankind, is John's bequest at the end of the first century to the next generation of Christians. In making this bequest John performed an act of first-class importance in the history of the Church.

---

[67] Idem in *BZ* 1 (1957), 69–109, esp. 90–101, with which P.-H. Menoud, *L'évangile de Jean* (Paris 1958), 17, agrees.

[68] Cf. e.g. F.-M. Braun, "L'arrière-fond du quatrième évangile" in *L'évangile de Jean*, 179–96.

Beside this concept of Christ there appears in the Johannine writings an image of the Church which also shows a new aspect.[69] The ecclesiological content of John's Gospel has indeed often been misunderstood because critics allowed themselves to be too much influenced by a phraseology which seems to imply an individualistic concept of the salvation process (3:16; 5:24; 6:56; 15:5). It was believed that he showed a lack of interest in active missionary and pastoral work, characteristics of a community conscious of being a church.[70] In reality the author of the Johannine writings possessed a highly individual, deeply thought out concept of the Church, which he over and over again sought to impart to his readers.

John's Gospel leaves no doubt that men are received by a sacramental act into the community of those who by faith in Jesus attain eternal life: "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (3:5) The Spirit that the risen Lord will send effects this new birth and gives the new, divine life. The baptized form the community of believers, cleansed from all sin by the blood of Jesus (1 Jn 1:7). The "anti-Christs" are separated from their fellowship, because they do not hold steadfastly to the true faith of Christ and to brotherly love (1 Jn 2:19–20; 5:1–2; 4:2–3; 2:9–10), and so lose their divine sonship.[71] Only within this community does one become a partaker in the other source of that life, given, as in baptism, by the Spirit: namely, the Eucharist. Participation in the eucharistic meal, at which the faithful receive the real flesh and blood of the risen Lord (Jn 6: 53–58), unites them most intimately with him and with one another and strengthens the bonds of their fellowship as nothing else can.

The evangelist seeks to explain and interpret the reality of this fellowship by words and images employed by Jesus, which have always had an ecclesiological significance. The image of the one shepherd and one flock (Jn 10) illustrates above all the inner unity and compactness of the Church, but also her universality; for all men, Jew as well as Gentile, will one day be members of her flock (11:52; 17:20ff.).[72] The transfer to Peter of the office of shepherd will ensure the unity of the Church in the future as well. The secret inner life of the Church shines forth in the figure of the vine and its branches. Only in close and permanent attachment to the true vine, Christ, do the members of the Church possess life; only if they remain in this community do they remain also in him and be capable of bringing forth fruit.

---

[69] For what follows cf. esp. R. Schnackenburg, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Freiburg i. Br. 1961) 93–106, Eng. tr. *The Church in the New Testament* (Freiburg-New York-London 1965).

[70] E. Schweizer, "Der johanneische Kirchenbegriff" in *Studia Evangelica* (Berlin 1959), 363–81, esp. 379.

[71] R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953), 155–62.

[72] For the origin of the supplementary chapter from Johannine tradition, cf. M.-E. Boismard, "Le chapitre 21 de S. Jean" in *RB* 54 (1947), 473–501.

According to the evangelist's view, the Church is called to bear witness, in the midst of a hostile world, to the risen Christ and to the salvation brought by him. (15:26–27). This leads to conflict with the world and so inevitably to actual martyrdom: the Church becomes a church of martyrs. It is a theme to which the Apocalypse constantly returns, whether the Church be regarded under the image of the heavenly woman[73] who has to fight and overcome the dragon (Rev. 12), or whether she be represented as those who follow the Lamb (14:1–5; 13:7–10). The fellowship of the followers of the Lamb here on earth is strengthened in its constancy by the sight of the perfect brethren who have already conquered, "for they loved not their lives, even unto death" (12:11), and have overcome Satan "by the blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony" (ibid.). Thus is completed the bridge between the heavenly and the earthly Church, who, as the bride of the Lamb, is on the way to her marriage, to her own perfecting. When she reaches the goal of her journey, she will live on as the new Jerusalem in the kingdom of God at the end of the world.

This majestic view of the perfected Church was proclaimed, as a message of comfort and encouragement, to the actual Church of the late first century, oppressed by the persecution of Domitian.[74] In the fortifying possession of such a vision, she strode out boldly towards her objective. Out of these riches she was able to renew her steadfastness in the faith, whenever she was called upon to give further concrete witness to it.

---

[73] Cf. J. Sickenberger, "Die Messiasmutter im 12. Kapitel der Apokalypse" in *ThQ* 126 (1946), 357–427.

[74] R. Schütz, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes und Kaiser Domitian* (Göttingen 1933).

SECTION THREE

The Post-Apostolic Age

WITH the death of the last of the apostles the young Church lost the last leading figure who could be invoked as an eye-witness to the life, death and resurrection of the Lord. Her destinies were now entrusted to a new generation which was, however, conscious of being in a unique way pledged to maintain the traditions of the apostles. Therefore the post-apostolic age represents a phase in the history of the Church which can be regarded as a direct development of what was already begun. In points of detail, the Church of that period did indeed display characteristics which mark her off from the apostolic Church in the strict sense. Her mission field remained essentially the same as in the previous generation, which, starting out from Antioch, had taken a decisive step by addressing her preaching to the world of Hellenistic civilization. Missionary successes had evidently not been revolutionary either in numbers or in the social rank of the new adherents, even though a numerical increase, especially in the big cities of the empire, was clearly perceptible. Because of this, Christianity was to an increasing degree awakening the interest of its pagan surroundings; local persecutions occurred, usually caused by the antipathy of the local population, whereas the pagan State had as yet no definite policy in its relationship to the new religion. The chief development in the post-apostolic age was within the Church, and for our knowledge of it, the primary sources are the writings of the apostolic Fathers which began to appear at this time.

One can hardly speak of a deeper understanding or development of the central themes of Pauline theology. The favourite subject of theological discussion remained the controversy with Judaism, carried on however in a form so steeped in Jewish ideas that at first it might rather be called a theology of Jewish Christianity. Only in the works of the apologists do we perceive a Christianity more strongly affected by the religious philosophy of Hellenism; conflict with this and with Gnosticism (now a keen rival), necessitated a further theological development and represents a new phase in the history of the early Church.

The religious practice of the post-apostolic age remained, both in the narrower sacramental sphere of baptism and Eucharist and in its daily expression in prayer and asceticism, largely that established by apostolic tradition. Only in the question of discipline did the Church seek solutions for new problems which arose from the lapses of individual Christians during times of persecution. The greatest progress is probably to be seen in the further development of ecclesiastical organization, which gave each congregation a monarchical episcopate, whose jurisdiction was clearly defined. This arrangement became general. At the same time a growing consciousness of the underlying union of all Christian congregations with one another is apparent, expressing itself in cordial relations between them, in personal visits, in correspondence and in solicitude for the welfare of other congregations; in this respect, the church of Rome felt itself obliged by a higher degree of responsibility for all the others. The unity of all who confessed Christ in the Roman Empire was believed to be what the founder of the Church demanded. They also believed that in the episcopate set up by him and based on the apostolic succession they possessed a guarantee of that unity.

CHAPTER 8

The Conflict between Christianity and the Roman State Power

The Beginnings of the Conflict

THE Christian communities which sprang up in the cities of the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Church's missionary activity were bound, sooner or later, to attract the attention of their pagan neighbours on account of their marked aversion from everything connected with pagan worship. From the beginning this interest had a hostile tendency, all the more remarkable inasmuch as such a reaction on the part of the pagan masses towards new religious cults from the East (except for a few outbreaks against the Jews) was otherwise unusual. Besides, these non-Christian oriental cults generally conducted a lively propaganda, which in places met with considerable success. The cause of this hostile attitude on the pagan side towards the adherents of the Christian religion must, therefore, be sought in the latter itself. It lay ultimately in the claim to absolute truth with which the Christian faith entered the world, a claim which evidently could not be tolerant towards any other religion and was bound to involve the Church in a conflict of principles with the Roman State religion. There now appeared in the Roman Empire, for the first time, a religious movement which did not look upon its God merely as a special divinity, but as the only true God and Redeemer of the world, beside the worship of whom none other might exist. As the Christians also drew the practical conclusion from their convictions in daily life and cut themselves off absolutely from their pagan surroundings, they gradually came to appear to the latter as declared enemies of classical culture, permeated as it was by religion.

The hostile atmosphere thus created was demonstrably nourished by the Jews of the Diaspora, who could not forgive the Jewish Christians for their apostasy from the faith of their fathers. The way the Christians shunned contact with the outside world continually provided fresh fuel for and an appearance of credibility to those dark rumours which accused them of sexual immorality at their nocturnal meetings, and revolting practices in their religious worship. All this formed the soil from which grew that general opinion of the Christians as a low rabble who had only too much reason to avoid the light of publicity. A trifling occasion was therefore often sufficient for the mistrust and stored-up resentment of the pagan population to vent themselves in outbreaks of persecution. Sometimes during these, adherents of the new faith were deprived by mob justice of goods or life, or dragged before the civil authorities with loud demands for punishment.

The Christians themselves always felt such proceedings to be unjust persecution and showed little understanding of the fact that their religious exclusiveness offered some grounds for them. For this reason, the sources of our knowledge of the conflict between Christianity and paganism in pre-Constantinian times are of a peculiar nature and need careful consideration. Both separate descriptions and general accounts of the so-called persecutions were nearly all the products of Christian pens; a detailed history of them from the pagan point of view does not exist. In later Christian historical writing, the Christian attitude towards the events has understandably prevailed, showing on one side only the brutal persecutor who was later stricken down by well-merited divine punishment, and on the other the elect and the just, who by their steadfast witness deserved an imperishable heavenly crown. The view of writers like Lactantius and Eusebius have determined the image of the persecutions right down to modern times. The number of them was said to have been ten, because by mystical anticipation they were thought to have been prefigured in the ten plagues of Egypt.

With the abandonment of this traditional scheme, a more objective estimate of the question has become possible which has led us to recognize two important points: first, that it will not do to look upon every Roman emperor or provincial governor, under whose rule or administration Christians were put to death, as a man who persecuted them in blind rage solely because of their faith. The causes in individual cases differed widely and must be separately assessed. Moreover, the initiative for reprisals against the Christians did not come primarily from the State authorities; it was contrary to the principles of Roman religious policy to proceed with the power of the State against the adherents of a religious movement solely because of their beliefs. No doubt, the close connexion between the Roman religion and the State was regarded as one of the main supports of the empire. If, in Republican times, the invasion of foreign cults from the East was looked on with mistrust, and if, in 186 B.C. on the occasion of the famous affair of the Bacchanalia, certain counter-measures were taken, these were not primarily directed against the religious convictions of the adherents of a new cult, so much as against the immoral excesses which it brought in its train, making it a danger to Roman morality and therefore, indirectly, to the public good. The same motives later prompted the Roman authorities to take proceedings against soothsayers, astrologers and charlatans who caused political unrest by their horoscopes and prophecies.[1]

This policy was continued during the first century of the empire. The cult of the emperor, as it developed into divine worship such as Augustus received in the eastern provinces, did indeed become a new and essential component of the State religion. But its external form, its ritual, developed only slowly, so that the conscious rejection of emperor worship on the part of the Christians, could but seldom, in the first century, have been the motive for proceedings against them by the State. Only on isolated occasions did emperors like Nero and Domitian press certain prerogatives of the emperor cult and thus provoke conflicts which, however, did not affect the Christians exclusively.

The pagan State power first began to notice the special character of the new religious movement only because of the disturbances that occurred between Christians and Jews or pagans, and then it had to step in, in order to get these tumults under control. Only then, did the authorities gradually become convinced that the religious peace which had reigned hitherto, was being disturbed by the Christians and that the latter in fact constituted a threat to the customary religious policy of the empire. Only after closer observation did it become clear that the Christians also rejected the Roman State religion on principle and thus, in the opinion of the government, jeopardized the State itself. So the pagan State power can be mentioned only with certain limitations when we list the factors to which the persecution of the Christians is to be attributed. The primary cause was rather the claim to absoluteness made by the Christian religion itself; a secondary cause was the hostile attitude of the pagan population. Only in the third century did the conflict between Christianity and the pagan State become one of principle, when the latter thought it saw in the new religion a power that threatened its own existence.

---

[1] Cf. J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1956), 15–19.

Such a view of the circumstances in no way precludes unrestricted admiration for the attitude of the Christian martyrs, who professed their religious convictions with exemplary heroism and defended, for all time, freedom of conscience in the face of all earthly power.

The Persecutions under Nero and Domitian

The first case that can be verified with certainty in which a Roman State authority was closely concerned with a Christian has hitherto been thought to have been that of the apostle Paul who, invoking his right as a Roman citizen, appealed to Caesar when brought before the procurator Porcius Festus in 59 and was, therefore, taken to Rome. The proceedings apparently ended, as we have already mentioned, with an acquittal. Paul's religion was evidently not regarded as offending against the existing laws or public order. Recently, however, it has been claimed that indications have been found of an anti-Christian attitude on the part of the Roman State which may be dated to the beginning of Claudius's reign. This emperor, in a letter discovered in 1920,[2] was answering the complaints which had been brought to him by a Jewish (and Greek?) delegation from Alexandria which simultaneously conveyed a congratulatory address on his accession. The emperor specifically forbade the Jews of the Egyptian capital to invite thither fellow-countrymen from Syria or Egypt; if they disobeyed in this matter he would be compelled "to proceed against them with every means, since they would spread, as it were, a kind of pestilence over the whole world."[3] This "pestilence" has been understood as the Christian religion, which was then being propagated by its missionaries in Egypt and elsewhere in the Roman Empire. The text of Claudius' letter does not, however, force us to such an interpretation; its wording can without difficulty be understood as referring to the continual quarrels of the Jewish inhabitants of Alexandria among themselves and with the Greek population, which had repeatedly led to bloodshed. It is, moreover, against all probability that the Jews, in order to strengthen their position, should admit into the Egyptian capital precisely those Jews who had become converts to Christianity.

Another action of the same emperor can, with much greater justification be connected with Christian missionary work in Rome; it is mentioned by Dio Cassius and Suetonius. Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome because they were continually in conflict among themselves, the conflict being provoked by a man called Chrestos.[4]

---

[2] This is the London Papyrus 1912, published by J. Idris Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (London 1924); see also S. Lösch, *Epistula Claudiana* (Rottenburg 1930); H. Janne, "La lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins et le christianisme" in *APhilHistOS* 4 (1936), 273–95; H. Idris Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool 1954), 78 ff.; F. F. Bruce, "Christianity under Claudius" in *BJRL* 44 (1961–2), 309–26.

[3] *Pap. Lond. 1912,* 98–100.

An identification of this Chrestos with Christ positively obtrudes itself; and we may here be seeing the first effects of the Christian message among the Jewish community of Rome. The married couple Aquila and Priscilla, were also affected by the emperor's expulsion order, and they thereupon took up residence at Corinth, where they gave hospitality to Paul when he was preaching there about the years 49–50 (Acts 18:2–4). It may be assumed that the Jewish couple had already embraced Christianity, but were included in the imperial order simply because they belonged to the Jewish race. The emperor's action is, therefore, not yet to be regarded as anti-Christian; it was merely intended to put an end to a centre of unrest among the Roman population.

The earliest example of adherents of the Christian faith being persecuted by Roman authorities remains therefore the events which befell the Christian community at Rome after the burning of the city under Nero in the year 64. The account which Tacitus gives in his Annals provides valuable information about the background to these occurrences.[5] A remarkably persistent rumour was circulating among the people that Nero himself was responsible for the conflagration which on 16 July 64 destroyed several districts of the city completely and others in part. To get rid of this suspicion, the emperor (Tacitus reports) diverted it onto the Christians, "who on account of their misdeeds were hated". Some men, who had been arrested and charged, were bribed to denounce the Christians as the actual culprits. The latter were then seized in large numbers *(ingens multitudo)* and executed in the ways reserved for arsonists: some of the Christians were sewn into the skins of animals and thrown to wild dogs, others were clothed in inflammable materials and used as living torches after dark in Nero's gardens, which he threw open to the public for the spectacle. Tacitus had no doubt that the Christians were unjustly accused of arson, even though he believed that they deserved the severest punishments on account of their other crimes. He did not, therefore, share the compassion which was shown towards them at the time "because they were sacrificed to gratify the cruel whim of one man". Tacitus' description, no doubt correct in essentials, shows us that the Christian community at Rome in the seventh decade of the first century had a considerable number of members, for *ingens multitudo* certainly implies more than a handful. Furthermore, it is clear that the motive of the persecution by Nero was not his belief that the new religion constituted a threat to the State. In carrying out his plan he made unscrupulous use of the hostile attitude of the population towards the

---

[4] Suetonis, *Claud.* 25, 4: "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit."

[5] On the interpretation of Tacitus' account (*Annal.* 14, 44) cf. esp. H. Fuchs, *VigChr* 4 (1950), 65–93, and K. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana* (Heidelberg 1957), 229–39.

Christians, but he was not aiming at the Christian faith as such. Later Christian apologists, of course, generally regarded him as the first Roman emperor who persecuted Christianity from religious motives; according to Lactantius, Nero's proceedings had as their objective the complete extirpation of Christianity.

The statements about a persecution of the Christians which Clement of Rome made in his letter to the congregation of Corinth before the end of the century no doubt also refer to the events under Nero. He is the first Christian writer to mention them. Without naming Nero directly, he says that not only did Peter and Paul suffer a violent death, but also "a great number of the elect", among them women, had died after cruel tortures.[6] The reference to the great number and the manner of execution hardly admits room for doubt that we are here reading of the same events that Tacitus describes.

Lactantius is the only author who states that the Roman persecution under Nero was not confined to the capital but included the whole empire. This is improbable, for the other sources are silent on this matter and Lactantius possesses in other respects no exact knowledge of the events in Nero's reign. It would, besides, imply that the measures taken in 64 were not due to a passing caprice, but were based upon a law valid for the empire as a whole. Tertullian indeed says, when telling of the persecution under Nero, that all the proceedings of that cruel emperor were subsequently declared null and void, with one exception: the proscription by him of the Christian name was the only *institutum Neronianum* that was not removed by his *damnatio memoriae.*[7] Many modern historians quote this statement, assuming from it that a general edict of persecution was issued by Nero.[8]

The following considerations, however, are decisively against such an assumption. An edict of that kind must have had effects in the whole empire, and therefore in the East also; but all the sources, and, in particular, those for the East, say nothing of it. Moreover, at the beginning of the sixties, Christianity was hardly of such importance to the Roman Government that the latter should have had any occasion to take legal measures against it. What speaks most strongly against the existence of a Neronian edict of persecution, is the fact that never in later times did the Roman authorities base their attitude towards the Christian problem on such a decree. So Tacitus' account possesses in this matter also a greater degree of credibility; Nero's action against the Christians had no legal foundation, but sprang from the arbitrary will of the ruler, who thereby hoped to cleanse himself from the suspicion of arson. Nevertheless, public opinion regarding the Christians was certainly influenced by Nero's persecution of them; and Tertullian's words are no doubt to be understood in this sense. The vague feeling in the mind of the pagan masses that the Christians were a suspect lot, capable of dark crimes, was, as it were, sanctioned by their execution. From that time on, to be a Christian was to be an outlaw in the eyes of the people; what Nero had begun *(id quod a Nerone institutum est),* the moral proscription of the name of Christian, persisted for a long time. In the future, the Roman authorities could always find support from public opinion whenever the circumstances obliged them, in any particular case, to face the question whether the State should take action against the Christians or tolerate them. It is not hard to understand how this view of Christianity should gradually acquire the force of a principle of law by which the legal position of the Christians in the empire was largely determined.

---

[6] Clement, *Ep. ad Cor.* 6.

[7] Tertullian, *Ad. nat.* 1, 7, 9: "et tamen mansit erasis omnibus hoc solum institutum Neronianum."

[8] E.g. J. Zeiller in *Fliche-Martin* I, 292; H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'empire romain* (Brussels 1951), 25 ff.; J. Beaujeu, *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire I* (Paris 1955), 107.

The sources tell us far less about the persecution which the Christians endured under the emperor Domitian, though there is no doubt that it took place. There is first the clear and unequivocal statement of Melito of Sardes, who was fairly close in time to the event. He, in his apologia for the emperor Marcus Aurelius, mentions Domitian alongside Nero as an opponent of Christianity.[9] The remarks of the Roman Bishop Clement in his letter to the Corinthians (1:1), saying that the perils and tribulations which had suddenly fallen upon the Christians had prevented his writing sooner, can, moreover, hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a reference to measures taken by that emperor against the Christians.[10] Some statements of non-Christian authors can also be understood in this sense. Epictetus' reproach to the Christians that they went foolishly and thoughtlessly to their death,[11] implies that they were being persecuted, as does the remark of the elder Pliny, in his letter to Trajan,[12] that certain alleged Christians had asserted in court the fact of their renunciation of Christianity twenty years before.

Special importance seems due to the statement of Dio Cassius[13] to the effect that the consul Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla had been accused and condemned on account of "godlessness" (ἀθεότης), and with them "many others, who favoured Jewish practices". As Dio Cassius a little later calls the crime of these persons ἀσέβεια, it becomes clear that here is meant the *crimen laesae majestatis,* the crime of which the Christians were said to be guilty when, in the second century, they were accused of atheism. If the author here refers, as he evidently does, to Christians — he never mentions them by that name anywhere in his work — the accusation of godlessness makes intelligible the motive behind Domitian's action: it was the emperor's claim to absoluteness for his own person, expressed in the demands of a cult that knew no limitations. Certain references in the Apocalypse also fit in with this view of the facts if one accepts that it was written, at least in its present form, in the last years of the first century, as there are strong grounds for supposing.[14] According to the Apocalypse, the persecution of the Church which the author saw approaching, had, for its cause, the clash between emperor-worship on Domitian's pattern and the Christian idea of God. To the congregations of Asia Minor especially, Domitian's claim to divine honours must have been a heavy blow, because the flourishing imperial cult in that region hardly permitted any avoidance of the conflict. The pretext for the persecution in the eastern provinces was, therefore, based solely on the accusation of *lèse-majesté* which rejection of emperor-worship involved.

---

[9] *Euseb. HE* 4, 26, 9.

[10] J. Vogt, "Christenverfolgungen" (historical) in *RAC* II (1954), 1168.

[11] Epictetus, *Diss.* 4, 7, 6.

[12] Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 10, 96, 6.

[13] Dio Cassius, 67, 14, 1–2.

The sources make few concrete statements about the extent of the persecution and the number of its victims. We may believe the words of Dio Cassius that in Rome, besides the above-named consular pair, "many others" were implicated. That the consul for the year 91, Acilius Glabrio, likewise condemned to death by Domitian, was also executed for his Christian belief, cannot be proved, but the possibility is not to be excluded. In any case we must not try to support this view by reference to an archaeological discovery which has often been adduced as proof: the so-called crypt of the Acilii in the catacomb of Priscilla is not of earlier date than the middle of the second century.[15] Nor can the nucleus of the present catacomb of Domitilla on the Via Ardeatina be proved to be a burial place founded by the Roman lady put to death by Domitian, even though inscriptions suggest that Domitilla had connexions with the district where it lies.[16] As Dio Cassius states, the emperor Nerva did not accept the accusations of godlessness and Jewish practices and so the persecution ceased.

The Court Trials of Christians under Trajan and Hadrian

Of the legal position of the Christians during the reign of Trajan (98–117) and of the proceedings of the authorities in Asia Minor, in particular, we should know nothing if we had only Christian sources to rely on. The official question addressed to the emperor by a governor of Bithynia, as to what principle he should follow in certain border-line cases when dealing with Christians, shows clearly that in that Asiatic province numerous persons were denounced to the authorities as Christians, tried and examined, and, if they remained true to their faith, executed. Together with the answer, which the emperor personally sent to the governor in the form of a rescript, this correspondence between Pliny the younger and his imperial master[17] gives us an opportunity to study the attitude which the Government of the empire adopted towards Christianity at the beginning of the second century.

---

[14] See above, chapter 7.

[15] Cf. A. M. Schneider, *Festschr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen* 2 (1951), 182–90.

[16] L. Hertling and E. Kirschbaum, *Die römischen Katakomben und ihre Märtyrer* (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1955), 44–46.

Pliny, who took office in 111 or 112, gives us welcome information about the situation of the Christian religion as he found it in his province. It had already found many adherents outside the towns among people of all classes and ages. The reason why the governor was concerned with the Christian community was the fact that many of its members did not obey the imperial decree banning the *hetairies,* associations unrecognized by the State. These Christians were denounced to the governor, sometimes even anonymously. Pliny first established by examination that they were Christians and then ordered them, with threats of the death penalty, to give up their religion. Only when they obstinately persisted in it did he have them put to death, with the exception of those who were Roman citizens; these were, in accordance with the law, kept apart from the others that they might be transported to Rome for their cases to be heard.

Various occurrences during the trials, however, caused doubts to arise in the mind of the governor as to whether the method employed was legally correct; it sometimes came out at the hearings that many denunciations were made solely from motives of spite; in a long list of names of alleged Christians the accusers were anonymous. Many of those denounced asserted that they had never been Christians; they confirmed this by calling on the gods or by sacrificing before their images or before that of the emperor. Others claimed that they had long since renounced Christianity and likewise sacrificed to the gods and the emperor; they even emphasized their recantation by reviling the God of the Christians. The examination of those who confessed themselves Christians before the governor disclosed no crime against the existing laws, even when torture was applied.

Pliny formulated his scruples in a few precise questions addressed to the emperor. Must the age of the accused be taken into consideration? May one grant pardon if one of them recants? Is it the name alone (of Christian) which is to be punished, even when there are no other crimes? Are only those crimes to be punished which are associated with the name of Christian? Finally, Pliny tried to suggest an answer to the emperor which would enable him to proceed with leniency: if he were indulgent towards the penitent, he might expect to win back a large number to paganism.

---

[17] Both documents are in Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 10, 96, 97.

One thing appears clearly from Pliny's letter: the governor of Bithynia was unaware of any law or decree of the State which might serve as a norm in proceedings against adherents of the Christian faith. He does not at all ask how this or that formulation of a law should be interpreted or amplified. His dilemma is simply this: does the mere name of Christian suffice as grounds for persecution, or must other crimes be proved?

Trajan's answer confirms equally unmistakably that there was no general law regulating proceedings against Christians; the situation was still in the emperor's opinion such that he could establish no universally valid norm. He gave Pliny certain directives intended to lighten his difficulties — Christians were not to be sought out, anonymous accusations were to be ignored. A man denounced as a Christian was to be examined; if he denied his Christianity and confirmed his denial by invoking the Roman gods, he was not to be punished even if he had formerly been a Christian. Only he who on examination confessed himself to be a Christian and persisted in his confession was to be punished. Proof of crimes against other laws was therefore not to be demanded; the mere fact of being a Christian sufficed for condemnation.

The rescript of Trajan does not in any way attempt to give a reason for or to justify these principles; they were clearly self-evident and familiar to the emperor as an expression of the current public opinion about the Christians. The estimate of them which had grown up since Nero's time had become firmly established and was so general that even the Roman authorities could make this maxim their own: to be a Christian is something which is not allowed. That such a maxim was in contradiction to the acknowledged principles of Roman law shows the inconsistencies which the rescript contains. Although to be a Christian was already an offence, the authorities were not on their own initiative to seek out Christians. He who had made himself guilty of this crime could nevertheless escape punishment if he renounced his religion. It is noteworthy that even after this rescript the State authorities in the provinces were given wide freedom of action; according to the degree of the Roman official's independence from the pressure of pagan opinion, persecution could flare up in individual provinces and take extreme forms, or complete peace might reign. One positive advantage the Christians might feel they had gained, arose from the emperor's directive that no consideration was to be given to anonymous accusers; they were thereby protected from many vexations and might with the exercise of a little prudence expect to live in anyway relative security.

The sources give little information about the effects of Trajan's rescript. Thus we know no names of Christians who lost their lives in Bithynia, nor do we learn the fate of those who as Roman citizens were kept apart in order to be tried at Rome. Whether the references to persecutions in Polycarp's letter to the congregation of Philippi[18] apply to the reign of Trajan cannot be determined. There are only two martyrs whose names have been handed down that can with any certainty be attributed to this period. Bishop Simeon of Jerusalem, successor of James, met death by crucifixion at the age of 120 years.[19] Ignatius of Antioch was brought to Rome, probably being a Roman citizen, and was executed there while Trajan was still emperor, as Eusebius relates[20] on the authority of Irenaeus, without giving the exact date of his death. Reports of other martyrdoms under Trajan in later Acts are of such doubtful value that we can learn little from them.

Under Trajan's successor Hadrian (117–38) a governor again applied to the emperor for directions in his dealings with the Christians. The letter of the proconsul of the province of Asia Proconsularis, Getulius Serennius Granianus, to Hadrian is lost, but the emperor's answer to his successor in office, Minucius Fundanus, has been preserved by Justin, who included it in his *Apologia.*[21] Even more decisively than Trajan, Hadrian condemned anonymous denunciations of Christians and demands made by the mob for their punishment. Only when someone vouched with his name for the accusations was a Christian to be brought to trial, and only when it could be proved that the accused "had offended against the laws" was the governor to pronounce sentence "according to the gravity of the offence".

This rescript of Hadrian has been regarded as nothing more than a reaffirmation of the norms which Trajan had established.[22] In this view, the proof which the accuser had to produce would then be nothing more than evidence that the person named was a Christian. The proconsul, however, was to punish "according to the gravity of the offence". It is hard to see how in the mere fact of being Christian there could be any differences of degree in the eyes of the judge. The interpretation which Justin gives of the rescript is therefore more probable. According to him, Hadrian's attitude meant a relief for the Christians which went far beyond the norms fixed by Trajan; Christians could be punished only if they could be proved to have committed crimes against the existing laws of the State. Hadrian does not indeed exclude the possibility of prosecution for merely being a Christian, but he appears to have demanded proof that the accused had offended against Roman law. Be that as it may, the rescript was only giving guidance to a proconsul on how to act in his own province. Elsewhere a Roman administrator could well follow the maxim that the *nomen Christianum* in itself was worthy of punishment.

---

[18] Polycarp, *Phil.* 9, 12.

[19] *Euseb. HE* 3, 32, 3, 6 according to Hegesippus.

[20] *Euseb. HE* 3, 36, 3; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5, 28, 4.

[21] Justin, *Apol.* 68, 5–10; *Euseb. HE* 4, 9.

[22] W. Schmid, *Maja* 7 (1955), 5–13; J. Moreau, *op. cit.* 48.

There is every indication that Hadrian's rescript perceptibly ameliorated the position of the Christians. No document mentions an actual or even an alleged martyrdom in the province of Asia Proconsularis, nor can executions of Christians in other parts of the empire be attributed with certainty to the reign of Hadrian.

The principle that the mere fact of being a Christian was punishable remained the general norm during the rest of the second century, as is proved by several martyrdoms under Hadrian's successor Antoninus Pius (138–61). Justin adds to the appendix of his *Apologia* an account which relates, obviously with an exact knowledge of the details, the execution of three Christians at Rome,[23] who because of their steadfast profession of faith were condemned to death by the prefect of the city. The *Shepherd* of Hermas, with its remarks about Christians who remained constant or relapsed, likewise presupposes proceedings against them under Antoninus Pius.[24] The part played by the pagan populace in the carrying out of legal procedure against a Christian is made very clear in the report which the congregation of Smyrna gave on the death of their Bishop Polycarp.[25] In the form of a letter to the Christian community of Philomelion, the Christians of Smyrna relate how the pagans of the city, making a tumult, demanded of the magistrates that the bishop, who had fled, should be sought out and brought to judgment. As he refused to deny Christ he was condemned to death at the stake and burnt in the theatre. Fixing the date of this martyrdom does indeed involve some difficulties; but placing it in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, as Eusebius does, demands such a number of weakly-based hypotheses that the traditional view that Polycarp died under Antoninus Pius seems to be preferable.[26]

This survey of the persecutions of Christians in the Roman Empire from the time of Nero to the middle of the second century leads us to the following conclusions. There was no general law that governed the attitude of the State towards the Christians. Out of the hostile feeling of the pagan population there developed an opinion that regarded being a Christian as incompatible with the Roman way of life; from this arose a kind of legal maxim that made it possible for the authorities to punish adherence to Christianity as a crime in itself. The persecutions that resulted were only local, occurred only sporadically and were directed against individual

---

[23] Justin, *Apol. append.* 2.

[24] Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 2, 2–3; 3, 6–7; 4, 2, 5.

[25] *Martyr. Polycarp.* 3, 2.

[26] Cf. H. Grégoire, "La date du martyre de Polycarpe" in *AnBoll* 69 (1951), 1–38; E. Griffe in *BLE* 52 (1951), 170–7; 54 (1953), 178–81; H.-I. Marrou in *AnBoll* 71 (1953), 5–20.

Christians. They were generally sparked off by popular disturbances, and only because of these did the State authorities intervene. The number of victims was relatively small.

CHAPTER 9

The Religious World of the Post-Apostolic Age as Mirrored in its Writings

IF we turn from the letters of the New Testament to the writings of the post-apostolic age, we are immediately struck by the vast difference in form and content between the latter and the former. The writers of this period are but epigones of the great figures of the apostolic era. They took up the pen almost hesitantly in order to discuss questions concerning the Christian interpretation and ordering of life. In so far as we can clearly identify individual personalities among these writers, they have been given the honorary title of "Apostolic Fathers," to express the fact that they were conscious of being close to the time and world of the apostles. They felt themselves to be only followers of those great men, whose stature they did not in any way reach. Even Ignatius of Antioch, pre-eminent emong them for his lively religious sense, knew that he could not at all compare himself with them,[27] and Clement of Rome saw in "the excellent apostles" the unattainable ideal for his own generation.[28]

The regard in which the apostles were held remained undiminished, as is shown by those apocryphal writings which soon appeared, seeking to gain a heightened interest for themselves by the use of titles such as *Letter of the Apostles, Missionary Sermon of Peter, Letter of Barnabas, Acts of Paul, Acts of John,* etc.[29] Post-apostolic writings were largely nourished by the legacy of the apostles; what the apostolic fathers had to say was the echo and result of apostolic tradition. The pictures they paint of the religious life and thought of their time is for that very reason deserving of special attention.

The series of apostolic fathers begins with Clement of Rome, who is held to be the author of a lengthy letter addressed by the Roman congregation to the church of Corinth shortly before the end of the first century. Clement evidently wrote the letter in his capacity as leader of the Roman congregation, as is asserted by the most ancient tradition,[30] even though his position in the list of Roman bishops cannot be determined with certainty. The occasion of this letter was the report of a regrettable schism within the Corinthian church, which led to the removal from office of presbyters of proved worth by a group of younger members of the community. The Roman Christians felt themselves bound to their brethren in Corinth by strong ties of solidarity, because of which they earnestly admonished them to restore the unity of the Church.

---

[27] Ignatius, *Rom.* 4, 3.

[28] 1 *Clem* 5:2.

[29] Some of them belong to the first half of the second century, cf. *Altaner,* 72–83.

[30] Thus Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 2, 4, 3; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 3. Above all there is the tradition of Corinth itself, maintained by Bishop Dionysius in a letter to Pope Soter: *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 11.

In language and style, as well as in his handling of the subject, Clement shows his formal education no less than his religious and theological originality. Hellenistic philosophy, especially in its Stoic form,[31] was not unfamiliar to him, and he was highly receptive towards Hellenistic culture as a whole; but he stood closer to the world of the Old Testament and Jewish ways of thought, so that some have seen in Clement a convert from the Judaism of the Diaspora.[32] Especially informative about the personal piety of the author are those parts of the letter (chs. 59–61, 64) in which, as a Christian preacher, he addresses the congregation of Corinth and begs them to praise God in a prayer composed by him, just as he may often have concluded his homilies at religious assemblies in Rome. The letter also gives valuable information about office-holders in the early Church.

The most sharply defined figure among the apostolic Fathers is the bishop of a large Christian community in the East, Ignatius of Antioch, who during a wave of persecution was condemned to be thrown to wild beasts and suffered martyrdom at Rome in the last years of Trajan's reign (98–117). On the journey to the capital he wrote from the seaport town of Smyrna seven letters, three of which were addressed to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, members of which had come to Smyrna to visit the highly respected Bishop of Antioch. At Smyrna too he composed his epistle to the Roman Christians, whereas those to the Philadelphians, to the Christians of Smyrna, and to their bishop, Polycarp, were written at Troas. Their authenticity, in spite of some remarkable opinions put forward by a not unbiased "higher criticism", is now considered certain.

In attempting to assess the value of this *corpus Ignatianum* as a source of information on post-apostolic theology and religion, one must not overlook the fact that the seven letters were written more or less *extempore* by a prisoner condemned to death, under the eyes of his not very considerate gaolers. They are, therefore, not well-weighed theological treatises composed in conditions of tranquillity, but the spontaneous outpourings of a courageous leader, full of the love of Christ and a longing for martyrdom. All the more precious is this direct evidence, springing from the crowded life of the second century, concerning the beliefs, the piety and way of life in Christian communities at that time.

---

[31] L. Sanders, *L'hellénisme de S. Clément de Rome et le paulinisme* (Louvain 1943); W. C. van Unnik, "Is 1 *Clem* 20 purely Stoic?" in *VigChr* 4 (1950), 181–9.

[32] J. Daniélou, *La théologie du judéo-christianisme* (Paris 1958), 53–55, Eng. tr. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London 1964).

Polycarp of Smyrna, to whom one of the seven letters was addressed, was already bishop of that Asiatic see when he met Ignatius. As a bearer and transmitter of apostolic traditions he ranks high, for he had been, according to the testimony of his pupil Irenaeus, in direct contact with several of the apostles, whose eyewitness accounts of the life and teachings of the Lord he knew well.[33] As Polycarp met Pope Anacletus in Rome (*circa* 154–5 to 166–7),[34] the teachings handed down by the apostles were thus passed on to the second half of the second century by a highly qualified witness. Of the numerous pastoral letters that he wrote,[35] only one short note and a longer letter to the congregation of Philippi have been preserved, written shortly after the death of Ignatius. This letter gives us a valuable glimpse of the problems which seemed urgent to a Christian pastor of that time when he addressed the faithful of a congregation known to him.

Some of the writings attributable to the first or second post-apostolic generation are either anonymous or apocryphal, but they are nevertheless of great value as evidence concerning the religious life of the period. Chief of these is the "Doctrine of the Apostles", the *Didache,* which was probably written about the year 100 in Syria and incorporates a Jewish work on the "two ways". Its statements about circumstances within the Church oblige us to give it an early date, though some of its supplementary matter may have been written later.[36] Its editor's object was clearly to give newly-founded congregations in Syria a guide for the internal organization of their community life.

The so-called *Letter of Barnabas* — Alexandrian tradition early ascribed it to Paul's companion, though the text itself names no author — is the work of a Christian making no pretensions to learning, who after the destruction of Jerusalem and probably shortly before 130, engages in controversy with Judaism. In spite of his unfavourable estimate of the latter, which he reproaches with a fundamental misunderstanding of the Old Testament, his way of thinking is Jewish, and he is a witness to the Jewish-Christian character of post-apostolic theology.[37]

A strange, obscure work, the author of which calls himself Hermas, brings us to the end of the post-apostolic period. According to the Muratorian fragment, Hermas was a brother of Pius, bishop of Rome (*circa* 140–154). He gave his book the title of *The Shepherd* after the central figure, who appears in the second part as teacher of the Christians and preaches penance in commandments and parables. The first part is more apocalyptic in tone; in it the Church appears under various figures. A simple member of the community from a Jewish-Christian background here expresses himself about his own hard lot, interwoven with the description of which are sincere, sometimes naive, pictures of the life of the Church. The author is troubled about the lives of many Christians; without theological or speculative interests, he demands with great earnestness a moral reform of the Christian community. The *Shepherd* is a very important source for our knowledge of contemporary Christian ideas in Rome about the significance of penance in the life of the Church as a whole.

---

[33] *Euseb. HE* 5, 20, 6.

[34] Irenaeus in *Euseb. HE* 5, 24, 16.

[35] Ibid. 5, 20, 8.

[36] Thus A. Adam in *ZKG* 58 (1957), 1–47, whose opinion is to be preferred to that of Audet, *La Didachè* (Paris 1958), who considers an earlier date necessary.

[37] Cf. J. Daniélou, *op. cit.* 43–46.

Finally there are the so-called second letter of Clement, probably the oldest extant example of a sermon delivered during a religious service (perhaps at Corinth) about the middle of the second century, and the *Epistula Apostolorum,* a work in letter-form which first gives alleged words of Christ to his disciples after his resurrection and then goes on to speak, like a kind of apocalypse, of the *parousia* of the Lord and of the resurrection of the body and the last judgment, as well as of the missionary work of the apostles, uttering at the same time a warning against false doctrines.

Besides these written documents, there also existed in post-apostolic times a mass of oral traditions which handed down the teachings of the apostles: the so-called traditions of "the Elders",[38] attested mainly by Papias and Clement of Alexandria. The former, according to Irenaeus "a pupil of John and companion of Polycarp",[39] zealously collected them from the elders or from those who had been in contact with them, as he himself relates;[40] by the "Elders" he probably means members of the earliest community at Jerusalem. Clement also stresses the fact that he had taken down from old presbyters oral traditions which went back to the time of the apostles.[41] As the presbyters of Clement cannot be identical with the Asiatic elders of Papias, they may have been descendants of Jewish Christians belonging to the original community who came to Alexandria after the destruction of Jerusalem. In content, these traditions of the elders concern the doctrine of angels, the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis and chiliastic ideas, so that this stream of tradition also informs us about the nature of post-apostolic theology.

If we base an account of the theological principles and religious life of the post-apostolic age on this body of writings, we find that its most characteristic feature is the controversy with contemporary Judaism. This can be shown to have existed everywhere where numerous Christian congregations encountered the Judaism of the Diaspora, especially therefore in Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt, but also in Rome. The claim of the Jews to be the chosen people, the sole heirs of God's promises, was opposed from the Christian side with the thesis that after the unfaithfulness and falling away of the Jewish people the Christians were the true Israel, who had taken over the inheritance of the rejected nation.

---

[38] Ibid. 55–64.

[39] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 5, 33, 4.

[40] *Euseb. HE* 3, 39, 3–4.

[41] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1, 1, 11–12; *Euseb. HE* 6, 13, 8–9.

This thesis is most strongly expressed by the author of the letter of Barnabas, but it also plays an important part in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch. God (the argument runs) did indeed once make his covenant with Israel, but the latter relapsed again and again into idolatry and thereby rejected it. The promises made to the people of the covenant were fulfilled when Jesus was recognized as the Messiah by a new people, the Christians.[42] Jewish invocation of the Old Law was in vain; the Jews in their literal-mindedness had so missed the sense of the Law's religious and ceremonial ordinances that their worship had become almost idolatrous, their attitude one of "lawlessness" (ἀνομία);[43] God had finished with them when he allowed the Temple to perish and gave mankind the "New Law of our Lord Jesus Christ".[44] The rejection of Jesus by the Jews was ultimately due to their misunderstanding of the Old Testament; they did not see that in him the promises of the Old Law were fulfilled. The christology of the post-apostolic age was largely characterized by this scriptural proof that Jesus was the Messiah, which was based upon testimony collected from the Old Testament itself.[45]

Whereas the strongly anti-Jewish attitude of Barnabas limited his view of the soteriological significance of Christ, this was more clearly seen by other post-Apostolic writers, as for example, Clement of Rome, who knew that Jesus had shed his blood for our salvation and thus atoned for the sins of the whole world;[46] even more clearly is this idea expressed by Ignatius of Antioch according to whom the flesh of Christ had suffered for our sins and won us eternal life, giving us a new relationship with the Father.[47] Anti-Jewish polemics figure largely in the *Didache*, which warns against Jewish fasting and prayers, but at the same time takes over Jewish elements for the liturgy of the Lord's supper.[48] In other writings of the time this anti-Jewish attitude is less evident, for instance in the first letter of Clement; while in the *Shepherd* of Hermas it actually gives way to one which is markedly friendly towards Judaism.

---

[42] Ps.-Barnabas, *Ep.* 4, 6–8; 14.

[43] Ibid. 9, 6; 16, 2.

[44] Ibid. 16, 5; 2, 6.

[45] M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (Paris 1948), 186 f.

[46] 1 *Clem* 8:1 f.

[47] Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 7, 1; *Trall.* 9, 2; *Eph.* 11, 1; *Rom.* 2, 2; 7, 2.

[48] *Didache* 8, 1 f.; 9–10.

The central place that the Lord gave to *prayer* in the religious life of his disciples remained unaffected in the Church of post-apostolic times. Christian prayer was still in many respects akin to that of the Jews; it was still addressed to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but every Christian knew that he was the Father of Jesus Christ. It also continued to employ Old Testaments forms, for the Old Testament had been inherited as a priceless possession by the new and true Israel. But a fresh note is audible in more than one of the prayers of this time — a note of victorious confidence, of buoyancy arising from the consciousness of being redeemed. Thus the Father is thanked with gladness for the new life which he has given to men in Jesus.[49] With joyous gratitude Polycarp thanks the Father of Jesus Christ for the gift of martyrdom; for this and for all things he praises and glorifies him now and for ever, confirming his thanks with the word *Amen* that had been taken into the Christian liturgy.[50] In the same tone of freshness is the great song of praise in the epistle of Clement, which does pray for the blessings which a Christian will always ask his God for: for peace and justice in this world, as well as for help for those in distress and wisdom for the mighty. But it is ever mindful of the one great fact, that Christians have been chosen by the Father from among all men as being those who love the Father through his son Jesus Christ, by whom they have been made holy.[51]

In their hieratic restraint these texts unmistakably show their nearness to liturgical prayers as they were formulated by the bishops who conducted the eucharistic celebration. They are therefore addressed exclusively to the Father, according to the example of the Lord in his prayers; prayer is offered to the Father in the name of his son Jesus Christ, the high priest.[52] This does not mean that private prayers were not also quite early addressed to Jesus Christ; even Pliny (*circa* 112) knew that the Christians sang hymns to their Lord,[53] the prayers of the martyrs to Christ give us in their fullness and frequency an idea how familiar direct invocation of Christ must have been in the earliest times.[54]

The sacraments do not figure so prominently in the writings of the apostolic fathers as at a later period. Their ritual forms were still in process of development, but their essential place in the Christian life as a whole is clear. This is especially true of the sacrament of initiation, *baptism.* The *Didache*[55] stresses the importance of carrying out the rite properly;

---

[49] Ibid. 9, 2–5.

[50] *Martyr. Polyc.* 14, 1–3.

[51] 1 *Clem* 59–61.

[52] Ibid. 61:3.

[53] Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 10, 96; for examples in the N.T., cf. 1 Tim 3:16; Rev 5:9–13.

[54] K. Baus, "Das Gebet der Märtyrer" in *TThZ* 62 (1953), 19–32.

[55] *Didache*, 7, 1–4.

immersion in "living" (flowing) water is desirable,[56] but in exceptional cases it suffices to pour water thrice over the head of the person to be baptized. More important is it that every time baptism should be administered "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" — the trinitarian formula is the essential formula of baptism. This is what is meant when the *Didache* elsewhere[57] speaks of "baptism in the name of the Lord". The Christian was aware that in baptism he received the seal of the tri-personal God, to whose sovereignty he thereby submitted. The Pauline representation of baptism as a burial with Christ and a rising again with him is perhaps indicated by the practice of immersion as the regular form.

The importance of baptism was underlined by the requirement of a preparatory fast, to which both the person to be baptized and the one administering the sacrament were obliged, but in which, if possible, other members of the congregation were also to take part, for baptism concerned them all — a new member was being incorporated into the community of those who were united in belief in the Lord. That baptism would give a special character to the life of a Christian, that it would be like a suit of armour to him, is emphasized by Ignatius of Antioch, for whom the healing power of the baptismal water is founded upon the sufferings of Christ.[58] The author of the epistle of Barnabas is also aware of the profound connexion between the Cross and baptism; through the latter, the redemption by Jesus Christ becomes applicable to man, for it brings forgiveness of his sins.[59] Hermas also is convinced of this; the question of the meaning and effect of baptism is one with which he is much preoccupied. According to him it is the foundation of the Christian's life; "he plunges as a dead man into the water and emerges from it a living man".[60] In baptism Christians receive the seal of the Son of God, without which there is no salvation; only this sealing makes a man a disciple of Christ. It unites all who receive it in one Spirit, in faith and love, and it admits them into the kingdom of God, into the fellowship of the Church.[61] This seal can indeed be broken, the gifts conveyed by baptism can be lost; therefore every baptized person has a moral obligation "to keep the seal intact".[62]

Statements about the *Eucharist* in the writings of the post-apostolic age are rarer and more restrained. It was celebrated on the Lord's Day. According to the *Didache,* it is a sacrifice the purity of which can be endangered by sin; therefore Christians ought to confess their sins before its celebration. Moreover, he who lives unreconciled to his neighbour ought not to take part in the eucharistic celebration.[63] The Eucharist has been given to Christians as food and drink which are above all earthly nourishment, for it gives eternal life through Jesus.[64] Ignatius of Antioch sees the Eucharist as a bond uniting all who believe in Christ. For the individual it is an elixir of life, an antidote against death, because it nourishes life in Christ and so guarantees resurrection to eternal life.[65] The man who excludes himself from it, because he will not confess "that it is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ", lives under the threat of death.[66] Just as the Eucharist joins the individual to Christ, so it unites all the faithul among themselves, since they all partake of one flesh and one chalice at one altar.[67] But it can effect this unity only when celebrated in the presence of the rightful bishop or his delegate; "if a man is not within the sanctuary, he must refrain from the bread of God."[68] Eucharistic communion not only symbolizes the unity of the Church, it also creates it.

---

[56] See T. Klausner, "Pisciculi" in *Festschrift F. J. Dölger* (Münster 1939), 157–60.

[57] *Didache*, 9, 5.

[58] Ignatius, *Polyc.* 6, 2; *Eph.* 18, 2.

[59] Ps.-Barnabas, *Ep.* 11, 1, 8.

[60] Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 9, 16, 4.

[61] *Past. Simil.* 9, 17, 4; 9, 16, 3; *Vis.* 3, 3, 10; 8, 2, 2–4.

[62] *Past. Simil.* 8, 6, 3; thus also 2 *Clem* 8:6; cf. F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis* (Paderborn 1911), 70–73.

The outstanding feature of post-apostolic piety is its christo-centricity. The will of Christ is the norm for the moral life of Christians, his commandments govern their behaviour; the Son of God himself is now the Law.[69] Christ's life has become the model which his faithful follow, the imitation of Christ the basis of Christian piety,[70] which sees in martyrdom its noblest proof.[71] Certainly the Christian knew that behind the will of Christ there was the will of the Father; but this was revealed in the example of Jesus Christ, and he who followed it came to the Father or lived in the Father.

Life in Christ and the imitation of him represented an ideal towards which all indeed were to strive, but which many Christians failed to attain. Hence the admonitions of the bishops, who were constantly calling upon their congregations to imitate God and his Son. The failure of such Christians faced the young Church with a problem that found its expression with some asperity in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Most of the members of the Roman congregation had indeed remained faithful to the obligation of their baptism, and some had distinguished themselves in persecution as confessors or martyrs;[72] but others had been unable to bear this trial. They had vacillated, full of fear, considering whether to deny or to confess, and only after lengthy hesitation had they decided to suffer for the Christian name. In the face of a threatening new persecution, certain Christians seemed likely to adopt a similar wavering and timorous attitude.[73]

---

[63] *Didache,* 14, 12.

[64] *Didache* 10, 3 can hardly be understood as referring to Christian truth as such, as thanks have already been given for that in 10, 2. The eucharistic character of the prayers in *Didache* 9 and 10 being by no means certain, they cannot be taken into consideration here.

[65] *Eph.* 20, 2; *Smyrn.* 18, 2.

[66] *Smyrn.* 7, 1.

[67] *Phil.* 4.

[68] *Eph.* 5, 2.

[69] 1 *Clem* 3:4; Polyc., *Phil.* 4, 1; Ignatius, *Magn.* 13, 1; 2 *Clem* 3:4 f.; Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 8, 3, 2.

[70] 1 *Clem* 16:17; 33:7, 8; Polyc., *Phil.* 10, 1; Ignatius, *Eph.* 10, 3; *Trall.* 2, 1.

[71] Ignatius, *Rom.* 4, 2; 5, 3; 6, 3.

Besides this lack of hope and courage in the hour of danger, Hermas saw other failings in the Roman church. Tepidity and slackness had become widespread, because the desire for possessions and riches had seduced many from the practice of religion, and they lived the same kind of life as the pagans. For them persecution constituted the greatest danger, since they preferred earthly possessions to loyalty towards their Lord.[74] Another evil that was rife among the Roman congregation was ambition and striving after the first places, with regrettable consequences for the peace and unity of the faithful. The elders and deacons especially were liable to such rivalry.[75]

Did there exist a possibility of atoning for such grave failings, or had the offenders finally forfeited their salvation? The Shepherd tells Hermas that it would be in conformity with the Christian ideal if baptism remained the only way of forgiving sin; some teachers had made this a law. But God grants to all those who have fallen another chance to repent, for he knows to what trials man is subject on account of his frailty and the wiles of the Devil. However, if a man falls again and again, and every time wishes to atone by repentance, he is not to entertain any deceptive hopes: his salvation is in jeopardy.[76] There was evidently an opinion that repeated repentance was possible. Between this and the rigid doctrine mentioned above, Hermas desires to show a middle way, but like an anxious preacher he stresses with great earnestness that after this second opportunity of atonement has been granted, the forgiveness thus won must not again be imperilled at any price, all the more so as the "building of the tower" will soon be finished. Hermas therefore bases the impossibility of further repentance on eschatological grounds; soon the Church would be complete, and he who did not then find himself inside the tower, who did not belong as a pure member to the Church, could not be saved.[77] Hermas does not discuss the problem of the unforgivability of certain sins; but the question of repentance was already a burning one about the year 140. The *Shepherd* gives us an instructive glimpse of the discussion it raised in the Roman congregation. In the third century it was to be taken up again on a broader basis and with louder repercussions.

---

[72] Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 8, 1, 16.

[73] Ibid. *Simil.* 9, 23, 2–5.

[74] Ibid. 8, 8, 1; 9, 1; 9, 20, 1.

[75] Ibid. 3, 9, 7; 8, 7, 4; 9, 26, 2.

[76] *Past. Mandat.* 4, 3.

[77] *Past. Vis.* 3, 5, 5.

CHAPTER 10

The Development of the Church's Organization

IN comparison with the development of theology in the post-apostolic age, progress in completing the ecclesiastical organization in that period was far more extensive and significant. The links which bound the constitution of the post-apostolic Church to the organization of the Pauline community were still indeed apparent; but everywhere a further development from the early beginnings is observable, leading to more highly organized forms both within the individual congregation and in the Church as a whole. This fact gives the post-apostolic age of the Church a special importance.

First of all, the individual congregation is more clearly defined as regards its significance and function as part of the Church's organism. The Christians of a city were now everywhere joined together in separate congregations or local churches. The church of God, dwelling far away in Rome, greets the church of God in Corinth; Ignatius addresses his letters to clearly defined local churches, to those of Ephesus and Magnesia, to the church which, in the territory of the Romans, stands first; the congregation of Smyrna sends to the church of God in Philomelion an account of the martyrdom of its bishop, Polycarp.[78] This joining together of the followers of Christ in a city to form a single congregation differs markedly from the organization of contemporary Judaism in the Diaspora, which had several synagogues in the same place, several congregations but smaller groups.[79]

There was no Christian that did not belong to such a local congregation. He joined with all his brethren in the eucharistic celebration, at which the unity of the post-apostolic congregation is most clearly apparent. Ignatius of Antioch unwearyingly proclaims this unity, which he seeks to explain by various images and comparisons: the congregation is like a choir whose singers praise the Lord with one voice, or like a company of travellers following the directions of its Lord. For the author of the first letter of Clement the unity of the congregation is symbolized by the harmony of the universe or by the arrangement of the human body, in which each member has its appropriate function. Hermas sees it in the image of a tower built upon the cornerstone that is Christ.[80]

---

[78] 1 *Clem prooem.;* the *inscriptiones* of the letters of Ignatius and the *Martyrium Polycarpi.*

[79] Cf. for Rome J. B. Frey, "*Le judaïsme à Rome aux premiers temps de l'église*" in *Biblica* 12 (1931), 129–56.

This vital, compact unity of the congregation was a possession to be constantly guarded, for it could be dangerously threatened by the tendency to disputatiousness and petty jealousy which led to divisions in the community, or by self-will in interpreting Christ's teaching. Schism and heresy were therefore regarded as the great enemies of unity in the early Church, even though they were not as sharply distinguished from one another as in later times. There is hardly a written work of the post-apostolic period which does not mention the schismatic tendencies which appeared now here, now there; it was not always a definite splitting away hardening into irreconcilability, but often ambition, jealousy, or back-biting, which created a climate of dissatisfaction against which the *Didache* and pseudo-Barnabas gave warning, but which was also present in the Roman congregation at the time of Hermas.[81] More serious was the situation at Corinth, a congregation formerly distinguished by its spirit of brotherhood; although we cannot discover all the details of the events at Corinth, the epistle from Rome attributed to jealousy the deep division which had caused once leading members of the congregation to be removed from office — jealousy, which was the root of so many evils in the religious past of Israel and also even at that early date in the young Christian Church. The Roman congregation was profoundly grieved by these happenings and condemned them severely.[82]

To the apostolic fathers, the danger of heresy was even greater. As the pastoral and Johannine epistles had had to warn against heretical falsification of Christian doctrine, so it was also Asiatic Christianity in particular that was exposed to danger from heretical groups in post-apostolic times. Ignatius of Antioch directed his attack against spokesmen of Docetism, who said that Christ had not possessed a real body and asserted that the Jewish Law was still valid. There was only one attitude for members of the Christian community to adopt towards them, and that was strict avoidance of all association with them and a closer drawing together of the faithful among themselves, not only in Antioch, but also in Smyrna, Philadelphia, and Philippi. In Rome, too, Hermas knew of attempts to introduce strange doctrines.[83] The leaders of the Church organized the campaign against heresy with exhortations and with warnings to other congregations, almost in the same way as they would soon have to do, with all energy, in opposing Gnosticism.

---

[80] Ignatius, *Magn.* 7, 1–2; *Eph.* 9, 2; *Philad.* 1, 2; *Rom.* 2, 2; 1 *Clem* 19:2–3; 20:1–4, 9–11; 37:5; Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 3 and *Past. Simil.* 9.

[81] *Didache,* 4, 3; Ps.-Barnabas, *Ep.* 19, 12; Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 8, 7, 4, *Past. Vis.* 3, 9, 7–10

[82] 1 *Clem* 4:1–7; 5–6; 54:1–2.

[83] Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 4, 1; *Philad.* 6, 2; *Polyc.* 7, 1; 6, 3; Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 8, 6, 5.

According to what is perhaps the oldest document of the post-apostolic period, the letter of the church of Rome to that of Corinth, the leaders of the congregation were divided into two groups: one bore the double designation of elders (presbyters, πρεσβύτεροι) and overseers (episcopi, ἐπίσκοποι), the other was represented by the deacons (διάκονοι). [84] At the end of the post-apostolic age we also meet in the *Shepherd* of Hermas the two names *overseers* or *elders* for the holders of leading offices in the Church, deacons and teachers being mentioned as well.[85] The *Didache* names only overseers and deacons, Polycarp on the other hand only elders and deacons.[86] Only the letters of Ignatius distinguish clearly between the three offices of overseers, elders and deacons. Every congregation had only one overseer or bishop, to whom the college of elders (priests) and deacons was subordinate.[87]

In Antioch and in a number of congregations in Asia Minor there existed therefore in the second decade of the second century a monarchical episcopate: the government of the church was assigned to one bishop, whereas elsewhere both previously and subsequently, this development was not complete, or at least our sources do not confirm that it was. The one office, which in apostolic times bore the double designation of episcop or presbyter, was divided into two and the term overseer or bishop reserved exclusively for the holder of the highest office in the congregation. The sources do not make it possible for us to follow the phases of this development, nor do they tell us if it took place everywhere in the same way. Soon after 150 the monarchical episcopate seems to have generally prevailed throughout the area of Christian expansion.

The apostolic fathers also partly worked out a theology of ecclesiastical offices, the authority of which is ultimately derived from God. He sent Jesus Christ, who gave the apostles the commission to proclaim the Gospel; they, in accordance with this commission, appointed overseers and deacons, whose places were to be taken at their death by other approved men who would continue their work among the faithful. Thus Clement of Rome[88] regarded the authority of heads of congregations as based upon Christ's commission to the apostles, from whom all power of government in Christian communities must be derived by uninterrupted succession.

Ignatius further developed the theology of the episcopate in another direction; he was the most eloquent advocate of the complete and unconditional bond of union between bishop and congregation. The latter was one with its bishop in thought and prayer; only with him did it celebrate *agape* and Eucharist. Its members should follow him in obedience as Christ did the Father; nothing should take place in the congregation without the bishop. Even the administration of baptism and the performance of marriage ceremonies were reserved to him.[89] Presbyters and deacons had a share in his authority; the faithful were to obey the presbyters as the apostles, and in the deacons they were to honour the law of God.[90] The bishop could demand such an attitude from his people only because he represented Christ to them; he who, like the teachers of false doctrines, rejected the authority of the bishops was a rebel against the Lord, who was the actual if invisible bishop of every congregation.[91] The office-holders for their part saw their mission wholly in the light of its supernatural origin and were conscious that in the fulfilment of their task they were guided by the Spirit. Ignatius felt himself thus guided when he urged the Philadelphians to be in agreement with their bishop and presbyters; he was conscious of being the possessor of heavenly mysteries, he knew things visible and invisible. To Polycarp of Smyrna the manner of his death was supernaturally revealed; the Spirit moved Clement of Rome to address his admonition to the Corinthians.[92]

---

[84] 1 *Clem* 44:2–6.

[85] Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 2, 4, 2–3; 3, 5, 1; *Past. Simil.* 9, 26, 2; 9, 27, 2.

[86] *Didache* 15, 1; Polyc., *Phil.* 5, 3; 11, 1.

[87] Ignatius, *Magn.* 2, 1; 6, 1; *Philad.* 4; 1, 2; *Smyrn.* 8, 1; 12, 2; *Trall.* 2, 2–3; *Polyc.* 1, 2.

[88] 1 Cor 42; 44: 1–3.

Two factors then worked together in order that the bishop and his assistants might fulfill their official duty: the apostolic, that is, God-given origin of their authority, and guidance through the divine Spirit. Thus supported, they conducted the eucharistic celebration, presided at the *agape*, proclaimed the true doctrine and were guarantors of the purity of the Gospel, guardians of the apostolic traditions.

The working of the Holy Spirit was not, however, limited to the leaders of the congregation; it could be felt everywhere among the faithful. Clement of Rome saw in the faith, the wisdom and the chastity of the Corinthians special graces from the Spirit, which were shared by the congregations of Magnesia, Ephesus and Smyrna.[93] Individual members of such congregations claimed to possess very special gifts, like Hermas or the author of the epistle of Barnabas, who speaks of a deep "insight" which he was able to transmit only in part.[94] Charismatic gifts were therefore also present in post-apostolic times, and there were also, as in the earlier period, similar tensions between those of the laity who were favoured by the Spirit and the leaders of the community. This is especially apparent in the *Didache*, which gives to the "prophets" a special rank. They appear as teachers, they devote themselves to the service of the poor and they have to "give thanks"; they therefore have a particular role in the assemblies. But they had to prove before the congregation their claim to special gifts; for there were false prophets who did not preach the truth and were out to make money. Recognition was due to the tried and true prophet; he was above criticism, to submit him to judgment would have been to sin against the Lord.[95] One has the impression that the editor of the *Didache* is here fighting for a prophetic ideal which was sinking in general esteem, no doubt in favour of the "teacher", whose suitability had to be strictly examined.

---

[89] Ignatius, *Eph.* 4, 1; 5, 2; *Polyc.* 5, 2; *Trall.* 7, 1–2.

[90] Idem, *Smyrn.* 8, 1–2.

[91] *Trall.* 1, 1; 2, 1; *Magn.* 3, 2.

[92] *Philad.* 7, 1–2; *Eph.* 20, 2; *Martyr. Polyc.* 5, 2.

[93] 1 *Clem* 28:1–2; 48:5; Ignat., *Magn.* 14, 1; *Eph.* 9, 1–2; *Smyrn.* inscr.

[94] Ps.-Barnabas, *Ep.* 1, 4–5; Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 5, 5–7; *Past. Simil.* 9, 331.

Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*, was a prophet of the Roman church to whom were vouchsafed many visions which he had to make known to the faithful. They concerned the single important subject of repentance, and he sought to win over to his point of view the presbyters, the official leaders of the congregation. Hermas claimed no teaching authority to which the heads of the congregation were obliged to submit; when he stepped forward in the assembly he was received with respect, for the Spirit spoke through him. That the Spirit did speak through him, it was the business of the authorities to make sure. Hermas knew too that there were false prophets who were known by their works.[96] In the case of Hermas there was clearly no rivalry between the possessor of special gifts and the office-holders; harmony seems to have been established and their respective tasks recognized. A few decades later Montanism was to bring prophecy once more into the foreground and compel the ecclesiastical authorities to take up a definite position.

The congregation of post-apostolic times did not however exist in isolation and self-sufficiency. It knew itself to be linked with all the others and united in one organism, through which flowed a supernatural principle of life: Christ the Lord. All the congregations together formed a new people, the universal Church, which was made manifest in every individual congregation. All nations were to recognize that Christians were "the people of God and the sheep of his pasture";[97] under the banner of Christ the faithful, both Jews and Gentiles, were united in one body, the Church of Christ;[98] all who had received the seal were one in the same faith, in the same love;[99] Christ had given his flesh for his new people.[100] Ignatius of Antioch was the first to call this international community of the faithful "the Catholic Church", whose invisible bishop was Christ.[101] Its catholicity was such a striking characteristic that by its presence the true Church could be recognized.[102]

---

[95] *Didache,* 10, 7; 11, 3, 7–11; 13; 15, 1–2.

[96] Hermas, *Past. Mand.* 11, 1–14, on which see G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'église de S. Clément de Rome à S. Irénée* (Paris 1947), 140–3.

[97] 1 *Clem* 60:4.

[98] Ignat., *Smyrn.* 1, 2.

[99] Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 9, 17.

[100] Ps.-Barnabas, *Ep.* 7, 5.

[101] Ignat., *Smyrn.* 8, 2.

The Christian experienced the unity and catholicity of his Church in many ways in his daily life. Not only was the missionary welcomed like a brother when he met some of the faithful in a city; the bishop, priest, or deacon who brought a message, even the simple Christian whose business took him to foreign parts — they were all received with brotherly hospitality wherever there was a group of Christians.[103] An active correspondence between one congregation and another kept alive the consciousness of belonging to a great universal community. News was exchanged, joys and sorrows shared; long journeys were even undertaken in order that important questions of a religious nature might be discussed in common.[104]

The inner unity of the universal Church was assured by other powerful ties. Christians sought to maintain religious unity by a rule of faith which, beginning with simple forms, gradually acquired more precise and definite expression;[105] it was in essential points the same everywhere and was impressed upon all Christians at baptism. Unity of worship was established in the celebration of the Eucharist, which did indeed show local variations in form and in the text of many prayers, but which was essentially the same central act of the Christian liturgy, so that Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna in Asia Minor could celebrate it also in the church of Rome. [106] Unity in faith and worship was further preserved by the fact that the tradition of the Church was always the standard to be followed. For here no novelty of human origin could or should be admitted; loyalty to tradition was a prerequisite for the preservation of the truths of the faith and the unity of worship. With striking frequency we find the apostolic fathers, even at this early date, invoking tradition, which was looked upon as a legacy from the apostles and therefore inalterable.[107] Unity in belief, worship and apostolic tradition could ultimately be guaranteed only by him who was their Lord and protector, Christ; therefore the Church turned to him in prayer, imploring him to gather together the people of God from the ends of the earth, to bring them to unity and to preserve them in it.[108]

Even though the bishop's sphere of activity was his own congregation, he was not exempt from all responsibility for the Church as a whole. It was not only a feeling of solidarity with the faithful of other congregations that prompted bishops like Ignatius and Polycarp to address to them words of encouragement or rebuke; they acted thus from a sense of duty. There was, indeed, no bishop of the post-apostolic age who intervened in the affairs of other local churches with the same authority as in his own congregation, or could give instructions to the whole Church. Even Clement of Rome was too much of a background figure, as compared with the Roman church as such, to make it possible for us to attribute to him, on the strength of his epistle to the church of Corinth, a right to admonish, in the sense of a primacy, supported by a special authority. Rather was it the Roman congregation as such that made a claim exceeding the limits of brotherly solidarity. There are no grounds for supposing that Rome's advice had been asked for; the Roman letter seeks to re-establish peace by admonition and counsel, though sometimes its language takes on a more decisive, almost threatening tone that seems to expect obedience.[109] Noteworthy too is the respect which Clement's first epistle gained in Corinth and in the rest of the Church during the period immediately following, so that it was sometimes regarded as inspired scripture.[110] This implies the existence in the consciousness of non-Roman Christians of an esteem of the Roman church as such which comes close to according it a precedence in rank. It is especially noticeable in Ignatius' letter to the Romans. Its enthusiastic introduction is unique when we compare it with the prefaces to his other letters; the accumulation of honorific and fulsomely respectful epithets is hardly to be explained by personal temperament or by the purpose of the letter alone. In obvious allusion to the epistle to the Corinthians, the letter states that the Roman congregation acted as teacher to others.[111] Ignatius does not however mention the Bishop of Rome, and his words about the precedence of Rome in charity[112] (i.e. in charitable activities) can in no way be understood in the sense that any special personal dignity was accorded to its bishop.

---

[102] The development of this idea is already indicated in *Martyr. Polyc.* 16, 226.

[103] *Didache* 11, 1–10; 13, 1–4; Hermas, *Past. Simil.* 8, 10, 3; 9, 27, 2.

[104] 1 *Clem* 55:1; Ignat., *Eph.* 1, 3; 2, 1; *Magn.* 2, 1; *Trall.* 1, 1.

[105] We already find in Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 1, 1–2; *Trall.* 9, forms which show a marked development compared with those of the N. T.

[106] *Euseb. HE* 5, 24, 17.

[107] Especially Papias in *Euseb. HE* 5, 20.

[108] *Didache* 9, 4; 10, 5; 1 *Clem* 59:2; Ignat. *Eph.* 4, 1–2.

In conclusion it may be added that the stream of Christians coming from elsewhere to Rome indicates a special attraction of that church which cannot be explained solely by the fact that Rome was the capital of the empire. Orthodox Christians, as well as adherents or founders of sectarian and heretical movements (we need merely mention Polycarp of Smyrna, Justin, and Hegesippus, and the Gnostics Valentinus, Cerdon, and Marcion), sought support or recognition at Rome which would count as legitimation in their own country. This fact also is evidence of the precedence allowed to the church of Rome.

---

[109] 1 *Clem* 57:1–2; 59:1–2.

[110] G. Bardy, *op. cit.* 112 f.

[111] Ignat., *Rom.* 3, 1.

[112] Ignat., *Rom.* inscr.

CHAPTER 11

Heterodox Jewish-Christian Currents

QUITE early there developed alongside the orthodox Jewish Christianity of the Jerusalem community and of the post-apostolic period, other Jewish groups which took over Christian elements in doctrine and worship. But, in contrast with genuine Jewish Christianity, they transformed these elements and thereby separated themselves from it as well as from post-biblical Judaism. With the latter, however, they shared the main ideas of late Jewish apocalyptic literature, and they recognized the Mosaic Law. It seems indeed not impossible that Jewish sectaries, who already had religious practices different from official Judaism,[113] borrowed Christian elements and thus emphasized their differences. Their separation from orthodox Jewry was not so much the result of changes in religious practice as of fundamentally different doctrines. These were concentrated on two main questions: Christology and the binding force of the Mosaic Law. The latter question was, as we have seen, a cause of considerable conflict in the congregations founded by Paul and was bound sooner or later to lead to the disavowal of the "judaizers" by the Church, if they insisted on imposing observance of the Law upon Gentile Christians as necessary to salvation. Evidently it came to a separation soon after the death of James, when the judaizing group endeavoured to set up their candidate, Thebutis, against the lawfully elected successor of James, Simeon.[114] The emigration of the orthodox Jewish Christians to the region east of the Jordan and their consequent dispersion in Coelesyria weakened their inner cohesion and rendered them more open to the influence of Jewish sectaries. For the Church as a whole, however, the christological question grew more and more important and became a criterion of orthodoxy for individual Jewish Christians and Jewish-Christian congregations.

The Christology of Kerinthos[115] was, for orthodox Jewish Christians, a ground for bitterly opposing him. His character and doctrine have indeed been distorted by the addition of fantastic and legendary features, notably by Epiphanios;[116] but Irenaeus, with his connexions with Asia Minor, may well be reporting what is essentially correct when he states that Kerinthos lived towards the end of the first century in western Asia Minor, and that he asserted of Jesus that the latter was the natural son of Mary and Joseph.

---

[113] Cf. M. Black, "The Patristic Accounts of Jewish Sectarianism" in *BJRL* 41 (1959, 302.

[114] Hegesippus in *Euseb. HE* 4, 22, 4–5.

[115] For Cerinthus, see G. Bardy, *RB* 30 (1921), 344–73; W. Bauer, *RGG*, 3rd ed. I, 1963.

[116] Epiphanius, *Panar.* 28, 5.

As Jesus had distinguished himself above all other men by his justice and wisdom, Christ in the form of a dove had descended upon him after his baptism; from then on he had proclaimed the hitherto unknown Father and performed miracles. Before the end, Christ had again left him; only Jesus suffered death and rose again.[117]

This image of Christ, tinged with Adoptionism and Docetism, was bound to be unacceptable to the Christians of Asia Minor; an indication of this is to be seen in the curious note of Irenaeus that the apostle John was prompted to write his Gospel by the teachings of Kerinthos. Kerinthos also had Gnostic ideas, for according to Irenaeus, he distinguished the "highest God" from the creator of the world, who did not know the former. Eusebius[118] says moreover that Kerinthos favoured a crude form of chiliasm which may have had its origin among the Jewish sects. He does not seem to have gained a large following; the statements of Epiphanios, who speaks of a sect of Kerinthians, are open to question.

The Jewish-Christian group that in Irenaeus goes by the name of *Ebionites* was, however, a considerable movement. Early Christian heresiologists derive this name from a person called Ebion, but it is more probable that it comes from the Hebrew word *'ebjon* (poor). The adherents of this movement would, then, have seen in the name a descriptive designation which referred to their simple way of life. Perhaps the Ebionites were, in the beginning, orthodox Jewish Christians, who, so far as they personally were concerned, had remained faithful to the Law. There would then be much in favour of the assumption that they were originally successors to those members of the primitive Church who settled beyond the Jordan and in Coelesyria. Later, however, they began to propound views on christology and on the binding nature of the Mosaic Law which were heterodox and led to their breaking away from the Church. A clue to the date of their separation is perhaps to be found in Justin Martyr,[119] who distinguishes two groups of Jewish Christians: those who saw in Jesus a mere man, and those who acknowledged him as the Messiah and Son of God. The separation between heretical and orthodox Ebionites must therefore have taken place about the year 150.

Among the writings of the Ebionites, a Gospel of their own must first be mentioned. It was probably the Gospel of Matthew, revised in an Ebionite sense; Epiphanios has preserved fragments of it.[120] Ebionite ideas are also to be found in a treatise dating from the first half of the second century, containing the "Sermons of Peter", rewritten by the editor of the pseudo-Clementines. An Ebionite theological writer, known to us by name, is the translator of the Bible, Symmachus, whose various works on the Scriptures were extant in the time of Origen.[121]

---

[117] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 26, 1; 3, 34; 3, 11, 1.

[118] *Euseb. HE* 3, 28, 4.

[119] Justin, *Dial.* 47–48.

[120] Epiphanius, *Panar.* 30, 3, 13; cf. *Hennecke-Schneemelcher,* I 3rd ed., 75–108.

No uniform picture can be given of the subsequent history of the Ebionite movement. Both in the attitude towards Christ and in the degree of importance attached to the Law and to sacrifices, there were different tendencies and shades of opinion. Some of the Ebionites accepted Gnostic ideas and indulged in bizarre speculations. The following characteristics are typical of the Ebionite movement in so far as it was heterodox. In their concept of the origin of the world the Ebionites took a dualistic view. God, in the beginning, set up a good and an evil principle: to the latter was given dominion over the present world; to the former, dominion over that which is to come. The good principle is Christ, the promised messianic prophet. Jesus of Nazareth was consecrated by God as Messiah and supplied on the day of his baptism in the Jordan with divine power. He was not the existing Son of God, but the naturally begotten son of a human couple, raised to the rank of Messiah because of his exemplary fulfilment of the Law of God. He was, besides, the "true prophet", who had already appeared in Adam and Moses, each time with a special mission, and who as Jesus was to bring the Jews back to the pure observance of the Law and to win the Gentiles for God.[122] This task he was to fulfill by preaching the word of God, not, therefore, by an extraordinary act of salvation, nor by dying for man's redemption. The Ebionites rejected belief in his redemptive death, as Christ had withdrawn himself from Jesus at the time of the crucifixion. The Ebionite image of Christ is thus essentially conditioned by its adoptionist character and by its denial of the soteriological significance of his life and death.

Joined to this christology was the Ebionites' demand for observance of the Law, which was, it is true, to be purged of its distortions. Such, for instance, were the false pericopes which had been later added to the Law of Moses, and above all the bloody sacrifices which represented a falsification of the divine will. This reform of the Law had been effected by Jesus in his teaching; he had shown what was genuine in the Law and in conformity with the will of God, and what contradicted it. He had rejected every form of worship by sacrifices, and therefore his death too had not the character of a sacrifice. Sacrifices were replaced by a life of poverty and community of goods; the Ebionite purified himself by daily washings, by participation in a ritual meal of bread and water, and by celebrating both Sabbath and Sunday.

Together with their esteem for the Mosaic Law and their rejection of the soteriological significance of Christ's death, the Ebionites also showed a certain "anti-Paulinism, expressed particularly in the "Kerygmata Petrou" an Ebionite treatise of the first half of the second century which influenced the pseudo-Clementines. According to it, Paul was the great opponent of the Law, "the hostile man", who falsified the true ideas of Jesus. The Ebionites did not accept his elevation to the rank of apostle, for this dignity belonged only to those who had personal acquaintance with Jesus, whereas Paul's vocation rested upon visions and revelations that were nothing more than illusions inspired by devils. Here the Ebionites may be said to represent the heirs of those judaizers who appear in Paul's epistles as opponents of his missionary activity. The "Kerygmata Petrou" also shows an anti-Trinitarian tendency and rejects the Trinitarian interpretation of some Old Testament passages usual in Christian circles.

---

[121] *Euseb. HE* 6, 17.

[122] L. Cerfaux, "Le vrai prophète des Clémentines" in *RSR* 18 (1928), 143–63.

Recently, certain common features shared by Ebionites, Essenes and Qumran Jews have been pointed out.[123] These are especially evident in their attitude towards the Temple, its priesthood and the bloody sacrifices. Thus the Ebionite movement may have been part of a larger current of opinion, which in its extreme forms broke altogether with the official worship of the Temple. The originality of the Ebionites would then have lain in the evaluation they set upon the person of Christ.

Close to the Ebionites stood other Jewish-Christian groups which, on account of certain opinions held by them, can likewise not be regarded as belonging to orthodox Christianity. First, there was the sect of the *Elchasaites,* which, by the third century, had spread to some extent. It was founded by a man named Elchasai, who was active on the borders of Syria and Parthia during the early decades of the second century. This sect sent out missionaries and gained adherents in the East as far as the Euphrates and Tigris. It had considerable success in Palestine, and, through Alcibiades of Apamea, it even tried to get a footing in Rome at the time of Hippolytus. Its message was based upon a holy book to which a supernatural origin was ascribed. In it, two heavenly beings played a principal part, a female one, called the Holy Spirit, and a male one, the Son of God or Christ, who came into the world in repeated incarnations. The sect practised a baptism, fully clothed, which was believed to effect forgiveness of sins, as well as frequent washings, which delivered from sickness and defects.[124] The foundation of the Elchasaites' way of life was the Law. Circumcision, observance of the Sabbath, and praying towards Jerusalem were obligatory. They disapproved, however, of the Old Testament sacrifices, as well as of certain parts of the Scriptures; Paul they emphatically rejected. The prophecy of an approaching great war, that would usher in the end of the world, shows apocalyptic traits; he who, when the time came, was in possession of a mysterious formula would be saved. The teaching of the holy book of Elchasai was to be kept secret since not all were worthy of it.

---

[123] O. Cullmann, "Die neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judenchristentum der Ps.-Klementinen" in *Festschrift R. Bultmann* (Berlin), 68–86.

[124] E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959), 221–35.

The question as to the original source of Elchasaitism cannot be definitely answered from the evidence at present available. Jewish elements were clearly present; and Christian influences, such as the baptismal formula and a vision of Christ, said to have been enjoyed by Elchasai, are easily recognizable. But the treatment of Christ as a mere man and a simple prophet shows the Christianity of the movement to have been undoubtedly heterodox. Gnostic elements also point in the same direction; among these may be mentioned the repeated incarnations of Christ, the concept of a "highest God" and the use made of magical formulas.

The sect of the *Mandaeans* can be included here, inasmuch as it was probably connected originally with heterodox Jewish baptist sects which had grown up in eastern Syria and Palestine. Baptism played a predominant part in their worship. It was carried out by immersing the candidate thrice in flowing water, and it could be repeated several times. Great importance was also attached to the liturgical celebration of the ascent of the souls of the dead to the realm of light. According to the Mandaean mythology, there was a great king of light or Great Mana, besides whom there existed innumerable lesser manas; opposing him was a world of black water peopled by demons. John the Baptist was highly revered by the Mandaeans, whereas Jesus was regarded as a false prophet and liar whom John unmasked. Mandaean influence on Christian baptism cannot be proved; the ritual of the baptist sects was evidently supplemented by later borrowings from Nestorian baptismal customs. Other alleged Christian elements in the Mandaean cult are of secondary importance and recede into the background when compared with the Gnostic, Iranian, and Babylonian influences (e. g. astrology). That it originally had links with early Jewish Christianity cannot be assumed.[125] The sect, which still survives with a strength of about 5000 members in the region of the Tigris and Euphrates, did not develop a literature of its own until the seventh or eighth century. It regards Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as false religions.

Finally, the influence of heterodox Jewish Christianity in some early Gnostic groups can be noted, even though the course of these influences is hard to trace. One cannot indeed speak of a Jewish Gnosis in the strict sense, for Judaism does not accept radical dualism in the shape of two original principles of good and evil, equal in rank.[126] Some Jewish schools of thought did preach a relative dualism, accepting a world of angels and demons subordinate to one God; these governed the destinies of nations and individuals.[127]

---

[125] M.-J. Lagrange, "La gnose mandéenne et la tradition évangélique" in *RB* 36 (1927), 321–49, 481–515, 37 (1928), 5–36; H. Lietzmann, "Ein Beitrag zur Mandäerfrage" in *SAB* 27 (1930), 596–608.

[126] Cf. esp. H. J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (Tübingen 1956), 37 ff.

Such a Gnostic tendency in heterodox Jewish Christianity can be seen in Samaritan Gnosis, which went back to Simon Magus,[128] who was of course not unfamiliar with Jewish Christianity (Acts, 8:10). Its speculations about the creation of the world by angels, the battle of these with one another and the liberation of mankind by the "virtues and powers", may have been derived from heterodox Jewish sources. Such views could have come via Simon's pupil Menander and the latter's pupils Saturninus (more correctly Satornil) and Basilides to Syria and Egypt, and there joined the Gnostic currents already existing.

The so-called "Apocryphon of John" among the Gnostic writings of Nag Hammadi, with its interpretation of Genesis and its doctrine of archons and angels and the part played by them in the Creation, clearly points to kindred speculations in later heterodox Judaism and in heretical Jewish Christianity.[129] The early Church did not have to engage in controversy to a great extent with all these heterodox Jewish-Christian schools of thought, because she did not come into close contact with all of them. Where, however, such disputes did arise, Christianity had an opportunity to clarify and affirm its beliefs.

---

[127] K. Schubert, "Problem und Wesen der jüdischen Gnosis" in *Kairos* 3 (Salzburg 1961), 2–15.

[128] Cf. L. Cerfaux, "La gnose simonienne" in *RSR* 15 (1925), 480–502, 16 (1926), 5–20, 265–85, 481–503.

[129] For details see below, chapter 15.

SECTION FOUR

The Church in the Second Century

CHAPTER 12

The Position of the Church under the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. Martyrdom of the Congregations of Lyons and Vienne

THE writers of early Christian apologetical works ascribed to the emperor Marcus Aurelius (161–80) an edict favourable to the Christians, which Apollinaris of Hierapolis and Tertullian invoked, when they wished to oppose, as unjust, the proceedings of provincial authorities against the Christians of their day.[1] They saw the explanation of this emperor's attitude in the miraculous fall of rain which, it was said, came in answer to the prayer of a Christian legion and saved the imperial army from defeat in the war against the Marcomanni.[2] It may be that the idea of a philosopher on the throne, who endeavoured, as ruler, to put the Stoic ideal into practice, favoured such an estimate of the emperor.

The reality was otherwise. The emperor's own writings show how much he despised the Christians in his heart, because (as he believed) they threw their lives away for an illusion. That he was determined not to let the State religion be jeopardized by fanatical sectaries and by the introduction of hitherto unknown cults is shown by a rescript of 176–7, which was not indeed specially directed against the Christians, but which could easily be employed against them by provincial authorities.[3] Whether this was so in individual cases cannot be proved, but the increase in the number of complaints from the Christians during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, expressed in the apologetical writings of Melito of Sardes, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and the Athenian Athenagoras, clearly indicate a worsening of their situation. Melito drew the emperor's attention to the fact that the Christians of Asia Minor were exposed day and night to plundering and robbery at the hands of people of the baser sort, treatment such as even hostile barbarian tribes would not be subjected to; their attackers invoked new decrees, which however the author could not believe the emperor had issued.[4] Athenagoras also complained in his apologia, addressed to Marcus Aurelius, that the Christians were being hunted, robbed, and persecuted, and begged him to put an end to the denunciations of which the Christians were victims.[5]

---

[1] *Euseb. HE* 5, 5, 1–7; Tertull., *Apol.* 5; *Scapul.* 4.

[2] W. Zwikker, *Studien zur Markussäule* (Amsterdam 1941), 206 ff.; J. Guey, "La date de la 'Pluie miraculeuse' (172 après J.-C.) et la colonne aurélienne" in *MAH* 60 (1948), 105–27, 61 (1949), 93–118.

[3] J. Beaujeu, *La politique romaine à l'apogée de l'empire 1: la politique religieuse des Antonins* (Paris 1955), 356–8.

That such was the situation is confirmed by a series of individual martyrdoms in different parts of the empire which can be dated in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. In Rome the philosopher Justin was the most notable victim among a group of Christians who were put to death between 163 and 167 after a trial conducted by the city prefect himself, Junius Rusticus. Justin's pupil Tatian seems to attribute part of the responsibility for the death of these Christians to the intrigues of the pagan philosopher Crescens.[6] The martyrdoms of three bishops in the East, of which Eusebius gives a reliable account, also belong to the decade 160–70.[7] The execution of Publios, Bishop of Athens, between 161 and 170 is attested by a letter from Bishop Dionysius of Corinth to the church of Athens. Bishop Sagaris of Laodicea died a martyr's death "when Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia", therefore about the year 164. At the same time Thraseas, Bishop of Eumenia in Phrygia, probably also met his death; Polycarp of Ephesus informed Pope Victor that he was buried at Smyrna. There are good reasons for assigning the martyrdom of a group of Christians from Pergamum to the reign of Marcus Aurelius; Karpos, Bishop of Thyatira, and a deacon, Papylos, were there condemned to be burnt at the stake. A Christian woman, Agathonike, who was present, openly professed her faith and voluntarily threw herself into the flames.[8]

The clearest account of the background, circumstances, and course of a wave of local persecution under Marcus Aurelius is provided by a joint letter from the Christian communities of Lyons and Vienne in Gaul, in which they tell their brethren in Asia Minor what befell them in the year 177; Eusebius has included nearly the whole of it in his History of the

---

[4] *Euseb. HE 4, 26, 5–6.*

[5] Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 1, 3.

[6] The Acts of the martyrdom of Justin and his companions are in Knopf-Krüger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929), 15–18, which contains a bibliography, esp. *Delehaye PM* 119–21; Tatian, *Or.* 19, 1.

[7] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 2; 4, 26, 3; 5, 24, 4.

[8] New revision of the Latin and Greek texts by H. Delehaye in *AnBoll* 58 (1940), 142–76. Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Festgabe K. Müller* (Tübingen 1922), 46–57, and A. M. Schneider in *JdI* (1934), 416ff.

Church.[9] The Bishop of Lyons was then the aged Potheinos, who was assisted by a priest called Irenaeus; a deacon, Sanctus, belonged to the congregation of Vienne. A considerable number of the Christians in these cities came directly or indirectly from Asia Minor, such as, for instance, the Phrygian physician Alexander or Attalos of Pergamum, who possessed Roman citizenship. Besides these members of the upper class, the lower ranks of society, including slaves, were represented in the congregation of Lyons, in which, on the whole, there was an active religious life.

In the summer of 177, when representatives of all Gaul were assembled in Lyons for the festival of the imperial cult, the popular rage suddenly vented itself on the Christians, who were supposed, as elsewhere in the empire, to be guilty of atheism and immorality. After some initial vexations (the Christians were forbidden to enter Government buildings and to walk in public squares) the mob drove a group of them into the market-place, whence the Roman tribune, after examining them, had them led off to prison until the absent governor could deal with the matter personally. At the inquiry instituted by the latter on his return, a Christian who had not previously been arrested, Vettius Epagathos, volunteered to prove before the court that the accusations of crimes against religion and the State which were made against his brethren were unfounded. As he confessed, on being questioned by the governor, that he was himself a Christian, he too was arrested. Statements made by pagan slaves in the service of Christians accused their masters of heinous crimes; and thus in a few days the *élite* of both congregations found themselves in prison. During the trial, about ten Christians abjured their faith; the remainder were condemned to death, the execution of the sentence being accompanied by exquisite torments. Bishop Potheinos died in gaol after brutal ill-treatment; the others were thrown to wild beasts in the arena.

When the governor heard that Attalos, a distinguished man, was a Roman citizen, he postponed his execution in order to inquire of the emperor what line of action he should follow. He was told that apostates were to be pardoned; those who stood fast in their profession of Christianity were to be put to death. All proved steadfast, and so the executions continued. Besides the newly baptized Maturus, the deacon Sanctus, Attalos, and Alexander, the report specially singles out for praise the courage of the young girl Blandina and fifteen-year-old Pontikos. The bodies were not handed over to the families of the Christians for burial, but after six days they were burnt and the ashes scattered in the Rhône. The letter gives no exact number of the victims; only a later tradition mentions about fifty names.

---

[9] *Euseb. HE* 5, 1, 1–2, 8; see H. Quentin, "La liste des martyrs de Lyon" in *AnBoll* 39 (1921), 113–38.

Christians under Marcus Aurelius were not always condemned to death, but were sometimes sentenced to forced labour in the mines. This appears from a fragment of a letter quoted by Eusebius which was addressed by Dionysius of Corinth to the Bishop of Rome, Soter (167–75).[10]

If we seek the reasons for this obviously increased severity of the Roman authorities towards the Christians, fresh legal measures on the part of the emperor cannot indeed be adduced. His decision in reply to the governor's inquiry clearly shows that the legal position remained as it appears in Trajan's rescript and in the resultant practice under Hadrian. Neither are there grounds for supposing that the provincial authorities, even though the legal position remained the same, had been urged from Rome to take sterner measures. The circumstances of the persecution at Lyons and the above-mentioned complaints in the writings of the apologists show rather that it was public opinion under Marcus Aurelius which had become more unfavourable to the Christians. This hostile atmosphere now found expression more frequently and more intensively than under Hadrian, who had still been able to intervene to curb such excesses. If a provincial governor now gave in to the pressure of popular rage oftener than before, in Rome also public feeling was taken more into account and was given an outlet in the baiting of Christians.

The general discontent of the population of the empire under Marcus Aurelius was fed by various causes. The endless campaigns of that emperor laid many burdens on the people; the constant threat of hostile invasion increased the irritation of frontier populations. People were further aggravated by natural disasters such as the overflowing of the Tiber and outbreaks of the plague. Pogroms were the almost inevitable result. When it was noticed, at the ceremonies of propitiation, ordered by the emperor to avert the pestilence, that the Christians were conspicuously absent, the popular anger found its obvious outlet.

The Christian communities, for their part, had, albeit unwittingly, drawn attention to themselves more than usual about that time. The disputes with the Gnostics in particular congregations could hardly remain concealed from the pagans around them; even if the latter could not understand the background to these disputes, the Church's increased opposition to pagan culture and the Roman State nevertheless became apparent. Mention might also be made of the Montanist movement, at least in certain cases, if the growing irritability of the pagans is to be understood. The exalted desire for martyrdom that was peculiar to the Montanists, and their fanatical refusal to have anything to do with the pagan culture on which the State was based, could easily be attributed to Christianity as such, with disastrous results. Of course, the fact that in the congregation of Lyons for instance one member came from Phrygia is not sufficient to prove that it contained a Montanist group.

---

[10] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 10.

The situation did not change under Marcus Aurelius' son Commodus (180–92), although it is known that he was personally tolerant towards individual Christians, some of whom were able to hold influential offices at his court. Later therefore, Christian writers such as Eusebius[11] attributed to the reign of Commodus a higher rate of conversions. The emperor's attitude was partly due to the influence of his wife, Marcia, who according to Dio Cassius[12] had the Christian presbyter, Hyacinth, as her teacher and was in friendly relations with the church of Rome, although she cannot necessarily be regarded as having been a baptized Christian. Thanks to her, Commodus ordered the release of the Christians who had been condemned to forced labour in the Sicilian mines.[13]

This emperor did not issue any new instructions for the conduct of the State authorities towards the adherents of the Christian faith, a fact proved by isolated trials of Christians during his reign, which can be understood only in the light of the previously existing practice. The first extant document of Christian origin in the Latin language[14] gives an account of proceedings against six Christians in the African town of Scili, who were condemned to death by the proconsul Vigellius Saturninus in July 180. It may be presumed that these Christians had been denounced to the Roman authorities, for the proconsul tried to make them renounce their faith and had them executed only after their refusal to do so. A denunciation was no doubt also the cause of the trial of the Roman senator Apollonius in 183–4, which Eusebius relates in an extract from the original acts of this martyr.[15] The prefect Perennis even canvassed opinions in the Senate on this case and clearly was very unwilling to pronounce sentence upon a man of such high rank, doing so only when the latter obstinately persisted in his profession of faith.

That the representatives of the Roman State did not always act against Christians in a spirit of brutal fanaticism is also shown by the attitude of the proconsul Arrius Antoninus, of whom Tertullian relates[16] that he once, when a large group of Christians stood before his tribunal, imprisoned only a few of them, releasing the others with the words: "You unhappy wretches, if you wish to die, have you not ropes and precipices enough?"

---

[11] Ibid. 5, 21, 1.

[12] Dio Cassius, 72; cf. also Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4, 30, 46, and Hippolytus, *Philosophoumena* 9, 11, 12.

[13] See A. Bellucci, "I martiri cristiani 'damnati ad metalla' nella Spagna e nella Sardegna" in *Asprenas* 5 (Naples 1958), 25–46, 125–55; J. G. Davies, "Condemnation to the Mines" in *Univ. of Birmingham Hist. Journal* 6 (1958), 99–107.

[14] Text in Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 28–29; see F. Corsaro, "Note sugli Acta martyrum Scillitanorum" in *Nuovo Didaskaleion* (Catania 1956), 5–51.

[15] Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 30–35; see J. Zeiller in *RSR* 40 (1925), 153–57, and E. Griffe, *BLE* 53 (1952), 65–76.

[16] Tertullian, *Ad Scapul.* 5, 1.

There are accounts of martyrdoms during this period at Apamea in Phrygia;[17] and Theophilus of Antioch alludes to actual persecutions in Syria when, at the end of his apologia, he remarks that the Christians "are subjected to cruel torments even to this hour".[18] This general formula implies the continuance of individual martyrdoms, of which, because of the incompleteness of our sources, we have no exact knowledge.

This survey of the persecution of Christians under the last two Antonines shows clearly that the attitude of the Roman State towards Christianity, which had been developed under Trajan, still existed; Christians were brought to judgment only when they had been denounced as such to the authorities, but profession of the Christian faith sufficed for their condemnation, proof of other crimes not being required. For these reasons, we have only sporadic evidence that trials of Christians took place; under Marcus Aurelius they were forced upon the authorities more than before by a public opinion that had grown more hostile and often expressed itself in riotous behaviour. The cause of this attitude was the increased nervousness of the pagan population. The situation is reflected in the growing apologetical literature of the second half of the century, which will be dealt with more fully later.

CHAPTER 13

Literary Polemic against Christianity

THE animosity of the pagans which we have described, with its explosions of popular anger and the action taken by the State authorities in consequence, brought the Christians more and more into the public eye, especially during the first half of the second century. Accordingly, there developed a new reaction of paganism against Christianity, this time on the intellectual plane. A will to resist arose in pagan intellectual circles. The resources of profane culture were employed in the battle against Christianity. Mocking speeches, pamphlets, and books became the means of carrying on a literary war, which began about the middle of the second century and soon reached its first climax in the satirical writings of Lucian of Samosata and in the "True Doctrine" ('Αληθὴς λόγος) of the philosopher Celsus.

---

[17] *Euseb. HE* 5, 16, 22.

[18] Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* 3, 30.

This was of great significance for the history of the Church, because it was one of the factors that provoked a reaction from the Christian side; the Christians took up the pen and adopted an attitude of defence and counter-attack. The resultant body of apologetical works became a special department of early Christian literature, giving a characteristic note to the second half of the second century.

The first beginnings of a pagan literary polemic are discernible in the report of Tacitus on Nero's persecution, mentioned earlier. Even though that author did not regard the Christians as responsible for the burning of Rome, his ironic words about their abominable superstition, their heinous crimes and their hatred of mankind reveal the extent of his contempt for them. His opinion of them could not have been without effect among his readers. A little later we meet in Suetonius a similar characterization of the Christians when he calls them adherents of a *superstitio nova ac malefica* and thus clearly and contemptuously distinguishes them from those who practised the old, true religion.[19] A like opinion was held by Epictetus, who coldly disapproves of the readiness of the "Galileans" for martyrdom, since it was (he says) based on blind fanaticism.[20] These, however, are casual remarks made by pagan writers who show no real knowledge of the new religion.

From the middle of the second century a growing unrest becomes evident among educated pagans on account of the increase of the Christian movement, which evidently could not be halted in spite of popular tumults and police measures. The representatives of pagan philosophy now had occasion to become more closely acquainted with the intellectual and religious phenomena of Christianity and to engage in controversy with it. An early example of a discussion between a member of the Church and a pagan philosopher is the encounter between the apologist Justin and the Cynic, Crescens, in Rome. According to Justin's account,[21] Crescens went about proclaiming that the Christians were "atheists and fellows of no religion"; though he did so more to please the pagan majority than because he had any sound knowledge of the facts. If he did learn anything at all of the teachings of Christ, he certainly did not, Justin thinks, grasp their scope and importance. In his disputation with Crescens, no doubt conducted in public, Justin did not feel that he had had the worst of it and was quite ready for further debate. Justin's pupil Tatian hints that Crescens sought to avenge himself on his Christian adversary by other means than those of argument.[22]

---

[19] Suetonius, *Vita Neronis* 16.

[20] Epictetus, *Diss.* 4, 6, 7.

[21] Justin, *Apol. append.* 3.

[22] Tatian, *Or.* 19, 1.

This example shows that the polemic of the educated adopted the reproach of the masses that the Christians were atheists. The same applies to the pagan rhetor Fronto, who enjoyed a certain consideration, not because of his intellectual importance, but on account of his position as tutor to the imperial princes Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius. In a speech before the Senate or in a public lecture (afterwards, no doubt, circulated in writing), Fronto took up the grave suspicions which the common folk repeated about the Christians: at their gatherings they were supposed, after having indulged in luxurious meals and partaken copiously of wine, to give themselves up to the worst excesses, including incest.[23] It is noteworthy that this member of the intellectual upper class obviously took no trouble to inquire into the justification for such evil rumours, and gave them, in his speech, an importance which could not fail in its effect on public opinion. This effect lasted until the beginning of the third century at least, when Minucius Felix wrote his Dialogue; the passage quoted by him from Fronto was obviously equally well known to pagans and Christians.

The picture of the Christians which Lucian of Samosata gives in his satire "On the Death of Peregrinos Proteus" cannot strictly speaking be regarded as a polemic against them. For this mocker, who with his sharp pen so readily exposed the weaknesses of his fellow men to the laughter of their contemporaries, was free from hatred against the Christians; he saw in them neither a danger to the State nor a threat to public order, and therefore scorned to repeat the venomous atrocity stories that were current about them. He regarded their religious convictions and their everyday behaviour as belonging to the human follies and errors which he enjoyed pillorying; but he regarded the folly of the Christians as particularly harmless. On his numerous journeys, Lucian had often heard of the adherents of this new faith, and no doubt he had occasionally been able to observe them at first hand. As, however, his alert eye was intent only on what might provide material for burlesque or be exploited for its comic possibilities, his knowledge of Christianity remained quite superficial. The writings of the Christians seem not to have interested him, and of their inner religious world he had no idea. Thus it was that he drew the following caricature of them.

The swindler Peregrinos easily succeeds in exploiting the credulity of the men of Palestine; he is soon playing a leading part in the assemblies of the Christians. He interprets their scriptures, writes some new ones himself, and in a short time he is enjoying almost divine honours. When, on account of his having murdered his own father, he is thrown into prison, this only increases the respect the Christians have for him. With unwearying zeal they seek to ease his lot, visit him day and night in prison and procure him every assistance at his trial, while he unscrupulously exploits their helpfulness and unselfishness for his own enrichment. For the Christians' belief in immortality and their readiness to die Lucian had sympathy rather than cynical mockery; he felt the same about their brotherly love, their contempt for earthly possessions and their community of goods; every clever swindler could exploit this attitude and could soon became rich among them. It is only when the Christians see that Peregrinos Proteus disregards some of the commandments of their religion that they forsake him.[24]

---

[23] Minucius Felix, *Octav.* 9, 6.

Through this caricature of the Christian life we see a perceptible glimmer of the real situation. Lucian had heard something of the esteem in which one who professed the faith was held by his brother-Christians; he knew of their solicitude for the imprisoned, of their community spirit, and their courage in the face of death. But, even in a critic so free from hatred, we cannot fail to notice the lack of depth and the gaps in Lucian's knowledge of essential features of the Christian religion. Of Christ himself he had only the vaguest ideas; what Christ's life and teaching, death and resurrection meant to the Christians of that period was quite unknown to him. His notion that Peregrinos could be regarded by the Christians as the author of sacred books is as grotesque as his statement that they honoured the deceiver as a god. The distorted image of true Christianity which Lucian produced could hardly have appeared very attractive to the pagans who read his work. Towards a religion whose adherents were indeed harmless, but at the same time naïve fools, and who moreover were completely uncritical with regard to their own traditions of belief, one could scarcely react other than with pitying amusement. Lucian's portrait of Christianity could not fail to produce its effect in the intellectual battle with paganism.

Celsus

Celsus, who wrote in the eighth decade of the second century, raised the controversy to quite a different level in an extensive work to which he gave the equivocal title Ἀληθὴς λόγος. We no longer possess the whole work, but lengthy excerpts quoted by Origen in his refutation of Celsus, while not enabling us to make a complete reconstruction, do give us a clear idea of its basic arguments. Its author cannot be assigned exclusively to any philosophical school. His idea of God is largely coloured by a moderate Platonism; he therefore recognizes an absolutely transcendent, first and supreme God, immutable and without form, who should be honoured rather in the individual soul than in fixed forms of communal worship. Besides this supreme God, revealed through philosophical deduction, numerous lower gods claim the reverence of mankind, since to them have been assigned special tasks; these gods include the constellations and the tribal gods of the different nations. The demons are also inferior gods, who indeed often occupy a place in the thoughts and actions of men exceeding their actual importance. Finally, Celsus ranks earthly rulers nearly as high as the lower gods, because men owe their welfare to the order maintained by them in the world.

---

[24] Lucian, *De morte peregrini* 11–13.

Celsus thus represented a philosophical creed which rejected monotheism and tolerated, in the Greek manner, popular religion and the mystery cults, provided they in some measure corresponded to the fundamental ideas of his own philosophically based religion. Every new religion must, according to Celsus, justify itself, whether as a popular belief or as a local cult. Christianity appeared to him as a new religious movement, and therefore he subjected it to examination. He had learnt as much as possible about this new religion. He had taken pains to understand its scriptures, he knew parts of the Old Testament, the Gospels, and other Christian literature as well. Evidently he had also sought personal contact with its adherents and spoken with them about questions concerning their faith. Jewish sources and Jewish-Christian polemical writings had provided further information. He summed up the results of his studies in a learned and substantial work, which does not however limit itself to displaying theoretical knowledge but also draws practical conclusions. Since his conclusions were wholly unfavourable to Christianity and were expressed moreover in a highly aggressive way, Celsus' Ἀληθὴς λόγος was a decisive event in the history of literary polemic between paganism and Christianity. The importance attached to the work and its possible effect on the public can be seen from the fact that the most significant theologian of the third century, seventy years after its appearance, thought it worth while to write a detailed refutation of it.

Celsus' philosophical principles did not allow him to accept either the Christian doctrine of Creation or the idea of Revelation. A world which was created out of nothing and will pass away again was something that did not fit into his cosmology; even the manner in which the Old Testament describes the creative activity of God seemed to him irreconcilable with the dignity of the Supreme Being. God, according to the idea of Celsus, sat enthroned at an inapproachable distance from the world and could not reveal himself without changing his nature or subjecting himself to the vicissitudes of history and coming into dangerous proximity to evil. Platonic dualism and Stoic cosmology were the basis of Celsus' attitude; to him the idea of God's becoming man appeared positively shameful: "No God and no Son of God has ever descended to earth, nor ever will."[25]

With this rejection of the doctrine of the Incarnation, Celsus coupled a characterization of the person of Jesus of Nazareth which was bound to offend every Christian deeply. According to him, Jesus was only a man who had gained respect and authority through the means employed by Egyptian sorcerers; but no one would think of giving one of these the title of "God's Son". Jesus was really nothing but a juggler, a boaster, and a liar, whose moral life was by no means blameless. The veneration which Christians had for him was comparable to the cult of Antinous, the favourite slave of Hadrian; their worship was addressed to a dead man, not to a divine being.

The opposition of Celsus to the Christian doctrine of angels was connected with the Greek idea of the impossibility of divine intervention in the course of human history. A God, who at a definite time in history sent a messenger with a mission of salvation, would be breaking the inalterable law to which all earthly things were subject.

Far more effective than his attacks on Christan doctrines was the unfavourable description Celsus gave of the Christians themselves and of their daily life. They were (he said), for the most part, men of limited intelligence, who did not understand their own doctrines and would not discuss them; they even regarded "foolishness" as a mark of distinction. Their faith was the religion of the stupid and of stupidity;[26] their deliberate exclusion of the Logos from their religious life was in itself a condemnation of Christianity in Greek eyes. Christian preaching even warned its hearers against earthly wisdom and thus frightened away those to whom Greek culture represented an ideal. That was why it found its audience in those social classes to which, in any case, culture was foreign, namely among the slaves, the lower orders of the despised manual workers and their like, among immature children and women. This was no wonder, for the founder of Christianity belonged to the lower classes, having been only a carpenter.

Celsus based his moral judgment of the Christians as deceivers and liars on their having consciously borrowed ideas from the Greek past, distorting and falsifying them in their propaganda; whereas the Greeks revered their intellectual heritage. Thus Christianity sinned against the Logos and was the irreconcilable opponent of the ἀληθὴς λόγος, the "true doctrine" of the Greeks. It offended furthermore against that other Greek ideal, that of loyalty to the Nomos, the reverent regard for tradition in religion and worship, which was respected as an unwritten law by all nations. Moses had already disregarded this law when he established Jewish monotheism instead of Egyptian polytheism; but when Jesus of Nazareth began to proclaim a new faith, it was rebellion against the Nomos and an act of apostasy. This falling away from the Nomos forced Christianity into isolation and made it a miserable, hole-and-corner religion, the adherents of which Celsus compared to a group of earthworms assembled on a dunghill, vying with one another as to which of them was the greatest sinner.[27]

---

[25] Celsus, *Fragm.* 5, 2.

[26] Cf. for the following C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos. Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum* (Berlin 1955; with Bibliography).

The revolt of the Christians against the sacred ideals of Logos and Nomos gave Celsus a pretext for branding them as a gang of lawbreakers who had to shun the light of publicity. Jesus had picked out men of evil repute to be his apostles, men who carried on the unclean businesses of publicans and sailors; he himself was nothing but a "robber chief"[28] at the head of his band of brigands. The successors of the apostles, the Christian preachers of the author's own time, were no better. Their words found an echo only among criminals, whom they incited to further crimes. It was therefore the duty of the State authorities to intervene against a religion which, in a secret and forbidden confederacy, rebelled against all traditional law and order. Sympathy for the victims of the resulting persecution would be out of place.

Here we must stop to ask the question: how far was such a powerful attack effective? It could hardly count on any appreciable success among the Christians themselves. The distorted picture of Jesus was bound to fill them with disgust, especially as it came from a man who was acquainted with the Gospels. The same is true of his characterization of the apostles and early disciples, as well as of his contempt for the martyrs, to whom Celsus denied all moral worth, although elsewhere he highly praised loyalty to religious convictions. His complete misunderstanding of the Christian concept of sin and of what gave the Christians their inner cohesion was bound to prevent his work from having any profound effect on the members of the Church. One may, indeed, justly point out that Celsus was guided in his polemic against the Christians by the motive of saving from destruction the high Greek ideals of a life according to Logos and Nomos. But in considering it necessary to employ in the process a language of contempt and mockery, which did not shrink from the vilest abuse of what he knew to be sacred to the Christians, he served his cause badly. His appeal to the Christians to come out of their isolation and to take part in the social life of the Roman State thereby lost all appearance of sincerity.

---

[27] *Contra Celsum* 4, 23.

[28] *Fragm.* 2, 12; 2, 44b.

The effect of Celsus's book upon contemporary paganism may well have been different. An educated pagan who, without personal knowledge of Christianity, read this work which described, with pretensions to extensive learning, a movement threatening all Greek culture held sacred, could with difficulty bring himself to take much positive interest in such a contemptible religion. The book may indeed have done much to strengthen the conviction that severe measures against such a movement were necessary. Whether Celsus succeeded in bringing about a renaissance of pagan religion in the face of the menace of Christianity may justly be doubted. Subsequent developments indicate that the latter's powers of defence were rather strengthened than weakened by this attack.

CHAPTER 14

The Early Christian Apologists of the Second Century

EVEN before the middle of the second century, some writers on the Christian side had begun a task which, because of its purpose, later earned them the name of apologists. They belonged entirely to the Greek-speaking part of the empire and form a compact group, which in the second half of the century grew in number and importance. In many respects they introduced a new phase in the development of early Christian literature; for the aim of the apologists was intentionally wider than that of their immediate predecessors, the apostolic fathers. They wanted to do more than provide the members of nascent communities with the most important truths of Revelation in a simple form. They saw clearly that the situation of Christianity in the first half of the century, especially in the Hellenic East, presented its writers with new tasks.

The apologists perceived that the faith was meeting with ever-increasing hostility in every department of public life. This development led them to address their pagan neighbours directly, in order to give them, in more or less extensive explanatory writings, a truer picture of the Christian religion. Thus an unbiased judgment of its adherents and a juster treatment of them would be made possible. In the situation then obtaining, any explanatory work on the true character of Christianity was necessarily also a defence against the suspicions and false judgments of the pagan world. Hence such a work was called ἀπολογία, "apologia" or speech for the defence. But it was not difficult to combine missionary and propagandist intentions, and these authors worked at least indirectly towards the spread of the faith among their readers.

The Christian apologists did not need to create the literary form for their purpose; it existed already in the speech for the defence, the *logos,* which was delivered before the judicial authorities and subsequently published. There was also the *dialogue,* the immediate occasion and circumstances of which were usually fictitious. Both forms were used in Christian apologetics. The defensive speech, in pamphlet form, was employed especially when addressing the pagans; the dialogue was more used in controversy with Judaism.[29] This controversy had entered a new phase now that the political existence of Palestinian Jewry had come to an end through the Roman victory over Bar Cochba. In the changed circumstances renewed discussion with the Diaspora Jews about the true Messiah had become possible.

The method and choice of theme varied according to the adversary addressed. In dialogues with the Jews, the main theme was already given: only Jesus of Nazareth could be the true Messiah, for in him alone were fulfilled the messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. In debate with pagan religions and Hellenistic culture there was a wider choice. First of all, the persistent rumours accusing the Christians of sexual immorality, atheism, and inadaptibilty for social life had to be refuted, for it was these rumours that kept alive the animosity of the pagan masses. More space was devoted to setting forth the truths of the Christians and the ethic on which it was based. In this connexion the Christian writers were fond of adding some more or less sharp criticism of the pagan gods and mythology for which contemporary philosophers might sometimes have provided both stimulus and example. A few of the apologists endeavoured to prove that the religious quest of the most profound pagan thinkers found its fulfilment in Christianity. Alongside such a more or less positive appreciation of the cultural achievements of paganism there was also, however, a purely negative attitude which treated all that Greek civilization had produced with cheap mockery. Repeatedly, the apologists draw the conclusion that the right to existence of such a lofty religion as Christianity could not be denied, and that, therefore, the measures taken against its adherents by the authorities were completely lacking in justice.

The series of apologetic writers begins with the Athenian Quadratus, who, according to Eusebius,[30] addressed an apologia to the emperor Hadrian. The single fragment of his work which is certainly genuine, permits no conclusions about its general character. Various attempts to see the *Apologia* of Quadratus in this or that extant apologetical work of the early Christian period must be regarded either as unsuccessful or as hypotheses which have not met with unanimous acceptance by historians.[31]

---

[29] Such as the lost work by Ariston of Pella: *Disputation between Jason and Papiscus concerning Christ* (*circa* 140); cf. *Quasten P,* I, 195 f.

[30] *Euseb. HE* 4, 3, 1; the fragment ibid. 4, 3, 2.

On the other hand it has been possible to rediscover complete in a Syrian translation the long-lost work of his fellow-countryman and contemporary, Aristides, and to show that the Greek novel *Barlaam and Joasaph,* in the version of John Damascene, is a free adaptation of it. Aristides was no doubt addressing the same emperor, Hadrian, as Eusebius (who knew his *Apologia* in the original text) was aware of.[32] The author, however, did not succeed in presenting and developing his theme effectively. His main argument was that the three races, barbarians, Greeks, and Jews, did not possess the true idea of God; only the fourth race, the Christians, had the true doctrine and moral code. He was not above borrowing some of the Epicureans' religious criticism and employing Jewish arguments against polytheism. His clumsy style is no doubt partly due to his efforts to use the language of contemporary philosophy in order to bring home to his readers the fundamental truths of Christianity. These, for him, consisted in the belief that Jesus Christ as Son of God had come down from Heaven and taken flesh of a virgin, and that after his death and resurrection he had commanded the apostles to proclaim the true God to all nations and to make them observe his commandments; he who obeyed these would become a partaker in eternal life.

Aristides' tone becomes warmer when he speaks of the daily life of the Christians (c. 15), which recommends itself by its lofty purity of morals. He was deeply permeated with the belief that Christianity alone could bring salvation to mankind. This earliest surviving attempt of a Christian apologist to introduce his faith to his pagan fellow-citizens leads one to suppose that a recent convert from paganism was bold enough to undertake a task which he was not yet quite capable of fulfilling.[33]

An incomparably higher achievement was the work of Justin, a convert from a Greek family of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, who as director of a school in Rome, died a martyr's death about the year 165.[34] An Apologia with an appendix, addressed to Antoninus Pius and his son Marcus Aurelius, together with a lengthy *Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon* have come down to us, the remnant of eight works by Justin which were known to Eusebius.[35] The *Apologia* to the two emperors was written about 150. Whether the appendix, often called the *Second Apologia,* was published with it as its original conclusion, or was a supplement added later, it is difficult to decide.[36] The *Dialogue* refers to the *Apologia* as having already appeared; more precise indications as to its date are lacking.

---

[31] Cf. *Altaner* 117f. The most interesting view so far is that of P. Andriessen, who considers that the Apologia is identical with the *Letter to Diognetus;* cf. his essays, *RThAM* 13 (1946), 5–39, 125–49, 14 (1947), 121–56, and *Vig Chr* 1 (1947), 129–36; *SE* 1 (1949), 44–54; *Bijdragen* 11 (1950), 140–50. On this question see also G. Bardy, *APhilHistOS* 9 (1949), 75–86; B. Altaner, *RAC* I, 652–4.

[32] *Euseb. HE* 4, 3, 3, The Syrian translation is addressed to "Adrianos Antoninos", i. e. Antoninus Pius; but the translator is more likely to have been mistaken than Eusebius.

[33] Cf. W. Hunger, "Die Apologie des Aristides eine Konversionsschrift" in *Scholastik* 20–24 (1949), 390–400. On its doctrinal content see P. Friedrich in *ZKTh* 43 (1919), 31–77.

[34] The account of his martyrdom is in Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 15–18.

The career and the superior education of their author give these writings a special importance. Justin belonged to the educated upper class. As a professional philosopher he was acquainted with all the principal intellectual movements of his time, and as an unswerving seeker after truth he had tried them all in turn and found inner peace only when he recognized Christianity to be "the only certain and adequate philosophy" (*Dial.*, c. 8). He thereupon embraced it and devoted the rest of his life to proclaiming and defending it. It is understandable that, as a teacher of this philosophy in Rome before a pagan public and pupils, he made use of philosophical ideas and ways of thought that were familiar to them and were in some measure akin to the truths of Christian Revelation. He attacked polytheistic mythology with the methods placed at his disposal by the "enlightened" philosophers. To it he opposed the one true God, the "Father of the universe" (*Apol.* app. 6), who is without origin and himself the first cause of the world, and for whom there is no name that can express his nature. He is enthroned above the world, in which he cannot be directly apprehended by the senses. Justin does not argue that this one God is called "Father" because he has favoured men with a kind of divine sonship, but, rather, because he is the first cause of creation. He seeks to connect this philosophical idea of God with elements of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity as expressed in the Creed, so that the Christian belief in God is shown as including also belief in Jesus Christ his Son and in the prophetic Spirit.[37] The Logos was in the beginning with God; he was begotten by the Father and appeared in his divine fullness in Jesus Christ, as Holy Scripture had foretold. He has not indeed the same rank as the Father, but, as his Son, he shares the divine nature (*Dial.* 61). Even before his manifestation in Christ, the Logos was active; not only did the Father create the world through him, but he also appeared frequently as the "angel of the Lord", he spoke in the prophets of the Old Testament, and he was active too in such eminent men as Heraclitus, Socrates and Musonios, in whom he was at work as "germinal Logos", so that these and many others who lived in accordance with the Logos working in their reason are actually to be reckoned as Christians.

---

[35] *Euseb. HE* 4, 18, 1.

[36] Cf. A. Ehrhardt in *JEH* 4 (1953), 1–12. He repeats the theory of two independent apologias.

[37] W. Pannenberg, "Der philosophische Gottesbegriff in frühchristlicher Theologie" in *ZKG* 70 (1959), 1–45.

If in Justin's teaching about God and the Logos Stoic influence is especially evident,[38] his ideas on the activities of angels and demons show a strong affinity with the Platonic philosophy of his time.[39] God gave the good angels charge over men and earthly affairs (*Apol.* 2:5). They are not pure spirits but possess aerial bodies, nourished by a kind of manna (*Dial.* 57). The fall of the angels was caused by their having sexual intercourse with women. Their children are the demons, who from their kingdom of the air exercise their baleful influence on mankind, until at Christ's return they will be cast into everlasting fire. They are the actual founders of the pagan cults; they also made the Jews blind to the Logos and so caused his death on the Cross. They continue by their cunning to prevent the conversion of mankind to him and to God. But in the name of Jesus Christ the redeemer, a power has been given to Christians which protects them against the demons (*Dial.* 307).

Justin's Christianity has another side, less influenced by philosophical abstractions, which appears when he writes of the daily life of the Christians, in which he took part like any other member of a congregation. Its high moral level was for him a convincing proof that the Christians were in possession of the truth. They led a life of truthfulness and chastity, they loved their enemies and went courageously to death for their beliefs, not because they had been persuaded of the importance of these virtues by philosophical considerations, but because Jesus had demanded of them a life in accordance with such ideals. It was for Justin an incontrovertible proof of the truth of Jesus' message that in him all the prophecies of the Old Testament were unequivocally fulfilled. He esteemed the Old Testament as highly as the Gospels, the "memoirs of the apostles" (*Apol.* 66 and *Dial.* 100).

With the artlessness of a simple member of the Church he speaks of baptism and the eucharistic liturgy as essential components of Christian worship. Baptism, performed "in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe and of our redeemer Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit" (*Apol.* 61), frees us from sins previously committed and creates a new man through Christ; as the Christian is spiritually enlightened by it, baptism is also called "enlightenment".[40] The purest form of worship is the eucharistic sacrifice,[41] at which the faithful, joined in brotherly union, bring bread and wine over which the head of the congregation utters a prayer of thanksgiving. These gifts are again distributed among the faithful, but now they are no longer ordinary bread and wine but the flesh and blood of that Jesus who himself became flesh. This change is wrought by the words which Jesus spoke over the bread and wine at the Last Supper and which he told the apostles to repeat (*Apol.* 62). This food the Christians call the Eucharist; it has replaced the Old Testament sacrifices, which God rejects. It is the perfect sacrifice which Malachy foretold, and the fulfilment of the spiritual sacrifice which the Greek philosophers longed for and which they regarded as the only worthy form of divine worship. It is the only true λογικὴ θυσία, because the Logos himself, Jesus Christ, is its centre.[42]

---

[38] G. Bardy, "S. Justin et la philosophie stoïcienne" in *RSR* 13 (1923), 491–510, 14 (1924), 33–45; M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des Pères* (Paris 1957); R. Holte, " Logos Spermatikos. Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St Justin's Apologies" in *StTh* 12 (1958), 109–68; N. Pycke, "Connaissance rationelle et connaissance de grâce chez S. Justin" in *EThL* 37 (1961), 52–85.

[39] C. Andresen, "Justin und der mittlere Platonismus" in *ZNW* 44 (1952–3), 157–95; W. Schmid, "Frühe Apologetik und Platonismus (Prooimion des Dialogs mit Tryphon)" in *Festschrift O. Regenbogen* (Heidelberg 1952), 163–82.

In other matters, too, Justin's views reflect the traditional teaching of the early Church, even when this was in contradiction to pagan sensibilities. Quite naturally he speaks of the mystery of the cross and the redemption of mankind by the bloodshed and death of the Son of God. His belief in the resurrection of the body, which would one day bring incorruptibility to the just, was unshakeable. Although, according to his own words (*Dial.* 80), not all good Christians agreed with him in this, he expected a millennium — thousand-year kingdom — in Jerusalem which would begin at the end of time, when the souls of the dead would be delivered from Hades.

We could certainly give a more complete picture of Justin's theology if his other works had been preserved. In these he stated his attitude towards the heresies of his time and dealt in more detail with questions such as the Resurrection, the universal dominion of God, and the human soul.[43] His apologetical purpose in controversy with the pagans required him to show a philosophical and rational basis for his faith, whereas the dispute with the Jews limited him very much to the question of the

---

[40] C. I. Story in *VigChr* 16 (1962), 172–8 (Justin on Baptism).

[41] See O. Casel, "Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Justinus" in *Katholik* 94 I (1914), 153–76, 243–63, 331–55, 414–36; O. Perler, "Logos und Eucharistie nach Justinus Apol. 66" in *DTh* 18 (1940), 296–316; Otilio de N. Jesús, "Doctrina eucarística de San Justín" in *RET* 4 (1944), 3–58.

[42] J. Gervais, "L'argument apologétique des prophéties messianiques selon S. Justin" in *Revue de l'Univ. d'Ottawa* 13 (1943), 129–46, 193–208.

[43] *Euseb. HE* 4, 11, 8; 4, 18, 4–5. Cf. B. Seeberg, "Die Geschichtstheologie Justins des Märtyrers" in *ZKG* 58 (1939), 1–81; H. Bacht, "Die Lehre des hl. Justinus Martyr von der prophetischen Inspiration" in *Scholastik* 26 (1951), 481–95, 27 (1952), 12–33; N. Hyldahl, "Tryphon und Tarphon" in *StTh* 10 (1957), 77–90. On the influence of Justin on Irenaeus cf. F. Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien adv. Marcionem* (Leipzig 1930), 339–74.

Messiah. Nevertheless, one is bound to say that he did not confine himself to a purely philosophical Christianity; his survey represents a significant advance in the development of early Christian theology when compared with the world of the apostolic fathers and the earlier apologetic of Aristides.

Justin's pupil, the Syrian Tatian, shared with him a similar way to Christian faith, for he too had found his way to the truth only after long searching (he had been initiated into the Mysteries) and by reading the holy books of the Christians (*Orat.* 29). His "Speech to the Greeks", written to justify his conversion, marks a retrograde step in comparison with Justin's *Apologia.* Whereas the latter found elements of truth everywhere in Greek philosophy and spoke with high esteem of some of its representatives, Tatian had, for the cultural achievements of Greece, only mockery and contempt. None of these, he said, was of Greek origin, but everything was borrowed from the barbarians, upon whom the Greeks looked down with such arrogance; and even then, they had misunderstood or maliciously distorted that which they had borrowed (*Orat.* 1 ff.). The theology of the Greeks was folly, their theatres were schools of vice, their philosophy full of deception, their games, music, and poetry, sinful (*Orat.* 21–28). Such a whole-sale condemnation was not exactly likely to make an educated Greek receptive to what Tatian had to say about the Christian religion.

The centre of this religion, he said, was the one God without a beginning, clearly distinct from the material world he created through the Logos. God intended man to rise again after the consummation of all things and would also be man's judge. Man, endowed with free will, could decide to be on the side of goodness and so enter into immortality, in spite of the influence of the demons, who sought to lead him astray. It was they who tried to force upon mankind belief in Fate, and for this they would finally suffer eternal damnation. Man, as God's image, could free himself from their domination if he renounced matter by strict self-mortification. This the Christians did, though they were calumniously accused of every possible vice.

The incomplete and fragmentary nature of Tatian's theology strikes us at once. What is especially noticeable is his failure to give any details about the person and the redemptive action of Christ, particularly when addressing pagan readers. Indeed, he states only a few of the fundamental points of his theology, the selection of which was governed by a predetermined schema of missionary preaching. The want of moderation in Tatian's attack on Hellenistic culture was in accordance with his character, namely his tendency to extremes, which eventually after his return to his native Syria about the year 172 was to lead him outside the Church to become the founder of the Encratites, a Christian sect which rejected marriage as sinful and renounced the use of flesh or wine in any form.[44]

Tatian's other surviving work, which he called Τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον, had a much more far-reaching effect than his apologetical work. It was a harmony of the Gospels which was intended to reduce the four separate gospels to a single account. This *Diatessaron,* which the fragment of Dura-Europos (dating from before 254) seems to show was written in Greek, was used as a liturgical book in the Syrian church until the fifth century, and St Ephraem wrote a commentary on it. It was early translated into Latin, and it evidently influenced the text of the Gospels outside Syria. The surviving Armenian text of Ephraem's commentary and versions of the *Diatessaron* in Arabic, Latin, and Middle Dutch enable us to make a reconstruction of its original form.[45]

Athenagoras, the "Christian philosopher of Athens", wielded a more skilful pen than any of the apologists above mentioned. About the year 177 he addressed a petition to the emperor Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, in which he refuted the calumnies against the Christians, claimed for Christianity equal rights with pagan philosophies, and therefore demanded its toleration by the State. The nobility of tone of the work as a whole is matched by Athenagoras' attitude towards the Greek philosophers, many of whom showed monotheistic tendencies without on that account being looked upon as atheists. The reproach of atheism made against the Christians ought therefore to be dropped, for they believed in one God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and were convinced of the existence of a world of angels to whom was entrusted the ordering of the universe (*Suppl.* 10). The existence of this one God can be proved even by reason alone (*Suppl.* 8). Revelation shows the divinity of the Logos; the working of the Holy Spirit, who is an emanation of God, is especially perceptible in the prophets (*Suppl.* 7 and 10). The high standard of Christian morality was proved by the purity of their married life and the esteem in which virginity was held among them, a second marriage being regarded as "decent adultery" (*Suppl.* 31–35). The Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, so difficult for the Greeks, Athenagoras sought to prove philosophically in a special work. It is clear that in the writings of this apologist the philosophical argument had gained in quality and the theological understanding of Christianity in depth.

---

[44] R. M. Grant, "The Heresy of Tatian" in *JThS NS* 5 (1954), 62–68; G. Blond "L' 'hérésie' encratite vers la fin du IVe siècle" in *Science religieuse* (Paris 1944), 157 to 210; F. Bolgiani, "La tradizione ereseologica sull'encratismo" in *Atti Accad. Scienze Torino* 91 (1956–7), 1–77.

[45] I. Ortiz de Urbina, "Trama e carattere del Diatessaron di Taziano" in *OrChrP* 25 (1959), 326–57.

Only the *Three Books to Autolykos* survive out of the considerable body of writings left by Theophilos, a men of Hellenistic education who, after his conversion about the year 180, became head of the Christian congregation at Antioch.[46] Autolykos was his pagan friend, to whom he wished to prove, in a pleasing Greek style, that the Scriptures of the Christians (that is, the Old Testament) were superior, both in antiquity and in religious and philosophical content, to everything that the Greek intellect had produced. The line of argument and the defence against pagan calumnies follow the usual course. In Theophilos' account of the faith we meet for the first time in a Christian writer the designation τριάς (Trinity) (2:15), for the persons of which he always uses the terms Θεός (God), Λόγος (Logos), Σοφία (Sophia) (1:7; 1:10; 2:18). The evangelists were for him, like the prophets, bearers of the Spirit; their writings, with the epistles of Paul, were the "holy, divine word" (2:22; 3:13–14). The human soul was potentially immortal; immortality would be given as a reward for freely choosing to observe the commandments of God (2:27).

Except for a few fragments, the apologia of Bishop Melito of Sardes, as well as the works of the rhetor Miltiades of Asia Minor and Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, are lost.[47] With courage and dignity Melito pointed out to Marcus Aurelius the unjust plundering and persecution to which the Christians were exposed, whereas the benevolent attitude of the emperor's predecessors, except Nero and Domitian, had brought God's blessing on the Roman Empire.[48] Eusebius has preserved a list of the other works of this much respected bishop, the titles of which show the astonishing range of his interests.[49] It is highly probable that a homily on Exodus 12, rediscovered in a papyrus of the fourth century, is by Melito. This, preached no doubt at a Paschal celebration of the Quartodecimans, gives important information about early Christian teaching in Asia Minor on original sin, on the redemptive act of Christ, on baptism, and on the character of sermons at that time. A hymn in the same papyrus fits so well with the Easter liturgy of the Quartodecimans and with the ideas of Melito that it too has been claimed for the Bishop of Sardes.[50]

There are finally two other apologetical writings which belong to the closing years of the second century or the beginning of the third. The anonymous *Letter to Diognetus* attracted attention more by its elegant Greek than by its theological content; it has repeatedly tempted scholars to identify its author, but it is difficult to prove anything. A short criticism of the Jewish and pagan religions is followed by the oft-quoted hymnic chapter on the Christians' daily life: "Every foreign place is their home, and their home is a foreign place to them; . . . they dwell on earth, but their conversation is in heaven; they love all men and are persecuted by all; they are poor and enrich many. They are despised and are thereby glorified. They are insulted and they bless; they are mocked and show honour to those that mock them; punished with death, they rejoice as if they were awakened unto life. In brief, what the soul is to the body, the Christians are to the world" (chapters 5 and 6). The reality, it is true, did not in the year 200 everywhere correspond to the ideal. The satire of Hermias, Διασυρμὸς τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων, is rather an audacious pamphlet than a reasoned study. It makes fun of the contradictions in the teachings of various philosophers or schools of philosophy about God, the universe and the human soul.

---

[46] *Euseb. HE* 4, 24; Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 25; *Ep.* 121, 6, 15.

[47] See *Quasten P,* I, 228 f.

[48] *Euseb. HE* 4, 26, 5–11.

[49] Ibid. 4, 26, 2.

[50] The Easter Hymn has been edited with a commentary by O. Perler, *Ein Hymnus zur Ostervigil von Meliton?* (Fribourg 1960); see also J. Daniélou in *RSR* 48 (1960), 622–5.

A general appreciation of the achievement of the second century apologists can no longer defend, without qualification, the thesis that their endeavours to make Christianity intelligible to the Hellenistic world played a decisive part in hellenizing the Church. The genuinely Christian content of apologetical literature is too unequivocal to support such a thesis, especially when we remember its purpose. In their efforts to appeal to pagans and Jews the apologists could not give a complete exposition of Christian theology. For this reason also they had to renounce any intention of describing in detail the Christian mysteries. Compared with the apostolic fathers, however, they show a considerable development in their teaching about God, in the christology of the Logos, in the doctrine of the Trinity, and in Christian anthropology. Great progress was made in biblical studies; a start was made at establishing a canon; the doctrine of inspiration began to be developed, and the Old Testament became the foundation of a christology based on the Bible. Finally, in the works of the apologists we get valuable information on the building up of the inner life of the Church in the second century, notably for instance in the liturgical parts of Justin, in the accounts of the relations between Church and State and of the missionary activity of the young Church.

The question as to the success of the second century apologists is, of course, difficult to answer. They did not attain one of their objects, which was to place the Christian religion on the same footing as other cults and thus put an end to persecution by the State. But their works may well have increased the self-confidence of the Christians not a little; and the missionary and propagandist purpose which motivated the work of the apologists certainly played a considerable part in the expansion of Christianity before the end of the second century, especially in the East.

CHAPTER 15

The Dispute with Gnosticism

IF the literary polemic of paganism represented no great danger to the Christian community, there arose in so-called Christian Gnosticism an adversary which, from the first decades of the second century, constituted to an increasing degree a threat to her very existence. It was part of the manifestation of late classical religious syncretism which, based on oriental dualism, united Jewish religious ideas with certain elements of the Christian revelation, albeit in a distorted form. Now, as a mighty current bent on sweeping all before it, it came flooding in from the East.

Gnosticism had a great attraction for Hellenistic man; it made a real appeal to him, demanding that he make up his mind. Its impetus was derived ultimately from its claim to bring to religious-minded persons a valid interpretation of the world and of themselves — the claim made by Christianity itself. Its message was expressed in a copious literature, often of considerable stylistic beauty, and proclaimed by teachers and heads of philosophical schools with respected names. The power of Gnosticism to win recruits was supported by a liturgy which borrowed its forms from the mystery cults or from Christianity and which made skilful use of its symbolic content. The Gnostics carried on a well-planned propaganda, which employed sacred hymns as well as fascinating novels, and they strove to organize their newly-won adherents into a close-knit community. With a sure instinct, Gnosticism felt the Church to be a serious competitor, and it made a bold attempt to conquer her from within, to infiltrate into her congregations and to disrupt them by forming Gnostic cells inside them. The existence of ecclesiastically organized Christianity depended on whether the heads of the Christian congregations saw this danger and were able to sustain a defensive struggle that would tax all their energies.

Until recently, the incompleteness of our sources prevented the writing of any satisfactory account of the basic teachings of Gnosticism and of its manifestations. Only a few works of Gnostic origin were known in the original, as, for instance, the *Pistis Sophia*, which is fairly late, and the *Books of Jeû*, containing alleged revelations of Christ to his disciples. The reason for this state of affairs is that after the victory of Christianity a large part of Gnostic literature — which, in the second century, must certainly have exceded Christian literature in quantity — was destroyed or else perished through lack of interest. To a great extent therefore the only available material was that contained in quotations and excerpts preserved in the works of Christian anti-Gnostics, especially in those of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus, and to a lesser degree in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and the later authors, Epiphanius of Salamis and Filastrius of Brescia.

But even anti-Gnostic literature survives only in part. Thus, what was perhaps the earliest work of this kind, Justin's *Against all Heresies,* written at the time when Gnosticism was most flourishing, is now lost.[51] The anti-Gnostic literature of the Church was naturally polemical, deliberately picking out from Gnostic works that which it was most easy to attack; this selection therefore hardly permits us to form a complete picture of the whole realm of Gnostic ideas, for the Christian writers' account of it could not be other than one-sided.

A completely new situation with regard to source-material was brought about by the discovery in 1945–6 of the extensive library of a Gnostic community near the Upper Egyptian town of Nag Hammadi in the vicinity of the former Pachomian monastery of Chenoboskion. It contained in thirteen papyrus manuscripts more than forty hitherto unknown works in the Coptic language, mostly direct translations from the Greek. These translations belong to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century; the Greek originals were probably written in the second century. Many of the titles of the newly-found treatises at first led to the supposition that they were already known Christian apocrypha; but closer inspection revealed that their contents are quite new. For example, there are apocryphal gospels of Thomas and Philip, a "Gospel of the Egyptians" and a "Gospel of Truth". There are Acts of the apostles Peter and Matthias. Apocalyptic literature is particularly well represented by apocalypses of Peter, Paul, John, James (three), Dositheos, and Seth (Sem). As in many of the manuscripts the prophet Seth plays a central role, we may assume that the library of Nag Hammadi belonged to the Sethian sect, which is often mentioned by early Christian writers. There are, moreover, works of Hermes Trismegistos, doctrinal works by Gnostic leaders such as Silvanos and Eugnostes; others claim to be an "Explanation of Gnosis" or an account of the nature of the archons.[52] Up till now only a fraction of the newly discovered manuscripts is available in the original language or in translations;[53] only the publication of all the texts will make possible an account of Gnosticism that will be accurate in detail.

---

[51] Justin refers to this work in *Apol.* 1, 26.

[52] Cf. the general account in J. Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d'Égypte* (Paris 1958), 165 ff. and W. C. van Unnik *Evangelium aus dem Nilsand* (Frankfurt a. M. 1960), 26 ff., Eng. tr. *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (London 1960).

[53] To the texts named above in the Sources may be added: "Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Welt" in *Muséon* 72 (1959), 349–52; "Traktat über die drei Naturen" in *ThLZ* 84 (1959), 243–56.

On first acquaintance, Gnostic writings convey an overall impression of a confusing mass of ideas and questions, often expressed in strange forms. When examined, however, they reveal a basic theme which recurs in all the variations of Gnostic opinion and can be reduced to one question and the attempt to answer it. The question is: How can man find the true knowledge which will explain the riddle of the world and the evil therein, as well as the riddle of human existence? The Gnostic, Theodotos, gave a rough definition of gnosis. Knowledge (Gnosis) of the answers to the following questions gives freedom: "Who were we? What have we become? Where were we? Whither have we been cast? Whither do we hasten? From what will we become free? What is birth? What is rebirth?"[54] In the answers to these questions the same basic ideas recur: man's inmost being longs for union with the true, perfect, but unknown God. Man, however, by a peculiar destiny has been banished to this imperfect world, which is not the creation of the supreme God, but can only be the work of a lesser, imperfect being, who rules it with the help of evil powers. Man can be free of their domination only if he rightly knows himself and is aware that he is separated from the perfect God. Only this knowledge makes possible his return to the upper world of light where the true God dwells.

This basic theme of Gnosticism, giving mankind an interpretation of the universe and of being, cannot in the present state of research be ascribed to any single, clearly comprehensible and generally recognized source. Rather are its elements derived from different religious movements which are known to have existed during the syncretic period in the Near East and the eastern Mediterranean area. These elements were connected with one another in a variety of ways, so that Gnosticism continually appears under different aspects according to the regions to which it spread and the formulations of its leading representatives. The observer is not confronted with any compact system of clearly defined concepts or dogmatic teachings, but with a multicoloured stream of religious ideas and opinions, which can look different from different points along its banks. Nevertheless, certain currents are discernible which show from which tributaries the river as a whole was formed.

First of all, there already existed a certain substratum of Gnostic ideas independent of any contact with Christianity.[55] Among these was a strongly marked *dualism,* which made an absolute opposition between light and darkness, between good and evil. The home of this dualism is to be found in ancient Iran. When these Iranian ideas met the Genesis account of Creation, this was interpreted in a Gnostic sense. The Creator God of the Old Testament became the Demiurge who did not know the light. Another source whose waters flowed into the Gnostic stream was astrological learning. Since the time of Alexander the Great, astrology had spread through the Hellenistic world from its Babylonian place of origin and had had a far-reaching effect with its doctrine of the influence of the planets on the destinies of man and the world. If such concepts were already widespread in Hellenistic times, it was in the Gnostic movement that they acquired a special force, as we can see from the speculations about the constellations, about the Pole star as the beginning of the kingdom of light, and about the spheres of the seven evil planets or archons.

---

[54] *Excerpta ex Thodoto* 78, on which see W. C. van Unnik, *op. cit.* 33.

[55] Compare J. Doresse, *op. cit.* 332.

The new discoveries at Chenoboskion stress the fact that Egypt was a fruitful soil for the growth of Gnostic ideas. It is true that the influence of Egyptian religion needs to be more closely studied, but the hermetic writings in the library at Nag Hammadi certainly point to an undeniable connexion between Egyptian Hermetism and Gnosis. Even though in these writings a demiurge plays no part in the creation of the world and the bizarre figures of the demons are lacking, the opposition which they proclaim between light and darkness, the encounter of a higher being with matter, the liberation of man who is tied to matter and his ascent to God once he is free — all this is part of Gnostic thought, only here the biblical and Christian elements are absent.

The relationship between Judaism and Gnosis constitutes a difficult problem.[56] It is generally admitted that the world of the Old Testament played a significant part in Gnostic literature. The latter is, besides, full of images and ideas such as were current in Jewish apocalyptic works. Biblical influence is particularly strong (even though the Gnostics disagreed with the Bible) in the Gnostic account of Creation. It seems not impossible that late Jewish sectarianism exercised a mediatory function between Iranian and Hellenistic religious currents on the one side and the Gnostic movement on the other, since it can be proved that there were Jewish heretics who were prepared to accept dualistic ideas. One feels compelled to ask if there were not here and there connecting links between Essenes and Gnostics. The Qumran community imposed, like the Gnostics, a strict commandment of absolute secrecy regarding certain parts of its doctrine; the *Book of Discipline* further teaches that God, when he created man, appointed two spirits to govern him, the spirit of truth and the spirit of wickedness, which could make a man into a son of light or a son of darkness — a fundamentally dualistic conception which is strongly reminiscent of similar ideas in Gnosticism. It has also been suggested that remnants of the Qumran community survived in Gnostic circles.[57]

---

[56] G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York 1943); J. Maier, "Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelreise in der Jüdischen Apokalyptik und 'Gnosis'" in *Kairos* 5 (1963), 18–40; see also the works of H. J. Schoeps.

Lastly there were the religiously-tinged philosophical currents of Hellenism, which undeniably found expression in syncretic Gnosticism. Certain themes of Gnostic theology are already foreshadowed in the Platonic doctrine of the fall of the soul and its attachment to the matter of the body. Stoicism too contributed its share to Gnostic thought. The Gnostic writings of Chenoboskion eagerly take up the allegorical interpretations of Homer and Hesiod which Hellenism had developed. Probably, however, the borrowings of Gnosticism from Hellenistic philosophy were in its terminology rather than in its ideas.

When *syncretism* was at the peak of its development, Christianity entered the Hellenistic world from its Palestinian birthplace and, in the syncretic climate of the time, it became the object of growing interest. Many men of that age could not but listen when a new redemption was promised to them through a person who was also the bringer of hitherto unknown revelations. Moreover, the new tidings of salvation came accompanied by a corresponding form of worship whose mysterious rites were alleged to ensure salvation. Such a message and such a cult offered many points of contact through which a connexion with the prevailing religious syncretism might be attempted.

Even, though the process of adopting Christian elements is no longer possible to follow in detail, nevertheless the figure of Christ had soon become a part of Gnostic thought, and many who followed syncretic tendencies were soon claiming to be Christians. About the year 160 Justin mentions men of his time who called themselves Christians, acknowledging Jesus as Lord, but who saw in the Creator of the world only an evil god; there were already several groups of such Christians, who were named after their leaders Valentinians, Marcionites, or Basilidians.[58] A little later Celsus refers to Christian communities known to him as Valentinians and Gnostics.[59] Both Justin and later Origen emphasize, however, that such groups did not represent true Christianity and did not belong to the Church. The syncretic character of such sects is even more clearly shown in Irenaeus' account of a certain Marcellina, who came to Rome in the time of Bishop Anicetus and tried with some success to make converts to her ideas. Her adherents called themselves Gnostics. Among the images of the religious leaders whom they revered was to be found, beside those of Pythagoras and Plato, that of Christ, which supposedly came from Pilate.[60]

---

[57] Cf. J. Doresse, *op. cit.* 326f. and R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (London – New York 1959).

[58] Justin, *Dial.* 35, 1–6.

[59] Origen, *Contra Celsum* 5, 61.

[60] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 25, 6.

The leaders of such Gnostic communities appealed in support of their teachings to apostolic tradition or to the words of Christ himself; Ptolemaeos, for instance, a pupil of Valentinus, in his *Letter to Flora.*[61] Others incorporated in their systems Christian ideas in a distorted form, as for example the Valentinians when they stressed the need for redemption, without which no man could reach the *pleroma* or "fulfilment"; the baptism of Jesus effected the remission of sins, but only redemption by Christ, who had descended into him, brought perfection. One became a partaker of this redemption by a mysterious rite and certain formulas to be recited during its performance. Thus the redeemed was to say: " I am confirmed and redeemed; I redeem my soul from this aeon and from all that derives from it, in the name of Jao, who redeemed this soul in Christ, the Living One."[62] Besides echoes of New Testament phraseology, what is here chiefly remarkable is the splitting of the person of the redeemer into an earthly Jesus and a heavenly Christ in a way quite unacceptable to the Christian Church.

Although Christian writers give no precise information on the subject, it may be presumed that the teachers and proselytizers of Gnosis found some of their adherents among the members of the Church, who often lacked the critical power to recognize at once the heterodox character of such opinions. Two factors may have contributed to the success of Gnostic propaganda. First there was the stress laid on ecclesiastical tradition, on which the doctrine of the "true Gnosis" and the salvation to be attained through it alone was supposed to be based; this tradition, because of its exalted nature, could be transmitted only in secret and was clothed in parables that could be explained only to those who were capable of understanding them.[63] Was not this what the gospel of Mark said (4:33–34): "And with many such parables he spoke to them the word, according as they were able to hear. And without parables he did not speak to them: but apart, he explained all things to his disciples"?

From this secret source came the abundance of Gnostic scriptures, which invoked now this apostle or disciple, now that, as the specially chosen messenger of revelation. The very fact that the contents of these revelations were so wrapped in mystery was bound to make them interesting to many Christians, particularly when their attention was directed to them by veiled allusions. Moreover, the success of the Gnostics in winning adherents was founded upon the thesis that they, as Christians of a higher rank, "spiritual men" (πνευματικοί), alone possessed the true interpretation of cosmic events and were thus the only ones capable of attaining to perfect knowledge of God. He who, like the great mass of Christians, tried to work out his salvation merely by faith and good works, remained for ever on a lower level, a lesser Christian or "psychic".[64] It was unavoidable that a far-reaching conflict should arise between the prophets of such a distorted form of Christianity and the leaders of the Church, if the latter did not wish the substance of their faith to be dissolved.

---

[61] Ptolemy, *Ep. ad Flor.* 7, 8–9.

[62] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 33, 3–7.

[63] Ibid. 1, 3, 1.

The Principal Manifestations of Gnosticism

Though the different currents in Gnosticism show a certain basis of opinions held in common, they also show equally clearly how much room there was in the movement as a whole for variations and even contradictions.

The Syrian group belongs to the early phase of Gnosticism and it formed around Menander and Satornil (called Saturninus by Irenaeus) with its centre at Antioch. Menander, a Samaritan by origin, is said to have proclaimed himself as the Redeemer, who had been sent into this world by the invisible powers. The author of the *Philosophoumena* gives more details about the teachings of Satornil. The unknown supreme Father created the angels, powers and aeons of the upper world; the lower, earthly world, however, was the work of seven lower spirits, the highest of whom was identified with the God of the Jews, the Creator of Genesis. To them, man owed his wretched existence, since they had not been able to create him in the image of the Supreme Being. But the Power from above had sent him also a spark of life, which after his death would enable him to return to those higher beings whom he could claim as his kindred.[65] Satornil is said to have been the first Gnostic to mention Jesus; but he was also regarded as a pupil of Simon Magus, in whom Christian apologists saw the actual founder of Gnosis.

The Basilidian school owed its origin to the Syrian Basilides. It ushered in the golden age of Gnosticism and attained great influence, especially at Alexandria, but it also had adherents at Rome. Basilides was very active as an author and, among other works, wrote a commentary on the Gospels in twenty-four books, besides hymns and prayers. A Christian, Agrippa Castor, is said to have attempted a refutation of Basilides in a lost work, *Elenchos*. This Gnostic addressed himself to the Christians with the claim that he was the recipient of secret doctrines which the Redeemer had entrusted to the apostle Matthias in special conversations before his ascension.[66] He was familiar with Persian dualism and taught an elaborate doctrine of emanation; according to him innumerable angels inhabited the four heavens and their 365 firmaments. Christ was sent into the world by his unbegotten Father to save from the power of the archons those who believed in him; it was only apparently that he took a human form, and Simon of Cyrene died on the cross in his stead.

---

[64] Ibid 1, 6, 1–2.

[65] *Philosophoumena* 7, 28.

[66] J. Doresse, *op. cit.* 21.

The Egyptian Valentinus was evidently Gnosticism's most gifted exponent. In the form in which he preached it, with lofty religious and poetic enthusiasm, it became the most dangerous threat to genuine Christianity. He began to teach at Alexandria about the year 135 and then propagated his opinions in Rome for nearly thirty years. There he seems to have played a leading part in the Christian community, but after a quarrel with the Roman Christians he returned to the East. His teachings were spread by means of letters, hymns, and sermons, and a *Treatise on the Three Natures* is also attributed to him. Irenaeus mentions a *Gospel of Truth* which was said to have been written by Valentinus, and among the finds at Nag Hammadi is a work of this title, the contents of which do not contradict what we know of Valentinus' doctrines. Many of these can be gleaned from writings or fragments of works by his pupils, for example Ptolemaeos, who in his *Letter to Flora* is a moderate propagandist for the Gnostic religion; or Heracleon, who had a predilection for the Gospel of John and wrote commentaries on it which Origen was later to discuss. Perhaps another work of Heracleon survives among the manuscripts at Chenoboskion.

Valentinus' Christian opponents reproached him with having borrowed his wisdom largely from Pythagoras and Plato; they rightly saw that the Gnostic's ideas were similar to those of these philosophers. He also, however, frequently follows Pauline lines of thought and employs words of Christ, interpreted in a Gnostic sense, and this gives his teaching a biblical colouring that may have made it seem familiar to many Christians. The basis of his doctrine of the universe is the common Gnostic myth of the invisible Father, from whom the "syzygies" of the emanations proceed, of which the thirty highest aeons form the pleroma. This is the upper spiritual world, wherein all earthly events have their origin, and to return to which is the longing of imperfect creation.[67] The latter is the work of the Demiurge, who created man and breathed into him the psychic or "natural" element which binds him to matter. Unknown to the Demiurge, however, man also received a pneumatic or "spiritual" element; if this has been awakened and formed by the true Gnosis which the Redeemer brought to earth, the spiritual part of man will be saved at the end of the world and can be again united with the light. In order to make possible the ascent of the lower world towards the light, Jesus became man, and upon him at his baptism the Spirit descended. For the passage to the light, which led the soul through the realm of the hostile powers, the dying Gnostic was, among the Valentinians, prepared by anointings and secret formulas, in which he said to the angels of the Demiurge that he possessed the true knowledge (gnosis) about himself and whence he came, so that they could not harm him.[68]

---

[67] H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* (Stuttgart, 4th ed. 1955), 297.

On the fringe of these main Gnostic schools, there existed also various sectarian groups representing a highly popularized Gnosticism in which now this, now that particular doctrine often blossomed forth in the most luxuriant forms. Among such sects, anti-Gnostic literature mentions in particular the Barbelo-Gnostics, the Ophites, Naassenes, and Sethians. The first of these took their name from Barbelo, a female emanation of the Father who had the functions of the Logos. In their dualistic interpretation of the universe they employed the Old Testament, allegorically explained; the *Apocryphon Johannis* belongs to this sect, whose adherents were mainly in Egypt and Syria.[69] In the mythology of the widespread sect of the Ophites[70] a special place was given to the serpent, a religious and cosmic symbol in various pagan cults; it represented the son of Jaldaboath, the creator of the heavens and of the angels and demons, who had rebelled against the supreme Father and God. The first human couple was cast out of Paradise by Jaldabaoth, but the serpent too was banished to earth and there he sowed discontent among men and sought, with his six sons, to prevent their return to the supreme Father. But one of the highest aeons, Christ, came into the world in the man Jesus, through whom he proclaimed the truth to mankind. Since his resurrection, the elect had been initiated by Jesus into the mysteries and thus could escape the domination of the Demiurge. Not all Ophite groups regarded the serpent as evil; to some he was neutral, to others the symbol of saving knowledge. The Naassenes probably represented a large sub-group among the Ophites, who, according to Hippolytus, considered themselves to be the true Gnostics and found confirmation of their opinions in all religions.[71]

The sect of the Sethians, both by its use of the serpent-symbol and its borrowings from Greek mythology, closely resembled the Ophites and Naassenes. The author of the *Philosophoumena,* in describing their teachings, mentions a holy book of this sect called the *Paraphrase of Seth.* In its myth of creation, there are not two but three principles in the universe: light, darkness, and between the two, a pure *pneuma* resembling the perfume of balsam. These three forces are reflected in many forms throughout the cosmos, especially in the symbol of the womb, which through the co-operation of light, darkness, and *pneuma* gives birth to man. The perfect Logos also had to enter into the womb of a virgin; but he was able to cleanse himself and drink the cup of living water, without which no man can find salvation. In one of the manuscripts of Nag Hammadi, entitled *Paraphrase of Sem,* we find the same doctrine of the three principles of the universe (light, darkness, and *pneuma*), so that there is hardly any doubt that it is a Coptic version of the work mentioned in the *Philosophoumena.*[72]

---

[68] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 21, 5.

[69] Cf. L. Cerfaux, "Barbelo-Gnostiker" in *RAC* I, 1176-80.

[70] Cf. E. Amman, "Ophites" in *DThC* XI, 1063–75; G. Kretzschmer, "Ophiten und Naassener" in *RGG,* 3rd ed. IV, 1659.

[71] *Philosophoumena* 5, 6.

The myth of the triad of world principles is thus a characteristic of the Sethian sect. As other manuscripts in the library of Chenoboskion refer to the prophet Sem or Seth or claim to have been written by him, it may be presumed that the whole collection belonged to a Sethian community, and that further knowledge about the doctrines of the sect may be expected from it. Even now, a preliminary inspection of its contents shows that its ideas were often clothed in a mantle of Christianity,[73] so that the Sethians can undoubtedly be regarded as representatives of a Christian form of Gnosticism.

Marcion

Even if Marcion cannot be called a Gnostic in the full sense, he nevertheless adopted so much of Gnostic thought in his teaching that he may not unjustly be included here as representing a Christian Gnosticism of his own. The facts of his life show us a man of strong will, energy, and initiative combined with organizing ability. A well-to-do native of Asia Minor (he owned a shipping business at Sinope in Paphlagonia), he came into conflict while still quite young with the leaders of the local Christian community, probably because of differences of opinion about the interpretation of Pauline doctrines. His exclusion from the congregation in his own city was followed by his rejection on the part of leading Asiatic Christians such as Papias and Polycarp of Smyrna.

About the year 140 Marcion came to Rome, where he joined the Christian congregation, which he supported with generous financial contributions. His connexion with the Syrian Gnostic Cerdon, who also lived in Rome, no doubt made him more closely acquainted with Gnostic ideas, from which he took especially his doctrine about the Old Testament Creator. The latter was not for Marcion the true God, the Father of

---

[72] J. Doresse, *op. cit.* 171 ff.

[73] Ibid. 215–37, 237–56.

Jesus Christ, but only the strict and just God who in the Mosaic Law laid upon the Jewish people an unbearable yoke. In Rome too, Marcion's peculiar opinions met with no recognition, and in the autumn of 144 he left the Christian Church, albeit unwillingly.

He at once began with skill and energy to win over adherents, to whom he gave a close-knit organization. Everywhere there arose, alongside the Christian congregations, Marcionite associations, governed by bishops who in turn were assisted by presbyters. As their liturgy continued to follow closely the usage of the Catholic Church,[74] the change-over to Marcion's church was for many Christians not too difficult; and the initial success of the Marcionites, which was evidently considerable, was no doubt largely due to the influx from Christian circles. The strict organization of his establishment distinguished Marcion's community from the other Gnostic groups and gave it a special impetus which made it a serious danger to the Church. She soon recognized this threat, and the majority of ecclesiastical writers from Justin to Tertullian felt obliged to take up the pen against Marcion and his doctrines. Only when their irreconcilability with apostolic tradition was convincingly proved could their attraction for orthodox Christians be neutralized.

Marcion's teaching was based upon a clearly defined canon of scripture, from which the whole of the Old Testament was *a priori* excluded, for therein spoke the God of justice, the creator of the universe, the Demiurge, who was a stranger to goodness and love. The good God revealed himself only when he sent Christ as the Redeemer, who brought to tormented mankind the Gospel of the love of God. Paul was the only apostle who accepted this Gospel without falsifying it. It found expression in his epistles and in the Gospel of Luke, though even these writings had been corrupted by interpolations due to the apostles who adhered to the Old Testament God. Therefore everything had to be removed from them which sought to introduce into the revelation of Christ the justice and legalism of the Old Testament. Marcion wrote a commentary on these purified scriptures, the *Antitheses,* preserved only in a few fragments, which was primarily concerned with explaining his fundamental thesis, the contrast between the Old and the New Testament.

Marcion's thesis, with its dualistic approach, was a direct attack on the Christian concept of God, which did not permit of a division between a strict, merely just Creator and a God of love unknown till the coming of Christ. This doctrine alone might have caused the Christian writers to include Marcion among the Gnostic teachers. But his christology also justified them in doing so; it was less its modalistic colouring than its

---

[74] Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3, 22. Even Augustine, *De Bapt. contra Donatistas* 7, 14, 31, recognizes the validity of Marcionite baptism.

Docetism which provoked their opposition. For Marcion, the idea that the Redeemer Christ sent by the good God should have chosen impure human flesh to be the bearer of the Deity was impossible; a real human birth would have subjected Christ to the dominion of the Demiurge. The Christian adversaries of Marcion, who pointed out that the latter's doctrine of the apparent birth of Christ led to the conclusion that his death on the cross was also apparent and that therefore the redemption was ineffective, were difficult to refute, even though Marcion tried to maintain the reality of the crucifixion. The fact that his pupil Apelles corrected him on this very point clearly shows the weakness of the Marcionite doctrine compared with that of the Catholic Church. In the eyes of his opponents Marcion was finally placed in the Gnostic camp by his rejection of marriage, which, in consequence of his view of the body as a part of evil matter, he forbade to all baptized persons.

Marcion's theology was indeed free from the bizarre speculations of Gnosticism about the emanations of the *pleroma,* free from astrological beliefs, from fantastic cosmogony and from the overestimation of pure gnosis as opposed to faith with its consequent gradation of Christians into "pneumatic" and "psychic". The Gnostic ideas which he adopted were enough, however, to make him suspect in the eyes of the Church and to make his teaching seem in an increasing degree a grave danger to essential features of the Christian faith. That the Church opposed him and his sect with more determination and energy than she did many other Gnostic groups was due to his disturbing success, to which the gravity of his ascetic demands and, perhaps most of all, his strong personality contributed. Like no other figure in the Gnostic world, Marcion compelled the Church to consider and to reconsider her own attitude to Scripture and criteria of faith, to overhaul her organization and to deploy her whole inner strength in face of such a menace.

The Church's Self-Defence and the Importance of the Christian Victory

The Church's campaign against the threat to her existence caused by the manifold attractions of Gnosticism was waged in two ways, each supplementing and supporting the other. First, the leaders of individual congregations immediately took practical steps against those Gnostics who endeavoured to infiltrate into them, or who, having previously belonged to the congregation, sought from within to win over its members to their new faith. Secondly there were the theological writers of the time, who attacked the Gnostic movement on the literary plane, demonstrating the irreconcilability of its doctrine with Christian revelation and opposing its main theses with the corresponding truths of Christianity, now more precisely formulated as the result of profound study and development.

The defensive struggle at the pastoral level naturally left little evidence in the literary sources and it is therefore harder to reconstruct it in detail. The immediate object was bound to be the suppression of centres of infection within the congregations; that is, the exclusion of the bearers of Gnostic doctrine from the community and the prevention, for the future, of the formation of Gnostic cells in their midst. Only the excommunication of Marcion himself found much of an echo in early Christian literature, but it serves as an example for many similar occurrences that are not mentioned. Probably it was already his Gnostic convictions at their earliest stage, which led to his expulsion from the Christian congregation of his home town, Sinope. Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna also cast him out; in Rome likewise the leaders of the church came to recognize that the exclusion of such a wealthy and influential man was the only means of protecting the Christians from the errors which he preached.[75] Similar measures were no doubt taken in all places where the danger of the formation of Gnostic cells within Christian congregations was seen. The complaint of many Gnostics that the Catholics would have nothing to do with them and called them heretics, although they held the same doctrines, implies such defensive action on the part of the senior clergy. Other Gnostics voluntarily separated themselves from the Christian congregations when they found themselves isolated and unable to carry on their activities; such isolation was itself due to the initiative of the Church authorities or to the congregations' own efforts. Valentinus seems to have been late in breaking with the Church, but he had been repeatedly reprimanded in the congregations to which he had belonged.

The eradication of Gnostic cells was accompanied by sermons explaining the insidious nature of false doctrines, and Christians were warned by their pastors of the danger to the true faith. Irenaeus gives excerpts from the sermons of an Asiatic priest which he had himself heard;[76] they are entirely affirmative in tone and are concerned with expounding the orthodox Catholic teaching, but they unmistakably constitute a refutation of characteristic Marcionite doctrines, without any mention of Marcion by name. We are led to suppose that instruction and immunization against the Gnostic menace was the practice of most Christian leaders of the time.

That this form of defence was not merely local is shown by the example of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth about the year 170. Eusebius devotes some informative lines to his pastoral activities.[77] Dionysius carried on a lively correspondence not only with the churches in Greece itself but even with Asia Minor and far-off Pontus, seeking to build up a broad defensive front against the heresies of the age. He urged the Christians of neighbouring Athens and the island of Crete to hold fast to the true doctrine and warned them against false teachings, just as he warned the congregations of Amastris and Nicomedia in Bithynia. The heresy of his time was primarily Gnosticism; indeed, his letter to Nicomedia expressly names Marcion, to whose errors he opposed the "Canon of Truth". The special situation in which Christianity found itself placed with regard to Gnosticism made the bishops more fully aware of their duties as guardians of orthodoxy, and the increased activity of the heads of congregations which resulted made the faithful more conscious of the monarchical episcopate and of its significance for the future.

---

[75] A. von Harnack, *Marcion* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1924), 24–27; for the documentary proofs, see ibid. 3*–5*, 15* f.

[76] *Adv. haer.* 4, 27–31.

Parallel to this activity of the bishops in combating Gnosticism ran that of the theological writers, to whom the rise and growth of the Gnostic movement acted as a powerful stimulus. An extensive body of literature from the Catholic side supported the Church authorities and provided a theological basis for the counter-attack. Most of this anti-Gnostic literature has perished, especially since the fourth century, when, because of the completely changed situation, there was no need to take any interest in the products of the second. A considerable part of these writings was still extant when Eusebius wrote, and he mentions a number of authors who were active in their production, but he evidently gives only a selection. Among them were Agrippa Castor, who opposed Basilides, Rhodon from Asia Minor who wrote against Marcion and his pupil Apelles, and Modestus, whose refutation of Marcion was specially praised by Eusebius.[78] Bishops who wrote anti-Gnostic works include Melito of Sardes, Philip of Gortyna in Crete and Theophilos of Athens, all of whom were concerned with refuting Marcion; this shows how much importance was attached to the man and his work. He was also the object of attacks by Justin Martyr and several other theologians whom Eusebius does not name.[79]

Certain apocryphal writings on the Catholic side, such as the *Acta Pauli*[80] and the *Epistula Apostolorum*[81] were also of anti-Gnostic tendency and were intended as the orthodox counterpart to similar literature of

---

[77] *Euseb. HE,* 4, 23, 2–6.

[78] Ibid. 4, 25.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Cf. C. Schmidt, *Acta Pauli* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1905); Πράξεις Παύλου (Hamburg 1936).

[81] C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu* (Leipzig, 1919); H. Duensing in *Hennecke-Schneemelcher,* I, 126–55.

Gnostic provenance. Hegesippus, who was of oriental origin, wrote his *Memorials* (of which some fragments are extant) against the Gnostics; soon after the middle of the second century, seeking instruction in the true doctrine in view of the widespread success of Gnosticism, he came to Rome. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, in his "Unmasking and Refutation of the False Gnosis", gives an analysis of Gnosticism based on his own reading of Gnostic writings, which is of outstanding merit. Another work which he planned to write against Marcion seems not to have been carried out. To his account of Gnostic systems Irenaeus added a refutation of their errors. He opposed them, using his own exact knowledge of Scripture and tradition, with the true doctrine of the Church. The author's interest in his subject and the soundness of his work make us forget any stylistic failings; his achievement was not surpassed by any of the anti-Gnostic writers who succeeded him. Of equal merit is the author of the *Philosophoumena* or *Refutatio*, which is generally ascribed (though not with absolute certainty) to the priest Hippolytus, who came from the East and was active in Rome at the beginning of the third century.[82] His work presupposes a knowledge of Irenaeus; but he brought a new point of view into the discussion, inasmuch as he sought to show that the opinions of the Gnostics were not taken from Holy Scripture but from the works of the Greek philosophers, from the mysteries, from writers on astrology and magic — in fact, from non-Christian sources. Hippolytus' account of the catholic attitude is concise and jejune compared with that of Irenaeus and gives little information about the nature of the Church's campaign against Gnosticism. In this respect his work resembles the *Syntagma*,[83] a review of the heresies that had arisen down to the author's time. The original is lost, but it can be reconstructed from the writings of later users.

More important are the works of the only Latin writer who engaged in the controversy with Gnosticism, Tertullian of Carthage, who, however, did not write until the third century. The two short treatises, *De carne Christi* and *De resurrectione carnis* prove positively from Scripture that two of the Gnostics' theses were untenable: their doctrine of Christ's "apparent" body and their rejection of the resurrection of the body. Three other writings were directed against particular Gnostics: Hermogenes, the Valentinians, and Marcion. To the last work, consisting of five books, Tertullian devoted special care; it gives a detailed account of the principal

---

[82] Ed. by P. Wendland, *GCS* 26 (Berlin 1916). For discussion of the authorship, see P. Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe* (Paris 1947); idem in *RHE* 47 (1952), 5–43; *RSR* 41 (1954), 226–57 (against Hippolytus); G. Bardy and M. Richard in *MSR* 1948, 1950–1, 1953 are in favour of Hippolytus. Further bibliography in *Altaner* 185.

[83] P. Nautin, *Hippolyte, Contre les hérésies* (Paris 1949).

Marcionite doctrines followed by a skilful refutation based on reason and the Bible. In *De praescriptione haereticorum*[84] he explains the meaning and value of apostolic tradition as opposed to the claim of the heretics, especially the Gnostics, to possess the true doctrine of Christ. The language he uses is that of the Roman law courts.

On the basis of this surviving anti-Gnostic literature we are able to give some account of the character and quality of the theological struggle against Gnosticism, at least in its main features. In general one may say that the Church's theologians thought out anew and established on a firmer foundation those points of Christian revelation which were particularly attacked and threatened by Gnostic teachings.

The claim of the heretics to be the sole possessors of the revelation imparted by Christ to his apostles meant nothing less than a depreciation of the Christian scriptures, which dated from apostolic times, and of the other, extra-biblical apostolic traditions; furthermore it implied a rejection of the Christian bishops' claim to be the only lawful witnesses to that body of tradition. If this Gnostic thesis were correct, then the whole foundation crumbled on which the inner cohesion of the Church had hitherto rested. The Christian theologians set to work to prevent the threatened collapse by bringing into the foreground the concepts of *apostolic tradition* and *succession*, and by deciding and confirming what constituted the Christian scriptures. A starting-point for the establishment of a *canon* of New Testament scriptures was already given in the books of the Old Testament, recognized as sacred; these served as a model and an encouragement to accord rank and respect to books from the period of the primitive Church. Even though we can no longer clearly discern the beginnings of this development, it is evident that two originally separate collections, the four Gospels and the Pauline epistles, gradually came closer together, although the latter were not yet accorded parity of esteem with the Gospels. According to Melito of Sardes, in the years 170–80, books of the New Testament were placed on the same level as those of the Old. No doubt the example of Marcion, who declared a clearly defined canon of New Testament writings to be necessary, hastened a development already begun in the Church. She did not however copy Marcion, but, in sharp contrast to him, accepted the Old Testament as sacred scriptures — the Christian understanding of them being made easier by developing allegorical interpretation — and then incorporated in her New Testament canon other books rejected by Marcion, notably the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse. In the controversy with Gnosticism this canon became widely accepted, and in the "Muratorian

---

[84] The works mentioned are in *CSEL* 47 (1906) and 70 (1942); reprinted in *CChr* 1–2 (1952–3).

Fragment", a list (made by the Roman congregation or one closely attached to it) of the New Testament books held to be canononical, it is already approaching its final form before the end of the second century.[85]

In deciding which individual writings were to be included, the Church had to be able to invoke an undisputed, objective principle. This was to be found in ecclesiastical *tradition.*[86] Only those books could be recognized as canonical which went back to apostolic times and had from an early date been particularly esteemed in the traditions of the whole Christian community. The only guarantors of the genuineness of such traditions were those leaders of congregations who could trace their unbroken succession back to the apostles. The positive effect of this principle of apostolic *succession* was to assure the place of *tradition* as an essential element of the Church's faith and theology. Its negative effect was to strip the Gnostic apocrypha and doctrinal works of their authority and cut them off from the Church, for in no case could they claim to be acknowledged by the witnesses and guardians of apostolic tradition.

A second principle was employed by the Christian theologians in their war against error, that which Irenaeus calls the *Canon of Truth,*[87] given to the faithful at baptism. This seems to refer to the baptismal "symbol" or profession of faith, or at least to the summary of truths to which the catechumens had been introduced during their instruction before baptism. Whoever compared the teachings of the Gnostics with this norm or rule of faith could immediately see how they contradicted the true doctrine. The profession of faith at baptism had in fact about the middle of the second century been expanded in a christological sense[88] to affirm more emphatically the reality of the human birth and of the Passion and death of Christ. This was a blow at the Docetism of many Gnostic sects and a declaration of the historicity of our Lord's miracles in the face of "spiritualist" attempts to explain them away. The same creed proclaimed the one God and Lord and Creator of the universe and thus rejected all Gnostic speculations about the origin of the cosmos as well as Marcion's doctrine of two gods. The Christian conviction of the resurrection of the body contrasted with the Gnostics' contempt for the body as part of matter, held by them to be radically evil.

---

[85] Cf. Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction* (Freiburg–New York–London, 3rd ed. 1963), 20–40, and O. Cullmann, *Tradition* (Zürich 1954), 42–54.

[86] J. Ranft, *Der Ursprung des katholischen Traditionsbegriffes* (Würzburg 1931); H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt* (Tübingen 1953), 163–94; A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London 1953), and esp. H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Truth* (London 1954), 241–58, 322–48.

[87] *Adv. haer.* 1, 9, 4; 1, 22, 1, on which see Turner, *op. cit.* 349 ff.

[88] The texts are in *Denzinger* nos. 1–12 and H. Lietzmann, *KlT* 17–18, (Berlin, 4th ed. 1935); see also Bibliography.

During the course of the conflict some individual theologians were moved to lay stress on certain truths of revelation which were endangered or distorted by Gnostic opinions. Thus Irenaeus made it his special concern, in the face of the dualistic misunderstanding of original sin, to expound the true doctrine of the Fall, and in oppostion to Gnostic self-redemption to emphasize the gratuitousness of the gift of grace.[89] The exaggeration by the Gnostics of the value of "knowledge" for redemption was later the occasion for Clement of Alexandria and Origen to consider more deeply the relationship between faith and knowledge and to acquire a Christian understanding and a true theological appreciation of Gnosis.[90]

The Christian doctrines and principles brought into prominence by the opponents of the Gnostics do not of course contain any hitherto completely unknown elements of the faith. The Church could hardly have saved her independence, threatened as it was by the innovations of Gnostic propaganda, by combating them with novelties of her own. For the Church, the rise of the Gnostic heresy was nevertheless a very efficient stimulus to reconsider the truths she possessed, to formulate some of them more clearly and to emphasize them more decidedly. Marcionitism in particular hastened the process of the development of dogma and of the Church's consciousness of her own identity, and thus it played its part in forming the character of the "Great Church" of the future. But it would be a distortion of historical reality to see in that Church merely an anti-Marcionite movement. Her inner riches exceeded the sum-total of the doctrines defended in the attack on Marcionitism; the very strength of the independence with which the young Church defeated Marcion and the other Gnostics reveals the extent of those riches.

The decisive victory in the Church's favour occurred before the end of the second century; within a few decades the poison had been ejected, and Gnosticism was thrown back upon itself. Marcion's church, because of its strict organization, lasted longer; but the other Gnostic groups lost all cohesion and lapsed into sectarianism, even though their ideas exercised a certain power of attraction upon educated members of Christian congregations in the big cities down to the middle of the third century, as the works of the Alexandrines, of Hippolytus and Tertullian testify. After that time, anti-Gnostic polemic writings appeared only sporadically, and their complete cessation in the fourth century proves that the once so powerful movement had become insignificant. The actual importance of this swift and permanent victory lies in the fact that the Church, faced by the Gnostic attack, preserved her special character as a supernatural community sharing the same faith and way of life and founded by Christ. Thus she escaped the danger of being swallowed up and of perishing in the sea of Hellenistic syncretism.

---

[89] Esp. Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 3, 4; 3, 18, 2; 3, 18, 7; 3, 23, 1; see E. Scharl, *Recapitulatio Mundi. Der Rekapitulationsbegriff des Irenaeus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1941); A. Houssiau, *La christologie de S. Irénée* (Louvain 1955).

[90] O. Casel, "Glaube und Gnosis" in *JLW* 15 (1951), 164–95; T. Camelot, *Foi et gnose chez Clément d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1945); J. Moingt, "La gnose de Clément d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la foi et la philosophie" in *RSR* 37 (1950), 195–251, 398–421, 537–64, 38 (1951), 82–118; W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Klemens von Alexandrien* (Berlin 1952).

CHAPTER 16

The Rise of Montanism and the Church's Defence

THE conflict with Gnosticism was not yet over when a new movement arose in the bosom of the Church which called itself the "New Prophecy". Its opponents called it the "heresy of the Phrygians", thus indicating the geographical area which saw its birth. Only in the fourth century was the term "Montanism" invented, when it was desired to emphasize the part played by Montanus in originating it.

The name "New Prophecy" aptly describes the basic idea of this movement. It took up again that form of religious enthusiasm, so much esteemed in the primitive Church, which regarded certain individual believers as specially favoured messengers of the Spirit and as prophets who placed their gifts at the service of the community. False prophets, illusionaries and swindlers among them had indeed, here and there, brought discredit on prophecy and created mistrust of any new "bearers of the Spirit" that might arise. There had also been tension between those favoured by the Spirit and those who wielded ecclesiastical authority; but good relations had always been restored, for charismatic gifts and the authority of the clergy were not necessarily mutually exclusive. This time, however, it came to a clash between prophecy and authority, which led to the exclusion of adherents of the movement from the community of the Church.

The development of the Montanist movement had an early phase, then a period when it underwent modification by Tertullian, and finally a stage of decline after the Church had defeated it. The early phase began about 170, when the recently baptized Montanus, in the village of Ardabau on the borders of Phrygia and Mysia, proclaimed to his fellow-Christians, with ecstatic behaviour and in strange, obscure language, that he was the mouthpiece and prophet of the Holy Spirit, who was now, through him, to lead the Church to all truth. At first this message was received with some doubts; but when two women, Priscilla and Maximilla, joined

Montanus and in a similar ecstatic manner uttered their prophecies, while Montanus himself promised his adherents a higher place in the approaching heavenly Jerusalem,[91] a wave of enthusiasm swept away all hesitation. No connexion can be proved between the old Phrygian cults and the New Prophecy, though the population of the interior of Asia Minor does seem to have had a certain tendency towards religious excesses. The initial success of the three prophets was considerable, although they confined themselves to oral propaganda and at first had no writer of consequence to proclaim their message to the world. For this very reason the prophecies of Montanus and his female companions were treasured by the followers of the movement, and they were soon collected and circulated. Only a few of these *oracula* are to be found in the works of anti-Montanist writers or of Tertullian, so that we have to rely largely on the accounts of opponents to find out what the New Prophecy consisted of.

The most prominent feature of it was its *eschatological message:* the second coming of the Lord was at hand and with it the heavenly Jerusalem would be set up in the plain near the Phrygian town of Pepuza. In many parts of the empire men were not unprepared for this message, due to the grave tribulations which pestilence, war, and social distress under Marcus Aurelius had brought in their train. Hippolytus relates that a Syrian bishop had gone out at the head of his congregation to meet Christ, whom he intended to await in the desert, and that a bishop in Pontus had announced what had been revealed to him in a dream — that the last judgment would take place in a year's time. There would be no need to believe the Scriptures any more (this bishop had added) if his prophecy were not fulfilled.[92] Probably the Montanist movement would have had little effect either in depth or in extent if it had confined itself to the proclamation of its eschatological message; when the prophesying ceased, a more sober frame of mind would, as in similar cases, have returned. But the prophets drew consequences from their alleged heavenly mandate which involved far-reaching interference with the existing practice of the Church and eventually forced the ecclesiastical authorities to condemn the whole movement.

Fasting suggested itself as a means of spiritual preparation for the coming of Christ, for it had long been recognized as a form of inner sanctification, and the official fasts known as "stations" had also been instituted from eschatological motives.[93] Hitherto these fasts had been limited to two half-days in the week and recommended by the Church to the faithful as a voluntary exercise. Montanus went beyond the previous practice when he made continual fasting a matter of precept for all Christians, since Christ's return might be expected at any hour. When it did not take place, the fast was confined to the customary stational days but prolonged till the evening and two weeks of abstinence were added, during which only dried food was permitted.[94]

---

[91] Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48, 10; Tertullian, *De exhort. cast.* 10.

[92] Hippolytus, *In Daniel.* 4, 18–19.

[93] Cf. H. Kraft, "Die altchristliche Prophetie und die Entstehung des Montanismus" in *ThZ* 11 (1955), 258 ff.

The same eschatological attitude lay behind the second demand of the Montanist prophets, that which forbade the Christian who was waiting for his Lord to make any attempt at flight from martyrdom. Evasion would have meant a renewed attachment to this world, which was after all approaching its end. Earthly possessions, too, had no value any more, so it should not have been difficult for Montanists to give up their gold, silver, and other valuables to pay for the support of their preachers and prophets.

The Montanists' demand for the *renunciation of marriage* (as far as this was possible) was bound to have the most decisive effect. In their eyes it was marriage that most strongly attached men and women to this world. Both prophetesses set a good example by ceasing to live with their husbands; they evidently represented it as a duty that others should imitate this example and forbade marriages to take place in the brief span of time before the second coming of the Lord. Tertullian later amended this rule to prohibition of second marriages. Priscilla had a further reason for requiring total continence: it made one better able to see prophetic visions and to utter prophetic messages.[95]

Montanism naturally showed most enthusiasm in its early phase. New communities in Lydia and Galatia soon added to its already numerous adherents in Phrygia. From the provinces of Asia Minor it passed to Syria (ever receptive to new ideas), where it was especially successful at Antioch; soon it appeared in Thrace also. The Gallic congregations of Lyons and Vienne heard about the Montanist movement surprisingly early, as appears from Eusebius,[96] who writes of a correspondence between those congregations and "brethren" in Asia and Phrygia in which it figures. Eleutheros, Bishop of Rome, was independently informed of the rise of the New Prophecy, but he clearly did not regard it as a serious danger, for he uttered no judgment upon it. Perhaps he was confirmed in this attitude by the Christians of Lyons, who sent their presbyter Irenaeus to Rome with a letter which likewise did not condemn the Phrygian movement. Pope Zephyrinus (199–217) also looked favourably upon it at first, for he sent its members letters of peace, which were the expression of fellowship within the Church. Tertullian ascribes the later change in Pope Zephyrinus' attitude to Praxeas of Asia Minor, who had given him more detailed information, admittedly somewhat distorted, about the prophets and their churches.[97] The Roman bishops, then, were at first unaware of the danger which the New Prophecy represented to the existence of the ecclesiastical organization and of an ordered congregational life.

---

[94] Tertull., *De ieiun.* 1, 2, 10.

[95] *Euseb. HE* 5, 18, 3.

[96] Ibid. 5, 3, 4.

The first setback to the further spread of the movement was the death of the three original bearers of the prophecy. Maximilla died in 179. It was she who had announced: "After me no other prophet will come, but there will be the consummation of all things."[98] She had with these words enabled many followers to form a judgment upon the genuineness of her prophesying, and it could not be other than unfavourable. Perhaps the movement would have declined more rapidly — certainly the conflict with it would have taken a different form on the Church's side — if a man of the stature of Tertullian had not joined it and, on the level of literary discussion at least, given it a new importance.

We have no evidence as to when and how the African writer came into contact with the New Prophecy. From about the years 205–6 onwards his writings show not only that he knew its basic teaching and its demands on the faithful, but that he approved of them. Even in a man of the spiritual greatness of Tertullian one might have assumed there would be a period of inner struggle preceding the change from Catholic to fanatical Montanist, for his new faith involved a contrast, patent to all the world, with his previous convictions; he now scorned in unmeasured invective what he had once ardently defended and respected. What it was that appealed to him in the New Prophecy is not difficult to see when we read his Montanist writings. He found in it an attitude towards the Christian way of life which, in its pitiless severity to all that was mediocre, corresponded to his own rigoristic approach, but which could not in any way be connected with the Gnostic heresy or with the false doctrines of a man like Praxeas. What attracted him even more perhaps was that in the Montanist form of Christianity one could directly invoke the Holy Spirit in support of one's opinions; before this highest court of appeal all others had to be silent — the martyrs, the episcopal Church, the Bishop of Rome himself.

Tertullian was not, however, the man to accept the New Prophecy quite uncritically. He thought out afresh its doctrines and organization and modified it so much in detail that Tertullian's Montanism is something altogether different from that of the early days. The three great prophets of that first phase were for him no inviolable authority. He possessed indeed a collection of their prophetic utterances, but he made sparing use of them and preferred to lend weight to his views by appealing to the Paraclete directly. Especially did he deny to women in the Montanist community, as conceived by him, a rank like that accorded to Priscilla and Maximilla. They were not to hold any priestly function, nor were they to be allowed to teach or to speak at divine worship, even if they possessed the gift of prophecy; their use of it, if so endowed, was to be confined to private utterances.[99] He also disavowed the more concrete prophecies referring to the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem — Pepuza he never mentions. One gets the impression that he wished to detach the New Prophecy from its connexion with the personalities of its early phase and its local associations with Asia Minor and to give it a universal character. His grand design, of which neither Montanus nor his female assistants were capable, is clear from the new basis in salvation history which Tertullian gave the movement. Its real mission consisted, according to him, in bringing Christianity and mankind in general to adult maturity through the working of the Paraclete.[100]

---

[97] Tertull., *Adv. Praxean* 1.

[98] Epiphan., *Haer.* 48, 2, 4.

Tertullian's principal Montanist writings[101] repeat the rigoristic demands of the New Prophecy with undiminished severity and in passionate language. With a sophistry that sometimes borders on the acrobatic he defends the prohibition against flight in time of persecution, and represents one marriage only as a commandment of the Paraclete that admits of no exception *(secundae nuptiae adulterium).*[102] In like manner he proves the obligation to fast, which the "natural men" or "psychics", whom he reviles in unmeasured terms, refused to accept. His attack on the Church's practice in the matter of penance is of ruthless severity towards sinners and the fallen. It was his attitude on this question that made him into an opponent in principle of the episcopal Church and led him finally to break away from ecclesiastical authority based upon the apostolic succession.

He soon had to give up his attempt to win over the Christian congregation in his home town of Carthage to the Montanist movement. It is remarkable that *after* Tertullian's time the sources are at first completely silent about Montanism; in no work or letter of Cyprian is there even a remote echo of it. Evidently the exaggerated rigorism of its African advocate had been unable to gain any large body of adherents among the simple Christian folk of that region. Tertullian's writings, however, undoubtedly found readers; their literary quality and the uniqueness of their contents would have ensured that. But there were only readers, not converts. Shortly before Augustine's death a remnant of Tertullianists rejoined the Church in Africa and brought their basilica into Catholic possession.

---

[99] Tertull., *De virg. vel.* 9.

[100] Ibid., 1.

[101] *De fuga in persecutione, De monogamia, De ieiunio adversus psychicos, De pudicitia.*

[102] *De monog.* 15.

The defensive campaign of the ecclesiastical authorities against Montanism began, as we have said, slowly, because the latter's opposition to the Christian way of life and to the tradition of the Church became apparent only on closer examination. Emphasis on fasting and readiness for martyrdom, as well as praise for high moral standards in marriage had always been staple themes of Christian preaching; even the renewal of esteem for the prophetic gifts of the early Church gave no cause for alarm. In the message of the New Prophecy there was, moreover, no connexion to be seen with the errors the Church had hitherto been fighting against. Only when it became clear that its genuinely Christian aims were distorted by an immoderate exaggeration of their real significance, and that they represented a falsification of Christian tradition, did defensive action become necessary.

The bishops of Asia Minor must sooner or later have had to face the question, which is bound to arise in the case of every enthusiastic movement, whether the claims of the New Prophecy were not based upon an illusion. Some of them therefore tried to test the genuineness of these prophetic gifts, but they were repulsed by the Montanists. The bishops repeatedly took counsel together (the first example of such synods in the history of the Church) and came to the conclusion that it was not the Spirit of God which spoke through the new prophets. They were therefore to be excluded from the fellowship of the Church together with their adherents. Even towards the middle of the third century a synod of bishops in Iconium was concerned with Montanism; splinter groups were to be found in Spain at the end of the fourth, in Rome at the beginning of the fifth, and in the East even as late as the ninth century.

The victory of the Church over Montanism had consequences for her which brought her unique nature into greater prominence and determined her future development. By refusing to make the excessively ascetic programme of the Montanists a norm binding on all Christians, she escaped the danger of sinking to the level of an insignificant sect of enthusiasts and preserved herself for the task of bringing the message of Christ to all men and making it possible for that message to be effective in every cultural milieu. Moreover, by eliminating uncontrollable religious subjectivism as represented by the Phrygian prophets, with its claim to the sole leadership of the faithful, the Christian community was assured of objective guidance by the traditional office-holders whose calling was based on objective criteria. Finally by renouncing an eschatological hope which believed its fulfilment to be impending, it became possible for the Church to consider with an objective eye her tasks for the present and the future and to embark upon them with confidence: these were her own inner strengthening and her further missionary activity in the Hellenistic world.

CHAPTER 17

The Expansion of Christianity down to the End of the Second Century

THE question of the Church's expansion in the second century brings us back to Palestine again. The Jewish war of the first century had, for the time being, put an end to the missionary work of the Jerusalem congregation and of the Christians dwelling in the countryside. Many of the Christians who had fled to Pella, east of the Jordan, probably did not go back to Palestine; those who returned were faced with the task of rebuilding community life in and outside Jerusalem, so that by the years 73–74 a new period of Palestinian Jewish Christianity had begun. Its centre was again at Jerusalem, where the congregation was presided over by Simeon until his martyrdom about the year 107.[103] Regarding the size of the congregation our sources make only vague statements; but a remark of Eusebius is noteworthy, according to which "very many of the circumcision had come to the faith in Christ" down to the time of Simeon's death.[104] From this it is clear that the new community, like its predecessor, engaged in missionary activity; for Jews in large numbers had settled again in the city after the catastrophe of the seventies, but they now lacked a Temple as a centre for their religious life.

Hegesippus states that at this time there were also Christians outside Jerusalem, especially in Galilee, and this information is confirmed by rabbinical sources.[105] The missionary efforts of the Christians certainly encountered enormous difficulties. First of all they had to deal with heterodox Jewish Christianity, which, partly at least, continued to assert that the Law was still binding on all Christians and recognized Jesus of Nazareth as a great prophet indeed, but not as the Messiah and Son of God; moreover, it had been permeated by Gnostic ideas, as formulated by Simon Magus, Dositheos, Menander and Kerinthos.[106] Samaria especially was under the influence of Simon and Menander and offered little scope to the Christian mission.[107]

---

[103] *Euseb. HE* 3, 32, 1–3.

[104] Ibid., 3, 35.

[105] Ibid., 3, 20, 6; 3, 32, 6; cf. A. Schlatter, *Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit* (Gütersloh 1927), 363.

[106] J. Daniélou, *La théologie du judéo-christianisme* (Paris 1958), 67–89, Eng. tr. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London 1964).

The Christians met the most determined opposition from orthodox Palestinian Jewry, based as it was upon a profound hatred of the "apostates" who had renounced the Sabbath and proclaimed as Messiah him whom the Jews had nailed to the cross.[108] According to the evidence of Justin,[109] not only was this hatred deliberately fomented in the synagogues of Palestine, but it led to powerful missionary counter-activity; from Palestine the Jews sent forth "chosen men" who were to work against the spread of the Christian faith everywhere, especially in the main centres of the Jewish Diaspora. The denunciation of Bishop Simeon also came from anti-Christian circles in Palestine. He was denounced before the proconsul Atticus as being a descendant of David and a Christian, and in the year 107 he was, according to the principle of Trajan's later rescript, crucified after steadfastly professing the faith.[110] Accessions from paganism were probably not considerable in Palestine; the only convert from paganism who is mentioned is Aquila, the translator of the Bible, who, according to the late account of Epiphanios, joined the Church at Jerusalem, but because of his superstitious tendencies was subsequently excluded from the congregation.[111]

As the Jewish war had brought to an end the original community, so did the rebellion of Bar Cochba in the years 132–5 conclude the second phase of Palestinian Christianity and with it the possibility of missionary work among the Jews of Palestine. Persecution by the leader of the rebellion caused the deaths of many Jewish Christians;[112] others again fled beyond the Jordan. As no person of Jewish race was allowed to live in the city of Aelia Capitolina, built on the site of Jerusalem, a Christian congregation could be recruited only from pagan converts. Its first bishop, Marcus, was therefore, as Eusebius states, a Greek; and all his successors down to the middle of the third century bore Greek or Roman names.[113] The Gentile-Christian congregation of Jerusalem played no remarkable role during the rest of the second century, at the end of which the bishopric of Aelia ranked below that of Caesarea. In the rest of Palestine too, the Christians were now mainly Greeks, dwelling almost exclusively in the towns. All attempts at christianizing the Jewish rural population failed down to the time of Constantine, because of determined hostility towards everything Christian.[114]

---

[107] Justin, *Dial.* 120, 6; *Apol.* 26 56.

[108] *Euseb. HE* 3, 27, 5.

[109] Justin, *Dial.* 133, 6; 137, 2; 17, 1; 108, 2.

[110] *Euseb. HE* 3, 32, 3–6.

[111] Epiph., *De mensuris* 14–15; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3, 21, 1, calls him a proselyte.

[112] Justin, *Apol.* 31.

[113] *Euseb. HE* 4, 6, 4.

In neighbouring Syria the Christian churches dating from apostolic times maintained themselves or increased in importance. The Christians in Damascus, Sidon, and Tyre, likewise had increased in numbers during the course of the second century, while the Phoenician countryside remained largely pagan. In Antioch especially — its earliest important mission-centre — Christianity gained in consideration on account of its bishop, Ignatius, and acquired new converts from among the Greek-speaking population. The letter of Bishop Theophilos, written shortly after 180 to Autolykos,[115] is both apologetical and propagandist in tone and shows that missionary work was going on among the pagan upper class.

In the second half of the second century new territory was opened up to Christianity in the east Syrian district of Osrhoëne, when the Jewish Christian Addai began to work in Edessa and its immediate neighbourhood. His labours were continued by the future martyr Aggai and the leaders of the Edessan congregation, Hystaspes and Aggai, the latter of whom had to excommunicate Bardesanes (converted to Christianity in 179) on account of his Gnostic errors. The existence of Christians between Nisibis and the Euphrates in the second half of the second century is suggested by the Aberkios inscription.[116] At that time other congregations were established around Edessa, among which we must presume there existed a certain degree of organized union, for a synod at Edessa discussed the question of the date of Easter.[117] Tatian may have compiled his *Diatessaron* for these communities. The consecration of Bishop Palut for the see of Edessa, which took place at Antioch about the year 190, shows Antioch's interest in this promising mission-field, which was soon to be contested by various heretics. That the royal house was converted to Christianity in the second century and that Christianity was established as the State religion has often been accepted as fact; it remains, however, open to question.[118] The destruction of a Christian church at Edessa in the flood of 201 is evidence of a well developed ecclesiastical organization. Bardesanes mentions regular Sunday assemblies and fasting on particular days.[119] It is characteristic of the young Syrian church that it did not confine itself to the cities, but from the beginning concerned itself with the evangelization of the country folk. From Edessa Christianity penetrated farther east into Mesopotamia, thanks to the labours of the missionary Addai.

---

[114] Cf. *Harnack Miss* 638–43.

[115] See above, chapter 14.

[116] Cf. I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Gr* 15 (1934), 84–86.

[117] *Euseb.* HE 5, 23, 4.

[118] I. Ortiz de Urbina, *loc. cit.*, 86–91.

[119] Cf. H. H. Schaeder, "Bardesanes von Edessa" in *ZKG* 51 (1932), 21–74, esp. 72.

Whereas southern Arabia appears to have had no Christians for a long time, northern Arabia or Transjordan shows evidence that Christianity was known there in the first and second centuries. "Arabs" were represented among the Jews and proselytes staying in Jerusalem at the first Pentecost (Acts 2:11). The faith may also have been brought to the lands east of the Jordan by Jewish Christians fleeing from Jerusalem and Palestine. The apologist Ariston, who wrote his *Dialogue between Jason and Papiskos concerning Christ* shortly before the middle of the second century, belonged to the congregation of Pella.[120] But before the third century there can have been only individual Arab conversions, most likely in cities such as Bostra, which had come into contact with Hellenistic civilization.

The beginnings of Christianity in Egypt are obscure, in spite of the discovery of numerous papyri of the first and second centuries. As the account of the founding of the Egyptian church by Peter is based on later legends,[121] the fragment of John's Gospel on papyri of the early second century may be regarded as the earliest proof of the presence of Christians on Egyptian soil.[122] We must also bear in mind that the Gnostic mission had more initial success there than orthodox Christianity, of the existence of which in Alexandria we have no clear evidence dating from before the last two decades of the second century. Pantaenus is the first mentioned preacher of the Christian faith; about the year 190 Bishop Demetrios was the head of an already considerable congregation, consciously preparing for the growth of the Church in the third century.

Besides the district of Osrhoëne, the provinces of Asia Minor were the most receptive to Christian preaching in the second century. Both inland and on the west coast, missionaries could continue to build on the foundations laid by Paul. Even by the end of the first century a number of cities in the west of Asia Minor had organized churches (Apoc 2–3) in addition to those founded by the apostle. Ignatius of Antioch maintained relations with these and with the churches of Magnesia and Tralles. The testimony of Pliny is particularly significant: he states that about the year 112 there was in Bithynia a considerable Christian rural population.[123] In the following decades the names of cities in Asia Minor in which Christianity had gained a footing continued to multiply; they are found in nearly all provinces.[124] The correspondence of Dionysius, Bishop of

---

[120] *Quasten P,* I, 195 f.

[121] *Euseb. HE* 2, 16.

[122] See above, chapter 7, note 4.

[123] Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 10, 96.

[124] *Harnack Miss* 737 f.

Corinth, of which Eusebius tells us,[125] is addressed to a whole series of congregations, such as those of Nicomedia, Amastris, and "the communities in Pontus". It shows us a well-organized Christianity, able, in the synods of the eighties, effectively to oppose the Montanist movement.[126] Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus could point to the glorious Christian tradition of his congregation, which gave it a special place among those of the west coast.[127]

In Crete the churches of Gortyna and Knossos are now known by name, as the correspondence of Dionysius of Corinth shows,[128] whereas we have no information about the growth of the Pauline foundations in Cilicia and Cyprus during the second century. Compared with the rapid expansion of Christianity in Asia Minor, the areas of Greece and Macedonia evangelized by Paul clearly lagged behind. Corinth surpassed all other churches in the intensity of its life, which, under Dionysius, attained a high degree of ecclesiastical organization. Athens, at this time gave to the Church the apologist Aristides. We have no reliable information about attempts at christianizing the Danubian provinces in the second century; Christians among the soldiers stationed there may have won occasional converts to their faith.[129]

In the Latin West, the growth of the Christian congregation at Rome was probably greatest. The letter of Clement, Bishop of Rome, to the church of Corinth shows that despite the persecutions under Nero and Domitian the Gospel had gained many more believers before the end of the first century, though these may have been largely non-Romans.[130] The respect in which the Roman church was held appears from the powerful attraction it exercised upon the Christians of the eastern provinces; Ignatius speaks of it, as we have seen, with expressions of the deepest reverence. Marcion, Aberkios, Hegesippus and Irenaeus, Valentinus and Theodotos, Justin, Tatian, and Polycarp of Smyrna — all travelled for various reasons to the capital in the West; some to seek recognition for their peculiar doctrines, others to learn there the true Christian teaching or to work for the peace of the Church. Hermas, still writing in Greek, gives us a glimpse of ecclesiastical life in Rome with its everyday problems. With Bishop Victor towards the end of the second century the Latin element begins to predominate.[131] The educated Greek Justin set himself a missionary task in Rome when, in a school like those of classical Greece, he taught "the true philosophy" to interested persons among the intellectuals of the capital. From the extensive charitable activity which the Roman congregation was able to carry on in the second half of the century[132] we may conclude that its membership was considerable. There is little evidence concerning Christian advances in other parts of Italy during the second century. One might well expect there to have been missionary expeditions from the capital, but, quite possibly, the fact that the majority of the congregation consisted of non-Latins made such undertakings too difficult. At the most, we can say that in the second half of the century some bishoprics had been established south of Rome.

---

[125] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 1–13.

[126] Ibid. 5, 16, 10.

[127] Ibid. 5, 24, 1–6, on which see V. Schultze, *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften*, II/2 (Gütersloh 1926), 107 f.

[128] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 5 7–8.

[129] Cf. *RAC* IV, 166 f.

[130] The list of popes (cf. *Harnack Miss* 818–32) shows predominantly Greek names during this period.

[131] Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 53.

Whereas Sicily does not appear to have been touched by Christian missionaries before the third century, Roman North Africa proved relatively early to be a profitable field for their activity, although we do not know their names nor the route they followed. The first document that gives information about African Christians, the Acts of the martyrs of Scili,[133] already presupposes the existence there of Latin Christianity, for the six Christians who were put to death in July 180 (a later addition to the Acts shows that other Christians of the province fell victims to the persecution) evidently possessed the epistles of Paul in Latin. The place in which a large Christian community first grew up was, naturally enough, the capital, Carthage, where the catechetical and literary work of Tertullian about the year 200 was so extensive that it would have been possible only in a Christian group that was already numerically strong. The way in which the Roman, Scapula, proceeded against the Christians[134] also compels us to assume that a considerable number of Christians had existed for some time in Africa. And if Bishop Agrippinus, about 220, could summon seventy bishops to a synod,[135] we may conclude that intensive evangelization had been going on in the countryside for a considerable period. North Africa is the only large area of the Latin West at this time which can in any way be compared with the mission fields of eastern Syria and Asia Minor.

The populations of the delta and middle valley of the Rhône owed their first contact with Christianity to the commercial relations between Asia Minor and the south coast of Gaul. For the old Greek colony of Massilia this contact must have come quite early.[136] The numerical strength of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, which is implied in the account of forty or fifty Christians of those cities martyred under Marcus Aurelius, also presupposes a long period of development. Irenaeus of Lyons can be regarded as a missionary bishop, concerned for the Celtic population of his adopted homeland; no doubt he intended to preach the Gospel among the Gauls, although, as he himself hints, the language problem was a source of difficulties.[137] To him too we owe our knowledge of Christian congregations then existing "in the Germanies" — probably in the Rhenish provinces with their chief towns of Cologne and Mainz — and in the Spanish provinces.[138] But if Christianity had already penetrated to the frontier towns on the Rhine, it had certainly also reached Trier, situated further inside the frontier and much more frequented by traders. Its relations with the cities of the Rhône valley suggest too the way by which the faith reached the Moselle.

---

[132] Dionysius of Corinth thanks the Roman church for its support of many congregations: *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 10.

[133] Knopf-Krüger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929), 28 f.

[134] Tertull., *Ad Scapul., passim.*

[135] Cyprian, *Ep.* 71, 4.

[136] E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne,* I (Paris 1947), 45.

This survey of the expansion of Christianity in the course of the second century gives a clear impression that the missionary enthusiasm of the primitive Church was still fresh and active. Intensive work continued in the original mission fields of the apostles, with great success in the parts of Asia Minor, where Paul had preached. New areas were opened up, especially in east Syria and Mesopotamia in the Orient, in North Africa, Gaul, Germany, and Spain in the West. The bearers of the Gospel were primarily the congregations and the enthusiasm of individual Christians; there is no indication of a central direction and organization of missionary work. The names of the missionaries are for the most part unknown.

Besides the type of preaching familiar from the apostolic period, new ways of proclaiming the Gospel were being employed. First there was the written word, used by the apologetical writers of the second century, whose intentions were also missionary and propagandist. Then there were some Christians who made use of the classical system of education; as teachers in private schools, they expounded the Christian faith. Finally, the heroic behaviour of the martyrs in times of persecution became a missionary factor of the first importance, gaining for Christianity a body of new adherents which, if not numerically great, was spiritually of the highest quality.

---

[137] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer., praef.* 1, 3; see E. Griffe, *op. cit.* 43.

[138] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 10, 2.

PART TWO

The Great Church of Early Christian Times

(*c.* A.D. 180–324)

Introduction

THE transition to the third century introduces the period of the early Christian Church in which it finally became the "great Church" through a combination of external expansion and inner development. In a space of some one hundred and thirty years an interior stability was attained in organization, ritual, day-to-day parish life and clarity of aim in theological studies. Upon attainment of external freedom, it was immediately possible for the Church to assume the tasks inherent in the promising new situation.

In the first place the decisive missionary advance within the Roman Empire was successfully continued through the third century. This gave both previously existing and new communities of Christians a numerical strength which provided a large degree of immunity to deliberate attack. The organization necessary to cope with this growth was supplied by the formation of larger associations of churches. These developed around certain centres: Antioch in Syria, Alexandria in Egypt, Ephesus in Asia Minor, Caesaria in Pontus, Carthage in North Africa, and Rome, which served the rest of the Latin West. Rome, under such bishops as Callistus, Stephen, and Dionysius, developed a remarkable initiative in the domain of dogmatic teaching, revealing an increasingly distinct awareness of a duty, and a corresponding claim, to leadership within the one great Church.

Everywhere within the Church new forms in liturgy and parish life were created and testify to an intense determination to lead the Christian life. Systematic organization of the catechumenate shows a clear pastoral awareness of the importance of serious introduction to the sacramental world of Christianity. The differentiation of the lower grades of the sacramental order illustrates the clergy's ability to adapt itself to growing pastoral demands. The shock resulting from the large number of Christian defections during the Decian persecution led to thorough reflection, and the regulation of the practice of penance. The rise of the order of ascetics and of the early eremitical movement demonstrated a serious striving after Christian perfection, and laid the foundations for the full growth of monasticism in the fourth century. Various ecclesiastical ordinances served to stabilize liturgical forms in the life of the parish communities; and, in addition, there were at least the beginnings of the separate rites and liturgies which were to characterize the greater groupings within the Church. Christian art developed, and testifies to the growing sureness and confidence of Christian feeling and attitude towards life.

The most enduring effect resulted from the further elaboration of Christian theology in the third century. This development received new impulses from pagan opponents and writers, and from controversies within the Church. The encounter with Middle Platonism proved especially valuable, for it contributed to the rise of the theological school of Alexandria, which had Origen as its outstanding creative figure. Through the work of scholars from Alexandria and Antioch the central position of the Bible in the work of theology was recognized, and great commentaries expounded its significance for faith and religious life. The Trinitarian question formed the centre of an important theological discussion. The monarchical attempt at a solution to this problem was rejected, but a subordinationism was advanced which held the seeds of the fourth century's great dogmatic controversy.

SECTION ONE

The Inner Consolidation of the Church in the Third Century

CHAPTER 18

The Attack of the Pagan State on the Church

The Persecutions under Septimius Severus

WITH the accession of the Syrian dynasty's founder Septimius Severus (193–211), a tranquil phase of potential development, both internally and externally, seemed to begin for Christianity. This emperor soon publicly demonstrated his goodwill towards individual Christians. His contemporary, and fellow-African, Tertullian gives definite and impressive proofs of this attitude.[1] Christians held influential positions at court, as they had under Commodus. For example, Proculus, who had once succeeded in curing the emperor of an illness, lived until the end of his life in the imperial palace; and Prince Caracalla's nurse was a Christian woman. Men and women of Roman senatorial families, whose adherence to the Christian faith was known to the emperor, were openly protected against the mob, while he vouched for their loyalty. It is possible that the emperor's tolerance was encouraged by the Syrian princesses who accompanied his wife Julia Domna to court, for they looked sympathetically on all religious trends, especially those of oriental origin. It is a further indication of the freedom of Christianity in the first years of his reign that, about the year 196, the bishops were able to meet in synods at which the date of Easter was discussed.[2] It is true that proceedings against individual Christians were not unknown, for the legal situation created by the rescript of Trajan was still unaltered. Tertullian's *Liber apologeticus* (*c.* 197) was provoked by the occurrence of such cases. It was not until the tenth year of his reign that Septimius's attitude altered drastically and created a completely new situation for Christianity.

In the year 202 an imperial edict was issued forbidding conversion to Judaism or Christianity under pain of heavy penalties.[3] In practice this meant the abandonment of Trajan's principle *conquirendi non sunt* (they are not to be searched out), for the new ordinance could only be implemented by police supervision of the Church's activities. It was not only the individual Christian who was at the mercy of a denunciation; the Church as an organization was affected. Every activity which aimed at winning new members could be punished; therefore all missionary work would be made impossible and Christianity would slowly die out within the empire. This change in the emperor's attitude is intelligible only if we believe that he had come to recognize that Christians had not attained new religious convictions merely as isolated individuals. He must have realized that their faith bound them together in a universal organized community of belief possessing a strong cohesive power of resistance. For practical reasons of State this development may have seemed undesirable to him, so he hoped to avert it by cutting the Church's artery and making her further growth impossible. The voices of a few Christians who refused military service[4] may have strengthened Septimius in the conviction that the Christian religion was just as dangerous to the maintenance of the order of the State as was the radical opposition of the Montanists to everything connected with it. It was this anxiety which was expressed by Dio Cassius, when he made Maecenas warn Augustus to abhor and punish those who wished to introduce foreign customs into the native Roman religion. They could only give rise to conspiracies and revolutionary machinations against the monarchy, counselled Maecenas, and for the same reason no atheism or black magic should be tolerated.[5] The immediate consequences of the imperial edict showed its purpose even more clearly. In Alexandria and Carthage two places within the empire possessing large Christian communities, the persecution now affected catechumens and newly baptized persons, for they particularly transgressed the new edict. The Christian school of Alexandria, which had led many a pagan religious inquirer to the new faith, was now subjected to such supervision that its teachers were compelled to leave the town in A.D. 202. Six pupils of Origen, who was working at that time as a Christian teacher, were executed. Two of them were still catechumens, and another had only just been baptized.[6] At the beginning of the year 203, a group of catechumens were arrested, and their heroic bearing at their execution forms the theme of one of the most precious accounts of a martyrdom surviving from the third century.[7] The noble Perpetua and her slave Felicitas, together with her teacher Saturus and fellow catechumens Revocatus, Saturninus and Secundulus, were never forgotten in the African Church. The account of their act of testimony to the faith, which may well have been composed by Tertullian, was read and re-read during divine service down to the days of Augustine.[8]

---

[1] Tertullian, *Ad Scap.* 3–4.

[2] *Euseb. HE* 5, 23–5.

[3] Spartianus, *Septim. Sever.* 16, 9: "Iudaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit; idem etiam de Christianis sanxit." Schwarte disputes the genuineness of the last part in "Das angebliche Christengesetz des Septimus Severus" in *Historia* 12 (1963) 185–208.

---

[4] Tertullian, *De cor. passim;* Origen, *Contra Cels.* 5, 33; 7, 26; 8, 70, 73; cf. A. Harnack, *Militia Christi* (Tübingen 1905), 55–75.

[5] Dio Cassius, *Hist. Rom.* 52, 36.

[6] *Euseb. HE* 6, 3, 1; 4, 1–3.

[7] *Passio ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis,* ed. J. van Beek (Nijmegen 1956); an editio minor, *FlorPatr* 43 (Bonn 1938). On Chap. 7 of the*Passio,* see F. J. Dölger, *AuC* II (1930), 1–40; and on Chap. 10, ibid. III (1932), 177–91.

Proceedings against Christians as individuals were also continued. In one instance three Christians of Carthage were condemned to death at the stake; another died in prison.[9] Augustine himself was acquainted with the record of a woman martyr of Carthage, Gudentis, beheaded in 203.[10] From occasional references by Tertullian we can infer that the anti-Christian attitude of various individual Roman officials or the hostility of the pagan populace prompted renewed recourse to the rescript of Trajan. Tertullian's early work *To the Martyrs* (A.D. 197)[11] was addressed to Christians in prison awaiting trial. His later work concerning flight in time of persecution, indicates that under Septimius Severus many African Christians including clerics, escaped arrest through timely flight, or obtained their safety by bribing the police. One such persecution, which took place in Egypt in 202, is expressly attributed by Eusebius to the edict of Septimius against the catechumens. The prefects Laetus and Aquila secured the arrest of Christians from as far away as the Thebaid and had them brought to Alexandria, where they were executed, in many instances after repeated torture.[12] The most outstanding figures among these were Origen's father Leonides, the virgin Potamiaina (who was later held in high honour), her mother Marcella, and the soldier Basilides, who had been prompted by the example of Potamiaina to adopt the Christian faith.[13] One Christian writer was so impressed by the harshness of this wave of persecution that he saw in it the coming approach of Antichrist.[14] For other provinces of the empire the available sources are scanty. In Cappadocia the governor Claudius Herminianus persecuted the Christians because he could not forgive the conversion of his wife to the new faith.[15] It is possible that Alexander, later Bishop of Jerusalem, confessed the faith at this time with other Christians of Cappadocia, just as Bishop Asclepiades of Antioch stood firm under persecution.[16] No reliable information is available on the course of the persecutions in Rome. They either abruptly ceased or died away gradually in the last years of Septimius's reign.

---

[8] Cf. J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme* (Paris 1956), 82.

[9] *Passio ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis* 11, 9.

[10] Augustine, *Sermon* 294: "in natale martyris Gudentis"; see also 284 and 394.

[11] New critical edition by A. Quacquarelli (Rome 1963).

[12] *Euseb. HE* 6, 1; 6, 2, 2.

[13] Ibid. 6, 5, 1–7.

[14] Ibid. 6, 7.

[15] Tertullian, *Ad Scap.* 3.

[16] *Euseb. HE* 6, 8, 7; 6, 11, 4-5.

Certainly Caracalla (211–17) inaugurated a period of religious toleration which was of considerable advantage to Christianity, as was recognized by the early Christian writers themselves. It has indeed been thought that an anti-Christian motive lay behind the so-called *Constitutio Antoniniana* (by which Caracalla in 212 granted Roman citizenship to all free men in the empire), because it made it easier to bring a charge of *laesa maiestas.* But this contention is refuted both by the unrestricted praise that Augustine accords this act[17] and by Caracalla's whole attitude to Christians whom he knew personally. We find them once again in influential positions at court: the freedman Prosenes was private chamberlain under Caracalla,[18] and when, on the emperor's accession to the throne, an amnesty was granted to deportees, Christians were not excepted from it. The proceedings of the proconsul Scapula (211–12) against the Church in the three North African provinces are, therefore, not to be ascribed to an order of Caracalla, but were rather provoked by rigorist tendencies among African Christians. Tertullian was their constant spokesman, advocating rigid principle in such works as *On the Soldier's Crown,* a rejection of military service for Christians.[19] Scapula may have been led to take the steps he did by the jurist Ulpian's publication of the various existing imperial rescripts concerning Christians, in his *De officio proconsulis.*[20] Tertullian leaves no doubt that the methods of execution employed were particularly cruel, though he names only one of the victims: the Christian Mavilus from Hadrumet, who was thrown to the wild beasts.[21]

The short reign of Heliogabalus (218–22)[22] records no event by which his attitude to Christianity can be judged, unless it be his plan to make the cult of the sun-god of Emesa obligatory in the empire. This favourable situation for Christianity improved still further under his successor, Severus Alexander (222–35). The intellectual and religious atmosphere of the court was determined by the emperor's gifted mother, Julia Mamaea. She may be judged to have had definite leanings towards Christianity; a hagiographer of the fifth century actually considered her a Christian. During a stay in Antioch she sent for Origen requesting his presence to discuss religious questions;[23] and Hippolytus of Rome dedicated one of his treatises to her.[24] Her tolerance is reflected in the attitude of the young emperor, who accepted numerous Christians among his closer associates and entrusted the building of the library near the Pantheon to the Christian Julius Africanus.[25] His policy of religious toleration is accurately characterized by a phrase of his biographer in the *Historia Augusta*, which states that he left the Jews their privileges and allowed the Christians to exist.[26] This latter assertion is borne out by the unhampered development of Christian life in the East. Christian inscriptions of this period are found in great numbers in Asia Minor, and it was possible to erect a Christian place of worship in Dura-Europos before 234. In the West Christian burial was now organized quite freely at Rome.[27] It is characteristic that no legal proceedings against a Christian and no Christian martyrdom can with certainty be assigned to Alexander's time.

---

[17] Augustine, *De civitate dei,* 5, 17.

[18] Cf. L. Hertling–E. Kirschbaum, *Die römischen Katakomben und ihre Martyrer* (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1955), 213.

[19] *De cor. passim; De idol.* 17.

[20] Lactantius, *De inst. div.* 5, 11, 18.

[21] Cf. *Ad. Scap.* as a whole; and on Mavilus, ibid. c. 3.

[22] K. Gross, "Elagabal" in *RAC* IV, 998 ff.

[23] *Euseb. HE* 6, 21, 3–4.

[24] *Quasten P,* II, 197.

A reaction did not occur until the reign of the former guards officer Maximinus (235–8). The change of policy first affected the numerous Christians at court; but, as Eubesius emphasizes,[28] it was directed principally against the Church's leaders. To that extent it introduced a new note into the anti-Christian actions of an emperor. Had this reign lasted longer, it could have been of grave consequence for the Church. In Rome itself, it can be established that the two Christian leaders there, namely Bishop Pontianus and the priest Hippolytus, were deported to Sardinia, where both died.[29] Origen reports the danger to some Christians; it was at this time that he dedicated his *Exhortation to Martyrdom* to his friend Ambrose and the priest Protoctetus. A typical reaction of the pagan masses produced an attack on the Christians in Cappadocia following an earthquake, for which they regarded the Christians as responsible.[30]

The struggle for power by the soldier emperors who followed left them no leisure to occupy themselves with the question of the Christians. But in Philippus Arabs (244–9) a ruler came to power who showed such sympathy for the Christians that a complete reconciliation seemed possible between Christianity and the government of the Roman State. Indeed Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria tells us that about twelve years after Philippus' death many people were saying that the emperor had been in fact a Christian; Eusebius mentions the claim as merely talk.[31] On the basis of another unconfirmed rumour that the emperor once joined the crowd of penitents in a Christian congregation before Easter, hagiography wove the assertion that Philippus was the first Roman emperor to have accepted Christianity. But on 21 April 248 the emperor still took an active part in a celebration of the official worship on the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of Rome. And the idea that he was secretly a Christian, but publicly an adherent of the State religion, is not in accord with the attitude of the men of antiquity, to whom a sophistical distinction of that sort was alien. Nevertheless, the rumours indubitably had their root in the high degree of goodwill towards Christianity exhibited by Philippus' government. The consul in office in the year 249 was certainly a Christian.[32] And the emperor's personal inclination and that of his wife Severa are mirrored in the correspondence between the imperial pair and Origen, which Eusebius had, at least in part, available to him.[33] But not even so much sympathy could protect the Christians of Alexandria from an outburst of popular rage in the year 249. A refusal to revile their religion[34] cost many of them their lives.

---

[25] Ibid. 138.

[26] Lampridius, *Alex. Sev.* 22, 4: "Iudaeis privilegia reservavit, Christianos esse passus est."

[27] Cf. also A. Alföldi in *Klio* 31 (1938), 249–53, on his decision favourable to the Christians in a land dispute.

[28] *Euseb. HE* 6, 28.

[29] G. Bovini in *RivAC* 19 (1942), 35–85.

[30] *Euseb. HE* 6, 28; Firminian of Caesarea in Cyprian, *Ep.* 75, 10.

[31] *Euseb. HE* 6, 34; 7, 10, 3.

A retrospective survey of the relations between the Roman State and Christianity in the first half of the third century makes it clear that the phases of really peaceful co-existence, and sometimes of positive toleration, predominate over the waves of harsh persecution. Only twice can the features of a systematic policy against Christianity be observed: first when Septimius Severus made adherence to Christianity an indictable offence; and secondly when Maximinus Thrax took action against the leaders of the Christian communities. For the rest, the haphazard, unsystematic proceedings against individual Christians reveal the vacillating religious policy of the holders of power in the State and of their subordinate authorities in the provinces. The unsettled course adopted by these officials was partly a result of the political decline of the empire under the soldier emperors. At the beginning of the second half of the century the possibility of a definitive reconciliation between State and Church which had emerged under Philippus Arabs, was brusquely reduced to a utopian dream. The emperor Decius came to power and determined to re-establish the old brilliant reputation of the Roman State by restoring its ancient religion.

The Persecution under Decius

The first measures of the new emperor might appear as a typical or common reaction against the rule of a predecessor. Christians were arrested as early as December 249, and in January 250 the head of the Roman community,

---

[32] J. Moreau, *op. cit.* 92.

[33] *Euseb. HE* 6, 36, 3.

[34] Ibid. 6, 41, 1–9.

Bishop Fabian, was put to death.[35] A general edict in 250, however, soon proved that Decius was pursuing aims concerning the Christians which far exceeded those of his predecessors. The text of his edict has not been preserved, but its contents can be largely reconstructed from contemporary sources. All the inhabitants of the empire were summoned to take part in a general sacrifice to the gods, a *supplicatio*. This appeared to be a summons to the people for the purpose of invoking the protection of the gods. They were to entreat for the well-being of the empire by an impressive and unanimous demonstration. But it was significant that, at the same time, exact supervision of the edict's implementation was ordered throughout the empire. Commissions were set up to see that the sacrifice was performed, and to issue everyone with a certificate, or *libellus*.[36] Before a certain date the *libelli* were to be exhibited to the authorities; and anyone refusing to sacrifice was thrown into prison, where attempts were often made to break his resistance by torture. Although the decree did not explicitly condemn the Christians, their leading representatives and writers rightly considered it to be the most serious attack that their Church had yet sustained. It is impossible to state with precision what motive exercised greater influence upon the emperor: the opportunity to determine the exact number of adherents to Christianity, or the expectation of a mass return to the old State religion. The undoubted initial success of the measures favours the latter motive. The bitter laments of the bishops Dionysius of Alexandria and Cyprian of Carthage leave no doubt that the number of those who in one way or another met the demand of the edict especially in Egypt and North Africa, far exceeded the number of those who refused it. What Origen had recently remarked was verified to a terrifying extent: the heroic days of his youth were past. That former spirit had yielded to the laxity and barrenness of the present.[37] Some of the Christians of Alexandria appeared before the commission trembling with fear, and performed the sacrificial rite as required; others denied that they had ever been Christians, and still others fled. Many offered sacrifice when on the point of arrest; others endured a few days in prison refusing to sacrifice until they were due to appear in court; and some submitted only after torture.[38] In North Africa many Christians thought they could avoid a decision by not actually offering sacrifice. They secured for themselves from a member of the verification commission, through bribery or other means, a certificate of having done so. These were the so-called *libellatici*, whose fault was not considered as grave as that of the *thurificati* who offered incense or of the *sacrificati* who offered a full sacrifice before the image of the gods.[39] In Rome, some Christians resorted to the device of having their *libelli* taken and attested by intermediaries.[40] The large number of the *lapsi* in North Africa is proved by Cyprian's statement that, when the danger slackened, they flocked to those who had confessed the faith, in order to obtain "letters of peace" from them and facilitate their readmission into the Christian community.[41] The Bishop of Carthage felt it particularly disturbing that two of his own fellow-bishops in North Africa were among those who fell away. One of them had even persuaded the majority of his flock to offer sacrifice, and the other subsequently wished to remain in office without making atonement. He had also to number two Spanish bishops among the *libellatici*.[42] In the East, the martyr Pionius saw his own bishop zealously arranging the precise accomplishment of the ritual of sacrifice.[43]

---

[35] Cyprian, *Ep.* 37, 2; 6, 3–9, 1. Cf. *Duchesne LP*, I 4.

[36] Forty-three such *libelli* have been found so far on Egyptian papyri.

[37] Origen, *In Ierem. hom.* 4, 3.

[38] *Euseb. HE* 6, 41, 10–13.

In contrast to these, however, there was in every province of the empire an *élite* ready to answer for their belief with their lives. Here, too, Cyprian's letters provide the most informative account of the situation in North Africa. He had sought out a place of refuge in the neighbourhood of Carthage, but was able to keep in touch with his flock by correspondence and convey words of encouragement and consolation to the Christians who were already under arrest. Those in prison, including many women and children, showed an intense and genuine longing for martyrdom that was not always fulfilled, for many were released even before the end of the persecution. Cyprian deplored the pride and moral lapses by which some of these latter detracted from the worth of their true confession of faith, but he was able to enroll others among his clergy, so exemplary was their behaviour. Cyprian does not give exact figures regarding those who offered the sacrifices, and names only a few of the *confessores*.[44] Naturally, the number of those put to death, the *martyres coronati* or *consummati*, was smaller by comparison. Cyprian mentions two by name, but presupposes a larger number. The confessor Lucianus once mentions sixteen by name, most of whom were left to die of hunger in prison.[45] In Rome, too, Christians were released from gaol after resolutely confessing their faith, among them a certain Celerinus whose brave bearing so impressed the emperor Decius that he gave him his freedom; Cyprian later ordained him lector.[46] The case of the two Spanish bishops mentioned above reveals that the commission was effective in Spain, but we have no certain information about Gaul. For Egypt, Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria mentions the kind of death suffered by fourteen martyrs: ten of them died at the stake and four by the sword. But he knew of numerous other martyrs in the towns and villages of that country, just as he knew that many Christians died of hunger and cold while fleeing from persecution. Finally, he mentions also a group of five Christian soldiers who voluntarily confessed their faith when they encouraged a waverer to stand fast; because of their outspoken courage the court left them unmolested.[47] In neighbouring Palestine Bishop Alexander of Jerusalem died a martyr's death at that time, as did Bishop Babylas, the leader of the Antioch community.[48] The aged Origen's longing for martyrdom was at least partly satisfied in Caesaria where he was subjected to cruel torture. The fundamentally trustworthy account of the five Christians of Smyrna who were imprisoned, and of whom Pionius was burnt to death, is the only echo of the effects of the Decian persecution in Asia proconsularis.[49] Gregory of Nyssa provides late and vague reports about events in Pontus: he tells us that numerous Christians were arrested under Decius, while their bishop, Gregory Thaumaturgus, fled with many others.[50] A host of further accounts of early Christian martyrs places the death of their heroes in Decius's reign. As sources they are worthless, for the cult of these alleged martyrs cannot in any way be substantiated and perhaps their martyrdom was attributed to Decius's persecution only because he had acquired the reputation in later times of being one of the cruellest persecutors of the Christians.[51]

---

[39] Cyprian, *De laps. passim,* and *Ep.* 55, 2.

[40] Ibid. *Ep.* 30, 3.

[41] *Ep.* 20, 2.

[42] *Ep.* 65, 1; 59, 10; 67, 6.

[43] *Mart. Pionii* 15, 2; 16, 1; 18, 12.

[44] Cyprian, *Ep.* 6, 10, 13, 38, 40.

[45] *Ep.* 10 and 22.

[46] *Ep.* 37 and 39.

The rapid cessation of the Decian persecution is in a sense surprising. One would have expected that the considerable initial success attained by such shock tactics would have been exploited and deepened by further systematic measures. The impression gained is that the administrative apparatus was overtaxed by so extensive an undertaking. The departure of the emperor for the Danubian provinces, occasioned by a new invasion of the Goths, halted it completely; and his death on the battle-field prevented its rapid resumption. From the point of view of Roman government, no tangible and lasting success was gained by this calculated and systematic attack on the Catholic Church. The great mass of those who had fallen away soon clamoured to be received into the Church again, while many *libellatici* atoned for their fault by a new confession of faith shortly after their lapse. The number of former Christians won over to the State religion does not seem to have been particularly high. The Christian community, for its part, recognized that much within it was decayed and ready to crumble. Conscious leaders of communities, like Cyprian, were spurred by this condition to serious reflection, which after long controversies about the question of penance, was to lead to a regeneration of the Church.

---

[47] *Euseb. HE* 6, 41, 14–23; 6, 42, 1–4.

[48] Ibid. 6, 39, 2–5.

[49] Text in Knopf–Krüger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929), 45–57; on this cf. *Delehaye PM*, 28–37.

[50] Gregory of Nyssa, *Panegyr. in Greg. Thaumat.* in *PG* 46, 944–53, esp. 945 D.

[51] *Delehaye PM*, 239 ff.

Valerian and Gallienus

The ensuing seven years of tranquillity for the Church (250–7) were disturbed only by a short wave of persecution in Rome. The emperor Trebonius Gallus had Cornelius, the head of the Christian community in Rome, arrested and exiled to Centum Cellae (Cività Vecchia), where he died in 253.[52] The latter's successor, Lucius (253–4),[53] was likewise banished, but the death of the emperor soon permitted his return to Rome. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, reports arrests in Egypt also occurring at that time.[54] Gallus's repressive action was probably aimed at indulging popular sentiment, which blamed the Christians for the plague then devastating the empire. The first years of the reign of his successor, Valerian (253–60) produced for the Church a situation which Dionysius of Alexandria celebrates in enthusiastic tones. No predecessor of Valerian had been so well-disposed towards the Christians. Indeed so friendly was Valerian's attitude that his household was, so to speak, one of God's communities.[55] But the fourth year of the emperor's reign brought a surprising change, introducing a short but extremely harsh and violent persecution. Like that of Decius, this policy could have proved a severe threat to the Church, because it too was based on a well-considered plan. Dionysius blames the emperor's minister and later usurper, Macrianus, for this reaction. Macrianus certainly may have suggested the idea of remedying the precarious financial state of the empire by confiscating the property of wealthy Christians. Valerian was probably also impelled by the threatening situation of the empire in general. He sought to counter a possible threat from within by a radical move against the Christians. The plan is clear even in the edict of 257: the blow was to strike the clergy; bishops, priests, and deacons were to be obliged to offer sacrifice to the gods and any of them celebrating divine worship or holding assemblies in the cemeteries were to be punished with death.[56] In North Africa and Egypt, the leaders of the churches, Cyprian and Dionysius, were at once arrested; and, in addition, many Christians of the African provinces were condemned to forced labour in the mines. The edict of 258 took a further decisive step: clerics who refused the sacrifice were to be immediately put to death. But this time the leading laity in the Christian communities were also included. Senators and members of the order of knights were to lose their rank and possessions, as were their wives; the latter could be punished with banishment and their husbands with execution, if they refused to offer sacrifice to the gods. Imperial officials in Rome and the provinces, the *caesariani*, were also threatened with forced labour and the confiscation of their possessions for similar offence.[57] The aim of this policy was clear: the clergy and prominent members of the Christian communities, who enjoyed wealth and position, were to be eliminated; and the Christians, thus deprived of leaders and influence, were to be condemned to insignificance. The victims were numerous, especially among the clergy. North Africa lost its outstanding bishop in Cyprian, who met his death with unforgettable dignity. His flock showed their love and respect once again when he was beheaded, soaking cloths in his blood and interring his remains with reverent joy.[58] Rome had its most distinguished martyr in Pope Sixtus II, who was joined in death by his deacons.[59] There is an authentic account of the death of the Spanish bishop, Fructuosus of Tarragona, and two of his deacons.[60] The head of the Egyptian church, Dionysius of Alexandria, was condemned only to an exile which he survived.[61] The victims were also numerous among the lower clergy: in May 259, the deacon James and the lector Marianus[62] died in Lambaesis, North Africa; there were clerics also in the group with Lucius and Montanus.[63] The deacon Laurence, later transfigured by legend, achieved the greatest posthumous fame among the Roman victims of this persecution.[64] The report of the historian Socrates that Novatian also died for his Christian convictions in the reign of Valerian was formerly treated with some reserve. It has recently received considerable support from the discovery of an epitaph which a certain deacon Gaudentius dedicated "to the blessed martyr Novatian".[65] The proportion of laity among the victims of the persecution was not inconsiderable: it was probably quite large in Egypt[66] and highest in North Africa.

---

[52] *Duchesne LP,* I, 150ff.; Cyprian, *Ep.* 60 and 61.

[53] Cyprian, *Ep.* 61, 1.

[54] *Euseb. HE* 7, 1.

[55] Ibid. 7, 10, 3.

[56] Cf. A. Alföldi, "Der Rechtsstreit zwischen der römischen Kirche und dem Verein der popinarii" in *Klio* 31 (1938), 323–48.

---

[57] Cyprian, *Ep.* 80.

[58] *Acta Cypr.* in *CSEL* 3, 3, CX–CXIV; Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 62–64 (with bibliography).

[59] Cyprian, *Ep.* 80, I.

[60] Text in Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 83–85; on this cf. P. Franchi de Cavalieri in *SteT* 65 (1935), 183–99, and J. Serra-Vilarò, *Fructuós, Auguri i Eulogi, martirs sants de Tarragona* (Tarragona 1936).

[61] *Euseb. HE* 7, 11, 4–6.

[62] *Martyr. ss. Mariani et Iacobi*, Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 67–74.

[63] Ibid. 74–82.

[64] H. Delehaye in *AnBoll* 51 (1938), 34–98.

[65] *Socrates HE* 4, 28; cf. C. Mohlberg in *ELit* 51 (1937), 242–9; and A. Ferrua in *CivCatt* 4 (1944), 232–9.

The persecution ceased with the tragic end of the emperor who was taken prisoner by the Persians in 259 and soon died. The general impression left by the attitude of the Christians on this occasion is far more favourable than in their previous tribulation. Only in one African record of martyrdom is there a mention of lapsed Christians. The shock of the Decian persecution had produced its salutary effect; the Christians met this trial with far more calm determination than they had displayed eight years previously, and withstood it extremely well. The political situation both at home and abroad would have prevented Valerian's son and successor, Gallienus (260–8), from continuing the fight against the Christians. But he was not content, with a merely tacit cessation of the persecution and issued an edict of his own in the Christians' favour. This is referred to in a further rescript of 262 to Dionysius of Alexandria. In this the emperor says that he had restored their places of worship to the Christians some time previously, and that nobody was to molest them in these places.[67] This recognition of ecclesiastical property by the highest civil authority represented a far-reaching act of toleration, and had a favourable effect on the future of the Church. Although Christianity was not yet officially recognized thereby as a *religio licita,* nevertheless there began with Gallienus' edict a period of peace which lasted more than forty years, and which could not but further its development both within and without. It was with good cause that Eusebius celebrated this time as a period of glory and freedom for Christianity. It was possible to build churches without hindrance, and preach to the barbarians and Greeks, while Christians occupied high offices of State, and enjoyed warm sympathy everywhere.[68]

---

[66] Cyprian, *Ep.* 76 and 80, and *Euseb. HE* 7, 11, 18–26.

[67] *Euseb. HE* 7, 13.

[68] Ibid. 8, 1, 1–6.

CHAPTER 19

Further Development of Christian Literature in the East in the Third Century

The Beginnings of the Theological School of Alexandria

THE inner consolidation of Christianity in the third century is particularly evident and impressive in the domain of early patristic literature. More and more frequently, members of the ruling classes joined the new faith and felt impelled to serve it by word and writing in ways which corresponded with their level of culture. This created an essential condition for the development of a learned theology. The earliest attempts of this kind are found of course as early as the second century, when educated converts such as Justin and his pupil Tatian presented themselves publicly in Rome as teachers of the "new philosophy", and gave a well-grounded introduction to the understanding of the Christian faith to a relatively small circle of pupils.[1]

The "schools" of these teachers were not, however, institutions of the Roman Christian community itself, but private undertakings by learned Christians. Out of a sense of missionary obligation, and in the manner of philosophical teachers of the time, these men expounded their religious beliefs to a circle of those who might be interested, and substantiated them by constant comparison with other religious trends. In a similar manner Gnostics like Apelles, Synerus, and Ptolemy, appeared in Rome as private teachers; and men like Theodotus from Byzantium and perhaps Praxeas, too, tried within the framework of such private schools to win support for their particular Monarchian views. While no objection was raised against the teaching activities of orthodox laymen like Justin, the authorities of the Roman community took exception to the activities of Gnostic or Monarchian teachers, and finally excluded them from the community of the Church. These problems induced the Roman bishops of the third century to seek to bring private Christian schools under their control and to transform them into a purely ecclesiastical institution which would administer the instruction of the catechumens. No theological school within the proper sense of the word developed either in Rome or elsewhere in the Latin West, because certain conditions of an intellectual kind were just not present. Neither were the personalities to whom they might have been of use. But both prerequisites were existent in great quantity in the East.

---

[1] Tatian's pupil Rhodon must also be reckoned among these; he attracted some attention by his controversy with the Marcionite Apelles, cf. *Euseb. HE* 5, 13, 5–7.

Christian Schools in the East

In the Greek East the Egyptian capital, Alexandria, with its scientific tradition and the interest generally shown by its educated upper classes in religious and philosophical questions, was to prove the most favourable soil for the development of a Christian theology on a learned intellectual basis. By establishing the two great libraries of the Sarapeion and the Museion, the first Ptolemies had laid the foundation of that lively interest in the most varied branches of learning which had developed in Alexander's city during the Hellenistic period. This cultural development, especially in the areas of Hellenistic literature and neo-Platonic philosophy, helped to create a general atmosphere which was to prove particularly fruitful when it encountered Christianity. Educated Alexandrians who had adopted the Christian religion were inevitably moved to confront it with the intense cultural life around them; and those of them who felt impelled publicly to account for their faith became the first Christian teachers in the Egyptian capital. The available sources of information about the beginnings of Christian teaching in Alexandria are not very rich; only Eusebius speaks of them in any detail, and his treatment is relatively late and rather uncritical. Nevertheless, the intensive research of recent years has produced some reliable results. According to these sources it is impossible to speak of a "school of catechists in Alexandria" as early as the end of the second century.

The first Christian teacher whose name is known is Pantainus, of Sicilian origin, who was giving lessons about the year 180, expounding and defending his Christian view of the world; but he was teaching without ecclesiastical appointment, just as Justin or Tatian had earlier done in Rome. Any interested person, pagan or Christian, could frequent this private school, and the syllabus was entirely a matter for the teacher's judgment. Clement of Alexandria must be considered to have been the second teacher of this kind, but he cannot be regarded as the successor of Pantainus at the head of any school. He publicly taught the "true gnosis" independently of, and perhaps even simultaneously with Pantainus. The first phase of Origen's teaching activity still had this private character. At the request of some friends who were interested in the Christian religion, he gave up his position in a grammar school and devoted himself as an independent teacher to instruction in the Christian religion, which was clearly open to Christians and pagans alike. It was only later,[2] perhaps about 215, that he undertook the instruction of catechumens at the request of Bishop

---

[2] There are contradictions in Eusebius's account. It seems extremely unlikely that a young man of seventeen would be placed in charge of a school for catechumens; cf. M. Hornschuh, in *ZKG* 71 (1960), 203–7.

Demetrius,[3] and so became the ecclesiastically-appointed head of a catechetical school. He soon further expanded this role assigning the actual teaching of the catechumens to his friend Heraclas, certainly with the consent of the bishop. He provided a circle of educated persons and advanced students with a systematic exposition of the philosophic knowledge of the age, crowned by instruction in the Christian religion.[4] In this respect, Origen had taken a decisive step; the work which Clement before him had undertaken as a private teacher was now placed directly at the service of the church of Alexandria, which thereby received a school of its own in which instruction in the Christian religion was given in no way inferior in quality to the contemporary pagan course of education. This institution alone has a claim to the title of a theological school. It is true that its real importance was due to the intellectual quality of the man who was its leader and soul until the year 230. And it is not surprising that Origen's bold step was received with some reserve: he soon had to defend himself against the accusation of attributing too much importance to profane philosophy,[5] but the success and enthusiastic support of his students made him keep to the path he had taken. When the rift between Origen and Bishop Demetrius led to his quitting the country, the Alexandrian school of theologians quickly reverted to a simple school for catechumens, giving to those seeking baptism their first introduction to the Christian religion. Origen took the nature and spirit of his foundation with him to Caesarea and Palestine. Here he tried until his death to realize his ideal of a Christian institute for advanced teaching, this time with the full approval of the Palestinian episcopate.

After Origen's death, it is only possible to speak of an Alexandrian theological school in a wider sense; we can only denote a theology bearing the characteristic marks which the two first great Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, gave it: namely, the drawing of philosophy into the service of theology, a predilection for the allegorical method of scriptural exegesis, and a strong tendency to penetrate by speculation on an idealistic basis the supernatural content of the truths of revelation.

Clement of Alexandria

While none of the writings of the first Alexandrian teacher, has come down to us,[6] three longer works and a small treatise survive from the pen of

---

[3] *Euseb. HE* 6, 14, 11.

[4] Ibid. 6, 18, 3–4. Origen expounds his educational ideal in a letter to his pupil Gregory of Neo-Caesarea: *Ep. ad Greg.* 1.

[5] *Euseb. HE* 6, 19, 13–14.

[6] H.-I. Marrou considers he may well be the author of the *Letter to Diognetus;* cf. Marrou's ed., *SourcesChr* 33 (1951), 266 ff.

Clement. Though they are merely the remnants of a more extensive production, they permit us to form an impression of his characteristics as a writer, his theological interests, and the aim of his teaching. Clement was the son of a pagan family of Athens, became a Christian in adult life and, after extensive travels, reached Alexandria towards the end of the second century. There he was active as a Christian teacher until the persecution under Septimius Severus forced him to emigrate to Asia Minor about the year 202, and he died still in this area, about 215.

Clement's secular learning is shown by the very title of the first of the three main works mentioned above. On the model of Aristotle, Epicurus, and Chrysippus, he too wrote a *Protrepticus,* a discourse of admonition and propaganda, which presupposes educated pagan readers who are to be won over to his "philosophy". His aim is, therefore, in fact the same as that of previous apologists, but his work is far superior to their writings in form and tone. Naturally, in a Christian apologia, polemic against pagan polytheism could not be lacking, but it is conducted by Clement in a calm and thoughtful manner. He concedes that many of the pagan philosophers, Plato above all, were on the way to a knowledge of the true God; but full knowledge, and with it eternal salvation and the satisfaction of all human aspiration, was only brought by the Logos, Jesus Christ, who summons all men, Hellenes and barbarians, to follow him. A level of discourse on the Christian faith was here attained that had not been known before, and one which could appeal to a cultivated pagan. Many a discerning reader must have had the impression that inquiry into this religion and discussion with its enthusiastic spokesman might be worthwhile.

Anyone who allows himself to be won over as a follower of the Logos must entrust himself absolutely to the latter's educative power. Clement's second main work, the *Paidagogus,* is therefore intended as a guide in this respect, and at the same time as an aid to training in Christian things. The fundamental attitude required is first developed: the Logos-Paidagogos has provided by his life and commands in Holy Scripture the standards by which the life of a Christian should be directed; the Christian who acts in accordance with them fulfills to a higher degree the "duties" to which, for example, an adherent of the Stoic philosophy knows he is obliged, since the demands of the Logos are in the fullest sense "in conformity with reason". Clement illustrates the application of this basic principle with many examples from daily life, and displays a gift of discernment and a balanced and fundamentally affirmative attitude to cultural values. Both Christian ascesis and Christian love of one's neighbour must prove themselves in the actual circumstances of civilization. The magnificent hymn to the Paidagogus Christ, which ends this work,[7] effectively emphasizes the position occupied by the person of Christ in Clement's personal piety.

---

[7] *Paidag.* 3, 12, 101.

Their formal treatment and intellectual structure show that the *Protrepticus* and the *Paidagogus* are essentially related works. The second further suggests[8] that Clement intended to complete a literary trilogy with another work, the *Didascalos,* which was to follow the others and offer a systematic exposition of the chief doctrines of Christianity. But the third surviving work, the *Stromata,* cannot be considered as the conclusion of this trilogy, for its themes are quite different from those announced, and in style and form it in no way corresponds to the first and second studies. The title itself indicates its literary category: a number and variety of questions are treated in an informal manner, as in the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus, or the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, and are intended in the first place to appeal to pagans interested in religious and philosophical matters. There is good reason to think that these questions relate to the themes which Clement treated in his oral teaching, and that consequently their very form reveals the marks of their origin.[9] One purpose certainly pervades the whole work: to prove by reasoned confrontation with contemporary Gnosticism that the Christian religion is the only true gnosis, and to represent the faithful Christian as the true Gnostic.

At baptism every Christian receives the Holy Spirit and thereby the capacity to rise from simple belief to an ever more perfect knowledge; but only those rise to attain it in fact who perpetually strive to do so, and who struggle for ever greater perfection in their manner of life. Only by an increasing effort of self-education and by penetrating more and more deeply into the gospel, and that solely within the Church, which is the "only virgin Mother",[10] does a man become a true Gnostic and so surpass the cultural ideal of the "wise man" of pagan philosophy. That pagan ideal certainly represents a value which must be acknowledged, but it is only a preliminary stage. The model of the Christian Gnostic is the figure of Christ, whom he must come to resemble, and by following whom he becomes an image of God.[11] Linked with this is a perpetual growth in the love of God, which makes possible for the Gnostic a life of unceasing prayer, makes him see God and imparts to him a resemblance to God. This ascent from step to step, does not, however, remove the true Gnostic from the company of his brethren to whom such an ascent has not been granted; rather does he serve them, ever ready to help, and summons them to follow his path by the example of the purity of his life. Such practical questions of actual living stand in the centre of Clement's thought and teaching. Speculative theological problems occupy only the fringe of his interests. He takes over the idea of the Logos from St John, but does not penetrate more deeply into it. The Logos is united with the Father and the Holy Spirit in the divine Trias; the world was created by him, and he revealed God with increasing clarity, first in the Jewish Law, then in Greek philosophy, and finally in becoming man. By his blood mankind was redeemed, and men still drink his blood in order to share in his immortality.[12] The Redeemer Christ recedes, for Clement, behind the Logos as teacher and lawgiver. He did not further speculative theology properly so-called, but he is the first comprehensive theorist of Christian striving after perfection, and posterity allowed him to be forgotten far too readily.

---

[8] Ibid. 1, 1, 3.

[9] Cf. A. Knauber in *TThZ* 60 (1951), 249ff.

[10] *Paidag.* 1, 6, 42.

[11] *Strom.* 7, 13, 2.

Origen

Fortune did not favour the life-work of Origen, the greatest of the Alexandrian teachers and the most important theologian of Eastern Christianity. The greater part of his writings has perished because the violent quarrels which broke out concerning his orthodoxy led to his condemnation by the Synod of Constantinople in 553. As a consequence, his theological reputation suffered for a long time, and the reading of his works was proscribed. Few of these works remain in his Greek mother-tongue, and the greater part of his biblical homilies has survived only in Latin translations, notably those by Jerome and Rufinus. Friends and admirers in the third and fourth centuries preserved a little of his canon and this helps to throw light on the aim and purpose of his life's work, the most useful of this evidence being preserved in the sixth book of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Though this sketch is transfigured by retrospect vision, Eusebius had at his disposal a collection of Origen's letters, and obtained many details from men who had known him personally in Caesarea.

The first decisive influence on Origen was that of the Christian atmosphere of his parents' home.[13] There he inherited and never lost the high courage to confess his faith, and the constant readiness to be active in the ecclesiastical community. An excellent education in secular studies made it possible for him, after the martyr's death of his father, Leonides, to support the family by teaching in a grammar school. Quite soon, while instructing interested pagans in the Christian faith on his own initiative, he felt the need of a deeper philosophical training; and this he found in the lectures of the neo-Platonist Ammonius Saccas, whose influence on him was strong and lasting. Journeys in his early manhood took him to Caesarea in Palestine, where he became a friend of the bishop, Theoctistus, and of Alexander, the head of the Jerusalem community, to Arabia at the invitation of the imperial governor; and also to the West, where he travelled to Rome. These journeys gave him a vivid idea of the life of the Church as a whole, and strengthened his inclination to work everywhere through his lectures for a deeper understanding of Scripture and belief.

---

[12] *Paidag.* 2, 19, 4.

[13] Eusebius's precise details are to be preferred in this to Porphyry's vague allusions to a pagan period in Origen's life. It is certainly correct that Origen was familiar with Greek culture.

His appointment as teacher of the catechumens and his duties as head of the theological school in Alexandria brought his rich intellectual and spiritual powers to full development, and initiated the creative period of his life. This was not fundamentally disturbed when, in the years 230–1, conflict with Bishop Demetrius forced him to transfer his activities to Caesarea in Palestine. The ostensible cause of his estrangement from the local bishop was his ordination to the priesthood without the former's knowledge. It was conferred on him by Palestinian bishops, although Origen, being a eunuch (he had castrated himself in a youthful excess of asceticism), was not, according to the views of the time, a suitable candidate. The deeper reason, however, was the bishop's inability to have a man of such high reputation and intellectual quality by his side. The understanding which was shown to Origen in his second sphere of activity, namely in Palestine, was munificently repaid by him; for, in addition to his actual teaching, he served the life of the Church directly, both by his tireless preaching and by public theological discussions about problems of the day, which repeatedly took him as far as Arabia. He had occasion to crown his fidelity to faith and Church by manfully confessing the faith during the Decian persecution, when he was imprisoned and subjected to cruel torture. About the year 253 or 254 he died in Tyre as a result of this treatment, when nearly seventy years of age.

The kernel of Origen's theological achievement was his work on the Bible, his efforts for its better understanding and the use made of it to create a right attitude in belief and true piety. The bulk of his literary production derived from this concern. It took the form of critical and philological work on the text of Scripture, scientific commentaries on individual books, and finally in his abundant discourses on the Bible, which were recorded by stenographers and later published. These are works of edification; not merely intellectually stimulating, they delve into the ultimate depths of Christian life. The impressive undertaking of the Hexapla[14] served to establish a trustworthy text of the Bible. It presented in six parallel columns the original Hebrew in Hebrew characters, a Greek transcription, the translations by Aquila and Symmachus, the Septuagint and the Theodotion translation. What was probably the only copy of this work was placed in the library of Caesarea, where it could still be consulted in the time of Jerome and even later. A particularly hard fate overtook the great scriptural commentaries; many of which perished completely, or did so with the exception of a few fragments, such as the commentaries on Genesis, the Psalms, Proverbs, Isaias, Ezechiel, the Minor Prophets, Luke, and most of the Epistles of St Paul. Larger portions of the commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles, the Gospels of St Matthew and St John were preserved, partly in Greek and partly in Latin translations. The works which most frequently survived were homilies, particularly esteemed for their pastoral use of the Old Testament. About six hundred of them have come down to us, but only twenty-one in the original Greek.

---

[14] See *Quasten P,* II, 44 ff., and G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae* I (Rome 1958).

It was with an attitude of deepest reverence that Origen undertook this service of Holy Scripture; for in it he encountered the living word of God which it embodies. Consequently, the understanding of Holy Scripture is for him "the art of arts" and "the science of sciences".[15] And just as all events take place in mysteries, so Scripture also is full of mysteries which unveil themselves only to one who implores this revelation in insistent prayer.[16] From this consideration sprang Origen's spontaneous appeals to "his Lord Jesus" to show him the way to a right interpretation of a difficult passage of Scripture.[17] He knew that this is only found when the deeper spiritual and divine sense is recognized, that which is hidden behind the letter is the treasure hidden in a field. That is why the allegorical interpretation of Scripture was not for Origen merely a traditional and easily applied method, taken over from the exposition of secular texts. It was often a compelling necessity for him, absolutely essential if what is sometimes offensive in the purely literal sense of Scripture is to be transcended. Origen was fully aware that allegory has its limits.[18] Nevertheless, in the hand of the master and despite all errors in detail, this method remains the path that leads him to the very heart of Scripture, affording ultimate religious insight and knowledge.

The daily reading of Scripture, to which Origen exhorts us,[19] became for him the well-spring of his personal religious life; and it also made him a teacher of the Christian ideal of striving after perfection, whose subsequent influence was immeasurable: first on Eastern monasticism, and then in the Latin West, by way of St Ambrose. The ultimate goal of the ascent to perfection is the resemblance to God, to which man was called when God created him in his own image and likeness. The surest way to this goal is the imitation of Christ; and to be so centred on Christ is the characteristic attitude of Origen's piety, just as later the principle "Christus" was the basic concept of his pupil, Ambrose of Milan.[20] A man who imitates Christ chooses life and chooses light.[21] A presupposition for the success of this imitation is correct self-knowledge, which brings awareness of one's own sinfulness; and this, in turn, imposes a stubborn fight against the perils which threaten from world and from one's own passions. Only a person who has reached *apatheia* is capable of further mystical ascent, but this cannot be attained without a serious ascetic effort, in which fasting and vigils have their place just as much as the reading of Scripture and the exercise of humility.[22] Those who, following Christ's example, freely choose a celibate life and virginity will more easily reach the goal.[23] The ascent to mystical union with the Logos takes place by degrees, a progress which Origen sees prefigured in the journey of the people of Israel through the desert to the promised land.[24] The profound yearning for Christ is fulfilled in a union with him which is accomplished in the form of a mystical marriage;[25] Christ becomes the bridegroom of the soul, which in a mystical embrace receives the *vulnus amoris.*[26] Origen here is not only the first representative of a profound devotion to Jesus, but also the founder of an already richly developed Christocentric and bridal mysticism, from which the medieval Christocentric spirituality of William of St Thierry and Bernard of Clairvaux derived, and from which it drew considerable substance. In this way the personality of the great Alexandrian had its deepest ultimate influence precisely where it is most authentically evident: in its calm, limpid, and yet ardent love for Christ.

---

[15] *In Ioannem comm.* 13, 46.

[16] *In Exod. hom.* 1, 4; *Ep. ad Greg.* 4.

[17] *In Levit. hom.* 1, 1; 5, 5; *In Matth. comm.* 10, 5.

[18] *In Num. hom.* 9, 1.

[19] *In Gen. hom.* 10, 3.

While in Alexandria, Origen wrote a systematic exposition of the chief doctrines of Christianity. He gave this first dogmatic handbook in the history of Christian theology the title Περὶ ἀρχῶν (Concerning Principles), and dealt in four books with the central questions concerning God, the creation of the world, the fall of man, redemption through Jesus Christ, sin, freedom of the will, and Holy Scripture as a source of belief. The Greek original has perished, as has also the literal Latin translation made by Jerome. This surviving version by Rufinus, has smoothed down or eliminated entirely many things to which objection might be raised. There is, consequently, some uncertainty about the precise view which Origen held on certain questions.[27]

---

[20] Cf. K. Baus, in *RQ* 49 (1954), 26–29.

[21] *In Levit. hom.* 9, 10.

[22] *In Ierem. hom.* 8, 4; *In Exod. hom.* 13, 5.

[23] *In Num. hom.* 24, 2; *In Cant. comm.* 2, 155.

[24] *In Num. hom.* 27.

[25] *In Cant. comm.* 1.

[26] Ibid. 2, 8.

In his introduction, Origen speaks with great clarity about the principles of method which guided him in his work; Scripture and tradition are the two primary sources for his exposition of Christian doctrine. He knows that they cannot be approached with a philosopher's inquiry, but only with the attitude of a believer. The Old and New Testaments, the books of Law, the Prophets and the Epistles of St Paul: all contain the words of Christ and are a rule of life for the Christian, because they are inspired.[28] The authority of the Church guarantees that no spurious writings intrude; only what is accepted in all the communities as indubitably Holy Scripture is free from the suspicion of being apocryphal.[29] Only that truth can be received in faith which does not contradict ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition, and this is found in the teaching of the Church which per *successionis ordinem* was handed down from the apostles.[30] Consequently, the Church is not only intended to be the guardian of Holy Scripture, but is also its authentic interpreter, for she alone has received from Christ the light which enlightens those who dwell in darkness.[31] She is the true Ark in which alone men can find salvation: the house which is marked with the blood of Christ and outside which there is no redemption.[32] She is like a fortified city, and anyone who remains outside her walls is captured and killed by the enemy.[33] Men enter Jesus' house by thinking like the Church and living according to her spirit.[34]

As the rule of faith contains only the necessary fundamental doctrines preached by the apostles, without giving further reasons for them or showing in any detail their inner connexions, a wide field of activity remains open to theology. According to Origen, this is where the task lies for those who are called to it by the Holy Spirit through the special gifts of wisdom and knowledge. Theirs is the vocation of penetrating deeper into the truths of revelation and of framing by an appropriate method a theological system from Scripture and tradition.[35] The execution of his own project makes it plain that Origen was not a born systematizer; he had not the power to carry through his conception on a strictly logical plan. But of much greater weight than this imperfection of form, are the particular theological views which gave rise to the later controversies about their author's orthodoxy. In his doctrine of the Trinity, Origen still thinks in Subordinationist terms: only the Father is ὁ Θεός or αὐτόθεος: the Logos, of course, likewise possesses the divine nature, but in regard to the Father he can only be called δεύτερος Θεός.[36] Yet Origen clearly expresses the eternity of the Logos and characterizes him as ὁμοούσιος;[37] and so an advance is made here as compared with early Subordinationism. Origen, one might say, is on the path that led to Nicaea. In Christology, too, he devises modes of expression which point to the future: the union of the two natures in Christ is so close in his doctrine that the communication of idioms follows from it;[38] as far as can now be traced the term God-man, Θεάνθρωπος, first occurs with Origen, and probably he prepared the way for the term Θεοτόκος.[39] Origen also followed paths of his own in the doctrine of Creation; before the present world, a world of perfect spirits existed to which the souls of men then belonged; these were, therefore, pre-existent. Only a fall from God brought upon them banishment into matter which God then created. The measure of their pre-mundane guilt actually determines the measure of grace which God grants each human being on earth.[40]

---

[27] Cf. M. Harl, "Recherches sur le Περὶ ἀρχῶν d'Origène en vue d'une nouvelle édition" in *Studia Patristica* 3 (Berlin 1961), 57–67.

[28] Origen, *De princ. praef.* 1; *In Matth. comm.* 46.

[29] *De princ. praef.* 8; *In Matth. comm.* 61.

[30] *De princ. praef.* 2.

[31] *In Gen. hom.* 1, 5.

[32] Ibid. 2, 3; *In Jesu Nave hom.* 3, 5.

[33] *In Ierem. hom.* 5, 16.

[34] *Disput. cum Heracl.* 15.

[35] *De princ. praef.* 3 and 10.

All creation strives back towards its origin in God, and so is subjected to a process of purification which can extend over many aeons and in which all souls, even the evil spirits of the demons and Satan himself, are cleansed with increasing effect until they are worthy of resurrection and reunion with God. Then God is once more all-in-all, and the restoration of all things (ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων) is attained.[41] The eternity of hell was practically abandoned as a result of this conception. That a new Fall would be possible after this process and consequently a new creation of the world and a further series of purifications necessary, was presented by Origen merely as an arguable possibility and not as certain Christian teaching. Critics have reproached Origen with further errors in his theology, which might be described as spiritualism and esotericism. By this is meant his tendency to undervalue the material creation and to except the spirit from the need for redemption, and also his tendency to reserve the innermost kernel and meaning of the truths of revelation for the circle of the perfect, the *pneumatikoi*, or the spiritual ones. Both accusations have a certain justification but have often been very much exaggerated. Origen recognized perfectly the proper value of what pertains to the senses and the body, and in fact, saw its importance precisely in its function as an image of a spiritual world that lies behind it. Consequently, he did not call for its annihilation, but for its spiritualization and transfiguration. He was likewise convinced that every baptized person is called on principle to perfection, but that there are many stages on the way to it, and that every stage can assimilate only an appropriate part of the truth of revelation. He believed in consequence that the full grasp of Christian truth is only possible at the final stage.

---

[36] *De princ.* 1, 2, 13; *Contra Cels.* 5, 39.

[37] *In ep. ad Hebr. fragm.*

[38] *De princ.* 2, 6, 3.

[39] *In Ezech. hom.* 3, 3; *In Luc. hom.* 6, 7.

[40] *De princ.* 2, 8 ff.; *Contra Cels.* 1, 32–3.

[41] *De princ.* 1, 6, 1 and 3; 3, 6, 6; *Contra Cels.* 8, 72.

Like every theological achievement, that of Origen must be judged according to the possibilities and conditions which the age provided. He approached theological problems with the equipment and questions of a third-century man trained in philosophy; and most of the defects of his theology can be seen to derive from the limits and conditioning circumstances of this philosophy. But, viewed as a whole, his theological work, and especially his systematic treatise *Concerning Principles,* represents a creative personal achievement and consequently an enormous advance in Christian theology. For a judgment of the whole, the fact is important that the work was inspired by the purest ecclesiastical spirit. For all the independence and freedom of his theological questioning and inquiry, Origen wanted only to serve the Church, and was always ready to submit to her judgment. "If I", he once addressed the Church, "I, who bear the name of priest, and have to preach the word of God, offend against the doctrine of the Church, and the rule of the gospel and were to become a scandal to the Church, then, may the whole Church with unanimous decision cut off me, her right hand, and cast me out."[42] Such an attitude should have prevented posterity from proscribing Origen's work as a whole merely because of particular errors and mistakes, in the way that happened later.

Dionysius of Alexandria; Methodius; Lucian of Antioch and his School

Subsequent teachers in the school of Alexandria, which after Origen's departure, as has been said, assumed once more the character of a school for catechumens, are overshadowed by their great predecessors. The title of "great" was given to Dionysius, later bishop of the Egyptian capital (247–8 to 264–5), more on account of his personal bravery in the Decian persecution and his zealous activity in ecclesiastical affairs than because of any theological achievement. The orthodoxy of his teaching on the Trinity was doubted in Rome, and he attempted to demonstrate it in an apologia composed in four books against Dionysius, Bishop of Rome. He opposed the chiliastic ideas of Bishop Nepos of Arsinoë in his work *On the Promises,* in which he rejected John the apostle's authorship of the Apocalypse.[43]

---

[42] *In Ios. hom.* 7, 6.

[43] *Euseb. HE* 7, 24ff.

Dionysius is the first Bishop of Alexandria for whom we have evidence of the custom of announcing the date of the day of the Resurrection each year to Egyptian Christendom in the so-called "Easter letters". With the exception of two letters, his extensive correspondence has been lost. The written works of Theognostus and Pierius, Dionysius's successors at the head of the school for catechumens, drew on Origen's achievement. The *Hypotyposes* of Theognostus was a dogmatic work, while Pierius occupied himself more with exegesis and homiletics.[44] Whether Peter, who was Bishop of Alexandria from about 300, also worked in the catechetical school is uncertain: the fragments of his treatises indicate particularly pastoral interest, as do those on penitential regulations and on the Pasch, though some opposed the alleged errors of Origen.

Other Eastern writers are also found within the range of Origen's influence, and their inferior performances make the greatness of the master stand out in sharper relief. We owe a panegyric on Origen to his pupil Gregory Thaumaturgus († *c.* 270), a miracle-working bishop in central Asia Minor who was soon transfigured by legend and became a highly honoured figure in the Byzantine church. Gregory's panegyric gives an instructive glimpse at the teaching method of the revered master. The laity, too, took an interest in theology and exegetical questions. This is proved by Julius Africanus of Palestine († *post* 240), a friend of Origen, who in a letter to the latter raised doubts about the authenticity of the story of Susanna, and in another inquired into the genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke.[45] The learned priest Pamphilus of Caesarea in Palestine sought to serve Origen's aims by continuing the tradition of the master in his teaching and learned inquiries. His interests lay particularly in the text of Scripture, as well as in collecting Origen's writings and in taking care of the library founded by Origen in Caesarea. The Diocletian persecution brought him martyrdom after long imprisonment (310), during which he wrote an Ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ὠριγένους, or *Defence of Origen,* in six books, of which only the first survives in the Latin translation by Rufinus.[46] The writer Methodius is included in the opposition that formed against Origen. According to Jerome and Socrates,[47] he was Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, but more probably he lived as an ascetic and as a private Christian teacher. In his discussion of Origen he rejected the latter's doctrine of the pre-existence of souls and the theory of a cycle of several creations of the world, but could not free himself from Origen's allegorical interpretation of Scripture. For his literary works he preferred the dialogue form, and he displays a good knowledge of Plato.[48] His *Symposium* was in fact an important work, especially in its influence on the history of spirituality. It praises the Christian ideal of virginity and ends with a famous hymn to Christ the bridegroom and his bride the Church.

---

[44] Fragments in R. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae* 3 (Oxford 1846), 405–35; cf. L. B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria, Theognostus, Pierius and Peter* (Cambridge 1908).

[45] W. Reichardt, *Die Briefe des S. Julius Africanus* (Leipzig 1909); E. Blakeney, "Jul. Africanus" in *Theology* 29 (1934), 164–9.

[46] *Euseb. HE* 6, 32, 3; *PG* 17, 521–616.

[47] Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 83; *Socrates HE* 6, 13.

The beginnings of the second theological school in the East are no less obscure than those of the Alexandrian school. It sprang up in the Syrian capital of Antioch, an important centre of the Hellenic world where conditions were similar to those in Alexandria. Tradition unanimously names the Antiochan priest Lucian as founder of the school, which may have been preceded by undertakings on a smaller scale and more private in character. In the time of Bishop Paul of Samosata, a priest named Malchion enjoyed a considerable reputation in Antioch for wide learning, but was a teacher in a secular Greek school. He demonstrated his superior theological training in the controversy with Paul of Samosata at the Synod of Antioch (268) which led to the latter's condemnation.[49] Another priest of Antioch whose biblical interests and knowledge of Hebrew were praised, was Dorotheus, a contemporary of Lucian, but he is not expressly said to have been a Christian teacher.[50] It is only with Lucian that the records in the sources become more precise. The fact that Lucian was one of the clergy of Antioch permits the assumption that his activity as a Christian teacher was authorized by his bishop. His theological learning, which is praised by Eusebius,[51] did not find expression in extensive publications. His real interest was in biblical work and more particularly in a new recension of the Septuagint, for which he consulted the Hebrew original. It enjoyed high repute and was widely used in the dioceses of Syria and Asia Minor. Lucian's exegetical method must be gathered from the biblical works of his pupils; it takes principally into account the literal sense and only employs typological interpretation where the text itself demands it. Similarly, it is only from the works of his pupils that it is possible to form an idea of Lucian's other theological characteristics. He always starts from biblical data, not from theological presuppositions, and attains, among other things, a strict Subordinationism in the doctrine of the Logos. This was represented soon after by Arius and some of his fellow-pupils, the so-called Syllucianists, and they expressly referred to their teacher for it. The characteristics of the Antioch school became fully clear only in the great age of the Fathers, in connexion with the Trinitarian and Christological controversies.

---

[48] Cf. M. Margheritis, "L'influenza di Platone sul pensiero e sull'arte di s. Metodio d'Olimpo" in *Studi Ubaldi* (Milan 1937), 401–12. On the dialogue technique, cf. G. Luzzati, ibid. 117–24.

[49] *Euseb. HE* 7, 29, 2.

[50] Ibid. 7, 32, 3–4.

[51] Ibid. 9, 6, 3.

CHAPTER 20

The Development of Christian Literature in the West in the Third Century

The Rise of Early Christian Latin and the Beginning of a Christian Literature in Latin. Minucius Felix

THE essentially different course taken by the development of Christian literature in the West in the third century, particularly in Rome, was determined by the linguistic tradition of the Roman Christian community, which at first was composed for the most part of Greek-speaking members and consequently used Greek for preaching and the liturgy. Only with the disappearance of the Greek majority did the necessity arise for translating the Holy Scriptures of the new faith into Latin, of preaching in Latin, and finally of using Latin as a liturgical language too. The first traces of the existence of a Latin Bible extend back, as far as Rome is concerned, into the latter half of the second century, for the Latin translation of the *First Letter of Clement* must have been made at that time.

In Africa, at the turn of the century, Tertullian also quoted from a Latin Bible which he had at hand. The unknown translators thereby initiated the development of early Christian Latin, and with this achievement created the conditions for the rise of an independent Christian literature in the Latin tongue. Old Christian Latin was firmly based in one respect on the colloquial language of the common people, to whom the missionaries at first addressed themselves. On the other hand, it borrowed certain words from the Greek, for many Latin words were impossible to employ because of their previous use in pagan worship. And, finally, for many central concepts of Christian revelation and preaching, existing Latin terms had to be given a new content. In this way there arose, by a lengthy and extremely important process, a sector of early Christian Latin within the wider field of later Latin. It is clearly distinct from the language of secular literature, possessing its own unmistakable style. No single person, therefore, created early Christian Latin: not even Tertullian, the first writer to attest its existence through his writings. Naturally, it took a certain time for this Christian Latin to acquire such flexibility and clarity that it could be used for more important literary works. It is characteristic that the theological discussions in Rome at the end of the second and in the third centuries were still conducted to a large extent in Greek. Justin wrote his *Apologia* in Greek; Marcion and the early disputants in the Trinitarian controversies were from Asia Minor; and even Hippolytus, the first theologian of rank to live and write in Rome, was of Eastern origin, and published his works in the Greek language.

A further characteristic of Latin Christian theology in the third century was that it was not developed in theological schools as was its Eastern counterpart. There was no lack of institutions for the instruction of catechumens at key points of christianization such as Rome and Carthage; but schools where important theological teachers of Origen's kind provided an introduction to the Christian religion for cultivated pagans were unknown in the West. Tertullian, it is true, exercised a strong influence, and Novatian was certainly a theologian of importance; but neither of them was head of a school in its proper sense.

The *Octavius Dialogue* of Minucius Felix presents a defence of Christianity written in a distinguished and polished style by a lawyer trained in philosophy who was particularly influenced by Stoic thought. Caecilius, the pagan speaker in this dialogue, views pagan polytheism with marked scepticism, but, because Rome owed its greatness to it, would give it preference over the Christian religion, whose invisible God seemed to him a figment of the imagination, whose adherents were without culture and gave themselves up to shameless orgies. The Christian Octavius proves by purely philosophical arguments, without any appeal to Holy Scripture, that a sceptical standpoint on religious questions is untenable, and he rejects as calumnies the accusations made against the Christians. The dialogue does not go deeper into the content of the Christian faith. Its diction is still free from the typical features of early Christian Latin, and its style still strongly recalls the artistically cultivated prose of the later Antonines. One may for these reasons be inclined to date this elegant apologia before Tertullian's *Apologeticum* in the much-disputed and still open question of priority.

Hippolytus

Hippolytus can be regarded as a link between East and West. His person and work even today present many unsolved problems for research. It can be said with certainty that he was not a Roman by birth but a man from the East, thinking Greek and writing Greek, whose home was possibly Egypt and very likely Alexandria: a true Roman would scarcely have expressed as low an opinion of Rome's historical past as Hippolytus does.[1] He came to Rome probably as early as Pope Zephyrinus's time and belonged as a priest to the Christian community there, in which his culture and intellectual activity assured him considerable prestige. His influence is evident in all the theological and disciplinary controversies which stirred Roman Christianity in the opening decades of the third century. His high conception of the functions of a priest, among which he emphatically reckoned the preservation of apostolic traditions, did not permit him to shrink from bold criticism of the Roman bishops when he thought those traditions threatened by their attitude and measures. The position he assumed in the controversy over Modalism must be mentioned later. His rigoristic attitude on the question of penance made him an irreconcilable opponent of Bishop Callistus (217–22), and the leader of a numerically small but intellectually important opposition group. Nevertheless, the conjecture that he had himself consecrated bishop at that time, and so became the first anti-pope in the history of the Church, finds no adequate support in the sources. And there is just as little reliable evidence that it was the writer Hippolytus whom the emperor Maximinus Thrax banished to Sardinia with Pope Pontian, that it was he who was there reconciled to the latter and died in exile.[2] But it is possible that Hippolytus lived on through the period of the Novatian schism, belonged to this movement for a while and after being received once more into the Christian community survived until later than 253.[3] Both Eusebius and Jerome give a list of his writings;[4] and their titles reveal him as a writer having such notable breadth of interest as to suggest comparison with Origen, though certainly he never achieved the latter's originality and depth. If the statue of a teacher which was discovered in 1551 actually represents Hippolytus — an incomplete catalogue of his works and an Easter calendar are carved on the side of the teacher's chair — it is tangible evidence of his reputation.

---

[1] See in particular J.-M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte* (Rome 1959), 290f.

Hippolytus most clearly shares with Origen an inclination to the study of Scripture, which he expounds in the same allegorical way, though a more sober use of this method is unmistakable in his case. It is true that only a small remnant of his biblical writings has survived, but among them is a significant commentary on Daniel in the Greek original, and an exposition of the Canticle of Canticles, complete but in translation. In the Susanna of the Book of Daniel he considers that the Church, the virgin bride of Christ, is prefigured, persecuted by Jews and pagans. Likewise the bride and bridegroom of the Canticle of Canticles are understood as Christ and his Church, and sometimes the bride is considered to be the soul that loves God, an interpretation that was taken up particularly by St Ambrose in his exposition of Psalm 118, and so transmitted to the Middle Ages.

---

[2] There are sound reasons for supposing that confusion later occurred with another Hippolytus, who was also a priest and who was honoured as a martyr: cf. Hanssens, *op. cit.* 317–40. It would then be the latter Hippolytus who was referred to in the *Depositio martyrum* of 354.

[3] The supposition is based chiefly on a letter written to Rome in 253 by Dionysius of Alexandria, which presupposed that Hippolytus was still alive; cf. *Euseb. HE* 6, 46, 5, and Hanssens, *op. cit.* 299 f.

[4] *Euseb. HE* 6, 12, and Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 61.

Anxiety for the preservation of apostolic traditions was the second motive determining Hippolytus's work as a writer. They seemed to him threatened in doctrine and in the performance of divine worship. Consequently, he wrote a *Church Order* designed to ensure the maintenance of traditional forms in the most important rules and formulas for conferring Orders, the various functions of ecclesiastical offices, the conferring of baptism, and the celebration of the eucharist. This *Traditio Apostolica* no longer survives in its original language, but it forms the kernel of a series of further Church Orders such as the *Apostolic Order,* the *Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ,* the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the eight books of the *Apostolic Constitutions.* Its principle impact was felt in the East, especially in Egypt, as the many translations into Coptic, Ethiopic, and Arabic show, while the Latin version (*c.* 500) is incomplete. For Hippolytus, his *Church Order* probably represented an ideal form which was not designed for the needs of a particular community, but intended to provide a norm by which the Church leaders could test the conformity of their liturgical prescriptions with apostolic tradition.[5] It drew its material chiefly from Eastern sources, and consequently cannot be regarded as a Ritual which Hippolytus based on the liturgical forms customary in Rome at the beginning of the third century.

The anti-heretical dogmatic writings of Hippolytus served to safeguard apostolic tradition in doctrine. An early work was his *Syntagma* against thirty-two heresies, treating of the erroneous doctrines which had appeared in the course of history down to his own day. Unfortunately only its concluding part, which refutes the teaching of Noëtus, is extant. Another anti-heretical work is attributed to Hippolytus: *The Refutation of All Heresies,* also called the *Philosophoumena,* which indicated in its first part the errors of pagan philosophers and the aberrations of pagan religions (Book 1–4), and then proceeded to oppose the Gnostic systems in particular (Books 5–9). The argument in this work owes a great deal to Irenaeus. The Tenth Book provides a recapitulation of the whole work, and adds a brief account of the content of Christian belief. The chief purpose of the author is to demonstrate his thesis that the root of all heresies is that they did not follow Christ, Holy Scripture, and tradition, but reverted instead to pagan doctrines.[6] The historical transmission of this work is extremely confused. The First Book was ascribed to Origen, but the manuscript containing Books 4–10 was not discovered until 1842 and names no author. Only the fact that the writer refers to other works of Hippolytus as his own writings[7] — his *Chronicle* and his study *On the Universe* — makes the attribution to Hippolytus at all possible. The *Philosophoumena* have very much the character of a compilation, and give the impression of being a first draft which did not receive further revision. The polemic is caustic and oversteps all bounds when a personal opponent is attacked, so that an Hippolytus different from the author of his other works seems to be speaking here.[8] The concept of the Church, which the *Philosophoumena* express, is particularly striking. In the commentary on Daniel and the exposition of the Canticle of Canticles the Church appears as the spotless bride of Christ, permitting no place for a person who has incurred grievous moral guilt, but here in the controversy with Callistus the Church is addressed as the bearer and safeguard of truth, whose purity and authenticity have to be watched over by bishops in legitimate apostolic succession. The author turns passionately against those who forget their task and who, though appointed members of the hierarchy, open too wide to sinners the gate of the Church of the saints.

---

[5] See *Trad. apost.,* ed. E. Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia* (Leipzig 1900), 56, 1–13; 78, 30—5; 80, 30–5.

[6] *Refut., praef.*

[7] Ibid. 10, 30 and 32.

Novatian

Novatian may be considered as the first Roman theologian of importance, but his culture and gifts had to overcome manifold contradictions within the Roman community. Although he had received only the baptism of the sick, and so, according to the conception of the time, displayed a lack of courage to confess the Faith, Pope Fabian had nevertheless ordained him priest;[9] and about the year 250 he played a decisive role in the Pope's *collegium.* When the papal see was vacant, he continued the correspondence of the Roman Church with other communities abroad, and in two or three letters to Cyprian[10] expounded the Roman position concerning the treatment of those who had lapsed during persecution, a position identical with Cyprian's prudent practice. About 250 Novatian wrote his chief theological treatise on the Trinity. Here he made use of the work of earlier theologians, especially Hippolytus and Tertullian, and carefully formulated the state of the question in clear language of much formal distinction. The theology of Marcion is rejected in his treatise, as well as the Modalist conception of the Monarchians; Novatian propounds a very definite Subordinationism, which however much it emphasizes Christ's Godhead subordinates him to the Father almost more strictly than in earlier theology. He expresses himself very briefly on the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son and the Father, but here too emphasizes the subordination of the Spirit to the Son. He lays great stress on the role of the Holy Spirit within the Church, which is preserved by his gifts inviolate in holiness and truth. This work of Novatian brought the theology of the Trinity in the West before Constantine's time provisionally to an end, until Augustine later revived discussion on the subject.

---

[8] This caused P. Nautin to ascribe the *Philosophoumena,* the *Chronicle,* and the work *On the Universe* to another author, whom he called Josipos. Even if his arguments are not convincing on this, he clearly perceived and rightly emphasized the striking difference of style and particular range of themes in the *Philosophoumena* as compared with the other writings of Hippolytus.

[9] See *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 6–22; cf. also ibid. for the one-sided characterization of Novatian by Cornelius.

[10] In Cyprian's *Letters,* nos. 30, 36, and perhaps 31.

Novatian's other writings are pastoral in character and belong to the later phase of his life when, after leaving the Roman community, he led his own rigoristic, strictly organized society, as its bishop. His separation from the Roman community was due in the first place to personal motives especially aroused when Cornelius was preferred to him in the election of bishop in 251. The rift became irreparable when Novatian tried to justify his own secession by a concept according to which there could be no place for a mortal sinner in the Church of the saints, however ready he might be to atone by penance. While African circles, contrary to Novatian's expectation, ultimately refused him a following, he found numerous adherents in the East, who regarded themselves as the Church of the "pure" (καθαροί).[11] Dionysius of Alexandria had difficulty in preventing a greater defection than occurred,[12] and in the West a synod of sixty bishops under the leadership of Pope Cornelius clarified the situation by excommunicating Novatian and his followers. The first of Novatian's three pastoral letters to his communities deals with the question of the obligation of Jewish food laws, which he rejected; the second adopts a negative position on visits to the pagan theatre and circus; the third, *De bono pudicitiae*, presents a lofty exposition of the early Christian ideal of chastity in which marital fidelity and high esteem of virginity are forcefully proclaimed. Regarding Novatian's end, we have only the report of Socrates that he died as a martyr in the persecution by Valerian. An epitaph found in a catacomb in Rome in 1932, which reads: "Novatiano beatissimo martyri Gaudentius diaconus fecit", appears to confirm this report.[13]

Tertullian

The contribution made by the young African Church to early Christian literature in the third century was of greater weight and consequence. All evidence seems to indicate that Christianity found its way from Rome to these provinces beyond the sea, and that the first missionaries still used

---

[11] *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 1.

[12] He tried to persuade Novatian to return; see his letter in *Euseb. HE* 6, 45.

[13] *Socrates HE* 4, 28; see Chapter 18, above.

Greek in their preaching. Towns provided the earliest points of contact for Christian teaching, especially and above all Carthage, which had flourished again under Roman rule and where the upper classes were quite familiar with Greek.[14] But the transition to Latin for preaching and liturgy took place earlier in Africa than in Rome. The *Acts of the Martyrs of Scili,* the first dated Latin document of Christian origin (A.D. 180), probably already presupposes a translation of the Pauline epistles into Latin; a few years later Tertullian used a Latin translation of the Bible, which was not to his taste; and, about the middle of the third century, Cyprian quoted it so habitually that it must have been generally known by that time.[15]

The Christian literature which begins with Tertullian vividly reflects the special features of the world of African Christianity in the third century. This area was exposed to most grievous tribulations in the persecutions of the time and had to pay a very heavy toll in blood for its steadfastness in the faith, which was rewarded by a proportionately rapid growth of the Church. The African church was characterized to an almost equal extent by the internal controversies which it suffered with the Gnostic sects and Montanism, by the struggles for its unity which it waged against the schismatical movement of Novatian and Felicissimus and, after the middle of the third century, by the quarrel concerning baptism conferred by heretics. All this left its mark on the early Christian literature of North Africa, and gives it its lively and sometimes pugnacious quality. At the same time the first differences which were to divide the Greek and Latin literature more and more sharply from each other are already apparent within it. The latter was not as much concerned as was the East, in grasping the metaphysical content of revelation and demonstrating its superiority over Hellenistic religious trends. Its prime interest lay, rather, in directly practical questions of actual living in pagan surroundings, such as logically follow from the Christian doctrine of redemption; and it was concerned, furthermore, with the translation of belief into action, which demands a fight against sin, and with the positive practice of virtue as a contribution of the individual Christian to ensuring salvation.

In Tertullian we meet the first and at the same time the most productive and distinctive writer of pre-Constantinian literature in North Africa. Born about 160 in Carthage, he was the son of a pagan captain, received a solid general education in the humanities, and pursued special studies in law and

---

[14] See J. Mesnage, *Le christianisme en Afrique,* I (Paris 1915); C. Cecchelli, *Africa christiana, Africa Romana* (Rome 1936); G. Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne* (Paris 1948), 52–72.

[15] See G. D. Aalders, *Tertullianus' citaten uit de Evangeliën* (Amsterdam 1932); B. Botte in *DBS* 5 (1952), 334–7; H. J. Vogels, *Handbuch der neutestamentlichen Textkritik* (Bonn, 2nd ed. 1955).

Greek. He entered the Church as an adult, as a result of the impression made on him by Christians' fidelity to their beliefs under persecution, and immediately placed his wealth of gifts at her service. The sources do not make it clear whether he became a priest or remained a layman. The period of his activity as a writer covers approximately a quarter of a century (*c.* 195–220), and comprises two parts of roughly equal length but of quite contrasting nature. Until *c.* 207 he was a convinced and declared member of the Catholic Church, but then he joined the Montanist movement and rejected wholesale what he had previously revered. This change accounts for a double feature in Tertullian's nature which is apparent to every reader of his works. He is a man who gives himself utterly and uncompromisingly to whatever he professes at any given moment: anyone who thinks differently than he is not only an opponent of his views but is morally suspect. His temperament, which inclined him to extremes, led him almost inevitably out of the Church when he encountered in Montanism a form of Christian belief in which the utmost rigorism was the law. For the defence of his conviction of the moment, he had at his command a mastery of contemporary Latin such as no other writer of those years possessed. In expounding his own position, he employed an impressive eloquence supported by comprehensive learning in every field, which he drew upon with brilliant effect. He had also the gift of that brief incisive turn of phrase which holds the reader's interest. His acute intellect relentlessly uncovered the weakness of an opponent's argument, and helds up to ridicule those who differed from him. There can be no doubt that Tertullian's work was read, but its power of conviction is open to suspicion. It seems that even Montanism was not in the end sufficient for his excessive and immoderate nature; and Augustine credibly reports that before his death he became the founder of a sect named, after himself, the Tertullianists.[16]

In a series of writings Tertullian tried to place before the pagans a true picture of the Christian religion. After a first attempt in *Ad nationes,* he found in the *Apologeticum* a form that suited his ideas. The work is directly addressed to the *praesides* of the Roman provinces, but indirectly to paganism as a whole. Tertullian takes in each case ideas familiar to the pagans as the starting point of his argument, and contrasts them with Christian doctrine and Christian life. He effectively makes it clear that the most grievous injustice is done to the Christians by condemning them without knowing the truth about them. Tertullian therefore asks not for acquittal but for justice based on impartial investigation of the truth. In this way his apologetics advances in content beyond that of the Greeks of the second century, and at the same time achieves an artistic form superior to any coming before.

---

[16] *De haeres.* 86. G. Säflund, *De pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians* (Lund 1955), would like to consider Tertullian's *De pallio* as his last work, and as giving the defence of that step; but Säflund's arguments are not convincing.

Tertullian also defended the claim of the Church to truth and her possession of truth against the heresies of the age and especially against Gnostic trends. This he accomplished in a treatise on principles which makes brilliant use of his legal knowledge: the *De praescriptione haereticorum* demonstrates that Christianity, as opposed to heresy, can substantiate a clear legal claim to the possession of truth. Long before heresies appeared, Christian teachers were preaching that message which they had received from the apostles and which had been entrusted to the latter by Christ. Consequently, Holy Scripture is in the possession of the Church alone; only she can determine its true sense and so establish the content of belief. A series of monographs was also directed by Tertullian against individual Gnostics or their particular tenets; such a work was that against Marcion, mentioned above, which refutes his dualism and defends the harmony between Old and New Testaments. He seeks to safeguard the Christian doctrine of Creation, the resurrection of the body and the status of martyrdom against volatilization by the Gnostics; and against Praxeas he expounds the Church's conception of the Trinity with a clarity hitherto unknown. He deals with practical questions of Christian daily life in his short works on the meaning and effects of baptism, prayer, theatrical shows, patience, and the spirit and practice of penance. A rigoristic strain is often perceptible even here, and it becomes predominant in the works of the Montanist period. In this latter phase he made demands in utter contradiction of his earlier views, as for instance when he opposes second marriages in his *De monogamia,* military service and all trades in any way connected with idolatry in the *De corona* and *De idolatria,* and proclaims the most rigorous practice of fasting in *De ieiunio.* His fight against the Church took particularly harsh forms; he disputed her right to remit sins, which he reserved in the *De pudicitia* to the Montanist prophets alone.

Viewed as a whole, Tertullian's interests as a writer were not of a speculative kind, and he gives no systematic exposition of Christian doctrine. His importance in the history of dogma rests on the value of his writings as evidence of the stage of development which various particular doctrines had reached in his time; but it must also be borne in mind that his adherence to Montanism essentially modified his views. He was speaking as a Montanist essentially about the nature of the Church when he rejected an official priesthood and affirmed: *ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.*[17] A pre-eminent position with the power of binding and loosing belonged only to Peter, and was not therefore conferred on later bishops.[18] The conception of original sin as a *vitium originis* was familiar to him, in the sense that through Adam's sin evil concupiscence has poisoned human nature, but he does not infer the necessity of infant baptism from this.[19] Tertullian thinks in very concrete terms about the Eucharist; those who take part in the *orationes sacrificiorum* receive the body of the Lord which is just as truly the real body of Christ as was the body on the cross; and the soul is nourished on the body and blood of Christ.[20] In Christology and the theology of the Trinity, he employs a terminology which influenced subsequent developments in the Latin West: according to him, Jesus Christ is true God and true man, both natures are united in one person but not confused.[21] The expression "Trinitas" as well as the term "persona", is found for the first time in Latin literature in Tertullian:[22] in this Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are "unius substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis".[23] The Logos existed already before the creation of the world, but only became Son at the creation, and consequently as such is not eternal.[24] The more precise relation of Father and Son is viewed in a Subordinationist manner: the Father alone has the fullness of the Godhead; the Son has only a derivative part.[25] The Holy Spirit too is thought of as a person: he is the real teacher in the Church, who first of all led the apostles into all truth, but who is also operative as the representative of God and Christ in every Christian community,[26] especially through Holy Scripture which is his work and in which his voice is audible.[27]

---

[17] *De exhort. cast.* 7; cf. *De fuga* 14; *De pud.* 21, 17.

[18] *De pud.* 21, 9–11.

Cyprian

A notable influence on posterity was also exercised by Bishop Cyprian of Carthage as a writer of the African Church. The authenticity of his personality and the example of his pastoral care stamped characteristic features on the Christianity of his native land.[28] The interest taken in his writings was likewise due to the deep impression produced by these qualities. In theology he owed much to Tertullian, whom he called his master and whose works he constantly read.[29] His treatises and letters deal mostly with the solution of questions of the day, as they arose through persecution and the threat to ecclesiastical unity from sectarian divisions. A personal note is struck in the little work *Ad Donatum,* in which the religious certainty attained in baptism after long search finds attractive expression. Cyprian as a pastor turned with a word of consolation to the Christians of North Africa in time of plague, and summoned them to be ready to make sacrifices in order to perform works of mercy. This he did in his *De mortalitate* and *De opere et eleemosynis.* He extols the Christian ideal of virginity and utters warnings against the destructive consequences of dissension in the *De habitu virginum* and *De zelo et livore* and here too he takes up the ideas of Tertullian in his writings on the Our Father and on patience. His treatise *On the Unity of the Church* shows greater independence both in content and in the personal position it reveals; and it has greater value as evidence of the concept of the Church held in the mid-third century. The representative and guarantor of ecclesiastical unity is the bishop, who is united with his fellow bishops through the common basis of the episcopate in the apostolic office.[30] Among the holders of the latter, Peter had objectively and legitimately a special position which rested on the power of binding and loosing imparted to him alone.[31] As this was committed by Christ to only *one* apostle, the unity that Christ willed for the Church was established for ever.[32] Cyprian does not yet infer from this an effective jurisdiction of Peter over his fellow apostles, nor a transmission of his personal prerogatives to his successor as Bishop of Rome. Rather does there belong to the Roman church a position of honour, founded on the fact of Peter's work and death in Rome.[33] Cyprian unambiguously rejects a Roman right of direction, for instance in the question of the validity of baptism for heretics. The individual bishop is responsible to God alone for the guidance of his community even in such matters.[34] Cyprian sets a very high value on membership in the Church of Christ: nobody has a claim to the name of Christian who has not his own name in this Church; only in her is his salvation assured, according to the pregnant formula: "salus extra ecclesiam non est."[35] Children, too, should share in the membership of the Church as early as possible, and so infant baptism is a practice which Cyprian takes for granted.[36] Fidelity to the Church in persecution merits the highest recognition; those who in martyrdom have sealed their testimony to Christ and his Church with the sacrifice of their lives obtain immediately the vision of God.[37] In this belief, Bishop Cyprian himself accepted a martyr's death in a manner which kept his name in undying remembrance in the African Church.

---

[19] *De an.* 41; *De bapt.* 18.

[20] *De or.* 19; *De cor.* 3; *De pud.* 9, 16; *Adv. Marc.* 3, 19; *De res. carn.* 8.

[21] *Adv. Prax* 27; *De carne Christi* 5.

[22] *Adv. Prax.* 3.

[23] Ibid. 12.

[24] Ibid. 7; *Adv. Hermog.* 3.

[25] *Adv. Prax.* 9, 13; B. Piault, "Tertullien a-t-il été subordinatien?" in *RSPhTh* (1936), 181–204.

[26] *De bapt.* 6, 12; *De praescr.* 22, 8–10; 13, 5.

[27] *Adv. Hermog.* 22, 1; *De idol.* 4, 5.

[28] For Cyprian's influence on Augustine, see J. B. Bord in *RHE* 18 (1922), 445–68; also B. de Margerie in *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 15 (1963), 199–211.

---

[29] See Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 53.

[30] *Ep.* 54, 1; 68, 5.

[31] *De eccl. unit.* 4.

[32] Ibid. 7.

[33] *Ep.* 71, 3.

[34] *Sent. episc. init., CSEL* 3, 1, 435 f.

[35] *Ep.* 73, 21; 55, 24.

[36] *Ep.* 64, 2 and 5.

CHAPTER 21

The First Christological and Trinitarian Controversies

THE apologists of the second century in their discussions of pagan polytheism emphasized above all strict monotheism which they did not consider imperilled by their conception of Logos-Christology. In the Church's defensive action against Gnosticism, the emphatic stress on the unity of the divine nature was similarly prominent, and so theology in the second century did not concern itself in great detail with the problem of the relation between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It was obscurely felt that, in the one indivisible God, certain distinctions were present which were manifested particularly in the Creation and the Redemption. The apologist Theophilus had even employed the term "Trias" for this reality,[1] but a deeper conceptual penetration of this truth of revelation and a corresponding linguistic formulation of it had not been attained. Theological reflection was now, at the end of the second century, to concern itself precisely with the question of the Trinity. The Logos-Christology presented by the apologists, and further developed by the second-century writers, was defective to the extent that it subordinated the Son to the Father. According to this concept, the Logos, existing from all eternity within God (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος), came forth from the Father only as Creator and ruler of the world (λόγος προφορικός), only then was begotten and only then became the personality distinguishing him from the Father; and, therefore, he was not eternal in the same sense as the Father.[2] But this Subordinationism at first less disturbed people's awareness of the faith, because they saw in it no direct threat to the divinity of Christ. Emphasis on the difference between the Father and the Son must, however, have given cause for hesitation when the unity of God was brought into greater prominence. In fact this Christological Subordinationism led at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third to a vigorous reaction by Christian circles who were anxious at all costs to safeguard the divine unity. The movement owed its origin to men of the Greek East; but the controversies about their theories took place chiefly in the West and especially in Rome. We owe the very name Monarchianism, by which we try to characterize this theology, to a Latin theologian: the African Tertullian renders by the formula "monarchiam tenemus" the slogan[3] by which its adherents tried to express their holding fast to the one God and to a single divine principle.

---

[37] *De eccles. unit.* 14; *Ep.* 55, 20.

[1] *Ad Autol.* 2, 15.

[2] Already in Justin, *Apol.* app. 6; Theophil., *Ad Autol.* 2, 10–22; further in Hippol., *Refut.* 10, 33, 1; Orig., *De princ.* 1, 3, 5; *In Joh.* 2, 21.

Emphasis on the unity of God, however, necessitated a decision on the Christological problem, and in this process the Logos-Christology was contested in two ways. Some regarded Christ as merely a man, but one born of the virgin Mary and of the Holy Spirit, and in whom God's power (δύναμις) was operative in quite a special way. This so-called Dynamist Monarchianism safeguarded the one divine principle but virtually abandoned the divinity of Christ. Another solution of the problem was proposed by those who declared that the one God revealed himself in different ways or *modi,* now as Father, now as Son. This theory so effaced the distinction between Father and Son that it was said that the Father had also suffered on the Cross; and the supporters of this attempted solution are therefore called Modalist or Patripassian Monarchians. Dynamist Monarchianism, which is also not inappropriately called Adoptionism, betrays a rationalist attitude which found the idea of God's becoming man difficult to accept. Consequently, it seems to have gained a wider hearing in intellectual circles, but small support among the common people. The sources name as its first exponent an educated leather-merchant called Theodotus of Byzantium, who came to Rome about 190 and there sought support for his theological ideas. He and his followers tried to prove from Scripture, by means of philological textual criticism, their fundamental thesis that Jesus, until his baptism in the Jordan, led the life of a simple but very upright man on whom the Spirit of Christ then descended.[4] Their interest in logic and geometry, their esteem for Aristotle and their relations with the doctor Galen and his philosophical interests gave offence to the faithful.[5] Theodotus's expulsion from the ecclesiastical community by the Roman Bishop Victor (186–98) did not mean the end of the Adoptionist movement; and a series of disciples — including Asclepiodotos, Theodotus the younger, and later Artemon — transmitted the ideas of its founder. The first two attempted to organize the Adoptionists in a church of their own, and won over even the Roman confessor Natalis as its leader, though he shortly left their movement.[6] Theodotus the younger added a new element to previous theories by designating Melchizedech as the highest power, standing higher than Christ, as the actual mediator between God and man.[7] About the mid-third century a double argument inspired the Adoptionists' doctrine: on the one hand, they attacked the orthodox view as ditheistic;[8] and on the other, they also claimed that as true guardians of apostolic tradition they would teach regarding Christ only what had always been believed at all times.[9] An exponent of a particularly crude Adoptionism in the East, in the second half of the third century, was Paul of Samosata, a bishop of Antioch in Syria, whose teaching and life preoccupied several synods.[10] It is true that he employed in his theology the Trinitarian formulas of his age, but he divested them of their orthodox meaning by teaching that "the Son" designated only the man Jesus, in whom the wisdom of God had taken up abode; that, furthermore, "the Spirit" is nothing other than the grace which God gave the apostles. And by "wisdom of God", or Logos, Paul did not understand a person distinct from the Father, but an impersonal power. Although at a first synod in the year 264 he skilfully evaded being pinned down to definite views, the learned priest Malchion demonstrated his errors to him at a second assembly of bishops, which removed him from office and expelled him from the Church's community. At the same time, the synod rejected the statement that the Logos is of the same nature as the Father (ὁμοούσιος), because Paul of Samosata meant by this term to deny the Logos a personal subsistence of his own. The Catholic community of Antioch, under the new bishop Domnus, was obliged even to call in the help of the civil authorities against Paul following his deposition, to make him vacate the episcopal residence. Yet, even after his condemnation, Paul had a considerable following in the so-called Paulicians, who were condemned by the nineteenth canon of the General Council of Nicaea. After his death the leadership of the group passed to a certain Lucian who later joined the orthodox community. It is unlikely that the latter is the same man as the martyr, Lucian of Antioch († 312), the founder of the school of Antioch, though this Lucian also held a Subordinationist Logos-Christology.

---

[3] *Adv. Prax.* 3.

[4] Hippol., *Refut.* 7, 35.

[5] *Euseb. HE* 5, 28, 13–14.

[6] Ibid. 5, 28, 1–3 and 9.

Modalist Monarchianism

The Modalist attempt at a solution of the Logos-Christological problem spread relatively widely because it obviously appealed more strongly to simple religious minds, for whom the biblical statements about the unity of God and the full divinity of Christ were deep convictions. Any conception which separated the Son or the Word too sharply from the Father seemed suspect here, because it could lead to the existence of two Gods being deduced from it. Once again, the first representative of Modalist teaching whose name is now known was a Greek, by name Noëtus, who according to Hippolytus came from Smyrna in Asia Minor. He vigorously emphasized the dogma of the one God, the Father, asserted also that Christ is identical with the Father, and affirmed the inference that the Father became man and suffered on the Cross.[11] Following two discussions with the priests of Smyrna, Noëtus was expelled from the Church, yet nevertheless found supporters for his ideas. His disciples appealed to passages in the Old and New Testaments (such as Exod 3:6; Isa 44:6; 45:14–15; Jn 10:30; 14:8 ff.; Rom 9:5), which they construed in the sense of implying an identity of Father and Son. They countered the difficulty which the Prologue of St John's Gospel presented in this respect by allegorical interpretation.[12] Epigonus, a pupil of Noëtus, brought the doctrine to Rome, where it was taken up by Cleomenes. Praxeas, whose character and origin remains obscure, also perhaps came from the East to Rome, where he was still pursuing Modalist lines of thought in the time of Pope Victor. According to Tertullian's polemic against Praxeas, written about 213, the latter taught the complete identity of Father and Son, and denied that the Logos had any subsistence peculiar to himself,[13] so that in reality it was the Father who suffered, died, and rose from the dead. Praexas seems to have modified his view to the extent that he distinguished the man Jesus from the God Christ, who was identical with the Father, so that the Father is said to have suffered together with the Son.[14] Despite their different starting-points, the Dynamist and Modalist conceptions resemble each other here in a striking way.

---

[7] Hippol., *Refut.* 7, 36.

[8] Novat., *De Trin.* 30.

[9] In *Euseb. HE* 5, 28, 3 f.

[10] Ibid. 7, 27–30.

Another member of the Patripassianists, as the adherents of this doctrine were later called by Cyprian,[15] was Sabellius, who is said to have come to Rome from Libya when Zephyrinus was bishop (199–217). It was probably he who gave Modalist doctrine a more systematic character, when he attributed to the one Godhead three modes of operation, so that the Father was its actual essence which, nevertheless, expressed itself also as Son and Spirit: as Father, God was the creator and law-giver; as Son, he was operative in the redemption; as Spirit, he conferred grace and sanctification.[16] It is impossible to obtain a completely clear and incontestable picture of Modalist ideas, since only their opponents — Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius — report them. In Rome, the centre of Modalist propaganda, there was at first no clash with the authorities of the community there. But there was a reaction by the leading theologian, the learned Hippolytus, who sharply attacked the Roman bishops Zephyrinus (199–217) and Callistus (217–22), because of their favouring, as he alleged, and even recognizing this false doctrine. He accused the former, an "ignorant and uneducated man", of maintaining two conflicting theses simultaneously: firstly, "I know only one God, Christ Jesus and no other, who was born and suffered"; and, secondly, "It was not the Father who died, but the Son."[17] But what is apparent from these two formulas is rather the concern of the Roman bishop to emphasize the divinity of Christ on the one hand, and to insist on the distinction between Father and Son on the other hand, though he lacked an unobjectionable terminology for his purpose. Hippolytus's criticism that Zephyrinus entertained Modalist views was probably provoked by the mistrust that the latter felt for Hippolytus's manner of expression, which sounded to him suspiciously ditheistic. That Hippolytus's judgment was far too harsh is plain from his verdict that Callistus had let himself be misled by Sabellius, though it was Callistus himself who expelled the latter from the Church. It is clear that Callistus was also trying to pursue a middle course between the downright Modalism of Sabellius and, in his judgment, the ditheistic tendency of the learned Hippolytus. In opposition to the latter, he laid all emphasis on the unity of God, when he said that Father and Son are not separate beings; in opposition to Sabellius, he held fast to the distinction between the Father and the Logos, who existed before all time and who became man. He was conscious, therefore, of the dubiousness of Modalist doctrine, but he likewise regarded the doctrine of two or three distinct divine "persons" as an even greater danger to the content of faith concerning the one God. Yet neither did he, in his search for the right balance between the two tendencies, have yet the appropriate terminology at his disposal.

---

[11] Hippol., *Contra Noetum,* 1.

[12] Ibid. 15.

[13] Tertull., *Adv. Prax.* 5 and 7.

[14] Ibid. 27.

[15] Cyprian, *Ep.* 73, 4.

[16] Epiph., *De haeres.* 62, 1.

Nevertheless, the struggle of Hippolytus and Tertullian against Modalism bore fruit, as can be seen from the advance in Trinitarian theology in the work of Novatian about the mid-third century. The latter turned Tertullian's thought and preparatory work to account, and clearly moved away from Modalism in saying that the Son begotten of the Father, that is the Word, is not a mere sound but has subsistence proper to him, and thus is a "second person"; that the Son was not begotten in view only of Creation, but existed before all time, since it is in the nature of the Father as such ever to have a Son.[18] Novatian seeks with even greater emphasis to reject ditheistic lines of thought by stressing that the Son is God only in being the Son, who received his Godhead from the Father, and only as Son is distinct from the

---

[17] Hippol., *Refut.* 9, 11.

[18] Novat., *De Trin.* 31.

Father, so that there is no division of the divine nature. But Novatian does not express himself so plainly regarding the "person" of the Spirit, whom he regards as a divine power operative in the prophets, the apostles, and the Church.[19] According to him, the Son is subject to the Father, is less than the Father, and is obedient to the Father.[20] Novatian's manner of expression is, therefore, strongly Subordinationist; and his progress beyond Tertullian and earlier theology consists in his recognizing that the personal distinction between Father and Son does not have its ground in the economy of salvation, that the Son was begotten before all time, and that he subsisted, that is as a person, before the creation of the world.[21] This much was achieved, even if Novatian did not yet clearly grasp the doctrine of an eternal generation of the Son.

The discussion about Monarchianism extended beyond the West to other territories where Christianity had penetrated. In Arabia in the time of the emperor Gordianus (238–44), according to a rather obscure report by Eusebius,[22] a Bishop Beryllus of Bostra held the view that Christ had not existed in a way proper to himself before his incarnation, and that he possessed no divinity of his own but only that of the Father dwelling within him. This teaching suggests an Adoptionist Christology; and Beryllus's doctrine encountered contradiction from his fellow bishops, who devoted various synods to it and finally summoned Origen to debate the issue. The latter succeeded in refuting Beryllus and winning him back to the true faith.

Attention was further aroused by the controversy in which Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria engaged about the year 260 with Patripassianists of the Libyan Pentapolis. In several letters,[23] of which one was addressed to bishops Ammonius and Euphranor, Dionysius attacked the Modalist theories with an incisive yet reckless manner of expression; and he gave such imprecise formulation to the distinction between Father and Son, whom he termed a creature (ποίημα), that the unity of essence of both seemd blurred.[24] A denunciation of this doctrine in Rome caused the bishop there, also called Dionysius (259–68), to make a pronouncement which in several respects is important. He requested the Alexandrian bishop to make his views more precise, and at the same time adressed a letter to the community of Alexandria expounding the Roman conception of the Trinity. Without identifying Bishop Dionysius, but with an unmistakably sharp reference to the school of theologians from which he sprang, he said he had heard that there were catechists and teachers of theology in Alexandria who split up the most venerable kerygma of the Church, the monarchy or the unity of God, into three separate hypostases and three divinities, and taught a doctrine diametrically opposed to that of Sabellius. Whereas the latter maintained that the Son was the Father, and vice versa, these men in a certain way preached three Gods. In contrast with this view, the unity of God should be held just as firmly as the divine Trinity; yet, on the other hand, to speak of Christ as a creature, or to assert that there had been a time when he did not exist, was just as blasphemous as it was to call "his divine and inexpressible generation" a creation (ποίησις).[25] Dionysius of Alexandria thereupon replied with a detailed apologia,[26] in which he admitted that certain of his formulas were liable to misinterpretation, but pointed out also that justice had not been done to his view as a whole. He likewise rejected a separation of Father, Son, and Spirit, but maintained firmly that they are three "hypostases", for otherwise the Trinity would be dissolved. He stressed equally definitely the eternity of the Son. He said he had avoided the expression ὁμοούσιος (of the same nature) as not biblical, though rightly understood, it was nevertheless acceptable.[27] His résumé of his position, that the unity of God must be maintained but the three persons must also be acknowledged, clearly satisfied Rome, since the discussion was not pursued further. These issues, it is true, involved the problem of correct terminology, of which the differing senses of "hypostasis" afford a typical example, since it could be easily identified in Rome with Tertullian's "substantia". But behind these linguistic problems were the different aspects through which the theology of the Trinity was approached from East and West. In the West, the "dogma" of God's unity was sacrosanct, and it was difficult for people to recognize and acknowledge as "persons" the distinctions in the Trinity, of which they were convinced. The East was more sensitive to the mystery in the Trinity, as a consequence of its familiarity with the world of neo-Platonic thought concerning the hierarchy of being. This difference in mode of theological thought, together with the imperfection of the terminology worked out so far, found clear expression in the following century and gave rise then to a comprehensive discussion of the dogma of the Trinity.

---

[19] Ibid. 29.

[20] Ibid. 18, 26, 27 and 31.

[21] Ibid. 31 and 16.

[22] *Euseb. HE* 6, 33, 1–4.

[23] Ibid. 7, 26, 1.

[24] According to Athanas., *De sent. Dionys.* 14–18.

---

[25] Partly according to Athanas., *De decr. Nic. syn.* 26.

[26] Both Euseb., *Praep. evang.* 7, 19, and Athanas. *De sent. Dionys.*, quote parts of this apologia.

[27] Athanas., *De sent. Dionys.* 14–18, tries to represent Dionysius as being orthodox in every respect. Basil, *Ep.* 9, 2 (esp. *sent.* 4), realized with greater penetration that his opposition to Sabellian Modalism made him incline dangerously near to the opposite extreme.

Chapter 22

Manichaeism

A few decades after the great Gnostic movement of the second century had passed its peak, there was born the founder of a new religion, which came on the stage with a definite claim to be the most universal of all religions, and promised true redemption to all nations. It took its name from its founder, the Persian Mani or Manes, who is called in the Greek and Latin sources Μανιχαῖος or Manichaeus. Until the beginning of the present century, our knowledge of Manichaeism was mainly dependent on information from non-Manichaean sources, since a large part of the abundant Manichaean literature was destroyed as a consequence of the struggle waged against it by civil authorities and ecclesiastical circles, both in the Latin West and in the Byzantine East, and later also in lands under Islamic rule. Since the beginning of the present century, however, a number of discoveries have brought to light authentic Manichaean sources which permit a much more exact and comprehensive idea of this religion to be formed. The first in order of time among these are the texts which were discovered about 1900 in the caves of Turfan in the Chinese province of Turkestan and which contain fragments from Mani's *Book of Giants,* liturgical documents, confession formularies, a type of catechism, and dogmatic texts. But far more important was the 1930 finding of a Manichaean library in Medinet Madi in Upper Egypt, which contained letters and sermons of Mani, the so-called Cephalaea-fragments of a textbook of Manichaeism and an important large volume of psalms. These texts had been translated from Syriac into Coptic about the year 400 and they give an insight into the religious world of a Manichaean group which had created a powerful centre of propaganda in Upper Egypt about one generation after Mani's death. On the basis of these newly-discovered sources, the life and teaching of the Persian religious founder can now be represented more or less as follows.

Mani was born on 14 April A.D. 216, probably in the Parthian capital Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and belonged to a family related on both his father's and his mother's side to the Persian princely house of the Arsacides.[1] Mani's father belonged to a religious sect, perhaps the Mandaeans, in which strict abstinence from meat and wine was combined with purification ceremonies of many kinds. Mani was at first brought up in this sect, too, but repeated visions revealed to him very early that he was destined to be the missionary and herald of a new universal religion, the content of which was made known to him through further revelations. Mani quickly undertook a missionary journey to India, where, he preached with particular success in the province of Baluchistan. After his return home to Persia, he won the favour of his king, Shapur I (241–73), who permitted him freely to preach his religious message throughout the Sassanid kingdom. Mani now developed a comprehensive missionary activity, was himself engaged as a missionary in the West, as far as Nisibis, and sent out on a systematic plan other messengers of his faith, who, even during his lifetime, gained entry for his teaching into Egypt and the eastern provinces of Iran. Under King Bahram I, however, a radical change occurred affecting Mani's favour at court. It is probable that the priests of the Zoroastrian religion accused him of subversive plans and heresy; and, after a short imprisonment, Mani died in captivity in 277. His followers described his manner of death as crucifixion, but by the term was meant only his martyr's death for his beliefs. Upon Mani's death there ensued a powerful wave of persecution against his adherents, some of whom fled to the West, while others emigrated to India and China, where they secured great influence which persisted as late as the fourteenth century.[2]

---

[1] G. Widengren, *Mani und der Manichäismus* (Stuttgart 1961), 30 f.

Mani set down the content of his missionary teaching in a series of writings which soon attained canonical force. The most important of these are: *The Great Gospel from Alpha to Tau,* which was provided with an album of pictures; the *Treasure of Life,* from which Augustine frequently quoted; the *Book of the Mysteries,* in twenty-four chapters; and finally his letters discovered in Upper Egypt.[3] According to these works, a radical dualism in the doctrine concerning God characterizes Manichaeism: there are two highest beings or principles of equal rank, the one of light and the other of darkness. Both are unbegotten and eternal; both possess equal power but stand in irreconcilable opposition to one another, each in a realm of his own: the region of light or the good, which lies in the North, and the region of evil, which lies in the South.[4] Each realm has a king: the realm of light is ruled by the Father of greatness; the realm of evil by the Prince of darkness who commands numerous demons. Between the two primary principles and their realms a conflict breaks out: the realm of matter seeks to swallow up the light; and, to defend the latter, the Father of greatness creates the first man, who with his five sons goes out to battle, but is conquered by evil. The first man becomes aware of his fate, and begs the Father of greatness for help. The latter emits from himself, after a series of intermediary emanations, the Living Spirit, who frees the first human being from evil matter and so redeems him.[5]

---

[2] Ibid. 47; 127–9; 132–5.

[3] For a description of this Manichaean literature, cf. ibid. 79–96.

[4] See No. 5 in A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus* (Berlin 1954).

[5] Adam, *op. cit.* No. 7.

This mythical occurrence is a symbol and image of the way of redemption for man, who is a mixture of light and darkness. As soon as a man becomes aware of this fact, that is to say knows himself, his redemption begins. And thereafter the Father of light helps him to free himself more and more from the darkness in him. For this purpose he sends the heralds of true religion to earth, who give men correct knowledge about themselves. These messengers are Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mani. They are representatives of the Manichaean redeemer, the emissary of light, and each of them brings to a part of mankind the true religion or gnosis, whose spread, however, is impeded from the opposite side. Before Mani, the heralds of religion had been assigned only certain parts of the world to which they were to bring true gnosis: Buddha worked in India, Zoroaster restricted himself to Persia, and Jesus to Judaea, or at least to the West. Neither did these three establish their message in writing; and consequently the religions they founded, especially the Christian religion, quickly fell to pieces or were falsified. Against such a background, Mani's mission stands out more sharply in its uniqueness: he is the last envoy of light, the apostle of the ultimate generation, the "seal of the prophet";[6] his message is the last summons to salvation; the world can now only be converted or for ever perish. Mani preached the highest, the perfect, gnosis; to reject it, is definitively to refuse salvation. The movement founded by Mani is, therefore, also the most universal religion ever known, comprising all earlier religions in itself, and at the same time leading beyond them. It will conquer the East and the West, and will be heard preached in all languages.[7]

From this Manichaean doctrinal system Manichaean ethics necessarily follow, the fundamental characteristic being the demand for abstinence from everything which links men to matter. In man light and darkness mingle; anyone who forgets this condition, or who does not repent, adheres more to matter, persists in ἀγνωσία, determined not to recognize his situation, and so rejects gnosis and thereby salvation. Consequently, the perfect Manichee renounces this world, seeks to possess nothing in it and subdues all his appetites; he binds himself by the triple seal of the mouth, the hands, and the womb; that is to say, he refrains from impure words and pleasures, and rejects menial work, for by these things the world of light, fragments of which are present in all visible, tangible things, is violated; he exercises absolute sexual continence and rejects marriage. In practice these lofty demands of Manichean ethics could not be fulfilled, a condition which led to the division of Manichaean believers into the elect, or *electi*, and the hearers, or *audientes*;[8] and there were special commandments for each according to their capacities. The hearers or catechumens served the elect, gave them food and clothing, and so hoped to be born sometime in the body of an elect and then to attain salvation.

---

[6] Ibid. No 1b.

[7] Adam, *op. cit.* Nos. 3 and 17.

[8] Ibid. No. 16.

In addition to being divided into such categories as these, the followers of the Manichaean religion were united in a well-organized church,[9] and this factor ensured them considerable impact in their missionary work. At the summit of the Manichaean church was a supreme head, the head of the apostles or the king of the religion, who had his residence in Babylon. The first head was naturally Mani himself, from whom every successor derived his authority. Subject to this supreme head was a hierarchy with numerous members comprising, in a series of grades, twelve apostles, seventy-two bishops or teachers of truth, and three hundred and sixty priests to whom all other members of the elect, both men and women, were attached as deacons. The great mass of hearers represented the last and lowest grade. The elect, particularly in China, were assembled in monastic communities, which were supported by the alms of the hearers. The ascetic exercises of Manichaeism included an elaborate practice of fasting. By fasting they prepared for a sort of confession,[10] in which they acknowledged transgressions of the commandments of abstinence. In their temples the Manichaean faithful gathered for a pure divine service of the word, which consisted of readings from Manichaean writings and the singing of their own hymns,[11] often possessed of high qualities of form. Other rites were rejected, since in them the body, which is bound to matter, is active, and only true gnosis brings salvation.

Of special importance is the marked dependence of Manichaean doctrine on Christian ideas. The high rank that is attributed to the person of Jesus is particularly striking. It is true that Mani lists the heralds of true gnosis, who had preceded Mani himself, as Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus and likewise his brethren; but the chief role is ascribed to Jesus. At the beginning of his letters, Mani emphatically calls himself "apostle of Jesus Christ".[12] This Jesus, as a heavenly "aeon", had appeared on earth with the semblance of a body, in order to teach mankind its real origin and true way of redemption. According to Arius, the Manichees called Christ "a part of the Father having the same nature as he";[13] and this use of the *homoousios* idea made the Arians their determined opponents. Thus, Jesus has become the guide of souls, whom the Manichees praised in many of their hymns. These sound in places so like purely Christian prayers, that the ear of a simple Christian could scarcely detect the Manichaean undertone when, for instance, he heard: "Come to me, living Christ! Come to me, O light of the day! O merciful one, O comforter, I cry to you so that you may turn to me in the hour of tribulation. Your sweet yoke I have taken upon me in purity. Honour and victory be to our Lord, the comforter and to his holy elect and to the soul of the blessed Mary."[14] Finally, this Jesus has sent the Paraclete promised by him, in order to free his teaching from falsification. The Paraclete came down upon Mani, and revealed hidden mysteries to him; and Mani became one with him, so that Mani could now come forward and teach as the promised Paraclete:[15] from Mani and through him there speaks the Spirit sent by Jesus. Neither does Mani pass over and ignore the Holy Scripture of Christianity.[16] It is true that he adopts a critical attitude to the Old Testament, because, in striking similarity to Marcion, he did not recognize the God of the Old Testament as the God of light; nevertheless, angels of light laid down some isolated truths even in the Bible of the Jews. But more important for Mani are the Gospels and Paul's letters: these also he considers as interspersed with Jewish errors, but they contain a rich store from Jesus' message regarding the profound structure of the world, the meaning of human destiny, the battle between light and darkness, and the liberation of the soul from the fetters of matter. Mani recognized these truths in the New Testament writings, singled them out and absorbed them into his preaching. Manichaeism showed particular interest also in New Testament apocrypha, such as the Gospel of Thomas and the legend of Abgar, and made use likewise of a version of the *Shepherd* of Hermas. This considerable adaptation of Christian elements in Manichean preaching was intended by Mani to facilitate contact with Christians in the West, and to win them over to his movement, just as he made similar use of the ideas of Zoroastrianism or Buddhism for his missionary work in the East. By taking over these various elements, Manichaean doctrine was intended to show that it was the fulfilment of all the religious aspirations of mankind.

---

[9] See Widengren, *op. cit.* 97–100.

[10] Adam, *op. cit.* No. 48.

[11] For examples of such hymns, ibid. Nos. 24–30.

[12] Adam, *op. cit.* Nos. 10 and 12.

[13] Letter of Arius to Bishop Alexander in Epiphanius, *Panar.* 69, 7–8.

The syncretic character of the new religion certainly ensured those initial successes which were everywhere apparent. The doctrines which Mani's zealous missionaries had to proclaim did not sound alien and did not come from a distant and unknown world. The fundamental ideal of a safe way to liberation from the evil in the world and of redemption through true gnosis was familiar to men of the third and fourth centuries. The Manichaean religion quickly spread in Mesopotamia, pressed on from there to Syria and Arabia, and soon found a particularly firm base in Egypt which was developed into a propaganda centre for the Mediterranean countries.

---

[14] Psalm 247 ed. by C. R. Allberry, *A Manichaean Psalmbook,* part II (Stuttgart 1938), 55 f.

[15] Adam, *op. cit.* No. 1b.

[16] See Widengren, *op. cit.* 125–7.

It clearly had marked success in Rome and North Africa, for the extremely severe edict which the emperor Diocletian issued in 297 to the proconsul of Africa, against this "pernicious innovation",[17] was based on the official complaints of the Roman authorities of that area. Death at the stake was ordered for leaders of the movement; their followers were to be beheaded, and Roman citizens of rank among them were to be punished by forced labour in the mines. Such measures, however, could not prevent the spread of Manichaeism. It can be shown to have existed in Rome under Pope Miltiades (311–14); from there it probably found its way to Gaul and Spain, also appearing in the Balkans.

The emperor Constantine was likewise disturbed by the doctrines of the movement, and had special reports drawn up on the subject.[18] Synods of the fourth century had to deal with Manichaeism repeatedly. A law of the emperor Valentinian I in the year 372 ordered the confiscation of houses in which the Manichees held their assemblies.[19] Theodosius II intensified the sanctions against them, and Justinian I reintroduced the death penalty for the profession of Manichaeism.[20] In North Africa Manichaeism exercised a peculiar fascination, to which the young Augustine succumbed for ten years, as did both with him and after him many members of the African upper classes. Augustine's fight against his earlier coreligionists introduces us to a number of Manichaean bishops, and reveals their extensive ecclesiastical organization which is confirmed by archaeological finds in North Africa. After the Vandal invasion, persecution affected them just as harshly as it did the Catholics; the formulas of abjuration for former Manichees on reception into the Church testify to their continued existence in the West extending into the sixth century. The Byzantine church in the East had to fight against them much longer, and the neo-Manichaean movements of the Middle Ages, especially in the Balkans, once again strikingly manifest the vitality of Mani's foundation.

Since Mani did not allow his followers to belong to another religion, the position of the Church in relation to Manichaeism was different from her defensive struggle against the Gnosticism of the second century. The penetration by individual Manichees into Christian communities, and the destruction of these from within, was less to be feared than direct apostasy or the conversion to the Manichaean religion, for which its missionaries openly strove. Its claim to sole possession of true and unfalsified Christianity, forced the Church authorities to take up a definite attitude and to put the faithful on their guard. Moreover, the Church could not but experience the Manichaean movement as a dangerous rival in her own missionary endeavour among the pagan population; thus a Christian defence was initiated relatively early. In a letter to his community[21] about the year 300 a bishop of Alexandria, perhaps Theonas, issued a warning against Manichaean doctrines of marriage and against their elect. Like Cyril of Jerusalem, Afrahat and Ephraem in the East, and like Leo the Great later in the West, other unnamed bishops must have combated the movement by their preaching. The Church enjoined particular vigilance when a Manichee wished to become a Catholic; and an attempt was made to ensure the genuineness of such a conversion by precisely-worded formulas of abjuration. Just as Augustine himself signed such a formulary,[22] so also it was imposed on others. He himself decreed that trust should be placed in the Manichee Victorinus only when he had given the names of all the Manichees known to him;[23] and Cyril of Jerusalem showed similar circumspection.[24] Very detailed formulas of abjuration, which had often to be signed even on the mere suspicion of Manichaeism, were in use both in the Latin West and in the Greek East.[25]

---

[17] Adam, *op. cit.* No. 56. On the question of authenticity, see W. Seston in *Mélanges A. Ernout* (Paris 1940), 345–54.

[18] See Ammianus Marcell. 15, 13, 1–2.

[19] Adam, *op. cit.* No. 57.

[20] See E. H. Kaden, "Die Edikte gegen die Manichäer von Diokletian bis Justinian" in *Festschrift H. Lewald* (Basle 1953), 55–68.

Hand in hand with these pastoral efforts to immunize the faithful against this heresy, there developed the theological defence carried on by writers. This was waged not only as occasion arose in theological studies, but also in special monographs, of which some have been lost.[26] The success which the Manichaean mission very early enjoyed in Egypt especially roused Egyptian authors to counter-measures. Even if Alexander of Lycopolis and his anti-Manichaean polemical treatise cannot be considered as Christian,[27] the work of Bishop Serapion of Thmuis represents an achievement against the Manichees which won special approval from Jerome,[28] and deserved it. In many of his writings, Didymus of Alexandria attacked this work, and wrote in addition a short treatise Κατὰ Μανιχαίων.[29] The four books of the Arabian bishop, Titus of Bostra,[30] against the Manichees have been preserved, as have the *Acta Archelae* of a certain Hegemonios who came presumably from Syria. Written in the form of a debate, these severely attacked Mani, the founder of the religion, and are a rich source for the early history of Manichaeism.[31] The anti-Manichaean works of Eusebius of Emesa, George of Laodicea, and Diodorus of Tarsus do not survive. In the Latin West, anti-Manichaean writers were less numerous; but, on the other hand, the West produced in Augustine the theologian who overcame the threat to the Church through years of reflection and argument, and in so doing made profitable use of Manichaean modes of thought, transposing suggestions derived from them into Christian terms.[32] From the evidence of his dialogue with Manichaeism, it is quite clear that the followers of the latter in Africa did not constitute a mass movement but were mainly recruited from intellectual circles. The Church's defensive struggle derived much benefit from the persecution of Manichaeism by the State. With Diocletian this persecution was still partly motivated by anti-Persian feeling; but, when the empire had itself become Christian, it represented a defence against heresy by means of the civil authority. So the Manichaean religion won its greatest successes in the Asiatic East; while, in the Mediterranean area proper, from the fourth century onwards, despite its obstinate persistence in individual cases, it never again became a danger to the Church as a whole in the way earlier Gnosticism had been.

---

[21] *Pap. Rylands* 469, which is Adam, *op. cit.* No. 35; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 6, 32, 34 and 36; Afrahat in Adam, *op. cit.*

[22] See Adam, *op. cit.* No. 61.

[23] *Ep.* 236. The so-called *commonitorium Augustini* also warns against allowing former Manichees too readily to be baptized, *CSEL* 25, 979 f.

[24] *Catech.* 6, 36.

[25] Adam, *op. cit.* Nos. 62–4.

[26] See editions listed in Bibliography, p. 491, 2. Indirect Sources.

[27] See O. Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur,* III (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1923), 102 f.

[28] *De vir. ill.* 99; on this, see *Quasten P,* III, 82 f.

[29] *PG* 39, 1085–110.

[30] *PG* 18, 1069–264; Syriac text ed. P. de Lagarde (Berlin 1859; reprinted Hanover 1924).

CHAPTER 23

Further Development of the Liturgy

THE growth of theological literature within the Church of the third century was accompanied by an equally important development in the liturgical domain. Here, too, new creative impulses are perceptible, from which the forms of divine worship grew, and which answered the needs of the communities of the great Church as they increased in strength.

Easter and the Easter Controversy

In the first place the feast of Easter was given an elaboration which made it in the minds of the faithful the central and pre-eminent celebration and memorial of Christian redemption. Two factors are especially responsible for this development: first of all the unfolding of the previous Easter festival itself, by increasing the duration of preparation and celebration; and, secondly, the bringing of the administration of the sacrament of Christian initiation into the Easter liturgy. The beginnings of this double movement extend back probably into the second century, since they are already apparent in an advanced stage early in the third. The sources which show this development most clearly, such as the Syrian *Didascalia,* some writings of Tertullian and the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, belong in all instances to the third century. The homilies on the Psalms by Asterius the Sophist were in fact written in the early fourth century, but often reflect a state of liturgical development which can be ascribed to the late third century.

---

[31] Ed. C. H. Beeson (Leipzig 1906); cf. *Quasten P*, III, 357 f.

[32] See especially Adam in *ZKG* 69 (1958), 6–23.

Despite differences of emphasis in detail, considerable similarity of view concerning the root idea of the celebration of the Easter festival can be assumed in both the East and West. It commemorated the fundamental truths and facts of Christian redemption, which were conferred upon mankind by the death and triumphant resurrection of the Lord.[1] In second-century Asia Minor and a few neighbouring regions, a Christian Passover was kept which naturally placed the thought of the Lord's passion in the foreground, but also included the idea that this passion leads to the resurrection. In accordance with Jewish custom, 14 Nisan was kept as the date for this Passover, by the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor and perhaps generally at first; it was prepared for by a strict fast and included a homily on Exodus 12 (as did the Jewish Passover). It was not exclusively a day of mourning nevertheless, and had a joyous conclusion with the agape and celebration of the Eucharist early on 15 Nisan. The Sunday Passover, the celebration of Easter on the Sunday following 14 Nisan, such as was known for instance in Syria, Egypt, Pontus, and the Latin West, likewise in no way excluded the thought of the Lord's passion from the fundamental idea of the feast. This thought was in fact incorporated into it by explicit commemoration, linked in this case also with a strict fast, because the recollection of the passion was the necessary condition for significant celebration of the triumphal resurrection of the Lord. The Easter vigil brought this Easter fast to an end, and constituted the bridge to Easter joy in the redemption perfected by the resurrection.

The so-called Easter controversy at the end of the second century is therefore misconstrued, if its basis is thought to have been a dispute over Easter festivals with fundamentally different content between the Quartodecimans[2] and the supporters of the Sunday pasch. It was rather a dispute about the date of the same Easter festival, and about the nature and duration of the same Easter fast. It led initially to no agreement, for both groups thought they could appeal to apostolic tradition in support of their own view.[3] It is no longer possible to determine when and by whom this Sunday Passover was introduced in Rome, but it must have become established there early in the second century, for Irenaeus plainly assumes the festival to have existed in the time of the Roman Bishop Xystus.[4] And the practice referred to by him is unlikely to have been a special creation in Rome itself, for such a supposition finds no support in the sources. Furthermore, the common elements shared by the Sunday celebration of the Easter festivities and the Passover feast of the Quartodecimans are very clear: the introductory strict fast; the reading of Exodus 12 with a homily appended; and, incorporated into a vigil celebration, a concluding eucharistic supper. These are best understood if we take the Sunday Easter celebration as a further development of the original Quartodeciman custom, but one which made the Sunday after 14 Nisan the culmination of the festival. This was done in order to emphasize more strongly the contrast with Judaism, and at the same time to bring more vividly into consciousness faith in the resurrection of the Lord as the crown of his work of redemption.

---

[1] Of fundamental importance: O. Casel, "Art und Sinn der ältesten christlichen Osterfeier" in *JLW* 14 (1938), 1–78.

[2] So, for example, B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner* (Gütersloh 1953), who does not go into the views of O. Casel.

The remaining differences in the manner of keeping the feast, whether according to the Sunday Easter rite or the Quartodeciman practice, were certainly felt and also disputed, as Irenaeus reports with reference to Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna and Anicetus of Rome;[5] but they did not at first burden the relations of the communities to one another in such a way as to endanger peace within the Church. That the differences in practice easily caused controversy is proved by the debate between Melito of Sardes and Bishop Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis about the year 170 in Asia Minor: a debate in which Clement of Alexandria also intervened. The latter based his argument on the Johannine chronology so as to criticize, in a work of his own, the custom of the Quartodecimans, and emphasized that Jesus, the true Paschal lamb, died and was buried on one day, the day of preparation of the Passover. In his reply, Melito justified the Quartodeciman practice by the dating of the Synoptics, according to which Jesus had celebrated the Passover before his death; and he asserted that this was what should still be maintained.[6]

---

[3] *Euseb. HE* 5, 23, 1; 5, 24, 6.

[4] Ibid. 5, 24, 14, and on this see B. Lohse, *op. cit.* 117. The interpretation of the passage in Irenaeus suggested by M. Richard seems untenable. Irenaeus definitely restricts the subject of the dicussion to the date of the already existing feastday, and the duration and nature of the fast usual before it; there was no question at issue whether the festival should be celebrated or not. According to M. Richard, a specifically Roman dispute about the date of Easter is to be postulated, within the Roman community under Soter's predecessors, in which the actual introduction of the Easter feast was controverted.

[5] *Euseb. HE* 5, 24, 16.

A few years before the turn of the century, the dispute over the date of the Easter celebration assumed graver forms. The immediate occasion is most probably found in Rome, where the priest Blastus sought to introduce the Quartodeciman custom, and managed to secure support among the Christian immigrants from Asia Minor.[7] About 195 the Roman Bishop Victor wished to establish a uniform regulation for the Church as a whole, and caused synods to be held everywhere for this purpose. Later Eusebius still possessed the results of the deliberations of some of these synods, which took place in Palestine, Pontus, and Osrhoëne; and he also knew the corresponding resolutions of a Roman synod, as well as the decisions of the churches of Gaul and of some individual bishops.[8] The majority expressed itself in favour of the Sunday practice; but determined contradiction came from the stronghold of the Quartodecimans, the province of Asia, for whose communities Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus made himself the spokesman. In accordance with a Roman request, he had likewise summoned the bishops of the province to a synod. This assembly came to the conclusion that the traditional practice was to be retained, as in Asia it was founded upon apostolic tradition.[9] The decision of the majority of all the synods moved Pope Victor to more severe action against the churches of Asia Minor, which he "attempted", as Eusebius emphasizes,[10] to exclude from the ecclesiastical community. But his action did not meet with general approval; and Irenaeus of Lyons resolutely advocated a course of tolerant treatment towards the followers of the divergent practice, which was evidently adopted.[11] The bishops of Palestine, too, strove for a uniform manner of celebrating Easter in accordance with the majority decision. The Quartodeciman minority remained faithful to their previous practice throughout the whole of the third century, and the Novatians in Asia Minor followed them in this.[12] The first canon of the Synod of Arles in 314 imposed the Sunday Easter, and the Council of Nicaea expelled the Quartodecimans from the ecclesiastical community.[13] Thereafter, their numbers continually declined, though even into the fifth century the great Church had to deal with them on occasion.[14]

---

[6] Fragments of Apollinaris from the *Chronicon paschale: PG* 5, 1297. The title of Clement's work, Κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἢ πρὸς Ἰουδαΐζοντας seems to indicate that in other places the Quartadeciman practice was felt to be a Jewish custom; cf. A. v. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I (Tübingen, 5th ed. 1931), 314.

[7] On Blastos, see, as well as *Eusebius HE* 5, 15, Ps.-Tertullian, *Adv. haer.* 8.

[8] *Euseb. HE* 5, 23, 3–4.

[9] Ibid. 5, 24, 1–8.

[10] Ibid 5, 24, 9.

[11] Ibid. 5, 24, 15–17. It seems impossible to limit Victor's action to the group of Quartodecimans at Rome; Eusebius' account is too plain. Victor would scarcely have summoned the synods outside Rome for such a limited purpose.

[12] *Socrates HE* 5, 21.

According to the most important sources for the third century, the pattern of the Easter celebration itself was also largely uniform in East and West. It was introduced by a strictly obligatory fast, which was viewed as an integral part of the Easter festival. The length of the fast was different from place to place, and could last for one, two, or even more days, as Irenaeus already attests.[15] It was kept most strictly in the East, where from the Monday of the appropriate week onwards, only bread, salt and water were taken, and on Friday and Saturday all food was dispensed with.[16] Fasting on these last two days was also demanded by the *Traditio apostolica,* but could be restricted to the Saturday in special cases.[17] Tertullian emphasizes that this fast gave special character to the days on which the Church was deprived of the Bridegroom.[18] Consequently, it was felt to be inseparably linked with the festival which had the whole occurrence of redemption as its content, the passage of the Lord and his community from death to life and from sorrow to joy.

The heart of the Easter celebration was the nocturnal vigil, for which all the Christians of a community assembled, so that it was not a family rite like the Jewish Passover, but essentially a social rite for all members of a congregation. Participation in it was a strict duty, so that Tertullian was afraid that the pagan husband of a Christian wife might have hesitation in allowing her to go to such a nocturnal festival.[19] The community assembled first of all for a service of prayer and readings, which occupied the first hours of the night; psalms, readings from the prophets and the Gospel are specially mentioned.[20] According to the *Didascalia,* the vigil belonged essentially to Easter day and consequently had a joyful conclusion;[21] and this aspect came increasingly to the fore with the further elaboration of the vigil celebration, such as must have occurred at the beginning of the third century. The solemn baptism must particularly be mentioned here, since about this time it was incorporated as a new element into the framework of the Easter liturgy. Tertullian had already regarded Easter, on account of its festive character, as being a particularly suitable date for baptism, without actually indicating the vigil in particular. But if Easter were really, as he says, the "dies baptismo solemnior", the liturgical location of the administration of baptism on this day could scarcely be sought outside the vigil celebration.[22] Although Hippolytus's *Church Order* does not formally name Easter day as a date for baptism, its statements concerning the immediate preparations for baptism make sense only if they refer to the last days of what was later to become Holy Week. The observation that people "must keep watch all night and have readings and instructions given to them (that is, to those to be baptized)" clearly points to the baptismal rite as part of the Easter vigil.[23] Asterius in the early fourth century speaks so much as a matter of course of the baptismal liturgy as an integral part of the festival of Easter night that the introduction of this liturgical custom must be ascribed to the third century according to him also.[24] In one of his homilies there is a hymn of praise to Easter night, which may rightly be described as a prefiguration of corresponding parts of the later Latin *Exsultet.* It gives authentic expression to the high place which the liturgy of the Easter vigil already occupied in the religious devotion of the early Christian Church:[25] "O night, brighter than day! O night, more radiant than the sun! O night, whiter than snow! O night, more dazzling than lightning! O night, more shining than torches! O night, more precious than Paradise! O night, freed from darkness! O night, filled with light! O night, which banishes sleep! O night, which teaches us to watch with the angels! O night, terror of the demons! O night, longing of the year! O night, which brings the Bridegroom to the Church! O night, mother of the newly baptized!" The crown and conclusion of the vigil was formed by the eucharistic celebration of Easter Sunday, which in all probability was very early distinguished in the East by the *Trishagion.*[26]

---

[13] For Arles: *Acta et symbola conciliorum, quae saec. IV habita sunt* (Leyden 1954), 23; For Nicaea: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 18.

[14] B. Lohse, *op. cit.* 128 ff.

[15] In *Euseb. HE* 5, 24, 12.

[16] *Didasc. apost.* 5, 18: see ed. by Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum* I (Paderborn 1905), 288.

[17] *Trad. apost.* 29: see ed. by Botte in *SourcesChr* 11 (1946), 64.

[18] Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 12–13

[19] *Ad uxor.* 2, 4.

[20] *Didasc. apost.* 5, 19 (290 Funk); according to Asterius Soph. (*Hom.* 8 and 9, and 28) psalms 5 and 15 in particular were used.

[21] *Didasc. apost.* 5, 20 (300 Funk).

The third century also produced the first outline of a paschal season which then became the nucleus and the first ritual cycle, of the developing ecclesiastical year. For fifty days after Easter the faithful commemorated with joyful hearts the resurrection of the Lord and their own salvation which this bestowed; the joyful character of this pentecost was emphasized by refraining from fasting and from kneeling at prayer.[27] The development of a definite octave of Easter is perhaps to be assigned to the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth, since Asterius takes it for granted as a well-established custom. Several of his extant homilies were pronounced on various days of Easter week to the newly-baptized, and consequently represent the earliest known example of mystagogic catechetics. He also accepts the Sunday after Easter as the conclusion of the octave.[28]

---

[22] *De bapt.* 19: "diem baptismo solemniorem Pascha praestat." Hippolytus, too, *In Dan. comm.* 16, gives Easter as a date for baptisms.

[23] *Trad. apost.* 20 (48 ff. Botte).

[24] Asterius, *Hom* 11, which also makes the ritual use of light in the liturgy of baptism quite probable.

[25] Ibid. *Hom.* 11, 4, and on this see H. J. Auf der Maur, "Der Osterlobpreis Asterios' des Sophisten" in *LJ* 12 (1962), 72–85.

[26] Once again Asterius provides the earliest certain evidence in *Hom.* 16, 15; he says that on this night the newly baptized would sing for the first time the ὕμνος τῶν πιστῶν. As Gregory of Nyssa also views the Trishagion in connexion with the solemn baptism, it was probably first used in the Easter liturgy. Gregory exhorts a catechumen to receive baptism so that he can sing it with the faithful (*De bapt. PG* 46, 461).

The final day of Pentecost at first had no festive character. A single reference indicates that in Spain, about the year 300, no uniform practice was followed regarding the final date of Eastertide: one group of Christians kept the fortieth day after Easter, while others kept the fiftieth. The Synod of Elvira disapproved of the former of these customs, and expressly declared that the fiftieth day after Easter was to be celebrated as the feast which ended the Easter cycle.[29] Since the feast of the Epiphany cannot be shown with certainty to have existed in the universal Church before the fourth century, its possible pre-Constantinian roots in Egypt must be discussed later.

The basis for the development of a third-century Christian calendar of feasts can be observed in the commemoration of the martyrs, which was already customary in the Church at that time. This practice sprang from the general honour paid to the dead which was also shown by the Christians to their own departed. On their private initiative, Christians often had the eucharistic oblation made for their dead at the grave-site on the anniversary of death, and customarily remembered them in their prayers. Tertullian repeatedly attests this custom at the beginning of the third century.[30] That such commemoration was emphatically held in honour of the Christian martyrs can easily be understood from the deep veneration which was very early shown them by the faithful. In the East a commemoration for the martyrs, as can be seen from the account of the martyrdom of St Polycarp of Smyrna, which in its concluding report speaks of the celebration on his "birthday", that is, the anniversary of his death.[31] In the West, such a development is perceptible from the sources only much later: The commemoration of a martyr, officially celebrated by the Church, is found in Rome in the first half of the third century: the *Depositio martyrum,* the

---

[27] Cf. Tertullian, *De cor.* 3; *De ieiun.* 14: "...quinquaginta exinde dies in omni exsultatione decurrimus." The custom of standing up to pray during Pentecost was sanctioned by the Council of Nicaea, canon 20.

[28] Asterius, in the headings to *Homilies* 8, 11, 30, 31; cf. *Homily* 21 as a whole.

[29] Synod. Illib., can. 43.

[30] Tertullian, *De cor.* 3; *De exhort. cast.* 11; *De monog.* 10.

[31] *Martyr. polyc.* 18; but see on this H. v. Campenhausen, *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarpmartyriums* (Heidelberg 1957), 3.

Roman calendar, names the Roman Bishop Callistus († 222) as the earliest example of a martyr honoured in this way, perhaps because it was only then that the Roman community acquired its own cemeteries, and so obtained by this legal right the possibility of organizing a commemorative ceremony.[32]

For North Africa, Cyprian testifies to a cult of the martyrs, regulated by the Church, in which the *confessores* were also included. He ordered that the days of their deaths also should be carefully noted, so that the eucharistic sacrifice might be offered[33] on those days, too, as well as on those of the martyrs. The giving of special prominence to the grave of a martyr by the architectural elaboration of his tomb probably occurred in places even in the third century, but only the *Memoria apostolorum* on the Appian Way outside Rome can be said with certainty to be a construction in that period, of a kind which was later generally called *martyrion.*[34] There are reasons for thinking that the pre-Constantinian memorial under the *Confessio* in St Peter's which must be identified with the *Tropaion* on the Vatican Hill mentioned by the Roman presbyter Gaius, should also be mentioned here.[35] At all events, the organization of a cult of the martyrs as a whole becomes in the third century a matter for ecclesiastical authority, that is, of the bishop of the community, whose influence on the development of liturgical worship is here particularly evident.

Catechumenate and Baptism

With the introduction of the catechumenate under ecclesiastical direction, as an institutional preparation for the reception of baptism, the growing Church at the end of the second century and beginning of the third accomplished one of its most important achievements and one very rich in consequences. Several causes were decisive in the Church's gradual construction of a carefully planned and organized course of instruction, containing provision for moral and religious training of those seeking baptism. The first impulse must have come from the considerable missionary success of the Church which developed towards the end of the second century. Such progress must have suggested the idea of an intensive probation of the pagan neophytes, if the previous level in the Christian communities was to be maintained. The urgent need for better instruction in the faith and deeper knowledge of it, was also increased by the threatening growth of propaganda from heretical groups, especially from the powerful Gnostic movement which penetrated even into the communities of the great Church. Finally, a systematic introduction on firm principles into the world of the Christian sacraments of initiation was found desirable, in view of the rival mystery cults, whose influence on pagan religious inquirers is not to be minimized.

---

[32] *Depos. mart.*, 14 Oct., ed. H. Lietzmann, *Die drei ältesten Martyrologien* (Bonn, 2nd ed. 1911) 4; cf. A. Stuiber, "Heidnische und christliche Gedächtniskalender" in *JbAC* 3 (1960), especially 30 ff.

[33] Cyprian, *Ep.* 12, 2; 39, 3. On the whole question, see *Delehaye* OC 24–49.

[34] See, in particular, F. W. Deichmann in *JdI* 72 (1957), 44–110 and, in general, A. Grabar, *Martyrium* (Paris 1946).

[35] See above, pages 115 ff.

In the development of the ecclesiastical institution of the catechumenate, certain earlier forms must be taken into account, which at first lay principally in the domain of private initiative. In particular, the first instruction in the faith must generally have been given on a private basis, but it was placed at a later stage under ecclesiastical supervision or made to depend on ecclesiastical authorization. Often an individual Christian was the first teacher of a pagan who had become acquainted with the new faith, and whose subsequent community membership was in question. Later it was the educated convert who came forward on his own initiative as a private teacher of the Christian religion, as the activity of Justin and of the earlier Alexandrian teachers shows; and who could then be taken into service by the Church.[36] These forms of private preparation of candidates for baptism were gradually incorporated by the Church, until by the beginning of the third century the organized institution was in existence, as it is found in the *Church Order* of Hippolytus. Concurrently, the development in North Africa was just reaching completion, as Tertullian testifies. These sources indicate the following general picture of the catechumenate in its standard form.

The admission of catechumens to instruction was controlled by the Church, who submitted the candidate for baptism to a strict examination, especially of his moral qualities. For this reason she first of all required that the candidate should name a Christian acquaintance as guarantor, who could vouch for the seriousness of his intention in conversion.[37] One may generally consider this guarantor to have been an apostolically active Christian, to whom the candidate for baptism owed his acquaintance with the Christian religion, and who now introduced him to the leader of the Christian community. There was as yet no special name for these witnesses in the catechumenate; they were not identical with a godfather in the later sense, since they undertook to guarantee only the worthiness of the candidate, and assumed no responsibility for his future manner of life. The acceptance into the catechumenate depended, moreover, on an examination of the candidate by the teacher of the catechumens, who might be a cleric or layman,[38] and whose inquiry extended to the motives of the candidate's request, his marital status, profession, and social position.[39] In the case of the slave of a Christian master, the latter's agreement and testimonial were required; and if this was unfavourable, the candidate was rejected. A number of professions were forbidden to the Christian of the third century, and therefore a candidate for the catechumenate might have to abandon his previous trade. Those occupations in particular were incompatible with his future status as a Christian which stood in a direct or highly potential connexion with pagan worship, such as those of a sacrificial priest, temple guard, actor,[40] astrologer, or magician, to which the Synod of Elvira added that of a charioteer in the circus[41]. Service in the army or in the civil administration gave rise also to hesitation. Tertullian could not believe that soldiers or officials could avoid every situation in which participation in pagan sacrifice and worship would be required of them, or in which they would come into contact with the service of the temples, or have to employ violence or weapons against others.[42] Anyone who joined the army after being accepted into the catechumenate was, according to Hippolytus's *Church Order*, immediately to be excluded from further instruction. The Christian attitude to sexual offences in the candidate for baptism was quite uncompromising: every prostitute was to be rejected and, if need be, the marital situation was to be regularized before admission to instruction. It is clear that, in the investigation of all these questions, decisive weight was attributed to the testimony of the guarantor. The precision of all these regulations shows the mentality of a Church conscious of her responsibility, who took her moral ideal seriously and courageously laid down clear conditions for those who wanted to become her members.

---

[36] See above, pages 229 ff., and Justin, *Apol.* 61, 1.

[37] *Trad. apost.* 16 (44 Botte).

[38] Ibid. 16 and 19. According to Origen, *Contra Cels.* 3, 51, it was still the Christians as a whole who had the duty of examining the candidates for baptism.

A favourable outcome of this initial inquiry opened the way to the catechumenate, into which the candidate was then received by a special rite, the marking with the sign of the cross; and thus became a *Christianus* or *catechumenus.*[43] A detailed set of rules regulated the life and activity of the catechumens.[44] They were placed under the *doctor audientium* for three years, though this period could be shortened in particularly zealous individual cases.[45] Their time was now occupied with special instruction, introducing them to the world of Christian belief, and with practical training in Christian spiritual life. The teaching was based on Holy

---

[39] For what follows, cf. *Trad. apost.* 16 as a whole (43–46 Botte).

[40] Cyprian, *Ep.* 2 also includes a man who instructs actors; the original connexion with the worship of the gods was still vividly felt.

[41] Canon 62.

[42] *De idol.* 17.

[43] Cf. F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis* (Paderborn 1911), 177; Tertullian, *De idol.* 1 and *De cor.* 2. In North Africa the catechumens were also known as *audientes* or *auditores,* as opposed to the *fideles,* the baptized: Cyprian, *Ep.* 29.

[44] In Hippolytus, *Trad. apost.* 17–20 (46–49 Botte); B. Capelle has attempted a reconstruction of the Latin translation in *RThAM* 5 (1933), 136–9.

[45] *Trad. apost.* 17; the Synod of Elvira (canon 42) lays down two years.

Scripture, with which attendance at the service of the Word and the homily also made them more familiar. Every lesson ended with a prayer and imposition of hands by the catechist.[46] The three-year period of the catechumenate was concluded by yet another examination of the candidate for baptism extending over his moral and religious performance during that time. The examination took place a few weeks before Easter, the principal date for baptism, and was conducted probably by the bishop. Once again a guarantor was required to appear for the candidate;[47] and the latter's performance was measured by "good works", among which visiting the sick and respect for the widows were expressly included.[48] An eminent form of excellence in a catechumen was arrest for Christ's sake; and if thereby death was suffered without baptism, the catechumen was nevertheless saved, because he had been "baptized in his own blood".[49]

A satisfactory outcome of the second inquiry led to the second and final stage of the catechumenate, which served directly to prepare the candidates, now called *electi,* for the reception of baptism soon to ensue. This stage was characterized by a greater use of liturgical prayers of purification or exorcisms, intended to heal and liberate more completely from Satanic power.[50] The bishop as leader of the community came even more prominently into the foreground. As the day of baptism approached, he tested once more by an exorcism the purity of the candidates and excluded the energumens. He prayed with them on the Saturday before baptism, laid his hands on them, and blessed their senses with the sign of the cross.[51] Perhaps the beginning of this second stage of the catechumenate was also the special time for the first renunciation of Satan, of which Tertullian speaks.[52] He also mentions that the weeks of final preparation included more intense practices of penance and frequent prayer and fasting,[53] which emphasized the importance of the event which was to come. A baptismal fast was imposed on the candidates on the Friday and Saturday preceding the Sunday when baptism was to be conferred.[54] In addition to this preparation of a liturgical kind, Hippolytus also mentions as a special task of the *electi* that "they are to hear the Gospel".[55] This comment probably means that they were now strictly obliged, and no longer merely authorized, to be present at the service of the Word at the celebration of the Eucharist, and there to hear readings from the Gospels and the homily.[56]

---

[46] *Trad. apost.* 18 and 19. [47] Cf. E. Dick in *ZKTh* 63 (1939), 25–27.

[48] *Trad. apost.* 20, 1.

[49] Ibid. 19, 2; Tertullian, *De bapt.* 12 and 14; Cyprian, *Ep.* 57, 4; 73, 21 and 23.

[50] Cf. A. Stenzel, *Die Taufe, eine genetische Erklärung der Taufliturgie* (Innsbruck 1958), 62 and 72.

[51] *Trad. apost.* 20, 3, 5 (48 f. Botte).

[52] *De cor.* 3. [53] *De bapt.* 20. [54] *Trad. apost.* 20, 5. [55] Ibid. 20, 2.

[56] Cf. A. Stenzel. *op. cit.* 64 ff.

The act of baptism was enclosed in the impressive framework of a night-long vigil, which time was occupied with readings and final liturgical instructions. It was chiefly during the Easter vigil that the greatest number of candidates were baptized; otherwise it was during a Saturday to Sunday night that the ceremony took place, if a special reason required a different date for baptism. The break of day, signalized by the crowing of a cock, brought the beginning of the baptismal action proper.[57] The candidates had set aside their clothes and all ornaments, and advanced to a font with a flow of clear water. The bishop had first of all consecrated the oils to be used at the baptism: the oil of thanksgiving and the oil of exorcism, which were each held ready by a deacon on the left and right of the priest. The sequence of candidates was prescribed as follows: children were baptized first,[58] with their parents or perhaps a member of their family giving the answers to the priest's questions for them; the men came next and then the women. The priest required each candidate individually to say the words of baptismal renunciation, turning to the West as he did so: "I renounce you, Satan and all your pomp and all your works"[59] Then followed the anointing with the oil of exorcism, together with the formula: "Every evil spirit go forth from you." Thereupon the candidate went to the priest by the font, and a deacon accompanied him into the water. The officiating bishop or priest laid his hands on him, and asked in sequence three questions regarding his belief:[60] "Do you believe in God the Father almighty? Do you believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God who was born by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, died, and was buried, who rose alive from the dead on the third day, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, who will come again to judge the living and the dead? Do you believe in the Holy Spirit, Holy Church, and the resurrection of the flesh?" To each question the candidate answered "I believe"; and as he did so the officiant poured water over his head.[61] A priest then anointed him with the oil of thanksgiving: "I anoint you with the oil in the name of Jesus Christ"; the baptized person now put his clothes on again, and after the end of the baptisms all went from the baptistery into the church. There a new rite was carried out with each of the baptized individually, the *consignatio,*[62] performed by the bishop. The latter placed his hand on the baptized person, and said a prayer as he did so, imploring the grace of God for the newly-baptized that he might serve God according to his will. Then he anointed the head of each with oil, made the sign of the cross on their brows, and gave each a kiss with the words: "The Lord be with you"; whereupon the confirmed person answered: "And with thy spirit." Then the newly-baptized joined the congregation of the faithful and celebrated the Eucharist with them for the first time.

---

[57] *Trad. apost.* 21, 1 (49 Botte).

[58] Infant baptism prevailed everywhere from the end of the second century, though hesitation was expressed on occasion, cf. K. Aland, *Die Säuglingstaufe im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche* (Munich 1961).

[59] *Trad. apost.* 21, 6 (50 Botte).

[60] Ibid. 21, 8–12.

[61] For North Africa, cf. Tertullian, *De cor.* 3; *Adv. Prax. 26.* For the accompanying anointing, *De bapt.* 7, 1.

[62] *Trad. apost.* 22 (52 f. Botte).

The foregoing account of the catechumenate and the baptismal liturgy are derived from the *Church Order,* or *Liturgy,* of Hippolytus, a document which is by far the most advanced ritually and, one might say, rubricistically, in the period. Since this is now considered to have been an ideal liturgical plan, originating in the East and suitable for adoption by any community, it can no longer be viewed with complete confidence as the typical baptismal liturgy of the Roman church.[63] The only informative material on the subject apart from this source and in any way comparable to it, concerns the North African church. Tertullian's occasional, but nevertheless valuable observations about the baptismal liturgy and practice of his country show points both of agreement and difference with those described above. The agreement is found mostly in factual details: chiefly in the existence of the catechumenate, the form of administration of baptism, and the way baptismal symbolism was employed. The differences consist less in the absence of particular features than in a different kind of assessment of the significance of preparation for, and administration of this sacrament. There seems to be no second stage in Tertullian's version of the catechumenate; the days of immediate preparation before the date of baptism are not described in detail; the special work *De baptismo* gives not a single text of the prayers used in the administration of baptism: all of these elements being necessarily related to a stage of organization of the ritual which had not yet been reached in North Africa. On the other hand, in the catechumenate of North Africa, the moral and ascetical training of the candidates had clearly greater weight than their introduction to a knowledge of the faith; the demand made on their moral quality was very high. The rejection of failures or dubious candidates was inexorable. The "juridical" evaluation of the act of baptism was especially marked; the latter appears as the "sacramentum militiae" or "sacramentum fidei", as the "pactio fidei" and "sponsio salutis"; a binding pact is concluded with the Church, which enrols the baptized in the "militia Christi."[64]

Broadly speaking, at the beginning of the third century the early Christian

---

[63] Cf. J. M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte* (Rome 1959).

[64] Cf. Tertullian, *De cor.* 11; *De spect.* 24; *Ad mart.* 3; *De bapt.* 6; *De pud.* 9. On the whole question cf. F. J. Dölger, "Sacramentum militiae" in *AuC*, II (1930), 268–80. Fundamentally the *pactio* is also present for Hippolytus in the baptismal renunciation.

Church as a whole had laid down the essential pattern regulating baptism which remained in force for the two centuries that followed. That pattern was still capable of completion, and underwent considerable modifications when peace came, but these only emphasized the quality of the foundations.

The Celebration of the Eucharist

In order to be able to survey more clearly and better estimate the development reached in the eucharistic liturgy by the end of the third century, it is well to start with the description given by Justin Martyr about the year 150. He first sketches the course of the ritual linked to baptism, then speaks of the common ceremony to which all came "on the day named after the sun".[65] From this double description, it can be seen that the service of readings which opened the liturgy had kept its place on Sundays: "The memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read aloud"; the reading is followed by the homily of the man presiding; and then come the prayers in common "for ourselves, for the newly-baptized and for all others wherever they may be". The reference to prayer for the newly-baptized permits the supposition that it was possible to insert prayers at this point for some special purpose, their formulation being left to the leader. The service of prayers and readings was terminated by the kiss of peace.[66] The second part of the ceremony stands out in clear contrast: it began with the bringing in of the sacrificial gifts though it is not said who brought the bread and the chalice with wine and water to the president. The essential element of this part is the prayer of the man presiding, which is called εὐχαριστία, and in which he sends up praise and honour to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks that the faithful had been given those gifts. The whole congregation taking part confirmed and ratified the εὐχαριστία of the president with the Hebrew word "Amen". The consecrated eucharistic gifts were then given by the deacons to all present, to be consumed, and portions were also taken to those who were absent. Justin emphasizes that only the baptized could receive this food, which was itself called Eucharist.[67]

Two features stand out in an especially clear manner in this eucharistic liturgy: first of all, there was its social character, drawing all the participating faithful into the actual liturgical action; they ratify expressly the thanksgiving uttered by the leader, and also share as a whole in the eucharistic meal. Moreover, the eucharistic great prayer is primarily one of thanksgiving. Justin insists on this idea in other contexts too, as other writers of the second and third centuries do after him,[68] so that the word "eucharistia" could now become a technical term for the Christian celebration of Mass.[69] The absence of explicit mention in Justin's *Apology* of the idea of sacrifice in the eucharistic liturgy may be due to the fact that he does not quote a complete text of the prayer. The concept was by no means unknown to him,[70] and εὐχαριστία could certainly include for him the idea of sacrifice.[71] Irenaeus speaks more clearly on this point, emphasizing especially that the gifts of bread and wine, which by God's word have become Christ's flesh and blood, represent the pure sacrifice of the New Covenant.[72]

---

[65] *Apol.* 65 and 67.

[66] Only mentioned in c. 65.

[67] Ibid. c. 66.

The elaboration which the eucharistic liturgy underwent between the period of the Apologists and the first half of the third century is again most clearly revealed by Hippolytus's *Church Order,* which also records a double description of the celebration of Mass, explaining firstly how it is carried out in connexion with the consecration of a bishop, and secondly how the Christian community celebrates Mass with its newly-baptized members.[73] The chief value of this source lies in the formulary of the eucharistic great prayer, of which a text is provided in full. The first of these two Mass liturgies starts with the introduction of the sacrificial offering carried by the deacons; the bishop, with the presbyters, stretches out his hands over the offering as he begins the great prayer of thanksgiving; the latter is introduced by a prayer of versicle and response between him and the whole congregation, just as it is found to the present day in the liturgy of the Roman Mass. The thanksgiving of the great prayer is addressed to the Father "through his beloved Son Jesus Christ", whom he has sent as saviour and redeemer. Christ is the Father's Word through which he created all things; he took flesh in the womb of the Virgin and was born of the Holy Spirit and of her; he took suffering freely upon himself to break the power of death and of Satan, and made known his resurrection. The congregation is following his example and command at the Last Supper (here the words of Christ are quoted), when it is mindful of his death and resurrection, offers to the Father the bread and the chalice, and gives thanks to him for considering them worthy to stand in his service. The bishop also prays that the Father may send down his Holy Spirit on the sacrificial offering of Holy Church, so that they may strengthen their faith in truth, "so that we may praise and glorify thee through thy Son Jesus Christ, through whom is glory and honour to thee, the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, in thy Holy Church, now and for ever." The Amen of the whole congregation here, too, ratifies the bishop's prayer.[74]

---

[68] Justin, *Dial.* 41, I; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4, 17, 5; Origen, *Contra Cels.* 8, 57.

[69] Cf. T. Schermann in *Philologus* 69 (1910), 375–410.

[70] *Dial.* 41, 2; 117, 2 and 3.

[71] Cf. T. Schermann, *loc. cit.* 385 ff. On the sacrificial character of the Eucharist before Justin's time, see J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, I, 25 ff. (New York 1951).

[72] *Adv. haer.* 4, 18,1; 3, 18, 1 and 19, 3.

[73] *Trad. apost.* 4 and 23 (30–33 and 53–56 Botte).

Just as Hippolytus's liturgy of the Mass was intended as a guide, which the leader of a community could keep to a greater or less extent, so too the eucharistic great prayer, in particular, was not intended as an obligatory text for all churches and all purposes, but as a model formulary, the structure and fundamental ideas of which could be retained, but which might be varied and developed in detail.[75] The bishop could therefore still on occasion freely create and shape the text, so that various types of eucharistic prayers of thanksgiving were possible for the celebration of Mass in the third century; and they can still be traced in the formularies which have been preserved in more recent liturgies. It is not possible to decide whether the *Trishagion* was already present in some of them. Hippolytus does not mention it; and the way in which Tertullian, and before him Clement of Rome, speak of the liturgy does not require the assumption that the *Trishagion* was always used in the Mass at that time.[76] But the "form of Mass" presented by Hippolytus can be regarded as a basic outline of the eucharistic liturgy as it was generally celebrated in the Church in those days: it is a liturgy still quite clear in structure and without much detailed elaboration. But when Pope Anicetus could invite Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna, during the latter's visit to Rome about the year 154, to celebrate the liturgy in the Roman community, and when in the Syrian *Didascalia,* about a hundred years later, it is said that an episcopal guest should be given the honour of "offering the sacrifice",[77] such evidence presupposes in different geographical regions a regulation of the ritual of the Mass which was uniform at least in its main features.

Occasional observations by other writers confirm and complete this picture of the eucharistic liturgy drawn by Hippolytus. Tertullian's writings in particular show on many points the identity or similarity of the African Mass liturgy with it.[78] In Tertullian's record also bread and wine were the gifts which the faithful provided for the sacrifice.[79] The eucharistic great prayer was addressed to the Father "per Christum Jesum";[80] but Tertullian does not expressly quote from it, though many echoes can be detected in his style and thought. He explicitly stresses that Christ, with the words "Hoc est corpus meum", makes the bread his body;[81] but he does not clarify the position of the Our Father and the place of the kiss of peace in the Mass liturgy. His remarks about the communion ritual are more informative:[82] the Eucharist was received under both kinds, as in Hippolytus's rite;[83] but while the latter cites the formulas with which the species were distributed by the bishop or priests to the faithful, that is "panis caelestis in Christo Jesu", "In Deo patri omnipotenti", and "Et Domino Jesu Christo et spiritu sancto et sancta ecclesia", with a confirmatory "Amen" from the communicant, Tertullian mentions only the Amen, which certainly presupposes that there was some preceding formula.[84] He demanded reverent care in handling the consecrated bread and wine; the faithful could take the former home, in order to receive the Eucharist privately when they were prevented from attending divine worship.[85] Tertullian also implies the existence of a formula for dismissing the congregation when he speaks of the people being sent away at the end of the eucharistic ceremony.[86] He does not name Sunday as the day preferred for celebrating the Eucharist, but he does mention Wednesday and Friday as days of the Stations, together with Mass.[87] That Mass was also celebrated at the funeral and on the anniversary of the death of one of the faithful has already been made clear. Since the second century, the time for Mass had been in the early morning before sunrise, as Tertullian clearly testifies.[88] Therefore, it was not linked, or was no longer linked, with the agape, which persisted as an independent meal.

---

[74] Ibid. 4 (33 Botte).

[75] Hippolytus says quite plainly, *Trad. apost.* 10 (41 Botte), that the texts he provides were not to be learnt by heart by the bishop: "Each must pray according to his capacities."

[76] Cf. W. C. van Unnik, "1 Clement and the 'Sanctus'" in *VigChr* 5 (1951), 204–48.

[77] *Euseb. HE* 5, 24; *Didasc. apost.* 2, 58, 3 (168 Funk).

[78] See on this E. Dekkers, *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis der liturgie* (Brussels-Amsterdam 1947), 49–67.

[79] *De monog.* 10; *De exhort. cast.* 11; and even clearer Cyprian, *De op. et eleem.* 15.

[80] *Adv. Marc.* 4, 9.

The first beginnings of the so-called "discipline of the secret" can also be traced in the third century. This is a modern term for the early Christian custom of keeping secret from the uninitiated the most important actions and texts of liturgical worship, especially baptism, the Eucharist, the Our Father, and the creed, or of referring to them in the presence of unauthorized persons in veiled terms only. In particular, the nature and form of liturgical initiation were to be kept secret, and "discovered" solely through the initiation itself. As this attitude took shape slowly, its beginnings cannot be discerned with complete clarity. It is scarcely possible to refer to Tertullian for elucidation since his occasional relevant remarks are obscure, and he moreover speaks ironically of the passion for secrets in the pagan mystery

[81] Ibid. 4, 40.

[82] Cf. E. Dekkers, *op. cit.* 59 ff.

[83] Tertullian, *De resurrect. carn.* 8; *Trad. apost.* 23 (54 Botte).

[84] *De Spect.* 25.

[85] *De cor.* 3; *De orat.* 19; *Ad uxor.* 2, 5.

[86] *De an.* 9, 4, and cf. F. J. Dölger in *AuC,* V (1940), 108–17.

[87] *De orat.* 19.

[88] *De cor.* 3; *De orat.* 19; *De fuga* 14; cf. also *Didasc. apost.* 2, 60, 2 (172 Funk).

cults, in a manner which would hardly have been possible if the North African Christians had observed a similar custom in his time.[89] But the attitude is apparent in Hippolytus's *Church Order*, according to which an unbeliever was not to be instructed about baptism and the Eucharist before he had been baptized or admitted to communion.[90] The use of the language of the mysteries was also probably in conformity with a growing discipline of the secret.[91] Similary, in Origen, formulas are found which may be interpreted as echoes of this thinking when he refrains from disclosing details to his hearers concerning the Eucharist, or when he tells the future candidate for baptism that he would later "be initiated into the exalted mysteries already known to those for whom such knowledge is appropriate".[92] Since most of this evidence comes from the East, the place of origin of the discipline of the secret is perhaps thus indicated. It attained its real force only in the fourth and early fifth centuries; consequently, its deeper motives and relation to the pagan mysteries will be discussed in greater detail later.

The Beginnings of Christian Art

A Christianity which had increased in numbers and self-awareness was provided for the first time in the third century with the possibility of engaging in artistic activity inspired by a Christian spirit, for only the longer periods of peace coming at that time afforded the special conditions required. Christian art was, however, initially opposed by a trend of considerable strength within the Church itself that stood in irreconcilable opposition to artistic activity as such.[93] The Old Testament prohibition of images (in Exod 20:4) was influential in this respect. Origen, for example, refers to it in saying that the Christians abominated temples, altars and images.[94] The pure spirituality of the Christian God was also felt by Minucius Felix to be an obstacle that obstructed worshipping Him in a special building.[95] The close connexion between the art of antiquity and pagan worship was in the forefront of Tertullian's mind when he radically rejected Christian activity in this domain. The devil alone, he says, had sent sculptors and painters into the world.[96] Even at the beginning of the fourth century the synod of Elvira decreed for the territories of the Spanish bishops that: "Images are forbidden in Church; what is honoured and worshipped must not be represented on the walls."[97] This hostile tendency to art and images could not, however, prevail over the positive trend which succeeded in making an important advance in the third century. Tertullian knew Christians who possessed drinking vessels bearing the image of the Good Shepherd.[98] Clement of Alexandria, for all his reserve regarding a representation of God, nevertheless suggested to the Christians of his day some symbols which their signet rings might bear, as the dove, fish, ship, anchor, and fisherman.[99] Giving due regard to such a favourable attitude towards art in the private domain, it was nevertheless the needs of liturgical worship in the stronger communities of the Church as a whole which finally obtained for art an official recognition by ecclesiastical authority. Another contributory factor was the inclination of the Christians, surrounded by a widespread pagan cult of the dead, to express in artistic form on the tombs of their dead whatever their faith proclaimed to them concerning death and resurrection.

---

[89] The references usually given are to *Apol.* 7, 6; *Ad ux.* 2, 5; *Adv. Val.* 1. On this see E. Dekkers, *op. cit.* 80–82.

[90] *Trad. apost.* 23 (56 Botte), with variants. This is so although Hippolytus himself speaks in detail of baptism and the Eucharist.

[91] Cf. *Protr.* 12, 118–20; Paed. 1, 5, 26.

[92] Origen, *In Lev. hom.* 9, 10; *In Iesu Nave hom.* 4, 1: " si . . . initiatus fueris venerandis illis magnificisque sacramentis, quae norunt illi, quos nosse fas est."

[93] Cf. H. Koch, *Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen* (Göttingen 1917); W. Elliger, *Die Stellung der alten Christen zu den Bildern* (Leipzig 1930).

[94] *Contra Cels.* 7, 64.

[95] *Octavius* 32.

First of all, the desire must have developed among the Christians for a place of worship of their own where the worthy celebration of the eucharistic liturgy would be possible, when the size of the congregations made this increasingly difficult in private houses. The written evidence for the existence of specifically Christian places of worship appears at the beginning of the third century.[100] About 205 a flood in Edessa in the East of Syria destroyed, among other things, "the temple of the Christians".[101] Hippolytus reports in his commentary on Daniel that the enemies of the Christians forced their way "into the house of God", just when the faithful had gathered there for prayer.[102] About the same time, Tertullian spoke of the "house of our dove", in a context which most probably indicates that the Christian place of worship in Carthage was referred to.[103] For the second half of the third century, evidence is available of Christian "churches" in Palestine[104] and Sicily.[105] About the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth, the Christian churches had become very numerous.

---

[96] *De idol.* 3.

[97] Synod. Illib., can. 36.

[98] *De pud.* 7, 10.

[99] *Paed.* 3, 59, 2, and cf. L. Eizenhöfer in *JbAC* 3 (1960), 51–69.

[100] Cf. J. R. Laurin, "Le lieu du culte chrétien d'après les documents littéraires primitifs" in *AnGr* 70 (1954), 39–57, and W. Rordorf in *ZNW* 55 (1964), 110–28.

[101] *Chronicum Edessenum* in *CSCO* 4, 3.

[102] *In Dan. comm.* 1, 20.

[103] *Adv. Val.* 3, and cf. F. J. Dölger in *AuC*, II (1930), 41–56. See also Tertullian, *De fuga* 3; *De idol.* 7.

[104] *Euseb. HE* 7, 15, 1–5.

[105] Porphyry, *Fragment* 76.

Eusebius indicates that the earlier places where the Christians had worshipped, prior to Diocletian, were everywhere replaced by more spacious buildings[106]. Christian places of worship were destroyed in Bithynia, Galatia and Pontus, Thracia, Africa, Spain, and Gaul, as a result of the Diocletian decree of persecution[107]. In contrast to these abundant and plain statements of the written sources, archaeological findings have not until now been rich. It has of course been thought, that the remains of older Roman houses found during excavations under some of the most ancient titular churches of Rome, such as San Clemente, St Pudenziana, St Martino ai Monti and others, are the remnants of the pre-Constantinian *domus ecclesiae* in each case;[108] but definite proof of the liturgical character of these earlier buildings has not been discovered.[109] An undoubted example of a pre-Constantinian Christian church has, however, been brought to light by excavations in Dura-Europos, a Roman frontier garrison on the west bank of the Euphrates, built about 232. The Christian character of this private house, adapted for use in divine worship, is clearly demonstrated by the frescoes of a room which was perhaps used as a baptistery: they depict the Good Shepherd among tombs, the healing of the man born lame, and Christ walking on the water.[110]

New possibilities of Christian artistic activity presented themselves when the Church in the first half of the third century came into possession of her own burial-grounds,[111] which were at first called cemeteries. In Rome from the ninth century onwards these were called the catacombs; this appellation deriving from the name of the field *in* or *ad catacumbas*, at the cemetery of St Sebastian on the Appian Way. The *cemeterium Callisti* must be considered the earliest purely Christian underground burial-place; it stood on land which Bishop Zephyrinus (199–217) donated to the Roman Church from his private estate, and the administration of which he entrusted to the deacon Callistus. The wall and ceiling surfaces in the grave-chambers of the catacombs were furnished with pictures. The painters were naturally dependent in form on contemporary secular art, but their choice of themes was mostly determined by Holy Scripture or other Christian sources. Among the earliest subjects were, for instance, Daniel between two lions in the den, Noah in the Ark, Jonah swallowed by the fish and cast out again, or the

---

[106] *HE* 8, 1, 5.

[107] See J. R. Laurin, " Le lieu du culte chrétien, d'après les documents littéraires primitifs" in *Studi sulla chiesa antica* (Rome 1954), 55 f.

[108] Cf. J. P. Kirsch in the Italian edition of *Fliche-Martin*, III, 537 ff.

[109] Cf. A. M. Schneider, "Die ältesten Denkmäler der römischen Kirche" in *Festschrift der Akad. der Wiss. Göttingen*, II (Göttingen 1951), 195–7.

[110] See illustrations 42–51 in Hopkins-Baur, *Christian Church at Dura-Europos* (New Haven 1934).

[111] Cf. F. de Visscher, "Le régime juridique des plus anciens cimetières chrétiens à Rome" in *AnBoll* 69 (1951), 39–54.

New Testament scene of the resurrection of Lazarus.[112] They must all be understood as references to the biblical accounts of the saving of a man from deadly peril, and consequently aim at proclaiming the Christian hope of entering into an eternal life, safe from all peril and threat from the powers of evil. Proceeding from the same current of ideas is the figure of the Good Shepherd, which is found in the early catacomb paintings and in epitaphs.[113] In this instance Christ is seen as the saviour who, as shepherd, brings life and, as teacher, brings true knowledge of God. Christ appears also as a teacher in the early Christian carvings on sarcophagi.[114] The image of Christ in pre-Constantinian times was enriched by a representation in mosaics in a mausoleum under St Peter's in Rome. These show the Christ-Helios journeying from Hades to the Father.[115] And so the third century had already in various ways laid the foundations of the flourishing art of the Christian empire in the following century.

CHAPTER 24

Spiritual Life and Morality in the Communities of the Third Century

IF THE sources are studied for the essential concepts and convictions which characterized the piety of the third century, two ideas and realities stand out, namely baptism and martyrdom. All writers of the period, who discuss in any detail Christian perfection and its actual realization, speak so insistently of baptism as the well-spring, and of readiness for martyrdom as the touchstone of the genuineness of a Christian way of life, that devotion to baptism and to martyrdom must be generally considered to be the fundamental twofold attitude to religious life in the early Christian Church.

Baptismal Spirituality

The first attempts of any magnitude to develop a theory of Christian perfection were undertaken by the early teachers of Alexandria. Clement of Alexandria tried to trace such a theory in the portrait of the Christian Gnostic which he sketched in the *Paedagogus* and the *Stromata*. There is no mistaking, in his account, the fundamental importance, theoretical and practical, which baptism held for perfection.[1] Using the terminology of the pagan mystery-cults, but in no way abandoning his conviction of the reality of the Christian sacrament of baptism, he describes its profoundly transforming effects: it brings complete forgiveness of sins, and liberates from the dark power of the demons.[2] In its positive aspect, it is a rebirth to new life in the kingdom of the Father, and so grants immortality; and, by the infusion of the Holy Spirit into the soul, gives also true knowledge of God, or *gnosis.*[3] Essentially, this gnosis is imparted to every baptized person, not merely to *pneumatikoi,* or spiritually endowed persons; and by it the grace-given root of all perfection is in principle implanted; this must grow throughout life.[4] For, even if the gnosis received in baptism cannot increase in its essential nature, it can nevertheless grow in extent within the baptized person; and above all it must stand the test in the struggle with evil.[5] In baptism there is a real, not merely a symbolic, repetition for the Christian of what baptism in the Jordan once effected for Christ. Consequently, the life which springs from baptismal grace is an imitation of Christ, with whom the believer is indissolubly united at his baptism.[6]

---

[112] Cf. J. Kollwitz, *Das Christusbild des 3. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1953), 7.

[113] Ibid. 11, with illustrations 2–4.

[114] F. Gerke, *Christus in der spätantiken Plastik* (Berlin 1940), 7–14.

[115] O. Perler, *Die Mosaiken der Juliergruft im Vatikan* (Fribourg 1953).

What is expressed by Clement quite plainly, but with some reserve and a certain formulary concision, is developed by Origen in rich abundance. This is particularly evident in his homilies, in an ardent metaphorical style with insistent kerygmatic appeal. It was in this way that Origen became the most zealous preacher of a deep-felt baptismal spirituality for the early Christian Church generally. He lays the foundation first of all in a theology of baptism, which bases all exhortations to live in accordance with baptismal grace on the supernatural sacramental event which occurs at baptism. He prefers to explain that event by reference to those principal Old Testament prefigurations of baptism which were to play such an important part in the mystagogical preaching of the fourth century.[7] He regards the whole path of the person seeking baptism from his first wish for instruction in the Christian faith through his acceptance into the catechumenate and his introduction to the law of God, to the day when in the midst of the priests he is initiated into the mysteries of baptism as prefigured in the exodus of Israel from Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the stages of the wandering in the desert and the crossing of the Jordan, after which the Promised Land is opened to him. Jesus instead of Moses is his guide on his further paths.[8] Just as Israel was then freed from the power of Pharaoh, so the baptized person is liberated from the dominion of Satan; and just as Israel journeyed through the wilderness, guided by the column of cloud and fire, so also the believer, who with Christ passed through Christ's death and burial, will rise on the third day through baptism in water and the Holy Spirit; and God will henceforth lead him on the way of salvation: "You become healthy, sound, and cleansed from the stains of sin; you come out a new man, ready to sing the new song."[9] By this act the Christian is summoned to follow Christ, the new guide who has been given him in baptism. Before, he was an *imitator diaboli;* now in baptism he has found a new example to follow: the Logos with whom and in whom he sets out on the paths of his spiritual life which is to lead him to the Father.[10] Baptism is, therefore, the beginning of this new life, since its life-giving power has its source in the death of Christ on the cross, and the life of baptismal grace derives ultimately from the crucifixion.[11]

---

[1] W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus* (Berlin 1952), 147–53.

[2] *Paed.* 1, 26, 2; 1, 30, 1; *Strom.* 4, 26, 5; *Exc. ex Theod.* 77, 3.

[3] *Paed.* 2, 118, 5; 1, 28, 1; *Protr.* 117, 4.

[4] *Paed.* 1, 25, 1; *Strom.* 7, 14, 1; 4, 160, 3.

[5] *Paed.* 1, 26, 3; *Protr.* 116, 4.

[6] *Paed.* 1, 25, 3; *Strom.* 7, 14, 1.

[7] Cf. J. Daniélou, "Traversée de la mer rouge et baptême aux premiers siècles" in *RSR* 33 (1946), 402–30, and F. J. Dölger, "Der Durchzug durch den Jordan als Sinnbild der christlichen Taufe" in *AuC,* II (1930), 70–79.

Origen bases his doctrine of the spiritual life as a baptismal one on these truths of the faith concerning the nature of baptism. That element which received its foundation by what happened sacramentally in baptism, must further develop; the new life then received must prosper in the spiritual life of the soul, but can do so only if it is renewed daily.[12] The Logos must be able to act in the soul of the baptized person like a vine, whose grapes reach their full sweetness gradually.[13] The Logos already exercises this purifying power in a soul which is preparing for baptism; the whole ascetical struggle of the catechumen to train himself in the life of Christian virtue receives its effectiveness from the anticipatory radiance of the grace of baptism.[14] But the spiritual life receives its accomplishment and stamp after baptism, and from the sacrament. The *apotaxis* of Satan pronounced in baptism must be constantly repeated if the grace of baptism is to be preserved. Its corresponding *syntage*, or covenant with Christ, imposes an obligation of absolute fidelity to the baptismal vow, which some keep without faltering, but which others break and so bear with them the shame of Egypt.[15] The task set every Christian in his religious life can be expressed, according to Origen, in the concise phrase τηρεῖν τὸ βάπτισμα, that is to preserve baptismal grace.[16] But the obligation of fidelity to the baptismal vow does not derive simply from the renunciation of Satan's world. By baptism Christ becomes the bridegroom and spouse of the soul, and marital fidelity must be preserved; a return to the impure spirits of the pagan period of life would break this fidelity and sully the white robe of baptism.[17] Fidelity to baptismal vows and to the divine espousals can be kept solely by a perpetual fight against the powers of the evil one. In this combat the baptized persons follow once more the example of their master, who was likewise tempted after his baptism in the Jordan; and so the daily practice of a baptismal spirituality is an actual imitation of Christ.[18] Viewed positively, the fidelity to baptism ensured by perpetual combat leads to the abundant development of all virtues. Two attitudes, which early Christianity held in particularly high esteem grow from a baptismal piety truly lived. These are genuine love of one's neighbour and readiness for martyrdom. Brotherly love is a transmission of the Father's love for us, which we receive in baptism: we imitate him when we give our love to our neighbour.[19] And, further, the Spirit conferred by baptism bestows the courage to suffer:[20] baptismal renunciation includes a willingness for martyrdom.[21]

---

[8] *In Iesu Nave hom.* 4, 1; cf. also *hom.* 5, 1; *In Num. hom.* 26, 4; *In Ioann. comm.* 6, 42, 220.

[9] Cf. the whole fifth *Hom. in Exod.*, especially 1, 2, and 5.

[10] *In Num. hom.* 12, 4; *In Exod. hom.* 10, 4; *In Gen. hom.* 2, 5.

[11] *In Gen. hom.* 13, 4; *In Exod. hom.* 11, 2.

[12] *In Rom. comm.* 5, 8.

[13] *In Cant. comm.* 2.

[14] *In Ioann. comm.* 32, 7; *In Iesu Nave hom.* 4, 1; *In Lev. hom.* 6, 2.

[15] *In Exod. hom.* 8, 4; *In Iesu Nave hom.* 26, 2; 4, 2.

In their doctrine of baptismal spirituality as the development of the grace of baptism and the imitation of Christ's example, the Alexandrian teachers were not framing the demands of an esoteric teaching on perfection addressed merely to an *élite.* Indeed, because in this context Origen was speaking to all Christians, he was therefore aware of the failure of many in the face of this lofty religious ideal;[22] and that is precisely what led him to preach repeatedly on a right understanding of the mystery of Christian baptism, and to call for its realization in daily life. Other pastors and writers of the third century speak in a similar way to the Alexandrians, if not with equal force. For Cyprian, Christian life is the continuance of the *renuntiatio saeculi,* which, once expressed in baptism, must now be made effective by following our Lord when God tests the Christians through persecution.[23] Cyprian's biographer Pontius reveals the same notion of Christian life as the carrying out of the obligations of baptism by not beginning his description of the bishop's life until the latter's baptism: "The deeds of a man of God should be counted only from the moment when he was born to God." He expressly emphasizes that Cyprian always preached during persecution that Christians must prove themselves worthy of their birth, and that a man born again of God could not belie his origin.[24] It was in accord with this judgment on the importance of baptism for the daily religious life of the Christian that such care was taken by the leaders of the Christian communities to provide a preparation for baptism in the catechumenate, and to organize a solemn celebration of it. The whole impact of initiation into the mysteries of the Christian faith was to work itself out in a religious life which never forgot the radiance of that hour nor the gravity of the solemn baptismal vow. When Christian art, in the previously-mentioned baptistery of the house church of Dura-Europos, represented the Good Shepherd among his sheep,[25] (signifying in this case Christ among the newly baptized Christians), it sought to inculcate forcefully in the faithful the importance and meaning of the baptismal sacrament.

---

[16] *In Ier. hom.* 2, 3.
[17] *In Exod. hom.* 8, 5; 1, 5; 11, 7.
[18] *In Exod. hom.* 2, 3; 1, 5.
[19] *In Cant. comm.* 2; *In Ioann. comm.* 20, 17.
[20] *Contra Cels.* 6, 44.
[21] *Protr.* 11, 107.
[22] *In Rom. comm.* 5, 8; *In Num. hom.* 5, 1.
[23] *Ep.* 13, 5, 3.

Devotion to Martyrdom

Whereas the preaching of baptismal spirituality was to increase in extent and depth in the spiritual doctrines of the fourth century, devotion to martyrdom as the second fundamental attitude in the striving for Christian perfection reached its height in the third. Closely linked with the idea of the imitation of Christ, esteem for martyrdom as the summit and crown of all perfection became the most widespread, and ascetically fruitful, watchword in the world of early Christian spirituality. At the end of the second century, when the Church increasingly made it a theme of preaching to her own members, there was already a rich tradition on which to build. With Ignatius of Antioch the connexion between martyrdom and imitation of Christ was already clearly grasped and forcefully expressed: a man is a true disciple of Christ only if he dies for Christ's sake; anyone who does not accept death willingly with eyes fixed "on his Passion" has not the life of Christ within him.[26] The recorder of the martyrdom of Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna expressly drew a parallel between Christ and the martyr; he saw the justification for the honour which was beginning to be paid to martyrs in the fact that they are the authentic disciples and imitators of the Lord. Similarly, the communities of Lyons and Vienne said proudly that their martyrs of the year 177 were emulators and imitators of Christ. They expressed the idea in biblical terms, saying of Vettius Epagathus that

---

[24] Pontius, *Vita Cypr.* 2: "hominis dei facta non debent aliunde numerari, nisi ex quo deo natus est"; ibid. 9 "quos renatos per deum constat, degeneres esse non congruit."
[25] See above p. 287.
[26] Ignatius, *Ad Rom.* 4, 2; *Ad Magn.* 5, 2; cf. *Ad Rom.* 6, 3.

"he was a true disciple of Christ, because he followed the Lamb wherever he went", even to the death of martyrdom.[27] Origen declared the same view,[28] and the pastor Cyprian took advantage of the persecutions to remind his flock that they had at such times to imitate Christ as a teacher of patience and suffering, and that in the daily celebration of the Eucharist they drank the Blood of Christ in order to be able one day to give their blood for him.[29] Anyone who suffers for confessing the name of Christ becomes thereby a "sharer and companion of his Passion", as Roman priests stressed in a letter to Cyprian.[30] The concept of following Christ and of imitating him occurs with especial frequence in the accounts of the martyrs and in the pronouncements of Christian writers concerning martyrdom.[31]

Devotion to martyrdom received a particular force of attraction from the idea that a martyr's violent death led in a unique way to union with Christ. It was a widespread conviction in the third century that this union with Christ is already manifest when a Christian confesses his fidelity to his Lord under torture. At that moment it is Christ who strengthens him, and so fills him with his presence that, in a kind of exaltation, he scarcely feels the pain of torture and execution.[32] Thus, the Christian captive Felicity replied to the jailer who derided her for groaning at the birth of her child: "Now it is I who suffer what I suffer; but there (that is, at her martyrdom), it will be another in me who will suffer for me, because I too will be suffering for him."[33] Cyprian comforted and strengthened Christians facing martyrdom with the assurance that the Lord "himself contends in us, goes to battle with us, and in our hard struggle himself gives the crown and receives it."[34] It was this idea which culminated in the custom of honouring the martyrs with the title of *Christophorus:* union with Christ attains perfection by suffering martyrdom.[35] The martyrs were convinced that nothing united them with Christ as directly as a violent death while bearing witness to him. From this belief sprang the aspiration, found as early as Ignatius of Antioch, precisely for this kind of death, which is described by Cyprian as "the baptism which, after our departure from the world, unites us directly to God",[36] and which consequently, as a baptism in blood, completely replaces the other baptism, and in fact surpasses it in efficacy, because there is no danger of later relapse. Ultimately, the value set on martyrdom as absolute perfection was based on the double conviction that martyrdom represents the highest form of imitation of Christ and unites us in a unique way with him. Clement of Alexandria equates martyrdom with τελείωσις, since anyone who dies for his faith "has accomplished the work of perfect love".[37]

---

[27] *Mart. Polyc.* 17, 3; 19, 1; *Euseb. HE* 5, 2, 2; 5, 1, 10.

[28] *In Ioan. comm.* 2, 34.

[29] Cyprian, *Ep.* 58, 1, 3.

[30] *Ep.* 31, 3: "collega passionis cum Christo."

[31] Cf. *Passio Perpet. et Felicit.* 18, 9; Clement of Alex. *Strom.* 4, 3, 14; Tertullian, *Scorp.* 9; *De resurrect. carn.* 8; Cyprian, *Ep.* 76, 7, 1; Pseudo-Cyprian, *De laude mart.* 6; 26; 29.

[32] Cf. *Mart. Polycarp.* 2, 2 and the Christians of Lyons, *Eusebius HE* 5, 1, 23, 42.

[33] *Passio Perpet. et Felic.* 15, 3; Cf. *Ep. ad Diogn.* 7, 9.

[34] Cyprian, *Ep.* 10, 4; 37, 2; 76, 7. Further references in H. v. Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche* (Göttingen 1936), 90, note 1.

[35] F. J. Dölger in *AuC*, IV (1934), 73–80.

There is no plainer way of proving love of God and of Christ than by suffering violent death under persecution. Consequently, the *exhortatio ad martyrium* was a regular part of early Christian preaching and literature; not a dull cliché, but a very real factor in the actual realities of the third century itself. Origen and Cyprian are its purest and most convincing exponents. Origen's work on the meaning and dignity of martyrdom is the expression of a genuine readiness and desire for martyrdom, exhorting his own father in prison not to be dissuaded by the thought of the fate of his family from bearing witness unto death, and pointing with pride to friends and pupils who had travelled the road to the end.[38] Origen regarded the times of persecution as the truly great age of the Church because of the martyrs, whereas he had to recognize with sorrow that long periods of peace quickly led to slackening of enthusiastic faith.[39] Cyprian's letters to his flock during persecution present the same picture. In his own behaviour the Bishop of Carthage displayed the balanced and wise prudence that the Church demanded, which did not foolishly and fanatically seek martyrdom,[40] yet did not fail in the hour of trial. When, during the Decian persecution, an alarmingly large number of lapsed Christians created no small problem for the Church authorities, Cyprian had also to observe that readiness for martyrdom was found only in an *élite*.

Devotion to martyrdom is also clearly seen in the efforts of Christian circles to find substitutes for actual death by martyrdom, when for various reasons this was not in fact attainable. In very early times there were those who considered a serious striving for moral purity as an attitude which, though certainly not equal in value to real martyrdom, nevertheless revealed in a way a martyr's mentality which put God first.[41] Origen was convinced that in a community there are Christians "who have taken up their cross and follow Christ and are ready to shed their blood for him", and so are martyrs before God.[42] Cyprian clearly expressed the difference between actual martyrdom and martyrdom of desire, and worked out a spirituality centred on martyrdom.[43] What was of essential importance here was the evolution of martyrdom into a criterion for Christian perfection, even if in detail only a greater or lesser resemblance to martyrdom was retained. Dionysius of Alexandria judged the self-sacrifice of some Christians who died in the time of the plague in the service of the sick almost on the same level as a martyr's death.[44] But a new development took place when certain ascetic modes of live, such as the state of virginity and retirement from the world, became considered as real substitutes for actual death by martyrdom, and were praised as a new way of following Christ.

---

[36] *Ad Fortun. praefat.* 4.

[37] *Strom.* 4, 4, 14.

[38] *Euseb. HE* 6, 2, 3–6; 6, 3, 4.

[39] *In Ier. hom.* 4, 3.

[40] Like the Montanists, cf. Tertullian's *De fuga in persecutione.*

[41] Already in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 4, 7, 43.

The Asceticism of the Third Century

Christians of both sexes who renounced marriage, who dissociated themselves more than others from secular life, yet remained with their families and put themselves at the service of the Christian community, are not found for the first time in the third century. The biblical basis for such a mode of life and the example of a celibate life given by Christ and St Paul produced at a very early date their effect, for the letter of the Roman Bishop Clement presupposes the existence of celibates, and the *Didache* refers to a type of wandering ascetic which was commonly active in the missionary field.[45] Ignatius of Antioch and Hermas of Rome knew of groups of virgins in their communities who enjoyed high esteem.[46] The apologists, in their descriptions of the life of the Christian communities, did not fail to point out to the pagans that a notably high number of men and women leading celibate lives testified to the high moral quality of the followers of Christianity; and the pagans themselves were impressed by this feature of Christian spiritual life.[47] Occasional references in second-century texts are followed in the third century by a series of writings which expressly concern Christian asceticism, and provide a detailed account of its ideals and of the dangers which beset it. Its adherents had become so numerous in the meantime that they represented an important factor in Christian daily life in the churches of both East and West. They were not yet committed to a definite mode of life with a fixed rule; and so they mostly remained with their families and still disposed of their own private property. Only the pseudo-Clementine letters *Ad virgines* indicate a tendency in that period for closer groupings, just as they also refer to missionary and charitable activity by the ascetics.[48] Moreover, there was still no set rite by which the Church herself received them into their state of life; they simply bound themselves by a very serious promise to a life of continence.[49] That promise, however, was known to the community authorities, who punished its transgression very strictly, namely by excommunication. On the other hand, the promise did not bind for ever; the ascetic for special reasons could forego his mode of life and contract matrimony.

---

[42] *In Num. hom.* 10, 2.

[43] *Ad Fortun.* 13; *De zelo et liv.* 16.

[44] *Euseb. HE* 7, 22, 7.

[45] 1 *Clem.* 38:2, which terms this life ἐγκράτεια; *Did.* 11 and 12.

[46] Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* 13, 1; *Ad Polyc.* 5, 2; Hermas, *Pastor Sim.* 9, 2; 10, 3; *vis.* 1, 2, 4.

[47] Justin, *Apol.* 15; 29; Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 33; Min. Felix, *Oct.* 31, 5. For the judgment of the pagan Galen regarding the Christians, cf. R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians* (Oxford 1949).

Within the community and among its rulers, the ascetics enjoyed unique esteem. For Clement of Alexandria, they were the "elect of the elect", while Cyprian saw in them "the more splendid part of Christ's flock, the flower of Mother Church".[50] A new element with increased prestige was ascetic virginity, since this was connected with the idea of the soul's espousal to Christ. Tertullian was already acquainted with the title "bride of Christ", used to honour virgin ascetics, both men and women;[51] and the term later became part of the customary official language of the Church. Origen's exposition of the Song of Songs,[52] in terms of the individual's conception of it as a description of the relationship between the particular soul and its heavenly bridegroom, Christ, inaugurated the triumphant progress of this idea through the centuries which followed. At first this notion was at the service of the ideal of virginity; Methodius of Olympus meant by his lyrical praise of virginity that it is not to be separated from espousal to Christ. The records of the martyrdom of virgins consecrated to God, such as Agnes, Pelagia, and Caecilia, are pervaded by this idea.[53] A theological basis was sought for the worth of the ascetics. Their mode of life was declared to be the worthiest substitute for death by martyrdom; like the latter, it called for total self-sacrifice,[54] and consequently, according to Cyprian's warning, the spirit of the martyrs must be living in the ascetics also. Methodius directly compares virginity with martyrdom, while others list the ascetics immediately after the martyrs: the latter bearing fruit a hundredfold, the former sixtyfold. The *corona virginitatis* is accorded to the *virgines utriusque sexus*, just as the *corona martyrum* is to the martyrs, for their life is a true following of Christ.[55] Such a lofty ideal is liable to particular perils. Tertullian warned the ascetics especially against pride, to which the high esteem in which they were held in the community might tempt them; the pseudo-Clementine letters show a similar awareness of the threat of vanity and empty show. Cyprian saw clearly the practical dangers which life in the world involved for the ascetics, and consequently demanded of them a high degree of all the virtues. Methodius tried to strengthen them positively by directing their minds to meditation and the wealth that lies therein; virginity should be a means of individual sanctification.[56]

---

[48] Cyprian, *De hab. virg.* 7–12, 18–19; Pseudo-Clement, *Ad virg.* 1, 8, 4; 1, 2; Origen, *In Iudic. hom.* 9, 1; *In Ier. hom.* 20; *Contra Cels.* 5, 49.

[49] Cyprian, *De hab. virg.* 4 and *Ep.* 62, 3. Canon 13 of the Synod of Elvira speaks of a *pactum virginitatis.*

[50] Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv.* 36; Cyprian, *De hab. virg.* 3.

[51] *De orat.* 22; *De resurr. carn.* 61; *De exhort.* cast. 13.

[52] Both in the commentary as well as in the homilies on the Song of Songs.

[53] Cf. the texts collected by J. Schmid in *RAC* II, 560 ff.

[54] Methodius, *Symp.* 5, 4; 11.

Ascetical excess and a disproportion between the individual's moral strength and such lofty idealism explain a grave aberration in Christian asceticism, especially in the third century. Christian ascetics lived together as "sister and brother" in a sort of spiritual matrimony, and so imperilled the virginity they had vowed to keep. Not only did they expose themselves to the insinuations and derision of the people around them, but they also failed grievously themselves. The sources leave no doubt about the existence and considerable extent of the aberration.[57] The system of agapetae extended through the East, in Syria and Egypt as well as in North Africa,[58] and forced the ecclesiastical authorities to decisive action. In Cyprian's time a deacon who was guilty in this matter was excommunicated. Cyprian's clearsightedness and freedom from illusion made him intervene even where there were as yet no serious lapses.[59] The *De singularitate clericorum*, an anonymous treatise of the third century, could not conceal the fact that the evil had penetrated certain clerical circles, which sometimes employed biblical texts to justify their attitude. Already in the third century some synods imposed heavy sanctions on the guilty, but the custom persisted obstinately in East and West, surviving in Spain down to the sixth century.[60]

The asceticism of the third century not only continued in its previous form, but also provided the source of two new developments which were rich in consequences. From this practice sprang the early monasticism of the East, which, in its first eremitical phase, was merely a transference of the life and activity of the ascetics from the Christian community into solitude, such as Athanasius's account of the eremitical period of St Antony's life records for the end of the third century. The baptismal spirituality and devotion to martyrdom of the second and third centuries, in conjunction with ascetical virginity, continued to exert influence as fundamental ideas of monasticism, and so proved their intense vitality. The vows taken by the monk were compared in value with a second baptism, and his life with a spiritual martyrdom which made him, like the actual martyr, an *athleta Christi,* while his continence ranked him in the company of those who are the brides of Christ.[61] The ideal of virginity additionally prepared the way for the concept of priestly celibacy.[62]

---

[55] Cyprian, *De hab. virg.* 21; Methodius, *Symp.* 7, 3; Pseudo-Clement, *Ep. ad virg.* 1, 5, 5; 1, 7, 1–2.

[56] Tertullian, *De virg. vel. passim;* Cyprian, *De hab. virg. passim;* Methodius, *Symp.* 4, 5; 7, 2; Pseudo-Clement, *Ep. ad virg.* 1, 3, 2; 1, 4, 2.

[57] Especially the *Ep. 2 ad virgines* of the Pseudo-Clement, Cyprian, *De hab. virg.* and *De singularitate clericorum.*

[58] Dionysius of Alexandria (*Euseb. HE* 7, 30, 12) calls them γυναῖκες συνείσακτοι, which was later rendered in Latin as *virgines subintroductae.*

[59] Cyprian, *Ep.* 4 and 13.

[60] So the Synods of Antioch (*c.* 267–8), Elvira (canon 27), Ancyra (canon 19), Nicaea (canon 3). Jerome, *Ep.* 117, and John Chrysostom still had to take up a definite position on the matter. Later Synods: Carthage (348) canon 3; Hippo (393) canon 20; Carthage (397) canon 17; Arles (443) canon 3; Agde (510) canon 10; Toledo (531) canon 3.

Within the Church as a whole the manner of life of the ascetics was an highly esteemed ideal, but nevertheless one which was always freely accepted, and only by a minority. As soon as individual Christians or groups attempted to make it a norm binding on all Christians, it inevitably led to conflicts between them and the ecclesiastical authorities. The Encratites, followers of the Syrian Tatian, represented such an ascetic ideal carried to extremes; they characteristically named themselves not after their teacher but after the ascetical principle of their life.[63] The Encratites of Mesopatamia admitted no one to baptism who did not observe absolute sexual continence, and thus forced married people who did not want to renounce matrimony into a perpetual catechumenate existence.[64] It is true that the other heretical views held by Tatian were decisive in his expulsion from the great Church about 172, but his ascetical rigorism certainly contributed to that judgment. Encratite tendencies are perceptible in many apocryphal acts of apostles, as well as in the lives of individual Christians. As long as *encrateia* was not imposed by these on every Christian as necessary for salvation, the Church could tolerate them or excuse individual cases, such as Origen's self-castration, as ascetical enthusiasm carried too far. The intense attachment of the third-century Church to the ascetical ideal can certainly be taken as a general proof of her high moral quality.

---

[61] Cf. E. E. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr* (Diss. Washington 1950); J. Schmid, "Brautschaft (heilige)" in *RAC* II, 561.

[62] Cf. Origen, *In Lev. hom.* 1, 6, which demands continence of the priest, for he serves the altar.

[63] Οἱ ἐγκρατεῖς according to Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1, 28, 1; and cf. Origen, *Contra Cels.* 5, 65.

[64] See A. Vööbus, *Celibacy a Requirement for Admission to Baptism in the Early Syrian Church* (Stockholm 1951).

Prayer not only maintained, as a matter of course, its position in the third century as an indispensable element in Christian worship of God, but to an increasing extent became the subject of theological reflection and practical concern for its right performance both liturgical and private. Alexandrian theologians worked devotedly at a theological interpretation of Christian prayer and endeavoured to incorporate it into their conception of Christian perfection as a whole. The Latins, Tertullian and Cyprian in particular, display in their expositions of the Our Father the greater interest of the Latin mind in questions of the actual practice of the life of prayer and in its importance for the detail of Christian daily life. For Clement of Alexandria the Christian's duty to pray is self-evident, for the soul must thank God without ceasing for all his gifts; and in the striving for perfection, prayer of petition is likewise indispensable, and it must be used to implore true gnosis and the forgiveness of sins.[65] After the example of his master, brethren and enemies are included in this prayer of the Christian, and he is mindful, too, of the conversion of the whole world to the true God. Prayer accompanies him in all he does, binds him most closely to God, makes him "walk in God".[66] Clement's best answer to the pagan reproach of ἀσέβεια (impiety) addressed to the Christians, is to point out that for them, prayer is the most holy and precious sacrifice with which to honour God.[67] With a certain hesitation he hazards the definition that prayer is "intercourse with God".[68] So the Christian consecrates his everyday life to God when he conscientiously keeps the hours of prayer and in this way bears witness to the Lord throughout his life.[69] The highest form of prayer for the true Gnostic is interior mental prayer, which Clement clearly distinguishes from vocal prayer. He does not, of course, reject the latter, but unquestionably assigns the highest rank to interior prayer: it needs no words; it is unceasing; it makes the whole life a holy day; and gives θεωρία, the vision of divine things.[70] In this distinction between vocal and mental prayer the later division of the spiritual life into active and contemplative is already indicated in a purely Christian sense. Clement is its first important pioneer.

Where Clement provided an outline sketch of prayer, Origen gives a whole monograph, which deepens and carries farther what Clement had begun. In order to gain a full view of Origen's teaching on prayer one must draw upon his theoretical exposition and upon the lively observations and the spontaneous prayers found in his homilies and biblical commentaries. Like Clement, Origen is profoundly aware that the life of the Christian must be a perpetual prayer, in which daily prayers have their indispensable place.[71] To be blessed, such prayer requires a certain disposition in the soul. Origen very definitely includes in this a continual defence against sin, lasting freedom from emotional disturbance, and finally interior recollection and concentration, which excludes all from without and within that cannot be consecrated to God.[72] Under such conditions, a Christian's prayer develops in an ascent by stages. The first stage being prayer of petition, which should request the great and heavenly things: the gift of gnosis and growth in virtue.[73] At the stage of the προσευχή, the praise of God is linked with prayer of petition.[74] The summit of Christian prayer is reached in interior, wordless prayer which unites the soul to God in a unique way.[75] This mirrors Origen's basic conception of a spiritual ascent by stages, ending in the loving knowledge of God in which the soul is "divinized".[76] A more concrete view of Origen's practice of prayer is given by the many actual texts of prayers which occur frequently in his homilies.[77] Somewhat surprisingly, they are often addressed to Christ, though in his treatise on prayer, Origen always maintains that prayer is to be addressed to the Father; theoretical conviction was overborne by the spontaneous devotion to Christ which is also apparent in many other ways in the homilies. Not only does Origen repeatedly exhort his hearers to pray to Jesus, but in his addresses, he himself continually turns to him in supplications of his own composition which reveal a rich and heartfelt devotion to Jesus. It is an eminently important fact in the history of spirituality, and consequently in the history of the Church, that the theory and practice of prayer represented by the Alexandrian Origen exercised an extensive influence. His teaching on prayer decisively affected the spirituality of the Eastern Church, particularly in its monastic form, and the practice of devotion to Jesus formulated in his prayers influenced, by way of Ambrose, Western mystical devotion to Jesus down to St Bernard's day.[78]

---

[65] *Strom.* 6, 113, 2; 6, 102, 1; 5, 16, 7.

[66] Ibid. 7, 62, 2ff.; 7, 41, 4, 6; 7, 40, 3; 7, 44, 5; 7, 35, 5.

[67] Ibid. 7, 31, 7.

[68] Ibid. 7, 39, 6: ὁμιλία πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἡ εὐχή, ὡς εἰπεῖν τολμηρότερον.

[69] Ibid. 2, 145, 6.

[70] Ibid. 7, 49, 6ff.; 6, 102, 1; 7, 35, 6; 7, 49, 4.

The commentaries on the Our Father by the two Latins, Tertullian and

---

[71] Origen, *De or.* 1, 12, 2.

[72] Ibid. 8, 1; 9, 1, 3; *Contra Cels.* 8, 17; 7, 44.

[73] The kinds of prayer are dealt with in connexion with 1 Tim. 2:1 in *De or.* 14, 2. On the prayer of petition, see also *De or.* 1, 17; 2, 2; 13, 4; *Contra Cels.* 7, 44.

[74] *De or.* 14, 2; 13, 5.

[75] *In Num. hom.* 10, 3; *Contra Cels.* 7, 44; *De or.* 9, 2; 10, 2.

[76] Cf. K. Rahner in *RAM* 13 (1932), 113–45.

[77] Cf. K. Baus in *RQ* 49 (1954), 46–55.

[78] Cf. F. Bertrand, *Mystique de Jésus chez Origène* (Paris 1951), 153ff.

Cyprian, introduce us to a view and atmosphere of Christian prayer that is both independent of, and very different from that of the Greeks. Both of them, of course, are like the Alexandrians, profoundly convinced of the obligation of prayer. Both they and the Greeks are inspired through the example given by Christ, who prayed himself and taught how to pray;[79] they know the same times for prayer and the biblical grounds for them, and have similar ideas about the mental conditions necessary for proper prayer.[80] But the two Latins are very far removed from the lofty idealistic strain of the Greeks. Deeper speculation about the nature and dignity of interior prayer and its significance for growth in the spiritual life is alien to them, and there is certainly no hint in their writing of a theory about the various stages of prayer. Their urgent concern is with the actual concrete form of prayer and its place in the daily life of the Christian community. For them the form of prayer to be preferred is the Our Father, the new form of prayer taught by Christ, and known to the Christians alone, because they alone have God as their Father.[81] Both understand the petition for daily bread in a predominantly eucharistic sense, which Cyprian expresses with warmth and emphasis.[82] For both, humility is the right attitude in which to pray; all passions and faults must be laid aside if the prayer is to find acceptance with God.[83] A trait of the Latin organizing spirit is evident in Tertullian's detailed treatment of questions concerning the external order of prayer, such as the times for prayer — morning prayers, evening prayers, grace, prayer at the third, sixth, and ninth hours — and the physical posture of those at prayer: they are to pray with hands raised and extended, in imitation of their suffering Lord on the cross.[84] Tertullian propounds an actual theological feature in what he says about the unlimited efficacy of Christian prayer,[85] and in his exposition of the second petition of the Our Father, which like Origen he understands in a directly eschatological sense: "Yes, very soon, Lord, may thy kingdom come; that is the longing of Christians, the confounding of the pagans, the joy of the angels."[86] Perhaps Cyprian's undeniable dependence on Tertullian has sometimes caused the original contribution of the African bishop in his exposition of the Our Father to be too easily overlooked. The much greater religious warmth and persuasiveness with which he speaks of prayer are to be appreciated, and he deserves further recognition for his emphatic identification of the Kingdom of God with Christ: "For whose coming we daily long, and whose early arrival we desire and long for."[87] Of paramount importance however, is the ecclesiological emphasis which he would like to see in the prayers of Christians: "When we pray, we do not pray for one but for the whole people, for we are all one"; the Christian people at prayer is joined together in the unity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; anyone who breaks this unity sins grievously, and lacks an essential condition for genuine prayer.[88]

---

[79] Tertullian, *De or.* 1; Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 1, 3.

[80] Tertullian, *De or.* 11–15; Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 4–6, 34. For the Greeks, cf. Clement, *Strom.* 2, 145, 1; 7, 40, 3; Origen, *De or.* 31, 2.

[81] Tertullian, *De or.* 2; Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 9–11.

[82] Tertullian, *De or.* 6; Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 18.

[83] Tertullian, *De or.* 11–14, 17; Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 4, 6.

[84] Tertullian, *De or.* 18–25; more briefly, Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 35–36.

[85] *De or.* 29.

[86] *De or.* 5.

Besides the Our Father, Tertullian and of course, Cyprian too, freely recognize improvised prayers.[89] Early Christianity had also at its disposal a collection of set prayer texts in the Old Testament Psalter. Its liturgical and private use presupposed, of course, its christianization, which must have taken place in the second century, as the singing of the psalms in divine worship and at the agape was an established custom by the beginning of the third century.[90] This christianization took place by way of a typological interpretation of the psalms, which either viewed the speaker in the psalms as Christ himself addressing the Father, or heard in them the voice of the Church recognizing in the *Dominus psalmorum* her glorified Lord and speaking directly to him. A particularly striking example of the first kind is Psalm 3, verse 6: "ego dormivi et soporatus sum et exsurrexi", which was already regarded by Justin as spoken by the Risen Christ on Easter morning. This interpretation is also found in Irenaeus and was taken over by Hippolytus and Cyprian.[91] Origen, too, has examples of praying the psalms to Christ[92] and thus illustrates the strength of the trend, for despite theoretical hesitation he cannot refrain from it. The christianization of the Psalter, which made it the prayer and hymn book absolutely preferred by the early Church, was furthered and facilitated by the importance and extent of prayer to Christ in early Christian popular devotion. This is strikingly evident in those prayers which rose spontaneously to the lips of martyrs when they were summoned to bear last testimony to their Lord. Most of these are words of gratitude to Christ for giving them the grace of bearing witness to him, or protestations that they accept death for his name's sake, or cries of supplication for Christ's strength and support in that hour of trial. A comparison of the number of prayers addressed to Christ by the martyrs with those addressed to the Father reveals their overwhelmingly Christocentric character.[93] In the domain of popular piety there are the strikingly numerous prayers to Christ in the apocryphal acts of apostles,[94] and many of the above-mentioned prayers to Christ in Origen's homilies must have been an echo from private popular piety.

---

[87] *De dom. or.* 13.

[88] *De dom. or.* 8, 24, 30.

[89] Cyprian, *De dom. or.* 3; Tertullian, *De or.* 9.

[90] Tertullian, *Apol.* 39, 18; Hippolytus, *Trad. apost.* (Ethiopic) in *Hennecke-Schneemelcher* 581; Πράξεις Παύλου (Hamburg 1936), 50ff.

[91] Justin, *Dial.* 97, 1; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4, 33, 13; Hippolytus, *Comm. on Psalms*, Frag. 37 (*GCS* 1, 2, 153); Cyprian, *Test.* 2, 24.

[92] Cf. for example, *In Ioann. comm.* 19, 3; *In Psalm.* 29, 3.

Finally, prayer addressed to Christ was expressed by turning to the East when praying. The first signs of this custom appear at the beginning of the second century, and it established itself widely in East and West in the third century. The grounds adduced for the custom are theologically notable: people prayed facing the East because the return of the Lord was awaited from that direction and because Paradise, the desire of all Christians, lies there.[95] This manner of praying to Christ therefore had an eschatological significance. For some Christian circles in the Greek and Syrian East, it was also a way of expressing the theological contrast to Judaism, whose followers prayed facing the Temple in Jerusalem. Another custom had been associated with it since the second century, that of praying before a crucifix, wooden or painted, so arranged that those praying stood facing the East. Here too the early Christian texts plainly indicate an eschatological motive for this custom: as a sign of the Lord's triumph, the cross will precede him, on his second coming, from the East.[96] This emphasis on the crucifix in the Christian's position at prayer was probably based on the extensive use of the sign of the cross in both private devotion and the liturgy, many testimonies to which are found in the writers of the third century.[97] Tertullian's statement can stand for many: "Whenever we go out or depart, at the beginning or end of anything, when we dress or put on our shoes, before the bath or before sitting down to table, when putting on the lights, when we lie down to rest or sit down on a chair, in every action of daily life, we sign our foreheads with the sign of the cross."[98] The texts of prayers and the position adopted for prayer therefore show private prayer in the early Christian Church as a whole that was centred to a large extent on Christ and on the cross.

---

[93] The proportion is about 6:1; cf. a selection of these prayers by K. Baus in *TThZ* 62 (1953), 23–8.

[94] A survey is found in E. v. d. Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit* (Leipzig 1901), 343–56.

[95] Cf. particularly, F. J. Dölger, *Sol salutis*, 136–70, 198–242. In the first concluding hymn of Methodius' *Symp.*, the virgins go in solemn procession eastwards to meet the heavenly bridegroom, Christ.

[96] This has been established by E. Peterson, "Das Kreuz und das Gebet nach Osten" in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959).

[97] Cf. F. J. Dölger, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens" in *JbAC* 1 (1958), 5–19; 2 (1959), 15–22; 3 (1960), 11–16; 4 (1961), 5–17.

[98] *De cor.* 3, 4.

The ascetical enthusiasm of the third century also led to a considerable practice of fasting both in connexion with liturgical worship and in the private devotion of Christians. The weekly fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays that had descended from apostolic times[99] became more firmly established and received a further development in the *statio* of the North African church. In Tertullian's time the *statio* was still quite definitely an ascetical exercise freely undertaken; it lasted until the ninth hour (3 p.m.), and was linked with a special divine service.[100] This latter, however, must be understood to have been the celebration of the eucharist, which would take place at the usual time before sunrise. The high esteem of Station fasting among Christians of North Africa can be judged from the refusal of many of the faithful to take part in the celebration of the Eucharist on Station days, because they thought the reception of Communion would break the fast.[101] In the East, the observation of the weekly fasts was, according to the evidence of the Syrian *Didascalia*, early imposed as an obligation.[102] In Carthage, Station fasting was sometimes extended to Saturday; the Roman church must also have known this custom, and it is encountered in Spain at the end of the third century.[103] The Church had to defend the voluntary character of Station fasting against the rigorism of Montanists and Encratites who represented it as an obligation strictly binding on all Christians. At this period, too, the motive for the choice of the two fast days in the week changed; while earlier it emphasized the independence of the Christian custom from the Jewish one (the Jews kept Monday and Thursday as fast days), now it was the connexion of the two days with the events of our Lord's Passion that was indicated: the betrayal by Judas on a Wednesday and death on the cross on a Friday. Thus fasting on these days was understood to be a fast of mourning and grief.[104]

The high value placed on fasting by the Church authorities is particularly evident from the various ways in which they incorporated it into the liturgy. As preparation for the feast of Easter, a Passover fast had been early introduced, but its duration differed from local church to local church and could extend over one, two, or even six days.[105] The baptismal fast of which there is evidence as early as the *Didache*, and in Justin, and which at first only lasted one or two days,[106] was now extended further; in the first period of preparation for baptism it consisted of restriction to bread, water, and salt, but in the days immediately preceding baptism it involved total abstention from food and drink.[107] The baptismal fast was envisaged in close relation to prayer, which fasting effectively supports; it was also considered a means of atoning for former sins and of preparing for the reception of the Spirit.[108] Finally, fasting became an extremely important factor in the penitential discipline of the early Christian Church generally, which imposed on the sinner for the duration of his penance restrictions on food and drink and sometimes days of strict fasting as well. Here, too, the significance of the fast was seen to be in the support it gave to the atoning prayer with which the sinner turned to God; but the Church always stressed in addition the salutary character of such penitential fasts in themselves.[109]

---

[99] *Did.* 8, 1; Hermas, *Past. Sim.* 5, 1, 2.

[100] Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 2, 10, 12–14.

[101] Tertullian, *De or.* 19; *De cor.* 3.

[102] *Didasc.* 5, 14, 15.

[103] Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 14; Hippolytus, *In Dan. comm.* 4, 20, 3; Synod. Illib., canon 26, and cf. J. Schümmer, *Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis* (Münster 1933), 152–9.

[104] Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 10; *Didasc.* 5, 14, 15.

[105] Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 2; Irenaeus, in *Euseb. HE* 5, 24; *Trad. apost.* 29 (64 Botte); *Didasc.* 5, 18; Dionysius of Alexandria, *Ep. ad Basil.* 1.

[106] *Did.* 7, 4; Justin, *Apol.* 61, 2; *Trad. apost.* 20 (48 Botte).

Fasting as a means to gaining mastery over concupiscence and unregulated sense pleasure and consequently as a way to higher perfection, found special favour in early Christian ascetic circles. It brought with it the danger of over-emphasis, and this sometimes found expression in heroic record-breaking performances such as are reported repeatedly from the monastic groups which superseded the ascetics.[110] As opposed to such aberrations, Christian authors very early emphasized that what was decisive was the spirit, a genuine penitential attitude and self-denial, which alone give bodily fasting its value.[111] Others stressed corporal works of mercy to the neighbour as a motive for fasting, for by its means a brother in need could be given more help.[112] The most valuable views here also are those that envisaged fasting in close conjunction with prayer; which can be given greater efficacy by this ascetical attitude.[113] Similarly efficacious was the widespread conception of fasting as an important preparation for every kind of reception of the Spirit, so that fasting became an indispensable requirement for men of the Spirit, prophets, teachers, and bishops.[114] This explains the inner link between prophecy and fasting which is encountered in Montanism; fasting there became an absolutely necessary condition for the gift of prophecy, and Tertullian in his work *De ieiunio* bitterly attacked from his own standpoint the great Church which should not approve such overrating of an ascetical practice.[115]

---

[107] Cf. J. Schümmer, *op. cit.* 166–8.

[108] Tertullian, *De bapt.* 20; *De ieiun.* 8, 12; Clement of Alex. *Exc. ex Theod.* 83, 84.

[109] Tertullian, *De paen.* 9–11; *Ad ux.* 2, 8; *Didasc.* 2, 16, 2; 2, 41, 6; Cyprian, *De laps.* 35.

[110] Euseb. *De mart. Pal.* 3; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 1–2, 11, 18, 22, 36, 38, 43, 45, 48, 52.

[111] Hermas, *Past. Sim.* 5, 1, 4; 5, 36; Justin, *Dial.* 15; Origen, *In Lev. hom.* 10, 2.

[112] Aristides, *Apol.* 15.

[113] Tertullian, *Apol.* 40, 13; *De fuga* 1.

[114] Cf. Acts, 13:2 and also Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 2, 2, 1; 3, 1, 2; 3, 10, 6ff.; Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 13; *Fragm. Murat.* 9–16.

[115] Cf. particularly R. Arbesmann, "Fasting and Prophecy in Pagan and Christian Antiquity" in *Tr* 7 (1949–51), 52–71.

The ideals of Christian perfection just described, represented, as has already been emphasized, maximum demands, the achievement of which was only possible to an *élite* and consequently to a minority among the Christians. There arises, therefore, the question how the great majority of the community members in town and country lived their daily religious lives in pagan surroundings and within a secular civilization determined by pagan principles. Unfortunately the sources, even for the third century, still do not provide very much information on this, and do not make it possible to draw a complete picture of Christian life valid for all the territories where Christianity had spread at that time. Most informative are the sources for North Africa, where the leading writers Tertullian and Cyprian, because of their marked concern with the practical questions of daily religious life reveal much that is interesting. In addition to these men, the Alexandrian teachers Clement and Origen must be mentioned, for they frequently speak of similar features in the Christian daily life of the Egyptian communities.

Any attempt to estimate objectively the achievements of Christianity in this domain must indicate very plainly the difficulties that the implementation of Christian moral ideals inevitably met with day after day. First of all, there were the afflictions to which Christian minorities are liable in any period of Christian missionary activity when forced to form and establish themselves in the midst of a pagan environment encompassing every section of private and public life. A large number of professions and trades directly served the polytheism of later antiquity and the Christians had to exclude themselves from these if they were not to imperil their own religious convictions.[116] The whole pagan atmosphere further presented a perpetual temptation to relapse into former habits of life, and this demanded of all Christians a renunciation that had to be continually and precisely renewed in daily life. The sexual licentiousness which characterized moral life in later antiquity particularly necessitated a very high degree of self-discipline. This itself created a test case where the Christian moral ideal had to prove its real quality.

The sources show that precisely in the third century, the Christian communities were exposed to searching trials which they did not entirely withstand. In the longer periods of peace which that age provided, the poison of the surrounding pagan atmosphere could exercise its slow but enduring effect. This became terrifyingly evident when a powerful wave of persecution such as those of Decius and Diocletian broke upon the Christian communities as exceptional tribulations. The large number of those who lapsed in the years 249–50 revealed a considerable slackening of Christian self-discipline, a condition which could oppose no decisive resistance to the tempting amenities of a pagan civilization. The picture which Cyprian had to draw speaks for itself.[117] Eusebius too, in his description of the general situation of Christianity before the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution was forced to indicate many suspicious features. Among these were especially the slackening of moral discipline and not a few lamentable quarrels of Church leaders among themselves. The Christians "like so many pagans . . . piled sin upon sin", and Eusebius was moved to explain the persecution as a divine judgment.[118] What we have to say about the question of penance will presently show that grave transgressions by Christians, especially those of a sexual kind, again and again moved the Church authorities to serious admonition and strict measures regarding atonement. But despite these undeniable dark shadows in the picture of general Christian life in the third century, it is indisputable that Christianity succeeded at that time in raising the moral level of the various churches and communities high above that of the pagan world around them.

---

[116] See page 277 above, in the description of the catechumenate.

Marriage and the Family

This is particularly striking in the matter of marriage and the family. It is true that Tertullian's description of the beauty of Christian marriage is an ideal picture which transfigures reality, but it proves that this ideal was recognized and that earnest efforts were made to realize it. Ignatius of Antioch had already recommended that the contracting of matrimony be sanctioned by the bishop. In Tertullian's time, too, Christians celebrated their marriage in the presence of the *ecclesia,* and had it sealed with a blessing, although this cannot have signified an actual liturgical rite or an indispensable participation of the bishop at the marriage in that period. The inner harmony of such a marriage derived from the common religious convictions of the two partners, and it drew its strength in good days and bad from a common sharing in the eucharistic repast.[119] As such conditions could not be present in marriages between Christians and pagans, these were disapproved of by the Church. Furthermore the Christian party was exposed all too easily to contact with pagan worship and the accomplishment of many religious duties and customs of the faith was made difficult by such an arrangement. When Cyprian lists the abuses in the North African church which called down the judgment of the Decian persecution, he assigns a special place to the marriages between Christians and unbelievers, through which "the members of Christ were abandoned to the pagans". Consequently, such marriages were expressly forbidden by the Church, and parents who gave their consent to the marriage of their daughter to a heretic, a Jew, or a pagan priest, incurred heavy ecclesiastical punishment.[120] The indissolubility of Christian marriage which had since St Paul found its deepest ground in its symbolical representation of the union of Christ and the Church (Eph 5:32; 1 Cor 7:10ff.), is emphasized by most writers of the third century.[121] The Church was also concerned with maintaining the sanctity of matrimony by preserving conjugal fidelity and reverence for children. Adultery was strictly punished by ecclesiastical penitiential discipline, any kind of abortion was proscribed as murder, and the exposing of children after birth was condemned. It was here that the demands of Christian ethics came into sharpest conflict with pagan lasciviousness or the Roman legal view, which regarded only the born child as a human being.[122]

---

[117] See above, page 224.

[118] *Euseb. HE* 8, 1, 7–9.

[119] Ignatius, *Ad Polyc.* 5; Tertullian, *Ad ux.* 2, 8.

Within Christian marriage of this kind, the position of the wife was that of a partner with equal rights, and Christianity thereby showed in principle a far higher regard for her than most of the pagan religions held at that time. Second marriages were not looked upon with favour; they were not of course forbidden as they were among the Montanists, but in accordance with the trend of the age towards asceticism, they were viewed as signs of diminished moral effort and even stigmatized by the apologist Athenagoras as "a respectable adultery". This opinion is not merely an isolated one, it corresponded to the Church's view which, on account of it, forbade clerics to take part in the celebrations of such marriages and treated a second marriage as an impediment to the assumption of or continuance in the clerical state. A third or fourth marriage was very definitely held to be a serious failure regarding the demands of Christian discipline and excluded one, as Origen said, from the circle of the perfect.[123]

Early Christian Works of Mercy

A criterion of the value of Christian ethical principles in daily life is provided by the way in which the commandment of Christian love for one's neighbour is fulfilled. Practical exercise of active charity towards a needy brother in the faith or towards a pagan afflicted with illness or misfortune was, in very striking contrast to the corresponding pagan attitude, an undeniable title of glory in the early Christian Church. One of the earliest forms of charitable activity was the "agape", meals in the Christian community which were intended to strengthen community spirit among their members of different social rank, but which at the same time provided the possibility of extending effective material help, in a tactful way, to the poor and needy within the community. They were held either in the private dwelling of a well-to-do member of the congregation or in premises belonging to the church with the bishop presiding — he could also be represented by a priest or a deacon — and inaugurating the meal with a prayer said over the gifts that had been brought. The bishop discussed with those in charge questions concerning the life of the community, and made sure that the absent sick and widows also received their share of the gifts. Sometimes the widows were invited separately by a fellow-Christian or foodstuffs were taken to them in their houses. The abuses that occurred here and there in connexion with the agape do not lessen the value of these meetings which, according to Clement of Alexandria, represented an original form of Christian sociability in marked contrast to pagan custom, and were intended to prevent social conflicts arising within the churches.[124]

---

[120] Tertullian, *Ad ux.* 2, 4–6; Cyprian, *De laps.* 6; Synod. Illib., canons 15–17; Synod. Arel. canon 11.

[121] Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2, 23; Origen, *In Matth. hom.* 14, 16; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4, 34; *De pat.* 12; *De monog.* 9.

[122] Synod. Illib., canons 14, 47, 64, 70, 78. Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 35; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9, 8; Min. Felix, *Oct.* 30, 2; Hippolytus, *Refut.* 9, 12, 25, and cf. F. J. Dölger in *AuC,* IV (1934), 23–55.

[123] Athenagoras, *Suppl.* 33; cf. Hermas, *Pastor. Mand.* 4; Theophilus, *Autol.* 3, 15; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2, 23; 3, 11; Origen, *In Luc. hom.* 17, 10; *In Ier. hom.* 20; *In Matth. comm.* 14, 22; Synod. Ancyr., can. 19; Neocaes., can. 3 and 17.

Tertullian in his *Apologeticum* gives an instructive glimpse of the beginning of the third century. There was a sort of common fund for the voluntary contributions of members and from it the poor were fed, old people in need looked after, orphans and destitute children cared for, brethren in prison helped, and those condemned to forced labour in the mines given support.[125] A special kind of early Christian charitable work was hospitality, taking in and looking after, with warm generosity, brethren in the faith who were travelling through. This custom was already praised in apostolic and subapostolic times and was no less esteemed and recommended in the third century. Origen made hospitality the theme of two of his homilies. Cyprian left money with one of his priests to be spent on strangers in need during his absence. The Syrian *Didascalia* insistently urges care for strangers on the bishop, and the Synods of Elvira and Arles stress it too. In the fourth century there grew from this charitable obligation a comprehensive organization which established hostels and hospices.[126] The impression made on pagan circles by this kind of practical charity is confirmed, despite himself, by Emperor Julian when he wrote that Christianity had been most lastingly furthered "by philanthropy to strangers and care for the burial to the dead".[127] The last-mentioned feature, concern for the worthy burial of poor brethren in the faith, was felt to be a duty of love, and was specially praised as something that characterized Christianity as opposed to paganism. Whenever possible, the dead were buried among their deceased brethren in the faith, and love was shown them beyond the grave by having the eucharistic sacrifice offered for them and by being mindful of them at prayer.[128]

---

[124] Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2, 1, 4ff.; Tertullian, *Apol.* 39, and cf. E. Dekkers, *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis der liturgie* (Brussels-Amsterdam 1947), 67–71; Hippolytus, *Trad. apost.* 26–7 (57–62 Botte); *Didasc.* 2, 28, 1–3.

[125] *Apol.* 39.

[126] Cf. G. Stählin in *ThW* V, 1–36 (φιλοξενία). According to *Euseb. HE* 4, 26, 2, Melito of Sardes wrote Περὶ φιλοξενίας. Origen, *In Gen. hom.* 4 and 5; Cyprian, *Ep.* 7; *Didasc.* 2, 58, 6; Synod. illib., can. 25; Synod. Arel., can. 9. See also Justin, *Apol.* 67, 6; Tertullian, *Ad ux.* 2, 4.

Pre-Constantinian Christianity had, of course, no slave problem in any sense that would have made it work for the abolition of slavery, but early Christian charity could not fail to be interested in the lot of the slaves. It contributed decisively to the improvement of their condition by recognizing slaves who became Christians as equal brothers and sisters with the rest of the faithful and by according them complete equality of rights[129]. Ecclesiastical offices, including that of bishop, were open to a slave. It did not detract at all from the reputation of the *Shepherd* that its author Hermas had been born a slave.[130] Slaves among the martyrs, both men and women, were held in unqualified esteem; Blandina, for instance, in Lyons and Felicity in Carthage. Degrading treatment of slaves by Christian masters was severely censured and, if need be, punished with ecclesiastical penalties. On the other hand, slaves who patently misunderstood "Christian freedom" and tried to have their freedom purchased from the common fund of the community were reminded of the deeper sense of Christian service which made it possible for them to bear their position for the honour of God.[131]

Christian brotherly love had really to prove itself in the times of extraordinary catastrophes which were not lacking in the third century. Dionysius of Alexandria sang a paean to the Christian readiness for sacrifice which distinguished the laity as well as the clergy in Alexandria during an epidemic about the year 250. Without fear of infection, they had cared for their sick brethren and given their lives thereby, while the pagans had avoided their sick relatives and abandoned their dead without burial. When plague was raging in Carthage, Cyprian summoned his flock by word and example to organized relief action which did not deny care and attention to the pagans. And once again the attitude of the Christians contrasted honourably with that of their pagan fellow-citizens during an epidemic in Maximinus Daia's time, when they cared for the hungry and the sick without distinction of creed.[132]

---

[127] *Sozom. HE* 5, 15.

[128] Aristides, *Apol.* 15; Tertullian, *Apol.* 39; Lactantius, *Div. instit.* 6, 12; Cyprian, *Ep.* 67, 6. Tertullian, *De monog.* 10; *De cor*, 3; *De exhort. cast.* 11; Cyprian, *Ep.* 1 and 12.

[129] Tatian, *Or.* 11; Aristides, *Apol.* 15; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4, 21, 3; Tertullian, *De cor.* 13; Euseb. *De mart. Pal.* 11, 1.

[130] See the references in E. J. Jonkers in *Mnemosyne* 10 (1942), 286–302.

[131] Synod. Illib., can. 5. — Ignatius, *Ad Polyc.* 4, 3.

Practical Christian charity also extended to any communities which were in special need in any of the territories to which Christianity had spread. They were helped with an impressive, matter-of-fact spontaneity which reveals a sense of community among the faithful of the whole Church, and which was shown by no other religious group of the time. The sources give the strong impression that the conduct of the Roman church was felt to be exemplary in this regard. Apparently the church of Rome was immediately ready to give active assistance whenever news was received of special need in any community no matter how remote. What Dionysius of Corinth praised in this respect in 170 is also valid for the third century: "From the beginning it was your custom to do good to all the brethren in many ways and to send assistance to many communities in towns everywhere. In this way you have lightened the poverty of the needy, supported the brethren in the mines and so, like Romans, held fast to a custom handed down from of old by your fathers. Your blessed bishop Soter not only maintained this custom but carried it further."[133] For Dionysius of Alexandria reports about a hundred years later that Rome regularly sent relief to the churches in Arabia and Syria, and in Cappadocia it was not forgotten in the days of Basil that the Roman church under Bishop Dionysius (259–69) sent funds there so that Christian prisoners might be ransomed from pagan rulers. A remark by Eusebius implies that Rome gave similar help during the Diocletian persecution also.[134] A similar sense of responsibility for other churches distinguished Cyprian of Carthage; he had a collection made among his flock for the communities in Numidia and its considerable yield was employed in caring for their prisoners.[135]

The practical accomplishment of the tasks imposed by the duties of brotherly love required, in the bigger communities of the third century, a certain administrative organization and personnel. Women were increasingly employed in order to supplement the efforts of deacons who were the appointed helpers of the bishops in charitable welfare work; they were in any case indispensable in the care of their own sex. Widows were the ones first considered for such work; they were regarded as a special order within the community and held in high regard on account of Timothy 5:3–16. Only approved women were received — a judgement on this was a task of the bishop — without consecration and without prescribed vows. They were particularly employed in private pastoral work in the home and in missionary work among women. They devoted themselves to educating orphans, worked as nurses, and sometimes undertook the care of those in prison.[136] From the second century onwards, unmarried women were also admitted for such purposes, and later for them as well as for the widows engaged in charitable works the title of deaconess was used. When the order of widows and virgins, through its adoption of an ascetical manner of life, detached itself more and more from this kind of task, the function of the deaconess became, especially in Syrian territory, a definite office in the community; she was now especially concerned in looking after women catechumens and candidates for baptism, in domestic pastoral work with Christian women in pagan families, and in caring for sick women. In the fourth century, as a consequence of the entry of the pagan masses into the Church, the office of deaconess increased even more in importance and attained its definitive form and full development.

---

[132] *Euseb. HE* 7, 22, 7–10 and 9, 8, 1; Cyprian, *De mortal. passim;* Pontius, *Vita Cypr.* 9.

[133] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 10; cf. Ignatius, *Ad Rom. proem.:* ἡ προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης.

[134] *Euseb. HE* 7, 5, 2; 4, 23, 9; Basil, *Ep.* 70.

[135] Cyprian, *Ep.* 76–79, especially *Ep.* 62.

As the office of deaconess cannot be shown to have existed in the Latin West before the fourth century, the widows who were already known to Hermas in Rome as a special order, probably retained the same functions.[137] The deliberate creation of an institution so adapted to the talents and disposition of women is to that extent a praiseworthy original achievement of the early Christian Church. The benefits it brought caused later centuries to maintain it in principle even if in ever-different forms.

Christian charitable activity inevitably confronted the Church with a series of social problems, such as those of property and wealth, labour and poverty, which obliged her to adopt definite positions. The most detailed treatment of these is found in Clement of Alexandria, though his views cannot be taken as those of the Church as a whole. He maintains in principle the New Testament detachment from property and wealth, though his estimate of these is not so pessimistic as that of some other Christians. Wealth in itself does not exclude from the kingdom of heaven, just as poverty alone cannot guarantee access to it, but Clement is also profoundly convinced of the serious danger which wealth brings to any Christian. Whether wealth and property prove a curse to a Christian depends on whether or not he is the slave of these possessions and makes them the business of his life. Those who possess inner freedom in regard to them and bear their loss calmly, belong to the poor in spirit whom the Lord declared to be blessed. A right use is made of them when they are put to the use of the brethren.[138] Hence the high praise of almsgiving that is found in most writers of the age culminates, as far as pre-Constantinian times are concerned, in Cyprian's special treatise on this subject. Already in the so-called *Second Letter of Clement,* almsgiving had been ranked higher than fasting and prayer and with Cyprian it attains the rank of a means of grace by which the Christian can atone for daily faults committed after baptism.[139] Without doubt the bishop's exhortations to benevolence were willingly followed by many Christians, as is proved by the forms of Christian charitable action which we have just described. Some in ascetical enthusiasm gave all they had or distributed their gifts without discretion, so that Origen for example utters the warning that the situation of anyone in need should be carefully investigated and appropriate help given.[140]

---

[136] Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3, 97; Origen, *De or.* 28, 4; *In Luc. hom.* 17, 10; *In Is. hom.* 6, 3; *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 11; *Didasc.* 3, 1, 2; 3, 21. Tertullian, *De virg. vel.* 9; *Ad. ux.* 1, 7; *De exhort. cast.* 13.

[137] The name "deaconess" occurs for the first time at the Council of Nicaea, canon 19. — *Didasc.* 3 12, 1–4; Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 1, 4, 3.

[138] Clement of Alexandria, *Quis div. salv. passim; Paed.* 3, 35; *Strom.* 2, 22, 4; 4, 31, 1.

For all her welfare work, however, the Church in no way failed to proclaim the high personal worth of labour and she opposed the view of antiquity which regarded manual labour as an evil and a bitter necessity, as a sign of lack of freedom and of slavery. She followed the Jewish and New Testament pattern in this and emphasized that even simple work was estimable and was preferable to the idle luxury of many pagans. Church ordinances simply regarded work as a duty and proclaimed that a Christian who was capable of working should not receive any relief from the community.[141] It is only with Augustine that deeper reflection on the moral and religious meaning of labour began and led to the formation of a Christian ethic of work. The contribution which the Church of the third century made to the practical solution of the problem of labour was so comprehensive that it attracted the attention of the pagans. Tertullian reports how many of them, in light of this, said with ironic disdain, "Look how they love one another!"[142] What was meant as derision, was in the last analysis high praise.

The Attitude of Early Christianity to Secular Civilization and Culture

It was in accord with the fundamentally ascetical attitude of early Christianity that it regarded with marked reserve the amenities of late-antiquity civilization. Though Tertullian's rigorism may have gone too far in its radical rejection of most of civilization's benefits as the inventions of pagan demons, even level-headed men condemned pagan luxury. Clement of Alexandria, for example, repudiated everything that served an exaggerated cultivation of beauty and the body and which degenerated into pleasure-seeking luxury, though he by no means opposed reasonable care for health and a moderate use of jewellery.[143] The great threats to the Christian ideal of morality represented by pagan entertainments, gladiatorial contests, theatrical shows, and dances, were deliberately shunned if for no other reason than their connexion with idolatry, even though this was often no longer very perceptible. But the discussions which Tertullian and Novatian had to engage in on the subject show that many Christians found it difficult to free themselves from their deep-rooted liking for these things.[144]

---

[139] Clement, *Ad Cor.* 2, 16; Cyprian, *De op. et eleem.* 1.

[140] Cf. Hermas, *Pastor. Mand.* 4–6; Origen, *In Matth. comm.* 61.

[141] *Did.* 12, 2–5; Aristides, *Apol.* 15; Tertullian, *De idol.* 5, 12; *Apol.* 41; Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3, 11; *Didasc.* 2, 4, 3.

[142] *Apol.* 39.

The estimate of pagan literature and learning by Christian writers of the third century is very mixed. The Greeks with some reservations show themselves far readier than the Latins (excepting Lactantius) to attribute importance to them. Clement of Alexandria could not concur in the opinion of those who regarded philosophy as an invention of the devil. He even accorded to Greek philosophy a providential significance as a preparation for Christianity, while admitting that some of its representatives, in their preoccupation with words and style, had let themselves be misled into losing sight of the relevant content. Philosophical thought, even in Christianity, can still help to prepare the way for faith. In literature, Clement sets a positive value on tragedy because it teaches men to raise their eyes heavenwards.[145] Origen, too, felt and expressed open-minded sympathy with many achievements of secular learning. In his controversy with Celsus he defended himself against the latter's accusation that he was illogical in adducing the testimony of pagan philosophers in favour of the immortality of the soul; he also contested the assertion that the dialectical method was rejected by Christians. Origen recognized the importance of secular studies for Christian instruction, but compared unfavourably the sophistry and rhetoric of many teachers with the simplicity and conscientiousness of the evangelists.[146] The attitude of Hippolytus was much more reserved. He explained the rise of heresies by their dependence on Greek philosophies, though he still gave Greek literature preference over the wisdom of Egypt, or of Babylon and the Chaldees.[147]

On the Latin side, Minucius Felix arrived at a radical repudiation of pagan poetry and literature, the mythological content of which rendered it unsuitable, he considered, for use in Christian education of young people. He was just as unwilling to overlook philosophical scepticism in the question of knowledge of God, though he passes a favourable judgment on the endeavours of other thinkers to arrive at a true conception of God.[148] Tertullian's attitude was of a particularly complex nature and was, of course, expressed with varying intensity and differently based according to his theme and the moment of writing. In his early apologetic works, the possibility of attributing some value to philosophical endeavour is at least indirectly conceded when Tertullian himself quotes the critical works of pagan philosophers on religion for the purposes of his own argument.[149] In his polemical works of controversy against heresies his judgment on the value of philosophy is more sceptical; he makes philosophy at least partly responsible for erroneous doctrine and its theses are only utilizable when they agree with Christian truth.[150] His practical, ascetical writings then reveal intense pessimism in his judgment of all pagan literature, which can make scarcely any contribution to the formation of Christian moral life. Consequently, the profession of teacher in pagan schools is intolerable for a Christian; Tertullian could not conceive of anyone teaching something of which he was not genuinely convinced.[151] Here something of the contradictions in Tertullian's soul become apparant. He himself possessed a comprehensive knowledge of pagan literature and learning which he often placed in a very distinguished manner at the service of his work as a Christian writer. Yet he contested in an increasingly radical manner, and as it were despite himself, the idea that these studies possessed any worth whatsoever for the culture of a Christian. Cyprian, as a man of deeds, only expressed himself sporadically on these questions; according to him, the truths of Christian faith have no need of rhetoric; pagan tragedy only taught immoral behaviour, pagan ethics failed to provide motives for virtue and dealt with empty words, "but we are philosophers not in words but in deeds".[152] Even more incisive in form is the uncompromising rejection of pagan literature found in the apocryphal writings of the third century that are attributed to Cyprian. It is only shortly before the turning-point under Constantine that in Lactantius there is found a Christian writing in Latin whose regard for the greatness of the past of Rome made possible a more favourable estimate of its literary achievements. As a former teacher of rhetoric, he also saw some value in this branch of knowledge, and he found more in philosophy, which teaches how to distinguish truth and falsity, even though pagan philosophy had often failed. Cicero remained for him *eloquentiae unicum exemplar,* and he esteemed Virgil as the *poeta summus* of Latin literature, but in regard to the theatre he expressed certain reservations.[153]

---

[143] Tertullian, *De cor. passim; De cultu fem. passim;* Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2, 8 and 11–12; 3, 2 and 10–11; Min. Felix, *Oct.* 12, 38; Cyprian, *De laps.* 6.

[144] *De spect. passim,* especially 1; Novatian, *De spect.* 2–3.

[145] Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6, 17, 156; 6, 8, 66; 6, 17, 153; 1, 5, 28; 6, 16, 151; 5, 14, 122; *Protr.* 4, 59.

[146] Origen, *Contra Cels.* 3, 81; 6, 7; 6, 14; 3, 39.

[147] Hippolytus, *Refut. I proem.;* 10, 5; 10, 34.

---

[148] Min. Felix, *Oct.* 23, 1; 23, 8; 38, 5; 20, 1–2; 14, 2; 31, 1.

[149] *Ad nat.* 1, 10; 2, 4–7; 2, 16; *Apol.* 14, 19, 24, 46–47.

[150] *De praesc.* 7; 43; *De resurr. carn.* 3; *De an.* 2.

[151] *De spect.* 30; *De pat.* 1; *De paen.* 1; *De cor.* 10.

[152] *Ad Don.* 2; 8–9; *De bono pat.* 2–3.

The counterpart to the predominantly unfavourable estimate of pagan literature and philosophy made by the majority of third-century Christian writers was their proud awareness that in the the Old Testament, the Gospels, Epistles and other documents of apostolic tradition, they possessed an intellectual patrimony far superior to the wisdom of the Greeks. The works of the apologists and exegetes and the achievements of the writers of Alexandria and North Africa who professed the Christian faith, represented in the eyes of their fellow-believers an intellectual life which provided a perfectly adequate substitute for what they had given up. If Christianity in the third century was not yet able to develop any systematic and specifically Christian ideal of culture, it nevertheless laid foundations upon which a later age could build.

The Early Christian Church and the Pagan State

Of particular interest is the relation which developed in the third century between the pagan State and the Church. The Christian society became clearly aware of her growing inner strength and felt herself to be the "great Church". This increase in strength within and without was not hidden from the pagan State either, and it now reckoned with her as a power that required the adoption of a new attitude. This consciousness existed on both sides and is most strikingly revealed by Cyprian's proud remark that the emperor Decius heard the news of the rebellion of a rival usurper much more calmly than the announcement of the election of a new Bishop of Rome.[154] Both sides considered the relationship afresh and the outcome was of far-reaching importance for the period that followed. Among the Christians there was really only one voice at the beginning of the century that expressed a radical rejection of the Roman State; Hippolytus saw the power of Satan behind the Roman *imperium,* he envisioned it as represented by the first beast in the Apocalypse (13:1 f.) and the fourth beast in Daniel (chapter 7); in diabolical imitation the Roman empire copied the faithful Christian people which the Lord had gathered together from all nations and tongues.[155] Such a judgment expresses the overwhelming pressure that sometimes weighed upon a Christendom fixed within a structure of power that worshipped its emperor as a god. The position of the Alexandrian teachers was quite different. Clement was fundamentally loyal to the pagan

---

[153] *Div. instit.* 1, 1, 9; 3, 13, 17 ff.; *Epit.* 25, 7 ff.; on Cicero and Virgil: *De opif.* 20, 5; *Div. instit.* 1, 19, 3.

[154] *Ep.* 55, 9.

[155] *In Dan. comm.* 4, 9; *De antichr.* 25.

State when he affirmed the obligation of taxes and military service and recognized Roman law; if that State persecuted the Church, the hand of Providence was to be worshipped.[156] The only limit to this recognition was set by the cult of the emperor and the idolatry encouraged by the State. Origen is the first to attempt to cope theoretically with the relation between the Church and the pagan State. On the basis of Romans 1:13 ff., he derives the power of the *Imperium Romanum* from God, who has conferred judicial authority on it in particular. To the intrusive and insistent question of how a State authority that came from God could combat the faith and religion of the Christians, he answered that all the gifts of God can be abused and that those who held the power of the State would have to render an account before the judgment-seat of God.[157] God's providence permitted persecutions but always gave back peace again.[158] In principle the Christian showed loyalty to this State and followed all its laws as long as they did not stand in contradiction to the clear demands of his faith, as, for instance, the required recognition of the cult of the emperor did.[159] Origen, however, thought that a special providential mission had been assigned to the Roman empire; its unity which comprised the civilized world of that time and the *pax Romana* effective within it, had according to God's will smoothed the way for the Christian mission and so the empire acted, ultimately, in the service of the faith.[160] Tertullian, too, for all his bold defence of the freedom of the Christian conscience in the face of the Roman State, was profoundly convinced that it was under the authority of God. As the God of the Christians is therefore also the God of the emperor, they pray for the emperor's well-being and in fact for the continuance of the Roman Government.[161] Tertullian's positive affirmation of the Roman State, in principle, is not altered by the frequent reservations he has to express regarding political activity by Christians. These latter spring from his conception of a considerable permeation of public life by Satanic influences which make Christians strangers in this world despite their loyalty as citizens.[162]

It is not surprising that with so much recognition in principle of the authority of the Roman State, contacts in practice between it and the Church became frequent in the third century. Origen could lecture to the womenfolk of the Syrian rulers in Antioch; his correspondence with Emperor Philippus Arabs is a significant sign of tolerance. At the beginning of the reign of Valerian many Christians worked in the Roman imperial palace.[163] Emperor Gallienus ordered by rescript that the Christians should be restored their consecrated places and he forbade further molestation.[164] The Christian community of Antioch could even dare to appeal directly to Caesar Aurelian for an edict in a lawsuit between itself and the deposed Paul of Samosata.[165]

---

[156] *Paed.* 2, 14, 1; 3, 91, 3; 2, 117, 2; 3, 91, 2; *Strom.* 1, 171 and 4, 79, 1.

[157] *In Rom. comm.* 9, 26.

[158] *Contra Cels.* 8, 70.

[159] *In Rom. comm.* 9, 29.

[160] *Contra Cels.* 2, 30.

[161] *Apol.* 30; 32; 39. Dionysius of Alexandria also stresses prayer by the Christians for the emperor: *Euseb. HE* 7, 1. The prayer *pro salute imperatorum* is an inheritance from very early Christian times, cf. L. Biehl, *Das liturgische Gebet für Kaiser und Reich* (Paderborn 1937).

[162] *De idol.* 17; *De cor.* 13.

All this shows that in the third century the relation between State and Church cannot in many spheres be regarded as one of hostility nor, from the point of view of the Church, even as a matter of indifference. A process is perceptible which may be described as one of gradual mutual approach even though the Church unmistakably expressed the limits of her recognition of Roman power. Only twice, under Decius and Diocletian, was this development harshly interrupted. This occurred because both still believed in the possibility of a violent solution. How completely their opinions failed to recognize the signs of the times was shown by the enormously rapid change after Constantine's victory. A view of the exhaustive way the foundations of a reconciliation between Church and State were laid even in the third century shows that the events following the failure of the Diocletian persecution were not as revolutionary a turning-point as they have often been interpreted to be.

CHAPTER 25

The Holiness of the Christian and his Church

THE faithful of early Christian times had to conduct their religious life on the foundation of a baptismal spirituality and "preserve the seal of baptism". This implied a lofty awareness of the obligation of all the baptized to holiness in a holy Church. Despite their vivid knowledge of this duty, and despite all efforts to conform to it, the ideal was never carried out by all members of the various communities, and the writings of the apostolic and sub-apostolic age in particular reveal with perfect clarity that at no period in the young Church was there complete absence of sin. Paul himself had to excommunicate an incestuous person from the church at Corinth (1 Cor 5:1–13), and on frequent other occasions had to reprimand individual members of a community for sinful behaviour

---

[163] *Euseb. HE* 6, 21, 3–4; 6, 36, 3; 7, 10, 3.

[164] Ibid. 7, 13.

[165] Ibid. 7, 30, 18–19.

(Eph 4:17–31; 1 Cor 6). The author of the Apocalypse deplored grave faults in the communities of Asia Minor (Apoc 1–3). Clement of Rome had to exhort the Corinthian community not only to avoid as possible dangers but to give up as deplorable realities a whole series of grave failings such as sedition, covetousness, licentiousness, fraud, and envy.[1] Similar or identical sins are implied in the community of Philippi by the letter of Polycarp of Smyrna, and the so-called *Second Letter of Clement.*[2] About the middle of the second century the *Shepherd* of Hermas drew a grave picture of the failure of many Christians of the Roman community, in which there were adulterers, swindlers, drunkards, covetous people, and the like.[3] Then the third century sources make it plain that with the growth in size of the individual congregations, the number of those increased within them who did not succeed in avoiding sin even in its most serious forms. The ideal of a holy Church all of whose members persevered in the grace of baptism until death, remained a high aim which was never achieved.

This undeniable situation created a serious problem for the individual Christian, the single community, and the Church as a whole. Had the Christian who lost baptismal grace forfeited salvation for ever, had he definitely left the Church, or was there still a way for him to "recover the (lost) seal of baptism"?[4] Were some sins perhaps of such gravity that no penance, however strict, could atone for them? Were they unforgivable, and did they make return to the Church's society for ever impossible?

The discussions about the possibility of a penance which atones for sins committed and gives back participation in the life of the ecclesiastical community, accompany the Church, it might be said, from her very first hour, and in the third century they reached an almost dramatic culmination. The struggle for the holiness of Christians and the sanctity of their Church assumed concentrated form in the question of penance and, in the controversies about penance, became a factor of the first importance in the Church's own life. This is reflected, too, in ecclesiastical history research. Until now it has not been possible to reach generally accepted conclusions, since both the complicated condition of the sources and the close involvement of the problem of penance with the concept of the Church made objective decision difficult. To understand the questions regarding penance in the third century, it is necessary to have an acquaintance with previous developments; a brief sketch of these must, therefore, be given first.

---

[1] Clement, *Ad Cor.* 1, 3, 13, 30, 35.

[2] Polycarp, *Ad Phil.* 2–3, 5–6, 11; Ps-Clement, *Ep.* 2, 4.

[3] *Pastor Sim.* 6, 5.

[4] Ibid. 8, 6, 3.

Jesus' preaching indubitably demanded an absolutely radical renunciation of evil (Lk 9: 62; 14: 25), and also judged the situation of someone who has relapsed as graver than that of someone who has not yet been converted (Mt 13:3 ff.). On the other hand, he knew the sinfulness of his closest followers and did not exclude even the disciples who were unfaithful to him from reconciliation and from responsibility for important tasks in the *basileia* of God. God's readiness to forgive a sinner many times, is the basis for the precept that they must be equally ready to go on forgiving their brethren (Mt 18:22; 6:12; 7:11). With the conferring of the power of binding and loosing on the apostles as bearers of authority, the Church was appointed to pass judgment on the faithful who sinned, that is to say, to expel them from the community or to free them from the bond again, and forgive them their sins (Mt 18:15 ff.; Jn 20: 21 ff.). That authority was given without restriction; no sin was excepted as unforgivable, and so no sinner was excluded permanently from the Church unless he hardened himself impenitently in the "sin against the Holy Spirit" (Mt 12:31 ff.). St Paul acted in accordance with this when he "delivered to Satan" the incestuous sinner of Corinth, excluded him from the sacramental company of the faithful, "excommunicated" him (1 Cor 5:3 ff.). In accord with such individual measures, Paul expects that members of the community who have sinned grievously by lewdness and debauchery will be converted (2 Cor. 12:21). In other New Testament writings, too, the view prevails that every sinner can obtain forgiveness again if he does penance (Jas 1:21; 5:19 ff.; 2 Pet 3:9; 1 Jn 2:1 ff.). Only if he refuses penance and atonement does his fault become for him "the sin unto death" (1 Jn 5:16). The prayer of the sinner, and that of the community praying for him, open the way to forgiveness (1 Jn 5:14 ff.; Jas 5:14 ff.); the community of the faithful occupies itself with the sinner who is doing penance, and who makes his confession before it (1 Jn 1:9).[5] The Apocalypse admonishes bishops not to tolerate idolatry and licentiousness in their communities, but also recognizes that God himself can still bring the worst sinner to penance (Apoc 2:2; 2:14 ff.; 2:20–3).

This New Testament conviction of the possibility of penance and reconciliation of the sinner with God and with the community of the faithful, also persisted in the sub-apostolic period. Its writers suffer intensely when they see that the ideal of a society of brethren sanctified by baptism is thoroughly disgraced by some,[6] but they all issue an urgent summons to penance, which will restore salvation to each.[7] By such penance they meant genuine conversion, that is, renunciation of sin and a

[5] See *Did.* 14, too.

[6] Cf. Ps-Clement, *Ep.* 2, 14, 1.

[7] Ibid. 8, 1–3; Ignatius, *Ad Philad.* 3, 2; 8, 1; *Ad Symrn.* 9, 1; 1 *Clem* 7: 4, 5.

return to obedience to God's commandments.[8] This is expressed in prayer of repentance, fasting, and alms-giving,[9] and an integral part of it consists in confession of sinfulness before God and the community of the brethren.[10] In the sub-apostolic period, too, penance was always something that concerned the community. The authorities attended to ecclesiastical discipline and excommunicated the obstinate sinner, that is, they excluded him from participation in religious life and broke off all association with him "until he did penance". During the sinner's "time of excommunication", the community tried to help him by its impetrative prayers.[11] The judgment as to when the sinner had, through penance, sufficiently atoned for his fault, was clearly a matter for the Church authorities. Their favourable judgment brought him pardon and re-incorporation into the religious life of the ecclesiastical community, which was convinced that he had thereby obtained pardon also from God.[12]

Penance in the *Shepherd* of Hermas

Gaps occur even in the rather occasional remarks regarding penance which we can find in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. They give no details about the duration of penitential excommunication, nor about its enforcement and control, nor about the procedures of release and reception. Yet they clearly reveal the fundamental affirmation of the possibility of doing penance for all sins without exception. In this context it is difficult to understand the attitude of some with respect to Hermas, the author of the *Shepherd*. They have assigned the author of this mid-second century work as the first Christian who attempted to break a previously strict practice of denying any possibility of penance to a Christian who had placed himself outside the Christian community by grave sins committed after baptism. Hermas is said to have proclaimed a single opportunity of penance after baptism, and this has been construed as a display of Christendom's deviation from the original ideal of a Church of the saints. It is further said that the disastrous consequences of Hermas' proceeding are not mitigated even by an attitude regarding these possibilities of penance as an exceptional measure. This is considered to be similar to the jubilee of the Old Testament, which by its very nature had time limits set to it. Such an interpretation of the purpose of the Hermas document[13] is certainly favoured to some extent by its literary genre. Hermas chose the form of an apocalypse in order to preach his conception of penance in visions and parables; consequently his basic purpose only reveals itself on closer examination and even this leaves an obscure and contradictory residue.

---

[8] Ibid, 56, 1; Ps-Clement, *Ep.* 2, 8, 4.

[9] 1 *Clement* 48, Justin, *Dial.* 90, 141; Ps-Barnabas, *Ep.* 19, 10; Ps-Clement, *Ep.* 2, 16, 14.

[10] *Did.* 14, 1; 4, 17; Ps-Barnabas, *Ep.* 19, 12.

[11] Ibid, 19, 4; Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* 4, 1; 7, 1; Polycarp, *Ad Phil.* 6, 11; 11, 2; Ps-Clement, *Ep.* 2, 17, 3; *Did.* 15, 3.

[12] Ignatius, *Ad Phil.* 3, 2; 1 *Clem* 57: 2.

[13] The latest representative of this view was R. Joly in *RHR* 147 (1955), 35–49, but

Hermas receives the new revelation about penance in his second vision; his former ideas regarding the question can therefore be gleaned from his statements that are prior to this event. In the first vision he states without reservation that his children are written again in the books of life "when they do penance from the bottom of their hearts"; yet these had lapsed from the faith and had denounced their parents as well.[14] Only those who refused penance, or undertook it merely in appearance, could not reckon on forgiveness.[15] The revelation imparted to Hermas receives a new element with the announcement that the previous possibility of penance has a time limit set to it; it lasts until a certain day with a single possibility of penance for sins committed after bapism. The end of the world, heralded by an imminent persecution[16] is approaching and no further chance is available for subsequent sins. The modification in the time available for penance is, therefore, given eschatological grounds. In support of the thesis that Hermas here proclaims, for the first time in the history of the Church, a fundamentally new possibility of penance after baptism, reference has been made in the first place to his conversation with the Shepherd to whom Hermas submits his doubts. Here: "some teachers" are said to hold the view that only the penance afforded at baptism and with baptism brings remission (ἄφεσις) of sins and that no further possibility of penance exists. The "Shepherd" confirms the correctness of this view; he says that anyone who has received forgiveness of sins by baptism ought really (ἔδει) not sin any more; the mercy of God, however, grants to those who have fallen again through human weakness a single, last penance.[17] Whether these teachers should be regarded as the spokesmen of a minority inclining to rigorism, or as the representatives of a catechetical practice which unswervingly proclaimed the ideals of a baptismal spirituality and the preservation of baptismal grace,[18] may remain an open question. It remains established in any case that a majority, including Hermas himself, were aware of a possibility of penance subsequent to baptism. As compared to the repeatedly proclaimed demand

---

with the notable qualification that Hermas is said to be here opposing a rigorist trend in the Roman community.

[14] Hermas, *Past. Vis.* 1, 3, 2; 2, 2, 2–4.

[15] *Past. Vis.* 1, 4, 2; *Sim.* 8, 6, 4; 8, 7, 2; 9, 26, 3.

[16] *Past. Vis.* 2, 2, 5; 2, 3, 4; 3, 5, 5; 3, 8, 8 f.; *Sim.* 9, 9, 4.

[17] *Past. Mand.* 4, 3, 1–7.

[18] Cf. K. Rahner in *ZKTh* 77 (1955), 398 f.

for the realization of the baptismal ideal in daily life it was less emphatically stressed and, according to the "Shepherd's" words, was only to be preached with great discretion, out of regard for the newly baptized.[19] Hermas is obviously disturbed and anxious over the possibility that penance after baptism might contain some element of uncertainty; it might, for example, be prevented by some unforeseen circumstance. In the mind of the faithful its efficacy must have probably seemed less certain when compared with the radical effect of baptism. The Shepherd's answer gives Hermas confidence again, and makes him hope that his children, and all who are willing to make use of the proffered second chance of penance will obtain forgiveness even though a time limit is set.[20] While Hermas unquestionably states that there is only one possibility of post-baptismal penance, the reason given is not that there is simply no more time left for penance after the proclamation of his revelation. Rather it is explained as being something that is unrepeatable in principle, probably on the idea that just as there is only one baptism which confers forgiveness, so there is only one penance which blots out post-baptismal sins.[21] Furthermore, Hermas is convinced that the penance of someone who has relapsed a second time could not have been an irrevocable rejection of evil; it could not therefore have been genuine penance; and God could not have thereby granted forgiveness. The principle of the singleness of *paenitentia secunda* is clearly formulated for the first time by Hermas and remained in force for a long time.

Among penitential practices for the sinner, Hermas reckons confession of sins, prayer, fasting, almsgiving, and the humility with which he takes all these exercises upon himself.[22] When the atonement is complete, that is to say, when it corresponds to the measure of guilt, its double effect supervenes: it brings forgiveness of sins, and healing, while restoring life to the soul, the seal of baptism that had been lost.[23] Hermas makes it clear by his image of the tower, which is symbol of the Church, that penance is not only a matter between God and the sinner, but involves the Church. The sinners stand outside this tower, some near and others farther from it.[24] Anyone not in the tower is excluded from the community of the Church; anyone who is no longer taken into the tower is lost. As, however, it is the Church which excludes, which, in the sense of that time, excommunicates the adulterer or the man who has relapsed into idolatry,[25] all who stand outside the tower are persons who have been so excommunicated by her. Reception again into the tower presupposes an examination on whether the excommunication penance can be regarded as sufficient or "completed". Such an examination was, of course, the prerogative of the Church authorities[26] who either kept the sinner back at a "lesser place"[27] or, granting him complete reconciliation, let him back into the tower again, received him once more into the community of salvation of the Church. It is to be noted that Hermas' intention was not to completely describe the ecclesiastical penance of his time, but rather simply to preach penance.

---

[19] Hermas, *Pastor Mand.* 4, 3, 3.

[20] *Past. Vis.* 2, 2, 2–3, 4; *Mand.* 4, 3, 7.

[21] *Past. Mand.* 4, 1, 8; 4, 3, 6; on this see K. Rahner, *op. cit.* 405.

[22] *Past. Vis.* 1, 1, 3; 3, 1, 5; 3, 9, 4–6; 3, 10, 6; *Sim.* 5, 1, 3; 9, 23, 4; *Mand.* 8, 10.

[23] *Past. Vis.* 2, 4; 1, 9; 8, 6, 3.

[24] Ibid. 3, 2, 7 and 9; 3, 7, 1–3; 3, 5, 5. It is not possible to conclude, as Grotz does in *Die Entwicklung des Bußstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1955), that there are two groups of sinners, one excommunicate, the other not, though the latter are subjected to ecclesiastical penance; what is decisive is that they are all outside the tower. The different distances at which they stand from the tower is an index of their guilt or of their "excommunication-penance."

Tertullian's Two Views of Penance

The increased membership of the communities, especially in the phase of intense growth that characterized the latter half of the second century, involved more frequent cases of failure in Christian life and so heightened the importance of the question of penance. Even if convinced in principle that a second penance was not to be refused to such sinners, it was possible in the practice of penitential discipline to choose stricter or milder forms according to whether emphasis was placed on the Christian ideal of holiness or on the Christian motive of mercy. Both tendencies could be represented in the same community and both are perceptible here and there in the sources, too. When Dionysius of Corinth, about 170, requires that all "who repent of some fall, error or even a heresy", are to be received again, he not only expresses the generally recognized view, but also clearly opposes a tendency of another kind.[28] A rigoristic trend emerged in Phrygian Montanism. At first this appeared to be a protest against the excessively lax view and manner of life of many Christians, but later revealed itself as an extremist movement whose first prophet Montanus upheld the thesis: "Potest ecclesia donare delicta, sed non faciam, ne et alii delinquant." "The Church can forgive sins, but I shall not, lest others fall away."[29] This amounted to demanding that for the sake of discipline in its communities, the Church should refuse sinners the possibility of penance, the granting of which she was in principle admitted to possess. The initial success of Montanism shows that this demand met with a certain amount of sympathy, because it was apparently trying to achieve an uncompromisingly high ideal of holiness. The question of penance became a prime problem at one stroke when Tertullian by his adherence to Montanism made this demand his own. He proclaimed it with all the subtlety of his intellect and the pitiless rigour of his will. However, as a member of the Catholic community of Carthage, he had previously expounded the traditional view of the question of penance in his own work. The twofold position he adopted offers an exceptional opportunity of investigating the problem more closely through comparison.

---

[25] Hermas, *Past. Mand.* 4, 1, 8–9.

[26] Cf. *Past. Vis.* 3, 9, 7–10.

[27] On this, see K. Rahner, *loc. cit.* 410–24.

[28] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 6.

[29] Recorded as an "oracle" of Montanus by Tertullian, *De pud.* 21, 7.

When Tertullian wrote his monograph *On Penance* in the first years of the third century, the existence of the possibility of a single penance for the baptized was something of which he had no doubt whatever.[30] God knows the perils to which the Christian is exposed, even after baptism, and which are due to the malice of the devil. For those who fall victims, God has "established the second penance in order to open the door to those who knock, but only once, because it is already the second time, but not again any more, because the next time is already too late."[31] As opposed to this, Tertullian quite unmistakably expresses his real ideal and in doing so reminds us by the very words he uses of the same attitude in Hermas. He speaks of the possibility of this penance only against his will because it might easily mislead some into far too careless an attitude towards sin.[32] Tertullian also clearly reveals that the loss of baptismal grace was felt to be a very grave failure in the Catholic community, so that some almost lost the heart to make a new beginning and in a sort of despair were no longer willing to undertake the second penance. It is to them that his admonition was addressed: "It certainly ought to be hard for us to sin a second time but to do penance a second time ought not to daunt us."[33] It is of special importance for judging Tertullian's later attitude to observe that in his Catholic days he maintained the universality of penance and excepted no sin as unforgivable. Moreover, only grave sins are in question as matter for penance — penance is of course intended to restore the lost grace of baptism[34] — and he names a few incidentally, not in the sense of an exhaustive catalogue or list, such as "to succumb to carnal lust or the allurements of the world, to deny the faith for fear of the secular power, to stray from the right path as the result of false teachings".[35] In another passage he mentions lust *(stuprum)*, eating of idol-offerings, and heresy *(perversa docere)*.[36]

---

[30] The chapters 7–12 in *De paen.* deal with them together.

[31] *De paen.* 7, 10. [32] Ibid. 7, 2. [33] Ibid. 7, 12. [34] Ibid. 7, 11. [35] Ibid. 7, 9.

[36] Ibid. 8, 1. Other sins of course are matter for penance in Tertullian's view and he mentions them on occasion as grave transgressions in other works. See K. Rahner, *Festschr. K. Adam* (1952), 141–4.

A radical change in Tertullian's view about penance is revealed in *De pudicitia*, a later open polemic in which he now denies the Church any right to forgive grave sins and reserves this to the spirituals of the Montanist movement which he had joined in the meantime. In the very introduction a Catholic bishop is sharply attacked for publishing a definite edict saying "I also forgive the sins of adultery and fornication for those who have done penance."[37] It was tempting to see in this bishop the then leader of the Roman community, because the expression *pontifex maximus* and *episcopus episcoporum*, by which Tertullian refers to him, at first sight seemed to point to Rome. But the alleged identification of the bishop under attack with Callistus or Zephyrinus of Rome cannot be maintained because Tertullian himself excludes it by saying later that this bishop presumptuously asserted that the power granted to Peter of binding and loosing had passed to every church, "which is related to Peter". That can only mean that Tertullian's opponent was a (North African) bishop who saw the power of binding and loosing present in every church that was in communion with Peter.[38] This interpretation gains considerably in weight from a remark of Cyprian's that some African bishops had earlier refused penance to adulterers;[39] Tertullian's African opponent was defending the view opposed to theirs.[40]

By praising himself for his unashamed renunciation of his earlier error, namely the Catholic teaching,[41] Tertullian himself says with all desirable clarity that the attitude expressed in *De pudicitia* regarding penance represents something new. This obliged him, it is true, to reinterpret his earlier scriptural proofs of the universality of ecclesiastical penance by a display of what can only be called exegetical acrobatics. What is fundamentally new is his division of sins into remissible and irremissible, among which those of idolatry, adultery, and murder play a special part. It is not really admissible to speak of a triad of capital sins in Tertullian, for he mentions other unforgivable sins as well as the three above named,[42] even though he tried to adduce special reasons for these three from the decalogue and the apostolic decree in Acts.[43] To prove the irremissibility of certain sins by the Church, Tertullian appeals to the fact that they would not be forgiven by God either,[44] but he has to contradict himself by saying, in another passage, that forgiveness of these sins must be left to God.[45] It is not that the three capital sins were treated as unforgivable in the Church's penitential discipline before Tertullian's Montanist period, for in that case he could not have passed them over in silence in his work *De paenitentia.* The triad is rather to be considered a construction of Tertullian which he thought to use effectively in his polemical writings against the Catholic Church.

---

[37] *De pud.* 1, 6.

[38] *De pud.* 21, 9. The attempts of K. Stockius, "Ecclesia Petri propinqua" in *AkathKR* 117 (1937), 24–126, and of W. Koehler, *Omnis ecclesia Petri propinqua* (Heidelberg 1938), to show that Tertullian meant the Roman Church here, must be considered to have failed; cf. C. B. Daly, *Studia patristica,* III (Berlin 1961), 176–82.

[39] *Ep.* 55, 21.

[40] In view of Tertullian's liking for employing literary fictions in his controversies, it is not impossible that the *episcopus episcoporum* is not intended to designate some particular bishop but to represent all the bishops of North Africa who took up the attitude which Tertullian was attacking; cf. A. Ehrhard, *Kirche der Märtyrer,* 366ff.

[41] *De pud.* 1, 10–13.

[42] *De pud.* 9, 9; 19, 25; *Adv. Marc.* 4, 9.

[43] *De pud.* 5 and 12.

In his monograph on penance and in some parts of the Montanist polemic, Tertullian becomes the first Christian writer to provide enough detail about the penitential procedure for a clear picture of its operation to be obtained. The first stage was an external action that Tertullian liked to call by the Greek term *exhomologesis,* confession.[46] The sinner had openly to admit *(publicatio sui)* that he was in a condition that forced him to perform the official penance. How this public confession was actually carried out in fact is not really clear. When penance for notorious faults was involved, the summons to do penance probably came from the church authorities themselves, who in particularly serious cases could on their own initiative inflict exclusion from the ecclesiastical community, that is, excommunication. The question is more difficult in regard to secret grievous sins, for which the same duty of penance certainly existed as for those publicly known.[47] Various considerations suggest that, in this case, the sinner himself spoke to the leader of the community. For, in the first place, he himself might be in doubt whether his sin necessitated his doing penance at all. Then, too, the gravity of the works of penance which was required, and particularly their duration, depended on the gravity of the sins committed; their allocation presupposes adequate confession by the sinner to the church authority. This explains Tertullian's emphatic admonition to undertake penance whatever the very understandable obstacles in the soul; for after all it was better for the sinner to be publicly absolved than to remain hidden in damnation.[48]

Performance of public penance began with exclusion from participation in the eucharistic service and the prayer of the community; the penitent now no longer possessed *communicatio ecclesiastica.*[49] This act, which belonged to the head of the community, was not identical with the present canonical procedure of excommunication. It consisted rather of installation in the status of penitent, who thereby stood "outside the church" *(extra*

---

[44] Ibid. 17, 8. [45] Ibid. 19, 6. [46] *De paen.* 9, 1, 5 etc.

[47] Ibid. 10, 8.

[48] Ibid. 10–12, especially 10, 8: "an melius est damnatum latere quam palam absolvi?"

[49] *Apolog.* 39; *De pud.* 18, 2.

ecclesiam stare).[50] The sinner could prepare for the beginning of public penance by private works of penance. Tertullian is the first to speak of these in some detail;[51] in addition to continual prayer in a contrite frame of mind, he mentions fasting intended to increase the efficacy of that prayer, the wearing of sackcloth and ashes as an expression of a penitential spirit, and restrictions in care for the body. The sinner performed public penance in two stages. First he stood at the entrance to the church *(pro foribus ecclesiae* or *in vestibulo),* probably in penitential clothes; clerics and laity passed by him and on his knees he asked for the help of their prayers and for readmittance into their society.[52] The second stage restored entry to the inside of the church itself, where the penitent again had to implore the impetratory prayer of the congregation and the restoration of his former membership.[53] Such penance extended over a considerable space of time, which varied according to the gravity of the fault, and probably according to the contrite attitude of the penitent; lifelong penance does not seem to have been imposed in Tertullian's time.[54]

To the first act of excommunication at the beginning of the penance there corresponded the act of reconciliation at the end through which the bishop granted pardon *(venia)* and "restoration" *(restitutio).* The outward form in which this took place cannot be clearly gathered from Tertullian, but most probably it corresponded to the rite customary in Cyprian's time: imposition of hands in conjunction with a prayer.[55] Although Tertullian does not go into detail about the act of reconciliation performed by the bishop until the *De pudicitia,* this certainly existed already in his pre-Montanist days. A second penance intended to restore the grace of baptism[56] loses its meaning if there is not at the end of it a recognizable concluding action which incorporates the penitent into the community again, granting him what he has requested so imploringly. That this act was definitely performed by the bishop of the community is demonstrated in the fact of Tertullian's polemic against the bishop of the Catholic Church who claimed to pardon sins of adultery. But the community, too, was drawn into the process of reconciliation by its impetratory prayer for the penitent, which can certainly be understood in a deeper sense of collaboration. The absolution and reception again of a sinner into the sacramental community can be felt as a special concern of the Christ-society, without any claim being made thereby to share the sacramental authority of the bishop.[57] The reconciliation pronounced and accomplished by the bishop gave back to the former sinner *pax* with his Church,[58] and conferred and guaranteed at the same time, reconciliation with God, just as baptism as first penance blotted out sins and gave the grace of being a child of God.[59] This reconciliation was guaranteed on the one hand by the power of the impetratory prayer of the Church, which is at the same time the prayer of Christ, and therefore infallible, and on the other hand, it was vouched for by the authority of the Church to forgive sins as God's representative. In respect to this last assurance, appeal was made on the Catholic side to Matthew 18:18.[60] Immoderate and lacking in objectivity as the Montanist Tertullian's controversy about penance and penitential discipline was in regard to the Catholic Church, it nevertheless had positive effects. It caused the Catholics to rethink the biblical and theological foundations of the customary practice of penance and very likely prompted a more precise formulation of these in their preaching. Tertullian was not able to win a large or lasting following in Carthage and North Africa.

---

[50] *De pud.* 1, 21.

[51] *De paen.* 9–10.

[52] *De pud.* 1, 21; 9, 4 and 6; 4, 5; 7, 10; *De paen.* 10, 5–6.

[53] *De pud.* 13, 7; 18, 13.

[54] *De paen.* 7, 11; 12, 7.

[55] Cyprian, *De laps.* 16; *Ep.* 15, 1; 16, 2; 18, 1; 20, 3 etc.

[56] *De paen.* 7, 11; and on this, see K. Rahner, *Festschrift K. Adam* (1952), 149 ff.

More serious consequences for ecclesiastical unity seemed at first to portend from a controversy about the practice of penance that broke out almost at the same time in Rome. In this dispute the learned priest Hippolytus sharply opposed the Roman bishop Callistus (217–22) and it is clear that it had no intrinsic connexion with the African disputes. Hippolytus here appears as the representative of a rigorist trend such as had perhaps already existed in the Rome of Hermas' time. He accused Callistus of general laxity in administering ecclesiastical discipline and alleged a few examples. Callistus allowed a bishop to remain in office even if he were guilty of grave offences; all clerical appointments were open to men who had married twice or even three times; clerics who married were not guilty of sin; and finally Callistus declared that marriages between free women and men of lower rank, not excluding slaves, were valid, although these were forbidden by Roman law. Hippolytus summed up his indictment in the reproach that even as the member of a sect he would be free from charge for his sins, provided he joined the "school of Callistus".[61] It is evident that the actual question of penance was not at issue here. Callistus issued no regulation introducing innovations in penitential practice or even any conceding for the first time in contrast to earlier custom the possibility of penance for adulterers. It certainly was neither a matter of remissible and irremissible sins nor one of the Church's authority to forgive sins, as it was with Tertullian. Callistus plainly held to the general customary doctrine and practice of penance which based the view that there are good and bad in the Church on the parable of the tares among the wheat. Hippolytus himself admitted that Callistus had the majority of the Catholics of Rome on his side. And even Hippolytus himself cannot be described as an adherent of the opinion that some sinners cannot be forgiven; perhaps he was only demanding stricter and perhaps even lifelong penance for some offences. In fact, if the author of the *Philosophoumena* is identical with the Hippolytus of the *Apostolic Tradition*, he conceded in principle that a bishop had authority to absolve from every sin.[62] And the practice of reconciling a heretic after he had performed public penance, was already in existence even under Callistus' predecessor Zephyrinus (199–217). This is proved by the account handed down by Eusebius regarding the confessor of the faith, Natalis, who after rigorous penance was received once more into the community of the Church by the Roman bishop.[63] Hippolytus' followers were only a minority which formed a "school" of their own in Rome, but with apparently no adherents outside the city and which disintegrated when Hippolytus died, if it had not done so already.

---

[57] K. Rahner, ibid. 152–4.

[58] *De pud.* 1, 21; 12, 11 *(pax)*; 3, 5; 15, 5 *(communicatio)*.

[59] *De paen.* 7, 14; 10, 8; *De pud.* 2, 15; 3, 1–3 etc.

[60] *De paen.* 10, 6 ff.; *De pud.* 5, 14. — *De pud.* 1, 6; 21, 9.

[61] Hippolytus, *Refut.* 9, 12 (the whole chapter).

Penitential Discipline in North Africa in Cyprian's Time

Renewed discussion of the question of penance in North Africa and subsequently in Rome was occasioned by the course taken by the Decian persecution which was so deplorable for the Church as a whole. By the end of it, the large numbers of lapsed forced the Church's leaders to review the previous penitential practice, at least in certain respects. This phase of early Christian controversies about penance is of the greatest consequences for the history of the Church, because it substantially threatened ecclesiastical unity and led in actual fact to divisions which culminated in the extensive anti-Church of the Novatians.

Bishop Cyprian of Carthage saw himself faced with a new situation when news came to him where he was hiding from the pagan authorities, not only of the large numbers who had lapsed during the persecution, but also about a serious breach of the penitential discipline which had previously been under his own firm control. Some priests were receiving into the Church again those who had fallen, without requiring any work of penance from them at all. Many of the lapsed produced "letters of peace" *(libelli pacis)*, which had been issued to them by martyrs before their death, or by confessors of the faith, and in which prompt or immediate granting of their readmission to the community of the Church was recommended. Cyprian at once forbade his priests under pain of deprivation of office, to receive the lapsed again; he informed the confessors that he could only regard their letters of peace as a recommendation to the Church authorities; they did not represent an ecclesiastical decision having force of law. When more news arrived about growing unrest in his flock, he gave his clergy instructions to grant ecclesiastical *pax* at once to lapsed persons who were on their death-bed, if they could produce letters of peace from martyrs, but to other dying persons only if they had previously given proofs of genuine willingness to do penance; he would make further regulations for the rest of the lapsed after his return to Carthage.[64] Some of the lapsed immediately accepted these measures of Cyprian and declared themselves willing to do penance, although they were in possession of letters of peace. Others, however, revolted and wrote to Cyprian that they had already been given back their peace with the Church by a martyr. Cyprian ironically described these proceedings by saying that the lapsed behaved as though they were the Church[65] and it was his place to graciously request from them their admission into the Church. A cleric called Felicissimus soon put himself at the head of this group. In Cyprian's absence and without his knowledge he had been appointed deacon of the Carthaginian community by the priest Novatus. He was joined by a few other clerics who were already opposed to Cyprian on other grounds. They won over a considerable part of the community, regarded themselves as the rightful Catholic community of Carthage, and developed an intense propaganda against Cyprian.[66]

---

[62] See the prayer of consecration of the bishop in *Trad. apost.* 3.

[63] *Euseb. HE* 5, 28, 8–12.

This was the situation that Cyprian met when he returned to Carthage at Easter in 251. He soon published his work *On the Lapsed*, which gives an instructive description of the general situation of the North African Church before and after the Decian persecution. In this work Cyprian once again expounded his standpoint in the matter of penance; he opposed strongly the lax practice of his opponents and demanded serious and comprehensive penance from the lapsed as a condition for their reception[67]. The opposition group now provided themselves with their own episcopal leader in the person of the priest Fortunatus and also endeavoured, through a delegation to Rome, to obtain recognition from Pope Cornelius. The latter, however, repulsed them and informed Cyprian of his attitude[68].

---

[64] Cyprian, *Ep.* 1; 15; 16; 18 and 19.

[65] *Ep.* 33 and 35, especially 33, 1.

[66] Ibid., 41, 1 ff.; 42 and 43, 1–7; 52, 3.

[67] *De laps.* 15 and 16.

[68] *Ep.* 59, 1, 9, 16.

Cyprian's energy soon succeeded in ensuring that the ecclesiastical authorities would alone handle the penitential discipline for the lapsed. At a synod summoned by him and attended by numerous African bishops in the year 251, serious penance was unanimously required from all the lapsed, but with special treatment prescribed for the *libellatici* and the *sacrificati;* the former could quickly obtain the *pax* after a careful examination of each individual case; the *sacrificati,* however, who had been guilty of downright denial of their faith by a complete performance of the pagan sacrifice, were only to be received again when in danger of death. But anyone who thus far had not shown himself ready to undertake penance should be excluded from peace with the Church even when in danger of death, because clearly no will to do penance was present at all. Cyprian justified the milder treatment of the *libellatici* by the much lesser gravity of their offence.[69]

When a new persecution threatened under Emperor Gallus and seemed likely to surpass the Decian persecution in intensity, a second synod in Carthage in 252 again dealt with penitenial discipline for the lapsed. It was decided, in view of the grave situation, to concede to all the lapsed admission to the peace of the Church if they had begun their works of penance from the very day they lapsed. This decision was justified by the considerations: that peacetime practice could not be maintained now, that all now needed strengthening by the Church, and that it was impossible to debar from the Blood of Christ those who were expected and required to shed their blood for Christ. It was indicated that only those were capable of accepting martyrdom whom the Church had armed for that struggle, and that the Holy Spirit could only speak through those who had received the Spirit of the Father through peace with the Church.[70] As the persecution of Gallus, however, did not assume the proportions that had been feared, the argument about penance for the *lapsi* was settled by the victory of Cyprian's views, which the North African bishops made their own. The opposition group round Felicissimus and Fortunatus likewise lost its importance, so that soon after the Second Synod of Carthage, peace was to all intents and purposes restored in Cyprian's community.

This sketch of the course of the North African dispute about penance shows clearly that discussion extended to two definite questions: first whether the restoration of peace with the Church was possible without performance of works of penance, and secondly, if a decision about it belonged to the Church's leaders or whether a testimonial from martyrs or confessors of the faith possessed binding force over ecclesiastical authority. Cyprian's opponents advocated a relaxation or even abolition of the previous stricter practice and, as opposed to this, Cyprian defended the maintenance of a full performance of penance and its control by church authority. His attitude in no respect reveals any break with an earlier severer practice of a kind which rejected the possibility of atonement by public canonical penance for the sin of apostasy; in other words the remissibility or the irremissibility of this sin was not the subject of this controversy at all. The possibility of admission to penance, or of definitive reception into the church community again, was in fact presupposed by both parties. After initial hesitation, Cyprian allowed himself to be won over to a milder handling of penitential practice on one point only: he was persuaded to grant reconciliation to the dying even though they had not yet carried out the customary penance, the only qualifying condition being the possession of a letter of peace from a martyr or a confessor of the faith.[71]

---

[69] Cf. the account of this to Bishop Antonianus, *Ep.* 55, 6; 55, 13–16; 55, 23.

[70] Ibid. 57.

As regards the outer form of the institution or liturgy of penance, the following can be gathered from Cyprian's writings. The first act was the *paenitentiam agere* or *satisfacere* of the sinner, his works of penance, that is, prayer, fasting, wearing penitential clothes, almsgiving, and other such works of self-denial.[72] But these acts were not placed at the private discretion of the penitent; they were carried out with the knowledge of the Church who supported them with her prayer and determined their duration.[73] The second stage was the *exhomologesis,* the part of the penance which took place in the presence of the community. It consisted in the request of the penitent to the bishop, clergy, and congregation, that they should receive him back into the community of the Church and grant him reconciliation.[74] Whether this happened only once or more often, cannot be determined with certainty. It nevertheless presupposed a non-public admission of guilt to the head of the community (the bishop), which Cyprian terms *confessio.*[75] Cyprian's *exhomologesis* is misunderstood when it is regarded as special form of penance. The "real ecclesiastical penance" was different from excommunication penance or "full penance" and is said to have developed from the *exhomologesis.*[76] The third and final act was reconciliation proper and took place through imposition of hands by the bishop. It is first mentioned for the Latin church by Cyprian but it was a long-established rite and one that was, of course, in use even earlier in the East.[77] The bishop accomplished the act of reconciliation by reason of the power of binding and loosing committed to him.[78] The community took part in the judgment which decided whether reconciliation was to be granted, but no details are given about this collaboration. Reconciliation, when accomplished, restored to the penitent *communicatio* with the Church, he again received the *pax ecclesiae.*[79] He was thereby permitted to take part once more in the eucharistic service and to receive the Eucharist.[80] Furthermore Cyprian was convinced that the *pax* accorded by the Church was also ultimately significant for salvation, for by it the former penitent was again incorporated into the community of the Church in which alone it is possible to work out one's salvation.[81]

---

[71] *Ep.* 8, 3; 30, 8; 18, 1; 29, 2; 20, 3. — *Ep.* 55, 6; 57, 1; 64, 1.

[72] *De laps.* 24, 30, 35.

[73] Ibid. 32; *Ep.* 4, 4.

[74] *Ep.* 15, 1; 16, 1; 19, 2; 20, 3.

[75] *De laps.* 28, 29; *Ep.* 55, 17, 19.

[76] J. Grotz, for example, in *Die Entwicklung des Bußstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1955); against this view, S. Hübner in *ZKTh* 84 (1962), 171–95.

[77] Cyprian, *Ep.* 16, 2; Origen, *In Lev. hom.* 2, 4; *Didasc.* 2, 18, 7; 43, 1.

The Roman Controversy on Penance and the Schism of Novatian

While Cyprian had to oppose a tendency to laxity in the imposition of penance on the part of his own clergy in North Africa, Rome was faced about the middle of the century, by a rigorist movement which derived particularly effective and dangerous impetus from the personality of the man who led it and gave to it theological foundation. In striking similarity to Tertullian, the Roman priest Novatian also originally upheld the traditional teaching on penance but soon proclaimed an extremely rigoristic view though for reasons different than those which motivated the African. In particular he rejected any reception of the lapsed into the Church's community as incompatible with her holiness. The Roman attitude on the reconciliation of the lapsed was expressed even before Novatian's time in a letter which some priests of that church had addressed to Cyprian; they had demanded even more definitely than the African bishop that sick persons among the lapsed who repented of their fault and desired reconciliation should be "helped".[82] This view was at first held by Novatian, too. As secretary of the Roman college of priests while the see was vacant in the years 250–1, he had had to deal with correspondence to churches abroad, and his elegant pen was able to express it eloquently and attractively. When (he wrote to Cyprian) humanly speaking, the death of one of the lapsed seemed imminent, he should with appropriate prudence be "helped", provided he had already performed works of penance publicly, had repeatedly expressed abhorrence for his defection and had demonstrated his sorrow by his tears.[83] There was agreement between Rome and Carthage on another point, too. Just as Cyprian was to undertake a definite settlement of the question of penance upon his return to Carthage, so too a final decision would be given in Rome when the community again had a bishop. In connexion with this, a principle of Roman practice in questions of law and faith which was to play an outstanding part in the dispute about heretical baptism and later on, was here formulated for the first time: *nihil innovandum,* they would hold fast to tradition.[84] This letter of Novatian's also contains an interesting detail in that the Roman confessors of the faith unlike their friends in Carthage, refused to issue letters of peace to the lapsed, and were resolute opponents of any relaxation of previous practice in ecclesiastical discipline; they consequently disapproved the vehement demand of the African *lapsi* for immediate reconciliation. To grant it to them too quickly would be to act like a doctor who only closes a wound without giving it time to heal and so only makes the illness worse.[85] When Novatian also observes that the apostasy had assumed such proportions in the whole Church that a final settlement ought only to be made by common consultation of bishops, priests, deacons, and the laity who had stood firm, he seemed to have a Roman synod in mind.[86] A further letter to Cyprian, the style of which likewise identifies Novatian as the author, sharply criticized the lapsed in Carthage who were not willing to wait for Cyprian's return and who despite their serious offence, demanded the *pax* with the Church and even asserted it had already been granted them by heaven. It was high time the letter states that they did true penance, proved the genuineness of their contrition, and brought down God's mercy on themselves by humble submission.[87] Neither of Novatian's two letters justifies the view that in the Roman church until then, no forgiveness had been granted for the sin of denial of the faith; on the contrary, reception of the lapsed into the Church is also presupposed by Novatian when he says at one point that prayer should be made that the penance of the lapsed might obtain forgiveness for them and at another point, that a humble attitude on the part of the fallen would facilitate their request for readmission.[88] Two observations still spring to the mind of one who reads the masterly formulation provided in these two letters of Novatian. Whilst merciful love is always perceptible in Cyprian's whole outlook on the fallen, it is quite lacking in Novatian; he is cold, almost harsh towards them and appeals with an undertone of pride to the glorious Roman tradition.[89] It is also difficult to avoid the impression that his suggestion that a settlement of the whole question of penance for the lapsed could only be undertaken after the election of a new Roman bishop, was not given without a certain reservation. Was he perhaps to be the man to whom this task would fall?

---

[78] Cyprian, *Ep.* 57, 1.
[79] Ibid. 64, 1.
[80] Ibid. 4, 4; 16, 2; 18, 1; 55, 29.
[81] Ibid. 73, 21; 74, 7; *De eccl. unit.* 6.
[82] Cyprian, *Ep.* 8, 3.
[83] Ibid. 30, 8.

---

[84] Ibid. [85] Ibid. 30, 2 and 3. [86] Ibid. 30, 5. [87] Ibid. 36, 1–3.
[88] Ibid. 30, 6; 36, 3. [89] *Ep.* 30, 2.

The change in Novatian's attitude on penance occurred when the election of a successor to Pope Fabian, possible with the end of the Decian persecution, elevated not him but Cornelius as Bishop of Rome. The picture that Cornelius draws of his opponent in a letter to Fabius of Antioch[90] is certainly distorted by personal resentment, but it is confirmed in many factual details by the correspondence of Cyprian, who was level-headed and not easily given to exaggeration, and by other sources. Novatian had himself set up as a rival bishop in Rome with the assistance of the priest Novatus from Carthage[91] and tried to win more supporters with the slogan that the readmission of the lapsed into communion with the Church was to be refused on principle. A Roman synod of sixty bishops and numerous other clerics excommunicated Novatian and confirmed by synodal decree the previous Roman practice of admitting apostates to penance.[92] Novatian, however, immediately set about building an opposition church everywhere in East and West. He moved energetically and with undeniable skill in propaganda, taking the organization of the universal Church as a model.[93] In Rome and Italy the success of his endeavours was certainly small, for the prompt action of Cornelius in calling the Roman synod clarified the situation. According to Cornelius' ironical account, Novatian adjured and implored his followers to remain faithful to him, even when he was administering the Eucharist to them, but their numbers continued to shrink.[94] His propaganda took no root in North Africa either, because Cyprian had the situation well in hand there and probably also because the conversion of the leader of the lax party, Novatus, to the opposite camp did not particularly recommend the Novatian movement. Nevertheless, Novatian's letters designed to win over African bishops actually had a certain effect, as the case of Bishop Antonianus shows. He had resisted Novatian from the start, but when he received a letter from him, became hesitant nevertheless and turned to Cyprian for enlightenment. Cyprian's answer is available in a long letter that develops his whole conception of the doctrine of penance.[95] Cyprian also gave Pope Cornelius his support in the struggle against Novatianism by a brisk exchange of letters with Rome and succeeded in inducing some of Novatian's followers to rejoin the legitimate bishop of Rome.[96]

In other regions the successes of Novatian propaganda were more considerable. In Gaul, Bishop Marcian of Arles joined the movement and pitilessly refused reconciliation to the lapsed, even on their death-bed, so that many of them died in despair. Cyprian took up the case and requested Pope Stephen (254–7) in a special letter, to excommunicate Marcian and to give the church in Southern Gaul a new leader.[97] Signs of Novatian infiltration into Spain also exist but were not really perceptible until later. Bishop Pacian of Barcelona († before 329), still remembered a document shown to him by a Novatian, Simpronianus, containing the assertions, "After baptism there is no penance any more; the Church cannot forgive any mortal sin and she destroys herself when she admits sinners."[98] That might very well be a sequel to the Novatian doctrine of penance. This likelihood is increased by the many decrees of the Synod of Elvira, which by their rigorist tendency show a sympathy of this kind existing very early in Spain.

---

[90] *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 5 ff. [91] Cyprian, *Ep.* 52, 2. [92] *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 2.

[93] According to Cyprian, *Ep.* 73, 2, he imitated this.

[94] *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 18, 19.

[95] *Ep.* 55, which has already been quoted several times.

[96] *Ep.* 44–54.

What influence Novatian and his doctrine had on many distant communities in the East is notable; it found supporters particularly in Syria and Palestine, in the Asia Minor provinces of Bithynia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Cicilia, and even in Armenia and Mesopotamia. Novatian took part personally in propaganda in the East by writing letters to leading bishops. There is for instance a letter to Dionysius of Alexandria, in which he seeks to justify his step in founding a church of his own. Dionysius' reply to Novatian has been preserved. The Bishop of Alexandria adjures him insistently to desist from his project, to urge his followers to return to Catholic unity and so at least to save his own soul.[99] A particular danger of the inroad of Novatian influence existed in Fabius of Antioch who had a tendency to rigorist views and consequently "was rather inclined to schism" as Eusebius put it. Dionysius of Alexandria, however, succeeded in keeping him to the traditional conception by expounding the doctrine of penance in detail and by providing examples from real life which showed the longing of the lapsed for reconciliation.[100] Eusebius transmits a few valuable indications about the extent of Dionysius' correspondence for he still had access to it.[101] From one of these letters it appeared that Novatian's schism threatened so strongly to consolidate itself in the East that the leading bishops in Cicilia, Cappadocia, and Palestine wanted to discuss the whole question in a synod at Antioch and had invited Dionysius to it.[102] The latter contributed substantially, by his vigorous work of making the issues clear through letter-writing, to halting the Novatian movement. But he was certainly mistaken about the measure of his success when he later reported to Pope Stephen that peace was restored to the Church in the East, that "the innovation of Novatus" (= Novatian) had been "rejected", and that there was everywhere great joy over the restoration of unity.[103] Novatianism still persisted for a long time in the East, even if only in small sectarian communities which went further than the rigorism of their first founder and pretentiously called themselves Cathars, the church of the pure.[104]

---

[97] *Ep.* 68, 1–3.

[98] Pacianus, *Ep. ad Sympronianum* 3, 1.

[99] In *Euseb. HE* 6, 45. [100] Ibid. 6, 44, 1–6. [101] Ibid. 6, 44–6. [102] Ibid. 6, 43, 3.

Doctrine and Practice of Penance in the East in the Third Century

A sketch of the doctrine and practice of penance current in the eastern regions to which Christianity had spread, may well begin with a reference to Irenaeus of Lyons, who came from Asia Minor. He, too, was one of those who still represented the strict ideal of holiness inherited from the beginnings of the Church, and who would have refused readmission into the Church to those who had incurred the guilt of serious offences.[105] Irenaeus himself was particularly imbued with the thought that the likeness to God given to man by redemption, obliges him to a perfectly holy and sinless life.[106] Because Christians had been given such high graces, they must be subjected to a much stricter judgment than the men of the Old Testament, and consequently, after their baptism, ought to be on their guard against any sin, because the death of Christ is not efficacious for them a second time.[107] On the question whether there is any salvation at all for a sinner after baptism, Irenaeus makes no pronouncement, but on another occasion he expresses perfectly clearly the possibility of such penance; he believes that God gives his peace and friendship to those "who do penance and are converted"; only those who persist in apostasy impenitently are eternally lost.[108] Particularly important is a remark in the so-called "rule of faith" of Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1, 10, 1), that summary of ancient belief inherited from the apostles,[109] where it is said that God will "graciously grant life to those who persevere in his love — some from the beginning, some since penance — will grant them incorruptibility and surround them with eternal glory". It follows from this, that the conviction that men could regain the love of God by penance even after baptism, has always belonged to the belief of the Church.[110] To designate this penance, Irenaeus commonly uses the expression *exhomologesis;*[111] he is in fact silent about a reconciliation of the penitents but this follows indirectly from his belief in the efficacity of penance. That penance after baptism is a concern of the Church, is clear from his observation that priests had the duty of watching over the moral life of Christians and, when necessary, of expelling a sinner from the Church.[112]

---

[103] Ibid. 7, 5.

[104] Ibid. 6, 43, 1; *Concil. Nicaen.* can. 8. Some Novatian inscriptions in Asia Minor, *DACL* XII, 1759. Also cf. *Cod. Theodos.* 16, 5, 2; *Socrates HE* 5, 21, 22.

[105] Cf. B. Poschmann, *Poenitentia secunda* (Bonn 1940), 212.

[106] *Adv. haer.* 3, 18, 1; 3, 9, 1; *Epid.* 42.

[107] *Adv. haer.* 4, 27, 1–4.

[108] Ibid. 4, 40, 1; 5, 26, 2.

[109] Ibid. 1, 10, 1.

[110] Cf. K. Rahner in *ZKTh* 70 (1948), 452–5.

[111] *Adv. haer.* 1, 13, 5, 7; 3, 4, 3.

The position of the Alexandrian teachers on penance and penitential discipline is characterized by the fact that it is lacking in the polemic note of the controversies of the Latin West; their statements were not formulated in the heat of argument against hostile views. Clement's conception of penance is, in the first place, marked by his idea of purification, which was influenced by Plato; in accordance with it, he represents liberation from sin as a rather long process, but one that is not possible without penance.[113] What is also striking, is his considerable agreement with Hermas' doctrine on the subject. Like him, he stresses that the ideal of Christian life is to avoid all offences after the great forgiveness of sins in baptism;[114] God knows human weakness and grants the possibility of a second, but single, penance; this cannot be repeated because renewed penances would show that no serious penitential attitude of mind was present.[115] Clement views the effect of penance in a similar way to Hermas; it confers indeed, like baptism, forgiveness of sins, but not solely as a gift of divine pardon, and only after previous painful purification consisting of prayer, fasting, and works of brotherly love.[116] To penance there belongs, too, a confession of guilt, but details about the course of this exhomologesis are not given.[117] No fault is considered irremissible, as what he has to say about the woman taken in adultery, the good thief, and heretics, shows.[118] Like Irenaeus, Clement does not speak of a reconciliation, but that for him, too, penance ended with readmission into the Church, follows from his story of the young man who had fallen into error and whom the apostle John "brought into the Church" again after long prayer and fasting.[119] Clement is the first writer who recommends for the penitent a sort of spiritual guide, whose help by prayer and admonitions would be of great profit to him.[120] Such spiritual directors are, in addition to the Church authorities, the perfect Christians, the

---

[112] Ibid. 4, 26, 2, 3; 4, 27, 4.

[113] *Quis div. salv.* 40, 3–6; 42, 14, 15; *Strom.* 7, 10, 56.

[114] *Strom.* 56, 1.

[115] Ibid. 2, 13, 56ff.; 2, 13, 59.

[116] Ibid. 2, 12, 55, 6; 2, 70, 3; *Quis div. salv.* 40, 1; 42, 14, 15; *Strom.* 2, 15, 71.

[117] *Strom.* 2, 59, 3.

[118] Ibid. 2, 23, 147; *Quis salv.* 38, 4–39, 2; 42, 7; *Strom.* 7, 16, 102.

[119] *Quis div. salv.* 40, 1. A temporary exclusion from the Church is indicated by *Strom.* 7, 16, 102, 4; see on this A. Méhat in *VigChr* 8 (1954), 232.

[120] *Quis div. salv.* 31, 1; 41, 1–6; *Strom.* 7, 12, 79.

Gnostics, and the poor of the community. The efficacy of their help by prayer and mortification is founded on their personal perfection.[121] In this way, Clement introduces the *pneumatic* (Spirit-endowed) spiritual guide into the penitential practice of the Eastern Church, in which he was to play an outstanding role after the rise of monasticism.

Like Clement, Origen was less interested in the concrete details of penitential practice than in its theoretical basis, which, however, he does not expound systematically, either. His high esteem for baptism and the effects of its grace made him painfully aware of the gross contradiction to the ideal patent in the daily life of many Christians. Sin after baptism in all classes, in all the grades of the hierarchy, as well as in all its forms, was for him an undeniable fact. Lighter sins, of course, do not lead to the loss of the grace of baptism and consequently do not exclude from the sacramental community life of the Church. But the sinner's grave offences bring death to his soul and place him in a condition worse than that before his baptism; such a sin can no longer be wiped out by grace, as in baptism, there is only forgiveness through an appropriate penance of atonement.[122] The model of this penance was given in the punishment imposed by Paul on the incestuous Corinthian which was designed "for his salvation on the day of judgment".[123] Origen, therefore, taught the possibility of forgiveness of sins after baptism by penance even in fact for those grave faults which he counts among the deadly sins, such as idolatry, adultery, unchastity, murder, or other serious offences.[124] He only excepts from forgiveness the sin of impenitence, which by its nature is an unreadiness to do penance;[125] penance for grave sins cannot be repeated.[126]

Origen makes many remarks which indicate that the Church authorities were involved in the accomplishment of penance; he compares them with doctors to whom one must show the wounds so that they might apply the correct remedy.[127] An important part is played for him by admonitory reprimand, *correptio*. Its severest form is excommunication, and Origen sternly blames those in authority in the Church who through cowardice omit to impose it where necessary.[128] Even though he also demands that penance should not be so hard as to discourage the sinner, its duration is nevertheless greater than that of preparation for baptism. A novelty in

---

[121] *Eclog. proph.* 15, 2.

[122] *In Joann. comm.* 2, 11; 15, 15; *Exhort mart.* 30; *In Exod. hom.* 6, 9; *In Lev. hom.* 11, 2.

[123] *In Lev. hom.* 14, 4.

[124] *In Ioann. comm.* 19, 4; *De or.* 28, 9, 10.

[125] *In Ioann. comm.* 19, 13.

[126] *In Lev. hom.* 15, 2.

[127] *In Ioann. hom.* 37, 1, 1.

[128] *In Lev. hom.* 3, 2; *In Iesu Nave hom.* 7, 6.

Origen is the remark that reconciled Christians could no longer be admitted to office in the Church.[129] The sinner has to open himself by confession to the bishop as the physician of souls, and the bishop will also determine whether the character of the sin makes public penance necessary at all.[130] In his discussion of the spiritual director, Origen goes further along the road indicated by Clement; the guide must not be a priest, and he can be of particular help to the sinner in the blotting out of lesser offences, if he takes part in the penitential performance of works and prayer voluntarily undertaken.[131] Sharp disapproval is shown to some priests who claimed to be able to forgive sins as grievous as idolatry, adultery, and unchastity "by their prayer".[132] In Origen's perspective, that can only mean that these clerics ascribed efficacy for forgiveness, even for such serious offences, presumptuously to their personal care for the sinner by way of *correptio,* instead of requiring of him the acceptance of public canonical penance. In no way can the remark be interpreted in the sense that Origen taught certain capital sins to be ecclesiastically irremissible.

Even more definitely than Clement, Origen maintains the thesis that the priest's power of remission is bound up with his personal perfection. He attributes the power of forgiveness even to ordinary Christians who have attained a high degree of personal perfection.[133] That, however, does not mean that someone not a priest could accomplish ecclesiastical reconciliation, for Origen reserves this, as well as excommunication, to the bishops. But it remains true that the Alexandrian theologians attributed quite special value to the collaboration of a perfect Christian in the performance of penance. With Origen, this view is connected with the importance that he ascribes to the "saints" in the life of the Church; just as the sin of one of her members always affects the whole Church, so, too, she is involved as a whole in reparation. The reincorporation into the Church that follows on reconciliation has a salutary effect, because the salvation of the individual and his membership of the Church are inseparably bound up with one another.[134] Consequently, the act of reincorporation must in fact also effect forgiveness of sins, even if, for Origen, this effect is not as predominant among his interests as desire to emphasize the task of the spiritual physician of the soul in the process of freeing the penitent from sin.

---

[129] *In Ioann. comm.* 28, 7; *Contra Cels.* 3, 51.

[130] *In Lev. hom.* 2, 4; *In Matth. comm.* 13, 30; *In ps. 37 hom.* 2, 6.

[131] *In Lev. hom.* 5; *In Matth. comm.* 4, 16, 8. These texts cannot be used to prove the existence of private penance in the present-day sense in Origen: cf. K. Rahner in *RSR* 37 (1950), 452–6.

[132] *De or.* 28, 10. [133] *De or.* 28, 8; *In Matth. comm.* 12, 11–14.

[134] *In ps. 36 hom.* 2, 4; cf. *In Ezech. hom.* 10, 1.

Particularly informative on the penitential liturgy in the East is the Syrian *Didascalia,* the composition of which can be assigned to the first decades of the third century. This is especially true since alleged anti-Novatian features cannot definitely be established in it or in any case can be regarded as later additions.[135] It emphasizes most persistently the duty incumbent on the bishop of care for sinners; to him also belongs the occasionally indispensable exclusion of an obstinate offender from the ecclesiastical community, which should be carried out without respect for persons, without favouritism. The bishop's authority in the whole matter of penance is founded on the power of binding and loosing committed to him.[136] The measures he takes in regard to the sinner have always a double aim; they should strengthen the community of the faithful in what is good, while giving the sinner hope of forgiveness. The bishop should act on the model of the Good Shepherd, who is forgiving sins and imparting peace through him.[137] No fault, however grave, is excluded from the bishop's power to forgive.[138] According to the *Didascalia,* the process of penance takes more or less the following course: when the bishop has heard of a sinner in his flock, he takes him to task, reproaches him sharply with his faults and then excludes him from taking part in the common life of the Church; members of the community, too, castigate his sinful behaviour.[139] After a certain time, however, they intercede with the bishop for him, especially through the deacons; the bishop assures himself of the genuine quality of the sinner's repentance and, with renewed admonitions and advice, imposes on him a penance, in which fasting occupies a special place, proportionate to his guilt.[140] With the acceptance of this penance imposed by the bishop, the "liturgical" phase of the sinner's penitential course begins and this lasts until the act of reconciliation proper. The *Didascalia* warns the bishop when a sinner is denounced by members of his flock, not only to check conscientiously the foundation of the accusation but also to consider the motives of such denunciations.[141] During the official period of penance the sinner is admitted to the readings and the sermon; consequently the excommunication is already in a sense mitigated.[142] Full reconciliation is only granted with the imposition of hands by the bishop which takes place to the accompaniment of prayer by the congregation; it makes the sinner a member of the Church again and restores to him the Holy Spirit, lost by sin. A special reference is here made to the parallel giving of the Spirit by baptism.[143] The ecclesiastical nature of penance is made clearer in the *Didascalia* than anywhere else, for it is linked with the episcopal head of the community. Consequently the sacramental character of the forgiveness of sin, conferred by him, is apparent too.

---

[135] Cf. P. Galtier, "La date de la Didascalie des apôtres" in *Aux origines du sacrement de pénitence* (Rome 1951), 189–221.

[136] *Didasc.* 2, 20, 3–4; 2, 8, 4; 2, 10; 2, 11, 1–2; 2, 18, 2.

[137] Ibid. 2, 15, 8; 2, 20, 9.

[138] Ibid. 2, 22–23, 1; 2, 24, 3.

[139] Ibid. 2, 16, 1–2.

[140] Ibid.

[141] Ibid. 2, 37, 4–5.

[142] Ibid. 2, 39, 6; 2, 41, 1.

A special feature of the doctrine of the *Didascalia* on penance must also be particularly noticed; it is nowhere said that the post-baptismal penance, described at such length and with such care, was unique and unrepeatable. That is striking in a work that so often emphasizes the remissibility of sins committed after baptism. The *Didascalia* seems rather to presuppose that penance can be repeated after a reconciliation has already taken place, because it does not concede this in one particular case, that of an informer who lapses. Yet it could have simply appealed here to the principle that penance is only possible once; in fact, however, it adduces the reasons for this case at length and in detail, giving different grounds.[144] The supposition that the *Didascalia* recognized the possibility of repeated penance and reconciliation after baptism, is strengthened by a further observation, that between the practice of canonical penance in the *Didascalia* and the practice of excommunication from the synagogue there are so many striking parallels,[145] that some features in the *Didascalia* account are only intelligible as a slightly developed continuation of the synagogue custom. But in this, every excommunication could be lifted repeatedly. If we add that the *Apostolic Constitutions,* which also originated in Syrian territory, likewise do not recognize ecclesiastical penance as occurring only once,[146] the conclusion becomes inescapable that the single unrepeatable canonical penance was not everywhere current in the East, and that this cannot simply be held to have been the original practice. In the West, as has been shown above, it appears for the first time with Hermas, and pastoral reasons are given for it. If he was the very first to introduce it, perhaps as a concession to a rigorist trend, this would permit the whole attitude of the Church to penance before his time to be characterized as a period of greater mildness, and the assumption of a contrary development from an original strictness to a growing laxity, would be shown to be erroneous.

With a single exception other accounts from the East regarding the question of penance give no new information at variance with the picture that has been drawn.[147] Origen's pupil, Gregory Thaumaturgus, mentions the division of penitents into various classes as an arrangement established long since, but the terminology he uses was, it seems, not yet fixed.[148] Some consider the classes of the "hearers" and "fallen" as definitely attested, others think that those of the "weepers" and "bystanders" are, too.[149] The synods of the fourth century gradually gathered penitential regulations into canons and so formed the transition to the juridically formulated canonical penance of succeeding generations.

---

[143] Ibid. 2, 41, 1. [144] Ibid. 2, 43, 1–4.

[145] Cf. K. Rahner in *ZKTh* 72 (1950), 278 ff.

[146] *Const. Apost.* 2, 40, 1.

[147] On the view of Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria, see above, p. 337.

Disputes Concerning Penance after the Persecution of Diocletian

The Diocletian persecution again made the question of the treatment of apostates a topical one. For this time, too, in various regions the Church had to deplore *lapsi,* even though, as will presently be shown, the whole outcome on this occasion was far from being as deplorable for her as it had been during and after the wave of attack under Decius. As regards Rome, the fact of disputes about the question of penance under Pope Eusebius (310) is established, but the circumstances remain obscure. An inscription dedicated by Pope Damasus (366–84) to his predecessor Eusebius, says that the latter had required the fallen to do penance, but had met with contradiction over this from a certain Heraclius, who "forbade" penance to the *lapsi.*[150] The text does not permit us to attribute with certainty to Heraclius one of the two possible extreme positions, the rigorist view, which refused penance to the apostates or the laxist view, which demanded their reception without penance, though the first is more likely. According to Damasus, the discussion of these matters led to serious unrest and to a split in the community; the dispute brought about the intervention of the emperor, Maxentius, who banished the leaders of the two parties, Bishop Eusebius and Heraclius. On the other hand, a connexion between the disputes about penance under Eusebius' predecessor, Marcellinus (296–304), and the Diocletian persecution, can no longer be maintained. Marcellinus,[151] too, Damasus reports in another epigram,[152] required the performance of penance from the fallen and had met with strong opposition over this. As Marcellinus did not live to see the beginning of the Diocletian persecution, the offences of these *lapsi* cannot be determined more precisely.

---

[148] In his so-called *Epistula canonica, PG,* 10, 1019–48, and J. B. Pitra, *Iuris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta,* I (Rome 1864), 562–75.

[149] B. Poschmann, *HDG* IV/3, 39. — J. Grotz, *op. cit.* 400–8.

[150] Ferrua, *Epigrammatica Damasiana* (Rome 1942), 129: ... "Heraclius vetuit lapsos peccata dolere, Eusebius miseros docuit sua crimina flere."

[151] Damasus actually names Marcellus, but he is probably to be identified with Marcellinus. Cf. R. H. Röttges in *ZKTh* 78 (1956), 385–420.

[152] Ferrua, *op. cit.* 181.

The controversy connected with the Diocletian persecution in North Africa cannot, strictly speaking, be considered as a dispute about penance. Many Christians had submitted to Diocletian's demand that they should hand over their holy books, and were regarded as *traditores*. The consecrations of bishops who were *traditores* were held by a rigorist section to be invalid. When in 311 the newly-elected bishop of Carthage, Caecilian, was consecrated by an alleged *traditor*, Bishop Felix of Aptungi, the violent Donatist conflict burst out. An account of this belongs, however, to the history of the fourth century.

The problem of the *lapsi* occupied the Alexandrian church, too, when the Diocletian persecution abated, and its bishop, Petrus, laid down in an *epistula canonica* the principles on which penitential practices were there to be determined. These canons which are still extant, show no real development in penitential practice since Origen, but they reveal a warm sympathy for the fate of the fallen.[153] Bishop Petrus, however, is also named as one of the leaders of the two parties which opposed one another over the question of penance in an early phase of the so-called Meletian schism[154] in Egypt. The leader of the other group was Meletius himself who, according to the admittedly late account of Epiphanius, firmly opposed, with numerous confessors, the readmission of the lapsed.[155] The question of penance was, however, not the starting-point of this division in the Egyptian church; it was provoked rather by Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, in the Thebaid, who encroached upon the bishop of Alexandria's rights of consecration. Meletius, however, used the question of penance to win supporters in the struggle against the bishop of the Egyptian capital and to give the churches dependent on himself a distinctive and effective slogan. After a few years the question of penance ceased to be topical in the Meletian disorders and Meletius' supporters soon joined the Arians and made common cause with them against Athanasius.

After the revolutionary change under Constantine, the controversies about the problem of penance ceased. It is the lasting merit of the Church of the third century, in the often intense struggles for a right understanding of Christian penance in the face of the rigorism that kept flaring up again and again, to have defended the spirit of compassionate understanding for the sinner which the founder of the Church had preached, and yet to have prevented the incursion of lax tendencies into Christian penitential discipline.

---

[153] The Canons are given in J. B. Pitra, *op. cit.* 551–61; cf. J. Grotz, *op. cit.* 409–13.

[154] Cf. K. Baus in *LThK* VII, under Meletius of Lycopolis.

[155] Epiphanius, *Haer.* 68.

CHAPTER 26

The Development of the Church's Constitution in the Third Century

THE third century led in many ways to a further development of the Church's constitution. In addition to the three grades of the ministry in the second century, new lower clerical grades develop, the episcopal office is increasingly consolidated and gains in prestige, the organization of the various individual communities becomes more complex, and in the East, in particular, ecclesiastical provinces take form; the system of synods receives new and intense impetus, and finally, the pre-eminent position of the Roman church and its bishop grows unmistakably stronger by recognition and by contradiction. The sum of these developments in the Church's constitution confirms that here, too, Christianity had grown from its origins into the "great Church" of early Christian times.

The Clergy

The existing orders of bishop, presbyter, and deacon remained unchanged in intrinsic significance, of course, but in many ways were more sharply differentiated, and to some extent, too, underwent an extension in the scope of their functions. The conditions for admission to a particular ministry were further developed, and for the office of bishop a deeper theological grounding was attempted. This strongly emphasizes the ever-growing importance of the bishops for the life of the Church as a whole in the third century. The various problems within the Church, such as the defence against Gnosticism and Montanism, the greater demands made on the authorities by the various waves of persecution, the elucidation of the question of penance, and the struggle against threats of schism, display a monarchical episcopate functioning fully in the third century and in unquestionable possession of the plenary powers that its ministry conferred. The bishop was now the undisputed leader of the ecclesiastical community in all the expressions of its life; he proclaims the faith to it by preaching, and is ever vigilant for the purity of the faith, the correct performance of the liturgy, especially in baptism and the celebration of the Eucharist; he is the guardian of Church discipline and responsible for the observance of the Christian ideal of life by his flock. He guides its works of charity from day to day, and organizes its relief measures in times of need and crisis. He represents his community in its relation with other local churches or at the synodal assemblies of church leaders of a province, which were now becoming important, or at even larger regional assemblies. In this way the bishop became an important link between the individual community and the Church as a whole, and an effective furtherer of Church unity.

It is understandable that theological reflection, too, turned more and more to an office in the Church, the holder of which occupied so central a position in Church life and in the minds of the faithful. A deeper grasp was sought of its nature and basis, with a consequent emphasis on the duties that such an office imposes. Origen, more than any other writer of the third century, concerned himself with the ecclesiastical ministry. He met many of its representatives during his lifetime and in his maturity was himself ordained priest. Not for a moment did he doubt the right and justification of the ministry. The bishop's authority is founded on our Lord's words conferring the power of the keys on Peter; consequently, it is God who calls a man to such an office, and the choice should always be left to God when it is a question of appointing a new bishop in a community.[1] The holder of this office has the task of leading men to the kingdom of God, consequently, he should be a model of every virtue.[2] He has to preach the word of God, therefore he must read and meditate the Holy Scriptures, not preaching his own ideas, but what the Holy Spirit has taught him.[3] He has to accomplish liturgical worship and he should only raise in prayer hands that are undefiled.[4] Origen evidently holds the view that the efficacy of priestly authority is bound up with the personal holiness of the man who bears it.[5] Hence his unmistakably sharp judgment on the clergy of his time, when he compared the reality with the ideal held out to them. The Church which ought to be the temple of God and the house of prayer, had become a den of thieves; bishops, priests, and deacons were full of avarice, ambitious of power, ignorant and even irreligious; ambitious men intrigued for these offices which had become a traffic and which were transmitted from unworthy occupants to unworthy successors.[6] In the choice of a new bishop, therefore, the community should be present and take care that the man chosen is outstanding by reason of his learning, holiness, and virtue.[7]

In the West, it was Cyprian who, a few years after Origen, was the first Latin writer to try to determine the nature and function of the office of bishop in the Church. There can be only one bishop in the local church, who is its judge, and takes the place of Christ.[8] The bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop; anyone who is not with the bishop, is not in the Church, either.[9] The Church, by the will of her founder, is an episcopal Church; "it is built up on the bishops and is ruled by them as overseers."[10] At his election, God in some way expresses his consent, and consequently, the bishop is responsible to God alone.[11] But the responsibility is not limited to his own community; it extends to the whole Church. Origen, too, emphasized that a bishop is called to the service of the whole Church.[12] With Cyprian, this responsibility is expressed in the serious concern of the bishop for maintenance of ecclesiastical unity.[13] He links the idea of succession with the office of bishop by saying that it is founded on our Lord's words to Peter (Mt 16:18), and from there proceed the ordination of bishops and the organization of the Church through the changes and succeeding course of time.[14] According to Cyprian, Bishop Stephen of Rome, too, claims to have the see of Peter *per successionem.*[15]

---

[1] *In Matt. comm.* 12, 14; *In Lev. hom.* 6, 6; *In Num. hom.* 22, 4; *In Jesu Nave hom.* 32, 2.

[2] *In Matth. comm.* 14.

[3] *In Ezech. hom.* 2, 2.

[4] *In Rom. comm.* 9, 42.

[5] *In Matth. comm.* 12, 14; *De or.* 28, 8.

[6] *In Matth. comm.* 16, 21–2; 15, 26; *In Ezech. hom.* 10, 1; *In Num. hom* 22, 4.

[7] *In Lev. hom.* 6, 3.

[8] *Ep.* 59, 5.

On account of the importance of the office of bishop, the appointment of a man to the position had to be ensured by a sound method of choice. Like Origen, Cyprian, too, expects the community to collaborate in it. This was required because the congregation would be acquainted with a candidate who was a member of it, and be able to form a judgment of his manner of life.[16] The bishops of the province were to play a decisive part in the choice, too, and its validity depended on their consent, which included a judgment about the legitimacy of the way in which the election had been carried out.[17] The right of consecrating the chosen candidate also belonged to these bishops; the Canons of Hippolytus had already recognized this.[18] When it is stated, with a certain emphasis, that the bishop to be consecrated must have been chosen by the whole people, that must be understood in a way that does not exclude the collaboration of neighbouring bishops.[19] Cyprian regards the method of election observed in North Africa as a divine tradition and apostolic custom, and one that was widespread.[20]

---

[9] *Ep.* 66, 8.

[10] *Ep.* 33, 1: "... (ut) ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur."

[11] *Ep.* 59, 5; 55, 21; 69, 17; 72, 3.

[12] *In Cant. comm.* 3: "qui vocatur ad episcopatum, non ad principatum vocatur, sed ad servitium totius ecclesiae."

[13] *Ep.* 73, 26.

[14] *Ep.* 33, 1: "inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit."

[15] *Ep.* 75, 17.

[16] *Ep.* 67, 5; 59, 5 *(populi suffragium);* 55, 8.

[17] *Ep.* 67, 5 *(episcoporum iudicium);* 59, 5 *(coepiscoporum consensus).*

[18] Ibid. 67, 5 and *Trad. apost.* 2 (26, Botte).

[19] Cf. K. Müller in *ZNW* 28 (1929), 276–8.

[20] *Ep.* 67, 5: "traditio divina et apostolica observatio."

The Syrian *Didascalia* indicates in a very special way the pre-eminent position of the bishop in his community and pays homage to his dignity by the most laudatory expressions; he takes God's place in the community, he is the image of God and the mediator between him and the faithful.[21] In his office as preacher, he is "the mouth of God", encouraging righteousness, urging on to good works, enthusiastically extolling God's benefits, but speaking, too, of the future wrath at God's judgment.[22] The *Didascalia* speaks more insistently than any other pre-Constantinian work of the qualities required by the episcopate and the shortcomings that would exclude one from it. The first requirement is close familiarity with Holy Scripture, of which the bishop must be the interpreter. A wider intellectual formation is desirable, but is not an indispensable condition.[23] As all his conduct is to be a model to his flock, he must fulfill the highest demands on moral qualities and character.[24] Guarantees of this are more likely to be provided by a certain maturity in age and so the bishop chosen should be fifty years old if possible, and in the case of a younger candidate, his real suitability should be determined by conscientious investigation.[25] Access to episcopal office was barred to a man who had been married more than once; the manner of life of the wife and children had to be in harmony with the high dignity of the head of the family.[26] The presbyters or priests occupy, generally speaking, in the *Didascalia,* the position that the *Letters* of St Ignatius of Antioch had already assigned to them; they are the advisers and associates of the bishops, and collaborate particularly in judicial proceedings against a Christian, but have no claim to share by right the gifts of the community.[27] The third century, however, also saw signs of increasing importance in the office of priest, at least in some of the regions to which Christianity had spread. This was connected with growing numbers of Christians in country districts for whom no bishop, but only a presbyter, could be appointed as leader of the community. This was certainly the case in Egypt after the middle of the century as Dionysius of Alexandria testifies.[28] It can scarcely be doubted that a village presbyter, appointed to such small communities, had also the right of celebrating the Eucharist. An extension of priestly faculties was also granted in times of need, such as persecutions, when the bishop, through arrest or flight, could no longer personally care for his flock. A letter of Cyprian is instructive here, which empowered presbyters and deacons in times of special peril through sickness, to hear the confessions of the lapsed and to reconcile them.[29] Finally, the growth of priestly functions was due to the growth in this century of large Christian communities, often with several thousand members in the more important towns of the Roman Empire such as Rome, Carthage, Alexandria, and Antioch. The frequent mention of priests at the administration of baptism in the rite described by Hippolytus, is just as noticeable in this respect as the emphasis on the part they played in the ordination of new priests, on whom they laid hands with the bishop.[30] In Rome, the setting up of the *tituli* as actual pastoral districts[31] gave a more independent position to the priests to whom they were entrusted than was possible in smaller communities. The care of Christians in the countryside around Alexandria by travelling priests (περιοδευταί)[32] at the beginning of the fourth century, already points clearly to the incipient development that led to the "parish", which likewise was to give the presbyter a new and wider sphere of activities, and so bring increased importance to his office.

---

[21] *Didasc.* 2, 18, 2; 2, 11; 2, 25, 7.

[22] Ibid. 2, 28, 9; 2, 17, 6.

[23] Ibid. 2, 1, 2; 2, 5, 3.

[24] Ibid. 2, 6, 5.

[25] Ibid. 2, 1, 1–3.

[26] Ibid. 2, 2, 1–4. There was, therefore, no obligation to celibacy yet in the third century; Canon 6 of the Synod of Elvira then imposed it on clerics from deacons upward.

[27] Ibid. 2, 34, 3; 2, 46, 6; 2, 48, 4.

[28] In *Euseb. HE* 7, 24, 6–9; cf. also ibid. 6, 44, 2–5.

In the daily life of an average Christian community, the presbyters, however, were still less prominent than the deacons. As the chief official assistants of their bishops, especially for the care of the poor, and in the administration of funds, they came into more frequent contact with individual members of the congregation and so, as the *Didascalia* says, were the bishop's "ear and mouth, heart and soul".[33] As the deacon had to keep the bishop informed about all that happened in the community, discussions of its affairs gave him, by the nature of things, much influence. The *Didascalia* considers that the well-being of the community depended on harmonious collaboration between bishop and deacon.[34]

The growing needs of the communities in the third century finally led to the development of further grades in the series of clerical ministries which, however, all remained below the rank of deacon. They are listed in the catalogue of the Roman clergy which Bishop Cornelius drew up in a letter to Fabius of Antioch.[35] According to this, there were seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, and fifty-two exorcists, lectors, and doorkeepers, in the Church's service. The holders of these offices mostly figured in a liturgical role, others had special tasks in connexion with corporate works of mercy, such as care for those mentally ill and for epileptics. The exorcists had charge of this latter task, whilst the subdeacons are to be regarded as direct assistants of the deacons, with the acolytes, in turn, as helpers of the subdeacons. The most frequently mentioned office among the minor orders is that of the lector,[36] whose duty was to read aloud at divine service; this presupposed a certain education in the man entrusted with it, and gave special prestige. The doorkeeper looked after the entrances to the place of divine worship, and kept out unauthorized persons.

---

[29] *Ep.* 18, 1.

[30] *Trad. apost.* 8; 21 (37, 49–51 Botte).

[31] See below, page 380.

[32] *Euseb. HE* 8, 13, 7; *Epist. episc. Aegypt.* in *PG* 10, 1566.

[33] *Didasc.* 2, 44, 4.

[34] Ibid. and 3, 13, 7.

[35] *Euseb. HE* 6. 43, 11; they are also all mentioned, with the exception of the *ostiarius*, by Cyprian.

Appointment to these offices, as to those of priest and deacon, belonged exclusively to the bishop who, of course, could consult his flock about suitable candidates. The bishop handed the lector the book of readings when he was inducted into his office, but as the *Traditio apostolica* emphasizes, he received no ordination. The subdeacon was not ordained by imposition of hands, either.[37]

The beginnings of the so-called "irregularities", or canonical impediments are already clearly perceptible in the third century. As has already been said, anyone who had once been obliged to perform public canonical penance was incapable of receiving holy orders; similarly, baptism received in sickness *(baptismus clinicorum)*, which was considered to show a lack of courage to confess the faith, excluded from ecclesiastical office; finally, voluntary self-mutilation was regarded an an impediment to orders, though in Origen's time this was not yet generally recognized.

As the bishop and deacons were completely occupied with their duties, in the larger communities, it was the obligation of the faithful to see to their upkeep; this was a charge on the general gifts of the faithful for the whole needs of the Church.[38] The other clerics were dependent on private means, or on their income from a profession in civil life. Cyprian even had to complain of the excessive acquisitiveness of some bishops, and the Synod of Elvira was obliged to lay down quite definite regulations about the clergy's commercial transactions.[39]

Little information is available about the training of the clergy for its religious and ecclesiastical tasks at this period; it was not yet subject to fixed rules laid down by the Church authorities. Consequently, the cleric obtained his theological knowledge first of all in the lessons of the catechumenate and further by private study, sometimes, perhaps, with a learned Christian teacher, who after the fashion of the philosophers of antiquity, now also gave lessons in the "philosophy" of Christianity. Knowledge of liturgical functions was provided by direct participation in the prayer and worship of his church. The growing variety of ecclesiastical orders provided the possibility of being tested in a lower grade, and of gradually acquiring deeper religious knowledge and increasing familiarity with the tasks of a higher office.[40]

---

[36] Tertullian *De Praescr.* 41 mentions it; the East at first only had the grade of lector, reader (ἀναγνώστης).

[37] *Trad. apost.* 12 and 14 (43 Botte).

[38] *Didasc.* 2, 25,4 and 14.

[39] Cyprian, *De laps.* 6; Synod. Illib. can. 19.

The Bishop and his Church

The growth of the Christian communities in the third century and the development of their organization which this involved, has already been pointed out several times. The elaboration of divine worship in the liturgy of baptism and the celebration of the Eucharist, and the creation of more grades in the ministry, are among the most significant phenomena of this kind. In this connexion, we have still to speak specifically about the position of the individual church under its bishop as the holder of ecclesiastical property. This, particularly in the large town communities of the third century, was becoming of considerable importance. The gifts of the faithful which were expended on the manifold activities of the local church, were collected in a common fund which probably became a permanent institution quite early.[41] In Tertullian's time, these gifts had assumed the character of a voluntary monthly personal contribution, the proceeds of which were placed in the community chest *(arca)*.[42] In this way, the local churches everywhere acquired property and funds, the control and administration of which ultimately belonged to their bishops. As well as contributions in money and things in daily use (foodstuffs and clothes), there soon came gifts of houses and land, so that even before Constantine's time, the property of the church communities consisted of money and real estate.[43] The existence of this church property was not unknown to the civil authorities; Tertullian and Origen, of course, discussed quite openly the problems connected with it. Since this property was not touched by the State, except in the abnormal circumstances of various particular persecutions, this presupposes the recognition of the individual communities as the legal owners in civil law.[44] The decrees of the State authorities after the end of the Diocletian persecution, which provided for the return of the confiscated property to the various Christian communities as its legal owners, similarly indicate that the capacity of the churches to own property was recognized by the State in the third century.[45] This development, too, shows clearly that the Church of the third century had grown into a condition and circumstances which plainly distinguish it from the preceding period, and justify the designation "great church" of early Christian times.

---

[40] On this, see *Harnack Miss* 860–6.

[41] Ignatius of Antioch was already familiar with it: *Ad Polyc.* 4, 3; and so was Justin, for *Apol.* 67, 12 implies its existence.

[42] *Apol.* 39; the common chest of Alexandria was called γλωσσόκομον, cf. Origen, *In Matth. comm.* 11,9.

[43] Cf. Tertullian, *Ad Scap.* 3; Origen, *In Lev. hom.* 11, 1; Cyprian, *De op. et eleem., passim.* On the property of the Roman church in houses and cemeteries, cf. *Liber pontif.* 26; *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 10; for Antioch, ibid. 7, 30, 7.

[44] Cf. G. Krüger, *Die Rechtsstellung der vorkonstantinischen Kirche* (Stuttgart 1935, reprinted Amsterdam 1961), 191–226.

Another development in the sphere of organization was also important for many episcopal churches. They grew not only in numbers, but also in geographical extent. When, in Egypt,[46] there were churches in the country which were served either by a resident priest or by a cleric from the bishop's centre, it followed that as the communities came into existence, they did not automatically receive a bishop as their head, but remained subject to the bishop of the nearest larger community. In that way a development began in the third century which led in the direction of a bishop's centre, it followed that as the communities came into existence, A reshaping of organization was taking place which led to two new forms: a bigger episcopal diocese comprising several Christian communities in town and country, but with only one bishop at their head, and a Christian community which received a pastor of its own for its immediate religious needs; he however, whether priest, or, as in a few places, chorepiscopus,[47] was always subject to the bishop.

Forms of Organization Larger than the Local Community

The coming into existence of the "great church" is made very tangibly clear by the association of the various individual communities under their bishops into a higher structure, the church province. The rise of this was determined particularly by two factors. One of these followed from the method of the early Christian mission which first tried to gain a footing in populous towns, which would mean the provincial capitals in the Roman Empire, and attempted to found its first communities there. Normally, the evangelization of further larger centres in the province would begin from the bishop's community in the provincial capital, and the new churches that had come about in that way naturally maintained close relations with the mother-church. Consequently, all the daughter communities founded by a central episcopal church were bound together by mutual ties. In this association a certain leading role naturally fell to the bishop of the mother-church, and from the fourth century, this was expressed by the title "metropolitan". But more decisive than the link created by such missions, was the formation of ecclesiastical provinces by the establishment of synods which, from the end of the second century, brought together the bishops of specific regions to discuss important Church affairs. The question of the date of Easter, and the Montanist movement, are mentioned as motives for such meetings which, of course, were not limited to the bishops of particular political provinces, but extended beyond these. In this way, a synod on the occasion of the Easter controversy brought together the bishops of Caesarea in Palestine, Aelia, Ptolemais, and Tyre, whose sees, in fact, lay in two provinces, namely, Syria and Palestine. These bishops also kept in touch with the bishop of Alexandria and came to an agreement with him about the date of Easter.[48] In the same way, bishops from various civil provinces such as Cappadocia, Galatia, Cicilia, and others, took part in the middle of the third century in the Synod of Iconium in Asia Minor.[49] In any case, such synods were a regular custom in the East at the beginning of the third century, while in North Africa they were still unknown, as appears from a remark of Tertullian which also shows that such synodal assemblies were felt to be an important and impressive outward manifestation of Christianity.[50] It is clear from the list of those who took part in the Council of Nicaea that, at least in the East, the association of the local churches into church provinces was later adapted to the frontiers of the political provinces, for the list follows the order of the latter.[51] The same Council took for granted the existence of the ecclesiastical provinces by assigning to all the bishops of a province the right to install a bishop in his diocese and reserving the right of confirming this to the metropolitan of the province.[52]

---

[45] Ibid. 231–42.

[46] Cf. *Euseb. HE* 7, 24, 6. On the division of the Roman community into districts for pastoral purposes, see *Harnack, Miss* 854–60.

[47] *Euseb. HE* 7, 30, 10; Syn. Ancr., can. 13.

In the Latin West, the tendency for wider associations of this kind only appeared later, and then assumed different forms. What happened was not really the formation of several ecclesiastical provinces in the proper sense, as in the East, but directly a supra-provincial association of all the episcopal sees in North Africa on the one hand and of central and southern Italy on the other. The leadership of these forms of organization fell to the bishops of Rome and Carthage, particular weight attaching to the fact that the communities of these great cities had been the starting-points in the christianization of the territories of which they were now the ecclesiastical leaders. When the Bishop of Carthage summoned synods in the third century, his invitation was addressed to the bishops of all the civil provinces in North Africa, and was so accepted.[53] Similarly, the synods held by the Roman bishops of the third century brought together all the bishops there were in Italy at that time. Consequently, Rome and Carthage were ecclesiastical administrative centres of a rank far superior to that of a mere ecclesiastical metropolis. Two such higher centres also became increasingly prominent in the third century East, Antioch and Alexandria. In Antioch, synods met which were attended by the bishops of all Syria and of eastern Asia Minor, like the one planned in 251 against Novatianism,[54] or those of the years 264–8, which were particularly concerned with the case of Paul of Samosata.[55] The missionary interests of the Antioch bishops extended further than the territory of a church province, too, as their concern about Cicilia or Osrhoëne shows.[56] The same applies to the episcopal see of the Egyptian capital, whose occupant controlled the affairs of the episcopate of the Lybian Pentapolis, although this belonged administratively to Crete. Here, too, the third century development was confirmed by the Council of Nicaea:[57] all the bishoprics of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis were made subject to the bishop of Alexandria, and at the same time, express reference was also made to the similar pre-eminence of Rome. Antioch had similar rights, obviously in the sphere of the political diocese of Oriens. In this way, the occupants of these two eastern episcopal sees were recognized as a sort of higher metropolitans, and so the foundation was laid for the development of later patriarchates. There is only a hint in Canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea that similar tendencies were showing themselves in other places. It is only Canon 2 of the Council of Constantinople (381), that makes it clear that the bishops of Ephesus, Heracleia, and Caesarea were also trying to obtain such supra-metropolitan rights for the political dioceses of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus — without, in the long run, succeeding.

---

[48] *Euseb. HE* 5, 23, 25.

[49] Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* 75, 7.

[50] Tertullian, *De ieiun.* 13.

[51] Cf. E. Schwarz in *AAM NF* 13 (1937), 14ff.

[52] Conc. Nic., can. 4.

The Pre-eminent Position of Rome and its Bishop

The preceeding account has repeatedly had occasion to indicate the special influence which the Roman community exercised on questions and events that exceeded the sphere of interest of an average episcopal community.

---

[53] Cf. for example, the introduction to the *Sententiae episcoporum.* They come from the provinces of Africa (proconsularis), Numidia, Mauretania; cf. the list of the synods from 251–6 with the numbers of those taking part and the names of the provinces represented in *DHGE* 1, 747–50.

[54] *Euseb. HE* 6, 46, 3.

[55] Ibid. 7, 5, 1–2.

[56] Ibid. 6, 12, 2; see below, chapter 27, p. 372.

[57] Conc. Nic., can. 6.

Similarly, too, there was perceptible the echo of a claim to a pre-eminent position, of a kind that revealed special recognition and regard for the Roman community within the Church as a whole. In that way a development was powerfully pursuing its course, the bases of which were clearly visible in the sub-apostolic period.[58] The features already indicated must now be brought together into a unified view with other facts and statements of ecclesiastical writers that have not yet been mentioned.

In the description of the Church's fight to defend herself against Gnosticism, the importance which Irenaeus of Lyons attributed to apostolic tradition for the recognition of true doctrine has already been mentioned.[59] Now it must be particularly stressed that he ascribed very high value to the Roman church for the ascertaining of apostolic tradition. This latter can, indeed, be established, he maintains, in every church whose bishops can be derived in a genuine series of succession from the apostles.[60] But it is sufficient to prove this succession in the "greatest and oldest church known to all", that of Rome; for "it was founded and built by the two glorious apostles Peter and Paul" and its list of bishops proves that in it, "the apostolic tradition and preaching of the faith" has come down to our time.[61] Here, therefore, a special pre-eminence of Rome is linked with the fact that its church rests on the most distinguished apostolic foundations and has always remained true to the doctrine of the apostles. Consequently, anyone seeking the truth, will find it in Rome; all the Gnostic founders of sects can be refuted by the traditional truth found in Rome. The relevance of the Roman church to the discovery of truth, which is already expressed very strikingly in all this, would certainly gain even more weight if the statement of Irenaeus which has been discussed for centuries[62] without yet receiving an absolutely satisfactory interpretation, could also be quite certainly taken as referring to the Roman church and to it alone.[63] This reference, however, is neither imperatively demanded by the context, nor is it free from serious philological difficulties. Irenaeus' line of thought is, plainly, as follows: The apostolic tradition is found with certainty in the communities which rest on a directly apostolic foundation; there are several of these and each of them has a stronger power, grounded in its (apostolic) origin, for the ascertaining of truth, than any other Christian community whatever. But Rome stands out even from this series of apostolic foundations, because, as is everywhere recognized, Peter and Paul were its founders. Then Irenaeus summarizes; with such a church of apostolic foundation every individual church must agree, because precisely such a church has always preserved the apostolic tradition. One of these churches is the Roman church; which is even in a particularly favourable position for establishing the apostolic tradition, but not exclusively so.[64]

---

[58] See above, chapter 10, p. 152.

[59] See above, chapter 15, p. 197.

[60] *Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 1.

[61] Ibid. 3, 3, 2.

[62] Cf. the survey of the various attempts at interpretation in L. Spikowski, *La doctrine de l'église dans s. Irénée* (Strasbourg 1926), 146–55.

[63] *Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 3: "ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem (al. potentiorem) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio (For with such a church, on account of the greater authority of its origin, every church must agree, that is to say, all the faithful everywhere, in which (church) the tradition which is from the apostles has always been preserved by these who are everywhere)."

The Jewish Christian Hegesippus, living about the same time as Irenaeus, showed an interest for the succession of Roman bishops, deriving from similar motives. In his fight against the Gnostic heresy, he sought to ascertain the tradition of belief in the more important Christian communities of his time. Where he found a tradition transmitted from bishop to bishop (διαδοχή), that for him was a proof of the authenticity of its doctrine. His journey to the various churches led him to Rome, where he convinced himself of the existence of such a *diadoche* right down to the last bishop, Eleutherius.[65] Here, too, a specific importance is attributed to the Roman church for a knowledge of apostolic tradition purely preserved. Tertullian, likewise, names Rome, and Smyrna in addition as examples of a church which could trace back to an apostle the list of its bishops in succession.[66]

Consciousness of a pre-eminent position of the Roman church in determining apostolic tradition, was also the basis of the attitude of the

---

[64] The difficulty of interpretation is partly due to the loss of the original text. Of special importance appear to be the attempts of P. Nautin in *RHR* 151 (1947), 37–78, and B. Botte in *Irénikon* 30 (1957), 156–63. P. Nautin succeeds in proving that the grammatical structure of the sentence makes it impossible to construe *hanc ecclesiam* as referring exclusively to the Roman church. On the other hand, it does not seem possible that, as he maintains, it refers to the *ecclesia universalis;* for in that case *omnis ecclesia* would also have to refer to each Gnostic community to which a certain *principalitas* belonged, yet Irenaeus never calls a Gnostic sect *ecclesia.* If, however, *hanc ecclesiam* is regarded as a church of directly apostolic foundation, it is easy to see that it has a *potior principalitas* in regard to any other Christian community at all which derives its origin only indirectly from the apostles. The suggestion of B. Botte *(op. cit., ad fin.),* is worth considering: that *conservare* might be understood in the sense of τηρεῖν and those referred to by *ab his qui sunt undique* as the Gnostics from whom the apostolic tradition is being "guarded". Even if the famous text of Irenaeus must be abandoned as one of the proofs of early Christian awareness of the primacy, this does not affect the development of this awareness elsewhere, where it is manifest in various ways.

[65] Cf. *Euseb. HE* 4, 22, 3.

[66] *De praescr.* 32.

Roman Bishop Victor (189–98) in the dispute about the keeping of Easter.[67] He appealed to apostolic tradition to justify the Roman practice of keeping Easter on the Sunday after 14 Nisan. He then demanded quite definitely that the churches of Asia Minor should also follow this custom, threatening in the event of a refusal the most serious of measures, that is, exclusion from the ecclesiastical community, because he regarded the Asia Minor practice as heterodox.[68] A claim by Rome to leadership is here apparent which goes far beyond the pre-eminence attributed to it as the guardian of apostolic tradition. It is only explained by the Roman bishop's awareness of his ability to intervene authoritatively in the affairs of even distant churches. Victor did not state the source of this awareness in his own case. In any event, his instruction[69] that synods were to be held about the matter was followed even by the bishops of Asia Minor, although they held different views from Rome. The majority of the synods decided on the Roman custom. Opposition to the Roman demand was raised by Bishop Polycrates of Ephesus and his fellow bishops, because they also believed themselves bound to an apostolic tradition. When Polycrates in his answer to Pope Victor, emphatically recalled the great figures of the Asiatic church of the past, this suggests that Victor had supported the Roman claim on the foundation of its church by Peter and Paul; but that Victor also felt himself to be the guardian of orthodoxy, is proved by his excommunicating the Monarchian Theodotus. A few decades later, Sabellius was excommunicated for heresy by the Roman Bishop Callistus.[70]

An unmistakable expression of the bishop of Rome's awareness that he occupied a special position within the Church as a whole, is encountered in various measures of a disciplinary nature taken by Pope Stephen (254–7). Two Spanish bishops, Basilides of Emerita and Martialis of Asturica, had got sacrifice certificates in the Decian persecution and on account of this and other transgressions, had been deposed.[71] Basilides went to Rome and obtained, by false representation of the case, as Cyprian emphasizes,[72] his own rehabilitation and that of his colleague. Two things are notable about this incident. A Spanish bishop had recourse to Rome because he was convinced that it was the place to which he could appeal against the decision of a Spanish synod, and that there, a disciplinary case of this sort could be dealt with and decided with legal authority. Even more significant is the case that has already been mentioned, that of Bishop

---

[67] See above, chapter 23, p. 271, with the references in the notes.

[68] *Euseb. HE* 5, 24, 9, [69] Ibid. 5, 24, 8.

[70] Ibid. 5, 28, 6 and Hippolytus, *Refut.* 9, 12. Both matters can of course be regarded as internal affairs of the Roman community.

[71] See the whole *Ep.* 76 of Cyprian.

[72] *Ep.* 67, 5.

Marcion of Arles, a convinced follower of Novatian, who allowed the lapsed in his community to die without reconciliation, despite their readiness to repent. This time, it was Cyprian of Carthage who turned to Pope Stephen in a very significant letter[73] that demanded from him decisive action against Marcion, that is to say, his deposition and the appointment of a new head of the community, whose name was to be sent to the African episcopate so that they might know with whom they were to maintain fellowship.[74] The whole tenor of the letter implies the view that the Arles case concerned the pope alone, and could only definitively be decided by him, and that Rome could determine authoritatively who was to be granted ecclesiastical fellowship and who was not. The same conviction was current in Gaul, because Cyprian's letter was sent as a result of steps taken by Faustinus,[75] the bishop of Lyons.

This public recognition of the pre-eminent position of the Roman bishop by Cyprian, at least as regards Spain and Gaul, is rather surprising when it is compared with his theoretical standpoint and attitude to Rome in the dispute about baptism by heretics. It is true that in Cyprian's writings there are statements about the Roman church which at first sight seem to amount to recognition of a special authority of Rome. In one of his letters to Pope Cornelius he denounces the conduct of that section of his clergy that was opposed to him, in sending representatives to Rome in order to win over its bishop to their side. They brought letters "to the chair of Peter and to the chief church, from which the unity of the bishops took its rise".[76] The Roman see is elsewhere called by him "the place of Peter".[77] In his work *On the Unity of the Church,* Cyprian speaks about the foundation of the Church, which he considers is expressed in our Lord's words at Matthew 16:18. By designating Peter as the rock, Christ proclaimed that he "is building the Church on one man, that the origin of unity derives from one".[78] The other apostles were, to be sure, equal to Peter in dignity and power, but the beginning of unity is identified with Peter. Apparently favourable to the primacy, too, is the version of the fourth chapter of this work that is found in some manuscripts, where we read: "Is anyone who leaves the see of Peter, on which the Church is founded, still convinced that he is within the Church?" and: "Certainly the others were what Peter was, but *Petro primatus datur* and so one

---

[73] *Ep.* 68. [74] *Ep.* 68, 3–5.

[75] *Ep.* 68, 1.

[76] *Ep.* 59, 14: "ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." This text remains just as important even if we see it as expressing the view of Cyprian's opponents; cf. J. Ludwig, *Der hl. Märtyrerbischof Cyprian von Carthago* (Munich 1951), 44.

[77] *Ep.* 55, 8.

[78] *De eccles. unit.* 4.

Church and one *cathedra* is manifest."[79] It can be considered probable that these sentences, which bear the unmistakable stamp of Cyprian's style, were to be read in the "first edition" of his work and were only suppressed when it was revised at the time of the dispute about heretical baptism; there is no need to assume any later interpolation from some Roman partisan.[80] But closer analysis of Cyprian's linguistic usage obliges us to abandon these texts as conclusive proofs that the idea of the Roman primacy existed in the mind of the North African bishop. Cyprian is here still simply expressing a chronological pre-eminence of Peter over the other apostles in the conferring of the power of binding and loosing, for they, of course, according to his own words, possessed the same plenary power as he. Consequently, all the bishops possess, even now, one and the same equal episcopal office. In the *cathedra Petri,* Cyprian sees the well-spring of ecclesiastical unity, which has its beginning in Peter. Cyprian does not, however, voice the consequence that this well-spring even now, in his own day, has this function of bringing about unity, in the *cathedra* of the Bishop of Rome. He does not seem to draw it in his own mind, either, for he maintains most emphatically the thesis that bishops are responsible to God alone for the administration of their bishoprics.[81] What Cyprian thought in an actual concrete situation about the right of a Roman bishop to issue binding ordinances with decisive authority for the Church as a whole is shown by the test case of the dispute about heretical baptism which may appropriately be described at this point.

The Controversy about Heretical Baptism

The Christian communities first encountered the problem of heretical baptism when heretical (or schismatical) groups of some size formed, and when members of these wanted to enter the Catholic Church. When it was a case of persons who had been pagans, and who had received baptism in the heretical community, the question arose whether the baptism that had been conferred on them was to be considered valid. The same reply was not given in all the Christian communities. In North Africa, Tertullian's treatise on baptism contains a first standpoint rejecting validity.[82] A synod about 220, under Bishop Agrippinus of Carthage, maintained a similar view.[83] In the East (especially in Asia Minor), there was a widespread practice of baptizing again on reception into the Church, persons baptized in heresy. Firmilian of Caesarea himself took part in a synod in Iconium (not earlier than 230), at which bishops from Galatia, Cicilia, and other neighbouring provinces, decided they would continue to rebaptize Montanists at their reception.[84] The Alexandrian theologians were also critical of the baptism of heretics, even if they did not make a clear pronouncement about its validity.[85] It is true that the Alexandrian church under Bishop Dionysius took up the same position as Rome, where persons baptized in an heretical sect were received into the Roman community merely by imposition of hands. The different estimation of heretical baptism and the resulting difference of treatment of those who had received it, could plainly have existed side by side for decades in the Church without one side having felt the practice of the other to be intolerable. But shortly after the middle of the third century a serious clash occurred over the matter, when the various views found unyielding defenders in Cyprian of Carthage and Stephen of Rome. An African bishop, Magnus, had submitted the inquiry to Cyprian whether "those who came from Novatian" had to be baptized again in the Catholic Church. Cyprian's comprehensive answer is clear; baptism is entrusted to the Catholic Church alone and her baptism alone is valid; anyone who has not got the Holy Spirit cannot confer that Spirit.[86] Cyprian submitted a similar inquiry from eighteen Numidian bishops to a synod in 255 and it came to the same conclusion.[87] But according to Cyprian "a few colleagues" were still in doubt whether the African practice were the correct one; in a letter that Cyprian wrote after the synod, a tone of irritation with them is unmistakable. There is also a certain sting in it against Rome; for Cyprian attacks the thesis that in such questions appeal should not simply be made to tradition, but that rational reflection should be allowed to have its say; Peter, whom the Lord chose first, did not make any arrogant claims on that account, and did not presumptously occupy the first place *(primatus)*.[88] A synod considered the question again early in 256 and Cyprian wrote at its request to Pope Stephen, enclosing the resolutions of the previous year's synod as well as his previous correspondence on the subject. The whole file clearly showed that Cyprian regarded the Roman custom, and the view of the validity of heretical baptism on which it rested, as a grave dogmatic error, but, with remarkable lack of logic, he wrote that he did not want to impose his view on anyone, as each bishop was free to administer his own flock. He added with heavy irony that there were, of course, people who, in their stubbornness, were not to be dissuaded once a decision had been made.[89]

---

[79] Ibid. "qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata ecclesia, deserit, in ecclesia se esse confidit? — hoc erant utique ceteri, quod fuit Petrus, sed primatus Petro datur et una ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur." On the problem, see M. Bénevot, *St Cyprian's De Unitate c. 4 in the Light of the Manuscripts* (Rome 1937); and compare the two versions side by side in J. Ludwig, *op. cit.* 33.

[80] Cf. in particular D. van den Eynde in *RHE* 29 (1933), 5-24, with the older literature there given; further references in *Altaner* 197 f.

[81] *Ep.* 59, 14; see A. Demoustier in *RSR* 52 (1964), 337–69.

[82] Tertullian, *De bapt.* 15; cf. *De praescr.* 12; *De pud.* 19.

---

[83] Cyprian, *Ep.* 73, 3; 71, 4.

[84] Firmilian in Cyprian, *Ep.* 75, 7; a synod with the same result took place about this time in Synada, cf. *Euseb. HE* 7, 7, 5.

[85] Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1, 19; Origen, *In Ioann. comm.* 6, 25.

[86] *Ep.* 69, 1 and 2 and *passim.*

[87] Cf. *Ep.* 70.

[88] *Ep.* 71, 3.

Pope Stephen's answer to this letter has not survived, but a clear echo of it is found in Cyprian's correspondence. One of his letters describes it as "uninformed and written without due reflection", and Stephen's standpoint is termed an error.[90] Cyprian was particularly up in arms over the principle with which the Roman bishop justified his standpoint. "No innovation, but stand by tradition", because in intention it stamped Cyprian as an innovator.[91] Furthermore, he considered that Stephen's letter had also contained some "haughty matters, beside the point".[92] The letter of Firmilian of Caesarea, preserved among Cyprian's correspondence, throws welcome light on the meaning of these remarks. Cyprian was informed that Pope Stephen's initiative in the matter of heretical baptism was not limited to North Africa. A letter had been sent from Rome to the churches of Asia Minor too, demanding that they should abandon their practice of rebaptism, and threatening excommunication.[93] Cyprian's deacon, Rogatianus, conveyed to Firmilian a report from his bishop about the previous course of the discussion in North Africa. The detailed answer of the Cappadocian bishop shows how deeply concerned they were in Asia Minor over Stephen's action; all the blame for the split was placed on him, and Firmilian compared him with Judas.[94] It is also said that Stephen, in his folly, "glories in his position as a bishop and claims to hold succession of Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church rest".[95] This makes it clear that Stephen was appealing to Matthew 16:18 and claiming for himself, as Peter's successor, Peter's position in the Church. Previous Roman bishops' awareness of a pre-eminence belonging to them in the Church as a whole, which had already been present earlier was, as a matter of fact, now for the first time given a formal basis in that biblical text which in future was to be increasingly regarded as the decisive attestation of the Roman primacy. The two leading bishops of North

---

[89] *Ep. 72*, especially c. 3. [90] *Ep.* 74, 1.

[91] *Ep.* 74, 1–2. On the formula "nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est", cf. F. L. Dölger in *AuC* I (1929), 79ff. It is a principle with which Rome had already defended its liturgical tradition, when Novatian wrote in the matter of the *lapsi*, "nihil innovandum putavimus" (Cyprian *Ep.* 30, 8).

[92] *Ep.* 74, 1: "superba quaedam et ad rem non pertinentia."

[93] *Euseb. HE* 7, 5, 4–5.

[94] *Ep.* 75, 2.

[95] *Ep.* 75, 17: "de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt."

Africa and Asia Minor did not bow to Stephen's claim. Cyprian had his position confirmed again at a third synod in September 256, in which eighty-seven bishops took part from the three provinces of Africa proconsularis, Mauritania, and Numidia, — not actually comprising the majority of the approximately two hundred bishops who there were at that time.[96] The episcopal delegation sent to Rome with the resolutions of the synod was not even received by Stephen, and he went so far as to give instructions that it was not to be received in the church community there either.[97] That meant a breach with the church of North Africa led by Cyprian. It was the most important demonstration of Rome's position of pre-eminence yet undertaken by one of its bishops, and Stephen undertook it, even at the cost of a rupture, in the consciousness of occupying and of having to fulfill the office and function of Peter in the Church as a whole. It is not surprising that this claim met with resistance. Just as in the history of the Church, Rome's task of leadership only became more clearly manifest in situations which demanded its active exercise, such situations becoming gradually more frequent with the Church's growth; so also from an historical point of view the idea of the Primacy had to develop and became clearer through a process of some length. Cyprian of Carthage, in his striving for an understanding of Matthew 16:18, is an example of a transitional stage in the process of clarification. It seems much more worthy of note that in the face of such contradiction the idea of the primacy prevailed and held its ground.

The question of heretical baptism did not, however, lead to a division of long duration in the early Christian Church. The two leaders of the opposed views in the West, died shortly after one another, Pope Stephen in 257 and Bishop Cyprian as a martyr on 14 September 258. Their followers were not so personally involved in the dispute and at first let it rest, one side tolerating the practice followed by the other. In the East, the zealous Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria endeavoured to mediate between the two camps; six letters on the matter went to Rome. A brief reference in one of these letters, written "imploringly", to Pope Stephen, praises the unity of all Eastern bishops in repulsing Novatianism.[98] His implication is clear: ought it not to be possible to avoid a schism in the discussion about heretical baptism, too? Dionysius appealed in the same sense[99] to Stephen's successor, Sixtus (257–8). Under Sixtus' successor, Dionysius (260–8), the conflict between Rome and the bishops of Asia Minor seems to have been settled. In the West, after a first approach at the Synod of Arles,[100] a final clarification was achieved by the dogmatic work of Augustine, in the sense of the Roman view and practice.

---

[96] See *Sent. episcop. 87 de haer. baptiz. proem.*

[97] *Ep.* 75, 25.

[98] *Euseb. HE* 7, 5, 1–2.

[99] Ibid. 7, 5, 3; 7, 9, 1 and 6.

[100] Can. 8 (314).

The Alexandrian Bishop Dionysius, who was so zealously concerned with peace in the Church, experienced personally, however, that the Roman bishop demanded an account of anyone who put forward false or misleading views in matters of faith, when, in about 260, in controversy with the Patripassians, he used insufficiently precise formulas regarding the distinction between Father and Son.[101] The Bishop of Rome not only required of him a precise exposition of his views but directly addressed himself to Dionysius' flock and warned them of teachers who threatened to falsify the previous teaching of the Church about the Trinity. Here too, the intervention of Rome, even against a bishop of such undeniable merit as Dionysius of Alexandria, demonstrates that its bishop knew he was responsible for safeguarding right belief in the whole Church.

The pre-eminence of the Roman position also received spontaneous recognition. The lyrical homage of the Christian Aberkios of Phrygia to the Church of Rome dates from the early third century. He is sent to Rome by a holy shepherdess in order to see a realm, a queen in golden robe and golden shoes and a people possessing a shining seal.[102] Here poetic expression is given to the power of attraction radiating from this Christian community in the West even as far as the eastern provinces of the empire. Origen, too, saw Rome, and not a word from him or any other "pilgrim to Rome" of the time, indicates that it was the fame or the prestige of the imperial capital, as such, that drew them to it. What Origen says can certainly be considered as representative of many: "I wanted to see the ancient church of the Romans."[103] The visits, delegations and letters which came to Rome, and which have been so often mentioned above, frequently had only one purpose, that of obtaining from this Church and this bishop a recognition and confirmation of their aims or views. They testify thereby to the existence of a widespread conviction that both possessed a unique position.

This is also manifest in a final, very significant fact; the language of Christian symbols seized on the theme in order to express a reality in its own way or to make it accessible in a new form. The very expressive and widespread symbol of the ship of the Church[104] was developed into the picture of the Church as Peter's ship. It is encountered in the texts of the early third century, in the letter of the pseudo-Clement to the apostle

---

[101] See above, chapter 21, pp. 259 f., with references to sources.

[102] No doubt is possible regarding the Christian character of the inscription since the investigation of F. J. Dölger in *Ichthys* II (Münster 1922), 454–507; see also the text in *RAC* I, 13.

[103] *Euseb. HE* 6, 14, 10.

[104] Cf. especially H. Rahner, "Antenna crucis III" in *ZKTh* 66 (1942), 196–227, 67 (1943), 1–21, republished in H. Rahner, *Symbole der Kirche* (Salzburg 1964), 473–503; J. Daniélou, "Le navire de l'église" in *Les symboles chrétiens primitifs* (Paris 1961), 65–76.

James, which introduces the Clementine *Recognitions* and is probably of Roman origin.[105] Here Peter admonishes the hesitant Clement, to whom he entrusts his see, not to fail in service to the faithful who are in danger on their voyage through this life. The owner of this ship is God, its helmsman-pilot Christ, the bishop stands in the bows, the passengers are the brotherhood of believers; the bishop has the hardest task, he must vigilantly listen to the words of the helmsman (Christ) and repeat his orders clearly. Consequently, all the brethren must obey the bishop, who "presides in truth", for the *cathedra Christi* is entrusted to him.[106] With astonishing sureness here, conviction about the position of the Roman bishop has been transposed into the language of symbolism; he is the second pilot of the ship of the Church, over which he has full official authority. The προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης (presiding by love) of the *Letter to the Romans* of Ignatius of Antioch has become the προκαθεζωμένος ἀληθείας (having the presidency of truth) and he has to preach the truth of him whose chair he occupies. Novatian, too, emphasized, not without self-satisfaction, in the letter which he wrote to Cyprian when the see was vacant in 250–1, that the Roman church held the wheel of the ship of the Church in firm hands. The greatest hour of the symbol of the *navicula Petri* was only to come in the post-Constantinian and early medieval period, when it was given an ecclesiastico-political interpretation, but its symbolism is theologically richer in the Clementine *Recognitions*.

Devotion to the Church in the Third Century

The previous chapters have attempted to portray all the important expression of the life of the Church as a whole in early Christian times. The reality revealed by this picture is manifold and full of contrasts, like everything which is living. A final feature has to be added to the picture. This Church is not only an object of knowledge, is not only given its theological basis and affirmed with understanding, its very reality is taken up into the affections of the faithful, felt as a gift of grace. Just as there was a spirituality of baptism and martyrdom, there was a spirituality centred on the Church.

This was given most profound expression by the application of one of the fundamental words of humanity to the Church, which was loved as the "mother" of the faithful. This name was prepared for by the personification of "faith" as a maternal figure in Polycarp of Smyrna[107] and by Hermas, to whom the Church appeared as a revered woman.[108] The

---

[105] On this cf. H. Rahner in ZKTh 69 (1947), 6.

[106] Ps-Clement, *Recogn.* 14–17.

[107] Phil. 3, 2 alluding to Gal. 4:26. Cf. also *Acta ss. Iustini et sociorum* 4, 8.

[108] *Pastor Vis.* 2, 1, 3; 2, 4, 1; 3, 9, 1.

Christians of Lyons were the first to apply the name "mother" to the Church, like an expression that had long been familiar to them; the martyrs of the year 177 were the children born of her who went home in peace to God without saddening their mother.[109] According to Irenaeus, the heretics have no share in the spirit of truth; they are not at the breast of Mother Church who, at the same time, is the Bride of Christ.[110] The catechists, in preparing for baptism, clearly liked to represent the Church to the catechumens as a mother who bears her children in baptism and then feeds and guards them. Tertullian speaks with deep feeling, especially in his pastoral writings, of *domina mater ecclesia* who, with motherly care, looks after those who are imprisoned,[111] and whose children, after baptism, recite the Our Father as their first prayer in common with their brethren, "in their mother's house",[112] whilst the heretics have no mother.[113] The same note of deep feeling is found in the terminology of the Alexandrians; for Clement, the Church is the Virgin Mother who calls her children to herself and feeds them on sacred milk.[114] Origen sees her both as *sponsa Christi* and as mother of the nations; bitter sorrow is caused her by impenitence and attachment to evil.[115] The term *mater ecclesia* has become a real expression of filial love and piety in the writings of Cyprian, who sings the joy this mother feels about her virginal children and brave confessors; but he also knows the tears which she sheds for the lapsed.[116] More than any other writer of the third century, he evokes the picture of this mother when the unity of the Church is threatened by schism. His urgently repeated appeals to the faithful to preserve their unity at all costs culminate in one of his most celebrated sayings: "That man cannot have God as his Father who has not the Church as his Mother."[117] In a mystical vision, Methodius of Olympus sees the Church like a richly jewelled queen with her place at the right hand of the bridegroom.[118] For her sake, the Logos left the Father and was united to her when she was born from the wound in his side. The newly-baptized are conceived in the embrace between Logos and Church; born again, from her, to an eternal life and accompanied by her maternal care throughout life, to perfection.[119]

---

[109] *Euseb. HE* 5, 1, 45; 5, 2, 6. [110] *Adv. haer.* 3, 38, 1; *Fragm.* 30. [111] *Ad mart.* 1.

[112] *De bapt.* 20; on this see F. J. Dölger in *AuC*, II (1930), 142–55.

[113] *De praescr.* 42, 10. [114] *Paed.* 1, 6, 42; 3, 12, 99.

[115] *In Cant. hom.* 1, 7; *In Iudic. hom.* 5, 6; other texts in J. C. Plumpe, *Mater ecclesia. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity* (Washington 1943), 70–80.

[116] *De hab. virg.* 3; *Ep.* 10, 4; *De laps.* 8.

[117] *De eccles, unit.* 6: "habere non potest deum patrem qui ecclesiam non habet matrem."

[118] *Symp.* 2, 7, 50; see A. Demoustier in *RSR* 52 (1964), 554–88.

[119] Ibid. 3, 8, 70–2; cf. also, as well as Plumpe, *op. cit.* 113–22, *H. Rahner* in *ZKTh* 64 (1940), 71–74.

As well as this picture of the Church as Mother, which appealed most directly to the feelings of the faithful, early Christian preaching made use of other images, too, in order to make clear to the hearers the reality of the Church and impress it on their hearts. So, according to Hippolytus, the Church is "God's spiritual garden with Christ as its ground", with an inexhaustible stream of water, from which the four rivers of Paradise flow, the four Gospels which announce the Lord to the world.[120] Origen compares the Church with Paradise in which the newly-baptized fulfill the works of the Spirit.[121] The Johannine parable of the vine and the branches (Jn 15:1–7), must have proved particularly rich as a catechetical theme; it is applied to the Church by the Fathers repeatedly with far-ranging symbolism.[122] All these metaphors were of a kind to give the Church distinctive emotional associations in the mind of her members and to make the Church dear to them in a sense of very real affection.

A widespread devotion to the Church of this kind in the third century is like the spirituality of baptism and martyrdom spoken of above, an important factor in the history of the Church, and must not be passed over unnoticed. Even if the depth and extent of its influence is often difficult to measure and determine, there is no doubt of its presence; it gave the consciousness of the Church in the third century a characteristic stamp, and may be regarded as one of the sources from which the early Christian Church as a whole drew some of its vitality.

CHAPTER 27

The Extent of Christianity prior to the Diocletian Persecution

RUNNING parallel to the rich development of life within the Church, in literature and liturgy, organization and the practice of spirituality, was a growth in numbers which gave Christianity at this period, even when viewed from outside, the character of a "great Church". The inner strengthening of the Church in this century created the conditions for her decisive missionary success in the world of Hellenic civilization right up to the beginning of the Diocletian persecution. This eminently important process in the history of the Church was influenced not only by such conditions, but also by the conjunction of further favourable factors of varying importance in their actual impact.

---

[120] Hippolytus, *In Dan. comm.* 1, 17; similarly Cyprian, *Ep.* 73, 10.

[121] Cf. J. Daniélou: "Sentire ecclesiam" in *Festschrift H. Rahner,* (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 96.

[122] Ibid, 100–2. Also "Un Testimonium sur la vigne dans Barnabé 12:1" in *RSR* 50 (1962), 384–99.

In the first place, the two long periods of peace in the third century must be mentioned. They offered the Church, to an extent unknown before, missionary possibilities of making herself known, and they were only disturbed by a few waves of relatively brief persecution. These chances were used variously in the different geographical territories of the Empire and on its frontiers. Moreover, the drive of Christianity towards expansion was furthered by developments in the paganism of antiquity itself. The crisis of the ancient world in the third century consisted not only of the threatening decay of the Roman Empire, but was also, and equally, of a crisis in the existing religious and cultural forces.[1] Under the emperor of the Syrian dynasty, the Roman State religion abandoned what had been its traditional foundations. New cults from the East gained increasingly larger followings even in the Latin world, until finally emperor Caracalla gave entry to their divinities into the Roman temples;[2] the Baal of Emesa, the Sun-God of Palmyra, Egyptian Sarapis and Persian Mithras burst the framework of the ancient Roman religion, and robbed it of its exclusiveness. In its place appeared a wide-ranging syncretism which, to be sure, aimed at offering something for every religious inquirer, but was itself poor in religious substance and consequently represented, in fact, a weakening of earlier religious forces. Christianity could advance into this increasing vacuum, and with its claim to offer, in the midst of this religious confusion, both absolute truth and what was "new" and full of promise for the future, found a ready hearing among the pagan population. The Christian preaching of the age not only presented this claim with firm assurance of victory, but increasingly found for it a distinguished form in speech and writing which won the respect of the cultivated pagans. At the beginning of the third century the Alexandrian teachers Clement and Origen dared to attempt to win to Christianity not only cultivated people but culture itself.[3] On the foundation of Christian revelation, they set up a new ideal of culture to which, they were convinced, the future belonged; and they were liberal enough to incorporate in this ideal those elements of pagan education and culture which did not contradict the fundamental truths of the gospel. In East and West, Origen gained an outstanding reputation and became an attractive force with far-reaching influence. Towards the end of the century there grew up in Antioch the second intellectual centre of

---

[1] Cf. F. Altheim, *Der Niedergang der alten Welt*, II (Frankfurt a. M. 1952), 197–233.

[2] K. Bihlmeyer, *Die syrischen Kaiser zu Rom und das Christentum* (Rottenburg 1916), 9–28.

[3] K. Prümm, *Christentum als Neuheitserlebnis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939), 382–8.

Christianity in the East; it influenced the Syrian hinterland as much as Alexandria did Egypt. In the West, also, Christianity produced writers of quality and reputation who are a striking testimony to the higher standards of Christian literary production. This rich increase in credit and prestige brought Christianity an ever-growing number of adherents from the pagan upper class. Under the Syrian emperors, under Philippus Arabs and Gallienus, there were Christians in influential positions at the imperial court, and an increasing number of bishops sprang from the educated classes. Certainly the majority of the pagan population still met the appeal of the new religion with refusal and, especially in leading circles, so did the "conservatives" who instinctively defended existing intellectual and cultural property. But at the beginning of the fourth century, a minority of such strength and quality professed the new religion, that its resistance could not be broken by the last onslaught under Diocletian.

The East

At the beginning of the third century commenced that rise of the Christian world of Alexandria which made the Church there the intellectual centre of eastern Christianity. Origen's activity as a teacher brought many Gnostics and pagans under its spell; his later friend and patron Ambrose is the best-known example of a learned convert made by him and he was followed by many others. Naturally the Alexandrian community also formed the missionary centre from which sprang attempts to christianize the inhabitants of the Egyptian countryside and neighbouring peoples. The expansion of Christianity into the countryside is increasingly attested by the numerous finds of papyri in Egyptian territory containing biblical fragments, especially St Paul's Epistles, the Synoptic Gospels, the Gospel of St John and the Acts of the Apostles, of which more than twenty can be assigned with some certainty to the third century.[4] The Decian persecution revealed the existence of many Christians in towns and villages even outside Alexandria, and the mention of various bishops[5] shows the growth of hierarchically organized churches which may be presumed to have existed in most provincial centres. Dionysius, the leading bishop of Egypt about the middle of the century, visited several Christian communities in Fayûm which clearly had a considerable number of members.[6] When during the persecution of Decius, he himself had to go into exile, he and his companions used the opportunity to act as missionaries to the pagans of their place of exile.[7] A papyrus written about the year 300 speaks of two Christian churches in Oxyrhynchus, one in the north, the other in the south of the town.[8] Naturally the Greek-speaking missionaries first addressed themselves to the Greek element in the Egyptian population, but by the middle of the century, there is also evidence that members of the Coptic-speaking part of the nation were being converted to Christianity.[9] The beginnings of Egyptian monasticism stretch as far back as the third century and its early eremitical phase had its first famous representative in St Anthony, who was a Copt.[10] By the beginning of the fourth century certainly, a considerable minority of the population of Egypt was Christian.[11]

---

[4] H. Idris Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool 1954), 84 ff.

[5] *Euseb. HE* 6, 42, 1, 3; 6, 46, 2.

[6] Ibid. 7, 24, 6.

The Christian world of Northern Arabia, which became more prominent in the third century, followed the lines of the Alexandrian centre, though whether these relations had their foundations in missionary work from Alexandria, must remain an open question. Origen was held in high regard by the Christians of the province of Arabia;[12] its governor wrote a letter to Bishop Demetrius of Alexandria asking him to send Origen to him so that he might learn about Christianity. Origen answered the request, and care for the Church's doctrine frequently led him to the capital of the Arabian province of Bostra, where about 240, he took part in two synods.[13] This was plainly done at the instance of Bishop Beryllus, the leader of the Arab Christians, who was also active as a writer.[14] The recently discovered script of a religious discussion of Origen with Bishop Hieraclides, in the presence of several bishops, regarding the question of the Trinity, probably took place in a church in Arabia.[15] The later occupants of the episcopal sees of Arabia whose existence is attested here, took part in the Council of Nicaea. It is impossible to determine to what race the Christians in Arabia at this period belonged.

The motherland of Christianity, Palestine, lagged behind the more rapid development of Egypt in the third century. The country people still to a large extent shut themselves off from Christian belief and the faithful were mainly to be found among the Greek population of the cities. About twenty names of towns or villages with Christian groups or communities are known from pre-Constantinian times and sixteen of their bishops took part in the Council of Nicaea. In his report about the Palestinian victims of the Diocletian persecution, Eusebius quotes almost exclusively Greek names for the martyrs, whose relatively small numbers are an index of the extent to which Christianity had spread. The Christians of Jerusalem did not achieve the importance which one would have expected from its ancient Christian tradition, though pilgrimages of Christians from other parts of the Empire[16] which sprang up in the third century, contributed to a revival and increase of its prestige. Among its bishops, Alexander was prominent; he showed his interest in theological learning by establishing a library,[17] probably inspired by the example of Alexandria; he held the teachers Pantaenus and Clement in high esteem, and was on terms of friendship with Origen.[18] The leadership of Palestine in ecclesiastical affairs had been taken over at an early date by the bishops of the provincial capital, Caesarea, and they represented this church province at the synods of Antioch. The Christian community of Caesarea also became the theological and intellectual centre when Origen, after leaving Alexandria in 230, finally settled here, and with strong support from Bishop Theoctistus, was able to pursue his work. The renown of the Alexandrian, and his manifold activity as a teacher so contributed to the successful development of Christianity in this Palestinian town, that about the year 300, even the pagan part of its population was not ill-disposed.[19]

---

[7] Ibid. 7, 11, 13–14.

[8] H. I. Bell, *op. cit.* 87.

[9] G. Bardy, *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris 1940), 209 ff.

[10] K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (Tübingen) 101 ff.

[11] According to Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 3, 5, the majority of people in Egypt in his day had already abandoned the pagan cults.

[12] G. Kretzschmer, "Origenes und die Araber" in *ZThK* 50 (1953), 250–79.

[13] *Euseb. HE* 6, 33, 3; 6, 37.

[14] Ibid. 6, 20, 2.

[15] J. Scherer in his edition, *Sources Chr.* 67 (1960), 19–21; on Bishop Alexander see P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains* (Paris 1961), 105–37.

An essentially similar situation was to be found in Phoenicia which already belonged to the greater Syrian area. Here, too, conversions to Christianity at first were confined chiefly to the coastal towns where there were more Greeks, while the mission had scarcely any success in the countryside. In the interior, the great pagan centres of worship of the Sun-god in Emesa, Heliopolis, and Palmyra, occupied a dominant position which made entry for Christian teaching difficult. Syrian national susceptibilities played their part here, causing Christianity, represented by Greeks, to be judged unfavourably. In the towns of Damascus and Paneas there were Christians, because in these towns Hellenism was stronger. In the third century, as a consequence, the coastal towns of Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, Byblos, and Tripoli remained the centres from which Christianity spread, and of these Tyre took the lead about 250. In this town, Origen died and was buried and Tyre also had the most martyrs in the persecution of the fourth century.[20]

---

[16] Euseb. *Demonstr. evang.* 6, 18, 23.

[17] *Euseb. HE* 6, 20.

[18] *Euseb. HE* 6, 14, 8.

[19] *Harnack Miss*, 647.

[20] *Euseb. HE* 8, 7, 1; 8, 13, 3; *De mart. Palaes.* 5, 1; 7, 1.

In Coelesyria proper, the rise of the Christian church of Antioch, already so marked in the second century, continued. Within its walls the synods met, from the middle of the third century onwards, attended by bishops from a wide area and naturally presided over by the Antiochan bishop. When the Bishop of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, himself stood before such a synod accused of Christological heresies,[21] it became clear that this episcopal see already possessed considerable political importance even at that time. And it is very clear that the see of Antioch, as well as that of Rome, was no longer a matter of indifference to the civil government, from the fact that the case of Bishop Paul was even brought before the emperor Aurelian, his decision being sought, and given, regarding the ownership of the bishop's residence in the Syrian capital.[22] Towards the end of the third century, Antioch also became a centre of theological learning for the East, though at a certain distance behind Alexandria. Christian teachers of repute in Antioch at that time were the priests Malchion and Dorotheus[23] but above all Lucian, later a martyr (in 311),[24] who laid the foundations of the Antioch theological school. The Christian church in Antioch also became a missionary centre which not only worked at christianizing the immediate surroundings, but was also engaged in spreading Christian faith in more distant regions, such as the centre of Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Persia. In the Syrian hinterland, the missionary efforts of Antioch encountered those of Edessa. Success here was considerable in the third century, for twenty bishops from Coelesyria came to the Council of Nicaea, most of them probably from larger towns, but there were also two chorepiscopi who spoke on behalf of the Christian mission in the country.[25] A certain index of the intensity of this, is given by Eusebius' remark that the prisons in Syria after the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution in 303, "were everywhere filled with bishops, priests, deacons, lectors, and exorcists".[26]

In Osrhoëne, Christianity made such strides in the capital, Edessa, in the third century, that it could be considered a Christian town at the beginning of the fourth[27] and the centre of the Syrian Christian world. The beginnings of a Christian school in Edessa probably also extend into the third century.[28] The mission to the countryside started from Edessa, and by 260 it counted several communities with bishops.[29] At the same time, Christianity advanced in adjacent Mesopotamia, to the East. On its borders, the garrison town of Dura-Europos on the Euphrates had a Christian community at the beginning of the third century. The rooms set aside for worship in a private house rebuilt for this purpose have actually been discovered. A fragment of the Greek *Diatessaron* of Tatian, also discovered in Dura-Europos, shows how widely this was known.[30] The existence of other churches in Mesopotamia is attested by a reference by Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria.[31] In the third century, too, there also arose the bishopric of Nisibis, which was later an intellectual centre of Syrian Christianity, and that of Seleucia-Ctesiphon on the Euphrates, the future ecclesiastical metropolis of the region.[32].

---

[21] G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate* (Louvain, 2nd ed. 1929); on the charge, cf. H. de Riedmatten, *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate* (Fribourg 1952).

[22] See above, p. 318.

[23] *Euseb. HE* 7, 29, 2; 7, 32, 2–4.

[24] G. Bardy, *Recherches sur s. Lucien d'Antioch et son école* (Paris 1936).

[25] *Harnack Miss* 671.

[26] *Euseb. HE* 8, 6.

[27] Cf. *Euseb. HE* 2, 1, 7.

[28] E.-R. Hayes, *L'école d'Edesse* (Paris 1930).

[29] *Euseb. HE* 7, 30, 10.

Nearby Persia was opened in the third century as a new missionary territory for the Christian religion. Individual missionaries were able to penetrate into the Persian highlands from the Adiabene district. Political causes then led to the settlement of larger groups of Syrian Christians in the Persian empire; about the middle of the century (252), the incursions of the Sassanid rulers into Roman territory began, as a consequence of which numerous Syrian Christians were deported into the interior of Persia where they were given the opportunity for forming settlements of their own. In the organization of their church life and the practice of divine worship, Shapur I left them complete freedom, and so there sprang up, in addition to the purely Persian Christian communities, those which had exclusively Syrian members. As one of the Persian invasions had reached Antioch, there were Greek Christians among the prisoners too, and these had a place of worship of their own in Rev-Ardashir, later the seat of the Persian archbishops.[33] When the revolutionary change in policy regarding the Church, which occurred in the Roman Empire under Constantine, became known to the Christians of Persia, their sympathies were, understandably, on the side of the now Christian empire; this led to a change in the attitude of the Sassanids to Christianity and prepared the way for the harsh persecution which under King Shapur II in the fourth century was to cost the young Persian Church a heavy toll of vicitims.

In view of the strength of that Christianity, it would be quite within the realm of possibility for east Syrian or Persian missionaries to have penetrated into western India at this time. The St Thomas Christians of south-west India, of course, regard the apostle Thomas as their first missionary,[34] but the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*, on which they have to base that belief, is not a very sound source. When Origen mentions India on one occasion, he still regards it as a pagan country.[35] Arnobius the elder, however, clearly assumes the existence of individual Christians about the year 300[36] and the well-organized Christian communities attested by Cosmas Indicopleustes about 525 in Malabar, in the region of present-day Bombay, and in Ceylon,[37] oblige us to assume a fairly long missionary development with its beginnings in the fourth or fifth century. That again suggests the possibility of evangelization by Persian Christians who had fled east from Persia under persecution and this conjecture is supported by the later dependence of the Indian Christians on Seleucia-Ctesiphon.[38]

---

[30] O. Eissfeldt, "Dura-Europos" in *RAC* IV, 362–70 with bibliography.

[31] *Euseb. HE* 7, 5, 2. No certain dates can be ascertained from the *Chronicle of Arbela*, for the indications for earlier times are unreliable; cf. I. Ortiz de Urbina in *OrChrP* 2 (1937), 5–32. The *Chronicle of Arbela*, however, receives a much more favourable criticism from G. Messina in *Orientalia* 6 (1937), 237 ff.

[32] *Harnack Miss* 691.

[33] A. Allgeier, "Untersuchungen zur ältesten Kirchengeschichte von Persien" in *Katholik* 98 II (1918), 224–41, 289–300.

The region of Asia Minor maintained throughout the third century the lead in christianization which it had gained by the end of the second over other parts of the East. The province of Cicilia, the geographical link between west Syria and Asia Minor preserved, however, a marked orientation towards Antioch. The Pauline origin of the church of the city of Tarsus gave it special rank and caused it to become the metropolitan see of the province. Dionysius of Alexandria is probably referring to the metropolitan dignity of the Bishop of Tarsus when he gives Hellenus of Tarsus precedence over the other bishops of Cicilia.[39] Examples of churches with bishops were those of Epiphania and Neronias, whose leaders were represented at the Synod of Ancyra in 314, and seven more were named as taking part in Nicaea, among them was a chorepiscopus, evidence that Christians in the countryside were already also joined into communities.[40] Of the provinces of Asia Minor, Cappadocia and Pontus are prominent, both on account of the prestige of their metropolitans and their strong missionary interest. Firmilian of Caesarea was the recognized leader of the Cappadocian episcopate at their annual meetings and an enthusiastic admirer of Origen, whom he invited to his diocese.[41] He corresponded with Cyprian of Carthage on the question of heretical baptism and so is already a pointer to the later theological standing of Caesarea.[42] A considerable number of martyrs also contributed to its renown. At the end of the period of persecution the Christians were already in a majority in Cappadocia.

---

[34] Cf. L. W. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St Thomas* (Cambridge 1956), 43–64.

[35] Origen, *In Iesu Nave hom.* 15, 5.

[36] Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 2; 12, and on this, G. E. McCracken, "Arnobius of Sicca" in *ACW* 7 (1949), 311 ff.

[37] Cosmas Indicopl., *Topogr. christ.* 3, 178.

[38] Cf. R. Garbe, *Indien und das Christentum* (Tübingen 1914), 153–5.

[39] *Euseb. HE* 7, 5, 1.

[40] *Harnack Miss* 730 ff. [41] *Euseb. HE* 6, 27. [42] Cyprian *Ep.* 75.

The Pontic regions, lying to the North of Cappadocia, were also a fertile mission field in the third century. Here, of course, there were certainly considerable Christian communities quite early, such as Amastris, Synope, Pompeiopolis, soon joined by the important Amaseia which was the metropolis as early as 240.[43] The missionary, however, who succeeded in winning even the majority of the country population to Christianity, was Gregory Thaumaturgus. He received his theological formation with Origen and, after his return home, was consecrated bishop of his native town, Neo-Caesarea, by the Bishop of Amaseia.[44] In his activity a well-thought-out missionary plan can be detected. After the Decian persecution he travelled systematically through the country districts, acquired precise knowledge of the strength of paganism and the religious customs of the people, and framed his missionary method accordingly. He succeeded in shaking the confidence felt by the people in the pagan priesthood and drew them to Christianity by an impressive liturgy. He seized on the liking of the population for festivals and celebrations in the course of the years, by giving these a Christian content and making festivities in honour of the martyrs the culminating points of the year. By his work, paganism was considerably overcome,[45] though the task of deepening Christian belief remained for the later bishops of Pontus, as can be seen from the discussions of a Synod of Neo-Caesarea between 314 and 325 which dealt in detail with the discipline of the churches of Pontus.[46] By that time, however, Pontus could be considered a country which, to a large extent, had accepted the Christian faith.

The evangelization of Armenia was essentially influenced by the neighbouring regions of Pontus and Cappadocia in the west and Osrhoëne in the south-east, and this had consequences of various kinds for the Armenian Church. The first missionaries probably came from the South, from the Edessa area, preached in the province of Sophene in Lesser Armenia, and used Syriac as the language of the liturgy. It was probably here in the south-east that Meruzanes was a bishop; Dionysius of Alexandria addressed a letter to him about penance.[47] The decisive impulse for the complete conversion of the country came, however, from Cappadocia. The Armenian, Gregory, had fled there when, in his country, struggles were taking place between the Persian Sassanids, the rulers of Palmyra, and finally, Rome. Gregory became acquainted with Christianity in Caesarea and was baptized there (*c* A.D. 285–90). After his return he became the great missionary of his nation, which, on this account, honoured him with the title of "The Illuminator". In his work of conversion he had the full support of his king, Trdat II, who with the upper classes of the country, embraced the Christian faith. The acceptance of Christianity by the Armenians assumed a political complexion when this was presented as a national alternative to the Persian religion previously imposed upon them. After overcoming the resistance of the pagan priests, Christianity became the State religion and the Church was richly endowed with the former temple treasure. The religious centre was Ashtishtat where the chief pagan shrine had stood and Bagravan was another important see.[48] The influence of Cappadocia remained because Gregory and his immediate successors recognized Caesarea as a kind of higher metropolitan see. In his missionary methods Gregory the Illuminator seems to have imitated Gregory Thaumaturgus of Pontus, for he, too, zealously encouraged veneration of the martyrs and replaced pagan centres and seasons of worship by Christian churches at those places and by festivals in memory of Christian saints.[49] The report of the forty martyrs of Sebaste[50] shows that Christianity, by 300, had already a strong hold in the country districts of Armenia, too. Some of the village communities had a bishop at their head, others only priests and deacons. The last great persecution fell in Armenia on a country that was, in its majority, Christian, so that the fight of Maximinus Daia against the Christians was felt as an attack upon the whole nation.[51] It was only in post-Constantinian times that evangelization of Georgia began on any considerable scale, but Christianity may well have become known there in individual cases through the busy trade that existed with the west of Asia Minor.[52]

---

[43] *Euseb. HE* 4, 23, 26. The bishops of Pontus had also taken part in the discussions about the date of Easter, ibid. 5, 23, 3.

[44] *Quasten P*, II, 123 ff.

[45] These details can be gathered from the account that Gregory of Nyssa gives of the life of Gregory Thaumaturgus; it is not entirely free from legendary elements in other respects: *PG* 46, 893–958.

[46] The Canons of the Synod in F. Lauchert, *Die Kanones der altkirchlichen Concilien* (Freiburg i. Br. 1896), 35 ff., and in E. J. Jonkers, *Acta et symbola conciliorum quae saeculo quarto habita sunt* (Leyden 1944), 35–8.

[47] *Euseb. HE* 6, 46, 2.

Although there is scarcely any question in the sources of any marked clash between paganism and Christianity in the western provinces of Asia Minor in the third century, nevertheless at this period, particularly in the towns, the Christian religion had achieved the position of an important minority. This much is clear from the situation that the Roman authorities discovered everywhere when they tried to put into effect Diocletian's religious edicts and the ordinances of Maximinus Daia or Licinius. In Nicomedia itself, where the persecution began, there were many Christians in high State positions, and even at court. This corresponded to their numerical strength in the administrative centre; there were similar strong communities in the Bithynian towns of Nicaea, Chalcedon, Prusa and others, as the presence of their bishops at the Council of Nicaea shows: and further expansion in the country is indicated by the existence of two chorepiscopi.[53] A similar picture emerges for the provinces of Galatia, Phrygia and Pisidia; for their bishops met in synods in Iconium and Synnada at the time of the dispute about heretical baptism. Ancyra, the metropolis of Galatia, had quite a considerable synod in 314; its proceedings are extant.[54] Laodicea, the metropolitan see of Phrygia possessed a celebrated martyr in Bishop Sagaris and the number of bishops of this province at Nicaea was considerable (eight). In Phrygia the wealth of Christian inscriptions from pre-Constantinian times is very striking, and neighbouring Pisidia is also distinguished by them; there, the best known sees were Iconium and Laodicea and nine others whose holders figure on the list at Nicaea. Least information is available in the sources for the provinces in the south of Asia Minor, Lycia, Pamphilia, and Isauria, although once again the presence of twenty-five bishops from these areas at Nicaea proves the intensive missionary work of the previous century. The same is true of the west coast of Asia Minor where as well as the famous names of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamon, Sardes, Thyatira, and Miletus, a large number of other towns having churches ruled by bishops must be listed.

---

[48] F. Tournebize in *DHGE* IV, 294 ff.

[49] *Harnack Miss* 760.

[50] Text in R. Knopf - G. Krüger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929), 116–19, and bibliography.

[51] *Euseb. HE* 9, 8, 2.

[52] K. Lübeck, *Georgien und die katholische Kirche* (Aachen 1918), 6.

The impression of a far-advanced christianization of Asia Minor given by this survey of individual regions and provinces, is confirmed by a quantity of reports and indications referring to the whole of this territory. It is clear that, with the exception of the short Decian persecution, almost unrestricted freedom was available here throughout the third century for the preaching of the Christian faith. This is shown by the numerous epitaphs, even from smaller places in Asia Minor, upon which the Christian faith of the dead could be openly expressed.[55] Similarly, the building of Christian places of worship seems to have encountered no difficulties; a little town like Amaseia in Pontus had several churches in the time of Licinius[56] and would scarcely be unique in this respect. In many provinces, for instance in Phrygia and the neighbouring regions, a high degree of christianization had already been reached by the middle of the century, for Dionysius of Alexandria terms the communities of these areas "the most populous churches".[57] Lucian of Antioch no doubt had such conditions in Asia Minor in his mind, when, in a discourse in Nicomedia, he said that "whole towns" had accepted the truth of the gospel.[58] In the Diocletian persecution a town of the province of Phrygia was burnt down because the whole of it was Christian.[59] Finally, Maximinus Daia when considering Asia Minor, justified his measures against the Christians on the grounds that "almost all" would be converted to that religion.[60] The high percentage of bishops from Asia Minor present at Nicaea (and yet a number of absences must be reckoned with), shows too, that Christianity had here already given itself a thoroughly systematic organization, such as was required for the pastoral care of such a numerous following in the churches of both town and country.

---

[53] *Harnack Miss* 762–85, also for what follows.

[54] Cf. F. Lauchert, *op. cit.* 29–34; E. J. Jonkers, *op. cit.* 28–35.

[55] Collected in the *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua* IV and VI published by the American Society for Archaeological Research (London-Manchester 1928–56). Cf. also, H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1922).

[56] Eusebius *Vita Const.* 2, 1–2.

The sources contain only sparse material, until the fourth century, on the progress of Christianity on the Greek islands. Certainly it was only by chance that no bishop from Crete took part in the Council of Nicaea, as of course the existence of churches with bishops in Cnossos and Gortyna, as early as 170, is proved by the correspondence of Dionysius of Corinth.[61] On the other hand, the Christian communities of the islands of Corcyra, Cos, Lemnos, and Rhodes, had sent representatives. Christianity can also presumably be taken to have existed before 300 on the island of Patmos with its rich traditions. Cyprus was represented at Nicaea by the bishops of Salamis, Paphos, and Trimithus;[62] here the proximity of Antioch had plainly been favourable to more rapid development. Finally Christianity before the Council of Nicaea had also found entry into the Greek settlements on the northern coasts of the Black Sea and in the Crimean peninsula, for the two bishops, Theophilus of Gothia and Cadmus of Bosphorus, who are known to have taken part in the Council, came from that area. Christianity had also been spread even among the Goths north of the Black Sea by Cappadocian prisoners of war who had been taken there in 258, after an attack on Asia Minor.[63]

The Greek mainland could not, about the year 300 rival either the intensity or extent of evangelization as it existed on the west coast of Asia Minor or in Bithynia, although stronger missionary activity might have been expected from towns of Pauline tradition. Something of the kind is perceptible in Corinth,[64] which concerned itself with the christianization of the Peloponnesus. The latter possessed, in the third century, several Christian communities, for "the bishops of Achaea" championed Origen in 231. Corinth, as the ecclesiastical metropolis, also possessed preeminence over Athens which preserved even into the fourth century the character of a pagan city and a centre of secular learning. It is not really clear why Origen twice stayed in Athens. He praised the order and peace of its church which, he said, contrasted with the noisy assemblies of the Athenian people.[65] Further north, the island of Euboea and the towns of Thebes, Larissa, and, of course, Thessalonica, had episcopal churches whose leaders were present at Nicaea in 325.[66]

---

[57] In *Euseb. HE* 7, 7, 5. [58] *In Rufin. HE* 9, 6. [59] *Euseb. HE* 8, 11, 1.

[60] Ibid. 9, 9a, 1.

[61] Ibid. 4, 23, 5, 7–8. [62] *Harnack Miss* 786, 677. [63] Ibid. 797.

[64] Cf. the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the church of Lacedaemon: *Euseb. HE* 4, 22, 2.

The West

It was only gradually that the romanized Balkans with their Danubian provinces and the adjacent Noricum became receptive to the message of the gospel.[67] Reports about missionary activity by disciples of the apostles in these areas are legendary, but are supposed with no reliable evidence. Traces of Christianity can be found for Noricum, at the very earliest, in the second half of the third century; influence from Aquileia must be presumed for this. About the year A.D. 304 Florian became a martyr at Lauriacum (Lorch). It is only reports of the martyrdom of Christians in the Diocletian persecution that show that Christian faith had penetrated various Balkan areas by the beginning of the fourth century. For the provinces of Moesia and Pannonia the number of martyrs is in fact relatively high; among them were the bishops of Siscia, Sirmium, and Pettau; in Durostorum (Moesia) the soldier Dacius was executed, and a remarkable report of his trial and death is extant.[68] The list of those present at Nicaea mentions, as well as those named above, the episcopal sees of Dacus, in the province of Dardania, Marcianopolis in Moesia and Serdica in Dacia. In addition, there are about twelve other places where Christian churches may be presumed to have existed but, with one exception, they are only towns. It was in these that the Christian faith first won large numbers of adherents, and the evangelization of the country people remained a task for the fourth and fifth centuries.

In Italy the third century signified a period of strong external and inner growth for the Christian community of the capital, Rome; the number of its members was increasing considerably, its internal organization was developing and becoming firmer and its prestige within Christianity as a whole was continually increasing. When Pope Callistus declared at the beginning of the third century that marriages between slaves and Roman matrons would be regarded as valid by the Church, it can be inferred that Christianity had also penetrated the upper classes. About the middle of the century, the total number of all Christians in Rome had increased so considerably that their pastoral needs could no longer be attended to from one church centre; a division into seven pastoral districts proved necessary, and was probably implemented under Pope Fabian.[69] Eusebius provides very precise and significant figures regarding the strength of the clergy of the city of Rome under Pope Cornelius (251–3). The total of 154 clerics included 46 priests, 7 deacons, 7 hypodeacons, 42 acolytes, and also 52 exorcists, lectors, and doorkeepers. The numbers of widows and poor people cared for by the community at that time was more than 1,500.[70] Even if the percentage of those dependent on ecclesiastical charity is put rather high, a total number of Christians of some 10,000 must probably be inferred from all this.

---

[65] *Euseb. HE* 6, 23, 4; 6, 32, 2. [66] *Harnack Miss* 788–92.

[67] Cf. A. Lippold - E. Kirsten in *RAC* IV, 166–9.

[68] Text in Knopf - Krüger, *op. cit.* 91–5.

In the second half of the century the administrative development was continued by the introduction and arrangement of what were later known as the titular churches; various districts of Rome now received a *domus ecclesiae:* a fairly large private house obtained by the community. As well as rooms for the clergy of the district these also provided rooms for divine worship and other pastoral purposes. The titular churches formed, with the cemeteries, the properties which were given back to the Church after the Diocletian persecution.[71] It is also clear that the proportion of Christians in the total population of Rome at the beginning of the fourth century was very considerable from the attitude of Emperor Maxentius, who, though a pagan himself, deliberately refrained from any persecution, because he did not wish to turn the strong group of Christians into political opponents at home.[72] Finally, the often-quoted remark of Cyprian[73] that Emperor Decius had said that he was less concerned over the news of the revolt of a rival emperor than by the election of a new bishop in Rome, indicates the great prestige of the Roman bishop, but also, indirectly, implies the importance of the Roman Christian community in the middle of the third century.

Doubtless many a missionary campaign was undertaken by this strong and eminent church to win to Christianity the immediate and also more distant surroundings of the capital. Unfortunately the details are lacking that would permit a more detailed account of the course of evangelization of central and southern Italy. Its success is shown by the controversy connected with Novatian's step in trying, after his separation from the great Church, to set up an ecclesiastical organization of his own for his followers. He had himself consecrated by three bishops as their leader and these three had been fetched from Italy, that is to say, in this case, from the country.[74] Pope Cornelius gave new leaders to the churches of these bishops and then summoned a synod to Rome in which sixty Italian bishops took part, with numerous presbyters and deacons. Cornelius, in his report to Bishop Fabius of Antioch, provided a register containing the names of the bishops and their sees which included the name and see of the bishops who were prevented from taking part in the Roman synod, but who had written to disapprove of Novatian's proceedings.[75] Unfortunately, this double list of bishops, which might have given information about the distribution of Christian churches in central and southern Italy, has not been preserved. If, however, as well as the sixty participants in the Roman synod and the bishops who were prevented from attending, the episcopal supporters of Novatian are also counted, the number of Christian communities in Italy about the year 250 must easily have amounted to a hundred. The signatures of those taking part in the Synods in Rome in 313 and Arles in 314 mention eight of these sees by name. About fifty other place-names can be inferred from reports of martyrdoms and archaeological finds as being probable locations of Christian communities even before Constantine's time.[76] The country population of central and southern Italy, of course, had not been effectively reached by the Christian mission at the beginning of the Peace of the Church. A surprisingly low level of christianization is also displayed by the provinces of upper and northern Italy; these obviously at that time were not envisaged in Rome's missionary interests. Particularly the Tyrrhenian side of Northern Italy seems to have remained completely devoid of Christian influence before the fourth century. One of the oldest churches in Aemilia must have been Ravenna, whose list of bishops goes back to the third century.[77] Close to it in age Rimini, Cesena, and probably Bologna, too, may have been pre-Constantinian churches.[78] The martyrdom of Antoninus indicates that there was a Christian community in Piacenza at that time.[79]

---

[69] Hippolytus, *Refut.* 9, 12; on this K. von Preysing in *ZKTh* 38 (1914), 422ff; *Duschesne LP,* I, 148.

[70] *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 11.

[71] Cf. F. Lanzoni, "I titoli presbiterali di Roma antica" in *RivAC* 2 (1925), 195–257; R. Vielliard, *Recherches sur les origines de la Rome chrétienne* (Maçon 1941) 27ff.; E. Josi in *ECatt* XII, 152–8.

[72] H. v. Schoenebeck, *Beiträge zur Religionspolitik des Maxentius und Constantin* (Leipzig 1939), 4–27.

[73] *Ep.* 55, 9.

In Venetia, Aquileia was an important early Christian centre which certainly had a bishop as its head in the second half of the third century.

---

[74] *Euseb. HE* 6, 43, 8.

[75] Ibid. 6, 43, 2, 10, 21.

[76] *Harnack Miss* 811–16.

[77] M. Mazzotti in *ECatt* X, 558–73, and bibliography.

[78] *Delehaye OC* 328 ff.

[79] Ibid. 329.

Its fourth bishop, Theodore, and his deacon, Agathon, took part in the Synod of Arles in 314 and he was also the builder of the first Christian basilica in his city.[80] From here, Christianity could easily penetrate to Verona and Brescia, both of which received their first bishops in the third century. The presence of Christians in Padua before Constantine's time may be considered probable.[81] Perhaps even older than that of Aquileia is the Christian community of Milan, capital of the province of Transpadana. Its bishop, Merocles, who took part in the two Synods of Rome, 313, and Arles, 314, appears sixth among the bishops of Milan, so the see must have dated from the first half of the third century. The local martyrs, Felix, Nabor, and Victor, were the glory of Christian Milan in the fourth century.[82] It is doubtful whether Christians can be presumed to have existed in nearby Bergamo before Constantine. The sources give no indication about Christians in the country districts of any of these provinces before this time and the country people, in fact, were only won over to Christian belief in the fourth and fifth centuries, by apostolic bishops of the towns.

The large islands of the Tyrrhenian Sea, Sardinia and Sicily, however, lay within the sphere of Rome's interest. There is reason to suppose that Christianity came to Sardinia through Roman Christians who had been condemned to forced labour in the mines there.[83] The first bishop of the island whose name is known, is Quintatius of Calaris (Cagliari) who, with his priest, Ammonius, took part in the Synod of Arles. In the interior of the island, paganism certainly persisted for a long time. During the Decian persecution, the Roman clergy were in correspondence with Christians of Sicily.[84] Syracuse on the east coast, with its rich traditions, is a Christian centre whose catacombs date back to the third century[85] and whose bishop, Chrestus, was invited by Constantine to the Synod of Arles.[86]

The third century represents for the Church of North Africa the decisive period of its pre-Constantinian growth, when Christianity was embraced by practically a majority in the towns. Tertullian's writings in many respects reflect the vitality and vigour with which evangelization was carried on at the beginning of the century. The report of the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicity gives a striking impression of the eager life of the church of Carthage, whose members belonged to every social class.[87] The persecution under Scapula, in 211, involved Christians of the provinces of Byzacena and Mauretania.[88] Particularly significant for the expansion of Christian communities throughout North Africa are the growing numbers of bishops who took part in the synods, which were particularly frequent there. Bishop Agrippinus (218–22) already had seventy bishops around him at a synod in Carthage, including some from Numidia,[89] and at a synod in Lambaesis about 240, their number had already risen to ninety.[90] Finally, the transactions of the synod of 256 not only record the attitude adopted to heretical baptism by the eighty-seven bishops who took part but also give the names of their sees.[91] According to this, Africa proconsularis had the greatest proportion of bishoprics; they were also numerous in Numidia though much rarer in Mauretania and Tripolitania. The correspondence and other writings of Cyprian are a mine of information regarding the size and variety of the community of Carthage, the capital, with its numerous and strongly organized clergy, and regarding the differing quality of the members of the church,[92] a terrifyingly large part of whom gave way in the Decian persecution, while others bravely bore noble testimony to their belief. At the summit of this great community Cyprian himself ruled as a conscientious pastor and also as the sovereign head of African Christendom. By his character and personality, he put in the shade every provincial governor in the North Africa of his time and publicly and eminently illustrated the validity of the faith he represented.

---

[80] *ECatt* I, 1722 and bibliography; J. Fink, *Der Ursprung der ältesten Bauten auf dem Domplatz von Aquileja* (Cologne 1954) and on this, L. Voelkl in *RQ* 50 (1955), 102–14.

[81] *Harnack Miss* 871.

[82] *Delehaye* OC 335–7.

[83] Hippolytus, *Refut.* 9, 12.

[84] Cyprian *Ep.* 30, 5.

[85] G. Agnello, "La Sicilia cristiana" in *Atti de I° congresso nazionale di archelogia cristiana* (Rome 1952); by the same author, *Actes du V^e congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Vatican City 1957), 291–301; further bibliography, ibid. 156–8.

[86] *Euseb. HE* 10, 5, 21.

The Christian religion was able, by the end of the period of persecution, to conquer for itself the majority of North African towns through its great prestige and through the impetus gained by its relatively rapid expansion.[93] Shortly before, the most distinguished representatives of pagan literature, the Africans Arnobius and Lactantius, had accepted the Christian faith. In the Diocletian persecution apostasy and fidelity seemed to have more or less balanced; it became clear that such a proportion of the population of the urban settlements had decided for Christianity that it was no longer to be defeated. The Donatist controversy gives the impression of there being two denominations of one Christian people, for whom paganism had come to be a long-past episode of history. Nevertheless, the African Church still had a great missionary task before it, that of winning, as well as the romanized population, the Punic element of the nation and then the Berber tribes in south and west on the fringes of the North African mountains, so intensively to Christianity, that in times of persecution and tribulation they could preserve it independently. It will have to be shown later that neglect of this double task was one of the reasons why Christianity could not survive the Islamic invasion to any notable extent.

---

[87] Text edited by C. I. M. Beek (Bonn 1938, *FlorPatr* 43).

[88] Tertullian, *Ad scap.* 3–4.

[89] Cyprian *Ep.* 71, 4.

[90] Ibid. 59, 10.

[91] *Sent. episc.* 87 and cf. the cartographical expression of the information in F. van der Meer - C. Mohrmann, *Bildatlas der frühchristlichen Welt* (Gütersloh 1959), Map 4, p. 10.

[92] Cf. D. D. Sullivan, *The Life of the North Africans as revealed in the Works of St Cyprian* (Diss. Washington 1933).

[93] *Euseb. HE* 10, 5, 16–18.

Information about the progress of Christian expansion in the Spanish provinces in the third century is not exactly abundant. There is an important letter of Cyprian's which indicates that in his time there were organized churches with bishops in various places in Spain, though he only names four of them, Leon, Astorga, Merida, and Saragossa.[94] Cyprian also knew that these Spanish bishops met in synods but no missionary is named as preaching the faith there and no church from which he was sent. A certain link of Spanish Christianity with Rome can, perhaps, be inferred from the fact that one of these bishops appealed to the Bishop of Rome against the verdict of a synod. The reports of Christian martyrdoms indicate the existence of Christian groups, apart from those in the towns already mentioned, in Tarragona, Cordova, Calahorra, Alcala, Sagunto, and Astigi.[95] Particularly informative for our purpose are the transactions of a synod which took place immediately before the beginning of the period of peace, in the town of Elvira (Granada) in the South of Spain;[96] we have already frequently quoted them. Twenty-three churches of the province of Baetica (Andalusia) were represented by their bishops or other clerics; the representatives of fourteen other churches came from the province of Tarragona, eight of them from the frontier region of Baetica and two from the province of Lusitania. From the home towns of those who took part in the synod, it seems clear that the south-east of Spain had been most affected by evangelization, which had been stronger there than towards the Atlantic coast, the west or the north-west of the country.[97] The tenor of the decisions of the Synod of Elvira provides a welcome measure of the effectiveness of previous missionary work in the Spanish provinces. This must be described as alarmingly slight, even if it is taken into account that the resolutions of such congresses generally do not stress the good features of religious life. Freedom from pagan customs and superstition was far from attainment, relations between Christian masters and their slaves showed little Christian spirit, attendance at church left much to be desired, all ranks of the clergy failed morally, and sexual transgressions were widespread. The impression given in this case is not that a new worldly trend had begun in previously excellent communities, but that there had been a serious lack of the intensive missionary endeavour necessary to inculcate into persons, who had, perhaps, been converted all too rapidly, a Christianity which permeated all sections of life. This is confirmed, in particular, by the fact that the attempt was made to remedy the faults that existed by stern, punitive measures.[98] The mission in Spain before Constantine's time, was not yet able to give the Church any bishop or writer of rank, and a broad field still lay open for missionary consolidation.

---

[94] Cyprian *Ep.* 67.

[95] *Delehaye OC* 362–71.

[96] Text in Lauchert, *op. cit.* 13–26 and in Jonkers, *op. cit.* 5–23. On the list of those taking part, cf. *Hefele–Leclercq*, I, 214 ff.

[97] See Map 4 in F. van der Meer - C. Mohrmann, *op. cit.* 10.

In Gaul, Christianity won most of its new adherents in the third century in the south-east, along the Rhone. As well as Lyons, other bishoprics existed as early as 200 but their names are not known. Arles is first mentioned in a reference by Cyprian,[99] and it soon became important. Its bishop, Marcion, took part in the Roman Synod of 313; and in 314 the town was appointed by Constantine himself as the place where the bishops' conference should meet to discuss the Donatist problem. At this, the Provincia Narbonensis was represented by five other bishops, whilst from Aquitania another three bishops were present, but from the province of Lyons, only two.[100] In short, christianization was progressively less westwards; missionary work only started there on a larger scale in the fourth century. In the province of Belgica, Trier (Trèves) became a bishopric in the second half of the century;[101] its third bishop, Agricius, was also at Arles in 314. The fact that there were Christians at the court of Constantius Chlorus in Trier,[102] is more an indication of the emperor's tolerance than of the size of the Christian community. The growth of the latter became more rapid only during Constantine's reign as sole emperor, when the previous place of worship had to be replaced by a bigger church. For the whole of the rest of the province of Belgica, there is no information about Christian missionary activity, so that before Constantine, there cannot have been any successful work here.

It is true that Irenaeus already speaks of churches even in the province of Germania;[103] if he was thinking of organized communities under bishops, only the Roman centres such as Cologne and Mainz could be meant. Only in Cologne, however, is an episcopal church definitely known to have existed before Constantine's time; its leader, Maternus, was invited to the Synods of Rome and Arles. Farther down the Rhine, excavations in Xanten, which was then Colonia Traiana, have revealed a martyr's shrine and consequently proved the existence of Christians before Constantine's time, at least in this settlement on the lower Rhine.[104] Christians can also be presumed, with some reason, to have existed in Germania inferior, in Tongern, for the town was the seat of a bishopric in the first half of the fourth century, under Bishop Servatius. In South Germany, Christians are found only in Augsburg, where the martyrdom of St Afra is recorded.[105]

---

[98] On this see J. Grotz, *Die Entwicklung des Bußstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1955), 414–27.

[99] *Ep.* 68, 1.

[100] Cf. Map 4 in F. van der Meer - C. Mohrmann, *op. cit.* 10.

[101] M. Schuler in *Trierer Zeitschrift* 6 (1931), 80–103.

[102] Euseb. *Vita Const.* 1, 16.

[103] *Adv. haer.* 1, 10, 2.

The first certain evidence of the presence of Christians in the British Isles is the account of the martyrdom of St Alban of Verulam,[106] but this cannot be supposed to have occurred during the Diocletian persecution because Constantius Chlorus did not permit the edict against the Christians to be put into effect in the territories he governed. The same applies to to the deaths for the faith of the martyrs Julius and Aron in Legionum urbs (Caerleon), farther west.[107] However, Britian was represented by the bishops of London, York, and, probably, Colchester at the Synod of Arles, so that, after all, communities of some size must have developed before the peace of Constantine began. But the real work of conversion, with marked success, only started here, too, in the following century.

The attempt has been made to estimate in figures the results of Christian missionary work at the beginning of the fourth century, and it has been thought that, out of a total population in the Roman Empire at that time of about 50 millions, there must be assumed to have been at least 7 million Christians, that is to say, nearly fifteen per cent.[108] As, however, the proportion of Christians was not uniform everywhere in the Empire, these figures have only a limited value. More important is the knowledge that christianization in many areas, such as Asia Minor, and the regions of Edessa and Armenia, had affected half the population, while in other provinces of the Empire, such as Egypt, along the Syrian coast, in Africa proconsularis, and in the capital Rome and its immediate surroundings, such a large minority held the new faith that the decisive missionary advance of the Christian religion had in fact been made successfully in various parts of the Empire. The fact was also important that in other areas, such as Phoenicia, Greece, the Balkan provinces, southern Gaul and southern Spain, as well as in northern Italy, so many missionary bases had been won, that further development would proceed there with comparable success. It was only in a few frontier districts in the East, on the north and west coasts of the Black Sea, in the Alps, in the Germanic provinces, along the Atlantic coast of Europe, and in the British Isles, that the Christian mission was still in its infancy. Anyone who surveyed this situation as a whole, at the beginning of the fourth century, and assessed it, could without great difficulty be certain that the advance of the movement of Christian belief was no longer to be stopped by the methods of a State persecution. The young Emperor Constantine drew the conclusion from such a realization.

---

[104] Cf. W. Neuss in *RQ* 42 (1934), 177–82 and W. Bader in *AHVNrh* 144–5 (1946–7), 5–31; W. Neuss, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Köln* I (Köln 1964), 31–108.

[105] *Delehaye* OC 259; *Bauerreiss,* 23 ff.; for the Regensburg martyrs see J. A. Fischer in *Jahrbuch für Altbayerische Kirchengeschichte* (1963), 28.

[106] *Bede HE* I, 17 ff, following older sources; cf. W. Levison, "St Alban and St Alban's" in *Antiquity* 15 (1941), 337–59.

[107] Gildas, *De exid. et conquestu Brit.* 10.

[108] *Harnack Miss* 946–55; L. Hertling in *ZKTh* 62 (1934), 243–53.

The question might be raised: what intensity and depth actually had Christian missionary work in the course of the third century? Two phases may be distinguished in it; the long period of peace in the first half on the century had, of course, brought the Church notable outward gains, but the direct effect of the wave of persecution under Decian showed that it was not consolidated by corresponding religious growth in depth. The enormously large number of apostasies in Egypt, Asia, North Africa, and Rome made it unmistakably clear that admission to the Church had been granted far too optimistically and readily, when a more rigorous catechumenate would have been justified. Some lessons were obviously drawn from this during the second period of peace after the collapse of the Decian persecution. The last persecution, under Diocletian, showed a far more favourable balance sheet; and so more attention was given to deepening the effects of missionary work.

When it is remembered that the missionary activity of the pre-Constantinian Church was chiefly concerned with people who belonged to a relatively high civilization, with rich forms of religion and a multifarious variety of cults, it must be admitted that the results as a whole were outstanding. Comparison with the relatively slight success of Christian missions with culturally advanced nations of modern times, such as Japan, or the upper classes in India, turns out entirely to the advantage of the early Christian Church. The missionary task imposed by the founder of the Christian religion had been taken up enthusiastically by its adherents and, despite tribulations, sometimes of the most grievous kind, it was prosecuted with ever renewed energy. In the third century, the thought of missionary obligation fully prevailed in the doctrine of ecclesiastical writers. Hippolytus expressly points out that the gospel in the first place must be preached to the whole world.[109] Origen expresses similar thoughts, and he was convinced that the unified Roman Empire was the providential condition for the rapid diffusion of the gospel.[110] He knew the figure of the regular missionary, wandering not only from town to town but from village to village and from place to place, to win new believers in the Lord, receiving hospitality from well-to-do Christian men and women but taking with him on his missionary journeys only as much as he actually needed to live.[111] Individual Christians often felt obliged to missionary work in their sphere of life, soldier and merchant, slave and Christian at court, women and confessors in prison. The Christian writer, too, was conscious of his missionary task.[112] All contributed their share, so that a numerically large and internally strongly consolidated early Christian Church could undergo the supreme test of the Diocletian persecution.

---

[109] *In Dan. comm.* 4, 17.

[110] *Contra Cels.* 8, 72; 2, 30.

[111] Ibid. 3, 9.

[112] Clement of Alex., *Stromata*, 1, 1.

SECTION TWO

The Last Attack of Paganism and the Final Victory of the Church

CHAPTER 28

The Intellectual Struggle against Christianity at the End of the Third Century

WHEN Emperor Gallienus (260–8), at the beginning of his reign, put an end to the persecution ordered by his father Valerian and adopted a series of measures favourable to the Christians, some of these, like Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria, indulged in extravagant hopes, that a new era was dawning for Christianity.[1] Gallienus' rescript was, in fact, followed by a period of peace lasting about forty years during which the Christians did not suffer any centrally organized persecution. They were able in relative freedom to pursue and consolidate the internal and external development of their society into the "great Church" of early Christian times. Eusebius paid tribute to the years before the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution as a time of the most extensive toleration of Christianity and of the public expressions of its life, and emphasized three freedoms particularly which the Christian religion was at that time permitted to enjoy: freedom of belief, which allowed the Christians of all social classes to profess their faith publicly; freedom of worship, which allowed unrestricted access to Christian church services and made it possible everywhere to build great churches; and freedom of preaching to all, unhampered by anyone. As well as this, there was the markedly benevolent attitude of the civil authorities, who treated the leaders of the Christian communities with particular respect.[2]

Seeing that such a phase of tolerance was followed by the Diocletian persecution, which brought the most violent wave of oppression Christianity had yet experienced, the question must be put whether many Christians did not overlook certain signs of the times and underestimate happenings which pointed to a development less favourable to Christianity and which make the turn of events under Diocletian intelligible.

In the first place, the situation of the Christians, even under the emperors since Gallienus, was in no way guaranteed by law. It was self-deception when some Christians thought that the tolerant attitude of individual emperors, and a consequently tolerant attitude of some high officials, had also brought about a definitive change in the mentality of the whole non-Christian population of the empire and already ensured final agreement with the pagan civil power. It was still possible for the hostile sentiment of an official to strike an individual Christian with extreme severity, for no law defended the Christian against such measures. The account of the martyrdom of the distinguished Marinus of Caesarea in Palestine, which Eusebius gives from his own certain knowledge, shows that even "when the Church was everywhere at peace" a Christian could still be brought before the court on mere denunciation and suffer execution, simply on account of his loyalty to his faith.[3] How quickly the change of mind of an emperor could lead to a completely altered situation can be seen, too, from the fact, guaranteed by Eusebius and Lactantius, that even Emperor Aurelian (270–5) allowed himself to be won over against the Christians "by certain advisers" and was preparing an edict of persecution, the application of which was prevented only by his sudden death.[4] This perpetual legal uncertainty shows that the period of toleration introduced by Gallienus was very far from a transformation of the situation as a whole such as was realized under Constantine.

---

[1] Cf. *Euseb. HE* 7, 23.

[2] Ibid. 8, 1, 1–6.

It was inevitable that particularly serious consequences would in the long run flow from a new wave of intellectual intolerance towards Christianity which emerged among the educated, from Aurelian's reign onwards, and which found its exponent in the neo-Platonist Porphyry. In Phoenicia, where he was born near Tyre, about 223, Porphyry had already come into contact with Christianity, though it cannot be proved that he once believed and later abandoned it, as early assertion would have it.[5] According to his own statement, he met Origen in his youth,[6] and was able to see for himself the rapid growth in adherents to the Christian religion in the period of peace after 260. He owed his first philosophical and theological formation to Longinus in Athens; in 263, when he was thirty, he came to Rome, where he became the pupil, friend, and intellectual heir of Plotinus whose discourses he published in the *Enneads*. Plotinus himself, of course, did not engage in direct controversy with Christianity but in the second *Ennead* there are, nevertheless, some references which would seem to exclude a favourable estimate of it. When he reproached there his opponents, "the Gnostics", with despising the created world and with maintaining that, for them, there was a new earth to which they would come after death, and when he pillories their custom of "calling the worst of men their brothers,"[7] it is impossible to avoid the impression that it was the Christians of whom he was speaking.

---

[3] Ibid. 7, 15, 1–5.

[4] Ibid. 7, 30, 20–21; Lactantius, *De port. pers.* 6.

[5] *Socrates HE*, 3, 23, 37; cf. also Augustine, *De civ. dei*, 10, 28.

[6] *Euseb. HE* 6, 19, 5.

With Porphyry, a negative attitude to Christianity is perceptible, even in his early writings. In his *Philosophy of the Oracles*, he has a Christian woman described, in a saying of Apollo, as unteachable and impossible to convert; she is said to grieve for a dead God who, however, was condemned to death by just judges; and the Jews are placed on a higher religious level than the Christians.[8] The fifteen books *Against the Christians*, on which Porphry worked from about the year 268, are indubitably the most important contribution to the ambitious attempt of neo-Platonism to renew Greek wisdom and religious sentiment, and to hold the educated classes especially to them, in face of the increasingly successful advance of Christianity. The task that he had in this way set himself demanded for its successful accomplishment far more than Celsus' project a hundred years before. Christianity had developed since that time literary productions that commanded the respect even of an educated pagan. A comprehensive discussion of the Bible was now particularly necessary, for through Origen's work, the Scriptures had achieved wide-ranging influence. To his plan for a comprehensive refutation of Christianity, Porphyry brought, as can be seen from the fragments which survive, genuine knowledge of the Christian Scriptures, a trained critical and philological mind, and a considerable gift of exposition. In quite a different way to the Ἀληθὴς λόγος of Celsus, Porphyry's work immediately called forth Christian defences against his design. Probably even in his lifetime the reply of Methodius of Olympus was published; Jerome mentions it with respect;[9] then Eusebius of Caesarea brought out a voluminous refutation in twenty-five books;[10] both, however, in the opinion of Jerome and Philostorgius, were excelled by the performance of Apollinaris of Laodicea in thirty books.[11] The same fate has overtaken attacker and defenders, for all these works have completely perished. Constantine ordered, even before the Council of Nicaea, the destruction of the "godless writings" of Porphyry, "the enemy of true piety", the first example of the proscription of a written work hostile to Christianity by the civil power; Emperor Theodosius II in 448 again ordered the burning of all Porphyry's writings.[12] Clearly, however, a pagan had made a selection from Porphyry at the beginning of the fourth century, summarizing his chief objections to Christianity. Macarios Magnes, perhaps Bishop of Magnesia, argued against this even as late as 400 in his *Apocriticus* and so preserved a relatively large number of excerpts from Porphyry.[13]

---

[7] *Enneads* II, 9, 5, 9, 14, 18.

[8] Augustine, *De civ. dei* 19, 23.

[9] *De vir ill.* 83; *Ep.* 48, 13; 70, 3.

[10] *Quasten P*, III, 333.

[11] Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 104; *Philostorgius HE* 8, 14.

[12] *Socrates HE* 1, 9, 30; *Cod. Theod.* 16, 6, 66.

Even though Porphyry did not subject the figure of Christ to such a harsh judgment as the evangelists, the apostles, and Christians in general, he nevertheless finds in it many features which in his estimation are incompatible with a truly religious and heroic personality. In the first place, Christ does not show himself to possess the divine power which he claims for himself; he refuses out of fear, to throw himself from the pinnacle of the Temple; he is not master of the demons; he fails lamentably before the high priests and Pilate; and his whole Passion is unworthy of a divine being. In comparison with him, the wonderworker Apollonius of Tyana of the first century, is a far more impressive figure.[14] After his resurrection, Christ should have appeared, not to simple unknown women, but to Pilate, to Herod, in fact to the Roman Senate; he should have given his ascension a much more grandiose setting; this would have spared his followers their harsh persecutions, for in face of such demonstrations of divine power, all doubt of his mission would have been silenced.[15] The evangelists are severely rejected for their presentation of Jesus' deeds and words, which they themselves invented and did not experience.[16] Their accounts are full of contradictions, inexactitudes, and absurdities and merit no belief.[17] Porphyry felt the profoundest antipathy for the leading figures of the early Church, Peter and Paul; Peter, he considered was in no way fitted to the high office to which he was called — Porphyry does not in the slightest contest this call —, and his choice was one of Christ's worst mistakes.[18] Paul seems to him a repulsive character; double-tongued, mendacious, perpetually contradicting himself and perpetually correcting himself, he preaches in his eschatology a doctrine of the end of the world, the Last Judgment, and the resurrection of the dead, which provoked the harshest contradiction of the neo-Platonist.[19] The opposition of Peter and Paul in the question of the obligation of the Mosaic Law for Jewish and pagan Christians did not escape Porphyry; but the behaviour of both showed them up he asserts, as pitiable figures.[20]

The central doctrines of the Christian faith and the essential features of Christian worship are also decisively rejected. Christ's doctrine demands irrational faith, too large a demand for thinkers and philosophically trained persons.[21] Christian monotheism really only thinly disguised polytheism, for the angels also appear as divine beings.[22] The doctrine of the Incarnation fills every Greek with abhorrence, and so does the Christian Eucharist, which Porphyry regards as a rite such as is not found even among the most savage tribes; for him the words of Christ at John 6:54, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man . . ." are bestial, and these words alone place St John's Gospel far below the work of the Synoptics.[23] Christian baptism, which is supposed by one washing to expunge all faults, even the worst, of adults, can only be considered an immoral institution inciting to new vices and wickedness.[24] Christian esteem for the poor and sick meets with absolute incomprehension and for the ideal of Christian virginity Porphyry has nothing but mockery.[25] The characteristic note and tone of Porphyry's controversy with Christianity, is bitter sarcasm; here is no open mind, striving for objective understanding of an alien religious movement; Porphyry is very definitely taking sides in a struggle between the civilization of antiquity and Christianity, which had entered its decisive phase. The aim of the Christians he describes as a "barbarous venture"[26] and he clearly approves punitive measures by the civil authorities when he says, "what penalties could be too severe to impose on men who abandon the laws of their country?"[27] And here, the fate of the empire is far from being as much in the forefront of Porphyry's mind, as all that the intellectual and religious tradition of Hellenism meant to him. He was irritated and embittered that Christianity had undertaken a threatening and surprisingly successful attack on it.

---

[13] For the proof of these literary links, cf. especially A. Harnack, *TU* 37/4 (Leipzig 1911). Quotations will here be given from the *Fragments* of Porphyry in Harnack's edition, *AAB* 1916, I.

[14] *Fragm.* 48, 49, 62, 63.

[15] *Fragm.* 64, 65.

[16] *Fragm.* 15.

[17] *Fragm.* 9–17.

[18] *Fragm.* 23–26.

[19] *Fragm.* 27–34.

[20] *Fragm.* 21, 22.

Among the Christians, Porphyry's work was certainly felt to be important, or it would not have provoked the rapid and effective reaction represented by the writings that have been mentioned above. By a central item of his attack, Porphyry even exercised very considerable indirect influence on a definite sector of early Christian literature. His assertion that the gospels are unworthy of belief on account of their numerous patent contradictions, led Christian writers to give this problem special attention and to suggest solutions in the literature of *Quaestiones et responsiones*, beginning with the *Quaestiones evangelicae* of Eusebius of Caesarea and leading, by way of the *De consensu evangelistarum* of Augustine, down to Hesychius of Jerusalem's collection of sixty-one such questions.[28] It is strange that Porphyry, whose hostility to Christianity was universally known,[29] was intensively studied by Latin theologians of later antiquity. Augustine especially could not conceal a certain sympathy for him, a consequence of the positive influence neo-Platonism had had on his own religious course; and he liked to think that Plato and Porphyry "would probably both have become Christians" if they had met and had been able to combine their views about the destiny of the soul.[30]

---

[21] *Fragm.* 54. [22] *Fragm.* 75, 76. [23] *Fragm.* 69. [24] *Fragm.* 88.

[25] *Fragm.* 87, 58, 33.

[26] *Fragm.* 39. [27] *Fragm.* 1.

[28] Cf. G. Bardy, "La littérature patristique des quaestiones et responsiones sur l'écriture sainte" in RB 41 (1932), 210–36, 341–69, 515–37; 42 (1933), 211–29; H. Dörries, *Erotapokriseis* in *RAC* 6 (1964), 347–70.

Porphyry's book against Christians had serious consequences in pagan upper-class circles. To many, a religion could not but appear unacceptable which so sinned against the Logos, against clarity and against truth as, according to his account, the doctrine and practice of the Christians did. Above all, his work made the opposition between neo-Platonism and Christianity unbridgeable. The claim of the latter to exclusive possession of truth, was felt to be a denial of all that the World Logos had until then made known to mankind.[31] If a strong civil power desired once again to take violent measures against the followers of the Christian faith, it would encounter considerable sympathy among the educated, and a favourable climate prepared by Porphyry.

The possibility of literary polemic against Christians being linked with the will to actual persecution by the State was realized in the person of Sossianus Hierocles who as a high civil servant (he was successively Praeses of the provinces of Arabia Libanensis and Bithynia, then Prefect of Egypt[32]) took up his pen and attacked Christianity in two works which he entitled Λόγοι φιλαληθεῖς, with obvious reference to the work of Celsus.[33] He played an essential part in preparing the Diocletian persecution;[34] although it cannot be determined whether or not the appearance of his two treatises preceded its outbreak. It is true that Hierocles ostensibly presented himself as a benevolent adviser, for, as Lactantius emphasizes,[35] he spoke "to the Christians", not against them. That this attitude was not honest, is clear not only from the shameless treatment to which he permitted Christian virgins to be subjected as Prefect of Egypt,[36] but also by the content of his polemical writings as reported by Lactantius. Hierocles took his material largely from Porphyry's work, that is evident from the most important arguments that he deploys against the Christian religion: the Holy Scriptures of the Christians are composed of lies and contradiction; the apostles generally and Peter and Paul in particular, were uneducated, ignorant men, who spread lies everywhere; Christ was the head of a robber band of nine hundred men and his alleged miracles were far surpassed by those of Apollonius of Tyana; finally, non-Christians, too, believed in a highest God, the creator and sustainer of the world.[37] Hierocles' only contribution here from his own resources is his description of Christ as the leader of a robber band and the great prominence given to Apollonius of Tyana, that wandering philosopher with the aureole of legend of the first century, whose life had been written by Philostratus at the request of the emperor's mother Julia Domna about the year 220.[38] Perhaps in this biography Philostratus himself was trying to present his age with a religious figure who could compare favourably with Christ.[39] That, in any case, was the sense in which the miraculous power of Apollonius was exploited by Porphyry, so that Eusebius of Caesarea in his reply to Hierocles made the comparison between Apollonius and Christ the central point of the refutation. Eusebius denied any originality or independence to Hierocles' work, because he thought he had based himself on Celsus.[40] Clearly, therefore, Eusebius had not yet in his possession a copy of Porphyry's work which was Hierocles' real source, and to which Eusebius himself later composed a reply.

---

[29] Firmicus Mat., *De err. prof. rel.* 13, 4 calls him "hostis dei, veritatis inimicus, sceleratarum artium magister"; Augustine, *De civ. dei* 9, 12: "Christianorum (*sermo* 242, 7: fidei christianae) acerrimus inimicus."

[30] *Serm.* 241, 6, 7.

[31] Cf. H. Dörries, "Porphyrios" in *RGG*, 3rd ed. V, 463 ff.

[32] On the difficulties of this career, cf. J. Moreau: *Sources Chr* 39 II, 292–4.

[33] Lactantius, *Div. inst.* 5, 3, 23.

[34] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 16, 4 calls him "auctor et consiliarius ad faciendam persecutionem."

[35] *Div. inst.* 5, 2, 12.

[36] Eusebius, *De mart. Palaes.* 5, 3.

Lactantius knew of another philosopher, teaching in his time in Bithynia, who at the beginning of the Diocletian persecution, published a work called *Three Books against the Christian Religion and Name,* but it is no longer possible to establish who he was. According to Lactantius' brief indication of its contents, the opportunist author, in an unctuous style, wanted to lead back to the cult of the gods those who had strayed, and prevent them from being exploited, in their simplicity, by unscrupulous men. Consequently, he praised the emperors who had taken the necessary measures to suppress a godless superstition, only worthy of old women; he had no knowledge of the nature of the Christian religion.[41] Though Lactantius seems to attribute no great importance to the work of this unknown philosopher, and does not appear to regard him as any special danger to Christianity, nevertheless he was a link in the chain of general animosity against Christianity, especially among the educated, which characterized the atmosphere of the pagan side on the eve of the persecution.

As a last source of anti-Christian polemic and propaganda, the pagan priesthood must be mentioned; it observed with understandable disquiet the powerful rise of the Christian movement, and inevitably felt itself threatened in its prestige and privileges. Its influence on the renewed friction is clear in the report of Lactantius, which is confirmed by Eusebius, that Diocletian, who still shrank from violent persecution, sent an augur to question the oracle of Apollo of Miletus; only the utterance of this oracle, which was unfavourable to the Christian religion brought about, he alleges, the decision.[42] The guiding hand of the pagan priesthood is also easy to perceive in an event that perhaps occurred even earlier. Once when Diocletian wanted to proceed with the taking of the auguries, the priests explained to him that they remained without effect because the presence of "profane men" nullified them. That was a reference to the Christians at court, and Lactantius affirms that Diocletian thereupon prescribed a sacrifice to the gods for all at court and in the army; those who refused were to be flogged, or expelled from the army, as the case might be.[43] It can be inferred that this method of the priesthood was not limited to isolated cases but was employed on a wide scale, from the reference in Arnobius the Elder with which he opens his work *Ad Nationes:* the atrocities already attributed earlier to the Christians would be revived and would be exploited by augurs, soothsayers, oracle-mongers and people of that kind, who saw their clientèle evaporating.[44]

---

[37] Lactantius, *Div. inst.* 5, 2, 13–15, 3–23.

[38] Cf. G. Gross, "Apollonius von Tyana" in *RAC* I, 529–33 with bibliography.

[39] Cf. P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* (Paris 1934), 311 ff.

[40] *In Hieroclem* 1.

[41] *Div. inst.* 5, 2.

The features described indicate that, about 270, a wave of anti-Christian polemic and propaganda set in which tried in the first place to win over the educated classes, but later also influenced wider circles. This must be counted as an essential factor in any understanding of why, at the beginning of the fourth century, there could still have been such a violent, yet for paganism fundamentally hopeless, trial of strength between the power of the Roman State and the Christian religion.

CHAPTER 29

Outbreak and Course of the Diocletian Persecution down to Galerius' Edict of Toleration, 311

THE growing hostility to Christianity that has just been described cannot itself explain Diocletian's relatively sudden transition from liberally exercised toleration to the harshest of persecutions. The emperor practised toleration for years, quite deliberately, for he could not have been unaware of the Christian religion's growing successes and its ceaselessly increasing power of attraction. From the imperial palace in Nicomedia he could see an obviously representative Christian place of worship.[1] The Christian faith of high civil servants who every day were at their work around him, could no more be unknown to him than that of numerous court officials[2] or the reported, and very likely, inclination of his wife Prisca and his daughter Valeria towards the Christian religion.[3] That tolerance of the emperor led historians of his own and of modern times largely to absolve him from responsibility for the outbreak of the persecution. Lactantius sees in the *Caesar* Galerius the driving force which practically wrung from the vacillating Diocletian the order to proceed against the Christians.[4] In this he certainly contradicts himself, for in another passage as we have seen, he names Hierocles as the "originator and adviser" in preparing the persecution.[5] In fact, a number of causes and influences were operative which profoundly influenced Diocletian's decision to use measures of State compulsion, but he made the decision with full freedom and personal responsibility. The central motive for his action can most probably be found in a conviction that Christianity stood in the way of the work of reconstruction which he had so successfully undertaken in the most various spheres of life of the Roman Empire. After securing the frontiers, strengthening the civil government and eliminating financial difficulties at home, he now turned to the burning religious problem, the solution of which he envisaged solely in terms of a restoration of the old Roman religion. He referred to this as early as 295, in his edict concerning marriage; and two years later, in his decree against the Manichees, he described them as worthless men "who set up new and scandalous sects against the older religions".[6] His collaborators and advisers, such as Galerius and Hierocles, propounded to him a solution which they thought correct, and perhaps confirmed him in the line in which he, too, saw the solution. The renewed mood of hostility to Christianity in the educated upper classes and to some degree in the common people, too, seemed to him to recommend this course. But he undertook it on his own responsibility.

---

[42] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 11, 7–8; Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 2, 50, 51.

[43] *De mort. pers.* 10. [44] Arnobius, *Adv. nat.* 1, 24.

---

[1] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 12, 2.

[2] Adauctus and Dorotheus, the first a high official in the finances, the other in the administration of crown-lands: *Euseb. HE* 8, 2; 7, 22, 3; Christians employed at court: Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 10, 4.

[3] *De mort. pers.* 15, 1.

[4] Ibid. 11; Eusebius varies in his judgment on the question of responsibility, cf. R. Laqueur, *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit* (Berlin 1929), 77–80.

[5] *De mort. pers.* 16, 4; *Div. inst.* 5, 2, 12: "qui auctor in primis faciendae persecutionis fuit".

[6] *Coll. mos. rom. leg.* 6, 4, 1; 15, 3 and on this cf. J. Vogt, *Constantin der Große und sein Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1960), 123.

It is understandable that Diocletian began the fight against Christianity by a purge of the army, for the reliability of the army was the highest principle of Roman State power. But it was also suggested by some very recent disturbing events. In 295 in Numidia the Christian Maximilian had vehemently refused to be recruited, and in Mauretania three years later the Christian centurion Marcellus refused to continue in military service when on the anniversary of the assumption of the titles of *Jovius* and *Herculius* by the two emperors, he would not break the vow which bound him to Christ.[7] Further incidents were caused by two veterans, Tipasius and Julius, in 298 and 302 when, on the occasion of a special gift, they refused the coins on which the emperors were represented as sons of the gods. Fabius, an official in the civil administration and *vexillifer* of the governor of Mauretania, refused to carry "pictures of dead men", that is to say, the standard with the device of the divinized emperors.[8] In all these cases the conflict had a religious foundation; the Christians in question were not opposed to military service as such; they were refusing to take part in an act of pagan worship, which is what the various forms of honour paid to the emperors signified for them, after the rulers had proclaimed themselves sons of Jupiter and Hercules. A decree issued by Diocletian as early as 300 aimed at removing such unreliable elements from the army; it laid down that all soldiers had to sacrifice to the gods or leave the army.[9] The failure of the augury already mentioned, and the oracle given when the Milesian Apollo was consulted, then led him, after a consultation with the Senate, to publish the general edict of February 303. This ordered in the name of the four emperors, the destruction of all Christian places of worship, the surrender and burning of all their sacred books, and it forbade all their assemblies for divine worship. Extremely serious, too, was the degradation of the Christians which was laid down by the edict; if they were in the imperial administration, they were enslaved; notabilities among them lost the privileges of their rank, and their offices, and all Christians in the empire were declared incapable of performing legally valid acts.[10] In Nicomedia a beginning was made by demolishing the church opposite the palace; a Christian who, in spontaneous indignation, tore down the edict that had been nailed up, was immediately executed.[11] Two outbreaks of fire in the imperial palace whose authors could not be discovered, even by the harshest interrogation, made the situation worse; the Christians in the court administration were subjected to severe tortures, then burnt or drowned; in particular, distinguished Christians were compelled to offer sacrifice, among them Diocletian's own wife and daughter.[12] And now the real impact of the persecution was aimed against the clergy; in the town where Diocletian resided, Bishop Anthimus was executed, and elsewhere, too, many clerics suffered imprisonment or death,[13] presumably because they did not comply with a provision of the edict requiring them to hand over the sacred books. That was certainly the reason for the decapitation of Bishop Felix of Thibica in North Africa,[14] and for the execution of a number of laity from Numidia.[15] It is true that there were those among the clergy who failed in this, too, especially in North Africa and Rome, and they later were stigmatized as *traditores.*[16] The sources do not provide a survey of the outcome of the first edict in all parts of the empire. Being a decree of the supreme emperor, the edict was of course addressed to the three other members of the tetrarchy and they were expected to put it into effect. This did happen in all parts of the empire, but with differences of intensity. In the west, Emperor Maximian showed himself particularly compliant, whilst his *Caesar* Constantius carried out the decree very negligently in Gaul and Britain, for though he destroyed buildings he did not imprison or put to death.[17]

---

[7] The *Acta* of both are in Knopf–Krüger, *Ausgewählte Martyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929) 86–9.

[8] Cf. W. Seston, *Mélanges Goguel* (Paris 1950) 242ff.

[9] *Euseb. HE* 8, 4, 2–3.

[10] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 13; *Euseb. HE* 8, 2, 4; *De mart. Palaest. proem.* 1.

[11] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 12 and 13; *Euseb. HE* 8, 5.

Diocletian was soon driven further on the course he had begun. In Syria and in the Melitene region disturbances broke out which were attributed to the persecution.[18] These occasioned a second edict which robbed the Christian communities of their pastors, and so struck the ecclesiastical organization at a vital spot; the prisons everywhere filled with "bishops, priests, deacons, lectors, and exorcists", so that no room was left for common criminals.[19] A third edict contained more detailed instructions for proceedings against the clergy; anyone who carried out the pagan sacrifices went free; anyone who refused was tortured and put to death.[20] The fourth and last edict, early in 304, completed the imperial legal measures against Christians by imposing sacrifice to the gods on all of them without exception.[21] In the previous autumn, Diocletian had celebrated in Rome the twentieth anniversary of his rule, the *vicennalia,* and had given great prominence in this to faith in the Roman religion which had been revived by him. The Romans in fact were less interested in the display of serious piety, than in the games and gifts that the *vicennalia* celebrations brought with them. On his return journey from Rome to Nicomedia the emperor, who was disappointed with the inhabitants of the ancient imperial capital, contracted a serious illness which weighed heavily on his mind and gave rise to profound anxiety in the imperial palace.[22] Whether the fourth edict was the result of his depression, or of the disappointing outcome of previous measures, can scarcely be determined. Recourse was now had to the method of Emperor Decius, and the persecution was extended to a part of the population that numbered six to seven millions, bringing down unspeakable suffering on them by the most brutal methods of oppression; at the same time admitting by that very fact that success could now only be looked for from such desperate expedients. The intensity of the persecution did not alter when on the common abdication of the two *Augusti,* Diocletian and Maximian, there began on the first of May 305, the second tetrarchy which placed Constantius Chlorus in the West and Galerius in the eastern part of the empire in the highest rank and conferred the title of *Caesar* on Severus and Maximinus Daia, thus passing over young Constantine, son of Constantius, contrary to what the army had anticipated. Since Constantius as *Augustus* held firm to his previous tolerance, and as his *Caesar,* Severus, adopted this attitude too, it was only during the two-year rule of Maximian and in the territory under his jurisdiction that the edicts of persecution were systematically carried out. The later changes in the head of the government in the West did not cut short the toleration practised there; both Constantine, who succeeded his father in 306, as well as Maxentius who, in the same year, ousted Severus from power, were averse to any persecution of the Christians though from different motives. The eastern part of the Empire, in contrast, was forced to bear the full burden from the first edict of the year 303 until Galerius' decree of toleration in 311; an exception was Pannonia where, after 308, Licinius ruled as *Augustus,* and out of tactical considerations, desisted from molesting his Christian subjects.

---

[12] *De mort. pers.* 14 and 15, 1; *Euseb. HE* 8, 6, 6 and on this P. Collinet in *RHE* 45 (1950), 136–40.

[13] *Euseb. HE* 8, 6, 6; Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 15, 2–4.

[14] Account of the martyrdom in Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 90ff.

[15] Augustine, *Breviculus collat.* 3, 25–7.

[16] See below, chapter 30, p. 418.

[17] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 15, 6–7; *Euseb. HE* 8, 13, 13 absolves Constantine's father even from this measure.

[18] *Euseb. HE* 8, 6, 8.

[19] Ibid. 8, 6, 9.

[20] Ibid. 8, 6, 10.

[21] Euseb. *De mart. Palaest.* 3, 1.

The two chief witnesses on the Diocletian persecution, Eusebius and Lactantius, are unfortunately completely silent about the course and scope of Maximian's proceedings in the West. Consequently, definite details about the names of martyrs and their home provinces are often difficult to ascertain with certainty, though here and there the history of the cult of the martyrs provides some evidence for the existence of individual martyrs in this period. Even if the large number of alleged Roman martyrs mentioned in some not very trustworthy accounts, without indication of the time of their martyrdom, cannot be ascribed *in globo* to the Diocletian persecution, some of them certainly fell victims to it; the history of their cult shows them to have been historical persons. So there is a certain probability that St Agnes, who has been very much transfigured by legend, was martyred at this time[23] and so were Sebastian, Felix and Adauctus, Peter and Marcellinus;[24] perhaps the most important epigram of Pope Damasus refers to the latter.[25] When Eusebius says of Pope Marcellinus (296–304), "persecution carried him off", this phrase certainly strongly suggests death by persecution,[26] yet the lack of his name in the oldest list of martyrs and bishops raises difficulties. There is a fragmentary but authentic account of the interrogation and execution of the Sicilian martyr Euplius of Catania.[27] The report of Bishop Eucherius of Lyons († about 450) regarding the martyrdom of an entirely Christian legion under its commander Mauritius in Agaunum (Switzerland) about 286, is legendary; in the first place, no persecution of Christians can be shown to have taken place in the early part of the reign of Maximian and Diocletian; secondly, there scarcely existed at that time in Roman army a self-contained Christian legion like the Theban; and, finally, all other sources are completely silent about such a spectacular occurrence.[28] The number of victims was not small in the North African provinces, and Spain, too, had a series of martyrs[29] among whom greatest honour fell to deacon Vincentius of Saragossa; for some names, however, an absolutely certain ascription to the years 303 to 305 is not possible.[30]

---

[22] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 17.

In the Balkans, and in the eastern provinces, the persecution raged for eight years, though with occasional local interruptions. There, Galerius and after 305 his *Caesar,* Maximinus Daia, supplied the impetus; they were also responsible for the cruel ingenuity of the methods of persecution. For Palestine and Phoenicia, some of Eusebius' reports are eye-witness accounts and he also collected reliable information about the martyrdoms in Egypt. There are credible accounts of some of the Illyrian martyrs, for instance Bishop Irenaeus of Sirmium and the three women of Salonica, Agape, Chione, and Irene.[31] In the Asia Minor provinces of Cappadocia and Pontus, the persecuted Christians were faced with particularly inventive torturers who ironically described putting out the right eye or maiming the left leg with red-hot iron as humane treatment and who tried to outdo one another in discovering new brutalities.[32] When it was found that all the inhabitants of a little town in Phrygia were Christians, they burnt it down with everybody in it.[33] Eusebius includes the report of the martyr-bishop Phileas of Thmuis about the exquisite tortures inflicted in Egypt which exploited all the technical possibilities of those days;[34] the doubts that arise when reading this letter, as to whether such inhumanities were even possible, can unfortunately be removed by recalling similar events in the very recent past.

---

[23] *ActaSS Ian.* II 350ff.; E. Schäfer, "Agnes" in *RAC* I, 184.

[24] J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1956), 120ff.

[25] In Ihm, *Damasi epigr.* 29; *Delehaye OC* 280ff.

[26] *Euseb. HE* 7, 32, 1; cf. J. Zeiller in *Fliche–Martin,* 466 n. 6.

[27] Critical text in P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Note agiografiche* VII (Rome 1928), 1–46; on this F. Corsaro, "Studi sui documenti agiografici intorno al martirio di S. Euplo" in *Orpheus* 4 (London 1957), 33–62; published separately (Catania 1957).

[28] Cf. D. van Berchem, *Le martyre de la légion thébaine* (Basle 1956); G. Curti, "La passio Acaunensium martyrum di Eucherio di Leone" in *Convivium Dominicum* (Catania 1959), 297–327; L. Dupraz, *Les passions de s. Maurice d'Agaune* (Fribourg 1961); H. Büttner, "Zur Diskussion über das Martyrium der Thebäischen Legion" in *ZSKG* 55 (1961), 265–74. It is not impossible that the cult of a Maurice (of Apamea perhaps) was transferred from the East by Bishop Theodore of Agaunum.

[29] J. Zeiller in *Fliche–Martin* II, 467 lists the best-known names. On Vincent cf. M. Simonetti, "Una redazione poco conosciuta della passione di s. Vincenzo" in *RivAC* 32 (1956), 219–41.

[30] Most of them are attested for the first time in Hymns 3–5 of Prudentius, *Peristephanon.*

Eusebius gives us no actual information about the number of victims, except in Palestine. From his special account of this area, it seems that the number was less than a hundred. Elsewhere, however, the figure was considerably higher, certainly in Egypt, for example, where Eusebius, who clearly was closely acquainted with events there, states that ten, twenty, or sometimes even sixty or a hundred Christians were executed on a single day.[35] Applied to the eastern provinces, with their relative density of Christian population, this reckoning gives a total of several thousand dead. In addition there were the numerous confessors of the faith who were tortured at this time and dispatched to forced work in the mines.[36] Eusebius mentions by name only the most distinguished victims, especially among the clergy; for example, he notes in addition to those already listed: the priest Lucian of Antioch, the founder of the school of theology there; the bishops of Tyre, Sidon, and Emesa in Phoenicia; among the prominent Palestinian martyrs are Bishop Sylvanus of Gaza and the priest Pamphilus, "the great ornament of the church of Caesarea"; at the head of the Egyptian martyrs he placed Bishop Peter of Alexandria, besides whom he also mentions by name six other bishops and three priests of the Alexandrian community.[37] It is striking that Eusebius is silent about those who failed in the persecution; both among clergy and laity there were those who did, as is shown by the re-emergence in Egypt of the problem of how to treat the *lapsi.*

---

[31] Texts in Knopf-Krüger, *op. cit.* 103–5, 95–100; on the latter cf. *Delehaye PM* 141–3.

[32] *Euseb. HE* 8, 12, 8–10.

[33] Ibid. 8, 11, 1.

[34] Ibid. 8, 10, 4–10; on the martyrdom of Phileas, see F. Halkin in *RHE* 38 (1963), 136–9; *AnBoll* 81 (1963), 5–27.

[35] Ibid. 8, 9, 3.

[36] Ibid. 8, 12, 10.

[37] Ibid. 8, 13, 1–7.

Although the manner of proceeding against the Christians, particularly as Maximinus Daia practised it, was strongly disapproved of by many pagans[38], it was only in 308 that there was a momentary lull[39] which may have been connected with Maximinus Daia's annoyance at Licinius' elevation to the position of *Augustus.* Some of the Christians condemned to forced labour in the mines were set free, or they were granted some relief. Among the Christians, people were already beginning to breathe again when Maximinus Daia introduced a new wave of oppression with a decree ordering the rebuilding of the ruined pagan temples and announced new detailed ordinances for the conduct of sacrifices to the gods.[40] The real turning-point came with the serious illness of the *Augustus* Galerius, which seemed to the Christians only intelligible as an intervention of divine providence. A beginning had already been made with plans for his *vicennalia* when the emperor fell ill in 310 and in the vicissitudes of his dangerously worsening condition he took to reflecting on the scope of the whole action against the Christians. The outcome was the edict of the year 311 ordering the cessation of the persecution throughout the empire. The text of the decree, which is reproduced by Lactantius and, in a Greek translation, by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History,*[41] still reveals the emotion that Galerius must have experienced when he realized that his policy of violence against the Christians, determined upon by him from the start and energetically put into effect, had been an error and a failure. The edict bears the names of the four rulers, but the tone is that of Galerius, in whose mind a new understanding was only with difficulty taking shape. It begins with the affirmation that the emperors had in their earlier measures only the good of the State in view and had been striving for a restoration of the old laws and Roman manner of life and had wanted to win the Christians, too, back to these. For the Christians had fallen away from the religion of their ancestors and in revolutionary upheaval had made their own laws for themselves. However, the edicts of persecution had not been able to bend the majority of Christians, many of them had had to lose their life and others had become confused. The outcome was religious anarchy in which neither the old gods received appropriate worship nor the God of the Christians himself received honour. In order to put an end to this state of affairs, the emperors grant pardon and permit "Christians to exist again and to hold their religious assemblies once more, providing that they do nothing disturbing to public order".[42] Another document addressed to governors is promised, which will provide more detailed instructions for the accomplishment of the edict. The Christians are charged to pray to their God for the welfare of the emperor, the State and themselves.

---

[38] According to Eusebius, *De part. Palaest.* 9, 3, many called it oppressive and excessive, disgusting and stupid.

[39] Eusebius, *De mart. Palaest.* 9, 1.

[40] Ibid. 9, 2.

[41] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 34; *Euseb. HE* 8, 17, 3–10.

Galerius' edict was a document of the greatest importance; by it the highest representative of the power of the Roman State rescinded a religious policy which had been in force for more than two hundred years. From now on, the Christians were relieved of the oppressive legal uncertainty of the past; for the first time an imperial edict expressly recognized them; their belief was no longer *superstitio* and *religio illicita,* but by an imperial juridical pronouncement of toleration, put on the same footing as other cults. That was more, and must have meant more, to the Christians than all their freedom, however welcome, in the so-called periods of peace which were devoid of any legal basis.

The two rulers in the West had no difficulties in proclaiming the edict in their dominions; it only gave legal foundation to a state of affairs that had already existed for some time. In the East, Maximinus did not in fact have the text of the edict published, but he gave his prefect of the guard, Sabinus, instructions to announce to subordinate authorities that no Christian was any longer to be molested or punished for the practice of his religion.[43] They drew the immediate conclusion from this, at once liberated all Christians who were in custody and recalled those who had been condemned *ad metalla.* A monstrous psychological weight was lifted from the Christians of the eastern provinces and this intensified religious activity; the places of worship that still existed filled again, people flocked to divine worship; in the streets cheerful groups of exiles were seen returning home. Even those who had given way in the persecution, sought reconciliation with the Church and asked their brethren who had stood firm, for the help of their prayers and for readmission into their company. Even the pagans shared the Christians' joy and congratulated them on the unexpected turn of events.[44] This toleration, legally guaranteed, rightly appeared to open to the Christians the gate to a brighter future.

---

[42] *De mort. pers.* 34, 4: "ut denuo sint christiani et conventicula sua componant ita ut ne quid contra disciplinam agant."

[43] Sabinus' circular letter in *Euseb. HE* 9, 3–6.

[44] Ibid. 9, 1, 7–11.

CHAPTER 30

The Definitive Turning-Point under Constantine the Great

Reverse under Maximinus Daia

IN Galerius' mind the edict of toleration in 311 was intended to introduce a new state of affairs in religious matters. In his experience the God of the Christians had proved to be a real power which was to be recognized, together with its followers, and incorporated among the numerous religious beliefs of the empire so that the religious peace so attained might prove a blessing to the State and the tetrarchy ruling it. In this way the edict corresponds to the views of a pious polytheist and adherent of the Diocletian conception of the State such as Galerius was, and does not need to be made intelligible by other influences brought to bear on him. The view that the *Caesar* Licinius was the first to advocate the idea of toleration and was the intellectual originator of the change in the East because he wanted to ensure by it the favour of the Christians for his plans of conquest in the Orient,[1] finds no support in the sources. Others have wanted to discover in Constantine the driving force which made Galerius, in his sickness, change his religious policy.[2] But such an early and striking proof of sentiments favourable to Christianity in Constantine would certainly have found an echo in Eusebius and Lactantius; yet they are completely silent about it.

Galerius died a few days after the publication of the edict and Licinius guaranteed that toleration would be observed in his dominions, but the joy of the Christians over the freedom they had acquired was short-lived in the eastern provinces and in Egypt. Maximinus Daia who had scarcely concealed his inner resistance to the policy of toleration, even in the way he announced this, returned after a few months step by step to his earlier methods of oppressing the Christians. He began by forbidding the Christians to assemble in their cemeteries[3] and tried to expel them from the larger towns. Recourse was had to other crude means, such as inspired petitions by pagans to the emperor requesting him to forbid Christians to stay in their towns. A leading role was played in this by the treasurer of the city of Antioch, Theotecnus, who also spread alleged oracles calling for the banishment of Christians from the Syrian capital and its surroundings.[4] This device set a precedent, and petitions to the emperor from all kinds of towns multiplied. Maximinus answered such addresses with rescripts of his own which were published throughout the province and most graciously conceded the requests.[5] The towns felt most highly honoured by the imperial answers and had the petitions and rescripts recorded on tablets or pillars as a lasting memorial.[6] One of the plaques with its inscription has been found in the little town of Arycanda in Lycia and bears an incomplete Latin text of the imperial rescript and the petition, in Greek, "of the people of the Lycians and the Pamphilians".[7] The imperial propaganda against the Christians did not shrink from even meaner methods. In Damascus an imperial official forced women of bad repute, by threats of torture, to declare that formerly, as Christians, they had taken part in the debaucheries in which the Christians indulged in their places of worship. The text of this declaration was conveyed to the emperor and on his orders published in town and country.[8] Another method of denigration consisted in fabricating documents attributed to Pilate which were "full of blasphemies of every kind against Christ"; they, too, at the wish of the ruler, were posted up in public and the teachers in schools had to use them instead of textbooks and make the children learn them by heart.[9] With this harsh anti-Christian propaganda Maximinus combined energetic reorganization of the pagan cults; all the towns received priests and high-priests chosen from officials particularly attached to the State.[10] All these measures of the emperor quickly recreated an atmosphere in which the officials thought themselves justified in taking active steps against the Christians. The punishment of banishment from the towns was once more imposed, even if it was not fully implemented; leading Christians were once more arrested, imprisoned and condemned to death; death by wild beasts and by beheading were once again used as methods of execution. Eusebius assigns to this phase of the persecution the martyrdom of bishops Sylvanus of Emesa and Petrus of Alexandria mentioned above, as well as the priest Lucian of Antioch.[11] The situation which had become very serious again for the Christians was relieved, however, in a surprising way by a communication from the emperor at the end of 312, to his prefect Sabinus, of which Eusebius provides a translation.[12] The same aim, it is true, is maintained in principle, that "of recalling the population of our provinces ... to the service of the gods"; the earlier measures of Diocletian and Maximian are represented as just. Maximinus stresses that he had already given instructions earlier not to use violence in this matter and asserts that nobody had been banished or mishandled in the eastern territories since then. This is contradicted by the fact that, in the same document, he had to insist that the Christians might not be subjected to contumely and ill-treatment but were rather to be brought back to recognize the worship of the gods by kindness and instruction. Maximinus tries to justify his rescripts in answer to the petitions of the towns by saying that such requests deserved a gracious answer and that this was pleasing to the gods as well. The letter ends with the instruction to the prefect to bring the imperial order to the attention of all provinces. It is understandable that after so much bitter experience, the Christians mistrusted even this limited toleration; consequently they did not yet hold the assemblies they had formerly been accustomed to and certainly did not dare to build new churches or otherwise draw attention to themselves.[13] They could not at first comprehend the reasons behind Maximinus' new line of policy. It was determined by far-reaching events in the western parts of the Empire which had made Constantine master of Italy and Africa after his victory over Maxentius in October 312. The victor had immediately intervened with Maximinus in favour of the Christians[14] and the new political situation made it advisable for him to veer into a more tolerant course. The young *Augustus* of the West thus became active in religious policy in a way that extended far beyond his own dominions. We have now to consider his attitude to Christianity.

---

[1] So H. Grégoire in *Revue univ. Brux.* 36 (1930–1), 259–61.

[2] For example, H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche* 3, 57, referring to E. Schwarz, *Kaiser Konstantin und die christliche Kirche* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1936), 58.

[3] *Euseb. HE* 9, 2.

[4] Ibid. 9, 2–3.

---

[5] Ibid. 9, 4; 9, 7, 3–14, copy of the rescript to the city of Tyre.

[6] Ibid. 9, 7, 1–2.

[7] Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae* n. 569; *CIL,* III, n. 12132 and 13625b.

[8] *Euseb. HE* 9, 5, 2.

[9] Ibid. 9, 5, 1.

[10] Ibid. 9, 4, 2.

[11] Ibid. 9, 4, 3; 9, 6, 1–4.

[12] Ibid. 9, 9a, 1–9.

Constantine's "Conversion" to Christianity

The question of Constantine's turning to Christianity, the fact, its course and its date, was and is hotly disputed among historians and this is partly due to the nature of the sources capable of providing an answer. Constantine's own historiographer, Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea, a friend of the emperor from 325 onwards, was profoundly convinced of his hero's providential mission and he views all the events of his life, which changed the complexion of the age, in the light of this. His *Ecclesiastical History* reflects in its successive editions not only how his knowledge in particular matters increased but also how many of his views changed in the direction of a heightened glorification of the emperor. Certainly the *Life* of the emperor attributed to Eusebius is dominated by this tendency; the consequent suspicion has given rise to a series of conjectures, ranging from the hypothesis of several revisions by the author and even to the suggestion that it is a pseudonymous work, written only about 430.[15] The reaction against this judgment on the *Vita Constantini* led to a firm defence of its authenticity[16] which recently received considerable support from a papyrus discovery; this document from about the year 324 contains a fragment of an edict of Constantine to the peoples of the East, quoted in the *Vita* and which had been regarded by one of the harshest critics of the latter as a plain forgery.[17]

---

[13] Ibid. 9, 9a, 11.

[14] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 37, 1; and on this, A. Piganiol in *Historia* 1 (1950), 86–90.

The second contemporary author, Lactantius, likewise sided with Constantine and his appointment as tutor to the emperor's eldest son, Crispus, shows the degree of trust that he enjoyed with the emperor. But for that reason he, too, is suspected of regarding Constantine in all too glowing and therefore distorting a light. Of pagan criticism of the emperor only a little has been preserved through his nephew Julian and the historian Zosimus. On the other hand the discourses of panegyrists are particularly valuable for the light they throw on the religious change in the emperor during his transitional phase. The possibility of closer understanding of the world of his religion is also provided by the numerous letters and ordinances of the emperor which have been studied more recently to considerable profit. The religious symbolism of the coinage, too, provides an insight into the changing views of the emperor. Two characteristics stand out even in early tradition regarding Constantine; the passionate partisanship he aroused for and against himself, and a tendency to the formation of legends.[18] They show that the life achievements of this ruler influenced the lot of his contemporaries and posterity as deeply as only those of the great figures of history can do.

There is little in the sources about the childhood and youth of Constantine or of his religious development at that period. Constantius and Helena, his parents, were certainly pagans at the time of his birth in 285. His attachment to his mother was deep and lasting. The former innkeeper[19] was not Constantius' legal wife, for higher officers were not allowed to marry native women of the province. A few years after Constantine's birth, his father left her in order to contract a socially appropriate marriage with Theodora, the step-daughter of Maximian. The son presumably remained at first with his mother Helena and probably received his first religious impressions from her as a consequence. She was gifted above the average. Through her son she later made her way to Christianity;[20] and when he became sole ruler, Constantine was able to give her the position of first lady in the empire and she filled it to perfection.[21] It is questionable whether any marked influences of a religious kind came to Constantine from his father; it would be possible to recall Constantius' striking independence in relation to the official religious policy of the Diocletian tetrarchy. He never appeared particularly in the role of a client of Hercules; he rather felt leanings towards Mars, who was specially honoured in his dominions.[22] His aloofness in regard to the policy of edicts of severe persecution has already been mentioned. It permits the inference that he deliberately rejected all compulsion in religious matters. Eusebius characterized Constantius as an adherent of monotheism[23] and so probably viewed the emperor as a representative of the religious trend in the third century which gave increasing predominance to the one divine Being, the *summus deus* which transcended all other deities. Positive relations of Constantius' family to Christian circles are perhaps indicated by the name Anastasia given to one of his daughters, for at that time it was only found among Christians or Jews;[24] another of his daughters, Constantia, later showed herself a convinced Christian. At any rate the general atmosphere of Constantine's father's house was rather well-disposed towards Christians and that is how Constantine found it when in 305 he went to his father in the West after his flight from Nicomedia. Other strong influences must also, however, be reckoned with those which he received in his impressionable years as a youth at the court of Diocletian, where he lived through the outbreak and severity of the persecution of the Christians and perhaps even then felt its questionableness. When in 306 Constantine was elevated by his father's troops to the position of *Augustus,* he maintained his father's religious policy, one of far-reaching toleration towards his Christian subjects and of conscious independence of the rulers in the East. Whether, as Lactantius seems to suppose, he issued a general edict of toleration when he took over power,[25] must remain an open question, but it is not impossible that, in isolated cases, he expressly assured Christian communities of their freedom of worship.

---

[15] Cf. most recent survey in K. Aland, "Die religiöse Haltung Kaiser Konstantins" in *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 205–15.

[16] Especially by J. Vogt in *Historia* 2 (1953), 463–71; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Constantiniana* (Rome 1953), 51–65; F. Vittinghoff, "Eusebius als Verfasser der Vita Constantini" in *RhMus* 96 (1953), 330–73.

[17] See A. H. M. Jones in *JEH* 5 (1954), 196–200 and K. Aland in *FF* 28 (1954), 213–17.

[18] On Constantine's posthumous history, see E. Ewig in *HJ* 75 (1956), 1–46; W. Kaegi in *Schweiz. Zeitschr. für Geschichte* 8 (1958), 289–326; H. Wolfram in *MIÖG* 68 (1960), 226–43.

[19] Ambrose, *De obit. Theodos.* 42, states she was a *stabularia.*

---

[20] Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3, 47.

[21] Ibid. 3, 42–5.

[22] Cf. the examination of coins minted by him in H. von Schoenebeck, *Beiträge zur Religionspolitik des Maxentius und Constantin* (Leipzig 1939), 31 ff.

[23] *Vita Const.* 1, 17.

[24] Cf. H. Lietzmann, "Der Glaube Konstantins des Großen" in *SAB* 29 (1937), 268.

[25] *De mort. pers.* 24, 9; cf. J. Moreau in his commentary on this work, 343 ff.

It was of fundamental importance that Constantine at this time was notably alive to the religious question. He linked his personal religious sentiment quite definitely to a mission entrusted to him by the divinity for the whole empire. That became apparent in the year 310 when the fall of Maximian placed him in a situation that called for a fresh decision. The devices on coins show that Constantine at that time freed himself from the theology of the tetrarchy by choosing as his special patron-god, instead of Hercules, the *sol invictus;*[26] this expressed a new political conception. The sun-god was worshipped in all parts of the empire in different forms, in Gaul as Apollo, by the troops as Mithras; he was the god of the whole empire, as Aurelian had already regarded him. The emperor who placed himself under his protection and experienced his assistance was thereby called to determine the destinies of the whole empire. These ideas are indicated in the panegyric pronounced in 310 in Trier in the emperor's presence.[27] In this, Constantine's claim to rule was no longer based on his belonging to the tetrarchan system, but was justified by his descent from an imperial line; the patron of this dynasty and of its present member was said to be Apollo who had revealed himself in a unique way to Constantine. On a visit to a shrine of Apollo in Gaul, he was declared to have seen the god with Victoria and they had given him a laurel wreath with the figures XXX and so had promised Constantine victory and long life.[28] This was an announcement of the emperor's claim to universal dominion and his patron god was the *sol invictus* in the form of the Gallic Apollo.

Constantine took the first step towards the realization of his idea in the autumn of 312 when, against the advice of his entourage, he took the field against the usurper Maxentius, then master of Italy and Africa, and whose troops outnumbered his. Previously he had obtained Licinius' agreement to this undertaking and promised him the hand of his sister Constantia in return. It would be a mistake to interpret the background to this conflict as though Maxentius were an oppressor of the Christians and Constantine their champion. In fact Maxentius had tried to win over the Christians by going beyond what was laid down in the Galerian edict of 311 and restoring to the Christian community in Rome at the beginning of 312 its confiscated property.[29] Nor did Constantine's propaganda make out Maxentius to be a persecutor of Christians, but described him as a tyrant, plundering and oppressing his subjects and from whose yoke Rome ought to be set free. In a rapid onset Constantine overran Maxentius' defences which extended in echelon as far as the Alps, brought the whole of Northern Italy under his sway and approached the city of Rome which his opponent intended to defend as his last stronghold. The decision turned in Constantine's favour at the battle of the Milvian Bridge to the north of the city on October 28, 312. Maxentius lost throne and life, and the way was open for Constantine into the Western capital consecrated by tradition. He was in possession of the whole of Western Europe and had victoriously concluded the first stage of his journey to universal rule.[30]

---

[26] H. von Schoenebeck, *op. cit.* 24–6 and A. Piganiol, *L'empereur Constantin* (Paris 1932), 22-7.

[27] *Paneg.* 7 in E. Galletier, *Panegyrici latini,* 2 vols. (Paris 1949–52).

[28] Ibid. 7, 21; cf. H. Kraft, "Kaiser Konstantin und das Bischofsamt" in *Saeculum* 8 (1957), 10ff.

[29] H. v. Schoenebeck, *op. cit.* 4–23.

This campaign was followed by Constantine's decisive turning to the God of the Christians, to which contemporary Christian writers, pagan panegyrists, and Constantine's behaviour directly after the victory all testify.

The first report of it is given by Lactantius[31] who says that Constantine had been exhorted in a dream to put God's heavenly sign on his soldiers' shields and so give battle. The emperor followed this instruction, he says, and made them put an abbreviation for "Christus" on their shields by bending the upper end of the letter X placed sideways. This statement of Lactantius is in itself quite clear. It describes the sign drawn on the shields as an X stood on its side, that is, +, which, by having its top arm bent over was changed to a ⳨, that is to say a *crux monogrammatica,* a sign which at that time was not unknown to the Christians as well as their real Christ monogram ☧.[32] Lactantius does not claim that what he relates was a miraculous occurrence. A dream of the emperor, which in view of the situation shortly before the battle was quite an understandable one, was the cause of the instruction, which was easy to carry out and the significance of which could be easily understood by all: emperor and army were not taking the field as usual, under a pagan magical sign, but under the protection of the God of the Christians. The victorious outcome showed that the Christian God had brought about this decision and that he now must be recognized as a divine patron. That was the picture of the remarkable event that was current in the emperor's entourage when Lactantius in 318 published his book *On the Manner of Death of the Persecutors.* Lactantius did not permit himself any interpretation of the psychological foundation of this event and it is most certainly impossible for the modern historian to reconstruct this; the fact can only be accepted. There are no grounds for emending Lactantius' text,[33] for it is clear in itself and there is certainly no ground at all to look for a literary model of his report and to claim to find this in the pagan panegyrist who reported Constantine's visit to the shrine of Apollo in Gaul in 310;[34] neither in form nor in content can this narrative be claimed as a basis for Lactantius' story.

---

[30] Cf. for the course of the campaign, E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches,* 1 (Vienna 1928), 139ff. and J. Vogt, *Constantin der Große und sein Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1960), 155–60.

[31] *De mort. pers.* 44: "Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus ut caeleste signum dei notaret in scutis atque ita proelium committeret. Facit ut iussus est et transversa littera X summo capite circumflexo Christum notat."

[32] Cf. C. Cecchelli, *Il triunfo della Croce* (Rome 1954), 65–79 and 151–70.

The same event is clearly at the bottom of the account given by Eusebius about twenty-five years later in his biography of the emperor,[35] but how much more extensive it is now, in comparison with Lactantius' brief report! According to Eusebius, Constantine wanted to wage the campaign against Maxentius under his father's protector-god and prayed to him to reveal himself and grant his aid. Straightaway the emperor and the army saw in the late afternoon "in the sky above the sun the radiant victory sign of the cross", and near this the words: "By this, conquer: τούτῳ νίκα". The following night, Christ appeared to him with the cross and told him to have it copied and to carry it as protection in war. The emperor had a standard made according to his specifications; a long shaft with a cross-bar ending in a circle which bore in the middle the monogram of Christ, ☧, such as Constantine later had attached to his helmet, too. A rectangular banner hung down from the cross-bar and above this on the shaft were fixed the images of the emperor and his sons. Eusebius appeals to the fact that he had seen this banner himself[36] and this could not have happened before 325 when his closer relations with the emperor began. At that time, however, the banner had already become the imperial standard, which was later called the *labarum*.[37]It is noteworthy that Eusebius does not give this report of the vision of the cross in the last edition of his *Ecclesiastical History* (about 324). The conclusion that strongly suggests itself, that he knew nothing about it, and that as a consequence it was added to the *Vita Constantini* by another hand later on, is, however, excluded because Eusebius clearly refers to the vision of the cross in his speech on the anniversary of the emperor's accession in 335 and also says in the *Ecclesiastical History* that at the beginning of his campaign against Maxentius, Constantine had prayed and appealed to Christ for help.[38] Consequently in the *Vita* he gives the version of what had happened as this took shape in Constantine's mind after a certain lapse of time from the event itself and in the transfiguring light of the memory of his victorious course. The accessory details dressing it out in legendary fashion must not, however, distract the view from the essential kernel common to both reports. Constantine was convinced that the sign of the cross had been revealed to him at the beginning of his campaign against Maxentius; he had changed it into the monogram of Christ and with his help had triumphed over his opponent who trusted to the power of the pagan gods. His veneration for Christ as his protector-god was due to this event and it occasioned his turning to Christianity.

---

[33] As J. Moreau does in his edition, 1, 127.

[34] So H. Grégoire and his school.

[35] *Vita Constant.* 1, 27–32.

[36] Ibid. 1, 30.

[37] First found in Prudentius, *Contra Symm.* 1, 486, probably derived from *laurus*, laurel; cf. H. Grégoire in *Byz(B)* 12 (1937), 227–81.

[38] Euseb. *Tric.* 6; *HE* 9, 9, 2.

The question arises whether and in what form this turning found expression in Constantine's still pagan entourage. In the autumn of 313 in Trier, the pagan panegyrist celebrated Constantine's victory over Maxentius and in accordance with tradition, had to speak of the god who had given victory. It is striking that the speaker does not name him, but says that Constantine in agreement with the god present to him and with whom he was linked by a profound secret, had taken the field, despite the fears of his officers, because this god had promised victory.[39] A god who is near, who conveys direct instructions to his protégé,[40] who secretly encourages him and assures him of victory, are all forms of expression which were intelligible to Christians as well as to educated people of neo-Platonic views; they indicate the way in which Constantine conveyed his experience to those around him. Even more important, the same speaker, in his description of the solemn entry of Constantine into Rome, does not mention the traditional procession of the victor to the Capitol and the usual sacrifice there to Jupiter: evidently the emperor omitted it and so again proclaimed that he owed his victory to another god.[41] This is also in agreement with another break with the usual pagan practice of taking the omens by examining entrails; Maxentius had done this before the battle, but Constantine, the panegyrist points out, trusted to his god's instructions.[42] The panegyrist conveys a strong impression that after his victory over Maxentius, Constantine moved away from the customary pagan worship.

The triumphal arch in Rome, dedicated to the emperor after his victory by the Roman Senate and completed in 315, was naturally decorated with carvings which corresponded to the ideas of the pagan senate; the latter regarded the *sol invictus* as the emperor's protector-god and consequently had Constantine represented as entering the city in triumph with the attitude and gesture of the sun-god.[43] The inscription on the triumphal arch is more reserved and does not mention his god's name but ascribes the victory to an "inspiration of the divinity" and the emperor's greatness of soul.[44] Here this divinity is still the neo-Platonic "highest being", but could also be understood by Christians in their sense.

---

[39] *Paneg.* 9, 2, 4–5; 9, 3, 3.

[40] Ibid. 9, 4, 4: *divina praecepta.*

[41] Ibid. 9, 19, 3, and cf. especially J. Straub in *Historia* 4 (1955), 297–313; in a contrary sense, F. Altheim in *ZRGG* 9 (1957), 221–31.

[42] Ibid. 9, 2, 4; 9, 4, 4, and on this H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins* (Göttingen 1954), 248 ff.

Another monument is of greater importance; it too was intended to commemorate the victory and Constantine's view of it. This is the statue of the emperor in the Forum, bearing in the right hand, on Constantine's personal directions, "the sign of suffering that brought salvation". The inscription is due to Constantine's own initiative and explains the sign in his hand. "By this salutary sign, the true proof of power, I saved and freed your city from the yoke of the tyrant and gave back to the Senate and Roman people, as well as freedom, their ancient dignity and their ancient glory."[45] In view of this emphatic indication of the inscription, there can be no question of its being the usual *vexillum* in the emperor's hand which the Christians had then interpreted in the form of a cross;[46] it is the *signum caeleste dei* of Lactantius, the Christian cross, probably in the form of the monogram. Consequently this statue is not only a novelty by its form, being the first example of an emperor's statue with a standard,[47] but it expresses in a particularly clear manner both Constantine's conviction that he had been led by this standard, and his will publicly to proclaim this.

Finally the process of turning towards Christianity, even in a very qualified way, is indicated in the coins Constantine had struck. Christian symbols gradually appear beside the images of the old divinities especially the *sol invictus,* which can be traced on coins down to the year 322. From Ticinum a silver medallion struck on the occasion of the *decennalia* of 315 shows the helmeted head of Constantine bearing a clear Christ monogram ☧ on the crest of the helmet.[48] Coinages from the Siscia mint have, after 317–18, the same sign on the emperor's helmet, and from 320 on, coins appear with the Christ monogram in the field next to the *vexillum.*[49]

---

[43] Cf. H. P. L'Orange - A. v. Gerkan, *Der spätantike Bildschmuck des Konstantinbogens* (Berlin 1939).

[44] In Dessau, *Inscriptiones latinae selectae* n. 694: "instinctu divinitatis — mentis magnitudine."

[45] *Euseb. HE* 9, 9, 10–11; cf. *Vita Const.* 1, 40 and *Tric.* 9, 8.

[46] So H. Grégoire in *Antiquité classique* 1 (1932), 141–3.

[47] Cf. A. Alföldi in *Pisciculi* 11; P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, *Constantiniana* (Rome 1953), 98–100. Recently the possibility is seriously entertained that the gigantic head of Constantine in the Palazzo dei Conservatori belongs to this statue; cf. H. Kaehler: *JdI* 67 (1952), 1–30 and C. Cecchelli, *op. cit.* 13–40.

[48] Illustrations in *Pisciculi* plates 1 and 2, and see also A. Alföldi, ibid. 4 ff. and *Studies in Honour of A. C. Johnson* (Princeton 1951), 303–11; better illustrations in H. Kraft, *Kaiser Constantins religiöse Entwicklung* (Tübingen 1955), 35–58.

[49] Cf. H: v. Schoenebeck, *op. cit.* 35–58.

Even though the introduction of the significant Christ symbol among the devices on coins was slow, it was not possible without the emperor's approval. Even if it is regarded as nothing more than a proof of the neutral attitude of an emperor who was now taking Christianity into account as well as paganism, nevertheless the use of the Christ monogram on the helmet can scarcely be interpreted otherwise than as a personal proclamation of Constantine himself.

Of considerable significance, too, for the emperor's attitude to Christianity were some measures directly connected with the victory of October 312. That very same year a letter must have gone from Constantine to Maximinus calling for an end to persecution of Christians in the eastern regions. It has already been shown how this wish was carried out.[50] Are we to suppose that the emperor was only impelled to this rapid step because he was anxious to inform Maximinus that he regarded himself as the highest *Augustus?* Similarly in the same year 312, he commanded in a letter to prefect Anullinus in North Africa that confiscated Church property should be restored.[51] Another letter was addressed directly to the Catholic Bishop of Carthage, Caecilian, who received quite a large sum for the clergy "of the lawful and most holy Catholic religion".[52] Both measures go far beyond the intention of the edict of Galerius and the second already shows the emperor taking special interest in the liturgical concerns of the Catholic Church. This may have been awakened in him by the Spanish bishop, Ossius of Cordova, who appears already in this letter as Constantine's adviser on Church affairs. The Church's worship forms the centre of a third very important document[53] which freed the clergy of the Carthaginian church from obligation to public service so that they might devote themselves unhindered to the performance of the liturgy. Constantine gave as a reason for this measure, appealing as he did so to the lessons of experience, that neglect of the worship of God had brought the State into grave danger, whereas its careful observance would bring happiness and prosperity. In adopting this position it is quite clear that, in the emperor, opinions drawn from the Roman conception of religion were struggling with new religious ideas; Constantine has become aware of the importance of Christian worship even if no understanding of its real content is perceptible. He feels obliged not merely to ensure freedom for this worship, for that was done by the edict of Galerius, but to ensure its exact and worthy accomplishment, because he sees in it a condition for the success of the work he has begun.

---

[50] See above, pages 406–7.

[51] *Euseb. HE* 10, 5, 15–7.

[52] Ibid. 10, 6, 1–5.

[53] Ibid. 10, 7, 1–2, and on this Dörries, *op. cit.* 18 ff.; H. Kraft, *op. cit.* 164 ff.

The features of Constantine's proceedings in regard to Christianity in the year 312–13, which have been discussed, vary, it is true, in evidential force. Taken as a whole they nevertheless impose the conclusion that during this period Constantine had accomplished his personal turning to Christianity. By themselves and quite apart from the further measures belonging to the emperor's religious policy until the beginning of his period of rule as sole emperor, they exclude the date 324 as the beginning of this change. Constantine's "conversion" must, it is true, only be understood in the sense of a "turning" founded on a recognition which perhaps had already been maturing in him for some time, that the God of the Christians alone had a claim to the worship due to the highest Being. The features mentioned do not themselves permit us to judge how far Constantine had advanced towards an understanding of the Christian message of redemption, or to what extent he had made principles of Christian ethics the guiding standard of his personal activity.

From the Convention of Milan, 313, to the Beginning of Sole Rule, 324

In February 313 Constantine and Licinius met in Milan to discuss the new political situation created by the former's victory. The marriage between Licinius and Constantia was also then celebrated. In regard to religious matters, discussions led to a settlement which, however, did not find expression in the form of an Edict of Milan, as was formerly thought.[54] But it is clear that this agreement was not merely concerned with putting into effect the measure of toleration laid down by the edict of Galerius;[55] it rather involved in principle a substantial extension of this as a comparison of the Galerian text with the content of two decrees of Licinius published after his victory over Maximinus Daia will show. One of them is dated from Nicomedia and Lactantius gives the Latin text;[56] the other is in Eusebius[57] and was probably intended for Palestine. The Latin document, which diverges slightly from the Greek in Eusebius, opens with a direct allusion to the negotiations between Constantine and Licinius in Milan. It is stressed in the first place that the emperor intends to settle the religious question by toleration: everyone, including Christians, had full freedom to follow the religion he preferred; that would be a guarantee for continued favour from the *summa divinitas*. Then, however, come a series of special ordinances for the Christian Church, which, by their content, intensity of insistence and tone of respectful goodwill, far exceeded Galerius' grudging grant of toleration. All places in which the Christians had been accustomed to assemble, that is, churches and cemeteries, were returned to them without charge, whether they were in public or private possession.[58] Moreover this property was to be conveyed directly to the various Christian communities, whose corporate legal existence was thereby recognized.[59] Finally a conviction is expressed which would have been quite impossible with Galerius; that through this treatment of the Christian religion, the divine favour, that the emperors had experienced in such great matters, would continue for ever in its beneficial effect on public welfare.[60] There is little likelihood of mistake if the allusion to divine favour is understood as referring to the successes of Constantine's campaign. The special decrees about Church property correspond to the measures that Constantine had already adopted for Africa, and reveal the part he played in the making of the Milan agreement. The latter can be considered as the religious policy which he was chiefly striving to carry out. The benefits it accorded could not, however, be enjoyed by the Christians of the eastern provinces and Egypt, until the conflict between Licinius and Maximinus, which still persisted, had been brought to an end. The latter sought a quick military decision when, early in 313, he moved to the Balkans at a moment when he knew that Constantine was occupied by his war with the Franks of the Rhine. Lactantius represents the battle between the two rulers as a religious war; he describes Maximinus making a vow to Jupiter before the battle that in case of victory he would destroy the Christian name; an angel reveals to Licinius a prayer to the *summus deus* which would bring him victory if it were recited before the battle by the whole army.[61] The prayer is neutral in content; perhaps the only Christian element being the angel who reveals it. Maximinus was decisively defeated at Adrianople and harried by Licinius in a rapid pursuit which struck deeply into Asia Minor. He still tried to win the sympathies of his Christian subjects by an edict of unrestricted toleration,[62] and prepared for a new battle. His death in Tarsus in the autumn of 313 abruptly ended the struggle and brought all the eastern territories under Licinius' authority and the Milan agreement. The conqueror showed little magnanimity to the family and closest supporters of Maximinus; they were mercilessly exterminated, among them Diocletian's wife and daughter who had sought Maximinus' protection.

---

[54] Cf. J.-R. Palanque, "A propos du prétendu édit de Milan" in *Byz(B)* 10 (1935), 607–16, and H. Nesselhauf, "Das Toleranzgesetz des Licinius" in *HJ* 74 (1955), 44–61.

[55] So J. Moreau in *Annales Univ. Sarav.* 2 (1953), 100–05.

[56] *De mort. pers.* 48, 2–12.

[57] *HE* 10, 5, 1–14.

The conquest of the oriental territories brought Licinius an enormous increase of power and Constantine had to postpone for the moment his ultimate aim of establishing a universal Roman rule. The two *Augusti* occupied themselves first with consolidating and strengthening what had been won. In the religious question, Licinius maintained the principles of the Milan agreement; Constantine, with his mental alertness, already saw the approach of a problem and a task which were to attract him more and more as time went on: that of bringing the Christian Church closer to the State, of discovering a form of mutual relation for them which would correspond to his view of their respective missions. These views changed and became clearer in a process that took some time. He moved to a solution through the experience afforded him by his gradually deepening penetration into the specific nature of the Christian world and the questions belonging to it. He encountered them for the first time on a large scale through developments within the Church in North Africa which, shortly before his victory, had led to a profound split among adherents of Christianity there. The beginnings of the Donatist movement must be here recalled because they explain the personal attitude of the emperor to the Christian religion; a connected account and evaluation of it will only be possible later.

---

[58] Lactantius, *De mort. pers.* 48, 7.

[59] Ibid. 48, 8–9.

[60] Ibid. 48, 11.

[61] Ibid. 45–7.

[62] *Euseb. HE* 9, 10, 7–11.

The superficial occasion of the Donatist schism was the question of church discipline regarding what judgment was to be passed on the action of Christians who had handed over the Holy Scriptures to the pagan authorities in the Diocletian persecution. One group among those who had remained faithful regarded it as grave betrayal of the faith and called the guilty *traditores;* among the latter were laymen, clerics, and even bishops. The question became theologically important when it was linked to the particular opinion traditional in North African theology, according to which the validity of a sacrament depended on the state of grace of its minister; consequently the sacraments conferred by a *traditor*, an apostate ultimately, could not be regarded as valid. The controversy became extremely acute when it was involved in the personal difficulties provoked by the quarrel about the succession to Bishop Mensurius of Carthage. In 312 when Caecilian, who had previously been deacon of Carthage, was called to the see, one group in the church which felt slighted because of the sharp treatment of one of its most influential members, whom Caecilian had criticized for his over-enthusiastic cult of the martyrs, pointed out that one of those who had consecrated him bishop, Felix of Aptungi, had been a *traditor*. The case was taken up by the first Bishop of Numidia, Secundus of Tigisis, and brought before a synod of seventy Numidian bishops, which declared Caecilian deposed. In this action of the Numidian episcopate, a certain rivalry with Carthage no doubt also played its part. First, Majorinus became rival bishop to Caecilian and then, after 313, Donatus, the real intellectual head of the opposition, from whom the rapidly developing schismatical church, the *pars Donati,* took its name.

When Constantine in 312 sought information about the situation in his newly acquired territories, he found himself faced by this complicated situation, very difficult for an outsider to grasp in its ultimate connexions, and even more difficult to comprehend on account of the hostility of both groups, embittered by personal rancour. He probably received his first report from the point of view of Caecilian's supporters, perhaps from Bishop Ossius, who very early showed himself to be well-informed about the African clergy. Of course, Constantine at that time could not understand the dogmatic background to the dispute, but he immediately recognized its adverse effects on the unity of the Christian society and strove as occasion offered to restore that unity. In the first place he saw that by the dissension the correct accomplishment of Christian worship was no longer assured, and this, as has already been indicated, was of particular concern to him. Consequently he was ready to make the help of State officials available to bring back into line the disturbers of the peace, for that is how the Donatists chiefly appeared to him.[63] Thereupon the Donatists addressed themselves directly to the emperor, handed in a memorandum through proconsul Anullinus, explaining their attitude to Caecilian and asking for the dispute to be settled by Gallic judges.[64] Constantine accepted this suggestion and turned to the Bishop of Rome, Miltiades, informing him what he had decided in the matter: Caecilian was to come to Rome with ten bishops of his choice and so was his opponent; there an ecclesiastical court consisting of Miltiades and three bishops of Gaul, those of Arles, Autun, and Cologne, was to hear the case and give judgment. The emperor stressed that the inquiry into Caecilian must determine whether he answered to ecclesiastical requirements "which are to be held in high respect". Finally, he affirmed that he had the greatest reverence for the Catholic Church and did not wish any division to be found in it anywhere.[65]

It is clear from this document that the emperor realized he was in a position which in many respects was completely novel to him. A Christian denomination had invoked the help of the civil power and requested the appointment of impartial judges. The emperor tended to think in legal terms and could not refuse such a request but was it possible for him to hand over such a purely ecclesiastical question to a civil court? Constantine decided on episcopal judges, leaving the matter, therefore, in ecclesiastical hands and hoping that in that way peace would be restored.[66] There can be no question, therefore, of any presumptuous intervention of imperial authority in the internal affairs of the Church, but the intense interest of the emperor in the restoration of peace within the Church is unmistakable. Miltiades invited, and this can scarcely have been contrary to the emperor's intentions, a further fifteen Italian bishops to the proceedings, clearly as members of a larger *consilium,* such as was customary for decisions of far-reaching importance.[67] The unanimous verdict of the court pronounced Donatus guilty and confirmed Caecilian as legitimate Bishop of Carthage. The Donatists, however, contested the judgment on the ground of defects of procedure, and the emperor found himself obliged to have the matter dealt with once more. The proceedings were conducted this time in Arles in the summer of 314 on a much bigger scale and with the assistance of numerous bishops, the imperial postal service being put at their disposal for the journey.

---

[63] Letter to Bishop Caecilian, ibid. 10, 6, 1–5; in H. v. Soden, *Urkunden zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Donatismus* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1950), no. 8.

[64] See Soden, *op. cit.* nos. 10 and 11.

[65] Soden, *op. cit.* n. 12; cf. H. Kraft, *op. cit.* 166–9.

[66] On the legal aspect of the matter, see H. U. Instinsky, *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Munich 1955), 59–82.

In the emperor's letter of invitation a double advance in his understanding of Christianity may be observed. He now sees the Church as a society which, in fraternal harmony, accomplishes by its rites the true worship of God.[68] Anyone who does not respect the unity of this society endangers his salvation; so the Church is felt to be a means to salvation. The emperor knows that he is on the side of this society when he claims for himself and for Aelafius, who was known to be a Christian, the designation of *cultor dei,* which here may be taken as a substitute for *christianus.*[69] He does not yet feel himself to be a complete member of the Church, but he fears for her reputation and her universal mission when he points out that the quarrels of Christians among themselves hold back from her the followers of the pagan religion. When Constantine says that, furthermore, he himself could be brought to account by the *summa divinitas* if he were to ignore the divisions in the Church and that he would only be tranquil again when the fraternal harmony was restored, his growing personal attachment to the Church is manifest. A more personal relation to the bishops was forming, too, for in his letter to those taking part in the Synod of Arles, he addressed them for the first time with what was after that to be his habitual mode, as *carissimi fratres;*[70] and he asks with feeling for their prayers "that our Redeemer may always have mercy on me".[71]

---

[67] Instinsky argues this convincingly, *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Munich 1955), 77 ff.

[68] Soden, *op. cit.* n. 15; H. Kraft, *op. cit.* 170 ff.

[69] H. Kraft, *op. cit.* 54 ff., and Soden, *op. cit.* no. 14.

[70] Soden, *op. cit.* no 18, and on this H. Kraft, *op. cit.* 184–191 and *Saeculum* 8 (1957), 40 ff.

[71] Ibid. conclusion: "meique mementote, ut mei salvator noster semper misereatur." The central part of this letter cannot be made use of, for it is suspected of being an interpolation, cf. H. Kraft, *op. cit.* 186–9.

After the unsuccessful outcome of the Synod of Arles, Constantine decided after all to end the Donatist schism by his own means. His attempt at pacification met with no success when he first of all refused to allow the Donatist delegation to Arles to return to Africa. He was also frustrated in his effort to install another bishop in Carthage instead of Caecilian. In a threatening tone the emperor announced to both parties that he was going to come to Africa himself and proclaimed his aim of leading all men to the true religion and the worthy worship of Almighty God.[72] In this letter to the *vicarius* Celsus, the Christian ruler's consciousness of his mission is expressed with perfect clarity: it is the emperor's task *(munus principis)* to remove all error, to be solicitous for the preaching of the true religion, to maintain concord and ensure divine worship; and the *vera religio* to which the emperor knows he is bound, is Christianity alone. Constantine did, after all, desist from a journey to Africa, but in a letter at the end of the year 316, plainly took the side of Caecilian and his supporters.[73] When disturbances occurred, from 317 onwards, he sent in troops, had Donatist bishops exiled, and their churches seized, but this only created martyrs and the sense of martyrdom until he resigned the struggle.[74] Constantine had to learn early, by experience, that divisions in Christendom are only embittered by the attempt to remove them by means of the civil power; even though his attempt sprang from the conviction that he had to take that way to save the unity of the Christian Church, as an obligation of his function as ruler. At the same time, however, dangerous possibilities are already visible which arose for the Church from the sense of mission of a Christian ruler who thought himself justified by a religious call to intervene directly in the Church's own essential concerns.

This gradual and growing attachment of the emperor for Christianity was accompanied by certain laws which revealed the influence of Christian ideas or restricted the influence of pagan religious activity.

The general line of Constantine's legislation shows increasing regard for the dignity of the human person;[75] this is seen in an ordinance of the year 315 forbidding the branding on the face of those condemned to forced labour or to the amphitheatre,[76] for the human face may not be disfigured as it is formed to the likeness of heavenly beauty. The biblical and Christian character of this explanation is unmistakable. A similarly humanitarian tendency combines with respectful recognition of those in charge of the Christian communities, in an ordinance addressed to Bishop Ossius which declares that Christians could free their slaves in the presence of the bishop with full legal validity, and clerics likewise, in certain cases, without written documents and without witnesses.[77] As the liberation had to take place "in the bosom of the Church" it is treated as an action of religious significance. Similar regard for the episcopal office is expressed in the important decision allowing Christian bishops to set up a court of arbitration, even for civil cases, if the parties to a dispute make application to the judge to have their case transferred to one. And what *lex christiana* then decides has the force of law.[78] The law freeing those who were unmarried and without children from certain obligations may rightly be regarded as framed with the ascetics of the Christian Church in view.[79] Of decisive importance was Constantine's Sunday law, March-July 321, ordering cessation from work in the courts and from manual labour on this "venerable day".[80] The religious quality of the day makes it appropriate to distinguish it by particularly pious works such as the liberation of slaves, which could be attested on a Sunday by an official document. There is no question of seeing in the *dies solis* here a day dedicated to the sun; the introduction of a civil holiday on the first day of the week was plainly intended honourably to distinguish the Lord's day of the Christian Church, an essential feature of its liturgy. A special favour granted to the Catholic Church is represented by the edict which allowed anyone the right to bequeath in his will whatever he liked to the Catholic community.[81] There was no such provision for Jewish or schismatic communities.

---

[72] Soden, *op. cit.* no. 23; To the *vicarius* Celsus, final sentence.

[73] Soden, *op. cit.* no. 25.

[74] Cf. W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church* (Oxford 1952), 159–62.

[75] Cf. J. J. Van de Casteele, "Indices d'une mentalité chrétienne dans la législation civile de Constantin" in *Bulletin Assoc. G. Budé* 14 (1955), 68–74.

[76] Cod. Theod. IX 40, 2.

Certain legal provisions were necessary to protect the right to free profession of religion laid down in the Convention of Milan, in its detailed application to Christianity. Christian converts from Judaism who were molested by their former co-religionists receive the special protection of the law.[82] Only the Catholic faith is considered here to be *cultus dei;* neither Judaism nor paganism can claim to possess it.[83] An actual incident formed the basis of a law of May 323 imposing the penalty of flogging or heavy fine on those who compelled members of the Christian community, whether clerics or laity, to take part in the pagan lustral sacrifice.[84] It is significant that Constantine here no longer designated the pagan religion as such by a neutral term, but characterized it pejoratively as *superstitio.* When in Lucania the clerical privilege of immunity was not respected by pagans, Constantine reemphasized this;[85] the expressions he uses, again entail plain value judgments on the old and the new religions and make his own position quite evident: the clergy, he says, devote their pious activity to the worship of God, whilst the impious hostility of the pagans aims at impeding them in this function.

---

[77] Ibid. IV 8, 1. [78] Ibid. I 27, 1. [79] Ibid. VIII 16, 1.

[80] Cod. Theod. II 8, 1a and II 8, 1.

[81] Ibid. XVI 2, 4. [82] Ibid. XVI 8, 1.

[83] Cf. H. Dörries, *op. cit.* 170.

[84] Cod. Theod. XVI 2, 5.

Finally a restriction of the extent to which pagan religion could be practised was introduced by the double decree on divination in 319 and 320,[86] which forbade under strict penalties the practice of this custom in private. This cannot have concerned the abolition of an abuse, for divination in public remained permissible. But it was precisely in private life that divination made possible for pagans an effective propaganda for their religion and one that escaped all control. Through restriction to public divination a check was ensured and the possibility of secret propaganda eliminated.[87]

These laws from the time when Constantine was sole ruler confirm the picture already drawn. The emperor was under the influence of Christian ideas, his concern for the accomplishment of Christian worship sprang from an inner personal interest and in this or that case a preference for the Christian religion is perceptible. Of particular importance is the unmistakable tendency of the emperor to call on the moral and religious values of the Christian religion and the authority of the Christian church leaders, for the benefit of the State. As a consequence, various features of the public life of the age already receive a Christian stamp. His attitude to paganism is in principle tolerant, but in the law against augury the first limitation of its freedom of action is seen.

The struggle for sole rule in the Roman Empire, which had been impending for some time between Licinius and Constantine, was to take the latter an important step further on the road to public and personal recognition of the Christian religion. A first military clash in Pannonia and Thrace in the autumn of 316[88] gave no decision, but the gains of territory in the Balkans that it brought to Constantine and the recognition of his two eldest sons as *Caesares* notably strengthened his position for the now inevitable final confrontation. The struggle, though ultimately concerned with the claims to the political leadership of the empire, nevertheless assumed the character of a religious war that was finally to decide the victory or the defeat of Christianity. Licinius had maintained the provisions of the Convention of Milan in his dominions since 313,[89] although by doing so he had not, like Constantine, intended to bring the Christian Church nearer to the State or even commit various public tasks to it. The marked favour shown to Christianity by the *Augustus* of the West, led Licinius gradually to diverge from the line of religious policy laid down in Milan, and after about 320 to exert pressure increasingly on the Christians in the East. Freedoms previously enjoyed were not expressly revoked, it is true, but petty bureaucratic restrictions were put on them; on freedom of worship, for example, by forbidding Christian church services inside towns or in enclosed places or by requiring separate services for men and women. Freedom of preaching was restricted by forbidding the clergy to give instruction in the Christian faith to women, and charitable activity in favour of those in prison was hampered.[90] More serious still was the abolition of freedom of belief when Christians were dismissed from the army or administration.[91] Finally came measures aimed at the Church's organization; synodal assemblies of bishops were forbidden.[92] It is not surprising that the sympathies and hopes of Christians in Asia Minor and the Near East turned to the *Augustus* in the West. The resentment of high officials was vented in violent measures. In Pontus some places of worship were closed and others demolished; some bishops were arrested, others banished; some were condemned to death and executed,[93] although no general persecution was ordered. When after massive preparations, war broke out in the summer of 324, Constantine deliberately gave it a Christian stamp by giving the army the now fully developed *labarum* as a standard in battle, whilst Licinius questioned the pagan oracles and implored the help of the gods by sacrifices.[94] Constantine's victories in battle at Adrianople and on the Bosphorus in July and at Chrysopolis in Asia Minor in September 324, forced Licinius to capitulate and accept negotiations with Constantine. The latter spared Licinius' life at the request of his wife Constantia and assigned Thessalonica as his place of detention, but later had him executed, ostensibly for treasonable plotting.

---

[85] Ibid. XVI 2, 2.

[86] Ibid. IX 16, 1; XVI 10, 1.

[87] Cf. on this H. Karpp, "Konstantins Gesetze gegen die private Haruspizin" in *ZNW* 41 (1942), 145–51.

[88] On this dating see C. Habicht, "Zur Geschichte des Kaisers Konstantin" in *Hermes* 86 (1958), 360–78.

[89] *Euseb. HE* 10, 2.

Constantine's complete victory and the position of sole ruler which it gave him, almost inevitably introduced a new phase of religious policy, for he was not now hampered by need to take into consideration the differing views of a fellow-ruler or rival. The Christians, especially in the East, looked forward with intense expectation to what was to come. Eusebius speaks in the final section of his *Ecclesiastical History* of the days of rejoicing with which the emperor's victory was celebrated. He, too, saw clearly what possibilities a unified Roman Empire directed by an emperor well-disposed towards Christianity could open for the Christian faith; "people rejoiced about present benefits and looked forward to future ones".[95] The first proclamations of the victorious emperor were of such a kind as to confirm these hopes. A comprehensive decree concerning the inhabitants of the eastern provinces at once cancelled the wrong done to the Christians in the time of persecution, and provided generous compensation.[96] More important still are those sections of the document in which Constantine explained the significance of recent events as the great battle for recognition of the Christian God who revealed his might in the success of Constantine's army. He stated that God had chosen him as his instrument in order "to lead (the nations) to the service of the holiest law and to spread the most blessed faith" and that not only are thanks due to the most high God for that, but: "I owe him my whole soul, every breath and every stirring of my mind, wholly and completely."[97] The earlier consciousness of a mission has now been replaced by a bold knowledge of his election which in future was to mark all the emperor's acts. The decree ends with the exhortation to serve "the divine law", that is to say, Christianity, with all reverence.[98] Constantine's personal profession of Christianity is expressed even more plainly in a second communication to the eastern provinces in which the pride of the victor is mingled with thanksgiving for divine election.[99] Here Constantine turns in prayer to God: "Under your guidance I have begun and completed these salutary deeds. I had your sign carried before us and so led the army to glorious victories; and if any necessity of the State should require it, I shall follow the same dispositions of your power and do battle against your enemies. For that I have consecrated my soul to you; ... I love your name and honour your power which you made known by many signs and so strengthened my faith. I long to set to work and build up again for you the holiest of houses."[100] The final words vividly express the intense drive of the emperor standing in the full possession of his powers; he had a clearly defined aim, the restoration of the Christian Church. The same document also shows the calibre of the victorious emperor as a statesman; he will not persecute adherents of paganism or force them to become Christians; freedom of conscientious decision is guaranteed: "Each must hold what his heart bids him."[101] Only the future could show whether Constantine would stand by this, and the programme it represented.

---

[90] Ibid. 10, 8, 11; *Vita Const.* 1, 53 and 54.

[91] *Euseb. HE* 10, 8, 10; *Vita Const.* 1, 54.

[92] *Vita Const.* 1, 51.

[93] *HE* 10, 8, 13–17.

[94] *Vita Const.* 2, 4.

---

[95] *HE* 10, 9, 6–8; *Vita Const.* 2, 19.

[96] *Vita Const.* 2, 30–41.

[97] Ibid. 2, 28–9. [98] Ibid. 2, 42.

[99] Ibid. 2, 48–60. [100] Ibid. 2, 55. [101] Ibid. 2, 56.

CHAPTER 31

The Causes of the Victory of the Christian Religion. The Scope and Import of the Turning-Point under Constantine

THE turning-point in the history of the Church which was reached when the first Christian emperor became sole ruler, raises two questions of great importance for a right understanding of the whole situation of the Church at the beginning of the fourth century.

1. The first question regarding the causes of the final success of Christianity in its conflict both with the rival religious currents of late Antiquity and with the power of the Roman State as well has often been formulated and has received very divergent replies. A very superficial one attempts to explain the victory of Christianity by the process of decay in which the civilization of later Antiquity was involved at precisely that time; this is alleged to have given syncretist Christianity a fundamentally easy triumph over a world in dissolution.[1] This view is blind to what properly characterizes Christianity as a religion, and only postpones the problem, for at once a new question arises, why in that case did Christianity survive in the general disintegration, and not one of the other religious movements of the age? It is just as difficult to understand the final Christian success if this is viewed as the victory of a proletarian revolution in a class-war over the upper-class which until then had dominated the Roman Empire.[2] It is true that Celsus had already reproached Christianity for having a particular attraction for the lowest and uneducated social classes of the empire's population,[3] but all Christian preaching of pre-Constantinian times shows plainly that it was deliberately addressed to all classes and all races in identical fashion. In fact, this universality of the Church can rightly be regarded as one of the factors that were particularly effective in bringing about the final success of the Christian religion. But the question remains, what were the reasons for the attraction exercised by Christianity on all social classes and on all nations.

Another answer to the question regards the support given to Christianity by Constantine as the real reason for its success. Such a view of things, however, confuses cause and effect; Constantine acted from insight into the actual victory already achieved by Christianity when he first tolerated and then favoured it. His immediate predecessors, the persecuting emperors, realized that their persecutions had failed, even Diocletian himself, perhaps, and certainly Gallienus and Maximinus Daia, and so did Maxentius, though he was not himself a persecutor; they only drew the logical conclusions from this realization, against their will and too late. Sooner or later some emperor after Constantine would have had to seek an understanding with the victorious Church. Constantine's decisive act and what logically followed, his religious policy favourable to the Christians, certainly made the Church's task very much easier, but they do not explain the Church's victory.

---

[1] The first exponent of the "decadence theory" was E. Gibbon, who passionately advocated it in the *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire;* it was put forward in a modified form by F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum* (Halle 1948), 16.

[2] So, for example, A. J. Toynbee, *A Study of History,* 1, 57 ff.; and likewise Marxist histories.

[3] *Contra Cels.* 3, 59.

The answers which seek an explanation in an element within the Church itself are closer to the facts of the case. Attention has rightly been directed, for example, to the above average level of morals and character reached by most followers of Christianity, which was proof against the heaviest trials. The fact of actual or at least always extremely possible persecution subjected candidates for baptism to an inexorable selection which provided the various Christian communities with a considerable percentage of members whose quality is scarcely paralleled in the history of the Church. The teaching in the catechumenate made it clear to them that adherence to Christianity demanded a radical break with their previous manner of life; anyone who made this break did so from a deep conviction of faith which was the source of his strength in the hour of trial. The failure of many Christians in the Decian and Diocletian persecutions does not contradict this; the frank admission of such losses by Dionysius of Alexandria and Cyprian of Carthage and their efforts to heal the wounds caused in the Church by too indiscriminate a reception of candidates for baptism in the period of peace, attest the serious determination of the Church as a whole to maintain the high level in her communities. The pagan world was also impressed by the attitude of the Christians towards their persecutors, for whom they entertained no feelings of revenge or desires for reprisals. The comprehensive charitable work of the early Christian Church as a whole also represented a strong attraction. Here, too, the question remains open what the ultimate root of this attitude and these high moral qualities was.

There is a good deal of truth in the view which attributes the success of Christianity to the values which it had to offer to a late Hellenistic world which in religious matters was in a state of unrest and inquiry. It is correct that Christianity could often advance into a spiritual vacuum which it filled with the message, proclaimed with a joyful certainty, of the new and unique way to salvation founded on a divine revelation. But this Christian message of salvation must have been characterized by an ultimate, definite quality of its own which enabled it to gain the advantage over Gnosticism, neo-Platonism, or the pagan mystery-cults, for these, too, claimed to come forward with the means of bringing the fulfilment of its longings to the human soul seeking salvation.

Augustine in the seventh book of the *Confessions* points the way to a real answer to the question of the ultimate cause of the Christian victory. He says that in the writings of the Platonists he found many assertions that he met with again later in Christian doctrine; but neo-Platonism could not in the long run hold him, because it was unaware of the sentence in the Gospel of St John: "The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us."[4] It was the message of the incarnate God and the conception of *humilitas* that has its ultimate roots in the Incarnation which, according to Augustine's own words, made him a Christian. This locates the decisive reason which led to the victory of Christianity, the source from which all the other factors previously mentioned received their force in the person of Jesus Christ and the message proclaimed by him; this by its unique character and absolute novelty left all other religious trends of the age far behind it. It is not difficult to perceive in the third century historical sources the unique fascination, and the power appealing to all the capacities of the human heart that is exerted by the person of Christ. Belief in his mission bound the first disciples to him, faith in his redemptive death on the cross, hope in the resurrection promised by him, are the ultimate reason for the enthusiasm of the original community, the success of Paul's missionary preaching, and the joyful readiness of the Christian martyrs to die as witnesses. The origin of this belief, its intensity and its inexhaustible vitality cannot be explained by historical means, but its existence and radiating force are plainly perceptible in its effects. By faith in the God-man, Jesus' followers joined in a society of brotherly love which, in a way never known before, abolished all social and racial barriers between men. The impression that the vitality and strength of Christianity had their roots in Jesus Christ was what in the final resort led Constantine to recognize the God of the Christians. It was similarly that absolutely new thing in his message which won the men and women of later Antiquity in increasing proportions for him. Its central content was the proclamation of the Incarnation of the only-begotten Son of God and his redemptive death of atonement on the cross; and the very contradiction aroused in pagans by the doctrine of a crucified God, shows plainly how absolutely new this message was felt to be. The way in which mankind was to share through baptism and Eucharist in the salvation won by Christ's death on the cross was also moral. It was a new demand that the genuineness of a man's belief in this redeemer had to be proved by a life imitating his, extending even to the sacrifice of life itself, and finally it was a new message that Jesus brought of another world in which human beings after their resurrection will be united with their Lord in an eternal life. Irenaeus expressed accurately the feelings of pre-Constantinian Christendom: "He brought all that is new by bringing himself."[5] It was this whole experience of novelty and originality, conveyed to the men of late Antiquity by the message and person of Christ, that we must consider as the deepest historically perceptible reason leading to Christianity's triumph over the resistances which opposed it in the first three hundred years of its existence. The Christian believer sees in this event the disposition of divine Providence which accompanied the young Church throughout all the heights and depths of the first decisive part of its journey.

---

[4] *Conf.* 7, 9, 14.

2. The second question regarding the scope and import of the "Constantinian turning-point" has often been raised, and at the present time forms the central topic of a vigorous discussion[6] which unfortunately lends the theme something of a catchword character. There is general agreement that the complete change in the relation between Christian Church and Roman State wrought by Constantine was an event of first importance in the history of the world. In the estimate of its scope and consequences for Christianity in particular, however, opinions differ considerably according to the philosophical standpoint or the conception of the Church held by those who are attempting to judge. Some see its significance in the fact that the Roman emperor succeeded, by his alliance with the Church, in making that Church serviceable to the State, and so founded the system of Caesaropapism which held the Church in degrading dependence on the State, and which was the never really seriously contested practice of the Byzantine world. The Church is said to have been at fault through her silence in the face of such enslavement and to have herself contributed to narrowing her effective possibilities in regard to her divine mission. Others see in Constantine's favour and the privileges accorded to the Christian religion the first step on the road of a fateful deviation that has persisted down to the present day; the Church authorities are alleged not to have withstood temptation to power and to have bolstered their position with secular privileges, to have striven for dominion over secular spheres of civilization alien to the Church's mission; and so as a power-seeking Church to have destroyed both the credibility of her claim to a religious mission and the impact of her missionary endeavours. Both judgments agree in viewing the attitude of the Church

---

[5] *Adv. haer.* 4, 34, 1.

[6] On this discussion, see H. Rahner, "Konstantinische Wende?" in *StdZt* 167 (1960–1), 419–28, and the bibliography he gives.

at the "Constantinian turning-point" as a decline from the ideal of the gospel, in which opposition to the world, separation of secular and ecclesiastical authority, and the renunciation of the use of earthly power in the fulfilment of her missionary task are considered, on this view, to be essential. An estimate of the "Constantinian turning-point" based on criteria drawn from sources contemporary with that development might, however, lead to the following conclusions.

The closer relation brought about between the Christian religion and the Roman State had not, as a matter of fact, the radically revolutionary character that is sometimes attributed to it. As we have already seen, pre-Constantinian Christendom had already sought a tolerable relation even towards the pagan State because, as St Paul had taught (Rom 13:1–7), behind every secular power the will of God was discerned.[7] The numerous contacts in the course of the third century between followers of the Christian religion and representatives of the Roman State clearly reveal a development that would lead to mutual recognition and the collaboration of the two societies. The toleration of all religions laid down by Constantine and Licinius in the Convention of Milan in 313 could not, in the conception of that period, be of long duration. Religion and the State in late Antiquity were not known except as related to one another in principle. It would have been revolutionary if the Roman emperor and State had made absolute neutrality in regard to all religious cults a lasting principle of its policy and had been uninterested in any relations at all between the State and religion. The idea of a State necessarily neutral in religious matters in the context of a pluralist society, is an anachronism for the beginning of the fourth century. Consequently it was a perfectly normal way of thinking for Christians of the time to expect that under an emperor whose sincere conversion to their faith was not to be doubted, Christianity would gradually take the place of pagan worship. And that, in addition, their affections fixed on that emperor with unreflecting enthusiasm, is psychologically perfectly understandable. The Christians of the eastern territories of the empire, especially, had years of most severe mental and nervous strain behind them; one wave of persecution after another had broken over them from the very beginning of the century; the hope for peace that sprang up when persecution slackened was suddenly and bitterly disappointed again and again as violent oppression flamed up once more. Then with Constantine an emperor who was of their faith became sole ruler and gave every guarantee for the beginning of a lasting peace. Inevitably that released an overwhelming flood of enthusiasm which Eusebius voiced when he opened the Tenth Book of his *Ecclesiastical History* with the cry of exultation from Psalm 97: "Sing ye to the

---

[7] See above pp. 316–18 for the statements of Christian writers of the time on this question.

Lord a new canticle, for He hath done wondrous things"[8]. Second thoughts about a deviation or aberration in development were all the more absent because the biblical sayings about civil authority being willed by God were applied precisely to the new situation and the anointed king of the Old Testament was seen as the model for Constantine who, just like the former, bore responsibility for a correct worship of God by the nations subject to him.[9] It is asking too much of bishops of that time who attributed such a theocratic value to the Christian emperor to expect them to have seen immediately the dangers that objectively were involved in the new relation developing between Church and State and to look for prophetic warnings from any of them. Insight into the presence of such dangers could only be gained by experience and only then did a decision of the Church on the problem of the relation between Christian State and Christian Church fall due.

The positive as well as negative possibilities that presented themselves for the Christian Church at the beginning of Constantine's period of sole rule may be summarized as follows. The freedom granted to the Church released strong forces that could be devoted to the unhampered building-up of life within the Church. Freedom of worship and of preaching within the Church was guaranteed by law. New conditions were created for the worthy performance of the liturgy through the possibility for reconstruction and the erection of new Christian places of worship which were generously accorded by the State. The religious care for the faithful in the various forms of catechetical instruction, preaching and sacramental life was no longer subject to any restriction. New and attractive tasks appeared for ecclesiastical writers in unhampered work in pastoral and theological literature. The missionary function of the Church was likewise no longer impeded by any restrictions and was able to develop in a particularly fruitful way, for freedom of conscience was guaranteed in the profession of a religious faith.

It was now also possible for the Church to undertake the enormous task of christianizing secular culture and public life and to develop and give a Christian stamp to an intellectual life of her own. The Church did not feel this task to be in any way a problematic one, for ideas of the independence of secular culture and civilization were alien to her. Here the Church faced perhaps her most radical task of adaptation. Previously she had lived consciously at a distance from the cultural world around her and had withdrawn from the completely pagan public life into her own specific moral and religious domain which was easier to preserve in complete isolation. Freedom now led her out of this separate existence but as a consequence, exposed her at the same time to risk; in the attempt to penetrate secular civilization with Christian ideas, she became more vulnerable to alien elements which could adulterate her belief and her morality. This imposed heavy responsibility on Christian leaders.

---

[8] *HE* 10, 1, 3.

[9] Cf. S. L. Greenslade, *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius* (London 1954), 11 ff.

A danger for the high moral and religious standard of the Christian communities was created by the favour shown by Constantine to the Christian religion: people could now seek admission to the Church because adherence to Christianity offered social and professional advantages. The principle of selection that had been effective in times of persecution ceased to exist and the institution of the catechumenate became more important than ever.

Objectively the most difficult task to which the Church was set was the discovery of the right mental attitude to the new relation of Church and State. The double danger present was not, as we have already indicated, consciously realized from the start. Eusebius was still quite unconcerned and full of praise for Constantine when reporting that now, "the bishops received imperial documents and honours and subsidies".[10] It must have been a temptation for many bishops especially in the East, after being oppressed for so long, to sun themselves in the imperial favour and so lose their freedom. More dangerous was the tendency, deriving from the emperor's view, not to consider the Church as a partner *sui generis*, but to make her serviceable to the interests of the State and so to stifle her independence and necessary freedom in the realm of internal Church affairs. It has, of course, been said that Pope Miltiades recognized this tendency of the emperor even in the early phase of the Donatist dispute when Constantine refused to regard the verdict passed by the Roman bishop's court on the Donatist leaders as final and ordered the matter to be dealt with again,[11] but the sources say nothing definite about this. Only the bitter experiences under Emperor Constantius could give the episcopate some idea of how exceedingly difficult it could be to achieve a healthy, fruitful equilibrium in the mutual relations between a State under Christian leadership and the Catholic Church.

---

[10] *HE* 10, 2.

[11] For example, B. Lohse, "Kaiser und Papst im Donatistenstreit" in *Ecclesia und Res Publica, Festschrift für K. D. Schmidt* (Göttingen 1961), 85–88.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. The Subject Matter, Methods, Ancillary Sciences, and Divisions of Church History, and its Relevance for Today

Subject Matter

J. A. Möhler, *Einleitung in die Kirchengeschichte: Ges. Schriften und Aufsätze,* ed. by J. J. I. Döllinger, II (Regensburg 1840), 261–90; A. Ehrhard, "Die historische Theologie und ihre Methode" in *Festschrift S. Merkle* (Düsseldorf 1922), 117–36; E. Müller, "Die Kirchengeschichte. Die Darstellung der Lebensäußerungen der Kirche in ihrer zeitlichen Entwicklung im Aufbau der Theologie" in *3. Lektorenkonferenz der deutschen Franziskaner 1925* (Münster 1926), 95–108; P. Guilday, *An Introduction to Church History* (St Louis 1925); K. Adam, "Das Problem des Geschichtlichen im Leben der Kirche" in *ThQ* 128 (1948), 257–300; P. Simon, *Das Menschliche in der Kirche Christi* (Freiburg i. Br. 1948); H. Jedin, "Zur Aufgabe des Kirchengeschichtsschreibers" in *TThZ* 61 (1952), 65–78; J. Lortz, "Nochmals zur Aufgabe des Kirchengeschichtsschreibers" ibid. 317–27; H. Jedin, "Kirchengeschichte als Heilsgeschichte?" in *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 119–28; O. Köhler, "Der Gegenstand der Kirchengeschichte" in *HJ* 77 (1958), 254–69; G. Gieraths, *Kirche in der Geschichte* (Essen 1959); J. Wodka, *Das Mysterium der Kirche in kirchengeschichtlicher Sicht: Mysterium Kirche,* ed. by F. Holböck and T. Sartory (Salzburg 1962), 347–477 (Large bibliography). Protestant Works: E. Seeberg, *Über Bewegungsgesetze der Welt- und Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin 1924); W. Köhler, *Historie und Metahistorie in der Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen 1930); H. Karpp, "Kirchengeschichte als Theologische Disziplin" in *Festschrift R. Bultmann* (Stuttgart 1949), 149–67; E. Benz, "Weltgeschichte, Kirchengeschichte und Missionsgeschichte" in *HZ* 173 (1952), 1–32; J. Chambon, *Was ist Kirchengeschichte?* (Göttingen 1957); D. Forbes, *The Liberal Anglican Idea of History* (Cambridge 1952); P. Meinhold, "Weltgeschichte – Kirchengeschichte – Heilsgeschichte" in *Saeculum* 9 (1958), 261–81 (good bibliography); E. Benz, *Kirchengeschichte in ökumenischer Sicht* (Leiden – Cologne 1961); M. Schmidt in *RGG*, 3rd ed. III, 1421–33.

The Theology of History at the present time: J. Wach, "Die Geschichtsphilosophie des 19. Jh. und die Theologie der Geschichte" in *HZ* 142 (1930), 1–15; J. Bernhard, *Der Sinn der Geschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1931); H. Rahner, "Grundzüge katholischer Geschichtstheologie" in *StdZ* 140 (1947), 408–27; K. Thieme, *Gott und die Geschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1948); H. Urs v. Balthasar, *Theology of History* (New York 1963); J. Endres, "Die Grenzen des Geschichtlichen" in *DTh* 30 (1952), 73–110; J. Daniélou, *The Lord of History* (Chicago 1958); J. Maritain, *On the Philosophy of History* (New York 1957); A. Dempf, *Weltordnung und Heilsgeschehen* (Einsiedeln 1958); J. Möller, "Die Frage nach der Transzendenz der Geschichte" in *Festgabe J. Lortz* II (Baden-Baden 1958), 567–84; O. *Köhler,* "Der neue Äon" in *Saeculum* 12 (1961), 181–204 (discussion on recent literature). — Protestant Works: N. Berdyaev, *The Meaning of History* (New York 1936); P. Tillich, *The Interpretation of History* (New York 1936); E. Rust, *The Christian Understanding of History* (London 1947); H. Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (London 1949);

K. Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago 1949); R. Niebuhr, *Faith and History: A Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History* (New York 1951); E. Harbison, "The Meaning of History and the Writing of History" in *CH* 21 (1952), 97–107; C. Fabro, "La storiografia nel pensiero cristiano" in *Grande antologia filosofica* 5 (Milan 1954), 311–503 (with Italian translation of patristic and medieval texts); W. Kamlah, *Christentum und Geschichtlichkeit* (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1951); H. Berkhof, *Der Sinn der Geschichte: Christus* (Göttingen 1962); S Mead, "Church History Explained" in *CH* 32 (1963), 17–31.

Ecclesiology, as far as it concerns the historical element: H. de Lubac, *The Splendor of the Church* (New York 1956); J. Beumer, "Ein neuer, mehrschichtiger Kirchenbegriff" in *TThZ* 56 (1956), 93–102; S. Sáki, *Des tendences nouvelles de l'ecclésiologie* (Rome 1957); K. Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church* (London – New York 1964); K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *The Episcopate and the Primacy* (Freiburg – London – New York 1962); J. Auer, "Das Leibmodell und der Kirchenbegriff der katholischen Kirche" in *MThZ* 12 (1961), 14–38; "Sentire Ecclesiam" in *Festschrift H. Rahner* ed. J. Daniélou and H. Vorgrimler (Freiburg i. Br. 1961).

Methods

J. G. Droysen, *Historik,* ed. by R. Hübner (Darmstadt, 3rd ed. 1958); C. de Smedt, *Principes de la critique historique* (Liège 1883); E. Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (Leipzig, 6th ed. 1914, new impression 1960); H. Feder, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (Regensburg, 3rd ed. 1924); L. E. Halkin, *Critique historique* (Liège, 4th ed. 1959); W. Bauer, *Einführung in das Studium der Geschichte* (Tübingen, 2nd ed. 1928; new imp. Frankfurt a. M. 1961); L. Gottschalk, *Understanding History* (New York 1950); G. Garraghan, *A Guide to Historical Method* (New York, 3rd ed. 1951). The following develop their methods from the writing of history: M. Ritter, *Die Entwicklung der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Munich – Berlin 1919); F. Wagner, *Geschichtswissenschaft* (Freiburg i. Br. 1951). K. Erslev, *Historische Technik* (Munich – Berlin 1928); H. Nabholz, *Einführung in das Studium der mittelalterlichen und der neueren Geschichte* (Zürich 1948); H. Quirin, *Einführung in das Studium der mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Brunswick, 2nd ed. 1961); L. Halphen, *Initiation aux études d'histoire du moyen âge* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1952); G. Wolf, *Einführung in das Studium der neueren Geschichte* (Berlin 1910). The views of the French school of social history are represented by the collection *L'histoire et ses méthodes,* ed. by C. Samaran (Paris 1962).

Ancillary Sciences

An excellent summary is found in A. von Brandt, *Werkzeug des Historikers. Eine Einführung in die Historischen Hilfswissenschaften* (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1960).

1. Chronology

H. Grotefend, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit,* I (Hanover 1891), II (Hanover – Leipzig 1898), the most comprehensive and detailed work, with a general account of the history of the calendar in vol. I; adequate for the student in most cases is: H. Grotefend, *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Hanover, 10th, ed. 1960). For chronology in Classical times, see W. Kubitschek, *Grundriß der antiken Zeitrechnung* (Munich 1928); for practical use, H. Lietzmann, *Zeitrechnung der Römischen Kaiserzeit, des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (3rd ed. revised by K. Aland, Berlin 1956). For the dating of documents, see the appropriate sections of H. Bresslau and H. W. Klewitz's *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre,* II, 2 (2nd ed. 1931, new imp. 1958) and

A. Giry, *Manuel de diplomatique*, II (Paris 1894, new imp. 1925). Comprehensive tables in C. de Mas Latrie, *Trésor de chronologie, d'histoire et de géographie* (Paris 1889); J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology* (Princeton 1964).
For the astronomical basis: W. F. Wislicenus, *Astronomische Chronologie* (Leipzig 1895); F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1906–13).
The founder of the critical method in chronology was D. Petavius with his *De doctrina temporum* (Paris 1627, with many later editions). An instructive example of the problems of medieval chronology is offered by W. E. van Wijk, *Le nombre d'Or. Étude de chronologie technique. Suivie du texte de la 'Massa Compote' d'Alexandre de Villedieu. Avec traduction et commentaire* (The Hague 1936).

2. Palaeography

A brief but excellent introduction to Latin palaeography with bibliography is B. Bischoff, *Paläographie*, 2nd revised ed. by W. Stammler (Berlin 1957) in *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß*, 379–452. The principal Textbooks are E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1912); G. Battelli, *Lezioni di paleografia* (Vatican City, 3rd ed. 1940); H. Foerster, *Abriß der lateinischen Paläographie* (Berne 1949); M. Prou, *Manuel de paléographie latine et française*, ed. by A. de Boüard (Paris, 4th ed. 1924); G. Cencetti, *Lineamenti di storia della scrittura latina* (Bologna 1954), which takes into account recent research on the history of writing. Summary accounts of the latest researches in different countries are to be found in the principal periodical, *Scriptorium* (Antwerp 1946 seqq.).

HANDWRITING. The latest general account of the history of handwriting is J. Fevrier, *Histoire de l'écriture* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1959). For particular periods see *Nomenclature des écritures livresques du IX^e au XVI^e siècle* (Paris 1954), which contains B. Bischoff, "La nomenclature des écritures livresques du IX^e au XIII^e siècle" (7–14); G. J. Lieftinck, "Pour une nomenclature de l'écriture livresque de la période dite Gothique" (15–34); G. Battelli, "Nomenclature des écritures humanistiques" (35–43). See also: J. Mallon, R. Marichal und C. Perrat, *L'écriture latine de la capitale à la minuscule* (Paris 1939); B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit,* I (Wiesbaden, 2nd revised ed. 1960); W. Meyer, *Die Buchstabenverbindung der sogenannten gotischen Schrift* in *AGG*, Phil. Hist. Klasse I, 6 (1897); A. Hessel, "Die Entstehung der Renaissanceschriften" in *AUF* 13 (1935), 1–14; H. Hirsch, "Gotik und Renaissance in der Entwicklung unserer Schrift" in *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* (1932). H. Fichtenau, *Mensch und Schrift im Mittelalter* (Vienna 1946); compare however the critical discussion by A. J. Walter, "Die Schrift als Kulturobjekt" in *MIÖG* 57 (1949), 375–82; for a general survey of this subject, D. McMurtrie *The Book* (New York–London, 3rd revised ed. 1943).
On the history of writing in the Middle Ages the classic work of W. Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 3rd ed. 1896, new imp. Graz 1958) remains unsurpassed; L. Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Beschreibstoffe im MA mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der päpstlichen Kanzlei*, I, in *MIÖG* Suppl. vol. 16 (1953). Palimpsests: F. Mone, *De libris palimpsestis latinis* (Karlsruhe 1855); E. Chatelain, *Les palimpsestes latins* (Paris 1903); for recent research the bibliography in the works of A. Dold is important: *Colligere Fragmenta* in *Festschrift A. Dold* (Beuron 1952) IX–XX. On penmen and penmanship: J. Destrez, *La pecia dans les MSS. universitaires du XIII^e siècle* (Paris 1935); S. Haynal, *L'enseignement de l'écriture aux universités médiévales* (Budapest 1954); H. Hajdu, *Lesen und Schreiben im Spätmittelalter* (Pécs–Funfkirchen 1931).

ON WATERMARKS: G. Piccard, "Wasserzeichenforschung als historische Hilfswissenschaft" in *AZ* 52 (1956), 62–115; C. M. Briquet, *Les filigranes*, 4 vols. (Paris, 2nd ed. 1923); V. A. Mosin and M. Traljić, *Filigranes des XIII*^{e} *et XIV*^{e} *siècles* (Zagreb 1957); T. Weiss ed., *Handbuch der Wasserzeichenkunde* (Leipzig 1963).

ABBREVIATIONS AND CRYPTOGRAPHY: The most practical textbook is A. Capelli, *Dizionario di abbrevature latine ed italiane* (Milan, 5th ed. 1954). J. Walther, *Lexikon diplomaticum* (Ulm, 2nd ed. 1756) is still useful. For the history of abbreviations: L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (Munich 1907); by the same, *Lehre und Geschichte der Abkürzungen, Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen,* I (Munich 1909); B. Mentz, *Die Tironischen Noten* (Berlin 1942); W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915); D. Bains, *A Supplement to Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1936); B. Bischoff, *Übersicht über die nichtdiplomatischen Geheimschriften des MAs* (Munich 1954) also in *MIÖG* 62 (1954), 1–27; A. Meister, *Die Anfänge der diplomatischen Geheimschrift* (Paderborn 1902); by the same, *Die Geheimschrift im Dienste der päpstlichen Kurie* (Paderborn 1906).

MUSIC: For the development of musical notation, see *Paléographie musicale: Les principaux MSS. de Chant Gregorien publ. en facsimile* (Solesmes 1889 seqq.), esp. vols. 2–3 (1891–2), with examples from the ninth to seventeenth centuries; J. Wolf, *Handbuch der Notationskunde,* I (Leipzig 1913), with a good historical survey; C. Parrish, *Notation of Medieval Music* (New York 1957); W. Apel, *Gregorian Chant* (Bloomington 1957); G. K. Fellerer, *History of Catholic Church Music* (New York 1960).

ILLUSTRATED WORKS: *Monumenta Palaeographica. Denkmäler der Schreibkunst des MAs,* ed. by A. Chroust, 3 series, I (Munich 1899–1906), II (Munich 1909–17), III (Munich 1918–39), arranged regionally, with more than 500 plates. Most suitable for the student are the following: F. Steffens, *Lateinische Paläographie* (Trier, 2nd ed. 1929), with 125 plates and full explanations; W. Arndt and M. Tangl, *Schrifttafeln zur Erlernung der lateinischen Paläographie,* parts 1 and 2 (4th ed. by M. Tangl, Munich 1904–6), 3rd part ed. by M. Tangl (Munich, 2nd ed. 1907); J. Kirchner, *Scriptura latina libraria* (Munich 1955); F. Ehrle and P. Liebaert, *Specimina codicum latinorum Vaticanorum* (Bonn 1912).

Illustrated works covering a limited field: E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (Oxford 1933 seqq.), intended to include in ten parts all MSS. of the period before 800; a parallel work for documents before 800 is A. Bruckner and R. Marichal, *Chartae latinae antiquiores* (Olten–Lausanne 1954 seqq.); A. Bruckner, *Scriptoria medii aevi Helvetica,* 8 parts published to date (Geneva 1936 seqq.); E. Petzet and O. Glauning, *Deutsche Schrifttafeln des 9. bis 16. Jh.,* 5 parts (Munich 1910–30); R. Thommen, *Schriftproben aus Basler Handschriften des 14. bis 16. Jh.* (Basle, 2nd ed. 1908); G. Mentz, *Handschriften der Reformationszeit* (Bonn 1912); J. Kirchner, *Germanistische Handschriftenpraxis* (Munich 1950).

GREEK PALAEOGRAPHY: For this science founded by the Maurist Br. Mountfaucon with his *Palaeographia graeca* (Paris 1708), consult: V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1911–13); W. Schubarth, *Griechische Paläographie* (Munich 1925); H. Hunger, *Studien zur griechischen Paläographie* (Vienna 1954).

3. Libraries

GENERAL WORKS: *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft,* founded by F. Milkau, 2nd revised and corrected ed. by G. Leyh (Wiesbaden 1957 seqq.); *Répertoire des Bibliothèques de France,* I: *Bibliothèques de Paris* (Paris 1950); II: *Bibliothèques des Départements* (Paris 1950); III: *Centres et Services de Documentation* (Paris 1951); K. Schottenloher, *Bücher bewegten die Welt. Eine Kulturgeschichte des Buches,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1951–2). Periodical: *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* (Leipzig 1884 seqq.) *[ZblB].*

Particular Fields of study: T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Literatur* (Berlin 1882, new imp. Aalen 1959); T. Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig 1890, new imp. Graz 1955); K. Löffler, *Deutsche Klosterbibliotheken* (Bonn–Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1922); F. Ehrle, *Historia bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum tum Bonifatianae tum Avenionensis* (Rome 1890); A. Pelzer, *Addenda et emendanda ad Francisci Ehrle Historia,* I (Vatican City 1947); E. Muntz and P. Fabre, *La bibliothèque du Vatican au XV*^{e} *siècle d'après des documents inédits* (Paris 1887). An important work for the study of medieval libraries is *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* ed. by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences (1918 seqq.); P. O. Kristeller, *Latin MS. Books before 1600. A list of the Printed Catalogues and Unpublished Inventories of Extant Collections* (New York, 2nd ed. 1960): this first appeared in *Tr* 6 (1948), 227–317, 9 (1953), 393–418; R. Hale, *Guide to Photocopied Historical Material in the United States and Canada* (Ithaca 1961); P. Haner ed., *A Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States* (New Haven 1961).

4. Study of Documents

Bibliographies and Periodicals: H. Oesterley, *Wegweiser durch die Literatur der Urkundensammlungen,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1885–6); L. Santifaller, *Neuere Editionen mittelalterlicher Königs- und Papsturkunden* (Vienna 1958), with details of editions of medieval papal documents. The oldest and most important periodical is the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* (Paris 1839 seqq.) *[BECh]*; also *Archiv für Urkundenforschung* 1–18 (Leipzig 1907–44) *[AUF],* which is specially devoted to the study of documents. A continuation, with a wider scope, is: *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde* (Cologne–Graz 1955 seqq.) *[ADipl].*

Textbooks and Manuals: H. Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien,* I (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1912), II/1 (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1915), II/2, 2nd ed. by H. W. Klewitz (Berlin 1931, new imp. Berlin 1958), index by H. Schulze (Berlin 1960); A. de Boüard, *Manuel de diplomatique française et pontificale,* I: *Diplomatique générale* (Paris 1929); II: *L'acte privé* (Paris 1948); L. Paetow, *A Guide to the Study of Medieval History* (New York 1931) revised ed.
Textbooks for particular fields of study: O. Redlich, *Allgemeine Einleitung zur Urkundenlehre;* W. Erben, *Die Kaiser- und Königsurkunden des Mittelalters* (Munich 1907) [Part I of Below–Meinecke, *Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte*]; O. Redlich, *Die Privaturkunden des Mittelalters* (Munich 1911) [Part III of Below–Meinecke, *Handbuch*]; R. Thommen, *Grundbegriffe, Kaiser- und Königsurkunden* (Leipzig–Berlin 1913) [A. Meister, *Grundriß der Geschichtswissenschaft,* I]; L. Schmitz-Kallenberg, *Papsturkunden* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1913) [Meister, *Grundriß,* Part II]; H. Steinacker, *Die Lehre von den nichtköniglichen Privaturkunden* (Leipzig 1906) [Meister, *Grundriß,* Part III]; R. Heuberger, *Allgemeine Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien* (Leipzig 1921). For Byzantine diplomatics, see F. Dölger, *Byzantinische Diplomatik* (Munich 1956).

Illustrated Works. H. von Sybel and T. Sickel, *Kaiserurkunden in Abbildungen,* 11 parts (Munich 1889–91); A. Brackmann, *Papsturkunden* (Leipzig–Berlin 1914) [G. Seeliger, *Urkunden und Siegel in Nachbildungen für den akademischen Unterricht,* 2].

History of Diplomatics. The Benedictine J. Mabillon laid the foundation of the scientific criticism of documents in his work *De re diplomatica libri VI* (Paris 1681), *vide infra,* Enlightenment. Modern methods of research have been developed mainly by German and Austrian scholars: T. Sickel, *Die Urkunden der Karolinger,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1867); J. Ficker, *Beiträge zur Urkundenlehre,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1877–8); the various works of P. Kehr *(vide infra)* are excellent.

Regesta. Collections of *Regesta* of papal documents: P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum 1198* (Berlin 1851), 2nd ed. by S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1885–8, new imp. Graz 1958); A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno 1198 ad annum 1304,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1874–5, new imp. Graz 1957). For the new ed. under the direction of P. Kehr commissioned by the Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, cf. the work of L. Santifaller (p. 439). *Regesta* of papal documents are to be found in the various series published by the Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome (see the bibliographies to vols. II–IV).

Sigillography: W. Ewald, *Siegelkunde* (Munich 1914); P. Sella, *I sigilli dell'Archivio Vaticano,* 2 vols. (Rome 1937–46); V. Laurent, *Documents de sigillographie byzantine* (Paris 1954); R. Gandilhon, *Sigillographie des universités de France* (Paris 1952).

5. Archives

Manuals: A. Brennecke, *Archivstudien,* ed. by W. Leesch (Leipzig 1953); H. O. Meissner, *Archiv- und Aktenlehre der Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1952); A. Mazzoleni, *Lezioni di archivistica* (Naples 1954).

Periodicals: *Archivum. Revue internationale des archives* (Paris 1951 seqq.); *Archivalische Zeitschrift* (Stuttgart–Munich 1877 seqq.) *[AZ].*

Guides to Archives: D. H. Thomas and L. M. Case, *Guide to the Diplomatic Archives of Western Europe* (Philadelphia 1959); K. A. Fink, *Das Vatikanische Archiv. Einführung in die Bestände und ihre Erforschung* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1951). A good example of a general catalogue of an important set of archives is: L. Bittner, *Gesamtinventar des Wiener Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs,* 5 vols. (Vienna 1936–40).

6. Heraldry

General: J. Siebacher, *Grosses und allgemeines Wappenbuch,* Nuremberg, 1st ed. 1594, 8 new impressions (unaltered) since 1854. The best general accounts are D. L. Galbreath, *Handbüchlein der Heraldik* (Lausanne, 2nd ed., 1948) O. Hupp, *Wappenkunst und Wappenkunde* (Berlin 1928); H. Hussman, *Deutsche Wappenkunst* (Leipzig 1940); L. Fejerpataky, *Magyar Czimeres Emlekek,* 3 vols. (Budapest 1901–2); C. Fox-Davies, *A Complete Guide to Heraldry* (London–New York 1951); J. Burke, *Britain's Genealogical and Heraldic History of Landed Gentry* (London 1939); A. Wagner, *Heralds and Heraldry in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1956); S. Konarski, *Armorial de la noblesse polonaise titrée* (Paris 1958).

Ecclesiastical Heraldry: Baron du Rouve de Paulins, *L'héraldique ecclésiastique* (Paris 1911); B. B. Heim, *Wappenbrauch und Wappenrecht in der Kirche* (Olten 1947). For papal and cardinalitial arms see A. Ciaconius-Oldoin, *Vitae et res gestae summorum Pontificum et S. R. E. cardinalium,* 4 vols. (Rome 1677); D. L. Galbreath, *A Treatise on Ecclesiastical Heraldry,* I: *Papal Heraldry* (Cambridge 1930); C. Erdmann, "Das Wappen und die Fahne der Römischen Kirche" in *QFIAB* 22 (1930–1), 227–55; by the same, "Kaiserliche und päpstliche Fahnen im hohen Mittelalter", ibid. 25 (1933–4), 1–48; O. Kirchberger, *Die Wappen der religiösen Orden* (Vienna 1895); M. Gorino, *Titoli nobiliari e ordini equestri pontifici* (Turin 1933); E. Zimmermann, *Bayrische Klosterheraldik* (Munich 1931); A. Walz, "Das Wappen des Predigerordens" in *RQ* 47 (1939), 111–47. There is no general account of the origin of the arms of the German bishoprics, but there are some good ones for individual sees, e.g. P. Bretschneider, "Das Breslauer Bistumswappen" in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Gesch. Schlesiens* 50 (1916), 225–56. For France: J. de Meurgey *Armorial de l'Église de France* (Macon 1938).

7. Geography and Cartography

GENERAL: G. Franz, "Historische Kartographie, Forschung und Bibliographie" (Bremen-Horn 1955) in *Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung*, Report No. XXIX; H. Hassinger, *Geographische Grundlagen der Geschichte* (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1953); L. Mirot, *Manuel de geographie historique de la France* (Paris 1930); M. Schmidt, "Probleme, Aufgaben u. Möglichkeiten kirchengeschichtlicher Kartographie" in *Misc. Hist. Eccl.* (Louvain 1961) 158–66; J. Prinz, "Eine Konfessionskarte Deutschlands", ibid. 147–57.

ATLASES. General historical atlases: G. Droysen, *Allgemeiner historischer Handatlas* (Bielefeld–Leipzig 1886); K. von Spruner and T. Menke, *Handatlas für die Geschichte des Mittelalters u. der neueren Zeit* (Gotha 1880); *Grosser historischer Weltatlas* ed. by the Bayrischer Schulbuchverlag (Munich 1954 seqq.); F. W. Putzger, *Historischer Schulatlas* (Bielefeld–Leipzig, 65th ed. 1960); G. Niessen, *Geschichtlicher Handatlas der deutschen Länder am Rhein* (Bonn 1950). J. Horrabin, *An Atlas of European History from the 2nd to the 20th Century* (London 1935); F. van der Meer, *Atlas de la civilisation occidentale* (Paris 1952). For ecclesiastical history: O. Werner, *Orbis terrarum catholicus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1890); E. McClure, *Historical Church Atlas* (London 1897); K. Heussi and H. Mulert, *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1937); L. Grammatica, *Testo e Atlante di Geografia ecclesiastica* (Bergamo 1928); K. Pieper, *Atlas orbis christiani antiqui* (Düsseldorf 1931); C. Streit, *Atlas Hierarchicus* (Paderborn, 2nd ed. 1929); A. Freitag and J. M. Lory, *Atlas du monde chrétien* (Brussels 1959); F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann, *An Atlas of the Early Christian World* (London 1958); E. Gaustad, *Historical Atlas of Religion in America* (New York 1962).

Missionary History: C. Streit, *Katholischer Missionsatlas* (Steyl 1906); J. Thauren, *Atlas der katholischen Missionsgeschichte* (Mödling bei Wien 1932); J Neuhäusler, *Atlas der katholischen Missionen* (Munich 1932); *Atlas Missionum a Sacra Congregatione de Propaganda Fide dependentium*, ed. by H. Emmerich (Vatican City 1958); A. Freitag, *Die Wege des Heils, Bildatlas zur Geschichte der Weltmissionen* (Salzburg 1960).

TOPOGRAPHY: J. G. T. Graesse, *Orbis latinus*, 3rd ed. revised by F. Benedict (Berlin 1922); E. Förstemann, *Die deutschen Ortsnamen* (Nordhausen 1863); H. Oesterley, *Historisch-geographisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Mittelalters* (Gotha 1881–3); U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, II: *Topo-bibliographie* (Montbéliard 1894–1903); L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés*, 2 vols. (Macon 1935–9); *Germania Sacra*, ed. by the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Deutsche Geschichte (Berlin 1929 seqq.). A basic work for the later Middle Ages (bishoprics and abbeys) is H. Hoberg, *Taxae de communibus servitiis* (Vatican City 1949). For ecclesiastical geography of the Byzantine Church see H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959) 148–229; R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin* III/1: *Églises et monastères de Constantinople* (Paris 1953).

8. Statistics

For general statistics of population: E. Kirsten, E. W. Buchholz, W. Köllmann, *Raum und Bevölkerung in der Weltgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Würzburg, 2nd ed. 1956). Numbers of population, including clerics and monks in individual bishoprics and monasteries, are till the later Middle Ages based mainly on estimates. Only from the late Middle Ages onwards do church registers, tithe lists, records of visitations and other documents provide more reliable figures; cf. H. Jedin, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Anfänge der Kirchenmatrikeln" in *ZSavRGkan* 32 (1943), 419–494; H. Börsting, *Geschichte der Matrikeln von der Frühkirche bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959). Concerning the cardinals, the papal court and the curial authorities, the annual *Notizie per l'anno...* have given exact statistics since 1716, from 1850–70 under the title *Annuario Pontificio.* In the *Gerarchia Cattolica,* appearing since 1872 (which in 1912 became the official *Annuario Pontificio*), holders of bishoprics are listed alphabetically. Valuable and by no means fully exploited material for the statistics of bishoprics and orders is contained in the lists of personnel and property dating mostly from the 18th century. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith first issued missionary statistics in 1843: *Notizia statistica delle Missioni cattoliche in tutto il mondo,* reprinted in O. Mejer, *Die Propaganda,* I (Göttingen 1852), 473–562.

The first bureau of ecclesiastical statistics following scientific methods, the *Zentralstelle für kirchliche Statistik,* was set up by the German bishops' conference at Cologne in 1915. It took over the *Kirchliche Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* edited since 1908 by H. A. Krose, SJ. Only in quite recent times have other countries followed this example, such as France, Holland, and Spain among others. The Federal Republic of Western Germany has now two research institutes, at Königstein and Essen, which are members of the International Federation of Catholic Research Institutes (FERES), whose headquarters are at Fribourg, Switzerland. The *Official Catholic Directory* published annually in the United States contains ecclesiastical statistics on America, Great Britain, and Commonwealth Nations, as well as the Philippine Islands and Mexico.

Divisions

E. Göller, *Die Periodisierung der Kirchengeschichte und die epochale Stellung des Mittelalters* (Freiburg i. Br. 1919); K. Heussi, *Altertum, Mittelalter und Neuzeit in der Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen 1921); O. E. Strasser, "Les périodes et les époques de l'histoire de l'église" in *RHPhR* 30 (1950), 290–304; O. Halecki, *The Limits and Divisions of European History* (New York 1950); id., *The Millennium of Europe* (Notre Dame 1963).
A general guide to the division of history: J. H. J. van der Pot, *De Periodisering der der Geschiedenis. Een overzicht der Theorien* (The Hague 1951); M. Tetz, "Über Formengeschichte in der Kirchengeschichte" in *ThZ* 17 (1961), 413–31.

Relevance for Today

A. Knöpfler, *Wert und Bedeutung des Studiums der Kirchengeschichte* (Munich 1893); cf. also: H. Schrörs in *HJ* 15 (1894), 133–45; A. M. Koeniger, *Voraussetzungen und Voraussetzungslosigkeit in Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte* (Munich 1910); Y. Congar, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* (Paris 1950); M. Richards, "Is Church History Really Necessary?" in *The Clergy Review* (1964); H. F. May, "The Recovery of American Religious History" in *The American Historical Review,* 70 (1964), 79–92. For further bibliography see above under Subject Matter, Ecclesiology.

II. The Writing and Study of Church History

There is still no satisfactory account of ecclesiastical historiography and its development into a science. F. C. Baur's brilliant *Die Epochen der Kirchengeschichtsschreibung* (Tübingen 1852, new imp. Darmstadt 1962) was Hegelian in its inspiration; it confined itself, like W. Nigg's *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung* (Munich 1934) to the main types — in recent times Protestant — without inquiring into the reciprocal effects of research, narrative and instruction. The same applies to the concise survey by P. Brezzi, *La storiografia ecclesiastica* (Naples 1959).

ANTIQUITY

The sources given in G. Loeschke's *Zwei kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Tübingen 1913), excellent as far as they go, have now been superseded. Brief but excellent information about the Church historians of antiquity, with full bibliography, is to be found in B. Altaner, *Patrology* (London–New York, 2nd imp. 1960) 263–93. For the Latin Fathers' consciousness of the Church see P. T. Camelot, "Mysterium Ecclesiae" in *Festschrift H. Rahner* (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 134–51.

EUSEBIUS AND HIS CONTINUATORS. The first ed. of Eusebius' Church History in the Greek text is that of R. Étienne (Paris 1544), with Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret; critical ed. by E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen, 3 vols. (Berlin 1903–9), Greek and Latin text; Greek and English text by H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Ulten (London, second edition 1952–3). R. Laqueur, *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit* (Berlin 1929); cf. *Altaner* 265 ff. for further bibliography. For Socrates and Sozomen see *PG* 67, 29–1630; Sozomen alone, ed. by J. Bidez and G. C. Hausen (Berlin 1960) [GCS 50]; Theodoret, ed. by L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1954); F. Scheidweiler, "Die Bedeutung der Vita Mitrophanis et Alexandri für die Quellenkritik bei den griechischen Kirchenhistorikern" in *ByZ* 50 (1957), 74–98. *Historia Tripartita* ed. by W. Jacob and R. Hanslik (Vienna 1952) [*CSEL* 71]; for bibliography see *Altaner* 275. The *World Chronicle* of Eusebius and Jerome ed. by R. Halm, 2 vols. (Berlin 1913–26) [*GCS* 24, 34], new ed. in 1 vol. (Berlin 1956). *Lesser World Chronicles* ed. by T. Mommsen in *MGAuctant* IX (Berlin 1892). For a brief survey of the Byzantine historians not here mentioned see H. G. Beck in *LThK* VI, 212 and General Bibliography to vols. I and II.

Of the extensive literature on Augustine's view of history (*Altaner* 504–5), only A. Wachtel, *Beiträge zur Geschichtstheologie des Aurelius Augustinus* (Bonn 1960) need be mentioned, especially for its full bibliographies; Paulus Orosius, *Historiae adversus paganos*, ed. with English translation by J. W. Raymond (New York 1936); bibliography, *Altaner* 280–1.

For schemata of sacred and profane history see van der Pot, *Periodisering der Geschiedenis*, 36–64, 76–84; J. Daniélou, "La typologie millénariste de la semaine dans le christianisme primitif" in *VigChr* 2 (1946), 1–16; P. E. Hübinger, "Spätantike und frühes Mittelalter" in *DVfLG* 26 (1952), 1–48; A. D. van den Brincken, "Weltaeren" in *AKG* 39 (1957), 133–49; B. Sticker, "Weltzeitalter und astronomische Perioden" in *Saeculum* 4 (1953) 241–49.

MIDDLE AGES

In addition to the still unfinished new edition of W. Wattenbach's standard work, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (1st ed. 1858) by W. Levison and H. Löwe (Weimar 1952–7) for the early and Carolingian period and by R. Holtzmann for the 11th–13th centuries (Tübingen 1948) (referred to as Wattenbach–Levison and Wattenbach–Holtzmann respectively), consult also K. Jacob, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter,* 5th ed. revised by H. Hohenleutner, I and II (Berlin 1959–61), III by F. Weden (Berlin 1952) [Sammlung Göschen 279, 280, 284]; R. I. Poole, *Chronicles and Annals* (Oxford 1926); T. F. Tout, *The Study of Medieval Chronicles* (Manchester 1934); H. Grundmann, "Geschichtsschreibung im MA" in *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß,* ed. by W. Stammler, III (Berlin 1957), 1273–336; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des MA,* 3 vols. (Munich 1911, 1923, 1931, new imp. of I, 1959) (to the end of the 12th cent.); G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie,* II and III, in 4 parts (Frankfurt 1955–62), with detailed analyses; for interpretations of history, see *Geschichtsdenken und*

Geschichtsbild, ed. by W. Lammers (Darmstadt 1961), which contains sixteen essays by leading authors, already published elsewhere. Finally there is O. Brunner's study, *Abendländisches Geschichtsdenken* (434–59) with extensive bibliographies.

For the medieval beginnings of ecclesiastical history in the strict sense, an important work is H. Zimmermann, *Studien zur Kirchengeschichtsschreibung im MA* (Vienna 1960) [*SAW*, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 235, 4]; necessary for deeper study of the subject are the numerous modern works on medieval ecclesiology: J. Beumer, "Zur Ekklesiologie der Frühscholastik" in *Scholastik* 26 (1951), 365–89; by the same, "Das Kirchenbild in den Schriftkommentaren Bedas der Ehrwürdigen", ibid. 28 (1953), 40–56; by the same, "Ekklesiologische Probleme der Frühscholastik", ibid. 27 (1952), 183–209; H. Riedlinger, *Die Makellosigkeit der Kirche in den lat. Hoheliedkommentaren des MA* (Münster 1958); for the history of Joachimism and the Franciscan spirituals, see E. Benz, *Ecclesia Spiritualis* (Stuttgart 1934). For the late medieval idea of the Church, see F. Merzbacher, "Wandlungen des Kirchenbegriffs im Spätmittelalter" in *ZSavRGkan* 39 (1953), 274–361; H. Jedin, "Zur Entwicklung des Kirchenbegriffs im 16. Jh." in *Relazioni del X° Congresso internazionale di Scienze Storiche IV* (Florence 1955), 59–73; L. Buisson, *Potestas und Caritas. Die päpstliche Gewalt im Spätmittelalter* (Cologne 1958).

SPECIAL SUBJECTS: H. Löwe, *Von Theoderich zu Karl dem Großen* (Darmstadt 1958); A. D. van den Brincken, *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Düsseldorf 1957); J. Spörl, *Grundformen hochmittelalterlicher Geschichtsanschauungen* (Munich 1935). For the medieval Vita, see H. Vogt, *Die literarische Personenschilderung des frühen MA* (Leipzig 1934); O. Köhler, *Das Bild des geistlichen Fürsten in den Viten des 10., 11. und 12. Jh.* (Berlin 1934). P. van den Baar, *Die kirchliche Lehre von der Translatio Imperii bis zur Mitte des 13. Jh.;* W. Goez, *Translatio Imperii. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Geschichtsdenkens und der politischen Theorie im MA und der frühen Neuzeit* (Tübingen 1958); H. Beumann, "Der Schriftsteller und seine Kritiker im frühen MA" in *StudGen* 12 (1959), 497–511.

HUMANISM, THE REFORMATION, AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHURCH HISTORY AS A SCIENCE

The influence of humanism on attitudes towards the Church and Church history still needs closer study. The leading accounts of modern historiography may still be mentioned: E. Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Munich–Berlin 1911); H. von Srbik, *Geist und Geschichte vom deutschen Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (Munich–Salzburg 1950); F. Meinecke, *Die Entstehung des Historismus*, 2 vols. (Munich, 3rd ed. 1959); W. Dilthey, *Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1921). See also L. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge 1963). For this subject, further reference may be made to the following surveys of sources: G. Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Gotha 1915–22); F. Schnabel, *Deutschlands geschichtliche Quellen und Darstellungen in der Neuzeit, I: Das Zeitalter der Reformation* (Leipzig 1931); an excellent general survey of the literature, embracing the whole of Europe, is E. Hassinger, *Das Werden des neuzeitlichen Europa* (Brunswick 1959), 401–86. For the rise of a new view of history, see A. Klempf, *Die Säkularisierung der universalhistorischen Auffassung* (Göttingen 1960); cf. O. Köhler in *Saeculum* 12 (1961), 191; W. Kaegi, *Chronica Mundi. Grundformen der Geschichtsschreibung seit dem MA* (Einsiedeln 1954). For an excellent survey of the Renaissance in its historical context: W. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought* (Cambridge 1948).

The only general account of the historiography of this period is E. Menke-Glückert, *Die Geschichtsschreibung der Reformation und Gegenreformation* (Leipzig 1912), which is inadequate for developments on the Catholic side. For the attitude of the Reformers towards Church history, see W. Köhler, *Luther und die Kirchengeschichte*, I (Erlangen 1900); H. W. Müller-Krumweide, *Glauben und Geschichte in der Theologie Luthers* (Göttingen 1953); H. Berger, *Calvins Geschichtsauffassung* (Zürich 1955); K. Räber, *Studien zur Geschichtsbibel Sebastian Francks* (Basle 1952). For the separation of sacred from profane history in Melanchthon, see P. Meinhold, *Ph. Melanchthon* (Berlin 1960), 90ff. The effect of the controversial point of view on the development of Church history into a science is studied by P. Polman, *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVIe siècle* (Gembloux 1932). For the publication of sources and the rise of criticism, see H. Quentin, *J.-D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris 1900); also *LThK* VI, 534ff.; P. Peeters, *L'Oeuvre des Bollandistes* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1961); E. Martène, *Histoire de la Congrégation de St Maur*, ed. by G. Charvin, 9 vols. (Ligugé 1928–43); E. de Broglie, *Bernard de Montfaucon et les Bernardins*, 2 vols. (Paris 1891); H. Leclercq, *J. Mabillon*, 2 vols. (Paris 1953–7), on this M. D. Knowles in *JEH* 10 (1959), 153–73; J. De Ghellinck, "L'édition de St Augustin par les Mauristes" in *NRTh* 57 (1930), 746–74. Studies of particular subjects: A. Herte, *Das katholische Lutherbild im Bann der Lutherkommentare des Cochlaeus*, 3 vols. (Münster 1943); B. A. Vermaseren, *De cath. Nederlandsche Geschiedsschrijving in de 16e en 17e eeuw* (Maastricht 1941); H. Borak, "Theologia historiae in doctrina S. Laurentii a Brindisi" in *Laurentiana* 1 (Rome 1960), 31–97.

The Enlightenment and Teaching of Church History

K. Völker, *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Aufklärung* (Tübingen 1921); E. C. Scherer, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten* (Freiburg i. Br. 1927), a fundamental introduction to the subject; J. Engel, "Die deutschen Universitäten und die Geschichtswissenschaft" in *HZ* 189 (1959), 223–378; K. Zinke, *Zustände und Strömungen in der katholischen Kirchengeschichtsschreibung des Aufklärungszeitalters im deutschen Sprachgebiet* (Bernau 1933). A. Walz, *Studi storiografici* (Rome 1940), 40–72, on the introducing of Church history as a subject of instruction at the Roman universities in the 18th and 19th centuries; A. Pérez Goyena, "Los orígenes del estudio de la historia eclesíastica en España" in *RF* 79 (1927). Histories of the faculties of Church history have been written by S. Merkle for Würzburg, E. Säger for Freiburg, E. Hegel for Trier, H. Jedin for Bonn, and A. P. Brück for Mainz.

The 19th and 20th Centuries and the Development of Church History as a Science

On the main currents in the science of history-writing during the 19th and 20th centuries: F. Wagner, *Geschichtswissenschaft* (Freiburg i. Br. 1951), 169–377 (full bibliography); important for Church history is E. Troeltsch, *Der Historismus und seine Probleme* (Tübingen 1922); id., *Der Historismus und seine Überwindung* (Berlin 1924); E. Laslowski, "Probleme des Historismus" in *HJ* 62–9 (1949), 593–606; H. Butterfield, *Man on his Past* (Cambridge 1955), important here because it deals in some detail with Döllinger's pupil, Lord Acton. For the progress of historical research in the 19th century in which Church history also shared, the great works on published sources must be consulted (e.g. H. Bresslau, *Geschichte der MG* [Hanover 1921], and H. Grundmann, *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 2 [1951], 538–47), as well as the publications of the historical institutes (e.g. W. Friedensburg, *Das Königliche Preußische hist. Inst. in Rom* 1888–1901 [Berlin 1903]; H. Kramer, *Das Österreichische hist. Inst. in Rom* 1881–1901 [Rome 1932]; for other historical institutes in Rome, see K. A. Fink, *Das Vatikanische Archiv* [Rome, 2nd ed. 1951], 152–80), and their annual reports in their respective periodicals; and not least the correspondence and autobiographies of famous historical scholars: *Die Geschichtswissenschaft in Selbstdarstellungen,* ed. by S. Steinberg (Leipzig 1925); *Die Religionswissenschaft in Selbstdarstellungen,* ed. by E. Stange (Leipzig 1927), containing among others H. Grisar, H. Schrörs and J. Schmidlin; P. M. Baumgarten, *Römische und andere Erinnerungen* (Düsseldorf 1927); T. von Sickel, *Römische Erinnerungen,* ed. by L. Santifaller (Vienna 1947). The account in this section is an attempt to trace the reciprocal effects of research, historical writing and instruction in the field of Church history, as I have done in *Das Konzil von Trient. Ein Überblick über die Erforschung seiner Geschichte* (Rome 1948), 167–213.

MÖHLER AND DÖLLINGER: J. A. Möhler, *Die Einheit der Kirche* (1825), ed. by J. R. Geiselmann (Cologne 1957); *Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze,* ed. by J. J. I. Döllinger, 2 vols. (Regensburg 1939–40); S. Lösch, *J. A. Möhler, Gesammelte Aktenstücke und Briefe,* I (Munich 1928); K. Bihlmeyer, "J. A. Möhler als Kirchenhistoriker" in *ThQ* 100 (1919), 134–98; H. Tüchle, *Die eine Kirche. Zum Gedenken J. A. Möhlers* (Paderborn 1939); J. R. Geiselmann, *Lebendiger Glaube aus geheiligter Überlieferung* (Mainz 1942); id., *L'ecclésiologie au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1960), 141–95; B. D. Dufourcq, "Schisme et Primauté chez J. A. M." in *RSR* 34 (1960), 197–231. The biography of Döllinger by his pupil, the Old Catholic J. Friedrich, 3 vols. (Munich 1899–1901) can be superseded only when the edition of his letters begun by V. Conzemius is completed; cf. V. Conzemius in *ZBLG* 22 (1959), 154–60; S. Lösch, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (Munich 1955). Discourse on the past and present of Catholic theology (1863) in *Kleinere Schriften,* ed. by F. H. Reusch (Stuttgart 1890), 161–96.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY TO VOLUMES I AND II

Containing the sources, historical accounts, periodicals, and other ancillary works of most importance for the study of the history of the ancient Church. The abbreviations are based on those employed in the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* I (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1957), 16–48.

I. LITERARY SOURCES

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN AUTHORS

The works of the ancient Christian authors are certainly of primary importance. They exist for the most part in the form of collections of writings, an account of the origin of which has been given in the Introduction. For many of these authors the editions in J.-P. Migne's two great series of patristic texts have not yet been superseded: *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca,* 161 vols. (Paris 1857–66) and *Series latina,* 221 vols., of which the four last contain indexes (Paris 1844–64, several vols. reprinted 1878–90). The indexes to the *Series graeca* were compiled by F. Cavallera (Paris 1912) and T. Hopfner, 2 vols. (Paris 1928–45). A Supplement to the *Series latina* in several vols. has been begun by A. Hamman (Paris 1958 seqq.); so far (1964) vols. I, II, and III, fasc. 1 and 2 have appeared.

Critical editions of the Latin and Greek authors are still being produced by the Academies of Science of Vienna and Berlin respectively in: *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (Vienna 1860 seqq.) and *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig 1897 seqq.). A parallel undertaking is: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* in several series (Leipzig–Berlin 1882 seqq.). The Benedictine abbey of St Peter at Steenbrugge (Belgium) is planning a new edition of the writings of all the Latin, Greek, and Eastern Fathers: *Corpus christianorum seu nova patrum collectio,* of which the Latin series has already been begun (Turnhout–Paris 1953 seqq.). A very valuable aid to study is the following work, prepared for this series by E. Dekkers and A. Gaar: *Clavis patrum latinorum* (Steenbrugge, 2nd ed. 1961). This gives a critical survey of all existing editions of the Latin Fathers. Some late Latin ecclesiastical writers have been edited in: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores antiquissimi* (Hanover–Berlin 1826 seqq.). For the early Byzantine period of Church history a work to be consulted is: *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae* (Bonn 1828 seqq.).
Greek and Latin texts of the Fathers (with French translation) are published in the collection edited by C. Mondésert known as: *Sources chrétiennes* (Paris 1941 seqq.); 102 vols. have so far appeared.
For the study of Greek and Latin Christian authors, M. Vatasso's *Initia patrum (latinorum),* 2 vols. (Rome 1906–8) and C. Baur's *Initia patrum graecorum,* 2 vols. (Rome 1955) are important aids. All printed works of the Fathers are listed according to their opening words.
The following are collections of Eastern Christian writers: *Patrologia Syriaca,* ed. by R. Grafin, 3 vols. (Paris 1894–1926); *Patrologia Orientalis,* ed. by R. Grafin and F. Nau (Paris 1903 seqq.); *Corpus scriptorum christianorum Orientalium* (Paris 1903 seqq.), begun by J. B. Chabot and now edited by R. Draguet, Louvain.

The smaller collections of individual writings of the Fathers listed below are intended for students' use: *Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum* (Turin): *Florilegium patristicum,* ed. by J. Zellinger and B. Geyer (Bonn 1904 seqq.); *Kleine Texte,* ed. by H. Lietzmann (Berlin 1902 seqq.); *Sammlung ausgewählter Kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften,* ed. by G. Krüger (Tübingen 1891 seqq.); *Scriptores christiani primaevi* (The Hague 1946 seqq.); *Stromata patristica et mediaevalia,* ed. by C. Mohrmann and J. Quasten (Utrecht 1950 seqq.).
For students also the so-called *enchiridia* are to be recommended. They contain a selection of characteristic patristic texts: C. Kirch and L. Ueding, *Enchiridion fontium historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae* (Freiburg i. Br., 8th ed. 1960); M.-J. Rouët de Journel, *Enchiridion patristicum* (Freiburg i. Br., 21st ed. 1959); M.-J. Rouët de Journel and J. Dutilleul, *Enchiridion asceticum* (Freiburg i. Br., 5th ed. 1958); C. Silva-Tarouca, *Fontes historiae ecclesiasticae medii aevi, I, saec. V–IX* (Rome 1930; selections); H. M. Gwatkin, *Selections from Early Christian Writers Illustrative of Church History to the Time of Constantine* (London 1937).

The principal series of translations of the Fathers are: *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter,* ed. by O. Bardenhewer *et alii,* 1st series, 63 vols., 2nd series, 20 vols. (Kempten–Munich 1911–39); *Sources chrétiennes,* the French translation mentioned above; *Ancient Christian Writers,* ed. by J. Quasten (Westminster, Md.-London 1946 seqq.); *The Fathers of the Church,* ed. by R. Deferrari (New York 1947 seqq.); *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (Edinburgh Collection) 1866–72, 24 vols., and 1 supplement. vol by A. Menzies, 1897; *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Buffalo Collection) 1884–6, supplemented by 28 vols. republished (Grand Rapids 1956); *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 28 vols. (Buffalo and New York 1886–90).

The actual Church historians among the ancient writers are of special importance: Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (down to 324) ed. by E. Schwartz in *GCS* 9, 1–3 (Berlin 1908–9); Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (down to 425) ed. by J. Bidez in *GCS* 21 (Berlin 1913); Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (305–439), ed by R. Hussey, 3 vols. (Oxford 1853); Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (324–425), ed. by J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen in *GCS* 50 (Berlin 1960); Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica* ed. by L. Parmentier, 2nd ed. by F. Scheidweiler in *GCS* 44 (19) (Berlin 1954); Gelasius, *Historia Ecclesiastica,* ed. by G. Loeschke and M. Heinemann in *GCS* 28 (Berlin 1918); Zacharias Rhetor, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (circa 450–540), preserved in a Syrian translation, ed. by E. W. Brooks in *CSCO* 83–4 (Paris 1919–21); Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (431–594), ed. by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier (London 1898, republished Amsterdam 1964); Rufinus of Aquileia's translation of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius, with two supplementary books of his own, ed. by T. Mommsen in *GCS* 9, 1–3 (Berlin 1908–9); Sulpicius Severus, the *World Chronicle* or *Historia Sacra* (down to 400), ed. by C. Halm in *CSEL* 1 (Vienna 1866); Paulus Orosius, *Historia adversus paganos,* an outline of world history to the year 474, ed. by C. Zangmeister in *CSEL* 5 (Vienna 1882); *The World Chronicles* of Tiro Prosper of Aquitaine, Cassiodorus and Isidore of Seville, edited by T. Mommsen in *MGAuctant* 9 and 11 (Berlin 1892 and 1894).

ACTS OF THE MARTYRS AND THE VITAE OF THE EARLY SAINTS

The Acts of the martyrs and the Vitae of the early saints are valuable source-material for the first centuries of the history of the Church. They have been catalogued in three works ed. by the Bollandists: *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1898–1901, reprinted in 1949), a supplementary vol. appeared in 1911; *Bibliotheca hagiographica* *graeca,* 3 vols. (Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957); *Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis* (Brussels 1910). *Acta Sanctorum,* begun by J. Bolland at Antwerp in 1643, serves editors and commentators working on these sources. The vols. are arranged according to the saints' days of the Roman Calendar, beginning with January. The most recent vol., no. 65, contains the ninth and tenth days of November. Two important supplementary vols. are: *Martyrologium Hieronymianum,* ed. by H. Quentin and H. Delehaye (Brussels 1931) and *Martyrologium Romanum,* revised by H. Delehaye (Brussels 1940). A selection of the most important *Acta* is found in: T. Ruinart, *Acta martyrum sincera* (Paris 1689. Regensburg, 5th ed. 1859). The selection by R. Knopf and G. Krüger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929), is intended for the use of students. A fundamental work for Byzantine hagiography is that of A. Ehrhard and J. M. Hoeck, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche,* of which vols. I–III have so far appeared (Leipzig 1937–52) (*TU* 50–2). The leading periodical for the whole field of hagiography is: *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels 1882 seqq.), with bibliography.

LITURGIES, CREEDS, ACTS OF COUNCILS, PAPAL DECREES

Source-works on ancient liturgies, creeds, acts of councils and papal decrees, important for our knowledge of the inner life of the Church, have been accorded separate treatment.

a) LITURGIES: Among collections of liturgical texts the following should be mentioned: J. A. Assemani, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universalis,* 13 vols. (Rome 1749–66, new imp. Paris 1922 seqq.); H. A. Daniel, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universalis,* 4 vols. (Leipzig 1847–53); N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1896–7). The following contain only Oriental texts: J. Goar, *Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecorum* (Paris 1647, Venice 1730, latest imp. Graz 1959); E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio,* 2 vols. (Paris 1716, Frankfurt 1847); H. Denzinger, *Ritus Orientalium,* 2 vols. (Würzburg 1863–4); F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western,* I: *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford 1896). There is new material in: H. Leclercq, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica* (Paris, I, 1902–13, V, 1904); W. Bulst, *Hymni latini antiquissimi* (Heidelberg 1956) contains early Latin hymns.
The recent collection *Opuscula et textus, series liturgica* (Münster 1933) publishes select liturgical texts, as does also: *Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen* (Münster 1918 seqq.).
Recent critical editions, especially of Latin texts, are named at the appropriate places in the present work; for them the following manuals on liturgy may be consulted: L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik* (Freiburg i. Br., 2 vols. 1932–3); M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica, I–IV* (Milan, 2nd ed. 1950–5); A.-G. Martimort (ed.), *Introduction à la liturgie* (Paris 1961).

Fundamental works for the study of ancient liturgies are: L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 5th ed. 1920), Eng. tr. *Christian Worship. Its Origin and Evolution. A Study of the Latin Liturgy up to the Time of Charlemagne* (New York, 2nd ed. 1954); J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de rebus orientalibus,* 3 vols. (Rome 1930–2); A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée* (Chevetogne, 3rd ed. 1953).

b) THE CREEDS of the ancient Church have been collected by A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln* (Hildesheim 1962). There is a selection in H. Lietzmann, *Ausgewählte Symbole der alten Kirche, KlT* 17–18 (Berlin, 3rd ed. 1931). Other collections are: H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (Freiburg i. Br., 31st ed. 1960), Eng. tr. *The Sources of Catholic Dogma* (St. Louis 1957); F. Cavallera, *Thesaurus doctrinae catholicae ex documentis magisterii ecclesiastici* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1937). For the early Byzantine period: J. N. Karmiris, Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς 'Ορθοδόξου Καθολικῆς

'Εκκλησίας (Athens, 2 vols. 1952–3, 2nd ed. 1960). See also: H. Lietzmann. "Symbolstudien" in *ZNW* 21 (1922), 22 (1923), 24 (1925), 26 (1927), now contained in H. Lietzmann, *Kleine Schriften, III* (Berlin 1962), 189–281; F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1894–1900, new impression Darmstadt 1964); J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Age, I: Les recherches depuis cinq siècles sur les origines du symbole des apôtres* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1949); F. J. Badcock, *History of the Creeds* (London, 2nd ed. 1938); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London, 2nd ed. 1960).

c) The Acts of the Early Christian Councils are to be found in the great collections of J. Hardouin, *Acta conciliorum et epistolae decretales ac constitutiones summorum pontificum* (Paris, 12 vols., 1714 seq.), and J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence – Venice 1759–98, new imp. and continuation, Lyons – Paris 1899–1927, new imp. Graz 1960–1). The Acts of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon have been published in critical editions by E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum* (Berlin 1914 seqq.). Smaller editions of texts are: F. Lauchert, *Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Konzilien* (Freiburg i. Br. 1896, new imp. Frankfurt 1961); E. J. Jonkers, *Acta et symbola conciliorum quae saeculo quarto habita sunt* (Leiden 1954). The decrees and canons of the early Christian Councils may now be conveniently found in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo *et alii* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962).

A basic work for the history of the ancient councils is: C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* I–III (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1873–7), and the French translation (with supplementary matter by H. Leclerq, *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*, I–III (Paris 1907–10). On the council of Chalcedon: *Das Konzil von Chaldekon*, ed. by A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, 3 vols. (Würzburg 1951–4).

d) The Principal Papal Decrees of the early period have been published in P. Coustant, *Pontificum Romanorum a s. Clemente usque ad s. Leonem epistulae genuinae* (Paris 1721, Göttingen 1796), and A. Thiel, *Epistulae Romanorum pontificum genuinae a s. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II*, vol. I (Braunsberg 1867). A collection of the earliest *Vitae* of the popes is contained in: *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. by L. Duchesne, 2 vols. (Paris 1907–15); new ed. by C. Vogel in 3 vols. (ibid. 1955–7) The history of the early popes is related in E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft*, 2 vols. (Tübingen 1930–3); J. Haller, *Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit*, I: *Die Grundlagen* (Urach – Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1950); F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste*, I: *Der Aufstieg des Papsttums* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1954).

EARLY CHRISTIAN PAPYRI

Early Christian papyri form a body of source-material that is constantly increasing in importance. Collections of papyri are being published, either in separate series or in special periodicals. The following may be mentioned: *Berliner griechische Urkunden* (Berlin 1895 seqq.); *The Oxyrhynchos Papyri* (London 1898 seqq.); *Papiri greci e latini della Società Italiana* (Florence 1912 seqq.); *Select Papyri*, 3 vols. in the Loeb Classical Library, ed. by A. S. Hunt, C. C. Edgar, and D. L. Page (London 1932–41).

Christian Texts only: C. Wessely, *Les plus anciens monuments du christianisme écrits sur papyrus, POR* 4, 2; 18, 3 (Paris 1907, 1924); G. Ghedini, *Lettere Christiane dai papiri del III° e IV° secolo* (Milan 1923). Other letters: *Aegyptus* 34 (1954), 266–82. Liturgical texts: C. del Grande, *Liturgiae, preces hymni Christianorum e papyris collecti* (Naples, 2nd ed. 1934); *Aegyptus* 36 (1956), 247–53, 37 (1957), 23–31.

Periodicals and ancillary studies: *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, ed. by U. Wilcken

(Leipzig 1901 seqq.); *Aegyptus, Rivista Italiana di Egittologia e Papirologia* (Milan 1920 seqq.), with valuable bibliography and specializing in Christian texts. W. Schubert, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Berlin 1918); K. Preisendanz, *Papyrusfunde und Papyrusforschung* (Leipzig 1933); A. Calderini, *Manuale di papirologia antica greca e romana* (Milan 1938, with bibliography, 176–92); F. Preisigke and E. Kiessling, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin 1925 seqq.); E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin 1923–38); W. Schubert, *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* (Bonn 1911), (= *Tabulae in usum scholarum,* ed. J. Lietzmann, No. 2).

PHILOLOGICAL AIDS

For work on the written sources of early Church history, a knowledge of certain branches of Classical studies, especially of philology, is indispensable. A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die klassische Altertumswissenschaft* give an introduction to this subject (3 vols., Leipzig, 3rd ed. 1921 seqq.). More comprehensive are the relevant volumes of the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* latest revised editions, now ed. by H. Bengtson (Munich 1955 seqq.).

A work of reference to be constantly consulted is: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* in the revised version of G. Wissowa, W. Kroll and K. Mittelhaus (Stuttgart 1893 seqq.).

The most important Latin dictionaries are: C. du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis,* first published in 3 vols. (Paris 1678), many times reprinted and enlarged, most recently by L. Favre, 10 vols. (Niort 1883–7); *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (Leipzig 1900 seqq.); A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to* A.D. *600* (Oxford 1949); A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Strasbourg 1954). See also C. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens,* I (Rome 1961), II (Rome 1961); H. Nunn, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin* (New York 1928); M. O'Brien, *Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography* (Washington 1930).

The most important Greek dictionaries are: H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus graecae linguae,* latest ed. in 8 vols. (Paris 1831–55); H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexikon,* ed. by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie (Oxford 1940); W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 4th ed. 1957); *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* ed. by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Stuttgart 1933 seqq.), Eng. tr. *Theological Dictionary of the New Test.,* vol. I (Grand Rapids 1964); G. W. H. Lampe, *A Greek Patristic Lexicon* (Oxford 1961 seqq.); E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (A.D. *146 to 1100)* (New York, 3rd ed. 1888). See also S. B. Psaltes, *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken* (Göttingen 1913); F. Blass and H. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen, 11th ed. 1961).

PALAEOGRAPHY: V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1911–13); B. A. van Groningen, *Short Manual of Greek Palaeography* (Leiden 1940); R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscripts grecs* (Paris 1954); H. Hunger, *Studien zur griechischen Paläographie* (Vienna 1954); F. Steffens, *Lateinische Paläographie* (Trier, 2nd ed. 1907–9); B. Bretholz, *Lateinische Paläographie* (Leipzig–Berlin, 3rd ed. 1926); G. Battelli, *Lezioni di paleografia* (Vatican City, 3rd ed. 1949); B. Bischoff, *Paläographie* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1957). To these may be added the vols. of facsimiles ed. by H. Lietzmann: *Specimina codicum graecorum Vaticanorum* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1929) and *Specimina codicum latinorum Vaticanorum* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1927), as well as the periodical *Scriptorium* (Antwerp 1948 seqq.).

PATROLOGY

The above-mentioned sources are all systematically treated in the histories of early Christian literature and in the manuals and textbooks of patrology, as follows: A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* 3 vols. (Leipzig 1893–1904); new impression of the 4th ed. with supplementary matter by K. Aland (Leipzig 1958); O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* 5 vols. (Freiburg i. Br., I–III, 1913–23; IV, 1924; V, 1932; repr. Darmstadt 1962). On Syriac writers: O. de Urbina, *Patrologia Syriaca,* I (Rome 1958); M. Moricca, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana,* 3 vols. (Turin 1924–34); A. Puech, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne,* 3 vols. (Paris 1928–9); F. Cayré, *Patrologie et histoire de la théologie, I: Précis de patrologie* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1958), Eng. tr. *A Manual of Patrology and the History of Theology* (Paris 1936), several new editions have appeared; P. de Labriolle, Eng. tr. *History and Literature of Christianity from Tertullian to Boethius* (London–New York, 2nd ed. 1947); F. Cross, *The Early Christian Fathers* (London 1960); J. Quasten, *Patrology,* 3 vols. so far (Utrecht 1950–60); B. Altaner, *Patrology* (Freiburg–London–New York, 2nd imp. 1960) from the fifth German edition 1958.

Certain sections of patristic studies are dealt with in the following works: M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,* I (Munich 1911, new imp. Graz 1959); F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1953); H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959, *HAW*); P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des IIᵉ et IIIᵉ siècles* (Paris 1961); A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der griechisch-christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche* (Munich 1939).

The works of the Eastern Christian writers are treated of in: A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn 1922), with additions by A. Baumstark and A. Rücker in the *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* III (Leiden 1954), 169–204; J. Chabot, *La littérature syriaque* (Paris 1935); F. N. Fink, "Geschichte der armenischen Literatur" in *Geschichte der christlichen Literatur des Orients* (Leipzig 1907); K. Kiparian, *Geschichte der armenischen Literatur,* I (Venice 1944); H. Thorossian, *Histoire de la littérature arménienne* (Paris 1951); G. Peradze, *Die altchristliche Literatur in georgischer Überlieferung, OrChr* 3–8 (Wiesbaden 1930–3); J. Karst, *Littérature géorgienne chrétienne* (Paris 1934); M. Tarchnišvili and J. Assfalg, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (Rome 1955); O'Leary, "Littérature copte" in *DACL* 9 (1930), 1599–635; S. Morenz, "Die koptische Literatur" in *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* I (Leiden 1952), 207–19; W. Till, "Coptic and its Value" in *BJRL* 40 (1957), 229–58, with bibliography; G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur,* 5 vols. (Rome 1944–53).

The chief bibliographical aid for the whole field is now the *Bibliographia Patristica,* ed. by W. Schneemelcher (Berlin 1956 seqq.). The *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine,* since 1921 associated with the *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous), is concerned only with Christian Latin literature.

II. MONUMENTAL SOURCES

EARLY CHRISTIAN EPIGRAPHY

Early Christian life, in so far as it has left "monuments" of itself (taking the term in its widest sense), is the subject of Christian archaeology. One of this science's most important branches is early Christian epigraphy, which is the study of Latin and Greek Christian inscriptions. These have mostly been collected according to localities; and among such collections, that of the city of Rome is of particular significance: J. B. de Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae,* 2 vols. (Rome 1864—80), enlarged by J. Gatti with a Supplement to vol. I (Rome 1915). The continuation of this work has been undertaken by A. Silvagni, *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae, Nova Series,* 3 vols. (Rome 1934–56). See also H. Zilliacus, *Sylloge inscriptionum christianarum veterum Musei Vaticani,* I–II (Helsinki 1963); I. Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage* (Helsinki 1963).

Next come the collections for separate countries: E. le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule,* 3 vols. (Paris 1856–92, new imp. Paris 1923); A. Hübner, *Inscriptiones Britanniae christianae* (Berlin–London 1876); E. Egli, *Die christlichen Inschriften der Schweiz* (Zürich 1895); S. Gsell, *Inscriptions latines d'Algérie,* I–II (Paris 1922–57); A. L. Delattre, *L'épigraphie funéraire chrétienne à Carthage* (Tunis 1926); J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda* (Barcelona 1942, supplement Barcelona 1942); F. X. Kraus, *Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinlande,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1890–4), now superseded by F. Gose, *Katalog der frühchristlichen Inschriften in Trier* (Berlin 1958); G. Behrens, *Das frühchristliche und merowingische Mainz* (Mainz 1950); J. B. Ward Perkins and J. M. Reynolds, *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* (Rome 1952).

The principal early Christian Latin inscriptions from all areas where discoveries have been made have been collected and explained by E. Diehl in *Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres,* 3 vols. (Berlin 1925–31).
Greek-Christian inscriptions have been published in: L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde and C. Mondésert, *Inscriptions grecques (et latines) de la Syrie,* 4 vols. (Paris 1929–55); W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder and W. K. C. Guthrie, *Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia, Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua,* IV (Manchester 1933); W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder, *Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria,* ibid. VI (Manchester 1939); H. Lietzmann, N. A. Bees, and G. Sotiriu, *Die griechisch-christlichen Inschriften des Peloponnes-Isthmos-Korinth* (Athens 1941); J. S. Creaghan and A. E. Raubitschek, *Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens* (Woodstock 1947). New discoveries are reported in the *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum* (Leiden 1923 seqq.).

AIDS to the study of Christian epigraphy: the following articles give a general account of the subject: L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, "Inscriptions grecques chrétiennes" in *DACL* VII, 623–94; H. Leclerq, "Inscriptions latines chrétiennes", ibid. 694–850. On the growth of the great collections of inscriptions, see 850–1089. Manuals and textbooks: R. Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine* (Paris, 4th ed. 1914); W. Larfeld, *Griechische Epigraphik* (Munich, 3rd ed. 1914); C. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der altchristlichen Epigraphik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1917); P. Testini, "Epigrafia" in *Archeologia cristiana* (Rome 1959), 327–543. Two volumes of the *Tabulae in usum scholarum* ed. by H. Lietzmann, give specimens: No. 4, *Inscriptiones latinae,* compiled by E. Diehl (Bonn 1912), and No. 7, *Inscriptiones graecae,* compiled by O. Kern (Bonn 1913). For the bibliography of the subject, see: *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* (Rome 1924 seqq.); *Fasti archeologici* (Florence 1948 seqq.).

NUMISMATICS

In recent times the ancillary science of numismatics has made a considerable contribution to our understanding of the history of the Church under the Christian emperors. The older bibliography is to be found in H. Leclercq, "Monnaie" in *DACL* XI, 2260–350. Further bibliographies in J. Babelon, "Monnaie" in *DBS* V (1957), 1346–75, and P. Grierson, *Coins and Medals, A Select Bibliography* (London 1954). The coins of imperial times have been collected and described by H. Mattingly and E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage* (London 1923 seqq.), of which vol. IX contains the coins of Valentinian I to those of Theodosius I; that containing those of Constantine is in preparation. Until it appears, consult J. Maurice, *Numismatique constantinienne,* 3 vols. (Paris 1906–13). Other important works: A. Alföldi, *Die Kontorniaten* (Budapest 1943); M. Bernhard, *Handbuch zur Münzkunde der römischen Kaiserzeit,* 2 vols. (Halle 1926). For a critical evaluation see V. Schultze, "Christliche Münzprägung unter Constantin" in *ZKG* 44 (1925), 321–7; K. Kraft, "Silbermedaillon Constantins des Großen mit dem Christusmonogramm auf dem Helm" in *Jahrbuch für Numismatik* 5–6 (1954–5), 151–78; G. Bruck, "Die Verwendung christlicher Symbole auf Münzen von Constantin I bis Magnentius" in *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 6 (1955), 26–32.

EARLY CHRISTIAN BURIAL

Early Christian methods of burial are also an important subject of archaeological study, centred largely on Rome. See: J. B. de Rossi, *La Roma sotterranea cristiana,* 3 vols. (Rome 1864–77); P. Styger, *Altchristliche Grabeskunst* (Augsburg 1927); idem, *Die römischen Katakomben* (Berlin 1933); idem, *Römische Märtyrergrüfte* (Berlin 1935); L. Hertling and E. Kirschbaum, *Die römischen Katakomben und ihre Märtyrer* (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1955); J. Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1903); F. Wirth, *Römische Wandmalerei* (Berlin 1934); S. Bettini, *Frühchristliche Malerei* (Vienna 1942); J. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi cristiani antichi,* 3 vols. (Rome 1929–36); F. Gerke, *Die christlichen Sarkophage der vorkonstantinischen Zeit* (Berlin 1940); G. Bovini, *I sarcofagi paleocristiani* (Rome 1949); C. Cecchelli, *Monumenti cristiano-eretici di Roma* (Rome 1944).

CHRISTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ART

Manuals and periodicals concerning Christian archaeology and accounts of early Christian art: C. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie* (Paderborn, 3rd ed. 1922); R. Krautheimer, *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae* (Rome 1937 seqq.); C. Cecchelli, *Iconografia dei papi* (Rome 1938 seqq.); B. Ladner, *Papstbildnisse des Altertums und des Mittelalters,* I (Rome 1941); P. Testini, *Archaeologia cristiana* (Rome 1959); O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und byzantinische Kunst* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1919, supplement Berlin 1939); O. M. Dalton, *Eastern Christian Art* (Oxford 1925); C. R. Morey, *Early Christian Art* (Princeton, 2nd ed. 1953); D. T. Rice, *The Beginnings of Christian Art* (London 1957); W. F. Volbach and M. Hirmer, Eng. tr. *Early Christian Art* (London 1961); F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann, Eng. tr. *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (London 1958); *Bollettino di archeologia cristiana* (Rome 1863–94) and *Nuovo Bollettino di archeologia cristiana* (Rome 1895–1923); *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* (Rome 1924 seqq.) with bibliography; *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1887 seqq.); *Cahiers archéologiques* (Paris 1945 seqq.); *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* (Münster 1958 seqq.); *Atti del III° congresso internazionale di archeologia cristiana* (Rome 1934); *Atti del IV° congresso,* 2 vols. (Rome 1940–8); *Actes du Ve congrès* (Paris 1957); F. X. Kraus, *Realencyclopädie der christlichen Altertümer,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1882–6); *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* 15 vols. (Paris 1907–53).

III. HISTORIES OF THE EARLY CHURCH

General

P. Batiffol, *Le catholicisme des origines à s. Léon,* 4 vols. (Paris, 3rd to 5th ed. 1911–30), many times reprinted; B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to* A.D. *461* (Oxford 1922); L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'église,* 3 vols. (Paris, 3rd to 5th ed. 1923–9), Eng. tr. *Early History of the Christian Church* (New York 1924) from the 1st French edition; idem, *L'église au VI^e siècle* (Paris 1925); G. Krüger, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* I (Tübingen, 2nd ed. 1923); J. Zeiller, *L'empire romain et l'église* (Paris 1928); J. P. Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte,* I (Freiburg i. Br. 1930); C. Poulet, Eng. tr. *History of the Primitive Church,* 4 vols. (New York 1942–8); A. Ehrhard, *Die Kirche der Märtyrer* (Munich 1932); idem, *Die katholische Kirche im Wandel der Zeiten und Völker,* 2 vols. (Bonn 1935–7); A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'église,* I–V (Paris 1935–8), Eng. tr. *A History of the Catholic Church,* 2 vols. (London – St Louis, 2nd ed. 1956); F. Heiler, *Die katholische Kirche des Ostens und Westens,* I (Munich 1937); H. Lother, *Geschichte des Christentums,* I (Leipzig 1939); J. von Walter, *Die Geschichte des Christentums,* I (Gütersloh, 2nd ed. 1939); K. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte,* I/1 (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1941); P. Hughes, *A History of the Church,* I (London, 2nd ed. 1948); E. Buonaiuti, *Geschichte des Christentums,* I (Berne 1948); C. Schneider, *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums,* 2 vols. (Munich 1954); P. Carrington, *The Early Church* (1st and 2nd centuries), 2 vols. (Cambridge 1957); H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche,* 4 vols. (Berlin, 3rd – 4th edd. 1961), Eng. tr. *A History of the Early Church,* 4 vols. (London 1937–51); K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte,* I (Paderborn, 13th ed. 1962), Eng. tr. *Church History,* I (Westminster, Md. 1958); K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf (ed.). *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* Göttingen 1962 seqq., in parts); *The Christian Centuries,* edd. L. J. Rogier *et alii,* vol. I, J. Daniélou and H. Marrou, *The First Six Hundred Years* (London – New York 1964).

Histories of Dogma

A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* 3 vols. (Tübingen, 5th ed. 1931, new imp. in preparation), Eng. tr. *History of Dogma,* 7 vols. (New York 1962); idem, *Dogmengeschichte (Grundriß)* (Tübingen, 7th ed. 1931), Eng. tr. *Outline of the History of Dogma* (London 1962); R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* I–II (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1922, new imp. Darmstadt 1960), Eng. tr. *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* (Grand Rapids 1956); idem, *Grundriß der Dogmengeschichte* (Leipzig, 7th ed. 1936); J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes dans l'antiquité chrétienne,* 3 vols. (I, 11th ed. Paris 1930, II, 9th ed. 1931; III, 8th ed. 1928), Eng. tr. *History of Dogmas,* from the 5th French ed. (St Louis – London 1928–32); F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (Tübingen, 6th ed. 1959); K. Prümm, *Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1935); idem, *Christentum als Neuheitserlebnis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939).

W. Koehler, *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des christlichen Selbstbewußtseins* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1951); H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen 1953); M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Tübingen, 2nd ed. 1954), Eng. tr. *The Formation of Christian Dogma* (New York 1957); A. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (London 1954); M. Schmaus, J. R. Geiselmann and A. Grillmeier, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1951 seqq.), Eng. tr. *The Herder History of Dogma:* B. Poschmann, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick* (Freiburg – London – New York – Montreal 1964) and B. Neunheuser, *Baptism and Confirmation* (Freiburg – London – New York – Montreal 1964); J. N. D. Kelly,

Early Christian Doctrines (London 1958); J. Daniélou, *Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée,* 2 vols. (Tournai 1958–61); A. Grillmeier, "Hellenisierung–Judaisierung des Christentums als Deutungsprinzipien der Geschichte des kirchlichen Dogmas" in *Scholastik* 33 (1958), 321–55 528–58.

Special Subjects

J. Stelzenberger, *Die Beziehungen der frühchristlichen Sittenlehre zur Ethik der Stoa* (Munich 1933); M. Viller and K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik der Väterzeit* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939); P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* I (Paris, 3rd ed. 1943), Eng. tr. *Christian Spirituality* (Westminster 1954); L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du Nouveau Testament et des Pères* (Paris 1960), Eng. tr. *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (New York 1963); A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig, 4th ed. 1924; a new imp. is projected), Eng. tr. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (New York 1937); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* I: *The First Five Centuries* (New York 1937); G. Schnürer, *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter,* I (Paderborn, 3rd ed. 1936), Eng. tr. *Church and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Patterson 1956); J. H. Waszink *et alii, Het oudste christendom en de antieke cultuur* (down to Irenaeus), 2 vols. (Haarlem 1951); C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (New York, second edition 1944, new impression 1957); W. Durant, *Caesar and Christ. A History of Roman Civilization and of Christianity from the Beginnings to* A.D. *325* (New York 1944); W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, Mass. 1961); H. Eibl, *Augustin und die Patristik, Geschichte der Philosophie in Einzeldarstellungen,* III, 10/11 (Munich 1923); B. Geyer, *Die patristische und scholastische Philosophie* in F. Ueberweg, *Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie,* II (Berlin, 11th ed. 1928, new imp. in preparation); K. Prümm, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der altchristlichen Welt* (Freiburg i. Br. 1943, new imp. Rome 1954); E. Kornemann, *Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeerraumes,* II: *Von Augustus bis zum Sieg der Araber* (Munich 1949); F. Lot, *La fin du monde antique* (Paris 1951), Eng. tr. *The End of the Ancient World* (New York, 2nd ed. 1961); E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire,* I (A.D. 284–476) (Paris, 2nd ed. 1959), II (A.D. 475–565) (Paris 1949); L. Bréhier, *Le monde byzantin,* 3 vols. (Paris 1947–50); G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich, 3rd ed. 1963), Eng tr. *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, 2nd ed. 1957).

IV. WORKS OF REFERENCE, PERIODICALS, AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Works of Reference

Besides the special lexica already mentioned, the following are important: *The Catholic Encyclopedia,* 15 vols. (New York 1907–12; supplementary volume, 1922), new encyclopedia in preparation; *Catholicisme, Hier–Aujourd'hui–Demain,* ed. by G. Jacquement (Paris 1928 seqq.); *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément,* ed. by L. Pirot and A. Robert (Paris 1928 seqq.); *Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* ed. by R. Naz (Paris 1935 seqq.); *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique,* ed. by A. Baudrillart, A. de Meyer, E. van Cauwenbergh and R. Aubert (Paris 1912 seqq.); *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique,* ed. by M. Villier, M. Olphe Gailliard, A. Rayez, and C. Baumgartner (Paris 1932 seqq.); *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* ed. by A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amann (Paris 1930 seqq.); *Enciclopedia cattolica,* 12 vols. (Vatican City 1949–54); *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon,* ed. by H. Brunotte and O. Weber (Göttingen 1955 seqq.); *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. by J. Höfer and K. Rahner, (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1957 seqq.); *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. by T. Klauser (Stuttgart 1950 seqq.); *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. by K. Galling (Tübingen, 3rd. ed. 1957 seqq.); P. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae* (Regensburg 1873; supplements 1879–86; new imp. Graz 1957); E. Bayer, *Wörterbuch zur Geschichte* (Stuttgart 1960); *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, F. L. Cross ed. (London 1957); K. Pieper, *Atlas orbis antiqui* (Düsseldorf 1931); K. Heussi and H. Mulert, *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1937); B. Llorca, *Atlas y cuadros sincrónicos de historia eclesiástica* (Barcelona 1950); R. S. Dell, *An Atlas of Christian History* (London 1960); J. G. T. Graesse, *Orbis latinus. Verzeichnis der wichtigsten Orts- und Ländernamen* (Berlin, 3rd ed. 1922).

PERIODICALS

Periodicals, most of which contain extensive book reviews, specially devoted to the study of early Christianity: *Antike und Christentum*, by F. J. Dölger, I–VI (Münster 1929–50); *Biblica* (Rome 1920 seqq.) with bibliography of primitive Christianity; *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* (Münster 1958 seqq.); *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, I–XV (Münster 1921–41); *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* (Regensburg 1950 seqq.); *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* (Münster 1951 seqq.); *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* (Paris 1955 seqq.); *Vigiliae Christianae* (Amsterdam 1947 seqq.); *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* (Giessen–Berlin 1900 seqq.).

Among the theological periodicals which give considerable space to matters concerning the early Church, the following are worthy of special mention: *Analecta Sacra Tarragonensia* (Barcelona 1925 seqq.); *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1903 seqq.); *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (Toulouse 1899 seqq.); *Byzantion* (Brussels 1924 seqq.); *Biblische Zeitschrift* (Freiburg 1903–29, Paderborn 1931–39, 1957 seqq.); *Church History* (New York–Chicago 1932 seqq.); *The Catholic Historical Review* (Washington 1915 seqq.); *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (Cambridge, Mass. 1941 seqq.); *Estudios eclesiásticos* (Madrid 1922–36, 1942 seqq.); *Échos d'Orient* (Paris 1892–1942); *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (Bruges 1924 seqq.); *Evangelische Theologie* (Munich 1934 seqq.); *Gregorianum* (Rome 1920 seqq.); *Geist und Leben* (Würzburg 1947 seqq.); *Historisches Jahrbuch* (Cologne 1880 seqq., Munich 1950 seqq.); *The Harvard Theological Review* (Cambridge, Mass. 1908 seqq.); *Irénikon* (Amay–Chevetogne, Belgium 1926 seqq.); *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (London 1950 seqq.); *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* (Cassel 1955 seqq.); *Journal of Theological Studies* (London 1899 seqq.); *Mélanges de science religieuse* (Lille 1944 seqq.); *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* (Munich 1950 seqq.); *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (Tournai 1879 seqq.); *Oriens Christianus* (Wiesbaden 1901 seqq.); *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* (Rome 1935 seqq.); *L'Orient syrien* (Paris 1956 seqq.); *Ostkirchliche Studien* (Würzburg 1951 seqq.); *Le Proche-Orient Chrétien* (Jerusalem 1951 seqq.); *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* (Toulouse 1920 seqq.); *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous 1884 seqq.); *Revue des Études byzantines* (Paris 1946 seqq.); *Revue des Études Grecques* (Paris 1888 seqq.); Revue des *Études latines* (Paris 1923 seqq.); *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* (Strasbourg 1921 seqq.); *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* (Strasbourg 1921 seqq.); *Revue de l'histoire des religions* (Paris 1880 seqq.); *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* (Paris 1896 seqq.); *Revue de Qumran* (Paris 1958 seqq.); *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (Paris 1907 seqq.); *Recherche de science religieuse* (Paris 1910 seqq.); *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* (Rome 1947 seqq.); *Studia Anselmiana* (Rome 1933 seqq.); *Sacris erudiri* (Bruges 1948 seqq.); *Studia Catholica* (Roermond 1924 seqq.); *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Leipzig–Berlin 1878 seqq.); *Theologische Quartalschrift* (Tübingen 1819 seqq., Stuttgart 1946 seqq.); *Theological Studies*

(Baltimore 1940 seqq.); *Theologische Zeitschrift* (Basle 1945 seqq.); *Traditio* (New York 1943 seqq.); *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (Trier 1888 seqq.); *Zeitschrift für Askese und Mystik* (Innsbruck–Munich 1926 seqq.); *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (Stuttgart 1876 seqq.); *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (Innsbruck–Vienna 1877 seqq.); *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (Tübingen 1891 seqq.).

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The most comprehensive periodical bibliography for the whole field of ecclesiastical history is contained in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* (Louvain 1900 seqq.) Another important publication is *Bulletin de théologie ancienne et médiévale,* which is published in association with *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* (Louvain 1929 seqq.). The following also contain critical reviews of works on the early history of the Church: *Theologische Rundschau* (Tübingen 1897 seqq.) and *Theologische Revue* (Münster 1902 seqq.), section 5, in the bibliographical appendix.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One: The Beginnings

SECTION ONE

Jewish Christianity

1. *Judaism in the Time of Jesus*

General

C. K. Barret, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents* (London–New York 1957), H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 5 vols. (Munich 1922–56); R. A. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times* (New York 1948); R. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London–New York 1963); R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting* (London–New York 1957); W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period* (London 1941); J. Parkes, *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity* (London 1960); H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen 1949); idem, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (Tübingen 1950); idem, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (Tübingen 1956); J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London 1964); K. Schubert, *Die Religion des Nachbiblischen Judentums* (Freiburg–Vienna 1955); W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1926); N. Levison, *The Jewish Background of Christianity* (Edinburgh 1932); P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg 1928); J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu* (Göttingen, 2nd ed. 1962); F. Nötscher, *Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament* (Bonn 1962); B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Uppsala 1961).

Palestinian Judaism

E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ,* 3 vols. (Edinburgh 1886–90, abridged ed. New York 1961); W. O. E. Oesterley and T. A. Robinson, *A History of Israel,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1932); F.-M. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine,* 2 vols. (Paris 1952); M. Noth, *The History of Israel* (London, 2nd rev. ed. 1960).

G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era,* 3 vols. (2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass. 1946–8); J. Bonsirven, *Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Christ* (New York 1963); P. Demann, *Judaïsme* (New York 1961); L. Finkelstein, *The Jews, their History, Culture and Religion,* 2 vols. (New York, 3rd ed. 1960); *M. Hengel, Die Zeloten, Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I bis 70 v. Chr.* (Leiden–Cologne 1961); R. Travers Herford, *The Pharisees* (Boston, 2nd ed. 1962); M. Simon, *Die jüdischen Sekten zur Zeit Jesu* (Cologne, 2nd ed. 1962).

Qumran

Bibliography in the *Revue de Qumran* (Paris 1958 seqq.), earlier see C. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (Berlin 1957, vol. II, 1964); W. S. Lasor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1957* (Pasadena 1958); H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriften vom Toten Meer,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1952–8); idem, *Qumran-Probleme* (Berlin 1963); M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York 1955); idem, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York 1958); J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (London 1959); F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (New York 1958); J. P. M. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran* (London 1958); F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids 1959); K. H. Rengstorf, *Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* (Stuttgart 1960); J. Schreiden, *Les énigmes des manuscripts de la mer morte* (Wetteren 1961); A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford 1961); J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* 2 vols. (Munich 1961); G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London 1962); J. Carmignac, *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Baltimore 1962); H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran* (Philadelphia 1963); F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London, 2nd ed. 1961); L. Mowry, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church* (Chicago 1962); A. N. Gilkes, *The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London 1963); M. Baillet – J. T. Milik – R. de Vaux, *Les petites grottes de Qumran (2Q, 3Q, 5Q–10Q). Le rouleau de cuivre* (Oxford 1962); E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch* (Munich 1964); A. Braun, "Research reports on Qumran and N. T." in *ThR* 28 (1962); 29 (1963); 30 (1964); F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* (Bonn 1956); D. Howlett, *The Essenes and Christianity* (New York 1957); H. Braun, *Spätjüdischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus,* I, *Das Spätjudentum* (Tübingen 1957); K. Schubert, *Die Gemeinde von Qumran* (Munich 1958); H. E. Del Medico, *Le mythe des esséniens* (Paris 1958); H. Kosmala, *Hebräer, Essener, Christen* (Leiden 1959); O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in den Qumrantexten* (Tübingen 1960); E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran* (London 1960); K. H. Schelkle, *Die Gemeinde von Qumran und die Kirche des Neuen Testamentes* (Düsseldorf 1960); A. Adam, *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (Berlin 1961); H. H. Rowley, "The Qumran Sect and Christian Origins" in *BJRL* 44 (1961), 119–56; M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (New York 1961).

THE JEWISH DIASPORA

J. Juster, *Les juifs dans l'empire romain,* 2 vols. (Paris 1914); W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandrien und Rom* (Göttingen 1915); H. J. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (Oxford 1924); H. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia 1960); J. Leipoldt, *Antisemitismus in der alten Welt* (Leipzig 1933); V. Tscherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia 1959); W. Maurer, *Kirche und Synagoge* (Stuttgart 1953); L. Toombs, *The Threshold of Christianity* (Philadelphia 1960).

PHILO

Critical collected ed. by L. Cohn, P. Wendland, S. Reiter, and J. Leisegang, 8 vols. (Berlin 1896–1930); text with English trans. by F.-H. Colson, G. Whitaker (London 1928–52); text with French trans. by R. Arnaldez, C. Mondésert *et alii* (Paris 1961); general account by H. Leisegang in *Pauly – Wissowa* 19, 1–50; E. Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1925); E. Stein, *Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alex.* (Gießen 1929); J. Pascher, *Der Königsweg der Wiedergeburt und Vergottung bei Philo von Alex.* (Paderborn 1931); I. Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (Breslau 1932); W. Völker, *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alex.* (Leipzig 1938); E. R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven 1938); P. Katz, *Philo's Bible* (Cambridge 1950); H. A. Wolfson, *Philo,* 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 2nd ed. 1948); S. Sandmel, *Philo's Place in Judaism* (Cincinnati – New York 1956); H. Thyen, "Die Probleme der neueren Philoforschung" in *ThR* 23 (1955), 230–46; J. Daniélou, *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1958); S. Jellicose, "Philo and the Septuagint Vorlage" in *JThS* XII (1961), 261–71; R. Marcus, "Philo, Josephus and the Dead See Yahod (meaning community)" in *JBL* 71 (1952), 207–9; S. Lauer, "Philo's Concept of Time" in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 9 (1959), 39–46; H. Wolfson, "Philonic God and his latter-day deniers" in *HThR* 53 (1960), 101–24; J. de Savignac, "Le messianisme de Philon d'Alexandrie" in *NovT* 4 (1960), 318–24.

2. *Jesus of Nazareth and the Church*

General Accounts by A. Conzelmann in *RGG*, 3rd ed. III, 619–53; and A. Vögtle in *LThK* V, 922–32; A. Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (Oxford 1954).

L. de Grandmaison, *Jesus Christ*, 3 vols. (New York 1930–4); J. Lebreton, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* (New York, new imp. 1957); A. Goodier, *The Public Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ* (New York, new imp. 1950); G. Ricciotti, *Life of Jesus* (Milwaukee 1950); R. Guardini, *The Lord* (London 1956); J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (1925); M. Dibelius, *Jesus* (Oxford – Philadelphia 1949); R. Bultmann, *Jesus* (New York 1958); G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (London 1960, New York 1963); M. Goguel, *Jesus and the Origins of Christianity* (New York 1963); E. Stauffer, *Jesus and his Story* (London 1960).

J. Aufhauser, *Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1925); J. Moreau, *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus* (Brussels 1944); W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen, 4th ed. 1935); R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York – Oxford 1963); J. M. Robinson, *A New Quest for the Historical Jesus* (1959); H. Zabrut, *The Historical Jesus* (London 1963); F.-M. Braun, *Jésus, histoire et critique* (Paris 1947); B. Rigaux, "Historicité de Jésus devant l'exégèse récente" in *RB* 65 (1958), 482–522; R. Schubert (ed.), *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1960); J. Blinzler, *The Trial of Jesus* (Westminster, Md., 1959).

R. Schnackenburg, *New Testament Theology Today* (London – New York 1963); R. Bultmann, *The Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols. (London 1952–6); E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (London 1957); R. Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom* (Freiburg – London – New York – Montreal 1963); J. Bonsirven, *Theology of the New Testament* (Westminster, Md. 1964).

3. *The Primitive Church at Jerusalem*

F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles, Greek Text and Commentary* (London 1951); F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 5 vols. (London 1920–33); E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1959); A. Wikenhauser, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Regensburg, 3rd ed. 1956); M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York 1956); J. Dupont, *The Sources of Acts* (New York – London 1962); A. Ehrhardt, "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles" in *StTh* 12 (1958), 45–79.

E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (Berlin 1923); A. Loisy, *The Birth of Christian Religion and the Origins of the New Testament* (New York 1962); M. Goguel, *The Primitive Church* (New York – London 1964); O. Cullmann, *The Early Church* (London 1956); P. Carrington, *The Early Christian Church*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1957); E. Ehrhardt, "Christianity before the Apostles' Creed" in *HThR* 55 (1962) 73–119; O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship* (London 1953); W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia 1962).

SECTION TWO

The Way into the Pagan World

4. *The Religious Situation in the Graeco-Roman World at the Time of its Encounter with Christianity*

SOURCES

A. Fairbanks, *A Handbook of Greek Religion* (New York 1910); M. Nilsson, *Greek Folk Religion* (New York 1961); K. Latte, *Die Religion der Römer und der Synkretismus der Kaiserzeit* (Tübingen 1927); H. Kleinknecht, *Pantheion* (Tübingen 1929); N. Turchi, *Fontes mysteriorum aevi hellenistici* (Rome, 4th ed. 1930); A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, 4 vols. (Paris 1945–54); F. C. Grant, *Hellenistic Religions*, 2 vols. (New York 1953–4); idem, *Ancient Roman Religion* (New York 1957); H. Haas and J. Leipoldt, *Die Religionen in der Umwelt des Christentums: Bilderatlas zur Religionsgeschichte* (Leipzig 1926–30).

LITERATURE: 1. HISTORY OF CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION

See the histories of New Testament times already mentioned in addition to the following: P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1912); L. Friedlaender, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, 4 vols. (London 1928–36); W. R. Halliday, *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity* (Liverpool 1926); R. Heinze, *Die augusteische Kultur* (Leipzig 1930, new imp. Darmstadt 1960); W. Kroll, *Die Kultur der ciceronianischen Zeit*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1933); A.-J. Festugière and P. Fabre, *Le monde gréco-romain au temps de Notre-Seigneur*, 2 vols. (Paris 1935); J. Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome* (New Haven 1945); W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization* (London, 3rd ed. 1952); M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1941); U. Kahrstedt, *Kulturgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Berne, 2nd ed. 1958); U. Paoli, *Rome: its People, Life and Customs* . . . (London 1963); A. A. M. van der Heyden and H. E. Stier, *Bildatlas der klassischen Welt* (Gütersloh 1960).

2. RELIGION IN CLASSICAL TIMES

A. D. Nock, *Conversion. The Old and New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustinus of Hippo* (Oxford 1933); K. Prümm, *Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1935); K. Kerényi, *Die Religion der Griechen und Römer* (Munich 1963); R. Bultmann, *Die Religionen im Umkreis des Christentums* (Zürich, 2nd ed. 1954).

(a) Greek religion.

E. Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks* (New York 1925); O. Kern, *Die Religion der Griechen*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1926–38); W. Nestle, *Griechische Religiosität*, III (Berlin 1934); M. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion* (Oxford 1949); W. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (Boston–London 1950); K. Prümm, "Die Religion des Hellenismus" in *König H* II (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1961), 169–244; J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (New York 1957); J. Festugière, *Personal Religion Among the Greeks* (Berkeley 1960); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 3rd ed. 1960).

(b) Roman religion.

J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1929); F. Altheim, *Römische Religionsgeschichte,* III: *Die Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 1933); F. Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York 1956); idem, *Lux Perpetua* (Paris 1949); F. Grant (ed.), *Ancient Roman Religion* (New York 1957); H. Rose, *Ancient Roman Religion* (New York 1957); C. Koch, *Religio, Studien zu Kult und Glauben der Römer* (Nuremberg 1960); T. Glover, *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* (Boston 1960); K. Latte, *Die Religion der Römer* (Munich 1960); M. Vermaseren, *Mithra, ce dieu mystérieux* (Paris 1960).

(c) The Emperor Cult.

G. Herzog-Hauser, *Pauly – Wissowa,* Suppl. IV 806–853. E. Lohmeyer, *Christuskult und Kaiserkult* (Tübingen 1919); S. Lösch, *Deitas Jesu und antike Apotheose* (Rottenburg 1933); E. Stauffer, *Rom und die Cäsaren* (Hamburg 1952); L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Un concurrent du Christianisme. Le culte des souverains romains* (Tournai 1957); E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Darmstadt, 3rd ed. 1958); R. Étienne, *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Paris 1959); F. Taeger, *Charisma,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1960); H. Schlier, *Die Zeit der Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br., 3rd ed. 1962), 14 ff.; M. Nelsson, "The High God and the Mediator" in *HThR* 55 (1963), 101–20; B. Parsi, *Désignation et investiture de l'empereur romain. Ier et IIe siècles après J.-C.* (Paris 1963).

(d) Mystery religions.

F. Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra* (New York 1957); R. Reizenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leipzig, 3rd ed. 1927); H. Gressmann, *Die orientalischen Religionen im hellenistischen Zeitalter* (Berlin 1930); F. Saxl, *Mithra* (Berlin 1931); B. Heigl, *Antike Mysterienreligionen und das Christentum* (Münster 1932); S. Eitrem, *Orakel und Mysterien am Ausgang der Antike* (Zürich 1947); N. Turchi, *Le religioni misteriche del mondo antico* (Milan 1948); V. Magnien, *Les mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris 1950); H. Idris, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool 1953); E. Wallis, *Osiris: The Egyptian Religion of Resurrection* (New York 1961); A. Schütze, *Mithras-Mysterien und das Urchristentum* (Stuttgart 1948); G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleunisian Mysteries* (Princeton 1961); B. Metygee, "Considerations of Methodology in the Study of the Mystery Religions and Early Christianity" in *HThR* 48 (1955), 1–20; *Corpus inscriptionum et monumentorum religionis Mithriacae,* I–II (Hagae Comitis 1956–60); M. Vermaseren, *Mithra, ce dieu mystérieux* (Paris 1960); A. Alvarez de Miranda, *Religiones mistéricas* (Madrid 1961); R. Merkelbach, *Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit* (Meisenheim 1963); H. Hepding, *Attis, seine Mythen und sein Kult* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1964).

(e) Popular religion.

K. Preisendanz, *Papyri graecae magicae* (Leipzig 1928); F. R. Herzog, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus* (Leipzig 1931); F. Boll, *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung* (Leipzig, 4th ed. 1931); E. Massonneau, *La magie dans l'Antiquité romaine* (Paris 1934); E. Stemplinger, *Antiker Volksglaube* (Stuttgart 1948); R. Ehnmark, "Religion and Magic" in *Ethnos* 21 (1956), 1 ff.; W. Gundel, "Astrologie" in *RAC* I, 817–31. For a survey of literature on Roman Religion see H. Rose, "Roman Religion 1910–1960" in *JRS* 50 (1960), 161–72.

(f) Philosophy in late Classical times.

P. E. More, *Hellenistic Philosophies* (Princeton 1923); K. Praechter, *Das Altertum* in Ueberweg – Heinze, *Geschichte der Philosophie,* I (Berlin, 12th ed. 1926); L. Robin, *Greek Thought and the Origins of the Scientific Spirit* (New York 1928); E. Zeller, *Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie der Griechen* (Leipzig, 13th ed. 1928); K. Reinhardt, *Poseidonios* (Munich 1921); E. Bréhier, *Histoire de la philosophie,* II (Paris 1948);

A.-J. Festugière, *Epicurus and his Gods* (Oxford 1955); M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa,* 2 vols. (Göttingen 1948–9); M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des pères de l'église de Clément de Rome à Clement d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1957); R. Harder, *Plotin* (Frankfurt 1958).

5. *The Apostle Paul and the Structure of the Pauline Congregations*

Sources

The sources are the letters of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles. See also the apocryphal Acts of Paul, L. Vouaux, *Les actes de Paul et ses lettres apocryphes* (Paris 1913); R. A. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha,* I (Darmstadt, new imp. 1959); C. Schmidt, Πράξεις Παύλου.*Acta Pauli* (Hamburg 1936); R. Kasser, "Acta Pauli" in *RHPhR* 40 (1960), 45–7.

Literature

Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles, cf. above; commentaries on the letters of Paul cf. A. Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction* (Freiburg – London – New York 1958). For an extensive survey of Pauline literature see: B. Metzger ed., *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul* (Grand Rapids 1960); A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters: A Critical History* (Oxford 1948); E. Ellis, *Paul and his Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids 1961).

General Accounts of Paul's Life: A. Deissmann, *Paul. A Study in Social and Religious History* (New York, new imp. 1963); A. O. Nock, *St Paul* (London 1960); J. S. Stewart, *A Man in Christ* (New York 1944); E.-B. Allo, *Paul, apôtre de Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1956); W. von Loewenich, *Paul: His Life and Work* (Edinburgh 1960); M. Dibelius, *Paul,* edited and completed by W. G. Kümmel (London 1953); J. Klausner, *From Jesus to Paul* (Boston 1961); C. Tresmontant, *St Paul and the Mystery of Christ* (New York 1957); S. Sandmel, *The Genius of Paul* (New York 1958).

Biography of Paul: H. Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos* (Göttingen 1913); A. Steinmann, *Der Werdegang des Paulus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1928); O. Kietzig, *Die Bekehrung des Paulus* (Leipzig 1932); E. Kirschbaum, "Das Grab des Völkerapostels" in *Die Gräber der Apostelfürsten* (Frankfurt a. M., 2nd ed. 1959), 166–97; U. Wilckens, "Die Bekehrung des Paulus als religionsgeschichtliches Problem" in *ZThK* 56 (1959), 273–93; J. Dauvillier, "A propos de la venue de S. Paul à Rome" in *BLE* 61 (1960), 3–26.

Paul's Missionary Activity: W. M. Ramsay, *St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London, 7th ed. 1907); A. Oepke, *Die Missionspredigt des Apostels Paulus* (Leipzig 1920); J. Richter, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus als missionarische Sendschreiben* (Gütersloh 1929); K. Pieper, *Paulus, seine missionarische Persönlichkeit und Wirksamkeit* (Munster, 3rd ed. 1929); W. L. Knox, *St Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge 1939); M. Dibelius, *Paulus auf dem Areopag* (Heidelberg 1939); R. Liechtenhan, *Die urchristliche Mission* (Zürich 1946); H. Metzger, *Saint Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient* (New York 1955); C. Maurer, "Paulus als der Apostel der Völker" in *EvTh* 19 (1959), 28–40; J. Cambier, "Paul, apôtre du Christ et prédicateur de l'évangile" in *NRTh* 81 (1959), 1009–28; M. Meinertz, "Zum Ursprung der Heidenmission" in *Biblica* 40 (1959), 762–77.; E. Lerle, *Proselytenwerbung und Urchristentum* (Berlin 1961); F. Maier, *Paulus als Kirchengründer und kirchlicher Organisator* (Würzburg 1961); V. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden 1961).

Theology and Piety: B. Bartmann, *Paulus. Die Grundzüge seiner Lehre* (Paderborn 1914); W. Mundle, *Das religiöse Leben des Apostels Paulus* (Leipzig 1923); J. Schneider, *Die Passionsmystik des Apostels Paulus* (Leipzig 1929); H. Windisch, *Paulus und Christus* (Leipzig 1934); W. Schmauch, *In Christus. Eine Untersuchung zur Sprache und Theologie des Paulus* (Gütersloh 1935); J. Leipoldt, *Jesus und Paulus—Jesus oder Paulus* (Leipzig 1936); G. Harder, *Paulus und das Gebet* (Gütersloh 1936); A. Röder, *Die Geschichtstheologie des Apostels Paulus* (Speyer 1938); J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (Paris 1939); F. Amiot, *L'enseignement de S. Paul* (Paris, 2 vols. 1946); F. Prat, *The Theology of St Paul,* 2 vols. (Westminster, Md. 1952); J. Dupont, *Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de S. Paul* (Louvain 1949); R. Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St Paul* (London–New York 1964); G. Bornkamm, *Das Ende des Gesetzes. Paulusstudien* (Munich 1952); A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (New York 1955); A. Wikenhauser, *Pauline Mysticism. Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St Paul* (Freiburg–London–New York 1960); E. Lohmeyer, *Probleme paulinischer Theologie* (Tübingen 1954); W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 2nd ed. 1955); P. Demann, "Moïse et la Loi dans la pensée de S. Paul" in *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance* (Paris 1955); K. H. Schelkle, *Paulus, Lehrer der Väter (Rom 1–11)* (Düsseldorf 1956); L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St Paul* (Freiburg–London–New York 1959); J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London 1959); O. Kuss, Enthusiasmus und Realismus bei Paulus" in *Festschrift Th. Kampmann* (Paderborn 1959) 23–27; D. Whiteley, *The Theology of St Paul* (Oxford 1964); C. K. Barret, *From First Adam to Last. A Study in Pauline Theology* (London 1962); L. Cerfaux, *Le chrétien dans la théologie paulinienne* (Paris 1962); J. Dupont, *Le discours de Milet. Testament spirituel de Paul* (Paris 1962); O. Kuss, "Die Rolle des Apostels Paulus in der theologischen Entwicklung der Urkirche" in *MThZ* 14 (1963), 1–59, 109–87.

The Pauline Congregations: B. Weiss, *Paulus und seine Gemeinden* (Berlin 1914); W. L. Knox, *St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (London 1925); B. Bartmann, *Paulus als Seelsorger* (Paderborn 1921); K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus" in *Ges. Aufsätze,* II (Tübingen 1928), 44–67; J. Wagemann, *Die Stellung des Paulus neben den Zwölf* (Giessen 1926); W. Köster, *Die Idee der Kirche beim hl. Paulus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1929); K. Pieper, *Paulus und die Kirche* (Paderborn 1932); A. Wikenhauser, *Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1940); L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St Paul* (Freiburg–New York–London 1959); H. Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus" in *ZNW* 44 (1952), 1–53; J. Colson, *Les fonctions ecclésiales aux deux premiers siècles* (Paris 1956); K. H. Schelkle, "Römische Kirche im Römerbrief" in *ZKTh* 81 (1959) 393–404; R. Schnackenburg, *The Church in the New Testament* (Freiburg –London–NewYork–Montreal 1965); E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament* (London–Naperville, Ill. 1961); M. Guerra y Gómez, *Diáconos helénicos y bíblicos* (Burgos 1962); G. Dix, *Jew and Greek* (London, 2nd ed. 1955).

Special Studies: E. von Dobschütz, *Der Apostel Paulus. Seine Stellung in der Kunst* (Halle 1937); W. Straub, *Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus* (Tübingen 1937); E. Aleith, *Das Paulusverständnis der alten Kirche* (Berlin 1937).

6. *Peter's Missionary Activity and his Sojourn and Death in Rome*

Extra-Pauline Christianity: F. X. Pölzl, *Die Mitarbeiter des Weltapostels Paulus* (Regensburg 1911); A. Ruegg, *Die Mission in der alten Kirche, ihre Wege und Erfolge* (Basle 1912); K. Pieper, "Etappen und Eigenart der altchristlichen Mission" in *RQ* 34 (1926), 111–27; F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Rise of Gentile Christianity* (London 1927); R. Liechtenhan, *Die urchristliche Mission* (Zürich 1946); R. A. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha,* I (Leipzig 1891, new imp. Darmstadt 1959); J. Hervieux, *The New Testament Apocrypha* (New York 1960); *Hennecke-Schneemelcher,* II (Tübingen 1964); R. Söder, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike* (Stuttgart 1932); P. M. Peterson, *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter, his History and his Legend* (Leiden 1958).

Mission of the Apostle Peter. Sources: the Acts of the Apostles and the two letters of Peter. Commentaries on the letters of Peter: J. W. C. Wand, *I and II Peter* (London 1934); F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* (London 1958); C. Cranfield, *The First Epistle of Peter* (London 1958); idem, *I and II Peter and Jude* (London 1960); K. H. Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judasbrief* (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), with extensive bibliography on pp. xi–xvi.

On the apocryphal Acts of Peter: L. Vouaux, *Les actes de Pierre* (Paris 1922), and C. Schmidt in *ZKG* 43 (1924), 321–438; 45 (1926), 481–513. See also G. Stuhlfauth, *Die apokryphe Petrusgeschichte in der altchristlichen Kunst* (Berlin 1925); E. Dinkler, *Die ersten Petrusdarstellungen* (Marburg 1937); C. Cecchelli, *Iconografia dei papi,* I: *S. Pietro* (Rome 1938).

F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *Peter Prince of Apostles* (New York 1927); E. T. Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of Simon Peter* (New York 1933). R. Aigrain, *St Pierre* (Paris 1939); O. Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr* (Philadelphia, 2nd ed. 1962), on which see also P. Gaechter in *ZKTh* 75 (1953), 331–7; J. Schmitt in *RevSR* 28 (1954), 58–71; A. Vögtle in *MThZ* 5 (1954), 1–47; O. Karrer, *Peter and the Church. An Examination of Cullmann's Thesis* (Freiburg – London – New York – Montreal 1963); P. Gaechter, *Petrus und seine Zeit* (Innsbruck 1958); J. Pérez de Urbel, *San Pedro, príncipe de los apóstoles* (Burgos 1959).

Sojourn and Death in Rome: For the older literature down to 1934 see U. Holzmeister, *Commentarium in epitulas ss. Petri et Judae* I (Paris 1937), 37–40; H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1927); H. Dannenbauer, "Die römische Petruslegende" in *HZ* 146 (1932), 239–62; 159 (1939), 81–88; H. Lietzmann, *Petrus, römischer Märtyrer* (Berlin 1936); J. Haller, *Das Papsttum,* I (Stuttgart 1950), 475–85; K. Heussi, *Die römische Petrustradition in kritischer Sicht* (Tübingen 1955); K. Aland, "Der Tod des Petrus in Rom", *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 35 104.

The tomb of Peter: On the problem of the apostles' tombs in S. Sebastiano, see P. Styger, *Römische Märtyrergrüfte* (Berlin 1935); A. Prandi, *La memoria apostolorum in catacumbas* (Rome 1936); C. Mohlberg, "Historisch-kritische Bemerkungen zum Ursprung der sogenannten memoria apostolorum an der Appischen Straße" in *Colligere Fragmenta, Festschrift A. Dold* (Beuron 1952), 52–74; F. Tolotti, *Memorie degli apostoli in Catacumbas* (Vatican City 1953); P. Testini, "Le presunte reliquie dell'apostolo Pietro e la traslazione 'ad catacumbas'" in *Actes du V^{e} congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne* (Vatican City 1957), 529–38; J. Ruysschaert, "Les documents littéraires de la double tradition romaine des tombes apostoliques" in *RHE* 52 (1957), 791–831.

The excavations under the Basilica of St Peter. The official report on the excavations is *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di Pietro in Vaticano eseguite negli anni 1940–1949,* 2 vols. (Vatican City 1951). Further discoveries in M. Guarducci, *I graffiti sotto la confessione di S. Pietro in Vaticano,* 3 vols. (Rome 1958); idem, *The Tomb of St Peter: The New Discoveries in the Secret Grottos of the Vatican* (New York 1960). Literature which has appeared since the official report is listed in *Biblica* 34 (1953) 96*f.; and see especially J. Ruysschaert, "Recherches et études autour de la Confession de la basilique Vaticane (1940–58). État de la question et bibliographie" in *Triplice omaggio a S. S. Pio XII,* vol. 2 (Vatican City 1958), 3–47, and E. Dinkler, "Die Petrus-Rom-Frage, ein Forschungsbericht" in *ThR* 25 (1959), 189–230, 289–335; 27 (1961), 33–64, whose standpoint is more critical. Worthy of special mention are: A. M. Schneider, "Das Petrusgrab am Vatikan" in *ThLZ*

77 (1952), 321–6; E. Schäfer, "Das Apostelgrab unter St. Peter in Rom" in *EvTh* 12 (1953), 304–20; J. Carcopino, "Les fouilles de S. Pierre" in *Études d'histoire chrétienne* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1963), 93–286. R. O'Callaghan, "Vatican Excavations and the Tomb of Peter" in *BA* 16 (1953), 70–87; J. Ruysschaert, "Réflexions sur les fouilles Vaticanes, le rapport officiel et la critique" in *RHE* 48 (1953), 573–631, 49 (1954), 5–58; A. von Gerkan, "Kritische Studien zu den Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche in Rom" in *Trierische Zeitschrift* 22 (1954), 26–55; J. Fink, "Archäologie des Petrusgrabes" in *ThRv* 50 (1954), 81–102; C. Mohrmann, "A propos de deux mots controversés . . . tropeum–nomen" in *VigChr* 8 (1954), 154-73; J. Toynbee and J. Ward Perkins, *The Shrine of St Peter and the Vatican Excavations* (London 1956); E. Smothers, "The Excavations under St Peter's" in *ThSt* 17 (1956), 293–321; T. Klausner, *Die römische Petrustradition im Lichte der neuen Ausgrabungen unter der Peterskirche* (Cologne–Opladen 1956), on which see also E. Kirschbaum in *RQ* 51 (1956), 247–54; H. Chadwick, "St Peter and St Paul in Rome" in *JThS* 8 (1957), 31–52; E. Kirschbaum, *The Roman Catacombs and Their Martyrs* (Milwaukee 1950); A. von Gerkan, "Basso et Tusco consulibus" in *Bonner Jahrbuch* 158 (1958) 89–105; idem, "Zu den Problemen des Petrusgrabes" in *JbAC* 1 (1959), 79–93; H.-D. Altendorf, "Die römischen Apostelgräber" in *ThLZ* 84 (1959), 731–40; R. Ruysschaert, "Trois campagnes de fouilles au Vatican et la tombe de Pierre" in *Sacra Pagina* II (Paris 1939), 88–97; D. O'Conner, *Peter in Rome* (diss. Columbia University 1960; A. von Gerkan in *JbAC* 5 (1962), 23–32, 39–42; also T. Klauser, ibid. 33–38; R. Eggers, "Zu den neuesten Graffiti des Coemeteriums in Vaticano" in *RQ* 57 (1962), 74–77; E. Kirschbaum, *The Tombs of St Peter and St Paul* (London 1959); J. Carcopino, "Les fouilles de S. Pierre" in *Études d'histoire chrétienne* (Paris 1963), 93–286.

7. *The Christianity of the Johannine Writings*

COMMENTARIES

General accounts in A. Wikenhauser, *New Testament Indroduction* (Freiburg–London–New York 1958); P.-H. Menoud, "Les études johanniques de Bultmann à Barrett" in *L'évangile de Jean* (Paris 1958), 11–40.

JOHN'S GOSPEL: C. K. Barret, *The Gospel according to St John. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (London 1957); C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953); B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St John* (London 1958); R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen, 4th ed. 1953; supplement 1957); M.-J. Lagrange, *L'évangile de Saint Jean* (Paris, 6th ed. 1936).

REVELATION: E.-B. Allo, *St Jean, L'Apocalypse* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1933); J. Bonsirven, *L'Apocalypse de S. Jean* (Paris 1951); E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Tübingen 2nd ed. 1933); R. A. Charles, *Revelation*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh 1920).

LETTERS OF JOHN: C. A. Dodd, *Johannine Epistles* (London 1946); R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (Freiburg i. Br. 1963).

RESEARCH

A. C. Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History* (Oxford 1948); C. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1955); D. Lamont, *Studies in the Johannine Writings* (London 1956); F. L. Cross, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London 1957); G. Quispel, "L'évangile de Jean et la gnose" in *L'évangile de Jean* (Paris 1958), 197–208;

R. Schnackenburg, "Logos-Hymnus und johanneischer Prolog“ in *BZ* 1 (1957), 69–109; idem, "Die Sakramente im Johannesevangelium" in *Sacra Pagina* II (Paris 1959), 235–54; W. C. van Unnik, "The Purpose of St John's Gospel" in *Studia Evangelica* (Berlin 1959), 382–411; E. Schweizer, "Der Kirchenbegriff im Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes", ibid. 363–81; E. Haenchen, "Johanneische Probleme" in *ZThK* 56 (1959) 19–54; E. M. Sidebottom, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First-Century Thought* (London 1961); J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge 1943); F.-M. Braun, *Jean le théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne* (Paris 1959); H. M. Féret, *Die Geheime Offenbarung des hl. Johannes, eine christliche Schau der Geschichte* (Düsseldorf 1955); S. Giet, *L'apocalypse et l'histoire* (Paris 1957); P. K. Smith, "The Apocalypse of St John and the Early Church" in *JBL* 25 (1957), 187–95; A. Feuillet, *L'apocalypse: état de question* (Bruges 1963); J. Bonsirven, *Le témoin du Verbe, le disciple bien-aimé* (Toulouse 1956); K. L. Carroll, "The Fourth Gospel and the Exclusion of Christians from the Synagogue" in *BJRL* 40 (1957), 334–49; E. Käsemann, "Die Johannesjünger in Ephesus" in *ZThK* 49 (1952), 144–54; R. Schnackenburg, "Das vierte Evangelium und die Johannesjünger" in *HJ* 77 (1958), 21–38; G. MacGregor and A. Morton, *The Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Edinburgh 1961); S. Temple, "A Key to the Composition of the Fourth Gospel" in *JBL* 30 (1961), 220–32; T. Holtz, *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Berlin 1962); C. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1963); L. Bouyer, *The Fourth Gospel* (Westminster, Md. 1964); J. Sanders, "Saint John on Patmos" in *NTS* 9 (1963), 75–85; M. E. Boismard, "La tradition joannique concernant le baptiste" in *RB* 70 (1963), 5–42; P. Lamarche, "Le prologue de Jean" in *RSR* 52 (1964), 497–538.

SECTION THREE

The Post-Apostolic Age

GENERAL LITERATURE

R. Knopf, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter* (Tübingen 1905); P. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism* (New York–London 1911); W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen 1934); G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'église de S. Clément de Rome à S. Irénée* (Paris 1945); M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (Paris 1948); K. Hörmann, *Leben in Christus. Zusammenhänge zwischen Dogma und Sitte bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Vienna 1952); L. Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh 1954); P. Carrington, *The Early Christian Church*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1957); J. Daniélou, *La théologie du judéo-christianisme* (Paris 1958), Eng. tr. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London 1964); L. Goppelt, "Die apostolische und nachapostolische Zeit" in *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*, ed. K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, vol. I, part A (Göttingen 1962).

8. *The Conflict between Christianity and the Roman State Power*

SOURCES

The writers of the first and second centuries, especially the early apologists; editions: J. C. T. de Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum*, I–IX (Jena, 3rd ed. 1876–81); E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen 1914; omitting Theophilus).

Acts of the Martyrs: general survey in *Altaner* 246–52; G. Lazzati, *Gli sviluppi della letteratura sui martiri nei primi quattro secoli* (Turin 1956); M. Simonetti, "Qualche osservationi a proposito dell'origine degli atti dei martiri" in *RevÉAug* 2 (1956), 39–57; for current bibliography, the reader is referred to *Archivum Historiae Pontificae*, vol. I (Rome 1963).

Texts

Principal editions: *Acta Sanctorum* ed. J. Bolland *et socii* (from 1643, with supplementary matter in the *Analecta Bollandiana* from 1882) (Brussels); also, T. Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum* (1689, new imp. Regensburg 1859), with supplementary vol. by E. Blant, *Les actes des martyrs* (Paris 1882); R. Knopf and G. Krüger, *Ausgewählte Märtyrerakten* (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1929).
Translations: G. Rauschen, *BKV* 14 (Kempten 1913); O. Braun, *BKV* 22 (1915); L. Homo, *Les empereurs romains et le christianisme* (Paris 1931); H. Rahner (Freiburg i. Br. 1941); A. Hamman, *La geste du sang* (Paris 1953); O. Hagemeyer, *Ich bin Christ. Frühchristliche Märtyrerakten* (Düsseldorf 1961).

Literature

General: P. Allard, *Histoire des persécutions* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1903–8); P. Allard, *Dix leçons sur le martyre* (Paris, 8th ed. 1930); Z. Zeiler, *L'empire romain et l'église* (Paris 1928); A. Ehrhard, *Die Kirche der Märtyrer* (Munich 1932); P. Brezzi, *Christianesimo e impero Romano* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1944); H. Grégoire, *Les persécutions dans l'empire romain* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1963), on which see E. Griffe in *BLE* 53 (1952), 129–60; E. Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars* (London); G. Ricciotti, *The Age of Martyrs* (Milwaukee 1959); J. Moreau, *La persécution du christianisme dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1956); H. Leclercq, "Persécutions" in *DACL* XIV (1939), 523–94; J. Vogt, "Christenverfolgungen" in *RAC* II (1954), 1159–208; L. Dieu, "La persécution au II^{e} siècle. Une loi fantôme" in *RHE* 38 (1942), 5–19.

The Trial of Christians: H. Last, "The Study of the Persecutions" in *JRS* 27 (1937), 80–92; E. Griffe, "Le christianisme en face de l'état romain" in *BLE* 50 (1949), 129–45; A. N. Sherwin-White, "The Early Persecutions and Roman Law again" in *JThS NS* 3 (1952), 199–213; J. W. P. Borleffs, "Institutum Neronianum" in *VigChr* 6 (1952), 129–45; E. Griffe, "Les actes du martyr Apollonius et le problème de la base juridique des persécutions" in *BLE* 53 (1952), 65–76; V. Monachino, "Il fondamento giuridico delle persecuzioni nei primi due secoli" in *SC* 81 (1953), 3–32; A. Ehrhardt, "Das corpus Christianorum und die Korporationen im spätrömischen Recht" in *ZSavRGrom* 70 (1953), 299 to 347; 71 (1954), 25–40; H. Last, "Christenverfolgungen" (legal aspect) in *RAC* II (1954), 1208–28; C. Cecchelli, "Il nome e la 'setta' dei cristiani" in *RivAC* 31 (1955), 55–73; P. de Mouxy, "Nomen Christianorum" in *Atti AccadScienze Torino* 91 (1956–7), 204–36; A. Wlosok, "Die Rechtsgrundlagen der Christenverfolgungen der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte" in *Gymnasium* 66 (1959), 14–32; C. Saumagne, "Tertullien et l'Institutum Neronianum" in *ThZ* 17 (1961), 334–57.

The Persecution of Nero: H. Fuchs in *VigChr* 4 (1950), 65–93; H. Hommel, *Theologia Viatorum* 3 (1951), 1–30; E. Griffe in *BLE* 53 (1952), 158–60; B. Doer, *Das Altertum* 2 (1956), 15–28; K. Büchner, *Humanitas Romana* (Heidelberg 1957), 229–39; C. Saumagne, "Les incendiaires de Rome et les lois pénales des Romains" in *RH* 227 (1962), 337–60; J. Beaujeu, *Latomus* (Brussels), 19 (1960), 65–80, 291–311; L. Herrmann, *Latomus* 20

(1961), 817–20; H. Capocci, "Per il testo di Tacito, Annales 15, 44" in *Studia et Documenta hist. et juris* 28 (1962), 65–99; G. Roux, *Néron* (Paris 1962); E. Griffe in *BLE* 65 (1964), 1–16.

DOMITIAN: M. Dibelius, "Rom und die Christen im 1. Jahrhundert" in *SAH* 1941–2, part 2; M. Sordi in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 1–26; L. W. Bernard in *NTSt* 10 (1964), 251–60.

TRAJAN AND HADRIAN: W. Weber, *Festgabe K. Müller* (Tübingen 1922), 24–45; A. Kurfess in *ZNW* 36 (1937), 295–8 and *Mnemosyne* 7 (1939), 237–40; L. Dieu in *RHE* 38 (1942), 5–19; T. Mayer-Maly, *Studia et Documenta Hist. Juris (R)*, 22 (1956), 311–28; W. Schmid in *Maja* 7 (1955), 5–13; M. Sordi in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 344–70; L. Vidman, *Étude sur la correspondance de Pline le Jeune avec Trajan* (Praha 1960), 87–106.

VARIOUS: G. Lopuszanzki, "La police romaine et les chrétiens" in *Antiquité classique* 20 (1951), 5–46; J. Zeiller, "Nouvelles observations sur l'origine des persécutions contre les chrétiens aux deux premiers siècles" in *RHE* 46 (1951), 521–33; S. Giet, "Le témoignage de Clément de Rome sur la cause des persécutions romaines" in *RevSR* 29 (1955), 333–45; V. Grumel, "Du nombre des persécutions païennes dans les anciens chroniques" in *RevÉAug* 2 (1956), 59–66; W. H. Frend, "Some Links between Judaism and the Early Church" in *JEH* 9 (1958), 141–58; H. Meerhing, "Persecution of the Jews and Adherents of the Isis Cult at Rome A.D. 19" in *NovT* 3 (1959), 293–304; A. Fuks, "Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in A.D. 115–17" in *JRS* 51 (1961), 98–104; P. Brown, "Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy" in *JRS* 51 (1961), 1–11.

9. *The Religious World of the Post-Apostolic Age as Mirrored in its Writings*

SOURCES

The writings of the Apostolic Fathers. For the term, see J. A. Fischer in his edition (Munich 1956), IX–XII and G. Jouassard in *MSR* 14 (1957), 129–34. Collected editions: K. Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen 1924, new imp. 1957); J. A. Fischer, *First Epistle of Clement, Letters of Ignatius, Letter of Polycarp* (Munich and Darmstadt 1956). Other editions by K. Lake (London and New York 1930); S. Colombo (Turin 1930); D. Ruiz Bueno (Madrid 1950).
Translations: F. Zeller in *BKV* 35 (Munich 1918); by W. Bauer, M. Dibelius, R. Knopf, H. Windisch (with conmmentary), *Ergänzungsband zum Handbuch zum N.T.;* by J. A. Kleist (English, with commentary) in *ACW* 1 and 6 (Westminster, Md. and London 1946–8). On the language of the Apostolic Fathers: G. J. M. Bartelink, *Lexicologisch-semantische Studië over de Taal van de Apostolische Vaders* (Nijmegen 1952); H. Kraft, *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum* (Darmstadt 1963).

LITERATURE

General accounts in the textbooks of patrology by *Quasten P* I 29–157; *Altaner* 47–113.
GENERAL INTRODUCTIONS: A. Casamassa, *I padri apostolici* (Rome 1938); J. Lawson, *A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers* (New York 1961); K. Aland, "The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudoanonymity in Christian Literature of the First Two Centuries" in *JThS NS* 12 (1961) 39–49.

SPECIAL STUDIES: H. Schumacher, *Kraft der Urkirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1934); A. Heitmann, *Imitatio Dei* (Rome 1940); I. Giordani, *The Social Message of the Early Church* (Paterson,

N. J. 1944); J. Klevinghaus, *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (Gütersloh 1948); T. F. Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers* (Edinburgh 1948); A. Benoît, *Le baptême au deuxieme siècle* (Paris 1953); M. Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des pères de l'église de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1957); A. O'Hagan, *The Concept of Material Re-Creation in the Apostolic Fathers* (diss. Munich 1960); E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the 1st Century* (London 1960); G. Bruni, *Fonti religiose e riflessione filosofica nella Bibbia e nei Padri Apostolici* (Rome 1960); P. G. Verweijs, *Evangelium und neues Gesetz in der ältesten Christenheit bis auf Marcion* (Utrecht 1961); K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers,* 2 vols. (New York 1925); C. Richardson, *Early Christian Fathers* (London 1953), which ist the first volume of a new Protestant collection: *The Library of Christian Classics;* D. Barsotti, *La dottrina dell'amore nei Padri della chiesa fino a Ireneo* (Milan 1963).

SPECIAL EDITIONS and literature on individual texts:

(a) Clement of Rome: K. T. Schäfer in *FlorPatr* 44 (1941); A. Stuiber, "Clemens" in *RAC* III (1957), 188–97; J. Lebreton, "La trinité chez S. Clément de Rome" in *Gr* 6 (1925), 369–404; A. Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte* (Leipzig 1929); F. Gerke, *Die Stellung des 1. Klemensbriefs innerhalb der altchristlichen Gemeindeverfassung* (Leipzig 1931); E. Barnikol in *ThJ* 4 (1936), 61–80 (Christology, baptism, and the Lord's supper); P. Meinhold, "Geschehen und Deutung im 1. Klemensbrief" in *ZKG* 58 (1939), 82–126; L. Sanders, *L'hellénisme de S. Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme* (Louvain 1934); M. Smith, "Report about Peter in 1 Clement 5:4" in *NTS 7* (1960), 86–8; W. C. van Unnik, "1 Clem. 34" in *VigChr* 5 (1951), 204–48; idem, "Le nombre des élus dans la première épître de Clément" in *RHPhR* 42 (1962), 237–46; C. Eggenberger, *Die Quelle der politischen Ethik des 1. Clemensbriefes* (Zürich 1951); A. W. Ziegler, *Neue Studien zum 1. Klemensbrief* (Munich 1958); J. Colson, *Clément de Rome* (Paris 1960); C. Nielsen, "Clement of Rome and Moralism" in *CH* 31 (1962), 131–50.

(b) Ignatius of Antioch: P. G. Crone (Münster, 2nd ed. 1958); T. Camelot in *SourcesChr* 10 (3rd ed. 1958); M. Rackl, *Die Christologie des hl. Ignatius von Antiochien* (Freiburg i. Br. 1914); J. Lebreton, "La théologie de la Trinité d'après S. Ignace d'Antioche" in *RSR* 25 (1925), 97–126, 393–419; H. Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen* (Giessen 1929); C. P. S. Clarke, *St Ignatius and St Polycarp* (London 1930); C. C. Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* (New York 1935); J. Moffat, "An Approach to Ignatius" in *HThR* 29 (1936), 1–38; T. Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et l'unité chez Ignace d'Antioche" in *RHPhR* 18 (1938), 197–241; H. B. Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gütersloh 1940); R. Bultmann, "Ignatius und Paulus" in *Festschrift J. de Zwaan* (Haarlem 1952–3), 37–51); W. Bieder, "Zur Deutung des kirchl. Schweigens bei Ignatius" in *ThZ* 12 (1956), 28–43; J. Hannah, "Setting of the Ignatian long recension" in *JBL* 79 (1960), 221–38; V. Corwin, *St Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven 1960); H. Musurillo, "Ignatius of Antioch: Gnostic or Essene" in *ThSt* 22 (1961), 103–9; R. Grant, "Scripture and Tradition in St Ignatius of Antioch" in *CBQ* 25 (1963), 322–35; J. Colson, *Agape chez St Ignace d'Antioch* (Paris 1961).

(c) Polycarp of Smyrna: Letter to the Philippians in T. Camelot, *SourcesChr* 10 (3rd ed. 1958); P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge 1936); H. Katzenmayer, "Polykarp" in *IKZ* 59 (1951), 146–56; H. von Campenhausen, *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe* (Heidelberg 1951); P. Meinhold, "Polykarp von Smyrna" in *Pauly–Wissowa* 21 (1952), 1662–93; L. Barnard, "Problem of Saint Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians" in *ChQR* 163 (1962), 421–30.

(d) Didache: H. Lietzmann, *KlT* 6 (Berlin 1936); T. Klausner, *FlorPatr* 1 (1940); J.-P. Audet (Paris 1957) (with commentary), on which see H. de Riedmatten in *Angelicum* 36 (1959), 410–29; J. Schmid, "Didache" in *RAC* III, 1009–13; F. E. Vokes, *The Riddle of the Didache* (London 1938); E. Peterson, "Über einige Probleme der Didache-Überlieferung" in *RivAC* 27 (1952), 37–68; E. Stommel, "Did. 16, 6" in *RQ* 48 (1953), 21–42; A. Adam, "Erwägungen zur Herkunft der Didache" in *ZKG* 68 (1957), 1–47; P. Nautin, "La composition de la Didache et son titre" in *RHR* 155 (1959), 191–214; A. Agnoletto, "Motivi etico-escatologici nella Didache" in *Convivium Dominicum* (Catania 1959), 259–76; B. Butler, "The 'Two Ways' in the Didache" in *JThS* 12 (1961), 27–38.
On the liturgy of the Didache: H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl* (Bonn 1926), 230–8; A. Greiff, *Das älteste Pascharitual der Kirche* (Paderborn 1929); R. H. Connolly in *DR* 55 (1937), 477–89; A. Arnold, *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls* (Freiburg i. Br 1937); G. Dix in *Theology* 37 (London 1938), 261–83; E. Peterson in *ELit* 58 (1944), 3–13.

(e) Pseudo-Barnabas: T. Klauser in *FlorPatr* 1 (1940); J. Schmid in *RAC* I (1950), 1207–17; A. Williams, "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas" in *JThS* 34 (1933), 337–46; P. Meinhold, "Geschichte und Exegese im Barnabas-Brief" in *ZKG* 59 (1940), 255–303; K. Thieme, *Kirche und Synagoge* (Olten 1945), on which see *ZKTh* 74 (1952), 63–70; A. Hermans, "Le Ps.-Barnabas est-il millénariste?" in *EThL* 35 (1959), 849–76; L. W. Barnard, "The Epistle of Barnabas — a Paschal Homily?" in *VigChr* 15 (1961), 8–22; P. Prigent, *L'épître de Barnabé et ses sources* (Paris 1961).

(f) Epistula Apostolorum: C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern* (Leipzig 1919); H. Duensing, *KlT* 152 (Bonn 1925); Hennecke and Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen,* I (Tübingen 1959), 126–55.
Its origins: J. Delazer in *Antonianum* 4 (1929), 257–92, 387–430; J. de Zwaan, *Essays presented to R. Harris* (London 1933), 344–55; L. Gry, "La date de la parousie d'après l'epistula apostolorum" in *RB* 49 (1949), 86–97.

(g) Shepherd of Hermas: M. Whittaker, *GCS* 48 (Berlin 1956); English trans. C. Taylor, *The Shepherd of Hermas,* 2 vols. (London 1903–6); R. Joly, *SourcesChr* 53 (1958); Coptic fragments, ed. by T. Lefort in *Muséon* 51 (1938), 239–76; 52 (1939), 223–8; W. J. Wilson, "The Career of the Prophet Hermas" in *HThR* 20 (1927), 21–60; C. Bonner, "A Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas in the Papyri of the University of Michigan" in *HThR* 18 (1925), 115–27; A. V. Ström, *Allegorie und Wirklichkeit im Hirten des Hermas* (Leipzig 1936); E. Peterson, "Beiträge zur Interpretation der Visionen des Hermas" in *OrChrP* 13 (1947), 624–35; idem in *VigChr* 8 (1954), 52–71; A. O'Hagan, "The Great Tribulation to Come in the Pastor of Hermas" in *TU* 79 (1961), 305–11; R. Joly, "Judaïsme, christianisme et hellénisme dans le Pasteur d'Hermas" in *La Nouvelle Clio* 5 (1953), 356–76; S. Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs. Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas* (Paris 1963). On penance: B. Poschmann, *Poenitentia secunda* (Bonn 1939); R. Mortimer, *The Origins of Private Penance in the Western Church* (Oxford 1939); R. Joly in *RHR* 147 (1955), 32–49; K. Rahner in *ZKTh* 77 (1955), 385–431.

10. *The Development of the Church's Organization*

SOURCES

As for Chapter 9.

LITERATURE

As for Chapter 9 with the addition of the following: H. Bruders, *Die Verfassung der Kirche bis 175 n. Christus* (Mainz 1904); P. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism* (New York-London 1911); R. Sohm, *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1912); H. Lietzmann, "Zur altchristlichen Verfassungsgeschichte" in *ZWTh* 55 (1913), 97–153; H. Dieckmann, *Die Verfassung der Urkirche* (Berlin 1923); A. J. Maclean, *the Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church* (London 1930); O. Linton, "Das Problem der Urkirche in der neuesten Forschung" (diss. Uppsala 1932); N. Lämmle, *Beiträge zum Problem des Kirchenrechtes* (Rottenburg 1933); J. V. Bartlet, *Church Life and Order during the First Four Centuries* (Oxford 1943); K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry* (London 1947, new imp. 1957); G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'église de S. Clément de Rome à S. Irénée* (Paris 1947); J. Ebers, *Grundriß des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (Vienna 1950); H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte* I: *Die katholische Kirche* (Weimar 1950); H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht* (Tübingen 1952); S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (London 1953); J. Colson, *Les fonctions ecclésiales aux deux premiers siècles* (Bruges 1956); P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II^{e} et III^{e} siècles* (Paris 1961); A. Ehrhardt, "Christianity Before the Apostles' Creed" in *HThR* 55 (1962), 73–119.

ON THE DIFFERENT OFFICES IN THE CHURCH: G. Sass, *Apostelamt und Kirche* (Munich 1939); G. Saß, "Die Apostel in der Didache" in *Festschrift E. Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart 1951), 233–9; K. H. Rengstorf, ἀπόστολος in *ThW* I, 406–46; A. Michel, "Ordre, Ordination" in *DThC* XI, 1193–1405; L. Maréchal, "Évêque" in *DBS* II, 1297–1333; H. W. Beyer, ἐπίσκοπος in *ThW* II, 604–17; J. Colson, *L'évêque dans les communautés primitives* (Paris 1951); J. Munck, "Presbyters and Disciples of the Lord in Papias. Exegetic Comments on Eusebius, Hist. 3, 39" in *HThR* 52 (1959), 223–43; J. Colson, *La fonction diaconale aux origines de l'église* (Bruges 1960).

ON THE POSITION OF THE ROMAN CONGREGATION: F. R. van Cauwelaert, "L'intervention de l'église de Rome à Corinthe vers l'an 96" in *RHE* 31 (1935), 267–306, 765 f.; O. Perler, "Ignatius von Antiochien und die römische Christengemeinde" in *DTh* 22 (1944), 413–51; H. Katzenmayer, "Zur Frage des Primats und der kirchlichen Verfassungszuständigkeit in der Didache" in *IKZ* 55 (1947), 31–43; K. H. Schelkle, "Römische Kirche im Römerbrief" in *ZKTh* 81 (1959), 393–404; F. Dvornik, *The Idea of the Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959); O. Knoch, "Die Ausführungen des ersten Clemensbriefes über die kirchliche Verfassung im Spiegel der neueren Deutungen" in *TQ* 141 (1961), 385–407; N. Afanassieff *et alii, The Primacy of Peter in the Orthodox Church* (Westminster, Md. 1963); B. Hemmerdinger, "La prépondérance de l'église de Rome en 95" in *RSPhTh* 47 (1963), 58–60.

11. *Heterodox Jewish-Christian Currents*

GENERAL: H.-J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen 1949); B. Reicke, *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos* (Uppsala-Wiesbaden 1951); J. Daniélou, *La théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Paris 1958), Eng. tr. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London 1964); M. Black, "The Patristic Accounts of Jewish Sectarianism"

in *BJRL* 41 (1959), 285–303; J. Munck, "Jewish Christianity in post-Apostolic Times" in *NTS* 6 (1959–60), 103–16.

ON THE EBIONITES: general survey with bibliography by G. Strecker in *RAC* IV (1959), 487–500; H.-J. Schoeps, "Ebionite Christianity" in *JThS NS* 4 (1953), 219–24; L. Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh 1954); J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and their Literature" in *ThSt* 16 (1955), 335–72; S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London, 2nd ed. 1957); P. Vielhauer, "Judenchristliche Evangelien" in *Hennecke – Schneemelcher* I (Tübingen 1959), 75–108; H.-J. Schoeps, "Apokalyptik im Neuen Testament" in *ZNW* 51 (1960), 101–11; idem, *Das Judenchristentum* (Bern 1964).

ON THE PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES: general survey with bibliography by B. Rehm in *RAC* III (1957), 197–206 and K. Baus in *LThK* VI (1961), 334–5; B. Rehm, *Die Pseudo-Klementinen* I: *Die Homilien, GCS* 42 (Berlin 1953), II: *Die Recognitionen,* ed. by B. Rehm and F. Paschke (ibid., in preparation), at present only in *PG* I; W. Frankenberg, "Die syrischen Clementinen mit griechischem Paralleltext" in *TU* 48, 3 (Berlin 1937); H.-J. Schoeps, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (Tübingen 1950), 38–81; idem, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (Tübingen 1956), 68–86; G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Ps.-Klementinen, TU* 70 (Berlin 1958); H.-J. Schoeps, "Iranisches in den Ps.-Klementinen" in *ZNW* 51 (1960), 1–10; W. Ullmann, "The Significance of the Epistula Clementis in the Pseudo-Clementines" in *JThS* 11 (1960), 295–317.

ON THE ELCHASAITES: general account by G. Strecker in *RAC* IV (1959), 1171–86 (with bibliography); H. Waitz, "Das Buch des Elchasai" in *Harnack-Ehrung* (Leipzig 1921), 87–104.

ON THE MANDAEANS: general account by C. Colpe in *RGG* 3rd ed. IV, 709–12; K. Rudolf, *Die Mandäer,* 2 vols. (Göttingen 1960–1) (with sources and bibliography); J. Behm, *Die mandäische Religion und das Urchristentum* (Leipzig 1927); R. Reitzenstein, *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe* (Leipzig 1929); E. S. Drower, *The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran* (Oxford 1937); T. Säve-Söderbergh, *Studies in the Gnostic Manichaean Psalm-Book* (Uppsala 1949); W. Baumgartner, "Der heutige Stand der Mandäerfrage" in *ThZ* 6 (1950), 401–10; E. Bammel, "Zur Frühgeschichte der Mandäer" in *Orientalia* 32 (1963), 220–5; M. Simon, *Recherches d'histoire judéo-chrétienne* (Paris 1963).

SECTION FOUR

The Church in the Second Century

12. *The Position of the Church under the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. Martyrdom of the Congregations of Lyons and Vienne*

SOURCES

As for Chapter 9.

LITERATURE

As for Chapter 9, with the following additions: H. Eberlein, *Mark Aurel und die Christen* (Breslau 1914); A. S. L. Ferqharson, *Marcus Aurelius, his Life and his World* (Oxford 1951); W. Görlitz, *Mark Aurel, Kaiser und Philosoph* (Stuttgart 1954); J. Beaujeu, *La politique romaine à l'apogée de l'empire,* I: *La politique religieuse des Antonins* (Paris 1955);

J. Straub, "Commodus und die Christen" in *RAC* III, 262–5; A. Charny, *Les martyrs de Lyon de 177* (Lyons 1936); E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine,* I (Paris 1947), 17–33; H. Delehaye, "Les actes des martyrs de Pergame" in *AnBoll* 58 (1940), 142–76; E. Griffe, "Les actes du martyre Apollonius et le problème de la base juridique des persécutions" in *BLE* 53 (1952), 65–76; F. Corsari, "Note sugli Acta martyrum Scillitanorum" in *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 6 (Catania 1956), 5–51; H. Karpp, "Die Zahl der scilitanischen Märtyrer" in *VigChr* 15 (1961), 165–72; M. Sordi, "I 'nuovi decreti' di Marco Aurelio contro i cristiani" in *Studi Romani* 9 (1961), 365–78; J. Colin, *L'empire des Antonins et les martyrs Gaulois de 177* (Bonn 1964).

13. *Literary Polemic against Christianity*

GENERAL: J. Geffcken, *Das Christentum im Kampf und Ausgleich mit der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Berlin, 3rd ed. 1920); J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1929); P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* (Paris 1934); W. Nestle, "Die Haupteinwände des antiken Denkens gegen das Christentum" in *ARW* 37 (1941), 51–100; M. Sordi in *RSCI* 16 (1962), 1–28; J. Jungkuntz, "Christian Approval of Epicurism" in *CH* (1962) 279–93.

ON FRONTO: Labriolle, *op. cit.* 87–94; M. Brock, *Studies in Fronto and his Age* (Cambridge 1911).

ON LUCIAN: K. Mras, in *Pauly-Wissowa* XIII 2, 1725—77; A. Lesky, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (Bern 1958), 759–63, 765. Editions of *De morte Peregrini:* C. Jacobitz, *Luciani Opera,* III (Leipzig 1904), 271–87; K. Mras, *Die Hauptwerke des Lukian griechisch-deutsch* (Munich 1954), 470–505. Other works: J. Schwartz, *Lucien de Samosate. Philopseudès et De morte Peregrini* (Paris 1951, with commentary); M. Caster, *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps* (Paris 1936); C. Curti, "Luciano di Samosata ed i cristiani" in *Misc. di Studi di letteratura cristiana antica* (Catania 1954), 86–109; G. Bagnani, "Peregrinus Proteus and the Christians" in *Historia* 4 (1955), 107–12; H. D. Betz, "Lukian von Samosata und das Christentum" in *NovT* 3 (1959) 226–37; idem, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament* (Berlin 1961).

ON CELSUS: P. Merlan, "Celsus" in *RAC* II, 954–65 (bibliography to 1953). Editions of the fragments of Ἀληθὴς λόγος: O. Glöckner in *KlT* 151 (Bonn 1924); R. Bader (Tübingen 1940); English translation with commentary by H. Chadwick, *Origen, Contra Celsum* (Cambridge 1953); W. de Boer, *Scripta paganorum I–IV saec. de Christianis testimonia* (Leiden 1948); A. Miura-Stange, *Celsus und Origenes* (Giessen 1926); W. Völker, *Das Bild vom nichtgnostischen Christentum bei Celsus* (Halle 1928); A. Wifstrand, *Die wahre Lehre des Kelsos* (Lund 1942); W. de Boer, *De eerste bestrijder van het christendom* (Groningen 1950); C. Andresen, *Logos u. Nomos. Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum* (Berlin 1955, with bibliography); H. O. Schroeder, "Celsus und Porphyrius als Christengegner" in *Die Welt als Geschichte* 17 (1957), 190–202.

14. *The Early Christian Apologists of the Second Century*

COLLECTED EDITIONS of the apologists: J. C. T. de Otto, *Corpus apologetarum* (Jena, 3rd ed. 1876–81); E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (omitting Theophilus) (Göttingen 1914) with idem, *Index apologeticus* (Leipzig 1912). A new edition for the *GCS* is planned.

GENERAL LITERATURE: see *Bardenhewer* I, 181 ff. and *Quasten P,* I, 189 f.; J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* (Leipzig 1907), IX–XLIII and 239–322; A. Puech, *Les apologistes grecs*

du deuxième siècle de notre ère (Paris 1912); A. Hauck, *Apologetik in der alten Kirche* (Leipzig 1918); I. Giordani, *La prima polemica cristiana, gli apologetici del II° secolo* (Turin 1930; Brescia, 2nd ed. 1943); M. Pellegrino, *Gli apologetici greci* (Rome 1947); idem, *Studi sull'antica apologetica* (Rome 1947); E. Benz, "Christus und Sokrates in der alten Kirche" in *ZNW* 43 (1950–1), 195–224.
V. Monachino, "Intento pratico e propagandistico nell'apologetica greca del secondo secolo" in *Gr* 32 (1951), 5–49, 187–222; R. M. Grant, "The Chronology of the Greek Apologists" in *VigChr* 9 (1955), 25–33; idem, "The Fragments of the Greek Apologists and Irenaeus" in *Festschrift R. P. Casey* (Freiburg i. Br. 1963), 179–218.

Special Studies: F. Andres, *Die Engellehre der griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn 1914); K. Gronau, *Das Theodizeeproblem in der altchristlichen Auffassung* (Tübingen 1922); J. Lortz, "Das Christentum als Monotheismus in den Apologien des 2. Jahrhunderts" in *Festschrift A. Ehrhard* (Bonn 1922), 301–27; V. A. S. Little, *The Christology of the Apologists* (London 1934); F. J. Dölger, "Sacramentum Infanticidii" in *AuC*, IV (1934), 188–228; H. Rossbacher, *Die Apologeten als politisch-wissenschaftliche Schriftsteller* (Halberstadt 1937); M. Pellegrino, *Il cristianesimo di fronte alla cultura classica* (Turin 1954); H. Hommel, *Schöpfer und Erhalter, Studien zum Problem Christentum und Antike* (Berlin 1956); H. Wey, *Die Funktionen der bösen Geister bei den griechischen Apologeten des 2. Jahrhunderts* (Winterthur 1957); J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux II° et III^e siècles* (Tournai 1961), 11–80; A. Wifstrand, *L'église ancienne et la culture grecque* (Paris 1962); J. H. Waszink, "Some Observations on the appreciation of the Philosophy of the Barbarians" in *Mélanges Chr. Mohsmann* (Utrecht 1963), 41–56.

Aristides: Syrian and Greek text in R. Harris and J. A. Robinson, *The Apology of Aristides* (Cambridge 1893); Greek text in J. Geffcken, *op. cit.* 3–27, with commentary, ibid. 28–96; Goodspeed, *op. cit.* 3–23.

Justin: *The Apologies,* ed. by A. W. F. Blunt (Cambridge 1911); *G. Rauschen* (Bonn, 2nd ed. 1911); G. Krüger (Tübingen 1915); M. Pfättisch (Münster 1933); S. Frasca (Turin 1938); *Dialogus cum Tryphone,* ed. by G. Archambauld (Paris 1909) and Goodspeed, *op. cit.* 90–265. A new fragment of the *Dialogus* may be found in G. Mercati, *Biblica* 22 (1941), 339–66. On the text of the Apology see W. Schmid in *ZNW* 40 (1941), 87–138. General appreciation in M.-J. Lagrange, *S. Justin* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1914); G. Bardy in *DThC* VIII, 2228–77; M. S. Enslin in *JQR* 34 (1943), 179–205. See also: E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justinus Martyr* (Jena 1923); K. Thieme, *Kirche und Synagoge* (Olten 1945); W. H. Shotwell, *The Exegesis of Justin* (Chicago 1955); R. Holte, "Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St Justin's Apologies" in *StTh* 12 (1958), 106–68; O. Piper, "The Nature of the Gospel according to Justin Martyr" in *The Journal of Religion* 41 (1961), 155–68; J. Romanides, "Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel" in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 4 (1959), 115–34. Cullen, "I. K. Story" in *VigChr* 16 (1962), 172–8 (Justin on baptism); O. Giordano, "S. Giustino e il millenarismo" in *Asprenas* 10 (1963), 155–71. On the influence of Justin on Irenaeus, see F. Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem* (Leipzig 1930), 339–74.

Tatian: E. Schwartz (Leipzig 1888), *TU* 4, 1; translation, *BKV* 12 (1913), 177–257. On the dating, see R. M. Grant in *HThR* 46 (1953), 99–101. Earlier literature in *Quasten P,* I, 220–8. The basic work at present is M. Elze, *Tatian und seine Theologie* (Göttingen 1960), with full bibliography, 130–4.

Athenagoras: E. Schwartz (Leipzig 1891), *TU* 4, 2; P. Ubaldi and M. Pellegrino (Turin 1947); Geffcken, *op. cit.* 120–54, with commentary 155–238; English translation with commentary in *ACW* 23 (London 1956); H. A. Lucks, *The Philosophy of Athenagoras*

(Washington 1936); R. M. Grant, "Athenagoras or Pseudo-Athenagoras" in *HThR* 47 (1954), 121–9; idem, "Some Errors in the Legatio of Athenagoras" in *VigChr* (1958), 145–56.

THEOPHILUS: ed. by S. Frasca (Turin 1938); G. Bardy and J. Sender in *SourcesChr* 20 (1948); history of the text, R. M. Grant in *VigChr* 6 (1952), 146–59. General appreciation: E. Rapisarda, *Studi Ubaldi* (Milan 1937), 381–400; F. Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem* (Leipzig 1930), *TU* 46, 2, on which see J. Lebon, in *RHE* 26 (1930), 675–9, and R. M. Grant in *HThR* 40 (1947), 227–56; idem, "The Problem of Theophilus" in *HThR* 43 (1950), 179–96; A. Ziegler, *Festschrift G. Söhngen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962), 332–6.

MELITO OF SARDES: the Fragments are in Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae* (Oxford 1846), 111–53. Editions of the Homily: C. Bonner (London 1940); B. Lohse (Leiden 1958); M. Testuz (Cologne–Geneva 1960). On the text of the Homily see A. Wifstrand in *VigChr* 2 (1948), 211–23 and P. Nautin, in *RHE* 44 (1949), 429–38 (also against the authenticity); for its authenticity see esp. E. Peterson in *VigChr* 6 (1952), 33–43, and B. Lohse in the foreword to his edition; H. Chadwick, "A Latin Epitome of Melito's Homily on the Pascha" in *JThS NS* 11 (1960), 76–82. On his theology see A. Grillmeier in *ZKTh* 71 (1948), 5–14; idem in *Scholastik* 20–24 (1949), 481–502 (*Descensus Christi* and doctrine of original sin). On his doctrine of baptism see R. M. Grant in *VigChr* 4 (1950), 733–6. On his christology see R. Cantalamessa in *RSR* 37 (1963), 1–26.

LETTER TO DIOGNETUS: ed. by J. Geffcken (Heidelberg 1928); H.-I. Marrou in *SourcesChr* 33 (1951); English translation with commentary by A. Kleist in *ACW* 6 (1948); literature on the question of authorship in *Altaner* 136. On the contents see J. G. O'Neill in *IER* 85 (1956), 92–106.

HERMIAS: Text in *PG* 6, 1169–80, and H. Diels, *Doxographi graeci* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1929); A. di Pauli, *Die Irrisio des Hermias* (Paderborn 1907); L. Alfonsi, *Ermia filosofo* (Brescia 1947).

15. *The Dispute with Gnosticism*

SOURCES

W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis* (Tübingen 1932); H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* (Stuttgart, 4th ed. 1955); F. Sagnard, "Extraits de Théodote" in *SourcesChr* 23 (1948); G. Quispel, "Lettre de Ptolémée à Flora", ibid. 24 (1949); *Coptic Gnostic Writings,* I, ed. by C. Schmidt, *GCS* 13 (1905), new ed. by W. Till, *GCS* 45 (1959) (Contents: *Pistis Sophia,* the *2 Books of Jeû,* the *Apocryphon of John*); W. Till, *Die Gnostischen Schriften des Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU,* 60 (Berlin 1955) (Contents: *Gospel according to Mary, Apocryphon of John, Sophia Jesu Christi*); P. Labib, *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo* I (Cairo 1950) (Photocopies of *Sermon on the Resurrection, Apocryphon of John, Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Philip, On the Nature of Archons*); M. Malinine, H.-C. Puech, and G. Quispel, *Evangelium veritatis* (Zürich 1956); A. Guillaumont, H.-C. Puech ..., *L'Évangile selon Thomas* (Leiden 1959) (Coptic text); J. Doresse, *L'évangile selon Thomas ou les paroles secrètes de Jésus* (Paris 1959); W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (Naperville, Ill. 1960); J. Leipoldt and H. M. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyruscodices von Nag Hammadi* (Hamburg-Bergstadt 1960) (*Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Philip, On the Nature of Archons,* with commentary); R. M. Grant and D. N. Freedman, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus* (London, 2nd ed. 1960); R. Grant, *Gnosticism: A Source Book of Heretical*

Writings from the Early Christian Period (New York 1961); K. Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth. A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel,* trans. from the Coptic (Nashville 1960); A. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas* (Leiden 1962); W. C. Till, *Das Evangelium nach Philippos* (Berlin 1963).

LITERATURE: 1. GENERAL

General accounts in *RGG* 3rd. ed. III, 1652–61; *LThK* IV, 1021–30; and *Altaner* 138–147. See further E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1925); F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis* (Cambridge 1932); G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion* (Zürich 1951); H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* (Stuttgart 1955); H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist,* I (Göttingen, 2nd ed. 1954), II/1 (Göttingen 1954); A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermas Trismégiste,* IV: *Le Dieu inconnu et la gnose* (Paris 1954); G. van Moorsel, *The Mysteries of Hermas Trismegistus* (Utrecht 1955); H.-J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (Tübingen 1956); W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (Göttingen 1956); W. Frei, *Geschichte und Idee der Gnosis* (Bern 1958); R. McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem* (London 1958); R. Ambelais, *La notion gnostique du démiurge dans les écritures et les traditions judéo-chrétiennes* (Paris 1959); R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (New York–London 1959); E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959); C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule* I (Göttingen 1961).

2. THE DISCOVERIES AT NAG HAMMADI

H.-C. Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte" in *Coptic Studies in Honour of W. E. Crum* (Boston 1950), 91–154; M. Schenke in *ZRGG* 14 (1962).
On the Jung Codex: H. C. Puech and G. Quispel in *VigChr* 8 (1954), 1–51; 9 (1955), 65–102; F. L. Cross, *The Codex Jung* (London 1955); J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (New York 1960).
On the Gospel of Thomas: G. Quispel, "L'évangile selon Thomas et les Clémentines" in *VigChr* 12 (1958), 181–96; R. M. Grant, ibid. 13 (1959), 170–80; G. Quispel, "L'évangile selon Thomas et le Diatessaron", ibid. 13 (1959), 87–117; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Oxyrhynchos Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas" in *ThSt* 20 (1959), 505–60; K. T. Schäfer, *Bibel und Leben,* 1 (1960), 62–74; O. Cullmann in *ThLZ* 85 (1960), 321–34; H. Montefiore, "A Comparison of the Parables of the Gospel according to Thomas and the Synoptic Gospels" in *NTS* 7 (1960), 220–48; C. H. Hunziger in *ZNW* suppl. 26 (1960), 209–30; R. Roques in *RHR* 157 (1960), 187–218; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism* (New York 1960); B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (London 1961); R. Kasser, *L'évangile selon Thomas* (Neuchâtel 1961); R. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (London 1962).

3. SPECIAL STUDIES

W. C. Till, "Die Gnosis in Ägypten" in *Parola del passato* 4 (1949), 230–49; G. Widengren, "Der iranische Hintergrund der Gnosis" in *ZRGG* 4 (1952), 97–114; E. Haenchen, "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" in *ZThK* 49 (1952), 316–49; H. C. Puech, "La gnose et le temps" in *Eranos* 20 (1952), 57–113; W. H. C. Frend, "The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa" in *JEH* 4 (1953), 13–26; idem, "The Gnostic Sects and the Roman Empire", ibid. 5 (1954), 25–37; R. McL. Wilson, "Gnostic Origins" in *VigChr* 9 (1955), 193–211; 11 (1957), 93–110; E. Segelberg, "The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its Sacramental System" in *Numen* 7 (1960) 182–200; W. C. van Unnik, "Die jüdische Komponente in der Entstehung der Gnosis", ibid. 15 (1961), 65–82; G. Mead, *Fragments of Faith Forgotten* (Toronto 1960); J. G. Davies, "The Origins of Docetism" in *Studia Patristica* 6 (*TU* 81, Berlin 1962), 13–35; J. Maier, "Judentum und Gnosis" in *Kairos* 5 (1963), 18–40.

The Principal Manifestations of Gnosticism

1. Basilides: H. Waszink, "Basilides" in *RAC* I, 1217–25; G. Quispel, "L'homme gnostique. La doctrine de Basilide" in *Eranos* 16 (1948), 89–139; R. M. Grant, "Gnostic Origins and the Basilidians of Irenaeus" in *VigChr* 13 (1959), 121–5; W. Foerster, "Das System des Basilides" in *NTS* 9 (1962–3), 233–55.

2. Valentinian Gnosis: F.-M.-M. Sagnard, *La gnose Valentinienne et le témoignage de s. Irénée* (Paris 1947); G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose Valentinienne" in *Eranos* 15 (1947), 249–86; idem, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine" in *VigChr* 1 (1947), 48–73; idem, "Neue Funde zur Valentinianischen Gnosis" in *ZRGG* 6 (1954), 289–305; O. Reimhers, "Irenaeus and the Valentinians" in *The Lutheran Quarterly* 12 (1960), 55–59; A. Orbe, "Estudios Valentinianos" in *AnGr* (1955), 113 (1961).

3. Marcion: A. von Harnack, *Marcion* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1924; new imp. Darmstadt 1961); E. Barnikol, *Die Entstehung der Kirche im 2. Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions* (Kiel, 2nd ed. 1933); R. S. Wilson, *Marcion* (London 1933); J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago 1942); E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and his Influence* (London 1949); F. M. Braun, "Marcion et la gnose Simonienne" in *Byz(B)* 25–7 (1955–7), 631–48; A. Salles, "Simon le magicien ou Marcion?" in *VigChr* 12 (1958), 197–224.

4. Christian Gnosis: E. Haenchen, "Das Buch Baruch und die christliche Gnosis" in *ZThK* 48 (1953), 123–58; C. Grant, "Earliest Christian Gnosticism" in *CH* 22 (1953), 81–98; L. Bouyer, "Gnosis, le sens orthodoxe de l'expression jusqu'aux pères Alexandrins" in *JThS NS* 4 (1953), 188–203; G. Quispel, "Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie" in *EvTh* 14 (1954), 474–84; H. Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis" in *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann* (Berlin 1954), 67–82.

The Church's Self-Defence and the Importance of the Christian Victory

Tradition: J. Ranft, *Der Ursprung des katholischen Traditionsbegriffes* (Würzburg 1931); A. Deneffe, *Der Traditionsbegriff* (Münster 1931); B. Reynders, "Paradosis" in *RThAM* 5 (1933), 155–91; O. Cullmann, *Tradition* (Zürich 1954). For Irenaeus's idea of tradition, see the following articles: H. Holstein in *RSR* 36 (1949), 229–70; 41 (1953), 410–20; E. Molland in *JEH* 1 (1950), 12–28; E. Lanne in *Irénikon* 25 (1952), 113–41; A. Benoît in *RHPhR* 40 (1960), 32–43; M. Thurian, "La tradition" in *Verbum Caro* 57 (1961), 49–98. — Y. Congar, *La tradition et les traditions* (Paris 1960); G. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church* (London 1962); G. Widengren, "Tradition and Literature in Early Judaism and the Early Church" in *Numen* 10 (1963), 42–83.

Apostolic Succession: C. H. Turner, *Apostolic Succession: Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, ed. H. B. Swete (London, 2nd ed. 1921), 93–214; A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London 1953); H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen 1953); H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Truth* (London 1954); G. Dix, "The Ministry in the Early Church" in K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry* (London, 2nd ed. 1957) 183–303; J. Colson, "La succession apostolique au niveau du I$^{\text{er}}$ siècle" in *Verbum Caro* 54 (1960), 138–72; E. Schlink, "Die apostolische Sukzession" in *KuD* 7 (1961), 79–114; A. Benoît, "L'apostolicité au second siècle" in *Verbum Caro* 58 (1961), 173–84; G. Blum, *Tradition and Sukzession* (Berlin 1963).

The Establishment of the Canon: A. Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction* (Freiburg–London–New York, 4th imp. 1963), 18–35; M.-J. Lagrange, *Histoire ancienne du canon du N.T.* (Paris 1933); R. M. Grant, "The Bible of Theophilus of Antioch" in *JBL* 66

(1947), 173–96. For Marcion, see the works by J. Knox and E. C. Blackman mentioned at the beginning of the bibliography to this chapter. W. L. Dulière, "Le canon néotestamentaire et les écrits chrétiens approuvés par Irénée" in *NC* 6 (1954), 199–234; R. Harris, *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible* (Grand Rapids 1957); H. Bacht, "Die Rolle der Tradition in der Kanonbildung" in *Catholica* 12 (1958), 16–37; W. Marxsen and C. H. Ratschow in *NZSTh* 2 (1960), 137–50, 150–60; Y. Congar, "Inspiration des écritures canoniques et apostolicité de l'église" in *RSPhTh* 45 (1961), 32–42; W. van Unnik, 'Η καινὴ διαθήκη, *TU* 79 (1961), 212–27; K. Aland, *The Problem of the N.T. Canon* (London 1962).

THE CREED: H. Lietzmann, "Symbolstudien" in *ZNW* 2 (1922); 26 (1927) repr. in *Kleine Schriften* III (Berlin 1962), 189–281; J. Lebreton, *Histoire du dogme de la trinité*, I (Paris 1928), 141–73; J. de Ghellinck, "Les recherches sur l'origine du symbole" in *RHE* 38 (1942), 91–142, 361–410; O. Cullmann, *Les premières confessions de la foi chrétienne* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1948); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London 1950); W. Trillhaas, *Die apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisse* (Witten 1953).

HEGESIPPUS: K. Mras, "Die Hegesippfrage" in *AnzAW* 95 (1958), 143–53; W. Telfer, "Was Hegesippus a Jew?" in *HThR* 53 (1960), 134–53; N. Hyldahl, "Hegesipps Hypomnemoneumata" in *StTh* 14 (1960), 70–113.

IRENAEUS: W. W. Harvey's ed. (Cambridge 1857) was reprinted unaltered in 1949; J. Keble, *Five Books of St Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, Against Heresies* (Oxford 1872). A new critical ed. by F. Sagnard is appearing in *SourcesChr.*; Book III has already been published, 34 (Paris 1952), on this see P. Nautin *RThAM* 20 (1953), 185–202, B. Botte, ibid. 21 (1954), 165–78 and *ACW* 16 (1952), *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*. A new French translation of the *Demonstratio evangelica* with commentary by L.-M. Froidevaux in *SourcesChr* 62 (Paris 1959). Other works on Irenaeus: A. Benoît, *S. Irénée. Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie* (Paris 1960; with bibliography 257–62); J. Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus* (London 1948); W. Leuthold, *Das Wesen der Häresie nach Irenäus* (diss. Zürich 1954); L. Thornton, "St Irenaeus and Contemporary Theology", *TU* 64 (1957), 317–30. G. Wingren, *Man and the Incarnation* (Philadelphia 1959); E. Lanne, "La vision de Dieu dans l'Œuvre de s. Irénée" in *Irenikon* 33 (1960), 311–20; V. Hahn, "Schrift, Tradition und Primat bei Irenaeus", in *TThZ* 70 (1961), 233–43, 292–302; B. Reynders, "Premières réactions de l'église devant les falsifications du dépot apostolique" in *L'infallibilité de l'église* (Chevetogne 1963), 27–52; H. Dörries, "Urteil und Verurteilung – Ein Beitrag zum Umgang der alten Kirche mit Häretikern" in *ZNW* 55 (1964), 78–94.

16. *The Rise of Montanism and the Church's Defence*

SOURCES

P. de Labriolle, *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme* (Paris 1913); N. Bonwetsch, *Texte zur Geschichte des Montanismus* (Bonn 1914), *KlT* 129.

LITERATURE

P. de Labriolle, *La crise Montaniste* (Paris 1913); W. M. Calder, "Philadelphia and Montanism" in *BJRL* 7 (1923), 309–54; W. M. Ramsey, "Phrygian Orthodox and Heretics" in *ByZ* 6 (1931), 1–35; J. Zeiller, "Le Montanisme a-t-il pénétré en Illyricum?" in *RHE* 30 (1934), 847–51; H. Bacht, "Die prophetische Inspiration in der kirchlichen

Reflexion der vormontanistischen Zeit" in *ThQ* 125 (1944), 1–18; G. Freeman, "Montanism and the Phrygian cults" in *DomSt* 3 (1950), 297–316; S. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, "The Date of the Outbreak of Montanism" in *JEH* 5 (1954), 7–15; K. Aland, "Der Montanismus und die kleinasiatische Theologie" in *ZNW* 46 (1955), 109–16, *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 105–11; idem, "Augustin und der Montanismus"; ibidem, 149–64.

17. *The Expansion of Christianity down to the End of the Second Century*

GENERAL

W. M. Ramsey, *The Church in the Roman Empire before 170* (London, 13th ed. 1913); A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (2 vols. Leipzig, 4th ed. 1924), Eng. tr. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, I (New York, 2nd ed. 1962); F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Rise of Gentile Christianity (to 150)* (London 1927); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, I (New York 1937); G. Bardy, *La conversion au christianisme durant les premiers siècles* (Paris 1949); B. Kötting, "Christentum (Ausbreitung)" in *RAC* II (1954), 1138–59; P. Carrington, *The Early Christian Church*, II: *The Second Century* (Cambridge 1957); F. van der Meer and C. Mohrmann, *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (London 1958).

SPECIAL STUDIES

K. Pieper, *Die Kirche Palästinas bis zum Jahre 135* (Cologne 1938); C. Korolevsky, "Antioche" in *DHGE* III, 563–72; V. Schultze, *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften*, III: *Antiochien* (Gütersloh 1930); J. Kollwitz, "Antiochien" in *RAC* I, 461–9; I. Ortiz de Urbina, "Le origini del cristianesimo in Edessa" in *Gr* 15 (1934), 82–91; H. Leclercq, "Edesse" in *DACL* IV, 2055–110; E. Kirsten, "Edessa" in *RAC* IV, 568–72; M. Höfner, "Arabien" in *RAC* I, 579–85; R. Devreesse, "Le christianisme dans la province d'Arabie" in *Vivre et Penser* 2 (1942), 110–46; N. Edelby, "La Transjordanie chrétienne des origines aux croisades" in *PrOrChr* 6 (1956), 97–117; A. Böhlig, "Ägypten" in *RAC* I, 128–38; E. R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt* (New York 1952); H. I. Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool 1954); H. Leclercq, "Rome" in *DACL* XIV/2, 2546–67; G. de la Piana, "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century" in *HThR* 18 (1925), 201 ff.; A. Audollent, "Afrique" *DHGE* I, 706–12; A. M. Schneider, "Afrika" in *RAC* I, 173–9; J. Mesnage, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris 1912); C. Cecchelli, *Africa Christiana — Africa Romana* (Rome 1936); J. Ferron, "Carthage chrétienne" in *DHGE* XI, 1178–87; W. H. C. Frend, "The 'seniores Laici' and the Origins of the Church of North Africa" in *JThS NS* 12 (1961), 280–4; E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne*, I (Paris 1947), 7–50; R. Kasser, "Les origines du christianisme égyptien" in *RThPh* 12 (1962), 11–28; L. W. Barnard, "The Background of Early Egyptian Christianity" in *ChQR* 164 (1963), 300–10, 428–41; W. H. C. Frend, "A Note on the Influence of Greek Immigrants on the Spread of Christianity in the West" in *Festschrift T. Klauser* (Münster 1964), 125–9.

Part Two:

The Great Church of Early Christian Times

(*c.* A.D. 180–324)

GENERAL LITERATURE

A. Ehrhard, *Die Kirche der Märtyrer* (Munich 1932); *Fliche–Martin* II; *Lietzmann* II, 219–329, III, 1–67.

ON THE ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE THIRD CENTURY: M. Besnier, *L'empire romain de l'avènement des Sévères au concile de Nicée* (Paris 1937); *The Cambridge Ancient History*, XII (Cambridge 1939); E. Kornemann, *Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeerraumes*, II (Munich 1949), 174–288; F. Altheim, *Niedergang der alten Welt*, II: *Imperium Romanum* (Frankfurt a. M. 1952); J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1929); L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma e del mondo Romano*, vol. VI: *Da Decio a Costantino* (Turin 1961).

SECTION ONE

The Inner Consolidation of the Church in the Third Century

18. *The Attack of the Pagan State on the Church*

SOURCES

As for Chapter 9 above. The *acta* of the martyrs are referred to in the footnotes. New critical edition of Tertullian's *Ad martyras* by A. Quacquarelli (Rome 1963).

LITERATURE

K. Bihlmeyer, *Die syrischen Kaiser zu Rom und das Christentum* (Rottenburg 1916); L. Homo, *Les empereurs romains et le christianisme* (Paris 1931); A. Quacquarelli, "La persecuzione secondo Tertulliano" in *Gr* 31 (1950), 562–89; L. Koep, "Antikes" Kaisertum und Christusbekenntnis im Widerspruch" in *JbAC* 4 (1961) 58–76; G. de Ste Croix, "Why were the Early Christians Persecuted?" in *Past and Present* (1963), 6–38.

SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS: A. Calderini, *I Severi* (Bologna 1949); M. Fluss in *Pauly-Wissowa* A 2 (1923), 1940–2002; M. Platnauer, *Life and Reign of Septimius Severus* (Oxford

1918); U. Instinsky, "Studien zu Septimius Severus" in *Klio* 35 (1942), 200–19; J. Straub, "Caracalla" in *RAC* II, 893–901 (with bibliography); K. Gross, "Elagabal" in *RAC* IV, 998–1000; J. Straub, "Alexander Severus" in *LThK* I, 312 ff.; A. Alföldi, "Der Rechtsstreit zwischen der römischen Kirche und dem Verein der popinarii" in *Klio* 31 (1938), 249–53; A. A. Schwarte, "Das angebliche Christengesetz des Septimius Severus" in *Historia* 12 (1963), 185–208.

DECIUS: K. Gross in *RAC* III, 611–29. As sources the following are important: Cyprian, *De lapsis*, and *Epist.* 5–43, 55–6, 65–7; Dionysius of Alexandria in *Euseb. HE* 6, 39 to 42, and cf. H. Delehaye in *AnBoll* 40 (1922), 9–17.
E. Liesering, *Untersuchungen zur Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius* (diss. Würzburg 1933); A. Alföldi in *Klio* 31 (1938), 323–48; C. Saumagne, "La persécution de Dèce à Carthage d'après la correspondance de s. Cyprien" in *Bulletin soc. nat. antiquaires de France* (1957), 23–42; idem, "La persécution de Dèce en Afrique" in *Byz* 32 (1962), 1–29.
Texts of the *libelli: POr* IV, 2; XVIII, 3; *RB* 54 (1947), 365–9, and cf. R. Knipfing in *HThR* 16 (1923), 345–90; also *DACL* 9 (1930), 81–5; A. Bludau in *RQ* Supplement 27 (1927).

THE VALERIAN PERSECUTION: P. Franchi de' Cavalieri in *SteT* 9 (1902), 39–51; 27 (1915), 65–82; 33 (1920), 147–78; 65 (1935), 129–99; P. Healy, *The Valerian Persecution* (Boston 1905); P. Paschini, "La persecuzione di Valeriano" in *Studi Romani* 6 (Rome 1958), 130–7.

19. *Further Development of Christian Literature in the East in the Third Century*

GENERAL LITERATURE

Bardenhewer II; *Quasten P*, II; *Altaner* 212 ff.; D. van den Eynde, *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles* (Gembloux 1933); J. Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux II^e^ et III^e^ siècles* (Tournai 1961); P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II^e^ et III^e^ siècles* (Paris 1961).

SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA

W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandrien und Rom* (Göttingen 1915); G. Bardy, "Les écoles romaines au second siècle" in *RHE* 28 (1932), 501–32; idem, "L'église et l'enseignement pendant les trois premiers siècles" in *RevSR* 12 (1932), 1–28; L. Allevi, *Ellenismo e cristianesimo* (Milan 1934); G. Bardy, "Pour l'histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie" in *Vivre et penser* 2 (Paris 1942), 80–109; L. López Oreja, "Alejandría, su escueala, un maestro" in *Helmantica* I (1950), 402–52; A. Knauber, "Katechetenschule oder Schulkatechumetat? Um die rechte Deutung des 'Unternehmens' der ersten großen Alexandriner" in *TThZ* 60 (1951), 243–66; P. Brezzi, *La gnosi cristiana e le antiche scuole cristiane* (Rome 1950); E. A. Parsons, *The Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenic World* (London 1952).
R. Cadiou, *La jeunesse d'Origène. Histoire de l'école d'Alessandrie au début du III^e^ siècle* (Paris 1936); G. Bardy, "Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie" in *RSR* 27 (1937), 65–90; M. Hornschuh, "Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule" in *ZKG* 71 (1960), 1–25, 193–214; R. B. Tollinton, *Alexandrian*

Teaching on the Universe (New York 1932); E. Molland, *The Conception of the Gospel in the Alexandrian Theology* (Oslo 1938); J. Guillet, "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche: Conflit ou malentendu?" in *RSR* 34 (1947), 247–302; H. de Lubac, "Typologie et allégorisme" in *RSR* 34 (1947), 180–226; ibid. 47 (1959), 5–43; W. Gruber, *Die pneumatische Exegese bei den Alexandrinern* (Graz 1957); R. Cadiou, "La bibliothèque de Césarée et la formation des Chaînes" in *RevSR* 16 (1936) 474–83; G. Lattey, "The Antiochene Text" in *Scripture* 4 (1951), 273–77; F. Pericoli Ridolfini, "Le origini della scuola di Alessandria" in *RSO* 37 (1962), 211–30.

Pantainus: G. Gnolfo in *PrOrChr* 1 (1951), 295–304; P. Nautin in *Tome commémoratif du millénaire de la Bibliothèque d'Alexandrie* (Alexandria 1953), 145–52; A. Parsons, "A Family of Philosophers at Athens and Alexandria" in *Hesperia Suppl.* VIII (1950).

CLEMENT

Works in *GCS*, 4 vols. (1905–36, 2nd ed. 1936–60), edited by O. Stählin; also *SourcesChr* 2 (2nd ed. 1949): *Protrepticus;* 30 (1951): *Stromata* I; 38 (1954): *Stromata* II; 70 (1960): *Paidagogus* I; 23 (1948): *Excerpta ex Theodoto.* This latter work also edited by R. P. Casey (London 1934). Eng. *ANF* 2 (New York 1905).

Literature: J. Munck, *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandrien* (Stuttgart 1933); G. Lazzati, *Introduzione allo studio di Clem. Alex.* (Milan 1939); C. Mondésert, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse* (Paris 1944); M. S. Enslin, "A Gentleman among the Fathers" in *HThR* 47 (1954), 213–41; M. Pohlenz, *Klemens von Alexandrien und sein hellenistisches Christentum* (Göttingen 1943); T. Camelot, *Foi et gnose. Introduction à l'étude de la connaissance mystique chez Clément d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1945); F. Quatember, *Die christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens von Alexandrien nach seinem Pädagogus* (Vienna 1946); T. Rüther, *Die sittliche Forderung der Apatheia bei Klemens von Alexandrien* (Freiburg i. Br. 1949); W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Klemens von Alexandrien* (Berlin 1952); E. F. Osborne, *The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge 1957); K. Prümm, "Glaube und Erkenntnis nach Klemens von Alexandrien" in *Scholastik* 12 (1937), 17–57; J. Lebreton, "La théologie de la Trinité chez Clément d'Alexandrie" in *RSR* 34 (1947), 55–76, 142–79; J. Moingt, "La gnose de Clément d'Alexandrie dans ses rapports avec la foi et la philosophie" in *RSR* 37 (1950), 195–241, 381–421, 537–64; ibid. 38 (1951), 82–118; A. Orbe, "Teología bautismal de Clem. Alex." in *Gr* 36 (1955), 410–48; F. Hofmann, "Die Kirche bei Klemens von Alexandrien" in *Festgabe K. Adam* (1956), 11–57; J. Wytzes, "The Twofold Way: Platonic Influences in the Work of Clement of Alexandria" in *VigChr* II (1957), 226–45; ibid. 14 (1960), 129–53; E. Fascher, *Der Logos-Christus als göttlicher Lehrer bei Clemens von Alexandrien, Studien zum NT und zur Patristik, TU 77* (Berlin 1961), 193–207; T. Finan, "Hellenism and Judeo-Christian History in Clement of Alexandria" in *ITQ* 28 (1961), 83–114; G. W. Butterworth, *Clement of Alexandria with an English Translation (Loeb Classical Library)* (London – New York 1919); *Christ the Educator, FC* 23 (1954).

ORIGEN

Works in *GCS*, 12 volumes so far (Berlin 1899–1959), edited by P. Koetschau, E. Klostermann, E. Preuschen, W. A. Baehrens, M. Rauer; Engl. *ANF* 10 (New York 1903), Commentary on John and Matthew; *ACW* 19 (1954): *Exhortation to Martyrdom;* 26 (1957): *The Song of Songs; SourcesChr* 7 (1944): *Homilies on Genesis* (French translation only); 16 (1947): *Homilies on Exodus* (French translation only); 29 (1951): *Homilies on Numbers* (French translation only); 37 (1954): *Homilies on the Canticle*

of Canticles; 67 (1960): *Dialogue with Heracleides;* 71 (1960): *Homilies on Josue;* 87 (1962): *Homilies on Luke; Philocalia,* ed. J. A. Robinson (Cambridge 1893); *Hexapla Fragments,* ed. F. Field, 2 vols. (Oxford 1871–5); R. Cadiou, *Commentaires inédits des Psaumes* (Paris 1935); J. Scherer, *Le commentaire d'Origène sur Rom. 3:5–5:7* (Cairo 1955); idem, *Extraits des livres I et II du Contra Celsum d'Origène* (Cairo 1956). German translation *BKV (De orat.; exhort. mart.);* 52–53 *(Contra Celsum); Commentary on St John's Gospel* (Selections), R. Gögler (Einsiedeln 1959). Selections from the works as a whole, Hans Urs von Balthasar (Salzburg, 2nd ed. 1954).

General Surveys: G. Bardy: *DThC* XI, 1489–1565; H. Koch: *Pauly–Wissowa* 18/1, 1036–56; F. H. Kettler: *RGG,* 3rd ed. IV, 1692–1701; E. de Faye, *Origène,* 3 vols. (Paris 1923–30); R. Cadiou, *Introduction au système d'Origène* (Paris 1932); J. Daniélou, *Origen* (New York 1955), H. Musurillo, "The recent revival of Origen studies" in *ThSt* 24 (1963), 250–63; J. Daniélou, "Origène comme Exégète de la Bible" in *Stud. patrist.* 1 (*TU* 63, Berlin 1957), 280–90, H. Crouzel, "Origène est-il un systématique?" in *BLE* 60 (1959), 81–116.

Special Studies: W. Völker, *Die Vollkommenheitslehre des Origenes* (Tübingen 1931); H. Koch, *Pronoia und Paideusis* (Leipzig 1932); A. Lieske, *Die Theologie der Logosmystik bei Origenes* (Münster 1938); C. Vagaggini, *Maria nelle opere di Orig.* (Rome 1942); S. Bettencourt, *Doctrina ascetica Orig.* (Rome 1945); E. Latko, *Origen's Concept of Penance* (Quebec 1949); H. de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit. L'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène* (Paris 1950); J. Daniélou, *From Shadows to Reality* (London 1960); F. Bertrand, *Mystique de Jésus chez Origène* (Paris 1951); R. P. C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine on Tradition* (London 1954); E. C. Jay, *Origen's Treatise on Prayer* (London 1954); H. Crouzel, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène* (Paris 1956); M. Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du verbe incarné* (Paris 1958, with comprehensive bibliography); G. Teichweier, *Die Sündenlehre des Origenes* (Regensburg 1958); F. Faessler, *Der Hagiosbegriff bei Origenes* (Fribourg 1958); R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event. A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (London 1959); H. Crouzel, *Origène et la philosophie* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1962); B. Drewery, *Origen and the Doctrine of Grace* (London 1960); P. Nemeshegyi, *La paternité de Dieu chez Origène* (Tournai 1960); H. Crouzel, *Origène et 'la connaissance mystique'* (Bruges 1961); G. Gruber, Ζωή. *Wesen, Stufen und Mitteilungen des Lebens bei Origenes* (Munich 1961).

Articles on the Theology of Origen: Hans Urs von Balthasar, "Le mystère d'Origène" in *RSR* 26 (1936), 513–62; 27 (1937), 38–64; H. Rahner, "Das Menschenbild des Origenes" in *Eranos* 15 (1947), 197–248; J.-F. Bonnefoy, "Origène, théoricien de la méthode théologique" in *Mélanges Cavallera* (Toulouse 1948), 87–145; K. Rahner, "La doctrine d'Origène sur la pénitence" in *RSR* 37 (1950), 47–97, 252–86, 422–56; C. Vagaggini, "La natura della sintesi Origeniana e l'ortodossia e l'eterodossia della dogmatica di Origene" in *SC* 82 (1954), 169–200; A. Méhat, "Apocatastase" in *VigChr* 10 (1956), 196–214; G. Müller, "Origenes und die Apokatastasis" in *ThZ* 14 (1958), 161–90; E. von Ivánka, "Der geistige Ort von Περὶ ἀρχῶν zwischen Neuplatonismus, Gnosis und der christlichen Rechtgläubigkeit" in *Scholastik* 35 (1960), 481–502; V. Peri, "I passi sulla trinità nelle omelie origeniane" in *Studia Patristica* 6 (*TU* 81 [1962]), 155–80; M. Simonetti, "Due note sull'angelologia origeniana" in *Rivista di cultura classica mediaevale* 4 (1962), 165–208.

Articles on Origen's Spiritual Doctrine: K. Rahner "Les débuts d'une doctrine des cinq sens spirituels chez Origène" in *RAM* 13 (1932), 113–145; J. Daniélou, "Les sources bibliques de la mystique d'Origène" in *RAM* 23 (1947), 126–141; H. Jonas,

"Die origenistische Spekulation und Mystik" in *ThZ* 5 (1949), 24–45, and in the contrary sense J. Lebreton in *AnBoll* 67 (1949), 542–76; K. Baus, "Das Nachwirken des Origenes in der Christusfrömmigkeit des heiligen Ambrosius" in *RQ* 49 (1954), 21–55; H. Crouzel, *Virginité et Mariage selon Origène* (Paris 1963).

Dionysius of Alexandria: Engl. *ANF* 6 (New York 1903); C. L. Feltoe, *The Letters and Other Remains* (Cambridge 1904); P. S. Miller, *Studies in Dionysius the Great of Alexandria* (diss. Erlangen 1933); H. G. Opitz, "Dionys und die Libyer" in *Studies K. Lake* (London 1937), 41–53.

Peter of Alexandria: Fragments: *PG* 18, 449–522; *POR* I, 383–400; 3, 353–61. F. H. Kettler in *Pauly-Wissowa*, 19/2, 1281–8; E. W. Kemp, "Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria" in *JEH* 6 (1955), 125–42.

Gregory Thaumaturgus: Works: *PG* 10, 963–1232; Engl. *ANF* 6 (1903); "On Origen" ed. by P. Koetschau (Leipzig 1894). L. Froidevaux, "Le symbole de s. Grégoire le Thaumaturge" in *RSR* 19 (1929), 193–247; W. Telfer, "The Cultus of St Gregory Thaumaturgus" in *HThR* 29 (1936), 225–344; A. Soloview, "S. Grégoire, patron de Bosnie" in *Byz* (B) 19 (1949), 263–79.

Methodius: Works, edited by N. Bonwetsch in *GCS* (Berlin 1917); *De autexusio* in *POR* 22, 5; Engl. *ACW* 27 (Westminster 1958): *The Symposium; ANF* 6 (New York 1903).
J. Farges, *Les idées morales et religieuses de Méthode d'Olympe* (Paris 1929); K. Quensell, *Die wahre Stellung und Tätigkeit des Methodius von Olymp* (diss. Heidelberg 1952); V. Buchheit, *Studien zu Methodius von Olymp* (Berlin 1958); M. Pellegrino, *L'inno di simposio di s. Metodio* (Turin 1958, with text and commentary).

Lucian and the School of Antioch: G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Lucien d'Antioche et son école* (Paris 1936); H. Dörries, "Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta" in *ZNW* 39 (1940), 57–110; A. Vaccari, "La 'teoria' della scuola antiochena" in *Scritti di erudizione* (Rome 1942), 101–42; G. Mercati, "Di alcune testimonianze antiche sulle cure bibliche di San Luciano" in *Biblica* 24 (1943), 1–17; F. Alvarez Seisdedos, "La teoría antioquena" in *EstB* II (1952), 31–67; P. Ternant, "La θεωρία d'Antioche dans le cadre de l'Écriture" in *Biblica* 34 (1953), 135–58, 354–83, 456–86.

20. *The Development of Christian Literature in the West in the Third Century*

P. de Labriolle, *History and Literature of Christianity* (London–New York, 2nd ed. 1947).

Early Christian Latin: F. Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn 1928); J. Schrijnen, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein* (Nijmegen 1932); W. Süss, *Studien zur lateinischen Bibel* (Tartu 1932); M. A. Sainio, *Semasiologische Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der christlichen Latinität* (Hamburg 1940); M. Müller, *Der Übergang von der griechischen zur lateinischen Sprache in der abendländischen Kirche von Hermas bis Novatian* (Rome 1943); T. Klauser, "Der Übergang der römischen Kirche von der griechischen zur lateinischen Liturgiesprache" in *MiscMercati* I, 467–82; G. Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne*, I (Paris 1948); K. Baus in *TThZ* 61 (1952), 192–205; ibid. 68 (1959), 306–15 (with bibliography); C. Mohrmann, "Les origines de la latinité chrétienne à Rome" in *VigChr* 3 (1949), 67–106, 163–185. Further works of Mohrmann in the collected volumes: *Le latin des chrétiens*, I (Rome 1958); II (Rome 1961); *Liturgical Latin* (London 1959); E. Löfstedt,

Late Latin (Oslo 1959); M. Dilworth, "The Morphology of Christian Latin" in *The Clergy Review* 45 (1960) 88–97; E. Franceschini, "Latino dei Cristiani e Latino della Chiesa" in *Mélanges C. Mohrmann* (Utrecht 1963), 152–64.

Minucius Felix: Editions of the Works: J. P. Waltzing (Leipzig 1926); J. Martin (Bonn 1930); G. Quispel (Leyden 1949); M. Pellegrino (Turin 1950); Engl. *ANF* 4 (New York 1905); *FC* 10 (New York 1950). H. J. Baylis, *Minucius Felix and his Place among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church* (London 1928); R. Beutler, *Philosophie und Apologetik bei Minucius Felix* (Diss. Marburg 1936); M. Pellegrino, *Studi sull'antica apologetica* (Rome 1947). On the problem of the priority of Minucius Felix or Tertullian, and on the language of the *Octavius*, see *Quasten P*, II, 160–2.

Hippolytus: Works, edited by G. N. Bonwetsch, H. Achelis, P. Wendland, A. Bauer, R. Helm, in *GCS* 1, 26, 46 (Berlin 1916–55); Engl. *ANF* 5 (New York 1903). P. Nautin, *Hippolyte, Contre les hérésies* (Paris 1949); M. Brière–L. Mariès–B. C. Mercier, *Hippolyte, Les bénédictions d'Isaac, de Jacob et de Moïse, POR* 27 (1954), B. Botte, *La tradition apostolique de s. Hippolyte. Essai de reconstruction* (Münster 1963). Separate editions: *Commentary on Daniel* ed. by G. Bardy in *SourcesChr* 14 (1947); *Traditio Apostolica,* edited B. Botte in *SourcesChr* 11 (1946); Funk 2, 97–119; G. Dix (London 1937); Ethiopian text edited by H. Duensing in *AAG* 32 (1946); Coptic text, edited W. Till–J. Leipoldt in *TU* 58 (1954). Literature on the most recent discussion regarding the authorship of the *Philosophoumena,* the *Chronicle* and the *De universo:* P. Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe* (Paris 1947); idem, *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton* (Paris 1953); idem, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II*^{e} *et III*^{e} *siècles* (Paris 1961), 177 to 207; for a contrary view see G. Bardy, M. Richard, B. Capelle, B. Botte, G. Oggioni in *MSR* 1948, 1950–1, 1953–4; *RThAM* 1949–50, 1952; *RSR* 1947, 1954–5; *RHE* 1952; *SC* 1950–52; A. de Alès, *La théologie de s. Hippolyte* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1929); B. Capelle, "Le logos, fils de Dieu, dans la théologie d'Hippolyte" in *RThAM* 9 (1937), 109–24; K. Prümm, "Mysterion bei Hippolyt" in *ZKTh* 63 (1939), 207–25; E. Lengling, *Die Heilstat des Logos-Christos bei Hippolyt* (Rome 1947); A. Hamel, *Die Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom* (Gütersloh 1952); J. Lecuyer, "Épiscopat et presbytérat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte" in *RSR* 41 (1953), 30–50; A. Amore, "Note su s. Ippolito martire" in *RivAC* 30 (1954), 63–97; C. Edsman, "A Typology of Baptism in Hippolytus" in *TU* 64 (1957), 35–40; J.-M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte* (Rome 1959), criticized by T. G. Davies in *JTS* 11 (1960), 163–6; B. Botte in *BThAM* 8 (1960), 575–7; A. Amore, "La personalità dello scrittore Ippolito" in *Antonianum* 36 (1961), 3–28. A. Walls, "The Latin Version of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition" in *TU* 78 (1961), 155–62; G. Ogg, "Hippolytus and the Introduction of the Christian Era" in *VigChr* 16 (1962), 2–18; B. Botte, *La tradition apostolique de S. Hippolyte* (Münster 1963), on this C. Lambert in *RBén* 74 (1964), 144–7.

Novatian: No collected edition exists. Works: *De trinitate,* ed. W. Y. Fausset (Cambridge 1909); with German translation, and commentary by H. Weyer (Düsseldorf 1962); Engl. *ANF* 5 (New York 1903); *Concerning the Trinity, On the Jewish Meats, De cibis iud.* edited by A. Landgraf–C. Weymann in *Archlat Lexikogr.,* 11 (1898 to 1900) 221–49; *De spect.,* edited by A. Boulenger (Paris 1933), and see on this H. Koch in *Religio* 12 (1936), 245–65. On language and style, A. Boulenger in *Religio* 13 (1937), 278–94; B. Melin, *Studia in corpus Cyprianeum* (Uppsala 1946).
A. d'Alès, *Novatien* (Paris 1924); M. Kriebel, *Studien zur älteren Entwicklung der abendländischen Trinitätslehre bei Tertullian und Novatian* (diss. Marburg 1932); M. Simonetti, "Alcune osservazioni sul De trinitate di Novaziano" in *Studi in onore di A. Monteverdi* 2 (Modena 1959), 771–83. On the Logos doctrine: G. Keilbach in *Bogoslovska Smotra* 21 (1933), 193–224. On the *communicatio idiomatum:* R. Favre in *BLE*

37 (1936), 130–45. On angel Christology: F. Scheidweiler in *ZKG* 66 (1955), 126–39, and J. Barbel in *TThZ* 67 (1958) 96–105. On Novatian's biography: F. J. Dölger in *AuC* II (1930), 258–67; C. Mohlberg in *ELit* 51 (1937), 242–9; A. Ferrua in *CivCatt* (1944) 4, 232–9.

TERTULLIAN: Works in a collected edition, in *CSEL*, edited by A. Reifferscheid–G. Wissowa, A. Kroymann, H. Hoppe, V. Bulhart, P. Borleffs 20 (1890), 47 (1906), 69 (1939), 70 (1942), 76 (1957); and in *CChr* 1 and 2 (1954). For editions of individual works see *Altaner* 166–82, and *CChr* 1, xii–xiv. Engl. *ANF* 3 and 4 (1905); *Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage, ACW* 13 (1951); *The Treatise against Hermogenes* 24 (1956); *Treatises on Penance,* 28 (1959); apologetical works, *FC* 10 (1951); disciplinary, moral and ascetical works, *FC* 40 (1959); *On baptism,* ed. E. Evans (London 1964); *Against the Jews,* ed. H. Tränkle (Wiesbaden 1964).

On Language and Style: T. W. Teuwen, *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian* (Paderborn 1926); E. Löfstedt, *Zur Sprache Tertullians* (Lund 1920); H. Hoppe, *Beiträge zu Sprache und Kritik Tertullians* (Lund 1932); A. d'Alès, "Tertullian helléniste" in *RÉG* (1937), 320–62; H. Janssen, *Kultur und Sprache bei Tertullian* (Nijmegen 1938); V. Morel, "Disciplina" in *RHE* 40 (1944–5), 5–46; J. H. Waszink, "Pompa diaboli" in *VigChr* 1 (1947), 13–41; A. Kolping, *Sacramentum Tertullianeum* (Münster 1948); C. Mohrmann, *Tertull. Apologeticum* (Utrecht 1951), lxxxvi–cii. A *Lexicon Tertullianeum* is in preparation by G. Claesson. P. Guilloux, "L'évolution religieuse de *Tertullien*" in *RHE* 19 (1923), 5–24, 141–56; B. Nisters, *Tertullian, seine Persönlichkeit und sein Schicksal* (Münster 1950); M. Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts* (Oxford 1961).

Tertullian's Theology: A. d'Alès, *La théologie de Tertullien* (Paris 1905); R. E. Roberts, *The Theology of Tertullian* (London 1924); J. Morgan, *The Importance of Tertullian in the Development of Christian Dogma* (London 1928); J. Lortz, *Tertullian als Apologet,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1927–8); C. Becker, *Tertullians Apologeticum, Werden und Leistung* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1961); A. Quacquarelli, *Tertullianus ad Scapulam* (Rome 1957); G. Zimmermann, *Die hermeneutischen Prinzipien Tertullians* (diss. Leipzig 1937); J. Stirnimann, *Die Praescriptio Tertullians* (Fribourg 1949); K. Adam, *Der Kirchenbegriff Tertullians* (Paderborn 1907); H. Koch, *Callist und Tertullian* (Heidelberg 1920); W. Köhler, *Omnis ecclesia Petri propinqua* (Heidelberg 1938); V. Morel, *De ontwikkeling van de christl. overlevering volgens Tertullian* (Bruges 1946); T. Brandt, *Tertullians Ethik* (Gütersloh 1929); J. Büchner, *Tert. de spectaculis, Kommentar* (Würzburg 1935); the same work with commentary by E. Castorina (Florence 1961); J. Klein, *Tertullians christliches Bewußtsein* (Bonn 1940); K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum (Kommentar zu De corona)* (Bonn 1940); R. Franco, *El final del reino de Cristo en Tertuliano* (Granada 1955); G. Säflund, *De pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians* (Lund 1955); G. Calloni, *Tertulliano, Vita, Opere, Pensiero* (Modena 1957).

Tertullian's Doctrine of Penance: K. Rahner in *ZKTh* 60 (1936), 471–510; *Festschrift K. Adam* (Düsseldorf 1952), 139–67; B. Poschmann, *Poenitentia secunda* (Bonn 1940), 270–348; H. Karpp, *Schrift und Geist bei Tertullian* (Gütersloh 1955); E. Langstadt, "Tertullian's Doctrine of Sin and the Power of Absolution in 'de pudicitia'" in *TU* 64 (1957), 251–7; H. Finé, *Die Terminologie der Jenseitsvorstellungen bei Tertullian* (Bonn 1958); S. Otto, *Natura und dispositio, Untersuchungen zum Naturbegriff und zur Denkform Tertullians* (Munich 1960); K. Wöllfl, *Das Heilswirken Gottes durch den Sohn nach Tertullian, AnGr* 112 (Rome 1960); V. Décarie, "Le paradoxe de Tertullien" in *VigChr* 15 (1961), 23–31; W. Bender, *Die Lehre über den Heiligen Geist bei Tertullian* (Munich 1961); E. Dekkers, *Tertullian en de geschiedenis der liturgie* (Brussels 1947);

R. Cantalamessa, *La cristologia di Tertulliano* (Fribourg 1962); G. G. Blum, "Der Begriff des Apostolischen im theologischen Denken Tertullians" in *KuD* 9 (1963) 102 to 121; G. C. Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian" in *TThS* 14 (1963), 46–66; B. Piault, "Tertullien a-t-il été subordinatien?" in *RSPhTh* 46 (1936), 181–204. On *De idol.* and *De cultu fem.* see P. G. Van der Nat in *VigChr* 17 (1963), 71–84.

Cyprian: Works, edited by W. Hartel in *CSEL* 3, 1–3 (1868–71); *Tractatus,* edited S. Colombo (Turin 1935); *Epistulae,* edited L. Bayard, 2 vols. (Paris, 2nd ed. 1945); Engl. *Epistles and Treatises ANF* 5 (1903); *Treatises FC* 36 (1958). On Textual Criticism and Language: H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Bonn 1926); B. Melin, *Studia in corpus Cyprianeum* (Uppsala 1946). The *Vita* of Cyprian by Pontius, and the *Acta proconsularia* in *CSEL* 3, 3; the *Vita* separately, edited by M. Pellegrino (Alba 1955). On the *Vita* see R. Reitzenstein in *AGG* (1919), 177–219; J. Martin in *HJ* (1919), 674–712; *Delehaye PM* 82–104.

Special Studies: P. Monceaux, *S. Cyprien* (Paris 1902 and, without notes, 1914); S. Colombo, "S. Cipriano, l'uomo e lo scrittore" in *Didaskaleion* 6 (Turin 1928), 1–80; A. A. Ehrhardt, "Cyprian, Father of Western Christianity" in *ChQR* 133 (1941), 178–96; E. Hummel, *The Concept of Martyrdom according to St Cyprian* (Washington 1946); J. Ludwig, *Der heilige Märtyrerbischof Cyprian von Karthago* (Munich 1951); M. Jourjon, *Cyprien de Carthage* (Paris 1957).

Cyprian's Theology: A. d'Alès, *La théologie de S. Cyprien* (Paris 1922). Doctrine of Baptism: G. Bardy in *RSR* 14 (1924), 255–72, 385–99; N. Zernov in *ChQR* 117 (1934), 304–36; A. Stenzel in *Scholastik* 30 (1955), 372–85. Doctrine of the Eucharist: P. Batiffol, *L'eucharistie* (Paris, 9th ed. 1930), 226–47; G. Bardy in *VS Suppl.* 60 (1939), 87–119; S. Salaville in *ÉO* 39 (1941–42), 268–82. On the question of penance: H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Bonn 1926); M. C. Chartier in *Antonianum* 14 (1939), 17–42, 135–56; B. Poschmann, *Poenitentia secunda* (Bonn 1940), 368–424; K. Rahner in *ZKTh* 74 (1952), 252–76, 381–438; M. Bévenot in *ThSt* 16 (1955), 175–273; C. Daly, *TU* 64 (1957) 202–7; M. F. Wiles, "The Theological legacy of St Cyprian" in *JEH* 14 (1963), 139–49.

On Cyprian's Conception of the Church: H. Koch, *Cathedra Petri* (Giessen 1930); E. Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit der Kirche* (Berlin 1932), 44–116; B. Poschmann, *Ecclesia principalis* (Breslau 1933); J. Plumpe, *Mater ecclesia* (Washington 1943), 81–108; G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'église,* II (Paris 1947), 171–251; J. Ludwig, *Die Primatsworte in der altkirchlichen Exegese* (Münster 1952); M. Bévenot in *RSR* 39–40 (1951–2), 397–415. G. Klein in *ZKG* 68 (1957), 48–68; J. Colson, *L'évêque, lieu d'unité et de charité chez saint Cyprien de Carthage* (Paris 1961).

21. *The First Christological and Trinitarian Controversies*

J. Tixeront, *History of Dogmas* (St Louis–London 1928–32). A. von Harnack, *History of Dogma* (New York 1958); R. Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* (Grand Rapids 1956); F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte,* ed. K. Aland (Tübingen, 6th ed. 1959); W. Koehler, *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des christlichen Selbstbewußtseins,* I (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1951); M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas problemgeschichtlich dargestellt* (Tübingen, 2nd ed. 1954), abridged English edition: *The Formation of Christian Dogma* (London 1957); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London 1958); P. Meinhold, "Zur Grundlegung der Dogmengeschichte" in *Saeculum* 10 (1959), 1–20; W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen 1934); J. Brosch, *Das Wesen der Häresie* (Bonn 1936);

G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (London, 2nd ed. 1952); S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (London 1953); H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (London 1954); W. Doskocil, *Der Bann in der Urkirche* (Munich 1958); G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics* (London, 4th ed. 1958); J. Lebreton, Eng. tr. *History of the Dogma of the Trinity* I (New York 1939); F. L. Dölger, "Sonne und Sonnenstrahl als Gleichnis der Logostheologie des christlichen Altertums" in *AuC* 1 (1929), 271–90; M. Kreibel, *Studien zur ältesten Entwicklung der abendländischen Trinitätslehre bei Tertullian und Novatian* (diss. Marburg 1932); J. Barbel, *Christos Angelos* (Bonn 1941); E. Peterson, "Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem" in *Theologische Traktate* (Munich 1951), 45–147; A. Gilg, *Weg und Bedeutung der altkirchlichen Christologie* (Munich 1955); G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätslehre* (Tübingen 1956); W. Marcus, *Der Subordinationismus als historiologisches Phänomen* (Munich 1963).
G. Bardy, "Monarchianisme" in *DThC* X, 2193–209; idem, "Les écoles romaines au second siècle" in *RHE* 28 (1932), 501–32; G. La Piana, "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century" in *HThR* 18 (1925), 201–77; H. Stork, *Die sogenannten Melchisedekianer (Theodotianer)* (Leipzig 1928); H. Schöne, "Ein Einbruch der antiken Logik in die altchristliche Theologie" in *Pisciculi, Festschrift F. J. Dölger* (Münster 1939), 252–65; V. Macchioro, *L'eresi Noëtiana* (Naples 1921); A. d'Alès, "Le désaccord de la foi populaire et de la théologie savante dans l'église du III^{e} siècle" in *RHE* 19 (1923), 481–506, 20 (1924), 5–37. E. Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity* (New York 1957); R. Williams, *Guide to the Teachings of the Early Church Fathers* (Grand Rapids 1960); H. Hoppenbrouwers, *Recherches sur la terminologie du martyre de Tertullien à Lactance* (Nijmegen 1961); B. Schultze, *Teología latina y teología oriental* (Madrid 1961); J. Daniélou, *Message évangelique et culture hellénistique aux II^{e} et III^{e} siècles* (Tournai 1961); R. Cantalamessa, "Prassea e l'eresia monarchiana" in *SC* 90 (1962), 28–50.

On Zephyrinus: A. von Harnack in *SAB* (1923), 51–7; B. Capelle in *RBén* 38 (1926), 321–30; E. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas* (London 1948); A. d'Alès, *La théologie de s. Hippolyte* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1929); B. Capelle, "Le logos, fils de Dieu, dans la théologie d'Hippolyte" in *RThAM* 9 (1937), 109–24; C. L. Feltoe, *The Letters of Dionys of Alexandria* (Cambridge 1904); K. Müller, "Dionys von Alexandrien im Kampf mit den libyschen Sabellianern" in *ZNW* 24 (1925), 278–85; H. G. Opitz, "Dionys und die Libyer" in *Studies K. Lake* (London 1937), 41–53.

On Paul of Samosata: F. Loofs, *Paul von Samosata* (Leipzig 1924), and cf. A. von Harnack in *SAB* (1924), 130–51; É. Amann in *RevSR* 5 (1925), 328–42; H. de Riedmatten, *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate* (Fribourg 1952), and on this, see H. Scheidweiler in *ZNW* 46 (1955), 116–29; M. Richard, "Malchion et Paul de Samosate. Le témoignage d'Eusèbe de Césarée" in *EThL* 35 (1959), 325–38; J. M. Dalmau, "El 'homousios' y el concilio de Antioquía de 268" in *MCom* 34–35 (1960) 323–40.

22. *Manichaeism*

SOURCES

P. Alfaric, *Les écritures manichéennes*, 2 vols. (Paris 1918–19); A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus*, selected texts (*KlT* 175) (Berlin 1954), VI–IX.

1) Direct Sources
The *Fragments* of Turfân, published by F. W. Müller in *SAB* (1904–5); *AAB* (1904), II, and (1912), V; by A. von Le Coq in *SAB* (1907; *AAB* (1910–11; 1919; 1922); by

W. Bang in *Muséon* 38 (1925), 1–55; by W. Bang and A. von Gabain in *SAB* (1929–30); by F. C. Andreas and W. Henning in *SAB* (1932–34) and *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 10–12 (1942–47–8). The Chinese *Treatise,* edited by E. Chavannes and P. Pelliot in *JA* 1 (1911), 499–617. The Chinese *Hymnarium* of London, edited by E. Waldschmidt and W. Lentz in *SAB* (1933); the Latin *Fragment* of Tebessa, edited by P. Alfaric in *RHLR NS* 6 (1920), 62–98.

The Coptic Texts from Fayyum: *Homilies,* edited by H. Polotzsky (Stuttgart 1934); *Cephalaia* I, edited C. Schmidt (Stuttgart 1940); *A Manichaean Psalm-Book,* part II, C. R. C. Allberry (Stuttgart 1938). A selection of direct sources may be found in A. Adam, *op. cit.* nos. 1–34; there are a few texts also in G. Widengren, *Iranische Geisteswelt* (Baden-Baden 1961).

2) Indirect Sources

Papyrus J. Rylands n. 469 in *BJRL* 3 (1938), 38–46; Alexander Lycop., *Contra Manichaei opiniones,* edited A. Brinkmann (Leipzig 1895); *Acta Archelai,* edited C. H. Beeson (Leipzig 1906); *Serapion of Thmuis, Adversus Manichaeos,* edited R. P. Casey (Cambridge, Mass. 1931); *Titus of Bostra, Contra Manichaeos,* edited P. de Lagarde (Berlin 1895); Epiphanius, *Panarion, Haer.* 66, edited K. Holl (Leipzig 1931); the anti-Manichaean writings of Augustine in *CSEL* 25, edited J. Zycha (Vienna 1891); a selection is given in A. Adam, *op. cit.* nos. 35–64. J. Ries, “La Bible chez Saint Augustin et chez les Manichéens” in *RevÉAug* 7 (1961), 231–43.

Literature

Survey of researches: H. S. Nyberg in *ZNW* 34 (1935), 70–91, and J. Ries in *EThL* 33 (1957), 453–82, 35 (1959), 362–409. General studies: H. J. Polotzsky in *Pauly–Wissowa* Suppl. VI (1935), 240–71; G. von Selle, “Der Manichaeismus” in *Festschrift H. Kraus* (Kitzingen 1953), 422–35; C. Colpe in *RGG,* 3rd ed. IV, 714–22. H.-C. Puech, *Le Manichéisme. Son fondateur, sa doctrine* (Paris 1949); H.-C. Puech, “Die Religion des Mani” in *König H,* II (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1961), 499–563; G. Widengren, *Mani und der Manichäismus* (Stuttgart 1961); F. C. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees* (Cambridge 1925); H. H. Schaeder, “Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems” in *Vorträge Bibliothek Warburg* 4 (Leipzig 1927), 65–157; H.-C. Puech, “Der Begriff der Erlösung im Manichäismus” in *Eranos* 5 (1937), 183–286; T. Säve-Söderbergh, *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book* (Uppsala 1949).

Spread and Influence of Manichaeism: E. de Stoop, *Essai sur la diffusion du manichéisme dans l’Empire romain* (Ghent 1909); É. Chavannes–P. Pelliot in *JA* 2 (1913), 99–199, 261–394 (for China); W. Henning in *ZDMG* 90 (1936), 1–18; H. H. Schaeder, “Manichäismus und spätantike Religion” in *Zeitschrift MkRel* 50 (1935), 65–85; H. H. Schaeder, “Der Manichäismus und sein Weg nach Osten” in *Festschrift F. Gogarten* (Giessen 1948), 236–54; W. H. C. Frend, “The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa” in *JEH* 4 (1953), 13–26. Stephen Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge 1936); D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge 1948).

Manichaeism and Christianity: H. Leclercq, “Manichéisme” in *DACL* X, 1395–400; G. Bardy in *DThC* IX, 1841–95; E. Waldschmidt–W. Lentz, “Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus” in *AAB* (1926), 4; G. Messina, “La dottrina manichea e le origini del cristianesimo” in *Biblica* 10 (1929), 313–31; F. J. Dölger, “Konstantin der Große und der Manichäismus; Sonne und Christus im Manichäismus” in *AuC* II (1930), 301–14; E. Rose, *Christologie des Manichäismus* (diss. Marburg 1942); A. Böhlig, *Die Bibel bei*

den Manichäern (diss. Marburg 1947); G. Messina, *Cristianesimo, Buddhismo, Manicheismo nell'Asia antica* (Rome 1947); O. Stegmüller, "Das manichäische Fundamentum in einem Sakramentar der frühen Karolingerzeit" in *ZKTh* 74 (1952), 450–63; A. Adam, "Das Fortwirken des Manichäismus bei Augustin" in *ZKG* 69 (1958), 1–25; A. Böhlig, "Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus" in *BullSocArchéolcopte* 15 (1960), 41–61.

23. *Further Development of the Liturgy*

SOURCES

C. del Grande, *Liturgiae preces hymni christianorum e papyris collecti* (Naples 1934); J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* in *FlorPatr* 7 (1935); A. Adam, "Zur Geschichte der orientalischen Taufe und Messe im 2. und 4. Jahrhundert" in *KlT* 5 (3rd ed. 1960); Tertullian, *De baptismo*, edited J. W. P. Borleffs in *SCpr* 4 (1948); edited R. F. Refoulé in *SourcesChr* 35 (1952); Hippolytus, *Traditio apostolica*, edited G. Dix (London 1937); edited B. Botte in *SourcesChr* 11 (1946); *Didascalia*, edited F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, I (Paderborn 1905), 1–384 (Latin translation); edited H. Achelis – J. Fleming in *TU* 25, 2 (Leipzig 1904, German translation). Asterius Sophistes, *Commentarii in psalmos*, edited M. Richard in *Symbolae Osloenses* Suppl. 16 (Oslo 1956). H. Follieri, *Initia Hymnorum Ecclesiae Graecae* (Vatican City 1960); P. Radó, *Enchiridion Liturgicum*, 2 vols. (Barcelona 1961).

LITERATURE

L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship. Its Origin and Evolution* (London, 5th ed. 1949); A. Baumstark, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie* (Freiburg i. Br. 1923); F. L. Dölger, *Sol salutis* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1925); J. H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy* (Cambridge, 2nd ed.); H. Schmidt, *Introductio in Liturgiam Occidentalem* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959); T. Klauser, *Abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (Bonn 1949); A. Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy* (Westminster 1958); B. Steuart, *The Development of Christian Worship* (London 1953); A. A. King, *The Liturgy of the Roman Church* (London 1957); idem, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees* (London 1957); J. A. Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great* (Notre Dame 1957); E. Werner, *The Sacred Bridge* (New York 1959); A. Quacquarelli, *Retorica e liturgia antenicena* (Rome 1960); B. Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (Cleveland – New York 1961); E. Dekkers, *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis der liturgie* (Brussels – Amsterdam 1947); J.-M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte* (Rome 1959); W. Nagel, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes* (Berlin 1962); A. G. Martimort (ed.), *L'église en prières: Introduction à la liturgie* (Paris 1961).

EASTER AND THE DISPUTE ABOUT THE DATE OF EASTER: H. Kellner, *Heortologie* (Freiburg i. Br., 3rd ed. 1911); F. Cabrol, "Fêtes" in *DACL* V, 1403–14; A. Hollard, *Les origines des fêtes chrétiennes* (Paris 1936); A. A. McArthur, *The Evolution of the Christian Year* (London 1953); H. Leclercq, "Pâques" in *DACL* XIII, 1521–74; J. Jeremias, Πάσχα in *ThW* V, 895–903; O. Casel, "Art und Sinn der ältesten christlichen Osterfeier" in *JLW* 14 (1938), 1–78; J. Daniélou, "Le symbolisme du jour de Pâques" in *Dieu Vivant* 18 (1951), 45–56; H. Vorgrimler, "War die altchristliche Osternacht eine ununterbrochene Feier?" in *ZKTh* 74 (1952), 464–72; C. Mohrmann, "Pascha, passio, transitus" in *ELit* 66 (1952), 37–52, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (Rome 1958), 205–22; A. W. Watts, *Easter, its Story and Meaning* (London 1959); C. Marcora, *La vigilia nella liturgia (sec. I–VI)* (Milan 1954); A. Baumstark–O. Heiming, *Nocturna laus, Typen frühchristlicher Vigilfeier* (Münster 1957); P. Jounel, "La nuit pascale. Le dimanche et le temps de Pâques: La tradition de l'église" in *MD* 67 (1961), 123–44, 163–82; B. Lohse, *Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner* (Gütersloh 1953) (pages 143–8 for the older literature on the subject); B. Botte, "La question pascale" in *MD* 41 (1955), 84–95; M. Shepherd, *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* (Richmond 1960); M. Richard, "La question pascale au II^e siècle" in *OrSyr* 6 (1961), 179–212; P. Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens au II^e et III^e siècles* (Paris 1961), 65–89; C. Mohrmann, "Le conflit pascal au II^e siècle" in *VigChr* 16 (1962), 154–71; W. Cadman, "The Christian Pascha and the Day of the Crucifixion" in *TU* 80 (1962), 8–16; B. J. Van der Veken in *SE* 14 (1963), 5–33.

Catechumenate and Baptism: P. de Puniet, "Catéchuménat" in *DACL* II, 2579–90; F. J. Dölger, "Tertullian und die Bluttaufe" in *AuC* II (1930), 117–41; H. Rahner, "Pompa diaboli" in *ZKTh* 55 (1931), 239–73; B. Capelle, "L'introduction du catéchuménat à Rome" in *RThAM* 5 (1933), 129–54; G. Bardy, "L'enseignement religieux aux premiers siècles in *RAP* 66 (1938), 641–55; 67 (1938), 5–18; E. Dick, "Das Pateninstitut im altchristlichen Katechumenat" in *ZKTh* 63 (1939), 1–49; B. Welte, *Die postbaptismale Salbung* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939); O. Cullmann, *Le baptême des enfants* (Neuchâtel 1949); G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine on Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (London 1951); J. Lupi, "Catechetical Instruction in the First Two Centuries" in *Melita Theologica* 9 (1956), 61–71; R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "On the Baptismal Rite according to St Hippolytus" in *Studia Patristica* II (Berlin 1957), 93–105; J. Fisher, "The Consecration of Water in the Early Rite of Baptism" in *TU* 64 (1957), 41–46; A. Stenzel, *Die Taufe, eine genetische Erklärung der Taufliturgie* (Innsbruck 1958); J. Jeremias, *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* (London 1960); T. Torrance, "The Origins of Baptism" in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 11 (1958), 158–71; W. A. Be Vier, "Water Baptism in the Ancient Church" in *Bibliotheca sacra* 116 (1959), 136–44, 230–40; J. A. Jungmann, "Aufbauelemente im römischen Taufritus" in *LJ* 9 (1959), 1–15; E. Stommel, "Christliche Taufriten und antike Taufsitten" in *JAC* 2 (1959), 5–14; K. Kirsten, *Die Taufabsage* (Berlin 1960); A. Aland, *Die Säuglingstaufe im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche* (Munich 1961); T. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology* (Nijmegen 1962); G. Kretschmer, "Baptismal Liturgy in Egypt" in *JLH* 8 (1963), 1–54.

The Baptismal Creed: Texts, *Denzinger* 1–14; *KlT* 17–18 (2nd ed. 1931). Studies: F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbolum*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1894–1900, reprinted Darmstadt 1961); B. Dörholt, *Das Taufsymbol in der alten Kirche* (Paderborn 1898); J. Brinktrine in *ThQ* 102 (1921), 156–90; J. Lebreton in *RSR* 20 (1930), 97–124; F. J. Dölger in *AuC* IV (1933), 138–46; F. Badcock, *The History of the Creeds* (London 1938); O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (London 1949); J. H. Crehan, *Early Christian Baptism and the Creed* (London 1950); E. Lichtenstein in *ZKG* 63 (1950), 1–74; B. Botte, *Mélanges J. de Ghellinck*, I (Brussels–Paris 1951), 181–200; T. Camelot in *Lumière et Vie*, I (1952), 61–80.

Eucharist: G. Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Bußsakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten* (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1910); T. Schermann, *Ägyptische Abendmahlsliturgien* (Paderborn 1912); J. A. Jungmann, *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet* (Münster 1925); P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie* (Paris, 7th ed. 1930); G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London 1954); H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1955); J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter*, I (Freiburg i. Br. 1955); J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 2 vols. (New York 1951–5); W. Dürig, *Pietas liturgica* (Regensburg 1958); L. C. Mohlberg, "Carmen Christo quasi deo" (on

Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 10, 96) in *RivAC* 14 (1937), 93–123; A. W. Ziegler, "Das Brot von unsern Feldern, ein Beitrag zur Eucharistielehre des Irenäus" in *Festschrift zum Eucharistischen Kongreß* (Munich 1960), 21–43.

On Hippolytus' liturgy: R. H. Connolly in *JThS* 39 (1938), 350–69; H. Engberding in *MiscMohlberg*, I (1948), 47–71; E. Dekkers, "L'église ancienne a-t-elle connu la Messe du soir?" in *MiscMohlberg*, I (1948), 231–57. R. Hanson, "The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist" in *VigChr* 15 (1961), 173–6; G. Dollar, "The Lord's Supper in the Second Century" in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 117 (1960), 249–57; A. Adam in *TLZ* 88 (1963), 9–20.

Discipline of the Secret: E. Vacandard in *DHGE* III, 1497–513; O. Perler in *RAC* I, 667–79 (with very full bibliography); H. Clasen, *Die Arkandisziplin in der alten Kirche* (diss. Heidelberg 1956); A. Stenzel, *Die Taufe, eine genetische Erklärung der Taufliturgie* (Innsbruck 1958), 147–53.

The Beginnings of Christian Art: In addition to the works listed above, page 454, see: W. Neuss, *Die Kunst der alten Christen* (Augsburg 1926); D. T. Rice, *The Beginnings of Christian Art* (London 1957); E. Syndikus, *Die frühchristliche Kunst* (Aschaffenburg 1960); F. van der Meer, *Early Christian Art* (London 1961); J. Daniélou, *Primitive Christian Symbols* (Baltimore 1964).
J.-R. Laurin, "Le lieu du culte chrétien d'après les documents littéraires primitifs" in *Studi sulla chiesa antica* (Rome 1954), 39–57; C. Hopkins–P. V. C. Baur, *Christian Church at Dura-Europos* (New Haven 1934); O. Eissfeldt, "Dura-Europos" in *RAC* IV, 362–70; E. Kirschbaum, *The Roman Catacombs and their Martyrs* (Milwaukee 1957); J. Kollwitz, *Das Christusbild des 3. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1953); W. Schöne–J. Kollwitz–H. von Campenhausen, *Das Gottesbild im Abendland* (Berlin 1957); T. Kemp, *Christus der Hirt* (Rome 1943); A. M. Schneider, "Die ältesten Denkmäler der römischen Kirche" in *Festschrift der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Göttingen*, II (Göttingen 1951), 166–98. On the historical origins of ancient Christian art see T. Klauser, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der altchristlichen Kunst" in *JbAC* I (1958), 20–51; 2 (1959), 115–45; 3 (1960), 112–33; 4 (1961), 128–45; 5 (1962), 113–24; P. Thoby, *Histoire du Crucifix, des origines au concile de Trente* (Nantes 1959); A. von Gerkan in *Mullus, Festschrift T. Klauser* (Münster 1964), 144–9 (Dura-Europos).

24. *Spiritual Life and Morality in the Communities of the Third Century*

SOURCES

F. Cabrol–H. Leclercq, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, vol. 1b (Paris 1913); M.-J. Rouët de Journel, *Enchiridion asceticum* (Freiburg i. Br., 5th ed. 1958); H. Koch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Askese und des Mönchtums* (Tübingen 1933).
Translations: F. Cabrol, *Le livre de la prière antique* (Paris, 5th ed. 1913); G. Bardy, *La vie spirituelle d'après les pères des trois premiers siècles* (Paris 1935); L. A. Winterswyl, *Gebete der Urkirche* (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1952); A. Hamman, *Early Christian Prayers* (Chicago 1961); idem, *Le pater expliqué par les pères* (Paris 1952); idem, *Prières eucharistiques des premiers siècles* (Paris 1957); idem, *Le baptême d'après les pères de l'église* (Paris 1962).

LITERATURE

F. Martinez, *L'ascétisme chrétien pendant les trois premiers siècles* (Paris 1913); H. Strathmann, *Geschichte der frühchristlichen Askese,* I (Leipzig 1914); E. Buonaiuti, *Le origini dell'ascetismo cristiano* (Pincrolo 1928); M. Viller–K. Rahner, *Askese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939); P. Pourrat, *Christian Spirituality* (Westminster 1955); F. Cayré, *Spirituels et mystiques des premiers temps* (Paris 1956); L. Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (New York 1963); W. Völker, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes* (Tübingen 1931); J. Stelzenberger, *Die Beziehungen der frühchristlichen Sittenlehre zur Ethik der Stoa* (Munich 1933); J. Klein, *Tertullians christliches Bewußtsein und sittliche Forderungen* (Bonn 1941); F. Bertrand, *Mystique de Jésus chez Origène* (Paris 1951); W. Völker, *Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus* (Berlin 1952).

BAPTISMAL SPIRITUALITY: H. Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen 1908). A. von Harnack, *Die Terminologie der Wiedergeburt* (Leipzig 1920) (*TU* 42, 2); H. Rahner, "Taufe und geistliches Leben bei Origenes" in *ZAM* 7 (1932), 205–23; P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale de l'ancienne église* (Uppsala 1942); J. Daniélou, "Le symbolisme des rites baptismaux" in *Dieu vivant* 1 (1945), 17–43; W. M. Bedard, *The Symbolism of the Baptismal Font in Early Christian Thought* (Washington 1951); G. H. W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers* (London 1951); T. Camelot, *Spiritualité du baptême* (Paris 1960); T. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology* (Nijmegen 1962).

DEVOTION TO MARTYRDOM: H. Delehaye, "Martyr et confesseur" in *AnBoll* 39 (1921), 20–49; H. Delehaye, *Sanctus* (Brussels 1927); O. Michel, *Prophet und Martyrer* (Gütersloh 1932); H. von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche* (Göttingen, 2nd ed. 1964); E. Peterson, *Zeuge der Wahrheit* (Leipzig 1937); E. Günter, Μάρτυς (Gütersloh 1941); M. Lods, *Confesseurs et martyrs, successeurs des prophètes dans l'église des trois premiers siècles* (Neuchâtel 1958); R. Krautheimer, "Mensa-Coemeterium-Martyrium" in *Cahiers Archéologiques* 11 (1960), 93–119; N. Brox, *Zeuge und Martyrer, Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie* (Munich 1961); H. A. M. Hoppenbrouwers, *Recherches sur la terminologie du martyre de Tertullien à Lactance* (Nijmegen 1962); M. Pellegrino in *RevSR* 35 (1961), 151–75.

ASCETISM: H. Strathmann–P. Keseling, "Askese" II in *RAC* I, 758–95; M. Viller–M. Olphe-Galliard, "Ascèse, Ascétisme" in *DSAM* I, 960–77; H. Leclercq, "Cénobitisme" in *DACL* II, 3058–90; H. Chadwick "Enkrateia" in *RAC* V, 343–65; E. Peterson, "Einige Beobachtungen zu den Anfängen der christlichen Askese" in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959), 209–22; P. de Labriolle, "Le 'mariage spirituel' dans l'antiquité chrétienne" in *RH* 137 (1921), 204–25; J. Schmid, "Brautschaft, heilige" in *RAC* II, 546–64; H. Koch, *Virgines Christi* (Leipzig 1907) (*TU* 31–2); K. Müller, *Die Forderung der Ehelosigkeit in der alten Kirche* (Tübingen 1927); M. R. Nugent, *Portrait of the Consecrated Woman in Greek Christian Literature of the First Four Centuries* (Washington 1941); T. Camelot, *Virgines Christi* (Paris 1944); F. de B. Vizmanos, *Las vírgenas cristianas en la Iglesia primitiva* (Madrid 1949); K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (Tübingen 1937); F. Quatember, *Die christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens von Alexandrien nach seinem Pädagogus* (Vienna 1946). A. Voöbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* (Louvain 1960).

PRAYER: E. von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit* (Leipzig 1901) (328–53, texts of prayers); O. Dibelius, *Das Vaterunser, Umrisse zu einer Geschichte des Gebetes in der alten und mittleren Kirche* (Giessen 1903); G. Walther, *Untersuchungen zur*

Geschichte der griechischen Vaterunser-Exegese (Leipzig 1914) (*TU* 40, 3); F. Heiler, *Das Gebet* (Munich, 5th ed. 1923); F. L. Dölger, *Sol salutis, Gebet und Gesang im christlichen Altertum* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1925); J. A. Jungmann, *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1962); F. Cabrol, *The Prayer of the Early Christians* (London 1930); T. Ohm, *Die Gebetsgebärden der Völker und das Christentum* (Leyden 1948); B. Fischer, *Die Psalmenfrömmigkeit der Märtyrerkirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1949); K. Baus, "Das Gebet der Märtyrer" in *TThZ* 62 (1953), 19–32; L. Vischer, "Das Gebet der alten Kirche" in *EvTh* 17 (1957), 531–46; A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim* (Bonn 1957); E. Peterson, "Das Kreuz und das Gebet nach Osten" in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959), 15–35; A. Hamman, *Early Christian Prayers* (Chicago 1961); J. P. T. Deroy, *Bernardus en Origenes* (Haarlem 1963).

Fasting: F. Cabrol, "Jeûnes" in *DACL* VII, 2481–501; J. Svennung, "Statio-Fasten" in *ZNW* 32 (1933), 294–308; J. Schümmer, *Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis* (Münster 1933); R. Arbesmann, "Fasting and Prophecy in Pagan and Christian Antiquity" in *Tr* 7 (1949–51), 1–71; A. Guillaume, *Jeûne et charité dans l'église latine des origines au XII^e siècle, en particulier chez Léon le Grand* (Paris 1954); P. Gerlitz, *Das Fasten im religionsgeschichtlichen Vergleich* (diss. Erlangen 1954); article by the same author under the same title in *ZRGG* 7 (1955), 116–26; H. Musurillo, "The Problem of Ascetical Fasting in the Greek Patristic Writers" in *Tr* 12 (1956), 1–64.

Works of Charity: H. Leclercq, "Charité" in *DACL* III, 598–653; G. Marsot, "Bienfaisance" in *Dict. de Sociol.* III, 864–83; G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit*, I (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1895, reprinted Darmstadt 1959); W. Liese, *Geschichte der Caritas* (Freiburg i. Br. 1922); G. Meffert, *Caritas und Krankenwesen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Freiburg i. Br. 1927); H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* (Utrecht 1939); F. Lovsky, *L'église et les malades depuis le II^e siècle jusqu'au début du XX^e siècle* (Thonon Les Bains 1958); J. von dem Driesch, *Geschichte der Wohltätigkeit*, volume I: *Die Wohltätigkeit im Altertum* (Paderborn 1959).

Agape: "Agape" in *DACL* I, 775–848; P. Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive* (Paris, 7th ed. 1926); K. Völker, *Mysterium und Agape* (Gotha 1927); Bo Reicke, *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier* (Uppsala 1951); C. Donahue, "The ἀγάπη of the Eremites of Scete" in *Studia Monastica* 1 (1959), 97–120; A. Armstrong, "Platonic *eros* and Christian *agape*" in *Downside Review* 79 (1960–1), 105–2; J. Colson, *Agapè chez S. Ignace d'Antioche* (Paris 1961); C. Spicq, *Agape in the New Testament* (St Louis 1963).

Early Christian Moral Life: A. Baudrillart, *Moeurs païennes, moeurs chrétiennes*, 2 vols. (Paris, 2nd ed. 1936); J. Leipoldt, *Der soziale Gedanke in der altchristlichen Kirche* (Leipzig 1952); W. Schwer, "Almosen" in *RAC* I, 302–7; A. Kalsbach, "Armut I" in *RAC* I, 702–5; A. Bigelmair, "Armut II", ibid. 705–9; H. Greeven, *Das Hauptproblem der Sozialethik in der neueren Stoa und im Urchristentum* (Gütersloh 1935); H. Larmann, *Christliche Wirtschaftsethik in der spätrömischen Antike* (Berlin 1935); H. Holzapfel, *Die sittliche Wertung der körperlichen Arbeit im christlichen Altertum* (Würzburg 1941); A. T. Geoghegan, *The Attitude towards Labour in Early Christianity and Ancient Culture* (Washington 1945); J.-P. Brisson, "Les origines du danger social dans l'Afrique chrétienne du III^e siècle" in *RSR* 33 (1946), 280–316; M. Maeder, *La liberté et l'esclavage dans l'église primitive* (1951); G. Kehnscherper, *Die Stellung der Bibel und der alten Kirche zur Sklaverei* (Halle 1957), and on this see *ZKG* 69 (1958), 328 ff.; E. K. Jonkers, "Das Verhalten der alten Kirche hinsichtlich der Ernennung zum Priester" in *Mnemosyne* 10 (1942), 286–302; N. H. Baynes, "Idolatry in the Early

Church" in *Byzantine Studies* (London 1955); J. Alameda, *Como era la vida de los primeros cristianos* (Bilbao 1957).

Marriage and Family: H. Preisker, *Christentum und Ehe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Berlin 1928); J. Köhne, *Die Ehen zwischen Christen und Heiden in den ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Paderborn 1931); F. Blanke-F. J. Leenhard, *Die Stellung der Frau im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche* (Zürich 1949); J. Leipoldt, *Die Frau in der Antike und im Urchristentum* (Gütersloh 1962); J. Mayer, *Monumenta de viduis diaconissis virginibusque tractantia* (Bonn 1938) (*FlorPatr* 42); A. Kalsbach, *Die altkirchliche Einrichtung der Diakonissen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1926); A. Kalsbach, "Diakonisse" in *RAC* III, 917–28; C. C. Ryrie, *The Place of Women in the Church* (New York 1958); J. Daniélou, "Le ministère des femmes dans l'église ancienne" in *MD* 61 (1960), 70–96.

Church and Civilization and Culture; Church and State: J. H. Waszink, *Het oudste Christendom en de antieke Cultuur,* 2 vols. (Haarlem 1951); C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World* (Edinburgh, 2nd ed. 1955); O. Cullmann, "Early Christianity and Civilization" in *The Early Church* (London 1956), 195–209; C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (New York, 3rd 1957); W. Krause, *Die Stellung der frühchristlichen Autoren zur heidnischen Literatur* (Vienna 1958); W. Durant, *Caesar and Christ* (New York 1944). A. Decker, *Kenntnis und Pflege des Körpers bei Klemens von Alexandrien* (Innsbruck 1936); K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum, eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Tertullians* (Bonn 1940); C. Andresen, "Altchristliche Kritik am Tanz, ein Ausschnitt aus dem Kampf der alten Kirche gegen heidnische Sitte" in *ZKG* 72 (1961), 217–62; W. Bieder, *Ekklesia und Polis im Neuen Testament und in der alten Kirche* (diss. Basle) (Zürich 1941); R. Petry, *Christian Eschatology and Social Thought* (Nashville 1956); F. Stratmann, *Die Heiligen und der Staat,* II (Frankfurt a. M. 1949); J. Ferguson, "The Nature of Early Christian Pacifism" in *The Hibbert Journal* 55 (1956–7), 340–9; E. Peterson, "Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem" in *Theologische Traktate* (Munich 1961), 45–147. A. von Harnack, *Militia Christi* (Tübingen 1905, reprinted Darmstadt 1963); R. H. Bainton, "The Early Church and War" in *HThR* 39 (1946), 189–212; E. A. Ryan, "The Rejection of Military Service by the Early Christians" in *ThSt* 13 (1952), 1–32; H. Karpp, "Die Stellung der alten Kirche zu Krieg und Kriegsdienst" in *EvTh* 17 (1957), 496–515; H. von Campenhausen, "Der Kriegsdienst der Christen in der Kirche des Altertums" in *Tradition und Leben* (Tübingen 1960), 203–15; J. Leipoldt, *Griechische Philosophie und frühchristliche Aszese* (Berlin 1961); W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, Mass. 1961); A. Wifstrand, *L'église ancienne et la culture grecque* (Paris 1942); S. Perowne, *Caesars and Saints. The Evolution of the Christian State* A.D. *180–313* (London 1962); J.-M. Hornus, *Politische Entscheidung in der alten Kirche* (Munich 1963).

25. *The Holiness of the Christian and his Church*

General Surveys: É. Amann, "Pénitence" in *DThC* XII, 748–845; B. Poschmann, "Buße, Bußkleid, Bußstufen" in *RAC* II, 805–12, 813–16; K. Rahner, "Bußdisziplin" in *LThK* II, 805–9; W. Teller, *The Forgiveness of Sins* (Philadelphia 1960); P. Palmer, *Sacraments and Forgiveness* (London 1960); B. Poschmann, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick* (Freiburg-London-New York-Montreal 1963).

Special Studies of Penitential Discipline: H. Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes* (Tübingen 1908); P. Batiffol, "Les origines de la pénitence" in *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive* (Paris 1902), 45–302; G. Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Bußsakrament* (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1910); K. Adam, *Das sogenannte Bußedikt des Kallistus* (Munich 1917); J. Hoh, *Die kirchliche Buße im 2. Jahrhundert* (Breslau 1932); P. Galtier, *L'église et la remission des péchés aux premiers siècles* (Paris 1932); B. Poschmann, *Poenitentia secunda* (Bonn 1940); B. Poschmann, "Die altchristliche Buße" in *HDG* IV/3 (Freiburg i. Br. 1951), 18–41; P. Galtier, *Aux origines du sacrement de la pénitence* (Rome 1951) (*AnGr* 54); H. von Campenhausen, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen 1953); J. Grotz, *Die Entwicklung des Bußstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1955).

Other Special Studies: P. Galtier, "A propos de la pénitence primitive. Méthodes et conclusions" in *RHE* 30 (1934), 517–57, 797–846; H. von Campenhausen, "Die Schlüsselgewalt der Kirche" in *EvTh* 4 (1937), 143–69; R. Joly, "La doctrine pénitentielle du Pasteur d'Hermas et l'exégèse récente" in *RHR* 147 (1955), 32–49; K. Rahner, "Die Bußlehre im Hirten des Hermas" in *ZKTh* 77 (1955), 385–431; K. Rahner, "Die Sündenvergebung nach der Taufe in der Regula fidei des Irenaeus" in *ZKTh* 70 (1948), 450–5; K. Rahner, "Zur Theologie der Buße bei Tertullian" in *Festschrift K. Adam* (Düsseldorf 1952), 139–67; H. Koch, "Die Bußfrage bei Cyprian" in *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (Bonn 1926), 211–85; P. Chartier, "La discipline pénitentielle d'après les écrits de s. Cyprien" in *Antonianum* 6 (1939), 17–42, 135–56; K. Rahner, "Die Bußlehre des heiligen Cyprian" in *ZKTh* 74 (1952), 257–76, 381–438; M. Bévenot, "The Sacrament of Penance and St Cyprian's De lapsis" in *ThSt* 16 (1955), 175–213; S. Hübner, "Kirchenbuße und Exkommunikation bei Cyprian" in *ZKTh* 84 (1962), 49–84, 171–215; A. Méhat, "'Pénitence seconde' et péché involontaire chez Clément d'Alexandrie" in *VigChr* 8 (1954), 225–33; H. Karpp, "Die Bußlehre des Klemens von Alexandrien" in *ZNW* 43 (1950–1), 224–42; K. Rahner, "La doctrine d'Origène sur la pénitence" in *RSR* 37 (1950), 47–97, 252–86, 422–56; K. Rahner, "Bußlehre und Bußpraxis der Didascalia apostolorum" in *ZKTh* 72 (1950), 257–81. A. d'Alès, *Novatien* (Paris 1924); C. B. Daly, "Novatian and Tertullian. A Chapter in the History of Puritanism" in *IThQ* 19 (1952), 33–43. E. H. Röttgers, "Marcellinus–Marcellus. Zur Papstgeschichte der diokletianischen Verfolgungszeit" in *ZKTh* 78 (1956), 385–420; A. Amore, "È esistito Papa Marcello?" in *Antonianum* 33 (1958), 57–75.

26. *The Development of the Church's Constitution in the Third Century*

General Treatment

See the bibliography to Chapter 10 above, as well as: K. Müller, "Die Kirchenverfassung im christlichen Altertum" in *RGG* 2nd ed. III, 986–88; K. Müller, *Aus der akademischen Arbeit* (Tübingen 1930), 101–34; A. Adam, "Kirchenverfassung II" in *RGG* 3rd ed. III, 1533–945; H. Lietzmann, "Zur altchristlichen Verfassungsgeschichte" in *Kleine Schriften,* I (Berlin 1958), 141–85; E. Rösser, *Göttliches und menschliches, unveränderliches und veränderliches Kirchenrecht von der Entstehung der Kirche bis zur Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn 1934); G. Krüger, *Die Rechtsstellung der vorkonstantinischen Kirchen* (Stuttgart 1935, reprinted Amsterdam 1961); G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'Église de s. Irénée au concile de Nicée* (Paris 1947); E. Kohlmeyer, "Charisma oder Recht? Vom Wesen des ältesten Kirchenrechts" in *ZSavRGkan* 38 (1952), 1–36; H. Chadwick, *The Circle and the Ellipse. Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church* (Oxford 1959).

The Clergy

M. Andrieu, *Les ordres mineurs* (Paris 1925); H. Leclercq, "Célibat" in *DACL* II, 2802–32; G. Dix, "The Ministry of the Early Church" in K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry* (London, 2nd ed. 1947), 183–303; E. Lanne, "Le ministère apostolique dans l'œuvre de s. Irénée" in *Irénikon* 25 (1952), 113–41; J. Lecuyer, "Épiscopat et presbytérat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte de Rome" in *RSR* 41 (1953), 30–50; A. Adam, "Die Entstehung des Bischofsamtes" in *Wort und Dienst* (Bethel) 5 (1957), 1–16; J. Colson, *La fonction diaconale aux origines de l'Église* (Bruges–Paris 1960); H. von Campenhausen, "Die Anfänge des Priesterbegriffes in der alten Kirche" in *Tradition und Leben* (Tübingen 1960), 272–89; L. Ryan, "Patristic Teaching on the Priesthood of the Faithful" in *IThQ* 29 (1962), 25–51; J. G. Davies, "Deacons, Deaconesses, and Minor Orders in the Patristic Period" in *JEH* 14 (1963), 1–15; O. Perler, "L'évêque, représentant du Christ" in *L'épiscopat et l'Église universelle* (Paris 1962), 31–66; J. Colson, *L'épiscopat catholique. Collegialité et primauté dans les trois premiers siècles* (Paris 1963).

Local Churches and Synods

P. de Labriolle, "Paroecia" in *RSR* 18 (1928), 60–72; K. Müller, "Rom, Arelate und spanische Kirchen um 250" in *ZNW* 28 (1929), 296–305; J. P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum* (Paderborn 1918); F. Lanzoni, "I titoli presbiterali di Roma antica" in *RivAC* 2 (1925), 195–257; E. Kirsten, "Chorbischof" in *RAC* II, 1105–14; P. Batiffol, "Le règlement des premiers conciles africains et le règlement du sénat romain" in *Bulletin d'ancienne lit. et archéol. chrétiennes* 3 (Paris 1913), 3–19; G. Roethe, *Zur Geschichte der römischen Synoden im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1937); W. de Vries, "Der Episkopat auf den Synoden von Nicäa" in *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* (1963), 263–77.

The Roman Primacy

H. J. Vogels, *Textus antenicaeni ad primatum Romanum spectantes* (Bonn 1937) (*FlorPatr* 9); K. Adam, "Neue Untersuchungen über die Ursprünge der kirchlichen Primatslehre" in *ThQ* 109 (1928), 161–256, and *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Dogmengeschichte* (Augsburg 1936), 123–85; K. J. Kidd, *The Roman Primacy to* A.D. *461* (London 1936); P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (Paris 1938); E. Stauffer, "Zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte des Primats" in *ZKG* 61 (1943–44), 3–34; L. Hertling, "Communio und Primat" in *Misc. hist. pontif.* 7 (1943), 1–48, and also *Una Sancta* 17 (1962), 91–125; A. Rimoldi, *L'apostolo San Pietro fondamento della Chiesa ... dalle origini al Concilio di Calcedonia* (Rome 1958).

Hegesippus: T. Klauser, "Die Anfänge der römischen Bischofsliste" in *BZThS* 8 (1931), 193–213; H. von Campenhausen, "Lehrerreihen und Bischofsreihen im 2. Jh." in *Festschrift E. Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart 1951); N. Hydahl, "Hegesipps Hypomnemata" in *StTh* 14 (1960), 70–113.

Irenaeus: L. Spikowski, *La doctrine de l'église dans s. Irénée* (Strasbourg 1926) (lists older literature on the subject); H. Holstein, "Propter potentiorem principalitatem" in *RSR* 36 (1949), 122–35; R. Jacquin, "Ab his qui sunt undique dans s. Irénée" in *RevSR* 24 (1950), 72–87; D. J. Unger, "St Irenaeus and the Roman Primacy" in *ThSt* 13 (1952), 359–418; P. Nautin, "Irénée, Adv. Haer. III 3, 2. Église de Rome ou Église universelle?" in *RHR* 151 (1957), 37–78, and on this B. Botte in *Irénikon* 30 (1957), 156–63.

Cyprian and the Controversy on Heretical Baptism: G. Bardy, "Cyprien" in *DHGE* XIII, 1152–54, 1158–60; A. d'Alès, *La théologie de s. Cyprien* (Paris 1922), 380–8; H. Koch, *Cathedra Petri, Neue Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Primatslehre* (Giessen 1930), and on this K. Adam, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Dogmengeschichte* (Augsburg 1936), 186 95); B. Poschmann, *Ecclesia principalis* (Breslau 1933); T. Zapelena, "Petrus origo unitatis apud s. Cyprianum" in *Gr* 15 (1934), 500–23; F. de St Palais d'Aussac, *La réconciliation des hérétiques dans l'église latine* (Paris 1943); B. Neunheuser in *HDG* IV/2 (Freiburg i. Br. 1956), 44–47; G. Klein, "Die hermeneutische Struktur des Kirchengedankens bei Cyprian" in *ZKG* 68 (1957), 48–68; P. Camelot, "Saint Cyprien et la Primauté" in *Istina* 4 (1947) 421–34; G. Mongelli, "La chiesa di Cartagine contro Roma durante l'episcopato di s. Cipriano (249–258)" in *MF* 59 (1959), 104–201.

Devotion to the Church in the Third Century: J. C. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity* (Washington 1943); H. Rahner, *Mater Ecclesia. Lobpreis der Kirche aus dem 1. Jahrtausend* (Einsiedeln 1944); J. Daniélou, "Die Kirche, Pflanzung des Vaters. Zur Kirchenfrömmigkeit der frühen Christenheit" in *Sentire ecclesiam, Festschrift H. Rahner* (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 92–103; L. Bouyer, "Zur Kirchenfrömmigkeit der griechischen Väter", ibid. 104–12; H. Rahner, "Navicula Petri" in *ZKTh* 69 (1947), 1–35.

27. *The Extent of Christianity prior to the Diocletian Persecution*

General Treatment: In addition to the works given in the bibliography to Chapter 17 above, the following may be consulted: A. Bigelmair, "Der Missionsgedanke bei den vorkonstantinischen Vätern" in *ZMR* 4 (1914), 264—77; L. Hertling, "Die Zahl der Christen zu Beginn des 4. Jahrhunderts" in *ZKTh* 62 (1934), 243–53; K. Prümm, *Christentum als Neuheitserlebnis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939); J. Zeiller, "Observations sur la diffusion du christianisme en Occident" in *ATh* 5 (1944), 193–208; F. Altheim, *Die Krise der alten Welt,* III: *Götter und Kaiser* (Berlin 1943); *Niedergang der alten Welt,* II (Frankfurt a. M. 1952), 198–383; A. Ehrhardt, "The Adoption of Christianity in the Roman Empire" in *BJRL* 45 (1962–3), 97–114.

Egypt: J. Faivre, "Alexandrie" in *DHGE* II, 289–369; H. Leclercq, "Égypte" in *DACL* IV, 2457–571; A. Heckel, *Die Kirche von Ägypten bis zur Zeit des Nicänums* (diss. Strasbourg 1918); H. Delehaye, *Les martyrs d'Égypte* (Brussels 1923); G. Bardy, "Les premiers temps du christianisme de langue copte en Égypte" in *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris 1940), 203–16; J. M. Creed-De Lacy O'Leary, *The Legacy of Egypt* (London 1942), 300–31; R. Remondon, "L'Égypte de la suprême résistance au christianisme" in *BIFAO* 51 (1952), 63–78.

Arabia: R. Aigrain, "Arabie" in *DHGE* III, 1158–339; H. Charles, *Le christianisme des Arabes nomades* (Paris 1936); P. K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* (London-New York 1940); D. S. Attema, *Het oudste christendom en Zuid-Arabie* (Amsterdam 1949); G. Kretzschmer, "Origenes und die Araber" in *ZThK* 50 (1953), 250–79.

Palestine: R. Devreesse, "Les anciens évêchés de Palestine" in *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris 1940), 217–27.

Syria: E. R. Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse* (Paris 1930); P. V. C. Baur, *Christian Church at Doura-Europos* (New Haven 1934); G. Watzinger, "Die Christen in Dura" in *ThBl* 17 (1938), 113–19; O. Eissfeldt, "Dura-Europos" in *RAC* IV, 362–70; A. F. J. Klijn, *Edessa. Het Oudste Christendum in Syrie* (Baam 1963).

Persia: J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse (224–632)* (Paris 1904); A. All-

geier, "Untersuchungen zur ältesten Kirchengeschichte von Persien" in *Katholik* 98, II (1918), 224–41, 289–300; K. Lübeck, *Die altpersische Missionskirche* (Aachen 1919).

India: M. D'Sa, *History of the Catholic Church in India* (Bombay, 2nd ed. 1924); A. Väth, *Der heilige Thomas, der Apostel Indiens* (Aachen, 2nd ed. 1925); A. Mingana, "The Early Spread of Christianity in India" in *BJRL* 10 (1926), 435–95; L. W. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St Thomas* (Cambridge 1955); E. Tisserant, "Nestorienne" and "Syro-Malabare (Église)" in *DThC* 11, 157–66; 14, 3089–93.

Armenia: G. Klinge, "Armenien" in *RAC* I, 678–89; S. Weber, *Die katholische Kirche in Armenien* (Freiburg i. Br. 1903); F. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie* (Paris 1910); L. Arpee, *A History of Armenian Christianity* (New York 1946); M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia* (London 1955).

Georgia: K. Lübeck, *Georgien und die katholische Kirche* (Aachen 1918); K. Kekelidse, *Die Bekehrung Georgiens* (Leipzig 1928); W. Allen, *A History of the Georgian People* (London 1932); P. Peeters, "Les débuts du christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques" in *AnBoll* 50 (1932), 5–58.

Balkans: A. Lippold–E. Kirsten, "Donauprovinzen" in *RAC* IV, 166–89; J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes* (Paris 1918); R. Noll, *Frühes Christentum in Österreich* (Vienna 1954); I. Zibermayr, *Noricum, Bayern und Österreich* (Horn, 2nd ed. 1956).

Italy: H. Leclercq, "Italie" in *DACL* VII, 1612–841; *ECatt* VII, 386–9; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del sec. VII* (Faenza, 2nd ed. 1927); J. P. Kirsch, *Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum* (Paderborn 1918); U. Stutz, "Die römischen Titelkirchen und die Verfassung der stadtrömischen Kirche unter Papst Fabian" in *ZSavRGkan* 40 (1920), 288–312; E. Josi, "Titoli della chiesa Romana" in *ECatt* XII, 152–8; P. Styger, *Die römischen Katakomben* (Berlin 1933); H. Leclercq, "Ravenne" in *DACL* XIV, 2070–146; M. Mazzotti, "Ravenna" in *ECatt* X, 558–73.

Africa: J. Mesnage, *Le christianisme en Afrique. Origine, développement, extension* (Paris 1914); J. P. Brisson, *Gloire et misère de l'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris 1949), 32–141; A. Berthier–F. Logeart–M. Martin, *Les vestiges du christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale* (Paris 1951); C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955); C. Speel, "The Disappearance of Christianity from North Africa in the Wake of the Rise of Islam" in *CH* 29 (1960), 379–97; W. Telfer, "The Origins of Christianity in Africa" in *Stud. patrist.* 4 (Berlin 1961), 512–17; W. H. C. Frend in *JThS* 12 (1961), 280–4.

Spain: H. Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1916); *García–Villada*, I (Madrid 1929); S. McKenna, *Paganism and Pagan Survivals in Spain up to the Fall of the Visogothic Kingdom* (Washington 1938); A. Ferrua, "Agli albori del cristianesimo nella Spagna" in *CivCatt* (1940), IV, 421–31; T. Fernández Alonso, "Espagne" in *DHGE* 15 (1963), 892–901 (bibl.).

Gaul and Belgium: L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule,* I (Paris, 2nd ed. 1907); E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne,* I (Paris 1949), 51–116; M. Schuler, "Über die Anfänge des Christentums in Gallien und Trier" in *Trierer Zeitschrift* 6 (1931), 80–103; A. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique,* I (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1947).

Germany: Hauck, I (4th ed. 1922), 3–33; W. Neuss, *Die Anfänge des Christentums im Rheinland* (Bonn, 2nd ed. 1933); *Tüchle,* I (1950); *Bauerreiss,* I (2nd ed. 1958); H. Lehner–W. Bader, "Baugeschichtliche Untersuchungen am Bonner Münster" in *Bonner Jahrbücher* 136–7 (1932), 1–216; W. Neuss, "Eine altchristliche Märtyrerkirche unter dem

Chor der St.-Viktor-Kirche in Xanten" in *RQ* 42 (1934), 177–82; H. Leclercq, "Xanten et Bonn" in *DACL* XV, 3271–6 (with bibliography).

BRITAIN: E. Kirsten in *RAC* II, 603 ff.; J. Chevalier, "Angleterre" in *DHGE* III, 145–9; L. Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London 1932); G. Sheldon, *The Transition from Roman Britain to Christian England* (London 1932); W. Levison, "St Alban and St Alban's" in *Antiquity* 15 (1941), 337–59; N. Chadwick, *Studies in the Early British Church* (Cambridge 1958).

SECTION TWO

The Last Attack of Paganism and the Final Victory of the Church

28. *The Intellectual Struggle against Christianity at the End of the Third Century*

SOURCES

Porphyry, Περὶ Χριστιανῶν Fragments, edited A. von Harnack in *AAB* 1916/1 (97 fragments); addenda in *SAB* 1921–14 (five additional fragments); P. Nautin, "Trois autres fragments du livre de Porphyre 'Contre les chrétiens'" in *RB* 57 (1950), 409–16; Eusebius, *Contra Hieroclem, PG* 22, 795–868; also in C. L. Kayser, *Philostratus opera,* I (Leipzig 1870), 369–413, reprinted, F. C. Conybeare, *Philostratus, The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (London 1912).

LITERATURE

See the works listed in Chapter 13 by J. Geffcken, P. de Labriolle and W. Nestle, and in addition the following:
On neo-Platonism in general, *Ueberweg* I, 590–612. On Porphyry, *Ueberweg* I, 609–12 and 190* f. Articles on Porphyry by L. Vaganay in *DThC* XII, 2555–90, and R. Beutler in *Pauly–Wissowa* XXII, 278–313; J. Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre* (Ghent 1913); A. von Harnack, "Griechische und Christliche Frömmigkeit am Ende des 3. Jahrhunderts", in *Aus der Friedens- und Kriegszeit* (Berlin 1916), 47–65; A. B. Hulen, *Porphyry's Work against the Christians* (New Haven 1933); W. Theiler, *Porphyrios und Augustin* (Halle 1933); H. O. Schroeder, "Celsus und Porphyrius als Christengegner" in *Die Welt als Geschichte* 17 (1957), 190–202; J. J. O'Meara, *Porphyry's 'Philosophy from Oracles' in Augustine* (Paris 1959); J.-B. Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologists chrétiens de 270 à 361* (Rome 1954).

29. *Outbreak and Course of the Diocletian Persecution down to Galerius' Edict of Toleration in 311*

SOURCES

Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum,* edited J. Moreau in *SourcesChr* 39 (Paris 1954), I: Text and translation, II: Commentary; Eng. Trans. in *ANF* 7; *Euseb. HE* Book VIII and *De martyribus Palaestinae; Panegyrici latini,* edited E. Galletier, 2 volumes (Paris 1949–52). Various accounts of individual martyrs are indicated in the footnotes. On

Eusebius, cf. R. Laqueur, *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit* (Berlin 1929); D. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London 1960); J. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéenne* (Dakar 1961).

LITERATURE

See above Chapter 8, bibliography, in particular the works on the persecutions by H. Grégoire, J. Moreau, and J. Vogt. In addition: L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma e del mondo romano,* VI; *Da Decio a Constantino (251–337)* (Turin 1962); J. Vogt, *Constantin der Große und sein Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1960); J. Vogt, *Zur Religiosität der Christenverfolger* (Heidelberg 1962); G. Ricciotti, *The Age of Martyrs, Christianity from Diocletian to Constantine* (London 1960); G. E. M. de Ste Croix, "Why were the Early Christians Persecuted?" in *Past and Present* 26 (1963), 6–38; H. U. Instinsky, *Die alte Kirche und das Heil des Staates* (Munich 1963).

ON DIOCLETIAN: W. Ensslin in *Pauly-Wissowa* VII A, 2418–95; W. Seston in *RAC*, III 1036–53, and on this, cf. J. Straub, *Historia* I (Baden-Baden 1950) 487–99; W. Seston, *Dioclétien et la Tétrarchie,* I (Paris 1946); W. Seston, "A propos de la 'passio Marcelli centurionis'. Remarques sur les origines de la persécution de Dioclétien" in *Mélanges M. Goguel* (Paris 1950), 239–46; K. Stade, *Der Politiker Diokletian und die letzte große Christenverfolgung* (Wiesbaden 1927); N. H. Baynes, "The Great Persecution" in *Cambridge Ancient History,* 12 (London 1929), 646–77; A. Rehm, "Kaiser Diokletian und das Heiligtum von Didyma" in *Philologus* 93 (1938), 74–84; J. Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal der Spätantike* (Stuttgart 1939), 84–89, and J. Moreau in *Annales Univ. Sarav.* 2 (1953), 97 ff. Both these works deal with Diocletian's abdication.
ON MAXIMIANUS HERCULIUS: W. Ensslin in *Pauly-Wissowa* XIV, 2486–16.
ON GALERIUS: W. Ensslin in *Pauly-Wissowa* XIV, 2516–28; J. Vogt in *RAC* II, 1192–99; *Fliche-Martin* II, 457–77; M. Gelzer, "Vom Wesen und Wandel der Kirche" in *Festschrift E. Vischer* (Basle 1935), 35 ff.
ON MAXIMINUS DAIA: O. Seeck in *Pauly-Wissowa* IV, 1986–90; H. Grégoire, "La religion de Maximin Daia" in *Byz (B)* 8 (1933), 49–56.
ON MAXENTIUS: E. Groag in *Pauly-Wissowa* XIV, 2417–87; H. Leclercq in *DACL* X, 2752–69.

30. *The Definitive Turning-Point under Constantine the Great*

SOURCES

As in the previous chapter, together with Eusebius, *Vita Constantini,* edited by I. A. Heikel, *GCS* Eusebius I (Leipzig 1902). On the question of authenticity: I. Daniele, *I documenti Constantiniani della 'Vita Constantini' di Eusebio di Cesarea* (Rome 1938); J. Vogt, "Die Vita Constantini des Eusebius und der Konflikt zwischen Constantin und Licinius" in *Historia* 2 (1953), 463–71; P. Franchi de Cavalieri, *Constantiniana* (Rome 1953), 51–65; F. Vittinghoff, "Eusebius als Verfasser der Vita Constantini" in *RhMus* 96 (1953), 330–73; A. Jones "Notes on the Genuineness of the Constantinian Documents in Eusebius' Life of Constantine" in *JEH* 5 (1954), 196–200; H. Grégoire, "L'authenticité et l'historicité de la Vita Constantini attribuée à Eusèbe de Césarée" in *Bulletin Acad. Royale Belg.* 39 (1953), 466–83; J. Moreau, "Zum Problem der Vita Constantini" in *Historia* 4 (1955), 234–45; F. Scheidweiler, "Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios und die Vita Constantini" in *ByZ* 46 (1953), 293–301, and by the same author "Nochmals die Vita Constantini" in *ByZ* 49 (1955), 1–32.
The Letters, Decrees, and Laws of Constantine with religious content are dealt with

by H. Dörries, *Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins* (Göttingen 1954), and by H. Kraft, *Kaiser Konstantins religiöse Entwicklung* (Tübingen 1955) (with abundant bibliography 273–82). A. Bolhuis, "Die Rede Konstantins an die Versammlung der Heiligen und Lactantius' 'Divinae Institutiones'" in *VigChr* 10 (1956), 25–32.
On Eusebius as a historian, as well as J. Lacqueur (cf. bibliography to Chapter 29 above), I. Sirinelli, *Les vues historiques d'Eusèbe de Césarée durant la période prénicéenne* (Dakar 1961); G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople: A Contribution to the Criticism of the Vita Constantini Attributed to Eusebius" in *DOP* 6 (1951), 53–80.

Literature

Only a selection can be made from more recent writings; the literature available is immense. Surveys of this in: N. H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (London 1929); J. Miller in *BJ* 246 (1935), 42–130, 279 (1942), 237–365; E. Gerland, *Konstantin der Große in Geschichte und Sage* (Athens 1937); F. Staehelin, "Konstantin der Große und das Christentum" in *ZSKG* (1937), 385–417; 19 (1939), 396–403; A. Piganiol in *Historia* I (1950), 82–96; H. Karpp in *ThR* 19 (1950), 1–21; K. F. Strohecker in *Saeculum* 3 (1952), 654–80; E. Delaruelle in *BLE* 54 (1953), 37–54, 84–100.

General Treatment of Constantine: J. Vogt in *RAC* III, 306–79 gives the best summary and survey of the problems of research regarding Constantine. J. Burckhardt, *Die Zeit Constantins des Großen* (1853, Stuttgart, 6th ed. 1949); A. Piganiol, *L'empereur Constantin* (Paris 1932); E. Schwarz, *Kaiser Konstantin und die christliche Kirche* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1936); K. Hönn, *Konstantin der Große* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1945); A. H. Jones, *Constantine the Great and the Conversion of Europe* (London 1948); L. Voelkl, *Der Kaiser Konstantin* (Munich 1957); H. Dörries, *Konstantin der Große* (Stuttgart 1958); H. Dörries, *Constantine and Religious Liberty* (New Haven 1960); J. Vogt, *Constantin der Große und sein Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1960).

Constantine's Conversion: An account of research in J. Vogt, *Relazioni del X° Congresso internazionale di Scienze stor.* II (Florence 1955), 375–423; H. Grégoire, "La conversion' de Constantin" in *Rev. univ. Bruxelles* 36 (1930–1) 231–72; H. Grégoire, "La statue de Constantin et le signe de la croix" in *Antiquité classique* I (1932), 135–42; W. Seston, "La vision païenne de Constantin et les origines du christianisme constantinien" in *Mélanges Cumont* (Brussels 1936), 373–95; H. Grégoire, "La vision de Constantin 'liquidée'" in *Byz (B)* 14 (1939), 341–51; A. Alföldi, "In hoc signo victor eris" in *Pisciculi, Festschrift F. J. Dölger* (Münster 1939); J. Vogt, "Die Bedeutung des Jahres 312 für die Religionspolitik Konstantins des Großen" in *ZKG* 61 (1942), 171–90; J. Moreau, "Sur la vision de Constantin" in *RevÉAug* 55 (1953), 307–33; C. Martin, "L'Empereur Constantin fut-il un chrétien sincère?" in *NRTh* 78 (1956), 952–4; F. Altheim, "Konstantins Triumph von 312" in *ZRGG* 9 (1957), 221–331; H.-I. Marrou, "Autor du monogramme Constantinien" in *Mélanges Étienne Gilson* (Paris 1959), 403 to 414. On Constantine's attitude towards the *Sol invictus* see J. Karayannopulos in *Historia* 5 (1956), 341–57 and S. Kyriakidis in *Hellenika* 17 (1962), 219–46.

Constantine's Relation to Christianity: H. Koch, *Konstantin der Große und das Christentum* (Munich 1913); P. Batiffol, *La paix Constantinienne et le Catholicisme* (Paris, 4th ed. 1929); J. Straub, "Christliches Sendungsbewußtsein Konstantins" in *Das neue Bild der Antike* 2 (Leipzig 1942), 374–94); H. Lietzmann, "Der Glaube Konstantins" in *SAB* 1937, 29; H. von Schoenebeck, *Beiträge zur Religionspolitik des Maxentius und Constantin* (Leipzig 1939), new imp. Aalen 1962); J. Vogt, "Zur Frage des christlichen Einflusses auf die Gesetzgebung Konstantins des Großen" in *Festschrift L. Wenger,* II (Munich 1945), 118–48; J. Gaudemet, "La législation religieuse de Constan-

tin" in *RHEF* 33 (1947), 25–61; H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser* (Zürich 1947); A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* (London 1948); W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church* (Oxford 1952); C. Cecchelli, *Il trionfo della Croce* (Rome 1954); K. Kraft, "Das Silbermedaillon Constantins des Großen mit Christusmonogramm auf dem Helm" in *Jahrbuch für Numismatik* 5–6 (1954–5), 151–78; J.-J. Van de Casteele, "Indices d'une mentalité chrétienne dans la législation civile de Constantin" in *Bulletin Assoc. Guillaume Budé* 14 (1955), 65–90; A. Ehrhardt, "Constantins Verzicht auf den Gang zum Kapitol" in *Historia* 4 (1955), 297–313; H. U. Instinsky, *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Munich 1955); I. Karayannopulos, "Konstantin der Große und der Kaiserkult" in *Historia* 5 (1956), 341–57; R. Carson, "The Emperor Constantine and Christianity" in *History Today* (1956), 12–20; H. Kraft, "Kaiser Konstantin und das Bischofsamt" in *Saeculum* 8 (1957), 32–42; K. Aland, "Die religiöse Haltung Kaiser Konstantins" in *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 202 to 239, and by the same author "Der Abbau des Herrscherkultes im Zeitalter Konstantins" ibid. 240–56; J. Vogt, "Heiden und Christen in der Familie Constantins des Großen" in *Eranion, Festschrift H. Hommel* (Tübingen 1961), 148–68; I. Gillmann, "Some Reflections on Constantine's 'Apostolic Consciousness'" in *Studia patristica* 4 (Berlin 1961), 422–8; S. Calderone, *Costantino e il Cattolicesimo* (Florence 1962); E. L. Grasmück, *Coercitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit* (Bonn 1964).

31. *The Causes of the Victory of the Christian Religion. The Scope and Import of the Turning-Point under Constantine*

SECTION ONE: M. Sdralek, *Über die Ursachen, welche den Sieg des Christentums im römischen Reich erklären* (Breslau 1907); K. S. Latourette, *History of the Expansion of Christianity,* I (New York 1937), 160–70: "Reasons for Ultimate Success"; K. Prümm, *Das Christentum als Neuheitserlebnis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939); W. Eltester, "Die Krisis der alten Welt und das Christentum" in *ZNW* 42 (1949), 1–19; G. E. M. de Ste Croix, "Aspects of the Great Persecution" in *HThR* 47 (1954), 75–113; W. H. Frend, "The Failure of the Persecutions in the Roman Empire" in *Past and Present* 16 (London 1959) 10–30.

SECTION TWO: In addition to the Literature on Constantine in the bibliography to Chapter 30, see: K. Voigt, *Staat und Kirche von Konstantin dem Großen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Stuttgart 1936); K. Setton, *Christian Attitude Towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Address to the Emperor* (New York 1941); H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser. Eine Untersuchung der byzantinischen und theokratischen Staatsauffassung im 4. Jahrhundert* (Zürich 1947); F. E. Cranz, "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea" in *HThR* 45 (1952), 47–66; S. L. Greenslade, *Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius* (London 1954); G. Downey, *Philanthropia* in Religion and Statecraft in the Fourth Century after Christ in *Historia* 4 (1955), 199–208; J.-P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine de Septime Sévère à l'invasion arabe* (Paris 1958); K. Aland, "Das Konstantinische Zeitalter" in *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 165–201; ibid. "Kirche und Kaiser von Konstantin bis Byzanz", 257–79; B. Lohse, "Kaiser und Papst im Donatistenstreit" in *Ecclesia und Res Publica: Festschrift für K. D. Schmidt* (Göttingen 1961), 76–88; H. Rahner, "Konstantinische Wende?" in *Stimmen der Zeit* 167 (1960–1), 419–28; A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1963); R. Hornegger, *Macht ohne Auftrag* (Olten–Freiburg i. Br. 1963); P. Stockmeier, "Konstantinische Wende und kirchengeschichtliche Kontinuität" in *HJ* 82 (1963), 1–21; G. Brunner, "Zur Konstantinischen Frage" in *OstKSt* 11 (1962), 43–51.

GENERAL INDEX

Figures in italics denote pages where the subject receives more intensive treatment.

Aberkios inscription 207
Aberkios, Phrygian Christian 209, 364
abjuration, formulas of 266
abortion 308
absolute truth, Christian claim of 125
Abunoteichos, oracle 96
Achaea, christianization of 102, 379
Acilii, crypt of the 132
Acilius Glabrio, consul 132
acolytes 350
Acta Archelae 208
Acta Pauli 194
Acton, J. E., 1st Baron 36, 52f, 54
Acts of the Apostles 105
— apocryphal 112f, 298
Acts of the Martyrs 448
Adalbert of Bremen 17
Adam, symbol of human reason 67
Adam of Bremen 17
Addai, Christian missionary 207
Adiabene 373
Adonis 92
Adoptionism 154, 255
Adrianople 417, 424
Aelia Capitolina 206
Afra, martyr 386
Afrahat, 267
Agape, martyr 402
agape 284, 309
agapetae system 297
Agathonike, a Christian 160
Aggai, missionary 207
Agnes, St 401
agnosia 263
Agricius, Bishop of Trier 385
Agrippa Castor 187, 194
Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage 210, 361, 383
Aguirre, J. Sáenz de 27
Alban of Verulam, martyr 386
Alcibiades of Apamea 154
'Αληθὴς λόγος of Celsus 167
Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem 219, 225, 235, 371
Alexander, a Christian physician 161
Alexander VI, Pope 54
Alexander the Great 15, 88
Alexander of Roes 22
Alexandria, administrative centre of the Church 215, 355
— cultural centre 230, 368
— in the Jewish Diaspora 66
Alexandrians 50
Allatius, Leo 43
allegorical interpretation of the OT 67, 70, 189, 196, 231, 245
allegory and Gnosis 184
almsgiving 313
Altaner, Berthold 42
Alzog, J. 37
Amaseia 375, 377
Amastris 209, 375
Ambrose, St, Bishop of Milan 14, 236, 300
Amen 110, 281–3
Ammonius, presbyter of Calaris 382
Ammonius, Bishop 259
Ammonius Saccas, neo-Platonist 235
ἀνγναώστης 351
Ananias and Sapphira 79
Ananus, high priest 77
Anastasia, daughter of Constantius Chlorus 409
anchor, Christian symbol 286
Ancyra, Synod of (A.D. 314) 377
Andrieu, M. 44
angels, doctrine of 169, 174f, 178, 187
Anicetus, Pope 270, 283
Anna, prophetess 71
Anointed in Qumran, the 64
anointing of the sick 85
— among the Gnostics 189
— at baptism 279
Anselm of Canterbury, St 18
Anselm of Havelberg 20
Anthony, Roman general 89
anthropology 180
anti-Christian polemic 164–71, 389–96
anti-Gnostic literature 182, 194–5
Antigonus, Hasmonaean 59
Antioch in Pisidia 100
Antioch in Syria 77, 98, 101, 103, 207, 242, 372
— administrative centre of the Church 215, 355

Antioch, missionary centre 355
Antipater, father of Herod the Great 59
anti-Paulinism 156
anti-Semitism 68, 460
Antitheses of Marcion 191
Antonianus, African bishop 336
Antoninus of Florence 22
Antoninus Pius, Emperor 136, 173
Antony, the hermit 14
Anullinus, prefect in Africa 415, 419
Apamea 164
apatheia 237
Apelles, Marcion's pupil 192
Apocalypse *132f*
— in late Jewish thought 65f, 114, 153
— of John 114
— of Peter 114
apocalyptic literature of the Gnostics 182
apocryphal writings of the New Testament 137, 182, 194, 265
Apocryphon of John 158
ἀποκατάστασις 239
Apollinaris of Hierapolis 159, 179
Apollinaris of Laodicea 391
Apollo 93, 96, 396, 410
Apollonius, martyr 163
Apollonius of Tyana 392, 395f
Apologeticum 250f
apologists 159, 165, 171–80
apostles 73f, 78, 106, 253
— twelve 75, 78
— missionary work 111f
— according to Porphyry 392
apostolic college 75, 78
Apostolic Constitutions 246, 343
Apostolic Fathers 124, 137–40, 470–2
apostolic literature of the Gnostics 182
apostolic proclamation 70, 81, 110
apostolic tradition 124, 137, 151f, 246
apotaxis 290
Apuleius 91
Aquaviva, C. 30
Aquila and Priscilla 103, 129
Aquila, Roman prefect 219
Aquila, translator of the Bible 206
Aquileia 381
Arabia 208, 370
arca 352
archaeology, Christian 26, *42f* 454
Archelaus, son of Herod the Great 59
archisynagogus 66
archons 95, 182
Ardabau 199
Arianism 50
Aristides 173f
Aristides, Aelius 96
Ariston, apologist 208
Aristotle 232, 255
Arius 242, 264
Arles, *see* Synods
Armenia 375
Arnobius the Elder 383, 396
Arnold, Geylhoven 22
Arnold, Gottfried 30
Aron, British martyr 386
Arrius Antoninus, proconsul 163
Arsacides 261
art, Christian 216, *285–8*, 454
— and liturgy 286
Artemon, Adoptionist 255
Arycanda, inscription from 406
Ascensio Isaiae 114
ascetism 216, 232, 295–8, 422
— in Philo 67–68
— of the Montanists 204
— in Manichaeism 264
Asclepiades, Bishop of Antioch 219
Asclepiodotos, Adoptionist 255
Asclepios 91, 96
ἀσέβεια 299
Ashtishtat, Armenia 376
Asia Minor 101, 111, 119, 374f, 377
Asia proconsularis 102
Assemani, J. 43
Asterius the Sophist 269, 273
Astigi 384
Astorga, Spanish bishopric 384
astrology 94
— among the Mandaeans 157
— and Gnosticism 184
Atargatis 92
Athanasius 14
atheism 165, 178
Athenaeus 233
Athenagoras 159, 178
Athens 103, 209, 379
athleta Christi 298
Attalos, Christian in Lyons 161
Atticus, proconsul 206
Attis, cult of 92
audientes 277
— (hearers) in Manichaeism 263
Augsburg 386
auguries 396
Augustine 14f, 17, 28, 34
— and Manichaeism 266
— on heretical baptism 363
— and Porphyry 394
Augustus 60, 88–90, 105–7
Auranitis 59
Aurelian, Emperor 318, 390
Autolykos 178

Babylas, Bishop of Antioch 225
Babylon 94, 114
Bach, J. 43
Baeumer, S. 44
Baeumker, C. 42
Bagravan, Armenian see 376
Bahram I 262
Balkans 379
Ballerini, P. and G. 28
baptism, Christian 84, 108f, 122, 142f, 175, 179, 233, 273, 288f, 322, 339, 393
— of Jesus 71, 189
— effect of 84, 143, 289f
— seal of 142, 318f, 323
— symbol 151, 197, 280f, 289

baptism of the Elchasaites 154
— of the Mandaeans 157
— of the sick 247
— dispute about — by heretics 249, 359, *360–4*
— of heretics 253, 360
— date for 273, 279
— candidates 276–9
— by blood 278, 294
— act of 279–81
baptismal formula 143
— spirituality 142, *288–92*
— customs in Mandaeism 157
— renunciation 279
— vow 290
— obligation 291, 339
— robe 291
— fast 304
— grace, loss of 325
baptismus clinicorum 351
baptistery in Dura-Europos 287
baptist sects 157
Barbelo-Gnostics 189f
Bar Cochba rebellion 66, 172, 206
Bardenhewer, Otto 42
Bardesanes 207
Barnabas 77, 80, 100f, 111
Baronius, Caesar 6, *25*
Bartholomew of Lucca 19
Basilides, Bishop of Emerita 358
Basilides, Egyptian martyr 219
Basilides, Gnostic 187f
Basilidians, Christians 185
Basil the Great 311
Batanaea 59
Batiffol, Pierre 38, 44
Baumstark, Anton 43
Baur, F. C. 3, 35, 37
Beatus Rhenanus 24
Beck, H. G. 43
Bede, the Venerable 15f
being, Gnostic interpretation of 183
Belgica 385
Belial 64, 114
Bellarmine, Robert 26
Bellona 88
Benedict XIV, Pope 44
Benedict, St, founder of a religious order 50
Benno of Osnabrück 18
Berber tribes 384
Bernard of Clairvaux 28, 300
Bernard Gui 21
Beroea 103
Berossos 94
Berti, Gianlorenzo 31f
Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra 259f, 370
Bethlehem 71
Bigne, Marguerin de la 25
Bihlmeyer, K. 38
binding and loosing, Church's power of 326, 342
biography 5, 23; *see also* Lives
Bishop, Edmund 44, 55
bishop, *see also* episcopate
— representative of Christ 149
— and the Church 151, 253, 348
bishop, controls cult of the martyrs 275
— administers baptism 278f
— consecration of 282, 348
— power of absolution 328, 342f
— leader of the ecclesiastical community 346
— choice of 347f
— outstanding example to the community 347
— maintains ecclesiastical unity 348
— age of 349
— controls the community's property 352
— interpreter of Holy Scripture 349
— as arbiter 422
— in the Christian Roman empire 432
bishoprics in North Africa 383
Bithynia 111, 208
Blampin, Thomas 28
Blandina, martyr 161
Blastus, Quartodeciman 271
Blondel, D. 27
Blume, C. 44
Bolland J. (Bollandists) 28f
Bologna 381
Boniface VIII, Pope 8, 19
Book of Enoch 65
Book of Jubilees 65
Book of Mysteries in Qumran 65
Book of Noah in Qumran 65
Bornkamm, H. 3
Borst, Arno 5
Bosio, Antonio 26
Bossuet 30, 34
Bostra 208, 370
Bradshaw 49
Braun, Conrad 25
Braun, Josef 44
breaking of bread 84f, 109
Brémond, A. 29
Brémond, H. 46
Brescia 382
Brieger, Theodor 39
British Isles 386
brotherly love, Christian 110, 122, 428
Brück, H. 38
Bruno of Cologne 18
Buchberger, Michael 41
Buddha 263
Buddhism and Mani 265
burial, early Christian 221, 287f, 310, 454
Butler, Dom Cuthbert 55
Byblos 92
Byzacena 383
Byzantine historiography 13
Bzovius, Abraham 25

Cadmus, Bishop of Bosphorus 378
Caecilian. Bishop of Carthage 345, 415, 419
Caesar divus Julius 89
Caesarea in Cappadocia 215, 355
Caesarea in Palestine 60, 104, 371
caesariani 227
Caesarius of Heisterbach 18
Caesaropapism 429
calendar, Roman 116, 274
Callistus, Pope 215, 245, 247, 258f, 275, 329, 358, 379

Calvin, John 8, 50
Candace, Queen of Ethiopia 77
Canisius, Peter 25
Canon of Truth 194, 197
canon, scriptural 180, 194
Canons of Hippolytus 246
Canticle of Canticles 245, 296
Cappadocia 93, 111, 219–22, 374
Caracalla 217, 220f, 368
Carlyle, Thomas 55
Carneades 94
Carthage 210, 249, 383
— administrative centre of the Church 215, 355
Casel, Odo 44
Cassian 55
Cassiodorus 13
catacombs 287f, 382
catacumbas, in 116
catechetics 274
catechumenate 215, 231, 240, *275–8*, 289, 387, 432
catechumens 218
catechumenus 277
Cathars 248, 338
cathedra Petri 360, 365
catholicity of the Church 150f
Cauchie, Alfred 39, 56
causality, historical 4, 32
Cayré, F. 42
Ceillier, Remi 26, 40
Celerinus, Roman Christian 224
celibacy 65, 298
cells, Christian 101, 111
— Gnostic 193
Celsus 164, *167–71*, 391f
Celsus, Roman vicarius 421
cemeteries 226, 417
cemeterium Callisti 287
cemetery of St Sebastian 287f
censorship 53
centres of the Church 215, 355
Centum Cellae 226
Cephalaea, textbook of Manichaeism 261
Cephas 79
Cerdon, Gnostic 190
certificate of sacrifice, *see libellus*
Cervini, Marcello 26
Cesena 381
Chacon (Giaconius), Alphonse 29
Chalcedon 377
Chambon, J. 3f
charismatically gifted men 80, 105f, 149
charity, Christian 85, 102, 105, 152
Charlemagne 32f
Chateaubriand, F. R. 34, 49
Chenoboskion 182
Chevalier, Ulisse 41
chiliasm 14, 154, 176, 240; *see also* eschatology
Chione, martyr 402
chorepiscopus 353, 377
Chosen People, *see* Israelites
Chrestos, Christ 129
Chrestus, Bishop of Syracuse (Sicily) 382
Christ 82, 144, 150f, 154, 170, 191, 288, 392, 395, *428f*
Christ, His second coming 75, 109, 200
— as a title 81
— Son of God 108, *120f*
— His expiatory death 108
— the principle of the Church's life 150
— in Gnostic teaching 186, 189
— bridegoom of the soul 237, 291
— divinity of 255f
— His death on the cross 290
— comforts martyrs 293
— monogram 411f, 414
Christ-Helios 288
Christian, name of 132, 133f
— literature 229–54, 369, 383, 483–9
Χριστιανοί 77
Christians, legal position in the empire 131
— accused of godlessness 131
— tried in court *132–6*, 161, 163f
— and Roman citizenship 133
— number in Bithynia 133f
— denounced 133, 135, 390
— and Trajan's law 134
— legal status of 136f
— the true Israel 141
— moral failure of 144
— and pagan culture 162
— according to Celsus 169
— lawbreakers 170
— their daily life 175
— manner of life 179, 233
— in the Roman imperial court 217f, 318, 396
— and military service 218, 220, 251, 277, 317, 398
— deported 221
— lapsed 224–6, 228, 404
— banished 227, 405f
— Coptic 370
— number of *c.* A.D. 300 386
— in the army 398
— degradation of 398
— compelled to offer sacrifice 399
— denigrated 406
— high moral quality of 427
Christianity, expansion of 205–11, 367–88, 481, 500–2
— of the Johannine Writings 119–23, 467f
— religion of the slaves 169
— the only certain philosophy 174
— special features in Africa 249
— and Manichaeism 264f
— and the pagan State 316–18
— official religion in Armenia 376
— in Spain 385
— general animosity against 395
— syncretist 426
— and class-war 426
— causes of the final success 426–9
Christianus 277
Christo-centricity 144, 237, 303
Christo-centric spirituality 237, 300
Christology 121, 141, 153, 155, 191, 239, 252
Christophorus 293
Chronicle of Hippolytus 246
Chrysippus 232

Chrysopolis (battle A.D. 324) 424
Chrysostom, J. 28
Church, idea of the (ecclesiology) 1ff, 4, 9, 25, 46, 196, 247f, 253
— and culture 3, 6f, 177, 313–16, 431
— in America 56
— founded by Jesus 72
— as organic framework 73
— her universality 79, 122, 151
— unity of 109, 150, 253, 360, 366
— in John's Gospel 122f
— bride of the Lamb 123, 245, 366
— the new Jerusalem 123
— organization 146–52, 215
— the Great, an anti-Marcionite movement? 198
— functions attacked by Montanism 203f
— and State 218, 429, 432
— as Mother 233, *365f*
— and Holy Scripture 238
— and salvation 253, 420
— and Manichaeism 264, 266f
— and penance 324, 339, 341
— constitution 346–60
— provinces 353f
— devotion to 365–7
— symbolism 365f
— property 415
— independence 432
Cicero 315f
Cilicia 102
circumcision 69, 71, 101
civilization, pagan 307
civilization, secular, and Christianity *313–16*
Claudius, Emperor 103, 128
Claudius, letter of 128
Claudius Apollinaris 270
Claudius Herminianus, Roman governor 219
Clement VI, Pope 23
Clement of Alexandria 140, *230–4,* 270, 285, 288, 299f, 314, 339
Clement of Rome 130, 131, *137f,* 295
— discipline of penance 339f
Cleomenes, Modalist 257
clergy 80f, 227, *346–52,* 380, 383, 399, 415
clerical grades, Christian 216, 350
Cnossos 209, 378
Cocqueline 36
Coelesyria 153, 372
Cologne 211
Commodus, Emperor 163f
communicatio ecclesiastica 327
communion ritual 284
community life *288–319*
community of goods 85f, 155
communities, Christian 78, *105–11,* 311, *350f*
confessio 333
confessores 275
confirmation 280
confiscation 227
Congar, Yves 46
conscience, free 52
consecratio 89
consignatio 279
consilium 420
Constantia 409
Constantine the Great 6, 12, 32f, 266, 385, 405, 407, 408, 410, 414–17, 419–22, 423–5, 430
— basilica 118
— conversion 407–16
— vision of the cross 412f
— statue 414
— coinage 414
— edicts 416
Constantinian turning-point 429–32
Constantius, Emperor 432
Constantius Chlorus, Emperor 399f, 409
Constitutio Antoniniana 220
consummati (martyres) 224
continence 201, 295f
Convention of Milan *416f,* 430
conversion to Christianity 48, 217, 422
Corinth 103, 137, 147, 209, 378
Cornelius, captain 77
Cornelius, Pope 226, 248, 331, 336, 351, 359, 381
corona martyrii, virginitatis 296f
coronati (martyres) 224
correptio 340
Council of the Apostles 76, 79f, 83, 100–2
Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) 256, 271, 354f
councils 6, 8ff, 14, 23, 26f, 33, 50, 450
Coustant, Pierre 28
Covenant of Israel with Jahwe 60
Crabbe, Peter 24
Creation, Christian doctrine of 168, 239f
— Gnostic account 183f
— myth of the Sethians 189
Creator according to Marcion 190
Creighton, Mandell 53, 54
cremation of Christians 161
Crescens, pagan philosopher 160, 165
Crete 209, 378
Crimean peninsula 378
crimen laesae maiestatis 131f, 220
Cromwell 54
crux monogrammatica 411
cults, pagan 87f, 125, 277f; *see also* emperor
cultural ideal, Christian 233, 368
cultor dei 420
cultus dei 422
Curtius, E. R. 42
Cybele cult 88f, 92f
Cyprian, E. S. 32
Cyprian of Carthage 14, 223, *252f,* 291, 315, *330–4,* 347f, *359–62*
Cyprus 100, 378
Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem 267

Dacus (Balkans), episcopal see 379
Dahlmann, F. C. 41
Damascus 79, 207, 371
Damasus, Pope 116, 344, 401
Daniel in Christian art 287
Daniélou, J. 46
Dannenmayr, Matthias 33
Danubian provinces 209
deacon 106f, 279, 311, 350
deaconess 312
decadence, theory of 5, 21f, 24

Decius, Roman emperor 222–6, 294
Delacroix, S. 45
Delehaye, Hippolyte 43
Delisle, L. V. 36
Delius, W. 3
Delphi, inscription of Gallio 103
Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria 208, 231, 235, 370
Demetrius, opponent of Paul 103
demiurge 184, 188, 192
demons 95, 168, 175, 177, 263, 317
Denifle, H. 37, 42
Depositio martyrum 275
Derbe 100
diadochs, kingdoms of the 87, 89
διαδοχή 357f
διακονεῖν 80
Dialogue with the Jew Tryphon 173
Diaspora, Jewish 66–70
Diaspora Jews 68, 101, 120
Diatessaron *178*, 373
Didache 139, 141, 295
Didascalia, Syrian 269, 272, 283, 304, 342–4, 349
Didascalos, by Clement of Alexandria 233
Didymus of Alexandria 267
dies solis 422
Dietrich of Niem 21f
Dio Cassius 131f, 218
Diocletian, Emperor 266, *396–400*, 502f
Diodorus of Tarsus 268
Dionysius, Pope 215, 259, 311, 363
Dionysius of Alexandria 221, 223–8, 240, 245, 248, 259, 295, 310f, 337, 349, 361, 363, 369, 375, 378, 389
Dionysius of Corinth 115, 194, 209, 311, 324, 378
Dionysius Exiguus 13, 16
Dionysus cult 92
ditheism 256, 258
divine sonship 108, 120, 122
Docetism 147, 154, 192, 197
Dölger F. J. 42
Döllinger, J. J. I. 35, 50, 53
domina mater ecclesia 366
Dominic, St, founder of a religious order 50
Domitian, Emperor 131f
Domitilla 131
— catacomb of 132
Domnus, Bishop of Antioch 256
domus ecclesiae 287, 380
Donatists 345, 418–20, 432
Donatus 418
doorkeeper 350
Dorostorum (Moesia), episcopal see 379
Dorotheus, presbyter in Antioch 242, 276
Dositheos, Gnostic 182
dove, Christian symbol 286
Downside Abbey 54f
dreams, interpretation 95f
Dreves, M. 44
Drey, J. S. 35
Droysen, J. G. 10
dualism 155, 158, 168, 183f, 187, 191, 262
Duchesne, L. 5, 38, 44
Dunstan, St 55
Dura-Europos 178, 221, 287, 292, 373
Durandus, William 48
Dynamism 255f

Eadmer 18f
Early Christian authors (editions) 447f
Easter festival 68, *268*, *272f*
— date of 115, 207, 217
— hymn 179
— letters 240
— controversy *268f*, 358
— fast 269, 272
— liturgy 269
— vigil 269, *272f*, 279
— octave of 274
eastern churches 49
Ebeling, G. 3
Ebendorfer, Thomas 21
Ebionites 154–6
ecclesiastical year 273f
ecclesiology, *see* Church
Échard, J. 29
Edessa 207f, 286, 372
edicts of the emperor *223f*, *226f*, 397–9, 425f
Egypt 71, 93, 208, 219, 369
Ehrhard, Albert 2, 38, 40, 43
Ehrle, Franz 37, 42
Ehses, S. 39
Eisengrein, W. 25
Ekkehart of Aura 17
ἐκκλησία 77f
Elchasai, holy book of 156f
— his vision of Christ 157
Elchasaites 154f
Elders 80, 106
electi in Christianity 278
— in Manichaeism 263
Eleutherius, Pope 357
emanations 188, 262
emperor, cult of 88f, 94, 97, 120, *127f*, 132f, 398, 463
Encratites 178, 298, 304
end of the world 5, 65, 109; *see also* eschatology
Engelbert of Cologne 18
Enlightenment 2, 5, 9, *33ff*
Enoch, Book of 65
Ephesus, mission in 103f
— administrative centre of the Church 215, 355, 377
Ephraem 178, 267
Epictetus reproaches the Christians 131, 165
Epicurus 86, 173, 232
Epidauros 96
Epigonus, Modalist 257
epigraphy, Early Christian 453f
Epiphanes, sovereigns' title 89
Epiphania, episcopal see 374
Epiphanius, monk 13
Epiphanius of Salamis 13, 28, 153
Epiphany 274
episcopate 2, 11f, 40
— according to Ignatius of Antioch 148f
— and apostolic tradition 149
— and orthodoxy 194

episcopate and Scripture 196f
— theologically grounded 346f
— qualifications 349
— according to Cyprian *360–2*
episcops 106f, 148
Epistula Apostolorum 140, 194
Epistula Claudiana 128
epitaphs *377*; *see also* epigraphy
Erasmus, Desiderius 24
eschatology 1f, 5, 15, 17, 21, 392; *see also* end of the world
eschatological hope 93
esoterism 239
Essenes 63–66, 184
eternity of salvation in Qumran 64f
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι 82
Eubel, Conrad 40
Euboea 379
Eucharist 122, 143f, 151, 176, 252, 310, 393
— celebration 109f, *281–5*
— prayer 143
— great prayer 282f
εὐχαριστία 281
Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons 401
Eugnostes, Gnostic 182
Euhemeros 87
Euphranor, Bishop 259
Euplius, martyr 401
Eusebius, Pope 344
Eusebius of Caesarea *11–15*, 16, 19, 24, 56, 126, 135, 245
— refutation of Porphyry 391
— view of Constantine 407
— vision of the cross by Constantine 412f
Eusebius of Emesa 268
Evagrius Scholasticus 12
evangelists 179
Evenett, H. O. 56
Eve, symbol of sensuality 67
excavations, Vatican 116f
excommunication 193, 327f, 340
— penitential 321, 324
— from the synagogue 343f
exhomologesis 327, 333, 338
Exodus 12 in the liturgy of the Mass 269f
exorcism for catechumens 278
exorcist 350

Fabian, Pope 223, 247, 336
Fabius, African Christian 398
Fabius, Bishop of Antioch 337, 350
Fall of man 48, 198
Farlati 29
fasting, Christian 85, 143, 203, 207, 237, 304f
— in Manichaeism 91
— in the mysteries of Isis 91
— among the Montanists 200
fate and astrology 94
Fayûm, Christian communities 369
Feine, H. E. 45
Felicissimus, African cleric 249
Felicitas, martyr 219, 293
Felix, African bishop 399
Felix and Adauctus, martyrs 401
Felix, Bishop of Aptungi 345, 418
Felix, martyr of Milan 382
Felix IV, Pope 13
Feltoe 49
Festus, Roman procurator *77*, 128
fideles 277
Filastrius, Bishop of Brescia 182
Finke, H. 39f
Firmicus Maternus 92
Firmilian of Caesarea 361–3
fish, Christian symbol 286
fisherman 286
Flacius, Matthias 24
Flavius, Clemens, consul 131
Flavius Josephus 12, 64, 65, 69
Fleury, Claude 31, 56
Fliche, A. 38, 46
Flodoard of Rheims 17
Flórez, Enrico 29
Fortuna, oracle 96
Fortunatus, African presbyter 331
Fournier, Paul 44
Franchi de' Cavalieri, Pio 39
Francis of Assisi 18, 20
Franz, Adolf 44
Frederick I, Emperor 8
Frederick II, Emperor 8
freedom of belief, Christian 389
freedom of conscience 52
Fronto, pagan rhetor 166
Froude 51
Fructuosus, Spanish martyr 227
Frutolf of Michelsberg 17
Fundanus Minucius 135
Funk, F. X. 35, 38
future life, ideas of 93

Gaius, Roman presbyter 115, 275
Galatia 102f, 111
Galen, doctor in antiquity 255
Galerius, Emperor 397, 400f, *403f*, 405
Galilee 205
Gallienus, Emperor 228, 389
Gallio, Roman proconsul 103
Galli, priest of Cybele 92
Gamaliel 99
Gams, B. 40
Garampi, Giuseppe 29
García-Villada, Z. 5
Gasquet, Francis Neil, Cardinal 54
Gaudentius, deacon 227
Gaul 210, 385f
Gelasius of Caesarea 13
Gellius, Roman writer 233
Gennadius of Marseilles 22
Gentile Christians 79
George of Laodicea 268
Georgia 376
Gerbert of St Blasien 29
Gerhoh of Reichersperg 19
Germania 211, 385
Geyer, Bernard 42
Gibbon, Edward 47, 50, 56
Gieseler, J. K. L. 37, 56

γλωσσόκομον 352
glossolaly 107
Glycon, oracle 96
Gnosis, Samaritan 158
— according to Marcion 190
— in Manichaeism 263
Gnosticism *181–92*, 254f, 477–80
— and Judaism 157, 184
— sources 181f
— Christian 184f, 233, 289f
— influenced by the Bible 184f
— struggle with the Church *192–9*
— and development of dogma 198
— in Palestine 205
— in North Africa 249
Gnostic elements among the Elchasaites 157
— liturgy 181
— literature 181
— apocalyptic literature 182
— schools 229
godfather 276
Gooch 51
Good Shepherd 287f
Gospel (evangelium) 82, 154, 175, 393
Gospel of Truth 181
gothic revivalists 49
Goths, Christian 378
Görres 49
Gortyna (Crete) 209, 378
Grabmann, Martin 42
Graf, Georg 43
graffiti 116
Granianus, Roman governor 135
Gratian 24
graves of the apostles 115
graves of martyrs 275
Great Church 215f
Great Mother (Cybele) 91
Greece 102f, 378
Greek in Jewish liturgy 67
— literature 87
— comedies 87
— islands 378
Gregoras, Nikephoros 13
Gregory VII, Pope 33
Gregory XIII, Pope 26
Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa 14, 225
Gregory, Bishop of Tours 15
Gregory the Great 7, 36
Gregory the Illuminator 376
Gregory Thaumaturgus 225, 241, 343
Greving, J. 40
Grillmeier, A. 43
Gudentis, martyr of Carthage 219
Guibert, J. de 46
Guilday, Peter 39, 56
Guise, Charles 56

Hadrian, Emperor 135f, 173
Hagenbach, K. R. 37
Hardouin, J. 27
Harnack, Adolf von 42, 43
Hartzheim, J. 27
Hasideans 62f, 64
Hasmonaeans 59
Hassidim or Hasideans 62
Hauck, Albert 5, 41
Hefele, Carl Joseph 35
Hegemonios 268
Hegesippus 11, 195, 205, 209, 357f
Heimarmene 86
Helena, St, mother of Constantine 409
Heliogabalus, Emperor 220
Helios 93
Hellenism 67, 87
Hellenistic Jews in the primitive community 75f
— art forms 87
— religious philosophy 124
hellenization of the East 87, 90
— of Roman religion 87
— of Christianity? 180
Helyot, H. 29
Henry of Brussels 22
Henry VIII, King of England 47, 56
Heracleia, administrative centre of the Church 355
Heracleon, Gnostic 188
Heracles, Christian of Alexandria 231
Heraclius, Christian of Rome 344f
Heraclitus 174
heresy 147f, 199
Hergenröther, J. Joseph 38
Hermann the Lame 16
Hermas 136, 139f, 150, 265, *321–4*
Hermes Trismegistos 182
Hermetism and Gnosis 184
Hermias, apologist 179
hermits 215, 298
Hermogenes, Gnostic 195
hero cult 89
Herod Agrippa 76
Herod Antipas 59
Herod the Great 59f, 71
Hervet, Gentianus 27
Hexapla 235
hierarchy 106, 264
Hieraclides, Bishop 370
Hierocles, Roman official 394, 397
Hillel 63
Hinschius, Paul 44
Hippolytus of Rome 11, 15, 187, 195f, 200, 220f, *244–7*, 282–4, 286, 314, 329
— commentary on Daniel 245
— Church Order 246f, 273, 280, 282f
— study of Scripture 254
Hirbet Qumran 64
history of dogma 455f
holiness within the Church 2, 5, 17f, *318ff*
Holy Spirit 75f, 82, 105, 107, 149, 154, 199, 202, 233, 248, 252, 257
homily 236, 281
Honorius of Autun 22
Horace, Quintus Horatius Flaccus 88
hospitality 151, 309
Hughes, Philip 39, 56
Hugh of Fleury 19
Hugh of Saint Victor 48

Humanism 23
Hume 47
Hurter, Hugo 40
Hyacinth, Roman presbyter 163
hymns in the liturgy 109
— to Christ, by Clement of Alexandria 232
— Manichaean 264
hypostasis 260f
Hystaspes, Syrian Christian 207

Iconium 100, 204, 377
Ignatius Loyola 46, 50
Ignatius of Antioch 135, *138,* 141, 146, 292
— letter to the Romans 113f, 152f
Ildefonsus of Toledo 13
immortality of the soul 179
immunity for the clergy 415f, 422
imposition of hands 75, 84, 361
— in the discipline of penance 328, 333
Incarnation 121, 169, 393
India, Christian missionary activity 374
infant baptism 253, 279
initiation in mystery cults 92–94
Innocent III, Pope 25
inscriptions, Christian 221, 377, 453
inspiration 238
institutum Neronianum 130
instruction, Christian 275f
Iran 93, 183
Irenaeus, Bishop of Sirmium 402
Irenaeus of Lyons 11, 14, 115, 153f, 161, 195, 197, 201, 211, 270f, 338, 356, 429
— *Adv. haer.* 3, 3, 3 356
Irene, martyr 402
Isauria 377
Isidore of Seville 13ff, 15, 22
Isis cult 88, 90f
Israel, "holy remnant" 64
— holy war of 63
Israelites' consciousness of being the Chosen People 98
Italy 210, *379–82*

Jaffé, P. 41
Jahweh 60
Jaldabaoth, Gnostic 189
James, African martyr 227
James the Elder 76
James the Younger 76f, 79
— clauses of 83
Janssen, J. 34, 37, 40
Jerome, St *15f,* 22, 236, 237, 245
Jerusalem, Christian congregation 60, 101, 206, 371
— the New 65, 123
— heavenly 200
Jesus of Nazareth 66, *70–4,* 81f, 169, 176, 264
Jeû, Gnostic Books of 181
jewellery among Christians 314
Jews 60f, 66f, 77, 101, 103, 128
Jewish ethics 69
— Christians 76, 98f, 153
— Christianity, heterodox 153–8
— arguments against polytheism 173
Joachim of Floris 20
Joan of Arc 49
Johannes Scholasticus 13
Johannes Trithemius 22
Johannine writings 119f
John XXII, Pope 19
John the Baptist 66, 71, 120, 157
John the apostle 75f, 119f
— his Gospel 114, 119, 188, 208, 393
John Mark 100
John of Nikiu 13
John of Salisbury 19
John of Segovia 23
Jonah in Christian art 287
Joppa 76
Joseph 71
Joseph II, Emperor 33
Jubilees, Book of 65
Judaea 59, 76
Judaism and Christianity *59–70,* 124, 126, 140f, 184, 205, 217, 459–61
Judaizers 101
Judas 78
Judas Maccabaeus 59
Julia Domna 217
Julia Mamaea 220
Julian, Emperor 91, 310, 408
Julius, British martyr 386
Julius, Christian soldier 398
Julius Africanus 221, 241
Jungmann, J. A. 44
Justin Martyr, St 11, 14, 135, 160, *174–7,* 209, 243, 276, 281f
Justinian I, Emperor 266

Karpos, martyr 160
Katerkamp, Theodor 34
Kaufmann, C. M. 42
Kawerau, Gustav 37
Kehr, Paul 36
Kerinthos 153f
Kerygmata Petrou 156
kingdom of God 61, 72, 82f
Kirsch, J. P. 38, 43
kiss of peace 281, 284
Klauser, Theodor 42
Klee, H. 43
Knöpfler, Alois 38, 40
Knowles, Dom David 54f, 56
koinê 100
Königer, A. M. 45
Kraus, F. X. 38
Krose, H. A. 442
Krumbacher, Karl 43
Kurtscheid, Bertrand 45
Kuttner, Stephen 44
Kyrios, title 81f, 89, 108
κυριότητες 95

labarum 412, 424
Lactantius 15, 126, 130, 315, 383, 396, 408, 411
Laderchi, Jacob 25
Laemmer, Hugo 36
Laetus, prefect in Egypt 219

Lamb 121, 123
Landgraf, Artur 42
Laodicea, Phrygian episcopal see 377
lapsed Christians 224–6, 228, 404
lapsi 332, 334, *344f*, 403
Larissa, episcopal diocese 379
Last Judgment 61, 65
Latin, early Christian 243, *243f*, 486–9
— translation of the Bible 243, 249
Latourette, K. S. 45
Laurence, deacon 227
Law, Mosaic 61f, 70, 153, 155–7
Law, freedom from, according to Paul 101
Lazarus in Christian art 288
lector 350
legal status of Christians 136f, 162, 164, 389
Legionum urbs (Britain) 386
Lehmann, Paul 42
Leo XIII, Pope 23, 37, 43
Leo the Great, St 267
León, Spanish episcopal see 384
Leonides, Origen's father 219, 234
Leroquais, V. M. 44
Lesourd, P. 45
Letter to Aristeas 69
Letter of Barnabas 139
Letter of Clement 113, 152, 243
Letter of Clement, the so-called second 140
Letter to Diognetus 173, *179f*
Letter to Flora 186
Letter of James 85
Letter to the Philippians 106
Letters of Mani 262
letters of peace 224, 330–3
lex christiana 422
libellatici 223, 225, 332
libelli pacis 330
libellus, certificate of sacrifice 223f
Liber Pontificalis 13, 23
library in Alexandria 230
— in Caesarea 236, 241
— in Jerusalem 371
Libya 355
Licinius, Emperor 400, 403, 405f, 416f
Lietzmann, Hans 5
Lives of the Saints 14, 18, 27
Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham 53
Lingard, John 49, 56
Lippomani, Luigi 27
literature, Christian 229–54, 369, 383, 483–9
liturgy 3, 9, 26, 33, 43f, 46, 70, 215, 268–88, 449
— Jewish 66
— of the Lord's supper 141
— of the Marcionites 191
Loewenich, W. von 3
Logos 68, 86, 120f, 169, 174, 190, 239, 290
Logos-Christology 180, 234, 254f
London, episcopal see 386
Loofs, F. 43
Lord's Supper 84, 109
Lortz, Josef 38, 46
Louis the Pious 16
love of God 71, 233
love of one's neighbour 65, 232, 308f
Lubac, H. de 46
Lucian, Paulician 256
Lucian of Antioch 242f, 372, 402
Lucian of Samosata 164, *166f*
Lucianus, African confessor 224
Lucius, martyr 227
Lucius, Pope 226
Ludolf of Sagan 23
Luke's Gospel 191
Luther, Martin 8, 24, 32f, 50
Lycaonia 102
Lycia 377
Lydda 76
Lyons *160f*, 211, 292, 385
Lystra 100

Maaß, Joseph 5
Maassen, Friedrich 44
Mabillon, Jean 28, 29, 439
Maccabees, the time of the 64
Macedonia 102f
Macrianus, usurper 226
Macrina 14
Magazzi, archbishop 33
Magdeburg Centuries 6, 24
Magnesia 208
Magnus, African bishop 361
Mai, Angelo 43
Maimbourg, Louis 30
Mainz 211, 385
Maistre, J. de 34
Majorinus, African bishop 418
Malabar 374
Malchion. presbyter 242, 256
Mana, Great 157
Mandaeans *157f*, 261
Mani, sermons 261
Manichaean literature 261
Manichaeism 261–8, 490–2
Manitius, P. 42
Mansi, J. D. 27
Marana-tha 81, 109
Mark, Bishop of Jerusalem 206
Marcella, Egyptian martyr 219
Marcellina, Gnostic 185
Marcellinus, Pope 344, 401
Marcellus, Christian centurion 398
Marcian, Bishop of Arles 336, 359, 385
Marcia, wife of Commodus 163
Marcion *190–2*, 196, 209, 247, 251
Marcionites 185
Marcus Aurelius, Emperor 94, *159–63*, 178, 200, 211
Maria Theresa, Empress 33
Marianus, African cleric 227
Marinus, martyr of Palestine 390
marriage, Christian 295f, 307f, 329
— in Montanism 201, 203, 251
— mystical 237
— in Manichaeism 263
— prohibited among the Encratites 298
Martène, Edmond 28f, 44
Martialis, Spanish bishop 358

Martin, Victor 38, 46
Martin of Alpartil 23
Martin of Troppau 21
martyrdom, Christian 123, 144, 170, 254, 292, 294
— accounts 218, 225f
— readiness for 291, 294
— devotion to 292–5
— and imitation of Christ 292f
— substitutes 294
martyrs 211, 219, 400–2
— honoured 128, 292
— various kinds of death 225
— commemorated 274, 375
— number of 402
martyrion 275
Marx, Jacob 38
Mary, mother of Jesus 71, 265
Masiglio of Padua 8
Mass-form presented by Hippolytus 283
Massilia 210
mater ecclesia 366
Maternus, Bishop of Cologne 385
matrimony, sanctioned by the Church 307
Matthew (16:18) 359f, 362
Matthew Paris 22
Matthias, apostle 75, 78, 187
Mauretania 383
Maurists 28f
Mavilus African martyr 220
Maxentius, Emperor 380, 400, 407, 410
Maximian, Emperor 399f
Maximilian, Christian soldier 398
Maximilla, Montanist 199
Maximinus Daia, Emperor 376, 400, 401f, 405f, 417
Maximinus Thrax, Emperor *221f,* 245
meal in Qumran, ritual 65, 155
— in the Attis cult 92
— in the Mithras cult 93
— eucharistic 109, 281, 307
Medinet Madi (Egypt) 261
Meinecke Friedrich 47
Melanchthon, Philip 30
Melchizedech 256
Meletius, Egyptian bishop 345f
Melito of Sardes 131, *179,* 194, 270f
Memoria apostolorum 275
memorial services 116
Menander, Gnostic 187
Mensurius, Bishop of Carthage 418
Mercati, Giovanni 39
Mérida, Spanish bishopric 384
Merlin, J. 24
Merocles, Bishop of Milan 382
Meruzanes, Armenian bishop 375
Mesopotamia 208, 372
Messiah 59, 64, 68, 120, 172
Methodius of Olympus 241, 366, 391
metropolitans 354ff
Migne, J. P. 36
Milan 382
Milbiller 33
Miletus 104, 377
military service and Christians 218, 220, 251, 277, 317, 398
militia Christi 280
Milman, Henry Hart 51, 53
Milner, Joseph 48, 56
Miltiades, Pope 266, 419f, 432
Miltiades, rhetor 179
Minucius Felix 166, 244f, 285
miracles, belief in, in antiquity 96f
Mire (Miraeus), Albert le 26
Mishna 63
mission, Christian 2, 8f, *45f,* 69, 76, 97, 100–5, 111, 124, 180, 206f, 215, 218, 248, 387f, 429, 413
— centres 102f
— Jewish-Christian, among the Gentiles 98f
— Jewish 206
— Gnostic 208
— Manichean 261f, 264, 267
missionary method 100, 181, 211, 353, 375
Mithras cult 88, 93
Mithras, his cult image 93
Modalism 255–8
Modern History 52
Modestus, anti-Gnostic 194
Moesia 379
Mohlberg, Cunibert 44
Möhler, J. A. 2, 6, 35, 37, 56
Möller, W. 37
Mommsen, T. 55
Monarchianism 255–8
monarchical episcopate 148, 194, 346
monasticism 55f, 216, 298, 370
monotheism 60f, 69, 98
Montalbán, F. J. 45
Montanism 162, *199–205,* 218, 249
— victory over 204f
Montanus *199f,* 227, 324
Montfaucon, Bernard de 28
morals, Christian 173, *306f*
morality, ideal of 97, 178f, 427
Mosaic Law *see* Law
Moses 68, 170
Mosheim, Lorenz 32f, 48, 56
Mourret, F. 38
Mulders, A. 45
Muratorian Fragment 196
Muratori, L. A. 28, 44
Museion, library in Alexandria 230
Musonios 174
mystery cults *90–4,* 97, 177, 181
mystical union, ascent to 237
mysticism in Philo 68
— Christocentric 237
mythology 87, 157, 174

Naassenes 189
Nabor, martyr of Milan 382
Nag Hammadi 182
Natalis, Alexander 31
Natalis, Roman confessor 255, 330
nationalism 48
navicula Petri 365
Nazareth 70

Neale, J. 48f
Neander, A. 35, 50, 56
Neo-Caesarea 375
neo-Pythagoreanism 95
neo-Manichaeism 266
neo-Platonism 95, 390, 394, 413
Nepos, Bishop of Arsinoë 240
Neri, Philip 25
Nero, Emperor 113f, 129
Neronias, episcopal see 374
Nerva, Emperor 132
Neuss, Wilhelm 38
Newman, John Henry 36, 48, 50, 55
Nicaea, episcopal see 377; *see also* Council
Nicolas of Cusa 21
Nicomedia 209, 377, 398f
nihil innovandum 335
Nisan 269, 438–40
Nisibis 207, 373
Noah in Christian art 287
Noëtus 246, 257f
nomen Christianum 136
Nomos of the Greeks 170
Norbert of Iburg 18
Noricum 379
North Africa 210f, *382f*
Novatian 116, 227, 247f, *334–8*
— pastoral letters 248
Novatus, African presbyter 331, 336f
numismatics 454

Octavius Dialogue 244
offices in the Church 105–7, 138, 148, 346
Ohm, Thomas 45
Olivi, Petrus J. 20
ὁμοούσιος 239, 256, 260
Ophites 189
oracles 96
oracula of the Montanists 200
Oracula Sibyllina 69
Ordericus Vitalis 19
ordines minores 351
orientation when praying 303f
Origen 188, 220f, 232, 231, *234–40*, 259, *289–91*, 298–300, 314, 317, 340–2, 347f, 370
original sin 252
Orosius, Paulus 14, 56
Orsi, G. A. 31
Osiris cult 90
Osrhoëne 207, 355, 372
Ossius of Córdova 415, 419, 422
Ostia 93
Ottenthal, E. von 36
Otto of Freising 17, 36
Our Father, the 253, 299, 300f
— in the Mass 284
Oxford Movement 50
Oxyrhynchus 370

Pachymeres, Georgios 13
Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona 337
pactio fidei 280
Padua 382
paenitentia secunda 323
pagan literature and Christianity 314
Paideia (Greek culture) 169, 232
palaeography 451
Palestine 205f, 370f
Palladius 14
Pallavicino, P. S. 30
Palut, Bishop of Edessa 207
Pamphilia 377
Pamphilus, presbyter 241, 402
Pannonia 379
Pantaenus, Alexandrian preacher 208, 230
Pantheon 221
Panvinio, Onofrio 26
papacy 7ff, 16, 24ff, 29, 30, 54, 364
Papebroch, Daniel 28
Paphos (Cyprus) 378
Papias 12, 119, 140, 190
Papylos, deacon 160
papyri, Christian 119, 369, 450
Paraclete 203, 265
Paraphrase of Seth 189
parish, development of 350
parousia, expected 83, 85
pars Donati 418
Parthians 59
paschal cycle 273; *see also* Easter
Paschini, Pio 39
Passio ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis 218
Passover, Christian 269f
Passover fast 304
Pastor, Ludwig von 37, 40, 56
pastoral districts in Rome 380
patrology 452
Patmos 378
patriarchates 355
Patripassianists 255, 257
patristical studies 50
Paul 74, 97–99, 99, 103–6, 128, 129f, 156f, 191, 464f
— message of Christ 108
— his tomb 116
— epistles of 210, 249
Paul of Samosata 242, 256f
Paulicians 256
pax 334, 335
pax Augusta 89
peace, period before Constantine 222, 368, 389
Peeters, Paul 43
Pella 77, 205, 208
penance 215, 226, *318–45*, 597f
— in the Shepherd of Hermas 145, *321–4*
— according to Hippolytus 245
— possibility of, according to the N.T. 318f
— doctrine of the Apostolic Fathers 320
— unrepeatable 322
— edict of 326f
— procedure *327f*, 342f
— duty of 327
— before the congregation 328
— liturgy under Cyprian 333f
— in the East 338–44
— public canonical 341
— and clerics 341
— repeated 343f

penance and synagogue 343f
— canonical 344
— in Egypt 345f
penitential attitude 305
— fast 305
— practices 323, 327, 333
— clothes 328, 333
— discipline of Cyprian *330–4*
— — of Origen 340–2
— — of the Didascalia *342–4*
Pentapolis 355
Pentecost 75, 81, 111, 274
Pepuza 203
Peregrinos Proteus 166
perfection, Christian 233, 236, 288, 299f, 305
Pergamon 96, 377
Perge 100
Perpetua and Felicitas 218f, 382
persecutions 76, 116, 125–8, 220f, 405f, 424, 427, 468–70
persecutions of the Christians *127–36*, *160–4*, *217–28*, 373, *396–400*, 403, 405, 424, 482f, 502f
Persia 373f
persona 252, 260
Petavius, Dionysius 28
Peter 73, 78f, *112–15*, 130f, 251f, 359
— his tomb 115–18
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria 241, 345, 402
Peter and Marcellinus, martyrs 401
Petosiris, astrological writer 94
Petrie, Henry 47
Pettau, episcopal see 379
Pharisees 62f, 66, 72
Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis 402
Philip, apostle 76f, 80, 83, 98, 115
Philip, Bishop of Gortyna 194
Philip, son of Herod the Great 59
Philip the Fair 8
Philippi 103, 104, 110
Philippus Arabs, Emperor 221, 318
Philo 12, *67–70*, 460
Philosophoumena 246f
philosophy, pagan 165, 174, 177, 185, 231f, 314, 396
Phoenicia 371
Phrygia 103
Piacenza 381
Pierios of Alexandria 241
piety, Christian 125, 237, 292
— Jewish 62f, 69
— popular 303
Pilate, documents of 406
pilgrimage, places of in antiquity 96
pilgrimages 371
Pin, L. E. du 26, 40
Pionios, martyr 224f
Pistis Sophia 181
Pitra, J. B. 43
Pius I, Pope 139
Pius IV, Pope 55
Pius V, Pope 25
Pius XI, Pope 41f, 45, 53
planets 184
Platina, Bartolomeo 23
Plato 67, 175, 232, 241
Platonism 185
Pliny the Elder on the Essenes 64
Pliny the Younger 131, 133f
Plöchl, W. M. 45
pneuma in Gnosticism 188
pneumaticoi 239, 289
Pole, Cardinal 54
Polycarp of Smyrna 11, 119, 135f, 139, 142, 190, 209, 270, 274, 283, 292
Polycrates of Ephesus 115, 209, 271, 358
polytheism 306
Pompeiopolis in the Pontus 375
Pompeius Trogus 15
Pontianus, Pope 221, 245
Pontikos, Christian of Lyons 161
Pontius 14, 291
Pontus 111, 209, 225, 374
popular religions in antiquity 94–98, 168
Porphyry 234, *390–4*
Poseidonios 94
Possevino, Antonio 26
Possidius 14
Potamiaina, martyr 219
Potheinos, Bishop of Lyons 161f
Pourrat, P. 46
poverty 150, 312, 380
Praeneste, oracle 96
praescriptio 251
Praxeas 202, 257
prayer 95, 142f, 233, 281, *299–303*, 309
— in Jewish liturgy 66
— to Christ 81, 142, 300
— of petition 299f
— stages of 300f
— times of 301
— order of 301
— taught by Christ 301f
— of martyrs 302
prayer-texts, Christian 70, 300f
preaching, Christian 70, 75, 110, 193
presbyters (elders) 80, 106f, 148, 191, 282, 349
Priestley, J. A. 56
primacy, papal 2, 9, 26, 152, 358ff
primatus in Cyprian 359, 361
primitive Church 74–85
Prisca, wife of Diocletian 397
Priscilla, Montanist 199f
Proclus, Montanist 115
Proculus, Christian 217
πρόνοια in the Stoa 86
propaganda, Jewish 68
— anti-Jewish 70
— Christian 171
— Gnostic 186
— Manichaean 256
— anti-Christian 276, 406f
prophets and prophecy 60, 64, 107, 110, 150, 175, 178, 199
proselytes 69
Prosenes, Christian 220
προσευχή 300
Prosper of Aquitaine 14
Protrepticus of Clement of Alexandria 232f

Prusa, episcopal see 377
psalms in the liturgy 109
Psalter 302f
pseudo-Clement letters 155f, 296
"psychics" 187, 203
Ptolemaeos, Gnostic 186, 188
Ptolemies, kings 89, 91
Publios, Bishop of Athens 160
Pugin, August 49
Puteoli 111
Pythagoras 188

Quadratus, apologist 172
Quaestiones et responsiones 393
Quartodecimans 179, *269f*
Quasten, J. 42
Quétif, J. 29
Quintasius, Bishop of Calaris 382
Qumran *63–66*, 121, 184, 459f

Rabbi 63
rabbinical literature 114
rabbinical speculations 60
Rahner, Hugo 46
Rahner, Karl 46
Ranke 53
Rautenstrauch, abbot 33
Ravenna 381
Raynaldus, Odoricus 25
rebirth 92, 108, 289
Rechenberg, Adam 32
Recognitions, by Clement 365
reconciliation 328, 333, 339f, 341
Records Commission 47
redemption 97, 176f, 186, 234, 263
Reformation 49f, 52
refrigerium 116
Regino of Prüm 16
religion in antiquity 86–88, 184, 265, 462f
Renaissance popes 49
Renaudot, Eusebius 44
renuntiatio saeculi 291
rescripts of the emperor 133, 135, 159, 162
resurrection of the body 74, 108, 176, 178, 197
— of the Lord 74, 81
— of Osiris 91
Rev-Ardashir, Persian Christian community 373
Revelation, rejected by Celsus 168
Revocatus, African martyr 219
Rhodon, anti-Gnostic 194
Rhône valley, path of Christianity 211
rigorism, ascetical 202, 203, 250, 298, 313
Rimini 381
Ripoll, P. 29
Ritter. J. J. 37
ritual prescriptions of the Jews 68, 101, 120; *see also* liturgy, meal
Robertson 47
Rocca, Angelo 26
Rogatianus, African deacon 362
Rogger, Igino 38
Rohrbacher, R. F. 37
Rolls Series 47, 49, 51
Roma, personification 89
Roma, temples 89
Roman domination in Palestine 59f
— State religion 87, 125, 368
— citizenship 99
— religious policy 127, 424f
— imperium and Christianity 316
Rome, Christian community 104, 111, 128f, 152, 190, 201, 209f, 243, 355f, 380f
— Jewish community 66
— attraction of 152f, 210, 364f
— pre-eminent position 215, 316, *355–60*, 364
Rommerskirchen, J. 45
Rossi, Gianbattista de 43
Rosweyde, Heribert 27
Royko, Kaspar 33
Rufinus of Aquileia 13f, 237
rule of the community in Qumran 65
rule of faith 151, 197, 238
Ruotger 18
Rupert of Deutz 19

Saba, Agostino 39
Sabbath 68f
Sabellius 257f, 358
sacraments 3
sacraments of initiation 269
sacramentum militiae 280
sacrificati 223, 332
sacrifice 109, 156
sacrifices to the gods 227, 399, 403
sacrificial offering in the Mass 282
Sadducees 62
Sagaris, Bishop of Laodicea 160, 377
Sägmüller, J. B. 45
Salamis in Cyprus 100, 378
Salimbene von Parma 20
Sallustius, G. Crispus 18
salvation, history of 5f, 14f, 19, 32, 46, 59
— eternal 82, 97
— in the mystery cults 90, 92f
— and baptism 108
— economy of, 259
Samaria 59, 76, 205
Sanctus, deacon 161
Sanhedrin 60, 75, 79f, 104
Saragossa, episcopal see 384
Sarapeion 91, 230
Sarapis 91
Sardinia 382
Sarpi, Paolo 30
Sassanids 376
Satornil, Gnostic 187
Saturninus, African martyr 219
Saturus, African martyr 219
Saviour 82, 96
Scapula, proconsul 210f, 220f, 383
scepticism 244
Schaff, P. 56
schisms 147, 249, 345
Schmaus, M. 43
Schmidlin, J. 45
Schmidt, K. D. 3f
Scholasticism 8, 9, 24

school for Jews in Alexandria 67
— of catechists in Alexandria 230f
— theological 218, *230f*, 259
— — of Caesarea 231
— — of Antioch 242
schools, Christian missionary centres 211
— Christian, private 229f
— Gnostic 229
Schreiber, Georg 46
Schröckh, J. 33
Schrörs, Heinrich 40
Schubert, Hans von 5
Schulte, J. F. von 44
Schwaiger, Georg 38
Schwane, J. 43
Schwartz, Eduard 12
Sdralek, Max 40
scientific history 47, 49
Scili, African Christian community 163f, 210, 249
Scott, Walter 50
Scribes 62f
Scripture reading 236
Scripture, Holy 191, 235–8, 251f, 316
Sebaste in Armenia 376
Sebastian, martyr 401
Seckendorff, Veit Ludwig von 32
secret, discipline of 284
Secundulus, African martyr 219
Secundus, Bishop of Tigris 418
Seeberg, Reinhold 43
Seleucia-Ctesiphon 261, 373f
Seleucides, religious cult of the 89
Sem (Seth), Gnostic prophet 190
Seppelt, F. X. 38
Septimius Severus 94, 217–20, 232
septizonia, astrological 94
Septuagint 67–70, 236, 242
Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis 267
Serdica, episcopal see 379
Seripando, Girolamo 26
"Sermons of Peter" 154
serpent, religious and cosmic symbol 189
Servatius of Tongern 386
service in the community 105, 110
Seth, a Gnostic 182
Sethians, Gnostic sect 189
seven appointed helpers of the apostles 75f, 79f
Severa, wife of Philippus Arabs 222
Severus, Caesar 400
Severus Alexander, Emperor 220
Sextus Julius Africanus 11
Shammai, Jewish Scribe 63
Shapur I, King 262, 373
Shapur II, King 373
Shea, John G. 56
Shepherd of Hermas 136, 321
ship, symbol of the Church 286, 364
Sibylline Books 88, 96
Sicily 210, 382f
sick, visitation of the 278f, 312
Sickel, T. 36, 439
Sidon 207
Sigebert of Gembloux 16, 22
sign of the cross 277–9, 303
Silas 102
Silvanos, Gnostic 182
Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem 71, 135, 153, 205
Simon Magus 158
Sinope 190, 375
sins, irremissible 325f, 330, 333
Sirleto, Guglielmo 26f
Sirmium, episcopal see 379
Sirmond 27
Siscia, episcopal see 379
Sixtus II, Pope 227, 363
slave problem 310
slaves, Christian 161
sleep, healing 96
Sleidan, J. 15
Smedt, Charles de 43
Smyrna 136, 225, 377
Socrates 174
Socrates, historian 12
Sohm, R. 7
sol invictus 410, 413
Son of God 120f, 259
sons of light in Qumran 64
Sophene, province in Lesser Armenia 375
σωτήρ 82, 90
σωτηρία 90
soteriology 141
Sozomen 12
Spain 104, 211, 225, 384
Spengler, Oswald 4
Spirit, descent of 82
spiritual life 290, 299
— guide 339
— director 341f
sponsa Christi 366
sponsio salutis 280
St Marthe, brothers 29
St Sebastian's Basilica 116f
stars 94, 184
State and Church 7–9, 15, 19, 33, 317, 416, 423
— religion, Roman 88
— and Manichaeism 268
— pagan, and Christianity 316
— and Donatism 420
statio 304
Station fasting 200, 304f
Stegmüller, F. 42
Stephen, martyr 76, 79, 81–83
Stephen, Pope 337f, 348, *358–63*
Stoics 67, 86f, 94, 185
Stolberg, F. L. 34
Streit, R. 45
Stromata of Clement of Alexandria 233
Strutt, Joseph 48
Strzygowski, J. 42
Stubbs, William 51
Stutz, Ulrich 44
subdeacon 350
subjectivism, religious 214
Subordinationism 239, 242, 247, 252, 254, 259
succession, apostolic 148, 196, 203, 247, 348, *356–8*
Suetonius 18
Suffridus Petri 26

Sulpicius Severus 14, 18
Sunday 84, 284
Sunday law of Constantine 422
sun-god in the mysteries of Isis 91
— of Emesa 220, 368, 371
superstitio 422
superstition 94f, 103
supplicatio 223
Surius, Laurentius 27
Swieten, Gerhard van 33
Syllucianists 242
Sylvanus, Bishop of Gaza 402
symbolism in the cult of Adonis 92
— in the Church 367
symbols, Christian 286
Symmachus, translator of the Bible 155, 236
Symposium of Methodius of Olympus 242
synagogue 62, 66, 69, 80, 100
syncretism 90, 183, 368
synods (in general) 204, 217, 354f, 384
— of Ancyra (A.D. 314) 374
— of Antioch 256
— of Arles (A.D. 314) 271, 309, 363, 381, 385, 420
— of Carthage 210, 332f, 360–2, 383
— of Constantinople (A.D. 553) 234
— of Edessa 207
— of Elvira 274, 277f, 286, 309, 337, 351, 384f
— of Iconium 354, 361
— of Lambaesis 383
— of Rome 336, 381
— of Synnada 377
Syntagma, anti-Gnostic work 195, 246
syntage at baptism 290
Syracuse 382
Syria 60, 207f
"syzygies", Gnostic 188

Tacitus 115, 129, 165
Talmud 63
Tangl, Michael 36
Tarsus 99, 374f
Tatian 160, *177–9*, 209, 298
Teacher of Righteousness 64
τελείωσις 294
Temple 59, 64, 68, 72
τηρεῖν τὸ βάπτισμα 291
Teresa of Avila 46
Tertullian 115, 131f, 195, *202–4*, 210, 217–19, 243, *248–52*, 257, 272, 280, 283f, 286, 315, 325f
Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs 65
θεάνθρωπος 239
Theban legion 401
Thebes, episcopal see 379
Thebutis, Judaist 153
Theiner, Augustin 36
theocracy, Jewish 69
Theoctistus, Bishop of Caesarea 235, 371
Theodore, Bishop of Aquileia 382
Theodoret of Cyrus 12, 24
Theodorus Lector 13
Theodosius II, Emperor 266, 391
Theodotion, translator of the Bible 236
Theodotus of Byzantium 209, 229, 255, 358
Theodotus the Younger 255
Theognostos, Alexandrian teacher 241
theology, Christian 216, 238f
Theonas, Bishop of Alexandria 267
Theophanes Confessor 13
Theophilos, apologist 178f, 194
Theophilus, Bishop of Gothia 378
θεωρία 299
Theotecnus, opponent of Christianity 405
Thietmar of Merseburg 17
Thomas Becket 19
Thomassin, Ludwig 44
θεοτόκος 239
Thessalonica 103, 110, 379
Thomas Christians 374
Thraseas, Bishop of Eumenia 160
thurificati 223
Thyatira 377
Tiberius, Emperor 94
Tillemont, L. S. Lenain de 31
Timothy, disciple 102
Tipasius, Christian soldier 398
titular churches of Rome 287, 350, 380
Titus, Bishop of Bostra 267
Tixeront, L. J. 43
Todesco, L. 39
toleration, religious 86, 220–2, 228, 389, 396
— edict of 403, 417
Tomasetti, A. 36
Tomek, E. 5
Tongern 386
Tora 62, 70
tortures of the Christians 133, 219, 223f, 402
Trachonitis 59
Tractarianism 50
tradition and the Law 63
— apostolic 151, 196f, 238, 335, 356
— in Gnosticism 186
traditions of the Elders 140
traditores 345, 399, 418f
Trajan's law against the Christians 134
Tralles, Christian community 208
Transjordan 208
Traube, L. 42
Trdat II, Armenian king 376
Trebonius Gallus, Emperor 226
trias in Theophilus 179, 254
Trier 211, 383
Trimithus, bishopric on Cyprus
trinitas 252
Trinity 174, 178f, 239, 240, 247, 252, 254–60, 489f
Trishagion 283f
Trithemius, J. 26
Troas 103
Troeltsch, Ernst 47
tropaion of Gaius *115–18*, 275
Tüchle, Hermann 38
Turfân, texts of 261f
Two Ways, Jewish work 139
typology 242
Tyre 207, 235, 371
Ubertino of Casale 20

Ullathorne, William Bernard 54f
Ulpian, jurist 220
unity of the Church 109, 150, 253, 360, 366
— of the Christian congregation 146
— of worship 151
— of God 255–8

Valentinian I, Emperor 266
Valentinians 185f, 195
Valentinus, Gnostic 188, 209
Valeria, daughter of Diocletian 397
Valerian, Emperor 226f
Valla, Lorenzo 23
Vandals 266
Vatican Council, the First 55
Vatican excavations 115
Veit, L. A. 46
vera religio 421
Vergil, Publius Vergilius Maro 89
Verona, episcopal see 382
Vettius Epagathos 161
Via Appia 116f, 118, 287
Via Ardeatina 132
vicennalia, celebrated by Diocletian 400
Victor, martyr of Milan 382
Victor, Pope 209, 255, 257, 271, 358
Vienne 160, 211
Vigellius Saturninus, proconsul 163f
Vincent of Beauvais 21
Vincent of Lerins 1
Vincentius, Spanish martyr 401
virginity, Christian 178, 242, 248, 253, 295f, 393
vine and branches, symbol of the Church 122, 367
Vita Constantini 408
Vitae of the saints (editions) 448f; *see also* biography
vows 298
vulnus amoris 237

Waal, Anton de 39
Wadding, Luke 29
Walch, C. W. F. 32
Warneck, Gustav 45
washings, ritual 65, 93, 155f
Webb, W. 48
Werminghoff, Albert 45
Wessenberg, I. H. von 34
widows in the community 309, 311f
Wigand, Johannes 24
Wilkins, D. 27
William of St Thierry 237
Wilpert, J. 42
Wilson 49
worship, Christian 106, 109f, *281–5*, 415
worship, Christian place of 285f, 377, 398
Wycliffe, John 8

Xanten 386
Xantopulos 13
York, episcopal see in Britain 386

Zealots, Jewish group 63
Zeiger, Ivo 45
Zephyrinus, Pope 115, 201, 244, 258, 287, 330
Zeus, cult image of 91
Zoroastrianism 262f
Zosimus 408
Zwingli, Huldrych 8

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

II

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume II

THE IMPERIAL CHURCH FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

by

KARL BAUS

HANS-GEORG BECK

EUGEN EWIG

HERMANN JOSEF VOGT

Translated by

Anselm Biggs

A Crossroad Book

THE SEABURY PRESS · NEW YORK

1980
The Seabury Press
815 Second Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. II: *Die Reichskirche nach Konstantin dem Grossen*
II/1: *Die Kirche von Nikaia bis Chalkedon*
© Verlag Herder/KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1973
II/2: *Die Kirche in Ost und West von Chalkedon bis zum Frühmittelalter (551–700)* © Verlag Herder KG
Freiburg im Breisgau 1975

English translation © 1980 by The Seabury Press, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the written permission of The Seabury Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:
The imperial church from Constantine to the early
Middle Ages.
(History of the church; v. 2)
Translation of Die Reichskirche nach Konstantin
dem Grossen.
"A Crossroad book."
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Church history—Primitive and early church,
ca. 30-600. I. Baus, Karl. II. Series: Jedin,
Hubert, 1900- ed. Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte
English; v. 2.
BR145.2.J413 1980, vol. 2 [BR200] 270s [270.2]
ISBN 0-8164-0444-5 80-12615

CONTENTS

Preface xi
Preface to the English Edition xiii
List of Abbreviations xv

PART ONE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE IMPERIAL RELIGIOUS POLICY

(Karl Baus)

Chapter 1: From Christianity's Position of Equality to One of Privilege by the Favor of the Emperor Constantine II 3
Position of Church and Emperor in 324 3
The Growing Privileged Position of the Christian Religion 4
Constantine's Baptism and Death 14

Chapter 2: Origin and Course of the Arian Controversy to the Death of Constantine (337) 16
The Origin 16
The Council of Nicaea and its Outcome 22
The Development to the Death of Constantine (337) 29

Chapter 3: The Struggle over the Council of Nicaea under the Sons of Constantine 32
The Synod of Serdica and its Sequel 37
The Religious Policy of Constantius II as Sole Emperor (350–361) 41
The Double Synod of Seleucia–Rimini (359) 47

Chapter 4: The Attempted Restoration of Paganism by the Emperor Julian (361–363) 50

Chapter 5: Collapse of Arianism and Definitive Recovery of the Nicene Theology at the Council of Constantinople (381) 59
The Religious Policy of the Emperor Valens 61
The Work of the Young Nicenes 64
The Council of Constantinople (381) 67
The Creed of Constantinople (381) 71
The Synod of Constantinople as an "Ecumenical" Council 76

Chapter 6: Development of the Relationship of Church and State in the Fourth Century: The "Church of the Empire" 78
Church and State under Constantine I 78
Efforts to Subordinate the Church to the State by the Emperors Constantius and Valens 81
Ambrose and Theodosius 86
The "Church of the Empire" 89

PART TWO: THE THEOLOGICAL DISPUTES IN EAST AND WEST TO THE MIDDLE OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

(Karl Baus)

Chapter 7: Christology to the Council of Ephesus (431) 93
  The Christological Question in the Fourth Century 93
  The Search of Apollinaris of Laodicea for a Solution 94
  The Further Development of Christology to 428 96
  The Conflict between Cyril and Nestorius 100
  Ephesus 103

Chapter 8: From Ephesus to Chalcedon 108
  Reconciliation between Antioch and Alexandria 108
  Rise of Monophysitism 111
  The Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) 114

Chapter 9: The Origenist Controversy at the Turn of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries 121

Chapter 10: The Priscillianist Movement 129

Chapter 11: The Struggle with Donatism 136
  Donatism under the Constantinian Dynasty 136
  The Golden Age of Donatism under Bishop Parmenian 142
  Augustine and Donatism 148
  The Religious Discussion of Carthage (411) and its Sequel 156

Chapter 12: Pelagius and the Aftermath 161
  The Ideal of Morality of the Pelagian Circle 161
  The Discussion of Pelagianism within the Church 165
  Julian of Aeclanum 171
  Theological Augustinianism to the Mid-Fifth Century 174

PART THREE: INNER LIFE OF THE CHURCH BETWEEN NICAEA AND CHALCEDON

(Karl Baus; Chapter 13, section 3 by Eugen Ewig)

Chapter 13: Missionary Activity of the Church 181
  1. Christianization of the Population of the Empire 181
  2. Questions of Missionary Method 213
    The Representatives of the Missionary Idea and Missionary Work . . 213
    State and Mission 217
    Christian Mission and Judaism 221
  3. The First Contacts of Christianity with the Germans and the Conversion of the Goths 225

Chapter 14: The Building of the Organization of the Church of the Empire . 230
  The Local Episcopal Church 230
  The Metropolitan Union 223
  Superior Organization of the Greater Churches 236
  Ecclesiastical Assemblies 241

Chapter 15: The Further Development of the Roman Primacy from Melchiades to Leo I 245
  Popes Damasus I and Siricius 250
  Pope Innocent I 256
  Pope Leo the Great 264

Chapter 16: The Clergy of the Church of the Empire 269
The Various Orders 270
Preliminaries for Admission to the Clerical State 273
Clerical Marriage and the Beginnings of Celibacy 277
Choice and Ordination of the Clergy 281
Privileges of the Clerical State 284
The Collegiality of the Bishops 287

Chapter 17: The Liturgy 289
Differentiation of Liturgies in East and West 290
New Features in the Sacramental Liturgy 293
The Liturgical Year 302

Chapter 18: Preaching and Piety 307
Catechesis and Preaching 307
Christocentric Piety 319
Forms of Asceticism 322
Cult of Martyrs and Saints 323
Early Christian Pilgrimage 328
Survival of Pagan Customs in Christian Popular Piety 331
The Laity in the Church 334

Chapter 19: Early Christian Monasticism: Development and Expansion in the East 337
I. The Religious and Historical Background 337
II. Development and Expansion in the East 343
1. Egyptian Anchoritism. The Pachomians. The Monasticism of the Deserts of Nitria and Scete 343
The Egyptian Anchoritism 343
Cenobitism of the Pachomians 345
The Monasticism of the Deserts of Nitria and Scete 354
2. Monasticism in Palestine and Syria 357
Latin Monasteries in Palestine 360
Syrian Monasticism 362
3. The Monasticism of Asia Minor and Constantinople 367
4. Messalianism 371

Chapter 20: The Monasticism of the Latin West 374
Rome and Italy 375
Gaul 379
Spain 385
North Africa 386
Augustine's Monastic Role 387
Anti-Monastic Currents 390

Chapter 21: Church and Society 393
Marriage and Family 394
The Social Sphere 401
Magnates and Dependents 403
Rich and Poor 406
The Cultural Sphere 411

PART FOUR: THE EARLY BYZANTINE CHURCH
(Hans-Georg Beck)

Chapter 22: The Henoticon and the Acacian Schism 421

Chapter 23: The Elaboration of the Church of the Byzantine Empire in the Age of the Emperor Justinian I 433

Chapter 24: Justinian's Zigzag Course: The Origenist Troubles 443

Chapter 25: The Controversy over the Three Chapters and the Fifth General Council. End of the Age of Justinian 450

Chapter 26: Justinian's Successors: Monoenergism and Monothelitism 457

Chapter 27: The Rise of National Churches on the Frontiers of the Byzantine Empire 463
  The Church of the Nestorians 463
  The Coptic Church 469
  The Jacobite Church 475
  The Church of the Armenians 479

Chapter 28: Early Byzantine Monasticism 483

Chapter 29: Theological and Religious Literature 488

Chapter 30: Organization and Inner Life of the Eastern Imperial Church . . . 495

Chapter 31: Missionary Activity of the Early Byzantine Imperial Church . . . 504

Chapter 32: The Assault of Islam 509

PART FIVE: THE LATIN CHURCH IN THE TRANSITION TO THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

(Chapters 33 to 37 by Eugen Ewig; Chapters 38, 39, 42 by Karl Baus; Chapters 40, 41, 43, 44 by Hermann Josef Vogt)

SECTION ONE: THE MISSIONARY WORK OF THE LATIN CHURCH 517

Chapter 33: The Origins of Christianity in Ireland and Scotland 517

Chapter 34: The Conversion of the Franks and Burgundians. Origin and Organization of the Merovingian National Church 524

Chapter 35: The East Germans and Catholicism: The Conversion of the Sueves and Visigoths of Spain to Catholicism and the Second Flowering of Christian Antiquity in the Spanish Visigothic National Church 558

Chapter 36: The Lombards and Italy 574

Chapter 37: The Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons and the Beginnings of the Anglo-Saxon Church 585

SECTION TWO: INNER LIFE OF THE CHURCH TO THE END OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY 602

Chapter 38: North African Christianity from the Beginning of Vandal Rule to the Muslim Invasion 602
  The North African Church under Vandal Rule 602
  Christianity in Byzantine North Africa 609
  The Muslim Invasion and the Ruin of North African Christianity 612

Chapter 39: The Papacy between Byzantium and the German Kingdoms from Hilary (461–468) to Serguis I (687–701) 614

Pope Gelasius I (492–496) 616
Pope Hormisdas (514–523) 622
Pope Gregory the Great (590–604) 629
Popes of the Seventh Century 633

Chapter 40: The Ecclesiastical Organization and the Clergy 636
Papal Vicariates 636
Spain 636
Arles 637
Thessalonica 641
Parish Organization 644
Clergy 651
Formation 651
Morality 652
Celibacy 653
Archpriest 656

Chapter 41: Liturgy, Care of Souls, Piety 658
Liturgy 658
Care of Souls 673
Preaching 673
Baptism 676
Penance 677
Anointing and Imposition of Hands 682
Piety 683

Chapter 42: Latin Monasticism from the Mid-Fifth Century to the End of the Seventh Century 690
Italy 693
Monasticism in the Merovingian Kingdom 699
Spanish Monasticism 702
The Monasticism of Africa 705

Chapter 43: Theological Discussions 707
The Church's Confrontation with the Arianism of the Vandals and the Goths 707
The Semipelagian Quarrel 722
The Quarrel over the Three Chapters 728
Consequences of the Quarrel over the Three Chapters 733

Chapter 44: The Epilogue of Early Christian Latin Literature 736
Boethius 736
Cassiodorus 739
Gregory the Great 744
Isidore 750

List of Popes, Councils, and Rulers 757

General Bibliography 763

Bibliographies for Individual Chapters 775

Index 822

PREFACE

The work begun on the German original of this volume in the summer of 1963 was unfortunately interrupted for rather long periods by two serious illnesses of the author, and even after his recuperation the weakened state of his health forced on him still longer periods of rest from all exertion. Completion of the work was also delayed by the gradual transition from the character of a mere handbook to a broader presentation of the entire work as something closely dependent on the sources. Special reference should be made to the two themes of this volume, to which a relatively great space has been devoted. Thus far the Church's missionary work has been treated only sketchily or at least inadequately in this series, but in the period here under consideration individual events are collected or organized in full conformity with the results of archeological research, which of necessity succeeds in achieving at least a summary characterization and evaluation of the missionary endeavors of the Church of the Empire. The chapters on the development of early Christian monasticism had to try to make immediately clear the results of an intensive research in the preceding years on this relevant and important phenomenon of the Early Church. A later shortening of the finished chapters would have meant the abandoning of quotations from numerous references to sources that had just become known for the first time and of references to literature that had often been collected only with the greatest difficulty. As in Volume I, many a selection from the literary testimonies was felt to be unsatisfactory. The author did not quote about one-third of the secondary literature that he had worked through and decided in doubtful cases to use monographs and articles that, in addition to their factual content, offered an especially complete bibliography for their subject.

No one knows the limitations and deficiencies of a handbook better than its author. In part, these are due to the objective lacunae in the state of the research, to the extent that certain questions can be treated either not at all or only inadequately. They are further dependent on various problems connected with the interpretation of the sources in individual question, in which as yet no single interpretation can be achieved within the scope of the research. In accord with the nature of a handbook, only brief references could be made to such lacunae or to the status of controverted questions respectively. Finally, a handbook must also make a selection among the themes that present themselves: it will aim not to slight any really relevant question, but to a great extent remains dependent on the personal viewpoint and valuation of the historical reactions of the author and hence subjective. And so, despite his satisfaction over the completion of his work, he still feels as Augustine did earlier in regard to his preaching: *mihi prope semper sermo meus displicet* (*De catech, rud.* 2, 2).

The author understands his immense debt to the publishing company for its consideration and especially to his friend, Hubert Jedin, for his ceaseless and sympathetic encouragement to keep on with the work. Grateful mention is due also to his pupil, University Assistant Doctor Reinhard Hübner of Bonn, who again and again took pains to photocopy otherwise inaccessible periodical articles.

I also thank my colleagues of this volume, University Professors Hans-Georg Beck and Eugen Ewig, who, out of regard for me, delayed the publication of their long-finished contributions.

Finally, the fact that Volume II has been able to appear in print at all, and a lacuna in the entire work has at last been closed, is due especially to my pupil, Professor Hermann Josef Vogt of Tübingen, who was prepared to postpone his own work in order to write the still needed four chapters in which he quickly and surely organized the sources and literature.

Karl Baus

PREFACE TO ENGLISH EDITION

The long delay in the publication of the second volume of the *History of the Church* (formerly known as the *Handbook of Church History*) after the appearance of subsequent volumes has not been without merit. In the interim the publishers of the English edition have decided to resume the entire series which was discontinued after the publication of the German Volume V in 1970. This decision coincided with the completion of the project with the final volume covering the period from World War I to the present.

Unlike the German original, which appeared in two sections, the present edition combines the two in one volume, without abridgment. The first section (Parts One to Three) deals with the religious and political adjustments that followed the conversion of Constantine, the theological controversies and the inner life of the Church from Nicaea to Chalcedon. In the second section (Parts Four and Five) Hans Beck begins with the Henoticon and reaches through the age of Justinian to the Monotholite heresy. Special attention is given to the organization, theology, and spirituality of the Byzantine Church. What particularly enhances this volume is the treatment of the conversion of the Germanic and Celtic peoples and the resulting Germanizing of the organizational forms of Christianity and the beginning of the interplay between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium.* As in previous volumes the authors combine narration based upon actual sources with bibliography that includes both sources and literature.

Some may criticize the apparent inadvertance of Professor Baus to the findings of Fr. Dvornik on the Roman Synod of 382 and the relevance of Jerome's Vulgate for the claims of the papacy as explained by Ullmann. Yet it must be recalled that the purpose of this series is to stimulate further investigation rather than present apodictic claims. Its authors subscribe to the Augustinian description of the Christian experience as *memoria, distentio,* and *expectatio* and with Lord Acton, envision the history of the Church as a continuous development and not a burden on the memory, but an illumination of the soul.

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The Abbreviations from Volume I, pages xiii–xxii, are not repeated here.

AHC	*Annuarium historiae conciliorum,* Amsterdam 1969ff.
AHP	*Archivum historiae Pontificiae,* Rome 1969ff.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein,* insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Koln, Cologne 1855ff.
AkathKR	*Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht,* Mainz 1857ff.
Altaner-Stuiber	B. Altaner–A. Stuiber, *Patrologie,* Freiburg, 7th ed. 1966.
AM	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts.* Athenische Abteilung, Stuttgart 1876ff.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949ff.
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1878 to 1934 (from 1935: *ADRomana*).
AUF	*Archiv für Urkundenforschung,* Berlin 1908ff.
BALAC	*Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes,* Paris 1911ff.
BECH	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* Paris 1839ff.
BiblAug	*Bibliothèque Augustinienne,* Paris 1949ff.
BNJ	*Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher,* Athens–Berlin 1920ff.
BRAH	*Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia,* Madrid.
BullInstFrArchOr	*Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale,* Paris 1901ff.
CahArch	*Cahiers archéologiques,* Paris 1950ff.
CD	*La Ciudad de Dios,* El Escorial 1873ff.
COD	*Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta,* ed. Centro di documentazione di Bologna, Freiburg–Rome–Vienna 1962.
Cod. Just.	*Codex Justinianus,* rec. P. Krueger, Berlin 1906.
Cod. Theod.	*Codex Theodosianus,* ed. Th. Mommsen–P. Meyer, Berlin 1905.
Coll. Avell.	*Epistolae imperatorum pontificum aliorum,* ed. O. Guenther, *CSEL* 35, Vienna 1895–98.
Coll. Cist.	*Collectanea Cistercientia,* Forges (Belgium).
CollMechl	*Collectanea Mechliniensia,* Mecheln 1923ff.
Corsi di Ravenna	*Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina,* Ravenna 1954ff.
CRAIBL	*Contes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,* Paris 1857ff.
CRAIC	*Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,* Paris 1857ff.
DR	*Downside Review,* Downside Abbey, Bath (England).
DS	H. Denzinger–A. Schonmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (Barcelona–Freiburg i Br.–Rome–New York 33rd ed. 1965).
DSp	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* ed. M. Viller, Paris 1932ff.

EvTH	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich 1956ff.
FStud	*Franziskanische Studien,* Werl 1914ff.
GGA	*Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen,* Berlin 1738ff.
HS	*Hispania Sacra,* Madrid 1948ff.
IP	*Regesta Pontificum Romanorum,* congessit P. F. Kehr. *Italia Pontificia,* I–VIII Berlin 1906–35.
IRM	*International Review of Mission,* London 1911ff.
JR	*The Journal of Religion,* Chicago 1921ff.
JRS	*The Journal of Roman Studies,* London 1919ff.
LP	*Liber Pontificalis,* ed. L. Duchesne–C. Vogel, 3 vols., Paris 3rd ed. 1955–57.
MA	*Le Moyen-âge. Revue d'histoire et de philologie,* Paris 1888ff.
MG	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica inde ab a. C. 500 usque ad a. 1500; Indices* v. O. Holder-Egger and K. Zeumer, Hannover–Berlin 1826ff. *Abteilungen: MGCAP = Capitularia; MGEp = Epistolae; MGLL = Leges; MGSS rer. Lang. = Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum; MGSS rer. Mer. = Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum.*
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* (Innsbruck) Graz–Cologne 1880ff.
MiscHistEccl	*Miscellanea historiae ecclesiasticae,* Louvain 1970ff.
MRW	*Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* Münster 1938–1941; 1947–49.
NThT	*Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift,* The Hague 1945ff.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Schöneck, Schweiz 1944ff.
OAKR	*Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht,* Vienna 1949ff.
PEFQSt	*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements,* London 1868ff.
PJ	*Palästina-Jahrbuch,* Berlin 1905ff.
PTS	*Patristische Texte und Studien,* Berlin 1964ff.
RBK	*Reallexikon der byzantinischen Kunst,* ed. K. Wessel, Stuttgart 1963ff.
RDC	*Revue du droit canonique,* Strasbourg 1950ff.
RechAug	*Recherches Augustiniennes,* Paris 1958ff.
RHistSudEur	*Revue d'histoire du Sudest-Européen,* Bucharest 1913ff.
RHSp	*Revue d'histoire de la Spiritualité,* Paris 1972ff. (continuation of *RAM* with retention of volume and year).
RhVjBl	*Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter,* Bonn 1931ff.
RMA	*Revue du Moyen-Âge latin,* Strasbourg 1945ff.
RMab	*Revue Mabillon,* Ligugé 1921ff.
RömHM	*Römische Historische Mitteilungen,* Graz–Cologne 1858ff.
RPh	*Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes,* Paris 1926ff.
RQH	*Revue des questions historiques,* Paris 1866ff.
RSDI	*Rivista di storia del diritto italiano,* Milan 1927ff.
RThom	*Revue Thomiste,* Paris 1893ff.
SChr	*Sources Chrétiennes,* Paris 1940ff.
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden,* Munich 1880ff., Neue Folge 1911ff.
SMSR	*Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni,* Rome 1929ff.
SSL	*Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense,* Louvain 1922ff. (bisher 28 Bde).
Stpatr	*Studia patristica.* Papers presented to the (First . . .) International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, Berlin, *TU,* 1957ff.

StChH	*Studies in Church History,* Cambridge 1964ff.
StudMon	*Studia Monastica,* Montserrat 1959ff.
ThPh	*Theologie und Philosophie,* Freiburg 1966ff. (continuation of *Scholastik*).
ThStK	*Theologische Studien and Kritiken,* Gotha 1828ff.
Tpatrlit	*Textus patristici et liturgici,* Regensburg 1964ff.
TQ	*ThQ.*
VetChrist	*Vetera Christianorum,* Bari 1964ff.
WSt	*Wiener Studien, Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie,* Vienna.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928ff.
ZdAdL	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur,* Wiesbaden 1869ff.
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851ff.
ZS	*Zeitschrift für Semitistik,* Leipzig 1922ff.
ZSKA	*ZSavRGkan.*
ZWTh	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (Jena, Halle, Leipzig), Frankfurt a. M. 1858–1913.

PART ONE

The Development of the Church of the Empire within the Framework of the Imperial Religious Policy

CHAPTER 1

From Christianity's Position of Equality to One of Privilege by the Favor of the Emperor Constantine I

Position of Church and Emperor in 324

Although, at the beginning of Constantine's sole rule, the adherents of the Christian religion in the Roman Empire constituted only a considerable minority,[1] they were without any doubt infected by an unbounded optimism in regard to the future. To the Church historian Eusebius and his readers, Constantine was the servant and friend of God, who had had him "shine out of the deepest gloom and the darkest night as a great light and as a deliverer for all." "Now every fear that had once oppressed men was taken from them. Festive days were celebrated with splendor and pomp; everything was full of light. In the cities as well as in the country, in dancing and singing they gave honor first to God, the King of Kings, as they were instructed, and then to the pious Emperor and his sons, beloved by God."[2] Such a view and valuation of the future must have seemed well-founded to the contemporary Christians. For more than a decade the Emperor Constantine had assured to the Christian religion freedom to profess and proclaim its faith and, after giving it an initial equality with paganism, had shown it an ever more undeniable benevolence. Then, when he gave to his attack on Licinius the appearance of a war for the freedom of religion on behalf of the persecuted Christians of the eastern provinces, no one need further doubt the Emperor's personal conviction of the truth of Christianity. This was immediately confirmed by the first measures of a religious and political nature which Constantine took right after his victory and to which the penultimate sentence of Eusebius's Church history clearly refers.[3] Shortly before there had slipped from him a remark that indicates that the Bishop of Caesarea was pondering in his heart more far-reaching possibilities, which were no doubt also anticipated by many of his colleagues. He stated that, by his victory over Licinius, Constantine had again created a single and centralized Roman Empire, in which all the territories of the earth from the east to the farthest west, together with the north and the south, were subjected to one peaceable scepter. Would this politically united Roman Empire not also profess the one same faith, be united in the exclusive acknowledgment of the God of the Christians? This hour of triumph was not likely to give rise in Eusebius or in his fellow-bishops of East or West any doubt that such a collaboration of Church and State could have for the former any hazardous consequences.

---

[1] Cf. L. v. Hertling, *ZKTh* 62 (1934), 243–253.

[2] Eusebius, *HE* 10, 8–9.

[3] Ibid. 10, 9: "In every place were posted decrees of the victorious Emperor, full of kindness, and laws which testified to his liberality and genuine fear of God." Hence it is not true that Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* knew nothing about the decrees, of which the *Vita Constantini* gives the test.

It is clear that the sole rule he had gained, which freed him from any concern with a coruler, merely strengthened Constantine's sense of mission: he could, in accord with ancient ideas, in looking back to his way thus far, see himself confirmed at the end of 324 as the Chosen One of God. He did not consider it to be "idle boasting" when, in the first decree after the overthrow of Licinius, he acknowledged to the eastern provinces: "God wanted my service and regarded as appropriate the carrying out of his resolve."[4] Without doubt, for him this God was the God of the Christians, and hence his future attitude in regard to the Christian community could only be more and more cordial—he had to feel that he belonged to it in a unique way. But in the course of his consciousness of mission it was quite obvious that, if the Emperor felt a unique place was suitable for himself in or in regard to the Christian Church, this made it impossible for any other event or any other development of importance in the Christian world to be of no concern to him. If he himself stated that he was prepared, after the years of the persecution "to rebuild the most holy house [of God],"[5] then of course the ecclesiastical leadership could hardly bear to deal with important questions of conduct without, not to mention against, the Emperor. Much depended on how far Constantine felt the innermost being of the Church was something so independent that here limits blocked the power of the State. The ineffectiveness of his exertions in the early phase of the Donatist troubles could have been a first lesson for him.

The Growing Privileged Position of the Christian Religion

Immediately after he had achieved sole rule, Constantine's religious policy entered externally upon a path which now led, circumspectly but nevertheless resolutely, from Christianity's equality with the existing religions, guaranteed as early as 312, to its clear and public preeminence. This became tangible in a whole series of laws and measures which were issued from time to time during the scarcely thirteen remaining years of his reign. They began with the decree to the inhabitants of the eastern provinces: their principal item can be summarized as regulations on the restitution to be made to the Christians for the injustices of which they had been the victims. The individual points—removal of all degrading and damaging judicial sentences, such as privation of earlier rank in the public service and reduction to the state of slavery, the restoration to individual Christians or their heirs of property that had been confiscated or sold, the restoration of Christian communities to their former property rights, even if such property was now in the possession of the *fiscus* (imperial treasury) or, through purchase or gift, had come into other hands[6]—made clear that the Emperor's sympathy now belonged to the adherents of the Christian religion. The equality of all citizens before the law was abolished in practice when a later decree forbade to the high officials, provincial governors, and their immediate subordinates, if these still belonged to the old religion, the *external* profession of their faith by means of sacrifice, whereas Christian officials of the same rank could, as Eusebius stresses, "glory in the name of Christian."[7]

---

[4] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 2, 28; see J. Straub, *Das neue Bild der Antike* 2 (1942), 374–394.

[5] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 2, 55.

Constantine's legislation remained thereafter open to Christian influence, although the existing social order, which was basically untouched by Constantine, and the esteem for the prevailing Roman law limited this influence.[8] It becomes clearest in the fields of marriage and family life, as, for example, in the decrees which made divorce more difficult and forbade a husband to maintain a concubine, or those which decided that slave families were not to be broken up in a division of an inheritance.[9] The Christian respect for human life is seen also in the prohibition of gladiatorial games, while the abolition of crucifixion as a death penalty also showed regard for the honor due to Christianity in public.[10] Certain laws from the period before 324 which displayed a tone friendly to Christianity were again enacted, for example, the constitution which gave to a convert from Judaism clear legal protection against possible annoyance or persecution on the part of his former coreligionists. The fact that a state was bound to such protection—because the convert had, by his change of faith, dedicated himself "to the holy worship and opened for himself the door to eternal life"—clearly expresses the relationship felt by Constantine of the supreme legislator toward the respect due to the Christian faith even in the public sphere.[11] The same attitude appears in the comment appended to the ratification of judicial decisions of the bishops in civil suits: the "authority of the holy religion," which constitutes the basis of the judgment given by the Catholic bishop, guarantees its fairness and assures it against any appeal.[12] Finally, a general law gives to all the privileges assured in the decrees on religion their intrinsic value, of the utmost importance for the future: they were now for the benefit only of adherents of the Catholic faith, not of heretics and schismatics.[13] A decree that left untouched the houses and cemeteries of the Novatians which had long been in their possession[14] was not inconsistent with this: it proceeded from the principle that heretical or schismatic communities were ordinarily not to remain in possession of property that they had taken from the Catholic Church. This expression of a more positive valuation of the Novatians may have been based on the fact that they recognized the decision of Nicaea; but it may have lain in the hope of the Emperor's ecclesiastical entourage that an easier reconciliation with them was to be anticipated. Hence the decree on the Novatians was an exception in the field of law and, to this extent, a confirmation of the general edict against heretics[15] which Constantine had published soon after his victory over Licinius. In it "Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulicians, and Cataphrygians" were sharply attacked and subjected to harsh decrees; any gathering, even in private houses, was forbidden to them, their churches were confiscated and turned over to the Catholic Church, and their other property was awarded to the *fiscus.* Only one sentence contains the invitation to join the Catholic Church. Eusebius speaks also of a law which permitted the confiscation of heretical writings; according to him, the edict had the desired effect in its entirety, since "nowhere on earth did there remain an association of heretics and schismatics."[16] In contradiction of this statement of Eusebius, both in substance and in tone, it should be noted that Constantine threatened no sanctions against individual members of an heretical community who persisted in their religious conviction, even if the Emperor's language is harsh in regard to heretics, because in his eyes they were already rebel Christians. He thought he had to proceed against heresy as such, because it upset the peace and harmony of Christianity and thereby not only caused great dangers for the calm and order of the Empire, but also impeded Christians on the road to salvation.[17]

---

[6] Ibid. 2, 30–41.

[7] Ibid. 2, 44.

[8] Cf. H. Dörries, *Selbstzeugnis,* 274.

[9] *Cod. Theod.* 9, 7, 2; 3, 16, 1; *Cod. Just.* 5, 26, 1; *Cod. Theod.* 2, 25, 1.

[10] *Cod. Theod.* 15, 2, 1; Sozomen, *HE* 1, 8, 13.

[11] *Constit. Sirm.* IV; see H. Dörries, op. cit., 203.

---

[12] *Constit. Sirm.* I; H. Dörries, op. cit., 197–199.

[13] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 1.

[14] Ibid. 16, 5.

[15] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 64–65; on the decree against heretics as a whole and on the question of its genuineness, see H. Dörries, op. cit., 82–84.

[16] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 66.

The Emperor displayed a greater toleration toward the adherents of paganism, especially since in this case there was a question of prominent persons in public life, such as, for example, the Neoplatonist philosophers Hermogenes, Nikagoras, and Sopatros[18] or members of old and well-established families in the Roman Senate. But from 324 on, he made no effort to conceal his ever growing contempt for the pagan religion. As early as the autumn of 324 a letter to the inhabitants of Palestine let it be known that the Emperor regarded his victory as also a defeat of paganism;[19] and even if the second edict to the eastern provinces of the Empire[20] stresses toleration in regard to the adherents of the old faith as governmental policy and even justifies it as "Christian," nevertheless the overall tenor of the document must have made thoughtful pagans aware that the Emperor's clearly expressed sympathies for Christianity—whose adherents are contrasted as "believers" to "the erring"—implied no happy future for the pagan religion. Words were followed by deeds, which could also be interpreted by the pagans in no other way than as a repression of their religion in the public sphere. Here belongs the appointment of a bureaucracy consisting of a majority of Christians, when high administrative posts, left vacant by the change of ruler in the east, had to be again filled, although on the basis of the status of the religious confessions at least an equality in the distribution of positions could have been expected; furthermore, the public offering of sacrifice by the pagan minority among the officials was forbidden.[21] Also the manner in which Constantine in 325 celebrated his *vicennalia*—the twentieth anniversary of his accession—in the East must have made the pagans anxious. The celebration took place in the midst of the bishops who had assembled for the Council of Nicaea and the customary panegyric was composed and delivered, not by a pagan *rhetor,* but by a Catholic bishop.[22] Thus the Catholic episcopate gradually stepped into the place which the pagan upper class had hitherto occupied. The most intimate entourage of the Emperor at court reflected this new picture, an unmistakable sign of a changing world.

A special significance belongs, furthermore, to Constantine's measures which envisaged a steady suppression of pagan worship. In 324 he expressed the wish that pagans too might enter "into the brilliant house of [Christian] truth," but he clearly contrasted with it "the temples of delusion," which would be left to the pagans if they so desired.[23] Soon, however, laws appeared whereby individual temples lost their revenues, were deprived of their images of the gods, or were completely done away with. In this connection it should be noted that both Christian and pagan writers report these measures with much exaggeration: the latter, in order, in their bitterness, to censure the conduct of the Emperor; the former, especially Eusebius, in order triumphantly to attribute to the first Christian on the imperial throne the complete overthrow of heathen worship.[24] The following facts are sure: the famed and much visited temple of Asclepius in the Cilician Aegae was completely destroyed, as was the shrine of Aphrodite at Aphaca in Phoenicia,[25] whose cult could have seemed especially offensive to Christians. This motive was all the more present in the elimination of the temple of Aphrodite which had been erected on the site of Christ's tomb.[26] Phoenician Heliopolis (Baalbek) was also long a center of the cult of Aphrodite, which, according to Eusebius, was now forbidden by an imperial law that at the same time made known Constantine's missionary zeal, since it expressly invited the inhabitants of the city to accept the Christian faith. He sought to break down the totality of the pagan atmosphere of the city by erecting a church, which with its numerous clerics should become the center of a Christian community life.[27] Eusebius also knew of a special decree of the Emperor which put an end to the liturgical honoring of the Nile, in whose service there was a priesthood consisting of eunuchs. Also, the oriental cults of Mithra and Cybele conspicuously declined in the years of the reigns of Constantine and his sons.[28] But more than anything else the method by which the Emperor pillaged many a pagan shrine of the East in order to beautify his new capital on the Bosporus must have embittered every convinced heathen. Imperial officials traveled through the provinces and thoroughly searched the temples for suitable materials, especially for usable precious metals; at one temple the bronze doors were dismantled, at another the metal roof-tiles were removed. Statues of the gods were stripped of their jewels and whatever of them seemed usable was confiscated. Especially costly statues were taken to Constantinople and installed in the public squares of the city or in the imperial palace. No consideration was given even to objects so rich in tradition as the tripods of the Pythia in Apollo's shrine at Delphi. Eusebius reports that all this included mockery and derision of the pagan priesthood; of course whether he is correctly stating the Emperor's intention when he says that out of the idols he "made a toy which served as a laughing-stock and object of mockery" must be doubted.[29] But the bringing of the pagan religion as such into ridicule was unmistakable, since the images of its gods were now reduced to objects of exhibition, and only an artistic significance was thereafter attributed to it. Modern historians sought to derive these measures of the Emperor from purely financial necessities or to ascribe to him an interest in "artistic history." But the bitter reaction of the pagans indicates something different.[30]

---

[17] H. Dörries, "Konstantin und die Häretiker," *Wort und Stunde* I, 113–116.

[18] Cf. A. Alföldi, *Conversion,* 99, 105.

[19] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 2, 26–27, 42.

[20] Ibid. 2, 48–60, especially 56.

[21] Ibid. 2, 44.

[22] Ibid. 1, 1.

---

[23] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 2, 56.

[24] Cf. A. Alföldi, op. cit., 107.

[25] Sozomen, *HE* 2, 5, 5; Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 55–56.

[26] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 26–27.

[27] Ibid. 3, 58.

[28] Ibid. 4, 25. Cf. J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd. ed., 1929), 95, with note.

The imperial action gains in relief when it is considered against the background of the interest which Constantine devoted to building activity for the benefit of Christianity. As with most other rulers who took delight in construction, the Emperor's imagination made itself known here in an especially tangible way. Eusebius was very much attracted by this aspect of the Emperor's solicitude for Christian matters and spoke of it in detail in so far as it extended to the eastern part of the Empire. Constantine's view early turned to Palestine, which clearly played a special role in his religious and political plans, precisely because it could, as the beloved pilgrimage goal of Christians from all parts of the Empire, strengthen their awareness of belonging to one community.[31] He wanted the sites of Christ's burial and resurrection in Jerusalem to be treated with special distinction; hence he had the burial grotto opened and rebuilt and then had a basilica erected, for which he had the money raised by the governors of the eastern provinces, and on the decoration of which he concerned himself even with details.[32] Mount Olivet, as the place of the Ascension, also obtained a basilica,[33] which was at the same time intended as a memorial of the Emperor's mother, Helena, since she had especially encouraged its construction. A decisive role in the erecting of the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem is also attributed to her by Eusebius, and the Emperor likewise generously aided in its adornment.[34] The Emperor, through a special circular, informed the episcopate of Palestine of his determination to build a basilica at the Oak of Mamre and invited them, together with the bishops of Phoenicia, to foster the work in every way.[35] Precisely in this connection it is noteworthy how the Emperor considered church building as his personal concern. No doubt he urged the bishops to intensive cooperation, but since he demanded exact reports on the implementation of his orders and reserved the final decision to himself even in regard to details, it becomes obvious that he regarded himself as the real building contractor, who gave instructions through his officials to the chief architects, artists, and craftsmen.[36] Outside Palestine it was especially the cities of Antioch and Nicomedia, populous and rich in tradition—the latter had been the eastern capital—which were distinguished by magnificent basilicas.[37]

---

[29] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 54.

[30] Cf., for example, Libanius, *Or* 30, 6; 62, 8; Julian, *Or.* 7.

[31] Cf. W. Telfer, "Constantine's Holy Land Plan," *StudPatr* I (Berlin 1957), 696–700; J. Lassus, "L'empereur Constantin, Eusebe et les Lieux saints," *RHR* 171 (1967), 135–144.

[32] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 25–29; letter of the Emperor to Macarius of Jerusalem, ibid. 30–32; description of the whole situation, ibid. 33–40.

[33] L. H. Vincent, "L'Eleona, sanctuaire primitif de l'Ascension," *RB* 64 (1957) 48–71.

In the West the Christian congregation of the ancient imperial capital could take pleasure in the special generosity of the Emperor, which presented it with an abundance of grandiose church buildings and magnificently introduced the period of Christian architecture in Rome. The series of Constantinian basilicas was opened here with a church in honor of the Saviour with a nearby baptistery (after 313) which would later receive the name of John at the Lateran. The property on which it was built was a personal gift from the Emperor to the Christian community of Rome.[38] The first church erected as a memorial of martyrs, likewise encouraged by Constantine, was that of Saints Peter and Marcellinus, to which was attached the tomb of the Empress-Mother Helena.[39] It was followed by the immense enterprise on the Vatican Hill, with which, despite all the technical difficulties, a worthy monument was to be erected to the memory of the Apostle Peter over the place of his burial. Even if the beginning of the construction of the first Saint Peter's basilica has not yet been definitely established,[40] nevertheless the inscription which was once mounted on the triumphal arch of the church and has survived makes clear that the initiative was Constantine's.[41] Less pretentious was the memorial over the tomb of the Apostle Paul on the Ostian Way, which the *Liber Pontificalis* also ascribes to Constantine.[42] The memory of the two Apostles Peter and Paul together was also honored by a special church on the Appian Way near the present basilica of San Sebastiano, where decades earlier Christians had assembled to celebrate their memory.[43] Likewise, the erecting of the great double church in the former western capital of both Constantine and his father, Trier, must be assigned to the Emperor's initiative.[44]

---

[34] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 43.

[35] Letter, ibid. 3, 52f., Sozomen, *HE* 2, 4, 1–8.

[36] H. Kraft, op. cit., 121.

[37] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 50.

[38] *LP* I, 172; Optatus of Mileve, *De schism. donatist* 1, 23.

[39] C. Cecchelli–E. Persico, *SS. Marcellino e Pietro* (Rome 1936); F. W. Diechmann, *JdI* 72 (1957), 44–110.

[40] J. Toynbee–J. B. Ward Perkins, *Shrine,* 196f.

[41] Diehl, no. 1752: "Quod duce te mundus surrexit in astra triumphans hanc Constantinus victor tibi condidit aulam." That the beginning of the construction could not have occurred before 324 is proved by the goods assigned to the Church in the East, over which Constantine had no authority earlier.

Doubts have naturally been expressed as to whether this emulation of Maecenas by Constantine in favor of the Christian religion should be estimated as a characteristic expression of his personal religious conviction.[45] Such skepticism, however, overlooks the circumstance that the age of Constantine scarcely knew this distinction—possible in a rationalistic age—between inner conviction and external behavior. One more closely approaches historical truth if one attributes Constantine's zeal for building Christian churches to a religious notion, that is, to his idea of the Church, which he intended to express symbolically by the act of constructing a house of God adorned with all splendor. He understood, at least after the Council of Nicaea, the Church as the Kingdom of God, which is ruled by divine law, and the earthly church building with its architectural arrangement and its height pointing heavenward was to him a reflection of that properly ordered kingdom, through which the individual human being and Christian finds the road to heaven.[46] The Emperor aimed, by means of splendid basilicas in all the geographical areas of the Roman Empire, to insert the very Empire itself into the order created by God: the Empire entrusted to him should be Christian.

This becomes most clearly apparent in the greatest building enterprise which the Emperor undertook and was able to complete: the establishing of the new imperial capital on the Bosporus, which was to bear his name. There is no doubt that the new imperial residence, which was also the seat of the imperial government, was, by the will of the Emperor, intended from the start to have the character of a Christian city;[47] hence, in contrast to old Rome, it must be free of the elements proper to paganism. It is true that he permitted the older capital in the West to retain its historical rank and hence preserved continuity by giving to the new foundation the name of Second Rome.[48] He also borrowed many of its institutions, such as the Senate, the division into fourteen urban regions, and certain administrative forms. But what was really new lay in the religious sphere: the Empire received a Christian centre, which thus in a sense made it an Anti-Rome.[49] The city on the Tiber could cherish the old traditions, and the members of the esteemed senatorial families could still treasure their pagan cults, but the Emperor's interest was simply no longer directed to this city, which he seldom visited. The earliest coins with the *Tychē*, the personification of the new city, show the globe in her hand on the Cross of Christ.[50] The constructing of new pagan temples was not considered in the planning of the new city, and the pagan priests at the cult sites existing in pre-Constantinian Byzantium lost their revenues. On the other hand, Christian churches in honor of the martyrs and several basilicas were, from the first, part of the Emperor's building plan, as, for example, a church in honor of Christ dedicated under the title of *Sophia,* a church of peace (*Eirēnē*), and especially the Church of the Apostles, intended to correspond to the basilicas of the Apostles at Rome; it was destined to receive the remains of the Emperor in an adjoining room in the midst of the monuments honoring the twelve Apostles.[51] He commissioned Eusebius to have fifty costly manuscripts of the Bible prepared for liturgical use.[52] Monuments with Christian representations, such as that of the Good Shepherd or of Daniel, adorned the public squares of the city, and the sign of the cross was among the ceiling panels of the imperial palace.[53] When, following intensive building activity, the city was solemnly dedicated on 11 May 330, four years after its founding, it had no Capitoline temple, no cult of Vesta, no pagan priestly college.[54]

---

[42] *LP* I, 198.

[43] See P. Styger, *Römische Martyrergrüfte* I (Berlin 1935), 26f.

[44] See finally K. Th. Kempf, *Germania* 42 (1964), 126–141.

[45] Cf. H. Schrors, *ZKTh* 40 (1916), 517, note 2.

[46] See H. Kraft, op. cit., 118f., who refers to *Ad coetum sanctorum* 5.

[47] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 48: "He wanted to dedicate his city to the God of the martyrs."

Efforts have been made to play down the pro-Christian religious policy of the Emperor that has just been described, in so far as it shows a positive personal attitude to this religion, by referring to individual traits in the Emperor's character which presuppose a pagan rather than a Christian viewpoint. In this connection mention is made of his cruel behavior toward his son Crispus and his wife Fausta, whom Constantine shockingly had executed in 326. The sources,[55] which do not permit a totally reliable reconstruction of the events, seem to say that the Emperor had been informed that an illicit relationship existed between Crispus and his stepmother. The Emperor, who was personally blameless in the matter, had reacted with the greatest indignation in sternly passing judgment and certainly did not make use of Christian mildness in an effort to restore the honor of his family life. But does this procedure demonstrate any pagan convictions of the Emperor? Others, on the contrary, have found, following pagan authors, that precisely this crime drove Constantine, in his need of expiation, into the arms of Christianity.[56] Opposed to this, however, is the fact that the Emperor postponed his expiating baptism until he was on his deathbed. It is also pointed out that Constantine was never able to dissociate himself from the pagan imperial cult and therefore was not a convinced Christian. But a more exact examination proves that it was precisely this Emperor who introduced the christianization of the imperial cult. It is certain that the importance which this form of honoring the Emperor had acquired in the course of time was immense: it had become not only an element of court ceremonial, but an expression of the very concept of Emperor itself.[57] For Christianity that ingredient of the imperial cult was thereafter unacceptable which saw in the Emperor a man-made-God and hence one deserving of divine honors. But a second ingredient of the cult could be "baptized": that which recognized in the Emperor one chosen and especially guided by God. It was exactly this notion that Constantine and bishops like Eusebius took up and on which they based the Emperor's special position in the world and in relation to the Church. According to this view, the hitherto customary court ceremonial could be retained to a great extent, for example, *adoratio,* or genuflection, which was later adopted from here by all western imperial and royal rulers and even by the popes. Other forms of honoring the ruler were modified: thus, the title *invictus,* which equated the Emperor with the Sun-god, was replaced by the more modest *victor.* Constantine rejected the title *divus* for himself, and on the picture on his coins he had the halo around his head replaced by the more neutral nimbus.[58] It was crucial that Constantine rejected for himself the pagan sacrifice as an express act of homage toward a god. When the Umbrian town of Hispellum proposed to build a temple to the Emperor and the *gens Flavia,* the resolution was as usual approved but with the express prohibition of celebrating pagan rites of worship in it;[59] in other words, the temple for Constantine and his family had the character of a simple monument.

---

[48] J. Vogt, *Constantin,* 215f.; Sozomen, *HE* 2, 3, 5: *Nea Rome, altera Roma,* first in Optatus Porphyr., *Carm.* 4, 6.

[49] Cf. A. Alföldi, *Conversion,* 111.

[50] H. v. Schoenebeck, 41 and 61f., A. Alföldi, *Conversion,* 110.

[51] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 48; cf. R. Krautheimer, "Zu Konstantins Apostelkirche in Konstantinopel," Mullus, *Festschr. Th. Klauser* (Münster 1964), 224–229.

[52] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 4, 36; see C. Wendel, *Zentralbl. f. Bibl.* 56, (1939), 165–175.

[53] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 49.

[54] J. Vogt, *RAC,* 353.

---

[55] Especially Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 2, 29.

[56] Julian, *Caesares,* (336, Hertlein).

[57] Cf. especially O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reischsidee* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1956).

[58] See A. Alföldi, *RM* 50 (1935), 144f.; H. Dörries, *Selbstzeugnis,* 281–285.

Without any doubt, Constantine was interested in seeing his personal position within the ecclesiastical community especially stressed. Hence he fully concurred when Christian writers of the time compared him with Abraham or Moses and addressed him as God's vicar on earth, whose palace was the earthly reflection of the heavenly throneroom.[60] He himself once said that he felt himself to be *episkopos tōn ektos,*[61] a bishop instituted by God to look after the people of his Empire in the religious sphere also, except in the area of the sacramental leadership that pertained to the priesthood of the Church.

Constantine's Baptism and Death

As already stated, some claim to see a continuation of Constantine's pagan convictions in the fact that he so long deferred the reception of baptism, until he felt his end approaching. To this it must be objected that the Emperor saw daily in his entourage or even on his journeys men of undoubtedly Christian convictions who likewise again and again postponed baptism, even though the Church itself disapproved such a practice.[62] It was partly fostered by Christian teaching in regard to baptism: on the one hand, the sublimity of baptism, the exalted worth of baptismal grace, was extolled, and the difficulty of renewing it when it had been lost by sin was so solemnly described, that many a Christian was unwilling to expose himself to risk by a too early reception of baptism. That such considerations could carry weight with such a temperament as Constantine's cannot be disputed. But again and again Constantine stated that he regarded himself as a member of the Church.[63] Perhaps one may even say that the Emperor sometimes entertained the notion that his direct call by the God of the Christians to be sole ruler established for him so immediate a relationship that he felt himself not obliged to the act of baptism.[64]

---

[59] The Hispellum edict: *CIL* XI, 2, no. 5265; see H. Dörries, op. cit., 209–211.

[60] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 1, 12, 38.

[61] Ibid. 4, 24; see J. Straub in *StudPatr* I (*TU* 63, Berlin 1957), 678–695, and S. Calderone, *Constantino e il Cattolicesimo* (Florence 1962), XI–XLV.

[62] Cf. especially F. J. Dölger, "Die Taufe Constantins," op. cit., 429–437. Basil and his brother Gregory, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose, sons of outstanding Christian families, were not baptized until adulthood; so too was the Emperor Constantius II, whose Christian conviction can hardly be questioned. Ironically, Basil (*Hom.* 13, 5) and Gregory Nazianzen (*Or.* 40, 11) later insisted upon earlier reception of baptism.

[63] Cf., for example, Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 1, 32, 3–4, 17; 4, 29; 13, 17, 2, where he calls himself the *syntherapon* of the Christians; finally, his discourse *Ad coetum sanctorum* (*GCS* Eusebius, 1).

Furthermore, if one considers the manner in which Constantine prepared himself for death,[65] here too can be recognized a clearly Christian attitude of faith. The thought of his death had early occurred to him, because while he was erecting the Church of the Apostles, as earlier mentioned, he had had his tomb prepared along with it: his coffin was to be placed in a mausoleum attached to the church, between two rows, each of six burial slabs dedicated to the memory of the twelve Apostles so that he could share in the prayers which would be offered here in their honor. The Emperor seems to have celebrated Easter of 337 without any difficulties. A few weeks later he fell ill and at first sought a cure in the baths of the East. When he recognized the seriousness of the sickness, he called for some bishops to come to Nicomedia and asked them for baptism, which, according to Eusebius, he received in the spirit of the first Christians; then, after the rite, he continued to wear the white garments, "because he no longer wanted to touch purple."[66] And the disposition of his soul was that of an authentic believer. The last words which Eusebius reports from him were uttered shortly after his baptism: "Now I know myself to be truly happy; now I know that I have become worthy of immortal life, a sharer in the divine life."[67] After he had handed over the Empire to his sons and had taken leave of the high officials and the military commanders, he died on Pentecost, 22 May 337. His remains were brought to "his city" and first laid out in the imperial palace and later buried as provided for, in the presence of his second son, Constantinus, after the celebration of the liturgy.[68]

With the recognition of Christianity as his own religion and that of the Roman Empire, Constantine had accomplished a deed of world-historical consequences. His memory lived on in East and West, and soon his image, like that of many of the great ones of history, was seized upon and glorified by legend. But in the good as well as in the questionable elements of his activity, this ruler continued to operate powerfully through the centuries in which there was a Christian Empire. Each time that a new Emperor ascended the throne at Byzantium, he was thereafter hailed by the magnates of the Empire as *Neos Kōnstantinos.*[69] Since very few of his Byzantine successors measured up to the greatness, both as ruler and as man, of this exemplar, this appeal to their predecessor was more often harmful than beneficial to the Church of Byzantium. It also admitted him as the "equal of the Apostles" into its liturgical calendar and thereby from the start weakened its own position in later conflicts with the throne. In the Latin West, it is true, Constantine's memory was also often and at times unscrupulously appealed to in Church–State confrontations,[70] but a remarkably surer instinct preserved the Roman Church from enrolling him among the saints. It thereby did the greatest service to itself and to the true significance of the first Christian Emperor.

---

[64] Cf. J. Vogt, *RAC,* 359f.

[65] See Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 4, 60–71.

[66] Ibid. 4, 62.

[67] Ibid. 4, 63.

[68] Ibid. 4, 67; on Constantine's burial see H. Dörries, op. cit., 413–424.

[69] Cf. O. Treitinger, op. cit., 130f.

---

[70] See E. Ewig, "Das Bild Constantins d. Gr. in den ersten Jahrhunderten des abendländischen Mittelalters," *HJ* 75 (1956), 1–46; W. Kaegi, "Vom Nachleben Constantins," *Schweiz. Zschr. f. Gesch.* 8 (1958), 289–326; H. Wolfram in *MIÖG* 68 (1960), 226–243.

CHAPTER 2

Origin and Course of the Arian Controversy to the Death of Constantine (337)

The Origin

Very soon after his entry into the eastern capital, Nicomedia, Constantine learned that the Christian community of the East, like the Church of North Africa, was torn by a conflict which had already reached threatening proportions. Eusebius characterized it as "a mighty fire," which had its beginnings in the Christian congregation of Alexandria, spread from there throughout Egypt, neighboring Libya, and other provinces of the East, and split both the bishops and the ordinary folk into two camps, which so fiercely attacked each other that the Christian fraternal strife had become the subject of jokes in pagan theatrical productions.[1] This implies that the war in the fall of 324 already had a certain history and hence its beginnings are to be placed in the years before the instituting of measures hostile to Christians by Licinius.[2]

The man under whose name the conflict has come into Church history, the priest Arius, was a pastor in the Catholic Church in the part of Alexandria known as Baucalis, but he came from Libya[3] and had obtained his theological formation, not at the school of Alexandria, but in all probability in Syrian Antioch, since he counted himself among the pupils of the Antiochene priest Lucian, the founder of that city's theological school. These apparently found their former membership in this school a mark of distinction and through it they found themselves united in friendship in later life, when, not without pride, they acknowledged themselves as "Collucianists" in allusion to their former teacher.[4] Sources not well disposed to Arius attributed to him charming manners, a strictly ascetical manner of life, a general education, and a special talent for "dialectics."[5] From 318 through 319 he expounded in his sermons and teaching an idea of the *Logos* and his relation to the Father, for which he found a considerable following within his congregation, in a part of the clergy, and especially among the consecrated virgins; whereas others decisively rejected it.[6] When his bishop, Alexander, learned of the special views of his priest, he did not at first regard the matter as cause for alarm but believed that it should be examined in a theological discussion in which both sides could express and justify their ideas.[7] And so, in the presence of Alexander, Arius stated that, in his opinion, "the Son of God was created out of nonbeing, that there was a time when he did not exist, that, according to his will, he was capable of evil as well as of virtue, and that he is a creature and created," while his opponents insisted on the consubstantiality and eternity of the Son with the Father.[8] Alexander, who praised both sides for their theological zeal, finally accepted the second view mentioned and ordered Arius never to propound his opinion again.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 2, 61.

[2] Cf. W. Schnemelchen, *Chronologie,* against E. Schwartz, *Ges. Schr.* III, 156–168.

[3] Epiph. *Panar.* 68, 4; 69, 3; 71, 1.

Since Arius resolutely refused to comply, and Bishop Alexander could only fear that the peace of the Church of Alexandria was seriously threatened, because Arius could count on a certain following among the clergy, he excommunicated him and his clerical adherents.[9] If Alexander believed that Arius was, by this action, condemned, together with his following, to the condition of an insignificant sect, he was greatly mistaken. The originator of the discussion did not intend to recognize the excommunication and leave the Church: instead, he wanted to bring his ideas to victory within the Church. For such an undertaking he could expect success, because he knew that outside Egypt also there was no unanimous opinion in this theological question, and a considerable part of the episcopate sympathized with his theses. Hence, when in a letter to the influential bishop of the imperial capital, Eusebius of Nicomedia, a "Collucianist," he gave an account of the existing confrontation in Alexandria,[10] he took the definitive step which deprived the conflict of its local limitations and could only gain for it an impact throughout the Church. Arius's making contact in this way with the episcopate outside Egypt now forced Bishop Alexander to a more decisive action. He summoned, probably in 319, a synod of all Egypt—apparently some 100 bishops. He made known the result of their deliberations in an encyclical[11] to all bishops of the Catholic Church: Arius and his supporters in the Egyptian and Libyan clergy were excluded from the Church because of their "errors which dishonored Christ;"[12] the supporters were six priests, the same number of deacons, in addition to Bishops Secundus and Theonas, both Libyans like Arius; later, two more priests and four deacons were included.[13] The circular gave a concise exposition of the Arian propositions and a somewhat more detailed refutation; it also contained a sharp personal reference to Eusebius of Nicomedia, which declared that Alexander knew who would play a leading role on the opposite side in the now unavoidable expansion of the conflict. Not without alarm, Eusebius had replied to Arius in regard to the latter's letter: "You think correctly, but pray that all may think in the same way;"[14] nevertheless, he at once set to work with energy and became the zealous progagator of the ideas of the Alexandrian priest.[15] Arius had meanwhile left Egypt and finally—after a brief stay with Eusebius of Caesarea, who likewise supported him for a short time[16]—arrived in Nicomedia, which now became a center of Arian propaganda, very effectively directed by the subtle Eusebius. As early as 320 a Bithynian synod that he had convoked sent a circular to all bishops which called for the restoration of ecclesiastical communion with those who had been condemned, since they were orthodox; pressure should be put on Alexander to receive them back.[17] Arius drew up a profession of faith, which, in his own name and that of his friends who had been excommunicated with him, protested that their faith was that which they had heard Alexander proclaim within the Church of Alexandria: according to it, only the Father is eternal, he alone is without beginning, but the Son is God's perfect creature, he does not possess his being together with the Father, since the Father existed before the Son.[18] Probably at this time he also wrote a work entitled *Thalia,* or *Banquet,* a mixture of prose and verse, in which he recruited for his ideas in popular form.[19]

---

[4] Arius, *Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia,* G. H. Opitz, *Urkunden,* no. 1, 5.

[5] Epiph. 1, C. 69; Sozomen, *HE* 1, 15, 3 (*dialektikotatos*).

[6] Epiph. 69, 3.

[7] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 15, 4.

[8] Ibid. 1, 15, 3: *τόν υἱὸν τοῦ ϑεοῦ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γεγενῆσϑαι, καὶ εἶναί ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ αὐτεξιουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν ὑπάρχειν καὶ κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα.* 1, 15, 5: *οἱ δὲ ὡς ὁμοούσιος καὶ συναίδιός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί.* Arius appealed for his view to the tradition of the Alexandrian Church; cf. E. Boularand, "Denys d'Alexandrie et Arius," *BLE* 67 (1966), 161–169.

[9] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 15, 5–7.

---

[10] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 1; here he names as partisans, in addition to the addressee, the Bishops of Caesarea in Palestine, Lydda, Tyre, Berytus, Laodicea, and Anazarbus, while three—those of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Tripolis repudiate him and hence are labeled by him as "heretics."

[11] Ibid. no. 4b.

[12] Ibid. *Christomakos hairesis.*

[13] Ibid. no. 4a.

[14] Ibid., no. 2.

[15] Example of a recruiting letter to Paulinius of Tyre in G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 7.

[16] Ibid., nos. 3 and 7; the second letter, addressed to Alexander, claims that Arius was misunderstood.

From many sides, Alexander was now pressed to issue a revision of his judgment on Arius,[20] but he felt himself all the more obliged to warn others about him and his teaching. In a bulky treatise for Bishop Alexander of Thessalonica,[21] which was, however, intended as a circular for other bishops, Arius and the priest Achilleus were branded as the real causes of the disturbance, who, with total disregard of the apostolic tradition, were, following the example of the Jews, waging war against Christ and denying his divinity. An encyclical sent by Alexander to all the bishops of the East, and preserved in a Syrian fragment, obtained the assent of some 200 bishops, not only the Egyptians but also those of Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece, and the Balkan Peninsula.[22] Also, Pope Silvester I in Rome was informed of the events in Alexandria and of the excommunication of the Alexandrian clerics.[23] These were merely examples of a much more copious correspondence on this question: Epiphanius was acquainted with a collection of some seventy letters of Alexander relating to this matter.[24]

As a consequence of the literary feud, which was soon conducted in full vehemence, in which mutual distortions of the teaching and viewpoint of the one side were alleged by the other, and crude accusations of a personal nature were adduced against one another, the fronts quite early hardened into clear intransigence. At this stage the split in Eastern Christianity became known to the Emperor Constantine, probably through the bishops of the East, and it seems that at first, because of a certain embarrassment, he was not informed about the entire seriousness or about the theological significance of the quarrel. Otherwise, his first attitude is scarcely intelligible, as it appears in a letter to Alexander and Arius,[25] which he had delivered at Alexandria by his western episcopal adviser, Hosius of Córdoba. Here the cause of the quarrel is seen in a completely unnecessary discussion of an unimportant point of the exegesis of a scriptural passage (Prov. 8:22), on which indeed there could be private, differing views, but which should not rashly be made public. Reference was made to the example of the philosophers, among whom quite often disagreement prevailed in individual questions of the systems represented by them without this leading to division among their followers. Hence the two opponents were summoned to become reconciled and to restore peace and unity in the Church so that general harmony, his political goal, could be assured in the Empire. The comparison of the Church with a school of philosophy and the evaluation of the essence of the discussion as an unimportant question of detail[26] make clear how superficially at that time the Emperor had grasped the nature of the Church and the understanding of the figure of Christ; it likewise shows how very much he mistook the situation if he thought that it could be rectified by a summons to the two original spokesmen to become reconciled. In reality, a quite long-standing dispute over a fundamental question of Christian theology had cropped up once again: on its solution depended whether Christianity would lose or retain its deepest religious riches, whether it would remain a revealed religion or not.

---

[17] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 15, 10.

[18] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 6.

[19] Cf. the surviving fragments in G. Bardy, *Lucien* . . . , 246–274.

[20] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., nos. 11 and 12.

[21] Ibid., no. 14.

[22] Ibid., no. 15.

[23] Ibid., no. 16.

[24] *Panar.* 69, 4.

A half-century before Arius the question of the relationship of Father and Son had been discussed by Greek and Latin theologians,[27] and then too, by a striking parallel, a representative of the Alexandrian school and an Antiochene played a leading role, even though not in direct discussion. At that time theological terms and formulations which were characteristic of the discussions in the Arian controversy played a special role. At Antioch the bishop of that day, Paul of Samosata, declared around 260 that the biblical expression "Son of God" signified only the Man Jesus, born of the Virgin Mary, in whom the *Logos* had taken up his dwelling, but in order to safeguard the unity of God, Paul acknowledged in the *Logos* or divine *Sophia* no *hypostasis* of its own, but let it consist in God, "just as the human reason in the human heart."[28] Hence to him the unity of God was the highest principle, and he was to be claimed as the representative of an emphatic Monarchianism. However, he conceded the designation of God to the Man Jesus, because the divine wisdom was operative in him in a special way, just as the prophets and saints were participants in the divine aid.[29] At the Second Synod of Antioch (ca. 268) the expression *homoousios* played a role in the discussion; its improper use by Paul was condemned, but there was no intention of thereby entirely rejecting it in speculation on the Trinity.[30] For, shortly before, Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria had been blamed by the Roman Bishop of the same name (259–268) because of his excessive reserve in regard to this terminology, and in a letter justifying his attitude he had to admit that the expression, even though it was not biblical, was nevertheless acceptable if properly understood.[31] From these two discussions it is clear that in the third century the term *homoousios* was not yet so amply clarified that it could be used safely and without possible misunderstanding in theological statements on the Trinity;[32] hence no exact terminology was yet available for dogmatic formulation.

---

[25] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 17.

[26] Because of this excessively wrong interpretation of the entire situation, P. Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne* (Paris, 4th ed., 1929), 309f., was unwilling to recognize the authenticity of the work, but wrongly so; the first statements of Eusebius of Caesarea on the content of the conflict in the *Vita Constantini* are similarly vague.

[27] Cf. vol. I, chap. 21, with the literature there listed.

[28] H. Riedmatten, *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate* (Fribourg 1952), 26.

The question of the relationship of the Son to the Father had also intensively engaged the most important theologian of the third century in the East, and Origen's view became everywhere discernible in its effect on the struggle over the orthodox understanding of the Trinitarian doctrine in the fourth century. He expressed very clearly and unequivocally that the *Logos* is a divine being, and when a bishop of his day, Beryllos of Bostra, on the frontier of Arabia, proposed the thesis that Jesus Christ was only a man, whom the Virgin Mary bore, at the request of the bishops of the province of Arabia Origen undertook a journey to Bostra in order to refute this thesis at a synod.[33] But even Origen had not yet achieved the utmost clarity in the same question. There are numerous expressions of his which indicate that, while he ascribed to the *Logos* a divine dignity, he still subordinated him to the Father, perhaps under the influence of Neoplatonic ideas.[34]

Finally, it is to be noted that the intellectual climate of Alexandria could still be under a certain influence of Gnostic ideas, which also taught a graduated hierarchy of divine beings, and, when Arius propounded his theology, many an Alexandrian Christian may have been reminded of such Gnostic speculation. Later Athanasius accused Arius of being dependent on the system of the Gnostic Valentine.[35]

---

[29] Ibid., 8.

[30] Ibid., 106f. Cf. also M. Richard in EThL 35 (1939), 325–338.

[31] Cf. vol. I, 259.

[32] See I. M. Dalmau, "El 'homoousios' y el concilio di Antioquía de 268," *MCom* 34–35 (1960), 323–340; G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1965), s.v. 959.

[33] Eusebius, *HE* 6, 33, 1–3; see P. Nautin, *Lettres et ecrivains chrétiens des IIe et IIIe siècles* (Paris 1961), 209–218.

[34] Cf. W. Marcus, *Der Subordinationismus* (Munich 1963), 126–163.

The Council of Nicaea and its Outcome

At Alexandria Bishop Hosius soon had to recognize that the way envisaged by the Emperor for a settlement of the dispute—reconciliation of Arius with his bishop and cessation of all public discussion of the controverted point—was not at all practicable. He hardly even encountered the already condemned Arius in the Egyptian capital, and it was not difficult for Alexander to convince the Emperor's theological adviser that the question was of the greatest theological significance and had to be definitively settled. And so Hosius probably went back directly to Nicomedia to see the Emperor in order to report to him on the failure of his mission.[36] Soon both of them understood that there was only one possible way of restoring peace to the Church: to summon the entire episcopate of the Church to a great synod, which, after exhaustive consultation, would have to issue a binding decision.

The early sources[37] all attribute to the Emperor Constantine the initiative for this solution, and they are to be believed. In the early phase of the Donatist controversy he had hit upon the convocation of the Synod of Arles (314) for a like procedure, so that the manner now chosen represented absolutely nothing new, as is often maintained.[38] Besides, in the meantime the Emperor must have learned that a second question, that of the date of Easter, also needed solving in order to put an end to varying practice in some provinces. It is certain that Constantine neither had negotiations with Rome on an eventual convocation of the great synod nor did he ask the consent of the Roman Bishop. Only the Sixth Ecumenical Council, held in 680, ascribes a common summons to Emperor and Pope,[39] and only the later Legend of Silvester, which tells of the baptism of the Emperor in the Lateran Palace and his being cured of leprosy, pushes the Pope into the foreground when it says that the Synod of Nicaea took place "at his command."[40]

---

[35] *Apol. adv. Arianos* 3, 65; cf. also *Ep. ad Serap.* 1, 10f.

[36] Serious reasons militate against the existence of a synod which many scholars maintain was held at Antioch in 324–325: with Hosius, it is supposed to have rejected the doctrine of Arius; see G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 18, and J. R. Nyman, *StudPatr* 4 (*TU* 79, Berlin 1961), 483–489 and I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nizäa und Konstantinopel* (Mainz 1964), 49f.

[37] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 6; Theodoret, *HE* 1, 7, 1; Sozomen, *HE* 1, 17, 1.

[38] Cf. G. Langgärtner, "Das Aufkommen des okumenischen Konzilsgedankens," *MThZ* 15 (1964), 111–126.

[39] *Mansi* XI, 661.

[40] *LP* I, 34.

The invitations to the bishops of East and West specified Nicaea in Bithynia as the place of meeting and May 325 as the date for beginning the deliberations.[41] Many a bishop may have read in the text of the invitation, not without pleasure, that he might use the public post *gratis* for the journey and that he was the Emperor's guest during the sessions.[42] The sources do not indicate whether one or the other of them might have experienced some uneasiness because here the State power was displaying an initiative which, in certain circumstances, could be dangerous for the independence of the Church.

The number of participants in the Council is not clearly established. Eusebius says there were more than 250; Athanasius, also an eyewitness, on one occasion gives the round figure of 300, but elsewhere he gives 318. Later historians uphold this last number, especially since it had a biblical mystical prototype: Abraham's troop of retainers amounted to 318 (Gen. 14:14).[43]

Among the Council Fathers were revered figures who, like Paul of Neocaesarea and the Egyptian Paphnutius, had distinguished themselves in the persecution of Diocletian by their constancy, but a leading role in the theological discussion was confined to a minority. To it belonged Alexander of Alexandria, who had hitherto taken the lead in the fight against Arius; Eustathius, bishop of the Syrian capital and splendid theologian, who as a staunch opponent of Arianism would later have to experience exile and would refute the erroneous doctrine in a large work that is unfortunately lost;[44] Marcellus of Ancyra,[45] whose hostility to the teaching of Arius would later drive him to extreme opposition and lead to his own condemnation at the Second General Council in 381. To the group of firm opponents of Arius belonged also Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem. The faction of Arius's friends was led by Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia; right after him is to be mentioned his namesake, the head of the congregation of Caesarea in Palestine, who in dogmatic speculative questions did not reveal any of that special aptitude that would gain for him at Nicaea the favor of Constantine, which he later knew so well how to utilize again and again.

The Latin West was only poorly represented, but this is not difficult to understand: the long journey, even with the possibility of using the public post, must have caused many a bishop from Africa or Gaul, Italy or Britain to hesitate, and so only five complied with the Emperor's invitation. At their head stood Hosius of Córdoba, who had long been the Emperor's adviser but was very likely also the representative of the Pope, for he always comes first in the list of names of the bishops.[46] Rome also sent two priests, Vitus and Vincent,[47] who sat with Hosius. Of the remaining four bishops, only one is adequately known to Church history, Caecilian of Carthage,[48] whose name is intimately related to the outbreak of the Donatist quarrel.

---

[41] A Syrian notice—G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 20—according to which Ancyra was envisaged as the place of meeting, hardly merits belief.

[42] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 6; Theodoret, *HE* 1, 7, 2.

[43] Cf. M. Aubineau, "Les 318 serviteurs d'Abraham et le nombre des Peres au Concile de Nicée," *RHE* 61 (1966), 5–43.

[44] Cf. Quasten, *P* III, 302–306; Sozomen names the most important participants in *HE* 1, 17, 2.

[45] On his theology, M. Tetz in *ZKG* 75 (1964), 217–270.

Even at the first general council there were men who would today be called *periti,* theological advisers of the bishops, as, for example, the youthful deacon Athanasius of Alexandria, who accompanied Alexander and often intervened in the debates. In addition, there were present a number of interested educated laymen, who eagerly discussed the progress of the discussions among themselves.[49]

Even before the solemn opening of the Council, conversations had started among the Council Fathers on the principal question which had brought them together; naturally in these the representatives of the "pro" and "contra" met and at times sought to strengthen their faction by gaining the as yet undecided. But the embarrassing spectacle of intrigues was also not absent from the first ecumenical council. The Emperor was presented with documents in which this or that bishop was accused of personal lapses, until Constantine called the bishops together, displayed the unread and probably also anonymous letters, had them burned before their eyes, gave them a few serious words on fraternal concord among bishops, and called upon them to turn to the real task that had brought them to Nicaea.[50]

Since the church of the congregation of Nicaea scarcely offered adequate space for all the activities of the Council, the Emperor had placed his own palace in the city at its disposal for the entire period of the sessions. Eusebius enthusiastically and lyrically described the solemn opening, which took place on 20 May 325.[51] The bishops had taken their seats along the two long sides of the meeting hall and eagerly awaited the entry of the Emperor, for whom a gilded chair had been set up. It made a strong impression on them when the tall figure of the Emperor, adorned in purple, strode through their ranks and did not

[46] V. De Clercq, *Ossius of Cordova,* 228–250.

[47] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 17, 2 who adds that Pope Julius (instead of Silvester) could not attend because of his advanced age.

[48] *Manzi* II, 696.

[49] Theodoret, *HE* 1, 11, 4.5; Sozomen, *HE* 1, 17, 3; 1, 17, 7–18, 1.

[50] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 17, 4–5.

[51] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 10.

take his place until by signs he had directed the bishops to sit. After a brief greeting by one of the bishops, the Emperor began a speech in Latin in which the admonition to peace and harmony within the Church was of unmistakable emphasis: an exhaustive discussion of the causes of the conflict should open the way to reconciliation and peace, and in this way the bishops would also render to him, their "fellow servant," a vast favor. Then he turned over the floor to the presidents of the synod.[52]

Since the acts of the Council of Nicaea have not been preserved, neither a reconstruction of the order of business or of the exact chronological course of the debates nor an exact number of the sessions or even of the total duration of the Council is possible. Apparently, the faction friendly to Arius at once seized the initiative and proposed a formula of faith into which essential elements of Arian theology seem to have been incorporated.[53] But it encountered the violent protest of the opposition, as did also the passages read aloud from Arius's *Thalia,*[54] and it quickly became clear that his extreme formulations had no chance of being accepted by the Council. Then the supple Eusebius of Caesarea intervened in the debates with a compromise proposal and recommended to the Council the acceptance of the baptismal creed in use in his diocese.[55] The bishops recognized fully the orthodoxy of this creed, and Constantine too regarded it as correct, as Eusebius stresses, not without self-satisfaction, but some held that certain supplements were indispensable whereby the statements just discussed should be made precise and an explanation of the creed in the Arian sense should be excluded.[56]

It was precisely the supplementary propositions that produced the at times violent discussion to flare up again and again, and in it there was no lack of mutual recriminations on both sides.[57] In particular, the acceptance of the word *homoousios* ("one in being"), which in the sequel was destined to become the keyword and slogan of Nicene theology, caused long debates. It not only seemed unacceptable to the expressly Arian-oriented bishops, but could produce uneasiness in many another eastern bishop, as its hitherto constantly varying history demonstrated. To the representatives of the Latin Church, on the other hand, it could seem quite appropriate, since they found in it the exact parallel to what in the West since the time of Tertullian was expressed by *consubstantialis* or *eiusdem substantiae.*[58] Eusebius ascribes the acceptance of *homoousios* into the text of the Nicene Creed simply to the initiative of the Emperor, who exerted himself to the utmost in regard to the orthodox interpretation of the term by the Greeks and to the reconciling of the opposing viewpoints.[59] It is very probable that it was suggested to Constantine by Hosius of Córdoba; but that Hosius was thereby acting on the orders of the Roman Bishop cannot, of course, be proved. The other individual formulas adopted in the definitive text of the Creed[60]—"eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father"—assured that the statements concerning Christ would not be susceptible of any Arian interpretation. The conclusion also contained an unequivocal rejection of the Arian theology: "But some say: 'There was a time in which he was not' and 'Before he was born, he was not' and 'He was created out of nothing,' or they claim that the Son of God is of another substance (*hypostasis*) or another being (*ousia*), or he was created or subject to change or alteration. The Catholic and Apostolic Church declares them excluded from its membership." This excommunication affected primarily Arius himself and his two episcopal friends, Secundus and Theonas, since, except for them, all the other Arians signed the Creed which had been unambiguously recommended for adoption by the Emperor.[61] For Arius it must have been a bitter disappointment that the Collucianists had thus abandoned him: for him there now remained the road to exile, and the ban did not spare his own writings and those of his adherents.[62] When Eusebius notes that, through his diplomatic skill and his personal charm, the Emperor had brought it about that the bishops "were of one mind and one view on all points"[63] this was surely not true of all those who had been Arians previously and was probably not true even of himself.[64] Men like Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea still stood secretly at the side of the condemned Arius, but they did not dare to directly attack the Creed that had been so solemnly approved by the Emperor so long as he lived. However, they soon found ways and means to bring defenders of the Creed into discredit with the Emperor and thereby began the fierce struggle which the faith of Nicaea had to endure for decades in order that it might be accepted in the Universal Church.

---

[52] Ibid. 3, 11–12; Sozomen, *HE* 1, 19, 2–4.

[53] The text is no longer extant; cf. Theodoret, *HE* 1, 7, 14–15.

[54] Theodoret, *loc. cit.;* Athanasius, *Ep. ad Episc. Aeg.* 13.

[55] It is preserved in the letter of Eusebius to his congregation: G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 22, 4.

[56] Ibid. no. 22, 7.

[57] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 13.

---

[58] See H. Kraft, *ZKG* 66 (1954), 1–24, and I. M. Dalmau, op. cit.

[59] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 22, 7, and Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 13, 3.

[60] See the critical text in G. L. Dossetti, 226–240, and E. Boularand, 250–259.

[61] Philostorgius, *HE* 1, 9, reports that fifteen Arian bishops signed only because of the threat of exile made by the Emperor.

[62] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 21, 4.

[63] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 13, end.

[64] He himself said in one place—G. H. Opitz, no. 22, 10—that he had assented to the *homoousios* for the sake of peace; later it was said jeeringly that fear of exile alone had extorted his signature: Philostorgius, *HE* 1, 10.

After the adoption of the Creed, the Council Fathers took up the other points of the agenda. In the matter of the date of Easter they agreed on the practice of the greater part of the Church, which celebrated the solemnity of the Resurrection on the Sunday after 14 Nisan. Then disciplinary questions were discussed, and the decisions were set down in twenty canons. Finally, the Council decided on a generous solution for the schism caused in Egypt by Bishop Meletius of Lycopolis: Meletius was to retain his position as bishop and his see; the bishops and clerics ordained by him were received back into the Catholic Church after the imposition of hands, and the bishops could be promoted to sees as they became vacant, but only with the consent of the Metropolitan of Alexandria.[65]

Constantine tried quickly and effectively to assure the newly won unity in the faith, first by means of a solemn and impressive closing of the Council. Probably after the adoption of the Creed and in connection with the twentieth anniversary of his accession, he gave a splendid banquet for the Council Fathers in his palace at Nicomedia; Eusebius, always so easily enthused, compared it to the glory of the heavenly kingdom.[66] The bishops gladly accepted the presents which Constantine gave to each of them on this occasion. Before their departure he asked all of them to come to him once more, admonished them henceforth "to maintain peace among themselves, to avoid the envy that leads to strife," and recommended himself to their prayers.[67] Soon afterwards, he sent a comprehensive report on the Council "to the churches"—this probably meant chiefly those not represented at Nicaea—and in it he unambiguously attributed to himself the initiative for the great Synod.[68] The Emperor assured the faithful that all questions had been carefully examined and unity in the Church had thereby been achieved. He devoted much space to the decree on the uniform date of Easter and stressed in surprisingly sharp words the necessity of holding Christianity at a distance from Judaism. A special letter went to the congregation of Alexandria in which Constantine expressed his joy over the restoration of unity of faith and once again rejected the errors of Arius.[69] The above-mentioned special synodal letter of the Council probably went to all the larger communities. In the still extant copy to the Christians of Egypt and Libya the excommunication of Arius and his two episcopal friends is made known and especially justified by the condemnation of his teaching.[70]

---

[65] Text of the canons in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (ed. Alberigo) 5–14; the decision on the Meletians is given in the letter of the Council Fathers to the congregations of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis in Theodoret, *HE* 1, 9, 2–11 (G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 23, 6–11). Cf. also Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 71.

[66] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 14.

[67] Ibid. 3, 16 and 21.

[68] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 26.

The Council of Nicaea, with its decision on the faith, was an event of the utmost importance for an understanding of Church history as a whole, especially the history of the councils. In it we find the first council in history which without any doubt possessed an ecumenical character, since to it were invited bishops from all the geographical areas of Christianity, and they attended, even though in varying strength. It did not deprive the Council of any legitimacy that the Emperor took the initiative in convoking it, since the Bishop of Rome consented to Constantine's action by sending his own representatives. This first ecumenical council, with its adoption and promulgation of its Creed, made a decision in the area of faith which was equivalent to a dogmatic definition. For the entire course of the Council and the long struggle of the Council Fathers over a formula that as clearly as possible rendered the testimony of faith made clear their intention here to issue a definitive judgment that bound the Universal Church in a controverted question of belief. The manner of achieving the decision revealed at the same time a process that would be of the greatest significance in the history of dogma. The Church seeks to assure individual doctrines of faith from misinterpretation or heretical explanation in such a way that it clarifies the testimony hitherto accepted by complementary additions, elucidates them by more precise formulation, and for that purpose even takes philosophical terms into its service, if these seem appropriate. The guaranteeing of the threatened statement of faith in its orthodox sense is, accordingly, a decisive factor in the development of dogma. The goal of the Council was achieved despite all human shortcomings and meanness, despite all the risks which proceeded also from Constantine's pressure, which, while it really threatened the freedom of individual bishops, did not destroy it. The noteworthy remark in the Emperor's letter to the congregation of Alexandria exactly touches the theological reality here referred to: "What the 300 bishops have decided is nothing else than the decree of God, for the Holy Spirit, present in these men, made known the will of God."[71] The validity of this statement is not lessened by the fact that in the next five decades of the fourth century there raged a struggle over the recognition of the Nicene theology, which convulsed the Church to its innermost depths and renewed the fear of its early dissolution into various denominations.

---

[69] Ibid. no. 25.

[70] Ibid. no. 23, 2–5.

[71] Ibid. no. 25, 8.

The Development to the Death of Constantine (337)

Only a few months after the ending of the Council it was plain that the Arian faction would not abandon the struggle for its understanding of the Trinitarian theology. Two of its leading bishops, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea, informed the Emperor that they withdrew their assent to the Creed of 325. The Emperor, not accustomed to seeing decisions which he had solemnly approved treated in this fashion, regarded this step as self-exclusion from the ecclesiastical community, sent the two bishops into exile in Gaul, and gave their former sees to prelates loyal to Nicaea. A letter to the congregation of Nicomedia makes known Constantine's great displeasure with the malicious behavior of its bishop.[72] And an intervention by the Emperor with Bishop Theodotus of Laodicea,[73] who publicly manifested his sympathy for Arius, let it be understood that he would act energetically for the observance of the Nicene decrees.

But from the beginning of 328 a reversal in the Emperor's attitude began to appear—not, it is true, in his position with regard to the Council, but concerning individual representatives of the pro-Arian faction. The reasons for the change are difficult to ascertain clearly. In that year the exiled Bishops Eusebius and Theognis were permitted to return from banishment and again occupy their former sees of Nicomedia and Nicaea.[74] And now that same Eusebius, who three years previously had been condemned by the Emperor in the harshest terms, succeeded more and more in gaining the Emperor's ear and favor and finally in occupying that very position which earlier Hosius of Córdoba, who had probably returned to his Spanish see after the Council, had held as theological adviser and which automatically made him the effective promoter of the interests of Arius. Here one may probably take into account the influence of Constantine's stepsister, Constantia, who lived in Nicomedia and whose confidence the bishop of the imperial capital, a member of the upper class, had long possessed.[75] Eusebius of

---

[72] Ibid. no. 27.

[73] Ibid. no. 28.

[74] Philostorgius, *HE* 2, 7.

[75] Some scholars admit that their rehabilitation followed at a second session of the Council of Nicaea in 327, but the genuineness of the document supporting this thesis is subject to the gravest suspicions; cf. E. Schwartz, *Ges. Schr.* III, 205–213, N. H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great* (London 1930), 22; the contrary is upheld by G. Bardy, *RSR* 23, (1933), 430–450, and I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nizäa und Konstantinopel,* 135–139.

Caesarea in Palestine had probably also contributed to the change of attitude, for his culture and his rhetorical talents strongly impressed the Emperor, all the more since his courtliness avoided any uncouth stressing of opposing views. It is also possible that the Empress-Mother Helena spoke in praise of him at court when she reported on her impressions of her journey to the Holy Land, where of course she met the bishop of the capital of the Province of Palestine.

Soon after his return from exile, Eusebius of Nicomedia energetically and methodically assumed the leadership of the Arian faction. He clearly understood that the fight must not be conducted directly against the Nicene Creed, because that would certainly provoke the Emperor's opposition. It was more important first to eliminate the leading personalities of the opposition. Following the close of the Council, Bishop Eustathius of Antioch had at first become the dominant figure of this group. Even at Nicaea he had played a strong role, opposing Arius by literary means, and through his sarcasm he had irritated Eusebius of Nicomedia by making fun of his new career.[76] The Emperor was cleverly told that Eustathius was a morally doubtful character, again and again disturbed the religious peace, and had expressed himself disrespectfully in regard to the Emperor's Mother. The Emperor gave his assent to a synod held at Antioch c. 331, at which the friends of Arius deposed Eustathius, whom the Emperor then exiled to Thrace.[77] Before long, he was followed by eight bishops of his group; then, encouraged by this success, the Arian party directed its attack against Athanasius, who had been elected to the see of Alexandria after Alexander's death in 328. At Nicaea itself they had acquired a lasting impression of this new bishop's energy and constancy and could see in him the actual rising champion of the Nicene theology.

In his case too the Arians' accusation chose the route of insinuation and represented as the real cause of the still nonexistent religious peace the tyrannical character of the Bishop of Alexandria, who did not trouble himself about law and order and stopped at no methods of force to make his own interests prevail. Among other things, he was supposed to have murdered Bishop Arsenius, who, as a Meletian, had not submitted unconditionally; he had had other Meletian bishops flogged and had profaned a chalice used in the liturgy.[78] The Emperor was so impressed by these charges that he gave instructions that the bishops whom he had invited to the dedication of the church he had built at Jerusalem over the tomb of Christ should treat the case of Athanasius at a synod in nearby Tyre (335).[79] The Synod was completely dominated by the Arian faction, which admitted almost none but opponents of Athanasius. The Egyptian bishops in his retinue were turned away as uninvited; furthermore, the Emperor's representative, Count Flavius Dionysius, was a declared adherent of the Arian faction. At Tyre there also appeared for the first time two bishops from Pannonia who would often play a changing role in the later confrontations, Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, whom Arius had gained for his views, probably during his exile. At this Synod Athanasius was not only in the role of the accused; he also stood before men who almost without exception were his bitter opponents, so that here he could expect no just verdict and even had to fear for his life. Deciding to leave Tyre secretly, he went to Constantinople to meet the Emperor in person.[80] The Synod at once decreed his deposition. Since Athanasius was not admitted to an audience, he addressed the Emperor directly when the latter had gone riding on horseback, described the proceedings at Tyre, and asked for justice. At first Constantine rendered no decision but commanded the participants of the Synod of Tyre to come to Constantinople; but only four of them, the two Eusebiuses, Ursacius, and Valens, appeared.[81] They advanced a new charge against Athanasius, which amounted to high treason: that he sabotaged the imperial decrees in Egypt and prevented the export of the grain necessary for the capital's life. The Emperor could have decreed the death penalty for these crimes, but instead he ordered the exile of Athanasius to Trier.[82] It is by no means clear why Constantine did not have this ridiculous accusation more thoroughly investigated. It seems to have been for him a welcome pretext for finally removing far from the East a troublesome man, who, in his view, stood in the way of reconciliation.

---

[76] See M. Spanneut, *DHGE* 16, 13–23 (Lit.) and H. Chadwick, *JThS* 49 (1948), 27–35.

[77] Theodoret, *HE* 1, 21, 4–22, 1. The date of the Synod is much controverted, 326, 330, 331, 338? See H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Serdica* (London 1958), 149.

[78] In his *Apologia contra Arianos,* Athanasius enumerates the charges.

Now, of course, the Arian party had a free hand, and they wanted to crown their series of successes thus far with the full rehabilitation of Arius, hence with his absolution from censure and reinstatement in his priestly rights. For him too the situation had improved. It is true that as late as 333 the Emperor had issued an edict against him and his adherents and in a rather lengthy letter to Arius and his friends he had once more repudiated their doctrine.[83] But at the latest in November 334

---

[79] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 41, 42; the letter to the members of the Synod also in Theodoret, *HE* 1, 29; cf. F. Scheidweiler, *ByZ* 51 (1958), 87–99.

[80] See P. Peeters, "Comment s. Athanase s'enfuit de Tyr en 335," *Acad. R. Belg. Cl. Lettres* 30, 5 (Brussels 1944), 131–177; *id., AnBoll* 63 (1945), 131–144.

[81] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 86; Sozomen, *HE* 2, 281–313.

[82] Athanasius, loc. cit.

[83] G. H. Opitz, op. cit., no. 33, 4.

Arius received a letter from the Emperor, which urgently invited him to court for an exchange of views.[84] Arius on this occasion presented to Constantine a profession of faith, which skillfully evaded the very point at issue but seemed to the Emperor to prove that Arius did not teach what his opponents attributed to him. Hence he referred him to a future synod, which should absolve him from excommunication.[85] This possibility presented itself to the Arian bishops at the above-mentioned meeting in Jerusalem. They declared Arius's doctrine to be orthodox and for this purpose appealed to the profession of faith that he had presented. Then they lifted the excommunication pronounced against him at Nicaea and asked the Emperor to reinstate him in his priestly rights. This was intended to take place in a solemn ecclesiastical function, but Arius died shortly before.[86] The Emperor's death the next year was to mean the beginning of further progress upward for the Arians. The eastern part of the Empire fell to his son Constantius II, who had chosen Arianism as his faith and would procure exclusive recognition for it during the twenty-four years of his reign, when necessary with any means available.

---

[84] Socrates, *HE* 1, 25; from the letter it follows that such an invitation had been issued earlier.

[85] Text of the profession of faith in Sozomen, *HE* 2, 27, 7ff.

[86] Decision of the Synod of Jerusalem: Sozomen, *HE* 2, 27, 13–14; Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos,* 84; *De syn.* 21. Death of Arius: Athanasius, *Ep. de morte Arii ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* 19. Athanasius saw a divine judgment in the sudden death. Arius probably died, not at Alexandria, but at Constantinople.

CHAPTER 3

The Struggle over the Council of Nicaea under the Sons of Constantine

Constantine the Great believed he had made sufficient provision for the future of the Empire when in 335 he informed his three sons of his planned division of its territory. The oldest, Constantine II, was to receive the Prefecture of Gaul, the East was assigned to Constantius II, and the central part, that is, Africa, Italy, and Pannonia, was to belong to the youngest, Constans. In addition, two sons of Constantine's half-brother Dalmatius were given a share in the government, but in a weaker position. This plan was never fully implemented. For the first months after Constantine's death, the Empire was still ruled in his name. In September 337 his three sons assumed the title of Augustus; at the same time a military revolt in Constantinople produced a bloodbath, in which all male relatives of the three Augusti, except for the brothers Gallus and Julian, nephews of Constantine, were murdered together with several high officials—whether this happened with the consent of Constantius, who was present, or whether he was merely a helpless spectator, cannot be determined. But the incident only too clearly shows how little a Christian spirit had penetrated the army and administration. The division of the spheres of power was somewhat altered: Constantine II retained the West with Trier as his capital; the East continued under Constantius II; Constans took the Balkan peninsula and resided at Sirmium, but his oldest brother was a sort of guardian for him and had an honorary precedence among the three. However, Constans claimed full equality and had recourse to arms when Constantine II refused. In his preparation for the war, the latter fell into an ambush at Aquileia and lost his life (340). Constans took control of the sphere that had belonged to his dead brother and for the next ten years was ruler of the Balkan Peninsula and the entire West. Constantius had to accept in silence this extension of his brother's power, since he was tied down in the East because of permanent unrest on the Persian frontier.

No reaction in favor of paganism or even an attempt at a restoration was to be expected from any of the young Emperors. They had all been raised as Christians, and the Christian faith corresponded to their inner convictions. Both surviving Augusti departed to a great extent from the line of relative toleration maintained by their father toward the adherents of paganism and the private practice of heathen worship, as a series of legislative measures proves. The year 341 was decisive in this regard, with an edict issued by Constantius, which began: *Cesset superstitio, sacrificiorum aboleatur insania.*[1] Of course, it is not entirely clear whether only the excesses of pagan worship or pagan sacrifices in general were here meant. The new harsh tone was unmistakable, and through it Christians were encouraged to a bellicose attitude toward paganism and its manifestations of life. The writer Firmicus Maternus, converted to Christianity not long before, in his neophyte's zeal demanded of the Emperors the closing of the temples by law, the melting down of the statues of the gods, the confiscation of temple property.[2] The Arian Bishop George of Cappadocia, who had been installed at Alexandria in place of Athanasius, pathetically cried out when he passed by a pagan temple: "How long is this tomb to remain standing?"[3] This aggressive attitude exploded here and there in actual measures taken by Christians against individual sanctuaries. In Syria, Bishop Marcus of Arethusa had a pagan shrine demolished and on its site built a church; at

---

[1] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 2.

[2] *De err. prof. rel.* 28, 6; 29, 1.

[3] Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 11, 7.

Caesarea in Cappadocia the shrines of Zeus and Apollo were destroyed; in Phrygia the temple in Merus was closed.[4] The Christians had a model for their actions in the attitude of the state officials: for example, the Caesar Gallus had the relics of the martyr Babylas solemnly transferred to the shrine of Apollo in Daphne, a suburb of Antioch, in order thereby to proclaim that the power of this once highly esteemed oracle had been broken by the Christian saint; at Alexandria, the *stratēgos* Artemius had the Sarapeion plundered by his soldiers.[5] It is noteworthy that all these incidents took place in the eastern half of the Empire and apparently remained isolated cases. That the exercise of pagan worship still persisted and was performed at least in secret follows from the repeated decrees of the imperial officials, which again and again enjoined the earlier prohibitions. Some refer especially to divination and pagan magic,[6] but that many temples were closed on the basis of official decrees is proved above all by the fact that the Emperor Julian had them again opened by special decrees, again permitted the sacrificial rites in them, and restored the property taken from them.[7] Occasional compromises made by the Emperor Constantius do not contradict his basically hostile attitude toward heathen worship. Moderation especially in regard to the pagan senatorial faction in Old Rome seemed to him to be politically advisable. On the occasion of his visit to the western capital in 356 he permitted the continuation of the privileges of some old cults, but he had the altar of Victory removed from the Senate chamber and by his conduct while visiting the most important monuments of Rome he showed that for these witnesses of the pagan religion he had an interest that concerned the history of art rather than religion.[8] It was clear that followers of this religion could exert no influence that carried any weight on the imperial religious policy as a whole.

Of course, the Christianity of the Empire must have awaited with great tension the first expressions of the Emperors in regard to the conflict for or against the Nicene Creed, which had split especially the faithful of the eastern half of the Empire into two camps and finally had brought the better prospects of victory to the Arian faction. But at first the adherents of the Creed and of its champion Athanasius could breathe freely. As early as three weeks after the death of Constantine the Great, his son at Trier made known in a letter to the Christian congregation of Alexandria that the exile of its bishop was at an end.[9] Soon the other exiled bishops who were loyal to Nicaea received permission to return to their sees; hence one could assume that these measures were based on an understanding among the dead Emperor's sons. Athanasius on his return journey several times met with the Emperor Constantius—at Viminacium, at Caesarea in Cappadocia, at Antioch[10]—and for the time being nothing indicated any discord between them. But the arrival of the former pastors in their sees had less gratifying consequences. Almost everywhere they had been given successors after their banishment, and these were unwilling to yield without more ado, and hence in several cities there were disturbances and confrontations in the local congregations.[11]

---

[4] Theodoret, *HE* 3, 7, 6; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 4, 88–91; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 4, 2; Socrates, *HE* 3, 15.

[5] John Chrysostom, *In Bab.* 12; Julian, *Ep.* 60 (70 Bidez); Sozomen, *HE* 4, 30, 2.

[6] Law of 23 November 353: *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 5; of 1 December 356; ibid. 16, 10, 4–6.

[7] Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 4, 3; 22, 5, 2.

[8] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 3; Ammianus Marcellinus, 16, 10, 3; Symmachus, *Rel. ad Gratianum* 3, 7, 6–7.

The Eusebians—the faction surrounding Eusebius of Nicomedia—were naturally dismayed at the return of their most capable opponent and decidedly denied that the resumption of the See of Alexandria by Athanasius was permissible in canon law: an ecclesiastical synod, that of Tyre in 335, had deposed him by a valid judgment and this act could not be annulled by a unilateral decision of the Emperor. They even sent a priest, Macarius, to Pope Julius at Rome to present to the Pope the synodal acts of Tyre and show the illegality of Athanasius's return.[12] At the same time they recognized as Bishop of Alexandria the former priest Pistus, who had been ordained by a friend of Arius as Bishop of the Meletians. A man of the energy and readiness for action of Athanasius reacted quickly and firmly. A synod of all the Egyptian bishops, summoned by him in 338, solemnly declared its confidence in him as Egypt's lawful chief bishop and demonstrated in a circular to all bishops of the Church that he had been elected bishop ten years earlier in complete accord with canon law, that his deposition by the Synod of Tyre was an act accomplished by naked power, and that he had received no successor at the time of his banishment; hence he had returned to his still vacant episcopal *cathedra.*[13] This encyclical, which went also to Rome and to the three Emperors, provoked the Eusebians to an ill-advised step. They now asked the Pope for the convoking of a synod which should decide the case of Athanasius and thereby abandoned the validity of the decree of the Synod of Tyre, which they had so strongly stressed.[14] At the same time they repudiated Pistus, hitherto claiming to be the successor of Athanasius, and decided for a foreigner, Gregory of Cappadocia, who was quickly ordained a bishop and brought to Egypt.[15] Since until now the clergy and people of Alexandria had admittedly possessed the right to elect their bishop, this wholly uncanonical procedure encountered the most violent resistance from the Catholics of Alexandria, and the new bishop had to enter the Egyptian capital in 339 under military protection—the outcome was violent disturbances, resulting in a number of deaths. However, Athanasius had to yield to force and left his episcopal city for the second time, not without, in a fiery protest, calling the attention of all bishops to the fate of the Church if people silently tolerated the terror.[16] Meanwhile, invitations were issued by Pope Julius to a synod at Rome, but now the Eusebians declined to go there, even though it was they who had asked for the synod. They again referred to the fact that an eastern synod had already decided the question: a western synod could not even discuss or decide a case which was an internal affair of the eastern Church.[17] This only induced the Pope all the more painstakingly to examine at a Roman Synod (340–341) the matter of Athanasius, who was present with a group of other exiled bishops, on the basis of all the documents obtainable. It reached the conclusion that Athanasius was the lawful Bishop of Alexandria, and Pope Julius communicated this to the eastern bishops in a dignified letter, in which was clearly heard the claim of the Roman Bishop to summon to himself cases involving even eastern episcopal sees and to render decisions binding the Universal Church. He very skillfully reproached them for their inconsistency if they here rejected a second treatment of a question decided by a synod, whereas in the case of Arius they had invariably acted otherwise.[18] But the decision of the Roman Synod had no effect on the actual circumstances: Athanasius had to remain in the West and maintain only by letter his relations with the Egyptian Christians who remained loyal to him.[19] The opponents of *homoousios* met in the East when the church built by Constantius at Antioch was solemnly dedicated in the fall of 341. At this Dedication Synod they composed a circular in which they were careful not to call themselves adherents of Arius: they would only follow the tradition but in their profession of faith they avoided every formula which had been adopted into the Nicene Creed.[20]

---

[9] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 87.

[10] Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 5.

[11] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 3, 8–9.

[12] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 19.

[13] Ibid., 3–19.

[14] Ibid., 20.

---

[15] Socrates, *HE* 2, 9.

[16] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.*, 9–10; *Epist. encycl.* 6.

[17] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos*, 31–35; Sozomen, *HE* 3, 8, 4–8.

[18] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 15; *Apol. contra Arianos* 21–31; for the Pope's letter, see P. Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne* (Paris, 4th ed., 1929), 416–423.

[19] A letter in which he provided bishops for thirteen vacant Egyptian sees: *PG* 26, 1412–1414.

The Synod of Serdica and its Sequel

Commotion reappeared in the discussion because of the political events which had made the young Constans sole ruler in the West and thereby had increased his power, to which Constantius in the East could not be indifferent. When Constans asked his brother for a clarification of the attitude of the bishops in the eastern part of the Empire, a delegation of four bishops soon appeared at the court in Trier and presented the Emperor with a new creed, in which, it is true, some theses of Arius were rejected without his being named, but the *homoousios* was not mentioned, as though the Council of Nicaea had not taken place.[21] But meanwhile Pope Julius also had again become active: he had asked the Emperor Constans to obtain his brother's consent to a new synod, to be attended by bishops of both parts of the Empire, which should definitively end the conflict. Constantius agreed, and so a meeting of all bishops was summoned to Serdica (Sofia) in the Balkan Peninsula;[22] this city was in the dominions of Constans but lay next to the frontier of the Eastern Empire.

Both factions arrived there in the fall of 342 or 343.[23] At the head of the approximately ninety western bishops were Hosius of Córdoba, now well advanced in years, and two priests, Archidamus and Philoxenus, as representatives of Pope Julius.[24] The easterners, fewer in number—between seventy-five and eighty—were led by Stephen of Antioch and Acacius of Caesarea in Palestine—Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had become Bishop of Constantinople, had died in 341—but, characteristically, they were accompanied by two high officials of Constantius.[25] Unfortunately, only a single common session of the two groups took place because the easterners laid down a *condicio sine qua non:* the deposed eastern bishops, Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepas of Gaza, were not to take part in the Synod, since, as the accused, they could have neither seat nor voice in it.[26] Even when Hosius proposed that Athanasius should himself, if proved innocent, remain in the West if his return to Alexandria was undesirable, they remained intransigent. The eastern bishops held a special session, composed an encyclical for the Universal Church, and left Serdica by night under the pretext that they had just received news of a victory of their Emperor Constantius over the Persians, which they had to celebrate with their congregations.[27] By leaving the Synod they created the impression that the entire procedure was already completed for them. In a circular to the whole Church body they repeated the old accusations against Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra and condemned the leading western bishops, especially Pope Julius, Hosius of Córdoba, and Maximinus of Trier, because through them "Marcellus, Athanasius, and the other criminals" had been "again received into the ecclesiastical community."[28]

---

[20] Athanasius, *De syn.* 22; Socrates, *HE* 2, 10; Sozomen, *HE* 3, 5, 5.

[21] Athanasius, *De syn.* 25; Sozomen, *HE* 3, 10, 4–6.

[22] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 3, 14; Anthanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 3–4.

[23] The date is still controverted; cf. the summary in H. Hess, op. cit., 140–144 (for 343), who, however, overlooked the contribution of W. Schneemelcher to the question (for 342).

[24] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 2, 9–15; 3, 16.

[25] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 15.

The westerners necessarily alone completed the program determined for the Synod. They made a documentary examination of all the accused eastern bishops: the charges against Athanasius and his friends were again shown to be unsupported, whereas their enemies and their successors in their sees had committed serious offenses against canon law. Hence the westerners, in their turn, cut off the leading men of the East from the ecclesiastical community.[29] Some bishops also wanted a new creed to be promulgated and presented a sketch of it, but Athanasius rightly opposed this, saying that the Nicene Creed was entirely adequate and should not be debased by an unending production of further creeds, as the easterners were doing.[30] The members of the Synod then acquainted the bishops of the Universal Church with the decrees they had issued and asked those not present to give their assent.[31]

The Synod of Serdica is important in the history of canon law because it promulgated disciplinary regulations in twenty-one canons, which had become necessary in view of the bitter experiences of the recent years.[32] Thus it was expressly established that a deposed bishop had the right to appeal against the verdict, which, furthermore, could be made only by the synod of his province and in this form: that his fellow-bishops had to submit the matter to the Bishop of Rome; it was up to the Pope to decide whether the sentence was just or refer the case for further consideration to the synod of a neighboring province, at which he could have himself represented.[33] It was enjoined on the bishops not to entice any clerics from other dioceses into their own or to ordain them without the consent of their own bishop or to give a parish to one who had been excommunicated by his own bishop.[34] The bishops' duty of residence was strictly interpreted, and a transfer to another see was firmly prohibited.[35] An unambiguous allusion to events of the very recent past was evident in the decrees which forbade lengthy journeys of the bishops to the imperial court.[36] The bishops did not go home without appealing urgently to the Emperor Constantius to end the intrigues and violent procedures of individual bishops against their confreres and that government officials should not interfere in ecclesiastical matters.[37]

---

[26] Athanasius, ibid. 15 and 44; Sozomen, *HE* 3, 11, 4.

[27] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 16 and 44; *Apol. contra Arianos* 48.

[28] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 3, 1–29.

[29] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos,* 36, 49.

[30] Theodoret, *HE* 2, 8, 37–52: Greek text of the draft; Latin in Mansi, VI, 1215ff.; see Athanasius, *Tom. ad Antioch* 5.

[31] Greek in Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 44–51 and Theodoret, *HE* 3, 8, 1–36; Latin in Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 2, 1–8.

[32] Their long-controverted authenticity, also that of canons 3, 4, and 7 on the right of appeal to Rome, is now regarded as established; cf. H. Hess, op. cit., 22–24. Critical text of C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumento juris antiquissima* I, 480–482.

On the whole, the Synod of Serdica, on which people in the West had set such great hopes, ended without positive result, apart from its canons. Because of the excommunication of the leaders in East and West the atmosphere was so envenomed that a breach between eastern and western Christianity already became visible, one of the first stages in that long process of alienation which would finally lead to the definitive schism. This alienation must have been especially serious when the political power of a part of the Empire stood from time to time behind the notion that it acted for its episcopate in dogmatic or disciplinary questions. A development of this sort was already under way in the area ruled by Constantius. The Emperor clearly took sides against all who in any manner had demonstrated their sympathy for the decrees of the western bishops at Serdica. Bishops and clerics were banished, and the Emperor had guards posted to prevent the return home of those bishops who had been rehabilitated at Serdica.[38] Then came unexpected help from the West. The six-years-younger Constans did not restrict himself to caring for the peace in the ecclesiastical sphere in his part of the Empire, but exerted on his older brother a clearly visible pressure so that the Athanasians might enjoy their rights in the eastern part of the Empire—and Constantius had to reckon with the energy and superior diplomatic skill of Constans, who had already shown in the case of

---

[33] Can. 3, 4, 7.

[34] Can. 16, 18, 19.

[35] Can. 14, 15; 1, 2.

[36] Can. 8–12.

[37] The content of the letter is summarized by Hilary, *Liber I ad Constantium* 1–5.

[38] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 17 and 19.

Constantine II that he did not intend to deviate from decisions once made. Around Easter 344 there appeared at the court in Antioch a delegation from the West, of which the Bishop of Cologne, Euphratas, was a member; it brought a letter from the Emperor Constans, in which permission was requested for Athanasius to return to his episcopal city. While the delegation did not achieve the return of the exiled bishop, the persecution of Athanasius's adherents in Egypt was stopped for a while.[39] The influence of Constans remained effective, and when Bishop Gregory died in 345 Constantius by letter invited Athanasius to return to his diocese. But Athanasius bided his time and prepared carefully for his return journey. He solemnly took his leave of the Emperor Constans and Pope Julius, who gave him a laudatory letter for the people of Alexandria.[40] At Antioch the Emperor himself received him; he did not, however, agree to Athanasius's demand to be confronted with his opponents so as to be able to defend himself, but he seemed ready to make a definitive peace with Athanasius, since he required the Prefect of Egypt to return all official documents which had been sent to him on the subject of Athanasius.[41] The reception of the long-exiled Egyptian bishop in Alexandria resembled a triumphal procession. With satisfaction Athanasius pointed out that more than 400 bishops in the East and West were in communion with him; even his two bitter opponents from the Balkan Peninsula, Valens and Ursacius, declared to Pope Julius that they accepted the decrees of the Synod of Serdica, requested admission into the communion of the Church, and in a letter to Athanasius called him their brother.[42] Even if some bishops of the East were not internally in agreement with this development, it still seemed that now the way to a definitive pacification had been entered on. But again a political happening frustrated the hope through the death of the very one who had started this development. In January 350 Count Magnentius was acclaimed as Emperor at Autun in Gaul. The Emperor Constans had to flee to Spain, but was overtaken in the Pyrenees by his mutinous troops and murdered. After a war that went in favor of one side and then of the other for three years, Constantius succeeded in overwhelming the usurper.[43] The second son of Constantine became sole Emperor, and the religious policy of the State was again in the hands of one man.

---

[39] Ibid. 20–21.

[40] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 51 and 57; *Hist. Ar.* 21.

[41] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 54, 55, 23.

[42] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* II, 20.

[43] See J. Moreau, *JbAC* 2 (1959), 180, 165f.

The Religious Policy of Constantius II as Sole Emperor (350–361)

The apprehensions about Constantius's religious policies by Athanasius and his friends seemed at first to be without foundation. Constantius informed Athanasius that he would take into account the wishes of his dead brother and that Athanasius could always count on his support.[44] The latter was well advised when he maintained a strictly reserved tone with regards to a delegation from the usurper Magnentius, who hoped to gain the Egyptian bishop for his side; he called upon his congregation to pray for the Emperor Constantius.[45] The more Constantius made progress at the expense of the usurper, however, the more strongly the hostility of the opponents of Athanasius became evident, and the Emperor drew ever closer to them. From the beginning of 352 they reproached him for his adherence to Constans and the reception of the delegation from Magnentius and tried to arouse suspicions of his disloyalty in Constantius.[46] They increased their exertions when, through the death of Pope Julius in 352, Athanasius lost one of his most staunch supporters in the West.[47] The new Pope, Liberius (352–366), also rejected their accusations against Athanasius and turned to Constantius, who was then staying at Arles, with the request that he summon a synod to Aquileia, which should reestablish ecclesiastical peace between East and West.[48] It was not a good sign that the Pope's envoys found with the Emperor at Arles the two Pannonian bishops, Valens and Ursacius, who had in the meantime become his theological advisers for the Latin West. The Emperor was ready to hold a synod at once, but at Arles, to which the Gallic bishops were invited (353). However, none of the pending theological questions were presented for their discussion: instead, they received the draft of a decree which contained the condemnation of Athanasius.[49] At first the papal legates demanded the discussion of their theological differences, but in vain. Just as his father had done at Nicaea in regard to the minority, so now the Emperor threatened the western bishops with deposition and exile in the event that they refused to sign the decree. Together with this threat, the crafty eloquence of Bishop Valens of Mursa persuaded one Gallic bishop after another, who besides had only a meager knowledge of the entire prehistory of the case of Athanasius, to give the demanded signature; only one of them remained unmoved, Paulinus of Trier, who was therefore exiled to Phrygia, where he died.[50] Pope Liberius likewise could not give his assent and demanded of the Emperor the summoning of a new general council.[51] Constantius very willingly agreed to this request, since he knew that no serious resistance of his will was to be expected from this episcopate, and named Milan as the meeting place of this Synod. A few easterners and a considerable number of western bishops appeared there in 355.[52] With this Synod began a disgraceful tragedy, for which the Emperor was chiefly responsible, since he did not tolerate the slightest resistance to his will and let himself be induced to ever more severe measures. Again the only thing he wanted from the members was to sign the judgment condemning Athanasius. When Bishop Eusebius of Vercelli proposed, on the other hand, that the bishops present should first add their signatures to the Nicene Creed, and Bishop Dionysius of Milan prepared to do just that, there were ugly scenes.[53] As a consequence the Emperor had the remaining sessions transferred from the church to the imperial palace,[54] in order better to control the bishops, and again he succeeded, by means of the same threats, in obtaining the same result as at Arles. With three exceptions, all yielded to force: these three were Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Dionysius of Milan, against whom exile was decreed. The Arian Auxentius of Cappadocia was forced upon the Milanese Catholics as their bishop: he could not even preach to his flock in their mother tongue. After the close of the Synod, imperial envoys sought out the absent bishops and extorted their signatures. In Gaul they encountered a certain resistance, the soul of which was soon recognized as Bishop Hilary of Poitiers, who in the next years would play an important role in keeping the Latin West from succumbing to Arianism. He was now compelled, with other bishops of southern Gaul, to take part in a Synod at Béziers (356), where it was possible to obtain by cunning the assent of most of the participants to the condemnation of Athanasius. Only Hilary and Rhodanius of Toulouse refused and hence had to take the road to exile in Phrygia.[55]

---

[44] Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 23.

[45] Ibid. 9.

[46] Athanasius, ibid. 3f., and *Hist. Ar.* 30.

[47] Julius died 12 April 352: *LP* I, 9.

[48] Hilary, *Fragm. Hist.* 5, 1–6.

There was still really only one western bishop whose attitude could not be a matter of indifference to the Emperor and his advisers—the Bishop of Rome, Pope Liberius. When he learned of the outcome of the

---

[49] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 39.

[50] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 1, 6; Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 27.

[51] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 5, 3; 6.

[52] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 9, 1.

[53] Hilary, *Ad Constant.* 1, 8; Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 31–34.

[54] Lucifer of Cagliari, *Moriendum esse pro Filio Dei* 1.

[55] Hilary, *Contra Constant.*, no. 2; on the Synod of Béziers, see E. Griffe, *La Gaule Chrétienne* I (Paris, 2nd ed. 1964), 224–228.

Synod of Milan, he wrote at once to the three exiled bishops to express to them his appreciation of their upright conduct and his regret at not sharing their fate.[56] But at first the rank of the Roman Bishop seemed to recommend to the Emperor still another method. The imperial official Eusebius carried rich presents to the Pope, and only when these were firmly rejected did threats follow. When the Pope had the gifts, which had been placed in St. Peter's, removed from the church, the Prefect of the City, Leontius, received the command to bring Liberius to court by force. In order to avoid disturbances among the population, the act had to take place under the cover of night.[57] At the court in Milan there were sharp confrontations between the excessively excitable Emperor and the Pope, who with dignified firmness refused to condemn the "godless Athanasius, whose insolence cannot be described," as the Emperor put it.[58] Finally, the Emperor gave him three days for reflection, after which he was to decide for signing and at the same time for returning to Rome or for exile. But after only two days Liberius was taken into exile in Thrace, where he was entrusted to the care of an Arian bishop. The 5,000 gold pieces which the Emperor gave him for his expenses were rejected, as was also the money which the Empress wanted him to have.[59] Apparently a long resistance by the Pope was expected, since after a while he received a successor: a deacon, Felix, who lacked the character to refuse the office.[60] In this way virtually every voice that could evoke real resistance was silenced. But the Emperor's entourage remembered that in remote Spain there was still Bishop Hosius of Córdoba, who was almost a centenarian by then. This old man still seemed dangerous and when, despite repeated letters from the Emperor, he was not prepared to break with Athanasius, he was brought to the Balkan peninsula and kept in prison, probably at Sirmium.[61]

After the West had thus been intimidated by the Emperor, it was possible to proceed with greater security against Athanasius, who was still in Alexandria. In reply to all efforts to overawe him Athanasius cleverly referred to the Emperor's letters, in which the latter had assured him of his sympathy and help. The attempt to stage a popular uprising against him also miscarried.[62] Finally, a detachment of soldiers invaded the Church of St. Theonas during a liturgy at which Athanasius was present in order to arrest the bishop. In the resulting tumult, which claimed several lives, Athanasius escaped (February 356) and betook himself to the monks in the desert, who received him with great joy.[63] Against the will of the people, who had appealed to the Emperor, the congregation of Alexandria in 357 again received an outsider as bishop, after the churches had been taken from the Catholics and given to the Arians.[64] This Bishop George introduced a real regime of terror throughout Egypt, had bishops and priests sent into exile, and in every possible way molested the faithful who remained loyal to Athanasius, until finally after eighteen months the Alexandrians tired of the terror and put to flight the bishop who had been imposed on them.[65] But still Athanasius could not venture to return—and so the defenders of the Nicene Creed were driven out of public view. In his hiding place among the Egyptian monks Athanasius wrote some of his most important works of vindication. In the *Apologia to the Emperor Constantius* he refuted the calumnies then in circulation about him and devoted great care to both content and style. The *Apologia for His Flight* was addressed to the Universal Church and became one of his most popular writings. The *Apologeticus against the Arians* is, because of the numerous documents it gives, of inestimable value for the history of the years 339–357. In the *History of the Arians,* which he dedicated to the Egyptian monks, he pitilessly took his opponents to task, described their intrigues in often violent words, and called the Emperor Constantius a precursor of the Antichrist.[66] Lucifer of Cagliari included the Latin translation with his five often extravagant writings against Constantius, which also had their origin in exile.[67]

---

[56] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 6, 1–2.

[57] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 35–37.

[58] Theodoret, *HE* 2, 16, 1–27.

[59] Cf. M. Goemans, "L'exil du pope Libère," *Mélanges Chr. Mohrmann* (Utrecht 1963), 184–189.

[60] Theodoret, *HE* 2, 17, 3; Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 75.

[61] *Coll. Avell.* 2, 32.

[62] *Hist. aceph.* 4.

In all these controversies the question of the orthodox faith was no longer in the foreground; rather, the quarrel had to do with the recognition or rejection of bishops, more precisely of Athanasius and his followers in the episcopate. Whoever acknowledged him was an adherent of the orthodox faith, so said his friends; whoever condemned him made a profession of peace and at the same time showed his loyalty to the Emperor, said Constantius. Hence as soon as the opponents of Athanasius achieved political influence, their first concern was not to proclaim to their followers the content of the faith which they represented but to drive from their sees bishops who were friends of

[63] Athanasius, *Apol. de fuga* 24.

[64] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 55–58; Sozomen, *HE* 4, 9, 8–12.

[65] Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 28; *Hist. Ar.* 73; Epiphanius, *Panar.* 76, 1.

[66] Special edition of the *Apologia ad Constantium* and of the *Apologia de fuga* by I. M. Szymusiak in the *SChr* 56 (Paris 1958).

[67] *CSEL* 14 (Vienna 1886, ed. W. Hartl).

Athanasius and replace them with their own partisans. Hence it should cause no surprise that it was difficult to find in their ranks at the middle of the fourth century anyone primarily interested in the dogmatic question. But this situation changed from about 356, when the skilled dialectician Aëtius, after a colorful career, entered upon the road to theology and was ordained a deacon by Bishop Leontius of Antioch.[68] He took up again the real purpose of Arius, the question of the relationship of Father and Son, and expounded the hitherto radical solution to it in word and writing. According to him, the Son is neither equal to nor like the Father in substance, but at the most only similar to him; hence he repudiated the terminology discussed up to that time and came out in effect for the formula *anomoios.* The history of dogma regards him as the founder of the Anomoians or Aëtians, the radical Arian wing.[69] But at Antioch Aëtius found little approval of his radical theology and so he turned to Alexandria, where Eunomius, eventually Bishop of Cyzicus, later met him and was gained to his views.[70] However, these two introduced a split among the Arians into different groups and thus became the unwitting cause of a weakening of the entire anti-Nicene movement.

The view of Aëtius was also shared by the Bishop Germanius, who in 351 had been called from Cyzicus to Sirmium. Here in the summer of 357 he sketched a new creed, in which the expressions *substantia, consubstantialis,* and *homoousios* were disavowed.[71] They sought to win for this formula the signature of the aged Hosius, who was at Sirmium, and they succeeded. The now 100-year-old man, whose mental vigor had long ago deserted him, still retained enough clarity of mind and energy so that no condemnation of his long-time friend Athanasius could be wrung from him.[72] Far more important was the change of attitude on the part of Pope Liberius, which probably occurred even earlier. There exist four presumably genuine letters of the Roman Bishop in which, made pliable under pressure from Arian bishops in his exile in Thrace, he abandoned his previous attitude and now condemned Athanasius, accepted the communion of his opponents, and also signed a creed which he had hitherto rejected, which was probably that of Sirmium of 351 and did not necessarily have to be interpreted in a heretical sense. At the same time he asked that permission for his return to Rome be obtained from the Emperor.[73] Liberius was to suffer bitterly for this weakness, which was more a defect in his character as a man than in theology. When in 358 the Emperor let him go back to Rome, he required that he share with his "successor" Felix the office and dignity of Bishop of Rome. If the sympathies of the Romans were with Pope Liberius, so that Felix saw himself obliged to leave Rome, still outside Rome Liberius's reputation had fallen so low that he no longer played any special role in the theological discussions of the next years.[74]

---

[68] On him see G. Bardy, *RHE* 24 (1928), 809–827.

[69] Cf. R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* II (Darmstadt, 5th ed. 1959), 104.

[70] See E. Vandenbussche, *RHE* 40 (1944–45), 47–72; L. Abramowski, *RAC* 6, 936–947.

[71] Text in Hilary, *De syn.* 11, and Athanasius, *De syn.* 28.

[72] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 12, 6; Hilary, *De syn.* 11, 63, 87; cf. B. Llorca, "El problema de la caída de Osio de Córdova," *EE* 33 (1959), 39–56.

But the radical wing of the young Arians did not meet with the approval which their representatives had expected with their Creed of Sirmium of 357. Not only in Gaul[75] and North Africa,[76] but even in Arian circles in the East there appeared a strong opposition to the attack on the divinity of the Son, clearly represented by this group, and now a moderate trend was able to move more strongly into the foreground; it came closer to the Nicenes than to the radical Eunomians. Its leader was the theologian Basil of Ancyra,[77] who around Easter 358 invited several bishops to his city and then in their name published a document important for the further development of the discussion.[78] On the one hand it decisively rejected the Anomoian thesis, and on the other it proposed as a new term the word *homoiousios*. The similarity in nature of the Son with the Father that was thereby expressed meant without doubt a great movement toward the view of the Nicenes. Beyond that, they succeeded in gaining for this formula the Emperor, who had up until then favored the Anomoians. It was confirmed at a Synod in Sirmium in 358 and also received the signature of Pope Liberius.[79] Both Athanasius and Hilary spoke in a friendly manner of this new terminology, which to them seemed capable of an orthodox interpretation and should be discussed in an atmosphere of affability.[80] But Basil of Ancyra exploited the imperial favor he had won only for a sharp attack on the Anomoians, whose leaders in the episcopate now had to experience, for their part, the bitterness of exile.[81] Then he sought the greatest possible solemn sanctioning of his theology, which should occur at a great general council at Nicaea.[82]

---

[73] The four letters in Hilary, *Fragm. hist.: CSEL* 65, 155, 168, 170, 172; see A. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius* (Vienna 1919), pp. 153–183. P. P. Joannou, op cit., 125f. regards the letters as a fabrication.

[74] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 15, 4–6; Theodoret, *HE* 2, 17; *Coll. Avell.*, 1.

[75] Bishop Phoebadius of Agen then wrote his treatise *Contra Arianos;* see G. Fritz, *DThC* 12, 1369–1374. The text is in *PL* 20, 13–30 and A. Durengues, *Le livre de Phoebade contre les Ariens* (Agen 1927).

[76] Hilary, *Adv. Constant.* 26; see G. Folliet, *RÉB* 24 (1966), 212; A. Pincherle, *SMSR* 39 (1968), 169–182.

[77] On him see Quasten, *P* III, 201–203; E. Schwatz, *Ges. Schr.* IV, 27–28.

[78] Preserved in Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73, 12–22.

[79] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 14–15.

[80] Athanasius, *De syn.* 41; Hilary, *De syn.* 81; cf. P. Löffler, *ZKG* 71 (1960) 26–36.

The Double Synod of Seleucia–Rimini (359)

While Basil busied himself with the preparations for this council, another group of bishops succeeded in suggesting to the Emperor the notion of two synods, which should meet simultaneously—in the West for the Latin episcopate, in the East for the bishops of the eastern provinces. It is understandable that this plan could seem uncommonly attractive to the Emperor. The eastern synod could, despite the splits, count on a sure "Arian" majority; from the bishops of the West he could assume, on the basis of the experiences of the recent past, that he would gain the signing of one of the creeds recently proposed by him. The city of Seleucia in Isauria was selected as the meeting place for the bishops of the East, while the Latin bishops were to meet at Rimini on the Adriatic.[83] With this double synod began the last act of the distressing drama which the religious policy of Constantius as a whole represents. First, a preparatory commission was summoned to Sirmium in May 359 to draft the outline of a creed which would be laid before both synods.[84] The still extant Greek version of the draft, on which the industrious as well as fickle Valens and Ursacius collaborated, must have been no slight surprise for Basil of Ancyra. For the key word of the new creed was not the *homoiousios* that he was propagating, but the *homoios tō patri,* which thus expressed only the *likeness* of the Son to the Father. The representatives of this theology had apparently been able to gain the Emperor's ear with the argument that so vague a formula, which excluded the question of substance, could win many participants in the synods who were of the most varied tendencies. The preparatory commission established the procedure for the double synod; after the conclusion of the deliberations each synod should send a delegation to the Emperor, communicate the results to him, and at court give the decrees their definitive form.[85]

And so in the summer of 359 more than 400 western bishops from all the provinces of that part of the Empire arrived at Rimini.[86] Only Rome was not represented: the Emperor had apparently not had any invitation sent there, because there were two Bishops of Rome—a sign that the weakness of Liberius in regard to the imperial demands had not been able to enhance his reputation even with the Emperor. At first there was only an Arian minority of about 20 percent, whose leaders were the Pannonians Valens and Ursacius, Auxentius of Milan, and Saturninus of Arles. They confronted an overwhelming orthodox majority, which at first decided the agenda. They did not even consider the most recent Creed of Sirmium, excluded the leaders of the minority from the ecclesiastical community, professed again the Nicene Creed, and appointed a delegation to explain their views to the Emperor. Since the opposition did not submit, two delegations at once set out for the East to meet the Emperor in the vicinity of Constantinople.[87] Whereas the Arian group at once obtained an audience, the majority's delegation was told that it might wait for the present at Adrianople, then at Nicaea in Thrace.[88] They were headed by the upright Restitutus of Carthage, who was not equal to the situation. Representatives of the Arian minority soon appeared among them and so complicated the Sirmium formula with further explanations that finally in October 359 they signed and solemnly ratified their union with the formerly excommunicated bishops of this group.[89]

---

[81] Philostorgius, *HE* 4, 8–9.

[82] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 16, 1–4; 14–19; Jerome, *Chron. ad ann. 358.*

[83] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 16, 21.

[84] Ibid. 4, 17, 3; Green text in Athanasius, *De syn.* 8; Socrates, *HE* 2, 37; see J. N. D. Kelly, *Creeds,* 289f., and E. J. Jonkers, op. cit., 104f.

[85] In a letter of the Emperor to the members of the Synod of Rimini, Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 7, 1–2.

Meanwhile, the 400 bishops at Rimini waited for three months for the possibility of returning to their dioceses. The city offered few diversions, and the imperial officer who was responsible for external order made it even clearer to them that without their signature to the last Creed of Sirmium there would be no permission to leave. Thus the majority inexorably fell to pieces until at last they were even ready to thank the Emperor in a letter for his solicitude for the purity of the faith. A last group of some fifteen bishops who still had hesitations was won over with the indication that, even after signing, they could still make certain explanatory additions.[90] The additions did not interest the Emperor in the least: he now had in his hands an imposing document, the Creed of Sirmium, that, signed by all the bishops of the West—the exiles excepted—stood in an irrevocable opposition to the Nicene Creed.

[86] Sulpicius Severus reports the course of the Synod, *Chron.* 2, 41–45; Hilary gives several texts, *Fragm. hist.* 7–9; see C. A. Balducci, *Aspetti religiosi e politici del concilio di Rimini* (Rimini 1960); on Rimini see also Y. M. Duval, *Hilaire et son temps,* 51–103.

[87] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 8, 1–4.

[88] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 19, 1–2.

[89] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 8, 5; the formula of Nice in Theodoret, *HE* 2, 21, 3–7.

[90] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 9; Jerome, *Adv. Lucif.* 17.

While the tragedy of Rimini was drawing to a close, the bishops of the East met at Seleucia at the end of September 359.[91] The approximately 150 bishops were unevenly divided among the three "Arian" factions, the strongest of which was that of the Homoiousians—Basil of Ancyra, Macedonius of Constantinople, Silvanus of Tarsus—followed by the Homoians, led by Acacius of Caesarea[92] in Palestine and hence called Acacians, while the weakest was the young Arians, represented by George of Alexandria and Eudoxius of Antioch. The majority advocated the renewed approval of the creed which the dedication Synod of Antioch in 341 had issued, whereas the Acacians at a special session of their faction adopted the last Creed of Sirmium but appended the condemnation of the term *anomoios*.[93] When the Homoiousians persisted in their refusal, the Acacians left the Synod and began at once to deal with the Emperor, to whom also the Homoiousians sent their own trusted envoys. In the struggle for imperial recognition, the Acacians were finally victorious, since their theology coincided with what had just been signed at Rimini. After a long and bitter resistance, the Homoiousians gave in, when the Emperor declared that he wanted on 1 January 360, the beginning of his tenth consulship, to make known to the inhabitants of the Empire that religious peace had been restored.[94] Thereby the Creed of Nicaea was, at least externally, completely annulled, since with the acceptance of the Homoian theology a clearly Arian view had prevailed.

The Emperor now wanted this success to be assured by an ecumenical synod, which met at Constantinople in January 360,[95] but at which, apart from the eastern bishops, only a few from Thrace were represented. Once again the Creed of Rimini was ratified, to be valid for all future time. Then judgment was passed on bishops who thought otherwise: they were, however, condemned not for heterodox doctrine but for alleged disciplinary transgressions while in office. Thus all the leading bishops among the Homoiousians lost their sees, and Constantius strengthened the decrees of deposition by exiling those concerned. As formerly in the West, the effort was made to gain the assent of the eastern bishops who had not participated in any of the most recent synods. But the most powerful personality, Athanasius, had not yet been discovered by the imperial police in his hiding place; they could only state that he had sent an encyclical to the bishops of Egypt and Libya, which called upon them to be loyal to the faith and to refuse their signatures.[96] And so it happened that Egypt as a whole remained loyal to the faith. In the other provinces of the East also there were everywhere individual bishops who preferred exile to the denial of their faith.[97] The vacant sees were filled by Acacius, mostly with men who in the past had not been compromised in any faction. Especially the important ecclesiastical centers of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Caesarea in Palestine, Sirmium in the Balkan Peninsula, and Milan now had convinced Arians as their shepherds, and "Arianism" seemed to have become for all time the only permissible Christian faith. It was in regard to this situation that Jerome made his celebrated remark: "The world groaned and was amazed that it had become Arian."[98] Nevertheless, a radical alteration of the total political situation in the Empire led also to a change in the ecclesiastical sphere.

---

[91] Socrates, *HE* 2, 39–40; Sozomen, *HE* 4, 22; Hilary, *Adv. Constant.* 12–15.

[92] On Acacius see J. M. Leroux, *Stpatr* 8 (Berlin 1966), 82–85.

[93] Athanasius, *De syn.* 29; Socrates, *HE* 2, 39–40.

[94] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 23, 8.

[95] Ibid. 4, 24.

[96] Athanasius, *Ep. encycl. ad epp. Aegypti et Libyae.*

[97] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 27, 7.

[98] Jerome, *Adv. Lucif.* 29: "ingemuit totus orbis et arianum se esse miratus est."

CHAPTER 4

The Attempted Restoration of Paganism by the Emperor Julian (361–363)

In April 360 the Emperor Constantius directed his cousin Julian, who as Caesar was at Paris with the legions of Gaul, to send him immediately the best troops, since without them he could not control the continuing disturbances caused along the eastern frontier by the Persians.[1] The soldiers thereupon acclaimed Julian as Augustus, and after some hesitation he accepted. He began immediately to prepare for the now unavoidable military confrontation with his imperial cousin, and in the summer of 361 he led his troops to the East. As early as October he was in Sirmium, whose garrison at once recognized him as Augustus.[2] Constantius also prepared for war, but on the march to the Balkan Peninsula he fell mortally ill at Tarsus. Following the example of his father, he had himself baptized on his deathbed by the Arian Bishop Euzoius; he died, aged forty-four, on 3 November 361, thereby transmitting the rule of the entire Empire to the last member of the Constantinian Dynasty.[3] A few weeks later Julian received homage as Emperor in his birthplace, Constantinople, but the inhabitants of the capital were soon aware that the Empire had obtained a ruler who, in contradistinction to his dead cousin, was a convinced adherent of paganism and at once appointed as his advisers two renowned representatives of this religion, the philosophers Maximus and Priscus.[4]

---

[1] Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 3, 8, 3f.; Ammianus Marcellinus, 20, 4, 1f.

[2] Ammianus Marcellinus, 21, 9, 6f.

[3] Socrates, *HE* 47, 4; 3, 1, 1; Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 2, 96.

Although there is a relatively rich mine of sources on the Emperor Julian, it is not easy to form from it an unquestionably objective picture of his character and aims. So far as this comes from the camp of his adherents and admirers,[5] it glorifies him, often extravagantly, as the restorer of the Hellenic religion and of the Greek spirit. Christians, on the other hand, have often drawn a caricature of him and given him the insulting nickname of "Apostate,"[6] because in their view he had betrayed the religion in which he was raised. His letters and speeches seek, naturally, if also very subjectively, to justify his change of religion and the corresponding religious policy.

Like the sons of Constantine, Julian was raised a Christian, but since he lost his mother a few months after his birth, a decisive factor was lacking in his upbringing. Then the massacre of his father and a brother during the bloodbath in Constantinople in 337 exercised on the seven-year-old a shock that would never be forgotten. The profound antipathy toward his cousin Constantius, whom he readily connected with this episode, had its deepest root there. At first he was entrusted for his education to Eusebius of Nicomedia, Bishop of Constantinople, who of course could not devote himself intensively to this task. Later the constantly suspicious Constantius had him and his half-brother Gallus taken to the imperial estate Macellum[7] in Cappadocia, and a certain Mardonius was appointed teacher of the two princes. Here both were also baptized and as devout children they accepted the surrounding Christian religious world and atmosphere. They took part in the Christian liturgy and were even appointed to read the sacred texts aloud.[8] By his own admission, Julian was deeply impressed by the Church's charitable activity,[9] and there is no doubt that the growing boy and youth at that time accepted the Christian faith. The intellectually curious Julian satisfied his desire for reading by means of the books which George of

---

[4] Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 2, 2–7; Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 3, 11, 2.

[5] Among them were especially the *rhetor* Libanius and the historians Zosimus and Ammianus Marcellinus.

[6] He was so called by Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 21, 26, and Augustine, *De civ. dei* 5, 21.

[7] On Macellum see A. Hadjinicolau, *Byz(B)* 21 (1951), 15–22; A. J. Festugière, *JRS* 47 (1957), 53–58.

[8] According to Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 4, 23, 97; *HE* 5, 2, 10, both brothers were even admitted to the local clergy.

[9] *Ep.* 84 (Bidez).

Cappadocia, the later Arian Bishop of Alexandria, lent him and part of which he copied.[10]

But at Macellum there also occurred Julian's youthful religious crisis, which he had to endure in spiritual loneliness.[11] Above all, he had no friend of his own age to whom he could express himself or an understanding older person who could have shown him the example of a mature Christianity. Neither his stepbrother Gallus, totally different in temperament, nor the Arian George could make up for this lack. And so his seeking spirit and his strong religious gift turned to that world to which Mardonius had first introduced him in his reading of Homer, [12] the Greek religion in its Hellenistic form. When Julian was permitted to leave Macellum c. 347, he took up the study of rhetoric, first at Constantinople, then at Nicomedia, where he became acquainted with the pagan *rhetor* Libanius.[13] During a stay at Pergamum he got to know the philosopher Aedesius; then he became at Ephesus a pupil of the Neoplatonist Maximus, who especially introduced him into the mystery cults that he so highly esteemed.[14] Their secret ritual completely captivated the prince, and when in 354 he spent several months in Athens, he did not fail to have himself initiated secretly into the Eleusinian Mysteries.[15] The relationship with the distinguished pagan teacher of the Athenian academy, Priscus, completed his religious transformation: out of the young Christian of Macellum there had developed, not a scoffer like Lucian or a cynical skeptic of a Voltairean stamp, but a convinced follower of the Hellenic religion, who was supported by an enthusiastic, mystical ardor. But the formation of Julian's character also ended with this development. Admirers and opponents agree that his was a complicated nature, marked by strong contrasts.[16] His ascetical outlook made him scorn not only external pomp, especially in court ceremonial, but also personal comfort to an almost repulsive neglect of all care of the body,[17] and preserved him from any sexual excesses. He was stoutly loyal to his few friends, but was otherwise clearly ill at ease, especially toward his subordinates. In public appearances he was nervous and restrained, but his bravery and unpretentiousness in war gained him the respect of his soldiers. He clung stubbornly to measures he had taken and was intolerant of differing views. He was surprisingly eager for the praise of the mob and spoke obtrusively of his virtues.[18] When the people of Antioch with their unrestrained wit ridiculed him for his gloomy avoidance of the theater and spectacles, for his untidy appearance and his zealous piety, he reacted bitterly and reprimanded them like a schoolmaster but candidly admitted that he had no sense of humor.[19] As a dark shadow on his character must also be reckoned the fact that for almost a decade of public life he carefully concealed his religious change and through continued participation in the Christian liturgy pretended still to hold a faith which he had abjured years before, even when, as Caesar in Gaul, he was relatively independent.[20] This hypocrisy in religion, uncharacteristic of antiquity, cannot be excused by the danger into which a profession of paganism would have brought him with Constantius.

---

[10] *Ep.* 106 and 107.

[11] On it see A.-J. Festugière, *Antioche paienne et chrétienne* (Paris 1959), 69–74.

[12] Julian, *Misopogon* 351–352.

[13] Libanius, *Or.* 18, 14.

[14] Julian, 235A–B; 253B.

[15] J. Bidez, *Julian der Abtrünnige,* 125–128.

[16] Cf. The attempt at a total characterization in A.-J. Festugière, *Antioche,* 63–89.

[17] He himself boasts of it: *Misopogon* 338B–339B.

With the death of his imperial cousin, Julian removed the mask. He accompanied the remains, at the head of the funeral procession, to the burial services in the Church of the Apostles. But then in rapid succession followed measures which made clear a total reversal of the imperial religious policy hitherto maintained. A new appointment of the holders of the more important state offices betrayed a clear preference of the profession of paganism, and it was not softened by an occasional gesture in regard to an individual Christian.[21] The *labarum,* the standard with the Christian symbols which Constantine had introduced, was replaced by the old pagan banners, the images of the pagan gods soon appeared again on the coins, and its former pagan character was restored to the state. In several "edicts of toleration" all the restrictions to which pagan worship had been subject under his predessors were annulled; hence the temples were reopened, the sacrifices were permitted, the veneration of the gods was restored.[22] But in Julian's view toleration of paganism included the elimination of the injustice which Constantine especially had inflicted on paganism: in him he saw the real innovator and offender against the traditions of the Empire.[23] This meant the rebuilding of the temples destroyed since Constantine and the return of the shrines which had long ago been given to other hands. The implementation of this decree led in many places to serious conflicts, on the one hand because many Christians refused, on the grounds of conscience, to cooperate thus in the revival of paganism, and on the other hand because some pagans believed that the new situation gave them license now to plunder Christian churches, maltreat priests, violate Christian virgins, and deride Christian worship. In this way several Christians met death and for the future ranked as martyrs.[24] Julian, who refused to countenance a bloody persecution of Christians, very strongly disapproved especially the tumults at Alexandria, but the guilty got off without punishment.[25]

---

[18] Ammianus Marcellinus, 25, 4, 18: "vulgi plausibus laetus, laudem etiam ex minimis rebus intemperans appetitor, popularitatis, cupiditate cum indignis loqui affectans." On his self-praise: O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* 4 (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1922), 343f.

[19] In the *Misopogon, passim;* for his lack of humor, *Caesares* 306B.

[20] As late as the Epiphany 361 he attended the liturgy at Vienne; Ammianus Marcellinus, 21, 2, 4–5: "adhaerere cultui Christiano fingebat, a quo iam pridem occulte desciverat."

[21] J. Bidez, *Julian,* 227.

[22] Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 5, 2.

[23] Ibid., 21, 10, 7f.; cf. J. Vogt, "Julian über Konstantin," *Historia* 4 (1955), 339–352; C. Lacombrade, "L'empereur Julien et la tradition romaine," *Pallas* 9 (1960), 155–164.

It was soon apparent that the Emperor Julian was considering not a mere elimination of the injustice to paganism: he also ordered for it a reform program that should restore to it its former privileges and the leading position as religion of the State. At the head of this program was the reorganization of the pagan priesthood, on which he expressed himself in more detail in two letters to the high priests of Galatia and Asia.[26] He himself not only assumed the title and rank of Pontifex Maximus: he actively exercised the functions of the office. Every province of the Empire was to receive a pagan high priest and, for the goddesses, a high priestess, to whom the priests and priestesses in the cities and in the individual sanctuaries were subject. The names of individual high priests are known; they were for the most part Neoplatonists or Sophists, but they also included an apostate Christian bishop, Pegasius of Ilium.[27] On this reorganized priesthood Julian forcibly imposed guidelines for its activity and personal conduct. The members were to lead a strictly disciplined life and give the believers an example of piety. He directed their reading through a sort of "Index of Forbidden Books." In the temples they were to preach the pagan doctrines of faith and exactly perform the sacred rites, cultivate a fraternal spirit in their congregations, and take special care of the poor and the sick; it was in connection with this last point that Julian alluded to the corresponding practice of the "godless Galilaeans."[28] In some ways this whole program seemed like a copy of the forms of Christian organization and practices, and it has been suggested, perhaps not incorrectly, that Julian was expecting, for this reason, the conversion of some Christians to his renewed pagan religion.

---

[24] Philostorgius, *HE* 7, 33 (Bidez, 223f.); Gregory Nazianzen, *Or. 1 in Julian;* Sozomen, *HE* 5, 10, 5–11, 11; Socrates, *HE* 3, 15; Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 11, 4–10. See B. de Gaïffier, "Sub Juliano Apostata," *AnBoll* 74 (1956), 5–49.

[25] *Ep.* 60; Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 11, 11.

[26] *Ep.* 84 and 89.

[27] J. Bidez, *Julian,* 281, gives a few names.

[28] *Ep.* 84.

With great pains the Emperor also worked to revive the pagan system of oracles and the mystery cults; he thereby reopened the door for the return of the soothsayers, the casters of horoscopes, and the magical forms of pagan folk religion.[29] For himself he implemented the reform program very conscientiously. When he was staying at Constantinople, he performed the daily sacrifices in the shrine of Mithra that he had built; and in the cities to which his duties as Emperor brought him he daily visited the temples and very gladly acted as priest of the sacrifices.[30] He tolerated nothing that seemed injurious to the pagan cults. When, during his last visit to Antioch, he visited the once famed temple of Apollo in the suburb Daphne, he found it sadly neglected and the sacrifices ignored because the senate of the now mostly Christian city was no longer willing to provide any more financial expenditures for it. And the oracle which Julian requested here from Apollo was likewise not forthcoming. It was then pointed out to the Emperor that in the vicinity of the temple his stepbrother Gallus had once had the remains of the martyr Babylas buried in a chapel. Here Julian understood the reason for Apollo's silence and immediately had the relics of the Christian dead removed. A few days later the Temple of Apollo went up in flames, and even though the strictest investigation supplied no sure basis, Julian was convinced that the Christians were the authors of the fire. He had the great church in the city, built by Constantius, closed and hence had to endure the mockery of the inhabitants of the metropolis.[31]

It is of the greatest importance that the Emperor Julian coupled his pagan reform program with a measure against Christianity which, it is true, was unbloody, but which was supposed to affect the esteem of the Christian religion in regard to the public in a manner that in the long run threatened its very existence. The school law of June 362[32] directed that in the future all appointments of teachers in any school had to be approved by the city authorities and confirmed by the Emperor.[33] A circular[34] with the decrees regarding implementation revealed the real meaning of the law. The examination by the officials was to include not only the pedagogical abilities and moral qualities of the candidate, but especially his religious convictions. It would be intolerable for a teacher to explain Homer, Hesiod, Herodotus, Demosthenes, and the others without honoring the gods in whom they believed; anyone who believed that they erred in this should go to the Church of the Galilaeans and there explain Matthew and Luke. In this way Christians were in practice excluded from admission to the still highly esteemed rhetorical education, and the positions in public life which they had hitherto occupied were refused them. Their religion had to become gradually the religion of the uneducated. There was no adequate substitute for the ancient cultural values, even if some educated Christians, such as Apollinaris of Laodicea, and his father of the same name, did compose, to replace Homer, a biblical history in twenty-four hymns and reproduced the content of the gospels in Pindaric meters or on the model of Platonic dialogues.[35] The exclusion of even esteemed Christian teachers, for example, Marius Victorinus at Rome or Prohairesius at Athens, from their profession aroused a great public outcry, even though the Emperor was willing to make an exception in favor of the second of those just mentioned.[36] The law was rightly felt by the Christians as malicious and degrading, but it also caused great uneasiness among pagans. Ammianus Marcellinus, otherwise well disposed to the Emperor, was of the opinion that it should be concealed under perpetual silence.[37]

---

[29] Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 4, 3, 2f.; Libanius, *Or.* 18, 126; John Chrysostom, *In s. Bab* 14.

[30] Libanius, *Or.* 18, 127; Himerius, 7, 9; for Constantinople, *Misopogon* 344B–C, 361A, D; Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 12, 6–8; 27, 7, 3; 14, 3.

[31] See J. A. Festugière, *Antioche paienne,* 82–84.

[32] See G. Downey, "Julian and the Schools," *Classical Journal* 53 (1957), 97–103.

[33] Partly in *Cod. Theod.* 13, 3, 5; *Cod. Just.* 10, 53, 7.

[34] In Bidez (*Ep.* 42), pp. 73–75; interpretation of the Christian historians: Socrates, *HE* 3, 12, 7; Theodoret, *HE* 3, 8, 1.

It may be assumed that the disappointment over the ill success of his efforts at religious reform drove the Emperor to the path of greater harshness. Only a small circle of educated pagans welcomed the severe initiative in this sector, but the pagan clergy themselves did not enter enthusiastically into the plans of the imperial Sovereign Pontiff, and all the more the common people displayed a notable apathy.[38] Obviously the number of conversions from Christianity to paganism remained far behind the Emperor's expectations. Consequently, the measures increased more and more: they purposely, it is true, aimed to avoid a bloody persecution of Christians, but as a whole they subjected them to a special law and made them second-class citizens. Julian was entirely in accord with the inner thrust of the school law when he now excluded Christians from the higher posts in the state administration and from the imperial guard and ironically stated that Christian moral doctrine forbade them to draw the sword.[39] It is noteworthy how very much Julian again and again let himself be provoked to petty annoyances by cities that had a Christian majority. Thus he threatened the inhabitants of Edessa and Nisibis that he would refuse them aid against Persian attacks. In Palestine he punished Maiuma by revocation of its city rights, which he transferred to nearby Gaza. Caesarea in Cappadocia felt the imperial displeasure because people had looked on idly when the temples of Zeus and Apollo were destroyed there.[40] Even the Christians' manner of burial repeatedly evoked his anger. In February 363 an edict forbade the burial of corpses by daylight on the ground that pagans were thereby offended and the gods of light were insulted by the sight of such ceremonies.[41] The inhabitants of the Syrian city of Emesa were praised by him because "they had burned the burial places of the Galilaeans." The governor of Caria was ordered to burn or tear down the memorial shrines of the Christian martyrs, since they polluted the air around the temple of Didyma.[42]

---

[35] Cf. Sozomen, *HE* 5, 18, 3–5.

[36] Marius Victorinus: Augustine, *Conf.* 8, 5, 10; Prohairesius: Julian, *Ep.* 31.

[37] Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 10, 7: "Illud autem erat inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio, quod arcebat docere magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos, ritus christiani cultores."

[38] J. Bidez, *Julian,* 331.

Finally, the Emperor's assault was aimed at those who strengthened the Church's life and organization by their influence—the bishops, as leaders of the Christian congregations. Until now he had spared them out of a certain diplomacy. At the very beginning of his reign he had allowed the bishops exiled by Constantius to return home; in so doing, he was also, of course, as Ammianus Marcellinus maliciously remarks, fostering the expectation that conflicts between Arians and Catholics would thereby be renewed and Christian strength would be diminished.[43] Thus Athanasius was able to return to his episcopal city from his six-years' exile among the monks of Egypt and take up his duties again, but, to Julian's displeasure, what had been expected to be new confrontations with the Arians was more like a reconciliation. And so in October 362 he had an edict delivered to Athanasius, which again decreed his expulsion. When the Alexandrian Christians then sent a petition to the Emperor to ask the recall of their bishop, Julian gave full reign to his hatred of Athanasius in an extravagant letter to the inhabitants of the city: they, the lords of Egypt, had made themselves slaves of the Hebrews and were now interceding for this arrogant monster Athanasius, against whom he could only decree outlawry.[44] Bishop Eleusius of Cyzicus was driven from his city, because he had influenced the pagan inhabitants, desecrated the temples, and built homes for widows and virgins.[45] When Bishop Titus of Bostra complained to the Emperor that his clergy were unlawfully subjected to injuries by the officials, he received a sharp reprimand in a letter to the population of the city, which branded the Christian bishops as the scourges of the public order and called upon them to expel the bishop of their city.[46]

---

[39] Socrates, *HE* 3, 13, 1; especially Julian, *Ep.* 83: "in appointments to office, pagans are absolutely to be preferred to Christians."

[40] Julian, *Ep.* 53, 91, 56, 115; Sozomen, *HE* 6, 1, 1; Theodoret, *HE* 3, 26, 2.

[41] Julian, *Ep.* 136.

[42] Ibid. 124; *Misopogon* 357C.

[43] Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 5, 2f.; Philostorgius, *HE* 7, 4.

[44] Julian, *Ep.* 110–112; see O. Seel, *Klio* 32 (1939), 175–188.

The Emperor could not fail to give vent to his deep hatred of Christianity in his literary works. In his *The Caesars or the Banquet* is found a ridiculing of Christian baptism, penance, and the figure of Jesus, which pushes into the background everything that pagan polemic had thus far offered.[47] His *Against the Galilaeans,* on which he worked at Antioch in the winter of 362–63, was intended to summarize all the negative things which he had to say about the hated religion.[48] The trustworthy testimony of some sources maintains that Julian toyed with the plan of carrying out a radical persecution of Christians after the Persian campaign of 363 is not to be doubted.[49] The invitation issued by him to the Jews to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem certainly had an anti-Christian motive: the newly built temple should give the lie to the word of Jesus on its destruction (Luke 21:5f), which was frequently quoted in Christian apologetics, and unmask its author as a false prophet.[50]

The expedition against the Persians, from which the Emperor Julian anticipated glory and honor for the Empire, led to his sudden end. After some initial successes, the imperial army had to retreat, and in a rear-guard action Julian was mortally wounded by a soldier's arrow. He died on 26 June 363 in the presence of his Neoplatonist friends Maximus and Priscus, only thirty-two years old; in accord with his own wish, he was buried at Tarsus, the birthplace of the Apostle Paul.[51]

The sudden downfall of the Emperor occupied the thought and imagination of pagans and Christians in the succeeding decades. The incident led a pagan, as Jerome reports,[52] to this bitter reflection: "How can the Christians claim that their God is long-suffering? What is more violent and more swift than this anger, which could not defer its intervention for a second?" On the Christian side a twofold legend early embellished this death with colorful details. In one version Julian turned, complaining, to the Sun-god, whom he had so highly honored: "Helios, you have abandoned me."[53] The second version has the Emperor die with the words: "O Galilaean, you have conquered!"[54] Both versions express in their separate ways an historically apt perception. It was an illusion when Julian thought that paganism could at that time be returned to the primacy it had once held by official promotion and the work of his uncle Constantine could be wiped out. It was an even greater misjudgment of reality if he thought that in his time an attack on Christianity with the aim of destroying it, even by means of recourse to the power of the State, had a prospect of success. The failure of his twofold undertaking decisively weakened further the position of paganism.

---

[45] Sozomen, *HE* 5, 15, 5.

[46] Julian, *Ep.* 114.

[47] Caesares, 336A–B.

[48] The extant fragments are in C. J. Neumann, *Juliani imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* (Leipzig 1880).

[49] J. Bidez, *Julian,* 315f.

[50] See J. Vogt, *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum* (Leipzig 1939), pp. 46–59.

[51] J. Bidez, op. cit., 346–349; Ammianus Marcellinus 25, 3, 10–23; Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 3, 29, 1; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 5, 13–18.

[52] Jerome, *In Habacuc* 2, 3 (*Pl* 25, 1329D).

[53] See the statements in Philostorgius, *HE* 7, 15.
[54] Theodoret, *HE* 3, 25, 6–7.

CHAPTER 5

Collapse of Arianism and Definitive Recovery of the Nicene Theology at the Council of Constantinople (381)

Perilous though the situation of Nicene Christians must have seemed after the victory of Arianism at the double Synod of Seleucia–Rimini in 359, a change quickly began when the death of the Emperor Constantius withdrew State support from the Arians. In the West, as in the East, bishops loyal to Nicaea undertook to heal the injury done and to rally again the strength of their congregations. In the West, Gaul quickly became the central area of orthodoxy, the soul of which was Bishop Hilary of Poitiers. Constantius himself had let him return home from banishment because he felt that there he would stir up less unrest than in the East. At his suggestion the Gallic bishops met in synod at Paris,[1] probably in 360, and composed a letter to the eastern bishops, in which they deplored their earlier conduct, separated themselves from the adherents of the false teaching of Valens, Ursacius, Auxentius, and Saturninus of Arles, and made an unambiguous profession of the Nicene faith.[2] It is to be attributed to Hilary's influence especially that the Latin West was never again seriously threatened by Arianism.

[1] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicon* 2, 45; cf. P. Galtier, *Saint Hilaire de Poitiers* (Paris 1960), pp. 70–73. On the date of the Synod see C. F. A. Borchardt, op. cit., 178.
[2] See Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 11, 1–4.

In the East, Alexandria naturally became a center of ecclesiastical restoration when Athanasius, on the accession of Julian, left his hiding place among the Egyptian monks to return to his congregation. With undiminished energy he consulted the Egyptian and other bishops in 362 in regard to the situation and the necessary steps for the restoration of unity of faith.[3] The question of again filling the sees hitherto occupied by Arian bishops proved to be especially delicate. Those bishops who in the past had clearly professed the Arian faith could, after doing penance, be again received into the ecclesiastical communion, but in each case they were reduced to the lay state; one who had been led astray by coercion or deception should retain his rank and office, but he had to subscribe in writing to the Nicene Creed. The implementation of the decrees often encountered the greatest difficulties in individual cases. Especially precarious was the situation at Antioch, whose Christians had split into three groups. The first believed that they had to remain loyal to the dead Bishop Eustathius, who had clung to Nicaea, and they gathered around the priest Paulinus. The largest faction upheld Meletius, the lawfully elected successor of Eustathius, but he had not yet returned from exile. The head of the third community was the Arian Euzoius, whom the Emperor Constantius had summoned to Antioch. The Synod of Alexandria, just mentioned, sent a delegation with its decrees to the Syrian capital in order to bring about a meeting of the Paulinians and Meletians, but meanwhile the impulsive Lucifer of Cagliari, who was in Antioch, had ordained Paulinus as bishop.[4] This rash step brought about the so-called Schism of Antioch, which not only split the Christians of the city, but was also going to compromise relations between the East and Rome for years. Even the authority of an Athanasius did not suffice to overcome the division. When he was invited to Antioch by Julian's successor, the Emperor Jovian, he probably offered ecclesiastical communion to Bishop Meletius; since the latter hesitated, he decided for Paulinus, whose following thereby obtained a great moral boost, while the division between Meletians and Alexandria became ominously deeper.[5] For their part, the Meletians asserted that they had always held the faith of Nicaea,[6] and hence gained ever more recognition from the remaining Nicenes. Arian groups also strove for the favor of the new Emperor; in so doing, the Homoiousians with Basil of Ancyra showed the greater readiness to reach agreement, whereas the Alexandrian "Arians" again tried, in accord with the old methods, to gain the Emperor against Athanasius, but without any success.[7] The disunion among the Arians promised a better future for the adherents of Nicaea.

---

[3] A comprehensive report on the outcome of the discussions of this Synod is extant in the so-called *Tomus ad Antiochenos* (*PG* 26, 796–802); cf. C. B. Armstrong, "The Synod of Alexandria and the Schism at Antioch in A.D. 362," *UThS* 22 (1920–21), 206–221, 347–355.

[4] Athanasius, *Tom. ad Antioch,* 3; Jerome, *Chron. ad ann. 362.*

[5] Athanasius, *Ep. ad Jovian. imp.* (*PG* 26, 813); Basil, *Epp.* 89, 214, 258; Epiphanius, *Panar.* 77, 20.

[6] In the letter of a Synod directed by Meletius to the Emperor Jovian: Sozomen, *HE* 6, 4, 6–10.

The Religious Policy of the Emperor Valens

As early as February 364 Emperor Jovian was succeeded by an officer of the guard, Valentinian I (364–375), who at the demand of the army selected as second Augustus his brother Valens (364–378), to whom he gave the eastern part of the Empire, while he assumed control of the Balkan Peninsula, western Europe, and North Africa.[8] In a striking reversal, the religious-political situation again changed, just as it had under Constantius and Constans. Valentinian in the West was personally an adherent of Nicaea, but he avoided any favoring of a specific view and left to the bishops of his area complete freedom in dealing with ecclesiastical questions,[9] whereas Valens followed the "Arian" confession and, in alliance with his influential court bishop, Eudoxius of the Homoian faction, sought to promote it to exclusive recognition in the East.[10] At first the Homoiousians provoked his anger when, at a Synod of Lampsacus, probably in the fall of 364, they rejected the Creed of Rimini, declared the *homoiousios* essential for distinguishing the divine Persons, and demanded the restoration of the bishops exiled by the Anomoians in 360. When a delegation wished to report to the Emperor at Heraclea on the decrees of Lampsacus, the members were told to follow Bishop Eudoxius; when they refused, they were sent into exile.[11] After repeated discussions at various places in Asia Minor, the Homoiousians sent a delegation of three to the West in order to ask help from Pope and Emperor. Valentinian I was then staying in Gaul; Pope Liberius received the three bishops, but required of them the repudiation of the Creed of Rimini and the profession of that of Nicaea. When they agreed, the Pope gave them letters for their principals—there were sixty-four bishops—and for all orthodox bishops of the East. They also received letters of communion from bishops of Italy, Sicily,

---

[7] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 4, 3–5; 6, 5, 1–4; Socrates, *HE* 3, 24, 25; Athanasius, *Ep. ad Jovian. imp.* (*PG* 26, 820).

[8] On the two rulers see A. Nagl, *Pauly-Wissowa* 2. R. VII, 2, 2097–2137 and 2158–2204 respectively, and E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* I, 2nd ed., 172–190.

[9] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 7, 1–2.

[10] Ibid. 6, 6, 10; on Eudoxius, M. Tetz, *Stpatr* 3 (*TU* 78, 1961), 312–323.

[11] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 7, 3–9.

North Africa, and Gaul. When the delegates had reported the results of their journey at a Synod at Tyana in Cappadocia, the members approved the effecting of unity of faith with Rome and decided to act in the same sense at an expanded Synod at Tarsus. But Bishop Eudoxius had this meeting forbidden by the Emperor.[12] A promising development toward the restoration of a uniform confession was thereby abruptly cut short. Hard times came again for the Nicenes also. During a stay at Antioch, Valens sent Bishop Meletius again into exile and had the churches made inaccessible to all who declined to have communion with Bishop Euzoius.[13] An edict of 365 decreed that all episcopal sees again filled under Julian were to be vacated by the Nicenes. Athanasius was affected by this law, but since disturbances broke out in Alexandria the Emperor yielded and let him return: now the bishop was able to work unmolested in his episcopal city until his death in 373.[14]

In the years 365–69 the attention of the Emperor Valens was so taken up, first by the struggle against the usurper Procopius and then from 367 by the Gothic War that he had to let the religious question rest. This breathing-space gave the Nicenes the possibility of considerably strengthening their position, since they were able to fill vacated episcopal sees in Asia Minor and Pontus, such as Ancyra, Caesarea, and Nazianzus, with men of their confidence.[15] The work begun at the Synod of Lampsacus for a merger of Catholics and Homoiousians, however, made no progress. The latter split again, this time because a part rejected the reconciliation with Pope Liberius and again repudiated the *homoousios*,[16] but mainly because a new theological question, that of the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, moved ever more to the foreground of the discussion and began again to divide minds.

The Nicene Creed had stated quite simply the Church's faith in the Holy Spirit. Later Athanasius had taken up the topic in his *Letters to Bishop Serapion of Thmuis* and had rejected the thesis that the Holy Spirit is a creature only and distinct from the angels only in degree. And the Synod of Alexandria of 362 confirmed the conviction of the true divinity of the Holy Spirit.[17] Some pastorally outstanding bishops among the Homoiousians had, however, hesitations about this doctrine and came out against it with varying nuances. Among them was Bishop Eustathius of Sebaste (since 356), who played a role in the struggle against the Anomoians and was held in high esteem among his people because of his strictly ascetic life and his unselfish works of charity.[18] With Basil of Ancyra and Eleusius of Cyzicus he constituted the leadership of the Homoiousian faction and was part of the three-man delegation which had discussed the restoration of unity of faith with Pope Liberius. Besides Eustathius and Eleusius, Marathonius of Nicomedia also belonged to the group that denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit. But in the years around 365 one cannot yet speak of a faction of "Pneumatomachoi."[19]

---

[12] Detailed description of the embassy and its results in Sozomen, *HE* 6, 10, 3–12, 5.

[13] Ibid. 6, 7, 10.

[14] Ibid. 6, 12, 5–16.

[15] Philostorgius, *HE* 5, 1; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 19.

[16] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 12, 4; thirty-four bishops composed these decrees at a Synod at Antioch in Asia Minor.

[17] See J. Lebon in the introduction to the translation of the four letters to Serapion in *SChr* 15 (Paris 1947), 56–77, and the commentary by C. R. B. Shapland, *The Letters of St. Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit* (London 1951); Athanasius, *Tom. ad Antioch.* 3.

A sharp persecution of Catholics and non-Homoians was instituted by Emperor Valens by means of the events which occurred in Constantinople in connection with a new appointment to the see of that city in 370. After the death of Eudoxius the Catholics decided on Evagrius, who was at once ordained, but was sent into exile by Valens together with the consecrating prelate.[20] When the Catholics firmly rejected the candidate of the Arians, Demophilus, the Emperor proceeded with great harshness against them[21] and immediately extended the persecution to the provinces. After his victorious campaign against the Goths, he regarded the time as ripe to do away, once and for all, with the multiplicity of Christian factions in his part of the Empire and to compel religious unity through the exclusive recognition of the Homoian confession. All bishops were to profess the Creed of Rimini–Seleucia by means of their signatures, and the recalcitrant lost their sees. Officials saw to the implementation of the imperial commands everywhere with military assistance and used it also against the lesser clergy and the monks, whose opposition was punished by imprisonment or deportation.[22] Syria was especially hard hit by the wave of persecution: Valens usually resided in its capital. Bishop Meletius had to go into exile for the third time, Catholic churches were given to Euzoius and his clergy, and Nicene Christians were constantly vexed by the officials.[23] The bishops of Laodicea, Edessa, Batna, and Samosata were also exiled, and the congregations of Beroea and Chalcis were subjected to the severest oppression.[24] During the lifetime of Athanasius, no persecution was undertaken in Egypt, but after his death in May 373 it broke out all the more violently against the successor he had designated, Peter. The Prefect Palladius had the Church of Saint Thomas occupied under tumultuous circumstances and, by means of police power, inducted the Arian Bishop Lucius into office. Clerics and monks were imprisoned and then exiled or sent to the mines. Eleven bishops and 126 clerics were deported to Diocaesarea in Palestine, and not infrequently an effort was made to break the opposition by executions. Bishop Peter abandoned Egypt secretly and went to Pope Damasus I in Rome, from where he informed the episcopate of the Universal Church about the happenings in Alexandria.[25]

---

[18] On him see J. Gribomont, *DHGE* 16, 26–33 (Lit.).

[19] On Eleusius see H. de Riedmatten, *DHGE* 15, 144f.; on Marathonius, G. Bardy, *Fliche–Martin* 3, 254f.

[20] Socrates, *HE* 4, 14; Sozomen, *HE* 6, 13, 2–4.

[21] Socrates, *HE* 4, 16, 4–6, and Sozomen, *HE* 6, 14, 1–4, report the martyrdom of eighty clerics, who were burned on a ship. Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 25, 10, knows of only one priest who was burned.

[22] Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 25, 11–12; 43, 46.

[23] Theodoret, *HE* 4, 24, 2–25, 6; Sozomen, *HE* 6, 18, 1, reports numerous executions.

The Work of the Young Nicenes

Cappadocia was the province of Asia Minor in which the moral reputation of Bishop Basil of Caesarea caused the Emperor Valens to limit substantially the persecution of the Catholics. Since 370, Basil, as metropolitan, had guided the destinies of this important ecclesiastical province as the one best acquainted with the religious questions of the age, since he had been the adviser of his two predecessors. His descent from an esteemed Christian family, his splendid education gained at the academies in Constantinople and Athens, his unflinching loyalty to the long established faith,[26] were combined with the gift of leadership and diplomatic skill and provided him with a strength of character which impressed everyone who came into close contact with him.[27] It could only be of great importance to the government to gain this influential man for its ecclesiastical political goals, a task to which the Prefect Modestus dedicated himself. The meeting of the two men found a powerfully resounding echo through the artistically impressive and dramatic description which Gregory Nazianzen gave of it in his eulogy at the death of his friend.[28] Basil, in a sure and superior attitude, repulsed both the at first very courteous attempts at persuasion as well as the minister's threats made in mounting anger. To the remark of the astounded prefect, that up to now no one had ever dared speak so candidly to him, came the proud and cool reply: "Perhaps you have never yet had to deal with a bishop."[29] As a result of his minister's report, the Emperor Valens during a tour of the provinces of Asia Minor attended Mass on Epiphany 372 in Basil's church and was so impressed by his religious seriousness that he gave up all his exertions to gain him to the Homoian confession, left him in his position, and even gave him large amounts of landed property for the charitable institutions which Basil was having built.[30] Thus the Bishop of Caesarea more and more became the protector of the persecuted Catholics for wide areas of the East, to whom people looked for the encouraging and guiding word. Basil tried in every way to profit by the possibilities open to him and worked tirelessly for the strengthening of the Catholics and the union of all groups that acknowledged Nicaea. Thus when episcopal sees became vacant, he filled them with Nicenes or established new sees in order to enlarge the number of his suffragans: he did not always find the anticipated sympathy, as, for example, with Gregory Nazianzen, who never forgave his friend for having destined for him "the miserable village of Sasima" as an episcopal see.[31] A bitter disappointment was caused him by Bishop Eustathius of Sebaste, with whom Basil had once been joined by a common enthusiasm for the ascetical and monastic ideal. Eustathius had, after a struggle, accepted the Nicene Creed, but then, through his denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, he had rendered impossible the union of the Homoiousians with the Catholics and he finally accused Basil of sharing the erroneous doctrines of Apollinaris of Laodicea.[32] But Basil had been hurt the most deeply by the fruitlessness of his efforts to liquidate the unfortunate Schism of Antioch. He could in good conscience see Meletius as the legitimate Bishop of Antioch, who was properly chosen, ordained by the bishops of his province, and had been exiled three times for his gradually achieved conviction of the truth of the faith of Nicaea, whereas Paulinus, the bishop of the minority that continued loyal to Eustathius, was compromised by an election and an ordination that were not free of canonical irregularity.[33] But Alexandria clung to Paulinus from emotional rather than theological grounds, and since Rome obtained its information on the ecclesiastical situation in the East exclusively from Alexandria, the West was not inclined to intervene on behalf of Meletius and the efforts of Basil. With increasing bitterness, Basil could not but understand that his letters and messages with the request for help through the dispatch of Roman delegations or letters of recognition for the leaders of the movement for unity found no corresponding echo in Pope Damasus I. It was not only wounded self-consciousness that induced Basil to write that Damasus was a proud man, and that from the arrogance of the westerners no real aid should be expected.[34] It was a misfortune that, because of one-sided reporting from Alexandria and Antioch people in Rome did not understand that in the East it was really no longer a question of the Arian factions, which were dissolving, but that the newly appearing theological trend, which denied the faith in the divinity of the Holy Spirit, deserved the greatest attention.

---

[24] Theodoret, *HE* 4, 12–15; Basil, *Epp.* 132, 219–222.

[25] Theodoret, *HE* 4, 22, 1–36, gives excerpts from the letter; further data in Socrates, *HE* 4, 20–22, Sozomen, *HE* 6, 19, 1–20, 12.

[26] In *Ep.* 223, 3, Basil strikingly takes pride in this loyalty.

[27] Cf., for example, the sketches of H. v. Campenhausen, *Griechische Kirchenväter* (Stuttgart 1955), 86–100.

[28] *Or.* 43; it moved J. H. Newman to a masterly translation into English: *The Church of the Fathers* (London, 4th ed. 1868), 14–17.

---

[29] *Or.* 43, 50.

[30] Theodoret, *HE* 4, 19, 1–13; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 43, 52–54.

[31] Gregory Nazianzen, *De vita sua* 439–446.

[32] Basil, *Epp.* 223, 224, 226.

[33] See the letters of Basil to Athanasius and Meletius, *Epp.* 66–69.

Hence people in the West were in no position to evaluate the theological work of the so-called Young Nicenes—they were, in addition to Basil, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, and their common friend, Amphilochius of Iconium.[35] The Young Nicenes understood two things: 1) that by the fundamental adherence to the statements of Nicaea a precise definition of terms for its correct understanding was achieved, and 2) the question of the divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit must be decided. They resolved the first task, Basil especially, by giving to the hitherto loose and hence still interchangeable[36] concepts *ousia* and *hypostasis* an unambiguously defined content. *Ousia* now became exclusively the expression for the "nature" of God, whereas *hypostasis* was reserved as an indication of the special being in which the divine nature is expressed in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit: *mia ousia, treis hypostaseis* became the classical formula in the theology of the Trinity.[37] Each of the three *hypostaseis* has its characteristic features: the first, that of fatherhood (*patrotēs*), the second, that of sonship (*hyiotēs*), the third, that of sanctifying (*hagiasmos*).[38] For the distinctions among the three persons there are already found in Gregory Nazianzen the terms "Unbegottenness" (*agennesia*), "Going

---

[34] Basil, *Ep.* 239. On the efforts of Basil, Damasus, and the Latin bishops to gain the support of the East, see M. Richard, *AnBoll* 67 (1947), 178–202, and E. Amand de Mendieta, *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R. P. Casey* (Freiburg 1963), 122–166.

[35] On him see H. Gstrein, "Amphilochios von Ikonion: Der vierte 'Grosse Kappadokier,'" *JÖByzG* 15 (1966), 133–145.

[36] The Synod of Alexandria in 362 still spoke of one or three hypostases: Athanasius, *Tom. ad Antioch,* 5 (*PG* 26, 800f.).

[37] Especially Basil, *Epp.* 38 and 236. For Gregory Nazianzen, S. González, *La formula μία—οὐσία τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις* (Rome 1939); for Gregory of Nyssa, W. Jaeger, op. cit. (Leiden 1966).

[38] C. Andresen. "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes," *ZNW* 52 (1961), 1–39.

Forth" (*poreusis*), and "Mission" (*ekpempsis*).[39] If Basil also does not assert the *homoousios* expressly of the Holy Spirit, he nevertheless in fact clearly declares his divinity and equality of nature, while Gregory Nazianzen formally teaches this.[40] In the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit the Young Nicenes preferred the formula "from the Father through the Son."[41] It was the undeniable merit of the Young Nicenes to have prepared through their theological work for the decisions on the faith at the Council of Constantinople, to have brought the theology of the Trinity to a first settlement, and thereby to have assisted the Nicene theology to its permanent break-through. A more external presupposition for this was, it is true, created by the political developments of 378–79. Because of a new Gothic mutiny in the Balkan Peninsula, the Emperor Valens was compelled to go to war, for which he asked the help of his nephew Gratian, Emperor in the West since 375. Before his departure for the area of disturbance, he rescinded the sentences of exile against the Catholic bishops, and hence Antioch and Alexandria again received their Bishops Meletius and Peter. Without waiting for the help sent by Gratian, Valens rushed into a decisive battle and on 9 August 378 lost throne and life near Adrianople.[42] In January 379 Gratian elevated the Spanish general Theodosius to co-Augustus and assigned him the East as his sphere of rule.[43] Both Emperors professed the Nicene Creed, for which a more peaceful future seemed now to open up.

The Council of Constantinople (381)

In a treatise of 377, *To the Westerners*—Pope Damasus I is envisaged chiefly—Basil of Caesarea had said that East and West would have to come to necessary decisions "in a common consultation" on questions of faith which had been raised by the doctrines of Eustathius of Sebaste and Apollinaris of Laodicea and through the sympathy of Paulinus of Antioch toward the ideas of Marcellus of Ancyra. But he had to admit that the reign of the Emperor Valens did not offer the *kairos* for so comprehensive a synod.[44] In the autumn of 379, on the initiative of Meletius, who had become the leader of the orthodox majority since Basil's death on 1 January 379, 153 bishops met at Antioch for a synod at which they declared their unity of faith with Rome.[45] Such a step was entirely in keeping with what was to be expected of the religious policy of the Emperor Theodosius I; at the same time it was also the prerequisite for achieving an acceptable solution in the matter of the Schism of Antioch.[46] Shortly before the Synod of Antioch there appeared an edict of the Emperor Gratian and his imperial colleagues, Valentinian II and Theodosius I, which forbade all heresies and conferred validity on only decrees issued in favor of the Catholic religion.[47] The personal "official explanation" of the religious policy of the new Emperor was not long in coming. The celebrated edict *Cunctos populos* of 28 February 380, addressed to the inhabitants of Constantinople but of interest to the entire population of the Empire, declared it was the wish of the Emperors that all the peoples ruled by them should live in the religion which the Apostle Peter had handed down to the Romans and which the Pontiff Damasus as well as Bishop Peter of Alexandria professed: "hence that we believe in the one divinity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit in equal majesty and holy Trinity." Only the adherents of this confession were to bear the name of Catholic Christians: the rest were branded with the infamy of heresy, they must not call their sects churches, and they had to expect not only divine but also imperial punishment.[48] This decree of Theodosius has received the most extreme interpretations, from the private creed of the Emperor to a declaration that, in the language of an almost insane religious fanaticism, made Christianity the exclusive State religion, and indeed autocratically, without any ecclesiastical collaboration.[49] But a private creed of an Emperor would hardly have been taken into the official legal collections of the Codes of Theodosius II and Justinian I and would not have threatened sanctions for possible offenses against it. More surely, with this edict the Emperor was making known that he would tolerate and promote only the profession of faith in which he had been raised and which had meanwhile become that of the majority of the Empire's inhabitants. Furthermore, it cannot be denied that the imperial edict was intolerant in the modern sense of the word, but the question of toleration, as today understood, presented itself as little to Theodosius as it did to the other Emperors of the fourth century.[50] That he intended to enforce his religious and political program, not autocratically, but with the ecclesiastical representatives of the Nicene faith, is seen in this edict, which characterizes the religion of Pope Damasus and of Bishop Peter of Alexandria as the norm against which the genuineness of every creed must be measured. It was no disavowal of this norm or even a "change of course," but a clarification and an application to the special situation of the eastern part of the Empire when an edict of January 381 identified this profession with the Creed of Nicaea.[51] When, perhaps in 380—the exact date is not clearly established—a potentially mortal illness attacked him, Theodosius had himself baptized by an unambiguous supporter of the Nicene faith, Bishop Acholius of Thessalonica.[52] And when he came to Constantinople in November 380, here too he quickly made the situation clear. The Arian Bishop Demophilus, in a conversation with the Emperor, refused to go over to orthodoxy and had to give way to the Nicene, Gregory Nazianzen, who the previous year had been appointed to care for the combined congregations of the orthodox and whom the Emperor now pointedly accompanied to his installation in the Church of the Apostles.[53]

---

[39] *Or.* 25, 16.

[40] Basil, *Contra Eunom.* 3, 5 (*theotēs autou*); Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 12, 6. On Basil cf., in addition to H. Dörries (see the Lit.), B. Pruche, *RSR* 52 (1964), 204–232 (on the Holy Spirit) and S. deBoer, *NThT* 18 (1963–64), 362–380 (on the *homoousios* of the Holy Spirit).

[41] Basil, *De Spir. S.* 18, 45; *Contra Eunom.* 2, 32; 2, 34; Gregory of Nyssa, *Quod non sint tres dii* (*Opera* III, 1, Leiden 1958), 56.

[42] Ammianus Marcellinus, 31, 12, 10–13, 19; on the political importance of the battle see J. Straub, *Philologus* 95 (1953), 255–286.

[43] Theodoret, *HE* 5, 6, 3; Pacatus, *Paneg.*, 10–11.

---

[44] Basil, *Ep.* 263, especially c. 5.

[45] See G. Bardy, "Le concile d'Antioche (379)," *RBén* 45 (1933), 196–213.

[46] Whether the latter was really found cannot be determined with certainty because of the contradictory reports in Socrates, *HE* 5, 5, and Theodoret, *HE* 5, 3, 9–16. The subsequent history of the Antiochene Christians in the next years speaks against it.

[47] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 5 of 8 March 379.

[48] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 1, 2 (=*Cod. Just.* 1, 1, 1).

[49] See W. Ensslin, *Religionspolitik,* 27f.

The notion of a council, at least for the eastern part of the Empire, could not but intrude itself powerfully after the death of Valens, and Theodosius, as early as the spring of 380, had made known his intention in this regard, most probably first to Bishop Acholius of Thessalonica, who then for his part informed Pope Damasus of the imperial plans.[54] The problems which recommended a settlement by a synod were especially urgent for the East; the Schism of Antioch and the question of the Holy Spirit. The Emperor's letters, which invited the bishops to the capital of the East for May 381, must have been sent a few weeks after the beginning of the year, so that those who would participate could have time for preparations and travel.[55] The extant lists of participants,[56] which of course are not free of mistakes, give the number of those attending as about 150; of these, almost half—seventy-one—came from the Diocese of the East alone and constituted, under the leadership of Meletius of Antioch, the strongest group. He himself had gone early to Constantinople and perhaps even influenced the selection of the bishops to be invited.[57] For the other participants, among whom the Young Nicenes—the two brothers of Basil of Cappadocia and their friend Amphilochius of Iconium—stood out prominently, maintained cordial relations with Meletius. Meagerly represented were the coastal areas of Asia Minor, where were situated most of the bishoprics headed by "Pneumatomachoi"; also absent at first were the Egyptian bishops, and even Bishop Acholius did not arrive until after the opening of the Council. The "Opposition" was invited to the Synod—only on the initiative of the Emperor, because it was so difficult to settle the negotiations with the thirty-six "Pneumatomachoi" bishops under Eleusius of Cyzicus in the course of the discussions. A decision on the question of the position of the Holy Spirit would have been hardly credible unless at least an attempt at a clarification in discussion with the opposition had been undertaken. In accord with the Emperor's intention, the Council of Constantinople was certainly not to be merely a synod of one faction, namely, the Meletian.

---

[50] Even the cautious Emperor Valentinian I issued an edict against the Manichaeans (*Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 3) and favored Christianity in numerous decrees; see Coleman-Norton, I, nos. 127–162.

[51] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 6; it orders, besides, the return of the churches to the Catholic bishops, while it forbids heretics to own churches and to stay in cities.

[52] Socrates, *HE* 5, 6; Sozomen, *HE* 7, 4, 3.

[53] Sozomen, *HE* 7, 5, 1–7; Gregory Nazianzen, *Carm. hist.* 2, 1, 11, 1354–1370.

[54] Damasus, *Ep.* 5 (*PL* 13, 368A) already knew of it at this time.

[55] No text of this document survives, but Socrates, *HE* 5, 8, gives May 381 as the beginning of the meeting.

[56] See Schwartz and Honigmann, op cit., and also N. Q. Kingh, *Stpatr* 1 (Berlin 1957), 635–641.

Before the sessions began, the participants were received by the Emperor, who singled out Bishop Meletius by an especially deferential greeting and hence, so to speak, suggested him as president of the Council. The sessions did not take place, however, in the imperial palace, and Theodosius neither took part in them personally nor had himself represented by officials, so that freedom of discussion was fully guaranteed. Since, as in the case of Nicaea, no records of the sessions of the Council of Constantinople are extant, the exact course of the discussions cannot be determined with certainty. But probably first on the agenda came the question of the recognition of Gregory Nazianzen as legitimate shepherd of the congregation of Constantinople, because his call to the see of the capital could possibly be regarded as opposed to canon 15 of Nicaea,[58] which forbade the transfer of a bishop. But since Gregory had never taken possession of the see of Sasima, the Synod could declare his election canonical and permit his solemn enthronement.[59] Probably connected with this matter was canon 4 of the Synod, at least in substance: it declared the ordination of the adventurer

---

[57] Cf. A. M. Ritter, op. cit., 38f.

[58] Text in J. Alberigo, *COD* 12. Socrates, *HE* 5, 8; Sozomen, *HE* 7, 7, 2–5; see A. M. Ritter, op. cit., 68, note 1.

[59] Sozomen, *HE* 7, 7, 6; Theodoret, *HE* 5, 8, 2; Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de vita sua* 1305ff., 1525ff.

Maximus, at the instigation of Alexandria, as invalid; it had taken place without Gregory's knowledge.[60] In the first days, however, the Council's president, Meletius, died unexpectedly; he had been preeminently suited for the position because of his reputation and his diplomatic skill.[61] It was suggested that now the presidency of the Synod be given to the Bishop of Constantinople: of course, the new president would at once be confronted with the thorny problem of the succession of Meletius at Antioch. Gregory was unable to put through his motion that the settlement of the question be left open until the death of Paulinus, that is, that Paulinus be recognized as the single orthodox bishop, but the Council reached no agreement.[62]

In the first weeks of the Council must be put the discussion of the orthodox teaching on the Holy Spirit, which, in keeping with the situation in the eastern part of the Empire, had to constitute a central point in the synodal debates. An agreement between the orthodox majority and the Pneumatomachoi or Macedonians was of the deepest concern to Theodosius too. His hopes were, of course, thoroughly disappointed. Despite all exertions, especially by Gregory Nazianzen, the faction with Eleusius of Cyzicus could not be moved to recognize the divinity of the Holy Spirit and immediately left the Council: in so doing it had warned its members in a circular against recognition of the faith of Nicaea.[63]

The Creed of Constantinople (381)

It would have corresponded to the example given at Nicaea, but also thoroughly to the situation of 381, if in the negotiations with the Homoiousians at Constantinople the effort had been made to induce them to agree to a creed in which the content of the Nicene Creed was accepted but through which also the question of the Holy Spirit would have been adequately declared. In fact it is now revealing to see this formula in the text which was taken into the Latin Mass from the late sixth century as the "Creed of the 150 Fathers of Constantinople"[64] and is today known by the not entirely apt name of "Creed of Nicaea–Constantinople." The scholarly discussion on the background and time of origin of this text has not yet reached a unanimous agreement.[65] The Council of Chalcedon (451), it is true, saw in the Fathers of Constantinople the authors of this Creed, who wished by it to comment on the Creed of Nicaea through antiheretical additions on the Incarnation of the *Logos* and the divinity of the Holy Spirit[66]—and this remained the traditional view until the second half of the nineteenth century. However, this was decisively rejected with the claim that the so-called Creed of Constantinople was older, since it was quoted almost verbatim by Epiphanius of Salamis in his *Ancoratus,* written in 374, and on closer examination was proved to be the baptismal creed of the Church of Jerusalem, which Cyril of Jerusalem used as the basis of his catecheses held after 350;[67] it could have been made known to the Fathers of Constantinople through Cyril or through the bishops of Cyprus who were represented at the Synod of 381.[68] The strongest grounds, however, are represented by the view that the work of Epiphanius originally contained the Creed of Nicaea[69] and that at Constantinople a special creed must have been composed, especially since there are repeated references to its existence in the sources before 451, even if only by hints, as in Gregory Nazianzen or more clearly in Theodore of Mopsuestia.[70] Thus the testimony of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon maintains its weight, that the Creed of Nicaea–Constantinople really goes back to the Synod of 381. To the question why the Fathers of Constantinople set up still another creed beside that of Nicaea the answer is only probable: that because of the discussion of the Trinitarian doctrine, lasting for decades, into which the Holy Spirit was ever more drawn, they regarded this procedure as unconditionally necessary. In favor of the assumption that its text originated in connection with the negotiations for union with the Macedonians, desired by the Emperor, is the fact that on the one hand the term *homoousios* was given up in regard to the Holy Spirit, while on the other hand related formulas were employed which assured the results achieved by the theology of the Young Nicenes.[71]

---

[60] Canon 4 in J. Alberigo, op. cit., 28; on the affair of Maximus, see A. M. Ritter, op. cit., 50–52.

[61] Theodoret, loc. cit.; Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de vita sua* 1573ff., and especially the funeral eulogy of Gregory of Nyssa on Meletius (*Opera,* IX, 441–457).

[62] Gregory's view of the problem: *Carmen de vita sua* 1583ff., and *Or.* 42, 20–22.

[63] Socrates, *HE* 5, 8, and Sozomen, *HE* 7, 7, 2–5, place the negotiations with the Macedonians before the beginning of the Synod, and probably they are correct. Even so, they limit the opposition of the Macedonians to the *homoousios* of Nicaea, whereas Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de vita sua* 1739–1777, denies this.

[64] First in Spain at the Third Council of Toledo in 589; cf. J. A. Jungmann, *Missarium sollemnia* I, 578. Text of canon 2 of the Synod of Toledo in *Concilios Visigoticos,* ed. J. Vives (Barcelona 1963), 125.

---

[65] See the history of this discussion and the latest critical viewpoint in A. M. Ritter, op. cit., 132–208.

[66] J. Lebon, "Les anciens symboles dans la définition de Chalcedoine," *RHE* 32 (1936), 809–876, especially 810–812.

[67] The chief representative of this thesis was A. v. Harnack, who in *RE,* 3rd ed., 11, 12–28, gives a summary of the reasons.

[68] Cf. I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nizäa und Konstantinopel,* 212f., who regards the authorship of Epiphanius as likely.

[69] By E. Schwartz, *ZNW* 25 (1926), 38–88, and earlier by Chr. Papadopoulos, *Das Symbol der 2. ökumenischen Synode* (Athens 1924).

[70] Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmen de vita sua* 11, 1703ff.; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Homélies catéchétiques* 9 and 10 (ed. R. Tonneau–R. Devreesse, Rome 1949), 215ff.; perhaps such a reference is also contained in the letter of the Synod of Constantinople of 382: see Theodoret, *HE* 5, 9, 13.

An exhaustive analysis of the text[72] of the Creed of Constantinople makes clear that the statements of that of Nicaea were left intact. For the additions in the first and second article that went beyond this—"maker of heaven and earth," "eternally begotten," "by the power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary, and became man," "for our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate," "is seated at the right hand of the Father," "his kingdom will have no end"—are found here and there earlier in other formulas or texts and hence are not new creations of the Fathers of Constantinople.[73] It is rather the new statements on the Holy Spirit in the third article on which the great theological importance of this creed is based. Whereas Nicaea said simply, "We believe in the Holy Spirit," the following amplifications are found here: "the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father. With the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets."[74] With the profession of "Lordship" (*to kyrion*) with the title *kyrios,* the divine character is claimed also for the Holy Spirit, as for the Father and the Son, just as Basil of Caesarea had already concluded from 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 2 Thessalonians 3:5, and 2 Corinthians 3:17.[75] And the designation "giver of life" intends to affirm that the One so designated is God, as the Young Nicenes often stressed.[76] By means of the formula "who proceeds from the Father" it was intended to oppose the thesis of the Macedonians, that the Holy Spirit is a being created by the Son; that the procession from the Father is instead an argument for his divinity had been stressed by Gregory Nazianzen in connection with John 15:26.[77] However, the most decisive statement on the divinity of the Holy Spirit is: "With the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified." The same worship (*proskynēsis,* as the proper act of divine adoration) and the same honor (*doxa,* as the more ritual honoring in the liturgy) which belong to Father and Son are proper also to the Holy Spirit. Since the time of Cyril of Jerusalem the orthodox theology had fought precisely for the inclusion of the Holy Spirit in the doxology as the ritual liturgical formula of divine worship.[78] The approval by means of the Creed of Constantinople was therefore basically equivalent to a profession of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit, and no convinced Macedonian could have signed this formula. Why the term *homoousios* was, then, not adopted for the Holy Spirit can only be surmised. Perhaps it was hoped to make the Pneumatomachoi better disposed toward union by means of an argument closer to Scripture. After the failure of the efforts for union such deference could be disregarded. The next year a new synod at Constantinople spoke unambiguously of the "one divinity, power, and substance of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" and again rejected "the blasphemy of the Eunomians, Arians, and Pneumatomachoi."[79] But the Council of 381 had already issued such a condemnation in a special canon (1) when it said that "especially the heresy . . . of the Pneumatomachoi" was to be anathematized. The Emperor's edict of 30 July 381[80] immediately drew the consequences of this judgment: it ordered the immediate surrender of all churches to the bishops "who confess that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are of one majesty and power, of the same honor and dominion." The criterion of the orthodox faith of these bishops consisted in their communion with Nectarius of Constantinople, Timothy of Alexandria, Diodoris of Tarsus, Amphilochius of Iconium, Helladius of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and some others—hence the representatives of the defenders of orthodoxy at Constantinople.

---

[71] Thus plausibly A. M. Ritter, op. cit., 189–195.

[72] Text in G. L. Dossetti, op. cit., 244–250.

[73] See I. Ortiz de Urbina, op. cit., 214–217.

[74] (*πιστεύομεν εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιων*) *τὸ κύριων καὶ ζωοποιὸν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν δια τῶν προφητῶν.*

[75] Basil, *De Spir. S.* 21; 56–57; *Contra Eunom.* 3, 2; see H. Dörries, op. cit., 67.

[76] Basil, *Contra Eunom.* 3, 4; *De Spir. S.,* ibid.; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or. Theol.* 5, 29.

[77] *Or. Theol.* 5, 8; 10–11. As is well known, the *Filioque* of the Latin text was first added in Spain toward the end of the seventh century; cf. J. Gill, *LThK,* 2nd ed., IV, 126f.

Thus the Council of 381 effectively brought to a close the long discussion of the Trinitarian question and thereby assisted the theology affirmed at Nicaea to a definitive triumph. Within the Church of the Empire Arianism of every sort no longer meant any serious danger. Perhaps a threat could still come from the German Goths, who, together with Christianity, had received the Arian creed. But among them it had become their tribal religion, and no recruiting missionary strength proceeded from it; hence it maintained itself only so long as the tribal prince of the moment professed it.

---

[78] Cf. *Catech.* 16, 4; Athanasius, *Ep. ad Serap.* 1, 31; Basil, *De Spir. S.* 1; 26; *Ep.* 159, 2; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 5, 12, 28; 31, 28; Gregory of Nyssa, *Ep.* 24; *De Spir. S.* (*Opera* 3, 1, 94).

[79] Letter of the Synod of 382 to Pope Damasus and the western bishops in Theodoret, *HE* 5, 9, 1–18; also in J. Alberigo, *COD*, 21–26. In it there is reference to what the Synod of 381 had set forth, but it is not said that this was done in the form of a tome.

[80] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 1, 3.

Apart from canons 1 and 4, already mentioned, a special importance in canon law and Church history attaches to the two other decrees of the Council of Constantinople, composed in the form of canons.[81] Canon 2 has to do with the ecclesiastical organization in the eastern part of the Empire and indirectly makes known that the pertinent decrees of the Council of Nicaea (canons 4–7) had often been disregarded in the confusion of the recent decades. Hence it was again inculcated that the affairs of one ecclesiastical province were to be dealt with by the corresponding provincial synod. With a clear reference to Alexandria it was declared that the bishop there was responsible only for Egypt, and in this regard must proceed "in accord with the canons." It can scarcely be doubted that the interference by Peter of Alexandria through the secret ordination of Maximus (cf. *supra* on canon 4) was in this way being censured. It was decreed for the entire Church that no bishop might exercise ecclesiastical functions outside the political diocese to which his see belonged. In this connection all the political dioceses of the eastern part of the Empire were named: the East, with a confirmation of the privileges granted by Nicaea to the Church of Antioch, and Asia, Pontus, and Thrace—these last three with no mention of a church whose bishop had the direction of the respective sees belonging to them. Here one can see the development which was one day to end with the establishing of the eastern patriarchates. The canon concluded with a reference to the churches in missionary lands, which were to be cared for in accord with the prevailing practice, hence by the centers from which their missionaries came.

Canon 3 of the Synod of Constantinople was with its concise text by far the one most heavy with consequences: "The Bishop of Constantinople should have the Primacy of Honor after the Bishop of Rome, for this city is the new Rome."[82] Hitherto the special rank of Antioch and Alexandria had been seen rather in the apostolic origin of their congregations than in the political importance of these cities. Here the excessive elevation in rank of the episcopal see of Byzantium—until now a simple bishopric under the Metropolitan of Heraclea—was unambiguously founded on the political importance of the new capital of the eastern part of the Empire, while indirectly the special position of the Roman Bishop was reduced to the political rank of Old Rome. It cannot be said that only an eastern principle was applied to Constantinople;[83] rather, a concurrence of different tendencies were in effect. One such was surely the antagonism between Alexandria and Constantinople, which led to a victory of that faction of bishops at the Synod who were hostile to Alexandria. To this may probably be added the desire of the Emperor to gain and secure for the bishop of his residence a position which raised him above all the bishops of the East. In this canon, however, one can hardly discover any anti-Roman spite, since it did not question Rome's proper rank, and there seems not to have been any direct reaction from Rome.[84] Such would have been expected rather from Alexandria and Antioch, even if the canon had been issued before the arrival of the Egyptian bishops at Constantinople.[85] But Alexandria had too strongly compromised itself through the intrigues with Maximus, and Antioch was without a spokesman since the death of Bishop Meletius. Besides, many bishops from other provinces of the East may have taken comfort in the idea that in question was not a claim to jurisdiction by the Bishop of Constantinople, but only a Primacy of Honor. That this latter would eventually grow of its own great weight into a jurisdictional primacy is easier to understand with historical hindsight than was possible in the days of the Synod of 381.

---

[81] Text in J. Alberigo, *COD,* 27f. The Greek tradition, it is true, knows seven canons of the Synod of 381, whereas the Latin knows only four. Numbers 5 and 6 probably belong to the Synod of 382; canon 7 is not demonstrable until c. 450; cf. I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nizaä,* 233.

[82] J. Alberigo, *COD,* 28: *τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆζ τιμῆζ μετὰ τὸν ʽΡώμης ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν ʽΡώμην.*

The Synod of Constantinople as an "Ecumenical" Council

The question as to whether the participants in the Synod of Constantinople understood their meeting as a Council of the entire Church of the Empire must be answered with a clear "no" on the basis of the indications in the extant sources. It was not such a Council of the Empire by virtue of its actual composition: the western episcopate had not been invited and was also not represented at it.[86] Even more important is the characteristic which the members themselves attributed to their meeting when in their closing report to the Emperor Theodosius they designated it as "Synod of the bishops assembled from the various eparchies" (namely of the East).[87] Correspondingly, the Emperor had the decrees of this Synod published only in the eastern part of the Empire, and the Synod itself apparently sent no report of its work to Rome or to the western episcopate. The Synod of Constantinople of 382, it is true, in its letter to Rome characterized the assembly of bishops of the previous year as an "ecumenical synod,"[88] but, in accord with the linguistic usage of the fourth century, "ecumenical" here did not intend to express a qualification of canon law but only to assert that its participants came from the Greek-speaking *oikumene* and had been summoned by the Emperor.[89] To this then corresponds also the estimation of the Synod of Constantinople in East and West until the Council of Chalcedon. Western sources in general no longer speak of it after 382 and eastern testimonies are sparse and they never refer to it as they do, for example, to the surpassing value of the Council of Nicaea, while from 431 the Council of Ephesus was regarded as the "second synod." The reappraisal of Constantinople first occurred at Chalcedon, when an emphatic recognition was given to the Creed of Constantinople, and in justification of the so-called canon 28 on the prerogatives of the bishop of the imperial capital the canons of 381 were cited as "Synodikon of the Second Synod."[90] In an edict of the Emperor Justinian I of 545, then, "the four holy synods" constitute a firm unit, whose dogmas are as esteemed as the Holy Scriptures.[91] In the west Pope Gregory the Great found a similar formulation when he wished to accept and honor "the four Councils"—Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon—as the four books of the "holy gospel."[92] In this way the gradual recognition of the Council of 381 as an "ecumenical" Council reached its conclusion. The answer to the question of whether all the assumptions of canon law were at hand in the sense of the canonical understanding of the ecumenicity of a council must not be given by the Church historian.

---

[83] Thus A. M. Ritter, op. cit., 93: the quoted canon 9 of the Synod of Antioch of 341 speaks only of the responsibility of a Metropolitan for the entire "Eparchy," because so many men gather in his city for their "business."

[84] The first official protest by the Roman See came only at the Council of Chalcedon: *ACO* II, III, 3, 114. Both Leo I and Gregory I maintain that the canons of 381 were not made known to Rome: Leo, *Ep.* 106, 5; Gregory, *Ep.* 34.

[85] An exact date for the enacting of the individual canons cannot, in my opinion, be deduced from the sources.

[86] The later participation of Bishop Acholius of Thessalonica does not contradict this, since he was hardly an *official* representative of the West.

[87] Text in *Mansi* III, 557–560.

---

[88] Theodoret, *HE* 5, 9, 13 and 15.

[89] Canon 6 of the Synod of 382 speaks of the different kinds of synods and enumerates them thus: the provincial synod (*τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας πάντων ἐπισϰόπων*), the synod of the (political) Diocese (*μείζων σύνοδος τῶν τῆς διοιϰήσεως ἐπισϰόπων*), and finally the *οἰϰουμενιϰὴ σύνοδος*, which in the context can mean only a general synod of the eastern episcopate summoned by the Emperor. The same meaning appears earlier in Epiphanius, *Expos. fidei* 13: *ἄνευ ἐπιϰρίσεως συνόδου οἰϰουμενιϰῆς ἀναβαπτίζειν τοὺς ἐρχομένους . . . ἀπὸ Ἀρειανῶν*. Not until Palladius, *Vita Chrys.* 20, does *σύνοδος οἰϰουμενιϰὴ* coincide with *σύνοδος δυτιϰῶν τε ϰαὶ ἀνατολιϰῶν* (*Vita* 3).

[90] *ACO* II, 1, 3, 96.

[91] *Nov.* 132, 1.

[92] *Ep.* IV, 25.

CHAPTER 6

Development of the Relationship of Church and State in the Fourth Century: The "Church of the Empire"

The presentation thus far of the discussion within the Church concerning the recognition of the Creed of Nicaea has already made abundantly clear that at that time the idea of neutrality toward the Church was totally foreign to the Roman State in its fourth-century leadership. The Emperors of this period showed instead a lively interest in the contemporary problems of the Church, especially the questions of unity of belief, of uniformity of organization, and of missionary work among pagans and often intervened with the greatest intensity in the search for a solution of these problems. However, for this very reason there was presented with growing urgency the question of the right relationship of Church and State, which pressed more and more for a solution tolerable to both sides. It is advisable, in a summary glance back at the contemporary attitude of the individual Emperors to this problem and its evaluation on the part of the Church, to follow the route which was pursued in the search for a solution until the end of the fourth century. It will thus be seen that this was a long and circuitous process, at the end of which stood the Christian "Church of the Empire" of late antiquity, which was, however, differently understood and evaluated in East and West.

Church and State under Constantine I

Earlier in the comment regarding the "Constantinian Turning-Point"[1] it was pointed out that, even after the victor of 312 had turned to this religion, Christianity did not have to undertake a thoroughly radical examination and reorientation of its attitude to the Roman State as such. Long before Constantine there were weighty voices among the Christians which had a positive estimation of the Roman State, as for example Origen,[2] who ascribed to it a providential mission for the spread of the Christian faith, and, with Tertullian, many others for whom prayer *pro salute imperatorum* was a duty.[3] The two long periods of peace in the third century even made possible repeated positive contacts of Christian personages with Emperors or relatives of the imperial family, which intimated the reconciliation between State and Church that was under way. Then when Constantine gave the Church complete freedom of belief and of preaching and, with the start of his sole rule, Christianity began to be ever more privileged, in the enthusiastic exuberance of these years the problem of Church and State did not yet present itself to either side in its full precision. Constantine's awareness of mission[4] demanded for the Church a special position, but this did not yet lead to a situation which made necessary a clear delineation of boundaries laid down for a Christian Emperor. When the Emperor set out to bring the Church closer to the State and to gain it for a close collaboration in the interest of imperial unity, only regard for the pagan majority of the inhabitants of the Empire bade him not to overextend his special position and not to permit serious conflicts to arise. That in this regard Constantine shrank from intervening in specific internal affairs of the Church in an authoritarian manner and with full power to impose his decision is demonstrated by his reluctant reaction when he was approached by the Donatists for an imperial judgment in their conflict with the Catholics of North Africa: he referred them to an ecclesiastical court or to a synod (Arles 314).[5] Only when its judgment was presented, did he direct measures according to it. Even in the growing Arian controversy, the Emperor saw himself only as qualified to urge peace and unity, not as the Lord of the Church, to whom pertained the final decision. At Nicaea he permitted full freedom of speech and debate and strove by means of persuasion and diplomacy for the greatest possible unanimous acceptance of the creed formulated by the majority of the bishops. Only once did he overstep, in our modern view, the limits hitherto observed by him: when he threatened the representatives of the opposition with exile and hence limited their freedom of decision, but the protest that might have been expected from the bishops did not occur.[6] Hence the phrase attributed to Constantine—that he was the *episkopos tōn ektos*—seems to be a valid paraphrase of the attitude that he claimed and exercised in regard to the Church.[7]

---

[1] See vol. I, chap. 31.

[2] Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2, 30; Tertullian, *Apol* 30, 1; see H. U. Instinsky, *Die Alte Kirche und das Heil des Staates* (Munich 1963), 41–60.

[3] See finally K. Aland, "Kirche und Staat in der alten Christenheit," *Festschr. f. H. Kunst* (Berlin 1967), 19–49, especially 33–37.

In Constantine's lifetime ecclesiastics had not yet struggled hard and bitterly over the problem of Church and State and the position of the Emperor vis-à-vis the Church respectively. The right of the Emperor to summon synods was in no way questioned, and his efforts to steer the course of the theological discussions through his ecclesiastical advisers were accepted as self-evident; the punishment of exile repeatedly decreed by him for adherents of the opposition, who were unwilling to submit to the verdict of council or synod, encountered no decisive resistance, apparently not even among those directly affected, such as Arius and his friends. This attitude of the Church was to a certain degree motivated by the sacred evaluation of the position of the ruler in antiquity, which was gradually transposed into the Christian view. Even more importance in Constantine's case derived from the glorifying atmosphere of the recognition and the boundless gratitude in which his victory over his pagan opponents, his official legitimation of the Christian religion, and, not least, his personal conversion to Christianity had placed him. Finally, the heaping of privileges on the Church, especially when he was sole ruler, with their special effect on the position of the bishops in public life,[8] had lulled rather than sharpened the critical conscience of some bishops in regard to such connections with the State.

---

[4] See *supra,* chap. 1.

[5] Cf. W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church,* 147f.

[6] Philostorgius, *HE* 1, 9.

[7] See *supra,* chap. 1.

However, it was of enormous significance for the future that this first of all Christian Emperors served as the model when Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea undertook to establish theologically the position of the Christian imperial office in relation to and in the Church. In the panegyrical writings of Constantine, which belong to the last period of his life, Eusebius outlined a political theology to which appeal was later made, again and again, especially at Byzantium, when people sought to justify the uniqueness of the Emperor's position in the Church. He expounded its fundamental idea in his festive discourse on the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine's accession, delivered in the latter's presence in 335. According to it, the earthly *Imperium* is a reflection (*eikōn*) of the heavenly kingdom, and as the latter has only one Lord, the Father, so also the reflection has only one Emperor, who receives his sovereign power and his virtues as ruler from the Father through the *Logos* Christ.[9] His task as ruler is to deliver mankind from the power of the demons, from idolatry, from polytheism, and to lead it to recognition of the true God.[10] Hence the Emperor is called to promote the realization of God's plan of salvation with human beings: and so he becomes God's vicar (*hyparchos*) on earth.[11] With the elimination of polytheism, monotheism achieved the victory, and hence the earthly *Imperium* is also monarchical in principle.[12] In his writings Eusebius applied this basic theory to the changes of his own time, experienced by him with a grateful heart. The

---

[8] See *infra,* chap. 16.

[9] *Laud. Constant.* 5; 17, 12.

[10] Ibid. 6; Eusebius, *HE* 10, 9, 1.

[11] *Laud. Constant.* 7, 13.

[12] Cf. E. Peterson, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem* (Leipzig 1935), 78–81, 94ff.; F. E. Cranz, "Kingdom and Polity in Eusebius of Caesarea," *HThR* 45 (1952), 47–66.

Emperor Constantine, converted to Christianity, has become the "new Moses," since, as the other once freed the Jewish people, he has now brought freedom to the Church. His turning to Christianity was not only a personal profession: he proclaims this Christianity to be the only true religion and thereby becomes its great missionary. Therefore, he may be called shepherd, bringer of peace, teacher, physician of souls, and father; in fact, he enters upon a new relationship to God, he becomes "friend and beloved of God," who is always near him, who gives him his protection in war, enlightens him in the carrying out of his office, reveals himself to him in visions, and discloses the future to him.[13] From such an evaluation of the Christian Emperor Eusebius now deduces his position in the Church. Since *Imperium* and Church are both reflections of the heavenly kingdom, they are in practice identical in the now Christian *Imperium Romanum,* but this has only one supreme head, the Christian Emperor, God's vicar, who thus becomes in a certain sense Lord of the Church. He becomes not only its protecting Lord but "a sort of universal bishop"[14] whose full power over the Church has a quasi-priestly character; for it extends also to the right performance of worship and to the preaching of the gospel. Fundamentally he is also over the bishops: only the Emperor's personal modesty lets him behave "as one of them," even though he can give them commands and admonitions and is the arbiter of their conflicts.[15]

This political theology of Eusebius far surpasses, of course, what Constantine had actually claimed for his own position in relation to the Church. But it supplied many a building stone for the Byzantine State–Church system and fostered a serious development which is already discernible in its beginnings under Constantine: *all* ecclesiastical factions or interest groups of the fourth and fifth centuries sought to gain the favor of the ruler of the moment. They turned spontaneously to the State for aid in order to impose their view, even in theological questions. In accord with the character of the Emperor who was addressed, this could at any time easily expand into something with no limits, depending on his awareness of his special position and his rights relative to the Church.

Efforts to Subordinate the Church to the State by the Emperors Constantius and Valens

This limitless power became a reality under Constantine's second son, Constantius, in whose reign is to be placed the second step in the progress of the problem of Church and State that pressed for a solution. This Emperor's inclination to exercise a strict control over the Church became apparent for the first time on the occasion of the Synod of Serdica (342). Whereas the group of western bishops arrived and functioned without an escort provided by the State, there were in the delegation from the East two high State officials, whom Athanasius sarcastically referred to as "their school masters and attorneys."[16] When the western episcopate dared in an impressive letter[17] to refer to the moral constraint which State officials were exercising on the faithful of his dominions and implored him to end this abuse and to guarantee complete freedom of judgment also in the religious sphere, Constantius reacted sharply, especially since he could not but feel the decisions of some of the canons issued at Serdica as a criticism of the methods of his religious policy, those, namely, whereby the frequent visits of some bishops to the imperial court were forbidden,[18] an abuse which Athanasius had earlier censured.[19] The petition that he would permit the exiled bishops to return to their sees was answered by the posting of sentries to prevent this. For his part he exiled clerics who made known their sympathies with the decrees of the Synod.[20] He undertook to subject the Church completely to his control when, after the death of his brother Constans, he had assumed sole rule. In the fall of 353 he submitted for their signatures to the bishops of Gaul meeting at Arles and to the legates of Pope Liberius a prepared decree, which condemned Athanasius and punished any resistance with banishment, while he rejected from the start any discussion of the question of faith.[21] "With whip and pastry" he succeeded in obtaining the signatures of all the Gallic bishops, except that of Bishop Paulinus of Trier, who therefore was exiled to Phrygia.[22] Constantius's claim to direct the Church reached its climax two years later at the Synod of Milan (355), called by him, at which he again demanded the condemnation of Athanasius by the bishops, whereas they demanded a clear decision in favor of the Nicene Creed. To achieve his end, this time he had recourse to methods which dishonoured him as Emperor. He had the sessions of the Synod transferred from the church at Milan to his palace and, hidden behind a curtain, listened to the bishops' discussions.[23] The resistance of the bishops finally elicited from him the ominous word that reproduced exactly his innermost attitude to the problem of State and Church: "What I want must be regarded as canon law."[24] Thus was the complete subjection of the Church to the State demanded: it was to be a State–Church incorporated into the *Imperium,* whose absolute sovereign was the Emperor. No Emperor of the fourth century expressed or outdid such a claim with the same precision. This expression made Constantius the unequivocal champion of the most extreme solution, which in the succeeding years he steadfastly tried to realize with the same methods as before, that is, in changing from despotic harshness to coaxing persuasion, which cleverly avoided only one thing: to permit a bishop of independent mind to become a martyr by shedding his blood. Again exile was the fate of the few upright bishops, while the papal legates were shamefully ill treated.[25] Even Pope Liberius, after a long, fruitless discussion with the Emperor, was exiled to Thrace. Likewise, the consent of the Gallic bishops who had not been present at Milan to the condemnation of Athanasius was extorted at the Synod of Béziers (356), and the two inflexible ones, Hilary of Poitiers and Rhodanius of Toulouse, followed the other opponents into banishment.[26] The Synod of Rimini (359) offers the same picture: again a prepared creed is submitted to the bishops, not for discussion but for unconditional surrender. In the Emperor's letter to the members of the Synod occurs the statement: "No decree can have the force of law anywhere, if our will denies it any importance and obligation."[27] It contains the same claim to power in regard to the Church as the *dictum* of Milan and degrades the synod of bishops to a mere farce.[28] The minority of bishops subservient to the Emperor at Rimini also frankly admitted that Contantius claimed for himself the right of asserting his will, even in theological questions, when they exuberantly thanked him for having stricken the *homoousios* from the Nicene Creed: "Through the authoritative decision of Your Piety, we see all those defeated who use that word for God's Son."

---

[13] See R. Farina, op. cit., 187–235.

[14] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 1, 44, 1–2: *οἰά τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ Θεοῦ καθεστάμενος*; see J. Straub, *DOP* 21 (1967), 37–55.

[15] R. Farina, op. cit., 236–255.

---

[16] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.,* 15.

[17] Text in Hilary, *Fragm. hist. or. Syn. Serdic.* (*CSEL* 65, 181–184).

[18] Can. 8–12; see H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Serdica* (Oxford 1958), pp. 128–136.

[19] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 3.

[20] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 17–19.

[21] See *supra,* chap. 3.

[22] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 13, 1, 6 (*CSEL* 65, 102).

---

[23] Lucifer of Cagliari, *Moriendum esse pro filio dei,* 1 (*CSEL* 14, 285).

[24] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 3: ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι, τοῦτο κανὼν νομιζέσθω. His obstinacy in theological questions was not even concealed from pagans: see Ammianus Marcellinus, 21, 16, 18: *ritum omnem ad suum trahere conatur arbitrium.*

[25] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 41.

[26] See *supra,* chap. 3.

[27] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* A, 8, 2 (*CSEL* 65, 94).

[28] Accordingly, it can hardly be maintained that Constantius had "regard for the earlier autonomy of the Church and granted to the Church courts a collaboration and the final decision in questions of faith": W. Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Theodosius d. Gr.* (Munich 1953), 25f.

Lucifer of Cagliari reproached the Arian bishops with having acceded to Constantius's claim to be *episcopus episcoporum.*[29]

In its confrontation with the claims of the Emperor Constantius to a leading role, the Church had to endure bitter disillusionments and an often distressing collapse of its own episcopate.[30] But it was precisely the harshness and vehemence of this Emperor that also summoned the first men from its ranks to the battlefield for the defense of the irrevocable independence and freedom of the Church. The resistance was led by Athanasius of Alexandria, who, soon after his return from his first exile, in an encyclical to the Universal Church referred to the threat to the Church's freedom, which arose from the fact that forces external to the Church interfered, contrary to custom, in the filling of episcopal sees; hence he summoned all Catholic bishops to unanimous resistance. Thus Athanasius was the first bishop of the fourth century to formulate the Church's claim to freedom vis-à-vis the State.[31] Pope Julius joined him when he complained that the freedom of ecclesiastical decisions was jeopardized by the threat of exile and death.[32] The letter of the western members of the Synod of Serdica to Constantius drew an unmistakable line of separation between Church and State when they attributed to the latter only concern for the public well-being and rejected any interference in the ecclesiastical sphere; a deviation from this line takes liberty from men and leads necessarily to slavery.[33] Equally spirited was the reply of the aged Hosius of Córdoba to the Emperor, when the latter still sought to gain him, after the tragedy of Milan, for his procedure: "Do not meddle in ecclesiastical matters . . . God has entrusted to you the imperial power, but to us the things of the Church . . . It does not behoove us to rule on earth, nor you, Emperor, to offer sacrifice."[34] This letter was followed by the fiery protest of Hilary of Poitiers, who in his exile wrote of his indignation of soul since the Emperor did not give him the opportunity to explain it to him in person. Above all, he pitilessly exposed the methods which Constantius employed to achieve his ecclesiastical political aims: he overwhelmed the bishops with honors in order to enslave them; he did not have them beheaded but killed with gold; he flattered in order to dominate; he exempted the Church from taxation but he thereby seduced it into denying Christ.[35] The often fanatical polemics of Lucifer of Cagliari accurately revealed especially the questionable character of Constantius's arguments whereby he sought to justify his religious policy: if his persecution of the Nicenes was wrong, he claimed, God would have had to sweep away him and his *Imperium* long since.[36] No similarly strong opposition to any Christian Emperor of the fourth century had appeared on the side of the Church. Certainly the effort of Constantius to incorporate the Church into the State and to subject it to it was shattered not only on this resistance, but in the jubilation with which people greeted the bishops banished by him on their return from exile after his death;[37] the joy resounded because of the newly acclaimed freedom of the Church, so bitterly fought for.

---

[29] Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* A, 6, 1 (*CSEL* 65, 87); Lucifer of Cagliari, *Moriendum esse* 13 (*CSEL* 14, 311).

[30] See *supra,* chap. 3.

[31] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 3, 19; *Ep. encycl.* 6 (*PG* 25, 236); see E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papstiums* I (Tübingen 1935), 138–154.

[32] In Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 31–35.

[33] In Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* (*CSEL* 65, 181–184).

[34] Hosius in Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 44.

Under the Emperor Valens (365–378) the Church in the eastern part of the Empire was again exposed for a time to similar stresses as in the days of Constantius.[38] Again the creed of an ecclesiastical faction, this time that of the Homoians, was to achieve exclusive recognition by the means proper to the State's power—imprisonment, deportation, and various types of coercion. And again there was resistance to this impeding of the Church's freedom, not only on the part of the genuine Nicenes but also of some bishops who were inclined to the *homoiousios,* but preferred exile to yielding to imperial dictation. It is significant for the Emperor's attitude that by direct interference he even forbade a planned meeting of the Homoiousians at Tarsus, when the latter intended to discuss a union with the supporters of Nicaea.[39] If he finally left Athanasius and Basil, the two champions of orthodoxy, in their sees, this was due not to any change of heart by the Emperor but to fear of possible political disturbances, which banishment could have evoked. Occasionally Basil had expressed his theory of the problem of Church and State.[40] In connection with Romans 13:1–4, the Bishop of Caesarea was convinced that all the power of the State comes from God and therefore the Christian owes obedience to it, when its laws promote the welfare of society. But since the earthly *Imperium* is always subordinated to the divine law, the Christian's duty of obedience to it finds its limits at the spot where the State's power oversteps its competence and makes demands which oppose God's law. Therefore he let the Emperor

---

[35] Hilary, *Contra Const.* 7; 10.

[36] In *De regibus apostaticis* (*CSEL* 14, 3–65).

[37] See, for example, Jerome, *Dial. adv. Lucif.* 19.

[38] See *supra,* chap. 5.

[39] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 12, 5.

[40] Cf. G. F. Reilly, *Imperium and Sacerdotium according to St. Basil the Great* (Washington 1945).

Valens know that neither torture nor threats could induce him to put his signature, as commanded by the Emperor, to the Homoian creed.[41] He thereby encouraged clerics and laymen to resist the State's might, if it aimed to force them to the Arian faith.[42] The events and experiences of his days stood behind his words when he wrote to an official that he was grateful to God for a ruler who was a Christian, an upright character, and a conscientious guardian of the laws which order human life.[43] The calmness of these words is far removed from the excessive glorification of the Christian imperial power from the pen of Eusebius of Caesarea. Gregory Nazianzen insisted on the right of the Church to prefer its own marriage legislation to that of the State and regarded it as intolerable that, for example, the defining of the boundaries of bishoprics should be decided by a secular power.[44] And Gregory of Nyssa had serious reservations in regard to the State–Church system then developing in the East.[45] Hence both Latins and Greeks raised their voices for the liberty of the Church in the face of the power of the State.

Ambrose and Theodosius

The problem of Church and State entered a new and decisive phase when in the last quarter of the century two men confronted it: each in his own sphere tended to represent categorically and firmly his notion of the freedom of the Church or of the sovereignty of the State: Ambrose of Milan and Theodosius the Great. The Bishop of Milan had already made clear, in the confrontation between the Emperor Gratian (375–383) and the pagan faction at Rome, that he did not hesitate to appeal even to the conscience of an Emperor if it was a question of protecting the rights of the Church.[46] He felt himself impelled to this all the more when Gratian's younger brother, Valentinian II (383–392), came under the influence of a faction of officials and clerics who strove to procure a strong position for Arianism in Milan at the expense of the Catholics. In resisting this effort, Ambrose took so fundamental a stand on the relationship of imperial power and Christian Church that he exercised the greatest influence on the future. First, Ambrose compelled the Emperor to cancel his decrees whereby he had ordered the sequestration of two Catholic churches, to be handed over to the Arians.[47] When the Emperor then called upon the bishop to agree to an imperial court of arbitration, which should decide whether Ambrose or the Arian Auxentius was the lawful Bishop of Milan, the Catholic bishop twice in succession expressed his basic idea of the limits of the State's power in relation to the Church. In a letter to the Emperor[48] he informed him in unambiguous language that he would not appear before the imperial arbitration court, because laymen cannot sit in judgment on clerics in questions of faith. On the contrary: according to custom, in such cases bishops would correct Christian Emperors, but Emperors would not correct bishops; he, the Emperor, who still had to earn admittance to baptism, arrogated to himself a decision in questions of faith for which only a synod of bishops in a church was proper.[49] Even more decisive are the statements in the sermon[50] in which Ambrose rejected the plan of Auxentius to make himself Bishop of Milan with the help of the State's power. For an Emperor who professed to be a Christian there was no greater honor than that he be called "son of the Church." "The Emperor is in the Church, not over the Church."[51] This expression, which would never have occurred to a Eusebius, was, it is true, uttered as part of a concrete situation, but at the same time it proclaimed a principle which Ambrose and after him the Latin Church would always defend: the Christian Emperor is not the master of his Church but its beneficent patron; questions of faith, the discipline of the clergy, the form of the liturgy, the administration of ecclesiastical property, are, according to Ambrose, withdrawn in principle from the competence of even the Christian State.

---

[41] Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 43, 50.

[42] Basil, *Ep.* 243, 248.

[43] *Ep.* 225.

[44] Cf. J. Plagnieux, *S. Grégoire de Nazianze Théologian* (Paris 1951), 429–432: "Église et Empire dans la correspondence de s. Grégoire": see, for example, *Or.* 17, 8, and *Ep.* 185, 4.

[45] Cf. G. May, "Gregor von Nyssa in der Kirchenpolitik seiner Zeit," *J Ö ByzG.* 15 (1966), 105–132.

[46] H. Glaesener, "L'empereur Gratien et s. Ambroise," *RHE* 52 (1957), 466–488.

For his principle that the Christian Emperor is not the master of the Church, but its son, Ambrose had to stand up to an Emperor of the stature of Theodosius the Great, who, like Constantine, was filled with an exalted consciousness of his sovereign position and who, because of his earlier unflinching stand for the Catholic creed, possessed the boundless sympathy of the Church. A first occasion for conflict arose when in 388 a group of fanatical Christians in the town of Callinicum on the Euphrates frontier, with the consent of their bishop, burned the Jewish synagogue, and the Emperor ordered the rebuilding of the synagogue at the expense of the Catholic bishop. Bishop Ambrose, however, saw in this command an unreasonable encouragement of a religious group hostile to Christianity and demanded that the Emperor annul his decree. When the latter hesitated, Ambrose spoke to him during Mass in the Milan cathedral and declared that he would not continue the Mass until the Emperor solemnly promised to act as Ambrose had requested.[52] Theodosius finally yielded, but he long retained a deep resentment because of this humiliation at the hands of the bishop of his residence. On surer ground Ambrose made use of another incident to prove to him that a Christian Emperor is subject to the moral demands of his Church. When the people of Thessalonica murdered an unpopular imperial official, the Emperor, in a first fury, gave the brutal command to proceed with cold steel against the people assembled in the stadium. The Emperor, it is true, soon rescinded his order, but the counterorder arrived too late and a large number of inhabitants of the city were slain. For this serious crime Bishop Ambrose demanded public penance of the Emperor; he left Milan and declared in a letter to Theodosius that he would remain away from his episcopal city until Theodosius should accept the penance. Once again the Emperor submitted.[53] The highest holder and representative of the power of the State subjected himself to the penitential discipline of his Church, which a bishop uncompromisingly required of him. Again a line was drawn which even an Emperor might not overstep. Questionable as Ambrose's argumentation was in individual cases, notably that of Callinicum, with his basic viewpoint he had created a sort of model which was to remain valid in the Latin West for the relations of the Church and the Christian State. Both powers stood in a basically positive relationship to each other, but the innermost sphere of the Church's life—faith, the moral order, ecclesiastical discipline—remained withdrawn from the State's influence. Of course, not every Latin bishop of the future was an Ambrose, but in the West people held fundamentally to the solution achieved at the close of the fourth century and only formulated it more precisely in the course of time, as, for example, was done by Pope Gelasius I.[54] The customarily humble formulas in connection with the Emperors of late antiquity, found in episcopal and papal documents, for example, in those of Leo the Great, are, despite their often flowery character, no proof to the contrary.[55]

---

[47] Ambrose, *Ep.* 20.

[48] *Ep.* 21.

[49] *Ep.* 21, 4: *in causa fidei episcopos solere de imperatoribus Christianis, non imperatores de episcopis iudicare;* also, *Ep.* 21, 5, 15.

[50] *Sermo c. Auxentium,* with *Ep.* 21, also in H. Rahner, *Staat und Kirche,* 150–184.

[51] *Sermo c. Auxentium,* 36: *imperator enim intra ecclesiam non supra ecclesiam est.*

---

[52] Ambrose to Theodosius: *Ep.* 40; report to his sister: *Ep.* 41; on the episode in the Milan basilica see F. J. Dölger, *AuC* 1, (1929), 54–65.

[53] Ambrose, *Ep.* 51; *De ob. Theodos.* 34; see C. W. R. Larson, *Stpatr* 10 (Berlin 1970), 297–301.

[54] Cf. A. K. Ziegler, "Pope Gelasius I and his Teaching on the Relation of Church and State," *CHR* 27 (1942), 412–437.

[55] J. Gaudemet, *L'église dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1959), 503.

In the East the development followed another route. It is true that here there was later no lack of people who pointed clearly to the limits of the State's power in relation to the Church, as, for example, John Chrysostom, who in a striking parallel to Ambrose said that "the holy laws have subordinated the head of the *basileus* to the hands of the priests," who defended the Church's right of asylum against the minister Eutropius, and who, when the Gothic leader Gainas, demanded a Catholic church of the capital for Arian worship, candidly reminded the Emperor Arcadius that it would be better to lose his imperial dignity than to become guilty of surrendering a church.[56] But here finally the theocratic valuation of the imperial power, which Eusebius had introduced with his excessive glorification of Constantine, proved to be stronger and under Justinian I reached a height never again surpassed.

The "Church of the Empire"

To express the real situation of the Church in the constant ups and downs of the imperial religious policy of the fourth century the term "Church of the Empire" was coined, but this makes necessary some clarifying remarks in order to avoid possible misconceptions of the situation concerned. The term aims to characterize in compact form that total situation in the relations of Church and State which came to a first preliminary conclusion under the Emperor Theodosius I. Fundamental to this relationship was the fact that the State's power and the Church agreed in principle on a close collaboration in the public sphere. This became possible because the Emperor, personally and as representative of the State's authority, professed the faith which the Church preached and the majority of the Empire's inhabitants accepted. Since this faith had been proclaimed as the official religion of the Empire, the State accorded the Church manifold privileges and encouragement. It supported the Church's social and charitable activity; it exempted the clergy from certain offices, from military service, and from some taxes; the bishops were included in the State's administration of justice. Other religious communities, such as the still surviving remnant of paganism, Judaism, and especially such Christian sects as the official Church regarded as heretical, could not be encouraged by this Christian State, nor was it tolerant or even only neutral in their regard.

For its part, the Church basically approved this *Imperium* that was now Christian and recognized the independence of the State's sphere. In its preaching it stressed that the power of this State came from God and depended on God. In its liturgy it prayed for the holder of this State-power and thereby conceded to him a religious importance and guarantee. The criticism of ecclesiastical writers in the religious and political conflicts of the fourth century was directed not against the State as such and not against the imperial power as such: it was concerned with the interference by individual representatives of the State in the inner life of the Church. The extraordinarily close union of the two was not questioned, especially since in the thought of the day an alternative to it was not known and could scarcely be understood.

---

[56] John Chrysostom, *Hom. de stat.* 2, 3; *in illud Vidi Dominum hom.* 4, 4–5; on Eutropius: Socrates, *HE* 6, 5; Sozomen, *HE* 8, 7; *Cod. Theod.* 9, 44, 1; on Gainas: Sozomen, *HE* 8, 4, 7–9.

But the enormous dangers which such an alliance of the two partners of the Church of the Empire implied were indeed seen and expressed by several representatives of the Church. They knew very well that the State's power was exposed to the constant temptation to abuse in relation to the Church. Others felt clearly that the privileges granted by the State and often all too eagerly claimed and sought by some bishops compromised the credibility of their preaching, as, for example, Jerome, when he wrote: "Since the Church has come under Christian Emperors, it has indeed grown in power and wealth, but it has decreased in moral strength."[57]

Finally, it is to be noted that the expression "Church of the Empire" reproduces only a very external aspect of the total reality of the Church at that time. It would, above all, be a serious misunderstanding, if one were to assume that the self-evaluation of the contemporary Church was expressed fully in what is included in "Church of the Empire." The best theologians of the time knew well that the Church in its innermost essence belonged to another area, namely to that reality of the order of grace which was bestowed on mankind through Christ's redemptive act.

---

[57] Jerome, *Vita s. Malchi* 1 (*PL* 23, 55B): "postquam (ecclesia) ad Christianos principes venerit, potentia quidem et divitiis maior, sed virtutibus minor facta est."

PART TWO

The Theological Disputes in East and West to the Middle of the Fifth Century

CHAPTER 7

Christology to the Council of Ephesus (*431*)

The Christological Question in the Fourth Century

In the fourth century the problem of the Trinity so monopolized the forces of theology and the Church that, in comparison, a second very important question—that of the orthodox understanding of the union of God and Man in Christ—at first remained in the background. This Christological problem was, of course, quite familiar to the pre-Constantinian theologians, such as Hippolytus, Origen, or Novatian, but in their day there was as yet no exhaustive search for a solution.[1] Only the Arian theology was unavoidably confronted with the Christological problem and made some very precise statements on it, but at first these led to no deeper discussion, first because the main interest was focused on the Trinitarian question, then probably because the opposing school had as yet no carefully thought out answer. To the extent that the inadequate state of the sources and the as yet incomplete research permit, the view of Arian theology on this question can be thus summarized.[2]

1. In the Incarnation, the *Logos* assumed only the body of a man, but not a human soul, for in this case the *Logos* perfectly took the place of the soul. 2. This *Logos-Sarx* Christology was connected most intimately with the basic Arian thesis: that the Son is "a creature," in whom all the human traits reported by the evangelists—that Jesus was grieved, that he felt abandoned by the Father—had to be attributed to the *Logos;* the *Logos* would not have really become Man, if not he, but the human soul, had been the bearer of these "imperfections." 3. The unity of the Word with the flesh assumed was as closely understood as the unity of the soul with the body so that in the *Logos*-become-flesh there was basically only one nature. An Arian fragment, which is attributed to Bishop Eudoxius of Constantinople (d. 369), expresses it clearly: "we believe in one single Lord Jesus Christ . . . made flesh, not made man; for he did not take a human soul . . . not two natures, since he was not perfect man, but God was in place of the soul in the flesh, the entirety one nature through articulation."[3] This Arian Christology has not only a monophy-

---

[1] A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* (London 1965), 125–172.

[2] J. Liébaert, "Christologie," *HDG* III, 1, 60–65.

[3] In F. Dièkamp, *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi,* 64f.

site hue, but a monophysite core, even if not the developed terminology of the later Monophysitism.

The Council of Nicaea took no position in regard to the *Logos-Sarx* Christology, probably especially because this was not yet presented in a formulation that would have clearly disclosed its dangers. But soon afterwards some theologians, including Eustathius of Antioch, Marcellus of Ancyra, and, from the West, Hilary of Poitiers, recognized its weakness and for their part insisted that a human soul in Christ must be accepted, because otherwise the human traits ascribed to the *Logos* would force one to conclude that God was changeable. With this stressing of the complete Incarnation of the *Logos,* then, they opposed a *Logos-Anthrōpos* Christology to the *Logos-Sarx* Christology.[4] To be sure, two such determined opponents of Arianism as Athanasius of Alexandria and Basil of Caesarea did not note the doubtful element in Arian Christology or paid no special attention to it. Athanasius, it is true, did not expressly reject the notion of a human soul in Christ, but neither did he expound it. The statement from the Prologue of John's gospel, "and the Word became flesh," was enough for him to believe in the real Incarnation of the *Logos.* Hence in him must be seen a representative of the *Logos-Sarx* Christology, who, however, did not draw from it the same conclusions as did the Arians.[5] Like Athanasius, Basil was also of the opinion that one need not interpret the plain statement of the Nicene Creed on the Incarnation of the Word through expanding supplements. Since he too expressed himself otherwise only reservedly on Christology, it can be said that, as in other questions, here too he came close to the view of Athanasius.[6]

The Search of Apollinaris of Laodicea for a Solution

The theology of the day occupied itself somewhat more in detail with the effort made soon after the middle of the fourth century by a bishop closely bound to Athanasius to solve the Christological question, and after a rather lengthy discussion rejected it at the Council of Constantinople (381). Apollinaris the Younger, trained in philosophy and a keen thinker, had, following his theological studies at Antioch, become

---

[4] On Eustathius, cf. M. Spanneut, "La position théologique d'Eustathe d'Antioche," *JThS* 5 (1954), 215–220; on Marcellus of Ancyra, see J. Fondevila, *Ideas trinitarias y cristologicas de Marcelo de Ancyra* (Rome 1953); on Hilary, P. Galtier, *Saint Hilaire* (Paris 1960), 108–158.

[5] See M. Richard, "Saint Athanase et la psychologie du Christ selon les Ariens," *MSR* 4 (1947), 5–54, and A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 193–219.

[6] J. Liébaert, "Christologie," loc. cit., 75–77.

Bishop of Laodicea, the West-Syrian city of his birth, c. 360.[7] Throughout his life, he was a determined adherent of the Nicene doctrine of the identity of nature of the Son with the Father and clung also to the prevailing belief in the unchangeability of the divine *Logos*. But in Christology he upheld an idea which put him very close to the Arian notion just described. He also denied the existence of a human soul in Christ, but in so doing he sought to penetrate much deeper into the problem of Christ's humanity and to master it with the intellectual means of contemporary philosophy. According to him, Christ possesses a human body and a *nous* or a *pneuma,* a rational soul, which, however, is identical with the *Logos;* for it would be impossible that two natures, endowed with spirit and will, could coexist in one and the same being, since one must come into conflict with the other by means of its will and its individual activity.[8] Hence this idea of the essential autonomy of the spiritual nature made it impossible for Apollinaris to assume a perfect humanity in Christ: in the God-become-Man there can be only *one* spirit, only *one* living efficacy—the *Logos.*[9] Nevertheless, Apollinaris adhered to the prevailing expression—the Word became a Man. Even for the union of the Word with the flesh he found a unique answer: *Logos* and flesh became one, just as body and soul are one in the human being: after their union they form a single nature, which, however, comes about through a mixing of God and Man.[10]

A discussion of the theses of Apollinaris seems to have first occurred at the Synod of Alexandria in 362; probably the problem was raised by representatives of Bishop Paulinus of Antioch.[11] Agreement was reached on a formula, which seemed acceptable to both the followers of Paulinus and those of Apollinaris, but they interpreted it in a different sense. According to it, the Redeemer did not have a body without a soul, without sense-perception, without reason, for in the Word the redemption pertained not only to the body but also to the soul.[12] But the Apollinarists understood this soul as the *Logos,* whereas the Paulinians saw it as the human soul of Jesus. After the Synod of Alexandria, the adherents of Apollinaris zealously made further propaganda for the doctrine of their master until in 374 Epiphanius of Salamis again pointed to the basic error of the Apollinarist solution: namely, that through it the redemption of the entire human nature is not assured.[13]

---

[7] On him see Quasten, *P* III, 377–883.

[8] *Fragment* 8 in H. Lietzmann, op. cit., 204.

[9] J. Liébaert, "Christologie," loc. cit., 80.

[10] Apollin., *Ep. ad Dionysium* (Lietzmann, 20); *Fragm.* 13 (Lietzmann, 234).

[11] J. Liébaert, "Christologie," loc. cit., 84.

[12] *Tomus ad Antioch.* 7 (*PG* 26, 804, B).

[13] Epiphanius, *Ancor.* 75, 119.

The two Cappadocians, Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, both made a noteworthy contribution to the discussion of the Apollinarist Christology, since both decidedly demanded the existence of an intact human soul in Christ.[14] In connection with Origen, Gregory Nazianzen constructed his Christology on the concept of the "mixture" (*krasis, mixis*), in which, however, the humanity of Jesus was not diminished but transfigured.[15] Gregory of Nyssa also explained the unity of Christ by means of the concept of mixture and developed in detail the idea of the transfiguration of the humanity of Jesus; however, he deepened the doctrine of the soul of Christ when he said that the intact human soul must be postulated for the reason that the death of Christ could only be understood as a separation of soul and body.[16] More so than Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa employed dyophysite formulas and thereby stood closer to the *Logos-Anthrōpos* Christology.

The disputed question was laid before Pope Damasus in Rome in 375 by the priest Vitalis, a follower of Apollinaris. At first, the Pope regarded as acceptable a cleverly worded profession of faith submitted by Vitalis, but later, in three letters to Paulinus of Antioch, he expressly repudiated the teaching of Apollinaris and in the summer of 377 solemnly condemned him and his adherents.[17] When, two years later, a synod at Antioch under Bishop Meletius accepted the Roman judgment, the effort by Apollinaris to solve the Christological problem was definitively rejected in East and West. The Council of Constantinople in 381 repeated the condemnation when in canon I, which enumerated the heresies of the day, it named also the Apollinarists.[18] It is not known how Apollinaris himself acted in regard to the rejection of his Christology, but in any event he remained Bishop of Laodicea until his death (not before 385). A conflict over Apollinarianism, even only slightly comparable to the Arian controversy, did not take place. To be sure, he still retained a certain following, since as late as 420 a group of Apollinarists joined the Church again.[19]

The Further Development of Christology to 428

The repudiation of Apollinarianism at first represented only a clarification in a negative sense: the route which aspired to find a solution of the

---

[14] See A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 278–291: "Cappadocian Christology."

[15] See especially *Epp.* 101 and 102 and *Or.* 2.

[16] Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Apollin*, 25; *Contra Eunom.* III, 63; *Refut. confess. Eunom.*, c. 179–180; *Contra Apollin.*, 17.

[17] Damas., *Ep.* "Illud sane" (*PL* 13, 352 B–353 A); Basil, *Ep.* 266.

[18] *DB* 85; *COD* 27 (Alberigo). A decree of the Emperor Theodosius I (March 388) forbids Apollinarists to conduct the liturgy and to ordain: *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 14.

[19] Cf. H. Lietzmann, op. cit., 36–42, 76–78.

Christological question in the denial of the human soul of Jesus was not passable. Soon the discussion of the issue was resumed, and the participants were almost exclusively theologians from the Greek-speaking world. Of course, one must no longer, as was formerly usual, combine some of these writers into a homogeneous faction because of their Christological statements and assign them to the "Theological School of Antioch." Diodorus of Tarsus, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia represented such distinct outlooks that one cannot speak of a uniform Christological system among them. Hence it is more correct to speak in a broader sense of two currents that gradually became more sharply outlined: of these, the one represented rather the Christology of the assumed humanity and hence approximated the *Logos-Anthrōpos* system, whereas the Christology of the God-made-Man had its home in Alexandrian theology.[20]

As a typical representative of a Word-Man Christology among the Antiochene theologians there loomed the figure of the former Bishop Diodorus of Tarsus (d. before 394), who as the outstanding teacher of theology at Antioch counted John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia among his students and provoked the displeasure of the Emperor Julian because of his decisive defense of the divinity of Christ.[21] This esteem of Diodorus was based on extracts from his single anti-Apollinarist work, *Contra Synousiastas,* but they came from the opposing faction and were later used against Diodorus by Cyril of Alexandria; hence they may have been subjected to distortion.[22] To the extent that the very precarious state of the sources favoring Diodorus permits us to know, he was primarily interested in assuring the divinity of Christ, which he saw jeopardized by Apollinaris's idea of the unity between Word and flesh and which led him to formulations that had a very dualistic ring. He paid no attention to the human soul of Christ as a theological quantity and so the Antiochene Diodorus is rather to be regarded as a representative of the *Logos-Sarx* Christology.[23]

John Chrysostom must also be understood as a representative of an Antiochene theology, but in his writings are found neither speculative presentations of the mystery of the Incarnation nor detailed remarks on Apollinarianism. To the preacher Chrysostom, Christ is in the traditional language the Word-made-flesh-and-man and the flesh is the dress or dwelling of the Word. The title *Theotokos* is not found in his works, nor any reason for it. At times he stresses that Word and flesh are a single entity, but that this union did not come about by mixture.[24]

---

[20] J. Liébaert, "Christologie," loc. cit., 102f.

[21] Cf. A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 261–263.

[22] M. Richard investigates the fragments in *Mélanges F. Grat* (Paris 1946), 99–116.

[23] A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 263–270.

On the other hand, Diodorus's other pupil, Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), developed new ideas and formulas on the Christological question, which were of great significance for the further completion of the doctrine of Christ. Of course, here the most recent research in the history of dogma had to establish several revisions in the traditional estimation of Theodore's Christology; his orthodoxy was, it is true, not questioned in his lifetime, but in the confrontation with Nestorius he, as his alleged teacher, became subject to the suspicion of heresy at the hands especially of Cyril of Alexandria, and finally he was condemned by the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553 as a "Nestorian."[25] His Christological thought must be seen, especially in his case, in the context of his total theology, which is not primarily speculative but rather "kerygmatic." It is based on the notion that God's plan of salvation has as its goal the immortality of human beings and that a preliminary participation in the eternal goods was given to those already on earth by Christ in baptism and the Eucharist, and after his resurrection this participation became full reality.[26] Hence it was Theodore's chief concern to stress, against Arians and Apollinarists, the complete humanity of Christ, its total efficacy, and thereby to assure and make known its soteriological importance. In this he energetically distinguished two perfect natures in Christ, that of the "assumed" and that of the "receiver," so energetically that the impression was produced that their unity would seem only too loose, especially since he sought to make it understandable by the expression of the "indwelling" of the Word in the assumed humanity. But Theodore worked, in his constantly renewed point of departure, to show that this unity of the two natures was still no mere accident but an entirely unique inner relationship, which joined the divine *hypostasis* of the *Logos* with the human nature. He tried to describe it with the aid of the word *prosōpon* (not with *hypostasis*): the one *prosōpon* of Christ is the result and ultimately possible expression of the intimate union between the human nature and the *hypostasis* of the *Logos*. In Theodore *prosōpon* did not yet have the content of "person," first established by Chalcedon, and likewise *physis* and *hypostasis* were not yet ideally distinct in his thought. Theodore did not yet succeed in satisfactorily defining the unity of the two natures in Christ in the concrete, but through the formulations used by him he moved toward the solution which Chalcedon gave. They made it possible for him to worship the humanity of Christ together with the divinity in one adoration and to grant to Mary the title *Theotokos.*[27] Accordingly, it is not permissible to designate Theodore of Mopsuestia as a "Nestorian before Nestorius."

---

[24] See C. Hay, "St. Chrysostom on the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ," *FStud* 19 (1959), 290–317.

[25] Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Diodorum et Theodorum* (only fragments remain). On the chronological course of the confrontation, see L. Abramowski, "Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien," *ZKG* 67 (1955–56), 252–287.

[26] Cf. I. Oñatibia, "La vida cristiana tipo de las realidades celestes," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 1 (1954), 100–133; see especially L. Abramowski, *ZKG* 72 (1961), 266–274.

The basic tenet of Alexandrian Christology after Nicaea was clearly stated by Athanasius in his words on the Incarnation: "Man did not become God, but God became Man in order to make us godlike."[28] Hence in this Christological thought the *Logos* is always the starting-point; he united the humanity to himself in the most intimate manner, not by elevating a man to himself, but by making himself a Man.[29] Peter, the successor of Athanasius, was in Rome at the very moment when Pope Damasus had Apollinarianism condemned at the Synod of 377, and with it he professed his faith in the full humanity of Christ. In a letter to the exiled Egyptian bishops he speaks of the two natures as of two "persons."[30] A further variation within the Alexandrian Christology is especially apparent in Didymus the Blind (d. 398), who in his youth, like Athanasius, first operated within the framework of the *Logos-Sarx* system, but after the condemnation of Apollinaris expressly professed the undiminished human nature in Christ.[31] The commentary on the psalms, rediscovered at Tura in 1941, which certainly proceeded from Didymus's following if not from his pen, acknowledged further that the soul of Christ could be exposed to anguish and perplexity and even ascribed to Jesus two *prosopa,* a devine and a human: here, then, *prosōpon* is still understood in its former meaning of "manner of appearing,"[32] no doubt a strong approximation of the Antiochene ideas and terminology.

Most intimately linked with the Christological discussion in the first half of the fifth century was Cyril, who in 412 was chosen to occupy the see of Alexandria. In his writings, however, must be distinguished two clearly contrasted phases in regard to the Christological question. The earlier covers the first sixteen years of his episcopate and shows Cyril as the undoubted heir of Athanasius, who, like the latter, came into confrontation with the Arian Christology and steadfastly upheld the immutability of the *Logos*-made-Man, but without proceeding to its disavowal of the soul of Christ or even mentioning Apollinarianism.[33] Incidental remarks of Cyril, it is true, let us know that he presupposed a soul in Christ, but for him it had no theological or soteriological significance. It was his aim to emphasize that Christ possesses divinity *kata physin,* by nature, but not humanity, with body and soul, "by nature": instead, he made them his. Hence Christ is, indeed, God and Man, but in a certain sense more God than Man.[34] Accordingly Cyril at first still represented a stage of the development in the Christological question, which as a whole had been already reached by Athanasius; the stronger emphasis on the divinity gives a presentiment as to how he would react if he was confronted with a theology which aspired to give a greater importance to Christ's humanity.

---

[27] The individual references in A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 338–360, and J. Liébaert, op. cit., 92–95.

[28] *Adv. Ar.* 1, 39.

[29] Athanasius, *Adv. Ar.* 3, 30.

[30] Theodoret, *HE* 5, 10, 5; Peter of Alexandria, *Ep. ad episc. Aeg.* (*PG* 33, 1291–93).

[31] Thus in *De trin.* 3, 21, and *Comm. in Zach.* 1, 193; 1, 280; 4, 92; 4, 235.

[32] Text in A. Gesche, *La christologie du Commentaire sur les Psaumes découvert à Toura* (Gembloux 1962), 135, 316.

The Conflict between Cyril and Nestorius

Soon after taking possession of the see of Constantinople in 428, Nestorius ascertained that in his congregation there was in process a discussion of whether Mary should be called "Mother of God" (*Theotokos*) or "Mother of the Man" (*Anthrōpotokos*). He immediately took sides in his preaching and sought to bring about unity within the congregation by designating the title "Mother of Christ" as theologically the most appropriate.[35] But since the title of *Theotokos* was customary even before Nicaea and in addition was employed without hesitation by many outstanding theologians of the fourth century and, most importantly, was consecrated in the consciousness of the faithful by its employment in the liturgy, the new bishop's attack on the word aroused shock and was regarded as a deviation from the preaching of the past. Opposition to Nestorius's view was first expressed in Constantinople, where the monks especially protested, but lay people also participated actively in the dispute, which at times assumed doubtful forms during the liturgy. A lampoon was posted to the doors of the cathedral, which unambiguously labeled Nestorius a heretic. When Bishop Proclus of Cyzicus defended "the holy Mother of God" in a sermon in Nestorius's presence, the latter at once retorted that such a notion favored the erroneous doctrine of Arius.[36] Toward the end of 428 news of the happenings in the capital reached Alexandria also, where Cyril, without actually naming Nestorius, intervened decisively, first in letters to the bishops and monks of Egypt for the title of *Theotokos;* then in a letter to Nestorius himself, he requested enlightenment about his teaching, but from him he received only an arrogant admonition to Christian restraint.[37] With this letter of Cyril's began the second phase in the Alexandrian bishop's Christology, which at the same time marked the beginning of the serious quarrel between him and Nestorius. Unfortunately, this conflict is encumbered also with features which are founded on the character of the two protagonists. In Nestorius an inclination toward intolerance of the views of others and a consequent inability to learn from them make a very unfavorable impression; Cyril sought to put across his ideas with adept and often highly questional diplomacy, in which a certain antagonism of Alexandria with regard to the see of Constantinople may have played a role. However, it will not do to see in these traits, especially on Cyril's part, the real motivating forces for the theological discussion and to undervalue it as mere logomachy.[38] Despite all the at times depressing human foibles which can be established in the course of the conflict, it dealt with questions of high theological and religious relevance.

---

[33] Cf. especially J. Liébaert, op. cit., and F. M. Joung, *JEH* 22 (1971), 103–114.

[34] References in G. Jouassard, "Une intuition fondamentelle de s. Cyrille d'Alexandrie dans les premières anneés de son épiscopat," *RÉB* 11 (1953), 175–186.

[35] The report on it is given in his *Ep. ad Joann. Antioch.,* in F. Loofs, *Nestoriana,* 185.

[36] The lampoon, *ACO* I, I, 1, 101f.; the sermon of Proclus, ibid. I, I, 6, 103–107; the reply of Nestorius, ibid. I, V, 1, 37.

Nestorius himself immediately started a lively propaganda in behalf of his Christological theses, and it was also he who first informed Pope Celestine I (422–432) of the conflict in a letter which contained an exposition of his own standpoint and repudiated the view of his opponents as Arian and Apollinarian. For their part, his adversaries sent several of Nestorius's sermons to Rome; the deacon Leo, the future Pope, sent them on to John Cassian, Abbot of Saint-Victor de Marseille. Cassian thereupon wrote his *De incarnatione Domini,* which rejected the teaching of Nestorius, but without supplying a criticism that went deeper and farther.[39] Cyril, meanwhile, was not inactive. His second letter to Nestorius,[40] important for the history of dogma, must be dated at the beginning of 430. In it he asked Nestorius in his preaching to pay attention, "with all solicitude for the words, to doctrine and to loyalty to the faith" and to bring them into harmony with the doctrines of the Fathers. These last had unhesitatingly termed Mary the *Theotokos* because of her was born the body, with which the *Logos* had united himself "as regards the *hypostasis*" (*kath' hypostasin*); because of this union it may be said that the *Logos* suffered and rose. The retort, much sharper in tone, of Nestorius, rejected the title of *Theotokos*[41] because it evoked the idea that the divine nature itself was born and died and hence was capable of suffering and mutable; but to intend to ascribe to the *Logos* birth, suffering, and death—such is precisely the madness of Apollinaris, of Arius, and of other teachers of error. Cyril also had recourse to the members of the episcopate[42] and warned them against the suspicious teachings of Nestorius; with subtle diplomacy he especially approached the imperial family, which was well disposed to the Bishop of Constantinople, by means of theological essays—one each to the Emperor, the Empress, and the Princesses[43]—to gain them to his side. Even in style, as Cyril informed Rome, he proved himself superior to Nestorius. In the summer of 430 Pope Celestine received from him a comprehensive dossier with a detailed description of the events thus far, with his personal evaluation of the Nestorian teaching, and with pertinent extracts from the Greek Fathers,[44]—all this in a Latin translation, a gesture which Nestorius had neglected.

---

[37] These letters of Cyril and the reply of Nestorius in *ACO* I, I, 1, 10–25. Cyril's Easter letter to the bishops, *Homil. pasch.,* 17 (*PG* 77, 768–789).

[38] Cf., for example, E. Schwartz, *Cyrill und der Mönch Viktor* (Munich 1928), 3ff.

[39] Nestorius to Celestine, *ACO* I, II, 3, 12–14. Cassian, *De incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium, CSEL* 17, 235–391.

[40] *ACO* I, I, 1, 25–28.

Rome had to take a stand. The Pope might have believed that in the report from Nestorius and in material transmitted by Cyril he had sufficient information to give a decision at the synod at the beginning of August. Cassian's work was also probably before him, and Cyril's deacon Posidonius was at his disposal for further information; but there was no one at hand to explain in more detail the position of Nestorius. Obviously no one in Rome remembered that a few years earlier Augustine of Hippo in a clarifying discussion had assisted the Gallic monk Leporius to a correct grasp of exactly that Christological question for which Nestorius was seeking a solution. Leporius too rejected the *communicatio idiomatum,* because he thought one could not speak of a God who was born of a woman and crucified. Both the example of Augustine in his dealings with the "teacher of error," but also the text of the creed that he probably formulated and Leporius signed,[45] could have been of assistance to Rome for the proceedings in regard to Nestorius. But he was summarily condemned because, in contradiction of the tradition, he saw in Christ a mere Man, because he questioned Christ's virginal birth which had given to the world the true Son of God, through whom we have been redeemed. The Roman judgment displays no knowledge of the discussion of the Christological problem which had occupied the theologians of the East for years. True, it repulses the threat to tradition by the attack on Nestorius, but it shows no positive way to a deep understanding of the unity and diversity in Christ.

---

[41] Ibid. I, I, 2, 29–32.

[42] Cyril, *Epp.* 14 and 16, *ACO* I, I, 1, 96–98.

[43] *De recta fide ad Theodos. imp., ACO* I, I, 1, 42–72; *De recta fide ad Augustas. De recta fide ad Dominas,* ibid. I, I, 5, 26–118; see now C. Scanzillo, *Asprenas* 13 (1966), 275–294.

[44] Report to Celestine, *ACO* I, I, 5, 10–12. To this time belongs also his work *Contra Nestorium, ACO* I, I, 6, 13–106.

[45] Leporius's profession of faith in *PL* 31, 1221–30; Augustine's letter to the Gallic bishops, *Ep.* 219. On the whole matter, see P. Glorieux, *Prénestorianisme en Occident* (Tournai and Paris 1959), 5–38.

The Pope at once informed Nestorius, the clergy, and the people of Constantinople of the verdict of the Roman Synod and demanded of its bishop a public recantation within ten days; after that, judgment would be issued on him. Cyril of Alexandria was directed, in Rome's name, to see to the implementation of the synodal decree.[46] This mandate was to have fateful consequences, for Cyril went far beyond his instructions. Instead of making the attempt to induce Nestorius to the required recantation in the appropriate form, he had him solemnly condemned also by the Alexandrian Church at a synod in November 430 and transmitted to him the judgment of the synod, which in the harshest manner blamed him for the "blasphemies" and the "scandal" that he had brought on the Church with his errors. In addition, Cyril claimed that Rome had recognized "that the letters sent to you by the Alexandrian Church reproduce the orthodox faith perfectly." And so he inclosed a profession of faith and twelve other propositions in which was contained what he was required to condemn.[47] But in this letter and above all in the twelve anathemas were contained precisely the specific formulas of Cyril's Christology, which to Nestorius had always appeared dubious. He did indeed receive Cyril's letter, but at first he declined to comment and immediately apprised his friends at Antioch of Cyril's new demands. In these they saw new evidences of the Apollinarianism of the Alexandrian Christology, to which they must not submit. The fronts had again hardened.

Ephesus

While the envoys of Cyril, with the decrees of the Alexandrian Synod, were still en route to Constantinople, a letter had already been sent by the Emperor Theodosius II to Cyril: it made known that the Emperor had invited all the metropolitans of the East with some bishops of their respective provinces to appear at Pentecost 431 in conveniently located Ephesus for a general council.[48] Invitations were sent also to Rome and Hippo, but Augustine was dead by the time the letter was sent, and

---

[46] Celestine's letters on the decrees of the Roman Synod, *ACO* I, I, 2, 5–20.

[47] Cyril's letter and the Twelve Anathemas, ibid. I, I, 1, 33–42.

[48] Ibid. I, I, 1, 73.

Bishop Capreolus of Carthage designated the deacon Bassula to represent the African Church. Pope Celestine, whose decision in the case of Nestorius was now ready, had to consider how, in the new situation, to maintain Rome's authority so far as possible: he aimed to achieve this through letters to the Emperor and the bishops gathered in council, on whom he urged harmony. Once again, he saw his strongest support in Cyril, whom he appointed as his own vicar at the Council, since he expressly instructed his official legates to maintain the closest contact with the Bishop of Alexandria and follow his judgments.[49] Thus Cyril regarded himself as the real master of the Council, whose direction, for this reason, was certainly not remarkable for the most rigorous objectivity. That he wanted to fight for his Christological ideas was understandable. But the course of the Council shows that he was determined to promote the victory of these ideas with the most highly questionable methods. A strong escort of more than forty Egyptian bishops and of numerous clerics and monks would back him. Together with a group of bishops from Macedonia and the provinces of Asia Minor, Nestorius also had arrived on time. The Palestinian episcopate came late, but still absent were the Roman legates and the friends of Nestorius, the so-called Orientals—that is, the Syrian bishops with John of Antioch. In a letter[50] John made known that they would soon be there: their arrival had been delayed by all sorts of travel difficulties.

It does not help Cyril's reputation that he awaited the arrival neither of the papal delegation nor of the Antiochene bishops, but on his own authority fixed the opening of the Council for 22 June, against the express protest of the imperial representative, Count Candidian, and a group of sixty-eight bishops.[51] But they bowed to his will and thus about 150 bishops assembled in the principal church of Ephesus. To these—again under protest—Candidian read the Emperor's invitation to the Council, which was thereby regarded as opened.[52] Only Nestorius, with a few bishops, stayed away from the meeting, despite repeated citations: he declared he would come when all the bishops had arrived.

The discussion in the first stage of the sessions proceeded in agreement with Cyril. After the reading of the Nicene Creed, the priest Peter of Alexandria moved that the so-called Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius be made public, and after Cyril had made an appropriate intervention the bishops, one after another, noted that the content of this letter was in conformity with the Creed of Nicaea.[53] The reply of Nestorius to Cyril's letter was also read but it was loudly condemned as blasphemous. The bishops likewise took cognizance of Celestine's letter to Nestorius and of Cyril's Third Letter with its Twelve Anathemas and, this time without a vote, put them into the acts. After some bishops had reported certain expressions used by Nestorius in private conversations, the sentence was issued that excluded him "from the episcopal dignity and from every meeting of priests." A letter "to Nestorius, the new Judas," informed him of the decision of the gathering. In a letter characterized by a powerful emotion of triumph, Cyril reported to his Alexandrian congregation that "the enemy of the faith" had fallen.[54]

---

[49] Celestine's letters, *ACO* I, II, 21–27; the invitation to Rome, ibid. 114–116.

[50] *ACO* I, I, 2, 8.

[51] Ibid. I, IV, 27f.; 32. Cyril's later justification of his proceedings regarding the Emperor, *Apol. ad Theodos.*, *ACO* I, I, 3, 83, is not free of contradictions.

[52] Report of the bishops concerning the opening session to Pope Celestine, *ACO* I, I, 3, 4. For Candidian's protest, ibid. 2, 8.

Nestorius and some of his friends issued a sharp protest against the proceedings of the meeting and blamed with special severity the local Bishop of Ephesus, Memnon. The Emperor's representative also reported to his master and declared the decisions of the episcopal gathering to be both illegal and invalid.[55] Four days after this session, John of Antioch and the Syrian bishops arrived. When they had been informed of events, John summoned a countermeeting, in which about fifty bishops participated: for their part they now deposed Cyril and Memnon and so informed the Emperor as well as the clergy and people of Constantinople. Theodosius II declared that all the measures thus far taken were void and he would dispatch an official to make an investigation on the spot.[56] Just the same, the majority of the Council met again, when, at the beginning of July, Celestine's legates arrived. These made known Celestine's letter to the Council, took note of the minutes of 22 June, and ratified by their signatures the condemnation of Nestorius.[57] When John of Antioch rejected Cyril's repeated citations, because he intended to await the arrival of the imperial officer, he and the Syrian bishops were excommunicated by the majority, so that now each of the two factions had visited anathema on the other. In six canons the majority expressed itself in regard to the adherents of Nestorius and in a seventh canon forbade for the future every effort to draw up other creeds besides that of Nicaea. A comprehensive report on the activity of the Council thus far was sent to Pope Celestine.[58]

Cyril's majority had thus completed its work, but the members could not disperse before the arrival of the imperial agent, who did not reach Ephesus until the beginning of August. Count John made known to the bishops of both factions a decree of the Emperor, which ordered the deposition of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, and asked the other bishops to go home. When Cyril's adherents in particular protested, John had the three named confined in Memnon's residence.[59] After a final attempt by the Emperor to arrange a compromise of the opposing positions—he had requested delegations from both groups to come to him at Chalcedon—remained fruitless, he declared in September that the Council was ended. But Cyril had already left Ephesus secretly, probably because he feared that in the meantime a successor would be given him in Alexandria, as had already happened to Nestorius.[60] In an effort to turn the mood at court in his favor, Cyril did not shrink from a lavish distribution of gifts among the influential people of the capital—Nestorius later bitterly characterized this as bribery, and it laid an enormous burden of debt on the Church of Alexandria.[61] Nestorius, who had already received a successor in Maximian, had to return to his monastery at Antioch; later, he was exiled to Petra in Idumaea, and finally to the Libyan Desert. He was still alive when people were preparing to do at Chalcedon what Ephesus had not yet been able to achieve: to give the real solution to the Christological problem.

---

[53] Ibid. I, I, 1, 25–31.

[54] Ibid. I, I, 1, 31–54.

[55] Ibid. I, I, 5, 13–15; I, IV, 33.

[56] Ibid. I, 5, 119–127.

[57] Ibid. 3, 53–57.

[58] Ibid. I, I, 3, 24f. Report to Celestine, ibid., 5–9. The canons, *COD* 52–54.

But, just the same, the Council of Ephesus, in the midst of all the depressing human shortcomings, brought about theological progress in the Christological question. First, the bishops had, in their conscious renunciation of the claim to a new creed, indicated the Nicene Creed as the unchangeable norm, against which all future efforts at deepening the understanding of the faith must be measured. Second, by their solemn declaration that Cyril's Second Letter was in harmony with the statements of the Nicene Creed, they had recognized the *communicatio idiomatum* and the title of *Theotokos* for Mary as obligatory. Finally, with their condemnation of Nestorius, they warded off certain dangers for the faith of Nicaea which were contained in his new Christological starting-point. The acceptance of this decision of the bishops gathered around Cyril at Ephesus by the legates of Pope Celestine gave it decisive weight and in a certain sense pointed to the direction which Christological discussion had to take in the future. If, even through the approval of Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius, no formula contained in it and no concept used by it was sanctioned, still the Council of Chalcedon could have recourse to it and utilize it for its clarifying and progressive statements on the faith.[62]

---

[59] *ACO* I, I, 3, 31f; I, IV, 53f.

[60] Ibid. I, I, 7, 80.

[61] A list of the gifts (*eulogiae*) and those who received them, *ACO* I, IV, 222–225; see P. Battifol, "Les présents de s. Cyrille à la cour de Constantinople," *BALAC* 1, (1911), 247–264.

The work of the Oriental bishops around John of Antioch was also not fruitless. As a justification of their attitude, they had presented to the imperial agent at Ephesus a profession of faith in which they confessed "one Christ, one Son, one Lord," in whom both natures are united without admixture, and that "on the basis of this union the Holy Virgin is *Theotokos*."[63] In the special situation prevailing at Ephesus, this significant formulation of the Antiochene faction did not have a direct effect, but when peace was concluded between Antioch and Alexandria two years later, this statement of faith constituted the basis on which the reconciliation became possible.

It will always be a source of regret that at Ephesus there was no objective, unemotional discussion between Nestorius and his friends on the one side and Cyril's group on the other. Perhaps it would in this way have been made clear that the theological opposition of the two was definitively conditioned by the absence of a clarified and strictly defined terminology. Perhaps Nestorius would have learned that the tradition disregarded by him very probably knew the title of *Theotokos* and hence the *communicatio idiomatum,* and perhaps Cyril would have seen that Nestorius had struggled seriously for an understanding of the substantial unity of the two natures in Christ and thereby stood substantially closer to orthodoxy than so it seemed from a distance. That, instead, Nestorius was branded as the "new Judas" and the "Blasphemer" casts a dark shadow over Ephesus. When later, in his exile, Nestorius obtained knowledge of Pope Leo's *Epistola ad Flavianum,* he at once swore in a letter to the people of Constantinople that he agreed with the theology of Leo and Flavian.[64] His defense, contained in the retouched *Liber Heraclidis,* does not, however, make known any essential advance beyond the positions he had already achieved in 431.[65]

---

[62] Cf. A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition,* 417.

[63] *ACO* I, I, 7, 70.

[64] In F. Nau, *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas,* 373f.

[65] See A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 433–452, especially 452.

CHAPTER 8

From Ephesus to Chalcedon

Reconciliation between Antioch and Alexandria

When in March 432 Pope Celestine, in letters to the participants in the Council of Ephesus, to the Emperor, and to the new Bishop of Constantinople, Maximian, expressed his congratulations on the Council's successful achievement,[1] he was obviously only inadequately informed of the real situation in the East. The members had gone their separate ways completely unreconciled, and each faction furthermore made as a precondition of peace a demand which was absolutely rejected by the other side. The Antiochenes insisted on the withdrawal of the Twelve Anathemas by Cyril, who for his part demanded the express assent of the Orientals to the condemnation of Nestorius. And in the background there continued to lurk the still to be accomplished theological working out of the Christological problem. The fact, then, that relatively soon there occurred an essential rapprochement between Antioch and Alexandria was due, first, to the efforts of the Emperor and then to the energetic mediation of the aged Bishop Acacius of Beroea,[2] who enjoyed the great respect of both sides. Theodosius II sent a special deputy, Aristolaus, to warn the two faction-leaders forcefully to resume the negotiations and also brought Simeon Stylites into the effort for peace.[3] Even in Cyril's first reaction to a letter from Acacius, the latter thought he detected a certain readiness on the part of the Alexandrian for reconciliation; if at Antioch people could agree to the deposition and condemnation of Nestorius, then the quarrel now in progress could be regarded as over and forgotten. At the urging of the Bishop of Beroea, John of Antioch sent Bishop Paul of Emesa to Cyril with a letter into which the creed earlier formulated at Ephesus by the Orientals was inserted: it contained the recognition of the title of *Theotokos.* In addition, in the letter the deposition of Nestorius was approved, his teaching was condemned, and the ordination of Maximian as his successor was accepted.[4] Cyril joyfully replied to this far-reaching accommodation of the Orientals with the declaration that now the same faith prevailed in the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria. For his part, it was a significant concession that in his answer he made absolutely no mention of the Anathemas against Nestorius and hence no longer insisted on their acceptance.[5] The Emperor Theodosius and Pope Sixtus III (432–440) were at once informed of the completed union; the Pope sent his congratulations to the two leading bishops and thereby indirectly approved the formula of faith which had made possible the concluding of peace.[6]

---

[1] Celestine, *Epp.* 22–24.

[2] Cf. G. Bardy, "Acace de Bérée et son rôle dans la controverse nestorienne," *RevSR* 18 (1938), 2–45.

[3] Theodosius II to Simeon Stylites, *ACO* I, 1, 4, 5–6.

[4] *ACO* I, 1, 4, 7–9.

For the permanence of this peace, however, it was decisive to what extent the union proclaimed by the two spokesmen would be accepted by their respective followings in the episcopate. The Egyptian bishops made no difficulties, but some non-Egyptian collaborators of Cyril, especially Acacius of Melitene, who had stood forth at Ephesus as a strong opponent of Nestorius, had serious scruples that now the Anathemas and the Cyrillan formula of "one nature of the Logos-made-Man" were removed from the discussion and that this could further a relapse into Nestorianism. In a series of letters Cyril sought successfully to dispel these hesitations.[7] It was incomparably more difficult for John of Antioch to gain all the bishops of the Syrian region for the acceptance of the Union of 433. The Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis demanded, now as earlier, the repudiation of the Anathemas by Cyril, and the Bishops of Tarsus and Tyana, as spokesmen of an opposing faction, even turned to Sixtus III to obtain a condemnation of the Alexandrian.[8] That finally the majority of the Orientals were actually ready to accept the Union was a consequence of the position which their most important theologian, who was also a man of the highest integrity of character and of deep piety, Bishop Theodoret of Cyrrhus,[9] reached after a severe struggle. His hesitations concerning Cyril's Christology were ultimately founded on the latter's Anathemas against Nestorius, in which in the last analysis he saw Apollinarianism, since they spoke of a mixture (*krasis*) of the two natures, which would lead inevitably to Monophysitism. Once Cyril no longer insisted on the Anathemas, and Theodoret gradually understood that for Cyril the terms *physis* and *hypostasis* were not synonyms, he declared that, still urged by John of Antioch, Acacius of Beroea, Simeon Stylites, and friendly monks, he was prepared to sign the Formula of Union. He also informed Cyril personally of his decision that he believed he must refuse only a condemnation of Nestorius.[10] Since also Andrew of Samosata, who until now had likewise rejected Cyril's Anathemas, achieved through his theological work a deeper understanding of the formulas "one *hypostasis*" and "two natures," there remained only a weak minority in opposition, which followed Alexander of Hierapolis.[11] As ever more new efforts to create disturbances proceeded from it, John of Antioch arranged to have Alexander and some other bishops exiled to Egypt. Theodosius II intended to draw the consequences of the position now gained, and in 436 he issued a severe edict against the Nestorians, which prohibited the possessing, reading, and disseminating of the writings of Nestorius and ordered them to be surrendered and burned.[12]

---

[5] Cyril's letter, ibid. I, 1, 4, 15–20.

[6] Letters of Sixtus III, *ACO* I, 2, 107–110.

[7] Cyril, *Epp.* 40, 44–46, 50, 55, 67; some in *ACO* I, 1, 4, 20–37; I, 1, 3, 90–101; I, 1, 6, 153–162.

[8] Alexander of Hierapolis to Acacius of Beroea, *ACO* I, 4, 18; letter of Pope Sixtus, ibid. 145–148.

[9] For the development of his Christology cf. especially M. Richard, *RSPhTh* 25 (1936), 459–481, and A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition,* 419–427.

The peace established with so much labor was again jeopardized when in 435 a violent discussion erupted over the orthodoxy of Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, dead since 428.[13] It was started by two Armenian priests, who laid before the new Bishop of Constantinople, Proclus, promoted to that office in 434, the question of what was to be thought of Theodore's orthodoxy: Bishops Acacius of Melitene and Rabbula of Edessa had warned against his writings. Proclus then composed an essay in which he took a mediating position between the "Antiochene" and the "Alexandrian" Christology.[14] In it he condemned some excerpts from Theodore's writings, but without naming him. But Bishop Ibas of Edessa, Rabbula's successor since 435 and a resolute Antiochene, protested a condemnation of these propositions: he had translated Theodore's writings into Syriac and disseminated them in Armenia.[15] But Proclus had recourse to John of Antioch, asking him to approve the doctrine expressed in the essay and the condemnation of Theodore's propositions. However, the Antiochenes declined to agree to the latter point because it seemed to them improper to sit in judgment on one who was deceased and had died in peace with the Church;

---

[10] To Theodoret's criticism of the Anathemas Cyril replied in *Apologeticus contra Theodoretum, ACO* I, 1, 6, 107–146. In his *Ep.* 112 (*SChr* 111, 46–56) Theodoret gives a summary of his position in their regard to 449. The intervention of the monks, *ACO* I, 4, 170; see M. Richard, *MSR* 3 (1946), 147–156.

[11] On Andrew of Samosata see A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 427–432, and L. Abramowski, *OrChr* 41 (1957), 51–64.

[12] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 66.

[13] Important for the chronology of the events is L. Abramowski, *ZKG* 67 (1955–56), 252–287.

[14] It is the so-called *Tomus ad Armenios, ACO* IV, 2, 187–195; on Proclus in this context, M. Richard, *RHE* 38 (1942), 303–331, and V. Inglesian, *OrChr* 41 (1957), 35–50.

[15] Letter of Ibas to the Persian Bishop Maris, *ACO* II, 1, 3, 32–34.

furthermore, the excerpts from Theodore, torn from their context, were quite susceptible of an orthodox interpretation. But it was more significant theologically that John concurred with the Christological formula proposed by Proclus: "I know only *one* Son . . . and confess *one hypostasis* of the Word-made-flesh." Here the Cyrillan *physis* was replaced by *hypostasis:* the assent of the Antiochenes was an important step toward a formula that could be recognized by both sides. And since Cyril did not insist on an express condemnation of Theodore, the controversy ended and for several years peace prevailed among Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople.[16]

Rise of Monophysitism

When a new phase in the discussion of the Christological question began in 446, some of the previous spokesmen were no longer alive. At Antioch Domnus had succeeded his dead uncle, John, in 442; Cyril died in 444 and his place was taken by Dioscorus, one of the most questionable figures of the century in the eastern episcopate; and in 446 Flavian became bishop of the imperial capital. Here had appeared some time earlier as herald of an extreme "Alexandrian" Christology the Abbot Eutyches,[17] who was, however, unable to justify it with a well-founded theological knowledge. His basic thesis was that no one was permitted to go beyond the Creed of Nicaea and the decision of Ephesus—this was an allusion to the Formula of Union of 433. He expressed his own Christological doctrine in the obstinately repeated proposition: "I confess that before the union our Lord consisted of two natures, but after the union I confess one single nature."[18] Since Eutyches had at his disposal a considerable following among the monks of the capital and maintained good relations with the scheming minister Chrysaphius, his godchild, it was not without peril to come out against his doctrine, which betrayed an unambiguously Monophysite tendency. But Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who in comparison with the weak Domnus was now more than ever the outstanding man of the Antiochenes, dared to launch the attack, when in 447 he published an exhaustive Christological work, to which he gave the title of *Eranistes* (*The Beggar*).[19] In this dialogue the beggar expounded the idea that in Christ divinity and humanity constitute only one nature, since the divine nature has assumed the human into itself, as the sea absorbs a drop of water. The orthodox partner in the conversation objected that the two natures were not blended together at their union and that the divine nature is immutable and incapable of suffering; he supported his presentation with copious citations from the Fathers. Both in Constantinople as well as in Alexandria it was at once grasped that from now on Theodoret of Cyrrhus would be the opponent in any effort to assist a Monophysite Christology to victory. As once Dioscorus imperiously demanded of Domnus the removal of Theodoret from office and the approval of Cyril's Anathemas. The calm but decisive reply of the two Antiochenes to Dioscorus, however, left no doubt that the Union of 433 would still not be sacrificed.[20]

---

[16] View of the Antiochenes in a letter from John to Cyril, *Ep.* 67 among his letters; see Cyril, *Ep.* 72; on the whole matter, E. Schwartz, *Konzilsstudien* (Strasbourg 1914), 62–67.

[17] On Eutyches cf. the literature in A. van Roey, *DHGE* 16, 87–91.

[18] *ACO* II, 1, 1, 143: ὁμολογῶ ἐϰ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆσϑαι τὸν ϰύριον πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ.

[19] *PG* 83, 27–336; see R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mops.*, 166–168.

Naturally, Bishop Flavian was acquainted with the view of Eutyches, but he was not aggressive in character and at first he avoided taking any stand. However, in November 448 Eusebius of Dorylaeum, well known from his days in Constantinople under Nestorius, brought before the *Synodos Endemousa* the accusation that Eutyches rejected the doctrine of the two natures in Christ as set down in Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius and in the Formula of Union of 433.[21] After some evading tactics, Eutyches finally presented himself with a considerable retinue of monks and officials before the synodal court. At first he tried to parry by means of a neutral creed and a general assertion of his orthodoxy, but he was then asked directly whether he accepted the formulas "of two natures" and "the two natures." As a consequence of his refusal, the verdict of the Synod deprived him of his abbatial and his priestly dignities and declared him anathema.[22] Eutyches now had recourse to a great protest demonstration that should cause his case to reecho throughout the Church. In a series of letters[23] to the Bishops of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, to Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna, and to Pope Leo I, he emotionally complained that some people wanted to exclude him, a septuagenarian, from the number of the faithful, although he aimed only to adhere to the faith of Nicaea and Ephesus. In addition, he skillfully exploited his relationship with Chrysaphius, who influenced the Emperor entirely in favor of Eutyches and who finally succeeded in converting him to the idea of a new council, which probably sprang from Eutyches himself. Bishop Flavian, it is true, tried to thwart his plan and hence had recourse to Leo the Great, but it was already too late. A decree of the Emperor, dated 30 March 449, appointed 1 August for the opening of the Council: the place of the sessions should again be Ephesus. A special invitation proceeded to the Syrian Archimandrite Barsumas, because he had proved himself in the struggle against the heresy of Nestorius, and contrary to all custom he had the right to sit and vote at the imperial Synod. Dioscorus was asked to bring along twenty Egyptian bishops; at the same time he was told that Theodoret of Cyrrhus was forbidden to take part in the Council.[24] Thereby the strongest theological force of the opposition was shamefully excluded. The purpose was clear: without any risk, Eutyches was to be rehabilitated, Flavian deposed, and all "Nestorians" rendered innocuous.

---

[20] Cf. Theodoret, *Epp.* 82f., 85f., 92–96, 99, 100, 103f., 106 (now all in *SChr* 98 and 111).

[21] *ACO* II, 2, 1, 3. For knowledge of the course of the process, basic is E. Schwartz, *Der Prozess des Eutyches* (Munich 1929).

[22] Acts of the Synod, *ACO* II, 1, 1, 124–144.

[23] *ACO* II, 1, 1, 175; II, 1, 2, 45f.; only the letter of Pope Leo is extant, ibid. II, 1, 1, 71; to Dioscorus, II, 1, 1, 69.

As soon as he had received the invitation, Leo the Great named as his legates Bishop Julius of Puteoli, the Priest Renatus, and the Deacon Hilary—destined to be his successor—and to them he gave letters to various personnages of the capital as well as to the Emperor and Bishop Flavian. Since Bishop Flavian had again and again urgently alerted the Pope to the danger which could proceed from so well planned an imperial Synod, he tried to induce the Emperor to forgo the Council, but in vain. The letter to Flavian was the great *Epistola dogmatica ad Flavianum,* the so-called "Tome of Leo," the Roman decision of the Christological problem.[25] Flavian's apprehensions received a further confirmation, when on 6 August 449 the Emperor designated Dioscorus as president of the imperial Synod, which met two days later in the same church as eighteen years previously.[26] The external picture was already depressing. The Emperor had sent a strong police squadron under the minister Elpidius, Eutyches had ordered his monastic following to come from the capital to Ephesus, Barsumas brought a group of Syrian monks, and Dioscorus had with him a detachment of Alexandrian *parabolani*—members of a guild of nurses of the sick, who could be used for other purposes also. As early as the first session, Dioscorus made known how he intended to preside over the Synod. He ruthlessly disregarded the desire of the papal legates, who wanted Leo's letter to be read aloud at the beginning of the proceedings. Instead of letting Eusebius of Dorylaeum be heard, he was overwhelmed with loud abuse at the mere mention of his name, but the accused was allowed to submit an account of the proceedings of the Synod of Constantinople which grossly distorted the truth. Then Dioscorus called for a vote as to whether Eutyches was orthodox: 113 of about 140 participants agreed that he was and hence rehabilitated him.[27] Then the seventh canon of the Synod of Ephesus of 431 was read: it forbade adding anything to the Nicene Creed or making any changes in it. According to Dioscorus, Flavian and Eusebius had violated this prescription; hence they were deposed, and the bishops were expected to ratify this act by their signatures. When Flavian protested against this procedure, when the Roman deacon called out *contradicitur* into the church, and some bishops likewise expressed hesitations, Dioscorus had the church doors opened and soldiers, noisy monks, and a shouting mob streamed in. In the midst of this tumult the overawed bishops signed the decree of deposition of Eusebius and Flavian; the last-named was personally threatened by Barsumas. He was at once banished and died soon after on the way to his place of exile.[28] In another session, Dioscorus by the same means achieved his ultimate goal: the proscription of the Bishops Ibas and Theodoret, who were absent, and of Domnus of Antioch. His devoted monks loudly demanded the condemnation of "Nestorianism," to which Dioscorus cynically replied that their appeal was divinely inspired.[29] By this deposition of the three leading Antiochenes, the Union of 433 was annulled and, to all appearances, the Monophysite faction had achieved a triumphal success. When Pope Leo had received the report of his deacon Hilary on the course of this imperial Synod, he could characterize it only with the statement that it was no *iudicium* but a *latrocinium.*[30] And so it went into history as the Robber Synod of Ephesus.

---

[24] The Emperor's decree of convocation, *ACO* II, 1, 1, 69; invitation to Barsumas, ibid. II, 4, 143f.

[25] Leo's letters, *Epp.* 28–35, *ACO* II, 4, 6ff.

[26] Letter of appointment to Dioscorus in J. Flemming, op. cit., 5; a summarized survey of the course of the Synod by J. Liébaert, *DHGE* 15, 574–579.

The Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451)

What little importance the Alexandrian Dioscorus attributed to Rome's attitude was ascertained, not without surprise, when he tried to make the Monophysite Christology alone valid. In this case also his actions clearly revealed his distance from the stature of his predecessor, Cyril. The affront to the papal legates and the condemnation of Pope Leo at Ephesus, managed by him, were to hurt him seriously when it came time to pass judgment on him at Chalcedon. He was perhaps still en route home when Flavian's appeal was sent to Leo the Great, soon to be followed by that of Theodoret of Cyrrhus.[31] The Pope immediately fell in with Flavian's suggestion that a new council be summoned. After a Roman Synod had strongly condemned the decisions of Ephesus of 29 September 449, the Pope wrote to the Emperor, to the latter's sister Pulcheria, to the clergy, and to the monks of the capital who were loyal to Flavian.[32] He urgently pressed the Emperor to annul the decisions just recently reached at Ephesus until a great synod in Italy, at which bishops *ex toto orbe terrarum* should be present, should restore unity of faith. When the Emperor, despite another admonition, maintained silence, Leo had his concern made known to him through Valentinian III and the Empress Galla Placidia: Theodosius coldly replied that the law had not been violated at Ephesus and that, besides, the Patriarch of Rome should not interfere in eastern affairs.[33] But Leo remained unyielding. In a letter to Bishop Anatolius of Constantinople, who had made known to the Pope that he had become Flavian's successor, he demanded from him a profession of faith that was in conformity with the teachings of the *Epistola ad Flavianum* and announced that a Roman delegation would again ask the Emperor for the convoking of a general council in Italy.[34] The legates could not implement their assignment. Theodosius II died at the end of July as a result of a fall. The heir of the Eastern Empire was his energetic sister, Pulcheria, who four weeks later married the Illyrian officer Marcian and had him proclaimed Emperor. With this change on the imperial throne there at once occurred a complete reorientation of the total ecclesiastical and political situation.

---

[27] *ACO* II, 1, 1, 90f., 94–96, 182–186. On the number of participants see E. Honigmann, *Byz(b)* 16 (1944), 34–37.

[28] *ACO* II, 1, 1, 191; II, 5, 118. On Flavian's death see H. Chadwick, *JThS,* m.s., 6 (1955), 17–34.

[29] On this session the Syrian acts give the principal report; see J. Flemming, op. cit., 6f., 13–19, 57, 61–69, 87, 91–105, 123–128, 131–151. On the role of monks at this Synod see the exhaustive study by H. Bacht, *Chalkedon,* 221–231.

[30] Leo's expression *latrocinium, ACO* II, 4, 51. The Greeks also soon called it *leistrike synodos:* Cyril Scythop., *Vita s. Euthymii,* 27; *Vita Sabae,* 56.

Pulcheria had long disapproved the ecclesiastical-political line of her brother, which was determined by his minister Chrysaphius. She had the latter brought to trial: the court had sufficient grounds to issue the death sentence against him.[35] The bishops deposed and exiled at Ephesus were recalled to their sees, among them Theodoret and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, who likewise at once called for a new council. Eutyches was sent to a monastery in the vicinity of the capital, and Bishop Anatolius held himself clearly aloof from Dioscorus of Alexandria, who thereby lost all support. In his first letter to Pope Leo, announcing his accession to the throne, the Emperor Marcian declared that he was in agreement with the project of a new council, and the Empress Pulcheria wrote in the same vein.[36] The so surprisingly favorable change of situation in the East, however, now made a general council no longer seem so urgent to the Pope, and he replied to the Emperor that he might, to begin with, want to do nothing about a convoking of the prelates: papal legates could clarify at Constantinople what still needed to be done.[37] But in the meantime Marcian had already informed the Patriarch Anatolius that, in agreement with the Pope, he intended to summon an imperial synod to Nicaea.[38] Leo I experienced some uneasiness on learning this, but he assented and made clear that he was determined to do everything to prevent the repetition of any occurrence such as the recent débâcle at Ephesus. He explained that this time his legates would preside over the Council in the Pope's name and as his only representatives. In a letter to those expected to participate he defined within a certain range the tasks which were envisaged for the episcopal gathering: it was to reinstitute solemnly in their offices and dignities the bishops punished at Ephesus because of their fidelity to the faith; it was to adopt as its own in the doctrine of the Incarnation what had already been expounded in detail in his *Epistola ad Flavianum;* under the presidency of his legates, everything was to be avoided that contradicted the faith and the canons.[39] This was unambiguous: this time no Dioscorus should so contemptuously disregard the papal authority, as had happened two years earlier at Ephesus. A large number of bishops had already arrived in Nicaea by 1 September 451 and were awaiting the Emperor, who had promised to participate. Since, however, state business too often required his presence in the capital, Marcian summoned the bishops to more favorably situated Chalcedon on the Bosporus, and there on 8 October 451 they met for the opening session in the Church of Saint Euphemia.[40]

---

[31] Flavian's appeal, *ACO* II, 2, 1, 77–79, was presented to the Pope by Hilary. Theodoret's letter, *Ep.* 113 (*SChr* 111, 56–66).

[32] They are letters 44f., 50f., in *ACO* II, 4, 19–25.

[33] Among the letters of Leo, *Epp.* 54, 56, 62.

[34] *Ep.* 69, *ACO* II, 4, 30.

[35] See P. Goubert, "Le rôle de Sainte Pulchérie et de l'eunuque Chrysaphios," *Chalkedon* I, 303–321.

With some 350 participants,[41] the Council of Chalcedon was until that time the most imposing ecclesiastical gathering in history. Although only six of its members came from the Latin West, its ecumenical character was established from the beginning, because Pope Leo I had guaranteed unequivocally his presence at the Council.[42] Thus at the beginning of the first session Bishop Paschasinus, as legate, spoke and declared "at the instruction of the Bishop of Rome" that he moved that a seat and a vote at this Council be denied to Dioscorus. Thus was the process inaugurated against the Bishop of Alexandria, which was completed at the third session. The discussion proceeded not entirely one-sidely and peaceably, since the Egyptian bishops tried again and again to justify their behavior at Ephesus, and Dioscorus himself was able repeatedly to take the floor. When the bishops who had at that time condemned Flavian confessed their guilt and asked the Council's pardon, he declined to join them in this step and did not appear again at the third session, even though he was summoned to it three times. Finally, in the name of Leo I, Paschasinus declared that Dioscorus was deprived of his priestly and episcopal dignity. Anatolius was the first to accept this verdict; he was followed by 192 bishops of the same opinion. The decree of deposition was signed by 308 bishops. The Emperor received a report on the course of the trial, and shortly thereafter Dioscorus was relegated to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in 454.[43] Flavian had already been rehabilitated in the first session, and to Theodoret of Cyrrhus, whom Pope Leo had earlier justified, a place was pointedly allotted by the imperial commissioners, though not without demonstrations of displeasure by some adherents of Dioscorus.[44] Since the Emperor had left it to the Council to decide on bishops such as Juvenal of Jerusalem and others who especially shared guilt for the happenings at Ephesus, there was a willingness to let them participate fully in the Synod. A group of monks from Constantinople again firmly refused to condemn Eutyches; not until 20 October were they threatened with excommunication, if they had not accepted the Council's decrees within thirty days.[45]

---

[36] *ACO* II, 1, 1, 10; II, 3, 1, 17–20.

[37] Leo, *Ep.* 82–86, *ACO* II, 4, 41–45. What was meant were disciplinary questions, such as the return of the Eutychians and the rehabilitation of Bishops Theodoret and Ibas.

[38] To Anatolius, *ACO* II, 3, 1, 17–20.

[39] Leo I, *Epp.* 89f., 92f., 95, *ACO* II, 4, 47–52.

[40] On the transfer of the Council, *ACO* II, 1, 1, 29f. A. M. Schneider, "Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon," *Chalkedon* I, 291–302.

[41] On the fluctuating numbers cf. V. Laurent, "Le nombre des Pères du Concile de Chalcédoine," *Acad. Roumaine,* Bull. section hist., 26 (Bucharest 1945), 33–46.

These personal matters had to give way to the theological theme on which the Council had inevitably to take a stand. As early as the second session, on 10 October, it became clear that the Emperor had other ideas on the form of this stand than did the great majority of bishops. At the beginning of the session, his commissioners moved that the bishops be permitted to elaborate an exposition of the orthodox faith, hence a new creed. However, the Council Fathers were of the opinion that in the Nicene Creed, in the profession of the 150 Fathers of Constantinople, in the letters of Cyril to Nestorius, and in Leo's *Tome* the orthodox faith was so authentically formulated that no new statement should be sought. All these documents were read aloud, whereupon it was affirmed in loud acclamations that Cyril and Leo taught the same thing and that, through Leo, Peter had spoken. A few bishops from Palestine and Illyricum, however, asked for elucidation of some of Leo's formulas, and so it was decided that Anatolius with a few bishops should seek to clarify these points in the next days.[46] When at the fourth session the imperial officials took up the question of the formula of faith, the bishops again let them know that they regarded Leo's *Epistola* as an adequate document. Only thirteen Egyptian bishops declared they were not in a position to sign the *Tome* of Leo and return with it to Alexandria.[47] Then the fifth session, on 22 October, brought the Council to an extremely critical position. On the one side was the express wish of the Emperor for a new creed, because he saw in one the sole possibility of a union and a settlement. On the other side were the overwhelming majority of the bishops, who were unwilling to go beyond the Nicene Creed. The opinions of the bishops diverged in their evaluation of Leo's *Tome.* While the Roman legates sought to have it recognized as a declaration of the Nicene faith, a group of Greek bishops around Anatolius did not attribute to it that rank and presented an outline of their own, to which, however, the legates were again unwilling to consent. The situation became so critical that the representatives of Rome threatened to depart in order to convoke the Council in the West.

---

[42] Leo I in the letter to Marcian (*ACO* II, 4, 48): ". . . in his fratribus quos direxi . . . mea sit aestimanda praesentia." See M. Goemans, "Chalkedon als 'allgemeines Konzil,'" *Chalkedon* I, 251–289.

[43] The acts on Dioscorus, *ACO* II, 1, 1, 65–70; II, 1, 2, 15–42.

[44] *ACO* II, 1, 1, 111f.; II, 1, 3, 9f.

[45] Ibid. II, 1, 2, 116–121.

At this point the Emperor intervened and again emphasized that he regarded the issuing of a creed as absolutely necessary. Either each metropolitan could present one or a commission could prepare an acceptable formula for the participants; if that should not be possible, he too would like to have a synod meet in the West. Thereupon the Council appointed twenty-three bishops, who after only three days were able to present the definitive Creed of Chalcedon: it could also be approved by the Roman legates because in it proper regard was had for Leo's *Epistola dogmatica.*[48] And so the Council was able to publish its decree on faith at the sixth session on 25 October, which acquired a special *éclat* through the presence of the imperial pair. In a Latin address, Marcian said that he had convoked this Council "in order to strengthen the faith," and after the reading of the decree he asked the assembly of bishops whether they approved this Creed. Since all the bishops gave an affirmative answer, he thanked them for the restoration of the unity of faith and asked them to complete at once the still unfinished business of the meeting.[49] This included the especially important question of the orthodoxy of Bishops Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa, who had been condemned at Ephesus II as Nestorians. From time to time the Roman legates intervened in their favor in the lengthy and quite excited discussion by calling attention to the fact that the decrees of Ephesus II had already been annulled by Pope Leo I. Both men were recognized by the Synod as orthodox and as the lawful holders of their bishoprics.[50]

---

[46] Ibid. II, 1, 2, 69–84.

[47] Ibid. II, 1, 2, 110–114.

[48] Ibid. II, 1, 2, 123–130.

The first serious collision between Greek bishops and the papal legates occurred in the final session, on 1 November, when the latter filed a solemn protest against a decree which had been composed the day before, in their absence, by the eastern episcopate. In the so-called canon 28 of Chalcedon the precedence within the patriarchates was regulated, and the preeminence of Constantinople over the other eastern patriarchates was established. Since the legates did not prevail with their protest, they reserved to the Roman See the decision on this canon, which was destined to play a fateful role in the later relations of Rome and Constantinople.[51] A solemn address of the Council to the Emperor constituted the final item of the acts of the Imperial Synod of Chalcedon, in which once again the importance of Rome for the success of the Council and of the *Epistola dogmatica* of Leo I for the clarification of the question of faith was underlined.[52]

No council of early Christian times has met with so varied an evaluation as has that of Chalcedon. The direct participants—Emperor, Pope, and the majority—saw as, above all, the enthusiasm of the solemn concluding session shows, that through this Council the true faith in the God-Man Jesus Christ was assured and thereby ecclesiastical unity was restored in East and West. The more recent research into the history of dogma has sometimes passed a wholly negative judgment on the Council because, by the introduction of philosophical concepts into its statement of faith it totally hellenized the biblical understanding of the person and message of Jesus and in this way definitely falsified it. The verdict of some Church historians is also extremely critical since the violent conflict that at once followed Chalcedon in regard to the interpretation of its Creed and the secession of the Egyptian and Syrian Churches that developed out of the conflict more than sufficiently show that it was quite unable to guarantee the unity and cohesion of the Christian world. A comment on the significance of the Council demands first a concise analysis of its Creed.[53] Its decisive statement reads:

---

[49] Ibid. 130–139.

[50] Ibid. II, 1, 3, 7–11.

[51] Ibid. II, 1, 3, 87–99.

[52] Ibid. II, 1, 3, 110–114.

> Hence we follow the holy Fathers and unanimously teach that the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, is one and the same. The one and same is perfect in his divinity and perfect in his humanity, true God and true Man, consisting of a rational soul and a body.
>
> The one and same is equal in substance to the Father in his divinity and equal in substance to us in his humanity; he became like us in all things, except sin [Heb. 4:15]. He was begotten of the Father before all time in his divinity; in the latest epoch, however, the same was born for us and for our salvation of Mary the Virgin and Mother of God in his humanity.
>
> We confess one and the same Christ, the Son and Lord, the only-begotten, who exists in two natures, without admixture, without change, without division, without separation.
>
> The difference of natures was never annulled through the union; rather the special property of each nature is preserved as the two come together into one person or *hypostasis.*
>
> We confess, not one separated and mutilated into two persons, but one and the same only-begotten Son, the divine Word, the Lord Jesus Christ.

The first words themselves stress the principle from which the authors of the Creed would derive their conclusions: the basis of their statement was the tradition, as it was present in the Bible, the Creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, and the decrees of Ephesus of 431; hence they intended to offer no revolutionary new formula, which would have, even in the slightest degree, violated the substance of this tradition. It was in accordance with this that, so to speak, each single formula was taken from the texts which were available to the Council; hence, in addition to the Second Letter of Cyril to Nestorius, mentioned by them, these were the Formula of Union of 433, elaborated by the Antiochenes and approved by Cyril, Flavian's profession of faith of the *Synodos endemousa* of Constantinople (448), and the *Epistola dogmatica* of Leo I. Here were found the concepts of nature, *hypostasis,* and person, but so widely clarified that they could be employed for a statement of faith that had now become necessary—necessary because the two dangers had to be repelled which most powerfully threatened the dogma of the person of Christ in the recent past: Nestorianism and Eutychianism.

---

[53] Text, *ACO* II, 1, 2, 126–130; also *COD* 59–63. Detailed assessment of the Creed by I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Chalkedon* I, 389–418, and A. Grillmeier, op. cit., 480–487.

Since the then most important centers of ecclesiastical life each contributed to this conciliar definition, it could all the easier take rank as the expression of the faith of the Universal Church. The Creed of Chalcedon accordingly expressed, in its adhering in principle to the tradition, the Christological dogma in a form which corresponded to the real need. Its Fathers neither wanted to nor could do more in view of the contemporary state of theology. To wish to charge that, as though in a prophetic preview of developments to come, they did not incorporate into their definition safeguards that would have made the appearance of Monothelitism and Monoenergism impossible, is to fail to grasp the task which they saw before them and also to overestimate the possibilities of the hour; in fact, it means ultimately to fail to understand that each age is summoned to find for the message of revelation the form of definition which is suitable and intended for it.

The critic must pass judgment on Chalcedon from a point of view more proper to Church history. The type and manner in which certain disciplinary measures of the Council were accepted and employed would have damped the high spirits of some bishops. The conduct of several Egyptian participants in the discussion of what happened at Ephesus in 449 must have made them fear that at Alexandria the form of the deposition of their Patriarch Dioscorus would be felt rather as a severe humiliation of the Egyptian Church than as a deserved punishment for a bishop. On the other hand, it was to be expected that the rehabilitation of Bishop Theodoret could be represented, even if not absolutely wrong in his case, at least as a relapse into Nestorianism. And the bishops around Anatolius had a slight presentiment of the discontent which they had inserted into the so-called canon 28; otherwise, they would hardly have so urgently asked Pope Leo to confirm it. The presentiment was not a delusion.

CHAPTER 9

The Origenist Controversy at The Turn of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries

Around the turn of the fourth to the fifth century there erupted a relatively brief but violent quarrel over the orthodoxy of Origen, in which Greeks and Latins took part. It represents the first phase of that development which would finally lead to the theological outlawry of the hitherto most important writer of Greek Christianity. In his lifetime the Alexandrian had experienced both rejection and recognition. That the tensions between him and his bishop, Demetrius, which c. 230 compelled him to leave his homeland, were due to the theological ideas that Origen represented is unlikely.[1] But Peter of Alexandria and Methodius, both of whom died in 311, raised questions especially about his doctrine of the preexistence of souls and his eschatological views,[2] and the distinguished anti-Arian Eustathius of Antioch very sharply criticized the manner in which Origen used the allegorical method.[3] But compared with these, the number of his admirers was far greater, beginning with his contemporaries, the Bishops Alexander of Jerusalem and Firmilian of Caesarea, his pupil Gregory Thaumaturgus,[4] and down to Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea, who dedicated to him a voluminous defense at the beginning of the fourth century.[5] Above all, the teachers at the theological school of Alexandria regarded themselves as his spiritual heirs, for example, his pupil, Dionysius the Great, who defended Origen's allegorical method against the attacks of Bishop Nepos of Arsinoe,[6] then Theognostus, who transmitted his views in his *Hypotyposeis,*[7] and Pierius, who was nicknamed the Younger Origen because of the quality and extent of his literary works.[8] Finally, Didymus the Blind attempted in a work of his own an orthodox interpretation of Origen's doctrine of the Trinity, but of course adopted the latter's teaching on the soul and eschatology as his own and hence fell under condemnation for these views in connection with the Origenist controversy of the sixth century.[9] Basil and Gregory Nazianzen compiled the much read *Philocalia,* an anthology of the writings of the Alexandrian,[10] and with them Gregory of Nyssa and likewise Athanasius appealed to his authority for one or another theological opinion; it was equally recognized among Latins such as Hilary of Poitiers, Eusebius of Vercelli and Ambrose of Milan.

---

[1] See vol. I, chap. 19; Origen himself complained repeatedly of falsifications of his writings; cf. Rufinus, *De adulteratione librorum Origenis,* c. 7.

[2] On Peter of Alexandria, see Quasten, *P* II, 115; the Dialogue of Methodius *On the Resurrection* (*GCS* 27, 217–424) was aimed against both Origen's doctrine of the soul and his theories about eschatology.

[3] In his only extant work, *On the Witch of Endor Against Origen* (ed. E. Klostermann, *KlT,* 83, Bonn 1912).

[4] See his *Thanks to Origen,* ed. H. Crouzel, *SChr* 148 (Paris 1969).

[5] Pamphilus wrote an *Apologia hyper Origenous* in five books, to which Eusebius added a sixth; see *HE* 6, 36, 4, and Photius, Bibl 118. Only Book 1 is extant in Rufinus's translation (*PG* 17, 521–616).

[6] In his *Peri epangelion:* Eusebius, *HE* 7, 24.

[7] Photius, *Bibl.* 106, knew the seven books of *Hypotyposeis* and indicated their Origenist ideology.

[8] On Pierius: Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 76.

[9] On the last defense, see Socrates, *HE* 4, 25, and Jerome, *Apol. contra Rufinum* 1, 6; 2, 16; 3, 28. On the problem of the condemnation of Didymus by the Synods of Constantinople of 543 and 553, see A. van Roey, *DHGE* 14 (1960), 427.

[10] J. Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen* (Cambridge 1893).

The controversy over the orthodoxy of the Alexandrian theologian was again kindled to a bright flame in 394 by Bishop Epiphanius of Salamis, whose impetuous nature was united to a strong inclination to persecute all real or presumed theological errors. Since he had put the name of Origen in his catalogue of heretics, he was unremitting in his efforts to combat the influence of his writings.[11] As the point of departure for his anti-Origenist activity, his Palestinian homeland had to intrude itself upon him, in particular Jerusalem and its neighborhood, since the city's Bishop John was well known as a zealous admirer of Origen, and the monks in some monasteries of his bishopric read Origen's works. Especially the superiors of two Latin monastic foundations, Jerome and his friend Rufinus, had, as translators of Origen's homilies, contributed greatly to the dissemination in particular of his ideal of piety in the Latin world.

Jerome says[12] that at the beginning of 393 a certain Atarbius visited the monasteries of Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity and demanded of the monks their consent to a condemnation of Origen—perhaps by order of Epiphanius, but probably even without the latter's knowledge. While Bishop John and Rufinus firmly rejected this demand, Jerome, after some hesitation, assented to the condemnation of Origen and thereby posed no slight riddle for his circle of acquaintances. For it was precisely he who, with his special gift for enthusiasm, had hitherto so often sung the praises of the Alexandrian teacher, celebrated him "as Teacher of the Church after the Apostles" and as "immortal genius," and became indignant that at one time proceedings had been started against him in Rome "not because of the novelty of his theses, not because of heresy, as baying dogs are now alleging against him, but because people could not bear the fame of his eloquence and his learning."[13] This 180 degree turn can probably be understood only as the fear of the monastic superior at Bethlehem that he might also fall under even the slightest suspicion of deviating from the orthodox doctrine. A few weeks after Atarbius, Epiphanius of Salamis appeared in Jerusalem and there delivered a sermon against Origenism, by which he believed the bishop of the city had also been infected. Before the assembled congregation he implored him to abandon Origen, "the father of Arius, the root of all other heresies."[14] The resulting ill-feeling between John and Epiphanius became worse when the latter, in his indiscreet fashion, at the request of a delegation from Jerome's monastery ordained the latter's brother Paulinus, first a deacon and then a priest, without John's knowledge.[15] Presuming to perform these ordinations was not only a tactless procedure but an offense against canon law, which forbade interferences by an outside bishop with the rights of the local bishop and, in particular, with ordinations.[16] Jerome further poisoned the atmosphere when he translated into Latin a letter from Epiphanius, in which the latter had sought to justify his procedure and also his criticism of Origen and hence made the conflict of the two bishops known also to Latin Christianity.[17] While Epiphanius steadfastly demanded of John the unconditional condemnation of Origen, John insisted on the invalidity of the uncanonical ordination of Paulinus and ordered the expulsion from his bishopric of the monks who upheld Epiphanius. Finally the Bishop of Jerusalem had recourse to the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria to ask his help: thus this risky confrontation soon acquired an excessively provincial character. At first Theophilus sent his priest, Isidore, to Jerusalem, but his attempts at mediation were unsuccessful. He brought back to Alexandria a letter from John to Theophilus, in which he described the events in great detail from his viewpoint and referred especially to Jerome's change of mind in his estimation of Origen.[18] When this letter also arrived in Rome, where Jerome's opponents sought to use it against him, he composed an insultingly sharp pamphlet against the Bishop of Jerusalem,[19] whom he reproached for haughtiness and an unambiguous Origenism. Then Theophilus succeeded in settling the conflict at Jerusalem, and in the process Rufinus and Jerome became reconciled.[20]

---

[11] Epiphanius, *Ancor.* 13; *Panar.* 63, 1–72, 9. On the role of Epiphanius in this phase of the struggle cf. especially M. Villain, *RSR* 37 (1937), 5–18.

[12] *Apol. contra Rufinum* 3, 33.

[13] Jerome, *De nomin. Hebr. praef.*, *Vir. ill.* 54; other examples in F. Cavallera, op. cit. 2, 115f.

In 397 Rufinus returned to the West, first to Rome, where people showed a great interest in him, since he had lived for twenty-five years as a monk in the East. In his report on Palestine the discussion of Origen's orthodoxy naturally played a special role, and Rufinus decidedly represented the view that the theology and teaching on piety of the Alexandrian author had much to give to the Latin West. At the request of a friend he translated the first book of the already mentioned

---

[14] Jerome, *Ep.* 51, 3.

[15] Ibid. *Ep.* 51, 1, 16.

[16] Cf., for example, canon 14, 22, of the Synod of Antioch (341); canon 3 of the Synod of Serdica (342); canon 2 of the Council of Constantinople (381).

[17] It is the just cited *Ep.* 51 in Jerome.

[18] Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 82, in which Jerome again accused John.

[19] *Contra Johann. Hierosol.* (*PL* 23).

[20] Jerome, *Apol. contra Rufinum* 3, 24.

Apologia for Origen, which Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea had once composed. To the work he added an essay *On the Falsification of the Works of Origen,*[21] in which he defended the really indefensible thesis that the contradictions and theologically doubtful opinions in Origen's works go back to unscrupulous falsifiers: for this he of course appealed to corresponding statements of the Alexandrian himself. In this he also alluded to the conduct of Epiphanius, who had seen it as his duty to defame Origen everywhere.[22] Rufinus then set about translating Origen's theological masterpiece, the four books *Peri Archōn.* In a foreword he set forth the methodological principles which had guided him in his work: he had omitted specified passages of the work which he regarded as falsifications or had so modified them as to bring them into harmony with theologically correct expressions of Origen in his other writings. He further emphasized that he intended, by means of his translation of Origen's works and the method followed by him in it, only to continue the work of that great man who had already translated more than seventy of Origen's homilies into Latin and had announced further translations.[23] Every informed reader knew that here Jerome was meant, but there is no justification to assume that Rufinus spitefully intended by this reference to injure him. He was all the more taken aback, when he learned what some Roman friends of Jerome had reported to the latter at Bethlehem, without his knowledge. They had deceitfully obtained possession of the as yet uncorrected translation, which had not yet been released for publication by Rufinus, and sent it to Palestine with an accompanying letter. In this they expressed their amazement over the orthodoxy claimed for Origen by Rufinus and asked Jerome for a faithful translation of the *Peri Archōn.* They maliciously added that Rufinus spoke as though he and Jerome were of the same opinion in regard to the esteem in which they held Origen.[24]

At once Jerome set to work, and before long his now really literal translation of the *Peri Archōn* reached Rome, omitting nothing, polishing nothing—unlike that of Rufinus, it is no longer extant—accompanied by two letters, one destined for the friends, the other directed to Rufinus, and of course both differing in tone and content. Apart from some ironically pointed formulas, Jerome assured Rufinus that, though he felt he had been attacked, he did not want to break again the friendship reestablished at Jerusalem.[25] But the letter to Pammachius and Oceanus attacked, sharply and irritably, the admirers of Origen and insinuated to them that, with their admiration for him, they were also approving his questionable ideas and would in this way become heretics themselves.[26] Jerome's friends did not send on the letter intended for Rufinus but saw to it that he received the second, sharp letter. It is exactly this situation that shows how disastrous it was that the Alexandrian Theophilus should have been involved in the discussion on Origen. For, just as earlier, the Patriarch of Alexandria did an about-face and from being an admirer became a decided opponent of Origen and joined with Jerome in an alliance whose goal was the condemnation of the theologian, already dead for a century and a half, and the disparagement of all who treasured his writings.[27] In this, not even a primarily theological motive seems to have influenced Theophilus's change of heart, but difficulties in matters of discipline with the monks of the Nitrian Desert, who were favorable to Origen. He had Origenism condemned at a synod early in 400 and in connection with this he undertook an anti-Origenist propaganda on a grand scale. In a series of Easter letters, which Jerome eagerly translated into Latin and disseminated, he warned the Christians of Egypt against the "blasphemies," the "madness," the "criminal error of Origen, this Hydra of all heresies," who equated the devil with the Son of God and forbade anyone to turn in prayer to the Son.[28] In circulars to the bishops of Palestine and Cyprus, in letters to individual bishops, such as Epiphanius, he demanded the synodal condemnation of Origen and his heresies.[29] Finally he had recourse in letters and through messengers to Rome in the effort to obtain also from Pope Anastasius I a condemnation of Origen. The circle of Jerome's friends was also active in the same sense, and so the Bishop of Rome also condemned "some blasphemous doctrines that had been laid before him, and still others put into writing for him, together with their author," and communicated this verdict also to Bishop Simplician of Milan.[30]

---

[21] Now *CChr* 20 (1961), 1–17.
[22] *De adult. libr. Orig.* 15.
[23] Rufinus, *Praef. libr. Peri Archon;* also as *Ep.* 80 among Jerome's letters. As late as 396 the latter said that one should read Origen: *Ep.* 62: *quomodo Origenem legere debeamus.*
[24] In Jerome, *Ep.* 83.
[25] Ibid. *Ep. 81.*

It was Eusebius of Cremona, a monk in the monastery at Bethlehem, who had presented the incriminating doctrines of Origen to the Pope, apparently by order of Jerome. With Pammachius and Marcella he was in Rome as one of the eagerest and most unscrupulous agitators against the theological reputation of Origen and of his translator, Rufinus. With dismay, Rufinus must have ascertained that someone had presented to the Pope a proposition alleged to have come from his translation of the *Peri Archon,* which represented a clear falsification.[31] This induced him to go directly to the Pope and explain both his motives and the methodological bases for his translations of Origen. Again he vigorously insisted that he had corrected his copy wherever it seemed to him necessary in relation to the faith and he added a profession of faith, from which it was obvious that he, Rufinus, held the same faith as was professed in Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and his native Aquileia.[32] Rufinus seems to have received no reply from the Pope. In a letter to John of Jerusalem, who had probably intervened at Rome in behalf of Rufinus, Anastasius avoided a clear decision on his writings and said that one must leave this to his conscience and to God's judgment.[33]

---

[26] Ibid. *Ep.* 84.

[27] Their exchange of letters: Jerome, *Ep. 82, 86–90,* 99.

[28] Three of these festive letters in Jerome, *Ep.* 96, 98, 100. Some also consider Theophilus as the author of an anonymously transmitted, sharply polemical, anti-Origenist treatise (in G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana* III, 3, 1903, 103–122), which Jerome also probably translated into Latin; cf. L. Chavoutier, *VigChr* 14 (1960), 9–14.

[29] Jerome, *Ep.* 98; 90.

[30] Ibid. *Ep.* 88; Anastasius to Simplician, ibid. *Ep.* 95.

Then in 400–402 Rufinus wrote his *Apologia contra Hieronymum,* which was intended first to be a reply to Jerome's *Epistula* 84 to the extent that it called into question Rufinus's orthodoxy, but became also a strong counterattack on the monastic superior at Bethlehem, whose inconsistency in his estimation of Origen was shown, as was the carelessness in regard to the truth of which his Roman friends had become guilty. In contradistinction to Jerome's method of working, who according to his own expression had dictated his letter *celeri sermone* and who had taken up his pen "as a result of a mere little rumor,"[34] Rufinus devoted much care to his work. Hence he pointed out to Jerome not only two acknowledged positive judgments on Origen, but quite a number of other and often more enthusiastic evaluations in his other works. He could also prove that he either had not or had not clearly held himself aloof from theologically questionable expressions of the Alexandrian, which he quoted. Out of Rufinus's whole work there is heard the deep disillusionment over a former friend, who, instead of discussing the defects and mistakes of his work in fraternal conversation by letter, had at once branded him as a heretic and besides had been the spiritual creator of the agitation stirred up against him in Rome.

The mere knowledge that Rufinus had composed an *Apologia* against him—again Jerome's informants were Pammachius and Marcella, who also gave him some details of the content—moved him immediately to write a reply in two books; to these he added still a third, when he had the text of Rufinus before his eyes.[35] In theatrical elegance and stinging irony Jerome's defense against Rufinus's *Apologia* is clearly superior, but in regard to content it is one of the most distasteful examples of theological polemics. He did not set himself to rebut the really sound criticism of Rufinus but tried to do so through mere sarcasm. His personal invectives against his former friend make painful reading: Rufinus's wretched style, he says, makes it obvious that he had scarcely attended school, but the books of the ignorant always find readers.[36] He unscrupulously questions the honesty of Rufinus's profession of faith to Pope Anastasius and compares his argumentation to the tricks of a fox. After reading the first two books, Rufinus sent Jerome a letter, which has been lost, and hence we do not know his final word in this matter—he kept silent for the last eight years of his life. And Jerome? When he learned of Rufinus's death in 410, he wrote in triumph that now the scorpion lies pressed flat under the earth of Sicily, now finally the many-headed Hydra ceases to hiss.[37] No doubt Augustine expressed the view of many when he called this polemic of this former pair of friends a *magnum et triste miraculum* and asked himself, depressed, whether one should not fear some day to become the enemy of one's friend "if that which we now lament could happen between Jerome and Rufinus."[38]

---

[31] Rufinus, *Apol. contra Hieron.* 1, 17–19.

[32] *Apol. ad Anastasium, CChr* 20, 19–28.

[33] Anastasius, *Ep. ad Joh. Hierosol., PL* 20, 68–73, and E. Schwartz, *ACO* I, 5, 3f.

[34] Jerome, *Ep.* 84, 12; Rufinus, *Apol.* 1, 3, on Origen: *levi rumusculo permotus velut censor accurrit.*

In the East the struggle focused ever more on the adherents of Origen; Theophilus of Alexandria had assumed leadership. And now John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, was also drawn into the conflict, because he had received some Egyptian monks in flight from Theophilus. He did not rest until he had arranged the deposition of Chrysostom and his relegation to the exile in which he died.[39] Here too Jerome proved to be an only too willing collaborator of Theophilus, when he translated into Latin a libel against Chrysostom that Theophilus had written. But he may not have seen through the intrigues of the Bishop of Alexandria until the end.[40]

The controversy ended with a victory of the anti-Origenists. In his *Apologia* against Rufinus, Jerome had written that he had undertaken an absolutely literal translation of Origen's *Peri Archōn* precisely "to hand over the heretical author to the Church so that it could sit in judgment on him."[41] He had achieved his goal. Rome and Alexandria had condemned the teachings and person of Origen; in Constantinople the unwilling bishop had to yield to such a verdict; and finally an imperial edict forbade the reading of the works of the Alexandrian.[42] No formal condemnation of Origen as a heretic occurred until 150 years later at the Fifth General Council of Constantinople (553). But by then a consequence of the anti-Origenist strife that became deplorable for Church history was discernible: through the restricting of the view to the actually vulnerable theological ideas of the Alexandrian theologian, the remaining immense theological and religious wealth of his works was no longer seen and a stimulating aftereffect on the religious life and the work of theology was frustrated, especially in the Eastern Church.

---

[35] *Apol. adversus libros Rufini, PL* 23, 371–514.

[36] *Apol.* 1, 17.

[37] Jerome, *In Ezechiel.*, praef. 1; further, *Ep.* 125, 18; F. Cavallera, op. cit. 2, 131–135.

[38] Augustine, *Ep.* 73, 6, 10.

[39] Cf. Chr. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* II (London 1960), 192–206.

[40] Quotations from this work in Facundus Hermian., *Pro defensione trium capit.* 6, 5.

[41] *Apol. contra Rufinum* 1, init.

---

[42] Anastasius, *Ep. ad Joh. Hierosol.* (*ACO* I, 5, 3, Schwartz).

CHAPTER 10

The Priscillianist Movement

In October 380 ten Spanish and two Aquitanian bishops met in synod at Zaragoza to discuss an ascetical movement which seemed in some parts of Spain and South Gaul to threaten ecclesiastical discipline and Christian morality. The outcome of the discussions was summarized in eight short decrees,[1] which afford a first look at the unique character of this movement. Gatherings were forbidden in which women met with unfamiliar men, and certain writings were read or lectures were heard. It was forbidden to fast on Sundays or to stay away from the church during Lent for superstitious reasons. Persons were not to seek out hiding places in the mountains or go to unfamiliar farms for meetings. The custom of taking the Eucharist home from church was strictly censured. It was also not permitted to shun the church during the twenty-one days preceding the Epiphany on 6 January, to stay at home or in the mountains and go about with bare feet. One who had been excluded from the Christian community by his own bishop might not have recourse to another bishop for readmission. A cleric should not abandon his state in order to become a monk. No one should assume the title of "teacher" without the consent of the ecclesiastical authority. Virgins consecrated to God might not take the veil until the age of forty, after examination by the bishop. The censured behavior and practices were not designated by the members of the Synod as, for example, errors against the true doctrine: they were to be regarded as the expression of an eccentric and fanatical ascetical ideal, which was accompanied by a certain awareness of belonging to a chosen few, as appears in the claim to the title of "teacher." For the interior lifestyle of the community, this trend and the more prominent inclination to withdrawal from the community could represent a real danger in the eyes of the bishops. It is true that the synodal decrees of Zaragoza did not explicitly name any follower of this asceticism, but other sources leave no doubt that there was question of that movement whose leader in those years was a member of a well-to-do family, Priscillian, who also gave it its name.[2] Priscillian, it is true, cannot be termed the author of all the views to which the sect subscribed, for there are frequent references to a certain Marcus from Egypt who first spread "Gnostic" and "Manichaean" ideas in Spain, which two of his followers, Helvidius and Agape, passed on to Priscillian.[3] Be that as it may, Priscillian must be regarded as the man who, on the basis of his background, education, and oratorical ability and because of his ascetical self-discipline and winning manners, from c. 370 brought to the movement a strong following from all classes; among them were some Spanish bishops, such as Instantius and Salvian.[4]

---

[1] The eight canons in J. Vives, *Concilios visigóticos,* 16–18.

Priscillian's talents and education, so extolled by Sulpicius Severus, do not of course exactly stand out in the texts attributed to him, since both the style and intellectual construction were rather clumsy, so that doubts as to his authorship are readily understandable, even if there has been little success in attributing them with certainty to another Priscillianist writer.[5] However, they make it possible to gain an understanding of the movement from their viewpoint and to verify to what extent the ideas denounced by their opponents are really demonstrable. The author of these treatises exerted himself enthusiastically to establish the conformity of his beliefs with Catholic doctrine and to characterize the contrary thesis as a libel by enemies. Finally, the demand for the strictest asceticism is basic: it alone can really overcome the lusts of the flesh and the allurements of the world, and it is emphatically based on the Apostle Paul. The strong recommendation of fasting in Lent[6] can in a sense render intelligible the decision of the Synod of Zaragoza in canon 2. The still obscure allusion of the Synod in canon 1 to "readings" in their gatherings is elucidated by the third Priscillianist treatise, which ascribes to the Apocrypha a kind of rank whereby they are, so to speak, likened to the canonical Scriptures and which marks as guilty before God whoever rejects them, because he repudiates the revelation of God made in them through "the Prophets."[7] The Priscillianists' conviction of being a chosen few is strongly expressed when it is said that some of them are already proved to God as elect (*electi deo*) and when the author, as spokesman of all Priscillianists, loudly proclaims that he too possesses the Spirit of the Lord.[8] This conviction of belonging to the chosen and the excessively high esteem for the Apocrypha could only appear to the bishops as suspicious. Into this religious climate of Spain there now entered also the apocryphal Latin *Letter of Titus,* which enthusiastically praises virginity. It addresses especially ascetics of both sexes, who once vowed celibacy, but broke this vow or put it in the greatest peril by the so-called "spiritual marriage" of the *syneisaktos,* the cohabitation of men and women under one roof. The letter attacked this abuse sharply; in addition to the Bible and the pertinent Latin literature—pseudo-Cyprian, *De singularitate clericorum* and *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima;* Jerome, *Epistula* 117; pseudo-Jerome, *Epistula* 42; et al.—it quoted the apocryphal Scriptures in an unusual degree, especially the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles and Apocalypses. The high esteem for the Apocrypha certainly brings the author of the work close to the Priscillianist movement, but he must not have belonged to it, for the grievances blamed by him must, on the basis of ecclesiastical testimonies, have been sought earlier among the Priscillianists themselves.[9]

---

[2] The two most important sources: 1) the *Liber ad Damasum* (*CSEL* 18, 34–43), from the Priscillianist side; 2) the report of Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 47; of course they contradict each other in one essential point: the Priscillianist work claims that no adherent of the sect was condemned at Zaragoza, whereas Sulpicius reports that two bishops, Instantius and Salvian, and the laymen Helpidius and Priscillian were anathematized.

[3] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 46; Jerome, *Ep.* 133, 4; Isidore of Seville, *Vir. ill.* 15, 9. Apparently Hosius of Córdoba had already been in conflict with this Marcus; cf. V. C. de Clercq, "Ossius of Córdoba and the Origins of Priscillianism," *Stpatr* 1 (= *TU*, 63, Berlin 1957), 601–606.

[4] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 46, gives the following plastic picture of Priscillian's personality: " . . . familia nobilis, praedives opibus, acer, facundus, multa lectione eruditus, disserendi ac disputandi promptissimus; . . . vigilare multum, famem ac sitim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parcissimus, sed idem vanissimus, et plus iusto inflatior profanarum rerum scientia . . . multos nobilium pluresque populares auctoritate persuadendi et arte blandiendi allicuit in societatem . . . et nonnulli episcopi depravati, inter quos Instantius et Salvianus.

[5] Edited by G. Schepss, *CSEL* 18 (Vienna 1889).

The rapid spread of the Priscillianist sect into almost all of Spain finally induced Bishop Hyginus of Córdoba to indicate this danger to his metropolitan, Idacius of Mérida, who for his part turned to Pope Damasus I. Probably the Pope supplied the stimulus for the Synod of Zaragoza, since in his reply he stressed that no one may be condemned without having been heard.[10] The reprimand expressed at Zaragoza in regard to the sect may have been a mere warning or an exclusion from the Christian community, but it led directly to a hardening of the opposing views. Idacius of Mérida came ever more to the fore as the most determined opponent of the movement. He merely embittered the other side through his relentless pursuit and so, as Sulpicius Severus says, "put one more faggot under the fire that had just been started."[11] Another bishop stood not far behind him: Ithacius of Ossonuba, who was destined to play a pernicious role in the further course of the dispute. For their part, the Priscillianists' position was reinforced when Instantius and Salvian ordained Priscillian as Bishop of Ávila, and two more bishops, Hyginus of Córdoba and Symposius of Astorga, joined them. Sulpicius Severus, who did not at all approve the tendencies of Priscillianism, blamed Ithacius for seeking now to suppress the sect with the power of the State and in fact, "through many odious machinations," secured from the Emperor Gratian an edict "against the Manichaeans," which deprived the Priscillianists of their churches and sent them into banishment.[12]

---

[6] Priscillian, *Tract.* 4 (60f., Schepss).

[7] *Tract.* 3 (53 Schepss): "magis ob hoc rei sumus quod omnia quae de deo sunt profetata non legimus."

[8] *Tract.* 2 (42 Schepss): "alii nostrum iam in ecclesiis lecti deo"; *Tract.* 3 (55 Schepss): "libet me unum clamare pro totis 'quia et ego spiritum domini habeo'" (1 Cor. 7:40).

[9] Pseudo-Titus, "De dispositione sanctimonii," ed. D. de Bruyne, *RBén* 37 (1925), 47–63; see A. de Santos Otero, "Der apokryphe Titusbrief," *ZKG* 74 (1963), 1–14.

The leaders of the sect—Instantius, Salvian, and Priscillian himself—utilized their exile for a journey to Rome in order to defend themselves before Pope Damasus, but they were not received; similarly later they were not admitted to see Ambrose of Milan: they could only conclude that both had seen the decrees of the Synod of Zaragoza as cutting off the Priscillianists from the ecclesiastical community. Now, for their part, the Priscillianists followed the same route that Ithacius had taken earlier and through bribery obtained a rescript from the *magister officiorum* Macedonius that gave them back their churches and enabled Priscillian and Instantius—Salvian had died at Rome—to return to Spain. Here, with the aid of the Proconsul Volventius, they could not only reorganize their forces: they even obtained an order for the arrest of Ithacius of Ossonuba, who, however, escaped imprisonment by flight to Trier.[13] The free development of the Priscillianist movement seemed assured.

But the political development in the West unexpectedly promoted the plans for revenge entertained by Ithacius. Maximus had himself acclaimed as Emperor in Britain in 383, and, since the usurper made Trier his residence, Ithacius soon succeeded through mendacious representations in so injuring the Priscillianist leadership in the Emperor's eyes that the latter ordered that the principal persons among the accused had to present themselves to an ecclesiastical Synod at Bordeaux, c. the spring of 384. When the first, Instantius, sought to defend himself, he was deprived of his episcopal office by the Synod. But Priscillian rejected the bishops as judges and, in a striking inconsistency, appealed—in one of the canons ascribed to him he had condemned the provision that clerics should have recourse to the secular court for their defense[14]—to the Emperor, to his own undoing, as will appear. Sulpicius rightly blamed the members of the Synod of Bordeaux, who, instead of passing sentence as the canonically appropriate judges, even on an unwilling Priscillian, or, if he rejected them as prejudiced, transferring their right to other bishops, freed the way for a civil trial.[15] This could have very serious consequences in the future for the Church's claim to decide such matters as pertaining to its exclusive competence.

---

[10] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 46; Priscillian, *Liber ad Damasum* (*CSEL* 18, 35).
[11] *Chron.* II, 46.
[12] Ibid. II, 47.
[13] Ibid. II, 48.

The conducting of the criminal trial at Trier—it had come to that since Ithacius had pushed the alleged criminal behavior of Priscillian into the foreground—took quite a long time. With Priscillian, several of his followers were brought to Trier, where the two bishops, Ithacius and Idacius, resumed with renewed vehemence their prosecution of the accused and also of all those suspected as sympathetic to the ideas of Priscillian or pupils who were more preoccupied than was usual with the reading of religious works or attracted attention through ascetical self-discipline. This suspicion even befell Martin of Tours, who during a stay at Trier earnestly entreated both Ithacius and the Emperor to withdraw the charges from the secular court and not to shed blood, for it was entirely sufficient if the accused were cut off from the Church by a sentence of the bishops.[16] In fact, the beginning of the process was postponed so long as Martin stayed at Trier. After his departure, the Emperor yielded to the pressure of Bishops Magnus and Rufus, who are mentioned only here—perhaps they belonged to the personnel of the court—and authorized the Prefect Evodius to conduct the trial; he was known for his strictness. After the second examination, Priscillian was found guilty of the crime of magic (*maleficium*): he did not deny this or other moral lapses, such as participation in prostitution. He remained in prison until the Emperor, having received the Prefect's report, decreed the death penalty for Priscillian and some of his associates; it was to be carried out on him at once by beheading, but this was probably not done before 386.[17] Further sentences of death were issued in processes immediately following; others accused were punished by banishment, which affected the Bishop Instantius, already deposed in Bordeaux.[18]

---

[14] *Canones Priscill.*, no. 46 (129 Schepss): "quia ecclesiastici non debeant ob suam defensionem publica adire iudicia sed tantum ecclesiastica."

[15] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 49.

[16] *Chron.* II, 50.

The echo from the death penalty was vast and, happily, clearly disapproving among the most important bishops of the day. Even before the execution, Ambrose of Milan, during a stay at Trier, had coldly declined any meeting with the group of bishops who were demanding the death of the Priscillianists, and he thereby gained the disfavor of the Emperor.[19] Martin of Tours likewise refused his *communio* to them and was only prepared for a gesture of accommodation when the Emperor promised to recall the officials he had already sent to Spain to proceed against allegedly refractory Priscillianists. Apparently Pope Siricius had also asked the Emperor for a report on the Trier proceedings; the latter sent him the acts of the trial and assured the Pope that the verdict was reached in a correct procedure on the basis of the confession of the accused persons.[20] A wave of indignation rose against Ithacius and his supporters. A Bishop Theognitus had impeached them at Trier in full publicity; it was found necessary to summon to Trier a synod of bishops friendly to the Emperor, which absolved Ithacius from the reproach of guilt in that pernicious sentence.[21] It did not matter. Ithacius lost his Spanish see of Ossonuba through deposition, Idacius preferred to abdicate his voluntarily.[22] The incident had a further sequel for Felix, Bishop of Trier. Although, as Sulpicius Severus expressly stresses, his behavior was beyond reproach, many Gallic bishops denied him their communion because he had upheld the ordination of the friends of Ithacius and hence was regarded as a representative of their faction. Pope Siricius and Ambrose adhered to this view. This so-called Gallic Felician Schism, with its unhappy consequences for the Church in Gaul, only ended with the death of Felix or, more probably, with his renunciation of the see of Trier, which followed the Synod of Turin (c. 398–401).[23] The most balanced judgment on the affair of Priscillian was expressed by Sulpicius Severus when he said that he disliked both the guilty and the accusers, and among these latter most of all Ithacius, in whom was nothing holy, to whom, along with Idacius, what mattered was rather to overcome the hated opponent than the heresy.[24] The historian of today can only add to this verdict that, precisely because of its balance and clarity, it is unnecessary and inadmissible to charge the trial of Priscillian against the Universal Church or through an exaggerated interpretation of the sources to allege, for example, that Pope Innocent I, by his rejection of the Priscillianist sect, indirectly included the approval of the sentence of death issued at Trier.

---

[17] See E. Suys, "La sentence portée contre Priscillien," *RHE* 21 (1925), 530–580. On the date of the trial at Trier see now P. Stockmeier, "Das Schwert im Dienst der Kirche," *Festschr. A. Thomas* (Trier 1967), 423–425.

[18] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 51.

[19] Ambrose, *Ep.* 24, 12 (*CSEL* 82, 214f.)

[20] Maximus Augustus, *Ad Siricium ep.* 4 (*CSEL* 35, 91).

[21] Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* 3, 12–13.

[22] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 51.

[23] Council of Turin, can. 6 (187, Lauchert); see E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* I (Paris, 2nd ed. 1964), 328f.

The end of Priscillian and his companions by no means meant also the end of the Priscillianist movement. In Spain the execution of its leaders at first even evoked new sympathy. His adherents now honored Priscillian as a martyr and prepared an imposing funeral for him and the other dead after the transfer of their remains there; and to swear in Priscillian's name was regarded as a deeply religious act.[25] Up to the Synod of Toledo, between 397 and 400, whose central theme was again Priscillianism, a group of bishops belonged to the movement, such as Symposius and Dictinius, who abjured their error only in connection with this Synod, together with the priest Comasius.[26] Other bishops and clerics, who had compromised themselves after Priscillian's execution through their sympathy for the sect, were stripped of their offices; others, like Paternus of Braga, who was only convinced of the error of their doctrines through reading the works of Ambrose, were allowed to retain their sees.[27] Naturally, such gentleness seemed inappropriate to some bishops, and there resulted a schism between a rigorist and a conciliatory wing in the Spanish episcopate, which only an energetic warning from Pope Innocent I, addressed to the rigorists, could heal.[28] The Synod of Toledo, in addition to twenty disciplinary canons and a profession of faith, issued eighteen brief anathemas, which dealt exclusively with Priscillianism and made known that the movement was then more and more assuming heterodox characteristics. Thus to it were now ascribed, for example, a strong Sabellian doctrine of the Trinity (canons 2–4) and an incorrect Christology (canons 5–7, 13), as well as Manichaean and Gnostic traits, since they taught that there was one God of the Old Testament and another of the gospels (canon 8; cf. also canons 1 and 9). The excessive estimation of the Apocrypha was again condemned (canon 12), and likewise the rejection of marriage (canon 16), the refusal to eat flesh meat (canon 17), and astrological practices (canon 15). The Synod repeatedly based its judgment on the works and letters of Priscillian. The movement was considered to be still very dangerous and hence the bishops were admonished to the greatest vigilance. After this renewed strong condemnation of Priscillianism, his followers disappeared from view and for the most part went to remote Galicia.[29] Bishop Toribius of Astorga has confirmed their continued existence there *c.* 445 and even found clerics who were well disposed to them.[30] The sect was still alive in the sixth century, for Montanus of Toledo found it in the bishopric of Palencia, but his friend Toribius was able to bring about its disappearance.[31] The last report of the existence of at least a few Priscillianists points to Braga in northwestern Spain. Pope Vigilius mentions them in 538 in a letter to the city's bishop, Profuturus.[32] The Synod of Braga in 565 finally directed attention against their Apocrypha, took a position against them in seventeen anathemas, and urged the bishop to intense zeal in the struggle against the heresy.[33] In the later sources no contemporary significance is assigned to Priscillianism: it is spoken of as a phenomenon that has long ago disappeared.

---

[24] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* II, 50.

[25] *Chron.* II, 51, 8.

[26] Their professions in J. Vives, *Concilios visigóticos,* 28–30.

[27] Ibid., 20–33.

[28] Innocent I, *Ep.* 3 *ad episc. synod. Tolet.* (*PL* 20, 486–489).

---

[29] Leo the Great, *Ep.* 15 (in B. Vollmann, op. cit.).

[30] According to the report of one Idacius, *Chron.*, can. 16; 130 (*MG, Auct. ant.*, 11, 15, 24).

[31] Montanus of Toledo, *Epp.* 1 and 2 (*PL* 65, 54f.).

[32] Pope Vigilius, *Ep. ad Profuturum* (*PL* 84, 829f.).

[33] Acts of this Synod in J. Vives, *Concilios visigóticos,* 65–77.

CHAPTER 11

The Struggle with Donatism

Donatism under the Constantinian Dynasty

After 320 the Emperor Constantine I increasingly had given up his various efforts to restore the unity of the Church which had been shattered in North Africa by the Donatist Schism,[1] permitted the banished Donatists to return to their homes in May 321,[2] and in a letter to the bishops and Catholics of North Africa[3] asked them to practice patience and leniency with regard to Donatist encroachments; in other words, in practice he had come to terms with the existence of two Christian Churches in this part of the Empire. But the moral condemnation of the Donatist leadership, finally expressed by him, in no way hindered the ranking Bishop Donatus of Carthage from using energetically and skillfully the now relative peace that had been provided for the organizational construction and inner consolidation of his Church. And so, undisturbed, the Donatists could erect their chapels, village churches, and even great basilicas, especially in Numidia and Mauretania, as the archeological finds, for example at Thebesta, Thamugadi (Timgad), and Castellum Tingitanum, prove.[4] Only occasionally were there clashes with the Catholics, who were gradually reduced to the minority.[5] Parallel with the building of the inner life of the Church ran an intensive propaganda by means of letters and sermons, which sought to make good the Donatist claim to be the pure wheat in the field, the true Church, whereas the community of the Catholics was to be despised as a growth of rank weeds.[6] The complete success of the Donatists was considerable. Donatus could really feel himself to be Primate of Africa,[7] when, toward the close of Constantine's reign, he gathered some 270 bishops around him for a synod at Carthage, where the conditions for the reception of Catholics into the Donatist Church were discussed. Donatus was flexible enough to dispense them from the otherwise strictly required rebaptism, if this appeared unacceptable to individuals.[8] It speaks for their conviction that the future of Christianity in North Africa belonged to their Church when the Donatists dared to deprive the Catholics of Constantina in Numidia of the basilica that Constantine had built for them,[9] when Donatus in a letter could designate the Prefect Gregory as a "blemish on the Senate and disgrace among Prefects," and when copies of this letter, which was celebrated as an heroic deed, could move with impunity throughout the country.[10] The efforts of the Donatists to gain adherents also outside North Africa, however, had only slight success. At Rome alone did they succeed in founding a relatively small congregation, which, however, could meet only outside the city gates.[11] Whether the Donatists on their own initiative applied for recognition by the Synod of Serdica (342–343) is unknown. In fact, the circular issued from there by the eastern bishops went also to Donatus and was later estimated by Donatist circles as a recognition of their Church; on the other hand, the successor of Caecilian, Bishop Gratus of Carthage, was present on the side of the western bishops at the Synod of Serdica.[12] The Donatist Church thus remained a Christian sect substantially confined to North Africa.

---

[1] See vol. I, chap. 30.

[2] H. v. Soden, *Urkunden,* no. 30.

[3] Ibid., no. 31.

---

[4] Archeological proofs in W. H. C. Frend, op. cit., 162f.

[5] See *CIL* VIII, 21, 517 (= Soden, no. 34).

[6] Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* 2, 2, 5.

[7] Optatus, *De schism. Donatist.* 3, 3.

[8] Augustine, *Ep.* 93, 10, 43 (= Soden, no. 38).

[9] Optatus, Appendix, no. 10 (= Soden, no. 36).

[10] Optatus, 3, 3 (= Soden, no. 37).

[11] Its first bishop was the African Victor of Garba (Optatus, 2, 4).

In the first decade of the reign of the Emperor Constans, nothing changed regarding the reserve that his father Constantine had finally exercised toward the African problem of the Christian schism. The steadily growing consolidation of the Donatist Church and the much more impressive position of Donatus at Carthage in comparison with the pallid figure of the Catholic Bishop Gratus probably induced the supreme head of the Donatists to apply to the Emperor Constans in an effort to obtain from him a unification of all Christians of North Africa under Donatist leadership.[13] At first the Emperor sent the officials Paul and Macarius with donations for the poor and the churches of both denominations in North Africa in the effort thus to gain more exact information about the possibilities of union and to create a favorable climate.[14] However, this mission led to a serious clash between the power of the State and the Donatist Church. At once Donatus saw in the participation of both officials in the liturgy of the Catholic bishops and in the contacting of members of the Catholic Church from among the ordinary people a favoring of the opposing side. When the two envoys appeared before him, he greeted them with the famed *Quid est imperatori cum Ecclesia?*, refused their gifts, and instructed the clergy not to receive the commission at all.[15] Vague rumors of enforced union, alleged to be planned by the officials, quickly envenomed the atmosphere, and when the officials went to the province of Numidia the attitude of the population there had become so threatening that military protection seemed necessary for them.[16] As a matter of fact, the Bishop of Bagai, also named Donatus, was organizing armed resistance, for which he summoned the Circumcellions,[17] a religious and fanatical movement on the fringes of the Donatist Church, but one that was at the same time determined to fight; it appeared from c. 340 on, with growing strength. Its name is derived by Augustine[18] from the *cellae,* that is, from the chapels erected in memory of martyrs, which were also much frequented by pilgrims and in the vicinity of which the Circumcellions preferred to live.

---

[12] Augustine, *Ep.* 44, 3, 6; *C. Crescon.* 3, 24, 38; 4, 44, 52; Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 50; *Mansi* III, 67, 120.

[13] Optatus, 3, 1; 3, 3; see Frend, op. cit., 177.

[14] See E. Grasmück, op. cit., 112f. on Optatus, 3, 3.

[15] Optatus, 3, 3; 7, 6.

[16] Ibid. 3, 4.

[17] On the problem of the Circumcellions cf. F. Martroye, *DACL* 3, 1692–1710; Frend, op. cit., 172–178; A. H. M. Jones, *ThSt* 10 (1959), 280–298; H. J. Diesner, op. cit., 53–77.

[18] *C. Gaudent.* 1, 28, 32; cf. also *CIL* VIII, 9585 (*cella* = chapel of a martyr).

The causes of the rise of the Circumcellion institution are insufficiently clear, just as the question of the ultimate meaning of the movement has still not found a unanimous answer.[19] Their followers called themselves, with predilection, *milites Christi* or *agonistici*[20] and thus aspired to be regarded as heirs and representatives of the early Christian view of martyrdom and of readiness for it; but their exalted esteem for it often amounted to a fanatical yearning for death, which they wanted to suffer in the bloody fight with the enemies of the faith, pagans as well as Catholics. Some Circumcellions provoked what were precisely suicidal situations, in which they hoped to find death: they purposely and defiantly provoked the officials to intervention, attacked travelers whom they then challenged to fight, offered themselves to pagans as sacrifices for their worship or saw to their own death by hurling themselves from rocks or into raging rivers.[21] Whoever found this death in the struggle was considered a martyr and hence was buried within the church building and honored by a special inscribed slab.[22] In addition to this religious fanaticism, a social ingredient must also be kept in mind in the Circumcellion movement, for some of its adherents appear quite openly as enemies of the wealthy Roman landowners in the western provinces of Numidia and Mauretania; they attacked and plundered them or extorted blackmail from them.[23] Of course, the sources do not permit us to transform this characteristic of the Circumcellions into the fundamental idea of Donatism as a whole and ultimately to see in it a social revolutionary rising aginst the oppression of the peasants by the dominant classes in Late Roman North Africa, among whom the Catholic Church in particular would have to be reckoned. This interpretation cannot even explain why this movement grew up in those decades precisely in the Donatist Church, which was without any doubt richer and socially more esteemed, and attacked the Catholic Church, which found its adherents chiefly in the coastal cities with the socially depressed classes. It would also remain a riddle that Augustine, who devoted some thirty years of his lifework to the Donatist question and showed himself in his sermons to be thoroughly conversant with the problem of poverty, should not have known this basic characteristic of Donatism. The Circumcellions were, without doubt, convinced followers of the Donatist Church and its ideas but especially supported by a fanatical enthusiasm, which could make of them either martyrs or terrorists. The Donatist leadership consciously exploited them for its aims when it seemed expedient to do so, but it also held aloof from them when their conduct could become injurious to the good name of their Church.[24]

---

[19] Cf. the juxtaposition of the several efforts at interpretation, the latest in A. Mandouze, *Saint Augustin* (Paris 1968), 357–361, note.

[20] Optatus, 3, 4; Augustine, *Ep.* 108, 5. *Agon* for the martyr's struggle occurs already in Cyprian, *Ep.* 10, 4.

[21] See the list of proofs in Frend, op. cit., 175.

[22] Augustine, *Ep.* 88, 8: "vivunt ut latrones, moriuntur ut circumcelliones, honorantur ut martyres." Optatus, 3, 4.

[23] Augustine, *C. Gaudent.* 1, 28, 32: (hoc genus hominum) . . . "maxime in agris territans, ab agris vacans."

When in 347 Bishop Donatus of Bagai recruited the Circumcellions for armed resistance to the Roman troops who were accompanying Paul and Macarius on their visit through the province of Numidia, this was to have portentous consequences for the entire Donatist community. The resistance group was annihilated in a bloody battle, and Bishop Donatus of Bagai was executed as the ringleader.[25] In the eyes of the Donatists, these dead were also martyrs, and their Church felt itself confirmed anew in its self-awareness as the community of the persecuted through this incident. Unimpressed by the fate of Bishop Donatus, a delegation led by a Bishop Marculus remonstrated with the commissioner Macarius; they so exasperated him that he had the delegates flogged and Bishop Marculus imprisoned and later executed. The *Passio Marculi,* from a Donatist pen, celebrates him as one of the great martyrs of the movement.[26]

These occurrences quickly led to a radical about-face of the imperial religious policy on the African question. An edict of 15 August 347 abruptly ordered the uniting of the two Churches under the headship of the Catholic Bishop Gratus of Carthage. Donatus and the other chief personages of his community who had not fled with the lower clergy were sent into exile.[27] This shocked the ordinary members of the Donatist Church, who submitted as a whole to the commanded merger; thus the Donatist Church also had its *lapsi* and *traditores.* Resistance was rare, and the conduct of one Maximian was all the more unusual: he ripped up a copy of the notification of the decree of union and for his pains endured prison and death; later, he was held up as proof that even in the persecution years of the *Macariana tempora,* as the Donatist literature refers to it, the spirit of martyrdom had not entirely disappeared.[28]

The union of Catholics and Donatists, ordered by imperial edict, existed in form for fourteen years—from 347 until the accession of the Emperor Julian. However, it is amazing how little the Catholic leaders did in those years to change a decreed union into one of hearts. It is true that Bishop Gratus of Carthage soon convoked a synod (c. 348–49) to discuss the new situation, but only some fifty bishops, including a few former Donatists, were present—another sign of the current weakness of the Catholic side. The synodal decrees[29] made clear that first some abuses in the Church itself were to be eliminated, as, for example, the frequent and too long absences of many bishops from their sees. Probably decisive, however, was the fact that the Catholic episcopate just then had no personality of strong religious powers of radiation, who could have fostered in the Donatists an inner consent to the union, or at least could have made it easier to accept. The successor of Gratus at Carthage, Bishop Restitutus, found his time also powerfully claimed by the conflict over the Creed of Sirmium under the Emperor Constantius; in this the leadership of the Synod of Rimini was entrusted to him. And so, outside Carthage, the position of the Catholics was only slightly strengthened, as, for example, at Curubis and also in Thagaste, where new Catholic congregations appeared.[30] In their real spheres of expansion, Mauretania and Numidia, the Donatists soon remained largely unmolested. They were able to build a great basilica to their martyr Marculus in Vegesela; many pilgrims visited the site of his execution and here strengthened their hope in a coming new era.[31] To this hope contributed considerably the Bishop Macrobius, head of the Donatist congregation in Rome, who as a priest of the Catholic Church had joined Donatism and, after the death of Donatus in exile (c. 355), wrote letters of encouragement to the Donatists and probably also composed the *Passio Maximiani et Isaaci,* which may have promoted to no slight degree the determination to hold out.[32]

---

[24] Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* 1, 11, 17; *C. litt. Petil.* 1, 24, 26; *C. Crescon* 3, 49, 54.

[25] Optatus, 3, 4, 6; Augustine, *In ev. Joh. tract.* 11, 15.

[26] The *Passio Marcul* in *PL* 8, 760–766.

[27] The decree, not preserved in its text, is proved by the Donatist *Passio Maximiani et Isaaci* in *PL* 8, 768, which also admits the flight of the Donatist clergy. Chief source is Optatus, 3, 1.

[28] The account, embellished by legend, is in the above-mentioned *Passio Maxmiani et Isaaci, PL* 8, 766–773.

The hope of a reversal was realized when the Emperor Julian came to power in 361. At once three of the exiled bishops, in the name of the Donatist hierarchy, appealed to the Emperor and asked him to permit all to return to Africa from banishment and to give them back their churches. Julian ordered the restoration of the situation as it had been before the Decree of Union of 347,[33] but the Donatists used their newly acquired freedom for reprisal, which often assumed frightful forms.

---

[29] Acts of the Synod in *Mansi* III, 349ff.

[30] *Gesta Collat. Carth.* 1, 187; Augustine, *Ep.* 93, 5.

[31] On the excavations of the basilica see P. Cayrel and P. Courcelle, *MAH* 51 (1934), 114–142, and ibid. 53 (1936), 166–183.

[32] For him see Gennadius, *Script. eccles.* (*PL* 59, 1060), and *Passio Maximiani et Isaaci* (*PL* 8, 768).

[33] Optatus, 2, 16, 17; Augustine, *C. lett. Petil.* 2, 97, 224; *Ep.*, 93, 4, 12; 105, 2, 9.

Expulsion of the Catholics from their own churches, ill-treatment of the clergy to the extent of even a few cases of death, desecration of the Catholic Eucharist, dishonorable treatment of Donatists who had gone over to the Catholic Church—these were the order of the day.[34] Since many pagan officials witnessed these excesses passively, because they knew that the Emperor had no interest in halting the fights of Christians among themselves, the Catholic minority was thrown back into a state of demoralization and resignation. Among the bishops returning from exile was the highly gifted Parmenian, elected supreme head of the Donatists. Through his leadership the Donatist Church quickly came to a blossoming in which it seemed to become the unique denomination in North African Christianity.

The Golden Age of Donatism under Bishop Parmenian

During the period of exile under Constantius, the Donatist bishops had come to know the qualities of Parmenian, since they had chosen him to be the successor of Donatus in Carthage, even though he was non-African.[35] Within a few years he created for himself a position which left no doubt as to his authority within the Donatist Church and also showed him to be a match for all situations with which he was confronted in his approximately thirty-years' episcopate. The ecclesiastical and political atmosphere, favorable to Donatism under the Emperor Julian, certainly made it easier for him to grow rapidly into his round of duties, and so also did the fact that Julian's successors, by reason of the Arian confusion, had to concentrate their ecclesiastical and political interests on the eastern and European provinces and thus let him work virtually undisturbed at rebuilding his community. But the deeper reasons for his unquestionable successes are to be found in his character and intellectual qualities. Praise was bestowed on him, not only by the Donatist side, on the ground that he was assured in his decisions, remained loyal to his convictions, kept himself aloof from intrigue and brutality, and in specifically Donatist concepts was a man of the middle course.[36] His oratorial and literary endowment (*eloquentia*) was expressly recognized by Augustine.[37]

The new supreme head of the Donatists also played a substantial role in the rise of the Donatist theological literature, which occurred at the period of Parmenian's episcopate. To his pen are due the "New Psalms," probably rhymed songs which were supposed to make the basic doctrines of their confession more easily understood by the laity and which were still popular in Augustine's time.[38] In the first years of his activity he tackled a work which probably bore the title of *Adversus ecclesiam traditorum* and in five books presented a comprehensive and also original ecclesiology of the Donatists. The care which Optatus of Mileve devoted to refuting it gives an indication of the impression which it left on the Catholic side.[39] According to Parmenian, the true Church can be recognized by this, that, as the Bride of Christ, it possesses a fivefold dowry: the *cathedra,* that is, the power of the keys entrusted to the bishops; the angel, who stirs the water at baptism (John 5:4); the Holy Spirit; the baptismal font (*fons*); and the baptismal creed (*sigillum*), without which the font cannot be opened. Since these five gifts can be found all together only in the Donatist community, the Catholics are branches torn from the tree of the Church.[40] With a clear appeal to Cyprian's *De unitate ecclesiae,* Parmenian further argued that the Catholics had, through recourse to the power of the State against the Donatists, automatically betrayed the true Church; hence a return to it called for penance, which, however, was unthinkable without rebaptism. The cruelties blamed on them by the Catholics were not to be compared to the violence of the imperial soldiery but were a legitimate reaction against the persecutors of the Church, even if bishops were responsible for them.[41]

---

[34] Optatus, 2, 16–19; 2, 21; 2, 24–26; 6, 2; 6, 5–7.

[35] Optatus, *De schism. Donatist.* 1, 5, charges that as a *peregrinus* he did not know the origins of the Schism; possibly he came from Spain or Gaul, ibid. 2, 7.

[36] The evidence brought together by P. Monceaux, op. cit., 5, 221ff.

[37] *C. Crescon.* 1, 2, 3.

More significant was the controversy which Parmenian had to engage in with a member of his own Church, the lay theologian Tyconius,[42] who must be regarded as one of the most important writers of Donatism. His scriptural studies had let him achieve, above all, a universal understanding of the Church, as its own community reveals it. Even the non-African Christian groups were for Tyconius's churches, even if they were in communion with the *traditores* of North Africa. The biblical parable of the weeds which grew with the wheat induced him to question also the Donatist demand that, as the Church of the Pure, it must hold itself aloof from every staining contact with the wicked. Christianity would, on the contrary, be divided through a much deeper split into two parts, into a Kingdom of God and a Kingdom of Satan: to which of the two kingdoms the individual Christian belongs by virtue of his own voluntary decision will only be made known on Judgment Day.[43] In an open letter Parmenian rejected Tyconius's dangerous theses: a review of the history of Donatism shows how, in fact, the entire non-Donastic Christianity became guilty through its communion with the *traditores,* so that only the Church of the Donatists, as the one persecuted by the Emperors, is the pure one, unique also in the possession of the true baptism of Christ. More than twenty years later, Augustine, at the urging of his fellow bishops, wrote a refutation of this *Epistula Parmeniani,* so powerful still was the influence it exercised. Tyconius, however, was not dissuaded from his views by it, and so Parmenian had him excommunicated from the Donatist Church at a synod. The expectation of many a Catholic that he would convert to the Catholic Church, was, however, not realized.[44] With the condemnation of Tyconius, Donatism gave up the possibility of a break-through into a greater theological breadth and became hardened in its sectarian narrowness, the creed of which was the cry: "Great is the Church of the Numidians: we are the Christians, and only we are."[45]

---

[38] Augustine probably means them when, in *Ep.* 55, 18, 34, he speaks of songs of the Donatists, "which sprang from human art."

[39] The train of thought of the nonextant work can be inferred only from Optatus, *De schismate Donatistarum.*

[40] Optatus, 2, 6–8.

[41] Optatus, 2, 18, quotes in this context Parmenian's words: *aliud sunt milites missi, aliud episcopi ordinati.*

[42] On him cf. E. Dinkler, *Pauly-Wissowa* II, 6, 649–656, Gennadius, *Script. eccles.* 18 names four works by him: 1) *De bello intestino,* 2) *Expositiones diversarum causarum,* 3) *Liber regularum,* 4) *Commentary on the Apocalypse.* The third, a work on hermeneutics highly praised by Augustine, is preserved in its entirety (ed. F. C. Burkitt, Cambridge 1894); the fourth can be reconstructed from fragments (now *PL,* Suppl. 1, 621–652).

Two episodes under Parmenian show how the relationship with the Roman State, necessarily poisoned by the notion of the Donatist "Church of the Persecuted," ultimately led, again and again, to damaging reversals for this Church itself. At the accession of the Emperor Valentinian I in 364, Romanus became *comes Africae*; with his inclination toward corruption and avarice he did not spare even the predominantly Donatist province of Mauretania.[46] When the Circumcellions resisted him and for their part also committed serious excesses, ten Donatist bishops under the leadership of Rogatus of Cartenna solemnly protested against them and finally separated themselves from the Donatists in order to realize the Donatist ideal as the Church of Nonviolence[47]. More serious were the consequences for the Donatist Church, especially in Mauretania, when it openly sympathized with the revolt against Rome which the tribal chief Firmus[48] had staged in 372. The Donatists also recognized him as King and gave him their support the more readily as Firmus moved firmly against the Rogatists around Cartenna.[49] Rome did not leave unpunished the coresponsibility of the Donatists in this revolt: in 373 Donatist rebaptism had already been prohibited, and after the suppression of the revolt by the General Theodosius, father of the future Emperor, Donatist worship was forbidden in cities and village communities,[50] and some especially compromised Donatist leaders went into exile, among them a Bishop Claudian, who assumed the leadership of the Donatist congregation at Rome. A further imperial edict of 377, which again gave validity to all laws hitherto issued against Donatists,[51] could have been ominous for them, but the Vicar Flavian, successor of Theodosius, now in disfavor, was entrusted with its implementation, and he was himself a Donatist,[52] who enforced the ordinance against his coreligionists only very laxly.

---

[43] Cf. J. Ratzinger, "Beobachtungen zum Kirchenbegriff des Tyconius," *RevÉAug* 2 (1956), 173–185, and id., "Herkunft und Sinn der Civitaslehre Augustins," *Augustinus Magister* II, (1954), 965–979.

[44] Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* 1, 1, 1; *Doctr. christ.* 3, 30; cf. L. J. van der Lof, "Warum wurde Tyconius nicht katholisch?" *ZNW* 57 (1966), 260–283.

[45] Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* 1, 2, 3; *Sermo* 46, 16, 40.

[46] Ammianus Marcellinus, 29, 5.

[47] Augustine, *Ep.* 93, 11, 49, to Vincent, an acquaintance from his youth, who later became bishop of these Rogatists.

Thus the last fifteen years of Parmenian's term of office became the period in which the Donatist Church achieved its fullest blossoming. Both the number of its members and its importance in the public awareness had clearly made it the strongest Christian denomination, to which the Catholic faction seemed ever more like a harmless sect. Also, the contemporary Catholic bishops were vague figures in comparison with Parmenian. Restitutus of Carthage was compromised because he had yielded at Rimini in 359, his successor Genethlius was nervously intent on avoiding any conflict with the Donatists, and his Church gave the impression of an intimidated minority. This harmlessness of the Catholics caused even the animosity of the Donatists to die out and a certain patronizing manner in regard to the now apparently definitively beaten opponents to arise. Contacts between the members of both denominations became normal in day-to-day matters, and occasionally Donatists recruited in an actually peaceable manner for the passage of Catholics to their communion.[53]

A change in this total situation, so advantageous to Donatism, only began in the first years of the last decade of the fourth century. It was occasioned especially by two factors, the one personal, the other political. After the death of Parmenian, the leadership of the Donatist

---

[48] See *Pauly-Wissowa* 6, 2383.

[49] Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* 1, 10, 16; *C. litt. Petil.* 2, 83, 184.

[50] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 6, 1; 16, 5, 4.

[51] Ibid. 16, 6, 2.

[52] Augustine, *Ep.* 87, 8.

[53] Augustine, *Ep.* 33, 5; 35, 2; *De bapt.* 2, 7, 10.

Church was entrusted to Primian,[54] a choice that was to prove to be a serious blunder. Primian was the representative of an extremist group, who was also inclined personally to radicalism, appealed as a demagogue to the instincts of the masses, and had only a rudimentary feeling for what was genuinely religious. His authoritarian rule quickly aroused opposition, of which his own deacon, Maximian, a descendant of the great Donatus, made himself the spokesman. An opposition faction of forty-three bishops accused Primian of serious crimes at a synod and demanded of him an accounting for his administration. Since Primian disregarded such a demand, a new synod in 393 deposed him; around 100 bishops, and hence about one quarter of the Donatist episcopate, were represented.[55] Primian now moved to the counterattack against the Maximianists, in which he unscrupulously employed all means of defamation and force, even the full power of the State, when this was possible, and especially that of the Circumcellions. After such intimidation, he then had Maximian, who had meanwhile been ordained a bishop, excommunicated at the Synod of Bagai (394), removed from his residence by the state authorities, and his cathedral razed to the ground.[56] The adherents of Maximian were also exposed to this sort of pressure, and so one by one they submitted. The harsh rule of Primian left with many Donatists a feeling of depression and facilitated for some their later passage to Catholicism.

A similar negative effect was produced by a second personality of the Donatist episcopate: Optatus, elected Bishop of Thamugadi (Timgad in southern Mauretania),[57] in whom a bellicose religious fanaticism was joined with a strong inclination toward princely display. The anniversary of his episcopal ordination was always for him the occasion to give a splendid reception, at which he accepted the attentions of his colleagues and of the people who were devoted to him.[58] The appropriate setting for this was supplied by the great basilica, built probably by him on a hill in the city, with its spacious atrium and richly decorated baptistery: to the contemporary Donatists it seemed a symbol of their strength, and an inscribed mosaic proclaimed the glory of their founder.[59] Under Optatus the Circumcellions became a paramilitary troop,[60] which was at the bishop's disposal for every need, and for a decade it was the terror of the landowners of southern Numidia and especially of the Catholics.

---

[54] On him P. Monceaux, op. cit. 6, 111–147; Augustine judges him unusually harshly: *Enarr. in ps. 36, serm.* 2 and 3.

[55] Augustine, *Enarr. in ps. 36, sermo* 2, 19–21; fifty-five bishops signed the decree of deposition, but cf. Augustine, *C. Crescon.* 4, 6, 7: "centum vel amplius tunc episcopi." Judgment on Primian, *PL* 11, 1183–1189.

[56] Decrees of the Synod of Bagai, *PL* 11, 1189–1191; see Augustine, *C. Crescon.* 4, 58, 69.

[57] On the still existing Christian monuments see P. Monceaux, *Timgad chrêtien* (Paris 1911); Chr. Courtois, *Timgad, antique Thamugadi* (1951).

[58] Augustine, *C. litt. Petil.* 2, 23, 53; *Ep.* 105, 5.

Optatus took the fatal step in his career when he made an alliance with the Numidian Gildo,[61] brother of the rebel Firmus. In 386 the Emperor Theodosius had made Gildo *comes Africae,* apparently because it was believed that his loyalty could be depended on because of his close relations with the court—his sister Salvina had married a member of the imperial family. His position was further strengthened when he was appointed *magister utriusque militiae* for Africa. But gradually Gildo yielded to the temptation to construct for himself in Africa a power independent of Ravenna. He saw the route to this in a closer connection with Byzantium, from where control over him could be exercised with greater difficulty than from Italy. To what extent Optatus was familiar with these plans can no longer be determined. Nevertheless, he was regarded as the spiritual author of that intimate collaboration between the Primianists and Gildo, which gave him a free hand to bring back, by his own methods, the still reluctant Maximianists into the Donatist Church (397).[62] From then on, he was allied with Gildo for better or for worse, even when in 397 Gildo moved to open rebellion against Ravenna by trying to stop the export of grain to Italy. Rome's commander in chief, Stilicho, immediately understood the magnitude of the danger, but craftily put Gildo's brother, Mascazel, at the head of the contingent of troops bound for Africa, since they had become bitter enemies because of a family feud.[63] Since the deeds of violence against Catholics had again become so numerous that the Emperor had decreed the penalty of death against Numidian plunderers of churches,[64] the military enterprise against Gildo and Optatus obtained also an ecclesiastical and political coloring. The Roman troops succeeded in stopping Gildo in the vicinity of Theveste and there annihilating him in the spring of 398. A few weeks later the two fleeing protagonists of the undertaking fell into Roman hands and were executed as rebels. Nevertheless, the simple Donatist folk saw in the enthusiastically venerated

---

[59] On the mosaic cf. E. Albertini, *CRAIBL* 1939, 100ff.

[60] Augustine, *C. ep. Parmen.* 1, 11, 17; 2, 2, 4.

[61] On Gildo's revolt, see H. J. Diesner, *Klio* 40 (1962), 178–186.

[62] Augustine, *C. Crescon.* 3, 60, 66; 4, 25, 32.

[63] Orosius, 7, 36; Claudian, *De bello Gildonico*; see O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* 5 (reprint ed. Stuttgart 1966), 286ff.

[64] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 31.

Optatus a martyr, whereas his fellow bishops scrupulously held themselves aloof from him.[65]

This defeat introduced at the same time the ruin of Donatist prestige in North Africa. In the future there were no longer any high officials who could still sympathize with their movement. The way and the aim of erecting a "national" Church with the help of native rebels in a North Africa delivered from the Roman yoke had definitely proved to be an illusion. Likewise, the bishops saw the questionable nature and sterility of a behavior by the Roman State-might in which the power of evil was revealed, and hence no practicable solution for the relationship of Church and State was found. The Catholic community could, it is true, after this compromising of the Donatists, build extensively again on the favor of the imperial government. But it could not be satisfied with that. It could only win over the humiliated Donatists interiorly if it succeeded in making clear to them the theological untenability of their position. Until now they had lacked men who had the qualifications for this. With the ordination of Augustine of Thagaste as Bishop of Hippo, a decisive change occurred here too.

Augustine and Donatism

When in 388, after an absence of five years, Augustine returned to his native city of Thagaste, the split of North African Christianity into two denominations had not directly induced him to become active for a recovery of the lost unity. The ideal of a community of ascetic life with like-minded men stood too solidly in the center of his thoughts and plans. Only after his ordination as a priest for the Church of Hippo Regius, whereby he was given pastoral responsibility for the local Christians, did activity for the solution of the Donatist problem become a personal task for him. For an understanding of Augustine it is crucial to know that the central motive for his personal involvement in this question was the pastoral mission, perceived as a sublime responsibility, to guard those confided to him in the Church and to win back the others for the Church and the truth proclaimed by it. This pastoral duty is the real key to the understanding of the tireless and versatile activity of the Bishop of Hippo, which for almost thirty years claimed his total spiritual and physical strength, at times to exhaustion.

It was first Augustine's conviction that the ideal route for the restoration of religious unity lay in the personal word, spoken and written—a route which was most in accord with his personal talent. A return of the

---

[65] On the death of Optatus, Augustine, *C. litt. Petil.* 2, 92, 209; Gildo perhaps committed suicide (*Chron. min.* 1, 298).

Donatists compelled by forcible measures would have brought to the Catholic Church only *ficti christiani*[66] and hence would have had unfavorable effects on the religious level of the community. Augustine's first efforts to make contact with the Donatists of his immediate vicinity were, then, supported by a strong faith in the strength of his enticing word. Wherever he saw the possibility of a personal conversation or of an objective discussion on the question of the schism, he courteously presented himself. When he noticed that a meeting with him was avoided because of his superior education or his oratorial gifts, he agreed to leave to the Donatists the choice of a partner in the conversation.[67] His letters to Donatist personages are marked by a deep religious seriousness: knowing no insult. Without hesitating, he addresses them as brothers, since to a great extent they agree with the Catholics in doctrine and liturgy. In an effort to get beyond the armor plate of the hardened fronts, he proposed to leave aside the useless reproaches over the second-rank questions and to seek new ways.[68] But the frost of disillusionment quickly fell on these exertions, begun with earnestness. They remained without important success especially as regards the bishops of the other side; only a few Donatist laymen were attentive to this new voice from the Catholic camp or even went to Augustine's sermons.[69] The strongest effect of these first steps was verified within the Catholic community, since, as Possidius put it, "in virtue of a gift of God, the Catholic Church in Africa now began again to raise its head, which so long had lain lacerated, oppressed, and crushed in the face of the powerful heretics."[70]

For Augustine this relative failure was only an occasion to seek new possibilities for the fulfillment of his spiritual function without at any time giving up the efforts for dialogue with the other side. He saw it in two courses: he must himself move out of the local confinement of Hippo and its surrounding neighborhood and draw the entire Catholic episcopate of North Africa into the solution of the task, and, second, the discussion of the theologically decisive questions must be pushed into the foreground. For the first element of the problem the ideal coworker was Aurelius,[71] elected c. 391 to the see of Carthage: his gifts of leadership and organization would be proved in a long episcopate—he died c.

---

[66] See *Ep.* 33 and 93, 17.

[67] Examples: *Ep.* 33 and 23 to the Donatist Bishops Proculeian and Maximus respectively; cf. also *Civ. dei* 22, 8, and *Ep.* 34, 6.

[68] *Ep.* 33, 1: "me sincero corde agere et cum tremore christianae humilitatis;" *Ep.* 23, 6: "tollamus de medio inania obiecta quae . . . iactari contra invicem solent."

[69] Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 9, 2, 10; *Ep.* 72 and 105.

[70] Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 7, 2, 8.

[71] On him see A. Audollent, *DHGE* 5 (1931), 726–738.

430—and in a trouble-free lifelong friendship with Augustine. The theological assignment could at that time be undertaken by only one man in North Africa, the Bishop of Hippo.

The natural place for the consideration of the Donatist problem by the entire Catholic episcopate was the institution of the North African Episcopal Synod. It is to the merit of Bishop Aurelius to have infused new life into the episcopate, when, at the first Synod convoked by him to Hippo in 393, he had a decision taken to the effect that in the future the bishops of all the North African provinces were, so far as possible, to assemble annually for conciliar consultations.[72] There is no doubt that this resolute leadership, after long years of resignation, gave the episcopate a new consciousness of its strength and at the same time enabled Augustine to explain his view of the tasks to his fellow bishops and gain them for it. Already in Hippo people were concerned with the question of the conversion of Donatist bishops and priests to the Catholic Church. Whereas earlier synods had declined to receive them into the Catholic clergy with the rank they then held, now an exception would be made for those who had not performed rebaptism or who wished to convert together with their former congregation.[73] The Synod of Carthage in September 401 went a step farther: it left to the individual bishop the decision on the reception of Donatist clerics, but provided a new criterion for this: "when it seems useful for the pax christiana."[74] It was further decided now to seek direct conversation with the Donatist bishops and congregations on a broader plane, this task being entrusted to selected bishops, who were to proceed *leniter et pacifice.* They were instructed to take up especially the Maximianist Schism among the Donatists themselves, because here the inconsistency of the Donatist leadership was made visible, since it had recognized as valid the baptism conferred by the separated Maximianists on their reception back into the Donatist community.[75] In all this it is easy to recognize the hand of Augustine, for whom direct dialogue was always a primary aim; also in other respects he stood for the possibility of a decision by the individual bishop and always conceded a special rank to argumentation with the

---

[72] The results of the discussions of this Synod are preserved in the so-called *Breviarium Hipponense, PL* 56, 418–431 (= *Mansi* III, 917–924). Cf. Ch. Munier, "Cinq canons inédits du concile d'Hippone du 8 Oct. 393," *RDC* 18 (1968), 16–29. Under Aurelius some twenty synods were held: *Conc. Carth. a. 525, Mansi* VIII, 643.

[73] *Brev. Hippon.* II, 37. A motive for this moderation was, of course, also the vast breakdown of the care of souls among the Catholics, of which the synods of the time had to complain again and again; cf. Aurelius at the Synod of Carthage in June 401, *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.,* 55–56.

[74] *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.,* can. 68: "si hoc paci Christianae prodesse visum fuerit."

[75] Ibid., can. 66 and 69.

Maximianist Schism.[76] Apparently encouraged by certain successes—by 402 three former Donatist bishops were heads of Catholic congregations[77]—the Synod of Carthage in August 403 determined to try a religious dialogue on the highest plane. Every Donatist bishop received an invitation, which was delivered to him by state officials, to whom he was also to direct his reply. In the text of the invitation, the Synod asserted the sincerity of its intention and asked the bishops of the opposing side to appoint their representatives for a special synod of their own, with whom then the Catholic delegation wished to discuss *cum pace* every question connected with the split; a rejection of the invitation would, of course, be equivalent to an avowal that one was not sure of one's cause.[78] But the eagerly raised expectations of the Catholic Synod were not realized. Primian of Carthage curtly declined the invitation with the original Donatist formula that "it is contrary to the dignity of the sons of martyrs to meet with the descendants of traditores," communicated his decision to all Donatist bishops, and thus anticipated the decision of his own Synod, which bluntly rejected the Catholics' invitation.[79] The heightened activity of the Catholics and the partial success released, moreover, a new wave of acts of violence by the Donatists, whose victims were first the especially active Catholic bishops and Donatist clerics who had converted to Catholicism. Augustine's friend Possidius was attacked on a journey and cruelly mistreated, and an attack planned against Augustine himself was not actually carried out only because his guide took the wrong route.[80] The Catholic Bishops Maximian of Bagai and Servus of Thubursicu endured further mistreatment, and the latter's father, an aged priest, died a little later as a result. Former Donatist clerics who suffered persecution were the Priests Restitutus and Marcus and a Subdeacon of the Church of Urgis.[81]

When the Catholic Synod discussed the new situation at Carthage in

---

[76] Augustine, *Ep.* 245, 2; *C. Crescon.*, 1, 4; *Retract*, 2, 26, 29, 35. See A. C. de Veer, "L'exploitation du schisme maximianiste par s. Augustin dans la lutte contre le Donatisme," *RechAug* 3 (Paris 1965), 219–237.

[77] Augustine, *Ep.* 69; *C. Crescon.* 2, 12.

[78] The invitation in *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.*, can. 92 (*Mansi* III, 791–794). The preparatory measures, ibid., can. 91. The decrees of the officials on the invitation procedure, *Gesta coll. Carth.* 3, 174; *Brevic. coll.* 3, 6.

[79] Primian's reply in Augustine, *C. part. Don. post gesta* 1, 1: "indignum est ut in unum conveniant filii martyrum et progenies traditorum." Cf. Augustine, *Enarr. in ps. 36* II, 18.

[80] Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 12; the doubts in the report of Possidius are baseless: H. J. Diesner, *Stpatr* 6, 4 (Berlin 1962), 350–355.

[81] On Maximian, Servus, and Restitutus, see Augustine, *C. Crescon.* 3, 47 and 53; on Marcus, Augustine, *Ep.* 105, 3.

June 404, there was basically a consensus that, in the face of such massive recourse to force, the protection of state officials would have to be requested. While a group of mostly older bishops now regarded the compelling of union by imperial law as necessary and in this regard recalled the favorable results of earlier political measures—perhaps they were thinking of the decrees of the Emperor Constans in 347 and 348—the view held by Augustine prevailed: it disallowed any radical prohibition of Donatism and demanded only the prevention of acts of violence by the officials as well as the punishment of the Donatist bishops and clerics whose responsibility for them could be proved. The legal basis for this seemed to be provided in the heresy laws issued by the Emperor Theodosius in 392: a new edict would not be necessary. The Bishops Theasius and Evodius, as delegates of the Synod, were to inform the Emperor of the events of the last months and ask for the needed measures of protection.[82] But when the delegation arrived in Ravenna, the Emperor Honorius had already made his decision. The Numidian Bishops previously mentioned, Maximian and Servus, had given him so impressive a description of the situation, with reference to their personal fate, that on 12 February 405 he issued an Edict of Union,[83] which far exceeded the desires of the Synod. In this the Donatists were completely equated with heretics because they taught the necessity of rebaptism and also practiced it. To this corresponded strict sanctions: transfer of Donatist churches to the Catholic Church, prohibition of every sort of assembly, and exile for bishops and clerics who refused union. Carelessness in the implementation of the edict by the officials was to be punished by a fine. There was quick action in Carthage: Primian went into exile, and with him Bishop Petilian of Cirta. They went to Ravenna and surprisingly declared themselves ready to take part in a religious disputation with a Catholic bishop: the *praefectus praetorio,* as judge, should give the verdict on the outcome.[84] But in the provinces there appeared everywhere strong resistance by the Donatists; the officials often withdrew in the face of it, so that in a series of decrees Honorius had to urge the implementation of the Edict of Union.[85] The effects differed widely from place to place, and especially where the conversions were numerous one had to doubt the honesty of some of them.[86] The fall of General Stilicho in 408, to whom the Donatists attributed a substantial role in the imperial policy of suppression, evoked among them the hope of a reversal. The report was spread that the prescriptions of 405 were annulled, and the Donatists sought to gain back by force what had been taken from them by law in property and respect. Aurelius of Carthage again had to ask help from Ravenna, and by word and deed it was made clear to the Donatists that the laws of 405 remained completely in force.[87] The newly appointed Proconsul, Donatus, interpreted these very strictly and intended to impose the death penalty, but Augustine at once protested.[88] Not until Donatus was replaced by the pagan Macrobius was the pressure on the Donatists lessened, and at the beginning of 410 an edict for North Africa surprisingly decreed that everyone could freely decide for one Christian denomination or the other.[89] This declaration of toleration was, however, withdrawn by August of the same year at the petition of a delegation of Catholic bishops, which again explained to the Emperor the ideas and desires of the Catholic episcopate for a comprehensive and *definitive religious dialogue* of the two confessions.[90] Thereupon, the Emperor on 14 October 410 officially commissioned the Senator Marcellinus to do the preparatory organizational work for this conference and at the same time appointed him as its president and arbiter.[91] This time the Donatists could hardly hold themselves aloof, since two years earlier they had asked for such a conversation. At last Augustine's purpose, conceived years before and unwaveringly expounded, seemed to be fulfilled.

---

[82] Discussions of the Synod, *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.,* canon 93; see the report of Augustine, *Ep.* 185, 7, 25.

[83] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 37, 38; 16, 6, 4, 5.

[84] Augustine, *Ep.* 88, 10; *Brevic. coll.* 3, 4; *Gesta coll. Carth.* 3, 141.

[85] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 39, 41 and 43; cf. *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.,* can. 94.

[86] Augustine, *Ep.* 185, 30: *plurimi simulando communicaverunt.*

But had Augustine not long before turned against the idea of a peaceable discussion of a reunion by the fact that he was finally persuaded that a forceful solution was necessary and agreed to recourse by the secular power? A decision on Augustine's attitude in this question has to start with the incontrovertible fact that he himself repeatedly and frankly admitted a change in his views.[92] He expressed himself equally clearly with regard to the motives which occasioned this change. First, it was the realistic insight, gained in the concrete and often cruelly harsh

---

[87] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 41, 44, 46.

[88] *Ep.* 100, 2.

[89] The decree is missing in *Cod. Theod.,* but it was certainly issued and is to be explained by the difficult inner political situation of 409–410, which compelled the Emperor to a tolerant attitude, even if it was only temporary. See *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.,* canon 108; Augustine, *Ep.* 108, 6, 19. On the whole matter, A. C. de Veer, "Une mesure de tolérance de l'empereur Honorius," *REB* 24 (1966), 187–195.

[90] *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.,* can. 107f.; *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 51; *Gesta coll. Carth.* 1, 4, 5.

[91] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 11, 3.

[92] For example, *Ep.* 93, 5, 16–17: "mea primitus sententia non erat nisi neminem ad unitatem Christi esse cogendum; verbo esse agendum, disputatione pugnandum, ratione vincendum, ne fictos catholicos haberemus." Cf. also *Retract.* 2, 21; *Ep.* 185, 25; *C. Crescon.* 3, 48, 53.

African workday, that both the life of individual Catholics and the free proclamation of the *veritas catholica* could be assured only thus against the force of the Donatist raids. Many Donatists, he further believed, would only then have the possibility of a free decision, when the pressure was taken from them to which they were exposed by their own leadership. Besides, he let himself be convinced by the examples set before his eyes by his colleagues that state legislation in the past had led many Donatists to reflect and then to become convinced Catholics. And finally, he had acquired the insight that in the concrete African situation there was no more question of a mere schism, but of a heresy, which appeared most clearly in the Donatist doctrine of baptism, which made the effect of this sacrament depend, not on Christ, but on the moral quality of the one baptizing.[93] Hence, against this heresy there must be recourse to the laws which the State, now guided by a Christian Emperor, had issued for such cases, with the restriction, of course, that in their application *caritas christiana* must always be assured and especially the death penalty must never be decreed.[94] These laws, it is true, were understood as coercion by those whom they affected, but regard must be had for their purpose: they aimed to lead to the good, the holy, just as there was a persecution which led back out of error one who had fallen into the error. It was that persecution, as the workers practiced it in the gospel when they were sent by their master to the highways and hedges with the order "to coerce" the poor "to come in" (Luke 14:23), or as the shepherd is who "persecutes" the lost sheep, brings it back to the flock, even against its will, and thus saves it (Matt. 18:12–14). "Why should not the Church compel its lost sons to return, if the lost sons compel others to their ruin?"[95]

It is understandable that this attitude of Augustine and its motivation is the trait of his activity which encounters the strongest opposition today, and the modern understanding of toleration will always have reservations in regard to it. Of course, whoever rejects the figure of Augustine as a whole will ascribe "dirty hands" to him here also, and those to whom the Catholics of North Africa in the fourth century are now objects of sympathy will see in Augustine's conduct only a probably deliberate deception and in his well-known use of the rules of ancient rhetoric in the literary confrontation a cheap trick, without exerting himself for definite individual proofs for such evaluations.[96] The real question is whether Augustine's justification of the claim to the use of force by the State did not exercise an unwholesome effect on the future and serve religious groups of later times and the most varied tendencies as an alibi for their procedure. One certainly cannot see in him the first theorist of the Inquisition,[97] since Augustine did not by any means aspire to elaborate an abstract desk-solution, valid and practicable for all times for the question of the permissibility of religious compulsion, but he was seeking a way out of an unusually complex, boundlessly tormenting situation, with which he was daily confronted. But it must be said that Augustine did not consider what theoretical consequences could be deduced in another situation from his concrete reflections.[98] Furthermore, he had not seen that a collaboration even with a State under Christian leadership, whose questionable character he had come to know well in another respect, necessarily had to have also a political character in the North Africa of his day—guarantee of the political and economic control of the country against the background of denominational unity—and in the eyes of the Donatists actually did have it. Thus the purely religious concern of Augustine became through this dovetailing of denominational and political interest burdened in his own lifetime with a heavy mortgage and in later centuries continued to operate as political Augustinianism.[99]

---

[93] Augustine repeatedly justified the change in his view, in special detail in letters 93 and 185.

[94] *Ep.* 110, 1; 133, 1; 134, 2; 153.

[95] *Ep.* 185, 6, 23: "cur non cogeret ecclesia perditos filios ut redirent, si perditi filii coegerunt alios ut perirent?" On the Augustinian meaning of *cogite intrare* in contrast to *compelle intrare* and on *persecutio* in the sense of the French *poursuite* cf. the philogical remarks of A. Mandouze, *S. Augustin,* 348f., with note.

Persons have aimed to explain Augustine's outlook by his inadequate view for the political quality and impact of religious questions also. There is something correct in this, but one is still in the superficial. If Augustine's anti-Donatist works are left to operate by themselves as a whole, if his pertinent correspondence and still more his sermons are examined, one can scarcely fail to hear that here speaks the voice of a man who was so driven and instigated by religious responsibility to bring back again to the Church the brothers who had fallen into error,[100] that, compared with it, all other considerations moved to the background.

---

[96] Cf. a summary of such evaluations in A. Mandouze, op. cit., 337 and 353, with note.

[97] P. Brown, *St. Augustine* (London 1967), 240; ibid., 235.

[98] See H. Maisonneuve, "Croyance religieuse et contrainte. La doctrine de s. Augustin," *MSR* 19 (1962), 49–68, on Augustine's influence on the *Decretum Gratiani* in causes 23 and 24 on the repression of heresy.

[99] Cf. A. Mandouze, "L'Afrique chrétienne, le Donatisme et s. Augustin," *Cahiers de la Pierre-qui-Vire,* no. 17 (Paris 1967), 279–297.

[100] Especially impressive *sermo* 46.

The Religious Discussion of Carthage (411) and its Sequel

While the imperial rescript which ordered the holding of the religious discussion was not very conciliatory in what it said of the Donatists, the measures which the notary Marcellinus employed in preparing for it make clear the effort to win as many as possible of the Donatist bishops to participate. In a letter[101] that invited all bishops of both denominations to Carthage on 1 June 411, he assured the Donatists that he would render his verdict in complete impartiality. For their part, they could still appoint a second arbiter, and they received the guarantee that after the conclusion of the conference they might return unmolested to their bishoprics. Until his verdict, all measures of compulsion against the Donatists were suspended; the local officials received appropriate instructions. The response to this letter was everywhere gratifying for Marcellinus. The Donatist Primate Primian not only announced his own personal appearance: he also, through a circular, asked all his fellow bishops to arrive in Carthage as far as possible in full strength.[102] A few days before the beginning of the conference Marcellinus was able to present both sides with a detailed agenda, to ask their approval and their disposal of the introductory procedures suggested in it.[103] Even before the opening of the conference, seven bishops from each group were selected from all the assembled bishops as spokesmen, and an equal number of advisers were to stand at their side. The minutes of the debates, for the recording of which a bureau of stenographers[104] was available, were to be edited by a commission of four representatives of each side and then published by being posted. The Donatists' reply[105] did not commit itself in regard to the agenda but criticized very strongly the fact that only the elected representatives and not all the bishops present were to be admitted to the discussions, despite their having elected the delegates envisaged by Marcellinus. The Catholics not only gave their unconditional assent to the proposed agenda. They obliged themselves beyond it: in the event of a negative outcome of the conference, to relinquish to the Donatist bishops their episcopal sees; if the decision should go in favor of the Catholics, however, the Donatist bishops might retain their rank and office, if they joined the Catholic Church.[106] Their effort to create a climate favorable to negotiations was unmistakable; for example, in some sermons Augustine asked the

---

[101] *Gesta coll. Carth.* I, 5; I, 4, the imperial rescript.

[102] Ibid. II, 50; Augustine mentions the circular in *Ad donat. post coll.* 24, 41.

[103] *Gesta coll. Carth.* I, 10.

[104] See E. Tengström, *Die Protokollierung der Collatio Carthaginiensis* (Göteborg 1962).

[105] *Gesta coll. Carth.* I, 14.

[106] Ibid. I, 16; Augustine, *Ep.* 128, 1; *Brevic. coll.* I, 5. Augustine succeeded in gaining all the Catholic bishops except two for this pledge: *Gesta cum Emer.* 6.

Catholics of Carthage to abstain from any demonstration and to promote the purpose of the union dialogue through their prayers.[107] In contrast to the Donatists, the Catholics also published their *mandatum,* the text with the names of their delegates together with the instructions imparted to these,[108] in which was clearly staked out the line they were to adhere to in the discussions. The essential question must be and remain that of the true Church: questions of detail, such as "the case of Caecilian," must be sharply separated from it. A list of scriptural texts, probably assembled by Augustine, was appended for the theological argumentation. The accusations to be expected from the Donatists on the recognition of heretical baptism by the Catholics, on the employing of State power in the fight against the Donatists should always be rejected with reference to the entirely identical conduct of the Donatists on the occasion of the Maximianist Schism and under the Emperor Julian. For questions of historical facts, such as, for example, the one mentioned above, about whether Caecilian or his consecrator Felix had been a *traditor,* the documents of the official archives were to be referred to; Augustine had likewise carefully collected these. Every attempt of the Donatists to proceed to the discussion of individual questions of secondary importance was to be resisted from the start with the firmly stated demand to speak on the central problem of the conference—the true Church.

When on 1 June Marcellinus opened the conference in the Baths of Gargilius, there appeared for the Catholic side only their eighteen delegates, but for the Donatists the entire episcopate present at Carthage.[109] From the first moment on it was their tactic, by raising ever more new questions of procedure, into which Marcellinus at first entered with great forbearance, to postpone or put aside the discussion of the basic theological questions. The first two days of sessions thus passed, whereupon the conference was interrupted in order to give the Donatists time for a study of the Catholic *mandatum,* to which they composed a systematic refutation.[110] When, after the resumption of the debate on 8 June, they demanded that this refutation be read and at once discussed, Augustine immediately recognized his opportunity and supported their motion because thereby the possibility was given to him to proceed exactly according to the outline sketched by him and in a complete presentation to expound the Catholic standpoint in all important points.[111] His supreme command of the subject, his certainty in the interpretation of the Bible, his exact knowledge of the acts, his quickness of repartee in regard to the Donatists' objections made him the dominant figure of this day. Late in the evening Marcellinus ended the debate and announced his verdict, according to which the Donatists had been refuted by the Catholics *omnium documentorum manifestatione.*[112] A few days later he once again made known the result of the conference in the form of an edict, which was finally ratified by a rescript of the Emperor Honorius of 30 January 412.[113]

---

[107] *Serm.* 357 and 358.

[108] *Gesta coll. Carth.* I, 55.

[109] Ibid. I, 2.

[110] Ibid. II, 12; III, 258.

[111] Ibid. III, 260–261. *Brevic. coll.* 3, 15, gives Augustine's intervention.

Before long, the Donatist bishops filed with the Emperor an appeal against the verdict, which they based especially on the claim that Marcellinus had not only committed several mistakes in regard to form but had also made himself guilty of partisanship, even of corruptibility.[114] But the state officials did not accept this and coldly and inexorably drew the consequences of the verdict. Marcellinus, in addition, ordered that all Donatist clerics who now still refused the union must at once surrender their churches to the Catholics, that the alliance with the Circumcellions was to be dissolved, and that all meetings of Donatists were thereafter forbidden.[115] The imperial rescript of January 412 put all earlier prohibitions again in force, inflicted severe fines on the recalcitrant, if necessary the confiscation of a person's entire property, and threatened with exile from African soil the clergy who rejected the union.[116] Some Catholics were in complete agreement that the laws should be applied in all strictness: now mildness would be negligence or weakness. Again Augustine made himself the spokesman for *mansuetudo catholica,* which above all forbade the employment of the death penalty. He also definitely asked in other cases for a mild procedure, so that he had to defend himself against the reproach that he clearly favored the Donatists, since he demanded freedom from punishment for them.[117]

Although Augustine could claim for himself the decisive role in the issue of the religious debates in favor of the Catholics, he had no feeling of personal triumph. It is true that he once spoke of *evidentissima victoria nostra,* but by that he meant the victory of *catholica veritas.* When the mass conversions then got under way and he was praised as the author of such successes, he cooly parried this with *non sunt haec opera nostra, sed*

---

[112] According to Augustine, *Brevic. coll.* 3, 43; the text of the sentence of Marcellinus is not extant.

[113] The edict at the end of the *Gesta coll. Carth., PL* 11, 1418–1420; the imperial rescript, *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 52.

[114] Augustine, *Ad donat. post coll.* 1; 16; 57; 58; *Gesta cum Emer.* 2; 3.

[115] Text = the so-called *sententia cognitoris, PL* 11, 1418–1420.

[116] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 52.

[117] *Ep.* 139, 2; 153.

dei.[118] Besides, he was under no illusions in regard to the quality of some conversions and hence urgently emphasized the duty of the bishops through their pastoral exertions to procure the interior turning of the former Donatists to Catholic unity, as he tried this in an exemplary manner in his sermons.[119] But a minority long refused to have anything to do with union. To it probably belonged most of the bishops, according to Augustine the real *victi* of the religious debate, whom he frequently took to task from now on and whom he likewise distinguished from the great crowd of Donatist faithful, as well as the unfortunately obdurate remnant of the Circumcellions, who c. 420 threatened suicide if anyone aimed to bring them by force to union with the Catholic Church.[120] As late as 418 more than thirty Donatist bishops could meet in Numidia and even ordain new bishops.[121] The persistence of a stubborn Donatist remnant is also attested to by a whole series of imperial decrees which followed the Edict of 412 and extended to the Vandal invasion: in them the proper officials were repeatedly asked strictly to implement the measures decreed; otherwise they would themselves be held to account.[122] In 420 Augustine published his last anti-Donatist work; thereafter, the subject of Donatism is treated only occasionally in his correspondence and in general not at all in his sermons; and for decades from 418 it disappeared from the minutes of the North African Episcopal Synods.[123] The greatest personal duty and the most oppressive responsibility which Augustine's episcopal office had laid on him had been taken from him.

Beside the solution of the practical pastoral task of restoring the unity of the Christianity of North Africa, there proceeded with equal poise the theological outcome of the intellectual confrontation with Donatism, which found its expression in Augustine's anti-Donatist writings.[124] It is given, first, in the definitive explanation of the relationship of sacrament and minister, and, second, in a deepened grasp of the nature and mission of the Church. The Donatist practice of rebaptism originated in a concept of the sacrament that made its effect dependent on the "purity" of its minister. To Augustine this implied "placing one's hope in a man" and not in Christ, the *author* of the sacraments, whose merits alone give them their efficacy. Hence it is not Peter or John, it is also not Judas, who baptizes: it is always Christ who baptizes.[125] The inner purity and sanctity of the sacrament is, therefore, attainable neither from the holiness nor from the impurity of the minister; it is neither enhanced nor decreased by such.[126] Since Augustine again distinguishes between the sacramental act, which the minister performs, and the saving grace of the sacrament, which only the Holy Spirit, operating in the Church of Christ, grants, he is able also to recognize the existence and validity of the sacraments administered by schismatics and heretics, but they remain without salvific effect, since this is bound up with the presence of the Holy Spirit which, for its part, is found only in the communion with the true Church. As soon as a person who has been externally baptized has been incorporated into the one Church by the imposition of hands, he shares in the unity produced by the Holy Spirit and hence also in the sacramental grace bound up with it.[127] It is true that Augustine elaborated these distinctions and principles chiefly in connection with the sacrament of baptism, but he extended them also to the other sacraments, especially to orders and the Eucharist. In this way Cyprian's understanding of sacrament in theology was definitively overcome.

---

[118] *Ep.* 141, 1 and 3; 142. The mass conversions in *Ep.* 185, 3: "liberantur per illas leges . . . fundi, pagi, vici, castella, municipia, civitates." 185, 7: "multi . . . correcti sunt et cotidie corriguntur." Cf. also *Sermo* 359, 7; Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 13.

[119] *Ep.* 185, 8; *Sermo* 112; 137–138; 197; 296; 359; see also a series in the *Enarr. in ps.*

[120] His work *Contra partem Donati post gesta* is a relentless settlement with the Donatist episcopate, which he seeks to isolate from the people. The Circumcellions: *Ep.* 204.

[121] *C. Gaudent.* I, 37, 47–48.

[122] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 54–56; 63–65.

[123] The last work was *Contra Gaudentium*; the last letters were *Ep.* 108 and 109 *c.* 423. The Synod of 1 May 418 concerned itself definitely with the now necessary new organization of the North African sees: *Cod. can. eccl. Afr.* canons 117–124.

[124] See the summary of Y. Congar, *BiblAug* 28 (1963), 86–124.

Augustine enriched the doctrine of the Church through new, deep insights, which became possible to him through the distinction of the *ecclesia* as it now is and the *ecclesia qualis futura est.*[128] Whereas the Donatists understood themselves as the Church of the Pure, which is without spot or wrinkle, Augustine perceived that in the "Church as it now is" good and evil live together until the judgment, which will produce the definitive separation. A person can belong to it *corpore* or also *corde*: in the first case, he indeed possesses the *communio sacramentorum* but does not belong to the *societas sanctorum* or *Spiritus,* and hence he also does not possess the *pax, unitas,* and *caritas* which are precisely gifts of this Spirit. The Church, it is true, is the community of those who hear the call of God in Christ or will still hear it, but the inner unity of this Church only becomes complete reality through the *pax* which the Holy Spirit operates in it. Thus, as this Spirit is the bond between Father and Son and hence perfects the community of the three in unity, so he is also the bond which enables the Church to become the "communion of saints."[129] With this view of the Church, Augustine again left behind him Cyprian, who saw the foundation of unity in the communion of the bishops, and he corrected the ecclesiological exaggeration of the importance of the episcopal office among the Donatists, in so far as they saw in its bearers as ministers of the sacraments also the ministers of the corresponding gift of grace and hence called them spiritual fathers in the real sense. For Augustine, on the contrary, the Church is the spiritual mother of the faithful and, as such, holder of the power of the keys and of infallibility.[130] Further to elucidate the reality of this *mater ecclesia,* Augustine with predilection grasped the image of the *columba,*[131] whose symbolic power to express ideas the Bible so often uses when it speaks of peace, purity, loyalty, and the Holy Spirit. He deepened and enriched the symbolic content of the Word when he called the Church itself *columba* and saw in this Dove the unique and faithful Bride of Christ; which, innocent and pure, groans for its sinful members and, groaning, calls to those who are separated from it, which received the Holy Spirit in order through him to give *pax* to all its members. Only one who possesses this *pax columbae* works out his salvation, and so Augustine holds in the deepest understanding to Cyprian's expression: *extra ecclesiam nulla salus.* Augustine thereby introduces the valid propositions in Cyprian's grasp of the Church into his own deepened ecclesiology,[132] but there was in his days no theologian on the Donatist side who could have recognized this, taken it up, and so cooperated to restore the *pax ecclesiae* in contemporary North African Christianity in a less painful manner.

---

[125] Repeated in various forms: *C. ep. Parmen.* II, 15, 34; *C. litt. Petil.* I, 9, 10; *In ev. Joh. tract.* 5, 18; 6, 8; 15, 3.

[126] *De bapt.* III, 10, 15; IV, 21, 28.

[127] *De bapt.* V, 23, 33; *C. ep. Parmen.* II, 13, 18; *Sermo* 269, 2.

[128] *Brevic. coll.* III, 10, 20; *Retract.* II, 44, 2.

---

[129] See Y. Congar, *op. cit.,* pp. 100–103, and *HDG* III (1971), 3–6.

[130] Cf. P. Rinetti, "Sant'Agostino e l'Ecclesia mater," *Augustinus Magister* II, 827–835.

[131] Evidence for *columba = ecclesia, BiblAug* 28 (1963), 104–109, with note.

[132] See F. Hamer, "Le baptême et l'église," *Irenikon* 25 (1952), 263–275.

CHAPTER 12

Pelagius and the Aftermath

The Ideal of Morality of the Pelagian Circle

The sources do not tell us when and why the Romano-Briton Pelagius[1] left his homeland and went to Rome, where he lived from c. 390 as a

---

[1] Most sources name Britain as his homeland: Augustine, *Ep.* 186, 1; Orosius, *Apol. c. Pel.* 12, 3: M. Mercator, *Common* 1; only Jerome, *In Hierem.,* prol. and 3, 1, indicates Ireland.

Christian ascetic, without, however, joining a monastic community in the strict sense. In the same circles of the Roman community in which Jerome in the days of Pope Damasus had recruited for the ascetical manner of life, successfully and against opposition, Pelagius gained the highest esteem and could gather about him a flock of the like-minded, among them a former lawyer named Caelestius,[2] who was soon to become a zealous and versatile propagandist of the specifically moral principles of his master. As the decisive basis for the high esteem of Pelagius in certain circles of the now Christian upper class at Rome must be mentioned the uncompromising seriousness with which he proposed his moral demands, to which was joined a remarkable gift for recruiting impressively for his ideal by word and writing.[3] Of his numerous works, only three are extant as to whose authenticity there is no doubt: a brief commentary on the thirteen Pauline Epistles, a formally very appealing ascetical treatise to the Roman lady Demetrias of the *gens Anicia,* and his profession of faith for Pope Innocent I. On the basis of recent research, however, four other brief works can be assigned to him today with great probability. A series of other texts, mostly in the style of letters, comes, if not directly from his immediate circle of pupils, at least from the Pelagian world of ideas.[4] For a knowledge of them, of course, anti-Pelagian writings are not unproductive, especially those of Augustine, notably his report *De gestis Pelagii* to 417 and some of his letters, and the contributions of Jerome, Orosius, and Marius Marcator—but they must be read with a very critical eye. From these works emerges pretty much the following picture:

The basic concern of Pelagius and his followers is suggested in concise form in the letter of a man who had joined the movement in his youth: he now knows *quomodo veras Christianus esse possim.*[5] The Pelagians understood this genuine complete Christianity as the opposite of that attitude which was characteristic of the life of many average and half-Christians toward the end of the fourth century in the large Christian congregations, especially that of Rome. Many of these were all too gullible in regard to the view that the mere reception of baptism was a guarantee of salvation. Others excused their moral minimalism with the argument that it was in practice impossible to avoid sins in the allurements of each day; still others believed that the demand of a sinless and perfect Christian life was valid only for an elite.[6] To this lethargy of resignation, Pelagius and his circle opposed a moral ideal which was characterized by a strong optimism in the evaluation of human nature and its capabilities and in a consequent appeal, corresponding to it, to the human desire to achieve.[7] Only that Christian will assure his salvation who, by the exertion of all his powers, fulfills the *mandata* of God. God gave the capability for this when he endowed human nature with free will and the gift of distinguishing good from evil, gifts which, so to speak, represent a *naturalis sanctitas,* which qualified some pagan philosophers for moral capacity of a high level. In addition, God specially grants to Christians in the exemplary lives of the great biblical figures, but chiefly in the edifying life of Christ, a help based on grace, which stimulates them to the "perfect justice."[8] Besides the *exemplum Christi* there is, furthermore, the constant reference to the heavenly reward which awaits the Christian after a perfect life, a distinguishing mark of the Pelagian preaching, which tirelessly called upon it to harness the capabilities proper to human nature for the supreme goal of perfection and which in this connection often appealed to feelings of pride and fame, which were accorded the goal achieved.[9] The *verus Christianus* fulfills, however, not only each *praeceptum Dei* uncompromisingly—a distinction between greater and lesser importance is to him just as unsympathetic as that between venial and mortal sins—but he proves himself to be such precisely in the firm acceptance of definite attitudes, which the gospel praises as signs of perfection. *Continentia, castitas,* and *paupertas* are for Pelagius ideals which he would like to see lived not only by an elite but eventually by all Christians: in other words, he championed basically a moral Puritanism, which should realize itself in a Church without spot or wrinkle.[10] Thus the Pelagian movement moved in a certain sense close to the moral rigorism of a Novatian, but in contrast to the latter Pelagius intentionally gave his following no organizational structure of its own. Thus, just as he neither entered the clergy nor attached himself as a monk to a religious community, so everyone should work and recruit for the program of an authentic Christianity by his life within the Church.[11]

---

[2] See G. Bardy, "Célestius," *DHGE* 12 (1953), 104–107.

[3] The literary talent is recognized by both Jerome, *Dial. c. Pel.* 3, 16, and Augustine, *De pecc. orig.* 24.

[4] Probably genuine: 1) *De vita christiana, PL* 40, 1031–1046; 2) *De divina lege, PL* 30, 105–116; 3) *Ep. de virginitate, CSEL* 1, 224–250; 4) *Ep. ad Celantiam, CSEL* 56, 329–356 (=Jerome, *Ep.* 148). Catalogue of other "Pelagian" works in A. Hamman, *PL,* Suppl. 1, 1104–1109, 1679–1683, and S. Prete, *Pelagio,* 192f.

[5] *Ep. Honorificentiae tuae* 2 (*PL,* Suppl. 1, 1691).

---

[6] The criticism of the failure of many Christians in daily life runs through all Pelagian literature; cf., for example, *Ep. ad Demetr.* and *De vita christiane.*

[7] Especially clearly expressed by Pelagius himself: *Ep. ad Demetr.* 2; cf. R. Pirenne, *La morale de Pélage* (Rome 1961).

[8] *Ep. ad Demetr.* 3–7; 8: "illius (=Christi) exemplo ad perfectam iustitiam incitati meliores illis esse, debemus qui ante legem fuerunt."

[9] *Magnitudo praemii: Ep. ad Demetr.* 9–11; the *gloria,* ibid. 22.

[10] The *ecclesia sine vitio et macula: De div. lege* 1. The obligation of all Christians to this life, ibid. 7; the equality of all the commandments, ibid. 16.

And so at first Pelagianism presented itself as a reform movement, which understood Christianity as a totality of the highest moral demands, which the individual Christian is called upon to realize in constant ascetical activity. The totality of these moral commands, the law of God, he finds in Scripture, which he must know and constantly reflect on.[12] If, accordingly, Pelagianism does not offer primarily a theological system of doctrines, still it presupposes some theological notions and theses, which grew ever sharper in the course of later discussion. To these belongs a completely distinct evaluation of Adam's sin, which was only his personal guilt and could only operate negatively on the human race as an example of disobedience to God's command. The free will of man remained intact, and every man can, even after the fall of Adam, avoid sin by the strength of a free decision for good or evil.[13] Similarly, grace, which God gives through Christ, is understood chiefly as the positive example of a Christian life, which strongly stimulates the disciples of Christ to follow him in the fulfilling of the *mandata dei.* Baptism blots out only personal guilt, and hence infant baptism must not be justified by absolute necessity for salvation. Even the efficacy of the sacraments and the necessity of prayer for a Christian lifestyle are undervalued by the Pelagian movement in favor of a moral accomplishment due to one's own powers.

The reform movement of Pelagius and his circle found a remarkable echo from the start. At first it was certainly the total impression of his strong personality, which assured great success for his program, especially in Rome, despite some resistance. It is significant for his reputation that the noble *gens Anicia* counted Pelagius among the three men of contemporary Latin Christianity—the other two are Jerome and Augustine—from whom an ascetical treatise was requested when one of its members, Demetrias, took the veil.[14] Even among many bishops of the day, the first impression was positive, and Augustine spoke constantly with appreciation of the ascetical reputation which Pelagius enjoyed. Caelestius especially displayed a busy propaganda for the spread of the Pelagian reform ideas, and soon there appeared a whole network of Pelagian groups, which kept contact with one another by a brisk correspondence, which, so far as it has been preserved, shows a striking inclination to remain anonymous. The propaganda had special success in Sicily, where Caelestius was active longer, but soon adherents cropped up in North Africa; there was also a favorable response in South Italian Campania and in northern Aquileia, and more remotely in Spain, Gaul, and Ireland. In the East an early basis was established on the island of Rhodes, and before long Palestine and the cities of Ephesus and Constantinople were touched by the movement.[15]

---

[11] *De div. lege* 9: "ego te christianum volo esse, non monachum dici et virtutem propriae laudis possidere magis quam nomen alienum."

[12] *Ep. ad Demetr.* 23.

[13] See the anonymous *Ep. de possibilitate non peccandi, PL,* Suppl. 1, 1457–1462.

[14] The already mentioned *Ep. ad Demetr.* of Pelagius, the answers of Jerome and Augustine are *Epp.* 130 and 150 respectively.

The Discussion of Pelagianism within the Church

Hesitations about the demanding reform ideas of Pelagius were at first expressed more in the form of a diffuse uneasiness and, it seems, more in lay circles than in those of the official hierarchy. At Rome Pelagius had to defend his program in occasionally stormy discussion; unfortunately, those who debated him are unknown. In Sicily the radical demands of the Pelagian ideal of poverty, with its social consequences, especially evoked anxiety among the wealthy Christians of the island. In North Africa it was Caelestius's theses regarding infant baptism that called forth the resistance of many Christians. The first official decision by bishops was brought out only by the intervention of the Milanese deacon Paulinus, who filed an accusation against Caelestius with Bishop Aurelius of Carthage in 411. Caelestius, questioned in detail before a synod[16] as to what he thought of a guilt inherited from Adam even by children and of the necessity, then, of baptism for them, refused to give a direct answer and was condemned. Hence he had to abandon his plan of being admitted to the clergy of Carthage and go to Ephesus, where he received the priesthood.[17] But the discussions continued, so that Augustine, who had not taken part in the Synod, as late as 413 delivered in Carthage two sermons on the meaning of infant baptism, in which he expressly asked that the other side not be branded as heretical.[18]

The previous year, 412, Augustine, at the request of his friend, Count Marcellinus, had expressed his view of infant baptism in a special work, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum,* and in it he made known that the Pelagian moral teaching threatened to compromise for him central truths of faith on the *gratia Christi,* the understanding of which he had gained in an unceasing exertion, strongly influenced by his personal religious route. He refrained from any personal polemic against Pelagius, whose commentary on the Pauline Epistles he had meanwhile read and whose entirely inadequate exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans he had at once ascertained with a sure look. His anxiety grew, the more Pelagian literature came into his hands. A Christian of Syracuse in Sicily had informed him of the activity of the Pelagians on the island and presented to him five of their theses on the question,[19] three of which he discussed in a detailed reply: the alleged capability of man to achieve "justice" by his own power; the denial of an original sin in children, which moved him to a careful exegesis of Romans 5:12, and the obligation in principle on all Christians to renounce all riches.[20] Two bishops, whose precise homeland is unknown, had sent him a treatise which bore the inscription *Definitiones Caelestii* and also came from Sicily. For Augustine the authorship of Caelestius was not absolutely sure, even if the manner of argumentation seemed to speak powerfully for it. Tersely and precisely, Augustine refuted the theses of the treatise in turn and then gave his exegesis of the biblical texts (*testimonia*), with which the author sought to support the Pelagian moral doctrine—*De perfectione iustitiae hominis.* He then elaborated with special care one of Pelagius's own works, the fundamental aim of which was to point out the high natural and moral dignity of human nature: in day-to-day life it is, he claims, of course, at times subjected to some rather fortuitous mistakes, but in principle it is capable of *impeccantia,* if one fulfills two conditions: 1) if he becomes aware that God has granted him the immortal gift of a rational will endowed with freedom of decision, and 2) if he makes firm use of this gift deriving from grace. Two pupils of Pelagius, Timasius and Jacobus, had sent Augustine this work of their master's, *De natura,* in the hope that he could perhaps make possible, with a clarifying and deepening judgment, a rapprochement or a reconciliation of the opposing positions. In his reply *De natura et gratia* (415), Augustine tactfully did not name the author, although it was just this work that, by his own admission, had opened his eyes to the great danger which clearly threatened the salvation of Christians by its doctrine.[21] All the more relentless was he in the case and he frankly exposed the basic error of the Pelagian system: it so highly commends the work of the creator—human nature, which was in no sense weakened by Adam's sin—that a redeemer is superfluous.[22] To it he contrasted his thesis of *natura vulnerata, sauciata, perdita,* which makes a saving and redeeming grace, the *gratia Christi,* indispensable, and for it the Christian must pray unceasingly. Christ's redemptive act is intrinsically undermined by Pelagius, who also actually denies the necessity of prayer when he claims it belongs to the natural capabilities of man to achieve his salvation.[23] With *De natura et gratia* Augustine offered what was up to then the most consistent refutation of the Pelagian understanding of human nature and at the same time the long authentic explanation of the relationship of nature and grace. Augustine also found a threat to the necessity of grace for salvation in the *Epistula ad Demetriadem* by Pelagius, against tendencies of which he strongly warned.[24]

---

[15] On the spread of the movement see S. Prete, *Pelagio,* 20–27.

[16] On the Synod of 411 Augustine reports after an examination of the acts: *De gratia Christi* 2, 2–4; cf. *De gest. Pel.* 11, 23, and *Ep.* 157, 22. The exact date of the Synod, whether before or after the Donatist conference of 411, has not been established; see J. H. Koopmans, *VigChr* 8 (1954), 149–153, and F. R. Refoulé, *RevÉAug* 9 (1963), 41–49.

[17] M. Mercator, *Common. s. nom. Cael.* 2; see S. Prete, *Mario Mercatore polemista antipelagiano* (Turin 1958).

[18] Augustine, *De gest. Pel.* 11, 25; they are *Sermones* 293 and 294.

---

[19] *Ep.* 156 among Augustine's letters.

[20] *Ep.* 157, to Hilary.

[21] *De gest. Pel* 23, 47.

In 415 the discussion of Pelagian doctrine within the Church shifted to Palestine, where Pelagius had gone in 412–413 and had entered into close relations with Bishop John of Jerusalem. Toward the turn of the years 414 to 415 Jerome had tackled Pelagius in an unfortunate manner and claimed to bring his moral doctrine into relationship with various suspected ideas of Origen, Evagrius Ponticus, Jovinian, and others.[25] Then in the summer of 415 the Spanish priest Orosius, who had spent some time with Augustine on his journey to Palestine, eagerly announced in Jerusalem the hesitations with which westerners regarded certain theses of Pelagius and his adherents, and thereby stirred such unrest that Bishop John arranged consultation for 20 July 415. But since Pelagius denied that he held the propositions attributed to him by Orosius in this form, John decided that the matter should be left to the Latin Church: here in the East the quarrel should end.[26] But two former Gallic bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, who had been deposed because of scarcely commendable ecclesiastical and political intrigues and had been exiled to the East, in a *Libellus* again made accusations against Pelagius and Caelestius, and this time a synod of fourteen bishops under the presidency of the Metropolitan Eulogius of Caesarea in Diospolis (Lydda) was supposed to try to clarify the question.[27] However, the two accusers did not appear in person at the Synod (December 415). The *Libellus* probably contained some extracts from the *Testimonia* of Pelagius, quotations from his letters to Livania, and some of the theses of Caelestius which had earlier been condemned at Carthage. Since Pelagius here too explained the propositions alleged against him in a sense which seemed orthodox to the fourteen bishops and since he clearly held himself aloof from the theses of Caelestius that had been submitted, the Synod decided that Pelagius "belongs to the ecclesiastical and Christian community."[28] Pelagius saw in the verdict of the Synod not only a personal triumph over his calumniators, to whom he immediately made it known in the West also, but also a positive approval of his thesis that one can be without sin and easily fulfill the commandments of God.[29] Doubts, such as those raised by Augustine especially, seemed after the Synod of Diospolis no longer apt.

---

[22] *De natura et gratia* 34, 39: "non debemus sic laudare creatorem, ut congamur, immo convincamur dicere superfluum salvatorem."

[23] Ibid. 23, 47; 52, 60; 53, 62.

[24] *Ep.* 188 *ad Iulianum.*

[25] In his *Ep.* 133 *ad Clesiphontem;* in his later (415) *Dial. c. Pel.* he repeats the charges. On Pelagius and the resurgence of the Origenist quarrels see R. F. Evans, *Pelagius* (London 1968), 6–25.

[26] Orosius, *Liber apol. c. Pol.* 3–7; the presentation by Orosius is influenced by his disillusionment over the failure to condemn Pelagius; cf. G. de Plinval, *Pélage,* 275–278; as tactless as Jerome, his ridicule touched even Pelagius's external appearance.

In Africa the news that the episcopal Synod of Diospolis had rehabilitated Pelagius understandably evoked consternation. Augustine at once asked Bishop John of Jerusalem for a copy of the synodal acts, sent him at the same time a copy of Pelagius's work *De natura* with his own refutation, and implored him not to let himself be deceived by Pelagius.[30] As a matter of fact, Augustine could no longer get rid of the suspicion that in certain situations Pelagius glossed over his real conviction, and his suspicion was further nourished when he ascertained some serious contradictions between a report coming from Pelagius and the text of the acts.[31] Even today no clear reply can be given to the question whether Pelagius disavowed his pupil Caelestius out of conviction or still supported him in secret and whether under pressure he interpreted his own expressions differently from the way he basically understood them. He himself helped to create this problem through his conduct.[32]

For Augustine it was first important to establish that the fourteen bishops at Diospolis could give an orthodox interpretation to the explanations supplied by Pelagius and, at least indirectly, also reject the theses of Caelestius that had been condemned at Carthage, when he at once saw that Pelagius would have inflexibly to give an exact definition of the ideas employed by him, as, for example, that of *gratia.* Thus he could henceforth deal only with what could be gathered from the works of Pelagius and Caelestius as their doctrine, and, now as before, this was in his eyes in contradiction to Scripture and the Church's conviction of faith. The two Synods of the African episcopate of the fall of 416, one at Carthage, the other at Mileve, were also based on this idea, when they renewed the verdict which had been issued against Caelestius five years earlier. In letters to Pope Innocent I, they asked him for his part to reject the Pelagian errors on free will and the fate of unbaptized infants.[33] In addition, Augustine and some of his friends presented to the Pope their anxieties in regard to the growing spread of Pelagian ideas, to which a stop was possible only if Rome itself with its apostolic authority forced Pelagius to recant his *De natura* and the doctrine contained in it.[34] Again Augustine attached a copy of this work and of his refutation, which he apparently regarded as an especially clear analysis of the Pelagian ideas.

---

[27] The acts of the Synod are not extant, but Augustine knew them and in *De gestis Pelagii* (probably as late as 416) he evaluated them in detail.

[28] *De gest. Pel.* 20, 44.

[29] Ibid. 30, 54; Augustine quotes from a letter of Pelagius to the Synod: "quattuor decim episcoporum sententia definitio nostra comprobata est, qua diximus posse hominem sine peccato esse et dei mandata facile custodire, si velit."

[30] *Ep.* 179.

[31] *De gest. Pel.* 31, 56; 35, 60.

[32] S. Prete, *Pelagio,* 192f.

Innocent acknowledged the three African writings in January 417. He approved the doctrine of grace expounded by the Synod of Carthage: Pelagius and Caelestius are *inventores vocum novarum* and should be excluded from the ecclesiastical community if they clung to their errors. He was, it is true, in possession of the synodal acts of Diospolis but could form no judgment as to what in them was true or false. He saw no possibility of summoning Pelagius to Rome for trial; he must come on his own to obtain absolution; the doctrines expounded in *De natura* are without doubt erroneous.[35] The Pope's cautious decision did not perhaps correspond to all the expectations of the African episcopate, but nevertheless he condemned the Pelagian doctrines, so that Augustine in his sermon of 23 September 417 could say, with regard to the discussion that had hitherto taken place that, now an answer had arrived from Rome, the case was finished, and, please God, the error would also be ended soon![36]

When Augustine spoke these words, a complete reversal had taken place at Rome. Pope Zosimus (417–18), successor of Innocent I, who had died in March 417, received still another letter addressed to Innocent by Pelagius with an appended creed; both were supposed to justify his previous conduct and teaching. Slightly later came a letter from the new Bishop of Jerusalem, Praylos, who very warmly took Pelagius's part.[37] Soon after the death of Innocent I, Caelestius appeared in Rome and presented the new Pope with a *Libellus* containing a presentation of his doctrine; he demanded a review of the African judgment issued against him. In two letters to the African episcopate Zosimus reported on the events in Rome and the decisions reached by him:[38] Caelestius should be regarded as rehabilitated if his earlier accusers could not demonstrate within two months in his presence that his confession was dissimulated. Letter and creed of Pelagius, the Pope said, had completely justified him in the eyes of the Roman clergy; it was incredible that a man of such genuine faith could be so calumniated. In Africa persons had acted imprudently and precipitately in the Pelagian question. Despite other attempts at interpretation,[39] it is very difficult in the case of Zosimus not to admit an all too great gullibility vis-à-vis the constantly held protestations of Caelestius and Pelagius. In Africa people thereafter remained convinced of the danger of the Pelagian doctrine and probably sought also to gain the court of Ravenna for this view. Caelestius contributed his own efforts to it. Restless as ever and all too certain of his victory, he provoked new discussions in Rome, which led to disturbances in the city. Thereupon the Emperor Honorius on 30 April 418 published an edict which banished Caelestius and Pelagius from Rome and forbade the further spread of their teachings. In addition, the Prefect of the City decreed that no one might provide shelter for the fugitive Caelestius.[40] At the same time a synod at Carthage renewed the verdicts previously issued against the Pelagians and rejected their chief errors in eight canons.[41] Finally, Pope Zosimus, who had already dissociated himself from Caelestius, expressed in an encyclical, the so-called *Epistula tractoria,* with the unambiguous approval of the attitude maintained in Africa, the definitive condemnation, which was to be signed by all bishops, and published in the entire Empire as an imperial Edict.[42] Pelagius, soon driven from Palestine also and again condemned by a Synod of Antioch, perhaps ended his days in an Egyptian monastery, whereas Caelestius, now here, now there, preached further resistance or demanded his readmittance to the ecclesiastical community.[43]

---

[33] *Epp.* 175 and 176 among Augustine's letters.

[34] Augustine, *Ep.* 177.

[35] The three letters of Innocent I in Augustine, *Epp.* 181–183.

[36] *Sermo* 131, 10: "iam enim de hac causa duo concilia missa sunt ad sedem apostolicam, inde etiam rescripta venerunt. Causa finita est; utinam aliquando finiatur error." See K. Adam, "Causa finita est," *Festgabe A. Ehrhard* (Düsseldorf 1922), 1–23.

---

[37] The creed, *PL* 45, 1716–1718. Fragments of Praylos's letter in Augustine, *De grat. Christi et de pecc. orig.* II, 19–22.

[38] In the *Coll. Avell.* no. 45, 46 (=*CSEL* 35, 99–108).

[39] For example, F. Floëri, "Le pape Zosime et la doctrine augustinenne du péché originel," *Augustinus Magister* II (Paris 1954), 755–761; hesitations, on the other hand, in G. de Plinval, ibid. III, 262.

[40] On the disturbances at Rome: Prosper, *Chron. ad. a. 418;* edict of Honorius, *PL* 48, 379–386; decree of the Prefect of the City Volusianus, ibid. 408f.

[41] D nos. 101–108 (1 May 418).

[42] Letter of Zosimus to the African bishops of March 418, *Coll. Avell.,* no. 50; Fragments of the *Tractoria* in Augustine, *Ep.* 190, 23, Prosper; *Sed. apost. auctor.* 7, M. Mercator, *ACO* I, 5, 66–68.

Julian of Aeclanum

A group of eighteen Italian bishops who declined to sign the *Tractoria* of Pope Zosimus[44] included the young Bishop Julian of Aeclanum in Apulia, who now quickly became the spiritual head of the Pelagians. Son of Bishop Memor, [45] a member of the circle of friends of Paulinus of Nola, and married to the daughter of the Bishop Aemilius of Benevento, Julian was a representative of the South Italian landed aristocracy, which, after the acceptance of Christianity, looked upon the episcopal office as worth seeking for its sons, retained certain externals of the life and society of this class, and continued to esteem pagan literature. For the gifted son the father arranged a good education, which included a knowledge of the Greek language as well as the study of Greek philosophy, in which Stoic doctrines and Aristotelian logic especially appealed to him.[46] Quite early Julian let himself be converted to the Pelagian ideas, even though he substantially modified their ascetical harshness. His idea of Adam's life in Paradise is determined equally by the lifestyle of his circle and by Virgil's *Georgics,* which he loved to quote.[47] His wit, his ease at sarcastic formulation, and his quickness of repartee in discussion had made him an esteemed figure in the South Italian upper class; they predestined him after the disappearance of the current leaders of the Pelagian movement to become the literary champion of their ideals. But to defend these meant not only to clash with Augustine but to make the latter's theology ineffective. Julian set up means and methods for this goal; they often left a painful impression, but here the contrast of the generations may have played its role. The young Julian sought irreverently to depreciate the achievement of the elders, while aiming to expose them to ridicule. He characterized Jerome's exegetical work summarily as childish and lacking in all originality; only with effort can one suppress laughter over it.[48] His invectives against Augustine knew no limits, either of justice or of nobility. Like the Donatists, he did not refrain from pointing with raised finger to Augustine's earlier manner of life, to represent him as an unconverted Manichaean, to point out his origin from a questionable family, to call his following a mob, and, accordingly, to brand him as *patronus asinorum.*[49] For his struggle against him, he even made claim to Roman national emotions, when he wanted it to be regarded as a new Punic War against a dangerous group of Africans, which aimed to force strange dogmas on the Church of Italy; it is a question of freeing this Church from assault on the part of African bandits.[50] Could a decent Italian subscribe to a theology which came from so doubtful a milieu?

---

[43] Synod of Antioch, Mansi, IV, 296; reference to Egypt: Isidor, Pel., *Ep.* 314, and Euseb., *Ep. ad Cyrill. Alex., CSEL* 35, 114. Celestius: Prosper, *C. collat.* 21, 2.

[44] Some bishops of Gaul also sympathized with Pelagianism, and it had followers in Britain and the Balkans: decree of Emperor Valentinian III of July 425 (*PL* 48, 409); Prosper, *Chron. ad a. 429, PL* 54, 594 and 707.

[45] Augustine, *Ep.* 101, was directed to him; he had asked for Augustine's *De musica* for his son Julian, then a deacon.

[46] Gennadius, *De vir. ill.* 45; on Julian's philosophical formation see F. R. Refoulé, op. cit., with the qualifications of F. J. Thonnard, *RevÉAug* 11 (1965), 296–304.

[47] Cf., for example, Augustine, *Opus imperf. c. Jul.* 3, 129; 4, 38; 5, 11.

[48] Reference of G. Morin, *RBén* 30 (1916), 4.

Augustine was deeply affected by the vehemence of these personal attacks and made a sharp polemical reaction such as appears in none of his works against other opponents; in this there apparently played a role of personal disappointment over the development of a man who had had his sympathy for a long time because of the relations of friendship with his father.[51] If his remark that Julian was the architect who first put the ideas of Pelagius into a system was surely meant to be ironical, so also the long-drawn-out effort to refute this "young man" proves that he regarded his work as noteworthy, at least as dangerous.[52] That Augustine admitted the sharpest calumnies by Julian word for word into his rejoinders intimates that he saw in their mere publication a judgment on their author.

After the issuance of the *Tractoria,* Julian at once protested that here a signing by the bishops was extorted, where as a council was needed to discuss the question.[53] In a sort of manifesto the Pelagian opposition group developed its program: it would defend the freedom of the will as well as the essential goodness of human nature, which is free from any inherited strain; it would oppose the theses of the other side about a *peccatum naturae* as an attack on the sanctity of marriage, behind which stands ultimately a Manichaean heresy. In another place they formulated their theses in "Five Praises," which they wanted to proclaim: praise of the creature, praise of marriage, praise of the law, praise of free will, and praise of the saints.[54] But at first the Pelagians had no possibility of realizing their program in the West: they suffered removal from office and banishment. Julian went to the East and found refuge with Theodore of Mopsuestia, where he busied himself with his literary works. These were especially his refutation of Augustine's *De nuptiis et concupiscentia,* to which he devoted two voluminous works, the *Libri quattuor ad Turbantium* (c. 419), and the *Libri octo ad Florum* (c. 421–22), which for their part are contained to a great extent in Augustine's *Opus imperfectum contra Julianum.*[55] The essential issue of their confrontation is the question of *peccatum originale* and of the intimately related concupiscence. Augustine had proceeded from all men's need of redemption as this was expressed in Scripture. And since infants are not excepted from this need of redemption, despite their personal sinlessness,[56] the explanation for this can be found only in the fact of an original sin, the sin of Adam, which was transmitted by him, as representative of the human race, to all his descendents. Augustine finds the fact of this original sin and its consequences for all mankind stated everywhere in Scripture, especially in Romans 5:12, which he explained according to the Latin text. He understands the nature of Adam's sin as the alienation of the soul from God to the visible world, as *amor sui,* which most powerfully manifests itself in *concupiscentia,* which in turn becomes most clearly tangible in sexual desire. The fact that since Adam the human race has been a *massa peccati* in need of redemption discloses to him further a glance at the concrete situation of mankind with its need, its distressing misery, even that of innocent children—a picture which the optimistic anthropology of Julian of Aeclanum treated with downright disdain. For his part he severely criticized Augustine's doctrine of original guilt and concupiscence in fiery words as Manichaeanism, without recognizing that Augustine's understanding of sin could in no sense be reconciled with the Manichaeans' material idea of sin and that it was exactly the Manichaean dualism as a whole that was for Augustine the decisive ground for abandoning the sect, even though he may unconsciously have retained from it individual but not especially striking modes of thought.[57] In comparison to the naturalist and rationalist grasp of human nature and its possibilities, Augustine's theological anthropology is of incomparable religious depth, though also at times of a gloomy seriousness, especially in individual formulations. But this pessimistic basic trait never turns in him into a despairing fatalism, because the Christian Augustine was totally penetrated by a living faith in Christ's redemptive act, as it was expressed in prayer and the sacramental life of the Church, and to it he remained most intimately bound; Augustine the pastor, so filled with hope, proclaimed it, year in and year out, in his sermons to his congregation of Hippo.

---

[49] Individual examples in G. de Plinval, *Pélage,* 355–360; *patronus asinorum:* Augustine, *Opus imperf.* 4, 46.

[50] Ibid. 1, 42; 1, 72; 3, 16; 6, 18; *Contra duas ep. Pel.,* 3, 31.

[51] *Contra Jul.* 1, 4, 12; *Opus imperf.* 4, 50: *in disputatione loquacissimus, in contentione calumniosissimus, in professione fallacissimus.*

[52] *Contra Jul.* 6, 36; *Opus imperf.* 3, 169. On Julian's exegetical works see, besides G. Bouwman (Literature), G. de Plinval, "Julian d'Eclane devant la Bible," *RSR* 47 (1959), 345–366.

[53] Augustine, *Contra duas ep. Pel.* 2, 5; 4, 34; *ACO* I, 2, 100.

---

[54] The so-called Manifesto of Aquileia, *PL* 48, 509–526; the five *laudes: Contra duas ep. Pel.* 4, 1.

[55] The quotations from them are brought together by A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum* (Leipzig 1897); id., *Die vier Bücher Julians von Eclanum an Turbantius* (Berlin 1910).

[56] *Sermo* 293, 11.

[57] Cf. A. Adam, "Das Fortwirken des Manichäismus bei Augustin," *ZKG,* 69 (1958), 1–25; see the restrictions of W. Geerlings, *ZKTh* 93 (1971), 45–60.

The collapse of the Pelagian movement between 420 and 430 was obvious. In the West the court of Ravenna persisted in its rejection, despite the protests of those affected. A group of deposed bishops, among them Turbantius, finally signed the *Epistula Tractoria.*[58] In 429–430 Caelestius and Julian tried to get from the Emperor Theodosius II and the Patriarch Nestorius a new investigation of their case and reception back into the Church, but they foundered on the opposition of Pope Celestine.[59] For him the question of Pelagianism had already been so unambiguously decided by his predecessors Innocent and Zosimus that he saw no reason to have it again treated at the Council of Ephesus. Hence apparently there the Roman acts on the condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius were only read aloud, and the Council accepted them without further discussion.[60] Julian thereafter led an unending wandering life; in 439 he exerted himself to no avail with Pope Sixtus III (432–440) for restoration to his former see of Aeclanum; he was again condemned under Pope Leo I (440–461) and died in Sicily c. 450.[61] From now on Pelagian ideas persisted below the surface in various places.[62]

Theological Augustinianism to the Mid-Fifth Century

In the last years of his life Augustine's doctrine of grace, which in its substantive form had long been fixed, obtained its final formation and at the same time its crudest formulation in his statements on predestination and God's salvific will. The occasion for renewed preoccupation with certain aspects of his teaching on grace was supplied by a letter from Augustine to the Roman priest Sixtus,[63] the future Pope, in which he had sketched his idea of the total dependence of all justification on grace. Years later this letter caused a lively discussion in the monastery of Hadrumetum in the diocese of Uzala, since some monks were of the opinion that Augustine's doctrine of grace, not owed to us and not merited by us, took away free will and contradicted the doctrine of the Church that the good works of a person receive their reward on the day of the Last Judgment.[64] The new position on this problem, requested of Augustine, was at hand in his *De gratia et libero arbitrio,* whose essence was the proof of the absolute necessity of grace and in which it was immediately explained in what sense the free will still endures under the operation of this grace. Since a monk of the monastery deduced from this work that no one, then, is to be corrected who does not carry out the commandments of God, but one could only pray that he would fulfill them, Augustine in a second work, *De correptione et gratia,* directed the monks of Hadrumetum to the essential problem of the grace of perseverance: it causes with certainty the salvation of the one who receives it, but one to whom it is denied remains liable to a relapse. However, since it is at the same time an impenetrable secret, whoever belongs to the children of promise, every Christian, can and should be reprimanded and admonished to keep the commandments.

---

[58] Possidius, *Vita s. Aug.* 18; Augustine, *Opus imperf.* 1, 1.

[59] In two letters (*ACO* I, 2, 12–15), Nestorius asks Pope Celestine for clarification of the matter.

[60] See J. Speigl, "Der Pelagianismus auf dem Konzil von Ephesus," *AHC* 1 (1969), 1–14; on the question of an eventual favoring of Pelagianism by Nestorius see, among others, M. T. Disdier, "Le pélagianisme au concile d'Éphèse," *EO* 34 (1931), 314–333.

[61] Prosper, *Chron. ad a. 439;* Quodvultdeus, *Dimidium temporis* 12, 3. Condemnation of the Pelagians by Leo I, *Epp.* 2 and 18.

[62] Pope Gelasius (492–96) to the Bishops of Picenum: *CSEL* 35, 357–368; Britain: Constantius, *Vita Germani* 4, 25; cf. also M. Abel, "Le Praedestinatus et le Pélagianisme," *RThAM* 35 (1968) 5–25).

This very work brought about Augustine's final expression on the problem of grace. Letters of his adherents Prosper and Hilary from Gaul,[65] both laymen, reported to him that in the local clergy and especially among the monks of Marseille opposition had developed to his doctrine of the separation of human beings into the chosen and the rejected at the creation, a doctrine which was contrary to the Church's tradition, in its consequences deprived every personal exertion for virtue and penance of its meaning, and placed the proclamation in sermon and catechesis in the presence of enormous difficulties. Moreover, these circles referred to the fact that Augustine was now proposing a new idea, since he earlier taught that election was based on God's foreknowledge, that man could of himself come to faith, and that an eternal punishment for infants dying without baptism was uncertain. Hence they held that a correction of his most recently proposed doctrine was necessary in the sense that the beginning of faith and perseverance in grace are attributed to the natural will of man, that predestination depends on the foreknowledge of God, and hence the number of the elect cannot be irrevocably determined. The determination of the calling must be so understood that God calls all men to the sacrament of rebirth, but that he intends to accept only the baptized into his kingdom.[66]

---

[63] *Ep.* 194 (end of 418 or beginning of 419).

[64] The details must be taken from Augustine's *Letters* 214 and 215 and the letter of Abbot Valentine of Hadrumetum to Augustine.

[65] In Augustine, *Epp.* 225 and 226.

Although Augustine felt that "he had done enough in this matter," he was at once ready with an answer to the difficulties of the Marseille monks, which he gave in the two treatises *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae;* they constitute a unity and were seen as such by him and by Prosper.[67] The first was concerned chiefly with the problem of the beginning of faith, while the second placed predestination in the center. Free of any polemic against those who thought otherwise, but still very decisive in expression, Augustine here too insisted that grace is only grace when it is not bound to any ever so slight human preachievement; hence it is also necessary for the *initium fidei,* for the initial turning of man to faith, and then, as the grace of perseverance, leads to the perfection of sanctification. Far from taking away the free will of man, grace first gives him that quality by which he freely chooses and does the good. This radical lack of a need to merit grace and its universal effectiveness is, however, seen by Augustine exclusively against the background of a divine compassion for lost humanity, which, of course, can be understood, in connection with Romans 8:29f., only as predestining election for salvation. That this predestination embraces only a small number of souls, fixed from the start, was brought home to Augustine through the experience that only a minority live a real Christianity, but it seemed to him strictly demanded by Matthew 22:14: *multi enim sunt vocati, pauci vero electi.* Why the predestining call of grace goes out to these and not to other souls remains wrapped in the *mysterium* of the divine decree. Perdition strikes the rejected not through a positive act of predestination to sin, but as a consequence of their nonelection. God's righteousness is revealed in their fate, since they have no legal claim to his mercy. Since no Christian has any certainty whatever of his election, everyone can and should hope, pray, and love in humility.

This so consistently operating system confronted Augustine inexorably with the universal salvific will of God, clearly proclaimed by Scripture—1 Timothy 2:4—but he did not succeed in solving this basic opposition despite his various attempts at exegesis. Furthermore, he was unable convincingly to justify his thesis—and thereby he exposed another weakness of his doctrine of predestination—that the small and fixed number of the elect was conditioned by the total number of the angels, which, after the fall of the angels, had to be filled up again by those predestined to salvation.

---

[66] It is not to be excluded that Prosper and Hilary in their letters had already presented their own deductions from the doctrine of the Semipelagians, who had not as yet drawn them; cf. K. Rahner, "Augustin und der Semipelagianismus," *ZKTh* 62 (1938), 171–196.

[67] Prosper quotes them as the two books *De praedestinatione sanctorum: Pro Augustino responsiones, PL* 51, 187.

Extreme Augustinianism, as expressed in his late writings, had its opponents, who came closer together after Augustine's death. John Cassian and Vincent of Lérins[68] turned definitely against his doctrine and now for their part represented ideas which overstressed the accomplishments of the human will in the first turning to grace. They thereby again called forth a defense of the Augustinian doctrine of grace, of which Prosper of Aquitaine, already mentioned, especially made himself the leading spokesman.[69] It was his aim, on the one hand to explain Augustine's theology of grace through extracts from his pertinent works—*Liber sententiarum ex operibus s. Augustini* or *Liber epigrammatum ex sententiis s. Augustini*—and on the other hand to demonstrate the weaknesses of the "Semipelagian" teaching of Cassian and Vincent of Lérins on grace—*Liber contra collatorem* and *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum.* In the question whether Prosper himself, in the course of the debates, separated himself from strict Augustinianism, opinion remains divided,[70] especially since the question is mixed with that of the author of the work *De vocatione omnium gentium.*[71] Those who ascribe it to Prosper—and the stronger reasons favor this—will have to say that, with all his defense in principle of Augustine's basic position, he has attempted to achieve a reconciliation of the opposing standpoints, while he avoided not only certain terms of Augustine, such as that of *praedestinatio,* but consciously pushed Augustine's milder formulations on the relations of grace and free will and God's salvific will into the foreground; in his works these are found alongside quite crude statements and at times lent to his teaching on grace a dialectical character. Soon after Augustine's death, Prosper had personally intervened in his favor with Pope Celestine and sought to obtain a condemnation of his opponents: the Pope was indeed prepared for a summary praise of Augustine but refrained from any determination of individual questions of the Augustine doctrine of grace.[72] There was never any ecclesiastical approbation of strict Augustinianism, but it still had enormous long-range effects, since it ever more tempted individuals to follow the "doctor of grace" to those heights in whose thinner air only a few could breathe without anxiety.

---

[68] John Cassian in his *Conference* 13, *CSEL* 13, 361–396; the *Obiectiones* of Vincent of Lérins, attacked by Prosper, are not extant. On the anti-Augustinian tendency of his *Commonitorium* see E. Griffe, *BLE* 62 (1961), 81–104, and W. O'Connor, *Doctor communis* 16 (1963), 123–157.

[69] Prosper's works: *PL* 51; a commentary with English translation of the works written in defense of Augustine: *ACW* 32 (London 1963) by P. de Letter.

[70] Literature on this question in R. Lorenz, "Der Augustinismus Prospers von Aquitanien," *ZKG* 73 (1962), 217–252, 217, footnote 1.

[71] *PL* 51, 647–722: good commentary by P. de Letter, *ACW* 14 (London 1952).

[72] Celestine I, *Ep.* 21, *ad episc. Gall.* (*PL* 50, 528–530).

PART THREE

Inner Life of the Church between Nicaea and Chalcedon

CHAPTER 13

Missionary Activity of the Church

The religious and political turning point of the years 311–324 meant also for the Church's missionary task hitherto unknown possibilities. It is true that the number of Christians, especially in the far more urbanized eastern part of the Empire and in Roman North Africa increased considerably in the third century, but still, in comparison with the totality of the Empire's population, they represented a minority, noteworthy though it was. The now favorable point of departure for gaining the pagan majority, however, concealed certain dangers in an appraisal of the credibility of the Christian confession. One was that of conversions because of opportunism, which appeared almost automatically with the acceptance and encouragement of Christianity by the Emperors and could not but encumber the Church with many a purely external Christian. Another, more pernicious in its possible consequences, was the temptation in evangelizing to employ, with the toleration or even the aid of the State, means and methods that aspired to effect the conversion to Christianity by pressure and force rather than conviction. It will be shown that the Christian mission of this period did not always escape such a danger. Nevertheless, the outcome of the Church's missionary exertions lasting for more than a century was clear: around the middle of the fifth century the people of the Roman Empire professed and felt themselves to be Christians, except for a few pagan remnants, the closed group of the Jews, and some German tribes. Unfortunately no contemporary wrote down the course and character of this process of christianization in a special treatise: hence it can be put together only out of many individual reports and remains and always only incompletely.

1. Christianization of the Population of the Empire*

The mission of the Egyptian Church[1] was c. 325 in an especially favorable starting-place, since, with its approximately ninety episcopal sees at that time, it had already found its definitive organizational basis, from which the christianization of peasants, still mostly pagan, could be undertaken.[2] In Athanasius it already had the supreme head of a territorial church, and he, aware of his goal, guided the evangelization from his center at Alexandria. In a letter to the Monk-Bishop Dracontius of Hermopolis Parva (c. 354–55) he designated the evangelization of pagans as the eminently episcopal duty and expected that the erecting of this see would bring with it a larger number of conversions, especially since pagans themselves had held out the prospect of their conversion if a bishop was given to them.[3] He firmly urged the christianization of southern Egypt and kept himself personally informed on the spot; perhaps he founded the see of Syene in such a "visitation journey." Certainly the still young congregation on the Nile island of Philai owed its first bishop to his initiative. When the army inspector for Upper Egypt, the Christian Macedonius, reported that the Christians in this pagan pilgrimage center, with its celebrated temple of Isis, had not even a church and were attended to only sporadically by clergy from Syene, Athanasius appointed this very officer as Bishop of Philai: he worked there long and successfully and was even able to win for the Christian faith Mark, the son of the pagan high priest.[4] The success of his missionary efforts motivated the still pagan circles of Alexandria, which from 360 to 390 had as their spiritual head the Neoplatonist Antoninus and participated actively in the worship of Sarapis and of Isis in Menuthis, to the resolute defense of their faith. In 391 occurred a bloody clash between Christians and pagans of Alexandria, in which the authoritarian Bishop Theophilus was not guiltless, in connection with a ridiculing procession which Christians arranged with pagan cult objects. The Emperor then had the great temple of Sarapis closed and transferred to the Christians, who remodeled it into a Christian church; the same fate later befell the temple of Isis at Menuthis.[5] The most shocking incident in the confrontation between pagans and Christians in Egypt was the death of the pagan philosopher Hypatia in 415: after severe maltreatment, she was cruelly murdered by a fanatical mob under the leadership of a lector.[6] Beside the bishop there appeared also the monk as missionary in Egypt; he devoted himself especially to the conversion of pagan priests, since this usually implied further conversions. A distasteful example of monastic missionary zeal is offered in the first half of the fifth century by the powerful Abbot Schenute, superior of the White Monastery of Atripe at Akhmîm (Sohag) in Upper Egypt. Against the still relatively strong pagan minority he instigated the Christians by inflammatory words, took part personally with groups of his monks in the destruction of their temples and the plundering of their villages, and thereby very seriously compromised the Christian mission.[7] Casual missionaries were the two priests Protogenes and Eulogius of Edessa, who had been banished under the Emperor Valens because of their fidelity to Nicaea to the Upper Egyptian village of Antinoë, where they at once gathered around them the children of the still overwhelmingly pagan inhabitants, taught them to read and write in a sort of anticipated mission-school, and after some time baptized them.[8]

---

* References will be made in the proper place to the mission beyond the imperial frontier.

[1] H. Leclercq, "Égypte," *DACL* IV, 2430–71; E. Hardy, *Christian Egypt* (New York 1952); H. Idris Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Greco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool 1954).

---

[2] The number of about 100 bishops from the year 319 remains consistent, e.g., in Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 50, who gives the names of ninety-one bishops.

[3] *Ep. ad Dracontium* 1 and 7 (*PG* 25, 523–534).

[4] On Syene, G. Bardy, *DHGE* IV, 1319. On Philai, see the *Vita* of the monk Apa Aaron, ed. E. W. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts* (London 1915), *CXLIV–CLVI* and 432–525 respectively. A Bishop Mark of Philai took part in the Synod of 362 at Alexandria: *PG* 26, 808. Cf. P. Nautin, "La conversion du temple de Philae en église chrétienne," *CahArch* 17 (1967), 1–43.

[5] R. Herzog, "Der Kamf um den Kult der Menuthis," = "Pisciculi," *Festschr. F. J. Dölger* (Münster 1932), 117–124; P. Rémondon, "L'Égypte et la suprême résistance au christianisme," *BullInstFrArchOr* 51 (1952), 116–128. On the end of the Sarapeum see J. Schwartz, *AmerStudPapyrol* 1 (1966), 97–111.

For the external success of the missionary work of the Egyptian Church the assertions relating to the city of Oxyrrhynchus may be taken as typical. Circa 300, there were here, besides a synagogue and a dozen pagan temples, two Christian churches; a century later it shows twelve Christian churches, whose number increased still more into the sixth century.[9] Soon after 400 A.D., only a minority professed paganism, and after fifty more years the christianization of the country was completed. However, many of the new Christians broke only with difficulty from the influences of their former religion. As late as 420 Bishop Cyril in his Easter letters repeatedly had to speak against superstitious practices. Especially among the peasants magic and sorcery held on tenaciously, and many a specifically Egyptian cult, such as the veneration of the Nile, could be overcome only in a painful process of "christianization."[10]

Athanasius's missionary interest extended beyond the frontiers of Egypt, since c. 350 he ordained Frumentius, a native of Tyre, for an area which has been universally identified with Ethiopia and its contemporary capital, Axum.[11] The brothers Frumentius and Aedesius, on their return from a journey to India, had gone to land in a port on the African coast of the Red Sea and from there were taken to the court of Axum, where they soon obtained positions of trust. Later, on his return journey to his Syrian homeland, Frumentius pointed out to Athanasius at Alexandria the possibilities of a Christian mission in the Kingdom of Axum, whereupon Athanasius ordained him a bishop and sent him back to Ethiopia. Athanasius confirmed this procedure himself in his *Apologia* to Constantius II, in which he reproduced a letter of the Emperor to the Ethiopian King Ezana, in which Constantius demanded the expulsion of Frumentius to Egypt so that the Arian Bishop George of Alexandria could examine the legality of his ordination and his faith. The activity of Frumentius found expression also in Ethiopian tradition, which gave him the name of Abba Salama (Father of Peace) and commemorates him in the liturgy on 26 Hamlé (20 July). In addition, it is reported by the Byzantine historians Theodoret, Socrates, and Theophanes; only the Arian Philostorgius attributes the first mission among the Ethiopians to his fellow Arian Theophilus, who had earlier worked in Yemen at the command of the Emperor Constantius II.[12] The prevailing interpretation of the sources shows that preference should be given to it rather than to the one recently proposed, according to which Frumentius was ordained by Athanasius as Bishop for Hither India and was never in Axum, and that Christianity came to Ethiopia only in the second third of the fifth century in its Monophysite form.[13] It can never satisfactorily explain either the letter of the Emperor Constantius to the then ruler of Axum or especially the Ethiopian tradition regarding Frumentius.

---

[6] Socrates, *HE* 7, 15: see K. Prächter, *Pauly-Wissowa* IX, 1, 242–249.

[7] *Apophthegm. Patrum,* no. 492 (Abbot Macarius); no. 1087 lat.: J. Leipoldt, "Schenute von Atripe" (*TU* 25, 1, Leipzig 1903), 175–182.

[8] Theodoret, *HE* 4, 18, 7–12.

[9] H. Rink, *Strassen und Viertelsnamen in Oxyrrhynchos* (Giessen 1924), 44ff.

[10] E. Drioton, "Cyrille et l'ancienne religion égyptienne," *Kyrilliana* (Cairo 1944), 231–246; R. Rémondon, "Un papyrus magique copte," *BullInstFrArchOr* 52 (1953), 157–161; A. Hermann, "Der Nil und die Christen," *JbAC* 2 (1959), 30–69.

[11] G. Lanczkowski, *JbAC* 1 (1958), 143–145; E. Hammerschmidt, "Die Anfänge des Christentums in Äthiopien," *ZMR* 38 (1954), 281–294; A. Dihle, *JbAC* 6 (1963), 67–69.

Important stimuli for the Christian mission in Palestine[14] went out from Constantine, who through his initiative for the erecting and adorning of Christian churches on the sites of Judaeo-Christian history, with their wealth of tradition, pushed the land of origin of Christianity powerfully into the consciousness of contemporary Christianity. Jerusalem especially, with its immediate neighborhood, obtained in the course of the fourth century—after a brief interruption due to the reaction under the Emperor Julian—even in externals the character of a fully Christian city, with the steadily growing number of its churches, monasteries, oratories, and hospices, which attracted ever larger crowds of pilgrims, some of whom settled for long periods in Palestine and contributed greatly to the strengthening of the native Christianity. Even in

---

[12] Thus Rufinus, *HE* 10, 9, who refers to the oral report of Aedesius; Athanasius, *Apol. ad Constant.* 29–31; Theodoret, *HE* 1, 23; Socrates, *HE* 1, 19; Theophanes, *Chron.* 5, 13; Philostorgius, *HE* 3, 6.

[13] Thus F. Altheim–R. Stiehl, *Christentum am Roten Meer* I (Berlin 1971), 393–483.

[14] H. Leclercq, "Palestine," *DACL* XIII, 755–767; F. M. Abel, *Histoire de Palestine* II (Paris 1952).

Caesarea, the seat of the civil administration, there existed relatively early a rather strong gentile Christian community, and in the port city of Maiuma the majority were Christian under Constantine.[15] But in the countryside Christianity had as yet only a few adherents, since Judaism to a great extent refused to have anything to do with the Christian mission. The eighteen congregations of Palestine represented at Nicaea constituted only a minority of the total population of these sees.[16] Bishop Asclepas, who had to care for the Christians of Gaza and its vicinity, could have a residence in the city only as a result of Constantine's intervention, and toward the end of the fourth century the number of Christians here and in the coastal towns of Anthedon and Raphia were still insignificant.[17] In Tiberias, Capharnaum, Nazareth, and Diocaesarea a Christian of Jewish birth, Joseph, had Christian churches built because here there were only a few Christians. The powerful anti-Christian wave under the Emperor Julian revealed in the Palestinian provinces the stubborn resistance of Jews and pagans which the mission here encountered.[18] In the territory of ancient Edom, Aila (Aqaba), on the north shore of the gulf of that name, was mentioned as the first episcopal see at the time of Nicaea, and at the same time there was an episcopal congregation in the old Nabataean city of Petra. Two more episcopal sees on the south shore of the Dead Sea are known through the list of participants in the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and at Chalcedon there was present also a bishop from the island of Jotabe (Tirana) in the Gulf of Aqaba. To the Patriarchate of Jerusalem belonged two communities in the territory of Moab, Areopolis, whose Bishop Anastasius was at Ephesus in 449, and Characucoba, which is attested by the mosaic map of Madaba.[19] Also in Palestine monks appeared as missionaries, such as Hilarion, who was active in the vicinity of Gaza and in the Negev, and Euthymius, to whom the see of Parembolai owes its origin and for which Juvenal of Jerusalem, at his request, c. 425 ordained as bishop a sheik of a Saracen tribe.[20] The Christian mission in the three Palestinian provinces probably did not achieve its strongest impact until the fifth century. The lists of participants in the two Synods of Jerusalem of 518 and 536 name some fifty bishops for them, who were spread out preponderantly in places with the rank of cities.[21]

---

[15] F. M. Abel, "Jérusalem," *DACL* VII, 2311–2334; Jerome, *Ep.* 46, 11; Cl. Kopp, "Pèlerinages aux lieux saints," *DB,* Suppl. 7, 589–605; A. Negev, "Césarée maritime," *Bible et Terre Sainte* 41 (1961), 6–15; Maiuma: Sozomen, *HE* 2, 5, 7–8; 5, 3, 6–7.

[16] E. Honigmann, "La liste originale des Pères de Nicée," *Byz* 14 (1939), 17–76.

[17] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 4, 38; Mark the Deacon, *Vita Porphyrii* 19; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 8, 7.

[18] Eusebius, *Onomast.* 26, 108; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 73, 26; *Panar.* 1, 30, 4–12; reaction under Julian: Sozomen, *HE* 7, 15, 11; Julianus Imperator, *Epp.* 53, 56, 91; see J. Vogt, *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum* (Leipzig 1939).

[19] F. M. Abel, *Histoire de Palestine* II, 345–349; N. Edelby, *PrOrChr,* 6 (1956), 110. Mosaic of Madaba: *DB,* Suppl. 5, 627–704.

[20] Sozomen, *HE* 15, 15; Jerome, *Vita Hil.* 25; Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita s. Euthymii* 15; 27.

In the Roman province of Arabia, with its eastern frontier never determined and in the south too often shifting, a greater missionary activity was inaugurated when Constantine assumed sole rule. It proceeded from the provincial capital, Bostra, which was the seat of a bishop as early as the third century. The Metropolitan of the city was the object of a severe attack by the Emperor Julian, who called upon the population to expel him.[22] Between Nicaea and Chalcedon the number of bishoprics here rose from five to eighteen, two of which, Madaba and Gerasa, testify by the completeness and quality of the extant Christian monuments that in the fifth and sixth centuries Christianity must have been the predominant religion of their inhabitants.[23] Again monks shared in the mission work. The tribal Princess Mawia asked for the hermit Moses as bishop, and the conversion of the Saracen Sheik Zocomos likewise went back to the influence of a monk.[24]

Christian missionary activity in non-Roman South Arabia got under way through the Emperor Constantius II, when he, probably also out of political considerations, sent an embassy under the leadership of the Arian Theophilus "the Indian," from the island of Socotra, to the Himyarites (Neğran). Despite the competition from Judaism, it had a certain success, since the tribal Prince allowed the building of three churches, for which he even placed the means at the disposal of the Christians; one arose in the capital, Zafar, the second in the port city of Aden, the temporary quarters of the Roman merchant fleet, and the third on the Persian Gulf.[25] Monophysite missionaries from Egypt and Nestorians from the North also strove in the fifth century to gain the Himyarites, for whom a bishop is demonstrable in Neğran c. 500. But the Christian church in Neğran was destroyed in an attack by the Jewish

---

[21] A. Alt, "Die Bistümer der alten Kirche Palästinas," *PJ* 29 (1933), 67–88; R. Devreesse, "Les anciens évêchés de Palestine," *Mémorial Lagrange* (Paris 1940), 217–227; on Eleutherepolis see E. Bagatti, *Stud. bibl. Francisc. lib. ann.* 22 (1972), 109–129.

[22] R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche* (Paris 1945), 208–240; N. Edelby, "La Transjordanie chrétienne des origines aux croisades," *PrOrChr* 6 (1956), 97–117, with map; M. Höfner, "Arabien," *RAC* I, 579–585. On Bostra, Julianus Imperator, *Ep.* 114.

[23] *ACO* II, I, 350; A. Alt, "Bischofskirche und Mönchskirche im nördlichen Ostjordanland," *PJ* 33 (1937), 89–111. On Madaba, B. Bagatti, *RivAC* 33 (1957), 139–160; C. H. Kraeling, *Gerasa* (New Haven 1938); S. Saller–B. Bagatti, *The Town of Nebo* (Jerusalem 1949).

[24] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 38, 1–9, 14–16; A. Alt, *PJ* 34 (1938), 93–104.

[25] Philostorgius, *HE* 3, 4–5.

Sabaean King Masruq in 523, and some Christians met death, including Arethas, later venerated as a martyr. Thereafter the South Arabian Christians remained a weak minority, which, after the appearance of Muhammad, partly migrated to Kufra on the Euphrates.[26]

The Christian community of the Syrian capital, Antioch, recovered rapidly from the reverses of the persecutions of Diocletian and Licinius, especially since it was able to enjoy the emphatic benevolence of Constantine.[27] Up to the reign of the Emperor Julian, probably the majority of the city's population belonged to it, since the Christians could even dare public counter-demonstrations against the Emperor's measures of repression. Even the literary polemic of Julian and of the *rhetor* Libanius could not stop the progress of the mission, with which the atrophying of the pagan temple service ran parallel. When Chrysostom said c. 390 that in the event that each of the "approximately hundred thousand" Christians would donate a loaf, the misery of the poor of Antioch would be decidedly alleviated, it was thereby declared that at the end of the fourth century the city was regarded as Christian. Theodoret of Cyrrhus confirms this for 415, since he knew at that time of still only an "entirely small remnant of pagans" in the city, to which, however, must be added a considerable Jewish community.[28] Finally, this situation was also reflected in the number of the churches constructed at Antioch in the fourth century: to the church of the Old City, destroyed under Diocletian but soon rebuilt, were added the Constantinian basilica and three memorial churches of the martyrs Babylas, Romanus, and Drosis.[29] Three factors conditioned this favorable missionary development of the Syrian metropolis: the greater power of radiation of the Christian message in comparison with the here especially questionable pagan system of worship; the intensive recruiting of man to man, to which the pastor Chrysostom tirelessly exhorted the congregation;[30] and finally the attraction emanating from monasticism, highly esteemed in Syria, and from leaders of communities, such as Eustathius, Meletius, Flavian, and of preachers and theologians, such as Chrysostom, Diodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus.

---

[26] J. Ryckmans, "Le christianisme en Arabie du Sud préislamique," *L'Oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà* (Rome 1964), 413–453; C. D. G. Müller, *Kirche und Mission unter den Arabern in vorislamischer Zeit* (Tübingen 1967), 11–14; I. Shahid, *The Martyrs of Najrân, New Documents* (Brussels 1971).

[27] On Antioch in addition to R. Devreesse in footnote 22 supra, see Chr. Papadopoulos, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀντιοχείας (Alexandria 1951). Constantine's splendid basilica for Antioch: Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 50.

[28] Theodoret, *HE* 3, 10–12; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 19, 4–20, 7; Ammianus Marcellinus, 22, 13; Libanius, *Or.* 2, 10, 60, 30 (only four temples left undamaged); Chrysostom, *In Matth. hom.* 85, 4; Theodoret, *HE* 5, 35, 5.

[29] W. Eltester, "Die Kirchen Antiochiens im 4. Jh.," *ZNW* 36 (1937), 251–286; J. Lassus, *Antioch on the Orontes* 2 (Princeton 1938), 5–44; G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton 1962).

[30] P. Andres, *Der Missionsgedanke in den Schriften des Joh. Chrysostomus* (Hünfeld 1935), 158–162.

Outside Antioch also the Syrian people accepted Christianity relatively quickly, since as early as the mid-fourth century there were churches in numerous cities and villages of the Syrian and Phoenician provinces, as appears from the reports of the Church historians on the pagan reaction under Julian. At that time, for example, two churches in Damascus were burned, the church at Beirut was destroyed, and the cult of Dionysus was introduced into the Christian churches of Epiphania and Emesa. For the fourth and fifth centuries the existence of a notable ecclesiastical architecture can be shown in the entire Syrian area; moreover, the numerous Christian inscriptions permit the conclusion that at the beginning of the fifth century the majority of the Syrian peasants also professed the Christian religion.[31] An informative piece of evidence for the situation in a single bishopric is provided by the famous letter of Theodoret of Cyrrhus to Pope Leo, whom he tells that his see embraces 800 *paroikiai,* by which can only be understood overwhelmingly rural pastoral districts.[32] This complete evidence is corroborated by the status of the ecclesiastical organization in the territory of the Patriarchate of Antioch at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, which then exhibited some 130 episcopal sees.[33] Once more a special rank belongs to monasticism, above all in the rural sections of the Syrian provinces. The early Stylites had already established their reputation among the people in the service of evangelization. The monks Thalelaus (in the vicinity of Gabala) and Abraam were mentioned as zealous missionaries; the latter gained "a large village" in the Lebanon especially by means of his social solicitude for the faith. He later continued his activity in Osrhoene, where, as Bishop of Karai south of Edessa, he found a still pagan majority.[34] Edessa itself needed in the fourth century only to give to the external picture of the city a Christian character by the erecting of new churches and martyrs' shrines within and without the walls, but the emphasis on the missionary duty of all Christians by Ephrem the Syrian still indicates the continued existence of paganism in the wider neighborhood.[35] Missionaries from Edessa had made Christianity known in the Roman frontier province of Mesopotamia before Constantine, and bishops from the communities of Macedonopolis, Resaina, and perhaps even Amida were among the participants of the Council of Nicaea. The sources for the fourth century provide no more detailed information on the progress of the mission in the sparsely settled rural districts.[36]

---

[31] F. M. Abel, *Histoire de Palestine* II, 280; J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie* (Paris 1947); id., "Syrie" *DACL* XV, 1855–1942; G. Tschalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord* (Paris 1953–58); L. Jalabert–R. Mouterde–J. P. Roquais, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Syrie* I–VII (Paris 1929–1970); see C. Mondésert, *Stpatr* 1 (Berlin 1957), 649–658.

[32] Theodoret, *Ep.* 113.

[33] R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche,* 136–140.

[34] Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 17, 26, 28; *HE* 4, 18, 14; 5, 4, 6; Sozomen, *HE* 6, 1, 1; *It. Eger.* 20, 8; see B. Kötting, "Das Wirken der ersten Styliten Missions- und Erbauungspredigt," *ZMR* 37 (1953), 187–197; O. Hendricks, "L'activité apostolique des premiers moines syriens," *PrOrChr* 8 (1958), 3–25.

Even in the fourth century the Antiochene mission embraced also the Arab nomads in the East Syrian frontier district, since "a Bishop of the Arabs," Timothy, was present at the Synod of Antioch in 363. Chrysostom probably had the same area in mind when in a letter to the priest Constantius he spoke of Phoenicia and "Arabia" as his mission-field. Christian Arab nomads lived here until the days of Islam.[37] The Arab tribes living still farther to the east in the territory of Hira under the Lakhmid Dynasty, however, owed their first acquaintance with Christianity to Christian prisoners who were settled here by the Sassanids. Later, the Nestorians, very eager to engage in evangelization, likewise worked here and asserted their influence even as far as the South Arabian Neğran and achieved remarkable successes among the Arabs on the western coast of the Persian Gulf.[38] East Syrian Christians from the Sassanid Kingdom continued in the fourth to sixth centuries the missions begun earlier in North India and perhaps also took under their care the Christian communities of South India that had been founded from Egypt, as an exact analysis of the Thomas Tradition makes probable.[39] The Nestorian mission achieved its greatest expansion when it pushed into Central Asia, to Tibet, China, and even to Manchuria, and could establish here the provinces "of the Outside."[40]

---

[35] P. Krüger, "Missionsgedanken bei Ephrem dem Syrer," *MRW* 4 (1941), 8–15. If the anonymous *Vita* of Bishop Rabbula (412–436) were reliable, he would have labored zealously as missionary to the pagans and Jews; cf. on the *Vita* P. Peeters, *RSR* 18 (1928), 187–203. On the ecclesiastical building at Edessa, E. Kirsten, *RAC* IV, 578, and *JbAC* 6 (1963), 144–172.

[36] C. Karalevsky, "Amida," *DHGE* II, 1238 f.; E. Honigmann, *Byz(B)* 14 (1939), 46.

[37] Socrates, *HE* 3, 25; Chrysostom, *Ep.* 221; see C. D. G. Müller, op. cit., 6–8.

[38] C. D. G. Müller, op. cit., 9–11.

[39] L. W. Brown, *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas* (Cambridge 1956), 43–91; A. Dihle, "Neues zur Thomas-Tradition," *JbAC* 6 (1963), 54–70.

[40] E. Tisserant, "Nestorienne (L'Église)," *DThC* XI, 157–323; L. Dauvillier, "Les provinces chaldéennes 'de L'Exterieur' au moyen-âge," *Mélanges F. Cavallera* (Toulouse 1948), 261–313; J. M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne* I–III (Beirut 1965–69).

To the fourth century (c. 325–361) belongs also the conversion of the Georgians,[41] on the southern slopes of the central Caucasus; it was begun by a Christian female prisoner, later called Nino; and King Mirian, whom she converted, permitted Greek missionaries, probably from Antioch, to come to his country. At the beginning of the fifth century the Georgian Church had already gained a degree of autonomy, which was completed by the appointment of a *Catholicus* under King Wachtang I (446–499).[42] The fact that the head of the Georgian Church had to be ordained at Antioch into the eighth century may probably indicate an earlier missionary tie.

The relatively high state of christianization achieved at the beginning of the fourth century in the still undivided province of Cilicia—nine bishops and one *chorepiscopus* represented it at Nicaea—probably obtained a new impetus from the destruction of the temple of Asclepius at Aegae by Constantine.[43] At the time of the Council of Chalcedon, in fact, it must have come to an end, for the two provinces into which Cilicia had been divided toward the end of the fourth century now comprised seventeen sees. A similar growth in the number of bishoprics between Nicaea and Chalcedon—from ten to twenty-two—occurred in the provinces of Isauria,[44] likewise oriented toward Antioch; Seleucia, the metropolitan see of Isauria, attracted many pilgrims through the sanctuary of Thecla that stood before its walls. But the inhabitants of the Isaurian mountains, long feared because of their raids, remained inaccessible to the gospel much longer, since as late as the fifth century they attacked Christian monasteries and communities and carried off their bishops into captivity.[45]

The completion of the evangelization of the island of Cyprus[46] may have coincided with the recognition of its ecclesiastical independence in regard to Antioch at the Council of Ephesus of 431. Here too the progress of the mission can be ascertained only externally in the growing number of bishops. At Nicaea the island was represented by three bishops—a larger number of sees is, however, not to be excluded—and at the Synod of Serdica (c. 342) twelve took part, while in his circular to the bishops of the island c. 400 Theophilus of Alexandria mentioned fifteen of those addressed by name, among whom are to be counted some *chorepiscopi*. Around the turn of the fifth century Bishop Tychon of Amathus still had to confront followers of the cults of Aphrodite and Artemis. But a mosaic epigram of the fifth century reflects the final situation: Christ is victor over Apollo.[47]

---

[41] R. Janin, *DThC* VI, 1239ff.; K. Kekelidse, *Die Bekehrung Georgiens zum Christentum* (Leipzig 1928); P. Peeters, *AnBoll* 50 (1932), 5–58; M. Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington 1963); F. Thalamon, "Histoire et structure mythique: la conversion des Ibères," *RH* 247 (1972), 5–28.

[42] M. Tarnisvili, "Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der kirchlichen Autokephalie Georgiens," *Kyrios* 5 (1940–41), 177–193.

[43] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 3, 57; Sozomen, *HE* 2, 5, 5.

[44] The corresponding episcopal lists in Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche,* 126 and 137f.

[45] *Itin. Eger.* 23, 1–6; Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 10. On Thecla's city see E. Herzfeld–S. Guyer, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* II (Manchester 1930), 1–89; for Cilicia and Isauria, ibid. III (1931), *Anatolian Studies* 2 (1952), 85–150, 4 (1954), 49–64.

[46] E. Kirsten, "Cyprus," *RAC* III, 493–498; R. Janin, "Chypre," *DHGE* XII, 791–802; G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus* I (Cambridge 1948, reprinted 1972).

In Asia Minor[48] as a whole the end of the age of persecution made public that the majority of the Greek and Hellenized population of the cities and of the larger rural centers of settlement had already been won for the Christian religion. A wide-meshed net of episcopal congregations covered the provinces at the time of Nicaea, and from the day-to-day life of these communities proceeded the missionary attraction which in the next decades disposed the greater part of those who were still pagans to the acceptance of Christianity. Specifically missionary questions strikingly disappeared in the decrees of Asia Minor synods of the first half of the fourth century.[49] The growing christianization of the peasantry in particular is noticeable in the remarkably large number of *chorepiscopi* in some Asia Minor provinces: for example, in the days of Basil there were some fifty of them for the see of Caesarea.[50] The efforts of the Emperor Julian to restore paganism found only the slightest echo in Asia Minor. All the eagerness of his vicar for Asia, Justus, who had sacrificial altars again constructed at Sardes, sought to rebuild decayed or destroyed temples, and himself offered public sacrifices, remained as much without effect as did his displeasure that in Galatia the wives, children, and domestic servants of many pagan priests were Christians.[51] When, c. 450, an inhabitant of Ephesus put in an inscription that he had replaced the statue of Artemis with a cross, the change that was under way was expressed powerfully in symbol.[52] Naturally, from now on, especially in the cities and among the upper class, some individuals still professed paganism or secretly adhered to it. Also smaller ethnic groups, such as the tribe of the Magusaeans, who had moved from Babylonia to Cappadocia and whose religious world is described in detail by Basil, clung to their ancestral religion. In the early fifth century the monk Hypatius did missionary work in Bithynia, which had very long had a majority of Christians, and considerable groups of adherents of pagan cults still existed in the time of the Emperor Justinian I in the mountains of the provinces of Asia, Caria, Lydia, and Phrygia, since John of Ephesus claims at that time to have converted "tens of thousands" of them from Constantinople in accordance with a well prepared mission plan and the aid of new monastic foundations.[53]

---

[47] Serdica: *Mansi* 3, 69, and Athanasius, *Contra Ar.* 50; Theophilus of Alexandria: Jerome, *Ep.* 92. *Chorepiscopi:* Sozomen, *HE* 7, 19, 2. For the *Vita* of Tycho see H. Delehaye, *AnBoll* 26 (1907) 229–232, 240–245. On the mosaic epigram: T. B. Mitford, *Byz(B)* 20 (1950), 105–175.

[48] H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1922); V. Schultze, *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften* II, 1 and 2 (Gütersloh 1922–26); H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Provinces* (Oxford 1937); J. Keil, "Asia," *Rac* I, 740–749.

[49] The Council of Ancyra in canon 24 warned against pagan soothsayers, the Council of Laodicea in canon 30 forbade clerics and ascetics to visit specified baths in order not to scandalize the pagans, and its canon 39 forbade participation in pagan festivals.

[50] E. Kirsten, "Chorbischof," *RAC* II, 1108; five *chorepiscopi* from Cappadocia were present at Nicaea.

[51] Eunapius, *Vitae sophist.*, 503; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 16, 1–8.

A special role in the process of the evangelization of Asia Minor may be attributed for the fourth century to Cappadocia.[54] The bishops of the metropolis, Caesarea, from where the christianization of Armenia by Gregory the Illuminator started, maintained lively contact with their daughter churches; until 374 they ordained the Armenian chief bishop and claimed a sort of right of visitation in the communities of Asia Minor.[55] The see of Caesarea became, with its organization of ecclesiastical community life—social care, liturgy, organization of monasticism, elimination of pagan cult shrines—and the type of public life allied with it in relation to Christian life, the missionary model for the congregations of the neighboring provinces.[56] And the very openness of the Cappadocians among the bishops of Asia Minor toward a profane education became a missionary factor of the first order, since it essentially facilitated conversion to Christianity on the part of the upper class, which stood close to these bishops socially.[57] The receptiveness of Cappadocia to the missionary task is finally discernible in the series of important missionaries whom it produced, as, for example, the Bishop of the Goths Ulfilas, Eutyches, who labored among the Goths of the Crimea, and Vetranio, who became Bishop of Tomi in Scythia.[58]

---

[52] H. Gregoire, *Recueil des inscriptions . . . ,* 104.

[53] Basil, *Ep.* 258, 4; Callinic., *Vital Hyp.* 30, 1–2; 43, 16; John of Ephesus, *Church History* 3, 36–37; see L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VIme siècle* (Paris 1925), 276–280, and E. Honigmann, *CSCO* 127 (Louvain 1951), 207–215.

[54] E. Kirsten, "Cappadocia," *RAC* II, 861–891.

[55] Basil, *Epp.* 97, 99, 100, 195, 228f.; F. Tournebize, "Arménie," *DHGE* IV, 294–301.

[56] U. W. Knorr, *Basilius d. Grosse. Sein Beitrag zur christlichen Durchdringung Kleinasiens* (dissertation, Tübingen 1968); R. Janin, "Césarée de Cappadoce," *DHGE* XII, 199–203. Julianus Imperator, *Ep.* 78; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 4, 1.

[57] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 4, 43, had already praised the scholarship of the Cappadocian bishops.

[58] G. Bardy, "La patrie des évêques," *RHE* 35 (1939), 237f.

In the other provinces of the Diocese of Pontus the missionary task of the communities in city and countryside in the fourth century consisted chiefly in the deepening and elaborating of the religious life, as is clear from the discussions of the Synods of Ancyra (314), Neocaesarea (between 314 and 325), and Gangra (340–41).[59] Only occasionally were missionary enterprises or procedures mentioned in the sources for the fourth century in the heavily urbanized provinces of the west coast of Asia Minor. In the Hellespont Bishop Parthenius of Lampsacus in the middle of the century had to ask the Emperor's permission to do away with the still open pagan temple; to John Chrysostom is attributed the combating of the cult of Cybele in Phrygia and the definitive elimination of the worship of Artemis at Ephesus.[60]

In regard to the further development of the Christian religion on the islands of the Aegean Sea the sources permit no detailed statements. It may have proceeded to the larger islands, such as Rhodes, Samos, Chios, Lesbos, and Lemnos, just as to the nearby coastal cities. Here and there an archeological discovery indicates the building of a church in the pre-Byzantine period.[61]

In the southern provinces of the Diocese of Thrace—Europa and Rhodope—for the period c. 300 one can pretty much assume the state of christianization which had been achieved in the Asia Minor provinces of Hellespont and Bithynia, which lay opposite. Indeed, in the Thracian interior there were also pre-Nicene communities, as at Philippopolis, Adrianople, Deultum, Anchialus, and Durosturum, from which probably came "the Moesians and Thracians" among the bishops whom Eusebius mentions as participants in the Dedication Synod of Jerusalem in 331.[62] The central and northern Thracian provinces were only touched by the Christian mission to a greater degree in the fourth century. Their special interest was of importance to the Gothic tribes which had settled on the lower Danube. The most successful missionary was the already mentioned Ulfilas, who, after his episcopal ordination in 341, worked to the north of the Danube until persecution compelled the Christian Goths to flee c. 350: they were then settled by the Emperor Constantius in Lower Moesia.[63] Later missionaries were active among the nomadic Gothic tribes on the lower Danube, sent there by Chrysostom, who in Constantinople itself had exerted himself to win the Goths and even in his exile was concerned that Bishop Unilas, whom he had ordained, should receive a worthy successor.[64] In the last decades of the fourth century occurred the missionary work of Bishop Nicetas of Remesiana from the province of Dacia, who succeeded, after a full year's exertions, in gaining the tribes of Thracian Bessae in the mountains around Philippopolis; they became especially zealous adherents of the new faith.[65] Likewise under the Emperor Arcadius the Abbot Jonas of the monastery of Halmyrissus in the Thracian mountain range with his monks evangelized the inhabitants in the vicinity: his fight against pagan idols reminds one of the procedures employed earlier in Gaul by Martin of Tours.[66]

---

[59] W. M. Ramsay, "The Church of Lycaonia in the 4th Century," *Luke the Physician* (reprint ed. Grand Rapids 1956); also the text in H. Leclercq, "Lycaonie," *DACL* IX, 2787–2897. For Phrygia see V. Schultze, II, 397–477, and H. Leclercq, *DACL* XIV, 758–806.

[60] Thus the late *Vita Parthenii* (*PG* 114, 1348); on Chrysostom, see C. Kukula, *Forschungen in Ephesos* 1 (Vienna 1909), 269; F. Miltner, *Ephesus, Stadt der Artemis und des Johannes* (Vienna 1958).

[61] E. Euangelides, Ὁ χριστιανισμὸς ἐν ταῖς Κυκλάσι (Syros 1908); H. Balducci, *Basiliche protocristiane e bizantine a Coo* (Pavia 1936); A. M. Schneider, "Samos in frühchristlicher und byzantinischer Zeit," *AM* 54 (29), 97–141; "Chios," *DHGE* XII, 743–746; "Lesbos," *DHGE* XII, 573–575.

[62] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 4, 43; H. Leclercq, "Dobrogea," *DACL* IV, 1231–1260, and "Mésie," ibid. XI, 500–508.

For the Diocese of Macedonia as a whole, a clear missionary lag is established by a glance at the provinces of Asia Minor, despite the great tradition of the congregations founded there by Paul. To them, it is true, up to the Council of Nicaea had been added other communities in Larissa, Thebes, on Euboea, at Sparta, on Crete, in Nicopolis, in Epirus, as well as at Stobi and Skupi in Macedonia proper, but paganism was long able to maintain itself here, not only in the country, but also in cult centers such as Delphi and Eleusis and especially at Athens itself.[67] When Basil and Gregory Nazianzen studied at the Athenian school of higher learning around the mid-century, the city was still overwhelmingly pagan, the Panathenaea and the festivals in honor of Dionysus were still publicly celebrated, and Christian students were in the minority.[68] In an edict which forbade nocturnal sacrifices, Valentinian I exempted the mystery cults of Greece; as late as 375 people attributed to the sacrifices in honor of Achilles and Athena the fact that Athens and Attica were spared the earthquake that then hit southern Greece.[69] At Athens the esteem and influence of paganism were kept alive especially through the teachings of the later Platonic Academy, whose staunch rejection of Christianity was permitted up to the time of Justinian I.[70] Only Alaric's invasion of Greece in 395 and the gradual execution of the decrees of Theodosius I and his sons on the closing of the temples caused the decline and disappearance of the pagan cults. The transformation of many cult centers, including the complex of the Acropolis, into Christian churches in the first half of the fifth century seems to have succeeded without resistance.[71] The increase in the number of episcopal sees between the beginning of the fourth and the middle of the fifth century from between ten and fifteen to almost fifty makes equally clear that the break-through in the evangelization of Greece only occurred after 400.[72]

---

[63] K. Klein, "Gotenbischof Wulfilas als Bischof und Missionar," *Festschr. F. Müller* Stuttgart 1967), 84–107. On the ancient Christian inscriptions of Scythia, J. Barnea, *Studi teologici* 6 (1954), 65–112.

[64] Theodoret, *HE* 5, 30–312; Chrysostom, *Ep. ad Olymp.* 9, 5.

[65] Attested by Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 17 and 29, and Jerome, *Ep.* 60, 4; see D. M. Pippidi, "Niceta di Remesiana e le origini del cristianesimo dacoromano," *RHistStudEst-Eur* 33 (Bucharest 1946), 99–117.

[66] Callinic., *Vita Hyp.* 3, 1–12; 30–2.

[67] H. Leclercq, "Achaïe," *DACL* I, 323–340; Crete: *DHGE* XIII, 1033–1037; Delphi: E. Dyggve, *CahArch* 3 (1948), 9–28; Stobi: E. Kitzinger, *DOP* 3 (1946), 81–162; Saloniki: *DACL* XV, 648–673. Other literature in C. Andresen, *Einführung in die christliche Archäologie* (Göttingen 1971), pp. 37f.

For the Danubian provinces[73] of the Dioceses of Dacia and Illyricum, as well as for Dalmatia, a rather similar course of missionary work must be assumed. To the pre-Nicene congregations, such as Sirmium, Siscia, and Salona, whose existence is attested by the martyrdoms under Diocletian and Licinius, there were added in the course of the fourth century about a dozen more, among them Serdica, Naissus, Remesiana, Viminacium, Singidunum, Mursa, and Sabaria, from which the rural areas were gradually evangelized from the end of the century. The unstable political situation of the frontier areas and also the Arian controversy, which was spirited precisely in the central Balkans, often obstructed a continuous mission. And the remarkably tenacious persistence of pagan cults restricted the progress of christianization.[74] Nicetas of Remesiana, just mentioned, must be again singled out as a missionary in Dacia in the years before and after 400. The rich archeological finds in the Dalmatian coastal city of Salona[75] make possible today an instructive glimpse into the sometimes stormy progress of Christianity in a rather large urban settlement. Here, for example, the missionary work was begun c. 300 by merchants who, according to their grave inscriptions, probably came from Syria; according to the evidence of the first two bishops in the persecution of Diocletian, this young nucleus grew quickly into a flourishing community, as the basilicas, baptisteries, and burial grounds prove and the honorable treatment of the Bishop of Salona by Pope Zosimus in 418 confirms; it continued as a metropolitan see until the invasion of the Slavs at the beginning of the seventh century. From there were then evangelized the Dalmation interior and Albania just to the south.[76]

---

[68] Himerius, *Or.* 3, 53; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 35 and 43; see P. Gallay, *La vie de s. Grégoire de Naziance* (Lyon 1943), 36ff.

[69] Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 4, 3; 4, 18.

[70] E. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen* III, 2 (reprint ed. Hildesheim 1963), 687–931. Universal prohibition of all instruction by pagan teachers in 529: *Cod. Just.* 1, 11, 10; especially for Athens in Malalas, *Chron.*, 18; see A. Cameron, "The Last Days of the Academy of Athens," *ProcCambrPhilolSoc* 195 (1969), 7–29.

[71] A. Frantz, "From Paganism to Christianity in Athens," *DOP* 19 (1965), 187–205.

[72] The bishoprics in 458: *Mansi* 8, 611f.

[73] J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain* (Paris 1918); H. Leclercq, "Illyricum," *DACL* VII, 89–180; A. Lippold–E. Kirsten, "Donauprovinzen," *RAC* IV, 169–189, with map; ibid., 150.

[74] On Arianism in the Balkans, M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident* (Paris 1967), 59–99. Pagan cults: *RAC* IV, 169f.

In Pannonia,[77] Sirmium, quite early important in ecclesiastical politics, was the base from which in the last quarter of the fourth century proceeded an intensive missionary work among the peasants; it had largely achieved its goal by the time of the Avar invasion. This applies also to the area of Vienna, which belonged to Pannonia Superior, as archeological discoveries in Klosterneuburg, Petronell (Carnuntum), Donnerskirchen, Au am Leithaberg, and statements of the *Vita Severini* show.[78] For the two provinces of Noricum[79] one must reckon with missionary undertakings which came from Aquileia to the south. Here too the pre-Constantinian starting-points, Lorch and Pettau, were further developed, and from the end of the fourth century the rural areas were included in the mission; in them destructions of pagan temples and the building of Christian churches, especially numerous in the interior of Noricum, can be demonstrated for this period.[80] Athanasius also mentions bishops from Noricum who approved the decrees issued in his favor by the Synod of Serdica, but he does not specify their sees.[81] But episcopal communities certainly arose in Roman times at Virunum (Maria Saal), Teurnia (St. Peter i. Holz), Aguntum (near Lienz), and Celeia (Cilli), while one may assume rather than exclude those for Juvavum (Salzburg) and Ovilava (Wels).[82] The efficacy of Saint Severinus in Noricum Ripense from 453 or 454 was no longer primarily missionary: it especially served charitable concerns, the organization of monasticism, and the peaceful association of Catholics and Arian Germans.[83]

---

[75] J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans la province romaine de Dalmatie* (Paris 1908); Salona: E. Dyggve, *History of Salonitan Christianity* (Oslo 1951); E. Ceci, *I monumenti cristiani di-Salona* (Milan 1963).

[76] G. Stadtmüller, "Altheidnischer Volksglaube und Christianisierung in Albanien," *OrChrP* 20 (1954), 211–246.

[77] T. Nagy, *Geschichte des Christentums in Pannonien, Diss. Pannon.* 2, 12 (Budapest 1939); G. László, *ZKG* 59 (1940), 125–146. Episcopal list for Pannonia: *DACL* XIII, 1055–1057.

[78] E. K. Winter, "Wiener Frühchristentum," *Jb Verein Gesch Wiens* 12 (1955–56), 7–83; E. Swoboda, *Carnuntum* (Vienna, 3rd ed. 1958); A. A. Barb, *Burgenl Heimatbl* 15 (1953), 97–118; R. Noll, *Das Leben des kl. Severin* (Berlin, 3rd. ed. 1963).

[79] R. Noll, *Frühes Christentum in Österreich* (Vienna 1954); I. Zibermayr, *Noricum, Bayern und Österreich* (Horn, 2nd ed. 1956).

[80] R. Egger, *Frühchristliche Kirchenbauten im südlichen Noricum* (Vienna 1916); id., *Teurnia* (Klagenfurt, 5th ed. 1958); F. Miltner, *Aguntum und Lavant* (Baden 1957).

The christianization of Upper Italy and of the Raetian provinces (Italia Annonaria)[84] first began on a broad scale likewise only in the fourth century. To the three episcopal churches of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, which certainly belong to the period before 300, were added around the turn of the century Padua, Verona, Brescia, and Bologna, while the other bishoprics north of the Apennines originated only in the later fourth and the fifth centuries. The missionary importance of Milan, the sole metropolis of the fourth century, is brought into clear relief by the other sees. It was determined by the city's commercial situation as the starting-point of important routes, especially to the Alpine passages, through its character as the Late Roman administrative center and imperial residence, but also through the great esteem which the bishops of the fourth century had won for the community, starting with Mirocles, who took part in the Synods of Rome (313) and Arles (314), to Eustorgius and Dionysius, firm anti-Arians, down to Ambrose.[85] Under the sure guidance of Ambrose, the Early Christian Church of Milan gained its strongest missionary efficacy. It was accomplished first by the preaching of the bishop, who over and over reminded the members of his congregation of their personal duty through a pure life to make the Christian faith attractive to pagans of their neighborhood; in addition, he appealed directly to the pagans and Jews among his audience and sought to clear up their reservations in regard to Christianity.[86] The impact of the Metropolitan Ambrose was determined just as strongly in relation to missionary activity. Personal relations between him and the Bishops of Como, whom he ordained, of Pavia (Ticinum) and Lodi (Laus Pompeia) make his collaboration in the erecting of these sees likely,[87] and his correspondence with the Bishops Constantius and Vigilius treated the missionary task of preaching or the problem of marriage between Christians and pagans.[88] Milan's missionary radiation is also made known by the fact that a series of Upper Italian bishops of the day came from the metropolis, such as Felix of Bologna, Theodore of Modena, and perhaps also Sabinus of Piacenza. In two important cases Ambrose finally assumed missionary tasks which extended far beyond his metropolitan province. When the Princess of the Marcomanni, Fritigil, asked him for more detailed information on the Christian faith, he wrote for her a catechism in the style of a letter.[89] In the great confrontation with the group that was trying to restore paganism at Rome, he was the preeminent speaker on the Catholic side. Similar missionary initiatives are not known in connection with any of the contemporary Roman bishops.

---

[81] Athanasius, *Apol.* 1, 36f.; *Hist. ad mon.* 28.

[82] M. Hell, "Spätantike Basilika in Juvavum," *Mitteil Ges Salzb Landesk* 107 (1967), 71–113.

[83] R. Noll, footnote 78 supra; E. K. Winter–Kl. Kramert, *St. Severin,* 2 vols. (Klosterneuburg 1958–59); A. Aign, *Ostbair. Grenzmarken* 3 (1959), 168–200; Kl. Gamber, *RQ* 65 (1970), 145–157.

[84] *ECatt* VII, 386ff., *DACL* VII, 1632–1747; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi d'Italia,* 2 vols. (Faenza, 2nd ed., 1927); P. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* (Berlin 1906ff.).

[85] *Storia di Milano* I–II (Milan 1953ff.); list of bishops: *DACL* VIII, 983–1002; *Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate* (Ravenna 1961), 47–139.

[86] J. Mesot, *Die Heidenbekehrung bei Ambrosius von Mailand* (Schöneck 1958), especially 55–66.

Christianity had still not penetrated c. 400 into the valleys of the southern Alpine strips, as, for example, in the Val di Non near Trent, where at that time three clerics, probably on instructions from Bishop Vigilus, first built a little church, from which they started their mission. They were killed by the pagan population when they refused, for themselves and their few converts, to take part in a pagan procession through the fields. But the death of the missionaries became the occasion for the quick conversion of the inhabitants of the valley.[90] Bishops Zeno of Verona (c. 362–372) Gaudentius of Brescia (d. before 406), and Maximus of Trier (c. 397–415) found themselves in a genuinely missionary situation. They saw the members of their communities not only threatened by still continuing pagan customs; there still existed all around them a considerable pagan minority, especially among the peasants, who were often carelessly left alone in their veneration of idols and their sacrificial rites.[91] Some came occasionally to hear the bishop's preaching; Maximus addressed them at the beginning of Lent and asked them to decide to accept Christianity.[92] Almost no information exists regarding the evangelization of Emilia and Romagna, which in the late fifth century belonged to the metropolitan province of Ravenna. Most of the bishops of the sees in this area are not known until the late fourth century. Their bishops tended in part toward Milan, especially so long as Ambrose was alive.[93] Christianity reached Ravenna by way of its port of Classis, which, however, was never the seat of a bishop.[94] In the rural parts of the bishoprics subject to Ravenna the mission hardly got under way to any great extent before the sixth century.[95]

---

[87] *ECatt* VI, 19–26; XII, 1234–1237; I, 655ff.

[88] *Epp.* 4, 2, 19.

[89] Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii,* 36.

[90] Report of Vigilius of Trent: *PL* 13, 549–558, substantially confirmed by Gaudentius of Brescia, *Tract.* 17, and Maximus of Turin, *Sermones* 105–108. See I. Rogger, *I martiri Anauniesi* (Trent, 2nd ed. 1966), and C. E. Chaffin, *Stpatr* 10 (*TU* 107, Berlin 1970), 263–269.

[91] F. J. Dölger, "Christliche Grundbesitzer und heidnische Landarbeiter," *AuC* 6 (1950), 297–320, especially 305–309.

The way into the Val d'Aosta, to the Valais, and to the Raetian provinces was shown to the Christian mission by the Roman roads, which proceeded all together from Milan. While a bishop is not attested for Aosta (Augusta Praetoria) until the year 451, Bishop Theodore of Octodurum in the Valais took part in the Synods of Aquileia and Milan in 381 and 392–93 respectively; with his name is connected the start of the veneration of Saint Maurice and his companions at Agaunum.[96] After Geneva, which became a see at about the same time as Octodurum—its first bishop was Isaac—it is Gallic missionaries, from Lyon, who brought Christianity both into the Jura and to the *civitas Helvetiorum,* where Christians are demonstrable for the fourth and fifth centuries at Solothurn (cult of Ursus and Victor), Zürich (Felix and Regula), Zurzach (Verena), and Augst—places which belonged to the bishopric of Avenches (Aventicum), which was founded after 400.[97]

The name of a Bishop of Chur, capital of Raetia Prima, first appears in the acts of the Synod of Milan of 451, but c. 370 the missionary Gaudentius had worked in Bergell, south of the Septimer Pass,[98] where, however, the "Raetiarum episcopus" Valentine, who lived around the mid-fifth century and was buried at Mais near Meran, had his seat. Valentine's burial place presupposes the existence of Christians in the

---

[92] Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 91, 2; Zeno of Verona, *Tract.* II, 1, 1.

[93] Thus Bologna, Piacenza, Modena, Imola, and others; see J. P. Palanque, *S. Ambroise et l'empire romain* (Paris 1933).

[94] W. F. Deichmann, "Zur ältesten Geschichte des Christentums in Ravenna," *RivAC* 42 (1966), 167–175.

[95] M. Mazzotti, "Le pievi del territorio ravennate (sec. VI–X)," *Corsi di cultural sull'arte rav.* 1 (1958), 63–83.

[96] P. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* VI, 2, 157f. (Aosta); H. Büttner, *Frühmittelalterliches Christentum und fränkischer Staat* (Darmstadt 1961), 155–182 (see of Octodurum); P. Aebischer, "La christianisation du Valais," *Valesia* 17 (1962), 171–206.

[97] M. Besson, *Nos origines chrétiennes* (Geneva 1940); H. Büttner, op. cit., 162–167; O. Perler, *ZSKG* 51 (1957), 81–100 (baptistries); R. Laur-Belart, *Die frühchristliche Kirche in Kaiseraugst* (Basel 1967).

[98] H. Büttner, "Die Entstehung der Churer Bistumsgrenzen," op. cit., 109–154.

Vintschgau in the fifth century.[99] It is natural to assume it also for the Eisack Valley, even if the local bishopric of Säben (Sabiona) is first attested for the late sixth century.[100] By way of the Via Claudia (the Reschen-Scheideck Pass) the Christian message could arrive at the upper Inn Valley, where now excavations have brought to light church buildings of the fifth and sixth centuries in Pfaffenhofen near Telfs and in Imst.[101]

The pre-Constantinian community of Augsburg (Augusta Vindelicorum) grew so rapidly in the fourth and fifth centuries that here too one must reckon with an episcopal see in Roman times, whose existence is, moreover, made clear for the capital of Raetia Secunda. A great complex of former church buildings under the present Sankt Gallus Chapel with a basilica of three aisles and frescoes of a continuous illustration of the gospels point clearly to the previous existence of a cathedral.[102] The conjecture that Passau and Regensburg were also episcopal sees at that time is, however, not supported by favorable finds of that extent, even if the *Vita Severini* presupposes church buildings—basilica and baptistery—at Passau and an Early Christian cemeterial basilica could be proved in Regensburg.[103] That even in the Roman period Christianity penetrated into the rural parts of Raetia Secunda is shown by the remains of a church that was constructed in the last third of the fourth century on the Lorenzberg near Epfach (Abodiacum, rural district Schongau) and a note in the *Vita Severini,* according to which the saint came upon a wooden church in Quintanis (Künzing).[104]

In comparison with Milan, the missionary activity of Aquileia,[105] which was a metropolis as early as the fifth century, left little trace in the sources, but the evangelization of the immediate vicinity, hence of the Istrian Peninsula with the later sees of Trieste, Parenzo, Pola, and

---

[99] Eugippius, *Vita Severini* 40, 1. All suggestions—Augsburg, Chur, Passau—remain hypothetical.

[100] A. Sparber, *Das Bistum Sabiona* (Brixen 1942); id. *Kirchengeschichte Tirols* (Bozen 1957): Bishop Inguin c. 590.

[101] On Pfaffenhofen: G. Kaltenhauser, *Veröffentl Museum Ferdinandeum Innsbruck* 44 (1964), 75–98; on Imst: A. Wotschitzky, *Öst Zf Kunst Denkmalpfl,* 15 (1961), 97–104.

[102] F. Zoepfl, *Das Bistum Augsburg . . .* (Augsburg 1955), 1–20; P. Stockmeier, *JbaltfairKG* 23 (1963), 40–76, especially 60–64.

[103] *Vita Severini,* 22; M. Heuwieser, *Geschichte des Bistums Passau* I (Passau 1939); J. Sydow, *RivAC* 31 (Regensburg 1955), 75–96.

[104] On Epfach: J. Werner, *Neue Ausgrabungen in Deutschland* (Berlin 1958), 409–424; on Künzing (Quintanis): *Vita Severini* 15, 1.

[105] Episcopal list of Aquileia: *DHGE* III, 1114–1118; literature on the rich early Christian monuments in C. Andresen, *Einführung in die christl. Archäologie* (Göttingen 1971), 81f. On the rights of metropolitans: A. Villotta Rossi, *Memorie storiche foroguiliesi* 43 (1958–59), 61–143.

Pedena, and then of the district of Friuli, with Concordia Sagittaria, Altinum, Treviso, Feltre, and others, probably proceeded from Aguileia.[106] The same influence may be assumed also for Emona (Laibach), farther to the east, since the bishop of this city, Maximus, took part in the Synod of Aquileia of 381. However, paganism was still so self-assured here that as late as 388 its priests dared to greet the Emperor Theodosius in full official robes on the occasion of his passage to Italy.[107] Finally, the fact that the sees of southern Noricum still belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Aquileia indicates early missionary relations with Aquileia; in the sixth century it was decisively upheld by the Metropolitan of that province.[108]

The course of the evangelization of central and southern Italy is far less easily elucidated than that of Upper Italy because of the scanty sources. It is true that at the beginning of the fourth century there were at hand favorable starting-points for the Christian mission in Rome itself and in the communities of some commercial centers, such as Ostia, Terracina, Naples, Syracuse, and Cagliari, but precisely here it made a surprisingly slow advance. In the old imperial capital itself the number of Christians grew steadily throughout the entire fourth century, as the building of new titular churches under Popes Silvester I, Mark, Julius I, Liberius, and Damasus I makes clear,[109] but on the whole Rome long presented the image of a predominantly pagan city, whose highest official, the Praefectus Urbi, did not usually belong to the Christian Church. The sarcastic description of life in the city of Rome c. 350 by Ammianus Marcellinus, according to whom interest in the theater and games of chance stood in the foreground and megalomania and ostentation had caused the ancient Roman virtues to be forgotten, did not regard Christianity as worthy of mention in this context.[110] The pagan religious calendar continued in use, pagan temples were still constructed or restored—the temple of Apollo and that of Liber, of Silvanus, and the Porticus of the *di consentes*—the cults of Cybele and Mithras lasted into the 390s, the cult of Isis probably into the fifth century, and only toward the end of the fourth century did the problems of recruiting for the pagan priesthoods begin.[111] The Christian mission encountered a powerful obstacle in the stubborn and often bellicose rejection of the new religion by the majority of the aristocratic upper class, which was unwilling to sacrifice all that the ancient Roman tradition meant for it, carried out a varied propaganda for it, intervened at the court in Milan, and finally, in cooperation with the usurper Eugene, even tried a decision by battle.[112] Even the defeat thereby suffered did not mean the end of paganism in the city, since the government as late as the fifth century still took into consideration the susceptibilities of the reduced pagan senatorial aristocracy. However, a noteworthy missionary recruitment must be attributed to some ladies of this circle, who from 380 followed the ascetical movement in Christianity and through their activity assisted the upper class to a new understanding of their "Romanness," which now had a Christian basis.[113] Outside Rome also the long persistence of paganism is occasionally noticed, for example, in Ostia, where in 359 the Praefectus Urbi sacrificed to the Gemini, and in Capua, where as late as 387 cult processions were held according to the pagan calendar.[114] As in the North, here too the peasantry could be induced only with difficulty to abandon their ancestral religion. In 409 Honorius took steps against officials because they tolerated pagan cults; Benedict found on Montecassino a shrine of Apollo that was frequented by the people and holy groves in which they sacrificed to demons; and the Bishop of Fundi converted a temple of Apollo into a church as late as the mid-sixth century.[115]

---

[106] P. Paschini, *Storia del Friuli* I (Udine 3rd ed. 1953); G. Brusin, *Archivio Veneto* 76 (1965), 5–13; G. C. Menis, *La basilica paleocristiana nelle settentrionali della metropoli d'Aquileia* (Vatican City 1958).

[107] Acts of the Council of Aquileia, 76 (*PL* 16, 939); *Paneg. lat.* XII, 37, 4 (Emona).

[108] R. Noll, *Frühes Christentum in Österreich* (Vienna 1954), 69f.

[109] L. Duchesne, *Histoire de l'Église* II, 448ff.

[110] Ammianus Marcellinus, 14, 6, 2–26.

[111] J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1959), 635–652 (Lit.)

Of the approximately 200 sees which c. 600 are demonstrable for the territory of Italia Suburbicaria, hence also for Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, about half may have existed at the end of the fourth century, since a synod for this area under Pope Siricius in 381 counted some eighty participants; seventy-eight more bishoprics were founded in the fifth century, and the remainder only in the sixth century.[116] Latium and Campania displayed the greatest density of bishoprics, and then came Etruria and Umbria. It decreased to the east and southeast with the distance from Rome; of course, for this the demographic relationship must also be reckoned. A special importance for the evangelization of Campania may be assigned to the community of Naples.[117] A few bishoprics from the first half of the fourth century indicate a relatively early christianization of southern Etruria as far as Orvieto and Perugia, but Florence, Lucca, and Pisa also had episcopal congregations early.[118] Except for Spoleto, known from 353–54, the episcopal sees in northwestern Umbria are demonstrable with certainty only in the fifth and sixth centuries, and also for the sees of neighboring Picenum a sure tradition goes no further back.[119] In the case of the relatively early founding of Benevento at the beginning of the fourth century, Naples would seem to be the starting-point of the mission; however, as late as 375 the Roman Symmachus praises the pagan faction of the city for its receptiveness to the public interests.[120] Just as Syracuse was the entrance-gate for the gospel into Sicily, so it became also the point of departure for the evangelization of the interior, which proceeded rapidly after Constantine.[121] The shepherds of several episcopal communities stood on Athanasius's side in the confrontation concerning him at the mid-fourth century.[122] Letters from Leo I and Gelasius I were addressed to the entire episcopate of Sicily. In the correspondence of Gregory I the island seems to be entirely Christian, although there was still no episcopal see in the interior.[123] In the course of the fifth century the Christians on Malta received a bishop, as did those of the Liparaean Islands northeast of Messina around 500.[124] In Sardinia[125] the community of the port city of Cagliari was the bearer of the mission to the interior, which at first was concerned with the Roman colonies at Sulci, Forum Trajani, and Turris on the northwest coast. And "bishops of Sardinia" were also mentioned among the supporters of Athanasius,[126] but without precision of number and place-names. However, the northeast of the island still showed numerous pagans to the end of the sixth century, and Pope Gregory worked for their conversion.[127] A somewhat slower development must, finally, be assumed for Corsica,[128] whose bishops Athanasius also mentioned and who, according to Gennadius of Marseille, unanimously approved the *Expositio catholicae fidei* which Eugene of Carthage had composed in 483.[129] But in the time of Pope Gregory the mission experienced a setback, since some of the converts in the see of Aleria—there were in all five sees—reverted to paganism. The bishop was admonished by the Pope in regard to his missionary duty and received from him material help for his task.[130]

---

[112] H. Bloch, "The Pagan Revival in the West at the End of the Fourth Century," A. Momigliano, *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity* (Oxford 1963), 193–218.

[113] P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine* (London 1972), 161–185.

[114] Ammianus Marcellinus, 19, 10, 4. On Ostia see R. Meiggs, *Ostia* (1960). On Capua, H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones sel.,* no. 4918.

[115] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 46; Gregory I, *Dialogues* 2, 8; 3, 7.

[116] Synod of 386; *Mansi* 3, 678; D. Gordini, "Lo sviluppo cristiana (in Italia) dopo il IV secolo," J. Daniélou–H. Marrou, *Nuova storia della Chiesa* I (Turin 1970), 535ff.

[117] D. Mallardo, *Storia antica della Chiesa di Napoli* (Naples 1943); D. Ambrosi, *Storia di Napoli* I (1967), 625–759.

---

[118] A. Falcini, *Le origini cristiane del cristianesimo nell'Etruria romana* (Florence 1952); F. Baroni, "Le origini cristiane di Lucca," *Atti RAc Lucchese Scienze Lett Arti,* no. S.5 (1952), 47–89.

[119] A. Reggiani, *Ricerche sulle origini del cristianesimo nell'alta valle del Tevere* (Città di Castello 1960); L. Alleri, *Piceno religioso nell'antichità* (Ascoli Pic. 1940); S. Prete, *AnGr* 70 (1954), 73–77 (on Ancona and Fermo).

[120] Symmachus, *Ep.* 1, 3.

[121] G. Agnello, "Sicilia paleocristiana," *Oikumene* (Catania 1964), 579–591.

[122] Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos,* 36; Synod of Sicilian bishops c. 366: *Mansi* 3, 371.

[123] Leo I, *Epp.* 16 and 17; Gelasius I, *Epp.* 14 and 17.

[124] *ECatt* 7, 1925ff. (Malta); 7, 1404 (Lipari).

[125] F. Lanzoni, *Archivio storico sardo,* 1915.

[126] *Mansi* 3, 41; 3, 51.

[127] Gregory I, *Ep.* 4, 23–26.

[128] J. B. Casanova, *Histoire de l'Église de Corse* I (Zicavo 1931).

At the beginning of the fourth century a double missionary task was presented to the Church in the North African[131] part of the Roman Empire. One had to do with gaining the adherents of paganism, on the defensive, it is true, in most cities, but nevertheless still influential. Second, the evangelization of the population on the *latifundia,* especially of the western provinces, and of the tribes in the southern frontier district, had to be tackled systematically, if one wished the achievement thus far to continue. The implementation of this task was no doubt aggravated for decades and partly impeded by the long confrontation between the Donatist and the Catholic Churches, which on both sides tied down the best forces, even if both denominations constantly received adherents from paganism. The Catholics had a strong support in parts of the upper class, who enjoyed a great influence in intellectual life, in the administration, or through their economic position. The city of Timgad alone c. 360 still counted forty-seven pagan priests, and in the cities of Calama and Musti they were functioning even later. A pagan temple was erected at Lambaesis under Valentinian I, and the most important pagan cult center of the North African provinces, the magnificent temple of the Dea Caelestis at Carthage, remained opened until the last years of the fourth century.[132] The preaching and correspondence of Augustine afford a glimpse into the missionary understanding and the day-to-day missionary activity of a North African bishop in the first decades of the fifth century.[133] His preaching goes again and again into the objections of pagans of all classes, who indicated them as the reason for their rejection of Christianity; they were taken very seriously by him when they deserved to be, and he exposed their emptiness when they were accepted clichés.[134] He candidly admitted that the life of many a Christian meant a no less serious hindrance for the Christian mission than the split of the North African Church into two bitterly warring denominations.[135] Hence he called attention to the missionary duty of every individual Christian to lead his pagan acquaintances to Christ, as formerly the Samaritan woman had done with regard to her fellow townspeople.[136] Augustine also used his contacts by letter with pagans in order to present to the correspondent, whose influence on the peasantry he by no means underestimated,[137] in a manner mostly very courteous but in fact resolute, the inner emptiness of the pagan religion and the hopelessness of its current situation.[138]

---

[129] *De script. eccl., PL* 58, 1116f.

[130] Gregory I, *Ep.* 6, 62; i, 1.

[131] On the mission, A. Audollent, "Afrique," *DHGE* I, 810–861; A. M. Schneider, *RAC* I, 173–179; J. Mesnage, *Le christianisme en Afrique* I (Algiers–Paris 1914); G. Gagé, "Nouveaux aspects de l'Afrique chrétienne," *Annales École Hautes Études Gand* 1 (1937), 181–230. On paganism, G. Charles-Picard, *Les religions de l'Afrique antique* (Paris 1954); id. *La Carthage de s. Augustin* (Paris 1965); M. Leglay, *Les religions orientales dans l'Afrique ancienne* (Algiers 1956).

[132] J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1929), 102f., 144.

[133] G. Walter, *Die Heidenmission nach der Lehre des hl. Augustinus* (Münster 1921); G. Metzger, *Kirche und Mission in den Briefen Augustins* (Gütersloh 1936).

The further collapse of North African paganism was hastened by the legislation introduced by Theodosius and continued by Honorius, which here too decreed the closing of the temples, forbade public worship, had cult images and statues removed from the temples, and had temple property seized, but did not aim to trouble personally pagans who lived peaceably.[139] The often careless execution of these laws induced the episcopal Synod of Carthage of 401 twice to ask the state officials for a stricter intervention and to destroy the pagan shrines still existing in the countryside, even in remote districts, especially since they were lacking in artistic value. But not until 407 did General Stilicho issue an edict which corresponded to some extent with such desires.[140] In consequence of the now increasing State pressure there were bloody encounters between pagans and Christians, as at Sufetula and Calama, where both sides broke the law.[141] In 407 the Christians were permitted to make use of the temple of the Dea Caelestis at Carthage, which had been closed earlier, and Bishop Aurelius pointedly had his *cathedra* located on the place occupied by the statue of the pagan goddess. Some pagans even now still clung to prophecies which promised the imminent collapse of the Christian world in North Africa;

---

[134] P. Courcelle, "Propos antichrétiens rapportés par s. Augustin," *RechAug* 1 (Paris 1958), 149–186.

[135] *Serm.* 5, 8; 47, 28. The alibi for the pagans: "ecce quales sunt Christiani": *Enarr. in ps.* 70, *hom.* 1, 17, 10.

[136] *In Jo. ev. tr.* 15, 33; *sermo* 25, 8 Denis.

[137] In *Enarr. in ps.* 54, 13, he mentions the often heard expression: "If that man were also a Christian, no one would remain a pagan."

[138] *Epp.* 16–17; 233–234; 132; 135–137; 90–91; 232; see V. Capánaga, "Intelectuales paganos del siglo V frente al misterio di Cristo," *Oikumene* II (Catania 1964), 439–454.

[139] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 13, 15–20.

[140] *Cod. can. Eccl. Afr.,* canons 58 and 84; *Constit. Sirm.* 12.

[141] Augustine, *Epp.* 50; 91, 8; *Ep.* 62, 17f., disapproves of an unauthorized procedure by Christian groups; see also *Ep. 47, 3.*

eventually all they could do was to hide the images of the gods in caves and ravines and practice their worship underground.[142]

All too meager are the reports on the Christian mission among the non-Roman population of the frontier zone of North Africa. Augustine knew that even c. 400 there "were numerous tribes in Africa to whom the gospel has not yet been preached;" although he had also heard of conversions of individual members of a tribe. Here, however, he did not intervene personally, but expected their full conversion in the future.[143] But there is evidence that evangelization was begun here even before the invasion of the Vandals. The tribe of the Arzuges is repeatedly mentioned; its area of settlement is thought to have been on the southern frontier area of Byzacena and Numidia.[144] For example, a Catholic and a Donatist bishop from the "country of the Arzuges" took part in the religious discussion at Carthage in 411, and in 419 Bishop Aurelius addressed a circular to the bishops in the South, among whom he counted those residing in the mountain ranges of Byzacena and of Arzugitania.[145] Archeological discoveries, whose dating, it is true, remains uncertain, show that the mission had established even rural settlements in the western provinces of Mauretania Caesariensis and Tingitana.[146] A vivid example of a spontaneous mission beyond the frontier of Roman territory is handed down by Victor of Vita.[147] Four Christian slaves whom the Vandal King Gaiseric had given to a pagan tribal chieftain in the desert of Caprapicti immediately undertook missionary work there and later, through envoys, requested from a bishop in Roman territory a priest who would baptize the newly converted and build a church. Such missionary activity, of course, was not possible during the century of Vandal domination in the area controlled by them. Systematic missionary work was resumed only after the conquest of North Africa by the Byzantines in 533. There then occurred the conversion of the Gadabitani in the vicinity of Leptis Magna, of the Garamantes in the Fezzan and perhaps of the Maccurites in Mauretania, of which Procopius and John of Biclar report.[148]

The idea seems problematic that the North African Church failed to translate the Bible and the liturgy into the Berber and/or the Phoenician language and by making use of elements of the native culture to create a North African national Church, which would then have survived the domination of Islam. Apart from the still open linguistic questions about the state of development of Phoenician at this time, it is noteworthy that even the Donatists and the equally active evangelizing Manichaeans for their part made no such attempt. It seems rather that at the climax of the Christian mission the Latin provincial culture[149] was eagerly accepted by the inhabitants together with Christianity. For the development of an indigenous Christianity a greater time-span would probably have been required than was at the disposal of the Christian mission up to the Vandal invasion.[150]

---

[142] Augustine, *Enarr in ps.* 40, 1, 57; *in ps.* 70, II, 4, 30; Quodvultdeus, *De promiss.* 3, 44–45 (eyewitness report on the temple of the Dea Caelestis).

[143] *Epp.* 199, 46; 93, 24.

[144] A. Audollent, *CRAIBL* (1942), 202–215.

[145] *Gesta Coll.* I, 207 (*SChr* 195, 894f.); letter of Aurelius: *Mansi* 4, 447.

[146] A. Berthier (ed.), *Les vestiges du christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale* (Algiers 1943); R. Thouvenot, "Les origines chrétiennes en Mauretanie Tingitane," *Rea* 71 (1969), 354–378.

[147] *Hist. pers. Afr. prov.* I, 35–37.

[148] Procopius, *De. aedif.* 6, 4, 12; John of Biclar, *Chron. min.* II, 212 and 512; see Ch. Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine* (Paris 1898), 327f.

In the history of the evangelization of Gaul[151] the fourth century presents especially the phase in which Christianity established itself, in a virtually uninterrupted growth, in most cities of the Gallic provinces. At the first council on Gallic soil, the Synod of Arles in 314, sixteen Gallic sees were represented, and the existence at this period of ten others can be accepted with some certainty. The larger number of these bishoprics was in southern Gaul,[152] where from the pre-Constantinian center, Lyon, a mission route upward through the Rhone Valley to the Rhine and into Belgica was marked off. Scarcely thirty years later Athanasius counted thirty-four Gallic bishops as his adherents,[153] from the mid-century the bishoprics increased rapidly in the West and Northwest, and about a hundred years after the Synod of Arles there were episcopal congregations in almost all the more than 100 *civitates* of Gaul, mostly in the principal localities. This means that in all these cities a considerable part of the inhabitants professed the Christian faith. Since the metropolitan organization also established itself in the first decades of the fifth century, the basic ecclesiastical constitution of Gaul was complete soon after 390.[154] By whom and with what methods this urban evangelization occurred in each case escapes us to a great extent.

---

[149] G. Charles-Picard, *Nordafrika und die Römer* (Stuttgart 1962).

[150] See P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine* (London 1972), 279–300.

[151] E. Demougeot, *Gallia* I: *RAC* VIII, 822–927. Basic is L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* I–III (Paris, 1899–1915). Also E. Mâle, *La fin du paganisme en Gaule et les plus anciennes basiliques chrétiennes* (Paris 1950); E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine* I (2nd ed.), II (2nd ed.), III (Paris 1964–66).

[152] J. R. Palanque, *Annales Univ Montpellier* 1943, 177–183; *Provence historique* (1951), 105–143 (early sees in Narbonensis and Provence).

[153] *Contra Arian.* 50. The details of the list of participants of an alleged Synod of Cologne of 346 agree in part with this.

[154] E. Griffe, I (2nd ed.), 332–336; M. Moreau, *Rome et le christianisme dans la région rhénane* (Paris 1963); W. Neuss, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Köln* I (Cologne 1964), 21–108; E. de Moreau, *L'Église en Belgique* I (2nd ed. Brussels 1947), 23–48.

The christianization of the peasantry of Gaul, on the other hand, began for the most part only in the last decades of the fourth century and reached its climax only in the fifth century. Since it was, first of all, the duty of the bishop in the territory of a *civitas,* for a time it remained dependent on the rise of the individual see, and practically and in its efficacy on the initiative of its leader, so that in a glance at the whole of Gaul one must reckon with a very much differentiated process. Except for a few allusions to a rural mission in the early period,[155] the sources mention Martin of Tours (d. 397) and Victricius of Rouen (d. c. 407) as the first bishops who devoted themselves systematically to the mission in the countryside, pushing on, each in his own bishopric and occasionally beyond its boundaries. According to the report of Sulpicius Severus on Martin's work for the *conversio paganorum,* certainly literary and hagiographical in composition, the peasants of the middle Loire at that time lived totally in the ancestral world of their Celtic and slightly Romanized customs of field-processions, and of the cult of trees and springs, with the unpretentious shrines which at first they staunchly defended when the bishop of the Christians wanted to prove by word and deed the powerlessness of their gods.[156] After the often forcible destruction of their shrines, at times a rather large part of the population was converted to the mightier God of the Christians, and then Martin erected in their *vicus* a chapel or small monastery in place of the previous small pagan temple in the field; he also appointed clerics for the further care of the new converts and hence called into being the first cells of Christian worship in the countryside.[157] When Paulinus of Nola compared the somewhat younger Victricius to the Bishop of Tours, he was including in this high praise also his missionary work, which extended beyond his see of Rouen northward into the territory of the Nervii and Morini to the channel coast, which had still scarcely been touched by Christianity. He also established churches and monasteries in larger places (*oppida*), on islands, and in remote forest districts.[158] What

---

[155] The *diaconi urbici* mentioned by the Synod of Arles in canon 18 probably presuppose rural deacons also.

[156] Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini,* 12–15; see the commentary by J. Fontaine, *SChr.* 134 (1968), 713–807. Number of Christians in the country, *Vita* 13, 9: "pauci admodum, immo paene nulli."

[157] Clerics in rural churches: Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* 3, 8, 5, and *Ep.* 3, 6. Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 10, 13, 3, names six *vici* in which Martin had churches built. A striking decline in the use of pagan shrines or their destruction can be demonstrated for this time; see E. Mâle, op. cit., 37–40, and M. Moreau, *Rome et le christianisme dans la région rhénane,* 117–120.

[158] Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 18, 4–5; Victricius, *De laude sanctorum* 1; see D. A. Stracke, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis . . . van Brabant* 13 (1961), 5–30; R. Herval, *Origines chrétiennes. La II^e^ Lyonnaise gallo-romaine* (Paris 1966).

Gregory of Tours reported of his contemporary, Bishop Simplicius of Autun, recalls Martin's missionary method. Simplicius too intervened to stop a procession of farmers in the land of the Aedui, who were carrying a statue of Cybele Berecynthia through their fields and vineyards. He too gained some for Christianity.[159] At times churches arose outside the cities also, in Roman camps, for example, at Carcassonne and Uzès in Narbonnensis and in Arlon in Belgica Prima, which then became ecclesiastical meeting-places for the people of the vicinity. The mission in the countryside experienced a powerful advance also from Christian landowners, for example, from Paulinus of Nola and Sulpicius Severus, who had chapels and oratories erected on their land and, often encouraged in this by the bishops, also exerted themselves for the conversion of their peasants. Such churches on a villa are demonstrable as especially numerous in southern Gaul for the fifth and sixth centuries, since the Arian Burgundians and Visigoths for the most part respected the Catholics' freedom of worship. Synodal legislation concerned itself to an ever greater extent with this development, reserved to the bishops the supervision of the clergy in these at first private churches, but conceded the population of the vicinity attendance at Mass in them, except on the solemnities of the Church year. From such starts grew many of the later parishes.[160] And for the Gallic rural mission the saying of Augustine was pertinent: that it was an especially difficult task to vanquish paganism in the hearts of new converts.[161] Christian preaching and synods had the opportunity, even far into the sixth century, to wrestle with a tenacious holding on to pagan custom.[162]

The course of the evangelization of the Iberian Peninsula[163] in the fourth and fifth centuries can be determined only in the barest outlines. The lists of participants in the Synods of Elvira (between 306 and 314) and Arles (314) and some further indications make clear that at the beginning of Constantine's sole rule Christianity had its center of gravity in Baetica and southern Tarraconensis, since the majority of the Spanish members of the synods came from some forty places situated in these provinces.[164] The decrees of Elvira, moreover, give acquaintance with a Christianity which still needed various forms of missionary work for its deepening; apparently there was a definite desire to take up this task.[165] With the flowering of a noteworthy Christian literature, the spread of monasticism, the struggle over Priscillianism, and the interest which Rome showed in the Spanish Church, it becomes understandable that in the course of the century this Church gained in expansion and in inner quality. At the Synods of Zaragoza and Toledo, in 380 and 400 respectively, as well as in the letters of Popes Siricius and Innocent I to Spanish bishops, paganism in fact scarcely plays any role. That the mission took the route from the cities on the Spanish east coast into the interior can be determined to a degree from the churches and cemeteries with their sarcophagi, which archeological research could demonstrate above all in the present provinces of Barcelona, Gerona, Tarragona, Valencia, Alicante, and Murcía.[166] Occasionally, inscriptions of the fourth and fifth centuries supply a glimpse of the gradual expansion of Christianity in the countryside.[167] As in Gaul, so also on the Iberian Peninsula Christian churches on the *villae* of owners of *latifundia* became of importance for the origin of Christian congregations in the country. The Balearic Islands were affected very early by missionary work, and the majority of their inhabitants professed Christianity before the Vandal invasion.[168] However, one must reckon with a very different compactness of evangelization in the individual districts of Spain, especially with a sharp decline from east to west and northwest respectively. That the invasion of the Alans, Vandals, and Sueves at the beginning of the fifth century became a hindrance for an intensive missionary preaching in the affected parts cannot be doubted. Only the almost total lack of synodal activity throughout the fifth century speaks clearly here. Especially in the land of the Basques and in Cantabria can the mission be found first in an initial stage c. 400, since here no bishoprics are demonstrable even for the period of Visigothic rule.[169] Relatively slight also was the density of sees in the area of the source of the Tajo, west from Toledo, south of the middle Júcar (the present province of Albacete), and in the direction of Lusitania. Hence mission work among the peasants was by no means everywhere completed even in the Visigothic period: Bishops Martin of Braga and Polemius of Astorga were powerfully claimed by it even in the late sixth century,[170] and the majority of the parishes arose only from this time on.[171]

---

[159] Gregory of Tours, *In gloria confessorum* 76.

[160] E. Griffe, III, 260–298; Visitation by bishops: Sulpicius Severus, *Ep.* 1, 10; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* 9, 16.

[161] Augustine, *Enarr. in ps.* 80, 14: *magnum opus est intus haec idola frangere.*

[162] Cf., for example, Caesarius of Arles, *Serm.* 13, 14, 53–55. Canon 2 of the so-called Council of Arles II (c. 442–508) threatened sanctions against a bishop who did not energetically intervene against such abuses.

[163] J. F. Alonso, "Espagne," *DHGE* XV, 892–908 (Lit.); Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España* I, 2 (Madrid 1929); M. Torres–R. Menéndez Pidal, *Historia de España* II (Madrid, 3rd ed. 1962), 447–486.

[164] See *Atlas Zur Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg 1970), Map 4.

---

[165] On the Synod of Elvira: A. C. Vega, *España Sagrada,* 53–54 (Madrid 1961), 331–367; J. Gaudemet, *DHGE* XV (1963), 317–348.

[166] P. de Palol, *Arqueologia cristiana de España Romana* (Madrid 1967, with the literature); D. Iturgaiz, "Baptisteros de Hispania," *AST* 40 (1967), 209–295.

[167] J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España romana y visigoda* (Barcelona, 2nd ed. 1969), nos. 1–3, 56, 87–88, 114–115, 120, 139–141, 148, 268, 363, 367, 525–527, 539, 546, 557. Galicia in the northwest knew inscriptions only from the sixth century.

[168] P. de Paloe, op. cit., 3–38; C. Veny, "Early Christianity in the Balearic Islands," *Classica folia* 21 (1967), 210–233.

[169] J. González Echegaray, *Orígines del cristianesimo en Cantabria* (Santander 1969).

In the political Diocese of Britannia[172] also there existed at the beginning of the fourth century a certain ecclesiastical organization, as the participation of the Bishops of York, London, Lincoln or Colchester, and perhaps also the representative of a fourth see—possibly Cirencester—at the Synod of Arles proves.[173] The number of sees continued to grow up to the Synod of Rimini (359),[174] but the Christians in Roman Britain long stood in the shadow of paganism, whose shrines in the larger places were still visited till the end of the century, and in the rural areas into the fifth century. Excavations at *villae* in Lullingstone (Kent) and Hilton St. Mary (Dorset) with their private churches reveal that the Christian religion also found entry into the families of well-to-do landowners.[175] But to what extent the peasants as a whole accepted it cannot be determined. For a consolidation of the Church c. 400 and later, especially in the upper class, we have the witness of lively theological discussions in Britain, which motivated the visit of the Gallic Bishops Victricius of Rouen (c. 395) and Germain of Auxerre (429 and perhaps again c. 445); on this occasion Germain also preached to the Christian peasants.[176] That Christian communities also existed in the western and northern frontier zones of Roman Britain is certain: from them came the two missionaries, Patrick and Ninian, for whom the conversion of the Irish and the Picts became their lifework. In these areas Christianity of a Roman stamp could continue without a break,[177] whereas in the southeast and center of the island it was subjected to serious impediments when c. 450 the still pagan tribes of Jutes, Angles, and Saxons invaded in several waves and made themselves rulers of these territories. From the almost complete silence of the sources for this time, however, one may not infer a total extinction of Christian life in the Anglo-Saxon part of the island.

---

[170] Martin of Braga wrote *De correctione rusticorum* for Polemius. See S. McKenna, *Paganism and Pagan Survivals in Spain up to the Fall of the Visigothic Kingdom* (Washington 1938).

[171] J. F. Alonso, *La cura pastoral en la España romanovisigoda* (Rome 1955), 201–209.

[172] E. Kirsten, "Britannia," *RAC* II, 603–611; W. C. H. Frend, "The Christianization of Roman Britain," M. W. Barley–R. P. C. Hanson, *Christianity in Britain 300–700* (Leicester 1968), 37–49, with the literature.

[173] J. G. Mann, *Antiquity* 35 (1961), 316–320.

[174] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2, 41.

[175] On the persistence of paganism: W. C. H. Frend, *JournBritArchAssoc* 18 (1955), 1–19; M. J. T. Lewis, *Temples in Roman Britain* (Cambridge 1966). On the early Christian monuments: J. M. C. Toynbee, *JournBritArchAssoc* 16 (1953), 1–24; Ch. Thomas, *Britain and Ireland in Early Christian Times* (London 1971).

[176] Victricius, *De laude sanct.* 1, 2; Prosper, *Chron. ad an. 429;* Constantius, *Vita s. Germani* 3, 12–20, 5, 25–28; see J. Evans, "St. Germanus in Britain," *Archeologia Cantiana* 80 (1965), 175–185.

[177] A. C. Thomas, "The Evidence from North Britain," and W. H. Davies, "The Church in Wales," Barley–Hanson, op. cit., 93–121, 131–150.

The presentation thus far makes clear that the evangelization of the peoples of the Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries was by no means a uniformly developing process in all parts of the Empire; hence the usual wholesale judgment that immediately after Constantine's turning to Christianity the pagan masses poured into the Church requires a substantial differentiation. It must first be established that in the missionary progress of this epoch several waves are apparent. The freedom of worship granted by Constantine first revealed the real situation: the number of Christians had grown so strongly, especially in the second half of the third century, that in some urban congregations larger church buildings were necessary in order to hold the believers who were now able openly to profess their Christianity. After that, especially in the East, an active missionary work had begun, which brought to the Church a steady, though not spectacular, growth.[178] Then, after the defeat of the anti-Emperor Magnentius (351–53), Christianity gained ground considerably in the cities of the western provinces. The failure of the Emperor Julian's effort at restoration introduced the concluding phase in the East, but also promoted the mission in the West, as Hilary of Poitiers emphasizes.[179] Whereas for Chrysostom the end of paganism in the eastern part of the Empire, apart from a few frontier places, was a generally acknowledged fact, Jerome, Gaudentius of Brescia, Maximus of Turin, and others saw the period of the influx of the masses in the West only in the Theodosian age.[180] The striking temporary and occasionally even qualitative lag in the peasantry of the Balkans, Italy, Gaul, and Spain in comparison to the East must have had an essential cause in the decline of civilization which existed precisely here between East and West, and which, for its part, was again conditioned by the different demographic situation. The greater population density of the eastern provinces with their many cities and their higher cultural level offered the Christian mission in the East the incomparably more favorable presuppositions also for the rural mission.

---

[178] *The Expositio totius mundi et gentium* (ed. J. Rougé, *SChr* 124, Paris 1966), which did not exist before 359, permits one to assume a still quite strong paganism.

[179] Hilary of Poitiers, *Tract. in ps* 67, 20.

[180] Jerome, *Epp.* 69, 3; 107, 2; Gaudentius of Brixen, *Sermo* 8, 25; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2, 33; Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 99, 2; Chrysostom, *In Mt. hom.* 1, 5.

Christianity was able at this period to get a foothold also on the other side of the Empire's frontiers, especially among the peoples along its eastern boundary. Jerome was even of the opinion that the moment had already come when the gospel had been proclaimed to all peoples, and Augustine regarded a conversion of the as yet still pagan peoples as possible in the next generation. More important than the all too optimistic estimation of the missionary present and future was the fact that the "Church of the Empire," following the completion of evangelization in the interior, now became more keenly aware than earlier of the duty of evangelizing the "barbarians" also.[181]

2. Questions of Missionary Method

THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MISSIONARY IDEA AND MISSIONARY WORK. More sharply than in the pre-Constantinian epoch the local episcopal church now appeared in focus as the real bearer of the missionary idea and of the day-to-day mission work. The community was and remained the foundation without which the direct goal of the mission could not be realized: to win for the Christian faith the non-Christians living in the district and to confirm them in the new faith after their reception into the ecclesiastical community. In this regard, clergy and laity were under the same obligation, even if they fulfilled it with a differing importance and in distinct roles. On the bishop, as the responsible head of the community, devolved the full direction of mission work, its coordination and supervision, and on his initiative or his failure depended to a great extent the quality of the missionary exertions of a community. He and the clergy delegated by him were above all responsible for the organizing and implementation of the catechumenate, and hence the examination and admission of candidates for baptism, the instruction of the catechumens, the solemn baptismal catechesis, and the continued pastoral care of the neophytes.[182] In the contemporary situation the total religious life of the congregation had a missionary orientation—liturgy, piety, charitable activity, and monasticism had their missionary function within the community. This is true also of the normal preaching of the faith, which again and again addressed also the non-Christians directly or indirectly and sought their admission to the community of Christians.[183] The great importance which belonged to the missionary task of the laity is clear in the extant sermons of the day. Many preachers enjoined not only the general missionary obligation of the laity: they especially stressed the eminent role of an exemplary conduct for the recruiting impact of the Christian message on the pagans; Chrysostom was especially insistent and precise in this regard. It distressed him that now, since the great majority had converted to Christianity—he is speaking of Antioch—scarcely any conversions of the pagan minority are to be recorded. But for him it meant that "there would be no more pagans, if we were true Christians."[184] In the East, as in the West, people deplored the lack of missionary zeal among the owners of *latifundia,* who did not take the pains to get teachers and priests for their workers or want to erect chapels for them, but instead had expensive baths constructed for themselves.[185] Nevertheless, many lay persons must have taken their missionary obligation seriously, for without their help within the community, without that of the unknown merchants, travelers, officials, soldiers, and sailors who did spontaneous missionary work everywhere in the Empire when an opportunity offered itself, the total effect of the mission would not have been achieved; hence the local episcopal churches essentially supported the missionary work of the "Church of the Empire."

---

[181] Jerome, *Ep.* 107, 2; *In Mt* 24, 14. Augustine, *Epp.* 197, 4; 199, 46. Cf. J. Vogt, *Kulturwelt und Barbaren* (Mainz 1967), 49ff.

[182] On the catechesis of the catechumenate see chap. 18.

[183] Especially Chrysostom, Basil, Ambrose, Zeno of Verona, Maximus of Turin, and Augustine. Sermons for an exclusively pagan audience are not extant.

Examples such as that of Martin of Tours and of Victricius of Rouen show that bishops also felt responsible for the mission beyond the bounds of their congregations. More and more the metropolitans and synods and at times the heads of the developing patriarchates attended to missionary duties in the sphere of their competence.[186] Attention has already been directed to the impact of Basil in the East and of Ambrose in the West, likewise to the interest of Juvenal of Jerusalem for the mission among the Arab nomads and the superregional mission activity of Athanasius, who just because of his missionary successes among the pagans was sent into exile by the Emperor Julian.[187] In a unique manner Chrysostom, as Bishop of Constantinople, looked after the mission among the Goths and in Phoenicia: his correspondence with the missionaries working there—the priests John, Basil, Nicholas, and the monks Gerontius, Simeon, and Mari—sought to keep their missionary zeal alive. Gifts, which were intended for him in his exile were sent on to them by him. When some missionaries were killed by the local pagans and others were mistreated, he at once sent the priest Rufinus to the mission area and had every possible assistance promised, including new coworkers, if this should be necessary.[188] The missionary initiatives of the Bishop of Rome for his metropolitan area of Italia Suburbicaria may also be assumed, even if they appear in the written sources relatively late. The first mention of the evangelizing work of a Roman Bishop extending to an area remote from his immediate territory occurs under Pope Celestine I, who in 431 sent the former deacon Palladius as missionary bishop to Ireland. But Gregory I was probably the first missionary Pope in the full sense.[189]

---

[184] *In ep. I ad Tim., hom.* 10, 3: οὐδεις ἀν ἦν "Ελλην, εἰ ἡμεῖς ἤμεν Χριστιανοὶ ὡς ἔδει; also *In ep. I ad Cor., hom.* 3, 5; *In illud "Salutate Priscillam" hom.* 2, 1. For Ambrose and Augustine see *supra,* footnotes 88 and 135; Augustine, *Sermo* 25, 8 Denis: invitation to the laity: "adducite ad lavacrum baptismatis quos potestis."

[185] Chrysostom, *In Act. hom.* 18, 4–5; Zeno of Verona, *Tract.* I, 15, 6; Gaudentius of Brixen, *Tract.* 1, 3, 28; Maximus of Turin, *Tract.* 91, 106–108.

[186] See supra, footnote 162.

[187] Sozomen, *HE* 5, 15, 1.

Beside the evangelization conducted by the local congregation and the agents of the ecclesiastical provinces there appeared, in increasing measure, the more spontaneous and individual work of monasticism, which became a first-rate mission factor, especially in the eastern part of the Empire and its border areas.[190] In all countries and provinces in which cenobites and hermits had centers, monks appeared as missionaries, some in the vicinity of monastery and hermit's cell, others as itinerant preachers. They followed neither a fixed missionary program nor a uniform method, but adapted themselves to the situation of the moment. Sometimes the confidential conversation was preferred, then the mere reading of Scripture with a brief explanation, then again preaching to a village community, and even at times discussion with an educated pagan. That many a one overestimated his abilities in this regard appears from the warnings of Ammonas and Evagrius Ponticus that at first one should prepare in solitude for missionary preaching.[191] Others gained access to the pagans when they defended them against the encroachments of tax collectors or brought them aid in their material needs. Among some monastic missionaries there persisted the inclination to show themselves as fighters against demons by forcible destruction of pagan shrines, and for this they were not unwilling to ask the aid of state officials. Often the building of a church or the founding of a monastery was intended to help assure the first missionary success. The missionary activity established by the early monasticism of the East was continued with great zeal and notable success by its Nestorian and Monophysite successors.[192]

---

[188] Chrysostom, *Epp.* 21, 28, 21, 53–55, 69, 123, 126, 175, 221.

[189] Prosper, *Chron. ad an. 431.* A. Seumois, *La papauté et les missions au cours des six premières siècles* (Louvain 1953) exaggerates the role of the papacy in this period. R. A. Markus, "Gregory the Great and a Papal Missionary Strategy," *StChH* 6 (1970), 29–38.

[190] I. Auf der Maur, "Das alte Mönchtum und die Glaubensverkündigung," *NZM* 18 (1962), 275–288; A. Yannoulatos, "Monks and Mission in the Eastern Church during the fourth Century," *IRM* 58 (1969), 208–226.

[191] Ammonas, *Ep.* 1; Evagrius Ponticus, *Ep.* 58; *Antirrh.* 7, 1.

In contrast to the pre-Constantinian mission, the period treated here knew in increasing measure, therefore, the "full-time missionary"; hence, all lay persons, clerics, and monks who left their home community or monastery to devote years and decades of their life to the conversion chiefly of the peasantry of the imperial provinces or of individual tribes beyond the imperial frontiers.[193] They usually selected their own mission field, since no central ecclesiastical mission in the modern sense existed as yet, to train missionaries and set up a well-developed mission plan.

The mission of the fourth and fifth centuries also did not yet make use of a special mission school, although the freedom of preaching offered the possibility for this. The Christianity of the period did not even know any specifically Christian school, but utilized further the educational possibilities at hand.[194] The notion of bringing to the peasantry, for example, also profane knowledge together with the faith did not come within the contemporary missionary's line of vision.

One must not esteem too highly the missionary propaganda effect which proceeded from the Christian contribution to the contemporary literary confrontation between Christian and pagan, since at times only a small minority took part in it. Many a pagan who read a Christian apologist may have been influenced by the argument from the victory of the Christian God over the pagan idols, but the often immoderately triumphalist tone of this literature, as in Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum,* its insulting aggressiveness against the worship of the gods, and the intolerance in regard to its adherents, as in the case of Firmicus Maternus, *De errore profanarum religionum,* must rather have repelled than gained adherents.[195] The later publications on this theme—one thinks of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, of the *Dialogue between Zachaeus and Apollonius,* and especially of Augustine's *Civitas Dei*—are quite removed from such a tone, but they did not appear until critical actuality no longer pertained to their view of the contemporary missionary situation.[196]

---

[192] O. Hendriks, "L'activité apostolique du monachisme monophysite et nestorien," *PrOrChr* 10 (1960), 3–25, 97–113.

[193] K. Holl, "Die Missionsmethode der alten und der mittelalterlichen Kirche," *Ges. Aufs.* III (Tubingen 1928), 117–129, limits his thesis that the ancient Church did not know the professional missionary practically to the pre-Constantinian period.

[194] Only in Armenia in some monasteries do there appear to have been schools in the service of the mission; cf. I. Auf der Maur, op. cit., 284, footnote 97. Footnote 8 *supra* mentions a case that remains unique.

[195] Cf. J. R. Laurin, *Orientations maîtresses des apologistes chrétiens de 270–361* (Rome 1954), 307–445; J. Vogt, "Toleranz und Intoleranz im constantinischen Zeitalter: der Weg der lateinischen Apologetik," *Saeculum* 19 (1968), 344–361, especially 350ff.

STATE AND MISSION. The attitude of the Emperor Constantine[197] in this question was still basically determined by the conviction that State compulsion through legal sanctions was to be rejected vis-à-vis non-Christians. Hence he held that only a propaganda for the Christian faith was defensible which respected freedom of conscience and expected the religious unity of the Empire from the power of conviction inherent in the Christian message. Individual measures, such as the prohibition, conditioned by political considerations, of private auspices in 319 or the attack on the cult of Aphrodite at Hierapolis and the closing of the temple of Asclepius at Aegae, let him positively maintain personal toleration in regard to the conviction of individual pagans. His emphatic favoring of the Church in many areas, of course, makes clear that the Christian mission could be sure of his benevolence.

This relative toleration was abandoned by Constantine's sons, when at the end of 341 by imperial law they forbade pagan sacrifices and when Constantius II, after a temporary mildness, sharpened the pressure on the pagans by two laws of 356, which ordered the closing of the temples, forbade all sacrifices, and aimed to punish violations with the death penalty and confiscation of property.[198] Here appeared the determination to force paganism out of public life and to promote the christianization of the Empire with the State's means of powers. The laws may have motivated also the illegal and tumultuous proceedings of individual Christian groups, which in several places of Asia Minor and Syria sacked or destroyed pagan shrines.[199] Of course, the inculcating of the edicts, which soon followed, and a special threat of punishment against individual provincial governors who saw to their execution too laxly showed that their impact did not correspond to expectations. After his visit to Rome in 357, even the Emperor saw himself compelled not to insist any further on their application.[200] To what extent the pressure of conscience, produced by it, had actually led to conversions, is not of course ascertainable in the individual, but in the partly serious outrages which under the Emperor Julian again befell the Christians may be recognized a pagan reaction to this pressure. Such experiences with harsh intolerance could only induce the Emperors Jovian and Valentinian I to renounce it, thereby gaining much praise from the pagan side;[201] it also accorded to the Christian mission a phase of peaceful work, more conformable to its nature and hence also more successful.

---

[196] On Theodoret see P. Canivet, *Histoire d'une entreprise apologétique au V^e siècle* (Paris 1957). Also the "Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii," ed. G. Morin, *FlorPatr* 39 (Bonn 1935), must be mentioned here.

[197] H. Dörries, "Konstantinische Wende und Glaubensfreibeit," *Wort und Stunde* I (Göttingen 1966), 1–117, especially 25–45, 65–72.

[198] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2–3; 5–6.

[199] Theodoret, *HE* 3, 7, 3, and 6; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 4, 1–5.

[200] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 4; Symmachus, *Rel.* III, 7; see J. Moreau, *JbAC* 2 (1959), 169.

For the last important period of antipagan religious policy the Emperor Theodosius I was mainly responsible,[202] since, after the liquidation of the Arian confusion, he aimed to bring about the complete religious unity of the Empire by a definitive deprivation of the pagans' rights. The abandonment of the title of Pontifex Maximus, the discontinuance of State support for specific pagan priesthoods, the rejection of the drive by the still pagan part of the Roman senatorial aristocracy in the struggle over the *Ara Victoriae* were followed by a series of laws,[203] which consistently and at the same time flexibly pursued the aim of eradicating from the public consciousness the notion that paganism was still a somehow important phenomenon. When the Prefect Cynegius, who was supposed, as the Emperor's agent in the East, to supervise personally the execution of the law on the closing of the temples, went beyond his instructions and allowed some of the shrines to be destroyed, Theodosius gave him a pagan, Tatian, as successor, to appease the wrath of pagan circles—described by Libanius in *Pro templis*—as he usually appointed members of the pagan upper class to the highest offices of state. But he behaved just as firmly, if a moment or an event seemed especially favorable for antipagan measures. The decrees of 391–92,[204] which represent the climax of the antipagan legislation, since they now also forbade every sort of private pagan worship, must be attributed rather to the Emperor's wish to do penance than to the influence of Ambrose, since Theodosius also took care to act consistently independently also in ecclesiastical political questions. The victory over the usurper Eugene,[205] whom, to their own misfortune, the pagan group at Rome had joined, gave him the welcome possibility of finally accomplishing the deprivation of all of paganism's power. Its fate was now sealed in the awareness of the public: it was clearly felt that paganism no longer presented the State with an internal political problem, its few adherents could still serve it only in isolated esoteric circles or remain left to their popular faith in the country; the still preserved greater pagan monuments had only an artistic character. The antipagan laws of the succeeding Emperors were then mostly only corroborations of those of Theodosius I.[206] If Christian fanatics in locally limited cases still appealed for the aid of the State against stirrings of pagan belief, this was justified with reference to the pertinent laws of Theodosius.

---

[201] Themist., *Or.* 5, 67b–c; *Or.* 7; Ammianus Marcellinus, 30, 9, 5; see A. Nagl, *Pauly-Wissowa* VII, A, 2, 2198ff.

[202] W. Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Theodosius* (Munich 1953); N. Q. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London 1961), 71–92; A. Lippold, *Theodosius der Gr. und seine Zeit* (Stuttgart 1968), 38–43, with footnotes.

[203] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 7–9; R. Klein, *Der Streit um den Victoriaaltar* (Darmstadt 1972); Symmachus, *Rel.* III; Ambrose, *Epp.* 17, 18, 57, with commentary.

[204] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 10–12.

[205] On Eugene: J. Ziegler, *Zur religiösen Haltung der Gegenkaiser im 4. Jh. n. Chr.* (Kallmünz 1970), 85–104.

If it remains so difficult to appraise the impact of this antipagan legislation on the missionary success of the Church in details, so little too can it be doubted that, as a whole, it greatly promoted it. Such aid seemed admissible by it, despite the occasional appearance of scruples, since it came from Christian Emperors. It was noted that, in contrast to the attitude of the pagan political leadership with regard to Christians before Constantine, there was no bloody persecution of pagans in which the positive conversion to Christianity by means of a court judgment or torture had been extorted, and it was stressed again and again that conversions without free decision of the will were worthless.[207]

The pagan reaction[208] to the Christian mission of this period and the consequent repressive measures taken by the State offer a complicated picture. It is above all expressed in the literary repudiation of Christianity and in the defense of its own religious tradition; it was the resistance of the intellectuals, whose professional and journalistic activity was hardly curtailed, because it apparently seemed less dangerous to the State than that of an augur, who at his nocturnal consultation about the future might prophesy the imminent overthrow of an Emperor. The most important representative of this circle in the East was the Antiochene *rhetor* Libanius (314–393), who spiritedly deplored the threat to the previous cultural and religious advance, greeted the Emperor Julian as their majestic restorer—but he interceded for the Christians persecuted by the latter—and demanded of Theodosius I an energetic intervention against those who destroyed temples.[209] Himerius and Themistius took a less firm stand for their pagan convictions, and Themistius could even become Prefect of Constantinople and tutor of

---

[206] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 13, 19, 23, 25; *Cod. Just.* 1, 11, 7. Exceptions: *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 42; 16, 10, 21; Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 5, 46, 3–5.

[207] Cf. Chrysostom, (?) *De s. Babyla,* 3; Augustine, *Sermo* 62, 17f.; Gregory I, *Ep.* I, 35.

[208] J. Geffcker, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1929); P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* (Paris 1934); A. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1963).

[209] Libanius, *Or.* 2, 12, 16, 18, 37, 62; *Ep.* 763, 819. On *Or.* 30 (Pro templis): R. van Loy, *Byz(B)* 8 (1933), 7–39; 389–404 (with commentary); on the dating (386): L. Petit, ibid. 21 (1951), 285–309.

Theodosius's son Arcadius. A deep contempt of Christianity again filled Eunapius of Sardes (c. 345–420), who in a collection of *Lives of the Sophists* drew a picture of those men whose hope was the Emperor Julian, but who after his death could no longer rouse the courage to act, but withdrew into their world of theurgy and mysticism.[210] As late as the fifth century pagan philosophers could still teach and write at Alexandria (Hypatia, Asclepiodotus, and Ammonius) and Athens (Proclus and his successors in the Neoplatonist school, Marinus, Isidore, and Simplicius) without, however, being able to exercise an influence threatening to Christianity.[211]

In the West too, persons took up the pen for the preservation of the pagan religious tradition, but especially in Rome they combined this fight with political activity and with a moderate glance at the remaining possibilities. In the pagan senatorial faction at Rome[212] the direct massive polemic against Christianity was for the most part avoided: instead, persons were recruited for paganism through the fostering of ancient Roman literature, through translations such as those of the biography of Apollonius of Tyana and of the pseudo-Apuleius Asclepius, in which the antipagan laws of Theodosius were deplored.[213] The ancient Roman priesthoods were zealously fostered, and in them important offices were personally assumed. In the struggle over the *Ara Victoriae* this group was politically active and through Symmachus demanded full freedom of religion for the adherents of paganism.[214] After the victory of Theodosius over the usurper Eugene on the Frigidus in 394, of course, the opposition of the pagan remnant was forced to extreme caution. The author of the *Historia Augusta* could now recruit for toleration only anonymously and in obscure form. Before him the poet Claudian concealed from Ausonius his sympathies for pagan literature by a half-hearted conversion to Christianity, and Rutilius Namatianus limited himself to a bitter criticism of monasticism.[215] Finally there remained only external behavior and resignation, which in any case dared to express itself only in private circles.

---

[210] Eunapius, *Vitae sophist.*, ed. W. C. Wright (London 1968): L. J. Daley, "Themistius' Plea for religious Tolerance," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 12 (1971), 65–79.

[211] See Geffcken, op. cit., 197–214; W. E. Kaegi, "The Fifth Century Twilight of Byzantine Paganism," *Classica et Medievalia* 27 (1966, publ. 1969), 243–275.

[212] B. Kötting, *Christentum und heidnische Opposition in Rom am Ende des 4. Jh.* (Münster 1961); H. Block in A. Momigliano, op. cit., 193–218.

[213] Macrobius's *Saturnalia* gives a picture of this circle, in which at first Praetextatus played the leading role. Asclepius, c. 24–25: *Corpus Hermet.* II (Paris 1945), 327, 329.

[214] Cf. F. Paschoud, *Roma aeterna* (Rome–Berne 1967); R. Klein, *Symmachus* (Darmstadt 1971, with the literature).

[215] On the *Historia Augusta,* J. Straub, *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik in der christlichen Spätantike* (Bonn 1963); P. Langlois, "Les poèmes chrétiens et le christianisme d'Ausone," *RPh* 43 (1969), 39–58; A. Cameron, *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (London 1970).

At times the Christian mission encountered a longer lasting negative reaction among the peasantry of individual provinces, such as in Upper Egypt and in parts of Syria and North Africa. Here the tenacious clinging of this stratum of the population to its legacy was occasionally seen in local tumults against Christians, but it was not in a position to organize a systematic, widespread resistance.[216]

If one asks about the quality of the total result of Christian evangelization in the Late Roman Empire, important deficiencies must not go unnoticed, despite the outstanding accomplishments. Among the successes must be reckoned the gladly given assent and tirelessly accepted missionary duty of the communities, of monasticism, of the professional missionaries, as well as the profound spiritual change in many new Christians, manifested impressively in the intensive participation in the life of a richly developing liturgy, in the surrender to the monastic ideal, in the consolidation of charitable works, and in the brilliant rise of an independent Christian literature. However, the complementary missionary work after baptism was not everywhere carried out with the necessary care and intensity, so that a continued growth of pagan custom quite often debased Christian piety in content and form and at times even produced a relapse into paganism. Some conversions were not based on inner conviction but proceeded from a regard for a professional career or under the pressure of State power. The agitated complaints of many pastors and writers on the *semichristiani* in the communities here speak a clear language. The quantitatively great and rapid success of the mission had only too often to be paid for with a painful lack of interior quality in the new Christians.[217]

CHRISTIAN MISSION AND JUDAISM. It is a striking characteristic of the mission history of the fourth and fifth centuries that the bustling activity of the Christian communities for the gaining of pagans did not display an equally balanced parallel in regard to contemporary Judaism. Constantine, it is true, in an edict of 315 to the leadership of the Jewish communities, threatened with severe penalties such Jews as harassed their former coreligionists in any way: this assumed a certain stream of Jewish converts at this time. Also at Constantinople the example of Constantine is said to have induced "many Jews" to embrace Christianity.[218]

---

[216] W. H. C. Frend, "The Winning of the Countryside," *JEH* 18 (1967), 1–14.

[217] W. Daut, "Die 'Halben Christen' unter den Konvertiten und Gebildeten des 4. und 5. Jh.," *ZMR* 55 (1971), 171–188. To this pertains also the sharp criticism of Christian behavior in Salvian, *De gubernatione mundi* (c. 440). Relapses into paganism: Chromatius of Aquileia, *Tract.* 4, 4, 1–2; for Gregory I, see footnote 130, *supra*.

[218] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 8, 1; Sozomen, *HE* 2, 3, 7.

But this can refer only to locally limited occurrences, since an Empire-wide movement of conversion among the Jews would have been reported with gratification by Christians such as Eusebius. Those conversions too must not have been very numerous which allegedly followed the appearance of the Cross in Jerusalem under Bishop Cyril or the extraordinary occurrences at the failure of the attempted rebuilding of the temple by the Emperor Julian.[219] To be sure, into the fifth century in East and West individual Jews always converted to Christianity, and Ambrose even speaks once of *plurimi ex Judaeis* in this context, but in another place he himself gives the correct proportion when he says that there were all too few of the many.[220] Also Chromatius of Aquileia once remarked that one daily witnessed many Jewish conversions, and yet he preached repeatedly in a polemical manner on the *judaica infidelitas.*[221] The report of a Bishop Severus, according to whom at the beginning of the fifth century the entire Jewry of the island of Minorca—several hundred—had let themselves be persuaded by miracles worked by the relics of Stephen to embrace Christianity scarcely appeared before the seventh century.[222] More deserving of credence is the account, spread in East and West, that a group of Jews on the island of Crete under the Emperor Theodosius II asked for baptism because they had been deceived by a juggler who appeared as a new Moses.[223] Hence in most cases it was a question of individual conversions, which came about in the normal missionary way—through contact of individual Christians with Jews. On the Christian side people did not always seem convinced of the sincerity of such a conversion, since hardly ever is it reported that a Jewish Christian was admitted to the clergy.[224] That purely external conversions occasionally happened appears from an edict of the Emperor Honorius, who in 416 granted to baptized Jews a return with impunity to their former faith, whereas as a rule the passage of a Christian to Judaism was strictly punished.[225]

---

[219] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 5, 5; Socrates, *HE* 2, 28, 22; Theodoret, *HE* 3, 20, 8; Sozomen, *HE* 2, 22, 13.

[220] Basil, *Ep.* 45, 2; Chrysostom, *Quod Christus sit deus,* 2; Augustine, *Ep.* 82, 17 (to Jerome); 196, 11; *C. Faust.,* 12–13; Ambrose, *Expos. Luc.* 7, 172; 6, 64.

[221] Chromatius of Aquileia, *Tract.* 35; *tract. in Mt.* 10, 2, 5; 10, 3, 3; *Sermo* 43, 31–32; see *SChr* 154 (Paris 1969), 56, footnote 1.

[222] *PL* 41, 821–832; ed. crit. G. Segui-Vidal (Rome–Mallorca 1937); on the dating: B. Blumenkranz, *Les auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les Juifs et le Judaisme* (Paris 1963), 106–110.

[223] Socrates, *HE* 7, 38; Cassiodorus, *Hist. trip.* 12, 9. On the alleged missonary successes of Rabbula of Edessa among the Jews, see footnote 35, supra.

[224] Socrates, *HE* 5, 21.

[225] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 8, 23; Socrates, *HE* 7, 17.

It is in accord with the facts just described that in the not inconsiderable Christian literature of the period which deals with the relationship of Christianity and Judaism,[226] only rarely can a special interest in an intensive mission to the Jews be established. It is found, for example, with Ambrose, who despite his anti-Jewish theological polemic and his unyielding attitude in the matter of the rebuilding of the synagogue of Callinicum, insisted that the Church send its missionaries also to the Jews and that Jewish converts be given material support, who personally exerted himself for the conversion of a learned Jew, in his sermons addressed the Jews directly, urged them to accept Christianity, and gave directions for their instruction in the catechumenate.[227] A similar attitude is found in Sidonius Apollinaris and especially in Gregory I, who, it is true, was very solicitous for the conversion of the Jews but decidedly condemned every form of compulsion in their regard.[228]

But in the Christianity of the fourth and fifth centuries, more and more the idea imposed itself that a mission to the Jews was ultimately purposeless, because they did not want to convert, in fact, in accord with God's plan of salvation, they could not convert for the time being, since their "hardness of heart," lasting until the end of time, was to attest that through their unbelief in the Messiah the call of the Chosen People to God was lost by them and now the Church of Christ has become the true Israel.[229] It would be too superficial a judgment if one wanted to see in this notion only a theological alibi for the lack of success of a Christian mission to the Jews, since it already belonged in its beginnings to the New Testament and distinguished itself in a longer development until Augustine justified it by the mystery of predestination.[230] This theological explanation of the unconvertibility of Israel was expounded by some Christian writers about a defamation of Judaism, as, for example, by Gregory of Elvira, Augustine, Leo I, and Caesarius of Arles. But in general it was accompanied by a strong animosity, which at times, as in Chrysostom, lost all moderation in tone and in Cyril of Alexandria led to anti-Semitic excesses.[231] The acidity of this polemic had one of its causes in the peculiar power of attraction of the Jewish religion, which again and again induced Christians in East and West to take part in Jewish festival customs, in the observance of the Sabbath, and so forth, and very keenly upset some bishops.[232] A further cause was inherent in the rivalry in which Jewish recruiting of proselytes and Christian mission confronted each other in their quest for pagans.[233] Finally, the emotions were again and again charged in daily life by the fiery manner of discussion, in which both sides spared themselves nothing in unspeakable charges.[234]

---

[226] See A. L. Williams, *Adversus Judaeos* (Cambridge 1935); B. Blumenkranz, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins* (Basel 1946); id., *Les auteurs chrétiens;* D. Judant, *Judaïsme et Christianisme. Dossier patristique* (Paris 1969), 325–350: Index patristique.

[227] J. Mesot, *Die Heidenbekehrung bei Ambrosius von Mailand* (Schöneck 1958), 69–73: preaching to the Jews.

[228] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epp.* 8, 13; 6, 11; 3, 4; on Gregory I: B. Blumenkranz, *Les auteurs,* 73ff.

[229] M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1964), 162–165; Y. Bodin, *S. Jerôme et l'église* (Paris 1966), 162–165.

[230] K. H. Rengstorf, *Kirche und Synagoge, Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden* I (Stuttgart 1968), 23–83; on Augustine: B. Blumenkranz, *RechAug* 1 (1958), 225–241. K. Hruby, *Juden und Judentum bei den Kirchenvätern* (Zurich 1971).

State legislation[235] followed only with hesitations the general estimation of contemporary Judaism by the majority of Christians and until the last years of the reign of Theodosius I maintained that the Jewish religion was not forbidden and also repeatedly condemned the destruction of Jewish synagogues by Christian fanatics. Some laws, which at first aimed to emphasize and assure only the preeminence of Christianity over Judaism—prohibition of conversion to Jewish belief, of the possession of Christian slaves, of mixed marriages—were then followed from the end of the fourth century in growing measure by decrees which also restricted most painfully the freedom of worship and of profession, as well as the standing of the Jews in civil law. They made ready that atmosphere in which Merovingian and Visigothic kings regarded the compulsory baptism of Jews as a permissible means of gaining religious unity within their spheres of authority.

---

[231] Greg. Illib., *Tract.* 3–6, 11, 13. Augustine, *Adv. Judaeos, Pl* 42, 51–64; on Leo I: B. Blumenkranz, *Kirche und Synagoge* I, 97–101; on Caesarius: J. Courreau, *BLE* 71 (1970), 92–112. On anti-Jewish propaganda in general, M. Simon, *Versus Israel,* 116–274, and B. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chrétiens,* 213–278; on Chrysostom: M. Simon, *Recherches d'Histoire Judeo-chrétienne* (Paris 1962), 140–153; on Cyril: H. I. Bell, "Anti-Semitism in Alexandria," *JRS* 31 (1941), 1–18; cf. also Cyril's Easter letters, 1; 4–6 (*PG* 77, 513–533). Syrian Fathers (Aphraates, Ephrem) also took part in this polemic, just as the Arians did; see W. Cramer, *Kirche und Synagoge* I, 176–186. From the Arian Bishop Maximinus came a *Tractatus contra Judaeos,* ed. C. H. Turner, *JThS* 20 (1919), 293–310; see B. Capelle, *RBén* 34 (1922), 81–108.

[232] Synods also warned against "Judaizing"; cf. Syn. Illib. canons 16, 16; 49–50, 78; Laodic. canons 38–39; *Stat. eccl. ant.,* 84, 89.

[233] B. Blumenkranz, "Die jüdish-christliche Missionskonkurrenz (3.–6. Jh.)," *Klio* 39 (1961), 227–233.

[234] M. Simon, *Verus Israel,* 214–238, rightly refers to the often overlooked sharp polemics on the Jewish side. An instructive example in Augustine, *Enarr. in ps.* 43, 17, 7.

[235] Survey in J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1959), 623–633, with the literature. The laws are collected in the *Cod. Theod.* 16, 8; see J. E. Seaver, *Persecution of Jews in the Roman Empire 410–438* (University of Kansas 1952); B. Kötting, *Kirche und Synagoge* I, 145–149.

3. The First Contacts of Christianity with the Germans and the Conversion of the Goths

"The Churches established in the [two] Germanies have believed nothing other and transmitted nothing other than those in the Spanish provinces or among the Celts, than those in the east or in Egypt, than those in Libya or in the middle of the world."[236] This much quoted sentence from *Adversus haereses,* composed c. 180–182 by Bishop Irenaeus of Lyon, is the first testimony for the presence of Christianity in the Roman Rhinelands, the provinces of Mainz and Cologne. Even the archeological testimonies reach no farther up. In the third century Christianity must have gained strength on the Rhine and the Danube, as the reports of the martyrdoms in these provinces indicate. In the second half of the third century the beginnings of an episcopal organization on the wide frontier of the Empire facing the Germans became visible. With this is included a *terminus a quo* for the first contact of the Germans with the Church.

Christianity appeared to the Germans as an element of late ancient civilization with which they had to come into conflict, and, indeed, in the West at first as one form of religion alongside others. Preeminent in power and fame among the Alemanni kings who in 357 fought the Romans near Strasbourg were Chnodomar and his nephew Serapio. Serapio was originally named Agenarich, but in Gaul he had assumed the cult name Serapio after his initiation into the mysteries of Isis.[237] The Frank Silvanus, in the Roman service, became around the same time a Christian,[238] and in fact a Catholic, since in the West orthodoxy was the dominant form of Christianity. Conversions of German officers to the Christian religion still remained the rare exceptions during the fourth century. Not until the fifth century were the Germans who had risen in the imperial service or their successors converted to Christianity in growing numbers. The successors of Germanic lords who had risen in the imperial senatorial aristocracy also assimilated themselves interiorly to the new faith; for example, the *Patricius* Merobaudes, who c. 440 founded a monastery in the see of Troyes,[239] or the *Comes* Arbogast of Trier, whom Auspicius of Toul characterized c. 470 as *praefiguratum sacerdotio.*[240]

The line between the Germans who had risen in the senatorial aristocracy and the princes of the *foederati,* who with their people had bound themselves to the Emperor by a *foedus,* was fluid. But the decision for Christ could not remain a private matter among the federate princes in view of the close fusion of religion with the total life of the people. It also automatically affected the group of people whom the prince governed and hence led more or less inevitably to a collective conversion. The earliest testimonies for a mass conversion on the Rhine refer to the Burgundians, who, according to Orosius and Socrates, accepted the Catholic Christianity of the Gallo-Romans after they had settled c. 407 on the left bank of the Rhine.[241] A similar decision may have been made also by groups of Frankish *foederati* even before the end of the fifth century.[242] The Sueves in Spain became Catholic under Rechiar (448–451).[243] The confession of Christ probably implied at times also an acknowledgment of *Imperium* and Emperor: it was a question of a formal act rather than of a real conversion. Thus is explained how the Burgundians and the Sueves without difficulty exchanged Catholic for Arian Christianity when they fell under the influence of the Arian Goths.

---

[236] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I, X, 2; *BG* 7, 552.

[237] Ammianus Marcellinus, XVI, 12, 1 and 25.

[238] M. Waas, *Germanen im römischen Dienst im 4. Jh.* (dissertation, Bonn 1965), 123ff.

[239] F. Lot, "Un diplôme de Clovis confirmatif d'une donation de patrice romain," *Revue Belge de Phil. et d'Hist.* 17 (1938), 906–911.

[240] E. Ewig, *Trier im Merowingerreich* (Trier 1957), 57, footnote 226.

Earlier and more enduringly than the Germans on the Rhine did the Goths on the lower Danube and the Black Sea coast come into contact with Christianity. Cappadocian war prisoners, perhaps also anonymous missionaries, were the first agents of the gospel, which at first probably found followers in the lower classes. A Bishop Theophilus of Gothia, who perhaps functioned in the Crimea, signed the acts of the Council of Nicaea in 325. Among the Visigoths the treaty concluded with Constantine in 332 may have favored contacts with the Christian religion. Very soon heterodox teachers also appeared. The Mesopotamian sectarian Audaeus worked among the Visigoths during his exile in Scythia (Dobrudsha). Alongside Audians and Catholics were the Arians, whose denomination was destined to become the Gothic form of Christianity, not least because of the considerable personality of the Gothic Bishop Ulfilas.

---

[241] Paul Orosius, *Hist. adv. Pag.* 41, sect. 8, *CSEL* V, 554; Socrates, *HE* 30, *PG* 67, 805; O. Fiebiger–L. Schmidt, *Inschriftensammlung zur Gesch. der Ostgermanen* (Denkschriften Ak. Wiss. Wien, phil. hist. Kl., 60, 3, 1918), no. 72: Christian grave inscription of the Protector Domesticus Hariulf of the royal family of the Burgundians. I hold, with Hauck and L. Schmidt (*Die Ostgermanen,* 2nd ed. 1941, 138), against K. D. Schmidt (*Bekehrung* I, 407ff.) to the authenticity of the testimonies of Orosius and Socrates. Perhaps one may also see Burgundians in the Germans who appear on the Christian grave slabs of Wiesbaden and Worms (see H. Büttner, "Frühes fränkisches Christentum am Mittelrhein," *AMrhKG* 3 [1951], 18, 32).

[242] The Frankish kinglet Chararich, whom Clovis deprived of his authority, was a Christian, since Clovis let him and his son enter the clergy (Gregory, *Hist. Fr.* II, 41). If, with Lot, one dates the elimination of the Frankish kinglets in the years after the victory over Syagrius, Chararich had become a Christian before Clovis. It is possible that the Frankish Kings of Cologne were already Christian; cf. K. Corsten, "Die fränkischen Königsgräber in Köln, *RhVjBl* 10 [1940], 168–171.

[243] K. D. Schmidt, *Bekehrung,* 374–376.

Ulfilas was born c. 311. Through his mother he was a descendant of Cappadocian war prisoners, but his father was probably a Goth. As a cleric-lector he began to translate the Bible into Gothic. He went with a Gothic embassy to the court of Constantine I or of Constantius II. Eusebius of Nicomedia, Bishop of Constantinople from 338, ordained him Bishop of the Goths, perhaps in 341 at the Synod of Antioch. Ulfilas professed the moderate Homoian Arianism of Acacius and as bishop completed his translation of the Scripture. He escaped a first persecution of Christians in 347–348, and the Emperor settled him with his faithful near Nicopolis (Trnovo). Ulfilas died at Constantinople in 381 or 383. The Gothic group that had followed him remained permanently separated from the main body of their nation and survived in the Balkans as a peaceful tribe of herdsmen.

The persecution of 347–48, like the next one of 369–372, struck at all Gothic Christians, regardless of denomination. The second persecution was related to a new Visigothic-Roman conflict and probably also to a power struggle between the Visigothic Princes Athanarich and Fritigern.[244] At that time both rivals were still pagans, but Fritigern, as the representative of a pro-Roman policy, may already have been leaning to Christianity. Athanarich at first held his ground in the leadership of his people. The persecution inaugurated by him was at the same time an anti-Roman reaction. The Audians were routed, and their remnant joined the Catholics. A group of Catholic Goths withdrew from the main body and migrated to Thrace.

Athanarich's position was shaken when in 376 the Huns attacked the Visigoths after they had overrun the Ostrogothic Kingdom. Under Fritigern's leadership bands of Visigoths trespassed on the soil of the Empire. At that time Fritigern seems to have embraced the Arian confession of his patron, the Emperor Valens; his passage was followed by the historically decisive mass conversion of his people to Arianism.[245] The conflict with the imperial administration, in the course of which Fritigern finally led his Visigoths in 378 to victory over the Emperor Valens at Adrianople, made no change in the religious decision. If there were still destined to be anti-Christian excesses even after the treaty with Theodosius in 382, Visigothic paganism thereafter was without significance for the future of the people. Catholic Christianity also now moved to the background. It maintained itself as the popular religion only among the separated groups, such as the "Crimea Goths."

---

[244] The historicity of the conflict between Fritigern and Athanarich is denied by Thompson with arguments that are unconvincing.

[245] Thus the traditional view. Thompson dates the mass conversion only in the years 382–395.

The origin and course of the Gothic mission can be understood only against the background of the Church history of the Greco-Roman East. The power of radiation of Greek Christianity, whose nucleus was Asia Minor, explains the early start of the work of conversion. The various denominations of the East met in missionary territory. The Goths accepted the diluted Homoian Arianism, which in the decisive moment of history was the denomination of the Eastern Emperor and of the court of Constantinople. Ulfilas's creed corresponded to the formula of Rimini (359), which for its part was based on the formulas of Sirmium (359) and Antioch (341). The Gothic Church also borrowed from the Church of the Empire the episcopal organization. The national liturgical language grew out of the needs of the mission: an important achievement of Ulfilas,[246] but against the background of the relations of the East, where, in addition to Greek and Latin, there were also a Syriac and a Coptic liturgical language, it was nothing revolutionary. Ulfilas's translation of the Bible obtained the full recognition of the Church Fathers Jerome and John Chrysostom.

A deeper understanding of the controversies which occupied the theologians of the East in the fourth century may be presumed in any event in Ulfilas, but not in the new converts. It is extremely doubtful whether the Homoian Arianism better corresponded to definite Germanic ideas than did Catholic orthodoxy.[247] The Goths did not choose the appealing Christian profession after a critical examination; they accepted the form of Christianity which Constantinople offered them. That, just the same, a Gothic national Church arose is explained by a rare coincidence: the death of the Emperor Valens on the battlefield of Adrianople sealed the fate of Arianism within the Empire. The Gothic Homoians were thereafter separated from the Church of the Empire by a deep ditch.

The isolated Gothic Church preserved the Homoian body of religious beliefs essentially unchanged. The Gothic theologians of the fifth and sixth centuries lacked originality. They fell to a certain degree under the influence of *Romania* when in the fifth century the Goths moved from the eastern to the western half of the Empire. Ulfilas's

---

[246] Excessively stressed by Scardigli, *Conversione,* 67ff. Scardigli wrongly sees in Ulfilas's translation work a conscious achievement of the spiritual confrontation with the Empire.

[247] According to K. D. Schmidt (*Bekehrung* I, 275), Ulfilas saw the relationship of God the Father to Christ in the perspective of the Germanic Father-Son relationship and of the tribal idea.

Bible was sporadically revised with a view to the Latin Bible, and there seem also to have been bilingual Gothic-Latin Bibles.[248]

Except for the translation of the Bible and the liturgical language, it is possible to speak of a germanization at the earliest in the area of the ecclesiastical organization. The ecclesiastical classifications which could not be modeled on the urban districts had to conform to the organization of the people or of the army—hundreds, five-hundreds, thousands. Gothic Arianism early gave a place to the proprietary church system, perhaps under the influence of a Germanic proprietary temple system. Monasticism was not admitted or in any case played no substantial role. Certain modifications of the ecclesiastical constitution in the sense of an assimilation to the Roman *civitas* organization and the organization of the Church of the Empire occurred after the settlement of the East Germans in the western half of the Empire but cannot be understood exactly. Annual synods of the Arian clergy at Geneva are attested for the Burgundians.[249] Only the Vandals, as *imitatores imperii,* established an Arian patriarchate.

At first the Gothic Church clung purposely to the universalism of the old Church and, like it, claimed alone to represent the true doctrine. But when the East Germans founded their kingdoms in the western provinces of the Empire it appeared that a missionary Arianism could only imperil the inner peace of the kingdoms. While the Vandals did not shrink from establishing Arianism as the religion of their kingdom,[250] the Goths and the other Arian peoples accustomed themselves to regard their Church as a national institution while renouncing missionary exertions in regard to the Romans. Hence the "tolerance" relating to Catholic *Romania* was conditioned by a special political situation and finally led to stagnation.

The renunciation of missionary work, of course, was limited to Catholic *Romania* and did not extend to the Germanic and Iranian peoples. For the "Gothic religion" were won the Ostrogoths, Gepids, Vandals, Alans, Rugii, Heruli, and Sciri, and temporarily the Burgundians, Spanish Suevi, and Lombards. Further particulars of this Arian mission are unknown. Its chief representatives in the first phase must have been the Little Goths of the Balkans. The Asdingian Vandals had certainly been won c. 400, since they transmitted Arianism to the Silingian Vandals on the Main and the Alans, who with them crossed the Rhine at the end of 406. The Ostrogoths probably accepted Ulfilas's

---

[248] E. A. Thompson, *The Visigoths,* 144ff.

[249] K. D. Schmidt, *Bekehrung,* 371.

[250] They apparently went from Homoian to radical Arianism (K. D. Schmidt, *Bekehrung,* 371).

Christianity even before their migration to Pannonia in 455. At the same time the Gepids, another Gothic clan, must have become Arians. The Gepids certainly passed on their Christianity to the Rugii, the Sciri, and the Heruli, with whom they were politically united under Attila's rule, then through their common struggle for freedom against the Huns in 454 and their common opposition to the Ostrogoths. The Arianism of Ulfilas seems to have reached even the Thuringians and Bavarians.[251] Latecomers were the Heruli and especially the Lombards, who after long hesitation probably only made their decision shortly before their invasion of Italy in 568, perhaps with a view to the Ostrogoths remaining in Italy.

Gradually Arianism established itself among all the Germans of the Danube: its area of expansion corresponded to a culture province defined by the Goths. It remained foreign to the Germans on the Rhine; however, the Goths finally carried it also to the peoples who migrated to Gaul and Spain, among whom now the Arian Gothic influence came into conflict with the Roman Catholic environment. The Burgundians, for example, who in a close alliance with the Visigoths (c. 451–471) obtained a new royal dynasty of Gothic blood, converted to Arianism. And the Sueves of Spain became Arians under the influence of their partners after they had concluded an alliance with the Visigoths c. 464. Ostrogothic emissaries were active at the Frankish court in an effort to introduce Arianism, and not without success until Clovis's decision cut the ground from under them. Among the Burgundians and the Spanish Sueves Arianism never sank roots so deeply as among the Goths, Vandals, and Danube Germans.

---

[251] On this controverted question: E. Klebel, "Zur Gesch. des Christentums in Bayern vor Bonifatius," *Gedenkgabe zum 1200. Todestag* (Fulda 1954), 388–411; also, F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich–Vienna 1965), 337, footnote 48, pp. 345ff., 358, footnote 100. On the basis of purely linguistic arguments Scardigli accepts a Gothic mediation to the other Germans (*Conversione,* 84–86).

CHAPTER 14

The Building of the Organization of the Church of the Empire

The Local Episcopal Church

The rapid progress of evangelization of the population of the Empire after the Church obtained freedom led to a strong increase in the number of Christian congregations, which, as previously, continued to be local churches governed by a single bishop. The ordination of a successor even in the lifetime of the present bishop was, therefore, as in the case of Augustine, regarded as an illicit deviation from the norm.[1] Whereas in the East the word *paroichia* established itself for the local church, the terminology in the West long remained unsettled: here, in addition to *paroecia, ecclesia, territorium, fines episcopatus,* and *dioecesis* were also used.[2] The decision as to the necessity or opportunity for establishing new local churches lay usually with the bishops of an ecclesiastical province. The weightiest prerequisite for the new foundation was a sufficient number of faithful: the Council of Chalcedon expressly related it to the rise of new cities; the faithful in hamlets and on farms were to be cared for by itinerant pastors who belonged to the clergy of the urban community.[3] And so areas with many cities had correspondingly high numbers of bishoprics of no great extent in size, while in areas of few cities their *territorium* was substantially larger. Hence in the Latin West the first type was especially characteristic of North Africa and of central and southern Italy, the second of Upper Italy, large parts of Gaul, of Spain and the Danubian and Balkan provinces.[4] Ordinarily the episcopal boundaries coincided with the civil administrative boundaries of the cities, but numerous deviations and quarrels over jurisdiction between neighboring bishops show that no strictly obligatory law existed on this matter. Hence there were also episcopal congregations in settlements which had no city rights, in addition to bishoprics within whose territory lay two or more cities.[5] Great exertions were required to establish the principle which restricted the bishop in the exercise of his functions to the territory of his own local church. Again and again synodal decrees had to enjoin that no bishop could ordain in another bishopric without the consent of the head of the ecclesiastical province or ordain a candidate who was subject to another bishop.[6] In the West the Bishop of Rome did not regularly intervene in the erecting of new local churches, but restricted himself to the warning to observe the relevant synodal decisions. The African episcopate decided in complete independence the various problems which occurred at the incorporation of Donatist local churches into the Catholic Church. In the East, on the other hand, the State power was quite often appealed to in cases of conflict or acted on its own.

---

[1] Cf. Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 7, 2; Augustine, *Ep.* 213, 4, besides Eusebius, *HE* 6, 11, 1–3, and Theodoret, *HE* 2, 17, 4–7.

[2] Examples of *paroichia;* Patristic Greek Lexikon s.v. II D; the Latin terms indicated in A. Scheuermann, op. cit., 1059ff. *Dioecesis* as the term for the local church is not found until the beginning of the fifth century.

[3] Council of Serdica, can. 6; Council of Chalcedon, can. 17.

[4] J. Gaudemet, op. cit., 324f.

[5] For Italy see S. Mochi Onory, *Vescovi e città* (Bologna 1933); for Gaul, E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* II (Paris 2nd ed. 1966), 125–133.

[6] J. Gaudemet, op. cit., 328

The connection of a bishop with a local church bound him to permanent residence in his community, from which he was to be absent only for serious reasons and ordinarily no longer than three weeks. This duty of residence was often disregarded, especially in the fourth century, because of the inclination of some bishops to be present personally at the imperial court in order to request material aid for their community and also at times personal privileges. Hence synods forbade these journeys or made them dependent on a written permission from the metropolitan.[7] The unlimited duty of caring for his community also justified the prohibition to transfer a bishop to another see, which was motivated by patristic theology with the idea of a mystical marriage between bishop and local church, to be terminated only by death. In the course of the fourth century this prohibition, despite strict sanctions such as deposition and excommunication, was again and again disregarded and especially in the East often led to serious conflicts. From the beginning of the fifth century there appeared an easing of the prohibition, since reasons for exceptions were recognized—rejection of a new bishop by the community, prohibition of entering upon the office by the secular power, pastoral necessity.[8] The provincial synod had to consider whether deposition was to be decreed because of serious lapses, but against its verdict the one concerned had the right of appeal to Rome, which inquired whether the case was to be taken up at another synod. In the East, on the other hand, at times the Emperor, on his own initiative, decreed the deposition of a bishop.[9]

The growing number of faithful in the city congregations and the success of the mission among the peasantry introduced, from the fourth century on, certain new features into the structure of the episcopal local church. In larger cities, such as Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, Carthage, and Milan, in addition to the cathedral, other churches became necessary in thickly populated urban areas. In Rome this led to the constructing of the so-called *titular churches,* to which members of the clergy of the city of Rome were assigned for the care of souls in these areas. However, these *tituli* remained parts of the one Roman local church; their clerics belonged, furthermore, to the *presbyterium* of the Roman community, whose unity was stressed by the liturgy celebrated by the

---

[7] Council of Nicaea, can. 16; Council of Antioch, can. 3; Council of Serdica, can. 7–8, 11–12; Council of Carthage (390), can. 7, (397) can. 56.

[8] J. Gaudemet, op. cit., 328; J. Trummer, "Mystisches im alten Kirchenrecht. Die geistliche Ehe zwischen Bischof und Diözese," *OAKR* 2 (1951), 62–75.

[9] Council of Serdica, can. 7.

Roman Bishop in the titular churches by turns.[10] In the Greek East there developed for the care of the peasants belonging to a local church the institute of the *chorepiscopus,* with which the first synods of the fourth century, such as those of Ancyra, Neocaesarea, and Nicaea, concerned themselves. Their regulations consistently emphasize the full dependence of the *chorepiscopus* on the real head of the community, who alone defined the sphere of his functions. The so-called Synod of Laodicea (collection of canons c. 343–381) forbade any further ordination of *chorepiscopi* and intended to replace them with itinerant pastors, while the Synod of Seleucia–Ctesiphon permitted only one *chorepiscopus* for a community. As yet the West had not received the institute of the *chorepiscopus.*[11] In the often quite extensive bishoprics of Gaul and North Italy special pastoral stations were erected in the rural settlements far removed from the cathedral, and these for their part represented a liturgical center for the inhabitants of the smaller villages and farms of the vicinity. Such subordinate places were, it is true, not parishes in the full sense of the word, since they did not yet administer their own church property, and the clergy working there had no real jurisdiction for an exactly defined territory, but the development toward the later parish was foreshadowed.[12]

The Metropolitan Union

As early as the late second century initial movements toward a spatial organization within the Universal Church were clear: these would go beyond the episcopal local church. Various rules of the Council of Nicaea now show that out of these starts there developed a clearly organized structure of differing sizes. One of these consisted of the gathering of all local churches of one civil province into a union, which in the lands of Greek speech was called *eparchia,* in those of Latin speech *provincia.* But this development by no means proceeded uniformly in the entire range of the distribution of Christianity, as regards either time or the causes which determined it.

The Council of Nicaea took for granted the fully developed ecclesiastical province or metropolitan union in the East when it ruled that the ordination of a bishop should be performed, so far as possible, by all the bishops of a province, and the confirmation of his election should come from the "metropolitan."[13] The very title metropolitan indicates that this chief of an ecclesiastical province had his seat in the metropolis, the capital of the civil province. Here too the boundaries of the ecclesiastical and of the corresponding civil sphere of administration generally coincided. The synods of the fourth and fifth centuries determined rights of the metropolitan in more detail: He led the episcopal synod of the province, which should meet twice a year, in discussing and deciding questions of more than local importance. Thus there belonged to the metropolitan a certain function of control over the religious and ecclesiastical life within the province and over the performance of their duties by the bishops, who had to obtain from him written permission, the so-called *litterae-formatae,* for an absence of any length from their see.[14] The Synod of Antioch in 341 stressed on the one hand that the local bishop was independent in his administration of his see, but on the other hand it called attention to the fact that the metropolitan was responsible for the care of the ecclesiastical province and without his consent and that of the other bishops he could not undertake anything that went beyond this.[15] Here it became clear that an adjustment between the claims of the local bishop and the measures to be decided collegially by the provincial synod was not always easy to achieve.

---

[10] G. Matthiae, *Le chiese di Roma dal IV al IX secolo* (Bologna 1963), 54–77.

[11] E. Kirsten, "Chorbischof," *RAC* II, 1105–14.

[12] For North Italy, G. Forchielli, *La pieve rurale* (Rome 1931); for Gaul, E. Griffe, op. cit. III (Paris 1965) 260–291.

[13] Council of Nicaea, can. 4.

The metropolitan organization established itself first and extensively in the Greek East, except for Egypt, which quite early showed a large area in which all bishops of the country as well as of Libya and the Pentapolis were apparently directly subject to the Bishop of Alexandria without the intermediate stage of the metropolitan. In the Latin West the development was still less uniform. In North Africa[16] it exhibited certain differences quite early, in so far as the rank of metropolitan, who was here called primate, sometimes belonged to the senior bishop of the province according to the date of his ordination, thus he did not have to have his seat in the provincial capital. Besides, a special position pertained to the Bishop of Carthage, who was always Primate of the Provincia Proconsularis, and, in addition, as *Primas totius Africae* summoned and directed the African plenary councils, which possessed special authority. On the other hand, the metropolitan organization did not exist at all in the area of the civil Diocese of Italia Suburbicaria with ten provinces and the islands of Sicily and Corsica, whose relatively numerous local bishops were directly subject to the Bishop of Rome and so always appeared at the Roman synods. In Upper Italy the Bishop of Milan[17] first appeared as metropolitan of an ecclesiastical province which comprised several civil provinces. This was first connected with the importance of Milan in the civil sphere, which it had gained as imperial residence since Diocletian and as seat of the vicar for the administration of *Italia Annonaria,* and then with the demographic situation of Upper Italy, which had far fewer cities than the South and the district around Rome. Likewise, the small number of cities in the provinces of Venetia, Istria, Raetia, and Noricum enabled the Bishop of Aquileia from c. 425 to become the sole metropolitan of this extensive territory.[18] In neighboring Pannonia a de facto preeminence belonged to the Bishop of Sirmium, which from time to time was the imperial residence and seat of a *Praefectus Praetorio.* But the development to a full metropolitan constitution here was at first impeded by the wandering of the peoples. In the other political dioceses of the Balkans it could be fully established—in Thrace from the start, because here the practice of the Eastern Church always prevailed, and in Dacia since it belonged to the eastern part of the Empire (395).[19] In Gaul, on the other hand, the assimilation of the ecclesiastical organization to the civil administrative spheres is clear. With some divergences, from the late fourth century the provincial capitals of Gaul became also the seats of the metropolitan. Thus the Metropolitan of Narbonensis Prima resided in the provincial capital, Narbonne, but when the city of Arles was designated after 392 as seat of the Prefecture of Gaul, the Bishop of Arles at once claimed the metropolitan dignity.[20] For Spain in the fourth century there are no clear statements in the sources on the organizational development of the Church there. The Council of Elvira at the beginning of the century, at which met nineteen bishops, mostly from the south of the country, knew, it is true, a *prima cathedra episcopatus,* by which, however, the see of the senior bishop is to be understood at first, but metropolitan authority was not attributed to him. Only after the middle of the fifth century was the metropolitan organization found in Spain in particular features. The special situation of the Spanish Church under Visigothic rule induced its episcopate to lean more powerfully on Rome and to receive its canonical rules from there. It was not until the sixth century that the great age of the Spanish provincial synods began.[21]

---

[14] J. Gaudemet, op. cit., 381.

[15] Council of Antioch, can. 9.

[16] G. Bardy, "Afrique," *DDC* I, 293–307.

[17] P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (Paris 1938), 41–54.

Also in the case of the ecclesiastical provinces did the boundaries in most cases coincide with those of the corresponding unit of civil administration, but Innocent I expressly insisted that a new arrangement of the civil provinces in Syria must not include a revision of the ecclesiastical organization.[22] When, on his own initiative, the Emperor Theodosius II made Beirut an ecclesiastical metropolis and assigned to it six local churches of the province of Tyre as it then existed, this led to a protracted struggle with which even the Council of Chalcedon had to deal. It rejected the imperial measure and thereby claimed for itself competence for such decisions.[23]

---

[18] H. Leclercq, "Aquilée," *DACL* I, 2655.

[19] J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes* (Paris 1918), 364–376.

[20] E. Griffe, op. cit., II, 137–146.

[21] D. Mansilla, "Orígines de la organización metropolitana en la Iglesia española," *HS* 12 (1959), 1–36; on Elvira, J. Gaudemet, *DHGE* 15, 317–348, with the literature.

Superior Organization of the Greater Churches

Finally, the Council of Nicaea also knew a form of classification of churches on a still larger scale, in which all the local churches of a quite extensive geographical area or unit of administration larger than the civil province were combined under the bishop of the most important city of this area. Canon 6 of the Council specified three of these structures: To the Bishop of Alexandria was acknowledged the ancient "customary right" which gave him the supremacy over all the local churches of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis; the same "custom" held for the Bishop of Rome; and the privileges of Antioch were to be similarly maintained. In the last two cases, it is true, there was no delimitation of the geographical area within which the full authority of the Bishop of Rome or of Antioch was valid, just as the vague formulation in regard to the "privileges" of Antioch is noteworthy. But the context of the canon makes clear that in both cases there was question of a form of organization which extended far beyond the framework of a metropolitan union, but for which as yet no special designation had been found. In the discussion of the content of canon 6, the position of the Bishop of Jerusalem also played a role. Out of consideration for the ecclesiastical past of his city a "position of honor" was awarded to him, but his subordination to the Metropolitan of Caesarea in Palestine was expressly stressed. By its canon 6 the Council of Nicaea basically recognized the classifications of the greater churches that were later termed "patriarchates."[24]

Their development was completed in a rather lengthy process, whose course was determined by several factors. In the first place, both chronologically and in accord with their internal importance, the geopolitical and economic importance of the three cities, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, must be named: their local bishops became the leaders of these great ecclesiastical classifications. This factor had already to a certain degree determined the route of the early Christian mission, when the first missionaries sought to gain a foothold precisely in the great political centers of the Mediterranean world and in the congregations founded there gained the bases for mission work in the territory dependent on these cities.[25] The consciousness, spontaneously springing from missionary relationships, of the solidarity of the congregations of Syria, Egypt, and central and southern Italy further promoted their organizational merger into greater unions. This assimilation of the ecclesiastical organization to the existing administrative division of the Empire, which presented itself virtually without alternative, was even the sole and unrestricted justification for the erecting of the fourth patriarchate, that of Constantinople, when the Synod of 381 conferred on the bishop of the eastern imperial capital his new rank, "because his city is the New Rome."[26] Later alterations in the organization of the political spheres did not, of course, automatically involve corresponding changes of the ecclesiastical structure. When, through Diocletian's reform of the Empire, the previous administrative independence of Egypt was annulled and the country was incorporated into the political Diocese of Oriens, subject to the vicar at Antioch, no one at Nicaea attacked the established ecclesiastical organization of Egypt.[27]

---

[22] Innocent, *Ep.* 24, 2.

[23] Council of Chalcedon, can. 12.

[24] H. Chadwick, "Faith and Order at the Council of Nicaea. A Note on the Ground of the 6th Canon," *HTR* 53 (1960), 171–195.

The development of the patriarchates was influenced by still another factor, which pertained to the popular and hence to the linguistic and cultural individuality of the inhabitants of those territories in which the greater Church classifications arose. This factor not only contributed to the origin of one patriarchate each in the Egyptian and Syrian cultural areas: it was likewise one of the causes why both in the properly Greek-speaking sphere and in the Latin area only one great patriarchate each was established, even though here several political dioceses existed as extensive units of administration. Initiatives toward several supra-metropolitan groupings were, it is true, also present here, as the Council of 381 testifies in addressing the respective episcopates of the Dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace as a unit.[28] But the further development to independent ecclesiastical organizational spheres with the centers at Ephesus, Caesarea, and Heraclea was thwarted at Chalcedon, which in canon 28 subordinated these territories to the see of Constantinople. When the Council called the bishops of the cities mentioned "exarchs" and recognized them as appeal courts for conflicts between the local bishop and the metropolitan, a remnant of this aborted development could have been reflected.[29] In the territory of the single Latin patriarchate an effort in the direction of a larger member Church of a certain autonomy is known only for Africa, where the Bishop of Carthage, as *Primas totius Africae* and president of the North African plenary council, functioned in a certain sense as the suprametropolitan. For this development both the political and cultural importance of Carthage and its position as mission basis for the evangelization of the North African provinces must be taken into account. The Vandal invasion prepared the end of this relative autonomy of the North African Church and occasioned its close union with Rome. The Latin vicariates of Thessalonica and Arles disappeared here just as did the "Patriarchate" of Aquileia, since their heads exercised their authority, often only for a brief period, by direct commission from Rome, or, like the Bishop of Aquileia as well as those of Milan and Ravenna, were ultimately only metropolitans of an extensive ecclesiastical province.[30]

---

[25] See vol. I, 100–105, 207–209, and F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity,* 4f.

[26] Council of Constantinople I, can. 3.

[27] F. Dvornik, op. cit., 9f. Between 380 and 382 Egypt became again an independent administrative area.

[28] Council of Constantinople I, can. 2.

The special political circumstances under which Christians lived in Armenia and Persia caused, also outside the frontiers of the Empire, the rise of two large ecclesiastical structures, which in their organization must be equated de facto with the eastern patriarchates. The Armenian Church in the first decades of its existence maintained close relations with Caesarea in Cappadocia, where Gregory the Illuminator accepted Christianity and then preached it to the nation. The common conversion of King Trdat and of the majority of the nation early favored the development of a national Church under a chief bishop of its own, who from the fifth century was called the *Catholicus.* The heavy pressure exerted on the Armenian kings by their powerful Persian neighbors motivated them to relax the ties of their Church with the "West" more and more, and the irresistibly progressing subjugation of Armenia by the Persians almost completely curtailed the contacts with Western Christianity just at the time of the great councils of the fifth century. Hence the definitive separation and independence of the Armenian Church was not the result of its own exertions but the consequences of political events to which the Armenian people were subjected.[31] In Persia the beginnings of a leading role of the Bishop of Seleucia–Ctesiphon probably go back to the fourth century. The Synod of 410 under Bishop Isaac awarded him jurisdiction over the Persian episcopate: the Synod of 424 confirmed and further defined his position as independent of every other ecclesiastical authority.[32]

---

[29] Council of Chalcedon, can. 9, 17.

[30] For Thessalonica and Arles see the next chapter on Siricius, Innocent, Zosimus, Boniface, and Leo I. For Aquileia, see H. Schmidinger, *MIOG* 60 (1952), 335–354, and H. Fuhrmann, *ZSavRGkan* 40 (1954), 43–61.

[31] F. Tournebize, "Arménie," *DHGE* IV, 298–303; G. Amadouni, "L'Autocéphalie du Katholicat Arménien," *I patriarcati orientali* (Rome 1968), 141–165.

For the development and rights of the patriarchates of the East there was adduced relatively late a further factor, which was destined to gain considerable importance eventually: the apostolic origin of the leading episcopal sees or the Petrine principle of the founding of churches. At the Council of Nicaea its significance was still so slight that it gained for the Bishop of Jerusalem, as already mentioned, only a "position of honor." Bishop Cyril (c. 348–386) had struggled to no purpose for an elevation in rank, with appeal to the apostolic character of his throne, and with just as little success was his successor, John (386–417), able to separate himself from the metropolitan union of Caesarea.[33] Only the tenacity and adaptability of Bishop Juvenal (422–458) succeeded, after a first ineffectual attempt at Ephesus in 431, in obtaining at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the recognition of Jerusalem as a patriarchal see and jurisdiction over all Palestine; in this the essence of his argumentation was precisely the apostolic foundation of the Jerusalem community, which, was, moreover, distinguished as the site of the resurrection of Christ.[34] Whereas Pope Leo I at first sharply censured Juvenal's procedure at Ephesus—he must at that time have made use of unauthentic documents—in his later correspondence with Juvenal he passed over the opportunity in silence.[35]

The principle of apostolic origin also played a role in the protracted conflict between the patriarchate of Antioch and the episcopate of the island of Cyprus in regard to its ecclesiastical independence.[36] The bishops of Antioch apparently concluded from the privileges confirmed at Nicaea and from the political membership of the island in the Diocese of Oriens its subordination to Antioch. Thus Bishop Alexander, who induced Pope Innocent I (402–417) to write to the Cypriots to admonish them to observe the canons, and also John of Antioch (420–441) urged the right of their see to ordain the metropolitan of the island, but the Council of Ephesus decided to maintain the previous custom whereby the bishops of the island ordained their newly elected metropolitan.[37] When c. 488 the Patriarch Peter repeatedly demanded the subordination of Cyprus, referring to the fact that the island received the faith from Antioch, an apostolic foundation, the Cypriot bishops could outdo this argument. The discovery of the alleged tomb of the Apostle Barnabas in 488 proved unambiguously the apostolic origin and hence the equality of rank of the Cypriot Church with the Antiochene. The Emperor Zeno thereupon assured for the island, with a series of distinctions for the archbishop, the definitive independence later called autocephaly.[38]

---

[32] Cf. besides W. de Vries, *Mél Tisserant,* and W. F. Macomber, "The Authority of the Catholicos Patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon," *I patriarcati orientali,* 179–200, also J. M. Fiey, "Les étapes de la prise de conscience de son identité patriarcale par l'Église syrienne orientale," *OrSyr* 12 (1967), 3–22. The so-called *Chronicle of Arbela* can no longer be quoted as source for this development; see J. Assfalg, *OrChr* 50 (1966), 19–36, and J. M. Fiey, *OrSyr* 12 (1967), 265–302.

[33] For Cyril, Sozomen, *HE* 4, 25, 2; for John, Jerome, *C. Joann. Hieros.,* c. 37.

[34] Cf. especially E. Honigmann, "Juvenal of Jerusalem," *DOP* 5 (1950), 209–279.

[35] Leo I's rebuke to Juvenal: *Ep.* 119, 4; the later correspondence: *Ep.* 139 and 159.

[36] See R. Janin, "Chypre," *DHGE* XII, 791–810.

Rome most effectively represented the principle of the apostolic origin of the patriarchal see as the basis of the higher organization of the greater churches. Even if in the pre-Constantinian period the political importance of Rome may also have had a certain influence on its ecclesiastical ascent, in the corresponding expressions of its bishops this played as little a role as in other writers before Chalcedon.[39] When the political rank of Constantinople was urged as the motive for the establishing of a higher rank for its bishop, again and again recourse was had against this "political" argumentation, first by Pope Damasus, who would admit only the really "Petrine" sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch,[40] through Boniface I, who protested against an edict of Theodosius II in 421 which granted to Constantinople the privileges of Old Rome,[41] down to Leo I and especially Gelasius I, who found in the Petrine Principle of the founding of churches not only the strongest weapon against the claims of Constantinople, but because of the unique relation of the Apostle Peter to the Roman community regarded themselves as justified in understanding Rome in an entirely specific sense as the *Sedes Apostolica* and themselves as the heirs of Peter's privileges.[42] It speaks in favor of the strength of the notion of apostolicity that it even exerted its impact on Byzantium. From the seventh century on, the see of Constantinople was increasingly called "apostolic," in the beginning perhaps as a consequence of the discussion of the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch," and then it was reinforced in the course of the Iconoclast quarrel. In the ninth century the apostolic character of the see of Constantinople was further supported by the thesis that it was the heir of

---

[37] Innocent I, *Ep.* 24; Council of Ephesus, can. 8: *Mansi* 4, 1465–1470.

[38] Report on the discovery of Barnabas's relics: Theod. Lector, *HE* 2, 2; see H. Delehaye, "Saints de Chypre," *AnBoll* 26 (1907), 235ff.

[39] The claim of canon 28 of Chalcedon, that "the Fathers had conferred on the see of Old Rome its privileges, because this city was the imperial city," cannot be attested by any text.

[40] Preserved in the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum, PL* 13, 374.

[41] Boniface I, *Ep.* 14, 15.

[42] See the following chapter on Leo I.

Ephesus and hence of the Apostle John, and then by the connection with the legend of the Apostle Andrew, who through his disciple Stachys brought about the christianization of Byzantium and whose relics were venerated from the fourth century in the Church of the Apostles. Thus was the route opened for the theory of the Pentarchy, according to which five patriarchs were instituted by the Holy Spirit to govern the Church as successors of the Apostles and supreme Shepherds of equal rank.[43]

The patriarchates of the East represent, without doubt, a pluralist element in the organizational structure of the Early Church. This pluralism grew spontaneously from different presuppositions and factors. Rome recognized it in principle, where it could be supported on apostolic origin. But together with this pluralism there went the possibility of manifold tensions and conflicts, especially when a patriarch, as in the case of Rome, felt he must understand his eminently apostolic origin as the mission of leadership within the Universal Church. The ups and downs of these tensions and conflicts belong from then on to the exciting themes of Church history.

Ecclesiastical Assemblies

The institution of the ecclesiastical assembly, familiar from the pre-Constantinian period and called *concilium* or *synodus,*[44] was further elaborated in the fourth century and completed by new forms. At Nicaea the dates for the holding of the provincial synod were established: twice a year, at the beginning of Lent and in the fall, all the bishops of an ecclesiastical province were to meet in order to discuss questions of Church discipline. The observance of this rule had to be repeatedly inculcated later, with constant appeal to the decision of Nicaea.[45] It was the business of the metropolitan to invite the bishops to the synod, at which he also presided. The duty of all bishops to take part was enjoined, and unjustified absence was punished.[46] The subject of the discussions was especially the disciplinary and liturgical regulation of the communities of the province, the examination of the legality of episcopal elections that had taken place, and the erection or division of bishoprics. The provincial council was functioning in the fourth and fifth centuries wherever the metropolitan organization had been introduced. Apparently it was in greater use in the East than in the West, where it was known in North Africa, Gaul, and, except in the fifth century, also in Spain. But it was not in use in Italy, where interprovincial forms of ecclesiastical assembly did not permit it to appear. As the lowest degree of all synods it knew no collaboration of the State officials, either in the summoning or in the execution of its decrees. Even if the provincial synod had certain characteristics common to the State provincial assemblies, nevertheless the cause of the ecclesiastical institution cannot be seen in these: their existence as early as the age of the persecutions, but especially the foregone conclusion of the process, make such a borrowing improbable and unnecessary. But probably the analogous profane institution may have been of influence in the development of an "order of business" for the synod in the fourth and fifth centuries, and hence for the course of the sessions, the role of the presidents, the manner of voting. Because of their eminent ability in function, which lay in the limited number of participants, the homogeneity of the geographical area, the limited nature of the questions to be treated, and the frequency and regularity of the meetings, the provincial synods of the Early Church had a great significance for the regulation of the day-to-day life of the ecclesiastical communities.

---

[43] F. Dvornik, op. cit., chaps. 4, 6, 7.

[44] Cf. A Lumpe, "Zur Geschichte der Wörter concilium und synodus in der antiken Latinität," *AHP* 2 (1970), 1–21.

[45] Council of Nicaea, can. 5; Council of Antioch, can. 20; Council of Chalcedon, can. 19; Council of Riez (439), can. 8; Council of Orange (441), can. 28 (29); Leo I, *Ep.* 14, 7.

[46] Council of Laodicea, can. 40; Council of Chalcedon, can. 19; Council of Carthage. (401), can. 10; Council of Arles II, can. 19.

The plenary council of the North African Church represents the organizationally most mature form of a synod comprising several ecclesiastical provinces. It was supposed to take place annually and thereby adopted the principle of the periodicity of the provincial synod.[47] All the ecclesiastical provinces of North Africa had to send at least three representatives to this plenary council: they were elected from the members of the provincial synod.[48] Under the presidency of the Bishop of Carthage, it concerned itself chiefly with questions which directly affected the entire North African Church, but it could also take a position on problems of the Universal Church and for weighty cause be convoked for an extraordinary session.[49] The African plenary council distinguished itself in the confrontation with the Donatist Church, in the condemnation of Pelagianism, and in the discussion with Rome over the rights of the African Church, by a high degree of firmness and independence.

The synods which the Bishop of Alexandria convoked were councils of the entire Church of Egypt, which knew no division into metropolitan provinces. Hence all the bishops of that country and of Libya and the Pentapolis took part. They were not held at periodic intervals but only when it seemed advisable to the Bishop of Alexandria. Antioch also knew interprovincial synods, in which, however, neither the group of participants seems exactly fixed nor can a regularly recurring time for their convocation be discerned.

---

[47] *Breviar. Hippon.*, can. 5 (Carthage 397); *Cod. eccl. afr.*, can. 73 (Carthage 401).

[48] *Cod. eccl. afr.*, 14 and 127 (Carthage 418, 419). For the province of Tripolis there was only one representative because of the small number of bishoprics.

[49] *Cod. eccl. afr.*, 94 and 95.

Among all the interprovincial councils a clearly unique position belongs to the Roman Synod,[50] which represented the ecclesiastical assembly of all bishoprics which were subordinate to the Bishop of Rome as the single Metropolitan of *Italia Suburbicaria.* It not only dealt with questions which applied to the bishoprics of this territory but also intentionally made decisions on events and problems that primarily concerned other ecclesiastical spheres of jurisdiction, as, for example, the Donatist question, the case of Athanasius at the Synods of 340 and 353, the Antiochene Schism at several synods under Pope Damasus in 368, 377, and 382, the affair of Chrysostom under Pope Innocent I, and finally the question of Nestorius under Celestine I in 430 and the Synod of Ephesus of 449 under Leo I. Here the powerful role of the Roman Bishop is clear: as president, he used the Roman Synod as framework and forum for decisions that he intended to have regarded as binding on ecclesiastical territories outside his own metropolitan sphere.

In Upper Italy too there appeared interprovincial councils under the direction of the Metropolitans of Milan (Ambrose), Aquileia, and later also of Ravenna, as the normal form of the ecclesiastical meeting. Although in Gaul, despite several attempts, no ecclesiastical center could achieve the position of, let us say, Carthage, here too from the end of the fourth century the synod embracing several ecclesiastical provinces grew in importance, as the gatherings at Valence in 375, Bordeaux in 384, Turin in 398–400, Riez in 439, Orange in 441, and Vaison in 442 prove.[51]

Both the regularly recurring as well as the extraordinary interprovincial councils were, with few exceptions, summoned by the bishop of the current ecclesiastical center. The convocation of the great ecclesiastical assemblies, whether the episcopate of a part of the Empire or that of the entire Empire was invited to them, came directly from the Emperor, mostly at his initiative, at times at the request of the Roman Bishop.[52] The first example of an imperial summons was present at the Synod of Arles in 314, to which Constantine I invited all bishops of his sphere of rule.[53] That the Emperors understood the convocation as the proper act of the ruler's will is especially clear from this, that eventually they intended to punish any bishop who did not attend; hence they expected not only gratitude for a support given to the Church but obedience to a command. They not only created the technical presuppositions for the meeting of the council, which would, moreover, have overburdened the Church: they also determined the date and decided the exact group of participants and to a degree also the subject of the conciliar discussions. Although no secular or ecclesiastical law defined the imperial right of convocation, at this time it was not denied by any council or by the Roman Pope, but was expressly recognized, as, for example, by Leo I, who, after the disappointment of the Synod of Ephesus of 449, asked the emperor Theodosius II "to arrange" a new council.[54] The imperial interest in the council convoked by him extended also to the course of the discussions, from which concrete results were expected. Hence, the Emperor was usually represented at the council by high officials, who, it is true, did not exercise the presidency, but saw to the orderly course of the debates and again set in motion business that had come to a standstill.[55] The bishops' freedom of speech and of decision was in principle substantially respected, apart from the authoritarian interference of the Emperor Constantius II, who at the Synods of Arles in 353 and Milan in 355 sought to extort a condemnation of Athanasius by threat and physical strength.[56] That the Emperors confirmed the decrees of the great councils and gave them the force of law in the secular sphere was, after all, only normal.[57]

---

[50] See, besides G. Roethe (literature), also H. Marot, "Les conciles romains des IV^e^ et V^e^ siècles," *L'Église et les églises 1054–1954, Mélanges L. Beauduin* I (Chevetogne 1954), 209–240.

[51] E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* I (2nd ed.), 340–348: Les conciles interprovinciaux; J. Gaudemet, "La législation des conciles gaulois du IV^e^ siècle," *Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Medieval Canon Law,* Strasbourg, September 1968 (Vatican City 1971), 1–13.

Of course, the conciliar decrees received their validity within the Church, not from the imperial confirmation, but from the council itself. It is true that the Pope did not take part personally in any council outside Rome, but he was represented by his legates. If the participants made known to him the outcome of their deliberations, this did not happen at first in order to procure for them their force in law.[58] A new development is not apparent until the fifth century and thereafter. After the Synods of Carthage (416) and Mileve (417), the African bishops asked from Rome the confirmation of their decrees in order to obtain greater esteem for them; Rome more and more claimed the right to examine conciliar decisions and, if necessary, to reject them if they contradicted the Church's understanding of tradition and the faith. Leo I clearly regarded himself as the court which was set over the council and from which it received its authority.[59]

---

[52] F. Dvornik, "Emperors, Popes and General Councils," *DOP* 6 (1951), 3–23; A. Mozzillo, "Dei rapporti tra gli imperatori ed i concili ecumenici da Costantino a Giustiniano," *Archivo Giuridico* 147 (1954), 105–128.

[53] See examples of invitations from the Emperor to Arles in H. v. Soden, *Urkunden,* nos. 14 and 15.

[54] *Ep.* 43.

[55] Especially apparent at Chalcedon; see supra, chap. 7.

[56] See supra, chap. 3.

[57] For Nicaea, Rufinus, *HE* I, 5; imposed by the *Cod. Theod.* 16, 5, 38; 16, 11, 2; Constantinople of 381: *Cod. Theod.* 16, 1, 3; Ephesus: *Mansi* VII, 495; Chalcedon: *Cod. Just.* 1, 3, 23.

A new type of synod developed from the second half of the fourth century in Constantinople, where the bishops who were just then staying in the imperial capital met with the local bishop, probably mostly at the suggestion of the Emperor, to discuss important ecclesiastical happenings or problems. Since the presidency devolved upon the bishop of the capital, this gathering of bishops, called *Synodus Endemousa,* became an important factor in the constructing of the authority of the see of Constantinople and, in a further development, an important administrative organ of the Byzantine Church.[60]

---

[58] The canons of Nicaea were not presented to him at all; the decrees of the Synods of Arles and Serdica were made known to him so that he might publish them.

[59] *Epp.* 44–45; 47–48; 50–51; 103; 105; 120; 146–149.

[60] Cf., besides J. Hajjar, also R. Potz, *Patriarch und Synode in Konstantinopel* (Vienna 1971), 17–31.

CHAPTER 15

The Further Development of the Roman Primacy from Melchiades to Leo I

Even in the pre-Constantinian period of Church history a position of preeminence of the Roman community and its head within the Universal Church had developed; it became especially obvious under Victor I and Stephen I.[1] For the further growth of such a claim to leadership it had to be of decisive significance how the Empire, once it had become Christian, would react to this, since to it likewise was conceded a special position, based on religion, in the developing Church of the Empire. When in 313 Constantine I denied the proposal of the Donatists to have their quarrel with Bishop Caecilian of Carthage settled by a secular court and referred this task to an episcopal court under the direction of the Roman Bishop Melchiades (311–314), [2] this was neither an unjustified interference of the Emperor into inner-Church matters nor, on the other hand, the recognition of a Roman claim to primacy, but simply regard for an already acknowledged preeminence of the Roman See in the Latin Church of the West, to which corresponded also the special treatment of the Roman community, as manifested in the gift of the Lateran Palace as the episcopal residence and in the encouragement of church construction, especially in the erecting of St. Peter's basilica by the Emperor. Since, however, the verdict of the episcopal court was not accepted by the Donatists, the Emperor regarded himself as justified, in the interest of peace, on his own initiative but without any objections on the part of the Church, in convoking a synod of the bishops of his area of rule to Arles in 314; at it Pope Silvester I (314–335) was represented by two priests and two deacons. The absence of the Roman Bishop was explained without difficulty by the pressing tasks which his office, just assumed, placed on him in Rome. But the members of the Synod themselves knew of a preeminence of the Roman See, since they first made known to Silvester the results of their discussions with the purpose that the Universal Church should be informed of them from Rome; hence they saw in Rome a sort of central office of information for the other churches. Their address, *Gloriosissime Papa,* for Silvester does not, of course, entitle one to see here an official title given to the Pope by the Emperor whereby the Emperor had included the Bishop of Rome in the rank of the secular *gloriossimi:* rather, it was an allusion and evidence of the Pope's position as a *confessor* in the Diocletian persecution.[3] In the early phase of the Arian controversy Pope Silvester was surprisingly of little prominence, partly perhaps because the discussion occurred chiefly in the East and because another western bishop, Hosius of Córdoba, was the Emperor's adviser. At the Council of Nicaea Rome was again represented by two priests; however, it is not clear whether they played a special role in the discussions, especially in the formulation of the Nicene Creed. The later important religious political measures of Constantine do not allow one to see any special contacts with the occupant of the Roman See, just as in general the two decades of Silvester's pontificate found no noteworthy place in contemporary literature. Later legend abundantly filled up this vacuum when it supplied the relations of the first Christian Emperor to the contemporary Roman

---

[1] See vol. I, chap. 26.

---

[2] Letter of Constantine to Melchiades: Eusebius, *HE* 10, 5, 18–20; on the legal side of the process, cf. H. U. Instinsky, "Kaiser Konstantin und das Gericht des Bischofs Miltiades in Rom," *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Munich 1955), 59–82.

[3] The letters of Constantine to the Synod of Arles and the letter of the members of the Synod to Silvester in H. v. Soden, *Urkunden zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Donatismus* (Bonn 1913), nos. 14–18. On the address *gloriosissime,* see Instinsky, op. cit., 83–101.

Bishop with fanciful details, which first appeared in the *Actus Sancti Silvestri* that originated in Rome in the fifth century and tendentiously attributed the conversion, baptism, and miraculous healing of the Emperor to Silvester, who in return was recompensed in imperial style with privileges and gifts. To the later forger of the so-called Donation of Constantine, the *Constitutum Constantini,* these "acts" offered welcome material.[4]

Bishop Mark (336), who held office only a brief nine months, was succeeded by Pope Julius I (337–352), during whose pontificate the preeminence of Rome could develop in relatively greater freedom of movement, since the sons of Constantine were at first much less active in ecclesiastical political matters than was their father. Above all, in the confrontation over the person and affair of Athanasius the papal authority could strengthen itself considerably in East and West. It is significant that both the opponents and the adherents of Athanasius turned to the Roman Pope to obtain from him approval of their attitude. First it was the Eusebians who sought at Rome the recognition of Pistus, designated by them as Bishop of Alexandria, and even proposed a synod which should confirm the deposition of Athanasius. Athanasius and the Alexandrian Church also sought justice at Rome, the former in person when he was expelled by Constantius from his episcopal city. And Bishop Marcellus of Ancyra, deprived of his office by the Eusebians, went to Julius I, since he expected to be rehabilitated by him. A Roman Synod in the autumn of 340 or at the beginning of 341 under the leadership of the Pope decided that Athanasius and Marcellus were to continue as the legitimate occupants of their sees; Julius I justified the decrees of the Synod in a comprehensive, well-balanced letter[5] to the Eusebians, who had remained away from it, and stressed unambiguously that, according to ancient prescriptive law, it had been their duty to turn first to Rome in the matter of Athanasius "so that from here it could be decided what was right." The Pope regarded himself also as qualified to dispense justice that was binding in the ecclesiastical affairs of the East and referred in this connection to a tradition descending from the Apostle Peter.

The awareness of being obliged to act for the Universal Church was expressed in Julius I's initiative with which he asked the Emperor Constans to convoke an imperial synod which should definitively settle the conflict. Since the Eusebian bishops refused their collaboration from the start, the Synod of Serdica (342 or 343) did not take place as a general council and even later it was not evaluated as such, even if the western bishops, together with a few Greeks, discussed questions and issued decrees which applied also to the Eastern Churches, such as the vindication of Athanasius and Marcellus and the punishment of the leading Eusebians. They communicated the results of their deliberations to the Universal Church, even the canons which stated the right of appeal of bishops to the Pope and awarded to the Pope the supreme judicial right of decision.[6] However, the East did not accept the decrees of Serdica and so they could affect the position of the Roman Bishop only in the Latin Church. But there is no doubt that through the shrewd and decisive intervention of Julius I on behalf of Athanasius the moral reputation of the Pope was notably strengthened.

---

[4] Basic for the origin of the Silvester Legend is W. Levison, *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit* (Düsseldorf 1948), 390–465; on its effect, E. Ewig, *HJ* 75 (1956), 10–37. New edition of the *Constitutum Constantini* by H. Fuhrmann, *Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui,* fasc. X (Hanover 1968).

[5] Preserved in Athanasius, *Apol. contra Arianos* 21–35, loc. cit., can. 35; see P. P. Joannou, op. cit., 66–70.

With the acquiring of sole rule by Constantius in 353 there also began for the Latin Church a decade in which the Church's freedom was not only curtailed but forcibly suppressed by the despotic imperial caprice. No bishop had to taste it so bitterly as did Julius's successor, the former Roman deacon Liberius (352–366), in whom the papacy of the fourth century experienced its deepest humiliation and hence strong damage to its authority. In the first three years of his pontificate[7] he appeared throughout as the firm defender of the Nicene faith and its champion Athanasius and aimed to promote this twofold concern to victory at a synod in Aquileia, which he requested from the Emperor. When, instead of this, Constantius at Arles in 353 extorted the condemnation of Athanasius by the Gallic bishops and the Pope's representatives, Liberius bitterly deplored the collapse of his legates and of the Gallic episcopate and stated that he would prefer to die rather than to consent to decrees which contradicted the gospel.[8] Two years later he had to experience again that the majority of the bishops at Milan (355) succumbed to the pressure of the imperial threats and assented to the condemnation of the Bishop of Alexandria. In the letter to the three bishops who had been exiled then—this time his legates also stood firm, despite abuse—he courageously declared his solidarity with them and asked their prayers that he might withstand the attacks falling upon him and maintain faith and Church intact.[9] Then after the Synod of Milan the

---

[6] For the documents of the Synod see W. Schneemelcher, "Serdika 342," *EvTh* (special issue 1952), 83–104, especially 94. The canons in C. Turner, *Ecclesiae Occid. Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* I, II, 3 (Oxford 1930), 452–544; see H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Serdica A.D. 343* (Oxford 1958).

[7] For the context of the events see supra, p. 45.

[8] Letter to Hosius of Córdoba in Hilary, *Fragm. hist.* 6, 3.

[9] Ibid. 6, 1–2.

Emperor exerted an enormous physical and psychological pressure on Liberius in order to extort from him his assent to the verdict of condemnation on Athanasius—testimony of the high moral authority of the Roman Bishop, which even the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus recognized as the motive of Constantius's procedure.[10] But neither threats nor presents, which an envoy of the Emperor alternately offered the Pope, nor the Emperor's violent fits of anger at a conference in Milan, where Liberius had been brought from Rome by night, could move the Pope to yield. Only a two-years' exile to Beroea in Thrace, thereupon decreed, combined with the persuasive tactics of the local bishops, adherents of the Emperor, and an agonizing homesickness, brought about the emotional breakdown, which caused the Pope to write those letters that were so seriously damaging to him, in which he broke off the Church's communion with Athanasius and with no sense of honor begged for only one thing—to be allowed to return to Rome.[11] A fall of Liberius into heresy, such as Jerome claimed some years later, cannot be maintained, since, while the Pope did indeed sign the first and the third creeds of Sirmium, which excluded the *homoousios,* they otherwise permitted a quite orthodox interpretation. For the Pope's personal esteem, the disloyalty toward Athanasius weighed heavily enough; he was so compromised that Constantius could coolly disregard him in the following years. Rome was neither invited to the Synod of Rimini in 359 nor was any effort made this time to obtain its assent to the decrees: its voice now carried no weight in the Emperor's ears. Even if the sympathies of a majority of the Roman community were with the returning exile and forced Felix, who had been made Bishop of Rome by Constantius in Liberius's absence, to leave the city, Liberius knew that at first he had to be silent. He seems not to have tried to make a personal vindication of his conduct, but his eager exertions for a rapprochement and reconciliation of the strictly Nicene with the Homoiousian faction after the death of Constantius and his clear repudiation of the creed of Rimini–Nice may have been regarded by him as a sort of making amends.[12] However, later Roman tradition harshly judged his failure and put, not him, but his temporary opponent Felix (II) in the list of legitimate Popes.[13]

---

[10] Ammianus Marcellinus, 15, 7, 10: "auctoritate potiore aeternae urbis episcopi firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti."

[11] The letters must be regarded as authentic, since even Athanasius, Hilary, the Luciferians of Rome, and Jerome clearly speak of a collapse by Liberius; see the evidence in J. Zeiller, "La question du pape Libère," *BullAncLitArchCrét* 3 (1913), 20–51, especially 22f.; P. P. Joannou, 125f., speaks unconvincingly against it, again of forgeries.

[12] Letter to the bishops of Italy in Hilary, *Fragm. hist.,* and to the eastern bishops in Socrates, *HE* 4, 12.

[13] See Duchesne, *LP,* Introduction, CXXff. A verbose, laudatory epitaph (Diehl, *ILCV,* no. 967) can hardly refer to Liberius.

Popes Damasus I and Siricius

A consequence of the case of Liberius was, finally, the serious disturbances within the Roman community which broke out at the election of his successor. A minority, which rejected any reconciliation with the former adherents of Felix (II), quickly decided for the deacon Ursinus, whereas the majority chose the deacon Damasus (366–384) as bishop; while he may perhaps have been a partisan of Felix for a time, after the return of Liberius from exile he firmly adhered to him. Several bloody clashes of the two competing factions claimed more than 100 dead, for which, according to the version of Ursinus's adherents, Damasus alone was said to be responsible, whereas the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus saw the cause of the chaos in the unchecked striving of both candidates for the Roman episcopal dignity, which assured its bearer a life in easy circumstances and external honors that of course was in sharp contrast to the simple life of self-denial, but deserving of respect, of some bishops abroad in the provinces. Even when order was gradually restored in Rome externally by the State authorities, the conflict smoldered for a year still, since the schismatic congregation of Ursinus persisted. It obtained new support when a Jew, Isaac, who had temporarily converted to Christianity, complained to the Prefect of the City against Damasus because of offenses not named in detail, and Roman clerics were tortured in the course of the trial.[14] The imperial court acquitted Damasus, but he later used the case as the occasion to propose to the Emperor a comprehensive new organization of spiritual jurisdiction. A Synod convoked by him in 378, which again rejected as calumnies the complaints lodged against him by Isaac, submitted two proposals to the Emperors. In the event that clerics from Italy did not recognize a verdict pronounced against them by a spiritual court, the case should, with the aid of the State power, be sent to the court of the Bishop of Rome, but in the rest of the Empire to that of the metropolitan, while for trials of metropolitans the Bishop of Rome was exclusively competent. But he should be answerable only to the imperial council in the event of an accusation, in case the matter could not be settled by the sentence of the Roman Synod.[15] With these proposals Damasus was certainly trying to expand and guarantee a special spiritual jurisdiction recognized by the State and to obtain for the Roman Bishop in particular a privilege that would clearly have underlined his preeminent position in the West. The reaction of the Emperors to these proposals was curious: in regard to the first they granted more than was asked, since they extended the cooperation of the State in the execution of episcopal judgments to the entire western part of the Empire, but they indirectly rejected the second, the specially requested judicial competence of the Roman Bishop, with the vague explanation that the well-known sense of justice of the Emperors made it impossible that frivolously slanderous charges would be brought against the Bishop of Rome. From whatever motives, it seemed inadvisable to the political leadership of the Roman world to grant so exceptional a position to the ranking bishop of the West: Damasus had to be content with a half-success.

---

[14] The certainly one-sided report of the faction of Ursinus: *Coll. Avell.,* no. 1; Ammianus Marcellinus, 27, 3, 12–15; the imperial rescripts against Ursinus: *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 5–12. The situation of the sources permits no complete reconstruction of the events, neither chronologically nor topographically; see P. Kunzle, *RQ* 56 (1961), 1–61, 129–166, and A. Lippold, *Historia* 14 (1965), 105–128.

[15] The letter of the Synod of 378: *Mansi* 3, 624, and *PL* 13, 575–584; the imperial rescript: *Coll. Avell.,* no. 13.

In the final phase of the Arian disorders also the Pope displayed initiatives which indicate clearly his exertions to promote the importance and rank of Rome within the Universal Church. The first Synod convoked by Damasus (368 or 369–370), which dealt with the elimination of the still present Arian influence in the Latin West, stressed in a letter to the Illyrian episcopate that the Nicene Creed, which came into existence with the collaboration of Rome, was valid in the entire Roman Empire, while, on the other hand, the decrees of the Synod of Rimini (359) were without effect, because the Roman Bishop, "whose judgment must be obtained in preference to all others," had never assented to them.[16] Hence the criterion of the orthodoxy of a creed must be its approval by Rome, and this claim found expression a decade later in the well-known law of Theodosius I of 27 February 380, whereby the Christian faith was declared the State religion in that form which the Romans once received from the Apostle Peter and which was now professed by Bishop Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria. Both here and in the question of jurisdiction Damasus had apparently not recognized how doubtful it was to claim state aid for establishing his preeminent position or even to permit it to grant it. Too easily could the privilege become an oppressing shackle.

In the East also Damasus sought energetically to have Rome's authority recognized, not always successfully of course, especially in the question of the Schism of Antioch, in which Rome, informed solely and inadequately by Alexandria, clung stubbornly to the person of the Old Nicene Paulinus and by which it evoked the strong displeasure of Basil of Caesarea because of the arrogant tone of several Roman documents, even though Basil assigned to Rome a deciding function in questions of faith.[17] Damasus resolutely made use of this when at a Roman Synod in 378 or 382 he solemnly rejected the errors of Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, the Macedonians, and others and transmitted these anathemas as the authoritative decision of Rome to Paulinus of Antioch,[18] to whom he had had sent a creed earlier, which was to serve as a standard to decide with whom communion was possible according to the Roman view and with whom it was not possible.[19] Damasus tried to influence the appointment to the See of Constantinople when he rejected the elevation of Maximus the Cynic, urged by Alexandria, and commissioned Bishop Acholius of Thessalonica to work at the approaching Council of 381 for the election of a worthy man who could assure the peace of the Church.[20] It was, of course, precisely two canons of this Synod which gravely impeded any binding intervention by Rome into the inner ecclesiastical affairs of the East. While canon 2 defined the jurisdictional spheres of the eastern patriarchates, without even mentioning Rome, canon 3 gave to the Bishop of Constantinople "the primacy of honor after the Bishop of Rome, because that city is the New Rome."[21] Hence it could not but be welcome to Damasus when persons from the East applied directly to Rome and in individual cases asked its help, as, for example, did Paulinus of Antioch and Epiphanius of Salamis, to whom was accorded participation in a Roman Synod, or when Christians from Beirut asked of Rome a condemnation of their former Bishop Timothy. He aptly esteemed such "appeals" as an expression of the reverence which belonged to "the Apostolic See," because Peter had once taught in this Church.[22] With this formula, which merely completed the identification of the Roman episcopal see with "the Apostolic See"—it is first met under Pope Liberius and was used by Damasus with unambiguous frequency—the Pope claimed a rank which was based not on Rome's political importance but on the quite special relation of the Apostle Peter to this community. But since it also appears in letters to the Greek East, which likewise exhibited apostolic churches, Rome intended to have preeminence in their regard also. This is confirmed by the fact that this formula, quickly accepted in the West, encountered a clear reserve in the East and here Rome was regarded only as one Apostolic See among several.[23] Among these ideas of Damasus on a Roman preeminence within the Universal Church is to be included a text which is found in the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* and was probably formulated at a Roman Synod under Damasus, perhaps in 382. Here the "Petrine" sees are presented in the order of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, but at the same time it is stressed that the Roman See owes its primacy not to synodal decrees but to the Lord's words in Matthew 16:18, and that this rank was further reinforced by the double martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome.[24] If the document actually goes back to the Synod of 382, it is easily understood as Rome's stand with reference to canons 2 and 3 of the Council of Constantinople of the previous year and it again shows Damasus as a resolute champion of a steadily growing claim to a Roman Primacy, which through him found hitherto unknown formulations. Noteworthy grounds also give reason to see Damasus as the author of a comprehensive letter to the Gallic bishops. Here he asks those to whom he is writing, who have applied to the authority of the Apostolic See, to pay attention to what he has to say, and he warns them not to tolerate certain abuses in the Gallic clergy. He states impersonally that this or that is forbidden, that a person is excluded from the communion of the Apostolic See if he does not hold to what Scripture, apostolic discipline and tradition, the things handed down by the Fathers, and the *regula ecclesiastica* have established. Fundamentally new decisions or laws are not issued. Hence in this letter there is a sort of preliminary stage of the papal decretals, the content and form of which was perfected only under the next Pope.[25]

---

[16] Damasus, *Ep.* 1, which was later sent also to all bishops of the East.

---

[17] See supra, p. 66; see also Basil, *Ep.* 263.

[18] It is the so-called *Tomus Damasi* (*PL* 13, 358ff.), which P. Galtier, *RSR* 26 (1936), 385, ascribes to the Synod of 382 and whose author he regards as Ambrose.

[19] Damasus, *Ep.* 3.

[20] Damasus, *Ep.* 5 and 6 to Acholius.

[21] Text of the canons: *COD,* 27f., see also supra, p. 75.

[22] Paulinus and Epiphanius in Rome: Jerome, *Ep.* 108, 6; 127, 7; on Timothy of Beirut: Damasus, *Ep.* 7.

Another aspect of the many-sided activity of Pope Damasus is disclosed by his correspondence with Jerome, whom he took for a while into the service of the papal chancery: his interest in the Bible, in individual points of exegesis as well as, especially, in a revision of the Latin translations of the Bible that were often different from one another and faulty. That he entrusted Jerome with this task marks him as a far-sighted initiator of a work which was destined in the future to exercise a wide-reaching impact as the *Vulgata.*[26] In Rome itself the name of Damasus lived on in the numerous—fifty-nine—metrical inscriptions, which, not without an overestimation of his poetical abilities, he composed for many occasions and had carved in noble characters on marble by the master Furius Dionysius Philocalus. They were intended chiefly for the glory of the most distinguished Roman martyrs, for the church buildings constructed or restored by him, and for the remembrance of the deceased of his family. The inscription for his own tomb simply professes his faith in the resurrection through Christ.[27]

---

[23] Evidence in P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (Rome 1938), 151–168; up to the Council of Ephesus of 431 *Sedes Apostolica* does not usually occur in the exclusive Roman understanding in eastern texts, and later only sporadically.

[24] Edition of E. Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum* (*TU* 38, 3, Leipzig 1912); on the discussion of the decree see the literature in E. Caspar, I, 598f., in addition to G. Bardy, *DBS* III, 579–590, and E. Schwartz, *ZNW* 29 (1930), 161–168. On the emphatic appeal to Paul and Peter, cf. H. Chadwick, "Neotestam. et Patristica," *Festschr. O. Cullmann* (Leiden 1962), 313–38.

[25] As *Ep.* 10 among the letters of Siricius (*PL* 13, 1181–94), critical edition by E. Babut, *La plus ancienne décrétale* (Paris 1904), 69–87; literature in Haller, I, 2nd ed., 510, in addition to E. Dekkers, *Clavis,* no. 1632, and A. Hamman, *PL* 1, 309 and 568, both of whom regard Damasus as the author.

Into the concept of the leadership role of the Roman Bishop as developed by Damasus his successor Siricius (384–399) introduced no decisively new characteristics. The former deacon of the Roman community was, probably with an eye to possible intrigues by the still living Ursinus, elected without delay and emphatically recognized by the court.[28] Surely the sarcastic remark of Jerome on the *simplicitas* of the new bishop, who judged all others in accord with his own caliber, is full of resentment, since Jerome himself, as he states,[29] was regarded according to an almost unanimous judgment as a worthy successor of Damasus. But it reveals a grain of truth when Siricius was gauged against the figure of the contemporary Bishop Ambrose of Milan. In the latter's hands, not in Rome, met the great threads of Church politics: Ambrose corresponded with the bishops of the East, guided important superregional synods, and was the decisive conversationalist of the Emperors and of the imperial administration, whereas the activity of Siricius remained confined to the inner sphere of the Latin Church, and here he followed the guidelines developed under Damasus. His importance lies in the fact that he further developed, both in content and in form, into a serviceable instrument, the initial steps achieved by his predecessor for an independent papal legislation that embraced the entire Church of the West. This becomes evident in the voluminous document which is present in the letter of the Pope to Bishop Himerius of Tarragona in Spain,[30] a reply of the Apostolic See to questions on a rebaptism of former Arians, on the dates of baptism and problems of penance, on monastic and clerical discipline. Just as the Emperor gave a *responsum* provided with the force of law to the *relatio* of a provincial governor, so here the Pope took a position in regard to the report of the Spanish bishop and issued legally binding rules for the questions raised, and he no longer recommended their observance: he commanded it—*jubemus; inhibemus; mandamus; decernimus; tenenda sunt decretalia constituta; quae a nobis sunt constituta, intemerata permaneant*—and threatened sanctions for disregard. Siricius justified his full authority by reference to his office, which laid on him the care for all, whose burden he has to bear, which rather the Apostle Peter bears in him, who guards him as the heir of his full authority in all his measures (*Ep.* 1, 1). Anyone who does not adhere to the order given by him separates himself from the safe apostolic Rock on which Christ built his Church. The addressee is ordered to bring these *statuta apostolica* to the knowledge of the bishops of the provinces of Cartagena, Baetica, Lusitania, and Galicia. Here for the first time are found all the material and formal elements which constitute the essence of the papal decretals, which in the future were only refined in details and achieved the highest importance.[31] Similarly Siricius declared in a letter to the bishops of North Africa, in which he made his own the decrees of a Roman Synod, that everyone is excluded from communion with Rome who does not comply with the directions given here.[32] A decree to the bishops of Central and South Italy on the conditions for admission to the episcopal office was again based on the *cura omnium ecclesiarum,* laid on the Pope, and stressed that unity in faith demands also unity in tradition.[33] A letter to the Bishop Anysius of Thessalonica made known Rome's special interest in the ecclesiastical affairs of the Balkan Peninsula. To the bishop was entrusted control of all episcopal ordinations in Illyricum and there was an allusion that for such an office a cleric of the Roman Church might be considered, if necessary. Here a stage of that development became clearly discernible which had already begun under Damasus and was completed with the formal erection of the Papal Vicariate of Thessalonica under Innocent I.[34] Siricius intervened in the emotional discussion which was kindled by the former ascetic Jovinian, who denied the value of fasting and declared marriage and virginity equal in rank, and, according to Ambrose, denied the *virginitas Mariae in partu.* At the Synod of 390 Siricius had Jovinian and his followers cut off from the

---

[26] Correspondence in Jerome, *Epp.* 19–21, 35–36; see the *praefatio in quattuor evangelia ad Damasum* (*PL* 29, 557–562). The translation of Didymus, *De spiritu sancto,* by Jerome was suggested by Damasus; here too see the corresponding *praefatio.*

[27] Edition by A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasi* (Rome 1942); on Damasus's veneration of the martyrs cf. J. Vives, *S. Dámaso, papa español y los mártires* (Barcelona 1943). Damasus's own tomb inscription, no. 12, Ferrua. On the literary quality of the epigrams see S. Pricoco, *Miscell. studi letteratura crist. antica* (Catania 1954), 19–40.

[28] Letters of Siricius: *PL* 13, 1131–1196. Recognition by the Emperor: *Coll. Avell.,* no. 4.

[29] Jerome, *Ep.* 127, 9; 45, 3.

[30] Siricius, *Ep.* 1.

---

[31] H. Getzeny, *Stil und Form der ältesten Papstbriefe* (dissertation, Tübingen 1922), and J. Gaudemet, *L'église dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1959), 220–226.

[32] Siricius, *Ep.* 5.

[33] Siricius, *Ep.* 6.

[34] Siricius, *Ep.* 4.

Church, while he left the verdict on Bishop Bonosus of Naïssus, who did not recognize the perpetual virginity of Mary, to the Synod of Capua directed by Ambrose in 391 and to the bishops of Illyricum.[35]

Pope Innocent I (402–417)

At the start of the fifth century stood the forceful personality of Innocent I (402–417)—his predecessor, Anastasius I, whose intervention in the Origenist controversy has already been treated,[36] was in office only three years—who sought to realize his own high notion of the primacy of the Roman Bishop with methodical determination.[37] The broad field of ecclesiastical discipline presented itself as an especially favorable area for the realization of his leadership task, perceived as a duty, since it gave occasion to manifold inquiries in Rome and made it possible for Innocent to use the now fully developed instrument of the decretals, controlled by him in a masterful way. Of course, it is found especially frequently in Rome's own metropolitan sphere, hence in the bishoprics of Central and South Italy. The inquiries made known some abuses in these churches: encroachments of one bishop on the jurisdictional area of his neighbor, laxity in regard to heretics, admission of the unworthy to spiritual office, and frequent ignorance of the liturgical and canonical prescriptions. With the bishops concerned, Innocent spoke unambiguously in the language of the superior: he preferred to give his rebukes in the ironical form of reprimand of *miramur,* and there was praise only when a person turned in doubt to him, *ad caput atque apicem episcopatus.*[38] Although from time immemorial a certain plurality prevailed, especially in the field of the liturgy, Innocent wanted to make the *consuetudo Romana* the sole binding norm in the entire area of Church order and, indeed, on the untenable ground that all the churches of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Sicily, and the Mediterranean islands received their bishops from Peter or his successors.[39] The same goal was pursued in the letters, written in a still more peremptory tone, to the Gallic Bishops Exsuperius of Toulouse and Victricius of Rouen,[40] at times a *responsum* to appropriate inquiries, which gave the Pope the gladly taken opportunity to secure outside the Roman metropolitan area legislative recognition of the Roman Church order, especially since, as he stressed, it was based on apostolic tradition and ultimately on Peter, "through whom the apostolic and episcopal office took its beginning in Christ."[41] The position of Rome as the highest court of appeals was ably underlined and in regard to content was extended by his demand that all the more important cases (*causae maiores*) be submitted to the Apostolic See. Since it was not decided what at a given time was to be regarded as *causa maior,* the Pope assured himself the possibility of intervention as he saw fit, while on the other hand the reference contained in the formula *causae maiores* to the supreme judicial position of Moses (Exod. 18:22) gave a biblical consecration to the Roman claim.[42]

---

[35] Condemnation of Jovinian: Siricius, *Ep.* 7. In addition, Jerome, *Adv. Jovinianum* and Augustine, *De bono conjugali* and *De sancta virginitate,* also took issue with Jovinian. On Bonosus: Siricius, *Ep.* 9, probably composed by Ambrose; cf. his work *De instit. virginis* and the appendix to his *Ep.* 56 (=Siricius, *Ep.* 9).

[36] See supra, p. 126. His extant letters: *PL* 20, 68–80, and *PL, Suppl.* 1, 790–792.

[37] The letters (35): *PL* 20, 463–611; 84, 657.

[38] Innocent, *Epp.* 37–41; quotation supra, *Ep.* 37, 1.

[39] *Ep.* 25, 2, to Decentius of Gubbio.

[40] *Ep.* 2 and 6. Innocent also sent a decretal to the Synod of Toledo (c. 400): *Ep.* 3.

The intention of Innocent I to guarantee the competence of Rome in Eastern Illyricum underlay the first extant writing from his hand, a letter to Anysius of Thessalonica, which announced the change in the Roman See and in a general formula confirmed to him the right of supervision "in that area" allegedly granted to him by his three predecessors.[43] But the Pope only took the decisive step in 415, when he commissioned Rufus, successor of Anysius, again with appeal to biblical models, to undertake "in our stead" (*nostra vice*) the care of all bishoprics in the Illyrian Prefecture and thereby created the Apostolic Vicariate of Thessalonica, which was supposed to guarantee the claim of Roman supremacy against Constantinople.[44]

Innocent I came into a direct confrontation with the eastern patriarchates in the course of the serious conflict centering on John Chrysostom. The latter, bishop of the capital since 398, had lost the favor of the court through his candid preaching, had become unpopular also with a part of the clergy because of his demand for an ascetic lifestyle, and finally had become the victim of the intriguing Bishop of Alexandria, Theophilus, who could never reconcile himself to the exalted rank given to Constantinople by the Synod of 381.[45] When in 404, at the Emperor's command, Chrysostom was deprived of his office and exiled to Armenia, he turned to the Bishops of Aquileia, Milan, and Rome for help.[46] Innocent I thereupon demanded the convocation of a general synod of the eastern and western episcopates at Thessalonica, adhered to this demand despite Theophilus of Alexandria,[47] and sent to the Emperor Honorius the acts pertaining to the case, with the petition to protest in this sense to his brother at Constantinople. But the treatment of the delegation dispatched by Pope and Emperor to Constantinople—it was treated en route without respect by the eastern officials, not admitted to the Emperor's presence, and forcibly sent back to Italy[48]—clearly showed the limits which were set down for a Bishop of Rome in the Eastern Empire. The effort of the Pope to display an independent initiative in a conflict within the Eastern Church miscarried; he encountered serious difficulties from the leading bishops of the East—Alexandria and Antioch—and he foundered on the attitude of the Eastern Emperor, who claimed for himself the ultimate power of decision. Thus there remained to Innocent only the formal protest and the honorable and immovable maintaining of ecclesiastical communion with Chrysostom, whose restoration to the diptychs he stubbornly demanded of the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople even after Chrysostom's death in 407. He utilized the correspondence with Alexander of Antioch to expound to him his idea that the supremacy of Antioch over the episcopate of the political Diocese of Oriens was based, not on imperial marks of esteem but on the decrees of Nicaea;[49] the sarcasm toward the higher valuation of the See of Constantinople by the Emperor was obvious.

---

[41] *Ep.* 2, 2.

[42] *Ep.* 2, 5.

[43] *Ep.* 1.

[44] *Ep.* 13; for the date (17 June 415) see E. Schwartz, *Festschr. R. Reitzenstein* (1931), 145ff., and J. Macdonald, *Stpatr.* 4 (*TU* 79), 478–482.

[45] Cf. Chr. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* I (London 1960), 155ff.

[46] Preserved in Palladius, *Vita s. J. Chrys.* 2.

A highly significant possibility of realizing Innocent I's grasp of his teaching authority in the strict sense was, finally, offered by his attitude in regard to the Pelagian controversy. In 416 three letters reached him from Africa[50]—one each from episcopal synods in Carthage and Mileve, the third from Augustine and four of his fellow bishops—in which the fear was expressed that the suspected doctrines of Pelagius would continue dangerously in consequence of his rehabilitation by the Synod of Diospolis (415), unless their condemnation should follow from Rome. All three letters extolled the authority of the Apostolic See, which derived from the authority of Scripture and should confirm the verdict of the African episcopate on the heresy and thereby give it a special effect. In his reply of January 417 Innocent praised the bishops for following tradition founded, not on human, but on divine decree and for turning to the Apostolic See because they knew that all matters, even those of the most remote provinces, could not be definitively settled until they had been brought to Rome's attention.[51] This was above all true in questions of faith, in which all bishops had to turn to Peter in order to obtain from this apostolic source an answer to their questions.[52] Here Innocent expressed the conviction, the first to do so with such unambiguity, that the *Sedes Apostolica* possesses the highest teaching authority. It has been doubted that this conviction was shared by the African episcopate, especially since Innocent deepened and extended the notion of the authority of the Roman See. But it will have to be granted that the praise and the biblical justification of this authority, which the bishops bestowed on it, showed it on a route that would lead to its full recognition.

---

[47] *Ep.* 7 to the clergy and people of Constantinople, from Sozomen, *HE* 8, 26, 7–19. *Ep.* to Theophilus in Palladius, *Vita s. J. Chrys.* 3.

[48] Letter of Honorius to Arcadius in Innoc., *Ep.* 8 and 9; report on the fate of the embassy in Palladius, *Vita s. J. Chrys.* 4.

[49] Innoc., *Ep.* 12 to Chrysostom; correspondence with Alexander of Antioch and other bishops: *Ep.* 5; 19–21; 23–24.

[50] In Augustine, *Ep.* 175–177 (=Innoc., *Ep.* 26–28); the Pope's replies: *Ep.* 29–31; see W. Marschall, op. cit., 127–160.

The satisfaction of the African bishops over the decision of Pope Innocent I turned quickly into dismay when in rapid succession there arrived two letters from the Greek Zosimus (417–418), who had been elected Pope; they made known that Caelestius had exculpated himself in person and Pelagius through a profession of faith presented in writing, and that in Africa these men had been condemned frivolously and precipitately on the basis of statements of extremely doubtful witnesses; they would be regarded by Rome as rehabilitated if no one could demonstrate their alleged errors within two months.[53] But the African episcopate remained firm and forced Zosimus first to a revision, even though limited, of his verdict on Caelestius.[54] When then an African general council in May 418 again rejected the Pelagian doctrines and stated concisely that the verdict of Pope Innocent on Pelagius and Caelestius was still in effect, and when at the same time the Emperor Honorius agreed with this view and banished the adherents of the heresy, Zosimus, in accord with a Roman Synod, published an anathema on the Pelagian doctrines.[55] Although the Pope apparently had no appreciation of the theological achievement of Augustine in the Pelagian question, Augustine tried to explain in a conciliatory manner the Pope's fluctuating attitude from a pastoral care for those in error.[56]

The crude way in which Zosimus sought to correct, in accord with the

---

[51] Innoc. *Ep.* 29, 1.

[52] *Ep.* 30, 2.

[53] Letters of Zosimus: *PL* 20, 639–704; here *Ep.* 2 and 3 =*Coll. Avell.*, nos. 45 and 46.

[54] *Ep.* 12 =*Coll. Avell.*, no. 50.

[55] Verdict of the African Synod: *Cod. eccl. Afr.* can. 108–127; see Prosper of Aquitaine, *C. collat.* 5, 3. Rescript of Honorius: *PL* 48, 379–386. Fragments of the *Epistula Tractoria* of Zosimus: *PL* 20, 690–697; see supra, chap. 12, footnote 42.

[56] Augustine, *C. duas. ep. Pel.* II, 3, 5; *De grat. et pecc. orig.* II, 6, 7.

Roman view, the right of appeal hitherto prevailing in the African Church, had a similarly negative effect. A priest of the bishopric of Sicca, Apiarius, was stripped of his office by his bishop and had appealed against this judgment directly to Rome, contrary to African disciplinary law, which for such cases provided for, first, appeal to a neighboring bishop, then to the African general council, and directly forbade any further appeals.[57] Opposing the demand made by a papal delegation in Africa that Apiarius should be reinstated in his earlier rights, Aurelius of Carthage insisted that the matter first be treated at the coming synod.[58] This synod received the repentant Apiarius back into the communion of the Church, but ordered his removal from the see of Sicca and so informed Pope Boniface I (418–422), not without indicating how very much people in Africa were affected by Zosimus's arrogant manner.[59] When the case was exactly reenacted under Pope Celestine I in 424—Apiarius relapsed, was again excommunicated, again appealed to Rome, from where the same legate as before was sent with concrete instructions—the African episcopate reacted very decisively: for the future the Pope was not to accept any appeal from a priest condemned in Africa, not to believe complaints frivolously, and not to accept into communion persons excommunicated in Africa, since to do so was contrary to the decrees of Nicaea.[60] The last reference shows precisely that the African bishops were really concerned about the maintaining of their own rights.

It has been surmised, probably wrongly, that in his unfortunate procedure Zosimus was under the influence of a man who, without doubt, supplied the impetus for a further serious blunder by the Pope. In the latter's first letter after his election, to the Gallic episcopate,[61] Bishop Patroclus of Arles was given a series of striking privileges, which were to lead to a first serious conflict. No Gallic cleric might thereafter apply to Rome without a letter of recommendation from the Bishop of Arles; and all controverted matters within the Gallic Church were to be submitted to him, provided that, not being *causae maiores,* they did not have to be sent on to Rome; finally, the Bishop of Arles was elevated to metropolitan over the territory of the three provinces of Viennensis and Narbonensis I and II and the full right to ordain was given him for them. This special position was first justified by the personal merits of Patroclus, then by the false claim that Arles had received its first Bishop Trophimus from Rome and thereby had become the mother Church of all Gaul. When the directly affected Bishops of Narbonne, Vienne, and Marseille complained in Rome over the curtailment of their previous rights, they were sharply repulsed, and Proculus of Marseille was even deposed.[62] The ensuing disturbances within the Gallic Church compelled the successor of Zosimus to annul his measures and restore the ancient metropolitan order.[63] In the two years of his pontificate Zosimus had, through his ill-advised decisions, wasted much of the capital in papal authority which Innocent I had prudently and systematically collected.

---

[57] Documents on the case of Apiarius in C. H. Turner, 561–624; see E. Caspar, I, 358–360, 366–371, and W. Marschall, op. cit., 161–197.

[58] Instruction for the legates: *Ep.* 15. Zosimus appealed mistakenly to the canons of Nicaea instead of to those of Serdica, which were, however, unknown in Africa.

[59] *Cod. eccl. Afr.,* can, 134.

[60] Ibid., can, 138.

[61] Zosimus, *Ep.* 1. On the whole matter, G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste im 5. und 6. Jh.* (Bonn 1964).

The dubious administration of Zosimus, which in his last months had even evoked opposition in his own clergy,[64] had an impact in the confusion over the selecting of his successor. There occurred a double election, since one faction proclaimed the deacon Eulalius, probably favored by Zosimus, while the majority of the priests expressed themselves for the Roman Boniface I (418–422). In accord with the report of Symmachus, Prefect of the City, the Emperor decided for Eulalius, but, when further exertions for peace were fruitless, he directed a great synod to settle the schism. However, since the adherents of Eulalius, against the imperial command, kept Rome in unrest through further demonstrations, Honorius finally decided that Boniface should assume the office.[65] Under the impression of the recent chaos, Boniface sent a petition to the Emperor, in which in a general form he requested his protection for the Church, whereupon Honorius issued a rescript prescribing that in a future double election in Rome a new election by the entire community should decide the Roman Bishop.[66] This first papal election arrangement in history, decreed by the State, had, it is true, no influence in the later period, but the esteem and independence of the Roman See at first suffered because of it.

In addition to the already treated tasks of clarifying the right of appeal of the African Church in the case of Apiarius and to the restoration of the metropolitan rights in Gaul, Boniface also faced the critical question of ecclesiastical supremacy in the Balkans. This was seriously threatened when the bishops of Thessaly, unhappy with an appointment arranged by Rome to the episcopal see of Corinth, applied to Constantinople and obtained from the Emperor Theodosius II an edict whereby all controverted cases of the Churches of Illyricum were to be submitted to the bishops of the capital of the Eastern Empire, since this city possessed the rights of Old Rome.[67] In letters to Bishop Rufus of Thessalonica, whose vicariate was confirmed, and to the bishops of Thessaly, Boniface repeated in the language of Innocent I that the care for the Universal Church was laid on the Bishop of Rome as a duty and hence included also the Churches of the East, who accordingly had consulted Rome in serious questions in the past.[68] Furthermore, the Pope induced the Emperor Honorius to write to Theodosius II, who thereupon instructed the *Praefectus Praetorio* for Illyricum to observe the previous order of ecclesiastical circumstances in his sphere of authority.[69] The view of Rome was clearly formulated by Boniface: that, despite all recognition of the rank of the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch, Rome alone was the head, the others were the members (*Ep.* 14, 1).

---

[62] Zosimus, *Ep.* 4–7, 10–11.

[63] Boniface (his letters: *PL* 20, 749–792), *Ep.* 3 and 13; see also Celestine, *Ep.* 2.

[64] Zosimus, *Ep.* 14.

[65] The pertinent documents in the *Coll. Avell.*, nos. 14–37.

[66] Petition to the Emperor Honorius: Boniface I, *Ep.* 7; rescript on the papal election: *Coll. Avell.*, no. 37.

The understanding of the primacy by Pope Celestine I (422–432)[70] found expression above all in the decisions which resulted from the controversy over the teaching of Nestorius. When the latter and Cyril presented to him in the summer of 430 their view of the Christological question and of the previous course of the discussion, he saw in this an appeal from the East to Rome, at once had a position adopted in regard to it at a synod, and made known its decrees to those directly concerned and to the clergy of Constantinople.[71] Cyril was commissioned,[72] "in his place," to see to the implementation of the Roman synodal verdict, which called upon Nestorius to recant and, in case of his refusal, excluded him from the ecclesiastical community. In the letter to Constantinople Celestine stressed that the Christians there were also his flock, for whom, in according with 2 Corinthians 11:28, his paternal care was intended. Here a repeated claim of the Pope became clear: the eastern Churches were also confided to his care, hence he could and must intervene in their affairs also, especially if, as here, there was a question of faith; he could make binding decisions and appoint a deputy. But the further development showed that, as previously, people were of a different opinion in the East in regard to such a claim. The decision of the

---

[67] Edict of Theodosius: *Cod. Theod.,* 16, 2, 45.

[68] Boniface I, *Ep.* 13–15; see *Ep.* 6 of the *Coll. Thessal.,* which likewise comes from Boniface.

[69] Letter of Honorius and reply of Arcadius: *Coll. Thessal.,* nos. 15 and 16 (in Boniface I, *Ep.* 10 and 11).

[70] His letters: *PL* 50, 417–558, and *PL,* Suppl. 3, 20f. In a new edition: *ACO* I, 1, 7, 125–137, and I, 2, 5–101. On Celestine in general: *DHGE* 12, 2794–2802.

[71] They are letters 11–14.

[72] *Ep.* 11.

Emperor to have the controversy over Nestorius settled at an imperial Synod, to which Rome too was invited, had put Celestine into a precarious position, since Rome had already taken a position and could not revise its verdict. And so the legates appointed for Ephesus received orders to consult there with Cyril, not to intervene directly in the discussion but only to express their view of the verdict rendered, and for the rest to be mindful of the authority of the Roman See. Of course, the letter to the Synod stated clearly that the legates had to carry out what had already been decided at Rome and that the Pope did not doubt that the Council would assent to these decrees.[73] But since Cyril, appealing, it is true, to his function as Celestine's deputy, without awaiting the arrival of the papal delegation, had already accomplished the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius, the verdict of Rome could only be made known subsequently to the participants in the Council. But the Roman Legate Philip ably explained their acclamations as recognition of the head by the members and declared before the assembled Synod that "Peter, head of the Apostles, pillar of the faith and foundation-stone of the Church, up to this day and for ever lives and governs in his successors" and that Celestine is his successor and representative; this Synod took note of these explanations without objection.[74] The Pope soon claimed for himself, in an assessment of the Council's work, the chief role in the outcome and stressed in regard to the clergy of Constantinople that Peter had not abandoned them in their need.[75] Thus far no Pope had emphasized to the Eastern Churches as clearly as Celestine the rank of the Roman Bishop as head of the Universal Church, but an express acceptance of his claim did not follow at Ephesus.[76]

Relations with the Eastern Churches also played a considerable role in the pontificate of Sixtus III (432–440).[77] The Union between Alexandria and Antioch of 433,[78] brought about after much exertion and not without Rome's collaboration, filled the Pope with great satisfaction; in a letter to John of Antioch he stressed how important it was to be of one mind with Rome, since in the successors of Peter was found the tradition which the latter had received.[79] The cordial relations now existing between the Eastern Churches and Rome were temporarily overshadowed by an effort by the Bishop of Constantinople, Proclus, in 434 to recover influence in Eastern Illyricum, in which he had the support of some of the bishops of the area. Sixtus discreetly repulsed this attack, on the one hand calling attention to the position and rights of the Bishop of Thessalonica as *vicarius sedis apostolicae* and defining them precisely, and on the other hand making known to Proclus his expectation that he would not listen to the Illyrian priests or bishops who would apply to him contrary to the law.[80] Finally Sixtus maintained the remembrance of the two important theological decisions of his time in impressive buildings. He had the Liberian basilica on the Esquiline rebuilt and in its magnificent mosaics and in its dedication inscription had the dogmatic statements of Ephesus in honor of the *Theotokos* published. And the transformation and decoration of the Lateran baptistery, with the distiches on the efficacy of the grace of baptism in man, recalled the defense against the Pelagian assault on the nature of Christian grace.[81]

---

[73] *Ep.* 17 and 18.

[74] Report on the session of 10–11 July 431: *SchAC* I, 1, 3, 53ff.

[75] *Ep.* 25.

[76] On Celestine's interest in the Irish mission, see chap. 13, p. 215.

[77] Nine letters preserved: *PL* 50, 583–618; *PL,* Suppl. 3, 22f. and *ACO* I, 1, 7, 143–145; I, 2, 107–110.

[78] See supra, pp. 108–111.

[79] *Ep.* 6.

Pope Leo the Great

In Leo I (440–461),[82] who even before his official elevation as deacon of the Roman congregation had exercised a strong influence on his two predecessors, the consciousness of the primacy in the Early Church achieved its first definitive climax.[83] This Pope was deeply convinced that only Christ is the true and eternal Bishop of his Church; he can bear the burden of his office only in reliance on him who works in him and accomplishes the right that he does.[84] But since Christ as the eternal Bishop granted to Peter an imperishable participation in his episcopal power, Peter always presides over his Roman See, and it is Peter who likewise works and acts through his heirs.[85] Leo I deepened this notion of the Roman Bishop as Peter's heir already employed by Siricius, and saw in it the real justification of the primacy: just as the heir enters into all rights and duties of the one whose heir he is, so the current Bishop of Rome, as Peter's heir, assumes his function, full authority, and privileges. Not Peter's having worked in Rome, not the possession of Peter's tomb, but the legally understood succession of the heir permits the Roman Bishop to function as Peter's vicar.[86] And furthermore, as, according to Matthew 16:18, more power was entrusted to Peter than to the other Apostles, so the same is true for the relation of his heir to the other bishops.[87] On such a basis Leo understood himself as called to an office whose burden and dignity he likewise felt. It placed on him the duty of supervising in the Universal Church the purity of doctrine and standing up for a manner of life within this community which corresponded to the gospel and the tradition of the Fathers. As no Pope before him Leo I sought to do justice to this duty, in a seriously accepted responsibility and in the awareness of a high dignity, and at the same time with a watchful eye for the possible in the concrete individual case and with diplomatic skill.

---

[80] *Ep.* 7, 8, and 10 =nos. 11, 12, and 14 of the *Coll. Thessal.* Letter to Proclus: *Ep.* 9 and 13 of the *Coll. Thessal.*

[81] On the building activity of Sixtus III see R. Krautheimer, *Festschrift E. Panofsky* (New York 1961), 291–302.

[82] His letters and sermons: *PL* 54, Suppl. 3, 329–350. New edition of the *Sermones* (previously 1–64) by J. Leclercq–R. Dolle: *SChr* 22 bis, 49, 74 (Paris 1949–61); letters: Schwartz, *ACO* II, 1–4. Literature on Leo I: P. Batiffol, *DThC* 9, 218–301; H. Lietzmann, *PWK* 12, 1962–1943; Altaner–Stuiber, 7th ed., 357–360.

[83] Especially important *Sermones* 2–5 and 82–84.

[84] *Serm.* 2, 1; 5, 3f.; 83, 3.

[85] *Serm.* 5, 4; 3, 4; 2, 2; Siricius, *Ep.* 1, 1. *Consortium potentiae: Serm.* 4, 4, 2; see M. Maccarrone, *San Pietro in rapporto a Cristo* (Rome 1968), 63–67.

In the territory of the Latin Church Leo's claim to leadership encountered no fundamental opposition: it was recognized, of course, without reserve by a relatively weak Western Empire. When the Pope learned of the existence in Rome of a not inconsiderable Manichaean community, he proceeded against it energetically and secured without hesitation an imperial edict which intensified the punishments already prescribed against it and for years he warned in word and writing against the Manichaean danger.[88] When various congregations of the province of Venetia enlisted the services of former Pelagian clerics without adequate supervision, he admonished the Bishop of Aquileia to greater vigilance. Learning that Priscillianism was again flourishing in Spain, he supplied in a decretal concrete instructions for the action of the bishops. Abuses in episcopal elections in North Africa, which came about in consequence of the Vandal invasion, induced the Pope to write to the episcopate of Mauretania, to demand a comprehensive report on the measures adopted.[89] Leo's jurisdictional power seems to have been questioned, and only temporarily, by a single Latin bishop, Hilary of Arles, a former monk of Lérins, in whom purely personal ascetism was joined to a strong inclination to a not always discreet supervision of ecclesiastical discipline in the whole Gallic Church. He derived the right to this from alleged privileges of the see of Arles, which he also personally defended before a Roman Synod, to which two Gallic bishops had turned with their grievances—one because he had been uncanonically deposed by Hilary, the other because he had decided on a successor in his own lifetime. Leo quashed both measures of Hilary; he left him in office, but only as Bishop of Arles, whose metropolitan rights passed to the senior bishop of the province. In a masterfully formulated and measured letter to the bishops of the province of Vienne the Pope made known his decisions and emphasized expressly that he made them in his character as successor of Peter. He aptly utilized the case to have an edict, requested from the Emperor Valentinian III for the Count Aëtius in Gaul, confirmed, to the effect that the primatial claim of the Roman Bishop was independent of any consent by the State.[90] Since Hilary submitted to the Roman judgment, the case remained only an episode without that importance which is at times ascribed to it. Leo I had to call his vicar at Thessalonica to order when the latter exceeded his authority in regard to the metropolitans of his territory. In a formula become famous, which was later to enjoy great vogue at the papal chancery, the Pope made clear to him that the Roman Bishop had summoned him, in transmitting the vicariate, only to a share in his care as shepherd, not to the fullness of his power. Leo found an equally clarifying expression for the meaning and range of episcopal collegiality: all bishops are equal in dignity, but not in rank, as was already the case in the Apostolic College, since preeminence was given to one. From this pattern (*forma*) was deduced its measure in the pastoral care, which was different according to the importance of the individual see, but the care of all of them flowed together into the comprehensive care of Peter's see for the Universal Church: only a *concordia sacerdotum* thus understood guaranteed the unity of the Church.[91]

---

[86] *Serm.* 3, 4: "cuius [scl. Petri] vice fungimur." On the justification of the primacy from the *hereditas sedis,* cf. W. Ullmann, "Leo I and the Theme of Papal Primacy," *JThS* n. s. 11 (1960), 25–51.

[87] *Sermo* 4.

[88] Leo, *Ep.* 7; 8 (Edict of Valentinian III); *Serm.* 16, 22; 24; 34; 42; 76; cf. also Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chron. ad ann.* 443.

[89] Against the Pelagians: *Epp.* 1 and 2; Priscillianists: *Ep.* 15 to Turribius of Astorga; see B. de Gaiffier, *AnBoll* 59 (1941), 34–64, and J. Campos, *Helmántica* 13 (1962), 269–308. Decretal for Africa: *Ep.* 12.

However, the real and decisive testing area for the possibility of realization of Leo's understanding of the primacy was and remained the Churches of the East. Already in his letter of congratulations to Dioscorus of Alexandria, who had announced his election, the Pope in a cautious formulation mentioned that unity must prevail between Rome and Alexandria, since in the Roman Church the traditions of Peter, honored by the Lord with the primacy, were held in respect and in Alexandria those of his disciple Mark, and between teacher and pupil no opposition should exist.[92] A direct reply from Dioscorus to Leo's letter is not extant, but what he really thought of Rome's position in the Universal Church was expressed clearly in the treatment which he accorded to Leo's legates at the imperial Synod of Ephesus in 449.[93] He imperiously pushed aside their demand that the Synod at least let the papal verdict on the teaching of Eutyches, as contained in Leo's letter to Flavian of Constantinople, be read, and just as coolly he disregarded the Roman protest against the deposition of Flavian. This unambiguous nonrecognition of any special position of Rome by the Church of Alexandria was accompanied by the negative attitude of the Emperor Theodosius II, who bluntly rejected the combined petitions of the Pope, the Emperor Valentinian III, and the latter's mother Galla Placidia for the convoking of a new council in Italy. In his reply to Valentinian he consciously spoke only of the "Patriarch" Leo, whereas the letters of the Western imperial family clearly referred to Rome's universal rank.[94] It is true, the Pope had often extolled in lyric terms the importance of the imperial office for maintaining the purity of the faith and had characterized its representatives as inspired by the Holy Spirit, but the real value of such formulations becomes discernible when it is established that Leo I by no means now abandoned the Eastern Church to the leadership of the Emperor. On the contrary, he was obliged to remind it continually of its duty to protect and be vigilant, did not hold back with pronounced criticism of the failure of Ephesus in 449 for which the Emperor was largely responsible, and demanded that a new council must correct "quae contra fidem facta sunt," and he even expressed his concern that the Emperor could in regard to a truth of faith become the victim of deception.[95] Certainly, the bishops deposed at Ephesus in 449—Flavian, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus—turned to Rome for help and to some extent expected or asked of the papal authority direct reinstatement in their former offices, but such voices remained isolated.[96]

---

[90] Leo I, *Ep.* 10; Edict of Honorius: ibid., *Ep.* 11; see E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* II (Paris 1957), 160–170.

[91] Leo I, *Epp.* 6 and 14; 14, 1: "vices enim nostras ita tuae credidimus caritati, ut in partem sis vocatus sollicitudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis." On the episcopal office, ibid. 14, 11.

---

[92] Leo I, *Ep.* 9.

[93] On the prehistory and course of the Synod of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon, see supra, chaps. 7 and 8.

[94] Letters of Leo and of the imperial family: *Epp.* 54–58; replies of Theodosius: *Epp.* 62–64.

[95] Cf. the letters of Leo to Theodosius and Pulcheria: *Epp.* 43–45 and *Ep.* 54 ("indefessis precibus divinam misericordiam posco, . . . ne falli vos patiatur"). Cf. P. Stockmeier, *Leo I. d. Gr. Beurteilung der kaiserlichen Religionspolitik* (Munich 1959).

[96] Letters of Flavian and of Eusebius: *ACO* II, II, 1, 77–81; of Theodoret in Leo I, *Ep.* 52.

Like Pope Celestine earlier at Ephesus in 431, now Leo I had to be concerned that at the Council of Chalcedon his doctrinal decision contained in the *Epistola ad Flavianum* should not be again questioned. In keeping with this concern was the conduct of his legates, who repeatedly stressed the supreme teaching authority of Rome and intended to prevent any procedure that contradicted this notion.[97] As a matter of fact, no formal objection to it was raised at the Council, and the legates could have seen from their point of view a recognition of the Roman standpoint in several incidents, as in the third session of the Council, in which under their presidency and in their formulation, the verdict on Dioscorus was handed down, which referred expressly to the Roman primacy.[98] They could, like Leo himself later, find great satisfaction in the acclamation which greeted the *Epistola Dogmatica*—"Peter has spoken through Leo"—and interpret this in the sense of an approving confirmation of the Roman teaching authority. In reality the situation was by far not so clear. Without doubt, the letter to Flavian was once again discussed, and a group of the bishops had hesitations because of certain formulations, which had to be cleared up. The acclamations for the *Epistola* must obviously be understood as the Council's confirmation that Leo's teaching concurred with the tradition of the Fathers; hence the Council regarded itself as authorized, first to examine it and then to proclaim it. The Council acted even more independently in questions of jurisdiction, as, for example, the reinstatement of the deposed bishops, which it decided lay within its competence.[99] This independence appears most strongly in the decree of the Council which is contained in the so-called canon 28 and granted to the see of Constantinople the same rights as the Roman See possessed, since they were of equal rank as the imperial cities. From this was derived for the Bishop of Constantinople the right to ordain all the metropolitans of the Dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace and of all bishops in the areas bordering these territories. The Council maintained this decree against the protest of the papal legates, but after the conclusion of the sessions turned to the Pope, again expressly recognized his teaching authority, explained the meaning of the canon, and asked him "through his recognition to honor" this decree also. The Emperor Marcian and Bishop Anatolius also petitioned Leo in the same sense.[100] Leo's protracted comments in letters to the imperial pair and to the Bishop of Constantinople evaluated canon 28 as a serious affront to the decrees of Nicaea and solemnly declared it invalid,[101] but achieved only a temporary suspension of the decree.

---

[97] On the following cf. W. de Vries, "Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem Konzil von Chalkedon," *OrChrP* 35 (1969), 88–122.

[98] Verdict on Dioscorus: *ACO* II, 1, 15ff.; in Latin: Leo I, *Ep.* 103.

[99] Leo I, *Ep.* 98.

[100] Text of the canon: *ACO* II, I, 3, 89–94; letter of the Council: ibid., 116–118. Letters of Marcian and Anatolius: Leo I, *Ep.* 100f.

Glancing at this complex situation, one must say that the Council of Chalcedon did not express an unlimited and full recognition of Leo's understanding of the primacy, but the Roman teaching authority in the strict sense found a measure of assent previously unknown and later never again realized, whereas a competence of Rome in questions of ecclesiastical discipline and jurisdiction could not be established, but was only occasionally accepted by individual bishops. How unenduring was even this relative success was quickly revealed by the struggle that at once began in the East over the validity of the Council of Chalcedon.[102] Of course, in the West the primacy of the Roman Bishop was no longer challenged in the full breadth understood and formulated by Leo I. Certainly, the surpassing personality of this Pope contributed to this: in the contemporary West no figure of similar importance could be set beside him. Above all, through Leo's fearlessly standing up for the protection of Rome and Italy in the face of Attila (452) and of the Vandal King Gaiseric (455),[103] the Pope had become the support and anchor in their earthly misery in the eyes of many in place of an imperial office that was completely breaking down.

---

[101] Leo I, *Ep.* 104–106.

[102] See *Chalcedon* II, 13–177.

[103] Prosper, *Chron. ad ann. 452 and 455.*

CHAPTER 16

The Clergy of the Church of the Empire

At the beginning of the fourth century there had long been a general conviction that, within the Christian community, there had to be a special clerical state with various ranks, to each of which were allotted specific duties in the service of the community. The synodal and papal legislation of the age, as well as the initiative of individual bishops, tried to assure to the mandate of this state the highest possible efficacy, especially by defining the conditions for admittance, more clearly distinguishing the spheres of activity of the individual offices from one another, and caring for the spiritual and intellectual formation of its members. Individual authors produced outlines of a priestly ideal, which could keep alive the seriousness and meaning of the priestly mission.

The Various Orders

The actual division of the clergy into two groups, characterized by Innocent I as *clerici superioris* and *inferioris ordinis,*[1] was familiar to the fourth century. To the first clearly belonged bishops, priests, and deacons, whose ordination was reserved exclusively to bishops and whose special rank was also recognized by state legislation.[2] The lesser ranks, on the contrary, were subject to wide variations, not only in regard to their number and esteem but also to their field of activity.[3] The orders most often named in the sources—those of subdeacon, acolyte, exorcist, porter, and lector—were not actually found in all local congregations, nor was admission to the next highest order strictly related to the exercise of the preceding degree; there was not even agreement whether each of the orders named really represented a clerical function. The lectorship[4] was usually regarded as the stage of entry into the clerical career: in the fourth century it was often conferred on boys who seemed suited for the clerical state. At first the lector was responsible for the reading of the Scripture in the liturgy, later also for the singing of the psalms. The East gradually distinguished the singer from the reader, without however ordaining the former for his function,[5] whereas in Rome the liturgical choir was constituted of lectors. Since the function of the lector presupposed a certain education, this order was usually regarded as the necessary preliminary for admission to one of the higher orders.[6] The office and function of the porter are rather hazy in the sources: in the enumeration of the orders by Siricius, Innocent I, and Zosimus it was not usually mentioned, whereas at the end of the fifth century Gelasius I named it but did not count it in the clerical state. However, it existed at Milan under Ambrose, in Africa the porter was regarded as a cleric, and the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* expressly speak of his ordination. In the East the function appeared in some sources of the fourth century, but the *Apostolic Constitutions* did not know any ordination to it. In the time of Justinian, the porter no longer belonged to the clergy and was not again mentioned after the

---

[1] *Ep.* 2, 3.

[2] Even a *chorepiscopus* could ordain a priest or deacon: Council of Antioch, canon 10. A rule of the Emperor Arcadius decided that bishops, priests, and deacons could not be required to serve in a *curia: Cod. Theod.* 12, 1, 163.

[3] Cf. especially W. Croce, op. cit.

[4] See H. Leclercq, "Lectorat," *DACL* VIII, 2247–2269; A. Quacquarelli, "Alle origini del lector," *Convivium Dominicum* (Catania 1959), 381–406.

[5] Council of Laodicea, can. 23, 24; *Const. Apost.* 2, 26, 3; Jerome, *Ep.* 52, 5. Only the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua,* probably compiled by Gennadius of Marseille *c.* 475, in canon 98 name as the last clerical stage the *psalmista,* probably adopted from the East.

[6] Council of Serdica., canons 10 and 13 respectively; *Test. D.N.J. Chr.* 1, 45.

Trullan Council. The name and the presentation of the church keys in the ordination probably assigned to him a supervision of the church and of those present during the celebration of the liturgy.[7] The *Apostolic Constitutions* also denied a special ordination for the office of exorcist, since he possessed a charism directly bestowed by God for his task, which consisted in the care of the catechumens and energumens. In East and West the function clearly lost importance from the fifth century and finally ceased to exist.[8] Whereas the office of acolyte was never able to establish itself in the East,[9] it acquired in the West, and especially at Rome, a certain respect: its holders appeared as the assistants of the subdeacons in the liturgy, although they are found in Gaul only toward the end of the fifth century.[10] The subdiaconate must be regarded as a splitting-off from the office of deacon, but its functions were not, of course, clearly defined everywhere. At Rome its number corresponded to that of the Seven Deacons, and this indicates them as their assistants. Their cooperation in the liturgy, as with the case of the acolytes, gradually withdrew behind tasks which were entrusted to them in the administration of Church property.[11] In the course of the fourth century there occurred in the rapidly growing communities a further differentiation of the duties of deacons and priests; their more precise definition led on occasion to considerable difficulties. Since the deacons were in many respects the direct cooperators of the bishop, at times even his representatives—they played a special role in the administration of Church property, in the choice of candidates for ordination, and in liturgical functions—their reputation and influence were quite often greater than that of the priests. At Rome they constituted the *collegium* of the Seven Deacons, whose head was called the archdeacon by the end of the fourth century, and it was mostly from their number that the Pope (or also the Antipope) was elected.[12] The sources make known that they rather often claimed liturgical functions that were reserved to the priests or in general sought precedence over these. And so various synods had to remind them of their real rank and clearly relegate them to the place behind the priests.[13] These had full authority to administer baptism and celebrate the Eucharist in the event that they were appointed to a church of their own; otherwise, they supplied for the bishop in these functions in his absence. At times they were even entrusted with preaching, which was basically the bishop's responsibility.[14]

---

[7] Cf. *DACL* XIV, 1525–1533; R. Gryson, "Les degrés du clergé et leurs dénominations chez s. Ambroise," *RBén* 76 (1966), 119–127.

[8] *DACL* V, 964–978; *Const. Apost.* 8, 26; W. Croce, op. cit., 264.

[9] Only Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3, 8, mentions acolytes once in the retinue of the bishops at the Council of Nicaea.

[10] *DACL* I, 348–356; *Stat. eccl. ant.*, can. 94.

[11] *DACL* XV, 1619–1626; Council of Laodicea, can. 21, 23, 25.

[12] On the Roman deacons cf. V. Monachino, *La cura pastorale a Milano, Cartagine, e Roma nel sec. IV* (Rome 1947), 327f. For the Popes from the college of deacons, see M. Andrieu, "La carrière ecclésiastique des papes," *RevSR* 21 (1947), 90–120. Diaconate in the East: P. Rentinck, *La cura pastorale in Antiochia nel sec. IV* (Rome 1970), 172–175.

In the fourth and fifth centuries attempts were made to reevaluate the priesthood with a view to the rank of the bishop and also to justify this in theory. The notion of one Aërius of Sebaste, for whom the episcopate and the priesthood were equal in rank, was rejected by Epiphanius of Salamis on the ground that only the bishop could ordain priests. Chrysostom also saw as the sole difference between priest and bishop the full power of the latter to perform the ordination of clerics.[15] In the West the Ambrosiaster and Jerome regarded the distinction between the two orders as not original, since priest and bishop are in principle *sacerdotes*; the later distinction in rank goes back, they said, to mere considerations of expediency. Similar ideas are found in the treatise *De septem ordinibus* (after 420) and, independently of it, in Isidore of Seville.[16] Tendencies of this sort were however rejected by Innocent I, who expressly calls priests *secundi ordinis,* and later by Gelasius I, who aimed to penalize with deposition the encroachments of priests, e.g., the ordaining of acolytes and subdeacons and the preparation of the chrism.[17]

While the Synod of Serdica enacted the general rule that the cleric should prove himself for a time in the individual orders before he could advance to a higher one, Popes Siricius and Zosimus established definite intervals—*tempora,* the later interstices—for remaining in one order, but the observance of this had to be again imposed by Leo I. Then Gelasius I championed the noteworthy idea that these prescriptions were to be treated flexibly and should be accommodated to the contemporary demands of preaching.[18]

As regards the numerical strength of the clergy, both in individual communities and in entire provinces and countries, there are few reliable reports from this period, but no doubt in the Church of the Empire of the fourth century it grew considerably in proportion to the number of Christians. Complaints about the lack of recruits for the priesthood were raised in Africa, however, at the time of the Donatist controversy and in Italy as a result of the chaos of the migrations of the peoples.[19]

---

[13] Gaudemet, op. cit., 103; the "haughtiness" of Roman deacons was strongly censured by the Ambrosiaster: *Quaest. Vet. et Novi Test.* 101 (*CSEL* 50, 193ff.).

[14] Ibid. 101, with footnote.

[15] Epiphanius of Salamis, *Adv. haeres* 74, 5; John Chrysostom, *In ep. I ad Tim. hom. 11.*

[16] See J. Lécuyer, "Aux origines de la théologie thomiste de l'épiscopat," *Gr* 35 (1954), 56–89.

[17] Innocent I, *Ep.* 25, 3; Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 6; cf. Leo I, *sermo* 48, 1; Ambrosiaster, *In 2 Tim.* 3, 10.

[18] Gaudemet, op. cit., 149–152; Gelasius, *Ep.,* 14, 2.

Preliminaries for Admission to the Clerical State

In contrast to certain particular early Christian factions, such as Montanists or Priscillianists, the Church of the Empire on principle admitted only men to clerical orders. Deaconesses, who in the Latin West never achieved the same importance as in the East, were, it is true, inducted into their state by a special rite—imposition of hands and prayer—but the really sacramental sphere was not open to them. Their service was chiefly oriented to the women of the community, whom they prepared for baptism, took care of in the actual baptism, nursed in sickness, and acted as their contact with the clergy of the community.[20]

Ecclesiastical legislation of the period in general required for admission to the individual orders a maturity corresponding to their importance, but in determining the age for ordination it was still fluctuating and not uniform.[21] From the decretal of Pope Zosimus on the length of the interstices the following minimum ages result: for the acolyte and subdeacon, twenty-one; for the deacon, twenty-five; for the priest, thirty years. The most frequently mentioned age for the ordination of a bishop varied from forty-five to fifty years of age.[22] The numerous exceptions indicate that these statements referred to standards whose observance could be disregarded if there was question of the ordination of an especially qualified man. For example, Ambrose of Milan became a bishop eight days after his baptism at the age of twenty-four, and Hilary of Poitiers before he was thirty-five; Epiphanius of Pavia (d. 496) became a subdeacon when he was eighteen, a deacon at twenty, a priest at twenty-eight, and in the same year he was made a bishop.

The previously universally observed requirement of physical integrity and psychological health in the candidate for ordination was differentiated from the fourth century. Not only self-mutilation but strongly deforming scars or the lack of a bodily member excluded one from ordination,[23] as did mental disorder and epilepsy.[24] But more important for the Church was the fitness in moral character for the ecclesiastical state, and the testing of this was demanded with increasing urgency. This testing included a rather protracted probation of the previous layman in the faith and a moral life, and so the ordination of a neophyte was possible only by way of exception.[25] This probation clearly had to be denied to those who had apostatized in a persecution.[26] But a greater flexibility was shown to those who came to the Catholic Church from a schismatic or an heretical community, and on occasion their clerics might be left in their previous rank, as in the case of the Novatians at Nicaea and of the Donatists in North Africa.[27] It was more difficult to determine an objective standard for the evaluation of moral qualities. The general view was that no fitness for the clerical state was present in those who had had to submit to public ecclesiastical penance because of serious sins.[28] The earlier mentioned *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua,* a sort of manual for the clerical state, demanded that, in addition to usurers, agitators and those who took justice into their own hands were excluded from orders.[29] That these norms were often not observed is proved by the complaints, raised again and again, by the Popes on the ordination of *indigni* and the exclusion, decreed by them, of the guilty from the clerical state.[30] That the clergy had to have at its disposal an extensive theological and pastoral knowledge because of its duty of proclaiming the faith and caring for souls was stressed by many authors and bishops of the time as well as by the Popes of the fourth and fifth centuries,[31] but the sources provide only slightly varied statements on the contemporary educational program of clerics. The leading bishops and theological writers of the age, a minority compared to the totality of the clergy and for the most part members of the educated class, had attended the profane schools of the fourth and fifth centuries and hence were also in a position to acquire the requisite theological knowledge through private study.[32] In the East this group could acquire a high degree of theological formation at the few theological schools, of which at that time the *Asceterium* of Diodorus at Antioch occupied an exalted rank.[33] There were also men with this type of education who regarded certain fields of profane knowledge as necessary for a deeper grasp of theology. But the great majority of the lesser clergy at this time had at their disposal no theological institutions with a definite program of studies, and so the clerical aspirants were for the most part introduced by the contemporary local clergy into Scripture, the manner of administering the Sacraments, and the rest of pastoral activity. Under especially favorable conditions, as, for example, in large communities or under a bishop who welcomed initiative, a sort of scholastic instruction could develop, as was already foreshadowed in the Roman *schola cantorum* of the third century and then must be assumed in the beginnings of the *vita communis* of the clergy of the Church of Vercelli under Bishop Eusebius (d. c. 371) and for some communities of North Africa.[34] The clergy of the congregation of Hippo obtained an optimal formation under Augustine in his *monasterium clericorum,* but in his letters he had at times to complain in distress about the low level of knowledge of some clerics in the country.[35] From the fifth century also some monasteries of the Latin West acquired a great importance for the education of clerics, as, for example, the South Gallic island monastery of Lérins, from which proceeded many bishops, who then sought to form the clergy in their sees on the Lérins model.[36] The heart of the priestly education was generally considered to be the knowledge and understanding of Scripture, which was strictly demanded by all the contemporary "mirrors" for priests and bishops.[37] The *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* required that it be ascertained in a candidate for the episcopacy before his ordination that he possessed a satisfactory literary education, was familiar with Scripture and reasonable in interpreting it, that he knew the doctrines of the Church and concurred with the basic truths of faith.[38] The cultural and economic crisis that accompanied the migration of the peoples and the consequent lack of recruits naturally caused these requirements often to be to a great extent disregarded.

---

[19] For North Africa see R. Crespin, op. cit., 55–60; other references in Gaudemet, op. cit., 106f.

[20] The most important sources in J. Mayer, "Monumenta de viduis, diaconissis virginibusque tractantia," *FlorPatr* 42 (Bonn 1938); also A. Kalsbach, *RAC* IV, 917–928 (with literature). On the problem of the ordination of deaconesses: P. H. Lafontaine, 64–67, and R. Gryson, *Le ministère des femmes.*

[21] Lafontaine, 164–216.

[22] Zosimus, *Ep.* 9, 3; earlier, Siricius, *Ep.* 1, 9–10.

---

[23] Council of Nicaea, can. 1; Jerome, *Ep.* 52, 10; Innocent I, *Ep.* 37, 1, 3; Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 2.

[24] Council of Elvira, can. 29; Council of Orange (441), can. 15(16); Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 2.

[25] Lafontaine, 354–393.

[26] Council of Nicaea, can. 10.

[27] Ibid., can. 8 and 19. On the Donatists, see R. Crespin, op. cit., 99–103.

[28] Siricius, *Ep.* 1, 14; Council of Toledo I, can. 2; Innocent I, *Ep.,* 2, 2; 39; *Statut. eccles. ant.,* can. 84; Augustine, *Ep.* 185, 10, 45; Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 2.

[29] *Statut. eccles. ant.,* c. 55.

[30] Damasus, *Ep. ad Gallos episc.* 5; 14; 16; Siricius, *Ep.* 1, 8; Innocent I, *Ep.* 2, 2; 39; Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 2.

[31] Lafontaine, 311–334; R. Lebel, "La formation intellectuelle et pastorale des prêtres au grand siècle patristique," *Le prêtre hier, aujourd'hui, demain* (Paris 1970), 102–114.

---

[32] Cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 21, in which he asks Bishop Valerius for the free time.

[33] R. Leconte, "L'asceterium de Diodore," *Mélanges bibliques A. Robert* (Paris 1959), 531–536.

[34] For Vercelli, Ambrose, *Ep.* 63, 65. Several synodal decrees from North Africa require that youngsters being considered for the clerical career should be instructed in Scripture and the conciliar decrees before ordination: *Breviar. Hippon.,* canons 1–2; Council of Carthage, canon 3; *conc. eccl. afr.,* canon 18.

[35] Cf. F. van der Meer, *Augustinus als Seelsorger* (Cologne 1951), 270–280.

[36] E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne,* 3 (Paris 1965), 332–341.

[37] Worthy of mention here are all the homilies of John Chrysostom; Jerome, *Ep. 52 ad Nepotianum* (c. 8: *sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit);* Augustine, *Doctr. christ.* (4, 6: *scripturarum tractator et doctor);* Gregory I, *Ep.* 4, 29; 5, 48; 10, 34; 13, 15.

[38] *Statut. eccles. ant.* I.

Certain structures of the society of late antiquity also presented the Church and State of the fourth and fifth centuries with problems in regard to admittance to the ecclesiastical state, and both of them, at times from different motives, tried to solve them, for the most part in the same direction. For example: the slave was basically an equal and full member of the Christian community, but his social and legal lack of freedom in contemporary society often made him seem as unsuited for a clerical function as were the serfs bound to the soil on the State domains or the estates of the owners of *latifundia* by the colonate legislation. Even the freedman was to be included with them in a certain sense, since he remained bound to his former lord through various obligations, and in certain cases the lord could cancel the manumission. And so the Synod of Elvira (c. 306) forbade the ordination of freedmen whose *patroni* were still pagans, a prohibition which the First Synod of Toledo (400) modified to the extent that it made the admission dependent on the consent of the former lord.[39] Pope Leo I expressed himself in a general way against the ordination of slaves and other dependents, because their ties to their lords did not permit them to devote themselves totally to the service of God.[40] Pope Gelasius I justified this regulation on the ground that the ordination of these unfree would disregard the rights of others and the state legislation, except in the case of the *colonus* who had obtained the written permission of his lord. Slaves ordained contrary to this rule had to return to their lord, unless they were already priests; deacons could retain their office only if they supplied a substitute to their lord.[41] The state laws here mentioned by Gelasius were, first, a decree of the Emperor Theodosius II, which forbade the ordination of a *colonus* without the consent of his lord and only permitted one already ordained to continue in the service of the Church if he paid the tax laid on him and a substitute took over his former duties. Furthermore, a decree of the Emperor Valentinian III forbade the ordination of slaves and *coloni* and left bishops and priests from these classes in their offices only if they had already occupied them for thirty years.[42] In addition, state legislation sought to keep members of individual professions or holders of state or urban offices from entry into the clerical state because they seemed indispensable for the operation of the administration and the economy. These included especially the *decuriones,* members of the urban *curiae*; the holders of this office formerly desired it, because it was privileged, but later it became a compulsorily hereditary administrative function, and from the third century its holders were subject to growing financial burdens since they had to be responsible from their own resources for the raising of the taxes assessed on their city and in addition had to perform costly services for the State and the community. A possible way of escaping from such burdens was entry into the ecclesiastical state (or into a monastery); hence in the late Empire this was forbidden to *decuriones* by frequently renewed state legislation or was made more difficult by financial sanctions.[43] The Church formally yielded to these demands, but only half-heartedly, since it had to be concerned for adequate recruits to the clerical state. Popes and synods, it is true, repeatedly referred to the observance of the imperial directives but only rarely pronounced corresponding penalties against those who violated them and again and again subsequently granted a dispensation.[44] For its part, the Church had hesitations about the admission of former state officials, who after the reception of baptism could have been forced, for example as soldiers or judges, to shed blood or to preside over pagan feasts.[45] Here the long existing Christian conviction that one in so "secular" a service could be freed of guilt only with difficulty came into operation in a concrete manner. According to another interpretation, former administrators of property or trustees could be ordained only if they proved that they were free of all possible obligations arising from their previous activity.[46]

---

[39] Council of Elvira, can. 80; Council of Toledo I, can. 10.

[40] Leo I, *Ep.* 4, 1.

[41] Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 2; 14, 14; 20; 50.

[42] Theodosius II =*Cod. Just.*, 1, 3, 16; Valentinian III: Nov. 35, 3 and 6.

Clerical Marriage and the Beginnings of Celibacy

At the beginning of the fourth century there were in the Church clerics of all ranks of the hierarchy who continued, without any limitations, the married life they had entered before ordination and others who, of their own accord, had decided for continence in marriage or for the renunciation of any marriage. In the pre-Constantinian sources married clerics are naturally mentioned more frequently than the unmarried. From the third century, in the wake of the high esteem of the ideal of virginity, the *continentia* of the clergy was extolled with great praise. Tertullian and Origen made clear their sympathy for it, and justified it with the greater efficacy of its prayer and the special purity required for intimacy with the Christian mysteries. Clement of Alexandria adduced as motive for the continence of the clergy, which he found in the Apostle Paul, the greater availability for the care of souls and the example proposed to *virgines.*[47]

---

[43] Cf. A. H. Jones, *The Late Roman Empire* II (Oxford 1964), 745f.

[44] Innocent I, *Ep.* 3, 4; 37, 3; Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 3; 15, 1.

[45] Damasus, *Ep. ad Gallos episc.,* 10; Siricius, *Ep.* 6, 1, 3; 10, 5, 13; Innocent I, *Ep.* 3, 4; Council of Toledo I (400), can. 8.

[46] Council of Carthage (348), can. 8 and 9.

Of the married cleric it was at first required only that his marriage be spotless in every respect, that is, that both spouses enter into marriage as virgins and always maintain mutual fidelity. A second marriage did not measure up to this ideal, and so a man who had remarried or the husband of a widow was excluded from the clerical state. This rule at first lasted throughout the fourth century, but even so there were in the East discussions as to whether a marriage contracted before baptism should be considered here and whether the prohibition of the second marriage applied only to the higher orders. However, one who, when unmarried, had received one of these orders could not later enter into a marriage; a possibility envisaged by the Synod of Ancyra (314) that a deacon might, at his ordination, reserve for himself the right to a later marriage was soon abandoned.[48] True, in the East there was no lack of tendencies which desired of the married cleric, especially in the higher orders, a total continence in his marriage, but the Council of Nicaea had not accepted a motion for a legal stipulation in this sense.[49] And the Synod of Gangra (340 or 341) had sharply rebuked the adherents of Bishop Eustathius of Sebaste, who demanded the strictest asceticism, because they refused to take part in the Eucharist celebrated by a married priest. The Canons of Hippolytus rejected the demand that a priest to whom a child was born should be deposed, and the *Apostolic Canons* forbade a bishop, priest, or deacon to dismiss his wife "on the pretext of piety."[50] It was only under the Emperor Justinian I that the practice of the Eastern Church experienced a substantial limitation, when he forbade a man who had children or grandchildren to be ordained a bishop: concern for them could all too easily distract him from his duties toward God and Church and bring him into the temptation to bestow ecclesiastical property on his descendants. The definitive legislation for the Eastern Church came from the Quinisext Council of 692, which required of the married candidate for the episcopacy separation from his wife and her entrance into a monastery, whereas it permitted to priests and deacons the continuation of their marriage and demanded continence only on days on which they celebrated or concelebrated the liturgy.[51]

---

[47] R. Gryson, *Origines,* 7–32.

[48] Council of Ancyra, can. 10; see N. Jubany, *AST* 15 (1952), 237–256.

[49] Sozomen, *HE* 1, 11.

[50] Council of Ancyra, can. 10; *Can. Hippol.,* no. 8; *Can. Apost.,* no. 5

[51] On the legislation of Justinian and of the Quinisext, see R. Gryson, 110–123.

In the Latin West the development ran in another direction, since here from the late fourth century, under the authoritative leadership of Rome, the demand was made and firmly established by law that clerics of the higher orders were obliged, if they were married, to absolute continence after ordination. It is true that such an obligation was first stated at the beginning of the century at the Spanish Synod of Elvira,[52] but it remained a local matter. The first Roman document that was concerned in detail with the question was the letter of Pope Damasus I (366–384) to the Gallic episcopate. It justified the regulation by arguing that a bishop or priest, who preached continence to others, had himself to give an example and must not esteem physical fatherhood more highly than the spiritual fatherhood which his office so often bestowed on him. The model of the Apostle Paul and that of the priesthood of the Old Testament obliged the servants of God always to preserve themselves "pure," since they had to be prepared at any moment to administer baptism, to celebrate the Eucharist, and to reconcile sinners. The violation of this "cultic purity" by the priest meant that he did not deserve this name and was not worthy to have the *mysterium* of God confided to him.[53] Damasus's successor, Siricius (384–399), took up the question in two other decretals, which disapproved strongly of the practice whereby in Spain remarried men were admitted to the higher orders without objection from bishops or metropolitans or that priests, after their ordination, continued married life and for this even appealed to the priesthood of the Old Testament: for the future, he declared, no bishop, priest, or deacon who violated this law would find clemency or pardon.[54] Around the turn of the fourth to the fifth century the strict continence of married clerics in the three higher ranks of the hierarchy was a clearly decided question in the pronouncements of the Popes. Innocent I added to the decrees of his predecessors the provision that a monk who aspired to admission to the clergy must not for that reason count on being freed from the obligation of celibacy that he had earlier assumed. The further inculcating of the rules of continence by Popes Zosimus (417–418) and Celestine I (422–433) made it clear, of course, that violations still had to be deplored again and again. Leo I (440–461) finally extended the law, without detailed justification, to subdeacons, whose growing approach to direct service at the altar brought them closer to the deacons.[55]

The papal legislation on clerical marriage at once found expression in the synodal decrees of various ecclesiastical territories. The Synod of Carthage of 390, referring to the enactments of an earlier council, imposed total continence on bishops, priests, and deacons, and, like the Popes, justified it by their service at the altar. Eleven years later a Synod of Carthage of 401 decided that offenses against the law should be punished by the removal of the guilty from their offices. Such sanctions seem rarely to have been necessary, since Augustine expressly praised the model attitude of the African clergy in this matter.[56] The Synod of Turin in 398 issued similar rules for Upper Italy, and for the Balkans Pope Leo I expressly confirmed the regulations already long in force there.[57] Likewise, the Synod of Toledo in 400 admitted into its decrees the directives on clerical marriage given by Pope Siricius for all the Spanish provinces.[58] In Gaul the effects of the papal decretals were felt only relatively late at the First Synod of Orange in 441, which for the future would only admit married men if they bound themselves to continence.[59]

---

[52] Council of Elvira, can. 33.

[53] Damasus, *Ep. ad Gallos episc.* 2, 5–6.

[54] Siricius, *Ep.* 1, 15, 20; *Ep.* 5, 3–5.

[55] Innocent, *Ep.* 2, 10–13; Zosimus, *Ep.* 9; Celestine I, *Ep.* 4, 6–8; Leo I, *Ep.* 14, 4.

Not only the papal decretals but the corresponding synodal legislation were motivated in their requirement of the sexual continence of the higher clergy most often by the cultic purity requisite for the administration of the Sacraments. In this unsatisfactory justification there operated, in addition to the Old Testament prescriptions of purity, especially the idea of the high dignity of the Christian priesthood, which was seen as fundamental in its relation to the Eucharist.[60] A more exact investigation of the total picture of the contemporary priesthood, as it is sketched in the patristic literature and appears in the texts of the ordination liturgy,[61] can, however, establish a series of further essential motives for priestly continence: the greater availability for service in the preaching of the gospel;[62] the exemplary life of the priest, who preaches continence and virginity to others the more efficaciously if he sets a convincing example;[63] the spiritual fatherhood of the priest, who imparts the higher spiritual life through administering baptism and reconciling penitents;[64] and finally, even if more indirectly, the imitation of the priestly model of Christ himself and the specific participation in his priesthood. The essence of this *lex continentiae* can be understood only against such a total background.

---

[56] Augustine, *De coniug. adult.* 2, 20, 22.

[57] Council of Turin, can. 8; Leo I, *Ep.* 14, 4.

[58] Council of Toledo I, can. 1; 3–7; 18; 19.

[59] Council of Orange (441), can. 21.

[60] See R. Kottje, "Das Aufkommen der täglichen Eucharistiefeier in der Westkirche und die Zölibatsforderung," *ZKG* 82 (1971), 218–228.

[61] There is no comprehensive investigation of the picture of the priest in the Early Church. A survey of the available individual studies is given by J. Onatibia, "Introducción al estudio de los Santos Padres sobre el ministerio sagrado," *Teología del sacerdotio* I (Burgos 1969), 95–122; also R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon s. Ambroise* (Louvain 1968), and E. Boularand, "Le sacerdoce mystère de crainte et de l'amour chez s. Jean Chrysostome," *BLE* 72 (1971), 3–36.

[62] Besides the decretals mentioned, see also Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 1, 9, 14f.; Epiphanius, *Panar.* 59, 4, 1–7; Chrysostom, *De sac.* 4, 2.

The episcopal recommendations of total continence in the higher clergy must have been suggested by the idea of uniting the clerical office and celibate monasticism, as was often the case in Egypt as early as the days of Athanasius.[65] Probably this union was also true of the already mentioned *vita communis* of the clergy of the Church of Vercelli, which Bishop Eusebius introduced; Augustine implemented it in the *monasterium clericorum* of the community of Hippo, for which he also found sufficient recruits. The Gallic Bishop Veranus, probably of Lyon, who corresponded with Pope Hilary (461–468), championed the idea that monks should be ordained as priests, since a number of select and proved men, even though it might be smaller, would through their example be of use for the Church's tasks.[66] It is clear here that at first individual bishops, going beyond the general ecclesiastical regulations, demanded the affirmation of total celibacy as a condition for admission to the clergy of their local churches.

Choice and Ordination of the Clergy[67]

The vocation to an ecclesiastical office occurred in principle through election made by the entire community, clergy and people, but the manner in which the people participated showed considerable differences.[68] Reflected most clearly in the sources is the manner of the election of a bishop. Generally the new bishop was called from the clergy of the local church because a candidate of this sort could best be evaluated by the electors; to be sure, exceptions were not at all rare.[69] Since as unanimous a choice as possible was desired,[70] the clergy of the community first agreed on a candidate, whom the people then approved and for whom the assent of the bishops of the ecclesiastical province, especially that of the metropolitan, was asked. Occasionally, as in the case of Ambrose of Milan, the community in a public demonstration demanded the ordination of a man acceptable to it. And the participation of the people is demonstrable in the election of a series of Popes. But this was gradually limited by several factors. For example, the circle of the laity was reduced to the socially leading class of members of the community, such as *curiales,* senators, and others, who came to a decision in private discussions, while the rest of the people only acclaimed. To the decline of the lay element corresponded the growing influence of the bishops of the ecclesiastical province, which was often fostered by the lack of agreement of the community on the candidate to be elected or by its decision for a candidate who was canonically unsuitable. If the bishops themselves were divided in their choice, the final decision belonged to the metropolitan.[71] Apart from Central Italy, for which the Pope possessed the metropolitan rights, the latter intervened only if disputed cases were referred to him; for the rest, he limited himself to inculcating the norms generally valid for the election. Finally, the secular authority also interfered in the filling of vacant episcopal sees, either through high officials or through the Emperor personally, without thereby creating a legal basis for such a procedure. This exercising of influence is especially found in the East, where all types—from the discreet wish through heavy pressure to unambiguous command—were made use of. Even if in the majority of cases an entirely worthy candidate was chosen bishop, a large number of precedents is demonstrable in the fourth and fifth centuries in which the episcopal election was burdened or debased by abuses of various sorts, such as designation of his successor by the previous bishop, the selfish favoring of a candidate, and simoniacal or similar intrigues.[72]

---

[63] Chrysostom, op. cit. 3, 17; 6, 2; 6, 8; Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* 3, 176.

[64] Besides Eusebius and Epiphanius (footnote 62 supra), see also Ephrem, *Poem. Nisib.* 19; Chrysostom, loc. cit. 3, 5; Damasus, *Ep. ad Gallos episc.* 2 (which likens the binding of the bishop to a church with the ring of married persons); Augustine, *Sermo de ordin. episc.* 7 (*PL,* Suppl 2, 642).

[65] Athanasius, *Ep. ad Dracontium* (*PG* 25, 532) gives the names of seven monk-bishops.

[66] *Sententia s. Verani de castitate sacerdotum, PL* 72, 701f.

[67] Cf. F. L. Ganshof, "Note sur l'élection des evêques dans l'empire romain au IV^{me} et pendant la première moitié du V^{me} siècle," *Rev Internat Droits de l'Antiquité* 4 (1950), 467–498; especially for Gaul: E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* II (Paris, 2nd. ed. 1966), 213–235.

[68] Popes Zosimus to Gelasius I held firmly to a participation by the people in some form; see Gaudemet, 332, footnote 1.

A peculiar mentality of the time was revealed by some reports on ordinations to which the candidate envisaged was compelled by stratagem, surprise, or direct force: this procedure was apparently not seen as questionable. No bishop, no pope, no synod declared such ordinations invalid, only rarely were they blamed, and only once does an imperial edict declare invalidity in an individual case.[73] At times the unanimous will of the people may have been regarded as God's voice; sometimes the refusal of the one elected was more an initial reaction of terror in the face of the responsibilities which such a function imposed. But one also gets the impression that it pertained to the style of the age to utter a formal rejection of the office in order not to fall under the suspicion of seeking the episcopal dignity from ambition or greed.[74]

---

[69] G. Bardy, "Sur la patrie des évêques dans les premiers siècles," *RHE* 35 (1939), 217–242.

[70] Gelasius I, *Fragm.* 1.

[71] According to the *Statut. eccles. ant.* I, it was required: "consensus clericorum et laicorum; conventus totius provinciae episcoporum; metropolitani auctoritas vel praesentia."

[72] Examples in Gaudemet, 108, with footnote.

Since the fundamentals of the rite and law of ordination were laid down in the pre-Constantinian period, especially by means of the *Traditio Apostolica* of Hippolytus, it is sufficient here to refer to the additions that completed them. Now in the Latin West *ordinatio* became in the colloquial speech of the Christians the designation for the rite of ordination, whereas *consecratio* was reserved for the ordaining prayer that accompanied the rite of the imposition of hands.[75] Furthermore, definite times for ordination were developed: for episcopal ordination, Sunday, which Leo I designated as an ancient custom; for the ordination of priests and deacons, the Ember Saturdays and the Saturday preceding Passion Sunday. All ordinations were incorporated into the celebration of the Eucharist.[76] While the *Apostolic Constitutions* knew the imposition of hands also for subdeacon and lector, in the West it remained reserved for the three higher ranks of the hierarchy;[77] in East and West the imposition of the book of gospels was also added to the rite of episcopal ordination.[78] Although Gelasius I emphasized the exclusive right of the bishop to ordain, by way of exception he granted to the priest the bestowing of the ordination of subdeacons or acolytes. Quite frequently the bishops of this period had to be reminded that they could exercise their right of ordination only within their sees and in regard to members of their own church.[79] In principle, clerics were ordained for service in a definite local church; a transfer to another church should be possible only by way of exception, but, especially in the case of bishops in the Eastern Empire, it was more frequent than the ecclesiastical legislation envisaged.[80]

---

[73] Nov. 11 of the Emperor Majorian (460).

[74] Cf. the Emperor Leo I, *Cod. Just.* 1, 3, 30: *indignus est sacerdotio, nisi fuerit ordinatus invitus.* Also in the Late Roman Empire the verbal rejection of power was customary even in the choice of the Emperor.

[75] P. M. Gy, "Réflexion sur le vocabulaire antique du sacerdoce chrétien," *Études sur le sacrement de l'ordre* (Paris 1957), 125–145, =*Das Apostolische Amt,* 92–109; J. Gaudemet, "L'ordre dans la législation conciliaire de l'Antiquité," ibid., 233–356 and 172–192 respectively.

[76] Leo I, *Ep.* 10; Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 11 and 15, 3; *Constit. Apost.* 8, 5.

[77] *Constit. Apost.* 8, 21f. *Statut. eccles. ant.,* can. 90–92; ibid., can. 93–97 enumerate the *instrumenta* which symbolize the duties of candidates for the lesser orders.

[78] *Constit. Apost.* 8, 4; *Statut. eccles. ant.,* c. 90. See P. Batiffol, "Las liturgie du sacre des évêques," *RH* 27 (1927), 733–763; B. Botte, "Le rituel d'ordination des Statuta ecclesiae antiqua," *RAM* 11 (1939), 223–241.

[79] Examples in Gaudemet, 116f.

Privileges of the Clerical State

Under the first Christian Emperor not only was the special status of the clergy, hitherto prevailing within the Church, also recognized by the State: in addition, it became a clearly privileged state by the granting of specific rights in comparison with the average citizen or the various professional groups. Constantine first freed it from the so-called *munera,* specified services performed for the State, such as the duty of assuming the office of *decurio,* properly provisioning the imperial retinue or troops passing through, or performing certain compulsory services (*munera sordida*), in order to make possible the unrestricted carrying out of its ecclesiastical duties.[81] An exemption of clerics from the land tax, granted by the Emperor Constantius in 346, was as early as 360 again limited to ecclesiastical property in the strict sense, and all clerical privileges in regard to taxation were annulled by the Emperor Valentinian III in 441 because of the precarious financial status of the Empire.[82] The exempting of the clergy from the *lustralis collatio,* a tax which merchants had to pay every five years, seems to have had an especially negative effect on the reputation of the Church.[83] The numerous complaints about clerics engaged in business on behalf of the Church show that this privilege opened the door to abuses and obliged the State and the Church to repeated restrictions and prohibitions.[84]

Of special importance for the credit of the Church in public life became the recognition of the judicial activity of the bishop in civil disputes, hitherto exercised only within the local episcopal congregation, that is, the incorporating of the so-called *audientia episcopalis* into the Roman civil law procedure.[85] Constantine was convinced that an episcopal court, because of the high moral authority of the judge, guaranteed justice more and specifically protected Christians from the danger of being subjected to a prejudiced pagan judge, although now the pagan citizen could entertain the same suspicion with regard to the Christian bishop. In practice, then, this privilege proved to be for the Church a rather dubious gift. Hilary of Poitiers indicated that the function of a state judge clearly contained dangers for Christians if it was sought from ambition and because, even with disinterested motives, it inevitably ensnared them in quarrels and injustice.[86] The majority of bishops were overburdened in this way because of a lack of juridical education; however, they could renounce the performance of this function as judge. Augustine, who was not lacking in the prerequisites for it, complained very strongly that this judicial function claimed many an hour which he would prefer to devote to prayer or the study of Scripture and that the bishop's verdict usually displeased one party, which then accused him of having bent the law. Yet he thought it was right that Christians should not have recourse in their disputes to the state court, but he regretted that no lay Christians were available for the office of judge.[87] Around the turn of the fifth century the *audientia episcopalis* was restricted to the merely mediating function of arbiter, which a Council of Carthage in 397 had already favored and which was far more suited to the meaning of the episcopal office. It seems that, for the Church's part, no one complained about this, and the same was true when the Emperor Valentinian III restricted this mediator's activity to purely ecclesiastical cases.[88]

---

[80] Ibid., 112f.

[81] First known edict of October 313: *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 2, and Eusebius, *HE* 10, 7, 2; later decrees on freeing from service as *curiales: Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 1; 16, 2, 7 (also for Donatists); 16, 2, 11; 16, 2, 18. Freeing from *munera sordida:* ibid. 16, 2, 10 (probably 346).

[82] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 10; Nov. 10.

[83] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 28 (343); expanded by *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 10 (346), and 13, 1, 1 (356).

[84] *Quaest. Novi et Veb. Test.* 127, 35; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 1, 23; *Dial.* 3, 15; Jerome, *Ep.* 52, 5; Augustine, *Enarr. in ps.* 70, s. 1, 18f.; Maximus of Turin, *hom.* 114. *Cod. Theod.* 16, 2, 15 (359); 13, 1, 11 (379); 16, 2, 36 (401); Nov. 35, 4 (452); Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 15.

Because of the summoning of the bishops to judicial functions there were attempts to deduce the raising of the episcopate of the Church of the Empire to noble status by the Emperors and hence its legal enrollment in the high ranks of the official hierarchy of the Late Roman Empire; it was said that it was already introduced by Constantine when, probably as early as 313, he had created for the Bishop of Rome the rank of the *gloriosissimi,* which was later made accessible to the other bishops; even priests and deacons, for the sake of honor, obtained the dignity of an *illustris.*[89] However neither can any vestiges of imperial decrees of such import be detected nor did the imperial chancery in its correspondence make use of the pertinent titles nor can an expression of it be found in the ecclesiastical epistolography of the age.[90] Instead, there developed a properly Christian vocabulary for the address and title of the occupants of ecclesiastical functions; the imperial chancery made use of this, and this made known a gradual differentiation according to the stages of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which could probably be suggested as such by the state model.[91] In the state sphere must also be sought the models for a series of episcopal insignia, such as the pallium, stole, footwear, and the like, which from the fifth century emerge in the liturgical dress of the clergy; but, again, there is no trace of an official bestowal of such insignia by the Emperor on the claim of an elevation of the episcopate to the nobility. The episcopal *cathedra,* for its part, was already in the pre-Constantinian age a sign of the episcopal dignity and both a symbol of the bishop's teaching authority and a symbol of the apocalyptic throne of God which could clearly be derived from the collision of Christianity with Hellenistic-Oriental ideas of the throne of the God-King.[92]

---

[85] *Cod. Theod.* 1, 27, 1 (318); *Const. Sirmond.* I (333). The second edict was based on the first, which it made more precise. The texts raise much discussed individual problems; cf. Gaudemet, 231f.

[86] Hilary of Poitiers, *In ps. tract.* 1, 10; see T. Klauser, *JbAC* 5 (1962), 172–174. In Hilary there is no word about bishops, but they may have been meant also.

[87] Augustine, *De opere monachorum* 29, 37; *Enarr. in ps.* 25, 13. See A. Pugliese, "Sant'Agostino giudice," *Studi P. Ubaldi* (Milan 1937), 263–299.

[88] *Cod. Just.* 1, 4, 7; *Cod. Theod.* 1, 27, 2 =*Cod. Just.* 1, 4, 8. Conc. Carth (397), c. 10. Valentinian III, Nov. 35 (452). It is often recalled that in the judicial activity of the bishop *misericordia, pietas,* and *pax* should also be dispensed: Ambrose, *Expos. ps. 118,* 8, 25; Augustine, *Sermo* 13, 5, 5; Theophilus of Alexandria=Jerome, *Ep.,* 96, 20; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 145; *Statut. eccles. ant.,* c. 54.

It is undisputed that the episcopal office in the fourth and fifth centuries, both through the development within the Church—growth of the spiritual authority in the numerous and increasingly strong local churches, at synods and councils, enhanced influence through economic and financial independence—as well as through the respectful and considerate treatment of its holders by the Emperors, the court, and the officials of the imperial administration and of the urban authorities gained an enormous social prestige. Unfortunately, it also seemed desirable to the uncalled to a great degree and was often sought with means and methods which had to be censured by the Church again and again in the severest tone.[93] But a considerable gain in prestige accrued to the episcopal office from those manifold social welfare activities which so often made the bishops of the transition period from late antiquity to the Early Middle Ages the advocates of the poor and the miserable, the helpers of refugees, the spokesmen of prisoners, and even the defenders of the episcopal city in the threat of the migrations. The designations *pater populi, pater civitatis, pater urbis et pater patriae,* which did not signify the bishop's legal position, were the spontaneous echo which this aspect of the episcopal activity aroused in the hearts of those who experienced it in themselves.[94]

---

[89] Thus especially T. Klauser, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte* (Krefeld, 2nd ed. 1953), and *JbAC* 5 (1962), 172–174, but here restricted to such bishops as had assumed the judicial office in civil processes. The thesis of Klauser is partly exceeded by C. Andresen, *Die Kirchen der alten Christenheit* (Stuttgart 1971), 405f.

[90] For a criticism of Klauser's idea see H. U. Instinsky, *Bischofsstuhl und Kaiserthron* (Munich 1955), 83–102; S. Mazzarino, *Jura* 7 (1956), 351f.; finally, independent of one another, R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon s. Ambroise* (Louvain 1968), 106–110; E. Chrysos, *Historia* 18 (1969), 119–128, and especially E. Jerg (with literature), who exhaustively investigates the styling of imperial laws, charters, and letters of the day and reaches a clearly negative result. Canon 7 of Chalcedon even expressly forbade the assumption of any state dignity (*axia*) by the clergy.

[91] Examples again in E. Jerg: see also P. Canivet, "Catégories sociales et titulature laique et ecclésiastique dans l'Histoire Philotheé de Théodoret de Cyr," *Byz(B)* 39 (1969), 209–250, especially 230–239.

[92] E. Stommel., "Die bischöfliche Kathedra im Christlichen Altertum," *MThZ* 3 (1952), 17–32, and the further discussion in *JbAC* 1 (1958), 52–78; H. U. Instinsky, *RQ* 66 (1971), 66–77.

The Collegiality of the Bishops

The *presbyterium,* which, according to the letters of Ignatius, assisted the local bishop in his duties, retained its function of service and of acting as deputy also in the fourth and fifth centuries. To be sure, at times the bishop was admonished to make use of the advice of his priests in specific cases, but the priests did not constitute a *collegium* which could act as such independently of the bishop by virtue of its own full power.[95] The efforts described earlier to equate the office of priest and bishop in rank toward the end of the fourth century remained isolated and without direct effects. The *ordo episcoporum,* for its part, maintained its independence, which since Irenaeus was based on the conviction that the bishops as a whole were the successors of the Apostles and continued their function within the Church. The consciousness of the apostolic succession of the bishops remained also and was fully maintained under the primacy of the Roman Bishop that was at the same time achieving complete recognition and to a degree manifested itself in new ways. This could be observed especially in the development of the terminology, which the age employed for the episcopal office and its function. If the term *sedes apostolica* was used by the Roman bishops ever more frequently to denote their own see, this was true at the same time for other episcopal sees, even those to which no special rank pertained either from tradition or from their momentary organizational importance: *every* episcopal see was, therefore, *sedes apostolica.*[96] The same idea is found in the application of the epithet *apostolicus* and of the noun *apostolatus* to the rank and activity of every bishop.[97] The designation of a simple bishop as *summus pontifex* is even seen for the first time in a papal letter and appears especially in the address of letters to Gallic bishops.[98]

---

[93] The correspondence of Gelasius I especially provides an abundance of disgraceful incidents. For the criticism from monasticism two examples: Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2, 32, 4; Isidiore of Pelusium, *Ep.* V, 89.

[94] Gaudemet, 350–356; for Italy, S. Mochi Onory, "Vescovi e città (sec. IV–VI)," *RSDI* 4 (1931), 245–330.

[95] Priests, compared to the bishop, occupy "the second throne"; Constantine in Eusebius, *HE* 10, 5, 23; *Statut. eccles. ant.,* can. 2.

An occasion on which the collegiality of the bishops especially appears was an episcopal ordination. Since in canon 4 the Council of Nicaea prescribed the presence of all bishops of the ecclesiastical province, but at least three of them, in this liturgical act, it was regarded as the norm, which was to be observed even under very difficult circumstances and which was again and again called to mind. In Africa a certain preference for the number of twelve consecrators was established—it suggested the idea of a representation of the college of Apostles. Even if no more detailed theological justification for the plurality of consecrators in the episcopal ordination was given, still the idea of episcopal collegiality was clearly expressed by it.[99]

The concept of the apostolic succession also formed the basis for the idea of the collegiality of the bishops, which, especially in the fifth century, was decisively championed by the papacy itself in connection with the Christological controversies.[100] Even before the Council of Ephesus, Pope Celestine referred Nestorius to the fact that, by his doctrine, he was excluding himself from the communion of the episcopal college, and his letter to the Council stressed that the proclamation of the gospel was entrusted to the episcopate in its totality, as it had once been confided to the college of Apostles, from which it had legitimately inherited this commission. Pope and bishops were obliged in their collegial responsibility to guard the true faith for the Universal Church and to stand up against error. For the bishops who continued to support Nestorius there was no place any longer in the episcopal college. Sixtus III invited these bishops "again to enter the *synedrion* of the bishops" in order to be received back into the ecclesiastical communion. Pope Leo I further deepened this understanding of episcopal collegiality when he emphasized that each bishop, in addition to his own see, bears a responsibility for the Universal Church, that in the ultimate analysis the Holy Spirit produces the inner unity of this college, and that of course no bishop can exercise his pastoral office in the Church if he is not in communion with Peter's successor.[101] This idea of collegiality was defended by the other Popes of the century down to Gelasius I, who emphasized that the legitimacy of the episcopal college is derived from the college of Apostles and in this way precisely is distinguished from every *collegium haereticorum.* Collegiality thus understood was further expressed in the formula of the *consortium* and of the *communio episcoporum* and finally determined also the sense of the designations *fratres, coepiscopi, collegae,* and *consortes,* which the Popes liked to apply to the bishops. The further history of the idea of episcopal collegiality makes clear that the understanding of it gained as early as patristic times was again obscured in the future by other developments or almost fell into oblivion.[102]

---

[96] On what follows: H. Marot, "La collégialité et le vocabulaire épiscopal du V^e au VII^e siècle," *La collegialite épiscopale* (Paris 1965), 61–98; J. Lécuyer, "La communion épiscopale dans les conciles africains entre 400–425," *Mel A.M. Charue* (Gembloux 1969), 101–122.

[97] Customary are: *apostolicus honor, apostolica reverentia, apostolica dignatio, apostolica merita; vir, domnus, praesue apostolicus.*

[98] Zosimus, *Ep.* 9, 2f. Only from the beginning of the twelfth century was *summus pontifex* reserved to the Pope.

[99] See L. Mortari, *Consacrazione episcopale e collegialità* (Florence 1969), and P. Zmire, "Recherches sur la collegialité épiscopale dans l'Église d'Afrique," *RechAug* 7 (1971), 3–72.

[100] See J. Lécuyer, *La collégialité* . . . 41–57; G. Medico, *RSPhTh* 49 (1965), 369–402; R. Garcia, "El primado romano y las colegialidad en la controversia nestoriana," *Studium* 11 (1971), 21–63.

---

[101] A. Tuilier, "Le primat de Rome et la collégialité de l'épiscopat d'après la correspondance de s. Léon avec l'Orient," *Nuovo Didaskaleion* 15 (1965), 53–67.

[102] Y. M. J. Congar, "Notes sur le destin de l'idée de collégialité en Occident au moyen âge," *La collégialité* . . . , 90–129; id. "La collégialité et la primauté de Rome dans l'histoire," *Angelicum* 47 (1970), 403–427.

CHAPTER 17

The Liturgy

The new situation consequent on the gaining of the Church's freedom and the turning of the imperial office to the Christian religion also influenced to a great degree the very heart of the interior life of the Church—the liturgy. These influences were for the most part directly related to the special missionary situation in which the Church then found itself. Now it had to prepare for its initiation a constantly growing flock which, for whatever motives, was requesting admission into the Christian community; hence the existing institution for this preparation, the catechumenate, was subjected to a severe test. Since, with the increasing number of Christians, more mediocrity also penetrated the congregations and with it the number of failures grew, the earlier penitential discipline was again examined in regard to its meaning and function. Furthermore, as always in periods of increased missionary activity, the Church was confronted with the problem of adaptation and hence with the question to what extent it could christianize certain forms of pagan celebrations and piety and incorporate them into its liturgical sphere. And so a series of new elements appeared in its sacramental liturgy, in church building, and in the liturgical year. The new relationship of the Church to the State and to public life made possible and likewise produced new forms, especially in the area of liturgical representation and the expansion of the liturgical calendar of celebrations.

Differentiation of Liturgies in East and West

From the fourth century there can be observed an increasing differentiation of liturgies, hitherto uniform in their basic features, but in principle free in the construction of word and rite: several factors contributed to this. Thus occasionally there was seen a tendency to unite the wording of the liturgical prayers more strictly to fixed norms and subject it to a certain control in order to shield it from possible heretical falsification.[1] Then, the development of much larger ecclesiastical structures supplied an impetus for the differentiation of the liturgies. The liturgy in use in the churches of the chief centers of these areas, especially of the developing patriarchal sees, acquired the character of a norm and gradually established itself in the sphere of influence of these ecclesiastical centers. In addition, the difference of languages and the cultural and national self-consciousness of individual regions produced by them in the areas of the expansion of Christianity repeatedly proved to be an especially effective principle of the differentiation, which included also the liturgical sphere. Finally, after the Councils of Ephesus in 431 and Chalcedon in 451, Nestorians and Monophysites went their own ecclesiastical ways and thereby promoted a special development of their respective liturgies. The process of differentiation naturally extended over a rather long period of time, at the end of which stands the codification of the liturgies, which took place for most of them only in the sixth and seventh centuries, but thereafter still admitted supplements and modifications.[2]

---

[1] See the decrees of two African synods (Hippo in 393 and Carthage in 397), which refer to erroneous prayer formulas, prescribe that prayer address the Father in the liturgy, and demand examination of episcopal prayers adopted from elsewhere: Mansi, III, 884, 895, 922.

Of the great eastern patriarchates—Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople—the first named displayed, with its proximate and remote hinterland, a richly creative liturgical activity. A more ancient core of it belongs to the so-called Apostles' Liturgy of the East Syrians, which first appeared in its complete form in the fifth century in the Syriac language and which remained the liturgy of the Nestorians, of the Uniate Chaldaeans, and of the Malabar Christians.[3] The West Syrian Liturgy was distinguished for a special wealth in anaphoras (formulas of the Eucharistic Prayer or Canon). The Liturgy of James, originating in Jerusalem, must be regarded as their basis, as is testified both by the mystagogic catechisms of Cyril of Jerusalem and by Jerome. Known in the Syriac translation to the author of the *Testamentum Domini* of the fifth century, it became the normal liturgy of the Christians in the sphere of Edessa (Jacobites).[4] Antioch itself or at least its immediate vicinity was the home of the so-called Clementine Liturgy and of the Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles, which is today generally regarded as the prototype of the Liturgy of Chrysostom, which was used in the Syrian capital probably even before the Council of Ephesus.[5] In the so-called Liturgy of Mark, Alexandria created its oldest formula, which is attested by papyrus texts of the fourth and fifth centuries and influenced the prayers of the *Euchologion* attributed to Bishop Serapion of Thmuis (d. after 362);[6] as the Liturgy of Cyril, it is still used by the Copts. Alongside the Liturgy of Mark there later appeared those of Basil and Gregory, which were taken over from Asia Minor or Syria and translated into Coptic. The Coptic liturgical formulas were finally passed on to the Ethiopians, who translated them into their national tongue and enriched them with several anaphoras. The two formulas of the Byzantine Liturgy—those of Basil and Chrysostom—were not original creations of the imperial capital. The first, long preferred to the second, must actually be linked with its namesake, who had elaborated a liturgy already in use at Caesarea. The second, named for Chrysostom only from the tenth century, could very probably have come to Constantinople before 431 in the form of the previously mentioned Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles and been reorganized by Bishop Nestorius.[7] Of all the eastern liturgies, the Byzantine experienced the farthest expansion, especially among the Slavonic peoples, in whose evangelization it was used in the Old Slavonic translation. Among the characteristic features of the oriental liturgies, as these became known in the fourth and fifth centuries, must first be mentioned their understanding of the liturgy as a participation in the angels' heavenly service of God, which was further elaborated to a dramatically fashioned mystery celebration. In this the Christological discussion of the age found its expression in the stressing of the salvific deeds of the Redeemer and of the omnipotence of the divine *Logos:* the liturgy became the festive representation of the priestly action of Christ, and the liturgical acts became "pictures and symbols communicating the reality of the historical work of salvation, especially of the resurrection" (Schulz)—an understanding of the liturgy which was especially promoted by John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia.[8]

---

[2] An exhaustive characterization of the liturgies according to their form and content is the task of the history of the liturgy. First information in S. Salaville and A. Raes (see the Literature for this chapter). Comprehensive bibliography in A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée,* 215–247, to be complemented by the surveys of G. Kretschmar, *RGG,* 3rd ed., IV, 404–407; A. Raes, *LThK,* 2nd ed., VI, 1087–1091; B. Fischer, ibid., 1901–1995, and the current reports on the literature of the *ALW.*

[3] The editing of all Syriac anaphoras was produced by the Papal Oriental Institute at Rome from 1939.

[4] On the East Syrian Liturgy see now B. Botte, *Les anaphores syriennes orientales,* and D. Webb, "La liturgie néstorienne des apôtres Addai et Mari," *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident* II, *Lex Orandi* 47 (Paris 1970), 7–24, 25–49. Clementine Liturgy: *Const. Apost.* VIII, 5, 11–15, 11.

[5] H. Engberding, "Die syrische Anaphora der zwölf Apostel und ihre Paralleltexte," *OrChr* 12 (1937), 213–247.

[6] Text in Quasten, *Monumenta,* 44–48, 49–67.

Since Western Christianity at that time did not know any plurality of languages suited to the liturgy and, apart from Rome, no leading ecclesiastical see of the rank of Antioch or Alexandria could impose its authority, there were lacking here two of the factors, important in the East, for the differentiation of liturgies. Hence all western liturgies were linked by the one Latin language and it is natural to assume that before the completion of the two great liturgical types of the West—the Gallican and the Romano-African—there existed a general basic western form, from which Rome relatively early dissociated itself, whereas the Gallican Rite—to its subspecies belonged the Old Spanish, the Ambrosian, the Old Gallic, and the Celtic liturgies—later opened itself to oriental influences.[9] To the general traits of the Gallic type belongs a relatively uniform order of the Mass, which knew prayers recurring virtually unchanged, and gave, not a fixed Canon, but a proper formula for every Sunday and every feast. In many prayers there appeared a deviation from old tradition, as, for example, in the preface, which often abandoned the character of the earliest prayer of thanks in favor of a prayer of petition. Also in the prayer part, with its inclination to verbosely solemn statement, was seen the influence from the East, which is found also in the rite of the presentation of the offerings, placed before the beginning of Mass. And finally the delight in splendid execution of the rites also recalls similar traits of oriental liturgies. The effect of the confrontation with Arianism can be observed as a striking peculiarity especially in the Spanish and the Gallican liturgies: in this the idea of Christ's mediatorship was pushed into the background and the prayer addressed to Christ was more strongly emphasized. To this corresponded again a preferred worship of the Trinity, just as the Byzantine Liturgy knew it.[10] Only in the Milanese Liturgy was Roman influence, in addition to these general Gallic features, found relatively early, since as early as the time of Ambrose it used the Canon of the Roman Mass. The originally Greek liturgy of Rome completed as early as the third century its translation, begun in the third century, into Latin c. 370, with the introduction of the Latin Canon.[11] Its most important characteristic was its adhering to the idea of Christ's mediatorship, which was manifested in the doxologies of the Mass prayers, which ended only "per Christum," and the prayer addressed to Christ was left to the sphere of popular piety. Furthermore, it gave up dramatic and poetic elements, such as the hymn, in the structure of the liturgy and thereby obtained a feature of objective and sober solemnity, which rather impeded a greater activity of the people. Only the later liturgical exchange with the sphere of the Gallican Liturgy produced a greater liveliness.

---

[7] On the history of the origin of the two Byzantine formulas see the summary of the present state of research in H. J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie* (Freiburg 1964), 18–28.

[8] On the elaboration of the form of the creed of the Byzantine Liturgy see the above-mentioned work of H. J. Schulz.

[9] See J. A. Jungmann, *Liturgie der christlichen Frühzeit,* 216–226.

New Features in the Sacramental Liturgy

The new missionary situation of the fourth century first operated in the broader area of the baptismal liturgy. Here especially the early institution of the catechumenate fell into an almost startling crisis, which, however, stood in a certain connection with the public recognition of Christianity. Whereas previously the acceptance of a pagan into the catechumenate presupposed in every respect a seriously intended and seriously undertaken commitment to the new faith, to which corresponded an immediately following intensive preparation, usually of three years, for the reception of baptism, now indeed the number steadily grew of those who asked admission to the catechumenate. But the number of pagans who made of it only a preliminary profession of Christianity grew also and at first deferred the reception of baptism, often until they fell into a sickness that endangered life or even, as Chrysostom said, "to the final breath," so that in a flagrantly abused development baptism became for them a sort of Sacrament of the Dead.[12] The question as to the causes of this development permits several answers.[13] Not only Emperors such as Constantine and Theodosius were among those who postponed their baptism, but also Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others must be included: in their case, on the one hand their involvement with the perils of their profane calling, on the other hand the awareness of a lack of personal maturity made the postponement of baptism seem advisable. But in the case of the greatest number what was probably decisive was the fact that with admittance to the ranks of the catechumens a person was identified publicly as a Christian (with the accruing advantages) and that now, out of convenience or the fear of personal failure, one could evade the moral testing firmly demanded by Christian preaching after the reception of baptism.[14] The consequence was a suspicious increase in the number of merely nominal Christians within the communities.[15] The Church drew conclusions from such a situation and reconstructed the previous order of catechumens, separating the really serious seekers of baptism from the one large class of catechumens. But for one who joined the catechumenate the former manner of admission was complemented by an introductory catechesis,[16] which was supposed to give him a first knowledge of the new way to salvation and place him in the position to receive with some profit the teaching supplied in the normal preaching to which he had access. To this catechesis was joined the rite of admission, which consisted of an imposition of hands, joined with a signing of the cross (*consignatio*) and, at least in North Africa and Rome, the presentation of salt.[17] If the catechumen was not then induced to take part in the direct preparation for the reception of baptism, he belonged thereafter to the anonymous crowd of those to whom applied the bishops' annual admonition to have themselves enrolled (*apographesthai, nomen dare*) at the beginning of Lent in the list of those immediately seeking baptism.[18] For this group of *photizomenoi, competentes,* or *electi* (Rome) the Church supplied an instruction and a religious training intended for them; the baptismal catecheses preserved from East and West give information on the content and goal of this training. The instruction included, as earlier, an introduction to Scripture and the communicating of the Creed (*traditio symboli*) and of the Lord's Prayer, both of which were learned by heart so that they could be "given back" in the solemn baptismal profession.[19] The instruction was accompanied by repeated prayer, impositions of hands, and signing with the cross, which were intended to strengthen the candidate on his way to baptism and shield him from demonic influences.[20] The length of this preparation, despite the three years so often mentioned in the sources, was in practice reduced to one Lent, and hence, in spite of all the efforts of the bishops, a really effective "practice in Christianity" was often not realized. With the completion of the christianization of the Mediterranean peoples and the now almost exclusively practiced baptism of infants, this form of the catechumenate came to an end. The mission among the Germans, with its preference for tribal baptism, had to develop new ways and methods for the training in the faith and life of a Christian.

---

[10] J. A. Jungmann, *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1962), and id., "Die Abwehr des germanischen Arianismus und der Umbruch der religiösen Kultur im Mittelalter," *Liturgisches Erbe und pastorale Gegenwart* (Innsbruck 1960), 3–86.

[11] T. Klauser, "Der Übergang der römischen Kirche von der griechischen zur lateinischen Liturgiesprache," *MiscMercati, SteT* 121 (Rome 1946), 467–482.

---

[12] See the vivid description of a death-bed baptism in John Chrysostom, *Cat. ad illum.* I, 1. Blaming of postponement of baptism also *In Joh. hom.* 18, 1; *In Act. hom.* 23, 4; *In ep. II ad Cor. hom.* 2, 6; Basil, *Hom. in s. bapt.* 7; Gregory of Nyssa, *De iis qui bapt. differunt;* Ambrose, *Expos. in Luc.* 7, 220f., 225; *De Hel. et jej.* 22, 83–85; *De Noe,* 25; *Epp.* 79 and 80.

[13] One can hardly mention here the lack of zeal of the pastoral clergy, but must rather think especially of the great demand for it in the large communities. The episode related by Chrysostom, *In Act. hom.* 46, 3, of a mass baptism of uninstructed catechumens is clearly related to a situation of necessity (earthquake or other catastrophe: *orgé Theou*), in which the catechumens rushed to baptism and received it.

[14] Chrysostom, *Cat. ad illum.* 1, 7, treats the problem in detail and refers to the parallel of the postponement of penance. Similarly, Ambrose, *Expos. ps. 118* 16, 43; *De paen.* 2, 98.

[15] Augustine, *De cat. rud.* 5, 9, warns against accepting such candidates: *non vult fieri [christianus] potius quam fingere;* cf. also *Conf.* 1, 11, 18, and Abrose, *Ep.* 17, 8 (*nomine Christiani*).

[16] *De cat. rud.* offers two models of such catecheses.

The growing number of Christian families involved at this period an increasing extension and importance for infant baptism, but not without discussion within the Church regarding the most appropriate time and a dispute with Pelagianism over its legitimacy. In the East Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom especially championed it on the ground that it bestowed on children as yet free of personal sins the status of children of God and "seal and consecration."[21] In the West Augustine defended infant baptism as an old tradition and justified it theologically against Donatists and Pelagians—in regard to the last-named especially through his doctrine of original sin.[22] A proper baptismal ritual for infants was not developed; the rite of admission of the decaying catechumenate was retained for them—impositions of hands, signing with the cross, presentation of the blessed salt—and the sponsors or parents who took care of them during the baptism made the answers to the baptismal questions and the *redditio symboli.*[23]

---

[17] On the meaning of the salt ceremony, see A. Stenzel, 171–175.

[18] *Itin. Eger.* 45, 1; Chrysostom, *Cat. bapt.* 1, 2; 2, 1; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Cat.* 12; Ambrose, *Expos. ev. Luc.* 4, 76; *Ep.* 80, 1–6; Augustine, *Conf.* 8, 2, 4; 9, 6, 14; *Sermo* 132, 1: *ecce Pascha est, da nomen ad baptismum.*

[19] *Itin. Eger.* 46, 3; John Chrysostom, *Hom. ad Antioch.* 3, 1; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Cat.,* 11, 1; 12, 25; Ambrose, *Ep.* 20, 4; Augustine, *Sermo* 213–214 (*traditio symboli*); *Serm.* 56–59 (Lord's Prayer); *Sermo* 215 (on giving back the Creed).

[20] Still important is F. J. Dölger, *Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritual* (Paderborn 1909); the late research is summarized by K. Thraede, *RAC* VII, 85–100 (with the literature, 114–117).

In the fourth and fifth centuries the importance of the so-called Discipline of the Secret increased;[24] but, of course, its meaning was not entirely grasped when persons understood it as a mere keeping secret the sacred texts and rites. Moreover, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer were familiar from Christian literature and the Bible, and the publication of mystagogic catecheses also spread the knowledge of the baptismal and Eucharistic liturgies. Rather, one should not speak of the mysteries in the presence of those not called or admit them to their celebration. The "not called" were all those who lacked the required means for the right understanding and experiencing of the mysteries. But this possibility was acquired only by "initiation," by the performance of the worship. Anyone who had not yet obtained the status of child of God could not, according to Theodore of Mopsuestia, pray the Lord's Prayer meaningfully and effectively,[25] and so the ultimate meaning of baptism and the Eucharist was only directly made known to the neophyte after his initiation. It must not be denied that influences from the realm of the non-Christian understanding of mysteries were effective, but they could be allowed by the Church all the more unhesitatingly, the more these mysteries themselves lost in real significance.

The Eucharistic celebration also admitted new elements in the fourth and fifth centuries and through continued development in individual points drew ever closer to the form of the "Mass."[26] First, the Liturgy of

---

[21] Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 40, 7, 23; Chrysostom in Augustine, *C. Julian.* 1, 21.

[22] J. C. Didier, "S. Augustin et le baptême des enfants," *RevÉAug* 2 (1956), 109–129.

[23] *De cat. rud.* 26, 50; *Ep.* 98, 5; see J. C. Didier, *MSR* 22 (1965), 79–90.

[24] Examples in O. Perler, *RAC* I, 667–676; also A. Stenzel, 147–153; finally on Chrysostom, T. Finn, 37–39.

[25] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *In Rom.* 8, 15.

[26] J. A. Jungmann, "Von der 'Eucharistie' zur 'Messe,'" *ZKTh* 89 (1967), 29–40. Basic for all particular questions on the development of the Mass liturgy is J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum solemnia;* H. Zwinggi, "Der Wortgottdienst bei Augustinus," *LJ* 20 (1970), 90–113; 129–140.

the Word of God, usually with three readings from the Old Testament, the Apostle, and the gospel and the sung texts interpolated between them, obtained its definitive structure. The readings, which began immediately after the entry of the clergy and the greeting of the congregation, were proclaimed by the lector or, in the case of the gospel, by the deacon, while the psalm between them was sung by a cantor from the ambo. In the psalm, after each segment, the response sung by the people was inserted; in the first chant it was taken from the psalm itself, but in the second it was the "alleluia verse,"[27] which led into the gospel. In the territory of Antioch there was developed in this place the antiphonal chant, in which the people, divided into two choirs, alternately sang the verses of the psalm.[28] The homily of the bishop or priest was followed by the intercessions—prayers introduced by *oremus* for the catechumens, the penitents, the faithful, and the whole world, to which the community in the East—Jerusalem and Antioch—sometimes replied with the cry *Kyrie eleison.*[29] The custom was adopted by the West and here in the form of the *Kyrie*-litany took the place of the customary intercessions; it was finally transferred to the beginning of the Mass, where it accompanied the entry of the clergy and ended with a prayer.[30] The still remaining *oremus* of the intercessions thus became the introduction to the prayer over the gifts of bread and wine, which represented the transition to the Liturgy of Sacrifice.

Both the Anaphora of the East and the Canon of the Latin Mass at first display a uniform and obvious structure. The great Eucharistic Prayer of thanksgiving was proclaimed aloud to the silent congregation—this was still the meaning of the term *praefatio* when it was used for the entire Canon[31]—and it was interrupted only by the *Trisagion* (*Sanctus*), adopted from the East, c. 400. In contrast to the East, the West at this time produced a large quantity of prefaces in the narrower sense, which called attention to one or another topical motive for the Eucharistic Prayer of thanksgiving.[32] The central idea of the entire prayer of thanks was the presentation of the sacrifice, which was referred to in a preparatory way in the *Te igitur* and *Quam oblationem* of the Roman Canon and was then completed with the words of institution, which at the same time effected the transubstantiation of the gifts of bread and wine. The following prayers, *Supra quae* and *Supplices,* renewed the offering and asked for the definitive acceptance of the sacrifice by the Father; the solemn final doxology with the people's *Amen* of affirmation concluded the Canon. In the Antiochene family of liturgies after the words of institution, according to the baptismal catecheses of Cyril, God was called upon in a special prayer, the so-called transubstantiation *epiclesis,* to send the Holy Spirit on the sacrificial gifts in order to make them the flesh and blood of the Lord, and thus they brought the recipient to salvation.[33] The clear make-up of the Canon underwent a certain confusion through the placing of the intercessions before and after the *anamnesis,* for which again the East provided the model. In this the offering of the sacrifice was joined to prayers for the local and the Universal Church and their clergy and special martyrs and saints, with whom people understood themselves as constituting one great community; also inserted were names of those who wished to have a concern of their own included in the sacrifice; finally, especially in Masses for the dead, were mentioned the names of the deceased for whom a remembrance was desired in this sacrifice.

---

[27] H. Engberding, "Alleluja," *RAC* I, 216–233, and A. G. Martimort, *Kyriakon* II, *Festschrift J. Quasten* (Münster 1970), 811–834.

[28] Theodoret, *HE* 2, 24, 9–10; Philost., *HE* 3, 13.

[29] *Itin. Eger.*, 24; *Const. Apost.* 8, 6.

[30] A full form is preserved in the so-called *Deprecatio Gelasii;* see B. Capelle, *RBén* 46 (1934), 126–144, and C. Callewaert, *RHE* 38 (1942), 20–45.

[31] Chr. Mohrmann, "Sur l'histoire de praefari-praefatio," *VigChr* 7 (1953), 1–15 =*Études sur le latin des chrétiens* III (Rome 1965), 291–305.

[32] A. Stuiber, "Libelli sacramentorum romani," *Theophaneia* 6 (Bonn 1950).

While the Communion Rite of the Eucharistic celebration in the eastern liturgies underwent considerable expansion through the acceptance of several new individual rites and of the accompanying prayers,[34] it remained emphatically simple in the Latin Mass. The breaking of the bread, the kiss of peace, and the Lord's Prayer were followed immediately by the communion of clergy and faithful under both species, the deacon ministering the cup. The reception of the Eucharist by all participants in the celebration was the normal thing in the West longer than in the East. After Communion the deacon, with the admonition "Bow your head," announced the prayer of dismissal, the *oratio super populum,* which was then a part of every Mass. But, probably as early as the fifth century, the *Postcommunio* was created, the last of the three prayers, which, as the conclusion of the *Kyrie*-litany, of the preparation of the gifts, and of the Communion Rite, must, because of the precision of their statements and their stylistic purity, rightfully rank as preeminent creations of the Roman Liturgy. Later, together with the prefaces, they were collected in the so-called Sacramentaries, which accordingly represent the texts of the prayers to be uttered at Mass by the celebrant.[35]

---

[33] On the *epiclesis:* B. Botte, *SE* 6 (1954), 48–72, and J. P. de Jong, *ALW* 4 (1955), 245–278; 5 (1957), 33–79.

[34] J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae* III, 485–519.

[35] On the early sacramentaries and the time of their origin see the introductions to the history of the Latin Liturgy.

At first glance it seems surprising that the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries clung with a fundamental stubbornness to the externally strict penitential discipline hitherto in use, even though the growing throng of average persons of this period would lead one to expect instead a moderation here, just as in the catechumenate. But the testimony of the sources is clear: in addition to a certain further development in secondary details, the previous order was fixed ever more by canonical rules through episcopal letters, synodal decrees, and decretals, and thereby a flexible administration was rendered difficult; above all, the principle of the nonrepetition of penance remained inviolable.[36] Even though a surer criterion was lacking as to which offenses in individual cases were subject to public ecclesiastical penance and which were not, and though Augustine also stressed that the gravity of the offense was to be determined by the intention of the sinner,[37] in practice there was agreement on a rather uniform catalogue of such sins: idolatry, heresy and schism, murder, abortion, adultery, serious theft, implacable hatred, slander, drunkenness, attendance at immoral theatrical performances—these seemed more or less completely crimes deserving of penance in the appropriate enumerations of these decades.[38]

And so, as earlier, the sinner who on his own initiative opened himself up to his bishop or whose offense was notorious, was initiated into the class of penitents at a public Mass by the formal sentence of the bishop.[39] Since he was now no longer a full member of the ecclesiastical community, he, like a catechumen, could attend only the Liturgy of the Word or at least he could no longer offer his gifts for the sacrifice and receive Communion. In the East, which in general tended toward a milder practice, the effort was made to strengthen the penitent, through the elaboration of several degrees of penance in his desire for atonement and by means of a penance priest who took charge of him, at least at Constantinople, to ease his gradual return to full membership in the Church.[40] During the time of penance imposed on him, the length of which depended on the gravity of the offense and on the penitential zeal and hence also on the judgment of the bishop, and differed from place to place, the penitents often received the special blessing of the bishop during the liturgy.[41] The date for the beginning of the period of penance was at first the Monday after Pentecost, then, probably from the fifth century, the Monday after the First Sunday of Lent. It ended with the solemn act of reinstatement, the *reconciliatio,* which, except in cases of necessity, was reserved to the bishop. It ordinarily took place on Holy Thursday,[42] and was inserted between the gospel and the Offertory procession. After an address the bishop prayed that God would give the penitent back to the Church and then laid his hand on him as he knelt before him and raised him up.[43]

---

[36] Ambrose, *De paen.* 2, 10: *sicut unum baptisma eta it una paenitentia.*

[37] *De div. quaest.* 83, 26; cf. also *Enchir.* 21.

[38] Such catalogues in Augustine, *Sermo* 351, and Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 179. Only Pacian, *Paraen.* 4, wanted to adhere to the old threefold idolatry, murder, and adultery, but he encountered opposition.

[39] *Ordo paenitentium, Conc. Araus.* (441), can. 3; *Conc. Arel.* II, can. 28.

[40] See J. Grotz, *Die Entwicklung des Bussstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche* (Freiburg 1955).

Membership in the class of penitents involved for the one concerned, especially in the West, a heavy psychological burden and many restrictions in his private and professional life. The public nature of penance produced a demand that the average Christian of the day was often not equal to, even if the discretion of the bishop, the encouragement of the clergy, and the prayers of intercession of the community could provide help to him. The penitential duties, such as fasting, prohibition of marriage during the time of penance, the forbidding of marital relations among those already married, often lasted for five, ten, or twenty years, and in some cases, especially in Spain, which was inclined to rigorism, for the remainder of life.[44] Any failure during the period of penance led to the permanent exclusion from the ecclesiastical community, which on occasion some were not even willing to grant again to the dying. The heaviest burden of all perhaps was the fact that his previous status clung to the reconciled penitent for the rest of his life. Hence, for example, not only was admittance into the clergy forever denied him, but as a husband he had also to refuse marital intercourse, he could not hold any public office or practice specified professions, including military service; in short, he was forever compelled to a lifestyle which otherwise only a monk would have freely adopted. Again, a nonobservance of these duties ranked as a relapse, which involved perpetual excommunication.[45]

The cause of this rigorism, especially in the Western Church, must be seen most pressingly in the adherence to an understanding of the Church, which aspired to see the *communio sanctorum* in the strict sense realized in every community in the changed situation of the fourth and fifth centuries and to assure it with severe sanctions. Naturally, this attitude laid more stress on the exact execution of the penalties imposed than on the encouraging of the desire for atonement in the penitent. Augustine represents a praiseworthy exception, since his personal religious pilgrimage, his theological thought, and his awareness of his pastoral responsibility inclined him to a more forgiving outlook.[46] To be sure, he attributed to the penitential discipline a position of importance in the life of the community, but he never lost sight of the fact that the Church in the world will always include "wheat and weeds" and he defended just this sort of Church against the puritanism of the Donatists. The consequences of such strictness were not absent. Alongside the postponement of baptism proceeded the postponement of public ecclesiastical penance, but now the Church, in contrast to the case of baptism, combated this only slightly, even to the extent of finally advising it in special cases, especially in still young men. Now the sinner was invited to make his entire life a constant preparation for penance and reconciliation,[47] which were reserved for advanced age. Thus the period of penance was gradually restricted to the brief span of mortal sickness, and reconciliation took place shortly before death. To be sure, the principle that ecclesiastical penance could not be repeated was saved, but its pastoral sense was undermined. The consequences of this development were, seen as a whole, so negative that eventually a basically new solution, private penance, became inevitable.

---

[41] Sozomen, *HE* 7, 16, 4–7, describes the rite customary in Rome.

[42] Innocent I, *Ep.* 1, 7.

[43] Leo I, *Ep.* 18, 13; 19, 6; Jerome, *Dial. c. Lucif.* 5.

[44] Thus the Spanish Synods of Elvira (c. 306), Zaragoza (380), and Toledo I (c. 400).

[45] Examples in Poschmann, *HDG* IV, 3 (1951), 55f.

During the fourth and fifth centuries more energetic efforts of the Church become discernible to incorporate marriage and the wedding celebration into the liturgy, especially since they were included, more than other segments in the course of life, in pagan or profane custom.[48] Increasingly, features of this custom were blamed, such as some dances on the occasion of a wedding, or the effort was made to have the custom of crowning the spouses rendered acceptable by a Christian interpretation.[49] At the same time it was urged that the contracting of marriage be publicly blessed by bishop or priest. In this regard the first steps toward the development of a liturgical rite of marriage become clear. In the East the bishop or priest was invited to the celebration of marriage in a private house and there he pronounced a prayer of blessing over the bridal pair; it was surrounded by the singing of psalms, but definite liturgical texts are not to be found before the eighth century. A blessing of the marriage crown and the crowning by the priest are mentioned in the fourth century, and they finally gave the Byzantine marriage rite its name, *stephanoma.*[50] At Alexandria the joining of the hands of the bridal pair by the priest was customary toward the end of the fourth century. In the West the Ambrosiaster first said something vague about a *benedictio* at a wedding; then Pope Siricius and Ambrose mentioned the custom of the *velatio,* in which the priest spread a veil over the heads of the bridal couple.[51] The *Praedestinatus* (c. 430–440) first mentioned a Eucharistic celebration in connection with marriage. A canonical rule for the blessing of the marriage by the priest existed at this time, however, only for clerics of the lower orders, to whom marriage was permitted.[52]

---

[46] On the Augustinian practice of penitential discipline see F. van de Meer, *Augustinus der Seelsorger* (Cologne 1951), 447–453, and J. Vermeylen, "Le cheminement de la pénitence selon s. Augustin," *CollMechl* 51 (1966), 514–546.

[47] Ambrose, *De paen.* 2, 11, 107; *Conc. Arel.* II, can. 24; Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 256, 4; 258, 2.

[48] K. Ritzer, *Formen, Riten, und religiöses Brauchtum der Eheschliessung in den christlichen Kirchen des 1. Jahrtausends* (Münster 1962).

[49] K. Baus, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum* (Bonn, reprinted 1966), 93–112.

The Liturgical Year

The position of Easter, now as earlier the *mysterium praecipuum* and the *excellentior festivitas* of all celebrations[53] which the liturgy observed, was now also brought to prominence in public life, since the Christian Emperors from Valentinian I honored the day by a special amnesty for prisoners,[54] though certain serious crimes were not included in it. In the religious and theological understanding of the feast a certain change occurred in the East, since, following the Trinitarian and Christological discussions of the age, the suffering of the Redeemer was deemphasized in favor of the idea of the resurrection. In the West, however, its original meaning was still retained: in the Easter Triduum from Good Friday to Easter Sunday, "the mystery of the death and resurrection" was celebrated, whereby a new life was given to mankind.[55]

With the fourth century the Easter season entered the final phase of its organization as a great Easter cycle, since now the feast was preceded by a rather long period of preparation—Lent. The Council of Nicaea mentioned for the first time the *Tessarakosté* without any details of its content; Eusebius spoke of an ascetical exercise of forty days before Easter; Cyril of Jerusalem, of a *metanoia* of forty days.[56] During his stay in Rome in 340 Athanasius discovered the custom of a forty-days' fast. However, the exact number of forty fast days established itself only after a longer development.[57] The preachers of the time, especially Augustine and Pope Leo I, give information on the liturgical structure and meaning of this Lent.[58] As in no other section of the liturgical year, the weekdays of Lent gradually obtained a public liturgy, which was celebrated at Rome as a stational liturgy. Every day people met for the *statio,* the fixed place of this celebration at one of the churches of the regions of Rome; the Pope himself conducted it and the many faithful who attended received Communion. The fast accompanying Lent was not prescribed in the modern sense by the Church; rather it was a clear form of curtailment, which knew only one meal, the evening *coena,* in which wine and meat were renounced.[59] Far greater weight was attributed, however, to self-discipline, to recollection and inner contemplation, which should prove themselves in genuine love of neighbor, readiness for personal sacrifice in almsgiving, and reconciliation. Since at the same time Lent was the preferred time for the immediate preparation of the *competentes* or *electi* for the reception of baptism and of the penitents for their *reconciliatio,* the liturgy of certain days was clearly influenced in its order of readings by this fact. For example, the catechumens were probably admitted to the stational liturgy on the third, fourth, and fifth Sundays of Lent in order then to learn the text of the baptismal Creed and of the Lord's Prayer.[60] Naturally, the last week was conditioned by the theme of the Redeemer's Passion, which however was liturgically fashioned variously according to the region. In Jerusalem were chosen those readings which reported the events of the Passion Week by the day and hour, corresponding to the biblical accounts. In Spain and North Africa a continuous reading of the history of the Passion was compiled, while Rome decided for the entire reading according to the four gospels on four different days.

---

[50] Gregory Nazianzen, *Ep.* 231 and 232; John Chrysostom, *In Genes. hom.* 48, 6.

[51] Ambrosiaster, *In ep. I ad Cor.* 7, 40; Ambrose, *Ep.* 19. Paulinus of Nola in *carm.* 25 describes the wedding of the lector Julian, the later Bishop of Aeclanum.

[52] Praedest., 3, 31; Siricius, *Ep. ad Himerium Tarrac.* 8; Innocent I, *Ep. ad Victr.* 4–6.

[53] Leo I, *Sermo* 47, 1; 48, 1.

[54] *Cod. Theod.* 9, 38, 3 (367), 4 (368), 7 (384), 5 (385); *Cod. Just.* 1, 4, 3. Cf. Leo I, *Sermo* 40, 5; 45, 4; 47, 3.

[55] See W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern,* 156–206; but against him it must be maintained that Leo I in his *Sermones de Quadragesima* throughout understands death and resurrection together as the basic idea of Easter. See especially *Sermones* 43, 3, and 48, 4; Augustine, *Ep.* 55, 24, speaks of a *triduum crucifixi, sepulti, resuscitati.*

[56] Council of Nicaea, can. 5; Eusebius, *De soll. pasch.* 4; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Procat.* 4.

The Pentecost, that is, the Easter Season, was concluded with the fiftieth day after Easter, which was at the same time devoted to the recalling of the descent of the Holy Spirit and the Ascension of the Lord. As early as the fourth century, however, the remembrance of

---

[57] Athanasius, *Easter Letter of 341,* appendix. Jerome, *Ep.* 24, speaks of the voluntary nature of the fast. Socrates, *HE* 5, 22, mentions a fast at Rome in the three weeks before Easter.

[58] List of pertinent sermons of Augustine in S. Poque, *SChr* 116, 352–354 (about 30); the twelve sermons of Leo I on Lent: *SChr* 49.

[59] Augustine, *Sermo* 210, 10f., reproves Christians who again debase the renunciation by a refined selection and preparation of other foods and drinks.

[60] The notice *pro scrutiniis electorum* in the Gelasian Sacramentary, indicates this; it was in the Mass formulary of that period.

Christ's Ascension was separated from this feast and given a feast of its own on the fortieth day of the Pentecost.[61]

The liturgical year gained its most significant enrichment at this period through an exchange between East and West, in which the West took from the East the feast of the Lord's Epiphany[62] and gave it Christmas; since both celebrations obtained a prolongation and a time of preparation, the basis was laid for the second festive cycle of the liturgical year. The first sure report on a feast which had as its content the birth of Christ and was celebrated on 25 December is found in a list of Christian feasts, the so-called *Chronographus* of 354, which took this notice from a model going back to the age of Constantine (336).[63] The date of 25 December, for which no one at all could appeal to a solid historical tradition, was probably not "worked out" on the basis of an astronomically symbolic idea.[64] Most probably the choice of this date was motivated by the feast of the birth of the pagan Sun-god, which the Emperor Aurelian introduced at Rome from the East after 274 and which thereafter was observed as *dies natalis solis invicti* on this day as a high civil holiday. To this *Sol invictus* the Christians consciously contrasted their Lord as the new light, the new sun, the *sol iustitiae,* as the one whom the sermons of the Fathers and the texts of the liturgy celebrated on his *dies natalis.*[65] The *sacramentum Christi nativitatis* was observed as early as c. 360 in Africa. For the *natalis Salvatoris* Ambrose composed the hymn *Intende qui regis Israel;* for Filastrius of Brescia (d. 397) the day was a very high feast, which was also celebrated at Aquileia in the time of Bishop Chromatius (c. 387–407) and was likewise known in Spain before the end of the fourth century, while Paulinus of Nola may have attested it less for Gaul than for South Italy.[66] In the East Christmas was first accepted in Cappadocia, Constantinople, and Syria in the penultimate decade of the fourth century, while it was not received until c. 430 in Jerusalem and Egypt, that is, in the regions which first knew the Epiphany, and for this reason occasionally the mystery of the birth was separated from the festive content of the Epiphany.[67]

---

[61] First attested by *Const. Apost.* 8, 33; by Augustine, *Sermo* 254; *Ep.* 54 presupposes it as a feast celebrated in the Universal Church. See also P. Devos, *AnBoll* 86 (1968), 87–108, and W. Huber, op. cit., 158, 165, 206–208.

[62] Augustine, *Sermo* 202, 2, expressly names the *ecclesia orientalis* as the home of the feast; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gest.* 21, 2, 5, knew in 361 that the Christians of Gaul called the feast *Epiphania.*

[63] *Chron. min.: MGAuctant.* 9, 1, 56ff.

[64] Thus L. Duchesne, *Origines,* 278f.; then H. Engberding, *ALW* 2 (1952), 25–43; H. Strobel, *ThLZ* 87 (1962), 183–194.

[65] Examples in B. Botte, *Origines,* 61–67; F. J. Dölger, *AuC* VI (1950), 1–56, especially 23–30; H. Rahner, *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung* (Zurich, 2nd ed. 1957), 190–199; H. Frank, *Festschr. Th. Michels* (Münster 1963), 136–154.

[66] Optatus Milev., *Sermo in nat. ss. Innoc.* 1. On Ambrose's hymn, A. S. Walpole, *Early Latin Hymns* (Cambridge 1922), no. 6; Filastr., *Haer.* 140, 1–4; Siricius, *Ep. ad Himerium Tarrac.;* Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 27, 43–45.

Just as *epiphaneia* in the area of Hellenistic religions meant the arrival or public manifestation of a god or of a god-king, so the corresponding basic idea of the Christian feast of the Epiphany was the appearance of the Lord in the world, his divine manifestation before mankind.[68] Sometimes this Epiphany was seen as realized in his birth, as, for example, originally in Jerusalem, Antioch, and perhaps also in Syria, but also in his baptism in the Jordan, as in Egypt, or finally in the homage of the magi and the miracle at the marriage at Cana, as Epiphanius of Salamis testifies.[69] The fact that 6 January was chosen for the feastday was certainly conditioned by missionary considerations. Thus a feast of the winter solstice celebrated around the same date in Egypt, or that of a miraculous fountain in various cities of the East could be christianized by the declaration that in Christ the true sun has shone or that the water of baptism (*photismos*) has brought true enlightenment to man.[70] Then, when the Roman Christmas was received into the local liturgies, the baptism of Jesus remained the central content of the Epiphany feast, which also made 6 January a baptismal day and was expressed in a second name for the feast (*ta phota*), while the celebration of the birth, joined with the adoration of the magi, was reserved for 25 December.

The reception of the Epiphany in the West occurred with no uniformity as to time and place and with differing emphases on the concept of the feast. It is earliest traceable for Gaul, where at first it was probably celebrated as *adventus salvatoris* in the original meaning of *epiphaneia.*[71] Paulinus of Nola (d. 431) first mentions, in addition to the adoration of the magi, the baptism in the Jordan and the marriage at Cana as ingredients of the content of the feast.[72] In Upper Italy Ambrose was the earliest witness for the feast; with him the baptism of Jesus was as much in the foreground as with Chromatius of Aquileia and Maximus of Turin, while a little later at Ravenna the *tria miracula*—adoration of the magi, baptism in the Jordan, and miracle of Cana—together were regarded as the content of the feast.[73] For Augustine the Epiphany was equal in rank with Christmas, the day on which the Lord made himself known to the pagans, who did homage to him in the magi.[74] Rome at the earliest accepted the Epiphany under Pope Innocent I (401–417) and, like the African and Spanish Churches, separated the adoration of the magi from the content of Christmas.[75]

---

[67] For Cappadocia, see J. Mossay (literature); for Constantinople, Gregory Nazianzen is witness in 379; for Antioch, John Chrysostom in 386–88. Bishop Juvenal first introduced it at Jerusalem, probably in connection with the Christological discussion of Ephesus, which also moved Cyril of Alexandria to accept the feast. Only Armenia maintained the one feast of the Epiphany. On the whole matter, B. Botte, *Origines.*

[68] Chr. Mohrmann, "Epiphania," *Etudes sur le latin des chrétiens* I (Rome 1958), 245–275; E. Pax, "Epiphanie," *RAC* V, 902–906.

[69] Jerusalem: *Itin. Eger.* 25, 6–12; Antioch: John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Pentec.* 1, 1, 2; Egypt: John Cassian, *Coll.* 10, 2; Epiphanius of Salamis, *Haer* 51, 9, 13; 51, 16, 1, 8.

[70] J. A. Jungmann, *Liturgie der christlichen Frühzeit,* 137f.

[71] Thus Hilary of Poitiers in a fragment (*CSEL* 65, 16f.); despite B. Botte, *Origines,* 47f., its authenticity must be held.

[72] Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 27, 46–52.

When both feasts were expanded through gradually growing celebrations in preparation and prolongation, the elaboration of a special Christmas cycle was introduced. A first step toward this appeared in Jerusalem, where the celebration of the feast at the time of the pilgrim Egeria began with a pilgrimage to Bethlehem, which was connected with a midnight Mass in Constantine's Church of the Nativity. After the return in the early morning there followed the daytime Mass in Jerusalem. Later this type of a first Mass was adopted at Rome as the preliminary celebration, when people arrived at the church in honor of Mary built by Pope Sixtus III (432–440) on the Esquiline at midnight for the liturgy in a chapel in front of a model of the grotto at Bethlehem (*ad praesepe*). Christmas obtained an after-celebration when its octave day was raised to prominence as the feast of the *Natale s. Mariae,* which by its very name indicated its connection with the Christmas mystery. One may also speak of an after-celebration for the Epiphany, since before the seventh century the gospel readings of the following Sundays and, to a degree, of the weekdays, took up the basic theme of the Epiphany and reported the signs by which Christ displayed his glory (John 2:11).[76]

A period of preparation for the Epiphany or Christmas respectively, in the sense of the later Advent, first appeared, not at Rome, but in Spain and Gaul. Hilary of Poitiers attests that people prepared for the Epiphany *per trium septimanarum secretum spatium;* the Council of Zaragoza (380) prescribed for the time from 17 December to 6 January—hence likewise for three weeks—a daily attendance at church, and a little later a letter from the circle of the monk Bachiarius urged spending the same period in prayer and fasting.[77] Toward the end of the fifth century there appeared in the fasting regulations of Bishop Perpetuus of Tours (d. 490) a decree that required a fast three times a week for the period from Martinmas to Christmas and hence at the same time provided the first sure testimony for the existence of Christmas in Gaul.[78] Similar admonitions to prepare for the feast of the Lord's birth by prayer and continence are found in Maximus of Turin and Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna. It was only in the course of the sixth century that Rome created an Advent liturgy in the strict sense by the introduction of five Advent Sundays, which Gregory the Great reduced to four and thereby brought to a conclusion the development of the second festive cycle within the liturgical year.[79]

---

[73] Ambrose, *In Luc.* 4, 76; Chromatius of Aquileia, *Sermo* 36, 1; on Maximus of Turin (d. between 408 and 423) see A. Mutzenbecher, "Der Festinhalt von Weihnachten und Epiphanie," *Stpatr* 5, 3 (1962), 109–116; Peter Chrysologus, *Serm.* 156–160.

[74] *Serm.* 199–204.

[75] C. Colbergh, "L'Epiphanie à Rome avant s. Léon," *RBén* 75 (1965), 304–307; Leo I, *Serm.* 31–38.

[76] U. A. Jungmann, op. cit., 254–257.

---

[77] Hilary of Poitiers, *CSEL* 65, 16f. Council of Caesaraug; can. 4; Bachiarius, *Ep. ad Marcell., PL,* Suppl. I, 1039f.

[78] Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* 10, 21, 6.

[79] W. Croce, "Die Adventsliturgie im Lichte der geschichtlichen Entwicklung," *ZKTh* 76 (1954), 257–296, 440–472.

CHAPTER 18

Preaching and Piety

Catechesis and Preaching

Every attempt to answer the question of how the clergy of the Church of the Empire saw and carried out the pastoral duty of preaching must remain unsatisfactory because of the special situation of the sources. To be sure, approximately 3,000 sermons and catecheses are extant from the period between Nicaea and Chalcedon, but they come from only some thirty authors, hence from a fraction of those who labored as pastors in these 125 years. And more than half of the stock that has been preserved belongs to two bishops, Chrysostom and Augustine,[1] and so it is not representative for a view of the entire clergy of the time. The criteria for this selection were mostly the quality of the sermons or at least the reputation of the author, but occasionally probably only chance preserved something. The average member of the pastoral clergy surely made frequent use of the models of recognized preachers.[2]

---

[1] The numbers can be only approximate; research today assigns about 800 to Chrysostom, to Augustine about 1,000 sermons and catecheses.

The ecclesiastical catechesis was now also exclusively one for adults and embraced the totality of their instruction and practice, through which the unbaptized were made conversant by an official of the Church with the testimonies of faith and the moral demands which should determine the life of a real Christian. Apparently, there was no special catechesis for children before the end of the sixth century, although the practice of infant baptism was steadily growing.[3] In families with a rather long Christian tradition, however, there was the private domestic catechesis, by which father or mother gave the child a first introduction into the Christian life and faith, if, in accord with the custom of the day, the reception of baptism was deferred until later. The Church urgently referred to such a duty of the parents, especially Chrysostom and Augustine; the latter even saw here "an ecclesiastical and, so to speak, episcopal task" conferred on the *paterfamilias.*[4] The official catechesis was more and more reserved to the clergy: only for the East are isolated lay catechists mentioned, and a special aptitude was demanded in them.[5] At Antioch it was mostly imparted by priests, and the same must be presupposed for the instruction at the Roman titular churches.[6] At Carthage a deacon was entrusted with the introductory catechesis at the admission into the catechumenate; priests probably likewise shared in the baptismal catechesis for the *competentes* in North Africa, since they also had the right to preach.[7] In the majority of other localities in East and West, however, the bishop was regarded as the teacher of the catechumens; the extant baptismal catecheses of this period came partly from priests, partly from bishops.[8]

Catechesis was determined, as regards its purpose, content, and method, entirely in relation to its missionary context. In his *De*

---

[2] Augustine *De doctr. christ.* 4, 29, 62, indicates this; Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 1, 15, refers to "the old custom in the East of having the homilies of the Fathers read in the churches."

[3] Cf. J. C. Didier, "Le pédobaptisme au IV^e siècle," *MSR* 6 (1949), 233–246.

[4] Augustine, *In Joh. tr.* 15, 13; John Chrysostom, *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis,* ed. B. K. Exarchos (Munich 1955); Jerome, *Ep.* 107 gives to the Roman lady Laeta a program for the religious education of her daughter Paula.

[5] *Const. Apost.* 8, 32, 17.

[6] For Antioch: John Chrysostom, *In Ep. II ad Cor. hom.* 30, 2; *In Genes. hom.* 12, 1; *In Ep. I ad Cor.* 3, 3; for Rome cf. Monachino, op. cit., 345.

[7] Augustine, *De cat. rud.* 1, 1; Ambrose, *Ep.* 2, 27.

[8] It is uncertain whether Cyril of Jerusalem delivered the baptismal catecheses as a priest; those of Chrysostom belong to his days in Antioch (388–389); on the dating of the catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia, cf. Quasten, *P* III, 409.

catechizandis rudibus[9] Augustine gave a systematic guidance for the Carthaginian deacon Deogratias, which influenced practical catechetics down to modern times and has retained its freshness to this day. In the two models which he appended of a longer and a shorter introductory catechesis can be read how he wished to see his advice carried out. Augustine did not underestimate the difficulties and relapses which often tended to demoralize the catechist, but he felt they could be overcome if he let himself be led by the joy of the heart.[10] In this the catechist must adapt himself to the individuality of his hearers, who often brought along very different assumptions, each according to his level of education, to their receptiveness to religious or other motives, which induced them to seek admission into the catechumenate.

The kernel of all catechesis, according to Augustine, had to be the history of salvation,[11] as it was revealed by Scripture in the dealings of God with men. It must be made known to the hearer in its most striking events, in the creation of Adam, the deluge, the covenant of God with Abraham, the priestly kingship of David, the deliverance from the Babylonian Captivity, and the all-decisive Christ-event. This *narratio* of the *mirabilia Dei* should show not only the inner connection of the Old and New Testaments, but impart a universal view of all history, as it was framed in God's plan of salvation. When the catechist understood judiciously how to make the inner connection between the history of salvation and the religious route of the catechumen, he would represent to him the love of God for mankind and for him as the ultimate motive of the divine work of salvation, which reached its climax in Christ's death and resurrection. The Christ-event especially was to be made known with such warmth and forcefulness that the catechumen came to the faith by hearing, achieved hope by believing, found love by hoping.[12] In a last *exhortatio* he should be admonished to guard faith, hope, and love from the allurements of that world out of which he came to the Church and not let himself be led astray by those baptized persons who again succumbed to this world. For the Augustinian catechesis it is also characteristic that it was entirely oriented to the positive exposition of salvation history and renounced polemic and rhetorical ornament. Unfortunately, no complete series of Augustine's *Sermones ad competentes* from any one Lent has been preserved, but only three separate explanations of the baptismal creed and the Lord's Prayer.[13] The first are by their very nature chiefly dogmatically instructive, but thoroughly alive, clear, and impressively formulated, even lightened by the remark that the catechumens should soon have no fears of failure in the trial recitation of the text to be learned by heart, since he was still their father, not a schoolmaster with the rod.[14] In the explanations of the Lord's Prayer the moral exhortation prevails; they are all the more stamped by the unmistakable tone of Augustinian intensity and warmth of statement, which wins and convinces, because the catechist is himself convinced.

---

[9] Special editions: G. Krüger (Tübingen, 3rd ed. 1934); A. Sizoo (Amsterdam 1947); G. Combes–J. Farges, *BiblAug.* 11 (Paris 1949); on the dating (not 405 but 399), see L. J. van der Lof, *VigChr* 16 (1962), 198–204.

[10] *De cat. rud.* 2, 5: *ut gaudens quisque catechizet, ea cura maxima est.*

[11] See J. Daniélou, op. cit., 249–262.

[12] *De cat. rud.* 8.

From the area of Greek speech no work of equal rank with *De catechizandis rudibus* has been preserved. Gregory of Nyssa, to be sure, in his *Logos catechetikos,* intended for the Christian teacher, also dealt with methodical questions, such as the adaptation to the individual situation of the hearers, but in contrast to Augustine he preferred a philosophical justification of the truths of faith and let the scriptural and theological foundation retreat unduly into the background.[15]

In the baptismal catecheses attributed to Bishop Cyril of Jerusalem, however, there is realized Augustine's central concern: to make salvation history the center of the instructions in the preparation of the candidates for baptism. The dogmatic exposition was carefully joined to the moral catechesis, occasionally apologetic remarks were inserted, and especially the concluding mystagogic catecheses were very clearly structured. The simple language, the appreciative entry into the situation of the hearers, the clever, deliberate manner of the presentation make these catecheses an especially informative model of Early Christian preaching.[16]

John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia, both outstanding representatives of the Antiochene catechesis, made prominent two aspects of it, since the first preferred the moral catechesis more in accord with his inclinations, while the other preferred the sacramental catechesis, which was apparently applied to hearers with a certain level of education. Chrysostom, the majority of whose extant catecheses come from Easter Week, untiringly inculcated in the newly baptized that they must remain *neophytoi* for the rest of their lives, and for this the Spirit given to them in baptism qualified them.[17] The explanation of the rite of Christian initiation by Theodore of Mopsuestia emphatically set off the eschatalogical character of baptism and Eucharist: with baptism the "new life" of the Christian begins, and the Eucharist nourishes it, while letting him participate in the death and resurrection of Christ and thus arrive at his own resurrection.[18]

---

[13] Catechesis on the Creed: *Serm.* 212, 213 (*PL,* Suppl., II, 536–543), 214; cf. also *De symbolo* I (*PL* 627–636); catechesis on the Lord's Prayer: *Serm.* 57–59; *sermo* 56 was probably not intended for the *competentes.*

[14] *Tract. de symb.* 11.

[15] New edition of the *Oratio catechetica* by H. Polack in Greg. Nyss., *Opera* III, 2 (Leiden), will soon be ready.

[16] Complete edition: W. C. Reischl–J. Rupp (Munich 1848–60); only the mystagogic catecheses: F. L. Cross (London 1951); A Piédagnol, *Schr* 126 (Paris 1966). On Cyril as a catechist sec A. Paulin (with the literature), also G. Touton, *PrOrChr* 1 (1951), 265–285.

In the mystagogic catecheses of Ambrose of Milan their inner relationship to eastern ideas is striking. Like Cyril of Jerusalem, he placed great importance on the understanding of the symbolic content of the sacramental rites, which he tried to explain by means of the typological interpretation of Old Testament events, figures, and individual books, especially the Song of Songs and Psalm 23.[19]

During the real catechumenate, now for the most part curtailed to one Lent, Christian preaching could not be satisfied with the catechetical introduction here provided. In addition to it, an intensive follow-up was necessary in order to extend the laying of the first foundation of a knowledge of the faith and of moral conduct and to deepen and consolidate it. This task was the lot of preaching, which for that reason long retained a missionary character and in an ever new onset had to free the newly won faithful from stubborn pagan custom and to seek to assure them in regard to pagan opposition that was still flaring up. With the increasing certainty that the future would belong to the Christian profession, these antipagan features of preaching grew in severity, which in some preachers could assume a denunciatory character. In cities having a strong Jewish element in the population, such as Antioch, the anti-Jewish preaching was of great importance, and it too could display a strongly polemic tone.[20] The Trinitarian and Christological controversies and the confrontation with Donatism and Pelagianism likewise found expression in preaching and occasioned a large number of dogmatic sermons. The topic of the sermon was expanded by the now powerfully developing cult of martyrs and saints, which introduced the laudatory sermon, the encomium or panegyric respectively, into Christian eloquence. Burning questions of Christian behavior, raised by the day-to-day care of souls, confer on many a sermon a marked exhortatory feature. Finally, special occasions, such as church dedications, anniversaries of episcopal ordination, and funerals of individuals, mostly of high-ranking personalities, gave the bishop opportunity for sermons of a special type, which were often influenced by their model in the profane sphere. The highest rank of all forms of preaching belonged at this period to the homily in the strict sense, which interpreted either entire books or rather long sections of Scripture or even a single word of Scripture and thereby connected specific concerns of pastoral care.

---

[17] The cathecheses of Chrysostom, edited by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia Sacra* (Petersburg 1909), pp. 154–183; the newly discovered baptismal catecheses, edited by A. Wenger, *SChr* 50 (Paris, 2nd ed. 1970), commentary by W. Harkins, *ACW* 31 (1963).

[18] R. Tonneau–R. Devreesse, "Les Homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste," *SteT* 145 (Vatican City 1949); see J. Quasten, *ThSt* 15 (1954), 431–439.

[19] Catecheses of Ambrose, ed. O. Faller, *CSEL* 73 (Vienna 1955); ed. B. Botte, *SChr* 25 (Paris, 2nd ed. 1961).

[20] On the anti-Jewish polemic of the period see supra, chap. 13.

In the Greek East a pupil of Lucian of Antioch, the Arian Asterius the Sophist (d. after 341), who had offered sacrifice in the persecution of Diocletian and therefore was excluded from any clerical function for the rest of his life,[21] was an early representative of the Scriptural preaching of the time. Since the right to preach was more and more attached to the office of priest or bishop from the fourth century, Asterius was one of the last "lay preachers," whose activity was censured by Athanasius as usurpation.[22] Of his commentary on the psalms, attested by Jerome and Theodore of Mopsuestia, most recently thirty-one homilies on Psalms 1 to 25 could be identified, which were delivered a long time after Nicaea to an audience that cannot be specifically localized.[23] The depreciating judgments of Athanasius and Theodore on their quality stands in opposition to the remark of Jerome that they were held in high repute among the author's Arian followers. The Easter homilies of Asterius,[24] thus far investigated in greater detail, justify a more positive evaluation; the sermons reveal in their often spirited form the trained *rhetor* and are penetrated by a theologically notable and high notion of the Easter mystery. The sixteen extant sermons of another Asterius also surpass the average. As Bishop of Amaseia (d. after 410) he was famous for his special homiletic activity. The six real homilies prefer New Testament pericopes, which are suited for moral interpretation; also the occasional sermons on the cult of martyrs, on fasting, against avarice and the celebration of Kalends show him as a pastor who understood the stylistic rules of rhetoric but feared their excesses.[25]

Of the Cappadocians, Basil likewise drew upon the psalms especially for preaching on Scripture; his fifteen extant homilies were probably taken down by stenographers and published later by him.[26] They interpret verse by verse in a lively language, which did not hesitate to admit improvisation and again and again looked into the situation of the congregation of Caesarea. This was especially impressed by the homilies on the work of the six days, which explained the account of the creation by a continual comparison with the state of knowledge of contemporary science;[27] the colorful descriptions of nature not only charmed their first hearers: Ambrose used these homilies for his work of the same title, and Augustine did the same in a Latin translation for his *De Genesi ad litteram.*[28] The more thematic sermons of Basil attest his deep familiarity with Scripture, from which the pastor aimed to construct his community. On the other hand, Gregory Nazianzen, whom Jerome called his teacher in the exegesis of Scripture and a later age would call the "Christian Demosthenes," admitted only one exegetical homily into the collection of his "talks,"[29] since he probably wanted to display as models of Christian eloquence only those addresses which he delivered on special occasions, such as funerals, ecclesiastical solemnities, striking incidents of his own life. Here he was pleased to show forth his rhetorical training, without however thereby essentially impairing the vivacity of the discourse and the personal note.[30] The twenty-six extant addresses of Gregory of Nyssa[31] are likewise mostly occasional sermons, in which an all too great space is allotted to contemporary rhetoric, so that at times they weary one with their pathos and their exaggerations. The examples which he delighted to take from natural science and medicine were concessions to the taste of the age; the preferred explanation of philosophical and theological problems and of controverted questions corresponds to Gregory's gifts and inclination. The exegesis of biblical texts—there are six homilies on Ecclesiastes, fifteen on the Song of

---

[21] G. Bardy, *Recherches sur s. Lucien d'Antioch et son ecole* (Paris 1936), 316–328.

[22] *De syn.* 18, 23.

[23] M. Richard, "Asterii Sophistae commentariorum quae supersunt," *SO,* fasc. suppl. 16 (Oslo 1056).

[24] H. J. Auf der Maur, *Die Osterhomilien des Asterios Sophistes als Quelle für die Gesch. der Osterfeier* (Trier 1967).

[25] C. Datema, *Asterius of Amasea, Homilies I–XIV* (Leiden 1970); two homilies were earlier published by A. Bretz, *TU* 40, 1 (Leipzig 1914), 107–121.

---

[26] *PG* 29, 209–493 (nine homilies); see also two homilies on Ps. 14 and 115, *PG* 30, 72ff. See J. Bernardi, op. cit., 22f.

[27] To the nine homilies on the work of the six days, edited by St. Giet, *SChr* 26 (Paris 1949), belong the two homilies *De origine hominis,* edited by A. Smets and M. van Esbroeck, *SChr* 160 (Paris 1970); ibid., 13–26 and 116–126, on the question of authenticity.

[28] The translation of Eustathius, edited by E. Amand de Mendieta and S. Y. Rudberg, *TU* 66 (Berlin 1958); on the later effect, St. Giet, op. cit., 70f.

[29] Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 117; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 37 on Matt. 19:1–12.

[30] See J. Bernardi, op. cit., 93ff., 254–256; B. Wyss, *Mus. Helvet* 6 (1949), 177–203; E. Bellini, *SC* 99 (1971), 269–296.

[31] *Opera Greg. Nyss.* IX, 1, ed. G. Heil, A. van Heck, E. Gebhardt, and A. Spira (Leiden 1967).

Songs, eight on Matthew 5:1–10, and six on the Lord's Prayer[32]—for the most part followed the homiletic form only externally and made abundant use of allegory for the explanation of Gregory's ascetical and theological concerns, but on the other hand surprisingly left the religious life of the community in the background.[33]

The homiletic achievement of John Chrysostom represents the unquestioned climax of Greek Scriptural preaching of the age. In more than 700 preserved homilies he, for the most part when he was a priest at Antioch, interpreted from the Old Testament parts of Genesis, the Psalms, and Isaiah, and, from the New Testament, much of Matthew, John, the Acts of the Apostles, and, with special devotion, most of Paul's Epistles.[34] He did not, it is true, express himself on the theoretical basis of his exegesis in the greater context, but the Scripture was to him wholly the inspired Word of God, to the service of which he knew he was called and to which he sought to do justice with a high sense of responsibility.[35] In relation to Scripture he aimed basically to strengthen the community in its faith and to lead it to a piety which should hold up in the day-to-day life of the great city of Antioch. As no other preacher of the East, Chrysostom possessed for this task one of the most favorable presuppositions, an innate oratorical endowment, which was not subject to the rules of style laid down in rhetoric but made use of them in an outstanding manner. With this native eloquence he joined a cordial understanding for the cares and problems that afflicted his hearers, and this created a unique relationship of trust between preacher and community. The latter openly rejoiced when, after a rather long illness, Chrysostom appeared again in the pulpit, so fortunate was he that he could again feel their love. To have to give up preaching stirred in his hearers as in himself a feeling which he characterized as hunger.[36] In all this he truly spoke to them not to please them: in Antioch, as later in Constantinople, he preached the demands of the gospel without compromise. To no bishop of the capital would the epithet "court preacher" be less suitable than to Chrysostom. Byzantine Scriptural preaching of the future found his homilies to be exemplary and used them again and again, of course mostly only as was possible to *Epigoni.* Among his admirers was especially his later successor in the see of Constantinople, Proclus (d. 446), but in his case a definitive judgment in regard to his preaching is rendered difficult because of the still unsolved questions relating to authenticity.[37] To his time and especially to his community he ranked as a good preacher who, however, clearly paid his debt to contemporary rhetoric.[38] The sermons today regarded as genuine mostly deal with the feasts of the Lord during the Church year, the *Theotokos,*[39] the Apostles, or other figures of the Eastern Church. Of the sermons of Theodoret of Cyrrhus (d. c. 460), also an admirer of Chrysostom, only scanty remnants have come down to us, although he was praised by his hearers as an outstanding speaker.[40] The ten talks on providence (*peri pronoias*)[41] were delivered in Antioch to a, for the most part, Christian and educated public, before which Theodoret was willing to renounce neither the carefully planned exposition of questions of natural science nor the copious use of rhetorical stylistic methods.

---

[32] *Opera* V, ed. P. Alexander; *Op.* VI, ed. H. Langerbeck; *Op.* VII, 2, ed. J. Callahan (ibid., 1960–69); see "Écriture et culture philosophique dans la penseé de Grégoire de Nysse," *Actes du colloque de Chevetogne,* 1966 (Leiden 1971).

[33] See J. Bernardi, op. cit., 261–332.

[34] *PG* 48–56.

[35] *Hom. in parab. decem mill. tal.* 4. On Chrysostom's understanding of Scripture see H. Eising, *OrChr* 48 (1964), 84–106, and R. Hill, *VigChr* 22 (1968), 19–37.

[36] *Hom. in parab. decem mill. tal.* 1; *hom. post terrae mot. init.* (37) *PG* 65, 679–888: 27 sermons, of which nos. 2, 4, 17 are fragments, no. 20 to Chrysostom. On the question of authenticity, B. Marx, *Procliana* (Münster 1940: on 80 sermons of Proclus in pseudo-Chrysostom) and F. J. Leroy, "L'homilétique de Proclos de Constantinople," *SteT* 247 (Vatican City 1967).

In the sphere of the Latin Church Upper Italy produced a series of bishops who left a quite abundant homiletic legacy. It was inaugurated by Zeno of Verona (362–c.372) whose sixteen sermons and seventy-seven sermon outlines were still clearly marked by the relatively late era of the evangelization of the countryside. From his African home Zeno brought a noteworthy rhetorical formation, which was strongly evident in the longer addresses.[42] Ambrose of Milan in his preaching displayed a decided preference for the Old Testament, from which he took the text for his numerous Scriptural sermons, apart from his commentary on Luke, on which likewise his homilies were based. Even in their book form, revised for publication,[43] his rhetorical education becomes clearly visible: the dignified, solemn language displays the Roman aristocrat as well as the bishop of the contemporary imperial city of residence, who was quite conscious of his position. But on the whole, his preaching, as he required of it also in theory,[44] was simple and natural, adapted to the subject as well as to the understanding of the hearers, and clear in its expression. During his stay in Milan, Augustine found the repute of Ambrose's eloquence confirmed and was deeply touched by the preacher's *suavitas sermonis,* which aimed rather to enlighten than to charm.[45] The study of the Greek Fathers, especially of Basil and Origen, induced him to adopt the allegorical exegesis of the Scriptural text because it seemed so productive for the preaching of his Christocentric piety.[46] Forty-one sermons, only very recently identified, of Chromatius of Aquileia (388–c. 408),[47] ordained a Bishop by Ambrose, acquaint us with a pastor who, free from rhetorical ambition, sought in simple but vivid language to make clear to his people the mystery of Christ, of his Church, and of their redemption. At the same time they give abundant information on the liturgy of the contemporary Church of Aquileia. Bishop Maximus of Turin (408–423), on the other hand, preferred thematic preaching to the homily in the proper sense.[48] His rhetorical training usually enabled him to find a clear articulation for his theme and a striking formulation of his thoughts. He was always aware that he had to speak in an easily grasped language to people who had not long before been gained to the Christian faith, if he wanted to lead them to a genuinely Christian conduct. A preacher thoroughly convinced of the importance of a tireless and painstaking preaching was the Spanish Bishop Gregory of Elvira (d. after 392), whose twenty-five homilies, together with two addresses of Pacian of Barcelona, represent the extant remnant of the sermon literature of his country from the fourth and fifth centuries. Five homilies are devoted to the explanation of the Song of Songs; the others, except one, interpret Old Testament texts and use them vividly and cleverly with regard to style for deepening his hearers' understanding of the faith.[49]

---

[37] Socrates, *HE* 7, 28, 41, 43.

[39] The sermon on the *Theotokos,* delivered in the presence of Nestorius, also in Schwartz, *ACO* I, i, 1, 103–107.

[40] Photius knew five of his sermons on Chrysostom, *PG* 84, 47–54. Reference to the response which his sermons found: Theodoret, *Ep.* 83, 90f., 145, 147.

[41] *PG* 83, 555–774.

[42] "Zenonis Veronensis Tractatus," ed. B. Löfstedt, *CChr* 22 (1971), in it, pp. 68*–123*, remarks on the language and style of Zeno.

[43] *CSEL* 32, 1–2; 62; 64, revised by C. Schenkl–M. Petschenig (Vienna 1897–1919).

[44] *Ep.* 2, 5, 7; *De off.* 1, 101; *De Isaac* 57.

Jerome's homilies provide a surprise in the sense that these sermons on various psalms and pericopes from Mark and other New Testament writings[50] renounce any rhetorical effect and linguistic elegance and show that the Christian preacher who has gone through the school of a profane education can thoroughly free himself from the ballast of the rhetoric of late antiquity. The impromptu homilies are in the traditional form of apparently uncorrected transcripts from the circle of his monks, with whom the "Abbot" of Bethlehem spoke familiarly and frankly on the dangers which could threaten a monk's life.

---

[45] *Conf.* 5, 13, 23.

[46] E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosius von Mailand* (Münster 1965).

[47] Edited by J. Lemarié, *SChr* 154 and 164 (Paris 1969–71); on the discovery and transmission of these *sermones,* ibid. 154, 9–40. Hitherto well known were a sermon on the eight beatitudes and seventeen *tractatus* on the gospel of Matthew, but despite the title they are not homilies: ed. A Hoste, *CChr* 9 (1957). Of this commentary on Matthew, thirty-three more *tractatus* have now been found; see R. Etaix–J. Lemarié, *SE* 17 (1966), 302–354, which were published in *CChr* 9A.

[48] The critical edition of A. Mutzenbecher, *CChr* 23 (1962), regards 111 sermons as genuine.

[49] *PL,* Suppl. I, 353–527; on the question of authorship, U. Dominguez del Val, *Repertorio de las ciencias eclesiásticas en Espãna* I (Salamanca 1967), 6–12. Also, G. M. Verd, "La predicación patristica española," *EE* 47 (1972), 227–251.

Precise in the range and quality of his homiletic achievement, Augustine represents the Latin counterpart of Chrysostom, from whom, however, he took so many individual features that he became a unique figure among Early Christian preachers.[51] The Bishop of Hippo also expressed himself in detail on the goal and form of the sermon and in so doing established the thesis that the Christian preacher need not have gone through the school of rhetoric in order to be able to perform his task objectively. He could model himself for this directly on Scripture and adhere to proved examples; in any event, the gifted preacher would do justice to the rules of eloquence, since they were natural to him.[52] More heavily than all rhetorical brilliance on the one hand or the displeasure of the grammarians because of unpolished diction on the other hand, there weighed on Augustine the duty of explaining the Word of God in so plain a manner that the less gifted could also grasp it.[53] To this end he delighted to give to his preaching the character of a dialogue, of the intimate conversation between the bishop at his *cathedra* and the congregation, which hung on his words and ingenuously replied to his questions. Augustine's lively spontaneity, his superior gift of improvisation, and his pedagogical skill were of uncommon benefit to such a manner of preaching. His biographer Possidius called special attention to the powerful impression which his method of preaching made on his hearers, and the expression probably coming from his successor in the preaching office repeats this impression in his own way: "now the cricket chirps, for the swan is silent."[54] The deep effect of Augustine's preaching was not least of all conditioned by a unique relation of trust and sympathy which united hearers and preacher. They were glad to come because they loved him and knew they were loved by a shepherd, who, like them, wanted to be only one member in the flock of Christ the Shepherd, by a teacher, who wanted to be only their fellow-pupil in the school of the one Teacher, Christ,[55] who placed significance neither on his intellectual superiority nor on his episcopal authority, who might therefore even scold and reprimand, if the life of the community supplied the occasion. At bottom, Augustine was convinced that one who is not himself first a hearer in his inner being will be only a hollow preacher.[56] Although not unaware of the strong echo which his preaching found in the congregation and which he sensitively recorded in all its nuances, he found the task of preaching a *magnum pondus* in the evening of his life, often deeply oppressed by the responsibility into which he knew he had been placed.[57] The fertile soil of his preaching was almost exclusively the Holy Scripture: his intimate knowledge of it effortlessly put at his disposal every verse of the Bible for spontaneous use and made his language completely saturated with the Bible. Differing from Chrysostom, Augustine preferred the allegorical exegesis of Scripture for preaching, since it supplied more abundant opportunities to his gift for making clear his understanding of the Word of God, as the homilies on the psalms and on John's gospel attest with special vigor.[58] While in the *Enarrationes in psalmos,* as well as in the general *sermones,* the great questions and themes of Christian life—the world as foreign, the meaning of suffering, Christian hope, life as prayer—are in the foreground, the figure of Christ, his message, and his Church are the dominant theme of the *Tractatus in evangelium s. Johannis,* which in its way represented an unsurpassed high point of Early Christian preaching. The preaching of the Latin Church lived for centuries on his homiletic legacy as a whole.

---

[50] Now also a new edition by G. Morin: *CChr* 78 (1958).

[51] F. van der Meer, op. cit., 473–544; Chr. Mohrmann, "Saint Augustin prédicateur," *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* I (Rome 1958), 391–402.

[52] *Augustins "Homiletik" im 4. Buch seiner Doctrina christiana* (ed. J. Martin, *CChr* 32 [1962] and G. M. Green, *CSEL* 80 [1963]); see H. I. Marrou, *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1949), 505–545; J. Oroz Reta, *La retórica en los sermones de s. Agustín* (Madrid 1963); F. Schnitzler, *Zur Theologie der Verkündigung in den Predigten des hl. Augustinus* (Freiburg 1968).

[53] *Enarr. in ps.* 36, 3, 6; *In Joh. ep. I, tr.* 6, 14, *De doctr. christ.* 4, 10, 4–25.

[54] Possidius, *Vita s. Aug.* 31, 9; Eraclius, *Sermo 'Puto, fratres,'* no. 2 *PL* 39, 1719; *cicada clamat et cygnus tacet.*

Of the Latin preachers after Augustine, a later age honored the Bishop Peter of Ravenna (c. 430–450) with the nickname Chrysologus, but his extant homilies do very little to justify it, at least in regard to form. To the principle which he himself laid down—that one must preach to the people only in a popular manner—he proved himself only too often unfaithful because of his delight in rhetorical ostentation.[59] More attractive, on the other hand, are the twenty sermons of Bishop Valerian of Cimiez (d. c. 460). They give a clear picture of the cult of martyrs in contemporary southern Gaul and stress the duty of the Christian to prove himself in daily life by charity toward his fellowmen, readiness for reconciliation, and humility.[60] The sermons of Pope Leo I are distinguished by linguistic elegance and solemn diction and are the first religious talks of a Pope of importance to come down to us. In them the consciousness of the rank of the Roman episcopal see is clearly reflected, but they do not cause one to forget the religious seriousness and the sparkling life of the Augustinian *sermones.*[61]

---

[55] *In Joh. ev. tr.* 6, 1; 13, 8; *Enarr. in ps.* 126, 3.

[56] *Sermo* 179, 1: *verbi enim dei inanis est forinsecus praedicator, qui non est intus auditor*; cf. also *De doctr. christ.* 4, 15, 32.

[57] Especially characteristic are *Sermones* 17 and 339. Good attendance at his preaching: *In Joh. ev. tr.* 3, 21; 6, 1; 7, 1. On the audience's approval see the examples in F. van der Meer, 498–502, and J. Zellinger, *Festgabe A. Knöpfler* (Freiburg 1917), 403–415.

[58] On the quality of the *Enarrationes in psalmos,* see M. Pontet, *L'exégèse de s. Augustin prédicateur* (Paris 1946), 387–553; J. Moran, *BAC* 235 (Madrid 1964), 11*–83*. On the *Tractatus in ev. Joh.,* M. F. Berrouard, *BiblAug* 71 (Paris 1969), 9–124.

Christocentric Piety

As the basic attitude and center of all piety, devotion to Christ in its various forms was pushed into the awareness of the faithful by Christian preaching even more powerfully than in earlier times. Christocentric baptismal piety, long stressed, still retained its rank, which could be noted in the thought and intensity which pastoral care devoted to the preparation for baptism and the elaboration of the baptismal liturgy. Naturally, the actuality of day-to-day Christian life often did not correspond to the untiringly extolled demand on the faithful to form their lives with regard to their baptismal promises, so that Chrysostom had to warn his neophytes against the example of those Christians whose behavior flagrantly contradicted what they had once promised.[62] Eucharistic piety also now fell short, among the majority of Christians, of the ideal proclaimed to them, since, especially in the large communities of East and West, preaching had to complain ever more of the declining or fluctuating attendance at the liturgy. Here now, more and more, a nucleus of dedicated Christians stood in contrast to the bulk of the members of the community, who found their way to the church only on the solemnities of the liturgical year or for special occasions.[63] Preaching clearly pushed devotion to the Passion to the foreground, as the numerous *sermones de passione domini* make known, and they prepared for the medieval devotion to the sufferings of the Lord.[64] Their effect was a widespread veneration of the Cross, which was expressed as well in the popularity of the sign of the cross as a gesture of prayer in private and liturgical piety, especially in the *adoratio crucis* on Good Friday, as in the triumphal cross of the apses of basilicas and of sarcophagi, in the simple cross on the walls of a private house or in the cell of the monk, and finally in the keen interest in the fate of the true Cross of Christ. The popular pilgrimages to Jerusalem had one of their roots here. The visit to the Holy Sepulchre and Mount Calvary, which was an established part of the religious celebration of Holy Week in Jerusalem in the fourth century makes one think of the stations of the later Way of the Cross.[65] The sermon on the Passion was also the occasion on which the demand for the "following of Christ" was made with special urgency: this was emphatically understood as an imitation of the example which Christ gave in his Passion as *doctor humilitatis* and as physician of suffering mankind.[66] Finally, Christocentric piety manifested itself impressively in prayer to Christ, which further expanded the start made earlier by Origen and the martyrs, and as a consequence of the stimulus which the Christological discussions since Nicaea gave it; the private piety of the prevailing attitude to prayer developed into it and received through Augustine its deepest theological justification.[67]

---

[59] Peter Chrysologus: *PL* 52, 183–666, and *PL,* Suppl. III 153–183 (on 180 genuine sermons); see A. Olívar, *Los sermones de s. Pedro Crisólogo* (Montserrat 1962).

[60] Valerian of Cimiez: *PL* 52, 691–756; *PL,* Supl. III 184–188; cf. E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* 3 (Paris 1965), 188–191.

[61] Leo I, *Sermones,* ed. J. Leclercq–R. Dolle, *SChr* 22 (2nd ed.), 49 (2nd ed.), 72, 200 (Paris 1961–73).

[62] John Chrysostom, *Cat. bapt.* 3, 8–18; 5, 20.

[63] K. Baus, "Die Eucharistische Glaubensverkündigung in der alten Kirche," *Die Messe in der Glaubensverkündigung. Festschr. J. A. Jungmann* (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1953), 55–70; J. P. Montminy, "La participation des laics à l'Eucharistie du III^{e} au VI^{e} siècle," *Sciences ecclés.* 19 (1967), 351–372. For Antioch: P. Rentinck, op. cit., 86–90; for Milan: V. Monachino, op. cit., 56f.,; for Hippo: F. van der Meer, 209–213.

The earlier arrangement of prayers with its set times for prayer in the course of the day and its basis, which found its first definite form in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, continued to endure under the influence of this writing: morning, evening, and mealtime prayer, prayer at the third, fifth, and ninth hours and once during the night, in order to be mindful at any given time of what the Lord did at these hours for the redemption of mankind. Every Christian had at his disposal as texts for his private prayer, first of all, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, which he knew by heart from the days of his preparation for baptism: the Church constantly urged him to use them as prayers. In addition, in connection with the Eucharistic celebration, some psalm verses and scriptural pericopes had become familiar to him, and they could nourish his private prayer. When the acts of martyrs were read, he often became aware of the call of Christ to the martyrs or heard how his pastors declaimed prayers on the spot and thus learned spontaneously to compose texts that corresponded to his personal situation. Again and again he was also urged by the Church to read the Bible privately.[68]

---

[64] A quite large number of sermons on the Passion by Chrysostom, Augustine, and Pope Leo I are extant.

[65] "Beiträge zur Gesch. des Kreuzzeichens," I–X, by F. J. Dölger, *JbAC* 1–10 (1958–67). On the symbol of the Cross: H. Rahner, "Antenna crucis," *Symbole der alten Kirche* (Salzburg 1964), 361–431. On the *adoratio crucis,* G. Römer, *ZkTh* 77 (1955), 70–86; P. Thoby, *Histoire du Crucifix* (Nantes 1959); P. Stockmeier, *Theologie und Kult des Kreuzes bei Johannes Chrysostomus* (Trier 1966); E. Dinkler, *Signum Crucis* (Tübingen 1967), 55–76.

[66] Especially marked in Chrysostom and Augustine: L. Meyer, *S. Jean Chrysostome, mâitre de perfection chrétienne* (Paris 1934), 220–228; M. Comeau, *RSR* 40 (1952), 80–89; T. van Bavel, *Augustiniana* 7 (1957), 245–281; P. C. Eijkenboom, *Het Christus-Medicus-motief in de preken van S. Augustinus* (Assen 1960).

[67] J. A. Jungmann, *Christliches Beten,* 6–41 (with the literature); on the Christocentrism of prayer in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, see K. Baus, *TThZ* 60 (1951), 178–188, 63 (1954), 321–339; *RQ* 49 (1954), 21–55.

An important further elaboration of the form of prayer is represented at this period by the change, effected in part under the influence of monasticism, of the earlier prayer-times from the private sphere into the liturgical prayer of the community in the church building. Here, it is true, the participation of the laity was possible only in the liturgical morning and evening prayer—Lauds and Vespers—but this was recommended so urgently that a serious Christian could not easily dispense himself from it. As regards content, an enrichment of the piety of the laity was thereby effected: they now came to know far more of the world of the psalms, Holy Scripture, and also ecclesiastical hymns and prepared texts, which they could also adopt in their private prayers. This daily liturgical prayer cannot be demonstrated for the fourth century in all areas where Christianity had spread; it was primarily the concern of the community and only in a rather long development became the obligatory *Officium* to be celebrated for the clergy of the cathedrals.[69]

The great preachers spoke again and again on the meaning and content of prayer and essentially, even with varying stress, they expounded the same ideas: that prayer, as conversation with God, requires the proper attitude of soul; that it is first of all a thanksgiving for God's spiritual gifts and should express the desire for the *vita beata;* that it must not be restricted to set formulas, even if such are often recommended; that one may pray for earthly things only in so far as they are necessary for life and promote one's salvation.[70]

---

[68] A. Hamman, *Prières des premiers chrétiens*; D. Gorce, *La lectio divina* (Paris 1925).

[69] J. Stadlhuber, "Das Stundengebet des Laien im christlichen Altertum," *ZKTh* 71 (1949), 129–183; D. Y. Hadidian, "The Background and Origin of the Christian Hours of Prayer," *ThSt* 25 (1964), 59–69; H. Leeb, *Die Psalmodie bei Ambrosius* (Vienna 1967).

[70] Prayer in Chrysostom: P. Rentinck, op. cit., 146–153; in Augustine: F. van der Meer, op. cit., 202–209.

Forms of Asceticism

"But we are not monks." Again and again Chrysostom had to meet this objection when at Antioch he proclaimed to the laity also the obligation to a life which should be in accord with the gospel.[71] Apart from marriage, however, he and other pastors of the day preached that in principle monks and lay persons were called upon to strive for the same perfection, since there is only a single ideal of perfection for all Christians, which must be realized everywhere. Hence aloofness from the world is for all Christians the basic ascetical disposition which was staunchly emphasized by the Christian preaching and the ascetical literature of the time, which claimed to have been written not merely for monks or to recruit for the monastic life.[72] Fasting was especially recommended as one possibility of its realization, understood not only as liturgical penitential fasting or as preparation for the reception of the Eucharist or even as mere hygienic fasting, but as a personal feat and attitude, which was oriented to man's goal in the next life.[73] Then to all the propertied classes was directed by the pastors a continual admonition to almsgiving, which was not only regarded as a social duty of Christians toward the poor or as a form of expiation of the personal guilt of sin, but was presented as the way to interior freedom vis-à-vis wealth and property. Wealth, of course, was not considered in principle as sinful, but it was always described, at times with powerful rhetorical pathos, as highly dangerous to the individual's salvation.[74] The total renunciation of often vast wealth and of a life of luxury, as was carried out not rarely in the fourth and fifth centuries by members of the upper class in Constantinople, Cappadocia, Rome, Gaul, Sicily, and North Africa, obtained unlimited praise from the ecclesiastical sector. For the most part this step sooner or later followed the entry upon a specific ascetical lifestyle, in which a person remained in his family or community as *continens* or *virgo* or joined an ascetic group or, more often, a community of nuns or monks or was admitted into the clergy. The Church at this time recruited intensely by word and writing in the lay world to urge a decision to this ascetical life, as the numerous works on continence or virginity respectively make known.[75] The earliest among them, such as the homilies of Eusebius of Emesa and the pertinent writings of Athanasius, still presupposed that these ascetics continued to live in their parental house or together with some like-minded persons.[76] Gregory of Nyssa emphasized that he wanted to recruit for the ideal of virginity in his treatise, and in it he repeatedly addressed male youth.[77] If, in so doing, he, like Eusebius of Emesa before him and Chrysostom in his early work on the same theme after him, and, even more, Jerome in his polemic against Jovinian, described the difficulty of married life in harsh terms, this was not at all a specifically Christian devaluation of marriage but a variation of a theme which was familiar since Aristotle and current throughout the Stoic diatribe.[78] Later Chrysostom came to a balanced judgment on marriage, and Augustine in his *De bono conjugali* and *De sancta virginitate* reproved Jerome's vehemence.[79] With the *corpus* of Ambrose's works on virginity they represent the high point of Old Latin Christian literature on this theme: the theological justification which Augustine hit upon for Christian virginity, his clear delineation in regard to the quite proper rank of marriage, and the sensible look at its dangers for those who freely chose it, secured for his estimation of virginity its millenial long-range effect.

---

[71] *In Ep. ad Hebr.* 7, 4: *In Gen. hom.* 21, 6; *In Mt. hom.* 7, 7.

[72] Cf., for example, Chrysostom, *In Ep. ad Hebr. hom.* 24; Ambrose, *De fuga saec.* Augustine, *sermo* 170 and *sermo de peregrinatione huius vitae* (*Misc. Agos.* I, 285); Eucherius of Lyon, *Ep. ad Valerianum cognatum de contemptu mundi*; see Z. Alszeghy, "Fuite du monde," *DSp* 5, 1593–1599.

[73] Augustine gives the deepest motive in *De utilitate jejunii*; see the translation of R. Arbesmann (Würzburg 1958), XIX–XXXVI.

[74] Basil, *Hom.* 7 (*ad divites*), used by Ambrose, *De Nabuthe*; see the commentary of J. Huhn, *De Nabuthe* (Freiburg 1950); Gregory of Nyssa, *De pauperibus amandis* I–II; John Chrysostom, *De eleemosyna,* see O. Plassmann, *Das Almosen bei Johannes Chrysostomus* (Münster 1961); Salvian, *Ad ecclesiam 11. IV,* ed. G. Lagarrigue, *SChr* 176 (Paris 1971); J. Mausbach, *Die Ethik des hl. Augustinus* I (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1929), 284–298; E. F. Bruck, *Kirchenvater und soziales Erbrecht* (Berlin 1956).

Cult of Martyrs and Saints

The freedom won through Constantine's conversion to Christianity gave to the already important cult of martyrs strong new impulses, which caused it to become, in the next hundred years, a very characteristic and, in its consequences, highly significant form of Early Christian piety, in whose development both the private initiative of individual faithful and the Church as representative of public worship shared. The previous view of the martyr as the perfect imitator of Christ, who through the power of grace had given witness to his Lord with his blood and now as *coronatus,* as the contemporary Christian art liked to show him, united with him in the glory of the next life, underwent no substantial modification; only one feature was now stressed: his dignity and his nearness to the glorified Lord made him the advocate of the faithful on earth and the protector of the individual as well as of the community which chose him as its patron.[80] Out of this esteem grew the strong interest in the grave of the witness to the faith and in the relics which it sheltered. In its direct possession was seen a special guarantee of the protection and intercession of the patron and it was distinguished from all other graves by a special cult building, erected as *martyrion* or *memoria* respectively or as a basilica over the grave, which in size and furnishing often vied with the churches of the community within the city walls. The community assembled in these cemetery churches on the *dies natalis martyris* to celebrate the Eucharist.[81] From the same root sprang the zealous effort to rediscover the tombs of those martyrs concerning whose martyrdom tradition often supplied only a summary account or who had fallen into oblivion in the shadow of an especially vivid martyr-figure, such as an early bishop of the community. The *inventio* of such a grave, which was often due to a vision or to information provided in a dream, became the most significant event which deeply affected the worship and piety of the community. Especially momentous *inventiones* of this sort were, in the West, the discovery of the bones of the Milanese martyrs Gervasius and Protasius, Nazarius and Celsus by Bishop Ambrose in 386 and the rediscovery of the grave of Stephen at Kaphargamala near Jerusalem in 415, which produced a new wave of devotion to Stephen, which, with the dispersal of his relics, embraced all areas of the Empire in a very short time.[82]

---

[75] A summary of this work is given by T. Camelot, "Les traités De virginitate au IV^e siècle," *Etudes Carmélit.* 31 (1952), 273–292.

[76] Eusebius of Emesa, *Hom. VI–VII De martyribus* or *De virginibus,* ed. E. M. Buytaert, Eusèbe d'Emèse, *Discours conservés en latin* I (Louvain 1953), 151–195. A homily of pseudo-Basil, *De virginitate,* D. Amand, *RBén* 63 (1953), 34–69, 211–238, is applied directly to the *paterfamilias*; see D. Amand de Mendieta, *RHE* 50 (1955), 777–820. On Athanasius: M. Aubineau, "Les écrits de s. Athanase sur la virginité," *RAM* 31 (1955), 140–173.

[77] Gregory of Nyssa, *De virg. praef.* 1, 1; c. 23, 3, 4, 7, ed. M. Aubineau, *SChr* 119 (Paris 1966).

[78] Cf. G. Chr. Hansen, "Molestiae nuptiarum," *Wiss. Zschr. Univ. Rostock* 12 (1963), 215–219.

[79] J. Dumortier, "Le marriage . . . d'après s. Jean Chrysostome," *Lettres d'humanité* 6 (1947), 102–166; R. d'Izary, *La virginité selon s. Ambroise* (Lyon 1952); J. G. Nolan, *Jerome and Jovinian* (Washington 1957). Augustine's reference to Jerome: *Retr.* 2, 48, 1.

A new phase of the cult of martyrs began with the *translatio* of the remains of martyrs to the churches within the city walls, although at first this procedure encountered considerable doubt and difficulties, since it was contrary to a twofold law, binding in East and West, according to which the deceased might be buried only outside city walls, and graves were regarded as "inviolable." The corresponding laws were repeatedly inculcated by the Christian Emperors also, and exceptions required the authorization of the highest administrative officials.[83] For the first known transfer of a martyr's body—that of St. Babylas to Antioch in 354[84]—the Caesar Gallus was able to give it more easily because with the new sanctuary of Babylas it was now possible definitively to displace in the suburb Daphne the cult of Apollo that had especially flourished there. In the transfer of the bodies of martyrs that he had found, Ambrose apparently regarded his position as bishop of the imperial residence as sufficient to exempt him from this law, but other bishops had to ask a dispensation. In Persia Bishop Marutha of Maipherkat requested it in 410 from King Yezdegerd I, and the subsequent transfer of the Persian martyrs into his episcopal city included the change of its name to Martyropolis. In Rome people at first took a reserved view of the all too frequent transfers, but bestowed the greatest care on the martyrs' tombs and the buildings belonging to them. The place of the new burial in the city church could be only in the closest proximity to the center of the church, the altar; the most faithful followers of Christ, who had offered their life in a total self-sacrifice, should be in closest touch with the spot on which the memorial of Christ's sacrificial death was celebrated.[85] Hence altar and martyr's tomb were at that time brought together, both in theory and in practice, into that intimate connection which would later be the rule everywhere, according to liturgical law, where there was a Christian altar.

---

[80] H. Delegaye, *Les Origines . . . ,* 100–140: "L'invocation des martyrs."

[81] On the cemeterial basilicas: A. Grabar, *Martyrium* I; R. Krautheimer, "Mensa-Coemeterium-Martyrium," *CahArch* 11 (1960), 15–40.

[82] Ambrose's report: *Ep.* 22; the discovery of Stephen's grave in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Analecta Hierosol. Stachyl.* 5 (Petersburg 1898), 25–53; the Latin text in *PL* 41, 807–818.

But this aim could be realized only if portions of martyrs' remains were supplied to those communities and churches which did not have so precious a possession at their disposal, and so it was necessary to proceed to multiply martyrs' relics by division into small and minute parts. The objections springing here from burial law and theological scruples were overcome with the argument that the protection and benefit for a community produced by the smallest particle of a relic was more significant than the integrity of the corpus, and the bodily resurrection of a martyr was not jeopardized, in view of God's omnipotence, by such parcelings.[86] They were also facilitated by the partition, begun earlier, of the Cross of Christ, particles of which went forth from the middle of the fourth century to all areas where Christianity had spread.[87] As with the transfer of whole tombs of martyrs, the obtaining, transfer, and burial of the relics of martyrs in the altar of the church was elaborated into a solemn ceremony. Since even this partition of relics did not satisfy the numerous demands, and since in the West people remained far more reserved in regard to the partitioning, a substitute was established in the so-called "second-class relics," usually expensive fabrics, which were brought into contact with the martyr's tomb or the place where the relics were deposited, to which, in accord with an ancient and Christian idea, the protective and healing power of the original relics then passed.[88] Parallel to the sharing of relics, still controlled by the Church to a degree, ran the intensive exertion of private circles to come into possession of such precious phylacteries, which early led to the doubtful abuses of a far-flung commerce in relics; they were, of course, disapproved by ecclesiastical and civil officials but could never be completely eliminated.

---

[83] *Cod. Theod.* 9, 17, 6, 7; on *translatio* in general: B. Kötting, *Reliquienkult,* 15–24.

[84] Sozomen, *HE* 5, 19, 13–19.

[85] Ambrose, *Ep.* 22, 13; see F. Wieland, *Altar und Altargrab* (Leipzig 1912); T. Klauser, *RAC* I, 343ff.

[86] Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 4, 26, 13; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or. c. Jul.* 1, 69; Gaudentius, *Tr.* 17, 35; Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina* 27, 447.

The conviction of the intercessory power of martyrs led many Christians to want to be themselves buried as close as possible to a martyr's grave. From this burial *ad sanctos* people expected aid for themselves at the hour of the resurrection, because one was conducted before God's judgment seat by the martyr who rose with him. The sober statement of Augustine that the place of burial of itself guaranteed no help for a dead person, but only the prayer of the living who commended him to the intercession of the martyrs, did very little to check this powerfully blazing desire in the second half of the fourth century for interment near the grave of a saint. Finally, the Church had to regulate by law burial inside a church and reserve it for a small circle of persons—bishops, priests, and a few lay persons of high rank.[89]

The cult of martyrs as an Early Christian form of piety was not promoted chiefly by the lay world or by monasticism, but in its essential features it was motivated, justified, and encouraged by the Church and its theologians. In scarcely any of the not very bulky homiletic legacy of a pastor of the time are there missing sermons in honor of a martyr, which extol his dignity, the power of his intercession, the example of his love of Christ, and the miracle-working efficacy of his relics. The Church not only allowed the interment of his body inside the house of God: it let its liturgical calendar be decisively determined by the memorial days of the martyrs and admitted their names into the text of the Eucharistic Prayer.

---

[87] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 4, 10; 10, 19; 13, 4.

[88] On second-class relics see B. Kötting, "Reliquienverehrung," *TThZ* 67 (1958), 327–334.

[89] Augustine, *De cura gerenda pro mortuis* 18; burial "ad sanctos": B. Kötting, *Reliquienkult,* 24–36.

The cult of saints who did not rank as martyrs began somewhat hesitantly in the first half of the fourth century and reached full development in its last two decades; it was, after all, an extension of the cult of martyrs to a group of the dead whose life and actions enabled them to be compared to the martyrs in some degree, because it likewise represented an outstanding profession and witness for Christ. They included, first of all, those who in time of persecution had suffered for the faith in prison, under torture, or in exile, but the desired confirmation by a bloody death was denied them. With such *confessores* were soon associated individual ascetics and monks, whose life was willingly ranked as unbloody *martyrium,* and finally also those who especially proved themselves in the Arian troubles or in the missions as courageous adherents and zealous preachers of the orthodox faith. *Martyrium sine cruore* was granted to all those, and they were quickly celebrated in word and writing, like the other martyrs: the hermits Antony and Hilarion, the Syrian monks, especially the Stylites, the exiled Bishops Paulinus of Trier, Dionysius of Milan, Athanasius, the protagonist of Orthodoxy, Basil, Peter of Sebaste, Ambrose of Milan, the missionary Martin of Tours, and others.[90] To them also was accorded the liturgical celebration of the day of their death and admittance into the liturgical calendar; private individuals and clerics competed in building memorial chapels and churches over their graves, in Syria even, as a precaution, in the lifetime of an esteemed hermit, and their relics were soon equally desired and at times literally fought over, as those of the old martyrs. The people were especially strongly involved in the spread and elaboration of the cult of this group of saints. The accounts of their life and activity were gladly filled in with that colorful detail which appealed to popular fantasy; the charismatic endowment of individuals was felt to be miraculous, and some lives of saints are mere collections of *miracula.*

In the Christian cult of saints were also included some outstanding figures from the world of the Old Testament, such as Moses, Abraham, David, some of the Prophets, and the Macchabee brothers, even though this was not without its difficulties for two reasons. The first was that thereby a certain recognition, if not commendation, of Judaism was expressed, and yet Christians were often still in polemical confrontation with it. Then, in the life of these persons the inner relationship to witnessing for Christ seemed to be lacking, and hence the decisive criterion for the dignity of martyr or confessor. Christian preaching theoretically countered this difficulty with the argument that these figures were Christians before the appearance of Christ, because their life served the ultimate goal of his coming, and thus the violent death of some Prophets, of Eleazar, of the Macchabees, could be understood as anticipated martyrdom and hence a Christian celebration in their memory was justified. In practice, the Christians of Palestine and Syria often neutralized or overcame the competing Jewish cult of saints by taking possession of the sites of the Jewish shrines and building churches there, such as at Hebron-Mambre, which then became centers of the Christian cult of saints.[91]

---

[90] H. Delehaye, *Sanctus,* 109–121: Du martyr au confesseur.

The cult of Mary had spread among the people long before theology had clarified the questions regarding her sanctity and virginity.[92] People besought "the protection of the *Theotokos*" at least at the beginning of the fourth century, as a prayer preserved on papyrus shows. However, in 377 Epiphanius of Salamis had to come out decisively against a sectarian debasement of her cult.[93] Bishop Severian of Gabala was of the opinion that Mary was to be invoked in prayer before the Apostles and martyrs; in the West her cult was theologically clarified and justified especially by Ambrose and Augustine.[94] The oldest Marian feast was celebrated in Constantinople even before the Council of Ephesus as *mneme Theotokou* on 26 December and in title and content recalled the *dies natalis* of the martyrs; the first churches dedicated to her go back likewise to this time. The Council of 431 freed the way for the complete development of the cult of Mary.[95]

Early Christian Pilgrimage

Another field of Early Christian popular devotion is found in the pilgrimage system, the prototypes of which are represented by the pilgrimage to the places most significant for memories of the Christian past, which lie above all in the Holy Land, and the pilgrimage to the tombs and relics of saints. The initial steps toward the pilgrimage to Palestine are seen, after a period of caution conditioned by the critical contrast to the Jewish pilgrimage system, in the pre-Constantinian journeys of individual Christians, such as Origen and the future Bishop Alexander of Jerusalem, a native of Cappadocia: they were motivated by theological and exegetical interests or by the desire to pray at the holy shrines.[96] As early as 315 larger crowds of pilgrims from all parts of the East were to be seen in Jerusalem,[97] and the pilgrimage movement received new incentives when, with the beginning of Constantine's sole rule, the external circumstances of the journey became more favorable and when the visit to the holy shrines received encouragement from higher up because of the esteem which the imperial family, especially Helena and Constantine himself, gave to it. But that one should not see in Constantine's measures the basic cause of the pilgrimages to Palestine is made clear by the report of the journey of a pilgrim from Bordeaux in 333, who in Jerusalem came upon a situation quite in accord with the entire pilgrimage system, such as can have developed only in a rather prolonged period of time.[98] In Jerusalem and its closest neighborhood, naturally, what was in the foreground for the pilgrims were the sites which had a relation to the events from the Redeemer's life; then followed the places of Old Testament tradition, while the cult of Christian saints began only with the discovery of Stephen's grave in 415, and the cult of Mary was discernible in Jerusalem still later. Hence the world of the Bible clearly determined the visits of the pilgrims: it was "the real Pilgrim's Guide" for the journey to the Holy Land.[99] This is true also for the places situated farther away, such as Cana in Galilee, Lake Genesareth, Mount Tabor, the Jordan Valley, the Dead Sea, Hebron in the south, and Mount Sinai.

---

[91] M. Simon, "Les saints d'Israel dans la dévotion de l'Église ancienne," *Recherches d'histoire judéo-chrétienne* (Paris 1962), 154–180.

[92] E. Jousaard, "Marie à travers la patristique," *Maria* I (Paris 1949), 69–157.

[93] Reproduction of the papyrus: *ECatt,* "Sub tuum;" against the early dating, but unconvincing, is O. Stegmüller, *ZKTh* 74 (1952), 76–82.

[94] Marian prayers in Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom.* 11; Augustine, *Sermo* 291, 6. C. W. Neumann, *The Virgin Mary in the Works of St. Ambrose* (Fribourg 1962).

[95] On the Marian feast: B. Capelle, *Études mariales* 7 (1949), 42ff.; A. Raes, *OrChrP* 12 (1946), 262–274. Cult of Mary in North Africa after Augustine: H. Barré, *RevÉAug* 13 (1967), 285–317.

Despite all external activity, as it showed itself occasionally at great pilgrimage centers, despite some bizarre and even grotesque individual features of the traffic in relics here, from the total experience of the Palestine pilgrimage, especially from the great liturgical observances of Holy Week and of the Finding of the Cross, lasting effects were produced on the devotion of the pilgrims, which were passed on by them after their return home. The precious account of the journey of the pilgrim Egeria attests this, despite all the simplicity of the statements, as decisively as do the letters of Jerome, based on observations made over years.[100]

The second type of pilgrimage, the visit to the grave and relics of the saints, naturally presupposed a certain progress in the cult of martyrs and saints, but it influenced its further expansion and intensification. In the course of the fourth century there developed, in the East a bit earlier than in the West, those great pilgrimage centers in all parts of the Empire, which always set large crowds of pilgrims in motion; here only the most important can be named.[101] In the Syrian capital, Antioch, with its many memorials of martyrs, that of the Seven Macchabees was, besides the shrine of Babylas, the most important point of attraction, but both were overshadowed by Kal'at Sim'an, the "rock" of Simeon the Older, the Stylite, who in his lifetime was the most popular ascetic of the entire Syrian area.[102] The grave of the Apostle Thomas at Edessa was as beloved a goal of pilgrims as the Church of Saint Sergius in Rusafa on the Euphrates, which in the Early Byzantine period saw the largest crowds of pilgrims.[103] In Seleucia-in-Isauria was the shrine of the legendary Thecla, Ephesus possessed the graves of the Apostle John and of the Seven Holy Sleepers, and from Chalcedon the miraculous blood-relics of Saint Euphemia proceeded into the Early Christian world.[104] A pilgrimage center with all its accessories had developed in Egypt around the tomb of Menas and made the City of Menas the "Early Christian Lourdes."[105] The highly regarded cult shrines of the capital of Constantinople were connected with outside saints: the two physicians Cosmas and Damian (*anargyroi*) and Daniel the Stylite; Demetrius, venerated also at Sirmium, obtained a famous shrine at Thessalonica.[106] In the Latin West no city could compete with Rome in the number of martyrs' tombs, among which those of the two Apostles Peter and Paul held the first rank also in the eyes of the numerous pilgrims; following them were the tombs of Hippolytus and Lawrence, all in the course of time distinguished by magnificent cemeterial basilicas. Bishop Paulinus proclaimed the glory of the martyr Felix at Nola in Campania, as the zealous custodian of his tomb.[107] At Carthage the annual memorial of Saint Cyprian attracted many Christians, who, to the sorrow of the bishop of the city, introduced the feast with a hardly edifying preliminary celebration. North Africa became the home of a widespread cult of Stephen, when relics from his grave arrived there after 415 and produced miraculous cures at Hippo, Calama, and Uzala, which were not questioned even by Augustine.[108] Catholics of Gaul and Spain made annual pilgrimages to Martin's grave at Tours; among them were many who expected a cure from their sickness. The Spaniards themselves had in the burial sites of the martyr Vincent at Zaragoza and of Saint Eulalia of Mérida pilgrimage shrines which were celebrated by Prudentius.[109]

---

[96] B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio,* 83–89.

[97] Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 6, 18, 23.

[98] *Itin. Burdig.* 589–596.

[99] B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio,* 105.

[100] New commentary on the *Itinerarium Egeriae*—text in *CSEL* 39, and *CChr* 175—by J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels* (London 1971). Jerome, *Epp.* 46; 108.

---

[101] Basic is H. Delehaye, *Les origines,* 141–403.

[102] G. Tschalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord* I (Paris 1953), 223–276.

[103] See J. Kollwitz, *Neue deutsche Ausgrabungen* (Berlin 1965), 45–70.

[104] F. Miltner, *Ephesus* (Vienna 1958), F. Halkin, *Euphémie de Chalcédoine* (Brussels 1965).

[105] Lives of Menas: *BHG* 3rd ed. nos. 1256–1269; state of the excavations in Menas City: W. Müller-Wiener, *AA* 1967, 457–480.

[106] L. A. Deubner, *Kosmas und Damian* (Leipzig 1907, reprint ed. 1969: report of miracles); A. Wittmann, *Kosmas und Damian* (Berlin 1967), On the *miracula s. Demetrii*: P. Lemerle, *ByZ* 46 (1953), 349–361, and V. Besevliev, *Byzantina* 2 (1970), 285–300.

[107] H. Leclercq, "Pèlerinage à Rome," *DACL* 14 (1939), 41–65; G. Bardy, *AnBoll* 67 (1949), 224–235; J. Fontaine, *Oikoumene* (Catania 1964), 243–266: Prudentius in Rome. On Felix of Nola: Paulinus, *Carmina* 15.

As the basic attitude for the pilgrimage the preachers of the period required a disposition which would prove itself in the following of Christ and the imitation of his saints. The motives could differ in individual pilgrims. In the foreground stood the desire and hope to find healing or counsel in personal need, especially in sickness; thanks for help given was also an opportunity for a promised pilgrimage. The notion of penance and expiation was not yet emphasized, even though it would hardly have been missing in the often great hardships of the pilgrim's journey. Criticism of the pilgrimage system was scarcely directed against the pilgrimage as such, but against the misunderstanding of it, its improper motivation, and the manifold corruptions of the practice of pilgrimage, especially as they appeared at the great pilgrimage centers.[110]

Survival of Pagan Customs in Christian Popular Piety

Like missionary work in all ages, so too that of the fourth and fifth centuries had to learn by experience that a relatively brief period of preparation for the reception of baptism did not suffice to supplant deep-rooted pagan practice in the newly converted. And so the pastors of all lands in East and West stood in a ceaseless struggle against various forms of pagan *superstitio,* which at times was mixed almost inextricably with what was Christian and seriously compromised the purity of devotion. People complained especially of the power of attraction of pagan magic, as practiced by astrologers, soothsayers, and faith-healers, who were again and again sought out by Christians, in spite of all the warnings of preachers.[111] The so-called Synod of Laodicea even had to decree that clerics of all ranks who acted as magicians, sorcerers, astrologers, and makers of amulets were to be deposed from their functions.[112] Chrysostom and Augustine knew practicing Catholics who had recourse to superstitiously selected days, incantations, and amulets, an especially objectionable practice, since they bore the sign of the cross. The Upper Italian Bishops Gaudentius of Brescia, Maximus of Turin, and Zeno of Verona had to censure the same procedure in some of their faithful.[113] Augustine knew that Christians used the book of the gospels to inquire into the future from it; others placed it on themselves in order to cure a headache, and with some resignation he stated that it was not intended for that but it was still at least preferable to pagan magic fillets.[114] In rural districts especially the attachment to the cult of trees, springs, and rocks continued tenaciously to exist, and again and again synods attacked it, apparently with no great success.[115] The attractions of pagan feasts could be dispelled only with difficulty, and persons even participated in revels in pagan temples. Clearly the temptation was irresistible for many when the days came, since on the Kalends of January the new year was introduced with boisterous celebration. Many bishops made the Kalends feast the theme of entire sermons and rejected the appeasing explanation of Christians that there was here still a question of a popular feast by arguing that the celebrations referred by their very origin to a pagan idol.[116]

---

[108] C. Cecchelli, "Il culto delle reliquie nell'Africa romana," *RPAA* 1939, 97–108; P. A. Février, "Le culte des martyrs en Afrique et ses plus anciens monuments," *Corsi di Ravenna* 17 (1970), 191–234.

[109] E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* 3 (Paris 1965), 214–259; C. García Rodríguez, *El culto de los santos . . .* (Madrid 1966).

[110] Such criticism was made by, for example, Gregory of Nyssa, *Ep.* 2, 17; John Chrysostom, *Ad Antioch. hom.* 3, 2; Jerome, *Ep.* 58, 4; Augustine, *In Joh. tr.* 10. See B. Kötting, *Stpatr* 5 (*TU* 80, Berlin 1962), 360–367.

An ingredient of the pagan cult of the dead was the *refrigerium,* a meal to which came the relatives of a deceased person on the third, seventh, and ninth days after the burial, on the anniversary of the death, and on the great memorial of the dead, the *Parentalia,* in February. The Christians retained this meal of the dead in a simple form without opposition from the Church and added to it a Christian feature when they had a part of the foods brought turned over to the poor. But in the fourth century this meal at the graves often assumed again, even among Christians, the noisy and unbridled form of pagan celebrations for the deceased.[117] Chrysostom not only blamed the loud lamentation of the relatives and wailers at a Christian funeral as pagan behavior, which contradicted the belief in the resurrection; he also disapproved the pomp which some Christians displayed there.[118] The meals were finally transferred into the churches on the memorials of the martyrs and in some places, especially in Italy and North Africa, degenerated into great revels with dancing and song. At Milan Ambrose, to whom the pagan origin of the *refrigeria* was always displeasing, early abolished them. Other bishops of North Italy followed him, whereas they continued at Rome, even in St. Peter's.[119] In Africa Augustine was the driving force that sought to end such abuses. He gained Bishop Aurelius of Carthage, where especially serious excesses occurred, for a discussion of the question at the Synod of 393 in Hippo, which forbade the custom. Augustine enforced the synodal decree, not without opposition, at Hippo and at the same time recommended that the foods hitherto destined for the memorial meal in the church be used for an *agape* at the graves of the dead in the cemetery and that gifts be given to the poor and the needy at the same time, for that was the Christian way, in addition to the liturgical celebration for the dead, to recall the deceased.[120]

---

[111] H. Leclercq, "Magie," *DACL* X (1931), 1097–1114; A. A. Barb, "The Survival of Magic Arts," A. D. Momigliano, *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the 4th Century* (Oxford 1963), 100–125; P. Brown, "Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity," *Religion and Society in the Age of Augustine* (London 1972), 119–146.

[112] Can. 35.

[113] John Chrysostom, *In Ep. 1 ad Tim. hom.* 10, 3; *In ep. ad Col. hom.* 8, 5; Gaudentius, *Tr.* 4, 13–16, 8, 16–18, 9, 27; Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 61, c. 4, 94, 98; Zeno of Verona, *Tr.* 1, 15, 6; 2, 21, 2. On Augustine, in addition to Zellinger (with literature), see also E. Hendrikx, *Augustiniana* 4 (1954), 109–136.

[114] *Ep.* 55, 20, 37; *In Joh. tr.* 7, 12; *En. in ps.* 127, 11.

[115] Cf. E. J. Jonkers, "Die Konzile und einige Formen alten Volksglaubens," *Vig Chr* 22 (1968), 49–53.

[116] Sermons "In Kalendas": Asterius of Amasea, *Or.* 4; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 38; Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 63; Pacian, *Paraen.*; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155. Bo Reicke, "Jahresfeier und Zeitenwende im Judentum und Christentum der Antike," *ThQ* 150 (1970), 321–334; M. Meslin, *La fête des Kalendes de Janvier* (Brussels 1970), 95–129.

Of course, it did not escape Augustine's watchful eye that a paganism of a subtler sort than that of the realistic popular devotion continued in some Christians, and he saw in it no slight danger. The traditional pagan vital feeling was carried like a subtle poison, as it were, in the blood: the desires for this world, the pride in one's own *virtus,* which so greatly opposed the understanding of Christian grace, the instinctive shrinking back, ever more revealing itself, from a crucified God, and finally the strong protest against the basic attitude of *humilitas.* Adherence to these features of paganism was the reason which made so many Christians of the upper class remain semichristian for years. Like no other preacher, Augustine spoke anxiously again and again of this basic danger to the Christian.[121]

---

[117] On the Christian *refrigerium* and other features of the cult of the dead: A. M. Schneider, *Refrigerium* (Freiburg 1928), and the works of Klauser and Stuiber (with the literature).

[118] John Chrysostom, *In Ep. ad Hebr. hom.* 4, 5; *Sermo de Anna* 5. 5.

[119] Augustine, *Conf.* 6, 2 (on Ambrose). Also unclear ideas on the fate after death played a role in the attitude of the bishops; see A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim* (Bonn 1957).

[120] Augustine's report on the proceedings: *Epp.* 22 and 29; synodal decree of 393: Mansi, III, 923. On the liturgy of the celebration of the dead, E. Freistedt, *Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage* (Münster 1928); A. C. Rush, *Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity* (Washington 1941).

The Laity in the Church[122]

The division of Christians, into the three groups of laity, clergy, and monks, actually already existing at the turn of the fourth century, became more precise in the course of the century and gradually found its fixed place in law together with the development of the corresponding terminology. In this process a clear change in the previous importance and position of the laity within the Church became perceptible, which went back to several causes. With the end of the persecutions the very intensely experienced community of the pre-Constantinian Church between clergy and laity, created by the same expectation of martyrdom, was relaxed everywhere. The glory of martyrdom now, in the opinion of many, passed ever more to asceticism and monasticism, the lifestyle of which, as already indicated, was esteemed as an unbloody martyrdom, and, even unintentionally created a clear distance between itself and the mass of believers. Further, because of the differentiation of functions and still more because of the expansion of its tasks and authority in the care of souls and administration, the clergy gained such power in authority and public respect that the previous position of the laity could not remain uninfluenced by it. And monasticism, with its outlook of holding itself far aloof from "the world," promoted the idea according to which the effort to work out its salvation directly in this world was regarded as doubtful in principle;[123] finally, the sort of lifestyle of many lay persons in the fourth and fifth centuries produced in some pastors a rather skeptical evaluation of the lay element.

The consequences of this change were, of course, neither the same in all areas of Christendom, nor was there always a question of a merely negative repudiation of lay influence, but often of a shifting within its previous spheres of duty. In the basilica the place of the people was now clearly distinct from the place of the clergy, which no lay person was supposed to enter.[124] In procession there developed a certain order of precedence, whereby the clergy, the monks, and the virgins and widows went ahead of the "people."[125] In the pastoral spheres, lay persons still took part in the preparation of the catechumens for baptism, especially widows in the instruction of the women; in cases of necessity lay persons could baptize, but women should not administer baptism, any more than they might instruct men.[126]

---

[121] Cf. P. Borgomeo, *L'église de ce temps dans la prédication de s. Augustin* (Paris 1972), 102–112.

[122] P. G. Caron, *I poteri giuridici del laicato nella chiesa primitiva* (Milan 1948); G. H. Williams, "The Role of the Layman in the Ancient Church," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* (Durham 1958), 9–42; W. H. C. Frend in St. Neill–H. R. Weber, *The Layman in Christian History* (London 1963), 57–87; E. Lanne, "Le laïcat dans l'Église ancienne," *Verbum Caro* 18 (1964), 105–126.

[123] Y. Bodin, "S. Jérôme et les laïcs," *REAug* 15 (1969), 113–147.

The ancient right of the laity to cooperate in the choosing of their clergy continued in principle and was still especially exercised in the election of the bishop. Of course, the form of their collaboration was not precisely fixed: for the most part it consisted of an acclamation of the candidate proposed. The people were also supposed to be consulted in the possible transfer of a bishop to another see; however, at least in the deposition of a bishop they were usually ignored. The Emperors especially often intervened in the election of a bishop, without regard for this right of the laity. The Synod of Laodicea, however, expressed itself against a participation by "the crowd" in the choosing of the clergy. In the West lay persons occasionally could take part in the annual synods; once, at a Gallic synod, the presence of lay representatives was prescribed.[127]

More and more the notion prevailed that the right "to teach" had to be reserved to the clergy. Thus lay preaching virtually ceased. Pope Leo I expressly forbade it and extended the prohibition to monks also, even if they had a certain level of education.[128] The few known exceptions only confirm the general practice. But the *Apostolic Constitutions* still permitted a lay person to be a teacher of catechumens, if he showed himself suited by his ability and his conduct. Only once was it permitted a layman to teach in the presence of clerics: however, this was not a right of the laity but a concession of the clerics.[129] Parallel to this limitation of an official teaching activity of the laity there developed, however, a growing sharing of the laity in the theological literary work of the time, which can be ascertained expecially in the West. Well-known "lay theologians" of this sort were, for example, Arnobius, Lactantius, Firmicus Maternus, Marius Victorinus, perhaps the "Ambrosiaster," and Prosper of Aquitaine.[130] The Donatist Church displayed qualified lay theologians in the teacher Cresconius and in Tyconius; in the circle of Pelagius were likewise found theologically interested laymen, and there were others, like Helvidius, among the correspondents and literary opponents of Jerome.

---

[124] *Const. Ap.* II, 57, 4–5; Synod of Laodicea, can. 19.

[125] Victricius, *De laude sanctorum* 2–3.

[126] Council of Elvira, can. 38; *Const. Ap.* III, 9; Augustine, *C. epist. Parmen.* 2, 13, 29; *Stat. eccl. ant.*, can. 37, 41, 100. On the group of "widows" see R. Gryson, *Le ministère des femmes dans l'église ancienne* (Gembloux 1972).

[127] For the West see J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1959), 331–333; for the East, *Const. Ap.* 7, 31, 1; 8, 4, 2; Theodoret, *HE* 1, 7, 10; 5, 9, 17; Sozomen, *HE* 5, 13, 2; 2, 19; Palladius, *Dial.* 16; Socrates, *HE* 1, 9; Chrysostom, *In II Cor. hom.* 18, 3; *In II Ep. ad Tim. hom.* 5, 1; *In Act. hom.* 14, 3; Synod of Laodicea, c. 13. According to the *Stat. eccl. ant.*, can. 10, the bishop must obtain the testimony and agreement of the laity before ordaining a priest. Laity at synods: *Conc. Illib. init.*; *Conc. Regense* (439); *CChr* 148, 73.

[128] Leo I, *Ep.* 118, 2; 119, 6; 120, 6.

[129] *Const. Ap.* 8, 32, 17; 3, 5; *Stat. eccl. ant.*, can. 38.

Unmistakable also was the influence of lay persons in high official or private position on the many areas of ecclesiastical life. Augustine's friend, the Count Marcellinus, could conduct the religious debate of Carthage in 411 and even act as arbiter. In the East ministers and high officials such as Eutropius, Candidian, John, Irenaeus at Ephesus, Chrysoretus, and Chrysaphius played a considerable ecclesiastico-political role. Well-to-do lay persons followed the example of Constantine as promoters of ecclesiastical construction and as founders of charitable institutions or supported the Church's care of the poor by corresponding bequests.

The calling upon the laity for the administration of Church property was often practiced but not uniformly regulated. In North Africa *seniores laici,* probably elected by the community, as a sort of ecclesiastical council, established an institutionalized field of duties. But in the East they were more and more replaced by clerics, although Chrysostom regretted that, for this reason, these were unable to do justice to their proper task of caring for souls.[131]

In East and West the importance and goal of the lay apostolate was clearly seen and urgently called for by the Church. It was seen as justified in the always recognized general priesthood of the laity, and hence it should be intended for the Universal Church. Chrysostom and Augustine precisely circumscribed the field of duties of this apostolate: they moved to first place the exemplary day-to-day Christian life, whereby a pagan would sooner be gained to Christianity than by any scholarly theological argument. Then, it should show itself in prompt and energetic help for the fellow Chrstian in religious or moral danger, who should be strengthened by the further giving of what one has learned in church from Christian preaching. To the unalterable content of such an apostolate belonged, finally, the missionary work of the layman among the pagans or heretics of his circle of acquaintances, who could be reached only with difficulty by the official preaching of the Church. The lay apostolate should be exercised in close collaboration with the clergy, who, according to Chrysostom, always need the prayer, the advice, and, at times, also the criticism of the laity,[132] as, conversely, the Church prays especially for the laity.[133]

---

[130] M. Sauvage, *Catéchèse et laïcat,* 97–99; 152–161.

[131] On the *seniores laici*: W. H. C. Frend, *JThS,* n. s. 12 (1961), 280–284. Synod of Antioch, c. 25; John Chrysostom, *In Mt. hom.* 85, 3; *In ep. ad Tit. hom.* 1, 4. Council of Chalcedon, c. 26.

---

[132] On the general priesthood of the faithful in the patristic age: J. Lecuyer, *MD* 27 (1951), 5–51; for the view of Chrysostom and Ambrose, cf. A. Nocent–B. Studer, *VetChrist* 7 (1970), 305–324, 324–340. The lay apostolate according to Chrysostom: P. Rentinck, op. cit., 235–250.

[133] Serap., *Euchol.,* can. 3, 5, 6.

CHAPTER 19

Early Christian Monasticism: Development and Expansion in the East

I. THE RELIGIOUS AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

When, in the two decades preceding the turn from the third to the fourth century, individual Christians in Egypt and, perhaps quite independently of these, in eastern Syria broke with their previous life in their family and community and went into solitude apart from other human beings in order to lead a life there of voluntary poverty and sexual continence, the step was taken which was to move beyond Early Christian ascetism to monasticism proper. Thereby began the history of a phenomenon of the inner life of the Church which had far reaching consequences for the Christianity of the succeeding centuries in East and West and characterizes it in various ways down to the present.

In a few decades areas remote from populous centers in Upper Egypt, later called the Thebaid from its geographical center of Thebes, and the region of the Nitrian Desert southwest of Alexandria, as well as the hilly country around Edessa in East Syria were settled by numerous anchorites, who built primitive huts for themselves or were satisfied with a cave. Many of them led their life in full isolation from one another and remained hermits in the strict sense for their lifetime; others, without any firm tie by means of a promise or a fixed rule, attached themselves to one of their number, who was to be their spiritual adviser and thus established a loose union of anchorites. History does not know any clearly outlined figure from whom, through his mere example or enticing word, the notion of realizing the following of Christ in such a way first proceeded. The young Egyptian Antony, who c. 273 left his native village of Kome in central Egypt in order to live as a hermit, first in its vicinity, later in the Libyan Desert, and then on a hill on the Nile, is indeed often called "the Father of Egyptian monasticism" but he was not the first anchorite: he was only one of many,[1] for whom, however, his charismatic endowment and the rank of his biographer Athanasius gained a very high repute. Since for the anchoretic life of East Syria, which was beginning about the same time, no clearly tangible founding figure can be named, the question of the causes of this unique phenomenon acquires special importance.

The history of religion, in the search for an answer, has looked carefully at non-Christian models, from which Christian monasticism may perhaps have been derived. Thus for a while it was believed that a preliminary stage had been found in the so-called *Katochoi* of the Egyptian god Sarapis, hence in those men who served their god in individual cells at the temple of Sarapis in Memphis or at other shrines, temporarily renouncing their possessions.[2] Certain common features of the religious attitude seem to speak in favor of deriving monasticism from some religious and philosophical trends in Hellenism, especially Neoplatonism and Neopythagoreanism, such as the emphasis on inner recollection and on holy silence in the interest of a clear self-knowledge, and finally a strikingly full agreement in ascetical terminology.[3] Most recently there has been an emphasis on certain influences which proceeded from Manichaeanism—and indirectly through it even from the contemporary Buddhism—on Early Christian asceticism and above all on the monasticism that further developed from it, not only in Egypt, but even more in Syrian Mesopotamia.[4] Here are adduced certain external traits, which are common to both movements, such as the extremely severe fasting, the absolute disengagement from every family tie, as well as the extreme rejection of earthly possessions and of manual labor. Finally, the question must present itself as to whether the immediate precursor of Christian monasticism, at least for the cenobitic type of the first disciples of Pachomius, must not be found in the "monastic community" of Qumran:[5] in its strict organization of the community life, its rejection of private property, its obligation to celibacy, and in its day-to-day ascetical practice, the Pachomian monasticism was to a great degree anticipated in the Qumran community.[6]

---

[1] Athanasius, *Vita S. Antonii* 3.

[2] Cf. the research of P. Gobillot, "Les origines du monachisme chrétien et l'ancienne religion de l'Égypte," *RSR* 10–12 (1920–22).

[3] Important are: R. Reitzenstein, "Das Athanasius Werk über das Leben des Antonius," *SAH* 1914, 8, and id. *Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca* (Göttingen 1916); for the terminology see K. Holl, "Die schriftstellerische Form des griechischen Heiligenlebens," *Ges. Aufs* II (Tübingen 1928), 249–269.

[4] First K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des christlichen Mönchtums,* 287–291; then A. Vööbus, "History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient," *CSCO* 184 (Louvain 1958), 158–169.

[5] See vol. I, 459 (literature) and 63–66; also E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran* (London 1960).

If Early Christian monasticism is first studied according to its self-understanding, there can be advanced from the corresponding literature a whole series of motives by which monks justified their decision for the form of life that they selected.[7] The idea of the following of Christ can, without difficulty, be recognized as the basic motive, which could be realized without compromise earliest in the radical estrangement from the "world," as Basil emphasized.[8] The monk intended "to go the humble way of Christ," the narrow and painful way of which Scripture speaks, whereby he might some day repeat the words: "See, we have left everything and followed you." (Matt. 19:27).[9] He was deeply permeated with the understanding that the following of the Lord forever placed him under the Cross, so that the Pachomian monks had themselves constantly reminded of the basis of their existence by a cross sewn on to their cloak, and Basil could define the existence of the monk precisely as "a carrying of the Cross."[10] In a steady gazing on their crucified model, the monks took up the hardships of their life and intended thus to effect their dying together with Christ.[11] They knew that in this they were gathered into a great troop, which was already living up to such an ideal before them, beginning with the Old Testament models of monasticism, Abraham, Moses, and Elijah, by way of John the Baptist, who in many respects seemed to them the founder of their mode of life,[12] to the Apostles and the primitive community in Jerusalem, which seemed to them, in its life characterized by an ascetic enthusiasm, the ever valid realization of the following of the Lord.[13] Without doubt a strong influence on the origin of early monasticism was this reaching back to the primitive Christian ideal whose theoretical rooting in the biblical world of ideas is already demonstrated. Since the days of Ignatius of Antioch the death of the Christian martyr ranked as the exalted form of the following of Christ; so the monks saw in the martyrs an inspiring prototype and made the latters' sacrifice of their lives for the Lord a constantly examined motive for their own attitude right down to the concrete demands of day-to-day asceticism.[14] In the persecution of Diocletian some of them had themselves been able to experience the mood of death proper to Christians; they now esteemed as their immediate precursors the ascetics of the third century and their own struggles as an unbloody martyrdom, which likewise deserved the *corona martyrii,* since it was practiced from the same conviction as the bloody form.[15]

---

[6] I. van den Ploeg, "Les Esséniens et les origines du monachisme chrétien," *Il Monachesimo orientale* (Rome 1958), 321–339; F. S. Pericoli Ridolfini (see the literature for this chapter).

[7] U. Ranke-Heinemann, *Das frühe Mönchtum. Seine Motive nach den Selbstzeugnissen* (Essen 1964).

[8] Basil, *Reg. fus. tract.* 6, 1.

[9] *Apophthegm. Patr.,* Arsen., 33; Ammonas, 11.

[10] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 32; Basil, *Renunt. saec.* 1.

[11] Pachomius, *Vita* I, 11: according to Chrysostom, *In Hebr. hom.* 15, 4, the monk should be "one crucified."

[12] Cf., for example, Serapion, *Ep. ad mon.* 11 (*PG* 40, 937B), and Jerome, *Ep.* 22, 36; 125, 7; for Abraham as model cf. Antony, *Ep.* 1, 1; Jerome, *Ep.* 58, 3.

[13] Cf. H. Bacht, "Heimweh nach der Urkirche. Zur Wesensdeutung des frühen Mönchtums," *Weltnähe oder Weltdistanz* (Frankfurt 1962), 114–140. The emotional nuance of "homesickness" and "nostalgia" should not cause one to soften the sober realism of ancient monasticism.

The following of Christ, supported by the concept of martyrdom, was finally preferably identified by early monasticism on a broad plane with the angelic life, that catchword that so drew people to asceticism; it was already used by the early Alexandrian theologians and helped to characterize the premonastic asceticism of East and West. It was reached only by way of the *apotaxis,* the renunciation of the world, through *enkrateia,* to be practiced in body and soul, through the exercise of the specific monastic virtues of poverty, obedience, and virginity, which led to the height of *apatheia,* the peaceful security in the possession of monastic perfection. In its perfection the *vita angelica* of monasticism thus became a life in the community of the angels, an anticipated life in Paradise.[16] With this a further motive for the monastic form of existence was touched upon, which did not, it is true, stand so prominently as others in the foreground, but was surely effective: the eschatological outlook of monasticism, which not only embraced the constant thought of one's own death, but also meant the conscious and wakeful expectation of the Lord's *Parousia.* A reawakening of the primitive Christian expectation of the *Parousia* is unmistakable in the early phase of monasticism,[17] and here there may be assumed at the earliest the influence of a certain disillusionment and sorrow over a legacy of the universal Early Christian enthusiasm, as it undeniably appears with the numerical growth of large Christian congregations in the period of peace of the third century.[18] However, this must not be equated with a rejection or a protest against the hierarchical Church as such or even only against the Church of the Empire of the fourth century, the problems of which did not take effect until monasticism had long been in a flourishing state and which therefore cannot be regarded as a cause for its origin.[19]

---

[14] See the copious material in E. E. Malone, op. cit.

[15] See vol. I, 295; also U. Ranke-Heinemann, op. cit., 97f.; also Jerome on the *Corona de Liliis,* which approaches the martyrdom of asceticism: *Ep.* 108, 31.

[16] Cf. S. Frank, ΑΓΓΕΛΙΚΟΣ ΒΙΟΣ (Münster 1964), which summarizes previous individual studies on the subject.

[17] Cf. U. Ranke-Heinemann, op. cit., 31f.

[18] Cf., for example, Origen, *In Ierem. hom.* 4, 3; Eusebius, *HE* 8, 1, 7–9.

With the realization of the following of Christ, thus understood, the Early Christian monk believed he could best fulfill two essential requirements of the gospel—those of a genuine striving for perfection and of a true love of God. The Lord's words in Matthew 19:21, "if you wish to be perfect," not only directly produced in Antony the decision as to his vocation: to many monks of the early period they became a motive, always to be reflected on anew, for their way of life.[20] Abbot Theodore designated the Pachomian system as the model for everyone who wanted to gather men around him in order to guide them to perfection.[21] The motive of the love of God is sounded everywhere in the literature of Early Christian monasticism: it is the source on which its asceticism is nourished. When Basil wanted to retain his friend Gregory for monasticism, he referred him to this, that "he who loves God abandons everything and withdraws into solitude with God"; Theodoret of Cyrrhus gave to his collection of monks' biographies the significant title of *History of the Love of God.*[22]

It thus became clear that Early Christian monasticism regarded itself as the realization of the purely Christian ideal of perfection and hence must be understood as a genuinely Christian creation, for an explanation of which a grasping at non-Christian models would be useless. The previously mentioned harmony between ascetical terminology and certain formulas of Hellenistic religious philosophy makes one think most easily of an indirect influence from this area, for example, by way of the teaching on perfection of Alexandrian theology, but this influence could be effective in a greater degree only in a later phase of monasticism, when educated men such as Evagrius Ponticus joined it in growing numbers. Among the early anchorites of Egypt and Syria, who mostly came from a lower social stratum, there were simply lacking the presuppositions for a deeper knowledge both of Hellenistic philosophy and probably of Origen, who may be regarded as the pioneer of monasticism in that through his doctrine of perfection he helped create a climate favorable to it.[23] And in regard to the Qumran sects, no ideological connection with later monasticism can be established, since their basic ideas directly contradicted the ideals of monasticism. To the Early Christian monk it would have been impossible to hate the sinner or to preach hatred of him; the consciousness of being an elect of the Sons of Light was just as foreign to him as the idea of ritual impurity, which at Qumran constituted the negatively oriented motive for the renunciation of marriage and of personal property. Finally, the protest of the Qumran people against the "wickedness in the temple" as the reason for their seclusion in the desert was as different from the motive of the following of Christ as was the eschatological hope of the monks for the Lord's *Parousia* from Qumran's expectation of the end of time, which was to bring the Messianic Kingdom to earth after a holy war against the Sons of Darkness.[24] Certain organizational similarities—a period of trial before admission,[25] manifestation of conscience to a superior—and ascetical practice, such as the external attitude in prayer, forms of fasting, depreciation of the bodily, can be established everywhere as common features where the followers of a religion aim to realize their ideals in the purest form in a community of their own, even a loosely organized one, and in this connection one may think of the Manichaean or Buddhist asceticism. Saint Ephrem pointedly expressed himself on this problem when he thus characterized the relationship between Syrian asceticism and that of the Manichaeans: "Their works are similar to ours, their fasting is like ours, but their faith is not like our faith."[26] The spirit on which the Early Christian monasticism lived was entirely different from that which externally similar religious tendencies or ways of behavior evoked. The question of the concrete occasion, which in the second half of the third century caused the turning of so many Christians to the monastic manner of life, can probably only be answered by saying that the ascetical ideal, long proclaimed in contemporary Christianity and already realized in an early form, was now so mature and strong that it pressed with an irresistible force for realization in an ultimately possible form, as this became tangible at the same time in Egypt and Syria.

---

[19] H. Bacht, "Mönchtum und Kirche," *Sentire Ecclesiam, Festschr. H. Rahner* (Freiburg 1961), 113–133, especially pp. 115–123.

[20] *Vita s. Antonii* 2; Basil, *Ep.* 223, 2; *Reg. fus. tract.* 8, 1; Cassian, *Collat.* 21, 5 (*quibus evangelicus cotidie intonat sermo)*; ibid. 3, 4 (Antony).

[21] T. Lefort, *Vies coptes de s. Pachôme* (Louvain 1943), 276.

[22] Basil, *Ep.* 2, 4; Theodoret, Φιλόθεος ἱστορία (*PG* 82); cf. U. Ranke-Heinemann, op. cit., 18–25.

---

[23] See H. Crouzel, "Origène, précurseur du monachisme," *Théologie de la vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 15–38; W. Schneemelcher, "Erwägungen zu dem Ursprung des Mönchtums in Ägypten," *Christentum am Nil* (Recklinghausen 1964), 131–141, especially 139; K. S. Frank, "Vita apostolica," *ZKG* 82 (1971), 145–66, especially 159ff.

[24] J. van den Ploeg, op. cit. 321–339.

[25] Cf., for example, A. Penna, "Il reclutamento nell'Essenismo e nell'antico monachesimo orientale," *RQum,* 1(1959), 345–364.

[26] Ephrem, *Prose Refutations* I (London 1912, ed. C. W. Mitchell), 184; on the thesis of A. Vööbus cf. A. Adam, *GCA* 213 (1959), 127–145.

II. DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION IN THE EAST

1. Egyptian Anchoritism. The Pachomians. The Monasticism of the Deserts of Nitria and Scete

THE EGYPTIAN ANCHORITISM. The early form of Christian monasticism was embodied in the anchorites, those Christians who, from the second half of the third century in a rapidly growing number, added to the asceticism hitherto practiced within the Christian community the permanent withdrawal from family and community. It became especially clearly discernible in Egyptian anchoritism, because in this case the state of the sources permits one of the richest glimpses into the development of early monasticism. A still recognizable intermediate stage between asceticism and anchoritism, in which an ascetic withdrew temporarily into solitude, existed also in other geographical areas: thus in the first years of the third century the later Bishop of Jerusalem, Narcissus, and before the mid-century the Roman priest Novatian, "out of love for [another] philosophy," went for a while into solitude.[27] Out of the world of Novatian rigorism proceeded also the anchorite Eutychian, who shortly after 300 lived on Bithynian Olympus as a highly esteemed hermit, without its being possible to demonstrate a connection with Egyptian anchoritism.[28] That Egyptian anchoritism had existed long before the great Antony is proved by the figure of the hermit living in the vicinity of his native village, whom Antony sought out soon after his own embracing the life of an anchorite and made his model.[29] Thus as the Early Christian asceticism in the cases just mentioned, apparently independent of one another, led to anchoritism in the vicinity of one's native village, so the latter in turn led to the stricter form of eremitism in the Egyptian desert. Here too a relatively early initial effort c. 300 is warranted, since a reliable report on the hermit Ammun presupposes the existence of some hermits in the Nitrian Desert and perhaps also in distant Scete long before his turning to anchoritism in common c. 320–330.[30] When in several favored areas the settlements of the hermits grew in number, there occurred the formation of anchorite communities, loose associations in which the hermits gathered around a monk of high repute who was to be their spiritual adviser and father, without, however, the position of superior of this community being given to him in the sense of an "abbot," for example, through a definite rule. Such groups of anchorites, which often united a considerable number of hermits, living separate from one another in their huts or other lodgings (cells), are frequently mentioned in the *apophthegmata* literature and the related descriptions of anchoritism of the *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius and the *Historia monachorum.* Thus in the Upper Egyptian Thebaid were the monks Or, Apollo, Pityrion, and Copres, "fathers of many brothers"; in the area of Arsinoe hermits flocked around the Abbot Serapion, who was also a priest.[31] The highest repute was gained by the colonies of anchorites of Lower Egypt, which were formed southwest of the Nile Delta in the wildernesses of Nitria and Scete.

---

[27] Eusebius, *HE* 6, 9, 6–10 (Narcissus); 6, 43, 16 (Novatian); see F. J. Dölger, *AuC* VI, (1950), 61–64.

[28] Socrates, *HE* 1, 13, 1–10.

[29] Athanasius, *Vita s. Antonii* 3.

[30] Socrates, *HE* 4, 23; see K. Heussi, op. cit., 75.

Antony the Great (c. 251–356), however, who overshadowed all the others, was regarded in the early monastic literature as the "Father" of a community of anchorites, first because his charismatic gift of leadership made him a unique spiritual guide ever more sought out by the hermits, and then because his biography, composed by the Bishop of Alexandria, Athanasius, who knew him personally, assigned him a singular position in the development of Egyptian monasticism. The special character and tendency of this account, whose authenticity can no longer be doubted,[32] must, of course, be noted, if one wants to obtain an accurate picture of Antony's life from the incidents and individual features here related. It has been rightly said that it offers no photograph of the saint but rather the work of a painter, who, so far as he can, aspires to reproduce the reality in which Antony lived.[33] As early as the first period of his anchoretic life, in which Antony lived in the burial chambers of the cemetery near his native village, are found essential characteristics of Egyptian monasticism: manual labor, prayer, and reading of Scripture. On each monk who had made progress, however, there was laid a task which he could not evade: the struggle with the demon, who played an especially ample role in the life of Antony.[34] It was ultimately a struggle with all the forces opposed to God, which had to consist of an ever new start and could be endured only in faith. Since a person was most strongly exposed to the demonic in the extreme solitude of the desert,[35] that was precisely where he took his stand and best proved his monastic character. Only one who had stood this final test could be a guide and adviser to others in their struggles.[36] Thus, when he was about thirty-five years old, Antony also left the vicinity of his home and proceeded to an abandoned fort on the other side of the Nile on the edge of the desert, which for twenty years was the scene of his struggle.[37] When he again left it in order to strengthen in their courage as confessors the Christians imprisoned at Alexandria in the persecution of Diocletian,[38] he came forward "as from a holy shrine, initiated into deep mysteries and as one filled with God."[39] He stayed for some years in this fort, but now as "father" of many hermits,[40] until he went still deeper into the desert c. 313, to the "inner mountain," some distance from the west bank of the Red Sea, but here too he was soon sought out by many "brothers" who wanted his advice and by clerics and lay persons who begged his aid.[41] Antony fully shared of the wisdom he had thus gained with the anchorites in his conversations, which Athanasius put together in long discourses; in them, despite all the rhetorical ornament, resound the Pauline ideas of demonic powers, which are overcome only by faith in the power of Christ. Antony attributes ultimately to this power his insight into the nature of the demonic and its power.[42]

---

[31] Cf., for example, *Hist. mon.* 2, 1; 8, 2; 10, 1; 15, 1; 18, 1.

[32] Cf., for example, K. Heussi, *Ursprung des Mönchtums,* 78–81.

[33] Thus L. Bouyer, op. cit., 39.

[34] Ibid., 69–98, and G. Switek, "Wüstenväter und Dämonen," *GuL* 37 (1964), 340–358.

[35] Athanasius, *Vita s. Antonii* 51–53.

[36] Ibid. 8–14.

CENOBITISM OF THE PACHOMIANS. In fact, it was an anchorite who had gone through Pauline school who understood that many a monk was imperilled rather than protected by this severest type of eremitism, and that therefore he was in need of a life in a community which gave him both a foundation and support through the brothers and through a spiritual adviser accessible at any time and at the same time made him equal to the numerous ascetical renunciations which a life in common imposed. Pakhôme, or Pachomius, born in the Upper Thebaid c. 287, as a young soldier under Maximinus Daia had come into contact with Christianity and after his military discharge had been baptized and then attached himself to a hermit named Palamon.[43] After spending several years as a hermit, he established a monastic community near the Upper Egyptian village of Tabennisi between 320 and 325: the members, by accepting a rule he had composed, bound themselves to realizing an ascetical manner of life in common that was the same for all, under the direction of a superior.[44] In this way Pachomius became the founder of cenobitism, which since then has never ceased to be practiced and was first to give to Christian monasticism its specifically religious and cultural effectiveness. This was true even when, for example, simultaneous foundations of a similar type could not be excluded,[45] since only to the work of Pachomius can really creative significance be assigned, which was based on his personality and was recognized as such by his contemporaries as well as by future ages. Certainly, for the first Pachomian monastery at Tabennisi, as well as for the monastic Rule, a rather long period of growth and maturation must be assumed, during which the ideas of the founder were clarified, especially the details.[46] Hence, in its extant form, the Pachomian Rule and the biographies of him reflect a certain completing of the monastic development.

---

[37] Ibid. 11–12.

[38] Ibid. 46.

[39] Ibid. 14.

[40] Ibid. 15.

[41] Ibid. 49–50; 61–64; 68; 72.

[42] Ibid. 5; 7; 9; 11; 30; 39; 40; 74–80; 83–84.

[43] T. Lefort, *Vies coptes,* 84; *Vita graeca* I, 12.

[44] The Coptic sources, especially *Vies coptes,* 67–69, report somewhat hazily of a first unsuccessful effort of this sort. The "Rule" is completely preserved only in Jerome's Latin translation. To the various Coptic versions must be added the Greek lives of Pachomius, of which the *Vita prima* is the most important, as well as Arabic and Syriac texts. On the extremely complex problem of their reciprocal relations, see finally A. Veilleux, op. cit., 11–107.

The exterior structure of a Pachomian monastery makes clear the new concept as opposed to anchoritism. The entire area of the monastery was surrounded by a wall and hence stressed its separation from the world: it could be entered only through the porter's quarters.[47] As its center may be regarded the great room (*synaxis—ecclesia*) in which the monks gathered for the liturgy.[48] The refectory for all the inhabitants of the monastery also underlined the community character of the new foundation.[49] The community, directed by the "father of the monastery," beside whom stood a substitute,[50] did not, however, live in a large continuous building, but was spread out in a series of houses, whose thirty to forty inmates were appointed for the most part to special duties in the service of the community—weavers, gardeners, bakers, fishers, shepherds—and were subject to their own house-superior or a "second" respectively.[51] The monastic community obtained its support partly through the work of monks again occupied in their former craft, the products of which were to some extent sold, and partly through the management of property which was acquired near the monastery.[52] Two traits of the Pachomian form were already noteworthy, which could easily have become a danger for the real ideal. One was the numerical size of the community, which certainly included several hundred monks.[53] This could only, in the long run, make heavier the function of the abbot, who should be the spiritual father of all his monks, or at least make it questionable. Second, the economic planning for the management of the large monastery led of itself to the acquisition of important property, finally to wealth and economic power, which for their part could gradually threaten the ideal of poverty.

---

[45] The *Vita graeca* I, 33–34; 42, etc. speaks of *monai,* who did not belong to the Pachomian community.

[46] *Vita graeca* I, 24f., describes the beginnings of common life with the first three disciples, whose number rapidly mounted.

[47] *Praec.* 84; *Vita gr.* I, 42; 81.—*Praec.* 50–52; *Vita gr.* I, 28; 40.

[48] *Praec.* 3; 31; 100; 102. *Vita gr.* 170; 88; 131, and passim.

[49] *Praec.* 28; 43; 91; 135.

[50] *Pater monasterii* in the "Rule" —*Praec.* 49; 51; 53–55, etc. —*pater tes mones* in the *Vita gr.* I, 28, etc. For the *deuteros* and *secundus* respectively, see *Vita gr.* I, 1.c; and *Liber Orsiesii,* 14 and 18; see B. Steidle, "Der 'Zweite' im Pachomiuskloster," *BM* 24 (1948), 97–104, 174–179.

[51] *Praec.* 1; 13; 15f.; 19f., and passim; *Vita gr.* I, 28 (house superior: *oikiakos*), 58f.; 94f.; 121f.; Jerome, *Praef. ad Reg.* 2; 6; *Epp. Pachom.* 4; 6; 7.

[52] *Praec.* 24; 58–65; 76f.; 108. *Ep. Pachom.* 8.

At first, however, the central religious idea under which Pachomius made his foundation remained decisive, namely, that of a holy community (*koinonia*) which was supposed to orient itself expressly to the community ideal of the primitive congregation. Just like the latter, the Pachomian community was to be manifested not only in separation from the world and the renunciation of personal possessions, but primarily in the common striving for salvation. "All should be a help to you, and you should assist all."[54] This saying of Pachomius to his monks was again and again taken up by his successors, with variations. For his beloved pupil Theodore there could be no more serious offense against the holy community than that a brother should become a scandal to another.[55] Horsiesi implored his monks not to limit themselves to care for their own salvation, but out of love for the brother one should become the servant of the other, and thus all represent "God's own family."[56] Offenses against fraternal charity were, then, especially severely blamed in the Rule of Pachomius and in the teaching of the Pachomian abbots, because they seriously jeopardized the basic law of Pachomianism, the *hierà koinonia.*[57]

The Pachomian community received the strength to realize its basic law from a life in and with the Holy Scripture. A painstaking examination of all important sources for Pachomian cenobitism has here led to a significant correcting of the earlier thesis concerning the aloofness of Early Christian monasticism from the Bible.[58] A glance at the letters and instructions of Pachomius reveals that he himself had a broad and deep knowledge of the Bible and was able to use it in all earnestness in the religious guidance of his monks.[59] Moreover, he aspired to educate all monks to a familiarity with the Bible and knew how to do so. Hence the Rule sharply inculcated that the individual monk should learn parts of Scripture by heart, and that the illiterate must learn to read for that purpose.[60] The order of the day in the monastery offered abundant opportunity "to meditate" on Scripture, that is, to recite to oneself the texts learned by heart.[61] An intimate acquaintance with the Bible also characterized the Pachomian Abbot Horsiesi, whom Gennadius praised in his catalogue of writers as a "holy man, perfectly versed in Scripture."[62] In a supplement to the Rule that probably goes back to him, it is said in an instruction to the house-superiors that the religious instruction of the monks should be accomplished "in accord with Holy Scripture," and those superiors should be regarded as good to whom Scripture was the norm of their performance of their office.[63] The individual prescriptions of the Rule were explained by a commentary of Horsiesi in a constant recourse to the Bible.[64]

---

[53] The round numbers of the monastic enthusiasts Palladius and Jerome (*Hist. Laus.* 32, and *Praef. ad Reg.* 7) are greatly exaggerated; cf. the more sober opinion of D. J. Chitty, *The Desert A City,* 24f., and footnote.

[54] Pachomius, *Katech.* (Lefort, *Oeuvres,* 5).

[55] Theodore, *Katech.,* 59 (Lefort); cf. ibid., 38, 41, 50, 52.

[56] *Liber Orsiesii* 8, 26, 28.

[57] Pachomius, *Katech.* 15–17; cf. Theodore, *Katech.,* 53, 57, 62 (Lefort); *Liber Orsiesii* 23, 38, 55. On the *koinonia* of the Pachomians, see A. Veilleux, 167–197.

[58] See especially H. Bacht, *Théologie de la vie monastique* 42–47; id., "Vom Umgang mit der Bibel im ältesten Mönchtum," *Theol Phil* 41 (1966), 557–566.

In complete consistency there proceeded from the Pachomian basic law of *koinonia* another essential feature of Pachomianism: the fundamental equality of all monks in their obligation to the Rule. To all without exception applied its prescriptions in regard to clothing, food, furnishing of their cells, manual labor, as well as in regard to the form of the religious life. There was no place here for the individualism, sometimes assuming bizarre forms, of separate anchorites in their manner of life nor for their subjective attitudes of asceticism and piety. With a surer look Pachomius understood that the inclination to spectacular ascetical feats often derived from very questionable motives. He had the instinct to know that each superior in the Pachomian system also had to be under the law of the Rule, if he did not want to compromise his authority in principle. Ultimately it was also care for the preservation of this uniform *koinonia* which determined Pachomius only rarely to accept priests into his community and to refuse the priesthood for himself,[65] an attitude which was therefore, but quite incorrectly, interpreted as proof of a tension between early monasticism and the hierarchical Church. For there are unambiguous testimonies for a high estimation of the priest on the part of Pachomius, which he tried to communicate to his monks also. Further, such a view contradicts the continual and close contact of the monastic founder with his local bishop and above all with Athanasius, which was transmitted to his successors, and their relations with the hierarchy.[66]

---

[59] Pachomius, *Epp.* 3–5; *Katech.*, 1–26 (Lefort); here alone thirty-one books of the Old Testament and twenty-one of the New Testament are cited.

[60] *Praec.* 13, 49, 122, 140.

[61] H. Bacht, "'Meditatio' in den ältesten Mönchsquellen," *GuL* 26 (1955), 360–373.

[62] Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 8.

[63] *Praec. et. Instit. praef.*

[64] In Lefort, *Oeuvres,* 81–91.

[65] *Vita gr.* I, 27; *Vies coptes,* 96 (Lefort). At first the monks attended the Sunday Mass of the nearest village church; later they had a diocesan priest come to celebrate the liturgy.

However, the uniformity in the Pachomian monastery was assured in the long run only if two presuppositions were fulfilled: the poverty of the individual as a radical renunciation of any personal possession, of every independent ability to dispose even of things of daily use, and unconditional obedience toward superiors of every rank. Apparently Pachomius found the definitive type of the cenobitic ideal of poverty only after an experiment with the form of relative poverty practiced in groups of anchorites—responsibility of the individual, at least for food and clothing—which, however, led to serious disadvantages.[67] Now possessions which were necessary for the life of a large monastery became the "property of Christ,"[68] which the monk could use only under obedience. Obedience, as the Pachomians understood it, differed from that of the anchorite in regard to his spiritual father not only in degree but in principle. Among the anchorites it was at times almost a technical training, which aimed to make the self-will and the private judgment so submissive that the monk, after achieving its highest form, could be sent forth into self-reliance; whereas, according to Pachomius, it was an unalterably permanent attitude which should cause the monk to grow to perfection in and through his community.[69] The prescriptions of the Pachomian Rule on the meaning and importance of poverty and obedience in the monastery of cenobites were never essentially improved by later monastic rules, and this too is evidence of the creative significance of the Coptic monastic founder.

A further characteristic of the Rule of Pachomius must bring into prominence the following other features. It was of an emphatic simplicity in form, which permitted the gradual growth of the ascetical perception of its author to be discerned. Pachomius was not concerned for a planned, systematic structure and did not aspire to an impressive formulation of his thoughts. Likewise, the objective content of the regulations here assembled were simple in a definite sense: in them is not found an expression of a theologically based ascetical theory, such as, for example, the doctrine of perfection which the Alexandrian theologians offered. Finally, a balance in individual ascetical demands, determined by a deep knowledge of souls, was a special characteristic of this Rule. It sought, as a binding norm for all the members of the monastery, a prudent average, which on the one hand left full scope for more expression of personal initiative, and on the other hand punished transgressions against the norm with penalties that always respected the inner dignity of the person.

---

[66] Cf. especially H. Bacht, "Mönchtum und Kirche," *Sentire Ecclesiam,* 115–122; also P. Tamburrino, *Aspetti ecclesiologici del monachesimo pacomiano del secolo IV* (dissertation, Rome 1968).

[67] *Vies coptes,* 3–5, 66–69 (Lefort).

[68] Ibid., 195. For the ideal of poverty see H. Bacht, *Strukturen christlicher Existenz, Festgabe Fr. Wulf* (Würzburg 1968), 283–300.

[69] Cf. *Vies coptes,* 178 (Lefort), for the high praise which Pachomius bestowed on the monk who lived "quite simply in obedience," and the enthusiastic recognition which the obedience practiced in the Pachomian monasteries found in other monastic circles: John Cassian, *Inst. Coenob.* 4, 1; 4, 30, 2.

Corresponding to the elevated religious quality of Pachomius's Rule was its far-reaching impact on the future,[70] which was, however, more strongly evident for the Latin West than for the East. Thus it can be assumed that, for his concept of cenobitism, Basil was influenced by the Pachomian monasteries he visited in 357, even though occasionally in the form of a critical judgment on individual features; thus a literary dependence of his asceticism on the Rule of Pachomius is not sure.[71] Its impact is due especially to the translation by Jerome, which he made in 404 from the Greek for monks, originally from the Latin West, of the Pachomian monastery of Metanoia in Canopus near Alexandria. After him it was especially John Cassian, who, as Abbot at Marseille (d. c. 430), through his *De institutis coenobiorum* directed interest toward the Pachomian system.[72] In the so-called *Regula Vigilii,* which probably originated in Italy c. 500, there appeared a revision of Pachomius's Rule, and later in the sixth century the rules of two bishops of Arles, Caesarius and Aurelius, unmistakably show its influence.[73] In Italy also it was adapted to the needs of the local monasteries before Benedict, who himself in his *Regula monasteriorum* often made use of it, but as a master.[74] In the ninth century Benedict of Aniane (d. 821), in the course of the reform of Frankish monasticism, again assured a wider influence to the Rule of Pachomius, when he admitted it to his collection of rules then known and often appealed to it for individual reforms.[75] Finally, its long-range effect can be established at the beginning of modern times, since it served as a model for details of the constitutions of the Society of Jesus.[76]

---

[70] See C. de Clercq, *Mélanges L. Halphen* (Paris 1951), 169–175, and H. Bacht, *Liturgie und Mönchtum* H. 11 (1952), 92–96.

[71] J. Gribomont, *Theologie de la Vie monastique . . . ,111f.*

[72] See Book 4, 1; 4, 4; 4, 10; 4, 17; 4, 30, 2, and the corresponding examples in the issue of *SChr* 109 (1965).

[73] On the *Regula orientalis* see Boon, op. cit., XLIIff. and A. Mundó, *StudMon* 9 (1967), 231; on Caesarius and Aurelius of Arles, *DACL* 2, 3199–3205; 11, 1864.

[74] H. Bacht, op. cit. 95f.

[75] *PL* 103, 423–702, 717–1380.

The Pachomian ideal of *koinonia* quickly displayed its power of attraction. A group of monks from Tabennisi made a new foundation in the village of Phbow (*Pabau*), some miles down the river. Two already existing independent "monasteries" in the same place asked admittance to the Pachomian community—they were the monasteries of Scheneset (Chenoboskeion) and Tmuschons (Monchosis)—and thereby submitted to the Pachomian Rule, whose correct observance was assured by the fact that Pachomius assigned monks from his own foundation to these monasteries. He himself moved c. 337 from Tabennisi to Phbow, which thereafter became the chief monastery and motherhouse of the Pachomian system.[77] With the founding of new monasteries and the accepting of existing monastic communities, Pachomius had taken a decisive new step. He had called into being the first "Order" in the history of Christian monasticism, for all the monasteries recognized his Rule as the basis of the *koinonia* and saw in him the common superior-general of the monastic union. This first group of four monasteries was followed in the lifetime of the abbot-general, Pachomius, by other foundations, one in the district of Latopolis, four in the area around Panopolis (Akhîm) some sixty miles down the Nile, and finally even two monasteries of nuns: hence at the death of the founder in 346 the Order included eleven settlements.[78] Beside the abbot-general was an *economus,* by whom the economic administration of all the monasteries was controlled. The unity of the Order was maintained by frequent visitation journeys of the superior-general and by a "general chapter," held semiannually, which brought together all Pachomian monks into the motherhouse of Phbow, first for the common celebration of Easter and for religious renewal, then again in the summer to discuss the periodic economic and organizational questions of the Order.[79]

In a summary of the lot of the Pachomian Order down to the Council of Chalcedon two figures are especially prominent from the time of the founder, and each was significant for the community in his own way. Horsiesi had, as a youth, joined Pachomius at Tabennisi and was appointed by him superior of the monastery of Scheneset.[80] When Pachomius's successor, Petronius, shortly before his death in 347, appointed him as abbot-general, Horsiesi assumed this function not without anxiety, since he knew the limits of his ability for the leadership of a great Order. It soon became clear what the authority of the founder had meant for the cohesion and the spirit of the community. In his visitations Horsiesi repeatedly had occasion to point out that it was not in keeping with this spirit for individual monks to strive openly for positions in the Order.[81] Still more distressing was the knowledge that the economic interests of monasteries acquired as property were threatening to obscure the original ideal of poverty and paralyzed the ascetical energy of the foundation period. A surge of secularization was laying hold of most of the monasteries and led in the second generation of cenobitism to an Early Christian "poverty controversy," when the abbot of the monastery of Tmuschons rebelled against Horsiesi's demands, worked successfully in other monasteries for a more moderate observance, and finally threatened the secession of his monastery from the Order.[82] Since Horsiesi was unable to control this situation, he summoned the former Abbot of Tabennisi, Theodore, to Phbow, made him his vicar, and withdrew to his former monastery of Scheneset.[83]

---

[76] H. Bacht, op. cit., 96.

[77] See *Vies coptes,* 91, 155 (Lefort); *Vita gr.* I, 54.

[78] *Vita gr.* I, 83; monasteries of nuns: ibid. 32, 134. On the chronology and the geographical location of the monasteries see D. J. Chitty, *TU* 64 (Berlin 1957), 379–385.

[79] Cf. J. Rezać, *OrChr* 23 (1957), 381–414. On the importance of the Pachomian general chapter see B. Steidle, *Erbe und Auftrag* 44 (1968), 104–110.

[80] *Vies coptes,* 220, 273f. (Lefort); *Vita Pachom. gr.* I, 117, 119.

With Theodore the external direction of the Order was assumed by a monk who had once been Pachomius's favorite disciple, had been early named by him as Abbot of Tabennisi, and finally had become his close collaborator at Phbow.[84] As "vicar" of Horsiesi, but in constant consultation with him, he gradually restored discipline by discretion and energy, saved the imperiled unity of the Order, and, in the eighteen years of his vicarship (350–368), by means of visitations of the monasteries, his instructions for the monks, and his constant appeal to the spirit of the founder, again led the *koinonia* to internal and external growth, so that at his death it counted twelve houses of monks and three of nuns.[85] Horsiesi had to carry responsibility for the direction of the Order alone for four more years—he died after 386—but he tried to do justice to his task through his own gifts of a deep interiority and a piety nourished on the Bible. In regard to the ideals that he desired as characteristics of the Pachomian Order, a document from his pen, which has been rightly named his testament, inform us. In the so-called *Liber Orsiesii* he urgently called upon his monks, with constant appeal to the legacy handed down from their father Pachomius, to uncompromising poverty, to the preservation of the *koinonia* through a joyful participation in the ordering of the monastic life, and finally to a living on Holy Scripture, which must be the foundation of their ascetical striving.[86]

---

[81] *Vita Pachom. gr.* I, 126.

[82] Ibid. 127.

[83] Ibid. 129–130. On Theodore see B. Steidle, "Der heilige Abt Theodor von Tabennisi," *Erbe und Auftrag* 44 (1968), 91–103.

[84] *Vies coptes,* 100–104, 132 (Lefort); *Vita Pachom. gr.* I, 78.

[85] *Vita Pachom. gr.* I, 134; see D. J. Chitty, *The Desert A City,* 36.

For the period after Horsiesi's death, the sources for the history of the Pachomian Order flow in trickles only. True, there was an important new foundation on the Egyptian coast of the Mediterranean, where Theophilus of Alexandria c. 390 had the Pachomian monastery of Metanoia built in place of the shrine of Sarapis at Canopus, which he had destroyed. In it monks from the Latin West also joined the Pachomian system, and for them Jerome translated the Rule of Pachomius from a Greek version into their mother tongue in 404.[87] C. 400 and later, authors often mention the Pachomians but only in a very general way, so that not even the names of the abbots-general after Horsiesi are known.[88] The abbot of a particular monastery is occasionally named, such as Victor of Tabennisi, who took part in the Council of Ephesus in 431, or Martyrius of Phbow, who had a large church built in honor of the Order's founder.[89] However, the silence of the sources cannot be regarded simply as a sign of a decay of the cenobitic ideal. In the second half of the fourth century there arose right in Upper Egypt two other *cenobia* which, it is true, did not join the Pachomian Order, but one of which made the expanded Pachomian Rule its norm of life. This, still partly standing today, was the so-called White Monastery near the village of Atripe, which the Copt Pgol founded and which obtained historical importance through his nephew Schenute of Atripe (c. 333–451). As to the nature and aims of this man, his many letters and speeches, whereby he became the founder of the Coptic national literature, give more copious information than the eulogistic biography by his successor, Besa.[90] Without any doubt, Schenute was an impressive figure, on whom however his lack of balance and the impetuosity of his temperament cast many a shadow. His ascetical strictness, tending to rigorism, occasionally burdened his monks excessively: at times he punished failings against the Rule with brutal chastisements.[91] He censured in fiery words abuses in the life of Egyptian Christians, and he proceeded with fanatical hatred against the remnant of paganism. Outside his monastery he worked, without being a theologian himself, through partisanship for the view of the Alexandrian patriarchs in the Christological strife of his day,[92] as well as through his relations, by means of letters, with the leading personalities. He himself stood in an unresolved tension between the cenobitic and the anchoretic ideal, which often led him for rather long periods into solitude and operated negatively on the inner harmony of the White Monastery. The not slight power of attraction of his community, despite everything, was conditioned by its purely Coptic character. The consequent limitation impeded Schenute's influence from reaching beyond the boundaries of Egypt, such as fell so richly to the lot of Pachomian cenobitism because of its openness and prudence: Schenute let himself be all too little influenced by its spirit.

---

[86] See H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs,* 29–52, and B. Steidle, "Der 'Oberen-Spiegel' im 'Testament' des Abtes Horsiesi," *Erbe und Auftrag* 43 (1967), 22–38.

[87] On the monastery of Metanoia see E. Schwartz, *ACO* II, 1, 2, 217, and D. J. Chitty, op. cit., 57 and 77.

[88] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 38–41; Sozomen, *HE* 3, 14, 19–18; *Hist. mon.* 3.

[89] See P. Ladeuze, op. cit., 202f.

[90] The *Life of Schenute* by Besa: *CSCO* 41 (Louvain 1906), edited by J. Leipoldt; Latin translation by H. Wiesmann in *CSCO* 129 (ibid., 1951). Besa's other writings were edited by K. H. Kuhn, *CSCO* 157–158 (ibid., 1956); on Besa see the articles by K. H. Kuhn, *Muséon* 66 (1953), 225–243; *JThSt,* n. s. 5 (1954), 36–48, 174–187, 6 (1955), 35–48.

[91] A monk died as a result of whippings which Schenute himself administered: J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe,* 143.

THE MONASTICISM OF THE DESERTS OF NITRIA AND SCETE. In addition to the Thebaid, Egyptian monasticism had another important area of colonization in Lower Egypt on the northern border area of the Libyan Desert, which extended from the south by way of the base-line of the triangle Rosetta–Cairo–El-Alamein to the area west of the Nile Delta. The old sources early distinguished three centers of gravity of monastic settlement here, whose exact geographical situation could be clarified only very recently.[93] The first lay in the vicinity of the village of Nitria (today Barnugi), the entrance to the Libyan Desert, about nine leagues southwest of ancient Hermopolis Parva (today Damankur). One day's march farther south from Nitria lay the Kellia (*ta kellia*), a settlement of widely scattered monks' huts, which had a church as its center. The third center of gravity was about forty leagues south of Nitria in the so-called Desert of Scete (*he Sketis*), modern Wadi-el-Natrûn, where even today a salt and soda enterprise exploits the presence of sodium there.

A relatively abundant source material gives information about the monasticism of Lower Egypt also. The *Historia monachorum,* a travel story, which was written in Greek c. 400, perhaps by the Alexandrian deacon Timothy, and was revised a few years later by Rufinus in Latin,[94] reproduces the impressions of a traveling party which c. 395 had come from Jerusalem to visit the monastic colonies of the Thebaid as far as

---

[92] He accompanied Cyril of Alexandria to the Council of Ephesus in 431: J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe,* 41f.

[93] By H. G. Evelyn White, *The History of the Monasteries of Nitria and Scetis* (New York 1932); see C. Martin, *NRTh* 62 (1935), 113–134, 238–252. See the sketch-map in H. G. Evelyn White, Plate I, and D. J. Chitty, *The Desert A City,* before p. 89.

[94] On the priority of the Greek text, see A. J. Festugière, *Hermes* 83 (1955), 257–284. The Latin version of Rufinus in *PL* 21, 389–412, probably used other material.

Diolcus on the Mediterranean. Some twenty years later (419–420) Bishop Palladius of Helenopolis in Bithynia published his description, based on his own observation, of contemporary monasticism in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor; called *Historia Lausiaca* because it was dedicated to a chamberlain, Lausus, it is in the form of brief edifying biographies, which show many legendary features. Especially rewarding for a knowledge of the spiritual, religious atmosphere of Egyptian monasticism are the so-called *Apophthegmata Patrum* (*Sayings of the Fathers*), in the Greek original a collection, arranged alphabetically according to the names of eminent monks and often composed of anecdotes, of religious and ascetical instructions or symbolic acts of the Fathers, which an editor compiled soon after 500—it was known to the *Rule* of Benedict—from oral and written material in circulation.[95]

The first monk to settle on Mount Nitria, soon after 330, was Ammun, a native of the Delta area; he built there two cells, in which he lived for twenty-two years.[96] Only a few years later the number of monks had so grown that some of them desired a greater solitude and built for themselves new cells some leagues farther to the south, from which grew the settlement of the Kellia; it remained in contact with the Nitrian colony and toward the close of the century included approximately 600 monks.[97] On Mount Nitria lived anchorites in the strict sense, alongside others who united in quasi-monasteries, which numbered as many as 200 monks.[98] The center of the settlement was a large church, in which the monks assembled on Saturdays and Sundays to celebrate the liturgy. To perform it and to see to preaching and administration there were in Palladius's time eight priests among the monks. The many visitors were received in a special hospice.[99] The reputation of the Nitrian monks led to the selecting of bishops for Egyptian sees from their ranks quite early.[100]

However, the highest esteem was enjoyed by the monasticism of Scete, for this was a desert in the full sense of the word (*he paneremos*), whose wildness made the greatest demands on the physical and moral strength of the hermits. One who could cope with them had passed the most severe test and was counted among those monks who "in perfection and wisdom towered over all who dwelt in the monasteries of Egypt."[101] Macarius the Egyptian, after a long itinerant life of asceticism, was the first to discover the route to Scete c. 330, and, during the sixty years that he lived here—from c. 340 as a priest—he became the undisputed spiritual father of the hermits of Scete.[102] In Scete too the number of monks grew rapidly: toward the end of the fourth century they were divided into four semianchoretic communities, from time to time cared for by a priest.[103] But the real direction belonged to the Old Fathers (*gerontes*), to whom God had given the charism of the enlightening "word." The beginner subjected himself to them in order to be introduced into the meaning of monastic life, and around them assembled all who were striving for a higher perfection. "Father, say a word to me on how I may be saved": this is the formula constantly repeated in the *Apophthegmata* whereby the monk asked the saving help of the Old Father, who thus became the living "rule" in place of the written Rule of the Pachomian monasteries. The "words" of the Old Fathers did not, of course, proclaim any profound "theology of monasticism," since they took a rather skeptical view of theological speculation and hence treated with mistrust the learned monks in their ranks, such as Evagrius Ponticus.[104]

---

[95] The Latin version, *Verba seniorum,* coming from various translations from the second half of the sixth century is arranged thematically (according to monastic virtues). On the status of the research in the question of the Greek textual tradition see J. C. Guy, *RAM* 41 (1965), 113–124.

[96] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 8; *Hist. mon.* 22.

[97] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 7.

[98] Palladius, *Vita s. J. Chrys.* 17.

[99] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 7.

[100] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 10, 12, 46; *Vita s. Chrys.* 17.

The last two decades of the fourth century have been labeled the Golden Age of the monasticism of Nitria and Scete. It came to an end when Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria, in his conflict with real or alleged adherents of Origen, withdrew his former favor from the monks of Lower Egypt, bitterly persecuted them, and thereby put many of them to flight from c. 400 on.[105] A more severe blow struck the colonies of Scete in 407–8, when the barbarian tribe of the Maziken made a plundering attack, an episode which older fathers interpreted as punishment for the loss of the genuine monastic spirit of earlier years.[106] In crowds they then abandoned their cells, most never to return—among them John Kolobus, superior of one of the four anchorite communities of Scete, the famed Poimen with his brothers, and also the highly esteemed Arsenius, allegedly of a Roman senatorial family, to whom the *Apophthegmata* attribute the despairing saying: "The world has lost Rome"—an allusion to the taking of Rome by Alaric in 410—"the monks, Scete."[107] Other later plundering expeditions further weakened the settlements at Scete. The four monasteries still standing in the Desert of Scete and still partly inhabited, with their strong walls and defense towers, from the sixth to the ninth centuries, make known that the monks of later times still had to assure themselves against incursions by the desert tribes.[108]

---

[101] Cassian, *Collat.* 10, 2, 3; cf. J. C. Guy, "Le centre monastique de Scété dans la littérature du V^{e} siècle," *OrChrP* 30 (1964), 129–147.

[102] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 17; *Apophth.,* Macarius.

[103] Cassian, *l.c.,* see D. J. Chitty, *The Desert A City,* 35.

[104] J. C. Guy, "Les Apophthegmata Patrum" *Théologie de la vie monastique,* 73–83; *Apophth.,* Evagrius, no. 7.

[105] See H. G. Evelyn White, op. cit., 125–144.

[106] D. J. Chitty, *The Desert A City,* 66f.

2. Monasticism in Palestine and Syria

The biblical past of the Sinai Peninsula makes it understandable that from the fourth century it became not only the goal of many a pilgrim to the Holy Land but also a favorite site of settlement of early monasticism.[109] The monk Silvanus, originally from Palestine, with a group of twelve disciples who had gathered around him in the desert of Scete, came to Mount Sinai c. 380, and there he stayed for several years before founding a new monastic colony at Gerasa in Palestine. One of his pupils, Netras, was summoned to occupy the episcopal *cathedra* of Pharan in the peninsula.[110] When, between 381 and 384, the pilgrim Egeria visited Mount Sinai, there were many anchorites' huts on its slopes and at the summit a small church, in which the monks asembled to celebrate the liturgy.[111] Apparently the types of anchoritism of Lower Egypt were adopted here. The great age of Sinaitic monasticism began, however, only with the founding of a monastery of cenobites by the Emperor Justinian I. The monastic settlements near the port city of Rhaitou on the east bank of the Gulf of Suez also go back to the fourth century, even though the report by one Ammonius of a raid by the Blemmyes on Rhaitou, in which forty monks were killed, merits no credence.[112]

The Holy Land could not but exert an especially strong power of attraction on the budding monasticism. It is true that the first steps here are in darkness but the beginning of the activity of Saint Chariton must be placed c. 330. According to his *vita,* written in the sixth century, he came as a pilgrim from Iconium in Asia Minor to Palestine and had his cell at Pharan, northeast of Jerusalem; from it developed the "Laura of Saint Chariton."[113] With the word *laura* is obtained the designation for the specifically Palestinian type of monastic settlement, in which the cells of the monks, situated close to one another, were erected around a center of the colony, which, in addition to other buildings, included the church, in which all members of the *laura* gathered for worship on Saturdays and Sundays. The *vita* ascribed in Chariton the founding of two more *lauras,* one at Duha near Jericho, the other at Suka, which probably lay south of Bethlehem. These three *lauras* going back to Chariton are attested elsewhere too for the fourth century.[114] While for them no dependence on Egyptian prototypes can be demonstrated, the two other monastic foundations of the fourth century in Palestine were more surely closely linked with Egyptian monasticism. Hilarion, to whom before 392 Jerome devoted a much read brief biography that glorified him to an heroic degree, had studied at Alexandria, then spent some time with Antony the Great, and after his return to his native Palestine lived, first, for about twenty years, following the Egyptian anchoretic manner, near Maiuma, the port of Gaza. Later he left Palestine and, after a long wandering life, died on Cyprus c. 370. Even if some details of his *vita* by Jerome are questionable, still the defined historical framework is acceptable.[115] Perhaps even Epiphanius, the later Bishop of Salamis on Cyprus, was Jerome's source; in any event, he became acquainted with monasticism in Egypt and then founded near his Palestinian birthplace, Besanduk near Eleutheropolis, a monastic community, which he governed for thirty years.[116]

---

[107] *Apophthegmata* under John Kolobos and Poimen, Arsenius, no. 21.

[108] On the later history of the monasticism of Scete see H. G. Evelyn White, op. cit., 217ff.

[109] Cf. D. Gorce, "Pelerins et residents du Sinai des premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne," L. Prevost (ed.), *Le Sinai* (Paris 1937), 127–182.

[110] *Apophth.*, Silvanus, especially nos. 4–5; Sozomen, *HE* 6, 32, 8; Netras: *Apophth.*, s.v.

[111] *Itinerarium Egeriae* 3–5; the *monasteria* (*plurima*) 4, 6, are here clearly the lodgings of the monks. For the chronological start of the *Itinerarium* see P. Delvos, *AnBoll* 85 (1967), 165–194.

[112] The Egyptian monk Sisoes repeatedly encountered the monk Ammon of Rhaithou: *Apophth.*, Sisoes, nos. 17, 26. On Ammonius's report see R. Devreesse, "Le christianisme dans la péninsule sinaïtique des origines à l'arrivée des musulmans," *RB* 49 (1940), 205–233.

Of great importance for the further development of Palestinian monasticism in the fifth and sixth centuries was a foreigner, Euthymius, from Melitene in Lesser Armenia, who came to Palestine in 405 and lived first in a cell near the Chariton *laura* of Pharan.[117] With a friend he found here, Theoctistus, he settled six years later in the present Wadi Mukellik west of Qumran. When other monks joined them, they first wanted to establish a *laura* of the Pharan type, but then decided for a *cenobium,* the direct control of which was assumed by Theoctistus, while

---

[113] *Vita Charit.* 13, 21, 24. Cf. G. Garitte, *DHGE* XII, 421–423.

[114] On the location of the *lauras* see D. J. Chitty, op. cit., 14f., and the sketch-map before p. 88. The *laura* of Duka is mentioned by Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 48; for Suka, cf. Cassian, *Collat.* 6, 1; for Pharan, Cyril Scythop., *Vita s. Euthymii* 6–8.

[115] E. Coleiro, "St. Jerome's Lives of the Hermits," *VigChr* 11 (1957), 161–178; for Hilarion: Sozomen, *HE* 3, 14, 21–27; 5, 10, 1–4.

[116] Sozomen, *HE* 6, 32, 2–3; Jerome, *C. Joann. Hieros.* 4.

[117] Cyril Scythop., *Vita s. Euthymii* 5–6.

Euthymius lived in a nearby cave as spiritual adviser.[118] Here he made contact with a Bedouin tribe, which he gained for Christianity and whose sheik, at his suggestion, was ordained by Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem as first "Bishop of the Camp."[119] Euthymius was also active as a missionary when he spent some time in the wildernesses of Ruban and Ziph, south of Hebron. After his return he founded, following some resistance, in the vicinity of the monastery of Theoctistus a *laura,* from which, after his death in 473, the whole cenobitic complex became the monastery of Euthymius.[120] Here for four decades Euthymius was the outstanding figure of Palestinian monasticism and continued to have an impact through his disciples, among whom, besides Theoctistus and others, were Domnus, later Bishop of Antioch, Stephen, later Bishop of Jamnia, Martyuris, later Bishop of Jerusalem, Abbot Gerasimus, and the young Sabas, who was destined to become the preserver and enlarger of the Euthymian monastic ideal in the sixty years after his teacher's death. Euthymius was responsible for that custom which characterized the relation of *cenobium* and *laura* in Palestine and was made by Abbot Sabas the norm: the young monk was first schooled in the *cenobium* and only after a certain testing by his abbot was he freed for the harder demands of the semianchoretic form of life of the *laura.*[121]

Also worthy of mention as a monastic founder was another foreigner, who came from the Georgian princely house of Nabarnugi, lived first as a hostage at the court of the Emperor Theodosius II at Constantinople, then fled to Jerusalem c. 429, soon became a monk there and founded in Jerusalem a hospice for pilgrims and the poor, from which grew "the Monastery of the Iberians." Peter the Iberian—this was his name as a monk—had to leave his Jerusalem monastery because of his Monophysite views, lived near Gaza, and in 453 became Bishop of Maiuma. The controversies over Chalcedon forced him to flee again, first to Egypt, then to Phoenicia, where he died in 488.[122] Under Bishop Juvenal, Palestinian monasticism obtained an "archimandrite of the monks"[123] in the person of the *Chorepiscopus* Passarion. This incident shows that individual bishops quite early were striving for a close binding of monasticism to the Church. Then the Council of Chalcedon enacted the canonical rule which subordinated the monastic system in principle to episcopal supervision.

---

[118] Ibid. 7–9; the monastery was later called the Theoctistus Monastery.

[119] Ibid. 10 and 15; on the role of this Bishop Peter at the Council of Ephesus of 431, see *Vita s. Euthymii* 20, and *ACO* II, 6, 57.

[120] *Vita s. Euthymii* 16 and 39; on the excavations at the Monastery of Euthymius see D. J. Chitty, *PEFQSt* 1928, 134f.; 1932, 188ff.

[121] Cf. Cyril Scythop., *Vita s. Euthymii* 31; *Vita Joann. Hesych.* 7.

[122] A *vita* preserved in Syriac reports on him, edited by R. Raabe (Leipzig 1895); see D. M. Lang, "Peter the Iberian and his Biographers," *JEH* 2 (1951), 158–168.

[123] *Vita s. Euthymii* 16. Passarion had himself built a large *cenobium* in Jerusalem: *Vita Petri Iber.,* 35 (Raabe).

Latin Monasteries in Palestine. Sooner or later eastern monasticism had to exercise its power of attraction on the Latin West also, which had already obtained authentic accounts of the new asceticism from Athanasius, when he was at Trier in 335, at Rome in 340–43, at Aquileia in 345, and could soon become enthusiastic about these forms of Christian life when Athanasius's *Life of Antony* had become accessible to it in a Latin translation. Before long individual Christians were in Egypt and Palestine,[124] but only on Palestinian soil did there arise monasteries which were founded by Latins and which received a special character from them.

Among the three monastic foundations to be mentioned here from the period before Chalcedon, a woman from the Roman aristocracy always took part in a decisive way with her resources and her ascetical enthusiasm. The first was Melania the Elder,[125] born c. 341, who, following the death of her husband, Valerius Maximus, Prefect of the City in 361–63, joined an ascetic circle, journeyed to Egypt c. 372, and after a visit to the monastic settlements on the Nitrian range came to Palestine. At Alexandria she may have made the acquaintance of Rufinus of Aquileia, with whom c. 380 she founded a double monastery on Mount Olivet, for whose support she supplied the means. In this very first Latin settlement there was established a characteristic which would appear normal also in the later Latin foundations: the lively interest in ascetical and theological literature.[126] After a prolonged stay in the West, during which she visited her cousin Paulinus at Nola in 400 and Augustine at Hippo in 404, Melania died in her monastery on Mount Olivet c. 410, whereas Rufinus, who had left Palestine in 397, never returned there.

The second Latin monastic foundation was the common work of Jerome and the eminent Roman lady, Paula the Elder.[127] The former had lived since soon after 372 as an anchorite in the desert of Chalcis southeast of Antioch but felt unequal to the demands of the life and had returned to Rome, where he took care of an ascetical circle of prominent ladies. In 385 he left Italy with several monks because of a strong antimonastic movement and went to Palestine; some months later Paula, with her daughter Eustochium, followed him there. After a visit to the monastic colonies at Nitria they went back to Palestine and in 386 selected Bethlehem as their permanent abode. In the next three years a convent of nuns and a monastery of monks arose here, and also a hospice for pilgrims, for the building of which Paula was responsible. The nuns were divided into three groups according to their social background, each with its own superior—such an arrangement presupposes a not insignificant number of members.[128] The community of the monastery of men was smaller, but the intellectual prestige of its superior, Jerome, gave it great importance. The house that he directed, in which the Latin liturgy was to a great extent retained, was not only a center of pastoral care, which attended to the catechumens and Christians of the vicinity, but it became, especially for many pilgrims from the West, a welcome Latin island in the Holy Land. In addition, Jerome's monastery played a role in the confrontations on the burning religious questions of the day—the controversy over Origen, Pelagianism—and through the active correspondence which its abbot maintained became a powerful source of information on the Christian East for Latin Christianity, from which proceeded numerous stimuli to the monasticism of the West.[129] After Paula's death in 404, her daughter Eustochium[130] assumed the direction of the nuns for the next fifteen years; she died c. 419. The tradition was continued by her niece, Paula the Younger, who had come to Palestine c. 415 and who became an eager disciple of Jerome.[131] He himself died on 30 September 419 or 420 at Bethlehem, and with his death information on his monastery ceased.

---

[124] For Jerusalem Florentinus and Martinianus are named c. 370: Jerome, *Epp.* 4 and 5.

[125] See F. X. Murphy, "Melania the Elder," *Tr* 5 (1947), 59–77. The most important sources: Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 46, 54–55; Paulinus of Nola, *Epp.* 28–29, 31, 45.

[126] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 55; Rufinus, *Apol. 2,* 11.

[127] Cf. A. Lippoldt, "Paula," *Pauly-Wissowa,* Suppl. X (1965), 508f., with the literature. Principal source of Jerome's necrology, *Ep.* 108.

The third Latin monastic complex in Jerusalem owed its origin to the noble Roman husband and wife, Pinian and Melania the Younger,[132] granddaughter of Melania the Elder. After the early death of their two children, they decided on the ascetic life and placed their vast wealth at the service of this ideal. Fleeing before Alaric's Goths, they spent the year 410 in Sicily together with Melania's mother Albina, and there they met Rufinus. After that they lived for seven years on their North African property, were in contact with Augustine,[133] and, after the now obligatory visit to Egypt in 417, settled definitively in Jerusalem. At first the Egyptian experience motivated them to a more anchoretic life, but then its burdens induced Melania to build a convent for nuns; after her husband's death in 432, a monastery for monks followed.[134] A young monk Gerontius, encouraged by the couple, gradually developed into its superior; he later wrote the biography of his benefactor. It was in accord with the tradition of Jerome that these Latin foundations of the fifth century also displayed theological interests. But the greater force of attraction proceeded this time from the abundant charitable activity of the founder and her relationships with the aristocracy, which brought Melania into contact with the court of Constantinople and especially with the Empress Eudocia, whom she could welcome in her convent and accompany on a journey to the Holy Land.[135] With Melania's death on 31 December 439 her foundations passed into Greek hands and thereby gradually lost their Latin character.

---

[128] *Ep.* 108, 14, 20.

[129] His letters went to Italy, Gaul, North Africa, and Pannonia.

[130] The grave inscription for Paula, composed by Jerome: *Ep.*, 108, 33; on Eustochium: Jerome, *Ep.* 22; 46; 54; 107–108; 151, 3; D. Gorce, *DHGE* 16, 43–45.

[131] On Paula: Jerome, *Ep.* 134, 2; 143, 1; 153; Gerontius, *Vita s. Melan. jun.* 40; 63; 68. The famous *Ep.* 107 of Jerome on Paula's education was addressed to her mother, Laeta.

[132] On them see H. Leclercq, *DACL* XI (1933), 209–230, and especially D. Gorce in his introduction to the edition of the *Vita s. Melaniae, SChr* 90 (1962), 20–45.

SYRIAN MONASTICISM. Early Christian monasticism found an eminently favorable climate in the larger Syrian area, whose Christian population quickly showed itself responsive to the ascetical ideal to an especially strong degree. The Encratite movement of the second century, with its stern demands for renunciation of marital rights and abstinence from wine and meat for every Christian, here found a stronger echo than in other regions to which Christianity had expanded.[136] In East Syria as late even as the fourth century the reception of baptism was often joined to the commitment to a life in poverty and complete continence, so that the baptized, as "Sons and Daughters of the Covenant," represented the elite of the Church whereas other Christians continued in the catechumenate.[137] It is, however, incorrect to refer these features proper to Syrian Christianity exclusively to Persian or Manichaean influences, as well as to regard the whole early Syrian Church as a purely ascetical movement and to derive from this the early monasticism of this district, characterized by it. In the question, very recently again discussed, whether Syrian monasticism was autochthonous in its origin, that is, independent of any Egyptian influence, it is permissible to assume for early eremitism the possibility of an independent development from the strict asceticism in the pre-Constantinian Syrian Church.

---

[133] Cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 124–126; Gerontius, *Vita s. Mel. jun.* 19–21.

[134] Monastery of women (ninety nuns): *Vita s. Mel. jun.* 41; monastery of monks: ibid. 49.

[135] *Vita s. Mel. jun.* 53–55, 58–59.

[136] See vol. I, 177f., 298.

[137] Cf. E. Beck, *SA* 38 (1956), 343–347, with the evidence from Afrahat and Ephrem.

But in the post-Constantinian period the Egyptian example more certainly had an impact on the further development, since, for example, Chrysostom preached enthusiastically on it and urgently recommended to his Antiochene audience the reading of the *Life of Antony* by Athanasius.[138] But certain peculiarities of Syrian monasticism, such as the tendency to excessive severity, to striking and bizarre forms of asceticism, and the uncritical and enthusiastic admiration of these by the Christian population, must probably be regarded as the expression of the Syrian cultural inclination towards religious exuberance.

In his *History of the Monks* Theodoret gives a vivid description of the different types of the Syrian monasticism of his time:

> Some struggle in community; there are many thousands of such monasteries; others choose the eremitcal life and are intent on conversing with God alone. Others praise God while living in tents and huts, others still in holes and caves. Many . . . endure the hardships of the climate. Now they grow numb in the extreme cold, now they burn under the scorching rays of the sun. Some stand without interruption, others allot the day to sitting and praying. Some have inclosed themselves within walls and avoid contact with men, others renounce such seclusion and are accessible to all who want to see them.[139]

Here as elsewhere eremitism was first in time, here a development independent of Egyptian monasticism was earliest conceivable, especially since certain ascetical forms, such as the wearing of heavy iron chains and the neglected coiffure, were rejected by the Egyptians as empty show.[140] In fasting and renunciation of sleep and of bodily hygiene the anchorites demanded results which often led to serious and permanent injury to health, even to mutilation, but only rarely did they encounter a sure official criticism.[141] A specifically Syrian peculiarity in eremitism was represented by the so-called Stylites, whose first highly esteemed representative in the pre-Chalcedon period was Simeon the Elder (c. 390–459). After a long stay in a monastery near Teleda, he became a hermit near Televsnin in the desert south of Cyrrhus and because of his kindness and amiability was sought out by numerous pilgrims. In an effort to escape the accompanying annoyances, Simeon withdrew into a hut on the platform of a pillar that grew constantly taller, and from this he again preached to the people. After his death there arose around this pillar one of the largest churches in Syria (Kal'at Sim'an).[142]

---

[138] On the thesis of dependence on Persian and Manichaean influences, defended by A. Vööbus, see the weighty objections of A. Adam, *GGA* 213 (1960), 127–145. On the relationship to Egyptian monasticism: S. Jargy, *PrOrChr* 2 (1952), 112–124; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism* I, 138–146. Chrysostom on Antony: *In Mt. hom.* 8, 5. The translations of the Pachomian Rule from the period after Chalcedon, of the *Apophthegmata,* and of the writings of Evagrius into Syriac expanded the contacts with Egyptian monasticism.

[139] Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 27.

[140] Examples for ascetical exuberance in Theodoret, *Hist. rel.,* passim; A. Vööbus, II, 277f. Rejection: *Hist. Mon.* 8; A. J. Festugière, *Antioche,* 355.

[141] Criticism by Bishop Meletius of Antioch: Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 26.

The organizationally intermediate stage between the individual hermit and the cenobitic monastery, the community of anchorites with a hermit as spiritual father was found also in Syria.[143] Favorite areas of settlement of such anchorites were the mountains in the immediate vicinity of Antioch, then the desert of Chalcis, the Amanus Range in the north, the neighborhood of Edessa in Osrhoene, and the mountainous country of Tur'abdin in northern Mesopotamia. Even women chose the eremitical life, but mostly they decided for the convent community, which they found more suitable.[144] From the second half of the fourth century the number of monasteries in all the Syrian provinces increased remarkably. Occasionally the sources state that in these monasteries people lived according to the "rule" which the founder or an esteemed superior had given them, but it remains unclear whether this referred to a rule fixed in writing. The canons enacted by Bishop Rabbula of Edessa[145] show that even in this early period there were the beginnings of an ordering of the monastic life by set norms.

Characteristic of early Syrian monasticism was the unbounded esteem which it enjoyed in high and low alike. The simple folk, members of the upper class, the episcopate, and the contemporary imperial family were among its admirers, who made pilgrimages to the hermits and monasteries and expected help from the monks through their prayer and gifts of miracle and prophecy. Corresponding to this esteem was the vast influence which monasticism exercised on the religious conduct and piety of the people.[146] From its circles, especially from those of cenobites, the leaders of episcopal sees were chosen in increasing number.[147]

---

[142] See H. Delehaye, *Les saints stylites* (Brussels 1923), XXIV–XXXIV; A. J. Festugière, *Antioch,* 347–401. On Kal'at Sim'an, cf. G. Tschalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord* I (Paris 1953), 233–276.

[143] Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 2; 4–5; 10.

[144] Theodoret, ibid. 29–30; also J. M. Fiey, *OrSyr* 10 (1965), 281–306.

[145] Survey of the monasteries in A. J. Festugière, *Antioche,* 311–346, and especially in A. Vööbus, II, 61–69, 140–146, 159–184, 224–255. On the "rules": A. J. Festugière, *Antioche,* 315–319; A. Vööbus, *OrChrP* 24 (1958), 385–392, and *id., Syriac and Arabic Documents regarding Legislation relative to Syrian Monasticism* (Stockholm 1960); here the canons of Rabbula of Edessa on pp. 24–50, 78–86. An inscription of 354 from al-Hit in Hauran (southern Syria) proves already the existence of an organized *cenobium* with an archimandrite, an *economus,* and a church dedicated to St. Sergius: Waddington, *Inscr. de la Syrie* 2/26.

As usual in the early monasticism of the East, so too in Syrian monasticism of the early period no special theological interest can be ascertained. Only rarely did members of the upper class enter a monastery, and this step clearly involved a renunciation of one's profane education. Reading and writing were important means of providing access to Holy Scripture, entire sections of which, for example, the psalms, were learned by heart so that one could meditate on them and use them in the common prayer.[148] Occasionally monks are mentioned who mastered the art of copying manuscripts, but they used this skill for producing biblical manuscripts.[149] At times monks came forward as opponents of Arianism or of Messalianism,[150] but this was exceptional. Monastic schools in the proper sense, which supplied the young monks with an education beyond the elementary, did not exist,[151] and still a great space was allotted to theological study. This only became possible after cenobitism had left its founding phase behind it and the monasteries had obtained a secure economic foundation. Hence at this period monks as theological authors remained exceptional phenomena, such as Rabbula, the later Bishop of Edessa (d. 435), or Narsai, who for about twenty years (437–457) was director of the school of Edessa.[152]

To the picture of early Syrian monasticism belong two more features, worthy of a positive evaluation: its social charitable activity and its missionary work.[153] The early hermits, despite their modest resources, had an open hand for strangers and pilgrims who stopped at their cells and a helpful heart in regard to the needs of the poor and the sick. Individual monks courageously stood up for a fair treatment of the socially dependent vis-à-vis proprietors, tax collectors, or moneylenders. Monasteries soon organized their social activity through the constructing of hospices for strangers and hospitals.

---

[146] Cf. A. Vööbus, II, 316–326.

[147] Examples in Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 2–3, 5, 10, 17. *Itinerarium Egeriae,* 19–21. List of Syrian monk-bishops before Chalcedon in O. Hendriks, *PrOrChr* 8 (1958), 4–6.

[148] Knowledge of the psalms and reading of Scripture: Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 2, 5, 20.

[149] Chrysostom, *In 1 Tim. hom.* 14, 4; John of Ephesus, *POR* XIX, 209.

[150] Theodoret, *Hist. rel.* 2, 3.

[151] Chrysostom, Adv. *oppugn. vitae mon.* 3, 11; 3, 18 urges the people of Antioch to entrust their children to the monks of the neighborhood, who can give them instruction in Greek and even in Latin, but this does not presuppose an organized monastic school. Cf. A. J. Festugière, *Antioche,* 18ff., 209f.

[152] Ephrem's writing can hardly be claimed as an achievement of Syrian monasticism, since it is uncertain whether Ephrem himself can be reckoned as a monk: cf. E. Beck, *RAC* 5, 521–524, against A. Vööbus, *Literary Critical and Historical Studies in Ephrem the Syrian* (Stockholm 1958) and *History of Asceticism* II, 394–399. Cf. finally L. Leloir, "Saint Ephrem, moine et pasteur," *Théologie de la vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 85–97.

[153] See A. Vööbus, *Einiges über die karitative Tätigkeit des syrischen Mönchtums* (Pinneburg 1947); O. Hendriks, "L'activite apostolique des premiers moines syriens," *PrOrChr* 8 (1958), 3–25.

Since the hermits' cells were mostly in the country, in the midst of an often still strongly pagan population, missionary work was offered a direct opportunity here. In the neighborhood of Edessa the monk Abraham gained a whole village for Christianity; another Abraham, of Karra, successfully preached the gospel in the district of Emesa in Phoenicia Secunda. For the Phoenician mission, which John Chrysostom encouraged from Constantinople, Syrian monks put themselves at his disposal, and he could entrust the missionary activity on the Euphrates to monks from the monastery of Zeugma.[154] Also active as a missionary in Mesopotamia was the founder of the *Acemetae,* Alexander, first as a hermit, later with his entire monastic community. Special success was achieved by the missionary preaching of the Stylite Simeon the Elder, to whom was due the conversion of the Bedouin Arabs.[155] Very probably Syrian monks also had a considerable share in the evangelization of Armenia and even of Ethiopia.[156]

Still to be noted was the especially favorable relationship of Syrian monasticism to the official Church: there were no substantial tensions. A positive presupposition for this was surely the already mentioned fact that the number of bishops taken from the monastic institute was relatively large. It is true that the heralds of Syrian monasticism, Ephrem, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, say little about an active participation of monks in the religious life of the congregations. Most hermits even seem to have participated only rarely in the Eucharistic celebrations of the communities, but Communion was kept in one's dwelling and could have been given to oneself if a priest who happened by on occasion had celebrated the Eucharist among them;[157] the Church took no offense at that. The priesthood for its own sake was not sought by monks, and even less the episcopal office, but the motive was clearly awe of the high responsibility thereby imposed. Hence the monk encountered priest or bishop with the greatest deference, and obedience to them was a matter of course. Chrysostom saw this relation of monasticism to the Church[158] in a more profoundly theological context than did Theodoret. According to him, monasticism was called to be a sign for Christianity that it is possible radically to realize the gospel's ideal of perfection and through a life of poverty and virginity to proclaim the eschatological message of the coming of the Kingdom of God in a way that could not be ignored. If the need of the moment demanded it, the monk must of course be prepared temporarily to give up his existence as a hermit or cenobite and assume a concrete task in the Church, that is, put himself at the Church's disposal as preacher or missionary or, if the aptitude were present, through accepting the episcopal office.

---

[154] John Chrysostom, *Epp.* 49, 53–54, 123, 126.

[155] Cf. B. Kötting, "Das Wirken der ersten Styliten. Missions- und Erbauungspredigt," *ZMRW* 37 (1953), 187–197.

[156] See Hendriks, op. cit., 22–24.

[157] Cf. P. Canivet, "Theodoret et le monachisme syrien avant le concile de Chalcédoine," *Théologie de la Vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 241–282, especially pp. 278f. Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 93.

3. The Monasticism of Asia Minor and Constantinople

The beginnings of monasticism in Asia Minor are connected in the sources with the name of the later Bishop Eustathius of Sebaste,[159] who is noted in the acts of a Synod of Gangra in Paphlagonia c. 341 as head of an ascetic group whose ideals seemed to threaten the internal order of ecclesiastical life in the congregations of Asia Minor. According to the letter of the members of the Synod and their decrees, consisting of twenty canons, the Eustathians so disdained marriage that they declined to participate in a Eucharist celebrated by married priests. They upheld an extreme ideal of poverty which they stressed externally by intentionally wretched dress and by the disregard of all bodily care, but which they proclaimed didactically when they declared that no one could attain to salvation who did not renounce all possessions. In opposition to the Great Church they fasted especially on Sundays, and some rejected all bodily pleasure. Also, the customary celebrations in honor of the martyrs did not meet with their approval; they assembled in private houses for their own liturgies and thereby produced the danger of schism. Here there was question probably of a radical ascetical movement, perhaps influenced from Syria; supervision of it and its incorporation into ecclesiastical life had not yet been achieved.[160] But then this task was assumed by a man who, like the family from which he came, saw in Eustathius of Sebaste a great model of the ascetic, monastic form of life.[161] After his baptism, Basil of Caesarea was convinced that this sacrament obliged every Christian to the ascetical life in the meaning of the gospel, and he moulded on it the life of the community of ascetics which gathered around him and his friend, Gregory Nazianzen, at Annesi in Pontus.[162] Even as a bishop he remained united with it, but he also preached to his congregation at Caesarea the ideals of virginity and poverty, without, however, making them a law for all members of the community: he thereby tacitly overcame the extreme tendencies of the Eustathians. When the group of ascetics at Annesi and probably also at Caesarea developed gradually by a sort of dead weight into a cenobitic community, there followed more and more from the questions posed by day-to-day life also the necessity of an "ordering" in writing. The origin of Basil's *asketikon* must be viewed in the light of this development; to it he brought not only the knowledge he had gained on a journey made for information to the monastic centers of Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia,[163] but in a second version he introduced the insights to which day-to-day practice in a cenobitic community led.[164] It was from the first intended only for the monks connected with Basil at Annesi and Caesarea, and hence it was not a rule of an Order in the canonical sense.

---

[158] J. M. Leroux, "Monachisme et communauté chrétienne d'après saint Jean Chrysostom," ibid., 143–190, especially 174–186.

[159] Sozomen, *HE* 3, 14, 31–37; Epiphanius, *Panar.* 75.

[160] Cf. S. Salaville, "Eustathe," *DThC* 5, 1565–1574.

[161] Basil, *Ep.* 1; 119; 223, 5; 244, 1; Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Macrinae* (op. 8, 377–380).

According to Basil the fundamental law of all ascetical life is the love of God, which demands a radical renunciation in regard to a world which despises God's commandments.[165] This law is best realized in a specific community, which carries along and forms the individual. The eremetical life cannot give this help, and, besides, it contradict's man's social nature.[166] Giving up of the world and its goods is turned by Basil into something positive as self-discipline of renunciation (*ekrateia*) and is clearly distinct from any Manichaean dualism. The monk can still in certain cases personally manage his property that he has dedicated to the Lord, but it is recommended that the administration be turned over to an individual.[167] Life in the community demands order and subordination, which is to be effected in obedience to the superior (*proestos*). This obedience finds its deepest justification in the example of the Lord, who gave himself always and entirely to the Father's will. The superior himself, with his vicar, at whose side is a council of seniors, is placed in a serious responsibility, first of all as spiritual father of those entrusted to him.[168] Basil gives a high rank to manual labor, because, first of all, it should make possible to the monastery charity toward the poor and become the touchstone for the purity of the love of God.[169] In so fundamental a deriving of the monastic existence from the word and spirit of the gospel, as the *asketikon* offers it, a definite dedication of the monks to the study of Scripture is self-evident.[170] A further trait of the Basilian "Rules" is, despite all absence of compromise in what is basic, a deep discretion and magnanimity in things of second rank, which does not keep at hand a ready solution for all possible individual situations of everyday life but leaves them to the decision of the superior or of the individual monk. This should also be gained interiorly, in the case of a transgression of the rules, by mild punishment and loving reprimand for their true observance.[171] An excelling human and religious mind was here at work. The gradual maturing of he Basilian monastic life gave it an inner balance and elasticity that made essentially new forms superfluous in Byzantine monasticism: every later "reform" of eastern monasticism, such as that of the Studites, was therefore ultimately always a return to the Basilian legacy. Its quality becomes discernible in the influence which, like the Pachomian Rule, it exercised on the Latin monasticism of the West, beginning with Rufinus and Cassian by way of Benedict of Nursia to Benedict of Aniane, who gave it a place in his *Concordia Regularum.*[172]

---

[162] Basil, *Ep.* 223, 5.

[163] Basil, *Ep.* 223, 2; see J. Gribomont, *RHE* 54 (1959), 115–124.

[164] The textual history of the *Asketikon* reveals that there were a first and a second version; the first, *Little Asketikon,* was the model for the translation of Rufinus. Only the second, definitive edition, the *Large Asketikon,* has two parts, called by the copyists the "large" and "small rule" respectively (*PG* 31, 889–1306), which was probably finished after Basil's ordination as Bishop. Cf. L. Lèbe, *RBén* 76 (1966), 116–119.

[165] Basil, *Regulae fus. tract.* 1.

[166] Ibid., *Reg.* 3–5.

[167] *Reg. fus.* 16–17; 9; *Reg. brev.* 85; 87; 107; 187.

The sources are silent in regard to monastic foundations in the provinces of central Asia Minor in the period before Chalcedon. But on the Asiatic shore of the Bosporus, still within the limits of the capital, several monasteries arose around this time. One of the most important was Rufinianai, founded by the imperial minister, Rufinus, who first colonized it with Egyptian monks, but after his fall in 395 they abandoned it. Circa 400 the monk Hypatius, on whose activity as superior his pupil Callinicus reported,[173] took charge. There was also a monastic settlement on the Rhebus stream, several kilometers above the east end of the Bosporus, and on Mount Auxentius, north of Chalcedon, there arose a convent of nuns and a monastery of monks, both in the fifth century.[174]

---

[168] *Reg. fus.* 24–54, contains the norms on the organizational aspect of community life. On the understanding of obedience in Basil, see J. Gribomont, *VS Suppl.* (1952), no. 21, 192–215.

[169] *Reg. fus.* 37–41.

[170] *Reg. brev.* 235–236; 95.

[171] *Reg. fus.* 50–53.

[172] Cf. J. Gribomont, *L'Histoire du Texte . . .* , passim.

[173] On Rufinianai, see R. Janin, *ÉO* 22 (1923), 182–190.

[174] Rhebas: Callinicus, *Vita s. Hypatii,* can. 45; Mount Auxentius: R. Janin, *DHGE* 9, 27.

In regard to the beginnings of monasticism at Constantinople the sources give information that is partly contradictory. The capital certainly attracted monks from the eastern provinces of the Empire early, and at first they lived there as individuals or in rather small groups. To the Church historian Sozomen Marathonius was already regarded as superior of a monastic community (*synoikia monachon*): he was a former official who had been won for the ascetic life by Eustathius of Sebaste c. 350. On the other hand, the hagiographical literature attributes the founding of the first *monasteriŏn* in Constantinople to the Syrian monk Isaac c. 382. But even before Isaac the number of monks in the city must have been considerable, since they played an important role in the controversy over the doctrine of Macedonius. From the end of the fourth century other monasteries appeared in rapid succession, since the Council of Ephesus in 431 recognized Abbot Dalmatus, Isaac's successor, as superior of all monks in the city. In 448 representatives of twenty-three monasteries signed the judgment of the Synod which repudiated the teaching of Eutyches.[175] Among these monasteries that of the so-called *Acemetae* occupied a special place: it had been founded by the monk Alexander near the Church of Saint Menas. He had lived for a time in a monastery in Mesopotamia, then wandered, preaching through the Syrian provinces with a crowd of monks, and c. 425 came to Constantinople, where many monks from other monasteries soon entered the community he directed. A special force of attraction proceeded from the custom, brought along from Syria, of celebrating in the monastery uninterrupted prayer throughout the night—hence the name *akoimētoi* for these monks—for which groups of monks of different languages took turns. When jealousy and intrigues drove the *Acemetae* from the city, they went to Asia Minor, where Alexander's successor, John, could finally make a new settlement at Eirenaion on the Bosporus, which began its great growth under its third abbot, Marcellus. From this monastery in 468 the Patrician Studios summoned some monks for his new foundation in the capital that was later to be so famous.[176]

The monks of this period did not always give joy and comfort to the bishops of the capital. They were eager to share, at times tumultuously, in the confrontations raging around the "orthodoxy" of their bishops, of whom Macedonius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Nestorius were able to experience their power and aggressiveness as much as John Chrysostom, who urged them to better monastic discipline and aspired to exercise a certain control over their life.[177] In this attitude of the monasticism of the capital it becomes very clear that a framework had to be discovered which also incorporated it canonically into the total life of the Church. For the area of Eastern Christianity this momentous work was undertaken by the Council of Chalcedon in a series of canons.[178] The most important norm was given in canon 4, which subjected every monastery to the supervision of the diocesan bishop. Without his knowledge neither a small colony nor a monastery could be established in the future. The canon further decreed that a monk remained bound for the duration of his life to the monastery in which he began his ascetical career: he could leave it only for a weighty reason and temporarily with the consent of the diocesan bishop. Canon 8 also strengthened the position of the bishop in relation to the monastery: monks who were clerics, and hence members of the hierarchy, remained explicitly subject to the bishop's jurisdiction. Other canons tried to guarantee the ideal of the vocation by forbidding the assumption of a secular function or military service and denying to monks and nuns entry into marriage.[179] With this legislation of Chalcedon eastern monasticism, as an ecclesiastical state, obtained its official position in the total organism of the Church. True, the canons did not exhaust all possibilities of canonical regulations for monasticism, but they offered a framework capable of sustaining the burden, which could be filled in by later decisions if new developments within monasticism should make them necessary.

---

[175] Sozomen, *HE* 4, 27, 4 (Marathonius); on the monastery of Isaac: R. Janin, *Les Églises et les monastères de Constantinople* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1968), 86–88; Synod of Ephesus on Abbot Dalmatus: *ACO* I, 1, 7, X–XI; list of monastic representatives of 448: ibid. II, 1, 147.

[176] On the monastery of the Acemetae: R. Janin, *RÉB* 12 (1954), 76–79.

4. Messalianism

In the second half of the fourth century there appeared in Syria and Mesopotamia a movement led by monks, whose ascetical practice and teaching soon evoked opposition from ecclesiastical circles. The first to speak of them was Ephrem the Syrian; he called them Messalians—those who pray intensively—and spoke rather vaguely of their lack of discipline.[180] Gregory of Nyssa spoke of ascetics known by him who lived at the expense of others and valued the daydreaming they regarded as revelations more highly than the teachings of the gospel.[181] Epiphanius of Salamis knew of them from hearsay and stressed their moral licentiousness.[182] Theodoret of Cyrrhus was the first to name some of the "authors of error," among them a certain Simeon. He states also that the Messalians, if necessary, avoided being cut off from the Church by disavowing their doctrines. According to his report, Bishops Letoius of Mytilene, Amphilochius of Iconium, and Flavian of Antioch especially fought against the movement. It was also Amphilochius who c. 390 submitted the question of the Messalians to a synod at Side in Pamphylia, which, after adherents of the movement had been heard, rejected the following doctrines: baptism does not eradicate the root of sin, but only incessant prayer, which alone can expel the demon dwelling in the human soul; the Messalian pneumatic must reject work; he can foretell the future, see the Trinity with the eyes of his body, and physically perceive the descent of the Holy Spirit in his soul.[183] A Synod of Constantinople of 426 raised basically the same objections against the Messalians, except that it now emphasized at the head of the propositions to be condemned their thesis that in each newly born person dwells a demon which drives him to his evil deeds. Newly added was the charge of a false understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity and of Christology, which caused the Messalians to approach Sabellianism and Docetism. For its verdict the Synod relied on an investigation of a Messalian work, on which Bishop Valerian of Iconium reported.[184]

---

[177] See G. Dagron, op. cit., 261–72.

[178] The canons in *ACO* II, 1, 2, 159ff., and in *COD* 63–75. On the entire matter L. Ueding, *Chalkedon* II (Würzburg 1953), 569–676, is fundamental.

[179] Canons 7 and 8.

[180] Ephrem, *Sermo* 22, 1 (*CSCO* 169, 79, Beck). The first to mention the Greek name *Euchitai* for the Messalians was Jerome, *Dial. adv. Pelag.* (*PL* 22, 498).

[181] Gregory of Nyssa, *De virg.* 23, 3. See M. Aubineau, *SChr* 119 (Paris 1966), 534–541, with the literature.

This work, called *Asketikon,* was presented to the Council of Ephesus of 431, when, on the motion of Bishops Valerian and Amphilochius of Side, it took up the Messalian movement, which had then spread, especially in Pamphylia and Lycaonia. The decrees of the Synod of Constantinople of 426 were confirmed, the *Asketikon* was condemned, disavowal was demanded of persons suspected of the erroneous doctrine. deposition and excommunication were decreed against clerics who refused to comply and excommuniation against lay persons, and the Messalians were forbidden to have monasteries. Furthermore, the Council rejected eighteen individual propositions extracted from the *Asketikon,* which John Damascene placed in his *History of Heresies.*[185] They refer to the binding of the human soul to the demon, to the effect of baptism, the importance of prayer, to the physically perceptible presence of Christ and of the Holy Spirit; the reproach of overesteeming dreams, of aversion to work, and of licentiousness was no longer raised.

In the investigation of the *Asketikon* and its probable author, patristic scholarship through an important discovery was placed before an abundance of new problems in regard to Messalianism. To a series of the propositions condemned at Ephesus there were found more or less exact parallels in the *Spiritual Homilies,* which, under the name of Macarius of Egypt, occupied a high rank in the ascetical mystical literature of the Christian East.[186] An intensive preoccupation, begun at once, with the complex of questions thereby raised led not only to the discovery of further writings of the same sort and provenance: it is believed that their author has been found in that Simeon of Mesopotamia called a Messalian by Theodoret and some manuscripts, and he must also be regarded as the author of the *Asketikon.*[187]

---

[182] Theodoret, *HE* 4, 11, 1–8, and Epiphanius, *Haeret. fab. comp.* 4, 11.

[183] List of condemned propositions: Kmosko, n. XXI (*PS* I, 3). A Synod under Flavian of Antioch confirmed the verdict.

[184] In Kmosko, no. XIV.

[185] The *Horos* of the Synod of Ephesus in E. Schwartz, *ACO* I, 7, 117f.; the individually condemned propositions from the *Asketikon* in Kmosko, no. XVI.

However, in this work there is definitely no longer a question of the "vulgar" Messalianism of the early years, which Ephrem, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius, and the first anti-Messalian synods had condemned. As now presented, any moral laxity is condemned in it, the work of the "brothers" is highly esteemed, and the phantasies of many a pneumatic no longer play a role. Here one encounters rather a refined theology of experience, in which a high but not an exclusive importance is assigned to prayer, in which ascetical training is a self-evident presupposition for the acquiring and preserving of the Spirit and his grace, and in which a devaluation of baptism is no longer traceable. Of course, this purified Messalianism is also not free of abnormalities—for example, an exaggerated view of the value of the experience of grace and the "tangibility" of the love of God—but according to the more recent observations Gregory of Nyssa and Diadochus of Photice regarded this Messalianism, after a tacit correction of its errors, as an ascetical attitude possible to them.[188] Hence it seems that doubts are not to be excluded whether the *Asketikon* condemned at Ephesus represented such a Messalianism or whether extracts presented from it did not give a distorted picture of its doctrine.[189] Of course, the negative verdict of Ephesus burdened it, without however being able to exclude the enormous influence of its writings on the mysticism of the future.

---

[186] The observation is due to the Benedictine, L. Villecourt, "La date et l'origine des Homélies spirituelles attribueés à Macaire," *CRAIBL* (Paris 1920), 29–53.

[187] Thus first H. Dörries, *Symeon von Mesopotamien* (see the sources).

[188] R. Staats, *Gregor von Nyssa und die Messalianer* (*PTS* 8, Berlin 1968), defends with noteworthy reasons the priority of the Great Letter of the Messalians to Gregory's *De instituto christiano.* H. Dörries, "Diadochus und Symeon," *Wort und Stunde* (Göttingen 1966), 334–417, indicates a similar and at the same time correcting and adopting "dependence" of Diadochus. G. M. Bartelink, *VigChr* 22 (1968), 128–136, calls attention to Messalian formulas in the *Vita* of Hypatius by Callinicus.

[189] See H. Dörries, "Die Messalianer im Urteil ihrer Bestreiter," *Saeculum* 21 (1970), 213–227, and J. Gribomont, op. cit. Also, in M. Canevet, *RÉG* 82 (1969), 404–423, the discussion on the authenticity of Gregory of Nyssa's *De instituto christiano.*

CHAPTER 20

The Monasticism of the Latin West

While the Latin West, especially in Rome and North Africa, had its own Early Christian asceticism on a considerable scale,[1] a native monasticism in the proper sense, independent in origin and development from the movement in Eastern Christianity, cannot be demonstrated with certainty for the West. Both the eremitical life and the organized monastic system began in the West only after the middle of the fourth century—at a time, then, when the knowledge of eastern monasticism had long ago reached the West through various channels and could have a further stimulating impact, especially when the already lively relations between Eastern Christianity and the Christian congregations of the West became more intense in the early phase of the Arian struggles. As early as 324 Hosius of Córdoba was at Alexandria to perform a task for Constantine, and there he certainly obtained knowledge of the just blossoming monasticism. The same is true of the pilgrims from the West, who came to the East in growing numbers after 324 and were able to observe in Palestine the great interest of the imperial family in the holy places. The wholly credible report that Constantine and his sons sent letters to Antony in Egypt[2] shows the significance which persons of the highest station attributed to monasticism. The repeated stays of Athanasius in the West—at Trier in 335, at Rome c. 340–343, at Aquileia c. 345–gave him and his entourage the possibility of speaking as eyewitnesses of the powerful movement which had taken hold of the East. His testimony achieved its full impact when his account of the life and work of Antony, written c. 357, became accessible to a larger Latin circle of readers in an early Latin translation soon after 360.[3] A momentum favorable to monasticism certainly proceeded also from the itinerant eastern monks who appeared from time to time in the West, especially in Rome.[4]

The knowledge of eastern monasticism at first, however, operated in the West only to reinforce the already existing ascetical communities, which, especially in Rome, saw themselves sanctioned in their ideals, gained further members, and were able to found new ascetical circles. The fact that a relatively long starting-time was needed in the West before an organized monastic system arose—this development began on a broader plane, apart from individual cases, only toward the end of the fourth century—becomes intelligible when the state of the expansion of Christianity in the West c. 350 is kept in mind. The real Christian centers were the cities with their relatively densely populated hinterland, but, according to the ideas of the time, these were precisely not the areas of settlement favorable to monasticism, which required solitude.[5] Not until the conversion of a majority of the rural population was achieved were conditions advantageous to an organized monasticism of some magnitude created. A survey of the individual regions of the West makes clear at the same time important differences within Latin monasticism itself as well as in comparison with its eastern precursor.

---

[1] See vol. I, 295–299. On the temporary eremitical life of the priest Novatian (c. 250), see H. J. Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum* (Bonn 1968), 39, 228.

[2] Athanasius, *Vita s. Antonii* 81.

[3] See supra, chap. 19, II.

[4] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 37, 45. Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis* 29–40, knows of a tradition according to which Hilarion in his wanderings is said to have gone as far as Epidaurus and Salona in Dalmatia.

Rome and Italy

The growing knowledge of eastern monasticism exerted its greatest influence in the circles of the Roman communities of Christians who were already open to the ascetic ideal. The correspondence of Jerome, who was especially active during his second Roman sojourn (381–384) as a zealous promoter and propagandist of the monastic ideal, informs us that the members of these circles were mostly ladies of the upper class, who, like Asella, Marcellina, sister of Bishop Ambrose of Milan, and Irene, sister of Pope Damasus I, at first led a life of virginity as individuals in their families or, like Marcella, decided on the ascetic type of life as widows.[6] More and more they joined in larger ascetical groups or domestic communities respectively, among which those of the prominent Romans, Lea, Paula, Melania the Younger, and Proba played a special role.[7] A substantial approach to the monastic form of life was indicated when ladies of these circles left Rome and continued their former community on one of their properties in the country.[8] But some of them, such as Melania the Elder, Paula the Elder, and finally Melania the Younger, apparently saw that the possibility of a complete realization of the monastic ideal could take place only in the East and emigrated there.[9] Augustine was the first to speak of a real monastery of Roman women c. 387: he knew a group of widows and virgins who lived together, gained their support by the work of their hands, gave themselves a rule of the house, according to which tried "superiors" undertook the moral and spiritual direction of the community, and in which *caritas* was reckoned as the highest command.[10]

---

[5] Jerome unceasingly stresses the necessary "flight from the cites": *Ep.* 14, 6, 1; 58, 5, 1; 125, 8, 1; *In Amos* 2, 11; *In Marcum* (*CChr* 78, 459f.).

[6] Asella: Jerome, *Ep.* 24; Marcellina: Ambrose, *De virg.* 3, 4, 37; Paulinus, *Vita Ambr.* 4; Irene: A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana* (Vatican City 1948), 107–111; Marcella: Jerome, *Ep.* 127.

[7] Lea: Jerome, *Ep.* 23; Paula: Jerome, *Ep.* 108; Melania the Younger: Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 61, see D. Gorce, *SChr* 90 (Paris 1962), 40f., Proba: Jerome, *Ep.* 130, 7.

[8] Such as the above-named Marcella, Lea, and Melania the Younger.

The ascetical ideal apparently found a far weaker response among the men of the Roman community. There were, it is true, ascetics living alone here too quite early, but there seems not to have been the intermediate stage between them and the monastery, the community of male ascetics. Before long, even some of these ascetics, because of their extravagant behavior in dress and conduct, evoked the opposition of Christian circles.[11] Again Augustine attests the existence of several organized monasteries of men, in which men educated "in the divine science" were superiors and the community, "according to the custom of the East," as he stressed, assumed responsibility for its support through its own labor.[12]

For Rome it is only natural to raise the question of the position of the Roman Bishop in regard to the monastic movement of this period. Pope Damasus I (366–384) surely has to be considered as a definite promoter especially of women's asceticism: he encouraged it in word and writing. His successor, Siricius (384–399), was of the same mind: he expressed his opposition to a devaluation of the ascetical ideal. When, after the fading of the threat from the barbarian invasions in the early fifth century, the number of monks increased, Popes Innocent I (401–417) and Zosimus (417–18) intervened to issue regulations.[13] Among the Popes of the century are included also the first Roman founders of monasteries. The *Monasterium in Catacumbas* near the basilica of the Martyr Sebastian on the Via Appia owes its origin to Pope Sixtus III (432–440), and his successor, Leo I (440–461), founded a monastery near the Vatican basilica, later called that of Saints John and Paul; it was probably responsible for the liturgy in the basilica.[14]

---

[9] See supra, pp. 360f.

[10] Augustine, *De mor. eccl. cath.* I, 33, 70–73. A convent of women, allegedly founded by Constantina, sister of Constantine, at S. Agnese fuori le mura cannot be definitely proved; see G. D. Gordini, op. cit., 229f., against P. Schmitz, *RBén* 38 (1926), 189–195.

[11] Jerome, *Ep.* 22, 27–28.

[12] Augustine, *De mor. eccl. cath.* I, 33, 70.

[13] *LP* I, 220 (Innocent); Zosimus, *Ep.* 9 (*PL* 20, 670).

[14] On the foundations of Sixtus III and Leo I, see G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries* (Vatican City 1957), 163–172.

In a glance at the rest of Italy, what is first noteworthy is a relatively strong spread of the eremitical life on the coasts and islands of the Tyrrhenian Sea and, less often, in the Adriatic. The first island hermit known by name was Martin of Tours, who, after a brief time as a hermit in the vicinity of Milan, had to yield to pressure from the Arians and withdraw to the island of Gallinara off the Riviera, opposite the city of Albenga, c. 357–360.[15] Augustine knew a monastic community on the island of Capraria, modern Capraia, northeast of the northern tip of Corsica. The same island was named by Rutilius Namatianus as the abode of men "dreading the light," who called themselves monks. He also mentioned the island of Gorgo, today Gorgona, on the latitude of Livorno, because a young ascetic who had abandoned wife and property "had buried himself alive" there.[16] On the island of Tinetto at the northwestern exit from the Gulf of La Spezia, excavations have revealed the remains of a hermitage of the late fourth century.[17] Bonosus, a friend of Jerome, withdrew c. 374 to an island off the Dalmatian coast. Ambrose and Jerome spoke quite generally of this eremitism, which populated numerous islands of the Tyrrhenian Sea and the remote inlets of the coast.[18] Clearly here the island character was felt to be a substitute for the solitude of the wildernesses into which the anchorites of Egypt and Syria went.

The first founding of a monastery on Italian soil is connected with the name of Bishop Eusebius of Vercelli, who gave this foundation a specific orientation. Before being called to become bishop of the North Italian city, Eusebius had been a lector at Rome and had already decided on a life of virginity and asceticism before he was banished to the East in 355 because of his fidelity to the Nicene Creed. It was probably only after his return from exile in 363 that he united the clergy of his cathedral in a monastic *vita communis;* hence he was the first founder of a *monasterium clericorum* in Church history, since, until then, there was in East and West no model for his institution, so far as the sources inform us, and his contemporaries were quite aware of the novel character of his work.[19] Ambrose mentions the singing of hymns, common prayer, study of Scripture, manual labor, and fasting as important ingredients of the life of the clerical community of Vercelli,[20] which thus appears as the anticipation of Augustine's *monasterium clericorum* at Hippo and, with the requirement of the study of Scripture, already displays a specifically western element.

---

[15] Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* 6, 5; see the commentary of J. Fontaine, *SChr* 134 (1968), 582–602.

[16] Augustine, *Ep.* 48; Rutilius Namatianus, *De reditu suo* 439–452; Gorgo: ibid., 515–526. Spanish studies identify, probably incorrectly, Capraria with the island of Cabrera in the Balearics: cf. Hülsen, *Pauly-Wissowa* 3, 2, 1546.

[17] Cf. R. Trinci (among others): *Bollettino Ligustico* 9 (1957), 45–62.

[18] Bonosus: Jerome, *Ep.* 3, 4; Ambrose, *Exaem.* 3, 5, 23; Jerome, *Ep.* 77, 6: "insulas, Etruscum mare . . . reconditos curvorum litorum sinus, in quibus monachorum consistunt chori." Island monasticism received reinforcements from Africans who left their country in the period of Vandal rule.

Milan under Bishop Ambrose must also be named as a further center of ascetic monastic effort in Italy. At the time of Augustine's stay at Milan there existed outside the city gates a monastery of men; the superior of the numerically not inconsiderable community was a learned priest, and Bishop Ambrose himself was its eager patron.[21] Elsewhere too Ambrose stood up as the advocate of monasticism, when he praised the island eremitism, extolled the work of Eusebius of Vercelli, or bitterly reprimanded two former monks who now reviled what they had once vowed.[22] But his care was directed in a special way to women who had vowed ascetical virginity. He put his word and his pen at the service of their ideal: from his efforts speaks the resolute seriousness of the Roman-become-Catholic-Bishop, who contrasted the exalted claim of Christian discipline with a lax pagan moral concept.[23] While virgins came from Piacenza and Bologna, and even refugees from North Africa, to Milan in order "to take the veil" (*ut his velantur*) there, Ambrose did not find in his episcopal city unanimous approval of his recruiting, and so he once sarcastically remarked: "I preach here and find a hearing elsewhere; I would almost prefer to preach elsewhere in order to convince you!"[24]

In the rest of Italy, apart from Bologna, where the monastic community counted some twenty nuns, there existed in Ambrose's day one convent of nuns at Verona, on which Bishop Zeno expended his care.[25] Jerome addressed one of his letters to the *virgines* in his native Haemona. As early as 370 Rufinus was a monk in a monastery of his home town, Aquileia. When c. 400 he translated Basil's *Asketikon* for the monks of a monastery of Pinetum, he asked that copies be sent "also to other monasteries" of the West.[26] In South Italy asceticism first got a foothold with Paulinus, who came from Bordeaux and from 395 led a monastic life with his domestic community. The ascetical communities which Melania the Younger established c. 408 on her properties in Sicily and Campania may also have been "domestic monasteries" of this sort.[27] Later biographies ascribe to many a bishop of the fourth to the sixth century special interest in monasticism or even the founding of monasteries, but in individual cases this cannot be ascertained with certainty from other sources.[28]

---

[19] Ambrose, *Ep.* 63, 66: ". . . primus in occidentis partibus diversa (i.e., monasterii continentiam et disciplinam ecclesiae) coniunxit." Pseudo-Maximus of Turin, *Sermo 7,* 22 (*CChr* 23, 25): "eosdem monachos instituit esse quos clericos; . . . ut si videres monasterii lectulos, instar orientalis propositi indicares." The sermon is to be assigned near the end of the fourth century. In his letter from exile to his congregation at Vercelli Eusebius does not mention the clerical monastery: *Ep.* 2 (*CChr* 9, 108). On Eusbius: C. de Clercq, *DHGE* 15, 1477–1483.

[20] *Ep.* 63, 82: "hymnis dies ac noctes personant; orationibus conciliare crebris; student lectioni, operibus continuis mentem occupant; jejunii labor."

[21] Augustine, *De mor. eccl. cath.* I, 33, 70; *Conf.* 8, 6, 15.

[22] Ambrose, *Ep.* 63, 7–9; *Enarr. in ps.* 36, 49.

[23] Especially to be mentioned here are works developing out of sermons on the ideal of virginity: *De virginibus, De viduis, De virginitate, De institutione virginis,* and *Exhortatio virginitatis;* see the special editions in Altaner–Stuiber, 382; the literature in E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosius von Mailand* (Münster 1965), 250, footnote 223.

[24] *De virginibus* I, 11, 58–61.

Gaul

For Gaul also we must presuppose a premonastic asceticism, even if the testimonies for it are relatively sparse and of a later date. A decree of the Emperor Valentinian I (c. 370), which exempted the consecrated virgins of Gaul from a tax, assumes the existence of women's asceticism, just as does a canon of the Council of Valence (374), which dealt with the *virgines* who had abandoned their former state.[29] Also at Trier there is known about the same time the institution of *virgines deo dicatae,* and even before the turn of the century a decree of Pope Damasus I (366–384) or of his successor, Siricius (384–399), expresses itself on the question of the treatment of such virgins who became unfaithful to their vows.[30] The majority of these *virgines* in Gaul still lived with their families, but they occasionally gathered into rather small groups following the trend toward a monastic community.[31]

The first reports on male asceticism in Gaul are connected with the name of the man who ranks clearly as the founder of Gallic monasticism—Martin of Tours. His discharge from military service was motivated by his decision for an ascetical existence, which, after a short stay with Hilary of Poitiers, he first put into practice as an itinerant ascetic in the Balkans, then outside the gates of Milan, and, as already mentioned, on the island of Gallinara off the Ligurian coast.[32] After Hilary's return from exile in 360, Martin lived at first in a hermitage in the vicinity of Poitiers, with great probability on the site of the later monastery of Ligugé, eight kilometers south of the city.[33]

---

[25] Ambrose, *Epp.* 5 and 6; in *De virginitate,* 130, Ambrose praises the Bishop of Bologna, Eusebius, for his successful work for *virginitas.*

[26] Haemona: Jerome, *Ep.* 11; Aquileia: Rufinus, *Apol.* I, 4; Pinetum: Rufinus, *Praef. in Regul. s. Basilii* (*CChr* 20, 241).

[27] Nola: P. Fabre, *S. Paulin de Nole* (Paris 1949), 39ff.; Melania: Palladius, *Hist, Laus.* 61.

[28] See G. Penco, *Storia,* 27–42.

[29] *Cod. Theod.* XIII, 10, 4; *Conc. Valent.,* can. 2 (374).

[30] Augustine, *Conf.* 8, 6, 14 (Trier); the papal decretals: *PL* 13, 1178.

[31] Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* 2, 11, was the first to mention a *monasterium puellarum;* see R. Metz, op. cit., 119–124. Bishop Victricius of Rouen requested from Pope Innocent I (402–417) instructions for the care of *virgines lapsae: PL* 20, 469–481.

By accepting a few disciples, this hermitage gradually became a colony of anchorites, and the same is true of the cell to which Martin withdrew soon after his call to be Bishop of Tours c. 371; from it grew the monastery of Marmoutier. The rapidly growing number of hermits—soon there were some eighteen—caused the appearance here too of certain forms of common life, such as common meals and common prayer. Since manual labor remained forbidden to monks in an effort to keep from them a spirit of acquisitiveness—only some younger monks prepared the manuscripts needed for reading and prayer—the community's support had to be defrayed from the property supplied by brothers coming from well-to-do families and from the aid of the congregation of Tours. A series of traits of this monastic colony points unmistakably to like structures in Egyptian monasticism, as they are demonstrable in Antony's union of hermits or of those on Mount Nitria. Among these characteristics must be counted not only the loose, unregulated organization, but especially the basic ascetical concept that understands the monk's being as the following of Christ, as realized in apostolic poverty on the model of the primitive community—common possessions, clothing—and in constant warfare with demons. The essential ingredient of this struggle with demons was the destruction of pagan temples, the erecting of Christian churches in their place, the instructing of people through preaching, and the foundation of new monastic settlements.[34] In this way Martin's monasticism received a decidedly pastoral and missionary trend, which gave it a specific character. Since new bishops were eagerly chosen from the circle of Martin's disciples and they promoted the monastic ideal in his spirit, the early monasticism on the Loire retained its special nature also in the future. Naturally, it aroused opposition among some bishops, to whom Martin's vast influence among the people was distasteful, but whose reputation, defended and propagated by the literature on him written by Sulpicius Severus, guaranteed a decisive and continuous impact, especially in southwestern Gaul.[35] After renouncing his paternal inheritance, Sulpicius also personally sought to realize in practice Martin's ascetical ideal with some modifications, when he introduced for himself and his household at his country residence, Primuliacum,[36] a lifestyle which united individual ascetical features, such as living in separate cells and a simple monastic garb, with intellectual activity and a ready hospitality to monks, especially those of Marmoutier. For this ascetic circle the memory of Martin was the unifying bond and the tomb of his pupil Clarus, whom Sulpicius Severus had buried at Primuliacum, was a constant stimulus for his veneration.[37] The influence of Martin may also be assumed for the monasticism of the bishopric of Rouen, farther northwest, since the bishop of that see, Victricius, knew Martin personally, venerated him, and, just like him, had monasteries established near newly erected churches.[38] And Maximin, who founded a monastery at Chinon on the Loire, west of Tours, was a disciple of Martin.[39]

---

[32] Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* 5, 1–3; on Martin's stay at Milan and on Gallinara, see supra, p. 377. It is possible that even before 356 Hilary of Poitiers had lived as an ascetic or in a community of ascetics with his clergy; cf. J. Fontaine, op. cit., 559, footnote 2.

[33] Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* 7, 1. On the most recent excavations at Ligugé cf. the reports of J. Coquet in the *RMab* 1954–1961, especially 51 (1961), 54–70; the first to use the name Ligugé were Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita s. Hilarii* 1, 12, and Gregory of Tours, *Virtutes s. Martini* 4, 30.

[34] The question of where Martin got his knowledge of eastern monasticism seems secondary, since there were many possibilities from the mid-fourth century. A derivation of Martin's monasticism from that of Italy, as made by F. Prinz, op. cit., 93f., only puts off the question, since the East was also the model for the Italian monasticism of the fourth century.

About a decade after Martin's death the second phase in the expansion of Gallic monasticism began, which especially included Provence and was to surpass Martin's form of monasticism in its significance for Church history. The starting-point and, for a century, also the center of this movement was the double island off the coast of Cannes, today called Lérins. On the larger island, Lerinum or Lerina, there settled, between 405 and 410, with his friend Caprasius, Honoratus, of a prominent family, after he had decided in his early manhood for the ascetical life against the opposition of his father.[40] From its modest anchoretic beginning, there developed in the course of twenty years an *ingens fratrum coenobium,* as John Cassian called the foundation c. 425.[41] Honoratus, soon ordained a priest, remained, until his call to be Bishop of Arles in 428, the spiritual father of the monastery: while he perhaps did not supply it with a written Rule, he did give it an order of life entirely oriented to the Egyptian model. The reputation of the *coenobium* on this *beata insula* not only attracted many visitors but brought it a remarkably high percentage of recruits from the upper class families of Late Roman Gaul, which gave to the monasticism of Lérins a character clearly in contrast to that of Martin. Even more momentous for the Gallic Church of the fifth century was the fact that monks of Lérins coming from this very class were chosen as bishops and thus brought to their new circles of work the spirit that determined the religious and theological character of the monastery. Besides Honoratus, they included his cousin, Hilary, who became his successor at Arles and, as pastor and energetic metropolitan, for two decades determined the destinies of the Church in southeastern Gaul. There were also Maximus, second Abbot of Lérins, elected to the see of Riez, and Faustus, who succeeded him in both the abbatial dignity and the episcopal office.[42] Bishop Eucherius of Lyon (from 434) remained an enthusiastic champion of Lérins throughout his life; c. 420 he settled with his wife and children on the smaller island, Lero, and named as tutors of his sons no less than the monks Hilary of Arles, Salvian, Priest of Marseille, and Vincent, who may be identified with the author of the famous *Commonitorium.*[43] A brother of this Vincent was the monk Lupus, later Bishop of Troyes, while the sons of Eucherius, Salonius and Veranus, went as bishops to Geneva and Vence respectively.[44] Apparently there was in progress here a development similar to that in the Eastern Church, in which the selecting of bishops from the monastic state became the rule. Thus the spiritual and theologically unique character of the island monastery is found again in the monastic community established by Hilary at Arles and in that existing at Lyon even before Eucherius's time.[45] From Lyon the spirit of Lérins radiated also to the Jura monasteries, since Romanus, founder of the first of these, Condat (Saint-Claude, c. 430), had learned "the life of the monks" in a monastery at Lyon, and at Condat under the later Abbot Eugendus the monks read, in addition to the ascetical works of Basil, Pachomius, and Cassian, also "what the holy fathers of Lérins" had published.[46] Another important influence on the monasticism of the fifth century in southeast Gaul proceeded from the work of John Cassian, just mentioned. He came probably from the Romanized Dobrudsha (*natione Scytha*) and hence was a Latin-speaking monk. After a first stay in a monastery at Bethlehem, he had lived some ten years among the anchorites of Scete in Egypt until c. 400; he was next a deacon under John Chrysostom at Constantinople and later, probably as a priest, a member of the clergy of the Church of Antioch. In the service of his bishops he was twice in Rome, where he became acquainted with the later Pope Leo I. For reasons that cannot be clarified with certainty, he came c. 416 to Marseille, where Bishop Proculus gave him the Church of Saint-Victor outside the city.[47] Here he founded the famed monastery of monks, dedicated to Saint Victor; it was followed by a convent of nuns, to which Caesarius of Arles later sent his sister for her formation.[48] At the Church of Saint-Victor Cassian composed his two great works on the way of life and the spiritual world of eastern monasticism—the *Instituta Coenobiorum* c. 424 and the *Collationes* c. 426–28. Here too was displayed his collaboration in the theological discussion of his time on Nestorianism and Augustine's doctrine of grace.

---

[35] On the peculiarity of Martin's monasticism, one is referred especially to the commentary of J. Fontaine in *SChr* 134, on the *Vita s. Martini,* canons 10 and 13. New foundings of *monasteria* by Martin: *Vita,* canon 13; *Dial.* 2, 8; 3, 8. On the literary character of the *Vita s. Martini,* see also J. Fontaine, *SChr* 132, Introduction; its basic tendency is that Martin was a second Antony; see F. S. Pericoli Ridolfini, "La vita Martini e la vita Antonii," *Studi e Materiali stor. rel.* 38 (1967), 420–433.

[36] On the road from Bordeaux to Narbonne, in the border area of Aquitania and Narbonnensis, see J. Fontaine, op. cit., 32–38, and *SChr* 134, 894f. (map).

[37] Clarus: Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* 23; *Ep.* 2, 5; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 32, 6 (tomb inscription).

[38] Victricius, *De laude sanctorum* (*PL* 20, 443–458); Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* 3, 2; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 18.

[39] See E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* III, 329.

---

[40] *Sermo de vita s. Honorati* 4–13 (eulogy by Hilary of Arles on his predecessor on the anniversary of his death, probably 431).

[41] In the *Praefatio* to the *Collationes* XI–XVII, which he dedicated to Honoratus and Eucherius.

[42] Faustus of Riez, *Sermo* 34 of the homilies of pseudo-Eusebius, *PL,* Suppl. III, 633–640 (eulogy on Maximus).

[43] Eucherius, *De laude eremi* 42–43 (praise of the island); *Instruc.* I, *praef.* (teacher of his sons). On Vincent: F. Prinz, op. cit., 52, and, more cautiously, E. Griffe, op. cit., III, 337.

[44] E. Griffe, op. cit., II, 222f., 287. Here are considered only the monks of Lérins who became bishops to about the mid-century.

The Abbot of Marseille himself stated the goals of his monastic writings in the dedications, which were directed to the various bishops, monastic superiors, and anchorites of Gaul.[49] He aspired to familiarize, in detail and reliably, the leadership of Gallic monasticism both with eastern cenobitism and also with the spirituality of the eremitism there. The proved cenobitic rules of the East, especially that of Pachomius, whose individual features were lovingly described in the *Instituta Coenobiorum,* should be a help to the Gallic monasteries, often founded rather haphazardly and still not sure of their way, for the preservation of the apostolic tradition, in which Cassian seemed to regard as advisable a certain adaptation to the climate and customs of life of the country.[50] He assigned to anchoritism an objectively higher rank, it is true, since it presupposes a deeper ascetical discipline, but its high requirements could even become a danger. Although his admiration and secret love belonged to this form, he selected for himself, in a sense as a model for Gallic asceticism, the ordered life in the monastery within the city. Two characteristics of the monasticism of the Rhone certainly go back to Cassian's work: first, the decidedly high estimation of the eastern, really the Egyptian, model, which was here grasped more keenly and more profoundly than in the monasticism of Martin of Tours, and, second, the greater receptivity to a "theology of monasticism," which he brought as a legacy of the East from the circle around Evagrius Ponticus to Provence. From this resulted ultimately the lively interest in the theological discussion of the time on the validity of the Augustinian doctrine of grace, in which the monasticism of southeast Gaul took a laudable share. Still more important, of course, was probably the long-range impact of this abbot who had come to Marseille from the Balkan Peninsula. The discreet, intelligent judgment, the sure view for the ascetically possible, the winning purity of his ideals, and the attractive style of his writings decisively prepared for the great future of Latin monasticism in the Middle Ages.[51] Finally, southeastern Gallic monasticism experienced certain impulses from the East which went back to the contacts of Jerome with the monastic circles in Toulouse and Marseille. Through the monk Sisinnius he was informed of the ascetical movements in Toulouse, which induced him to dedicate his commentary of Zechariah to Bishop Exsuperius and his exegesis of Malachi to the monks Minervius and Alexander.[52] In a letter to a certain Rusticus of Marseille, who in 427 became Bishop of Narbonne, he recommended the ascetic life in a community of brothers, whereas he expressed himself rather critically in regard to Martin of Tours.[53]

---

[45] Arles: *Vita s. Hilarii* 10; on Lyon: F. Prinz, op. cit., 66f.

[46] *Vitae Patrum Jurensium* 11 (Armanus); 174 (Eugendus): *SChr* 142 (1968), 250, 426.

[47] On Cassian's homeland: H. I. Marrou: *Miscell. G. de Jerphanion* II (Rome 1947), 588–596; on his membership in the clergy of Antioch, see E. Griffe, *BLE* 55 (1954), 239–244; on his activity in Marseille, again H. I. Marrou, *RMA* 1 (1945), 5–26.

[48] Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 62; L. Laurin, *Notice sur l'ancienne abbaye Saint-Victor de Marseille* (Marseille 1957); *Vita Caesarii Arelat.* 1, 35.

[49] Cf. J. Leroy, "Les préfaces des écrits monastiques de Jean Cassien," *RAM* 42 (1966), 157–180; id., "Le cénobitisme chez Cassien," ibid. 43 (1967), 121–158.

---

[50] *Instit. Coenob., praef.* 8–9. Here there seems to be a reproof for the relative freedom of Martin's monasticism. But Cassian knew and esteemed also the few anchorites in the area of Provence, such as Helladius and some monks on the Stoechades islands (Iles d' Hyères off Marseille), to whom he dedicated *Collationes* XVIII–XXIV; see the preface to *Coll.* XI and XVIII.

[51] Cf. E. Pichery in his introduction to *SChr* 42 (1955), 56ff.

[52] Sisinnius is mentioned by Jerome, *Ep.* 119, 1; *Comm. in Zach. prol.; Contra Vigil.* 3, 17. Minervius and Alexander: *Comm. in Amos* III, *prol.; Comm. in Malach., prol. Ep.* 119 is also addressed to them.

[53] Letter to Rusticus: *Ep.* 125; on Martin, without naming him, *Ep.* 60, 9.

Spain

While premonastic asceticism is first attested for the Iberian Peninsula by the Synod of Elvira,[54] reports on the existence of monasticism here do not occur until c. 380, but then they of course make clear that it was not a question of an institution just coming into being there. Bishop Hosius of Córdoba, who stayed at Alexandria in 324 as Constantine's delegate, was able to report about eastern monasticism, so that he will be first thought of as the agent, in the reference of Athanasius, through whom Spain also had obtained knowledge of the life of Antony. But it is known for sure only that he dedicated a work on virginity to his sister, who belonged to a group of consecrated virgins.[55]

The Synod of Zaragoza in 380 used the term *monachus* for the first time in a Spanish text in a special context: it decreed punishment for the passage of a cleric to monasticism because he thereby "aspired to appear [as] a more zealous observer of the law."[56] Five years later, on the other hand, Pope Siricius (384–399) in a letter to Bishop Himerius of Tarragona expressed the wish that clerics should especially be chosen from monasticism; in the same letter monasteries of men and women are mentioned as a normal thing in the province of Tarragona.[57] Monasteries are also taken for granted for the same time in a correspondence between a society lady and a nun, who advised the former to withdraw to a convent for prayer from Christmas to Epiphany.[58] It is uncertain whether the islands off the east coast of Spain knew monasticism at this time.[59]

A unique representative of Spanish monasticism in the last years of the fourth century was Bachiarius, of whom Gennadius reports that he chose the *peregrinatio* in order to preserve his asceticism; in fact, Bachiarius defended his itinerant monasticism spiritedly.[60] In his *De lapso* he showed himself to be an ascetic of sound judgment and great knowledge who had studied Tertullian, Cyprian, and Jerome. Of course, his itinerant monasticism brought on him the suspicion of being an adherent of Priscillian ideas, which, however, he decisively repudiated in an *apologia.*[61]

---

[54] Council of Elvira, can. 13.

[55] Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 5; Athanius, *Vita s. Antonii* 93. Jerome remained close to an ascetical couple from Spain: *Epp.* 71, 75. The First Council of Toledo (c. 400), 6, 16, 19, was also concerned with *virgines.*

[56] Conc. Caesaraugust., 6.

[57] Siricius, *Ep. ad Himerium* 1, 13, and 1, 6.

[58] G. Morin, who attributes both letters to Bachiarius, edited them with commentary: *RBén* 40 (1928), 293–302, reprinted in *PL,* Suppl. 1, 1035–1044.

[59] On the monasticism of the Balearic island of Cabrera, see supra, p. 377., footnote 16.

[60] Gennadius, *Vir. ill.* 23; Bachiarius, *De fide* 2.

No doubt, however, the reaction to Priscillian's movement brusquely interrupted the further development of monasticism in the Iberian Peninsula. True, Priscillianism must be evaluated primarily as a dualistic heterodox theology and hence is dealt with in another place, but from this theology its adherents developed an extreme and exaggerated ascetical practice, which brought even orthodox monasticism into disrepute and evoked in some bishops otherwise not unfriendly to asceticism a long-lasting distrust of it.[62] This burden and the disturbances beginning after the turn of the century, which were connected with the occupation of the country by the Sueves and later the Visigoths, delayed until the beginning of the sixth century a stronger recovery of monasticism.

North Africa

Especially in North African Christianity the ascetical life had achieved a noteworthy expansion and a high esteem as early as the third century. From the days of Tertullian, the North African Church knew *virgines* or *continentes* of both sexes, who were encouraged by Bishop Cyprian with special care and often proved themselves in time of persecution. They continued to exist throughout the fourth century and apparently increased in number and importance, since the synods of this period were repeatedly concerned with them and issued rules which pushed them more and more in the direction of the common life.[63] Perhaps the rank and spread of asceticism were a reason why in a glance at the rest of the development of the inner life of the Church in North Africa real monasticism appeared there relatively late. To be sure, the thesis has been proved untenable that the monasticism of North Africa owed its origin, its basic organization, and its first expansion to Augustine exclusively.[64] For he himself testified to the existence of several monasteries at Carthage c. 400, and they could not have originated on his initiative because in them an understanding of monasticism was represented by at least one group of monks which was diametrically opposed to the Augustinian view.[65] The characteristics of this group, condemned by Augustine with the utmost sharpness, their extraordinary coiffure, their rejection of all manual labor, their complacent appearance in public, and especially the subjectivity and capriciousness of their scriptural exegesis apparently betrayed Messalian influences.[66] And the itinerant monks, strongly condemned by him, whose unworthy conduct brought their entire state into discredit, clearly reveal eastern peculiarities.[67] If, then, Augustine cannot be called the "father" of African monasticism,[68] nevertheless to him belongs the credit for instituting a monasticism which bore the stamp of his spirit and through its quality was called to become a highly significant element of the inner life of the Church, first in that of North Africa, then through its continued operation in all of Western Christianity.

---

[61] *De lapso: PL* 20, 1037–1062; see J. Duhr, *Le De lapso de Bach.* (Louvain 1934). *De fide: PL* 20, 1019–1036; see J. Madoz, *RET* 1 (1940–41), 457–488.

[62] Cf. Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2, 50; the Synods of Zaragoza and Toledo (380 and 400 respectively) already hinted at a reaction.

[63] See G. Folliet, "Aux origines de l'ascétisme et du cénobitisme africain," *SA* 46 (1961), 25–44. For the decrees of the Synods of Carthage of 349, 390, 397, and that of Hippo of 393, ibid., 31–34.

[64] Thus following P. Monceaux, "Saint Augustin et saint Antione," *Miscell. Agostiniana* II (Rome 1931), 61–89, especially J. M. del Estal in a series of essays in *La Ciudad de Dios,* pp. 169–172 (1956–59), and finally in *StudMon* 3 (1961), 123–136.

Augustine's Monastic Rule

Certainly decisive, first of all, for the formation of this monasticism was the personal direction of both monasteries founded by Augustine at Hippo—the monastery of lay persons, of which he as a priest was superior, and the later episcopal *monasterium clericorum,* as he called it.[69] The intensive study of the problem of the Augustinian Rule in the most recent period has led to the conclusion that Augustine put in writing his ideas on a monastic form of life. A comprehensive investigation of the manuscript tradition of all pertinent texts has shown that the so-called *Praeceptum,* earlier called the *Regula tertia* or *recepta,* can alone claim to be regarded as Augustine's monastic Rule,[70] and a comparison of this text with Augustine's other writings, especially the *De opere monachorum,* has confirmed this result with the strong stylistic and factual relationship here demonstrable.[71] Hesitations about Augustine's authorship, which may be drawn from the not strictly logical train of thought or from the fact that Augustine did not mention this text in the *Retractiones*—the list of Augustine's writings in Possidius is, besides, incomplete—lose weight if it is accepted that it was destined only for private use, not for publication. Of course, the question of the dating of the Rule is still open, since reasons can be adduced for a relatively early (shortly before 400) as well as for a later beginning (c. 425–26).[72]

---

[65] *Retract.* 2, 47: *cum apud Carthaginem monasteria esse coepissent.* At the request of Bishop Aurelius of Carthage, Augustine intervened with his *De opere monachorum* in the violent controversy over these monasteries.

[66] See G. Folliet, "Des moines euchites à Carthage en 400–401," *Stpatr* 2 (*TU* 64, Berlin 1957), 386–399.

[67] Characteristics of itinerant monasticism: *De opere monachorum* 28, 36.

[68] Also the statement of Petilian, that Augustine had introduced *hoc genus vitae* (*sc. monasteriorum et monachorum*), cannot be understood in this sense; cf. B. Quinot, *RevÉAug* 13 (1967), 15–24.

[69] *Sermo* 355, 2.

[70] The result is published by L. Verheijen in volume I of *La règle de s. Augustin;* ibid., 417–437, the critical edition of the text of the *Praeceptum.* Volume II of L. Verheijen contains the history of the research on the question of the Augustinian Rule; on Verheijen see A. Manrique, *Misc. patrística, Homenaje P. A. C. Vega* (El Escorial 1968), 289–328.

An effort to put forward what was specifically Augustine's in his understanding of monasticism must not overlook that Augustine only gained his insight through a rather long development, determined by the stages on the way of his religious life. At times these became for him the opportunity to rethink his ascetical ideal and concretely to realize the insights thereby acquired. The *Confessiones* clearly show that Augustine's first encounter with monasticism in Italy forever stamped his understanding of Christian asceticism. But even then he knew that anchoritism in the real sense was not possible for him personally even if he spoke of it with admiration.[73] In the *vita communis,* which, with some like-minded persons, he established in his paternal home at Thagaste after his return from Italy, an Augustinian peculiarity will be seen alongside certain features common to that cenobitism, such as seclusion from the world and renunciation of marriage: the high rank which was assigned to intellectual activity, the contemplative grasp of Christian revelation. Still, the community of Thagaste cannot yet be called a *monasterium* in the full sense, since apparently the renunciation of personal property was not yet required of all its members, who came chiefly from the educated class. These limitations do not occur in Augustine's two foundations in Hippo, in which he tried to realize the now definitively acquired monastic ideal. In the monastic life at Hippo the following features may be called specifically Augustinian: 1. The *vita communis* was understood as one of the highest possibilities for realizing the love of God and neighbor on the basis of a deeply Christian understanding of *amicitia,* which unites all.[74] 2. The life of the community was supported by the atmosphere of a great inner breadth in the relationship to one another and to the superior, which was determined by the freedom bestowed in grace.[75] 3. For *lectio,* spiritual study in the broader sense, a pride of place was demanded and maintained, which gave to the Augustinian monastery a characteristically intellectual alertness and receptiveness to all religiously significant questions.[76] 4. The *monasterium clericorum* was put definitely at the service of the care of souls, so that the Augustinian monasticism was emphatically apostolically oriented and effectively bound to the *ecclesia.*[77]

---

[71] See T. I. van Bavel, *Augustiniana* 9 (1959), 12–17. A commentary on the *Praeceptum,* the common work of Bavel and Verheijen, will clarify this relationship.

[72] For the early beginning, besides I. van Bavel and L. Verheijen, especially D. Sanchis, *StudMon* 4 (1962), 7–33; for a later dating, A. Sage, *RevÉAug* 14 (1968), 128–132.

[73] Augustine, *De mor. eccl. cath.* 31, 67.

[74] *Praeceptum* I, 2: "sit vobis anima una et cor unum in deum." V, 2: "ut in omnibus superemineat caritas." *Sermo* 356, 8: "caritatis unitas."

This Augustinian monastic ideal operated in the future in a double form: first, directly in the area of the North African Church in the monasteries which were founded here by friends and disciples of Augustine and were directed in his spirit; then, indirectly through the influence which the Augustinian Rule acquired on other monastic systems outside Africa. Augustine's biographer Possidius stressed that he personally knew some ten men, who were called out of the *monasterium clericorum* in Hippo to be bishops and founded monasteries in their sees.[78] It can hardly be doubted that they gave to their establishments the Augustinian Rule as the norm of monastic life, just as Augustine by his personal contacts exercised a further influence on them.[79] A prudent appraisal establishes that up to his death some thirty monasteries of men came into existence in North Africa which more or less bore his stamp. Even the foundations that occurred after his death in the later part of the fifth century for the most part referred back to the model he created.[80] No less important was the later impact of the Augustinian Rule on the newly created monastic rules of the future. Caesarius of Arles and Benedict were under obligation to him in their new creations;

---

[75] *Praeceptum* VIII, 1: "observetis haec omnia cum dilectione . . . non sicut servi sub lege, sed sicut liberi sub gratia constituti." VII, 1: the superior is *pater;* "plus amari adpetat quam timeri." IV, 9: consideration and understanding for the erring. III, 1, 3, 5: warm-hearted care of the sick.

[76] *Praeceptum* V, 9–10: rules for the monastic library; Possidius, *Vita s. Aug.* 31; *Enarr. in ps.* 99, 12: *lectio* is the monks' occupation. Study of Scripture: *Ep.* 21, 3; cf. A. Penna, "Lo studio della Bibbia nella Spiritualità di s. Agostino," *S. Augustinus, Vitae spir. Magister* I (Rome 1958), 147–168; A. Manrique, *Los monjes y los estudios* (Poblet 1963), 13–39.

[77] See L. M. Verheijen, *Théologie de la Vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 205ff., and A. Zumkeller, "Biblische und altchristliche Leitbilder des klösterlichen Lebens im Schrifttum des hl. Augustinus," *Augustiniana* 18 (1968), 5–21.

[78] Possidius, *Vita s. Aug.* 11: ". . . ferme decem, quos ipse novi, sanctos et venerabiles viros continentes et doctos beatissimus Augustinus diversis ecclesiis, non nullis quoque eminentioribus, rogatus dedit. Similiter et ipsi . . . monasteria instituerunt et . . . fratres ad suscipiendum sacerdotium praestiterunt."

[79] The superior of the lay monastery at Hadrometum in 427 asked Augustine *instruere* his monks *in regula monasterii:* Aug., *Ep.* 216, 6.

[80] J. J. Gavigan, op. cit., 116–144, gives a list of the North African monasteries of the fifth century according to the literary sources and archeological finds.

the *Regula Monasterii Tarnatensis* of the sixth century was chiefly only an adaptation of the Augustinian Rule, the use of which can also be ascertained in the *Regula Pauli et Stephani* and in early Spanish monastic regulations.[81]

Thus the most recent results of research prove that also in this aspect of the Church's inner life Augustine was a creative initiator and continuing force.

Anti-Monastic Currents

A phenomenon as striking as monasticism could not but immediately arouse the interest of pagan circles, which of course did not examine it according to its own self-awareness but for the most part condemned it only because of its external appearances and thus reached an often pointedly negative verdict. The Emperor Julian, it is true, admitted that Christians "in great number" decided for this form of life, but in their senseless asceticism, which drove them into the desert or burdened them with chains and iron collars, he could see only the activity of a demon, to whom they voluntarily subjected themselves.[82] The *rhetor* Libanius attributed to them a dark life of wickedness, which concealed itself under their ascetical exterior, and attributed to them the ultimate responsibility for the destruction of pagan temples.[83] A similar view was held by Eunapius of Sardes, who reproached them especially for the cult of martyrs—they had, he said, made gods out of slaves executed because of their crimes—and even accused them of high treason, since in 395 they had, so he claimed, facilitated Alaric's invasion of Greece via Thermopylae.[84] The historian Zosimus formulated the reproach, often raised later, that monks, because of their renunciation of marriage, were worthless to human society and, under the pretext of wishing to support the poor, they made mankind poor because of the gifts they begged.[85] The former Prefect of the City of Rome, Rutilius Namatianus, also had harsh words for eremitism; he branded it as a scandal that recently a young man of a prominent family gave up marriage and "buried himself alive" on the island of Urgo.[86]

However, the Christian Emperors also occasionally had reason for criticism of the behavior of some monks and did not hesitate to take energetic legal measures because of certain encroachments. When monks from the Nitrian Desert took part in 375 in a riot of the population of Alexandria, which was directed against the installation of the Arian Bishop Lucius, the Emperor Valens forced them abruptly into military service and threatened severe punishments in cases of refusal.[87] And the Emperor Theodosius I had to complain repeatedly of the tumultuous appearance of monks who in 387 took part in a riot in Antioch and made themselves prominent in the destruction of the synagogue at Callinicum. In 390 he even forbade them to settle in cities, and six years later an edict by his sons sharply condemned their seditious intervention in favor of men who had been condemned to suitable punishments because of their crimes.[88]

---

[81] Cf. L. Verheijen, *La règle de s. Augustin* II, 213–217, with map. A. Manrique is preparing a study of the later impact of the Augustinian Rule down to Benedict of Aniane.

[82] Julian, Emperor, *Ep.* 89f.

[83] Libanius, *Or.* 2, 32.

[84] Eunapius, *Vitae sophist.* p. 472f., 476.

[85] Zosimus, *Hist. nova* 5, 23.

[86] Rutil. Namat., *De reditu suo* 429–452, 515–526.

In the properly internal sphere of the Church there were often at first tensions between episcopate and monasticism, which had various causes. It could not but disturb the bishops that here an institution had come into being which at first escaped control by the hierarchy. The hierarchy could rightly point to the fact that at times monasteries had been established whose existence seemed not adequately assured; that questionable elements often found admission, whom a previous careful investigation would have excluded; that monastic superiors were chosen who were in no sense equal to their task. Thus are explained the exertions of the episcopate to incorporate monasticism as a state in the Church and to place it on the organized bases established by canon law, just as they were first secured by the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon.[89] And the claim made, at least de facto, by some monks to belong to a state which was of higher rank than the episcopate occasionally produced friction.[90] Additional matter for conflict was given, finally, when the strictly ascetical life of the monks operated as a silent reproof vis-à-vis the attitude, remote from renunciation, of some bishops, a motif which becomes clearly discernible in the distrust of the Gallic and Spanish episcopates in regard to monasticism in the fourth and fifth centuries.

The antimonastic movement proved to be strongest in lay Christian circles of the fourth and fifth centuries: it appeared as a reaction to the exuberant enthusiasm for monks at the time. Here also the discrepancy between the new ascetic ideal and the ordinary lifestyle of the upper class in the large cities of late antiquity was felt as a reproach, and

[87] See Jerome, *Chron. ad a. 375;* Orosius, *Adv. pag.* 7, 33, 3; *Cod. Theod.* XII, 1, 63.

[88] Theodosius against Ambrose: *monachi multa scelera faciunt,* Ambrose, *Ep.* 41, 27; the imperial edicts: *Cod. Theod.* XVI, 3, 1; IX, 40, 16.

[89] See supra, p. 371.

[90] Cf., for example, Athanasius, *Ep. ad Dracontium* 10.

people sought to counter it by a sort of defensive attitude. This is clearly attested for Antioch by John Chrysostom, according to whom local Christians branded monks as charlatans and seducers who enticed men from their previous environment to a dismal life in the desert.[91] In Rome the ladies of the higher-class circles who had gathered into ascetical communities found themselves exposed to the caustic mockery of their former friends. At the burial of Blesilla, whose early death some ascribed to excessive asceticism, there were scenes of protest, in which it was demanded that "the monastic rabble" should be expelled from the city or thrown into the Tiber.[92] When the prominent married couple from Aquitania, Paulinus and Theresia, chose the ascetic life, Ambrose predicted that this step would produce a wave of indignation.[93] Augustine likewise had to defend monasticism in Africa; its individual representatives themselves evoked much blame by their defiant appearance, which was later manifested at Carthage also.[94] Finally, in both East and West the opposition of some parents, never entirely quieted throughout the later centuries, was also vigorous: they took precautions to prevent their children from exchanging a hidden life in the bosom of their family for self-burial in the monastery.[95]

The antimonastic atmosphere of some circles expressed itself finally in a discussion, conducted at times with vast bitterness, simply about the justification of the ascetical ideal. Of course, an at times imprudent and all too enthusiastic exaltation of the ideal of virginity could be felt to be a devaluation of Christian marriage. In Rome the layman Helvidius in 382 published a work which attacked Mary, the model of all virginity, and denied her perpetual virginity by appeal to Matthew 1:8 and 1:25 and Luke 2:7 and 8:20. The refutation by Jerome, who was then living at Rome, became of enduring significance for the history of dogma because of its Mariology.[96] A few years later occurred Jovinian's attack against some fundamental theses of Christian asceticism: in his glance at the high estimation of celibacy he maintained the equality of the states of virgins, widows, and the married, since only the reception of baptism determined the rank of the Christian. To the high esteem for fasting he replied with the thesis that it is just as meritorious to eat with thanksgiving to God. Jerome's excessive reaction was followed by the condemnation of Jovinian by a Roman Synod c. 390, with which Ambrose of Milan agreed.[97] He himself was moved to a written defense of monasticism when two members of the monastery of men at Milan departed and made propaganda for Jovinian's ideas in neighboring Vercelli.[98] Once again Jerome put in an appearance when c. 406 the priest Vigilantius from southern Gaul, censured, in addition to what he regarded as the excessive cult of martyrs and relics, especially the overestimation of the monastic ideal by the Christian people. What, he asked, was to become of an orderly pastoral care, who would win sinners and the children of the world for virtue, if everyone went into the monastery? Retreat into solitude from such duties was, he said, rather a desertion than a fight.[99]

---

[91] See his apologia, *Against the Despisers of Monasticism,* with the commentary by A. J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne* (Paris 1959), 192–210. Also Gregory of Nyssa, *De virgin.* 23, 4, criticized the rigoristic as well as the lax conduct of some monks.

[92] Jerome, *Ep.* 38, 5; 45, 4; 39, 6, the expression *genus detestabile monachorum.*

[93] Ambrose, *Ep.* 58, 5.

[94] Augustine in his *De opere monachorum* and *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae;* c. 411 the *Consultationes Zachaei et Apollonii* 3, 3, are also critical. For North Africa as the place of origin of this work, P. Courcelle, *RHR* 146 (1954), 174–193. Cf. also Salvian, *De gub. mundi* 8, 14, 19.

[95] John Chrysostom, *Contra detrect. vit. mon.* 1, 2; *In Ephes. hom.* 3; Ambrose, *De virginibus,* passim.

[96] Jerome, *Adv. Helvidium, PL* 23, 183–206; on Helvidius, cf. G. Jouassard, *Melanges Saumier* (Lyon 1944), 139–156; P. Antin, "Le monachisme selon s. Jérôme," *Théologie de la Vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 191–201.

This antimonastic reaction, to which was denied a greater success than it intended, had, however, noteworthy positive effects. To the extent that it was aimed at actually existing abuses in the asceticism and conduct of some monks, it contributed to their elimination and helped to prevent other false developments. The ecclesiastical leadership was obliged to guide the at times impetuously enthusiastic movement along orderly paths and finally it provided the possibility of accepting monasticism as such without restrictions.

---

[97] Jerome, *Adv. Jovinianum, PL* 23, 211–238; Augustine also took a stand against Jovinian in his *De bono conjugali* and *De sancta virginitate.* On the Roman Synod see *Hefele–Leclercq* II, 78ff. On Ambrose and Jovinian cf. F. Homes Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* II (Oxford 1935), 393–398.

[98] Ambrose, *Ep.* 63, *ad eccl. Vercell.*

[99] Jerome, *Adv. Vigilantium, PL* 23, 339–352; see *Ep.* 61, *ad Vigilantium.*

CHAPTER 21

Church and Society

In the process, extending over the entire fourth century, of the evangelization of the population of the Roman Empire, the Church was confronted with social structures, economic relations, forms of cultural life, and the daily habits of the society of late antiquity, which pressed for a confrontation under various aspects. The following account will show briefly on what especially relevant areas of the social life of the age the Church took a position, positive or negative, whether it sought or achieved a change—in short, in what respects the society of late antiquity experienced a transformation because of the existence and influence of Christianity.

Marriage and Family

A judgment on the esteem of the area of marriage and family by the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries must distinguish between the preaching of pastors and the writings of ecclesiastical authors, with their predominantly moralistic and exhortatory tendency, and the canonical regulations which were directed to this complex of questions. It must first be ascertained that the Church had to a great extent accepted the rules of the currently valid secular law of marriage, such as the legal contracting of a marriage and its consequences, the position of the *paterfamilias,* and the law of inheritance.[1] When ecclesiastical writers indicated contradictions between the Christian order of marriage and profane laws on marriage, they were referring concretely to the different evaluation of individual questions and did not intend to reject the totality of the civil legislation on marriage. Also, the profane customs surrounding weddings were often retained by Christians and on the Church's part were challenged only in those features which were connected with pagan religious notions or in their occasionally coarse boisterousness, which contradicted Christian sensitivity.[2]

However, those regulations of the Roman marriage law which employed a different standard in regard to the evaluation of adultery by the man and the wife did encounter a clear repudiation from the Christian side. People found unjust a law which penalized the adultery of the wife in every case but that of the husband only if it was committed with a married woman. It was further disapproved because it forced the husband to separate by a prescribed procedure from his wife when she was guilty of adultery and deprived him of the possibility of forgiving her and thereby saving the marriage.[3] The Church came into a still sharper opposition to the civil law of marriage with its definite defense of the indissolubility of marriage in principle and, based on this, its repudiation of remarriage of Christians divorced in accord with the current law. It is true that from some expressions of Christian writers and pastors it can be inferred that the Church permitted the remarriage of the man, not of the woman, if he was divorced from his wife on the ground of her infidelity. But a careful analysis of these passages and of their context and the consideration of all views of the writing of the period on the entire complex of questions make clear that the overwhelming majority of contemporary Christian theologians did not approve the remarriage of divorced persons.[4] Some false interpretations of pertinent patristic texts are conditioned by the fact that they assent to the separation of the couple on the basis of the so-called Matthew-clauses (5:32 and 19:9) but do not express themselves on the question of remarriage, which, however, in no sense means approval of it. Occasionally, Christians who were living in an unrecognized second marriage were, after appropriate penance, admitted to the ecclesiastical community and the reception of communion. But this practice is to be understood only as a pastoral, helpful measure in a complicated situation, not as a recognition of the legality of such a marriage. As the ultimate justification of this fundamental attitude of the Church, the really new element in the Christian understanding of marriage is given: it cannot be regarded only as a contract, again terminable for certain reasons, between the marriage partners, but as a union based on a divine ordinance, which obtains its indissolubility from that higher reality which Augustine termed *sacramentum* and in which he saw the sharing of the couple in the union which binds Christ and his Church.[5] Even under the Christian Emperors the Church was unable in this question to change the civil law substantially. A decree of Constantine I of 331, which at least limited the grounds for divorce, may indeed have been influenced by Christianity, but it did not attack the principle of the dissolubility of marriage by *divortium* (separation by mutual agreement) or *repudium* (after the adultery of one party) and of the then possible remarriage any more than did the constitution of his sons of 339, which made the punishment for adultery more severe.[6] In a synodal decree of 407 or 416, which unambiguously maintained the prohibition of a remarriage of divorced persons, no matter which party was guilty, the African bishops required that there should be a demand for an imperial law on this question, but as late as 449 a civil regulation still did not give up the principle of dissolubility by *repudium,* but only made divorce more difficult "in the interest of the child" and in so doing made husband and wife equal in law.[7] Hence, in this matter, the "Constantinian Turning-Point" meant no decisive change for the Church.

---

[1] R. Orestano, *Struttura giuridica del matrimonio romano* I (Milan 1951), 410ff.

[2] This is especially stressed by Chrysostom; see P. Rentinck, *La cura pastorale in Antiochia nel IV secolo* (Rome 1970), 256–259.

[3] G. Delling, "Ehebruch," *RAC* IV, 676f.

---

[4] This comprehensive analysis is provided by H. Crouzel, *L'église primitive face au divorce* (Paris 1971); here, pp. 11–18, also the bibliography on the question. Only the Ambrosiaster, *Comm. in ep. ad Rom.* 7, 3–4.8–11.15. 39–40, expresses himself clearly for the permissibility of remarriage of the legally separated husband.

[5] Augustine, *De bono conjug.* 7–8, 6–7; *De nupt. et concup.* 1, 10. 17. 21.

[6] *Cod. Theod.* 3, 16, 1, on this and the later imperial laws, F. Delpini, *Divorzio e separazione dei conjugi nel diritto romano e nella dottrina della Chiesa fino al secolo V* (Turin 1956).

The enthusiastic recruiting, already described in chapter 18, of ascetical writers for the ideal of virginity led to a reaction on the part of some Christians, who incorrectly saw it as eclipsing the real worth of Christian marriage. This caused some Church Fathers to define their view of the relationship of marriage and virginity and more deeply to establish the understanding of marriage. Chrysostom and Augustine especially made clear that the higher rank demanded for virginity was by no means to be understood as a devaluing of marriage.[8] Ambrose considered it necessary to deal with the scruples which were asserted in the interest of the State against the strong ecclesiastical propaganda for the ideal of virginity in a look at its possible demographically negative effects.[9] The Church had no objections against regulations of the civil law of marriage which in specific cases forbade the contracting of marriage, as, for example, because of close relationship. But for its own part it decreed new marriage impediments, which followed from its understanding of the conjugal union among Christians and here too it was able to influence civil legislation. Thus, more and more in the fourth century it objected to marriages between Christians and pagans or Jews, although such marriages occasionally brought missionary acquisitions—one thinks of the ladies of the Roman upper class. The numerous canons of the synods of the time, despite the prohibition, did not regard such marriages as invalid but merely inflicted canonical penance on the parents or the married partners.[10] The civil law here went beyond the view of the Church in so far as it legally forbade marriages between Christians and Jews and punished offenses against the law with the death penalty or with the sanctions laid down for adultery.[11]

While Roman law denied any juridical worth to marriage between slaves, the Church regarded them as valid, but also had to have regard for the rights of the slaves' master. Perhaps it must be attributed to ecclesiastical influence that a law of Constantine I forbade the master to break up slave families in a partitioning of his property.[12] If the slaves did not belong to the same master, the Church made the recognition of their marriage dependent on the agreement of both masters. The real problem was that of marriage between slaves and free persons, which the civil law forbade. The Church could and would recognize such marriages of themselves, but demanded the emancipation of the slave before the contracting of his marriage, thereby of course at the same time leaving it to the discretion of the slaveowner.[13]

---

[7] Canon of the African bishops: *Mansi* III, 799 and 1163; *Cod. Just.* 5, 17, 8 (of 449).

[8] For Chrysostom, see J. Dumortier, *Lettres d'humanité* 6 (1947), 102–166; T. Zissis, *Kleronomia* 1 (1969), 285–310; P. Rentinck, op. cit., 251–280. For Augustine, N. Ladomierszky, *S. Augustin, docteur du marriage chrétien* (Rome 1942). Jerome, *Ep.* 49, makes precise his view expressed in *Adv. Jovinianum.*

[9] Ambrose, *De virg.* 7, 35–37; Augustine, *De s. virgin.* 13; Jerome, *Ep.* 123, 14.

[10] Council of Elvira, can. 15–17; Council of Arles (314), can. 11; Council of Hippo (393), can. 12; Council of Carthage (397), can. 12; Council of Laodicea, can. 10, 31; Council of Chalcedon, can. 14.

[11] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 8, 6 (339); 3, 7, 2 (388).

The Church furthermore changed the meaning and extent of the rights which the Roman *patria potestas* gave to the *paterfamilias* over the contracting of marriage by his children. It wanted this to be understood not so much as a right but rather as concern for the child. Thereby it also gave the mother a voice and finally allowed the child the right, if the occasion arose, to reject the spouse destined for him or her by the father.[14]

Finally, the Church redefined the relations of the married couple to each other and hence gave to married life a much deeper basis than profane law had ever been able to do. This relationship was to be measured in principle against the model of the union which existed between Christ and his Church. Accordingly, its foundation was love, *caritas coniugalis,* which knew a thoroughly hierarchical ordering of marital and family life, but which abolished all legal inequality in a spiritual and religious community of life.[15] This *caritas* took from the husband in his basically recognized role of leadership the harshness of the Roman *dominus* and *gubernator praepotens* in marriage; it made the *reverentia mulieris* a voluntarily assumed subordination of the wife, which was now based, no longer on the inequality of the sexes but on the position and role of the wife in the family life.[16] Such equality of the partners bound them to equal fidelity and hence regarded failings against this as equally serious; in fact, the adultery of the man was even more serious, since he, as head of the family, was bound to exemplary behavior.[17] When the Christian writers and pastors of this period in their preaching praise as virtues of the wife *pudicitia* and *castitas coniugalis,* display the figures of Susanna and Mary as models, and characterize care for husband and children as their foremost duty, this should be valued positively, especially with a glance at some features of contemporary social life, and no antiemancipatory attitude of the Church should be seen, even if the reality more and more lagged behind the proclaimed ideal.

---

[12] *Cod. Theod.* 2, 25, 1 (325).

[13] On the marriage of Christian slaves see R. Orestano (supra, footnote 1), I, 420ff.

[14] Augustine, *Ep.* 254 (on the mother's role); Ambrose, *De virg.* 1, 9, 56; 10, 58; *De virginit.* 5, 25. But some of the Fathers maintained the unlimited right of the father.

[15] Ambrose, *Exaem.* 5, 7, 18; Augustine, *De bono conj.* 7; *C. Faust.* 19, 26; 23, 8; *Sermo* 51, 13; Jerome, *Ep.* 77, 10; Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 45, 2; *In ep. I ad Cor. hom.* 19, 1; 26, 8; *In ep. ad Eph. hom.* 20, 2.

[16] Basil, *Hom. in ps.* 1, 3; Ambrose, *Exaem.* 5, 7, 19; on Augustine cf. F. J. Thonnard, "La morale conjugale selon s. Augustin," *RevÉAug* 15 (1969), 113–131, here 127ff.

[17] Augustine, *De conjug. adult.* 2, 7.

Likewise the relationship of parents and child experienced under the influence of Christianity a change, the effects of which were clearly perceivable in the society of late antiquity. Even the Church conceded to the paternal authority vis-à-vis the child the chief role, but it diminished its absolute character, since it esteemed it more as a duty than as a right, softened the *patria potestas* to *paterna pietas,* and especially sought to give the mother greater influence on the education of the child.[18] There were ever more admonitions to parents to be understanding teachers and models in living for their children.[19] The paternal authority found its limits when it sought to deprive the child of the free decision for the Christian faith or wanted to force the daughter to enter a convent out of material considerations.[20] Parents who neglected their duty to support their children should be punished with ecclesiastical punishments, just as the children's duty of caring for their parents in need bound them too.[21]

Just how much the Church's emphasis on the care of the child was justified is made clear from some rather melancholy features of the society of late antiquity. Augustine knew that parents with one to three children decided against any more because they did not wish to compel their offspring ever to beg.[22] The Council of Elvira excluded for life from the ecclesiastical community "the mother or any other relative" who exposed their children to prostitution out of greed.[23] The practice of the poorer classes of selling their children, and thus usually of depriving them of their freedom, was clearly condemned by the Church but maintained itself tenaciously: imperial laws as late as 391 and 451 still had to forbid it.[24] The exposing of children, quite common in the ancient world, early encountered the strong condemnation of the Church, which saw in it a barbaric effect of the *patria potestas.*[25] Ecclesiastical writers attacked the causes of this abuse, which must not be attributed chiefly to great economic need but to the utilitarian viewpoint of the head of the family, unwilling to share his means with a large group of children. They bewail even more the harsh lot of the exposed, who, in the event of escaping death, were mostly destined for the life of a slave, a catamite, or a prostitute.[26] A law of Constantine I brought about in 331 the first limitation of the custom, in so far as it deprived the child's father of the right to demand the foundling back later from the foster parents, but the practice itself was still tolerated, and only under Valentinian I was it subjected to certain penalties under the influence of the Church.[27] Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine make clear that it still occurred frequently in their days; Augustine reports that *virgines sacrae* occasionally gathered up such children and had them baptized.[28] In 412 the Emperor Honorius once again had to emphasize that the exposure of children was deserving of punishment.[29] The decrees of two Gallic synods required that a person should report the receiving of a foundling to his church, which saw to it that, after a period of ten days, he remained forever with the foster parents.[30] Hence there was the individual Christian, who took an interest in such children, and the Church approved and encouraged this attitude of Christian *caritas.* Many Christian grave inscriptions make known what a good relationship had bound foster parents and *alumnus* or *threptos* in life.[31] Under the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) there were in the East orphanages (*orphanotropheia*) conducted by the Church; a law of the Emperor Justinian I was the first to speak of church homes which especially received and educated foundlings (*brephotropheia*); hence they appeared at the latest in the second half of the fifth century.[32] The State as such developed no initiative of its own in this matter: it left these, as in other cases also, to ecclesiastical *caritas.*

---

[18] H. Karpp, "Eltern," *RAC* IV, 1206–1219; M. Roberti, "Patria potestas e paterna pietas," *Studi Albertoni* I (1935), 257–270; R. Laprat, "La rôle de la mater familias d'après s. Augustin," *RMA* 1 (1945), 129–148.

[19] Basil, *Moral.* 76, 2; *Exaem. hom.* 9, 4; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 7, 5; *Const. Apost.* 4, 11. On Chrysostom, J. Dumortier, *Rech Sciences humaines* 15 (1947), 222–238.

[20] Basil, *Epp.* 276; 119, 18; Jerome, *Ep.,* 54, 3.

[21] Conc. Gangr., can. 15 and 16; Ambrose, *Ex. ev. Luc.* 8, 73; Augustine, *In Joh. tr.* 30.

[22] Augustine, *Sermo* 57, 2.

[23] Council of Elvira, can. 12.

[24] Basil, *Hom.* 6, 4; *In ps.* 14, 2, 4; Ambrose, *De Nab.* 5, 24; *De Tob.* 8; *Cod. Theod.* 3, 3, 1; *Nov. Val.* (III), 33. Constantine had permitted the selling of children in cases of necessity: *Cod. Just.* 4, 43, 2.

Likewise in the matter of the adoption of children, a practice influenced by Christian doctrine established itself. Whereas, according to

---

[25] Justin, *Apol.* 27; Min. Fel., *Oct.* 31; Tertullian, *Ad nat.* 1, 15.

[26] Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* 6, 20.

[27] *Cod. Theod.* 5, 9, 1 (331); *Cod. Just.* 8, 51, 2 (374).

[28] Basil, *Ep.* 199, 33; Ambrose, *Exaem.* 8, 6; Augustine, *De nupt. et. concup.* 1, 15, 17; *Ep.* 98, 6.

[29] *Cod. Theod.* 5, 7, 2 (412). Only Justinian I definitively regulated in 529 the legal situation of the foundling, who was to be in principle "free" and might not be made a slave or *colonus*: *Cod. Just.* 8, 51, 3.

[30] Council of Vaison, can. 9, 10 (442); Council of Arles II, can. 51.

[31] Examples in H. Leclercq, "Alumni," *DACL* I, 1295–1301.

[32] *Cod. Just.* 1, 2, 17.22.

Roman law, the possibility of adoption again was in the father's power, which however was usually conditioned by economic interests, since a substitute was sought for the deceased heir or the nonexistent one, now the wife also obtained the right of adoption, and acceptance as a child was seen primarily as concern for the orphaned child and was recommended by the Church as a work of mercy.[33]

Just as did ancient medicine, so the Church too energetically attacked abortion, which in the late Roman Republic and throughout the imperial period had achieved a special expansion, and issued severe ecclesiastical penalties for it.[34] Augustine saw facing him a theoretical difficulty, because one could not with certainty determine the moment when the fetus was infused with the soul, but his fundamental rejection of the ending of pregnancy at any time was unambiguous. Like Tertullian, he had, in conformity with the medical practice of the day permitted embryotomy by the physician in the event that this was the only possibility of saving the life of the mother.[35] When the Emperors Severus and Antoninus inflicted punishment for abortion on the wife as *crimen extraordinarium,* they justified their action on the ground that it deprived her husband of his child, but the girl who had an abortion went unpunished. Ecclesiastical writers, on the other hand, saw in it a double murder—the suicide of the aborting wife, whose deed often had fatal consequences for her, and the murder of the unborn child.[36] The Church's synodal legislation was concerned from the early fourth century with the question and steadfastly defended the right to life of the unborn child.[37] That the constant sharpening of the conscience of its members by the Church had a positive effect can scarcely be doubted.

Less numerous and productive are the statements in the sources on the situation of the illegitimate child, which was very unfavorable in Greece and Rome and could apparently be little influenced by the Church. Augustine regarded children born of incest as unqualified to inherit. But Jerome was opposed to the illegitimate child's having to suffer for the sins of his parents.[38]

---

[33] *RAC* I, 102f.; *Const. Apost.* 4, 1–2.

[34] F. J. Dölger, "Das Lebensrecht des ungeborenen Kindes und die Fruchtabtreibung in der Bewertung der heidnischen und christlichen Antike," *JbAC* 4 (1934), 1–61, 280–282; J. H. Waszink, "Abtreibung," *RAC* I, 56–60.

[35] Augustine, *Enchir.* 23, 85f., *Quaest. de Exodo* 80; *De nupt. et concup.* 1, 15; *C Faust* 15, 7; *De mor. eccl. cath.* 2, 18, 65; *Sermo* 10, 5; 267, 3.

[36] *Const. Apost.* 7, 3, 2; Basil, *Epp.* 118, 2.8; 186, 2; 199, 3; 217, 52; Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Rom. hom.* 24, 4; *In Mt. hom.* 28, 5; Ambrose, *Exaem.* 5, 58; Jerome, *Epp.* 22, 13; 121, 4.5.

[37] Council of Elvira, can. 63, 68; Council of Ancyra, can. 21; Council of Lérida, can. 2 (546).

[38] Augustine, *Quaest. sup. levit.* 76.

Unfortunately there are no detailed descriptions of day-to-day Christian marital and family life in the sources of the time, and hence its impact on contemporary society is not really comprehensible.[39] Chrysostom quite often draws the ideal picture of Christian family life, which, according to a comparison favored by him, should represent a "Church in miniature." According to it, a religious atmosphere unites parents, children, and servants into a community in the Holy Spirit, which is marked by peace and concord. The father is responsible for instructing wife, children, and slaves in the faith, for reading Scripture with them, and with seeing to the common prayer.[40] Some families sought, it is true, to live up to such an ideal, as especially inscriptions or monuments or, for example, the reports of the three Cappadocians on their families make known, despite a bit of idealization,[41] but no sure statement is possible as to the extent of their influence.

The Social Sphere

The reform of the Empire, begun by the Emperor Diocletian and completed by Constantine I, had long-range consequences for the Empire's social structure. In the absolute monarchy established by them all political power was concentrated in the person of the Emperor, at whose disposal for exercising it was a tightly organized central imperial administration, which in turn required a greatly enlarged bureaucracy in the provinces and an expanded control machinery.[42] The power thus concentrated on the one side created new dependencies on the other. It became directly discernible in the effects of a tax system which had to produce the enormously high revenues demanded by a more than grandiose lifestyle of the court, the salaries of the officialdom, and the support of the army. The pitilessly collected taxes hit the small handicraft industries as well as the peasants and small tenants especially hard, above all since steadily rising prices placed an additional burden on them.[43] In an effort to escape this compulsory situation, many small tenants surrendered themselves as *coloni,* with property and family, to the protection of the owner of *latifundia.* However, they only exchanged their former "freedom" at the cost of a still harsher dependence, for a law of Constantine I of 332 bound them and their descendants forever to the soil of their new master, and later laws left them the status of freemen only theoretically. Together with the State domains, a higher percentage of the arable land was concentrated in the hands of a numerically small upper class, which ruthlessly exploited its economic privileges in the fixing of prices and, on the basis of its power, was also in a position to ward off efforts at a stronger control by the provincial bureaucracy.[44] The *decuriones* also, occupants of an originally honorable function in the administration of the cities, now had not only to bear the responsibility with their own property for the cities' tax yield, but were, together with their heirs, bound by law to this function.[45] The workers in State factories—weaving and spinning, mints, arms, the great bakeries of the capital—in so far as they were not already slaves, and the members of specified professions—retailers, smaller transport enterprises, and so forth—were subjected to still stronger compulsion. Their *collegia,* in which they were associated according to profession, were transformed into a sort of compulsory guild: any change to another calling, and in most cases even the change of the place of work, was forbidden to the members, and not even entry into the army was allowed. Hence in practice the possibility of social advance and social mobility was ended. Included in the compensation for work, as in the case of slaves, were food and lodging and minimal cash wages. The attempt to escape this situation by flight was penalized by harsh punishments, which especially affected those who granted refuge to an escapee. The fact that persons even dared flight across the frontier explains the bitter expression of Salvian that many would now see Roman *humanitas* among the barbarians, because they could no longer endure the barbaric *inhumanitas* in their homeland.[46] The State tried to make up for the growing decline in working class strength by sending those condemned by penal law and vagabonds to its factories. The series of laws quickly following one another shows, first, how very much the State was at this time overburdened by the economic problems, and also their content reveals a profoundly inhumane attitude toward the great mass of the socially unimportant. Thus the unsolved opposition between *potentiores* and *humiliores* became a powerful element in the process of the dissolution of the Western Empire. How did the Church react in this situation?

---

[39] J. Gaudemet, "La transformation de la vie familiale au Bas-Empire et l'influence du christianisme," *Romanitas* 5 (1962), 58–85.

[40] Examples in P. Rentinck, op. cit., 277–280.

[41] *DACL* II, 1015–1054; V, 1099–1102, 1853–1856; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 18, 8; 43, 12; Basil, *Ep.* 223, 3; Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Macr.,* passim; cf. also Salvian, *Ep.* 4, 11–14.

[42] On the form of government and bureaucracy see A. H. M. Jones, op. cit. I, 321–410.

[43] On the tax system, ibid., 448–469.

---

[44] Law of 332: *Cod. Theod.* 5, 17, 1. On the colonate, P. Palasse, *Orient et Occident, à propos du colonat romain au Bas-Empire* (Lyon 1950).

[45] See A. H. M. Jones, II, 737–757, and W. Schubert, *ZSavRGrom* 86 (1969), 287–333.

[46] Salvian, *De gub. dei* 5, 21. See N. Charbonnel, "La condition des ouvriers dans les ateliers impériaux aux IV^e et V^e siècles," *Aspects de l'Empire Romain* (Paris 1964), 61–93; 88–92, list of laws.

MAGNATES AND DEPENDENTS. Neither the absolute monarchy of the Late Roman Empire nor its economic system nor the basic structures of contemporary society were questioned in principle by the Church of the time. True, it saw the harshness and injustices which were a part of the totality of these relationships and felt them as such, but considered them as the consequences of sin, which were to be endured. It neither envisaged nor sanctioned a change in the existing order, for example, by means of violence. This fundamental viewpoint becomes especially clear both in the theoretical evaluation of ancient slavery and in its attitude in practice to those subjected to it. According to Augustine, slavery certainly was opposed to the will of God, who had created man free, but injustice and force brought out inequality among men, just as sin made him as an individual the slave of his passions—which was even more severe. He believed this twofold form of slavery would continue to the end of time, "until wickedness ceases and all dominion and human power are empty and God is all in all."[47] Whenever the Church Fathers spoke of the lot of the slaves, however sharply they criticized their inhumane treatment, they did not demand the ending of slavery by law or by revolution.[48] They saw it partly as a necessary element of the contemporary economic order or as a form of property and hence, as a whole, respected the enactments of civil law applying to slaves. The Church even took slaves into its service and possession when they came to it through legacies and, if necessary, defended its right to own them.

At the same time, however, the Church stood up more decisively and comprehensively for the alleviation of the lot of slaves than any other institution or social group in the world. If master and slave were Christians, it could relax the relationship between them to a great extent by its preaching that no social differences carried any weight before God, since all the baptized are brothers, children of one heavenly Father, to whom emperor and beggar, slave and master pray.[49] Hence in the liturgy there was no sequestering of slaves from the free, the marriage of slaves was regarded as valid, and a slave was admitted to offices in the Church if his master consented or even gave him freedom. Christian preaching ever more demanded that the treatment of the slave in a Christian home should correspond to this evaluation. Included here were not only clothing and food and the avoidance of every cruelty, even in the punishing of a guilty slave, but positive kindness and gentleness, and especially care for his religious welfare, instruction in the faith by the master of the house, and participation in the common prayer of the *familia.*[50] It was due to the influence of the Church that from the fourth century the emancipation of slaves grew to a considerable extent. Since it regarded the possession of slaves as legitimate, it could only recommend their emancipation, but it did so energetically and purchased the freedom of slaves with its own means. However, freedom did not always seem to the slave a desirable goal since it did not automatically bring social security. Hence Chrysostom advised that, before emancipation, slaves be permitted to learn a craft which would assure them their livelihood.[51] It is in this context that one must see the fact that some of their slaves expressed themselves against emancipation when Melania the Younger and her husband Pinian, after their turning to asceticism, freed several thousand slaves on their properties, and wanted to remain in the service of one of their relatives.[52] Doubtless it must be attributed to this constant intervention of the Church for the voluntary emancipation of slaves that in 331 the Emperor Constantine I gave the Church the right of carrying out the emancipation by a special act within the church building with all the legal consequences which were united to the civil law procedure. In this *manumissio in ecclesia* the master presented his slave to the bishop; in the presence of the congregation the *libellus,* the charter of emancipation, was read aloud, the bishop was asked to ratify it, and then the *tabulae* were broken which contained the documents of the earlier act of purchase or the unfree status of the one to be freed.[53] This officially recognized form of ecclesiastical emancipation established itself, it seems, over a rather long period of time in the Universal Church,[54] and was finally adopted into the laws of the Burgundians and Visigoths which applied to the former Roman population.

---

[47] Augustine, *De civ. dei* 19, 15; Gregory of Nyssa, *In Eccl. hom.* 4; Chrysostom, *In Gen. hom.* 4; *De Lazaro hom.* 6, 7–8.

[48] Council of Gangra, can. 3; Augustine, *Enarr. in ps.* 124, 7–8. Also Salvian, *De gub. dei* 43, 6, who sees the cause in the crimes of slaves rather than in the bad treatment of them by their masters and does not summon to revolt.

[49] With constant appeal to the Epistle to Philemon; cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 15, 23; Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 7, 23; 40, 18; Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Philem.* (entire); *In ep. I ad Cor. hom.* 19, 4; *In ep. ad Eph. hom.* 22 (entire); *In ep. ad Hebr. hom.* 25, 3; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 5, 14; Augustine, *Ep.* 23, 1; *Enarr. in ps.* 32, 2, 29; *Sermo* 58, 2; 59, 2; 211. On the concept of "brotherhood" in the High Patristic Age, see J. Ratzinger, "Fraternité," *DSAM* 5, 1151–1155, with the literature, 1166f.

---

[50] *Const. Apost.* 4, 6, 4; Chrysostom, *In ep. ad Eph. hom.* 22; Conc. Illib., can. 5; Ambrose, *Ep.* 2, 31; Augustine, *De civ. dei* 14, 14–15; *Expos. ep. ad Gal.* 64; Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 36, 3; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 26.

[51] *Const. Apost.* 4, 9; Chrysostom, *In ep. I ad Cor. hom.* 40, 5; Augustine, *Sermo* 31, 6; 356, 3.7.

[52] Gerontius, *Vita s. Melan.* 10, and Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 61, 52; Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 21, 251–263.

[53] Law of Constantine: *Cod. Theod.* 4, 7, 1 (to Bishop Hosius of Córdoba); description of a *manumissio in ecclesia* in Augustine, *Sermo* 21, 6; formula of a *libellus* of emancipation in Ennodius, *Opusc.* 8. On the whole matter, F. Fabbrini, *La manumissio in Ecclesia* (Milan 1965).

A further possibility of assisting slaves was offered to the Church when the ancient right of asylum[55] was extended to Christian churches, and thus slaves who fled to a church were under its special protection. But since the former master usually asserted his right of ownership, conflicts in such cases were not rare, and State laws sought to limit the right of asylum for slaves more precisely. A law of 398 seems generally to have ordered the restoration of slaves who had fled to the protection of the Church to their earlier position with Church cooperation. Later, in 432, the extradition after one day of an unarmed slave who had fled to a church was ordered, presupposing his master accorded him freedom from punishment "in honour of the place where he sought help."[56] The right to sell the refugee slave to another master did not, of course, belong to the Church. The Synod of Orange in 441 decreed ecclesiastical penalties on one who, as a substitute for his own escaped slaves, forcibly took possession of other slaves of the Church.[57]

The flight of the slave to a monastery was also the subject of a protracted quarrel between State and Church,[58] since the former could not, for economic reasons, tolerate a mass flight of slaves to monasteries, but monasticism neither would nor could reject slaves when their motives for entry into the monastery proved to be unobjectionable. However, the Church had severely censured the sect of the Eustathians, who stirred up slaves against their masters, and Basil was willing to grant to a slave admission to the monastery only when his master compelled him to sin. Jerome and Cyril of Alexandria also stressed that the obedience of the slave to his master had its limits.[59] The Emperors Arcadius and Honorius promised slaves freedom and the protection of the Church if they would abandon their Donatist masters, because they were said to be compelled there to rebaptism.[60] Finally State and Church agreed at the Council of Chalcedon that slaves could become monks only with the express consent of their master, which had to be presented in writing.[61]

---

[54] In Africa persons hesitated at first: *Cod. eccl. afr.*, cans. 64 and 82; in Gaul the Synod of Orange of 441, can. 7, and the so-called Second Synod of Arles, cans. 33 and 34, demanded its recognition.

[55] L. Wenger, "Asylrecht," *RAC* I, 836–844.

[56] *Cod. Theod.* 9, 45, 3 (398); 9, 45, 5 (432).

[57] Council of Orange, can. 5 (6).

[58] Cf. H. Bellen, op. cit., 78–92.

[59] Council of Gangra, can. 3; Basil, *Reg. fus. tract.l* 11; Jerome, *In ep. ad Gal.* 3, 6; *In ep. ad Tit.* 2, 3; Cyril of Alexandria, *De ador. in spir. et verit.* 8.

[60] *Cod. Theod.* 16, 6, 4.

Far less successful were the exertions of the Church to control the abuse of power of which the *potentes,* the high officials and the owners of great wealth, often the same group of persons, made themselves guilty in the late Empire. Augustine frankly said that many proprietors in North Africa had acquired their wealth through fraud and robbery. The proverb "You are what you have" was, he said, the slogan of these robbers, the oppressors of the peasants and small tenants, of those who forcibly took possession of others' goods and disavowed the goods entrusted to them. Many Christian senators in Africa did not concern themselves with the lot of their *coloni.* And Augustine had to admit: hardly anyone dared say it to their face because that was too dangerous.[62] Salvian extended even to the bishops the charge that persons would keep silent about the violent deeds and exploitation by the ruling class or spoke of them only half-heartedly; the bishops, of course, did not so act out of cowardice but in order not to stir up the guilty to worse still, and so the poor, widows, and orphans had to keep on suffering. If the Gallic priest must be regarded as engaging in some degree of rhetorical exaggeration, his diagnosis that the Roman Empire was breathing its last (*extremum agens spiritum*) because of such wickedness of the *potentes,* was correct.[63] The few synodal decrees of the Church hardly altered anything in the total situation. The Council of Toledo of 400 wanted to cite before the episcopal court a magnate who pillaged a poor person or cleric and, in the event of his refusal, excommunicate him; the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* instructed the bishops to accept no gifts from those who oppress the poor.[64] The scattered individual measures of the Emperors proved to be ineffective.

Rich and Poor. Only a variation of the phenomenon of power and dependence in the society of late antiquity was the relationship of wealth and poverty, which the Church challenged to a decision in its crisis of these decades. Three features stood in the foreground in this matter: overwhelmingly unequal distribution of property and wealth, which made only the *potentes* also the *divites,* who wanted to see the disposal of their property unrestricted by any obligation toward the *pauperes*; the usually luxurious lifestyle of the proprietors, who placed no limits on themselves in the enjoyment of their wealth; the extensive lack of a purposeful concern of the State for a legal basis which would have ameliorated the situation of the economically and socially weak.

---

[61] *Cod. Chal.,* can. 4; *Nov. Val.* (III), 35, 3 (452).

[62] Augustine, *Ep.* 58, 3; *Enarr. in ps.* 72, 12; *in ps.* 51, 14: "proverbium avarorum rapacium, innocentes opprimentium, res alienas invadentium, commendata negantium; 'Quantum habebis, tantus eris.' "

[63] Salvian, *De gub. dei* 5, 5; 4, 6.

[64] Council of Toledo I, can. 11; *Stat. eccl. ant.,* can. 94 (69).

Although the Fathers, with certain nuances in individual points, defended the opinion that the current distribution of property and wealth was not without sin, that is, that it came about through injustice, force and fraud, they accepted it as it was. They neither thought of a legal redistribution of property nor did they say a word about a change of this condition by force. Basically, they recognized private property and did not regard wealth in itself as sinful, even if their sharp words in the censuring of its abuse by its possessors could at times arouse the impression that they had championed the thesis that private property is theft.[65] Quite the contrary: they stressed very definitely the social obligation of private property—and this is the really new element in the stand of Christianity on the social question of the day. Since God determined the goods of this world for the welfare of all, the present possessors are, in the last resort, only their stewards; private property is legitimate only when it is administered in the sense of its social bond.[66] This means on the one hand to renounce every unchecked dependence on wealth and every injustice in acquisition and gain, every egoistic enjoyment, and on the other hand to use it for the alleviation of social hardships, to give to the poor what belongs to them. In the concrete question of what part of his property and income the individual must use for this, the views of the Fathers were not unanimous. Some, such as Basil and Jerome, certainly showed their sympathy for radical renunciation, as the gospel recommends, but they knew that was only a counsel. There was agreement that "the superfluity" was intended to assure the necessities of life for the poor. Some recommended using one-half or one-third of the revenues for that; others suggested that among the heirs one more—Christ—should be counted and then to give to all the same share in the property: the *pars Christi* would then belong to the poor.[67] Collectively, the expressions of the pastors and writers on the social bond of private property are so serious that one could not measure up to them by an occasional alms but only by a clear renunciation.

To the urgency of these demands corresponded the relentless condemnation of the behavior of some rich persons and of the methods and practices which had become common in economic and commercial life. The characterization of the well-off proprietors of Cappadocia by Basil is just as impressive as the pictures which Chrysostom sketched of the rich merchants or shipowners at Antioch.[68] Ambrose described the wealthy spendthrift, who distributed enormous sums for the presentations of circus games, theatrical performances, or his hunting enjoyment, as well as the unscrupulous greedy one, who in times of famine speculated with the hunger of the poor.[69] On the same level lay the blame for the inhuman believer who compelled his debtor to sell his children or even prevented his being buried until the debt was paid.[70] The Church Fathers led a bitter struggle against every form of overcharging in business, against usury, as they regarded the request for interest on a loan. Synods issued a series of decrees which forbade lay persons and clerics to charge interest. Their repetition lets us infer a continuing nonobservance, especially since the civil law in this matter in no way supported the Church's view.[71] Apparently the Church also turned directly to the State in the interest of the poor. A Synod of Carthage in 401 once asked of the Emperor the appointment of *defensores* to protect the poor from the encroachments of the rich.[72]

---

[65] The thesis of the Eustathians that wealth excludes from salvation was rejected by the Synod of Gangra in its circular. On the differing views of individual Fathers see St. Giet, *RSR* 35 (1948), 54–91; on Augustine's notion of private property, D. J. Macqueen, *RechAug* 8 (1972), 187–229.

[66] See especially P. Christophs, *L'usage chrétien du droit de propriété* (Paris 1964).

[67] On the portion of the property set aside for the poor as the basis of the so-called soul's portion in the later law of inheritance, see E. F. Bruck, *Kirchenväter und soziales Erbrecht* (Berlin–Heidelberg 1956).

The Church did not rest satisfied with appeals to the conscience of the faithful, but in the growing misery initiated a social welfare work which made its preaching credible. This work was supported by the individual community, and the local bishop was ultimately responsible for it; the direct administration was entrusted to a deacon, who had deaconesses and widows at his disposal for specific services. Especially in the communities of the larger cities the local *caritas* had to deal with an abundance of demands and duties. Chrysostom gave a vivid account of the conditions in Antioch. Of the already Christian majority of the population of the city, he says, 10 percent could be reckoned among the really wealthy, and equally great was the number of the poor "who possess nothing at all," while the remaining 80 percent formed the economic middle class. On the list of poor of the community were some 3,000 names of widows and virgins, who received daily support. To them must be added "the captives, the sick and convalescing in the *xenodocheia,* the strangers, the cripples, the clergy, and still others, who appear by chance every day." The revenues of the Church of Antioch, however, were not greater than those of one rich man and of one man of the middle class combined, and ten times more was needed to be able really to deal with the poverty. Hence it was even more urgent to depend on the gifts of the faithful, whose right hands were, unfortunately, not too generous.[73] The once so flourishing *agape* had long not been equal to the needs, since it was exercised only privately, whenever a well-off person invited a crowd of the needy to a meal.[74] It was true that now the congregations in a growing number were coming by means of legacies into the possession of landed property, but the revenues, from which the bishop had to support also his clergy and the churches, did not suffice at this time for all purposes. Augustine agitatedly told how the poor accosted him on his way to the church and asked from him a word in their behalf with the faithful, but he had to admit: "We give what we have, we give so far as we can, but we are not in a position to help according to need."[75] The same was even true for the Rome of Pope Leo I, since every year in Lent he urgently announced a collection for the poor, for which people should plan their gifts.[76]

---

[68] Basil, *Or.* 6, 2, *ad divites;* Chrysostom, *In Kal.*; *In Mt. hom.* 28, 5. Cf. also Gregory Nazianzen, *De pauperum amore;* Gregory of Nyssa, *De pauperibus amandis* I–II.

[69] Ambrose, *De Nab., passim; De off.* 3, 2, 13; 3, 6, 41; 3, 9, 41; see F. Homes Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* II (Oxford 1935), 461–468, and J. Huhn, *Ambrosius von Mailand als sozialer Bischof* (Fulda 1946). For Augustine, *Sermones* 13, 16, 41, 123, and *Enarr. in ps.* 38, are important; see H. Rondet, "Richesse et pauvreté dans la prédication de s. Augustin," *RAM* 30 (1954), 193–231. Also, Zeno of Verona, *Tract.* 1, 3, 5–6; Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 17, 2; 18; Gaudentius Brix., *Sermo* 13.

[70] Ambrose, *De Nab.* 5, 21; *De Tobia* 8, 30; 10, 36.

[71] See St. Giet, "La condemnation du prêt à interêt au IVe siècle," *Science religieuse* (Paris 1944), 95–128.

[72] *Cod eccl. afr.,* can. 75.

As the preeminent accomplishment of the *caritas* of this period may be reckoned the establishing of houses which saw to the care of the sick and the aiding of the poor, the orphans, and the *peregrini,* both because of their direct service to the needy of every sort and because of their signal importance for the *caritas* of the following centuries. The entirely unique justification of Christian social care, which was found ultimately in Christ, suffering need and a stranger, was basically different from the few non-Christian enterprises of a similar sort in antiquity, which were based, not on religious, but on generally humanitarian considerations.

The first charitable institutions were probably inns for "foreigners" passing through; it had long been regarded as an *officium hospitalitatis* of each bishop to take care of them. They originated as real pilgrimage hostels on the occasion of the flourishing of this movement at the mostly more important pilgrimage centers, such as Jerusalem, the city of Menas, and Nola in Campania.[77] The first known *xenodocheion,* which existed as early as 356 at Sebaste, accepted also the sick and lepers.[78] This must have been generally the case in the smaller communities, which had only one house of this kind. The high estimation of hospitality by monasticism caused a *xenodocheion* to appear in every larger cenobitic monastery, and the receptiveness of Egyptian and Syrian monasticism for the needs of the poor and sick was early an object of praise. During a famine at Edessa Ephrem the Syrian shook the rich out of their apathy and with their contributions erected a hospital for the needy with 300 beds; those from the rural neighborhood who were in misery were received there.[79] The drawing of monasticism into the Church's charitable work by Basil[80] was to have an especially positive impact, since it not only provided new helping forces, but also brought about an enduring connection of monasticism with the Church's daily work. The most important undertaking in organizational planning and execution is connected with the name of Basil the Great, who had an institution built on the city borders of Caesarea, which included, besides a monastery and residences for the clergy, a hospice for pilgrims and a hospital for the poor, to which were attached all necessary services, physicians, nurses, workshops, and means of transportation. Its size even led to a gradual shifting of the center of the city around this new foundation, which in the fifth century was named for its founder Basilias.[81] In Antioch also the community possessed a rather large hospital and a special hostel for strangers.[82] When the first founding of such houses at Constantinople must be placed is uncertain, but in 472 the Emperor Leo I confirmed privileges which had been granted to early hostels for strangers and poor houses.[83] In the Latin West the first works of *caritas* arose around the turn of the fifth century; the employing of the Greek names for them indicates the eastern model. At Rome the wealthy Fabiola had the first hospital (*nosocomium*) constructed, and a *xenodochium* was built at the expense of Pammachius at Porto near Ostia.[84] The hospice at Nola which Bishop Paulinus described was a home for both pilgrims and the aged. Augustine likewise called the institution erected by him at Hippo a *xenodochium,* but remarked that the thing itself was known in Africa before the Greek loan-word.[85]

---

[73] Chrysostom, *In Mt. hom.* 66, 3.

[74] Chrysostom, *In I Thess. hom.* 11, 5; Jerome, *Ep.* 22, 32; Augustine, *Sermo* 178, 4; 259, 5.

[75] Augustine, *Sermo* 61, 13. The Church's real property increased considerably only toward the end of the fourth century, when also more of the rich belonged to the Church; see P. M. Conti, "La proprietà fondiaria della chiesa dal secolo V all'VIII," *Misc. hist. eccl.* IV (Louvain 1972), 43–51. Basil and Ambrose in their lifetime distributed their property among the poor, and Gregory Nazianzen bequeathed his by testament. The text of the testament in Pitra, *Juris eccl. Grace. hist. et monum.* 2 (Rome 1962), 153–160; see F. Martroye, *Mém. Soc. nat. antiquaires de France* 76 (1923), 219–263.

[76] See his *Sermones* "De collectis" (6): *SChr* 49, no. 20–25.

---

[77] B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa,* 375–386; on the unique basis for Christian hospitality, P. Miquel, *DSAM* 7, 815–819.

[78] Epiphanius, *Adv. haer.* 3, 55.

[79] Sozomen, *HE* 3, 16, 12–15 (Ephrem); cf. A. Vööbus, *Einiges über die karitative Tätigkeit des syrischen Mönchtums* (The Baltic University 1947).

[80] Basil, *Reg. brev. tr.* 155.

[81] Basil, *Epp.* 94; 176; 143 (hospice for the poor at Amaseia c. 373); Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 43; Sozomen, *HE* 6, 33, 4 (Basilias). On the entire matter, St. Giet, *Les idées et l'action sociale de s. Basile,* 417–423.

[82] Chrysostom, *Ad Stagir. cons.* 3, 13; *In Mt. hom.* 66, 3; *In Act. hom.* 45, 4.

[83] *Cod. Just.* I, 3, 32, and 34.

The Church also included in its charitable care captives and prisoners. Visits by the bishops to prisons were already an established custom when in 409 the Emperor Honorius granted them control of the administration of penal institutes and of the treatment of captives. Some State decrees of the fourth century, which reorganized the carrying out of punishments and tried to make it more humane, may go back to Christian influence.[86] For the support and ransom of captives, who were often carried off in raids by barbarians, the Church at times spent considerable sums.[87]

At this time the State furnished the Church some support in its charitable work and granted privileges to individual establishments, and in the Early Byzantine period, of course, State supervision was assured. The fact remains that nothing of equal rank by the State could be set beside the comprehensive social concern of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, either in regard to its efficiency or its ethical and religious justification.

The Cultural Sphere

At the beginning of the fourth century Christianity represented only a minority in the society of late antiquity, the cultural life of which was still stamped by paganism in all areas. With the growing number of those Christians who, on the basis of their social provenance and position, had been formed by this culture, the Church was presented in an acute form with the question of what could be accepted or adapted from it from the Christian viewpoint and what was to be rejected. The answers which Christian writers gave to this question were very different, partly determined by their personal experience, partly depending on the significance which the individual attributed, negatively or positively, to a particular feature of this culture. The evaluations varied often in the course of time, as the trend toward dissolution became clearer in the cultural life of late antiquity and a Christianity that had become more self-conscious regarded as less serious the dangers threatening it from there.

---

[84] Jerome, *Epp.* 77, 6.10; 66, 11.

[85] Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 20, 114–117; Augustine, *Sermo* 355, 2; *In Joh. tr.* 97, 4. *CIL* 8, 5341, records the erecting of a hospice for strangers by an official at Calama.

[86] *Cod. Theod.* 9, 3, 1–6 and 7 (409); J. M. López Riocerezo, "La humanización en la penalogía de la Ciudad de Dios," *Ciudad de Dios* 167 (1956), 311–334. At Easter, for example, prisoners were granted amnesty: *Cod. Just.* 1, 4, 3; Leo I, *Sermo de quadr.* 2 and 7, 4.

[87] Ambrose, *Ep.* 18, 16; *De Off.* 2, 15, 70f.

The content of profane literature of antiquity was for the most part repudiated; the mythology that dominated it was rejected as immoral, and occasionally ridiculed, and the style of some authors was denounced as frivolous.[88] But not quite every educational value was denied it. Thus Basil wanted to retain the study of Greek literature in the education of youth, presupposing that a proper selection was made of it and there was a clarification of its moral quality.[89] Gregory Nazianzen expressed himself even more positively: he thought that since, according to the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. 10:5), one should take all thought into the service of what is Christ's, the knowledge of profane literature could also lead to the strengthening of the faith. Ambrose saw that the works of pagan authors should be considered so that their errors could be refuted, but he attributed a proper value to some of their philosophers also. Jerome, on the contrary, usually expressed himself negatively, but he had to endure the charge by Rufinus that his facile repudiation of profane literature was opposed to his practice, since he constantly quoted its authors and in the monastery at Bethlehem read "his Virgil" and other pagan poets and historians with the young.[90] Augustine himself indicated the development which his view in this question had gone through.[91] His baptism was not, despite all the existential seriousness of his conversion, an absolute repudiation of everything that ancient culture had formerly meant to him, but the beginning of a critical process which only ended in his years as a bishop. Certainly, already at Cassiciacum, he gave up the *vanitas litteraria* of rhetoric and rejected the *curiositas,* the eagerness to know the new for its own sake, to which he had once succumbed. But ancient authors such as Cicero and Virgil still meant much to him; for his literary creations he retained the dialogue form and the stylistic laws of rhetoric, and his program of religious and philosophical studies was oriented to the old *artes liberales.*[92] Augustine the pastor only completed the real break with ancient culture when in his day-to-day activity for souls he believed he experienced not only their insignificance for his work but even more he noticed their impeding effect on the final serious acceptance of the gospel by the faithful. Now his judgment on the formalism of rhetoric and the striving for oratorical elegance became coolly repudiating and his blaming of the immorality of this literature, whose effects he ever more encountered, became unrelenting. He avoided the coarsely massive invective which others used, because he had recognized that, like the culture that supported it, it was also destined for collapse. Corresponding to this was his almost sober outline of a properly defined course of education, which was conceived, it is true, primarily for the education of the clergy, but which he hardly would have presented differently for the Christian laity. According to the *De doctrina christiana,* the study of the Bible, based on the faith, is the *unum necessarium* for the spiritual work of the cleric; from the program of a profane education great importance belongs to the sciences, such as geography, history, natural science, and so forth, since they promote a better understanding of Scripture. A small circle, which possesses the compulsion and inclination for a *vita contemplativa* in the Christian understanding may pursue philosophical studies further. The final reason for Augustine's radical repudiation of profane culture is the knowledge, gained through personal experience, of the exclusive worth of the *summum bonum,* which more and more filled him with that deep skepticism in regard to everything that must be ascribed "to this world."[93]

---

[88] Chrysostom, *In Tit. hom.* 5; Lactantius, *Div. inst.* 1, 9–21; Augustine, *De civ. dei* 5.

[89] Basil, Πρὸς τοῦς νέους, ed. F. Boulenger (Paris, 2nd ed. 1952).

[90] Ambrose, *Exp. ev. Luc.* 1, 2; Rufinus, *Apol. c. Hieron.* 2, 11. Jerome's knowledge of Greek literature was of course limited: P. Courcelle, op. cit., 47–78.

[91] Augustine, *Retract.* 1, 3.

[92] F. G. Maier, *Augustin und das antike Rom* (Stuttgart 1955), 21–25.

Augustine's theses certainly had their effects in the circles and relationships which he could directly influence. With all his distrust of the profane educational system of the day, still he, like the rest of the Fathers, did not require a properly Christian school in which his program could have been realized.[94] The children of Christians continued to go to the secular schools, the youth continued to attend the higher academies, at which for a long time yet the pagan teachers were in the majority, and they were still on familiar terms with pagan education. The Church hoped that the religious instruction in the family, as Basil and Chrysostom recommended it, would make it immune to the danger here threatening and that the gradually increasing number of Christian teachers in the schools would help to neutralize pagan influence in the framework of the instruction. Also lacking were all indications that the Church would have sought to gain at the State's expense influence on the form of the instructional program of the secular schools. Even in ecclesiastical legislation its attitude of aloofness vis-à-vis profane education found only slight expression.[95]

---

[93] Fundamental is the analysis of *De doctrina christiana* by H. I. Marrou, *S.Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1949), 331ff.; cf. also E. Kevane, "Augustine's De doctrina christiana," *RechAug* 4 (1966), 97–133.

[94] H. I. Marrou, *Geschichte der Erziehung im klassischen Altertum* (Freiburg–Munich 1957), 465ff.

Thus it is not surprising that all important authors of the Church of this period made the formal influence of their profane education evident. Gregory Nazianzen could never hide his pride in his rhetorical training, Gregory of Nyssa was to a great degree dependent on it, Ambrose handled the literary genre of the *consolatio* in his funeral sermons just like a profane author, and the confrontation with his pagan opponent Symmachus over the Altar of Victory showed him to be quite equal to the latter in dialectics. Poets such as Gregory Nazianzen, Prudentius, and Paulinus of Nola bear comparison with the contemporary poetry, just as do Eusebius, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Optatus of Mileve, or even Orosius with the profane historians. Christian epistolary literature had representatives in Basil, Jerome, and Augustine, who clearly left a Libanius and a Symmachus behind them.[96] Certainly the superiority of the Christian literature of the Golden Age of the Fathers was based primarily on its content of ideas, on the freshness and power of conviction of its testimony, which knew that the future belonged to it, that in it was a new hope of awakening faith in a new-found meaning of human existence. Besides, the Latin authors could make use of a vocabulary which was at their disposal in Old Christian Latin and which gave a new life to the language of the West, threatened by a dangerous sclerosis.[97] In the Greek-speaking Church, it is true, it had not reached the point of forming a special Greek language, because the great writers here could make use of the standard classical tongue, which, if used flexibly, was understandable even by the audience of a Chrysostom and especially embraced the reading circle, the gaining of which was of ever greater importance to the Church.[98] The total impact of this Christian literature on the society of the time would not have been possible without this recourse to the formal elements of the classical tradition.

In regard to a further sector of the cultural life of late antiquity the Church's attitude remained consistently implacable—that of the theater, the circus games, and the system of entertainment. The performance of the ancient tragedies had, from the Hellenistic Age, been supplanted by mime and pantomime, the stage with cabaret and ballet now served for the relaxation of the people, the fights of gladiators and hunting of animals in the amphitheatres, chariot-racing in the circus of the big cities, on the numerous festivals of the year attracted thousands of often fanatically enthusiastic spectators.[99] Chrysostom and Augustine complained strongly that on days of such entertainments the churches remained almost empty.[100] The Church's criticism was directed against the waste of vast sums, which the arranging of the games required, but even more against the immorality which was propagated by the stage. To some degree the fight against gladiatorial combats was successful, since, because of their brutality and brutalizing effect, they were also objected to by pagans. As early as 325 Constantine I had had them forbidden in the eastern part of the Empire, but in the West, according to Augustine's testimony, they still enjoyed the greatest popularity until the Emperor Honorius definitively had them stopped here too at the beginning of the fifth century.[101] At first the State did not attack the other forms, stage and circus, especially since a great part of the games was built into the official calendar of festivals.[102] The ecclesiastical mission and preaching were, however, firmly convinced that here lay a substantial hindrance for the spreading and appreciation of Christian moral doctrine. In its opposition it went even to the extent of outlawing all professions which were in the service of the theater and of the contemporary entertainment industry. Not only prostitutes and pimps, but also actors of every sort, the organizers of the performances, gladiators and hunters in the pursuit of animals fell under the verdict. Augustine could appeal to ancient Roman tradition, which did not reckon the profession of actor among those socially recognized.[103] Hence the performer had to give up his profession if he wanted to be admitted to baptism, and Communion was denied to Christians among them.[104] The Emperors Gratian and Theodosius I supported the Church in so far as they wanted to remove Christian women from these professions, sought to stop the training of zither-players, and forbade their appearance at theatrical presentations or private celebrations.[105]

---

[95] *Stat. eccl. ant.*, can. 5 (16) forbids only the bishop to read the pagan authors.

[96] Jerome wrote *De viris illustribus* because he could then (393) demonstrate that Christian literature no longer lagged behind the pagan: Prolog., see P. Nautin, *RevÉAug* 16 (1970), 39.

[97] Chr. Mohrmann, "Quelques observations sur l'originalité de la littérature chrétienne latine," *Le latin des chrêtiens* I (Rome 1958), 139–150.

[98] See, besides Mohrmann, C. Fabricius, "Der sprachliche Klassizismus der griechischen Kirchenväter," *JbAC* 10 (1967), 187–199.

---

[99] M. Bieber, *The History of Greek and Roman Theatre* (Princeton, 2nd ed. 1961); G. Ville, *Les jeux des gladiateurs dans l'empire chrétien* (Paris 1900).

[100] C. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* I (London 1959), 235–255; F. van der Meer, *Augustinus der Seelsorger* (Cologne 1951), 73–83.

[101] Augustine, *Conf.* 6, 7, 11–13; *De civ. dei* 3, 14; *De symb. ad cat.* 22. The imperial prohibitions: *Cod. Theod.* 15, 12, 1; *Cod. Just.* 11, 41.

[102] The laws on the closing of temples (*Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 3.17. 19 of 342, 399, and 407) stress that the popular feasts were not affected by this.

[103] Cf. O. Brabant, "Classes et professions 'maudites' chez s. Augustin d'après les Enarrationes in psalmos," *RevÉAug* 17 (1971), 69–81, here 71–75.

[104] Council of Elvira, c. 62; *Cod. eccl. afr.*, can. 63 (Carthage 401); Council of Arles. I, can. 4, 5; Council of Arles II, can. 20; Council of Carthage (397), can. 35; Augustine, *De civ. dei,* 2, 13; *In Joh. tr.* 100, 2; *Enarr. in ps.* 102, 13; 147, 3.

Christian preachers of morals had to recognize that in this field a thoroughgoing success would be denied them unless they managed to eliminate the many profane feastdays with which the *ludi circenses* and *ludi scaenici* were connected or to neutralize their character, that is, to christianize the profane festive calendar and gradually replace it with a purely Christian one.[106] The enormous difficulties of this project could not be mastered without the direct assistance of the Emperors. But the latter had to take into consideration the great popularity of the *ludi* of every sort with the masses, whose awareness of the pagan origin of such entertainment of the people was, moreover, very much missing. A series of feasts could be decontaminated by dropping the names of the pagan gods and the sacrifices which had been connected with them, as was done c. 357 by a decree of the Emperor Constantius II. The Church could hardly object to the feastdays on which the Emperor's or his ancestors' accession to the throne was commemorated, and hence in these cases the games continued. The designation of the Christian Sunday as a day of rest, ordered by Constantine I and later repeated, was a first step on the road to a christianized calendar of feasts.[107] Then in 389 the Emperor Theodosius I in a decree published an arrangement of feastdays in which the Christian days of celebration already predominated over a series of neutral feasts, such as the birthdays of Emperors, harvest feasts, and so forth: all Sundays and the two weeks before and after Easter, Epiphany, and Christmas were here recognized by the State as Christian festival times, and the previous pagan feasts were no longer included in it.[108] It was a further concession to the Church that the same Emperor also forbade the circus contests on Sundays, but, of course, only if the "Emperor's birthday" did not fall on a Sunday.[109] And so only a half-success was on the whole gained by the Church here. The circus continued to maintain its fascination, especially in the East, at Constantinople, Antioch, and Thessalonica. Further progress could be expected only from a purely liturgical calendar of feasts.

If one should still ask, at the end of this presentation, what changes were accomplished in the society of late antiquity in the period between

---

[105] *Cod. Theod.* 15, 7, 4.8.10.12.

[106] An extant festive calendar, the so-called *Chronographus* of 354, already offers a singular mixture of originally pagan calendar and Christian days of celebration, among which are Easter, the days of burial of the Roman Bishops, and the *dies natales* of the Roman martyrs. See H. Stern, *Le calendrier de 354* (Paris 1953).

[107] *Cod. Theod.* 2, 8, 1; 2, 8, 18.

[108] *Cod. Theod.* 2, 8, 19, again ratified by the Emperor Arcadius in 395; ibid. 2, 8, 22.

[109] *Cod. Theod.* 2, 8, 20.

Nicaea and Chalcedon from the aspect of Church history, the answer can be summarized roughly thus: the fundamental fact is the change in religious confession, by which this society moved from a pagan to a Christian majority. In this Christian majority two groups became socially relevant: the clergy, graded according to rank and sphere of function, and monasticism, which appeared as special states and exercised a powerful impact on society. Then, beside them were changing groups, which developed in the violent confrontations over the correct understanding of the content of the Christian faith, covering this whole period, and at times led to the formation of Christian sects. Out of this struggle over "orthodoxy" grew that serious hardening and establishing of religious intolerance, which marked this society as a whole and which is passed on as a legacy to the future. No group could allow the others the right to their own respective understanding of the faith; for the "orthodox," Arians, Donatists, Macedonians, and Monophysites, those belonging at the time to the other groups became heretics, whom people sought to combat with the aid of the State and also to curtail their civil rights. The victorious group was only more bitterly charged by the defeated with the flaw of erroneous belief, violence, and injustice.[110]

This now Christian society did not aspire to alter anything in the basic organization of the State, and could alter very little in the economic and social structure. In some areas, such as that of the family, of the estimation of marriage and of the child, of the status of the slave, of the understanding of property, and of charitable concern, positive beginnings were created, at times with the modest support of the State. It is difficult to appraise the change in the moral conduct of this society. The moral preaching of the time leaves no doubt that here there was no radical modification. Only a minority, strong though it was, seems to have taken Christian ethics seriously in a genuine commitment. But the sources still indicate a change which did not call attention to itself very spectacularly: this was the gradual, quiet infiltration of Christian images, ideas, and subjects, which came from the world of the Bible and slowly altered daily speech; it was the becoming accustomed, still in progress, to Christian standards of value and ways of behaving, which preaching sought tirelessly to communicate. In some areas, not merely to be understood spatially, the Church was still in a missionary situation: the span of 125 years between Nicaea and Chalcedon was still the time of sowing rather than of the harvest.

---

[110] J. Vogt, "Toleranz und Intoleranz im konstantinischen Zeitalter," *Saeculum* 19 (1968), 344–361; Colm Liubhéid, "Theodosius II and Heresy," *JEH* 16 (1965), 13–38.

PART FOUR

The Early Byzantine Church

CHAPTER 22

The Henoticon and the Acacian Schism

The great ecclesiastical assembly at Chalcedon produced no peace, despite the exclamation of the Council Fathers: "We are agreed; there is only one faith!" On 31 October 451, without the assent of the Pope's legates, the Synod had issued that celebrated canon 28, which, following the precedent of the First Council of Constantinople, further consolidated the primacy of the "archsee" of Constantinople and thereby profoundly disturbed Rome—and, naturally, not only Rome. But it was also not to be expected that the dogmatic decisions of the Council would be readily accepted everywhere, and the fate of the Second Council of Ephesus of 449 had demonstrated that even imperial synods need not be unalterable. True, in their dogmatic decision the Fathers of Chalcedon had exerted themselves to praise Cyril of Alexandria, but they had made no effort to harmonize Cyril's famous formula *mia physis tou theou logou sesarkomene* with their own formula, *en duo physesi hen prosopon kai mia hypostasis.* Rather, with their definition they consolidated a conceptual development which was in advance of the contemporary state of the theological awareness of many bishops of the East and could only evoke the opposition of those to whom tradition was dearer than precision. It was not to be expected that the historically conscious Egyptians would submit to the renunciation of the Cyrillan theology parenthetically. Besides, the Synod had dared to depose the Patriarch Dioscorus, Cyril's successor, and to rehabilitate Theodoret of Cyrrhus, the *bête noire* of the Alexandrians.

In spite of a diplomatic letter of the Council Fathers to the Pope, especially in regard to canon 28, Leo the Great argued that the canon encroached upon the rights of Alexandria and Antioch and hence he tried to mobilize the eastern patriarchates.[1] But in this he had no success: the two superior sees intended to enforce their claims without Rome's help and so the Pope had to address himself in his polemic chiefly to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anatolius (451–58), who had to experience all its severity, whereas the Emperor was treated more considerately.

Because of all these questions of rank, the Pope neglected far too long to come out, officially and energetically, for Chalcedon's theological decisions. It was only on 21 March 453 that, under pressure from the

---

[1] In letters of 22 May 452 to Marcian, Pulcheria, and Anatolius.

Emperor, he could give a decision in their favor.[2] And when, soon after, Anatolius gave his consent to a general letter, which expressed apologies and regrets,[3] Leo had to regard this matter as settled—in any event he no longer returned to it with vigor. Of course, the loss of time could never be made up. If the recognition of the *Tome of Leo* at the Council had meant a climax of papal influence on the theology of the East, there now quickly followed a cooling of relations, from which the East-West connection would never recover. Above all, the old bond between Alexandria and Rome, which had made possible the conciliar politics at Ephesus, split. True, the Pope's last years did not witness the collapse of his work in the East, but after account had been taken of his authority at a critical moment, people now tried to get along without Rome.

The fate of Chalcedon was in principle decided in Egypt. Out of fear of the deposed Patriarch Dioscorus, the Egyptian bishops had refused to accept the *Tome of Leo.* Dioscorus was living in exile. Now the Orthodox had to concern themselves with selecting a successor to him who was qualified to pacify the enraged Egyptians, who already saw in their patriarch their recognized "national" leader. Thus a former intimate of Dioscorus, the Archpriest Proterius, was designated as his successor, without its being possible, however, to gain more than four bishops for him. This election resulted in a revolt of the people: the soldiers who were supposed to establish order were driven back and burned in the Sarapeion. Without new troops from Constantinople there was no hope of calm. Dioscorus died in 454, and in 457 he was followed by the Emperor Marcian, who had held Chalcedon very dear. Again there was rioting in Alexandria, and the leader of Dioscorus's adherents, the Priest Timothy the Cat, was ordained by the anti-Chalcedonians as their Patriarch on 16 March 457. The imperial governor immediately had him arrested, but the excitement among the people was so great that the measure had to be annulled. Nevertheless, the movement of revolt could no longer be checked, and a few days later the Orthodox Patriarch Proterius was murdered while he was officiating at Mass. Since the new Emperor Leo I (457–474)[4] at first had to let go the reins in Egypt, Timothy the Cat was able to establish himself. He succeeded in filling the episcopal sees in the country with his followers, and a Synod at Alexandria excommunicated the Pope and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch. The Alexandrian Pope, conscious of his power, provoked schism, and all the complaints made against him in Constantinople could accomplish nothing against it. Only the punishment of the assassins of Proterius could be achieved. On the whole, the activities of Timothy the Cat probably had little to do with dogmatic questions. The censure against Rome, Constantinople, and Antioch was probably intended to avenge Chalcedon's refusal to take Cyril's formulas into consideration, but even more the deposition of Dioscorus, Timothy's predecessor. And the new position which Constantinople was now determined to assume in the Universal Church—a position which Alexandria had hitherto occupied in the East—was certainly also included. If the rest of the East came to terms with Chalcedon only partially, this was probably less a sign of genuine conviction than a certain display of weariness. Anatolius was not a convinced defender of the dogmatic decision of 451, but the Council had to be of interest to him because its canon 28 concerned him—he was its beneficiary. Besides Egypt the chief centers of the opposition were the monastic circles in Palestine, to which the constant maneuverings of their Patriarch Juvenal, whose first concern at all ecclesiastical meetings was the independence of his patriarchate, supplied an occasion for discontent. The monks blamed him for betrayal of Cyril's theology. In the Empress Eudocia,[5] widow of the Emperor Theodosius II, who lived and intrigued in Jerusalem, they found the necessary, even financial, support. It was due to her influence that soon there was no monastery in the vicinity of the Holy City which maintained loyalty to Juvenal. Under the leadership of a monk, Theodosius, they gave the Patriarch on his return the alternatives of repudiating Chalcedon or resigning. Juvenal fled, swarms of monks raged in Jerusalem, bishops were murdered, and vacant sees were everywhere filled with adherents of this Theodosius. Only military units, which engaged in a pitched battle with the monks, were able to relieve Jerusalem and restore quiet. The leaders of the monastic revolt fled, but Eudocia maintained her position.

---

[2] *Ep.* 114: *Pl* 54, 1017–1020, and *ACO* II, 1, 2, 61.

[3] In the corpus of Leo's letters, no. 132: *Pl* 54, 1082–1084.

[4] On Leo I, cf. W. Ensslin, *Pauly-Wissowa,* s.v. XII, 2, 1947–61.

The Emperor Leo I was a military man who held himself aloof from religious questions; he had quite enough to do to reach an understanding with his *Protector,* the powerful Aspar, and gave to Chalcedon only a part of that attention which his predecessor had devoted to it. Timothy the Cat thought he could demand of him the revision of the decrees of Chalcedon by a new council. However, he had no success with this. Nevertheless, the Emperor permitted an investigation to take place, which he hoped would clarify how people stood in regard to recognizing Timothy the Cat as legitimate Patriarch of Alexandria and whether the decrees of Chalcedon should be maintained. The replies from most ecclesiastical provinces of the Eastern Empire were unanimously against the recognition of Timothy, and only one voice rejected the Council.[6] The answer of those provinces whose letters are no longer extant would be interesting. Perhaps they were more negative than positive in regard to the Council. In any event, Leo, probably under pressure from Aspar, long maintained a delaying policy, although the Pope did all he could to induce him to take steps against Timothy. It was only in 460 that the Emperor sent the Alexandrian into exile in Paphlagonia and finally to the Crimea. Timothy Salofaciol became Patriarch, but he did not succeed in restoring ecclesiastical unity in Egypt.

---

[5] H. G. Beck, "Eudokia," *RAC,* s.v.

When the Emperor Leo I died in 474, the Isaurian Zeno, whom Leo had finally played off against the overmighty Aspar, had himself proclaimed Augustus by the Empress Ariadne and their minor-aged son, Leo II. He probably had even less interest in theology than his predecessor, but already, as *Magister Militum per Orientem,* he had been under the influence of the personality of a priest, Peter the Fuller (*Gnapheus–Fullo*),[7] who, relying on the power of the *Magister,* had forced his election by a synod as Patriarch of Antioch, contrary, of course, to all the canonical rules. The Emperor Leo soon had him arrested and deported to Egypt, but Peter succeeded in fleeing to Constantinople, and, since he promised to keep quiet, he was entrusted to the rigidly orthodox Acemetae monks in the neighborhood of Constantinople. Zeno, even as Emperor half-barbarian, did not know how to make himself popular. As early as 475 he had to give way before a conspiracy, and Basiliscus, a brother of Zeno's mother-in-law, the Empress Verina, tried to seize the throne—with no more luck than Zeno. He believed he could dismiss Verina and thereby isolated himself from both factions. Perhaps he was of the opinion that he could form a strong following if he met the anti-Chalcedonians halfway. Without consulting a synod, he issued an *Encyclion,*[8] in which he decreed that people should be satisfied with the Nicene Creed and its confirmation by the First Council of Constantinople and that of Ephesus. The *Tome of Leo* and the *Horos* of Chalcedon were anathematized, and anyone who did not agree with this anathema should, if he was a cleric, be deposed, and, if he was a monk or lay person, be banished. The *Encyclion* was in no sense an innovation in matters of faith or even a Monophysite document. The brief explanations of the faith which it offers are orthodox, but only on the status of the period before the Council of Chalcedon: the tactic of backing down in terminology. The decree made it possible for Timothy the Cat to return to Egypt. He took the route via Constantinople, where the new Patriarch Acacius gave him the cold shoulder, and a majority of the monks would have nothing to do with him. On the other hand, he participated at Ephesus in a synod of the province of Asia: this must have been a satisfaction for him, because here Constantinople's detested patriarchal rights over the province were denied. Then he celebrated a triumphal entry into Alexandria, after Timothy Salofaciol had tamely withdrawn to a monastery. For the rest, Timothy the Cat adopted a moderate attitude and did not push his triumph to extremes. Peter the Fuller returned to Antioch and for some time again occupied "his" see. The Patriarch of Jerusalem also signed the *Encyclion.* The opposition to it was concentrated at Constantinople, where the Patriarch Acacius (471–489) mobilized clergy and people. Success was quick in coming, because the position of Basiliscus became even more difficult. In his need he now had the *Encyclion* followed by an *Antiencyclion,*[9] which annulled the former *pro forma* and ordered that every bishop should keep his place and that the drama of Nestorius and Eutyches must be definitely closed. With this the chaos was complete. In September 476 Zeno was able to march back into Constantinople, and Basiliscus went into exile. Likewise, the Fuller and the refractory Archbishop of Ephesus had to leave their sees, and Timothy the Cat was supposed to be deported a second time, but finally the old man was allowed to die in peace in June 477. His adherents acted quickly and chose as his successor his old friend, Peter Mongus, who, following the proved models, at once disappeared to a hiding place and from there ruled his flock, while Timothy Salofaciol was recalled by the authorities and ruled officially as Patriarch of the Church of the Empire. Whoever else had signed the *Encyclion* hastened to ask pardon and to accept the Council of Chalcedon. Everything seemed again in order, but anyone who watched more closely could hardly find this rapid pacification reassuring. Other means had to be thought of to give peace to the Church. The Patriarch Acacius of Constantinople took this task upon himself.

---

[6] The replies are collected in the so-called *Codex Encyclius;* see *ACO* II, 5, 24–98; T. Schnitzler, *Zum Kampf um Chalcedon, Geschichte und Inhalt des Codex Encyclius von 584* (Rome 1938).

[7] U. Riedinger, *LThK,* 2nd ed., s.v., VIII, 384. E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 182ff.

[8] Text in Evagrius, *HE* III, 4, 101–104; variant in *Vat. gr.* 1431, ed. E. Schwartz, "*Codex Vaticanus gr.,* 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenons," *AAM* 32, 6 (Munich 1927), 49ff.

Acacius was certainly not a fiery adherent of the formulations of Chalcedon. But he knew that the privileges of his see depended on the recognition of this Synod; he was by no means a "Monophysite"; and also he saw clearly that the inextricable confusion in the Church of the East could not be corrected by formulas, because it had not originated in formulas, but that it was a question of dealing with personalities, and in this there was little promise of success by going too far into the past in examining such persons. It was important to rebuild a front of good will, to let *oikonomia* rule, and not to make any *theologumenon* into a shibboleth. It was especially urgent to understand that, despite Rome, the theological development could not be brought to a halt even with Chalcedon, any more than it had stopped with earlier synods. Experience had taught that nothing was gained in a situation where two bishops contradicted each other to choose a third—leading only to a third faction—that one must rather balance the two candidates at the favorable moment and test their good will—and do so *hic et nunc.* This was the policy of Acacius—a policy, depending on one's point of view, of cunning or of a desperate good will. To be able really to judge Acacius one must know just how in his own ideas and in those of his contemporaries there could be an "ecumenical" synod of obligatory validity, and whether Chalcedon was in accord with these ideas. But we do not know this, and it is to be surmised that the experiences with the two Synods of Ephesus did not ease the problem for people of that day. Also, to not a few decisive procedures at the First Synod of Ephesus the label *latrocinium* was suitable: Acacius cannot be denied a certain greatness. He had to founder, not because he himself had been wrong in his idea, but because this concept required a flexibility which only a few would grant him, since they suspected a betrayal of the faith where the subject in debate was solely an effort not to cut a Gordian Knot, but patiently and gradually to untie it.

---

[9] E. Schwartz, ed., *Codex Vaticanus* 52.

In 481–82 there came to Constantinople at the order of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy Salofaciol, the monk John Talaia,[10] with the request that, after the Patriarch's death, a successor be chosen who was an adherent of Chalcedon but also a member of the Egyptian clergy. The Emperor was in agreement, but he made John Talaia take an oath in the presence of the Patriarch and the Senate that, under no circumstances, would he, Talaia, accept the episcopal office. The Emperor was moved to this step because of Talaia's connection with the Isaurian Illus, in whose regard Zeno had reason to entertain suspicions. If Talaia became Patriarch of Alexandria, Illus would find in refractory Egypt, so the Emperor believed, an all too powerful partisan. Salofaciol died in February 482 and Talaia pomptly became guilty of perjury by letting himself be elected as his successor. Rome was notified of the allegedly unanimous election, and the Pope was asked to confirm it.[11] The furious Emperor Zeno had Talaia deposed, and since at the same time Egyptian monks in Constantinople vouched for the person of the Patriarch Peter

---

[10] E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 195ff.

[11] *Coll. Avell.* 99, 448.

Mongus, the Patriarch Acacius undertook the first attempt for a solution of the Egyptian question: Peter should be recognized in so far as he gave guarantees which were incorporated into an imperial edict, the manuscript of which clearly points to Acacius as its author. The *Edikton Zenonos*[12] stressed first of all the inviolability of the decisions of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus. New was the canonical recognition of the anathemas of Cyril of Alexandria. It was modified by the acceptance of the Formula of Union of 433. There was no mention of Cyril's *mia physis* formula and its disavowal by Chalcedon was not annulled. Whoever did not accept this faith was punished with anathema, as was anyone who now or previously thought otherwise, whether "at Chalcedon" or at another synod.[13]Accordingly, the edict formally glided over the Synod of Chalcedon, but it was no more rejected than was the *Tome of Leo.* It was not the Council that was rejected, but apparently an anti-Cyrillan interpretation of its decrees, whereas excessive "Cyrillanism" had been repudiated by the Formula of Union of 433 and the disregard of the *mia physis* formula. The edict thereby anticipated to a certain extent an interpretation of the Chalcedonian decrees which did not prevail in Orthodoxy until the sixth century, but then for ever. Naturally the die-hards could only view the *glissando* over Chalcedon as a treachery to the Synod, just as the die-hard "Monophysites" felt the failure to condemn this same Synod. Acacius, the composer of the edict, which has entered history under the title of the *Henoticon,* could nevertheless hope to establish peace on the basis of this document. He succeeded in gaining Peter Mongus for the *Henoticon* and received him into the communion of the Church. Of course, the monks who supported John Talaia upbraided him, as before, as a heretic. Many renounced communion with him; he agreed to a few concessions which satisfied no one, and it required all his shrewdness to keep the excesses within bounds. At Antioch the Patriarch Calandion refused to sign the *Henoticon,* but he was unwise enough to conspire with the faction of Illus against the Emperor and hence had to go into exile in 484. Once again Peter the Fuller found the opportunity to occupy the coveted See of Antioch. He signed the *Henoticon,* but Acacius did not for that reason see the possibility of accepting ecclesiastical communion with this scintillating personality. Jerusalem made no difficulties. On the other hand, it was ominous that Rome showed no appreciation for the personality politics of Acacius. Unfortunately the Emperor had failed to publish the *Henoticon* at Rome, probably because he saw in the document no new regulation but only an *explicatio fidei.*[14] In any case, people at Rome were apparently pleased with it, for it presented no serious dogmatic confrontation but rested entirely on questions of law and discipline, which were essentially more congenial to the Roman mentality. The Emperor himself announced to Pope Simplicius the recognition of Peter Mongus.[15] The Pope protested to the Emperor and exhorted Acacius to have the Emperor change his mind. Acacius shrewdly cloaked himself in silence. In 483 Felix II became Pope, and this vigorous defender of Roman interests did not let himself be put off. He wrote to Emperor and Patriarch and again represented the view that Peter Mongus was a condemned heretic. The fact that Peter had professed the orthodox creed of the *Henoticon* was not mentioned at all, nor was the perjury of Talaia.[16] The last-named, meanwhile, had arrived in Rome and filed an official complaint against Acacius. In these circumstances the Pope decided on the extraordinary step, contrary to the tradition that a Patriarch could be condemned only by an imperial synod, of summoning Acacius before his court, spurred on by a letter from the Acemetae monks of Constantinople, who had at that time claimed a monopoly of Orthodoxy and now accused the Pope of being too remiss in the defense of the true faith.[17] His legates received instructions first to get into contact with precisely these Acemetae and obtain advice from them. As would happen all too often later, Byzantine skill succeeded in bringing the papal legates to the right way "with pastry and the lash," as E. Schwartz expressed it. Soon after their arrival in Constantinople, they were seen going solemnly, with Acacius and the envoys of Mongus, through Constantinople to the church. They kept themselves aloof from the Acemetae and promised the Patriarch to push forward at Rome the case of Mongus against Talaia. After their return, Pope Felix had the unfortunate legates deposed by a synod. Peter Mongus was again refused communion as a heretic, and Acacius was declared deserving of the most severe penalties. Soon after, the Pope took the further step of formally excommunicating the Patriarch of Constantinople. The reasons were the Patriarch's interference in the affairs of the other Eastern Churches—hence, fundamentally, the exercising of his primatial rights on the basis of canon 28 of Chalcedon—and his measures taken by order of the Emperor, but above all his communion with Mongus. Nothing was said about his faith.[18] By his not having obeyed the Pope's summons he had declared his own guilt. This was in 484 and, since Acacius did not submit, the so-called Acacian Schism was a *fait accompli*—a schism in which questions of faith were consciously evaded by both sides, and questions of personalities were tormented to the limits of the impossible. For this reason Acacius probably thought he should not reply, because the Pope had not at all looked into the explanations by the Emperor Zeno of Acacius's personal politics. What would he have been able to add to what had been said? The fact that Felix continued to uphold John Talaia gave little hope of the possibility of an agreement.

---

[12] Text in Evagrius, *HE* III, 14, 111–114, E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus,* no. 75, 52–54. Cf. S. Salaville, "L'affaire de l'Hénotique ou le premier schisme byzantin au V^{e} siècle," *ÉO* 18 (1919), 255–266, 389–397, 19 (1920), 49–68, 415–433; id., "Hénotique," *DThC* VI, 2153–2178; W. T. Townsend, "The Henoticon Schism and the Roman Church," *JR* 16 (1936), 78–86.

[13] . . . *οὐ καινίζοντες πίστιν, ἀλλ' ὑμᾶς πληροφοροῦντες* (Evagrius, *HE* III, 14, 113).

---

[14] *Coll. Avell.* 60, 152.

[15] The letters of the Pope to Emperor and Patriarch, ed. E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 63–69, 69–73, and A. Thiel, *Epistulae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae* I (Brunswick 1868), 222–239.

[16] E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen* 3, no. 1.

[17] Evagrius, *HE* III, 19, 117.

Acacius died in 489, and his policy seemed to crumble. His successor, Fravitas, was able, apparently under pressure from the Acemetae, to induce the Emperor to resume negotiations with Rome. However, the memory of Acacius was supposed to be spared, and the communion with Mongus to be maintained.[19] Hence, Fravitas was evidently under the incorrect impression that at stake was the recognition of Orthodoxy and not of primatial rights. Pope Felix undeceived him and insisted on the deletion of the names of Acacius and Mongus from the diptychs. Fravitas died in 490 without having seen the Pope's reply. His successor was Euphemius, a Syrian, the man of the Acemetae—or so it has been assumed—but in any event a strict Chalcedonian. On his own authority he removed Peter Mongus from the diptychs and in a letter to the Pope acknowledged the Synod of Chalcedon without reservations.[20] He was unwilling only to condemn Acacius, and in such a champion of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy this fact was a powerful testimony in favor of Acacius. It also prevents one from seeing in Euphemius an unscrupulous creature of the Acemetae, who roundly hated Acacius. Evidently Euphemius saw no Christian necessity to condemn Acacius after his death, as Rome demanded, even though the deceased Patriarch's policy may have been questionable to him also. Pope Felix remained obstinate and thereby prolonged the schism for some twenty years unnecessarily. The Emperor Zeno died in 491. The new Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) had been a high court functionary, not inexperienced in ecclesiastical matters and at one time even a candidate for the patriarchal See of Antioch.[21] In contrast to the last years of his predecessor, he was determined not to stake the politically undeniable successes of the *Henoticon* in the East and not to sacrifice them even to a Pope who, in his eyes, living under the protection of an Ostrogoth outside the actual sphere of power of his Empire, was pursuing a policy which did not take into consideration the difficult circumstances of the Eastern Churches and the idea of imperial unity. But at Rome Pope Gelasius I (492–496) unflinchingly continued the policy of his predecessor; Euphemius did not receive the least support, and with each day it became clearer that, for Rome, not the question of Chalcedon but that of the primatial position of Constantinople represented the questionable heart of the matter. Even though the Patriarch informed the Pope that the condemnation of Acacius would inevitably lead to a revolt of the "demes," that is, the so-called circus factions,[22] Gelasius persisted in his demand, and, even when the Emperor Anastasius sought to put pressure on him by means of King Theodoric, this was of no avail, probably because the King had at that time no interest in attaching the Pope to Constantinople.

---

[18] The papal edict, ed. E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 6–7. It contradicted the traditional law and hence was criticized on the ground that a Pope, on his own, without an ecumenical synod, deposed a colleague in the patriarchate.

[19] Mentioned in the Pope's answer: A. Thiel, op. cit., 266–269; E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 111–113.

[20] The letter is mentioned by the chronicler Theophanes, p. 135 (de Boor). Cf. *Grumel Reg* 175.

In 495 Euphemius was succeeded as Patriarch of Constantinople by Macedonius (495–511), whom the Emperor invested only after he had signed the *Henoticon.* At Rome the intransigent Gelasius was followed by Pope Anastasius II (496–98), who apparently exerted himself to prepare for an end to the schism by a judicious policy. But he died as early as 498, and hence his plans could not mature. In addition, there now broke out in Rome the so-called Laurentian Schism, which made any eastern policy impossible until 502.

If the opposition at Rome to the *Henoticon,* or, more precisely, to Acacius, was thus impeded, the vacillation of Acacius's successors in the East strengthened the opposition to the *Hemoticon,* which proceeded from theologians, to whom, it is true, the label of Monophysites can be simply attributed, but who energetically rejected the Synod of Chalcedon and saw in the *Henoticon* an all too compliant document. For them Cyril's theology was the starting point and the goal of Christological terminology: they rejected its explanation by Chalcedon. The most important men of this faction were Xenaia (Philoxenus) of Mabbug (Hierapolis) and Severus of Antioch.

Already as a teacher at the school of Edessa, Xenaia[23] had bitterly attacked the theology of the old Antiochene School, which for him represented nothing but pure Nestorianism. Peter the Fuller promoted him to the episcopal see of Mabbug and here he developed in the Syriac language, with which he alone was familiar, an active literary activity not only against the Council of Chalcedon, but also against the old Antiochenes, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and Ibas of Edessa. He even sought to explain the "True" faith to the Emperor and for this purpose came to Constantinople, where, of course, Macedonius did not receive him, and so he soon angrily departed. Severus,[24] a Greek from Pisidia, had considerably more success in the capital. He had first studied law and then was gained for the monastic life at Maiuma near Gaza. He employed the time in the monastery not only for the exercises of the ascetical life but also for a deeper study of all theology. Thus Severus became an opponent of the Synod of Chalcedon, whom the Chalcedonians could counteract only with difficulty. What led him to Constantinople was, first, the conflict with a certain Nephalius, who had originally belonged to his own faction but now vehemently defended the interests of the Chalcedonians and slandered the monastic groups around Severus to the Patriarch Elias of Jerusalem to such a degree that Elias had them driven out of their monasteries. Accompanied by crowds of monks, Severus traveled as their counsel to the Emperor, who received him with the greatest honor. Even when his case had been decided, he remained in the city from 508 to 511, and, in word and writing, developed a mighty propaganda against Chalcedon and, implicitly, also against the *Henoticon.* He gathered the opponents of the Patriarch Macedonius around himself, and people did not hesitate to spread falsehoods in order to compromise the Patriarch and to bring about his ruin. The shibboleth of Severus's cause became the so-called "Theopaschite Trisagion," that is, the *Hagios ho theos, hagios ischyros, hagios athanatos,* to which had been appended *ho staurotheis di'hemas*—hence a formula, which meant nothing more, if the *Trisagion* itself was understood Christologically and not in a Trinitarian sense, which was possible both historically and formally, but which could not but lead to misunderstandings if it was employed as a substitute for the controversial *mia physis tou theou logou sesarkomene.*[25] Macedonius was sacrificed by the Emperor because of all the difficulties caused him and the calumnies alleged against him, and replaced by Timothy (511–18), who could not really please any faction. The Monophysites wanted Severus in his place; the Alexandrians demanded of him an anathema against Chalcedon and the *Tome of Leo*; in Syria Xenaia continued to agitate and procured the deposition of the Patriarch of Antioch, Flavian, who had tried to champion the *Henoticon* in an orthodox manner. Severus was elected to replace him in 512, and he thoroughly exploited his new position of power to destroy all further opposition to his own *theologumena.* He solemnly declared, of course, that he accepted the *Henoticon,* but soon interpreted it in a way that could leave no doubt about his hostility to the Synod of Chalcedon. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Elias, also fell victim to Severus. His successor, John, was ready to make any concession to Severus, but the great superiors of the lauras and cenobiarchs, Sabas and Theodosius, thwarted him, and, flanked by the two monastic superiors, he was compelled solemnly to condemn not only Nestorius and Eutyches but now Severus also.[26] In the capital also an outspoken pro-Chalcedon opposition was constituted: it collected the adherents of the deposed Macedonius and even found powerful supporters in the imperial family. When in November 512 a procession of Severans once again marched through the streets with the "Theopaschite Trisagion," the opposition attacked, a revolt erupted, the statues of the Emperor were thrown down, and the rioters entrenched themselves in the *Forum Constantini.* Again the Emperor succeeded in restoring calm by prudent conduct, but now the opposition spread dangerously to the province. A Gothic officer in the imperial service, Vitalian,[27] exploited the dissatisfaction of the imperial *foederati* in the Balkan Peninsula and marched on Constantinople. To acquire friends in the capital, he made use of pro-Chalcedon catchwords. At first the Emperor thought he could overcome the danger by proceeding tactically. When this did not succeed, he saw himself compelled to appoint Vitalian as *Magister Militum Per Thraciam* and to promise to invite the Pope to a council at Herachea, at which the schism should be healed. A corresponding *Sacra* left for Rome. Pope Hormisdas, who had succeeded Symmachus in 514, took his time, evidently in order to consult Theodoric. And so the date of the council, set for 1 July 515, passed. In the meantime Vitalian appeared again before the walls of Constantinople. This time he was annihilated by the imperial troops and so the council, in which no one else had testified to a special interest, lost its *raison d'être* for the Emperor. The Pope twice sent legates, it is true, but they had to turn back without success. And so the Acacian Schism continued until the death of the Emperor Anastasius in April 518.

---

[21] L. Bréhier, "Anastase," *DHGE* II, 1447–1457.

[22] The letter is lost but is partly reconstructable from the Pope's reply in A. Thiel, op. cit., 312–321; E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* pp. 49–55.

[23] A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabboug* (Louvain 1963).

---

[24] G. Bardy, "Sévère d'Antioche," *DThC XIV* 1988–2000; J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien* (Louvain 1909); id., "La christologie du monophysisme sévérien," *Chalkedon* I, 425–580. More literature in Beck, 387–390.

[25] On the Trisagion cf. E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 242; V. S. Janeras, "Les byzantins et le trisagion christologique," *Miscellanea in honorem G. Lercaro* II (Rome 1967), 469–499; W. Elert, "Die theopaschitische Formel," *ThLZ* 75 (1950) 195–206.

---

[26] On the role of the Chalcedonian Palestinian monks cf. E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939), 385f.; H. Bacht, "Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchen politischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon," *Chalkedon* II, 193–314, especially 285ff.

[27] Cf. on him E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Brussels 1949), 178–181; V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der "Skythischen Kontroversen"* (Paderborn 1935), 127–136.

If one looks back to the years since 482, the period has a unique important turning point in the pontificate of Pope Anastasius II. At that time appeared the hope and the possibility of again achieving unity on the basis of an orthodox interpretation of the *Henoticon,* to which Acacius had always held. The death of the Pope wrecked the hopes. Neither his predecessors nor his successors took into account the difficulty of the situation in the East. They saw their obedience in the Vicariate of Thessalonica imperiled; they did not know how to acquiesce in a linking of the conciliar definition of Chalcedon with the notorious canon 28, although the latter had brought scarcely anything new in respect to the First Council of Constantinople, and they built their policy on the only apparently stable foundation of Ostrogothic rule in Italy. The Popes failed to note that Constantinople and its Patriarch had to remain victorious, precisely because they appeared, vis-à-vis the Emperor, in an independence which they owed solely to the Ostrogoth and Arian Theodoric. The *Henoticon* united the Eastern Churches in the face of Rome, and Alexandria was no longer a point of departure for Rome. The first years of the next imperial dynasty only seemingly justified the papal policy. John II and Vigilius would soon have to pay for the policy of a Felix and a Gelasius.

CHAPTER 23

The Elaboration of the Church of the Byzantine Empire in the Age of the Emperor Justinian I

With the Emperors Justin I (518–527) and Justinian I (527–565) there began not only a new and important epoch of the secular history of the Eastern Roman Empire; just as important, not to say questionable, was their period of power for the history of the Christian Church. In this regard we may, probably from the start, regard Justinian as the *spiritus rector* of the policy of his uncle, Justin, also. Even if we do not unreservedly go along with the historian Procopius in his evaluation, on carefully weighed grounds, of the motive for the ecclesiastical policy of the later Emperor, there remains enough that is enigmatical for modern historians to speak now of a zigzag course pursued by the Emperor, now of his imperturbably consistent policy. Some points of departure can be fixed with certainty; which of them at any one time was decisive, to what extent they collaborated and in what proportion, can only rarely be stated. There was, first, the dream of the restoration of the ancient extent of the *Imperium,* of a world empire ruled from a glorious center—a dream which in the spiritual climate of the sixth century could not disregard the disunity of the Church. Second, there was a scarcely to be denied particular interest in ecclesiastical and religious matters, and this interest may in part have sprung from a genuine piety, but a zealous piety which, contrary to the Lord's word, wanted to burn every alleged weed long before the harvest. To this was added a special theological commitment of the Emperor, the bases of which were, naturally, judged in various ways: for some he was an experienced student of contemporary theology; for others, an amateur, an unlucky lover, who unfortunately was Emperor and hence disposed of the force to make his notions into law. There always remains the question of his own part in the creeds and formulas—a question which underlies the same criteria as the question of his role in the entire Justinianean legislation. And, finally, there was Theodora, the great and much maligned Empress, whose influence must surely be taken into account in the ecclesiastical policy of the age, even when its impact can be determined only with difficulty. One should hardly speak, with Procopius, of a conscious, even crafty, political sharing, according to which, for example, Justinian would have on occasion complied with the orthodox demands, whereas Theodora retained the freedom indirectly to assure to the Monophysites the ability to continue to live and to operate, so that no faction could complain. This smacks too much of sophistry. The hand-in-hand and the mutual opposition of the imperial pair seems more complicated, dependent on the circumstances, and could hardly have happened without clashes. That the system still functioned probably lay in the character of the Empress and was based on the Emperor's bond with her.

The fact that Justin and Justinian were at once prepared to put an end to the so-called Acacian Schism and to comply with Rome's demands is certainly explained not by any already planned clutching at Ostrogothic Italy. It could no longer be doubted that the *Henoticon* policy of Anastasius had been mismanaged in the capital itself. Every new Emperor, especially if he had reached the throne under such precarious circumstances as had Justin, had, in any case and first of all, to gain the capital for himself. The dangerous Vitalian was still in the Thracian countryside, waiting to see what the new Emperors would begin to do. It may be that Justinian was basically a convinced Chalcedonian. In any event, Theodora had only been his wife for a short time and apparently was at first preoccupied with assuring her position, which might not have been too easy, in view of her past.

If Justin and his nephew had at first been of another view, events soon after the coronation of the new Emperor could only undeceive them.[1] The pro-Chalcedon monks, the Acemetae at their head, organized a popular tumult at the Sunday liturgy of the Patriarch John II (518–520) and forced him and his synod solemnly to recognize Chalcedon, repudiate the *Henoticon,* excommunicate Severus, and resume relations with the Holy See. Justin was induced to ratify this decision by edict.[2] And now envoys went to Rome to begin negotiations for peace. Pope Hormisdas, who received not only a formal letter from the Emperor,[3] but also an extraordinarily promising one from Justinian,[4] was in the best position to negotiate and did not want to let this opportunity slip by. The dogmatic position had long ago been delineated by the celebrated *Regula fidei Hormisdae,* which the Pope had prepared as early as 515 for the union council that was supposed to meet that year.[5] This *libellus* proceeded from the Primate of the Roman See and condemned first Nestorius and Eutyches and then also Timothy the Cat, Peter Mongus, Peter the Fuller, and especially Acacius. For the rest, the decision of Chalcedon together with the *Tome of Leo* was imposed as the norm of faith. Now people even in Constantinople were ready for the *damnatio memoriae* of Acacius, and in a meekness required by the Emperor and vigorously demanded by the monks, the Patriarch saw himself induced to accept the *Regula fidei* without discussion and to consign posthumously to Satan not only Acacius but also his successors, Euphemius and Macedonius, who certainly had done their best. The same fate befell also the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius, without any protest from the court. This took place on the memorable 28 March 519, a day which seemed to seal the victory of the Pope over the self-willed and, in Rome's eyes, illegitimate Patriarchate of Constantinople—but it was still only a pyrrhic victory, as the following decade proved. Shortly before the concluding of the negotiations the papal legates of Hormisdas in Constantinople had had to deal with a remarkable group, the so-called "Scythian," but really probably Gothic, monks from the Dobrudsha, men of the Goth Vitalian, who belonged to those ingenious types that are always proposing for Orthodoxy new formulas from which they anticipated salvation.[6] Their formula read: *Heis tes triados pathon,* or "Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin, one of [or in] the Trinity." Presumably they intended by it to prevent any Nestorian interpretation of the formula of Chalcedon, but in reality they approached that appendage to the Trisagion, which had meanwhile long ago become the precious possession of the opponents of Chalcedon. The legates could not do anything with this contribution of Latin theology—Maxentius, leader of the "Scythians," had received a "Latin education"—but Justinian let himself be gained for the formula, presumably out of consideration for Vitalian. A sign of the future: In a letter to Hormisdas, in which he recommended to him the monks and their formula, he attested, on his own initiative, the Orthodoxy of this fad.[7] But Hormisdas, at the climax of his success, did not intend to give to the heir to the throne even this satisfaction, apart from the fact that the monks made themselves so unpopular in Rome that he had them removed from the city. Justinian could wait.

---

[1] The events are described by S. Salaville, "La fête du concile de Chalcedoine dans le rite byzantin," *Chalkedon* II, 677–695.

[2] Michael the Syrian reported on it, II, 180 (Chabot).

[3] *Coll. Avell.* no. 160.

[4] *Coll. Avell.* no. 162. The entire correspondence which at this period proceeded from and arrived at the papal chancery is in this *Collectio,* nos. 1–104.

[5] Text: *Coll. Avell.,* no. 149. *Mansi* VIII, 441–442, gives the instructions for the legates. Cf. W. Haacke, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im acacian. Schisma* (Rome 1939).

The Emperor Justin, together with his nephew, may have pacified the capital by the Union of 519, but in not a few places it appeared that the *Henoticon* was still alive or, respectively, that the Emperor's surrender of the *Henoticon* now cleared the ground for the opponents of Chalcedon. The bishops, who were now supposed to renew communion with Rome, could not always make up their minds to condemn their predecessors or even Acacius. This was especially the problem in the European provinces of the Empire. An example was Thessalonica, the center of the Papal Vicariate in Illyricum, whose archbishops were plunged by the Acacian Schism into the greatest conflicts, since on the one hand they were to look after the papal interests and on the other hand they lived within direct range of the imperial city without Rome's being able to offer them effective aid. When the papal legates now journeyed through the city, they were actually assaulted and their host was murdered. At Ephesus the Synod of Chalcedon was vigorously condemned. At Antioch Severus had, of course, to leave his see and flee to Egypt, but wherever new bishops were installed in Syria, it was often possible to maintain them only with military aid. In addition, now the Nestorians sensed their advantage and began here and there publicly to celebrate as saints, in addition to Theodoret, also Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius himself. But from Egypt Severus again held all the strings in his hand, admonished, warned, wrote treatises and sermons, and directed the resistance. Hormisdas, in a complete misreading of the situation, thought he could have one of his legates, who happened to be an Alexandrian, elevated to the See of St. Mark. But the situation was so tense that finally the election had to be left to the Alexandrians: it fell on the Monophysite Timothy III, who rejected Chalcedon and the *Henoticon,* without a hair on his head being harmed. With the *Henoticon* the last clamp of the Church of the Empire was smashed.

---

[6] V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der "skythischen Kontroversen"* (Paderborn 1935); B. Altaner, "Zum Schrifttum der 'skythischen' (Gotischen) Mönche," *HJ* 62 (1943), 261–273, 72 (1953), 568–581; W. Elert, "Die Thoepaschitische Formel," *ThLZ* 75 (1950), 195–206.

[7] *Coll. Avell.*, no. 196, of 9 July 520.

The new alliance of the Pope with the Emperor could, however, only arouse mistrust in the Pope's ruler at Ravenna, King Theodoric. It is possible that the hypothesis that the Roman senatorial nobility began now to conspire with Constantinople was more than a suspicion. Perhaps the process against Boethius was related to it, and perhaps there was also a certain connection with it when Justin now, by an edict from the end of 524 ordered the closing of the Arian Gothic churches in Constantinople and excluded Arians from all offices and military positions.[8] Theodoric accepted the challenge and sent Pope John I himself, who was thereby put completely into his hand by way of diplomacy, as a messenger to Constantinople to demand of the Emperor the withdrawal of the edict. Pope John stayed in the capital from November 525 till Easter 526 and was received and treated with the greatest honor.[9] That Justin had himself crowned again by him is, of course, a mistaken interpretation of a simple "festive crown-wearing" in the sense of a constitutional act! A real success was not allowed to the Pope's mission. Most of the Arian Goths seem to have drawn the necessary conclusions from the imperial edict and to have converted so that the Emperor could with light heart promise the return of the churches. Apparently now the return to Arianism should also again be allowed. But here the Emperor remained firm, and Theodoric made his papal messenger pay for his lack of success by imprisoning him at Ravenna after his return.

Furthermore, Theodoric died soon after, in the fall of 526, and eleven months later the Emperor Justin followed him. Now Flavius Petrus Sabbatius Justinianus was sole ruler. There began an epoch of Church history which, like no other, bore the stamp of a single person. Its goal was unambiguously *one* Empire, *one* Church, outside which there were no salvation and no hope on earth, and *one* Emperor, whose principal care was precisely the welfare of this Church. In the pursuit of this goal Justinian knew no fatigue and with fanatical thoroughness he pursued what to him seemed false into the farthest hiding places, not of course without tactical skill and not without accommodation to the circumstances of the time and especially to the ratio of forces—likewise, not without the ability to close both eyes where there was question of men who actually should be subordinated to his will if they were not so extraordinarily useful. Finally, he had each and every thing in the Church also depend on his own decision, even when, in case of need, he treated the bishops so respectfully. For him the Pope of Rome was without doubt the Head of Christendom. He understood the primacy not only as a rank of honor, but also as the primacy of doctrine and faith, but the Primate was well advised to decide as seemed good to the Emperor.

---

[8] Theophanes the Chronicler on the Year 6016: p. 109 (de Boor).

[9] W. Ensslin, "Papst Johannes I. als Gesandter Theoderichs des Grossen bei Kaiser Justinos I.," *ByZ* 44 (1951), 127–134.

The one and only Church: to please it there must be no more pagans. The earlier legislation against paganism aimed at pagan worship and the legality of pagan meetings. Justinian decreed by law that every pagan must have himself and his family instructed and baptized under penalty of confiscation of his property.[10] The relapse of a Christian into paganism was punished by death.[11] The law was no empty threat. There were still pagans in the learned circles of the capital and at historical spots such as Athens; there was still a pagan rural population in the hills of Anatolia, for whose conversion a Monophysite, John of Asia, was good enough for even the Emperor; there were pagan shrines on the Upper Nile, in the oases, and in the Syrian Desert. The closing of the Neoplatonic School of Athens, a *thiasos* with slight philosophical appeal, probably was due to the imperial edict.[12] The philosophers found a cordial reception at the court of Chosroes of Persia, who was presumably not especially attracted by their muddled philosophy, since in the Peace of 532 he insisted on their unimpeded return to the Empire. This closing of the School of Athens was in no sense an event of importance in world history. In Constantinople also grammarians, sophists, and physicians of the highest circles were arrested as pagans and forcibly converted or flogged and, in individual cases, even executed. All this, however, did not stop the Emperor from taking into his service at court a Tribonian as *Quaestor Sacri Palatii* and a John of Cappadocia as *Praefec-*

---

[10] *Codex* I, 11, 9–10.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Cf. Malalas, 451 (Bonn).

tus Praetorio, whose paganism and pure atheism are vouched for by contemporary observers.[13]

The Jews had it "easier" than the pagans because their worship had long ranked as *religio licita.* To be sure, for a long time this license, which was alleged to be guilty of Christian doctrinal shadowboxing, had been surrounded by a crown of thorns of vexations, which Justinian unscrupulously increased with deeper spikes. He denied Jews the ability to testify in court in cases with Christians, forbade them to buy Church property and land concerning which there was question of building a church; true, he did not exempt them from the burden of *curiales* in their communities, but he forbade them any of the precarious honors which this burden could involve.[14] Finally, he even interfered in the synagogue worship and forced the permission to read the Torah in Greek or Latin but obliged the Jews in this case to use the Septuagint or at most Aquila's translation.[15] The Samaritans, on the other hand, were treated like pagans: their synagogues were closed,[16] leading to frightful rebellions of this Palestinian minority, which were put down with unprecedented severity—20,000 are said to have perished in the revolt of 529. Nevertheless, they rebelled again in 555, without any more success. It is noteworthy that in 551 even the Bishop of Caesarea stood up for them.

The remnant of heretics in the Empire was excluded by the Emperor from all offices and dignities and from teaching and the practice of law. These men hardly had any more rights in the courts. Their churches were to be closed.[17]

If the Emperor thus served the Church with his legislation against everything that was outside it, the Church was also expected to serve him. It would be false to assume that the Emperor made state officials out of the bishops, but he enveloped them in a whole series of discretionary duties in the service and for the benefit of the State.[18] The bishops were charged with the control of prisoners, they obtained the functions of arbiter if there was a circumventing of the law by a governor or if such was suspected and in disputes in the province to which the governor was a party. They had also, together with their *economi,* "to lend a hand" in the levying of the taxes of the community and, with a group of outstanding citizens, to examine the community's rendering of its accounts. They had also to make a discreet report on the governor's administration of his office to the Emperor. In other words: Justinian saw in the bishop a reliable representative of the municipal nobility without taking him into the imperial service in the real sense. He used him in order to play him off against the community as well as against the provincial administration. The bishop thereby obtained a position, the social consequences of which remained completely open. He could become the "feudal lord," like the notables of the city, with whom he was confused, but also the guardian of the interests of the people, covered by the protection of the central imperial authority. In order to make the bishops' position easier, the Emperor again and again had recourse to the expedient of guaranteeing the stability of the episcopal revenues through legislation.[19] Here there was question especially of assuring the endowments from which the ecclesiastical patrimony came for the most part. The church of a city received the right to legacies which were bequeathed by the testator in an unspecified manner to religious and charitable ends, for example, by designating Christ or a saint as heir; furthermore, the Emperor established brief terms within which legacies which had been set aside for charitable institutes had to be applied to their purpose. Church property could not in principle be alienated or otherwise impaired. No imperial law was to be valid according to which the support of troops was to be assured by Church property, no sacred utensils were to be employed for profane purposes—the single exception was constituted by the redemption of captives, for which no means could otherwise be raised. Gifts to the Church were exempted from the tax on profits. Outstanding gifts of money and endowments could be exacted at any time. Prescription took place only after 100 years. The leasing of Church property was limited—the terms were short, even when they differed—and it was possible only for the wealthy, who were in a position to pay the rent determined by the Emperor. But Byzantine legislation never knew a general exemption of Church property from taxation. There were, of course, exceptions, and the most important in Justinian's reign was undoubtedly the tax-exemption for the more than 1,000 farms (*ergasteria*) of the "Great Church" at Constantinople.[20]

---

[13] Cf. J. Irmscher, "Die geistige Situation der Intelligenz im Zeitalter Justinians," F. Altheim–R. Stiehl, *Die Araber in der alten Welt* IV (Berlin 1967), 334–362; W. E. Kaegi, "The Fifth-Century Twilight of Byzantine Paganism," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966), 243–275; D. J. Constantelos, "Paganism and the State in the Age of Justinian,"' *CHR* 50 (1964), 372–380.

[14] Novel 45.

[15] Novel 146.

[16] *Codex* I, 5, 17. Cf. S. Winkler, "Die Samaritaner in den Jahren 529/530," *Klio* 43–45 (1965), 434–457.

[17] *Codex* I, 5, 12.

[18] For what follows: H. G. Beck, "Kirche und Klerus im staatlichen Leben von Byzanz," *RÉB* 24 (1966), 1–24; there also the evidence.

---

[19] Evidence in A. Knecht, *System des justinianeischen Kirchenvermögensrechtes* (Stuttgart 1905); M. V. Levcenko, "Das Kirchengut im oströmischen Reiche während des 5. und 6. Jh." (in Russian); *ViVr* 2 (1949), 11–59.

Even if Justinian guaranteed to the Church in principle the free administration of its property, he still meddled vigorously in the methods of this administration. The number of administrative personnel in the provinces was exactly determined, the documentation in the administrative system was regulated in detail, even the dates of the rendering of accounts to the bishop and the amount of rent.

On the clergy themselves, especially the bishops, the legislation of Justinian used the finest phrases.[21] In order to assure this rank, it engaged in a thousand decrees on prerequisites for entry into the clergy, the behavior of clerics, their training, and so forth. Much of this was already contained in earlier ecclesiastical canons, but much also was due to the painstaking thought of the Emperor and was in some respects the expression of the mentality of Justinian and his age. Typical, for example, even if hardly new, was that it was now regulated by law that the share of the people in the election of the bishop was restricted to the outstanding men of the city,[22] and likewise that the one to be ordained had to sign an orthodox creed and swear that he had refrained from simony;[23] but it was also typical that the ordination fees were regulated in detail and that they were considerably high—for the patriarchs no less than twenty pounds in gold—and in this way, according to the Emperor's intention, an impoverishment of the churches should be prevented![24] Apparently the illegal charges were considerably higher. The Emperor emphatically inculcated the duty of residence and exerted himself especially to check the notorious Byzantine urge to travel to the imperial court. The bishop could be subjected to secular jurisdiction only with imperial permission.

With equal zeal the Emperor interested himself in synodal law, decided the dates for local and provincial synods, and regulated their *modus procedendi.*[25] In accord with tradition, he reserved to the Emperors the right to convoke an ecumenical synod.[26] And synodal canons were put on a footing of equality with the laws of the State.[27]

---

[20] Novel 43 (537). The Anastasis in Jerusalem also received certain privileges. Its economic burden had so increased because of the support given to the numerous pilgrims that it had to be given greater leeway in the use of its goods, if the ruinous financial position was not to last. Cf. W. Schubart, "Kaiser Justinian und die Anastasiskirche in Jerusalem," *ZNW* 37 (1938), 195–202.

[21] K. L. Noethlichs, "Materialien zum Bischofsbild aus den spätantiken Rechtsquellen," *JbAC* 16 (1973), 23–59.

[22] Novel 123; cf. Novel 137.

[23] Novel 137.

[24] Novel 123.

[25] Novels 123 and 137.

Significant for the complex of ideas of the legislator, not lacking in illusions, was the fact that he wanted to define Byzantine monasticism as far as possible according to cenobitic norms.[28] For anchorites and hesychasts within the monastery there were a couple of exceptional rules. But they too were to be subject to the abbot. The head of the monastery was the abbot elected by the community; the election was subject to the control and ratification of the bishop, who also possessed the supreme jurisdiction over the monastery. The law of Justinian knew no exemption. The monastery's property rights corresponded to the general ecclesiastical law of property.

The Universal Orthodox Church was divided, in the Emperor's view, into the five great patriarchates in order of precedence: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In this, as already mentioned, an absolute precedence was allotted to the Roman Patriarchate.[29]

This brief summary of Justinian's regulations cannot include, even approximately, everything that Justinian decided to the tiniest details, and in fact he not rarely went far beyond the ecclesiastical canons. He did this out of his awareness of high-priestly power, not in the sense of a modern State Church, just as there was no question at all of State and Church, but of Church and Emperor. That he felt himself to be inspired and especially favored not only as organizer but also as theologian was in itself nothing new in the notions of the age: Pope Leo the Great himself had acknowledged such an inspiration in an Emperor like Marcian. New was only the degree to which Justinian made use of this inspiration for his ecclesiastical policy. He thereby became the one who completed the Constantinian Church system, in so far as he fixed in law what had had only a "numinous" character in Constantine or Theodosius and at the same time marked out the infinitely broad extent to which a Byzantine Emperor could go in the Church, even if not without the Church. A perfect example of this is the second phase of his union policy in regard to the Monophysites, which was only apparently concluded with the Agreement of 519—apparently all the more for Justinian, who in this first phase had to make only too many concessions to the self-consciousness of Rome.

---

[26] *PG* 86, 1035.

[27] *Codex* I, 3, 44.

[28] A. Tabera, "De ordinatione status monachalis in fontibus Justinianeis," *Commentarii pro Religiosis* 14 (1933), 87–95, 199–206, 15 (1934), 412–418; B. Granic, "Die Rechtsetellung und Organisation der griechischen Klöster," *ByZ* 29 (1928–29), 6–34. Especially important is Novel 133 (539).

[29] Cf. *Codex* I, 1, 7, and Novel 131.

CHAPTER 24

Justinian's Zigzag Course: The Origenist Troubles

No one could maintain that the Union of 519 was a complete success. But despite all the severity of the antiheretical legislation, the refractory Monophysites and opponents of Chalcedon never fully felt it. Justinian, who was certainly in no way connected with Manichaeans, Novatians, and Montanists, was probably of the opinion that he could come to terms theologically with the moderate Monophysites, especially those who followed Severus. In regard to them, it was also not a question of any dwindling minority but of considerable proportions of the population of whole imperial provinces. Furthermore, now the Empress Theodora self-assuredly moved into the foreground. At the period of her roving life, she had apparently found Christian understanding[1] only from Monophysite bishops, who were not rarely at loggerheads with the established society, and now, as Empress, she was prepared to forget this fact for their sake. During the dangerous Nika Riot in January 532 she had been the one who through her pluck thwarted the flight of the Emperor and thereby saved him his throne. It goes without saying that this especially put the Emperor under obligation to her. Still, the new policy cannot be termed simply a consequence of the Nika Riot, apart from the fact that this political event had little or nothing to do with denominational opposition. Instead, soon after he had begun his reign as sole Emperor, Justinian had recalled Monophysite monks and bishops from their exile, and in the summer of 531 he invited six of them to Constantinople. They guarded themselves against a surprise by imperial theologians by means of a forestalling dogmatic declaration[2] and then came to the city, where, soon after the Nika Riot, following rather lengthy preliminary negotiations, a religious discussion was staged, the so-called *Collatio cum Severianis,* conducted on the Orthodox side chiefly by Hypatius of Ephesus.[3] The outcome was jejune: the

---

[1] It is John of Nikiu who reports that Theodora had at this time made the acquaintance of the Patriarch Timothy III at Alexandria, who became her spiritual father.

[2] Individual examples in E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis,* 389.

[3] On this we have an exhaustive report by a participant, Bishop Innocent of Maroneia, addressed to the Priest Thomas of Thessalonica, but it is extant only in Latin: *ACO* IV, 2, 167–184.

Severans acknowledged that Theodoret and Ibas of Edessa had rightly been rehabilitated by the Fathers of Chalcedon, and one bishop even let himself be induced to recognize Chalcedon. But that was all. The chief objection of the Monophysites against the decrees of Chalcedon was obviously the danger of a Nestorian interpretation of them, and this objection seems to have made a lasting impression on the Emperor, who participated only indirectly in the *Collatio,* and motivated him to undertake something in return. In any event, the Monophysites at first had a considerable breathing-space, and Justinian was ready to oblige them further. He published dogmatic letters[4] to the people of Constantinople and the cities of Asia and to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Epiphanius, and his synod, which once again represented a remarkable gliding over the decrees of Chalcedon. Instead, the Theopaschite Formula was now expressly accepted, which had deeply interested the Emperor since 520. It goes without saying that the Acematae monks were not pleased and, in keeping with their tradition, at once mounted a sharp attack against it, apparently without being clearly aware that the days of the Emperor Anastasius were past. They were said to have then gone so far in their "Nestorian" interpretation of Chalcedon that they even refused to Mary the title of *Theotokos,* which probably means no more than that the Acemetae did not want the *communicatio idiomatum* to be regarded as the *ultima ratio* of Christology. In keeping with their custom, they complained to the Pope. But Hormisdas was long since dead, and an imperial edict followed in their steps. Pope John II bowed to the imperial pressure and condemned the Acemetae on 23 December 534 and in so doing swallowed the Theopaschite Formula, which Hormisdas had loathed; in fact, in the letter to Emperor and Senate referring to this he even censured one of Cyril's Anathemas, in which the formula had been anticipated by way of suggestion.[5]

Now, at the Emperor's invitation, even Severus came to Constantinople and found lodging in the palace, where he remained until March 536. And with Severus there came to Constantinople, as they had already come on their own initiative under Anastasius, all the monks possible, openly and secretly, most of them living on the hospitality of the Empress Theodora and behaving in Constantinople as though it was the metropolis of the opponents of Chalcedon. When in 535 the patriarchal see became vacant, the Emperor nominated a certain Anthimus, who had previously been Bishop of Trebizond but had given up that see in order to live at Constantinople as an ascetic. Now he also appeared from one of Theodora's palaces, which aroused the suspicion that it had been she who had made him acceptable to the Emperor as a candidate. Apparently nothing could be objected against his orthodoxy; but, having become Patriarch, he accepted the communion of Severus and sent his announcement of enthronement not only to the bellicose Orthodox Patriarch Ephrem of Antioch but also to his Monophysite colleague in Alexandria. The total situation undoubtedly recalled that under the *Henoticon,* and the question may be raised whether it was not precisely toward this situation that Justinian was purposely steering.

---

[4] *Cod. Just.* I, 1, 6 and 7.

[5] Letters of the Emperor to the Pope: *Coll. Avell. Ep.* 84, 7–21, and *Cod. Just.* I, 1, 8. Letter of the Pope: *Coll. Avell. ep.* 84. Cf. also V. Grumel, "L'auteur et la date de la composition du tropaire Ὁ μονογενής," *ÉO* 22 (1923), 398–418.

The turning point came surpisingly fast, not indeed as the result of an organizational development, but, as it were, *ex machina.* For the second time since Justinian was in power, a Pope came to Constantinople in the spring of 536, Agapitus I, successor of John II. He came as envoy of the Ostrogothic King Theodhad. For, in the meantime, Justinian, using the assassination of Amalasuntha, daughter of Theodoric the Great, as his reason, had decided to roll back Ostrogothic rule in Italy from the south upward: Belisarius had already landed in Sicily. Reluctantly the Pope undertook the King's errand to induce the Emperor to withdraw. The Pope's mission had no political success. But Agapitus did not make his journey only as a royal envoy. Informed from all sides in regard to the remarkable proceedings in Constantinople, he had decided to utilize his stay in the capital to affirm his primatial rights, which indeed Justinian had frequently solemnly averred that he highly esteemed. From the very start Agapitus refused his communion to the Patriarch Anthimus, formally on the far-fetched pretext that, as a transfer from Trebizond, he could not be a valid Bishop of Constantinople, but de facto probably because he suspected him of Monophysitism. Justinian at once abandoned the submissive Anthimus, who disappeared to where he had come from, probably into one of Theodora's hiding places. Menas, from Alexandria, became the new Patriarch and was ordained by the Pope after he had signed an expanded *Formula Hormisdae.* A synod should decide the future fate of Anthimus: at least, such was Agapitus's plan. But he died at Constantinople on 22 April 536 before it could be realized. Nevertheless, the Emperor also fulfilled this wish of the Pope and on 2 May of that year the Synod met under the presidency of Menas and with the participation of a whole group of Latin bishops and Roman clerics who had come with the Pope, at their head the papal Deacon Pelagius, the future Pope. Antioch and Jerusalem were represented by *apocrisiarii* and delegations.[6] The formal charges against Anthimus were lodged by abbots from Constantinople. Since Anthimus did not appear, even though he had been summoned three times, and no one defended him, he was condemned *in absentia* and degraded. The Synod could have come to an end, but monks from Palestine also demanded the condemnation of Severus. Menas hesitated, but Justinian gave leave and so Severus also, together with his adherents, was anathematized. Hence the policy of Pope Agapitus bore fruit even after his death. The new *Henoticon* movement had ended.

---

[6] Acts: *Collectio Sabbaitica, ACO* III, 27–186; *Mansi* VIII, 873–1176.

What induced Justinian to this change of course is difficult to determine. It is certain that, for him, the Pope was always theoretically the highest court of the faith, but in practice the Emperor knew how to manipulate this court. It must not be overlooked that, after all, all his exertions to win back the Monophysites were without any particular success—even the Theopaschite Formula could not satisfy them. Perhaps the Emperor was content to leave the counteraction, which had to affect Theodora also, to the Pope, who was glad to undertake it. But presumably the situation in Italy also played a not unimportant role. We do not know how actively or carelessly Agapitus had represented the concerns of his King Theodahad. In any event, Belisarius was on the way to Rome, and perhaps the Pope was able to convince the Emperor how very much it would aid Belisarius's campaign, if, as representative of a blameless imperial Orthodoxy, he could confront the Ostrogoths, those heretics! It must not be excluded that at the time Italy was more important to Justinian than the recalcitrant Monophysites of the East. The success of Belisarius should not be jeopardized by an affront to the Roman Pope and his Catholic obedience in Italy.

After he had once made up his mind, Justinian drew the reins tight. Severus and the Severans were expelled from the capital, and Severus went again to Egypt as a refugee. Theodora did what she could to thwart these measures, but now her activity was solely defensive, no longer offensive. Pelagius, Agapitus's deacon, remained at Constantinople as papal *apocrisiarius* and seems to have played an important role as the Emperor's adviser. The Patriarch Ephrem of Antioch, a former general, occupied himself with the forcible conversion of Syria to Orthodoxy. In Egypt Monophysitism was already so much at home that it had split into factions, especially into that of the moderate Severans and that of the "Phantasiasts," the adherents of Julian of Halicarnassus,[7] who saw in Christ's body an *aphtharton* (Aphthartodocetists). The Patriarch Theodosius, a friend of Severus, had become Patriarch of Alexandria in 535 at Theodora's instigation, but he had had the greatest difficulties in establishing himself in opposition to the Julianists' man, Gainas. Now in 537 Theodosius was summoned to Constantinople; since he was unable to make up his mind to sign the *horos* of Chalcedon, he had to go into exile. After some time Theodora managed to have him come to Constantinople, where he enjoyed her protection and could do everything to govern his Egyptian Church from a distance. But, using his plenitude of power, the Emperor now named a certain Paul as Patriarch of Alexandria and supplied him with full authority, which corresponded to that of an imperial governor. Still, what the Emperor's theology had been unable to achieve, so also his policy of force could not do.

---

[7] R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche* (Louvain 1924).

Precisely around this time the repertory of *theologumena* on which people could become alienated increased unnecessarily, but now concerning a new point which had been regarded as long dead—Origenism. After the first Origenist controversy around the turn of the fifth century,[8] there had been silence in regard to the doctrine of the great Alexandrian. Here and there someone took up his pen to refute him, but the Christological controversy troubled spirits to such a degree that there remained no more room for the esoteric questions which had preoccupied Origen. In monastic circles, however, Origen, now as before, could not but exercise a mysterious power of attraction, to which Evagrius had already succumbed. And when the confrontation gradually hardened again in the first half of the sixth century, the difficulty seems to have been the same as it was a century and a half earlier: an extreme spiritualization of the spiritual life, seized upon by the *raptus* of the ascent to God in order to lose itself in him even to the loss of identity, in order to find again in him all that had fallen in one final transfiguration. What the Origen-minded monks took, as regards individual points, from their master, or more directly from the writings of his devoted Evagrius Ponticus, whether they were more concerned about a cosmological interpretation of the occurrences within the soul or whether they made Origen their "private domain," cannot now be determined, for what was written against them was only too remote from spirituality.[9]

The starting point and center of the new movement was Palestine. Here, since the second half of the fifth century, monasticism in both its cenobitic as well as in its anchoretic (*laura*) form had known vast progress. One of the most important foundations was the *laura* of the monk Sabas from Cappadocia (d. 532), which was founded in 483—Mar Saba. In 494 Sabas became Archimandrite of all the anchorites of Palestine, that is, representative of the Patriarch for these monastic groups. He was a great organizer, an eager builder, and a loyal champion of a problem-free Orthodoxy, but not the man who would be able, on the basis of his education, to evoke an understanding for Origenist currents. This tendency was present also among his monks, and, because Sabas was as he was, he faced opposition. Finally there occurred the exodus of the "cranks," of those dissatisfied with him, who c. 507 gathered in a new foundation, the "New Laura." Their leader was a certain Nonnus. After some time, Sabas succeeded in getting the New Laura also under his control to some degree and in imposing his abbots on it. One of these abbots, Agapitus, finally expelled the strict Origenists from the new foundation. Only after his death in 519 did they return and follow the technique of silence and of the secret importing and cultivating of their doctrine. This apparently succeeded, especially when in 511 the aged Sabas, as deputy of the province, traveled to the imperial court with a petition for remission of taxes; he included in his retinue, from the monks of the New Laura, a certain Leontius,[10] a native of Constantinople, who was one of the most convinced Origenists. At Constantinople, his home, Leontius saw no further reason to adhere to the obligation to silence of the New Laura and carelessly preached his doctrines. Now Sabas's eyes were opened and he indignantly expelled Leontius from his escort and very imprudently returned to Palestine without him; there he died in 532. Leontius received reinforcements from the Palestinian *Eremos,* notably the monks Dometian and Theodore Askidas.[11] What they told the Emperor, to whom they gained access, and what he understood of it, we do not know. In any event, they gained him for their cause, and he made Theodore Metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia and Dometian Metropolitan of Ancyra. But Theodore preferred to linger in proximity to the Emperor and left his bishopric to take care of itself.

---

[8] See supra, chap. 9.

[9] On the entire matter, cf. F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jh. und das fünfte allgemeine Concil* (Münster 1899); E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, 386ff.

Meanwhile, the Patriarch Paul of Alexandria had disappointed all the hopes which the Emperor had set on him. His acts of violence became intolerable, and even complicity in the murder of a deacon could be charged to him. Hence the Emperor had him banished to Gaza, where a Synod was supposed to depose him. The Synod did its duty, and the imperial delegates who had attended it were now confronted on the spot with Origenism. One of them, Papas Eusebius, influential at court, sought to finish with the problem by giving to the Abbot of the New Laura the order either to receive back the expelled Origenists or to drive the most determined anti-Origenists from the monastery. The

---

[10] Whether this Leontius is identical with that Leontius of Byzantium who was so concerned for the history of dogma is disputed. E. Schwartz, op. cit., 388f., denies this; M. Richard, "Léonce de Byzance était-il origeniste?" *RÉB,* 5 (1947), 31–66, favors it; cf. the history of the controversy in S. Helmer, *Neuchalkedonismus,* 31ff.

[11] On Dometian and Theodore, cf. the literature in Beck, 384.

Abbot Gelasius decided for the latter course. Those expelled now turned to the Zealous Patriarch of Antioch, Ephrem, who at once anathematized the Origenists. Dometian and Theodore Askidas, who learned of this at Constantinople, sought to induce the Patriarch of Constantinople, Menas, to renounce Ephrem's communion. But in the meantime a detailed written complaint arrived from the anti-Origenists from Palestine, who spoke out against the intrigues of their opponents. The Patriarch sent it on to the Emperor Justinian, who soon issued a severe edict against the person and doctrine of Origen.[12]

If the question is asked, who at court was sufficiently influential to put through such a measure against Papas Eusebius, against Askidas and Dometian, the answer is hardly the Patriarch Menas; most probably we may see the initiator in the Deacon Pelagius, who as *apocrisiarius* had taken part in the Synod of Gaza. Whoever it may have been, once he had been called upon, the Emperor completely plucked the strings of his theological instrument. His edict was not only the proclamation of measures but a theological treatise in the form of a conciliar decree. It not only proposed to refute Origen but also to defame him: with quotations, chiefly from *Peri Archon,* it made fun of the doctrine, which it then summarized in ten anathemas, to which the obedient theologians and prelates had only to submit. The edict may be dated at the beginning of 542. The Patriarch Menas was instructed to have it signed by all the clergy of the capital and to send the report of it to all other bishops for their signature. Neither the Pope nor any other Patriarch declined to sign. Of course, the leading Origenists refused to accept this decision and preferred to leave the *laura* for good and look for a place of refuge elsewhere. Dometian seems likewise to have rejected the edict after some hesitation, whereas Theodore Askidas apparently was able to force himself to sign it.

Origenism seemed to have received a mortal blow. But the appearance was deceptive, for under an assumed name the great mystics of the Byzantine Church again came under Origen's spell.[13]

---

[12] Decree against the Origenists: *PG* 86, 1, 945–990; *ACO* III, 189–214.

[13] Cf. A. Guillaumont, *Les "Kephalaia gnostika" d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origenisme chez les Grecs et les Syriens* (Paris 1962).

CHAPTER 25

The Controversy over the Three Chapters and the Fifth General Council. End of the Age of Justinian

By the "Three Chapters" are understood the person and the work of three theologians who played a certain role in the period between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and gradually, without the situation having required it, became a bone of contention between the different factions in ecclesiastical politics. In the first place was a letter of Ibas of Edessa from the period after the Union of 433, which by no means defended Nestorius but expressed other than friendly feelings toward Cyril of Alexandria. The letter recognized the Union of 433, but its author was not inclined to see in the great exegete, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the father of Nestorianism and hence to condemn him. Next, Theodore of Mopsuestia himself. People had long ago begun to characterize his theology as Nestorian, and now efforts were made to condemn him and his work posthumously, even though neither Ephesus nor Chalcedon had been prepared to do so. In the third place were some writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, which were directed against Cyril's Anathemas. As early as 431 Cyril himself had exerted himself in vain for the condemnation of Theodore. But he was opposed on the ground that in his lifetime Theodore had not been accused of a heresy and that he had died in peace with the Church. It would not do to insult such a man after his death. Ibas as well as Theodoret had, it is true, been deposed by the Robber Synod in 449, but Chalcedon had rehabilitated both. The latter Synod had as little to find fault with in Ibas's letter as in the anti-Cyrillan writings of Theodoret. In other words: an attack on these three *kephalaia* was basically an attack on the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. To be obstinate in regard to the letter of Ibas and then to argue that it was not from Ibas and in this way to respect the authority of the Council, which had thus rehabilitated someone other than the author of the letter, was clearly hairsplitting, since the Council had also implicitly recognized the content of the letter. The attack on Theodore revealed not only a complete lack of understanding of the development of ideas, but also simply a loss of decency in ecclesiastical politics. But Theodoret simply had to be sacrificed, because he had put his finger too well on Cyril's weaknesses. What could induce circles which pretended to stand for Chalcedon to make these Three Chapters the target of ruthless attacks and thereby shake confidence in the Council? Looked at as a whole, probably only the persistent anxiety of appearing in the eyes of the Monophysites as Nestorians, of abetting a Nestorian interpretation of Christological dogma with the formulas of Chalcedon, and of compromising the sincerity of the adherence to Orthodoxy with the just-mentioned personalities and their work. They might have been of the opinion that, if the Three Chapters were thrown overboard, the Severans could be induced to return. The backbiting of Church history, of course, gives more concrete motives.[1] It knows the name of the man who had systematically prepared the attack and it knows his motives: Theodore Askidas, in the role of adviser of the Emperor, was exposed to the gravest risks through the attacks on Origenism, which were not least of all aimed at him, and he was intent on revenge, which should be aimed at the strict Chalcedonians, who had denounced Origenism to the Emperor. In the attack on the Three Chapters he found the way, under the pretext of purging Chalcedon of disagreeable concomitants, of striking at the very heart of the Council and at the same time of involving the Emperor in a theological conflict of such magnitude that, for its sake, he would have to forget about Origenism and would be happy to retain Askidas as adviser.

However matters may have proceeded, Askidas was successful in convincing the imperial theologian of his ideas. Justinian was quickly prepared to compose a scholarly treatise in which he explained the Three Chapters in detail. To it were appended anathemas against Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings, against the works which Theodoret had composed against Cyril, and against the letter of Ibas and all those who claimed that Ibas was its author—probably the first censure in Church history in the question of literary criticism! Justinian explicitly felt he had to make sure that these anathemas had no other purpose than to confirm the decrees of 451. The treatise has been lost.[2] It must have been composed and published in the period between 543 and 545. While one could acknowledge in the case of the imperial decree against the Origenists that a single one summarized the arguments of the first Origenist controversy and that therefore the condemnation produced nothing substantially new, in his decree against the Three Chapters—for the treatise claimed to be just that—Justinian acted in a totally authoritarian manner as master of the Church and of dogma, without the backing of a synod and even for a long time without envisaging a confirmation by a synod. The bishops received the formal command to sign the anathemas. But this time there were difficulties. The Patriarch

---

[1] Liberatus goes into detail on this in his *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum, ACO* II, 5, 140ff.

[2] Fragments in E. Schwartz, *Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians* (Munich 1940), 73ff.

Menas of Constantinople finally signed, together with his synod, but obtained the promise that he could withdraw his signature if the Pope refused to sign. Alexandria caused hardly any difficulties, but the Patriarch Ephrem of Antioch probably did, although he likewise finally yielded. More trouble came from Palestine, where especially the pro-Chalcedon monks put pressure on the Patriarch. A great number of the bishops of the West maintained a decidedly negative attitude. The Pope's *apocrisiarii* at Constantinople refused the communion of the Patriarch Menas because he had signed; the African episcopate and most of the bishops of Italy and Gaul made the most vigorous opposition. And so it had to be the Emperor's chief task to gain the Pope. Pope Vigilius had succeeded to the See of Peter in Rome in 537; his role in the deposition of his predecessor Silverius by Belisarius had given occasion for suspicions,[3] and he seemed, in relation to the Byzantine government, to have always had a bad conscience. Now, for simplicity's sake, Justinian summoned him to Constantinople; only when he arrived there, in 547, was the new document officially presented to him for his signature. The conduct of the Pope now and in the sequel hardly requires commentary. To brand it as weak and purposeless is to make use of mild expressions. At first everything appeared quite promising. Like his *apocrisiarii,* he refused the communion of Menas, who apparently did not bother any longer to speak of the assurance that he could withdraw his signature. Menas got his revenge by no longer mentioning the Pope in the liturgy. But Justinian employed every possible means of pressure to induce the Pope to give in. Thus in the course of 547 Vigilius resumed communion with Menas and in April 548 he issued his famous *Judicatum,* in which he abandoned the Three Chapters, even if not without qualifications.[4] The agitation over this yielding by the Pope grew mightily and affected even his immediate entourage. Finally, Vigilius saw himself compelled to excommunicate even a group of deacons who had come with him from Rome to Constantinople, in order to defend himself from their disagreeable criticism. In return, he was himself excommunicated by a Synod of African bishops. The situation reached a dangerous climax for the Pope especially in the West, causing him to spread abroad that he had been induced by ignoble methods to publish the *Judicatum.* Justinian yielded for a moment and condescended to let the Pope abandon the *Judicatum* with the assurance that the matter should be decided at a synod. In return, he of course had the

---

[3] Liberatus claims that, in order to become Pope, Vigilius had promised the Empress Theodora that he would abandon Chalcedon.

[4] It can be reconstructed from the *Constitutum* to be mentioned infra: cf. *Coll. Avell.,* no. 83, 316–317.

Pope give a written and sworn assurance that he would cooperate with all his power for the condemnation of the Three Chapters and undertake nothing without coming to an understanding with Justinian—a complete surrender of the Pope, which naturally was kept secret. The Synod was a long time in coming: bishops on whose appearance the court set great store did not arrive, and it was desired to keep others as far as possible from the capital. Thus it was not difficult for Askidas to persuade the Emperor again solemnly to condemn the Three Chapters by a decree with thirteen anathemas in July 551.[5] Askidas himself undertook to deliver the decree to the Pope. But, now, probably under pressure from the western bishops, the Pope demanded the withdrawal of the edict and threatened Askidas and the Patriarch Menas with excommunication. At the same time he regarded it as necessary to seek security after this attack, and so he fled from his lodgings in the *Domus Placidiae* to seek asylum in the Church of St. Peter in the Palace of Hormisdas, where he then officially excommunicated Askidas.[6] Justinian tried by means of police power to drag the Pope from his asylum but Vigilius literally defended himself with hands and feet. Only when the Emperor gave him a guarantee of his personal freedom could he be induced to return to the *Domus Placidiae.* However, since Justinian did not keep his promise, but treated him like a prisoner, he fled a second time, now across the Propontis to the Council Church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon. Again there were on the Emperor's part all possible assurances, broken by roughness and acts of violence. Even Belisarius could not move the Pope to return. Here Vigilius published an encyclical,[7] in which he sought to justify his behavior and declared the deposition of Askidas. The Pope's followers even succeeded in publicly posting in various places the bulls of excommunication against Menas and Askidas. A definitive break seemed to be in preparation, but Justinian did not want matters to go so far. He got Menas and Askidas to apologize to the Pope, who then returned to Constantinople. Soon after, in August 552, Menas died, and the new Patriarch Eutychius declared from the beginning his loyalty to the Pope. Now there was definitive agreement to entrust the final decision to a synod. There followed difficult negotiations on the make-up of the Council; the Emperor succeeded in imposing his own ideas, which aimed only at the condemnation of the Three Chapters, in such a way that there remained to the Pope slight prospect of letting the opposition of the West exercise its impact; he was de facto deprived of any power of decision and accordingly decided not to participate in the sessions of the Council. The Synod—the so-called Fifth Ecumenical Council—met on 5 May 553, with 166 bishops present, of whom only a dozen represented the West. For tactical reasons Justinian also stayed away, but he let the bishops know that they had already condemned the Three Chapters by their signatures on the imperial edict, that the Pope also had condemned them, and that now there was in principle only a question of a ratification of these decrees. The Council exerted itself to persuade the Pope to participate, but Vigilius was content with holding out the prospect of an official opinion. Now as earlier, he made his participation in the sessions dependent on a stronger representation of western bishops. The Council proceeded to the agenda and began with the preparation for the condemnation of the Three Chapters. At this moment, on 14 May, the Pope published a *Constitutum,*[8] which he signed together with nine Italian bishops, two from Africa, two from Illyricum, and three from Asia Minor. "By virtue of his apostolic authority," Vigilius condemned sixty propositions from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia but strictly refrained from condemning this Church Father himself, just as he declined to anathematize Theodoret or the author of the Ibas letter, because thereby the decrees of Chalcedon would have been brought into question. The *Constitutum* forbade any polemic against the Three Chapters which went beyond this decree. True, the Emperor refused absolutely to receive the *Constitutum,* but nevertheless its content became known; causing the Emperor to pursue the route of publicity. He laid before the Council Fathers a packet of documents with letters of the Pope in which he defended his *Judicatum* and especially the minutes of his taking of his oath in 550. Thereupon the Fathers expunged the Pope's name from the diptychs, without excommunicating him. The authority of the Apostolic See as such was not to be impugned.

---

[5] E. Schwartz, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians,* 72–111.

[6] Text in E. Schwartz, *Vigiliusbriefe* (Munich 1940), 10–15.

[7] E. Schwartz, op. cit., 1–10.

On 2 June 553, at the last session, the Synod finally accomplished, in fourteen anathemas taken from Justinian's decree, the condemnation of the Three Chapters in due form. Theodore Askidas seemed to have won all along the line: Justinian had indeed no longer spent any time in implementing his decree against the Origenists; they dominated in the monasteries and episcopal sees of Palestine. But in Abbot Conon of the Great Laura there now arose unexpectedly a dangerous opponent, who knew exactly that they had their protector in Askidas. In 551 he himself appeared at Constantinople and denounced their doings to the Emperor. Justinian awoke and decided by means of a letter to the bishops who had come to the Council to bring up the matter again. To facilitate the proceedings he garnished his treatise again, likewise with fifteen anathemas.[9] Although we do not know the course of the negotiations, it is certain that the bishops made no difficulties. Their sentence was directed not only and not first against Origen himself, but against the Origenists of Palestine and concomitantly now also against Evagrius Ponticus. The negotiations must, in all probability, have been concluded in March 553 before the beginning of the Council, and Vigilius seems to have assented without hesitation.

---

[8] *Coll. Avell.,* no. 83, 230–320.

After everything had thus been "settled," the Emperor demanded all bishops who had not taken part in the Synod to sign its decrees. In the East there were only slight difficulties. The Origenists were expelled from the New Laura, and some bishops were removed from their sees. More important was the decision of the Pope. Rome, again firmly in Byzantine hands since 552, urgently called for the return of its Bishop. Justinian required as a preliminary that Vigilius recognize the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Once again the Pope yielded and on 8 December 553 uttered the condemnation.[10] On 23 March 554 a new *Constitutum* was published by the Pope, in which he denied the authenticity of the letter of Ibas and his vindication by the Council of Chalcedon.[11] Finally, in the spring of 555, the Pope was able to leave Constantinople. But en route he died at Syracuse. Thereby the opposition in the West obtained a still freer course and, despite severe police reprisals, stood firm. When finally the deacon Pelagius, who had again and again kept Vigilius on the path of the old convictions and hence had been imprisoned by the Emperor, also followed the route of recognition of the Council, this was now reason enough for the Emperor to impose him on the Romans as their Bishop in 556. The resistance which he encountered in Rome induced him, of course, to revise his attitude. But the schism between the Apostolic See and important portions of the western episcopate could not be prevented any longer.

As regards the Monophysites, the decrees of 553 left them completely unmoved. The Emperor's secret hope of still winning them back sadly miscarried, and Justinian seems never to have got over it. Perhaps this is the explanation of a renewed approach to a Monophysite faction, the final caprice of the imperial theologian. Allegedly it was a Palestinian bishop who made him more conversant with the doctrine of Julian of Halicarnassus,[12] the so-called Aphthartodocetism, according to which the body of Christ was an *aphtharton,* an incorruptible being, so that he could suffer on the Cross only because a special miracle made this possible. The representatives of this doctrine, also called Gaianites from one of their leaders, were especially widespread in Egypt, and perhaps once again the Emperor indulged in the hope of being able to gain, if not the Severans, at least this faction of Monophysites. He let himself be convinced of the correctness of Aphthartodocetism,[13] and, as was his custom, he then at once drew up a decree for a creed in favor of this doctrine, which was to be submitted to all bishops for their signature. The Patriarch Eutychius in the capital itself refused any sort of assent. But since the Emperor knew better, the Patriarch had to go into exile in 565. Whether the decree was really officially published is unknown. In any event, its content quickly became known and stirred up general displeasure, not only in the West but also in the East. Before the new conflict broke out fully, however, the Emperor died on 14 November 565, and no one was found who would accept and carry out his last idea.

---

[9] On the authenticity and dating, F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten,* 82ff. Text of the anathemas, 90–97.

[10] *Mansi* IX, 419f.

[11] *Mansi* IX, 457–488.

[12] R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ* (Louvain 1924).

With Justinian an era in Church history came to an end. From his own political viewpoint, his work may have been conclusive in the sphere of the Church; for Church history itself it started out promisingly orthodox, then was modified by the Theopaschite Formula, only to act in direct loyalty to the Pope in the years around 536. But then the route led to the Three Chapters, and he sacrificed an old, sober, precious theological legacy on the altar of a policy which in itself was hopeless. That great portions of the Church followed him along these dangerous roads of dilettantism meant for the Church a theological impoverishment, which could not be balanced for a long time, entirely apart from the fact that it gave no good testimony to the theological firmness of the bishops. Especially noteworthy was the style with which the Emperor put over his ideas. As he changed dogma and faith without regard for the Church's doctrinal authority, so before him no Emperor had so acted, and scarcely any—apart perhaps from Manuel I in the twelfth century—followed him in this: a proof that such a behavior cannot be derived simply from the Byzantine imperial idea, from the imperial "priesthood," and so forth. It may surprise, but, thus seen, Justinian was not even typical of the Byzantine imperial office—he was almost a unique phenomenon. Of course, with this manner of his, he established limiting values, which always remained perilously visible in Byzantium.

---

[13] M. Jugie, "L'empereur Justinien a-t-il été aphthartodocète?" *ÉO* 35 (1932), 399–404. An attempt to vindicate Justinian: M. Anastos, "The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia," *DOP* 6 (1951), 123–160.

CHAPTER 26

Justinian's Successors: Monoenergism and Monothelitism

If it is pretty certain that the Empress Theodora decisively influenced Justinian's ecclesiastical policy and no less decisively impeded it, so too it is not improbable that her niece Sophia, wife of the new Emperor Justin II (565–578), who until shortly before his accession to the throne is said to have sided with the Monophysites, had a hand in the affair when the Emperor began, after the start of his reign, to steer a course of meeting the Monophysites halfway. Imprisoned and exiled Monophysite bishops were permitted to return, efforts were undertaken through the mediation of imperial emissaries to settle intra-Monophysite dissensions, and finally Jacob Baradai was invited, together with the leading members of his Church, to a union conference at Constantinople. The discussions lasted for months without, of course, producing any concrete results. And so Justin II tried, as had the Emperor Zeno earlier, a new *Henoticon* in 567,[1] which again imposed Zeno's formulas, condemned the Three Chapters, granted amnesty to the Monophysites, recommended the rehabilitation of Severus—and did not mention Chalcedon. But for the Monophysites this was not enough. An imperial agent was supposed to persuade bishops and monks to accept it at a conference held at Callinicum on the Euphrates. Jacob Baradai and his loyalists would have been inclined to agree with the document with a few clarifications, but the monks especially wanted to have nothing to do with an imperial effort at union, so that the meeting ended with a shrill dissonance within the faction. Now the Emperor prepared a new version of the edict,[2] which recognized "the one nature of the Logos-made-Man" and spoke of a mental distinction of the natures, again without mentioning Chalcedon, but also without returning to the rehabilitation of Severus. The decree was to be implemented by force, and the Patriarch John the Scholastic of Constantinople (565–577) did all he could to let compulsion run its course. There were arrests and deportations in all areas. The persecution did not cease until Justin II gradually lapsed into insanity, and Tiberius II in 574 assumed control of the government in his stead and, after Justin's death, mounted the throne (578–582). The Patriarchs, including Eutychius, who had been called back from exile after John's death in 577, sought to continue the persecution, but the Emperor did not care to have much to do with it, and Eutychius himself soon became implicated in a doctrine on the resurrection of all flesh, which made him suspect of heresy.[3] The policy of Tiberius was probably also influenced by the aim of not antagonizing the Monophysite Arabs on the important Persian frontier. He solemnly received their Phylarch, al-Mundir, at Constantinople and did much to oblige his demands for the release of persecuted Monophysites. If he later abandoned al-Mundir on the advice of Maurice, his successor, there were other reasons for this.[4] The religious policy of Tiberius was continued by Maurice (582–602), who without doubt was personally a Chalcedonian. Under Phocas (602–610) and in the early years of the reign of Heraclius (610–641) the great attack of the Persians, who occupied parts of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, made such demands on the policy of the Emperors that there remained little time for the old denominational quarrels. In addition, the Persian occupation withdrew especially the Monophysites more or less from the imperial power. The problems did not again appear until Heraclius in long campaigns had forced the Persians to their knees, even if the preliminaries lay further in the past. The Jews, who, even if they had not encouraged the Persian invasion, had warmly greeted it, could hardly hope for mercy. The imperial troops made short work of them, and the struggle against them culminated in the imperial edict of compulsory conversion.[5] How should the Monophysites be dealt with, that is, not a minority but the population of entire provinces? Some of them, such as the Ghassanid Arabs, whom Maurice had treated so shabbily because of military distrust, may have done little to oppose the Persians, and the latter seem to have repaid this attitude. Michael the Syrian reports from this period: "The memory of the Chalcedonians was wiped out from the Euphrates eastward." Could the imperial government further disregard the separatist tendencies of the heterodox Syrians and Copts? Heraclius reflected on a solution and again sought the remedy in ecclesiastical union. His loyal and outstanding assistant in this was the Patriarch Sergius (610–638),[6] who had not the slightest interest in fishing in the troubled waters of Church policy. To make him suffer for what people are unwilling to charge to Pope Honorius I is one of the indiscretions of Church history. If it is said to have been the weakness of the Chalcedonian Christology that it did not clearly enough elaborate the unity over the duality, and if on the other hand the duality of natures in Christ could no longer be sacrificed, but the idea of person was still somewhat colorless, one could then seek the unity in Christ's will and activity. Already in some neo-Chalcedonian theologians were found formulas which referred to the *mia energeia,* the unique divine principle of activity in Christ.[7] To the Patriarch this formula seemed promising, and very soon he worked on a patristic *florilegium* which could multiply the testimonies in favor of it. In this Sergius seems to have relied especially on Bishop Theodore of Pharan, about whose loyalty to Chalcedon there was no doubt; and also on Bishop Cyrus of Phasis,[8] who in 631 was appointed by the Emperor as Patriarch of the Church of the Empire in Alexandria. Cyrus was prepared to forge out of this stock of ideas those formulas which should be presented to the Christian public as the basis of the common faith. In nine propositions, which had as content the fruit of the neo-Chalcedonian theology, that is, the reconciliation between Cyril and 451, the "Pact" was solemnly proclaimed at Alexandria on 3 June 633:[9] its principal item was the doctrine of one and the same Christ, operating divinely and humanly, "with the one theandric energy" (*theandrine energeia*)—a term for which one could appeal to the "unquestionable" authority of the Pseudo-Areopagite. The Monophysites exulted: "Now we no longer need to come to the Council of Chalcedon: it comes to us!" But the opposition was not slow to appear. The monk Sophronius, who soon after became Patriarch of Jerusalem (634–38), protested against the Formula of Union. He held to the Aristotelian principle that energy flows from nature, that hence in Christ two energies were to be admitted. He journeyed to the Patriarch Sergius at Constantinople, and it was characteristic of the latter that he was prepared to negotiate. Agreement was reached that for the future it was proper not to speak of energies at all but of the one operating Christ (*heis kai autos energon*); in other words, the one Operator should be stressed, not the principle of operation or the agency. Sophronius apparently deviated from his two energies because he could not refer to any patristic passages for the use of this formula. In any case, he relied on the agreement with the Patriarch when he also in his encyclical[10] left no doubt that in theory two natures have two principles of operation as their consequence. But now the Patriarch Sergius published a *Judicatum,*[11] which likewise abandoned the abstract formula of the one energy in favor of the concrete personal energy of the one operating

---

[1] Evagrius, *HE* V, 4, reports on the Emperor's *Henoticon*.

[2] Evagrius, op. cit.

---

[3] Cf. Beck, 380.

[4] See infra, p. 466.

[5] F. Dölger, *Regesten der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunden,* no. 206.

[6] *Grumel Reg,* no. 279–292; J. L. van Dieten, *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergius I. bis Johannes VI. (610–715)* (Amsterdam 1972).

---

[7] See especially W. Elert, *Der Ausgang der altchristlichen Christologie* (Berlin 1957).

[8] Beck, 431.

[9] *Hefele-Leclercq* III, 1, 333–343.

[10] *Mansi* XI, 461–510.

[11] Insert: *Mansi* XI, 533 C-E. V. Grumel, *ÉO* 27 (1928), 13, presupposes 536 E–537A. Cf., however, id. *Regest,* 287.

Christ. Even Maximus Confessor later regarded the formula as a good solution. For the Monophysites, of course, it could only be boring, for with it the problem of whether there was one or two natures was again wiped off the table. Sergius described the content and trend of his doctrinal decision in a letter to Pope Honorius.[12] The Pope agreed that there should be no talk of two energies; that it had not happened up to now and could produce confusion in terminology. He accepted the Patriarch's formula and inferred from it that it is appropriate to speak of one will (*una voluntas*) in Christ.[13] The vindication of the Pope needs no sophisms: He quoted the words of Jesus: "I have come, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me" and "Not my will be done, but thine," and so he somehow accepted a basic human principle of willing in Christ. If he then spoke of *una voluntas,* he obviously did not mean this basic principle but the concrete act of the will at a given time, which is determined by the divine will and only by it. The misfortune was that now again, instead of one word, an unclarified substantive was employed, which could be interpreted both as the basic principle as well as, in the final analysis, a decisive *arbitrium.*

Sergius was delighted with the initial help which the Pope offered him. And if the Pope preferred the formula *una voluntas,* then the Patriarch was prepared to put it in place of the *mia energeia,* which had anyhow already been abandoned; it became *hen thelema* in Greek. He gained the Emperor for a decree and in 638, the very year of the deaths of both the Patriarch and the Pope, there appeared Heraclius's *Ecthesis,*[14] in which the prohibition was issued against speaking of one or two energies, and instead one will in Christ was decreed as the statement of faith, again with the reason that Christ in the flesh had never been separated from the will of the *Logos* or had willed anything against it; that is, *thelema* was not interpreted as a theoretical faculty but as the actual will. What was harmful here was not theology but terminology.

Maximus Confessor, who had once been in the service of Heraclius, had then become a monk, and had fled from the Persians to Africa, first revealed himself as the man who was competent to deal with the linguistic difficulties of a philosophical nature. After a long period of preparation, in which he did not pin himself down, around 640 he vigorously intervened in the controversy.[15] For him, *thelema physikon* was a basic principle which belonged to the nature, and, since he was an enthusiastic adherent of the Council of Chalcedon, he was thus a Dyothelite. He had to reject the formula of Pope Honorius and the *Ecthesis;* true, he interpreted the Pope in an orthodox manner, whereas he did not do likewise with the Greek term. Otherwise, there was a predicament with the "gnomic" *thelema,* which was identical with the *arbitrium,* a property of the person; in Christ there can be only one since he subsists in the divine Person. The wretchedness of the following discussions consisted in this, that too little regard was had for this saving distinction, and probably also in this that Maximus demanded too much; that is, in the case of each one who spoke of one *thelema* without distinction he suspected that he thereby meant the physical faculty in itself. Hence, while in the eastern part of the Empire here and there the desire for union on the basis of the *Ecthesis* appeared, there arose in Byzantine Africa a center of resistance to the imperial policy. In view of the situation, the Emperor Constans II (641–668) decided on a new decree. His *Typus*[16] of 648 forbade any discussion at all of one or two energies and of one or two wills and abrogated the *Ecthesis.* Naturally, this prohibition had not the slightest prospect of being observed. Finally, Maximus turned to Rome, where the new Pope, Martin I, showed a complete sympathy for his train of thought. And so in 649 there was held a Lateran Synod which was entirely under the influence of Maximus's ideology. The Council Fathers repudiated both the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius and the *Typus* of Constans. They defined the doctrine of the two wills in Christ and excommunicated Sergius, his successor Pyrrhus, and Cyrus of Phasis, as if the distinctions of Maximus had in their day been common property. That they excepted Honorius from censure can be understood then really only on the basis of the ideas of the papacy. The Emperor Constans reacted with extreme violence. In 653 he had Pope Martin taken from Rome to Constantinople, where he was tried for high treason, probably because the Exarch of Ravenna, who was supposed to have arrested him in 650, had let himself be acclaimed as anti-Emperor in Rome and had come to an agreement with Pope Martin, which certainly could not be thought of without a tacit recognition of the usurpation by the Pope. In any event, there was no further mention of the original reason for the arrest, and every effort of the Pope during the trial to bring the *Typus* and the Monothelite controversy into the discussion was rejected by the court. Finally, the Pope was condemned to death for high treason, and then reprieved with banishment, in which he died in 655. In 653 the imperial police were also able to take Maximus into custody and deport him to Constantinople, where he too underwent a trial for high treason. It seems that his friendship with the Byzantine

---

[12] *Mansi* XI, 529–537.

[13] *Mansi* XI, 537–544. Cf. P. Galtier, "La première lettre du pape Honorius," *Gr* 29 (1948), 42–61.

[14] *Mansi* X, 992–997; see the synodal decree, op. cit., 1000–1001 in fragmentary form.

[15] Cf. P. Sherwood, *An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor* (Rome 1952).

---

[16] *Mansi* X, 1029–1032.

Exarch Gregory of Carthage became his cause of doom, because this Exarch likewise had himself acclaimed as anti-Emperor. Mutilated in hands and tongue, Maximus died in exile in 662. With this the climax of the controversy was overstepped. Constans II still attempted personally to make his authority felt in the West, but he was assassinated in Sicily in 668.

Constans II was succeeded by Constantine IV (668–685). He had no interest in the continuation of the quarrel, which had reached a deadlock. The Monophysites could not be gained back. The greatest proportion of them had not been under Byzantine rule for a long time, and there was no hope that the Empire would recover the lost eastern provinces. Africa, which had been the center of the opposition for a considerable time, had lost its leader with Maximus and besides had now likewise come under the control of Islam. The new orientation of Byzantine policy, which allowed greater weight to Byzantine Italy, made it seem appropriate to draw the Pope away from an opposition that was not without danger to the Empire. In 680 Pope Agatho could hold a preparatory Synod with 125 bishops, which in the spirit of that of 649 condemned Monothelitism. Then in 680–81 the Sixth Ecumenical Council was held at Constantinople, with the Emperor himself presiding. A letter from the Pope[17] was submitted to the Council Fathers which indicated the route to be followed. Almost all the bishops accepted the papal decree. Only six constituted an exception, including the Patriarch Macarius of Antioch, who seems to have remained the sole representative of the doctrine of Sergius. All were anathematized, and this censure was later extended to Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Phasis, the Patriarchs Sergius and Pyrrhus, and finally even to Pope Honorius. What was thereby condemned was a terminology, which could meanwhile be regarded as out of date. Historically, the verdicts were hardly justified, as the explanation of the Patriarch Macarius at the Synod made clear. The definition of the Synod itself spoke of two physical faculties of will in Christ, whose goals were not directed against each other, because the human will was in everything subject to the divine, almighty will.[18] The condemnation of the unyielding bishops produced no schism. The act was over, and no one wanted to go back to it. A question was disposed of, which had long ago lost its ecclesiastical and political meaning. After the Monophysites on the whole no longer belonged to the Empire, all these controversies had lost their threatening background: Orthodoxy withdrew into itself—Byzantium had become smaller.

---

[17] *MPG* 87, 1161ff.

[18] *Hefele-Leclercq* III, 472–538; K. Hirsch, "Papst Honorius und das VI. allgemeine Konzil," *Festschr. der 57. Vers. der Philol. in Salzburg 1929* (Baden 1929), 157–179; J. Rissberger, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis des Patriarchen Makarius von Antiochien* (Rome 1940; dissertation, partly printed).

There was one more episode when in 711–13 the Emperor Philippicus Bardanes in an imperial edict repudiated the decrees of the Sixth Ecumenical Council and declared Monothelitism to be the sole admissible ecclesiastical doctrine. With his overthrow, the phantom disappeared. And if later the Iconoclast Struggle was shoved into the Christological rut, intellectual connections cannot, it is true, be denied, but orthodox Christology in the precise meaning of the word was settled for all the Byzantine centuries by the Sixth Ecumenical Council. The victory was fragile, because all too much that was sound had been sacrificed, but an ever more schematized dogma did not in any case track down these losses, and some things that had earlier been regarded as Monophysite had meanwhile become orthodox through the work of the neo-Chalcedonians or had become the property of piety. Monophysitism and Monothelitism could be regarded as defeated, but they had long before brought a part of their religious concerns to safety in Orthodoxy.

CHAPTER 27

The Rise of National Churches on the Frontiers of the Byzantine Empire

The Church of the Nestorians

The theological problem of so-called Nestorianism was first decided at the Council of Ephesus in 431. But for the Orthodox world only the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553 at Constantinople, with its condemnation of the Three Chapters, drew the final conclusions, in part unnecessary, but in any case dogmatically not without danger. The decision of Ephesus would perhaps not have led to a breaking away of a separate Church, if, together with Nestorius, there had not also been a target in the great theologian of the Syrian Church, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the head of a school of exegesis which possessed canonical recognition for the East Syrian region and whose doctrines had found their domicile in the theological school of Edessa, one of the most exemplary educational institutions of Christianity.[1] It is true that the Bishop of Edessa, Rabbula, sought by every means to enforce the decrees of Ephesus and the Union of 433, but Ibas, the head of the School of Edessa, continued in the opposition, so that the Bishop finally dismissed him from the school. But Rabbula died in 435, and the following of the expelled teacher was so large that Ibas could now be elected his successor. To call him a Nestorian presupposes some arbitrariness. What he did not want was that Alexandrian terminology of a Christological enthusiasm should simply drive Antiochene sobriety from the field. Ibas had quite a hard time during his episcopate. The Robber Synod of 449 deposed him, but Chalcedon restored him, and he died in 457. He was followed by a metropolitan who now sought strictly to enforce Chalcedon. The opposition of the school was a thorn in his side, and the head of the school, whom Ibas had appointed, Narses, had to quit the field. As early as 433, when the Formula of Union had come into existence, some bishops of the Antiochene patriarchate, who were unwilling to accept this compromise, had settled in Persia. Also condemned by the Robber Synod, a disciple of Ibas named Bar-Sauma (d. before 496) followed them and became Bishop of Nisibis. Narses now joined him and at Nisibis they established as an offshoot of the school of Edessa the "School of the Persians," in which Nestorianism found a new home.[2] It may be said that, with this flight of Narses, Nestorianism as a denomination with the ability to develop into a Church came to an end in the Byzantine Empire. Instead, it now found a home in the Persian Kingdom, where it grew into the Christian "territorial Church." The School of Nisibis was in great demand; the organization was exemplary, the resources abundant, so that here generations of theologians and clerics could be trained who gave the Persian Church its best framework and helped it overcome the dangers of its isolated position on the border of the Universal Church. Bar-Sauma himself was one of the most vigorous representatives of this territorial Church. He was a tireless missionary, opposed the spread of the Monophysites and Messalians,[3] maintained a good relationship with the Great King of Persia, and knew how to use every means that could serve his ideas. That Nestorianism found entry into the Persian Church so easily is certainly connected with the fact that the School of Edessa had already established a reputation as a school whose graduates had for a long time spread their ideas in Persia; but probably also with the fact that the Church of Persia, which must have expressed itself emphatically in a Synod of 424 for its autonomy, that is, for its independence of Antioch, could develop in Nestorianism something like a theological self-awareness as opposed to West Syria and the Byzantine Empire.

---

[1] E. R. Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse* (Paris 1930).

---

[2] A. Vööbus, "Un vestige d'une lettre de Narsai et son importance historique," *OrSyr* 9 (1964), 515–523, dates the founding in 471; the School of Edessa was closed in 489, and the opponents of Orthodoxy migrated to Nisibis. Cf. also J. B. Chabot, "L'école de Nisibe, son histoire, ses statuts," *JA*, ser. IX, 8 (1896), 43–93; A. Vööbus, *The Statutes of the School of Nisibis* (Stockholm 1962); id., "Abraham de Bet Rabban and his Rôle in the Hermeneutic Tradition of the School of Nisibis," *HThR* 58 (1965), 203–214.

[3] A. Vööbus, *Les messaliens et les réformes de Barçauma de Nisibe dans l'église perse* (Pinneberg 1947).

At the head of this Persian Church there stood, at the latest from the beginning of the fifth century, a "Great Metropolitan," also called *Katholikos episkopos,* with his see in the twin cities on the Tigris, Seleucia–Ctesiphon.[4] He soon had the position of a Patriarch: it was incumbent on him to determine the dates of the great festivities, to convoke synods, to summon the bishops to him every two years. On occasion, synods expanded his powers: then he intervened in the division of the bishoprics and probably also named the bishops himself, and at times an effort was made in important matters to supply him with a board by whose decisions he was to be bound. But in general he ruled monocratically, and not improperly the Synod of 424 designated him as "our Peter." Intrusions into this closed jurisdiction and hierarchy became noticeable in the sixth century, when in 540 the Persian King captured Antioch and deported a large part of the city's population to his kingdom. He settled them in a city of their own near Ctesiphon, called New Antioch or Romagyris (Rumagan). The new population must have been, if not Monophysite, in any event not Nestorian, and anti-Nestorian propaganda from these circles soon made itself apparent. But on the whole the Patriarchate of Antioch did not succeed in extending its jurisdiction over Persia by means of this base. The opportunity offered itself again only in the tenth to the eleventh centuries, but under entirely different historical presuppositions.

The *Catholici* gradually progressed into a position which was not unlike that of the Byzantine patriarchs. The Great King influenced their election and apparently also reserved to himself on occasion their confirmation and installation. In return the patriarchs had a high rank at court and were not rarely appointed to state functions, for example, for embassies to Byzantium and the like. Now and then the King lent them his *bracchium saeculare* when there was question of pursuing heretics or of energetically settling other internal ecclesiastical matters.

The most important *Catholici* of the fifth and sixth centuries were Babai II (d. 502) and Aba Mar I (d. 552). The former governed in a period of peace between Byzantium and Persia, and so the latent Monophysitism promoted by the Emperor Anastasius I was able to have a missionary effect in Persia. Babai tried to keep everything about his Church pure, but the influence of the Byzantine Emperor on the Great King was strong enough so that the persecution of Monophysites was not too serious. Aba Mar was a convert from Zoroastrianism, the Persian State religion, and as such especially suspect and exposed to persecution on the part of the State priesthood. Before his ordination he had made long journeys into the Byzantine Empire and he now tried to consolidate the canonical bases of his Church. For this purpose he did not hesitate to receive into the canonical collection of his Church even the canons of the Synod of Chalcedon in so far as they seemed pertinent to him. He founded new bishoprics and in addition to the School of Nisibis there now arose a special one at Seleucia, whose significance is clear from the fact that it could on occasion have a say in the election of the *Catholicus.* The activity of Aba Mar was all the more esteemed as it came in a period in which King Chosroes I imposed not inconsiderable restrictions on Christianity in Persia. Aba Mar himself finally fell victim to the persecution. He barely escaped death and had to go into exile, from which he tried to govern his Church with unbroken spirit. He died in 552, soon after having received amnesty. That Chosroe's personal physician was appointed as Aba Mar's successor was a singular expression of the circumstances. The position of the new *Catholicus* was for that reason substantially better than that of his predecessor, but he also misused it autocratically. Under King Chosroes II (590–628) the Christians long remained unmolested. He was under the influence of his Christian wife, Shirin, but probably more importantly, he owed his throne to the Byzantine Emperor Maurice. After the overthrow of this Emperor, he posed as his avenger against the Emperor Phocas, and there followed the great Persian–Byzantine war, which finally brought about the collapse of Sassanid rule. The more this war expanded, the more precarious became the situation of the Nestorian Christians. Apparently they were regarded as potential allies of the Greeks, and hence in 608 Chosroes forbade the election of a new *Catholicus,* and the Church remained without a head until 628. It was one of the most important theologians of the Church, Babai the Great, who, as a sort of abbot-general of the North Persian monasteries, found at this time the opportunity to assume the actual direction of the Church and to guard it against the worst. The difficulties increased, the more Byzantine territories came under Persian occupation. The population of Syria and Egypt was to a great extent Monophysite. Persecuted as Monophysites by the imperial central government, they apparently offered only slight resistance to the Persian occupation and hence won their sympathy. With this began a new wave of missionary propaganda of the Monophysites in regard to their opposites, the Nestorians, in Persia, and for a moment it even seemed that they would succeed in getting the Catholicate into their hands. In these circumstances the Persian bishops were glad to waive the election of a *Catholicus,* which would then have been possible. Not until 628, when Chosroes II was overthrown by his son with the help of a Nestorian Persian, was it again possible for the Nestorians to breathe freely, and a new *Catholicus* was elected. Babai, on whom the election deservedly fell, refused it. In his place was chosen Ishar Yahb (628–644 or 646). The years of his reign saw the collapse of Sassanid rule and the compulsory peace with Byzantium, in the concluding of which he took part as an official delegate. But they also saw the assault by Islam on the Persian Kingdom and thus the beginning of a new epoch for his Church.

---

[4] W. de Vries, "Antiochien und Seleucia–Ctesiphon, Patriarch und Katholikos?" *Mélanges E. Tisserant* III (Vatican City 1964), 429–450; W. M. Macomber, "The Authority of the Catholicos Patriarch of Seleucia–Ctesiphon," *I patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio* (Rome 1968), 179–200.

The inner life of this Church in the period described was to a great extent determined by the development of the canonical foundations and of the organization. A series of synods was occupied with this task and sought to accommodate the legal prescriptions to the times. Still more important was the confrontation with the advancing Monophysites, who not only succeeded in gaining a number of monasteries for themselves but also in establishing at Tagrit[5] an episcopal see, which became the center of their exertions. The Nestorians, who were not a State–Church in the sense that the Byzantine Church was, but a tolerated, not rarely encouraged, and occasionally also persecuted denomination alongside the Persian State–Church, saw themselves forced to the defensive. It could happen that they had to appear before the Zoroastrian Great King for religious discussions with the Monophysites, which, of course, like all such undertakings, yielded success to neither side. In the Nestorian Church there were even formed groups which reached the conviction that a certain union with Byzantine Orthodoxy, which for its part persecuted the Monophysites, could be practicable. Of course the factions soon fell between two fires, for the same Byzantine Orthodoxy had finally, under Justinian, just condemned the spiritual father of the Persian Church, Theodore of Mopsuestia. Thus all these exertions had no success, and finally at the Synod of 612 the Persian Church decided to make officially its own the Nestorian creed of Babai the Great.[6] In this there was question of a proposition, which, translated into Greek, could be rendered with the doctrine of two natures (*physeis*) and two *hypostaseis* in Christ, but one single *prosopon.* A concise interpretation will assume that here *hypostasis* meant the complete existence of all characteristics of a nature, the divine as well as the human, while by *prosopon* was to be understood the actual historical manner of the total phenomenon. In other words, a formula which was only approximately covered by the corresponding Greek terms with which it could be rendered, and so it remained free for interpretation; a formula which could be interpreted not only as strongly Nestorian but perhaps even as approximately Chalcedonian. After the defeat of the Persians by Heraclius, on the occasion of the concluding of peace, religious discussions were also organized with the aim of a union of the two Churches. Accordingly, the *Catholicus* submitted a profession of faith which the Orthodox partners regarded as orthodox. Hence the formula of the Nestorian Church was interpreted in the sense of the Council of Chalcedon. But neither the Emperor Heraclius nor the *Catholicus* could make his view of such an agreement in faith palatable and credible to his respective Church. A long and differently proceeding ecclesiastical and political development of 200 years had long before erected barriers that were all too high. The Nestorian bishops would not accept the condemnation of Theodore and swallow the term "Mother of God."

---

[5] J. M. Fiey, "Tagrit, esquisse d'histoire chrétienne," *OrSyr* 8 (1963), 289–342.

[6] W. de Vries, "Die syrisch-nestorianische Haltung zu Chalkedon," *Chalkedon* I, 603–635; F. W. Macomber, "The Christology of the Synod of Seleucia–Ctesiphon, A.D. 486," *OrChrP* 24 (1958), 142–154; V. Grumel, "Un théologien nestorien, Babai le Grand," *ÉO* 22 (1923), 153–181, 257–280.

And so the Nestorian Church was forced into a life of its own, which it kept closed against the entire West, hence against Europe and Asia Minor. For this reason the mighty missionary *élan* which especially characterized this Church in contradistinction to the Orthodox Church of the Early Byzantine period, pushed ever farther eastward.[7] Even at this period there began that grandiose missionary activity which achieved its climax in the Middle Ages. As early as the sixth century Nestorian missionaries reached the western frontiers of India in Malabar. Cosmas Indicopleustes discovered them on the island of Socotra between the South Arabian and the African coasts and on the island of Sri Lanka. Even in Tibet the Nestorian mission probably dates back to the middle of the seventh century, and the first traces of Nestorians in China likewise extended to this time. The representatives of this mission were first of all monks. The origins of Persian monasticism[8] are probably to be sought in the area of Nisibis, from which it spread powerfully. Abraham of Kashkar (d. 586) is regarded as its organizer.

If now, from the middle of the seventh century, this Church fell under Islamic domination, this fact produced no decisive changes. In fact, now Monophysites and Nestorians were again under one secular rule, the Caliphate. But this seems to have been the aim: to permit each denomination its status quo, so that the Nestorian Church could develop further relatively peacefully. If the *Catholicus* and some other Nestorian Christians enjoyed high dignities and offices under Persian rule, collectively the Nestorians were still second-class citizens in Persia, so that the Islamic system of government brought nothing new.

---

[7] F. Nau, *L'expansion nestorienne en Asie* (Paris 1914); A. Mingana, "The Early Spread of Christianity in Central Asia and the Far East," *BJRL* 9 (1925), 297–371; J. Stervart, *Nestorian Missionary Enterprise* (Cambridge 1928); J. Dauvillier, "L'expansion de l'église syrienne en Asia centrale et en extreme orient," *OrSyr* 1 (1956), 76–87; C. Hendriks, "L'activité apostolique du monachisme monophysite et nestorien," *PrOrChr* 10 (1960), 3–25, 97–113.

[8] A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1958–1960), especially volume I.

The Coptic Church

If it is desired forcibly to assign a date of birth to the Coptic Church as an unorthodox Christian denomination in the sense of the later Byzantine Imperial Church, the year 536 could be designated, when the Emperor Justinian I, under the influence of the Pope and probably out of regard for his war plans in Italy, put an end to his policy of friendliness toward the Monophysites and allowed the Patriarch of the capital, Anthimus, to be deposed and expelled Severus of Antioch from Constantinople. Of course, the period of incubation began in 451 with the then incipient resistance to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon. Timothy the Cat and to some extent Peter Mongus represented the most important stages, and the activity of a Severus, of a Julian of Halicarnassus, and of similar figures consolidated interiorly what the ecclesiastical leadership of Alexandria carried through or tried to accomplish in relation to Byzantium. Then in 536 Justinian summoned the Patriarch Theodosius of Alexandria to Constantinople to demand from him submission to the decrees of the Synod of 536—the condemnation of Severus and so forth. Theodosius refused to sign and was banished. Like so many other Monophysites, he touched down in a palace of the Empress Theodora, where, in the company of like-minded monks and clerics, he had full scope to supervise the Monophysite faith of his flock in Egypt by means of dogmatic treatises and pastoral letters until his death in 566. He could do this all the more effectively as the imperial central government had little luck with its Orthodox Patriarch, forcibly imposed on Alexandria: in 542 Paul had to be deposed by an imperial judgment at a Synod of Gaza; his successor Zoilus refused to conform to the imperial policy in the Three Chapters Controversy and hence lost his see in 551. John II (569–579) did not even obtain recognition from all his Orthodox colleagues. But this unhappiness did not in any way ease the lot of the persecuted Copts. In 551 the imperial Patriarch Apollinarius came to Alexandria with the full authority of governor and high commissary and ruled with unprecedented violence. He confiscated all Coptic, that is, Monophysite churches and prevented the Monophysite clerics from even entering the city. In addition, the Monophysites were at odds among themselves. There was the powerful faction of the adherents of Julian of Halicarnassus, usually called Gaianites[9] from one of their first champions; there were the partisans of the middle line of Severus; then the Tritheists,[10] for whom was claimed also the famous philosopher, John Philoponus; and there were others besides. If it could have been achieved, there would have been as many patriarchs as factions. Actually, the unity of the Church was based on the people and on monasticism, especially popular with the people. The really religious figures of monasticism were Monophysites because of the belief that only this confession guaranteed the Redemption through the *Logos*-made-Man, but they were more interested in the ardor of this faith and the purity of life corresponding to it than in the scholarly distinctions of the heads of the schools. The most important representative of this attitude was probably Abbot Schenute of Atripe,[11] the superior of the "White Monastery" in Upper Egypt, who however had died in 451.

After the death in 566 of the Patriarch Theodosius of Alexandria, who was residing at Constantinople and who, while not uncontested in Egypt, had been something of an Ecumenical Patriarch of the Monophysites, it was not possible for some time to find a successor for him in Egypt itself.[12] Jacob Baradai, the "Ecumenical" Metropolitan of the Syrian Monophysites, had sought during the lifetime of the Alexandrian to appoint a *locum tenens* for Egypt, without finding any requited love on the Nile. This meant that now also Jacobites and Copts were at one another's throats. When the Syrian Church believed it had to intervene and the Syrian Archimandrite Theodore was appointed as Egyptian Patriarch, he encountered decisive repudiation in Alexandria. Then the aged deacon Peter was elected as anti-Patriarch in 575. As his first act, he immediately ordained seventy bishops and thereby created not only a large obedience but also filled up the great gaps in the hierarchy that had been caused by the dissensions, and by this coup established a counterpoise to the Imperialists, the Melkites, against which the government could for a long time only exert itself in vain. However, because Peter was not the candidate of the Syrians, there were new discords. Finally Jacob Baradai himself arrived to see that everything was done properly, but he soon submitted to the majority which Peter had acquired. Peter died as early as 577. On the occasion of the election of his successor, which again was a long time in coming, something like a compromise with the Jacobites was apparent: the new Patriarch came from Syria but had been a monk in an Egyptian monastery. But he, Damian (578–605), also brought no definitive peace. After Jacob Baradai had died in the same year on a second journey to Egypt, Damian claimed supremacy over the entire Monophysite Church, but with the single result that the strife between Syria and Egypt flared up again. Occasionally even the Monophysite monks refused him obedience, perhaps only because he was not an Egyptian.

---

[9] M. Jugie, "La controverse gaianite," *DThC* IV, 1002–1023.

[10] J. Lebreton, "Le trithéisme" *DThC* XV, 1860ff.

[11] J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe und die Entstehung des national-ägyptischen Christentums* (Leipzig 1923).

[12] E. W. Brooks, "The Patriarch Paul of Antioch and the Alexandrine Schism of 575," *ByZ* 30 (1929–1930), 468–476.

But if the Monophysite Church of Egypt was still so often split, if it could really agree so seldom on a patriarch, still the opposition to the Council of Chalcedon and to the Chalcedonian patriarchs imposed by Byzantium again united it. In addition, it even happened that the imperial governors, the *Augustales,* inclined to this confession, contrary to their official mandate, so that the outlaws could defy the imperial policy time and again. In any case, for the future the succession of Coptic Patriarchs continued unbroken, and if the Orthodox Patriarch had his seat guaranteed by troops in Alexandria in the Caesarium part of the city with the Cathedral of St. Mark, the monastery of Enaton in the vicinity of the capital constituted a more secure place for the Coptic chief shepherds because it scarcely curtailed their freedom of action. In the figure of the Orthodox Patriarch John III the Almoner (610–19) the Imperial Church once again had a representative whose pastoral zeal, whose blameless life, and whose legendary charity did not fail to make an impression also on the Monophysite population. Nevertheless, no union was achieved even under him. Besides, in 619 the Persians invaded Egypt and occupied it for almost ten years. The blow affected Monophysites and Orthodox equally, but if in the course of the years a certain alleviation occurred, in any case the Orthodox Church could not rely on any State privileges so as to persecute the Copts. And when the Emperor Heraclius, after the defeat of the Persian armies, also relieved Egypt again, he brought along that new "Monoenergist" creed which both sides could face with a common optimism.[13] In 633 the Imperial Patriarch, Cyrus of Phasis, proclaimed this Formula of Union of the one divine energy in Christ. True, Cyrus reported a great success to Constantinople, but the Copts sneered, not that they had come to the Council of Chalcedon, but that it had come to them. In the long run this effort had no success, and soon Islam replaced the Byzantines. In 642 the same Patriarch Cyrus had to surrender Alexandria to the Muslim general Amr, and after a few years all Egypt was in Arab hands. The

---

[13] See supra, p. 459.

Patriarch Benjamin,[14] the Chief Shepherd of the Copts, soon understood how to come to an arrangement with the Arab conquerors and to obtain for his Church a guarantee of that freedom for which the Islamic law of the Koran was always prepared. The same status would have been given to the Orthodox Church, but it was characteristic of the different treatment of the confessions that Benjamin could soon proceed to the reorganization of his Church, whereas the Melkites could not fill the See of St. Mark again for a long time. When then, from the eighth century, new patriarchs of the Orthodox faith were named for the See of Alexandria, it is frequently unclear how they arrived at their office and see and how large was the part of the population for which they could declare themselves at all responsible. The Egyptian Church of the Middle Ages was the Coptic Church and no other.

The formation of a special Coptic Church[15] can certainly be explained from the opposition to the decrees of the Synod of Chalcedon, in which people were convinced they had to see a condemnation of the theology and of the sacrosanct figure of the Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria. But even then this opposition was not of a purely dogmatic nature, but to a great extent the opposition of a proud self-awareness, residue of a time in which the Church of Alexandria, governed by its patriarch in a monarchical and autocratic manner, played the first role in the East, could always pride itself on the support of Rome, and had no serious competitors. But the Synod of Constantinople in 381 and, even more, canon 28 of Chalcedon had inflicted a blow on this position which the self-conscious patriarchs of Alexandria were not prepared to take. The people followed them blindly, for in the patriarch they saw not only the leader of the Church but also the representative of their Coptic individuality—a national individuality—in relation to which Byzantium and everything that came from Byzantium was regarded as foreign and inappropriate. This self-consciousness then led to a de-Hellenization of the ecclesiastical system, and it may be maintained that this de-Hellenization of the ecclesiastical system required a proper denomination in order to be able clearly to present itself, and Monophysitism was just the form for this. It led also to the development of a Coptic ecclesiastical literature.[16] This consisted for the most part of translations, since, where it is original, there is almost always question of a literary plane which corresponds rather to a scarcely differentiated religious consciousness than to dogmatic or juridical definitions, for example, hagiography,[17] which is devoted to Coptic saints, such as the patron of the desert, Menas, the saint of the camel-drivers and of the merchants on camel-back. Another example is the whole monastic literature, the literature of monastic rules and of monastic sayings, which was then translated into Greek, Syriac, and Arabic, and this authentic Egyptian institution, in so far as it deserves the name of institution at all, spread throughout the world. Schenute of Atripe was again one of the best representatives of this literature, which never sought to theorize but took its cue from occasion to occasion. Here belong also many sermons with a remarkable preference for angels and archangels, the *vitae* of monks and hermits, whose unconcealed Monophysitism bore the denominational opposition on the plane of the miraculous, but also serious catecheses and admonitions of provincial bishops and monastic superiors. Interest in "worldly" subjects was slight, and equally slight was the liking for history or chronicles.

---

[14] C. D. G. Müller, "Benjamin I," *Muséon* 69 (1956), 313–340; id., "Neues über Benjamin I," ibid. 72 (1959), 228–247.

[15] J. Leipoldt, "Zur Ideologie der frühen koptischen Kirche," *Bulletin Soc. Arch. Copte* 17 (1964), 101–110.

[16] S. Morenz, "Die koptische Literatur," *HO* 1, 2, 207–219; C. D. G. Müller, *Die koptische Predigt* (Heidelberg 1953).

Behind this literature there more and more stands monasticism.[18] This monasticism was Coptic in its origins and in Egypt remained Coptic to an eminent degree. It withdrew into the desert from the threatened economic world of Romanized Egypt of late antiquity, but the world pursued it, the entire contemporary world, and dragged it back into political publicity. The patriarchs of Alexandria, without regard for which dogmatic color they wore, saw in it their accomplice and used it unscrupulously. Not a few monks found pleasure in this role and gradually rose to positions of control over the religious and ecclesiastical life of the country, in fact not only of Egypt but far beyond. In any event, the Monophysite Church of Egypt can be understood not only from its ecclesiastical leaders, the self-conscious patriarchs. It was likewise a Church of a self-conscious monasticism. In connection with the state of consciousness of these monks, it has to be self-evident that strict denominational boundaries could not always be drawn. The fronts changed, but the self-consciousness—and that was what was enduring—a Coptic self-consciousness made it more and more the backbone of the Monophysite opposition.

Just as was the case with the Nestorian Church, so too a strong urge to mission to the outsider was characteristic of the Monophysite Church. For the Coptic Church the region south of Egypt—Nubia and

---

[17] P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine* (Brussels 1950), 27–48.

[18] P. Cauwenbergh, *Études sur les moines d'Egypt depuis le concile de Chalcédoine jusqu'à l'invasion arabe* (Paris–Louvain 1914); M. Cramer–H. Bacht, "Der antichalkedonische Aspekt im historisch—biographischen Schrifttum der koptischen Monophysiten," *Chalkedon* II, 315–338; F. R. Farag, *Sociological and Moral Studies in the Field of Coptic Monasticism* (Leiden 1964).

Ethiopia—offered itself as a principal mission field. It seems that an intensive missionary activity among the Nubians could not begin until the middle of the sixth century.[19] Until then the Nubians, in so far as they belonged loosely to the Empire, enjoyed, in opposition to the otherwise current laws against pagans, the privilege of still honoring, undisturbed, their goddess in the shrines at Philai on the Upper Nile. In 541 Justinian ended this privilege, and the Empress Theodora sent the Monophysite Priest John, who succeeded, with the support of a likewise Monophysite Bishop of Philai, in converting parts of the Nubians to Christianity. But Orthodox missionaries could also point to some successes. In the long run, however, the Monophysite propaganda was victorious, and Nubian Christianity was oriented totally in its organization to the Coptic Patriarchate of Egypt.

For Ethiopia[20] this propaganda meant the second mission wave, following the first in the fourth century. But here too only this second wave seems to have included an intensive evangelization. That Monophysitism found a quite natural admission to Ethiopia was connected with the fact that since the fourth century the country had been ecclesiastically oriented to Alexandria. Now in the fifth century there were especially mentioned as missionaries the "Nine Roman Saints," that is, men from the Roman Byzantine Empire, among whom are probably to be understood Syrian Monophysite monks, to whom in all probability the founding of a group of Ethiopian monasteries goes back. But this mission was unable to end the connection with Alexandria. The doctrine of the Ethiopian Church from that time seems to have shown no special interest in the inner Monophysite controversies, but, considering the distances from the centers of the disputes, this is not surprising. In any event, people saw in the Coptic Patriarch of Egypt the supreme court, and from the seventh century they had their own supreme bishop, the Abuna, ordained by him.

---

[19] J. Kraus, *Die Anfänge des Christentums in Nubien* (Vienna 1931); U. Monneret de Villard, *Storia della Nubia cristiana* (Rome 1938); W. H. C. Frend, "Nubia as an Outpost of Byzantine Cultural Influence," *Byzantinoslavica* 29 (1968), 319–326; A. Audollont, "La diffusion du christianisme en Afrique au sud des territoires soumis à Rome après le Vs.," *Comptes rendus Acad. Inscr. et Belles Lettres 1942,* 202–216; K. Michalowski, "La Nubie chrétienne," *Africana Bulletin* 3 (Warsaw 1965), 9–26; J. Kraus, "Neues zur Geschichte des christlichen Nubiens," *NZM* 24 (1968), 241–257.

[20] C. Conti-Rossino, *Storia dell'Etiopia* (Milan 1928); H. M. Hyatt, *The Church of Abyssinia* (London 1928); E. Hammerschmidt, "Die Anfänge des Christentums in Äthiopien," *ZMR* 38 (1954), 281–294.

The Jacobite Church

If the policy of Justinian had made its own contribution to enable the Coptic Church to become consolidated as an autonomous denomination, it was the same policy which, not only through its pressure, but also through its leaving matters alone, occasioned the rise of a Monophysite Church in Syria. After the Council of 536, the Emperor, as reported above, had had the Patriarch Theodosius of Alexandria come to Constantinople in order to gain him to the Council of Chalcedon. He had no success; but instead of being sent into exile, the Patriarch found secure lodging with the Empress Theodora and governed his Church as well as he could from his hiding place, which was one only in name. In 542 the thoroughly Monophysite Client King of the Arabs, the Ghassanid bar Harith bar Gabala, in the Syrian Desert, urged upon Theodora the appointment of some bishops for his territory. The Empress induced the Alexandrian Patriarch to ordain as bishops two Monophysites, who had been staying for some time at Constantinople: Theodore "of Arabia" and Jacob Burdeana (Baradai).[21] Theodore was given as his bishopric "the camp of the Arabs," hence mainly the Syrian Desert and the Transjordan area. We do not know any details of his activity except the fact that the Ghassanid Arabs remained for the future unambiguous representatives of Monophysitism. Jacob Baradai (d. 578) was entrusted with the entire East on a vast scale, beginning with the Greek islands by way of Asia Minor to Syria and Armenia, with his seat at Edessa. With immense enthusiasm, among all imaginable dangers and privations, disguised as a beggar, he evangelized wide territories, ordained thousands of priests, not always applying the strictest standards, and finally proceeded to organize for these priests a special Monophysite counterhierarchy that no longer concerned itself with the existing Orthodox hierarchy. The ground had long been prepared. As early as the first half of the century most of the Syrian bishops, especially in Syria Prima, in Osrhoene, in Euphratesia, and in Mesopotamia, had been adherents of Severus of Antioch. Now Jacob ordained some thirty new bishops of his denomination for episcopal sees that were mostly in the hands of the bishops of the Imperial Church. In 557–58 he appointed for his hierarchy in Sergius of Tella also a Patriarch with his "seat" at Antioch. He apparently regarded him as the sole legitimate successor of Severus. The succession of patriarchs was thereafter hardly ever interrupted, except through inner Monophysite schisms and quarrels. From a vague Monophysitism there had now come a Church in its own right. That neither the Patriarch nor most of the bishops could live in their cities mattered little. There were enough monasteries to give them shelter, and the imperial policy favoring Chalcedon was unable to harm them at all.

---

[21] H. G. Kleyn, *Jacobus Baradeua de stichter der syrische monophysietische kerk* (Leiden 1882); E. Hammerschmidt, "Jakobos Baradai," *LThK* 2nd. ed., V, 836.

When Chosroes II, the Persian Great King, who had some votive offerings left over for the Christian churches,[22] conquered broad areas of the Byzantine Empire, especially those territories in which the Monophysites lived could expect relief. In fact, the King expelled some Melkite bishops, but he felt it safer to fill the vacant posts with clerics from the Persian Kingdom. We do not know, however, whether there was a question here of Nestorians. Nevertheless, the Jacobites now succeeded in establishing themselves more firmly in Persia also and even obtained possession of a church in Seleucia–Ctesiphon, the Nestorians' stronghold. This, however, ended with the assassination of Chosroes. Soon after the victory of the Emperor Heraclius over the Persian Kingdom, Monophysite Syria came again under Byzantine rule. Now, here and there, the Byzantines were perforce greeted as liberators, but it happened that, as in Edessa, the bishop, a Monophysite, denied the Orthodox Emperor participation in the liturgy, which naturally only evoked fresh reprisals. Still, it was precisely Heraclius who, with the so-called Monoenergistic doctrine, sought ecclesiastical union for the last time, and for this end even convoked a special Monophysite Synod in which he took part. Since this attempt also miscarried, the persecution of the Monophysites was begun again by the imperial officials, so that they welcomed as deliverers from the ecclesiastical yoke of Constantinople the Muslims who arrived soon thereafter. With this began also for the Syrian Church a period characterized by legal relations which Islam had developed vis-à-vis the "Peoples of the Book," partly complemented by agreements between the conquerors and the bishops, who in the period of distress, as "city lords," had arranged the capitulation to Islam, but also interrupted by occasional persecutions, which of course were not basically of a dogmatic nature.

The supreme head of this Syrian Church remained, now as earlier, the Patriarch of Antioch, even if he did not succeed until 720 in establishing his seat in this city and even then only for a brief time. Ordinarily, the patriarchs, like the bishops, lived in the monasteries, from which they had for the most part come.[23] What distinguished the new Church from the Imperial Church was certainly not in the areas of liturgy or canon law. Here no great break appeared. What really mattered was faith or, better put, dogma, and here not even so much a Christology which would have been essentially different from the orthodox, as rather the resistance to the Council of Chalcedon and its Christological formulas, a resistance which the Church shared with the father of its theology, Severus.[24] This resistance was the real shibboleth, to which of course was gradually added an even stronger and stifling rejection of everything that the Greek imperial central government and its agents had to offer in ecclesiastical political ideas, that is, an awareness which, to be sure, cannot be termed a Syrian national mind, but represented a sort of preliminary of such a mind, a form which was essentially characterized by the linguistic distinction from Greek and not merely by an antipathy to the positive elements in the Greek intellectual world. Severus had written only Greek and hardly understood Syriac. But the longer, the more decidedly, the language of the Jacobite theologians became Syriac, there developed a literature which produced a time of flowering of the Syriac language.[25] Here must be mentioned especially Xenaia of Mabbug (d. c. 523), then James of Sarug (d. 521): the former was a classic author of Syriac literature, a dogmatician, a polemicist, a preacher, and an exegete at the same time, the latter was a representative of that metrical sermon literature which in similar form found admission even into the Byzantine world. No less important was the famous John of Edessa (d. c. 586), whom Justinian in his time for obscure reasons had appointed as missionary of the pagan remnant in Asia Minor and who, until his expulsion from Constantinople by the Emperor Justin II, had governed the Monophysites there. We are indebted to him not only for a Syriac Church history but also for the *History of the Eastern Blessed,* that hagiographical collection which became at least as important for the self-evaluation of his Church as all the dogmatic treatises. As regards the history of the Church, he obtained an important successor in Cyrus of Batna. For the seventh century there must be mentioned preferably Paul of Tella, the collaborator on the *Syro-Hexaplaris* of the Old Testament, and Thomas of Harqel, to whom the same credit may be attributed for the Syriac New Testament. One of the most important representatives of extensive scholarly interests was James of Edessa (d. 708). His educational road led him by way of Alexandria, he then became Bishop of Edessa, lost this see again, and taught in the monastery of Qennesrin, which was perhaps the outstanding Jacobite educational center of the time. He left a rich literary legacy.

---

[22] Cf. on the situation P. Peeters, "Les ex-voto de Khosrau Aparwez à Saint-Serge de Rosapha," *Mémoires Acad. Inscr. et Belles Lettres* 54 (1951), 23ff.

[23] The residences changed frequently, even though the "title" remained with Antioch. As cities of residence Aleppo, Edessa, Amida, Harran, etc., alternated.

---

[24] J. Lebon, "La christologie du monophysisme syrien," *Chalkedon* I, 425–580.

[25] Summarizing this literature, cf. A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn 1922); I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia syriaca* (Rome 1958).

He gave lessons in Greek over the opposition of those who now chose to despise not only the Imperial Church but everything else Greek; he is said to have known Hebrew also. Many translations from Greek can be traced back to him. His *Chronography* was much read and he was probably the author of the oldest Syriac grammar. Finally, he attempted a harmony of profane and biblical knowledge of the origin of the world in an uncompleted *Hexaemeron.* It should be mentioned only in passing that, as in the area of Greek speech, there were compiled dogmatic *catenae,* collections of spiritual talks of monastic superiors, that ecclesiastical poetry flowered, and that finally there was thereby supplied the presuppositions for a development of the liturgical texts.[26] All this led to that grand-scale Syriac mediating activity in the eighth century which passed on to Arabic Islam the union with the intellectual life of the Mediterranean world.[27]

In this world of the Jacobite Church monasticism played a significant role.[28] It was multiform, as elsewhere in the East. There were many hermits in cells and mountain caves, on pillars, and in huts. But there was also a whole multitude of well-populated *cenobia,* where meditation was cultivated, where asceticism was, just as in Egypt, intensified to virtuosity, and where economic activities were to some extent regarded with very mixed feelings. Above all, the monastic settlements in the desert developed styles of life purely in relation to the environment; these were suited to those of the Bedouins and were not without an affinity to ascetical forms of Islam. Theoretically, each monastery was subject to the bishop, without whom there was no blessing of the abbot, no founding of a monastery, and no external activity. But it remains noteworthy that the community in the Jacobite Church never lost its influence: it was always in a position to oppose its own weight to an exaggerated hierarchization of the Church.

This Monophysite Church, frequently called "Jacobite" from its great missionary, became not only a Church of the Syrians but also of the Arabs. That it had its champions in the Ghassanid Princes in the Syrian Desert has already been mentioned. And this form of Christianity pressed forward along the caravan routes into northern and central Arabia, but these Arabian territories did not constitute a separate ecclesial body of their own. Their Christianity remained loosely united to that of the Syriac Church. On the other hand, the Arabs had long pressed forward from the heart of their country into the Syrian area, and indeed not only into the Syrian Desert, but also as settlers inside the walls of the cities in the country east of the Jordan. The centers of Arabian Monophysitism were the episcopal city of Bosra and the great Sergius Pilgrimage in Rusafa, the headquarters of the Ghassanids (Sergiopolis). The Byzantine Emperors of the second half of the sixth century were not always successful in their treatment of the nomadic masses of Arabs on the frontiers of their Empire. They especially all too readily accused the Ghassanid Princes of treason, and so it happened that Islam, storming forward, found allies in these Christian Arabs who very soon submitted to the new religion, whose styles of life and worship in some respects were not all too different from their own. This interaction between Christian and previously pagan Arabs was probably responsible for the fact that there are Christian elements in the Koran, which have been designated, with some probability, as substantially Monophysite.

---

[26] A. Baumstark, *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten* (Paderborn 1910).

[27] G. Klinge, "Die Bedeutung der syrischen Theologen als Vermittler der griechischen Philosophie an den Islam," *ZKG* 58 (1939), 346–386; R. Paret, *Der Islam und das griechische Bildungsgut* (Tübingen 1950).

[28] E. Honigmann, "Nordsyrische Klöster in vorarabischer Zeit," *ZS* 1 (1922), 15–33; P. Krüger, *Das syrischmonophysitische Mönchtum im Tur-Ab(h)din* I (dissertation, Münster 1937), II: *OrChrP* 4 (1938), 5–46.

Concerning Christianity in South Arabia,[29] the time and starting point of evangelization are uncertain. In any event, we encounter this Christianity around the turn of the sixth century, especially in the Nedshran under rulers who were probably of the Jewish faith. In 573 a persecution broke out here also, which gave this young Christianity the first martyrs, especially Saint Arethas (Harith), who was then honored by the Monophysites of Syria as one of their own. The persecution evoked an action, supported by Byzantium, on the part of the Axumite Kings, who brought the Arabian Kingdom under vassalage to themselves until they in turn had to relinquish the area to the Persians, who were then replaced by Islam.

The Church of the Armenians

In the Armenian Church may be seen a Jacobite denomination so far as the basic interests of the doctrine are concerned. Of course, the historical origins were different. They reflected in a special way the vicissitudes of this people between Byzantine and Persian domination on the one hand and their own peculiar political system on the other. The Armenian Church became as it is, less on the basis of dogmatic and ecclesiastical political succession of imperial synods than on the basis of just these historical dangers. If Nerses the Great,[30] the chief Armenian

---

[29] J. Ryckmans, "Le christianisme en Arabie du sud préislamique," *L'oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà* (Rome 1964), 413–453, with citations of the literature.

[30] V. Inglisian, *LThK* 2nd. ed., VII, 882–883.

Bishop (d. c. 373), the alleged great-grandson of the evangelizer of Armenia, Gregory the Illuminator, has rightly been called the organizer of the Armenian Church, this was an organization along the lines of the Greek Church, specifically the Church of Cappadocia, just as Nerses himself had been educated and ordained a bishop in Caesarea. In his organization was reflected the relation of respect of Armenian Christianity toward the point of departure of the Armenian mission, Cappadocia. Already his successor, a bishop of the King, had to have himself ordained, to the great annoyance of Caesarea, in the rival metropolitan see of Tyana, until finally the King definitively renounced the ecclesiastical connection with Cappadocia. The period of this separation cannot be exactly pinpointed; there were many connections back and forth which existed then as previously, but the beginning of the ecclesiastical independence of Armenia had been made, even if not the beginning of a new Church of a different denomination. Soon after, the intellectual self-consciousness of the Armenians was also consolidated. Mesrop[31] (d. 440) gave the nation its own handwriting, and this achievement very soon led to an independent Armenian literature. It is self-evident that at first this was a matter of translations from Greek and Syriac, and in this borrowing the orientation to the intellectual center of the Byzantine Empire acquired a new importance. Of course, ecclesiastically it was now no longer Caesarea that played the great role, but Constantinople, which meanwhile had acquired the supremacy over Cappadocia, to which the Armenians turned.

From 429, however, Persian pressure on Armenia was especially strongly evident, and the connection with the Byzantine Empire to a great extent ended. No Persarmenian bishops could take part in the Synod of Ephesus, and only by means of Nestorian missionaries was it learned what had been done there. In 435 there went to Byzantium an inquiry from the *Catholicus,* which was answered with the *Tomus* of Prochus. Chalcedon too took place without any Armenian representation worthy of mention, and the events of the second half of the fifth century brought no improvement of the situation.[32] Meanwhile, in the Armenian Church people held fast to the doctrine of the unity in Christ. But Chalcedon had rendered decisions which, to Armenian ears, seemingly introduced scarcely familiar distinctions into this unity. The Armenians came in time to know of the *Tome of Leo,* but in a translation which was misleading. It was monks from the School of Severus who finally acquainted the Armenians with the *Henoticon* of the Emperor Zeno and interpreted it contrary to the Synod of Chalcedon. When in

---

[31] Ibid., 319.

[32] Id., "Chalkedon und die armenische Kirche," *Chalkedon* II, 361–417.

505 and 506 the Emperor Anastasius could force the Persians to an armistice which again brought the Armenian Church a certain freedom, since the Byzantine Church was strongly oriented by this very Emperor to a Monophysite interpretation of the *Henoticon,* this interpretation was now also adopted by the Armenian Church. The *Catholicus* Babgen (490–516) in 506 convoked a Synod at Dvin with Armenian and Iberian bishops, who accepted the *Henoticon,* less, it is true, as a rejection of Chalcedon, which they scarcely knew, than to repudiate Nestorianism, which under Persian rule had evangelized powerfully in Armenia. Under the domination of Justinian there was no change in this position of the Armenian Church. In 554 a Synod again met at Dvin, which completed the break with the Imperial Church—an important decision, especially in view of the ever present threat from the Persians and the Persian Nestorian Church standing behind it; but also in so far as the self-consciousness of the Church vis-à-vis Byzantium was consolidated and new impulses were supplied to the Armenian striving for independence and a new latitude in the confrontation between the two great Churches.

It was the Byzantine Emperor Maurice who sought to put an end to this autonomy of the Armenian Church, as well as to the political freedom and exerted the strongest pressure to convert the Armenians to the Synod of Chalcedon. This produced a schism. The *Catholicus* Moses II refused to take part in a Synod at Constantinople, whereupon the Emperor in 590 appointed an anti-*Catholicus* for the Armenians under direct Byzantine rule. Only a new attack on Byzantine Armenia by the Persians settled the matter in 610 in favor of the Monophysite Armenians. At this time also the Iberian *Catholicus,* Kiurion, forced himself, as an adherent of the Greeks and thereby of Orthodoxy, out of the close connection with and dependence on the Armenian Church.[33]

The great Persian–Byzantine war under the Emperor Heraclius again led to Byzantine domination of Armenia. The Peace of 629, which the Persians had to conclude after their defeat, relinquished the greatest part of the country to the Byzantines. On the whole, the Armenians were on the side of the Byzantine Emperor in these serious conflicts. But now the clergy of Armenia were again called upon to declare their adherence to the formulas of Chalcedon: if they would not, the Emperor would appoint an anti-*Catholicus.* The *Catholicus* Yezr yielded, and the Greek clergy offered a weak formula which culminated in the condemnation of Nestorianism, while Chalcedon was passed over in silence, apparently in order to gain the Armenians more easily. True, there was also resistance to this formula, but there can be no question of a real schism. That soon after, in the Monoenergist formula, Heraclius moved near to the ideas of the opponents of Chalcedon made the rallying easier. But from as early as 640 the Muslims were steadily advancing against Armenia, and with this the connection with the Byzantine Church was ended, even before the Arabs were definitively masters of the country. A Synod of Dvin under the Patriarch Nerses III in 648–49 completely rejected the formulas of Chalcedon, and the nation's leader at that time, Theodore Rechtuni, surrendered his country to the Caliph, who granted the Armenians a status of extensive autonomy. In 654 the Byzantine Emperor Constans II made an energetic effort, it is true, to recover Armenia politically and ecclesiastically, but in the long run he had no success.

---

[33] N. Akinian, *Kiurion the Catholicus of Georgia* (Vienna 1910; in Armenian); see P. Peeters, *AnBoll* 30 (1911), 106–109.

The direction of the Armenian Church lay in the hands of a supreme bishop,[34] a "Great Archbishop" or *Catholicus,* as he was frequently called—the title Patriarch gained the upper hand only relatively late. These *Catholici* were very firmly rooted in the feudalism of the country, and the ups and downs of their history is in some respects comprehensible only because of the rivalries of the tribes and tribal princes, the kings and sub-kings. Even the ecclesiastical organization, the erecting of honorary metropolises, and so forth, was not rarely determined by these political circumstances. The special way of life of the Church was expressed most purely in the literature, which to a great extent was restricted to the religious sphere. With Mesrop, already mentioned, began the so-called Golden Age of Armenian literature.[35] From Mesrop himself we know religious writings, talks, and circulars. What in individual cases is to be assigned to his pupils—biblical commentaries, homilies, sermons, and the like—can today be decided only with difficulty. Of special importance for the fifth century are Eznik of Kolb, who not only shared in the Armenian translation of the Bible but also turned against heresies in a polemic and published writings of a religious nature, and also John Mandakuni, the author of sermons and of hymns which were adopted into the liturgy. It was also in the fifth century that Mesrop found his biographer in his pupil Korium and that a man who called himself Agathangelus wrote a history of the evangelization of Armenia and of the missionary Gregory—the classic legend of the early Church history of the country.

The Church history of Armenia in Islamic times hardly differed from the history of any other Church under the domination of the Arabs. Noteworthy, to be sure, is the fact that many Armenians, under the pressure of the Arabs or because of the inner political situation of the country, migrated to the Byzantine Empire and there often achieved the greatest importance, so that the separation of the Armenian Church, despite the dogmatic differences, never meant that deep abyss between Byzantium and Armenia, such as had developed between the Jacobite Church and Byzantium or the Coptic Church and Byzantium.

---

[34] G. Amadouni, "L'autocéphalie du katholikat arménien," *I patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio* (Rome 1968), 137–178.

[35] B. Sargisean, *Dei tesori patristici e biblici conservati nella letteratura armena* (Venice 1897); H. Thorossian, *Histoire de la littérature arménienne* (Paris 1951).

CHAPTER 28

Early Byzantine Monasticism

The explosive growth of monasticism in the fourth and early fifth centuries was, it is true, accompanied by crises and setbacks, but its further expansion could not be halted by them. Egypt remained the mother country, goal of pilgrimages to the famed sites of the first enthusiasm, but gradually other imperial provinces also pushed themselves more powerfully into the foreground. Especially noteworthy was the power of attraction which Palestine exerted from the early fifth century. The stream of pilgrims from the whole world which hastened to the Holy Places brought along many a one who finally settled in Palestine for a life pleasing to God. Thus there arose here a monasticism which was less self-contained than in Egypt, more receptive in what concerned geographical provenance as well as social status.[1]

The most important founders of the period were without doubt Euthymius the Great, Theodosius the "Cenobiarch," and Sabas. Euthymius (d. 473)[2] founded a *laura,* whose church Juvenal dedicated in 429. Its very beginnings reflected "internationalism." Euthymius himself came from Melitene on the Euphrates, some of his first monks from the Sinai Peninsula, others were Cappadocians and Syrians, a "Roman" was mentioned, and finally a single Palestinian. The founder's life did not move only in the framework of monastic aims; no great abbot of the day could avoid the ecclesiastical political strife centering on the Patriarch Juvenal and ignore Chalcedon. The desert of Palestine was too near Jerusalem. Euthymius did not take part in the revolt of the monks around Theodosius in 452, and finally his exertions succeeded in inducing the ex-Empress Eudocia, who preferred to hatch her plots in Jerusalem if in this way she could thwart the Orthodox course of the Court of Constantinople, to become reconciled with Juvenal and abandon the propaganda against Chalcedon. The "Cenobiarch" Theodosius (d. 529)[3] laid out his foundation east of Bethlehem as a monastery of cenobites from the start. His home was Cappadocia and he had early entered the service of the Church as a psalmist. This circumstance and his familiarity with the writings and aims of his great countryman, Basil, were probably the reason why, against the trend of the age, he established a strict *cenobium.* It was apparently regarded in Palestine as a model of its type, and finally the Patriarch appointed Theodosius as Abbot-General, or Archimandrite, over all *cenobia.* Abbot-General of the archorites and *lauras,* that is, of the isolated or loosely associated monastic settlements, was Saint Sabas (d. 532)[4] son of a high official from Cappadocia. After some vicissitudes in various monasteries of the Holy Land, he withdrew into a hermitage in the vicinity of the west bank of the Dead Sea. Around 483 he made it into a *laura,* which soon attracted 150 monks—a "City in the desert," as it was called. Despite his gifts as an organizer, he had many difficulties, apparently because higher questions of spirituality did not interest him. When the controversy over the evaluation of Origen's doctrines flared up again, it led to a succession of a whole group of monks and the founding of the New Laura in 508, the center of the Origenist movement, and Sabas and his successors were able only gradually to assert their authority over it.

---

[1] Cf. S. Vailhé, "Les monastères de la Palestine," *Bessarione* 3 (1897–98), 39–58, 209–225, 334–356, 4 (1898–99), 193–210.

[2] Id., *Saint Euthyme le Grand,* special reprint from *ROC* 12–14 (1907–9); R. Génier, *Vie de saint Euthyme le Grand* (Paris 1909).

On the whole it can be said that, despite all difficulties, the three great founders contributed much to make Palestine gradually a refuge of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. The two named as archimandrites by the Patriarch found it difficult, of course, to exercise their authority in the southwest of the country also: here arose centers of Monophysite propaganda, which were oriented rather to Coptic Egypt than to Jerusalem. The Georgian Prince Nabarnugi, who became a monk in Palestine under the name Peter—Peter the Iberian[5]—had founded a monastery of Iberians at Jerusalem but had then withdrawn because of Juvenal and moved to this area. During the monks' revolt of 452 he was made Bishop of Gaza. He was able to occupy his see only temporarily, but through his activity he made the coastal strip of the country a refuge for Monophysites. It is significant that Severus, the later Patriarch of Antioch, was his pupil and finally settled near Gaza as a monk before he began his career in Constantinople.

---

[3] E. Weigand, "Das Theodosioskloster," *ByZ* 23 (1914–19), 167–216; H. Usener, *Der hl. Theodosios* (Leipzig 1890).

[4] A. Ehrhard, "Das griechische Kloster Mar Saba in Palästina," *RO* 7 (1893), 32–79.

[5] F. Honigmann, "Pierre l'Ibérien et les écrits du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite," *Bulletin Acad. Belge* 47, 3 (1952); D. M. Lang, "Peter the Iberian and his Biographers," *JEH* 2 (1951), 158–168; R. Raabe, *Petrus der Iberer* (Leipzig 1895).

The flowering of Palestinian monasticism left its mark also on the literature of the age. Whereas the spiritual content of Egyptian monasticism found expression in the collections of *Apophthegmata* of the great monastic fathers, Palestine gave to monastic literature a great biographer in the person of Cyril of Scythopolis[6] in the sixth century. He devoted great biographies to Euthymius and Sabas and also treated other monastic founders. He was certainly not entirely detached in regard to the ecclesiastical political procedures of the monks of his time. But he was still able to describe the monks and their life "from within" and to show how, despite all the politics, the great enthusiasm of the past again and again found new life. A half-century later the monastic life found in John Moschus,[7] whom the desire for travel took to all countries, the kind, enthusiastic miniaturist of anecdotes and stories of miracles, who in his spiritual "meadow" captured the charm of the final days before the onslaught of the Persians and Arabs.

At this period the Sinai Peninsula also moved into the full light of the history of the monastic life. In the vicinity of the episcopal city of Pharan on the east bank of the Gulf of Suez the monastic settlement of Raithu (el Tor) is attested from c. 400. On Sinai itself rose the Brier Monastery, later called the Monastery of St. Catherine, which Justinian had surrounded with a fortified wall and for which he built the church.[8]

In Syria around this time the village of Telnesin became a great pilgrimage spot of Christianity, for here there arose around the column on which Simeon the Stylite had led his ascetical life (d. 459) a mighty complex of churches, monasteries, and pilgrims' hostels, which of course the Monophysites soon claimed for themselves, just as they claimed the saint himself.[9] The Orthodox attached themselves instead to the younger Simeon the Stylite (d. 596), who had had his pillar on the *Mons Admirabilis* near Antioch.[10]

---

[6] E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939).

[7] Bardenhewer, V, 131–135; E. Amann, *DThC* X, 2510–2513; Beck, 412–413; E. Mioni, "Jean Moschus, moine," *DSAM* VIII (1973), 622–640; H. Chadwick, "John Moschus and His Friend Sophronius the Sophist," *JThS* 25 (1974), 41–74.

[8] R. Devreesse, "Le christianisme dans la péninsule sinaïtique des origines à l'année des musulmans," *RB* 49 (1940), 205–223; K. Amantos, *Σύντομος ἱστορία τῆς ἱερᾶς μονῆς τοῦ Σινᾶ* (Thessalonica 1953); G. F. Forsyth, "The Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai," *DOP* 22 (1968), 1–19.

[9] D. Krencker–R. Naumann, *AAB* 1939, H. 4; B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa* (Münster 1950), 69ff.

[10] J. Gouillard, *DThC* XIV, 2, 2974–2976; P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine* (Brussels 1950), 160–162, 134–136.

In the capital, Constantinople, monasticism made only slow progress. First, it was established in Bithynia and in the Asiatic suburbs, and almost always it was foreigners, especially Syrians, who appeared as founders: the hermit Auxentius (d. c. 473), for example, who settled on Mount Scopus and organized other colonies of monks around himself. The area around Prusa seems not to have become a country of monks until the seventh century. In Constantinople itself, despite all the legends, there were no monasteries from the time of Constantine the Great.[11] Foundations from the period of Constantius II are a part of the history of the heresies of the age. For "Orthodox" Constantinople the history of monasticism began with the foundation of the Syrian Isaac, later called Dalmatus. The most famous and, for the ecclesiastical political events of the capital, most significant foundation was that of the Monastery of the Acemetae by the Syrian Alexander, who had already been active as a founder on the Euphrates and came to Constantinople c. 405. The Studium Monastery was founded in 463, however, it did not experience its flowering until the early Middle Byzantine period. In the sixth century there suddenly appeared in Constantinople not a few "national monasteries" of Egyptians, Syrians, Bessi, Sicilians, "Romans," and so forth, which were perhaps no more than temporary lodgings of the groups mentioned, administered by some monks. They disappeared from the monastic history of Constantinople as quickly as they had appeared.[12]

It is possible that there was a monastery in the neighborhood of Thessalonica as early as the sixth century; what else we know of monasteries in Greece proper from this period is almost all legend.

The decades around and after the Council of Chalcedon saw monasticism at a climax of its activity in Church politics and for this reason at the height of the danger to its ideas and the ideals of the age of foundation. The peril was so obvious that people were concerned for a remedy.[13] Characteristically, it was the Emperor who produced a corresponding proposal, which was then enacted by the Council Fathers of Chalcedon with slight modifications as canons 3 and 4. Canon 4 denounced those monks who, relying on the esteem for their state among the public, created disturbances in Church and State, moved from place to place without fixed dwelling places, and founded "monasteries" where they pleased. The canon prescribed that no one must establish a monastery or oratory without the permission of the local bishop, that every monk was subject to the bishop's supervision and had to stay in his monastery in quiet (*hesychia*); further, that no slave might be accepted into a monastery without the consent of his master. For the first time also marriage was forbidden to the monk by canon law (canon 7).

---

[11] J. Pargoire, "Les débuts du monachisme à Constantinople," *RQH* 65 (1899), 67–143; G. Dragon, "Les moines et la ville," *Travaux et mémoires* 4 (1970), 229–276.

[12] R. Janin, "Les monastères nationaux et provinciaux à Byzance," *ÉO* 32 (1933), 429–438.

[13] L. Ueding, "Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus," *Chalkedon* II, 569–676.

It may be that in this way, for the first time, monasteries and monasticism were recognized at all in canon law or, respectively, were regarded as an institution of public law. However, the purpose which the imperial proposers had in mind was hardly achieved. At first it was often bishops themselves who misused monks for their own ecclesiastical political ends. After canon 4 granted them a power of dispensation, they continued unhindered in these activities. On the other hand, I believe that the monastic character in its details remained so undefined in regard to its external appearance as well as its legal description that it was always an easy thing to evade the prescriptions of the Council. And, third, the hierarchy itself was undecided in the midst of the struggles over the faith to the extent that "for the sake of the higher good" very religious but also fanatical and fanaticized monks again and again found reason to conduct themselves as saviors of the faith against the bishops. In any case, Church history after Chalcedon shows that the success of canons 3 and 4 was only meager. The monastic system of the Eastern Church was from the very beginning—if one excepts such as Pachomius and Basil, who, however, had only slight aftereffects as organizers—a movement rather than an institution. One was a monk by his own will, and an abbot by his own will. The action of the hierarchy had always to lag behind, since juridical concepts remained foreign to the essence of this movement. Without doubt, many educated men also found the way to the monastery. But to the great mass of monks, who rejected all culture, the enthusiastic awareness of a mission could always become a danger. Of course, it pertained to the essence of spirituality that historically it rarely moved into the light of day. Hence in Byzantium the history of monasticism easily became the history of its scandals. But the *Apophthegmata Patrum,* those precious collections of monastic epigrammatic sayings,[14] the great monastic *vitae* of the sixth century, the spiritual letters of a Barsanuphius in the sixth century, the conferences of the Palestinian Abbot Dorotheus, and the *Spiritual Ladder* of John Climacus of the seventh century say more on the heart of the movement than all the scandalous reports of fanaticism and squabblers in monasticism. In Maximus Confessor monastic mysticism found that height of synthesis which would never again be achieved in later Byzantium.

The legislation of the Emperor Justinian also tried to bring this monasticism under definitive control. It was due to him that more precise rules defined the details of vocation, of the reception, period of trial, and profession, and facilitated ecclesiastical control. But if he made the effort to make the strict *vita communis* generally obligatory, this was a failure, which disregarded the very nature of the "movement."

---

[14] Cf. W. Bousset, *Apophthegmata* (Tübingen 1923).

If one speaks of a total "monasticization" of Byzantine culture since the sixth century, this is false. There can be absolutely no word of such. Monasticism was strong, numerically and in its ideas, but it was not in the process of changing the rhythm of the life of late antiquity and of the Early Byzantine period, especially that of the cities. Many educated persons continued to be skeptical in regard to this state and took it to be rather a threat than something positive. Of course, the episcopal sees were occupied by monks, all the more frequently those of long duration, but it remained important that—as I see it—for example, the patriarchal see of Constantinople was never occupied by a monk between 450 and 650, unless Eutychius may be seen as an exception! The importance of monasticism for Byzantine life was that of a limiting value, not that of an integrating factor of daily life.

CHAPTER 29

Theological and Religious Literature

Mighty as may have been the dogmatic struggles which convulsed the Imperial Church from the mid-fifth century until the onslaught of Islam—this period by no means belongs to the great periods of classical theology. The formula of Chalcedon imposed on its champions rather the task of the masterly distinction than that of a synthesis, and the distinction had to keep separate what could be presented for religious experience only as a unity. Where there was question of unity, it found expression in a terminology which was not yet the common property of the age and in adjectives and adverbs—*adiairetos, achoristos*—which asserted the privative rather than the positive. An outstanding theologian would have been needed to make these necessarily colorless statements susceptible of religious experience. But for a long time the Chalcedonian theology had no such representative. And so philosophemes were sought with which to do justice to the distinctions. For the most part they lived on the vocabulary of the Aristotelian school, but no one who made use of them could without more ado be called an Aristotelian. In the *Tome* of Pope Leo I, this theology still had the powerful appeal with which the language of Latin rhetoric knew how to construct its antitheses in monumental precision. In the Greek syntax, more adept at modulation, it revealed its indigence very much more easily. Thus the strict Chalcedonian theology languished to some extent; it longed—to express it differently—for that Formula of Cyril, discriminated against at Chalcedon, of the one incarnate *physis* of the *Logos* or of the one *physis* of the *Logos*-made-Man.

That is not intended to mean that the history of theology of the age can supply no names. Perhaps Leontius of Byzantium may be mentioned here, even though his position in the framework of the totality of the theology of the epoch remains disputed.[1] Of course, the majority of the theologians very soon began to give way to their yearning for Cyril. The occasion was provided by the so-called *communicatio idiomatum,* that is, the possibility of uniting the divine and the human in one single statement in regard to the Person of Christ, that is, with the *hen prosopon* of Christ as the real bearer of the predicates. In this manner of speaking, one could no longer join the *"qua hen prosopon,"* presuppose it as self-evident, or consciously pass over it in silence. What then appeared was the desire for "Baroque formulations," impressive antitheses, and a fascinating inexactitude. The tendency went farther. Partly in conscious, partly in unconscious approximation of the standpoint of the opponents of Chalcedon, persons insisted on these formulations as a shibboleth of Orthodoxy, whereby they were plunged into serious internal confrontations, such as that over the Three Chapters. Many theologians of the time followed this trend, the Scythian monks as well as John the Grammarian of Caesarea in Palestine[2] or the Patriarch Ephrem of Antioch,[3] and in the Emperor Justinian I they all found their powerful helper, who assisted their theology to its break-through in the Imperial Church. Purest in its point of departure and most exact in its formulation was probably the doctrine of Bishop John of Scythopolis, who characteristically was also preoccupied in detail with the writings of the pseudo-Areopagite.[4] Furthermore, soon thereafter the champions of Monoenergism would derive precisely from the writings of the so-called Neo-Chalcedonians—the most recent representatives of this faction were so called—a part of their arguments, especially from Theodore of

---

[1] See Beck, 373–374; St. Otto, *Person und Subsistenz* (Munich 1968); S. Helmer, op. cit., 31–41; D. B. Evans, *Leontius of Byzantium, an Origenist Christology* (Washington 1970); S. Rees, "The Literary Activity of Leontius of Byzantium," *JThS* 19 (1968), 229–242.

[2] Beck, 377; S. Helmer, op. cit., 160–175.

[3] Beck, 378; S. Helmer, op. cit., 185–195.

[4] Beck, 376–377; S. Helmer, op. cit., 176–182.

Raithu, in so far as he is not identical with the initiator of Monoenergism, Theodore of Pharan.[5]

The attempted approximation to the standpoint of the Monophysites had, of course, no ecclesiastical political success. For these possessed in Severus of Antioch the greatest theologian of the day, to whom the Chalcedonian faction could oppose nothing of equal weight.[6] Based above all on a biblical-patristic culture, without involving himself overly in the uncertainty of philosophical terminology, he again took hold of the theology of Cyril of Alexandria. He always kept in view the concrete, historical appearance of Christ, and, proceeding directly from this concrete idea, he identified *physis, hypostasis,* and *prosopon* to a great extent. The idea of unity was the predominating one; in relation to the unity, the concrete unity in Christ, there cannot be two natures—*unio deletrix dualitatis.* The Synod of Chalcedon had entangled itself precisely in this contradiction and so, despite all appeasing interpretations, no recognition could be given to its decrees. The terminus of the unity in Christ could always be only the one divine nature.

But what made Severus the undisputed Church Father of the Monophysites was not only his consistent dogmatic system, the fact that he had an answer ready for every attack on the part of the Orthodox theology, but also the circumstance that his comprehensive literary work was concerned with all aspects of religious life. An extensive correspondence, festive homilies and sermons, liturgical poetry, and so forth enriched the life of a Church which found with him its route to independence.

There were, to be sure, also in the Monophysite Church deviations from this classical doctrine; but, beside Severus, Julian of Halicarnassus, the father of the Aphthartodocetists, and the representatives of the Theodosianists, Aktists, and Agnoites, and whatever else they may have been called, were all poor examples. Only John, nicknamed Philoponus, could stand beside Severus for the period of origin.[7] His work was intended as the balance between philosophy and dogma, and in it he of course fell into a sort of tritheism in the eyes of those who distrusted him—an interpretation which in its justification is dependent on how his notion of the Trinitarian nature and essence is interpreted. The

---

[5] Cf. W. Elert, "Theodor von Pharan und Theodor von Raithu," *ThLZ* 76 (1951), 67–76.

[6] Still the best is J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien* (Louvain 1919). For the literature: Beck, 387–390.

[7] H. D. Saffrey, "Le chrétien Jean Philopon et la survivance de l'école d'Alexandrie au VI siècle," *REG* 67 (1954), 396–410; B. Schleissheimer, "Zum Problem Glauben und Wissenschaft im sechsten Jahrundert," *Polychordia, Festschr. F. Dölger, Byz. Forschungen* 2 (1967), 318–344.

Monophysites themselves, in the long run, did not admit the reproach but set him alongside Severus, whom he had himself always defended. His work is still too little investigated and evaluated. Apparently he was one of the most important representatives of that philosophical and scientific viewpoint which so advantageously distinguished the higher schools of Alexandria from the teaching profession at Athens. Significant was his commentary on the biblical account of creation, which was based partly on the exegesis of the great Basil and, through his method of taking hold of problems, profitably contrasted to that *Topography* of Cosmas Indicopleustes,[8] which was really only an effort to explain the work of the six days, of course, in an awfully old-fashioned manner. The importance of the work lies in some interesting reports from the travel experiences of the author, not at all in the theological content.

Outside the framework of the dogma and polemics of the age stands the figure of the obscure pseudo-Areopagite, an author with an indestructible preference for mystification and doubtless also with the talent for it. If he is not identical with Peter the Fuller,[9] then the latter must be postulated as his twin-brother! Compared with the turbulent career of the Fuller, rarely blessed with success, his literary activity can be regarded as an attempt to construct an unreal view of life and to favor it with an indisputable authority—a cosmos which was ideally set off to advantage from the environment with which the author never got along, together with its everyday authority. And he succeeded to the extent that his centuries-long respectful acceptance cannot be explained by the pseudonym alone. The pseudo-Areopagite, with his treatises on the heavenly and earthly hierarchies, created a polished system of analogies which not only came halfway to meet the demands of the bishops of his own and later times but also gave to the liturgical achievement an in depth focus which became very important for the liturgical theology, as well as for the liturgical art of the Byzantines of the future. With his work on the divine names, of course, he made the attempt, condemned to founder in its innermost essence, to create a system of negative theology. And if his terminology on the *via supereminentiae* in the statements on God caused him to become lost in linguistic impossibilities, nevertheless he thereby set a standard for the necessary breakdown of all talk about God. In other respects it spoke for his mystic instinct that, in addition to a system of illumination, which proceeded in a strictly hierarchical manner and separated the simple man from God by a protracted series of degrees rather than united him with him, he stressed again and again the notion of the "nearness" of God, compared to which the distances in his "hierarchies" became irrelevant.

---

[8] W. Wolska, *La topographie chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustès* (Paris).

[9] U. Riedinger, "Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagites, Pseudo-Kaisarios und die Akoimeten," *ByZ* 52 (1959), 276–296; id., "Petros der Walker von Antiocheia als Verfasser der pseudo-dionysischen Schriften," *Salzburger Jb. der Philos.* 5–6 (1961–62), 135–156; R. Roques, *L'univers dionysien* (Paris 1954).

In any case, the pseudo-Areopagite stands outside his age; and if Severus is disregarded, it can be said that only the Monoenergist Controversy of the seventh century again gave Byzantium a theologian of his rank—Maximus Confessor,[10] who, of course, even less than Severus, can be restricted to dogma and polemics. It was certainly to his merit to have created, in the confusion over the definition of the energies and will in Christ, by means of a clear-sighted terminology, the presuppositions which were necessary in order to grasp the heart of the problem at all. Maximus was a Dyothelite as regards the physical faculty of willing in Christ, but in *thelema gnomikon* he saw a property of the *hypostasis*—a distinction which would have been suited to prepare a speedy end to the confrontation if attention had really been paid to it. But this was only one aspect of the importance belonging to the Confessor. It was probably decisive that in him exact dogma and mysticism achieved an insoluble connection. He hardly showed the importance of any new elements in the mysticism of the Byzantine Church: he was linked to Evagrius and through him to Origen, whereas pseudo-Dionysius, on whom, however, he wrote a commentary, remained rather on the fringes; he had incorporated Christology, which in my opinion Evagrius was little concerned for, into this system, and out of the dialectics of the Christological formulas, which had hitherto been handled all too abstractly, not to say negatively, he constructed a mystical theology of the Cross, on which a suffering and glorified Christ collected all antitheses into an ultimate unity. He was the greatest master of the mysticism of Christ in the Byzantine sphere—never again equalled, and, sadly, in the course of the centuries, if not forgotten, at least all too little regarded.

Besides Maximus there must be named the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius,[11] one of the first champions of the two energies in Christ as opposed to the Alexandrian Union of 633; he must be mentioned also as preacher, hagiographer, and religious poet; then also Anastasius of Sinai,[12] whose work and personality are still not sufficiently delineated, a sort of summist of anti-Monophysite polemics, but one who with some of his sermons determined the homiletics of the entire Byzantine period.

---

[10] H. U. v. Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners* (Einsiedeln, 2nd. ed., 1961); W. Völker, *Maximos Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens* (Wiesbaden 1965).

[11] Beck 434–436; Chr. v. Schönborn, *Sophrone de Jérusalem* (Paris 1972).

[12] S. N. Sakkos, *Περὶ Ἀναστασίων Σιναϊτῶν* (Thessalonica 1964).

It is curious to establish that, alongside the great Christological controversies of the age, the newly popular Origenism of the same age—if one disregards official notifications and, perhaps, Maximus Confessor—found hardly a literary expression. The presumption is natural that the *pateres pneumatikoi* in the monastic settlements of Palestine and elsewhere could hardly extract much from the system of the great Alexandrian to the extent that they could understand it at all, and that there were probably only individuals among the Palestinian monks who were conversant with more than single basic elements of Origenism, while the mass of the "Origenists" were only their followers. Individual traces of Origenism can be discovered here and there, but they are of no great importance. On the other hand, we know some collections of simple instructions for the spiritual life of the monks, especially in community, who, far removed from losing themselves in speculations, displayed an astonishing knowledge of the deep psychological processes of life in seclusion from the world and from it drew their concrete conclusions for the guidance of hermits and still more of cenobites. The collection of questions and answers of, for example, the recluse Barsanuphius,[13] who lived in Palestine in the mid-sixth century, with its very discreet method of direction of souls, the spiritual conferences of the Abbot Dorotheus,[14] from the same period and the same environment, which later enjoyed a great repute in the monastery of Studium, to name only some, especially happily represent this trend. If there was danger, then Origenism was not the only answer for the spiritual life of the time. Messalianism, with its dualistic world view, at least *in praxi,* its exclusive concern for the "pure," and its longing for a physical experience of the state of grace, gave much trouble to the guardians of Orthodox monasticism. Of course, in the spiritual instructions of Diadochus of Photice[15] they had a manual which came to meet the legitimate wishes as far as it staked out firm boundaries. Here a spiritual organ was discovered, the *aisthesis noera,* which should guide to the sure distinction between physically perceptible mystical phenomena and demoniacal delusions—a work of amazing psychological insight.

The classical Evagrian mysticism, here and there thoroughly indebted to Origenism, found only in the seventh century its revival in a form which made it acceptable to Orthodoxy. In addition to Maximus there must be mentioned here especially the Libyan monk Thalassius.[16] Probably also under obligation to this system was that treatise of the seventh century which had the widest impact, the *Klimax* (*Ladder of Paradise*) of John of Sinai,[17] even if in him the final stages of the union with God are rather hinted at than worked out. Interesting is the confirmation that in this work the famous Jesus-Prayer, the *mneme Iesou* more precisely, whose method goes much farther back, already appears as an integrating ingredient incorporated into the system of ascent, without the entrance into the spiritual behavior which this *mneme* presupposes as having already been simplified and rendered less demanding. It is proved that from this "Sinaitic" mysticism the route goes directly to Late Byzantine mysticism.[18]

---

[13] Beck, 395–396; M. Viller–K. Rahner, op. cit., 149.

[14] Beck, 396; M. Viller–K. Rahner, 150–151.

[15] F. Dörr, *Diadochus von Photike und die Messalianer* (Freiburg 1937).

[16] M. T. Disdier, *RÉB* 2 (1944), 79–118.

If the later Byzantine biblical exegesis again and again had recourse to the sixth century, this is so not because the explanation of Scripture at this period had been especially deep, but rather because in the sixth century the basis for those *catenae* was laid, which at the same time presented material and form in an outstanding way for the exegesis of long generations. Thus, as the dogmaticians collected ever more frequently anthologies of patristic passages for specific themes that interested them, finally to argue only from such *florilegia,* so now also the biblical exegetes began to assemble and arrange for every verse of a scriptural book the commenting texts of the most varied older authors. It remains noteworthy that these florilegists, consciously or unconsciously, in this always remained most strongly influenced by the great Antiochene exegetes even when these had fallen under the anathema of ecclesiastical synods as theologians, but this still speaks for the exegetical taste of the collectors.

One of the first compilers of *catenae* was apparently Procopius of Gaza[19] in the sixth century, famed as head of a school of Christian sophists in the Palestinian city. His *catena* of the Octateuch became the model for all later ones. He also commented in this manner on other books of the Old Testament. The homiletics of the sixth and seventh centuries did not occupy in the whole of theological literature anything resembling the place it had had at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries. In the epoch of controversial dogmatic nomenclature rhetorical emphasis and amplification were apparently more dangerous than a collection of definitions! Only isolated oratorical talent appears—for example, in Severus or in Sophronius of Jerusalem and in Anastasius of Sinai. Then in the seventh century there emerged numerous preachers, whose more precise determination as to time and place still offers difficulties, for example, a Leontius of Jerusalem, who is perhaps identical with a Leontius of Constantinople, a Pantaleon, and others.[20] Important for the future was also the homiletic legacy of the Cypriote Bishop Leontius of Neapolis,[21] who was at the same time the most important hagiographer of the century. With his *Life* of the Alexandrian Patriarch John the Compassionate he created a monument of the ecclesiastical life of Egypt before Islam[22] and, with the presentation of the "Fool in Christ," Simeon of Emesa, a precious document of bizarre popular religious life in the Middle East.[23]

---

[17] I. Hausherr, "La methode d'oraison hesychaste," *OrChrA* IX, 2 (Rome 1927), 134–137; A. Saudreau, "Doctrine spirituelle de s. Jean Climaque," *La Vie spirituelle* 9 (1924), 353–370; G. Couilleau, "Jean Climaque," *DSAM* VIII (1972), 369–389; D. Bogdanovic, *Jovan Lestvicnik u vizantijskoj i staroj srpskoj knjizevnosti* (Belgrade 1968); W. Völker, *Scala Paradisi. Eine Studie zu Johannes Climacus* (Wiesbaden 1968).

[18] Cf. I. Hausherr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale," *OrChrP* 1 (1935), 114–138.

[19] Beck, 414–422.

If the totality is surveyed, it may perhaps be said that the systematic theology of the age, apart from a few exceptions, lacked the trend toward the creative. Quotes and prayers were repeated mechanically; it was a period in which the so-called patristic proof, handled schematically, supplanted the creative interpretation of the Bible; the fact that some of the dogmaticians were at the same time impassioned and often unscrupulous ecclesiastical politicans does not make the picture more appealing. On the other hand, a Peter the Fuller, identified with the pseudo-Areopagite, reveals what these querulous people were spiritually capable of and thereby discloses something of the disunited breadth of the talents of these men of late antiquity. And if the monasticism of the time was in general no better than the hierarchy, it must not be forgotten that here too for the most part only the hotheads of history have been preserved. The above-mentioned ascetical writers from the desert spoke another language. Here the theology of spirituality made its supreme achievement.

---

[20] Beck, 456–458.

[21] Beck, 455–456.

[22] Edited by H. Gelzer (Freiburg–Leipzig 1893).

[23] Cf. H. Lietzmann, *Byzantinische Legenden* (Jena 1911).

CHAPTER 30

Organization and Inner Life of the Eastern Imperial Church

The Council of Chalcedon—and no end. Even for the organization of the Imperial Church the Synod constituted a decisive date. The famous canon 28,[1] to be sure, took up the decisions of the Synod of 381, but to a primacy of honor were now added jurisdictional privileges: the right of ordination in the ancient, hitherto autonomous great metropolitan areas of the provinces of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, and beyond them a sort of missionary primacy for the frontier areas of the Empire that were until now subject to no metropolis. And if in 381 there was mention of a primacy of honor "after that of Rome," in 451 one spoke of an equal rank with Rome. But, basically there was no question of a novelty in this canon. We must not forget that at the latest from 421 we have to reckon with the political equalization between Constantinople and Rome. Moreover, earlier John Chrysostom, as Archbishop of Constantinople, had made an energetic effort to deduce from canon 3 of 381 substantial rights of his see in regard to the ecclesiastical provinces of Asia Minor. Finally in 421 the Emperors Honorius and Theodosius II had already attempted to establish the authority of the bishop of their capital in Illyricum. Hence it is not unlikely that Chalcedon with its canon only consolidated what had already begun promisingly as a development. In a decree of 477[2] the Emperor Zeno took a further step. When, on the occasion of the restoration of Orthodoxy in Constantinople in opposition to Arianism, the Emperor Theodosius I had decreed as the norm the faith of Rome and Alexandria, so Zeno called the Church of Constantinople "mater nostrae pietatis et christianorum orthodoxae religionis omnium." Nothing was said of Rome. Of course, the Emperor Justinian I again very strongly stressed the Roman primacy and in a critical situation took it into account de facto. But soon Rome's freedom of action was for political reasons no longer all too great, and the East quickly became used, not indeed to writing Rome off, but to exerting itself only when no alternative remained. Rome's primacy was in no sense denied, but apparently it was believed that the claims of this primacy were satisfied with "honorable mention." That the old patriarchates and metropolitan sees of the East had submitted with pleasure to the new Primate in Constantinople is by no means true. But the more the chief bishops of the Imperial Church in Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt had to do to maintain themselves and prevail against the Monophysites, the more they were dependent on the protectorate of the Bishop of the capital. Then the occupation of broad areas of Christian territory by Islam only furthered this development. What canons and imperial laws prepared, what the activity of the Patriarch of Constantinople emphasized, was confirmed by the development of protocol, especially of the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch."[3] The Patriarch Dioscorus of Alexandria had already tried, of course unsuccessfully, to adopt this title, and in other bishoprics there are also traces of its employment. From the Acacian Schism at the latest this designation was tendered to the Byzantine Patriarch, probably at first rhetorically rather than officially. Apparently no one took it amiss. Only Pope Pelagius II, to whose ears it came that now even the synod officially used this title for the Patriarch, entered a protest against it with the Patriarch John the Faster (582–595). Gregory the Great, who in other respects, contrary to Leo the Great, in practice recognized canon 28, took up this protest. The Emperor Maurice thought he must urge peace, but Gregory argued that by his protest he was defending the rights of the other bishops, which were curtailed by such a title. He had no success. Of course, the title can be translated by a colorless "Patriarch of the Empire." But the Patriarchs of Constantinople themselves proved that it was susceptible of a weighty interpretation. It is significant that Photius was the first to introduce the title into the protocol of the patriarchal charters, that Cerularius was the first to adopt it on his seal, and that the patriarchs included it in their signature only from the thirteenth century. In other words: the stages in the development of the title occur together with the stages of the strained relations between Rome and Constantinople.[4]

---

[1] T. O. Martin, "The Twenty-Eighth Canon of Chalcedon: a Background Note," *Chalkedon* II, 433–458.

[2] *Cod. Just.* I, 2, 16.

Since the patriarchs of Constantinople were not content with the right of ordination in their new sphere, but exercised in it that jurisdictional and doctrinal authority which earlier the patriarchs of Alexandria called their own in Egypt and Libya, the development of their primacy was accompanied by a weakening of the old metropolitan organization. The entire life of the Imperial Church gradually concentrated on Constantinople, and it is significant that in the seventh century we obtain ever more sparse information on the individual life of great metropolises and great metropolitans, such as in Cappadocia or Pontus. Even at Chalcedon the Fathers complained that the organization of provincial synods had gradually fallen into oblivion and inculcated the holding of such meetings. The weaker the attendance at these synods in the province became, the more popular became the synod which assembled around the patriarch, the so-called *Synodus Endemusa,*[5] which can be traced back to the fourth century and where all metropolitans met who were staying in the capital for any reason. The ancient structure of the metropolitan organization was upset also by the ever more frequent creation of autocephalous archbishoprics, that is, by the elevation of simple bishoprics to the rank of archbishoprics, which however obtained no suffragans.[6] This exemption was mostly the outcome of political or personal rivalries. Basically, the most recent patriarch, that of Jerusalem, owed its origin to such an exemption. And the same is true of the autocephalous Archbishopric of Cyprus, and also for such ephemeral foundations as the city of Justiniana Prima by the Emperor Justinian.

---

[3] Cf. S. Vailhé, *ÉO* 11 (1908), 161–171; E. Caspar, *Geschichte der Päpste* II (Stuttgart 1933), 847; E. H. Fischer, "Gregor der Grosse und Byzanz." *ZSavRGkan* 36 (1950), 15–144.

[4] V. Laurent, *RÉB* 6 (1948), 5–26; id., *MiscMercati* III, 373–396.

[5] J. Hajjar, *Le synode permanente dans l'église byzantine des origines au XI^e siècle* (Rome 1962).

Again and again the effort was made to fix the status of the individual churches also in writing, and to these efforts we owe the so-called *Notitiae episcopatuum,*[7] which present the rank of the individual sees among themselves. Such a list for the Patriarchate of Constantinople may have come to a certain completion under the Emperor Justinian. Perhaps it was revised under the dynasty of the Emperor Heraclius. At that time it gave a number of thirty-three metropolises and now already thirty-four autocephalous archbishoprics. The *Notitia Antiochena* may have originated in the second half of the sixth century. Whether such lists were prepared for Jerusalem and Alexandria in this early period is doubtful.

All these problems strongly interfered with the legal status of the Church. If the Bible and the tradition of the Fathers were regarded as the primary sources of the canonical life of the Church, in the course of the generations the need arose for individual statements of norms and decisions, and soon the Imperial Church, like the Empire itself, saw itself faced with the problem of codifying the material as a whole.[8] At Antioch there occurred the first extant attempt at a systematic collection of the valid canon law. The redactor was one John the Scholastic, who later became the Patriarch John III of Constantinople (565–577). He divided the matter into fifty categories (*titloi*), under which he arranged the pertinent canons or parts of canons of the synods held up to then and regarded as binding and material from the canonistic writings of the Fathers. In this John relied on an unknown predecessor, who c. 545 had made a collection of canons in sixty titles and had added to it an appendix of twenty-one imperial laws on canonical matters. In addition to his collection of canons, John now also arranged a collection of civil law enactments on ecclesiastical material by excerpting the most important Novels of Justinian. Today this collection is known as the *Collectio 78*

---

[6] E. Chrysos, "Zur Enstehung der Institution der autokephalen Erzbistümer," *ByZ* 62 (1969), 263–286.

[7] Beck, 148–232.

[8] Ibid., 140–147.

capitum. John was not alone in this zeal to excerpt canonical matters from the Novels. From there it was then only one step to collections which took into account also the canon and *nomos,* the so-called *nomocanones,* that is, collections which brought into a single system canon law as well as imperial law—the latter in so far as it affected the Church. The oldest *nomocanon,* the so-called *Nomocanon of Fifty Titles,* likewise perhaps originated at Antioch. A second *nomocanon,* called the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles,* may belong to the age of the Emperor Heraclius. From it then proceeded later the so-called Photian *Nomocamon.*

If the life of the Byzantine Church is gauged by the pitiless dogmatic struggles, the harsh personal rivalries of the bishops and patriarchs, the blood that flowed, and the hatred that produced this bloodletting, the question arises where was the Christianity of this Church. Perhaps this impression, which the external events convey, is to some extent softened if one turns to the liturgy of the period. How this is of significance to the origins of the so-called Liturgy of St. Basil and the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom will long remain a puzzle. In all likelihood, both liturgies came from the Syrian area. But it was precisely our centuries in which they found at Constantinople their completion and a noteworthy enrichment. It is not useless to mention here a few small elements in the construction which were at that time inserted into the liturgy and which greatly account for its fascination. The fifth century enriched the liturgical formularies with the *Trisagion,*[9] over whose Trinitarian or Christological interpretation there was so much wrangling, but which, as an element of liturgical rhythmization and intensification vigorously prepared for the scriptural reading. Again, without the dogmatically disputed background of the time, that hymn, perhaps composed by Justinian himself, with the opening words *Ho monogenes huios,*[10] is unthinkable; it is one of the best examples of how in liturgical dress dogmatic strife could find the way back to its religious origin. The Emperor Justin II (565–578) is said to have introduced two hymns into the liturgy, which are probably older but in their new place incomparably reproduce briefly and deeply all that pertains to the essence of the Byzantine liturgy: first, the so-called *Cherubikon,* which presents all liturgical action in the Church as a duplication of the liturgy of the cherubim before the throne of the Most High, and then the communion song *Tou deipnou sou tou mystikou,* in which is expressed something of the humility of orthodox piety, which again and again, unobserved, cuts the ground from under the pageantry of the ecclesiastical organization. Probably the elaboration of those processions, which, as "the great" and "the little entrance," represent the dramatic climax of the Byzantine Foremass, may also be placed in the fifth to the sixth centuries. Also in this period the festal calendar acquired an important enrichment. The introduction of one of the chief Marian feasts, that of the *evangelismos*[11]—the Annunciation—may have occurred in the age of Justinian. The Emperor Maurice decreed the celebration of the *Koimesis* (Mary's Assumption),[12] and the feast of the Triumph of the Cross[13] on 14 September may indeed go back to earlier days, perhaps as a feast accompanying the dedication of the Anastasis at Jerusalem, but only the recovery of the relic of the Cross by the Emperor Heraclius after his victory over the Persians gave it its special brilliance for all succeeding ages. The sixth century also gave to the Byzantine Church its greatest liturgical poet, Romanus the Melode, the creator of the *Kontakion.*[14] This form of liturgical hymn is, one may say, rhythmic prose, and, as rhythmic prose, nothing other than a sermon. But this literary definition cannot obscure the high poetic gifts of Romanus, in whom the stylized antithetical dogmatic statement is joined in a special manner with an almost picturesque talent of typical viewpoint. Never again in Byzantine literature were the limits between speech and the art of poetry so fundamentally laid down as here. And what the Byzantine Church later produced in liturgical poetry lived on the not always sound amplification of this early creation.

---

[9] C. S. Tsogas, Ὁ *τρισάγιος ὕμνς:Χαριστήριον* Π. Κ. *Χρήστου* (Thessalonica 1967), 275–287.

[10] V. Grumel, "L'auteur et la date de composition du tropaire Ὁ *μονογενής,*" *ÉO* 22 (1923), 398–418.

Perhaps it is somewhat daring to designate another branch of the devout life of the Byzantine Church, which developed especially in this period, as a turning from the logomachy of the theologians of the time: the cult of icons. It can be pinpointed that the ancient Christian hostility to images came to an end precisely in the sixth century and that indifference in regard to icons could no longer be maintained.[15] The people seized upon icons not as a *Biblia pauperum* but honored them with the fervor which belonged to the bearers of grace, and the icons came to meet the people by dispensing grace, doing signs and wonders, consoling, and helping wherever the trust of the faithful demanded this. If it has been said that the cult of icons was an expression of Orthodoxy as such, this is correct certainly at the earliest only from the seventh century, but from then on all the more emphatically. As escape from the dogmatic misery it was a religiously intelligible process, which of course introduced in a fatal manner the dichotomy which gradually would determine the Byzantine ecclesiastical system ever more strongly. But perhaps one may go a step farther. There is question not only of escape but probably also of a religious event which in a remarkable manner decided the dogmatic struggle in its own favor. Without using the slogan, "Monophysitism of the Byzantine icon of Christ," the notion cannot be rejected that that vacuum which the formula of Chalcedon left unresolved was again filled in the icon, in an icon which, although artistically it could represent only nature, went beyond this nature to a degree and deified it, so that if it is desired to add a postscript to the Byzantine icon of Christ, the Cyrillan formula would be more adapted to this than the Chalcedonian.

---

[11] S. Vailhé, *ÉO* 9 (1906), 138–145.

[12] A. Raes, "Aux origines de la fête de l'assomption en Orient," *OrChrP* 12 (1946), 262–274.

[13] E. Honigman, "La date de l'homélie du prêtre Pantoléon sur la fête de l'exaltation de la croix," *Bulletin Acad. Belge* V (1950), 547–559.

[14] Beck, 425–427.

[15] N. H. Baynes, "The Icons Before Iconoclasm," *HThR* 44 (1951), 93–106; E. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age Before Iconoclasm," *DOP* 8 (1954), 83–150.

The religious life of the people was reflected also in the "life" of their saints. Mention has been made elsewhere of monastic *vitae.* But it is interesting that the hagiographer Romanus[16] made noticeable in this period that accumulating of legendary and not rarely piquant traits which occasionally even evoked the mistrust of the ecclesiastical authorities but apparently satisfied the taste of the people better than some of the labored expositions of hagiographical rhetoric. Certain products of this sort, such as the *martyrium* and the miracles of Saint Conon,[17] probably formed a kind of pilgrimage guide, which was on sale at the saint's cult center. The same may have been the case with the great reports of miracles, such as those about the two physicians, Cosmas and Damian,[18] who characteristically obtained the nickname *Anargyroi,* who cured without payment, and who were especially venerated at Constantinople, or about Cyrus and John,[19] the pair of healers, who became the successors of Menuthis in Egypt. Other romances were related to contemporary events. Thus the report of the miracles on the death of Mary may probably be connected with the introduction of the feast of the Assumption toward the end of the sixth century,[20] and the appearance of miracle-working saints from Persian territory—for example, we may mention Golinduch,[21] who "remained a martyr during life"—with the effort to stir up enthusiasm for the war against the fireworshipers. Of noteworthy edification is also the life of the *economus* Theophilus of the Church of Adana, in which has been seen a precursor of the Faust saga,[22] and still more remarkable the leap which Saint George made from the pagan myth to the sphere of the Christian slayer of dragons;[23] both reports, as also the first records in the long series of stories about Saint Nicholas of Myra[24] and the Greek version of the romance of Alexius,[25] are products of the seventh century. In regard to this fictitious hagiography a "political" treatment of the saints must not be forgotten. Testimonies are probably the incipient collecting of the miracles of Demetrius, the city patron of Thessalonica,[26] whose deeds reflected the fortunes of this city; other testimonies are texts, such as the report on the martyrdom of Arethas,[27] the bishop in southernmost Arabia, or the gradual introduction of the legend of the Apostle Andrew on the soil of the imperial capital, which would lead to the according of apostolic rank to the episcopal see of this city.[28]

---

[16] H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques* (Brussels 1905).

[17] *BHG* 2077.

[18] Ibid. 373ff.

[19] Ibid. 469ff.

[20] M. Jugie, *La mort et l'assomption de la sainte vierge* (Vatican City 1944), 117–126.

[21] P. Peeters, "Sainte Golindouch, martyre perse," *AnBoll* 62 (1944), 74–125.

If canonical decrees on discipline and order among clergy and laity are at all capable of giving information on the inner life of the community, this applies to the canons of the Synod of 691–92, which, because of the meeting-place in the imperial palace at Constantinople, is called the Synod "in Trullo" and regarded itself as an ecumenical completion of the Fifth and Sixth Synods, both of which had issued no disciplinary canons.[29] Without any systematic arrangement, these canons, 102 in number, presented a comprehensive and very instructive collection of prescriptions on the inner life of the Church of the period—at the same time a reflection of the difficult situation into which the Byzantine Church had fallen through the invasions of numerous barbarian tribes, through imperial measures of resettlement, and through new heresies. It was in accord with the negative type of canons that almost only the shady sides of ecclesiastical life were mentioned. Behind them stood an inner ecclesiastical development, to which far too little thought has been given, in view of the denominational and dogmatic struggles that claimed all the interest. The life which is visible here, in part clearly, in part in a shadowy way, was of variegated profusion. Jewish and pagan elements take up much room, developments in the direction of entirely specific contracting of the total view are under way, features of pre-Christian custom and non-Christian piety make their way. We meet clerics with *virgines subintroductae,* clerics as tax collectors and pawnbrokers, as frequenters of circus games and horse races, and some who join in conspiracies against their bishops; then types of asceticism or apparent asceticism which recall the doings of the so-called Saloi, the fools in Christ, Jews as the most popular physicians of the time, carnival performances with the wild antics of law students, common baths for men and women, false martyrologies, offensive rites, and so forth. Without doubt the Synod intended to legislate for the Universal Christ, but it is also certain that it had in mind the specifically Byzantine canon law and in a series of canons took a stand *expressis verbis* against the usages of the Western Church, for example in canon 13 on clerical marriage, canon 55 against fasting on the Saturdays of Lent, and in canon 67 with its prohibition of the use of kosher meat, quite apart from the repetition of the anathema against Pope Honorius I in canon 1.

---

[22] L. Radermacher, "Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage," *SAW* 206, 4 (Vienna 1927).

[23] K. Krumbacher, *Der heilige Georg* (Munich 1911).

[24] G. Anrich, *Hagois Nikolaos,* vol. II (Leipzig–Berlin 1917).

[25] *BHG* 56c.

[26] P. Lemerle, "La composition et la chronologie des deux premiers livres des Miracula S. Demetrii," *ByZ* 46 (1953), 349–361.

[27] P. Peeters, *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine* (Brussels 1950), 88.

[28] F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958).

[29] Edition of the canons in *Mansi* XI, 921–1006. Cf. also V. Laurent, "L'oeuvre canonique du concile in Trullo (691–692), source primaire du droit de l'église orientale," *RÉB* 23 (1965), 7–41.

The Emperor Justinian II sought to compel Pope Sergius I (687–701) to sign, but his emissaries were frustrated by the Italian militia, and the Emperor himself soon had to go into exile. But in 705 he recovered the throne and now tried by peaceful means; finally in 711 Pope Constantine went personally to the East, and everything indicates that he agreed orally with the Emperor on the recognition of the canons while expunging those that were expressly directed against Rome. The tradition of the canons in the Eastern Church did not take this reconciliation into account, but in the West people were gradually content.

If the picture in these synodal decrees is not without spot and wrinkle, these shady sides were brilliantly covered over in the ecclesiastical art of the time. The age of Justinian represents in this respect a climax of secular importance. The most excellent expression is the ecclesiastical architecture, to which Justinian devoted enormous sums. Here we cannot go into the abundance of the individual achievements. But in Hagia Sophia not only was a unique result achieved technically, but at the same time the mystical unity of God's Kingdom, Church, and Empire was expressed at one time. It was not only the Church which could do this. To architecture belonged the liturgy, and indeed ecclesiastical and imperial liturgy together in one interlacing, which means a sublimation of all that was called Byzantium—a sublimation which the Empire needed all the more, the more unfermented the juridical and canonical bases of just this interlacing were. Hagia Sophia is the expression of the Byzantine illusion of an Imperial Church, whose historical becoming and growing never measured up to the dream in stone. This flight from reality is, regarded from the viewpoint of Church history and not from that of art history, in my opinion also a *movens* within the Byzantine painting of the period, which more and more went in the direction of the icon, and in fact of the icon understood as a picture which bears grace and imports graces. The revolutionary change of the times after the break-through of the Justinianean restoration policy in the sixth century—barbarians and war on all frontiers and into the heartland of the Empire—awakened a great longing for the visible and tangible Savior, and what had begun as painting technique emptied under the eyes of the believer into a sort of real presence of the thing represented, brusque echo of the idea of a "hypostatic union" in the dress of art. The theologians, in so far as there were any, resigned or tried, themselves carried away, to lag behind with likewise clumsy formulas of the development of popular piety.

CHAPTER 31

Missionary Activity of the Early Byzantine Imperial Church

A good portion of the missionary activity of Eastern Christianity from the middle of the fifth century, both toward the South and the East, benefited the gradually growing independent denominations of the Nestorians and Monophysites. This has been dealt with in another chapter. The Imperial Church itself had taken a long time, after its liberation by the first Christian Emperors, until it again remembered its missionary commission.[1] At first little incentive can be detected in regard to bringing Christianity to the barbarians dwelling beyond the imperial frontiers. Perhaps this was connected with the incipient identification of *Orbis Romanus* and Christian *Ecumene.* If there was evangelization, then it was rarely an action which was organized by the hierarchy residing in the Empire, but for the most part the effort of individuals, who as merchants, slaves, or prisoners of war were taken to a remote area and here came upon pagans; in this again their first concern was only for those pagans who, like themselves, came from the Empire and were likewise war-prisoners or slaves. Then only from this nucleus of a "foreign congregation" did the work go farther and embrace the indigenous "barbarians." A second mission field was provided by those foreign tribes which gradually infiltrated the Empire or procured admission by force. Partly they themselves pressed for baptism, because they had recognized that with it they could more easily demand acceptance into the imperial community than without it, and because they identified or confused the blessings of the culture of the Empire with those of Christianity. Thus in the Byzantine mission the Christian idea entered into a symbiosis with the imperial idea, which basically only put the concept of Eusebius of Caesarea into practice.[2]

---

[1] E. A. Thompson, "Christianity and Northern Barbarians," A. Momigliano, *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1963), 56–78.

Especially interesting from this point of view was the mission to the Bedouins in the hinterland of Syria and in Palestine. Cyril of Scythopolis tells us about it in the *vita* of the monastic father Euthymius.[3] A Bedouin sheik from the area of Persian domination migrated with his tribe to imperial territory. The *Comes Orientis* Anatolius received him and now entrusted him with the border patrol opposite the Persian Kingdom. But he had a son who was ill. Hence he went, together with his tribe and property, to Euthymius in the Palestinian Desert, and Euthymius performed on the little Arab a miraculous cure, which moved the sheik to have himself and his family baptized. After some time the recent convert returned with crowds of Bedouins to the vicinity of Euthymius's monastic colony. Euthymius assigned them places for pitching camp and grazing, instructed them, baptized them, and built them a church in their camp. But this was not enough: he persuaded the Patriarch Juvenal to give these Bedouins their own bishop of Arabian blood, and Juvenal ordained the Bedouin sheik, who since his baptism was called Peter, as bishop of his people with his seat in the *Parembolai,* that is, the Bedouin camp. The tribal prince became also the bishop, and, in accord with the life habits of the Bedouins, no episcopal city was assigned to him: his seat was his own tent. The bishopric was not an ephemeral phenomenon: it played a role in the ecclesiastical life of Palestine, and the bishops themselves soon accommodated themselves to the ways of their colleagues in the cities. Around the middle of the fifth century we know a second tent-bishopric in Phoenicia Secunda, as the conversion of the Arabs seems generally to have made no insignificant progress deep into the interior of the country. A remote and yet important point of this mission was, for example, the island of Iotabe in the Gulf of Aqaba, where c. 470 there was organized an almost independent client state of the Empire, consisting of Arabs, who also had their own bishop; but we do not know where the missionaries came from. In 498 the "kingdom" again came under Roman rule, but the bishopric continued. All together, the lists of those attending the Council of Chalcedon enumerate no less than twenty Arabian bishops.

---

[2] H. G. Beck, "Christliche Mission und politische Propaganda im byzantinischen Reich," *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto 1967), 649–694.

[3] E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939), 18ff.

It is self-evident that, under the Emperors Justin I and Justinian I and their political and ecclesiastical concept, the imperial mission acquired stronger political tones than ever before.[4] The Persian policy, for example, played no insignificant role in this, in which a great importance was attributed to the Caucasian frontier area, a boundary of both Empires. It was Persian pressure on Caucasian Lazica that induced the local King Tzat to flee to Byzantium. This meant that he had to have himself baptized. The christening gifts of Justin I brought to the refugee an imperial patrician as wife and, in addition, the insignia of the royal dignity: the neophyte only had to become a vassal of the Empire.[5] Depending on the importance which policy had in a missionary enterprise, it could happen that Justin I, as later Justinian, knew exactly how to disregard the "denomination" of the missionaries, even if it did not correspond to the Emperor's denominational policy. Among the Himyarites in South Arabia a Jewish King, Dhu Nuwas, had seized power and begun to impede the expansion of Christianity and to persecute the native Christians. A combined action of the Byzantines and of the King of Ethiopia, who was friendly to them, was intended to restore order.[6] The operation was successful, Dhu Nuwas was defeated and killed, and the freedom of Christianity was renewed. People throughout the Empire were interested in the jeopardized situation of Christianity under Dhu Nuwas, especially the Monophysites, even when the Orthodox Emperor took charge of the settlement. And the Ethiopians, who carried out the occupation of South Arabia, must likewise have been closer to the Monophysite confession than to Orthodoxy. But besides the freedom of Christianity, the Emperor was concerned with something more. The territory of South Arabia may have interested the Empire relatively little, but again and again the Persians tried to establish themselves there so they could control Byzantine commerce through the Red Sea and probably also over the so-called Frankincense Route, which the Empire could not possibly allow. Even in the *Passio* of Saint Arethas, a report on the martyrdom of one el-Harith under Dhu Nuwas, the political background is pretty clear.

The Emperor Justinian adhered to the same line in his mission policy—only thus can it rightly be called. He sent missionaries to the Heruli, who had settled south of the Danube and were living in constant conflict with the native population. The Emperor expected to "tame" them through their christianization, and, so to say, to make them "devoted to the Empire." The historian Procopius, a witness of a conservative Romanism, was of the opinion that it would hardly be worth the trouble to convert inferior barbarians of such a type. But Justinian saw farther. His missionaries were successful: even the King had himself baptized, and Justinian was his sponsor. Finally even Procopius himself had to recognize that the situation on the Danube had substantially improved.[7]

---

[4] I. Engelhardt, *Mission und Politik in Byzanz. Ein Beitrag zur Strukturanalyse byzantinischer Mission zur Zeit Justins und Justinians* (Munich 1974).

[5] See A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First* (Cambridge, Mass. 1950), 259ff.

[6] Criticism of the sources and presentation of this controverted episode in A. A. Vasiliev, op. cit., 15–17, 283ff.; I. Engelhardt, op. cit., 171ff.; J. Ryckmans, *La persécution des chrétiens himyarites au VI^e siècle* (Istanbul 1956); I. Shahid, *The Martyrs of Najrân* (Brussels 1971).

Justinian devoted the same care as his uncle to the Caucasian lands, and here again in connection with the Christian mission. He was especially interested in the Abasgi, to whom he sent priests as missionaries, and these discharged their commission so thoroughly that the Abasgi expelled their pagan prince and oriented their policy entirely according to instructions from Byzantium.[8] Grand-scale planning is revealed also in the evangelization of the Tzanes in the vicinity of Lazica. Here christianization was at the same time "colonization;" Procopius reports that Justinian had insinuated that the conditions of life of the country must be changed if people did not want to risk a relapse into paganism. Thus he had the forests cleared and routes laid out for new roads; pastures for horse breeding were established; and commerce with the neighboring tribes was fostered. The prehistory of this progress toward civilization is found, of course, not in the desire of the Tzanes for baptism but in the fact that, protected and inaccessible through their geographical position, they had resisted the political wooing of the Byzantines, but under Justinian they had been defeated by the General Tzittas.[9] With the missionaries came also Roman officers, who laid out forts and staffed them with Roman garrisons. Evangelization was intended to bind the Lazi as well as the Tzanes "ideologically" with the Empire and thereby turn them away from Persia.

The great reconquest in the West also posed new missionary tasks for the Empire. Not in Italy, for the conversion of the Arian Ostrogoths constituted no problem for Justinian, since they only remained isolated in the Emperor's sphere of control. But the conquest of Africa required a securing of the frontiers in the direction of the Sahara, and here the mission was instituted. How much success it had is difficult to estimate. In any case, Christian communities existed in this area after the occupation by Islam—in contradistinction to Egypt and Syria—only in decreasing numbers. Under Byzantine rule we hear, so far as can be seen, only once that an entire Berber tribe asked missionaries from the Emperor Justin II.

---

[7] Procopius, *Bella* VI, 14, 33–35.

[8] Ibid. VIII, 3, 21.

[9] Procopius, *De aedificiis* III, 6, 9ff.

It has already been briefly mentioned that Justinian also had planned the mission to the pagans. For Asia Minor he entrusted the task to a monk of Amida, John, who later was nicknamed John of Asia, a Monophysite by origin, who apparently knew how to accommodate himself to the requirements of the Imperial Church. He has himself told us about his work, and he did not belittle his achievement. In any event, it is interesting for the evaluation of the religious circumstances in the heartland of the Empire that in the hill country east of Smyrna and Ephesus it was possible to evangelize pagans systematically. John boasts of having converted a hundred thousand of them. For them he built about 100 churches and approximately a dozen monasteries. The money came from Justinian's till; he also donated the white baptismal robes.[10] In other respects, the qualitatively important remnant of paganism was to be sought not in remote hilly areas but in the great cities among the intellectuals. And it would probably be a euphemism to speak of a mission to the pagans there. They were simply persecuted. An intellectual confrontation with paganism, such as had been attempted as late as the first half of the fifth century by, for example, Theodoret of Cyrrhus on a broad apologetic basis, occurred in this epoch only in inadequate starts, except in the sphere of philosophical doctrines, where, for example, John Philoponus and others took up the struggle against the pagan Neoplatonism of Proclus and his followers.

It would also be misleading to speak of a mission to the Jews. As *religio licita,* their faith was under the protection of the law, although no preacher failed to follow in the tracks of the great opponent of the Jews, John Chrysostom, by condemning them as the plague of mankind. One could only speak of mission if one could call vexation a mission. It occurred to the Emperors at the beginning of the seventh century to seek to convert them forcibly and to make the obligation of conversion a law. This must scarcely have influenced larger masses of Jews. Instead, the number of polemics against the Jews increased powerfully from the beginning of the seventh century. Especially to be mentioned is Leontius of Neapolis. The writings reveal rather clearly here and there that the Christian polemicist did not have an easy time in dealing with the arguments of the Jews, for example, in regard to the cult of icons.

We know scarcely anything about efforts at conversion directed to those new hordes of barbarians, the Bulgars and Slavs, who were pouring into the Empire from the North since the sixth century. Planned and centrally directed actions cannot be proved and are hardly imaginable. For the most part, the mission first began when the political situation had become a little clearer. This is true especially also of Islam. We have no information that shortly after the invasion of Islam into the ancient Byzantine provinces noteworthy efforts had been made to gain the conquerors for the Christian faith. In the intoxication of victory this would probably have been asking dangerously much of the conquerors. The intellectual confrontation with the new faith on the former imperial soil could be undertaken on literary grounds only several generations later, a discussion of which does not belong to the period here under consideration.

---

[10] *ROC* 2 (1897), 482ff.

CHAPTER 32

The Assault of Islam

In less than one generation Islam inundated great parts of Eastern Christendom and ended many quarrels simply by cutting them off from the capital of the Roman Empire. This storm did not arise by accident, and the permanence of its success lies to a considerable degree in the fact that large portions of the Christianity conquered by it were Arabic or already strongly infiltrated by Arabs. Along the commercial route which led from Damascus to southern Arabia, the so-called Frankincense Route, the city-system had considerably developed in the sixth century, due to the active traffic in goods in contrast to other provinces of the Empire.[1] These cities played their role as stopping places and commodity depots for the caravans from Mecca, which at that time became the center of Arabian commerce. Outside the walls of the cities arose caravanseries with Arab personnel. These centers of Arabic life more and more attracted seminomads from the nearby desert; and finally whole tribes, if they were not already urbanized, were still drawn into the city's sphere of influence. This development became all the stronger, the more frequently the other commercial routes of the Byzantine Empire to the East were closed by the wars with Persia.

But also the great desert around the Dead Sea beyond the Jordan and south from Damascus to the Persian Gulf had long ago become the exercise-ground of Arabian tribes. They could only partly be kept under control by the great powers, Byzantium and Persia. To the extent that this succeeded, they served their respective overlord as vanguard against the other great power. Thus in the East, at the mouth of the Euphrates, the Arabs under the leadership of their sheiks of the Lakhmid family[2] were again and again won by the Persians for service against the Byzantines. Their chief place was al-Hira, and from Persia they were partly gained for Nestorianism, even if the Lakhmids themselves accepted the Christian religion later than many of their followers. The "Byzantine" Arabs in the Syrian Desert had their chief place at Rusafa, east of Homs. Their leaders were the sheiks of the Ghassanid house,[3] who had early been won for Monophysitism. Much depended for both Empires on their careful handling of these desert tribes. The great Persian wars in the sixth century made great demands on this skill. It is probably not incorrect to assume that the denominational character of the Christianity of both tribal groups, on the one hand Monophysitism, on the other Nestorianism, was not any too deep. Monophysitism bound the Ghassanids to a denomination in which a self-consciousness in regard to the imperial central government could maintain itself more strongly than in Orthodoxy, and the Nestorianism of the Lakhmids was not the result of dogmatic considerations but of the mission of the Church of that country in whose direction the political ambitions of these Arabs moved. In addition, both denominations were united in the struggle against the ancient Arabian paganism, and the balance seemed to have been discovered especially happily in the monastic foundations in the desert.[4] These monasteries became, presumably independently of their confessional denomination, popular halting places for all Arabs. The harsh life in the desert must not have differed substantially from the asceticism of the Christian monks. Simple cult forms, frequent genuflection, fasting, religious invocations arranged in litany form, and so forth, easily impressed the Arabs, and the famed formula *Heis theos,* which had found wide diffusion in the Syrian areas as a Christian religious invocation,[5] placed on the believer no excessive demands. Many Arabs, drawn either by this religiosity or weary of their severe life as Bedouins, became monks in these monasteries, where people were prepared to accommodate their individuality. The best example without doubt was the treatment which very early in the fifth and sixth centuries Arabs who were devoted to the solitary life in the caves and *lauras* of Palestine found with the great monastic fathers, Euthymius and Sabas. Here, probably for the first time, the Arabs received a bishop of their blood, who was furnished no stable seat but, as Bishop of the Camps, was responsible for the evangelization of other tribes.[6] And here also must be sought the beginnings of the further progress of a thus modified Christianity toward the South to the oases of North Arabia via the caravan routes to Mecca and Medina.

---

[1] R. Paret, "Les villes de Syrie du sud et les routes commerciales d'Arabie à la fin du VI^{e} siècle," *Akten des XI. Intern. Byzantinistenkongresses* (Munich 1960), 438–444; R. Dussaud, *Les Arabes en Syrie avant l'Islam* (Paris 1907).

---

[2] G. Rothstein, *Die Dynastie der Lahmiden in al-Hira* (Berlin 1889); R. Devreesse, "Arabes-Perses et Arabes-Romains, Lakhmides et Ghassanides," *Vivre et Penser,* ser. 2 (1942), 263–307.

[3] H. Charles, *Le christianisme des Arabes nomades sur le limes et dans le désert syromésopotamien aux alentours de l'hégire* (Paris 1936); id., "Christianisme et Islam des nomades syro-arabes aux alentours de l'hégire," *En Terre d'Islam* 21 (1946), 71–90; id., "Les nomades de Syro-Mésopotamie et leur islamisation," ibid. 22 (1947), 172–189.

[4] See especially F. Nau, *Les Arabes chrétiens de Mésopotamie et de Syrie du VII^e au VIII^e siècle* (Paris 1933).

[5] Cf. E. Peterson, Εἷς θεός (Göttingen 1926).

Thus for Muhammad at the time when he had his religious experiences and wrote them down, Christianity was just as well known as was Judaism, regardless of whether or not he himself had come to Syria as a commercial traveler. Christian elements have frequently been identified in the Koran, and an exact analysis of these elements probably indicates specifically Monophysite features, by which the Christiantity which was familiar to Muhammad was affected.[7] That Muhammad at first saw his confederates in Judaism and Christianity is well known. This was not only naïveté but based on the common possession of a basic monotheistic attitude and on the strong doctrine of unity of the Monophysites, even if there cannot be denied what in my view is much too little emphasized; that the position which the Koran assigns to Jesus, if it should be traced to Christian influencss, looks to Nestorianism rather than to Monophysitism. Of course, in the long run both the Jews as well as the Christians refused adherence to the Prophet. They thereby fell under the verdict of persecution, but without the aim of compulsory conversion. As "Peoples of the Book," that is, possessors of revealed scriptures, they could, to the extent that they submitted and paid tribute, count on toleration and free exercise of their religion.

Nevertheless, the question remains whether this policy of toleration is sufficient to explain the enormous successes of Islam in the Christian area. One must certainly reckon with the unhappy treatment of the Christian Arabs by the Persians and the Byzantine Emperors.[8] In the twenty-years' war between Persia and Byzantium in the second half of the sixth century the attitude of the Arabs on the frontier obtained especially great importance. The Byzantine commander and later Emperor Maurice (582–602), who was especially hostile to Monophysitism, suspected the Ghassanid client-king al-Mundir of treason, finally went so far as to entice him into a trap, arranged with the Emperor his deportation to Sicily, and cut off from the Ghassanid Arabs the *annona,* the provision of the means of livelihood, to which they had a claim as *foederati* of the Empire. Naturally, revolt broke out. The Arabs fell on the Byzantine garrisons and plundered their supply camps, at first not in order thereby to prove their defection from Byzantium, but simply to assure their basic material existence. When Maurice had become Emperor, they exerted themselves for a new link with the Empire, but Maurice made the demand, absurd in the political situation, that they should renounce Monophysitism. Noman, a son of al-Mundir, is said to have retorted: "All Arabian tribes are Jacobites, and if they learn that I have accepted your communion they will kill me." The negotiations came to nothing; Noman followed his father into exile, although previously a safe-conduct had been promised him. Maurice divided up the Arabian Kingdom among a dozen sheiks, who had enough to do to deal with their inner conflicts and with the dream and the restoration of their Kingdom so that they again sided powerfully with Maurice's policy directed against Persia.

---

[6] See supra, p. 505.

[7] H. Grégoire, "Mahomet et le monophysisme," *Mélanges Ch. Diehl* I (Paris 1930), 107–119; J. Henninger, "L'influence du christianisme oriental sur l'Islam naissant," *L'oriente cristiano nella storia della civiltà* (Rome 1964), 379–411; Tor Andrae, *Les originies de l'Islam et le christianisme* (Paris 1955).

[8] See in detail P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam* I (Paris 1951).

Meanwhile, matters were no better for the Lakhmid Arabs. King Chosroes II was afraid that these Arabs would become too powerful and so he too enticed their sheik, also named Noman, into a trap and had him murdered. The results were the same as in the sphere of interest of the Byzantines: revolts and raids. The Persian governor, who should have dealt with them, could maintain himself in only one fortress, and domination over the country at large was lost. Thereby the loyalty of the Arabs toward their former overlords was seriously harmed; a dangerous vacuum appeared, and Islam was prepared to fill it.

It is unlikely that Muhammad himself had planned the great predatory raids of Islam. But his looting expeditions reached ever wider circles, and in the struggle with the oases in the North he came for the first time into hostile contact with united Christian Arab tribes. Shortly before his death he risked the first attack on imperial territory and at the same time sought contact with the Ghassanids, but without success. Finally there occurred a defeat of Islam near Mu'ta east of the Dead Sea. An expedition for revenge did not take place, since the Prophet died in 632 before carrying out his plans. The relations between the Arabs and the new Emperor Heraclius (610–641) had meanwhile improved again, and this was probably the reason for the first successes of the Empire against the Prophet's forces. However, unfortunately the Empire now again failed to supply the confederated Arabs with the means of livelihood. The reasons are difficult to discover, but it is not unlikely that the Patriarch of Antioch, who hitherto had turned over the tax payment of his Church in regard to the Empire entirely or partly as *annona* to the Arabs, stopped these deliveries, because the Emperor had taken enormous sums from the Church for the preceding Persian war, with the payment of interest for which he was now in arrears. In any case, in this critical situation the Empire could hardly count any longer on the loyalty of the Arabs. And so, after the Prophet's death, there began a mighty victorious advance. That these wars were begun is probably connected also with the fact that after Muhammad's departure the religious development in Islam was not yet concluded and hence his followers had to be kept at this task by every means. All too many of the Prophet's promises of booty were still unfulfilled, and the claims to leadership among his successors were still unclear. A diversion was necessary, and the weak flank of both the great Empires showed the direction. In the battle on the Yarmuk, a tributary of the Jordan, on 20 August 636, the fate of Byzantine Syria was decided, and it was not least of all the Ghassanids who turned the scales in favor of Islam. Jerusalem fell in 638, Mesopotamia was conquered in 639–640, from 640 the Arabs were in Armenia; Alexandria, the gate to Egypt, fell in 640, in 643 the Pentapolis, and as early as 647 began the raids into Cappadocia.

What was the situation of Christianity under the new rule? It was by no means without legal bases.[9] The conquerors proceeded, apart from the inevitable cases of harshness under such circumstances, in accord with treaties of capitulation, and the besieged Christian cities seem to have known this well enough. The precedent for the Arabs was apparently the treaty with the Christians of South Arabia, which assured them the free exercise of religion and a certain self-government, while on the other hand it required the payment of tribute, provisions for the support of the troops, and, as needed, the supplying of auxiliary contingents. The basic lines of this treaty were employed also in the Syrian and Mesopotamian cities. The situation of the Christians was also eased by the circumstance that at first the conquest scarcely affected the administrative system. True, Muslim governors were installed, but the administration itself remained, after as before, in the hands of native powers, hence mostly of Christians. The same taxes had to be paid, and ecclesiastical life was not substantially upset. Of course, it not rarely happened that the chief church of a city was transformed into a mosque, but in principle churches and monasteries enjoyed a relative freedom. In individual cases, naturally, much depended on the attitude of the governors. Occasionally, churches were destroyed, and the building of new ones forbidden; occasionally there were compulsory conversions or even martyrdoms, and the election of bishops and patriarchs could be impeded and postponed. But by and large these were exceptional phenomena. Only under the Caliph Abd-al Malik (685–705) did the situation deteriorate. Christians were dismissed from the administration, the poll tax was introduced for them, a distinctive dress was prescribed, and so forth.

---

[9] A. S. Tritton, *Nasara. Handwörterbuch des Islam* (Leiden 1941), 577–580; id., *The Caliphs and their non-Muslim Subjects* (1930).

Seen in its totality, of course, the Arab conquest meant an enormous loss of territory for the Imperial Church. Provinces in which Christianity had spent its earliest youth, great patriarchal sees of the Early Church, intellectually vigorous centers, such as Edessa, Antioch, and Alexandria, pilgrimage sites such as Jerusalem were forever lost to the Imperial Church. The fiction of the identification of Empire and Christian *Ecumene* was destroyed, just as the dream of one Emperor and one Church. This high price, however, brought to the Imperial Church a greater unity, for in so far as the denominations could then be kept apart geographically, the conquered territory to a great extent coincided with the country of the Monophysites and Nestorians, whereas the remaining imperial territory could in the main be claimed as orthodox. On the other hand, the Islamic law in the occupied territories brought in principle an equalization of the denominations and hence ended the ecclesiastical strife. The Melkites were no longer in a position to persecute the Monophysites. Conversely, there existed the possibility, because it could not be entirely disregarded, that precisely the "imperial" Christians still kept an eye on Byzantium, even politically, probably because of the fact that Monophysite resistance at the time of the conquest was apparently less than was that of the Orthodox, even if it might be difficult to cite much evidence for this thesis.

In the course of time the Islamic rulers, each in accord with the situation, employed the Christians of their lands as agents in their political game with Byzantium and not seldom recognized the Byzantine Emperor as the born protector of these Christians. The Byzantine Church profited from this, for since the Melkite patriarchs of Syria and Egypt disposed of only slight means of power, the patriarchs of Constantinople in the retinue of their Emperors would likewise appear as protectors of these patriarchates and from this position unhesitatingly deduce papal claims.

PART FIVE

The Latin Church in the Transition to the Early Middle Ages

SECTION ONE

The Missionary Work of the Latin Church

CHAPTER 33

The Origins of Christianity in Ireland and Scotland

Around the middle of the fifth century a new note was heard in the ancient praise of the City of Rome. "Ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia latius praesideres religione divina quam dominatione terrena," said Leo the Great (440–461) in his sermon for the feast of the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul. When the Emperors transferred their residence to Milan and Ravenna, Rome became the City of the Apostles. When the Empire reeled on its foundations, the Church carried the gospel outside the Graeco-Roman *Ecumene* to the barbarians. A new Western *Ecumene* arose on the foundation of the Christian faith and of Latin culture. According to the great Pope, this was the historical and theological mission of the Empire:

> *ut autem inenarrabilis gratiae [incarnationis] per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia praeparavit; cuius ad eos limites incrementa perducta sunt, quibus cunctarim undique gentium vicina et contigua esset universitas. Dispositio namque divinitus operi maxime congruebat, ut multa regna confoederarentur imperio, ut cito pervios haberet populos praedicatio generalis, quos unius teneret regimen civitatis.*[1]

Since the Church of the East had the advantage in time over that of the West, it is not surprising that it also radiated first into the barbarian world. In other respects, however, the Celtic mission of the West offers a genuine analogy to the Gothic mission of the East. As in the East it was Cappadocian, so in the Hesperides it was British war-prisoners who were the first messengers of the gospel, which took root in Ireland in the fifth century. The Aquitanian, Prosper Tiro, a friend of Leo the Great, noted in his *Chronicle* for the year 431: *Ad Scottos in Christum credentes ordinatus a papa Caelestino Palladius primus episcopus mittitur.* "Scots" was the ancient name of the Irish. The notice assumes the existence of Iro-Scottish groups of Christians, who were, however, without a bishop.

---

[1] "That you, as a holy and chosen people, as a priestly and royal city, preside by God's religion over a wider circle than through earthly rule. —But that the operation of this ineffable grace could spread over the whole world, the Roman Empire was prepared in the divine foresight, and the Empire grew to frontiers which made it everywhere the closest neighbour of all peoples. For this plan was mostly adapted by the divine decree to the work of redemption: that through the uniting of many lands with one Imperium the universal proclamation had access to the peoples which stood under the direction of one city": *Sermo* 82 (80), *PL* 54, 423.

The first Bishop of the Irish, Palladius, appears as early as 429 as a deacon: *ad insinuationem Palladii diaconi papa Caelestinus Germanum Autisidorensem episcopum vice sua mittit et deturbatis haereticis Britannos ad catholicam fidem dirigit.*[2] There may have been a connection between the mission of the Bishop Germanus of Auxerre to Britain and that of Palladius to Ireland. The mission of Germanus was intended for the fight against Pelagianism, which had numerous followers in Britain and from there may also have influenced the small groups of Irish Christians. Hence care for the orthodoxy of the Irish Christians may have been included in Palladius's commission.

Nevertheless, not Palladius but Patrick has gone down in history as Apostle of the Emerald Isle. Magonus Sucatus Patricius—this must have been Saint Patrick's full name—described his fate as a youth in the *Confessio,* composed by him probably toward the end of his life. He came from a Britanno-Roman curial family, which possessed a "villula" in the *vicus Bannavemtabernae,* a place not yet identified with certainty.[3] Although his father, Calpornius, had been a *decurio* and deacon, and his grandfather, Potitus, a priest, the religious atmosphere in the paternal home was not of the best. Patrick was sixteen years old when Iro-Scots on a plundering raid kidnapped him and took him as a slave to Ireland, probably to Tirawley, Connaught. Here he found the way to God. After six years he succeeded in escaping and returning to his parents. A vision admonished him to proclaim to the Irish the Good Tidings. And so he finally went back to Ireland as a missionary bishop.

Unfortunately, the *Confessio* contains no chronologically fixed points. Later Irish annals, whose origin and trustworthiness have recently been strongly controverted, unanimously record the arrival of the apostle in the year 432 but his death in 461 or 491–492. The problem is further complicated by the fact that in these sources sometimes two Patricks with different dates of death are listed. It will probably have to be held that there was only one Patrick, who was apparently born c. 390, came to Ireland as bishop c. 432 or soon after, and died c. 460.[4]

---

[2] Palladius was sent in 431 by Pope Celestine after his ordination as first Bishop to the Scots (=Irish) believing in Christ. —At the suggestion of the deacon Palladius, Pope Celestine sent Bishop Germanus of Auxerre in his place and led the Britons back to Catholicism after the expulsion of the heretics (429): *MGAuc. ant.* IX, 472ff.

[3] Summary of the proposed identifications in R. P. C. Hanson, *St. Patrick,* 113–116. Hanson thinks of one place in Somerset, Dorset, or Devon.

The most obscure part of Saint Patrick's life is the period between his escape from his Irish captivity and his return to Ireland as bishop. According to the likewise controversial *Dicta Patricii,* Patrick journeyed *per Gallias ad Italiam,* and he also visited the islands in the Tyrrhenian Sea. Patrick's biographers from the late seventh and the eighth centuries connect the saint with Bishop Germanus of Auxerre and hence also with Palladius, who after a brief and unsuccessful activity had died on his homeward journey or had been martyred by the Irish. It is also said, explicitly or implicitly, that Patrick also proceeded from the school of Germanus and entered upon the succession to Palladius. On the other hand, Hanson has recently defended the opinion that Patrick remained in Britain during the entire time, became a monk there, and was sent by the British Church as missionary bishop to the Irish. Patrick's missionary work can, in fact, also be understood from British postulates, since it has a parallel in the activity of the British Bishop Ninian, who in the early fifth century founded the episcopal church of Candida Casa (Whithorn, Galloway) beyond the frontiers of Roman Britain and worked among the southern Picts.[5] Still, it will not do to reject wholesale the sources of the seventh and eighth centuries on the history of the Apostle of the Irish without producing a convincing explanation for the origin of their statements.[6] *Rebus sic stantibus,* it must be maintained that Patrick toured Gaul and Italy before his elevation to the episcopate, and at this time became acquainted with the Mediterranean Provençal monasticism. His being sent by Germanus of Auxerre may be subject to stronger doubts.

The remembrance of the perhaps only brief activity of Palladius soon faded in Ireland. A note on three churches founded by him leads to the conclusion that Palladius was active chiefly in South Ireland and had perhaps established his chief seat at Cellfine (County Wicklow, Leinster).[7] Patrick, on the contrary, seems to have worked chiefly in North Ireland from Armagh. The Bishops Auxilius, Secundinus, and Iserninus, mentioned in early Irish tradition, may have come to Ireland as companions of Palladius.[8] But they must also have entered into contact with Saint Patrick;[9] there seem to have been ritual connections between Cellfine and Armagh.[10]

---

[4] Thus R. P. C. Hanson, ibid., 188.

[5] Ibid., 56–63 (detailed discussion of the pertinent literature) and pp.146ff.

[6] The view that the connection between Patrick and Germanus was based on oral tradition in the "form of folk-lore stories connecting Patrick with some great person who had left an impression on the popular mind—Amator or Germanus or Pope Celestine or Loeghaire" (Hanson, op. cit., 94), is not a satisfying explanation. One could rather consider a fusion of the Palladius tradition with that of Patrick, as seems to exist in the allegations on the two Patricks. But the statements in regard to Patrick's journeys in Gaul, Italy, and on the Tyrrhenian Sea would not thereby be explained. These statements are well suited to the fifth century but no longer to the seventh, since in the seventh century the very fame of Lérins had faded. In other respects, a sharp line of demarcation cannot be drawn between the British and the Gallic Church. Even the activity of Ninian had Gallo-Roman presuppositions, namely the work of Martin of Tours and of the Metropolitan Victricius of Rouen, as Hanson himself has stated.

The oldest Christian groups in Ireland seem likewise, just as the first Christians among the Goths, to have belonged to the lower class.[11] Patrick addressed all classes of the people, but naturally he also sought to win the toleration or the support of the dominant groups, whom he gained through gifts. The Irish mission, again like the Gothic mission, must have made use of the political and social structure of the people to be converted, and this differed considerably from that of the Empire. In Ireland there was a multiplicity of small tribal kingdoms (Tuathas), which were grouped into five areas—Connaught, Ulster, Meath, Leinster, Munster. In the fifth century there was not yet a central High King.[12] The Tuathas constituted the basis for the diocesan organization, which was brought from the continent to the Emerald Isle. Armagh lay in the vicinity of Emain Maechae, the royal seat of the Ulaid in Ulster, with whom Patrick probably entered into intimate relations. The Irish bishoprics of the fifth and early sixth centuries did not differ in other respects essentially from those of the mainland. Not until the sixth century did the monastic element become ever more prominent in the ecclesiastical centers, while at the same time the aristocratic notion of kinship influenced the ecclesiastical organization.

---

[7] L. Bieler, *Conversione,* 565.

[8] Hanson, op. cit., 196.

[9] Hanson's view that after the death of Palladius Patrick was active in Ireland as the sole missionary bishop rests on a problematic *argumentum e silentio* from the *Confessio.* On the other hand, the canons speak of the names of Patrick, Auxilius, and Iserninus, who are probably to be dated in the sixth century (Hughes, op. cit., 49).

[10] The Church of Armagh possessed in the eighth century relics of the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, as well as of the chief martyrs, Stephen and Lawrence. These relics bear a Roman character. Bieler would like to identify them with the relics which Palladius had received from Pope Celestine, and assumes their translation from Cellfine to Armagh (L. Bieler, *Conversione,* 565, 570ff.). Thereby an indication would be given that Patrick in due form entered upon the succession of Palladius. A powerful testimony for the Roman mandate for the Irish mission is also the letter of Abbot Columban to Pope Boniface IV of 612–15 (*Ep. Columbani,* no. 5, *MGEp* III, 170ff.). If this commission was offered only to Palladius, then the memory of Palladius must have been more vivid in the Irish Church at the beginning of the seventh century than in later times.

[11] L. Bieler, op. cit., 562.

[12] Hanson, op. cit., 225ff. (Appendix II).

The indicated transformation of the Church organization was noticeable also among the Celts of Britain, where it stood in close connection with the de-Romanization of the Britons. The de-Romanization of Britain was not based on a revolutionary repudiation of Rome. It was the consequence of the loss of the, for the most part, Romanized areas to the invading Angles and Saxons and of the isolation of Britain from the continent, caused by the wandering of the peoples. The Roman structures continued to operate for a while after the actual abandonment of the island by the imperial central government c. 408–410—the sub-Roman period. The decisive turning point came c. 457.[13] The great cities of London and York, attested as episcopal sees as early as 314, fell into the hands of the invading Germans, and the foundations of Roman Britain tottered. Latin, which hitherto had been the colloquial tongue of the urban population, was confined to the ecclesiastical sphere. The *civitates* were transformed into tribal kingdoms, which did not differ essentially from those of the Irish and the Picts. In this crisis the British population clung the more strongly to the Christian religion, which for Patrick had already become the sign of *Romanitas*[14] and was now assimilated with the incipient Celtic culture. The fusion was completed in the symbol of monasticism, which was then in the process of establishing itself in Western Christianity, but appealed in a special way to the self-willed Celts. The details of this process elude our view. In the eighth century Illtud, Abbot of the monastic island of Calday (Ynys Pyr) on the south coast of Wales, was regarded as *Magister Britannorum.* He was the teacher of the next generation—the second third of the sixth century—of which David of Menevia–St. David's (Wales), Samson of Dol (Brittany), and Gildas must be mentioned. Here was clearly apparent the development in which the monasteries became the chief center of ecclesiastical life. St. David's, like other foundations of its kind, was at the same time both monastery and cathedral under the direction of an abbot-bishop.

The monastic transformation of the Irish Church followed, according to a tradition now questioned, under the influence of the British monastic culture, even under the direct influence of men like David and

---

[13] An essential circumstance for this dating results from the ancient Celtic computing of the date of Easter, which corresponded to the older Easter cycle of the West that was modified in 342. As Hanson (op. cit., 67ff.) has shown, the instructions of Leo the Great of 454, based on this cycle, were familiar to the Celts, but not the Cycle of Victorius, accepted by Rome in 457.

[14] R. H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons* I (3rd ed. 1952), 65; Hanson, op. cit., 185ff.

Gildas. In any case, it was the work of the great abbots of the sixth century, the saints of the second and third stages (after the first stage of the missionaries), among whom must here be mentioned Finnian, Comgall, Brendan, and Columcille (Columba the Older). The series of great monasteries was begun c. 540 by Clonard in Meath, a foundation of the Abbot-Bishop Finnian, and other abbeys, such as Bangor (Ulster), Clonmacnoise (Connaught), Clonfert, Lismore (Munster), Moville, and Kildare (Leinster), followed. The Irish princes and kings supported these institutions, in which the abbatial dignity was usually reserved to the kin of the founder. The abbeys became centers of their own pastoral spheres (*parochiae),* which were grouped around the motherhouse and its daughter-foundations, but thereby broke up the territorial framework and grew beyond the older dioceses based on the small kingdoms.

Several old bishoprics, including Armagh, "reorganized themselves on a monastic basis" (Bieter), that is, under the direction of abbot-bishops; others were absorbed by the monasteries and monastic precincts. There were many abbeys, including those of the older Columba, whose abbots did not themselves receive episcopal ordination but had it conferred on one of their monks. The director of the ecclesiastical district in this case was not the bishop but the abbot. In these monastic *parochiae* jurisdiction and power of orders were separated: this contradicted the customary organization and from the viewpoint of the continent was an anomaly. Other anomalies are explained partly by the preservation of older customs—the method by which the Celts determined the date of Easter, which differed from the usage on the continent[13]—and partly probably also by the acceptance of national customs—such as the Irish tonsure, extending from ear to ear.

The rules of the Irish monastic fathers were based on the tradition of monasticism up to John Cassian. Ascetical-moral instruction occupied much space in them. The penitential system was based in other respects on the practice of oriental and Provençal monasticism. In the area of worship the Irish showed a special preference for litanies and apotropaic prayers (*loricae*). The cult of all the saints had one of its roots in Ireland.[15]

Instruction in the Irish monasteries served first of all the *lectio divina*: the reading of the pagan classics seems to have been not much pursued until the end of the eighth century. On the other hand, the Irish of the seventh and eighth centuries were masters in the fields of exegesis, grammar, and the *computus.*[16] Despite the inner monastic orientation to the religious and ascetical life, the Irish monasteries were not only religious but also intellectual, professional, and economic centers. Their schools were open to children and youths from the laity, who, if their parents expressed no other desire, took part in the monastic life.[17] From this often resulted lasting connections between monasteries and laity, which again were to the advantage of the monks' pastoral tasks. Thus the Irish stamped the spiritual life of the laity through the introduction of auricular confession and a graduated penitential system, which were adopted from monastic practice for the general care of souls.[18] Finally, not to be forgotten are the monks' charitable duties. To the circle of people that gathered around a monastery belonged also a not small number of the needy, who had to be cared for. All in all, it can be said that the great Irish monasteries were comparable to the little cities of the Early Middle Ages. Excavations have shown that they were fortified by stone walls.

---

[15] Bieler, op. cit., 577.

[16] B. Bischoff, *Monachesimo irlandese,* passim.

If, up to the middle of the sixth century, the Irish had learned from the Britons, they outstripped their teachers in the second half of the century. The most important personalities among the Old Irish abbots were the older and the younger Columba. Columcille (Dove of the Church) or Columba the Older (521–597) came of the royal house of the O'Neill of Connaught and became the Apostle of the Picts in modern Scotland (Caledonia). He entered Clonard as a monk and then founded the monastery of Derry in Ulster. After the battle of Culdranna (c. 561), which Columba had contributed to because of a quarrel over a biblical manuscript, he is said to have vowed to win again for Christ as many men as had fallen in the battle. Thus he devoted himself to the mission to the Picts, which had been started c. 400 by the Briton Ninian but had not advanced beyond the land of the southern Picts. In Caledonia toward the end of the fifth century Iro-Scottish princes had founded the little Kingdom of Dalriada or Argyle (Eastern Gael). A Pictish prince not far from Dalriada gave Columba the island of Iona in 563, on which the Irish Abbot founded a great monastery. From Iona the Picts and "Scots" of Caledonia were gained for the Church. At Columba's death in 597 the work had been completed. Iona remained the ecclesiastical metropolis of the newly won territory, although its abbots did not receive episcopal ordination.

The younger Columba, or Columban (530/540–615), was not related to his older namesake. He came from Leinster, became a monk of St. Comgall's Abbey of Bangor (Ulster), and in 592 with twelve companions set out for Gaul. He inaugurated the series of Iro-Scottish *peregrini* on the continent, and through his foundations of Luxeuil and Bobbio he belongs as much to Frankish and Lombard as to Irish history.

---

[17] A. Lorcin, *Vie scolaire,* passim.

[18] B. Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbusse im frühen Mittelalter* (Breslau 1930).

CHAPTER 34

The Conversion of the Franks and Burgundians. Origin and Organization of the Merovingian National Church

The conversion of the Irish and the Picts was without a parallel on the continent in the fifth and sixth centuries: the mission to the Germans did not at this time go beyond the frontiers of the Empire but concerned only the peoples who had invaded the Empire. Thus it appeared as an especially important and partial occurrence in the general process of the German-Roman assimilation on the soil of the Roman Empire. The leading classes—first the Germans bearing imperial titles of dignity, then the kings and their magnates—took the lead in this. The old pagan faith displayed little power of resistance and asserted itself only in residual elements. But we observe that Gothic prestige at times competed with Roman in the barbarian world. As noted earlier, the Goths succeeded in bringing the Burgundians, who had already gone over to Catholicism, and the Spanish Sueves to their own profession of Arianism around the middle of the fifth century. This statement underlines the historical change which Clovis produced in the history of the West.

The country of the encounter between the pagan Germans and Catholic Christianity was Gaul, and the representative of the German mission in the fifth and sixth centuries was especially the Gallic episcopate, in whom the spirit of the great bishops, Martin of Tours, Germanus of Auxerre, and Lupus of Troyes, was not extinguished. As early as 428–29 Rhenish Burgundians requested baptism from a bishop of Gaul. Hardly twenty years later Severus of Trier is said to have preached the gospel to unnamed peoples of Germania Prima. From the beginning of his reign, Clovis was in contact with Remigius of Reims, whose name remains forever bound to his through his baptism.

Contemporary sources threw little light on the origin of the conversion of the Merovingian Kingdom and of Clovis.[1] Gregory of Tours, the historian of the Franks, belonged to the generation of Clovis's grandsons. Nevertheless, his account of the age of Clovis must be correct in its basic features. Northern Gaul had since the death of Aëtius in 454 gone its own way to a great degree, and the Frankish-North Gallic symbiosis had been prepared long before Clovis. On the other hand, the Franks had little contact with the Gothic Arian world of the Mediterranean and Danube Germans. Not until the consolidation of Clovis's Kingdom between the Meuse and the Loire did Goths appear at the court of Soissons: Theodoric the Great sought to incorporate the Franks into his political system and in 494 married Clovis's sister, Audofleda.

---

[1] Basic is W. v. den Steinen, "Chlodwigs Übergang zum Christentum," *MIÖG* Erg-Bd 12 (1932–33), 417–501. I cannot accept the new chronology of the reign of Clovis, defended by A. van de Vijger [VIJGER] in several articles (*Revue Belge de phil. et d'hist.* 15 [1936], 859–914, 17 [1938], 63–69, 793–813; *MA* 53 [1947], 177–196. Tessier also follows v. d. Steinen essentially, which of course means that in the question of the conversion of Clovis one cannot avoid a more or less high degree of probability. Misleading is Rolf Weiss, "Chlodwigs Taufe: Reims 508," *Geist und Werk der Zeiten. Arbeiten aus dem Hist. Seminar der Univ. Zurich,* no. 29 (1971). Finally, Lippold and Schäferdiek, op. cit.; cf. also K. Schäferdiek, "Ein neues Bild der Geschichte Chlodwigs?" *ZKG* 84 (1973), 270–277.

Clovis now stood at the crossroads. It was very difficult for him to separate politics and religion. The connection with Theodoric meant for him acceptance into the circle of the great German Kings at the price of the recognition of the status quo, that is, of the leading position of the two Gothic peoples. A political option for Theodoric's system suggested the religious decision for Arianism, for which Theodoric was recruiting, not entirely without success. Clovis's sister, Lantechild, went over to the "Gothic religion," and his oldest son received at that time the name Theodoric, perhaps after the Ostrogothic King. However, the Frankish King did not commit himself: he married a Catholic princess of the Burgundian royal house and himself remained a pagan. But soon after his political decision was taken against the Goths: in 496 Clovis began war against the Visigothic King Alaric II.

At the same time a previous decision had thereby been made in favor of Catholicism. At the wish of Queen Clotilda, their first two children, Ingomer and Chlodomer, were baptized Catholics. Still, the die had not yet been cast. The account of Gregory of Tours makes known that religious *tremendum* was by no means unknown to Clovis. The death of Clotilda's first son immediately after baptism made the King doubtful. *Si in nomine deorum meorum puer fuisset decatus, vixisset utique.*[2] An illness of Chlodomer after his baptism aroused strong doubts in regard to the Christian God: *Non potest aliud, nisi et de hoc sicut et de fratre eius contingat, ut baptizatus in nomine Christi vestri protinus moriatur.*[3] Chlodomer recovered. Thereby the clarity of the sign against Christ was put in question, but a positive sign for Christ was still not at hand.

Clovis obtained the sign in the battle with the Alemanni. Even during the war with the Visigoths, there also occurred in 497, under circumstances unknown in their details, a war between Franks and Alemanni. The battle went against the Franks. Then Clovis appealed to the God of the Christians: *Jesu Christe, quem Chrotchildis praedicat esse filium Dei vivi, . . . tuae opis gloriam devotus efflagito, ut, si mihi victuriam super hos hostes indulseris . . . credam tibi et in nomine tuo baptizer.*[4] Christ granted victory to the Franks.

---

[2] "If the boy had been dedicated in the name of my gods, he would still be alive" (Gregory, *Hist. Fr.* II, 29).

[3] "It cannot be otherwise than it happened to him as to his brother: that, baptized in the name of your Christ, he will die" (ibid.)

Despite the Christian scriptural mode of composition of Gregory's account, there is present here a German ritual exercise, as is attested similarly among the Lombards also, who in a battle against the Vandals passed to the worship of the Asen by appealing to Wodan.[5] The Frankish victory over the Alemanni was regarded as a sign from God. The extant letter of the Metropolitan Avitus of Vienne to Clovis clearly alludes to this miracle: *Numquid fidem perfecto praedicabimus, quam ante perfectionem sine praedicatore vidistis?*[6] In the like manner, Eusebius had earlier interpreted the vision of Constantine and the victory at the Milvian Bridge as a miraculous revelation of Christ to the Emperor and connected it with Paul's call at Damascus *ouk ex anthropon, oude di' anthropon.*[7]

The further course of events has been convincingly reconstructed by Steinen out of the sources and baptismal customs of the day: After the consensus of the Franks had been obtained, in 498 Clovis promised at Tours to be baptized and before the baptism sent a "declaration of competence" to the Gallic episcopate, to which Avitus replied in the letter just quoted. Remigius officiated at the baptism at Christmas of 498 or 499 in Reims. The solemnity of the historical moment has continued until today in the famous statement of his address that was apparently correctly transmitted: *Mitis depone colla, Sigamber; adora quod incendisti, incende quod adorasti.*[8]

The passage of the Franks to Catholicism immediately appears in retrospect to the observer as a necessary consequence of the political decision against the Goths. The historical reality is thereby excessively simplified. Gregory's report shows clearly that the acceptance of the Catholic religion was first deferred by negative signs and was then decided only by a positive sign. Hence the conversion of Clovis was also a religious decision—not, it is true, from a deeper religious and moral insight but from belief in the power of the God to whom the Queen and the Bishop of Reims adhered. That the instruction of Remigius was geared only to this argument must not be deduced from this. The Gallic episcopate in its polemic against Arianism had also appealed to the Petrine apostolic tradition, which was understood in the sixth century through the impressive image of Peter as Gatekeeper of Heaven. Clovis, who built a church dedicated to Peter and the Apostles—Sainte-Geneviève near Paris—and at his death sent a crown to the Pope, must have known this argument.[9] Besides, the letter of Bishop Remigius on Clovis's accession to power, which had a strong ethical accent, allows the assumption that in the preaching of Remigius to the Franks moral instruction also had a place.[10] That Christian moral principles were still alive in the Gallo-Roman episcopate of the period is shown, among other places, by the *vita* of Bishop Nicetius of Trier, composed in the sixth century.[11]

---

[4] "Jesus Christ, whom Clotilda declares to be the Son of the living God . . . I implore your glory, your power: grant me victory over these enemies . . . and I will believe in you and have myself baptized in your name" (ibid. II, 30).

[5] K. Hauck, "Lebensnormen und Kultmythen in germanischen Stammes-und Herrschergenealogien," *Saeculum* 6 (1955), 186–223.

[6] "How should we still preach the faith to you, who have come to the faith which you already glimpsed before your conversion without a preacher?" (Avitus, *Ep.* 46, *MGAuctant* VI, 1).

[7] E. Ewig, "Das Bild Constantins d. Gr. in den ersten Jahrhunderten des abendländischen Mittelalters," *HJ* 75 (1956), 4, note 17.

[8] "Humbly bend your neck, Sigamber; adore what you have burned, and burn what you have adored!" (*Hist. Fr.* II, 31).

Clovis's conversion to Catholicism operated in two directions: on the German Kings and on the Gallic episcopate. The Metropolitan Avitus of Vienne wrote, in regard to the baptism of the Frankish King, the celebrated but long misunderstood sentence: *Vestra fides nostra victoria est.*[12] It contained no concealed appeal to Frankish weapons against the Burgundians—Avitus sought to divert Clovis's feverish activity to the Alemanni who were also threatening Burgundy—but expressed the hope that the Burgundians might soon follow the Frankish example. In fact, Clovis's conversion broke the spell whereby a German King could be only a pagan or an Arian. The Burgundian sub-king Sigismund of Geneva passed to Catholicism in the first years of the sixth century. He had the Cathedral of St. Peter of Geneva rebuilt and was the first German King to go on pilgrimage to the tombs of the Apostles at Rome.[13] When in 515 he succeeded his father Gundobad in the government of the entire kingdom, a second Catholic dynasty took its place beside the Merovingian in Gaul. However, it was not to last long, since

---

[9] E. Ewig, "Der Petrus—und Apostelkult im spätrömischen und fränkischen Gallien," *ZKG* 71 (1960), 215–251; id., "Die Kathedralpatrozinien im römischen und fränkischen Gallien," *HJ* 79 (1960), 1–61.

[10] *Epp. Austrasicae,* no. 2, *MGEp.* III, 113. Further testimonies from the sphere of royal ethics: E. Ewig, "Zum christlichen Königsgedanken im Frühmittelalter," *Vorträge und Forschungen* III, ed. T. Mayer (Lindau–Constance 1956), 19ff.

[11] Nicetius took an interest in the peasants and stood up against the arrogance of the Frankish lords (Gregory of Tours, *De gloria confessorum* 9).

[12] "Your faith is our victory" (Avitus, *Ep.* 46). On the interpretation of the passage cf. v. d. Steinen, *op. cit.*

[13] M. Burckhardt, *Die Briefsammlung des Bischofs Avitus von Vienne* (1938), pp. 76–85; L. Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen* I (Munich 1941), 158.

Clovis's descendants conquered the Burgundian Kingdom in 534 and divided it up.

The situation in the Visigothic Kingdom of Toulouse differed from that in Burgundy. The expansionist policy of King Euric (466–484), who had extended the boundaries of his dominion to the Loire, had opened a gulf between Arians and Catholics, which was still not entirely bridged c. 500. Clovis knew that he could count on the sympathies of wide circles of the episcopate and of a great part of the Roman population, although there were also circles which preferred the partly assimilated Goths to the uncivilized Franks.[14] Like a flourish of trumpets resounded the proclamation with which the King of the Franks, according to Gregory, began the war against the Visigoths in 507: *Valde molestum fero, quod hi Arriani partem teneant Galliarum. Eamus cum Dei adiutorium, et superatis redegamus terram in ditione nostra.*[15] Martin of Tours and Hilary of Poitiers, the patrons of the Gallo-Roman episcopate in the area of Gothic rule, showed themselves favorable to the Franks. At Vouillé in Poitou occurred the battle in which the Visigothic Kingdom of Toulouse was crushed. Now Theodoric the Great with his Ostrogoths entered the lists. He successfully shielded the Mediterranean lands against the Franks and the Burgundians allied with them, but could not prevent the two Aquitanian provinces and the royal city of Toulouse from coming under Frankish rule. Narbonensis (Septimania) was retained by the Visigoths, but after Theodoric's death Gascony and Provence were also occupied by the Franks.

The Frankish-Visigothic war of 507–511 became no less significant for Church history than for profane history. The North Gallic churches, which had suffered severely during the wanderings of the peoples, now found a firm support in Catholic *Romania* of Aquitania. Out of the collaboration of the Gallo-Frankish episcopate sprang the Frankish "national Church." In July 511, at the instigation of Clovis, the bishops of the Frankish territory met in Orléans for the first Council of the Merovingian Kingdom. The Council, whose agenda was decided by Clovis, laid down, under the King's influence, the fundamental law of the Merovingian Church and introduced ecclesiastical reorganization into the *Regnum Francorum.*

Synods at which a quite large number of bishops met to establish principles in doctrine, law, and liturgy, were nothing new in Church history. But up to the beginning of the sixth century the Empire had provided the framework for these gatherings of the episcopate. The bishops assembled on the level of the provinces, the civil dioceses, and the Empire. What was new was that now they met also on the plane of a *Regnum.* The German Kings, who occasioned and permitted these "national councils,"—as the first among them, even for the Catholic Church, must be named the Arian Visigothic King Alaric II[16]—thus in some respect took the place of the Emperor. They attached importance to the fact that the frontiers of their *regna* did not conflict with the ecclesiastical boundaries. Bishoprics which were separated from their former metropolises through new political boundaries were attached to the nearest metropolises of the particular sphere of power; fragments of bishoprics were newly constituted as autonomous sees. In these changes were expressed the collapse of the *Imperium* and the vitality of the new *Regna.*

---

[14] On this most recently K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen bis zur Errichtung der westgotischen katholischen Staatskirche* (Berlin 1967), 32ff.

[15] "I find it difficult to endure that these Arians occupy a part of Gaul. Let us with God's help set out, defeat them, and subject their land to our rule:" (*Hist. Fr.* II, 37).

The Germano-Roman national Churches naturally developed their own forms of religious life. But they still remained on the ground of tradition: they clearly regarded themselves as keepers of the tradition vis-à-vis the Emperor and the imperial synods convoked by him, which furthermore claimed general validity as ecumenical councils. Thus in the controversy over the Three Chapters, they assumed a conservative attitude and at first declined to accept the decrees of the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. For a time the quarrel over the Three Chapters overshadowed their relations with Rome. This did not lead to a break, however, for the traditional authority of the *Sedes Apostolica* as custodian of the tradition in faith and law was not questioned. When the opposition between Rome and Constantinople became worse in the seventh century, the Popes could throughout count on the Germano-Roman national Churches.

In the sixth century there was no lack of testimonies for pilgrimages from Gaul to Rome, for relations between the Popes and the Frankish Kings and bishops, which, it is true, depended also on the political relations with the Emperor. The echo of the Three Chapters Controversy was relatively weak in the Frankish Kingdom, but this was probably connected with the decline of theological training in the Merovingian Church.[17] The Papal Vicariate of the Metropolitan of

---

[16] K. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 42ff.

[17] As early as 549 the Gallic bishops protested at Orléans against Justinian's edict and Pope Vigilius's *Judicatum* in the affair of the Three Chapters. Bishop Nicetius of Trier wrote in the same vein to Justinian, probably after the Second Council of Constantinople of 553 (*Epp. Austr.,* no. 7, *MGEp.* III, 118). Then the polemic ceased. Not until 626 did a Synod of the Franco-Burgundian subkingdom at Mâcon again take up this question. Agrestius, a former monk of Luxeuil, had joined the schismatics of Aquileia and also attacked the *Rule* of Columban and Abbot Eustasius of Luxeuil. After his repudiation by the Burgundian episcopate, Agrestius went to Amatus and Romaric in

Arles continued after the incorporation of Provence into the Frankish Kingdom, and up to the time of Gregory the Great (590–604) it still had a certain practical importance. In the conciliar acts of the sixth century papal decretals were occasionally cited. It is surely due to the failure of the sources if after Gregory's death we hear nothing more of Frankish-Roman relations. The pilgrimages to the tombs of the Apostles did not come entirely to an end. Around the middle of the seventh century the darkness grows a bit less. Pope Martin I in his struggle against Monothelitism also mobilized the Frankish Church and wrote in this sense to King Sigebert III in 649.[18] He was in contact with the influential missionary Bishop Amandus, the "Apostle of the Flemings," who worked on the Meuse and the Scheldt.[19] The elevation of Theodore of Tarsus to be Archbishop of Canterbury in 668 marked an epoch not only in the history of the Anglo-Saxon Church but also in Frankish-Roman relations, which were now gradually intensified indirectly by way of Britain, although still hindered by the inner crisis of the Merovingian Kingdom.

The Merovingian national Church was not a closely knit unity, since in the Frankish Kingdom the principle of partition prevailed.[20] Although the Frankish *Regnum* constituted a unity in regard to constitutional law, in the subkingdoms tendencies toward autonomous development asserted themselves, and these operated also on the ecclesiastical plane. To be sure, the demarcation of boundaries among the subkingdoms led in the earliest period only to the founding of new bishoprics, and the ecclesiastical provinces were not at all affected by it. But councils of the entire Kingdom could, of course, meet only when the Frankish Kings were united among themselves or the Kingdom was under an undivided government. Two phases of stronger unity are clear: 511–555 and 613–638. In the first phase the councils of the Kingdom were sponsored chiefly by the Kings of Paris and Reims, while

---

the Austrasian monastery of Remiremont, where he was at first received (*Vita Columbani* II, 9 and 10, *MGSS rer. Mer.* VI). At his death Amatus of Remiremont solemnly professed the *Tomus Leonis* (*Vita Amati* 12, *MGSS rer. Mer.* IV, 220), that is, the Council of Chalcedon, but probably in taking a stand against the Second Council of Constantinople. The first canon of the Synod of Chalon (647–654) contains a profession of the faith of Nicaea and Chalcedon. The Synod of Saint-Jean-de-Losne (673–75) first formally professed the five ecumenical councils, hence also the Second of Constantinople, at which the Three Chapters were condemned.

[18] *Vita Eligii* II, 33, *MGSS rer. Mer.* IV, 689ff.; Jaffé, 2058–2059.

[19] P. E. de Moreau, *St-Amand, apôtre de la Belgique et du Nord de la France* (Museum Lessianum, Section missiologique, 7, 1927). W. H. Fritze, "Universalis gentium confessio," op. cit.

[20] E. Ewig, "Die fränkischen Teilungen und Teilreiche 511–613," *AAMz* 9 (1952); id., "Die fränkischen Teilreiche im 7. Jh," *Trierer Zschr.* 22 (1954), 85–144.

the Kingdom of Soissons occasionally held itself aloof. The second phase, the "Golden Age" of the Merovingians, was marked by the unified Kingdom of Chlotar II and Dagobert I.

There was no dearth of synods at which the episcopate of the individual subkingdoms met. They began in the Austrasian Kingdom of Reims with the Council of Clermont in 535; the first in Neustria was the Synod of Paris in 577. Most important were the Synods of the Burgundian subkingdom under Guntram (561–593) and Theodoric II (596–612), which were continued in the Neustrian-Burgundian councils after 638. Finally, the political chaos brought an end to the synodal activity in the late Merovingian period. Nothing is known of synods of the Austrasian subkingdom of the seventh century; the last council of the Neustrian-Burgundian subkingdom met c. 680. Bishops of the western Frankish Kingdom met once more in 696.[21] Then, together with the Kingdom, the metropolitan organization, which had been restored in the sixth century, also dissolved.

Instructive for the crucial points of ecclesiastical life in the Merovingian Kingdom were the meeting places of the councils. In the first phase, Orléans, situated on the boundary of *Francia* and Aquitania, was completely in the foreground. In the second half of the sixth century Paris stood forth more prominently; under Chlotar II and Dagobert I it became the center of political and ecclesiastical life. But, in addition to Paris, the Burgundian area around Lyon held its own as an ecclesiastical radiation center, and in the second half of the seventh century the synods of the western kingdom usually met in the Franco-Burgundian border area. Within the Burgundian subkingdom the Bishop of Lyon acquired a super-metropolitan precedence in the sixth century.[22] But this nucleus of a Burgundian national primacy did not develop, since in 613 the Burgundian subkingdom lost its independence. The fact that a primacy of the entire Frankish Kingdom could not develop is explained by the breaking up of the *Regnum* into subkingdoms.

The councils of the Kingdom and of the subkingdoms assembled at the command or at least with the assent of the Kings. But they were not under royal direction and issued their decrees independently in connection with the existing canon law, even if not without contact with the ruler. Their canons needed no royal ratification. Probably the Kings occasionally accepted individual decrees into their capitularies and thereby promoted their implementation. They were also not prevented from legislating on their own in ecclesiastical matters; however, the Merovingians made little use of this right to issue decrees. Councils and meetings of the magnates were strictly separate in the sixth century; only from Clothar II did the boundaries begin to become blurred. The understanding of the separation of the two spheres—a legacy of antiquity—gradually became dulled. It was surely no accident that just at this time began the Germanization of the episcopate, which until then had consisted mostly of Romans.[23] From now on we also encounter canons which forbade the bishops to participate in the hunt and to bear arms.

---

[21] W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford 1946), 47; E. Ewig, "Beobachtungen zu den Bischofslisten der merowingischen Konzilien und Bischofsprivilegien," *Festschr. Franz Petri* (1970), 171–193.

[22] L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux* I, 2nd. ed., 140–141; also my article quoted in the previous footnote.

Perhaps Clovis established a higher *wergeld* for the clergy: for the priest and bishop, the rate of the free Frank in the royal service; for the deacon, that of the Romance *Conviva Regis.* For civil cases within the clergy the ecclesiastical court was competent in accord with Roman law, which also in criminal cases against bishops took cognizance of their guilt and deprived of his office the one found guilty. The Merovingians recognized the juridical autonomy of the Church. In 614 Clothar II added the decision that criminous priests were also to be degraded by the bishop before the pronouncing of the punishment by the secular court.

On the other hand, another principle of the ancient ecclesiastical organization appears to have been impaired since Clovis: the election of the bishop by the clergy and people of the see, with or without the participation of the metropolitan and the bishops of the same province.[24] The councils inculcated this principle time and again, but as early as 549 we find the compromise formula: *cum voluntate regis iuxta electionem cleri ac plebis.* At least an effort was made to prevent one-sided and simonical nominations by the King. But in his edict of 614 Clothar II retained the right of rejecting and of examining the worthiness of the candidate for the episcopacy. The episcopal office was greatly desired, since the bishops took precedence in rank and esteem over all other holders of offices and dignities in the cities and provinces. Add to this that the wealth of the Church increased considerably in the sixth and seventh centuries through donations, and the privileges of immunity, which excluded the royal officials from owning Church property, and also the external power of the Church grew, especially in the episcopal cities.[25] Under this aspect is explained also the interest of the Kings in the filling of the episcopal sees. If in the early sixth century the episcopal function was still a domain of the established senatorial families, it soon became more and more the concluding of a career of the Germano-Roman magnates in the royal service.

---

[23] H. Wieruszowski, "Die Zusammensetzung des gallischen und fränkischen Episkopats bis zum Vertrag von Verdun," *Bonner Jbb* 127 (1922), 1–74.

[24] A. Hauck, *Die Bischofswahlen unter den Merowingern* (Erlangen 1883); E. Vacandard, "Les élections épiscopales sous les Mérovingiens," *Études de critique et d'histoire religieuse* 1 (Paris 1915), 123–187; P. Cloché, "Les élections épiscopales sous les Mérovingiens," *MA* 35 (2^e série, tome 26) (1924–25), 203–254; D. Claude, "Die Bestellung der Bischofe im merovingischen Reich," *ZSavRGkan* 80 (1963), 1–75; F. Lotter, "Designation und angebliches Kooptationsrecht bei Bischofserhebungen," *ZRG kan* 59 (1973), 112–150.

One must not, of course, fail to recognize that the extensive episcopal official power under the Merovingians was in some respects also impaired and infringed. The First Council of Orléans had, it is true, reestablished the monarchical power of the bishop over the members of the clergy and of the monastic order, and the succeeding synods issued decrees also on the metropolitan order and the competency of the clergy before the ecclesiastical courts. However, the episcopal organization of the Early Church was soon destroyed by the Proprietary Church System.[26] The principle that all churches founded by laymen should be conveyed to the bishop could not be maintained. Even the clerics appointed to the proprietary churches of magnates escaped the episcopate. The bishops tried to assure a minimum existence to the clergy of the proprietary churches of the magnates and reserved to themselves the right to examine them. They made the granting of benefices to clerics, the entry of clerics into patronage, and their summons to public business dependent on their consent. The episcopate sought in this way to keep the influence of the magnates as well as of the Kings over the clergy within defined bounds: without lasting success, since the proprietary church system prevailed more powerfully in the seventh century. Whether this process must be understood as a germanization of the ecclesiastical constitution is uncertain. It is certainly not to be evaluated only negatively, since the many proprietary churches, despite their defects, also promoted the christianization of the rural areas.

The relations between bishop and monasticism[27] were of a different sort from those between bishop and clergy: in its origin monasticism was a lay movement. After some initial difficulties it was incorporated into the old episcopal system. The monasteries enjoyed an internal autonomy under the direction of their abbots, but they were subject to the supervision of the local bishop, who performed all functions connected with holy orders within the monastic property. The abbots were supposed to govern only one monastery at a given time and were bound to attend the diocesan synod. Without the bishop's permission they might not leave their monastery, alienate any property, accept any benefices, enter into any relationship of patronage. The bishop's assent had to be obtained for new foundations. These rules applied in the sixth century also to the monasteries erected by the Kings and magnates. The papal privileges occasionally obtained for episcopal and royal foundations only thwarted the tendency discernible in the Frankish Kingdom toward an all too wide extension of episcopal power over the monasteries. They guaranteed especially the free election of the abbot, the autonomous administration of the monastic property, and the freedom of the monastery from the taxes customarily paid by other churches to the bishop. Royal and private proprietary monasteries in the strict sense are hardly demonstrable in Gaul in the sixth century, but Frankish Kings may have issued letters of protection for their foundations. If there existed a right of possession of the founder over the monastery, it probably ended with his death.

---

[25] L. Levillain, "Notes sur l'immunité franque," *Revue de droit français et étranger,* 4^e^ série, 6 (1927), 203–254; F. L. Ganshof, "L'immunité dans la monarchie franque," *Recueils de la Soc. J. Bodin* 1, 2nd. ed.: *Les liens de vassalité et les immunités* (Brussels 1958), 171–216.

[26] U. Stulz, *Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterlichen germanischen Kirchenrechts* (1895), is fundamental; Feine, *RG* I, 131ff. (with copious literature).

[27] Summary of the various trends in monasticism: F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich–Vienna 1965). Sixth century: L. Ueding, *Gesch. der Klostergründungen der frühen Merowingerzeit* (Eberings Hist. Studien 261, 1935); C. Courtois, "L'évolution du monachisme en Gaule de St. Martin à St. Columban," *Settimane di studio . . . IV. Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo . . .* (Spoleto 1957), 47–72. Development of privileges: E. Ewig, "Beobachtungen zu den Klosterprivilegien des 7. und frühen 8. Jh.," *Adel und Kirche, Gerd Tellenbach zum 65. Geburtstag* (Freiburg–Basel–Vienna 1968), 52–65.

A radical change, however, occurred when in 592 Columban appeared in the Frankish Kingdom with his twelve companions and on the southwestern edge of the Vosges founded Annegray, Luxeuil, and Fontaine, the first continental monasteries of the Irish type.[28] From Columban proceeded religious and moral impulses of the strongest sort, but the great saint completely disregarded the existing Gallo-Frankish monastic law. He ruled his foundations in an authoritarian manner, traveled at will, had ordinations performed by a bishop other than the local one, recognized no episcopal right to the monastic property, to taxes, or lodging, and performed pastoral functions beyond the monastery's territory. When he finally even refused to appear at synods and arbitrarily threatened King Theodoric II with excommunication, he was expelled from the Burgundian subkingdom in 610 and died in 615 in his Italian foundation of Bobbio. Nevertheless, Luxeuil remained a monastic center of the first rank, which radiated far to northern, eastern, and central Gaul. Columban's severe *Rule,* in which to a great extent organizational regulations were lacking, was united, soon after the departure of the monastic father, with the *Regula Benedicti* infiltrating from Italy to form the *Regula Mixta.* The Irish rites did not long maintain themselves, and monastic unions of the Celtic type were unable to establish themselves on the continent. But the monastic strivings for autonomy found extensive recognition among the Kings and the spiritual and temporal magnates who were affected by the spirit of Luxeuil. The monasteries obtained episcopal privileges which accorded them not only internal autonomy under the Rule, the free election of the abbot, and the inviolability of their property, but often even freedom from any authority of the local bishop. These episcopal privileges were often complemented by royal charters, which granted to monasteries of the type of Luxeuil their individual immunity over and above protection, withdrew them thereby from the general immunity pertaining to episcopal property, and constituted them as independent churches also in secular law. The route thus trod was not without perils. Like the proprietary church system, the monastic system of the new kind could not but lead, in the chaos of the late Merovingian epoch, to a far-reaching dissolution of the ecclesiastical organization. Now monk-bishops and itinerant bishops of the Irish type appeared also in the Frankish Kingdom.[29] The sources of religious energy became mountain torrents—of course, as such they preserved their importance for the christianization of the Merovingian Kingdom, which moved into a new stage with the monasticism of Luxeuil.

---

[28] The chief source is the *Vita Columbani, MGSS rer. Mer.* VI, 1–152. Briefer, more basic survey: W. Levison, "Die Iren und die fränkische Kirche," *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit* (Düsseldorf 1948), pp. 247–263. More recent studies on Columban and his impact on the continent: *Mélanges colombaniens* (Paris 1950). Last monograph on Columban: M. M. Dubois, *Un pionnier de la civilisation occidentale: St. Colomban* (Paris 1950). Further literature in F. Prinz, op. cit. More recently the contributions of Johannes Dufo ("Irische Einflüsse auf St. Gallen u. Alemannien"), Friedrich Prinz ("Frühes Mönchtum in Südwestdeutschland und die Anfänge der Reichenau"), K. U. Jäschke ("Kolumban von Luxeuil u. sein Wirken im alemann. Raum"), and Frantisek Graus ("Die Viten der Heiligen des südalemann. Raums u. die sogenannten Adelsheiligen"), in *Vorträge und Forschungen* 20 (1974).

The spread of Christianity is an essential chapter in the history of the Merovingian national Church. In the north and east of Gaul was a broad border zone, which extended from the province of Besançon (*Maxima Sequanorum*) via the provinces of Mainz (*Germania I*), Cologne (*Germania II*), and Reims (*Belgica II*) to the Province of Rouen (*Lugdunensis II*) and had been powerfully affected by the upheavals of the fifth century.[30] In the north of *Germania II* the cities of Nijmegen and Xanten had already been ruined before the end of the Roman period; thereafter sees were not reestablished in them. Also in parts of *Belgica II* Christian penetration remained weak. The immigration of the Salian Franks led in the fifth century to the collapse of the ecclesiastical organization in the districts of Tournai, Thérouanne (=Boulogne), and Arras, as well as to a strengthening of the rural paganism in the *civitates* of Cambrai, Vermand (Saint-Quentin—Noyon), Amiens, Beauvais, and Rouen. The episcopal see of Vermand was transferred to Noyon, that of Tongres to Maastricht. In the sphere of settlement and influence of the Alemanni on the Upper Rhine and Aar the Church was also affected by the collapse of the Empire. The see of Augst (=Basel) completely disappeared, the Bishop of the Helvetians withdrew from Windisch and Avenches to Lausanne, and German colonists reinforced the pagan rural population in the district of Besançon. The see of Chur (*Raetia I*) suffered losses in its northern areas.[31] Farther east in *Raetia II* (Augsburg) and in *Noricum Ripense* (Lorch) the episcopal organization was totally wrecked, even if Christian congregations continued at Augsburg and Salzburg. The Bishop of Augsburg seems to have fled to Säben (=Brixen). *Noricum Mediterraneum* (East Tirol, Carinthia, Styria) was first affected by the catastrophe when the Slovene Carinthians settled there at the end of the sixth century.

---

[29] H. Frank, "Die Klosterbischöfe des Frankenreichs," *Beiträge zur Gesch. des alten Mönchtums* 17 (1932).

[30] Cf. in addition to the general literature for the chapter (especially H. Büttner, G. Tessier, E. de Moreau, W. Neusse–F. W. Oediger), also E. Ewig, "Das Fortleben römischer Institutionen in Gallien und Germanien," *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* (Rome 1955), Relazioni VI (Florence s. d.), 599ff. For *Belgica II:* J. Lestocquoy, "L'origine des évêchés de la Belgique Seconde," *RHEF* 32 (1946), 43–52.

Between the two invaded areas on the Lower and the Upper Rhine lay a zone of stronger continuity, which included the *civitates* of Cologne, Mainz, Worms, Speyer, and Strasbourg. In this zone the continuance of Christian communities can be demonstrated not only in the cities but to a great extent also in the more important *castra.* Whether gaps in the episcopal lists indicate a temporary interruption of the episcopal organization is an open question. In any event, the Germans in these districts early came into closer contact with Christianity, and there also a favorable opportunity was offered for an ecclesiastical restoration: Here, of course, Clovis could not yet make the attempt, since he only incorporated the Rhineland into his enlarged Kingdom shortly before his death.

Gregory of Tours reports that more than 3,000 Franks were baptized with Clovis: probably the royal retinue and the groups which settled especially in the later subkingdoms of Paris and Orléans. But the first great Merovingian King set about the ecclesiastical reorganization in the

---

[31] H. Büttner, *Gesch. des Elsass* (Berlin 1939); id. "Die Entstehung der Konstanzer Diözesangrenzen," *ZSKG* 48 (1954), 225–274; id., "Zur frühen Gesch. des Bistums Octodurum-Sitten und des Bistums Avenches-Lausanne," ibid. 53 (1959), 241–266; id., "Die Entstehung der Churer Bistumsgrenzen" ibid., 81–104, 191–212; id., "Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer im Alpenraum zwischen Grossem St. Bernhard und Brennerpass," *HJ* 84 (1964), 1–33.

Salian Frankish territories north of Reims, though without the desired success; for the initial steps taken by him at Arras and Tournai (?) soon atrophied.[32] The Merovingians of Soissons, to whom these territories fell after Clovis's death, apart from Chilperic I (561–584), had little contact with the churches of southern Gaul, which could supply their surplus among the clergy. For finally Arras was united with the see of Cambrai, and the area of Tournai was assigned as a mission sphere to the see of Noyon (=Saint-Quentin).

The Austrasian Merovingians of Reims had greater success. Their Aquitanian enclaves constituted an intact recruiting ground for the clergy of Austrasian *Francia.*[33] Theodoric I (511–534) had clerics come from Auvergne to Trier, and Aquitanians are also demonstrable in the area of Reims, although both churches were not so severely affected by the convulsions of the fifth century. Around the middle of the sixth century the episcopal lists of Maastricht, Cologne, Mainz, and Strasbourg began anew with Gallo-Roman names, whose bearers must have been at least partly Aquitanians.[34] At the end of the sixth century the first Germans are encountered on these episcopal lists, and at the beginning of the seventh century bishops of Worms and Speyer with German names also appear.[35] Accordingly, a second stage of the restoration must have been reached c. 550, and the work itself must have been concluded c. 600. Probably at the latest in the sixth century the territories of Xanten and Nijmegen were added to the bishopric of Cologne, and the see of Strasbourg expanded to the former *civitas* of Augst (=Basel). The mission did not yet extend to the area on the right bank of the Rhine. Paganism must have disappeared from the cities first.[36] In the Trier Ardennes it came to an end toward the close of the sixth century.[37] It seems to have maintained itself longer only in the Liége Ardennes and in Toxandria.[38]

---

[32] For Arras: *Vita s. Vedasti, MGSS rer. Mer.* III, 399–422 (Remigius with Clovis's cooperation). For Tournai: L. Duchesne, *Fastes* III (1915), 114ff. It is striking that the list of Arras breaks off at the time of Gaugerich, who moved his see from Arras to Cambrai.

[33] E. Ewig, "L'Aquitaine et des pays rhénans au haut moyen âge," *Cahiers de civilisation medièvale* 1 (1958), 37–54.

[34] L. Duchesne, *Fastes* III, 157 (Mainz: Sidonius), 171 (Strasbourg: Solarius), 179 (Cologne: Carentinus). Tongres–Maastricht represents a special case in so far as here two or three bishops of the late fifth and early sixth centuries are known (Monulfus, Falco, Domitian), but then there is a gap between Domitian, last attested in 535, and Bettulfus, first noted in 614 (L. Duchesne, *Fastes* III, 189). On Cologne cf. now also F. W. Oediger, *Die Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Köln* I (Bonn 1954), and W. Neuss–F. W. Oediger, *Gesch. des Erzbistums Köln* I (Cologne 1964). Aquitanian origin is attested for none of the bishops named, but at least for Sidonius of Mainz it is to be assumed because of his name.

[35] German names begin at the end of the sixth century in Trier with Magnerich, in Cologne with Ebergisel, in Mainz with Sigimund, in Strasbourg (probably somewhat earlier) with Arbogast. In Maastricht there appears Bettulfus in 614; in Worms and Speyer in the same year the episcopal list is resumed with men of German names. Maastricht represents a special case in so far as here German names began as early as c. 500 (Monulfus, Falco). As is well known, German names do not permit a sure conclusion as to German origin. Bishops with Roman names still appear after those named in the lists of Trier, Cologne, and Strasbourg. Only from the second or third decade of the seventh century are only German names encountered in these lists. From this time on, one may speak with greater certainty of a germanization of the episcopate in the cities mentioned.

This first phase of the Frankish mission entirely took the form of an interior ecclesiastical restoration, which could make use of the existing congregations and probably be borne substantially by the clergy, even if monks and especially hermits were not entirely absent from it.[39] The hermits seem to have worked especially among the rural folk. The ecclesiastical restoration was promoted by the Kings in regard to organization and probably also materially, but there was no compulsory conversion of pagans. Only the sanctification of Sundays and holy days was imposed under penalty at the end of the sixth century[40]—a sign of the cultic and ritual view of Christianity. The prohibition of pagan worship, which Childebert I issued soon after 550, affected only the subkingdom of Paris, in which there must at that time have been hardly any pagans.[41]

---

[36] The sole witness of paganism in the Rhine cities concerns a Frankish *fanum* in Cologne (Gregory of Tours, *Vitae patrum* 6, 2, *MGSS rer. Mer.* 1, 681, before 525). The reports on the churches in the Rhenish cities confirm the assumption that paganism died out in them early.

[37] Gregory, *Hist. Fr.* VIII, 15, *MGSS rer. Mer.* 1, 380ff.

[38] The lives of the Bishops Lambert and Hubert of Maastricht/Liége speak still of the combating of paganism in the Ardennes and in Toxandria. Cf. E. de Moreau, op. cit., 95ff. 101ff.

[39] The churches of almost all the Roman *castra* in the area of the Cologne diocese were later in the bishop's hands (W. Neuss–F. W. Oediger, *Gesch. des Erzbistums Köln,* 293ff.). The same is true for the territory of the diocese of Trier, and, *cum grano salis,* also for Mainz. From this one may conclude that the mission was directed by the bishop and carried out by the diocesan clergy. Also known are the names of a series of ascetics, who founded, not great monasteries, but smaller cells or churches in the country, such as Wulfilaich, Goar, Fridolin, Ingobert, Wendelin, Disibod, Beatus, and Bantus. More exact reports are extant only on Wulfilaich, who first lived as a hermit and after an intervention by Magnerich of Trier became leader of a missionary or pastoral station. The work of the other saints mentioned may be made known in a similar way. An Aquitanian origin is attested by later sources for Goar and Fridolin.

[40] Decrees of the Frankish-Burgundian King Guntram and of his Austrasian nephew, Childebert II (*MGCap* I, 11, 17), as well as numerous passages in conciliar acts and *vitae.*

[41] *MGCap* I, 21. The *praeceptum* was issued soon after 550, and hence came from the later part of the reign. The Franks of Childebert appear still in the 670s as a closed,

The second phase of the interior ecclesiastical restoration began under Chlotar II (584/613–629) and Dagobert I (623/629–639). It was carried out predominantly by circles which belonged to or were friendly with the monasticism of Luxeuil—in the broadest sense. Strong Aquitanian forces also poured into this monasticism. The chief points of departure lay in the Neustrian territory and the Alemannian–Burgundian–Raetian frontier area.

The first missionary of this phase in the North Gallic-Frankish territories[42] seems to have been Walaric, who worked in the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens and gave his name to the abbey of Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme in the diocese of Amiens. He is said to have been sent forth by Columban, that is, before 610 or at the latest between 610 and 612. His successor, Blitmund, became the real founder of the abbey of Saint-Valéry in 615–628.[43] Richarius, patron of the abbey of Centula,[44] began his activity in the diocese of Amiens under Dagobert I. Dagobert founded the bishopric of Thérouanne (=Boulogne), whose first bishop was Audomar, a member of the Luxeuil circle, and to him the origins of the abbey of Sithiu (Saint-Omer–Saint-Bertin) went back.[45] Still under Clothar II, c. 625, began the activity of the Aquitanian Amandus, which extended chiefly to the see of Tournai, united with Noyon, even if for a time Amandus had been Bishop of Tongres–Maastricht (c. 649). The abbey of Elno–Saint-Amand, the chief base of the "Apostle of the Flemings," was founded under Dagobert I and richly endowed by him. The *Vita s. Amandi* tells, among other things, of an episode of conversion from the Beauvaisis. But the saint's real mission-field was the areas on the Scheldt and the Scarpe, the *pagus* of Ghent and the country of Antwerp—this of course probably only in the last years of Amandus, who died at an advanced age in 676. Among the younger companions and collaborators of Amandus was Bavo, who worked in Ghent and gave his name to the famous abbey there.[46]

---

politically active group. There must not have been pagans in this leading group—probably still among the lesser folk in the northern frontier areas of Rouen, Amiens, and Beauvais.

[42] On the mission in these areas: E. de Moreau, op. cit.; also, E. Vancandard, "L'idolâtrie en Gaule aux 6e et 7e siècles," *RQH* 65 (1899). Synopsis of the testimonies from the *vitae:* E. Ewig, "Die fränkischen Teilungen und Teilreiche im 7. Jh.," *Trierer Zschr.* 22 (1954), 99, no. 61.

[43] *Vita Walarici* 11, 22, 35, 36: *MGSS rer. Mer.* IV, 164, 168ff., 174ff. On paganism in the see of Amiens, also the *Vita Lupi ep. Senonici* 11, 12, ibid. IV, 182.

[44] *Vita Richarii* 2, 4, ibid. VII, 445ff.

[45] *Vita Audomari* 1–5, ibid. V, 754–756. H. von Werveke, "Het bisdom Terwaan," *Université de Gand, Recueil de Travaux publ. par la Fac. des Lettres,* 52e fasc. (Ghent–Paris 1924).

[46] *Vita s. Amandi* 13, 24, *MGSS rer. Mer.* V, 436ff., 447. *Vita s. Bavonis* 3, ibid. IV, 537.

Closely united with Dagobert I were the two great Bishops Eligius of Noyon (641–690) and Audoin of Rouen (641–684), but they obtained these episcopal sees only after the King's death. Audion worked closely with Wandregisil, a Frank of the Moselle country, founder of the abbey of Saint-Wandrille c. 645, while his relations with the Aquitanian Philibert, founder of Jumièges, were for a time strained. The last traces of paganism disappeared at that time from the diocese of Rouen.[47] The missionary activity of Saint Eligius was concentrated on what was then the diocese of Tournai, especially the areas of Kortrijk (Suebi), Bruges (*pagus Flandrensis*), and Ghent.[48] Around the same time Burgundofaro of Meaux must have sent the Irishman Kilian (Chillena) to Artois,[49] where Bishop Audebert of Cambrai (645/652–667) at that time raised the remains of the first bishop, Vedast, and founded the abbey of Saint-Vaast of Arras.[50] In Toxandria Lambert (671/675–before 706) and Hubert of Tongres–Maastricht (before 706–727) baptized the last pagans.

Progress can be clearly recognized from the absorption of more or less large pagan minorities in the territories of Rouen, Beauvais, Amiens, and Arras into the mission in the territories with an overwhelmingly pagan population—Thérouanne, Tournaisis, Toxandria, Kortrijk, Bruges, Ghent, Antwerp—which perhaps spread as early as the 680s from the Frankish-Frisian frontier territory to the Frisians.[51] The missionaries or mission directors were always monks or at least were in friendly relations with the Luxeuil circle, to which also belonged the Aquitanians, Amandus, Remaclus, and Philibert. Hence monasteries often grew out of mission stations, and in a newly founded diocese, such as Thérouanne, could have even a greater importance than the cathedral. Many new monastic foundations assisted them, so that the boundaries between mission and monastic organization often became blurred.

E. de Moreau, *St.-Amand, apôtre de la Belgique et du Nord de la France* (Louvain 1927); A. Verhulst, *Over de stichting en de vroegate geschiedenis van de St. Pietersen de St. Baafsabdijen te Gent* (Ghent 1953).

[47] *Vita Audoeni* 4, *MGSS rer. Mer.* V, 556. *Vita Wandregisili* 16, ibid. V, 26ff. E. Vacandard, *Vie de St. Ouen, évêque de Rouen* (Paris 1902), 641–684.

[48] *Vita Eligii* II, 2, *MGSS rer. Mer.* IV, 695.

[49] *Vita Faronis* 100, ibid. V, 194.

[50] A. B. Hoxie, "Translatis civitatis Atrebatensis," *Revue Belge de phil. et d'hist.* 16 (1937), 591–598.

[51] *Vita Wulframni ep. Senonici* 3, *MGSS rer. Mer.* V, 663. The value of this *vita* is very controversial. But I would accept a missionary activity of Wulfram in Friesland or in the Frankish-Frisian frontier zone where Willibrord was still working.

A detailed description of mission methods is found only in the *Vita s. Amandi,* composed c. 725. From this it follows that the preaching of the gospel in the predominantly or entirely pagan countryside was not free of dangers to life and limb and hence demanded an entirely personal effort. And so the missionary needed the royal protection. Perhaps such a royal letter of protection was the point of departure for the claim of the *Vita s. Amandi* that King Dagobert had issued a command for the forcible baptism of the pagans. Otherwise no trace of compulsion is found. Amandus created a first step for a missionary station by purchasing slaves and having them baptized. The *Vita* refers the break-through of the mission in Ghent to a raising from the dead by the saint. A direct connection of the mission with economic and social changes was not hitherto demonstrated, although the origin of large and rich monasteries in the final stage or after the completion of the conversion may have fostered the formation or consolidation of a land-owning upper class and the development of commercial places such as Quentovic and Dorestad.

The impetus proceeding from Luxeuil for the christianization of the North Gallic-Frankish areas occurred just as early but was still directly operative also in the Burgundian–Alemannian–Raetian frontier zone, where the mission to the Alemanni grew out of the ecclesiastical restoration in an entirely analogous manner to that of the North Gallic-Frankish lands.

The ecclesiastical organization had, as already said, completely collapsed in the old *civitas* of Augst (=Basel). The sees of Windisch–Avenches (*Helvetia*) and Chur (*Raetia I*) had been for their part powerfully effected by the immigration of the pagan Alemanni in the second half of the fifth and in the sixth centuries.[52] The Alemanni had poured into the area of the Aar, modern central Switzerland, as far as Lake Thun and the Lake of Lucerne, and in the east as far as the Lake of Zurich and the Upper Rhine. Some ancient Christian centers—Zurich (Felix-Regula), Bregenz (Aurelia), Zurzach (Verena)—were inundated, although the memory of the old religion maintained itself in them. In other *castra* or *vici* Christian communities continued, such as in Constance, Arbon, Grabs and Gams, in Solothurn and Grenchen. Here the ecclesiastical restoration and organization could begin. The episcopal cities of Strasbourg, Lausanne (=Avenches), and Chur offered support, but their capabilities had not yet been developed in the sixth century. The Alemannian dukes could also provide help: as members of the Austrasian and Burgundian aristocracies they had become Christians in the later sixth century.

---

[52] The following statements should be compared with the works of Büttner cited in the survey of the literature and in footnote 31, from which all particular details have been taken. In Büttner also the other literature. The discussion of the identity of Columban's disciple Gall with the founder of Sankt Gallen has recently been resumed. On this see now the contributions of Dufo, Prinz, and Jäschke in *Vorträge und Forschungen* 20, 1974 (see footnote 28).

The springtime of the mission in the country inundated by the Alemanni is connected with the name of Columban, to whom the Austrasian King Theodebert II assigned there in 610–11 a new field of operation after his expulsion from Luxeuil. Columban began in the Germano-Romance zone of penetration at Tuggen on the Lake of Zurich and at Bregenz on Lake Constance, but was unable to accomplish much, since after the defeat and death of Theodebert II in 612 he had to withdraw to Italy. More enduring was the cella founded by his pupil Gall (d. after 629), whose later rise to a great abbey could not, of course, have been foreseen in the seventh century. For a long time yet, Sankt Gallen was only one Christian station among others.

There was already a bishop at Constance in the time of Saint Gall. The Christians of Constance, Arbon, and Grabs were oriented to Chur, in whose sphere of influence Sankt Gallen was also erected. The origins of the see of Constance, to which was later assigned the land inundated by the Alemanni south of the Rhine, are unknown. Important for the separation from Chur was the fact that for a while the country south of the Rhine belonged to the Franco-Burgundian subkingdom (595–609/610, 612ff.). The original endowment of the see and its separation from Chur go back to Dagobert I (629–639), who at Constance itself was later regarded as founder of the bishopric. Burgundian influence was proclaimed by the patronage of Benignus over the church of Pfäffikon, which, with the newly founded churches of Saint Martin at Olten and Windisch, probably belonged to the first period of consolidation. The bishopric included the Aargau and the Thurgau, hence areas which had previously belonged to *Helvetia* and *Raetia.* But it soon extended also to the country of the Alemanni north of the Rhine, so that it became simply the "Aleman bishopric" with a territory unusually large even for medieval conditions. The conclusion must be drawn that this could not have happened without lasting support of the dukes of the Alemanni, if in the present state of research more detailed statements on the course and the bearers of the mission are not available. In any event there occasionally occurs a mere name, such as that of Saint Trudpert in the Breisgau.[53] Archeologically the Alemannian mission province north of the Rhine was marked by the appearance of the "Lombard" gold-leaf crosses, which point to influences from Italy, but thus far cannot be satisfactorily interpreted.[54] Lombard influences by way of Chur are conceivable. A ducal donation to Gall's Cella in the territory of Cannstatt from 708 may belong in the great period of the mission, which at that time was probably drawing to a close. The abbey of Reichenau, founded in 724, and Pirmin's circle may hardly have played a role in the conversion of the Alemanni, but they probably did in the consolidating and deepening of their Christianity.[55] The possessions of Reichenau and of the monastery of Sankt Gallen, whose rise began under Abbot Othmar (719/720–759/760), later marked the northern limits of the see of Constance.

---

[53] In addition, T. Mayer, *Beiträge zur Gesch. von St. Trudpert* (Freiburg 1937); H. Büttner, "Franken und Alemannen in Breisgau und Ortenau," *ZGObrh,* NF, 52 (1938), 323–359; id., "Christentum und fränkischer Staat in Alemannien und Raetien während des 8. Jh." *ZSKG* 43 (1949), 1–16.

Around the time when the bishopric of Constance was founded in the area south of the Rhine, there first appeared also a Bishop of Augst (=Basel), Ragnachar, a former monk of Luxeuil and disciple of Columban's successor, Eustasius (610–629). He may have collaborated in the founding of Luxeuil's daughter-monastery of Moutier-Grandval in the Jura, which Abbot Waldebert (629–670) put, together with the perhaps somewhat older cells of Saint-Ursanne and Vermes, under the authority of the Luxeuil monk Germanus of Trier. The new foundation of the see of Basel had, it is true, no long existence, since the diocese was attached to the see of Strasbourg in connection with the southern expansion of the dukes of Alsace. From Strasbourg mission influences seem to have proceeded early to the Upper Rhine. Strasbourg and Chur appear as stations in the life of Fridolin, who in the late sixth or in the seventh century came from Poitou to the Rhine and founded the cella of Säckingen. In the Thurgau the patronage of Arbogast over Oberwinterthur was proclaimed by Strasbourg influence. The Alsatian see acquired property, probably in the seventh century, at Solothurn and on Lake Thun. Thus Strasbourg appears to have shared at the side of Lausanne,

---

[54] On the gold-leaf crosses, most recent is J. Werner, "Fernhandel und Naturalwirtschaft im östlichen Merowingerreich nach archäologischen und numismatischen Zeugnissen," *Settimane di studio . . .* VIII. *Moneta e scambi nell' alto medioevo* (Spoleto 1961), 577: "In their quantity they may be native imitations, which indicated the basis of the Alpine commerce, the extension of a Lombard burial site to South Germany." O. v. Hessen, "Die Goldblattkreuze aus der Zone nördlich der Alpen," *Problemi della civiltà e dell' economia longobarda. Scritti in memoria di G. P. Bognetti* (Milan 1964), 199–226.

[55] On Pirmin, now see H. Löwe, "Pirmin, Willibrord und Bonifatius. Ihre Bedeutung für die Missionsgeschichte ihrer Zeit," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo nell' Europa dell' alto medioevo* (Spoleto 1967), 217–261; A. E. Angenendt, *Monachi peregrini. Studien zu Pirmin und den monastischen Vorstellungen des frühen Mittelalters* (Theol. diss., Münster 1969); id., "Pirmin und Bonifatius. Ihr Verhältnis zu Mönchtum, Bischofsamt und Adel," *Voträge und Forschungen* 20 (1974), 251–304.

Chur, and Luxeuil, in the ecclesiastical reorganization and mission in the Burgundian–Alemannian–Raetian frontier area.

The new beginnings of the see of Augsburg also extended back to the seventh century.[56] The reorganization seems to have begun at Saint Afra, where a Christian community had maintained itself. At the abbey, which celebrated the memory of Dagobert I, rich graves from the period around or before 700 were recently uncovered, among them perhaps also tombs of older bishops. The representatives of the mission on the Lech remain anonymous. Influences from Italy could have been noted in the late sixth century. That on the Frankish side Amandus then also worked in Augsburg remains only a weakly supported conjecture. Not until the eighth century does some light begin to dissipate the darkness. Beside Augsburg there appear as ecclesiastical centers Neuburg on the Staffel Lake, Epfach on the Lech, and the stations of Füssen and Kempten in the Allgäu, founded with the aid of the Sankt Gallen monks Magnus and Theodore. If Magnus was said to have really evangelized in the Allgäu, then paganism must have maintained itself there unusually long—into the 740s. Hence one should think rather of the organizational construction of the diocese, especially since right at this time the mayors of the palace established the Iller frontier between Augsburg and Constance.

Around the turn from the seventh to the eighth century Augsburg probably belonged to the territory of the dukes of Bavaria, which included the old province of *Raetia II* and parts of Noricum. Just as in the Raetian capital of Augsburg, so also apparently in the large Roman camp of Regensburg a Roman Christian community had maintained itself, grouped around the local basilica of Saint George.[57] The continuity of the cult of Saint Florian indicated similar circumstances at Lorch, and a Roman Christian congregation can have continued also at Passau.[58] Larger groups of free and wealthy Romans clearly continued around Salzburg–Reichenhall, whose ecclesiastical center may have been Saint Peter of Salzburg. Here even in the countryside at Bischofshofen the continuity of an early Christian cult, that of Maximilian, can be demonstrated.[59] In the North Tirol the immigrating Bajuwares came upon the tribe of the Breones, in which Christian influences had as yet scarcely established themselves.

---

[56] On Bavaria in general: R. Bauerreiss (see the survey of the literature). On Augsburg, Kempten, and Füssen: F. Zoepfl, *Das Bistum Augsburg und seine Bischöfe im Mittelalter* (Augsburg 1956); E. Klebel, "Zur Gesch. der christlichen Mission im schwäbischen Stammesgebiet," *Zschr. für württ. Landesgesch.* 17 (1958), 145–218; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum,* 334–336, 359–364, 406, 434; H. Büttner, *Konstanzer Diözesangrenzen,* 265–268, id., *Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer,* pp. 7, 9, 26; H. Hübener, "Zum römischen und frühmittelalterlichen Augsburg," *Jb. des RG Zentralmuseums Mainz* 5 (1958), 154–238; J. Werner, "Studien zu Abodiacum-Epfach," *Münchener Beiträge zur Vor-und Frügesch.* 7 (1964; in it, especially K. Schmid, "Bischof Wikterp in Epfach. Eine Studie über Bischof und Bischofssitz im 8. Jh."); K. Reindel, "Die Bistumsorganisation im Alpen-Donau-Raum in der Spätantike und im Frühmittelalter," *MIÖG* 72 (1964), 277–310.

[57] F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum,* 319, 332, 337, 380, footnote 171; J. Sydow, "Untersuchungen über die frühen Kirchenbauten in Regensburg," *RivAC* 31 (1955), 75–96; E. Klebel, "Regensburg," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* ed. T. Mayer, IV (Lindau-Constance 1958), 87–104; M. Piendl, "Probleme der frühen Baugeschichte von St. Emmeram in Regensburg," *ZBLG* 28 (1965) (*Festgabe M. Spindler*), 32–46; H. Büttner, *Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer,* 9 and 14.

The Raetian–Norican Christians in the Duchy of Bavaria were traditionally oriented to Aquileia. The connection with the ecclesiastical province of Aquileia had probably continued into the early seventh century.[60] However, the impulses proceeding from there grew weak as a consequence of the political and ecclesiastical isolation of the ancient metropolis of northeast Italy in the seventh century. Thereby the Roman-Christian island communities in Bavaria lost the support of the great ecclesiastical centers of the untouched Christian interior. Of the bishoprics of the province of Aquileia only the little refuge-see of Säben (=Brixen) in the Eisack Valley belonged to the territory of the Bavarian

---

[58] R. Noll, *Frühes Christentum in Österreich von den Anfängen bis um 600* (Vienna 1954). On Lorch and St. Florian: F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum,* 330ff. and 435. *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La Conversione al cristianesimo* (Spoleto 1967), 539–540 (More on the cult of Florian in Lombard Austria: Friuli, Vicenza, Treviso, Verona); F. Lotter, "Lauriacum—Lorch zwischen Antike u. MA," *Mitt. des oberösterreichischen Landesarchivs* 11 (1974), 31–49. On Linz: H. Koller, "Der Donauraum zwischen Linz und Wien. Kulturkontinuität und Kulturverlust des Romanentums nördlich der Alpen," *Hist. Jb. der Stadt Linz* (1960), 1–53. On Passau: M. Heuwiesser, *Gesch. des Bistums Passau* I (Passau 1939). F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum,* 325, 329ff., 413; id., "Salzburg zwischen Antike und MA," *Frühma. St.* 5 (1974).

[59] F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum,* 338, 395–404, 423ff.

[60] The more recent research on the Christian connections of Bavaria with the south and southeast began with E. Klebel, "Zur Gesch. des Christentums in Bayern vor Bonifatius," *St. Bonifatius. Gedenkgabe zum 1200. Todestag* (Fulda 1954), 288–411, to which Klebel himself added some supplementary material regarding Augsburg in his article cited in note 56. Klebel investigated the relations on the basis of patrons, of archaeology, of liturgy, and of ecclesiastical language. In his view patronage yielded little, whereas the early Christian buildings as well as the liturgy and ecclesiastical vocabulary clearly revealed relations. Klebel thought in this connection of Gothic Arian influences, and, like I. Zibermayr, *Noricum, Bayern und Österreich* (1956), of old connections with Sirmium. He did not greatly value the influences on the part of the Alpine Romans, who belonged to the province of Aquileia and like it adhered to the Schism of the Three Chapters. But the most recent research, which Prinz synopsizes in various places in his book, strongly emphasizes the connections with Italy, especially with Aquileia. Prinz accepted a more or less strong Roman continuity, not only in the Salzburg area but also around Regensburg and Passau. He thought he saw an opposition between these Roman Christian groups of the Aquileia observance and the Merovingian clerics and monks, who came into the country with Frankish rule (F. Prinz, op. cit., 354, 383, note 181). The conversion of the Bavarians who had immigrated into Raetia and Noricum was essentially the work of Merovingian missionaries. The ecclesiastical integration of the two groups of peoples was definitively "completed probably only with Boniface's organization of the Church." The following picture results: Arian influences may have been active among the Bajuwares but they are not really evident (F. Prinz, op. cit., 337, note 48, 358, note 100). The special nature of the South German ecclesiastical

vocabulary is unclarified (F. Prinz, op. cit., 345ff.). Influences from Milan have left traces in the liturgy and perhaps also in the cult of Ambrose at Augsburg (F. Prinz, op. cit., 334; E. Klebel, *Mission im schwäbischen Stammesgebiet,* 211). In the diocese of Augsburg Italian patronages are found: Valentine of Mais (near Meran), Zeno of Verona, Justina of Padua, Christina (Klebel, op. cit.). The Early Christian architecture of Noricum stood in the closest relations to Aquileia (R. Noll, *Frühes Christentum,* 127ff.). Also in the sequel the connection of the ecclesiastical architecture of Bavaria was maintained with now Lombard Italy (F. Prinz, op. cit., 444). Elements of the liturgy of Aquileia maintained themselves at Salzburg (F. Prinz, op. cit., 326, 398, 401); in Salzburg's Bischofshofen Maximilian of Celeia probably had an old shrine (E. Klebel, *Christentum in Bayern,* 395). Churches in the dioceses of Salzburg (E. Klebel, op. cit.), Regensburg (chapel: E. Klebel, op. cit.), and Freising (E. Klebel, op. cit., F. Prinz, 340, 344) were dedicated to Zeno of Verona. Vigilius of Trent was honored in the diocese of Freising and at Regensburg (E. Klebel, op. cit.). Cassian of Imola was patron of a Regensburg church (E. Klebel, op. cit., F. Prinz, op. cit., p. 338; J. Sydow, "Fragen um die Cassianskirche in Regensburg," *Der Schlern* 29 [1955], 452–457). The patronage of Saint George in Regensburg (St. Emmeram) and perhaps also elsewhere may have been transmitted from late antiquity or related to Italy or eastern connections (F. Prinz, op. cit., 337ff., 355; E. Klebel, *Mission in Bayern,* 399). Eastern influences (from Sirmium?) are detectable in the Passau liturgy (E. Klebel, *Mission in Bayern,* 403ff.). Byzantine jewelry is found in graves of Bavarian nobles (F. Prinz, op. cit., 355). Gold-leaf crosses are found on the Lower Inn and the central Salzach (J. Werner, op. cit., 54; H. Büttner, *Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer,* 21). The evidence cited is not all of the same cogency and probably not always chronologically exactly determined. Most of the Italian cults, especially the patronage of Cassian and the relatively widespread patronage of Zeno, must hardly have been adopted before the eighth century. Here the Lombard stratum appears surely more clearly than the Late Roman and Early Christian, which is more tangible in archeology and perhaps in liturgy. That Saint Florian of Noricum appears much more frequently in Lombard Austria as an ecclesiastical patron (cf. note 58) than in old Bavaria, that Saint Afra "already found admission into the Upper Italian preliminary forms of the Martyrologium Hieronymianum" (F. Prinz, op. cit., 345, note 75) but was only rarely a patron in Swabia, are paradoxes which still await clarification. From this one cannot without more ado infer an atrophying of the Late Roman Christian tradition in Raetia and Noricum, since the continuity of the shrine of Saint Afra is attested in the sixth century by Venantius Fortunatus, and the wandering route of the Luxeuil monk Agrestius permits no doubt for the early seventh century in connections existing between Bavaria and Aquileia (H. Büttner, *Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer,* 22). Also, Bishop Marcianus, who probably died in 608 and was buried at Grado, and who for forty years "peregrinatus est pro causa fidei," has his place here. His activity extended, according to H. Büttner (*Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer,* 21) "at the earliest to the Alpine region in the vicinity of the Brenner Pass and the northern approaches to the Alps."

dukes. Although Säben apparently carried on the tradition of Early Christian Augsburg, no initiative could proceed from it for the ecclesiastical reorganization and mission of the wider area occupied by the Bajuwares. The personnel of the little see was absorbed by the mission of the Breon country (North Tirol) and invaded by the Bajuwares, but in any event ecclesiastical radiations became noticeable in the approaches to the Alps as far as Augsburg.[61]

The decisive initiatives for the Bavarian mission came, not from the South, but from the West. At the very establishing of the Bavarian Duchy by Theodebert I (534–548) Gallo-Roman bishops (*Galliarum episcopi*) were installed, who tried to extend their influence also to *Noricum Mediterraneum* (Carinthia).[62] But their activity was without lasting effect. However, the Agilulfing Dukes, who made their appearance in the second half of the sixth century, professed the Catholic faith, causing the still mostly pagan Bajuwares to receive a Christian head. If the dukes came from Burgundy, as has recently been assumed by most,[63] they could have participated directly in the missionary initiative proceeding from Eustasius of Luxeuil (610–629). In fact, Tassilo I (529–after 610) seems to have supported Eustasius and his companion Agilus in the founding of a mission-station near Regensburg, from which resulted the abbey of Weltenburg.[64] From Luxeuil, also under Eustasius, went the monk Agrestius as missionary to Bavaria and from there to Aquileia, where he joined the schismatics of the Three Chapters.

On his journey to the Slavs, Amandus must also have crossed Bavaria, but there are no reports of a mission of the Apostle of the Flemings among the Bajuwares. Meanwhile, the christianization of the people must have been in full swing, when Emmeram (Haimchramm) came to Regensburg c. 665 (or 685–690), where he met death in an obscure conflict with the ducal family. The stops on Emmeram's route from Poitiers to Regensburg are unfortunately unknown. In view of the early relations of Columban's monasticism with Bourges and Poitiers, the supposition is natural that Emmeram also came from the Luxeuil circle. He could have taken the route of his probably somewhat older countryman, Fridolin of Säckingen, to the Rhine, on which Strasbourg may have been an intermediate station.[65] The monk-Bishop Erhard (of Narbonne?), who worked at Regensburg in the early eighth century, was, according to his biographer, in contact with the ducal house of Alsace.[66] In regard to Emmeram it does not go beyond a guess. However, the ducal residence of Regensburg clearly emerges as a chief point of departure of the Bavarian mission, both in the case of Eustasius and in that of Emmeram and Erhard. Also Bishop Rupert (Hrodbert), who probably left his diocese of Worms in 695 for political reasons in order to work in Bavaria, apparently went first to Regensburg and received from Duke Theodo the country of Salzburg as his field of activity, with supervision of the mission among the Slavonic Carinthians.[67]

---

[61] Säben as place of refuge of the Bishop of Augsburg: R. Heuberger, *Raetien im Altertum und im Frühmittelalter* (1932), 172; H. Büttner, *Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer*, 18–20 (Bavarian since c. 600), 23, 28. E. Klebel called attention to the old possessions of the sees of Regensburg, Freising, and especially Augsburg in the sphere of the see of Säben (*Mission im schwäbischen Stammesgebiet*, 186ff.). Whether references to mission connections are supplied with this remains still an open question.

[62] *MGEp* I, 1, 20; F. Prinz, op. cit., 352ff.

[63] E. Zöllner, "Die Herkunft der Agilulfinger," *MIÖG* 59 (1951), 245ff.

[64] F. Prinz, op. cit., 356–358. Prinz dates the Bavarian mission of Eustasius to the period c. 610, following Barrault; Büttner, on the other hand, c. 626–27 (*Frühmittelalterliche Bistümer*, 22).

The last in the series of "Apostles of Bavaria" was Corbinian, who came from Melun (province of Sens) and worked in Freising soon after 716.[68] Meanwhile, the Bavarian Duchy had been divided, and so Corbinian did not go via Regensburg, but perhaps was presented by Rome to the Duke of Freising. The deceased Duke Theodo had contacted Rome in 716 about erecting a Bavarian ecclesiastical province. This initiative of Theodo shows that the Bavarian mission was externally completed. Since Emmeram, Rupert, and Corbinian there were in the ducal capitals of Regensburg, Salzburg, and Freising, to which Passau was also added, "monk-bishops with fixed sees" (Schieffer).[69] However, it characterizes the position of the three churchmen that none of what became cathedral monasteries had been founded by them: the three patrons of Bavaria do not stand at the beginning of the history of the conversion of the country.

---

[65] *Vita Haimhrammi, MGSS rer. Mer.* IV, 452–526; F. Prinz, op. cit., 380ff., returns with Löwe and against Klebel and Zibermayr to the old dating of Krusch at c. 660–670. In regard to Emmeram's intermediate stops, only assumptions can, of course, be made. In this it should be noted that, of the Merovingian missionaries, according to tradition, besides Emmeram also Fridolin of Säckingen and Amandus came from Poitou. Well known is the role of Bishop Dido of Poitiers as the chief ally of the Pippinids in Grimoald's coup d'état of 656. Nevertheless, Prinz properly stresses that in the sources there is found no trace of support of Emmeram by the Franks.

[66] *Vita Erhardi, MGSS rer. Mer.* VI, 1–21; F. Prinz, op. cit., 385–387. Of the three statements of origin in the *vita,* the origin from *Narboanensis* (Septimania) has the greatest likelihood. Intermediate stops could have been Moyenmoutier and Alsatian monasteries. The period of activity was probably the first third of the eighth century.

[67] *Gesta Hrodberti, MGSS rer. Mer.* VI, 157–162; F. Prinz, op. cit., 394–403. Herwig Wolfram, "Der heilige Rupert und die antikarolingische Adelsopposition," *MSÖG* 80 (1972), 4–34; H. Baumann, "Zur Textgeschichte der Vita Ruperti," *Festschrift für H. Heimpel* 3 (1972), 166–196.

[68] *Vita Corbiniani, MGSS rer. Mer.* VI, 497–635; F. Prinz, op. cit., 388–394; H. Löwe, "Corbinians Romreisen," *ZBLG* 16 (1951–52), 409–420.

[69] T. Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas* (Freiburg 1954), 139. Cf. also the statements of F. Prinz, op. cit., 381–382, 386 (Regensburg), 390ff., 393ff. (Freising), 399, 401, 407 (Salzburg), 412 (Passau), on the cathedral monasteries in the later Bavarian episcopal seats.

On the whole, the picture of the mission among the Bavarians is somewhat clearer than that among the Alemanni. King Theudebert I probably gave the people a Christian leadership and sent Gallo-Roman bishops, who perhaps busied themselves in the reorganizing of the surviving Roman-Christian communities. No missionary impulse could go out from these, since their support in the Christian hinterland of Aquileia that had remained intact had been interrupted by the political frontiers and had finally failed entirely. The initiative for the Bavarian mission came from Luxeuil, in which perhaps the blood relationship of the monk Agilus with the Agilulfing ducal house played a role. And later missionaries may have been in contact with the monasticism of Luxeuil in the broader sense. Both the persisting Romance communities and the residences of the Agilulfings offered points of departure for the mission to the Bajuwares. In the seventh century there is no further word of a collaboration of the Merovingians.[70] Not until Charles Martel did the influence of the Frankish central power again assert itself. The conversion of the Bavarians to Christianity appears, then, like that of the Alemanni, as a process which was indeed represented by Frankish or Irish-Frankish elements, but took place within the tribe without a discernible exterior pressure.

While Christianity was being established among the Alemanni and the Bavarians, it was also carried to the neighboring lands to the right of the Rhine by the Rhenish episcopal cities. Dagobert I subjected the first church at Utrecht to the bishopric of Cologne; according to a later source, Soest is said at that time to have been assigned also to the see of Cologne.[71] If the orientation of the graves of the seventh century in Westphalia south of the Lippe may indicate that they were Christian, the mission would have already extended at that time to the entire part of the later diocese of Cologne to the right of the Rhine.[72] However, this interpretation is disputed. The first churches of Utrecht and Soest may have served a Frankish garrison in a still greatly pagan milieu. The advance of the Frisians and Saxons put an end also to these advance-stations: a new beginning had to be made in the eighth century. The areas that remained Frankish in the strip of Cologne, Bonn, and Koblenz on the right bank of the Rhine must have been Christian up to the early eighth century, since they were no longer mission territory in the Carolingian epoch. There are no direct written statements, but thus far only archeological testimonies for the Rhenish towns of Niederdollendorf and Leutesdorf.[73]

---

[70] In any event, Dagobert I could still have intervened, but in this matter one cannot go beyond assumptions.

[71] F. W. Oediger, *Regesten,* nos. 32, 35. See H. Büttner, *Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreiches,* 457.

[72] S. Gollub, "Zur Frage ältester christlicher Bestattungen in Westfalen," *Westfal. Forschungen* 11 (1958), 10–16.

The progress of the mission in the sector of Mainz, Worms, and Speyer stands out somewhat clearer. Here too the first testimonies come from Rhenish places. In Kastel and Wiesbaden Christianity persisted from Roman times; a Christian tombstone from Goddelau in the Ried (south of Trebur) is dated from the fifth or early sixth century. Other tombstones of the seventh and eighth centuries show an advance on the Lower Main as far as the Niddagau. An inscription of 711–717 from Nilkheim near Aschaffenburg confirms that the see of Mainz had at that time reached the Spessart frontier. Inferences permit the statement that the Wetterau had also been christianized at that time from Mainz. Advance-posts, but, in contrast to Utrecht and Soest, firmly in Frankish hands, were Büraburg (near Fritzlar), Amöneburg, Glauberg (near Büdingen), and the Kesterburg (Christenberg near Wetter). The Church of Saint Martin at Christenberg and the Church of Saint Bridget of Büraburg were probably built in the first or second decade of the eighth century.[74]

---

[73] J. Dietrich, "Die frühe kirchliche und politische Erschliessung des unteren Lahngebiets im Spiegel der konradinischen Besitzgeschichte," *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 157–194; E. Ewig, "Das Bistum Köln im Frühmittelalter," *AHVNrh* 155–156 (1954), 205–243; H. Büttner, "Siegerland und Westerwald im frühen Mittelalter," *Hess. Jb. für Landesgesch.* 5 (1955), 27; id., "Die politische Erfassung des Lahn-und Dillgebiets im Früh-und Hochmittelalter," ibid. 8 (1958), 1–21. The tombstones mentioned belong to the seventh century. The mission in the areas situated farther east must be dated in the early eighth century, the ecclesiastical organization in the later eighth and in the ninth centuries. The Trier mission center of Diekirchen on the Lahn must have been founded c. 700.

[74] H. Büttner "Frühes Christentum in Wetterau und Niddagau," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* (1948), 138–150; id., "Frühes fränkisches Christentum am Mittelrhein," *AMrhKG* 3 (1951), 16, 18, 39 (Kastel, Wiesbaden, Goddelau), 40 (Gimbach, Hochheim, Nilkheim), 38ff. (Büraburg, Amöneburg, Glauburg near Büdingen), 52 (Wetterau, Niddagau, Untermain); id., "Die Mainlande um Aschaffenburg im frühen Mittelalter," *Aschaffenburger Jb.* 4 (1957), 109–128; id., *Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreiches,* 457ff. On Kesterburg and the other Hessian fortifications cf. also W. Schlesinger, "Die Franken im Gebiet östlich des mittleren Rheins," *Hess. Jb. für Landesgesch.* 15 (1965), 18ff.; also K. Weidemann, R. Gensen, and N. Wand in *Althessen im Frankenreich* (*Nationes* II) W. Schlesinger 3rd. ed., (1975). Büttner dates the evangelization of Wetterau, Niddagau, and Untermain in the late seventh and early eighth centuries. The first, still wide-meshed net of churches of the Wetterau arose in the first half of the eighth century in connection with the Frankish fiscal area. Later Irish influence around Giessen: M. Gockel and M. Werner, "Die Urkunde des Beatus von Honau von

From Worms in the seventh century the Lower Neckar from Ladenburg to Wimpfen was opened up and at the end of the century the Wingarteiba with the Bauland had been reached. The abbey of Amorbach was erected in the early eighth century in the eastern Odenwald. From Speyer the Kraichgau and the central Neckarland were evangelized in the late seventh and early eighth centuries, and in this the abbey of Weissenburg, founded c. 660, played a special role.[75] Presumably around the same time influences proceeded from Strasbourg to the Ortenau and the Breisgau. The first monasteries in the Ortenau arose under the influence of Pirmin, of course only after the Frankish conquest of Alemannia in the decade 740–750.[76]

From Worms ancient roads ran to Würzburg, which in the seventh and early eighth centuries was the seat of the ducal house of the "Hedene" in the Main area. Christian influences were active here after the first third of the seventh century. The Irish Kilian, who is regarded as the Apostle of the country, and his companions Colman and Totnan lost their lives c. 689 in a conflict with the already Christian Duke Gozbert. Gozbert's son, Duke Heden II, who c. 700 extended his rule also to Thuringia, is said in a late tradition to have founded the Church of Our Lady of Würzburg on the Marienberg. In fact, Heden II exerted himself for the ecclesiastical structure in his lands. He tried to gain the Anglo-Saxon Willibrord for this task, giving him in 704 properties at Arnstadt, Mühlberg near Gotha, and Grossmonra in Thuringia and in 716 his family property of Hammelburg in the Saalegau of the Main area for the purpose of founding a monastery. Apparently Willibrord deputed some Anglo-Saxon helpers to go to Thuringia in 715–719, when the Frisian mission-field was closed to him by the Frisian Duke Radbod. However the monastery at Hammelburg did not materialize—a part of the property given there to the Anglo-Saxon was

---

778," W. Küther, *Die Wüstung Hausen* (1971), 136–166. Cf. also the contributions of Schlesinger, Wand, and Schwind in *Althessen im Frankenreich,* loc. cit.

[75] H. Büttner, "Amorbach und die Pirminlegende," *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 102–107; id., "Christentum und Kirche zwischen Neckar und Main im 7. und frühen 8. Jh.," *St. Bonifatius* (Fulda 1954), 363–387; id., "Fränkische Herrschaft und frühes Christentum im mittleren Neckargebiet," 22. *Veröffentlichung des Hist. Vereins Heilbronn* (1957), 7–15; id., *Die Mainlande um Aschaffenburg,* 111–112; id., "Das Bistum Worms und der Neckarraum während des Früh- und Hochmittelalters," *AMrhKG* 10 (1958), 9–38; id., *Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreiches,* p. 458. Büttner stresses that the earliest church organization on the Rhine, Neckar, and Main was very closely connected with the Frankish *fisci.*

[76] The beginnings of Gengenbach are said to extend back to c. 727: H. Jaenichen, "Warin, Ruthard und Scrot," *Zschr. für Württemberg. Landesgesch.* 14 (1955), 327–384. In the period of the powerful Alemannian duchy influences from Alsace were not, in my opinion, of very great importance.

turned over to the abbey of Echternach. In the March of Hammelburg and in Schweinfurt the abbey of Weissenburg also had possessions, which are first attested by the Weissenburg land record, drawn up after the middle of the ninth century. Whether these properties were presented by Heden II to the South Frankish abbey and were included in a missionary effort of Weissenburg is doubtful, according to the more recent studies. The tradition of the founding of the monastery of Saint Peter at Erfurt by Weissenburg is to be rejected as a fabrication.[77] On the contrary, there seem to have been relations between Heden II and Mainz. The legendary tradition that Bilichild, the foundress of a convent of Altmünster, established at Mainz around or shortly before 700, was a blood relative of the Würzburg ducal family is supported by the endowment of the abbey in the vicinity of Würzburg.[78] The oldest network of churches in the Main area was closely connected with the fiscal organization, as the endowment of the bishopric founded by Boniface through the agency of the Mayor Carloman shows. It was probably completed under Charles Martel after the breakup of the Main-Thuringian Duchy c. 719.

When Winfrid-Boniface took up his activity in Hesse and Thuringia on the other side of the forest, there were already old bases of the mission in these two districts and on the Main. The evangelization of the Frankish strip on the right bank of the Rhine, Alemannia, and Bavaria was completed. The German mission had grown out of the ecclesiastical restoration, which had achieved its first successes on the Rhine in the sixth century, then in the Burgundian–Alemannian–Raetian frontier zone at the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh centuries, and finally in the North Gallic-Frankish territory in the first and second thirds of the seventh century. But its great triumphs are due extensively to the Luxeuil monasticism, which renewed the missionary impulse and was active both on the North Gallic-Frankish front and in the sphere of the South German tribes.

---

[77] H. Büttner, *Frühes fränkisches Christentum am Mittelrhein,* 43–49 (there also influences from Reims); id., *Christentum und Kirche zwischen Neckar und Main,* 373–375; id., *Die Mainlande um Aschaffenburg,* pp. 111ff.; id., *Fränkische Herrschaft,* 9ff.; id., *Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreiches,* pp. 458ff.; F. Prinz, op. cit., 234–236, 238–241; J. Dienemann, *Der Kult des hl. Kilian im 8. und 9. Jh.* (Würzburg 1955). Patze–Schlesinger, *Gesch. Thüringens* I, 338–344; M. Werner, "Die Gründungstradition des Erfurter Petersklosters," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* Sonderband 12 (1973).

[78] H. Büttner, *Frühes fränkisches Christentum am Mittelrhein.* 50; id., *Die Mainlande um Aschaffenburg,* 113; E. Ewig, "Die ältesten Mainzer Bischofsgräber," *Universitas* 2, *Festschrift Bischof A. Stohr* (1960), 23; id., "Die ältesten Mainzer Patrozinien und die Frühgeschichte des Bistums Mainz," *Das erste Jahrtausend. Kunst und Kultur im werdenden Abendland an Rhein und Ruhr* I (Düsseldorf 1962); 125–127; F. Prinz, op. cit., 188ff.

The Merovingian Kings did not employ compulsion for the mission, but probably encouraged the ecclesiastical restoration and mission directly and indirectly. Thus Theuderic I brought Aquitanians to Austrasian *Francia* in order again to fill up the thinned ranks of the clergy there. Thus Theudebert II established Columban and his companions on the Lakes of Zurich and Constance, and Dagobert I summoned monks of Luxeuil to the North Gallic-Frankish country. The clerics and monks active in the mission obtained the royal protection and a material support that was occasionally very considerable, as the founding of the abbey of Saint-Amand shows. The distant possessions on the Rhine of the churches within Gaul hence probably go back in part to the use of these churches in restoration and mission. From it one can infer with the necessary caution to a sharing by the churches of Reims and Châlons, of Trier, Metz, and Verdun, in the work of rebuilding on the Rhine.

The royal encouragement operated indirectly in such a way that the mission could begin, and usually had begun, near the center of royal government: near the royal residences, the Roman and Merovingian fortifications, and the great fiscal manors, where churches were erected early for the needs of the court and of the Frankish garrisons and administration, and where the protection of the Merovingian officials was most effective. The decay of the Merovingian royal authority since the second third of the seventh century fundamentally changed nothing in this situation, since the dukes were Christian and in many respects could assume the functions of the crown in regard to Christianity and Church. True, they did not have the right to found new bishoprics.[79] In practice conflicts often resulted when the missionaries were regarded at the same time as political emissaries of the Franks or when they intransigently upheld canon law and ecclesiastical morality vis-à-vis a still *rudis christianitas.* To what extent the mission work suffered wrongs from case to case is difficult to determine.

In the city residences of kings and dukes and the fortresses there were still Romance Christian groups both on the Rhine and east of the Iller and south of the Danube, which had survived the wanderings of the peoples. On the Rhine, where the ecclesiastical restoration began as early as the sixth century, they supplied a powerful support for the work of construction, especially since the Aquitanian Gallic clerics were not seen by them as foreigners. But occasionally reactions against the helpers from the West and South appeared among the German Frankish population. The Raetian and Norican Romance peoples seem to have taken a more reserved stand toward the *episcopi Galliarum* and their helpers, perhaps also toward the Luxeuil monks of the seventh century, even if the opposition may have been at times overstressed by Prinz. Finally, at Regensburg and Salzburg the churches for which a Roman continuity is assumed became the germ cells of the new bishopric. As Prinz himself emphasizes, the Bavarian dukes in general must have maintained good relations with the indigenous *Romania.* The symbiosis, present from the beginning in the areas to the left of the Rhine and south of the Danube must, in any event, on the whole have facilitated the conversion of the Franks, Alemanni, and Bavarians who settled there.

---

[79] After the death of Dagobert I (638) no more bishoprics were established in the Merovingian Kingdom up to Boniface. On the other hand, the dukes of Alsace in the extending of their domination to the Swiss Jura, had the bishopric of Basel, only recently founded, given up and united the territory of Basel with Strasbourg. Constance developed in the period of the de facto vacancy of the throne into a national Alemannian see, by absorbing the entire Alemannian mission area and thereby became one of the largest dioceses of the Middle Ages. A plan of the Bavarian Duke Theodo of 716 for the ecclesiastical organization of his country could, characteristically, not be implemented. It remains historically significant in so far as then, for the first time, the effort was made in the Frankish sphere of influence to call upon the Pope for the founding of bishoprics.

On the Rhine line from Cologne to Worms the work of construction must always have lain in the hands of the bishops, where the episcopal organization, despite gaps in the lists of Rhenish bishops, had not entirely collapsed or could soon be rebuilt with the aid of Aquitanian and inner Gallic clergy. In this connection it was surely of importance that the outside helpers themselves were either clerics or, as monks of the older type, could be the more readily incorporated into the episcopal organization. The oldest churches were always subject to the bishop or to the abbots of the old basilicas dependent on the bishop, and in a few cases also to the King. The proprietary churches of the landowners only joined the others in the phase of completion. Monasteries of the Luxeuil type were likewise founded only in this second phase and developed especially in the arable areas of the Ardennes (=Eifel) and Vosges (=Hardt). They acquired a greater importance for the structure of the dioceses only in the sphere of the sees of Maastricht–Liège, Speyer, and Strasbourg, where they had a greater share in the real work of conversion.

In clear contrast to the Rhine zone in this respect were the North Gallic-Frankish and the Alemannian mission areas, where the sees of Thérouanne and Constance appeared for a long time as "poor relatives" as compared with abbeys such as Saint-Omer (Sithiu) and Sankt Gallen or Reichenau respectively, or the abbey of Saint-Vaast of Arras which formed a powerful opposite pole to the episcopal city of Cambrai. Finally, Bavaria represented a third zone, where the episcopal churches themselves first developed out of monastic beginnings. On the other hand, it can hardly be misunderstood that the stronger missionary dynamism in the seventh century lay in districts dominated by or at least strongly stamped by monasticism.

Thus it is implicitly said that the spread of Christianity is to be understood not only as an ecclesiastical-political-organization procedure, even if the organizational procedures can be seen the best. Of the motives of the conversion, of the spirit and methods of the mission, which were at least partly aimed at it, the sources unfortunately give only a very inadequate picture.[80] In the foreground often stood the tests of the power of the Christian God and of his preachers. *Procédés simples et violents,* such as the destruction of pagan sanctuaries and cult objects, sprang in general not from sheer fanaticism but were intended to display the powerlessness of the gods *ad oculos.* The positive counterpart to this was the miracles of the saints. But the *prouesses ascétiques* not only of the monks of Columban but also of the older hermits, such as Wulfilaich, also made a great impression. Also in keeping with the genuine Christian spirit were the works of mercy, including the redemption of captives. Spiritual instruction was apparently very strongly required by Caesarius of Arles.

In the conversion doubtless faith (profession) and cult stood in the foreground, if the two cannot be so sharply distinguished in the Christian sphere from ethics and morals, as Kuhn does this.[81] In the language of the Fathers *pietas* was, however, very strongly related to *clementia* and *misericordia.* In the Merovingian Frankish Kingdom there was no total absence of striking testimonies of genuine love of neighbor and of enemies. Furthermore, the Church also considered the protection of the defenseless and oppressed, of underage children and of foreigners, as its special task. But on the whole there still prevailed a formal understanding of the Christian religion, which led to an overemphasis of cult and rite as opposed to moral principles. Nothing is perhaps more characteristic of this religious formalism than the indulgence which the Merovingians allotted without exception to their godchildren in the family feuds that otherwise could have led to complete annihilation. The cultic bond woven by sponsorships was inviolable, stronger than all bonds of blood. In the same context belongs the careful regard for the ecclesiastical right of asylum, which could be circumvented only by stratagem. On the other hand, the vital religious impulses of this piety must also not be overlooked. In the strict observance of cultic-ritual prescriptions was expressed a genuine fear of God, but in this way one might occasionally try to outwit God. For the expiation of crimes committed, people were prepared for great physical exertions and material sacrifices. Numerous pilgrimages, foundations of new churches, and donations attest to this readiness. The often extravagant adornment of altars, saints' tombs, and churches is an eloquent expression of the religious sentiment of this age.

---

[80] Cf. on this F. Graus, *Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger* (Prague 1965); id., *Sozialgesch. Aspekte* (as in footnote 52); especially G. Tessien, *Conversion de Clovis,* 183–187 (see survey of literature for this chapter).

[81] H. Kuhn, "Das Fortleben germanischen Heidentums nach der Christianisierung," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La Conversione al cristianesimo,* 743–757.

To men of this type of mind the saints had to appear as helpers rather than as models.[82] A change of this sort was under way from the end of the fourth century: since the cult of relics gradually covered up the cult of the saints as understood more symbolically and theologically in the early period. German ideas expedited this process. Among the oldest saints honored in Gaul were Mary, the Apostles or the Princes of the Apostles, the Ambrosian martyrs, the protomartyr Stephen, Maurice (Gaul), Vincent (Spain), and Lawrence (Rome), as well as the great Gallic Bishops Hilary of Poitiers, Martin of Tours, Germanus of Auxerre, and Lupus of Troyes. In the early sixth century Peter was regarded as the foundation of the Catholic Church and symbol of its unity. But Peter was buried in Rome. Martin and Hilary acted more directly on Clovis: they were favorable to him in the Gothic war and he himself rescued their sanctuaries from the Goths. They remained the patrons of the Merovingians, of their Kingdom and their Church. Alongside them came in the sixth and seventh centuries the saints of the royal cities: Remigius of Reims, Médard of Soissons, Denis of Paris, and finally probably also Gereon of Cologne. Decisive weight was carried by the presence of the holy corpse in the royal city, in the royal burial basilica, or in one of the great episcopal cities of *Francia.* In Neustria and Burgundy the basilicas of celebrated saints—*ubi ipse sanctus corpore requiescit*—obtained from Queen Bathildis soon after the middle of the seventh century special privileges with their proper immunity. The individualization of the cult of the saints affected also the cult of Mary, although it was not connected with relics. Mary, who in the Early Church had been regarded as a symbol of the Church, became in the seventh century the patroness of many newly founded convents of nuns. The cult of Peter and of the other Apostles remained alive in the episcopate in the sixth century; in the seventh century it was borne to wider circles, not least of all by monks of Luxeuil.

It was in accord with the thinking of early medieval society that the canon law that was in a closer relationship to *ritus* became earlier and more frequently prominent than the Christian moral law. In the course of the sixth century the Kings gradually also accepted ecclesiastical rules into their capitularies. To be mentioned would be, among others, the already referred to prohibition of idolatry and sacrificial meals by Childebert I (c. 533), the prescription of fasting by Guntram, the command to sanctify Sunday by Guntram (588) and Childebert II (596), the prohibition of marriage between close relatives by Childebert II and of the marriage of nuns by Clothar II (614), as well as enactments on the law of asylum. The *Lex Salica,* compiled under Clovis, was still hardly touched by a Christian spirit, but the case was different with the *Lex Ribuaria,* drawn up in the first half of the seventh century. In it is found for the first time the later often quoted legal proposition, "Ecclesia vivit lege Romana," with which was expressed the recognition of a special ecclesiastical body of law. The *Lex Ribuaria* also received the legislation of Clothar II and Dagobert I, including the prescriptions which extensively subordinated to the Church's patronage freed men who had not belonged to the crown. Still stronger was the ecclesiastical influence in the *Lex Alamannorum* and the *Lex Baiuvariorum,* whose traditional compilations go back to the 720s and 740s. A great part of the royal decrees—*wergeld* of clerics, sanctification of Sunday, marriage of blood relatives, law of asylum, ecclesiastical patronage of freedmen—was accepted into these laws.[83] In them the bishop is contrasted with the clergy by a special *wergeld,* the oath is partially christianized, excommunication is added to the secular penalty for especially heinous crimes, such as parricide. It is difficult to determine the Christian influence on the spirit of the legal norms in the popular laws.[84] Christian legal thought is manifested in general only in an already formally Christian environment, that is, after the conclusion of the conversion in the stricter sense. In this later phase people were more energetic in abolishing pagan customs. This is more clearly expressed in the late seventh and early eighth centuries in the change of burial rites: in the giving up of depositing objects in graves and of interment in rows of graves, in the transfer of the cemetery to the parish church.

---

[82] On what follows: E. Ewig, "Die Kathedralpatroninien im römischen und fränkischen Gallien," *HJ* 79 (1960), 1–61; id., "Der Petrus-und Apostelkult im spätrömischen und fränkischen Gallien," *ZKG* 71 (1960), 215–251; id., "Le culte de St. Martin à l'époque franque," *RHEF* (1962), 1–32.

The christianization of State and society, running parallel to evangelization, began at the earliest and most clearly with the kingship.[85] Clovis at his baptism had had to renounce the divine origin of his family—*sola nobilitate contentus,* as Avitus of Vienne put it. The German ideas of a special royal healing power were not thereby lost. And the ancient forms of lifting up and installing the King did not change. The change began in the view of the ruler's calling: here a constant influence of Christian moral principles is first to be recognized. Already Remigius of Reims had impressed on Clovis the protection of the unarmed and the oppressed, of widows and orphans, in a simple transfer of episcopal duties to the King. He inaugurated the series of bishops who admonished the Kings to maintain *iustitia* in the sense of *aequitas,* to cultivate *pietas* in the sense of the personal fear of God as care for the Church and protection of the needy. In the liturgy of the seventh century the King took the place of the Emperor, the Frankish took the place of the Roman name. As special task of the ruler appeared here the maintenance of external peace, especially in regard to pagans. In the seventh century the King was represented as God's vicar in the government of the world, and to him was even attributed the function of conferring the episcopal function. Already there occurred references to the Old Testament kingship. Clothar II was the first Frankish King to be compared to David. In the early eighth century Dagobert I was designated in retrospect as Solomon, King of Peace.

---

[83] Many a conflict still flared up over the ecclesiastical law of marriage between missionaries of the seventh and early eighth centuries (Kilian, Corbinian) and the already converted dukes on the right side of the Rhine.

[84] J. Imbart, "L'influence du christianisme sur la legislation des peuples francs et germains," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo,* 365–396; G. Vismara, "Cristianesimo e legislazione germaniche. Leggi langobarde, alamanne e bavare," ibid., 397–467.

[85] E. Ewig, "Zum christlichen Königsgedanken im Frühmittelalter," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* ed. T. Mayer, III (Lindau–Constance 1956), 19–24.

Thereby was struck a new note, which was attentively listened to. Many clues show that in the period from c. 585 to 638 a new stage had been reached in the christianization of State and society: the boundaries between national councils and assemblies of magnates became blurred, Germans entered the episcopate in greater numbers, the Luxeuil monasticism radiated to the kingship and aristocracy of *Francia,* ecclesiastical decrees gradually found entry into royal and popular law. The development as such did not stop, but the organizing power of the Kingdom disappeared as a consequence of the hopeless decadence of the Merovingian Dynasty, which since 680 was clear to the whole world. Only the Carolingians took up the threads and tied them again.

CHAPTER 35

The East Germans and Catholicism:

The Conversion of the Sueves and Visigoths of Spain to Catholicism and the Second Flowering of Christian Antiquity in the Spanish Visigothic National Church

The West stood under the aegis of the East Germans, especially the Goths, for scarcely a century—from the extinction of the Theodosian Dynasty in 455 to the beginning of Justinian's wars of reconquest in

533. In the dissolution of the *Imperium* in the West the Vandals under Gaiseric (428–477), who probably was the first ruler to found a sovereign *regnum,* played a significant but ephemeral role. In contrast to the Vandals, the Goths gradually grew into the *Imperium,* although as Arians they remained separate from the Romans. Their kings took over the legacy of the great army commanders who had governed the *Hesperium Regnum* since the death of Theodosius I. Visigoths and Ostrogoths collaborated in this. The Visigoths had been settled, after they had broken out of the Balkans, as *foederati* in southwest Gaul (*Aquitania* II, province of Bordeaux) in 418 and there they established the Kingdom of Toulouse, which expanded over southern Gaul and northern Spain. The Ostrogoths invaded Italy in 489. From the Visigoth Euric (466–484), the great King in Gaul and Spain, hegemony passed to the Ostrogoth Theodoric (488/493–526), the imperial *patricius* and great King in Italy.

Politically and in Church history the Kingdom of the Vandals, whose Kings from Gaiseric to Thrasamund engaged in an active arianization, occupied a special position. Among the Vandals there occurred a real persecution of Catholics, which it is true did not lead to the ruin of the Afro-Roman Church but considerably impaired the importance and significance of that Church within the whole of Christianity.[1] In the two Gothic Kingdoms and that of the Sueves in Spain which was under Gothic influence and that of the Burgundians in Gaul, the Catholic Church was spared trials of this severity. The structure of these *regna* was arranged in a double pattern. The dual construction was based on the Late Roman separation of military and civilian and made possible an on the whole peaceful and at times even friendly coexistence of Arian Germans (military) and Catholic Romans (civilian). Of course, it constituted an impediment for the German-Roman symbiosis, although the Goths opened themselves in a greater degree to Graeco-Roman culture than did the Franks. For the most powerful bond of community was not education but faith.

So long as the Arian Germans lived as *foederati* inside the *Imperium,* their relations to the Catholic Church were not problematic, since the Church, as an imperial institution, was withdrawn from their competence.[2] True, there could be encroachments and plundering but not to the extent of a conflict of fundamental importance. Such a conflict first occurred when Euric dissociated the Visigothic Kingdom from the *Imperium,* by which the connection of the Catholic Church of his dominions with Rome and the Church of the Empire was severed, and the making of new appointments to vacant sees in his kingdom was thwarted. These restrictive measures crippled ecclesiastical life and naturally were felt as persecution, but they sprang from a new situation and had at bottom only a political, not a religious-ecclesiastical background. Euric's son and successor, Alaric II, replaced them with a positive policy of integration. The *Lex Romana Visigothorum,* also called *Breviarium Alaricianum,* which was published under him in 506, contained the essential decisions of imperial law which regulated the life of the Church in the *Imperium* and were now sanctioned as Gothic royal law for the Romans. The Synod of Agde, which met in the same year under the presidency of Bishop Caesarius of Arles, inaugurated, five years before the Franco-Gallic Synod of Orléans and eleven years before the Burgundo-Gallic Synod of Yenne (Epaon), the series of early medieval "national councils," which were to meet in the future on the basis of a *regnum* at the order or at least with the assent of the German king of the moment. Ecclesiastical affairs in the Visigothic Kingdom became normal, and the Catholic Romans put up with a general, but in extent not more carefully defined, supremacy of the Arian King over the Church.

---

[1] Cf. chap. 38. Here let us refer once more to the two basic works on the history of the Vandals: L. Schmidt, *Gesch. der Wandalen* (Munich 1942), and especially C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1950).

[2] For the statements on Euric and Alaric II, cf. K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Sueven,* 27ff. (new view with justified correction of views hitherto current).

Alaric's solution was not at first effective in the Gothic area, since the Frankish war of 507–511 put the bases of life of the Visigoths in question. The Kingdom of Toulouse perished and the strongholds of the nation in western Aquitania were lost to the Franks along with the capital. The great Ostrogothic King Theodoric saved his Visigothic kinsfolk from destruction, but annexed Provence to the area under direct Ostrogothic rule and at the same time claimed the government in the interest of his Visigothic grandson, Amalaric, son of Alaric II. Under Ostrogothic protection the Visigothic capital was first transferred to Narbonne.

Not only as King of the Ostrogoths but also at the same time as *patricius* in the service of the Emperor, Theodoric was ruler of Italy. His position in relation to the Roman Church as well as to the Catholic Church of the West in general was therefore not comprehensible in the national-church categories. Even if the Amal was said to have exercised an influence over the Roman Church in far broader measure than was previously believed, in fact his domination was to the advantage of the ecclesiastical autonomy of Rome vis-à-vis the Emperor.[3] In the entire

---

[3] Basic for the prevailing view is G. Pfeilschifter, *Der Ostgotenkönig Theoderich der Grosse und die katholische Kirche* (Münster 1896). Correcting details in W. Ensslin, *Theoderich*

Gothic area the relations of the Gallic-Spanish churches to Rome were again established, as the special mandate of Pope Hormisdas to the Bishop of Elne (province of Baetica) and the grant of papal vicariates to Arles for Gaul and Spain in 514 and to Seville for Baetica and Lusitania in 521 show. In Spain under Gothic rule the Church resumed its synodal activity of the old type: in the form of provincial, not of national councils.[4]

Thus the rule of Theodoric the Great in the Gothic Kingdoms of the West meant for the Church basically a return to the situation of late Roman times. There was at first no change in this in the Visigothic sphere even after Theodoric's death. For when the restoration policy of Justinian spread to Italy, the *intermedio ostrogodo* in the Visigothic Kingdom still continued under Kings Theudis (531–548) and Theudegisil (548–49). Theudis was able to stop new Frankish attacks in 531 and 541. Gothic rule was maintained in *Narbonensis I* (Septimania without Toulouse) and in Spain. In Spain, the Goths could gradually spread beyond Tarraconensis and Carthaginiensis into Baetica (province of Seville).

The future of the Visigoths was threatened less by external dangers than by inner conflicts since Theudis and Theudegisil did not succeed in establishing a new dynastic legitimacy. The power struggles of the great noble factions threatened at the end of the *intermedio ostrogodo* to lead to total chaos. Against King Agila who had been elevated to the throne in 459, a revolt was led by Athanagild, who sought help from the Emperor. Athanagild established himself in place of Agila, but he had to put up with the fact that the Byzantines, who had landed in southern Spain in 552, occupied parts of Baetica and Carthaginiensis and organized them as an imperial province. Nevertheless, the reign of Athanagild (551/554–567) meant a new start in the history of the Visigoths. Under this ruler Toledo, situated on the southern edge of the Gothic area of settlement in Spain (Castile–León), which had been the royal residence under Theudis, became clearly more prominent as the capital. The real refounder of the Spanish Visigothic Kingdom of Toledo, however, was Athanagild's successor, Leovigild (568/572–586).

---

der Grosse (Munich 1947). New but not yet thoroughly discussed view: G. P. Picotti, "Osservazioni su alcuni punti della politica religiosa di Teoderico," *Settimane di studio . . .* III. *I Goti in Occidente* (Spoleto 1956), 173–226; cf. also the survey of the literature in Haendler, *Literaturübersicht* 13, 3. Even if Theodoric had interfered far more strongly in the business of the Church than has thus far been held, there still remained a considerable distinction between the Ostrogothic and the East Roman Byzantine domination.

[4] On the impact of Theodoric's rule on the ecclesiastical situation in the Visigothic Kingdom, cf. K. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 68ff.

Beside the Visigothic Kingdom there existed in Spain a second German Kingdom of the Sueves, which embraced the weakly romanized province of Gallaecia (Braga) and parts of northern Lusitania.[5] The Sueves had become Arians in the fifth century under Gothic influence, but almost no reports concerning the history of their kingdom are extant for the last third of the fifth and the first half of the sixth centuries. The "sole genuine document" from this period, a letter of Pope Vigilius to the Metropolitan of Braga from 538, makes known that the Catholic Church was not then substantially impeded under Suevic rule, but opposed not only Suevic Arianism but also the Priscillianism which had been disseminated in wide circles of the province. From later sources it must be inferred that even paganism was not yet ended among the rural population of Galicia. A change in the Church history of the Suevic Kingdom began when King Chararic c. 550–555, under the influence of miracles at the tomb of Martin of Tours, passed over to Catholicism and around the same time the Pannonian monk Martin, who had traveled to Spain, established the new mission center of Dumio near Braga. Martin of Dumio, who soon became Metropolitan of Braga (after 561–580), successfully united with the Suevic mission the fight against Priscillianism and pagan remains. He established the Catholic national Church of the Suevic Kingdom. Rightly was he celebrated even in his own day as the Apostle of the Sueves, even if at his death Arianism had not yet been completely extirpated.

Martin of Dumio's work of conversion did not radiate directly to the Visigoths. But the dualist structure of State and society, which had been the characteristic mark of the Arian German Kingdoms, had also already become an anachronism among the Visigoths. The cultural romanization of the Goths had already begun in the Kingdom of Toulouse. Marriages occurred among the magnates of both groups of people, although they were forbidden by law. King Theudis himself married a lady of the Hispano-Roman senatorial aristocracy. Although Goths and Romans still lived according to different laws, Theudis enacted laws which were valid for both peoples. Gothic aristocrats and military men, especially in the southern parts of the kingdom, came into intimate contact with Roman magnates, who adhered politically to the Gothic Kingdom.[6] Ecclesiastical and cultural contacts with Latin Africa seem to have simulated Catholic controversial theology in the southern province around the mid-century and thereby released a missionary impulse which had an impact on the Spanish Gothic upper class.[7] Important Goths were converted to Catholicism and rose in the Catholic hierarchy.[8] Thereby new problems were created for the kings.

---

[5] On the history of the Spanish Sueves now see K. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 120ff. and 247ff. (there also the sources and literature). Schäferdiek's presentation retains its value even in comparison with Thompson (*Goths in Spain*).

[6] To these circles belonged the family of Leander and Isidore of Seville, whose father Severian left his native city of Cartagena when it was occupied by the imperial forces and migrated to the area that remained Gothic.

In the first decade of his reign Leovigild had to consolidate his kingdom and his own authority against internal and external enemies. He suppressed the unruly aristocracy in northern Spain and gained successes against Sueves and Byzantines. He assured the future of the dynasty as early as 573 by elevating his sons Hermenegild and Recared to *consortes regni,* probably following the imperial model. He gave the kingship new prestige by receiving imperial insignia and by his own coinage. Probably in 478–580 he tackled the interior reconstruction of the Kingdom. The prohibition of marriage between Goths and Romans, already much violated in practice, was abolished. In addition, Leovigild took the decisive step toward the unity of the Kingdom: he had the Gothic law of Euric revised and made the *Codex revisus* the law of the Kingdom.[9]

If the *imitatio imperii* was the *signum* of Leovigild's reign, it benefited the reputation of the Goths, whose kingdom he enlarged, whose law he made the basis of the beginnings of Gothic Spanish unity. In the course of this work there was posed also the question of the ecclesiastical and religious unity of the Kingdom of Toledo, but it seems only to have been raised by a tragedy in the royal family.

In 579 Leovigild made his oldest son Hermenegild regent of the Gothic territories of Baetica with his seat at Seville. Hermenegild had as his wife the Frankish Princess Ingundis, who, despite her very young age, had clung at the court of Toledo to the Catholic faith of the Franks in opposition to the powerful pressure of Queen Goswintha, her own grandmother.[10] In Seville Hermenegild himself now converted to

---

[7] J. Fontaine, *Conversion et culture,* 96ff. cf. also S. A. Thompson *Goths in Spain,* 37–38.

[8] Known by name are Masona of Mérida and John of Biclar, both of whom came from Gothic Lusitania.

[9] Thus Stroheker (*Leovigild*) and, following him, Schäferdiek. Thompson (*Goths in Spain*) and Sánchez-Albornoz (*Pervivencia y crisis*) think otherwise, holding to the traditional view that the unity of the kingdom was first established by Chindaswinth and Recceswinth. According to Thompson, Recared introduced the development of unity of law. The discussion is complicated by the opposing thesis of García Gallo, again taken up in modified form by Alvaro d'Ors, that the *Codex Euricianus* and the *Breviarium Alaricianum* were already national laws. Cf. also K. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 15, note 35, and C. Sánchez-Albornoz, op. cit., 137ff.; finally, D. Claude, *Gentile und territoriale Staatsideen,* 29.

[10] Ingundis was the daughter of the Austrasian King Sigibert I and of his wife Brunhildis; through her mother Brunhildis was a granddaughter of the Visigothic King Athanagild and of his wife Goswintha, whom Leovigild married after the death of

Catholicism under the influence of the Metropolitan Leander. The young prince thereby brought on a conflict with his father, who at this time certainly had an entirely different idea about the solution of the religious question.[11] A quarrel broke out. Hermenegild sought help from the Byzantines and Sueves but he could not hold out against his father. Leovigild conquered Seville and Córdoba in 584, and the son fell into his hands. Hermenegild could not be induced to recant. He was killed in Tarragona on Easter of 585 and the perpetrator remained unpunished.

It was in accord with the policy followed by him that Leovigild sought to realize ecclesiastical unity also on the basis of the "Gothic religion," but in doing so he made certain accommodations to Catholic views. In 580 the King convoked an Arian national Council to Toledo, which facilitated the conversion of Catholics by the abolition of the rebaptism hitherto practiced in conversions, something regarded as especially scandalous by the Catholics. Furthermore, Leovigild tried to efface the differences between Arianism and Orthodoxy by the accepting of the cult of Spanish saints and by his saying that he recognized the identity of substance of Christ with the Father, even if this expression must not be understood as an official formula of mediation. In an effort to achieve his goal, the King was not sparing in rewards but he also did not renounce external methods of pressure, such as exile and confiscation. However, there is no word of a bloody persecution. Naturally, the Goths who had accepted the Catholic faith and had obtained positions of leadership in the Catholic Church were exposed in a special degree to the King's pressure, such as the Metropolitan Masona of Mérida and Abbot John of Biclar. Also among the Sueves, whose kingdom he conquered in 585, Leovigild carried out an Arian reaction. The measures of compulsion, however, were by no means restricted to Catholic Germans. The goal of the ecclesiastical religious policy was also and especially the *transductio Romanorum ad haeresim Arianam.*[12]

Despite temporary successes, Leovigild did not achieve this goal. His

---

Athanagild in a second marriage. Goswintha was the stepmother of Hermenigild and Recared, who were born of Leovigild's first marriage.

[11] Intrigues of the grandmother Goswintha may have played a role but can hardly have been the sole cause of the conflict. That Leovigild's reforms were a homogeneous work is suggested by the parallels of his procedure in the implementation of the unity of law and faith. In both cases Gothic law and Gothic faith provided the bases of the policy of unity even if the King was prepared to include individual Roman elements. If Leovigild began with his reform of the law in 578, then he must have had definite ideas about his ecclesiastical policy as early as 578–580.

[12] Council of Toledo III, *PL* 84, 347. This definite witness of the sources speaks clearly against Thompson's hypothesis that Leovigild's ecclesiastical union was restricted only to German circles (Goths and Sueves).

son and successor, Recared (586–601), embraced the Catholic religion in 587, ten months after his accession, and thereby at the same time inaugurated the conversion of the Visigothic nation, which was solemnly proclaimed in 589 at the Third Council of Toledo, the first national Council of the Spanish Gothic Church. Here Recared appeared as a ruler in the succession of the Emperors Constantine and Marcian: *renovans temporibus nostris antiquum principem Constantinum magnum sanctam synodum Nicaenam sua illustrasse praesentia, necnon et Marcianum christianissimum imperatorem, cuius instantia Chalcedonensis synodi decreta firmata sunt.*[13] Thus did the assembled bishops acclaim him in accord with the imperial style and at the same time in actual insinuation as Apostle of the Goths: *Cui a Deo aeternum meritum nisi vero catholico Reccaredo regi? . . . Ipse mereatur veraciter apostolicum meritum qui apostolicum implevit officium.*[14]

The King eased the passage of the Goths to Catholicism by the fact that he accomplished the acceptance of the Arian clergy, including the bishops, into the Catholic clergy. Nevertheless, there was some resistance. Conspiracies of Arian groups in Lusitania, at court, and in Septimania were suppressed in 587–89. Whether an Arian reaction occurred later is uncertain.[15] But it has been noted that, of the eight Arian bishops who in 589 signed the acts of Toledo, four belonged to the Suevic area (Viséu, Porto, Tuy, Lugo) and, of the four Arian bishops of the Gothic area (Valencia, Tortosa, Barcelona, Palencia), only one (Palencia) had his seat in the heartland of Gothic settlement.[16] Accordingly, a part of the Gothic Arian clergy right in the Gothic heartland must have still held itself aloof in 589 and been gained only in the future. But even here there was no serious opposition. The Goths of the Castilian *meseta* gave up their burial customs in the early seventh century: along with Arianism there disappeared the last remnants of paganism.[17] In the Spanish literature of the early seventh century the

---

[13] "In our time renewing the ancient and revered Prince, Constantine the Great, as he enlightened the holy Synod of Nicaea by his presence, and also the most Christian Emperor Marcian, through whose stubborn exertions the decrees of Chalcedon were established" (Council of Toledo III, *PL* 84, 345).

[14] "To whom belongs eternal merit with God, if not to the truly Catholic King Recared? . . . He truly deserves the reward of an apostle who has fulfilled an apostolic function" (ibid.). Cf. E. Ewig, "Zum christlichen Königsgedanken," *Vorträge und Forschungen* 3, *Das Königtum. Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen* (Lindau–Constance 1956), 29ff.

[15] The reign of King Witterich (603–610) would, according to the *communis opinio,* have stood under this sign. For the contrary: S. A. Thompson, *Goths in Spain,* 157ff.

[16] J. Fontaine, *Conversion et culture,* 123ff.; K. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 215ff. Schäferdiek is responsible for determining that Murila was Bishop of Palencia.

[17] There is still mention later of pagan customs. (Toledo XII of 681, Egica's decree of 693), but the geographical reference in these is not clear. Pagan customs could have

Arian controversy no longer played a role. From 633 the episcopate was recruited from the circles of the Gothic aristocracy.[18]

No source informs us about the motives for Recared's conversion. Hence the historian cannot throw light into the heart of the King and his Goths but only point to the concomitant circumstances and people: to the family tragedy of the royal house, which is said to have deeply affected Recared as mediator between father and brother,[19] to the probably superior theological formation of the Catholic episcopate, to the impressive personality of Leander of Seville and other prelates. For the rest, religious and political motives may have been inseparably joined in Recared, as in Clovis, but at the same time the conversion was the decisive step to the unification of Spain under Gothic leadership. In this perspective Recared completed not the religious but probably the political testament of his father in the ecclesiastical sphere. The work of unification was continued after Recared's death by Sisebut (612–621) and Swinthila (621–632), who expelled the last of the Byzantines from the peninsula, by Chindaswinth (642–652) and Reccesswinth (649/652–672), who, following Justinian's model, again stamped the *Lex Visigothorum* in a Christian sense and thereby created the most important legal work of their time in the Latin West. The anti-Jewish legislation of the kings was supposed also to serve the idea of unity but the episcopate partly opposed it and partly took a reserved stand. It cast a deep shadow over the Spanish Gothic Kingdom and ultimately only exacerbated the political crisis of the late seventh century. It had a parallel only in the Empire.

In his *civitas regia* of Toledo the orthodox King of the Visigoths could appear as successor of the Western Emperors[20]—a west, of course, which was restricted to the Iberian Peninsula and its Gallic appendage of Septimania. Toledo was the single royal city of the West which, like Constantinople, was also the ecclesiastical capital. In it from 589 met all the Spanish Gothic national councils. Like the imperial city on the Bos-

---

maintained themselves in the Meseta, settled by the Goths, in connection with the Gothic customary law. The question whether a German customary law of the Gothic rural population continued into the Spanish Middle Ages is still controverted. Most recently Sánchez-Albornoz (*Pervivencia y crisis*) answers in the affirmative.

[18] S. A. Thompson, *Goths in Spain,* 289–292.

[19] According to Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Fr.* V, 38), Recared had assured his brother that he would not be "humiliated" if he surrendered to their father. The constraint to return to Arianism, which finally led to Hermenegild's violent death, was a violation of this promise. Recared apparently took this very hard and after his accession had the murderer of his brother executed also.

[20] J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville,* 872; E. Ewig, "Zum christlichen Königsgedanken," *Vorträge und Forschungen* 3. *Das Königtum. Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen* (Lindau–Constance 1956), 27ff., J. Lacarra, *Iglesia visigoda,* 358 and 376ff.

porus, Toledo had originally been only a simple episcopal city. Signs of an emancipaton from the older Metropolis, Cartagena (Carthago Nova), are first noticeable in 531. The Church of Toledo definitively gained metropolitan rank at the time when Cartagena was in the hands of the Byzantines. As the royal city, Toledo would in time outstrip the other metropolises of the kingdom, including Seville with its rich tradition. As early as 646 it was decreed that the neighboring bishops should annually make a visit *ad limina* to Toledo *pro reverentia principis et regiae sedis honore vel metropolitani civitatis ipsius consolatione.* From 656 the Metropolitan of Toledo directed the national councils, over which previously the metropolitans had presided alternately, according to the date of ordination or reputation. In 681 he obtained the right to approve candidates designated by the King in episcopal vacancies in the entire Kingdom, and in 683 it was enacted that King and Metropolitan of Toledo could summon, under pain of excommunication, every bishop to prescribed liturgical or judicial actions at Toledo.[21]

However, not the Metropolitan of Toledo but the King occupied the dominant position in the Spanish Gothic Church.[22] Recared had already claimed the right to fill episcopal sees, which his successors apparently exercised in a much broader scope than the other kings of the time—even before it was expressly fixed in 681 and was easily restricted by the participation of the Metropolitan of Toledo. Recared not only convoked the first national council, but he directed it, decided the agenda, and signed the acts. In 681 it was set down as a custom that the kings opened the council, made known in the *Tomus regius* the agenda they wanted, and then withdrew. If the decrees of the synod were to obtain validity in the national law, they needed sanction by a royal law *in confirmatione concilii.*

From the beginning the bishops were also involved in secular matters, but strictly in the framework of the program laid down by the ruler in the *Tomus regius.* As early as 589 secular magnates also attended the consultations; the presence of royal dignitaries became in the future the rule, and in 653 they acquired the right of participation in the discussions and of signing the acts. Finally the Councils of Toledo became in this way also national assemblies. They decisively stamped the Visigothic constitutional law, issued decrees on the election of the king, the rights of the crown, on high treason, on the legal status of the magnates. The bishops created a political ethics determined by the virtues of

---

[21] K. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 85; J. Lacarra, *Iglesia visigoda,* 376–378, S. A. Thompson, *Goths in Spain,* 196, 275–277, 288.

[22] S. A. Thompson, op. cit., 275ff.; J. Lacarra, op. cit., 355ff., 358, 364–366, 369ff. On the development of the conciliar custom, H. H. Anton. *König und Reichskonzilien,* 259ff. Objectification of the function and ethics of the ruler, ibid. 269ff.

iustitia and *pietas* of late antiquity, objectified the royal domination into a royal function, and introduced the anointing of the king to strengthen the ruler's authority—first attested in 672. From 633 the episcopate took part, alongside the *seniores Gothorum* in the election of the king. Around the middle of the seventh century there appeared mixed ecclesiastical and secular commissions, which had to be consulted for the pardoning of rebels and in the publication of laws, and finally they became competent as a forum for political trials relating to the episcopate and the nobility. "Medieval" changes were thereby anticipated in the Gothic Kingdom of Toledo, otherwise still so strongly stamped by late antiquity.

The Spanish Gothic national Church was in itself much more compact and more strongly centralized than the Merovingian. The *Itio in partes,* which is characteristic of the entire western development in the sixth and seventh centuries, was apparent in Spain before the passage of the Goths to Catholicism—at the death of Theodoric the Great in 526, at which the vicariate for Gaul and Spain, granted in 514 to Caesarius of Arles, de facto ended. The canonical collections, which constituted the basis for the development of canon law in Gothic Spain make this break clear.[23] The relations with Gaul came to a close, those with Africa moved to the foreground. As in the other countries of the West, Justinian's ecclesiastical policy aroused lively opposition in Spain also, but the Spanish attitude in the controversy over the Three Chapters was more strongly determined by the African polemic than elsewhere. The Spanish Church never recognized the Fifth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople II of 553.[24] The connection with Rome lost in intensity on the basis of the general historical development, but the tensions between the Visigothic Kingdom and the Empire also reacted unfavorably on the relations of the Gothic national Church with the papacy. Add to this that the Spanish Gothic episcopate no longer attributed great importance to the support of Rome after the conversion of the Goths to Catholicism.

In 589 and 633 the Spanish Church acknowledged that papal synodal letters had the same authority as the ecumenical councils.[25] Isidore of Seville saw in the Roman Bishop the head of the Universal Church, whom everyone is bound to obey, independently of the personal qualities of the successor of Peter: . . . *in nullo laeditur obsedientia nostra,*

---

[23] K. Schäferdiek, 69–75; Fournier–Le Bras, 67–69.

[24] J. Madoz, *Concilio de Calcedonia,* 197ff.

[25] J. Lacarra, op. cit., 360ff., Lacarra offers the best survey of Roman-Spanish relations. Thompson's presentation is more schematic, *Goths in Spain,* 184ff., 240ff., 250, 279.

nisi praeceperit contra fidem.[26] The relations between Spain and Rome had, after a long suspension, been strengthened again under Gregory the Great, who was a personal friend of Leander of Seville and had also sent him the pallium, without however renewing the Vicariate of Seville. Recared had made known his conversion and that of his nation to Catholicism to Gregory as head of all the bishops. King Chintila (636–39) sent a votive offering to Saint Peter. True, Recared did not really hurry with his communication to the Pope: the delay may have been attributable to a mistrust on the King's part in regard to the Roman Bishop as a subject of the Emperor. Real ill-feeling resulted when in 638 Honorius I in a letter of reprimand sharply reproached the Spanish episcopate's all too great complaisance toward the *perfidi,* that is, probably the Jews. Braulio of Zaragoza replied in the name of the Spanish Gothic Church. He recognized the *sollicitudo* for the Universal Church as the prerogative and task of the Roman Bishop, but made it clearly understood that the Roman intervention had already been dealt with, since God had correspondingly enlightened King Chintila. Braulio, not without irony, joined with this the hint that the Pope must exercise supervision over other churches not frivolously but only after a thorough examination of the matter.

In the future the connection between Rome and Spain seems to have been almost completely broken. In the period after Isidore papal decretals were no longer found in Gothic Spanish canon law. The Popes, for their part, apparently did not induce the Spanish episcopate to support their position vis-à-vis Constantinople in the Monothelite Controversy. Contact was not renewed until Leo II communicated to the Gothic Spanish Church the decrees of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople III of 680–81). Julian of Toledo, under whom the national primacy of the Church of Toledo was fully established, had the acts examined at provincial synods together with an *Apologeticum fidei,* which he had composed on his own. The decrees of Constantinople were received by the Spanish Church. However, Julian reacted in an unusually violent manner to a criticism of his *Apologeticum,* expressed only orally by Pope Benedict II, and had his answer, composed in a challenging form, read and approved at the Fifteenth Council of Toledo in 688. No break followed, because at Rome, where Benedict II had meanwhile died, no one took up the matter. The increasing gravity of the situation was to a great extent Julian's work, but the support which Julian found in the episcopate of the Visigothic Kingdom makes clear an estrangement between Spain and Rome. How far this estrangement went is difficult to say. The older view that the Church of Peter was the fundamental center of Christendom must not have been totally lost. For when the Muslims conquered the Visigothic Kingdom, the Primate Sindered of Toledo fled to Rome, where in 721 he signed the acts of a synod.[27]

---

[26] ". . . our duty of obedience is affected on no point except that he order something directly against the faith" (*Ep.* 6, 2 and 3: *PL* 83, 903). The obligation of obedience to the Pope as head of all members in the body of Christ is stressed by Isidore also in a letter to Bishop Eugene of Egara (*Ep.* 8, 2 and 3: *PL* 83, 908). The authenticity of this passage is of course disputed; cf. J. Lacarra, who accepts the authenticity (*Iglesia visigoda,* 361ff. and 362, footnote 19), as well as Y. Congar, who doubts it (*L'ecclésiologie du haut moyen-âge* [Paris 1968], 152, footnote 81). The letter to Eugene of Egara, however, contains no statement that would not also be covered by other witnesses from the period 589–638.

The inner structure of the Gothic Spanish Church was marked by an, on the whole, uninterrupted development on an Early Christian basis. Ecclesiastical immunity, the right of asylum, the jurisdiction and legal status of the clergy were more strongly determined by late antiquity than elsewhere. The economic independence of the parish churches and monasteries was in accord with the time. The proprietary church system spread to the Iberian Peninsula and included also the monasteries, but the foundations of the episcopal organization of the Early Church were only loosened by it, not convulsed. At the conversion of the Goths to Catholicism, the liturgy was enriched by the admission of the creed into the Mass *iuxta orientalium partium morem* at the order of King Recared. It received its characteristic formation in the seventh century through the collaboration of great bishops and abbots, who displayed an important literary activity and thereby also increased the self-consciousness of the Gothic Spanish Church. In the *Pactum* of Saint Fructuosus of Braga Gothic legal thought seems to have affected the relations between abbot and monk.

An early sign of the ties with home was the pride in the native saints, who from the late fourth century appeared beside Mary and the Apostles: Prudentius had celebrated the martyrs of Mérida, Córdoba, Tarragona, Barcelona, Gerona, Zaragoza, Alcalá, and Calahorra.[28] With Vincent of Zaragoza, who as the chief Spanish martyr found universal veneration even outside the Visigothic Kingdom alongside the Roman Lawrence and the Gallic Maurice, with Eulalia of Mérida, Justus and Pastor of Alcalá, Felix of Gerona, and many others, was later associated

---

[27] S. A. Thompson, op. cit., 250. Lacarra has overlooked this fact, which is not unessential for the evaluation of the attitude of the Gothic Church to Rome at the end of the Visigothic period.

[28] H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1933), 364–365.

Leocadia, a saint of the royal city of Toledo.[29] Foreign cults were also admitted, especially that of Martin of Tours, the patron of the Apostles of the Sueves, Martin of Braga.[30]

Late Roman Spain was not rich in important ecclesiastical teachers, bishops, and abbots, but Visigothic Spain took the lead over other countries. After the confusion of the migrations, new life burst forth in the sixth century, often simulated by the influx of foreigners, especially of Easterners and Africans. In the first half of the sixth century Mérida had three eastern metropolitans. Justinian's restoration strengthened the Greek influence in the south of Lusitania, in Baetica, and in the territory of Cartagena, and it there survived the collapse of imperial rule. Very old relations existed between Spain and Africa. They were strengthened by two waves of immigration in the days of the Vandal King Hunneric (477–484) and the Moorish expansion toward the imperial province of Africa c. 570, which also brought abbots and their communities to Spain. Episcopal and monastic schools replaced from c. 500 the rhetorical schools that had disappeared. The oldest monastic school is demonstrable at Valencia. Justus of Urgel, who had come out of it, signed the acts of the Second Council of Toledo in 531, at which decrees were issued on the education of clerics. The school of San Martín de Asán was founded in 522 by the Italian Victorian. C. 560 arose a new intellectual center at Dumio in Galicia. Soon after, the African Donatus established the *Monasterium Servitanum* in the province of Cartagena; the Goth John, the abbey of Biclar in Tarraconesis. C. 600 there existed at Zaragoza the abbey of Santa Engracia; at Toledo, Agalí. Many bishops came from these monasteries. In the last fourth of the sixth century Leander of Seville, Severus of Málaga, Eutropius of Valencia, Maximus of Zaragoza, and John of Gerona (Biclar) represented the intellectual life of Spain. From Leander's school proceeded Isidore of Seville, the country's Doctor of the Church.

Isidore stands beside Augustine and Gregory as one of the great teachers of the Western Middle Ages. He was born soon after 550 and succeeded his brother Leander as Metropolitan of Seville (599–636). His importance does not lie in the originality of his thought but in his encyclopedic scholarship, which he displayed especially in his masterpiece, the *Origines* or *Etymologiae.* The Middle Ages derived from it, among other things, the system of the *septem artes liberales.* A number of other treatises dealt with individual fields of knowledge, such as grammar (*Differentiae*) and astronomy (*De natura rerum*). In the succession to Jerome and Rufinus, Isidore wrote a history of Christian literature (*De viris illustribus*) and a world chronicle, which he completed by a history of the Goths, Vandals, and Sueves. Not a few of his writings are devoted to exegesis. In the *Synonyma* Isidore appears as the father of the mystical theology of the Middle Ages. The *Sentences,* a manual of Christian doctrine involving also the lay world inaugurated the medieval Sentence-literature. The treatise *De ecclesiasticis officiis* and the *Regula monachorum* deal with ecclesiastical life; the apologetical work, *De fide catholica,* with the Jewish question, so acute in the Visigothic Kingdom.

---

[29] The Church of Saint Leocadia at Toledo was built by King Sisebut (612–621): S. A. Thompson, op. cit., 162ff.

[30] P. David, *Études historiques,* 225–242.

The work of the Bishop of Seville was strongly engraved by antiquity—but of course by an already benumbed antiquity. Hellenistic natural science was known to Isidore only in fragments, philosophy only in condensations in the form of manuals. Thus, for Isidore, grammar with its methods (*Differentiae, Synonyma, Etymolograe*) became the basis not only of the trivium but also of the quadrivium, in fact of philosophy and theology. For him the "ancients" were no longer the classical writers but their late commentators who stood like a filter between him and the great authors of antiquity. Of course, through this filter Isidore also received the spirit of antiquity and made it so much his own that many regarded him as the last representative of the dying world. Through the Spanish Doctor of the Church Baetica became the "Conservatoire de l'érudition grammaticale antique" (Fontaine) and in this function replaced Roman Africa, on which Isidore's scholarship was essentially based, which probably supplied him with no slight number of Greek works in Latin translation. Next to Africa, only Italy can be mentioned as mediator, but at a great distance. By means of Rome, which under Gregory the Great maintained lively relations with Spain, some codices may have reached Spain, among them the later writings of Cassiodorus, Isidore's kindred-spirit, which the Bishop of Seville included in his work.

With his copious work, Isidore intended to serve not only scholarship. In the *Synonyma* he speaks to us as the mystic; in the *Historia Gothorum,* as the Spanish patriot. As Metropolitan of Seville Isidore was also preoccupied with the great questions of Church and *Regnum.* The Fourth Council of Toledo in 633 and the definitions of kingship and law in the *Lex Visigothorum* bear the mark of his spirit. Apparently the *Hispana,* the best general collection of canons of the age which became so important for the canon law development of the entire West through the Carolingian Renaissance, goes back ultimately to Isidore. It originated soon after 633 on the basis of a Spanish epitome, which in turn was based on collections from Provence and Tarraconensis. Thus in the origin of the *Hispana* is reflected the history of the Visigothic Kingdom since the reorganization by Theodoric the Great. Beside Isidore's *Summa* of divine and human knowledge stands the canonical *Summa* as an equally important achievement.

After the death of the *Doctor egregius* the cultural centers moved from the Mediterranean zone to the interior of Spain. Málaga, Seville, Cartagena, and Valencia receded. Mérida and Zaragoza asserted their rank, while Toledo under the two Eugenes, Ildefonse, and Julian flowered anew. The Goth Fructuosus, who had grown up in Palencia, became in the years 640–650 the father of the monks of Spain. He wrote his *Rule* for the church in Bierzo, the hill country of Alcalá, where, after him, his biographer, Valerius of Astorga, also lived. King Recceswinth made Fructuosus Bishop of Dumio and finally Metropolitan of Braga. The leading churchmen of the time elaborated, as mentioned, the "Mozarabic" Liturgy. The *Liber de virginitate s. Mariae* of Ildefonse of Toledo constituted a landmark in the history of the cult of Mary.

The importance of the geographical shifting of the cultural centers in the seventh century becomes clear from archeological investigation, which has established a Gothic province of settlement north of the Tajo in Castile and León, to which in the west was added the Suevic settlement in Galicia. The Spanish lands north of the Tajo took little part in the cultural development of the Mediterranean zone in the sixth century. Goths and Sueves were Arians, under the Romans of Galicia Priscillianism was not yet dead, and in the Cantabrian Basque mountains there were still pagans. The northern advance bastions of the south were Mérida and Toledo, which lay in the radiation sphere of Córdoba. The Goths preserved, according to the evidence of the finds, their national customs until the turn from the sixth to the seventh century. At this time the Christian art of Baetica, dependent on Africa, lost its force. A new style of architecture and art arose at Mérida and Toledo, which had built the bridge from the south to the north. It spread via the Gothic area of colonization into Tarraconensis and to Septimania. This last epoch of Gothic Spanish culture no longer bore an African stamp, but was dependent on that of the Empire through its relations with Byzantine Italy. In it was reflected the Gothic Spanish national consciousness of the time of King Recceswinth (652–672) and his successors. Only quite small churches of Gothia are extant from this phase: the imposing buildings of Toledo have perished. But with the colorful luster of the crowns of Guarrazar and the treasure of Torredojimeno a light still shines to our days from the time of the kings and metropolitans of Toledo, the Father of Monks Fructuosus of Braga, the *Hispana,* and the *Lex Visigothorum.*

CHAPTER 36

The Lombards and Italy

Late arrivals of the migration of the peoples, late also in embracing Arianism, were the Lombards, who, shortly before 490, under the supremacy of the Heruls, entered "Rugiland" (Lower Austria), occupied the country between the Enns, Danube, and March and in 508 threw off the yoke of the Heruls. C. 526 they moved into the first Pannonian province between the Danube and the Drave, long ago evacuated by the Romans, and thereby became the immediate neighbors of the Ostrogoths. Under their King Wacho (c. 510–540) they entered into friendly relations with the Gepids, who lived between the Theiss and the Carpathians, and with the Franks, both of whom were opponents of the Ostrogoths. A change occurred in Lombard policy when, after Wacho's death, Audoin (c. 540–560) assumed control, first as guardian of the heir to the throne, Walthari, then from c. 547–48 as King himself. Audoin fell out with the Franks and Gepids and c. 548 sided with Justinian, who granted to the Lombards for settlement the country between the Danube and the Save as well as eastern Inner Noricum—hitherto Ostrogothic provinces.

According to Procopius, the Lombards had declared in 548 that they were of one faith with the Emperor.[1] Although this was certainly a declaration of intention of the Lombard envoys, it must not have been taken entirely right out of the air. For, through the Franks, Catholic influence can have been at work, even if it would also have crossed with an Arian influence from the Gepid side. In the first years of King Alboin (c. 560–573) the religious decision was still undecided, as a letter of Bishop Nicetius of Trier to Alboin's first wife, the Frankish Princess Clodoswintha, shows. Only after the victory over the Gepids, immediately before the invasion of Italy in 568, did Alboin decide for Arianism, perhaps with a view to the assimilation of the Danubian remnants of Germanic peoples into the Lombard nation. Also the desire to gain the Ostrogoths still remaining in Italy may have played a role. This recently accepted Arianism did not go very deep. Portions of the people even continued as pagans.

The Lombards entered Italy, in contrast to the Ostrogoths, not as *foederati* but as conquerors.[2] Alboin occupied the provinces of Aquileia

---

[1] *Bellum Gothicum* III, 34.

[2] The Byzantines only carried out resistance when the Lombards took Milan and besieged Pavia. Following Bognetti, Mor and Fasoli have expressed the supposition that

(Venetia) and Milan (Liguria), except for the coastal districts, and then had a part of his troops advance via the La Cisa Pass into Tuscany in the direction of Benevento. After his death and the brief reign of his successor Cleph there ensued an interregnum (573–585), in which the Lombards lived only under dukes.[3] At this time the Emperor succeeded in attracting no small part of the Lombard *duces* into his service. Even after the renewal of the monarchy in 584, the restoration of political unity was at first a program rather than a reality. A Frankish-Byzantine coalition brought King Authari (584–590) to the edge of the abyss. The imperialists, who still possessed strong bridgeheads north of the Po, won back Reggio, Parma, and Piacenza and thereby drove a dangerous wedge between Lombard North Italy and the Lombard groups in Tuscany, Spoleto, and Benevento. Savior of the Kingdom was Agilulf (590–615), who subjugated the hostile dukes, eliminated the Byzantine wedge in western Aemilia, and conquered Cremona, Mantua, and Padua north of the Po (602–3). King Rothari (636–652) carried out a further break-through against the imperial positions by gaining Oderzo in Venetia, Modena in Aemilia, and in Liguria the entire coastal strip with Genoa. Now the Lombards possessed the entire province of Milan, the province of Aquileia except for Istria and the Venetian lagoon, the western half of Aemilia (Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, Modena), the greater part of Tuscany (Lucca–Pisa, Fiesole–Florence, Arezzo, Siena, Volterra, Chiusi, Volsinii), southern Umbria (Spoleto) with parts of Sabina, Samnium (Benevento), and parts of Campania (Capua). The duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, separated by the Exarchate of Ravenna and the Roman Duchy from the Regnum, stood in only a loose dependence on the crown. Benevento went into its own way and after 663 expanded over Apulia and Lucania.

The vicissitudes of the Church in the Lombard Kingdom become understandable only against the background of the political history. Paul the Deacon reports that, in contrast to the territories occupied under the rule of Alboin, the *civitates* conquered by the Lombard dukes were treated very harshly.[4] Modern research is inclined to trust this

---

the Lombards had occupied Italy north of the Po in 568–69 in an understanding with the Emperor Justin II, who had been concerned to shield Italy from the Austrasian Franks by means of the Lombards. This assumption cannot be verified.

[3] Mor raised the question whether the *Interregnum* was not in reality only a period of regency for Cleph's son, Authari. But this is no more than a guess.

[4] Through these Lombard dukes, . . . churches were despoiled, priests were killed, cities were overwhelmed, and peoples . . . were wiped out, except in those regions which Alboin had taken, Italy was for the most part captured and subjected by the Lombards (*Hist. Lang.* 32). Basic for the more recent research is G. P. Bognetti, *Continuità.* Of the older investigations, the following should be mentioned: A. Crivelucci, "Les évêchés d' Italie et l'invasion lombarde," *Studi storici* 15 (1904–6); L. Duchesne,

statement of the historian of the Lombards. In an effort to arrive at a correct judgment, it has taken into account the devastations of earlier wars, whose wounds were in no way healed at the entry of the Lombards. Thus, Venetia (Northeast Italy) was severely affected by the expedition of Attila's Huns in 452 while Central and Lower Italy, and also Milan, had suffered heavily in Justinian's Gothic war.

Although the two Metropolitans of Aquileia and Milan fled to imperial territory in 568–69—the former to Grado, the latter to Genoa—for the most part their suffragans remained in the two provinces occupied by the Lombards. On the basis of the privilege which Alboin granted to the Bishop of Treviso right after the occupation of the city, it may probably be assumed that also the other bishops who came to terms with the new situation obtained legal guarantees from the King. No vacancies can be proved at all in Venetia.[5] It is clear that in Liguria only Como was orphaned until the beginning of the seventh century, but the clergy stayed in the city. The picture is confusing in Tuscany, where long vacancies occurred in some episcopal cities (Lucca and especially Siena), whereas in others (Arezzo and Pistoia) the continuity was not disturbed.[6] At Spoleto disturbances cannot be established, but in any event the local dukes were occasionally federated. On the other hand, the bishoprics in the sphere of Benevento were entirely destroyed: Paul the Deacon may have been thinking of them especially when he spoke of the devastations of the dukes. The Lombards of Benevento were noted for special ferocity, and among them there were also still pagans. Finally also the cities and sees in the frontier zone disputed between the Lombard Kings and the imperialists were more severely affected: e.g., the *civitates* of Aemilia reconquered by Agilulf and the only recently conquered Venetian districts of Padua, Oderzo, and Altino, whose bishops withdrew to the Venetian lagoons. In retrospect one reaches the conclusion that greater disturbances occurred in the areas which

---

"Les évêchés d' Italie . . . ," *MAH* 25 and 26 (1905–6); *Atti del congresso internazionale di scienze storiche* III (Rome 1903).

[5] For the year 590–91 ten suffragans of Aquileia in Lombard territory are attested: Säben, Julium Carnicum, Belluno, Concordia, Trent, Asolo, Verona, Feltre, Treviso, and Vicenza (*Settimane di studio* . . . VII, 496). Six of them–Säben, Julium Carnicum, Concordia, Trent, Verona, and Feltre—were represented in 579 at a Synod in Grado (ibid., 499).

[6] Siena was already vacant from the end of the Gothic War. Bognetti has indicated that Lombard *exercitales* in Siena probably took the place of Italo-Roman *cives*. Similarly, this could have been the situation in Lucca, where apparently also a group of Ostrogoths had remained.

were too remote from the power of the King, and in those which were conquered late, disputed or after severe struggles.[7]

Before the eyes of the Lombard Kings stood the model of the Amals. Alboin chose Verona as the royal seat and thereby gave notice that he intended to follow Theodoric—"Dietrich of Bern." In 584 Authari was elevated to the throne at Verona and there in 589 married Theodelinda, daughter of the Duke of Bavaria; through her mother she came from the old Lombard royal house of Wacho, the tradition of which she introduced to the renewed Lombard kingship. Authari assumed the nickname Flavius, which the Amals had borne, as had also the Visigothic Kings since Theudis and Athanagild. Thus was a program of government imitated which promised to guarantee legal security also to the Italian population. The King was, of course, concerned strictly to maintain the separation between Lombards and Romans. At Easter 590 he issued a prohibition for Lombards to have their children baptized as Catholics.

That individual Lombards were converted to Catholicism in Authari's time is attested by Gregory the Great. The prohibition of Catholic baptism raises the suspicion that conversions were no longer limited to the smallest circles. The hopes of the Catholics of Venetia and Liguria may have been especially turned on Queen Theodelinda, who was likewise a Catholic and who, like them, did not recognize the Council of Constantinople of 553. The condemnation of the Three Chapters at this Council had led to schism in the provinces of Milan and Aquileia. The ecclesiastical alienation from Rome and the Imperial Church concealed from the start the danger of a political estrangement from the Empire. At first Narses had exorcised it by treating the Three Chapters with respect in North Italy, probably with an eye on the Franks, who also inclined to the schism and appeared still threatening even after their exclusion from the peninsula. The Emperor Maurice (582–602) adhered to this policy of Narses, but thereby encountered the opposition of the Popes, for whom naturally ecclesiastical unity had preference. The Roman influence operated more powerfully on the Metropolitan of Milan, a refugee at Genoa. The bishop-in-exile of Milan, Lawrence, secretly abandoned his opposition in 573, and his successor,

---

[7] The struggles led also to the dismantling (Brescello, Mantua) or even the destruction of the cities (Cremona, Padua), that is, to measures of an exceptional nature. In place of Padua, Monselice became the center of Lombard rule, and parts of the territory of the *civitas* came to the Lombard duchies of Vicenza and Treviso. The territory of Oderzo was divided among the duchies of Treviso, Friuli, and Ceneda, and a new see was erected in the Lombard ducal seat of Ceneda. Padua did not again become the seat of a bishop until c. 800 (G. P. Bognetti, *Continuità,* 445, 447).

Constantius, chosen in 593, was orthodox. But the suffragans of Milan in the Lombard Kingdom did not go along with this change. They adopted a position against Constantius at Lombard Brescia. The Metropolitan-in-exile, Deusdedit, elevated to succeed Constantius c. 600, was recognized at Milan, but the union of the province was still quite far off. Como, which c. 606 obtained a new bishop in Agrippinus, even joined the clearly schismatic province of Aquileia. For Aquileia the situation was only altered when, after the change of the imperial religious policy under Phocas (602–610), an orthodox Metropolitan was also installed at Grado in 607. The suffragans of Lombard Venetia, in contrast to the bishops of Lombard Liguria, consummated the break and elected their own Metropolitan, who took his seat at Cormons. The old province of Venetia was thus split into a Lombard metropolitan unit of Aquileia, with its seat at Cormons, later Cividale (Forum Julii), and an imperial metropolitan unit of Grado.

The clever policy of Narses and of the Emperor Maurice delayed the estrangement of the schismatics from the Empire but could not in the end prevent it, as the events of 607 show. The rapprochement of the schismatic Catholics in the Lombard Kingdom to the Lombard kingship became clear from the split of 593 in the province of Milan. It would hardly have been consummated so quickly if Queen Theodelinda herself had not been a Catholic and had found in her second husband, Agilulf, whom she had married after Authari's death, complete sympathy for the new policy, probably first conceived by her, of a close collaboration with the Romans of North Italy. Agilulf remained personally an Arian, but he transferred his residence from the "Gothic royal city" of Verona to imperial Milan, took Milanese Romans into his council, encouraged the restoration of the Milanese churches, and finally in 603 even had his son Adalwald baptised as a schismatic Catholic—totally contrary to the baptismal decree of his predecessor Authari. The office of godfather of Adalwald was assumed by Abbot Secundus of Nano in the diocese of Trent, the long-time confidant of the Queen and historian of the court. The schismatic mission that began c. 600 among the Lombards of the *Regnum* took place under the aegis of Saint Euphemia of Chalcedon. Its route was reflected also in the dedication of churches to the martyrs of the Val di Non (Nano) among the Lombard settlements of the west and to the Norican martyr Florian, whose cult the church of Aquileia spread farther, among the Lombard fortresses of the east.[8] The royal couple were also able to interest in their aims the Abbot Columban, who had fled to Italy in 612. They made over to him the Church of Saint Peter of Bobbio as the basis of his mission in the diocese of Tortona and tried through him to gain influence over the Pope at the same time.

---

[8] For the patrons of the schismatic mission cf. G. P. Bognetti (Castelseprio, *Milano longobarda*) and Mor (*Settimane di studio . . .* XIV, 539ff.).

The first phase of Agilulf's reign coincided with the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the initiator of the mission to the Anglo-Saxons, who at his accession was confronted also with the question of the conversion of the Lombards because of Authari's baptismal decree that had only just appeared. But Gregory saw in the liquidation of the Schism of the Three Chapters and in peace between the Lombard King and the Emperor the unalterable presuppositions for a corresponding Roman initiative. He staked all his energy on realizing these preliminaries, and in this sense especially tried to influence Queen Theodelinda. Complete success was denied him. After his death the Lombard royal pair even turned the tables by suggesting to Pope Boniface IV through Columban a new examination of the question raised by the Three Chapters.

Gregory's religious and peace policy, meanwhile, seemed to bear fruit when, after Agilulf's death, the imperial Exarch at Ravenna for his part adopted friendly relations with the Lombard court in view of the serious threat to the Empire from the Persians.[9] Church union thereby again became urgent. The Queen-Mother and the young King Adaloald apparently let themselves be convinced that the Council of Chalcedon had not been jeopardized by the Second Council of Constantinople, and the exertions for the liquidation of the schism led c. 625 to the reunion of the metropolitan territories of Aquileia and Grado. But the negotiations had apparently been carried out over the heads of the Lombard magnates and the schismatic episcopate. Both groups united against the court. Adaloald was overthrown in 625, Arian kings again ascended the throne, the residence was transferred to national Lombard Pavia, and the schism flared up again.

The wheel of history, nevertheless, did not let itself be turned back. Hence there cannot be any word of an Arian reaction worthy of mention, because the new ruler, Arioald, was also supported by the schismatic Catholics. Add to this that his wife, Gundeperga, daughter of Agilulf and Theodelinda, continued the Catholic tradition at court and in fact also under the next King, Rothari, whom she married as her second husband. Gundeperga, however, belonged not to the schismatic but to the orthodox faction. Still more important was the fact that the abbey of Bobbio under Abbot Attala, after Columban's death and indeed before 625, had clearly taken a stand on the side of Roman Orthodoxy and thereby became the first center of an orthodox mission among the Lombards. At the urging of its abbots, Bobbio was exempted from the jurisdiction of the local Bishop of Tortona by privileges of Popes Honorius I of 628 and Theodore I of 643 and directly subjected to Rome. The abbey still remained closely bound to the royal family, and its aspirations vis-à-vis Tortona were supported by Ariwald as well as Rothari and Gundeperga.

---

[9] After Agilulf's death (c. 616) the Visigothic King Sisebut sent a letter to the Lombard court, in which he called upon the young King and his mother to convert the Lombards to Catholicism. The backgrounds of this Visigothic initiative are still unclear.

The actual state of peace between *Regnum* and *Imperium* under Adaloald and Arioald, which lasted into the first years of Rothari (636–652), facilitated the throwing of a bridge from the Lombard court by way of Bobbio to Rome. But then in 643 Rothari again moved to the offensive against the *Imperium:* relations between Old and New Rome had fundamentally changed because of the Monothelite quarrel that erupted in 640. This explains why the ecclesiastical cooperation between Rome and Pavia, established by means of Bobbio, was not interrupted by Rothari's war. In Tuscany the bishopric of Siena was restored—this could now happen only with the active collaboration of Rome, since Tuscany belonged to the Roman ecclesiastical province. The Catholic mission was reinvigorated by clerics and monks who had fled from the East of the Empire. It then spread to the Tuscan Lombards, who had not yet been affected by the schismatic mission. Rothari also permitted the bishops of Lombard Tuscany to take part in the Lateran Synod of 649, at which the Metropolitan of Milan and his suffragan of Tortona immediately appeared. Perhaps after the conquest of Genoa by Rothari the Metropolitan of Milan returned to his old provincial capital during this King's reign; in this way, beside Bobbio and Siena, there had been created a third starting point for the Lombard mission of the Roman observance. However, this cannot be regarded as certain.

Hence, paradoxically, the Catholic orthodox mission in the Lombard Kingdom gained its first bases under the two Arian Kings Ariwald and Rothari. The representative of the dynastic and Catholic community at court had been Queen Gundeperga. After Rothari's death and the brief reign of his son Rodoald, in 653, when the crisis between Emperor and Pope had reached its climax, a cousin of the Queen was made ruler of the Lombards: Aripert I, a nephew of Theodelinda. Aripert (652–661) was an orthodox Catholic. He annulled the position of Arianism as the State religion and close to the older parish church of Saint John the Baptist at Monza he founded Saint Savior at Pavia.[10] But he did not exploit the political opportunities present in the conflict between Emperor and Pope; hence he did not fulfill the hopes which the Lombards had probably placed in him. Thus, after Aripert's death, Duke Grimoald of Benevento was able to use a contest over the throne between the King's sons, Perctarit and Godepert, to gain the crown for himself with the aid of an Arian group, which probably supported Godepert.

---

[10] Saint Savior was not the first Catholic royal church at Pavia; Queen Gundeperga had already had a Church of Saint John built there.

It is significant that the Arian Lombards of the *Regnum,* from whom had probably come the initiative for the *coup d'état,* no longer felt strong enough to raise a king from their own ranks but turned to the Duke of Benevento. The Beneventan Lombards, just as those of Spoleto, had not been touched by the Catholic mission of North Italy, and the great questions of the *Regnum* had remained foreign to them. Their Arianism bore the marks of a strong, unreflecting popular faith, which did not exclude pagan and Catholic elements. Grimoald (662–671) was devoted to the Archangel Michael, whose sanctuary lay on Monte Gargano in the Duchy of Benevento. He ascribed to the Archangel a victory over the Byzantines and spread his cult to Pavia, where his Catholic followers took it up. Michael pushed the older cult of John the Baptist into the background and became patron of the kingdom and nation of the Lombards—strange to say, through the initiative of an Arian ruler, who had even allied with the Arabs against the Emperor.

Grimoald's reign was basically an anachronism, which ran counter to an historical development introduced long before. Perhaps the King in his last years even returned to the course of his predecessors. When he died, the Lombards called back Perctarit.

Under Perctarit (661/671–688) and his son Cunincpert (678/688–700), made coruler as early as 678, decisions finally matured which had been so long in preparation. Bishop Mansuetus of Milan (672–681) was the first Metropolitan of Liguria—of Lombard "Neustria"—who can be proved to have resided again in the old capital of Northwest Italy. King, Pope and Metropolitan took in hand the reorganization of the ecclesiastical province. Anastasius, the last Arian Bishop of Pavia, converted to Catholicism. The days of the schism were numbered in the province of Milan. Ecclesiastical union was apparently achieved without friction, since the common position in the Monothelite question made the old controversy over the Three Chapters pointless. When the Emperor Constantine IV yielded in the Monothelite quarrel, and Pope Agatho in 679 called upon the national churches of the West for a great demonstration of faith, a Synod of the province of Milan again met for the first time and placed itself behind the Pope. The peace of the Church, which the Sixth Ecumenical Council ratified at Constantinople in 680–81, also brought about the first official conclusion of peace between the Lombards and the Emperor. On this occasion the obligation of loyalty to the *res publica* and the Emperor, which the Roman suffragans assumed in their oath of obedience to the Pope as their Metropolitan, was changed for the Roman suffragans in the Lombard Kingdom into the obligation to work for the maintenance of peace between the *res publica,* that is, the *Imperium,* and the *gens Langobardorum.*

The acts of the Synod of Milan were drawn up by the deacon Damian, who soon after, following the death of Anastasius, who had converted to Catholicism, was made Bishop of Pavia and missionary Bishop for the Lombards. Under Damian the royal city of Pavia became the real center in the last phase of the Lombard mission under Roman auspices, and as such, in an analogy to Bobbio, was withdrawn from the ecclesiastical province of Milan and directly subordinated to Rome.[11] Damian had studied in Greece and was probably himself Greek, as indeed his helpers, according to the testimony of their names and those of the patrons of the mission stations, were mostly also Greek or orientals and were probably sent to Damian directly from Rome. Thus there existed between the last phase of the Lombard mission and the last phase of the Anglo-Saxon mission under Theodore of Tarsus and Hadrian of Naples a "parallelismo cronologico e metodico."[12] The wave of immigration from Greece, the East, and Africa to Italy, which the Monothelite controversy and the Arab invasion had produced, worked to the advantage of the conversion of the Germans. Among the Lombards of North Italy, the cult of Donatus enables one to infer also an impact from Tuscany (Arezzo).[13]

At the same time the Roman-oriental mission made progress also in the sphere of Spoleto and—in keeping with the reconciliation of the royal family with the dukes of Benevento—in Lombard Lower Italy. Duke Romuald I of Benevento (662–687) was converted by Saint Barbatus. Near his residence arose a church of Saint Peter, and the bishoprics of Benevento and Siponto were reestablished. Not Benevento, but Lombard "Austria," the province of Aquileia, the chief bastion of the schismatics, was the last support of the opposition to the Catholic monarchy—an opposition, it is true, in which Arianism no longer played any role, and political motives were at least a match for ecclesiastical ones. Spokesman of the rebels was Duke Alahis of Trent, to whom

---

[11] G. P. Bognetti, "Le origini della consacrazione del vescovo di Pavia da parte del pontefice romano e la fine dell'arianesimo presso i Longobardi," *Atti e memorie del IV congresso storico lombardo* (Milan 1940). Bognetti's view is not undisputed, but with certain modifications it was also accepted by Bertolini. The presentation given in the text follows Bertolini.

[12] G. Fasoli, *Longobardi,* 140ff.

[13] G. P. Bognetti, *Continuità,* 424. Bognetti traces the cult of Donatus among the Lombard centers of North Italy not, of course, to missionaries, but to settled royal Arimanni from the vicinity of Arezzo.

Perctarit had had to yield also the Duchy of Brescia. Alahis revolted at the change on the throne in 688. Battle occurred on the Campus Coronate on the Adda, and in it the Archangel Michael appeared as patron of the *Regnum.* Alahis was defeated. Cunincpert had a church dedicated to Saint George built on the battlefield, for he was venerated at Byzantium as the patron of the army. A decade later a Lombard Council at Pavia sealed the return of the last schismatics of the province of Aquileia to Orthodoxy. The King sent the acts of the Synod of 698–99 to the Pope for confirmation. The separation of the ecclesiastical provinces of Aquileia and Grado, long ago hardened by the political boundaries between *Regnum* and *Imperium,* continued.

At Cunincpert's death the development begun under Agilulf and Theodelinda was essentially complete, but had been again and again thwarted not least by political vicissitudes. True, it must be taken into account that the political background was especially prominent in historical retrospect. For the jejune tradition hardly lets one perceive the personal motives of the evangelizers and the converts, the individual effort and the methods of the missionaries.[14] As elsewhere in history, here too one must avoid seeing in the result only the consequence of a necessary development. Certainly the weight of the Catholic Roman tradition was great in Italy, and Arianism was very much weaker among the Lombard people than among the Goths. However, the frequent ups and downs, the seemingly strangely chaotic course of Lombard mission history in comparison to the other German peoples, shows that the religious confrontation cannot be reduced to a scheme.

The Catholic monarchy gained stature among the Lombards only under King Liutprand (712–744) in consequence of a dynastic crisis, which again suspended the development for a full decade. However, essential outlines had already been fixed under Perctarit and Cunincpert. The Synod of Pavia can be compared, *mutatis mutandis,* with the national Council of Toledo of 589. It was convoked by the King and, in keeping with the imperial model, met in the hall of the royal palace. Union was solemnly sworn in the Church of Saint Michael, patron of the Kingdom. Since Perctarit or Cunincpert the bishops of Pavia were exempt and seem in the eighth century to have occupied a mediating position between Rome and the *Regnum.*[15] King Liutprand founded the court chapel near the Church of Saint Saviour and built

---

[14] It is clear that also in the history of the conversion of the Lombards the miracle played no small role (cf. O. Bertolini, *I papi,* 347, note 50), and Gregory the Great may have thought of an impact on the Lombards while composing his *Dialogues.* But of course, thereby only one aspect is brought forward.

[15] O. Bertolini, *Le chiese longobarde,* 475ff.

Saint Peter in *Caelo Aureo.*[16] Like the Frankish and Visigothic Kings, he exerted influence on the nomination to bishoprics and in his capitularies gave validity to ecclesiastical principles, once even expressly by appeal to the Pope as *caput ecclesiarum Dei et sacerdotum* [*in omni mundo*].[17] Many boundary disputes between sees of the *Regnum* during the ecclesiastical reorganization of the *Regnum* were carried to his forum. The episcopate was even bound to military service in the late period of the *Regnum.*[18]

Meanwhile, Pavia, in contrast to Toledo, did not achieve primatial status, and in the Lombard Kingdom, also in contrast to Visigothic Spain, no national councils can be proved.[19] The ancient metropolitan organization in Italy—differing from that in Gaul and Spain—thwarted the full construction of the national Church. For only two ecclesiastical metropolises—Milan and Aquileia (Cividale)—lay within the *Regnum.* The Lombard sees of Aemilia belonged to Ravenna; those of Tuscany, Spoleto, and Benevento, to the ecclesiastical province of Rome.

The Visigothic Kings had "wedded" Spain, as Isidore of Seville said. The conversion of the Lombards and the liquidation of the schism seemed to offer the Lombard Kings the possibility of making Italy their "bride." As legend has it, Authari is said to have marked the frontier of the Lombard Kingdom on the shore of Reggio di Calabria with his spear.[20] In the inscription of a Crown donated by him Agilulf was designated as *rex totius Italiae.*[21] Cunincpert's epitaph at Saint Savior of Pavia ended with the verses: *Quem dominum Italiae patrem atque pastorem / Inde flebile maritum iam viduata gemet.*[22] After the reconstruction of the *Regnum* Liutprand set himself the goal of making his sovereignty really effective over Spoleto and Benevento and of including the Exarchate of Ravenna with the Pentapolis in the Kingdom of the *a Deo dilecta et catholica gens Langobardorum.*[23] In regard to Rome he was satisfied with a *defensio.* But these ideas found no echo in Imperial Italy. The frontiers between *Regnum* and *Imperium* were too powerfully consolidated in minds, and Rome clung to the political status quo, although precisely at that time Iconoclasm had led to a new ecclesiastical conflict with the Emperor. The political conflict between Pope and King became thereby inevitable. The Popes had long clung to the Late Roman idea of the Empire, in which the welfare of the Universal Church was inextricably bound with that of the *Imperium;* now they felt themselves ever more clearly to be the protectors of Imperial Italy, indeed in a certain way even as the guarantors of the autonomy of Spoleto and Benevento. The sworn obligation of working for peace between *Imperium* and *Regnum,* which the Lombard suffragans of Rome undertook at their ordination, was reinterpreted as early as 740 as the obligation to defend the papal status quo policy with the Lombard King: at the very time when the first papal appeal went out to the Franks. In this way was created a conflict of conscience for the Roman suffragans in the Lombard Kingdom and, in addition, for all *viri devoti* in the clerical and lay states. The Lombard Kings tried for a while to settle the conflict only on the political plane. Even Aistulf in a politically critical situation carefully spared the ecclesiastical rights of Rome. Only Desiderius in 769 opposed Rome on the field of canon law, when he sought to withdraw the parts of Istria occupied by the Lombards from the obedience of Grado and had a layman of his choice uncanonically elevated to the metropolitan see of Ravenna. Five years later came the decision: the *Regnum Langobardorum* was wrecked in its conflict with Rome.

---

[16] Perctarit and his wife built Saint Agatha at Pavia and outside the city a basilica in honor of Mary in the Lombard cemetery (G. Fasoli, *Longobardi,* 138).

[17] G. Fasoli, op. cit., 156.

[18] O. Bertolini, *Le chiese longobarde,* 491 (testimony for Lucca of 754.)

[19] Scarcely a trace is also found of provincial and diocesan synods in Lombard Italy. After the Synod of Pavia of 698 only one Milanese Synod under King Aistulf is attested (O. Bertolini, *Settimane di studio* . . . VII, 1, 515.)

[20] Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Lang.,* 32.

[21] The authenticity is disputed. Cf. R. Elze, "Die eiserne Krone in Monza," *Herrschaftszeichen und Stantssymbolik (Schriften der MG* 13), in the negative, and the recension of G. P. Bognetti, *Archivio storico lombardo,* Serie ottava, V (1954–55), 1–10, in the affirmative. The context of the testimonies favors the genuineness.

[22] According to G. P. Bognetti, *Milano longobarda,* 241.

[23] The epithets were borrowed from the style of the imperial chancery.

CHAPTER 37

The Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons and the Beginnings of the Anglo-Saxon Church

The age of the migrations meant for Britain a very much deeper turning point than for Gaul, Italy, and Spain. The German tribes of the "Anglo-Saxons"—Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and other national fragments—occupied the most permanently romanized eastern provinces with the metropolises of London and York and thereby hastened the process of deromanization among the Britons who had withdrawn to the West and were more and more isolated from the continent. Hence the Celtic language and culture again filtered through among the old established population, even if the Britons clung to the Christian faith and to the Latin language in the liturgy; in fact for a long time still they regarded themselves as members of Romania.[1] In their political and social structure the Britons and Anglo-Saxons did not differ substantially from one another. Both were, like the Picts of Scotland, organized in petty kingdoms, among which, it is true, one or the other occupied a position of hegemony. But no symbiosis of the two peoples took place. Especially in the south of the island there persisted a hostile confrontation, which did not allow a missionary impulse to appear among the Britons.

For the first Christian influences became noticeable among the Anglo-Saxons not from the British neighboring districts but from Gaul. Aethelbert of Kent, who as Bretwalda, "ruler of Britain," occupied a position of hegemony south of the Humber, before 589 married a Merovingian Princess, Bertha, daughter of King Charibert I of Paris (561–67). In her entourage came the Frankish Bishop Liuthard to the court of Canterbury. For the Queen's worship a cemeterial basilica of Roman Canterbury was furnished and presumably then dedicated in honor of Saint Martin of Tours.[2] A treasure-find in this church indicates relations with the Garonne. Apparently, through the King's Frankish marriage, connections had been established with Charibert's territory between the Lower Loire and the Garonne—Nantes, Tours, Poitiers, Bordeaux. To what extent older ecclesiastical relations between Gaul and Britain were revived from the fifth century is uncertain. However, the Merovingian Church could hardly develop a stronger missionary activity on the other side of the Channel at the end of the sixth century, since it was still entirely preoccupied with the ecclesiastical restoration within the Merovingian Kingdom.

The real initiative for the Anglo-Saxon mission proceeded from Gregory the Great. The universal mission mandate given by Christ had never entirely fallen into oblivion in the Roman Church. Leo the Great had still seen it in a connection with a providential mission of the Roman Empire: *disposito namque divinitus operi congruebat, ut multa regna uno confoederarentur imperio, et cito pervios haberet populos praedicatio generalis, quos unius teneret regimen civitatis.*[3] Gregory the Great was in this tradition, but he lived in a changed world. Under Augustine's influence he had again established the biblical eschatological understanding of the universal mission to pagans and in so doing had progressed from the "basic affirmation of the Church's universal missionary commission"to the "planning and organizing of a missionary enterprise outside the boundaries of the Roman Empire."[4]

---

[1] Corresponding testimonies from St. Patrick's writings are quoted in J. Ryan, "The Early Irish Church and the See of Peter," *Settimane di studio . . .* VII. *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'800,* II (Spoleto 1960), 551. The clearest: Ecclesia Scottorum, immo Romanorum, ut Christiana ita ut Romani sitis. The notion basic to this expression is closely related to the view, to be mentioned *infra,* of Leo the Great.

[2] Bede dates the patronage of Martin at Canterbury to Roman times. Wallace-Hadrill is inclined to accept this testimony (*Rome and the Early English Church,* 529). But cf. M. Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest Church,* 35, 48.

[3] "For it especially accords with the work ordained by God that many kingdoms were united into the one Empire and [thus] the universal proclamation of the faith had quick

If the intellectual background of the great Pope's initiative, of the greatest importance for the future of the West, was to some extent judicious, so too the particular circumstances by which his interest was directed precisely to the Anglo-Saxons still remain obscure. The question how Britain, removed from the Roman *ecumene* for a century and a half, came again into Rome's line of vision is answered tersely but in a simplistic manner, by the Northumbrian *Vita Gregorii* and the Northumbrian legends transmitted by Bede. The external beauty of Anglo-Saxon slaves, which struck Gregory on a visit to the Forum, made him recognize that the Angles were called to be coheirs of the angels.[5] The impressive narration was probably based on the fact that in 595 Gregory gave the commission to buy up Anglo-Saxon slaves in Gaul, that is, probably in Marseille, in order to have them educated in the Christian faith with a view to a future mission activity in their homeland, even if it is not impossible that Anglo-Saxon slaves also came to the Roman market. As testimony for Northumbrian ideas of the beginnings of the mission, the narrative is worthwhile, but as a historical report it encounters critical doubts.

access to the peoples whom the rule of the one City held under its control" (*Sermo* 82, *in natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli,* PL 54, 423).

[4] W. H. Fritze, *Universalis gentium confessio,* 113. Fritze rightly objects to the view represented especially in English research that Gregory's mission work must be understood from Roman imperial presuppositions (e.g., cf. M. Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest England,* 45, and J. Godfrey, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England,* 69). That meanwhile the notion of the Imperial Church was not dead to Gregory can hardly be denied in view of every acknowledgement of his specific achievement—the renewal of the biblical "theonomous" mission idea. It was known to the Pope that the Britain occupied by the Anglo-Saxons had once belonged to the Empire, and his plan of ecclesiastical organization followed the older Roman organization. Gregory's inner connection with the Empire proceeds from other witnesses, and the restoration of imperial rule in the West lay for contemporaries at least in the realm of the possible (J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit. 522). Thus it seems to me that the distance between Leo the Great and Gregory is not so great as Fritze assumes.

[5] ". . . Rursus ergo interrogavit, quod esset vocabulum gentis illius. Responsum est, quod *Angli* vocarentur. At ille: 'Bene,' inquit, 'nam et *angelicam* habent *faciem,* et tales angelorum in caelis decet esse coheredes. Quod habet nomen ista provincia de qua isti sunt adlati?' Responsum est, quod Deiri vocarentur idem provinciales. At ille: 'Bene,' inquit, 'Deiri; de ira eruti et ad misericordiam Christi vocati. Rex provincia illius, quomodo appellatur?' Responsum est quod Aelli diceretur. At ille adludens ad nomen aid: 'Alleluia, laudem Dei Creatoris illis in partibus oportet cantari!' " (Hist. eccl., II, 1).

The story told by Bede is said to have occurred in the time of Pope Benedict I (575–79). A first reference to Britain is found in Gregory's *Moralia,* which was composed between 585 and 595. The question whether as early as 585 Gregory had conceived the plan of the mission and then intended to implement it personally—five years before his elevation to the papacy—is controverted. However, the mission had certainly been prepared long in advance, as the already mentioned mandate to buy Anglo-Saxon slaves of 10 September 595 shows. The recruiting of the first missionaries caused difficulties, for the Roman diocesan clergy evidently declined. Finally in the late spring of 596 Gregory sent the Prior Augustine with a group of monks from the monastery of Sant'Andrea al Monte Celio, which he himself had founded. The Roman missionaries landed in the spring of 597 on the island of Thanet, belonging to the Kingdom of Kent.

Gregory had not selected Kent as the starting point of the mission by accident. He must have been informed, at least in broad outline, about the possibilities of a missionary activity at the court of Canterbury. Nevertheless, the journey to the remote pagan country seemed at least to those involved as a dangerous adventure: they would have very much liked to have turned back soon after their departure. Gregory did not give in, but sent to his envoys letters of recommendation to the Papal Vicar of Arles, the bishops of Aix-en-Provence, Vienne, and Autun, the Abbot of Lérins, the Frankish Queen Brunhildis and her grandsons, Theodoric II of Frankish Burgundy (Chalon-sur-Saone) and Theodebert II of Austrasia (Metz). With regard to the Queen, the Pope motivated his missionary embassy thus: he had learned that the Angles wished to become Christians but no bishop of the neighborhood undertook to care for them. From this one could infer an initiative from Kent. But this was contradicted by, among other things, the distrust with which, according to Bede, the royal house of Kent first displayed toward the Roman missionaries. The Christian Franks in Kent seem not to have overbusied themselves in thirty years in preparing the King for Saint Augustine.[6]

The first difficulties were, however, soon overcome, and the mission work made good progress. Aid came from the Merovingian Kingdom by means of Bishop Syagrius of Autun, who was close to Queen Brunhildis. In July 598 Gregory could report to the Patriarch of Alexandria great successes, which were climaxed by the conversion of King Aethelbert, baptized probably at Easter 601. Augustine, who had been ordained a bishop in the Frankish Kingdom, founded, with the King's assistance, Christ-Church, the Cathedral of Canterbury, and near the basilica of Saint Martin a monastery, whose Church of Saint Austin was to receive the tombs of the bishops and of the royal family of Kent. The episcopal church obtained the patronage of the Saviour in imitation of the Roman cathedral at the Lateran, while the monastic church was dedicated in honor of the Princes of the Apostles.

---

[6] Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit. 527.

The newly established Anglo-Saxon Church was, in accord with Gregory's wish, to be independent of the Gallic Church and the Papal Vicar of Arles, but was to be united with the Celtic British churches of the island. Augustine was to prepare for the founding of two ecclesiastical provinces with London and York as metropolises for twelve sees each, which were to be brought to completion after his death. As head of all the churches of Britain, he received the pallium in 601 with the permission to take his seat in London.

Gregory's plan of organization was based on the older Roman division of Britain—apparently Diocletian's more recent arrangement, whereby Britain was divided into five provinces, was no longer known at Rome. However, the plan of organization corresponded neither to the political circumstances of the early seventh century nor to the status of the mission. London belonged to the Kingdom of Essex, whose ruler was subordinate to the Bretwalda of Canterbury and, besides, was still a pagan in 601. Under these circumstances, Augustine's removal to the ancient Romano-British metropolis was impracticable, and the union of the Anglo-Saxons with the British churches foundered on the difference of ecclesiastical usages, on the national antipathy of the peoples, and on Augustine's imperious manner.

The proclamation of the faith could develop only on the basis of the existing situation, and thus for the time being the mission extended only to the kingdoms which were closely connected with Kent—to Essex and East Anglia (Norfolk and Suffolk). Augustine and his companions gained a firmer footing in Essex, where a nephew of King Aethelbert ruled. Circa 604 Rochester was founded as a second see in Kent, with its Cathedral of Saint Andrew, and in Essex the bishopric of London, with the Cathedral of Saint Paul near the Roman forum. As little pressure for the acceptance of Christianity was exercised there as in Kent: *Didicerat enim* [*rex*] *a doctoribus auctoribusque suae salutis servitium Christi voluntarium, non coactitium esse debere.*[7] Gregory had instructed the missionaries not to destroy pagan temples but to turn them into churches and to give pagan feasts a Christian content: *ut dum eis aliqua exterius gaudia reservantur, ad interiora gaudia consentire facilius valeant. Nam duris mentibus simul omnia abscidere impossibile esse non dubium est, quia et*

---

[7] "The King had indeed learned from his teachers, from whom he received salvation, that the service of Christ is voluntary, and must not be compulsory" (*Hist. eccl.* I, 26).

is, qui summum locum ascendere nititur, gradibus vel passibus, non autem saltibus elevatur.[8]

Augustine's mission, geared to individual conversion, naturally did not exclude the idea that the conversion of outstanding princes should also involve the wholesale conversion of their retinues and clients, in which on occasion pressure may have been resorted to. Even so, at Augustine's death between 604 and 609 not even all the members of the royal families of Kent and Essex had become Christians. And so after the death of King Aethelbert in 616 and of his nephew of Essex there could ensue a pagan reaction, which, it is true, produced only a temporary reverse in Kent, but in Essex and East Anglia it destroyed the first buds of Christianity.[9] On the other hand, a decade later there opened up great prospects for the mission in northern England. King Edwin of Deira (Yorkshire), who also ruled Bernicia (Northumbria) and the Lindissi (Lindsey) and acquired the hegemony in Anglo-Saxon territory, in 625 married a daughter of Aethelbert of Kent. To northern England with the Queen went Paulinus, one of the missionaries from Kent, who was made a bishop. Edwin came into conflict with the West Saxons and in 626 held out the prospect of his conversion in the event of his victory. After the fortunate outcome of the battle he presented to the Witenagemot, that is, the meeting of the magnates of his kingdom, the question of whether Christianity should be accepted. The Witenagemot decided for collective conversion. The King had himself baptized at Easter 627.

Bede's report on the discussion at the Witenagemot is a significant monument from the history of the German mission, even if it cannot rank as a contemporary testimony in the strict sense. It shows that not only the God promising victory and success made an impression, but also the problem of the meaning and end of human life played a role.

---

[8] ". . . so that, if some joys were preserved for them externally, they might the more easily assent to the inner joys. For it is doubtless impossible at the same to cut away everything from hard hearts, because whoever seeks to mount to the highest place goes up by degrees and steps, not by leaps" (*Hist. eccl.* I, 30). The magnanimity with which Gregory took into account the circumstances of the mission also in matters of ecclesiastical discipline and in the law of marriage becomes evident from his *responsa* transmitted by Bede (*Ep.* XI, 56a), which according to the more recent investigations of English and Belgian scholars must probably be regarded as genuine, except for a few interpolations (on the controversy with S. Brechter, cf. the literature for this chapter).

[9] Very different views of Christianity become clear from the example of the two Kings of East Anglia and Essex. Raedwald of East Anglia had in his pagan *fanum* a Christian and a pagan altar (*Hist. eccl.* II, 15), and hence he subscribed to a religious syncretism. Sigebert of Essex was killed because he practiced love of enemies (*Hist. eccl.* III, 22) and hence understood the basic command of Christian ethics and made it his own in a manner rare for his day.

> *"Talis," inquiens [unus optimatum], "mihi videtur, rex, vita hominum praesens in terris, ad conparationem eius, quod nobis incertum est, temporis: quale cum te residente ad caenam cum ducibus ac ministris tuis tempore brumali, accenso quidem foco in medio, et calido effecto caenaculo, furentibus autem foris per omnia turbinibus hiemalium pluviarum vel nivium, adveniens unus passerum domum citissime pervolaverit; qui per unum ostium ingrediens, mox per aliud exierit. Ipso quidem tempore, quo intus est, hiemis tempestate non tangitur, sed tamen parvissimo spatio serenitatis ad momentum excurso, mox de hieme in hiemem regrediens, tuis oculis elabitur. Ita haec hominum vita ad modicum apparet; quid autem sequatur, penitus ignoramus. Unde si haec nova doctrina certius aliquid attulit, merito esse sequenda videtur."*[10]

The second ecclesiastical province of York, planned by Gregory, seems to have become a reality after the publicly decided conversion of the Angles north of the Humber. Paulinus took his seat at York, where, soon after the baptism of King Edwin, there began the construction of a stone cathedral, which replaced the one erected before the King's baptism and the wooden church dedicated in honor of Saint Peter. Popes Boniface V (619–625) and Honorius I (625–638) maintained contact also with the Northumbrian mission. The connection between Rome and the *ultimi habitatores mundi* was consolidated, and Honorius even brought it about in these years (629–632) that South Ireland accepted the Roman calculation of Easter.[11] But the precarious political stability of Britain again led to a severe setback. In 632 King Edwin perished at Hatfield in a battle against Penda of Mercia and the British King Caedwalla of Gwynedd. The Northumbrian mission collapsed. When Honorius I sent the pallium for Paulinus of York, the latter was in flight to Kent with the Queen and her children. Penda, ruler of the central English Kingdom of Mercia—the "March Kingdom" of the Angles against the Britons—was until his death in 654 the "central figure of Anglo-Saxon history."[12] He was and remained a pagan.

---

[10] "The present life of men on earth, O King," said one of the magnates, "seems to me in comparison to the time which is unknown to us to be of this sort: as when a sparrow hurries through your house in flight, where you are sitting down during the winter with your dukes and servants for a meal around the hearth-fire in warm comfort—but outside the winter rain and snowstorms rage everywhere. The sparrow flies through one door and at once goes out again through another. So long as it is inside, it is untouched by the fury of the winter. But in an instant the tiny space of calm unconcern has been traversed and it is already withdrawn from your eyes, returning from winter into winter. Thus seems the life of men for a short while; but what may follow we do not know. Hence if this new teaching brings more certainty, it should be properly followed." (*Hist. eccl.* II, 13).

[11] J. Ryan, *The Early Irish Church and the See of Peter,* 568–569.

Paulinus ended his life as Bishop of Rochester (635–644). Canterbury and Rochester, the two Kentish sees, had weathered the storm, and in 624 the precedence of Canterbury in the Roman mission sphere was sanctioned with the sending of the pallium by Pope Boniface V. But Canterbury's mission area shrank considerably in the following period. Rome was distant and offered little help. In place of Roman support there came with the approval of the Popes support from the Merovingian national Church of Gaul, which had already offered shelter to the refugees of the first pagan reaction, Bishops Mellitus of London and Justus of Rochester.[13]

South of the Humber there were in the time of Penda of Mercia (632–654) only two kingdoms which could be designated as Christian: Kent and East Anglia. In addition to them, Wessex must be mentioned as a third kingdom, but at that time it was only beginning to open itself to the new teaching.[14] Christian influences had first obtained recognition in East Anglia by way of Kent (Canterbury) and then by way of Deira (York). But the *nova doctrina* was only established under King Sigebert (630–35), who was baptized in Gaul and on his accession to the throne brought in the Frankish Burgundian Bishop Felix. Felix probably came from the circle of Luxeuil monasticism; his connections indicate especially Meaux and the monastery of Faremoutiers, which very early became a center of attraction for Anglo-Saxon princesses and ladies of the Anglo-Saxon nobility. The Frankish Burgundian bishop, whose missionary activity was authorized by Canterbury, founded the see of Dunwich in the south of the East Anglian *Regnum* (Suffolk). In the north of the country (Norfolk) the Irish mission obtained a foothold, still under Sigebert, through Abbot Furseus at Cnobheresburg near Yarmouth. The two East Anglian missionary groups were apparently in friendly relations. They were united in a common work, and the difference of observances was at least moderated by the Irish influence on the Luxeuil circle.[15]

---

[12] Stenton, p. 39. According to Deanesly, Penda seems to have been Bretwalda or at least to have exercised de facto an analogous hegemony (*Pre-Conquest Church*, 81). Stenton thinks otherwise: he adheres to Bede's statement on Oswald of Northumbria's hegemony.

[13] The views here presented are based especially on Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit., 535–536.

[14] Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest Church*, 81.

[15] "The earliest Anglian Church was founded, through the initiative of Canterbury, by a Burgundian bishop, Felix. Its Gaulish affinities need no emphasis; they lead one to Faremoutiers, Chelles, Lagny, Péronne and quite possibly to Luxeuil" (Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit., 530).The statements of the English historian need comment. Faremoutiers and Chelles were Merovingian convents of nuns, in which the Anglo-Saxon element was

From c. 633 the Gaul (?) Birinus worked independently of Canterbury in Wessex, which up to then had not been included in the mission. Birinus had received permission to preach to pagans from Pope Honorius I and had been ordained a bishop by the exiled Metropolitan Asterius of Milan. In 636 he baptized the King of Wessex, Cynegils, and took his seat at Dorchester, at that time the center of the kingdom. His successor was the Frank Agilbert (c. 650–660), who belonged to the circle of the founders of the monastery of Jouarre in the diocese of Meaux, had studied in South Ireland, and had been ordained a missionary bishop in the Merovingian Kingdom. In 660 Agilbert fell out of favor because he was not sufficiently fluent in the Saxon tongue.[16] His successor, Wini, also ordained in Gaul, transferred the episcopal see c. 663 to the new chief residence, Winchester, but he could not long maintain himself. He was followed by Agilbert's nephew Hlothere (Clothar), at the desire of the West Saxon King and with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury,[17] whose precedence was thereby acknowledged also in Wessex. Of course, there can be no question of a direction of the mission by the metropolitans at Canterbury either in East Anglia or in Wessex. Deusdedit (654–663), the first Anglo-Saxon on the archiepiscopal *cathedra,* was de facto restricted to Kent in his activity.

---

especially strongly represented. Chelles, however, as a convent of nuns was founded by Queen Bathildis only after the death of Bishop Felix in 647. Hence direct connections could have existed only between Felix and Faremoutiers. Lagny (diocese of Meaux) was founded by Furseus after his move to the Frankish Kingdom, at the earliest in 640 and probably in 644–45, with the help of the Neustro-Burgundian Mayor Erchinoald. The latter transferred the remains of Furseus (d. 650) to Péronne, when he founded the monastery, whose direction he gave to Furseus's brother, Foilan, who had settled in the Merovingian Kingdom in 650 (P. Grosjean, "Notes d'hagiographie celtique," 38: *AnnBoll* 75 [1957], 392ff.) Direct relations could again have existed only between Lagny and Bishop Felix. The possibility exists that Felix, through his Merovingian contacts, supported Furseus's monastic foundation. The circumstances, then, indicate closer relations with the diocese of Meaux. On both East Anglian missionary groups, cf. also Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest Church* 76, 81ff.

[16] Agilbert did not return finally to the Merovingian Kingdom until after the Northumbrian Synod of Whitby (664); he became Bishop of Paris c. 667 and died between 680 and 691. He was buried at Jouarre, and his sarcophagus is preserved. The abbey of Jouarre was founded by Ado, a brother of the great Bishop Audoin of Rouen, and early transformed into a double monastery (before 650, perhaps as early as 642). The first Abbess, Theudechildis, was a sister of Agilbert. The nuns seem to have come from Faremoutiers, only about twenty kilometers away. Jouarre itself supplied the first nuns for the royal monastery of Chelles and from Ebroin's proprietary monastery of Notre-Dame de Soissons. Saint Osanna, buried at Jouarre, is said to have been a sister of the Northumbrian King Osred (705–716). Cf. J. Guérout, "Les origines et le premier siècle de l'abbaye," *L'abbaye royale Notre-Dame de Jouarre* (Paris 1961), 1–67.

[17] Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit., 530.

The great turning point of the mission came from the north. The Angles north of the Humber had been again united after the defeat of Hatfield by the brothers Oswald (633–641) and Oswiu (641–670) of the royal family of Bernicia. In 641 Oswald fell in the struggle against Penda of Mercia, but in 654 in the battle of Winwood Oswiu was able to break Mercia's supremacy and restore the Northumbrian hegemony.

During the reign of Edwin of Deira (616–632) the two brothers had lived in exile among the Irish and Picts of Caledonia and there they had become Christians of the Irish observance. In 634, Oswald had the Irish Abbot Aidan come from Iona; with the King's help, Aidan founded the monastery of Lindisfarne and became the abbot-bishop there. Aidan was followed by Finnan (651–661) and Colman (661–64). After Oswiu's victory of 654, Finnan baptized Penda's son Peada, who married a daughter of Oswiu, and King Sigebert of Essex, a "friend" of the Northumbrian ruler. The Irish Diuma was sent to Mercia as missionary bishop, and his Anglo-Saxon companion Cedd was soon after sent to Essex.

Thus Irish influence grew in England in the second third of the seventh century. On the other hand, Roman and continental influences made themselves apparent even in Irish-oriented Northumbria by way of Essex and Kent. The mission circles overlapped in wide areas of the Anglo-Saxon world, and conflicts could not be avoided. Into the center of the controversies moved the differences in regard to determining the date of Easter and hence also of Lent, which greatly aggravated daily life in intimate circles. At the Northumbrian court King Oswiu celebrated Easter according to the Irish calendar; the Queen, raised in Kent, according to the Roman calendar. The disadvantages which ensued called peremptorily for a clarification, and so in 664 the King summoned a Synod to Whitby.

In the Kentish beginnings of the mission, the opposition between the Roman-continental and the Celtic-insular ecclesiastical systems, strengthened by the hostility between Anglo-Saxons and Britons, had occasionally assumed sharp forms. At Whitby a different climate prevailed. Roman influences had vindicated themselves in the Irish Church: the South Irish had accepted the Roman calculation of Easter a generation earlier. Irish churchmen did not question apostolicity of faith as the basis of ecclesiastical unity, they went as pilgrims to Gaul and Rome, and they also encouraged their pupils to go.[18] Hence the decision of Whitby could hardly be in doubt. The Frankish Bishop Agilbert of Wessex and his Anglo-Saxon pupil, Abbot Wilfrid of Ripon, defended the Roman standpoint against Colman of Lindisfarne. When Wilfrid appealed to the authority of Peter and in this connection quoted Matthew 16:18, the King intervened:

---

[18] Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest Church,* 83. Wallace-Hadrill sees in the "emotional link with the cultus of St. Peter and thus with St. Peter's successors" the unifying bond which held together the so differently patterned Anglo-Saxon churches even before the mission of Theodore of Canterbury (op. cit., 531).

> *"Verene, Colmane, haec illi Petro dicta sunt a Domino?" Qui ait: "Vere, rex." Ait ille: "Habetis," inquit, "vos proferre aliquid tantae potestatis vestro Columbano datum?" At illi ait: "Nihil." Rursum rex: "Sic utrique vestrum," inquit, "in hoc sine ulla controversia consentiunt, quod haec principaliter Petro dicta, et ei claves regni caelorum sint data a Domino?" Responderunt: "Etiam" utrique. At ille ita conclusit: "Et ego vobis dico, quia hic est ostiarius ille, cui ego contradicere nolo; sed, in quantum novi vel valeo, huius cupio in omnibus oboedire statutis; ne forte, me adveniente ad fores regni caelorum, non sit qui reserat, averso illo, qui claves tenere probatur."*[19]

In this way the dispute was settled in favor of the Roman group. Colman abandoned Northumbria with a group of intransigents, but other Irish remained. The great abbatial bishopric of Lindisfarne was divided into the sees of Ripon and York.

No less important than the Synod of Whitby was the change of episcopacy which soon after occurred at Canterbury. When the Anglo-Saxon candidate chosen by the Kings of Kent and Northumbria died after his arrival at Rome, Pope Vitalian, after a painstaking selection, elevated the Greek Theodore of Tarsus. Theodore went to Kent in 669, accompanied by the Neapolitan Abbot Hadrian, an African by birth. During his long episcopate (669–690), Theodore, who was the first Bishop of Canterbury recognized in the entire English Church, gave shape to this Church. Seven bishoprics, among them two for Kent (Canterbury and Rochester), and one each for the kingdoms of Northumbria (York), East Anglia (Dunwich), Mercia (Lichfield), Essex (London), and Wessex (Winchester), were reorganized. New sees were erected in the relatively large kingdoms of Northumbria (Lindisfarne, Hexham) and Mercia (Lindsey, Worcester, Hereford). After the conversion of the South Saxons by Wilfrid (680–85), the see of Selsey arose in Sussex. After Theodore's death the number of Anglo-Saxon bishoprics was increased by only a few new foundations in Northumbria (Whithorn), East Anglia (Elmham), Mercia (Leicester, Dorchester,) and Wessex (Sherborne).

---

[19] "Did the Lord really say this to Peter, Colman?" He replied: "That is so, O King." Thereupon the King asked: "Have you anything of such force to present for your Columba?" He answered: "Nothing." Then the King said: "And so you both agree that this was said in the first place to Peter and to him the keys of the Kingdom of heaven were given by the Lord?" Both answered: "Yes." Then the King thus concluded [the debate]: "And I say to you: This one is the gate-keeper, whom I will not resist; rather I want to obey his orders in every way according to my knowledge and ability, lest, when I come before the gates of heaven, there may be no one there to open to me, because he turns his back on me who obviously holds the keys" (*Hist. eccl.* III, 25). On the long traditional picture of the heavenly gate-keeper cf. K. Hallinger, "Römische Voraussetzungen der bonifatianischen Wirksamkeit im Frankenreich," *St. Bonifatius Gedenkgabe zum 1200. Todestag* (Fulda 1954), 320–361.

Under the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, England became an ecclesiastical unity long before it constituted a political unity. The English Church assembled in provincial synods, which were at the same time "national synods." Since, as a consequence of the political pluralism, the councils could not be dated by regnal years, the episcopate adopted the era of the Incarnation, which soon began from England its triumphal procession through the West. The calculation of Easter was defined, and *stabilitas loci* was stipulated for monks, the clergy, and the episcopate. However, Theodore of Tarsus adopted basic elements of the Irish practice of penance, and for the first time he prescribed annual confession for all. A *Poenitentiale,* which was based on Theodore's instructions and was widely disseminated under his name, "acted so that the improved and individual penitential system of auricular confession became the common property of the Universal Church, with graduated expiatory acts even for secret sins."[20] On the other hand, the Roman influence spread from England to the Celts of the British Isles. In 704 and 716 the Northern Irish of Bangor and the Picts adopted the Roman calculation of Easter. Only the Celts of Wales held fast to Columba's old usage until 768.[21]

For two generations England remained under the ecclesiastical direction of Canterbury. Then when the Bishop of York received the pallium in 735, Northumbria separated itself from the ecclesiastical province that had embraced all England. The bisection was not only in accord with the plan of Pope Gregory but also with the special development of the northern Anglo-Saxon Kingdom. And thus it remained in the future. The ecclesiastical province of Lichfield (788–803), established in the eighth century by the Mercian overlords of the South, had no permanence. Also, the attempt of the King of Mercia to transfer the ecclesiastical metropolis of southern England from Canterbury to London was unsuccessful, although in this case one could appeal to Gregory the Great. But the tradition of the *sedes* of Augustine and Theodore of Tarsus already was too strong.

---

[20] T. Schieffer, op. cit., 76. Archbishop Theodore had no prejudices against the Irish. He elevated three pupils of Irish schools to be bishops (Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest Church,* 102; on his personality, ibid., 104–107).

[21] Deanesly, ibid., 89ff.

[*Viri de gente Anglorum*] *qui maxime familiores apostolicae sedi semper existunt,*[22] said a source of the ninth century about the Anglo-Saxons. In keeping with its origin and its character as an early medieval missionary Church, the Church of England was "more Roman" than those of the Frankish, Gothic, and Lombard kingdoms, which in their roots went back to antiquity and had a richer inheritance. The cult of Saint Peter was firmly anchored in all the German-Roman churches,[23] but it acquired a special intensity in England.

> Saint Peter clearly became the national saint, to whom monasteries and churches . . . were dedicated in great numbers. The most obvious and best known characteristic of this religious devotion was the stream of Anglo-Saxon pilgrims to the thresholds of the Apostles . . . many a one closed his earthly life in Rome, such as two Kings . . . Caedwalla (d. 689) and Ine of Wessex (d. 726).[24]

In 679 the Anglo-Saxon Church met at Hatfield at the request of the Pope in order to station itself behind Rome in the Monothelite question. The attachment to Rome also received juridical forms in England. Here the right of the metropolitan was first connected by Gregory with the reception of the pallium, a vestment consisting of a strip of white wool, which the Popes had previously granted to their vicars. By means of the pallium the metropolitan obtained a participation in the rights of the Pope and the title of "Archbishop" which had previously denoted a supermetropolitan position. As in the Lombard Kingdom, where the Pope had shared in the Lombard mission and in the reorganization of the ecclesiastical province of Milan, there occurred also in England the exemption of monasteries, which were freed from the power of the local bishop and directly subjected to Rome.[25] True, these privileges of exemption, which were granted only in a few special cases on the initiative of the founder, were not an effort by Rome to interfere in the circumstances of the English Church. For the English Church was, no less than the Frankish, Gothic, and Lombard, a "national Church," even if united more firmly with Rome. The competence of king and archbishop, of Witenagemot (meeting of the magnates) and synod extended

---

[22] "(The men of the nation of the English) who were especially closely connected with the Apostolic See from time immemorial" (*Gesta abb. Fontanellensium* 14, ed. Löwenfeld, 42). See Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit., 520ff.

[23] E. Ewig, "Der Petrus-und Apostelkult im spätrömischen und fränkischen Gallien," *ZKG* 71 (1960), 215–251. The cult of Peter had Early Christian roots outside England. It symbolized at the same time the apostolic succession of the episcopate and the union of the bishops with Rome.

[24] T. Schieffer, op. cit., 75.

[25] W. Levison, op. cit., 25ff.

> to such important tasks as the erecting of sees, . . . the naming of the bishop by the king [was] not regarded as unusual, . . . his assent to the election was taken for granted, the expulsion of the bishop from his church by the king was not unprecedented. The supremacy of the king was recorded in a legislation which assured the Church the state's protection, but also maintained an ecclesiastical disciplinary power over clerics and laity. . . . The bishops and abbots came from princely and noble families, which devoted themselves zealously to the founding of churches and monasteries, but also, in keeping with the custom of the proprietary church system, retained ownership of them.[26]

The phases of the christianization of Anglo-Saxon life can be clearly followed. The first Anglo-Saxon in the see of Canterbury was Frithona (654–663), who took the Christian name of Deusdedit. In the 640s and 650s are found the first Anglo-Saxons among the bishops of Rochester (Kent), East Anglia, and Wessex. Apart from Canterbury, all the episcopal sees of England were occupied by natives from the 670s. Earconbert of Kent (640–664) was the first Anglo-Saxon King to order the destruction of pagan shrines in his kingdom. King Aethelbert of Kent, who had the oldest Anglo-Saxon national law compiled, had already established penalties for offenses against God, the clergy, and the churches. But the national laws which Ine of Wessex and Wihtred of Kent issued in 694 and 695 are the first witnesses of a stronger Christian influence. The system of records which the Church brought to England clearly began under the episcopate of Theodore of Canterbury. From the start, the Anglo-Saxon Church was most intimately linked to monasticism, and indeed both that of Ireland as well as that of Rome and Gaul. But the great Anglo-Saxon monastic fathers—Cuthbert of Lindisfarne, Wilfrid of York, Benedict Biscop, Aldhelm of Malmesbury—belonged to Theodore's generation or were younger contemporaries of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Cuthbert (d. 687) assembled the Irish usages of his monastery into a Rule. With the romanization of the English Church the Benedictine Rule found entry, for which Wilfrid of York and Benedict Biscop (d. 690) obtained recognition in broad areas of the country. The Benedictine abbeys were to a far greater degree centers of education than were the Irish monasteries, which were for the most part overburdened by pastoral work. However, the Benedictine stamp of Anglo-Saxon monasticism must not be overestimated. Augustine and his companions were not "Benedictines," and until the eighth century one can probably speak of a Benedictine dominant character, but not of an exclusively Benedictine monasticism among the Anglo-Saxons.[27] Characteristic of early Anglo-Saxon monasticism were the double monasteries, which originated in the Merovingian Kingdom, but achieved special flowering in England.[28] There seem to have been no monasteries solely for nuns in the Early Anglo-Saxon period. Among the great abbesses who presided over communities of men and women, preeminent was Hilda of Whitby (d. 680) a relative of King Oswiu of Northumbria.

---

[26] T. Schieffer, op. cit., 73.

The Anglo-Saxon schools first entered the light of history with Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Hadrian of Canterbury (669–707/710). A special priority of the Canterbury school was the study of Roman Law and the, at that time, unique pursuit of Greek. But the brilliance of the South English cathedral school faded in the eighth century. The Anglo-Saxon center of education shifted to Northumbria: first to the monasteries of Saint Peter at Wearmouth and Saint Paul at Jarrow, founded by Benedict Biscop in 674 and 681–82 respectively, and from there to the Cathedral of York under Archbishop Egbert (734/735–766). In addition to the great schools of Canterbury, Wearmouth–Jarrow, and York, there were, however, some other centers of education which have not yet been sufficiently investigated, including that of Mercian Lichfield.

The founding or renewing of the school of Canterbury under Theodore and Hadrian marked the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon "Renaissance," which was eminently represented by Aldhelm of Malmesbury (c. 640–709), the Venerable Bede (672–735), and Alcuin, and with Alcuin led to the "Carolingian Renaissance." The importance of the West Saxon Aldhelm, who had gone through the school of Canterbury, lay in the field of grammar, prosody, and religious education. Greater than he was the Northumbrian Bede, who as teacher at Jarrow cultivated not only biblical exegesis, grammar, and poetry, but also chronology and historiography.

> The after-effects of his chronological work . . . extend to the present day, for Bede here put the Alexandrian-Roman calculation of feasts into the canonical form for the Middle Ages and brought about the definitive victory of this Easter cycle, still standard for us. In fact, he threw bridges in a twofold respect . . . to the Roman sixth century by popularizing the reckoning of time after the birth of Christ in historiography. And precisely as a historian, Bede enjoys imperishable fame, for his masterpiece, the . . . *Historia ecclesiastica gentis*

---

[27] K. Hallinger, "Papst Gregor d. Gr. und der hl. Benedikt," *SA* 42, 265.

[28] S. Hilpisch, "Die Doppelklöster, Entstehung und Organisation," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums* 15 (Münster 1928); W. Levison, op. cit., 22ff.

Anglorum, already marks a climax of the just then beginning medieval writing of history.[29]

The foundations of the Christian Anglo-Saxon culture were Roman, characterized by the canonical collection of Dionysius Exiguus, the Roman Easter cycle, the *ordo cantandi Romanus,* the *Regula Benedicti.* Benedict Biscop journeyed no less than six times to Rome and brought back from there "an innumerable collection of books of every sort."[30] But he also bought up books at Vienne and was a monk at Lérins for two years. His friend, Wilfrid of York, received decisive impressions of ecclesiastical life at Lyon. Lyon and the neighboring cities possessed well-endowed libraries in the Early Middle Ages, in which even Spanish literature, especially Isidore of Seville, was represented. Bede was familiar with Isidore and the Gallic literature of the fourth to sixth centuries: a great part of the works at his disposal must have come directly from the Frankish Kingdom.[31]

The Irish element in Anglo-Saxon culture is so clear that one often speaks simply of Insular Civilization without a detailed distinction of the two elements. The common criterion which strikes the eye is the Irish hand, which generally found acceptance in England and, as "insular," differed from "continental." However, one must think also of the Irish penitential law, of which mention has already been made. Controverted is the provenance of the insular book illumination, which originated in the transfer of the "barbarian" metalcraft to the book. The traditional view that the insular miniature is an achievement of the Irish of the sixth and seventh centuries is today under attack. Weighty arguments in fact maintain that this highly developed art arose c. 700 in Northumbria.[32]

---

[29] T. Schieffer, op. cit., 79. However, more recent studies have underlined the share of the Church of Canterbury. If the *Historia ecclesiastica* moved beyond the restricted North English framework to a general Church history of England, this was due in two ways to Abbot Albinus of St. Austin (Sts. Peter and Paul): by the stimulus which he gave to Bede and by the documentary material which he sent him by the London priest Nothelm (Deanesly, *Pre-Conquest Church,* 42ff.). The relations of the Northumbrian monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow to Canterbury went back to Benedict Biscop, who for two years governed the abbey of Saint Austin.

[30] Bede, *Historia abbatum* 6, ed. Plummer, 369.

[31] Wallace-Hadrill, op. cit., 527ff.

[32] A. W. Clapham, "Notes on the Origins of Hiberno-Saxon Art," *Antiquity* 8 (1934), 43–57; F. Massai, *Essai sur les origines de la miniature dite irlandaise* (Brussels 1974); F. Henry, "Les défuts de la miniature irlandaise," *Gazette des Beaux Arts* (1950), 5–34; F. Massai, "Il monachesimo irlandese nei suoi rapporti col continente," *Settimane di studio,* . . . IV. *Il monachesimo nell' Alto Medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale* (Spoleto, 1957), 139–163. According to M. Deanesly, the abstract Hiberno-Saxon art of the cross and manuscript came from Iona via Solway Firth to Lindisfarne. The Northumbrian manuscript illumination combined Celtic and classical traditions (relationship, not filia-

Strange to say, the literary influence of the Emerald Isle gained recognition especially in southern England c. 700: through Aldhelm, who had grown up in the West Saxon abbey of Malmesbury, founded by Irish, and who adopted the obscure style of the Irish, characterized by alliteration and affected vocabulary.

While in the Romance lands Latin was still so close to the colloquial speech that it could also be still understood in broader circles, the problem of the popular tongue presented itself early in Ireland and England. Christianization had already given rise in Ireland to a literature in the popular speech, and we also observe the same phenomenon in England. Aethelbert's Kentish *Lex* is the first national law written down in the German language. The *Widsith* and the Beowulf epic—monuments of the pagan heroic age—must first have been fixed in writing in the eighth century. But also the new Christian content pressed for expression in the national language: Bede reports about the stablehand Caedmon, who received from God in a dream vision the commission to sing his praise. Caedmon entered the monastery of Whitby and followed the command, *ita ut, quicquid ex divinis litteris per interpretes disceret, hoc ipse post pusillum verbis poeticis maxima suavitate et conpunctione compositis, in sua, i.e., Anglorum lingua proferret.*[33] Caedmon introduced a religious poetry into the popular language, the chief works of which belong to the eighth and early ninth centuries.

The beginnings of Christian Anglo-Saxon culture decayed with the close of the mission in England, the last acts of which were the conversion of Sussex (680–85) and of the Isle of Wight. A few years later the mission crossed to the continent with Willibrord. But the Anglo-Saxon mission on the continent belongs to Frankish history. For the home of a saint is—as we may say by varying a fine expression of Delehaye[34]—not the country in which he was born, but the spot of earth where he worked and where his remains rest.

---

tion, with the Irish art of the Book of Durrow and the Book of Kells) and developed its own metaphorical style (*Pre-Conquest Church,* 183–187).

[33] " . . . so that, whatever he learned of Holy Scripture through interpreters, he expounded after a brief interval in poetic words of the greatest beauty and deepest sensitivity in his own tongue, that is, that of the Angles" (*Hist. eccl.* IV, 22).

[34] "La patrie du martyr n'est pas la contrée qui lui a donné le jour, mais l'endroit de la terre qu'il a arrosé de son sang et òu reposent ses restes" (H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs,* [Brussels, 2nd ed. 1933], 40).

SECTION TWO

Inner Life of the Church to the End of the Seventh Century

CHAPTER 38

North African Christianity from the Beginning of Vandal Rule to the Muslim Invasion[1]

When Augustine's life was nearing its end, the Church of North Africa seemed to look forward to a peaceful further development. The majority of the population of the Roman provinces, especially in the cities, had converted to Christianity; the still pagan minority, including members of the intellectual and propertied upper class, could be gained through a prudent missionary work, as could the pagan tribes on the long southern frontier of the romanized territory, to whom thus far too little attention had been given, because all too many personnel were tied down by the conflict between Catholics and Donatists. True, the Donatist denomination still existed, but it was forced on the defensive by State measures and especially by Augustine's theological work. Here too a positive development could be anticipated, if Augustine's program was followed, which had as its goal the inner reconciliation of the two denominations. But all this depended decisively on a consolidating of the political situation in the Western Empire, which had fallen into a very precarious position because of the wanderings of the peoples.

The North African Church under Vandal Rule

Suddenly the relatively calm situation changed for North Africa also, when in May 429 the tribe of Arian Vandals, then numbering c. 80,000 persons, under King Gaiseric (428–477) crossed from the southern Spanish coast to Tangiers and began its progress through the Roman provinces.[2] Thus began for the North African Church a period, lasting more than a century, of suppression and persecution by the new rulers, which added to it severe material and even deeper-reaching moral injuries. This persecution, which probably affected Catholics and Donatists in equal measure, knew two phases of greater and lesser intensity; it also had locally circumscribed centers of gravity and occasionally was suspended for several years, but it can neither be questioned as a whole nor minimized in its brutal characteristics. The statements of the different sources, among them eyewitness reports, are too unanimous for this and are in part confirmed by archeological investigation.[3]

---

[1] Since North African Christianity had to experience from 430 to 700 a development strongly differing from the rest of the Latin Church, a comprehensive presentation is suggested for it here.

[2] Victor of Vita, *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* 1, 2. For the earlier history of the Vandals, cf. the works of L. Schmidt and C. Courtois (in the literature).

The first, extremely harsh wave of persecution extended from the beginning of the invasion to the definitive establishment of Vandal power (429–442). Since the Vandals were preceded by the reputation of a special intolerance toward the Catholic clergy, many bishops and priests considered flight, but the aged Augustine at once intervened with a clarifying word and stressed firmly that it was the duty of the clergy to persevere everywhere, even if only a remnant of the congregations remained which would need the help of its priests then in precisely such a situation of misery.[4] The first reports on the behavior of the conquerors which reached the eastern provinces were depressing: churches burned, monasteries destroyed, cemeteries desecrated, private houses plundered, and everywhere the corpses of the slain or of those tortured to death.[5] The roads were inundated with refugees, and Bishop Capreolus of Carthage could not even gather the bishops for a synod in order to appoint the delegates for the Council of Ephesus.[6] Only a few cities, such as Cirta, Hippo, and Carthage, which were moreover filled with refugee peasants, were able to hold out longer. A first agreement with Ravenna, which in 435 recognized the Vandals as *foederati,* was exploited by Gaiseric to prepare for new warlike measures, and the persecution of the clergy continued. In the province of Byzacena the bishops of Vita and Usurita were tortured to death; three others, including Possidius of Calama, were exiled; three noble Spaniards in Vandal service who refused to convert to Arianism were executed.[7] A series of sermons give information about the situation and frame of mind of the Catholics, especially in Carthage before the conquest of the city in 439; with good reason they are attributed to the

---

[3] The attempt by C. Courtois, *Victor de Vita et son oeuvre* (Algiers 1954), to question extensively the value of the statements of Victor's *Historia persecutionis* has rightly been rejected.

[4] Augustine, *Ep.* 228 *ad Honoratum,* put by Possidius in his *Vita s. Augustini,* c. 30.

[5] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 1, 3–4; Possidius, *Vita s. Augustini,* c. 28.

[6] Capreolus, *Ep. ad concil, Ephes., ACO* I, 2, 64, *PL,* Suppl. 3, 259.

[7] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 1, 10; Honoratus, *Ep. ad Arcadium* (*PL* 50, 567–570); Prosper, *Chron. ad. a.* 437/38.

Bishop Quodvultdeus.[8] He regarded the calamity which had overtaken the Church of North Africa as punishment for the tepidity of many Christians, who were even now to be found in the circus instead of letting themselves be guided by the heroic model of their martyrs, Perpetua, Felicity, and those who right then in the country were more gladly enduring death than betray their faith. An apparently considerable number of Christians had already succumbed to the pressure of the enticements of the Vandals and had gone over to the Arian profession. In the most severe expressions they were warned of attempts at blackmail and bribery.[9]

After the fall of Carthage the wrath of the conquerors exploded in full force against the inhabitants because of their long resistance. So many people met death that they had to be interred in a mass-grave without ecclesiastical burial. Plundering affected especially the property of the Church: the principal churches of the city were given to the Vandal clergy, others were used as barracks. Bishop Quodvultdeus was banished with a part of his clergy and taken to damaged ships, which however still reached Naples.[10] The senators and other members of the upper class were first expelled from the city, then banished from the country. Flight brought some of them as far as Syria, where Bishop Theodoret of Cyrrhus took care of them.[11] An organized care of souls was not possible for years in the occupied territories, and the demoralizing consequences were not lacking. The pressure was partly alleviated when a new treaty between Gaiseric and the Emperor Valentinian III in 442 transferred to the Vandals the provinces of Proconsular Africa, Byzacena, Tripolitana, and eastern Numidia as an independent sovereignty—the so-called *sortes Vandalorum*—while western Numidia and the two Mauretanias remained imperial. Pope Leo I at once tried to reconstruct, at least in these provinces, a Church government capable of functioning.[12] After a vacancy of fifteen years, the Vandal King also allowed the occupation of the see of Carthage by Bishop Deogratias in 454.[13]

The political chaos produced in Italy by the assassination of Valentinian III in 455 was exploited by Gaiseric for a quick attack by his fleet on the Tyrrhenian Sea; he took Rome by a *coup de main* and subjected the city to a heavy contribution in art treasures and precious metals; Pope Leo I had to surrender liturgical vessels but obtained from Gaiseric in return that the city would be spared burning and bloodshed. In addition to the widowed Empress and her two daughters, the Vandals carried off to Africa a large number of captives of different ranks, whose misery Bishop Deogratias tried to alleviate so far as he could. When he died in 457, the Church of Carthage was again orphaned for twenty-four years.[14] Any new filling of an episcopal see that became vacant was forbidden, so that of the 164 episcopal communities of Proconsular Africa eventually only three had a bishop.[15] Not until toward the end of Gaiseric's reign could the Emperor Zeno obtain permission for the return of the exiled clerics (475).[16]

---

[8] Catalogue of the twelve *sermones: CIP,* nos. 401–412; survey of the state of the discussion about the author in P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire,* 126, note 7.

[9] Especially characteristic are the two *sermones de tempore barbarico, PL,* Suppl. 3, 287–298, and *PL* 40, 698–708.

[10] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 1, 6; 1, 9; 1, 16.

[11] Ibid. 1, 12; 1, 15; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Ep.* 29, 31, 36, 52–53, 70.

[12] Leo I, *Ep.* 12; *Ad episc. Afr., PL* 54, 646–656.

[13] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 1, 24.

The first years of the reign of King Hunneric (477–484) seemed to introduce a change for the better, since Catholic worship was again allowed and the community of Carthage obtained a new head in Bishop Eugene (481).[17] Through his social concern, he quickly gained high esteem, but thereby aroused the envy of the Vandal clergy and of the Patriarch Cyrila, who gradually succeeded in inducing the King to a change of course. At first attendance at Catholic worship was forbidden to all who wore Vandal dress, hence also to all Catholics in the service of the Vandals.[18] A repulsive campaign of moral defamation of clergy and nuns ensued. Then all Catholics in the army and administration were given the alternative of accepting Arianism or giving up their positions; but the latter were punished by confiscation of property and banishment to Sicily or Sardinia.[19] With the issuing of a decree in 483 which banished almost 5,000 people, clerics and laity of all classes, to the frontier district of the province of Byzacena, dominated by the Moors, the persecution under Hunneric reached its first climax. Victor of Vita described the march of the exiles to the desert, partly as an eyewitness; for many it became a road to death. Rediscovered inscriptions and the remains of a memorial chapel of their graves confirm his report.[20]

Probably as a reply to the remonstrances of the Emperor Zeno, Hunneric summoned the Catholic bishops to Carthage for a religious discussion on 1 February 484,[21] although the Vandal clergy, in contrast to the Catholic, had hitherto shown little interest in theological discussion.[22] Bishop Eugene wanted also Catholic representatives from non-African countries, especially from Rome, to be invited to it, because a discussion between Arians and Catholics was not merely an inner African matter. The request was rejected, and before the beginning of the conference some Catholic bishops who were versed in theology were banished or intimidated by ill-treatment.[23] What then took place at the sessions under the presidency of the Vandal Patriarch Cyrila was less a religious discussion than a passionate debate of both sides concerning questions of procedure; nevertheless, the Catholics were able to submit a detailed profession of faith, probably drawn up by Eugene.[24] King Hunneric at once took up the charge of the Vandal participants in the meeting that the Catholic bishops were the real mischief-makers and issued an edict which placed the Catholic Church entirely under particular law. According to this, the earlier imperial laws against heretics were again declared valid against all who within a determined interval had not been converted to Arianism: all churches were to be closed, all Masses, baptisms, and ordinations were to be discontinued, the liturgical books were to be destroyed, the church property was to be conveyed to the Vandal clergy.[25] After various tortures, a part of the bishops were deported to Corsica, the majority were degraded to the status of *coloni,* a remnant were forced to work in the mines.[26] Now the harshest phase of the persecution also overtook the general population; occasionally it had sadistic features. Add to this a severe famine, so that under the double pressure the number of conversions to Arianism from all classes rose sharply, while others bravely endured torture and death.[27] Only the accession of King Gunthamund (484–496) brought a mitigation of the terror. The decrees of banishment were partly annulled, Bishop Eugene after his return in 487 could also resume Mass in the cemetery church of a suburb of Carthage, at his request Gunthamund in 494 finally allowed the return of all the exiles, and Catholic churches were again opened everywhere in the country. The African Church as a whole offered a picture of devastation, in which the spiritual and moral damage weighed far more than the material—a recovery had to last for years. Since the surviving bishops at first could not meet for a synod of the entire African Church, they turned over the question of the treatment of the numerous *lapsi* to Rome for instructions; the sources, however, supply no data on the number of those willing to do penance.[28]

---

[14] Ibid. 1, 25–27. For the taking of Rome and its consequences see finally H. J. Diesner, *Das Vandalenreich*, 64f.

[15] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 1, 28–29.

[16] Ibid. 1, 51.

[17] Ibid. 2, 1–5.

[18] Ibid. 2, 6–11.

[19] Ibid. 2, 23–25.

[20] Ibid. 2, 26–37; the inscriptions in O. Fiebinger–L. Schmidt, "Inschriftensammlung zur Geschichte der Ostgermanen," *DAWW* 60 (1917), and 70 (1939), nos. 39 and 15 respectively; picture of an inscription in P. Courcelle, op. cit., plate 31, text p. 362.

---

[21] Decree of convocation in Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 2, 39.

[22] Until 484 there is known only a discussion between Cerealis and the Arian Bishop Maximinus (*PL* 58, 757–768), while on the Catholic side a series of African authors were concerned with the theme of Arianism: see Bardenhewer, 4, 545–557.

[23] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 2, 39–46. List of participants: *Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae, CSEL* 7, 117–134.

[24] Victor of Vita, *Hist.* 2, 56–101.

[25] Text of the edict, ibid. 3, 3–14.

[26] Ibid. 3, 20–21.

[27] Ibid. 3, 22–54; the famine and its effects: 3, 55–58.

But no real reconstruction, within and without, came about, for the period of relative toleration ended after the first years of the reign of King Thrasamund (496–523). When the ecclesiastical leadership in the province of Byzacena began around the turn of the century to give new bishops, as far as possible, to the orphaned communities, in opposition, of course, to a royal edict, a new decree sent both consecrators and the newly ordained into exile. Again part of the bishops had to flee or look for a hiding place, again conversions to Arianism were recorded.[29] Among the deported was the new Bishop of Ruspe, Fulgentius, whose theological learning soon made him the intellectual leader of the African episcopate.[30] Through his extensive correspondence, which he carried on from Sardinia, partly as "secretary" of the exiled bishops, through his activity as superior of the monastery founded by him at Cagliari, through his preaching and lecturing, he became a factor in ecclesiastical politics whose importance the Vandal King could not neutralize by mere banishment. When c. 515 Thrasamund let him be brought to Carthage[31] to have him give his opinion in regard to the objections of the Arian clergy against the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, he seemed to have had hopes of a disputation conducted in writing with Fulgentius alone rather than of a religious discussion on the model of 484. The Arian compiler of the *objectiones,* which the King had presented to Fulgentius, once in writing, the other time only read out, is unknown. Fulgentius replied in two works, which in their verbal respect toward the King corresponded to etiquette, but de facto represented the Catholic standpoint without any compromise; the second turned directly to Thrasamund and demanded of him that he accept the Catholic teaching.[32] Since Fulgentius used the relative freedom granted him in Carthage for a successful activity among Catholics and Arians, under the pressure of the Vandal clergy he had to return to exile in Sardinia in 517. An abecedarian psalm from his pen, oriented on the

---

[28] *Mansi* 7, 1056–1059, 1171–1174.

[29] Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* II, 2, 3; *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 230–321; Ferrandus, *Vita s. Fulgentii,* 9, 13, 17–18; Ennodius, *Ep.* 2, 14.

[30] Cf. the works by G. G. Lapeyre and H. J. Diesner (in the literature).

[31] Ferrandus, *Vita s. Fulgentii,* 20.

[32] The two works of Fulgentius: a) *Responsiones ad dicta regis Thrasamundi,* b) *Ad Thrasamundum regem Vandalorum libri tres: CChr* 91, 67–185.

Augustinian model and sharply anti-Arian, which urged the Catholics to remain true to the faith, belongs to this period.[33] Thus ended in failure the attempt of King Thrasamund to take the Catholic Church of North Africa into the service of the Vandal Kingdom, first by reprisals, then by more ecclesiastico-political procedures.

A lasting peace for the Catholic Church of North Africa was first brought about by the accession of King Hilderic (523–530), to whom hostility to Catholics was foreign, since he had spent years at Constantinople and regarded himself as a member of the Theodosian Dynasty through his maternal pedigree—he was the son of Eudocia and the grandson of Valentinian III. His first measures, probably undertaken in agreement with the Emperor Justin I—annulling of the decree of exile for the bishops, return of the alienated churches, permission for the filling of orphaned sees[34]—gave back freedom of worship and of preaching to the Church and made it possible for it to tackle the reconstruction of a too deeply disturbed ecclesiastical life. As early as 523 the bishops of Byzacena in synods at Junca and Sufes took inventory; two years later the new Bishop of Carthage, Boniface, summoned a general council, in which the list of participants, only sixty bishops, had of course to note many absences.[35] Hilderic's ecclesiastical policy of friendliness to Catholics, however, evoked an ever-growing opposition among the Vandals, at whose head stood Gelimer, a great-grandson of Gaiseric. Then when Hilderic's troops suffered several defeats in battle against rebel Berbers, Gelimer had him imprisoned and himself acclaimed as King of the Vandals in 530. The ever more clearly apparent decay of Vandal power induced the Emperor Justinian I, in spite of some hesitations because of the technical difficulties of the enterprise, to bring the North African provinces again under the full authority of the Empire by a military intervention. In half a year, September 533 to March 534, the Byzantine expeditionary force under Belisarius, supported by the native population, succeeded in breaking the Vandals' resistance. In the victor's triumphal procession at Constantinople was seen their last King, Gelimer.[36]

---

[33] Ferrandus, *Vita s. Fulgentii,* 21. For the abecedarian psalm see C. Lambot, *RBén* 48 (1936), 221–234; the text: *CChr* 91A, 877–885.

[34] Ferrandus, *Vita s. Fulgentii,* 25–26; Victor of Tunnuna, *Chron. ad a.* 523; Isidore of Seville, *Hist. Wandal.* 82. See H. J. Diesner, *Die Auswirkungen der Religionspolitik Thrasamunds und Hilderichs auf Ostgoten und Byzantiner* (Berlin 1967).

[35] Acts: *CChr* 149, 254–282; list of participants, ibid., 271f.; see *Hefele–Leclercq* 2, 1055–1074.

[36] Cf. C. Saumagne, "La reconquête byzantine de l'Afrique," *Les Cahiers de Tunisie* 7 (1959), 281–297.

Christianity in Byzantine North Africa

The Emperor Justinian, who saw himself confirmed in his religious mission through the success of the North African undertaking, promised in the law which reorganized the administration of the Diocese of Africa that all inhabitants of these provinces would understand in what freedom they could live under his rule.[37] Above all, the Catholic clergy could assume that they had special claim to freedom. They immediately began at a general Synod under Bishop Reparatus of Carthage in 534, in which 220 bishops were able to participate, discussions on the restoration of their so severely injured Church. In this, three problems occupied the foreground: 1) the restoration of all African clerics who were still staying in the other areas of the Empire, but now were needed for the rebuilding of an organized pastoral work in their homeland; 2) the procedure in the reception of Catholics who through force or seduction had gone over to Arianism, among whom were numerous clerics; 3) the reinstituting of the Catholic Church in its previous rights, which included both the return of its former possessions and the recognition of the special position of the Catholic denomination. For the first two questions the Council requested the confirmation of its decrees by Rome. According to these, only those clerics overseas should be received who could show in writing a special commission from their bishop. Further, every Arian cleric willing to return should be received only as a lay person, but the Church should see to his suitable support.[38] For the regulation of the third question an imperial decree was required, and Justinian issued it in August 535.[39] It ordered the return of all church buildings and liturgical vessels and confirmed the metropolitan rights of the Bishop of Carthage. Extremely severe were the measures which the decree laid down in regard to Arians, Donatists, Jews, and pagans: they had to close their churches and stop every cultic act; any gathering was forbidden; it sufficed that they were able to live. The Pope congratulated the Emperor for such zeal for the spread of God's Kingdom.[40]

This harshness would take a bitter toll. When, soon after the return of Belisarius to Constantinople, the indigenous tribes in the south and west of the central provinces rose against the new regime, the Arian and

---

[37] R. Devreesse, "L'église d'Afrique durant l'occupation byzantine," *MAH* 57 (1940), 143–168. Justinian's law: *Cod. Just.* I, 27.

[38] Letter of the Synod to Pope John II and replies of Pope Agapitus I: *Coll. Avell.*, nos. 85–87.

[39] *Nov.* 37.

[40] *Coll. Avell.*, no. 88.

Donatist clergy supported the rebels, so far as was possible, in their war, which lasted more than fifteen years and made a consistent and effective reconstruction of the Catholic Church impossible. But one gets the impression that the episcopate, on the other hand, had no comprehensive reconstruction plan sketched out on a wide view, although occasionally synods were held, which, however, like that of Byzacena in 541, were preoccupied chiefly with the special rights of their ecclesiastical province.[41] Add to this the further burden of the controversy over the Three Chapters, in which the African episcopate took an active part. As its two spokesmen first appeared Facundus of Hermiane and the deacon Ferrandus of Carthage, both of whom repudiated Justinian's theology or called for opposition to it.[42] In 550 the Synod of Carthage even withdrew its communion from Pope Vigilius in the event that he annulled his *Judicatum* and formally protested to the Emperor against the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[43] Of the heads of the African ecclesiastical provinces summoned to Constantinople, only the Primate of Numidia proved to be submissive to the imperial wishes, while Reparatus of Carthage had to pay for his refusal with banishment to Pontus, where he died in 563. A second group of eight bishops, who were probably chosen as delegates for the Council of 553 by the successor of Reparatus, Primosus of Carthage, because they were loyal to the Emperor, likewise caused no difficulties. After the Council Primasius of Hadrumetum accepted the condemnation of the Three Chapters, in return for which Justinian rewarded him with the dignity of Primate of Byzacena. But on their return to Africa these bishops encountered the cold repudiation of their colleagues, whose resistance to the decrees of 553 they could break only with the aid of the State's power. Among the unreconciled was Victor of Tunnuna, who as an exile had to lead a ceaselessly itinerant life and was finally confined to a monastery in Constantinople.[44]

With the accession of Justin II (565–578) this theological strife gradually died out, but the authoritarian claims of the Byzantine Emperor left their mark on the African episcopate. In the Exarch of Carthage they constantly had the representative of imperial power close by; he had to foster the true faith, of course, but at the same time he understood this commission as control over the Church or as a right to interfere in its affairs. Thus more and more there spread among the bishops a certain resignation, and smaller and smaller grew the number of those who devotedly troubled themselves over the restoration of religious life. Furthermore, a peaceful development favorable to this was again and again placed in jeopardy by tedious struggles with the rebel tribal chiefs, such as King Garmul, which only came to an end under the Emperor Maurice.

---

[41] *Mansi* 9, 111f., Justinian, *Nov.* 131.

[42] Ferrandus, *Ep.* 6; Facundus Hermian., *Pro defensione trium capitulorum, PL* 67, 527–852; two other works on the question, ibid., 853–878. The leading role of the African bishops in the Controversy over the Three Chapters is stressed by R. A. Markus, "Reflections on Religious Dissent in North Africa in the Byzantine Period," *StChH* 3 (1966), 140–149.

[43] Victor of Tunnuna, *Chron. ad a. 550.*

[44] Ibid., *ad a 551 ss.*

In the face of the frequent encroachments of an often corrupt bureaucracy the African Church more than previously sought aid from the Roman Pope, but only men like Gregory the Great could occasionally secure remedies here. His correspondence with his Legate, Hilary, with some reliable bishops, and with the high State officials partly discloses serious abuses also in the higher clergy, which could only be regarded as signs of a progressively negative development. Tirelessly, Gregory sought to shake the bishops out of their lethargy, which showed itself especially in regard to the Donatists, who were becoming again very active in Numidia, since the Emperor Maurice had relaxed Justinian's strict decrees. The Synod under Dominic of Carthage in 594 at least decided to watch more zealously than before over the preservation of the purity of the faith, but it still had to threaten with deposition bishops who were all too negligent. Several synods of Numidia likewise worked for the localizing of the danger, but Donatism persisted until the Muslim conquest.[45]

However, the resumption of missionary work among the pagan tribes in the frontier zones of the provinces represented a positive characteristic in the life of the African Church of this time. Here the Byzantine policy of securing the Empire's boundaries by the christianization of the population at the same time coincided with the Church's mission mandate. Already under Justinian the Moorish tribes in the south of the province of Tripolitana had been gained for Christianity. The year 569 brought the conversion of the Garamantes in the district of Fezzan in southwest Libya.[46] And in the south of Byzacena Christianity found entry among the tribes in the oasis of Girba and in the southern slope of the Aurès Mountains. In the extreme west of Mauretania Caesariensis numerous Christians lived under the rule of King Masuna, and their bishops took part in the synods at Carthage. Even Arabic authors attest that the Islamic troops in their conquest encountered many native tribes that professed Christianity.[47] The representatives of this mission activity are unknown as individuals. However, the outcome of their efforts was not lasting, since the follow-up of the evangelization requiring years, which would have assured a conversion in depth, was missing. Under the burdens of the Muslim invasion that soon occurred, the new faith possessed only slight and easily paralyzed powers of resistance.

---

[45] On Gregory's correspondence with Africa see P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam* II, 2 (Paris 1965), 226–233; on Donatism c. 600: R. A. Markus, *StChH* 1 (1964), 118–126, who, however, probably correctly, would see the basis for the careless attitude of some Catholic bishops in regard to the Donatists in a toleration, agreed to by both denominations, that had meanwhile appeared.

[46] Procopius, *De aedif.* 6, 4, 12; John of Biclar, *Chron. ad a.* 569.

The scanty sources on the interior situation of North African Christianity begin to flow somewhat more abundantly in the first decades of the seventh century, when the Monothelite Controversy made an impact here too. With the wave of eastern Christians who fled to Africa before the Muslim conqueror c. 640 came also adherents of Monothelitism, whose propaganda was, of course, at first severely suppressed by the Exarch George with the approval of the Catholics.[48] An opportunity for the African Church to reject the new theological doctrine just as decisively as once it had rejected the condemnation of the Three Chapters was the public dispute between Maximus Confessor and the former Patriarch Pyrrhus of Constantinople at Carthage in 645, in which Maximus overwhelmingly demonstrated the untenability of the Monothelite theology.[49] The bishops informed Pope Theodore of their rejection of Monothelitism and at the same time asked him to induce the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople to the same view or to exclude him from ecclesiastical communion. They addressed a letter with the same content to the Emperor Constans II (641–668), and finally directly called upon the Patriarch to abandon the erroneous teaching at the beginning of 646.[50] A delegation of African bishops took part in the Lateran Synod of 649, at which Pope Martin I solemnly rejected Monothelitism. With the episcopate of the other western countries the bishops of Africa adhered to Rome's verdict, which the Pope made known to all churches by an encyclical.[51]

The Muslim Invasion and the Ruin of North African Christianity

The tedious theological confrontations, along with other reasons, had led in the population of the North African provinces to a new wave of hostility toward Byzantine rule. The Exarch Gregory used this situation for open rebellion against the central government, but he was soon involved in battle because of an advance of Arab troops to Sufetula in Byzacena, and in it he found death (647). The incident should have been the signal for the Byzantine government to put the North African provinces at once in a state of defense. When, two decades later, the Arabs again invaded the same province, they could without hindrance build the city of Kairawan as their religious and military center in North Africa; thereby a constant threat to Carthage and the rest of North Africa was created. Only when in 696 the Arabs under Hassan brought Carthage under their power did the Emperor Leontius send a fleet, which was at first able to relieve the city, but in the spring of 697 the Byzantines yielded without a battle rather than face another attack. In the next years, the Muslim troops broke the resistance of the Berber tribes in Numidia and Mauretania, and in 709 all of North Africa except for the bridgehead of Septem (Ceuta) was in their hands.[52]

---

[47] See A. Audollent, "La diffusion du christianisme en Afrique au sud des territoires soumis à Rome, après le V^e siècle," *CRAI* 1942, 202–216, especially 212f.

[48] *Hefele–Leclercq* III, 1, 402–404.

[49] *Mansi* 10, 709–760, and *PG* 91, 287–354; see *Hefele–Leclercq,* 422–425.

[50] *Mansi* 10, 929–931, 943–949; see *Hefele–Leclercq,* 426–430, and V. Grumel, *ÉO* 26 (1927), 24–32.

[51] Acts of the Synod: *Mansi* 10, 863–1183; see E. Caspar, *ZKG* 51 (1932), 75–137.

Unfortunately there is no eyewitness report from a Christian pen which would directly inform in detail of the conduct of individual Christians as well as of Church leaders during the Islamic conquest and of the situation of Christianity in the following decades. One may certainly reckon with a considerable decline of the Christian population in the years of the subjugation, which was caused by the flight of many Christians to Italy and Gaul as well as by the death of many inhabitants in the severe battles for the possession of the cities, which were in the majority Christian.[53] However, the remainder of the Christians were at first treated according to the usual practice of the conquerors, that is, the exercise of their religion was allowed on the payment of a tax and the renouncing of any propaganda for their faith. But c. 720 a heavy pressure began under the Caliph Omar II on the still Christian Berbers to convert to Islam, and most succumbed to it. Archeological investigation has been able, it is true, to bring to light a considerable number of Christian inscriptions and remains of Christian churches, which attest the continued existence of Christians in several places of North Africa long after the conquest.[54] And reports of Arab writers and even letters from the papal chancery in the eleventh century testify to the continued life of at least small Christian groups up to this period.[55] But these testimonies underscore ultimately the fact that North African Christianity, differently from the Egyptian or Syrian under similar conditions, perished relatively fast as a large organized community. The question often raised as to the causes of this process can be answered only with reference to many factors.[56] A cause reaching far back was produced with the split of African Christianity into a Catholic and a Donatist denomination, which reduced their interior strength more and more. A further weakening followed from the Vandal persecution with its crushing permanent effect, from which the Church never really recovered. The rapid apostasy of the christianized Berber tribes, finally, was very much the fault of the African Christians themselves, who in the fourth century did too little and thereafter carried out an intensive mission activity too late among this part of the population and thus could not achieve an existential conversion. The rest of western and eastern Christianity in its total tragedy scarcely noted the ruin of a Church which had produced figures such as Tertullian, Felicity and Perpetua, Cyprian, and Augustine. There were no voices that would have given authentic expression to the shock of this loss.

---

[52] See finally M. Dall'Arche, *Scomparsa del Cristianesimo ed espansione dell'Islam nell'Africa settentrionale* (Rome 1967).

[53] Dall'Arche, op. cit., 150f.

[54] See W. Seston, "Sur des derniers temps du christianisme en Afrique," *MAH* 53 (1936), 101–124.

[55] C. Courtois, "Grégoire VII et l'Afrique du Nord. Remarques sur les communautés chrétiennes d'Afrique au XIe siècle," *RH* 195 (1945), 97–122, 193–226.

[56] C. J. Speel, "The Disappearance of Christianity from North Africa in the Wake of the Rise of Islam," *CH* 29 (1960), 379–397, who especially strongly emphasizes the effects of the Vandal persecution.

CHAPTER 39

The Papacy between Byzantium and the German Kingdoms from Hilary (461–468) to Sergius I(687–701)

The relative understanding with the Christian East, especially with Byzantium, reached under Pope Leo I, continued under his successor, Hilary (461–68),[1] who as Legate at the Synod of Ephesus of 449 had become acquainted with the East from personal observation. But a new topic of future papal concern was already intimated during his reign: the relationship to the Arian Germans. Hilary had to live with the fact that an Arian community had established itself in Rome and with the help of the German military commander Ricimer built a church of its own, from which grew the Church of Santa Agata dei Goti.[2] His program, announced at his accession, that he would strive especially for the unity of the episcopate, caused him to intervene repeatedly in the questions of jurisdiction among the Gallic and Spanish bishops, and in these cases he preferred to have his decisions reached at Roman synods.[3]

---

[1] Letters in A. Thiel, op. cit., 126–174.

[2] See H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste* I, 88.

The extant correspondence[4] of Pope Simplicius (468–483) shows that the post-Chalcedon development in the East was beginning to claim the special attention of the Popes. There, under the Emperors Leo I (457–474) and Zeno (474–491), the nascent Monophysite movement succeeded in filling the sees of Alexandria (Timothy the Cat) and Antioch (Peter the Fuller) with its own men, who enjoyed the special favor of the usurper Basiliscus (475–476). When the last-named, under their influence, condemned the creed of Chalcedon and the *Epistola dogmatica* of Pope Leo I in his *Encyclion,* and thereby intended to restore the Christological question to the position of Ephesus of 431, and when some 500 bishops, even though under pressure, assented to the edict, it was understood at Rome on what precarious ground the result gained with so much work at Chalcedon stood. In a series of letters Pope Simplicius implored the Emperor Zeno, restored to power in 476, and the Patriarch Acacius (471–489) to preserve the legacy of Chalcedon and to eliminate the people who were threatening it. The delaying tactics of Acacius, concerning whose failure to supply information the Pope repeatedly complained bitterly,[5] led to a steadily growing mistrust on the part of Rome, especially when Constantinople elevated an open supporter of Timothy the Cat, Peter Mongus, to be Patriarch of Alexandria. This mistrust in Rome worked disastrously in regard to the *Henoticon,* composed by the Patriarch Acacius and issued by the Emperor in 482, which aimed to bring about a union of the factions by a compromise, avoiding an unambiguous acknowledgment of Chalcedon but expressly recognizing Cyril's anathemas. The *Henoticon* promptly obtained the consent of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who interpreted it in the Monophysite sense. The urgent warnings of the Pope against an obliteration of principle remained unheeded.

Since neither Emperor nor Patriarch even notified the Pope about the *Henoticon,* the far more self-conscious and energetic Felix II (483–492),[6] in comparison to Simplicius, decided on crucial but momentous measures, especially since the abbot of the monastery of the Acemetae monks of Constantinople was complaining of Rome's hitherto hesitant attitude toward the Monophysite movement that was growing ever stronger. A papal embassy brought letters for the Emperor and the Patriarch, in which the latter was summoned to a Synod at Rome. When the papal legates were thereupon first imprisoned at Constantinople and then won over by bribes to accept the communion of Acacius and Peter Mongus, Felix II, in the setting of a Synod in July 484, had the Bishop of Constantinople solemnly deposed from his priestly office and any communion with him forbidden. In several letters to the clergy and people of Byzantium, to the monks of the city and its vicinity, but especially to Acacius and the Emperor himself, the decree of the Synod was made known and justified in sharp expressions.[7] The chief reason for the condemnation of the Patriarch was, in Rome's view, the fact that he had again accepted the ecclesiastical communion of Peter Mongus, whom he had himself once condemned as a heretic, and whose condemnation he had also demanded of Rome. At Rome, despite Acacius's contrary assertions, people remained convinced that the Patriarch of Alexandria had never repudiated his rejection of Chalcedon, especially since his adherents in Rome confirmed this.[8] Thus the Roman decision meant an open break between East and West, the Acacian Schism, which was deepened through the sharp and at times cutting instruction, never heard since the time of Ambrose, to the Emperor Zeno on the limits of imperial power vis-à-vis the Church: "The Emperor is a son of the Church, not a bishop of the Church. In matters of faith he must learn, not teach. . . . By God's will the direction of the Church belongs to the bishops, not to the civil power. If this is a believer, then God intends it to be subject to the Church."[9]

---

[3] The *universalis concordia sacerdotum, Ep.* 6, 2; here too his second principle: "ut in una ecclesia . . . una sit in omnibus observantia disciplinae."

[4] Thiel, 174–214; fourteen letters also in the *Coll. Avell.* For the post-Chalcedon development in the East see supra, Chapters 22–26 and W. H. C. Frend (Literature). Here it is only alluded to in so far as it is relevant to the contemporary papacy.

[5] Cf. for example, *Ep.* 17, 18, 20.

[6] His letters in Thiel, 222–277 and in part in E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen* (Munich 1934).

Pope Gelasius I (492–496)

The freedom of the Church from the tutelage of the State, here demanded, was also the primary goal of the activity of Pope Gelasius I (492–96), who as Felix II's deacon, had formulated the statements quoted.[10] The erasing of the names of Acacius and Peter Mongus from the diptychs remained for Rome the *conditio sine qua non* for the restoration of unity: only thus, so it was thought, was a clear recognition of Chalcedon assured. This attitude was also maintained when Acacius's successor Fravitas, made known to the Pope the hope of an elimination of the schism, and also when the next Patriarch, Euphemius (490–495), held himself aloof from Peter Mongus, because the latter had demanded of Fravitas the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon and thereby had himself confirmed Rome's suspicion of his Monophysite connections.[11] The reply of Gelasius I to Euphemius's notification of his election, which clearly aspired for peace and was not sparing in its praise of the Pope, was not only inflexible in the matter but even in form was a perplexing mixture of cold lack of courtesy and irony.[12] The Pope utilized his first contact with the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518) for the presentation, more moderate in tone but portentous for the future in its content, of the task and rank of the two powers by which the world is ruled, the *auctoritas sacrata pontificum* and the *regalis potestas.*[13] The competence of the latter is fully recognized for the secular sphere, and it also binds the bishops, but it remains subordinate to the former, so that the Emperor cannot direct the bishops, to whom *res divinae* are entrusted, according to his will, but is dependent on their judgment. Among the representatives of the spiritual authority, the occupant of that see is again preeminent whom the word of Christ placed ahead of all and whom the Church from time immemorial has recognized as its supreme head. The responsibility placed on this Apostolic See for the preservation of the purity of the faith has made necessary the exclusion of Acacius, since he maintained communion with those who rejected the creed of Chalcedon.[14] Gelasius also staunchly defended these views in his letter to the episcopate of the provinces of Illyricum and Dardania, which were especially exposed to Greek counterpropaganda. He thereby definitively secured himself against the reproach made by the Greeks that basically the See of Rome did not care about the question of faith but about the condemning of persons through whom it felt itself injured.[15] In reality, the theological question so deeply troubled the Pope that he gave an account of it in several treatises, some of them quite detailed, especially in the work *De duabus naturis,* which went beyond Leo I's achievement, since it displayed a deeper knowledge of Greek theology and found more precise formulations, even if it could not define the exact relationship of nature and person.[16] It must be admitted that Gelasius I understood that to a great degree he was responsible for preserving the heritage of Chalcedon from any falsification and depreciation, and since he saw it threatened also by the imperial power, he sharply pointed out the State's limits in relation to the Church. Unfortunately, he defended his view vis-à-vis Constantinople with a roughness that was bound to make the opponent obdurate rather than flexible.

---

[7] Felix II, *Ep.* 3–4, 6–12.

[8] See the extensive justification of Rome, probably put together under Felix II, among the letters of Gelasius I: *Ep.* 1, 18.

[9] Ibid., 1, 10.

[10] Cf. H. Koch, "Gelasius im kirchenpolitischen Dienst seiner Vorgänger," *SAM* 1935, 6; restrictive of this: N. Ertl, *AUF* 1 (1937), 56–112 and *DA* 2 (1938), 219f. The letters and treatises of Gelasius in Thiel, 285–613; the letters of the *Collectio Britannica* in P. Ewald, *NA* 5 (1880), 509–562, and in S. Löwenfeld, *Epistulae Pontificum Romanorum ineditae* (Leipzig 1885, reprinted at Graz 1959).

---

[11] Felix II, *Ep.* 14 and 15; Theophanes reports on the conflict of Peter Mongus with Euphemius, *Chron. ad a. 5981.*

[12] Gelasius I, *Ep.* 3.

[13] Gelasius I, *Ep.* 12, 2–3. On the terminology see W. Ensslin, *HJ* 74 (1955), 661–668, and W. Ullmann, op. cit., 18–20. On the Emperor's religious policy see C. Capizzi, *L'imperatore Anastasio I* (Rome 1969), 100–137. On the "Two-Power Theory," see A. K. Ziegler, "Pope Gelasius I and His Teaching on the Relation of Church and State," *The Catholic Historical Review* XXVII, 4, 412–437.

[14] Gelasius I, *Ep.* 12.

[15] Ibid. 7, 18, 26, 27.

The opinion that the Pope's intransigent attitude is explained by the strong backing which the Ostrogothic power in Italy gave him against Byzantium finds no corroboration in the sources. Already as a deacon, Gelasius had defended this policy in respect to Constantinople, before Theodoric had firmly established himself in Italy, and as Pope he just as courageously warned the Gothic Count Teja not to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs, especially since he belonged to another denomination and his master, Theodoric, had recognized the autonomy of the Church. When he once enumerated examples for ecclesiastical opposition to State encroachments, he could with satisfaction refer to the fact that he himself had refused any obedience to the German King Odocer, when the latter demanded something unlawful from him.[17] It is understandable that the Pope repeatedly turned to Theodoric from nonpolitical motives, since the Gothic King had expressly guaranteed to respect the Catholic Church and especially the Roman See.[18] If Gelasius's understanding of the primacy, as it is manifested in word and deed, is compared with that of Leo I, two important further developments become prominent: the obligation of the Roman Bishop to watch over the purity of doctrine was drawn more strongly into the foreground and maintained without compromise, and the freedom of the Church with respect to the highest representatives of the civil power was thought out anew and more deeply and formulated with a precision which defined the relations of the two powers to each other for the West for centuries, in a sense that strongly deviated from the understanding of the Byzantine imperial power.[19]

---

[16] The treatise *De duabus naturis* in E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen,* 85–106, then *PL,* Suppl. 3, 763–787; on the importance for the history of dogma see F. Hofmann, *Chalkedon* II, 64. Also the comprehensive treatise, *Adversus Pelagianam haeresim* (Thiel, 571–598) attests the Pope's theological interest.

[17] See footnote 9, Letter to Teja: *PL,* Suppl. 3, 753f.; on Odoacer: *Ep.* 26, 11.

[18] See W. Ensslin, *Theoderich der Grosse* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1959), 98–103.

[19] See A. St. McGrade (Literature for this chapter).

Because of this activity, another aspect in the total work of Gelasius I is occasionally unduly relegated to the background—his extensive pastoral work. In the heavy afflictions which the Ostrogothic conquest meant for the population of Italy, he exerted himself tirelessly for the alleviation of every misery. From Theodoric's mother, the Catholic Ereleuva, he asked support for his seeking of aid from the King.[20] He repeatedly reminded the clergy that one-fourth of the revenues of a church must be used for the poor, that the bishops should maintain captives and strangers from their share, that a conscientious administration of Church property was a duty of the episcopal office.[21] Concern for widows and orphans had to remain a constant aim of the clergy.[22] He often protested the rather frequent violation in those disturbed times of the churches' right of asylum.[23] An irrevocable presupposition for the pastoral mission of the Church was seen by Gelasius to be a zealous, conscientious clergy; in a comprehensive decretal he assembled guidelines for the selection of recruits, for their formation, for the active care of souls, for the building, endowing, and dedicating of churches.[24] True, the Pope had far more to blame than to praise in his clergy, but he still had a sympathetic heart for their problems and needs; full of concern, he inquired after the state of health of a sick bishop, warmly interceded for a priest whom some wanted to deprive of his position after an accident, and threatened to report to the King an official who disregarded the rights of his clergy.[25] Just as little did the Pope put up with a diminution of the rights of the lower clergy and of the laity by the bishops; when, during the election of a bishop, the bishops wanted to make the decision on the candidate among themselves, he decisively insisted that the clergy of all parishes and the entire community should take part in the election.[26]

Liturgical activity did not occupy the lowest rung in the pastoral work of Gelasius I. He may be regarded as the compiler of the old Roman *Kyrie-Litany,* the *Deprecatio Gelasii,* which was probably introduced in connection with an adaptation of the Universal Prayer, related to it in content, in the Mass liturgy.[27] Finally eighteen Mass formularies preserved in the *Sacramentarium Leonianum* go back to him. They are all in the context of Gelasius's struggle against the spring festival of the Lupercalia on 15 February, still attractive to many Romans in his day even if no longer understood in its pagan meaning; he took a stand against it in his comprehensive "Open Letter."[28]

---

[20] Gelasius I, *Fragm.* 36.

[21] Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14, 27; 17, 1; *Fragm.* 22–24, 28, 34. Dionysius Exiguus praises his beneficence: ". . . *omnes fere pauperes ditans inops ipse moreretur*" (Thiel, 287).

[22] *Fragm.* 31–33, *Ep.* 1, Löwenfeld.

[23] *Fragm.* 39–40.

[24] Gelasius I, *Ep.* 14; *Fragm.* 48 supplies a concise mirror of bishops.

[25] *Fragm.* 9; *Ep.* 9, Löwenfeld.

[26] *Fragm.* 4.

[27] The *Deprecatio Gelasii,* edited by B. Capelle, *RBén* 46 (1934), 135–144; see J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* I, 416–419 (with the text of the *Deprecatio*).

Under Pope Anastasius II (496–98) a change in the relations between Rome and Byzantium seemed to be in progress, since he delegated an embassy to the East to carry notification of his election to the Emperor. In a letter, very humble in form,[29] the Pope expressed his regret over the existing separation and unambiguously recognized the validity of the ordinations and baptisms performed by Acacius, but he still did not see himself in a position to confirm his orthodoxy by placing his name in the diptychs. In another place he even candidly expressed his satisfaction that the Church of Thessalonica had assented to the verdict of Gelasius I on Acacius.[30] Anastasius defended himself against the charge that the Apostolic See, for which he claimed the primacy of the Universal Church, had acted in the condemnation of the Bishop of Constantinople not out of concern for the faith but out of arrogance. The early death of the Pope prevented further discussion.

The split in the Roman congregation over the question of what attitude to maintain toward Byzantium led to a double election and hence to the Laurentian Schism,[31] which for years crippled the activity of the Roman See. After hearing the bitterly feuding factions at Ravenna, King Theodoric first decided against the pro-Byzantine priest Lawrence for Symmachus (498–514), in whose favor the earlier time of his ordination and the greater number of adherents also spoke. At a Roman Synod in 499 Symmachus tried to prevent a repetition of such occurrences by a unique decree on the papal election,[32] which aimed to assure to the reigning Pope a sort of right of designation of his successor and hence in practice excluded the collaboration of the community in the election of the Pope. Although Lawrence signed the synodal decrees and then assumed the see of Nocera, the pro-Byzantine senatorial faction continued its opposition to Symmachus and accused him to Theodoric of serious moral lapses, squandering of Church property, and disregard of the date of Easter, whereupon the King ordered an investigation of the accusations by a synod and appointed a visitor for the Roman Church until a clarification of the affair had been made. Despite repeated admonitions from Theodoric and pressure from the senatorial majority, the Synod, which met from early summer to late autumn 502, could not decide on a formal judicial process against Symmachus because people were of the opinion that the occupant of the Roman See cannot be judged by his subordinates. Finally, it reached the uniquely formulated decree that a verdict in this case must be left to God, that Symmachus himself should be regarded as immune from judgment and able freely to celebrate the liturgy in all churches.[33] But this outcome only hardened the resistance of the opposition, which brought Lawrence back to Rome and, in addition to the papal residence of the Lateran, was able to put him in possession also of most of the Roman titular churches, whereas Symmachus was restricted to Saint Peter's. The continuing disturbances in the city were accompanied by serious literary feuding, in which Ennodius, then still a deacon at Milan, and Avitus of Vienne intervened and in the course of which the so-called Symmachan Forgeries were launched, whose aim it was to prove by the example of alleged cases from the history of the papacy the principle that the first episcopal see cannot be subjected to any court—*Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur.*[34] Not until the fall of 506, when Theodoric had to take into account the growing political tensions with Byzantium, did he decide, pointedly and definitively, for Symmachus, to whom he had all the churches of Rome given back, and thus caused the end of the schism, especially since the opposing faction soon lost its head through the death of Lawrence, whom Symmachus had excommunicated.[35]

---

[28] All texts edited by G. Pomarès, *SChr* 65 (Paris 1959), with introduction on Gelasius's authorship.

[29] Anastasius II, *Ep.* 1 (the four genuine letters of the Pope–1, 3, 4, 6—in Thiel, 615–637).

[30] Anastasius II, *Ep.* 3, 1.

[31] The most important sources in E. Caspar, *Theoderich der Grosse und das Papsttum, KIT* 162 (Berlin 1931). Basic for the history of the schism is R. Cessi *ASRomana* 42 (1929), 5–229; on the synods, G. P. Picotti, *Studi in onore di G. Volpe* II (Florence 1958), 743–786; finally, C. Pietri, *MAH* 78 (1966), 123–139.

[32] Preserved as *Ep.* 1 of the letters of Symmachus Thiel, 641–654.

How very much this victory increased the Pope's self-consciousness in regard to Constantinople appears from his answer to a letter of the Emperor Anastasius, who saw himself betrayed by the Roman Senate and in his anger reviled the "illegally ordained" Pope as a Manichaean. Symmachus paid him back with equally gross coin, accused the Emperor of favoring every heresy, and branded him as a persecutor of the orthodox and a despiser of the Roman See.[36] Also a letter, probably composed by Ennodius by command of the Pope, to the Illyrian episcopate is characterized by a like intransigence toward Constantinople;[37] the gulf was not to be bridged under this Pope.

---

[33] Decree of the *Synodus Palmaris* in E. Caspar, op. cit., 17.

[34] Text of the forgeries: L. Duchesne, *LP* I, CXXXIIIff.; a part also in *PL,* Suppl. 3, 1249ff. Ennodius, *Libellus pro synodo;* Avitus, *Ep.* 34 in Caspar, 32–59. On the pre-Constantinian development of the principle, see M. Koeniger, *Festgabe A. Ehrhard* (Bonn 1922), pp. 273–300.

[35] *Fragm. Laurent* in Caspar, 31.

[36] Symmachus, *Ep.* 10; Anastasius's letter is not extant.

In the West Symmachus showed a special interest in the Church of Gaul. He not only restored the old vicariate rights of Arles in their full extent, but extended its jurisdiction even to the Spanish sees. A hitherto unusual distinction of a bishop was the granting of the pallium to Caesarius of Arles.[38] The conversion of the Arian Burgundian Prince Sigismund of Geneva to Catholicism—he appeared also at Rome as a pilgrim[39]—the first case of a change of denomination on the part of a German king, seems however not to have been clear in its significance to the Pope, any more than a Roman reaction to the baptism of the Frankish King Clovis can be perceived.

Pope Hormisdas (514–523)

For Pope Hormisdas (514–523),[40] previously the trusted collaborator and the successor of Symmachus, reconciliation with the East was also a duty of the first rank, but he undertook its solution with much greater caution, flexibility, and genuine readiness for peace. In this he was favored by certain factors of the inner political development in the East, such as the growing discontent of the population of the capital with the pro-Monophysite policies of the reign and the revolt of the general Vitalian in 513–15,[41] which forced the Emperor Anastasius at least temporarily to greater indulgence. To two letters from the Emperor, which invited Hormisdas to a Synod at Heracleia,[42] the Pope replied with the sending of a carefully briefed delegation under the leadership of Ennodius of Pavia in August 515, which explained in Constantinople the Roman minimum conditions for a restoration of peace: recognition of the Council of Chalcedon and of the pertinent writings of Pope Leo by the Emperor and the bishops of the East; condemnation of Nestorius, Eutyches, and their adherents, including Acacius; signing of a *libellus,* the *Formula Hormisdae,* and treatment of the cases of the deposed or exiled bishops before a papal tribunal. In addition, detailed instructions were given to the papal embassy for the conduct of the negotiations.[43] But the entire enterprise ended in failure, since the Emperor, after an abatement of the inner political difficulties, was not prepared to accept the Roman demands, especially the condemnation of Acacius.[44] The same fate befell a second attempt of the Pope in 517, who this time had given to his legates a series of letters and propaganda writings for the Patriarch, the bishops of the East, and the clergy and people of the capital. Pope and Emperor maintained their basic positions, and in a crude letter Anastasius declared that further negotiations were meaningless, since he "was unable to accept any commands" from Rome.[45]

---

[37] Symmachus, *Ep.* 13.

[38] Paraphrase of the rights of the vicariate: Symmachus, *Ep.* 14 and 16. Granting of the pallium in the decretal *Ep.* 15, 9; see G. Länggartner, *Dei Gallienopolitik der Päpste im V. und VI. Jahrh.* (Bonn 1964).

[39] Avitus of Vienne, *Ep.* 8 and 29 (Sigismund to Symmachus).

[40] Correspondence of Hormisdas in Thiel, 741–990 and, with a few exceptions, also in the *Coll. Avell., CSEL* 35.

[41] Cf. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* II (Paris 1949), 177–185.

[42] *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 109 and 107. But the synod probably did not take place.

Only the change on the throne in 518, which placed the Byzantine religious policy in the hands of the Emperor Justin I (518–527), a pro-Chalcedonian, and of his nephew and successor, Justinian I (527–565), brought a fundamental change. Since both men at once asserted their readiness for peace and asked for the sending of an embassy or, if possible, for the personal presence of the Pope, Hormisdas gave his legates the draft for a conclusion of peace, already worked out for Anastasius, in addition to letters to Justin, the imperial nephew, the Patriarch John, and other highly placed personalities of the capital; in these the glad and certain expectation of the restoration of Church unity was emphatically expressed.[46] Immediately after the arrival of the delegation some bishops in the Balkan Peninsula accepted the *libellus* of Hormisdas and hence confirmed the Roman optimism.[47] Surprisingly quickly, the legates were able to furnish the Pope with a detailed report of the union consummated on 28 March 519, when the Patriarch after initial hesitations signed the *libellus* amid the acclamations of clergy and people.[48] An enthusiasm of joy and gratitude over the ending of the thirty-five-year-old schism runs through the letters on both sides, exchanged on this occasion; the Pope stressed with praise the share of the Emperor in the arrangement of the union, but also admonished him to be active for the full restoration of unity in Antioch and Alexandria.[49]

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the "Gloria in excelsis

---

[43] The Roman conditions in the *Indiculus Hormisdae, Coll. Avell.,* no. 116a; the *Formula Hormisdae,* ibid., no. 116b; letter to the Emperor, no. 115.

[44] An imperial delegation was supposed to explain to the Pope and the Roman Senate the standpoint of Anastasius: *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 111–114, 125, 137.

[45] *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 126–134, 138. On the details of this second effort, see F. Hofmann, *Chalkedon* II, 81–84.

[46] *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 141–158.

[47] Ibid., nos. 213–214.

[48] Report of the embassy, *Coll. Avell.,* no. 223, supplemented by *Coll. Avell.,* no. 167.

[49] The entire correspondence in *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 160–165, 168–170, 176; analysis of the letters of Emperor and Patriarch to Rome in L. Magi, 29–55.

Deo" in the letters of thanks and congratulations from Pope Hormisdas to the Emperor Justin.[50] Of course, if the value of the achievement is gauged only on the criterion of the permanence of the success, then, with a view to the new difficulties soon to emerge, one would be inclined to speak of Rome's pyrrhic victory. But such an evaluation is not appropriate to the basically religious motives by which the papacy was guided in its exertions to guarantee the Christological propositions of Chalcedon. One needs only to ask what would have become of these if the papacy had left alone without resistance the changing interests of the imperial policies of the Byzantine Empire.

Resistance to the restored unity came, as was to be expected, principally from Egypt, from where the exiled Severus of Antioch tried to sabotage it, and from the Metropolitan Dorotheus of Thessalonica, whose deprivation of office the Pope was unable to effect with the Emperor.[51] A totally unnecessary threat to the peace was presented also by the so-called Theopaschite Controversy,[52] which proceeded from a group of Scythian monks. They demanded the solemn recognition of the formula "One of the Trinity suffered in the flesh," because by it the Council of Chalcedon was really protected against any Nestorian interpretation. Neither the papal legates at Constantinople nor Hormisdas at Rome saw the necessity of the formula, correct in itself, and rejected it as inopportune, since the statements of Leo I and of the Council of 451 did not require such an interpretive addition, which would perhaps occasion new discussions.

Despite all his involvement in the question of union, Pope Hormisdas sought to maintain close contact with the Western Church, as his correspondence with the Spanish Bishops John of Ilici, Sallust of Seville, the bishops of the province of Baetica, and the entire Spanish episcopate makes clear.[53] He informed them, among other things, of the end of the Acacian Schism, gave guidelines in regard to the discipline of the clergy, inculcated the holding of annual synods, and confirmed and defined the sphere of the Vicariate of Seville, always guided by the effort to keep awake and deepen the awareness of a living connection of the Spanish Church with Rome, even under the rule of the Visigoths.[54] His correspondence with Avitus of Vienne and Caesarius of Arles,[55] with the reports on the status and progress of the negotiations for union with the East, aimed to stimulate interest in the fate of the Universal Church.

---

[50] *Coll. Avell.,* no. 168.

[51] *Coll. Avell.,* nos. 225–227.

[52] See A. Grillmeier, *Chalkedon* II, 797–805 (Literature).

[53] Hormisdas, *Epp.* 24–26, 88, 142–143, Thiel.

[54] See the analysis of the letters by K. Schaeferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen* (Berlin 1967), 75–81.

[55] Hormisdas, *Ep.* 9, 22, 150.

Hormisdas's successor, John I (523–26), opened the series of those strikingly brief pontificates, whose holders were necessarily caught up in the struggle which the mortally threatened Ostrogothic Kingdom had to wage against the superior Byzantine power. These Popes were partly not spiritually and morally, partly not even physically equal to the burdens connected with this struggle, and so the papacy of these years had to endure an unmistakable loss of authority. The descent began in the last years of the reign of King Theodoric, who, through the turning of the Burgundian Sigismund and of the Vandal King Hilderic in 523 to the Byzantine Emperor, was thrown into a political isolation, which caused him to end his hitherto tolerant attitude toward the Catholics of Italy. In his suspicions, he had the Patrician Albinus, his minister Boethius (524), and the latter's father-in-law, Symmachus, leader of the Senate, executed, one after the other, because of alleged conspiracy with East Rome or the abetting of high treason.[56] When he learned that the Emperor Justin was applying the laws on heresy against the Arians of the Eastern Empire and turning over their churches to the Catholics, and that many Arians embraced their faith under pressure, he demanded of the Pope a shameful mission: John I, by a personal intervention with the East Roman Emperor, was to demand the repeal of these measures. The Pope, of course, even before his departure from Ravenna, refused to ask for a return of converted Arians to their former denomination. The humiliation imposed on him could not be offset by the manifold honors bestowed on the papal guest—the Emperor accorded him the *adoratio* proper in itself only to the imperial majesty, and at the Easter liturgy in 526 had the imperial crown placed on his head by the Pope instead of, as usual, by his Patriarch; they only increased the suspicion of the King, who after the Pope's return kept him at Ravenna because of the nonimplementation of his chief demand, and there he quickly died.[57] This treatment made John I a martyr in the eyes of the Roman Catholics, while only a few generations later legend made the Arian Ostrogothic King the melancholy persecutor of Catholics and had him, like Arius, the founder of his denomination, die a ghastly death, fancifully described.[58]

---

[56] W. Ensslin, *Theoderich der Grosse* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1959), 305–316.

[57] On the relations of Theoderic with Pope John I and on the Pope's journey to Byzantium, see H. Löwe, *HJ* 72 (1953), 83–100, and P. Goubert, *OrChrP* 24 (1958), 339–352.

[58] See *Anonym. Vales.* 16, 94–96; Procopius, *Bell. Goth.* 1, 1, 35; Gregory I, *Dialogi* 4, 30.

In an effort to assure a man of his confidence in the Roman See, Theodoric contrived the elevation of the deacon Felix III (526–530) as Pope,[59] but the King's death soon after, in August 526, did not allow a collaboration of any duration. Felix III's intervention in the final phase of the controversy over grace became of importance when he supported Caesarius of Arles in the warding off of Semipelagian tendencies, a help which the Gallic bishop used effectively at the Synod of Orange.[60] Since the opposition between pro-Gothic and pro-Byzantine factions continued even in the Roman clergy, Felix III sought to counter a possible double election after his death by the designation of the Archdeacon Boniface as his successor. His intention was supported by a decree of the Senate, which forbade any agitation about an election during the lifetime of a Pope.[61]

Nevertheless, after Felix's death a majority of the clergy decided on the pro-Byzantine former Alexandrian deacon, Dioscorus, who however died after a few weeks, and so Boniface II (530–32) quickly obtained general acceptance.[62] But when he too designated the deacon Vigilius as his successor, the clergy, with the cooperation of the Senate, compelled him to rescind this uncanonical decree,[63] a procedure which did considerable damage to papal prestige. What possibilities of conflict between Rome and Byzantium were also offered from now on in the Balkans was shown by the case of the Metropolitan Stephen of Larissa, who was deposed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, although his see belonged to the Vicariate of Thessalonica; his appeal to Pope Boniface became the subject of discussion at a Roman Synod.[64]

After a vacancy of three months, during which the papacy again lost respect because of the quarrel over the succession, in accord with the wish of the Ostrogothic King Athalaric the priest Mercury was elected Bishop of Rome—he called himself John II (533–35),[65] the first example of a change of name by a Pope. He let himself be won by the Emperor Justinian I for the acceptance of the Theopaschite Formula, by which the latter intended to strengthen his policy of union in regard to the Monophysites.[66] In this connection Justinian had, it is true, praised the doctrinal authority of the Roman Bishop in high-sounding words, but it became clear here that he would on occasion stress them for his own religious and political goals, an attitude which could easily bring the papacy into serious conflict or into unworthy dependence on the Byzantine imperial office.

---

[59] Thus in agreement are *LP* I, 106, Duchesne, and Cassiodorus, *Var.* 8, 15, 1.

[60] Felix III, *Ep. ad Caesar Arell.*, Caesarius, *Ep.* 11. The syllabus of the Synod of Orange, confirmed by Boniface II: Caesarius, *Op.* II, 70–78, Morin; see G. de Plinval, *Fliche–Martin* 4, 397–418.

[61] *Praeceptum Felicis* and *Senatus consultum: ACO* IV, II, 96f., *PL*, Suppl. 3, 1280f.

[62] Formula of recognition of Dioscorus's former adherents: *PL*, Suppl. 3, 1282.

[63] *LP* I, 281, Duchesne.

[64] Acts of the synod in the *Coll. Thessal.* 1–16, Silva-Tarouca.

[65] From him are preserved one letter each to the Emperor Justinian (*Coll. Avell.*, no. 84) and the Roman Senate (*ACO* IV, II, 206–210), and three to Gaul, *Ep.* 12–14, among the letters of Caesarius of Arles.

Pope Agapitus I (535–36)[67] showed himself to be equal to this danger to a certain extent: like John I a few years previously, he likewise had to make the journey to the Byzantine imperial court at the command of an Ostrogothic king, Theodahad, in an effort to induce Justinian to halt the already far developed preparations of East Rome for the liberation of Italy from Gothic rule.[68] While the Emperor, who again did not fail in external reverence for the Pope, brusquely rejected Theodahad's request, he showed himself to be surprisingly accessible in the ecclesiastical-political sphere. When, in spite of all pressure, Agapitus stubbornly refused to accept the communion of the Patriarch Anthimus, transferred from Trebizond to the see of Constantinople, friendly to the Monophysites, and a favorite of the Empress Theodora, Justinian abruptly abandoned Anthimus and put in his place the former priest Menas, who even had himself ordained by the Roman Pope. Emperor and Patriarch again professed the Formula of Hormisdas, and Justinian also confirmed the verdict of a synod which came out against Anthimus, Severus of Antioch, and their adherents, even though Pope Agapitus had died at Constantinople, following a brief illness, a few weeks after the elevation of Menas.[69] The sudden death of this strongly principled man, also very receptive to theological scholarship,[70] introduced the most serious crisis of the papacy in the sixth century.

After the news of his death had arrived, Silverius (536–37), a son of Hormisdas, was quickly made Pope by Theodahad. The struggle between the Byzantines and the Ostrogoths for the possession of the City of Rome and the intrigues of the deacon Vigilius, who had counted on his own election, were to be fatal to the new Pope. Even though on his advice the Romans had surrendered the city without a struggle to the Byzantine general Belisarius, the Pope was accused of high treason, deposed in a disgraceful manner, and banished to Lycia. At the command of Belisarius, who was probably following a directive of the Empress Theodora, Vigilius (537–555) was elected his successor. True, Justinian had Silverius brought back to Italy for a new investigation, but

---

[66] Justinian's letter is included in the Pope's reply.

[67] Letters: *PL* 66, 35–47, *Coll, Avell.*, nos. 86–91, Caesarius of Arles, *Ep.* 15 and 16.

[68] Cf. E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* II, 343.

[69] *Coll. Avell.*, nos. 89 and 90; see Caspar, II, 222–228.

[70] See H. I. Marrou, *MAH* 48 (1931), 124–169.

Vigilius had him relegated by Belisarius to the island of Ponza, where he died the same year, 537.[71] Vigilius believed he was now at the secure goal of his desires.[72] For the methods he used to achieve it he was to do penance with a humiliation such as had hitherto befallen no Pope.

In 543 the Emperor Justinian had by decree condemned the so-called Three Chapters and now he sought to end the resistance of the West to this edict precisely by having it signed by the Roman Pope, whom he curtly summoned to Constantinople for this very purpose. The tragedy during the eight years of the Pope's stay at East Rome has been told in Chapter 25: on the one side the figure of the authoritarian *Basileus,* who in opposition to the previous order disposed tyrannically of the doctrine and faith of the Church and played a repulsively cruel game with Vigilius's spiritual misery; on the other side, the equally depressing figure of the Pope, who, weak in character, changed his opinion with the lengthy pressure from the Emperor and entered into a secret, compromising agreement with him, and who ultimately lacked the courage to give the witness to which his office obliged him. In all this he should have been able to appeal for a clear, decisive attitude to the extensive support of the western episcopate, but instead he had to accept from it a stormy protest, which culminated in his excommunication by an African episcopal synod.[73] Spiritually and morally broken, Vigilius died at Syracuse on the return journey to Rome.

The mortgage left by him heavily burdened the pontificate of his successor, Pelagius I (556–561),[74] selected by Justinian. True, as papal *apocrisiarius* in Byzantium, he had first called upon his master to resist the Emperor's demands and had come out against them in a work of his own,[75] but then he had accepted the verdict of the Synod of 553 against the Three Chapters. Only painfully and with slight success could he overcome the enormous suspicion which he encountered everywhere in the West. In Tuscany several bishops refused to mention his name in the Eucharist, the Metropolitans of Aquileia and Milan renounced communion with him, in Gaul people disseminated his work in defense of the Three Chapters and spitefully compared it with his later attitude.

---

[71] On the deposition of Silverius, see P. Hildebrand, *HJ* 42 (1922), 213–249; O. Bertolini: *ASRomana* 47 (1924), 325ff.; and E. Stein, II, 386f.

[72] His letters and decrees: *PL* 69, 15–178, supplemented by E. Schwartz; Vigilius's letters: *SAM* (1940), 2, 1–15, and *ACO* IV, II, 138–168. On the whole matter, L. Duchesne, *L'Église au VI^e siècle* (Paris 1925), 151–218; P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (Paris (1938), 286–314; and Seppelt, II, 270–290.

[73] Victor of Tunnuna, *Chron. ad a. 550* (2, 202, Mommsen). Also Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro defensione trium capit.* II, 6, blames the Pope.

[74] Caspar, II, 286–305.

[75] *In defensione trium capitulorum,* ed. R. Devreesse (Rome 1932), then *PL,* Suppl. 4, 1284–1369.

Again and again the Pope stressed his loyalty to Chalcedon and the doctrinal writings of Pope Leo I, to his predecessors John II and Agapitus I, and even sent a solemn profession of faith to the Frankish King Childebert.[76] He was able gradually to overcome the opposition of the Romans by means of his grand-scale concern for the poor, the renovation of churches looted during the disturbances of the war, the reorganization of the administration of the papal patrimonies, and, not least, through his exertions on behalf of recruits for the clergy.

Only his successor, John III (561–574), was able to diminish the schism in Upper Italy when in 572 he gained the Bishop of Milan. But the ecclesiastical province of Aquileia again refused any union. In his pontificate occurred the invasion of Italy by the Arian Lombards in 568, whose pitiless warfare extensively limited the activity of his immediate successors, Benedict I (575–79) and Pelagius II (579–590). The appeals for help to Constantinople remained without an echo worthy of mention, since in the East people were tied down by the Persian war. But at that time Pelagius II saw in the Frankish Kingdom a possible support for the papacy, since he designated its kings as the helpers of Rome and Italy appointed by God, a concept which would be realized a century and a half later. Under Pelagius II occurred the first conflict with the Byzantine Church over the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch," which the Pope came upon as a designation for the Bishop of Constantinople in the acts of the Synod of 587.[77]

Pope Gregory the Great (590–604)

With the great-grandson of Felix III[78] there succeeded to the See of Rome a man who again so unmistakably represented the papal office by the uniqueness of his religious and priestly personality that to posterity he long appeared as the ideal figure of the papacy by which its later representatives more and more had to be measured. He came of a senatorial family and had risen in the civil service to be head of the city administration of Rome; after that he lived in the Roman monastery of Sant' Andrea al Monte Celio which he had founded,[79] until he was ordained a deacon in 579.

---

[76] Pelagius I, *Ep.* 7 (according to the numbering by Gassó-Batlle). He also made a profession of faith before the Roman community immediately after the election: *Ep.* 11.

[77] Pelagius II, *Ep. ad Aunarium episc.* (*MGEp.* III, 448), *ACO* IV, 2, 105–132; O. Bertolini, pp. 225–300.

[78] Sec. A. Ferrua, "Gli antenati di s. Gregorio M.," *CivCatt.* (1964), 4, 239/246.

[79] On the discussion of the "Benedictine" character of this monastery, see K. Hallinger, *SA* 42 (1957), 231–319; O. M. Porcel, *Scripta et Doc.* 12 (Montserrat 1960), 1–95, and P. Verbraken, *StudMon* 2 (1960), 438–440.

Gregory saw the relationship of the papacy to the Byzantine imperial office and hence also the relationship of Church and State in fundamentally the same understanding as had his predecessors. For several years, until the end of 585, he had lived as papal *apocrisiarius* at the Byzantine court, and in his view the *Basileus,* even when he was so doubtful a character as the Emperor Phocas (602–610), remained in principle the supreme head of the Christian *Imperium,* called by God, and even the Pope could treat with him only in the established forms of court etiquette. If in regard to the Lombards Gregory regarded as necessary a different attitude from that of the Emperor Maurice (582–602), this was not an indication or a result of a basically new orientation of papal policy, but an insight gained from Italy's bitter, concrete situation and based in the final analysis on pastoral considerations.[80] Since the Exarch of Ravenna was militarily not the equal of the Lombards, their pressure on the people and Church of Italy could be relieved only by the concluding of peace with them, and this again was only assured if there was success in gaining them for the Catholic confession.

It was also principally pastoral motives which caused Gregory's important correspondence with the Merovingian rulers, without whose consent and cooperation a change in the Frankish clergy, especially in the episcopate extensively infected by simony, could not be achieved. And so he had proposed an "eternal peace" between Franks and Byzantines,[81] because in his eyes it was the precondition for the restoration of health to religious life, especially in Italy. If Gregory also did not thus intend the Frankish alliance, de facto by these contacts with the Merovingian Kingdom he created the initial moves toward a development in the course of which the Byzantine protectorate would finally be exchanged for the German.

Gregory's rank in the history of the papacy is also not based on an especially striking defense of the Roman Primacy or on a profound theoretical justification of the primatial idea. Like his predecessor, he also protested against the title of "Ecumenical Patriarch" to John the Faster at Constantinople, because it seemed to him to place in jeopardy the preeminence of the Roman Church. But he lodged his protest in the form of an unofficial discussion and referred the Patriarch to the non-biblical character of this title, just as for himself he refused the title *universalis episcopus.* When his objection remained without effect, he did not for this reason permit matters to proceed to a break with the East, but, with recourse to a phrase of Augustine, he preferred in his letters the formula *servus servorum Dei,* which was later adopted by the papal chancery.[82]

---

[80] See Gregory's letter to Maurice, respectful in form but derisive in content: *Reg., Ep.* 5, 36.

[81] In the letter to King Theodoric II, *Reg., Ep.* 13, 9.

The real greatness of Gregory is based rather on his extensive pastoral activity, which made him one of the most important shepherds of souls among the Popes. Here must be mentioned charitable activity that shrank from no toil and no sacrifice; by means of it he sought to moderate the overwhelming misery of the people of Italy. Without hesitation he used for this purpose the patrimonial possessions of the Roman Church in Italy, Sicily, Dalmatia, and Provence, which, according to one of his most beautiful expressions, were "the property of the poor,"[83] and energetically reorganized the administration that had been shattered by the confusion of the interminable wars, so that a better yield would be forthcoming. He took the officials directly into the papal service, admonished them firmly to loyalty and justice, and especially protected the small farmers from exploitation. His warm-hearted care was directed especially to the socially weak, the orphans, the ashamed poor, those suddenly fallen into distress through misfortune. This aspect of his work, apart from the grateful devotion of the people, brought to Gregory a degree of esteem in the public life of Italy which elevated him far above the highest ranking official of the country, the Exarch of Ravenna.

Gregory devoted a great deal of time and energy to the improvement of the clergy, who everywhere, especially in the Frankish Kingdom, had sunk to a low level. For them he composed in his *Regula Pastoralis* an impressive mirror for shepherds, to which he added the happy motto: *ars est artium regimen animarum.* For centuries this was the book for the pastors of the West to the same degree that the *Regula Benedicti* was to become so for western monasticism.[84] In addition to the duty of daily self-examination, he especially inculcated in the clergy responsibility for the orthodox proclamation of the faith. Preaching was to take place during the celebration of the Eucharist and especially should explain the gospel of the day. Gregory's forty extant *Homilies on the Gospels*[85] supply an instructive glimpse into his special manner of preaching. They renounce any rhetorical accessories and aim to touch the heart of the faithful in their intentionally simple style and to impress themselves on the memory with their many examples taken from life.

---

[82] See E. H. Fischer, 97–110.

[83] *Reg., Ep.* 13, 23, 19.

[84] *PL* 77, 13–128. The motto, perhaps from Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 2, 16, *Reg. past.* I, 1. Cf. D. M. Wertz, *The Influence of the Regula pastoralis to the year 900* (dissertation, Ithaca 1936); C. Chazottes, *Sacerdoce et ministère pastoral d'après la correspondance de s. Grégoire le Grand* (dissertation, Lyon 1955); G. Hocquard, *La tradition sacerdotale* (Lyon 1959), 143–167 (priestly ideal).

[85] *PL* 76, 1075–1312; see H. Schwank, *Gregor d. Gr. als Prediger* (dissertation, Berlin, Hanover 1934). On Gregory's liturgical activity, see Chapter 41.

The former monk Gregory gave, even as Pope, a preferred place in his thought and works to monasticism, provided effective aid for monasteries that had fallen into distress, and sought in every way to support and renew monastic discipline. He addressed himself to monks in his most voluminous work, the *Moralia in Job,*[86] originating in talks which he later retouched. Here and in the twenty-two *Homilies on Ezekiel,* which likewise presupposed a preponderantly monastic body of readers, Gregory set down his thoughts on Christian ethics, piety, and striving for perfection,[87] gained from an allegorical exegesis of Scripture, which he preferred. What to today's reader seems a defect, precisely allegory, the breadth of the presentation, the numerous digressions, was regarded in another age as praiseworthy excellence and gained a deep-reaching aftereffect for these works in the medieval monasteries and, especially because of their content, in the moral theology of this period.[88] In addition to Scripture, Gregory's personal piety was nourished on that of his favorite author, Augustine, even if for the reproduction of his thought at the end of the sixth century the same linguistic possibilities of expression were no longer at his disposal. By his innermost inclination totally devoted to *contemplatio,* like his model he did not refuse himself to service for his fellowman in and outside the Church. Although Gregory was deeply affected by the idea that an aging world was moving to an end soon,[89] this conviction did not for a moment cripple his activity, which besides he had to wring from a usually sickly body. Rather, this eschatological tension impelled him to the undertaking which sprang from his initiative and was most pregnant in consequences both for Church history and universal history, the evangelization of the Anglo-Saxons. As no Pope before him, he understood the work of the mission as the first-ranking duty of the supreme head of the Church and in this connection he was the first Pope to consciously direct his gaze beyond the frontiers of the *Imperium.* His effort to gain the Lombards to Catholicism was partly determined by the severe distress of the Church in Italy itself, but in the Anglo-Saxon enterprise the biblical mission mandate operated in its original purity. (On the course and outcome of the Anglo-Saxon mission, see Chapter 37.)

---

[86] *PL* 75, 509–1162; 76, 9–782; *SChr* 32 (1950); *SChr,* 212 (1974).

[87] See R. Gillet, *DSp* VI (1967), 881–910, and C. Butler, *Western Mysticism* (London, 3rd ed. 1967), 65–92, 171–188.

[88] See D. Hofmann (Literature) and R. Wasselynck, *L'influence des Moralia in Job de s. Grégoire le Grand sur la théologie morale entre le VII^e et la XII^e siècle* (dissertation, Lyon 1956, typed).

[89] C. Dagens, "La fin des temps et l'église selon saint Grégoire le Grand," *RSR* 58 (1970), 273–288.

Someone once designated Gregory as a "really little great man" and claimed that he did not deserve the nickname "the Great."[90] Such a judgment was to a great extent determined by the lack of sympathy for the religious and moral qualities which were manifest in Gregory's pastoral work. The faithful of Italy and later of the other countries of Western Europe felt with a surer instinct that, besides diplomatic dexterity and authoritarian display, there was also greatness of heart, and for centuries willingly let itself be stamped by Gregory's religious world.

Popes of the Seventh Century

Gregory's immediate successors could not in their mostly brief pontificates maintain the papacy at the height reached by him. More than ever before, it fell into dependence on the Byzantine imperial office and into the tangled mesh of ecclesiastical politics, which operated especially ominously in the Monothelite quarrel. Only a few of its representatives are treated in what follows.

In the history of the City of Rome, Boniface IV (608–615) left his mark, for he obtained the Pantheon from the Emperor Phocas and consecrated it as the Church of *Sancta Maria ad Martyres,* and so in this way it has been preserved to the present.[91] The Roman Synod of 610 saw the first Bishop of London, Mellitus, among its participants.[92] The Schism of the Three Chapters, not yet liquidated in the ecclesiastical provinces of Milan and Aquileia, evoked new discussions when the Lombard King Agilulf patronized it and the monk Columban of the monastery of Bobbio let himself be induced by him to intervene in the quarrel. In a long letter he exhorted the Pope with Irish verbosity and very audacious formulations to that watchfulness in which, despite his name, Pope Vigilius had been deficient.[93]

The pupil of Gregory the Great, Pope Honorius I (625–638),[94] sought to carry out his office in the spirit of his model, with whom he shared a care for a correct adminstration of the Roman Patrimony and zeal for the winning of the Lombards. He had a partial success in his exertions to liquidate the schism in Upper Italy, since he contrived to fill the metropolis of Grado with a bishop loyal to Rome.[95] Honorius also showed great interest in the progress of the Anglo-Saxon mission and granted the pallium to the Metropolitans of Canterbury and York.[96] But his stand in the Monothelite controversy had a disastrous effect: with it he created the assumptions for the origin of the "Question of Honorius," so much discussed at the First Vatican Council.[97] When the Patriarch Sergius I of Constantinople reported in 634 on the divisions in this matter within the Eastern Church and proposed to him, in the interest of an elimination of the quarrel, that henceforth there be no further talk of one or two energies but only of one will in Christ, Honorius to a great extent followed this proposal, without seriously examining its theological significance and without considering the opposing view of, for example, the Patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem. In this regard he commended the avoidance of the manner of speaking of one energy and professed "one will of the Lord Jesus Christ," but, of course, he stressed that in this question he intended to follow the plain faith of the Bible and rejected whatever in new formulas could become a scandal especially for the unlearned in the Church.[98] The historic context of these expressions—approval of a suggestion of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had not requested a decision of faith universally binding, inadequate examination of the theological problem—lets it appear as highly doubtful that here Honorius intended to render a decision *ex cathedra* in today's meaning. The "Question of Honorius" received its real importance rather from the fact that the Sixth General Council of 680–81 believed it should and must condemn the Roman Pope as a heretic because of his expressions and that Pope Leo II (682–83) confirmed the decrees of the Council and hence its verdict on Honorius, even if he tried to soften it by the hint that the Pope, through his negligent conduct in this question, had become an abettor of heresy.[99]

---

[90] See Hallinger, I, 295; cf. the opposing view of Caspar, II, 512–514.

[91] Dölger, *Reg.* no. 156.

[92] Bede, *HE* 2, 4.

[93] Columban, *Ep. 5;* see G. S. M. Walker, *S. Columbani Opera* (Dublin 1957), XXXVIIIf.

[94] His letters in *PL* 80, 467–494, 601–607, *PL,* Suppl. 4, 1658f.

---

[95] Honorius I, *Ep.* 2, which Silva-Tarouca, *Gr* 12 (1931), 44, may regard as unauthentic, but which as regards content is confirmed by an inscription from St. Peter's; see Duchesne, *LP,* 325f.

[96] Honorius I, *Ep.* 6 and 7 (=Bede, *HE* 2, 17 and 18).

[97] See P. Stockmeier, "Die Causa Honorii und K. J. v. Hefele," *TQ* 148 (1968), 405–428; id., "Der Fall des Honorius und das erste Vatikanische Konzil," G. Schwaiger (ed.), *Hundert Jahre nach dem Ersten Vatikanum* (Regensburg 1970), 109–130 (literature).

[98] Letter of Sergius I: *Mansi* 11, 530ff.; reply of Honorius, ibid., 538–549; sec. P. Galtier, "La première lettre du Pape Honorius," *Gr* 29 (1948), 42–61; Fragments of a second letter of Honorius to Sergius in *Mansi* 11, 579ff.

[99] The acts in question of the Council of 680–81: *Mansi* 11, 550ff.; the position of Pope Leo II, ibid., 11, 730ff. and *PL* 96, 408–419. See K. Hirsch, "Papst Honorius und das VI. Allgemeine Konzil," *Festschrift der 57. Versammlung deutscher Philologen zu Salzburg 1929* (Baden bei Wien 1929), 158–179. On the whole matter: *DTHC* 7, 93–132; Caspar, II, 530–542, Seppelt, II (2nd ed.), 47–58.

How difficult it was to get free of entanglement with the imperial religious policy was to be learned, after the unsuccessful efforts of Pope Theodore I (642–49), especially by Pope Martin I (649–653/655),[100] who as a former *apocrisiarius* had a good knowledge of the theological dispute and of the personalities involved in the discussion. Without awaiting the imperial confirmation of his election, he had himself ordained and convoked a Synod to the Lateran for October 649, at which he had Monothelitism, its leading representatives, and their writings condemned, and had the verdict circulated to the Universal Church.[101] The Emperor Constans II (641–668), to whom the Pope had sent the synodal acts with the request that he assent to the anathema,[102] intended to enforce his will in Italy, and, after a first failure, had the Pope arrested by his Exarch in June 653 and brought to Constantinople. Here he was condemned to death, not because of his rejection of Monothelitism, but for alleged high treason, then reprieved with relegation to Cherson in the Crimea, where after a few months he died of physical and spiritual exhaustion in September 655.[103] What oppressed Martin most of all was the total silence of the Roman clergy, who as early as August 654, only too submissive to the imperial will, had elected as his successor Pope Eugene I (654–57).[104]

Only under Pope Agatho (678–681) was reconciliation between Rome and Byzantium possible, when he acceded to the request of Constantine IV Pogonatus (668–685) and, following preliminary preparations by the Lateran Synod of 680, sent a delegation to a "conference" at Constantinople, which became the Sixth General Council. At the fourth session the Pope's dogmatic letter was approved and in the concluding decree on the faith Monothelitism was definitively repudiated.[105] However, under the last Pope of this century, Sergius I (687–701) new tensions resulted, when the Emperor Justinian II (685–695 and 705–711) summoned a Synod at Constantinople—Trullan II or Quinisext of 692—at which, without the participation of the West, under the almost exclusive use of eastern sources of canon law, 102 canons[106] of a predominantly disciplinary character were issued, but Latin customs such as fasting on Saturdays or priestly celibacy were sharply rejected. When Pope Sergius decisively refused the assent demanded by the Emperor to these synodal decrees, it was intended that he, like Pope Martin earlier, should be made agreeable after a forcible kidnapping to Constantinople, but the plan foundered on the resistance of the militias of Rome, Ravenna, and the Pentapolis.[107] The aborted action revealed unmistakably the current limits of imperial power on Italian soil and definitively introduced the process of the political and ecclesiastical separation of the West from the East.

---

[100] Margin I's letters: *PL* 87, 119–204; *Mansi* 10, 785–1188.

[101] On the acts of the Synod: E. Caspar, *ZKG* 51 (1932), 75–135.

[102] Martin I, *Ep.* 3.

[103] An eyewitness report on the course of the trial in *PL* 129, 591–604; Martin's description of his arrest and journey to Constantinople in *Ep.* 14f.

[104] Martin I, *Ep.* 16 and 17.

[105] Acts of the Synod: *Mansi* 11, 19–920; definition of the faith also in *D* 289.

[106] *Mansi* 11, 921–1006; see *Hefele–Leclercq* 3, 560–581.

[107] Duchesne, *LP* 372f.

CHAPTER 40

The Ecclesiastical Organization and the Clergy

Papal Vicariates

SPAIN. Pope Simplicius (468–483) was the first to confer special full authority on a Spanish bishop, namely Zeno of Seville. Zeno, because of his particular merits, was to take care, in place of the Roman See and with its authority in Spain, that the decrees enacted by the Holy Fathers were not violated.[1] Pope Felix II(483–492), Simplicius's successor, wrote in the same vein to the same Zeno of Seville. Thirty years later Pope Hormisdas renewed the full authority of the Bishop of Seville, who was now Sallust. However, this letter[2] apparently contains a restriction: the power of vicar is valid only for the provinces of Baetica and Lusitania, hence for southern and southwestern Spain, no longer for central Spain or for the north and northwest. Likewise, in regard to content the authority which Sallust obtained from Pope Hormisdas was not so great: the privileges of the metropolitans were not to be infringed. The papal vicar was to be concerned chiefly for the observances of ecclesiastical tradition and, if necessary, summon synods. It seems also that this conferring of the privileges on Bishop Sallust of Seville did not proceed *motu proprio* on the Pope's part, but was demanded by a letter from the bishops of the province of Baetica, who showed themselves to be alarmed by the fact that Pope Hormisdas had granted special powers to Bishop John of Ilici. John had gone to Rome in 517 and on the one hand had informed the Pope of the situation in Spain and on the other hand had received from him the commission to send there a *libellus* on the question of Acacius for the bishops to sign and to make known rules of conduct in regard to ecclesiastical community with people coming from the East.[3] Of course, full authority comparable to that of the Bishop of Seville was not bestowed on the Bishop of Ilici, which lay about 100 kilometers north of Cartagena, to whose ecclesiastical province it belonged. John was only to press for the maintenance of the ecclesiastical canons and the papal decretals, especially of those of Hormisdas himself, in addition to making known the important canonical cases (*causae ecclesiasticae*) to the Pope.[4] Whether the Bishop of Ilici, relying on this papal letter, came forth with special authority is unknown. Likewise, nothing more is known of disciplinary measures of the Papal Vicar of Seville.[5] The sole testimonies are the papal letters themselves. Hence it is perhaps advisable not to speak of "vicariates" in the general sense, but merely to regard the bishops personally charged in each case as extraordinary envoys for very specific functions. Each individual Pope appointed them for the duration of his pontificate only, in the expectation that their zeal would be enhanced by the granting of the "vicarship." From the conversion of the Visigoths under King Recared in 586, the basis for a vicariate in Spain was eliminated. The Church felt itself to be safe under the protection of the King and flatly declined the care of the far distant Pope.[6] Gregory the Great seems already to have perceived this; in any event, he sent the pallium to his friend, Bishop Leander of Seville, as a purely personal distinction, even if he also appealed to tradition[7] and made it known to King Recared.[8] But this was not at all the granting of a vicarship.

---

[1] *PL* 58, 35.
[2] Ibid. 63, 426.

ARLES. We know more about the Vicariate of Arles, which went back to Pope Zasimus (417–18),[9] and was confirmed by Leo the Great, than about the papal vicariates in Spain. Leo's successor, Pope Hilary (461–68), expected from the Archbishop of Arles reports from time to time on all important ecclesiastical events and problems and scolded him if such information arrived from elsewhere.[10] The Bishop of Arles was to hold synods and issue letters of recommendation for traveling Gallic ecclesiastics. But Arles did not thereby gain precedence in southern Gaul; there persisted the old rivalry between Arles and Vienne, which possessed in Avitus a bishop towering far above the entire Gallic episcopate. Indeed, at the end of the fifth century there was an interlude in favor of Vienne. Pope Anastasius, whose letter is lost, gave Avitus of Vienne the right to ordain bishops in some churches which had hitherto belonged to the metropolitan territory of Arles. In 500 Pope Symmachus confirmed the rights of the Bishop of Arles, because Anastasius had acted against tradition.[11] In the next year Symmachus appeased the Metropolitan of Vienne: he was to suffer no loss if he could supply documents from which the legality of the decision of Anastasius should be made clear.[12] Only in 513 did Pope Symmachus definitively confirm the precedence of Arles,[13] and that even though Avitus of Vienne a decade earlier had converted Sigismund, son of the Burgundian King, to Catholic Christianity, and the latter had turned up in Rome as the first royal pilgrim from a German kingdom. Symmachus not only again took up the old tradition: Caesarius, the Archbishop of Arles, on his visit to Rome, had personally taken care to ask for new papal decrees for questions which had long ago been in reality canonically regulated.[14] Thus the Pope granted him the right, as the first western bishop, to wear the pallium.[15] In the next year Caesarius was expressly made Vicar for all the Gallic and Spanish provinces,[16] but this probably only meant that Caesarius was to be competent for all provinces under the sovereignty of Theodoric of Ravenna, who at the time was ruler of Provence and exercised a guardianship over the Spanish Visigothic Kingdom. The far larger part of Gaul was then already in the possession, respectively, of the Franks or of the Burgundians now quickly losing importance. As Papal Vicar, Caesarius was to exercise the function of a supermetropolitan: he alone should issue letters of safe-conduct for all ecclesiastics traveling from Gaul, just as Pope Zosimus had decided, and Pope Hilary had renewed it. Thus Arles possessed a clear position of preeminence in southern Gaul, which would probably have devolved on this see even without the papal vicariate. True, there is mention already of special care in questions of faith,[17] but Caesarius did not at all appear in the entire Semipelagian controversy as an ecclesiastical prince conscious of special authorization. Rather, he requested instructions from Rome and obtained them from Pope Felix III; besides, he even had the decrees of his synod confirmed by Pope Boniface II.[18] In the dispute over the ecclesiastical penance of Bishop Contumeliosus of Riez Caesarius was expressly entrusted by Pope John II with the supervision of the vacant see,[19] which should have been taken for granted in the case of a papal vicar. Furthermore, soon afterward Pope Agapitus I quite unnecessarily disavowed Caesarius in this same affair, blaming him for a too severe verdict, which Caesarius had not even issued.[20] On the contrary, humble as ever, he had defended the verdict of Pope John II against all the Gallic bishops and had supported it with synodal excerpts.[21] It is probably to be understood from the example of Caesarius and his relations with the various Popes that the vicariate authority had no firmly determined dimensions and hence the vicariate was not an element of the ecclesiastical structure; the vicar had merely to act *ad nutum pontificis.* This held good even when, for example, in the letter of Pope Pelagius I (556–561), it was stated that the Church of Arles possessed the primacy over Gaul and the vicarship of the Apostolic See.[22] Pelagius himself by no means regarded Bishop Sapaudus of Arles as his vicar from the start but only held out to him the prospect of such an honor, if he solicited it and especially stood up for the Roman Church.[23] He only obtained the dignity in the next letter.[24] Moreover, it meant a great deal to Pelagius to bind Sapaudus especially to him, although he seems to have been rather tardy;[25] he was to dispel all doubts remaining in Gaul about the personal orthodoxy of the Pope, who even before his election had recognized the Fifth Council of 553, which he had originally combated.[26] Sapaudus, however, seems to have accomplished nothing;[27] in fact he even had to endure that the Frankish King Childebert summoned him before the court of a subordinate bishop,[28]—which represented a clear contempt of his dignity as Primate and his vicariate, but at the same time made known that there could be no future for a papal vicariate of Arles in the Frankish Kingdom, especially since it apparently never played a role in the care of souls and the inner life of the Church.[29] Later Gregory the Great seems not to have taken this omen into consideration.

---

[3] E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* II, 144.

[4] *PL* 84, 819 f.

[5] Fernández Alonso, op. cit., 236.

[6] Braulio of Zaragoza, *Ep.* 21; cf. Lacarra, *Settimane* . . . VII, 362ff. The theoretical basis for such an attitude may be found in Isidore's explanation of the archiepiscopal office (*Etym.* VIII, XII, 6.7): the archbishop is the superior of the other bishops and metropolitans, who without him must not undertake anything, because while he does not have a *sedes apostolica* like the patriarch, still he possesses *vices apostolica*, that is, he stands in place of an Apostle. But if every archbishop by virtue of his offices has an apostolic vicariate, then a grant of special vicarship of the Roman Patriarch (ibid., no. 5) means no superiority of rank worth seeking.

[7] *Reg. Epp.* IX, 227.

[8] Ibid. IX, 228.

[9] Cf. *MGEp*, tom. III, *Ep. Arelatenses*, nos. 1–7.

[10] Ibid., nos. 15 and 19.

---

[11] Ibid., no. 23.

[12] *PL* 62, 51.

[13] *MGEp,* III, I, no. 25.

[14] Ibid., nos. 26 and 27.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid., nos. 28 and 29.

[17] Ibid., no. 28.

---

[18] Cf. infra. p. 727.

[19] *MGEp,* III, I, no. 33.

[20] Ibid., nos. 36 and 37.

[21] Ibid., nos. 34 and 35.

[22] Ibid., no. 51.

[23] Ibid., no. 49.

[24] Ibid., no. 50.

[25] Cf. ibid., no. 53.

[26] Cf. infra, pp. 730f.

[27] Cf. Caspar, op. cit. II, 301, and Langgärtner, op. cit., 164.

[28] Cf. *MGEp.* III, I, no. 52.

Especially deserving of being stressed is the fact that with Pope Vigilius (537–555), the predecessor of Pelagius, a new element became noticeable in the granting of the vicarship.[30] He obtained the assent of the Emperor Justinian before he agreed in 545 to the request of Auxanius of Arles, presented in 543, and transmitted special synodal jurisdiction to him, with the exception of *causae maiores.*[31] In the next year Vigilius even joined the conceding of the dignity of vicar to Aurelian of Arles with the commission to work for a good understanding between their Byzantine majesties, Justinian and Theodora, and the Frankish King Childebert. Hence the papal vicar at Arles was expected to contribute to the political and military encirclement of the Ostrogothic King Totila in Italy.[32] It is not known whether Aurelian undertook anything in this regard successfully.

In the following years the relations between Rome and Arles seem not to have been especially close; in any event, Gregory the Great had to have the Metropolitan of Arles warned by another Gallic bishop to send on to Rome the revenues which his predecessor had drawn from the patrimonies of the Roman Church but had withheld.[33] But it must not be concluded from this that there was a deterioration of the relationship between Gregory and Virgil of Arles, who had been named as vicar the year before; for the reason why Gregory turned to Protasius of Aix lay merely in this, that under Virgil's predecessor Protasius had been the administrator of the property of the Church of Arles.

The clearest and most comprehensive account of the papal vicariate for Arles comes from Gregory the Great in his three letters to Virgil, the bishops in Childebert's kingdom, and Childebert himself.[34] Virgil was to represent the Pope in Childebert's entire Kingdom; without his permission no bishop could undertake a journey of some distance; he was to decide questions of faith with a Commission of Twelve of the bishops. Only when a question could not be decided should it be submitted to the Pope,[35] whereas hitherto in principle all *causae maiores* had been reserved to the Pope. The bishops were admonished zealously to obey the invitations to synods, to be expected from Virgil. Childebert, who had supported Virgil's request for the grant of the dignity of vicar, was called upon to give him all assistance so that the abuses that were prevalent in the Church of Gaul, namely simony and the premature ordination of laymen, could be eliminated. One would expect success for this far-reaching project of Gregory, pushed with such effort. But, despite the great authority given him, his vicar acquired no important influence. Arles lay too much on the outer fringes of the Frankish Kingdom and had been incorporated into it too late. In the course of the sixth century the Bishop of Lyon obtained greater importance in the Frankish Kingdom; he was even referred to as Patriarch by the Synod of Mâcon in 585.[36] Of course, at Mâcon there were only the bishops of the kingdom of King Guntram, hence from Burgundy–Orléans, but they represented, nevertheless, six ecclesiastical provinces. At the great synods of the seventh century—Paris in 614, Clichy in 627, Chalon in 650—the Bishop of Lyon presided unchallenged. The vicariate of Arles came to an end at the moment when it should have obtained its greatest authority. In 613 Boniface IV granted the pallium to Bishop Florian of Arles still only as a personal distinction, after Gregory had been prepared to give it also to Bishop Syagrius of Autun, not only, of course, because the Frankish Queen Brunhildis intervened for him, but also because he seems to have been deserving due to the mission to England.[37]

---

[29] Beck, 34.

[30] Langgärtner, op. cit., 131f., naturally sees in it only a self-evident practice, which purely by chance is otherwise not attested.

[31] *MGEp.* III, I, nos. 39 and 40.

[32] Caspar, op. cit. II, 237.

[33] *Reg. Epp.* VI, 56.

[34] Ibid. V, 58–60.

[35] Ibid. V, 58.

Gregory the Great had himself probably understood that he could not adequately assert his influence by means of his vicar at Arles in the Frankish Kingdom. So he tried, through Abbot Cyriacus,[38] whom he sent to Gaul, and the Priest Candidus, whom he had appointed steward of the Roman patrimonies in Gaul,[39] to influence the Church in the Frankish Kingdom and to remedy its abuses through a synod, which should meet under the presidency of Syagrius.[40] But the new men likewise disillusioned him; neither the synod nor the reform of the Frankish Church took place!

THESSALONICA. After the civil dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace had been subordinated to the ecclesiastical supremacy of New Rome by canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, Western Illyricum was left under the supremacy of the sole Patriarch who could claim it, namely, the Bishop of Rome. True, a part of Western Illyricum belonged to the eastern half of the Empire, but through the delimiting of a sphere for Constantinople, it could, from Rome's viewpoint, appear less urgent to have a man of confidence in Illyricum than at the end of the fourth century, when precisely the Western Emperor had relinquished these provinces to the Eastern Empire and an ecclesiastical orientation of these sees to the East was to be feared. Thus the papal vicariate of Thessalonica apparently fell into oblivion in Rome itself c. 500 and was again brought to mind there only through the appeal of Bishop Stephen of Larissa, who had been deposed at Constantinople and hence had turned to Rome for help. At the Roman Synod of 531[41] the representatives of the Metropolitan of Larissa, two of his suffragans, submitted twenty-seven documents, all of which referred to the vicariate function of the Bishop of Thessalonica. Pope Agapitus had them examined for their authenticity by means of the Roman register. It is striking that Pope Agapitus now did not call upon the Metropolitan of Thessalonica to become involved in this affair or censure him for not bringing Stephen of Larissa's case before him and having it decided in the name of the Roman See. Nothing of the sort was also intended on the part of the Illyrian petitioner. The reference to the vicariate function, conferred repeatedly on Thessalonica, served only to emphasize the competence of the Bishop of Rome, and not of that of Constantinople, for Illyricum. In this connection people were probably aware that on the one hand the Illyrian bishops were inclined to appeal to Constantinople, that is, apparently to the Emperor, not so often to the Patriarch, and on the other hand in Constantinopolitan circles appeals to the Roman See were very badly received.

---

[36] *Conc. Galliae, CChr* 148A, 238; cf. Caspar, op. cit. II, 495.

[37] *Reg. Epp.* IX, 213 and 222.

[38] Ibid. IX, 213, 218, 219.

[39] Ibid. VI, 53 and IX, 221.

[40] Ibid. IX, 218 and 222.

But this Roman Synod of 531 did not involve, as might have been expected, a renewal of the papal vicariate of Thessalonica. Instead, the Emperor Justinian was soon busy; in 535 he raised his native city, under the name of Justiniana Prima, to the rank of an ecclesiastical supermetropolitan and assigned to it as its sphere of jurisdiction provinces for which Thessalonica had hitherto been competent. The assent of the Pope was not obtained nor was the papal vicariate of Thessalonica at all mentioned.[42] Law 131 of the year 545 then gave the definitive version of the Novel of 535. In it there is at least a reference to an agreement with Pope Vigilius, which however did not mean much, since the Pope probably merely had to acquiesce. To the city of Justiniana Prima was now granted the position of Rome's vicar for the provinces definitely assigned to it. In all this, then, there was no question of a papal authorization of the Bishop of Justiniana Prima but of an elevation in rank of this city by imperial decree, for which a canonical status familiar in Rome, that of a vicariate, served well. This occurred at the same time to the prejudice of Thessalonica, whose area of influence was diminished. But neither the Bishop of Justiniana Prima nor that of Thessalonica seems to have exercised the power of a vicariate by a Roman mandate in the sixth century.[43] Only Gregory the Great in one of his letters referred to the vicariate position of the Bishop of Justiniana Prima. He scolded[44] Bishop John, because in a legal quarrel with Bishop Adrian of Thebes *occasione vicium nostrarum* he had dared to commit a wrong.[45] True, judicial competence had been entrusted to John by the Emperor at Constantinople, but he had had a deacon turned over to the secular power and tortured. Gregory the Great examined the acts of the trial that were submitted to him and himself handed down a decision; hence he also did not bring in the Bishop of Thessalonica. He was apparently content with the transfer of the dignity to Justiniana Prima, for he bestowed it on the successor of the Bishop John whom he had blamed, who was also named John: *Pallium . . . ex more transmisimus et vices vos apostolicae sedis agere iterata innovatione decernimus.*[46] But not much authority is here discernible. John is admonished to be a good shepherd and to guard himself especially against simoniacal ordinations.[47] Gregory apparently did not intend to be active in the Balkans by means of the Bishop of Justiniana Prima. On another occasion[48] he addressed the metropolitans of Illyricum without distinction of rank or dignity. It was more in accord with his policy to intervene even in the Balkans through his stewards, assigning to them duties of supervision and representation even in jurisdictional questions. Thus the subdeacon Antoninus received instructions to arrange a canonical episcopal election in Salona, that is, to prevent a simoniacal election[49] and completely to rehabilitate the Archdeacon Honoratus of Salona.[50]

---

[41] *Mansi* VIII, 739ff.; cf. Caspar, op. cit. II, 207f.

[42] Caspar, op. cit. II, 209.

Gregory the Great was generally inclined now also to entrust with tasks of ecclesiastical discipline the *rectores* of the Roman patrimonies, whom he himself had appointed, in order to assure to his Church the necessary revenues—the local episcopate, which was earlier responsible for the administration of the goods, was really negligent in the transmission of the produce. The very first letter of Gregory that has come down to us speaks of the subdeacon Peter, who was to administer the Roman patrimonies in Sicily and in addition obtained the authority of a vicar with allusion to earlier models. If by these are meant the vicariates of Arles and Thessalonica, it is still clear that, as the papal stewards were appointed entirely *ad nutum pontificis,* so the vicariates were only to be thus understood and did not represent structural elements in the Church. In any case, in Church history they had as little future as the many new vicariates which Gregory conceded.[51] In North Africa, in Britain, in Ireland, there were never papal vicariates. In Africa the position of the Primate of Carthage on the one hand and the exertions for independence on the other hand were so strong that there was a situation there similar to that of Spain in the seventh century. Ireland probably lay too far on the fringe of Europe, and England was at first to be cared for from Gaul.

---

[43] For the ecclesiastical territory and the location of Justiniana Prima (between Nisch and Skopje), cf. *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte,* ed. H. Jedin, K. S. Latourette, and J. Martin (Freiburg 1970), no. 20.

[44] *Reg. Epp.* II, 6.

[45] Cf. Caspar, op. cit., II, 440f.

[46] *Reg. Epp.* V, 16. It must be kept in mind that the *Registrum* here offers the false sequence of events; hence V, 16, belongs before II, 6, and in both cases deals with the same Bishop John.

[47] Ibid. V, 16.

[48] Ibid. IX, 156.

[49] Ibid. III, 22.

[50] Ibid. III, 32.

Parish Organization

It is true that the future parochial organization could first be discerned not only in the country but also in the city as early as the fourth century, and in the great cities such as Rome, Carthage, and Alexandria even earlier, but what is today understood by "parish," which possessed a certain autonomy even vis-à-vis the bishopric, was first found in the epoch to be surveyed here.[52] Churches in the countryside are attested as early as the First Council of Toledo, which in 398 required in canon 5 that every cleric, if there was a church in his place of residence, should go there every day for the *sacrificium.* In this connection also the *castella, vici* (villages), and *villae* outside the cities were also mentioned as places where there were churches, and hence where the clerics should fulfill this duty. This prescription appeared, it is true, in number 63 of the collection of *capitula* of Bishop Martin of Braga in northwestern Spain c. 585 which states that clerics should come to the church morning and evening for the sacrifice of the psalmody, *psallendi sacrificium,* whereas participation in the celebration of Mass was required of all clerics only on Sundays (ibid., 64). The Council of Tarragona in 516 insisted on the daily celebration of Vespers and Lauds in all churches, but in this matter priest and deacon might alternate weekly. Probably the First Council of Toledo did not intend to oblige every cleric to the daily celebration of the Eucharist in his church,[53] but only imposed on clerics attendance at church as a duty of their state not attached to a locality. The synod attests that churches with regular worship were no longer anything unusual even in the countryside. But whether they were parish churches, hence whether the clergy had pastoral responsibility and authority for a definite territory is not clear. The ordinary worship might represent a free offering for the people living nearby or correspond to the desire of the founder[54] or even occasionally have served for the veneration of relics. In any event at Epaon in Burgundy in 517 a synod forbade in canon 25 the depositing of the relics of saints in a church in which there was not at least one cleric who could see to the regular psalmody. The rural parishes were apparently, in any case in southern Gaul, erected not in just any nucleus of a settlement but in a place which represented, even in pre-Christian times, a religious center for the surrounding peasantry.[55] Thus it becomes clear that the organization of the parish system in the country coincided with the evangelization of the country. Thus Martin of Tours, during his long episcopate, consolidated the christianization of the peasantry by the erecting of parishes. True, he himself founded only six, and his successors to the end of the fifth century founded only fourteen more parishes. Thus the see of Tours, which c. 500 still had the extent of a modern *département,* included only about twenty parishes.[56] Around the same time the bishop of Auxerre had the same number of churches in the country, of which eight were in *vici* and twelve in *villae*; a century later there were thirty-seven—thirteen in *vici* and twenty-four in *villae.*[57] In this regard not the entire area of the bishopric was divided into these pastoral centers, but they were responsible only for a smaller territory; the care of the rest of the territory was still directly incumbent on the bishop.

---

[51] For example, to the Bishop of Syracuse (*Reg. Epp.* II, 8) and the deacon Cyprian in Sicily (ibid. VII, 38, and oftener). In the entire seventh century the title of a papal vicar in the sense here used appears only twice, both times in connection with Thessalonica. Pope Martin I (649–654) saw in the heretic Paul of Thessalonica a special wickedness because he had not acted "as a vicar subordinate to the Apostolic See" (*PL* 87, 191D). Thirty years later John of Thessalonica signed the acts of the Sixth General Council (681) with the title "Vicar of the Roman Apostolic See." But we hear nothing about the conferring of the title (P. Conte, 206–210). Apparently, however, at least a memory was preserved at Thessalonica and Rome despite the interlude of Justiniana Prima.

[52] N. Maurice-Denis-Boulet, *MD* 36 (1953), 32.

While the Council of Agde in 506 still expressly forbade priests in canon 44 to give blessings or penance to the faithful in the church, Isidore of Seville at the beginning of the seventh century saw it as precisely the duty of a priest to bless the people. Hence, in the meantime a decisive change must have occurred; the credit belongs to Caesarius of Arles, who it is true held the presidency at Agde, but at the time had had only a few years' pastoral experience. Twenty years later at the Synod of Carpentras in 527 he drew the canonical consequences from his experiences as bishop and established an administration of the property of the rural churches that was to a certain degree autonomous. Previously, the bishop received[58] half the offerings in the cathedral—the rest of the clergy received the other half—and one-third of the offerings in the rural churches; their land and other property were on the whole administered by him. But now, in accord with the wish of Caesarius, the bishop could have recourse to the rural churches only when they were wealthy and his cathedral was in special need.[59] The Synod of Vaison in 529, likewise presided over by Caesarius, expressly gave to the priests in the country the right of preaching, which at the same time meant the duty of preaching; if no priest was present, the deacon should at least read aloud the Lord's Prayer (canon 2). For Caesarius preaching was the chief means of the care of souls. True, Pope Celestine had reproached some South Gallic bishops for turning over the entire activity of preaching to their priests,[60] but this seems to have referred to Masses in the episcopal church. But perhaps this papal admonition contributed to the fact that into the next century priests were regarded as unqualified to preach. Thus the decision of Caesarius of Arles was really a deeply effective measure and gave the rural clergy and hence the rural churches a real importance.

---

[53] Thus Fernández Alonso, op. cit., 207.

[54] Cf. Gregory the Great, *Reg. Epp.* IX, 71.

[55] Seston, op. cit., 241–254.

[56] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 10, 31; cf. E. Griffe, *MD* 36 (1953), 44.

[57] Griffe, op. cit., 55.

Caesarius wanted to go even further and oblige the rural priests to recruit their own successors, that is, first to educate young lectors,[61] and in this he appealed to Italian customs which he had himself come to know on the occasion of his journey to Ravenna and Rome. He surely was also thinking of the example of the school in his own episcopal residence and in those of many of his educated colleagues.[62] Thus here was the beginning of the parish school; indeed, it even appeared as a sort of seminary for priests. Caesarius himself seems not to have established any rural parishes; they were probably present in the territory of Arles in sufficient numbers.[63] But the admonition to the pastors to be concerned for the young clergy seems to have been successful; in any event, his *Vita* (II, 20) reports that Caesarius miraculously cured an only eight-year-old cleric on one of his visitation journeys. Then in the course of the sixth century there arose parish schools in various places in Gaul, not only in the form of a boarding school, as Caesarius intended, but also for externs.[64] But naturally these were to the advantage of the future clergy.

---

[58] In any event according to cans. 14 and 15 of Orléans of 511.

[59] *Concilia Galliae,* CChr. 158A, 48.

[60] E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne* II, 367f.

[61] Synod of Vaison 529, can. 1.

[62] Cf. Riché, op. cit., 166ff.

[63] Delage, *SChr* 175, 124.

The requirement of canon 18 of the Synod of Mérida in southern Spain in 666 went, it is true, in a similar direction, but it had a lesser impact. There the pastors were admonished, on the basis of the wealthy church property, which also included slaves, *familia ecclesiae,* to raise such church slaves in their house and to train them as lesser clerics—today they would be called altar boys—and servants. It must not be assumed that they were regarded as recruits for the priesthood. Besides, it is not known how much success the canon had, so that one cannot infer from it the existence of parish schools in all Spain.[65] It may be assumed that around the middle of the sixth century there were rural parishes in the entire Christian West, even if the network of the parochial organization became constantly thicker in the succeeding centuries. Even in the well documented districts of the Frankish Kingdom the number of parishes was then about five times smaller than today. Furthermore, the Arian Vandal Church in Africa seems to have known rural parishes as early as c. 500; in any case, the *Vita* of Fulgentius (chapters 6 and 7) reports on an Arian priest residing on a *villa.* We hear scarcely anything about Italy, apart from the reference in Caesarius. The reports on the Italian *pievi (plebes)* only begin in the eighth century.

The question of from when on parishes were also erected on *villae* cannot be easily answered. True, the First Council of Toledo in 400 presupposed churches in *villae,* and the First Council of Orange in 441 regulated the competence of the diocesan bishop for such churches; but precisely because the proprietors built these churches it seems to follow that it was not a question of parish churches. Many churches of *villae* became such only in the course of the sixth century; in every case they were such as early as 541, when a Synod of Orléans (canons 26 and 33) demanded adequate endowment for them and at the same time their subordination to the bishop.[66] The first builders of "proprietary churches" seem to have been bishops, who in this way intended to care for the people of a *villa* belonging to their cathedral. They also regarded themselves as justified in such care if the *villa* lay in the territory of another bishop. Great proprietors from the lay state seem then to have followed this example of the bishops. In any event, canon 9 of the First Council of Orange in 441 let it be presumed, when it required that the dedication and the entire administration of such a church was reserved to the bishop who was responsible for this territory and not to the builder-bishop, and *a fortiori* it did not pertain to a bishop invited at pleasure. If by this was meant also the administration of the property, then the wish of this synod was not universally implemented. In any case, the Second Council of Braga in northwestern Spain in 572 had to complain in canon 6 that churches were partly built simply for the purpose of making money, since the builder left one-half of the contributions received to the clerics appointed there and reserved the other half for himself. Since in preceding canons the Council had taken measures against the avarice of bishops, the suspicion is obvious that the censured erecting of churches for mere purposes of gain must be traced back to the bishops. The Seventh Council of Toledo in 646 still had to defend parish priests against the greed of the bishops in canon 4. But synods had to deal much more frequently with proprietary churches in order to insist that they and especially the clergy serving them were under the direction of the diocesan bishop or of his archdeacon respectively. Such admonitions were directed to the clergy of the proprietary church[67] or also to the proprietors.[68]

---

[64] For example in Auvergne; cf. Riché, op. cit., 324.

[65] Fernández Alonso does so, op. cit., 116.

[66] Cf. Beck, 75.

The parish organization spread slowly from South to North. It gradually established itself in England, for example, in the eighth century.[69] In Thuringia, Hesse, and Bavaria, on the other hand, it seems to have existed even before the arrival of Boniface. In any event, he encountered rural priests, whom he could only regard as half-pagan, as heretical, and as immoral (letters 68 and 91), and from this it must be inferred that a certain decay had already set in.

It needs to be observed also that, parallel to the increase in the number of churches in the country, the privileges of parish churches were stressed. True, the Synod of Agde in 506 recognized the justification of oratories and Masses in the country *propter fatigationem familiae,* and hence to spare long journeys to the serfs: at Easter, Christmas, Epiphany, Ascension, Pentecost, and the Birth of John the Baptist, however, the celebration of Mass should take place only in the cities (cathedrals) and parish churches; the clerics of the oratories had to come there, unless the bishop made an exception. Four years later, in 511, this demand appeared at Orléans in canon 25, on the one hand restricted to the three high feasts of Easter, Christmas, and Pentecost, and on the other hand it affected only the townsmen, not the clerics. Probably the liturgy was celebrated also on these feasts for the serfs. Hence in central

---

[67] Orléans 541, can. 26.

[68] Lérida 546, can. 3; Toledo 633, can. 33; Chalon 650, can. 14.

[69] Wallace-Hadrill, *Settimane,* . . . VII, 545.

Gaul people were more generous than in the South. In the Kingdom of Burgundy again the adult townsmen were admonished to seek out some bishop in the city at Easter and Christmas in order to receive his blessing.[70] This prescription had, of course, nothing to do with the parochial principle. Instead, this was all the more clearly expressed then in 535 at the Auvergne Synod in canon 15, in which the rule of Agde was renewed, whereby all "canonical" ecclesiastics not in the parishes were to assemble around the bishop; the adult townsmen were to do the same. Hence Mass was to be celebrated in parish churches on these feasts, but not in private oratories. Finally, canon 3 of the Council of Orléans in 541 decreed that the first citizens must not celebrate Easter outside the city; if one did so without having expressly obtained the bishop's permission, he should be refused communion on this feast. Hence the Eucharistic celebration was also presupposed in the *villae* on these great feasts.

After the middle of the sixth century such instructions disappeared. Apparently people had to come to terms with the fact that all high feasts were celebrated in the private churches; in addition, the number of parishes in the country, that is, also in the *villae,* grew considerably. Thus the Council of Lyon of 583 in canon 5 limited itself to inculcating in the bishops themselves that they celebrate in their own churches on Easter and Christmas, unless they were prevented by a royal mandate. And almost a century later, in 673, the Council of Saint-Jean de Losne in Burgundy in canon 8 again imposed this duty exactly. Behind all these decrees stands, of course, the self-evident assumption that the bishop or parish priest or the priest of an oratory respectively only celebrated once daily and that there were sufficient clergy. A totally different development occurred in Visigothic Spain. Although some churches were rich in land and serfs, others possessed nothing, so that the support of an ecclesiastic was not assured and several churches had to be assigned to one priest. But then he was obliged to celebrate on all Sundays in all his churches, and hence to celebrate several times.[71]

Noteworthy in the history of the parish is the change of name: *parrochia* originally denoted the urban congregation ruled by the bishop. Rural congregations were so named for the first time by Pope Zosimus in 417.[72] At first such a community that depended on the bishop was called *diocesis,* by which was expressed that the rural parish was an administrative unit of the local episcopal church. From the time of Sidonius Apollinaris at the end of the fifth century it became customary to use both expressions interchangeably. In the course of the sixth century the current distinction of name established itself with a few variations; this was true for the Merovingian Kingdom as well as for the sources available from Spain and Italy, notably Gregory's letters.[73] Then universally from the seventh century the territory of one bishop was designated as *diocesis,* the individual congregation subordinate to him as *parrochia.* The episcopal church had, so to speak, given up its honorary name and become a unit of administration; the religious life was moved into the parishes for the majority of the faithful. The consequence of this was that the parishes no longer felt so intimately joined to one another, as was the case in the unity of the episcopal *parrochia.* The bishop lost a good part of his religious authority and tried to compensate elsewhere by relying on the feudal lords.[74] Of course, the reason for this must not be sought only in the strengthening of the parishes but in this, that the originally annual visitation journey of bishops was disregarded by all parishes. The Council of Tarragona of 516 in canon 8 represented it as an ancient custom, which was no longer in use everywhere, so that churches could go to ruin without anyone caring about them. The Synod of Braga in 572 enacted an exact program for the visitation journey in canon 1, and the Fourth Synod of Toledo in 633 again imposed the duty of annual visitation in canon 36; in the latter case the bishop, if he was ill or hindered, could be represented by a priest. Hence it must be concluded that visitation journeys were probably made, but not with the necessary regularity. Equally or even more important for the union of bishop and parishes would have been the diocesan synods. The oldest whose acts are extant took place at Auxerre between 561 and 605. In Spain every pastor had to render an account to the diocesan synod, while the bishop reported on the results of the provincial synod.[75] But all together these synods also seem not to have been very frequent, so that the estrangement between bishop and rural clergy could gain ground.

---

[70] Epaon 517, can. 35.

[71] Council of Mérida in 666, can. 19. This obligation to several Masses on the same day seems to have led to the abuse that some priests themselves communicated only in the last of the Masses celebrated by them on one day. This abuse is severely censured by the Twelfth Council of Toledo of 681 in canon 5, which established as the penalty exclusion from communion for a year.

[72] *MGEp.* III, I, no. 1; cf. Seston, op. cit., 251ff.

---

[73] Gregory the Great, *Reg. Epp.* IX, 122: to the bishop belongs one diocese but a multiplicity of parishes; IX, 214: some parishes which now lie in Frankish territory were taken from the Bishop of Turin. Otherwise, *Reg. Epp.* IX, 218: the *sacerdotes,* hence the bishops, should hold "councils by parishes" in Gaul. Furthermore, in Gregory's view, the chief task of the *presbyter parrochialis* seems to be baptism and burial.

[74] Seston, op. cit., 253.

[75] Le Bras, *Settimane* VII, 600.

Clergy

FORMATION. The Gallic councils especially have much to say about the essential morals, the financial resources, and the rights of clerics, in particular the *privilegium fori,* but very little about their formation and education. Apart from Caesarius's initiative in regard to encouragement of recruits,[76] there were occasional references at councils to the effect that lay persons who were to become priests or bishops must study ecclesiastical discipline for at least a year.[77] In 524, in canon 2 of the Council of Arles, Caesarius stated as a reason for the ordination of laymen as bishops and priests the fast growing number of churches. Nevertheless there was surprise that it was Caesarius who brought forward this argument, although he himself seems not to have established any parish but had found sufficient churches.[78] When the Synods of Orléans of 533 in canon 16 and Narbonne of 589 in canon 11 demanded that only one who could read and write might be ordained a deacon, this was a sign of a quite low level of education of clerics. The Diocesan Synod of Auxerre, which took place between 561 and 605, said in canon 44 that lay persons must not disregard the instruction and admonition on the part of the archpriest, that is, probably generally on the part of their pastor; but it may be asked how these clerics were in a position to provide instruction and admonition. The overwhelming majority of pastors in the sixth century must not have been equal to theological confrontations, even if they had behind them the ideal career—ten years as lector, five years as subdeacon, fifteen years as deacon, twenty years as priest—as for example, the priest Cato at Clermont, who for this reason thought himself qualified to succeed the deceased bishop,[79] and hence probably correctly regarded himself as a very special person. But whoever had been a lector for ten years probably satisfied Caesarius's demand (*Vita,* I, 56) that every future deacon had to have read the entire Bible four times.

In Spain also conciliar legislation had to be concerned with the education of the clergy. Thus the Second Council of Toledo in 527 required in canon 1 that young lectors be trained in the bishop's house under a master and be introduced into the ecclesiastical sciences; at the same time Caesarius of Arles demanded that this be done not only on the level of the bishopric but, probably on a more modest scope, on the level of the parish. In canon 11 of Narbonne in 589 uneducated priests and deacons were obliged to learn to read and write. In canon 25 the Council of Toledo of 633 deplored the ignorance of some priests: it is the mother of all errors, and hence priests, that is, bishops, who should teach the people, must incessantly study and meditate on the Holy Scriptures and the canons. Knowledge of the canons was also demanded by the bishops in Gaul.[80] The fact that in Gaul no complaints of synods over the ignorance of the priests are found probably does not prove that the clergy were generally better educated than in Spain. For if there were episcopal schools in some twenty episcopal cities of Gaul,[81] it was the urban clergy who took advantage of them, hardly those in the country. The Spanish episcopal schools, which were the object of conciliar legislation, were, however, not the reason why there were bishops of outstanding literary merit in Spain; rather, they had obtained their education in monastic schools.[82] So that the individual priest would not be left to his own devices in his parish, the Council of Toledo of 633 in canon 26 demanded that the bishop give him a *sacramentarium* or *libellus officialis*. In Gaul we hear nothing of such books, except of the one which Sidonius Apollinaris, that highly educated Bishop of Clermont, had compiled at the end of the fifth century, apparently only for his own use.[83] But the clergy, even in Spain, should not be dependent on such books but know the entire psalter, the customary hymns and canticles, and the rite of baptism by heart.[84]

---

[76] Cf. supra, p. 646.

[77] Can. 2 of Arles 524, can. 6 of Orléans 538, and can. 9 of Orléans 549.

[78] Cf. supra, p. 646.

[79] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 4, 6.

MORALITY. The synods were even more concerned for the morals of clerics. In 583 it was decreed at Orléans in canon 30 that clerics from deacon upward must not engage in money-lending, which apparently was not generally forbidden for a Christian but only for clerics, who were supposed to separate themselves entirely from secular businesses. Thus at the Burgundian national Council of Epaon in 517 in canon 4 and at Mâcon in 585 in canon 13 the owning of hunting dogs and falcons was forbidden to them, as was participation in the hunt at Saint-Jean de Losne in Burgundy in 673. The Synod which met near Bordeaux in 662 forbade clerics in canon 1 to bear arms or wear extraordinary dress. Canon 1 of Narbonne in 589, which was at that time under Spanish Visigothic rule, similarly forbade clerics to wear purple dress. A few years earlier, at Mâcon in 581 in canon 1, it was enjoined on clerics to avoid secular dress entirely; of course, in none of these passages was it said how the ecclesiastical dress of clerics should look.

---

[80] Carpentras 529, *ep. synod.*; Orléans 538, can. 36.

[81] Cf. Riché, op. cit., 328ff.

[82] Ibid., 335ff.

[83] Cf. Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 2, 22. To this period must therefore be assigned the gradual origin of Mass *libelli* and sacramentaries. Cf. infra, pp. 658ff.

[84] Eighth Council of Toledo, 653, can. 8.

Clerics, more exactly priests and deacons, must not undertake a journey without a testimonial letter from their bishop; in any event, they must nowhere be admitted to sacramental communion.[85] From the time of Pope Zosimus the Bishop of Arles was to issue the required passports for all clerics traveling out of Gaul.[86] According to the view of the Council of Orléans in 533 in canon 9, priests must not even live together with so-called worldlings, unless the bishop has permitted this.

CELIBACY. Celibacy occupied the most space in clerical legislation. The requirement of celibacy for the higher clerics was made as early as c. 300 at Elvira, but this Council seems to have had no influence on the further development. The demand for celibacy again appeared toward the end of the fourth century with Popes Damasus I and Siricius. Then in the fifth century Innocent I and Leo the Great referred to Siricius, and Leo extended the requirement of celibacy also to subdeacons. However, this did not mean that married men would no longer be admitted to the higher ranks of the clergy, but only that, before their ordination, they must promise not to live any longer with their wives in the conjugal state. On the part of the Popes, however, there had always been hesitations about the ordaining of a married man, especially if he had children. Thus Pope Pelagius I (556–561) only very reluctantly agreed to the candidacy of a married man for the episcopal see of Syracuse. For each case he demanded that a complete list of his private properties be supplied in order to make certain that at his death he would not bequeath to his children a part of the ecclesiastical property.[87] Here must be recognized an important root of the legislation on celibacy, namely, concern for church property. Celibacy was the surest guarantee that ecclesiastical office-holders would have no heirs. Under Pelagius II (578–590), however, it became clear that in any case the subdeacons in Sicily for far more than a century had not carried out the requirement made by Leo the Great, and the corresponding instruction of the reigning Pope appeared to them as a novelty.[88] Gregory the Great expressed himself very urgently on the matter and declared that married men who received the higher orders must not dismiss their wives but must live with them, from then on, in complete continence.[89] In his *Dialogues* (4, 11) Gregory gave an example of how such continence was observed in an exemplary manner by a priest and his wife.

---

[85] For example, Orléans 538, can. 18.

[86] Cf. supra, p. 638.

[87] Letter 33 to the Patrician Cethegus.

[88] Cf. Gryson, op. cit., 166.

In Gaul people willingly accepted the new legislation from Rome. In its canon 21 the Council of Orange of 441 had already prescribed that for the future married men were to be ordained deacons only when they began an ascetic life, that is, took the vow of perfect chastity. This vow was also required of the wives of these clerics, so that, if, for example, the husband died, they for their part could not remarry.[90] But not all married men could be ordained to the higher ranks of the clergy: one who had married a second time or had married a widow was just as much out of the question as was one who had done public penance, for this excluded one entirely from the clergy.[91] The vow of perfect chastity, in which in Gaul was seen the most effective protection of celibacy, was required in Spain only about two centuries later, namely by the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633.[92] In Gaul also the Roman motivation for celibacy was adopted, especially the exegesis of First Corinthians 7:5, in which Paul, really to limit overzealous asceticism and to guard his Corinthians against disillusionment, had instructed them to hold themselves aloof in order to devote themselves for a time especially to prayer. But now, after celibacy seemed required,[93] this became the instruction: if lay people must live in continence so that their prayers may be heard, all the more then the priests and levites who constantly serve in God's presence and must pray for the people. Hence it is not surprising that almost all synods of the fifth and sixth centuries in Gaul imposed the obligation to continence on the higher clerics. In this connection it is interesting that the wife of the bishop was called *episcopa* and apparently occasionally played an important role in the administration of the see, for example, by undertaking the charitable activity.[94] A bishop who had no *episcopa* seems, according to canon 14 of the Council of Tours of 567, to have clearly been an exception. He should have himself served by clerics; these should see to it that no woman came into the house. The same Council spoke of the wife of a priest, *presbytera,* and of the *diaconissa* and the *subdiaconissa* in canon 20; apparently they all occupied a worthy rank in Church and society, but could no longer live together with their men in the married state. But the decrees on penalties for transgressions of these prescriptions were frequent, just as the synods quite often had to take care that clerics who were not married were reprimanded because of intercourse with women and issue regulations as to how the household of a priest should be managed. Only close female relatives might be in the house of a bishop or priest, such as the mother, sister, daughter, or other persons who could evoke no suspicion of any sort.[95] For the rest, the archpriests should especially see to it that other members of the clergy should always be in their company, who could give testimony to their continence.[96] In Spain canon 6 of the Council of Gerona of 517 expressed the desire that the higher clerics after their ordination should no longer live in a house with their wives, whom they had now to consider as their sisters; but this demand did not become law. After the conversion of the Arian Visigoths in 586 there resulted for the Spanish Catholic Church a special problem due to the conversion of certain Arian clergymen who had up to now been married and now also wanted to continue their marriage, after they had been accepted into the Catholic clergy following a special examination. But canon 5 of the Third Council of Toledo in 589 decreed that such ecclesiastics, if they insisted on their marriage, were to be degraded to the order of lector. The same Council proceeded especially severely against concubinage: the ecclesiastic should submit to canonical penalties, that is, be deposed and sent to a monastery, the woman should be sold as a slave and the price of the sale distributed among the poor (canon 5). The Fourth Council of Toledo in 633, which was entirely under the influence of Isidore of Seville, demanded in canon 27 that the priests and deacons of rural parishes take a solemn vow of chastity before their bishop; in 666 the same was required at Mérida by the bishops in canon 4. The Eighth Council of Toledo in 653 was forced to deal with subdeacons who not only continued their marriage but also those who believed themselves justified in marrying again after the death of their wives. They cited as motive that at their ordination they had received no *benedictio* from the bishop, as was the case with priests and deacons. In canon 8 the Council decided that a *benedictio* should be inserted into the rite of ordination of subdeacons so that such an evasion could no longer be allowed. But two years later, in 655, the Ninth Council of Toledo in canon 10 had to state that the many decisions of the Fathers which were supposed to serve to restrict the licentiousness of clerics had had no impact up to now, and so it had recourse to the severest means: children born to a cleric, from subdeacon to bishop, after his ordination, were not to be entitled to inherit, in fact they were forever to be slaves of the church which the clergyman served. If the Eleventh Council of Toledo in 675 decreed excommunication and perpetual banishment for a bishop who was said to have seduced a relative of a secular lord, then it was certainly thinking of an individual case, and this was not an allusion to the general moral level of the Spanish episcopate.

---

[89] *Reg. Epp.* I, 50; IX, 110.

[90] Cf. Agde 506, can. 16; Orléans 511, can. 13. In Mâcon 585, can. 16, this was extended even to the wives of exorcists and acolytes.

[91] Epaon 517, can. 2.

[92] Cf. Gryson, op. cit., 190.

[93] Ibid., 199.

[94] Cf. Beck, 27.

---

[95] Gerona 517, can. 7; Clermont 535, can. 16; Tours 567, can. 10 and often.

[96] Council of Tours 567, can. 20.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that toward the end of the seventh century an intellectual and moral decline in the Spanish episcopate must be deplored, which went back to the strong involvement of Church and State with each other: the bishops belonged to the electoral body for the crown, and the King named all bishops. Also in Frankish Gaul the influence of the crown on the filling of episcopal sees had grown greatly in the sixth century.[97] The consequence was that frequently laymen were ordained and simony flourished. The fact that in Gaul too the bishops became increasingly involved in politics in the seventh century must probably be attributed to this, that from the middle of the seventh century the parish system was established and the bishops had no further dynamic function within the Church.[98] On the other hand, there was a reason for this in the deficient education of the episcopate. True, c. 575 Gallic bishops were pleased to be extolled by Venantius Fortunatus because of their stylistic skill, and at the Synod of Mâcon in 585 Bishop Praetextatus of Rouen received only scattered applause for his preaching, because it displayed no rhetorical art,[99] so that an awareness of style may be assumed in a majority of the episcopate, but the complaints on the decline of education are general.[100] Gregory the Great especially tried to obtain bishops from monastic circles, because they guaranteed a minimum in intellectual and moral formation. Still one must guard against too dark a picture. In any event, for the sixth century in southeastern Gaul east of the Rhone and south of Lyon, of 148 bishops thirty-four at least can be named who were venerated as saints.[101] And when it is seen how decisively Gregory the Great proceeded against violation of duty,[102] it cannot be assumed that the entire episcopate had become corrupt.[103]

ARCHPRIEST. With the completion of the parish organization, in any event in Gaul, the title of "archpriest," which hitherto had been reserved to a cleric of the episcopal church, came into wider use. These were now the archpriests appearing in the countryside—for the sake of clarity they were called "village archpriests," *archipresbyteri vicani,* in canon 20 of the Synod of Tours in 567. They were not, as later in the Carolingian age, competent for several parishes, but at times only for their own parish, but there they were responsible not only for the care of souls but also for the behavior of all the others of the parish clergy, to which, in addition to readers, singers, in any event in Merovingian Gaul, seem to have always belonged at least a deacon and a subdeacon. In many cases it seems that, besides the archpriest, there were still other priests in the parish. Since the number of rural pastors who bore the title of "archpriest" is very large, but still smaller than the number of pastors in general,[104] it may be assumed that only those pastors did not bear the title of archpriest in whose parish there were no other priests.[105]

---

[97] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 3, 17; 4, 6; 4, 26.

[98] H. F. Muller, *L'époque mérovingienne* (New York 1945), 93f.

[99] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 8, 20.

[100] Gregory of Tours, *Hist., praef.;* Gregory the Great, *Regular pastoralis* 1, *Intro.*

[101] Beck, 40.

[102] For example, *Reg. Epp.* III, 44, 45.

[103] Giordano, op. cit., 81f.

In Spain, on the other hand, there continued to be only one archpriest in each episcopal church. He, or the archdeacon, according to canon 7 of the Synod of Braga of 563, which of course applied only to Galicia, had the duty of administering the third of the ecclesiastical revenues which was destined for the purposes of worship. And canon 5 of the Synod of Mérida of 666 decreed for all Spain that a bishop could be represented at a synod by his archpriest or another worthy priest but by no means by a deacon. Thus in Spain the archpriest appears alongside the archdeacon, in fact with a certain precedence. In Merovingian Gaul, on the contrary, the one archdeacon in each bishopric was placed over the many archpriests of the parishes, for lapses of the clergy were to be reported to him or to the bishop;[106] in regard to jurisdiction he was the vicar of the bishop and during the vacancy of the see the ultimately responsible steward. Some Gallic councils apparently wanted to exalt the esteem of the archpriests: they should be deposed only with the consent of the other priests[107] and only for a serious lapse;[108] they were to take care that younger clerics were always with them to testify to their fidelity to celibacy.[109]

Two synods of the seventh century, that of Clichy of 626 in canon 21 and that of Saint-Jean de Losne in Burgundy of 673 in canon 9, forbade without qualification the giving of the office of archpriest to a layman; hence this custom had probably crept in. But in this regard it was not greed that was blamed, as might be suspected.[110] There seems to have been another reason. The Council already mentioned, which took place at an unknown locality after 614, forbade the installing of a layman as archpriest by the bishop, unless the candidate exhibited special personal superiority and was alone in a position to defend the members of the parish. The archpriest was competent, in fact, not only for the care of souls and the supervision of the rest of the parochial clergy but also for the defense or representation respectively of the parish clergy in public. The diocesan Synod of Auxerre (between 561 and 605) decided in canon 43 that no judge must bring a cleric before his court without the consent of the bishop or of the archdeacon or at least of the competent archpriest. Apparently it became difficult to defend the parish clergy in this manner in the course of the seventh century in the framework of the decay of the Merovingian Kingdom and its organization. In any event, this may still have been possible for people who had secular esteem and secular power and who for this reason were appointed as archpriests by the bishops. Here would be a comparison with the function of monastic *advocatus* that would come into vogue later; but this providing of the archpriest from the lay state had no future.

---

[104] E. Griffe, *MD* 36 (1953), 57.

[105] Thus Sägmüller, op. cit., 35.

[106] For example, Auxerre 573/603, can. 20.

[107] Tours 567, can. 7.

[108] Council at an unknown place after 614, can. 11.

[109] Tours 567, can. 20.

[110] Of course, this motive cannot be excluded; canon 5 of the Synod of Chalon (between 647 and 653) finds fault that laymen (*saeculares*) had the property of a parish or the parish itself (apparently for the sake of the property) made over to them.

CHAPTER 41*

Liturgy, Care of Souls, Piety

Liturgy

The period between the pontificate of Leo the Great and the beginning of the eighth century brought the Roman Liturgy to full development and in many features to its definitive shape. The oldest extant collection of Mass prayers bears the name of Leo the Great; another, which reveals a later stage of development, is attributed in tradition to Pope Gelasius I (492–96), and a third, in which the liturgy appears substantially curtailed and more rigid, to Pope Gregory the Great (590–604).

The oldest of these sacramentaries must have originated through the combining of individual booklets, Mass *libelli,* which collected various Mass formulas for the same feast of the Lord or of a saint. These *libelli* themselves are probably to be explained by the fact that Roman priests who preserved them in the archives of the Lateran compiled Mass prayers recently drafted from time to time by individual Popes.[1] The Leonine, better called simply the Veronese from its place of discovery, extends only from the months of April to December: the beginning seems to have been lost. In April are found forty-four Mass formulas for feasts of saints, grouped together with different numbers of prayers; for Christmas there are nine formularies, not all of which, it is true, are complete, but all contain a proper preface. One gets the impression that the compiler aimed to preserve every discoverable prayer of the Roman Liturgy, but occasionally there was a wrong classification. Thus we find in this sacramentary under the date of 2 August nine formularies for the old Roman feast of Pope Stephen I, killed in 258 in the Valerian Persecution and, under the indication of place, *in cymeterio Callisti in via Appia,* hence of the burial place of the third-century Popes, but all these formularies refer to the Protomartyr Stephen, who died in Jerusalem and whose feast was celebrated on 26 December from the time he was generally venerated in the West.[2] In this connection, however, some of the formularies make known, through mention of the birth of Christ, that they were composed for the feast of this Stephen. Such a confusion would probably not have occurred to a Roman cleric.

---

* The author must, especially in this chapter, thank his teacher, Karl Baus, for his turning over of notes and references to the literature, but at the same time he regrets that not all the phenomena of the inner life of the Church in the brief period at his disposal could be pursued, as he would have liked to do in the earlier planned twofold division of the chapter.

The oldest extant manuscript of the sacramentary that is connected with Pope Gelasius comes not from Rome but from the Frankish Kingdom and is one of the many testimonies to the zeal with which Roman liturgical property was appropriated on purely private initiative in the Frankish Kingdom in the course of the seventh century. The Gelasian Masses are distinguished by this, that before the prayer over the gifts they provide two or three prayers which apparently are not optional, for then it is said: *item alia,* and hence one can infer more than merely two scriptural readings. In Gaul and Spain three readings were usual up to the adoption of the Roman liturgy.[3]

The Gregorian Sacramentary is preserved substantially in two forms: first, as the so-called Hadrianum, which was sent to Charles the Great as a result of his request by Pope Hadrian I, but which must have been supplemented in the Frankish Kingdom, since the Sunday Masses were missing, and then the Paduense, named from the place of finding, which was likewise written in the Frankish Kingdom but reached Padua via Verona, where the Mass of Saint Zeno was added to it.[4] In the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* the modern reader to whom the liturgy from the period before the reform of Vatican II is familiar immediately feels at home. The Mass formularies generally contain only three prayers, occasionally another optional one; the prefaces are strictly abbreviated. Here obviously there was at work a man to whom what mattered were clarity, purity, and intelligibility. People are quite prepared to recognize here the work of the great Pope, who reorganized the Roman ecclesiastical system at the turn of the seventh century. Probably for the sake of easier use, the Mass formularies were put into a continuous series, whereas the *Gelasianum* were put in three books, first the *Proprium de tempore,* in the second book the *Proprium de Sanctis,* in the third book the Votive Masses. Of course, the transition to the *Gregorianum* does not always also represent a qualitative advance; that Pope Gregory in remodeling made old prayers shallow in some places seems to have already struck the Frankish compiler of the *Gelasianum* that has come down to us:[5] in some places he did not take the more recent prayers, but followed the older and better form.[6] While the *Gelasianum* still gives no Mass formularies for the Thursdays of Lent, such are found from the start in the *Gregorianum-Hadrianum*—they were later added in the Paduense. But in fact, according to the information in the *Liber Pontificalis,* it was Pope Gregory II (715–731), who was also the first Pope officially to direct his energies to establishing the influence of the Roman Liturgy outside Rome, namely through Boniface in Bavaria, who ordered these Thursday Masses and had texts created for them. The *Sacramentarium Gregorianum-Hadrianum* can thus have achieved its definitive form not under Gregory I but at the earliest under Gregory II; this also follows from the presence of Gregory's feast on 12 March,[7] before the revision of the liturgical calendars. Hence when it is claimed in the title of the book that this sacramentary was *editum* by Pope Saint Gregory, this only means that Gregory was the liturgical authority for the eighth century, probably because his creative liturgical activity was still best remembered, though probably with some exaggeration. A first redaction of the *Gregorianum* occurred probably as early as under Honorius (625–638).[8] Especially characteristic, on the other hand again familiar to the modern person acquainted with the preconciliar liturgy, is the indication of the Roman churches in which Mass was celebrated, hence to which the Pope went on occasion, for example, on Christmas to Santa Maria Maggiore at night, to Santa Anastasia at dawn, to St. Peter's in the day. Hence it reveals the *Gregorianum* as clearly composed for the papal Mass, whereas the *Gelasianum* does not mention the stational churches but, for example, for the three Christmas Masses gives only the times of day, and so can thereby, among other things, be recognized as a Mass book for priests. Chavasse has discovered in it two strata, which he would like to explain by means of two Roman nonpapal liturgical centers, namely St. Peter's at the Vatican and St. Peter-in-Chains. But scholarship has not followed him in this absolutely. The two strata can probably be explained also by the assumption that two different priests coming to Rome, probably from the monastic state, must be regarded as responsible for the compilation.[9] One of the two could have come from Campania, which would explain the actually very striking emphasis on Campanian saints in the *Gelasianum* without one's having to suppose a Campanian origin for greater portions of the *Gelasianum.* In every case also the Old *Gelasianum*—many mixed forms later appeared in Italy and the Frankish kingdom—seems not to have been a genuine Roman work. The mixture of feasts celebrated in the sixth century in still locally separated churches, that is, only in individual ones dedicated to saints, seems to exclude this.[10] That Bishop Maximian of Ravenna was the author[11] seems not yet to be adequately demonstrated. True, the *Gelasianum* goes back to the time before Gregory the Great, but it cannot have received the form in which it migrated from Rome into the Frankish kingdom before 628, when the Emperor Heraclius brought the holy cross back from Persia to Jerusalem, for we find there on 14 September the feast of the Triumph of the Cross, which commemorates the victory of Heraclius.

---

[1] Cf. A. Stuiber, *Libelli Sacramentorum Romani, Theophaneia* VI (Bonn 1950).

[2] Cf. *Calendarium Polemii Silvii* of the year 448, *PL* 13, 676–688.

[3] Cf. infra, p. 669.

[4] Cf. Dushusses, *Einl.*

---

[5] *Cod. Vat. Regin. lat.* 316.

[6] C. Coebergh, *ALW* VII, 1 (1961), 56.

[7] Sect. 30, nos. 137–139, ed. Deshusses.

[8] Cf. Deshusses, 53.

Some references to the form of celebration of Mass can be inferred from the sacramentaries, but they contain no liturgical rubrics. This gap is closed by the so-called *Ordines Romani,* which give, among other things, the external course of the Papal Mass (*Ordo I*), of the preparation for baptism (*Ordo XI*), the celebration of Holy Week (*Ordo XXVII*), the ordination of clerics from acolyte to bishop (*Ordo XXXIV*).

In *Ordo I* the solemn papal stational Mass is described, in which the entire celebration begins with the assembling of the Roman urban clergy at the Lateran Palace. It is stated from which of the seven regions of the city the clergy had to carry out the service in the papal Mass on the individual days of the week. In what order the clergy go to the stational church is also described; it is even decided in what manner someone coming down the road may present a petition to the Pope, the *Apostolicus.* On Easter Sunday, when the Pope goes to Santa Maria

---

[9] C. Coebergh, loc. cit., 72.

[10] Id., loc. cit., 71.

[11] K. Gamber, *SE* 12 (1961), 19.

Maggiore, there comes to meet him on the Via Merulana the notary of this region to make known to him the number of children baptized on the vigil at Santa Maria Maggiore. The Pope rides to the stational church, and some other high dignitaries accompany him likewise on horseback, while the majority of the clergy precede on foot. Naturally, with so numerous an entourage, the entry of the Pope into the stational church was a very solemn procession, and it is not surprising that during it the *schola* executed a chant, the *introitus.* The Pope was preceded by a subdeacon with the censer and seven acolytes with candlesticks. The *Ordo* prescribed exactly how at which parts of the Mass the candlesticks were to be placed in the altar area. After the *introitus* the *schola* sang the *Kyrie eleison:* then the Pope, standing at his chair that had been specially brought along (*Ordo I,* 23) turned to the people and intoned the *Gloria,* but then immediately turned back to the East or the apse respectively. For the *Pax vobis* he again faced the people, but once more turned to the East to say *Oremus* and the prayer. This rubric seems to presuppose the, for the most part, de facto not real orientation of all Roman churches, hence it can probably be recognized as a Frankish interpretation.[12]

In regard to the direction in which the Pope prays there is also the important instruction (*Ordo I,* 87) that before the beginning of the preface the regionary subdeacons should station themselves opposite the Pope on the other side of the altar—*retro altare aspicientes ad pontificem*—so that they can give the responses to the *Dominus vobiscum, Sursum corda,* and *Gratias agamus.* Hence it must not be excluded, though it is also not self-evident, that the celebrating Pope faced the people on the other side of the altar.

Contact with the crowd of the faithful, at least with those of senatorial rank, was had by the celebrating Pope at the preparation of the gifts and the communion. Following the *Dominus vobiscum* and *Oremus* after the gospel—they apparently had long served no purpose (*Ordo* I, 63, 69)—the Pope, assisted on his right and his left by the first notary and the first *defensor,* went from his seat down to the nave in order to receive the gifts of the nobles (*principes*). He handed them to the regionary subdeacon and by the hands of the next subdeacon they arrived at the altar. At the same time that the Pope was receiving the gifts of bread, the archdeacon accepted the gifts of wine in little vessels and poured them into a larger chalice, which was then again poured into a larger vessel (ibid. 70). The gifts of bread and wine of the rest of the people were accepted by the bishop who performed the weekly service or the next deacon respectively (nos. 72 and 73). It is expressly stressed that the Pope also went to the women's side to accept their gifts. It is interesting that apparently all clerics taking part in the Mass brought gifts to the altar; even the Pope had his personal gifts of bread given to him by the archdeacon (nos. 74, 82, 83).

---

[12] Cf. C. Vogel, "L'orientation dans les ordines Romani," *Studi medievali* III (1960), 452ff.

During the actual celebration of the Eucharist a paten and only one chalice with handles stood on the altar. Naturally the chalice did not suffice for the communion of the entire clergy and people. Furthermore, the Pope communicated, apparently for the sake of solemnity but hardly in accord with the meaning of the Eucharistic celebration, not at the altar but at the seat. While a deacon brought the apparently very large paten[13] to the Pope seated on his cathedra, it should be noted that a piece of the Eucharistic bread remained on the altar so that during the celebration of Mass "the altar may not be without the sacrifice" (no. 105). After the communion of the Pope a small amount of wine from the consecrated chalice was poured into the large vessel containing unconsecrated wine, which the acolytes were holding. Then all clerics present communicated at the altar, during which the highest in rank of the celebrating bishops received the chalice from the hand of the archdeacon (no. 110). The consecrated wine still remaining after the communion of the clerics was likewise poured into the large vessel already mentioned. Then the Pope himself went down to the nave to give the consecrated bread to the faithful of senatorial rank. The archdeacon gave them the Precious Blood (no. 113), but apparently not from the chalice, which was in the meantime again put away (no. 112), but from the other vessel, which was filled from the large pitcher (nos. 111, 115). The wine which the faithful received in communion was therefore consecrated by contact with the Precious Blood poured into it.[14] This seems to have been a peculiar Roman usage. In Gaul from the start there were apparently two or three chalices on the altar in order to have sufficient consecrated wine at the disposal of the laity. But later Pope Gregory II found fault with this custom in his fourteenth letter to Boniface: Christ took one chalice and said, "This cup . . ." and so forth; hence it is not fitting to have two or three chalices on the altar.

For the distribution of communion also the Pope went to the women's side (*Ordo* I, 118) and returned to his seat for the final prayer. The external course of the celebration of Mass is strongly characterized by the two ceremonies of the kiss of peace, which was passed from clergy to people (no. 96), and the breaking of the Eucharistic bread, in which all priests present took part (no. 102). In order that no particles might be lost, the consecrated breads were first put into small bags (no. 101). The ceremony of the breaking of the bread was accompanied by the singing of the *Agnus Dei,* which according to *Ordo* I, 105, was sung by the *schola,* but according to *Ordo* XV, 53, by all. During this chant, the Pope dictated to a secretary the names of those who should be invited for this day to the noon meal with him or with his *vicedominus.* Then two clerics went down immediately to the nave and gave the invitation. Equally surprising is it to the modern reader that the archdeacon, with the Eucharistic chalice in his hand, announced where the next stational liturgy would take place (no. 108). The reason was perhaps that many left during the communion, so that this announcement could not be delayed until the end of Mass. It is also interesting that neither *Ordo* I nor *Ordo* XV attests a blessing at the end of Mass. Perhaps the deacon proclaimed *Ite, missa est,* but the Pope's last word was the concluding prayer, before which, furthermore, he did not direct the introductory *Dominus vobiscum* to the people, but said it toward the East or the apse respectively (no. 123). Of course, during the recessional the Pope blessed in order the bishops, priests, monks, *schola,* standard-bearers, candle-bearers, and sacristans (I, 126; similarly, *Ordo* XV, 65).

---

[13] It can also be carried by two clerics: *Ordo* I, 103.

[14] Cf. M. Andrieu, *Immixtio et consecratio. La consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du moyen âge* (Paris 1924).

The description of the celebration of Mass in *Ordo* XV, it is true, lets the personnel appear less; but it is doubtful whether it is therefore to be regarded as older.[15] It may for this reason deal with different degrees of solemnity. Both descriptions of Mass may probably belong to the seventh century,[16] but then to its last years, for it was Pope Sergius I (687–701) who introduced the *Agnus Dei,* attested in both, into the Roman Liturgy.[17] *Ordo* I especially shows a type of Mass so richly developed and at the same time so specific even in details and distributed among the different ranks of the clergy that probably Byzantine influence could rightly be responsible for it.[18] More exactly, one may think of the pontificate of Pope Vitalian (657–672), who disregarded the dogmatic tensions of the Monothelite controversy and thought of a compromise with Byzantium. The fact that the papal singers were later called *Vitaliani*[19] lets one conclude that Vitalian entrusted the new chants to the Lateran school, one of the two *scholae cantorum* founded by Gregory the Great, while that at St. Peter's continued to cultivate the traditional Roman urban chants.[20]

Thus there developed in the second half of the seventh century the new typically papal rite and chant, which differed from the old Roman considerably, but was only codified and recommended for dissemination in the West by Pope Gregory II (715–731).[21] One reason for this conclusion is that the English Church, which had been founded from Rome and accordingly had extensively adopted the Roman Liturgy, toward the end of the seventh century regarded the establishing of new contacts with Rome as necessary. In any event, Benedict Biscop, who died in 689 as Abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow, went to Rome several times and each time brought back liturgical books. On the journey at the time of Pope Agatho (678–681), John, Abbot of the Roman monastery of St. Martin, who at the same time was archcantor at St. Peter's, came with him to England, where he trained many clerics and wrote books on ecclesiastical chant.[22] All this seems to indicate that in the second half of the seventh century a decisive liturgical change was in progress at Rome.

---

[15] Van Dijk, *SE* 12 (1961), 458f.

[16] Id., loc. cit., 458, 446.

[17] *Liber Pontificalis,* ed. L. Duchesne, I, 376.

[18] Van Dijk, loc. cit., 462ff.

[19] Ibid., 487.

[20] Van Dijk, *ELit.* 77 (1963), 335–356.

But allusions to the changes of rite, which had taken place as early as the sixth century, can also be obtained from the sacramentaries. Thus the Mass formularies of the *Gelasianum* contain, after the prayer designated as *post communionem,* very frequently another prayer which is entitled *ad populum.* Also the formularies of the *Leonianum* regularly provide after the preface two prayers, the latter of which asks God's protection for the Christian people, believers, the household of God, and the like. Hence it seems that into the sixth century no blessing was spoken at the conclusion of Mass in Rome, but the prayer over the people. The *Gregorianum* contains in both its Hadrianic and its Paduan versions a prayer over the people only for the weekdays of Lent, as this was preserved up to our own day. Apparently in the course of the seventh century the episcopal blessing took the place of the prayer over the people as the conclusion of Mass at Rome.[23] Since this form probably represented a certain solemnity, it seems not to have been employed for the Lenten weekdays. That in the sixth century no other type of final blessing besides the prayer over the people was known appears from the report of the arrest of Pope Vigilius by the Byzantine police. He was dragged away from Mass; the people followed him and demanded to receive the prayer from him. After he had given the prayer, the people responded *Amen,* and the ship sailed off with the Pope.[24] Later a series of fifty-two blessings for various occasions was added to the *Gregorianum–Hadrianum* in the Frankish kingdom. The difference which existed between the *benedictio* and the *oratio super populum* was not only that the *oratio* was very much more concise than the *benedictio,* but especially that the *oratio* addressed God, whereas the *benedictio* addressed the people and mentioned God in the third person.

---

[21] Id., *SE* 12 (1961), 484.

[22] Bede, *Hist.* IV, 18; cf. Andrieu, *Ordines* II, 27f., and supra, p. 600.

[23] Cf. Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire Gélasien,* 188f.

[24] *LP* I, 297; cf. Chavasse, op. cit., 189.

The blessings were especially popular in the Gallican and Spanish liturgies, but there they had their place before the communion. This blessing was especially favored by Caesarius of Arles;[25] canon 44 of the Synod of Agde in 506 expressly reserved this blessing to the bishop. Furthermore, it was enacted in canon 47 that no one must leave Mass without having received the bishop's blessing.[26] It was probably endured as inevitable that then many left the church and only those who were to communicate remained. The fact that at Rome the place of the next stational liturgy was announced before the distribution of communion[27] seems to indicate that there too similar habits prevailed. The episcopal *benedictio* offered pastors the opportunity to enter again into the mystery of the feast and give the faithful a reminder for the journey. At the same time one could display all one's rhetorical gifts. In any event, this blessing seems to have been extraordinarily popular in Gaul and Spain with episcopate and people: all together 2,093 different formulas of benediction have come down to us,[28] and this, even though Pope Zachary in 751 in his letter to Boniface cited against such a peculiar Gallic custom very serious but probably not appropriate exegetical arguments and compared the Gauls, desirous of glory, with people who preach another gospel.[29] The *benedictio* was without doubt one of the elements of the Gallic or Visigothic-Spanish liturgies respectively which proved them to be more strongly pastorally oriented and popular than the Roman Liturgy. Therefore it is to be welcomed that the solemn *benedictio* in the most recent liturgical reform has again come into honor, provided it is employed only pastorally and does not serve for inflexible solemnization.

The liturgical dress customary in Rome during this time was quite different from contemporary custom. *Ordo Romanus* I expressly testifies that at the end of the seventh century a distinction was made between the liturgical and the ordinary dress. In connection with *Ordo* 34, 10, it is known that with the exception of the deacon, who was clothed in the dalmatic, all clerics from acolyte to the bishop, hence also the subdeacon and the priest, wore the *planeta* during the liturgy, but it was probably not like the Mass vestments of modern times, but must have been very long and wide, probably also of flimsy material, so that the acolytes could hold the sacred vessels or the gospel book with hands veiled in the *planeta.*

---

[25] Caesarius, *Sermo* 73, 2; 74, 2; 76, 3.

[26] Cf. also Delage, 165.

[27] Cf. supra, p. 664.

[28] Cf. *CChr,* Series Latina, 162 and 162a, ed. E. Moeller (1971).

[29] *PL* 89, 951f.

The liturgy in use in Gaul and Spain not only differed from the Roman as regards the already mentioned episcopal *benedictio* before communion, in which, of course, one should speak rather of a divergence of the Roman Liturgy from a probably extensively universal basic type. Reference has already been made[30] to the fact that the three prayers at the beginning of the Mass in the *Leonianum* and in the *Gelasianum* seem to point to three readings at Rome also. Of course, it must be taken into account that a wider reading attested in Rome, as also the first prayer, did not belong to the stational liturgy but were spoken in the church of the *collecta,* from which people marched to the stational church.[31] The churches of Gaul and Spain in any case preferred three readings; regularly one from the Old Testament, one from the epistles, and one from the gospel. In this connection, on feasts of saints the Old Testament reading could be replaced by the *passio* or *vita* of the saint or at least by its last part, which had not been read in the solemn morning Office.[32]

It is striking that in southern Spain before the middle of the sixth century gospel and sermon apparently only took place after the preparation of the gifts and the dismissal of the catechumens. In any event, canon 1 of the Council of Valencia in 549 decreed that the gospel should be read before the *inlatio munerum* and the *missa catechuminum* so that catechumens as well as the penitents could be edified by gospel and sermon, and others perhaps be even converted by them, as had occasionally happened. A few years later, in 561, canon 4 of the First Council of Braga, which of course made rules only for the small and at that time still dependent Kingdom of the Sueves, decreed that Mass should be celebrated according to the model which Bishop Profuturus had brought from Rome; and canon 5 stated that baptism likewise should be administered in the Roman way.

In fact, Pope Vigilius at the beginning of his pontificate had in 538, at the request of the Bishop of Braga, sent him a baptismal ritual and an *ordo precum* and had indicated that the latter always remained the same in the celebration of Mass, that only on Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Epiphany, and feasts of saints were *capitula* especially appropriate to these days inserted.[33] From this it may probably be deduced that on the one hand at Rome in the days of Vigilius there were still no liturgical books in which the celebrations of one year or even only of a part of the Church year were collected,[34] and on the other hand an official control of the variable prayers was not regarded as necessary. In fact, in contrast to the African Church, which very early knew prescriptions relating to the liturgical prayers, the Roman Church did not make the first efforts in this direction until the eighth century.[35] Until then limits were hardly placed on the creative liturgical activity of the Popes. Thus, the oldest Roman collection of prayers, hence the so-called *Sacramentarium Leonianum,* contains several Mass formularies which Pope Vigilius probably composed.[36] It is fitting to stress that at the Synod of Braga the texts that had come from Rome appeared as adequate models, hence that there was no wish to set limits to the free creative activity of the bishops for the variable prayers, whose volume in the Spanish Liturgy to a great extent surpassed the variable prayers of the Roman Mass.

---

[30] Cf. supra, p. 659.

[31] K. Gamber, "Oratio ad collectam," *ELit* 82 (1968), 45–47.

[32] Gregory of Tours, *Gloria martyrum* 89; cf. E. Griffe, *BLE* (1975), 23.

[33] *PL* 69, 18C =*PL* 84, 832B; cf. C. Vogel, *Settimane* . . . VII, 192f.

If it is also questionable to speak of a Gallic Liturgy, because in Gaul there was absolutely no uniformity, still some common characteristic features can be emphasized. To be sure, we first have adequate sources only for the seventh century, for the letters of pseudo-Germanus, in which is found a description of the liturgy, are really an "edifying commentary on the liturgical decrees of an unknown Frankish council of the end of the seventh century." All the extant Gallic sacramentaries, for example, the *Gallicanum Vetus,* the *Missale Goticum,* and so forth, are already romanized.[37] It has been pointed out that the Gallic, and likewise the Spanish, Liturgy shows a greater common character with the oriental than with the Roman. But it must be noted that in the variability of the Mass prayers Roman and Gallic Liturgies are in agreement against the oriental.[38]

The Gallic pontifical Mass probably did not know a solemn entry of the bishop to the accompaniment of song before the seventh century; the bishop seems rather to have come in without any special ceremony so that the deacon first had to urge the faithful to silence in order that then the bishop could greet them.[39] Then the *Trisagion* was sung in Greek and Latin; but it was probably adopted from the East only in the seventh century, and then the older *Kyrie*-litany standing at this place, which for its part had been introduced by canon 3 of the Synod of Vaison of 529 not only for Mass but also for Lauds and Vespers, was reduced to a mere appendage. The *Benedictus* occupied the place which the *Gloria* had maintained at Rome since Pope Symmachus. Then the celebrant said the first prayer, the *collecta.* After the readings from the Old Testament and the apostolic epistles, the Canticle of the Three Children, called the *Benedictio,* was executed as the intermediate song. The gospel was read from the ambo, to which there was a solemn procession. After this, some of the faithful left the church, as Caesarius complained (*Sermo* 73, 2) and tried to correct, among other things by having the church doors closed. After the sermon the deacon recited a litany, which was concluded with the collect of the celebrant. The dismissal of the catechumens and of the penitents was followed by the Prayer of the Faithful, but probably, as at Rome, this had been severely reduced under the influence of the Gelasian *Kyrie*-litany. During the bringing of the gifts to the altar the so-called *Laudes,* that is, a triple *alleluia,* was sung. To this was added the mention of the names of the dead, for whom prayers were to be offered, and this was continued in a special prayer *post nomina.* Next the kiss of peace was given, introduced by a suitable prayer *ad pacem.* At Rome in the early fifth century the kiss of peace had found its position at the place in the Mass familiar to us today. Also at Rome there was occasional criticism that in Gaul the names of those for whom there were to be prayers were mentioned before the Canon. The preface, called *contestatio* in the Gallic Liturgy, was often a long description of the miracles of a saint.[40] The further course of the Mass, namely, Canon, breaking of the bread, Lord's Prayer, was, except for the episcopal blessing before communion, very much like the Roman. But it should still be emphasized that in Gaul Psalm 33 was sung at communion, apparently because of verse 9: *Gustate et videte, quoniam suavis est Dominus.*

---

[34] K. Gamber, *Sakramentartypen,* 51f.

[35] Cf. M. Vos, 11.

[36] Chavasse, *ELit.* 64 (1950), 161–213; 66 (1952), 145–219.

[37] C. Vogel, *Settimane* . . . VII, 201f.

[38] Ibid., 200.

[39] Beck, 137ff.

The Spanish Visigothic Mass, in any case, from the time of Julian of Toledo, knew a penitential act of the priest at the beginning.[41] Isidore of Seville enumerates seven variable prayers,[42] which were to be attached to the Mass of the Faithful. The first is a prayer of admonition to the people; the second, an appeal to God that he would accept the gifts and hence corresponds to the Roman Prayer over the Gifts, the former *Secreta.* The third prayer is the *Oratio post nomina,* hence an intercession for the deceased just named. The fourth prayer is related to the kiss of peace, that is, it asks that what is expressed by the external sign may be effective in the faithful. The fifth variable prayer, the *inlatio,* corresponds to the Preface. After the *Sanctus* there is also a variable prayer, which leads on to the consecration. The *Liber ordinum* gives as the seventh variable prayer one after the account of the Last Supper (*post pridie*), whereas Isidore gives it as the transition to the Lord's Prayer. Apparently, Isidore wanted to extol the sacred number of seven, and so the *benedictio* and the *completuria,* which are attested by the *Liber ordinum* and other liturgical documents,[43] are left unmentioned.

---

[40] Gregory of Tours, *Virt. s. Martini* 2, 14; cf. *Beck,* 147.

[41] Fernández Alonso, 314.

[42] *Eccl. off.* I, 15; *PL* 83, 752ff; Fernández Alonso, 318ff.

Especially in comparison with the full mention of the names of the deceased and the prayers *post nomina* of the Gallic and Spanish Liturgies, it is surprising that no commemoration of the dead is found in the Canon in the *Gregorianum-Hadrianum.* However, this may be explained in this way, that at Rome on Sundays and solemnities, differing from Gaul, the deceased were not expressly named,[44] and the model sent to Aachen contains only the solemn form of the papal Mass. Furthermore, the *memento mortuorum* seems, together with the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus,* to have been inserted into the Canon by Pope Gelasius when the *Oratio fidelium* was abolished and at least in part supplanted by the *Kyrie*-litany.[45] If it is thought that the intercessions for the living and the dead must have been a special concern of the faithful, then, at Rome in any event, solemnity defeated popular appeal in the liturgy. Moreover, the papal rite and chant, newly introduced in the seventh century under Byzantine influence, made of the participants at Mass mere viewers and listeners.[46] Both the Gallic and the Spanish Liturgies were, from the pastoral viewpoint, superior to the Roman Liturgy, but only so long as the people understood the liturgical language.

To the normal liturgical life belongs not only the celebration of the Eucharist but also the Liturgy of the Hours. Early Christianity took care, as Tertullian testifies, to sanctify the important hours of the day by prayer. Then this became the special duty of monks. But also in the episcopal churches these hour-prayers of the *Officium divinum* are found in the sixth century, probably through adoption from the monastic life. Surest is the testimony for Arles, where Caesarius, who during his long episcopate retained his monastic ascetical life, had the entire Office, namely, Lauds, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, and, before the great feasts, Vigils celebrated by his clergy, but with the participation of the people, because these hours represented for him an important means of pastoral care, especially since he frequently preached at morning or evening prayer. In the sharing in these hours of prayer, which he presented as obligatory at least for Lent (*Sermo* 196, 2), he saw an essential manifestation of devotion.[47] But there must also have been psalmody, that is, the hour-prayers, in the rural churches and chapels, at least a morning and an evening prayer:[48] however, the more exact scope is unknown to us. In Spain, Isidore of Seville first attests[49] the Little Hours as a duty of the diocesan clergy, but nothing is observed in regard to an obligation of participation by the people. Besides, Isidore, who was basically as monastic-minded as Caesarius, seems not to have succeeded in introducing the Little Hours as a fixed element of the cathedral office.[50] Still, in the meantime the development had gone so far that Isidore attests Compline as a special hour-prayer after Vespers.[51]

---

[43] Cf. Beckmann, 91, 96.

[44] Cf. Andrieu, *Ordines* II, 276.

[45] Ibid., 278, footnote 1, and reference to K. L. Kennedy, *The Saints of the Canon of the Mass* (1938), 34–38.

[46] Van Dijk, *ELit.* 77 (1963), 336.

While in most areas of Christianity a distinction must be made for the seventh century between the monastic liturgy and the liturgy of the diocesan clergy, this was not the case at Rome, because there were monasteries at the great basilicas.[52] In fact the monks who were on duty at Rome before Benedict had "so thoroughly replaced the cathedral prayer by their own arrangement that the modern Roman Office has an expressly monastic character."[53] In the seventh century all the hours of prayer later customary took place, as can be learned from *Ordo Romanus* XII. It is expressly indicated that on Holy Saturday only the nocturns and *Matutinae Laudes* were prayed. Especially impressive in Rome must have been the customary double vigil celebration before great feasts. On the eve was held a vigil without *invitatorium* and without participation of the people, which included between five and nine readings and from six to nine psalms. Then around midnight began the second vigil, which was introduced by the *invitatorium* and took place with the participation of the people, and then to it were attached the *Matutinae Laudes.*[54]

The order of readings for the Liturgy of the Hours began at Rome in the spring, seven days before the beginning of Lent, with Genesis, which was followed by the other books of Moses and then Joshua and Judges (*Ordo Romanus* XIV, 27). For the Franks, however, the liturgical year began with Advent, so that *Ordo* XVI, which witnesses to the adoption of the Roman order of readings in Frankish monasteries, begins with Isaiah, which was also read in Advent at Rome, but the books of Moses were allowed to remain in Lent. Thus it may be assumed that, from the time people thought at all about the question of the beginning of the liturgical year, the spring date was the oldest. True, both the *Gelasianum* and the *Gregorianum* begin the cycle of the year with Christmas, but the Advent Masses still stand at the end of the series in the Sankt Gallen Late *Gelasianum,*[55] which on the one hand was under strong Frankish influence, and on the other followed the arrangement of the *Gregorianum.*

---

[47] Beck, 119.

[48] Cf. supra, p. 644f.

[49] *Eccl. off.* I, 19–23.

[50] Fernández Alonso, 340f.

[51] *Eccl. off.* I, 20, 21.

[52] Van Dijk, *SE* 12 (1961), 430.

[53] Pascher, *LThK* 2 (1958), 680.

[54] *Ordo Romanus* XII, 23, 24; cf. also Andrieu, *Ordines* II, 465, footnote 23; reference to Amalarius, *PL* 105, 1305f.

In Spain, on the contrary, it had become usual in the seventh century to have the liturgical year begin even with 17 November, hence with the start of the long period of preparation for Christmas.[56] But the originally Gallic usage of beginning with a shorter Advent definitively established itself. While at Rome, besides the books of the Bible, also the treatises of Jerome, Ambrose, and the other Fathers were read at the nocturns;[57] in Gaul also the accounts of the sufferings of the martyrs and the biographies of the Fathers acquired a place in them and were not displaced even at the adoption of the Roman order of readings.[58]

The hymns, without which the Church's Liturgy of the Hours is hardly possible, had in the countries of Western Christendom a very different fate, which can easiest be illustrated in the office of Good Friday. While at Rome very early the *Missa praesanctificatorum* (of the bread and wine), coming from the East, was adopted for Good Friday,[59] Isidore of Seville, who calls Palm Sunday also *Capitilavium,* because on it the heads of the children *qui unguendi sunt* were washed, and who reports expressly about the liturgical celebration of the *Cena Domini,* knows no Good Friday liturgy. It was first introduced by canon 7 of the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633. The fact that the hymn *Crux fidelis,* composed by Venantius Fortunatus, was sung in the Good Friday office was only possible after the decree of the First Council of Braga in 563, whose canon 12 had excluded all nonbiblical hymns from the liturgy, apparently out of concern that they might not be orthodox, had lost its meaning. Still, the Fourth Council of Toledo, just mentioned, saw itself required expressly to defend the newly composed hymns and to threaten their rejection with excommunication (canon 13). There would also be other "prayers" and "imposition of hands" composed for the liturgy. As a matter of fact, the Spanish Church in the seventh century produced some fifty hymns.

---

[55] *Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alemannischer Überlieferung,* ed. K. Mohlberg, *Liturgiegesch. Quellen* 1/2 (Münster 1939).

[56] Fernández Alonso, 354.

[57] Cf. *Ordo Romanus* XIV, 10.

[58] Cf. *Ordo* XIV, 10, Codex M.

[59] Cf. *Gelasianum* I, XLI, and Andrieu, *Ordines* III, 139.

Care of Souls

PREACHING. If occasionally a powerful means of pastoral care was seen in the publication of conciliar decrees[60] or in the reading of the accounts of martyrs' sufferings, after which, for example, Braulio of Zaragoza permitted the omission of preaching,[61] nevertheless the sermon was still the chief instrument of which pastors, especially of the sixth century, disposed. It was consistently composed of instruction for adults; we nowhere hear of a special catechesis for children.[62]

If one bears in mind that at the end of the sixth century there were still many pagans in Spain and especially in Gaul in the rural areas,[63] then one is surprised that absolutely no testimonies in regard to missionary initiatives are to be found.[64] At most it was expected that pagans should come to Mass and be converted by hearing the gospel and sermon.[65] Gregory the Great, who inaugurated the Anglo-Saxon mission and gave his missionaries very useful instructions and also wanted to have the pagan or heretical Germans in Italy converted by preaching and admonition,[66] recommended for the gaining of the pagan remnant still in Sicily only administrative measures, as it were: pagans who worked and lived on ecclesiastical property (*rustici*) should, if necessary, be compelled to convert by raising their rents.[67]

When Caesarius of Arles declared that the word of God and hence its interpretation in the sermon was no less than the body of Christ, that is, the reception of communion (*Sermo* 78, 2), he then attested to the usual high estimation of preaching which was general in Gaul of the sixth century. In Rome too it was known that there were then capable preachers in Gaul.[68] The *Statuta Ecclesiae antiquae* (no. 31) threatened with excommunication those of the faithful who went out during the bishop's sermon. Caesarius not only urged them to remain, he personally thwarted those who wanted to leave Mass early by even having the church doors closed and not opened again until after the blessing.[69] But it would be false to conclude from these references that people had no interest in preaching; in sixth-century Gaul it was still quite usual that the faithful reacted to the sermon with applause or rejection; occasionally there was loud muttering, especially against purposeful moral exhortation.[70] Caesarius demanded of his colleagues and of himself that they preach on all Sundays and solemnities; and in Lent he even did so daily (*Sermo* 230, 6), often even in the morning and evening, namely at Lauds and Vespers.[71] According to Avitus of Vienne also, preaching should be frequent. The normal sermon lasted, in any case with Caesarius, not more than a half-hour.[72] In most cases the sermons must have been very simple, because the preachers had an all too meager education, but also because it was desired to make oneself understood by all the hearers.[73] Of Caesarius it is known that he quite consciously preached on different levels, in each case depending on the state of education of his audience.[74] Caesarius was probably not the first who put his sermons at the disposal of others; but he was the first who planned his own collections of sermons and dispatched them even to Spain.[75]

---

[60] Cf. Sixteenth Council of Toledo of 693, can. 7.

[61] *Vita sancti Aemiliani* 2; cf. Fernández Alonso, 383.

[62] Fernández Alonso, 400.

[63] Cf. Gregory of Tours, *Vita Pat.* XVII, 5.

[64] Fernández Alonso, 258; *Beck,* 184.

[65] Ildefonse, *Cogn. baptismi* XVII, and Council of Valencia of 549, can. 1; also, see supra, p. 667.

[66] *Reg. Epp.* II, 4; IX, 102.

[67] Ibid. IV, 26.

[68] Arator to Parthenius, *PL* 68, 252; cf. *Beck,* 259.

[69] *Vita Caesarii* I, 27.

The bishops preached not only in their cathedrals but also especially on the occasion of the visitation of parish churches. Thus the work on the improvement of the peasants of Archbishop Martin of Braga in northwestern Spain is nothing more than a model sermon for which he had been asked by his colleague, Polemius of Astorga, and which was to be given chiefly on the occasion of the visitation, regarded as annually necessary.[76] There is also a visitation of Caesarius extant: *sermo in parrochiis necessarius.*[77] Of course, such a sermon could hardly take into consideration the parts of the liturgical year; but it can be gathered from many sermons of Caesarius and Avitus that the Gallic pastors of the sixth century found abundant points of contact in the feasts of the Church's year and the biblical readings proper to them.[78] The chief end of the sermon seems to have been to guide the thoughts of the hearers to eternity. But in this regard what mattered especially to Gregory the Great was to comfort the faithful so that they would not perish in the misery of this life (*Moralia* I, XIV, 27); Gregory lived in difficult times, which also marked his liturgical production. Caesarius, on the other hand, ascertained a rather careless attitude in his people and held before their eyes the picture of Christ the Judge. Indeed, he could even claim that the words of Christ on the Last Judgment would be completely sufficient of themselves alone; it was not necessary to have more of Holy Scripture (*Sermo* 158, 1).

---

[70] Beck, 266.

[71] *Vita Caesarii* I, 59.

[72] Beck, 263.

[73] Gregory of Tours, *hist. praef.*

[74] Delage, 202.

[75] *Vita Caesarii* I, 55.

[76] *Correct.* no. 1; Barlow, 183.

[77] In Morin, no. 13.

[78] Cf. Beck, 125, 264.

In the decisive struggle against superstition and magic, especially for the sake of cures, as they had been preserved from pagan times, Caesarius and Martin of Braga were in agreement.[79] The pastors of the whole Christian world must have seen themselves facing this task at the time. Caesarius of Arles, furthermore, saw himself forced especially to warn against drunkenness; for Martin of Braga, on the contrary, pride and vanity seem to have been the special dangers to the Christian life.[80] Caesarius stressed that it is more important to have Christ before one's eyes as model than to ponder individual commandments (*Sermo* 35, 2). The name of Christian does not do it alone; even the sign of the cross does not help alone: necessary are alms, love, justice, and chastity (*Sermo* 13).[81] On the other hand, Caesarius emphasized also the necessity of a minimal knowledge of the faith; at least one must master the Creed and the Lord's Prayer (*Sermo* 135, 1). But to an active Christian life also belong the gifts made at the altar (wax, oil, bread, wine) and attendance at Sunday Mass (*Sermo* 13). Later, canon 4 of the Second Council of Mâcon in 585 required that all men and women bring wine and bread to the altar every Sunday, because one may thus expect to be freed from sins and made a sharer in the communion of saints. Finally, the demand for Sunday rest was inculcated not only in sermons but also in synodal decisions.[82]

The Sunday rest, was, of course, not demanded for its own sake. On the one hand, it was, so to speak, defined interiorly: good works, even long journeys to visit a friend, were permitted.[83] Indeed, the earliest extant synodal decision on the question[84] was directed first against "Jewish" exaggeration, which allowed no sort of journey, preparation of foods, cleansing, and so forth. Only the agricultural work should remain undone. In other respects, the Sunday rest was not only an element of religious culture,[85] but a Christian profession, especially where it replaced the hitherto usual rest from work on Thursday, hence on Jupiter's day.[86]

---

[79] Beck, 280; Fernández Alonso, 412.

[80] Fernández Alonso, loc. cit.

[81] Cf. Griffe, *BLE* 76 (1975), 25.

[82] Council of Orléans of 538, can. 31; Narbonne of 586, can. 4; Chalon of 647/653, can. 18.

[83] Martin of Braga, *corr.* 18; Barlow, 202, 15ff.

[84] Orléans of 538, can. 31.

[85] Isidore, *De natura rerum* I, 4: *PL* 83, 965.

[86] Caesarius, *Sermo* 13, 5; 52, 2.

From the moral instruction which Caesarius provided for his hearers two points must be singled out, because they throw a piercing light on the situation in southern Gaul of the early sixth century. In spite of all the exertions of the pastors, the number of young men who early entered into concubinage and only later into lawful marriage was so large that it was not possible to excommunicate all of them (*Sermo* 43, 4.5). Naturally this evil custom prevailed only in the upper class. The ladies of the aristocracy were blamed by Caesarius because they wanted to restrict the number of their children to at most two or three and hence drank means that would produce a miscarriage or make them sterile. Caesarius regarded both as murder. Against contraception he had an interesting *argumentum ad hominem* ready: the noble ladies regard it as important that their serving women have numerous children so that a large serving class may grow up. But then they should not limit the number of future servants of God (*Sermo* 44, 2).[87]

BAPTISM. To the extent that, in the course of the sixth century, baptism was administered in ever greater numbers to children and no longer to adults, it took place more and more in the parishes and not only in the episcopal churches. However, there are accounts of the administration of baptism, for sixth-century Gaul, only in Caesarius.[88] At most there are references that not only infants but also one-year-old to two-year-old children were baptized. True, an effort was made to keep the Easter Vigil as the sole date for baptism, but canon 3 of the Council of Mâcon in 585 had to complain that occasionally at most two or three children could be found for this date. Most children were baptized at Christmas or on the feast of Saint John or on that of another saint;[89] even Clovis, the first Frankish King to be converted, had been baptized on Christmas, as appears from the letter of Avitus to the King.[90] Caesarius adapted himself to the new situation not only by accommodating the old catechumenate, which had its most intensive phase in Lent, to the conditions of the baptism of children, but also by anticipating in brief form for each baptism the preparations formerly properly made in Lent. Even infants were registered among the *competentes* and received the imposition of hands and the anointing on the forehead.[91] If at Rome the *scrutinia* were customary as examinations of the faith and life of the *competentes* and if in Africa exorcisms were seen in the *scrutinia,* the custom of Gaul, namely, that of exorcisms by breathing, was nearer to the African than to the Roman.[92] The giving of salt to the *competentes* was a typically Roman usage and had no parallel in Gaul. In the framework of the longer, pre-Easter preparation for baptism, a particular role was played by special instruction, which was addressed chiefly to the godparents. They bound themselves to teach the child later the minimum profession of faith, that is, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and to assure his or her introduction into virtue. For baptism in the course of the year Caesarius required at least a week of preparation, during which the child received anointing and imposition of hands, and the parents were supposed to fast and at least take part in the morning Mass.[93] Of course, he did not refuse baptism if the parents appeared in church with the child only for the baptism itself. An anointing administered immediately before baptism was not known in Gaul, but probably after baptism first the anointing with oil, then with chrism, and finally the *consignatio,* that is, the sealing with the sign of the cross. Very probably after the renunciation of the Devil the entire profession of faith was asked of the candidate or the godparents, perhaps in the way in which it was already attested in the *Church Order* of Hippolytus.[94] As the final ceremony there took place in Gaul the washing of the feet of the neophytes. A further symbol of faith in the Trinity may have been seen in the three steps which led down to the baptismal font.

---

[87] Cf. Delage, 133.

[88] Beck, 164.

[89] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* 8, 9.

[90] Cf. Beck, 168.

[91] Cf. Delage, 162.

Baptistries in Gaul were occasionally flanked by a bath house, which served for cleansing before the baptism. Occasionally too there was another area furnished with an apse, in which confirmation was administered by the bishop.[95] In Spain Ildefonse of Toledo, hence in the seventh century, like Martin of Braga in the sixth, still reckoned with adult applicants for baptism, to whom he gave the Creed on Palm Sunday and from whom he inquired about it on Holy Thursday.[96] In this connection the adult applicants were probably not only Jews baptized under compulsion; however, the pastoral practice of the Spanish Church in the seventh century was powerfully overshadowed by the compulsory conversion of Jews. Canon 57 of the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633, it is true, tried to assure freedom of religion, but it did not allow the reversion to Judaism of those converted by force. Besides, canon 3 of the Sixth Council of Toledo in 638 brought back the old harsh language.

PENANCE. While in most parts of the Western Church the bishops reserved to themselves the administration of penance and the imparting of reconciliation, at Rome this, like baptism, was the affair of priests.[97] For the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum,* intended for use by priests, contains rubrics and prayers for the treatment of the penitents on Ash Wednesday (I, XVI, no. 83) and their reception back into the community on Holy Thursday (I, XXXVIII, nos. 352f), whereas the *Gregorianum,* destined for papal use, contains a reference to the penitents neither on Ash Wednesday nor on Holy Thursday. The only prayer for penitents which is given (no. 989) is a later addition.[98] Furthermore, the *Gelasianum* prescribed on Ash Wednesday a solemn confining of the penitents. It is not said where this was to happen; in every case it seems to concern a special Roman custom. On Holy Thursday the penitents were again released from their voluntary custody.[99]

---

[92] The word *scrutinium,* furthermore, was not used: *Beck,* 172f.

[93] *Sermo* 225, 6; 229, 6; 121, 8.

[94] Caesarius, *Sermo* 12, 4; 85, 3; cf. Martin of Braga, *corr.* 15.

[95] Beck, 180.

[96] Fernández Alonso, 274.

In the sixth century, even though in principle the ancient form of public penance was maintained, in Gaul the periods of penance were strongly curtailed in comparison with the earlier custom, and the bishops were clearly aware of this fact.[100] But the ancient forms were kept: at the start of the period of penance the bishop imposed hands on the penitent and handed him the *cilicium,* a hood of goat's hair.[101] The penitent himself was then obliged to cut off his hair and put on the penitential garb.[102] Penitents were not allowed to take part in banquets and in trade; rather they were to spend their time in fasting and prayer; even military service was forbidden to them. Caesarius of Arles expected of penitents all the corporal works of mercy, such as to give alms, shelter strangers, care for the sick, bury the dead, and finally to clean the church.[103] But the most incisive demand was that of perfect continence in marriage. This obligation continued even after reconciliation, and hence it pertained to the permanent consequences of penance, just like the inability to be accepted into the clergy.[104] It was especially aggravating that even a penance accepted on one's deathbed had the same effect in the case of an unexpected recovery as every other public penance.

As regards admission to the clergy, evidently a very serious problem was seen here, which canon 1 of the Council of Gerona in 517 sought to solve: if a person had declared himself a sinner only generally in the most serious illness, but without actually confessing serious sins, he could later still become a cleric. Canon 54 of the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633 renewed this prescription. The problem of continence required in marriage by penance was solved differently. Avitus of Vienne[105] advised younger people who had no *culpae capitales* to prefer to die without penance than to put themselves in the danger that, on recovering, they could not observe conjugal continence and for that reason would have to be regarded as apostates. Canon 27 of the Council of Orléans in 538 decreed in the same sense that the penitential blessing must not be entrusted to young people; the married might receive the penitential blessing only in advanced age and also with the consent of the other spouse. It is surprising that it was really nowhere asked by what right permanent continence was demanded even after the completion of penance. Only Fulgentius of Ruspe seems to have convincingly solved the problem as pastor. Even in his first letter he declared that the penance accepted in danger of death obliged to continence only when the other spouse had consented to this. But even in this case he wanted to show a certain mildness. Anyone who could not observe continence should abstain from all wickedness and guard himself especially against avarice, that is, give alms. Then, according to Fulgentius's assurance, he might count on not being damned. Canon 8 of the Sixth Council of Toledo in 638 apparently first found a synodal regulation of the problem, conceding as a favor that everyone who had undertaken penance in danger of death but had recovered might go back to conjugal life; if the other spouse died, then the penitent must not remarry; but in the case of the demise of the reconciled penitent, remarriage was permitted to the surviving spouse. But the burden of penance and of its consequences was apparently not yet made tolerable thereby, for canon 4 of the Sixteenth Council of Toledo in 693 still had to state that some sinners committed suicide out of despair over the stringent penance. But the bishops did not have a solution for this problem: it must probably be said that here penance was literally reduced *ad absurdum.*

---

[97] Cf. Gregory the Great, In *Ezech.* 40, *Hom.* 10, 13.14.

[98] Cf. Chavasse, *Le Sacramentaire Gélasien,* 141f.

[99] *Cod. Vat. Reg. lat.* 316, ed. Mohlberg, no. 83, 352; cf. also J. A. Jungmann, *Die lateinischen Bussriten in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Innsbruck 1932), 65f.

[100] Council of Epaon of 517, can. 26; cf. *Beck,* 193f.

[101] Council of Agde of 506, can. 15.

[102] Ibid., and First Council of Barcelona of 540, canons 6 and 7.

[103] Delage, p. 166.

[104] Ibid., 167; cf. supra, pp. 653f.

In other respects, a broad decline of public penance can be ascertained in the course of the seventh century in Spain; its place was slowly taken by private penance.[106] In Gaul as early as the beginning of the sixth century Caesarius had to state that most persons put off penance to the end of their life (*Sermo* 60, 4); this situation was intensified in the course of the sixth century. Thus the time was clearly ripe for private penance. However, it did not come into practice first with the Celtic monks, disciples of Columban, but was spread by usages which can be ascertained as early as the sixth century in Gaul and Spain.[107] This is

[105] *Ep. de subitanea poenitentia, MGAuctant* VI, 2, 30; cf. *Beck,* 201.

[106] Fernández Alonso, 541.

[107] Beck, 220f.

true for both the laity and the clergy. Originally, there was no penance for clerics; they were deposed but might communicate as laymen; rehabilitation was not possible. But gradually a period of penance was also adopted for clerics, usually in a monastery, and after it restoration to office.[108] Gregory the Great quite often prescribed a penance even for bishops, for example, he imposed on John of Justiniana Prima thirty days' abstention from the Eucharist,[109] and on Spanish bishops six months' penance in a monastery.[110] Such a penance was doubtless public, but it did not prevent the people thus treated from remaining in or returning to their office respectively.

Canon 11 of the Third Council of Toledo in 589 aimed to eliminate the abuse whereby in some churches of Spain people practiced penance in such a way that they demanded reconciliation just as often as they had sinned and to restore the old canonical form to force. It seems however to be much more certain that priests were acting in the exercise of their office and that in this there was question of sins which excluded one from the Eucharist.[111] Less clear is a reconciliation, that is, absolution from serious sins, without public ecclesiastical penance in the writings of Caesarius of Arles. He first got around the difficulties which were connected with public penance by urging to frequent self-imposed penance and especially to examination of conscience (*Sermo* 50, 3). If he declared that *crimina,* hence serious sins, had to be effaced either by *elemosynarum remedia* or by *poenitentiae medicamenta* (*Sermo* 56, 2), he still seems to attribute to the private devotional exercise of almsgiving the same efficacy as he did to public ecclesiastical penance. The consequences would be that the penitent, after the verdict of his own conscience, would again join in the reception of the Eucharist.[112] On the other hand, Caesarius speaks not only in his *Rule for Virgins* of confession through which guilt is made known,[113] but he urges younger sinners against chastity to come quickly to confession and penance.[114] If one considers how reserved he was otherwise with penance, especially for younger persons, there is probably not a question here of public penance with all its consequences. And when he finally declared expressly that penance, which a person publicly undertakes, could also be performed in secret (*secretius*), then he seems to have thought of a procedure which took place, not indeed before the community, but, however, could be considered as ecclesiastical in so far as it was under the supervision and responsibility of the bishop.[115]

---

[108] Fernández Alonso, 560ff.

[109] *Reg. Epp.* III, 6.

[110] Ibid. XIII, 47.

[111] Fernández Alonso, 571.

[112] Thus Delage, 169f., against C. Vogel, *La discipline pénitentielle en Gaul des origines à la fin du VII^e siècle* (Paris 1952).

[113] *Floril. Patr.* 34, p. 36.

[114] *Sermo* 66, 1; similarly 56, 3; 65, 2.

In the *Vita* of Bishop Desiderius of Vienne and in that of Bishop Siffred episcopal absolutions seem to be attested apart from public penance.[116] It is most interesting that Bishop Philip of Vienne in 570 appointed the priest Theudarius as *poenitentiarius* of his diocese.[117] That means that many came to him and confessed their secret sins; each left *medicatus sanusque . . . securior et laetior.* Here confession and the forgiveness of sins in entirely the modern sense seem already attested.[118]

In this context attention should be directed to the Ninth Sermon of Gregory the Great on Ezekiel 40. He there requires (no. 18) the capability of distinguishing in penance: neither must discipline be too strict nor must mercy be too soft; neither must guilt be illegally remitted, because otherwise the guilty person would become more deeply involved in guilt, nor must guilt be regarded beyond the proper degree, because otherwise the penitent would become even worse, since he experienced no mercy. Indeed, it could even happen that a pastor, who lacked the spirit of discrimination, either was so easy on sins that he did not correct them, or, because he really injured in correcting, he did not remit the sins (no. 20). On this occasion Gregory reports that many are made aware of their sins by preaching and afterwards come to the preacher and confess and ask his intercession for their sins; he should then extirpate by his prayer the guilt which he made known through his preaching. The holy teachers must pray to almighty God for the contrite and sinners confessing their guilt. It is striking how often in this connection confession is stressed. If one recalls that the normal penitential care of souls, including excommunication and reconciliation, was provided at Rome not by the Pope himself but by the priests of the titular churches, then one is inclined to see here something like private or, better expressed, not public confession or penance. Perhaps one may even glimpse in the prayer of the holy teacher, which, according to Gregory, should efface sins, a deprecatory form of absolution, especially since Leo the Great declared (*Ep.* 108, 3) that the guilt of sin was absolved by the intercession of the bishop, *sacerdotalis supplicatio,* which brought the performance of public penance to an end. That finally around the middle of the seventh century penance was no longer connected with a class of penitents seems to be clear from canon 8 of the Council of Chalon

---

[115] Beck, 217.

[116] Thus Beck, 210f.

[117] *Vita Theudarii* 14.

[118] Beck, 214.

(between 647 and 653), since there penance is characterized as a remedy for sins and necessary for all men.

ANOINTING AND IMPOSITION OF HANDS. It has already been pointed out that in Spain and Gaul as well as at Rome in our period the neophytes received an anointing, in some places even a twofold anointing.[119] This anointing was not regarded at any time as the Sacrament of Confirmation or brought into connection with the Holy Spirit; Isidore, for example, who knew only one postbaptismal anointing, namely that with the chrism, declared rather that this anointing took place to make one like Christ, and only after that was the Holy Spirit given to the baptized and anointed by the imposition of the bishop's hands[120] or the invocation of the Holy Spirit respectively.[121] Furthermore, we know from a letter of Eugene of Toledo to Braulio of Zaragoza[122] that often even the deacons performed the anointing with chrism after the baptism. Anointing with chrism was ambiguous in so far as it could also be the external sign of the readmittance of heretics to the Church.[123] Canon 16 of the Council of Epaon in 517 decided that heretics who wished to convert should request the chrism from the bishop; but if they were dying, the priest might come to their aid with the chrism. Hence there was question here not of the anointing of the sick but of an anointing which could be placed on a level with the postbaptismal anointing. The otherwise customary imposition of hands as a sign of the reconciliation of heretics was, it is true, still cited by Pope Siricius in his letter to Himerius of Tarragona[124] in connection with the invocation of the Sevenfold Spirit, but Pope Vigilius in his letter to Profuturus of Braga (no. 3)[125] introduced a careful distinction: the reconciliation takes place not by that imposition of hands which acts through the invoking of the Holy Spirit, but by that one through which the fruit of penance is acquired and the restoration of holy communion (of the communion of the Church) is completed.

Nevertheless, canon 7 of the Second Council of Seville in 619 still seems to make no distinction between these two impositions of hands, when in one breath it forbids the priests to give the Holy Spirit through the imposition of hands to baptized faithful or to those converted from heresy. Perhaps one may see in this the aftereffects of early African theology, for this view corresponds exactly to that of Cyprian's opponents, who did not rebaptize but only wanted to impose hands for the reception of the Spirit.

---

[119] Cf. supra, pp. 676f.

[120] *Eccl. off.* II, 26.

[121] *Etym.* 6, 19, 54.

[122] Braulio, *Ep.* 35.

[123] Cf. infra, p. 710.

[124] See Denzinger–Schönmetzer, no. 183.

[125] *PL* 69, 18A =*PL* 84, 831C.

The anointing of the sick is attested for the sixth century in both Gaul and Spain. In Spain the oil for the anointing of the sick was consecrated on the feast of the holy physicians, Cosmas and Damian, with a prayer which asked the healing of body and soul by virtue of the sufferings of Christ.[126] There are many testimonies in Gaul that this holy oil was used by lay persons to cure the sick or drive out demons. The faithful were even urged to this by the clergy, for example, by Caesarius of Arles, but apparently chiefly to draw them away from ancient pagan magical practices.[127] Caesarius of Arles invited the sick to come to church to communicate and be anointed; thus would the admonition of the Epistle of James (5:14f.) be implemented (*Sermo* 19, 5). It is astonishing, however, that Caesarius could instruct the sick to have the consecrated oil given to them by the priest and to anoint themselves (*Sermo* 13, 3). That in this also Caesarius saw a complying with James 5:14 seems to indicate that he was not thinking of a self-anointing by the sick but has only expressed himself tersely on the subject.[128]

Piety

At the turn of the fifth to the sixth century the frequency of the reception of the Eucharist sharply declined. As early as 506 the Council of Agde in canon 18 had to declare that whoever did not communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost could not be regarded as a Christian. But since the same Council demanded a strict preparation for communion, it could hardly have paved the way to more frequent communion. Caesarius of Arles in his sermons appealed besides for communion on the feast of John the Baptist and the other martyrs, but he did not venture to require a regular Sunday communion. The reason was no doubt the strict standard which was laid on the necessary preparation. Thus, for example, Caesarius required of those who wished to communicate at least several days of conjugal continence (*Sermo* 16, 2; 19, 3; 44, 3).[129] He invited the newly married to stay away from church for a month (*Sermo* 43, 23). It deserves to be stressed that he emphasized the equality of rights and equality of obligation of both sexes according to Christian faith (*Sermo* 44, 5). In Spain continence was inculcated as a preparation for communion even in the marriage ceremony, and Isidore

---

[126] Fernández Alonso, 577.

[127] Beck, 242.

[128] Thus in any case, Beck, 245ff.

[129] Cf. Delage, 157.

(*Eccl. Off.* 1, 18, 9–10) required many days of continence, but perhaps in this lay a conscious exaggeration.[130] In any event, even daily attendance at Mass did not yet mean frequent communion.[131]

Christian piety is at times powerfully impressed by the saints, to whom special veneration belongs. In relation to the present-day understanding, one should ask first about the place which Mary occupied in the Christian consciousness. At Rome the name of Mary was introduced into the canon at the beginning of the sixth century, but the first Marian feasts in the West date only from the seventh century. The *Sacramentarium Veronense* (*Leonianum*), in which the first three months are missing, knows, in addition to the feasts of local Roman saints, only the veneration of the Baptist and of the Protomartyr Stephen, and Mary is mentioned only in a preface for the feast of the Baptist.[132] Under Pope Theodore (642–49) the feast of the Purification on 2 February was introduced, and before Pope Sergius I (687–701) were added the feasts of the Annunciation (25 March), the Assumption (15 August), and the Birthday (8 September). Here eastern influence is clearly to be seen.[133] In this it is noteworthy that Pope Sergius was apparently not satisfied with the form and the Mass formularies of the three last-named Marian feasts, but desired greater solemnity. He accomplished this by introducing a procession for these feasts, on which the people set out from another church. The *collecta* was recited in this church of the assembly. Thus these last three feasts obtained the same solemnity as was already customary on the feast of the Purification. This is revealed by the fact that the *Hadrianum* and the *Paduense* agree in the Mass formulary of 2 February and both provide a *collecta* at the beginning. On the other hand, in the *Paduense* the other three feasts have no *collecta* and hence no procession took place. The *Hadrianum* gives for the last three Marian feasts prayers differing from the *Paduense* and for each a *collecta* at the beginning.[134]

But the Marian feasts were not the oldest testimony to the veneration of Mary. In Gregory the Great, for example, we find no Marian feast attested, but he does mention churches dedicated to the Mother of God, not only Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome but also several churches and oratories in Italy, and one in Gaul, at Autun.[135] Then in Gaul in the seventh century numerous convents of nuns are ascertained whose churches were dedicated to Mary;[136] indeed, this was the rule, while monasteries of monks were mostly dedicated to Peter and Paul. Circa 705 the seriously ill Wilfrid of York was reproached in a vision of an angel that he had indeed erected churches for Peter and Andrew but still none in honor of Mary,[137] from which it must probably be concluded "that Mary and the Apostles belonged together in the piety of the age!" But the cult of Mary verified by patronages can be pursued farther back. Circa 400 Nicasius seems to have built the first Marian cathedral at Reims,[138] and this so set a precedent that in the sixth century in many episcopal churches a complex of three churches was characteristic, namely, with one church for clerics dedicated to the Apostles, one church for catechumens dedicated to Mary, and the baptistry dedicated to John the Baptist.[139] In Spain the cathedrals were mostly dedicated to Mary in the sixth and seventh centuries, but there the cult of Mary is found in literature only at the middle of the seventh century with the treatise of Ildefonse of Toledo on the perpetual virginity of Mary. The Tenth Council of Toledo of 656 in canon 1 transferred the feast of the Annunciation, which till then had not yet been celebrated uniformly on 25 March, to 18 December. The day was certainly not only chosen because it comes a week before Christmas, but also because at the Fifth Council of Toledo in 636 in canon 1 new rogation days had been introduced for the triduum of 15–17 December. In this connection there was probably only a question of accommodating King Chintila, who was seeking the protection of heaven, but later these rogation days served to enhance the solemnity of this Marian feast now transferred to Advent. The fact that in the festal Mass the above-mentioned treatise of Ildefonse, divided into six or seven sections, was read in place of the Old Testament selection shows how movingly and in response to the demands of the people and the time the Spanish Church of the seventh century fashioned its liturgy.[140]

---

[130] Thus Fernández Alonso, 335.

[131] Gregory of Tours, *Gloria Confes.* 65.

[132] *Sacramentarium Veronense,* ed. Mohlberg and others, no. 234.

[133] Deshusses, 53.

[134] Ibid., 54.

[135] Cf. *Reg. Epp., MGEp.* II, Index.

The long-disseminated view that the "Merovingian Age" was under the aegis of the patrons of the country and the place, "and the cult of Peter was only transmitted to the Carolingians by the Anglo-Saxons" can no longer be held, after it can be shown that not only in the seventh century were there seventy-eight monasteries under Peter's patronage, occasionally joined with the patronage of Paul or of Mary,[141] but that even for the early Merovingian period some forty basilicas in honor of Peter and about half as many cathedrals dedicated to him can be named.[142] In this regard, in many places the patronage of Peter seems to have succeeded a general patronage of the Apostles, so that the "cult of the Apostles obtained a more personal note." The Princes of the Apostles, especially Peter, passed over in the Early Middle Ages as the special patrons of the Roman Church into general awareness.[143] The Latin episcopate of late antiquity, in order to emphasize the unity of the Empire against all appearances of collapse, had fostered the cult of the two Princes of the Apostles and thus passed it on to the newly converted Burgundians, Visigoths, and Franks.[144] But in many places the cult of Peter in the later Merovingian period was overshadowed by the veneration of those saints whose remains were buried locally. This was not least of all connected with the fact that people could obtain only second-class relics from the Roman graves of the Apostles, whereas first-class relics corresponded more to the German mentality.

---

[136] E. Ewig, "Der Petrus- und Apostelkult im spätrömischen Gallien," *ZKG* 71 (1960), 217.

[137] Ibid., 227.

[138] Ibid., 247.

[139] Ibid.

[140] Fernández Alonso, 389.

[141] E. Ewig, loc. cit., 226.

Like the cult of Peter, so the newly Christian German peoples also adopted the custom of the pilgrimage from Latin and Greek antiquity. The first Christian king of the Burgundians, Sigismund, was at the same time also the first Christian German king to make the pilgrimage to Rome. He brought back relics, which were apparently soon used up, for he sent a deacon to Rome to fetch new relics.[145] In 590, Bishop Gregory of Tours likewise sent his deacon to Rome, and he brought back many relics. From him Gregory also learned how Peter's tomb was venerated at Rome. Especially impressive is the description that, if one prayed devoutly and piously enough, the little cloth which one was careful to let down to Peter's grave in order thereby to obtain a second-class relic was heavier than before after its contact with the tomb, and so one had proof of the grace of God.[146] From the British Isles also pilgrims came to Rome even before the year 500. The new German rulers of the island, who were converted to the Catholic faith, also adopted the high esteem for Peter and the instinct for the pilgrimage. Some rulers laid aside their crown and went as pilgrims to Rome. In their own country they erected churches in honor of Peter as substitutes: one who could not go to Rome should honor Peter here.[147] It is due to these eager pilgrimages of the Germans that in the fifth and sixth centuries, when Rome was gradually losing its external splendor, after it had lost its power, the former center of the Empire became the Holy City. In it during these centuries were honored the most famous martyrs of all Christendom; thus Rome became the agent and the distributor of these treasures. The pilgrimage to Rome for relics was of the greatest importance for the religious and cultural development of the West.[148] Indeed it can even be said that pilgrimages created and developed a Catholic spirit, that is, a universal spirit for the whole of Christianity. Through the pilgrimages was spread a really fraternal attitude among the faithful in the most varied lands.[149] In the seventh century there developed in Western Christianity, under the influence of the new penitential practice of the Irish monks, a new type of pilgrimage, namely, the penitential pilgrimage. It was chiefly undertaken by clerics, who were not admitted to public penance, for the expiation of serious sins; in this it was not a question of a specific goal, but of assuming homelessness as atonement. Of course, such pilgrimages also led to the holy places and contributed to the spread of the cult of saints and relics.[150] Deserving of mention in this context is also the pilgrimage to the shrine of the Archangel Michael on Monte Gargano in South Italy, because here was found not the tomb of a saint or the site of a biblical event in the center of the pilgrimage, but the place where, according to legend, the angel appeared. The pilgrimage, which then assumed a total European extent in the Middle Ages and could also be compared with the pilgrimages to Rome and to the alleged tomb of the Apostle James at Santiago de Compostela, apparently began as early as the seventh century.[151] Also, of course, to be mentioned would be the pilgrimage to the grave of Saint Martin at Tours, which in the sixth century was occasionally even more highly esteemed than the pilgrimage to Rome. In any event it corresponded to the active propaganda of Bishop Gregory of Tours.[152] But it must be remembered that the pilgrimage to Rome, which apparently received very early the character of a pilgramage of expiation, occupied a special place, in so far as people went as pilgrims not only to the tomb of the Apostle but increasingly at the same time and in the course of years to the successor of the Apostle, the Roman Pope, in whom people were quite aware was the power of the keys, that is, Peter's full power of forgiving.[153]

---

[142] Ibid., 242 and 244 respectively.

[143] Ibid., 249.

[144] Ibid., 250.

[145] Avitus, *Ep.* 27: *MGAuctant* VI, 2, 59.

[146] Gregory of Tours, *Gloria Mart.* 28: *PL* 71, 728ff.

[147] B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa,* 242.

At Arles there were in the sixth century some twenty to twenty-five feasts of saints;[154] in general, this century saw a powerful growth of the cult of saints, as can be inferred especially from the works of Gregory of Tours.[155] Originally, of course, the veneration referred to the martyrs, but then it was extended to the ascetics, who through their austerity had shown that they were of the same rank as the martyrs.[156] In many cities, for example, of southeast Gaul, there were tombs of saints, and people were interested in finding new ones, and then in some cases built large churches over the tombs.[157] But the saints were not only invoked at their graves, but also at a great distance away; then, of course, the effort was made to get into contact with them through relics. Gregory of Tours recommended their use in case of sickness, probably to wean the faithful from magical practices. It is noteworthy that Caesarius did not yet know this use of relics.

---

[148] Ibid., 244f.
[149] B. de Gaiffier, 35.
[150] C. Vogel, *Le pèlerinage pénitentiel,* 56f.
[151] A. Petrucci, 149–153.
[152] E. Delaruelle, 216f.
[153] A. Prandi, 446f.

It was important to know the exact day of death of a saint, because his feast had to be celebrated on it. A vigil was held throughout the night, or at least a very early celebration of Lauds. The solemn Mass began around nine o'clock; in it the *passio* or the *vita* of the saint was read. The clergy who served at the shrine of a martyr were furthermore obliged to treat the people flocking there to wine. For their part the faithful sought the closest possible contact with the tomb of a saint. Thus they took along, for example, oil from the lamps burning there, in order to use it against sickness.[158] The cult of saints must not only be regarded as a characteristic of popular devotion: it was rather a part of episcopal pastoral care. The picture of the saint might achieve more than the preaching of the bishop; indeed, it could even be said that the saint complemented the bishop's activity, but he was a mysterious, all-knowing power, which began to act where the bishop's action ceased.[159] In general, the bishops seem to have had no reservations in regard to the cult of saints and relics: quite the contrary. Canon 5 of the Third Council of Braga in 576 saw itself obliged to check somewhat the zeal that probably promoted the personal vanity of the bishops. The shrines of relics were to be carried by deacons; in no case, however, should a bishop, under the pretext that he had to hold the shrine of relics, have himself carried on a chair. Only once is it attested that a bishop, namely Serenus of Marseille at the end of the sixth century, took a stand against the cult of saints. He even had their images destroyed, because he assumed that the people adored them.[160] Gregory the Great[161] indeed praised his zeal for the exclusive adoration of God, but at the same time blamed the destruction of the images, since they could be of service to the faith of the uneducated.[162]

---

[154] Beck, 314.

[155] E. Griffe, 23.

[156] Beck, 287.

[157] Ibid., 292f.

[158] Ibid., 234ff.

[159] Muller, 81.

It must be stressed that the cult of relics was in no sense only a characteristic of popular devotion. In fact, the Christian theologians of late antiquity were occupied with the question and assured the faithful that even the smallest part of the relic of a martyr meant a great treasure, for the power and grace of the saint were in some way in every tiniest particle as in the entire body.[163] The distribution of relics, on the other hand, facilitated the collecting of relics of many saints, whereby people thought, probably quite naïvely, to assure themselves of the protection of many saints. In this way, the system of phylacteries, that is, the manufacture and use of amulets with relics, flourished.[164] The fact that at Rome no bodily relics of the Apostles were given up, but only second-class relics, was based not only on the cult of the Apostles but also on the belief that every division of the relics of the Apostles would have weakened the position of the papal primacy, which for that age was founded not only on the succession of Peter but on the possession of the Apostles' tombs.[165]

If it is now recalled that Isidore's monastic *Rule* (24, 1–2), hence a work from the seventh century, mentions for the first time an annual memorial on which the holy sacrifice was to be offered for all the deceased[166]—Masses for the dead, which were celebrated partly at the exact hour of death of the deceased, were known in Gaul as early as the sixth century[167]—then it may be said that the decisive monuments of Christian piety were formed in the period here surveyed. This applies especially if it may be assumed that auricular confession, only generally coming into practice under the influence of the Celtic monks, which is without doubt a characteristic of Catholic piety, was already spread in this period on the basis of the development of the ancient western practice of penance.

---

[160] But this does not seem to have been the case. From the reports of Gregory of Tours it appears rather that the most zealous devotees of the saints knew they depended on the almighty power of God, with whom the saints could only intercede. Cf. also van der Lof, p. 40.

[161] *Reg. Epp.* IX, 208, and XI, 10.

[162] Beck, 306.

[163] Kötting, *Reliquienverehrung,* 326.

[164] Ibid., 327.

[165] Ibid., 330.

[166] Cf. Fernández Alonso, 586f.

[167] Beck, 256f.

CHAPTER 42

Latin Monasticism from the Mid-Fifth Century to the End of the Seventh Century

The further development of Latin monasticism from c. 450 to 700 makes it clear that the episode of the wanderings of the peoples with its effects fostered the previously high estimation of the monastic ideal far more than obstructed it. The continuity with the monasticism of the fourth century was maintained, since both its ideal basis, the example of the East, and the earlier forms, cenobitic and eremitical, persisted. The latter experienced a certain variation, since, first, in addition to the strict eremitism of the individual, a type became more frequent which kept the hermit in the vicinity of a monastery and hence in contact with its abbot, and second, now itinerant hermits, at first predominantly of Irish origin, appeared, who joined to anchoritism the *peregrinatio,* the ascetical renunciation of home and all it meant.[1] From now on, eremitism was valued as the chief form of monastic existence, to the demands of which only one who had previously been proved in a cenobitic community should expose himself.[2]

The great majority of ascetics accordingly chose the cenobitic form of life, which in the period here treated acquired some characteristic features. Monasteries, growing vastly in number—their founders were, besides the individual monk, bishops, Popes, and also well-to-do lay persons, especially the Merovingian nobility and crown—first consolidated their inner organization, since they more and more lived according to a definite *Rule,* now fixed in writing.[3] In such Rules, indeed, the ideal of eastern cenobitism was ever more decisive, but everywhere an adaptation to the concrete circumstances of Western European areas was undertaken. This is already noticeable in the *Institutiones* (1–4) of John Cassian and in the Latin form of Basil's *Ascetica,* and more clearly in the revision of the *Rule* of Pachomius and the two rules coming from Lérins, the *Regula quattuor Patrum* and the *Regula Macarii,* which belong to the fifth century.[4] In southern Gaul abbots of several monasteries met on occasion for discussion of the inner structure of their monasteries, and from their decisions proceeded the so-called *Regula quattuor Patrum,* the *Regula secunda* and *tertia Patrum.*[5] The sixth century was the age of the great Rules of the Master and of Benedict of Nursia in Italy and of the Bishops of Arles, Caesarius and Aurelian, in Gaul, who, however, made use of earlier works. Some of the new Rules were expressly mixed Rules, *Regulae mixtae,* such as the *Regula Ferioli,* the *Regula Tarnatensis Monasterii,* the *Regula Orientalis,* and the *Regula Pauli et Stephani,* which took over whole parts of existing Rules.[6] Thus the Irish-Frankish monasticism acquired its own form through combining the *Regula Columbani* with the *Regula Benedicti.* In the monastic Rules of Spain from the seventh century, which were composed by Leander of Seville, his brother Isidore, and Fructuosus of Braga, even more eastern influence is detectable, in addition to that of the *Rule* of Augustine.[7] The observance of the same *Rule* in several monasteries did not yet lead to their organizational union.

---

[1] See J. Leclercq, "Mönchtum und Peregrinatio im frühen Mittelalter," *RQ* 55 (1960), 212–225, with much evidence for the eremitism of the sixth and seventh centuries, and also his survey, *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos* I (1963), 161–180; P. Doyère, *DSp* 4 (1960), 953–982.

[2] Thus already John Cassian, *Institut. Coenob.* 5, 36; 8, 17; *Coll.* 18, 3; Benedict, *Regula,* chapter 1; also A. Hastings, "St. Benedict and the Eremitical Life," *DR* 61 (1950), 191–211.

[3] Cf. A. de Vogüé, "Sub regula vel abbate," *Coll. Cist.* 3 (1971), 209–241.

In so significant an element of the Church's inner life that the numerous monasteries represented, the contemporary episcopate showed an understandable interest and aimed, stimulated by the monastic legislation of the Council of Chalcedon,[8] to see also in the Latin West the monastic system subjected in principle to its jurisdiction. This process of increasing episcopal control began in the fifth century, but, of course, it did not move everywhere at the same pace. In North Africa the oppressed situation of the Church under Vandal domination fostered an extensive independence of the monasteries. In Italy, following the Byzantine reconquest in 535, the eastern monastic canon law established itself especially in the area under Byzantine authority and thereby gave the bishop the possibility of calling upon the monks of the many smaller monasteries, especially in the South, for pastoral tasks. In the parts of Italy controlled by the Ostrogoths and then by the Lombards, however, the less numerous but often more important monasteries retained a greater freedom of movement with regard to the bishop.[9] Then Gregory the Great subordinated them in general to episcopal supervision, which in the course of the sixth century was recognized also in Gaul and Spain, as the synodal legislation of the time makes known. The crucial points of episcopal control were influence on, or at least examination of, the election of the abbot and overseeing the administration of monastery property. A relaxation and limitation of episcopal jurisdiction, however, followed in the seventh century from the influence which the wealthy layman who had participated in the founding of the monastery could keep for himself, or from privileges which the landowner granted to a monastery.[10] Monastic exemption, here under way, was first conceded in its full extent to the Upper Italian monastery of Bobbio by Pope Honorius I in 628.[11]

---

[4] *Regula Macharii,* ed. H. Styblo, *WSt* 76 (1963), 124–158, and A. C. Vega, *BRAH* 164 (1969), 27–34.

[5] *Regula quattuor Patrum, PL* 103, 435–442; *Regula secunda Patrum,* ed. J. Neufville, *RBén* 77 (1967), 92–95; *Regula tertia Patrum, PL* 103, 443–446; see A. Mundó, "Les anciens synodes abbatiaux et les 'Regulae Patrum,' " *SA* 44 (1959), 107–125.

[6] Catalogue of sixth-century rules for Gaul and Spain in A. Mundó, *StudMon* 9 (1967), 229–231.

[7] For editions of individual rules see infra, footnotes 63ff.

[8] For the aftereffects of Chalcedon's canons on monasteries in the ecclesiastical legislation of the West, see L. Ueding, *Chalkedon* II, 642–660.

A further important development in western monasticism of this period appeared with the undertaking of missionary activity on a scale hitherto unknown. From the thus far customary, often only occasional, mission among the population of the neighborhood of a monastery, the glance was directed to distant goals; there was a going over to the evangelization of unfamiliar peoples, which, as in the mission to the Anglo-Saxons, was planned and taken up on a grand scale. Then when the Irish-Scottish monks joined the ascetical *peregrinatio* with missionary work on the continent, the great missionary task was firmly anchored in the consciousness of western monasticism.[12]

As a final characteristic of Latin monasticism of this age must be mentioned the monastic school, an institution now spread everywhere. True, it served exclusively for the formation of the monastery's own recruits, who had to be enabled to read the texts for the liturgical service and the Holy Scripture as material for the *lectio divina* and be able to prepare the manuscripts required for this; hence it purposely excluded the profane, especially the pagan, literature of antiquity from its program. But this monastic school was still not an ever atrophying remnant of the decaying school system of the Later Empire with its other institutions; rather, despite its elementary character, it was the viable germ from which, just as from the episcopal schools of the age, the medieval school would spring as the agent of Western Christian education.[13] In the following geographically arranged survey the important facts, personalities, and tendencies in the monasticism of the period will be set forth.

---

[9] G. Penco, *Storia del monachesimo,* 27–42.

[10] On episcopal jurisdiction over early monasticism see T. P. McLaughlin.

[11] The *Privilegium Bobiensi coenobio datum: PL* 80, 483, and *IP* VI, 2, 249, no. 6.

[12] For the Anglo-Saxon and Irish-Scottish mission on the continent, see Chapters 37 and 34.

[13] See H. I. Marrou, *Geschichte der Erziehung im klassischen Altertum* (Freiburg 1957), 481f.; P. Riché, *Education et culture dans l'Occident barbare* (Paris, 3rd. ed. 1973), 140–163, 200–215, 336–350.

Italy

The eremitical life, already noteworthy in Italy at the turn of the fourth to the fifth centuries, retained its esteem in the following period, but now it was encountered, not only on the preferred islands of the Mediterranean, but also in the interior of the country, for example, on Montelucano near Spoleto.[14] The influence of Egyptian anchoritism here present was kept alive by the Latin translations of the *Apophthegmata* literature of the sixth century, the *Verba seniorum,* in which the future Popes Pelagius I (556–561) and John III (561–574) took part.[15] But Italian cenobitism was also further oriented toward the eastern model, as, for example, with Lawrence, probably a native of Syria, who around the middle of the sixth century founded near Spoleto the monastery of Farfa, eventually to become famous.[16] The *Regula Orientalis,* whose title indicates eastern influence, also had an Italian origin, apparently at the beginning of the sixth century. Gennadius praised its clarity, but erroneously attributed it to a deacon Vigilius.[17] Certain impulses for the Italian monasticism of this period proceeded also from African monks, who abandoned their homeland under the pressure of Vandal rule. Thus the African Gaudentius founded a monastery at Naples, and Fulgentius of Ruspe assembled African monks in two settlements at Cagliari on Sardinia, in which theological study occupied no small position.[18] Circa 500 a monastic community settled around the grave of Saint Severinus in the Castellum Lucullanum near Naples, whose second abbot, Eugippius, author of the *Vita* of Severinus, also wrote, according to Isidore of Seville, a *Rule* for his monastery, which is very likely identical with the anonymous *Rule* of a Parisian manuscript.[19] In the course of the sixth century the number of monasteries in Italy grew vastly, as the correspondence and the *Dialogi* of Gregory the Great show, in which is mentioned an abundance of monastic settlements, but no precise information on the circumstances of their origins is available.

---

[14] G. Penco, op. cit., 22.

[15] A. H. Salonius, *Vitae Patrum* (Lund 1920).

[16] G. Penco, op. cit., 22f., and *Atti II° convegno Studi umbri* (Perugia 1965), 257–276.

[17] Text of the *Regula Orientalis, PL* 103, 477–484; see A. Mundó, *StudMon.,* 9 (1967), 231, Gennadius, *Script. eccles.,* can. 51.

[18] *Vita Fulg.* 19; 24.

[19] Eugipp., *Vita Severini* 46, 6; Isidore of Seville, *Vir. ill* 26; see A. de Vogüé, "La Règle d' Eugippe retrouvée," *RAM* 47 (1971), 233–266.

Today, almost without exception, the two most comprehensive monastic Rules of this epoch, which since 1938 have been the object of an intensive and still not finished discussion, the so-called *Regula Magistri* (RM) and the *Rule of Benedict* of Nursia (RB), are assigned to the sixth century.[20] Between them exists so strong a relationship, in both content and form, that on the one hand the question of their reciprocal dependence, on the other hand that of the priority in time of the one over the other, urgently intrudes itself. The *Regula Magistri* is anonymous and in comparison with the *Rule of Benedict* about three times as large; in most manuscripts there is named as author of the latter a Benedict, who is apparently identical with that Benedict of Montecassino, whose signs and miracles Pope Gregory the Great described in the second book of his *Dialogi* and to whom he attributed a monastic *Rule* which was marked by *discretio* and clarity (*Dial.,* II, 36). True, Gregory supplied few chronological references to events in Benedict's life, but together with some credible criteria from the rest of the tradition about him they permit one to assign his life-span between 480/490 and 550/560. This tradition has him come from the old province of Nursia and study for a time at Rome in his youth. But he soon left the city in order to live as a hermit in a cave near Subiaco until disciples joined him, whom he is said to have gathered, according to the Pachomian model, into several communities. Then he sought to realize the experiences and insights gained here in regard to real cenobitism in a new foundation on Montecassino, where he must have died around the middle of the sixth century.

Today the priority of the *Regula Magistri* may be regarded as the established and also almost generally recognized outcome of the discussion just mentioned, and its origin ascribed to the first three decades of the sixth century, since, among other things, it represents a less developed cenobitism than that of the *Regula Benedicti,* since it also employs the apocryphal Scriptures to a degree that can only with difficulty be reconciled with the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis* of the early sixth century, and finally since it was already used by Abbot Eugippius of Lucullanum (d. c. 530) in his now identified *Rule.* On the other hand, there is less agreement on the homeland of the

---

[20] The complete bibliography on the investigation of both *Rules* from 1938 to 1970 was compiled by B. Jaspert, *StudMon* 13 (1971), 129–171, but separately as *Subsidia Monastica* I (Montserrat 1971). The discussion on the two Rules was initiated by M. Alamo, "La Règle de s. Benoît éclairée par sa source, la Règle du Maître," *RHE* 34 (1938), 740–755, but attention was called orally to the problem by A. Genestout; see A. Genestout, "La Règle du Maître et la Règle de s. Benoît," *RAM* 21 (1940), 5–112.

Regula Magistri: some would see its origin chiefly in the vicinity of Rome, others hold rather that it came from Provence.[21]

With the priority of the *Regula Magistri* there is also established its employment by Benedict, since a model common to both could be demonstrated with as little conviction as the thesis that Benedict was the author of both *Rules.* These did not find their definitive form in their first versions, but were expanded in content (the *Regula Magistri*) or improved in form (the *Regula Benedicti*): very likely the *Regula Magistri* was in Benedict's hands in an intermediate stage. Among the sources common to both *Rules* Holy Scripture holds the first place; both also refer to Cassian, and Cyprian is familiar to them, while the meager use of the apocrypha by Benedict indicates, not a direct knowledge of them, but a direct adoption from the *Regula Magistri,* apparently even without more detailed knowledge of their character. As the special property of the *Regula Magistri* is knowledge of Julianus Pomerius, Caesarius of Arles, and Nicetas of Remesiana, while Benedict is acquainted with far more voluminous relevant works, such as the *Vitae patrum,* the "Rule of our holy Father Basil," the *Historia monachorum,* the *Rule* of Pachomius, and especially the *Rule* of Augustine, from which he gained some ideas, without expressly naming it.[22] With the stock of ideas created from these sources Benedict put in order the knowledge acquired from his own experience and meditation, as this seemed to him essential for the cenobitic form of life and at the same time humanly possible. Thus, with a greater stylistic ability than the author of the *Regula Magistri* could call on, he created in a happy synthesis the hitherto most complete monastic Rule, which was to surpass for the next centuries in its greater power of attraction all other *Rules* from the early age of monasticism. It in no way diminishes the rank of Benedict's achievement when one refuses to designate him, as historically incorrect, as the founder of western monasticism or even as the Father of the West.[23]

If one asks about the basic idea of the *Regula Benedicti,* its Christocentrism will have to be named.[24] Already the decisive motive for the entry into the monastic community is the desire for the unconditional following of Christ. Service in the *militia Cristi Regis* determines the entire manner of life of the monk (*conversatio morum*). He gives obedience to the abbot,[25] because in him he sees Christ; he takes up every renunciation because he wants to share in the Passion of Christ; nothing is dearer to him than love for Christ. To assure this central following of Christ is the purpose of the regulations on the liturgy (*opus Dei*),[26] on the *lectio divina,* and on *stabilitas loci.*[27] With the following of Christ as thus understood, Benedict's second fundamental concern is assured, *caritas fraterna,* which must be at the same time as the deepest Christian *humanitas* the basis of any monastic community, an insight which Benedict to a great extent owes to the reading of the *Rule* of Augustine.[28] Some individual prescriptions of the *Regula Benedicti* are so flexibly composed that they could easily be adapted to various climatic conditions: hence its author reckoned on its spread. Whereas the testimonies for the existence of the *Regula Magistri* in the sixth century are relatively frequent, they begin only in the seventh century for the *Regula Benedicti.* Certainly the picture of Benedict in the *Dialogi* of Gregory the Great fostered its spread, and it appeared relatively early in the Merovingian Kingdom, at times as part of a *Regula Mixta,* for example, together with the *Rule* of Columban, until in the course of the eighth century it gained ground powerfully and through the combined efforts of the first Carolingian Emperors and of Abbot Benedict of Aniane (d. 821) achieved almost exclusive validity.[29]

---

[21] A good survey of the current state of investigation is supplied by the lectures and discussion of the First International Congress on the Rule of St. Benedict from 4–9 October 1971 at Rome, repeated in the first volume (Hildesheim 1972) of *Regulae Benedicti Studia.* Here we cannot go into many individual problems yet to be clarified.

[22] On the sources of both *Rules* see occasionally the introduction to the editions by A. de Vogüé in *SChr.*

[23] See B. Jaspert, "Benedikt von Nursia—der Vater des Abendlandes? Kritische Bemerkungen zur Typologie eines Heiligen," *Erbe und Auftrag* 49 (1973), 90–103; 190–207.

[24] Besides the editions with commentary mentioned, see the commentary of I. Herwegen, *Sinn und Geist der Benediktinerregel* (Einsiedeln 1944); B. Steidle, *Die Regel St.*

In the former minister of the Ostrogothic King Theodoric, Cas-

---

Benedikts (Beuron 1952); id. (ed.), "Commentationes in Regulam S. Benedicti," *SA* 42 (Rome 1957); G. Turbessi, *Ascetismo e monachesimo in San Benedetto* (Rome 1965); P. Delatte, *Commentaire sur la Règle de s. Benoît* (Solesmes 1969). On the Christocentrism of the Regula Benedicti see A. Borias, "Le Christ dans la Règle de s. Benoît," *RBén* 82 (1972), 109–139.

[25] On the position of the abbot, his election and installation, see, besides A. de Vogüé (Paris 1960, in the Literature for the chapter), K. Hallinger, *ZKG* 76 (1965), 233–245; H. Grundmann, ibid. 77 (1966), 217–223; R. Sommerville, *RBén* 77 (1967), 246–263; M. Angerer, *StudMon* 12 (1970), 43–56.

[26] See A. de Vogüé, *RBén* 71 (1961), 233–264; *RAM* 42 (1966), 389–404; 43 (1967) 21–33.

[27] On *conversatio* and *stabilitas* see B. Steidle, *SA* 44 (1959), 136–144, and *Erbe und Auftrag* 36 (1960), 103–112; H. Hoppenbrouwers, *Graecitas et Latinitas Christianorum primaeva,* Suppl. 1 (Nijmegen 1964), 45–96.

[28] See the proofs in A. de Vogüé, *La Règle de s. Benoît,* 131f., and A. Borias, "Hospitalité augustinienne et bénédictine," *RHSp* 50 (1974), 3–16.

[29] On the spread of both *Rules* see G. Penco, *Benedictina* 10 (1956), 181–198; *SA* 42 (1957), 321–345.

siodorus,[30] born c. 485, we meet a layman, who as a zealous promoter of monasticism founded on his South Italian estate of Squillace two colonies,[31] a settlement of anchorites on the hill of Castellum and in the immediate vicinity the real monastery of Vivarium, which was intended to serve a specific task, namely, scientifically based and organized work on the Bible that went far beyond the previous *lectio divina.* In his *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum,*[32] dedicated to the monks, Cassiodorus set down his ideas on this and developed a concrete program of studies. An important presupposition for this was a library[33] in which faultless biblical manuscripts, introductions to the Bible, the exegetical works of the Church Fathers, and those works of profane literature were on hand which could not be dispensed with for a scientifically fruitful study of the Bible. A special *scriptorium* should undertake the production of the necessary manuscripts. New in this concept was, first, the demand of genuine scientific activity at all, and then the strong stress which was laid on the recourse to profane literary scholarship, but which Cassiodorus tried to justify again and again. In the realization of such exalted aims, of course, not all the monks of the monastery were involved; in any event a rather long starting-time was needed before a work force capable of such achievement was trained. But as early as the founder's death c. 580 interest in the enterprise apparently began to flag, and thus from Vivarium came only one exegetical work, an *Expositio psalmorum,* and even this came from the pen of Cassiodorus himself,[34] who in it relied on Augustine's *Enarrationes in psalmos,* without attaining its religious value even remotely. What were the most worthwhile, then, were, first, the stock of the library built by Cassiodorus and his program developed in the *Institutiones,* which of course would later gain a substantial share in the renewal of scholarly activity in the West.[35]

---

[30] See, in addition to D. Cappuyns and R. Helm, *RAC* 2, 915–926, J. van Besselaar, *Cassiodorus, Level en werken* (Antwerp 1950).

[31] On the situation and structure of Cassiodorus's foundation, P. Courcelle, *MAH* 55 (1938), 259–307. That Cassiodorus introduced the *Rule of Benedict* at Vivarium is just as unproved as the view that he was the author of the *Regula Magistri,* which D. Cappuyns proposed in *RThAM* 15 (1948), 209–268.

[32] Edition of R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford 1937). On the importance of the *Institutiones* see L. Alfonsi, *Klearchos* 6 (1964), 6–20.

[33] See P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident* (Paris 2nd ed. 1948), 313–388, and L. Teutsch,"Cassiodorus Senator. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung seiner wissenschaftlich-bibliothekarischen Leistung," *Libri e Riviste* 9 (1959), 215–239; P. Riché, op. cit., 204–212.

[34] *CChr* 97–98, ed. M. Adriaen (Turnhout 1958). Cf. A. Ceresa-Gastaldo, "Contenuto e metodo dell'Expositio psalmorum di Cassiodoro," *VetChr* 5 (1968), 61–71.

[35] On Cassiodorus's later influence, see H. Thiele, *SM* 50 (1932), 378–419.

The powerful impulses which proceeded from Gregory the Great, himself a monk and founder of monasteries at Rome and on Sicily, to the contemporary monasticism of Italy, have been repeatedly mentioned. Many of his measures were intended for the external and internal reconstruction of the monastic system, which, like ecclesiastical life as a whole, had suffered because of the chaos of the Lombard invasion.[36] It was further significant that Gregory more and more took monasticism into the direct service of the Church, called abbots to become bishops, sent them on important missions to Ravenna or Pavia, for example, or assigned to them the preaching among the Lombards and the evangelization of the Anglo-Saxons. Here is discernible an informative change in Gregory's view of the vocation of the monk, which was based on his own career. Whereas he at first regarded the monk's being and the exercise of an ecclesiastical office or function as incompatible, he later saw in the service of the Church a possibility for attaining the highest perfection, since in it could be joined together the *vita activa* and *contemplativa.*[37] Soon after Gregory's death the Irish-Scottish monasticism acquired influence on the Italian, when in 612 Columban (d. 615) founded not far from the Trebbia, south of Pavia, his last monastery, Bobbio, which from the start enjoyed the rich encouragement of the Lombard royal family and in a certain sense was a royal proprietary monastery. Its rapid economic flowering allowed it an intensive activity in the cultural and theological sphere; especially by means of its *scriptorum* Bobbio became a first-class intellectual center in contemporary Italy, which with its numerous daughter-houses and through the spread of the cult of Columban, radiated not only in the area of Lombard rule but also into Byzantine territory. Columban's austere *Rule* remained in force under his first successors: only in the second half of the century did the influence of the *Regula Benedicti* gradually assert itself, to then become exclusively prescribed in the eighth century.[38]

---

[36] T. Leccisotti, "Le consequenze dell'invasione longobarda per l'antico Monachesimo italico," *Atti I° congr. internaz. Studi longobardi* (Spoleto 1951), 369–376. On the destruction of Montecassino in 577 see H. S. Brechter, *SM* 56 (1938), 109–150.

[37] In addition to P. Rudmann (Literature), cf. R. Gillet, "Spiritualité et place du moine dans l'Église selon s. Grégoire le Grand," *Théologie da la vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 323–351.

[38] The early charters for Bobbio in C. Cipolla, *Codice diplomatico del monasterio di s. Colombano di Bobbio* I (Rome 1918). On Bobbio's legal position see C. G. Mor, *S. Colombano e la sua opera in Italia* (Bobbio–Parma 1953), 73–83. A. Maestri, *Il culto di s. Colombano in Italia* (Piacenza 1955). On Bobbio's importance for the mission among the Lombards, see supra, Chapter 36.

Monasticism in the Merovingian Kingdom

In what had been Roman Gaul there continued as the two centers of gravity for the expansion of monasticism in the fourth and fifth centuries the area of the Lower Rhone Valley and Aquitaine, but in the sixth and seventh centuries they experienced important differentiations, partly coming from without. In Rhone monasticism the influence of Lérins at first still remained predominant, as especially the already mentioned *Regula Macharii* makes known.[39] Reference has already been made[40] to the importance of the synods of abbots, now making their appearance in the provinces of Narbonne and Provence. Bishop Caesarius of Arles (d. c. 542) became the most important promoter of southeast Gallic monasticism; he himself was a monk at Lérins before he assumed the direction of a monastery outside the gates of Arles, until 502. In the two monastic *Rules* composed by him—the first[41] was written for the convent of nuns of Saint John, founded by him as bishop, and his sister Caesaria was its superior; the second, a *Rule for Monks,* is probably only a revised abridgment of the *Rule for Nuns*[42]—now, besides the Lérins tradition, the influence of Augustine's Rule becomes traceable.[43] The *Rule for Nuns* obtained special esteem when Chlotar I's wife, Queen Radegundis (d. 587), adopted it for the convent of nuns of Saint Mary, later of the Holy Cross, founded by her; apparently this was true also in the two convents of nuns at Autun, founded by Queen Brunhildis.[44] Both *Rules* of Caesarius worked to stimulate later authors of monastic rules, such as his successor Aurelian, who strongly relied upon Caesarius in his *Rules* for the monasteries erected at Arles by King Childebert.[45] Likewise, for the anonymous author of the *Regula Tarnatensis monasterii,* which probably lay on the River Tarn in South Gaul, Caesarius, in addition to Augustine, was a source from which he took passages, partly verbatim. A relationship, more similar in ideas, with the *Rules* of Caesarius is present in the *Rule* of Bishop Ferreolus of Uzès (553–581) in the southern part of the Frankish Kingdom, but the *Regula Tarnatensis* was also familiar to him. All the above-mentioned post-

---

[39] See footnote 3.

[40] See footnote 4.

[41] Caesarius of Arles, *Opera* II, 101–129 (ed. G. Morin), and separately in *FlorPatr* 34 (Bonn 1933).

[42] Caesarius, *Opera* II, 149–155; see A. de Vogüé, *RAM* 47 (1971), 369–406.

[43] Already proved by C. Lambot, *RBén* 41 (1929) 333–341; cf. L. Rodorel de Seilhac, *L'utilisation par s. Césaire d'Arles de la Régle de s. Augustin* (dissertation, Paris 1967).

[44] Cf. E. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum,* 77f., and G. Marié, *Études mérovingiennes* (Paris 1953), 219–225.

[45] Text of both *Rules* of Aurelian in *PL* 68, 385–406.

Caesarian *Rules,* however, display no influence of the *Regula Benedicti.*[46] Finally, still in the seventh century, Bishop Donatus of Besançon (c. 624–660) relied on Caesarius's *Rule for Nuns* when he compiled a *Regula Mixta* for the convent of Jussa-Moutier; furthermore, this adopted much from the *Regula Benedicti* and some things from the *Rule* of Columban, among whose disciples Donatus had previously been.[47] The fact that the Rhone monasteries gave themselves a stricter organization so relatively early through the introduction of a *Rule* could not but have had a positive impact on the entire monastic life. It certainly contributed to the circumstance that precisely in the South Gallic monasteries there was a lively interest in theological and religious questions, as this became clear in the discussion on Augustine's doctrine of grace. It is furthermore striking that the very bishops who came from Rhone monasticism showed a special readiness actively to shape public life both in the ecclesiastical and in the secular sphere.

In the central and western areas of ancient Gaul monasticism was at first still under the influence of Martin's ideals and retained its old inclination to individualism, which showed itself, in addition to other ways, in the rejection of *stabilitas loci* and of the introduction of a definite monastic Rule. Thus there occurred again and again the founding of monasteries by individual monks without a definite plan and often soon abandoned; hence the first Frankish national Council of Orléans in 511, in clear conformity with the monastic regulations of Caesarius of Arles, made the establishing of monastic settlements dependent on the consent of the local bishop and prescribed that monks settle down.[48] That these decrees were implemented, however, only to a modest degree becomes clear from the reports of Gregory of Tours on the monasticism of the late sixth century, in which lack of discipline and organization was still characteristic.

The decisive impulse for a further development of Merovingian monasticism came when the Irish monk Columban[49] (c. 543–615) arrived there with twelve companions to the Frankish Kingdom c. 590

---

[46] *Regula Tarnatensis: PL* 66, 977–988; *Regula Ferrioli,* ibid., 959–976. See especially L. R. Delsalle, "Comparison, datation, localisation relative des Regles monastiques de. s. Césaire d'Arles s. Ferréol d'Uzés et de la Regula Tarnatensis monasterii," *Augustiniana* 11 (1961), 5–26; G. Holzherr, *Regula Ferrioli* (Einsiedeln 1961); F. Villegas, *RBén* 84 (1974), 7–65, with new text of the *Regula Tarnatensis.*

[47] Text: *PL* 87, 273–298; see S. G. Luff, *DR* 70 (1952), 180–203, and R. Hanslick, *Stpatr* 10, 1 (*TU* 107, Berlin 1970), 100–104.

[48] Council of Orléans (511), can. 11.

[49] Chief source is the *Vita Columbani* by the monk Jonas of Bobbio, ed. B. Krusch, *MGSS rer. Mer.* 4 (1902), an *ed. minor* (Hanover 1905). Columban's works edited by G. S. M. Walder, *S. Columbani Opera* (Dublin 1957).

and was able to put the monastic ideal of his homeland[50] into effect on new soil. When the Irishman gave up the position of first teacher at the school of his monastery of Bangor in order to go far way, his motive was the *peregrinatio* in its religious understanding, as he emphasized in his letter to the bishops of the Merovingian Kingdom.[51] Only when he came to know the depressing situation of the Merovingian Church from his own observation did he also decide on pastoral work among the people, in so far as this was possible in the framework of monastic community life. In this it was of the greatest importance that for his activity Columban quickly found the approval and support of King Sigebert and of the Merovingian upper class, who were powerfully impressed by the personality of the Irish monk. On the southeast slope of the Vosges he was able to establish, one after another, three settlements, Annegray, Luxeuil, and Fontaine,[52] of which the second became the most important because of the magnitude of the plan—refectory, monastic school, guest-house—and the rapidly growing number of monks. For these monasteries Columban wrote down his regulations, the *Regula Monachorum* in ten chapters, which rather determined the basic attitudes of the ascetical life of monks, and the *Regula Coenobialis,* a loose sort of notebook record of penances which were imposed for failings in the monastic life.[53] Both reflect the theory and practice of the Irish home monastery of Bangor, which its Abbot Comgall had there introduced. To these belong especially the serious, strict characteristic of striving for interiority, to which the monastic Rule leads, the order of prayer (Chapter 7), and the detailed penitential regulations of the *Regula Coenobialis.* From the start, Columban's foundation had a strong power of attraction, which was expressed in two important traits. First, the Frankish nobility were attracted in a unique way by the Irish-Scottish monastic ideal: its sons were partly educated at Luxeuil or entered there as monks: monks of Luxeuil were summoned to be bishops, who then called into being monasteries on the model of Luxeuil or introduced the order of Luxeuil into existing monasteries; and finally laymen made numerous new foundations in both Neustria and Austrasia and North Burgundy, so that the number of monasteries oriented to Luxeuil rose to more than 100 in the course of the seventh century.[54] The originally exclusive validity of the *Rule* of Columban was, of course, replaced in the course of the century by a *Regula Mixta,* into which it developed with parts of the gradually advancing Benedictine *Rule.* Second, there proceeded from these monasteries far-reaching pastoral activity, since auricular confession, which they recommended, and the stressing of a serious penitential attitude[55]—in brief, the excercise of an individual pastoral care—met a deep need in all levels of the population. This twofold success of the Luxeuil spirit, however, immediately became also an occasion for a serious conflict between monasticism and parts of the episcopate, as well as with King Theodebert II. The bishops were displeased by the relative independence of the Irish-Frankish monasteries, just as by the effective pastoral activity of Columban, and both the bishops and the King especially took a dim view of the candid words of the Irish monk, who unambiguously recalled to the diocesan clergy their duty as shepherds and sharply rebuked the King for his concubinage. Columban finally had to yield in 610 to the common pressure from both; after two years' missionary work among the still pagan population between the Lake of Zurich and Bregenz, he crossed the Alps in the fall of 612 and at Bobbio reached the last city of his *peregrinatio.*[56] But the work of the Irish-Scots on Frankish soil began an important stimulus for the religious elevation of the population of the Merovingian Kingdom, which can be ascertained at the beginning of the Carolingian Age.

---

[50] On the development and peculiar character of Irish-Scottish monasticism, see supra, Chapter 33.

[51] Columban, *Ep.* 2, 6.

[52] Jonas, *Vita s. Columb.* 1, 6; 1, 10.

[53] The *Regula Monachorum:* 122–142; the *Regula Coenobialis:* 142–168, ed. Walker. The manuscript tradition of both *Rules* shows many later enlargements; cf. Walker, Introduction, XLII–LII.

Spanish Monasticism

The development of Spanish monasticism in the fifth century was interrupted by the invasion of the Vandals, Sueves, and Visigoths, but after the consolidation of the political situation it knew a steady upswing, which led to a considerable flowering in the seventh century. Just as in Italy, here too eremitism retained its importance, especially on the Balearic Isles and in the mountains of Asturias and Galicia,[57] but the center of gravity lay in the cenobitic colonies, rapidly growing in numbers, which at first owed their origin to bishops and monks and then, after the conversion of King Recared to Catholicism in 589, also to the reigning dynasty.

---

[54] The history of these foundations in F. Prinz, 121–151, with maps V, VIIA, and VIIB; on the *Regula Mixta,* ibid., 270–289.

[55] The authenticity of the penitential attitude should be maintained in the readiness for corresponding works of penance, which Columban collected in two catalogues, preserved as *Poenitentiale;* see pp. 168–180 of Walker and the special edition of J. Laporte, *Le Pénitentiel de s. Columban* (Tournai 1958).

[56] On the chronology of this phase of Columban's life, see J. O'Carroll, *IThQ* 24 (1957), 76–95.

[57] Cf. M. C. Díaz y Díaz, op. cit., and A. Linage Conde, 244–250. Especially to be noted is the self-willed figure of the hermit Valerius of Bierzo.

Soon after 506 the monastery of Saint Martin of Asan was founded on the southern slope of the Pyrenees, north of Huesca; its Abbot Victorian (d. 558) was active to the mid-century for the spread of monasticism by the erecting of smaller colonies subject to him.[58] Even more important was the work of Martin of Braga, a native of Pannonia, who came from Palestine to Galicia c. 550 and there established the monastery of Dumio, over which he presided as abbot until he was called to be Bishop of Dumio in 556. By means of a collection of sayings of Egyptian Fathers, translated and revised by him, which could be employed as a "Rule," he gave his monastery an eastern outlook, which made it similar to the Martinian monasticism of Gaul.[59] Then, not without influence on Spanish monasticism, came the founding of the monastery of *Servitanum* in the Visigothic sphere by Abbot Donatus, who before 570 migrated from North Africa with seventy monks and a considerable library and soon acquired high esteem.[60] His successor Eutropius, who became Bishop of Valencia after the Council of Toledo of 589, defended the stern discipline of his monastery in a special work.[61] It must probably be assumed that the *Rule* of Augustine was followed in the *Monasterium Servitanum.*[62]

The treatise *De institutione virginis,* which Bishop Leander of Seville (d. c. 600) composed for his sister, the nun Florentina, made use of ideas from the writings of Jerome, especially his Letter XXII to Eustochium, but also of Cassian and Augustine; however, no traces of the *Rule of Benedict* can be found.[63] The *Regula Monachorum* of his brother and successor Isidore (d. 636) is, in regard to content, dependent on eastern monastic writings—the *Rules* of Pachomius and Macarius, Cassian—and on western works—Jerome, Caesarius of Arles, and perhaps also Benedict. His own achievement consisted in the clarity and balance with which he formed the material before him into a well-thought-out *Rule.*[64] Isidore reported also of a contemporary, Bishop John of Gerona (d. before 621), who founded the monastery of Biclarum on the spurs of the Pyrenees and wrote a *Rule* for it, but this must probably be regarded as lost.[65] A helpful promoter of monasticism was also Isidore's friend, Bishop Braulio of Zaragoza (d. 651), a pupil of the monastic school of Seville.[66] He maintained a correspondence with Fructuosus of Braga (d. c. 665), who came from a prominent Visigothic family, used his wealth for the erecting of several monasteries in Galicia and on the southern coast of Spain, and later became Bishop of Dumio and Metropolitan of Braga. His *Regula Monachorum* is based on Pachomius, Cassian, and Isidore, but also displays certain parallels to Jerome and Augustine.[67] Unique is the prescription in Chapter 22 that the monk, on entering the monastery, signs a *pactum,* in which he asserts the voluntary character of his decision and obliges himself in a sort of treaty to the fulfilling of the monastic statutes.[68] The *Regula communis,* attributed to Fructuosus, probably incorrectly, refers to another special type of monastery, common in Galicia, in which entire families led a sort of monastic life on their property, but this involved several abuses.[69]

---

[58] His tomb inscription in J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas* (Barcelona, 2nd ed. 1969), no. 284. Cf. also Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 4, 11.

[59] The *Sententiae patrum aegyptiorum* in C. W. Barlow, *Martini episcopi Bracarensis opera omnia* (New Haven 1950), 30–51. The Bishop of Braga called the Gallic Martin his *patronus*—see the epitaph composed by him in Barlow, p. 283—and Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 5, 1, calls him *Martini heres.*

[60] Ildefonse of Toledo, *Vir ill.* 4; John of Biclar, *Chron. ad a. 571.* The author of the *Vitae patrum Emeritensium* 3, reports the arrival of a rather large group of African monks at Mérida, a report whose nucleus can be true.

[61] Isidore of Seville, *Vir. ill.* 45; 65. Eutropius's work *De distinctione monachorum, PL* 80, 15–20, and in M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Anecdota wisigothica* (Salamanca 1958), 20–35. On Eutropius, also J. Vives, *DHGE* 16, 84–86.

[62] A. Manrique, "La Regla de s. Agustín en España durante los primeros siglos de su existencia," *CD* 182 (1969), 485–513, especially 488, 490.

[63] Leander's "Rule" is handed down in three versions: a) *PL* 72, 873–894; b) ed. A. C. Vega, *S. Leandro de Sevilla. El 'De instit. virg.'* (El Escorial 1948) =*PL* Suppl. 4, 1421–1449; c) ed. J. Mádoz, *AnBoll,* 67 (1949), 407-424. On Leander's sources see id. *MiscMercati* 1 (1946), 265–295, and J. Campos Ruiz, *BAC* 321, 9–19.

As a special characteristic of the Spanish monasticism of this period may be mentioned its receptivity to intellectual activity, in which the study of the Bible, which in Leander's view was also a duty in convents of nuns, retained its previous preeminence.[70] For the daily prescribed three hours of *lectio* the monk obtained his reading matter from the *sacrarius* from the monastic library of Seville; it included also the works of profane authors to the extent that they were beneficial for theological study.[71] Almost all the more important Spanish bishops of the seventh century obtained their considerable education in the monastic schools of Seville, Toledo (Agali), or Zaragoza, and as bishops continued to use and foster their *scriptoria.*[72] In this lively interest in intellectual activity may rightly be seen the influence of African monasticism at work, which proceeded from the monastery of *Servitanum,* already mentioned, under the African Abbot Donatus.[73] It was the merit of the Spanish monasticism of this period to have given to its Church an episcopate which, measured by its ascetical and theological formation, occupied a high rank in the Latin Church of the seventh century. The religious self-evaluation of this monasticism was, of course, traditional, if it is compared with the zeal which it devoted to the practical shaping of monastic life by means of rules, synodal decrees, and other writings. It was extensively oriented to the stock of ideas which was offered by Jerome, Augustine, and Cassian, and at times a renovation and reform of monasticism were understood in the sense of a return to its original idea.[74]

---

[64] *Regula Monachorum, PL* 83, 867–904, and *BAC* 321, 79–125; on its sources see R. Susin Alcubierre, *Salmanticensis* 14 (1967), 371–394. Synodal decrees on monasticism: *Concil. Hispa.* II, canons 10 and 11; *Concil. Tolet.* IV, canons 48–53, 56.

[65] Isidore of Seville, *Vir. ill.* 44. See J. Campos, *Juan de Biclaro* (Madrid 1960), 32–41. J. Pérez de Urbel, *Hispania* 1 (1940), 9–39; 2 (1941), 32–52, would identify John's *Rule* with the *Regula Magistri;* A. C. Vega, *BRAH* 16 (1969), 13–27, with the *Regula Macarii.*

[66] C. H. Lynch–P. Galindo, *S. Braulio, obispo de Zaragoza* (Madrid 1950).

[67] On Fructuosus, cf. M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *DSp.* 5, 1541–1546. The anonymous *Vita s. Fructuosi, PL* 87, 459–470, and in F. C. Nock (Washington 1946). The *Regula Monachorum, PL* 87, 1099–1110, and *BAC* 321, 129–162; its sources: R. Grégoire, *RAM* 43 (1967) 172–174; J. Oroz-Reta, *Stpatr* 10, 1(*TU* 107, Berlin 1970), 407–412.

[68] Model of such a *pactum: PL* 87, 1127–1130; *BAC* 321, 208–211; on the spread of the custom, see C. J. Bishko, *Estudios Menéndez Pidal* II (Madrid 1951), 514–531. The German character of this custom, assumed by I. Herivegen, *Das Pactum des hl. Fructuosus von Braga* (Stuttgart 1907, reprinted Amsterdam 1965), is uncertain.

[69] The *Regula communis: PL* 87, 1111–1127; *BAC* 321, 165–208; see J. Orlandis, "Los monasterios familiares en España durante la alta edad media," *Anuario de historia del derecho español* 26 (1956), 5–46.

The Monasticism of Africa

African monasticism, which reached a rapid flowering chiefly through the initiative of Augustine, was affected in the last months of his life by the invasion of the Arian Vandals, just as the African Catholic Church as a whole. In addition to churches and cemeteries, many monasteries were also destroyed, partly burned down, and their inhabitants expelled; some of them found death through the sword or torture, others were sent off into captivity.[75] Probably those monasteries were chiefly affected which lay on the Vandals' route of march or in the province of Africa Proconsularis, the special territory of settlement of the Vandals. Since many African monasteries of men also had clerics in their community, these were also included in King Gaiseric's decree of expulsion against clerics.[76] Going beyond his father's measures, King Hunneric (477–484) planned the total suppression of all monasteries, since by a decree of 484 he had them turned over to the Moors, but his death prevented the implementation of the project.[77] Under the persecution of Hunneric, besides clerics, also monks and nuns went over to the Arianism of the conquerors,[78] but the majority splendidly stood the test in difficult circumstances. When King Gunthamund (484–496) revoked in succession his predecessor's decrees of persecution and banishment, the expelled religious were able to return and put an end to the damage done in the persecution; even a relatively rapid renewal of monastic life can be ascertained, which is reflected, especially for the province of Byzacena, in the *Vita* of Bishop Fulgentius of Ruspe (d. apparently in 527).[79] As earlier, there were, in addition to monasteries which had only lay persons as members and were in the minority, others in which also clerics and, with them at times, the bishop lived as monks.[80]

---

[70] J. Orlandis, "La 'lectrio divina' en el monasterio visigodo," *Jus canon* 7 (1957), 149–156. Leander of Seville, *Reg. ad. virg.* 6.

[71] Isidore of Seville, *Reg. mon.* 8, 1.

[72] P. Riché, *Education et culture dans l'Occident barbare* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1973), 339–345. On Isidore's profane education see J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne visigothique* (Paris 1959), 735–762.

[73] P. Riché, op. cit., 345–348.

[74] On the theological importance of monasticism in the Visigothic period see J. Fontaine and M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Théologie de la vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 353–369, 371–383, and in Fructuosus, R. Grégoire, *RAM* 43 (1967), 159–176.

[75] In agreement are Possidius, *Vita s. Aug.* 28, 7, and Victor of Vita, *Hist. persec.* 1, 4–7. Whether the raping of nuns by barbarians in the province of Mauretania, of which Leo I, *Ep.* 12, 8 and 11, speaks, must be attributed to the Vandals is not certain.

At the Synod of Carthage in 525 there occurred an interesting discussion on monastic canon law. In this an Abbot Peter made charges against Bishop Liberatus, Primate of Byzacena, because the bishop had subjected the abbot's monastery completely to episcopal jurisdiction and treated the monks as though they were his clerics. The Council decreed the full independence of the monastery from the bishop, especially the free election of the abbot, and stressed that the *Rule* given to the monastery by its founder was to be observed in every respect; to the bishop belonged only the right of ordination of the clerics destined for liturgical duty in the monastery. The matter came up once again for discussion at the Council of Carthage of 536, at which a Bishop Felix from Numidia stood up for the confirmation of the synodal decrees of 525.[81] Frequently in the contemporary sources there is mention of a rule or order, according to which monasteries lived. It is, of course, natural to think here of the *Rule* of Augustine, especially since the memory of Augustine was highly esteemed precisely in the African monasteries, but the question must be left open, because in the time of Fulgentius there were monasteries of varied austerity of observance.[82] However, that Augustine's spirit lingered on in African monasteries of the fifth and sixth centuries can be inferred from the interest which they displayed in the study of the Bible and in the theological discussions of the day, as for example, the monks Ferrandus and Felix proved in the Three Chapters controversy.

---

[76] Victor of Vita, *Hist. persec.* 1, 14–15; 1, 51.

[77] *Passio septem monachorum* 5 (*CSEL* 7, 109): "universa monasteria virorum vel puellarum sanctarum gentibus id est Mauris cum habitatoribus donare praecepit."

[78] A Roman Synod of 487 established the conditions for their readmittance to ecclesiastical communion: *Mansi* 7, 1056–1058, 1171–1174; see *Hefele–Leclercq* 2, 934–935.

[79] The author was the monk and Deacon Ferrandus of Carthage: *PL* 65, 117–150. Critical edition of G. Lapeyre (Paris 1929). On the year of Fulgentius's death see C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955), 300.

[80] J. J. Gavigan, op. cit., 150–153.

[81] Acts of the Synods: *Mansi* 8, 633–656, 841–842, and *Concilia Africae, CChr* 249 (Turnhout 1974), 273–275 (Council of Carthage 525); 283 (Council of Carthage 536).

A new feature was brought into the picture of African monasticism when, after the Byzantine reconquest of North Africa by Belisarius (533–34), Greek monks in flight before the Persians came to North Africa from Palestine, Syria, and Egypt, or later in consequence of the Monothelite quarrel, and settled in Proconsular Africa, where in the first half of the seventh century four Byzantine monasteries, among them a *laura* of Saint Sabas, can be demonstrated.[83] Among the most famous representatives of this monasticism were, at least for a time, the Abbots Sophronius and Thalassius, that of Saint Sabas, and Maximus Confessor. The three last-named journeyed from Africa to Rome and took part in the Lateran Synod of 649, which occupied itself with the Monothelite controversy. When the Arab invasion began around this time, North African monasticism, with the African Church, was also drawn into the ever-changing struggles for the possession of these provinces and shared with it the fate of a long but inexorable death.

---

[82] Ferrandus, *Vita s. Fulg.* 12, 63; 28, 135.

[83] On the name and location of the Byzantine monasteries, see J. J. Gavigan, op. cit., 209–214.

CHAPTER 43

Theological Discussions

The Church's Confrontation with the Arianism of the Vandals and the Goths

The confrontation was conducted on the part of the Vandals in Africa as a persecution, using all the State's means of power. This is attested by the *History of the Persecution* in the province of Africa of Bishop Victor of Vita, published in 488–89, which was of course not only a historical record but at the same time an agency of the argument. Victor aimed (3, 62) to set right all who highly esteemed the barbarians and to show that the barbarians were still barbarians and had nothing else in mind than the annihilation of all Romans; hence he identified Catholics with Romans and conversely. He closed with a prayer that God might put an end to this punishment for the sins of the Romans (3, 70), but he probably also hoped to induce the Byzantines to intervene in Africa, in which of course he did not succeed. Over and above this purpose, the work, despite its partiality, remains one of the most important sources, from which it follows that the Vandals indeed tried to gain the Catholic African population, but insisted on the rebaptism of those converted. The Roman Count Sebastian, for whom King Gaiseric personally exerted himself, rejected conversion and rebaptism thus: "As bread originates by the fact of flour's passing through water and fire, so I was baptized and cooked by the fire of the Holy Spirit. When bread is again cut up, soaked again, and baked again and in this way becomes better, then I will have myself rebaptized."[1] Here it can be ascertained that the confrontation with the Arianism of the Germans was not only a matter for theologians and pastors, but also for the laity. The possibilities for the clergy were extraordinarily limited: Gaiseric forbade not only solemn Catholic funerals with chants and hymns,[2] because he regarded them as effective propaganda, but he also received reports on the sermons of the Catholic clergy. Anyone who had spoken of Pharaoh or Nebuchadnezzar or a similar figure from the Old Testament was accused of having thereby meant the king and was sent into exile.[3] Gaiseric may have been hypersensitive, but it must be assumed that in fact sermons in this encoded manner were doing battle against the Arian ruler who was persecuting the Church. Gaiseric's successor, Hunneric, in 483 again prescribed the creed of the Synod of Rimini of 359 for North Africa, because it was, he said, really ecumenical.[4] The Vandals should be regarded not simply as Arians, but as adherents of the vague creed of Rimini, hence as Homoians. It is remarkable that King Hunneric appealed expressly to the anti-Arian legislation of the Emperors in order to use it against the Homoousians, the Catholics.[5] When the Eastern Roman Emperor Zeno interceded with Hunneric to permit again the election of a Catholic bishop for Carthage, he demanded on his part freedom of worship and of preaching for the Arian bishops at Constantinople and in the eastern provinces; otherwise, the Carthaginian clerics would be exiled. Here can be recognized, at least in its initial stages, an Arian, or, rather, an anti-Catholic Germanic ecumenical conviction, which could not but appear threatening to the Catholic Church. Thus the clergy of Carthage preferred to renounce the election of a bishop, but had to yield to the wish of the people.[6]

---

[1] Victor, *Hist. pers.* 1, 6, 19–21.

[2] Ibid. 1, 16.

[3] Ibid. 1, 27.

[4] Ibid. 3, 5.

[5] Ibid. 3, 7, and 12.

In his history of the persecution Victor included a book on the Catholic faith,[7] in which, among other things, he presented the Christology of Chalcedon, that is, the doctrine of the two natures. Hence he was aware that only at Chalcedon was the definitive reply given to Arius. However, Fulgentius of Ruspe, Victor's younger contemporary,[8] was first able to argue successfully from there. In addition to the scriptural arguments, which were known from the first Arian controversy, and were already developed in the lands of Greek speech, Victor profited from the text of the Old Latin translation. Thus he quotes from Jeremiah 9:10: "They do not hear the voice of the substance." What was meant was: "The hills no longer hear the sound of the flocks": in this way Jeremiah described the abandonment of the land of Israel, punished for its sins. In this passage Victor saw a proof that the heretical Arians, who would have nothing to do with the common substance of Father and Son, were facing damnation.[9] Apparently the Vandals in Africa called themselves Catholics, while on the other hand they labeled both Roman Catholic Christians and Donatists together as Homoousians.[10] Thus Fulgentius could argue that the word "Catholic" was no more scriptural than was *homoousios;* the Arians would have to submit to being called the Triousians.[11]

From the disciplinary measures which the Church had to adopt it appears that the struggle against Arianism was not always successful, but that many of the faithful, even clerics, let themselves be seduced to the Arian side. Thus in 487 Pope Felix II assembled at Rome a synod of the African episcopate to solve the problems of the apostates in the Vandal persecution. In his letter to the bishops of Sicily[12] he made known the outcome: higher clerics who had gone over to the Arians should do penance throughout life; lesser clerics, monks, and lay persons should spend three years among the hearers and seven more years among the penitents, and for two years they must not take part in the presentation of gifts at the altar.[13] Later, canon 9 of the Council of Lérida in Spain in 523 decreed that all who had had themselves rebaptized without compulsion might only pray for seven years among the catechumens and then two more years among the faithful before they were fully reconciled. It is noteworthy that no regulation was made there for those who had accepted rebaptism under compulsion, probably because the Visigoths in Spain did not resort to force. As a rule, the Arians, or, more correctly, the anti-Nicene Germans, insisted on the rebaptism of those converted to them. The Visigothic King Leovigild in 580 was the first to disavow this demand in order to facilitate conversions.[14] But as early as c. 500 there were in Africa Catholics who went over to the Arians without rebaptism and expressed the hope that they had not sinned so seriously and would not incur the loss of eternal salvation.[15] On the other hand, under the rule of the Catholic Clovis, who in 507 seized the greatest part of Gaul from the Arian Visigoths, there were conversions of Arian clerics. For then, canon 11 of the Council of Orléans, which met at Clovis's command in 511, decreed that they were to be restored to office through the laying on of hands of the Catholic bishop; Arian churches should be consecrated. The national Burgundian Council, which met at Epaon in 517, decided, on the contrary, in canon 33 that only such churches should again be taken into Catholic use which had been Catholic before their occupation by the Arians; the others should be thoroughly desecrated. Naturally, such decisions were possible only in the areas ruled by Catholic princes. Arian lay persons who converted to Catholicism should be admitted to the Church by anointing with chrism, which the priest might administer in cases of necessity;[16] otherwise, the bishop. Gregory of Tours reports that both in Frankish Gaul[17] and also in Spain it even happened that sometimes a new name was given to the convert.[18] Gregory the Great, however, saw the reconciliation anointing for Arians only in the East; in the West the mere imposition of hands was performed.[19] One will hardly have to reckon with a change of practice, but think of the Italian Roman custom, which Gregory regarded as general for the West.

---

[6] Ibid. 2, 2.

[7] Ibid. 2, 56–101.

[8] See infra, p. 716.

[9] Similarly, Fulgentius in his replies to King Thrasamund: *CChr* 91, line 377.

[10] Fulgentius, *Ep.* 9, 4.

[11] Replies: *CChr* 91, lines 651ff.

[12] Cf. Hefele–Leclercq 2, 2, 934f.

[13] *Mansi* VII, 1057C.

In the first third of the sixth century Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, distinguished himself in southern Gaul as the opponent of Arianism. More important than his work on the mystery of the Holy Trinity and his Breviary against heretics was without doubt the fact that, due to his influence, canon 3 of the Council of Vaison in 529 prescribed the threefold *Sanctus* for all Masses. In this way it was probably intended to express that the three divine persons are holy in the same way, that is, they are of one being; for canon 5 decreed that, as hitherto in the East, Africa, and Italy, so now also in the southern Frankish Kingdom the "as it was in the beginning, is now, and will be for ever" was to be added to the *Gloria Patri* in order to counteract the Arian "There was a time when he was not." No doubt such liturgical anti-heretical measures were especially successful and lasting. In this connection it must be mentioned that the insertion of the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople into the Mass, which had taken place at Constantinople as early as the beginning of the sixth century, represented for the West an anti-Arian measure. The Visigothic King Recared decreed, in the introduction to the Third Council of Toledo in 589 immediately after he had converted to the Catholic faith with his people, that from now on this Creed was to be recited aloud at all Masses before communion. In the Spanish Visigothic Kingdom Recared also decided, as earlier in the Frankish Kingdom of Clovis, to retain celibacy for the reception of Arian clerics into the Catholic clergy, in case they were prepared.[20] Here a new ordination seems, however, to have been required; in any event, there is mention that the "blessing of the priesthood" must be received again.

---

[14] John of Biclar, *Chronicle* 14, 2.

[15] Cf. Fulgentius, *De remissione peccatorum* 1, XXII, 1.

[16] Epaon 517, can. 16.

[17] *Hist.* IV, 27.

[18] Ibid. V, 38; cf. infra, p. 713.

[19] *Reg. Epp.* XI, 52.

True, Victor of Tunnuna[21] reported for 507 that theology, that is, the doctrine of the Trinity, was discussed at the baths, but very little is said about debates among theologians. The encounter between the African Bishop Fulgentius, banished to Sardinia but briefly recalled to Carthage, and the Arian Vandal King Thrasamund c. 515 represented an outstanding episode, which could indeed be likened to that between Ambrose and Theodosius.[22] For this occasion Fulgentius composed his still extant three-volume work for King Thrasamund.[23] A little earlier Bishop Avitus of Vienne in the southern Frankish Kingdom may have discussed the Trinity with the still Arian Burgundian King Gundobad (d. 516).[24] Of course, the situation in the Burgundian Kingdom was different from that in the African Vandal Kingdom. Avitus succeeded in converting Sigismund, son and successor of Gundobad, to the Catholic faith. It is not surprising that for the period of Justinian's wars against the Germans there were no reports of theological discussions. Then toward the end of the sixth century there was at least a report of the debate between the Catholic Bishop Masona, who, furthermore, was of Gothic descent, and the Arian Bishop Sunna under King Leovigild at Mérida.[25] But the report creates the impression of something extraordinary. Unexpectedly Masona argued in a scholastically clear and convincing manner, so that his Arian opponent Sunna could not refute him. Hence there was surprise at how philosophically and technically this bishop could debate. Unfortunately, none of his arguments has been quoted. It must probably be assumed that such discussions were not at all frequent,[26] especially since Leovigild had this one held as a theological duel over the episcopal see of Mérida.

---

[20] Second Council of Zaragoza 592, can. 1.

[21] *MGAuctant* XI, 139.

[22] Diesner, *Religionspolitik* 13.

[23] See infra, p. 716.

[24] Cf. Letter 53 of Avitus to Heraclius.

[25] *Vitae Patrum Emeritensium* 11.

Gregory of Tours reports in his historical work, completed toward the end of the sixth century, two discussions which he himself had had with Gothic Arians from Spain, no doubt in such detail because the war against Arianism was to him an important concern; however, he introduced his complete work not only with the Nicene Creed but in the foreword he refuted the Arian argument from Mark 13:32—the Son does not know the time of the end—understanding by this Son the entire Christian people. The Goth Agila, who was not a priest but an envoy of King Leovigild, proved to be quite equal to the discussion, even if Gregory judged him quite contemptible.[27] He referred to the fact that, according to John 14:28, the Father is greater than the Son, that Christ was grieved and gave up his spirit, as Matthew's gospel declares in 26:38 and 27:50, and he even included the Holy Spirit in the discussion: he was promised and sent—. . . *Promissus—missus*—hence he is less than Father and Son. Gregory tried to argue from the miserable end of Arius, but drew from Agila the deserved rebuff: another's religion must never be ridiculed; the Arians did not do so; rather they permitted everyone the freedom to honor even a pagan sacrificial shrine by a bow of the head.[28]

The discussion with Oppila in 584[29] makes known that Gothic Arianism in Spain had meanwhile changed. Oppila professed himself to be orthodox—Father, Son, and Spirit are *unius virtutis*—and participated in the Mass but without communicating. But afterward Gregory took him to task, for he declared that he had stopped short because of the *Gloria Patri.* Glory must be given to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. In this Gregory recognized him as a heretic and discussed at length but without success, in order to convince him of the correctness of the Catholic formula: "Glory to the Father and the Son . . ." If the report[30] is included that the Arian Visigothic King Leovigild began to pray in Catholic churches and stated that the Son is *aequalis*

---

[26] This is the view of Díaz y Díaz, *Settimane* . . . V, 185.

[27] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* V, 43.

[28] Cf. also F. J. Dölger, *AuC* 6, 69f.

[29] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* VI, 40.

[30] Ibid. VI, 18.

Patri but he could not recognize the Holy Spirit as God, then it is seen how thoroughgoing was the change which King Leovigild imposed at the Arian Council of 580[31]—the only one of which we know: cessation of the demand for rebaptism, recognition of the equal divinity of the Son. Nevertheless, it is surprising that the King then clung so tenaciously to the Arian form of the *Gloria Patri.* From this it probably appears that the Arians, and *a fortiori* the Arian kings who ruled their Churches, were not really concerned with theologically pondered considerations, but rather with traditions, even with liturgical forms. In any case, Leovigild, of course without intending it, had prepared the conversion of his entire nation to Catholicism, by decreeing on the whole a decisive change which, in addition, already represented the half-way point to the Nicene profession;[32] for, through it, Arianism, which lived only on the basis of the tradition, could not but be convulsed. On the other hand, through this deep intrusion into dogma and ecclesiastical discipline, Leovigild must have prepared the supremacy of the later Catholic kings over the Church, especially since one must reckon with the fact that among the bishops of the Third Council of Toledo in 589, at which King Recared acted so authoritatively, were some who had taken part in Leovigild's Arian Synod of 580 but had meanwhile become Catholics.

Special doctrinal discussions of course occurred on the occasion of the marriages of princes, as, for example, when c. 565 the Arian Visigothic Princesses Brunhildis and Galswintha went from Spain as wives of two Frankish kings and were converted as a result of "the preaching of the bishops and the urgings of the kings," professed the Holy Trinity, and were anointed with chrism.[33] It is interesting that in the reverse case, that is, when a Catholic Frankish princess, Ingundis, came to Spain as the wife of an Arian Visigothic prince, Hermenegild, Gregory attributed the preaching to her. She thereby brought it about that Hermenegild became a Catholic, received the anointing with chrism, and in this connection even received a new name, John.[34] Gregory had little sympathy for anything Gothic, in fact for anything Spanish. Thus he did not mention the activity of Bishop Leander of Seville, which was of importance for Hermenegild's conversion, but only the admonition which the Bishop of Agde imported through Ingundis as she was en route.[35] For him, just as for Gregory the Great, it was Hermenegild who rebelled against his father and was finally murdered in prison, a martyr. On the contrary, the Catholic Spanish writers of the seventh century did not speak of Hermenegild's conversion but only of his alliance with the Greeks and his revolt against the legitimate King Leovigild.[36] Thus did the judgment change quickly through the elimination of the Arian controversy. If Gregory of Tours also apparently had an interest in extolling the Franks and hence also the Frankish Princess Ingundis who had gone to Spain to be married, there is no need to doubt the authenticity of the reports on her steadfastness and her religious formation. Despite the threats and blows of her mother-in-law, who even had her thrown into the Arian baptismal font in an effort to force her rebaptism, she declared in Spain: "It is sufficient that I was once cleansed of original sin by the healing bath of baptism and professed the Holy Trinity in one equality."[37] Ingundis's resolution may have contributed to King Leovigild's abandoning of the demand for rebaptism.[38] From the conduct of the three princesses, from the intervention of Leovigild and similar procedures in Vandal Africa, it may be concluded that Catholic Christianity developed an individual denominational moral sense among the newly converted German peoples, whereas Arian Christianity continued to be determined by the principles of the German *comitatus.*

---

[31] John of Biclar, *Chronicle* 14, 2.

[32] Cf. K. F. Stroheker, "Leovigild" in id., *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zurich-Stuttgart 1965), 134–191, especially 174ff.

[33] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* IV, 27.

[34] Ibid. V, 38.

[35] Ibid. IX, 24.

The struggle against Arianism, however, easily operated to the other extreme. King Chilperic, who also on other occasions showed himself to be quite pretentious, composed a dogmatic decree on the Trinity and intended to oblige all bishops to it.[39] Gregory of Tours at once recognized that in it Sabellianism was merely undergoing a revision, but only the Bishop of Albi was able to dissuade the King from his plan, which in any event had to be fitted into the total confrontation with Arianism. At the time a good share of this argument was borne by lay people, probably even by lay people of nonnoble rank, even if detailed accounts of this are lacking. Thus the merit for the overcoming of Arianism belongs not only to the outstanding figures among bishops and theologians, but to the totality of the Roman Catholic faithful.

The Arian German domination in North Africa and Italy, which had experienced in the sixth century a development working in the opposite direction, in the sense that the Vandals moved from intolerance to a certain toleration in regard to Catholics, whereas in the Kingdom of Theodoric the Great the converse was true,[40] ended in both cases in the middle of the sixth century in Justinian's reconquest. The Visigoths' Arian domination in Spain, which had been rather tolerant until c. 580, but then for a short time under Leovigild had exerted pressure on the Catholics, became Catholic under King Recared in 586, so that toward the end of the sixth century Arianism could really have been overcome everywhere if the Lombards had not produced a certain epilogue. It cannot be determined exactly what, as regards faith, they really brought with them to Italy; it is certain that many of them were still pagans, but they appeared not as persecutors of the Catholics but rather as brutal warriors.[41] Religiously and ecclesiastically, the Lombards, though masters of Italy, felt themselves overcome by the people they ruled. True, under the Lombard King Rothari, hence in the second quarter of the seventh century, there was in many a city of Italy besides the Catholic also an Arian bishop,[42] but we hear nothing about theological controversies. From c. 640 to 680 the Lombards converted to Catholicism, something that was facilitated for them by the circumstance that the Catholic Church was in opposition to Byzantium either because of the quarrel over the Three Chapters[43] or because of the Monothelite controversy,[44] so that they did not have to accept the religion of their political opponents.[45]

---

[36] Krusch-Levison, Gregory of Tours, *MGSS rer. Mer.,* p. 244, note 3.

[37] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* V, 38.

[38] See supra, p. 713.

[39] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* V, 44.

[40] Diesner, op. cit., 5 and 19.

What the Catholic writers transmit does not permit us to assume a very high theological level among the Arians. However, some important testimonies are still extant. Thus the famed *Codex Argenteus,* which is kept at Uppsala, a Bible manuscript written with silver ink, must have been written in Italy in the time of Theodoric and is proof of a high Arian religious culture. That there were also Arians of high theological and scientific rank can be deduced from a codex which was apparently written in Italy in the sixth century by an educated Goth.[46] There is found on the wide, originally empty border of a *codex* of Ambrose, which contained the first two books *De fide* of the Bishop of Milan and the *Gesta Aquileiensia,* hence the acts of the Synod of Aquileia of 381, the *Dissertatio Maximini contra Ambrosium.* Hence the writer of the gloss attached importance to correcting the report on that Synod influenced by Ambrose by this means, that he wrote into the same *codex* the work of the Arian Maximinus against Ambrose. This theological level of Gothic Arianism may have survived the political dominance. In any event, the polemic which Bishop Agnellus of Ravenna composed c. 560 against Arianism[47] was directed against Arian Goths.

---

[41] Cf. Sestan, *Settimane* . . . V, 661.

[42] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* IV, 42.

[43] Cf. infra, p. 728.

[44] Cf. supra, p. 635.

[45] Sestan, loc. cit. V, 664.

[46] Thus Kauffmann, op. cit., XXII.

It can be ascertained in the seventh century that the Bishop of Pavia was directly subject to Rome and was ordained by the Roman Bishop, even though Pavia really belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Milan. This case is the earliest exemption of a bishop in the West, in fact the only one at all until the eleventh century.[48] True, the royal Lombard residence was probably supposed to be especially honored, but this arrangement occurred as a result of the Arian quarrel. At Pavia apparently the Catholic succession had died out at the beginning of the seventh century, but then the Arian bishop became a Catholic: he had announced his conversion to the Roman Bishop and was received by him.[49]

Accomplishment and progress, but at the same time also endangering and one-sidedness of the anti-Arian theology, which had an impact on the future and to a degree even today, are seen most clearly in Fulgentius. At the beginning of the sixth century bishop of the North African city of Ruspe, he was during most of his episcopate an exile in Sardinia. He stood forth not only as the greatest Latin theologian of his century, but also as the most determined and profound opponent of the anti-Nicene Homoian creed of Seleucia–Rimini upheld by the Germans. In his anti-Arian works he quoted especially Cyprian and Tertullian, hence pre-Nicene authors, but not, for example, Augustine by whom he was so strongly influenced that he could be called the abbreviated Augustine. He argued against the Germans, who had stopped on the position of the Synod of Seleucia–Rimini,[50] from the height, meanwhile achieved, of Trinitarian theology and the development of Christological dogma. Thus, for example,[51] he aimed so to speak that no one could impute to him either the idea of two Christs or the introduction of a fourth person into the Trinity. And so, in regard to this basically outdated confrontation, he had at hand the anti-Nestorian concern of the fifth century and the anti-Apollinarist concern of the fourth. Indeed, he could even expound results of the purely theological development of the Vandals, not supported by ecclesiastical definition, as necessary for salvation. This was true especially of Augustine's psyschological analogy of the Trinity, which in him is found as *memoria—intelligentia* (respectively *cogitatio* or *verbum*)—*voluntas.*[52] For example, he declared[53] against Fabian that whoever later wanted to learn the truth of the Creator himself now had to look at the picture of the Creator in the mirror of created man; through this faith one could ascent to the sight. But Fulgentius did not stop with Augustine: in some Christological questions he went far beyond him. For Augustine, the soul of the Redeemer was, as it were, the connecting link between his divinity and his humanity, so that at the moment of his death the divinity remained united only with the soul, but not with the body.[54] Fulgentius, on the contrary, repeatedly stressed the idea that the divinity of Christ remained united with the body at his death; hence at least in this point he was influenced by eastern Christology,[55] for the first to express himself clearly in this sense seems to have been Gregory of Nyssa.[56] Fulgentius championed his doctrine[57] probably not only to stress the omnipresence of the supernatural nature of Christ and from there to prove its divinity, but also to expound its incapacity to suffer, which for the anti-Nicene Germans was always unacceptable: in the biblical accounts of the Passion they found the proof of the inferior divinity of Christ.[58] Fulgentius developed at least an elementary psychology of Jesus: It was of his human soul that it was said it did not yet know the good and the evil; of it was said that it grew in wisdom and grace.[59] In this too appeared the significant progress of the Nicene position in relation to the Arian dispute of the fourth century. Even more it was the result of the Catholic Trinitarian theology, that had meanwhile become common property, that Fulgentius attributed all appearances and all supernatural effects to the entire Trinity and thus merged the divine persons to such a degree that their invocation became indistinguishable. Against the argument of the anti-Nicene Fabian, that the "Our Father" is addressed to the Father alone and the sacrifice of the Church is offered to the Father alone, hence Son and Spirit are of a lower rank, Fulgentius reacted decisively and maintained that not only the "Our Father" but also the sacrifice of the Church are directed to the entire Trinity;[60] the same applies to the prayer of the prophets; the Father alone was named so that the danger of polytheism could be avoided;[61] because the Trinity is only one substance and effects our salvation in inseparable power and goodness, it is invoked together, even under the Father's name.[62] If Fulgentius rejects the view that Exodus 3:14f. refers to the person of the Father alone, and immutable being is attributed to him alone, with the argument that it would follow from this that the Father had appeared,[63] then this sounds archaic and recalls the ideas of the apologists[64] and the pre-Nicene theology in general. Hence it was expected that the appearance would be attributed to the Son, and Fulgentius thus interprets the divine appearance: God made himself visible by means of a *creatura subiecta;* hence Exodus 3:14 must refer to the entire Trinity.[65] Of course, Fulgentius still knew that some (*aliquanti,* apparently not only anti-Nicenes) referred to the revelations of God in the Old Testament and the coming down of God to the Son:[66] but the future did not belong to this interpretation.

---

[47] Schanz, op. cit. IV, 2, 595.

[48] Bertolini, *Settimane* . . . VII, 479.

[49] Bognetti, *Settimane* . . . VII, 429.

[50] Cf. supra, pp. 47ff.

[51] *Ad Trasam.* III, 2, 1.

---

[52] *Contra Fast. CChr* 91, nos. 643, 697, 774.
[53] *Fragm.* 18, 4–6.
[54] Grillmeier, op. cit. 325f., 391f.
[55] Ibid., 283.
[56] *Antirrheticus,* c, XVII.
[57] *Ad Trasam.* III, 1 and 3; 30 and 31; *Contra Fastidiosum* 20, 4 and passim.
[58] Cf. *Ad Trasam.* III, 19.
[59] Ibid. 1, 8, 2, and III, 16, 4.
[60] *Fragm.* 31 and 34 against Fabian.

The opponents of Fulgentius also, even though they appealed to the Council of Seleucia–Rimini, did not entirely stop in the first phase of the theological discussion of the Trinity, but included the question of the Holy Spirit with it. Fabian, for example, regarded the Holy Spirit as a subordinate essence of lesser rank, because one did not pray for his coming but that he be sent.[67] Hence here an argument from the prayer practice of the Church was opposed to the argument from the baptismal form, usual on the Catholic side, for the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The sending of the Holy Spirit, however, according to Fulgentius, could not be compared to the sending of the angels, as Fabian did it;[68] the Spirit is regarded rather as sent by Father and Son for this reason[69] that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, *a patre filioque procedit.*[70] Hence the later disputed *Filioque* had at least an anti-Arian root. But the procession gives to the Holy Spirit an entirely special rank. While essence of begotten or born can be transmitted from the one Son to the many adoptive sons, procession applies only to the Holy Spirit and cannot be stated of any creature.[71] Fabian had appealed for the lesser divinity of the Son to this, that man was created according to his image, hence according to that of the Son. But Fulgentius insisted that man is an image of the entire Trinity.[72] Without quoting the Augustinian analogy of the Trinity, he betrayed how very much he was dependent on it in this passage. But this meant, on the one hand, that only the intellectual part of human nature is understood as the image of God, namely memory—understanding—love, as representation of Father, Word, and Spirit, and, on the other hand, that, without this being intended, the relation of God to man is no longer a personal relation but appears as a natural reflection. Each has considerable consequences for Christian morality and piety in so far as, on the one side, the entire Trinity is, as the one substance, the one addressed in prayer and sacrifice,[73] and, on the other side, no positive importance can any longer be assigned to sexuality, for example.[74] Of course, the ideas of Fulgentius and of the other Catholic defenders of Nicaea were not so much pushed in this direction by original hostility to the body as rather by the insight that all statements about God can be made only in analogy. On the contrary, the opponents of Nicaea wished to imagine the divine as they imagined the human.[75] Indeed, Fulgentius blamed them for expressing thoughts of flesh and blood, which cannot inherit the Kingdom of God (cf. 1 Cor. 15:50). Such argumentation no doubt made an impression, but it confused the requirement which must be placed on philosohical thought with the New Testament requirement of penance and conversion.

---

[61] Ibid. 29, 18 and 19.

[62] *Fragm.* 30, 5.

[63] *Ad Trasam.* III, 10, 3.

[64] Cf. for example, Justin, *First Apology* 63, 10ff.

[65] *Ad Trasam.* III, 11, 1.

[66] Ibid. II, 10, 2.

[67] Cf. *Fragm.* 29, 14, against Fabian.

[68] *Fragm.* 28, 1.

[69] *Fragm.* 29, 18.

[70] *Fragm.* 19, 18 and passim, 27, 7.

[71] *Fragm.* 27, 8.

To the former Catholic monk, then Arian priest Fastidiosus, who thought that it would follow from the indivisibility of the Trinity that it had been born together, suffered together, and so forth,[76] Fulgentius replied with the aid of Chalcedonian Christology: Just as in Christ there are not two persons, although the special character of each of the two natures persists, so too the assumption of human nature was not common to the entire Trinity.[77] In this connection attention must be directed to a significant weakness of Fulgentius's theology, which clearly called for compensation. Although the unity of the person of the Redeemer was for Fulgentius an established theological possession, just as the duality of natures, it must be stated that he had no concept of person in the sense of personality, but understood *persona* almost as something natural: God suffered in the Man, because the person of God and of the Man is only one; God did not suffer with the Man, because the substance of God and of Man is not blended in the one Christ.[78] Because of the unity of the person, Scripture attributes suffering to the Son of God, but the divinity of Christ itself, which suffered for us according to the flesh, must be regarded as immortal and incapable of suffering.[79] Hence not the person is the subject, but the divinity of Christ. Finally, Fulgentius could even draw a parallel between the person-unity of God and Man in Christ, which signifies suffering and resurrection of the Son of God, with the nature-unity of Father and Son, in consequence of which the sacrifice of the Son by the Father is at the same time a self-sacrifice of the Son.[80] If, however, he says that both priest and also sacrificial gift are accomplishments and names of Christ's human nature[81] or the total Man offered himself or employed his soul respectively,[82] then the humanity in the Redeemer appears almost as an autonomous subject alongside the divinity of Christ. Thus Fulgentius comes suspiciously close to Nestorianism, because he lacks Cyril of Alexandria's doctrine of appropriation, that the Son of God made the flesh his very own with all its sufferings, and he also thought that in the anti-Arian opposition he had to insist that the entire Trinity is the subject of the sacrifice. Nevertheless, he there succeeded, where he renounced the concepts of nature and person, in expressing himself not only as authentically Cyrillan but as completely orthodox in the sense of the Universal Church, by employing the slogan of Cyril, "one and the same," adopted by Chalcedon. One and the same Christ experienced in the humanity what was of man, but in the divinity he remained incapable of suffering and immortal.[83]

---

[72] *Fragm.* 21, 3.

[73] Cf. supra, p. 718.

[74] Cf. doctrine of original sin, infra, p. 724.

[75] *Cogitare divina sicut cogitat humana: Fragm.* 28, 16, against Fabian.

[76] *Sermo Fast.,* no. 4.

[77] *Contra Fast.,* no. 12. Diesner (*Fulgentius,* 54) finds the invectives of Fulgentius against Fastidiosus merely painful. He probably understood them as expression of the conviction frequently expressed in the struggle against heretics, that heretics are morally inferior. Fulgentius's claim that the monk and priest Fastidiosus had fallen into impurity and had lived in it for two years and regarded himself as fortunate until he died apparently pretty early (*Contra Fast.,* 21, 1, and 22, 1) seems to show a knowledge of the facts. Perhaps there was question here of a monk who among other things had gone over to "Arianism" in order to marry and still remain a priest. Thus this case belongs to the history of celibacy; on the other hand, it makes clear that the Catholics had to do not only with Vandals who spoke Latin poorly but also with converted Latins.

The discussion of the idea that Christ suffered in his supernatural nature[84] led Fulgentius to claim that Christ assumed a rational soul with its *passiones* for the purpose of freeing our souls from all *passiones*.[85]

---

[78] *Ad Trasam* III, 18, 3.

[79] Ibid. III, 27, 2.

[80] Ibid. III, 32, 2.

[81] Ibid. III, 30, 5.

[82] Ibid. III, 18, 1.

[83] Ibid. III, 28, 3.

[84] Ibid. III, 19.

[85] Ibid. 21, 1.

There redemption is interpreted very one-sidedly, more Stoically than biblically. Hence the biblicism of the Arians evoked in the Catholics a moving away from the Bible in the direction of philosophical positions. This also operated exactly as one-sidedness in the theology of the Trinity. While the Nicenes of Serdica in 343 had still conceded that the Father is greater than the Son precisely on the basis of the name of Father, for Fulgentius the Son is subordinate to the Father only as the Incarnate One;[86] indeed, the Father must not even be placed before the Son.[87] Thus anti-Arianism led to the complete leveling of the theology of the economy of the Trinity.

A similar one-sidedness can be ascertained in the image of the Church: the true Church is characterized almost only by the faith in a Trinity undivided in substance;[88] the saving faith seems to be only the profession of God one in substance.[89] The proclamation of God's saving work in the historical Jesus moves into the background. For his ecclesiology, Fulgentius relied on Cyprian,[90] but for Cyprian there was outside the Church, the one Mother, absolutely nothing worth recognizing, Christian, endowed with grace. Fulgentius, however, as heir of the Augustinian anti-Donatism, sought the following compromise: The Church as Mother is like Sarah, and the schismatic or heretical communities are to be compared to her maid. The children of the maid could also be saved, if they came to the true Mother; only then is the truth of the paternal seed of use to them, namely, baptism administered validly in heresy.[91] However, it appears there when membership in the Church determines the effectiveness of the true divine gift of grace, when the Church stands above God or at least closer to the feeling of the believer or to the theological thinker. Thus this greatest theologian of the West in the sixth century is a proof of how fateful on the one side was an antiheretical position, especially then when the development of theology had proceeded beyond this controverted point, and on the other side how necessary was the acceptance of the total achievement of the past generations of theologians.

In fact, within Catholic piety and Catholic expressions of faith after the conclusion of the confrontation with the Arianism of the Germans, there are found remnants of this struggle which to a degree last to this day.[92] The Spanish Liturgy especially displayed the effort again and again to stress the equal divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit. That the language of prayer glides and it is often unclear which divine person is meant seems to be intention rather than carelessness. Something similar, if softened, could be found in the Gallic Liturgy. But the fact that the Spanish Bishop Braulio of Zaragoza (d. 651) spoke of the Creator Christ the Lord[93] has in this connection not received the importance that similar expressions of Gregory the Great have. For example, in his seventh Sermon on Ezekiel 1–3 (no. 2) he called Christ both Judge and Creator; Christ is our Maker (*auctor noster,* ibid., no. 4); Christ is Maker and Redeemer of the human race (ibid., no. 12); Christ is the Creator of all, even of the angels (ibid., no. 19); Christ is the *sublimis Deus,* of whom there is mention in Ezekiel (ibid. 8, 2); Christ is the ever active God, who inwardly infuses grace, while outwardly he draws man to himself. Indeed, just where Gregory stressed against Pelagius that we can do any good only on the basis of the Lord's gift (ibid. 9, 2) it was clear that he was thinking of Christ as God. And so his viewpoint, also in this connection, was more strongly anti-Arian than anti-Pelagian. This even appeared when Gregory forbade Bishop Desiderius of Vienne to teach grammar, because praise of Jupiter could not have place together with praise of Christ in one and the same mouth.[94] Hence Gregory instinctively opposed Jupiter, the pagans' supreme god, not to God the Father, but to Christ. Since Gregory, with his letters, homilies, and scriptural exegesis was of such importance for all of medieval devotion, it is not surprising if this outlook was disseminated: the *Heliandlied,* for example, was entirely influenced by it. Perhaps that custom of our age still simply to call the Crucified One the Lord God—compare "carving of the Lord God," "shrine of the Lord God"—is a final offshoot of that anti-Arian exertion to stress the divinity of Christ by every means. In any event, it must be affirmed that the Western Church was never so enduringly influenced by any dispute as by the struggle with Arianism. The two controversies still to be treated were rather episodes.

---

[86] *Contra Fast.,* 8, 1.

[87] *Nec praeferendus:* response: *CChr.* 91, line 614.

[88] *Remiss. peccat.* I, 22, 2.

[89] Ibid. I, 21, 7.

[90] Ibid. I, 21, 1.

[91] Ibid. I, 23, 1.2.

The Semipelagian Quarrel

Fulgentius, concerning whom there was detailed mention in the framework of the dispute with Arianism,[95] was also the one who completed the Augustinian doctrine of grace. With a view to the so-called Semipelagians, that is, those theologians such as the monk John Cassian and Bishop Faustus of Riez in southern Gaul, who had understood man's desire for salvation as the achievement of his own will and predestination simply as the result of God's foreknowledge, and whose view had prevailed at Gallic synods after 470, Fulgentius defended Augustine by pushing his doctrine to its most extreme consequences even if he did not overstate it. In Augustine are found contradictions, but not in Fulgentius. Augustine corrected himself several times—in his sermons he frequently withdrew, even quite far, from the theses which he upheld in his polemics. Fulgentius, however, came with inexorable logic, without letting himself relent through any sort of consideration, to the following chief doctrines.

---

[92] Cf. also J. A. Jungmann, "Die Abwehr des germanischen Arianismus und der Umbruch der religiösen Kultur im frühen Mittelalter," *Liturgisches Erbe und pastorale Gegenwart* (Innsbruck 1960) 3–86, especially 41 and 52ff.

[93] *Ep.* 20, cf. Jungmann, op. cit., 41f., notes 40 and 41.

[94] *Reg. Epp.* XI, 34. The study of grammar was actually not possible without the study of ancient pagan texts, always religiously colored.

[95] See supra, p. 716.

The guilt of our first parents was transmitted through procreation.[96] All men are unworthy of salvation and sentenced to damnation.[97] The free will is fundamentally incapable of turning itself to the good.[98] The grace of God is absolutely necessary to begin every meritorious work, to continue it, to bring it to a good end.[99] The grace of God is absolutely unearned, all are undeserving of it, it is granted to men through pure mercy and in accord with God's discretion.[100] God does not look at the future works of men to predestine them for heaven,[101] but only to predestine them for eternal punishment.[102] God's salvific will is universal (1 Tim. 2:4) only in so far as men are selected from all nations, all classes, and all ages.[103] Children dying without baptism are condemned to eternal punishments.[104] When it was objected to him that not only is baptism necessary for salvation, but also the eating and drinking of the Lord's body and blood, Fulgentius could thus interpret the reception of the Eucharist: Because all Christians are the one body of the Lord, one participates in this body at the moment when one is added to it, that is, baptized.[105] Hence baptism bestows all that is the content of the Eucharist.

For the rest, it is not the sacrament of baptism as such which grants deliverance from sin, but children are freed by means of the profession of others, since they are also bound by the chain of the unrighteousness of others. They are cleansed when others utter the spirit-filled profession, since they are also tainted by the carnal intercourse of others.[106] Hence, because children are destined by the agency of others for condemnation in a twofold manner—through the origin and the transmission of sin—they can also be externally destined for salvation through the faith and the profession of others. Hence, on the one hand, the sacrament is here spiritualized and made relative, and, on the other hand, *carnalis concubitus* and *spiritualis affectus* are as equally contrasted as spirit (=grace) and flesh (=sexuality) are directly natural contrasts. This impression is confirmed if the original sin of man is understood as the loss of the soul's health (*animae sanitas*) or of the garment of faith (*vestimentum fidei*), so that carnal desires inflict wounds on man.[107] It seems to be forgotten here that the sin of Adam consisted in the wish to be like God, not that the flesh gained the upper hand. But this is not the only one-sidedness which can be ascertained in this great disciple and executor of the testament of Augustine. He interpreted the redemption so consistently as a new creation that man could contribute nothing at all to it,[108] and God's salvific action had to precede in time every act proper to man. This constraint in the time-scheme and this clearly natural, indeed material, understanding of the power of sin and the grace of redemption did not facilitate an agreement with the opponents of such an excessively consistent Augustinianism; these doctrines were not then adopted unreservedly by the Universal Church, although Fulgentius was regarded in the whole of Christendom as the expert in the theology of grace, and people applied to him from Constantinople itself.[109]

---

[96] *Verit. praedest.* I, 4.5.

[97] Ibid. 7.

[98] Ibid. II, 5.

[99] Ibid. II, 13.

[100] *De fide* 33 and 34.

[101] *Verit. praedest.* III, 4.5.

[102] *Ad Monimum* I, 24.

[103] *Verit. praedest.* III, 15.

[104] *De fide* 70. On the whole: G. G. Lapeyre, *St. Fulgence de Ruspe* (Paris 1929), 271f.

[105] *Ep.* 12, 24, *ad Ferrandum.*

Fulgentius maintained that the eternal punishment of sinners was fair because they did not even wish to stop sinning, indeed they took more pleasure in the sin than in life;[110] however, he also regarded it as freely decided by God that pardon took place only here on earth, and thereafter only punishment; God could have decided otherwise, but he did not wish to.[111] The eternity of the punishment seemed to Fulgentius to be such a concern that it falsified his exegesis. Thus for him the sentence from the Sermon on the Mount, "You will not come out until you have paid the last penny" (Matt. 5:26), curiously became a proof for the unending pains of hell.[112] The fact that he so understood the resurrec-

[106] Ibid. 12, 18.
[107] *Ep.* 17, 26.
[108] Ibid. 17, 39.
[109] Cf. *Epp.* 16 and 17.
[110] *Remiss. peccat.* II, XXI, 3.
[111] Ibid. II, XX, 2.
[112] Ibid. II, V, 1.

tion of the dead that only the just acquired a transformed and transfigured body, while sinners, on the contrary, received a perishable one, capable of suffering,[113] was of course not his fault but the fault of the textual development, which had turned 1 Corinthians 15:51, "We will not all fall asleep, but all will be changed" into "We will all indeed rise, but not all will be changed."

As much as the emphasizing of grace and hence of the all-causality of God served to make man humble and take from him all pride, for example for ascetical achievements, so too, an unprecedented claim to authority could flow precisely from this. Thus Fulgentius declared that he intended to write to Euthymius in regard to the forgiveness of sins whatever God suggested to him; it is then necessary for salvation to say that exactly; but then the addressee must accept it.[114] But at least equally dangerous is the plain application of the doctrine of predestination to one's own experience, especially if it went hand-in-hand with antiheretical polemic. Thus it is said in Fulgentius's biography (XXI, 46), which came from one of his pupils and displayed his spirit, that the Arian Vandal King Thrasamund did not let himself be convinced by Fulgentius, because "he was not predestined to salvation." Later Gregory of Tours distinguished according to this standard between Arian Goths and Catholic Franks and regarded the possession of Gaul as proof of the divine favor for the Franks.[115] As much as the intervention of Fulgentius on behalf of the Augustinian theology of grace was a necessary reply to Semipelagianism, which had again established all of salvation, with the *initium fidei* as its basis, on the will of man itself, just as little could this theology be the last word in the question. The Universal Church followed Fulgentius less than Gregory the Great, or, at first, Caesarius of Arles respectively.

Caesarius of Arles, the somewhat younger contemporary of Fulgentius, had, in the conflict with Semipelagianism, not thought so one-sidedly of Augustine's doctrine as final, but, so to speak, had reduced it to the degree generally tolerable to the Church. Since the condemnation of Pelagius, it was the conviction of the entire Church that God's grace is necessary for every meritorious work. But it seemed, especially to some monastic circles, not only in Africa but also in southern Gaul, that human free will was abolished by Augustine's doctrine; by means of the theology of Fulgentius, such suspicions were even strengthened. Freedom seemed to be maintained only if at least the beginning of conversion, the first step to faith, was understood as the accomplishment of the human will itself. Even if especially Bishop Faustus of Riez, who had earlier been a monk on the island of Lérins, had expressed himself in this sense as early as the fifth century, this so-called Semipelagianism must still not be regarded as the characteristic attitude of mind of the island monastery, for Caesarius, who helped Augustine to victory against Semipelagianism, remained to the end of his life entirely under the stamp of Lérins. Of course we do not have from Caesarius a theological treatment of the problem, as we do from Fulgentius. But the expressions frequently coming from his pen, such as "with God's help" or "if the Lord grants it," make known that, like Augustine, he was convinced of the necessity of God's grace for beginning, continuing, and completing every good work.[116] To the hearers of his sermons Caesarius did not appear to suggest any Pelagian or Semipelagian errors; in any event, he rather saw himself compelled to take a stand against those who denied the freedom of the human will, Manichaeans and astrologers (*Mathematici*).[117] The will was so important for him because it could directly substitute for the external good work: fasting and almsgiving are doubly good; almsgiving alone is meritorious; fasting alone, without alms, is not meritorious, because it is, as it were, only a form of thrift, that is, of concern for self. But to one who has nothing at all from which he can give alms good will suffices, that is: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will." Sermon 199, in which these statements are found (Chapter 2), was regarded as the most widely read of all Caesarius's sermons, and this fact was surely no mere accident. It is shown in this, that the popular preaching tended rather to moralize than that the height of the Augustinian theology of grace could maintain itself. True, Augustine refers the words from the angelic hymn of Luke 2:14, which characteristically do not appear in his early anti-Pelagian writings, to the human will in the work *On Grace and Free Will* (2,4), but he there understood them entirely as the gift of God, not as the least achievement of man, as Caesarius did. Caesarius took pains to rework, in the Augustinian sense,[118] the material for his sermons, which he took wherever he found it, for example, in Faustus of Riez or in the collected sermons of the so-called Eusebius Gallicanus, but there still remained in his model sermons expressions such as would probably never have come from Augustine's lips. Our God feeds (*pascitur*) not on the abundance of alms but on the good will (*benevolentia*) of the giver, appears in *Sermo* 197, 4, which depended extensively on Faustus; indeed, Caesarius could even so express himself as though man had to care quite alone for his eternal salvation. In *Sermo* 198, 2, he indeed said that the soul is fed by the food of the Word of God, but he then explained: "If we each year fill barns, granaries, and cellars so that our body may have food for a year, how much must we then lay aside so that our soul may have suppport for eternity."

---

[113] Ibid. II, XI and XII, and *De fide* 37 and 72.

[114] *Remiss. peccat.* I, III, 1.

[115] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* II, 37.

---

[116] Delage, *SChr* 175 (1970), 192f.

[117] Ibid., 145.

[118] Cf. ibid., 109, note 2.

In the discussion with his colleagues, Caesarius put the accent differently. At the Synod of Valence in 528 he was attacked because of his standing up in principle for Augustine. It was characteristic of him that he did not compose a polemic against this Synod but turned to the Roman See. "A few (*pauca*) chapters" came from there as his answer, which he himself designated as extracts from Holy Scripture made by the Fathers.[119] Caesarius submitted them to a synod of his suffragans at Orange in July 529, which adopted them as their own. In regard to form, these *capitula* appeared with surprisingly little claim to authority. True, the first eight, which deal with original sin (1 and 2) and grace (3 to 8), are presented in the form of canons, beginning with "if anyone . . .," but they do not end with anathemas but with judgments such as: "contradicts the Prophet Isaiah" or "resists the Holy Spirit." It was the two chief errors of Pelagius—that only the body of man, not also the soul, was injured by sin, and Adam hurt only himself, not his posterity—that were shown to be contrary to Scripture. Then there was question principally of expounding that God does not await the decision of the human will for the good, that he not only increases faith but also grants the *initium fidei,* indeed even the devout desire for faith (canon 5); that his grace precedes every good human impulse (canon 6); that the nature of man, of itself, with the enlightenment and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is capable of no good work deserving of salvation (canon 7). Hence here was made a sharp separation between every supernatural salvific activity and every natural thing unimportant for salvation. And this is true not only of a part of men, so that some would be saved only by grace, others by the decision of their own will, but of all (canon 8).

Canons 9–25 present extracts from the propositions from the works of Augustine that had been collected by Prosper of Aquitaine. In some passages the harmony is not perfect, but essential modification probably cannot be established. The choice is, of course, characteristic; there is found no single expression on predestination or on perseverance in good. Of course, this is not due to Caesarius but probably to that Roman cleric who had made the selection from the Augustinian *florilegium.* Nevertheless, this selection agrees with the views of

---

[119] Denzinger–Schönmetzer, 370ff.

Caesarius. In any event, he emphatically stressed in his accompanying letter the necessity of the prevenient divine grace and the incapacity of human nature to acquire salvation of itself.[120] It was his desire to stress, however, that with the aid of Christ's grace the faithful should and could fulfill what was necessary for the soul's salvation. He came to speak of predestination only in the sense that he angrily rejected the idea that some are predestined by the divine omnipotence to evil. Of course, neither Augustine nor his overly consistent pupil Fulgentius had claimed that. The question to what extent predestination may and must be spoken of was not answered by the Second Council of Orange. Besides, even though Caesarius had requested and obtained from Pope Boniface II an express confirmation, in which divine grace, preceding every good work, was again emphasized,[121] it very soon fell into oblivion and was not again brought to light until the discussions of the Council of Trent. But Gregory the Great followed Augustine, on whom he extensively depended, only so far as did the Council of Orange, and thus showed that the Roman tradition, as whose expression it must be understood, had maintained itself.[122]

The Quarrel over the Three Chapters

The decree by which the Emperor Justinian I condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia, the anti-Cyrillan writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and the letter of Ibas to Mari[123] evoked a powerful rejection in the entire Western Church. The sharpest and most detailed repudiation of the imperial decree was the work of the African Bishop Facundus of Hermiane in his *Defense of the Three Chapters.* Although he was clear as to the authorship, he declared that he did not wish to regard Justinian as the author, because in it he discovered a contradiction of the faith already professed by the Emperor. Indeed, in accord with 1 Peter 2:17, one must fear God and honor the king. Thus, out of fear of God, he would refute what contradicted the Church of Christ but, out of honor for the king, not charge to the king the views he had to combat but charge them to the Eutychians, who had merely used the awe-inspiring imperial name (*terror personae*).[124]

Facundus knew he was in agreement with Justinian in this, that on the one hand one must profess as a definition against both Nestorians and Eutychians that one of the Trinity was crucified for us, and on the other hand that Mary is truly and really called Mother of God. But it must still be added—he apparently missed this in Justinian—that the same Lord Jesus Christ exists in two natures, that is, that divinity and humanity are not diminished in him.[125] True, Facundus occupied himself essentially with questions of form in order to show that the Three Chapters should not have been condemned, but he also offered a few noteworthy reflections of theological content. Thus in John 1:14 he found an adequate scriptural argument against Nestorians as well as Eutychians and their Apollinarist ancestors: "The Word became flesh" designated the one person, because the same one, who is God-Word, became Man; "he dwelt among us" shows that the two natures remain, because another is the one that indwells, and another is the one that serves as the dwelling.[126] Despite this Johannine perspective, Facundus declared that one comes through the humanity of Christ to the knowledge of his divinity,[127] and thereby expressed a basic rule always valid for theology and faith, even if often not sufficiently observed.

---

[120] Ibid., 396.
[121] Ibid., 398.
[122] Cf. infra, p. 748.
[123] Cf. supra, p. 450.
[124] *Defens.* II, 1, 3.

Facundus did not think that the Eutychians would really return to the communion of the Church when the Three Chapters had been condemned.[128] The attack on the Three Chapters would not succeed in freeing Chalcedon from the charge of pro-Nestorianism and thus make it acceptable to the Eutychians, but only in burdening it and fighting it. If it was a question of the defense of Cyril, then people would also have to attack, for example, Isidore of Pelusium and Gennadius of Constantinople and others, who had expressed themselves harshly in regard to Cyril.[129] Later the subsequent Pope Pelagius I also adopted this idea in his work, likewise called *Defense of the Three Chapters,* composed while he was still a deacon. He followed Facundus also in this argument: if praise of Cyril were the sole criterion of Orthodoxy, then the Eutychians would have to be considered orthodox.[130] But in his argumentation Facundus surely went too far when he claimed that the letter of Ibas should not now be condemned because it had been approved at Chalcedon. No synodal verdict was issued at Chalcedon on this letter any more than on the works of Theodoret, but there was question there of the person of the two bishops just mentioned, namely, whether they might be recognized as full participants in the synod and retain their episcopal sees.[131] Later it was declared on the part of Rome, in order to

[125] Ibid. I, 2, 15, 16.

[126] Ibid. VI, 4, 1–3.

[127] Ibid. VII, 7, 6.

[128] Ibid. I, 2, 6–8.

[129] Ibid. II, 1, 2; II, 4, 1ff. and 12ff.

[130] Ibid. VI, 2, 2ff.

[131] Cf. Duchesne, op. cit., 224f.

reconcile the Fifth Council with that of Chalcedon, that at Chalcedon there was question of the sessions of an ecumenical council only to the sixth session inclusively, hence only so long as the imperial commissioners supervised the agenda; the rest, in which Theodoret and Ibas had been rehabilitated, were not binding and were also not approved by Pope Leo.[132]

One will perhaps not agree with Facundus, but still show a certain admiration for the keenness of mind with which he defended the letter of Ibas. Since Ibas attacked Cyril only because of an Apollinarist opinion imputed to him, but then praised him because of his alleged conversion from Apollinarist error, a condemnation of the letter of Ibas means nothing more than subsequently to make Cyril a Nestorian.[133] In the case of Facundus, as of almost all opponents of the Second Council of Constantinople and moreover of the opponents of the Three Chapters—later theology has to a great extent adopted this simple legacy—a defect in historical reflection must be ascertained, when he wanted, for example, to defend Theodore of Mopsuestia with the allusion that he had been praised by such orthodox teachers as John Chrysostom and Gregory Nazianzen:[134] Theodore outlived both of them long enough to have been able to fall into serious errors. On the other hand, one insight of Facundus is perhaps still helpful today: the Church Fathers, who illuminated us like heavenly lights, often suffered eclipses exactly like these, namely, when they had controversies among themselves which we cannot understand and approve.[135]

That Facundus, however, toward the end of his work,[136] tried to reduce *ad absurdum* the strivings for union as they were being pushed in the East, especially by the Emperor Zeno, by the fact that he declared that where one God is, there can be only one Church and not, for example, different communities of the same Church, may indeed seem logical, but it causes one to suspect an inflexibility in the discussions, which then brought no honor to the Christian name in the course of Church history. Facundus himself in fact remained inexorably consistent; Pope Pelagius, on the contrary, who as a deacon had definitely championed the Three Chapters, but then had probably realized that Chalcedon had not been denigrated by the Council of 553, perhaps also by the hint that he was the only one under consideration as a successor for Vigilius, had been moved to a change of position,[137] but had to let himself be reviled by the irreconcilable Africans, especially by Facundus, as *nekrodioktes*—persecutor of the dead—because he had accepted the condemnation of the long dead Theodore of Mopsuestia. In this connection, Pelagius in his great profession of faith, which he made on his assumption of office at Rome, passed over Theodore in silence but expressly defended the persons of Theodoret and Ibas.

---

[132] Thus in a letter probably of the deacon Gregory, the future Pope, to Bishop Elias of Aquileia: *Reg. Epp.*, Appendix III, 1; *MGEp* II, 463.

[133] *Defens.* VI, 4, 13–15.

[134] Ibid. VII, 7, 21ff. and 28ff.

[135] Ibid. VI, 5, 32, 33.

[136] Ibid. XII, 4, 18.

Most strongly compromised was, of course, the memory of Pope Vigilius. Occasionally he incurred a plain *damnatio memoriae,* even there where his papal decisions remained in force. Thus the First Council of Braga in Galicia of 561 appealed four times to the letter of Vigilius to Profuturus of Braga in canons 4 and 5, but without mentioning Vigilius by name, although it otherwise cited all papal decrees by the name of the author.[138]

The most significant theological achievement in the quarrel over the Three Chapters, important even for posterity, was produced by the Roman deacon Rusticus, nephew of Vigilius. He was deposed and excommunicated by the latter because of his obstinate championship of the Three Chapters, that is, because of his opposition to recognizing the Fifth Council as ecumenical, but he found refuge in a monastery of the Acemetae at Constantinople. There he compiled the Latin collection of the acts of the Council of Ephesus, which was to serve not only the purposes of documentation but as an argument in the theological debate. He himself intervened in this with great energy and deep professional knowledge. True, his work on the definitions, which he himself mentions,[139] is lost, but the chief outcome seems to have been included in the extant disputation against the Acephalae. In it[140] Rusticus offered the results of the theological discussions which he had conducted at Constantinople, at Antinoë in the Thebaid, and at Alexandria. He showed himself in these discussions to be well acquainted with the Aristotelian philosophy and with real skill developed the theological speculative argument which Boethius had made important.[141] In the theology of the Trinity, it is true, he displayed a greater obligation to eastern thought than to that of Augustine and Boethius by basing the Trinity of the divine persons not so much on relations as rather on *proprietates;*[142] but in Christology he relied on Boethius's definition of person and at the same time carried it farther. "Person" was for him not the individual substance endowed with reason, but the rational individual subsistence. In this regard he seemed to be aware that person could not be defined in opposition to nature but could at most be described. Thus the person is the coming together, *concursus,* of all that describes the rationally endowed subsistence.[143]

---

[137] Duchesne, op. cit., 228.

[138] Cf. Schäferdiek, op. cit., 125f.

[139] *PL* 67, 1238B.

[140] Cf. *Praefatio, PL* 67, 1170B.

[141] Cf. infra, pp. 736 and 738.

[142] *PL* 67, 1237C.

Surely the individual human nature of the Redeemer, considered purely in itself, that is, apart from his divinity, could appear as a person; however, the true reality does not lead to such a view, but rather to the intellectual defect, namely the forgetting of the union, that is, of divinity and humanity in Christ. But at the moment when the spirit is reminded that that which is Man in the Redeemer did not, so to speak, remain in itself, but through the union became the special property of the subsistence of God the Word, he can no longer be regarded as a person.[144] Here, while Cyril's name does not appear, his doctrine of appropriation is employed. Thus Rusticus can further declare that the humanity of the Redeemer does not belong separately to itself, as is the case with us, but is so united with God the Word that it becomes his own just like garment and tool.[145] Consequently the humanity of the Redeemer is not so much itself a subject as rather in a subject. It thereby becomes clear that for Rusticus subsistence means, beyond substantiality, the being of subject. Thus not only was a step taken beyond Boethius and that which was expressed as still missing in him,[146] but even more that Leonine formula was tacitly corrected in which the Word and the flesh of the Redeemer appear as autonomous subjects and which had aroused such anger among the Cyrillans.[147] Here it is clarified also by a Latin theologian; this clarification being gained precisely in the discussion with Cyrillans that the Redeemer is a single subject and not a composite, but that the divine person is to be regarded as the subject of the human nature. Expressed in Aristotelian terms, this means that the humanity of the Redeemer is, in comparison to God the Word, to be understood not as a subject but as an accident.[148]

The fact that Rusticus described the relation between divinity and the humanity in the Redeemer again in analogy to the relation of soul and body in man,[149] as the theology of the fourth century had already done, does not represent a relapse into pre-Ephesus methods of thought, but shows how consistently Rusticus employed the Aristotelian potency-act and matter-form schema respectively and thus at least for a moment anticipated scholastic theology, which then of course, to its own hurt, was based not so much on Rusticus as rather on the less perfect definition of person of Boethius.

---

[143] Ibid. 1238B.

[144] Ibid. 1239AB.

[145] Ibid. D.

[146] See infra, p. 738.

[147] *Agit enim utraque forma . . . quod proprium est:* Denzinger–Schönmetzer, 294.

[148] *PL* 67, 1240C, *verbatim.*

[149] Ibid. 1239D.

Consequences of the Quarrel over the Three Chapters

The quarrel over the Three Chapters produced for the ecclesiastical organization of North Italy much more decisive and enduring consequences than the exemption of the see of Pavia as a consequence of the Arian controversy.[150] On the invasion of Italy by the Lombards in 568, the Bishop of Milan transferred his seat to Genoa, where he felt safer under Byzantine protection; likewise, the Metropolitan of Aquileia fled to imperial territory, namely to the island of Grado. Both metropolitans rejected the Second Council of Constantinople—they defended the Three Chapters.[151] At first the Byzantines apparently took no offense at this. But the Bishop of Milan, since he was dependent on the Sicilian property of his Church, was very quickly induced by the Roman Bishop to recognize the Second Council of Constantinople and to condemn the Three Chapters. This led the bishopric of Como, which really belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Milan, toward the end of the sixth century, to request from Aquileia the ordination of a bishop who upheld the Three Chapters. Como then remained a suffragan of Aquileia into the thirteenth century.[152] In this it became clear that the question of the Three Chapters agitated not only the episcopate but also the clergy and people, at least those of the clergy and people who came into question as electors of a new bishop.

For the Catholic Queen Theodelinda of the still extensively pagan or, respectively, Arian Lombards, it was a matter of course from her Bavarian homeland to recognize the Three Chapters, so that she refused to accept the communion of the Bishop of Milan when she learned that he recognized the Second Council of Constantinople. Thus Gregory the Great saw himself forced to have an admonition sent to her in which he defended the Second Council of Constantinople.[153] The letter, of course, did not reach the Queen's hands; instead, the Bishop of Milan, Constantius, in whose interest, among other things, it was written, held it back because he knew that the Queen would be only more enraged by this defense of the Second Council of Constantinople. Gregory wrote the Queen another admonition,[154] in which there was no mention of the Second Council of Constantinople, and praised Bishop Constantius of Milan for his prudence.[155] Hence Gregory was prepared to overlook the schismatic agreement of Queen Theodelinda with the Three Chapters because he saw in her a strong ally for the conversion of the Lombards to the Catholic faith.[156] He also decisively defended himself against the reproach of having abandoned Chalcedon; rather, he condemned all those who had been condemned by the four Councils and recognized all who had been recognized by them. But when he declared, vis-à-vis the Bishop of Milan, that the Second Council of Constantinople, which was counted by many as the Fifth Synod, had decided nothing on the faith but only on people, about whom nothing had been said at Chalcedon, this was inexact, for the Second Council of Constantinople had very probably discussions at Chalcedon *de personis,* namely of Theodoret and Ibas.

---

[150] See supra, p. 716.

[151] See supra, pp. 728ff.

[152] Bognetti, *Settimane* . . . VII, 429.

[153] *Reg. Epp.* IV, 4.

Gregory proceeded much more decisively against Bishop Severus of Aquileia, who had been detained for a year at Ravenna by the Byzantine Exarch Smaragdus and during this time had maintained communion with the opponents of the Three Chapters, the adherents of the Second Council of Constantinople.[157] The next year he had returned to Grado, where the patriarchate had taken refuge before the Lombards, and at a synod, yielding to the urging of his suffragans, he had repudiated the Second Council of Constantinople. Gregory now ordered him, with his supporters, the bishops who like him had maintained communion at Ravenna with the adherents of the Second Council of Constantinople, to Rome in order to hold there a synod on this question.[158] From the long petitions of the ten suffragans of Aquileia living under Lombard rule to the Emperor Maurice of Byzantium it became evident that Gregory intended to have the Patriarch of Aquileia brought to Rome by police power, in regard to which he of course relied on a decision of the Emperor from the previous year.[159] It appears from the Emperor's command to Gregory[160] that Severus himself and his suffragans who were in Byzantine territory also wrote in the same sense. In this it is remarkable that these bishops did not intend to justify themselves before a synod directed by Gregory because they saw in him their antagonist, while on the other hand they hoped to gain from the Emperor a nonpartisan verdict. In the event that the Emperor did not intervene in their favor, they called to his attention that future episcopal ordinations in the ecclesiastical province of Aquileia would take place with the aid of the Gallic archbishops who were close by; this would then be to the detriment of the Church of Aquileia and to the harm of the *res publica,* hence of the Roman Empire, because thus far he ruled also churches in barbarian territory by means of the Church of Aquileia. In a pretty rough tone the Emperor commanded Gregory for the time being to leave matters alone until peace had returned to North Italy, until Byzantium had again won the upper hand. But this never happened: there was no victory of Byzantines over Lombards, but there was a change on the throne at Byzantium. Phocas toppled Maurice and exerted himself to solve the question of Aquileia in the sense of Gregory the Great. When Severus had died at Grado as Patriarch of Aquileia in 607, Phocas had Candidian, loyal to Rome, installed as bishop by the Exarch Smaragdus. The outcome was that the bishops in the area of Lombard rule repudiated this new Patriarch at Grado and in Aquileia itself—old Aquileia, as they said—elected an adherent of the Three Chapters, John, who then took his seat as Bishop of Aquileia at Cormons in Friuli; later the seat was transferred to Cividale.[161]

---

[154] Ibid. IV, 33.

[155] Ibid. IV, 37.

[156] Cf. Bognetti, *Settimane* . . . VII, 496.

[157] Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Langob.* II, 26.

[158] *Reg. Epp.* I, 16.

[159] Ibid. I, 16a.

[160] Ibid. I, 16b.

It seemed for a time that an adherent of the Three Chapters had succeeded to the patriarchal see even in Grado, but Pope Honorius I was able, after John's expulsion by the Exarch of Ravenna, to have the Roman subdeacon Primogenius elected and enthroned at Grado. Honorius's tomb inscription thus extols him for the definitive gaining of Grado for Orthodoxy, not for a union of Grado and Aquileia, which in any event had been only an interlude:[162] the patriarchate of Old Aquileia persisted in schism until the end of the seventh century, that is, until the Synod of Pavia in 698. The two patriarchates long remained separate, at least until that of Grado was transferred in the fifteenth century to Venice, where the patriarch had continuously resided since the twelfth century, and that of Aquileia was abolished in the eighteenth century.[163] In all the rest of the Latin Church the opposition to the Second Council of Constantinople gradually died out without there occurring any too important controversies about it.

---

[161] Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Langob.* IV, 33.

[162] Gaez, *ZKG* 70 (1959), 131.

[163] Meyer, 12ff.

CHAPTER 44

The Epilogue of Early Christian Latin Literature

The Golden Age of the Fathers came to an end in the Latin West in the fourth century, but the rich treasures of biblical exegesis and the great accomplishments of the Fathers in speculative theology were transmitted beyond the collapse of the ancient world to the Middle Ages. In the period here studied the ideas of the Fathers were reconstructed and rethought, especially by Fulgentius of Ruspe, and their works were collected and again and again copied and used for the care of souls and preaching, especially by Caesarius of Arles. There were far-seeing men of the ancient world who sought to save from the general decline all that was worthwhile; indeed they probably succeeded also, despite their view of what they believed was the approaching end of history, in preparing a new and permanent synthesis of the traditional treasures of faith and thought. Some Christian writers can be named, poets and authors of saints' *vitae,* but in this chapter after Fulgentius and Caesarius were treated extensively in the discussion of the controversies with the Arians and the Semipelagians, those four great men together with their theological achievement should be exhaustively presented and evaluated on whom all the intellectuality and piety of the Middle Ages was based as on four pedestals: Boethius, Cassiodorus, Gregory the Great, and Isidore of Seville.

Boethius

Boethius, who sprang from the noble Roman house of the Anicii, was at the beginning of the sixth century in the service of the Ostrogothic King Theodoric for several years. In 523 or 524 he was accused of high treason—for conspiring with East Roman circles—and executed. In prison he wrote for his own solace the *De Consolatione Philosophiae,* which has a thoroughly religious but not clearly Christian content.[1]

Boethius entered the history of the European mind through his translations of Aristotle's works, especially of the works on logic, and the commentaries he composed on them, as one of the great initiators of medieval philosophizing. Compared to the philosophical works, his theological writings are of clearly negligible importance.[2] Nevertheless, they have acquired an extraordinarily great significance for Church history, especially for the history of theology and dogma. Through them Boethius became the founder of the argument from the *ratio theologica,* which then, scarcely a half-century later, the Roman deacon Rusticus used so skillfully in his fight against the decisions of the Fifth General Council, in his championing of the Three Chapters.[3] In this connection the four works on the *Unity of the Trinity,* the *Three Divine Persons, How Substances Can Be Good,* and *On the One Person and the Two Natures* (in Christ) are rather occasional writings.[4]

---

[1] Cf. also V. Schurr, *Trinitätslehre,* 3ff.

[2] Not thirty columns in Migne.

Boethius not only dedicated the first to his father-in-law Symmachus and the latter's other son-in-law Patricius, but he submitted it to their judgment. Because he discovered in all other contemporaries only intellectual sluggishness and subtle envy, he deliberately expressed himself concisely and introduced new words from the philosophical disciplines into theology, so that, besides himself and his two addressees, no one could understand the pamphlets, indeed would be scared off from reading them.[5] Boethius was thoroughly aware of presuming something unprecedented, but he relied on the authority of Augustine and wanted also to be gauged by his works. In seven chapters he explained that the divine substance is pure *forma,* that it is not subject to computation, that Aristotelian predicaments can be applied to God, that in God there must be talk above all of relations, because the names Father and Son express a reciprocal relationship, that finally the unity of God is based on substance, the Trinity on relations.

The three other pamphlets are dedicated to a Roman deacon John, probably the future Pope John I (523–526). Especially important is the treatise *On the One Person and the Two Natures against Nestorius and Eutyches.* In the introduction, Boethius reminded John that at a council, in which apparently both took part, a letter was read[6] according to which the Eutychians confessed indeed that Christ is of two, but not in two, natures. Because Boethius did not speak at the meeting itself, he had agreed with John on a discussion which, however, both were then prevented from holding, so that Boethius had to write to John what he really had intended to present orally. To this accident the history of theology owes a definition of person, which in Scholasticism enjoyed the highest repute. Since in the controversy with the Nestorians and the Eutychians there was question of person and nature, Boethius first investigated, in Chapter 1, the concepts of nature and person. Nature is not only statically the manner of being proper to everything, but also dynamically the propelling power of the natural movement, *motus principium,* whereby, for example, fire presses upward and earth presses down. He tried to establish what a person is by exclusion: person cannot be in the accidents, but only in the substance, but likewise neither in nonliving bodies nor in irrational systems of life; besides, a universal idea cannot be a person. To personality, then, belong substantiality, rationality, individuality.[7] And so there results the following definition: *persona est naturae rationalis individua substantia* (Chapter 3).

---

[3] Cf. Altaner-Stuiber, 7th ed. (1966), 564, and supra, p. 731.

[4] The authenticity of the brief summary of the Christian faith, *Tractatus IV,* is not certain.

[5] Prooemium.

[6] According to V. Schurr, *Trinitätslehre,* 108ff., the letter of the Scythian bishops, which is preserved in *Mansi* VIII, 221–226.

Boethius at once called attention to the fact that he here indicated not the etymology of person but an objective definition[8] of what was meant by *hypostasis* to the Greeks. But he did not go on to the property of the person; he did not comprehend the idea of subjective being,[9] because he proceeded from the question which natures really had person, hence which considered person as a characteristic of special natures and understood them himself as something natural.[10]

Boethius's definition exercised, to be sure, a strong influence on all succeeding theology, but it provided no single argument for his own confrontation with Nestorius (Chapters 4–7). There person merely is that whose unity is maintained in the duality of natures of the Redeemer. The Christological speculation was only carried further by the definition of person of Leontius of Byzantium—being of itself—and of the earlier mentioned Roman deacon Rusticus, who wrote at Constantinople—remaining in itself.[11]

Especially noteworthy is Boethius's argument that the subordinate Two-Person-Christology of Nestorius did not do justice to the newness (*novum*), the greatness (*magnum*), and the singleness (*semel*) of the coming of the Redeemer. There was earlier intimate relationship of human persons with God; they were even for that reason called Christ. In this regard, Boethius referred generally to the authority of the Old Testament, but without quoting a single scriptural passage. In this it is made clear how with him the theological process of proof freed itself from individual biblical arguments, but nevertheless remained convinced of being in general scriptural.

---

[7] Cf. Grillmeier, *LThK* V (2nd ed. 1960), 945.

[8] Of course, he offers in other, especially his philosophical works, other definitions, but they are of no interest here. Cf. M. Nedoncelle, *RevSR* 29 (1955), 201–238.

[9] Grillmeier, loc. cit., VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 291.

[10] Similarly, for example, also his contemporary Fulgentius; see supra, p. 720.

[11] Cf. supra, p. 732.

Cassiodorus

Cassiodorus, who had served as minister of three Ostrogothic kings in Italy, evidence of which is supplied by the edicts and letters of the rulers, the *Variae,* that came from him because they were formulated by him, in 535 left the service of the Gothic government that was becoming ever more anti-Roman and withdrew to private life. He had agreed with Pope Agapetus I to establish at Rome a theological academy, in which professional teachers should see to it that "on the one hand souls could receive the preaching necessary for salvation and on the other hand the speech of the faithful should obtain the same care and development" as pagan philologists and poets had bestowed on their language, with the difference, of course, that everything that was presented should be "chaste and pure" and hence should be distinguished clearly from the myths and poetry of the pagans. Cassiodorus had been greatly pained that hitherto there was still no scholarly academy for Christian theology in the West, as one had existed earlier in the East at Alexandria and in his day was flourishing in Syrian Edessa.[12] The Roman Church would share in the financing of the new Roman academy, which Cassiodorus himself intended to help pay for to a great extent; but the war, that is, Justinian's reconquest of Italy that had just begun, which led finally to the annihilation of the Ostrogothic Kingdom, prevented the implementation of the project. After the conclusion of the war, Cassiodorus, who had meanwhile spent several years at Constantinople, returned to Italy. Although Justinian now gave new assurances of support to state professors at Rome in an effort to make good the damage done by the war to education,[13] Cassiodorus did not again take up his earlier plan for an academy.

Instead, on his property in South Italy he founded a monastery which he called Vivarium, the center of whose life was represented by the library systematically established by him at great cost. For the monks he wrote two brief introductions to study or reading plans,[14] by which they were to be introduced into the theological and philosophical literature respectively on hand in the library. He was aware that he thereby, on the one hand, entered of necessity upon the post of professor (*ad vicem magistri*) and that on the other hand his two introductory works could not replace a live college of teachers. Rather, this should be the task of the writings of the Fathers collected in the library, especially of the scriptural exegetes. Since only Latin works were available to his monks, he had pertinent Greek commentaries, of which no Latin translation yet existed, put into Latin and included them in the great commentary. This consisted of nine *codices* emended by Cassiodorus himself, which contained commentaries on the following parts of Scripture: 1) the Octateuch, 2) the Books of Kings, 3) the Prophets, 4) the Psalter, 5) Solomon, or the Wisdom Books, 6) the Hagiographers, 7) the Gospels, 8) the Epistles, 9) the Acts of the Apostles, and 10) Revelation.[15]

---

[12] *Instit. prooemium.* That Cassiodorus mentions the School of Nisibis is, according to G. Ludwig (*Cassiodor,* p. 101), one of the indications that he intended to put his monastery in the line of the Antiochene exegetical and educational tradition, as this was embodied especially by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and hence he sought a certain aloofness from the new religious policy after Constantinople II. L. Duchesne (op. cit., p. 226) sees in the fact that Cassiodorus does not precisely mention Theodore the proof that he did not intend to intervene in burning questions. Of course, then he would have made clear a like aloofness as regards Origen.

[13] *Novellae,* App. VII, 22; P. Riché, *Éducation,* 182.

[14] *De institutione divinarum literarum* (=*Inst.*), *PL* 70, 1105–1150, and *De artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum* (=*Art.*), ibid., 1149–1220.

Among the exegetes were represented, besides the great Latin Fathers, also Greeks, such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen. At that time there were still no continuous commentaries on some books of the Bible, but only scattered remarks of the great Fathers. Thus in Volume II, that is, on the Books of Kings, and elsewhere, Cassiodorus collected the six questions and answers to Simplician by Augustine and three questions and answers of Jerome to Abundantius. Despite all his efforts, there remained gaps in the commentary. Cassiodorus sought to close them by, among other means, asking the priest Bellator to compose commentaries on various biblical books. But of all that Bellator contributed to Cassiodorus's work of collection—for example, two books on Ruth and the other outstanding women of the Old Testament[16]—nothing has survived. The nine-volume commentary seems not to have been completely copied, but soon to have been lost. In addition to the commentators, Cassiodorus also collected in a special *codex* works of some of the Fathers that were introductions to the Bible.

In regard to this whole project, his work consisted not only in collecting the patristic texts that appeared to him to be important and helpful, but also in the preparation of a reliable scriptural text, which represented precisely a presupposition for the salvation of souls. The word of the two or three witnesses, by whom each matter can be decided (Matt. 18:16, Deut. 19:15b), which in Origen served as an exegetical principle—a theological statement is to be proved by two or three biblical quotations[17]—became in Cassiodorus[18] the basis of textual criticism: two or three ancient *codices* guarantee a text.

---

[15] *Inst.* 1 and 9.

[16] Ibid. 1.

[17] *Matth. Com.* 10, 15; *GCS Origines* 10, 18, 29ff.

[18] *Inst.* 15.

As regards the text of the commentaries, Cassiodorus in no way felt himself obliged to the true maintaining of what had been transmitted; instead, the orthodoxy and the value for edification of a work is the supreme standard. Thus he took care that on the occasion of the translation of the commentaries of Clement of Alexandria all his imprudent (*incaute*) expressions were suppressed. Cassiodorus was not impressed by the fact that commentary on Paul was circulating under the name of Pope Gelasius but corrected, at least in the commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, all Pelagian errors which he discovered in it.[19] Some texts with which he was not in agreement he let stand as they were but with a corresponding marginal note, especially, for example, in the commentaries of Origen and Tyconius.[20] Cassiodorus also provided the biblical text with punctuation marks, so that it could better be read aloud. He himself revised the nine *codices* already referred to, but he left others to the work of notaries busy in the monastery. The mere spelling was to him so important for the understanding of the text that even at the age of ninety-three he composed for his monks a work on orthography, at the beginning of which he enumerated his earlier theological writings. The fact that here he began with the commentary on the psalms makes it obvious that he ascribed his work on the soul to an earlier, closed period of his life, to which also belonged his official letters, the *Variae.*

Although Cassiodorus found light from above in the entire Bible, nevertheless the psalter, the prophets, and the epistles meant the most to him, and at the same time they represented the deepest abysses and the summit of the whole Scripture.[21] He felt beginners in the study of Holy Scriptures should first take up the fourth *codex* and so become familiar with the psalter.[22] The monk should first fill himself with the reading of Holy Scripture, then apply himself to the commentators.[23]

Theological knowledge is acquired in various ways: first, one should read the *introductores,* for example, Tyconius and Augustine, then the *expositores,* in the third place the Catholic teachers who have left question-and-answer literature. Finally one must carefully investigate the entire *corpus* of patristic literature that has been handed down. But it is not done with reading alone: there is knowledge which comes to the monk only in discussion with an experienced elder.[24] Cassiodorus, it is true, sketched his reading plan for monks according to objective necessities, but the personal uniqueness of the individual must be respected. Thus he recommended to each of the monks to select one of the great Church Fathers, with whom he could engage in an inner dialogue.[25] Cassiodorus hoped that his monks, through zealous study of the great biblical exegetes, would become capable of composing biblical commentaries themselves, so that the passages not yet treated by the Fathers might find their exegesis.[26] He did not surrender the hope of being able to make scripture scholars of all his monks, but he reckoned that some would be capable of no intellectual work at all. They should devote themselves to horticulture, and for them the monastic library had on hand specialized works on that subject.[27]

---

[19] Ibid. 8.

[20] Ibid. 1 and 9.

[21] Ibid., *praef.*

[22] *Inst.* 4, and *Psalt., praef.* 16.

[23] *Inst., praef.*

[24] Ibid. 10.

The simple man in the monastery, *vir simplex,* should, however, also come into the enjoyment of some knowledge of profane science and philosophy (*mundanae litterae*), because they contributed not a little to the understanding of Scripture; this is explained by the fact that, apart from some additions by learned men,[28] they have their origin in Scripture, indeed they were directly stolen from it.[29] Thus, for example, Abraham was the first to bring arithmetic and astronomy to Egypt.[30] Hence the Fathers had recommended the reading of such works, because through them we are diverted from carnal things and led to things which could be grasped only by the heart. And so, abstraction is a means for the cultivating of spirituality. But for speculative theology Cassiodorus did not care: the Fathers interested him only as exegetes.[31]

Cassiodorus did not devote himself to secular knowledge only because he was convinced that it served for the understanding of Scripture, but also because he found its rules and standards employed in Scripture itself; for example, in the book of Job, all the tricks of dialectics. Thus he felt himself to be justified and obliged to leave to his monks also a complete library of the *artes* and to introduce them into the study of the three linguistic disciplines—grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic—as well as the four mathematical sciences—arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. This second introductory book actually represents a compendium[32] of the accomplishments of ancient scholarship, and became the foundation for the medieval division of the *artes* into the *trivium* and *quadrivium.* The chapter on rhetoric, for example, would still be useful today as an introduction. Of course, it is surprising when Cassiodorus, who in this second introductory work was still addressing his monks, declared that, within the court speech—judicial trials were the chief field of activity for rhetoric—the narrative must begin with the description of the people involved, in which connection the person who belongs to "our side" must be fittingly praised, whereas a person of the opposite side (*aliena*) must be disparaged.[33] The aged founder of Vivarium probably did not want to teach his monks such; instead, in these sentences one suspects a *verbatim* quotation from a work which Cassiodorus had in his library and which he excerpted for the introductory work. He seems on the whole, as must probably be inferred from occasional, unjustified repetitions, not always to have remembered the general view and to have simply followed a *codex* which he then had at hand.

---

[25] Ibid. 17.

[26] Ibid. 26.

[27] Ibid. 28.

[28] Ibid. 21.

[29] Ibid. 27.

[30] Article 2 with reference to Flavius Josephus, *Antiq.* 1, 9.

[31] Cf. P. Riché, *Éducation,* 206f. In his commentary on the psalms Cassiodorus summarizes all of ancient Christian education. For him the psalmist is a model for Cicero's *Orator.* But only the High Middle Ages understood Cassiodorus's formal scholarship, even though Carolingian exegetes had been happy to use him, as Schlieben, pp. 114f., stresses.

It is surprising that this man, who ranks as a great statesman, to whom the politically successful decisions of the Ostrogothic government in Italy are attributed, and to whom, in contrast to the idealist Boethius, a more balanced realistic sense is adjudged,[34] is said to have given to his monastery no constitution and prescribed no daily routine of life. Hence it is not surprising that in Cassiodorus some have sought to find the author of the *Regula Magistri.* But the fact that Cassiodorus, at the beginning of his last work, the one on orthography, in which he listed his religious and literary achievements, did not mention a monastic rule does not speak in favor of his being the author.

It must especially be stressed that Cassiodorus, in spite of all his preoccupation with ancient scholarship, still placed great value on emphasizing the differences in content and style between Scripture and profane scholarship. After he had concisely summarized Varro's *Cosmology*, he concluded his introduction to science with the invitation to be content with what Scripture says about the world and man.[35] Indeed, he even meant that the Semiticisms, anthropomorphisms, and translation errors of the Bible were signs of the divine manner of speaking and therefore must not be subjected to the laws of profane language or literary scholarship.[36] Thus, despite all his scholarly strivings, did Cassiodorus justify a fideist-authoritarian attitude, which long dominated the future.

---

[32] P. Riché calls it a digest.

[33] *Art.* 2, *PL* 70, 1158C.

[34] Cf. Schneider, 84 and 88.

[35] *Art.* 7, *PL* 70, 1218d.

[36] *Inst.* 15.

Gregory the Great

Gregory the Great, the last of the four great Doctors of the Latin Church, lived in an age which neither required great intellectual achievements—there were no serious theological controversies—nor permitted them: anxiety over a vestige of calm and order, indeed over daily bread for the poor often monopolized the attention of the Roman Bishop. Gregory had to reorganize the administration of all the patrimonies of the Roman See, since these, for the most part in the hands of the local episcopate, had scarcely yielded any returns. He was concerned for the correct use of money; since the coins customary in southern Gaul were not accepted in Italy—they had a lesser gold content—clothes for the poor at Rome had to be bought on the spot and—even in the hardest times Gregory was never only an almoner—young English slaves purchased to serve God in Italian monasteries.[37] Gregory would have deserved his epithet "the Great" entirely from his ecclesiastical-political and practical pastoral accomplishments, but he was not only a practical man. Even his letters gave, where necessary, not only admonition but also clear replies in theological questions. A chambermaid of the Byzantine Empress was not only urged to penance but also instructed that on earth there can be no guarantee of the obtaining of pardon, indeed of salvation at all.[38] In reply to the question whether all encountered by Christ in limbo were redeemed, Gregory relied not only on Filastrius and Augustine, but himself proved from the Bible that only those were redeemed by Christ who had good works to show.[39] Gregory's letters were clearly an inexhaustible mine for bishops and pastors who sought a model, but Gregory influenced the future more powerfully as the theorist of the pastoral office. Soon after the beginning of his pontificate he composed, as had Gregory Nazianzen, his *Regula Pastoralis* in an effort to show how justified had been his resistance. In the first part he described the suitable candidate for the episcopacy, in the second the lifestyle which the office requires, in the third the necessary differences in preaching, and closed with a brief admonition to humility. When Gregory (I, 5) interpreted the Levirate Marriage (Deut. 25:5ff.) as the episcopal office and in the glorified Christ the dead oldest brother, but relying on Matthew 28:10, saw in the bishop the youngest brother, who must see to producing offspring or let himself be reviled by the wife (the Church), then this was not exegesis in accord with standards current today, but no doubt a suitable means for stimulating seriousness and zeal for pastoral care. Gregory attested and demanded an awareness of responsibility that is almost Donatist in color, when he asked: How can one request from God pardon for others who does not himself know whether he is reconciled with him? (I, 10). When, on the other hand, in Genesis 9:1f. ("fear and dread of you is on all animals") he found the rejection of any ownership of men over their fellowmen and thereby a limit to the blame and punishment necessary in pastoral care (II, 6), one may indeed agree with him in this matter today.

---

[37] *Reg. Epp.* V, 10.

[38] Ibid. VII, 22.

[39] Ibid. VII, 15.

True, Gregory clearly saw in the bishop the superior, but he stressed that a candid word of a subject was to be regarded precisely as a sign of humble obedience, in any case by a pastor who is not full of self-love (II, 8). That Gregory equated preaching with admonition was probably solely conditioned by the time, but the third part of the *Pastoral Rule* offered in the enumeration of thirty-four pairs of opposites met in practice—joyful and sad, bold and shy, obstinate and fickle, sinner in act and sinner in thought, those who do evil secretly and do good publicly, those who do good secretly but publicly have a poor reputation, and so forth—such a differentiated description and introduction to exhortation that even today profit can be drawn from them. In them Gregory's view of the bishop as physician of souls holds good; he would have had him understood only as preacher, if such an extensive listing of characteristics were neither necessary nor possible. Thus it is no wonder that the *Pastoral Rule* was everywhere enthusiastically received, as in Spain, where Gregory had sent it to his friend Leander of Seville, and even in the East, where the Emperor Maurice had it translated into Greek.[40] In the Empire of Charles the Great several synods demanded the reading of the *Pastoral Rule* by all bishops. In England King Alfred the Great saw to its translation, together with the *Dialogues,* into Old English at the end of the ninth century and had a copy given to each bishop.[41] It meant for the diocesan clergy what the *Regula Benedicti* represented for monks.[42] Gregory formed for centuries the bishops who for their part formed the modern nations,[43] and thus he became the great teacher of the West.

In exegesis Gregory is less original. He collected and passed on to the

---

[40] Cf. ibid. XII, 6.

[41] *LThK,* 2nd ed., I, 334f. (Brechter).

[42] Altaner–Stuiber, 7th ed. (1966), 468.

[43] F. H. Dudden, op. cit. I, 239f.

Middle Ages what the Fathers provided, without of course really intending it, because he was convinced of the approaching end. In this he is surprisingly nearer to Origen than, for example, Augustine and Ambrose, even nearer than Jerome.[44] In his *Moralia in Job,* a commentary on the book of Job in thirty-five books, in the foreword[45] the distinction of the three senses of Scripture is theoretically explained, and Gregory set out to demonstrate the threefold exegesis, but he did not stick with the three levels which he had so clearly distinguished in Book I; as early as Book IV the historical sense no longer interested him and from Book V the exegesis was only allegorical and moral,[46] although Gregory was convinced that all meaning was lost if one did not take the historical sense seriously.[47] The distinction of the various senses of Scripture could be found in Gregory by future ages, but their order is disputed. Most of the time, Gregory ranked second the allegorical-typical sense, which in part provides information on Christ and in part on the Church, and thus is twofold, and he ranked third[48] the moral sense, that is, the exhortation to action contained in every scriptural word. Thus he used the deeper meaning only to justify the moral claims of the biblical word.

The ultimate goal in the context was action or, within preaching, admonition respectively. But the Bible was for Gregory not only the foundation of the sermon; it should also be read privately; the reader of the Bible is clearly the good man.[49] In the framework of the sermons on Ezekiel[50] the invitation to action seems not to be the highest and last; instead, the Word of God grows with the reader.[51] The demands are only the external of the Bible; its interior, however, offers promises.[52] Whether a person applies himself to the interior of Scripture is not placed fully in the preference of the interpreter; whoever neglects it deprives himself of the most valuable sense of the Word of God,[53] which he owes to his hearers, because only thus does faith gain its fullness.[54] In this regard Gregory was convinced with Origen that Holy Scripture itself compels appropriated exegesis: he counts all images, comparisons, anthropomorphisms, which would today be regarded as the literal sense, as allegorical statements. Thus he intended only to think more consistently, where today scientific exegesis would see an infringement of limits.[55] Nevertheless, he could be very tolerant in the exegesis of Scripture and concede that the one is satisfied with history, which will conduct him in the long run beyond himself,[56] that another seeks the *intelligentia typica*, finally the third the *intelligentia per typum contemplativa*, that is, then, advances by means of typology to contemplation without having placed himself more deeply in the moral sense. But Gregory took into account that the way to contemplation leads by way of *historia, moralitas,* and the *intelligentia allegoriae.*[57] This passage, which is probably not taken sufficiently seriously by Dudden and Hofmann, makes known that Gregory's piety is oriented not only to asceticism and moral activity but that his basically world-fleeing outlook revolves around the consideration of the eternal, around the vision of the promised good.[58] Morality as the first step to knowledge was generally an ancient philosophical notion and was self-evident to Origen, for example. If Gregory was really a man of antiquity, perhaps the last who speaks to us,[59] then for him morality could not be the highest and last.[60] On the other hand, through this recognition of contemplation, springing from loyalty to the tradition, as the goal striven for in various ways, he protected the intellectual life of the future from having at once to prove itself by usefulness and thus becoming atrophied in pure expedience.[61]

---

[44] D. Hofmann, op. cit., 12.

[45] Dedication to Bishop Leander of Seville, *Reg. Epp.* V, 53a.

[46] D. Hofmann, op. cit., 12.

[47] *In Ezech. 1–3, hom.* 3, 4; *Moralia* 21, 3.

[48] *Reg. Epp.* V, 53a, 3; *Moralia,* passim, especially 1–3 and elsewhere; cf. D. Hofmann, op. cit., 44ff.

[49] *Reg. Epp.* IX, 15.

[50] Twelve on Chapters 1–4, 3; ten on Chapter 40; in addition, there must be mentioned forty shorter festive sermons on the gospel texts, which, however, in their popular character are closer to the *Dialogues* than to the sermons on Ezekiel, which were delivered on successive days and directed to a religiously educated audience and hence must probably be more highly valued as testimony for Gregory's own view. Cf. V. Recchia, op. cit., 31.

[51] *In Ezech. 1–4, hom.* 7, 8.

[52] Ibid. 9, 30.

[53] *Moralia* 21, 1.

But Gregory exercised the widest influence on the future through his *Dialogi de vita et miraculis patrum Italicorum,* because they were read not only by clerics and monks, as were the *Moralia* and the *Regula Pastoralis,* but found their way to the laity.[62] Gregory showed in these artificially arranged stories in dialogue form in four books that not only the East but also Italy displayed ascetics and wonderworkers. Besides Paulinus of Nola and Benedict of Nursia—the latter's deeds fill all of Book II—the heroes are scarcely familiar; thus the *Dialogues* must be used only very cautiously as historical sources.[63] But in this is expressed not only an early Italian national pride,[64] but also the insight of the pastor and promoter of the mission among the Lombards and Anglo-Saxons that the Word of God is only there highly esteemed where one is influenced by the life of saints.[65] Thus Gregory sent his *Dialogues* to the Catholic Lombard Queen Theodelinda, in whom he saw his strongest ally for the gaining of this nation.[66]

---

[54] R. Manselli, *Settimane . . .* X, 81f.

[55] D. Hofmann, op. cit., 38.

[56] *In Ezech. 1–4,* hom. 10, 1.

[57] Ibid. 7, 10.

[58] Cf. R. Manselli, *Settimane . . .* X, 85f.

[59] P. Riché, op. cit., 194: Gregory is an ancient in style, in the form of his thought, and in the preference for moralizing examples.

[60] Cf. *Ezech. 1–3, hom.* 3, 9; 10. 11. 25. 43.

[61] Isidore of Seville adopted from Gregory the threefold steps of the meaning of Scripture, in which in the third and highest place stands the mystical sense (*Sententiae* 1, 18; *Ord. creatur.* 10); cf. R. Wasselynck, *RThAM* 32 (1965), 158.

[62] Cf. G. Dufner, *Die Dialoge Gregors d. Gr. im Wandel der Zeiten und Sprachen* (Padua 1968).

But Gregory not only narrated the edifying; he also introduced exegetical-dogmatic discussions, for example, on the question of how the saints, despite Romans 11:33 ("how inscrutable are his ways!"), have the knowledge of the divine decrees and express them (II, 16), or where hell is; whether the souls of the damned can be regarded as immortal (IV, 42–44); whether there is a purification in the next world (IV, 25 and 39); how ecclesiastical burial and prayer are of use to the dead (IV, 51ff. and 55). Of course, such questions were not answered purely theoretically or exegetically, but with the aid of examples, visions, and dreams from the lives of saints. The teachings on purgatory and on the expiatory power of the Mass thus found their securest place in Christian piety and from there in theology. That a priest secured eternal rest for a dead person by a week's penance and daily Mass did not influence the future as much as the thirty-days' celebration of Mass ordered by Gregory himself as abbot, by which a monk, who had sinned against poverty, after dying repentant was received into the company of the blessed (IV, 55); only this last usage continues as Gregorian Masses.

Gregory's teaching on penance and purgatory was based on the principle that no sin is forgiven without atonement,[67] and hence was always in the danger of a certain notion of a balance-sheet, but this would of course be eliminated by the fact that the uselessness of external works without love was frequently emphasized.[68] The basis for a certain intellectual imbalance of these doctrines on the last things lies in this, that on the one hand Gregory did not follow even the deeply revered Augustine in everything, and on the other hand, he first formulated views which up to now had prevailed in the Roman Church and thereby fixed them.[69] Gregory's teaching on original sin was entirely in accord with Augustine's: all mankind is collectively responsible for Adam's sin,[70] and children dying unbaptized go to hell.[71] Sexuality is the refuge of sin, desire is already defilement.[72] But in his doctrine of grace Gregory occupied an approximately middle position between Augustine and Semipelagianism: it is true that the gift of grace is the first beginning of conversion,[73] but free will is not only, as in Augustine, the form of grace realizing itself but an agent which must be added to it. Thus Gregory understood[74] Paul's sayings: "by the grace of God I am what I am" and "I have worked more than all" (1 Cor. 15:10). Hence Gregory tacitly dropped the idea of the irresistible grace and unconditional election and saw a certain merit in the assent of the human will to the prompting of grace. That God crowns his gifts when he crowns our merits means for Gregory that the free will acquires merits and finally God even imputes his gifts to man.[75] Gregory arrived at no doctrine of predestination because the idea of *praedestinatio post praevisa merita* did not suit him.[76] In him strict Augustinianism is limited by the demands of practical moral instruction; but Augustine himself had not remained entirely consistent in his sermons, and many a defender of Augustinianism at the beginning of the fifth century had also not been able to be so.[77] Gregory thus had the same convictions as the Synod of Orange,[78] which was in fact only the expression of the Roman reception of Augustine. It was not known to the Middle Ages, but these obtained their ideas through Gregory. That he bequeathed to the future, besides important stimuli for spirituality and mysticism, also peripheral Christian subjects, has just been mentioned: an Augustinian-inspired feeling of unworthiness justified an intensive cult of the saints,[79] especially then when Christ was seen as the Judge to come.[80] Of course, Gregory did not go so far as to characterize the cult of the saints as an essential part of Christianity, as his somewhat older contemporary, Gregory of Tours, did.[81] Finally, the Devil of the Middle Ages also appeared in that form in which he molested Dominic or Luther quite frequently in Gregory's *Dialogues* on the Italian Fathers. Thus Gregory passed on not only content to the theology of the future, but an abundance of ideas to the popular imagination and thereby to the plastic art and poetry, especially Dante.[82]

---

[63] G. Dufner, op. cit., 26ff.

[64] Ibid., 23.

[65] *In Ezech. 1–3, hom.* 10, 37.

[66] Paul the Deacon, *Hist. Langob.* 4, 5.

[67] *Moralia* 9, 54; 16, 82.

[68] F. H. Dudden, op. cit. II, 440, many proofs.

---

[69] Ibid. II, 374.

[70] *Moralia* 24, 7.

[71] Ibid. 9, 32.

[72] *Reg. Epp.* XI, 56a; *Moralia* 26, 44; 32, 39, and passim.

[73] *Moralia* 22, 13; 33, 38, and passim.

[74] *Moralia* 16, 30; 24, 24.

[75] *Moralia* 16, 30; cf. F. H. Dudden, op. cit. II, 338.

[76] F. H. Dudden, op. cit. II, 400.

[77] Cf. supra, p. 726.

[78] Cf. supra, p. 728.

[79] *Moralia* 16, 64.

[80] *Hom. in Evgl.* 32, 2.

[81] F. H. Dudden, op. cit. II, 371.

Isidore

In the literary work of Isidore, Bishop of Seville from 600, which was impressive only because of its bulk and the abundance of its information, the question of the Three Chapters occupied only a little space, but it was, so to speak, a test question, with the aid of which Isidore's position is easily determined. In Book VI of his great encyclopedia, which treats of ecclesiastical books and duties, he spoke also of conciliar decrees and especially stressed the four synods worthy of veneration, which chiefly comprise the whole faith, without even mentioning a fifth synod. Of course, it need not have been expressly excluded in this way; Gregory the Great also occasionally kept silent about it. In Book VII of the *Etymologiae* (7, 12, 5), where Isidore speaks of God, the angels, and the orders of believers, he thus explains the title "patriarch": he is a patriarch who has an apostolic see, for example, the one in Rome or in Antioch or in Alexandria. Hence, Constantinople was not recognized as a patriarchate. In Book VIII of the *Etymologiae* (8, 5, 66) it is said that the Acephalae got their name from this, that no founder could be determined for them, they were opponents of the Three Chalcedonian Chapters, they denied the uniqueness of the two substances in Christ, and recognized only one nature in him. Isidore most clearly expressed himself in his catalogue of authors,[83] in which he expressly vindicated Theodore of Mopsuestia: true, he was condemned by the bishops of the Acephalae at the instigation of the *Princeps* Justinian, but he was commended by praiseworthy men.[84] Here, therefore, the Council of Constantinople of 553 is designated as a synod of heretical bishops of the Acephalae, that is, of irreconcilable Cyrillans. Thus any possibility of recognition of this Council was basically excluded.

That Justinian is named, not as king, but as *princeps,* seems not to be meaningless. For Isidore "king" is an honored name: one keeps the name of king only if one acts rightly; one loses it through sin.[85] True, the title of *princeps* is also an indication of dignity and rank,[86] but "king" (*basileus*) means very much more, namely, that kings support the people as a foundation.[87] Hence, to Isidore, Justinian seems not to have been such a foundation. Apparently for Isidore whatever is connected with Constantinople did not rank as typical. Here not only theological evaluation but also the fate of Isidore's family became significant, because it was probably expelled by the Byzantines from Cartagena.[88] However, Isidore seemed quite generally to reject the centralized world-empires, hence also the Roman Empire and *a fortiori* Justinian's work of restoration, for in his book on grammar[89] he said that every people of whom the Romans had taken possession had brought to Rome, together with its treasures, also the blemishes of its language and of its morals.[90] Hence so much that is wicked could never come together in national states as in a universal state.

---

[82] Ibid., 437.

[83] *Vir. illust.* 4.

[84] Cf. Facundus, supra, p. 730.

[85] *Etym.* 9, 3, 4.

[86] Ibid. 9, 3, 21.

In some respects Isidore is to be compared with Cassiodorus; but while the latter after his turning to the religious life attributed value only to Jewish and Christian historiographers,[91] Isidore in his great work set Sallust and Livy on the same plane with Eusebius and Jerome. Thus to a certain extent in Isidore there can be ascertained a liberal assessment of ancient pagan scholarship in conformity with Augustine.[92] Isidore's works were hardly subject to a definite purpose; they were rarely apologetic and polemical and interested chiefly in knowledge as such. He himself had acquired great knowledge and he aspired to pass it on to younger clerics and his colleagues who expressly asked him for it. The most mature fruit of his willing acquiescence in such requests, of course, also of his own encyclopedic inclinations and perhaps also of the collaboration of a whole staff of secretaries, were the twenty books of the *Etymologiae,* which get their name from the fact that Isidore offers a great many explanations of words—Book X is wholly devoted to explanation of words arranged alphabetically—but also occasionally and perhaps more correctly also called *Origines,* because Isidore expected to arrive at the basic origin of things through explanation of words. The work, in which all the knowledge available in Isidore's day is assembled,[93] treats in its modern form grammar (I), rhetoric and dialectic (II), the four mathematical disciplines or the later Quadrivium (III), medicine (IV), laws and times with a survey of the six ages (V), ecclesiastical books and activities (VI), God, angels, and the orders of the faithful (VII), the Church and various sects (VIII), languages, peoples, military service, and degrees of kinship (IX), explanations of words (X), man and monsters (XI), living beings (XII), the world and its parts (XIII), the earth and its parts (XIV), architecture and estates (XV), stones and metals (XVI), agriculture (XVII), war and games (XVIII), ships, houses, and clothing (XIX), and finally domestic economy and storage (XX). The two books on the differences of names and things are like a preliminary study to the great encyclopedia. His different works on the Bible offer a number of *realia*, information on the biblical environment and times, but at the same time an abundance of allegories and possibilities of allegorizing, for example, on the numbers occurring in the Bible, so that the preachers of many centuries could obtain their equipment here.

---

[87] Ibid. 9, 3, 18.

[88] Cf. H. J. Diesner, *Isidor,* 9f.

[89] *Etym.* 1, 32, 1.

[90] Cf. A. Borst, *DA* 22 (1966), 41.

[91] *Inst.* 1, 17, 1.

[92] Cf. J. Fontaine, op. cit. I, 183.

[93] In Migne (*PL* 82) the work includes 650 columns. But it was not Isidore's concern to save the legacy of antiquity for itself (cf. Díaz y Díaz, *Settimane* . . . V, 897), but to put it at the service of the formation of the clergy of his day. Isidore hardly needed to examine theological controversies; the only theological opponents of the Catholics in Spain at the beginning of the seventh century seem to have been the Jews, as must

Isidore could express himself quite naïvely on difficult theological questions, when, for example, in his *Differentiae rerum*, he speaks just as directly and simply about God as about things of daily life. Of course, he then appended a series of questions, such as: "How is the Father unbegotten?" or "Who will understand all this?"[94] Thus he made clear that even in an encyclopedic presentation theology is not simply an exercise ground of the mind, but demands the highest respect and reserve. For the rest, Isidore was not only the expert on the Bible or books, but an observer of reality on earth. In his systematically theological work (*Sententiae*), derived almost entirely from Augustine, he had to speak of predestination and declared it a judgment of God which lets some people strive for the above and the inner, others for the below and the external; but then he stressed that in this great darkness man was unable to see through to the divine disposition (2, 6). Hence he distinguished between the order of experience and the order of theological statement of faith and thereby separated himself pleasingly from Fulgentius of Ruspe, for whom the Augustinian doctrine of predestination served to prove that clearly the Arian Vandals were not destined for salvation,[95] and from Gregory of Tours, who saw in history the proof that the Catholic Franks were destined to expel the Arian Goths from Gaul. Certainly for Isidore the great experience which the Spanish Church had undergone, namely, the conversion of the ruling Goths to the Catholic faith, played a decisive role for his theological reflection.

---

probably be concluded from Isidore's sole polemical work, *On the Faith against the Jews*, but this is amazingly dedicated to his sister Florentina.

[94] *Diff.* II, 3, 10, *PL* 83, 71C.

[95] See supra, p. 725.

Probably it must also be stated that Isidore was no longer a man of late antiquity, that he displays no longing for the old conditions, no enthusiasm for an empire, no faith in *Roma Aeterna*, no anxiety before the collapse of the world, as is the case, for example, with Gregory of Tours or, still more clearly, with Gregory the Great.[96]

One understands that Isidore was admired by his contemporaries for his knowledge and that the future world willingly took over these rich treasures without making the effort to go behind Isidore. Thus to Isidore is due principally the break-through of the seven liberal arts in the early Middle Ages.[97] His *Chronicle*, which was finished c. 615, was used and expanded a century later in Gaul. As early as the seventh century some of his works had spread as far as Ireland.[98] As in the case of Cassiodorus, so too Isidore's *Grammar,* that is, Book I of his encyclopedia, was by no means a grammar in our sense; rather, it is an introductory treatise to the various activities which pertain to a skill, to writing and expressing oneself.[99] Isidore was the only one in whom in the seventh century almost all the wealth of classical antiquity once more resounds across the very limited period of late antiquity. For him the *artes liberales* were an express instrument of culture, that is, a tool for the cultivation of thought and word. In this he is distinguished also from his older contemporary, Gregory the Great, who could indeed express himself very properly in practice, for example, in the foreword to the *Moralia*, but in principle and theory rejected such efforts.[100] Following the example of Augustine,[101] Isidore counted historiography in grammar, because all that is worth remembering was written down.[102] While in the other points he extensively followed the classical models, he showed himself independent in the definition of historiography and stressed that historiography, in contrast to the compiling of annals, was the work of eyewitnesses, who presented everything truthfully. Here the definition of historiography was gained by the aid of the idea of the gospels; hence it was defined in a Christian and theological manner.[103] Even when Isidore emphasized that the ancient historians had written in order to instruct and educate later ages,[104] he was influenced by the New Testament (Rom. 15:4).

---

[96] Cf. A. Borst, op. cit., 59f.

[97] Cf. B. Bischof, *Isidoriana,* 344.

[98] Ibid., 321.

[99] J. Fontaine, op. cit. I, 206.

[100] *Reg. Epp.* V, 53a, 5: the words of the heavenly oracle must not be forced into the rules of [the grammarian] Donatus.

[101] Augustine, *De ordine* 2, 12, 37.

[102] *Etym.* 1, 42, 2.

[103] J. Fontaine, op. cit. I, 181.

[104] *Etym.* 1, 43.

In contrast to Cassiodorus, with whom he must be compared again and again, Isidore composed a monastic *Rule* and thus also showed the way for the practical organization of the life of monks. In this he was concerned for the divisions of the day, for the architectural plan of the monastery, for example, the location of the infirmary, for the publishing of books, and so forth. In Isidore's opinion, the monks should devote themselves completely to the spiritual life; but their life should be characterized chiefly by manual labor, though not by heavy fieldwork, which was left to slaves. If secular laborers sing unseemly songs during their work, then the monks must, *a fortiori*, praise Christ during their work.[105] Hence, Isidore's monastery was not a monastery of intellectuals, like that of Cassiodorus, even though he was very much concerned for education. But the education of the clergy as a whole was a concern of his. For this reason the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633, inspired by him, complained in canon 25 especially of the ignorance of the clergy and imposed on the bishops the frequent reading of Scripture and the canons. Caesarius of Arles had also recommended the reading of the Bible as the means of education and of personal sanctification. The canonical regulations as obligatory reading were a new element, which was explained by the fact that meanwhile various canonical collections, such as that of Dionysius Exiguus and especially the so-called *Hispana*, had appeared.

In the *Liber Ordinum* (no. 43), which probably belongs to Seville, there is a special ordination for the cleric to whom is entrusted the care of the books and copyists. From the verses with which Isidore of Seville himself had embellished his library,[106] it appears that external quiet was demanded in the *scriptorium*, and uninterrupted work by the writers was presumed. From this it becomes clear that no longer as in antiquity were multiple copies made by dictation, but merely individual copies, probably only on demand and by individual order.

Isidore himself seems to have taught orally also,[107] but especially in his writings he supplied us[108] with all that was then necessary for the education of a cleric, namely, the *humaniora* in Books I–III and X of the encyclopedia and in the two books of *Differences;* theology proper in Books VII and VIII of the encyclopedia and in Book I of the *Sentences*—Books II and III are concerned with morals and the guidance of souls—and furthermore in the book *On the Catholic Faith.* He passed on biblical knowledge in his work on the Fathers, in the allegories, and in the questions from the Old and the New Testament. If the *Collectio*

---

[105] *Reg.* 5, 5, *PL* 83, 874B.

[106] Nos. 25–27; C. Beeson, *Isidorstudien* (Munich 1913), p. 166.

[107] Cf. Ildefonse of Toledo, *Vir. illustr.* 9, *PL* 87, 28.

[108] Thus Fernández Alonso, op. cit., 85f., and 89ff.

Hispana really came from Isidore,[109] he also took pains with instruction in canon law. Finally, pastoral theology is treated in the book on ecclesiastical duties and in the final chapters of the *Sentences.*

That Isidore was not an especially speculative thinker can be seen above all in his Christology, which, it is true, is thoroughly orthodox and takes pains to survey and preserve the doctrines of the Fathers, but which did not give attention to the achievements of the recent period, especially those brought forth in the dispute over the Three Chapters. Apparently Isidore knew no difference between *substantia* and *subsistentia*; if he says in Book VII of his encyclopedia (7, 4, 11) that in God there are three *hypostases,* it means in Latin either three persons or three substances, but in Latin substance is not expressed in the real sense of God but only *abusive,* for in the true sense of the word substance means in Greek person but not nature. It is interesting and, for Isidore, characteristic that in Book VII of his encyclopedia, where he enumerates the various names for the Son of God, he mentions not only the *homoousios* (7, 2, 14) but also the *homoiousios* (7, 2, 16); in this also it appears that he is in closer connection with the Christian literature of the fourth and fifth than with that of the sixth century, for Hilary had recognized the Homoiousians as orthodox.

Isidore forbade Christians to read pagan poetry, but he showed himself quite at home in it. Here one must not seek to discover an inconsistency. Perhaps Isidore was convinced of having provided for this work of reading and selecting once for all time for Christian education. In any case, he seems to have assumed that clerics must make the content of his works entirely their own. Thus he recommends the occasional reading and reflecting on brief sections.[110] In this regard, one should read quietly because one can thus better grasp what has been read, and because the voice is spared. Of course, even better than the reading is the repeated discussion in common of what was read, because in this way what is obscure or doubtful becomes clear.[111] Such discussion (*collatio*) was a custom in monasteries since the fifth century and in Isidore presupposes the community of monks or clerics. But Isidore definitely rejects the debate. Just as the *collatio* builds, so the *contentio* destroys. It loses the feeling for the truth, produces quarrels, even leads to blasphemy; for the sake of one's own glory the truth is often sacrificed; therefore sophistries must unconditionally be avoided.[112] Hence even though Isidore transmitted to the Middle Ages a good part of his knowledge, he could not become the father of scholastic theology, for characteristic of it is the methodical new start of confrontation with opposing authors and even the debate.

---

[109] Ibid., 92, with some reservations.

[110] *Sent.* 3, 14, 8–9.

[111] Ibid. 3, 14, 1–2.

[112] Ibid. 3, 14, 4–5.

If one surveys the work of the four Christian writers of late antiquity here presented—especially Fulgentius[113] and Caesarius should also be reckoned with them—then one understands that they prepared the riches of the faith and of thought of Christian and pagan antiquity for a new unity to be created by the Middle Ages. In this connection it has already been said also that they were not yet able themselves to create such a unity. This literature is vastly inferior to the great accomplishments of the fourth and fifth centuries, not only in linguistic style but also in theological content. The reason for this must not be sought only in the general cultural decline, in the chaos of war, the destructions and daily miseries, but probably especially in the isolation in which these men existed. Cassiodorus and Boethius expressed it in saying that they found no debating partners; Isidore was admired by his contemporaries and was asked for new works and new instruction, but he was unable to obtain help and encouragement from them. But this situation is presented clearest in the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great: true, there was a partner in conversation, but he really knew how to say nothing, and scarcely to pose real questions; Gregory himself alone had to see even to the progress of the discussion. Great new theological literature could not appear again until a new intellectually formed community had been born.

---

[113] In this regard Fulgentius must still be emphasized in regard to form and systematization. His *De fide ad Petrum* already presents such a systematization in the sense of later scholasticism that A. Grillmeier (*Fulgentius von Ruspe: Scholastik* 34 (1959) 526–565) speaks of "Primitive Sentences."

LIST OF POPES, COUNCILS, AND RULERS

Popes

Melchiades	311–314
Silvester I	314–335
Mark	336
Julius I	337–352
Liberius	352–366
Felix II*	355–365
Damasus I	366–384
Ursinus*	366–367
Siricius	384–399
Anastasius I	399–401
Innocent I	401–417
Zosimus	417–418
Boniface I	418–422
Eulalius*	418–19
Celestine I	422–432
Sixtus III	432–440
Leo I	440–461
Hilary	461–468
Simplicius	468–483
Felix II	483–492
Gelasius I	492–496
Anastasius II	496–498
Symmachus	498–514
Lawrence*	498–505
Hormisdas	514–523
John I	523–526
Felix III	526–530
Boniface II	530–532
Dioscorus*	530
John II	533–535
Agapetus I	535–536
Silverius	536–537
Vigilius	537–555
Pelagius I	556–561
John III	561–574
Benedict I	575–579
Pelagius II	579–590
Gregory I	590–604
Sabinian	604–606
Boniface III	607
Boniface IV	608–615
Deusdedit	615–618
Boniface V	619–625
Honorius I	625–638
Severinus	640
John IV	640–642
Theodore I	642–649
Martin I	649–653
Eugene I	654–657
Vitalian	657–672
Adeodatus	672–676
Donus	676–678
Agatho	678–681
Leo II	682–683
Benedict II	684–685
John V	685–686
Conon	686–687
Theodore*	687
Paschal*	687–692
Sergius I	687–701
John VI	701–705
John VII	705–707
Sisinnius	708
Constantine*	708–715

* Anti-Popes.

Councils

General Councils

I Nicaea	325
I Constantinople	381
Ephesus	431
Chalcedon	451
II Constantinople	553
III Constantinople	681

Other Important Councils

Elvira	c. 306
Arles	314
Ancyra	314
Tyre	335
Gangra	c. 340
Antioch	341
Serdica	342 or 343
Carthage	345 or 348
Sirmium	351 or 352
Arles	353
Milan	355
Seleucia–Rimini	359
Alexandria	362
Valence	374
Zaragoza	380
Constantinople	382
Carthage	397
Turin	398
I Toledo	397 or 400
Carthage	401
Riez	439
I Orange	441
I Vaison	442
Ephesus	449

IN ROME:

462
487 or 488
495
504
601
649
680

IN THE FRANKISH KINGDOM:

Tours	461
Arles	473
Agde	506
I Orléans	511
Epaon	517
Carpentras	527
II Orange	529
II Vaison	529
II Orléans	533
III Orléans	538
IV Orléans	541
V Orléans	549
Tours	567
I Mâcon	581/583
II Mâcon	585
Narbonne	589
Auxerre	561/605
Paris	614
Clichy	626
Chalon	647/653
St. Jean de Losne	673/675

IN SPAIN:

Tarragona	516
Gerona	517
II Toledo	527
Lérida	546
I Braga	561
II Braga	572
III Toledo	589
II Seville	619
IV Toledo	633
V Toledo	636
VI Toledo	638
VII Toledo	646
VIII Toledo	653
IX Toledo	655
X Toledo	656
Mérida	666
XI Toledo	675
XII Toledo	681
XIII Toledo	683
XIV Toledo	684
XV Toledo	688
XVI Toledo	693
XVII Toledo	694

IN AFRICA:

Carthage	484
Junca and Sufes	523
Carthage	525
Carthage	534
Carthage	550
Carthage	594
Carthage	645

IN ENGLAND:

Augustine's Oak	600/605
Whitby	664
Hertford	672
Hatfield	680
Burford	680
Twyford	684
Bapchild	698

Rulers

Roman Byzantine Emperors

Constantine I	306–337
Constantine II	337–340
Constans I	337–350
Constantius II	337–361
Julian	361–363
Jovian	363–364
Valentinian I	364–375
Valens	364–378
Gratian	375–383
Valentinian II	383–392
Theodosius I	379–395
Honorius	395–423
Arcadius	395–408
Theodosius II	408–450
John	423–425
Valentinian III	425–455
Marcian	450–457
Leo I	457–474

Zeno	474–491
Basiliscus	475–476
Anastasius I	491–518
Justin I	518–527
Justinian I	527–565
Justin II	565–578
Tiberius II	578–582
Maurice	582–602
Phocas	602–610
Heraclius	610–641
Constantine III	641
Constans II	641–668
Constantine IV	668–685
Justinian II	685–695
Leontius	695–698
Tiberius III	698–705
Justinian II	705–711

Merovingian Frankish Kings

Childeric I	457–481
Clovis I	481–511
Reims:	
Theodoric I	511–534
Theodebert I	534–548
Theodebald	548–555
Orléans:	
Chlodomir	511–524
Paris:	
Childebert I	511–558
Soissons:	
Chlotar I	511–561
Burgundy:	
Guntram	561–593

Austrasia:	
Sigebert I	561–575
Childebert II	575–596
Theodobert II	596–612
Theoderic II	596–612
Sigebert III	639–656
Childeric II	662–675
Paris:	
Charibert I	561–567
Neustria:	
Chilperic I	561–584
Chlotar II	584–629
Dagobert I	629–639
Clovis II	640–657
Chlotar III	657–673
Theodoric III	673–690
Clovis III	690–694
Childebert III	697–711

Visigothic Kings

Alaric I	395–410	Liuwa II	601–603
Ataulfq	410–415	Witteric	603–610
Sigeric	415	Gundemar	610–612
Wallia	415–419	Sisebut	612–621
Theodoric I	419–451	Swinthila	621–632
Thorismund	451–453	Sisenand	632–636
Theodoric II	453–466	Chintila	636–639
Euric	466–484	Tulga	639–642
Alaric II	484–507	Chindaswinth	642–652
Amalaric	507–531	Recceswinth	652–672
Theudis	531–548	Wamba	672–680
Theudegisel	548–549	Erwig	680–687
Agila	549–554	Egica	687–701
Athanagild	554–567	Witiza	701–709
Liuwa I	567–572	Achila	709–710
Leovigild	568–586	Roderic	710–711
Recared	586–601		

Ostrogothic Kings

Theodoric	493–526	Witigis	536–540
Athalaric	526–534	Totila	541–552
Amalasuntha	534	Teias	552–553
Theodahad	534–536		

Vandal Kings

Gaiseric	428–477	Thrasamund	496–523
Hunneric	477–484	Hilderic	523–530
Gunthamund	484–496	Gelimer	530–534

Lombard Kings

Alboin	568–573	Godepert	661–662
Clephq	573–575	Grimoald	662–671
Authari	584–590	Perctarit	671–688
Agilulf	590–615	Cunincpert	688–700
Adaloald	615–625	Luitpert	700–701
Arioald	625–636	Aripert II	701–712
Rothari	636–652	Liutprand	712–744
Aripert	653–661		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Bibliography in Volume I, pages 435–458, is presupposed. Here are given only source collections thus far not mentioned, as well as new works and new editions, for the period treated here. The titles are listed according to the two principal divisions of the period.

A.D. 324–451

I. SOURCE COLLECTIONS

The Supplement to Volumes 1–96 of Migne's Latin Patrology, edited by A. Hamman, is complete in four volumes (=PL Suppl.); still to follow are *addenda* and general tables. For the *Corpus Christianorum* (*CChr*) appeared J.-M. Clément, *Initia Patrum latinorum* (Turnhout 1971). Patristic sources are published in the following new series: *Patristische Texte und Studien* (=*PTS*), edited by K. Aland and W. Schneemelcher (Berlin 1946ff.). Texts on Church history and the history of theology, edited by G. Ruhbach et al. (Gütersloh 1966ff). *Traditio Christiana* (*TradChr*), text and commentary on patristic theology, edited by A. Benoit et al. (Zurich 1969ff).

EDITIONS OF LITURGICAL TEXTS: P. E. Brigthman–C. E. Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western,* I: *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1965); *Textus patristici et liturgici* (Tpatrlit), ed. Institutum Liturgicum Ratisbonense (Regensburg 1964ff.); Kl. Gamber, *Codices liturgici antiquiores* (Fribourg, 2nd ed. 1968).

CONCILIAR CANONS: P. P. Joannou, *Les canons des conciles oecuméniques; Les canons des synodes particuliers: Pubbl. della Pontificia commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale.* Fonti, fasc. IX: *Discipline générale antique* (*II^e–IX^e siècles*). Tom. 1 (Grottaferrata 1962); Id., *Les canons des Pères grecs:* ibid., Tom. 2 with Index analytique (ibid. 1963–64); J. Vives–T. M. Martinez–G. M. Diez, *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos* (Barcelona–Madrid 1963); *Concilia Galliae A. 314–A. 506,* ed. C. Munier: *CChr* 148 (Turnhout 1963).

EARLY CHRISTIAN INSCRIPTIONS: *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae,* new series by A. Silvagni, has been enlarged by A. Ferrua with vols. IV and V (Vatican City 1964–1971); A collection of the inscriptions of the Vatican Museum was published by H. Ziliacus, *Sylloge inscriptionum christianarum veterum Musei Vaticani,* 2 vols. (Helsinki 1963); E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres,* appeared in a second edition by J.

Moreau; see vol. IV: Suppl., ed., J. Moreau–H.-I. Marrou (Berlin–Zurich 1967); J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la España Romano y Visigoda* (Barcelona, 2nd. ed. 1969); W. Boppert, *Die frühchristlichen Inschriften des Mittelrheingebietes* (Mainz 1971); See E. Meyer, *Einführung in die lateinische Epigraphik* (Darmstadt 1973, Lit.); For the Greek and Latin inscriptions of Syria vols. V, VI, and VII must be added (to 1970); A. C. Bandy, *The Greek Inscriptions of Crete* (Athens 1970).

NUMISMATICS: K. Christ, *Antike Numismatik: Einführung und Bibliographie* (Darmstadt 1967); H. Mattingly–E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage,* VI: *From Diocletian to Maximianus (294–313),* by C. H. Sutherland; VII, *Constantine and Licinius (313 to 337),* by P. M. Bruun (London 1966–67).

COLLECTIONS OF STATE LAWS: *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges et novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes,* rec. Th. Mommsen–P. M. Meyer, 2 vols. (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1954); *Corpus Iuris Civilis,* rec. P. Krueger–Th. Mommsen–R. Schoell–G. Kroll, I: *Institutiones et Digesta* (Berlin, 16th ed. 1954), II: *Codex Justinianus* (ibid., 12th ed. 1959), III: *Novellae* (ibid., 7th ed. 1959); C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code. A Translation with Commentary, Glossary and Bibliography* (Princeton 1952); P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents to* A.D. *535,* 3 vols. (London 1966).

II. PRESENTATIONS

1. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

J. Danielou and H. I. Marrou, *The First Six Hundred Years,* Vol. 1 of *The Christian Centuries* (New York 1964); A. Mandouze, ed., *2000 Ans de Christianisme* (Paris 1975); B. Llorca, *Historia de la Iglesia Católica,* I: *Edad Antigua* (Madrid, 4th ed. 1964); K. D. Schmidt–E. Wolf, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* C 1: R. Lorenz, *Das vierte bis sechste Jahrhundert (Westen)* (Göttingen 1970); R. Kottje–B. Moeller, *Ökumenische Kirchengeschichte,* I: *Alte Kirche und Ostkirche* (Munich 1970); C. Andresen, *Die Kirche der alten Christenheit* (Stuttgart 1971); J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition* I: *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition* (100–600) (Chicago 1971).

2. CHURCH HISTORY OF INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

Chr. Papadopoulos, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἱεροσολύμων (Jerusalem 1910); id., Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας (Alexandria 1935); id., Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀντιοχείας (Alexandria 1951); G. I. Konïdaris, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλλάδος (Athens 1954); R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris 1945); E. Griffe, *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine* I^2 II^2 III (Paris 1964/66); E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'église en Belgique* I (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1945); Z. Garcia Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de Espāna* I (Madrid 1929); Q. Aldea Vaquero et al., *Diccionario de historia eclesiástica de España* (Madrid 1972ff.); I. H. Deanesley, *The Pre-Conquest Church in England* (London 1953); M. W. Barley–R. P. C. Hanson (eds.), *Christianity in Britain* (Lester 1968); L. Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London 1932); A. R. MacEwen, *History of the Church in Scotland* I (London 1913); H. M. Chadwick, *Early Scotland* (Cambridge 1949); W. Delius, *Geschichte der irischen Kirche* (Munich–Basel 1954); P. J. Corish (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism* I (Dublin 1967ff.); E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* I

(Innsbruck–Vienna 1935); J. Wodka, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* (Vienna 1959); Th. Schwegler, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in der Schweiz* (Stans, 2nd ed. 1943); R. Pfister, *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz* I (Zurich 1964); B. Bauerreiss, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns* I (St. Ottilien, 2nd ed. 1958).

3. HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

B. Altaner–A. Stuiber, *Patrology* (New York 1960); P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne* IV–VII (Paris 1912–1923); P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident. De Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1948); A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum 12. Jh.* (Munich 1949); N. K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul* (London 1955); I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia syriaca* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1965).

4. HISTORY OF DOGMA

R. P. C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church* (London 1962); B. Lohse, *Epochen der Dogmengeschichte* (Stuttgart 1963); A. Dempf, *Geistesgeschichte der altchristlichen Kultur* (Stuttgart 1964); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London, 3rd ed. 1965); A. Adam, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* I: *Die Zeit der Alten Kirche* (Gütersloh 1965); A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* (London 1965); M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident 335–430* (Paris 1967); K. F. Morrison, *Tradition and Authority in the Western Church 300–1140* (Princeton 1969); H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Father* I (Cambridge, Mass., 3rd ed. 1970); E. Boularand, *L'hérésie d'Arius et "La Foi" de Nicée* (Paris 1972).

5. HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS

Le Concile et les Conciles (Paris 1960); A. Grillmeier–H. Bacht (eds.), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (Würzburg, 2nd ed. 1962); G. Dumeige–H. Bacht, *Geschichte der ökumenischen Konzilien,* I: I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nizäa und Konstantinopel* (Mainz 1964), II: P. Th. Camelot, *Ephesus und Chalcedon* (Mainz 1963); A. M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein symbol* (Göttingen 1965).

6. HISTORY OF LITURGY

J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite, Its Origins and Development* (New York, rev. & abridged ed. 1959); A. G. Martimort, *Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1963–65); M. Righetti, *Manuale di Storia Liturgica,* I–IV (Milan, 3rd ed. 1964–69); H. A. Schmidt, *Introductio in liturgiam occidentalem* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1965); Th. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (Bonn 1965); J. A. Jungmann, *Liturgie der christlichen Frühzeit* (Friburg, 1967); E. Cattaneo, *Introduzione alla storia liturgica occidentale* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1969); W. Nagel, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1970); J. Daniélou, *La catéchèse aux premiers siècles* (Paris 1968); J. B. Schnyder, *Geschichte der katholischen Predigt* (Freiburg 1969); W. Schütz, *Geschichte der christlichen Predigt* (Berlin 1972).

7. HISTORY OF DEVOTION

H. Delehaye, *Sanctus* (Brussels 1927); Id., *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1933); A. Grabar, *Martyrium,* 3 vols. (Paris 1946); B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa*

(Münster 1950); R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie* (Paris 1953); H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques* (Brussels, 4th ed. 1954); Th. Klauser, *Christlicher Martyrerkult, heidnischer Heroenkult und spätjüdische Heiligenverehrung* (Cologne 1960); J. A. Jungmann, *Christliches Beten im Wandel und Bestand* (Munich 1969).

8. MONASTICISM

K. Heussi, *Ursprung des christlichen Mönchtums* (Tübingen 1936); G. Turbessi, *Ascetismo e monachesimo prebenedettino* (Rome 1961); *Théologie de la vie monastique. Etudes sur la doctrine patristique* (Paris 1961); *Los monjes y los estudios* (Poblet 1963); S. Frank, ΑΓΓΕΙΚΟΣ ΒΙΟΣ (Münster 1964); U. Ranke-Heinemann, *Das frühe Mönchtum. Seine Motive nach den Selbstzeugnissen* (Essen 1964); B. Lohse, *Askese und Mönchtum in der Antike und in der alten Kirche* (Münster 1969); St. Schiewietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum,* I/III (Vienna 1904–38); *Il monachesimo orientale* (Rome 1958); D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City* (London 1965); W. Schatz, *Studien zur Geschichte und Vorstellungswelt des frühen abendländischen Mönchtums* (Diss. Freiburg 1957); O. Chadwick, *Western Asceticism* (London 1958); J. Décarreaux, *Die Mönche und die abendländische Zivilisation* (Wiesbaden 1965).

9. HISTORY OF CANON LAW AND OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION

J. Gaudemet, *La formation du droit séculier et du droit de l'église au IV^e et V^e siècles* (Paris 1957); P. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte,* I: *Die katholische Kirche* (Weimar, 4th ed. 1964); W. M. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* I (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1960).

10. CHURCH AND STATE

K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century* (New York 1941); A. A. Ehrhardt, *Politische Metaphysick von Solon bis Augustin* II (Tübingen 1959); H. Rahner, *Kirche und Staat im frühen Christentum* (Munich 1961); A. W. Ziegler, *Religion, Kirche und Staat in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* I: *Geschichte* (Munich 1969); R. Klein (ed.), *Das frühe Christentum im römischen Staat* (Darmstadt 1971); P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire* (Madison 1939).

11. CHURCH AND CULTURE

G. Schnürer, *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter* I (Paderborn, 3rd ed. 1936); H.-I. Marrou, *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 4th ed. 1958); H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Göteborg 1958); O. Gigon, *Die antike Kultur und das Christentum* (Gütersloh 1966); A. Wifstrand, *Die alte Kirche und die griechische Bildung* (Bern 1967); M. Simon, *La civilisation de l'antiquité et le christianisme* (Paris 1972).

12. CHRISTIAN ARCHEOLOGY—EARLY CHRISTIAN ART

C. Andresen, *Einführung in die christliche Archäologie = Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* I B 1 (Göttingen 1971); A. Grabar, *The Great Centuries of Byzantine Art* (Geneva 1953); F. Gerke, *Spätantike und frühes Christentum = Kunst der Welt* (Baden-Baden 1967); R. Krautheimer, *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Harmsworth 1965); A. Khatchatrian, *Les Baptistères paléochrétiens* (Paris 1962); H. Kähler, *Die frühe Kirche. Kult and Kulturraum* (Berlin 1972); P. Testini, *Le catacombe e gli antichi cimiteri cristiani* *in Roma* (Bologna 1966); Th. Klauser, *Frühchristliche Sarkophage in Wort und Bild* (Olten 1966); F. W. Deichmann, (ed.) *Repertorium der altchristlichen Sarkophage,* I: revised by G. Bovini–H. Brandenburg (Wiesbaden 1966ff.); H. Karpp, *Die Mosaiken in S. Maria Maggiore zu Rom* (Baden-Baden 1966); E. Sauser, *Frühchristliche Kunst. Sinnbild und Glaubensaussage* (Innsbruck 1966); G. Schiller, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst* (Berlin 1966ff.); E. Kirschbaum, *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* (Freiburg 1968ff.); A. Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins* (Princeton 1968).

III. THE BACKGROUND OF SECULAR HISTORY

1. History of the Late Roman Empire

K. Christ, *Römische Geschichte. Einführung, Quellenkunde, Bibliographie* (Darmstadt 1973); O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* V–VI (reprint, Darmstadt 1966); F. W. Walbank, *The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West* (London 1946); E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* I² II (Paris 1949–59); S. Mezzarino, *Trattato di Storia Romana* II (Rome 1956); H. Dannenbauer, *Die Entstehung Europas* I (Stuttgart 1959); L. Musset, *Les Invasions. Les Vagues Germaniques* (Paris 1965); F. Lot, *The End of the Ancient World and the Beginnings of the Middle Ages* (London 1966); R. Rémondon, *La Crise de l'empire Romain* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1970); P. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity* (London 1971); R. Folz–A. Guillou–L. Musset–D. Sourdel, *De l'antiquité au Monde Médiéval-Peuples et Civiliasations* V (Paris 1972); A. Pignaniol, *L'empire Chrétien 325–395* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1972); A. H. M. Jones–J. R. Martindale–J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire,* I: *A.D. 260–395* (London 1971).

2. History of Religion and Culture

J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1929); P. de Labriolle, *La réaction paienne* (Paris 1936); H.-I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity,* (London–N.Y. 1956); H. Mattingly, *Roman Civilization* (London 1959); K. Büchner, *Römische Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 3rd ed. 1962); A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern–Munich, 2nd ed. 1963); J. Straub, *Heidnische Geschichtsapologetik in der christlichen Spätantike* (Bonn 1963); A. Momogliano (ed.), *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the 4th Century* (Oxford 1963); J. Vogt, *Der Niedergang Roms. Metamorphose der antiken Kultur* (Zurich 1965); J. Straub, *Regeneratio imperii* (Darmstadt 1972).

3. Legal, Economic, and Social History

S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo* (Rome 1951); M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* I/II (London, 2nd ed. 1957); S. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Roman Empire* (New York, 2nd ed. 1958); W. Seyfarth, *Soziale Fragen der spätrömischen Kaiserzeit im Spiegel des Theodosianus* (Berlin 1963); F. Wieacker, *Recht und Gesellschaft in der Spätantike* (Stuttgart 1964); A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602. A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey* I–IV (Oxford 1964); F. de Martino, *Le istituzioni politiche e la società del tardo Impero fino alla caduta della parte di Occidente* (Naples 1967); J. Gaudemet, *Les institutions de l'antiquité* (Paris 1967); J. Gagé, *Les classes sociales dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1971); N. Brockmeyer, *Sozialgeschichte der Antike* (Stuttgart 1972).

4. AUXILIARIES

H. Jedin–K. S. Latourette–J. Martin, *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg 1970); F. Littell, *The Macmillan Atlas History of Christianity* (New York 1976); *Grosser Historischer Weltatlas,* Part I: *Vorgeschichte und Altertum,* ed. H. Bengtson and Vl. Milojcic (Munich, 5th ed. 1972); *Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike, auf der Grundlage von Pauly-Wissowa,* ed. K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer, (Stuttgart 1964ff.); *Lexikon der antiken Welt,* ed. G. Andresen–H. Erbse–O. Gigon et al. (Zurich 1965); A. Blaise–H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens* (Turnhout, 3rd ed. 1967).

A.D. 451–711

A. THE EARLY BYZANTINE CHURCH

A comprehensive survey of the sources and presentations on the history of the Eastern Church is given in Volume III, pages 487–495. The following titles bring it up to date.

1. ANCILLARY SCIENCES: F. Dölger–J. Karayannopulos, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre,* 1: *Die Kaiserurkunden* (Munich 1967).

2. SOURCES: In the framework of the *Corpus Christianorum* appeared a *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* in three volumes, which includes Greek patristic literature to the eighth century. Already published are vol. II: *Scriptores ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum,* ed. M. Geerard (Turnhout 1974), and vol. III: *Scriptores saec. V–VIII, Concilia, Catenae* (1976); I. E. Karagiannopulos, *Πηγαὶ τῆς βυζαντινῆς ἱστορίας* (Thessalonica 1970).

3. GENERAL COLLECTIONS OF SOURCES: *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae,* Series Berolinensis, ed. H.-G. Beck–A. Kambylis–R. Keydell (Berlin 1967ff.); a second series appears in Washington (1967ff.); J. Meyerdorff, *Byzantian Theology,* (New York 1976).

4. COUNCILS: *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* Tom. IV vol. 1: *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum sub Justiniano Habitum,* ed. J. Straub (Berlin 1971); besides Tom. IV vol. III: *Index Generalis* Tom. I–IV. Pars 1^a: *Index Codicum et Auctorum,* by R. Schieffer (Berlin 1973).

5. STATE DECREES: P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church. A Collection of Legal Documents,* vol. 3: 453–534 (London 1966); C. de Clercq, *Fontes Iuridici Ecclesiarum Orientalium* (Rome 1967).

6. HISTORICAL STATISTICAL WORKS: V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople,* fasc. 1 (Paris, 2nd ed. 1972), fasc. 4 (Paris 1971); R. Janin, *Géographie Ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin,* vol. III: *Les Églises et les Monastères de Constantinople* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1969); vol. II: *Les Églises et les Monastères des Grands Centres Byzantins (Bithynia, Hellespont, Latros, etc.)* (Paris 1975).

7. MONASTICISM: *Les Moines d'Orient* II–IV (Paris 1961–64), A.-J. Festugière.

8. LITURGY: *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Dubia,* ed. P. Maas–C. A. Trypanis (Berlin 1970); *Romanos le mélode, Hymnes,* ed. J. Grosdider de Matons, vols. I–IV: *SChr*

99, 110, 114, 128 (Paris 1964–67); C. A. Trypanis, *Fourteen Early Byzantine Cantica* (Vienna–Cologne 1968); F. Halkin, *Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* (Brussels 1969).

Materials on Eastern History

1. POLITICAL HISTORY: R. H. Jenkins, *Byzantium. The Imperial Centuries A. D. 610–1071* (London 1966); J. M. Hussey (ed.), *The Byzantine Empire,* I: *Byzantium and its Neighbours,* II: *Government, Church and Civilisation = The Cambridge Medieval History,* vol. 1–2 (Cambridge 1966–67); L. Bréhier, *Le monde Byzantin,* 3 vols. (Paris, 2nd ed. 1968–70); P. N. Ure, *Justinian and His Age* (Harmondsworth 1951); D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth* (History of Civilisation) (London 1971); A. N. Stratos, *Byzantium in the 7th Century* (Amsterdam 1972ff.); C. D. Gordon, *The Age of Attila. Fifth Century Byzantium and the Barbarians* (Ann Arbor 1960); B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Justinians I.* vol. 1 (Berlin 1960); J. W. Barker, *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire* (Madison 1966); P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam, VI^e–VII^e siècle,* 4 vols. (Paris 1951–65); St. Runciman, *Byzanz = Kindlers Kulturgeschichte* (Munich 1970); K. Wessel, *Die Kultur von Byzanz* (Frankfurt a. M. 1970); *Byzantinische Forschungen* (Amsterdam 1966ff.); *Travaux et Mémoires.* Centre de Recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantine (Paris 1956ff.); *Collection "Le monde byzantin"* (Paris 1966ff.).

2. CHURCH HISTORY: A. S. Hernándex, *Iglesias de Oriente,* I–II (Santander 1963); F. Heiler, *Die Ostkirchen* (Munich 1971); E. v. Ivanka, J. Tyciak, et al., *Hdb. der Ostkirchenkunde* (Düsseldorf 1971); J. L. van Dieten–C. Mango–P. Wirth, *Geschichte der Patriarchen Sergios I bis Johannes VI (610–715) = Enzyklopädie der Byzantinistik* vol. 24 (Amsterdam 1972); C. Diehl, *Byzantium* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1960).

3. THE PAPACY AND THE EASTERN CHURCH: F. Dvornik, *Byzantium and The Papacy* (New York 1966); L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli Imperatori e Patriarchi Byzantini, VI–VII sec.* (Rome–Louvain 1972).

4. HISTORY OF THE INDIVIDUAL EASTERN CHURCHES: J. Ch. and M. Sournia, *l'Orient des Premiers Chrétiens. Histoire et Archéologie de la Syrie Byzantine* (Paris 1966).

5. LEGAL HISTORY: R. Guilland, *Recherches sur les Institutions Byzantines* 2 vols. (Berlin–Amsterdam 1967).

6. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY: D. Claude, *Die Byzantinische Stadt im 6. Jh.* (Munich 1969); G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton 1961); D. J. Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1968).

7. POLITICAL THOUGHT–CHURCH AND STATE: F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy,* 2 vols. (Washington 1966); P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First* (Thessalonica, 2nd ed. 1974); A. Riou, *Le Monde et l'Énglise selon Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris 1973).

8. MONASTICISM: A. -J. Festugière, *Ursprünge christlicher Frömmigkeit. Bildung oder Heiligkeit im Mönchtum des altchristlichen Orient* (Basel 1963).

9. LITURGY: H. -J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie. Vom Wesen ihrer Symbolgestalt* (Freiburg 1964); J. Darrouzès, *Recherches sur les Offikia de l'église byzantine* (Paris 1970); E. Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1961); E.

Wellesz–M. Velimitovii, *Studies in Eastern Chant* (London 1966ff.); J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance* (Paris 1975).

10. (a) LITERARY HISTORY: P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture a Byzance des origines au X^e siècle* (Paris 1971).

10. (c) HISTORY OF ART: K. Wessel, *Reallexikon der byzantinischen Kunst* (Stuttgart 1963ff.); D. T. Rice, *Art of the Byzantine Era* (London 1960); J. Beckwith, *The Art of Constaninople* (London 1961); Ch. Delvoye, *L'art byzantin* (Paris 1967); A. Grabar, *Great Centuries of Byzantine Painting* (Geneva 1953).

11. THEOLOGY AND SPIRITUALITY: W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge 1972); L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité orthodoxe* (Paris 1965); W. Völker, *Maximus Confessor als Meister des geistlichen Lebens* (Wiesbaden 1965); I. Hausherr, *Études de spiritualité orientale* (Rome 1969).

B. THE LATIN CHURCH

1. SOURCES

The Manuals of Patrology by Altaner–Stuiber[7] and Bardenhewer vol. V; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Lit. des Mittelalters* I (Munich 1911); G. de Ghellinck, *La Littérature Latine au Moyen Age* I (Paris 1939); P. Courcelle, *Histoire Littéraire des Grandes Invasions* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1964); Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter,* Heft 1 (Weimar 1952); Gebhardt, *Hdb. der Deutschen Geschichte,* I[9], ed. H. Grundmann (Stuttgart 1970); J. F. Kenney, *The Sources of the Early History of Ireland* I: *Ecclesiastical* (New York 1929; reprint with supplements: Dublin 1966); K. Hughes, *Early Christian Ireland: Introduction to the Sources* (London 1972).

2. GENERAL PRESENTATIONS

H. v. Schubert, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter* (Tubingen 1921, reprint ed. Hildesheim 1962); L. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church from Its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century,* 3 vols. (London, 1950–57); Daniel-Rops, *The Church in the Dark Ages* (Garden City, N.Y. 1962); *Le Chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'* 800 = *Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo* VII (Spoleto 1960); R. Lorentz, *Das vierte bis sechste Jh.;* G. Haendler, *Geschichte des Frühmittelalters und der Germanenmission* = *Die Kirche in inhrer Geschichte,* Part C 1 and E (Göttingen 1970 and 1961); M. Adriani, *L'Europa cristiana. Dal declino della romanità alle soglie dell'anno mille* (Storia del Cristianesimo, Rome 1971).

3. THE PAPACY

E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* II (Tübingen 1933); J. Haller, *Das Papsttum* I (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1953); F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste* II (Munich, 2nd ed. 1955); W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 3rd ed. 1970); P. Conte, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei Papi del secolo VII* (Milan 1971); L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini, VI–VII sec.*

(Rome–Louvain 1972); O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte al Bisanzio e ai Longobardi* (Rome 1941).

4. CONVERSION OF THE GERMANS AND HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

W. Lange, *Texte zur germanischen Bekehrungsgeschichte* (Tübingen 1962); K. D. Schmidt, *Die Bekehrung der Germanen zum Christentum* I–II (Göttingen 1939–42); *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa del Alto Medioevo = Settimane di studio . . .* XIV (Spoleto 1967); A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* I (Leipzig 1922; reprint, Berlin 1954); E. Mâle, *La fin du paganisme en Gaule et les plus anciennes basiliques chrétiennes* (Paris 1950); E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique* I (Brussels 2nd ed. 1945); R. Bauerreiss, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns* (St. Ottilien, 2nd ed. 1958); R. Pfister, *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz* (Zurich 1964); Z. Garcia Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España* II: 409–711 (Madrid 1932); A. K. Ziegler, *Church and State in Visigothic Spain* (Washington 1930); K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Sueben bis zur Errichtung der katholischen Staatskirche* (Berlin 1967); D. Claude, *Adel, Kirche und Königtum im Westgotenreich* (Sigmaringen 1971); K. Hughes, *The Church in Early Irish Society* (London 1966); L. Hardinge, *The Celtic Church in Britain* (London 1972); J. T. McNeill, *The Celtic Churches. A History, A. D. 200–1200* (Chicago–London 1974); H. Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England* (London 1972); C. J. Godfrey, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge 1962).

5. MONASTICISM

Il Monachesimo nell'Alto Medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale = Settimane di studio . . . IV (Spoleto 1957); J. Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York 1963); G. Penco, *Storia del monachesimo in Italia* I (Rome 1961); Ph. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoit* I–II (Maredsous, 2nd ed. 1948–49); F. Prinz; *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (4.–8. Jn.; Munich–Vienna 1965); J. Ryan, *Early Irish Monasticism* (Dublin 1931).

6. SPIRITUALITY

J. Leclercq et al., *Spirituality of the Middle Ages* (London 1968) J. Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale* (Paris 1964); *La Bibbia nell'Alto Medioevo = Settimane di studio . . .* X (Spoleto 1963); F. Graus, *Volk, Herrscher und Heilige im Reich der Merowinger* (Prague 1965).

7. CANON LAW

C. de Clercq, *La législation religieuse franque de Clovis à Charlemagne, 507–814,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1936–58); H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte,* I: *Die Katholische Kirche* (Weimar, 5th ed. 1972); A. W. Ziegler, *Religion, Kirche und Staat in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* I: *Geschichte* (Munich 1969); E. Lesne, *La propriété ecclésiastique en France aux époques romaine et mérovingienne* (Paris 1910); S. Mochi Onory, *Vescovi e città* (sec. IV–VI; Bologna 1933); G. Vismara, *Audientia episcopalis* (Milan 1937); F. Lot–R. Fawtier, *Histoire des institutions françaises au Moyen Age,* III: *Institutions ecclésiastiques* (Paris 1962).

8. SPECIAL PERIODICALS

Frühmittelalterliche Forschungen (Berlin 1967ff.); *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* (Paris 1910ff.); *Revista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* (Rome 1947ff.); *Hispania Sacra* (Madrid 1948ff.); *Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge 1972ff.).

The Background of Secular History

1. GENERAL PRESENTATIONS

M. Deanesly, *A History of Early Medieval Europe* (London 1956); J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Barbarian West* (London, 2nd ed. 1957); *Caratteri del secolo VII in occidente = Settimane di studio . . .* V (Spoleto 1958); R. S. Lopez, *The Birth of Europe,* (London 1966); *Il passaggio dall'antichità al Medioevo = Settimane di studio . . .* IX (Spoleto 1962); H. Dannenbauer, *Die Entstehung Europas,* II: *Die Anfänge der abendländischen Welt* (Stuttgart 1962); *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte,* V: *Islam; Die Entstehung Europas* (Frankfurt–Vienna 1963); K. F. Stroheker, *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zurich–Stuttgart 1965); P. E. Hübinger, *Kulturbruch oder Kulturkontinuität im Übergang von der Antike zum Mittelalter = Wege der Forschung* 201 (Darmstadt 1968); F. G. Maier, *Die Verwandlung der Mittelmeerwelt = Fischers Weltgeschichte* 9 (Hamburg 1968); J. Dhondt (ed.), *Das frühe Mittelalter = Fischers Weltgeschichte* 10 (Hamburg 1968); K. Bosl–A. Gieysztor et al., *Eastern and Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (London 1970); R. Folz, A. Guillou et al., *De l'antiquité au monde médiéval* (Paris 1972); Th. Schieder (ed.), *Hdb. der Europäischen Geschichte,* I: *Europa im Wandel von der Antike zum Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1975).

2. WANDERING OF THE PEOPLES

J. Fischer, *Die Völkerwanderung im Urteil der zeitgenössischen kirchlichen Schriftsteller* (Heidelberg 1948); F. Behn, *Römertum und Völkerwanderung* (Stuttgart 1963); L. Musset, *Les Invasions. Les vagues germanizues: Nouvelle Clio* 12 (Paris 1965); O. Bertolini, *I Germani-Migrazioni e regni nell'Occidente già romano* (Milan 1965); L. Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen* (Munich 1941, reprint 1969); L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Vandalen* (Munich 1942); C. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955); H. J. Diesner, *Das Vandalenreich* (Stuttgart 1966); E. Pontieri, *Le invasioni barbariche e l'Italia del V e VI secolo* (Naples 1960); *I Goti in Occidente = Settimane di Studio III* (Spoleto 1956); P. Scardiglia, *Die Goten. Sprache und Kultur* (Munich 1973); G. Pepe, *Il medioevo bararico d'Italia* (Turin 1963); G. P. Bognetti, *Italia Langobarda* I-IV (Milan 1966/68); *Atti del Convegno internazionale sul tema: La civiltà dei Longobardi in Europa* (Rome 1974); O. Perrin, *Les Burgondes. Leur Histoire des origines à la fin du premier Royaume, 534* (Neuenburg 1968); *Études mérovingiennes* (Paris 1953); J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Longhaired Kings* (London 1962); G. Tessier, *Le Baptême* de Clovis (Paris 1964); F. Lot, *Naissance de la France* (Paris 1970); G. Duby et al., *Histoire de la France,* I: *Naissance d'une Nation* (Paris 1970); E. Zollner, *Geschichte der Franken* (Munich 1970); G. Faider–Feytmans, *La Belgique à l'époque mérovingienne* (Brussels 1964); R. Menendez-Pidal, ed., *Historia de España* III (Madrid 1939, reprint 1957); D. Claude, *Geschichte der Westgoten* (Stuttgart 1970); M. Dillon-N. K. Chadwick, *The Celtic Realms* (London 1957); E. A. Thompson, *A History of Attila and the Huns,* (Oxford 1948.); id. *The Early Germans* (Oxford 1965); F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1971); J. Morris, *The Age of Arthur. A History of the British Isles from 350–650* (London 1973).

3. CULTURAL AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe A.D. 500–900* (London, 2nd ed. 1957); P. Brezzi, *L'urto delle civiltà nell'alto medioevo* (Rome 1971); P. Riché, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West, 6th–8th Centuries* (Columbia, S.C., 1975); E. I. Raby, *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1957); J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959); E. Salin, *La civilisation mérovingienne,* 4 vols. (Paris 1949–59); *La Scuola nell'Occidente latino dell'Alto Medioevo = Settimane di Studio . . .* XIX (Spoleto 1972); J. Paul, *Histoire intellectuelle de l'Occident médiéval* (Paris 1973).

4. HISTORY OF ART

A. Grabar–C. Nordenfolk, *Le haut Moyen-Age du IV*^{e} *au XI*^{e} *siècle* (Geneva 1957); J. Hubert–J. Porcher–W. F. Vollbach, *L'Europe des Invasions* (Paris 1967); P. Verzone, *Werdendes Abendland, 425–800 = Kunst der Welt* (Baden-Baden 1967); J. Beckwith, *Early Medieval Art* (New York 1974).

5. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY

R. Doehard, *Le Haut Moyen-Age occidental. Économies et sociétés: Nouvelle Clio* 14 (Paris 1971); A. Dopsch, *The Economic and Social Foundations of European Civilization* (New York 1937); S. Dill, *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age* (London 1926; reprint 1967); E. Ennen, *Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt* (Bonn 1953); J. P. Bodmer, *Der Krieger der Merowingerzeit und seine Welt* (Zurich 1957); R. Latouche, *The Birth of the Western Economy* (London 1961); *Moneta e Scambi nell'Alto Medioevo = Settimane di Studio . . .* VIII (Spoleto 1961); R. Fossier, *Histoire sociale de l'Occident médiéval* (Paris 1970); F. Fourquin, *Histoire économique de l'Occident médiéval* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1971); C. M. Cipolla, *The Fontana Economic History,* I: *The Middle Ages* (London 1972); C. Verlinden, *L'Esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale* I (Bruges 1955); L. White, *Medieval Technology and Social Change* (New York 1966); G. Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West* (London 1966).

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One

The Development of the Church of the Empire within the Framework of the Imperial Religious Policy

1. *From Christianity's Position of Equality to One of Privilege by the Favor of the Emperor Constantine I*

SOURCES

First must be named those given in Vol. I, chaps. 29 and 30. A new edition of the *Vita Constantini* for the GCS is being prepared by F. Winkelmann; cf. id., *Die Textbezeugung der Vita Constantini des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Berlin 1962, *TU* 84); *id.*, "Zur Geschichte des Authentizitätsproblems der Vita Constantini," *Klio* 40 (1962), 187–243. Constantine's letters and decrees are treated in Vol. I, chap. 30, of the work, already cited, by H. Dörries, 55–226, and H. Kraft, 207–270. Important now are Vol. I, pp. 58f., with the editions of the cited works of the Christian Church historians and chroniclers, and the works of the secular historians, especially *Zosimus Historia nova,* ed. L. Mendelssohn (Leipzig 1887, reprint ed. Hildesheim 1963); the Chronographia of Johannes Malalas, ed. J. Dindorf, *CSHB* 15 (Bonn 1831); the Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig 1883–5, reprint ed. Hildesheim 1963); the *Chronicon Paschale,* ed. Th. Mommsen: *Chronica Minora* I, 203ff. On the Latin side: Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae,* ed. C. U. Clark (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1962) or J. C. Rolfe (latest edition London 1950–52); the *Anonymus Valesianus,* ed. Th. Mommsen: *Chronica Minora* I, 259ff. or L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores* 24, 4 (Milan 1913). A survey of the lesser sources of the fourth century is given by A. Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien* (325–395) (Paris, 2nd ed. 1972), 467–473.—Coinage: *The Roman Imperial Coinage,* VII: *Constantine and Licinius,* A.D. *313–337,* by P. M. Bruun (London 1966).

LITERATURE

Besides the works cited in Vol. I: G. Bardy, "La politique religieuse de Constantin après le concile de Nicée," *RevSR* 8 (1928), 516–551; I. Karayannopoulos, "Konstantin der Grosse und der Kaiserkult," *Historia* 5 (1956), 341–357; K. Aland, "Der Abbau des Herrscherkultes im Zeitalter Konstantins," *Kirchengesch. Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 240–256; H. Dörries, "Konstantinische Wende und Glaubensfreiheit," *Wort und Stunde* I (Göttingen 1966), 1–117; C. Dupont, "Les privilèges des clercs sous Constantin," *RHE* 62 (1967), 729–752; R. MacMullen, *Constantine* (New York 1969); J. H. Smith, *Constantine the Great* (London 1971).

ON CONSTANTINE'S BUILDING ACTIVITY: General: L. Voelkl, "Die Konstantinischen Kirchenbauten nach Eusebius," *RivAC* 29 (1953), 49–66, 187–206; J. B. Ward Perkins, "Constantine and the Origins of the Christian Basilica," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 22 (1954), 69–90; R. Krautheimer, "The Constantinian Basilica," *DOP* 21 (1967), 115–140.—Palestine: C. Kopp, *Palästina-Hefte des Dt. Vereins vom Heiligen Land* 21–23 (1939), 117ff.; J. W. Crowfoot, *Early Churches of Palestine* (London 1941); E. Wifstrand, *Göteborgs Högskola Årskrift* 58 (1952), 1ff.—Rome: R. Vielliard, *Recherches sur les origines de la Rome chrétienne* (Mâcon 1941); F. W. Deichmann, *Frühchristliche Kirchen in Rom* (Basel 1948); R. Krautheimer et al., *Corpus Basilicarum christianarum Romae* III (Rome 1967).—For Trier the reports of the excavation in the cathedral area by K. Th. Kempf: *Neue Ausgrabungen in Deutschland* (Berlin 1958), 368–379, and "Untersuchungen und Beobachtungen am Trierer Dom," *Germania* 42 (1964), 126–141.—Constantinople: H. Leclercq, "Byzance," *DACL* II/1, 1375–1388; A. Heisenberg, *Grabeskirche und Apostelkirche,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1908); V. Schultze, *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften* I (Leipzig 1913); E. Gerland, "Byzanz und die Gründung der Stadt Konstantinopel," *BNJ* 10 (1933), 93–105; R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris 1950); id., *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin* I/3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris 1953); G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople," *DOP* 6 (1951), 53–80; Ph. Grierson, "The Tombs of the Byzantine Emperors," *DOP* 16 (1961), I–63; G. Bovini, "Le tombe degli imperatori d'Oriente dei secoli IV, V, VI," *IX° Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina* (Ravenna 1962), 155–178.

ON CONSTANTINE'S BAPTISM AND BURIAL: F. J. Dölger, "Die Taufe Konstantins und ihre religiösen Probleme," *Konstantin d. Gr. und seine Zeit,* 19. Suppl. Heft of the *RQ* (Freiburg 1913), 377–477; H. Kraft, "Zur Taufe Kaiser Konstantins," *Stpatr* I (*TU* 63, Berlin 1957), 642–648. —A. Kaniuth, *Die Beisetzung Konstantins d. Gr.* (Breslau 1941, Breslauer Hist. Forschungen 18); A. Grabar, *Martyrium* 1 (Paris 1946), 227–234.

2. *Origin and Course of the Arian Controversy to the Death of Constantine* (337)

SOURCES

Besides the works of the Church historians, Eusebius, Philostorgius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret: G. H. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites* (318–328) = Athanasius, *Werke* III 1 (Berlin 1934). The extant fragments from Arius's writings in G. Bardy, *Recherches sur Lucien d'Antioche et son école* (Paris 1936), 216–278. The other writings of Athanasius in the Berlin edition, continued by W. Schneemelcher and M. Tetz, otherwise still *PG* 25–28. Important for this are F. L. Cross, *The Study of St. Athanasius* (Oxford 1945); G. Müller, *Lexicon Athanasianum* (Berlin 1944–52); other literature in Altaner–Stuiber (^{7}1966), 271–279. Creed and canons of Nicaea: *DThC* 11, 339–416; J. Alberigo, *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (Freiburg–Rome 1962), 1–15; new critical edition by G. L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e Costantinopoli* (Rome 1967).—On the text of the creed: I. Órtiz de Urbina, *El símbolo niceno* (Madrid 1947); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London, 2nd. ed. 1960), 205–262.—On the lists of conciliar participants: E. Schwartz, *Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nikaia und Konstantinopel* (Munich 1937); E. Honigmann: *Byz(B)* 11 (1936), 429–449, 14 (1939), 65–76, 16 (1942–43), 22–28, 20 (1950), 63–71.

LITERATURE

I. Órtiz de Urbina, "La politica de Costantino nella controversia ariana," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici* V (Rome 1939), 284–298; G. Bardy, "L'Occident et les documents de la controverse arienne," *RSR* 20 (1940), 28–63; J. de Ghellinck, "En marge des controverses ariennes," *Misc. hist. A. De Meyer* I (Louvain 1946), 159–180; W. Schneemelcher, "Zur Chronologie des arianischen Streites," *ThLZ* 79 (1954), 393–400; V. C. de Clercq, *Ossius of Cordoba* (Washington 1954); E. Boularand, "Les débuts d'Arius," *BLE* 65 (1964), 175–203.

ON THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA: M. Goemans, *Het algemeen Concilie in de vierde eeuw* (Nijmegen 1945); *Le Concile et les Conciles* (Paris 1960), with the essays by H. Marot, P.-Th. Camelot, Y. M.-J. Congar; I. Órtiz de Urbina, *Nicée et Constantinople* (Paris 1963). —On Athanasius: G. Bardy, *S. Athanase* (Paris 1925); E. Schwartz, *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius = Ges. Schr.* III (Berlin 1959); id., *Zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts = Ges. Schr.* IV (Berlin 1960), 1–110; D. Ritschl, *Athanasius, Versuch einer Interpretation* (Zurich 1964).

ON THE THEOLOGICAL QUESTION: W. Elliger, "Bemerkungen zur Theologie des Arius," *ThStK* 103 (1931), 224–251; H. Berkhof, *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Amsterdam 1939); W. Schneemelcher, "Athanasius von Al. als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker," *ZNW,* 43 (1950), 242–256; H. Kraft, "Ὁμοούσιος," *ZKG* 66 (1954), 1–24; G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tübingen 1956); C. Andresen, "Zur Entstehung des trinitarischen Personbegriffes," *ZNW* 52 (1961), 1–39; W. Marcus, *Der Subordinationismus als historiologisches Problem* (Munich 1963); P. Gerlitz, *Ausserchristliche Einflüsse auf die Entwicklung des christlichen Trinitätsdogmas, zugleich ein religions-und dogmengeschichtlicher Versuch zur Erklärung der Herkunft des Homousios* (Leiden 1963); H. Vogel, *Das nikänische Glaubensbekenntnis. Eine Doxologie* (Berlin 1963); A. Weber, *'Αρχή. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Eusebios von Cäsarea* (Rome 1964); A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition. From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)* (London 1965), enlarged new edition of: *Die theologische und sprachliche Vorbereitung der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon = Chalkedon* I (Würzburg 1951), 5–202; E. Boularand, *L'hérésie d'Arius et la "foi" de Nicée* (Paris 1972).

3. *The Struggle over the Council of Nicaea under the Sons of Constantine*

SOURCES

As above for chap. 2; for the Arian Controversy add the *Historia acephala* in C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta juris antiquissima* I 2, 663–671; the collection of documents of Hilary of Poitiers in the *Opus historicum, CSEL* 65, and his other anti-Arian writings: *PL* 10. The canons and creeds of synods in E. J. Jonkers, *Acta et symbola Conciliorum, quae saeculo IV habita sunt* (Leiden 1954). H. Hess, *The Canons of the Council of Sardica A. D. 343* (Oxford 1958, with bibliog.). Commentary on the most important documents by P.-P. Joannou, *Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im 4. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1972). Decrees of the Emperors in the *Codex Theodosianus,* ed. Th. Mommsen–P. M. Meyer (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1954); also C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code* (Princeton 1952), and P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church* I (London 1966). For the history of the Emperors: Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae,* ed. C. U. Clark (Berlin 1910–15).

LITERATURE

J. Moreau, "Constantinus II, Constantius II, Constans," *JbAC* 2 (1959), 160–184; F. Martroye, "La répression de la magie et le culte des gentils au IV^{e} siècle," *RevueHistDroit* 4 (1930), 669–701; G. Gigli, *L'ortodossia, l'arianesimo e la politica di Costanzo II* (Rome 1950); W. Telfer, "Paul of Constantinople," *HThR* 43 (1950), 31–92; G. H. Williams, "Christology and Church–State Relations in the fourth Century," *CH* 20 (Chicago 1951) no. 3, 3–33; no. 4, 3–26; J. Fleming, *Commentary on the so-called Opus Historicum of Hilary of Poitiers* (Diss. Durham 1951); W. Schneemelcher, "Serdica 342," *EvTh,* Sonderheft 1952, 83–104; M. Fortina, *La legislazione dell'imperatore Costante* (Novara 1955); K. Kraft, "Die Taten der Kaiser Constans und Constantius II," *JbNumismatik und Geldgeschichte* 9 (1958), 141–186; P. Galtier, *S. Hilaire de Poitiers* (Paris 1960); M. Simonetti, *Studi sull'Arianesimo* (Rome 1965); C. F. A. Borchardt, *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle* ('s-Gravenhage 1966); G. Folliet, "L'épiscopat africain et la crise arienne au IV^{e} siècle," *RÉB* 24 (1966), 196–223; M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident 335–430* (Paris 1967); *Hilaire et son temps. Actes du Colloque de Poitiers* 1968 (Paris 1969); J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil* (Paris 1971).

4. *The Attempted Restoration of Paganism by the Emperor Julian (361–363)*

SOURCES

Iuliani imperatoris opera, ed. F. C. Hertlein, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1875–76); *Iuliani imperatoris librorum Contra Christianos quae supersunt,* ed. C. J. Neumann (Leipzig 1880); *Iuliani imp. Epistulae, leges, poemata, fragmenta,* ed. J. Bidez–F. Cumont (Paris 1922). Julian's works with English translation by W. C. Wright, 3 vols. (London 1913–23). New edition with French translation by J. Bidez–G. Rochefort–Chr. Lacombrade, I/II (Paris 1924–64). Julian's letters, Greek-German, ed. B. Weis (Munich 1973). Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae,* ed. C. U. Clark (Leipzig 1910–15, reprint ed. 1963). Zosimus, *Historia nova,* ed. L. Mendelssohn (Leipzig 1887, reprint ed. 1963).

LITERATURE

Surveys in Pauly-Wissowa 10, 26–91, and *DACL* 8, 305–399. Also: J. Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris 1930); P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* (Paris 1934), 369–436; R. Andreotti, *Il regno dell'imperatore Giuliano* (Bologna 1936); J. Vogt, *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum* (Leipzig 1939); H. Janssen, *Kaiser Julians Herrscherideal* (Diss. Kiel 1953); G. Ricciotti, *L'imperatore Giuliano secondo i documenti* (Milan 1956); G. Gigli, *Giuliano l'apostata* (Rome 1960); J. Leipoldt, *Der römische Kaiser Julian in der Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin 1964); P.-M. Camus, *Ammien Marcellin* (Paris 1967); H. Gärtner, *Einige Überlegungen zur kaiserzeitlichen Panegyrik und zu Ammians Charakteristik des Kaisers Julian* (Mainz 1968); Benoist-Méchin, *L'empereur Julien ou le rêve calciné* (Paris 1969).

5. *Collapse of Arianism and Definitive Recovery of the Nicene Theology at the Council of Constantinople (381)*

SOURCES

As for chaps. 3 and 4. To the writings of Athanasius and Hilary, add those of the Young Nicenes: Basil of Caesarea in *PG* 29–32; *De Spiritu Sancto,* trans. B. Pruche, *SChr* 17 (Paris 1947); *In Hexaemeron,* ed. S. Giet, *SChr* 26 (Paris 1949); *Epistulae,* ed. Y. Courtonne, I–III (Paris 1957–67). Gregory Nazianzen in *PG* 35–38; the five theological discourses, with translation and commentary by J. Barbel (Düsseldorf 1963); *Epistulae,* ed. P. Gallay, I–II (Paris 1964–1967). Gregory of Nyssa in *PG* 44–46, superseded by the edition of W. Jaeger–H. Langerbeck et al., vol. I–IX (Leiden 1921–67). Didymus the Blind, *De Spiritu Sancto,* in the translation by Jerome, *PG* 39. Epiphanius von Salamis, ed. K. Holl, *GCS* 25, 31, 37 (Leipzig 1915–33). On the Latin side: Ambrose, *De fide ad Gratianum, De Spiritu Sancto, De incarnationis dominicae sacramento,* ed. O. Faller, *CSEL* 78–79 (Vienna 1962–64); the letters in *PL* 16: discourses ibid. and in part in *CSEL* 73, ed. O. Faller (Vienna 1955). Acts of the Synod of Aquileia in *PL* 16, 916–955. The creed of Constantinople in G. L. Dossetti, *Il simbolo di Nicea e di Costantinopoli* (Rome 1967), 243–251.

LITERATURE

For the political history of the time, O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* 5 (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1920); E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* I (Paris 1959); G. Gigli, *Il regno dell'Imperatore Graziano* (Rome 1963).—F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche* (Paris 1905); S. González, *La fórmula μία οὐσία—τρεῖς ὑποτάσεις en S. Gregorio de Nisa* (Rome 1939); B. Schewe, *Basilius d. Gr. als Theologe* (Diss. Nijmegen 1943); W. Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Theodosius d. Gr.* (Munich 1953); J. Plagnieux, *S. Grégoire de Nazianze, théologien* (Paris 1951); J. Lebon, "Le sort du 'consubstantiel' nicéen," *RHE* 47 (1952), 485–529, 48 (1953), 632–682 (Athanasius and Basil); G. L. Prestige, *St. Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicaea* (London 1956); H. Dörries, *De Spiritu Sancto. Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas* (Göttingen 1956); L. Hermann, "Ambrosius als Trinitätstheologe," *ZKG* 69 (1958), 195–218; W. Seibel, *Fleisch und Geist beim hl. Ambrosius* (Munich 1958); E. Staimer, *Die Schrift "De Spiritu Sancto" von Didymus dem Blinden von Alexandrien* (Diss. Munich 1960); L. Béranger, *Études sur la christologie du "De trinitate" attribué à Didyme l'Aveugle* (Diss. Lyon 1960); N. Q. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London 1961); I. Órtiz de Urbina, *Nizäa and Konstantinopel* (Mainz 1964); A.-M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol* (Göttingen 1965); C. F. A. Borchardt, *Hilary of Poitiers' Role in the Arian Struggle* ('s-Gravenhage 1966); W. Jaeger, *Gregor von Nyssas Lehre vom Heiligen Geist* (Leiden 1966); J. Coman, "La démonstration dans le traité Sur le Saint Esprit de s. Basile le Grand," *Stpatr* 9 (Berlin 1966), 172–209.

6. *Development of the Relationship of Church and State in the Fourth Century: The "Church of the Empire"*

SOURCES

The most important texts on the Church's side in H. Rahner, *Kirche und Staat im frühen Christentum* (Munich 1961), 75–201 (with translation and introduction); the decrees of the Emperors in P. R. Coleman-Norton, *Roman State and Christian Church* I (London 1966). The original texts in the *Codex Theodosianus* and *Justinianus.*

LITERATURE

Besides the works cited in Vol. I, chap. 31, by Voigt, Berkof, Greenslade, Brisson, and Aland: H. v. Campenhausen, *Ambrosius von Mailand als Kirchenpolitiker* (Berlin 1929); M. Vogelstein, *Kaiseridee–Romidee. Das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat seit Konstantin* (Breslau 1930); K. F. Hagel, *Kirche und Kaisertum in Leben und Lehre des Athanasius* (Diss. Tübingen 1933); I. -R. Palanque, *S. Ambroise et l'empire Romain* (Paris 1933); E. Peterson, "Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem," *Theologische Traktate* (Munich 1951), 45–147; H. Lietzmann, *Das Problem Staat und Kirche im weströmischen Reich* (Berlin 1940); K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century* (New York 1941); G. F. Reilly, *Imperium and Sacerdotium according to St. Basil* (Washington 1945); J. Stratmann, *Die Heiligen und der Staat* (Frankfurt 1950); W. Ensslin, *Die Religionspolitik Theodosius' d. Gr.* (Munich 1953); A. Strobel, *Schriftverständnis und Obrigkeitsdenken in der ältesten Kirche* (Diss. Erlangen 1956); A. A. Ehrhardt, *Politische Metaphysik von Solon bis Augustin* II (Tübingen 1959); K. Aland, "Kaiser und Kirche von Konstantin bis Byzanz," *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960), 257–279; J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire Romain, IV^e^–V^e^ siècles* (Paris 1959); D. S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London 1960); N. G. King, *The Emperor Theodosius and the Establishment of Christianity* (London 1961); G. Pilati, *Chiesa e Stato nei primi quindici secoli* (Rome 1961); C. Morino, *Chiesa e Stato nella dottrina di s. Ambrogio* (Rome 1963); H. -J. Diesner, *Kirche und Staat im spätrömischen Reich* (Berlin 1963); R. Hernegger, *Macht ohne Auftrag. Die Entstehung der Staats-und Volkskirche* (Freiburg 1963); H. Nordberg, *Athanasius and the Emperor* (Helsinki 1963); E. L. Grasmück, *Coercitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit* (Bonn 1964); K. F. Morrison, *Rome and the City of God. An Essay on the Constitutional Relationships of Empire and Church in the Fourth Century* (Philadelphia 1964); R. Farina, *L'impero e l'imperatore cristiano in Eusebio di Cesarea. La prima teologia politica del cristianesimo* (Zurich 1966, with bibliog., 329–347); A. Lippold, *Theodosius der Gr. und seine Zeit* (Stuttgart 1968); A. W. Ziegler, *Religion, Kirche und Staat in Geschichte und Gegenwart* I (Munich 1969), 124–162; F. Winkelmann, "Probleme der Herausbildung der Staatskirche im römischen Reich des IV. Jahrhunderts," *Klio* 53 (1971), 281–299; M. Azkoul, "Sacerdotium and Imperium," *ThSt* 32 (1971), 431–464.

Part Two
The Theological Disputes in East and West to the Middle of the Fifth Century

7. *Christology to the Council of Ephesus* (431)

SOURCES

The Church historians Socrates and Evagrius; F. Diekamp, *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi* (Münster 1907); H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule* (Tübingen 1904), 167–270, 273–322; J. Flemming–H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaristische Schriften* (Syriac) = *AGG* 7, 4 (Berlin 1904). —**Diodorus of Tarsus:** R. Abramowski: *ZNW* 42 (1949), 19–49; M. Brière, "Fragments syriaques de Diodore de Tarse," *ROC* 10 (1946), 231–282. —**Theodore of Mopsuestia:** commentary on the Psalms, ed. R. Devreesse: *SteT* 93 (Rome 1939); commentary on John (a) Syriac, ed. I. M. Vosté: *CSCO* 115–116 (Louvain 1940); (b) Greek, ed. R. Devreese, "Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste," *SteT* 141 (Rome 1948), 305–419; fragments of the commentary on the great Pauline Epistles in K. Staab, *Pauluskommentare aus der griech. Kirche* (Münster 1933), 113–212; the catechetical homiles, ed. R. Tonneau: *SteT* 145 (Rome 1948). —**Cyril of Alexandria:** the dogmatic works in *PG* 75–76 and P. B. Pusey, *S. Cyrilli Alex. Epist. oecum. contra Nestorium; De recta fide,* 2 vols (Oxford 1875–77); letters in E. Schwartz: *ACO* I, 1–5 (Berlin 1927–30); *De incarnatione Unigeniti; Quod unus sit Christus,* ed. G. M. de Durand, *SChr* 97 (Paris 1964). —**Nestorius:** fragments in F. Loofs, *Nestoriana* (Halle 1905), in part also in E. Schwartz: *ACO;* P. Bedjan, *Le livre d'Héraclide de Damas* (Paris 1910); also L. Abramowski, "Untersuchungen zum Liber Heraclidis des Nestorius," *CSCO* 242, Subsidia 22 (Louvain 1963). —Acts of the Council of Ephesus, ed. E. Schwartz: *ACO* I, 1–2 (Strasbourg 1914ff.); also R. Devreesse: *RSPhTh* 18 (1929), 223–242, 408–431.

LITERATURE

The textbooks of the history of dogma: Harnack, *DG* II; Seeberg, II; Tixeront, II–III; Adam, I (Gütersloh 1965); *HDG* III 1a (Freiburg 1965). —R. V. Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies* (London 1940); A. Gilg, *Weg und Bedeutung der altkirchlichen Christologie* (Munich 2nd ed. 1955); A. Gesché, "L'âme humaine de Jésus dans la christologie du IV^{e} siècle," *RHE* 54 (1959), 385–425; G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics* (London 5th ed. 1960); J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London, 2nd ed. 1960); H. M. Diepen, *Douze dialogues de christologie ancienne* (Rome 1960); V. Monachino, "Il ruolo dei papi nelle grandi controversie cristologiche (399–555)," *I papi nella storia* (Rome 1961), 57–170; A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* (London 1965). —On **Apollinaris:** C. A. Raven, *Apollinarianism* (Cambridge 1923); H. de Riedmatten, "La christologie d'Apoll. de L.," *Stpatr* 2 (TU 64, Berlin 1957), 208–234; H. A. Wolfson, "Philosophical Implications of Arianism and Apollinarianism," *DOP* 12 (1958), 3–28. —On **Diodorus of Tarsus:** G. Bardy: *DSp* 3, 986–994; L. Abramowski: *DHGE* 14, 495–504; R. A. Greer, "The Antiochene Christology of Diodor of T.," *JThS* 17 (1966), 327–341. —On **Theodore of Mopsuestia:** E. Amann: *DThC* 15, 235–279; F. A. Sullivan, *The Christology of Th. of M.* (Rome 1956); L. Abramowski, "Zur Theologie Th.s v. M.," *ZKG* 72 (1961), 262–293; R. A. Greer, *Th. of M. Exegete and Theologian* (London 1961); U. Wickert, *Studien zu den Pauluskommentaren Th.s v. M. als Beitrag zum Verständnis der Antiochenischen Theologie* (Berlin 1962); R. A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ. A Study in the Christology of Th. of M.* (London 1963). —On **Nestorius:** E. Amann: *DThC* 11, 76–157; A. Grillmeier: *ThPh* 41 (1966), 401–410; F. Loofs, *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge 1914); I. Rucker, *Das Dogma von der Persönlichkeit Christi und das Problem der Häresie des Nestorius* (Oxenbrunn 1934); E. Amann, "L'affaire de Nestorius vue de Rome," *RevSR* 23 (1949), 5–37, 207–244; 24 (1950), 28–52, 235–265; L. I. Scipioni, *Ricerche sulla cristologia del Libro di Eraclide di Nestorio* (Fribourg 1956); A. Grillmeier, "Das scandalum oecumenicum des Nestorius," *Scholastik* 36 (1961), 321–356; M. V. Anastos, "Nestorius Was Orthodox," *DOP* 16 (1962), 117–140. —On **Cyril of Alexandria:** J. van den Dries, *The Formula of St. Cyril of Al.* Μια φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρϰωμένη (Rome 1939); H. du Manoir, *Dogme et spiritualité chez s. Cyrille d'Alexandrie* (Paris 1944); J. Liébaert, *La doctrine christologique de s. Cyrille d'Alexandrie avant la querelle néstorienne* (Lille 1951); L. M. Armendariz, *El nuevo Moisés. Dinámica cristocéntrica en la tipología de Cirilo de Al.* (Madrid 1962); P. Galtier, *Chalkedon I 345–387;* G. M. de Durand: *SChr* 97 (Paris 1964), 81–150. —On the **Council of Ephesus:** A. d'Alès, *Le dogme d'Éphèse* (Paris 1931); P. -Th. Camelot, *Ephesus und Chalkedon* (Mainz 1963).

8. *From Ephesus to Chalcedon*

SOURCES

As for chap. 7; also: J. Flemming, *Die Akten des Ephesinischen Konzils vom Jahre 449* (Göttingen 1917); acts of the Council of Chalcedon in *ACO* II/1–6 (Berlin 1933–38), in them (II/5) Liberatus, *Breviarium causae Nestorianorum et Eutychianistarum; Gesta de nomine Acacii vel Breviculum historiae Eutychianistarum* in *CSEL* 35, 440–453. The works of Theodoret of Cyrrhue in *PG,* 75–76; 83; the *Expositio fidei* in J. C. Otto, *Corpus apologetarum* 4 (Jena 3rd ed. 1880, reprint ed. Wiesbaden 1969); letters of Theodoret, ed. Y. Azéma: *SChr* 44, 98, 111 (Paris 1955–65). Separate edition of the pertinent letters of Leo the Great, *Tomus ad Flavianum; Contra Eutychis haeresim,* ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Textus et Docum.* 9, 15, 20 (Rome 1932, 1934, 1935), otherwise, *ACO* II 1–4 (Liste II 4, 170f.).

LITERATURE

As for chap. 7; also: M. Richard, "Notes sur l'évolution doctrinale de Théodoret," *RSPhTh* 25 (1936), 459–481; C. da Mazzarino, *La dottrina di Teodoreto di Ciro sull'unione ipostatica* (Rome 1941); H. Dörries, "Hypostasis. Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte," *NAG* phil. -hist. Kl. 3 (1955), 35–92; L. Abramowski, "Der Streit um Diodor und Theodor zwischen den beiden ephesinischen Konzilien," *ZKG* 67 (1955–56), 252–287—M. Jugie, "Eutychès et Eutychianisme," *DThC* 5, 1582–1609; id., "Monophysisme," ibid., 10, 2217–2306; E. Schwartz, *Der Prozess des Eutyches* (*SAM* 5, Munich 1929); R. Draguet, "La christologie d'Eutychès d'après les actes du synode de Flavien (448)," *Byz(B)* 6 (1931), 441–457; M. J. Nicolas, "La doctrine christologique de saint Léon le Grand," *RThom* 51 (1951), 609–660; Th. Sagi-Bunić, *Deus perfectus et homo perfectus, a concilio Ephesino (a. 431) ad Chalcedonense (a. 451)* (Rome 1965). —R. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (London 1953); A. Grillmeier–H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* I–III (Würzburg 2nd ed. 1960), here III, 828–865 bibliog. by A. Schönmetzer; K. Sarkissian, *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church* (London 1965); W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge 1972).

9. *The Origenist Controversy at the Turn of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*

SOURCES

Epiphanius Salam., Ancoratus 13; Panarion 63, 1–72, 9; Ep. ad Joh. Hierosol. = Jerome, Ep. 51. Rufinus, *De adulteratione librorum Origenis; Apologia ad Anastasium; Apologia contra Hieronymum;* the prologues to his translations of Origen in *CChr* 20 (1961), ed. M. Simonetti; the Apologia also separately (Alba 1957). Jerome, *Apologia adversus libros Rufini; Contra Joh. Hierosolymitanum* in *PL* 23, 371–514; the letters, *CSEL* 54–56. Anastasius papa, *Ep. ad Joh. Hieros; Ep. ad Simplicianum* in *PL* 20, 68–76.

LITERATURE

G. Fritz: *DThC* 11, 1565–1588; A. d'Alès: *DAp* 3, 1228–1258; G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus* 3 (Berlin 1908) 1–94; K. Holl–A. Jülicher, "Die Zeitfolge des ersten origenistischen Streites," in K. Holl, *Ges. Aufs.* 2 (Tübingen 1928), 310–350; F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme* I (Paris 1922), 193–288; II, 31–46, 115–126; M. Villain, "Rufin d'Aquilée. La querelle autour d'Origène," *RSR* 27 (1937), 5–37, 165–197; F. X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia* (Washington 1945); B. Th. Stauridis, "Αἱ 'Ωριγενιστικαὶ ἔριδες," Θεολογία 28 (1957), 550–577.

10. *The Priscillianist Movement*

SOURCES

Survey in B. Vollmann, *Studien zum Priszillianismus* (St. Ottilien 1965), 52–83. The most important: *Priscilliani quae supersunt,* ed. G. Schepss, *CSEL* 18 (Vienna 1889); also G. Morin, "Pro Instantio," *RBén* 30 (1930), 153–173; and J. Martin: *HJ* 47 (1927), 237–251. Orosius, *Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum = CSEL* 18, 151–157. Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* 2, 46–51; *Dialogus* 3, 11–13 (*CSEL* 1, 99–105, 208–211). Canons of the Spanish synods in J. Vives, *Concilios Visigóticos y Hispano-Romanos* (Barcelona–Madrid 1963).

LITERATURE

Comprehensive listing to 1965 in B. Vollmann, op. cit., xii–xxiv. G. Bardy: *DThC* 13, 391–400; E. Ch. Babut, *Priscillien et le Priscillianisme* (Paris 1909); J. A. Davids, *De Orosio et s. Augustino Priscillianistarum adversariis commentatio historica et philologica*

(Hagae Comitis 1930); A. d'Alès, *Priscillien et l'Espagne chretiénne* (Paris 1936); M. Martin, *Correntes da Filosofia religiosa em Braga des IV a VIs.* (Porto 1950); J. M. Ramos y Losertales, *Prisciliano. Gesta rerum* (Salamanca 1952); J. Madoz, "Arrianismo y Priscilianismo en Galicia," *Bracara Augusta* 8 (1957), 68–87; W. Schatz, *Studien zur Geschichte und Vorstellungswelt des frühen abendländischen Mönchtums* (typed diss. Freiburg i. Br. 1957), 98–259; A. Barbero de Aguilera, "El priscilianismo; ¿herejía o movimiento social?," *Cuadernos de historia de España* 37–8 (1963), 5–41; P. Stockmeier, "Das Schwert im Dienst der Kirche. Zur Hinrichtung Priszillians in Trier," *Festschr. Al. Thomas* (Trier 1967), 415–428; J. L. Orella, "La penitencia en Prisciliano (340–385)," *HS* 21 (1968), 21–56.

11. *The Struggle with Donatism*

SOURCES

H. v. Soden, *Urkunden zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Donatismus, KlT* 122 (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1950). For the rest of the Donatist literature: P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne* V (Paris 1920). Optatus of Mileve, *De schismate Donatistarum,* ed. C. Ziwsa: *CSEL* 26 (Vienna 1893). The anti-Donatist works of Augustine, ed. M. Petschenig: *CSEL* 51–53 (Vienna 1908–10), and in the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne,* vols. 28, 29, 32 (Paris 1963–66). On the chronology of these works and of the pertinent letters and sermons of Augustine: P. Monceaux, op. cit., 7 (1923), 275–292. *Gesta collationis Carthaginiensis* in *PL* 11, 1231–1418, *Mansi* IV, 19–245, ed. S. Lancel, *Schr.* 194–197 (Paris 1972ff.). Archeological material in H. Leclercq, "Donatisme," *DACL* 4, 1457–1505; P. Courcelle: *MAH* 53 (1936), 166–197; and A. Berthier et al., *Les vestiges du christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale* (Algiers 1942).

LITERATURE

A) ON DONATISM IN GENERAL: E. Altendorf, *Einheit und Heiligkeit der Kirche* (Berlin 1932); W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church* (London, 2nd ed. 1971); S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the Early Church* (London 1953); Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales d'Afrique* (Paris 1955); J. B. Brisson, *Autonomisme et christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine* (Paris 1958); also important A. Mandouze, "Encore le Donatisme," *Antiquité classique* 29 (1960), 61–107; Th. Büttner–E. Werner, *Circumcellionen und Adamiten* (Berlin 1959); H. -J. Diesner, *Kirche und Staat im spätrömischen Reich* (Berlin 1963); E. Tengström, *Donatisten und Katholiken* (Stockholm 1964); E. Grasmück, *Coercitio. Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit* (Bonn 1965).

B) ON AUGUSTINE AND THE DONATISTS: Surveys in C. Andresen, *Bibliographia Augustiniana* (Darmstadt 1962); T. van Bavel, *Répertoire bibliographique de saint Augustin 1950–1960* (Steenbrugge 1963); E. Lamirande, "Un siècle et demi d'études sur l'ecclésiologie de saint Augustin. Essai bibliographique," *RevÉAug* 8 (1962), 1–125.—Basic are: P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne* IV–VII (Paris 1920–23); P. Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin* (Paris, 4th ed. 1929); G. G. Willis, *S. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy* (London 1950); J. Ratzinger, *Volk und Haus Gottes in Augustins Lehre von der Kirche* (Munich 1954); the essays in *Augustinus Magister* II (Paris 1954), 835–914; St. J. Grabowsky, *The Church. An Introduction to the Theology of Saint Augustine* (St. Louis 1957); E. Lamirande, *L'église céleste selon saint Augustin* (Paris 1963); G. Bonner, *St. Augustine of Hippo* (London 1963), 237–311; R.

Crespin, *Ministère et sainteté. Pastorale du clergé et solution de la crise donatiste dans la vie et la doctrine de saint Augustin* (Paris 1965); H. B. Weijland, *Augustinus en de kerkelijke tucht* (Kampen 1965); P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (London 1967), 212–243; A. Mandouze, *Saint Augustin* (Paris 1968), 331–411; O. Perler, *Les voyages de s. Augustin* (Paris 1969); E. Lamirande, *La situation ecclésiologique des Donatistes d'après s. Augustin* (Ottawa 1972); on the conference of 411: S. Lancel: *Schr.* 194, 9–287.

12. *Pelagius and the Aftermath*

SOURCES

A. Bruckner, *Quellen zur Gesch. des pelagianischen Streites* (Tübingen 1906). Survey of the extant Pelagian literature by J. Morris: *JThS* n.s. 16 (1965), 26–60. Catalogue of the genuine and disputed writings of Pelagius by A. Hamman: *PL* Suppl. 1, 1101–1109.—Pelagius, *Expositiones in epistulas Sancti Pauli,* ed. A. Souter, *TSt* 9, 1–3 (Cambridge 1922, 1926, 1931); its text: *PL* Suppl. 1, 1110–1374; *Libellus fidei ad Innoc.* in *PL* 45, 1716–1718; *Epistula ad Demetriadem,* ibid., 30, 15–46. Basic for the question of authenticity, G. de Plinval, *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme* (Lausanne 1943); id., *Essai sur le style et la langue de Pélage* (Fribourg 1947); id., *RÉL* 29 (1951), 284–294; R. F. Evans, *Four Letters of Pelagius* (London 1968).—Julian of Aeclanum, *Commentarius in prophetas minores tres: PL* 21, 950–1104; *Expositio libri Job: PL* Suppl. I, 1573–1679.

THE ANTI-PELAGIAN AUTHORS: Jerome, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos: PL* 23, 495–590; *Ep.* 133: *CSEL* 56, 241–260; Orosius, *Liber apologeticus contra Pelagianos: CSEL* 5, 603–664; Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium* and *Super nomine Caelestii: ACO* I 5, 5–23, 65–70; Augustine: *CSEL* 42 and 60, rec. C. F. Vrba and I. Zycha (Vienna 1902, 1912); *PL* 44–45; S. Kopp–A. Zumkeller, *Aurel. Augustinus, Schriften gegen die Semipelagianer* (Würzburg 1955); A. Zumkeller, *Augustinus, Schriften gegen die Pelagianer* I–II (Würzburg 1964–71). In the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne* there has so far appeared Vol. 24 (Paris 1962: writings against the Semipelagians) by J. Chéné and J. Pintard; and Vol. 21 (Paris 1966: *De natura et gratia; De perf. justit. hom.; De gestis Pelagii*) by G. de Plinval and J. de la Tullaye. A useful compendium of Augustinian texts (with French translation) on the doctrine of grace by J. Chéné, *La theologie de s. Augustin. Grace et predestination* (Le Puy–Lyon 1962).

LITERATURE:

ON PELAGIUS: A.-J. Gaudel: *DThC* 12, 382–406; R. Hedde–E. Amann, "Pélagianisme," ibid., 12, 675–715; E. Dinkler: *Pauly-Wissowa* 19, 226–242; G. de Plinval (see supra, under Sources); J. Rivière, "Hétérodoxie des Pélagiens en fait de rédemption," *RHE* 41 (1946), 5–43; J. Ferguson, *Pelagius* (Cambridge 1956); T. Bohlin, *Die Theologie des Pelagius* (Uppsala 1957); S. Prete, *Pelagio e il Pelagianismo* (Brescia 1961); R. F. Evans, *Pelagius* (London 1968); P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine* (London 1972), 183–226.

ON JULIAN OF AECLANUM: A. Hamman: *PL* Suppl. 1, 1571–1572; G. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar zu den Propheten Osee, Joel und Amos* (Rome 1958); R. Refoulé, "Julien d'Éclane, théologien et philosophe," *RSR* 52 (1964), 42–84, 233–247.

ON AUGUSTINE: The sections in the Augustine bibliography of C. Anderson and T. Bavel (see chap. 11) and in *Bibliothèque August.* 24 (1962), 29–38; 21 (1966) 19–23; N.

Merlin, *S. Augustin et les dogmes du péché originel et de la grâce* (Paris 1931); Y. de Montcheuil, "La polémique de s. Augustin contre Julien d'Éclane," *RSR* 44 (1956), 191–218; A. Guzzo, *Agostino contro Pelagio* (Turin 1958); H. Ulbrich, "Augustins Briefe zum pelagianischen Streit" (typed diss., Göttingen 1958), partial printing: *RevÉAug* 9 (1963), 51–75, 235–258; J. Gross, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas* I (Basel 1960); J. Chéné, "Les origines de la controverse semi-pélagienne," *ATh* 13 (1953), 56–109; *RSR* 43 (1955), 321–341; N. K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul* (London 1955), 170–239; F. J. Thonnard, "La prédestination augustinienne et l'interprétation de O. Rottmanner," *RevÉAug* 9 (1963), 259–287; id., "La prédestination augustinienne, sa place en philosophie augustinienne," ibid., 10 (1964), 97–239; M. Huftier, *Le tragique de la condition chrétienne chez s. Augustin* (Paris 1964); id., *Libre arbitre, liberté et péché chez s. Augustin* (Louvain 1968); J. M. List, "Augustine on Free Will and Predestination," *JThS NS* 20 (1969), 420–447. The corresponding chapters in the books on Augustine (see chap. 7) by G. Bonner (317–393), P. Brown (340–407), and A. Mandouze (391–453); E. TeSelle, *Augustine the Theologian* (London 1970); G. Bonner, *Augustine and Modern Research on Pelagianism* (Villanova 1972).

Part Three
Inner Life of the Church Between Nicaea and Chalcedon

13. *Missionary Activity of the Church*

Sections One and Two

LITERATURE

Most important bibliog. in A. Seumois, "La mission chez les Pères," *Spiritus* 5 (1964), 215–219, and in K. Baus, "Erwägungen zu einer künftigen 'Geschichte der christlichen Mission in der Spätantike' (4.–6. Jh.)," *Reformata Reformanda, Festgabe f. H. Jedin* (Münster 1965), 22–38. There is no reliable complete presentation of the history of the missions in this period, even in the special works by J. Schmidlin (Steyl 1925); S. Delacroix, *Histoire des Missions catholiques* I (Paris 1956); A. Mulders, *Missiegeschiedenis* (Bussum 1957). W. H. C. Frend, "The Missions of the Early Church 180–700 A.D.," *MiscHistEccl* III (Louvain 1970), 3–23, takes up only individual questions. First sketch by B. Kötting, "Christentum" in *RAC* II (1954) 1138–1159. Important are the respective articles on various countries in *RAC*. Also K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* I (New York 1937), 171–369, and the pertinent sections in *Fliche-Martin* III (1926), 216–224, 489–504; IV (1937) 321–336, 497–534 (hitherto the most reliable presentation). The literature on the evangelization of individual provinces and countries is mentioned in the notes.

ON THE QUESTION OF MISSIONARY METHOD: A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford 1933); G. Bardy, *La conversion au christianisme durant les premiers siècles* (Paris 1949); K. Aland, *Über den Glaubenswechsel in der Geschichte des Christentums* (Berlin 1961); Chr. Mohrmann, "Das Sprachproblem in der frühchristlichen Mission," *ZMR* 38 (1954), 103–111; J. Lecuyer, "Aspects missionnaires de l'initiation selon les Pères de l'église," *NZM* 15 (1959), 1–13; E. Lamirande, *Pentecôte et mission chez les Pères de l'église* (Paris 1964); P. P. Joannou, *La législation impériale et la christianisation de l'empire, 311–476* (Rome 1972).

Section Three

LITERATURE

GENERAL HISTORY: E. Stein, *Gesch. des spätrömischen Reiches* I (Vienna 1928, Paris 2nd ed. 1959); id., *Histoire du Bas Empire* II (Paris–Brussels 1949); L. Schmidt, *Gesch. der* *deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderungszeit,* I: *Die Ostgermanen* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1941); id., *Gesch. der Wandalen* (Munich 1942); Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955); Chr. Sevin, *Die Gepiden* (Munich 1955); "I Goti in Occidente," *Settimane di studio . . .* III (Spoleto 1956); H. Rosenfeld, *Ostgoten und Westgoten: Die Welt als Geschichte* 17 (1957), 245–258.

GERMANIC RELIGION: W. Baetke, *Art und Glaube der Germanen* (Hamburg, 2nd ed. 1934); V. Grunbech, *Kultur und Religion der Germanen,* 2 vols. (Hamburg, 5th ed. 1954); J. de Vries, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte,* 2 vols. (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1956–57).

GENERAL HISTORY OF CONVERSION AND OF THE CHURCH: H. v. Schubert, *Gesch. der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter* (Tübingen 1921); K. D. Schmidt, *Die Bekehrung der Germanen zum Christentum,* I: *Der ostgermanische Arianismus* (Göttingen 1939); II: *Die katholische Mission bei den Westgermanen* (Göttingen n.d. [1942]); G. Haendler, *Gesch. des Frühmittelalters und der Germanenmission: Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Hdb.,* ed. K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, II (Göttingen 1961). Especially to be consulted is the detailed criticism of the literature appearing up to 1959 by G. Haendler, op. cit.—J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire* (Paris 1918); A. D. Momigliano, *Paganism and Christianity in the 4th Century* (Oxford 1963); in it, E. A. Thompson, "Christianity and the Northern Barbarians"; "La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'Alto Medio Evo," *Settimane di studio del Centr* XIV (Spoleto 1967); in it, *inter alia,* R. Manselli, "La conversione dei popoli germanici al cristianesimo. La discussione storiografica."

BASIC IDEAS OF THE MISSION: S. Delacroix, *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques* I (Paris 1956); A. V. Seumois, *La papauté et les missions au cours des six premiers siècles* (Paris–Louvain 1951); F. Paschoud, *Roma aeterna. Études sur le patriotisme romain dans l'Occident latin à l'époque des grandes invasions* (Zurich 1967); W. H. Fritze, "Universalis gentium confessio," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 3 (1969), 78–130; there also other literature.

CONVERSION OF THE GOTHS: P. G. Scardigli, "La conversione dei Goti al cristianesimo," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV (Spoleto 1967), 47–86; E. A. Thompson, "The Date of the Conversion of the Visigoths," *JEH* 7 (1956), 1–11; id., "Early Visigothic Christianity," *Latomus* 21 (1962); id., *The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila* (Oxford 1966). Thompson's theses are controverted.

GOTHIC BIBLE: Edition: W. Streitberg (*Germanische Bibliothek* II Bd 3, 1, Heidelberg 1919); F. Kaufmann, "Der Stil der gotischen Bibel," *Zs. f. Deutsche Philologie* 48 (1920), 7–80, 165–235, 349–388; 49 (1923), 11–57; H. Steubing, "Miscellen zur gotischen Bibelübersetzung des Ulfilas," *ZKG* 64 (1952–53), 137–165; K. Weinhold, *Die gotische Sprache im Dienst des Christentums* (Halle 1870); P. G. Scardigli, *Lingua e storia dei Goti* (Florence 1964); A. Mentz," Schrift und Sprache der Burgunder," *ZdAdL* 85 (1954), 1–17.

GERMAN CULTURE AND ARIANISM: O. Dibelius, *Die Germanisierung des Christentums* (Berlin 1934); H. E. Giesecke, *Die Ostgermanen und der Arianismus* (Leipzig–Berlin 1939). For the current state of the discussion cf. G. Haendler, op. cit.

ARIAN CHURCH ORGANIZATION: H. v. Schubert, *Staat und Kirche in den arianischen Königreichen und im Reiche Chlodwigs* (Munich–Berlin 1912); U. Stutz, *Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterlich-germanischen Kirchenrechts* (1895; reprinted 1957). Other literature in Feine, *RG* I. Most recent opinion: R. Höslinger: *ÖAKR* 3 (1952), 267ff.

For a discussion of the Gothic Arian influence on the Bavarians and Thuringians, cf. G. Haendler, op. cit., 9ff.

14. *The Building of the Organization of the Church of the Empire*

LITERATURE

1. GENERAL: J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1959); Plöchl I; Feine, *RG:* in these three works are also surveys of the corresponding canonical sources.—W. de Vries, "Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem Konzil von Chalkedon," *OrChrP* 35 (1968), 63–122; id., "Die Struktur . . . von Ephesos," *AHC* 2 (1970), 22–25; id., "Die Struktur der Kirche gemäss dem 1. Konzil von Nidaia," *Wegzeichen. Festgabe H. Biedermann* (Würzburg 1971), 55–81.

2. SPECIAL: A. Scheuermann, "Diözese," *RAC* III 1053–1063; P. de Labriolle, "Paroecia," *BullDuCange* 3 (1927), 196–205; id., *RSR* 18 (1928), 60–72; K. Müller, "Parochie und Diözese," *ZNW* 32 (1933), 149–185; S. Mochi Onory, *Vescovi e città* (Bologna 1933); H. Leclercq, "Métropole," *DACL* XL, 786–790; *DDC* I, 927–934; VI, 872–877; F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958); H. Chadwick; *The Circle and the Ellipse. Rival Concepts of Authority in the Early Church* (Oxford 1959); E. Lanne, "Églises locales et patriarcats à l'époque des grands conciles," *Irénikon* 34 (1961), 292–321; W. de Vries, "Die Entstebung der Patriarchate des Ostens und ihr Verhältnis zur päpstlichen Vollgewalt," *Scholastik* 37 (1962), 341–369; id., "Antiochien und Seleukia-Ktesiphon," *Mél. Tisserant* (Rome 1964), 429–450; H. Grotz, *Die Hauptkirchen des Ostens von den Anfängen bis zum Konzil von Nikaia 325* (Rome 1964); Y. Congar–B. D. Dupuy, *Das Bischofsamt und die Weltkirche* (Stuttgart 1964); *I Patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio* (Rome 1968).—N. Jung, "Concile," *DDC* III 1268–1280; G. Roethe, *Zur Geschichte der römischen Synoden im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1937); M. Goemans, *Het algemeene concilie in de vierde eeuw* (Nijmegen 1945); G. Kretschmar, "Die Konzile der alten Kirche" in H. J. Margull, *Die ökumenischen Konzile der Christenheit* (Stuttgart 1961), 75–200; J. Hajjar, *Le synode permanent dans l'église byzantine des origines au XI^e^ siècle* (Rome 1962).

15. *The Further Development of the Roman Primacy from Melchiades to Leo I*

SOURCES

Papal Letters: *PL* 13, 20, 50, 54; most of the letters of Celestine I, Boniface I, Sixtus III, and Leo I in a new edition by E. Schwartz: *ACO. Die Briefe über das Vikariat Thessalonike,* ed. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Collectio Thessalonicensis* (Rome 1937). L. Duchesne, *LP.* C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta Iuris antiquissima* I, II 3 (Oxford 1930).

LITERATURE

H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter* I (Freiburg 1900), 1–79; J. Chapman, *Studies on the Early Papacy* (London 1928); P. Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne* (Paris, 4th ed. 1929); id., *Le siège apostolique 359–451* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1924); id., *Cathedra Petri* (Paris 1938); E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* I (Tübingen 1930); J. Haller, *Das*

Papsttum I (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1950); F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste* I (Munich, 2nd ed. 1954); M. Maccarrone, *Vicarius Christi. Storia del titolo papale* (Rome 1952); H. Marot, "Les conciles romains des IV et V siècles et le développement de la primauté," *Istina* 4 (1957), 435–462; J. Meyendorff, "La primauté romaine dans la tradition canonique jusqu'au concile de Chalcédoine," ibid., 463–482; G. Jouassard, "Sur les décisions des conciles généraux des IV et V siècles dans leur rapport avec la primauté," ibid., 485–496; A. Rimoldi, *L'apostolo San Pietro fondamento della chiesa, principe degli apostoli ed ostiario celeste nella Chiesa primitiva dalle origini al concilio di Calcedonia* (Rome 1958); M. Maccarrone, *La dottrina del primato papale dal IV all' VIII secolo nelle relazioni con le chiese occidentali* (Spoleto 1960); V. Monachino, "Il primato nella controversia ariana," *Saggi storici intorno al papato* (Rome 1959); id., Il ruolo dei papi nelle grandi controversi cristologiche; Il papato tra Bizantini e Langobardi," *I papi nella storia* I (Rome 1961), 57–254; id., "Il primato nello scisma donatista," *AHPont* 2 (1964), 7–44; C. Falconi, *Storia dei papi e del papato* I: *La nascita del papato nel declino del impero* (Rome 1967); M. Maccarrone, *San Pietro in rapporto a Cristo nelle piu àntiche testimonianze* (Rome 1968); W. Marschall, *Karthago und Rom. Die Stellung der nordafrikanischen Kirchen zum apostolischen Stuhl in Rom* (Stuttgart 1971); P.-P. Joannou, *Die Ostkirche und die Cathedra Petri im 4. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1972).

16. *The Clergy of the Church of the Empire*

LITERATURE

1. GENERAL: Surveys in J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain, IV–V siècles* (Paris 1958), 98–185; Plöchl I (Vienna, 2nd. ed. 1960), 176–189; Feine, *RG*, 125–145 (lit.); D. Zähringer, *Das kirchliche Priestertum nach dem hl. Augustinus* (Paderborn 1931); G. Bardy (ed.), *Prêtres d'hier et d'aujourd'hui* (Paris 1954); *Études sur le sacrement de l'ordre = Lex orandi* 22 (Paris 1957); G. Pintard, *Le sacerdoce selon s. Augustin* (Paris 1960); R. Crespin, *Ministerè et sainteté. Pastorale du clergé et solution de la crise donastiste dans la vie et la doctrine de s. Augustin* (Paris 1965); R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon s. Ambroise* (Louvain 1968); L. Ott, "Das Weihesakrament. Die nachnizänische Patristik," *HDG IV* 5 (Freiburg 1969), 19–39.

2. INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS: M. Andrieu, *Les ordres mineurs* (Paris 1925); W. Croce, "Die niederen Weihen und ihre hierarchische Wertung," *ZKTh* 70 (1948), 257–315; "Diakonat," *DACL* IV, 738–746; *RAC* III, 888–909; *DSAM* III, 799–817; J. Blockscha, "Die Altersvorschriften für die höheren Weihen im ersten Jahrtausend," *AkathKR* 111 (1931), 31–83; P.-H. Lafontaine, *Les conditions positives de l'accession aux ordres dans la première législation ecclésiastique* (Ottawa 1963), 300–492; R. Gryson, *Le ministère des femmes dans l'eglise ancienne* (Gembloux 1972). Celibacy:—*DACL* II, 2802–2832; *DSAM* II, 385–386; B. Kötting, *Der Zölibat in der alten Kirche* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1970); R. Gryson, *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique* (Gembloux 1970); P. Pampaloni, "Continenza e celibato del clero. Legge e motivi nelle fonti canonistiche dei sec. IV e V," *Studia Patavina* 17 (1970), 5–59; H. Crouzel, "Le célibat dans l'église primitive," *Sacerdoce et célibat,* publ. by J. Coppens et al. (Gembloux 1971), 333–371.—G. Hörle, *Frühmittelalterliche Mönchs- und Klerikerbildung in Italien* (Freiburg 1914); W. Wühr, *Das abendländische Bildungswesen im Mittelalter* (Munich 1950), 17–45; *La formación sacerdotal en la Iglesia* (Barcelona 1966).—H. Leclercq, "Immunité," *DACL* VII, 323–390; C. Dupont, "Les privilegès des clercs sous Constantin,"

RHE 62 (1967), 729–752; G. Vismara, *Episcopalis audientia* (Milan 1937); W. Selb, "Episcopalis audientia von der Zeit Konstantins bis zur Nov. XXXV Valentianians III," *ZSavRGrom* 84 (1967), 162–217; Th. Klauser, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte* (Krefeld, 2nd ed. 1953); E. Jerg, *Vir venerabilis. Untersuchungen zur Titulatur der Bischöfe in den ausserkirchlichen Texten der Spätantike als Beitrag zur Deutung ihrer öffentlichen Stellung* (Vienna 1970).—Y. Congar (ed.), *Das Bischofsamt und die Weltkirche* (Stuttgart 1964); J. Lécuyer, *Études sur la collégialité épiscopale* (Le Puy-Lyon 1964); *La collégialité épiscopale. Histoire et théologie = Unam sanctam* 52 (Paris 1965); L. Mortari, *Consacrazione episcopale e collegialità* (Florence 1969).

17. *The Liturgy*

SOURCES

The most important: F. E. Brightman–C. E. Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* I (London 1966, reprint); *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima,* ed. J. Quasten, *FlorPatr* VII (Bonn 1935); Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses mystagogicae,* ed. A. Piédagnol–P. Paris, *SChr* 126 (Paris 1966); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Homiliae 12–16,* ed. R. Tonneau, *SteT* 145 (Vatican City 1949); John Chrysostom, *Huit Catéchèses baptismales, SChr* 50 (Paris, 2nd ed. 1970); Ambrose, *De mysteriis, De sacramentis,* ed. Botte, *SChr* 25 (Paris, 2nd ed. 1961); Niceta of Remesiana, *Instructio ad competentes,* ed. Kl. Gamber, *Tpatrlit* 1 (Regensburg 1964); Kl. Gamber, *Weitere Sermonen ad competentes I und II, Tpatrlit* 2 and 5 (Regensburg 1065–66). *Itinerarium Egeriae,* ed. A. Franceschini–R. Weber, *CChr* 175 (Turnhout 1958); A. Adam, *Zur Geschichte der orientalischen Taufe und Messe im 2. u. 4. Jh., KIT* 5 (3rd ed. 1960); J. C. Didier, *Le baptême des enfants dans la tradition de l'Église ancienne* in *Monumenta christiana selecta* (Tournai 1960); Ambrose, "De paenitentia," *CSEL* 73; Pacian, *Epistulae et Paraenesis, PL* 13; Augustine, *Textus selecti de paenitentia,* coll. B. Poschmann, *FlorPatr* 38 (Bonn 1934); Augustine, *Sermons pour la Pâque,* ed. S. Poque, *SChr* 116 (Paris 1966); Leo I, *Sermones de quadragesima; de passione Domini,* ed. R. Dolle, *SChr* 49 and 74 (Paris 1957 and 1961).

LITERATURE

See Vol. I, chap. 23; also: J. A. Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie* (Innsbruck 1941); A. G. Martimort, *L'Église en prière. Introduction à la liturgie* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1965); H. A. Schmidt, *Introductio in liturgiam occidentalem* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1965); Th. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (Bonn 1965); J. A. Jungmann, *Liturgie der christlichen Frühzeit* (Fribourg 1967); E. Cattaneo, *Introduzione alla storia liturgica occidentale* (Rome 2nd ed. 1969); W. Nagel, *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1970).—S. Salaville, *Liturgies orientales* (Paris 1932); J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus,* vol. II–III (Rome 1932); A. Raes, *Introductio in liturgiam orientalem* (Rome 1947); A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée* (Chevtogne, 2nd ed. 1953); H. J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie* (Freiburg 1964).

BAPTISM: P. de Puniet, "Baptême," *DACL* 2 (1914), 251–346; J. Jeremias, *Die Kindertaufe in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten* (Göttingen 1958); A. Stenzel, *Die Taufe* (Innsbruck 1958): J. Ysebaert, *Greek Baptismal Terminology, Graecitas christ. primaeva* 1 (Nijmegen 1962); Th. M. Finn, *The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John*

Chrysostom (Washington 1967); G. Kretschmar, "Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche," *Leiturgia* V (Kassel 1970), 145–273.

EUCHARIST: J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* (Vienna, 5th ed. 1962); M. Righetti, *La Messa. Commento storico-liturgico* (Milan, 3rd ed. 1966); W. Gessel, *Eucharistische Gemeinschaft bei Augustinus* (Würzburg 1966); B. Botte et al., *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident, Lex orandi* 46–47 (Paris 1970).

PENANCE: J. A. Jungmann, *Die lateinischen Bussriten* (Innsbruck 1932); B. Poschmann, *Busse = HDF* IV 3 (Freiburg 1951); C. Vogel, *La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule des origines à la fin du VII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1952); P. Galtier, *De poenitentia* (Rome, 3rd ed. 1956); P. Anciaux, *Histoire de la discipline pénitentielle* (Paris 1963).

THE LITURGICAL YEAR: N. M. Denis-Boulet, *Le calendrier chrétien* (Paris 1959); J. Pascher, *Das liturgische Jahr* (Munich 1963); M. Righetti, *L'anno liturgico* (Milan, 3rd ed. 1969); *Paschatis Sollemnia, Festschr. J. A. Jungmann* (Freiburg 1959); M. Merendino, *Paschale Sacramentum* (Münster 1965); W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern. Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche* (Berlin 1969); V. Peri, "La durata e struttura della Quaresima nell'antico uso ecclesiastico gerosolimitano," *Aevum* 37 (1963), 31–62; G. Kretschman, "Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten," *ZKG* 66 (1954–55), 209–253; R. Cabié, *La Pentecôte. L'évolution de la Cinquantaine pascale au cours des cinq premiers siècles* (Tournai 1965); B. Botte, *Les origines de la Nöel et de l'Epiphanie* (Louvain 1932); J. Mossy, *Les fêtes de Noël et de l'Epiphanie d'apreès les sources littéraires cappadociennes du IV^{e} siècle* (Louvain 1965); F. Nikolasch, "Zum Ursprung des Epiphaniefestes," *ELit* 82 (1968), 393–429.

18. *Preaching and Piety*

LITERATURE

CARE OF SOULS IN GENERAL: G. Dix, "The Ministry in the Early Church" in K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry* (London, 2nd ed. 1947), 183–303; V. Monachino, *La cura pastorale a Milano, Cartagine e Roma nel secolo IV* (Rome 1947); A. Mandouze, "Notes sur l'organisation de la vie chrétienne en Afrique à l'époque de s. Augustin," *ATh* 13 (1953), 151–171, 201–231; J. Fernández Alonso, *La cura pastoral en la España romano-visigoda* (Rome 1955); P. Rentinck, *La cura pastoral in Antiochia nel IV^{e} secolo* (Rome 1970).—F. Meyer, *Die Seelsorge des hl. Ambrosius (Diss. Rome 1941); F. Van der Meer, Augustinus der Seelsorger* (Cologne 1951); E. Bellini, "La figura del pastore d'anime in Gregorio Nazianzeno," *SC* 99 (1971), 269–296.

CATECHESIS AND PREACHING: M. Sauvage, *Catéchèse et laïcat* (Paris 1962); J. Daniélou, *La catéchèse aux premiers siècles* (Paris 1968).—B. Paredi, *La catechesi di Sant' Ambrogio* (Genoa 1957); A. Paulin, *S. Cyrille de Jérusalem catéchète* (Paris 1959).—F. Stingeder, *Gesch. der Schriftpredigt* (Paderborn 1920); H. Kerr, *The Preaching in the Early Church* (New York 1942); A. Niebergall, "Die Gesch. der christlichen Predigt," *Leiturgia* II (Kassel 1955), 182–353; St. Czerwik, *Homilia paschalis apud Patres usque ad saec. V* (Rome 1961); J. B. Schnyder, *Gesch. der katholischen Predigt* (Freiburg 1969); W. Schütz, *Gesch. der christlichen Predigt* (Berlin 1972); A. Olívar, "La duración de la predicación antiqua," *Liturgica* 3 (1966), 143–184; id., "Preparación e improvicasión en la prédica patrística," *Kyriakon* II (Festschr. J. Quasten, Münster 1970), 736–767; D. Attwater, *St. John Chrysostom, Pastor and Preacher* (London 1959); B. H. Vandenberghe *St. Jean Chrysostome et la parole de Dieu* (Paris 1961); J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Perès*

Cappadociens (Paris 1968); R. R. Ruether, *Gregory of Nazianzen, Rhetor and Philosopher* (Oxford 1969).

AUGUSTINE: M. Pontet, "Le prédicateur et son public," *L'exégèse de s. Augustin prédicateur* (Paris 1945), 35–110; H.-I. Marrou, "L'éloquence chrétienne," *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1947), 505–545; J. Pépin, "S. Augustin et la fonction de l'allégorie," *RechAug* 1 (1958), 243–286; J. Oroz Reta, *La retórica en los sermones de s. Agustín* (Madrid 1963); F. Schnitzler, *Zur Theologie der Verkündigung in den Predigten des hl. Augustinus* (Freiburg 1968); P. Christophe, *Cassien et Césaire prédicateurs de la morale monastique* (Gembloux 1969).

PIETY AND ASCETICISM: M. Viller–K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik der Väterzeit* (Freiburg 1939); A. Hamman, *Prières des premiers chretiens* (Paris 1952); L. Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (London/New York, 1963); E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosius von Mailand* (Münster 1965); J. A. Jungmann, *Christliches Beten im Wandel und Bestand* (Munich 1969); E. von Severus–O. Michel–Th. Klauser, "Gebet I/II," *RAC* 8, 1134–1258; 9, 1–36; J. A. Lamb, *The Psalms in Christian Worship* (London 1962); J. Schümmer, *Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis* (Münster 1933); A. Guillaume, *Jeûne et charité dans l'Église latine* (Paris 1954); Th. Pichler, *Das Fasten bei Basileios und im antiken Heidentum* (Innsbruck 1955); Th. Camelot, *Virgines Christi* (Paris 1944); F. de B. Vizmanos, *Las vírgenes cristianas en la Iglesia primitiva* (Madrid 1949).

CULT OF MARTYRS, THE SAINTS, AND THE DEAD: H. Delehaye, *Sanctus* (Brussels 1927); id., *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels, 2nd ed. 1933); A. Grabar, *Martyrium,* 3 vols. (Paris 1946); Th. Klauser, *Christlicher Martyrerkult, heidnischer Heroenkult, spätjüdische Heiligenverehrung* (Cologne 1960); A. Frolow, *La relique de la vraie Croix* (Paris 1961); B. Kötting, *Der frühchristliche Reliquienkult und die Bestattung im Kirchengebäude* (Cologne 1965); W. Delius, *Texte zur Gesch. der Marienverehrung und Marienverkündigung in der alten Kirche, KIT* 178 (Berlin 1956); F. Spedalieri, *Maria nella Scrittura e nella tradizione della Chiesa primitiva* (Messina 1961); D. M. Montagna, *La lode alla theotokos nei testi greci dei secoli IV–VII* (Rome 1963); B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa* (Münster 1950); A. Stuiber, *Refrigerium interim* (Bonn 1957); C. G. Rodríguez, *El culto de los santos en la España romana y visigoda* (Madrid 1966); Th. Klauser, *Die Cathedra im Totenkult der heidnischen und christlichen Antike* (Münster, 2nd ed. 1971); J. Zellinger, *Augustinus und die Volksfrömmigkeit* (Munich 1933); St. McKenna, *Paganism and Pagan Survivals in Spain up to the Fall of the Visigothic Kingdom* (Washington 1938); M. Striedl, *Antiker Volksglaube bei Johannes Chrysostomos* (Diss. Würzburg 1948).

19. *Early Christian Monasticism: Development and Expansion in the East*

I. The Religious and Historical Background

SMALLER SOURCE COLLECTIONS

J. de Guibert, *Documenta ecclesiastica ad christianae perfectionis studium spectantia* (Rome 1932); K. Koch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Askese und des Mönchtums* (Tübingen 1936); *Enchiridion de statibus perfectionis* (Rome 1949); H. U. v. Balthasar, *Die grossen Ordensregeln* (Cologne, 2nd ed. 1961); M.-J. Rouet de Journal–J. Dutilleul, *Enchiridion asceticum* (Freiburg, 6th ed. 1965).

GENERAL LITERATURE

Dictionnaire de Spiritualité (=*DSp*), ed. by Ch. Baumgarten–M. Olphe-Galliard (Paris 1932ff.); *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens* (Münster 1911ff.). Works on special periods: *Studia Monastica* (Montserrat 1959ff.); *Yermo* (Madrid 1963ff.). Surveys in the lexica: H. Leclercq, "Cénobitisme," *DACL* II, 3047–3248; id., "Monachisme," ibid., IX, 1774–1974; J. Olphe-Galliard, "Cénobitisme," *DSp* II, 405–416; A. Adam, "Mönchtum," *RGG*^{3} IV, 1072–1081; I. Auf der Maur, "Mönchtum," *LThK*^{2} VII, 545–548; Th. Spidlik–J. Sainsaulieu, "Ermites," *DHGE* XV, 776–787. Also: D. Gorce, *La lectio divina des origines à S. Benôit et Cassiodore* I (Paris 1925); J. Wagemann, *Entwicklungsstufen des ältesten Mönchtums* (Tübingen 1929); H. v. Campenhausen, *Die asketische Heimatlosigkeit im altkirchlichen und frühmittelalterlichen Mönchtum* (Tübingen 1930); Ph. Oppenheim, *Das Mönchskleid im Altertum* (Münster 1931); K. Heussi, *Der Ursprung des christlichen Mönchtums* (Tübingen 1936), also Th. Lefort: *RHE* 33 (1937), 341–348; M. Marx, *Incessant Prayer in Ancient Monastic Literature* (Vatican City 1947); E. E. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr (Washington 1950); Ph. Hofmeiser, "*Mönchtum und Seelsorge bis zum 13. Jh.," *SM* 65 (1953–54), 209–273; A. Adam, "Grundbegriffe des Mönchtums in sprachlicher Sicht," *ZKG* 65 (1953–54), 209–239; I. Auf der Maur, *Mönchtum und Glaubensverkündigung* (Fribourg 1959); L. Bouyer. *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (London/New York, 1963); G. Turbessi, *Ascetismo e Monachesimo prebenedettino* (Rome 1961); *Théologie de la vie monastique. Études sur la doctrine patristique* (Paris 1961); I. Hausherr, "Vocation chrétienne et vocation monastique selon les Perès," *Laïcat et sainteté* I (Rome 1963), 33–115; *Los monjes y los estudios* (Poblet 1963); S. Frank, ΑΓΓΕΛΙΚΟϹ ΒΙΟϹ (Münster 1964); U. Ranke-Heinemann, *Das frühe Mönchtum. Seine Motive nach den Selbstzeugnissen* (Essen 1964); P. Nagel, *Die Motive der Askese in der alten Kirche und der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (Berlin 1966); D. Knowles, *From Pachomius to Ignatius. A Study in the Constitutional History of the Religious Orders* (Oxford 1966); F. S. Pericoli Ridolfini, *Alle origini del monachesimo. Le convergenze esseniche* (Rome 1966); B. Lohse, *Askese und Mönchtum in der Antike und in der alten Kirche* (Munich 1969); S. Frank, "Die Erforschung der Anfänge des Mönchtums und die Frage der Hermeneutik," *FStud* 53 (1971), 28–44.

II. Development and Expansion in the East

LITERATURE

J. M. Besse, *Les moines d'Orient antérieurs au concile de Chalcédoine* (Paris 1900); St. Schiwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum* I–II (Mödling 1904, 1913), III (Vienna 1938); N. R. Nugent, *Portrait of the Consecrated Woman in Greek Literature in the First Four Centuries* (Washington 1941); I. Hauscherr, *Penthos. La doctrine de la componction dans l'Orient chrétien* (Rome 1944); *Il Monachesimo Orientale* (Rome 1958); *Théologie de la vie monastique* (Paris 1961); A.-J. Festugierè, *Les moines d'Orient* I (Paris 1961); J. Décarraux, "Du monachisme primitif au monachisme athonite," *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos* I (Chevetogne 1963), 19–57; Cl. Lialine, "Érémitisme en Orient," *DSAM* IV, 936–953; J. Leclerq, "Problèmes de l'érémitisme," *StudMon* 5 (1963), 197–212; D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City* (London 1965).

1. Egyptian Anchoritism. The Pachomians. The Monasticism of the Deserts of Nitria and Scete

SOURCES

ANTONY AND AMMONAS: Athanasius, *Vita s. Antonii, PG* 26, 835–976. The two Latin translations of the fourth century: 1. ed. G. Garitte (Brussels 1939, also H. Hoppenbrouwers: *Latinitas Christianorum primaeva* 14, Nijmegen 1960); 2. the translation of Evagrius: *PG* 26, 835–976 and *PL* 73, 125–170, also L. Th. Lorié: *Latin. Christ. prim.* 11 (Nijmegen 1955); The Coptic translation, ed. G. Garitte: *CSCO* 117–118 (Louvain 1949). Studies on the life of Antony: K. Holl: *GA* II (Tübingen 1928), 249–269; J. List, *Das Antoniusleben des hl. Athanasius* (Athens 1931); H. Dörries, "Die Vita Antonii als Geschichtsquelle," *Wort und Stunde, Ges. Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des 4. Jh.* (Göttingen 1966), 145–224. English translation of the Vita with commentary by R. T. Meyer: *ACW* 10 (1950). Antony's letters: Latin: *PG* 40, 977–1019; 1065; Georgian, ed. G. Garitte: *CSCO* 148–149 (Louvain 1955); on the authenticity: F. Klejna: *ZKTh* 62 (1938), 309–348. The Ammonas letters: Syria translation, ed. M. Kmosko: *POr* 10 (1915); Greek, ed. F. Nau: *POr* 11 (1916); Latin: *PG* 40, 1019–1060, also again F. Klejna, op. cit.

THE PACHOMIANS: F. Kozman, *Textes législatifs touchant le cénobitisme égyptien* (Rome 1935); rule and letters of Pachomius, ed. A. Boon–Th. Lefort, *Pachomiana latina* (Louvain 1932; Contents: "Rule" = *Praecepta;* letters [11]; *Liber Horsiesii*); Th. Lefort, "OEuvres de s. Pachôme et de ses disciples," *CSCO* 159/160 (Louvain 1956); lives of Pachomius: 1. Coptic, ed. Th. Lefort: *CSCO* 89 and 107 (Louvain 1925); *CSCO* 99/100 (Louvain 1933/34). Th. Lefort, *Les vies coptes de s. Pachôme et de ses premiers disciples* (Louvain 1943). 2. Greek, ed. F. Halkin, *S. Pachomii Vitae graecae* (Brussels 1932), also R. Draguet: *Muséon* 70 (1957), 257–306; the Vita graeca I in French translation by A. -J. Festugière: *Les moines d'Orient* IV 2 (Paris (1965); on the whole matter, A. Veilleux (see under Lit.), 1–137; also A. de Vogué: *RHE* 67 (1972), 26–27.—The *Liber Orsiesii* is edited by A. Boon, op. cit., 109–147; Coptic fragments: *CSCO* 159 (Louvain 1956), 63–99, by H. Bacht, *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs. Studien zum frühen Mönchtum* I (Würzburg 1972), 57–189.—Life and works of Shenoute of Athribis (Coptic), ed. J. Leipoldt and W. E. Crum: *CSCO* 41, 42, 73 (Louvain 1906–13), the Latin translation by H. Wiesmann: *CSCO* 96, 108, 129 (Louvain 1931, 1936, 1951). A life of Schenute by his pupil Besa, ed. J. Leipoldt: *CSCO* 41.

PALLADIUS: *Historia Lausiaca,* ed. C. Butler: *Texts and Studies* 6, 1–2 (Cambridge 1904); ed. A. Lucot (Paris 1912); on the history of the text, R. Draguet: *Muséon* 57 (1944), 53–146; 58 (1945), 15–96; 60 (1947), 227–255; 63 (1950), 205–230; *RHE* 41 (1946), 321–364: 42 (1947), 5–49.—The *Historia monachorum,* ed. A.-J. Festugière (Brussels 1971), with French translation and commentary.

THE APOPHTHEGMATA PATRUM: (a) Greek collection (alphabetically): *PG* 65, 71–440, supplements by F. Nau: *ROC* 10–18 (1905–13); also W. Bousset, *Apophthegmata* (Tübingen 1923) and J. -Cl. Guy, *Recherches sur la tradition grecque des Apophthegmata Patrum* (Brussels 1962). (b) Latin collection (thematic): *Verba Seniorum: PL* 73, 381–1062, supplemented by A. Wilmart: *RBén* 34 (1922), 185–198; on the transmission of the text, A. H. Salonius, *Vitae Patrum* (Lund 1920); on the planned new edition see C. M. Battle: *StudMon* I (1959), 115–120. W. Gemoll, *Das Apophthegma* (Vienna 1926). (c) Syriac collections: ed. P. Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* VIII (Paris 1897); F. A.

W. Budge, *The Wit and Wisdom of the Christian Fathers of Egypt. The Syrian Version of the Apophth. Patrum* (Oxford 1934). (d) Cassian, *Collationes patrum,* ed. M. Petschenig: *CSEL* 13 (Vienna 1886) and E. Pichéry: *SChr* 42, 54, 64 (Paris 1955–59, with French translation). Translations of the Apophth.: R. Draguet, *Les Pères du désert* (Paris 1949, with important introduction); B. Miller, *Weisung der Väter* (Freiburg 1965, complete following the Greek text, in selections from the Latin collection, with bibliog. pp. 497–516); L. Regnault, *Les sentences des Pères du desert. Nouveau recueil* (Solemes 1970).

LITERATURE:

ANTONY: L. Hertling, *Antonius der Einsiedler* (Innsbruck 1929); L. Bouyer, *La vie de s. Antoine* (St. Wandrille 1950); B. Steidle, "Homo Dei Antonius," *SA* 38 (Rome 1956), 148–200; F. Giardini, *La dottrina spirituale de s. Antonio abate e di Ammonio nelle loro lettere* (Florence 1957).

PACHOMIANS: P. Ladeuze, *Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhômien pendant le IV*^{e} *siècle et la I*^{ière} *moitié du V*^{e} (Paris 1898, reprinted. Frankfurt 1961); Th. Lefort "Les premiers monastères pachômiens" (topographical exploration), *Muséon* 52 (1939), 379–407; H. Bacht, "Antonius und Pachomius. Von der Anachorese zum Cönobitentum," *SA* 38 (Rome 1956), 66–107; id., "Mönchtum und Kirche. Eine Studie zur Spiritualität des Pachomius," *Sentire Ecclesiam* (Freiburg 1961), 113–133; id., "Horsiesius," *Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs;* 9–55; A. Veilleux, "La liturgie dans le cénobitisme pachômien au quatrième siècle," *SA* 57 (Rome 1968); F. Ruppert, *Das pachomianische Mönchtum und die Anfänge des klösterlichen Gehorsams* (Münsterschwarzach 1971).—J. Leipoldt, "Schenute von Atripe und die Entstehung des national-ägyptischen Mönchtums," *TU* 25, I (Leipzig 1903); D. G. Müller, *Die alte koptische Predigt* (Diss. Heidelberg 1954).

MONASTICISM OF THE DESERTS OF NITRIA AND SCETE: A. L. Schmitz, "Die Welt der ägyptischen Einsiedler und Mönche," *RQ* 37 (1929), 189–244; P. Pesch, *La doctrine ascétique des premiers maîtres égyptiens du IV*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1931); H. -G. E. White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi n'Natrûn* II (New York 1932); N. Schedl, *Jesus Christus. Sein Bild bei den Mönchen der Sketis* (Vienna 1942); H. O. Weber, *Die Stellung des Joh. Cassians zur ausserpachomianischen Mönchstradition* (Münster 1960); O. F. A. Meinardus, *Monks and Monasteries of the Egyptian Deserts* (Cairo 1961).

2. Monasticism in Palestine and Syria

SOURCES

Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis, PL* 23, 29–54; Anonymus, *Vita Charitonis,* ed. G. Garitte, *BullInstBelge de Rome* 21 (1941), 16–146; Cyril of Scythopolis, *Vita s. Euthymii,* ed. E. Schwartz, *TU* 49, 2 (Berlin 1939), 3–85; French translation of this *vita* with commentary by A. -J. Festugière, *Les Moines d'Orient* III 1 (Paris 1962); *Itinerarium Egeriae,* ed. W. Heraeus (Heidelberg, 2nd ed. 1921); ed. H Pétré, *SChr* 21 (Paris 1948); ed. Aet. Franceschini–R. Weber (Turnhout 1958); ed. H. Pétré–K. Vretska (Klosterneuburg 1958, with translation and commentary); E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Upsala 1911, reprinted. Darmstadt 1962); Jerome, *Epistulae,* ed. I. Hilberg, *CSEL,* 54–56; Gerontius, *Vita S. Melaniae junioris,* ed. D. Gorce, *SChr,* 90 (Paris 1962 with French translation and commentary).—Theodoret, *Historia religiosa, PG* 82, 1284–1496; chap. 26 ed. H. Lietzmann, "Das Leben des heiligen Symeon

Stylites," *TU* 32, 4 (Berlin 1908), 1–18. "Antonius mon., Vita Symeonis styl.," ed. H. Lietzmann, ibid., 20–78. The Syriac *vita* of Simeon in *Bedjan* IV, 507–644.—Socrates, *HE.*—Afrahat, "Sermo de monachis," ed. I. Parisot, *PS* I, 239–312. Ephraem, *Hymni de Abraham Qidunaja,* ed. Th. Lamy, *S. Ephraemi Hymni et sermones* III (Mecheln 1889), 749–863; *Hymni de Iuliano SABA,* ibid., 837–936. A Vööbus, *Syriac and Arabic Documents regarding Legislation relative to Syrian Asceticism* (Stockholm 1960).

LITERATURE

St. Schiwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum* II (Mainz 1913); H. Leclercq, "Laures palestiniennes," *DACL* VIII (1928), 1961–88; E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939); G. D. Gordini, "Il monachesimo Romano in Palestina nel IV secolo," *Saint Martin et son temps* (Rome 1961), 85–107. St. Schiwietz, *Das Mönchtum in Syrien und Mesopotamien und das Aszetentum in Persien* (Mödling 1938); J. van der Ploeg, *Oudsyrisch Monniksleven* (Leyden 1942); A. Adam, "Grundbegriffe des Mönchtums in sprachlicher Sicht," *ZKG* 65 (1953–54), 209–239; also E. Beck, "Ein Beitrag zur Terminologie des ältesten syrichen Mönchtums," *SA* 39 (Rome 1956), 254–267; id., "Asketentum und Mönchtum bei Ephräm," *Il monachesimo orientale* (Rome 1958), 341–362; O. Hendriks, "La vie cotidienne du moine syrien orientale," *OrSyr* 5 (1960), 293–330, 401–432; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient,* I: *The Origin of Asceticism. Early Monasticism in Persia = CSCO* 184 (Louvain 1960); A. -J. Festugière, "Les moines de Syrie," *Antioche païenne et chrétienne* (Paris 1959), 245–406; P. Canivet, "Théodoret et le monachisme syrien avant le concile de Chalcédoine," *Theologie de la Vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 241–282; L. Leloir, "La pensé monastique d'Ephrem," *Mémorial de l'école des Langues Orientales Anciennes* (Paris 1964).

3. The Monasticism of Asia Minor and Constantinople

SOURCES

Canons and letters of the Synod of Gangra: *Mansi* II, 1095–1122, also *Hefele-Leclerq* I/2, 1029–1045.—Basil's *Asketikon*: *PG* 31, 889–1305; Rufinus's Latin version: *PL* 103, 485–554. On the history of the text of Basil's Rules: F. Laun: *ZKG* 44 (1925), 1–61; Gribomont, *Histoire du texte des Ascetiques de saint Basile* (Louvain 1953); English translation with commentary by W. K. L. Clarke, *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil* (London 1925). Basil's letters: new critical edition by Y. Courtonne, 3 vols. (Paris 1957–66).—The poems of Gregory Nazianzen on Monasticism: *PG* 37.—The ascetical works of Gregory of Nyssa: *Greg. Nyss. Opera,* ed. W. Jaeger et al., VIII, 1 (Leyden 1952); *De virginitate,* with French translation and commentary, ed. M. Aubineau: *SChr* 119 (Paris 1966).—Callinicus, *Vita s. Hypatii,* ed. G. J. M. Bartelink: *SChr* 177 (Paris 1971); French translation with commentary by A. -J. Festugière, *Les Moines d'Orient* II (Paris 1961), 13–86.

ON MESSALIANISM: *PS* I/3 (Paris 1926), cxl–cclxi; G. L. Marriott, *Macarii anecdota* (Cambridge, Mass. 1918); H. Dörries, "Symeon von Mesopotamien. Die Überlieferung der Messalianischen 'Makarios' Schriften," *TU* 55, 1(Leipzig 1941); W. Jaeger, *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius* (Leiden 1954); E. Klostermann–H. Berthold, "Neue Homilien des Makarius (Symeon I: Aus Typus III)," *TU* 72 (Berlin 1961); Macarius's fifty spiritual homilies, ed. by H. Dörries–E. Klostermann–M. Kroeger: *PTS* 4 (Berlin 1964).

LITERATURE

J. Gribonmont, "Eustathe de Sébaste," *DSp* 4, 1708–1712 and *DHGE* 16, 26–33; id., "Le monachisme au IV^e^ siècle en Asie Mineure: de Gangres au Messalianisme," *Stpatr* II (*TU* 64, Berlin 1957), 400–415; id., "Le monachisme au sein de l'Église en Syrie et en Cappadoce," *StudMon* 7 (1956), 7–24.—J. Pargoire, "Basile," *DACL* 2, 1, 501–510; G. Bardy, "Basile," *DSAM* 1, 1273–1283; M. G. Murphy, *St. Basil and Monasticism* (Washington 1930); P. Humbertelaude, *La doctrine ascétique de s. Basile de Césarée* (Paris 1932); E. Amand, *L'ascèse monastique de saint Basile* (Paris 1949); id., "Le système cénobitique basilien comparé au système cénobitique pachômien," *RHR* 152 (1957), 31–80; J. Gribomont, "Le renoncement au monde dans l'idéal ascétique de s. Basile," *Irénikon* 31 (1958), 282–307, 460–475; id., "Saint Basile," *Théologie de la Vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 99–113; J. Plagnieux, "S. Grégoire de Nazianze," ibid., 115–130; J. Daniélou, "S. Grégoire de Nysse dans l'histoire du monachisme," ibid., 131–141.—R. Janin, "La banlieue de Constantinople," series of articles in *ÉO* 21–23 and 26 (1922–24, 1927); id., *Constantinople. Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1968 = *La Géographie de l'Orient byzantin* I, III); G. Dagron, "Les moines et la ville. Le monachisme à Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcédoine," *Travaux et Mémoires* 4 (1970), 229–276; J. Pargoire, "Acémètes," *DHGE* 1, 307–321; V. Grumel, "Acémètes," *DSAM* 1, 169–175.

ON MESSALIANISM: I. Hausherr, "L'erreur fondamentale et la logique du messalianisme," *OrChrP* 1 (1935), 328–360; A. Kemmer, *Charisma maximum* (Louvain 1938); H. Dörries, "Christlicher Humanismus und mönchische Geist-Ethik," *ThLZ* 79 (1954), 643–656; A. Vööbus, *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient* II (Louvain 1960), 127–139; J. Daniélou, "Grégoire de Nysse et le Messalianisme," *RSR* 48 (1960), 119–134; H. Dörries, "Urteil and Verurteilung. Kirche und Messalianer," *ZNW* 55 (1964), 78–94 = *Wort und Stunde* (Gottingen 1966), 334–351; id., "Diadochus und Symeon," ibid., 352–422; R. Staats, "Gregor von Nyssa und die Messaliner," *PTS* 8 (Berlin 1968); J. Gribomont, "Le dossier des origines du messalianisme," *Epektasis, Mélanges J. Daniélou* (Paris 1972), 611–25.

20. *The Monasticism of the Latin West*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: See above chap. 19; also; G. Bardy, "Les origines des écoles monastiques en Occident," *SE* 5 (1953), 86–104; W. Schatz, *Studien zur Geschichte und Vorstellungswelt des frühen abendländischen Mönchtums* (typed diss. Freiburg 1957); O. Chadwick, *Western Asceticism* (London 1958: trans. of the *Verba seniorum,* Cassian, and the Benedictine Rule, with introductions); H. U. von Balthasar, *Die grossen Ordensregeln* (Einsiedeln, 2nd ed. 1961); J. Décarreaux, *Les moines et la civilisation en Occident. Des invasions à Charlemagne* (Paris 1964); R. Lorentz, "Die Anfänge des abendländischen Mönchtums im 4. Jh.," *ZKG* 77 (1966), 1–61.

ITALY: G. D. Gordini, *Forme di vita ascetica a Roma nel IV secolo* (Alba 1952); id., "Origine e sviluppo del monachesimo a Roma," *Gr.* 37 (1956), 220–260 (lit.); G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries, V–X cent.* (Vatican City 1957); G. Pence, *Storia del monachesimo in Italia* I (Rome 1961).—Milan: A Roberti, "S. Ambrogio e il monachesimo," *SC* 68 (1940), 140–159, 236–253; R. de Izary, *La virginité selon s.*

Ambroise, 2 vols. (Diss. Lyon 1952); G. Penco. "Le origini del monachesimo in Liguria," *Benedictina* 9 (1956), 15–30.

GAUL: C. Courtois, "L'évolution du monachisme en Gaule de s. Martin à s. Colomban," *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale* (Spoleto 1957), 47–72; R. Metz, "Les vierges chrétiennes en Gaul au IV^{e} siècle," *SA* 46 (Rome 1961), 109–132; E. Griffe, "Moines et monastères," *La Gaul chrétienne à l'époque romaine* 3 (Paris 1965), 299–352; F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich 1965).—Martin of Tours: The most important source is the works on Martin by Sulpicius Severus: ed. C. Halm, *CSEL* 1 (Vienna 1866); new edition by B. Peebles–P. Hylton in *CChr* in preparation; the "Vita s. Martini" alone now in *SChr* 133–135 (Paris 1967–68), ed. J. Fontaine, with an important introduction in *SChr* 133, 17–210; Monographs on Martin: E. Ch. Babut (Paris 1912); A. Requier (Paris, 7th ed. 1929); J. Van den Bosch, *Capa, basilica, monasterium et le culte de s. Martin de Tours* (Nijmegen 1959); *Saint Martin et son temps* =*SA* 46 (Rome 1961), in it 3–24: E. Griffe, "Saint Martin et le monachisme gaulois."—Lérins: Sources: Hilarius Arelat., *Sermo de vita s. Honorati, PL* 50, 1249–1279; S. Cavallin, *Vitae ss. Honorati et Hilarii* (Lund 1952), 49–78; Eucherius, *De laude eremi, CSEL* 31, 179–194; H. Leclercq, "Lérins," *DACL* 8, 2596–2627; L. Cristiani, *Lérins et ses fondateurs* (St-Wandrille 1946); N. K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul* (London 1955), 142–169. —John Cassian: a) *Instituta Coenobiorum,* ed. M. Petschenig: *CSEL* 13 (Vienna 1886); ed. J.-Cl. Guy; *SChr* 109 (Paris 1965); b) *Collationes patrum,* ed. M. Petschenig: *CSEL* 17 (Vienna 1888); ed. E. Pichery: *SChr* 42, 54 (Paris 1955, 1958, 1959).—M. Olphe-Galliard, "Cassien," *DSAM* 2, 214–276; M. Cappuyns, "Cassien," *DHGE* 11, 1319–1348; H. Leclercq, "Saint-Victor," *DACL* 15, 545–557: F. Benoît, *L'Abbaye de s. Victor et l'église de la Major* (Paris 1936); L. Cristiani, *Jean Cassien* (Paris 1946); H.-O. Weber, *Die Stellung des Johannes Cassianus zur ausserpachomianischen Mönchstradition* (Münster 1961); J. -Cl. Guy, *Jean Cassien, vie et doctrine* (Paris 1961); O. Chadwick, *John Cassian* (Cambridge, 2nd. ed. 1967).—The Jura Monasteries: *Vitae patrum Jurensium,* ed. B. Krusch: *MGSS* rer. Mer. III, 131–166; ed. F. Martine: *SChr* 142 (Paris 1968, Lit.), also J. Doignon: *RAM* 46 (1970), 377–386; H. Leclercq: *DACL* 8, 430–438.

SPAIN: J. Pérez de Urbel, *Los monjes españoles de la edad media* I (Madrid, 2nd. ed. 1945); *id.,* "Le monachisme en Espagne au temps de s. Martin," *SA* (Rome 1961), 45–65; A. Mundó, "Il monachesimo nella penisola Iberica," *Il monachesimo nell'alto medievo* (Spoleto 1957), 73–108; G. M. Gilbert, "El eremitismo en la Hispania romana," *España eremítica* (Pamplona 1970), 41–47.

NORTH AFRICA: J. M. Besse, *Les moines de l'Afrique romaine,* 2 vols. (Paris 1903); J.-M. Destal, "¿Un cenobitismo preagustiniano en Africa?" in *Ciudad de Dios* 168 (1956), 375–405, 171 (1958), 161–195; G. Folliet, "Aux origines de l'ascétisme et du cénobitisme africain," *SA* 46 (1961), 25–44; J.-J. Gavigan, *De vita monastica in Africa septentrionali inde a temporibus s. Augustini usque ad invasiones Arabum* (Turin 1962, lit. IX–XXIV).—Augustine: M. Mellet, *L'itinéraire et l'idéal monastique de s. Augustin* (Paris 1934); Sanctus Augustinus, *vitae spiritualis magister,* 2 vols. (Rome 1959); A. Manrique, *La vida monástica en San Agustín* (Salamanca 1959); D. Riccardi, *La verginità nella vita religiosa secondo la dottrina di s. Agostino* (Turin 1961); A. Sage, *La règle de s. Augustin commentée par ses écrits* (Paris 1961); E. Boularand, "Expérience et conception de la vie monastique chez s. Augustin," *BLE* 64 (1963), 81–116, 172–194; A. Manrique, *Teología Agustiniana de la vida religiosa* (El Escorial 1964); L. Cilleruelo, *El monacato de San Agustín* (Valladolid 1966); L. Verheijen, *La règle de s. Augustin,* I: *Tradition manuscrite;* II: *Recherches historiques,* comprehensive bibliog. pp. 221–239

(Paris 1967); A. Zumkeller, *Das Mönchtum des heiligen Augustinus* (Würzburg, 2nd ed. 1968, with lit. 17–31, 323–332).

CRITICISM OF MONASTICISM: John Chrysostom, *Adv. oppugnatores vita monasticae: PG* 47, 319–386; Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium* and *Adversus Jovinianum: PL* 23; Augustine, *De opere monachorum: CSEL* 41 (Vienna 1900). —P. de Labriolle, "Rutilius Namatianus et les moines," *RÉL* 6 (1928), 30–41; L. Gougaud, "Les critiques formulées contre les premiers moines d'Occident," *RMab* 24 (1939), 145–163; P. Antin, "Le monachisme selon s. Jérôme," *MélBénédictins* (St-Wandrille 1947), 69–113; A.-J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne* (Paris 1959), 192–210.

21. *Church and Society*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: S. Mazzarino, *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo* (Rome 1951); M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire,* revised ed. by P. M. Fraser, 2 vols. (London 1957); W. Seyfarth, *Soziale Fragen der spätrömischen Kaiserzeit im Spiegel des Theodosianus* (Berlin 1963); A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602. A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey* I–IV (Oxford 1964); J. Vogt, *Der Niedergang Roms. Metamorphose der antiken Kultur von 200–500* (Zurich 1965); id., *Kulturwelt und Barbaren. Zum Menschenbild der späntiken Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden 1967); J. Gaudemet, *Les Institutiones de l'Antiquité* (Paris 1967); J. Gagé, *Les classes sociales dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1971). —N. Baynes, *The Early Church and Social Life. A Selected Bibliography* (London 1927); L. Polverini, "Società antica e cristianesimo," *Problemi di storia della Chiesa, sec. II–IV* (Milan 1970), 13–31 (report on research); E. Troeltsch, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen 1912); J. Mausbach, *Die Ethik des heiligen Augustinus* (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1929); H.-J. Diesner, *Studien zur Gesellschaftslehre und sozialen Haltung Augustins* (Halle 1954); J. Gaudemet, *L'église dans l'empire Romain, IV^e–V^e siecles* (Paris 1958); R. Sierro Bravo, *Doctrina social y económica de los Padres de la Iglesia* (Madrid 1967; extensive collection of texts); P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (London 1972).

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY: L. Godefroy, "Marriage," *DThC* IX, 2077–2113; H. Leclercq, "Marriage," *DACL* X, 1899–1982 (monuments); id., "Femme," ibid., V, 1300–1353; id., "Alumni," ibid., I, 1288–1306 (exposing of children); A. Oepke, "Ehe (Institution)," *RAC* IV, 651–666; G. Delling, "Ehebruch, Eheleben, Ehescheidung," ibid., IV, 666–719; H. Karpp, "Eltern," ibid., IV, 1206–1219; J. Gaudemet, "Familie," ibid., VII, 336–357; N. Ladomierszky, *S. Augustin, docteur du marriage chrétien* (Rome 1942); W. J. Dooley, *Marriage according to St. Ambrose* (Washington 1948); B. Biondi, *Diritto romano cristiano* III (Milan 1954); F. Delpini, *Divorzio e separazione dei conjugi nel diritto romano e nella dottrina della Chiesa fino al secolo V* (Turin 1956); J. Gaudemet, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain* (Paris 1958), 514–569; id., "Les transformations de la vie familiale au Bas-Empire et l'influence du cristianisme," *Romanitas* 4 (1962), 58–85; V. J. Pospishil, *Divorce and Remarriage* (New York 1967); H. Crouzel, *L'église primitive face au divorce* (Paris 1971).

THE SOCIAL SPHERE

A) CHURCH AND SLAVERY: H. Leclercq, "Esclaves," *DACL* V, 387–398; A. G. Kies, *Gedanken des hl. Augustinus über die Sklaverei* (Vienna 1942); B. Biondi, *Diritto romano*

cristiano II (Rome 1952), 373–447; W. L. Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia 1955); F. Michelini, *Schiavitù, religioni antiche e cristianesimo primitivo* (Bari 1963); M. I. Finley (ed.), *Slavery in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1968; bibliog.); W. W. Buckland, *Roman Laws of Slavery* (London 1970); H. Bellen, *Studien zur Sklavenflucht im römischen Kaiserreich* (Wiesbaden 1971); J. Vogt, *Sklaverei und Humanität. Studien zur antiken Slaverei und iher Erforschung* (Wiesbaden, 2nd ed. 1972); J. Vogt–N. Brockmeyer, *Bibliogr. zur antiken Sklaverei* (Bochum 1971); J. Schmidt, *Vie et mort des esclaves dans la Rome antique* (Paris 1973).

B) WEALTH AND POVERTY: R. Pöhlmann, *Gesch. der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt,* 2 vols, (Munich, 3rd ed. 1925); H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* (Utrecht 1939); H. P. Kohns, *Versorgungskrisen und Hungerrevolten im spätantiken Rom* (Bonn 1961); A. R. Hands, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (London 1968; to A. D. 250). —The articles "Almosen," "Armenpflege," "Armut," "Barmherzigkeit" in *RAC* I; "Gastfreundschaft," ibid., VIII, 1110–1123; "Charité," *DACL* III, 598–653; "Hôpitaux," "Hospices," "Hotelleries," ibid., VI, 2748–2770, "Liberalité des fidèles," ibid., IX, 489–497; "Hospitalité," *DSAM* VII, 815–819; G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit* (Darmstadt, reprint ed. 1959), 130–236; O. Schilling, *Reichtum und Eigentum in der altchristlichen Lit.* (Freiburg 1908); W. Liese, *Gesch. der Caritas* (Freiburg 1922); M. Pellegrino, *Salviano di Massiglia* (Rome 1942); S. Giet, *Les idées et l'action sociales de s. Basil* (Paris 1941); A. T. Geoghegan, *The Attitude towards Labor in Early Christian and Ancient Culture* (Washington 1945); J. Huhn, *Ambrosius von Mailand, ein sozialer Bischof* (Fulda 1946); M. Pellegrino, *S. Giovanni Crisostomo. Richezza e poverta* (Rome 1947); K. Farner, *Christentum und Eigentum bis auf Thomas von Aquin* (Bern 1947); E. F. Bruck, *Kirchenväter und soziales Erbrecht* (Berlin–Heidelberg 1956); A. Hamman, *Riches et pauvres dans l'église ancienne* (Paris 1962, Texts); P. Christophe, *L'usage chrétien du droit de propriéte dans l'Écriture et la tradition patristique* (Paris 1964); W. Schneemelcher, "Der diakonische Dienst in der alten Kirche," *Das diakonische Amt der Kirche,* ed. H. Krimm (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1965), 61–105; A. Hamman, *Vie liturgique et vie sociale . . . dans l'antiquité chrétienne* (Paris 1968).

THE CULTURAL SPHERE: P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1948); H.-I. Marrou, *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1949); R. Eiswirth, *Hieronymus' Stellung zu Lit. und Kunst* (Wiesbaden 1955); C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (New York, 2nd ed. 1957); O. Gigon, *Die antike Kultur und das Christentum* (Gütersloh 1966); A. Wifstrand, *Die alte Kirche und die griechische Bildung* (Bern 1967); *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse* (Leyden 1971; lectures); H. Jürgen, *Pompa diaboli. Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater* (Stuttgart 1972); W. Weismann, *Kirche und Schauspiele. Die Schauspiele im Urteil der lateinischen Kirchenväter unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Augustin* (Würtzburg 1972).

Part Four
The Early Byzantine Church

22. *The Henoticon and the Acacian Schism*

SOURCES

Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum, ed. E. Schwartz, II, 5 Collectio Sangermanensis 1936; E. Schwartz, "Publizistische Sammlungen zum akakianischen Schisma," *AAM* n.s. 10 (1934); id., "Der Codex Vaticanus graecus 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos," *AAM* 32, 6 (1927); *Collectio Avellana =Epistulae Imperatorum, Pontificum, aliorum inde ab anno 367 usque ad annum 553 datae* (Avellana Collectio), ed. O. Günther (Vienna 1895–98).

LITERATURE

F. Hofmann, "Der Kampf der Päpste um Konzil und Dogma von Chalkedon von Leo dem Grossen bis Hormisdas (451–519)," *Chalkedon* II (1953), 13–94; R. Haacke, "Die kaiserliche Politik in den Auseinandersetzungen im Chalkedon (451–553)," ibid., 95–177; S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus* (Bonn 1962); I. E. Anastasiou, "Relation of Popes and Patriarchs of Constantinople in Frame of Imperial Policy from the Time of the Acacian Schism to the Death of Justinian," *I patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio* (Rome 1968), 55–69; P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The religious policy of Anastasius the First* (Thessalonica 1974).

23. *The Elaboration of the Church of the Byzantine Empire in the Age of the Emperor Justinian I*

SOURCES

Collectio Avellana (see p. 3); *Acta Conciliorum oecumenicorum,* ed. E. Schwartz, II (Berlin 1940); E. Schwartz, "Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians," *AAM* n.s. 18 (1939) (Milan, reprint ed. 1973); *Corpus Juris Civilis,* ed. stereot. II; *Codex Justinianus,* ed. P. Krüger (1906); *Novellae,* ed. Schöll-Kroll (1912); *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius,* ed. J. Bidez–L. Parmentier (London 1898); *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia,* ed. Haury-Wirth (Leipzig 1963–1964).

LITERATURE

A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First* (Cambridge, Mass. 1950); W. Schubart, *Justinian und Theodora* (Munich 1943); B. Rubin, *Das Zeitalter Justinians* (Berlin 1960); R. Browning, *Justinian and Theodora* (London 1971); A. Knecht, *Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Justinians I.* (Würzburg 1896); E. Schwartz, "Vigilius Briefe—Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians," *SAM* 1940, 4(1940); id., *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939); H. S. Alivisatos, *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I.* (Berlin 1913); J. Meyendorff, "Justinian, the Empire and the Church," *DOP* 22 (1968), 43–60; E. Hardy, "The Egyptian Policy of Justinian," *DOP* 22 (1968), 21–41.

24. *Justinian's Zigzag Course: The Origenist Troubles*

25. *The Controversy over the Three Chapters and the Fifth General Council. End of the Age of Justinian*

SOURCES

Mansi IX, 171–657; *ACO* IV, *Concilium universale Constantinopolitanum,* ed. J. Straub (Berlin 1971); E. Schwartz, "Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians," *AAM* n.s. 18 (Munich 1939).

LITERATURE

E. Amann, "Trois Chapitres," *DThC* XV, 1868–1924; *Hefele-Leclercq* III 1, 1–132; R. Devreesse, "Le cinquième concile et l'oecuménicité byzantine," *MiscMercati* III (Rome 1946), 1–15; Ch. Moeller, "Le cinquième concile oecuménique et le magistère ordinaire," *RSPhTh* 35 (1951), 413–423; E. Chrysos, *Die Bischofslisten des V. ökumenischen Konzils (553)* (Bonn 1966); E. Schwartz, "Vigiliusbriefe. Zur Kirchenpolitik Justinians," *SAM* 1940, 2 (Munich 1940); F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jh. und das fünfte allgemeine Concil* (Münster 1899); E. K. Chrysos, ʽΗ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ πολιτικὴ τοῦ ʼΙουστινιανοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἔριν περὶ τὰ τρία κεφάλαια καὶ τὴν ε΄ οἰκουμενικὴν σύνοδον (Thessalonica 1969); id., "Τμήματα τῶν Πρακτικῶν τῆς ε΄ οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου παρὰ βυζαντινοῖς χρονογράφοις," *Κληρονομία 2* (1970), 376–401; J. Straub, "Die Verurteilung der drei Kapitel durch Vigilius," Κληρονομία 2 (1970), 347–375; W. de Vries, "Das zweite Konzil von Konstantinopel (553) und das Lehramt von Papst und Kirche" in *OrChrP* 38 (1972), 331–366.

26. *Justinian's Successors: Monoenergism and Monothelitism*

SOURCES

"Akten der römischen Synode von 649 and Akten des ökum. Konzils von 680–81": Mansi XI, 190–922 (preparation of the new critical edition of both synods by the Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften); *Theophanes Confessor,* ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig 1883–85); *Nicephorus Patriarche,* ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig 1880).

LITERATURE

P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam sous les successeurs de Justinien I^{er}* (Paris 1951); id., "Les successeurs de Justinien et le monophysisme," *Chalkedon* II, 179–192; M. Jugie,

"Monothélisme," *DThC* X 2, 2307–23; V. Grumel, "Recherches sur l'histoire du monothélisme," *ÉO* 27 (1928), 6–16, 257–277; 28 (1929) 19–34, 158–166, 272–282; 29 (1930), 16–28; P. Verghese, "The Monothelite Controversy—a Historical Survey," *Greek Orth. Theol. Review* 13 (1968), 196–211.

27. *The Rise of National Churches on the Frontiers of the Byzantine Empire*

LITERATURE

L. Duchesne, *Les églises separées* (Paris 1896); K. Lübeck, *Die christliche Kirche des Orients* (Kempten 1911); A. Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches* (London 1913); J. B. Kidd, *The Church of Eastern Christendom from 451 to the Present Time* (London 1927); F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (Munich 1937); D. Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East* II (Milwaukee 1946); W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1951); R. Janin, *Les églises orientales et les rites orientaux* (Paris, 5th ed. 1956); W. de Vries, *Die orientalischen Kirchen* (Würzburg 1960); B. Spuler, "Die morgenländischen Kirchen," *Hdb. der Orientalistik* I/8, 2 (Leiden 1961) 120–324; *I patriarcati orientali nel primo millennio, Orientalia christiana analecta* 181 (Rome 1968).

THE CHURCH OF THE NESTORIANS: G. P. Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals,* 2 vols. (London 1852); J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire Perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224–632)* (Paris 1904); W. A. Wigram, *An Introduction to the History of the Assyrian Church* (London 1910); E. Amann–E. Tisserant, "L'église nestorienne," *DThC* XI 1, 157–223; A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (Copenhagen 1936); A. K. Arbanites, Ἱστορία τῆς ἀσσυριακῆς νεστοριανικῆς ἐκκλησίας (Athens 1968).

THE COPTIC CHURCH: J. Leipoldt, *Schenute von Atripe und die Entstehung des nationalägyptischen Christentums* (Leipzig 1903); J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises jacobites (518–616)* (Paris 1923); A. Vlieger, *The Origin and Early History of the Coptic Church* (Lausanne 1900); M. Jugie, "Monophysisme (église copte)," *DThC* X, 2251–2306; Chr. Papadopulos, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας (Alexandria 1934); A Böhlig, *Ägypten und Byzanz bis zur arabischen Zeit* (Munich 1953); C. D. G. Müller, "Die koptische Kirche zwischen Chalkedon und dem Arabereinmarsch," *ZKG* 75 (1964), 271–308; E. L. Butcher, *The Story of the Church of Egypt* (London 1897); D. Müller, "Aufbau und Entwicklung der koptischen Kirche nach Chalkedon," *Kyrios* 10 (1970), 202–210.

THE JACOBITE CHURCH: W. A. Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites* (London 1923); M. Jugie, "Église syrienne monophysite," *DThC* X 2216–2251; E. Honigmann, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI^e^ siècle* (Louvain 1951); A. van Roey, "Les débuts de l'église jacobite," *Chalkedon* II, 339–360; W. Hage, *Die syrisch-Jakobitische Kirche in frühislamischer Zeit nach orientalischen Quellen* (Wiesbaden 1966); A. Vööbus, "The Origin of the Monophysite Church in Syria," *CH* 42 (1973), 17–26; W. H. C. Frend, "Severus of Antioch and the Origins of the Monophysite Hierarchy," *The Heritage of the Early Church. Essays in Honor of G. V. Florovsky* (Rome 1973), 261–275.

THE CHURCH OF THE ARMENIANS: F. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie* (Paris 1900); id., "Arménie," *DHGE* IV (1925), 290–391; R. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071* (Paris 1947); A. Ter-Mikelian, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur byzantinischen vom IV. bis zum XIII. Jh.* (Leipzig 1892); E.

Ter-Minassiantz, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den syrischen Kirchen bis zum Ende des 13. Jh.* (Leipzig 1904); M. Ormanian–T. Poladian, *The Church of Armenia* (London 1955).

28. *Early Byzantine Monasticism*

LITERATURE

St. Schiwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum,* 3 vols. (Mainz and Mödling 1904–38); J. Bremond, *Les pères du désert* (Paris 1927); K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt* (Leipzig 1898); P. van Cauwenbergh, *Études sur les moines d'Égypte depuis le concile de Chalcédoine jusqu'à l'invasion arabe* (Paris 1914); R. Draguet, *Les pères du désert* (Paris 1949); A.-J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient* (Paris 1961ff.); H. Bacht, "DieRolle des Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon," *Chalkedon* II, 193–304; D. J. Chitty, *The Desert a City* (Oxford 1966); R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères de Constantinople* (Paris 1953).

29. *Theological and Religious Literature*

LITERATURE

M. Richard, "Le néo-chalcédonisme," *MSR* 3 (1946), 156–161; Ch. Moeller, "Le chalcédonisme et le néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VI^{e} siècle," *Chalkedon* I, 637–720; W. Elert, *Der Ausgang der altchristlichen Christologie* (Berlin 1957); S. Helmer, *Der Neuchalkedonismus* (Bonn 1962); M. Jugie, "Monothélisme," *DThC* X 2, 2307–2323; M. Viller–K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* (Freiburg 1939); R. Devreese, "Chaînes exégétiques" in *DBS* I, 1084–1233.

30. *Organization and Life of the Eastern Imperial Church*

LITERATURE

F. Dvornik, *Byzance et la primauté Romaine* (Paris 1964; English trans. 1966); A. Michel, "Der Kampf um das politische oder petrinische Prinzip der Kirchenführung," *Chalkedon* II, 491–562; E. Herman, "Chalkedon und die Augestaltung des konstantinopolitanischen Primats," ibid., II, 459–490; Feine, *RG;* L. Wenger, *Die quellen des römischen Rechts* (Vienna 1953); J.-M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae ritibus orientalibus* II–III (Rome 1930–32); S. Salaville, *Liturgies orientales* (Paris 1942); N. Liesel, *Die Liturgien der Ostkirche* (Freiburg 1960); H. J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie* (Freiburg 1964). —On Iconology: *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst* I, 616–662 (K. Wessel); D. Talbot Rice, *Art of the Byzantine Era* (London 1963); O. Demus, "Die Rolle der byzantinischen Kunst in Europa," in *JÖByzG* 14 (1965), 139–155.

31. *Missionary Activity of the Early Byzantine Imperial Church*

32. *The Assault of Islam*

Part Five
The Latin Church in the Transition to the Early Middle Ages

SECTION ONE
The Missionary Work of the Latin Church

33. *The Origins of Christianity in Ireland and Scotland*

SOURCES

Libri s. Patricii, ed. N. J. D. White (minor edition, London 1918); *Libri epistolarum s. Patricii episcopi,* ed. L. Bieler; L. Bieler, *The Works of St. Patrick* (London 1953; English translation with commentary); *Liber Ardmachanus* in *The Book of Armagh,* ed. J. Gwynn (Dublin 1913); *The Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* in *Rer. Brit. medii aevi scriptores* 89, 2 vols., ed. Whitley Stokes (London 1887); *Vitae sanctorum Hiberniae,* ed. C. Plummer (Oxford 1910); *Adamnani Vita Columbae,* ed. I. T. Towler (Oxford 1920); *Adamnan's Life of Columba,* ed. A. O. and M. O. Anderson (London 1961); G. S. M. Walker, *S. Columbani opera* (Dublin 1957); *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland,* ed. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs I (Oxford 1869). —Other sources (annals, *vitae,* inscriptions, etc.): J. F. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland* I (New York 1929), as well as the bibliog. in R. P. C. Hanson, *Saint Patrick* (Oxford 1968). —K. Hughes, "Early Christian Ireland, Introduction to the Sources," in *The Sources of History. Studies in the Uses of Historical Evidence,* ed. G. R. Elton, 1972.

LITERATURE

PROFANE HISTORY: E. Curtis, *A History of Ireland* (London 6th ed. 1952). To be corrected by: T. F. O'Rahilly, *Early Irish History and Mythology* (Dublin 1946); D. A. Binchy, "The Fair of Tailtiu and the Feast of Tara," *Eriu* 18 (1958), 113–138; J. V. Kelleher, "Early Irish History and Pseudo-History," *Studia Hibernica* 3 (1963), 113–127; N. Chadwick, *Celtic Britain* (London 1963); H. M. Chadwick, *Early Scotland* (Cambridge 1949). —Other literature in R. P. C. Hanson, op. cit.

HISTORY OF THE MISSION AND THE CHURCH: L. Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London 1932); W. A. Phillips, *History of the Church of Ireland* I (Oxford 1933);

K. Hughes, *The Church in Early Irish Society* (London 1966); W. Delius, *Gesch. der irischen Kirch von ihren Anfängen bis zum 12. Jh.* (Munich–Basel 1954); H. Williams, *Christianity in Early Britain* (Oxford 1912); J. Bulloch, *The Life of the Celtic Church* (Edinburgh 1963); N. Chadwick, *Studies in the Early British Church* (Cambridge 1958); id., *The Age of Saints in the Early Celtic Church* (Oxford 1961); J. Mac Queen, *St. Nynia* (Edinburgh 1961); W. D. Simpson, *St. Ninian and the Origin of the Christian Church in Scotland* (Edinburgh 1940); L. Bieler, *The Life and Legend of St. Patrick* (Dublin 1949); id., "La conversione al cristianesimo dei Celti insulari e le sue ripercussioni nel continente," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo . . .* (Spoleto 1967), 559–580; J. Carney, *The Problem of St. Patrick* (Dublin 1961); R. P. C. Hanson, *St. Patrick a British Missionary Bishop* (Nottingham 1965); id., *St. Patrick* (Oxford 1968); J. Ryan, "The Early Irish Church and the See of St. Peter," *Settimane di studio . . .* VII. *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale . . .* II (Spoleto 1960), 549–574; id., *Irish Monasticism* (Dublin 1931); J. A. Duke, *The Columban Church* (Edinburgh 1932); M. M. Dubois, *St. Colomban* (Paris 1950); *Mélanges colombaniens* (Paris 1950); G. Schreiber, *Irland im deutschen und abendländischen Sakralraum* (Cologne–Opladen 1956).

HISTORY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE: Chr. Mohrmann, *The Latin of St. Patrick* (Dublin 1961); K. Meyer, *Learning in Ireland in the Fifth Century* (Dublin 1913); A. Lorcin, "La vie scolaire dans les monastères d'Irlande aux 5e–7e siècles," *Le Moyen Age Latin* 1 (1945), 221–236; B. Bischoff, "Il monachesimo irlandese nei suoi rapporti col continente," *Settimane di studio . . .* IV. *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale* (Spoleto 1957), 121–138.

34. *The Conversion of the Franks and Burgundians. Origin and Organization of the Merovingian National Church*

SOURCES

MG Scriptores. Auctores antiquissimi IV (Venantius Fortunatus) and VI, 2 (Avitus of Vienne); *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* I–VII (chronicles and *vitae* of the Merovingian period, including Gregory of Tours). —*MG Leges. Leges nationum germanicarum* (Lex Salica, Ribuaria, Alamannorum, Baiuvariorum); *Capitularia regum Francorum* I; *Concilia* I (Synods of the Merovingian Kingdom). Other editions of tribal laws: K. A. Eckhardt, *Germanenrechte* resp. *Germanenrechte* n.s. —*MG Diplomata imperii* I, ed. Pertz (Merovingian royal charters and charters of the Carolingian mayors). New partial edition: Lauer-Samaran, *Diplômes originaux des Mérovingiens* (Paris 1908); older edition, including private charters: Bréquigny-Pardessus, *Diplomata, chartae, leges . . . ad res franco-gallicas spectantia* I and II (Paris 1843–49; reprint ed. Aalen 1969). —*MG Epistolae* I and II (Register of Gregory the Great), III (collections of letters and letters of the Merovingian period, including Columban's). —Introduction to the sources: A. Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France* I (Paris 1901); Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Vorzeit und Karolinger* I (Weimar 1952) and supplement: R. Buchner, *Die Rechtsquellen* (Weimar 1953).

HISTORIES OF THE FRANKS: E. Zöllner, *Gesch. der Franken bis zur Mitte des 6. Jh.* (Munich 1970); F. Lot, *Naissance de la France* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1970); F. Steinbach, *Das Frankenreich: Hdb. der dt. Gesch.* I^2, ed. O. Brandt–A. O. Meyer–L. Just, 9. Lf. (n.d.); H. Loewe, *Deutschland im fränkischen Reich:* B. Gebhardt, *Hdb. d. dt. Gesch.* I^8, ed. H. Grundmann (1954); G. Tessier, *Le baptême de Clovis* (Paris 1964), excellent presentation, in which, despite the title, all of Merovingian history is treated; A. Lippold, "Chlodovechus," *RE* Suppl. (1974), 139–174.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FRANKISH KINGDOM: E. Ewig, "Die fränkischen Teilungen und Teilreiche 511–613," *AAMz 1952* no. 9; id., "Die fränkischen Teilreiche im 7. Jh.," in *Trierer Zschr.* 22 (1954), 85–144; id., *Descriptio Franciae: Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* I, ed. W. Braunfels—W. Beumann (Düsseldorf 1965), 143–177.

TRIBAL LAW: F. Beyerle, "Die Lex Ribuaria," *ZSavRGgerm.* 48 (1928) 348ff.; id., "Das Gesetzbuch Ribuariens," ibid., 55 (1935) 10ff.; id. in the introduction to the edition of the *MG Leges* I/3, 2; K. A. Eckhardt, *Lex Ribuaria* I (Göttingen 1959); F. Beyerle, "Die süddeutschen Leges und die merowingische Gesetzgebung," *ZSavRGgerm.* 49 (1929), 264–432; id., "Die beiden süddeutschen Stammescrechte," ibid., 73 (1956), 24–140; K. A. Eckhardt, "Leges Alamannorum," *Germanenrechte* m.s. (Göttingen 1958).

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND MISSION OF THE FRANKISH KINGDOM AND ITS PARTS: A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* I (Berlin 8th ed., reprint ed. 1954); K. D. Schmidt, *Die Bekehrung der Germanen zum Christentum,* II: *Die katholische Mission bei den Westgermanen* (Göttingen n.d. [1942]), 1–105 (Franks), 174–192 (Alemanni); Hoops, *Reallexikon der germ. Altertumskunde* II^2 (1974), "Bekehrung und Bekehrungsgeschichte," 177 (O. Gschwantler, Burgundians), and 180–188 (K. Schäferdiek, Germany and neighboring lands); E. Ewig, "Die christliche Mission bei den Franken und im Merowingerreich," *MiscHist Eccl* 3 (1970), 24–52; G. Tessier, "La conversione de Clovis et la christianisation des Francs," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto 1967), 149–189; E. Mâle, *La fin du paganisme en Gaule et les plus anciennes basiliques chrétiennes* (Paris 1950); H. Büttner, "Die Franken und die Ausbreitung des Christentums bis zu den Tagen des Bonifatius," *Hess. Jb. für Landesgesch.* 1 (1951), 8–24; id., "Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreiches bis zum Tode Karls des Grossen," *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* I, ed. W. Braunfels–H. Beumann (Düsseldorf 1965), 454–487; E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'église en Belgique* I (Brussels 2nd ed. 1945); R. Bauerreiss, *Kirchengeschichte Bayerns* I (St. Ottilien, 2nd ed. 1958); K. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte Schwabens* I (Stuttgart 1950); P. Paulsen, "Die Anfänge des Christentums bei den Alemannen," *Zschr. für württ. Landesgesch.* 15 (1956), 1–24; H. Büttner–I. Müller, *Frühes Christentum im schweizerischen Alpenraum* (Einsiedeln 1957); W. Neuss–F. W. Oediger, *Gesch. des Erzbistums Köln* I (Cologne 1964); H. Patze–W. Schlesinger, *Geschichte Thüringens* I (Cologne–Graz 1968); pertinent remarks, especially on the literature, in F. Delbono, "La letteratura catechetica di lingua tedesca," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo . . .* (Spoleto 1967), 697ff.

NOTION OF UNIVERSAL MISSION: W. H. Fritze, "Universalis gentium confessio," *Frühma. Studien* 3 (1969), 78–130.

MISSION AND MONASTICISM: F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich–Vienna 1965).

CANON LAW AND CONSTITUTION: K. Voigt, *Staat und Kirche von Constantin d. Gr. bis zur Karolingerzeit* (Stuttgart 1936); Carlo de Clercq, *La législation religieuse franque de Clovis à Charlemagne,* Univ. de. Louvain. Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2^e série, 38^e fasc. (Louvain–Paris 1936); H. Barion, "Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters," *KStuT* 5/6 (Bonn–Cologne 1931; reprint ed. Amsterdam 1963); E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique,* 6 vols. in 8 parts (Lille 1910–43).

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM: H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1949); R. Riché, "L'instruction des laïcs en Gaul mérovingienne au 7^e siècle," *Settimane di studio . . . V. Caratteri del seculo VII in Occidente* II (Spoleto 1958), 873–888; id., *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare aux 6^e–8^e siècles* (Paris 1962).

35. *The East Germans and Catholicism: The Conversion of the Sueves and Visigoths of Spain to Catholicism and the Second Flowering of Christian Antiquity in the Spanish Visigothic National Church*

The most important pertinent literature on the Kingdoms of the Vandals and the Ostrogoths is listed in notes 1 and 3. Only the sources and literature for the history of the Visigoths and Sueves in Spain are included in the survey.

SOURCES

Introductory presentation and lists of sources: B. Sánchez Alonso, *Fuentes de la historia española e hispano-americana,* 2 vols. (Madrid, 3rd ed. 1952); id., *Historia de la historiografía española* I (Madrid, 2nd ed. 1947); R. Grosse, *Las fuentes de la época visigoda y byzantina*: Fontes Hispaniae antiquae IX (Barcelona 1927); M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Index scriptorum latinorum medii aevi hispanorum* (Salamanca 1958–59).—Comprehensive publication of sources for Spanish history: H. Flórez, *España sagrada,* 52 vols. (Madrid 1747–1918); *MGAuct.ant.* XI (Spanish chronicles of the 5th to 7th centuries, including those of Hydatius, John of Biclar, Isidore), VI (poems of Martin of Dumio), XIV (poems and letters of Eugene II of Toledo); *MGSS rer. Mer.* V (Historia Wambae regis des Julian von Toledo); *MGLL* I (Lex Visigothorum); *MGEp* III (Epistolae Visigothicae); *Mansi* VII–XII and *PL*, 84 (Spanish councils); J. N. Garvin, *The Vitae ss. patrum Emeritensium. Text and translation with an introduction and commentary.* The Catholic Univ. of America. Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature 19 (Washington 1946); also: *Acta Sanctorum.* November 1. The works of the Spanish Church Fathers are in *PL* 37 (Valerius of Bierzo), 80 (Braulio von of Zaragoza, Taio of Zaragoza), 81–84 (Isidore of Seville, according to the edition of Arévalo), 87 (Fructuosus of Braga), 96 (Ildefonse and Julian of Toledo). More recent editions to be cited are; J. Madoz, *Epistolario de S. Braulio de Zaragoza, edición crítica. Biblioteca de antiguos escritores cristianos españoles* I (Madrid 1941); Claude W. Barlow, *Martini ep. Bracarensis opera omnia,* Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 12 (New Haven 1950); Isidore, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX,* ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford 1911). Inscriptions: J. Vives, *Inscripciones cristianas de la Espáña romana y visigoda* (Barcelona 1941); id., "Características hispanas de las inscripciones visigodas," *Arbor* 1 (1944), 185–199.

LITERATURE

HANDBOOKS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF THE VISIGOTHIC KINGDOM: R. Menéndez Pidal, *Historia de España* III. *España visigoda* (Madrid 1940); S. A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford 1969); R. d'Abadal y de Vinyals, "A propos du leges visigothique en Espagne," *Settimane di studio . . . V. Caratteri del secolo VII in Occidente* II (Spoleto 1958), 541–585; id., *Del reino de Tolosa al reino de Toledo* (Madrid 1960); P. Goubert, "Byzance et l'Espagne visigothique," *Études byzantines* 2 (1944), 5–78; id., "Influences byzantines sur l'Espagne visigothique," *RÉB* 4 (1946), 111–133; H. Messmer, *Hispania-Idee und Gotenmythos* (Zurich 1960); C. Sánchez Albornoz, "Otra

vez Guadalete y Cavadonga," *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 1/2 (1944), 11–114; id., "Donde y cuando murió Don Rodrigo, último rey de los Godos," ibid., 3 (1945), 5–105; K. F. Stroheker, *Eurich König der Westgoten* (Stuttgart 1937); id., *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zurich–Stuttgart 1965). This volume contains the following basic essays by Stroheker: "Die geschichtliche Stellung der ostgermanischen Staaten am Mittelmeer," "Leowigild," "Spanische Senatoren der spätrömischen und westgotischen Zeit." "Das spanische Westgotenreich und Byzanz;" D. Claude, *Geschichte der Westgoten* (1970); id., "Adel, Kirche und Königtum im Westgotenreich," in *Vorträge und Forschungen,* Sonderband 8 (1971); id., "Gentile und territoriale Staatsideen im Westgotenreich," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 6 (1972), 1–38.

LAW AND INSTITUTIONS: K. Zeumer, "Gesch. der westgotischen Gesetzgebung," *NA* 23 (1898), 39–112 and 571–630; 26 (1901) 91–149; Th. Melicher, *Der Kampf zwischen Gesetzes-und Gewohnheitsrecht im Westgotenreich* (Weimar 1930); F. S. Lear, "The Public Law in the Visigothic Code," *Speculum* 26 (1951), 1–23; C. Sánchez Albornoz, "Pervivencia y crisis de la tradición juríidica romana en la España goda," *Settimane di studio* . . . IX. *Il passaggio dall'Antichita àl Medio Evo in Occidente* (Spoleto 1962), 128–199 (with bibliog; including the works of García Gallo and Alvaro d'Ors); id., "El gobierno de las ciudades en Espana del siglo V al X," *Settimane di studio* . . . VI. La *città nell'alto medio evo* (Spoleto 1959), 359–391; J. M. Lacarra, "Panorama de la historia urbana en la peninsula ibérica desde el siglo V al X," ibid., 319–358; J. Orlandis, "El poder real y la sucesión al trono en la monarquía visigoda," *Estudios visigóticos* 3 (Rome–Madrid 1962); C. Sánchez Albornoz, "El aula regia y las asambleas políticas de los Godos," *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 5 (1946) 5–110; id., "El senatus visigodo," ibid., 6 (1946), 5–97; P. D. King, *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom* (Cambridge 1972).

ARCHEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF ART: H. Zeiss, *Die Grabfunde aus dem spanischen Westgotenreich* (1934); W. Reinhart, "La tradición visigoda en la nacimiento de Castilla," *Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal* I. (Madrid 1950), 535–554 (collection of older studies by the same author); J. Werner, "Die archäologischen Zeugnisse der Goten in Südrussland, Ungarn, Italien und Spanien," *Settimane di studio* . . . III. *I Goti in Occidente* (Spoleto 1956), 127–130; P. Palol de Salellas, "Esencia del arte hispánico visigodo; romanismo y germanismo," ibid., 65–126.

CHURCH HISTORY: P. B. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien,* 3 vols. (Regensburg 1862–79, reprint ed. Graz 1956); Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1929–36); P. David, *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal du 6^e^ au 12^e^ siècle* (Lisbon–Paris 1947); K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen bis zur Errichtung der westgotischen katholischen Staatskirche* (Berlin 1967); J. Vives, *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos* (Barcelona–Madrid 1963); J. Orlandis, "El cristianismo en la España visigoda," *Estudios visigóticos* 1 (Rome–Madrid 1956), 1–14; id., "La Iglesia visigoda y los problemas de la sucesión al trono," *Settimane di studio* . . . VII. *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma* I (Spoleto 1960), 333–351; J. Lacarra, *La iglesia visigoda en el siglo VII y sus relaciones con Roma;* ibid., 353–384; H. v. Schubert, *Staat und Kirche in den arianischen Königreichen und im Reiche Chlodwigs* (Munich–Berlin 1912); A. K. Ziegler, *Church and State in Visigothic Spain* (Washington 1930); H. H. Anton, "Der König und die Reichskonzilien im westgotischen Spanien," *HJ* 92 (1972), 257–281.

CONVERSION OF THE GOTHS AND PAGAN SURVIVALS: E. A. Thompson, "The Conversion of the Visigoths to Catholicism," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 4 (1960), 4–35; J. N. Hillgarth, "La conversión de los visigodos, notas críticas," *Analecta sacra Tarraconensia*

34 (1961), 21–46; J. Fontaine, "Conversion et culture chez les Visigoths d'Espagne," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto Medio Evo* (Spoleto 1967), 87–147; S. MacKenna, *Paganism and Pagan Survivals in Spain up to the Fall of the Visigothic Kingdom* (Washington 1938).

CARE OF SOULS: E. Göller, "Das spanisch-westgotische Busswesen vom 6. bis 8. Jh.," *RQ* 37 (1929), 245–313; J. Fernández Alonso, *La cura pastoral en la España visigoda* (Rom 1955).

CHURCH PROPERTY: G. Martínez Díez, *El patrimonio eclesiástico en la España visigoda* (Comillas 1959).

LITURGY: (Editions and literature): H. Gilson, *The Mozarabic Psalter* (H. Bradshaw Society 30, London 1905) (hymnarium); Dom Férotin, "Liber ordinum," *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica* 5 (Paris 1904) (rituals); "Liber Commicus, ed. por los padres de Silos," *Analecta Maredsolana* I (1893) (epistles and gospels); *Antiphonarium Mozarabicum, ed. por los padres de Silos* (León 1928); Dom Férotin, "Liber sacramentorum," *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica* 6 (1912) (sacramentary); G. Prado, *Manual de liturgia hispanovisigótica o mozárabe* (Madrid 1927); J. Pérez de Urbel, *Orígen de los himnos mozárabos* (Bordeaux 1926); C. Rojo y G. Prado, *El canto mozárabe* (Barcelona 1929).

CANON LAW: P. Fournier–G. Le Bras, *Histoire des collections canoniques en Occident* I (Paris 1931); G. Martínez Díez, *La colección canónica hispana* I (Madrid–Barcelona 1966).

MONASTICISM: I. Herwegen, *Das Pactum des hl. Fructuosus von Braga* (Stuttgart 1907); J. Pérez de Urbel, *Los monjes españoles en la edad media* (Madrid 1934); A. Mundò, "Il monachesimo nell peninsula ibérica fino al secolo VII," *Settimane di studio . . .* IV. *Il monachesimo nell'alto Medio Evo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale* (Spoleto 1957), 73–108.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM: E. Bagué, *Historia de la cultura española* (Barcelona 1953); M. Díaz y Díaz, "La cultura de la España visigotica del siglo VII," *Settimane di studio . . .* V. *Caratteri del secolo VII in Occidente* II (Spoleto 1958), 818–844; id., *Anecdota visigótica* (Salamanca 1959).

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE: J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne visigothique* (Paris 1959) (authoritative monograph with detailed bibliog. on Isidore and Spain in Isidore's time); Ch. H. Beeson, *Isidor-Studien. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lat. Philologie des Mittelalters* IV, 2 (Munich 1913); J. L. Romero, "San Isidoro de Sevilla. Su pensamiento histórico-político y sus relaciones con la historia visigoda," *Cuadernos de Historia de España* 8 (1947), 5–71; A. Borst, "Das Bild der Gesch. in der Enzyklopädie Isidors von Sevilla," *DA* 22 (1966), 1–62; J. Madoz, "El primado romano en España en el cielo isidoriano," *RET* 2 (1942), 229–255; id., "El concilio de Calcedonia en S. Isidoro de Sevilla," ibid., 12 (1952), 189–204; P. Séjourné, *Le dernier père de l'Église. St. Isidore de Séville, son rôle dans l'histoire du droit canonique* (Paris 1929); G. Le Bras, "Sur la part d'Isidore de Séville et des Espagnols dans l'histoire des collections canoniques," *RevSR* 10 (1930), 218–257; *Miscellanea Isidoriana* (Rome 1936); in it especially P. Séjourné, "St. Isidore et la liturgie visigothique," 221–251 and A. E. Anspach, "Das Fortleben Isidors im 7. bis 9. Jh.," 323–356; J. Fontaine, "La diffusion de l'œuvre d'Isidore de Séville dans les scriptoria helvétiques du haut moyen âge," *Schweizerische Zchr. für Gesch.* 12 (1962), 305–327; J. N. Hillgarth, "The East, Visigothic Spain, and the Irish," *Studia Patristica* 4 (Berlin 1961), 422–456; id., "Visigothic Spain and Early

Christian Ireland," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 62, sec. C, nr. 6 (Dublin 1962), 167–194.

OTHER MONOGRAPHS: F. Görres, "Leander Bischof von Sevilla und Metropolit der Kirchenprovinz Baetica," *ZWTh* 29 (1886), 36–50; id., "Mausona Bischof von Mérida und Metropolit der Kirchenprovinz Lusitanien," ibid., 28 (1885), 326–332; *Juan de Biclaro, obispo de Gerona, su vida y su obra. Introducción, texto crítico y comentarios por J. Campos* (Madrid 1960); J. Madoz, "Martín de Braga; el XIV° centenario de su llegada en la península ibérica," *EE* 25 (1951), 219–242; C. H. Lynch, *St. Braulio Bishop of Saragossa 631–651. His life and writings* (Washington 1938); Sister Athanasius Braegelmann, *The Life and Writings of St. Ildefons of Toldeo,* The Catholic Univ. of America Studies in Medieval History 4 (Washington 1942); F. X. Murphy, "Julian of Toledo and the Condemnation of Monothelitism in Spain," *Mélanges J. de Gellinck* (Gembloux 1951), 361–373.

36. *The Lombards and Italy*

SOURCES

Paulus Diaconus, *Historia Longobardorum; Vita s. Barbati: MGSS rer. Lang. et Italicarum* (1878). *MGSS rer. Mer.* II (Frankish sources with incidental but often important accounts for Lombard history); *Poetae Latini,* especially I (*Tituli saec. VIII*) and IV (*Rhythmi aevi merovingici et carolini*); C. Troya, *Storia d'Italia del medio evo IV* (*Codice diplomatico longobardo*))1852–59); L. Schiaparelli, *Codice diplomatico longobardo: Fonti per la storia d'Italia* 62–63, 2 vols. (Rome 1929–33); *Edictus Rothari,* ed. F. Beyerle (Weimar 1947) (including the capitularies of the Lombard Kings); Jaffé; P. J. Kehr, *Italia pontitificia,* 7 vols. (1906ff.); F. Schneider, *Die Epitaphien der Päpste* (Texte zur KG des MA 6, 1933); *Mansi* X–XII; *PL* 75–79 (works of Gregory the Great); *MGEp* I (Register of Gregory the Great).

LITERATURE

HISTORY OF THE LOMBARDS AND OF LOMBARD ITALY: L. Schmidt, *Die Ostgermanen* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1941); *Problemi della civiltà e dell'economia longobarda: Scritti in memoria di G. P. Bognetti* (Milan 1964); *Atti del I congresso internazionale di studi longobardi* (Spoleto 1952); C. G. Mor, *Lo Stato longobardo nel VII secolo:* G. Pocchettino, *I Longobardi nell'Italia meridionale* (Caserta 1930); G. P. Bognetti, *Chierici, A. de Capitani d'Arzago, Santa Maria di Castelseprio* (Milan 1948); id., *Milano longobardo: Storio di Milano* II (Milan 1954); O. Bertolini, *I Germani. Migrazioni e regni nell'Occidente già romano: Storia universale, dir. da E. Pontieri* III 1 (Milan 1965); G. Fasoli, *I Longobardi in Italia* (Bologna 1965).

LOMBARD MISSION, LOMBARD CHURCH HISTORY, ROME AND THE LOMBARDS: Cf. the works, cited above, by Bognetti, Bertolini and Fasoli. Also: G. P. Bognetti, "La rinascita cattolica dell'Occidente di fronte all'arianesimo e allo scisma," *Settimane di studio . . .* VII. *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'800* (Spoleto 1960), 15–41; id., "La continuità delle sedi episcopali e l'azione di Roma nel regno longobardo," ibid., 415–454; P. M. Conti, "Il 'monasterium,' sacello di fondazione privata e le missioni cattoliche nell Tuscia del secolo VIII," *Studi storici, Miscellanea in onore di M. Giuliana* (Parma 1965), 81–102; O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a*

Bisanzio ed ai Longobardi (1941); id., "I papi e le relazioni politiche di Roma con i ducati longobardi di Spoleto e di Benevento," *RSTI* 6 (1952), 1–46; id., "Riflessi politichi delle controversie religiose con Bisanzio nelle vicende del secolo VII in Italia," *Settimane di studio . . .* V. *Caratteri del secolo VII in Occidnete* II (Spoleto 1957), 733–790; id., "Le chiese longobarde dopo la conversione al cattolicesimo ed i loro rapporti con il papato," *Settimane de studio . . .* VII. *Le Chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale* I (Spoleto 1960), 455–492.—Id., "I papi e le missioni fino alla metà del secolo VIII," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al critianesimo nell'Europa dell'Alta Medio Evo* (Spoleto 1967), 327–363; P. M. Conti, "Aquileian, Eastern and Roman Missions in the Lombard Kingdom," *Misc.HistEccl* III (Louvain 1970), 62–70.

37. *The Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons and the Beginnings of the Anglo-Saxon Church*

SOURCES

MGAuct. ant. XIII 1 (Gildas and Nennius); *MGSS rer. Mer.* VI (life of Wilfrid of York); *MGEp* I and II (Registrum Gregorii). Jaffé I^2 (1885); Duchesne, *LP* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1907; reprint ed. 1955); Ch. Plummer, *Venerabilis Bedae opera historica,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1896; reprint ed. 1966); P. F. Jones, *A Concordance to the Historia eccl. of Bede* (Cambridge, Mass. 1929); *Bedae opera de temporibus,* ed. Ch. W. Jones (Cambridge, Mass. 1943); W. Jaager, *Vita metrica s. Cuthberti* (Leipzig 1935); B. Colgrave, *Two Lives of St. Cuthbert* (Cambridge 1940); F. A. Gasquet, *A Life of Pope Gregory the Great* (Westminster 1904); B. Thorpe, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* 2 vols., Rolls Series (1861); J. Earl–Ch. Plummer, *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, . . .* 2 vols. (Oxford 1892, 1899); A. W. Haddan–W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland* III (Oxford 1871); F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen,* 3 vols. (Halle 1903–16; reprint ed. Aalen 1960); F. L. Attenborough, *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings* (Cambridge 1922); J. M. Kemble, *Codex diplomaticus aevi saxonici,* 6 vols. (London 1839–48); W. de Gray Birch, *Cartularium saxonicum,* 3 vols. (London 1885–93; reprint ed. 1964).

FOR THE CHRONOLOGY: R. L. Poole, *Studies in Chronology and History* (Oxford 1934).

LITERATURE

F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1950), there, pp. 679–699, a general survey of the sources; R. H. Hodgkin, *History of the Anglo-Saxons,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1952); P. Clemoes, *The Anglo-Saxons. Studies presented to Bruce Dickins* (London 1960); W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford 1946); M. Deanesly, *The Pre-Conquest Church in England* (London 1961); id., *Side-Lights on the Anglo-Saxon Church* (London 1962); J. Godfrey, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge 1962); *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle-Ages,* ed. C. H. Lawrence (London 1965); cf. Th. Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas* (Freiburg 1954), with an excellent chapter on the origin and development of the Anglo-Saxon Church to the eighth century; K. Schäferdiek, "Bekehrung und Bekehrungsgeschichte III. England und Schottland," Hoops, *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde* II^2 (1974), 188–193.

ON BEDE: his sources and the related questions on the Roman beginnings of the mission: *Bede, his Life, Time and Writings,* ed. A. H. Thompson (Oxford 1935); S. Brechter, "Die Quellen zur Angelsachsenmission Gregors d. Gr.," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens* 21 (Münster 1941); id., "Das Apostolat des hl. Bonifatius und Gregors Missionsinstruktionen für England," *St. Bonifatius, Gedenkgabe zum 1200. Todestag* (Fulda 1954), 22–33; id., "Zur Bekehrungesgeschichte der Angelsachsen," *Settimane di studio . . .* XIV. *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medio evo* (Spoleto 1967), 191–215.—Opposite views: M. Deanesly–P. Grosjean, "The Canterbury Edition of the Answers of Pope Gregory I to St. Augustine," *JEH* 10 (1959), 1–49; P. Meyvaert, "Les Responsiones de St. Grégoire à St. Augustin de Canterbéry," *RHE* 54 (1959), 879–894; M. Deanesly, "The Capitulare Text of the Responsiones of Pope Gregory I to St. Augustine," *JEH* 12 (1961), 231–234.—Comprehensive: J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "Rome and the Early English Church. Some questions of transmission," *Settimane di studio . . .* VII. *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'800,* II (Spoleto 1960), 519–548.

SECTION TWO

Inner Life of the Church to the End of the Seventh Century

38. *North African Christianity from the Beginning of Vandal Rule to the Muslim Invasion*

SOURCES

Victor Vitensis, *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae,* rec. M. Petschenig: *CSEL* 7 (Vienna 1881); Quodvultdeus Carthag., *Sermones: C1P,* no. 401–412; *PL* Suppl. 3, 261–298; Fulgentius Ruspensis, *Opera,* ed. J. Fraipont: *CChr* 91–91A (Turnhout 1968); Ferrandus diac., *Epistulae: PL* 67, 887–950; *Breviatio canonum:* ibid., 949–962; *Vita s. Fulgentii,* ed. G. -G. Lapeyre (Paris 1929); Facundus Hermian., *Opera: PL* 67; Victor Tunnunensis, *Chronicon,* ed. Th. Mommsen: *MGAuctant* 11, 2 (Berlin 1894); Procopius, *Bellum Vandalicum,* ed. J. Haury (Leipzig 1905); ed. O. Veh (Munich 1971); *Concilia Africae.* A. 345–A. 525 cura et studio C. Munier: *CChr* 149 (Turnhout 1974).

LITERATURE

A. Audollent, "Afrique," *DACL* 1, 810–861; J. Mesnage, *Le christianisme en Afrique. Déclin et extinction* (Algiers 1915); J. Ferron–G. -G. Lapeyre, "Carthage chrétienne," *DHGE* 11 (1948), 1149–1159; A. Berthier ed al., *Les vestiges du christianisme antique dans la Numidie centrale* (Paris 1951).—L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Vandalen* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1942); Ch. Courtois, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique* (Paris 1955); P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques* (Paris, 4th ed. 1964); H. -J. Diesner, *Das Vandalenreich* (Stuttgart 1966).—G. -G Lapeyre, *Saint Fulgence de Ruspe* (Paris 1929); H. -J. Diesner, *Fulgentius von Ruspe als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker* (Stuttgart 1966).—Ch. Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine 533–709* (Paris 1896; reprint ed. New York 1964); Ch. -A. Julien, *Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord* I (Paris, 2nd ed. 1968).—M. Dall'Arche, *Scomparsa del cristianesimo ed espansione dell'Islam nell'Africa settentrionale* (Rome 1967).

39. *The Papacy between Byzantium and the German Kingdoms from Hilary (461–68) to Sergius I (687–701)*

SOURCES

Duchesne, *LP;* Jaffé, I–II; The papal letters in *PL* 59, 65–67, 69, 72, 80, 87, 89, 96. A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum* I (from Hilary to Hormisdas, Braunsberg 1867);

Collectio Avellana, ed. O. Guenther; *CSEL* 35 (Vienna 1895–98). Partial editions: 18 letters of Felix II and 8 of Gelasius I in E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma*=*AAM* 1934, 10; Gelasius, *Brief gegen die Lupercalien und 18 Messliturgien aus dem Sacramentarium Leonianum,* ed. G. Pomarès: *SChr* 65 (Paris 1959); 4 letters of Vigilius, ed. E. Schwartz: *SAM* 1940, 2; P. M. Gassó—C. M. Batlle, *Pelagii I epistulae quae supersunt* (Montserrat 1956).—The works of Gregory the Great: *PL* 75–79; *Registrum epistularum,* ed. P. Ewald–L. M. Hartmann: *MGEp.* 1–2 (1891/99); G. Corti, *Le lettere di Greg. M. L. I 1–50* (Milan 1972); *Dialogi,* ed. U. Moricca (Rome 1924); *Moralia in Job,* 11. 1–2, ed. R. Gillet–A. de Gaudemaris: *SChr* 32 (Paris 1950: New edition in preparation); 11, 11–14, ed. A. Bogognano: *SChr* 212 (Paris 1974); *Kommentar zum Hohenlied und Buch I der Könige,* ed. P. Verbraken: *CChr L* 144 (1963).

LITERATURE

See chap. 15, above; also: E. Caspar, Vol. II: *Das Papsttum unter byzantinischer Herrschaft* (Tübingen 1933); F. X. Seppelt, Vol. II: *Von Gregor d. Gr. bis zur Mitte des 11. Jh.* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1955); V. Monachino, *I papi nella storia* I (Rome 1961); W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 3rd ed. 1970); W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement* (Cambridge 1972).—W. Kissling, *Das Verhältnis zwischen Sacerdotium und Imperium von Leo I. bis Gelasius I.* (Paderborn 1921); L. Knabe, *Die gelasianische Zweigewaltentheorie bis zum Ende des Investiturstreites* (Berlin 1936); A. K. Ziegler, "Pope Gelasius I and His Teaching on the Relation of Church and State," *The Catholic Historical Review,* XXVII 4, 412–437. P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire (491–518)* (Madison 1939); W. Haacke, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im acacianischen Schisma* (Rome 1939), also "S. Martin," *RET* 1 (1941), 767–812; G. Westenburger, *Der Symmachusprozess von 501* (Diss. Tübingen 1940); O Bertolini, "Roma di fronte a Bisanzio e ai Langobardi," *Storia di Roma* IX (Bologna 1941); *Chalkedon* II, 13–192, 491–562; E. Pontieri, *Le invasioni barbariche e l'Italia del V e VI secolo* (Naples 1960); H. Rahner, *Kirche und Staat im frühen Christentum* (Munich 1961); G. Pepe, *Il medio evo barbarico d'Italia* (Turin 1963); F. Dvornik, *Das Papsttum und der römische Primat* (Stuttgart 1966); A. St. McGrade, "Two fifth-century Conceptions of Papal Primacy," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 7 (1970), 3–45; J. Gaudemet, "Aspects de la primauté romaine du V^{e} au XV^{e} siècle," *Jus Can.* 11 (1971), 92–134; P. Conti, *Chiesa e primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Milan 1971); L. Magi, *La Sede Romana nella corrispondenza degli imperatori e patriarchi bizantini, VI–VII sec.* (Louvain 1972).—F. X. Dudden, *Gregory the Great,* 2 vols. (London 1950); H. Grisar, *San Gregorio Magno* (Rome 2nd ed. 1928); P. Batiffol, *Saint Grégoire le Grand* (Paris 1928); R. Gillet, "Grég. le Grand," *DSp* 6 (1967), 872–910; L. Weber, *Hauptfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors d. Gr.* (Fribourg 1947, 259–268 the earlier literature); D. Hofmann, *Die geistige Auslegung der Schrift bei Gregor d. Gr.* (Münsterschwarzach 1968); O. Giordano, *L'invasione longobarda e Gregorio Magno* (Bari 1970).—Gregory the Great and Byzantium: E. H. Fischer: *ZSKA* 67 (1950), 15–144; P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam* II 2 (Paris 1965), 129–177.

40. *The Ecclesiastical Organization and the Clergy*

SOURCES

Gregory the Great, *Registrum Epistolarum: MGEp,* Tome 1 and 2 (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1957). *Epistolae Arelatenses genuinae: MGEp* III, 1–83 (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1957). H. T. Bruns, *Canones apostolorum et conciliorum saeculorum* IV, V, VI, VII, 2 vols. (Berlin 1839). Gallic councils: *CChr,* Series Latina, vols. 148 and 148a, ed. C. Munier–C. de Clercq (Turnhout 1963). *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos,* ed. J. Vives (Barcelona–Madrid 1963). *Gregorii episcopi Turonensis libri historiarum: MGSS rer. Mer.* I, 1 (Hannover 1951).

LITERATURE

E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* II (Tübingen 1933); G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste im 5. u. 6. Jh.=Theophaneia* 16 (Bonn 1964); H. G. J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France during the Sixth Century=AnGr* 51 (Rome 1950); J. Fernández Alonso, *La cura pastoral en la España romanovisigoda=Publicaciones del Inst. Esp. de. Est. Ecles.* A 2 (Rome 1955); W. Seston, "Note sur les origines religieuses des paroisses rurales," *RHPhR* 35 (1935), 241–254; E. Griffe, "Les paroisses rurales de la Gaule," *MD* 36 (1953), 33–62; id., *La Gaule chrétienne a l'époque romaine,* Vol. 3: *La cité chrétienne* (Paris 1965); M. J. Delage. Introduction to: *Césaire d'Arles, Sermons au peuple,* Tome 1 (*SChr* 175) (Paris 1971), 11–216; J. M. Lacarra, "La Iglesia visigoda en el siglo VII y sus relaciones con Roma," *Settimane di studi . . . VII* (Spoleto 1960), 353–384: J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "Rome and the Early English Church: some questions of transmission," ibid., 519–548; G. le Bras, "Sociologie de l'église dans le Haut Moyen-Age," ibid., 595–611; P. Riché, *Education et culture dans l'occident barbare. VI^e^–VIII^e^ siècles* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1973); R. Gryson, *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique du premier au septième siècle, Recherches et Synthèses, Histoire* II (Gembloux 1970); H. F. Muller, *L'époque mérovingienne. Essai de synthèse de philologie et d'histoire* (New York 1945); O. Giordano, *L'invasione longobarda e Gregorio Magno* (Bari 1970); J. B. Sägmüller, *Die Entwicklung des Archipresbyterats und Dekanats bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Tübingen 1898); P. Conte, *Chiesa e Primato nelle lettere dei Papi del secolo VII* (Milan 1971).

41. *Liturgy, Care of Souls, Piety*

SOURCES

Sacramentarium Veronense, ed. L. C. Mohlberg et al.=*Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta,* Series Maior, Fontes I (Rome 1956); *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli* (*Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), ed. L. C. Mohlberg et al. =*Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta,* Series Maior, Fontes IV (Rome 1960); J. Deshusses, "Le Sacramentaire Grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits," *Spicilegium Friburgense* 16 (Fribourg 1971); M. Andrieu, "Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen-Age," *SSL, Études et Documents,* Fasc. 11, 23, 24, 28 (Louvain 1931–56); J. Beckmann, *Quellen zur Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes* (Gütersloh 1956); *Concilia Galliae,* see chap. 40, supra; *Concilios Visigóticos,* see chap. 40, supra; *Gregor. M. Reg. Epp.,* see chap. 40, supra; id., "Homiliae in Hiezechihelem Prophetam," *CChr,* Series Latina 142, ed. M. Adriaen (Turnhout 1971); *Gregory of Tours,* see chap. 40, supra; "Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones," ed. G. Morin: *CChr,* Series Latina 103 and 104 (Turnhout 1953); *Martini Episcopi Bracarensis, Opera Omnia,* ed. C. W. Barlow (New Haven 1950).

LITERATURE

A. Stuiber, *Libelli Sacramentorum Romani = Theophaneia* VI (Bonn 1950); A. Chavasse, *Le Sacramentaire Gélasien* (Vaticanus Reginensis 316) "Sacramentaire Presbytéral en usage dans les titres romains au VII^{e} siècle," *Bibliothèque de Théologie,* Series IV. *Histoire de la Théologie,* vol. I (Desclée 1958); id., "Messes du Pape Vigile (537–555) dans le Sacramentaire Léonien," *ELit* 64 (1950), 161–213, 66 (1952) 145–219; C. Coebergh, "Le Sacramentaire Gélasien Ancien, une compilation de clercs romanisants du VII^{e} siècle," *ALW* VII, 1 (1961), 45–88; K. Gamber, "Das kampanische Messbuch als Vorläufer des Gelasianum. Ist der hl. Paulinus von Nola der Verfasser?," *SE* 12 (1961), 5–111; id., *Sakramentartypen. Versuch einer Gruppierung der Handschriften und Fragmente bis zur Jahrtausendwende.* Texte und Arbeiten, Heft 49–50 (Beuron 1958); S. J. P. van Dijk, "The Urban and Papal Rites in the Seventh and Eighth-Century Rome," *SE* 12 (1961), 411–487; id., "Gregory the Great, Founder of the urban schola cantorum," *ELit* 77 (1963), 335–356; M. Vos, "A la recherche de normes pour les textes liturgiques de la messe (V^{e}–VII^{e} siècles)," *RHE* 69 (1974) 5–37; C. Vogel, "Les èchanges liturgiques entre Rome et les pays francs jusqu'à l'époque de Charlemagne," *Settimane di studio . . .* VII (Spoleto 1960), 185–295; id., "Le pèlerinage pénitentiel," *Pellegrinaggi e culto dei santi in Europa fino alla Ia Crociata. Convegni del centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale* IV" (Todi 1963), 39–92; B. de Gaiffier, "Pellegrinaggi e culto dei santi," ibid., 9–35; A. Petrucci, "Aspetti del culto e del pellegrinaggio di S. Michele Arcangelo sul monte Gargano," ibid., 145–180; E. Delaruelle, "La spiritualité des pèlerinages a Saint-Martin de Tours du V^{e} au X^{e} siècle," ibid., 199–244; A. Prandi, "La tomba di S. Pietro nei pellegrinaggi dell'età medievale," ibid., 283–447; Beck, Fernández Alonso, Delage, and Muller, see supra, chap. 40; E. Griffe, "A travers les paroisses rurales de la Gaule au VI^{e} siècle," *BLE* 76 (1975), 3–26; B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio religiosa. Wallfahrten in der Antike und das Pilgerwesen in der alten Kirche = Forschungen zur Volkskunde Heft* 33–34–35 (Münster 1950); id., "Reliquienverehrung, ihre Entstehung und ihre Formen," *TThZ* 67 (1958), 321–334; E. Ewig, "Der Petrus- und Apostelkult im spätrömischen Gallien," *ZKG* 71 (1960), 215–251; L. J. van der Lof, "De san Agustín a san Gregorio de Tours. Sobre la intervención de los mártires," *Augustinus* XIX (1974), 35–43.

42. *Latin Monasticism from the Mid-Fifth Century to the End of the Seventh Century*

SOURCES

1. The rules for monks and nuns of the period, first collected by Benedict von Aniane (†821) in his *Codex Regularum,* edited by L. Holste (†1661) in Rome 1661, in a new version edited by M. Brockie (Augsburg 1759, reprint ed. *PL* 103, 393–664), reprint Graz 1957; cf. J. Neufville, "Les éditeurs des regulae Patrum, S. Benôit d'Aniane et Lukas Holste," *RBén* 76 (1966), 327–343. New edition in the *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum* in preparation. Survey of the monastic rules by A. Mundó in *LThK*^{2} VII, 540–542 and *CIP* nos. 1838–1876. 2. Separate editions of particular rules: *Regula Magistri* (= *RM*), Éd. diplomatique par H. Vandenhoven–F. Masai–P. B. Corbett (Brussels 1953); ed. A. de Vogüé, *SChr* 105–107 (Paris 1964–65, bibliog. pp. 15–25); *The Rule of the Master,* trans. Luke Eberle (Kalamazoo 1977). *Regula Benedicti* (=*RB*): ed. C. Butler (Freiburg, 3rd ed. 1935); G. Penco (Florence 1958, with Italian trans.); R. Hanslik, *CSEL* 75 (Vienna 1960); Ph. Schmitz (Maredsous, 2nd ed. 1962); G. M. Colombás–L. M. Sansegundo–O. M. Cunill, *BAC* 115 (Madrid, 2nd ed. 1968, with Gregory the Great's *Dialogi lib.* II); A. de Vogüé–J. Neufville, *SChr* 181–186 (Paris 1971–72, with important introduction, vol. I, 13–410). Since 1972 there appears an

annual volume: *Regulae Benedicti Studia* (Hildesheim), edited by B. Jaspert and E. Manning, from 2 (1973) with international bibliog. on the *RB.* Caesarius Arel., *Regula ss. virginum,* ed. G. Morin, *Florpatr* 34 (Bonn 1933); *Reglas monásticas de la España visigoda* (Leander, Fructuosus, Isidor) ed. J. Campos–I. Roca, *BAC* 321 (Madrid 1971, with Spanish trans.).

LITERATURE

GENERAL: See supra, chaps. 19–20; also: T. P. McLaughlin, *Le très ancien droit monastique de l'Occident* (Poitiers 1935), id., *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale* (Spoleto 1957); G. Penco, "Il concetto di monaco e di vita monastica in Occidente nel secolo VI," *StMon* (1959), 7–50; J. Leclercq, "Érémitisme en Occident," *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos* I (1963), 161–180; *Théologie de la vie monastique* (Paris 1961), 323–383; *Los monjes y los estudios* (Poblet 1963), 41–103; B. Steidle, "Die Einsetzung des Abtes im alten Mönchtum," *Erbe und Auftrag* 40 (1964), 179–196; F. Weissengruber, "Weltliche Bildung der Mönche (5./6. Jh.);" *Röm HM* 8–9 (1964–65), 13–28, 10 (1966–67), 12–42; A. Mundó, "Las reglas monásticas del siglo VI y la 'lectio divina'," *StMon* 9 (1967), 229–255; K. S. Frank, *Frühes Mönchtum im Abendland* I: *Lebensnormen* (Munich 1975).

ITALY: G. Ferrari; G. Penco (supra, chap. 20); Monographs on Benedict of Nursia: J. Chapman (London 1929); L. Salvatorelli (Hamburg 1937); J. McCann (London 1937); S. Brechter (ed.), *Benedikt, Vater des Abendlandes* (St. Ottilien 1947); R. Molitor (ed.), *Vir Dei Benedictus* (Münster 1947); I. Herwegen (Düsseldorf, 4th ed. 1951); I. Schuster (Viboldone 3rd ed. 1953); Cl. -J. Nesmy (Paris 1958); I. Herwegen, *Sinn und Geist der Benediktinerregel* (Einsiedeln 1944); E. v. Hippel, *Die Krieger Gottes. Die Regel Benedikts als Ausdruck frühchristlicher Gemeinschaftsbildung* (Paderborn, 2nd ed. 1953); Fr. A. Blazovich, *Soziologie des Mönchtums und der Benediktinerregel* (Vienna 1954); A. de Vogüé, *La communauté et l'abbé dans la Règle de s. Benôit* (Paris 1960); S. Pawlowsky, *Die biblischen Grundlagen der Regula Benedicti* (Vienna 1965); H. Schlögl, *Der hl. Benedikt als Pädagoge und Psychologe* (Diss. Vienna 1966).—Benedictines to 700: C. Butler, *Benedictine Monachism* (London 1919); St. Hilpisch, *Benediktin. Mönchtum* (Freiburg 1929); Ph. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoît,* 7 vols. (Maredseus 1942–1956).—D. Cappuyns, "Cassiodore," *DHGE* 11, 1349–1408; A. van de Vyver, "Les Institutions de Cassiodore et sa fondation à Vivarium," *RBén* 53 (1941), 59–88; G. Ludwig, *Cassiodor. Über den Ursprung der abendländischen Schule* (Frankfurt 1967, Bibliog. 169ff.); R. Schlieben, *Christliche Theologie und Philologie in der Spatäntike. Die schulwissenschaftlichen Methoden der Psalmenexegese Cassiodors* (Berlin 1974).—O. Porcel, *La doctrina monástica de san Gregorio Magno y la 'Regula monachorum'* (Madrid 1950); P. Rudmann, *Mönchtum und kirchlicher Dienst in den Schriften Gregors d. Gr.* (St. Ottilien 1956).

GAUL: L. Ueding, *Geschichte der Klostergründungen der frühen Merowingerzeit* (Berlin 1935); F. Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich 1965); G. Holzherr, *Regula Ferioli* (Einsiedeln 1961); G. Moyse, "Les Origines du monachisme dans le diocèse de Besançon (V–Xs.)," *BEC* 131 (1973), 21–104; F. Villegas, "La 'Regula monasterii Tarnatensis.' Texte, sources et datation," *RBén* 84 (1974), 7–65.

IRISH-FRANKISH MONASTICISM: H. Leclercq, "Luxeuil," *DACL* 9 (1930), 2722–2787; *S. Columbani opera* ed. G. S. M. Walker (Dublin 1957, with bibliog. pp. LXXXII–XCII); *Mélanges Colombaniens* (Luxeuil–Paris 1951); J. O. Caroll, "The Chronology of St. Columban," *IThQ* 24 (1957), 76–95; F. MacManus, *Saint Columban* (New York 1962).

SPAIN: *Perez de Urbel* I (supra, chap. 20), 165–528; J. F. Alonso, *La cura pastoral en la España romano-visigoda* (Rome 1955), 463–507; A. Mundó, "Monachesimo nella penisola iberica fino al secolo VII," *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo* (Spoleto 1957), 73–108; P. J. Mullins, *The Spiritual Life According to St. Isidore* (Washington 1940); C. M. Aherne, *Valerio of Bierzo* (Diss. Washington 1949); M. Martins, *O monacato de s. Fructuoso de Braga* (Coimbra 1950); J. Campos, *Juan de Biclaro* (Madrid 1960); A. Viñayo Gonzales, *San Fructuoso de Braga* (León 1966); M. C. Díaz y Díaz, "La vida eremítica en el reino visigodo," *España eremítica, Analecta Legerensia* I (Pamplona 1970), 49–62; A. Linage Conde, "Los orígenes del monacato benedictino en la peninsula ibérica, T. I.," *El monacato hispano prebenedicto* (León 1973).

NORTH AFRICA: J. J. Gavigan (supra, chap. 20); J. Diesner, "Das Mönchtum der Vandalenzeit in Afrika," *Kirche und Staat im spätrömischen Reich* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1964), 140–148.

43. *Theological Discussions*

SOURCES

Victor episcop. Vitensis, *Historia persecutionis Africae provinciae,* ed. M. Petschenig: *CSEL* 7 (1881); Fulgentius Ruspensis, *Opera,* ed. J. Fraipont: *CChr* 91 and 91 a (Turnhout 1968); "La Crónica de Juan Biclarense," ed. P. Álvarez Rubiano: *AST* 16 (1943), 16–42; *Vitae Patrum Emeritensium: ActaSS Novembris I,* 316–339 (Paris 1887) and J. N. Garvin (Washington 1946); Caesarius Arelatensis, *Sermones,* ed. G. Morin: *CChr* 103 and 104 (2nd ed. 1953); Paulus Diaconus. *Historia Langobardorum: MGSS rer. Lang.* 45–187; *Facundi episcopi ecclesiae Hermianensis opera omnia,* ed. J. M. Clement–R. van der Plaetse: *CChr* 90A (1974); *Rustici contra Acephalos disputatio: PL* 67, 1167–1254.

LITERATURE

Hefele-Leclercq (Paris 1907ff., Hildesheim–New York, 2nd ed. 1973); H. J. Diesner, "Fulgentius von Ruspe als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker," *Arbeiten zur Theologie* I, 26 (Stuttgart 1966); id., "Die Auswirkungen der Religionspolitik Thrasamunds und Hilderichs auf Ostgoten und Byzantiner," *Sitzungsber. der sächs. Akademie d. Wiss. Phil. -hist. Kl.* 113, 3, Berlin (1967); M. C. Díaz y Díaz, "La cultura de la España visigótica del siglo VII," *Settimane di Studio . . .* V (Spoleto 1958), 813–844; E. E. Sestan, "La composizione etnica della società in rapporto allo svolgimento della civiltà in Italia nel secolo VII," ibid., 649–677; O. Bertolini, "Le chiese Longobarde dopo la conversione al Cattolicesimo ed i loro rapporti con il papato," ibid., VII (1960), 455–492; G. P. Bognetti, "La continuità delle sedi episcopali e l'azione di Roma nel regno Longobardo," ibid., VII (1960), 415–454; F. J. Dölger, "Die Ehrfurchtsbezeigung beim Durchgang zwischen heidnischem Altar und christlicher Kirche. Arianische Gewissensbetäubung in der Spätantike," *AuC* 6 (1940–50), 69f.; K. F. Stroheker, *Germanentum und Spätantike* (Zürich–Stuttgart 1965); F. Kauffmann, *Aus der Schule des Wulfila* (Strasbourg 1899); M. Schanz–C. Hosius–G. Krüger, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* IV, 2: *Die Literatur des 5. u. 6. Jh.* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1959); A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* (London 1965); J. A. Jungmann, *Liturgisches Erbe und pastorale Gegenwart* (Innsbruck 1960); G. G. Lapeyre, *St. Fulgence de Ruspe* (Paris 1929); M. J. Delage, see chapter 40; L. Duchesne, *L'Église au 6e siècle* (Paris 1925); K. Schäferdiek, *Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen bis zur Errichtung der westgotischen katholischen Staatskirche = Ar-*

beiten zur Kirchengeschichte 39 (Berlin 1967); W. Goez, "Bemerkungen zu einem Bischofsgrab im Dom von Grado," *ZKG* 70 (1959), 121–140; W. Meyer, *Die Spaltung des Patriarchats Aquieleia.* Abhdl. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, Phil. -Hist. Kl. n.s. 2, 6 (1898).

44. *The Epilogue of Early Christian Latin Literature*

SOURCES

Boethius, *The Theological Tractates,* with an English translation, ed. H. F. Stewart–E. K. Rand (London–New York 8th ed. 1968). —Cassiodorus, *De institutione divinarum literarum: PL* 70, 1105–1150. *De artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum: PL* 70, 1149–1220; *Variae* and *De Anima: CChr* 96. *Expositio Psalmorum: CChr* 97 and 98. —Gregory the Great, *Epistulae: MGEp* I and II, cf. supra, chap. 40; *Moralia in Job: PL* 75, 510–76, 782. Bocks I–II, ed. R. Gillet–A. de Gaudemaris: *SChr* 32 (1950); *In Ezechielem: CChr* 142, ed. M. Adriaen (Turnhout 1971); *Dialogi,* ed. U. Moricca =*Fonti per la storia d'Italia* 57 (Rome 1924); *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi opera omnia: PL* 81–84.

LITERATURE

V. Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der skythischen Kontroversen = Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur-und Dogmengeschichte* 18, 1 (Paderborn 1935); M. Nedoncelle, "Les variations de Boèce sur la Personne," *RevSR* 29 (1955), 201–238; P. Riché, *Éducation et Culture dans l'Occident Barbare, 6ᵉ–8ᵉ siècles* (Paris 1962, 3rd ed. 1973); G. Ludwig, *Cassiodor über den Ursprung der abendländischen Schule* (Frankfurt a. M. 1967); A. Momigliano, "Cassiodorus and Italian Culture of His Time," *Proceedings of the British Academy* XLI, 207–245 (London 1955); R. Schlieben, *Christliche Theologie und Philosophie in der Spätantike. Die schulwissenschaftlichen Methoden der Psalmenexegese Cassiodors = Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 46 (Berlin 1974); F. Schneider, *Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter* (Munich 1926); F. H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great. His place in History and Thought,* 2 vols. (London 1905, 2nd ed. 1967); D. Hofmann, *Die geistige Auslegung der Schrift bei Gregor dem Grossen = Münsterschwartzacher Studien* 6 (1968); V. Recchia, *Le Omelie di Gregorio Magno su Ezechiele (1–5) = Quaderni di "Vetera Christianorum"* 8 (Bari 1974); R. Manselli, "Gregorio Magno e la Bibbia," *Settimane di Studio* X (Spoleto 1963), 67–101; R. Wasselynck, "L'influence de l'exégèse de S. Grégoire le Grand sur les commentaires bibliques médievaux (VIIᵉ–XIIᵉ s.)," *RThAM* 32 (1965), 157–204; G. Dufner, *Die Dialoge Gregors d. Gr. im Wandel der Zeiten und Sprachen = Miscellanea Erudita* XIX (Padua 1968); Cl. Dagens, "La fin des temps et l'Église selon S. Grégoire le Grand," *RSR* 68 (1970), 273–288; H. Hürten, "Gregor d. Gr. und der mittelalterliche Episkopat," *ZKG* 73 (1963), 16–42; V. Monachino, "Gregorio I," *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* 7 (Rome 1966) col. 222–278 (bibliog.); H. J. Diesner, *Isidor von Sevilla und seine Zeit = Arbeiten zur Theologie* 52 (Stuttgart 1973). Diesner has announced an "exhaustive study on Isidore"; A. Borst, "Das Bild der Geschichte in der Enzyklopadie Isidors von Sevilla," *DA* 22 (1966), 1–62 (bibliog.); J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Sevilla et la culture classique dans l'Espagne visigothique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959); M. C. Díaz y Díaz, see supra, chap. 43; *Isidoriana. Estudios sobre San Isidoro de Sevilla, en el XIV Centenario de su nacimiento* (León 1961); Fernández Alonso, see supra, chap. 40; Duchesne, see supra, chap. 40.

INDEX

Aba Mar I, *Catholicus* of Persia 465–466
Abasgi 507
Abd-al Malik, Caliph 514
Abraam, Bishop of Karai 188, 366
Abraham, monk 366
Abraham of Kashkar 468
Acacian Schism 429–433, 434–436, 497, *616–624*
Acacius, Bishop of Beroea 108–109
Acacius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine 37, 49–50
—and the Homoians (Acacians) 49, 227
Acacius, Bishop of Melitene 109–110
Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople 425–430, 433, 435–436, 615–617, 620, 622–623, 636; *see also* Acacian Schism
Acemetae monks 366, 370, 428–429, 435, 444, 486, 615, 731
Acephalae 731, 750
Achilleus, priest 19
Acholius, Bishop of Thessalonica 69–70, 252
Adalwald, Lombard King 578–580
Adrianople 48, 193
—battle of (378) 67, 227
adultery 394–395, 397
Advent 306–307, 671–672, 685
Aedesius, brother of Frumentius 183–184
Aedesius, philosopher 52
Aegean Islands, evangelization of 193
Aemilius, Bishop of Benevento 171
Aerius of Sebaste 272
Aethelbert, King of Kent 586, 588–590, 598, 601
Aëtius, Count 266, 525
Aëtius, deacon 45
Africa, North 507, 644, 707–711, 714, 725
—evangelization of 204–207
—Church in 602–614
—monasticism in 389, 691, 705–707
—under the Vandals 602–608
—in the Byzantine reconquest 609–612
—evangelization of pagans 611
—Muslim conquest of 612–614
Agape 130
Agapitus, Abbot of the New Laura 448
Agapitus I, Pope 445–446, 627–629, 639, 642, 739
Agathangelus, historian 482
Agatho, Pope 462, 581, 635, 665
Agaunum, Saint-Maurice d' 199
Agde, Synod of (506) 560, 645, 648–649, 666, 683
Agila 712
Agila, Visigothic King 561
Agilbert, Bishop of Dorchester 593, 595
Agilulf, Lombard King 575, 578–579, 583–584, 633
Agilus 547, 549
Agnellus, Bishop of Ravenna 716
Agrestius, monk of Luxeuil 547
Agrippinus, Bishop of Como 578
Aidan, Abbot-Bishop of Lindisfarne 594
Aistulf, Lombard King 585
Alahis, Duke of Trent 582–583
Alans 210, 229
Alaric I, Visigothic King 195, 356, 361, 390
Alaric II, Visigothic King 525, 529, 560
Albinus, patrician 625
Alboin, Lombard King 574–577
Alcuin of York 599
Aldhelm of Malmesbury 598–599
Alemanni 225, 525–527, 536, 539, 541–544, 549, 551–552, 554
Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria 17–20, 22
Alexander, Bishop of Antioch 239, 258
Alexander, Bishop of Hierapolis 109–110
Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem 122, 329
Alexander, Bishop of Thessalonica 19
Alexander, founder of the Acemetae 366, 370, 486
Alexandria 16–22, 27–28, 30, 34–36, 38, 40, 44, 50, 54, 57, 60, 62, 64, 66–67, 71, 75–76, 97, 101, 105–114, 118, 121–122, 124–129, 182, 184, 220, 232, 234, 240, 242–243, 247, 251–253, 257–258, 262–263, 266–267, 291, 302, 337, 345, 350, 358, 360, 374, 384, 391, 421–422, 425, 426, 433, 437, 442, 445, 452, 459, 469–474, 477, 491, 496–498, 513–514, 588, 615, 623, 644, 731, 739, 750

—patriarchate of 236, 291, 442
—Synod of (319) 18
—Synod of (338) 35
—Synod of (362) 60, 62, 95
—Synod of (400) 126
—Synod of (430) 103
—Synod of (c. 458) 422
Al-Mundir, Ghassanid Phylarch 458, 512
Amalaric, Visigothic King 560
Amalasuntha, Ostrogothic Queen 445
Amandus, Bishop, Apostle of the Flemings 530, 539–541, 544, 547
Ambrose, Bishop of Milan 86–89, 123, 132, 134–135, 197–199, 214, 218, 222–223, 243, 254–255, 270, 273, 282, 293–294, 302, 304–305, 311, 313, 315–316, 323–325, 327–328, 333, 375, 377–378, 392–393, 396, 399, 408, 412, 414, 616, 672, 715, 746
—and Valentinian II 86–87
—and Theodosius I 86–89, 711
—missionary activity of 197–198
Ambrosiaster 272, 302, 336
Ammianus Marcellinus 56–57, 201, 249–250
Ammonas 215
Ammun, hermit 343, 355
Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium 66, 70, 74, 372
Amphilochius, Bishop of Side 372
anaphora (canon) 291–293, 297
Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles 291–292
Anastasius, Bishop of Areopolis 185
Anastasius, Bishop of Pavia 581
Anastasius I, Emperor 399, 429–435, 444–445, 465–466, 481, 617, 621–623
Anastasius I, Pope 126–128, 256
Anastasius II, Pope 430, 433, 620
Anastasius of Sinai 492, 495
Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople 115–118, 121, 268, 421–422
Anatolius, *Comes Orientis* 505
anchorites 337–338, 343–346, 348–349, 354–355, 357, 360, 363–364, 383, 442, 484, 693, 697
—communities of 343–345, 349, 354–357, 364, 380, 382
Ancyra 62
—Synod of (314) 193, 233, 278
Andrew, Apostle 241, 502, 685
Andrew of Samosata 110
Anglo-Saxons 521, 530, 579, 582, *585–601*, 632–634, 665, 673, 685, 692, 698, 748
—schools 599–600
—culture 600–601
—vernacular literature 601
Annegray, monastery 534, 701
Annesi in Pontus 368
anointing 677, 682–683
—in baptism 677, 682
—of the sick 682–683
Anomoios 45, 49
—Anomoians 45–46, 61
Anthimus, Patriarch of Constantinople 444–446, 469, 627
Antiencyclion 425
Antinoe 183, 731
Antioch 17, 20, 34–36, 50, 53, 55, 60, 65–67, 75–76, 94, 103, 106, 108–111, 187, 189–190, 214, 232, 240, 243, 253, 258, 262–263, 275, 291–292, 298, 305, 308, 311, 314–315, 322, 325, 330, 360, 364, 383, 391–392, 408–410, 416, 421–423, 427, 430, 436, 442, 445, 465, 476, 485, 494, 498–499, 514, 615, 623, 750
—patriarchate of 187–188, 236, 239, 258, 291, 297, 442, 464–465, 476
—Schism of 60, 65, 68–69, 243, 251
—school of 17, 20, 97, 107
—Synod of (c. 268) 21
—Synod of (c, 331) 30
—Synod of (341) 36, 49, 227–228, 234
—Synod of (363) 189
—Synod of (379) 68, 96
—Synod of (c. 418) 170
Antoninus, Emperor 400
Antoninus, Neoplatonic philosopher 182
Antoninus, subdeacon 643
Antony, monk 327, 337–338, 341, 343, *344–345* 358, 360, 363, 374, 380, 385
Anysius, Bishop of Thessalonica 255, 257
Aphthartodocetists 446, 455, 490
Apiarius, priest 260–261
Aosta 199
apocrisiarius, papal 446–449, 452, 628, 630, 635
apocrypha 131, 135–136, 694
Apollinaris the Elder, Bishop of Laodicea 56
Apollinaris the Younger, Bishop of Laodicea 56, 65, 67
—Christology of 94–103, 109, 716, 729–730
Apollinarius, Patriarch of Alexandria 469
apophthegmata 344, 355–356, 485, 487, 693
Apostles' Liturgy of the East Syrians 291
Apostolic Constitutions 271, 278, 283, 335
Aqaba 185
Aquileia 41, 127, 165, 196–197, 200–201, 235, 238, 243, 248, 257, 265, 316, 360, 374, 379, 545–547, 549, 574–579, 582, 584, 628–629, 633, 733–735
—Synod of (381) 199–201, 715
Arabia 478–479, 506, 509, 513, 581, 613
—evangelization of 186–187, 189, 214, 479, 505–506, 510
Arbogast 543
Arbogast, *Comes* 225
Arabs 509–514
—Monophysite 458, 478–479, 506
—*see also* Arabia
Arcadius, Emperor 89, 194, 220, 257–258, 405
archdeacon 271, 648, 657–658, 662–664
archpriest 651, 655, *656–658*
Arethas, martyr 187
Arethas, Saint 479, 502, 506

Ariadne, Augusta 424
Arianism and Arians 16–32, 34–37, 45, 47–48, 74, 79–80, 86–87, 93, 98, 101, 195, 246, 251, 293, 327, 365, 374, 377, 417, 437, 496, 525, 527–528, 559, 562, 564–565, 573–574, 578–582, 602–609, 614, 622, 625, 655, 705, 707–722, 725, 733, 736, 752
—collapse of 59–61
—temporary recovery 61–63
—end of within Empire 74, 218, 251
—and the Germans 74, 226, 229–230, 527, 559
—and Christology 93–95, 100
—Visigothic Synod of (580) 713
Aripert I, Lombard King 580–581
Aristolaus 108
Arius 16–23, 25–26, 28–32, 80, 100–102, 123, 709
—doctrine of 16–23; *see also* Arianism and Arians
—*Thalia* 19, 25
—death 32, 625, 712
Ariwald, Lombard King 579–580
Arles 41, 235, 260, 266, 646, 653, 670, 687, 699
—vicariate of 238, 530, 561, 588–589, 622, *637–641*, 644
—Synod of (314) 22, 79, 197, 207, 209, 211, 244, 246
—Synod of (353) 41, 82, 244, 248
—Synod of (524) 651
Armagh 520, 522
Armenia 238, 257, 475, 479–481, 513
—evangelization of 192, 366, 480, 482
—Monophysite Church of *479–483*
-literature 480, 482
Arnobius 336
Arsenius, Bishop 30
Arsenius, monk 356
art, Byzantine 504
Arzuges 206
Ascension 303–304, 648, 667
Asceterium 275
asceticism 322–323, 337–342, 362, 374–376, 386, 392–393
—intermediate stage 343, 376, 386
Asclepas, Bishop of Gaza 37, 185
Asella 375
Asia Minor 193–194, 228, 458, 475, 496
—evangelization of 191–193, 228, 508
—role of Cappadocia in 192, 480, 517
—monasticism in 367–369
Asketikon, Messalian writing 372
asketikon of Basil 368–369, 379
Aspar 423–424
Asterius, Bishop of Amaseia 312
Asterius, Bishop of Milan 593
Asterius the Sophist 312
asylum, right of 405
Atarbius 123
Athalaric, Ostrogothic King 626
Athanagild, Visigothic King 561, 577
Athanarich, Visigothic Prince 227
Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria 22–24, 30–31, 34–38, 40–46, 49, 57, 60, 62, 64, 82–85, 94, 99, 122, 196, 203–204, 207, 243–244, 247–249, 281, 303, 312, 323, 327, 338, 344, 349, 374, 385
—writings 44, 62, 338, 344, 360, 363, 374
—and the freedom of the Church 84
—and evangelization 182–184, 214
Athens 52, 56, 64, 194–195, 220, 438, 491
Atripe, White Monastery of 353, 470
Attala, Abbot of Bobbio 579
Attila, King of the Huns 230, 269, 576
Audaeus and the Audians 226–227
Audebert, Bishop of Cambrai 540
Audofleda 525
Audoin, Bishop of Rouen 540
Audoin, Lombard King 574
Audomar, Bishop of Thérouanne 539
Augsburg 200, 536, 544–547
Augustine, Archbishop of Canterbury 588–590, 596, 598
Augustine, Bishop of Hippo 102–103, 128, 138–139, 142, 144, 148, 164–166, 171, 204–205, 213, 216, 223, 231, 258–259, 275, 280–281, 285, 296, 299, 301, 303, 306, 307–310, 313, 316–320, 323, 326, 328, 331–333, 336, 360, 362, 376–378, 392, 395–396, 398–400, 403, 406, 409, 411–415, 571, 587, 602–603, 608, 614, 630, 632, 697, 700, 705, 716–717, 719, 721, 723–728, 731, 737, 740–741, 744, 746, 748–749, 751–753
—and Donatism 148–161, 602
—and recourse to the secular power 153–155
—ecclesiology of 160–161
—and Pelagianism 162, 164–169, 171–174
—and grace 174–178, 383, 723, 725–726
—and paganism 204–205
—preaching of 317–319
—and monasticism 386–390, 705
—*Rule* of 387–390, 691, 695–696, 699, 703–704, 707
—and pagan literature 413
—educational program of 413–414
Aurelian, Bishop of Arles 640, 691, 699
Aurelian, Emperor 304
Aurelius, Bishop of Arles 350
Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage 149–150, 153, 165, 205, 260, 333
auricular confession 523, 596, 689, 702
Ausonius, poet 220
Auspicius of Toul 225
Austrasia 531, 537, 542, 553, 701
Authari, Lombard King 575, 577–579, 584
Autun 40, 588, 684, 699
Auvergne, Synod of (535) 649
Auxanius, Bishop of Arles 640
Auxentius, Bishop of Milan 42, 48, 59, 87
Auxentius, hermit 486
Auxerre, parishes in 645

Auxerre, synods of 650–651, 658
Avars 196
Avenches 199
Avitus, Bishop of Vienne 526–527, 558, 621, 624, 638, 674, 676, 679, 711
Axum 183–184, 479

Babai II, *Catholicus* of Persia 465–466
Babai the Great, Abbot 466–467
Babgen, *Catholicus* of Armenia 481
Babylas, Saint 34, 55, 187, 325, 330
Bachiarius, monk 385
Bagai, Synod of (394) 146
Bajuwares (Bavarians) 545–549
Balearic Isles 210
baptism 14, 160, 162, 164–165, 175, 213, 272, 277, 279, 281, *293–296,* 303, 305, 310, 319, 331, 335, 362, 372, 393, 415, 504, 507, 524, 667, *676–677,* 723
—Donatist idea of 154
—deferment of 294, 301
—preparatory catechesis 294–295, 308–311
—infant 164–165, 296, 308, 676–677
Bar Harith bar Gabala, Ghassanid King 475
Barnabas, Apostle 240
Barsanuphius, monk 487, 493
Bar-Sauma, Bishop of Nisibis 464
Barsumas, archimandrite 113–114
Basiliscus, usurper, 424–425, 615
—*Encyclion* 424–425, 615
Basil, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia 64–68, 70, 73, 85–86, 94, 122, 192, 194, 214, 251, 294, 312–313, 316, 327, 339, 341, 350, 383, 399, 405, 407–408, 410, 412–414, 484, 491
—on Church and state 85
—Liturgy of 292, 499
—and monasticism 367–369, 487, 695
Basilias 410
Basiliscus, usurper 388, 424–425, 615
—*Encyclion* 424–425, 615
—*Antiencyclion* 425
Bassula, deacon 104
Bathildis, Frankish Queen 556
Bavaria 577, 660, 733
—evangelization of 230, 544–549, 552, 554
—parish in 648
Bavo 539
Bede 587–588, 590, 599–601
Bedouins 478, 505, 510
Beirut 188, 236, 252
Belisarius, general 445–446, 452–453, 608–609, 627, 707
Bellator, priest 740
Benedict I, Pope 588, 629
Benedict II, Pope 570
Benedict Biscop, Abbot 598–600, 665
Benedict of Aniane, Abbot 350, 369, 696
Benedict of Nursia, Abbot 202, 350, 389, 671, 748
—*Rule* of 350, 355, 369, 535, 598, 600, 631 691, *694–696,* 698–700, 702–704, 745
Benevento 203, 575–576, 581, 582, 584–585
Benignus 542
Benjamin, Patriarch of Alexandria 472
Berbers 608, 613–614
Beroea 249
Bertha, Queen of Kent 586
Beryllos, Bishop of Bostra 21
Bethlehem 9, 123, 125–127, 306, 317, 358, 361, 412, 484
Beziers, Synod of (356) 42, 83
Biclar 704
Bilichild 552
Birinus, Bishop of Dorchester 593
bishopric *230–233*
—terminology 231
—erecting of 231
—duty of residence 232
—additional churches in 232
bishop 270–273, 275–276, 278–289, 297, 299–301, 308, 312
—right of appeal to Rome 38–39, 232
—responsible for evangelization 213–214
—duty of residence 232
—transfer to 232
—election of 36, 281–284, 335, 441, 532, 619
—judicial functions of 6, 284–285, 440
—titles 286
—insignia 286
—charitable activities of 287
—collegiality 287–289
—and Justinian I 439–442
—qualifications of 744–745
Blesilla 392
Blitmund 539
Bobbio 523, 535, 579–580, 582, 633, 692, 698, 702
Boethius 437, 625, 731–733, *736–738,* 743, 756
—writings of 736–738
Bologna 197
Boniface, Apostle of Germany 552, 648, 660, 666
Boniface, Bishop of Carthage 608
Boniface I, Pope 240, 260–262
Boniface II, Pope 626, 639, 728
Boniface IV, Pope 579, 633, 641
Boniface V, Pope 591–592
Bonosus 377
Bonosus, Bishop of Naïssus 256
Bordeaux 329, 379
—Synod of (c. 384) 133–134, 243
—Synod of (662) 652
Bosra 479
Bostra 186
—Synod of 21
Braga 136, 667
—Synod of (561) 667–668, 731
—Synod of (563) 657, 672
—Synod of (565) 136
—Synod of (572) 648, 650
—Synod of (576) 688

Braulio, Bishop of Zaragoza 569, 673, 682, 704, 722
Brendan 522
Brescia 197, 578, 583
Bretwalda 586, 588
Brier Monastery (St. Catherine) 485
Britain 517–521, 523, 530, 585–601, 644, 686
—evangelization of 211–212
British Christians 517–520, 521, 585–601
Brunhildis, Frankish Queen 588, 641, 699, 713
Bulgars 508
Burgundians 209, 226, 229–230, 405, 524–525, 527–528, 622, 638, 686
Burgundy, Kingdom of 531, 535, 541–542, 544, 547, 552, 556, 559, 649, 652, 657, 701, 711
Burgundofaro, Bishop of Meaux 540
Byzacena 603, 605, 607–608, 610–611, 613, 706
—Synod of (541) 610
Byzantine Liturgy 292–293, 499–500
Byzantium 12, 15, 75, 80, 147, 240–241, 456, 463, 465, 467, 469, 471–472, 479–483, 487–488, 492, 503, 506–507, 509–511, 514, 583, 614, 616, 618, 620–621, 626, 628, 635, 664, 715, 734

Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage 24, 137, 157, 245
Caedmon 601
Caedwalla, King of Gwynedd 591
Caedwalla, King of Wessex 597
Caelestius 162, 164–170, 174, 259
Caesarea in Cappadocia 34, 57, 62, 191–192, 238, 292, 313, 367–368, 410, 480
Caesarea in Palestine 50, 185, 236, 239, 439
Caesarius, Bishop of Arles 223, 350, 383, 389, 555, 560, 568, 622, 624, 626, 638–639, 646–647, 651, 666, 669–671, 673–680, 683, 691, 695, 699, 704, 710, 725–727, 736, 754, 756
—*Rule for Virgins* 680, 699
—*Rule for Monks* 699–700
—doctrine of grace 725–728
Cagliari 201, 203, 607, 693
Calandion, Patriarch of Antioch 427
Callinicum 87–88, 223, 391, 457
Candidian, Bishop of Aquileia 735
Candidian, Count 104, 336
Candidus, priest 641
canon law, Byzantine 498–499
Canterbury 586, 588–589, 592–593, 595–596, 598–599, 634
Cappadocia 64, 304, 322, 408, 480, 484, 497, 513
—role in evangelization 192, 480, 517
Caprasius of Lerins 381
Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage 104, 603
Capraria 377
Capua 202
—Synod of (391) 256
Carcassonne 209
Care of souls *673–683*
—preaching 673–676
—Sunday rest 675
—superstition and magic 675
—concubinage 676
Carloman, Mayor 552
Carpentras, Synod of (527) 646
Carthage 136–138, 140–141, 152–154, 165, 204–205, 232, 234, 238, 242–243, 258, 308–309, 330, 386, 392, 603–607, 609–611, 644, 708–709, 711
—Religious Discussion of (411) 156–158, 206, 336
—Synod of (c. 335) 137
—Synod of (c. 348) 141
—Synod of (390) 280
—Synod of (397) 285
—Synod of (401) 150, 205, 280, 408
—Synod of (403) 151
—Synod of (404) 152
—Synod of (411) 165, 168
—Synod of (416) 169, 245, 395
—Synod of (418) 170, 259
—Synod of (525) 706
—Synod of (534) 609
—Synod of (536) 706
—Synod of (550) 610
—Synod of (594) 611
Cassian, John 101–102, 177, 350, 369, 382–384, 522, 690, 695, 703–705, 723
—writings 383
Cassiciacum 412
Cassiodorus 572, *697*, 736, *739–744*, 751, 753–754, 756
—*Variae* 739, 741
—writings 739–743
—*see also* Vivarium
Castellum Tingitanum 137
catechesis 294–295, 298, 307–311
catechist 307–310
catechumen 213, 271, 297, 299, 303, 308–309, 335, 361, 667, 669, 685, 710
catechumenate 290, 293–297, 299, 308, 311, 362, 676
Catholic Church, privileged position of 4–14, 89
—laws favourable to 4–6
—official religion 68, 89
Catholicus of Armenia 238, 480–482
Catholicus of the Iberians 481
Catholicus of Persia 465–469
Cato, priest of Clermont 651
Cedd, missionary in Essex 594
Celestine I, Pope 101–106, 108, 174, 177, 215, 243, 260, 262–263, 268, 279, 288, 518, 646
celibacy, clerical *278–281, 653–656*
Celtic monasticism 521–523, 535, 690, 692, 698
Celts, mission to the *517–523*

cenobites 338, 345–354, 358–359, 364–368, 374, 382, 388, 442, 478, 484, 493, 690, 693–694, 702
—community of Tabennisi 345
—superiors 346–347
—size of communities 347
—separation from world 346
—poverty and obedience 349, 352
—"order" 351–353
Chalcedon 106, 116, 330, 453
—Council of (451) 72, 77, 98, 106–107, 114–121, 185–186, 188, 190, 231, 236–237, 239–240, 268–269, 290, 307, 351, 359, 363, 369 371, 391, 406, 417, 421–427, 429–433, 435–437, 443–444, 447, 450–452, 454–455, 457–459, 461, 463–464, 466, 468–469, 471–472, 475, 477, 480–481, 483–484, 486–490, 495, 497, 501, 506, 579, 615–618, 622, 624, 629 691, 709, 719–720, 729–730, 734
—Creed of 118–121, 425, 615, 617
—Canon 28 of 119, 121, 237, 268, 421, 423, 429, 433, 472, 496–497, 641
Chaldaeans, Uniate 291
Chalon, Synod of (650) 641, 681–682
Chararic, King of the Sueves 562
Charibert I, King of Paris 586
Chariton, Saint 357–358
Childebert I, Frankish King 538, 557, 629, 699
Childebert II, Frankish King 557, 639–640
Chilperic I, Frankish King 537, 714
Chindaswinth, Visigothic King 566
Chintila, Visigothic King 569, 685
Chlodomer 525
Chlotar I, Frankish King 699
Chlotar II, Frankish King 531–532, 539, 557–558
Chnodomar, King of the Alemanni 225
chorepiscopus 191, 233, 359
Chosroes I, King of Persia 438, 466
Chosroes II, King of Persia 466, 467, 476, 512
Christmas 304–307, 385, 416, 526, 648–649, 659–661, 672, 676
—Christmas Cycle 306–307
Christology 755
—of Arius, 17, 19
—in the fourth century 93–97
—in the fifth century 98–121
—and Priscillianism 135
—from 451 to 680 421–463
Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia 222, 304–305
Chronographus of 354, 304
Chrysaphius 111–112, 115, 336
Chur 199, 536, 541–544
Church of the Empire 78, 89–90, 245
—organization of 230–245, 496–499
—clergy 269–289
—liturgy 282–307, 499–500
—preaching and catechesis 307–319
—pagan survivals 331–334
—piety 319–321
—asceticism 322–323
—cult of saints 323–328, 500–502, 749
—pilgrimage 328–331
—laity 334–337
—eastern monasticism 337–373, 483–488
—western monasticism 374–393
—and society 393–417
—intolerance 417
—age of Justinian I 433–456
—literature 488–495
—antocephalous archbishops 498
—canon law collections 498–499
—Byzantine discipline 502
—Byzantine art 504
—Byzantine Missionary activity 504–509
—and Islam 509–514
Church, local; *see* bishopric
Church-state relations
—in the fourth century 78–90
—Emperor's position 80–81
—imperial despotism 83–85
—subservience of bishops 83
—Church of the Empire 89–90
—dangers 90
Cilicia, evangelization of 190
Circumcellions 138–140, 144, 146–147, 158–159
Clarus, monk 381
Claudian, Donatist Bishop 145
Claudian, poet 220
Clement of Alexandria 278, 740
Clementine Liturgy 291
Cleph, Lombard King 575
clergy, Christian *449–289,* 619, *651–658*
—Orders 270–273
—admission to 273–277, 281–282
—restricted to males 273
—age requirements 273
—moral fitness 274, 652–653
—knowledge 275, 651–652
—slaves and *coloni* 276
—state officials 276–277
—marriage of 277–280
—celibacy of 277–281, 653–656
—ordination 282–284
—privileges of 284–287
—titles 286
—insignia 286
—collegiality of bishops 287–289
—and Justinian I 441–443
—Byzantine 502–503
Clermont, Synod of (535) 531
Clichy, Synod of (627) 641, 657
Clodoswintha, Lombard Queen 574
Clotilda, Frankish Queen 525, 527
Clovis, Frankish King 230, 524–528, 532, 536–537, 556–558, 566, 622, 676, 710–711
Codex Argenteus 715
collegiality, episcopal 287–289
Cologne 225, 549–550, 554

Comasius, priest 135
Colchester 211
Colman, Abbot of Lindisfarne 594, 595
coloni 401, 406, 606
Columba the Older (Columcille) 522–523, 595–596
Columban (Columba the Younger) 523, 534, 539, 542–543, 547, 553, 555, 578–579, 633, 679, 698, *700–702*
—*Rule* of 535, 691, 696, 698, 700–702
Comgall 522, 701
communicatio idiomatum 102, 106, 444, 489
Como 733
confirmation 677, 682
Conon, Abbot of the Great Laura 454
Conon, Saint 501
Constance 541–544, 553–554
Constans I, Emperor 32–33, 37, 39–41, 82, 138, 152, 247
Constans II, Emperor 461–462, 482, 612, 635
Constantina 137
Constantine I, Emperor *3–32,* 59, 78–81, 87, 89, 136, 184–187, 189, 203, 209, 212–213, 216–217, 219, 221, 226–227, 244–247, 277, 283–286, 294, 304, 306, 323, 328–329, 334, 336, 362–363, 374, 385, 395–397, 399, 401–402, 404, 415, 442, 486, 526, 565
—position in the Church 4, 13–14, 81
—favouring of the Church 4–16, 80–81
—and heretics 6–7
—and pagans 7–9, 11, 53, 79, 190
—building activity 9–11, 184, 187
—idea of the Church 11, 20, 78–81
—and Christian morality 12
—and the imperial cult 13–14
—baptism and death 14–16, 22
—legacy of 15–16
—and Arianism 16, 19, 79
—and Nicaea I 22–28, 79
—and the aftermath of Nicaea I 29–32
—and Athanasius 31
—and Donatism 79, 136–137
—"Donation" of 247
Constantine II, Emperor 32–33, 35, 40
Constantine IV, Emperor 462, 581, 635
Constantine, Pope 503
Constantinople 8, 11–12, 32, 49–51, 55, 63, 68, 100–101, 103, 105, 107, 111–112, 116–117, 128, 165, 192, 194, 219, 221, 227, 240, 245, 252, 257–258, 261–263, 292, 299, 304, 314–315, 322, 328, 330, 362, 366, 383, 410, 416, 422–423, 424–426, 428–433, 435–438, 441–446, 448–449, 452–455, 457–459, 461, 469–471, 475–477, 480, 484–486, 488, 496–497, 499, 501–502, 514, 529, 566, 608–610, 615, 618, 622–624, 626–630, 635, 642–643, 708, 711, 724, 731, 738, 750–751
—special rank of 75–76, 119, 240, 268
—patriarchate of 237, 268, 291, 442, 496–498
—monasticism at 370–371
—Synod of (360) 49
—Synod of (382) 74, 76–77
—Synod of (426) 372
—Synod of (448) 112–114, 120
—Synod of (536) 469
—Synod of (587) 629
—Synod of (590) 481
Constantinople, First Council of (381) 23, *67–77,* 94, 96, 237, 252, 421, 424, 427, 433, 472
—canons of 75–77, 252
—creed of 71–76, 118, 120
—special rank of Constantinople 75–76, 237, 252, 257, 421, 472, 496
—as ecumenical 76–77
Constantinople, Second Council of (553) 98, 129, *454–455,* 463, 529, 568, 577, 579, 610 628, 639, 730–731, 733–735, 737, 750
—condemnation of the Three Chapters 454, 463
—condemnation of Origenism 129, 455
Constantinople, Third Council of (680) 22, 462–463, 569, 581, 634–635
Constantius, Bishop 198
Constantius, Bishop of Milan 578, 733
Constantius II, Emperor 15, 32–33, 37–44, 47–51, 55, 57, 59–61, 81–85, 141–142, 184, 186, 194, 227, 244, 248–249, 284, 416, 486
—and paganism 33–34, 217
—and Athanasius 35–44, 247
—and Arianism 32, 34–50
—and Pope Liberius 43, 46, 247–250
—position in the Church 81–85
Constitutum, First 454
Constitutum, Second 455
Contumeliosus, Bishop of Riez 639
Coptic Church *469–475,* 483
—ecclesiastical literature of 472
—monasticism 473
—missionary work of 473–475
Corbinian 548
Córdoba 564, 573
Cormons 578, 735
Cosmas Indicopleustes 468, 491
Council in Trullo (Quinisext) of (692) 271, 278, 502–503, 635
councils, ecclesiastical 241–245, 441–442, 528
—provincial synod 241–242
—interprovincial synod 242–243
—emperor's role in 243–244, 441–442
councils, "national" 528–532, 558, 565, 567–568, 596
Cresconius 336
Crete 222
Crispus, son of Constantine I 12–13
cult of martyrs and saints 323–329, 556–557
—grave and relics 324–331
—cult buildings 324, 327
—*translatio* 324–326

culture, late Roman, and Christianity 411–417
—dilemma presented 411–414
—Christian educational program 413–414
—Christians in Pagan schools 413
—Golden Age of the Fathers 414
—entertainment 414–416
—entertainers 415
—festivals 415–416
Cuthbert of Lindisfarne 598
Cunctos Populos 68–69
Curubis 141
Cynegils, King of Wessex 593
Cynegius, Prefect 218
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage 143, 160–161, 330, 385–386, 614, 683, 695, 716, 721
Cyprus 239–240, 359, 498
—evangelization of 190
Cyriacus, Abbot 641
Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria 97–112, 114, 118, 120, 183, 223, 262–263, 405, 421, 423, 427, 450–451, 459, 472, 490, 501, 720, 728–730 732, 750
—and Nestorius 100–171
—the Twelve Anathemas of 103, 105, 108–110, 112, 427, 444, 450, 489, 615
—and the Council of Ephesus 104–107
—and John of Antioch 108–110
—Liturgy of 291
Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem 72, 74, 222, 239, 291, 298, 302, 310–311
Cyril of Scythopolis 485, 505
Cyrila, Vandal Patriarch 605–606
Cyrus of Batna 477
Cyrus of Phasis, Patriarch of Alexandria 459, 461–462

Dacia, evangelization of 195–196
Dagobert, I, Frankish King 531, 539–542, 544, 549, 553, 557–558
Dalmatia, evangelization of 195–196
Dalmatus, Abbot 370, 486
Damascus 188, 509, 526
Damasus I, Pope 64, 66–69, 96, 99, 131–132, 162, 201, 240, 243, 250–255, 279, 375–376, 379, 653
—and the Roman Primacy 250–253
—poetry of 254
Damian, Bishop of Pavia 582
Damian, Patriarch of Alexandria 471
David of Menevia 521
deacon 270–273, 276, 278–280, 283, 286, 297–298, 308, 408, 646, 652–654
deaconess 273, 408
decretals, papal 253, 255–256, 279, 299, 530, 569, 619
Decretum Gelasianum 253, 694
Demetrias 162, 164, 167
Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria 122
Demetrius, Saint 330, 502
Demophilus, Arian Bishop of Constantinople 63, 69
Deogratias, Bishop of Carthage 604
Deogratias, deacon 309
Desiderius, Bishop of Vienne 681
Desiderius, Lombard King 585
Deusdedit, Archbishop of Canterbury 593
Deusdedit, Bishop of Milan 578
Dhu Nuwas, Himyarite King 506
Diadochus of Photice 373, 493
Dictinius, Bishop 135
Didymus the Blind 99, 122
diocesis 650
Diocletian, Emperor 187, 195–196, 235, 237, 246, 312, 340, 345, 401, 589
Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus 74, 97–98, 188, 275
Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria 21, 122
Dionysius, Bishop of Milan 32, 197, 327
Dionysius, Pope 21
Dionysius Exiguus 600, 754
Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite 459, 489, 491–492, 495
Dioscorus, antipope 626
Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria 111–117, 121, 266–268, 421–423, 497
Discipline of the Secret 296
Diospolis, Synod of (415) 168–169, 258
diptychs 258, 429, 454, 616, 620
divorce 5, 395
Docetism 372
Dometian, Bishop of Ancyra 448–449,
Dominic, Bishop of Carthage 611
Domnus, Bishop of Antioch 111–112, 114, 359
Donatism 79, *136–161,* 204, 206, 232, 242–243, 245–246, 273–274, 301, 311, 336, 405, 417, 602–603, 609–611, 614, 709, 721, 745
—and the Circumcellions 138–140
—forced union of 347–361, 140–141, 152
—Golden Age 142–148
—attempted suppression of 373–377, 145
—decline 147–148
—and Augustine 148–161, 296, 301
—forced union of 405, 152
—toleration of 410, 153
—Religious Discussion of 411, 156–158
—suppression of 412, 158
—persistence 159
Donatus, Abbot of Servitanum 703, 705
Donatus, Bishop of Bagai 138, 140
Donatus, Bishop of Besançon 700
Donatus, Bishop of Carthage 136–138, 140–142
Donatus, Proconsul 153
Dorotheus, Abbot 487, 493
Dorotheus, Bishop of Thessalonica 624
Dracontius, Bishop of Hermopolis Parva 182
Drosis, martyr 187
Diuma, missionary in Mercia 594
Dunwich 592, 595
Dvin, Synod of (506) 481
—Synod of (554) 481
—Synod of (648/649) 482

Earconbert, King of Kent 598
East Anglia Kingdom of 589–590, 592–593, 598
Easter 302, 310, 312, 351, 416, 577, 588, 590 625, 648–649, 661, 667, 676–677, 683
—Triduum 302
—Season 303
—date of 22, 27, 522, 591, 594, 596, 599, 621
—letters of Jerome 126; of Cyril 183
Eastern illyricum 257, 262, 264, 496, 642
economus 351, 502
Ecthesis 460–461
Ecumenical Patriarch 497, 629–630
Edessa 57, 188–189, 330, 337, 364–366, 410, 430, 463–464, 475–476, 514, 739
Edwin, King of Northumbria 590–591, 594
Egbert, Archbishop of York 599
Egeria 306, 329, 357
Egypt 16–18, 27–28, 31, 35, 49–50, 64, 75, 110, 126, 221, 225, 234, 236–237, 242, 281, 305, 330, 337–338, 341–343, 353–356, 358–362, 368 374, 377, 421–426, 436–437, 446, 456, 458, 466, 470–471, 473, 478, 495–497, 508, 513–514, 624, 707, 742
—and evangelization 181–183, 189
—monasticism 343–360, 382, 384, 483, 485
—and Chalcedon 421–424
—Coptic Church 469–474, 484
Eleusius, Bishop of Cyzicus 57, 63, 70–71
Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem 431–432
Eligius, Bishop of Noyon 540
Elpidius 113
Elvira, Synod of (306/314) 209, 235, 276, 279 385, 398, 653
Emesa 57, 188
Emmeram 547–548
Enaton, monastery of 471
Encratites 362
Encyclion 424–425
England, parish in 648
Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia 621–622
entertainment, late Roman 414–416
Epaon, Synod of (517) 560, 645, 652, 682, 710
eparchia 233
Ephesus 52, 105–106, 165, 191–193, 237, 241, 330, 425–426, 436, 508
—Council of (431) 77, 103–108, 111–112, 114, 120, 174, 185, 190, 239, 263–264, 267–268, 288, 290–291, 328, 353, 370, 372–373, 422, 424, 426–427, 450, 463, 480, 603, 615, 731, 732
—Council of (449) 113–115, 121, 185, 243–244, 267, 421, 426, 450, 464, 614
Ephrem the Syrian 189, 342, 366, 371, 373, 410
Ephrem, Patriarch of Antioch 445–446, 449, 452, 489
Epiphania 188
Epiphanius, Bishop of Pavia 273
Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis 19, 72, 95, 123–126, 252, 272, 305, 328, 358, 371, 373
Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople 444
Epiphany 304–306, 385, 416 648, 667
Epistula Tractoria 170, 172, 174
Erhard, Bishop 548
Essex, Kingdom of 589–590, 594
Ethiopia 183–184, 366, 474, 506
—Liturgy of 291
Eucharist 129, 142, 160, 272, 278–280, 283, *296–298,* 311, 319–322, 324, 366–367, 628, 645, 648–649, 663–664, 670, 680, 683, 723
—Liturgy of the Word 296–297, 299, 631
—nuptial Mass 302
—in honour of martyrs 324
—*see also* Liturgy
Eucherius, Bishop of Lyon 382
Eudocia, Augusta 362, 423, 484
Eudocia, Vandal Queen 608
Eudoxius, Bishop of Antioch 49
Eudoxius, Bishop of Constantinople 61–63, 93
Eugene, Bishop of Carthage 204, 605–606
Eugene, Bishop of Toledo 573, 682
Eugene I, Pope 635
Eugene, usurper 202, 218, 220
Eugendus, Abbot of Condat 383
Eugippius, Abbot of Lucullanum 693–694
Eulalia of Mérida, Saint 331, 570
Eulalius, antipope 261
Eulogius, Bishop of Caesarea 167
Eulogius, priest 183
Eunapius of Sardes 220, 390
Eunomians 46, 74
Eunomius, Bishop of Cyzicus 45, 252
Euphemia, Saint 330, 453, 578
Euphemius, Patriarch of Constantinople 429–430
Euphratas, Bishop of Cologne 40
Euric, Visigothic King 528, 559–560, 563
Eusebius Gallicanus 726
Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea 3–16, 18, 23–27, 29–31, 80–81, 85–87, 89, 122, 125, 193, 222, 302, 414, 505, 526, 751
Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum 112–115, 267
Eusebius, Bishop of Emesa 323
Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli 42, 123, 275, 281, 377–378
—*vita communis* 377–378
—*monasterium clericorum* 377–378
Eusebius of Cremona 126
Eusebius of Nicomedia, Bishop of Constantinople 18, 23, 26, 29–31, 35, 37, 51, 227
—Eusebians 35–36, 247
Eustasius, Abbot of Luxeuil 543, 547–548
Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch 23, 30, 60, 94, 122, 188
Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste 63, 65, 67, 278, 367, 370, 405
Eustochium 361, 703
Eustorgius, Bishop of Milan 197

Euthymius, monk 185, 359, 483–485, 505, 511, 725
Eutropius 89, 336
Eutropius, Bishop of Valencia 703
Eutyches, Abbot, and Euthchians 111–115, 117, 120, 267, 370, 425, 432, 435, 622, 728–729, 737
Eutyches, missionary in the Crimea 193
Eutychian, anchorite 343
Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople 453, 456–457, 488
Euzoius, Bishop of Antioch 60, 62–63
Euzoius, Bishop of Tarsus 50
Evagrius, Bishop of Constantinople 63
Evagrius Ponticus 167, 215, 341, 356, 384, 447, 455, 492–493
evangelization of Western nations 517–601
—Irish 518–523
—Picts 519, 521, 523
—Scots of Caledonia 523
—Franks 524–558
—Burgundians 524–558
—Alemanni 541–543, 549, 551–552, 554
—Bavarians 544–549
—Main-Thuringia 550–552
—Visigoths 565–573
—Sueves 562–564
—Lombards 574–585
—Anglo-Saxons 585–601
—charitable activities 555–556, 558
—and the saints 556
—christianization of state and society 557–558
Evodius, Bishop 152
Evodius, Prefect 133
Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse 256, 384
Ezana, Ethiopian King 184
Eznik of Kolb 482

Fabian 717–718
Fabiola 411
Facundus of Hermiane 610, 728–731
Family, *see* marriage and family
Farfa, monastery 693
Fastidiosus, priest 719
Fausta, Augusta 12–13
Faustus, Bishop of Riez 382, 723, 726
Felix (II), antipope 43, 46, 249–250
Felix, Bishop, Apostle of East Anglia 592
Felix, Bishop of Aptonga 157
Felix, Bishop of Bologna 198
Felix, Bishop of Trier 134
—Felician Schism 134
Felix, monk 707
Felix, Numidian Bishop 706
Felix II, Pope 428–430, 433, 615–616, 636, 709
Felix III, Pope 626, 629, 639
Felix, Saint 330
Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage 610, 707
Filastrius, Bishop of Brescia 304, 744
Finnan, Abbot of Lindisfarne 594
Finnian, Saint 522
Firmicus Maternus 33, 216, 336
Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea 122
Firmus, rebel 145, 147
Flavian, Bishop of Antioch 188, 372
Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople 107, 111–115, 117, 120, 267
—*Epistula Dogmatica ad Flavianum, see* Leo I, Pope
Flavian, Patriarch of Antioch 432
Flavian, Vicar 145
Florentina, nun 703
Florian, Bishop of Arles 641
foederati 226, 432, 512, 559, 574, 603
Fontaine, monastery 534, 701
Franks 226, 524–528, 554, 559, 561, 563, 574–575, 577, 584–585, 622, 630, 638, 662, 671–672, 686, 714, 725, 752
—national church of 528, 530–558, 597, 630
—proprietary church 533
—monasticism 534–535
—mission work 535–558
—ecclesiastical organization 541–542
—Salian 536–537
Fravitas, Patriarch of Constantinople 429, 617
Freising 548
Fridolin 543, 548
Frisians 540, 549, 551
Frithona, *see* Deusdedit, Archbishop of Canterbury
Fritigern, Visigothic Prince 227
Fritigil, Marcomannic Princess 198
Fructuosus, Bishop of Braga 573, 691, 704
—*Pactum* 570, 704
—*Regula Monachorum* 704
Frumentius, Bishop of Axum 183–184
Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe 607, 647, 679, 693, 706–707, 709, 711, *716–721,* 722–726, 728, 736, 752, 756
—doctrine of grace 723–725, 728
Furseus, Abbot of Cnobheresburg 592

Gadabitini 206
Gainas 89
Gainas, Patriarch of Alexandria 446, 456
—Gaianites 456, 470
Gaiseric, Vandal King 206, 269, 559, 602, 603–605, 608, 706, 708
Gall, monk 542–543
Galla Placidia, Augusta 115, 267
Gallinara 377, 380
Gallus, Caesar 33–34, 51–52, 55, 325
Galswintha, Frankish Queen 713
Gangra 117
—Synod of (340/341) 193, 278, 367
Garamantes 206, 611
Garmul, King 611
Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia 198–199, 212, 332
Gaudentius, monk 693
Gaul 59, 519, 523, 524–525, 529, 535, 553, 559, 561, 568, 584, 585–587, 592, 594,

613, 622, 628, 639, 641, 644–645, 647, 649, 652–654, 656–657, 659, 663, 666–670, 672–673, 676–679, 682–684, 688–689, 691–692, 710, 723, 725, 744, 752–753
—evangelization of 207–209, 381, 535–541
—monasticism in 379–384, 523, 534–535, 598–599, 699–703
Gaza 57, 185, 358–359, 431, 448–449, 484–485
—Synod of, and Origenism 448–449
—Synod of (542) 469
Gelasius, Abbot of the New Laura 448–449
Gelasius I, Pope 88, 203, 240, 270, 272, 276, 283, 289, 430, 433, *616–622,* 741
—pastoral activity of 619–620
—liturgical activity of 619–620, 658–659, 670
Gelimer, Vandal King 608
Genethlius, Bishop of Carthage 145
Gennadius, Bishop of Constantinople 729
Gennadius of Marseille 204, 348, 385, 693
Genoa 575–577, 580, 733
George, Exarch of Carthage 612
George of Cappadocia, Bishop of Alexandria 33, 44, 49, 51–52, 184
Georgians, evangelization of 190
Gepids 229–230, 574
Gerasa, monastery 357
Gerasimus, Abbot 359
Germain, Bishop of Auxerre 211, 518–519, 524, 556
Germanic peoples 225–230, 524–612
—national churches 229, 528–558, 564–573, 583–585, 597
—conversion to Arianism 230, 614
—Conversion to Catholicism 524–598
—laws of 556–557
Germanius, Bishop of Sirmium 45
Gerona, Synod of (517) 655, 678
Gerontius, monk 362
Ghassanid Arabs 458, 475, 478–479, 510, 512–513
Gildas 521–522
Gildo, usurper 147
Godepert, Lombard 581
Golinduch, Saint 501
Goswintha, Visigothic Queen 563
Goths 226, 229–230, 437, 520, 524–526, 556, 558–559, 561–564, 566, 568, 573, 583, 597, 725
—evangelization of the 193–194, 214, 225–230, 517
Gozbert, Duke of the Main Area 551
Grado 576, 578–579, 583, 585, 634, 733–735
Gratian, Emperor 67–68, 86, 132, 415
Gratus, Bishop of Carthage 137–138, 140–141
Gregory, Bishop of Elvira 223, 316
Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa 66, 74, 86, 96, 122, 310, 313–314, 323, 371, 373, 414, 417
Gregory, Bishop of Tours 209, 524–526, 528, 536, 686–688, 700, 710, 712–714, 725, 749–750, 752–753
Gregory, Exarch of Carthage 464, 612–613
Gregory I, Pope 77, 203–204, 215, 223, 307, 497, 530, 569, 571–572, 577, 579, 586–589, 591, 596–597, 611, *629–633,* 637, 640–641, 643–644, 650, 653–654, 656, 660–661, 664, 673–674, 680–681, 684, 689, 710, 713, 722, 725, 728, 733–735, 736, *744–750,* 750, 753, 756
—pastoral activity 631–633
—writings 631, 654, 744–750
—and monasticism 632, 692, 693–694, 695–696, 698
—and evangelization 632, 747–748
—and the liturgy 658–660
—exegesis 745–747
Gregory II, Pope 660, 663, 665
Gregory, Prefect 137
Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop of Sasima and of Constantinople 64–67, 69–73, 86, 96, 122, 194, 294, 296, 313, 341, 368, 370, 412, 414, 730, 744
Gregory of Cappadocia, Bishop of Alexandria 36, 40
Gregory Thaumaturgus 122
Gregory the Illuminator 192, 238, 480
Grimoald, Lombard King 581
Gundeperga, Lombard Queen 579–580
Gundobad, Burgundian King 527, 711
Gunthamund, Vandal King 606, 706
Guntram, Burgundian King 531, 557, 641

Hadrian I, Pope 659
Hadrian of Naples 582, 595, 599
Hadrianum 659–660, 665, 670
Hadrumetum, monastery 175
Hagia Sophia 503
handwriting, insular 600
Hatfield, Synod of (679) 597
Heden II, Duke of the Main Area 551–552
Helena, mother of Constantine I 9–10, 30, 329
Heliandlied 722
Helladius, Bishop of Caesarea 74
Helvidius 130, 336, 392
Henoticon (of 482) 426–437, 445–446, 480–481, 615
(of 567) 457
Heraclius, Emperor *458–461,* 461, 468, 471, 476, 481–482, 498–500, 512–513, 661
Hereford 596
Hermenegild, Visigothic Prince 563–564, 713–714
hermits 338, 343–345, 362–366, 368, 374, 377, 380, 390, 478, 493, 538, 690, 693, 702
—communities of 343–345, 364, 380, 486
—island hermits 377–378, 693, 702
Hermogenes Neoplatonist philosopher 7
Heros, Bishop of Arles 167
Heruli 229–230, 507, 574

Hesse 552
—parish in 648
Hexham 596
Hilarion, monk 185, 327, 358
Hilary 175
Hilary, Bishop of Arles 265, 382
Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers 42, 46, 59, 83–84, 94, 123, 212, 273, 285, 306, 380, 528, 556, 755
Hilary, papal legate 611
Hilary, Pope 113–114, 281, 614, 637–638
Hilda, Abbess of Whitby 596
Hilderic, Vandal King 608, 625
Himerius 219
Himerius, Bishop of Tarrangona 254, 385, 682
Himyarites 186, 506
Hippo 103, 148–150, 174, 275, 281, 331, 333, 378, 387–389, 411, 603
—Synod of (393) 150, 353
Hippolytus 93, 330
—Canons of 278, 677
—*Traditio Apostolica* 283, 320
Hira 189, 510
Hispana collection 572–573, 754–755
Historia Lausiaca 344, 355
Historia Monachroum 344, 354, 363, 695
Hlothere, Bishop of Winchester 593
Holy Spirit, divinity of the 62–63, 66–74
homoios 47, 716
—Homoians 49, 61, 63, 65, 85–86, 227–228, 708
homoiousios 46, 61, 85, 755
—Homoiousians 49, 61–63, 65, 71, 85, 249, 755
homoousios 21, 25–26, 36–37, 45, 62, 67, 73–74, 83, 249, 708–709, 755
Honoratus, Archdeacon of Salona 643
Honoratus, Bishop of Arles 381–382
Honorius, Emperor 152–153, 158, 170, 202, 205, 222, 258–259, 261–262, 399, 405, 411, 415, 496
—Edict of Union 152–153
Honorius I, Pope 458–462, 503, 569, 580, 591, 593, 633–634, 660, 692, 735
Hormisdas, Pope 432, 435–437, 444, 561, *622–625,* 627, 636–637
—*Formula Hormisdae* (*Regula Fidei Hormisdae*) 435, 445, 622, 627
Horsiesi, Abbot 347–348, 351–353
Hosius, Bishop of Córdoba 20, 22, 24, 26, 29, 37–38, 43, 45, 84, 246, 374, 385
hospitals 409–411
Hubert 540
Huneric, Vandal King 571, 605–606, 706, 708
Huns 227, 576
Hyginus, Bishop of Córdoba 131–132
Hymns in the liturgy 499–500, 672
Hypatia, philosopher 182, 220
Hypatius, Bishop of Ephesus 443
Hypatius, monk 192, 369
Ibas, Bishop of Edessa 110, 114, 119, 431, 444, 450–451, 454, 463–464, 728–731, 734
Iberians 209, 481, 484
icon 500–501, 504, 508
Idacius, Bishop of Mérida 131–135
Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch 287, 340
Ildefonse, Bishop of Toledo 573, 677, 685
Illtud, Abbot of Calday 521
Illus 426–427
Illyricum, evangelization of 195
imposition of hands 676–677, 682–683
India, Thomas Tradition of 189
Ine, King of Wessex 597, 598
Ingundis, wife of Hermenegild 563, 713–714
Innocent I, Pope 135, 162, 169–170, 174, 210, 235, 239, 243, 255–259, 261–262, 270, 272, 279, 306, 376, 653
—and disciplinary problems 256–257
—and *causae maiores* 257
—and John Chrysostom 257–258
—and Pelagianism 258–259
Instantius, Bishop 130, 132–134
Iona 523, 594
Ireland, conversion of 517–523, 524, 591–596, 598, 600–601, 644, 753
—monastic character of Church 521–523
—schools 522–523, 600–601
Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyon 225, 287
Irene 375
Isaac, Accuser of Pope Damasus I 250
Isaac, Bishop of Geneva 199
Isaac, Bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon 238
Isaac, monk 370
Isauria, evangelization of 190
Ishar Yahb, *Catholicus* of Persia 467
Isidore, Bishop of Pelusium 729
Isidore, Bishop of Seville 272, 568–569, *571–573,* 584, 600, 645, 655, 669–672, 682–683, 689, 691, 693, 736, *750–756*
—writings of 571–573, 750–755
—*Regula Monachorum* 703–704, 754
—*Etymologiae* 751–752
Isidore, priest of Alexandria 124
Islam 462, 467, 469, 471–472, 476, 478–479, 482, 488, 495, 496, 508, 509, *509–514,* 611–612, *612–614,* 707
—condition of Christians under 513–514
Italy 507, 519, 543–544, 559–561, 572–573, 582–585, 604, 613, 618–619, 625, 627, 629–632, 635, 640, 647, 650, 661, 673, 684, 711, 714–716, 733, 735, 739, 743–744, 748
—monasticism in 374–379, 388, 691, 693–698, 702
—Lombards in 574–585
Italy, central and southern (*Italia Suburbicaria*) 201–203, 215, 234, 243
Italy, upper, and Raetia (*Italia Annonaria*) 197–201, 234–235
Ithacius, Bishop of Ossonuba 132–134

Jacob Baradai, Bishop of Edessa 457, 470–471, 475
Jacobite Church 470, *475–479,* 483, 511–512
—Syriac ecclesiastical literature 477–478
—monasticism 478
Jacobus 166
James, Bishop of Edessa 477
James of Sarug 477
Jarrow, monastery 599, 665
Jerome 50, 58, 90, 123–128, 131, 162, 164, 167, 171, 212–213, 228, 249, 253–254, 272, 291, 312, 316, 323, 329, 336, 350, 353, 358, 360–362, 375, 377, 384–385, 392, 400, 405, 407, 412, 414, 572, 672, 703–705, 740, 746, 751
Jerusalem 9, 123–125, 127, 167, 184–185, 222, 239, 291, 297, 303, 305–306, 320, 324, 329, 339, 354, 358, 359, 361–362, 410, 423, 425, 427, 442, 445, 483–484, 498, 500, 513, 514, 659, 661
—patriarchate of 185, 236, 239, 442, 498
—Synod of (331) 193
—Synod of (518) 186
—Synod of (536) 186
John, Abbot of the Acemetae 370
John, Apostle 241, 330
John, archcantor at St. Peter's 665
John, Bishop of Antioch 104–105, 107–111, 239, 263
—and Cyril of Alexandria 108–112
John, Bishop of Aquileia 735
John, Bishop of Ilici 624, 636–637
John, Bishop of Jerusalem 123–124, 127, 167–168, 239
John, Bishop of Justiniana Prima 642–643, 680
John, Bishop of Scythopolis 489
John, Count 105–106, 336
John II, Patriarch of Alexandria 469
John II, Patriarch of Constantinople 435, 623
John, Patriarch of Jerusalem 432
John I, Pope 437, *625,* 627, 737
John II, Pope 433, 444–445, 626, 629, 639
John III, Pope 629, 693
John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople 89, 97–98, 128, 187–189, 193–194, 212, 214, 223, 228, 243, 257–258, 272, 294, 296, 308, 310, 314–315, 317–319, 322–323, 332–333, 337, 363, 366–367, 370, 383, 392, 396, 401, 404, 408, 413–415, 496, 508, 730
—Liturgy of 291, 499
—as preacher 314–315
John Climacus 487, 494
John Damascene 372
John Kolobus 356
John Mandakuni 482
John Moschus 485
John Philoponus, philosopher 470, 490–491, 508
John Talaia 426–429
John of Asia, missionary 438, 477, 508
John of Biclar, Bishop of Gerona 206, 564, 571, 704
John of Cappadocia 438
John of Ephesus 192
John III the Almoner, Patriarch of Alexandria 471, 495
John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople 497, 630
John the Grammarian 489
John the Scholastic, Patriarch of Constantinople 457, 498–499
Jonas, Abbot of Halmyrissus 194
Jovian, Emperor 60, 218
Jovinian 167, 255, 323, 392–393
Judaism 5, 27, 89, 181, 185–187, 197, 311, 327–328, 396, 458, 511, 677
—and Christian evangelization 221–224, 508
—and Justinian I 439, 508, 609
Judicatum of Sergius 459
Judicatum of Pope Vigilius 452, 454, 610
Julian, Bishop of Aeclanum 171–174
Julian, Bishop of Toledo 569–570, 573, 669
Julian, Emperor 33–34, *50–59,* 60, 62, 97, 141, 157, 185–188, 212, 214, 217, 219–220, 222, 390
—education of 51–52
—adherence to paganism 52–54
—character 52
—attempted restoration of paganism 34, 54–59, 191
—reform of paganism 54–56
—and the teaching profession 55–56
—resistance of pagans to reform 56
—removal of Christians from official posts 56–57
—and the bishops 57–58
—and Donatism 141–142
—writings 58
—death of 58–59
Julian of Halicarnassus 446, 455, 469–470, 490
Julianus Pomerius 695
Julius, Bishop of Puteoli 113
Julius I, Pope 35–38, 40–41, 84, 201, 247–248
Junca, Synod of (523) 608
Justin I, Emperor 433–437, 506, 608, 623–625
Justin II, Emperor 457, 477, 499, 508, 610
—and the Monophysites 457
Justinian I, Emperor 77, 89, 192, 195, 270, 278, 357, 399, *433–456,* 457, 467, 469, 475, 477, 481, 485, 487–489, 496, 498–499, 503–504, 506–508, 558, 561, 566, 568, 571, 574, 576, 608–611, 623, 626–628, 640, 642, 711, 715, 739, 750–751
—and unity 437–438
—and pagans 438–439, 474
—and Jews 439
—and Samaritans 439

—and heretics 439
—position in the Church 439–443, 451–452, 456, 628
—and negotiations with the Monophysites 443–447
—reconquest of Italy 445–446
—and Origen 448–449
—and the Three Chapters 450–456, 610, 728–729
—and Aphthartodocetism 455–456
Justinian II, Emperor 503, 635
Justiniana Prima 498, 642–643
Justus, Bishop of Rochester 592
Justus, Vicar 191
Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem 117, 185, 214, 239, 359, 423, 483–484, 505

Kairawan 613
Kellia 354–355
Kent, Kingdom of 588–592, 594–595, 598
Kilian 540, 551
Kiurion, *Catholicus* of the Iberians 481
Korium 482
Kunincpert, Lombard King 581, 583–584

La Cisa Pass 575
Lactantius 216, 336
laity in the Church 334–337
—growing separation from clergy 334–335
—and election of bishop 335
—end of lay preaching 335
—lay theologians 335–336
—administration of Church property 336
—lay apostolate 336–337
Lakhmids 189, 510, 512
Lambert 540
Lampsacus, Synod of (c. 364) 61–62
Lantechild 525
Laodicea, "Synod" of 233, 332, 335
Lateran basilica 10, 22, 589, 658
—palace 246, 621, 661
—baptistery 264
—*schola* of 664
—Synod of (649) 461, 580, 612, 635, 707
—Synod of (680) 462, 635
laura 358–359, 432, 447, 449, 483–484, 511, 707
Latin liturgies 292, 361, 585
—Gallican 292–293, 666–670, 722
—Romano-African 292
—Celtic 292
—Spanish 292–293, 666–668, 670, 722
—Ambrosian 292
—Roman 292–293, 297–298
Laurentian Schism 430, 620
Lawrence, antipope 620–621
Lawrence, Bishop of Milan 577
Lawrence, Saint 330, 556, 570
Lazarus, Bishop of Aix 167
Lazica 506–507
—conversion of 506–507
Lea 375
Leander, Bishop of Seville 564, 566, 569, 571, 637, 691, 703, 705, 713, 745
—"*Rule*" of 703
Lent 302–303, 309–310, 409, 660, 665, 670–672, 674, 676
Leo I, Emperor 410, 422–424, 615
Leo II, Emperor 424
Leo I, Pope 88, 101, 107, 112–121, 174, 188, 203, 223, 239–240, 243–245, 264–269, 272, 276, 279–280, 283, 289, 303, 319, 335, 376, 383, 409, 421–422, 424, 442, 497, 517–518, 586, 604, 614, 618, 622, 624, 629, 637, 653 658, 681, 730, 732
—*Epistula Dogmatica ad Flavianum* 107, 113, 115–116, 118–120, 268, 422, 424, 427, 432, 435, 480, 488, 615
—and the liturgy 658–659
Leo II, Pope 569, 634
Leontius, Bishop of Antioch 45
Leontius, Bishop of Neapolis 495, 508
Leontius, Emperor 613
Leontius, monk of the New Laura 448
Leontius of Byzantium 489, 738
Leontius of Jerusalem (or of Byzantium) 495
Leovigild, Visigothic King 561, 563–564, 710–715
Leporius 102
Lérida, Council of (523) 709
Lérins 265, 275, 381–382, 588, 600, 690, 699, 726
Letoius, Bishop of Mytilene 372
Lex Alemannorum 557
Lex Baiuvariorum 557
Lex Ribuaria, 557
Lex Romana Visigothorum 560, 566, 572–573
Lex Salica 557
Libanius, *rhetor* 52, 187, 218–219, 390, 414
Liber Heraclidis 107
Liber Ordinum 669–670, 754
Liber Pontificalis 660
Liberatus, Primate of Byzacena 706
Liberian basilica 264, 306, 660–662, 684
Liberius, Pope 41–43, 45–46, 48, 61–63, 82–83, 201, 248–250, 252
Libya 16, 18, 28, 49, 225, 234, 236, 243, 497, 611
—Libyan desert 338, 354
Lichfield 595–596, 599
Licinius, Emperor 3–4, 6, 16, 187, 195
Ligugé 380
Lincoln 211
Lindisfarne 594–596
Lindsey 596
Literature, Byzantine (451–700), *488–495*
—character 488–489
—theologians 489–492
—other writers 493–495
—homiletics 494–495
—lack of creativity 495
liturgical year 302–307, 671–672
Liturgy *289–307, 307–319, 499–500, 658–672*

—relationship to evangelization 289–290, 293–297
—differentiation between eastern and western 290–293
—characteristics of Oriental liturgies 291–292
—baptism 293–296
—Eucharist 296–298
—penance 299–301
—matrimony 301–302
—liturgical year 302–307, 499–500
—catechesis 307–312
—homily 310–319
—hours of prayer 320–321
—Byzantine 292–293, 499–500
—dress 666
Liturgy, Roman 658–668, 670, 672
Liturgy, West Syrian 291
Liturgy of James 291
Liturgy of Mark 291
Liturgy of the Hours *670–672*
—double vigil at Rome 671
Liuthard, Bishop 586
Liutprand, Lombard King 583–584
Livania 168
Lombards 229–230, 526, 543, *574–585,* 597, 629–630, 632–633, 691, 698, 715–716, 733–735, 748
—conversion to Catholicism 715
—national church 583–585
London 211, 521, 585, 589, 592, 595–596
Lorch 196, 536, 545
Lucian of Antioch 17, 312
Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari 42, 44, 60, 84–85
Lucius, Bishop of Alexandria 64, 391
Lupus, Bishop of Troyes 382, 525, 556
Luxeuil, monastery 523, 534–535, 539, 540–544, 547, 549, 552, 554, 556, 558, 592, 701–702
Lyon 199, 207, 382–383, 531, 600, 641, 656
—Council of (583) 649

Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem 23
Macarius, imperial agent 138, 140
Macarius, monk of Scete 356, 373, 704
Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch 462
Maccurites 206
Macedonia, evangelization of 194
Macedonians 71, 73–74, 252, 417
Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople 49, 370
Macedonius, Bishop of Philai 182
Macedonius, *magister officiorum* 132
Macedonius, Patriarch of Constantinople 430–432, 435
Macellum in Cappadocia 51–52
Mâcon, Synod of (581) 652
Mâcon, Synod of (585) 641, 652, 656, 675–676
Macrobius, Bishop 141
Macrobius, Proconsul 153
Magnentius, usurper 40–41, 212
Magnus, Bishop 133
Magusaeans 192
Mainz 225, 550, 552
Maiuma 57, 185, 358
Malabar Christians 291, 468
Malmesbury 601
Malta 203
Manichaeans 130, 132, 135, 172–173, 207, 265, 338, 342, 362, 368, 443, 621, 726
Mansuetus, Bishop of Milan 581
Marathonius, Bishop of Nicomedia 63
Marathonius, monk 370
Marcella 126–127
Marcellina 375
Marcellinus, Count 165, 336
Marcellinus, Senator 153, 156–158
Marcellus, Abbot of the Acemetae 370
Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra 23, 37–38, 67, 94
Marcian, Emperor 115–118, 268, 422, 442, 565
Marcomanni 198
Marculus, Bishop 140–141
Marcus, Bishop of Arethusa 33
Marcus, Egyptian 130
Marcus, priest 151
Mardonius, teacher 51–52
Marius Mercator 162
Marius Victorinus 56, 336
Mark, Evangelist 267
Mark, Pope 201, 247
Marmoutier 380–381
marriage, clerical 277–280, 302, 367, 503
marriage and family 5, 394–401
—Christian understanding of 394–396
—impediments 396
—of slaves 396–397
—rights of father 396–400
—equality of spouses 397–398
—parents and children 652, 398–400
—exposure of children 398–399
—orphanages 399
—adoption 399–400
—abortion 400
—illegitimate children 400
Marseille 175–176, 383–384, 587
Martin, Bishop of Braga 211, 562, 571, 644, 674–675, 677, 703
Martin, Bishop of Tours 133–134, 194, 208–209, 214, 327, 331, 377, *380–382,* 384, 524, 528, 556, 562, 571, 586, 645, 687, 700, 703
Martin I, Pope 461, 530, 612, 635–636
Martyrius, Abbot of Phbow 353
Martyrius, Bishop of Jerusalem 359
Marutha, Bishop of Maipherkat 325
Mary, Blessed Virgin 99–101, 106–107, 328–329, 392, 398, 444, 500–501, 556, 570, 573, 684–685, 729
Mascazel 147
Masona, Bishop of Mérida 564
Masruq, Sabaean King 187
Master, Rule of the 691, *694–696,* 743

Masuna, Berber King 611
matrimony 394–401
Mauretania 604, 613
Maurice, Emperor 458, 466, 481, 497, 500, 512, 577–578, 611, 630, 734–735, 745
Maximian, Bishop of Bagai 151–152
Mawia, Princess 186
Maxentius, Scythian monk 436
Maximian, Bishop of Constantinople 106, 108
Maximian, Bishop of Ravenna 661
Maximian, Donatist Bishop 146
—Maximianists 146–147, 150–151, 157
Maximian, Donatist martyr 140
Maximin, monk of Chinon 381
Maximinus, Arian writer 715
Maximinus, Bishop of Trier 38
Maximinus Daia, Emperor 345
Maximus, Bishop of Emona 201
Maximus, Bishop of Trier 198
Maximus, Bishop of Turin 212, 306–307, 316, 332
Maximus, philosopher 51–52, 58
Maximus, uncanonical Bishop of Constantinople 71, 75–76, 252
Maximus, usurper 132–134
Maximus Confessor 460–462, 487, 492–493, 612, 707
Maximus of Lérins, Bishop of Riez 382
Maziken tribe 356
Mecca 509, 511
Medina 511
Melania the Elder 360–361, 375
—double monastery on Mount Olivet 360
Melania the Younger 361–362, 375, 379, 404
Melchiades, Pope 246
Meletius, Bishop of Antioch 60, 62–63, 65, 67–68, 70–71, 76, 96, 188
Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis 27
Melkites 470, 472, 476, 514
Mellitus, Bishop of London 592, 633
Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus 105–106
Memor, Bishop 171
Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople 445–446, 449, 452–453, 627
Menas, Saint 330, 370, 410, 473
Menuthis 182, 501
Mérida 711
—Synod of (666) 647, 657
Merobaudes, *patricius* 225
Merovingian Monarchy 224, 525, 527–533, 535–537, 549, 553, 555–556, 558, 568, 588, 593, 599, 630, 640–641, 647, 650, 657–658, 659, 661, 711
—national Church 528, 530–558, 586, 592, 631, 641, 657
—proprietary church 533
—monasticism 533–535, 690–691, 696–697, 699–702
—missionary work 535–558
—ecclesiastical organization 541–542
Mesrop 480, 482
Messalianism 365, *371–373*, 387, 464, 493
Metanoia, monastery 350, 353
Methodius 122
metropolitan organization 207, 232–236, 241–243
—provincial synod 241–242
—interprovincial synod 242–243
Michael Caerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople 497
Michael the Syrian 458
Milan 50, 86–88, 197, 199, 202, 232, 234–235, 238, 243, 249, 257, 270, 333, 377–378, 380, 393, 517, 575–578, 580–582, 584, 597, 628–629, 633, 715, 733.
—evangelizing activity of 197–198, 200
—liturgy of 293
—Synod of (355) 42, 82–84, 244, 248
—Synod of (392–393) 199
—Synod of (451) 199
Mileve 258
—Synod of (416) 169
—Synod of (417) 245
Mirian, King of the Georgians 190
Mirocles, Bishop of Milan 197
missionary activity *181–230*
—dangers in the fourth century 181
—irregular progress 212
—method 213–224
—lay cooperation 213–214
—role of the state 217–221
—pagan reaction 219–221
—quality of results 221
—and Judaism 221–224
—and the Germans 225–230
Monarchianism 21
monasteries, double 360, 599
monasterium clericorum 385
Monasterium Servitanum 571, 703, 705
monasticism 410, 447, 692–694
—background 337–342, 375
—motives 339–341
—Christian ideal of perfection 342
—and evangelization 183, 188, 215
—anti-monastic currents 390–393
—and the hierarchy 391, 691–692
—and lay circles 391–393
—Nestorian 468
monasticism, eastern *343–360, 362–368,* 374, 470, 473, 478, *483–488,* 510
—Egyptian anchorites 343–345, 354–355, 362–363
—Egyptian cenobites 338–339, 345–354, 359
—Nitria and Scete 354–357
—Palestine 357–360
—Latin monasteries in Palestine 360–362, 374
—Syria 362–367, 478
—Greek 367–371, 486
—Messalianism 365, 371–373
—dangers in 486–487
monasticism, Greek *367–371,* 442, *486*
—and Chalcedon 371, 486–487
—and Justinian I 487–488

monasticism, western *374–393, 690–707*
—Latin monasteries in Palestine, 360–362, 374
—Rome and Italy 375–379
—Gaul 379–384, 534–535, 540–541, 551, 691
—Spain 385–386, 691, 702–705
—North Africa 386–390, 705–707
—Celtic 521–523, 535, 690–692, 698
—Germany 551, 554
—England 597–598
—missionary activity 692
—schools 692
Monoenergism 121, 459–460, 471, 476, 482, 489, 492
Monophysitism and Monophysites 109, 111–114, 184, 186, 216, 290, 359, 417, 427, 430–432, 434, 438, 442–446, 451, 455, 457–460, 462–463, 464–467, 469–472, 474–477, 479, 481, 484–485, 490–492, 496, 501, 504, 506, 508, 510–511, 514, 615–617, 622, 627
Monothelitism 121, 460–463, 530, 569, 580–582, 597, 612, 633–635, 664, 707, 715
Montanists 273, 443
Montanus, Bishop of Toledo 136
Monte Gargano 581, 687
Montecassino 202, 694
Moses, Arabian Bishop 186
Moses II, *Catholicus* of Armenia 481
Mount Auxentius 369
Mount Sinai 357, 483, 485
Muhammad 187, 511–513
Muslims, see Islam

Naples 201–203, 604, 693
Narbonne 235, 561
—Synod of (589) 651–652
Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem 343
Narsai of Edessa 365
Narses, general 577–578
Narses, head of school of Edessa 464
Nazianzus 62
Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople 74
Negran 186, 189
Neocaesarea, Synod of (314/315) 193, 233
Nephalius 431
Nepos, Bishop of Arsinoe 122
Nerses III, *Catholicus* of Armenia 482
Nerses the Great 479
Nestorian Church *463–469,* 473, 476, 480–481, 504
—in Persia 464–469, 481
—missionary activity 468–469
Nestorianism 120, 186, 189, 216, 290–291, 383, 431, 436–437, 444, 465, 467–469, 481, 510–511, 514, 624, 716, 728–730, 738
Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople 98, 100–110, 112, 118, 120, 174, 243, 262–263, 288–289, 292, 370, 425, 432, 435, 437, 450–451, 463, 622
—and Cyril of Alexandria 100–110
Netras, Bishop of Pharan 357
Neustria 531, 556, 701
New Laura, monastery 448, 455, 484
Nicaea 116
—First Council of (325) 6–7, 11, *22–29,* 65–66, 70–71, 74–75, 77, 79, 85, 94, 99, 100, 106, 116, 183, 185–186, 189–191, 193–194, 226, 233, 236–237, 239, 241, 246, 248, 258, 260, 269, 274, 278, 288, 302, 307, 312, 320, 417, 427, 716–719, 721
Nicaea-Constantinople, Creed of; *see* Constantinople, Creed of
Nicasius, Bishop of Reims 685
Nicene Creed 25–29, 34, 37–38, 42, 44, 48–49, 59–61, 65, 67, 69, 71–73, 78, 82–83, 94, 104–105, 111, 118, 120, 246, 251, 377, 424, 711, 713
Nicetas, Bishop of Remesiana 194–195, 695
Nicetius, Bishop of Trier 527, 574
Nicomedia 16, 18, 22, 29, 52
Nika Riot of 532–443
Nikagoras, Neoplatonist philosopher 7
Ninian, Apostle of the Picts 211, 519, 523
Nino 190
Nisibis 57, 468
—school of 464, 466
Nitria, Desert of 126, 337, 343–344, 354–356, 361, 380, 391
Noman, Ghassanid Prince 512
Noman, Lakhmid Sheik 512
Nomocanones 499
Nonnus, monk of the New Laura 448
Noricum, evangelization of 196–197, 201
North African Episcopal Synod 150, 234, 238, 242, 608
Northumbria, Kingdom of 587, 590–591, 593–596, 599, 601
Notitia Antiochena 498
Notitiae Episcopatuum 498
Novatian 93, 163, 343
Novatians 6, 274, 443
Nubia 473–474
Numidia 604, 610–611

Oceanus 126
Odoacer, King of Italy 618
Olympus in Bithynia 343
Omar II, Caliph 613
Oppila 712
Optatus, Bishop of Mileve 143, 414
Optatus, Bishop of Thamugadi 146–148
Orange, Synod of (441) 243, 280, 405, 647, 654
—Synod of (529) 626, 727–728, 749
Orders, clerical 270–273
Orders, lesser 270, 302, 647
—subdeacon 270–272, 279, 283, 651
—acolyte 270–272, 283

—exorcist 270–271
—porter 270
—lector 270, 283, 297, 646, 651
ordination 281–289
Ordines Romani 661
—*Ordo* I 661–664, 666
— XI 661
— XII 671
— XIV 671
— XV 664
— XVI 671
— XXVII 661
— XXXIV 661, 666
Origen 21, 78, 93, 167, 277, 316, 320, 329, 341, 356, 361, 447–449, 451, 454–455, 492–493, 740–741, 746–747
—on the Trinity 21
—and Christology 93, 96
—orthodoxy of *121–129,* 256, *447–449*
—*Peri Archon* 125, 127–128, 449
—condemned at Alexandria 126
—new controversy of sixth century 447–449, 451, 454–455, 484
—condemned in 553 129, 455
Orléans 531, 536
—Synod of (511) 528, 533, 560, 648, 700, 710
—Synod of (533) 651, 653
—Synod of (538) 679
—Synod of (541) 647, 649
—Synod of (583) 652
Orosius 162, 167, 226, 414
Ostia 201–202
Ostrogoths 227, 229–230, 430, 433–434, 445–446, 507, 528, 559–560, 574, 618–619, 627, 691, 715, 739–740, 743
Oswald, King of Northumbria 594
Oswiu, King of Northumbria 594, 599
Othmar, Abbot of Sankt Gallen 543

Pachomius, monk 338, 345–354, 383, 487
—and cenobitism 346–354, 694
—Pachomian "order" 339, 341, 345–346, 351–354
—*Rule* of 345–354, 369, 383, 690, 695, 704
—external structure 346–347
—superiors 346–347
—and the hierarchy 349
—simple form 349
—new foundations 351
—nuns 351
Pacian, Bishop of Barcelona 316
Padua 197, 659
Paduense 660
paganism, attempted restoration of 50–59
—reforms of Julian 53–57
—pagan resistance to reform 56
paganism, mission to 181–182, 508, 540–541, 611–612
paganism, suppression of 7–9, 11–12, 33–34, 205, 216–221
—plundering of temples 8
—persistence in Rome 201–202
—persistence in Africa 204–205
—pagan defense 219–221
—by Justinian I 438–439, 508, 609
pagan survivals in Christian piety 331–334
Palamon, hermit 345
Palencia 136
Palestine, monasticism in 357–361, 423, 447–449, 452, 483–485, 493
—Latin monasteries in 360–362, 374
—laura 358
Palestine, pilgrimage to 9, 184, 328–329, 368, 374
Palestine and evangelization 184–186, 505
Palestine and Origenism 447–449
Palladius, Bishop of Helenopolis 344, 355
—*Historia Lausiaca* 344, 355
Palladius, missionary Bishop in Ireland 215, 518–520
Pammachius 125–127, 411
Pamphilus 122, 125
Pannonia, evangelization of 196
Pantaleon 495
papacy, development (311–460) *245–269*
—expansion of jurisdiction 250–252, 254, 258–257
—appeal to 252–253, 257, 262, 267
—universal authority 254–255, 630
—and *causae maiores* 257, 260, 640
—and Chalcedon 268–269
—development (460–701) *614–636*
Papas Eusebius 448
Paphnutius 23
parabolani 113
Parembolai 185, 505, 510–511
Paris 50, 530–531, 536–539
—Synod of (c. 360) 59
—Synod of (577) 531
—Synod of (614) 641
parish 188, 233, *644–650,* 656–657
—school 646–647
—visitation of 674
Parmenian, Bishop of Carthage 142–145
—ecclesiology of 143
—and Tyconius 143–144
Parthenius, Bishop of Lampsacus 193
Paschasinus, Bishop, papal legate 117
Passarion, *chorepiscopus* 359
Passau 200
Paternus, Bishop of Braga 135
patriarchate 119, 236–241, 750
—and the liturgy 290–293
Patrick, Apostle of Ireland 211, 518–521
—*Confessio* 518
Patroclus, Bishop of Arles 260
Paul, Apostle 11, 131, 194, 253, 278–279, 314, 330, 412, 517, 526, 654, 685–686, 741, 749
Paul, Bishop of Emesa 108
Paul, imperial agent 138, 140
Paul, Patriarch of Alexandria 447–448
Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople 612

Paul of Neocaesarea 23
Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch 20–21
Paul of Tella 477
Paul the Deacon, historian 575–576
Paula the Elder 360–361, 375
—monasteries at Bethlehem 360–361
Paula the Younger 361
Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch 60, 65, 67, 71, 95–96, 252
Paulinus, Bishop of Nola 171, 208–209, 304–305, 330, 360, 379, 392, 411, 414, 748
Paulinus, Bishop of Trier 42, 82, 327
Paulinus, Bishop of York and Rochester 590–592
Paulinus, brother of Jerome 124
Paulinus, deacon of Milan 165
Pavia 579–584, 698, 716, 733
—Synod of (698/699) 583, 735
Peada, King of Mercia 594
Penda, King of Mercia 591–592, 594
Pegasius, apostate Bishop of Ilium 54
Pelagianism 161–178, 242, 258, 264–265, 296, 311, 361, 518, 725–726, 741
—condemned by Innocent I 169, 258
—reversal of condemnation by Zosimus 170
—condemned by Honorius 170
—leadership of Julian of Aeclanum 171–174
Pelagius 161–170, 174, 259, 336, 722, 725, 727
—moral ideal 162–164
—notion of grace 163–169
Pelagius I, Pope 445–446, 449, 455, 628–629, 639–640, 653, 693, 729–731
Pelagius II, Pope 497, 629, 653
penance *299–301,* 303, 596, *677–682,* 748
—restrictions on penitents 300, 678–679
—decline of public penance 679
—private penance 679–682
penitential system, Irish 523, 596, 600, 667, 669
Pentapolis 234, 236, 243, 513, 584, 636
pentarchy 241, 442
Pentecost 303, 648, 667, 683
Perctarit, Lombard King 581, 583
Perpetuus, Bishop of Tours 307
Persia 238, 476, 479–480, 505–507, 510, 661
—war with the Empire 58, 458, 460, 466, 471, 480–481, 500, 509–512, 579, 629, 707
—effect on Monophysites 458, 466
—Nestorian Church of 464–467
—and Armenia 479–481
Peter, Abbot 706
Peter, Apostle 10, 68, 118, 247, 251–253, 255–257, 259, 263–268, 289, 330, 517, 527, 556, 568, 582, 595, 597, 685–687, 689
Peter, Bishop of Alexandria 64, 67–69, 75, 99, 251
Peter, Bishop of Sebaste 327
Peter, Bishop of the Parembolai 505
Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria 470
Peter, Patriarch of Antioch 240
Peter, priest 104
Peter, subdeacon 644
Peter Chrysologus, Bishop of Ravenna 112, 307, 318
Peter Mongus, Patriarch of Alexandria 425–429, 435, 469, 615–617
Peter of Alexandria 122
Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch 424–425, 427, 431, 435, 491, 495, 615
—Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite 491
Peter the Iberian, Bishop of Maiuma 359, 484
Petilian, Bishop of Cirta 152
Petra 185
Petornius, Abbot 351
Pettau 196
Phantasiasts 446
Pharan 485
Phbow, monastery 351–352
Philai 182, 474
Philibert 540
Philip, Bishop of Vienne 681
Philip, papal legate 263
Philippicus Bardanes, Emperor 463
Philippopolis 193
Philocalia 122
Philostorgius, historian 184
Phocas, Emperor 458, 466, 578, 630, 633, 735
Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople 497
Picts 211, 519, 521, 523, 524, 586, 594, 596
Pierius 122
piety, Christocentric 319–321, *683–689*
—the cross 320, 325, 329
—the passion 320
—prayer during the day and night 320–321
—pagan survivals in 331–334
—decline of reception of Eucharist 683–684
—devotion to saints 685–689
—pilgrimage 686–688
—relics 687–689
—toward the deceased 689
pilgrimage 9, 184, 320, 328–331, 483, 529, 686–688
—reasons for 331
—hostels 409–411
—to Rome from England 597, 686–687
—penitential 687
—and monasticism 690, 700–702
Pinian 361, 404
Pirmin, monk 543, 551
Pistus, Bishop of Alexandria 35, 247
Pneumatomachoi 63, 70–71, 74
Poimen 356
Poitiers 380
Polemius, Bishop of Astorga 211, 674
Pontifex Maximus 54, 218
Posidonius, deacon 102
Possidius 149, 151, 317, 388–389
Possidius, Bishop of Calama 603
Praetextatus, Bishop of Rouen 656
Praylos, Bishop of Jerusalem 169

preaching 310–320, 646, 672–676, 744
—genres of 311–312, 673–675
predestination 174–177, 223, 723, 725, 727, 749, 752
preface of Mass 297–298, 658–659, 665, 669
priest 270–276, 278–280, 283–284, 287, 297, 301–302, 308, 312, 326, 348, 366, 646, 651
primacy, papal *245–269*, 438, 445, 496, 614–630
—expansion of jurisdiction 250–251, 252–254, 259
—appeal to 252–253, 262, 267
—and *causae maiores* 257, 260
—and Leo I 264–269
—and Chalcedon 268–269
Primasius, Bishop of Hadrumetum 610
primate 234, 238
Primian, Bishop of Carthage 146–147, 151–152, 156
—opposition to 146
Primogenius, Bishop of Grado 735
Primosus, Bishop of Carthage 610
Priscillian 130, 132–136
—execution of 133–134
Priscillianism 129–136, 210, 265, 273, 386, 562, 573
Priscus, philosopher 51–52, 58
privileges, clerical 284–287
—titles 286
—insignia 286
privilegium fori 651
Proba 375
Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople 110–111, 264, 315, 480
—*Tomus* of 480
Proclus, Bishop of Cyzicus 100
Proclus, Neoplatonist philosopher 220, 508
Proconsular Africa 604, 706–707
Procopius, historian 206, 433–434, 507, 574
Procopius, usurper 62
Procopius of Gaza 494
Proculus, Bishop of Marseille 261, 383
Profuturus, Bishop of Braga 136, 562, 667, 682, 731
Prohairesius 56
Proprietary church system 229, 533–535, 554, 570, 598, 647–648
Prosper Tiro of Aquitaine 175–177, 336, 518, 727
Protasius, Bishop of Aix 640
Proterius, Patriarch of Alexandria 422–423
Protogenes, priest 183
province, ecclesiastical 231, 233–236, 241
—provincial synod 241–242
—interprovincial synod 242–243
Prudentius, poet 331, 414, 570
Psalms, New 142
Pulcheria, Augusta 115–116
purgatory 748
Pyrrhus, Patriarch of Constantinople 461–462, 612

Qennesrin, Jacobite school of 477
Qumran 338, 342, 358
Quodvultdeus, Bishop 604

Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa 110, 364–365, 463
Radbod, Duke of Frisia 551
Radegundis, Frankish Queen 699
Ragnachar, Bishop of Augst 543
Ravenna 147, 152–153, 170, 174, 197, 199, 238, 243, 306, 437, 461, 517, 575, 579, 584–585, 603, 620, 625, 636, 646, 698, 734–735
—Exarchate of 575, 579, 584, 630–631
rebaptism 137, 143, 145, 150, 152, 159, 255, 405, 564, 708–709, 713–714
Recared, Visigothic King 563, 565–567, 569–570, 637, 703, 711, 713, 715
Recceswinth, Visigothic King 566, 573
Rechiar, King of the Sueves 226
refrigerium 332–333
—christianized observance 332–333
Regensburg 200, 544, 547–548, 554
Regula Ferioli 691
Regula Macarii 690, 699
Regula Monasterii Tarnatensis 390, 691, 699
Regula Orientalis 691, 693
Regula Pauli et Stephani 390, 691
Regula Quattuor Patrum 690
Reichenau 543, 554
Reims 526, 530–531, 537, 553
relics of saints 324–326
Remaclus 540
Remigius, Bishop of Reims 524, 526–527, 556, 558
Renatus, priest 113
Reparatus, Bishop of Carthage 609–610
Restitutus, Bishop of Carthage 48, 141, 145
Restitutus, priest 151
Rhodanius, Bishop of Toulouse 42, 83
Richarius 539
Ricimer 614
Riez, Synod of (439) 243
Rimini, Creed of 49, 61, 63, 83, 228, 249, 708, 716
—*see also* Seleucia-Rimini, Double Synod of
Ripon 595
Robber Synod; *see* Ephesus, Council of (449)
Rochester 589, 592, 595, 598
Rodoald, Lombard King 580
Rogatus, Bishop of Cartenna 144
—Rogatists 145
Roman Liturgy 292–293, 297–298
Romanus, *Comes Africae* 144
Romanus, founder of Condat 383
Romanus, martyr 187
Romanus the Melode 500–501
Rome 10–12, 19, 22, 34–36, 39, 45–46, 48, 56, 60, 62, 66, 68, 75–76, 86, 96, 99, 101–103, 119, 123–128, 132, 137, 141, 144–145, 162, 164, 169–170, 198, 201–202, 210, 215, 217–218, 220, 231–236, 238–241, 243–247, 249–271, 279, 288,

292–293, 295, 303–304, 306–307, 322, 325, 330, 333, 356, 360, 374–377, 383, 392, 400, 409, 410, 421–423, 426, 428–430, 432, 434–436, 438, 442–443, 446, 452, 455, 461, 472, 496–497, 503, 517, 521, 527, 529, 548, 556, 560–561, 568–570, 572, 575, 577, 580, 582–587, 589, 591–592, 594–595, 597–598, 600, 604, 606–607, 609, 611–612, 614–617, 620–629, 633–636, 638–642, 644, 646, 654, 659–661, 665–673, 676–678, 681–682, 684, 686–687, 689, 694–695, 698, 707, 709, 716, 727, 729–730, 734, 738–739, 744, 748, 750–751, 753
—patriarchate of 236–237, 240–241, 292
—monastic life in 374–375
—primacy of 245–269, 614–629
—Synod of (313) 197
—Synod of (340/341) 36, 243, 247
—Synod of (353) 243
—Synod of (368) 243, 251
—Synod of (377) 96, 99, 243
—Synod of (378) 250, 252
—Synod of (381) 202
—Synod of (382) 243, 253
—Synod of (390) 255, 393
—Synod of (430) 102–103
—Synod of (449) 115
—Synod of (499) 620
—Synod of (502) 621
—Synod of (531) 626, 642
—Synod of (610) 633
Romuald I, Duke of Benevento 582
Rothari, Lombard King 575, 579–580, 715
Rouen 208, 381, 540
Rufinus, imperial minister 369
—Rufiniani, monastery 369
Rufinus of Aquileia 123–128, 354, 360–361, 369, 379, 412, 572
Rufus, Bishop 133
Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica 257, 262
Rugii 229–230
Rupert, Bishop of Worms 548
Rusafa 479, 510
Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne 384
Rusticus, deacon 731–733 737–738
Rutilius Namatianus, poet 220, 377, 390

Sabas, Saint 359, 432, 447–448, 483–485, 511, 707
Sabellius 252, 372, 714
Säben 200, 536, 546
Sabinus, Bishop of Piacenza 198
sacramentary 298, 652, 658, 661, 665, 668
—*Gelasianum* 659–661, 665, 667, 672, 678
—*Gregorianum* 659–660, 665, 672, 678
— —*Hadrianum* 659–660, 665, 670, 684
— —*Paduense* 660, 665, 684
—*Leonianum* 620, 658–659, 665, 667–668
— —*Veronese* 659, 684
Saint-Jean de Losne, Synod of (673) 649, 652, 657
Saint Martin of Asan 703
Saint Peter's, *see* Vatican basilica
Saint-Victor de Marseille 101, 383
saints, Byzantine cult of 501–503
Sallust, Bishop of Seville 624, 636
Salona 195–196
Salonius, Bishop of Geneva 382
Salvian, Bishop 130, 132
Salvian, priest of Marseille 382, 402, 406
Salzburg 545, 548, 554
Samaritans 439
Samson of Dol 521
Sankt Gallen 542–544, 554, 672
Sant' Andrea al Monte Celio 588, 629
Santa Maria Maggiore *see* Liberian basilica
Santiago de Compostela 687
Sapaudus, Bishop of Arles 639
Sarapeion of Alexandria 34, 182, 422
Sassanid Dynasty 189, 466–467
Saturninus, Bishop of Arles 48, 59
Saxons 549
Scete 343–344, 354, 357, 383
Scheneset, monastery 351–352
Schenute, Abbot of Atripe 183, 353, 470, 473
—character 353
schola cantorum 275, 662, 664
schools, Anglo-Saxon 599–600
Sciri 229–230
Scythian monks 436, 489, 624
Sebastian, Count 708
Secundus, Abbot of Nano 578
Secundus, Bishop 18, 26
Seleucia-Ctesiphon 238, 476
—school of 466
—Synod of (410) 233, 238
—Synod of (424) 238–239
Seleucia-in-Isauria 190, 330
Seleucia-Rimini, Double Synod of 47–50, 59, 83, 141, 145, 211, 249, 251, 716, 718
Selsey 596
Semipelagianism 176–177, 626, 638, 722–728, 736, 749
Serapio, Alemannic Prince 225
Serapion, Abbot 344
Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis 291
Serdica 195
—Synod of (342/343) *37–40,* 82, 84, 137–138, 191, 197, 248, 272, 721
Serenus, Bishop of Marseille 688
Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople 458–460, 461–462, 634
Sergius I, Pope 503, 635, 664, 684
Sergius, Saint 330
Sergius of Tella, Patriarch of Antioch 475
Severian, Bishop of Gabala 328
Severinus, Saint 197, 200, 693
Severus, Bishop 222
Severus, Bishop of Aquileia 734–735
Severus, Bishop of Thubursicu 151
Severus, Bishop of Trier 524
Severus, Patriarch of Antioch 430–432, 435, 437, 443–444, 446, 451, 456–457, 469–

470, 475, 477, 480, 484, 490–492, 495, 624, 627
Severus, Septimius, Emperor 400
Seville 563, 567, 624, 704–705, 754
—Synod of (619) 682
—papal vicariate of 561, 568, 624, 636–637
Side, Synod of (*c.* 390) 372
Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont 223, 650, 652
Siffred, Bishop 681
Sigebert I, Frankish King 701
Sigebert III, Frankish King 530
Sigebert, King of East Anglia 592
Sigebert, King of Essex 594
Sigismund, Burgundian King 527, 622, 625, 638, 686, 711
Silvanus, Bishop of Tarsus 49
Silvanus, Frankish Christian 225
Silvanus, monk 357
Silverius, Pope 452
Silvester I, Pope 19, 22, 24, 26, 28, 201, 246–247
Simeon Stylites 108–109, 330, 363–364, 366, 485
Simeon Stylites the Younger 485
Simeon of Edessa 495
Simeon of Mesopotamia 372–373
Simplician, Bishop of Milan 126
Simplicius, Bishop of Autun 209
Simplicius, Pope 428, 615, 636
Sindered, Bishop of Toledo 570
Siricius, Pope 134, 202, 210, 254–255, 264, 270, 272, 279–280, 302, 376, 379, 385, 653, 682
Sirmium 33, 43, 45–47, 50, 196, 235, 249, 330
—Creed of (351) 45
—Creed of (357) 46, 48–49, 141, 228
—Synod of (358) 46
Siscia 195
Sisebut, Visigothic King 566
Sisinnius, monk of Toulouse 384
Sixtus III, Pope 109, 174–175, 263–264, 306, 376
slavery 403–406
—emancipation 404
—and monasticism 405
Slavs 508, 547
Smaragdus, Exarch of Ravenna 734
Smyrna 508
society and the Church *393–417*
—marriage and family 394–401
—divorce 394–395
—virginity 396
—orphanages 399
—abortion 400
—illegitimate children 400
—social classes 401–411
—caste system 401–402
—slavery 403–406
—*potentes* 406–408
—private property 407
—the poor 407–411
—charitable work 408–411
—culture 411–417
Socotra 468
Socrates, historian 184, 226
Soissons 525, 531, 537
Sopatros, Neoplatonist philosopher 7
Sophia, Augusta 457
Sophronius, Abbot 707
Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem 459, 492, 495, 634
Sozomen, historian 370
Spain 559, 561–562, 566, 568–572, 584–585, 636–637, 644, 647, 673–674, 709–710, 712 714–715, 745
—evangelization of 209–210
—monasticism in 385–386, 691–692, 702–705
—Church in 235, 241–242, 637, 650–652, 654–659, 666–667, 671–672, 677, 679–680, 682–683, 685, 691, 752
Spoleto 203, 575–576, 581, 582, 584–585, 693
Statuta ecclesiae antiqua 270, 274–275, 406
Stephen, Bishop of Antioch 37
Stephen, Bishop of Jamnia 359
Stephen, Bishop of Larissa 626, 642
Stephen I, Pope 245, 659
Stephen, Protomartyr 324, 329–331, 556, 659, 684
Stilicho 147, 152, 205
Studios, monastic founder 370, 486
—Studites 369, 486, 493
stylites 188, 327, 363, 478
Subiaco 694
Sueves 210, 226, 229–230, 386, 524, 559, *562*, 562–565, 571, 573, 667, 702
Sulpicius Serverus 130, 132–134, 208–209, 381
Sunna, Arian Bishop 711–712
Swinthila, Visigothic King 566
Syagrius, Bishop of Autun 588, 641
Syene 182
Symmachus, pagan leader at Rome 203, 220, 414
Symmachus, Pope 432, 620–622, 638, 669
—Symmachan Forgeries 621
Symmachus, Prefect of the City 261
Symmanhus, senator 625, 737
Symposius, Bishop of Astorga 132, 135
syneisaktos 131
synods, diocesan 650
Synodus Endemousa 112, 120, 245, 435, 443, 497
Syracuse 166, 201, 203, 455, 628, 653
Syria 63, 235, 237, 304–305, 328, 337–338, 341–342, 355, 367–368, 371, 377, 436, 458, 466, 471, 475–476, 478–479, 496, 508, 511, 513–514, 604, 707
—evangelization 187–189, 505
—monasticism in 362–367, 377, 485
— —peculiarities 363

——stylites 363
——esteem for 364
——activities 364-367
——and the hierarchy 366-367
—Jacobite Church of 475-479

Tabennisi 345-349, 351-352
Tagrit, Monophysite see in Persia 467
Tarragona, Synod of (516) 645, 650
Tarsus 50, 58, 62, 85, 109
Tassilo I, Duke of Bavaria 547
Tatian, Prefect 218
Teja, Count 618
Telnesin 485
Terracina 201
Tertullian 25, 78, 277, 385-386, 400, 614, 670, 716
Thagaste 141, 148, 388
Thalassius, Abbot 493, 707
Thalelaeus, monk 188
Thamugadi 137, 146, 204
Thanet, island 588
Theasius, Bishop 152
Thebaid 337, 344-345, 354
Thebesta 137
Thecla, sanctuary 190, 330
Themistius 219
Theoctistus 358
Theodahad, Ostrogothic King 445-446, 627
Theodelinda, Lombard Queen 577-580, 583, 733-734, 748
Theodo, Duke of Bavaria 548
Theodora, Augusta 434, 443-447, 457, 469, 474-475, 627, 640
Theodore, Abbot 341, 347, 352
Theodore, Bishop of Modena 198
Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia 72, 97-99, 110-111, 194, 188, 292, 296, 310, 312, 431, 437, 450-451, 454, 463, 467-468, 728, 730-731, 750
Theodore, Bishop of Octodurum 199
Theodore, Bishop of Pharan 459, 462, 490
Theodore, Patriarch of Alexandria 470
Theodore I, Pope 580, 612, 635, 684
Theodore Askidas, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia 448-449, 451, 453-454
Theodore of Arabia, Bishop of the Arabs 475
Theodore of Raithu 489-490
Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury 530, 582, 595-596, 598-599
Theodore Rechtuni 482
Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhus 109-115, 117, 119, 121, 187-188, 216, 267, 315, 341, 366, 372-373, 414, 421, 431, 437, 444, 450-451, 454, 508, 604, 728-730, 734
Theodoret, historian 184, 363
Theodoric I, Frankish King 537
Theodoric II, King of Burgundy 531, 535, 588
Theodoric, Ostrogothic King 430, 432, 437, 445, 525, 528, 559-561, 568, 573, 577, 618-621, 625-626, 638, 697, 714-715, 736
Theodosius I, Emperor 67-71, 74, 76, 86-89, 147, 152, 182, 195, 201, 205, 218-220, 224, 228, 251, 294, 391, 415-416, 442, 496, 559
—and Ambrose 86-89
—public penance of 88
—and paganism 218-219
Theodosius II, Emperor 102-106, 108-110, 112-113, 115, 174, 222, 236, 240, 244, 262, 267, 276, 359, 423, 496
Theodosius, general 145
Theodosius, monk 423, 484
Theodosius the Cenobiarch 432, 483-484
Theodotus, Bishop of Laodicea 29
Theognis, Bishop of Nicaea 26, 29
Theognitus, Bishop 134
Theognostus 122
Theonas, Bishop 18, 26
Theopaschite *Trisagion* 431-432, 436, 444, 446, 456, 624, 626
Theophanes, historian 184
Theophilus the Indian 184, 186
Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria 124-126, 128, 182, 191, 257, 353, 356
Theophilus, Bishop of Gothia 226
Theophilus, *economus* of Adana 502
Theotokos 97, 100-102, 106-108, 264, 315, 328, 444, 468
Thessalonica 88, 330, 416, 436, 486, 502, 620
—vicariate of 238, 255, 257, 262, 264, 266, 433, 436, 626, *641-644*
Theudarius, *poenitentiarius* of Vienne 681
Theudebert II, Frankish King 542, 553, 588, 702
Theudegisil, Visigothic King 561
Theuderic I, Frankish King 553
Theudis, Visigothic King 561-562, 577
Theveste 147
Thomas, Apostle 189
Thomas of Harqel 477
Thrace, evangelization of 193-194
Thrasamund, Vandal King 559, 607-608, 711, 725
Three Chapters Controversy *450-456*, 457, 463, 469, 489, 529, 547, 569, 577, 579, 581, 610, 610, 628, 633, 707, 715, *728-735*, 737, 750, 755
Thuringia 230, 551-552
—parish in 648
Tiberius II, Emperor 457-458
Timasius 166
Timgad, *see* Thamugadi
Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria 74
Timothy, Bishop of Beirut 252
Timothy, Bishop of the Arabs 189
Timothy, deacon of Alexandria 354
Timothy, Patriarch of Constantinople 431
Timothy Salofaciol, Patriarch of Alexandria 424-426
Timothy the Cat, Patriarch of Alexandria 422-425, 435, 469, 615
Timothy III, Patriarch of Alexandria 437

tituli, Roman 232, 308, 681
Titus, Bishop of Bostra 58
Tmuschons, monastery 351–352
Toledo 561, 563–564, 566–569, 572–573, 583–584, 705
—First Synod of (397/400) 135, 210, 276, 280, 406, 644–645, 647
—Second Synod of (527/531) 571, 651
—Third Synod of (589) 565, 583, 655, 680, 703, 711, 713
—Fourth Synod of (633) 572, 650, 652, 654–655, 672, 677, 679, 754
—Fifth Synod of (636) 685
—Sixth Synod of (638) 677, 679
—Seventh Synod of (646) 648
—Eighth Synod of (653) 655
—Ninth Synod of (655) 655
—Tenth Synod of (656) 685
—Eleventh Synod of (675) 656
—Fifteenth Synod of (688) 570
—Sixteenth Synod of (693) 679
—Arian Synod of (580) 564
Tome of Leo, see Leo I, Pope
Toribius, Bishop of Astorga 136
Totila, Ostrogothic King 640
Toulouse 384, 528
—Kingdom of 528, 559–560, 562
Tours 380, 526
—parishes in 645
—Synod of (567) 654, 657
Trdat, King of Armenia 238
Tribonian 438
Trier 11, 31, 33, 35, 37, 132–135, 360, 374, 379, 537–538, 553
Tripolitania 604, 611
Trisagion 499, 668
Tritheists 470, 490
Trophimus, Bishop of Arles 261
Turbantius, Bishop 174
Turin, Synod of (398/401) 134, 243, 280
Tyana 109
—Synod of 62
Tychon, Bishop of Amathus 191
Tyconius, Donatist theologian 143–144, 336, 741
Typus 461
Tyre 183, 236
—Synod of (335) 31, 35
Tzanes 507
Tzat, King of Lazica 506–507
Tzittas, general 507

Ulfilas, Bishop of the Goths 193–194, 227–229
—translation of Bible 227–229
Unilas, Bishop of the Goths 194
Union of 433 108–112, 114, 120, 263, 427, 450, 463–464
Union of 519 435, 442–443
Union of 633 459, 471, 492
Ursacius, Bishop of Singidunum 31, 40–41, 47–48, 59
Ursinus, antipope 250, 254
usury 408

Vaison, Synod of (442) 243
—Synod of (529) 646, 668, 710
Valence, Synod of (375) 243, 379
—Synod of (528) 727
Valencia, Synod of (549) 667
Valens, Bishop of Mursa 31, 40–41, 47–48, 59
Valens, Emperor 61–64, 67, 69, 85–86, 183, 227–228, 391
—recovery of Homoian Arianism 61–63
—death of 67
—position in the Church 85–86
Valentine, Bishop of Bergell 199
Valentinian I, Emperor 61, 144, 195, 204, 218, 302, 379, 399
Valentinian II, Emperor 68, 86
Valentinian III, Emperor 115, 266–267, 276, 284–285, 604, 608
Valerian, Bishop of Cimiez 319
Valerian, Bishop of Iconium 372
Valerius Maximus, Prefect 360
Valerius of Bierzo 573
Vandals 159, 206–207, 210, 229, 238, 265, 526, 559, *602–608*, 614, 647, 691, 693, 702, 706–711, 714, 716, 752
Vatican basilica 10, 43, 246, 333, 376, 621, 660
—*schola* 664–665
Vegesela 141
Venantius Fortunatus 656, 672
Veranus, Bishop of Lyon (?) 281
Veranus, Bishop of Vence 382
Vercelli 275, 281, 378, 393
Verina, Augusta 424
Verona 197, 379, 577–578, 659
Vetranio, Bishop of Tomi 193
vicariate, papal 238, 255, 266, *636–644*
—of Arles 637–641, 644
—in Spain 636–637
—of Thessalonica 255, 257, 266, *641–644*
Victor, Abbot of Tabennisi 353
Victor, Bishop of Tunnuna 610
Victor, Bishop of Vita 206, 605, 707, 709
Victor I, Pope 245
Victorian, Abbot 703
Victricius, Bishop of Rouen 208, 211, 214, 256, 381
Vienna 196
Vienne 638
Vigilantius, priest 393
Vigilius, Bishop 198
Vigilius, Pope 136, 433, 452–453, 455, 562, 610, 626, *627–628*, 633, 640, 642, 665, 667–668, 682, 731
—and the Three Chapters 451–455
—*Judicatum* 452, 454
—First *Constitutum* 454
—Second *Constitutum* 455
Vincent 382
—*Commonitorium* 382

Vincent, Roman priest 24
Vincent of Lérins 177
Vincent of Zaragoza, Saint 331, 556, 570
Virgil, Bishop of Arles 640–641
virgines subintroductae 503
Visigoths 209–211, 224, 226–227, 230, 235, 386, 405, 525, 528–529, 558–562, 564, 568, 570–573, 577, 583–584, 624, 638, 652, 656, 686, 702, 710–711, 715
—conversion to Homoian Arianism 227–229
—defeat of Valens 227
—organization of Church 229, 649–650
—mission to other Germans 230
—Arian Synod of (580) 713
—conversion to Catholicism 565–573, 637, 655, 752
—National Church 565–573
vita communis 377, 388
Vitalian, Pope 595, 664
Vitalian, rebel 432, 434, 436
Vitalis, priest 96
Vitus, Roman priest 24
Vivarium, monastery 697, 739, 743
Volventius, Proconsul 132
Vouillé, battle of 528
Vulgata 254

Wearmouth, monastery 599, 665
Wacho, Lombard King 574, 577
Wachtang I, King of the Georgians 190
Walaric 539
Waldebert, Abbot 543
Walthari, Lombard Prince 574
Wandregisil 540
wergeld 532, 557
Wessex, Kingdom of 590, 592–593, 598
Whitby, monastery 601
—Synod of (664) 594–595
Wihtred, King of Kent 598
Wilfrid, Abbot of Ripon 595, 598, 600, 685
Willibrord, Bishop of Utrecht 551, 601
Winchester 595
Wini, Bishop of Winchester 593
Witenagemot 590, 597
Worcester 596
Worms 550–551, 554

Xenaia, Bishop of Mabbug 430–432, 477

Yarmuk, battle of the 513
Yezr, *Catholicus* of Armenia 481
York 211, 521, 585, 589, 591–592, 595, 599, 634
"Young Nicenes" 64–67, 70, 73

Zachary, Pope 666
Zaragoza 705
—Synod of (380) 129–132, 210, 306, 385
Zeno, Bishop of Seville 636
Zeno, Bishop of Verona 198, 315, 332, 379, 659
Zeno, Emperor 240, 424–429, 435, 457, 480, 496, 605, 615–616, 708, 730
Zocomas, Sheik 186
Zoilus, Patriarch of Alexandria 469
Zosimus, historian 390
Zosimus, Pope 169, 196, 259–261, 270, 272–273, 279, 376, 637–638, 649, 653
—and Pelagianism 169–170, 259
—*Tractoria* 170, 172, 174
—and Apiarius 260–261
—and Patroclus of Arles 260–261

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

III

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume III

THE CHURCH
IN THE
AGE OF FEUDALISM

by

FRIEDRICH KEMPF

HANS-GEORG BECK

EUGEN EWIG

JOSEF ANDREAS JUNGMANN

Translated by

Anselm Biggs

CROSSROAD · NEW YORK

1982
The Crossroad Publishing Company
575 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* edited by Hubert Jedin
Vol. III: *Die mittelalterliche Kirche*
III/1: Vom kirchlichen Frümittelalter zur gregorianischen Reform
© Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1966

English translation © 1969 Herder KG

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by
any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Vom kirchlichen Frümittelalter zur gregorianischen
Reform. English.
The Church in the age of feudalism

(History of the church; v. 3)
Translation of: Vom kirchlichen Frümittelalter zur
gregorianischen Reform.
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Church history—Middle Ages, 600-1500. I. Kempf,
Friedrich. II. Title. III. Series: Handbuch der
Kirchengeschichte. English.; v. 3.
BR145.2.H3613 1982, vol. 3 [BR252] 270s 82-5038
ISBN 0-8245-0316-3 [270.3] AACR2

CONTENTS

Preface ix

Preface to the English Edition xii

List of Abbreviations xiii

PART ONE: THE CHURCH UNDER LAY DOMINATION

SECTION ONE: THE PAPACY'S ALIENATION FROM BYZANTIUM AND RAPPROCHEMENT WITH THE FRANKS (Eugen Ewig) 3

Chapter 1: Christendom at the Beginning of the Eighth Century 3

Chapter 2: The Revival of the Frankish Kingdom and the Crossing of the Anglo-Saxons to the Continent 7

Chapter 3: The Founding of the Carolingian Monarchy and the Progress of the Reform 16

Chapter 4: The Beginnings of the Papal State 20

SECTION TWO: THE GREEK CHURCH IN THE EPOCH OF ICONOCLASM (Hans-Georg Beck) 26

Chapter 5: The First Phase of Iconoclasm (730 to 775) 26

Chapter 6: The First Restoration of the Icons 32

Chapter 7: Interlude in Church and State 37

Chapter 8: The Second Phase of Iconoclasm (815 to 843) 41

Chapter 9: Theology and Monasticism in the Age of Iconoclasm 48

SECTION THREE: THE AGE OF CHARLES THE GREAT, 768 to 814 (Eugen Ewig) . . 54

Chapter 10: Charles the Great and Italy 54

Chapter 11: The Completing of the Frankish Empire 61

Chapter 12: Reform of Empire and Church: The Carolingian Renaissance . . . 70

Chapter 13: Iconoclasm, Adoptionism, and Filioque 78

Chapter 14: From Frankish Kingdom to Christian Empire 84

Chapter 15: The Development of the Carolingian Theocracy 95

SECTION FOUR: CLIMAX AND TURNING POINT OF THE CAROLINGIAN AGE, 814 to 840 (Eugen Ewig)) 103

Chapter 16: Reform in Empire and Church from 814 to 828 103

Chapter 17: The Carolingian Renaissance under Louis the Pious 115

Chapter 18: The Crisis of Empire and Church (828 to 840) 118

SECTION FIVE: THE WESTERN CHURCH FROM THE DEATH OF LOUIS THE PIOUS TO THE END OF THE CAROLINGIAN PERIOD (Eugen Ewig) 126

Chapter 19: The Frankish Empire from 840 to 875 126

Chapter 20: Spain and the British Isles. The Muslim and Viking Attacks on the West 133

Chapter 21: The Papacy and the West from 840 to 875 141

Chapter 22: The Degradation of the Papacy and the Empire (875 to 904) 151

Chapter 23: Reform, Theology, and Education under the Later Carolingians . . . 157

SECTION SIX: THE BYZANTINE CHURCH IN THE AGE OF PHOTIUS (Hans-Georg Beck) 174

Chapter 24: The Byzantine Church from 843 to 867 174

Chapter 25: The Byzantine Church from 867 to 886 181

Chapter 26: Photius: Work and Character 188

SECTION SEVEN: THE CHURCH AND THE WESTERN KINGDOMS FROM 900 TO 1046 (Friedrich Kempf) 194

Chapter 27: The New Kingdoms 194
  France 194
  Italy 197
  Germany 200

Chapter 28: Rome, the Papacy, and the Empire: 962 to 1002 205

Chapter 29: The Church in Spain, Ireland, and England: 900 to 1046 217
  Spain 217
  Ireland 221
  England 224

Chapter 30: The Spread of Christianity among the Scandinavians in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries 230

Chapter 31: Evangelization of the Slavs and the Magyars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries 235
  The Wends 235
  Bohemia and Moravia 237
  Poland 238
  Russia 240
  The Yugoslavs 243
  The Magyars 244

Chapter 32: The Papacy and the Empire from 1002 to 1046 247

SECTION EIGHT: CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, WORSHIP, PASTORAL CARE, AND PIETY: 700 TO 1050 (Chs. 33–35: Friedrich Kempf; Chs. 36–38: Josef Jungmann) 258

Chapter 33: Diocesan Organization 258
  Rural Churches 258
  Urban Churches and Chapters 264
  Diocesan Organization 267

Chapter 34: Prelacies and the Secular Powers. 269
  Bishoprics and Abbeys 270
  The Papacy and Papal Institutions 279

Chapter 35: Metropolitans, Primates, and Papacy 285
  Metropolitan Organization 286
  Primates, Apostolic Vicars, Legates 290
  The Papacy 291

Chapter 36: The Sacraments and the Mass 300

Chapter 37: The Clergy and the Care of Souls 307

Chapter 38: Forms of Devotion 312

SECTION NINE: RENEWAL AND REFORM FROM 900 TO 1050 (Friedrich Kempf) . . 320

Chapter 39: The Renewal of Monastic and Canonical Life 320
  Monastic Renewal 320
  The Lotharingian and German Area 321
  France 324
  Italy 328
  The Canons 330

Chapter 40: Education and Learning 332

Chapter 41: Heretical and Reform Movements among Clergy and Laity (1000 to 1050) 339

PART TWO: THE STRUGGLE FOR THE FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH

SECTION ONE: THE GREGORIAN REFORM (Friedrich Kempf) 351

Chapter 42: Beginning of the Reform: the German Popes (1046 to 1057) 351

Chapter 43: Progress of the Reform: the Lotharingian and Tuscan Popes (1057 to 1073) 358

Chapter 44: Pope Gregory VII (1073 to 1085) 367
  The Reform 370
  Reform Policy in the Various Countries 374

Chapter 45: Stubborn Fight and Victory: From Victor III to Calixtus II 385
  Victor III 385
  Urban II 386
  Paschal II 392
  Gelasius II. 398
  Calixtus II 398

SECTION TWO: THE BYZANTINE CHURCH FROM 886 TO 1054 (Hans-Georg Beck) . . 404

Chapter 46: The Byzantine Church from Photius to the Tetragamy 404

Chapter 47: The Road to Schism 409

Chapter 48: The Inner Life of the Byzantine Church between Photius and Caerularius 418

SECTION THREE: CHANGES WITHIN THE CHRISTIAN WEST DURING THE GREGORIAN REFORM (Friedrich Kempf) 426

Chapter 49: The New Shape of the Church: Law and Organization before Gratian . 426

Chapter 50: The New Relationship of the Church to Western Christendom . . . 436

Chapter 51: The Papacy, the Holy Wars, and the First Crusade 445

Chapter 52: The "Vita Evangelica" Movement and the Appearance of New Orders 453
  Differentiation in Monasticism 455
  The Canons Regular 460
  The Military Orders 464

Chapter 53: The Beginnings of Scholasticism 465

BIBLIOGRAPHY 473

  General Bibliography to Volumes III and IV 475
  Bibliography to Individual Chapters 497

LIST OF POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES 550

GENERAL INDEX TO VOLUME III 553

PREFACE

This third volume of the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* begins with the turn of the seventh century and concludes with the Concordat of Worms (1122) and the Ninth General Council (1123). In the original planning of the *Handbuch* it was intended that this volume should go to the end of the thirteenth Century and that the next volume should treat the Late Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Counter Reformation, but circumstances led to a change in plan. In principle there is no objection to the new arrangement, which is also to be found in other historical treatments. The period 700 to 1123 is clearly distinct from the preceding and the following epochs. The earlier and the present plan are about equal in merit; each has much in its favour. Volumes III, IV, and V deal with two especially exciting themes: the Schism between the Eastern and Western Churches and the split in the unity of Western Christendom. One who is chiefly interested in the history of the Western Church will regard the Late Middle Ages and the Reformation as a separate period ending with the Counter Reformation and will want to have them included in a single volume. In the history of the Latin-Greek *oikumene*, on the other hand, the Late Middle Ages constitute the end of a process that began with the turn of the seventh century, reached its climax in the Schism of 1054, and finally expired in the negotiations for union that extended into the fifteenth century. Hence it makes good sense to devote a special volume to this period.

This is precisely the plan followed by the German original. Volume III covers the whole period from *ca.* 700 to *ca.* 1500, but it appears in two half-volumes. In the English version it was decided to call them Volumes III and IV. Thus the English Volume III corresponds to the German Volume III/1. It is divided into two periods: the Early Middle Ages (700–1046) and the Gregorian Reform (1046–1124).

To avoid misunderstanding it is necessary to explain the term "Early Middle Ages", which in the German original is *Kirchliches Frühmittelalter*. Actually, the Middle Ages, as commonly understood, began before 700. Whether one prefers to see the beginning of the Middle Ages in the fifth or the sixth century, in any event there existed a German-Roman, and hence an early medieval, civilization in the newly established Germanic kingdoms in addition to the already present Roman civilization. Although the Church was affected by it, she still clung to her ancient Roman tradition; she was able all the more easily to do so when she could continue to live according to the Roman Canon Law. Only when, from the turn of the seventh century, three great powers — the Byzantine, the Muslim, and the Carolingian states — confronted one another, did the Western Church and early medieval civilization coalesce. The age then beginning, that of Canon Law under strong Germanic influence, marks the start of the *Kirchliches Frühmittelalter* — the "Early Middle Ages" as applied to the period covered by the first part of this volume. Among its characteristic features are: an intimate relationship between *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium,* royal theocracy, the proprietary church system, lay investiture, and new forms in liturgy, piety, and the care of souls. The elements that then became a part of the life of the Church were to a great extent conditioned by the time. Once the West had passed through its early medieval phase and had moved into the Classical Middle Ages, the Church had to do something about her early medieval externals. She did so in the age of the Gregorian Reform and thereby released the forces that were to develop in the next two centuries. The Church's "Classical Middle Ages" began with the Gregorian Reform.

From the viewpoint of Western history, then, it would seem natural to end this volume with the dividing line between the "Early" and the "Classical" Middle Ages and to postpone the Gregorian Reform to the next volume. But the period of the Gregorian Reform is of decisive importance also for the history of the Greek Church, especially for her relationship with Western Christendom. And in Byzantium this did not mark the start of a new period but rather the close of a long process whose outcome was virtually inevitable. There is no room for doubt that only a few persons were basically affected when in 1054 the papal legates and the Patriarch Michael Caerularius hurled anathema at one another. Of itself this conflict could not have definitively separated the Eastern and the Western Churches; it was only the immediately succeeding period that widened the break into a real schism. If, from the turn of the seventh century, the Greek Church, rigid in her tradition, and the Latin Church, buoyant with the influx of newer peoples, went more and more their separate ways, this process reached its final stage in the epoch of the Gregorian Reform. Confronting a Western Christendom which called into being the crusading movement and enabled the papacy to assume the leadership of the Christian world, the apprehensive Greeks regarded the prolonged separation as quite proper. An exact knowledge of the Gregorian Reform is the prerequisite to an understanding of the Schism. Hence, its course is appropriately included in this volume.

Several authors collaborated in this volume. Hans-Georg Beck undertook the history of the Greek Church — he will continue it into the fifteenth century in Volume IV — and the General Bibliography for Byzantine Church

History. Eugen Ewig wrote the sections on the Carolingian period. Josef Andreas Jungmann treated liturgy, pastoral activity, and piety in the Early Middle Ages. The writer of these lines dealt with the Saxon and Early Salian periods and the Gregorian Reform, compiled the General Bibliography for the Western Church, and edited the volume as a whole.

In regard to the bibliography, the crux of every handbook, it is to be noted that the individual chapters were produced in a period of about five years. The authors made every effort to add to the already completed chapters studies that appeared later. Special care was devoted to the General Bibliography.

Sincere thanks are extended to those already mentioned and to Herder Publishers for an appreciative and devoted cooperation.

Friedrich Kempf

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

Few periods in the history of Western civilization are of greater significance than the era which witnessed the emancipation of the papacy from the influence of Byzantium and its *rapprochement* with the newly emerging Carolingian *imperium*. In a sense the perduring characteristics of the next millennium were solidified during this epoch, universalism, feudal social structure, and a deep penetration of Latin Christian cultural elements.

While the Church in the West adjusted itself to the Muslim conquests and the conversion of the Germanic peoples, the East grappled with the problems of Iconoclasm, Adoptianism, the challenge of secular Hellenism, and the conversion of the Slavs. In spite of the differences which led to the Great Schism of 1054, cultural and theological interchanges produced affinities which lasted until the time of the Crusades, a revival of hagiography and mysticism, the struggle against the proprietary church, and the domination of religio-monasticism in literary and artistic traditions.

What differentiates the present volume of the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* from similar works is the close integration it achieves in its account of the affairs of the East as well as West during this critical period. It deftly avoids the traditional over-emphasis on the activities of the Church of Rome and offers a new answer to the ancient Hellenic query: Ἕλληνες ὄντες βαρβάροις δουλεύσομεν. At the same time its treatment of the new relationship of the Church and Western Christendom, the background of the Gregorian reform and the great debate on the essentials of a Christian society sheds new light on this central problem of medieval history. The detailed account of the new forms of devotion and the *vita evangelica* movements place medieval piety and liturgy in a new perspective. The study of the origins of Canon Law and Scholasticism reflect the research that has been made in these fields in recent decades. Rounding out the picture of the inner structure and life of the Church during this period are the lucid accounts of the evangelization of Northern and Eastern Europe. With its wealth of source material and its succinct treatment of a wide range of subjects from the Carolingian Renaissance to the First Crusade, the English edition of the *Handbuch* will, it is hoped, fill a *lacuna* not only for the Church historian but for the serious student of secular and cultural history as well.

John P. Dolan
University of South Carolina

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The bracketed references pertain to the General Bibliography of this volume.

AAB	*Abhandlungen der Deutschen* (till 1944: *Preussischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*. Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1815 seqq.
AAL	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Leipzig* (till 30, 1920 *AGL*), Leipzig 1850 seqq.
AAM	*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Munich 1835 seqq.
AAMz	*Abhandlungen* (der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse) *der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur*, Mainz 1950 seqq.
ActaSS	*Acta Sanctorum* [Gen. Bib. I, 10].
ADipl	*Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde*, Münster-Cologne 1955 seqq.
ADRomana	*Archivio della Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria*, Rome 1935 seqq. (1878 till 1934: *ASRomana*).
AGG	*Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (from Series III, 27, 1942: *AAG*), Göttingen 1843 seqq.
AHD	*Archives d'Histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen-âge*, Paris 1926 seqq.
AHPont	*Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, Rome 1963 seqq.
AHR	*The American Historical Review*, New York 1895 seqq.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln*, Cologne 1855 seqq.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht*, (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857 seqq.
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, (Leipzig) Münster and Cologne 1903 seqq.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte*, Speyer 1949 seqq.
AnBoll	*Analecta Bollandiana*, Brussels 1882 seqq.
Andrieu OR	*Les ordines romani du haut moyen-âge* [Gen. Bib. I, 9].
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria*, Rome 1878–1934 (from 1935: *ADRomana*).
AstIt	*Archivio storico Italiano*, Florence 1842 seqq.
AUF	*Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, Berlin 1908 seqq.
BAL	*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* (till 71, 1, 1919: *BGL*), Leipzig 1846 seqq.
BÉCh	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, Paris 1839 seqq.
Beck	H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959.
BÉH	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences philologiques et historiques*, Paris 1869 seqq.
BeitrGPhMA	*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* [Gen. Bib. I, 11].

Benedictina	*Benedictina,* Rome 1947 seqq.
BHG	*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca, ed. socii Bollandiani,* Brussels, 2nd ed. 1909.
Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome 1920 seqq.
BIStIAM	*Bollettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano,* Rome 1886 seqq.
BJRL	*The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester 1903 seqq.
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* Toulouse 1899 seqq.
BM	*Benediktinische Monatsschrift* (1877–1918: *St. Benediktsstimmen),* Beuron 1919 seqq.
Bouquet	*Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
Braun	J. Braun, *Der christliche Altar,* 2 vols., Munich 1924.
ByZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* Leipzig 1892 seqq.
Byz(B)	*Byzantion,* Brussels 1924 seqq.
ByzNGrJb	*Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher,* Athens-Berlin 1920 seqq.
CahArch	*Cahiers Archéologiques. Fin de l'Antiquité et Moyen-âge,* Paris 1945 seqq.
CambrHJ	*The Cambridge Historical Journal,* Cambridge 1923 seqq.; since 1958: *The Historical Journal.*
Caspar	*Geschichte des Papsttums* [Gen. Bib. II, 5].
Catholicisme	*Catholicisme. Hier — Aujourd'hui — Demain,* dir. par. G. Jacquemet, Paris 1948 seqq.
CCivMéd	*Cahiers de la Civilisation Médiévale,* Poitiers 1958 seqq.
ChartDipl	*Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres: Chartes et diplômes relatifs à l'histoire de France* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
CHR	*The Catholic historical Review,* Washington 1915 seqq.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850 seqq. (1871–87 Florence).
ClassHist	*Les classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-âge* [Gen. Bibl. I, 3].
CollText	*Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et l'enseignement de l'histoire* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
DA	*Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* (1937–43: *für Geschichte des Mittelalters,* Weimar), Cologne–Graz 1950 seqq. (cf. *NA*).
DACL	*Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* ed. by F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, Paris 1924 seqq.
Dahlmann-Waitz	*Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte* [Gen. Bib. I, 2].
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* ed. by R. Naz, Paris 1935 seqq.
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* ed. by A. Baudrillart and others, Paris 1912 seqq.
Dölger Reg	*Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Reihe A: Regesten. Abt. 1; Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453,* rev. by F. Dölger, 5 Fasc., Munich 1924–65.
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* ed. by Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1941 seqq.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* ed. by M. Viller, Paris 1932 seqq.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* ed. by A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, cont. by É. Amann, Paris 1930 seqq.
Duchesne LP	*Liber Pontificalis* [Gen. Bib. I, 5].
DVfLG	*Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* Halle 1923 seqq.
ECatt	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* Rome 1949 seqq.
EHR	*English Historical Review,* London 1886 seqq.

EI^{1}	*Enzyklopädie des Islams*, Leipzig 1913–38.
ELit	*Ephemerides Liturgicae*, Rome 1887 seqq.
ÉO	*Échos d'Orient*, Paris 1897 seqq.

Feine RG	*Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte* [Gen. Bib. II, 6].
Fliche-Martin	*Histoire de l'Église* [Gen. Bib. II, 3].
FlorPatr	*Florilegium Patristicum* [Gen. Bib. I, 11].
FontiStIt	*Istituto Storico Italiano, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
Fournier-LeBras	*Histoire des collections canoniques en Occident* [Gen. Bib. I, 4].
FZThPh	*Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie* (before 1914: *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und speculative Theologie;* 1914–54: *Divus Thomas*), Freiburg.

García Villada	Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España* [Gen. Bib. II, 4].
GdV	*Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
Gebhardt-Grundmann	*Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* [Gen. Bib. II, 2].
Geiselmann	J. R. Geiselmann, *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik,* Paderborn 1926.
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen,* Berlin 1738 seqq.
Giesebrecht	*Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* [Gen. Bib. II, 2].
Glotz	*Histoire Générale,* ed. by G. Glotz: *Le Moyen Âge* [Gen. Bib. II, 1 a].
Gr	*Gregorianum,* Rome 1920 seqq.
GRM	*Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift,* Heidelberg 1909–42 and 1951 seqq.
Grumel Reg	V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople,* Fasc. 1–3, Kadiköy 1932–47.

Haller	*Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit* [Gen. Bib. II, 5].
Hartmann	*Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter* [Gen. Bib. II, 2].
Hauck KD	*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* [Gen. Bib. II, 4].
Hefele-Leclercq	*Histoire des conciles* [Gen. Bib. II, 5].
Hesbert	R. J. Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum sextuplex,* Brussels 1935.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* (Cologne 1880 seqq.), Munich 1950 seqq.
HS	*Hispania Sacra,* Madrid 1948 seqq.
HThR	*The Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge, Mass., 1908.
HV	*Historische Vierteljahresschrift,* Leipzig 1898–1937 (till 1898: *DZGw*)
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1859 seqq.

IER	*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* Dublin 1864 seqq.
Ital. Pont.	P. Kehr, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum: Italia Pontificia* [Gen. Bib. I, 5].

Jacob-Hohenleutner	*Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte* [Gen. Bib. I, 2].
Jaffé	*Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* [Gen. Bib. I, 5].
JbbDG	*Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte* [Gen. Bib. II, 2].
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* London 1950 seqq.
JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41 (now *ALW*).
JÖByzG	*Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft,* Vienna 1951 seqq.
Jungmann LE	J. A. Jungmann, *Liturgisches Erbe und pastorale Gegenwart,* Innsbruck–Vienna–Munich 1960.
Jungmann MS	*Missarum sollemnia* [Gen. Bib. II, 10].

KRA	*Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen,* intro. by U. Stutz, Stuttgart 1902 seqq.
Künstle	K. Künstle, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst,* 2 vols., Freiburg 1926–28.

Lietzmann SG	H. Lietzmann, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Urexemplar* (*Liturgische Quellen* 3), Münster 1921.
LQF	*Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen,* Münster 1909–40, 1957 seqq.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* ed. by J. Höfer and K. Rahner, Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1957 seqq.
LuM	*Liturgie und Mönchtum, Laacher Hefte,* (Freiburg i. Br.) Maria Laach 1948 seqq.
MA	*Le Moyen-âge. Revue d'histoire et de philologie,* Paris, then Brussels: 1. Series: 1888–96; 2. Series: 1897–1929; 3. Series: 1930–41; 4. Series: 1946 seqq.
MAH	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* Paris 1880 seqq.
Manitius	*Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur im Mittelalter* [Gen. Bib. II, 11].
Mansi	*Sacrorum conciliorum . . . collectio* [Gen. Bib. I, 4].
Martène R	E. Martène, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus,* I–IV, Antwerp 1736–38.
MG	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [Gen. Bib. I, 3] *inde ab a. C. 500 usque ad a. 1500;* indices by O. Holder-Egger and K. Zeumer, Hanover–Berlin 1826 seqq. Sections:
MG Auct. ant.	*Auctores antiquissimi.*
MGCap	*Capitularia.*
MGConc	*Concilia.*
MGConst	*Constitutiones.*
MGDD	*Diplomata.*
MGEp	*Epistolae.*
MG Ep. sel.	*Epistolae selectae.*
MG Font. jur.	*Fontes iuris germanici.*
MGLiblit	*Libelli de lite.*
MGLL	*Leges.*
MGNecr	*Necrologia.*
MGPoetae	*Poetae.*
MGSS	*Scriptores.*
MGSS rer. Germ.	*Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis recusi* or *separatim editi* (octavo).
MGSS rer Germ. NS	*MG, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, Nova series* (octavo).
MGSS rer. Lang.	*Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum.*
MGSS rer. Mer.	*Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum.*
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* (Innsbruck) Graz–Cologne 1880 seqq.
Mirbt	*Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus* [Gen. Bib. I, 4).
MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati,* 6 vols., Rome 1946.
Mitteis	*Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt* [Gen. Bib. II, 8a].
Mohlberg	C. Mohlberg, *Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alamannischer Überlieferung* (*Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen* 1/2), Münster, 2nd ed. 1939.
MS	*Medieval Studies,* ed. by Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto 1939 seqq.
Muratori	*Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichte des Mittelalters,* Hanover 1876 seqq. (from 1937: *DA*).
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945 seqq.
ÖAKR	*Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht,* Vienna 1950 seqq.
OGE	*Ons Geestelijk Erf,* Antwerp–Thielt 1927 seqq.

OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Rome 1935 seqq.
OstKSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien,* Würzburg 1951 seqq.
Ostrogorsky	G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (= *Byzantinisches Handbuch,* Pt. I, vol. II), Munich, 3rd ed. 1962.

PG	*Patrologia graeca* [Gen. Bib. III, 3].
Pitra S	J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense,* 4 vols., Paris 1852–58.
PL	*Patrologia latina* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
Plöchl	*Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* [Gen. Bib. II, 6].
Potthast R	*Regesta Romanorum Pontificum* [Gen. Bib. I, 5].

QF	*Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte,* ed. by the Görres-Gesellschaft, Paderborn 1892 seqq.
QFIAB	*Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken,* Rome 1898 seqq.

RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. by T. Klauser, Stuttgart 1941 (1950) seqq.
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920 seqq.
RBén	*Revue bénédictine,* Maredsous 1884 seqq.
RE	*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* intro. by J. J. Herzog, ed. by A. Hauck, 24 vols., Leipzig, 3rd ed., 1896–1913.
RÉB	*Revue des Études byzantines,* Paris 1946 seqq.
RÉG	*Revue des Études Grecques,* Paris 1888 seqq.
RepFont	*Repertorium fontium historicorum medii aevi* [Gen. Bib. I, 2].
RET	*Revista Española de teología,* Madrid 1941 seqq.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921 seqq.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876 seqq.
Rhallis	*Rhallis and Potlis,* Σύνταγμα τῶν Θειῶν καὶ κανόνων . . . ἐκδοθὲν ὑπὸ Τ. Α. Ῥάλλη καὶ Μ. Πότλη, 6 vols., Athens 1852–59.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900 seqq.
RHÉF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France.* Paris 1910 seqq.
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Paris 1880 seqq.
Righetti	*Manuale di storia liturgica* [Gen. Bib. II, 11].
RivAC	*Rivista di archeologia cristiana,* Rome 1924 seqq.
RMab	*Revue Mabillon,* Ligugé 1921 seqq.
RNPh	*Revue néoscolastique de philosophie,* Louvain 1894 seqq.
Rolls Series	*Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi Scriptores* [Gen. Bib. I, 3].
RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1887 seqq.
RQH	*Revue des questions historiques,* Paris 1866 seqq.
RSIt	*Rivista storica Italiana,* Naples 1884 seqq.
RSPhTh	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris 1907 seqq.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910 seqq.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947 seqq.

SA	*Studia Anselmiana,* Rome 1933 seqq.
SAB	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen* (till 1944: *Preussischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1882 seqq.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1950 seqq.
SAM	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Abt., Munich 1871 seqq.
Santifaller NE	L. Santifaller, *Neuere Editionen mittelalterlicher Königs- u. Papsturkunden:*

	Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., Mitt. d. Wiener Dipl. Abt. der Mon. Germ. Hist. 6, Vienna 1958.
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der* (from 225, 1, 1947: *Österreichischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,* Vienna 1831 seqq.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica,* Milan 1873 seqq.
Schnürer	*Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter* [Gen. Bib. II, 1 c].
Schubert	*Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter* [Gen. Bib. II, 3].
SE	*Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschapen,* Bruges 1948 seqq.
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden bzw. zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige,* Munich 1880 seqq. (since 1911 new series).
Speculum	*Speculum. A Journal of Medieval Studies,* Cambridge, Mass., 1926 seqq.
SteT	*Studi e Testi,* Rome 1900 seqq.
StGThK	*Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche,* Leipzig 1897–1908.
StudGreg	*Studi Gregoriani,* ed. by G. B. Borino, 7 vols., Rome 1947–61.
StudiBiz	*Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici,* Rome 1925 seqq.
StudMed	*Studi Medievali,* Turin 1904 seqq.; N. S. 1928 seqq. (Nuovi Studi Medievali, Bologna 1923–27).
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909 seqq.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819 seqq.; Stuttgart 1946 seqq.
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basle 1945 seqq.
Tr	*Traditio,* New York 1943 seqq.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (till 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888 seqq.
Ueberweg	*Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie* [Gen. Bib. II, 12].
Veit	*Volksfrommes Brauchtum und Kirche im Mittelalter* [Gen. Bib. II, 1 c].
VIÖG	*Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* Vienna 1935 seqq.; 1946 seqq.
WaG	*Die Welt als Geschichte,* Stuttgart 1935 seqq.
Wattenbach	*Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* [Gen. Bib. I, 2].
Wattenbach-Holtzmann	*Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Deutsche Kaiserzeit* [Gen. Bib. I, 2].
Wattenbach-Levison	*Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Vorzeit und Karolinger* [Gen. Bib. I, 2].
Watterich	*Pontificum Romanorum Vitae* [Gen. Bib. I, 5].
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928 seqq.
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851 seqq.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (Gotha), Stuttgart 1876 seqq.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (Innsbruck), Vienna 1877 seqq.
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948 seqq.
ZSavRGgerm	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung,* Weimar 1863 seqq.
ZSavRGkan	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung,* Weimar 1911 seqq.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für Schweizer Kirchengeschichte,* Fribourg 1907 seqq.

PART ONE

The Church under Lay Domination

SECTION ONE

The Papacy's Alienation from Byzantium and Rapprochement with the Franks

Chapter 1

Christendom at the Beginning of the Eighth Century

Dark clouds hung over the Christian world as the seventh century gave way to the eighth. The entry of the Anglo-Saxons into the circle of Christian peoples must have been of little significance to contemporaries, compared with the loss of the two ancient and highly civilized Christian lands which were buried in the second Muslim flood: Africa and Spain. The great age of Latin Africa was past when the catastrophe loomed. Justinian had recovered for the Empire provinces much reduced in size, but they had experienced an "Indian Summer" under Byzantine rule. In the controversies over the Three Chapters and Monothelitism the African Church had still had something important to contribute and many successes among the Berbers to record. The expansion of Islam, which at first had come to a standstill in Tripolitania, was resumed in 669. The Arabs occupied the province of Byzacena, where they founded Kairawan, the future capital of Muslim North Africa. Carthage fell in 698. Resistance by the Christian Berbers and the last imperial strongholds in the West was broken in the first years of the eighth century, and Africa withdrew from the Christian cultural community. What was left of the Christian minority grew smaller and lost all historical significance.

The Visigothic Kingdom had occupied a leading position in the Germano-Roman civilization of the seventh century. But domestic conflicts facilitated the adventure of the Berber Tarik, who crossed over to Spain in league with the Gothic claimants to the throne from the family of Witiza. At the battle on the Guadelete, at Jérez de la Frontera, on 19 July 711, the last Gothic King, Roderick, lost crown and life. The conquest of the kingdom was the work of Musa, Muslim governor of Africa. While the Arabs were also occupying Septimania, the Gallic province of the Visigothic Kingdom (719–21, 725), Pelagius, a swordbearer of King Roderick, tried to reorganize the Christian resistance in Asturias. Pelagius's victory at Covadonga in 722 assured the permanence of the small Asturian principality, but it did not acquire any real importance until the second half of the ninth century. The

Church continued to exist in Muslim Spain, whose governor resided at Córdoba, but more and more lost contact with free Christendom.

The main power of the caliphate was, meanwhile, directed against the imperial city on the Bosphorus. The Byzantine Empire, convulsed since 695 by anarchy around the throne, seemed about to become an easy prey. The fall of Constantinople would, so far as one can judge, have opened up the pagan world of Central and Eastern Europe to Islam and thereby presented a mortal threat to Latin Christendom. The Arabs assaulted the walls of the imperial city for a solid year (15 August 717, to 15 August 718) but, contrary to all expectations, Constantinople held out. Its defender, the Emperor Leo III, became the saviour of Christendom. Fifteen years later, in the Battle of Poitiers (733),[1] Charles Martel brought the Arab advance to an end in the west also. Free Christendom had lost Africa and Spain but had repulsed the great offensive of the Muslim world and protected Central and Eastern Europe from Islam. The loss of provinces in the Mediterranean area was compensated by a mission in the interior of Europe. The centre of gravity of the Christian world began to shift "to the inner West" (ἐπὶ τὴν ἐσωτέραν χώραν τῆς δύσεως).[2]

A presupposition for this change was the dissociation of Rome from the ancient Empire, which had become a Greek state and had its centre of gravity on the Bosphorus. But to contemporaries this was an idea that could hardly be realized, since the Empire was not only a political but also a spiritual reality in which the Popes lived no less than the Emperors, despite the conflicts constantly breaking out since the *Henoticon* of 482. These conflicts were chiefly religious and ecclesiastical in nature, even if an Italian-Greek opposition stood out ever more distinctly in them. The Popes became Italy's spokesmen, but at the same time they spoke for a religious and ecclesiastical group which still saw the Empire as a unity. It should not cause surprise that Greek and oriental influence reached its zenith at Rome with the restoration of peace in the Church in 681. Of the thirteen Popes between 678 and 752, eleven were Sicilians, Greeks, or Syrians. Under Eastern influence the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross and the four great Marian feasts, Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, and Birthday, were introduced at Rome; they are first attested under Pope Sergius I (687–701). The *monasteria diaconiae,* all of them foundations of the sixth and seventh centuries and first mentioned under Pope Benedict II (684–85), displayed mostly Greek and oriental liturgical practices. They gathered in great numbers around the ancient *palatium* of the Emperors, which had become the Roman residence of the

---

[1] The traditional date of the battle of Poitiers is 732, but M. Baudot, "Localisation et datation de la première victoire remportée par Charles Martel contre les Musulmans" in *Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société de l'École des Chartes* XII, 1 (1955), 93–105, proves that the date was 733.

[2] Gregory II to the Emperor Leo III; cf. footnote 4.

Byzantine Exarch. The centre of the Greek colony was the Forum Boarium, with Santa Maria in Cosmedin. Other Greek quarters were near Santa Maria Antiqua *(Graecostadium)* and in the Suburra, near Santi Sergio e Bacco *(Graecostasis)*. There were Greek churches and monasteries on the Capitoline (Santa Maria in Aracoeli), on the Palatine (San Cesario), on the Aventine (San Saba), on the Caelian (Sant' Erasmo), and on the Esquiline (Santa Lucia Renati). Pope John VII (705–07) had an *episcopium* built at Santa Maria Antiqua, and his successors seem to have lived there until Zachary, who had the Lateran palace renovated.

The directors of the *monasteria diaconiae* probably played a role in the group of papal advisers, although they had not yet been admitted to the circle of deacons. The college of seven regionary deacons, which had constituted the papal council up to Gregory the Great, was no longer the only influential body. No deacon succeeded to the papacy from John V (685–6) to Gregory II (715–31). The group of seven of the later cardinal bishops is first encountered in 732. Stephen III (768–72) regulated their duties in the liturgical celebrations in the Roman basilicas, probably in conformity with an already existing rite. The number of titular churches, whose rectors constituted the group of later cardinal priests, seems to have been raised from twenty-five to twenty-eight at this moment. Thus the circle of the future cardinals became gradually more distinct in the early years of the eighth century.

In addition to the clergy, the high bureaucracy of the *iudices* became much more prominent in the latter part of the seventh century. Already ancient dignitaries were the *primicerius* and *secundicerius notariorum,* who managed the chancery, and the *primus defensorum,* head of the Church's attorneys. These were joined by the *arcarius* (income), the *saccellarius* (expenditure), and the *nomenculator* (care of the poor and pilgrims). The *vicedominus* directed the papal household, while the treasury and the wardrobe were administered by the *vestararius;* neither of these belonged to the group of higher *iudices*. The *bibliothecarius,* in charge of the archives and the library and first mentioned toward the end of the eighth century, also remained outside this board, whose number was only raised to seven in the ninth century with the admission of the *protoscriniarius,* director of the city notaries. All the *iudices* belonged to the Roman nobility, which also naturally included the members of the imperial official nobility of non-Roman origin.

The Greek and oriental Popes were loyal subjects of the Emperor, but they represented the Roman viewpoint in ecclesiastical questions no less firmly than Popes of Roman or Italian origin. The Syrian Sergius I rejected the Quinisext Council of 692, which attached ecumenical validity to such Greek and oriental customs as clerical marriage and various details of fasting and liturgy. When the Emperor Justinian II planned the fate of Martin I for him, the imperial troops in Italy sided with the Pope. For the first time an imperial warrant for arrest was inoperative in Italy. The anarchy in the imperial office, breaking out in 695, further weakened the imperial authority. Pope Constantine did, it is true, go to Constantinople in 710 to make peace with Justinian II, but this was to be the last papal journey to the Bosphorus. The Monothelite Philippicus Bardanes (711–13) was not recognized as Emperor in Rome. At Ravenna the Exarch named by Justinian II was assassinated, and the government of Byzantine Italy was assumed by George, who transformed the imperial troops into Italian militias. The overthrow of Philippicus Bardanes brought an end to the Italian interregnum, but the chaos in the Empire lasted until the repulse of the Arabs by the Emperor Leo III.

Leo, founder of the Syrian Dynasty, energetically set about reorganizing the Empire. But when he proclaimed a new tax he encountered at Rome strong opposition from Pope Gregory II (715–31), who as a Roman had a better grasp of Italian interests than his Greek and oriental predecessors and at the same time was also fighting for the property of his Church. The arrest of the Pope, ordered by the Emperor, again foundered on the resistance of the Roman militia, which was supported by the Lombards of Spoleto and Benevento. The troops of Venetia and the Pentapolis also mutinied, and in 726 or 727 the Exarch Paul was murdered. His successor, Eutychius, allied with the Lombard King Liutprand, who subdued the rebellious Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento. Eutychius was able to enter Rome in 729, but the King supported the Pope, and, since the situation in Byzantine Italy had been exacerbated by Iconoclasm, the Exarch had to give up any further measures against Rome.

Iconoclasm, which, appealing to the divine transcendence, attacked the pictorial representation of God and the saints, emanated from the East, where in 723 the Caliph Yazid II ordered the removal of all icons from the churches. It then spread to Asia Minor. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, opposed Iconoclasm, but the Emperor Leo III, who came from the borderlands between Cilicia and Syria, had meanwhile joined the opponents of images. He had the celebrated icon of Christ at the Chalke Gate pointedly destroyed in 726, thereby provoking a storm of indignation from the iconodule Greeks. A part of the army mutinied and set up an anti-emperor. But the rebellion was put down on 28 April 727. The Emperor now sought to gain the Pope for his idea. Their correspondence, which was protracted through 728 and 729, led to no agreement. Gregory II ranged himself by the side of the Patriarch Germanus, who, following an express prohibition of images on 17 January 730, obtained a successor who was submissive to the Emperor.

The prohibition of 730 led to a bloody persecution of the opposition. John Damascene, a high-ranking Christian official at the court of the Caliph, became the theological spokesman of the iconodules. In 736 he entered the monastery of Saint Sabas at Jerusalem. In the eyes of John Damascene, who justified sacred art and the veneration of icons by means of the Incarnation, Iconoclasm was a final offshoot of Monophysitism. In Ostrogorsky's words, "The Emperor was unable to impose Iconoclasm on alienated Italy". But the Pope firmly kept the ecclesiastical opposition in line and prevented the setting up of an anti-emperor by the troops of Italy. He did not give a thought to an alienation from the Empire. Nothing irrevocable had yet happened when Gregory II died on 11 February 731.

His successor, the Syrian Gregory III (731–41), again got in touch with the Emperor, but Leo III could no longer be diverted from the path he had taken. A Roman synod in November 731, at which appeared the metropolitans of Ravenna and Grado, "cum ceteris episcopis istius [He]speriae partis", expelled from the communion of the Church the despisers of ecclesiastical custom, who refused to honour sacred images and profaned them. What ensued is obscure. Perhaps, after a fruitless effort to subject Rome, Ravenna, and Venetia to his will by means of a naval demonstration, Leo III in 733 hit upon a decree which aimed to condemn Rome to insignificance. While confiscating the papal patrimonies in South Italy and Sicily, he cut off from Rome Sicily, Calabria, and the prefecture of Illyricum, comprising Thessalonica along with Macedonia and Greece, which had hitherto belonged to the Roman metropolitan and patriarchal jurisdiction, and attached them to the patriarchate of Constantinople.[3] Or perhaps he simply disregarded the Italian opposition as unimportant and abandoned Old Rome, fallen from its former height, to its fate. Whatever it may have been, the Emperor took no notice of the warning already directed to him by Gregory II: ὅτι οἱ ἄγριοι καὶ βάρβαροι ἥμεροι ἐγένοντο . . . πᾶσα ἡ δύσις καρποφορίας πίστει προσφέρει τῷ ἁγίῳ κορυφαίῳ.[4]

Of course, it remained to be seen whether the "Western" basis would bear the strain.

CHAPTER 2

The Revival of the Frankish Kingdom
and
The Crossing of the Anglo-Saxons to the Continent

The great Western power that united the Teutonic and the Latin genius was the Frankish Kingdom. At the beginning of the seventh century it had reached the first climax in its history, but from the end of the century it was menaced with inner dissolution because of the decay of the Merovingian Dynasty. This serious crisis was brought on by the assassination of King Childeric II in 675. Victor in the power struggle of the magnates was Pepin of Herstal. In the male line he descended from Arnulf of Metz and in the female line from Pepin of Landen; he united in his own hands the dynastic property of both families along the Meuse and the Moselle. The victory of Tertry in 687 made him master of the entire kingdom, with control of the kingship itself, which he made completely powerless around 700. Though Aquitaine and the duchies on the right bank of the Rhine went their separate ways, the kingdom was reinvigorated. But the premature deaths of his sons, Drogo and Grimoald, placed the work of the Arnulfing in jeopardy. This first *princeps Francorum,* dying at the end of 714, left no legitimate heir who had attained to his majority and who could have continued his father's lifework. And so the *Regnum Francorum* had to pass through the iron age of the bastard Charles Martel before reaching the great climax of its history under the Carolingians.

---

[3] This is the older view, still prevalent in German and Italian scholarship. The opinion of V. Grumel is different. He connects this measure with the "apostasy" of the papacy from the Empire, that is, with the Frankish alliance of Stephen II in 753–54. *Ostrogorsky,* 142 and n. 1, accepts the date proposed by Grumel.

[4] "That the savages and barbarians had become civilized . . . The entire West offers fruits in faith to the holy prince [Peter]." (Gregory II to the Emperor Leo III; see Caspar in *ZKG* 52 [1933], 83).

After Pepin's death three factions opposed one another in the Frankish Kingdom: Pepin's widow, Plectrudis, who was fighting for her grandson, Theudoald, a minor; the illegitimate Charles Martel, who was joined by a part of the Arnulfing supporters; and Raganfred, chosen mayor of the palace by the Neustrians and in control of the Merovingian King. Charles defeated the Neustrians at Vincy near Cambrai in March 717. In 717–18 he subjugated his stepmother Plectrudis at Cologne. In 719 there occurred a new war with the Neustrians, who were overcome this time near Soissons. Charles ruled Neustria to the Loire, but had to recognize Aquitaine as an independent principality. Only the victory over the Muslims near Poitiers in 733 opened up southern Gaul to him. In 733–36 he occupied Burgundy. Provence, whose governor Maurontus even asked for Muslim help, was conquered in 737–38. Thus the Frankish Kingdom was again constructed, and beyond the Rhine it was possible to incorporate Thuringia and much of Frisia. An effort was made to include Alemannia too, but it was not completed. In regard to Bavaria, like Aquitaine, Charles had to be content with a more or less effective suzerainty.

A second Frankish wave flowed over Gaul and Germany in the wake of the Carolingian reconquest of the Frankish Kingdom. The mayor's vassals from the Meuse, the Moselle, and the Rhine assumed the leading positions in the conquered territories and formed the matrix of the "Carolingian imperial aristocracy". The *princeps Francorum* provided new means of power for the central government. Since the crown lands and the confiscated property of opponents did not suffice, he had recourse to Church property, which had greatly expanded in the sixth and seventh centuries. The "secularization" was effected by direct confiscation or by the nomination of trusted laymen as bishops and abbots; they then placed the property of their churches at the disposal of the mayor for the equipping of troops. These brutal usurpations produced nothing less than chaos in the Church, and the metropolitan organization fell completely into ruins. Not the least consequence of the secularization was a powerful moral deterioration. Of course, it did not operate everywhere in the same way. The damage was least in the lands which constituted Charles's oldest center of support; worst in the territories which had been subjugated only after severe struggles. Charles's encroachments did not originate in an anti-ecclesiastical attitude. The Frankish *princeps* and his vassals were permeated with a strong religious emotion, which was powerfully stimulated by the struggle against the Muslims. They obtained their victories with Christ's help. Avignon, like Jericho, fell at the sound of trumpets. The chronicle which was compiled at the direction of Charles's brother, Childebrand, saw the *princeps Francorum* in the image of Joshuah. Some day the conqueror would have to be followed by the legislator.

In the 730's Charles's position had become established to such a degree that he could leave the throne unoccupied and before his death divide the realm among his sons. Carloman and Pepin the Short buried their father, who died on 22 October 741, in the royal vault of Saint-Denis and excluded their half-brother, Grifo, from the paternal inheritance. The first critical period of the change of authority was quickly overcome. In 743 the brothers again elevated a Merovingian to the vacant throne, but they quite frankly regarded the kingdom as their own. The subjugation of the Alemanni was completed in 746. Carloman, who had harshly sat in judgment over the adherents of Theudebald, last Duke of Alemannia, at Canstatt, renounced the government in 747. He founded a monastery on Monte Soracte near Rome and eventually became a monk at Saint Benedict's abbey of Montecassino. Not political but religious motives prompted Carloman's decision. Since the death of his father he had cooperated with the work of Boniface, and, according to Schieffer, "only those Anglo-Saxon Kings, who had preceded him on this path, could have been the decisive examples".

Roman missionaries had once journeyed to Anglo-Saxon Britain *via* the Frankish Kingdom, and since the mid-seventh century Anglo-Saxon pilgrims, churchmen, and kings had travelled the same road in the opposite direction. They usually crossed to Quentovic (Boulogne) or Rouen and proceeded from there on the Roman roads which led by way of Lyons to Italy. Wilfrid of York in 678 for the first time selected another route, by way of the mouths of the Rhine, since he was on bad terms with Ebroin, mayor of the palace of Neustria and Burgundy. He spent the winter of 678–79 with King Aldgisl in Frisia, where he preached the Gospel. Though Wilfrid's activity was a mere episode, it became the starting point for the Frisian mission which his pupil Willibrord undertook more than a decade later.

Willibrord, born in Northumbria around 658, grew up in Wilfrid's monastery of Ripon. When in 678 his master was deposed from the see of

York, the pupil left Ripon and spent the next twelve years in Ireland. There the Anglo-Saxon Egbert, who also had missionary ambitions, became his teacher. Since the Anglo-Saxon territories offered no further opportunities for missionary work following the conversion of Sussex and the Isle of Wight (681–86), Egbert in 688 sent his companion Witbert to the Frisians. The ultimate aim was missionary work among the closely related Saxons. But after only two years of frustration Witbert left. Radbod, who was anti-Christian, had replaced Aldgisl as King of the Frisians. But Egbert did not become discouraged. At his bidding Willibrord sailed for the continent in 690 with eleven companions.

Willibrord went, not to Radbod, but to Pepin of Herstal, who had just re-established Frankish suzerainty over southwest Frisia. The earlier Frankish mission of Amandus, apostle of Flanders, had reached as far as Antwerp, which now became Willibrord's first base. Around 692 he went to Rome and obtained the Pope's blessing on the work he had begun. The mission then spread to other areas bordering on the Frankish Kingdom. Willibrord's companion, Swithbert, during his master's absence, had himself consecrated a bishop by Wilfrid and undertook to preach among the Bructeri south of the Lippe. Two other Anglo-Saxons, both named Ewald, proceeded to the Saxons in western Münsterland. But this was a premature move. Both Ewalds were slain and a Saxon expedition destroyed the mission among the Bructeri before the turn of the century. Swithbert obtained from Pepin an island in the Rhine near Neuss, the present Kaiserswerth, where he died in 713.

In these circumstances the Anglo-Saxon mission at first confined its attention to Frisia. At Pepin's suggestion Willibrord returned to Rome, where on 21 November 695, he was consecrated a missionary archbishop and given the name Clement by Pope Sergius I. The fortress of Utrecht, which had been again in Frankish hands since the beginning of the seventh century, became the seat of the Archbishop. Willibrord saw to the rebuilding of the Frankish church of Saint Martin, that had been destroyed, and to the construction of a cathedral, which, following the example of Canterbury, he consecrated to the Redeemer. As bases to the rear he obtained the recently founded abbey of Echternach near Trier and the monastery of Süsteren near Maastricht. During Pepin's lifetime the mission prospered, but on his death it completely collapsed. Only after Radbod's death in 719, when Charles Martel had restored Frankish rule in southwest Frisia, could Willibrord resume the interrupted work. The church of Utrecht revived and was again endowed. Charles Martel's charter of 1 January 723, issued in regard to it, introduced a second phase of permanent missionary work, which, it is true, achieved enduring successes only within the Frankish frontiers west and south of the Zuyder Zee as far as the Yssel. His base was too restricted for a new ecclesiastical province such as the apostle of the Frisians had dreamed of. But when Willibrord died on 7 November 739, the foundations of the future see of Utrecht had been laid.

By that time Winfrid-Boniface was already the dominant figure among the Anglo-Saxon churchmen in the Frankish Kingdom. He came not from Anglian Northumbria but from Wessex. Born near Exeter in 672 or 673, he was sent for his education to the monastery of Exeter around 680. He later entered the abbey of Nursling near Winchester and was there ordained a priest. In mature life he decided upon the *peregrinatio propter Christum*. From the outset his aim was the conversion of the related Saxons of the continent, but only a mission land bordering on Saxon territory could provide the initial steps in this direction. And so in 716 Winfrid crossed from London to Dorestad near Utrecht. Meanwhile, the attempt to establish a mission there had failed because of Radbod, just as had Witbert's efforts in 688–89. Winfrid returned home again, but in 718 he left once more, this time forever.

It was just at that moment that Charles Martel had established his control of Frankish Austrasia. In February 718 Willibrord obtained a privilege from the new mayor. Winfrid, however, did not contact Charles; instead, he went *via* Neustria to Rome, where on 15 May 719, Pope Gregory II gave him a missionary mandate and at the same time the name Boniface, which from now on he used exclusively. For the moment the Frisian mission field seemed closed off. The situation looked more favourable along the southern frontier of the Saxon lands. In 704 and 717 Heden, Duke of the Thuringians, had sent rich presents to Willibrord and had thereby shown his interest in the Anglo-Saxon missionaries. And so Boniface went to Thuringia by way of Bavaria, where he apparently gained his disciple Sturmi at this time. In Thuringia he encountered resistance from the clergy who were already on hand. The conflict brought about a journey to Frankland, during which Boniface learned of the death of the Frisian King Radbod. Once again he devoted himself to the mission in Frisia, labouring there for two years under Willibrord's guidance.

In 716 and 718 Boniface had gone it alone, and so it should cause no surprise that in 721 he again left Willibrord. By way of Trier, where a young Frank, Gregory, joined him, he proceeded to the upper Lahn in order to evangelize the still pagan Hessians around Fritzlar and Kassel on the Saxon frontier. He found support in the commanders of the Frankish fortress of Amöneburg, where he established a first monastic cell. His preaching among the Hessians brought his first great success. He now went to Rome for the second time and on 30 November 722, he was consecrated a bishop by Gregory II. On this occasion he took the oath of obedience which the suffragan bishops of the Roman province were accustomed to take to the Pope as their metropolitan. The obligation of loyalty to the Emperor, which was included in this oath, was replaced by the engagement not to be in communion with bishops who acted contrary to the *instituta sanctorum patrum* and to take action against them, or, if this was not possible, to report them to the Pope. Thus Boniface's missionary diocese was intimately linked to Rome. Gregory II dismissed the new bishop with a recommendation to Charles Martel, who issued a safe-conduct for him at the beginning of 723. Boniface was now on the same footing as Willibrord.

Under the protection of the *princeps Francorum* the mission in Hesse made rapid progress. In 723 Boniface felled the "thunder oak" of Geismar and from its wood constructed the first church of Fritzlar, around which gathered a second monastic settlement. In 725 he went through the forest to northeastern Thuringia, where, following the extinction of the ducal family, pagan Saxon influence had gained ground. Ohrdruf, on the eastern slope of the forest, arose as the third monastery. After a decade missionary work in Hesse and Thuringia was completed. The time seemed ripe for establishing a new ecclesiastical province, and in 732 Pope Gregory III raised Boniface to the rank of archbishop by the bestowal of the pallium.

Should the projected province comprise only Boniface's missionary territory? Even the Thuringian territory along the Main, which had been Christian for some time, still had no ecclesiastical autonomy. A papal letter of 738 mentions among the tribes in Boniface's diocese the Thuringians, Hessians, Borthari (Bructeri?), the Nistresi (the Nister or Diemel area?), the Wedrecii (around Wetter or Wetterau?), the Lognai (Lahngau), the Suduodi (?), and the Graffelti (Grabfeld). Hence it may be surmised that the new province was to include the greatest part of the lands "in Germany", to the right of the Rhine, under direct Frankish rule, excluding the politically autonomous duchies of the Alemanni and the Bavarians. Then it is possible to explain the strong opposition evoked by the great project. Boniface had already encountered local opposition from the clergy. Until now he had dealt successfully with it. So long as he was working in remote frontier areas as the director of a mission, there had been few sources of friction with the Frankish episcopate. But the new plan was bound to provoke the Rhenish bishops against him, for they regarded the spacious territories of transrhenane "Germany" as their spheres of interest. The projected province failed to materialize, for, as Schieffer says, the necessary aid of Charles Martel, "which would have had to go far beyond the previous relationship of protection, was lacking".

The Archbishop utilized the next years in consolidating his position. The arrival of Anglo-Saxon helpers made new foundations possible. In the Thuringian territory along the Main arose the Anglo-Saxon convents of Tauberbischofsheim, Kitzingen, and Ochsenfurt. A great success for Boniface was the establishing of contact with the Bavarian Duke Hucbald (d. 736) and his successor Odilo. And Charles Martel's Saxon campaign, set for 738, even opened up the prospect of the longed for Saxon mission. In these years Boniface may have been tossed between hope and disillusionment until finally his third journey to Rome in 737–38 seemed to confirm all his hopes. Not only Thuringia and Hesse but also Bavaria and Saxony were entrusted to him. Gregory III extended the Archbishop's commission by making him his legate in Germany. In addition to the general credentials, the Pope gave him letters to the peoples of the transrhenane lands ruled by the Franks and to the bishops of the Bavarians and the Alemanni (Augsburg) and a missionary summons to the "Old Saxons".

The hope for an opening up of Saxony was premature and soon had to be buried. But in 739, with the aid of Duke Odilo, Boniface was able to regulate the Bavarian situation and to establish the bishoprics of Regensburg, Freising, Salzburg, and Passau, which had been envisaged long before. Bavaria did not yet obtain its own ecclesiastical metropolis; Boniface retained the supreme authority. Ecclesiastical organization in Thuringia and Hesse was now an especially urgent question. Boniface had probably not been able to undertake it while Charles Martel was alive, but the death of the *princeps Francorum* gave him a free hand.

Carloman, heir of Frankish Austrasia, at once sought a close cooperation with the Anglo-Saxon Archbishop in Germany, but Boniface had to pay for this cooperation by renouncing his position in Bavaria. Even in the last years of Charles Martel the emancipation of Bavaria from Frankish suzerainty had begun anew. The exclusion of the half-brother Grifo, whose mother was a Bavarian princess, led to the break between the Carolingians and Duke Odilo. Boniface had at first counted upon Grifo, but he promptly took hold of Carloman's hand, for there now opened up for him the prospect of a reform of the Church in the Frankish Kingdom. In 742 occurred the founding of the "Bonifatian" sees of Würzburg, Büraburg (Fritzlar), and Erfurt, to which was soon added Eichstätt in the Bavarian border districts of the Swalafeld and the Nordgau, ceded to the Franks. The first Frankish reform council met on 21 April 743. It was followed in March 744 by the reform councils of Les Estinnes in Hainaut (Carloman's territory) and Soissons (Pepin's territory).

The three Bonifatian reform councils sought the restoration of law and order in the Frankish Church and the renewal of moral and religious order among clergy and laity. Carloman subordinated the episcopate of his portion of the kingdom to the Archbishop-Legate Boniface. In Pepin's lands the ancient ecclesiastical provinces of Rouen, Reims, and Sens were to be restored. Annual provincial councils were to strengthen the inner structure of the provinces and promote moral reform.

Other decrees related to the restoration of diocesan structure. The subjection of the clergy to the diocesan bishop was reimposed. Priests were to report regularly to their bishop in regard to their conduct and the carrying out of their functions, while itinerant bishops and priests were not to be instituted without examination by a synod. But the ticklish question of the proprietary church was not taken up.

The restoration called for a guaranteeing of the material bases. The full restitution of ecclesiastical property, which Carloman had decreed in his first enthusiasm in 743, was toned down at Les Estinnes and Soissons. A portion of Church property — the greater part — was excepted from the restitution because of the military necessities, but thereafter it was to be regarded as "tribute-paying loan land". This decree was of far-reaching significance for the development of Frankish feudalism.

Moral prescriptions for clergy and laity promoted inner reform. Priests were forbidden to carry arms and thus to engage in the chase and in war and they were required to practise celibacy. The prohibition of heathen practices and the enjoining of the canon law on marriage concerned the laity. Only those belonging to the lower clergy were removed from office. The renewal of the personnel in the episcopate could not be undertaken abruptly but only as the occasion arose in a long-range plan.

The reform inaugurated in 743–44 profited not only the Church but also the reorganizations of the kingdom, as the regulations for the secularized Church property make clear. The two Carolingians acted as kings: they convoked and directed synods, appointed bishops, and created ecclesiastical provinces. "The principle of the territorial Church began to consolidate itself even in a monarchical and theocratic sense, not least under the stamp of Anglo-Saxon models . . . It corresponded to the usages of English legislation that the decrees of councils should no longer be promulgated as episcopal decrees, as in the Merovingian period, but as enactments of the ruler, as capitularies . . Furthermore, it was something new that Carloman and . . . Pepin . . . combined their first synods with an assembly of the secular magnates of the kingdom . . No really active role pertained to the Pope. He stood in the background as guardian and witness of the true faith and ancient morality, as the highest tribunal, to which respect was due . . . The task looming before Boniface corresponded to the role which Archbishop Theodore had been once called upon to play in the Church of his homeland" (Schieffer).

In these years Boniface was at the height of his creative activity. But the three reform councils meant only a beginning, not a completion, and the completion of the job was not granted to the Archbishop-Legate. Apart from the "Bonifatian" bishops, only those of Cologne and Strasbourg took part in the first reform synod. The opposition in the Austrasian episcopate was thus still strong. The names of those present at Les Estinnes are not known. Twenty-three bishops appeared at Soissons, all of them from the provinces of Reims, Rouen, and Sens. The reorganization of the province of Tours and of the sees in Burgundy and Provence could thus not yet be undertaken, and Aquitaine, like Bavaria, held aloof.

The programme of 743 was not to be entirely implemented, even in

Francia. The restoration of the three Western ecclesiastical provinces did not take place. The application for the grant of the *pallium* was sustained only for Grimo of Rouen. At first the restoration seemed to make better progress in Austrasia. A council of the whole Frankish Kingdom in 745 assigned Cologne to Boniface as a metropolitan see and deposed Bishop Gewiliob of Mainz, who had become guilty of shedding blood. The province of Cologne was to comprise the Rhenish sees from Speyer to Utrecht and the Meuse see of Tongres-Liège. Thus the province of Trier was excluded. Apart from this concession to the principal opponent, Milo of Trier, nothing else was done. The restoration of the metropolitan organization foundered also in Austrasia. The synod which met in 747 under the presidency of the Archbishop-Legate was indeed an imposing exhibition by the friends of reform in Austrasia and Neustria, but it did not obtain ratification by the Carolingians. In the same year Boniface lost his strongest support through Carloman's retirement. Pepin had all along represented a more cautious ecclesiastical policy. Now, having pushed aside his nephew Drogo and assumed the government in the entire kingdom, he had all the more to avoid opposition by the magnates. Boniface withdrew into the background.

Boniface remained Archbishop and Legate, but the Frankish realm was no longer the scene of his activity. The closing years of his life were devoted to the care of the more restricted sphere of Hesse and Thuringia and of his mainly Anglo-Saxon assistants. More prominent now were the abbey of Fulda, founded in 744, and the bishopric of Mainz, given to him in 746–47 on the collapse of the Cologne project. Fulda had been planned from the start as a great monastic civilizing center and had been organized on the model of the Benedictine archabbey of Montecassino by Boniface's pupil, Sturmi. Fulda lay in the diocese of Würzburg but on the extreme northern edge, and, in accord with the intention of the founder, it was to serve especially for the Christian penetration of the dioceses of Büraburg-Fritzlar and Erfurt "prope marcam paganorum". Hence in 751 Boniface obtained from Pope Zachary a privilege of exemption for the abbey, which freed it from the authority of the Bishop of Würzburg.[1] He thereby created in his old sphere of activity an "archiepiscopal enclave" with which he kept in closest touch from Mainz. As his successor at Mainz he chose his Anglo-Saxon pupil Lul. Pope Zachary acquiesced in Boniface's designs and allowed him in 748 to appoint a coadjutor bishop with a view to the succession. But it was not until 752 that Boniface consecrated him. For his plan he needed Pepin's consent; it was finally obtained through the good offices of Fulrad, Abbot of Saint-Denis. Apparently he then sought to establish in law the union of Mainz and Hesse-Thuringia, which for the time being was merely a personal union, by having Büraburg and Erfurt recognized as suffragans of Mainz. He was thus preparing the way whereby his successor Lul would later achieve the inclusion of the two fields of Boniface's missionary activity within the diocese of Mainz.

---

[1] According to W. Schwarz, *Jurisdicio und Condicio,* 91 ff., there was question of a papal privilege of protection, which assured the abbey's autonomy but did not infringe on the diocesan bishop's right of consecration.

The Anglo-Saxon mission territory of Frisia also remained subject to Boniface. In 741 the Archbishop-Legate had here appointed a bishop as Willibrord's successor and had given the abbey of Saint Martin at Utrecht to his Frankish disciple Gregory. When the see of Utrecht again fell vacant in 752–53, Hildegar of Cologne wanted to incorporate it into his diocese. But Boniface was able to defeat the claim of Cologne with the aid of Pepin, who in 753 committed the direction of the Frisian Church to him personally. In the very same year Boniface set out on the Frisian journey on which his life was to reach fulfillment. In the exercise of his office of shepherd of souls in Frisia, when on 5 June 754, within the Pentecost octave, he was intending to confirm some neophytes in central Frisia, the eighty-year-old apostle met a martyr's death near Dokkum in a pagan surprise attack. His remains were recovered by a Frankish punitive expedition and, in accord with his desire, were deposited at Fulda. His martyrdom brought about a complete *volte-face* in the Frankish magnates, who now paid to the saint the reverence they had denied to the living Archbishop.

Chapter 3

The Founding of the Carolingian Monarchy and The Progress of the Reform

From 747 the destiny of the Frankish Kingdom was in the hands of the Mayor Pepin. Born in 714, this second son of Charles Martel had been educated at Saint-Denis. His father had decided that he should inherit Burgundy and Neustria and in 740 had sent him to Burgundy with his uncle Childebrand. The young prince grew up in a Frankish *milieu* — he was a stranger to the Anglo-Saxons.

The men who directed Pepin's education at Saint-Denis are unknown to us. But under Charles Martel we encounter a churchman who can be compared with Willibrord and Boniface as a typical representative of the religious forces still alive in the Frankish Church — Pirmin, "apostle of the Alemanni". Pirmin's "earthly homeland" has been a subject of controversy for years, but it is of no importance in comparison with his intellectual world, which was certainly stamped by the monastic culture of southern Gaul and displayed a clearly Spanish element. Perhaps the father of Alemannian monasticism, who, in the manner of the Irish, had received episcopal consecration but represented the Benedictine rule and founded a monastic congregation resembling those of Fructuosus of Braga, was a refugee from Spain or Septimania. It seems that the Burgundian abbey of Flavigny, in the diocese of Autun, was one of the stops on his route. He emerged into history in 724, when, with the cooperation of Charles Martel, he founded the abbey of Reichenau. Strained relations with the Duke of the Alemanni, and perhaps also with the Bishop of Constance, led to his expulsion. He went to Alsace, where in 728 he established the abbey of Murbach, to which Charles Martel granted a charter of protection. From Reichenau was founded the Rhaetian monastery of Pfäfers in the diocese of Chur; from Murbach, the Leodegarcella at Lucerne. Pirmin himself worked thenceforth in the dioceses of Strasbourg and Metz. His pupil Eddo became Bishop of Strasbourg in 734. The monasteries of Neuweiler and Hornbach in the diocese of Metz owed their origin to Pirmin. When the see of Basel was revived on the dissolution of the Alsatian duchy in 739 and Strasbourg was compensated for the loss of the Sundgau by means of the Ortenau, Pirmin emerged as a monastic founder in the Ortenau too, with the establishing of Gengenbach (after 748) and the reform of Schwarzach (before 749) and Schuttern. He resided in the abbey of Hornbach, and there he died in 753.

Hornbach was the principal monastery of the Wido, a powerful Frankish noble family, to which belonged Milo of Trier, the chief opponent of Boniface in Austrasia. The founding and reform of the Ortenau monasteries was made possible by the assistance of another Frankish magnate from the Moselle country, Duke Rothard, who after 746 functioned with Warin as governor in Alemannia and introduced there the Carolingian county organization. For his part, Rothard was on intimate terms with the men who, under Pepin, were to assume the leadership of the Frankish Church — with Chrodegang of Metz, who came from the Meuse homeland of the Pepinids, and Fulrad of Saint-Denis, a Moselle countryman of the Arnulfings. Fulrad belonged to Pepin's chapel. Chrodegang had served as *referendarius* under Charles Martel and in 742 had received the see of Metz. As Bishop of Metz he founded the model abbey of Gorze in 748, from which monks were sent to Gengenbach and in 764 to Lorsch, a foundation of Chancor, Count of the Rheingau.

Fulrad first became prominent at a decisive turning point in Frankish history. Following his brother Carloman's retirement, Pepin had assumed the government of Austrasia without opposition, but he had to proceed once more against his half-brother Grifo, who, having been pardoned, was plotting revolts with Saxon and Bavarian help. Quiet did not ensue until after two victorious campaigns against Bavaria (747) and Saxony (748). "Quievit terra a proeliis annis duobus", remarked the semi-official chronicle of Pepin's uncle Childebrand, alluding to the Book of Joshuah, thereby underlining the providential character of this peace. Then Pepin dispatched his chaplain Fulrad and Bishop Burchard of Würzburg to Pope Zachary with the celebrated question: "de regibus in Francia, qui illis temporibus non habentes regalem potestatem, si bene fuisset an non". The two envoys returned with the papal answer: "ut melius esset, illum regem vocari, qui potestatem haberet, quam illum qui sine regali potestate manebat, ut non conturbaretur ordo . . ."[1] At the end of 751 Pepin was elected King by the Franks, raised to the throne, and anointed by the Frankish bishops. The last Merovingian was sent to a monastery.

Scarcely ninety years earlier the Pepinid Grimoald had snatched at the crown for his son, but the *coup d'état* had failed. Grimoald had kept to the forms of the secular law, having his son adopted into the royal Merovingian family. Pepin's election and enthronement also complied with Germanic law, which, however, was now complemented and reinforced by the royal anointing, borrowed from the Old Testament. The recourse to the Old Testament may have occurred spontaneously, and it was also suggested by the liturgy. But anointing had already been customary among the Visigoths in Spain, and it is by no means impossible that the Visigothic model may have had an impact in the Frankish Kingdom. In the early Carolingian age it was not only Pirmin's circle, which was connected with Chrodegang, that attested the Spanish cultural stream. Another witness was the spread of the great Spanish canonical collection, the *Collectio Hispana,* which was copied in 787 on the orders of Bishop Rachis of Strasbourg and was then revised at Autun. On the other hand, the inquiry made to the Pope presupposes the influence of the Anglo-Saxons, their regular exchange of correspondence with Rome, which, since the beginning of the Bonifatian reform, extended also to the mayors of the palace. According to the *Annales Regni Francorum,* compiled under Charles the Great, Pepin was anointed by Boniface, but this report is not confirmed by contemporary sources. The papal reply was based on the patristic notion of *ordo,* according to which name and thing corresponded to each other in the divine order of the world. It was, according to Büttner, an "award, clothed in the traditional forms of correspondence", made by the highest religious authority and not associated with any political conditions. The patristic idea of *ordo* thus came into a meaningful relationship with the Germanic idea that real kingship had to prove itself by means of a charism, "the royal healing".

The anointing of Pepin as King was of decisive importance for the development of the Christian notion of the king in the West. The ruler's position in the Church was thereafter sacramentally justified, for the royal anointing was regarded as a sacrament until the Investiture Controversy. The formula *Dei gratia rex* is first met under Charles the Great. The royal liturgy soon appeared not only at the king's anointing but also on great feasts, when he wore his crown. It acquired an imposing expression in the royal *laudes,* which may first have resounded for Pepin, even though they too are first attested for Charles the Great. The triumphant "Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat" began and concluded in the *laudes* the acclamations of Pope, King and Queen, royal family, and *exercitus Francorum,* joined with invocations of Christ, the angels, and the saints. In the basic version, determined under Charles the Great, the apostles were called upon for the Pope, Mary and the angels for the King, and the martyrs for the army. These groups corresponded in Visigothic Spain to the three divine Persons — the angels as the retinue of the Father, the apostles as that of the Son, the martyrs as that of the Holy Spirit. And so, despite the basically Christological character of the *laudes,* they symbolically expressed that the kingship belonged to the order of creation (God the Father), while the priesthood pertained to the order of redemption (God the Son).

---

[1] *Contin. Fredegarii,* 32, *MGSS rer. Mer.,* II, 182.

In this symbolism the *exercitus Francorum* occupied the place of the Christian people, the *ecclesia* — the sphere of the Holy Spirit. Appealed to on its behalf were the great old Gallic bishops, Hilary of Poitiers and Martin of Tours, and the old Gallic martyrs, regarded as national patrons. Thus the Franks clearly appeared to be the new Israel. The same idea was expressed in Pepin's prologue to the *Lex Salica,* with its emphasis on the divine election, the proficiency in arms, and the orthodoxy of the Frankish people, which, even in its pagan days, sought wisdom through divine inspiration, aspired to *iustitia* "according to the degree of its moral sense", and preserved *pietas.* This eulogy of the Franks corresponds to that of the Visigoths, composed more than a century earlier by Isidore of Seville, and seems to have been directly influenced by it.

Pepin's prologue of 763–64 was drawn up in the Carolingian chancery by Baddilo, who is seen from 757 as director of the scribes and from 760 to 766 as sole chancellor. Baddilo was a royal chaplain. Like vassals, the chaplains entered the service of the Carolingians by means of commendation, which obliged them, not to military service, but to liturgical service at court. To this "basic function" were soon added other tasks, such as responsibility for charters and diplomacy. With Pepin's coronation the chapel became the most important instrument of Christian kingship. Pepin gave it a more stable organization by appointing as *summus capellanus* the chaplain Fulrad, to whom in 750 he had given the abbey of Saint-Denis, the most distinguished royal monastery. And the chancery, as the chapel's field of activity, was more tightly organized. In 760 Baddilo became its first head.

Church reform was taken up again from 754, when Chrodegang had succeeded Boniface as head of the Frankish episcopate. The Council of Ver in 755 was followed by those of Verberie (756), Compiègne (757), Attigny (c. 760–62), and Gentilly (767). In the last named the Franks were first concerned with the question of Iconoclasm. At Ver a new effort was made to restore the metropolitan organization, but once again with no apparent success. In 769 only Wilchar of Sens was *archiepiscopus*. In addition to questions concerning episcopal authority in dioceses, the law of marriage was especially discussed. In order to provide material assistance again to the churches of the kingdom, Pepin imposed the tithe by law in 765. It was to be used exclusively for the care of souls; one-fourth was to go to the bishop, three-fourths to the parish clergy. The universal introduction of the tithe was of great moment for ecclesiastical organization, for, through the delimitation of tithe-areas, "the foundation was laid for a new system of small parishes". Chrodegang's rule for canons, composed around 754 for the clergy of the Metz cathedral, promoted the reform of clerical morals. In it Chrodegang followed the Roman model but also borrowed most of the regulations of the rule of Saint Benedict and relied on the Frankish synodal law. In contrast to monks, canons retained the use of their private property. At the Council of Ver the *ordo clericorum,* based on the *canones,* was for the first time placed alongside the *ordo monachorum*. Chrodegang and Pepin also began the Romanization of the Gallican liturgy and chant, which was realized under Charles the Great. Here were already seen the effects of the close relations with Rome, brought about by Pepin's Italian expeditions.

CHAPTER 4

The Beginnings of the Papal State

Since the conflict with the Emperor Leo III, Rome and Ravenna, though still parts of the Empire, had to depend on their own strength and devices in the face of the expanding Lombard Kingdom. The restoration of Rome's city walls, begun as early as 708 and resumed under Gregory II, was completed under Gregory III (731–41). Thereafter the basis of Roman politics remained that solidarity with Ravenna, Spoleto, and Benevento which had developed under Gregory II. The papacy found a more effective protection than city fortifications and alliances in the esteem which Peter, the prince of the apostles, was held in the Germanic-Roman world, not least by the Lombard King Liutprand, who sought not only to incorporate the exarchate and the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento into his kingdom, but also to protect the Roman Church. Thanks to Saint Peter's reputation, Gregory III was able to procure the restoration of Ravenna, occupied in 732–33, to the Exarch. Friendship with Spoleto led the Pope in 739 to the edge of the abyss, since the King, after subjugating the Roman duchy, appeared before Rome. Gregory III decided to invoke the aid of Charles Martel, but the *princeps Francorum,* to whom the Lombard King had given help against the Muslims in Provence in 737–38, sent the Abbot Grimo to negotiate peace. The immediate danger was exorcised, but the Lombard sword of Damocles continued to hang over Rome.

Gregory's successor, the Greek Zachary, in 742 again sent notification of his election and his profession of faith to the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople. Leo III's son and successor, Constantine V, was at that moment threatened by an iconodule anti-emperor, but in 743 he became master of the situation. The Lombard King utilized the opportunity to neutralize Rome by a twenty-years peace. In 742 Zachary had to give up the alliance with Spoleto and recognize the royal conquests at the expense of the exarchate. In return, Liutprand restored papal patrimonies and even four frontier fortresses of the Roman duchy that had been seized in 739. He also once again refrained from an attack on Ravenna because of papal intervention. The peace was maintained under Liutprand's successor, Ratchis (744–49). But it could hardly be kept secret from the Lombards that the independence of Ravenna and Rome depended entirely on their good will. King Aistulf, who in 749 overthrew his brother Ratchis, was determined to finish the job. He occupied Ravenna in 750–51 and in the spring of 752 inaugurated economic warfare against Rome.

When the Lombard's intentions in regard to Rome became clear, Pope Zachary was dead. His successor, the Roman Stephen II, engaged in negotiations and in June-July 752 concluded an armistice. Aistulf expected the Pope to advocate the recognition of the Lombard conquests by the Emperor. But Stephen II sympathized with the people of Ravenna and implored the Emperor to send military help. When the Lombard King learned this news, he sent the Romans an ultimatum in October 752 — to recognize his sovereignty and to pay a heavy tribute to Pavia. The Emperor sent, not an army, but an embassy under the *silentiarius* John. It reached Rome probably in November 752 and was then received by Aistulf at Ravenna. Negotiations continued. Envoys of King and Pope accompanied the *silentiarius* on his return to the imperial court.

The Pope understood that he could no longer expect any real aid from the Emperor. Constantinople was preparing for a new council, that could only aggravate the religious conflict with Rome. In this emergency Stephen II turned to Pepin. A first message, transmitted secretly by a pilgrim in March 753, depicted the precarious situation of Rome. Soon after the Pope sought an official invitation to the Frankish Kingdom. Pepin's return-embassy reached Rome in June and July. Aistulf now proceeded to a military attack on Rome, probably intending to present the Franks with a *fait accompli*. But he acted too late. In September the invitation to Frankland was delivered by two very exalted Frankish dignitaries. Archbishop Chrodegang and Duke Autcar, Pepin's brother-in-law. At the same time appeared the imperial *silentiarius* with an order to the Pope to negotiate with the Lombard King in the Emperor's name.

On 14 October 753, Stephen II, accompanied by the *silentiarius* John and the Frankish escort, left the Eternal City for Pavia. The Lombard King continued to be inflexible, but dared not prevent the Pope from continuing his journey into Frankland; the imperial envoy seems to have given his consent to this. Stephan II left Pavia on 15 November. He was welcomed on Frankish soil at the abbey of Saint-Maurice by Abbot Fulrad of Saint-Denis and Duke Rothard. The King awaited the Pope at the royal villa of Ponthion, southeast of Châlons, but sent his twelve-year-old son Charles to meet him. Stephen II reached Ponthion on the Epiphany 754. Pepin rode toward him, paid him the homage of *proskynesis* prescribed also by imperial etiquette, and escorted him, leading the Pope's horse by the reins. The discussions began the next day. Stephen appeared as a suppliant before Pepin, who, in his own name and the name of his sons, promised *defensio* on oath. Thus was the decision made. Details of the agreement were left for later. Stephen II spent the winter at the royal abbey of Saint-Denis, while the King sought to achieve his goals first through negotiations with Aistulf.

No fewer than three Frankish embassies went to the court of Pavia in 754, but the Lombard King proved to be an obstinate and dangerous opponent. He knew that among the Frankish magnates there was strong opposition to a military intervention in Italy. And, as a matter of fact, no agreement between Pepin and the magnates was reached at the March assembly at Berny-Rivière. Aistulf backed up the opposition by getting Pepin's brother, Carloman, to undertake a journey into the Frankish Kingdom. This danger brought the Pope and the Frankish King even closer together. Stephen loaned Pepin his spiritual authority so that he could relegate Carloman and his sons to a monastery. And at Easter 754, at the assembly of Quierzy near Laon, Pepin obtained a decision for the Italian campaign. The King apparently gave the Pope in writing a promise to guarantee the territorial status of Rome and Ravenna, of Venetia and Istria, and the autonomy of Spoleto and Benevento.[1] The two partners concluded a pact of friendship. Shortly before the departure for the campaign, Stephen at Saint-Denis solemnly anointed Pepin and his sons Charles and Carloman as Kings. He excluded the collateral line of the Pepinids from the kingship and bestowed upon the three Kings of the Franks the title of *patricius* as the expression of their protectorate over Rome, but it is uncertain whether he did so by virtue of an imperial commission or on his own authority.[2]

---

[1] E. Griffe, *Aux origines de l'État pontifical,* incorrectly regards the *donatio* of Quierzy, given only in extracts in the *Vita Hadriani* in the *Liber pontificalis,* as an interpolation. The only point debatable is whether, with the promise of Quierzy, there was also included the grant to Saint Peter of specified territories and of the island of Corsica, without prejudice to their belonging to the *Imperium* or to the *Regnum*. It is certain that "the Popes (from Stephan II) claimed the sovereignty of Saint Peter over all lands freed by the Franks from Lombard rule", and "that Pepin and Charles . . . made promises that to a great extent were never fulfilled" (R. Classen, *Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz,* 543, 542).

[2] Besides Dannenbauer, F. Dölger (*ByZ* 45 [1952], 187–90) and E. Stein defend the view that the Pope granted the title of *patricius* by order of the Emperor. On this question cf.

While Pepin was moving into Italy *via* the Mont-Cenis in August 754, his brother Carloman died in a monastery at Vienne. The attempted revolution in the Frankish Kingdom collapsed. Aistulf began negotiations for peace when the Franks besieged him in Pavia. In the treaty of peace he recognized Frankish suzerainty over the Lombard Kingdom and obliged himself to give up Ravenna "cum diversis civitatibus".

Peace was concluded between "Romans, Franks, and Lombards", though neither the Emperor nor the city of Rome was represented at Pavia. Aistulf evacuated Venetia and Istria and turned over Ravenna to the metropolitan of the city. But he retained parts of the exarchate and likewise did not entirely carry out the restorations due to Rome. The undefined constitutional situation of Rome and Ravenna allowed him to defer fulfilling his engagements and play off Ravenna against Rome. And as Iconoclasm flared up again at that very moment, a Lombard-Byzantine coalition moved into the realm of the possible.

But the Lombard King was lacking in patience. In December 755 he marched on Rome, which was completely invested on 1 January 756. Only the sea-route was still open. This the Frankish *missus* Warnehar took, together with three papal envoys, who in March delivered to the Frankish King a desperate appeal for help in the name of Saint Peter. In May an imperial embassy *en route* to Pepin arrived in Rome. It likewise took the sea-route to Marseilles, but when it got there Pepin was already before Pavia. The envoy George proceeded on to the King and made known his master's demand — the handing over of Ravenna and the exarchate to the Emperor. Pepin replied that he had embarked on the campaign only "pro amore beati Petri et venia delictorum", but he offered the Emperor a pact of friendship. The envoy conveyed the offer to Byzantium.

Aistulf capitulated at the end of June 756. The stipulations of the second peace of Pavia were substantially more severe than those of the earlier treaty. The Lombards had to surrender one-third of their royal treasury, renew the annual tribute of Merovingian times, and make the restitutions to the Pope through the agency of deputies of the Frankish King. Thus did the "Papal State" become a reality. It comprised the duchy of Rome and the exarchate of Ravenna with the Pentapolis. Officials and people took an oath to the Pope, and a papal administration was set up. In law the Papal State belonged, as

---

J. Deér, "Zum Patricius Romanorum-Titel Karls des Grossen" (*AHPont* 3 [1965], 31–86, with the other literature), and P. Classen (*Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz*, 552). In the form of the title *patricius Romanorum* Classen sees the determining argument against a grant by the Emperor, since, in imperial law, the patriciate was a dignity conferred by the Emperor with no territorial connection. With Dölger, Deér assumes that the territorial connection was first made by the Pope in regard to the *Ducatus Romanus* (*patricius*, protector of the Romans in the strict sense); in the Emperor's view the addition *Romanorum* expressed only in general the connection with the *Imperium Romanum* (*patricius* in the Roman Empire).

before, to the Empire. Pepin did not use the title *patricius Romanorum;* he probably did not want to prejudice an agreement with the Emperor. And Stephen II and his successors made it clear by their coinage and the dating of their charters that they recognized the imperial sovereignty.

The events immediately following seemed to favour the realization of the full Roman programme. King Aistulf died in December 756. His successor, Desiderius, was elevated to the throne in 757 in agreement with the Pope and with Abbot Fulrad of Saint-Denis, who had to supervise the implementation of the restitutions. Desiderius promised, in addition, to cede Bologna, Ferrara, Imola and Faenza, Ancona, Numana, and Osimo. The Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento commended themselves to the Pope. But Rome's exaggerated expectations were not realized. Paul I, who succeeded his brother Stephen on the papal throne on 19 May 757 and sent notification of his election to the Frankish King after the manner of the earlier notices sent to the Exarch, soon had to tone down his demands. Desiderius did not give a thought to observing his promises. In 758 he subjugated Spoleto and Benevento and got into contact with Byzantium, but King Pepin declined to make another expedition to Italy. He was wholly absorbed in completing the Frankish state, to which Septimania was added as early as 759 and reluctant Aquitaine in 768 after long struggles. Pepin was obliging to Desiderius in order to prevent a Lombard-Byzantine coalition. Paul I gave in and in his demands for restitution agreed essentially to the stipulations of the second peace of Pavia. He had to yield also at Ravenna, where a direct papal administration was replaced by an indirect one conducted by the metropolitan.

A *modus vivendi,* unstable though it was, had been discovered with the Lombards. Then relations with Constantinople became Paul I's great concern. In the fateful year 754 there had met at Hiereia on the Bosphorus an imperial iconoclast council, which brought on the flood-stage of Iconoclasm in the Empire. A new wave of Greek emigrants reached Italy, and the Pope placed at the disposal of the Greek monks the monastery of San Silvestro in Capite, founded in his own home in 761. After the Frankish-Byzantine discussions of 756–57 concerning friendship had failed, it was not until 763 that Frankish and papal envoys again proceeded to the imperial court. On this occasion Paul protested against the persecution of iconodules. He got into touch with the three oriental Patriarchs, who in the same year had taken a stand against the iconoclasts in a synod in Palestine. A Frankish embassy, which in 765 made the first journey to the Abbasid court of Baghdad, seems to have been suggested by the Pope and the Patriarch of Alexandria. Toward the end of this year the royal and papal mission returned after an unusually long stay at the imperial court. It was accompanied by Greek envoys, who proposed a matrimonial alliance to Pepin. The Emperor was apparently seeking to woo the Franks away from Rome. Pepin turned down the marriage proposal but did not let the ties with Byzantium break. When, after a rather long interval, due to the Aquitanian war, another synod of the kingdom met again in 767 at Gentilly, there occurred at it a religious discussion in regard to images between Greeks and Romans. Paul's apprehensions were proved to be groundless, for the Franks remained on the Roman side.[3]

Paul I died on 28 June 767, soon after the Synod of Gentilly. During his pontificate he had excessively favoured the *proceres ecclesiae* — the high ecclesiastical bureaucracy — and so his death was followed by a reaction on the part of the *iudices militiae*. The Roman military aristocracy was grouped around Duke Toto of Nepi; the *primicerius* Christopher became his adversary. Toto did not shrink from a *coup d'état*. Without even preserving the appearance of an election, he had his brother Constantine acclaimed as Pope by his friends and dependants. Constantine received the various orders *per saltum* and on 5 July 767, mounted the throne of Peter. The new Pope, elevated under such doubtful circumstances, worked zealously but vainly to obtain recognition by the King of the Franks. Meanwhile, he was the unchallenged master of Rome for more than a year. His opponent, Christopher, had to leave the city after Easter 768, but instead of entering a monastery at Spoleto, as he had promised, he went to the Duke of Spoleto and to King Desiderius, asking their help. The Lombards did not have to be entreated for long. The *primicerius* had friends in the city, and with their assistance a *coup de main* on Rome at the end of July succeeded. He was able to get rid of his Lombard confederates, who had riotously sought to set up a Pope, and, as *servans locum sanctae Sedis,* convoked a regular election-meeting for 1 August. In this the priest of Santa Cecilia, Stephen, was unanimously elected Pope. Constantine was conducted about the city in a mock-parade and on 6 August was condemned by a synod at the Lateran. On 7 August Stephen III was consecrated Bishop of Rome.

Against the will of the new Pope the victorious faction let itself be carried into shameful excesses. Constantine, interned in the monastery of San Saba, was blinded by a gang. The same fate was visited on the Lombard envoy, Waldipert, who died as a result of the brutality. These revolutionary occurrences made Stephen decide it was advisable to convoke a new synod, to which the Franks were also invited. An embassy set out for the Carolingian court at the beginning of September, but it did not find Pepin among the living. He died on 24 September; on the following day he was interred at Saint-Denis in the royal vault. The protection of the Roman Church in an extremely critical moment now devolved upon the young Kings, Charles and Carloman.

---

[3] In this context reference must again be made to the disputed dating of the exclusion of the Pope from the imperial sphere of sovereignty with the confiscation of the Roman patrimonies and the subjection of South Italy, Sicily, and the vicariate of Thessalonica to Constantinople, which is interpreted by some scholars as the imperial reply to the "apostasy" of Stephen II and the establishing of the Papal State; see Chapter 1, footnote 3.

SECTION TWO

The Greek Church in the Epoch of Iconoclasm

CHAPTER 5

The First Phase of Iconoclasm (730 to 775)

Iconoclasm shook the Byzantine Empire to a degree that is comparable only to the Arian troubles after Nicaea I or the Monophysite struggles of the fifth and sixth centuries. But, differing from these, it ended without a new denominational split coming into existence as a lasting consequence. Despite its effects on the West, which were especially political in nature, it was to a certain degree a special characteristic of an Orthodox world which was closing and isolating itself.

It did not occur by chance and cannot be dismissed as the fruit of imperial caprice in matters of faith. The hostility of the early Christian world to images was, it is true, appeased in the course of centuries as people learned how to make distinctions and to distribute emphasis, and the historical picture and the memorial led without violence to the cult of icons. But the voices which rejected this development or at least warned against it and saw the present trend as a departure from the primitive Christian ideal were never entirely silenced. It was only in the sixth and seventh centuries that icons entered on their victorious progress as cult images to any great degree, a progress which was powerfully accelerated by rampant popular credulity, legends, and miracles. Numerous miraculous icons appeared, images of Christ not made by human hands *(acheiropoieta),* of Mary by the painter-evangelist Luke, icons which had fallen from heaven, which bled, which resisted the enemies of the cult, which guarded cities, cured the sick, brought back the dead.[1] If this development impresses us as being a straight and undisturbed growth, this is only partly correct, because the opposing literature was almost entirely destroyed at the command of Nicaea II in 787.[2] But we can still hear voices calling for restraint and sobriety in scattered fragments of *catenae,* in Monophysite works, in citations from orthodox writings against Jewish propaganda, and so forth. There were whole areas in the Church which were opposed to images, notably Armenia, and it is significant that the most important Armenian sect which originated at that time, the Paulicians, made hostility to images their standard, apparently for the sake of the "pure Christian doctrine".[3] The great Iconoclasm of the eighth and ninth centuries meant only the effort to clarify this complex of controversial questions precisely and to enable Orthodoxy to arrive at a pure understanding of its own nature. Hence, at the beginning of the eighth century we have to inquire not so much into the causes of the controversy as into the external occasion for it.

---

[1] Still best summarized in E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder* (Leipzig 1899).

[2] Nicaea II, canon 9.

The contemporary pious chroniclers and later historians — all of them iconodules — regarded as the initiator of the movement the Emperor Leo III the Syrian (717–41). According to them, he was already subject, by virtue of his antecedents, to Islamic or Jewish influences, and hence he was predisposed to hostility to images, and his closest advisers had been recruited from this intellectual milieu. And, especially in modern literature, much has been made of the influence of the Paulicians on him. But all this is conjecture, for which there is no striking historical proof. In other words, such explanations are accepted because there is not enough willingness to admit the demonstrable existence of an ancient current which rejected the cult of images and the garland of legends and marvels creeping over it. Even the assumption of Monophysite ideas as coming from the Emperor's Syrian homeland is a mere hypothesis. The familiar search for the filiation of heresies and heretics clearly yields only a godfather.[4]

What we really know from unobjectionable contemporary testimonies, the letters of the Patriarch Germanus I (715–30), is the fact that the initiative lay, not with the Emperor, but with ecclesiastical circles — the bishops of Asia Minor. Again, there is no basis for the insinuation that these prelates were, for their part, influenced by any "Phrygian" heresies and that the ancient parallel tradition, hostile to images, of the Orthodox Church and concern for the purity of doctrine and worship were not sufficient to explain their activity. Most prominently mentioned were Bishop Constantine of Nacolia in Phrygia, Metropolitan Thomas of Claudiopolis, and Metropolitan Theodore of Ephesus. Whether these bishops were in contact with the future Emperor Leo while he was still *strategos* in Asia Minor is entirely unknown. Early in the 720's they went to Constantinople in order to induce the Patriarch Germanus to take steps against the cult of images. Germanus refused but did not attribute any particular significance to the matter. Perhaps on this occasion the bishops also called on the Emperor and found a more sympathetic ear. Back in their dioceses, they began to remove cult images on their own responsibility and to forbid their veneration, apparently without encountering any great opposition.[5] A first imperial announcement occurred most probably in 726; it consisted of, not a decree, but an exhortation to the people no longer to honor icons but rather to get rid of them.[6] The Emperor set the example and had a celebrated icon of Christ at the Chalke Gate of the palace removed. The sequel was a popular riot; some of the soldiers directed to remove the image were killed. The Emperor's measures were limited to corporal chastisement of the guilty and to banishment and fines. There were no martyrs in defense of icons, and the Patriarch Germanus continued in office, despite his discreet opposition. It is scarcely conceivable that the Emperor's exhortations and first fumbling measures could have had an effect throughout the Empire, so that, for example, the entire Helladic Theme would have arisen against Leo III and set up an anti-emperor in defense of orthodoxy. The revolt in Greece is indeed a fact. But the short period of time between the Emperor's proceedings against icons and the Helladic Theme's naval expedition against Constantinople does not permit us to relate these events as cause and effect. However, it is not to be ruled out that the rebels, who were very quickly suppressed, took upon themselves, in the course of the revolt, the struggle against the Emperor's Iconoclasm, to the extent that this was at all familiar to them. Just what is the point of Theophanes's report, not known to the Patriarch Nicephorus, that the Emperor then "did away with the schools and the pious method of education that had prevailed since the days of Constantine the Great",[7] is difficult to determine. Only a later legend exaggerated the story into a report of the burning of the professors of the higher school at Constantinople and of its library.

---

[3] N. H. Baynes, "The Icons before Iconoclasm" in *HThR* 44 (1951), 93–106 (the same article appears in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* [London 1955], 226–39); S. Der Nersessian, "Une apologie des images du VII^{e} siècle" in *Byz(B)* 17 (1944–5), 58–87; id., "Image Worship in Armenia and its Opponents" in *Armenian Quarterly* 1 (1946), 67–81; E. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm" in *DOP* 8 (1954), 83–150; J.-B. Frey, "La question des images chez les Juifs à la lumière des récentes découvertes" in *Bibl* 15 (1934), 265–300.

[4] N. Jorga, "Les origines de l'iconoclasme" in *Bulletin Sect. Hist. Acad. Roumaine* 11 (1924), 143–56; G. Ostrogorsky, "Les débuts de la querelle des images" in *Mélanges Ch. Diehl,* I (Paris 1930), 235–55; L. Bréhier, "Sur un texte relatif au début de la querelle iconoclaste" in *ÉO* 37 (1938), 17–22; J. Starr, "An Iconodulic Legend and its Historical Basis" in *Speculum* 8 (1933), 500–3. In regard to the famous edict of the Caliph Yazid II against the veneration of images by Christians in his empire, which Theophanes reports in his chronicle (AM 6215, 401 f., de Boor), even in the history of the caliphate it was a mere episode and, according to Theophanes himself, of no real significance; cf. also Levi della Vida, in *EI,* 1st ed., IV, 1257 f.; A. Vasiliev, "The Iconoclastic Edict of the Caliph Yazid II" in *DOP* 9/10 (1956), 23–47.

One cannot speak of an official Iconoclasm until 17 January 730, when the Emperor, after a final vain effort to gain the Patriarch Germanus to his policy, published an edict against the cult of images.[8] Germanus had to abdicate but was able to end his days in peace on an estate. Anastasius, his former *synkellos,* was made Patriarch in his stead and supported the imperial Church policy. The theological justification of this policy was apparently restricted essentially to the charge that iconodules were guilty of idolatry. It is only from this edict that the Patriarch Nicephorus dated the persecution by the iconoclasts. Theophanes speaks of many clerics, monks, and devout lay persons, who obtained the martyr's crown, but he seems to be condensing some decades. The hagiographical evidence scarcely leaves place for the supposition that under Leo III martyrdom was the rule, but there were individual cases.

---

[5] Correspondence of the Patriarch Germanus on this in *PG* 98, 147ff.

[6] Theophanes, AM 6217 (404 de Boor): ". . . ἤρξατο τῆς κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων καθαιρέσεως λόγον ποιεῖσθαι . . ." *Vita Stephani Junioris:* ". . . καὶ τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λαὸν ἐκκλησιάσας μέσον πάντων λεοντοειδῶς βρύξας . . . εἶπεν . . ." (*PG* 100, 1084 C).

[7] Theophanes, AM 6218 (405 de Boor).

Iconoclasm entered upon an acute and politically dangerous stage by virtue of the dispute with the Holy See. To be sure, economic and financial questions were crucial here alongside the religious, and these probably first brought the religious question to its special importance for Italy. In any case, the Emperor's intransigent attitude contributed essentially to alienate Italy from the Empire, to promote the *rapprochement* with the Franks, and to shatter the ancient Constantinian Imperial Church-*Oecumene.*

The intellectual basis for the dispute over Church practice very quickly appeared.[9] The most weighty contribution to the iconodules came from a Syrian monk, John Damascene. His friends in the Empire enabled him to find a powerful response, while he provided the iconodules with the Christological and soteriological arguments on behalf of icons. In addition, the admonition of George of Cyprus may also be mentioned, whereas the observations of the Patriarch Germanus can hardly be counted as really controversial literature. The icon-theology of this period did not confine itself to reasons drawn from liturgy and morality but immediately lifted the subject to the highest dogmatic plane. It fought the war by means of arguments from the theology of creation and from Christology, against Manichaeism and Monophysitism respectively. The opponents were soon unable to remain content with pointing to the danger of idolatry. What Germanus had already called for, a general council, appeared as a necessity.

Leo's son, the Emperor Constantine V (741–75), decided to hold the council, but in his own way. But at first he had his hands full, with the Empire's militant foreign policy and with maintaining himself against revolt.

---

[8] *Dölger Reg,* no. 294; on the date see Ostrogorsky, *loc. cit.* (footnote 4).

[9] On the Theology of Iconoclasm, see pp. 48ff.; also, G. Ostrogorsky, "Der Zusammenhang der Frage der heiligen Bilder mit der christlichen Dogmatik" (Russian) in *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 1 (1927), 35–48; id., "Die gnoseologischen Grundlagen des byzantinischen Streites um die heiligen Bilder" (Russian), ibid. 2 (1928), 47–52; G. Ladner, "The Concept of the Image in the Greek Fathers and the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy" in *DOP* 7 (1953), 1–34; L. Koch, "Zur Theologie der Christusikone" in *BM* 19 (1937), 375–87; 20 (1938), 32–47, 168–75, 281–8, 437–52.

Soon, however, perhaps after John Damascene's arguments had become known to him, he came forth himself as a theologian. He denied the possibility of an adequate icon of Christ, an εἰκών, which would not be an εἴδωλον, with reference to the impossibility of portraying Christ's divine nature. Only the Eucharist, he said, was a true image of Christ, living by the equality of nature between prototype and copy.[10] What else there was of iconoclast literature at this time has been lost. In any event, the ground had now been made ready for the general council.

It met on 10 February 754, at Hiereia, an imperial palace on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. Whether the Pope and the oriental Patriarchs had been invited is unknown. They were not represented, and in 787 this fact would constitute a chief argument against the ecumenicity of the synod. The Metropolitan Theodore of Ephesus, one of the first champions of Iconoclasm, presided. The number of participants — 338 Fathers — was amazingly high. The sessions continued until 8 August. It seems that the synod was not under any imperial pressure in regard to time and that its freedom of debate was not curtailed. In addition to the Emperor's theological works a *florilegium* of patristic passages hostile to images was apparently laid before the synod, and it seems to have made an impression. A whole generation later the iconodules still had to reckon with the arguments of the synod of 754, without being entirely capable of dealing with them. That some converts of 787 who had taken part in the discussions of 754 felt obliged to find fault with the *modus procedendi* of Hiereia should not cause surprise.

The synodal decree[11] is extant and shows clearly that the way of dogmatizing in the question of images, once entered upon, could not be abandoned. Christ is not capable of being represented; in fact, every image of Christ, according to what it intends to represent, presupposes either a Monophysite or a Nestorian Christology. Both the making and the honouring of icons were condemned. But the council warned against an indiscriminate destruction of existing works of art. Like the Emperor, the synod also discovered in the Eucharist alone an adequate image of Christ. On the other hand, the Fathers avoided the too bold ideas and formulas of the imperial theologian — another argument against the alleged subservience of the council.

Iconoclasm, hitherto supported by an imperial decree, was now a dogma of the entire Eastern Church. This is hardly saying too much. For whereas previous dogmatic decisions were always connected with the excluding of a group of the episcopate, for the most part of some importance, this does not seem to have been necessary at Hiereia — there is no mention anywhere of any noteworthy resistance by groups of bishops. And one could venture the opinion that the Church would have been on the road to that indifference toward images which the Carolingian theologians displayed, had not the Emperor Constantine V forced the issue, slowly, it is true, but ever more energetically, by going far beyond the conciliar decrees.

---

[10] Fragments of the imperial theology in G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites* (Breslau 1929), 7ff.

[11] The decree was read at the Second Council of Nicaea; see *Mansi* XIII, 204–364.

The fact that the slowly hardening opposition proceeded from the monks so embittered him against them that before long it was impossible to determine whether the persecution was directed chiefly against monasticism or against the cult of icons. The conjecture that the monastic world attacked the conciliar decrees for economic reasons — because they ruined its lucrative icon market — cannot be proved. It may perhaps be supposed that monks were closer to popular devotion, more attached to icons, than were the bishops, and hence, then at least, they did not so much carry out the will of the people but rather formed it. For to all appearances monasticism did not from the start have behind it the overwhelming majority of the people. Instead, the monks' opposing stand *vis-à-vis* the executive authority of the state probably first obtained for them a following among the masses. Much of what the iconodules said about the Emperor was probably only a logical inference from what he actually stood for. But other charges correspond closely with the character sketch of that powerful but hot-tempered and unpredictable ruler, with his wrath and his animosity, which he gradually displayed. He is said to have refused Mary the sacred title of Theotokos, to have denied the saints even the term "holy", and to have forbidden the cult, not only of icons, but also of relics. Where he encountered resistance, he confiscated the monasteries, transformed them into barracks, and enrolled the monks in the army.[12] An occasional provincial governor went even further, forcing monks and nuns to abandon celibacy. The government went to extremes in inflicting torture and banishment and did not shrink from the death penalty.

Considerable time elapsed, however, before the Emperor drew the ultimate conclusions. It was only about ten years after the Synod of Hiereia that the persecution broke out in all its harshness. Leader of the opposition was Abbot Stephen the Younger of Mount Auxentius in Bithynia. The Emperor tried in every way to break his resistance, and his trial was long protracted. It is possible that Stephen was actually not condemned to death but met death by being handed over to the rage of a mob. The monasteries of Bithynia, then the most important monastic settlement in the Empire, were depopulated, because the monks were either in exile or in prison. Churches were wrecked and profaned, and the monastic way of life was exposed to ridicule. But monasticism did not remain passive. From its circles proceeded violent pamphlets against the Emperor, such as the treatise *Ad Constantinum Caballinum,*[13] incorrectly attributed to John Damascene. Despite the persecution, monasticism built up a certain self-assurance and was recognized as the basic force of the whole Church, as a power which had the duty and the ability to represent the conscience of the Church in view of the lethargy of the episcopate.

---

[12] Cf. *Dölger Reg,* nos. 324, 327, 333, 337.

[13] *PG* 95, 309–44.

The number of martyrs in the strict sense was probably not very great, even under Constantine V. The people's support of the monks left much to be desired. And the army stood beside the Emperor with unfailing loyalty. His policy, however, had become so clearly ill-advised in the course of time that at his death in 775 a reaction was not an impossibility.

Chapter 6

The First Restoration of the Icons

At the death of the Emperor Constantine V the tide of the persecution of the iconodules had begun to ebb at last, though the position of the iconoclasts was not lost. Bound up with the name of the dead Emperor and of his father, Leo III, in the minds of many self-assured Byzantines in the army and in the high bureaucracy was the memory of a period of energetic national self-defence against Islam and the barbarian world. Besides, the recollection of the iconoclastic persecution ceased to endure, however deep it may have been, and was interpreted, not so much as a struggle for "purity of faith" as a parallel to the fight for national self-assertion. Constantine's measures in the recruiting of monks, for example, may have made all the more sense in these circles, if the Arabs, as was the case, pressed on into the Bithynian monastic centres. Be that as it may, the memory of these Emperors remained green, and all the more when their successors had hardly any noteworthy successes in foreign policy to their credit. In addition, at least one generation of Byzantine Christians had now grown up under Iconoclasm and had perhaps been able to establish that Church life had suffered no particular harm through the removal of icons. Thus, a restoration of the cult of images could be accomplished only with the utmost discretion and with consideration for the memory of the dead Emperors.

Constantine V's son, Leo IV (775–80), apparently did not envisage any such restoration. Nevertheless, he seems to have abolished his father's excessive measures of persecution. Following his death, his widow, Irene, came to power for her minor son, Constantine VI, by outmaneuvering the brothers of Leo IV. She was determined to make the most of it. The cult of images was very close to her heart and no one doubted that she would work to restore it. *Rebus sic stantibus,* such a policy was pro-monastic, and Theophanes noted from the outset that "the adherents of orthodox piety gradually acquired confidence again".[1] If anyone wanted to become a monk, he could do so without hindrance, and monasteries were reopened. At this time there was established in Bithynia the monastery of Sakkudion,[2] first ruled by Abbot Plato, uncle of Theodore of Studion. It became the source of an ecclesiastico-political movement of large proportions.

---

[1] Theophanes, AM 6273 (455 de Boor).

But in reality any restoration of pre-iconoclast conditions was illusory, so long as the decrees of the Synod of Hiereia were in force, for the council had regarded itself as ecumenical. Restoration could be effected only by another council, and it also required, not only in law but in fact, a new and uncompromised Patriarch. The Patriarch in office, Paul, was certainly not an iconoclast of any great importance, but he had once sworn to obey the decrees of Hiereia. Was it a mere coincidence that he now asked to resign because of sickness and recommended the holding of a new synod? As always, no one forced him to stay in office, though it seems that even the Empress esteemed him highly. But now she had the opportunity of placing a new man at the head of the Church. It is a testimony to her good sense and her grasp of the actual difficulties of the situation that she did not select a representative of the monastic faction, despite its heavy pressure, but a high official who was still a layman, the *protoasecretis* Tarasius. He seemed to assure the Empress a course that was politically sensible and moderate, and he did not disappoint her.[3] Well briefed, Tarasius also called for a new general council and made this a condition of his accepting his election as Patriarch. A large gathering at the Magnaura palace agreed to the demand, even though not without opposition.[4] Tarasius was thereupon consecrated Bishop of Constantinople *per saltum* on 25 December 784.

Probably in the spring of 785 he contacted the Holy See by sending notification of his elevation in the so-called synodical. The letter explained his promotion to the patriarchal dignity from the lay state, included a profession of faith which contained the orthodox doctrine of images, mentioned his demand for an ecumenical council, and asked the Pope to send two representatives.[5] About this same time Irene also made known to the Pope her plans for a council and asked him, probably in a second letter, to accept Tarasius's peaceful overtures.[6] Pope Hadrian took exception to certain points in the letters which he received. In the Empress's letters there was indeed expressed the good intention of restoring orthodoxy, but not the readiness to annul the injustice done by her predecessors to the Holy See in the seizure of Illyricum. The promotion of Tarasius from the lay state to the episcopacy was certainly in need of a dispensation because it was uncanonical, and the use of the expression "Ecumenical Patriarch" was still offensive to the Roman view. But the prospect of an ecumenical council that would destroy the memory of the pseudo-ecumenical Synod of Hiereia and could energetically restore an awareness of the papal primacy caused Hadrian to make light of his hesitations, recognize Tarasius with qualifications, and hail the Empress's plan for a council. He had all the more reason for this because he could probably scarcely afford to jeopardize by a refusal the projected marriage of Charles the Great's daughter Rotrudis to Constantine VI. Be that as it may, he named two delegates for the coming synod in a letter which contained an exposition of his faith on the subject of the cult of images. His representatives were Peter, Abbot of the Roman monastery of San Saba, and the Archpriest Peter. He expressly emphasized his right to confirm the decrees of the council.[7] The oriental patriarchates were likewise invited to participate. But their position *vis-à-vis* the Islamic authorities was such that Alexandria and Antioch could only manage to be represented by two *synkelloi* — and it is open to question whether these were really invested with full authority by their Patriarchs — while Jerusalem was unable to do even that much.

---

[2] Cf. *infra,* p. 52.

[3] *DThC* XV, 1, 54–57 (R. Janin); J. Andreev, *German i Tarasij* (Sergiev Posad 1907); Beck 489.

[4] Tarasius's procedure and discourse in Theophanes, AM 6277 (458ff. de Boor); for the opposition, see *Mansi* XII, 990.

[5] *Grumel Reg,* no. 351.

[6] *Dölger Reg,* nos. 341, 343.

The iconoclasts must have been worried about their position but they did not give up. We hear of heated conferences among their bishops, and this agitation had its effect. Tarasius felt obliged to threaten with punishments such gatherings as took place without his authorization, on the ground that they were uncanonical.[8] Then, when the council met in the church of the Apostles on 1 or 17 August 787, imperial guards invaded the building during the very opening session, at which Irene and her son were present, and put an end to the meeting, with the approval of some of the bishops. The Empress had to start over again. She first removed the guards from the capital on the pretext of an expedition against the Arabs and replaced them with line troops from Thrace, who in her opinion were more reliable. Finally, she considered it advisable to transfer the council to the country. As its site she selected Nicaea in Bithynia, probably in the hope of surrounding her synod with the lustre of the first ecumenical council. Here, with no further obstacles, the council could be solemnly opened on 28 September 787.[9]

In name the papal representatives occupied the presidency, but in the very first session the Sicilian bishops asked Tarasius to assume the direction of the discussions. The Empress was represented by observers. Statements in regard to the number of participants vary between 258 at the beginning of the synod and 335 at its conclusion. The number of bishops was supplemented by a considerable crowd of monks and abbots, who were apparently entitled to vote — compensation for their services in the preceding struggle in the Church. The most illustrious were Abbot Plato of Sakkudion, Theophanes Confessor, Nicetas and Nicephorus of the monastery of Medikios, and Abbot Sabas of Studion. The majority of the bishops came from Asia Minor, Thrace, and Macedonia. South Italy was represented by eight Sicilian and six Calabrian bishops. It is clear that a high percentage of the bishops, apart from the Italians, had come to some sort of terms with the preceding Iconoclasm. If they had all been excluded from the synod, it could not have met at all. It may be supposed that those were admitted without difficulty who had at once conformed to the changed situation in 780. Apparently the opposition first took action against all who had postponed their *recantatio* until the opening of the council. To this group belonged the prelates of such important metropolises as Iconium, Nicaea, Rhodes, Pessinus, Neocaesarea, and others. It goes without saying that the question of the validity of ordinations conferred by iconoclast bishops was also brought up. The monks vigorously opposed the admittance of these bishops, and it required all the skill of Tarasius, who was here loyally supported by the papal representatives, to avoid any wholesale condemnation. Whoever could show convincingly that he had changed his mind was to be admitted to the synod. Only those bishops who had taken part in the persecution of iconodules were to be deposed, but it seems that no particularly noteworthy number was so dealt with.

---

[7] *Mansi* XII, 1078–83.

[8] *Grumel Reg,* no. 354.

[9] Acts in *Mansi* XII, 951–1154; XIII, 1–485.

Among the Fathers of the Council there seems to have been no theologian of rank. Only the *vita* of Theodore of Studion states that Tarasius made special use of the advice of Abbot Plato. The bold speculations of John Damascene's first discourse on images were not taken into consideration. Both the handling of the *ratio theologica* and especially that of the proof from tradition were appallingly inadequate in comparison with the Council of 680. The manner of using the Old Testament would scarcely have obtained the approval of a single Council Father of the seventh century. In the demonstration of the Church's tradition all possible legends and miracle stories made a significantly deeper impression than the well-stated skeptical remarks of older Fathers, who were either not considered at all or were easily pushed aside. Hence it is also not surprising that, in contradistinction to the synod against the Monothelites, the adherents of the previous iconoclast doctrine did not lift a finger to make their earlier viewpoint even intelligible. The opposition maintained total silence, despite the call for a free exchange of views that was proclaimed at the beginning of the synod. In the history of theology the discussions of this synod mark the nadir for the Eastern Church. It may be assumed that those theologians who occupied themselves in a really "theological" manner with the cult of icons were in a dwindling minority and that any decision was prejudiced by religious emotion.

If the result of the debates in the *horos,*[10] that is, the conciliar definition, seems so much more sound, theologically moderate, and worthwhile, this is one of those marvels encountered so often in the history of the councils. One must not forget that Pope Hadrian's letter, which was read and applauded at the beginning of the synod, represented that Western theology of images which had developed, not on the basis of dogmatic speculation, but of considerations of moral theology. It was the special merit of Tarasius, gathered from his incidental remarks in the discussions, that he tried time and again to shake the complacency of his fellow bishops in regard to legends and again and again brought the terminology back to the precise distinction between λατρεία (adoration) and προσκύνησις (veneration).

---

[10] *Mansi* XIII, 373–79.

The *horos* declared the veneration of icons to be the orthodox doctrine, condemned Iconoclasm as a heresy, and ordered the destruction of iconoclast writings. The definition of "cult" itself was restricted essentially to its characteristic as "a mark of honour" (τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις), a term which includes lights and incense. This veneration was sharply distinguished from *latreia,* or real adoration. Veneration itself was justified by its relation to the person represented by the image. The moral value of cult was properly stressed, but no distinction was made between the Cross, images of Christ, and images of the saints. The Christological argument was touched on, but it was in no sense penetrated in depth.

The Empress invited the Fathers to hold the closing session at Constantinople in the Magnaura palace. On 23 October 787, the *horos* was again read, this time in the presence of Their Majesties. After the Empress's question as to whether it met with universal consent had been answered in the affirmative, the Empress, in defiance of protocol, signed ahead of her son and then had him sign. The twenty-two disciplinary canons, with which the acts end, were probably passed at this session. Some of them dealt with the situation created by Iconoclasm, such as the command not to dedicate churches without the deposition of relics and the prohibition of keeping heretical works or of using monastic buildings for profane purposes. Other canons attacked simoniacal abuses and called for simplicity and austerity of morals in the lives of clerics and monks.

The Patriarch Tarasius furnished Pope Hadrian with a brief report of the synod.[11] He obtained the acts through his legates, but in Rome they were wretchedly translated, and it was the defects of the translation that were taken over by the *Libri Carolini* and made the misunderstanding worse. Tarasius does not seem to have asked Rome to confirm the decrees.

Peace seemed to have been restored in the Orthodox Church. But Iconoclasm was not yet dead, and the Patriarch's wise attitude toward the *lapsi* of the preceding period created among the monks a resentful opposition which waited only for an opportunity to break forth.

---

[11] *Grumel Reg,* no. 359.

CHAPTER 7

Interlude in Church and State

The Second Council of Nicaea was, not least of all, a triumph for the Empress Irene. She had managed to neutralize the army's opposition, bind the party of the monks to her, and find a Patriarch on whom she could rely. Her rule was based on the reconciliation of her Church with Rome. And even though the engagement of Charles the Great's daughter Rotrudis and her son Constantine VI was not realized, she was now able to renounce such an outside support for her policy in the Empire's domestic affairs; in fact, she could precipitate a break on her own initiative, since Byzantine national pride seldom esteemed highly such foreign connections.[1]

Irene's exertions were directed ever more clearly toward sole rule. Her actually extraordinary position as ruling coempress was no longer sufficient, and Constantine VI had now reached an age which qualified him to assume the government. Since he could not expect that his mother would retire, he allied with army circles and elements of the official aristocracy in order by their aid — and this meant the help of iconoclasts — to enforce his claims. But the Empress-mother discovered the plot and took vigorous action. She demanded of the army an oath that guaranteed her position as coruler. The troops of the capital were persuaded to acquiesce, but the troops in the themes offered a bitter resistance and in 790 proclaimed Constantine VI as sole ruler. Irene yielded and withdrew. But only two years elapsed before her influence over her son had been re-established and her position as coempress was again a reality. Since Constantine VI did not live up to the expectations of the troops but performed without success, and to a certain extent with severe losses, on both the Bulgarian and the Eastern fronts, and likewise more and more sacrificed his adherents to the will of his mother, he so isolated himself that the troops sought to raise his uncles, brothers of Leo IV, to the throne. The attempt was suppressed in blood. Now the young Emperor had nothing more to hope for, from either his mother or the army. It was his mother's intrigues — the monastic chronicler Theophanes is the witness[2] — that maneuvered him into conflict with the monastic party and thereby gave the *coup de grâce.*

The juridical situation is less clear than has usually been assumed. According to Theophanes there is no doubt that Irene in 788 brought about the marriage of her unwilling son with Mary the Paphlagonian, forcing him to break off his engagement to Rotrudis. To what extent his mother then calumniated the young Empress cannot now be determined, but there was talk of an attempted poisoning. In any event, the Emperor felt justified in divorcing Mary and inducing her to take the veil — and he was even more ready to do so, since he had decided to marry Theodota, one of his mother's ladies-in-waiting. Three canonical problems were thereby raised: the question of the grounds for divorce, that of the right to remarry, and that of the Church's treatment of successive bigamy. The development of the Byzantine matrimonial law was not yet final, even as far as the Church was concerned, and each of the three questions could be variously answered. In addition, there was also the Emperor's exceptional position in regard to the canons; it had been brought up on occasion but had never been peremptorily settled. The precise legal situation can hardly be reconstructed now.

---

[1] Irene's role in cancelling the engagement to the Carolingian princess is clear from her son's reaction.

[2] Theophanes, AM 6282 (464 de Boor), AM 6287 (469 de Boor).

Confronted with the complex of questions, the Patriarch Tarasius had two alternatives — to prevent the Emperor from remarrying and hence to make the Emperor's iconoclast advisers his own declared opponents, with the risk of starting the Church conflict again, or of practising dissimulation, thereby pushing a part of the zealot monastic faction, which had not agreed to his moderate policy at the Council of 787, into open opposition. At first he refused his permission for a remarriage of the Emperor and threatened excommunication. Nevertheless, Constantine VI married Theodota with the proper solemnities, the priest Joseph blessing the union. It can no longer be determined whether Joseph was so authorized by Tarasius, but, in any event, the Patriarch did not take any very important steps. In other words, he did not impose ecclesiastical censures on the Emperor but only on Joseph, and then only after the Emperor's fall, and he let *oikonomia* prevail.[3]

Considering the situation of the Byzantine Church, such a procedure is understandable. But the previous Church quarrel had made clear the ambiguity of this situation; the monks who had borne the burden of the recent struggle were no longer willing to subordinate to this new Church system the prestige they had gained and, like the Patriarch, to let *oikonomia* supersede the law. Abbot Plato of Sakkudion and his nephew Theodore assumed the leadership of the resistance, but not all monks fell into line behind them. Even the highly esteemed monk-chronicler, Theophanes Confessor, displayed scarcely any sympathy for or approbation of the intransigent attitude of this group of monks. He aimed to keep aloof from the political involvement of the Studites — all the more emphatically as time passed — and he even hinted that the Studites aimed at schism. And in all this the Patriarch was to be affected every bit as much as the Emperor. They branded the Emperor's remarriage as adultery — hence the label of "Moechian Controversy", — accused the Patriarch of laxity, and withdrew from his communion. Both the Emperor and the new Empress did everything to bring the monks over to their side. When they failed, Plato and Theodore were imprisoned and banished. Thus the Emperor had alienated not only the army but also the ecclesiastical reform circles.

---

[3] *Grumel Reg,* no. 368. A brief account of the "Moechian Controversy" in R. Devreesse, "Une lettre de S. Théodore Studite relative au synode moechien (809)" in *AnBoll* 68 (1950), 44–57. Further details in the bibliography on Theodore of Studion; see *infra,* 53.

Irene's hour had struck. In 797 she had her son blinded — he lived only a few more years — and assumed the government as sole ruler of the Empire.[4] Plato and Theodore, restored to liberty by her, failed to speak against the murderess with a vehemence like that they had used against Constantine VI. Perhaps it was just this circumstance that rendered them unreliable in the eyes of Theophanes. Tarasius was compelled to excommunicate Joseph. The Empress Theodota was branded an adulteress and her child was disinherited.[5]

Tarasius died in 806, but the priest Joseph long continued to be the victim of the ambivalence which always characterized the notion of *oikonomia* in Byzantium. Tarasius's successor was another layman, the imperial chancellor Nicephorus,[6] well known as chronicler and saint of the second period of Iconoclasm. Nicephorus, Patriarch from 806 to 815, belonged to a family that had supplied defenders of the cult of images under Constantine V. He apparently needed time to determine his position in the ecclesiastical controversy of the day. The elevation of this layman again angered the Studites, and thus they again exposed themselves to criticism by Theophanes. Even worse was the fact that the Emperor Nicephorus I induced the new Patriarch to call a synod to restore the priest Joseph to the communion of the Church. The Emperor was probably acting out of resentment toward his predecessor, Irene. The Patriarch obeyed the imperial order and the synod agreed,[7] despite the protest of Theodore of Studion,[8] who explained that he was not against recourse to *oikonomia* in principle, but in this case the use of *oikonomia* would only lead to a great schism in the Church. Of course, the great schism was once again only a Studite schism. Actually the case was unimportant and obsolete, but Theodore could not bear that an affair in which he had long been most vigorously involved should now be settled affably. A new synod in 809 condemned the principles which Theodore had invoked.[9] Unfortunately, we know the guiding principles which the synod is supposed to have laid down only from Theodore's own pen,[10] and it is unquestionable that he formulated them too subtly. Be that as it may, he had to go into exile again. He then appealed, in great agitation, to Pope Leo III.[11] The Pope, who had only a short time before crowned the "anti-Emperor" Charles, declined to intervene and, with pastoral prudence, urged patience on

---

[4] On this point see W. Ohnsorge, "Das Kaisertum der Eirene und die Kaiserkrönung Karls des Grossen" in *Saeculum* 14 (1963), 221–47.

[5] Theodore of Studion, *Ep.* I, 31 (*PG* 99, 1012).

[6] P. J. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* (Oxford 1958), with a detailed listing of the earlier literature.

[7] *Grumel Reg,* no. 377.

[8] *Epp.* I, 21; I, 22; I, 24 (*PG* 99, 969–88).

[9] Ibid.

[10] *Ep.* I, 33 (*PG* 99, 1017–21).

[11] Ibid.

Theodore.[12] With the change on the imperial throne in 811 this exile too came to an end.

The Emperor Michael I (811–13) was apparently more influenced by Studite monachism than by the Patriarch Nicephorus, to whom he owed the crown. Just the same, the Patriarch now had the opportunity of sending his synodical[13] to Pope Leo III — something not permitted by the Emperor Nicephorus because of his bitterness over the coronation of Charles the Great. The embassy which delivered the synodical was the one which at Aachen recognized Charles as *basileus*.[14] In all probability the embassy also sought to obtain at Rome an expression of opinion in regard to the "Moechian Controversy". This would have been due less to the initiative of the Patriarch than to that of the Emperor, influenced by Theodore of Studion, since Theodore's petition to the Pope had so far had no result. Whether now the Pope actually spoke out in support of the Studites' attitude, as the *vita* of Theodore claims, or the imperial pressure was sufficient, in any event the Patriarch in 812 had to humble himself to the extent of deposing the priest Joseph again and making peace with the Studite opposition.[15] With this the nasty "Moechian" business was laid to rest.

It was not the only point causing trouble between Patriarch and monks. Already during the Second Council of Nicaea it had become evident that the mild attitude of the Patriarch Tarasius toward the bishops of the iconoclast period had not pleased the monks. Apart from a very few exceptions, the bishops had remained in possession of their sees. It seems that the monks sought another legal title in order to renew the episcopate according to their own views, whereas Tarasius steered a different course in this matter also. He was no friend of the iconoclasts, but he did not want in the Church a powerful group of deposed bishops, which would have made possible the survival of Iconoclasm and the restoration of the policy of the Emperor Constantine V.

The point at issue was the question of simony. A perusal of the canons of the Seventh Ecumenical Council would cause one to believe that a great number of the bishops of that day had acquired their sees through simony. But if the canons are compared with later statements of the Patriarch Tarasius on this point, such as the decree of 787–88, mentioned by the *Vita Tarasii,*[16] it seems to follow that the monks energetically labelled as simony all ordination fees, offerings made to the consecrating prelate, and the like. In any case, here too Tarasius first sought a *via media*. Bishops guilty of simony were not to be deposed forever, but, following a penance, that is, suspension for at least one year, they could be restored to office. The relevant decree was in keeping with the desire of the Empress Irene and was published in

---

[12] *Ep.* I, 34 (*PG* 99, 1021–8).

[13] *Grumel Reg,* no. 382.

[14] *Dölger Reg,* no. 385.

[15] *Grumel Reg,* no. 387.

[16] Ibid., no. 361.

787 or early in 788 — in any event, with the participation of the papal representatives at the Council.[17] The zealots among the monks, on the other hand, led by a certain Sabas, raised a storm and appealed to Pope Hadrian I. Eventually the Patriarch Tarasius had to give in. He was still, even now, accommodating to penitent simonists to a degree — and this too was taken amiss — but they were no longer allowed to exercise their office again.[18] This is evident toward the end of 790, that is, after Irene had been forced into retirement, in a letter to the anchorite and Abbot John and in a further letter to Pope Hadrian I, in which he submitted the matter to the Pope's judgment.

The quarrel between the Patriarch and the monks had to do, not with the bases of the orthodox faith, but rather with questions of *oikonomia,* that is, considerations of equity in applying the canon law. The fact that again and again the monks went to the point of schism in this matter shows how powerful their self-assurance had become in the meantime. The legal questions under discussion were questions of judgment — and to this extent the proceedings of the monks against their bishops were unprecedented. The image of the Patriarchs, both of whom are highly venerated by the Orthodox Church as saints, is not lacking in vacillation and imprecision, for their action was also always determined by the Emperor's will. To what extent this was an integral component of the training of the will of the "Church" in Byzantium was not clarified in this generation, since even the Studites had different ideas in regard to the Emperor's competence when he was on their side.

The Church-State aspect of the conflicts consists in this, that the monastic party was apparently unwilling to recognize the real motive of the Patriarchs — not to expose the precarious peace of the post-iconoclast period to any excessively strong tests. The Patriarchs, men of public life, could scarcely fail to note how weak was the consistently iconodule majority and how great the danger of a new flare-up of Iconoclasm. In this situation a firm alliance of the monastic party with the iconodule hierarchy would have been the need of the moment. It was not realized.

CHAPTER 8

The Second Phase of Iconoclasm (815 to 843)

The faith of the Byzantine nation almost always saw the destiny of its Empire intimately linked with its religion, with God's blessing or displeasure. From this point of view the divine mercy had apparently been rather on the side of the iconoclasts and their Emperors than on that of their successors, especially of the Empress Irene and the Emperor Michael I Rhangabe. One who did not share this popular belief could still make use of it for political ends, circumstances permitting. This seems to have been exemplified in the conduct of the Emperor Leo V. How did this come about? The iconodule predominance had obviously been most closely connected with Irene's government. No matter how she was extolled by monastic hagiography and chronicles, the reign of this Empress was a calamity for the Empire. Her unfortunate relations with the army, her military failures, the squandering of the revenues, and the misguided favouritism at court led to revolt. Irene's authority and coterie were swept away rapidly and pitilessly and the throne was given to Nicephorus I (802–11). The stern rule of the new Emperor brought him, in the eyes of many of the pious, close to the iconoclasts, and he was certainly no friend of monks. He did not halt iconoclast propaganda and in some respects his cynicism recalled Constantine V. But in 811 the Bulgars inflicted on him a severe defeat, which brought about his death and cost his seriously wounded son Stauracius his throne.

---

[17] Ibid., no. 360.

[18] Ibid., nos. 363f.

The new Emperor, Michael I (811–13), was plagued with extremely bad luck in his dealings with the Bulgars, and, according to Theophanes, most of the blame for this was due to the advice which the Emperor accepted from Theodore of Studion.[1] Commanders in Asia Minor allowed themselves to be seduced into a revolt which was clearly motivated by a hostility toward monks and icons as well as by the *restauratio memoriae* of Constantine V. The latter's still living sons were to be raised to the throne and the decrees of the Synod of 754 were to be revived. But apparently it was not possible to gain the entire army to the cause, and the revolt misfired. But when the Bulgars drew their lines more tightly around the approaches to the capital and the Emperor's maneuvers in Thrace became ever more unfortunate, the agitation against him in Constantinople became all the more intense. The iconoclasts broke open the tomb of Constantine V with the cry: "Arise and aid the city that is perishing!" They spread the report that the dead Emperor had bounded from the grave on horseback to ride out to a struggle of annihilation against the Bulgars.[2] Another severe defeat by the Bulgars caused Michael I to seek refuge behind the walls of the capital, whereupon the commanders in camp chose as Emperor the *strategos* of the Anatoliac Theme.

Leo V (813–20) thus rose to power on a wave which clearly suggested the mentality prevailing under the first two Syrian Emperors, and he regarded it, if not as right, at least as advisable to undertake an attempt at a restoration in this direction. But at first he was completely preoccupied with the Bulgar peril. When a treaty of peace had been made with the new Bulgar Khan, Omurtag, in 814, Leo felt that his time had come.

---

[1] Theophanes, AM 6305 (498 de Boor).

[2] Theophanes, AM 8305 (501 de Boor).

His most important advisers in this matter were Theodotos Kassiteras, related to the Syrian Dynasty, the Bishop Antony of Sylaion, and the learned grammarian, John Hylilas, allegedly of the family of the Morocharzanioi. The theological approach that was assumed held that the cult of images was permissible only if it was ordered by the Bible; since this was not the case, it could not be allowed. The really appealing argument, already referred to, was that the rule of the iconoclast Emperors had been a blessing for the Empire. But it was desired to elaborate the theological proofs and so search was made in libraries, with the result that the acts of the Synod of 754 were soon discovered. After this preparation, an approach was made to the Patriarch Nicephorus, probably in the late fall of 814. The imperial order to the Patriarch was at first to the effect that he should remove the icons from direct veneration by the people; hence no general destruction of images was ordered.[3] The Emperor felt that he could rely on the majority of the population. The Patriarch's reply was a decided negative.[4] The veneration of images, he said, was an ancient Church tradition and so needed no express order in the Bible. The Patriarch also refused to have the question again discussed by a synod or an episcopal conference. However, he probably had a presentiment of the danger and sought to have the iconodules close ranks firmly. A number of bishops and abbots, the most prominent of the latter being Theodore of Studion, joined the Patriarch and swore to maintain their unity and to withstand the iconoclasts even at the cost of their lives.[5]

It was especially important that at this moment of danger factionalism among the orthodox was resolutely put aside and peace was restored between the Studites and the hierarchy. The iconodules proceeded into the conflict armed with experience and enlightened by history. A part of the bishops who had associated themselves in this agreement soon bowed to the imperial will again, since Leo V apparently knew how to minimize his demands. He required only that the Patriarch should make one small concession — to remove from the immediate contact of the faithful the low-hanging icons in the church; there the matter should rest. As Nicephorus refused to agree even to this, he was deported to Asia Minor, where, in order not to become an obstacle to the peace of the Church, he resigned his office.

As early as 1 April 815, the Emperor appointed as the new Patriarch Theodotos Kassiteras (815–21), previously mentioned, and in the same month there met at Hagia Sophia a synod which renewed the decrees of the Synod of 754, sharply criticized Nicaea II, and again forbade the manufacture of images of Christ and the saints.[6] But there was intentionally no further reference to icons as idolatrous images, "for there are degrees of wickedness". Likewise, the Christological arguments were touched on only in passing. The patristic *florilegium,* which apparently served the participants in the synod as the basis of discussion, probably placed emphasis on the argument of "holiness". According to it, holiness is a quality imparted by God to the elect. No artist can, without blasphemy, claim to bestow similar properties on a material image. The practical implementation of the conciliar decrees provided for the removal of low-hanging images, which were too close to the devotion of the faithful, but to leave those higher up alone, in so far as no handling for religious purposes was attempted in their regard. They were left alone as γραφή *(scriptura).* Most probably no special declarations of submission nor even an oath to the synod was demanded; it was enough to maintain communion with the Patriarch.

---

[3] *Scriptor incertus de Leone Armeno,* 352 (Bonn).

[4] Ibid.

[5] *Grumel Reg,* no. 391.

[6] Reconstruction of the *definitio* and of the accompanying *florilegium* in D. Serruys, "Les actes du concile iconoclaste de l'an 815" in *MAH* 23 (1903), 345–51; substantially improved in

The council knew some success. In contradistinction to the first phase of Iconoclasm, however, monasteries and monks no longer formed the core of the opposition to the same degree. The letters and laments of Theodore of Studion are clear — many abbots joined the iconoclasts.[7] On the other hand, a considerable number of bishops can be named who now energetically represented the iconodule viewpoint. Alexander found the reason for this in the fact that since the time of the Emperor Leo IV monks had more and more been admitted to the episcopate; the prospect of an episcopal see was able to break the resistance of probable candidates in the monasteries.[8] This can be expressed in different words: the best in monastic circles had already become bishops and as such had offered resistance. It may be added that the strong intervention of the Studites under Theodore's leadership in political and ecclesiastical matters, which was not a part of the traditional role of Byzantine monasticism, had somewhat hurt his cause. And, finally, no explicitly iconoclast declarations were demanded, so that many monks were in the position of pursuing their own type of devotion without any real cost. The officials seem often to have been satisfied if they were assured that persons would neither hold meetings nor publicly propagate the cult of images. Only a few paid for their attachment to the cult of images with their lives. More common penalties were flogging and banishment. The most famous exiles were the Patriarch Nicephorus and, once again, Theodore of Studion, whose relations to each other improved under the force of circumstances without becoming cordial. Despite the assignment of a compulsory residence, Theodore was able to make the most of his very widespread

---

G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites* (Breslau 1929), 48–51; also P. J. Alexander in *DOP* 7 (1953), 37–66. Bibliography in *Hefele-Leclercq* III, 2, 741–98; M. Anastos, "The Ethical Theory of Images formulated by the Iconoclasts in 754 and 815" in *DOP* 8 (1954), 151–60.

[7] Cf. G. A. Schreiber, *Der heilige Theodor von Studion* (Münster 1900), 84.

[8] *The Patriarch Nicephorus* (Oxford 1958), 144f.

intelligence service; he was in contact with Rome and the oriental patriarchates, but the response was rather faint.

Emperor Leo V, inaugurator of the persecution, was assassinated during the Christmas festivities of 820. The ex-Patriarch Nicephorus commented with the remark that the Roman Empire had lost a godless but otherwise important ruler.[9] Theodore exulted that the winter was past, even if spring was still slow in coming.[10] Leo was succeeded on the throne by Michael II the Amorian (820–29), whose character and religious standpoint were painted in dark colours by later chroniclers hostile to the Amorian Dynasty. According to them, he was more favourable to Judaism than to Christianity. The few objective contemporary reports do not support these spiteful remarks. He was not a friend of the cult of icons, but in this he was acting less in accord with religious convictions than with the *status quo* in which he had grown up and which he felt unable to change without wrecking the Empire. To persecute was not in his nature, and besides he first had to consolidate his authority. Thus the exiles, such as Theodore of Studion, could return. Even Nicephorus would have been able to recover his patriarchal see, if he had only made up his mind not to touch the question of icons again. But Nicephorus was not prepared for this.

The Emperor issued a *thespisma,* whereby the entire dispute was to be buried in silence and everyone was to follow his own conscience.[11] If Michael did not consistently follow this policy thereafter, this was probably because there soon occurred a revolt which adopted as its own the catchwords of the iconodules. This was the revolt of Thomas, a Slav by birth. He had himself crowned Emperor by the Patriarch of Antioch, rallied to his standard the discontented, those behind in their tax payments, destitute peasants, beggars, and vagrants, and also clerics and dissatisfied provincial aristocrats, proceeded across Asia Minor, and laid siege to Constantinople.[12] The social revolutionary character of the movement seems to me to be secondary. There is much to support the thesis that its origins were in the imperial court, of a dynastic and political nature, and connected with the overthrow of Leo V. In no sense was it a question of a rising of iconodules as such; rather, this movement was, along with others, incorporated into a disparate programme which made use of every opportunity. It was only in 823 that the revolt could be suppressed. But the Muslim power, with which Thomas had allied, had again become fully active and did serious damage to the Empire.

Michael's son, Theophilus (829–42), witnessed the catastrophe of the fall of the strongest fortress in Asia Minor, Amorion, in 838. Theophilus was a more severe persecutor of iconodules than his father. He was a pupil of that John the Grammarian who in 815 had prepared the decrees of the iconoclast synod and who soon became the Patriarch John VII (837–43).[13] He was the most efficient personality among the iconoclast bishops, and the defamatory hatred of the orthodox was directed at him to a much greater degree than at the Emperor. On instructions from the Patriarch, the persecution, especially of monks, was intensified. The Emperor himself was not consistent in his attitude. His wife Theodora was apparently able to practise the cult of images without any great hindrance. But Theophilus had an iconodule like the Sicilian monk Methodius first flogged and imprisoned; then, very soon, he procured for him an honourable abode, even though it was secluded within the imperial palace, because he liked the man's knowledge and scholarship.

---

[9] Genesios, I, 17 (Bonn).

[10] *PG* 99, 1397.

[11] *Dölger Reg,* no. 402.

[12] See *Ostrogorsky* 171 f.

When Theophilus died Iconoclasm crumbled. The reasons for this collapse are complex. But first of all it must not be assumed that the entire Empire had meanwhile been converted to the cult of icons. Even as late as the time of Photius there was mention of iconoclasts. But, keeping in mind the uniquely political theology of the Byzantines, for whom the prosperity of the Empire represented God's reward for the orthodox faith, the political failures of especially the last iconoclast Emperors had presented the iconodules with impressive arguments. The sources make known that precisely these political misfortunes were thoroughly exploited against Iconoclasm. In addition, the iconoclasts of the second phase did not follow any strict line. Their *laissez-faire* deprived their policy of persuasive force, smoothed out the differences, and brought about a fatal indifference in their own circles. Another point must also be considered. If in the first period of Iconoclasm one gropes in total darkness in the effort to fix responsibility for the outbreak of the struggle on Paulicians, Saracens, Monophysites, or Jews, the influence of Paulician politicians, of Armenian sectarians and theologians, to whom iconoclastic ideas were natural, cannot be mistaken for the years 815 to 820 and perhaps even to 829. A certain infiltration of court society by such foreign elements, it seems, cannot be ruled out. But Theophilus, despite all borrowing from the greatly admired Caliphs of Baghdad, was making ready in what pertains to the history of civilization a self-realization of Greek thought that again rolled back the foreign influences. Furthermore, the catastrophe of Amorion awaked in him crusade projects which embraced all of Christendom and presupposed its oneness in faith. And, finally, the group of iconodules was more united and no longer so theologically defenceless in the face of the outbreak of hostilities in 815 as had been the case in 730. The period of peace between 780 and 815 had procured for the monks the esteem of the people; they were able to regard themselves as the religious leaders of the masses. And even if these masses, as such, ceased to be their adherents in the period of the second persecution, this happened, not because of conviction, but out of weakness, and the masses were ready, at the very moment when the pressure was eased, again to make common cause with them. And so the government had no choice but to revise its current policy. The question whether such a revision, in the sense of a legally established *laissez-faire* and not merely of one acknowledged on occasion, would not have achieved its goal as well as would a complete *volte-face* can hardly be decided in the present state of the sources.

---

[13] V. Grumel, "Jean Grammatikos et saint Théodore Studite" in *ÉO* 36 (1937), 181–89; Alexander, *op. cit.* 235f.

At his death Theophilus was succeeded by his three-year-old son, Michael III (842–67). The direction of the regency was assumed by the widowed Empress Theodora, a long-time devotee of icons. But the initiative for the restoration proceeded, not directly from her, but from her adviser and minister, Theoctistus. The Empress gladly allowed herself to be convinced by the political necessity, just so long as the memory of her dead husband was not disparaged. A way was found to oblige her. The Patriarch John VII was induced to abdicate, and his place was taken by the Sicilian Methodius (843–47). Then in March 843 a solemn synod was held which re-established the cult of icons.[14] Thus was ended a battle which had drained off the energies of the Orthodox world for generations. A peace was inaugurated which would no longer be troubled by this point. Orthodoxy was reunited in a new self-understanding, but at the price that religious attitudes which in the older Church had been entirely possible and lawful, even though perhaps not obligatory, now had to leave the inclosure of the Church.

Orthodoxy was reunited, but it also went into seclusion. In the whole of Church history the controversy over the cult of icons constitutes a divisive element, not by its nature but because of the attendant phenomena. The decision of 787 in favour of the cult of images can be understood formally as a common achievement of the Holy See and the Byzantine Church. But in 843 the Orthodox Church imposed the settlement without the assistance of the West. In between lay the papacy's difficulties with the theological ideas of Charles the Great and his compilers of theological *florilegia*. Theodore of Studion appealed to Rome, but, in the final analysis, to no purpose, although he and the Patriarch Nicephorus had learned to esteem the importance of the Apostolic See as the tribunal of the faith in the very heat of the battle. But their theoretical understanding was no longer honoured. Not the least reason for this was the fact that the first iconoclasts, even if they did not expel the First Bishop of their Empire from the Mediterranean ecclesiastical world, had, however, turned him around toward the northwest. In 787 the papacy had fallen into a painful situation, between Eastern Orthodoxy, to which it knew itself to be still closely bound up, and the unique theological concept of the "orthodoxus imperator" Charles. The theological opposition which here burst forth could be played down in later centuries by outstanding theologians, such as the Carolingians, but the political consequences of the opposition were on the scale of world history and could not be eliminated again. Hence, Iconoclasm consolidated the special life of the Orthodox Church, but at the same time it is one of the great milestones on the road leading to the separation of the Churches — not on the road of dogmatic controversy, but the road of a slow transformation and re-formation of rite and worship, leading to new emphases, to new contrasting effects, which no longer allowed the maintaining of the ancient East-West *koine* in civilization and Church.

---

[14] The *horos* is not in print; cf. *Beck* 56.

Chapter 9

Theology and Monasticism in the Age of Iconoclasm

In order to do justice to the intellectual situation of the Byzantine Church in the first phase of Iconoclasm it is necessary to proceed from the impression that the resistance of theologians and bishops to Iconoclasm was meagre. This impression cannot be removed by pointing to the powerful pressure exerted by the Emperors and the imperial police, for in the second phase of the struggle such pressure was unable to prevent the flowering of an iconodule theology. It seems to me to be far more reasonable to point out that the rest of eighth-century theology, like the profane literature of the age, was in no way distinguished for its richness — in other words, the "dark centuries" had not yet been left behind, and Iconoclasm was not responsible for them.[1]

The single celebrity of the age was John Damascene,[2] an Arab of distinguished family. He grew up at the court of the Caliph and eventually responded to the call to the monastic life at Mar Saba in Jerusalem. He died before 754. His work forces us to assume at Damascus, at Jerusalem, and in the lauras in the vicinity of the Holy City educational opportunities, especially a wealth of manuscripts, which surpass anything we know of the other metropolises of the caliphate. As the theologian of the cult of icons, John, like his successors, certainly took as his point of departure in his argumentation the questionable existence of authentic portraits of Christ and the saints and certainly confused the metaphysical image with the pictorial image. Thus for him the image became revelation and means of grace. Whatever one may think of these speculations, with John the totality expanded into a grandiose system of cosmic liturgy, into a hymn to the transfigured matter and world that God had created, into the visible expression of a theandric law which governs the whole redeemed world. Without realizing it and in a different connection he was thus continuing Maximus Confessor.[3]

---

[1] On the famous question, or rather hypothesis, of the hostility of Iconoclasm to culture, an hypothesis which can be refuted by an Emperor like Theophilus, cf. B. Hemmerdinger, "Ḥunain ibn Isḥâq et l'iconoclasme byzantin" in *Actes XII^{e} Congr. Intern. d'Études Byzant. 1961,* II (Beograd 1964), 467–69; id.,"La culture grecque classique du VI^{e} au IX^{e} siècle", *Byz(B)* 34 (1964), 125–33.

[2] For his life and work in general, see J. M. Hoeck, "Johannes von Damaskus" in *LThK* V, 1023–26, which made all earlier accounts of his life out of date. His writings in *PG* 94–96; critical estimate in J. M. Hoeck, *OrChrP* 17 (1951), 5–60.

In the history of theology John's name is, of course, especially linked with his *Sources of Knowledge* (Πηγὴ γνώσεως). In addition to a synopsis of the history of heresy, which presents many problems for the history of literature, this consists of a compendium of dialectics and of a compact exposition of the content of the orthodox faith (Ἔκθεσις ἀκριβής).[4] In this work John turns out to be, not an original thinker, but probably the most original mosaicist within the art of theology. To refuse him on this account a prominent place in the development of theology,[5] as has usually been the case, is to overlook the theme of this mosaic, for which the *depositum fidei* is a model. It likewise undervalues in principle the importance of "summarizing" for scholarship in general and for theology in particular, the importance of a cross-coordinator and of a reliable compass-card. In its first stages Western scholasticism, which had early become acquainted with John through translations,[6] esteemed this work highly. And on closer examination one can also understand how deep are John's tracks in Byzantine theology. His work, which, significantly, had its home beyond the frontiers of the Empire, did not constitute the winding up of the development achieved by the Fathers. But it did summarize this achievement with special skill, with real erudition and theological instinct, and passed it on for use in a poorer age. It must not be forgotten that the separation of philosophical and purely theological topics, apparently first made by John, was a contribution to systematization, which was able to facilitate substantially the self-realization of theology on the philosophical bases of its thought.[7] The influence of this theologian on the succeeding generations of Byzantine theologians can only be fully appreciated when one pictures to oneself the great importance attaching to liturgical reading in introducing young students of divinity to the world of thought of the theology of the past — the *vitae* of the saints sufficiently prove this. In these liturgical readings, however, the numerous sermons, hagiographical texts, and hymns of this saint play no slight role, even if the critical study of them is far from being completed. In the words of J. Hoeck, John Damascene "realized his own ideal perfectly".

---

[3] H. Menges, *Die Bilderlehre des heiligen Johannes von Damaskus* (Münster 1938); cf. also *Beck* 300f.

[4] B. Kotter, *Die Überlieferung der Pege gnoseos des heiligen Johannes von Damaskos* (Ettal 1959).

[5] In particular most recently, B. Studer, *Die theologische Arbeitsweise des Johannes von Damaskus* (Ettal 1956), whose impressive work does not, of course, lose its importance because of this criticism.

[6] Bibliography in *Beck* 480.

[7] Cf. G. Richter, *Die Dialektik des Johannes von Damaskos* (Ettal 1964).

The theology of the iconoclasts themselves is substantially less well known to us. However, from the extant fragments of the Emperor Constantine V and of the great Synod of 754 can be sifted trains of thought which are not without importance for the history of theology. This theology, too, made use of the works of the past, as has already been indicated in a general way. The following is deserving of special note. The Quinisext Council of 692, and hence the orthodox complement to the great imperial Councils of 553 and 680–81, had in its Canon 82 attacked the pictorial representation of Christian symbols, such as the Lamb of God, because in these symbols it saw "shadows" of the New Testament fulness but not the fulness itself. It seems as though, for the iconoclast theologians, this train of thought, that is, the full reality of grace of the New Testament, was the decisive element. Only in this way can we understand why again and again they pointed out that images in the Church caused persons to forget that in the Church there is *the* authentic image of Christ, the Eucharistic Bread, and that, in comparison with it, nothing else can claim any true reality.[8] The slight regard paid by the iconodule theologians of the second phase to this perhaps clumsily advanced argument may not have been without effect on the later and rather superficial Byzantine theology of the Eucharist. A synthesis was no longer sought in the heat of battle.

No slight role in the second phase was played by the Abbot of Studion, Theodore (759–826). His works on Iconoclasm have come down to us only in truncated form. Theodore was a person who united the exaltation of the martyr with the vehemence of the politician — of a politician who, even in times of peace in the Church, was almost always driven into opposition or else forced himself into it. He took up John Damascene's ideas, but sharpened them, brought them to too fine a point, and made the cult of icons an essential element in the theology of the Incarnation. In this, in accordance with an old characteristic of the Greek mind, which dominated, for example, most treatises of Byzantine sacramental theology, the element of light and of sight, hence something optical, was brought predominantly to the fore. However, Theodore's importance lay not in the field of speculative theology but in that of monasticism, to be discussed later.[9]

The greatest theologian of the second phase of Iconoclasm was certainly Nicephorus, Patriarch from 806 to 815; he died in exile in 828. It only rarely occurred to the iconoclasts of the second phase to label the cult of images idolatry. All the more, then, they emphasized the patristic basis of their doctrine, which was now in fact not too complicated. Nicephorus did not always display skill in this connection and put aside patristic texts, notably those of Epiphanius of Salamis, in a few cases where modern criticism cannot possibly follow him. He certainly did so not out of lack of philological scruples, but because his concept of ecclesiastical tradition was in no position to help restore the actual break in tradition. For what was characteristic of him was precisely that he, to a greater extent than John Damascene even, introduced this notion of tradition into the argumentation. The cult of images had to be lawful because it is the Church's tradition. It is worthy of note that from this very argument the concept of the Universal Church and the theological recourse to Rome come into their own. However, as in the case of Theodore, in Nicephorus also the "viewing" as a basic theological element pushed itself to the fore; the Gospel of hearing was substantially perfected in a Gospel of seeing. For the first time there is decidedly encountered in Nicephorus the condemnation of Iconoclasm as an heretical political theology, which sought to substitute the image of the Emperor, on coins, for the image of the heavenly *Pantokrator*.[10]

---

[8] Constantine V, fragment 21, in G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites* (Breslau 1929), 10.

[9] Bibliography *infra,* footnote 15.

In connection with John Damascene mention was made of the importance of the contemporary homiletics and hymnography. Representative of the age at its very beginning was Andrew of Crete (d. 740), with some fifty homilies, which enjoyed great popularity in the collections of the Byzantine Church for liturgical use. But Andrew also played a significant role in liturgical poetry as an early representative of that *Kanon*-poetry, which replaced the old *kontakion* and in which the poetic genius of the Byzantine Church found a congenial form.[11] The bulk of the liturgical texts in the official books of the Church was contributed by Andrew and, in addition, by Cosmos the Melode, foster-brother of John Damascene, Joseph, brother of Theodore of Studion, and Joseph the Hagiographer (d. 886).

The hagiography of the period began with the first *vitae* of the defenders of images, whereas canon law and exegesis attracted scarcely any notice.

Byzantine monasticism and its development are of particular importance in the period of Iconoclasm. The struggle of the Emperors against the monks played no part in the beginning of the movement, but when the orthodox resistance solidified it was the monks who assumed the leadership. This circumstance gave them an ecclesiastical and political importance which they did not again achieve until the late Byzantine period. The great centre of monasticism in the iconoclast epoch was, first of all, Bithynian Olympus, the holy mountain of the middle Byzantine period, and the adjacent districts from Kara Dagh (Sigriane) on the Propontis by way of the district of Atroa, southwest of Prusa, to the Gulf of Mundania (Apamea). The centre which furnished the archimandrite, or archabbot of the whole group, was, at least for a time, the Agauron monastery on the Plain of Prusa, the highest located (1430 m), the Photeinodios monastery, but even more important was the monastery of the Symbola. A group of settlements came into existence between the two phases of Iconoclasm. Among these were the monastic colony of Sigriane, of the celebrated Theophanes, confessor and chronicler; the monastery of Eustachios, founded by Joannikios; and the monastery of Abramites, established by the Patriarch Tarasius in the vicinity of the Agauron monastery. The monastery of Stephen the Younger, who died in 764 as a martyr in defence of icons, on Mount Auxentius near Chalcedon, may also be mentioned. Constantine V's persecuting measures did serious damage to some of these monasteries but were unable to prevent a rapid recovery. In this connection it is clear that we must not imagine these monasteries, apart from a few exceptions, as a solid complex of "imperial abbeys", but as loose settlements consisting of primitive lauras or mountain caves, hence as institutions which were not firmly established in one particular place but claimed all the mobility that so long characterized the Byzantine form of monasticism.[12] From this Bithynian monastic settlement proceeded also the new impulses of monasticism in the capital. The Abbot of the monastery of the Symbola, a seventh-century foundation, was that Saint Theosterictus who gave the habit to Plato, a citizen of distinguished family in Constantinople.[13] Plato succeeded Theosterictus as Abbot and then built the monastery of Sakkudion (781) on a family property in the plain. It was at Sakkudion that his nephew Theodore, the future Studite, began his monastic career. When Plato resigned in 794, Theodore took charge of the abbey, but in 798 he transferred the community, threatened by Muslim attacks, to the virtually abandoned monastery of Studion in Constantinople. Studion thereby became the headquarters of a circle of monks who were active and extremely interested in ecclesiastical and political affairs in the capital. After a few years their number was reported as more than 700, but this figure probably includes the remaining settlements in Bithynia and other *metochia*.

---

[10] Nicephorus's work is not yet published in full; what has been published is easiest found in *Beck* 490f. On his doctrine of images see A. J. Visser, *Nikephoros und der Bilderstreit* (The Hague 1952); a reliable monograph which takes into account the unpublished material is P. J. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* (Oxford 1958).

[11] *Beck* 500–02.

The norm for Byzantine monachism as regards organization was Justinian's legislation, which, with a few exceptions, had made the cenobitic ideal binding.[14] But this ideal had long been violated by the principle of freedom of movement and by the permanently present ideal of the anachoretic life, as well as by the institute of the spiritual direction of the novices by Πατέρες πνευματικοί, charismatically gifted elderly monks, whose influence sharply reduced that of the abbots. Theodore now tried to restore the purest form of the cenobitic ideal. This goal was promoted by his monastic instructions, by the brief rules, composed in verse, for the individual offices and occupations in his monastery, and above all by his rule, which we no longer possess in the original. Theodore, the type of the aristocratic Byzantine from the high official hierarchy, thereby transferred his qualities of leadership to the cloister and created for himself an instrument of the ecclesiastical policy already discussed.[15] But it would be wrong to think that he thus reformed Byzantine monasticism and gave it new commitments. One has rather the impression that most of the other monasteries were not prepared to follow him in this respect. The effort was limited to Studion and its success must have ended after a couple of generations. It was only two centuries later that Athanasius, the founder of the laura on Mount Athos, stirred the rule of the Studite to new life, but in an area remote from the capital and hence lacking the possibilities of excessively direct political ambitions.

---

[12] B. Menthon, *Une terre de légende, l'Olympe de Bithynie* (Paris 1935) and then various articles by A. Hergès in *ÉO* 1 (1898–99), (1899–1900), and *Bessarione,* a. 3, vol. 5 (1898–99); cf. also L. Laurent, *La vie miraculeuse de saint Pierre d'Atroa* (Brussels 1956).

[13] Cf. O. Volk in *LThK* VIII, 554f.

[14] Of the bulky literature, let it suffice to mention here: B. Granić, "Die Rechtsstellung und Organisation der griechischen Klöster nach dem justinischen Recht" in *ByZ* 29 (1928–29), 6–34; A. Tabera, "De ordinatione status monachalis in fontibus justinianeis" in *Commentarii pro Religiosis* 14 (1933), 87–95, 199–206; 15 (1934), 412–18.

[15] There is no critical edition of his works; most are in *PG* 99. The (revised) monastic rule is in *PG* 99, 1681–1824; the epigrams, ed. by A. Garzya, in Ἐπετ. Ἑταιρ. Βυζ. Σπουδῶν 28 (1958), 11–64. Monographs: G. A. Schneider, *Der heilige Theodor von Studion* (Münster 1900); I. Hausherr, *S. Théodore Studite* (Rome 1926). For further bibliography see K. Baus in *LThK* X, 45f.

SECTION THREE

The Age of Charles the Great (768 to 814)

CHAPTER 10

Charles the Great and Italy

At Pepin's death in 768 his older son, Charles, was twenty-six, while the younger, Carloman, was seventeen. The magnates did homage to Charles at Noyon, to Carloman at Soissons, where in 751 Pepin had been made King. Charles obtained the Atlantic provinces, from Gascony to Frisia; Carloman, the central and Mediterranean territories. Both Frankish Kings sent a delegation of bishops to the Roman synod which met on 12 April 769. In addition to thirteen Frankish bishops, there were represented seven Lombard bishops, twenty-one from the Roman duchy, and eleven from the exarchate. The blinded Constantine was sentenced to do penance and his elevation to the papacy and his ordinations were declared to be invalid. Other decrees determined the procedure of subsequent papal elections. An active vote was limited to the clergy; a passive vote, to the cardinal priests and cardinal deacons. To the laity was left only acclamation, but it was a legal requirement, for only after the acclamation was it possible to draw up the document of election, which had to be signed by the laity also. The election procedure thus determined continued to be an ideal. Practice quite often departed from it, but reformers had recourse to it later. Finally, the synod again expressed its views in regard to the question of icons, probably at the urging of the three oriental Patriarchs, who had condemned Iconoclasm.

The Roman synod put the seal on the triumph of the *proceres ecclesiae* over the *iudices militiae*. The *primicerius* Christopher was master of the city; his son Sergius became *secundicerius* and *nomenculator,* and his son-in-law Gratiosus was made *dux* of Rome. This faction represented, *vis-à-vis* the Lombards, the Roman maximum program. The intervention of King Desiderius had worked to his own disadvantage, but he did not remain idle. When the see of Ravenna fell vacant at the end of August 769 he successfully supported the candidate of the *militia* and occupied parts of Istria, which he sought to withdraw from the authority of Grado and attach to the Lombard ecclesiastical province of Aquileia. Very useful to the Lombard King was the conflict within the Frankish Kingdom which was known as early as the spring of 769 and quite obvious in the summer of 770.

After a new attempt by the Queen-Mother Bertrada to bring about a settlement had proved unavailing with Carloman in June 770, Charles sought allies against his brother. Bertrada effected a pact of friendship between Desiderius and Charles. Charles married a daughter of the Lombard King, thereby becoming at the same time the brother-in-law of Tassilo of Bavaria and of Arichis of Benevento, who had shortly before married other daughters of Desiderius. Charles certainly had no intention of allowing his father-in-law a free hand against Rome. In Italy he pursued a policy of maintaining a balance of power, just as Pepin had done after the second peace of Pavia. At his suggestion the *patrimonium Samniticum* in the duchy of Benevento was restored to the Pope. And Desiderius had to yield in regard to Ravenna. The archdeacon Leo, the Pope's candidate, was elected metropolitan and consecrated in Rome by Stephen III himself.

Stephen had by no means agreed to Charles's Lombard marriage. He drew closer to Carloman, for whose son Pepin, born in 770, he planned to act as godfather. The *primicerius* Christopher definitely favoured the connection with Carloman, from whom an anti-Lombard policy could be anticipated. But the Pope aspired to throw off the influence of the all-powerful *primicerius* and his faction, whose excesses he had never approved. The *cubicularius* Paul Afiarta, who had a secret understanding with Desiderius, worked to undermine Christopher. On his advice Stephen agreed to a conference with the Lombard King, who appeared before Rome with an army in the Lent of 771. At their meeting in Saint Peter's, Desiderius declared that he was prepared to make very generous restitutions if the Pope would abandon the *primicerius*. Stephen let himself be imposed upon and sacrificed Christopher, who was handed over by Desiderius to Paul Afiarta. He was savagely mutilated and died of his injuries three days later. The hopes which Stephen III had of his understanding with the Lombard came to nothing. Desiderius evaded his pledges with the scornful remark that Rome would still need his aid against Carloman. The Lombard King had become Rome's protector, and Stephen III had merely exchanged the tutelage of Christopher for that of Afiarta. He did not long survive this humiliation, dying on 3 February 772. Inspired by the best motives, he was unequal to the great things required of his office in an unscrupulous environment. His pontificate was a complete failure.

One can well imagine with what feelings Charles received the report of these happenings at Rome, which his *missi* had allowed to take place by their inactivity. The policy of the Lombard King had led him into a blind alley, for Charles could no more tolerate a Lombard protectorate over Rome than he could allow Carloman to intervene in Italy. If the tension between the brothers did not lead to war in 771, the Roman occurrences may have been the reason. Apparently even before the end of the year Charles dismissed his Lombard Queen and thereby broke completely with her father. Shortly before there had occurred an event which completely altered the situation and gave Charles all the trump-cards — his twenty-year-old brother Carloman died on 4 December 771 in the villa of Samoussy near Laon and was buried in the monastery of Saint-Remi at Reims. Before Christmas the magnates swore allegiance to the older brother at Corbeny. But Carloman's widow, Gerberga, fled with her two sons and a few *fideles* to the King of the Lombards.

While Charles was reuniting the Frankish Kingdom, a change was also in process at Rome. As successor of Stephen III there was chosen the deacon Hadrian, who belonged to the city nobility of the Via Lata and, by origin and career, gave promise of bridging the opposition between the *proceres ecclesiae* and the *iudices militiae*. Very soon after Hadrian's consecration, which took place on 9 February 772, the Lombard King sent to the new Pope a demand for a pact of friendship with him. As a *sine qua non* Hadrian stipulated the fulfilling of the promise of restitution which Desiderius had made to his predecessor. At the end of March he sent Afiarta to Pavia as his envoy, thus removing that dangerous man from Rome. Even before the arrival of the papal embassy, Desiderius had launched an attack on the exarchate; he seized Ferrara, Comacchio, and Faenza and laid siege to Ravenna.

The Pope protested against this violation of peace. Desiderius conspired with Afiarta for a repetition of the game of the previous year and demanded a personal meeting with Hadrian; the Pope would break with Charles and anoint as kings Carloman's sons, who were of minor age. But Hadrian, who had "a heart of diamond", did not let himself be intimidated. He insisted on his condition and began an investigation into the death of Sergius, who had been killed by Afiarta's associates while Stephen III lay dying. Afiarta's guilt quickly became clear. This lackey of the Lombard King was arrested on his return trip through the exarchate. Hadrian requested Leo of Ravenna to send Afiarta to Greece and to deliver him to the Emperor. But the metropolitan did not comply with this direction. On his own authority he eventually commanded Afiarta to be executed.

The crisis came to a head in the succeeding months, as the Lombards moved against the Pentapolis and finally against the Roman duchy itself. When they besieged Rome in the winter of 772–73, Hadrian, "necessitate compulsus", decided to appeal to Charles. Once again the papal envoy went by sea. He met the Frankish King at Thionville at the end of February or the beginning of March 773. Not until Charles had inquired of Desiderius about the Pope's complaints did he send an embassy to Rome. The Franks made known the papal demands for restitution at Pavia on their return journey but encountered a refusal. Thereupon Charles offered the Lombard King financial compensation in return for restitution. When Desiderius still persisted in refusing, Charles summoned the magnates to Geneva for a general assembly and a campaign. After the army had deployed in the Alps, he repeated his last offer —

but this time probably with the intention of containing the Lombard King until he could carry out his own strategic plan.

Like his predecessor, Desiderius drew up his forces in the defiles of the Mont Cenis, where Charles himself faced him. But the Frankish King had ordered a second army under his uncle Bernard to the Mons Jovis, or Great Saint Bernard. It went through the pass without much opposition and advanced to the Plain of the Po. Desiderius's army, seized with panic, fled in the direction of Pavia. The events of 754 and 756 were repeated, except that now was displayed the "Iron Charles", who abandoned his father's methods and demanded unconditional surrender from the Lombards. In September 773 he prepared for a long siege of the Lombard capital. Lombard resistance in the other cities of North Italy soon collapsed. At Verona Gerberga and her children fell into Charles's hands and were sent to a monastery, probably Corbie. Desiderius's son, Adalgis, who had also retired to Verona, escaped and finally got to Byzantine territory.

Meanwhile, defections from Desiderius had also begun in Central Italy. At the very outbreak of the war Lombards had fled from Spoleto and Rieti to Rome. After the first Frankish successes not only Città di Castello, Fermo, Osimo, and Ancona, but also the Lombards of Spoleto commended themselves to the Pope, who installed the new Duke, Hildebrand, at Spoleto. Only Arichis of Benevento, son-in-law of Desiderius, remained loyal to the Lombard King.

The course of events in Central Italy appears to have worried Charles, and so he decided on a further step that led beyond what his father had done. With a large retinue he made a pilgrimage to Rome at the end of March 774. The Pope, taken by surprise, made hurried preparations to receive him. When, on Holy Saturday (2 April), Charles reached the thirtieth milestone at the stop of Ad Novas, near Trevignano, there awaited him the Roman military nobility with the standards — a special mark of honour proper to the King. The succeeding acts followed the ceremonial customary in regard to the Exarchs. At the first milestone, at the foot of Monte Mario, Charles was met by the *scholae* of the *militia* under their *patroni* (officers) and by the children. The King dismounted and went on foot, as a pilgrim, to Saint Peter's, where the Pope with the clergy welcomed him. After entering the basilica and praying before the *confessio Sancti Petri,* the King requested permission to enter the city of Rome, "sua orationum vota per diversas Dei ecclesias persolvenda."[1] After Franks and Romans had sworn oaths of security to each other before the tomb of Peter, Pope and King proceeded together to the Lateran, where the Pope administered the Sacrament of baptism. The King then went back to Saint Peter's. He took up his lodgings, not in the imperial palace on the Palatine, but near Saint Peter's, where the *scholae peregrinorum,* the foreign quarters, were. In this may be seen consideration for the Emperor or even for the Pope and the Romans, for residence on the Palatine would have pertained to Exarchs in office.

---

[1] *Liber Pontificalis* I, 497.

On Easter Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday the King of the Franks participated in the solemn papal liturgy, traditionally celebrated at Santa Maria Maggiore, Saint Peter's, and Saint-Paul-outside-the-Walls respectively. On Easter Monday were heard for the first time in Rome the Frankish royal *laudes,* which Hadrian ordered sung in honour of his guest.

But Charles had not come to Rome merely to pray. On Easter Wednesday the decisive political agreements, which had certainly already been under discussion, were reached. The Pope, attended by the *iudices cleri et militiae,* went to Saint Peter's and asked the King to implement the *promissio* of Quierzy, which was now clearly interpreted as a promise of donation. The *promissio* was read. It received Charles's approval, whereupon he had his chancellor draw up a second promise of donation similar to the first *(ad instar anterioris).* In this Charles promised to Saint Peter and to his vicar, besides the duchy of Rome, which was not expressly mentioned, the island of Corsica, the exarchate of Ravenna, the provinces of Venetia and Istria, and also the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento. The northern frontier of the papal territory was designated by the line Luni–Sorgnano–La Cisa Pass–Parma–Reggio–Mantua–Monselice, which was probably borrowed from a treaty of *ca.* 600 and had been adopted for the *promissio* of Quierzy. The passage is probably to be understood to mean that the section from La Cisa to Monselice was to form the frontier of the exarchate, which then, though this is not said in so many words, ran to the southeast, following the ridge of the Apennines. Perhaps, in addition, the Lunigiana between La Cisa and Luni was also granted to the Pope, but hardly all of Lombard Tuscany. Charles's *promissio* was deposited in Saint Peter's in two copies. A third, drawn up by the papal chancery, was taken along by Charles when he returned to Pavia.

No less significant than the *promissio* were the consequences in regard to constitutional law that Hadrian drew from the new situation. Until Charles's Italian expedition Hadrian, like his predecessors, had dated his charters according to the Emperor's regnal years. Now the imperial regnal years disappeared from papal documents, and the Emperor's name and image from Roman coins. The years of the pontificate and the Pope's name and image replaced them.[2] The importance of this change is clear: the Papal State seceded from the Empire, the Pope became a sovereign.

---

[2] The new manner of dating first appears in 781–82, since no papal letters and charters have come down from the preceding years. Classen, *op. cit.* 545, points out that the dating according to the Emperor's years was first omitted at the Roman Synod of 769. In his view the new papal dating was perhaps not introduced until 781, when the Empress Irene was seeking an understanding with the West (ibid. 559).

This change may have been agreed upon with Charles, since about the same time he assumed an expanded title. The Lombard King surrendered to the Frankish ruler on 5 June 774; with his family he shared the lot of Gerberga and her children. Charles made his entry into Pavia on 7 June. On 16 July is first encountered the triple style of *Rex Francorum et Langobardorum atque Patricius Romanorum* to express the constitutional structure of Charles' expanded realm. If Charles officially assumed the designation of *Patricius Romanorum,* which had already been conferred on his father by the Popes but which Pepin had never used, he was thereby making known that the protection of the Papal State had now moved from the moral into the juristic sphere and had gained a new constitutional importance.

The old conflict between Lombard and Roman Italy was not, of course, ended merely because Charles had become *Rex Langobardorum* and *Patricius Romanorum*. Before his return to Frankland the King had indeed fulfilled Desiderius's promise of restitution, but not his own *promissio donationis*. He also permitted the Archbishop of Ravenna to establish himself as the intermediate court in the exarchate, which was expanded to include Imola and Bologna. The Pope was put off with the prospect of a later adjustment. But in 775 the whole newly erected structure of Carolingian Italy seemed to be tottering. The Lombard national opposition found support at Benevento, whose Duke, after the fall of Pavia, had assumed the title of Prince as a sign of his independence. Hadrian learned of an alliance of Benevento with the Dukes of Spoleto, Chiusi, and Friuli, with Adalgis, the claimant of the Lombard throne, and with the Byzantines. Then the death of the Emperor Constantine V, on 14 September 775, caused confusion in the ranks of the allies. Only Hrodgaud of Friuli rebelled at the end of 775, but this rebellion was still so serious that in December 775 Charles proceeded to Italy for the second time and remained there till July 776. He now instituted a reorganization of the Lombard Kingdom along Frankish lines, but still did nothing in regard to carrying out his *promissio*. Hadrian waited in vain for him to visit Rome.

The Pope was disappointed and annoyed, and his relations with the Frankish King cooled noticeably. Ravenna continued to be troublesome, and a papal effort to establish control of Istria failed. Hence in 777 Hadrian finally decided on a new embassy to Charles, who promised to visit him at Easter of 778. The baptism of the King's son Carloman was to take place on this visit. But the Spanish campaign rendered a new postponement necessary. In May 778 Hadrian tried a last time to bind the Frankish King to his *promissio* by holding up to him the example of Constantine. With his letter he inclosed charters in regard to the property of the Roman Church in Tuscany and the Sabine district, Corsica, Spoleto, and Benevento. The claims to the *patrimonium* in these areas should act as the basis for the claim of the Roman Church to the lands mentioned in the *promissio*. At the same time, however, there was thereby set up a face-saving device in the event that the political demands could not be implemented.

The mention of Constantine must not be overlooked. The text of the papal letter is reminiscent of the so-called *Constitutum Constantini,* for the dating of which, in our view, Hadrian's letter provides a *terminus ad quem.* The famous forgery made use in its *narratio* of the legend of Silvester, which can be shown to go back to *ca.* 500. According to the *Constitutum* Constantine the Great handed over to Saint Peter and his vicars, whose universal primacy he sanctioned by imperial law, the imperial *palatium* of the Lateran, the insignia of imperial sovereignty, and "Romae urbis et omnes Italicae seu occidentalium regionum provincias, loca et civitates". The Roman clergy obtained the dignities and prerogatives of the Senate. The Emperor transferred his residence to Byzantium and abandoned Rome and the West to the Roman Church, "quoniam, ubi principatus sacerdotum et christianae religionis caput ab imperatore celeste constitutum est, iustum non est, ut illic imperator terrenus habeat potestatem".[3] The imperial ratification of the Roman primacy could only have been directed at Constantinople, for this point was not contested in the West. It was, of course, already in the Silvester legend. In addition, the *Constitutum* emphasized the quasi-imperial position of the Pope in the West, that is, the papal sovereignty, first claimed by Hadrian after 774, as well as the sovereign rights to the provinces of Rome and Italy "seu occidentalium regionum", which are probably to be interpreted as a claim to a large Italian ecclesiastical principality. The formal criteria of the forgery permit an even earlier stage in the time of Hadrian's three predecessors, but the legal content points clearly to the pontificate of Hadrian, more particularly to the years 774–78.

Hadrian was probably under no great illusions any more as to the success of his final appeal to Charles. The King of the Franks, who, following the set back at Roncesvalles, had to suppress a new Saxon revolt, was unable to undertake his third Italian journey until the end of 780 and paid the long projected visit to Rome at Easter, 5 April 781. The time was ripe for an adjustment of the Italian question, especially since at Constantinople the Empress Irene, after the premature death of Leo IV on 8 September 780, had assumed the regency for her son, Constantine VI, who was under age. The Empress had resumed contact with the West. Solemn ceremonies, which served to secure the Carolingian Dynasty and to exonerate Charles, demonstrated at the same time the concord of Pope and King. Hadrian acted as godfather for the King's son Carloman, who was baptized as Pepin; he anointed the boy as King of Italy and his younger brother Louis as King of Aquitaine. The King's daughter Rotrudis was engaged to the young Emperor Constantine VI.

---

[3] *Const. Const.,* ed. W. Gericke, *ZSavRGkan* 43 (1957), 88 (K. Zeumer, *Festschrift für R. von Gneist* [Berlin 1888], 47ff.).

Hadrian and Charles together sent an embassy to the Duke of Bavaria, Tassilo, with the admonition to remain loyal to the Frankish King. The Pope interred his dream of a large Papal State. He renounced Terracina, which was disputed between him and Byzantium, or rather Naples, and his claims to Tuscany and the duchy of Spoleto. In return, Charles gave him the Sabine district, whose frontiers with regard to Spoleto were defined by Frankish *missi,* and the revenues paid to Pavia from Tuscany and Spoleto. Further frontier rectifications were probably held out to Hadrian, but they were not formally granted until 787, when Charles awarded to him southern Tuscany (Viterbo, Orvieto, and Soana) with the maritime cities of Grosseto (Rosellae) and Piombino (Populonia), the Liris frontier with Sora, Arpino, and Arce opposite Benevento, and the cities of Aquino, Teano, and Capua. The Benevento cessions could not, it is true, be fully realized, but the Papal State now acquired its definitive shape.

CHAPTER 11

The Completing of the Frankish Empire

Pepin had left to his sons a Saxon problem as well as an Italian one. The original Saxons made their home in Holstein. In the third century they had united with the Chauci, who lived between the Ems and the Elbe, and then they had advanced triumphantly to Britain as well as southward. Together with the Franks they had destroyed the Thuringian Kingdom in the sixth century and occupied the area south of Hanover between the Weser, the Elbe, the Unstrut, and the Saale. Finally, around 700 they conquered the territory of the Bructeri south of the Lippe, which belonged to the Frankish Kingdom. On the eve of Charles's Saxon wars the Saxon "state" appeared as a loosely organized aristocratic republic, with a strict class distinction between the chieftains of the original Saxon stock on the one hand and the *frilingen* and *laten* of the subjugated districts on the other.

Only more or less incidental features of Saxon paganism are known. The divine trinity, already transmitted by Tacitus, appears in the Saxon formula of abjuration as Wodan, Donar, and Saxnot (Ziu). Wodan and Saxnot occur also in the Anglo-Saxon genealogies, as ancestors of the royal houses. The "Saxon steed" played an important role as a cult animal; it followed the chieftain to his grave, and its flesh was eaten in the ritual meal. A very dark chapter in Saxon religious history has to do with belief in witches, which included a ritual cannibalism.

The earlier Carolingians put a stop to Saxon expansion and subjected the frontier areas of Westphalia and Eastphalia to tribute. Alongside the Frankish frontier fortresses churches were to be found quite early. Willibrord, Swithbert, and Boniface had started out here but had soon established new churches in the border zone. Important missionary centers were Utrecht, Swidbertswerth (today Kaiserswerth, precursor of the abbey of Werden), Amöneburg, Büraburg-Fritzlar, Fulda, and Hersfeld. At the time of Pepin the Anglo-Saxon centres of Frisia, Hesse, and Thuringia were often in competition with the old Frankish sees of Cologne, Mainz, and Worms. In the northern sector Utrecht, as the Anglo-Saxon centre, continued to exist independently of Cologne. But in the Rhine-Main sector the rivalry was partly appeased in Pepin's last years by the uniting of Büraburg-Fritzlar and Erfurt with Mainz. Charles the Great also intervened here by the grant of privileges which made Lorsch (772–73), Fulda (774), Hersfeld (775), Fritzlar (775–82), and perhaps also Amöneburg royal monasteries.

In the Hessian and Thuringian frontier districts there was no longer any possibility of a "non-political" mission, that is, one not directed by the Frankish King. But in the northern section the situation had not yet hardened to the same degree. The Utrecht mission extended in Charles's first years into the Frisian-Saxon frontier area around Deventer, where the Anglo-Saxon Lebuin built a church. Through Saxon friends he gained access to the tribal assembly at Marklo, where he urged the Saxons to accept Christianity voluntarily. But the Saxons' hour of destiny had already struck; it was now too late for a real decision in regard to accepting the Christian faith. The political and ecclesiastical incorporation of Saxony into the Frankish Kingdom must have been one of Charles's first aims. He set about realizing it in 772, immediately after the uniting of the two parts of the Frankish realm, and again took it up in 775 right after the conclusion of the Italian campaign. The Saxons formally submitted in 776 at Lippspringe and repeated this submission in 777 at the Diet of Paderborn, the first general assembly of the kingdom to be held in Saxony. They pledged their loyalty, according to their law, in exchange for their liberty and property. The beginnings of the Frankish march system in southern Westphalia (Dortmund) and in Angria (Paderborn) probably go back to this period. The first mass-baptisms took place. Abbot Sturmi of Fulda assumed charge of the Eresburg and the direction of the mission in the Paderborn area. No doubt the Cologne mission was also established in Westphalia south of the Lippe, and perhaps that of Mainz in the Eichsfeld and the Leine valley (Göttingen and Nörten) and that of Hersfeld in the district between the Saale, the Unstrut, and the Bode.

Outside the march areas Frankish rule seems to have rested especially only on the pro-Frankish faction of the nobility. But there was also an anti-Frankish party and to it belonged the Westphalian Widukind, of a noble family native to the district of Münster and Osnabrück. Instead of appearing in Paderborn, he had fled to the land of the "Northmen". He returned in the autumn of 778, after the Franks' defeat at Roncesvalles, and stirred up the revolt that brought on the second phase of the Saxon war. Up to this time Charles had not advanced beyond Osnabrück–Minden and Wolfenbüttel–Schöningen, but now he proceeded for the first time all the way to the Elbe, where he made contact with the neighbouring Slavonic tribes. The inhabitants of the Bardowiek around Lüneburg and the Northmen accepted baptism in 780. In that year all of Saxony was divided into mission jurisdictions. In July 782 a second general assembly of the Frankish Kingdom was held in Saxony, this one at Lippspringe. Here for the first time appeared envoys of the Danes and the Avars.

Charles felt that the time had now come to bring all of Saxony under the Carolingian government. The country was divided into counties, most of which were entrusted to the pro-Frankish nobles. Probably at that time the King also extended to Saxony the ecclesiastical legislation of the Frankish state and issued the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae,* which L. Halphen reduced to the dreadful formula: acceptance of Christianity or death. With terrible monotony the words "morte moriatur" occurred again and again — not only for refusal of baptism or violence to clerics or other Christians, but for violations of ritual prescriptions, such as the Lenten fast, or of the command to tithe. The only moderating effects were connected with the decrees on the right of asylum in churches and the rule that offences that were not public could be a matter of ecclesiastical penance.

Critics of Christianity and of the Church since the age of the *Aufklärung* have, again and again, quoted the *capitulatio,* which, as a matter of fact, is contrary to the basic principles of Christianity. The historian, however, must not stop with this absolute statement, but must put the question in accordance with the historical context. The death penalty was not something foreign to the Saxons — it was inflicted for marriage of persons of different classes and for trespass. Among the Franks death was the punishment of high treason, and for Charles the service of God and that of the King could not be separated. The King demanded obedience not only to himself but also to God, and by the same means and in the same spirit. Christians no less than pagans of that period were impressed especially by the *tremendum* in connection with religion. As in the Old Testament, *timor Dei* came before *amor Dei.* Religious and ecclesiastical precepts were generally understood as a whole, without making any finer distinctions between *ethos* and *ritus.* This is the explanation of what to the modern understanding is an incredible discrepancy between offence and punishment in the *capitulatio.* To be sure, churchmen were not lacking even in the eighth century who opposed the harshness of the law and the crude religious ideas upon which it was based. Criticism of the *capitulatio* and of the missionary methods of these years is an imperishable title to fame for Alcuin and for Paulinus of Aquileia, and it had an effect on Charles.

The *capitulatio,* which could only appear to the Saxons as a violent enforcement of a foreign faith and a foreign law, caused revolt to flare up again. An army, to which the King, called back to Frankland, had entrusted the subjection of the Sorb tribes, was wiped out on the Süntel, where the Franks suffered the worst defeat in the Saxon war. Nevertheless, the Saxons did not risk battle when Charles himself appeared on the scene. Widukind again fled to the Northmen, and the pro-Frankish nobles surrendered many rebels, who were now dealt with according to the *capitulatio*. In the autumn of 782 was held the criminal court of Verden, which the *Annales Regni Francorum* claim took a toll of 4,500 Saxon victims. The tradition in regard to this figure cannot be explained away, but the number must not be taken any more seriously in the literal sense than are other medieval statistics. The annalist merely intended to state that an unusually large number of Saxons were executed.

The execution at Verden had an effect opposite to that intended. The Saxon war reached its climax in 783–85 and in 784 even spread to Central and Eastern Frisia. When, finally, in the spring of 785 Charles advanced to the Bardowiek, negotiations took place with Widukind and Abbio, who met Charles at the palace of Attigny and were baptized there. Like other Saxon nobles, Widukind was presumably appointed to govern a Frankish county. According to a tradition which is credible, even though it cannot be traced back beyond 1100, he was buried in the church he had founded at Enger near Herford. His family continued to be prominent in Westphalia into the eleventh century, and from it came Queen Mathilde, mother of Otto the Great. With Widukind's submission the second and bloodiest phase of the Saxon war ended. The King prescribed thanksgiving throughout his dominions. The peace was unbroken for seven years, during which the foundations were laid for Saxony's ecclesiastical organization.

The sees of Mainz and Würzburg and the monasteries of Fulda, Hersfeld, and Amorbach became the chief agents of the evangelizing of southern Saxony. The mission field around Göttingen was incorporated into the diocese of Mainz. Hersfeld maintained a commanding position between the Unstrut, the Saale, and the Bode. On Sturmi's death in 779, Fulda relinquished the mission station of Paderborn to Würzburg and under Abbot Baugulf (780–802) took charge of the stations of Hameln and Minden. Amorbach obtained that of Verden.

The care of western Saxony was exercised by the sees of Cologne and Liège and the monasteries of Echternach and Corbie. The territory south of the Lippe was attached to the diocese of Cologne. Echternach assumed charge of the Münsterland; Liège, of Osnabrück; Corbie, of the stations of Meppen and Visbeck. The clergy of Utrecht were unable to supply any personnel for the early work in Saxony, for the conversion of Frisia had not yet been completed. But two Utrecht clerics did finally transfer from the Frisian to the Saxon mission: the Anglo-Saxon Willehad, who went to the county of Wigmodia (Bremen) in 780, and the Frisian Liudger, who took charge of Münster in 792. Each received a base of his own in the rear — Willehad the Cella Jüsten near Jülich, Liudger the Cella Leuze in Brabant. Closer to his mission territory Liudger founded the abbey of Werden.

The ecclesiastical personnel on the front did not suffice for the evangelization of eastern Saxony, and so the King applied to the bishoprics inside the Frankish Kingdom. The station of Elze–Hildesheim was attended to by Reims, the station of Seligenstadt–Halberstadt by Châlons. Traces of Trier's influence around Hamburg and of that of Metz around Magdeburg can be ascertained.

Gradually there grew up self-sufficient bishoprics in the mission areas, but not before the beginning of the ninth century. The earliest to be established were those in Westphalia and Angria — Münster, Osnabrück, Bremen, Paderborn, and Minden, in the years 803–07. The Eastphalian sees of Hildesheim, Halberstadt, and Verden apparently did not obtain their autonomy before the time of Louis the Pious. The sees of Münster, Osnabrück, and Bremen were assigned to the province of Cologne, which also acquired the Angrian see of Minden that grew out of the Fulda mission field. The sees of Paderborn, Verden, Hildesheim, and Halberstadt were allotted to the province of Mainz. Cologne and Mainz, which shared Saxony, were not by mere chance the ecclesiastical metropolises of the two great deployment areas in the Saxon wars.

While the Saxon wars were in progress Charles was also faced with a Spanish problem. Ever since the annexation of Septimania (or Gothia) to the Frankish Kingdom in 759, the Pyrenees had formed a strong frontier between Franks and Muslims. The Muslims had internal problems of their own. In 750 the Umayyad Dynasty had been supplanted by the Abbasids, who transferred the seat of the caliphate from Damascus to Baghdad. Abd-ar-Rahman, the only surviving Umayyad, fled to Spain, where he established the Emirate of Córdoba, independent of Baghdad. But throughout his life he had to contend with opposing factions.

There appeared before Charles at the Paderborn Diet of 777 Suleiman Ibn al Arabi, *wali* of Barcelona and Gerona, to request the King's aid against the Emir of Córdoba. He was allied with Hussain Ibn Yahya and Abu Thawr, *walis* of Zaragoza and Huesca, and presented the King with the keys of his cities in token of their symbolic surrender. As victor over Lombards and Saxons, Charles was then at a first climax of his power. He accepted the offer and probably expected that success would come to him as easily in Spain as it had in Italy. He seems to have envisaged the establishing of a Muslim Spanish vassal state.

The mobilization became a grand-scale undertaking. Not only all the peoples of the old Frankish realm but also Lombards and Bavarians were summoned, and in 778 the King in person led one army of Franks and Aquitanians via the western passes of the Pyrenees toward Pamplona. The second army marched via Septimania and Le Perthus toward Barcelona. The two armies united before Zaragoza around the middle of June. Thus far everything had proceeded smoothly, but now, for reasons unknown, the *Wali* Hussain refused to surrender the city. Charles finally gave up the enterprise and decided to withdraw. After destroying Pamplona, the Franks crossed the Pyrenees. On 15 August the army was attacked by Basques in the pass of Roncesvalles. Apparently the King was hurrying on ahead with a part of the troops. But the attack did not affect only the rear-guard, as Einhard claimed. The entire army was thrown into confusion and many leaders fell. Sixty years later their names were still on everyone's lips, including that of Roland, Margrave of Brittany, glorified in legend.

The assailants were not Muslims but Christian Basques of Navarre or possibly Gascony, and Charles apparently feared a revolt in Aquitaine. He decided to make his son Louis sub-King of Aquitaine in order to oblige the separatist feelings of the Aquitanians and at the same time to relieve the central government. The sub-kingdom was established in 781, together with the sub-kingdom of Italy.

An attack by the Muslims across the Pyrenees was not to be feared, but Abd-ar-Rahman undertook campaigns into the Ebro basin and in 781–3 re-established his authority as far as the Pyrenees. These expeditions also involved measures of retaliation against the Christian population, among whom Charles's ill-fated expedition had aroused the hope of deliverance. Many Christians who had been compromised with the Franks emigrated during the next years, among them persons such as Theodulf and Agobard, who were to play a leading role in the Carolingian Renaissance. In the view of this circle the enterprise of 778 assumed the character of an expedition to liberate Christians. The King himself never lost sight of Spanish Christianity from now on. In 782 Archbishop Wilchar of Sens conferred episcopal consecration on the priest Egila and commissioned him to work in Spain for "reform", that is, for a conformity of morals and customs with those of the Roman-Frankish Church. Behind this project stood King and Pope. At first the establishing of a religious and ecclesiastical influence was enough; the liberation of the Spanish Christians was postponed *secundum temporis opportunitatem*.

On the inclusion of the Lombard Kingdom into Charles's empire the future of Bavaria and of Benevento was left undecided. Tassilo of Bavaria had managed to strengthen his position within his duchy by means of the synods of Dingolfing (770) and Neuching (772). In 772 he won a decisive victory over the Carinthians, who now obtained a new Christian Duke and were evangelized from Salzburg. The ups and downs of Frankish power could for the future be clearly read in Frankish-Bavarian relations. The crisis did not mature until 787. Tassilo asked the Pope to mediate with the Franks, but Hadrian was already too closely bound to Charles, who rejected any mediation. A royal-papal embassy went to the court of Regensburg and demanded compliance with the obligations of a vassal, threatening excommunication. Tassilo submitted only as a result of a concentric deployment of the Franks around Bavaria. But he was unable to make the best of his lot. On the advice of his wife Liutberga, daughter of Desiderius, he got into contact with the Avars. Thereupon, the Frankish party among the Bavarian magnates instituted a process for high treason. It was deliberated in 788 at Ingelheim, where Tassilo had appeared. The indictment referred to disloyalty, threatening of royal vassals, and an understanding with the pagan Avars. Earlier cases of disloyalty to King Pepin were also adduced in support. The judges called for the death penalty, which Charles commuted to imprisonment in a monastery. The adherents of the ducal house were also sent to monasteries. Bavaria was placed under Charles's brother-in-law Gerold as prefect, but the ducal property went to the King.

Charles tackled the Beneventan question at almost the same time that he dealt with the Bavarian. When the Lombard Kingdom had been incorporated into the Frankish state, Duke Arichis had assumed the title of *princeps,* thereby claiming a royal position. He further expressed this claim by erecting palaces at Benevento and Salerno and in his charters and on his coins. He was able to maintain this policy for a time, due to Byzantine backing. But when the Empress Irene, who assumed the regency in the Empire after the death of the Emperor Leo IV, sought an understanding with the Franks and arranged the engagement of her young son, Constantine VI, to Charles's daughter Rotrudis in 781, Benevento was isolated. On the conclusion of the second Saxon war, Charles went to Italy in the winter of 786, and in January 787 he moved against the South Italian duchy. When he had advanced as far as Capua, Arichis made a peace proposal which the King accepted. Arichis took an oath of loyalty to Charles, furnished hostages, probably bound himself to pay tribute, and ceded to the Pope the territory west and north of the Liris, with a number of cities. At Capua appeared also an imperial embassy, which was to discuss the projected marriage of the young Emperor with Charles's daughter. But the marriage alliance had been concluded under different presuppositions. Not only the Beneventan question but also the new ecclesiastical policy of the Empress Irene, who had broken with Iconoclasm in 784, gave occasion for friction between her and the Western ruler. For Irene had invited the Pope, but not the Franks, to the council summoned by the imperial court to restore the cult of icons in the East and thereby ecclesiastical unity in Christendom.

At the end of March the King returned to Rome, where he kept Easter with Hadrian. Arichis was unwilling to preserve the peace. Hadrian learned that he had established contact with the imperial court. The Byzantines wanted to restore the pretender Adalgis to the Lombard Kingdom, and Arichis was to receive the dignity of *patricius* and become Duke of Naples. But the Duke died at Salerno on 26 August 787. The Frankish King came to terms with the Beneventans in the early summer of 788, appointing Arichis's son Grimoald as Duke, under the supervision of the Frankish *missus* Winigis. Grimoald had to include Charles's name on his charters, seals, and coins. In November 788 Winigis repelled an attack by the enraged Greeks. Since King Pepin quickly occupied Istria, the Byzantines, left with only Venetia, Naples, and a few maritime cities of Calabria and Apulia, were actually excluded from Italy.

After the ending of the Saxon war in 785 and the suppression of the Thuringian, or Hardrad's, revolt in the Main region in 786, the Frankish Kingdom experienced five years of relative quiet which were decisive for the progress of the Carolingian Renaissance. In this period Charles had secured the frontiers against the Bretons, the Wilzi of the Elbe, and the Greeks in Benevento and Istria and had annexed Bavaria. The incorporation of Bavaria made the Franks the immediate neighbours of the Avars and gave them new tasks.

A Turkish people like the Huns and the Bulgars, the Avars had emigrated from Siberia around 400 to the East European steppe, where they defeated Hunnic and Bulgar tribes and carried them along with them. Modern Hungary became the centre of their empire. After their abortive siege of Constantinople in 626, their power declined in the seventh century through the emancipation of Slavonic tribes and of the Bulgars, but it recovered in the eighth century. When Tassilo was deposed in 788, the dreaded nomads invaded Bavaria and Friuli, but they were driven back. Charles brought to maturity a plan for definitively warding off the danger by a great enterprise.

The campaign was carried out by three armies in the late summer of 791, and Charles advanced to Komárno. He spent the following winter and the spring of 792 at Regensburg, at which time the Rhine–Danube canal via the Rezat and the Altmühl (Bamberg–Regensburg) was planned. But the great operations contemplated for 792 could not be carried out. At the end of 791 Grimoald of Benevento deserted to the Byzantines, and the Lombard troops had to be sent to the south Italian frontier. On 6 July 792, the Saxons suddenly fell upon the recently assembled northern army. And in the autumn Charles was apprised by the Lombard Fardulf of a plot of his oldest son Pepin, whose right of succession had been put in doubt, with a large number of the Frankish high nobility. The Saxon revolt, apparently still restricted locally, was suppressed, and Pepin's conspiracy was nipped in the bud. The King reacted harshly. Some of the conspirators were executed, others were banished; these last included Pepin, who was interned at Prüm. But the crisis still had not been surmounted. A severe famine occurred. The campaign of the young Kings, Pepin of Italy and Louis of Aquitaine, against Benevento collapsed in the spring of 793. The Spanish Muslims exploited the situation, crossed the Pyrenees for the first time in forty years, and inflicted a heavy defeat on Margrave William of Toulouse near Orbieu. The Saxon revolt flared up again and became a serious conflagration. The Frankish state was in great peril.

It is amazing how calmly and quickly the King mastered the great crisis of 792–93. He saw correctly that possibly setbacks but not catastrophes could occur on the Beneventan front and in the Pyrenees, and so he entrusted the defensive in both sectors to his sons. Charles did not interrupt the Avar war but confided its management to Margrave Eric of Friuli and Gerold, prefect of Bavaria. The Frankish offensive was resumed in 795, and its success exceeded all expectations. Exploiting the chaos among the Avars, Eric of Friuli contrived to press as far as the "Ring" in the Theiss plain and to conquer this centre of Avar power, where the treasure amassed during the preceding two centuries fell into his hands. The immense booty even caused a rise in the price of food in the Frankish Kingdom during the next decade. Although guerilla warfare continued until 805, the hour of the Avar Kingdom had struck. In 796 King Pepin proceeded to Pannonia in order to accept the homage of the defeated. The Avar Prince Tudun went to Aachen and was baptized at the royal court. As with Widukind, Charles himself acted as godfather.

In 794 the King had assumed the direction of the Saxon war. The revolt once again involved all of Saxony and eastern Frisia. Charles amassed his troops at Mainz; his son and namesake did so in the Cologne area. The rebels were surrounded in the territory of the Eresburg and laid down their arms. Thereby southern Saxony, where the Saxon demesnes of the German Kings were later situated, was definitively pacified. Only the northern counties persisted in the revolt. The King led the campaigns in person until 798. He turned over the further operations, which went on until 804, to his son Charles. The Franks behaved ruthlessly. Many Saxons were transplanted to the interior of the empire. Temporarily, Nordalbingia was abandoned to the allied Slavonic Obodrites.

Within just about five years all the dangers that had appeared so menacing in 792–93 had been exorcised. The peaceful pursuits of the 780's could now be taken up again. During the crisis Charles had not lost sight of the intellectual problems, and in 794 at the Synod of Frankfurt he had forcefully expressed the Frankish claim, *vis-à-vis* Byzantium and Toledo, to have a decisive voice in theological matters also. The *Regnum Francorum* was being transformed into the *Imperium Christianum*.

CHAPTER 12

Reform of Empire and Church: The Carolingian Renaissance

In the first decade of his reign Charles the Great was so preoccupied with the great questions of "foreign policy" that little leisure for the inner order of his realm was left to him. Not until the second decade of his rule was he able to resume his father's legislative activity. His earliest extant capitulary dates from 779; three capitularies for Italy and the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae* have come down to us from the succeeding decade. Three capitularies of 789, including the *admonitio generalis* to the clergy, which represents a first climax, bring this early legislation to a close. What has survived of the capitularies does not exhibit all the legislation of these years but does make known the growing intensity of Charles's domestic political activity.

The word *capitulare* was new; it refers to the dividing of the text into *capitula* and was probably adopted from Lombard-Italian usage. In content the capitularies corresponded to the old decrees and edicts. They included laws of permanent validity, such as administrative and executive decrees, details of criminal law, public law, administrative and canon law, but before 800 not the details of private law (personal and family law, property law apart from that affecting *beneficia,* compensations, procedural law). Their juridical basis was the royal ban — the King's right to command under penalty. Following preparation by commissions of *legislatores,* the planned capitularies were submitted to the assembly of the magnates, which, however, had only a right to advise and recognize, not to consent in the modern sense. Purely ecclesiastical matters were often discussed by purely ecclesiastical commissions, which were then acting also as councils. Promulgation was made by the King orally *(verbum regis),* often in the form of solemn address *(adnuntiatio).* Hence the surviving capitularies are not legally binding law texts in the late Roman or the modern sense, but caption outlines of projects, *adnuntiationes* or circulars, in most cases informally jotted down by secretaries *ad hoc.* Only in special cases were capitularies drawn up by the chancery.

The great capitulary of Herstal of 779 was intended to foster peace in the kingdom. It contained severe decrees against robbery and brigandage. Even private retinues and sworn associations in gilds were forbidden. Counts and royal vassals who were negligent in administering justice were to forfeit their *beneficia;* judges in immunities who did not surrender fugitive criminals were to be removed from office. The King ordered the settlement of feuds by means of compensation. He confirmed his father's law on tithes and definitively regulated the question of Church *beneficia* by the introduction everywhere of the double tithe — *decima* and *nona* — as well as of a recognition rent.

The idea of peace again appeared in the *admonitio generalis,* probably formulated by Alcuin. Peace and order were promoted by organizational reforms of fundamental importance, which were implemented at this time, though the texts of the corresponding capitularies have not survived: the introduction of *scabini* in the counties, the earliest known case occurring in 780, and of *advocati* in the immunities before 792. The Carolingian *scabini,* like the earlier *rachimburgi,* were assessors and judges in the county court. Also like the *rachimburgi,* they were appointed from established landed proprietors of good repute, no longer from case to case but for life, under the supervision of royal *missi.* The *advocati* were chosen in an analogous manner. The place of the former *advocati,* named only *ad hoc,* was taken by permanently appointed *advocati,* selected in agreement with the count. Within the immunity they looked after the same functions — low justice — as did the *centenarii* or *vicarii* in the counties, represented the lord of the immunity and his peasants before the county court, and were responsible to the count for criminals who had taken refuge in the immunity. The counts were bound more closely to the ruler by becoming royal vassals. They were subordinate to the royal *missi,* who played a role in their appointment.

Missi are referred to in connection with this function as early as 779. There had long been *missi dominici,* but now they were sent out regularly. Charles divided the entire kingdom into *missatica,* based on tribal areas, marches, and ecclesiastical provinces and dioceses. *Missi* were selected from the higher clergy — bishops and abbots — and the chaplains, from counts and vassals, not resident in the district, in each case a cleric and a layman, whose cooperation was intended to strengthen the *concordia* of the two classes in the state. Not only the supervision of law and administration but also the promulgation of the capitularies pertained to their duties. The intensification of legislative activity certainly speeded up the constituting of the *missatica* in the 780's. Supervision of the carrying out of their functions by resident bishops, abbots, and counts fostered the development of the method of inquest in law.

In the *admonitio generalis* Charles appears as a Church reformer of the type of King Josiah of Israel, who exerted himself, *circumeundo, corrigendo, ammonendo,* to lead back the kingdom entrusted to him by God to true religion. Apparently the capitulary was drawn up by Alcuin. The first part of its decrees is based on the canonical collection of Dionysius Exiguus, given to the King by Pope Hadrian in 774. It constitutes a sort of summary of canonical regulations for the clergy in the framework of diocese and province. The restoration of discipline among monks and clergy by means of the renewal of the diocesan law of the early Church had been a fixed goal of all Frankish synods since Boniface. In the capitulary of Herstal Charles had first made the subordination of bishops to metropolitans a programme again. In addition to Wilchar of Sens, who after the death of Chrodegang of Metz seems to have been the only archbishop in the Frankish Kingdom, Tilpin of Reims, Possessor of Tarantaise, and Weomad of Trier around 780 and Lull of Mainz in 782 became archbishops. The elevating of Erembert of Bourges to be archbishop and metropolitan between 784 and 791 shows that the restoration included Aquitaine also, where, it is true, Erembert was probably the only metropolitan for a while. The establishing of ecclesiastical provinces could proceed rapidly since the Roman-Merovingian arrangement was maintained and a clear outline was available in the *Notitia Galliarum*. The reform seems to have faltered only in the south-east of Gaul, since the old quarrel between Vienne and Arles was revived in 794 and there also existed at that time uncertainties in regard to the rank of Tarantaise in Alpes Graiae, Embrun in Alpes Maritimae, and Aix in Narbonensis Secunda. Responsible for Germany and Rhaetia were still Cologne (for Frisia and Westphalia) and Mainz. Bavaria alone became autonomous as the province of Salzburg in 798.

Despite this recourse to the juridical arrangement of the earlier Church, the re-establishing of the ecclesiastical provinces in the Frankish Kingdom was no mere restoration. New was the combining of the archiepiscopal dignity with the office of metropolitan, which spread from England (Canterbury and York) first to the Frankish West (Sens) and then to the entire kingdom. In earlier times prelates superior in rank to metropolitans, such as patriarchs and papal vicars, were termed archbishops. Boniface and Chrodegang of Metz, as leaders of the Austrasian Church, were indeed archbishops but not metropolitans. Even under Charles the Great the archiepiscopal dignity was bestowed upon Angilram of Metz and Theodulf of Orléans as a personal distinction. But thereafter it was regularly given to the bishops of the metropolitan sees. The archiepiscopal pallium became the sign of the metropolitans,[1] who were now obliged to fetch the insignia from Rome within three months, presenting on this occasion a profession of faith. Before receiving the pallium they were not allowed to consecrate their suffragans. Thus the new archbishops were more closely attached to Rome than were the old metropolitans. At the same time, as sharers in papal authority they acquired a stronger position in their provinces. Alongside the Roman concept of the metropolitan power as a sharing in the universal primacy there persisted also the notion, coming from an earlier period, of a metropolitan constitution not created by the papacy.

The decrees of the second part of the *admonitio generalis* were very greatly modelled on the Ten Commandments, which were interpreted in the sense of the public peace. In one special chapter Charles imposed on the clergy the duty of preaching on faith and morals. The two groups, secular and regular clergy (*canonicae observantiae ordines vel monachici propositi congregationes*), are mentioned in the chapter on the conduct of ecclesiastics but are not distinguished in any detail. The *cantus Romanus* was prescribed for the liturgy, with reference to the regulations of King Pepin, which, to be sure, had by no means eliminated the existing confusion in the Gallican liturgy. Success was achieved only as a result of Charles's exertions. The liturgical books — sacramentary, lectionary, *ordines,* homiliary, antiphonary — were revised on the basis of Roman or Franco-Roman texts by the Carolingian court theologians and disseminated everywhere. Charles himself had asked the Pope for an authentic sacramentary and in 785–86 had received from Hadrian the *Gregorianum.* This, of course, contained only text for the papal liturgical rites; it had to be completed by Alcuin with recourse to the *Gelasianum* of Pepin. In Alcuin's recension this *Gregorianum* or *Hadrianum* obtained in regard to the Western liturgy the same importance that the *Dionyso-Hadriana* did in regard to Western canon law. Thus the consideration of Charles's liturgical reform leads in turn to the great teacher of the Carolingian Renaissance, who also had a decisive share in drawing up the *admonitio* of 789. It was not mere chance that the first allusion of certain date to Charles's concern for education is in the same *admonitio generalis.*

---

[1] The pallium was originally a scarf proper to imperial officials. Gregory the Great still obtained the imperial consent for conferring it. Cf. T. Klauser, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte* (Krefeld 1949), 19ff.

Charles's special gift for creating something new out of earlier modest beginnings appears also in an examination of the Carolingian Renaissance. At the Frankish royal court there had long been an "academy of pages", consisting of *pueri palatini,* youngsters of the royal family and of the higher nobility. According to Hincmar of Reims, the *pueri palatini* constituted a special *ordo.* At the time of Pepin they seem to have been under the patronage of Queen Bertrada, who was probably the first to stress learning in the proper sense in the training of the boys. The "academy of pages" was not identical with the chapel, to which belonged only men who had completed their education. However, under Charles the *pueri palatini* seem to have occasionally performed the function of court secretaries.

The teachers at the court school in Pepin's time are unknown. At the beginning of Charles's reign we find two "foreigners", pupils of Alcuin of York: the Anglo-Saxon Beornrad, who obtained the abbey of Echternach in 777, and the Irishman Joseph the Scot. Dungal, another Irishman, famed for his knowledge of astronomy, may also have been in the King's circle at that time. To these men from England and Ireland were added Italians from the time of Charles's second visit to Italy: the Lombard Fardulf, who came to Gaul as an exile in 776, and the grammarians Paulinus and Peter of Pisa in 776 or soon after. The year 782 saw the arrival at court of the Lombard Paul the Deacon; he came to ask pardon for his brother, who, like Fardulf, had taken part in Hrodgaud's rebellion. That was an epoch-making year, for in it Alcuin, who had directed the cathedral school of York since 767, took up residence at the Frankish court. He assumed the direction of the court school; when he departed for Tours in 796 it passed to Einhard and thereafter was held by Frankish court chaplains. The last great representative of the early Carolingian Renaissance, the Visigoth Theodulf, may have come into the Frankish Kingdom with the wave of Spanish emigrants in 780. Some time before 790 he was admitted to the circle of the court scholars.

The early Carolingian Renaissance came to an end with Alcuin's removal to Tours. By then the older teachers at the court school had already departed. Paul the Deacon had stayed in Frankland only a short time; in 785 or 786 he had gone back to Montecassino. In 787 Paulinus became Patriarch of Aquileia. Peter of Pisa also was back in Italy in the late 780's. Fardulf received the abbey of Saint-Denis in 793; Theodulf, the see of Orléans in 798.

The education imparted at the court school was based on the *Septem Artes,* handed down from late antiquity. The emphasis lay on the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic) but the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music) was not entirely neglected. In the words of Fleckenstein, the instruction was "not restricted to rigid . . . lessons, but grew . . . organically out of the close association of teachers and pupils". It comprised both the elementary and the higher levels, but was constituted differently according to the several groups of individuals. Only one group of them was being prepared for an ecclesiastical career; another group, for a career in the world. Teachers and outstanding pupils were gathered under the presidency of the King into a sort of "academy" with regular meetings. In these they had common discussions on learned topics, solved riddles, and read poetic letters.

The members of this intimate circle bore pseudonyms, marks of *familiaritas,* but not selected by caprice. First of all was Charles, known as King David. Then came the Archchaplain Hildebald, Archbishop of Cologne (*ca.* 791–819), who, as the foremost ecclesiastic of the realm, represented the High Priest Aaron. Einhard, inspector-general of the royal buildings, was called Beseleel, after the builder of the tabernacle. The abbots bore the names of ancient monastic Fathers — Adalard of Corbie was Antony, Richbod of Lorch was Macarius — or of prophets — Beornrad of Echternach was Samuel. Paulinus was called Timothy, after the disciple of the Apostle Paul. Charles's sister Gisela was called Lucy, his daughter Rotrudis Columba, after saints occurring in *the Laudes regiae.* Literary pseudonyms were borne by Alcuin (Flaccus), Angilbert (Homer), Modoin, later Bishop of Autun (Naso), an unknown Maro, and perhaps also Theodulf (Pindar). From poetry were taken the names of the high secular court dignitaries — of the seneschal Audulf (Menalcas), of the chamberlain Meginfrid (Thyrsis), of the cup-bearer Eberhard (Nemias); to this category belonged also the name of the deacon Reculf (Damoetas). If one looks more carefully, it is seen that, despite the numerical superiority of classical pseudonyms, the emphasis was on biblical names. The classical pseudonyms of the secular dignitaries had no importance of their own, but were merely taken from Virgil's *Eclogues.* The same is not true, however, of the literary pseudonyms. Horace, Homer, Ovid, and Virgil indicated scholars and poets. These nicknames expressed not only a veneration for the classical authors, but also ambition to reproduce them in a changed world, out of a Christian spirit. As Fleckenstein says, "Alcuin did not want to be an ancient pagan with Horace but that Horace should be a Christian Flaccus in him".

The renewal of the *Septem Artes* was undertaken, not as an end in itself, but in subordination to Charles's concern for reform. The study of the *Septem Artes* was the indispensable prerequisite for the emendation and exegesis of the sacred texts and for the proper ordering and organization of the liturgy. Reform had to begin with the simplest things — handwriting and orthography. Thus it appears in the *admonitio generalis.* It is said elsewhere that, while knowledge without works is dead, the prerequisite for right acting is right knowing.

Hence the first fruit of Charles's exertions for the reform of education was the new Carolingian script, which was distinguished from the older scripts by the clarity of the letters and the preciseness of words and sentences. Its first example — the poetic dedication of the Godescalc evangeliary, produced at court in 781–83 — is a landmark in the history of the Carolingian Renaissance. Refining of script and refining of language were intimately connected. The linguistic emendation led, not to a revival of classical Latin, but only to an elimination of vulgarisms. Latin and the Romance languages definitely separated. From the Carolingian reform proceeded Mediaeval Latin, based on the Bible and the Fathers and already foreshadowed in England. Flexible enough to express the new intellectual content, it became the language of the educated classes in the West. Apart from the literary works of the court circle there must be mentioned as the first document of the linguistic reform Part II of the *Annales Regni Francorum,* covering the period 794 to 807.

Around the same time began the wider manuscript transmission of classical authors. It testifies to the revival of the *Septem Artes,* in particular of the *trivium,* in which the study of the classics had been pursued in the schools since antiquity. But the pagan authors were not merely literature for study in school; they also provided a ready form for the expressing of secular values. Thus, for his biography of Charles in the ninth century Einhard went back to Suetonius, since the plan of the lives of saints was not applicable to a king's life. Hence it should not cause surprise "that the writings and poems dealing with Charles the Great reveal ancient forms in a far greater degree than do other works" (Fleckenstein). Later, in a similar manner, Aristotle unlocked for the Christianity of the thirteenth century a good bit of the "world". But David, as well as Solomon, as the Anglo-Saxon Cathwulf wrote to Charles in 775, was "in sapientia divina et saecularibus litteris inbutus".[2] Fleckenstein says that "when [the court] made itself, alongside and apart from the monasteries, the bearer of what had hitherto been a monastic education, this could indeed maintain its Christian but not its monastic character". There was no change in the subordination of the *litterae saeculares* to the *sapientia divina.* Charles did not long for a new Virgil but for just twelve Church Fathers like Jerome and Augustine. More important to him than the classical texts were the ecclesiastical, the *libri canonici veraces.*

---

[2] *MGEp* IV, 503.

The "authentic text" of canon law, presented to Charles in the *Dionyso-Hadriana* in 774, inaugurated the series of these *libri canonici.* Shortly afterwards other canonical collections of the "Gelasian Renaissance" found admittance into the Frankish Kingdom. The *Hispana* too was circulated. Archbishop Riculf of Mainz seems to have spread the *Hispana Gallica,* which his suffragan, Rachis of Strasbourg, had transcribed in 787. In various manuscripts the *Dionyso-Hadriana* was bound with the *Hispana.* Analogous connections with the capitularies, on the other hand, cannot be proved. The old canonical texts were apparently to constitute *the* norm, as being the authentic law.

The "authentic" sacramentary, the *Gregorianum* or *Hadrianum* sent to Charles in 786, which Alcuin completed by recourse to Pepin's *Gelasianum,* has already been mentioned. Alcuin also published a lectionary containing the Mass readings, which was in accord with the *Hadrianum.* The Roman *ordines,* containing the instructions for the rites, were revised by an unknown scholar. Charles entrusted to Paul the Deacon the task of compiling a homiliary — patristic readings for the Office — which was introduced universally by the *Epistola generalis.* Between 758 and 763 Pope Paul I had sent King Pepin a Roman antiphonary. It was edited by Amalarius and published under Louis the Pious — the last liturgical book to be prepared. Thus Roman texts were the basis of the *libri canonici* in canon law and liturgy. In this context must be mentioned also the *Rule* of Saint Benedict, since from as early as the seventh century it was regarded in Gaul as the "Roman" monastic rule. In 787 Charles had an "authentic" copy of it made at Montecassino. The Roman calendar of saints was also received, along with the Roman liturgical books. Alcuin inserted it into the *Hadrianum.* The cults of Roman saints pushed aside the Gallo-Frankish saints during the ninth century and dominated the field into the eleventh century. It was only during the crusades that they were complemented by oriental cults.

Charles the Great was also concerned about the text of the Bible, but, contrary to what has been maintained, he did not commission Alcuin to prepare a revised standard text. What Charles was mostly concerned with was to have manuscripts that were correct in regard to orthography and grammar. A first example of such exertions was the Maurdramnus Bible, produced at Corbie before 781. The same motives prompted Alcuin later, as Abbot of Tours (796–804), to have the entire Bible transcribed. A real textual revision was the work, not of Alcuin, but of Theodulf, who in this connection even made what was for the age "an unprecedented attempt to correct Jerome's work by the Hebrew text".[3] But none of the Bibles produced at Corbie, Tours, Orléans, and many other places was accepted and circulated as authentic by the court. The court had greater importance only for the spread of the psalter which Jerome had revised according to the Greek text. It had apparently been received under Pepin and, as the *Gallicanum,* established itself in the whole of Western Christendom. On the other hand, the Gospel text used in the court school was supplanted by that of the Alcuin Bibles from the second half of the ninth century.[4]

From the court proceeded the initiative for the renewal of cultural life. The Carolingian Renaissance spread from the court, and new centres of culture took their place beside the older ones. Teachers and pupils carried the spirit of the court school to the places where they assumed new duties. In the old and the new centres *sapientia saecularis* and *divina* were not cultivated only for their own sake. The pastoral care of souls was also to be renewed from the great churches. Extant is a corresponding decree of Theodulf for the diocese of Orléans: "Presbyteri per villas et vicos scholas habeant."[5] There had been parish schools as early as the sixth century. They gave elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and in particular a catechetical instruction. That the faithful should learn the creed and the "Our Father" by heart was a demand made by the Carolingian capitularies ceaselessly from the *admonitio* of 789.

Preaching and catechetical instruction could take place only in the vernacular. Hence it should not cause surprise that the baptismal vows, "Our Father", and creed, and later the doxology, the list of sins, and formulas of confession are among the oldest texts in the German language. In general, the *admonitio generalis* forms the *terminus a quo* in dating them. Earlier Old High German boundary descriptions of 777 and 779 from Fulda and Würzburg point to Anglo-Saxon models, and the alliterative religious poetry was probably also stimulated by the Anglo-Saxons; its oldest witnesses are the Wessobrunn Prayer and the Muspilli. The oldest glossaries go back to a very early time; they probably originated at Freising with Bishop Arbeo (764–83) and at Fulda and testify to scholarly efforts. From them developed a literature of translation, which included the psalter, hymns, and the Benedictine *Rule* (interlinear glosses), and reached their climax in a translation of works which were grouped around Isidore's *De fide catholica.*

If Old High German literature began earliest in Bavaria and Fulda, its development took place in a clear relationship to the Carolingian Renaissance. To be sure, none of the extant linguistic monuments came from the court itself. The centres of early German literature were Fulda, Lorsch and Mainz, Freising and Regensburg, Reichenau, Murbach, and Weissenburg. Without exception they lay in the area connected with Boniface, with Bavaria, and with Pirmin's Alemannia. Old High German was given its phonetic characteristics by an older Bavarian and a younger Rhine-Frankish linguistic movement. The Rhine-Frankish was not the speech of the court but of Mainz, whose importance as the ecclesiastical *metropolis Germaniae* becomes clear in a consideration of the beginnings of the German language and literature.

---

[3] Fischer, *Bibeltext und Bibelreform,* 178.

[4] Ibid. 193ff. (psalter) and 174 and 195 (Gospels).

[5] *PL* 105, 196 C. — Fleckenstein, *op. cit.* 44.

The mother tongue of the Carolingians was the Frankish of the Cologne-Maestricht district, which determined the Carolingian language of law and administration. In the old Frankish districts between the Rhine and the Seine the word *theodisk* was coined to specify the old Frankish language; it was used for the Germanic languages as a whole, the earliest examples dating from 786 and 788, when, in the age of Charles the Great, the existence of a Germanic family of languages became known. Since at the same time the Romance language was separating from Latin, the existence of a Romance family of languages also entered into men's consciousness. The recognition of the division of the Christian West into two great linguistic communities — they are called "rustica Romana lingua aut theotisca" in the synodal acts of Tours of 813 — thus arose from Charles the Great's reform of education, from the Carolingian "Renaissance".

Chapter 13

Iconoclasm, Adoptionism, and Filioque

With astonishing rapidity the Frankish Kingdom rose to the position of the ranking Christian political power from the middle of the eighth century, and at the end of the century it was also about to assume intellectual leadership in the West. The *Imperium,* still involved in difficult struggles with the caliphate and overrun by Slavonic immigrants in its European provinces, was relegated to the frontier of the *orbis christianus.* But the Emperors had maintained their claim to be the rulers of this *orbis.* As had once happened in the Frankish Kingdom, so now in Christendom itself *auctoritas* and *potestas* had separated. So long as Iconoclasm kept Rome and Constantinople apart, this may have seemed unimportant, especially since the imperial claim was scarcely recognized in the West any more. The reconciliation of Pope and Emperor at the Council of Nicaea in 787, however, could not fail to pose the question of the position of the Frankish King in Christendom. The attitude of the Franks to the decrees of Nicaea was thus encumbered with this question from the outset.

The acts of Nicaea reached Charles in a poor Latin translation that had been made in Rome. In 790 the King commissioned the Visigoth Theodulf to undertake a detailed refutation. Theodulf's first draft was discussed at court. Then Charles sent the Pope a memorandum in which he bluntly rejected the Council; this was the *Capitulare de imaginibus,* drawn up in the form of theses. Hadrian replied with a defense of Nicaea. His answer was also discussed at court and taken into account in the final redaction of Theodulf's work, but the viewpoint peculiar to Theodulf's treatise was maintained essentially unchanged. Thus originated in 791 the *Libri Carolini* — the embodiment of the Frankish view of the quarrel over images, composed by Theodulf, discussed and corrected in the court circle, and bearing the name of the King himself.[1]

Theodulf had not contented himself with a superficial refutation of the Latin translation of the acts. He had developed a theology of word and image of real value, and in addition he had taken up the question of the Emperor's position in the Church. In the question of images he established the Western view, following Gregory the Great. At the outset he defined its limitations against the iconoclasts, who confused image and idolatry. Essentially Theodulf completely agreed with the authentic acts of Nicaea, when he clearly distinguished *adoratio,* belonging to God alone, from *veneratio,* the honouring of the saints and their relics. But he was unwilling to allow even *veneratio* to images. The Platonic notion of art held by the Greeks, who honoured the prototype in the copy, was foreign to him. He understood the plastic art as a craft, the work of art as mere adornment, in its quality dependent on the worth of the material and on the skill and experience of the artist. It may indeed be able to make past deeds and happenings present, but not to represent adequately a religious content, in contradistinction to the revealed word. Hence, such revealed signs as the ark of the covenant and the cross were, in his view, superior to the religious picture. Thus Theodulf's rationalistic notion of art ended in a spiritualism based on the revealed word.

In the very first chapter the *Libri Carolini* sharply attacked the forms of the imperial cult that had been passed on to the Christian world. The polemic was aimed at the formula "per eum qui conregnat nobis deus", for God reigns in us, not with us. It was directed against the designating of the Emperors as *divi,* of their *gesta* as *divalia,* for these are *gentilia vocabula.* Not least, it rejected the epithet ἰσαπόστολος, for "tanta est distantia inter apostolos et imperatores, quanta inter sanctos et peccatores".[2] The honouring of images of the Emperor was directly connected with the theme of the cult of images, "nullam enim hoc scelus fecisse legimus gentem, nisi Babylonios et Romanos". Here the ancient equation Rome-Babylon for the *Imperium* was again dragged out. But the imperial authority as such was not for this reason to be depreciated. In another passage it was explained that, according to Scripture, emperors, like kings, are to be honoured, but in due form and not *propter se vel*

---

[1] A. Freeman, *Speculum* 40 (1965), 203–89, has definitively clarified the question of authorship and reaction in a dispute with L. Wallach.

[2] *Libri Carolini,* IV, 20, 212.

propter ordinem.[3] In the attack on the Empress Irene, whose right to speak at the Council was severely criticized because of her sex, the question of the legitimate imperial authority could perhaps be faintly heard.[4]

Connected with the polemic against the imperial office was that against the universal character of the Second Council of Nicaea. According to the *Libri Carolini* the universality of a council could be determined quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, a council should be regarded as universal if the totality of Christian churches was represented or consulted; qualitatively, if two or three churches (Mt. 18:20) issued decisions in the framework of the Catholic tradition. But the authoritative guarantee of tradition was the Roman Church, which "nullis synodicis constitutis ceteris ecclesiis praelata est, sed ipsius Domini auctoritate primatum tenet".[5] Thus was the ground cut from under the older view of the ecumenical council as convoked by the Emperor and justified by the participation of Rome and of the four eastern patriarchates. Charles, in whose name the *Libri Carolini* were issued, stressed with pride that the Church in his realm had never swerved from the "sancta et veneranda communio" with Rome; that this bond had been recently strengthened by the acceptance of the Roman liturgy; that he not only ruled Gaul, Germany, and Italy, but had also led the Saxons to the faith. Thereby, indirectly but unmistakably, was registered a Frankish claim to a voice in the great affairs of Christendom.

The fact that the *Libri Carolini* sharply emphasized the Roman primacy and at the same time challenged the validity of the Nicene decrees, which had been issued in agreement with the Pope, is not without irony. Charles sent the final redaction to the Pope, but shortly thereafter the great crisis broke and the matter was not pursued further for the time being. The King did not take it up again until 794, together with the question of Adoptionism, which ran parallel to it.

After his failure at Zaragoza Charles did not completely lose sight of Spanish affairs. Around 782 a certain Egila, whose name was Gothic and who had been consecrated by Wilchar of Sens as a bishop without a fixed see, went to Spain with the errand of propagating the Frankish ecclesiastical reform beyond the Pyrenees and of uniting Spain more firmly to Rome. Egila's mission was compromised by his overzealous helper, Migetius, who not only attacked mixed marriages between Christians and Muslims but also eating with Muslims and who by his Trinitarian doctrine made himself vulnerable to attack. The Spanish Primate, Elipandus of Toledo, who is said not to have been himself favourable to the intermingling of Christians and Muslims, had Migetius condemned by a synod at Seville before October 785. At this synod Elipandus described the relationship of the man Jesus to God by means of the image of adoption: "Christus adoptivus filius Altissimi humanitate, et nequaquam adoptivus divinitate".[6]

---

[3] Ibid. III, 29, 166.

[4] Ibid. III, 13. Freeman, *loc. cit.* 218, comments: "Implicit in this issue is the further question of imperial dignity: may it be vested in a woman? At this point pre-eminently in the *Libri Carolini* the nascent ambitions of Charlemagne come into collision with Byzantium." Of importance also in this connection is the reference of Beckwith (*Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben,* III: *Karolingische Kunst*, 297) that the first generation of Carolingian artists — the Godescalc Evangeliary of 781–3 and even the Dagulf Psalter of 795 — was under the influence of the art of Rome, but then the East Roman-Byzantine influence became clearly discernible. Beckwith first identifies "the atmosphere of an imperial audience in the great palace of Constantinople" in the Ada group (*c.* 800), and then especially in the group of manuscripts on the Vienna Evangeliary.

[5] *Libri Carolini,* I, 6, 20.

Elipandus's formula should not be understood as an echo of older heresies. In the Spanish Church the struggle against contrary heretical doctrines — Arianism and Apollinarianism, Priscillianism, Monophysitism, and Monothelitism — had led to a sharp contrasting of the two natures of Christ, and hence among the Spanish Church Fathers there appeared formulas similar to that of Elipandus for explaining the Man Jesus. The key expression was transmitted by the Mozarabic liturgy, which bore the stamp of Elipandus's predecessors, Eugene II, Ildefonso, and Julian. The problem in which the Metropolitan of Toledo was in sympathy with Nestorius was the safeguarding of Jesus's true manhood, perhaps because of the association with Muslims, for whom the God-Man was a stumbling block. The distinguishing of the two natures of Christ in the image of *filius adoptivus* (humanity) and *filius proprius* (divinity) was not heterodox, but outside Spain it could be misunderstood, for in Germanic law adoption signified a very loose bond, in contradistinction to the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*.

The formula of Elipandus would hardly have been attacked had there not developed in Spain itself an opposition between the free Christians of Asturias and those of the Emirate of Córdoba. The conflict originated with Abbot Beatus of Liébana, famed for his commentary on the Apocalypse, and his pupil, Bishop Etherius of Osma, who accused Elipandus of destroying the unity of the person of Christ and of denying the divinity of the Redeemer. Both were closely associated with the faction of Alfonso II, who was later to lead the struggle for Asturian self-assertion against the emirate. In 785 Elipandus replied with anathema against his opponents. Thereupon Beatus and Etherius composed a polemic, which they published in March 786. The Pope, who had been informed by adherents of Beatus and regarded Elipandus as a Nestorian, called upon the Spanish episcopate to bring the Primate back to the unity of faith. But, except for Teudila of Seville, the bishops of the Emirate of Córdoba ranged themselves behind the Metropolitan of Toledo.

---

[6] W. Heil ("Der Adoptianismus, Alkuin und Spanien" in *Karl der Grosse, Lebenswerk und Nachleben,* II, 95–155), following Spanish scholars, derives Adoptionism from the tradition of the Antiochene theology, which remained alive in Spain, where there long persisted an opposition to the Second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. Migetius's sect, in his view, was in the Pelagian tradition.

The Franks were also dragged into the conflict by the Asturians, who around 790 denounced the adoptionist attitude of Felix, Bishop of Urgel, an esteemed prelate in the area under Frankish rule south of the Pyrenees. The formula of Elipandus could not fail to give special offense in the Frankish sphere, for in the Carolingian view of Christ the stress lay on the divine nature, and the Roman notion of adoption, with its strong bonds, was unfamiliar to the Franks. In the summer of 792 Felix was summoned to a synod at Regensburg. Paulinus of Aquileia seems to have been entrusted with the refutation. Felix recanted at Regensburg and a second time at Rome. He then returned to his see but fled to Muslim Spain, where he again professed the formula of Elipandus. The Muslim attack of 793 enabled him to return to Urgel, and now the adoptionist propaganda reached formerly Visigothic Septimania.

In 792–93 Elipandus and the episcopate of the emirate protested to Charles and the Frankish episcopate against the treatment of the Bishop of Urgel. Charles sent the Spaniards' documents to Hadrian, who condemned them, whereupon the King summoned a general assembly and synod of his realm to meet at Frankfurt on 1 June 794. The meeting, presided over by the King and two papal legates, included the bishops of the entire Frankish dominion and possibly delegates from England and Asturias. The Council of Frankfurt was content, in so far as the Greeks were concerned, with condemning one proposition, which was indeed heterodox in the completely distorted Latin translation. Clearer and more comprehensive was the rejection of the Toledo adoptionist formula. A detailed refutation of Adoptionism was provided in two memoranda of the Frankish and Italian episcopates. That of the Italians was drawn up by Paulinus. The Frankish memorandum and a related letter from the King were composed by Alcuin, who had just returned from a rather long stay in England. Alcuin countered Elipandus's formula "Filius adoptivus" with the formula "Homo assumptus", which was intended to express that the human nature of Jesus had never had an autonomous existence. Whether or not the Toledans grasped the nuance is doubtful, since *adoptivus* and *assumptus* were very often used synonymously in Spain.

In regard to images the Council of Frankfurt did no more than condemn *adoratio,* and hence it did not touch the real kernel of the Nicene decrees. The *Libri Carolini* were never officially promulgated and were not even ratified at Frankfurt, probably out of regard for the Pope. For the moment the controversy over images was concluded by the Frankfurt decree; it did not flare up again in the West until the reign of Louis the Pious.

The case was different with regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit, which Theodulf had used against the Greeks, presumably for the first time, in the *Libri Carolini.* At issue was the *Filioque* in the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, "qui ex Patre Filioque procedit", which was lacking in the original text but had appeared from time to time, first of all with Ambrose. It was present especially in the Creed of the Council of Toledo of 589, adopted probably as a clarification of the Catholic view *vis-à-vis* Arianism. From the Mozarabic Creed the *Filioque* had passed into the Gallican, and was in Charles's Creed of 794 with which the royal letter to Elipandus concluded. Essentially there was involved, not a novelty, but an elucidation: "c'était affirmer d'une autre manière la Trinité consubstantielle".[7] But Theodulf had incorporated the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit in his polemic, and Hadrian's rejection of the polemic had included this point also. The question had played no role at Frankfurt. But Paulinus of Aquileia took up the matter again at a provincial synod at Cividale in 796–7, which justified the Frankish stand in greater detail. What was involved at the moment was a mere echo of the Frankish-Byzantine confrontation. The explosive force of the disputed question would not take effect until later.

Adoptionism was likewise treated again at Cividale, and afterwards Paulinus also composed a polemic against Felix. It was especially important to win back the adoptionists in Septimania and in the district south of the Pyrenees, reconquered since 798. Pope Leo III condemned Adoptionism at a Roman synod in October 798. As a result of the transalpine polemics, Alcuin in the spring of 798 sent a treatise to the monasteries of Septimania, wrote to Elipandus again in 799, and composed against Felix a new polemic, which he published in 800. The situation in Septimania was adjusted in 799 by the *missi,* Theodulf of Orléans and Leidrad of Lyons. Felix, whose see had again been incorporated into the Frankish Kingdom, was summoned to Aachen in the spring of 800, and there he disputed with Alcuin.[8] Having again recanted, he died around 818 after an exemplary life in exile at Lyons. Following his death, Agobard of Lyons composed a new and final refutation of his view.

In Asturias the circle around Beatus and Etherius won out with the accession of Alfonso II to the throne in 791. The Frank Jonas, later Bishop of Orléans, toured the country at this time, and at the latest in 799 Beatus was in friendly contact with Alcuin. With the establishing of the archiepiscopal see of Oviedo in 811 the small Christian Kingdom of Asturias withdrew from the obedience of Toledo. Adoptionism lingered on for a while in the Emirate of Córdoba, but basically its fate was sealed here too with the death of Elipandus.

---

[7] *Histoire de l'église,* VI, 175.

[8] Reverting to the older opinions Heil dates the letter to Elipandus as 798 and the Synod of Aachen as May 799.

CHAPTER 14

From Frankish Kingdom to Christian Empire

The Carolingian Kingdom had survived the crises of 778 and 792–93; it came out of the last and most severe crisis stronger and greater than it had been previously. The efforts of the 780's for inner order and the intellectual renewal could be taken up again and bear fruit. The King's "project for a capital" show that after the crisis he again addressed himself to the plans and measures of 786–91. Until 784 Herstal was the favourite villa in which the King spent most of his time, when he was not claimed by military and political enterprises in Saxony and Italy. But from the conclusion of the Saxon War in 785 Aachen took the place of the previously favoured villa. It was not the change from Herstal to Aachen that was of historical significance, but rather the related plan of building the new residence as a stable centre of the empire. On his Italian journey of 786–87 Charles took the preliminary steps for realization of this intention. The Avar war and the crisis of 792–93 must have delayed the completion of the residence, but from the end of 794 Aachen clearly and unambiguously appeared as the centre of the empire, even though the buildings had not yet been finished.

In legislation too Charles continued to build on the foundations laid in the 780's. The Frankfurt Capitulary of 794 took up again to a great extent the regulations of the two great capitularies of 779 and 789, especially the prohibition of *coniurationes,* the rules for the payments for benefices established out of secularized Church property *(decima, nona, census),* the regulations on Church discipline, which were stated in more detail, the directions for the setting up of schools and on the care of souls. In the Frankfurt Capitulary there occurred for the first time a regulation in regard to the proprietary Church law, which the Carolingians had not previously dared to touch. Charles did not infringe on the right of alienation belonging to the lords of churches, but he ruled that churches once erected had to be maintained and that the divine worship conducted in them must not be jeopardized. The proprietary church system was indirectly affected by the prescriptions on ecclesiastical discipline. Thus already in 743 Carloman and Pepin had decreed the universal obligation of the clergy to give an accounting to the bishop, to receive him on the occasion of the visitation and of his confirmation journey, and to get the chrism from him every year. At Herstal Charles had prescribed, without detailed comment, the episcopal authority to govern the clergy *secundum canones.* At Frankfurt he forbade his court clergy to have any dealings with refractory clerics. In a letter sent by Charles in 779–81 to his counts and vassals in Italy it was presupposed that lords of churches had to present their clerics to the bishop for their installation. At Frankfurt was published the universal prohibition for clerics to abandon one church for another without the consent of the local bishop.

Charles's efforts in regard to the economic resources of the empire are seen in the great ordinance for the demesne, the *Capitulare de villis,* which more recent study assigns to the last years of the eighth century. It prescribed an inventory of the royal property, contained regulations on the stocking of the royal manors, and specified the tasks and duties of the demesne officials. It also indirectly influenced ecclesiastical economic management and served as an example for the describing of the Church's property.

A circular letter of 794–800, the *Epistola de litteris colendis,* imposed on the cathedrals and abbeys of the empire the obligation of establishing schools. But the finest sign of the maturing process of these years was the new missionary method, which was defined at a synod held in Bavaria in 796 under the direction of Arn of Salzburg and Paulinus of Aquileia. At the outset the bishops mentioned that conversion is God's work, not man's. They demanded an accommodation to a *gens bruta et inrationalis,* which needed instruction. Mass baptisms and force were rejected. The instruction which had to precede baptism should aim at understanding and not at fear of man. The new principles were based on old insights of Gregory the Great. They were intended for the mission among Avars and Slavs, which belonged to the sphere of the Archbishops of Salzburg and Aquileia, but they were also to be applied to the Saxon mission. In this connection Alcuin's criticism of the previous mission, including the condemnation of the overhasty introduction of the tithe, brought about a change. The *Capitulare Saxonicum,* issued at Aachen in 797, introduced the new policy of reconciliation.

The age of the great conquests was concluded with the Avar war; it was now necessary to assure the gains against external attacks. Frankish might did not suffice to take possession of the entire Avar Empire. The Theiss became the frontier against the Bulgars, who annexed the eastern part of the former Avar realm. But even on the other side of the Theiss the Avars and the Moravians, Slovenes, and Croats, once ruled by the Avars, were now only under the supervision of the Prefect of Bavaria and of the Margraves of Friuli and Istria. In 796 King Pepin of Italy specified the Drave as the frontier between Bavaria and Italy, between the ecclesiastical provinces of Salzburg and Aquileia, and Charles ratified this in 803 and 811. While there were already two marches in the Italian sector, a real march organization was lacking in the Bavarian sector until the end of the century. It was created after the death of the Prefect Gerold in 799. Charles then founded the East March, attached to the see of Passau, and the March of Carinthia-Pannonia, attached to that of Salzburg.

There were no changes in Italy. As earlier, the Dukes or Margraves of Spoleto provided the border patrol *vis-à-vis* Benevento and the Byzantines. In the Pyrenees, on the other hand, the situation was not stabilized until the turn of the century. Envoys sent by Spanish Muslims to ask Charles's aid against the Emir Al Hakam of Córdoba turned up in Aachen in 797 and 798, but the King had become cautious. The Frankish offensive, resumed in 798, had only limited goals, which were achieved when Barcelona fell into the hands of the Franks in 801 after a two years' siege. The conquered strip of Spain, later the County of Catalonia, was attached to the existing March of Septimania (or Toulouse) and subjected ecclesiastically to Narbonne.

The expanded Frankish realm, now strengthened on its frontiers, did not have an equal in the Christian West. Only the British Isles, the Kingdom of Asturias, and the Principality of Benevento were not included in it. In Ireland and Britain there was a rather large number of small kingdoms. But the Irish and Anglo-Saxons were familiar with the institution of a hegemonic high kingship, which belonged to the Kings of Meath and Connaught in Ireland, to the Kings of Mercia in England.

In regard to Benevento Charles claimed a real suzerainty as successor of the Lombard Kings, but it remained illusory; in regard to the other Christian *regna* he claimed merely the recognition of a pre-eminence expressed in the forms of *amicitia*.

Irish history is quite obscure at this period. The see of Armagh, founded by Saint Patrick, achieved a sort of primatial rank in the Emerald Isle around 800 but it is uncertain whether it also entailed a political concentration. A remark of Einhard's that cannot be checked is our only indication of political relations between the Frankish King and Ireland.

Charles's claim to pre-eminence encountered resistance in England from the self-assured King Offa of Mercia (757–96). In 784 Offa assumed the style of *Rex Anglorum*. Following the Carolingian example he put the royal name on his coins. In 787 he had his son Egfrith raised to the throne as co-ruler and, again imitating the Carolingians, had him anointed as King. He also succeeded in securing the Pope's consent to make Mercia a separate ecclesiastical province with Lichfield as the metropolitan see. In his diplomatic relations with Charles Offa emphasized their equal partnership. This led to a break around 789, which, however, was patched up a few years later. In 796 Charles sent gifts, taken from the Avar booty, to the Pope, to King Offa, and to Aethelred of Northumbria. Mercia's high kingship declined soon after Offa's death and the province of Lichfield was abolished. The Kings of Northumbria and Wessex maintained friendly relations with the Franks, but not on the basis of equality. There was no longer a king among the Anglo-Saxons who could be compared with Charles even remotely.

Frankish-Asturian relations were determined by the common opposition to the Emirate of Córdoba and to the adoptionists. The Kingdom of Asturias first took shape under Alfonso II (791–843). He had himself anointed in the style of the former Visigothic Kings, and made Oviedo his capital and the ecclesiastical metropolis. He was thereby clearly laying claim to the succession to Toledo. In him Charles encountered a King who was as self-assured as Offa was, but the community of interests against Córdoba was too strong to permit dissension between Charles and Alfonso, and the actual predominance of the Frankish monarch in this partnership could certainly not remain unknown to the Asturian King. The *Annales Regni Francorum* report two Asturian embassies of 798, whereby Alfonso delivered gifts to the Franks, including a share in the great spoils gained in a surprise attack on Lisbon in 797.

The *amicitia* of the Frankish ruler with the other Christian kings of the West had become a reality, even though it might often have appeared in a somewhat different light beyond the Frankish frontiers from the way it appeared at Aachen. Efforts were made to explain the new reality in new words. As early as 776 the Anglo-Saxon Cathwulf had spoken of the Frankish state as "Regnum Europae"; and in 799 Charles seemed to the author of the "Paderborn Epic" to be "Pater Europae".

The ancient territorial name was certainly not unfamiliar to Alcuin also, but he thought in other categories. The designation *Imperium christianum* is found in his letters for the first time in 796–97; he used it also in his edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary to denote the *Imperium Romanum.* In 794 Paulinus of Aquileia had already referred to Charles as *Gubernator omnium Christianorum.* The name David, which Charles had occasionally used in his intimate circle since the 780's, now acquired a different importance, as the epithet *Novus David* shows, first used by Alcuin in a letter of 794. The Frankish monarch now appeared as Christendom's David, and the royal throne at Aachen was an imitation of that of Solomon.

The new expressions, meanwhile, were exclusively bound up with the religious and literary spheres. The special position assumed by the Frankish ruler was not juridically specified even by the name David. In Christendom the Emperor alone took precedence over kings. Charles had trodden the way of *imitatio imperii,* borrowing from the imperial office the monogram at the very beginning of his reign and later the metal *bulla.* The range of his dominion was specified, first in the *Libri Carolini* and then also in the letter issued by the Frankish episcopate at the Council of Frankfurt and by Alcuin, with the ancient geographical names: Gaul, Germany, Italy. Charles appeared as lord of the central provinces of the former Western Empire, successor of the Emperors. Imperial characteristics appeared in the court art in the last decade of the eighth century. In constructing the court chapel at Aachen Charles probably had in mind the imperial buildings in Constantinople and the imperial mausoleum of the Theodosian Dynasty at Rome. But the juridical step to the imperial office had not yet been taken. It was only in the final climax which the *imitatio imperii* achieved in the "Paderborn Epic" around 799 that a poet dared to seize upon the special titles reserved to the Emperor: Charles appears as Augustus, Aachen as *Roma secunda.* By then the crisis in

Constantinople and Rome was already evident to all the world: the gates to the imperial dignity had opened.

A state of war had existed since 788 between Byzantium and the Franks. Support at the imperial court enabled Duke Grimoald of Benevento to evade Frankish sovereignty in 791. The campaigns conducted against him in 791–93 by King Pepin of Italy were fruitless. A considerable part of the Italian army was involved in the Avar war, but the victories of Eric of Friuli on the Avar front in 795 and 796 made likely a new Frankish offensive in South Italy. Hence it is not surprising that in 797 the Emperor Constantine VI commissioned the Patrician of Sicily, Nicetas, to extend peace feelers. The young ruler, who was weary of the tutelage exercised by his mother Irene, reverted in the ecclesiastical sphere to Iconoclasm. It has been suggested that his new policy towards the Franks was determined by his religious policy.

The conflict between mother and son ended in tragedy. On 15 August 797, Irene had Constantine VI deposed and blinded. She assumed the government herself and thereby created a precedent in the history of the *Imperium* that was extremely vulnerable from the point of view of constitutional law. Since the internal political situation remained precarious, Irene also needed peace. In the autumn of 798 there appeared at Aachen an embassy sent by the Empress to offer the renunciation of Istria, then under Frankish occupation, and the surrender of Benevento. Although the deposition and blinding of Constantine VI were regarded in the Frankish state also as an unprecedented crime, Charles accepted the offer. The peace still awaited ratification, but before this came about a new and dramatic event occurred — the revolt against Pope Leo III.

Leo III had succeeded Hadrian I on 27 December 795. Einhard relates that Charles mourned the dead Pope as a brother. Relations between Charles and Hadrian had not always been untroubled. The Pope had had to give up his dream of a large Papal State in Italy and had stood up to the King when the latter attacked the Second Council of Nicaea. But throughout his life Hadrian had been loyal to the Frankish alliance and in particular he had maintained order in the Papal State. The King probably did not forget this.

The change in the Holy See in December 795 was the first since the incorporation of the Lombard Kingdom into the *Regnum Francorum*. The Romans carried out the election and consecration of Leo III without apprising the King of the Franks, thereby declaring their sovereignty. The new Pope sent to the *Patricius*-King not only the document of election, but also the keys to the *confessio Sancti Petri* and the standard of the city, with the request that the Romans' oath of obedience and loyalty be received by a representative. It may be doubted whether Hadrian would have offered the oath-taking in this form. But Leo, not belonging by birth to the city nobility, needed the support of the royal protector, since, probably from the outset, he had to deal with a powerful opposition, which included the family of his predecessor.

Charles's reply to Leo III contained fundamental statements regarding the duties of the two powers. They show to what a great extent power had shifted to the side of the King, whom Paulinus of Aquileia had panegyrized as *Rex et Sacerdos* in 794. The often quoted passages run as follows: "It is incumbent upon us, with God's help, to defend Holy Church outwardly with weapons everywhere against attacks by pagans and devastations by infidels, and to consolidate her inwardly through the understanding of the true faith. It is your task, Holy Father, like Moses, to lift up your arms in prayer and so to aid our army that by your intercession the Christian people, under God's guidance and guarantee, may always be victorious over the enemies of his holy name, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in the whole world."[1]

This passage certainly must not be considered in isolation; it must be seen together with the expressions of the *Libri Carolini* on the Roman primacy. By his remarks on the inner strengthening of the Church Charles certainly meant first of all his concern for ecclesiastical order, for the education of the clergy and the religious instruction of the people, just as Alcuin explained the *Rex et Sacerdos* formula by *Pontifex in praedicatione.* But concern for the inner consolidation of the Church had extended at Frankfurt also to questions of faith and it did not exclude the Pope, as the admonition shows: "Hold fast to the holy canons and carefully observe the rules of the Fathers . . . in order that your light may shine before men." It may be assumed that Charles had already heard complaints about Leo personally, for the instruction to the *missus* Angilbert contains the following sentences: "Admonish the Pope to lead an honourable life, to observe the sacred canons zealously, and to rule Holy Church in piety . . . Above all he should fight the simoniacal heresy, which only too often stains the body of the Church . . ."[2]

Gregory the Great had once written in a similar vein to the Frankish Kings, but now the roles were reversed.

It can be noticed that in these years the influence of the *patricius* was increasing also in the Papal State. In 798 Leo III adopted Charles's regnal years in papal dating. He also had the cooperation of Pope and King represented pictorially in Rome. The founder's mosaic in the apse of Santa Susanna shows the Pope on the right, the King on the left of Christ. More significant were the two great mosaics which were set up by Leo in the *triclinium* of the Lateran, the papal hall for the holding of synods, legal proceedings, and receptions. The first of these showed Christ with Peter and Constantine the Great; the second, Peter with Leo and Charles, in the same arrangement as at Santa Susanna. That the King was admitted in pictorial representations in Rome was a novelty, comparable to the acceptance of his regnal years in dating. In regard to constitutional law there was, it is true, no change, for in documents as well as in pictures the King occupied the second place. Also like his predecessors, Leo III coined as sovereign of Rome.

---

[1] *MGEp* IV, *Epp. Alcuini,* no. 93, 137f.

[2] Ibid., no 92, 135f.

The leaders of the Roman opposition to Leo were the *primicerius* Paschal and the *saccellarius* Campulus, relatives of Hadrian I. An inquiry from Alcuin to Arn of Salzburg in June 798 reveals that there was anxiety in the Frankish Kingdom in regard to events in Rome. The revolt broke out on 25 April 799. *En route* from the Lateran to the stational church of San Lorenzo in Lucina, the Pope was suddenly attacked in front of the monastery of San Silvestro in Capite. He was ill treated and stripped of the pontifical vestments. There is evidence that a deposition took place before the altar of San Silvestro. Mutilation — blinding and tearing out of the tongue — was probably ordered but not carried out. The same night Leo was transported to the monastery of Sant'Erasmo near the Lateran. The conspirators had probably condemned him to confinement in the monastery, the punishment for deposed dignitaries of both the ecclesiastical and the lay state. San Silvestro and Sant'Erasmo belonged to the Greek monasteries in Rome. For this reason relations between the conspirators and the imperial court have been alleged, but this is scarcely correct, for at that moment the Empress needed peace with Charles and there is not a trace of any Byzantine intervention.

A new papal election did not take place, perhaps from fear of the Franks, who were already presented with the *fait accompli* of the revolution against Leo. The Frankish Duke Winigis of Spoleto hurried to Rome, accompanied by the royal *missus,* Abbot Wirund of Stablo-Malmédy. Matters took an unexpected turn for the conspirators, since Leo succeeded in fleeing from Sant'Erasmo to Saint Peter's, where he met the Franks. After a Frankish attempt at mediation had failed, Winigis took the Pope with him to Spoleto and reported to the King.

Charles was at Aachen when he received the first news of the Roman happenings. He did not cancel a Saxon expedition that had already been announced, but dispatched an embassy with an invitation to the Pope to come to Paderborn. There he solemnly received Leo at the end of July. It was obvious that the King did not recognize the deposition, but the Pope was followed by envoys of the rebels, who now lodged a formal charge before Charles. It accused the Pope of adultery and perjury.

Events had taken a course which seriously endangered the papal sovereignty in Rome. The dramatic turn is clear from a letter of Alcuin to the King in June 799:[3] "Until now there were three men who counted in Christendom: The Vicar of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and you have apprised me of what has happened to him; the holder of the imperial office, the temporal ruler of New Rome, and how he was toppled, not by outsiders, but by his own, is in all mouths; and finally you, the King, whom our Lord Jesus Christ has appointed head of the Christian people and who surpass the other two in power, wisdom, and dignity. See, the safety of the Church of Christ depends entirely on you alone."

---

[3] Ibid., no. 174, 288.

The question was how the King could help. A mere restoration of Leo seemed impossible in view of the accusation. The Pope could have taken an oath of purgation according to Germanic law or declared his abdication. But it was not only Alcuin who had misgivings in regard to these solutions. Only the Emperor, if anyone at all, could act as judge of the Pope. But even the Emperor's competence was questionable according to the canonical principle formulated at the beginning of the sixth century: "Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur." And so Charles finally postponed a decision. He had Leo conducted back to Rome and through his *missi* introduced a process for gathering information.

The "Paderborn Epic", already mentioned, describes the reception of the Pope by the Frankish King according to imperial etiquette and thus shows that the imperial question was in the air. Soon after the Pope's departure, an envoy sent by the Patrician Michael of Sicily met the King in September. Unfortunately, the subject of their conversations is unknown. The next Byzantine embassy, delegated by the Empress *propter pacem confirmandam,* did not reach the Frankish Court until the beginning of 802.

The Pope was back in Rome on 29 November. In December royal agents, headed by the Archchaplain Hildebald of Cologne and Arn of Salzburg, held a *placitum* in the Lateran *triclinium,* to which Paschal and Campulus were invited. Arn complained to Alcuin *de moribus apostolici* in such a manner that Alcuin burned the letter. But the accusers had, in accord with Roman law, the burden of the proof, and apparently they were unable to adduce adequate evidence. The royal agents had no authority to render a final decision of the case, and so they restored Leo temporarily. The accusers were arrested and sent across the Alps "on the basis of a verdict of unjustified violence and violation of the peace", to quote Zimmermann.

The King took his time. He spent the winter at Aachen and in 800 at the beginning of spring set out for the North Sea. Here he took preventive measures of security against the Vikings, who shortly before had directed their first raids against Northumbria, Scotland, and Ulster. At the end of April he went via Rouen to Tours, where he received the submission of the Bretons and discussed with his son Louis the progress of the operations in Spain and the protection of the coasts of Aquitaine and Septimania from Muslim pirates. He surely also conferred here with Alcuin on the Roman question. His stay was prolonged because of the illness of Queen Luitgardis, who died at Tours on 4 June. Alcuin accompanied Charles back to Aachen, where in mid-June occurred the synod at which he overcame Felix of Urgel. The synod probably also afforded an opportunity of discussing the Roman question again in detail with the Frankish bishops.

The journey to Rome was not arranged until the general assembly of Mainz at the beginning of August. Again time elapsed before it got under way. At the middle of November Charles was in Ravenna. On November 23 he arrived at Mentana, twelve leagues from Rome. The Pope welcomed him at Mentana with a banquet. At the first milestone a solemn procession was formed, the mounted cavalcade of ruler and court, passing amid the acclamations of the Roman corporations and the foreign *scholae,* which had stationed themselves along the King's route. The ceremonial accompanying Charles's first entry into Rome in 774 had been quite different. This time it displayed the marks of honour rendered to the Emperor, and Charles could not but know that.

In Rome the King convoked a council on the model of the Frankish general synods. In addition to the higher clergy of Rome and of the Frankish Kingdom, the Roman Senate and the Frankish magnates were also invited to take part. The council held plenary sessions in Saint Peters's under the King's presidency on 1 and 23 December. But the first plenary session had already been preceded by preliminary discussions. The members of the council were not in agreement: a part upheld Alcuin's viewpoint, that the Pope could not be judged, while the others demanded that Leo exculpate himself. The outcome of the preliminary discussions was a compromise. In the opening address on 1 December the King declared that the purpose of the meeting was to examine the accusation against the Pope. The assembly replied that it was unwilling to sit in judgment on the Pope, whereupon Leo declared his readiness "to purge himself of the false charges in the presence of the assembly, following the example of his predecessors". At the plenary session of 23 December the Pope took an oath of purgation, which referred only to the points of the accusation. To quote Zimmermann again, "the other objections that had been made against Leo remained undiscussed".

Following the conciliar session the participants, according to the *Annals of Lorsch,* demanded the transfer of the imperial dignity to Charles on the ground that the imperial throne among the Greeks was vacant, while Charles already possessed the imperial city of Rome as well as all the other imperial capitals in Italy (Ravenna was meant and perhaps also Milan), Gaul (Trier and Arles), and Germany (probably Mainz), so that he was really already an Emperor without the title. Charles is said to have agreed. There is no reason to doubt this report. For ten years already the court theologians and the higher clergy had been expounding Charles's imperial position by referring to his possession of Italy, Gaul, and Germany. Was it mere chance that on that same 23 December the court chaplain Zachary returned from an embassy to Jerusalem accompanied by two monks of the monasteries of Mount

Olivet and Saint Sabas, who, on the orders of the Patriarch, delivered the keys of the Holy Sepulchre and of the City of David as well as a banner, thereby recognizing Charles as the protector of the Christians of the East? The imperial position of the great Frankish King could not have been more clearly demonstrated.

According to custom, the Pope celebrated the third Mass of Christmas 800 in Saint Peter's, where the conciliar session of 23 December had taken place. After the *oratio,* during which all bowed low, the *laudes* were intoned on solemn festivals. But before they were begun, Leo III took a crown and placed it on the King's head with a brief formula of blessing. At once the Romans acclaimed Charles as Emperor, and the imperial title was also included in the *laudes* by the congregation: "Carolo Augusto, a Deo coronato, magno et pacifico imperatori Romanorum, vita et victoria!"[4] Some sources report also the investing of Charles with the purple imperial mantle and the presentation of a scepter. Leo III rendered *proskynesis* to the new Emperor, just as it had been due to the former Emperors. It was the first and last *proskynesis* of a Pope before an Emperor of the mediaeval West.

Still controverted is the interpretation of the celebrated passage in Einhard's *Vita Caroli,* that Charles felt such an aversion for the *nomen imperatoris* that, despite the great feast day, he would not have gone into the church, if he had foreseen the Pope's intention.[5] In the present state of research it can no longer be held that Charles had been surprised by the act as such and was absolutely opposed to the imperial office. The context in Einhard permits us to suppose that Charles's expression was uttered in irritation over later complications with Constantinople. However, it must be recognized that the transfer of the Roman imperial office to the King of the Franks also posed internal constitutional problems, which could not become clear until later. Perhaps Charles, following the model of the council of 23 December, intended a greater role for his Franks in the act of his elevation and took offence at the manner in which the Pope and the Romans had pushed themselves into the foreground.[6] A proclamation as Emperor by the Franks with the exclusion of the Romans or even an autocratic assumption of the imperial title could, of course, not have been considered, since a "Frankish" empire would have been juridically insignificant and would have impressed no one. If Charles wanted the imperial office — and today this is certain — then he also had to accept the only possible form in which it could have been validly created: that of Roman constitutional law. The sources indicate that various nuances were possible within the prescribed form. The context of Charles's remark as reported by Einhard cannot be more precisely ascertained, despite all the exertions of scholars.[7]

---

[4] *Annales regni 801.* In the *Liber Pontificalis* the formula is given thus: "Karolo, piissimo Augusto, a Deo coronato, magno et pacifico imperatore, vita et victoria!" According to Classen, *op. cit.* I, 588, the version of the *Liber Pontificalis* corresponds to the "only text spoken by the Romans".

[5] *Vita Caroli,* 28.

[6] Thus Folz, *Couronnement impérial,* 172ff. But this supposition is still problematic. In no sense may the opinion be held which claims that in 800 Leo appeared in the role of a Pope who himself possessed the rank and attributes of an Emperor. Opposed to this opinion is the *proskynesis* which Leo exhibited to the new Emperor. As Classen says, personal motives may have been decisive for Leo III at this moment. "It was probably more important for him to render harmless his Roman opponents for all time than to insist on the postulate of the *Constitutum Constantini* that no earthly Emperor might rule in Rome" (*op. cit.* I, 574).

A few days after the imperial coronation Charles sat in judgment on the Roman opposition. The leaders of the rebels were, in accordance with Roman law, condemned to death as *rei maiestatis,* but then, on Leo's intercession, the sentence was commuted to exile. The judgment on the Roman opposition shows that, as Emperor, Charles had become overlord of Rome and of the Papal State. In the dating of papal charters the year of the Emperor took precedence over the year of the Pope. A testimony from the end of the ninth century makes known that the same change occurred in the matter of pictorial representation. The papal coins hereafter bore Charles's name and title on the obverse, Leo's monogram on the reverse.

That the Roman-Christian imperial ideology was adopted along with the imperial dignity appears from the imperial style, which was determined at the latest during Charles's stay at Ravenna in May 801. The old royal title — *Rex Francorum et Langobardorum atque Patricius Romanorum* — expressed the triple constitutional nature of Charles's authority. After the assumption of the imperial office the Roman reference had to move to first place. There could result constitutional difficulties, since the royal nation of the Franks was pushed into second place. These were evaded by adopting the formula *Romanum gubernans imperium,* customary in Italy, so that the imperial title was now: "Karolus serenissimus Augustus, a Deo coronatus, magnus et pacificus imperator, Romanum gubernans imperium, qui et per misericordiam Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum". The *Imperium Romanum* is to be understood here, in the sense of a theology of history, as "an institution with a mandate from God as the Ruler of the World".[8] The King of the Franks and Lombards executed the mandate as Emperor. The position of the Franks as the predominant people in the state was thereby maintained, and at the same time the imperial office was defined as dominion over Christendom.

The imperial title was not the only thing new in the symbolism of the state. Into his charters Charles introduced the solemn invocation of God, the years of the Emperor and of the indiction, and, in the case of bulls, a special eschatocol with a Byzantine-type chancery signature. He had an imperial seal cut, which bore on the obverse the image of the ruler, the imperial title, and the imperial epithets of the old type, on the reverse a symbol of the city of Rome, with the circular legend *Renovatio Romani imperii.* The image of the ruler on the new imperial coinage followed a medallion of Constantine; on the reverse was a church, with the inscription *Religio christiana.* Thus the symbolism of gold seal and coinage stressed the Roman and Christian imperial ideology; the image on the coins seems to indicate that Charles saw in Constantine his imperial exemplar.

---

[7] The best summary of the problem is given by Classen, *op. cit.* I, 589–91.

[8] Schramm, *Karl der Grosse im Lichte der Staatssymbolik,* 37.

CHAPTER 15

The Development of the Carolingian Theocracy

The imperial years of Charles the Great were a time of relative external peace for the Frankish world. The Emperor had Holstein organized as a march against the Danes. In the Slavonic foreland of Eastphalia the Wilzi, who were allied with the Danes, and likewise the Obodrites and the Sorbs finally had to acknowledge Frankish suzerainty. Supervision of the Danish-Slavonic frontier was assumed by the Emperor's oldest son, Charles, who from 798 had directed the last struggles against the Saxons on his own and in 800 had been anointed King by the Pope. The same tasks were thus assigned to him which his younger brothers were performing on the frontiers of Italy and Aquitaine.

Much greater anxiety was certainly caused the Emperor by the piratical raids of Spanish and African Muslims, who regularly visited the islands and coasts of the western Mediterranean from 806 to 813. Charles's security measures extended also to the North Sea and Atlantic coasts. However, the Viking peril was not yet apparent in these years. The Emperor's chief task lay in the sphere of domestic politics. Virgil had once described the historical task of the *Imperium* as a mission to establish peace, based on dominion. To the Roman notion of peace had been added the Christian concept, based on charity. It stood at the centre of Augustine's *Civitas Dei. Iustitia,* which realized *ordo, ordo,* whose fruit is *pax*, and *pax* itself were no longer understood as referring to the static internal life but were related to Christ; they were capable of increase, open to God.

The Germans did not know the universal peace of the Roman and Christian type. Their peace was of various forms and degrees, like the circles of law in which the German lived. The law circles of the house, the kinship, the confederation were regarded as autonomous communities, not derived from the state, which the King must not violate. Hence even the King's peace had no universal validity. It referred to definite aspects of public life — worship, court of justice, army. The King could not exclude the feud *infra patriam;* at most he could settle it. If he wished to impose universal peace, this was possible only by means of the *pax christiana*. The Christian peace, basically the concern of the Church, thereby became the business of the ruler. Thus is explained the remarkable admixture of religious, political, and social aspects of peace in the Carolingian capitularies.

The Christian royal dignity had made the ruler the representative of the *pax christiana*. But the transfer of the imperial office now provided new impulses and once again considerably intensified Charles's exertions for *iustitia, ordo,* and *pax*. The majority of the extant capitularies of the great monarch are from his imperial years, and the most important of these are from 802–03 and 805–06. The new ethos is most eloquent in the oath to the Emperor of 802. After the conspiracy of 786 Charles had reintroduced the Merovingian oath required of the subjects, and following the crisis of 792–93 he had required a second swearing. The older formula of the oath contained only the obligation of refraining from acts of *infidelitas* against the King. The instruction to the royal *missi* of 802 shows that this obligation was now transformed and extended. The oath to the Emperor obliged positively to active preparedness in the service of God, to active willingness for the realization of *aequitas*. Negatively, it obliged to a renunciation of any attack on the group of the defenceless especially protected by the Emperor — orphans, widows, the Church, pilgrims, strangers — and of any act against the Emperor's regulations. The duty of fidelity was formally reinforced by the acceptance of the formula of vassalage into the oath to the Emperor. After a renewed prohibition of all "private" sworn associations in 803 and 805, the taking of the oath as such was restricted in 805 to the oath to the Emperor — the oath of the subjects — the oath of vassals, which involved the Emperor, and the oath in court, that is, to the obligation toward God and the ruler.

The inclusion of God and his commandments in the oath-taking had as a consequence the extending of the cases of *infidelitas* and *periurium* to attacks on the defenceless, the usurping of royal property and the exploitation of *beneficia* for private ends, the misuse of representation in court, and disregard of military duty. Offences against the decalogue ranked thereafter as *infidelitas* and could be punished with corresponding penalties. The *latro* appears as "infidelis noster et Francorum". In this way a prohibition of the feud also became possible. The instructions to the *missi* of 802 and 805 contained such prohibitions and ordered the settlement of feuds by compositions: "distringantur ad pacem, etiamsi noluerint".[1] The instruction of 805 forbade the bearing of arms — *scuti, lanceae, loricae* — *infra patriam*. Thus was inaugurated the struggle of the mediaeval crown against the feud, even though it took centuries for it to have definite success.

The ruler's sphere of jurisdiction was considerably expanded by the acceptance of the *pax christiana,* and memories of the ancient imperial office probably contributed to a further expansion. In Charles's imperial capitularies the *Lex scripta* was stressed in a novel way as the basis of justice. The *Lex Saxonum* and the *Lex Thuringorum* were drawn up, and the publishing of the *Lex Frisionum* was prepared for. Even more significant was the inclusion of matter taken from tribal law in the legislation of the capitularies and the effort to create a uniform Frankish law. But after the first stimulus of 802–3 this attempt broke down.

---

[1] *MGCap* I, no. 44, 123, of 805. Cf. also *MGCap* I, no. 33, 32, of 802.

A special importance attaches to the Imperial Assembly of Aachen of October 802 in both secular and ecclesiastical legislation. Just as the relevant tribal law was prescribed for the laity, so the *Dionyso-Hadriana* and the Benedictine *Rule* were prescribed for the clergy. The *Dionyso-Hadriana* was, then, to occupy in Church life the same position as tribal law in secular life. But within the ecclesiastical sphere a clearer distinction was made between the diocesan and the regular clergy. The *vita canonica,* modelled on Chrodegang's *Rule,* was set off more clearly than before from the Benedictine *lex* of monasticism. The introduction of the Roman Office among the diocesan clergy and of the Benedictine Office among the regular clergy brought about a separation also in the liturgical sphere. At first, it is true, none of this went beyond decrees. The implementation of the new order was reserved for Louis the Pious, who again took up the work of the synod of 802.

The dogmatic discussions had come to rest. Only the controversy over the *processio Spiritus Sancti* flared up again in 809, since in Palestine there had occurred dissensions between the Frankish and oriental monks on this question. Theodulf of Orléans and Abbot Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel submitted opinions, and Charles once again involved the Pope in the matter. But the usually weak Leo clung to the position of his predecessor and refused to admit the *Filioque* into the Roman Creed.

In these years the capitularies were further concerned with questions of law, of ecclesiastical discipline, of education and pastoral activity. Legislation in regard to the proprietary church was further developed. While the bishop's participation in the nomination of the clergy serving such churches and his right of direction had already been established, now the episcopal right of supervision of the buildings belonging to proprietary churches was laid down (803–13), the simoniacal granting of such churches was forbidden, and the removal of the clerics serving them was subjected to the bishop's approval (813). In order to enhance the effectiveness of the legislation by capitulary and to put an end to graft and to oppression of the people by the *missi,* from 802 on Charles chose his *missi* only from the ranks of the bishops, abbots, and counts, no longer from the simple vassals. He then proceeded to set up definite *missatica.*

There are indications that the monarch's strength waned after 806; a grave chronic illness befell him in 811. In the capitularies of this period there were complaints that the *concordia* between the spiritual and the temporal magnates left very much to be desired. Clerical immunities on the one hand and the proprietary church system and ecclesiastical *beneficia* on the other gave rise to conflicts. In 809 the Emperor planned to resume ecclesiastical legislation on a more elaborate scale but the Danish peril of 810 forced him to put it aside. In 813 he convoked synods of the entire Empire to Mainz, Reims, Tours, Chalon, and Arles, which were to correct deficiencies and discuss the prosecution of the reform. In this connection he raised the question of the penitential discipline and thereby supplied impetus to the struggle against the insular penitentials under the auspices of canon law. But the completion of the work was not to be granted to him; it became the task of his successor.

The question of the succession had been most intimately connected with the constitutional formation of the Empire since Christmas of 800; for its part, the constitution of the Empire was inseparable from the development of relations with the Greek East. Charles's imperial coronation could only be regarded on the Bosphorus as an unprecedented usurpation and an immediate threat. The war between the Franks and the Beneventans was not yet ended, and in Byzantium it was feared that the Franks would attack Sicily. Furthermore, the relations which Charles had established at the end of 797 with the Caliph Harun-ar-Raschid of Baghdad could have been aimed at Constantinople and Córdoba. Meanwhile a peaceful solution was being sought in the West. When a Greek embassy arrived in Aachen at the beginning of 802, Charles is said to have tried to effect the union of the two Christian Empires by an offer of marriage to the Empress Irene.[2] Irene was dethroned on 31 October 802, soon after the arrival of the Frankish embassy, and relegated to a convent, where she died on 9 August 803. The new Emperor Nicephorus I sent Charles an embassy, which reached Salz in the summer of 803. But the negotiations collapsed. Charles apparently insisted on a recognition of his imperial dignity; his counter-proposals received no reply.

War eventually broke out, and the coasts of the Adriatic Sea became the scene of the conflict. The Patriarch Fortunatus of Grado, the highest ranking ecclesiastic in Venetia, had presented himself to Charles in August 803 to have his privileges confirmed. He probably urged the reconstituting of the ancient ecclesiastical province of Venetia (Aquileia), which had been divided for 200 years into the Lombard province of Aquileia (Cividale) and the imperial province of Venetia (Grado). As a matter of fact, in January 805 Emperor and Pope reached an agreement at Aachen "de Aquileiense ecclesia velut una, quae suam sedem haberet". The Patriarch's Frankish policy at first encountered resistance from the people of Venetia, who expelled him;

---

[2] The fantastic plan was probably based only on rumours then current in Constantinople (cf. Classen, *op. cit.* I, 596–98).

but then around the turn of 805–6 they appeared before Charles with the Dalmatians (Zara) to do homage to him. In 806 Nicephorus dispatched a fleet to recover the lost districts. After struggles which lasted until 810 and in which success varied from one side to the other, King Pepin succeeded in partially subjecting Venetia, but the Frankish attack on the Dalmatian maritime cities failed.

The Frankish monarch certainly regarded Venetia only as a dead pledge. When the Byzantine Emperor sent an envoy to Pepin in 810, Charles seized the opportunity to end the war. The envoy, who found that Pepin was dead, was invited to come to Aachen, where Charles offered the renunciation of Venetia and the Dalmatian cities in exchange for the recognition of the western imperial office. A Frankish embassy went to Byzantium in the spring of 811 to negotiate on this basis. Nicephorus fell in battle against the Bulgars in July, but his successor, Michael I, accepted the proposal. A Byzantine embassy which reached Aachen in April 812 proclaimed the recognition of the Western Emperor, and at the beginning of 813 a new Frankish embassy went to Constantinople for the ratification of the peace. In the negotiations of 811–12 Charles had agreed to renounce the Roman setting of his imperial dignity, as demanded by the Greeks. The authentic "Roman" imperial office, which alone was anchored in the classical and the Christian theology of history as the world Empire, was reserved to the Eastern Emperor, who, after the peace with the Franks, adopted the expanded title of Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ῥωμαίων *(Imperator Romanorum)*.

Peace with Constantinople brought also peace with Benevento in the summer of the same year 812. Grimoald II, who had lost his Byzantine support, acknowledged Frankish suzerainty and obliged himself to pay tribute. The third peace of this year was concluded around the same time with the Emir of Córdoba. The Western Empire had discovered a *modus vivendi* with the Eastern Empire and the neighbouring Islamic state, and so it was hardly an accident that relations between Aachen and Baghdad were thereafter discontinued.

The peace treaties of 812 crowned the work of Charles the Great. The future of the Western Empire was first definitely assured by the Byzantine recognition. A settlement had been found on the basis of the twofold imperial office, which remained from now on a fact in the history of Christendom. The renunciation of the universality of his imperial dignity, which was implied by the surrender of the Roman setting, was probably not difficult for Charles to make, for he was especially concerned for a position of equality with Constantinople, and this seemed to have been achieved with the recognition of the Western imperial office. It was hardly perceived at Aachen that the twofold emperorship could not but deepen the cleavage in Christendom, but was probably sensed at Rome.

The imperial coronation of 800 had proceeded, on the part of the Franks and of the Romans, from the assumption that the imperial throne was vacant. And the fantastic project of a marriage between Charles and Irene was based on the notion that there could be only one Emperor in Christendom. Irene's deposition, which could scarcely have become known in the West before the beginning of 803, compelled a rethinking of the imperial question. For Rome a solution certainly lay along the same lines as for Constantinople, since the Roman and Christian imperial idea was still a living reality in both cities: if it was necessary to come to terms with a second Emperor, he was permitted to be only an Emperor of a lesser order. But of course the omens were opposed: If the Greeks intended to reserve the authentic "Roman" imperial office for themselves, then the Pope was concerned to present the ruler of the West as the real world-emperor in the meaning of the theology of history. It has been surmised that in this connection Leo III made use of the Donation of Constantine, in which the precedence of Old Rome over New Rome was clearly stressed. As a matter of fact, evidence upholds this conjecture. However, the *Constitutum Constantini* was certainly not composed for this purpose; rather it was reinterpreted. In it could be read that Constantine had given the imperial crown to Pope Silvester, who, however, had declined to wear it. If the forger was concerned about the theoretical justification of the papal sovereignty in a new age with no Emperor, similarly after the reconstitution of the Western Empire a papal power to dispose of the genuine imperial crown of Constantine and of Old Rome could be deduced from the same text. Perhaps Leo III interpreted the passage in this sense after 802 and explained this interpretation to "his" Emperor on the occasion of a second visit to Frankland (November 804 to January 805).[3]

If this assumption is correct, Charles the Great did not go along with Leo's suggestion. He was unwilling to base the pre-eminence of the western imperial office on an interpretation of the *Constitutum* whereby that office would have been derived from the Pope; furthermore, he was neither able nor willing to consider the imperial question apart from the Frankish royal and dynastic law. His reply, given at Thionville on 6 February 806, was the regulation of the succession, the *Divisio imperii,* in which, following Frankish law, he divided the *imperium vel regnum* equally among his three sons. The already existing subkingdoms of the younger sons, Pepin and Louis, were enlarged in view of the succession: Italy by the addition of Rhaetia, Bavaria, and Alemannia south of the Danube; Aquitaine by means of the larger part of Burgundy to the line Auxerre-Chalon-Mâcon-Lyons-Savoy. The oldest son, Charles, was to receive the heart of the immediate ancestral area of dominion: *Francia* between the Loire and the Rhine, with northern Burgundy and northern Alemannia, with Frisia, Saxony, and Thuringia. The nucleus of this portion of the Empire was *Francia,* so that it is possible to speak of a division of the Empire into three subdivisions: Frankland, Italy, and Aquitaine. The pre-eminence of the oldest son was expressed by the allotting of *Francia* to Charles. A further characteristic of the *Divisio* lay in the uniform assignment of the most important Alpine passes to the three sons, who were to aid one another and to undertake together the protection of the Roman Church and of the other churches.

---

[3] Schlesinger, *Kaisertum und Reichsteilung,* 36ff.; see also Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz,* 90ff.

Older studies held that in the *Divisio* Charles had entirely disregarded the imperial office, but it has recently been demonstrated by Schlesinger that this view is incorrect. Out of regard for the still unclarified situation produced by the war with Byzantium, the ruler of the West left open two possibilities: a withdrawal to a hegemonic imperial office of a Frankish colouring and an imperial office in the succession to Constantine but disregarding the *Constitutum.* The expectation of the imperial office was made ready for the three sons by their elevation to be *consortes.* Charles thereby reserved to himself the possibility "of designating one of the *consortes* as sole bearer of the *nomen imperatoris*" or, "after the example of Constantine, of making all three the holders of the imperial title" (Schlesinger).

Charles the Great's two oldest sons died before the conclusion of the negotiations with Constantinople, which brought Byzantine recognition of the Western Empire. Only Pepin of Italy left a son, Bernard, to whom his grandfather assigned the Lombard Kingdom in 812. Bernard could not rank as an equal partner in the succession with the Emperor's only surviving son; he was also invested only with the subkingdom of Italy, not with the expanded inheritance of his father Pepin. Now only King Louis of Aquitaine was considered as successor in the imperial office and in the entire Empire. Charles intended to make him coemperor in his own lifetime, following the imperial practice of Constantinople. After he had obtained the consent of the magnates to this project, he had Louis come to Aachen. On 11 September 813, the Emperor, in his robes of state and attended by his son and the magnates, proceeded to the chapel at Aachen. After they had prayed together, he committed his son before the altar to the duties of ruler and lord. He then crowned Louis with a crown that had been laid on the altar[4] and had him acclaimed as *Imperator et Augustus* by the people. There was no religious coronation. The act of 813 shows that, despite his renunciation of the Roman setting of his title, Charles regarded himself as a "genuine" Emperor in succession to Constantine. At the same time the imperial office was now firmly bound up with Aachen und *Francia;* the polarity of *Imperium christianum* and *Regnum Francorum* was neutralized at least for the next reign.

---

[4] According to Thegan, *Vita Hludowici* in *MGSS* II, 592, Charles commanded his son Louis to put on his own head the crown that had been laid on the altar. In this statement Thegan is in opposition to all other sources, which speak of a coronation by the father. A self-coronation would have been without parallel at this period. If one nevertheless follows Thegan's account, the explanation is that the seriously ill and aged Emperor was, physically, in no condition to crown his son himself — as Eichmann and von Fichtenau agree — but the act was regarded as performed by the father.

The Empire was provided for. As early as the beginning of 811, when Charles fell gravely ill, he had arranged by testament a division of the treasure of the *camera.* On 22 January 814, the Emperor, who was almost seventy-two years old, was attacked by a high fever. Pneumonia developed, and the Emperor died on 28 January. His remains were laid to rest, not at Saint-Denis with his parents and his grandfather, but in the Marienkirche at Aachen.[5]

There has been talk of a crisis in the last years of Charles's reign. According to this, the Emperor achieved no real success in regard to Benevento and Brittany, the Elbe Slavs and the Bohemians, the North Sea Vikings and the Mediterranean Saracens. In particular, the great impulse of 802 petered out ineffectually. The *Divisio* of 806 stood in sharp contrast to the concept of Emperor and Empire as expressed in 802. There was no institutional substructure to support the gigantic Empire; only the unusual qualities of its creator enabled it to endure for a while. But as early as 811 the cracks in the building were already clear, and Louis the Pious inherited an *Imperium* that was already in a state of internal decay.

This sharp criticism is not without justification in individual points, but on the whole it goes too far. No danger threatened the Empire from Benevento, Brittany, or the Slavs, and the Viking and Muslim pirates became really dangerous only after the death of Louis the Pious. Today the *Divisio* of 806 is no longer regarded as a denial of the imperial idea of 802. The gigantic Empire did indeed lack an established officialdom, and it may be correct that, as a whole, it had to collapse sooner or later. But it long held its own, "thanks to its inherent solidity and tenacity" (Schieffer). But, above all, its distinctive force did not disappear with its break-up: none of the successor states could deny its Carolingian origin. The order of the Church, the feudal system, the reform of currency and courts, the new Christian concept of ruler and state, the Carolingian reform of education — all these outlived Charles's Empire. Through these accomplishments Charles became one of the great builders of Europe: with all his "desire to rule and to exercise power" still not extravagant in conquest, in the prudent use of elements at hand, in the arranging and binding of these elements into a new comprehensive whole, he is quite comparable to Augustus.

---

[5] In regard to the place of burial cf. Kreusch, "Kirche, Atrium und Porticus der Aachener Pfalz" in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben,* III, 499, with the bibliography: "under the ambo between the two eastern piers of the octogon".

SECTION FOUR

Climax and Turning Point of the Carolingian Age (814 to 840)

Chapter 16

Reform in Empire and Church from 814 to 828

When his father died, the thirty-five-year-old Louis of Aquitaine was in his prime. He was seriously inclined and did not care for noisy good fellowship. He early encountered the great reformer of his realm, who was to be closely associated with him throughout life, the Visigoth Witiza, who as a monk took the name Benedict.

Witiza was born in 751, son of a Visigothic Count of Maguelonne, who had joined the Franks. He became a page at Pepin's court and cupbearer of Queen Bertrada. In 774 he distinguished himself at the siege of Pavia. An accident that befell his brother made him reflect seriously, and in 780 he entered the abbey of Saint-Seine near Dijon, where he studied the oriental, Greek, and Latin monastic rules. When he realized that the complete observance of the Benedictine Rule was not possible at Saint-Seine, he founded the monastery of Aniane on his ancestral property in his Septimanian homeland. The new monasticism made a deep impression on the members of the social class to which Witiza-Benedict belonged. With his assistance the Margrave William of Toulouse established the monastery of Gellone in 804. At the royal court of Aquitaine the Chancellor Helisachar was one of the friends of the Abbot of Aniane. Up to 814 twenty-five monasteries are said to have been reformed or founded in Louis's kingdom. The reform also affected the neighbouring districts. Alcuin of Tours, Theodulf of Orléans, and Leidrad of Lyons caused the renewal of abbeys subject to them. The bishops meeting at Chalon-sur-Saône in 813 decided that the pure Benedictine Rule was to be observed throughout their jurisdictions. Charles the Great himself was impressed by the Aniane reform, but its great hour did not strike until the reign of his successor.

Although Louis was already coemperor, he seems to have expected opposition to his succession. He feared Charles's cousins, Abbot Adalard of Corbie and Count Wala, and took measures against his sisters' lovers, probably not only for reasons of morality. Charles's daughters were not permitted to choose between marriage and the veil, as their father had directed; they were thrust into convents. Louis conscientiously carried out the stipulations in regard to material things in his father's last will. He even maintained his half-brothers, Drogo, Hugh, and Theuderich at court and had his sisters' sons raised as befitted their station. Bernard of Italy came to do homage and was dismissed graciously. Of Louis's own children, Lothar and Pepin, who had already attained their majority, received Bavaria and Aquitaine as subkingdoms. The third son, Louis the German, was still a minor and remained in the company of his father.

The Emperor reorganized the Aachen *ministeria* by a new palace order and thereby introduced a stricter discipline along the court magnates. The palace school, the library, and the supervision of construction remained, but the poets vanished from Aachen for the time being. Louis did not have his father's versatility; his interests lay especially in theology and Church reform. Benedict of Aniane was summoned to the imperial court. He first received the abbey of Maursmünster in Alsace, but soon moved to the abbey of Inden, now Cornelimünster, which was consecrated in 817 as an imperial foundation near the *sedes* of Aachen. Alongside the Aachen palace school, whose brilliance faded in comparison with the later flourishing cultural centres of the Carolingian Renaissance in the Empire, stood the Benedictine abbey as the dominant reform centre.

Of the advisers and friends of Charles the Great several survived the old Emperor — his cousins Adalard of Corbie (d. 826) and Count Wala (d. 836), the Archchaplain Hildebald (d. 818), Theodulf of Orléans (d. 821), and Arn of Salzburg (d. 821). So did Jesse of Amiens (d. 837) and Einhard (d. 840), but in regard to age they belonged to the new Emperor's generation. Even before the end of 814 there came a break between Louis and the collateral Carolingian line of Adalard. The Abbot of Corbie was banished to Noirmoutier at the mouth of the Loire, while Count Wala became a monk at Corbie. There existed points of opposition connected with monasticism between Adalard and Benedict of Aniane. But personal and family differences between Louis the Pious and the Abbot of Corbie were probably the decisive factors. In Charles's last years Adalard and Wala had been closely associated with Bernard of Italy. They may have looked after his interests more energetically than was to the liking of the new ruler.

In other respects the new Emperor brought his own confidants to court without removing his father's advisers. Hildebald of Cologne retained the direction of the court chapel, which passed only after his death to Hilduin of Saint-Denis. Einhard gave up the direction of the palace school and of construction but he remained in the Emperor's council. Louis assigned him a number of important abbeys and in 815 the Mark Michelstadt in the Odenwald. More significant was the change in the chancery, where the chancellor of Aquitaine, Helisachar, replaced Charles's last chancellor, Jeremias. But Jeremias in no sense fell into disgrace; he soon accepted the archiepiscopal see of Sens, one of the most important churches in the Empire. Under Helisachar the business of the chancery was managed by Durandus. Both men seem to have come from Septimania, Benedict's native land. Durandus retained the conduct of business when in 819 Fridugis, an Anglo-Saxon pupil of Alcuin, replaced Helisachar as chancellor. He probably created the new formulary for charters, which expressed the spirit of the Carolingian Renaissance in the official documents and at the same time served the new ruler's ecclesiastical policy. In the direction of the palace school Einhard's successor Clement was followed by the chaplains Aldric, Thomas, Gotabert, and Walafrid Strabo. Aldric became Abbot of Ferrières in 821, chancellor of Pepin of Aquitaine in 827, and Archbishop of Sens in 829. Besides Jeremias and Aldric of Sens there were other outstanding representatives of the new generation in the episcopate: Agobard of Lyons (d. 840), Ebbo of Reims (d. 851), Hetti of Trier (d. 847), Modoin of Autun (d. c. 843), and Jonas of Orléans (d. 843). The Spaniard Agobard and the Aquitanian Jonas, together with Witiza-Benedict, Helisachar, and Durandus, represented the Aquitanian-Spanish element among Louis's advisers.

The laymen in the retinue of the new Emperor belonged almost exclusively to the Frankish imperial aristocracy. Louis seems to have increased the number of court functions at Aachen rather than to have made new appointments. The most influential councillors were counts from western *Francia*. The greatest influence in the first decennium of the reign was exercised by Matfrid of Orléans. In 821 Lothar's father-in-law, Count Hugh of Tours, also entered the circle of the highest ranking advisers. The contact of this Frankish aristocracy with its native country along the Meuse and the Scheldt, the Moselle and the Rhine, was at that time still quite vital. People knew that the Empire had been re-established from there and felt pride in being the representatives of this Empire.

But Louis the Pious did not rule only with a narrow circle of men of confidence. He also sought uninterrupted contact with the rest of the magnates. Imperial assemblies, which had hitherto met once a year only, were soon convened two or even three times a year. However, not all the magnates of the Empire always attended them. There were also smaller assemblies, which considered a specific question and rather resembled a great council. Government in council was a characteristic of the new style. It was successful so long as a leading personality was able to combine the divergent opinions and interests of the various groups. Leading personalities of this sort were apparently Benedict of Aniane and Wala of Corbie, who in succession had a decisive influence in determining imperial policy.

The change on the imperial throne took place at a time of peace, and so the real tasks of the new Emperor lay in the field of domestic policy. Louis and his advisers energetically set about these tasks. As early as 814 movement appeared in an imperial policy that had been stagnating for some years. *Missi* were sent to all parts of the Empire to inquire into and correct abuses in the administration of justice. At the same time the Emperor had ecclesiastical privileges called in for the purpose of reconfirmation. The confirmations were issued in accord with a new formula in which immunity and royal protection, two hitherto separate institutions, were merged. Immunity was an institution of public law and until the ninth century had been always granted to episcopal sees. It accorded to the immunist a certain autonomy in regard to taxation and courts of justice. Royal protection, on the other hand, was connected with entry into the sphere of the royal *mundeburdis;* royal proprietary monasteries in particular enjoyed it. By virtue of the union of immunity and protection episcopal sees and royal monasteries were assimilated: the latter obtained the greater internal freedom of movement of the old immune churches, while the former were admitted to the circle of royal churches. Thus Louis the Pious created a uniform Imperial Church, with a comprehensive Church reform as his aim.

After the constitutional presuppositions had been created, a great reform council met at Aachen in August 816. Its decrees affected clerics, monks, and nuns. For monks not only the Benedictine Rule but a uniform observance was prescribed; this observance assured a life apart from the world and, in Loewe's words, "directed [monasticism] to its proper tasks, particularly in liturgical prayer". Strict regulations in regard to inclosure relegated the laity to the periphery of claustral life. Manual labour was again enjoined, and monastic schools were restricted to the *oblati.* The Benedictine liturgy supplanted not only the Roman but also the *laus perennis*[1] and the *cursus Scotorum.* The lawgiver of monks was Benedict of Aniane. "Monasteria ita ad formam unitatis redacta sunt, acsi ab uno magistro et in uno imbuerentur loco. Uniformis mensura in potu, in cibo, in vigiliis, in modulationibus cunctis observanda est et tradita.[2]

Like the monastic reform, that of the canonical life also had recourse to the Aachen decrees of 802. The *Institutio canonicorum* that was now determined did not originate simply in Chrodegang's Rule for the clergy of Metz. It was inspired by the same ideal as Chrodegang's Rule, even though it was milder. It was based on statements from the Fathers of the Church. Clerics attached to cathedral and collegiate churches were allowed to retain their private property, but they were bound to the *vita communis,* including refectory and dormitory. The "uniformis mensura in cibo et potu" was also introduced here, but graduated in accord with the property of the churches. The Roman liturgy took care of the prayer life. Analogous regulations were contained in the *Institutio sanctimonialium,* or Rule for canonesses, which prescribed a regular liturgy and a limited common life. Benedict and Helisachar were probably the initiators of the reform.

---

[1] The unceasing celebration of the Divine Office, starting at the Burgundian royal abbey of Saint-Maurice at the beginning of the sixth century.

[2] *Vita Benedicti abb. An.* in *MGSS* XV, 215ff.

Ordo saecularis and *ordo regularis* had received their basic statutes at Aachen. The *vita canonica* of the diocesan clergy was clearly distinguished from the *vita regularis* of the monks in 816. The rules for canons and canonesses were sent to the bishops of the Empire, and their introduction within a year was made obligatory. Supervisory committees were announced to the monasteries for 1 September 817. After the close of the Council of Aachen the Emperor went to Reims for a personal discussion with the new Pope Stephen IV.

Leo III had died at Rome on 12 June 816. Stephen IV was elected as his successor and consecrated on 22 June. This was the first papal election to take place after the establishment of the Western Empire. In the Byzantine period papal elections had been ratified by the Emperor or Exarch before the consecration, though since the election of Zachary there had been no imperial approval. In 816 the Romans did not revert to the old imperial law, and Louis the Pious had nothing to do with the election. Stephen IV merely sent him a notification. But he had the Romans swear loyalty to the Emperor and requested a meeting with him.

Emperor and Pope met at Reims at the beginning of October 816. During a festive Mass in the cathedral Stephan IV anointed and crowned the Emperor and the Empress. For this purpose the Pope had brought the "crown of Constantine" from Rome, thereby underscoring the Roman notion of the imperial office. However, the events at Reims must not be overestimated — the Pope's biographer does not mention them at all. The coronation at Reims was not a constitutive act. Louis probably interpreted it as a "consolidating" of his imperial dignity. He renewed the *pactum amicitiae* with the Pope and allowed the opponents of Leo III, banished to Frankland sixteen years previously, to return to Rome. His other arrangements with the Pope were expressed in the privilege of 24 January 817, for the Roman Church, in which Louis confirmed in writing the freedom of papal elections and the autonomy of the Papal State in regard to administration and justice. The notification of the papal election was to be made only after the consecration, and the Emperor was to act as judge in the Papal State only in the event of a denial of justice. Stephen IV died on the very day on which the *Ludovicianum* was issued. The elevation of his successor, Paschal I, took place according to the form customary since Zachary and Stephen II and now formally recognized in the privilege.

Louis was content with a minimum of rights in Rome. But the exalted notion entertained by himself and his councillors in regard to the imperial office, which was characterized on the gold *solidi* as *munus divinum,* was not thereby affected. A reformulation of the imperial title had been rendered necessary because of the settlements with the Byzantines. With its concise simplification in the formula *Imperator Augustus,* not only the Roman but also the Frankish and Lombard relationship disappeared. The *Ordinatio imperii* of 817 expressed unambiguously that the Emperor should stand above the nations.

On Holy Thursday 817 the Emperor had an accident which impressed on him the transitory nature of earthly things. Magnates in his retinue besought him to promulgate a regulation of the succession, by which they meant a division of the Empire according to Frankish law. However, they afforded the opportunity for a new sort of imperial arrangement, which, following a triduum, was discussed and decided. The oldest son, Lothar, was elected and crowned coemperor "as a result of divine inspiration". The younger brothers, Pepin of Aquitaine and Louis, who obtained Bavaria, were made Kings, but both they and their areas of rule *(potestates)* remained subject to their father and his successors in the imperial dignity. Further divisions of the inheritance were forbidden even to the subkings. If there existed several heirs, election by the people should decide the succession.

In the *ordinatio* Empire and Church were understood as a unity. Hence the *unitas imperii* was regarded as willed by God. It must not be rent "by human division" to accomodate children, in order that no vexation may rise in Holy Church. On the unity of the Empire rested the eternal peace of the entire Christian people , the preservation of which the *ordinatio* claimed to foster. The office of Emperor and that of King were understood on the analogy of the office of bishop. Lothar was raised to the office of coemperor in an inspired election after a triduum, and this manner of election was provided for specific cases in the future, even for the subkings. The Emperor's penal law in relation to the Kings was copied from the Church's penal law: a threefold admonition *secreto per fideles legatos,* then *monitio et castigatio coram altero fratre,* and finally enforcement by the Empire after an interrogation of the imperial assembly.

In its impressive inclusiveness and its cold rationalism the *ordinatio* marks without any doubt a climax of Carolingian legislation and also of the Carolingian Renaissance, by whose leaders it was drawn up. At first the question remained open as to whether the daring imperial edifice would stand the test of history, even though it survived its first ordeal, the rebellion of Bernard of Italy. The legislators had assigned to the Italian *regnum* the same position as that accorded to Bavaria and Aquitaine. Thereby Bernard's rise to the rank of joint-king according to the old law was blocked. The Emperor's nephew had recourse to arms, but his fight for the old dynastic law ended in a complete debacle. In March 818 the unlucky prince, in whose ruin Theodulf of Orléans was also included, was condemned to death in an imperial assembly at Aachen. The Emperor commuted the sentence to blinding, as a result of which Bernard died. Italy received no new subking, and the unity of the Empire was assured for the immediate future.

Once the basic law of the *Imperium* had been secured against all opposition, the reform of 816 was again taken up. An imperial assembly met at Aachen after Christmas 818 to define the Church's ties to the Emperor and the Church's obligations to the Empire. The preface of the capitulary of 818–19 is a second significant document revealing the new concept of the Empire. It distinguishes the mortal person of the ruler from the imperial office, which stands on a lonely elevation. The Emperor is *adiutor Dei;* his sphere of duty embraces *ecclesiastica negotia* and *status rei publicae.* The Christian people are divided into three classes — canons, monks, and laity. The Emperor directs them and manages the reins of the Empire *aequissimo libramine.*

The filling of prelacies by the ruler had been an essential element in the administration of the Frankish Church since the sixth century. Most sees formally possessed the right to elect their bishops, whereas the abbots of the monasteries were in most cases determined by the founder or lord of the proprietary church. But the discrepancy between practice and law was here especially strong. In 818–19 Louis the Pious granted the right of election to all sees and to imperial monasteries of the *ordo regularis,* but he retained the right to confirm and invest, which involved a review of the election. The chapters of canons in the Empire did not obtain the privilege of election; here the direct nomination of the abbot or provost by the ruler continued to be possible, including the grant of the office to a lay abbot. Since, as a result of the distinction of the *vita canonica* and the *vita regularis,* many of the old monasteries of monks transformed themselves into canonries, the number of churches of which the monarch had the direct disposal remained considerable.

The contributions of the bishops to the Empire were of a public sort rather than of the nature of proprietary churches, and they continued basically as before. Unless it was otherwise determined in individual privileges, the bishops thus had also their court duties to fulfill — attendance at imperial assemblies and synods and the undertaking of the commission of *missi* — and to pay taxes and lodge the ruler and his envoys on journeys. The vassals of bishops owed military service to the monarch.

Besides their public burdens, the monasteries had to render in kind the *servitium* due from proprietary churches. In 818–19 Louis graded their burdens. In the first degree the full service was maintained, consisting of military levy, annual gifts, and prayer. A second degree was dispensed from the military levy, and a third from the annual gift as well, so that only the obligation of prayer for the Emperor remained. The determining of the three groups was made in accord with the current state of resources. A general invenventory of monastic property was ordered in connection with this definition.

Nonetheless, their imperial obligations were a heavy burden on the churches thereafter. In the hope of avoiding a disruption by them of the inner life of the Church a distinction was made between the property of the bishop or abbot and that of the chapter or monastery. The imperial burdens were laid on the property of bishop or abbot, while the goods of the chapter or monastery, the *mensa fratrum*, was to be reserved for the maintenance of the ecclesiastical community and its buildings as well as for the care of the poor. The episcopate was directed to place property at the disposal of ecclesiastical communities "ad claustra perficienda"; such land was freed from contributions to the ruler. These measures determined the development of the Church's organization for centuries and established the dualism of prelate and chapter. At the same time the reform inaugurated a new phase of architectural history, leading in the case of episcopal churches to the great cathedral.

The *capitulare ecclesiasticum* of 818–19 also regulated the situation of the lesser and the proprietary churches. Charles the Great had already decreed that the bishop should control the installation and removal and the conduct of the clergy of proprietary churches and prohibited the destroying of existing proprietary churches. Now, on the analogy of monastic and canonical reform, there was concern for the economic and social security of the clergy of proprietary churches, which was to be guaranteed by three fundamental rules. First, the ordination of the unfree to the priesthood was forbidden. Next, a minimum livelihood was fixed, consisting of one hide free of manorial burdens; for it, as well as for house and garden, tithes and offerings, only spiritual service was due. Finally, it was stipulated that a priest was to be appointed for every church with a legal minimum income. These principles were soon communicated from proprietary churches to parish churches under the bishop's immediate supervision, which were coming more and more to be regarded as the bishop's proprietary churches. Then two further regulations secured the rights of the manorial lords: bishops were obliged to ordain the clerics presented to them for proprietary churches if they were unobjectionable in their conduct and education and to assign the tithe to proprietary churches that were properly endowed and occupied.

The reform activity of these years was not confined to the ecclesiastical sphere. The administration of the court and of the finances at Aachen was reorganized early in the new reign. In addition to the holders of the old court offices there appeared under Louis *magistri ostiariorum, mendicorum, mercatorum, Iudaeorum* and a *mansionarius,* who was responsible for the residences of the magnates. Following the measures taken in Charles's last years, the *missatica* were erected as specified areas, in imitation of the ecclesiastical provinces. Within these jurisdictions a definite system for the transmission of orders was created. The capitularies were more clearly formulated, better arranged, more fundamentally justified, and more carefully preserved. Material from the tribal laws had already been introduced into the capitulary legislation under Charles. Louis the Pious went a step farther by having material from royal legislation adopted into the tribal laws, thereby conferring on royal law the enhanced prestige of *lex*.

Legislation by capitulary seems to have come to a temporary halt in 821. The Emperor's mentor, Benedict of Aniane, died on 11 February 821, and the Carolingian Empire moved into a new phase of its history.

The most conspicuous occurrence after the death of Benedict of Aniane was the reconciliation of the Emperor with Adalard and Wala and the amnesty granted to the rebels of 817 at the imperial assembly of Thionville in October 821. This was followed at Attigny in August 822 by the reconciliation of Louis with his three half-brothers, Drogo, Hugh, and Theuderich, who had been removed from court in 818 and forced to enter the clergy. At Attigny the Emperor made a public confession of his misdeeds against Adalard, Wala, and Bernard of Italy and did penance for all the wrong done perhaps by himself or his father. The bishops associated themselves with the confession and the penance. In this there has been a tendency to see a humiliation of the ruler by the proud Abbot Adalard, but such a view is wrong. Actually, it was a proving of the sincerity of the Emperor, who gave an example in the spirit of the new ruler-ethos. The work of 814–21 was not overthrown; rather it was ratified by the swearing of the magnates to the *ordinatio* at Nijmegen and Thionville in May and October 821. As Schieffer says, "What seemed to be regulated by statute and secured with regard to power was also to be consolidated morally in the spirit of justice, peace, and reconciliation".

Adalard gained a leading position in the Emperor's council, alongside the Archchaplain Hilduin, Abbot Helisachar, and Count Matfrid. Hardly noticeable as yet was the influence of the Empress Judith, whom Louis had married in 819 after the death of his first wife. One of the strongest personalities in the episcopate was Agobard, a man with a keen sense of duty, a clear and consistent, though not always realistic, thinker. His demand, made in 822 and repeated in 823, for the integral restitution of the property of the Church was disavowed by Adalard and Hilduin out of regard for the internal peace of the Empire. Nor would the two leading councillors allow a purely ecclesiastical consideration of the Jewish problem, which Agobard raised as a pastor of souls. Agobard had as little success in his attack on ordeals, which he launched in the spirit of Carolingian "rationalism", and in his proposal for making the *Lex Salica* the basis of a uniform imperial law. Obstacles insurmountable at that time were raised against this final bold demand, made in the spirit of unity.

In 822 Adalard left court for his abbey of Corbie, where he composed his *De ordine palatii,* probably as a sort of political testament. Meanwhile, his younger brother, Wala, had been appointed tutor of the coemperor Lothar. Lothar and Pepin, the two oldest sons, had grown up and married in 821 and 822 respectively, while the younger Louis was still at his father's court. When in 822 Lothar was sent to Italy to implement the Carolingian legislation, he was accompanied by Wala, who was of all the councillors the most conversant with the Italian situation. The young Emperor's measures in Italy were probably Wala's work essentially. Lothar stayed south of the Alps until 825. In 823, however, he returned to his father's court for two months, and while there he acted as godfather for his youngest brother, Charles. During these three years Italy was firmly incorporated into the Empire. But Lothar was not satisfied with the mere implementation of the Carolingian legislation. Beyond that he took a really unique step for this period in the field of culture by founding nine schools with corresponding school districts in the Lombard Kingdom.

The presence of the coemperor in Italy could not fail to have an effect on Rome. An invitation from Paschal I reached the young Emperor in the spring of 823. He accepted and was crowned by the Pope at Easter, like his father almost seven years earlier at Reims. But the meeting in Rome did not turn out entirely to Paschal's taste, since Lothar and Wala now took a firmer hold of the reins in the Papal State. After the departure of the Franks, some of the Pope's men killed two high papal functionaries "because in every respect they had shown themselves to be loyal to the young Emperor Lothar". Louis the Pious appointed an investigating committee. Paschal, however, checkmated it by taking an oath of purgation in regard to his role and shielding the ones responsible by a declaration that the dead men had been lawfully executed as traitors.

But the tables were turned when Paschal died in the spring of 824 and Wala procured the election of Eugene II, the candidate of the nobility. Thereby were established the preconditions for a new regulation of Frankish-Roman relations, which was published on 11 November 824 in the *Constitutio Romana.* In this Lothar declared that all persons under papal and imperial protection were unassailable, thereby putting his adherents for the future beyond the reach of a one-sided prosecution for treason. He introduced the principle of personality of law in the Papal State, where hitherto Roman law had prevailed. Even more decisive was the instituting of a supervisory tribunal officiating in Rome, composed of one papal and one imperial *missus.* They were to superintend the administration of the Papal State and make an annual report to the Emperor. The *mos canonicus* of the papal election was confirmed, but at the same time it was decreed that for the future the Pope-elect, before his consecration, had to take an oath *pro conservatione omnium* before the imperial *missus,* following the form of the oath first taken by Eugene II.

The Papal State was attached more firmly than ever to the Carolingian Empire by the *Constitutio.* At a Roman Synod in 826 Eugene II adopted also the Frankish legislation on proprietary churches in summary form. The bonds created by the *Constitutio* were lasting. Lothar strengthened them further in 844 by making the papal election dependent on a special imperial *iussio* and prescribing that it take place in the presence of imperial *missi.*

John IX approved this regulation at a Roman Synod of 898, although it actually went beyond the Byzantine imperial law.

Nevertheless, the *Constitutio Romana* did not affect the Pope as spiritual head of the Church. This point was made clear when on 17 November 824 an embassy from the Eastern Emperors Michael II and Theophilus appeared before Louis the Pious at Rouen. Its purpose was not only to re-establish relations, interrupted since the death of the Emperor Michael I in 813, but also to interest the Franks in a compromise with Rome in regard to the question of images. For Iconoclasm had flared up again at Constantinople under the Emperor Leo V (813–20). Michael II was inclined toward it but wanted to maintain internal peace. The attitude of the Franks, who allowed images but forbade any *adoratio,* seemed to him to provide a compromise solution. A Frankish embassy actually presented a petition in this sense at Rome. Eugene II maintained the decrees of Nicaea II, but granted the Emperor authorization to convoke a synod of the Empire in regard to Iconoclasm.

The synod met at Paris on 1 November 825, near or perhaps in the abbey of Saint-Denis, which was ruled by the Archchaplain Hilduin. As archchaplain he was the Emperor's first adviser in ecclesiastical questions, besides being personally interested in Greek theology. The participants in the synod, to which were submitted the letters of Pope Hadrian, the *acta* of Nicaea II, and the *Libri Carolini,* upheld the Frankish viewpoint, but aimed their polemic chiefly at the iconoclasts. They even outlined relevant replies from the Emperor to the Pope and from the Pope to the *Basileus,* which, however, Louis the Pious did not send on. He had the letter to the Pope rewritten and offered to Eugene II the sending of a common embassy to Byzantium, but nothing came of this. In regard to a second Byzantine embassy, that came to Compiègne in 827 *propter foedus confirmandum,* we know only that it delivered the works of the pseudo-Dionysius, certainly at the request of Hilduin. Iconoclasm had a journalistic epilogue in the Frankish Empire, evoked by the extremely iconoclastic writings of Bishop Claudius of Turin. Participants in the controversy included the Irishman Dungal and Bishop Jonas of Orléans. In the East Iconoclasm collapsed with the death of the Emperor Theophilus, and Orthodoxy was restored in 843.

Legislation in the Empire had come to a temporary halt in 821. The activity of the succeeding years centered rather on the enforcing of existing capitularies than on the introducing of new ones. Capitularies are not again extant until the years 825–26, and Abbot Ansegis of Saint-Wandrille probably began at that time his semiofficial collection of capitularies, which he completed in 827. Among the pieces from 825 belongs the *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines,* the third and final document dealing with the concept of Emperor and Empire. It resumed and continued the ideas of the preface of 818–19. Here, for the first time, the imperial office is described as a *ministerium,* on the analogy of the episcopal office. The two spheres appear under the terms *ecclesia* and *regnum*. New is the idea that every magnate in his post and his position participates in the Emperor's *ministerium*. The Emperor is the *admonitor*, the magnates are the *adiutores*, obliged among themselves to mutual support. The task of the clergy is to teach by word and example, to care for church, worship, and education. The task of the secular magnates is the realization of peace by just judgment, by the maintenance of public safety, by the protection of the defenceless.

The *admonitio* was issued at the Aachen imperial assembly in August 825, at which Wala seems to have reported on the government of Italy. Lothar's coregency was from now on expressed officially in charters and other documents, which for the future were published in the name of the two Emperors. After the Aachen assembly Wala returned to the monastery of Corbie, where at the beginning of 826 he succeeded his brother Adalard as Abbot. On this occasion Corbie's daughter house, Corvey on the Weser, the first great monastery in Saxony, became autonomous under Abbot Warin Wala, whose mother was from a Saxon family, had played a prominent role in the founding of Corvey in 821–22. Relations between mother and daughter houses did not cease after 826. On the contrary: through Wala Corvey was to acquire an important involvement in the Scandinavian mission, which began to develop just at this moment.

The Scandinavian mission grew out of the Saxon. It was started by Archbishop Ebbo of Reims, who sought a new field of activity when the Reims missionary territory in Saxony became independent with the founding of the see of Hildesheim in 815. Following the example of Boniface, Ebbo in 822 was appointed by the Pope legate for the North; in 823 the Emperor gave him Münsterdorf in Holstein as his base. The hour for the conversion of the North seemed to have struck when in 825 the strife in Denmark between Horik, son of King Göttrik, and the pretender Harold was ended. Harold, who presumably obtained modern Schleswig as a subkingdom, came to Ingelheim in 826 to do homage and on 24 June was baptized at Sankt Alban in Mainz. Louis the Pious invested him with the Frisian County of Hriustri at the mouth of the Weser as a Frankish fief. At Wala's suggestion the Fleming Anschar, *scholasticus* of Corvey, was appointed director of the mission in Harold's territory.

The high hopes of 826 were unfulfilled. In 827 Harold was expelled from Denmark. Anschar returned with some Danish neophytes, who were educated at Corvey and other Saxon monasteries. When envoys of the Swedish King Björn appeared in the Frankish Empire in 829, Wala urged the beginning of a new mission. Anschar accompanied the Swedish envoys to their country and now had more success. In 831 the see of Hamburg was founded for the mission among the Danes, the Swedes, and the Obodrites. Anschar was consecrated Bishop of Hamburg by the Emperor's brother, Drogo of Metz, and the Metropolitans of Mainz, Trier, and Reims. The Pope sent him the pallium and appointed him legate. Gauzbert, a relative of Ebbo of Reims, became Bishop of the Swedes in 832. Thus in these years the Frankish Church reached out for the first time beyond the frontiers established by Charles the Great. But it was the misfortune of the Nordic mission that it was getting started at the very moment when the collapse of the Frankish Empire was under way because of inner chaos.

Chapter 17

The Carolingian Renaissance under Louis the Pious

The beginnings of the Carolingian Renaissance go back to the palace school and the learned circle around Charles the Great. The palace school and library continued under Louis the Pious, and more and more men of the intellectual *élite* came forth from the school. The annals of the Empire were carried on, and Louis's court astronomer wrote the Emperor's biography. Poems were dedicated to the Emperor by Theodulf, Ermoldus Nigellus, and Walafrid Strabo, the only poet among the teachers at the palace school. Fréculf of Lisieux wrote a universal history for the instruction of young Prince Charles. The Irishman Dicuil dedicated his four books on the *computus* to Louis. But on the whole the *artes* gave place to theology. Rhabanus, Agobard, Dungal, Hilduin, Jonas, Prudentius, Amalarius, and Smaragdus dedicated works dealing with religion, the Church, and theology to the Emperor and the Empress.

It was in the very nature of the Carolingian cultural movement that the palace school at Aachen should not remain the sole centre of education. The courts of the subkings were not strangers to education. The Irishman Dungal was enabled by the Carolingians to go to Pavia, which occupied a central position in Lothar's educational legislation. Ermoldus Nigellus was at the court of Pepin of Aquitaine before being banished to Strasbourg. In addition to the courts, important regional centres had made their appearance under Charles the Great, and under Louis the Pious there were many more of them. Most of these centres lay between the Loire and the Rhine, but even so Burgundy (Lyons), German Franconia (Würzburg and Fulda), Swabia (Reichenau), and Bavaria (Salzburg and Freising) did not lack centres for the cultivation of the mind. It can be observed not infrequently that the first impulses came from the imperial court. Members of the Carolingian family, archchaplains, and archchancellors governed sees and abbeys which occupied an honourable place in the Carolingian Renaissance. From the court clergy proceeded many bishops with famous names.

The most distinguished cathedral school was probably that of Lyons.

From it came Agobard, his deacon and assistant Florus, the later Archbishop Amolo, and Bishop Claudius of Turin. Lyons represented the southern European school of thought with strong ties to Spain. The city was a centre of the Carolingian reform party and of Carolingian "rationalism". Agobard and Florus opposed lay domination in the Church and fought for free episcopal elections and the *privilegium fori.* To justify his demands in regard to Church and state, Florus made use of texts from Roman law, something that otherwise was encountered only in Italy (Pavia and Bobbio). He thereby became a chief witness for the *canonisation progressive du droit romain.* Agobard's political ideas and his fight against ordeals have already been considered. Agobard and Florus allowed only texts from the Bible in the liturgy. They rejected not only religious poetry in divine worship but also liturgical allegorizing. Agobard was also unenthusiastic about the cult of relics. He distinguished the shrines of the saints *(memoriae)* from the real houses of God *(templa).* The *enfant terrible* of the school was the Spaniard, Claudius of Turin, whose extreme hostility to images even evoked opposition in the Frankish Empire.

The chief opponent of the Lyons theologians in liturgical matters was Amalarius of Metz, a pupil of Alcuin at Tours. He perhaps went first to the diocese of Metz in 805, where he probably received the abbey of Hornbach. For a while he presided also over the Church of Trier, but his contemplative nature was not equal to the organizational tasks thereby imposed. Since the days of Chrodegang Metz had been the most important liturgical centre in the Frankish realm. In 836–37 Amalarius completed the series of canonical books of Charles the Great with an antiphonary compiled from texts of Rome and Metz. His renown as a liturgist had been established long before. It was based on the *Liber officialis,* first published in 821, then several times reissued and enlarged. In it were summarized his liturgical studies in a vast allegorical explanation of the chief part of the Church year (Septuagesima to Pentecost), ecclesiastical consecrations, liturgical vestments, the Mass, and finally the readings. His allegorical method was based on Bede, but it had first been applied to the liturgy by Alcuin. Amalarius handled it as a master and with originality, and he even claimed direct inspiration for his theories. He understood the Mass as a drama. Although he suffered defeat in his controversy with Agobard and Florus, his works became standard for the further development of the liturgical symbolism of the Middle Ages. But even before then Walafrid Strabo made use of them in his *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis ecclesiasticis.*

Amalarius was a scholar secluded from the world and living only for his theological and liturgical interests. The political and ecclesiastical controversies of the time found not the faintest echo in his writings. Hence he was a failure as Bishop of Trier, for a bishop could not ignore these questions. The episcopate was preoccupied with protecting the Church's rights *vis-à-vis* the magnates and with implementing the revived canon law. An irenical character like Jonas of Orléans not only took a stand in regard to images but also wrote *De institutione laicali* for Matfrid of Orléans and a mirror for princes for Pepin of Aquitaine. He drafted the acts, of great ecclesiastical significance, of the Synod of Paris of 829, using as their basis an *admonitio* to Pepin. To Jonas's predecessor Theodulf were due the first episcopal capitularies, which were followed by others at Liège, Basel and Freising. They contained the essential regulations for parish administration. In addition, their goal was the consolidation of episcopal authority in regard to the clergy and monks of the diocese, the enforcement of the Church's matrimonial and penitential law in regard to the laity, and the prevention of lay encroachments within the Church. In this connection the struggle against the insular penitentials was also stepped up. Since the existing canonical collections were too bulky and hence could be consulted only with difficulty, special collections, such as that of Laon, were compiled, or new penitentials appeared, drawn up in the spirit of the ancient ecclesiastical discipline of Rome. Of these last, the earliest went back to Halitgar of Cambrai (817–31). Not least of the tasks of the episcopate was that of assuring the material bases of ecclesiastical life, which were often still inadequate, especially in areas hardest hit by the secularizations of the early eighth century. Concern for the Church's property led to an examination of the property titles in archives and then to the narrating, by recourse to documents, of the history of bishops, including the acceptance of both authentic and forged charters, as at Le Mans under Bishop Aldric (832–57).

The school system, which formed only one part of the great field of activity of the bishops, occupied a central position in the monasteries. Hence it should cause no surprise that the main centre of book production and of literary culture was in the monasteries. It is true that Saint-Martin de Tours lost its rank as a central home of learning after Alcuin's death, but it became the great publishing centre of the ninth century, sending manuscripts and richly illuminated books to all parts of the Frankish Empire. Alongside Saint-Martin, the Reims *scriptoria* of Saint-Remi and Hautvillers became more prominent under Louis the Pious. No new central school sprang up at Aniane, the motherhouse of the Benedictine reform. Among the intellectual centres of *Francia* were Saint-Denis, where the Archchaplain Hilduin even fostered Greek and translated the writings of pseudo-Dionysius in 832–35, and Corbie, where in 831 Paschasius Radbertus launched the Eucharistic controversy of the ninth century with his *De corpore et sanguine Domini*. At Ferrières in the diocese of Sens Abbot Aldric (821–29) prepared the ground for his monastery's fame in the succeeding period.

Fulda was the leading monastic school in the reign of Louis the Pious. This foundation of Saint Boniface owed its position to the Abbots Eigil (818–22) and Rhabanus (822–42). Rhabanus Maurus, a Frank from Mainz, had been, like Amalarius of Metz, a pupil of Alcuin at Tours. He was not an original thinker like Amalarius, but the ranking expert in early Christian literature, in which he even surpassed his teacher, Alcuin. His literary productivity was extraordinary and included the *artes* as well as theology, in which field most of his work lay. These special talents made Rhabanus the *praeceptor Germaniae.* No other school in Germany could be compared with that of Fulda. Even Reichenau, which began its rise under Abbot Tatto and in Walafrid produced an important poet and scholar, lagged behind. At Fulda efforts were made to translate substantial portions of the Bible; here Tatian's harmony of the Gospels was translated into Old High German. Whether the *Heliand* and the Old Saxon Genesis, both of which were influenced by the Anglo-Saxon biblical poetry in spirit and form (alliteration), originated at Fulda or Werden is disputed. Rhabanus was aware of the existence of a Germanic group of languages, the *lingua theodisca,* and from him this knowledge passed to his pupils. But the word *theodiscus* established itself as a designation of the Germanic linguistic community at the same time also in other authors of the Romance-speaking West.

The development of the Carolingian Renaissance under Louis the Pious presents an imposing picture. It is true that the theological and ecclesiastical literature now occupied very much more room than it had under Charles the Great. But this orientation to Church themes must not be one-sidedly attributed to the Emperor's interests. A maturing is also expressed by it, since the preceding period would not yet have been capable of so comprehensive a discussion of the politics of Empire and Church. Meanwhile, the *artes,* it is true, received less emphasis than before, but they did not therefore lose their role in education as a whole. The ideas and demands of the leading men were not always in accord with historical reality. The great concept of the unity of Christendom in the Carolingian Empire was soon to prove to be an illusion. But in the discussion of Church reform and imperial unity, of the duties of ruler and magnates, the notions of dominion and service, of Church, Empire, and law were deepened and clarified. This clarification and this preoccupation with objectivity were enduring gains.

CHAPTER 18

The Crisis of Empire and Church (828 to 840)

Following a long period of peace there went forth a cry of alarm from the two Emperors to the magnates of the Empire in February 828: "Undique inimicos sanctae Dei ecclesiae commoveri et regnum . . . infestare velle cognoscimus."[1] The occasion for this alarm was provided by reverses on the frontiers: in Holstein, in the marches of Pannonia and Friuli, and in Catalonia. Viewed from a distance, none of this gave cause for panic, and the situation on the frontiers soon stabilized itself again. Charles the Great would hardly have been disturbed, but concern and anxiety prevailed at the imperial assembly which met at Aachen in February 828. Hugh of Tours, Matfrid of Orléans, and Balderic of Friuli were relieved of office. The cashiering of three great dignitaries produced a government crisis. General complaints in regard to imperial administration were heard in Aachen. Proposals for reform were to be submitted to the next imperial assembly. But the assembly summoned to Ingelheim for June found no opportunity to discuss reforms because of the military situation. Such discussion could not take place until December, at a rather small winter *placitum* in Aachen, which was prolonged to February 829. On this occasion Wala came forward with a great reform memorandum.

---

[1] *MGCap* II, no. 185, 5.

This former paladin of Charles the Great began with a sharp criticism of the court, in particular the absence of energetic leadership and the pursuit of *beneficia* by the courtiers, of the lack of pastoral activity and of discipline on the part of the clergy, and of the corruption, feuds, and factions among the secular magnates. He found the causes of the abuses in the passivity of the central authority and the unlawful intermingling of the ecclesiastical and secular spheres. The Emperor was urged to greater activity in upholding the law and to greater care in choosing his officials. Now as earlier, Wala regarded him as the *totius stabilimentum regni,* on which both the *ordo disciplinae* and the *status rei publicae* reposed. But in regard to the Church he attributed to him only a right of supervision and no real governing power. Like his trusted friend and biographer, Paschasius Radbertus, he probably saw the Emperor in the image of Theodosius rather than of Constantine.

For Wala the Church was an *altera res publica,* established as such on the Sacraments and the Church property and ruled by the bishops. He regarded Church property as a fief committed by God to the clergy; Christ had the sole disposition of it. The Church should carry out its own tasks within the framework of canon law and give an account of its work at annual provincial councils. Since chaplains had no canonically sanctioned superiors and did not fit into the order of the Christian classes of canons, monks, and laity — the canonical rule had not been prescribed for them — in Wala's view the chapel had nothing to justify its existence. The Abbot of Corbie demanded the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and denied the Emperor the disposal of Church offices, while allowing him a right of supervision that was still to be defined as regards its details. He did not exclude the granting of Church property in cases of public necessity. But such grants should be made "ob defensionem magis quam ad rapinam" and by the bishops, not by the direct action of the ruler.

As a testimony of the imperial idea Wala's memorandum was related to the preface of 818–19 and the *admonitio* of 825. The Abbot of Corbie did not deviate from the prevailing fundamental idea. His specific concern was to separate the spiritual and secular spheres so that the two estates of the Empire could thereafter devote themselves to their proper tasks. Bastard institutions such as lay abbacies and court chapel were the main targets of his attack. But Wala did not get bogged down in isolated phenomena and he furthermore distinguished the imperial right of supervision of the Church from the imperial right of ruling the *res publica*.

Although the memorandum unleashed a storm among all factions, it still left a lasting impression. Louis the Pious announced weekly court sessions at Aachen and summoned four synods at Paris, Mainz, Toulouse, and Lyons to investigate abuses in Empire and Church. The *missi,* who were sent out during the octave of Easter in 829, were to question *scabini* and people in regard to abuses. The synods met during the octave of Pentecost. Only the acts of that of Paris, drawn up by Jonas of Orléans, are extant. The first two books, which preceded the decrees, had probably already been sketched by Jonas beforehand. In addition to the episcopate's self-criticism, a real mirror of the official duties of bishops in the spirit of the reform of Louis the Pious, they contained fundamental statements concerning the proper order in Christendom. The Church, it is said, forms a body, which is organized in two classes, here described as *persona sacerdotalis* and *persona regalis.* The King thereby moved to the side of the laity, and this was further emphasized by appeal to Gelasius — "gravius pondus sacerdotum". However, Jonas did not deny the inclusion of the Church in the Empire; he declared at the outset that the Church was confided to the two Emperors for government and protection. The ruler holds his Empire from God, not from his ancestors. In Book II his ecclesiastical task is designated as *defensio.*

Like Wala, the other participants in the Council of Paris saw in the fusion of the spheres a basic evil, which kept them from their ecclesiastical duties, among other things from the convoking of annual provincial councils. However, in this matter there had been a continual improvement since King Pepin's time. Like Wala, the Paris Fathers pressed for the suppression of the court chapel as a bastard institution. But in the acts is to be found no attack on the lay abbacy. Lay abbots, it is said, should lead an honourable life, just like regular abbots. It was conceded that the Emperor had the right to appoint ecclesiastical dignitaries, and he was asked to exercise the greatest care "in bonis pastoribus rectoribusque constituendis". The same care was urged upon him in choosing his secular assistants ("in eligendis adiutoribus vestris et rei publicae ministris"). Here a fine distinction was made between the *constitutio* of the spiritual magnates and the *electio* of the secular magnates by the Emperor. This was in accord with Wala's ideas. But the Fathers of Paris refrained from any polemics. The difficult question of the separating of the spheres and of the *libertas episcopalis* was to be discussed at a later time, "suo tempore". Wala's influence is probably to be seen in the recommendation that public schools be established in three suitable cities of the Empire. Lothar had already set up corresponding schools in Italy.

In August 829 the magnates gathered at Worms for the imperial assembly. The episcopate submitted a full report, which followed the Paris decrees in all respects. But the Emperor did not at all agree with the *relatio episcoporum*. He suspended reform and by a unilateral decree established an inheritance for the now six-year-old Prince Charles, son of the Empress Judith. Swabia, Rhaetia, Alsace, and parts of Burgundy were constituted a duchy for him. This complex of territories did not correspond to any old unity, as did the Kingdoms of Aquitaine, Bavaria, and Italy. Nevertheless, the Emperor intended to make this area a subkingdom. The older sons were clearly surprised by the edict. Following the end of the assembly, Lothar was sent to Italy and his coregency was ended.

The opposition gathered at Corbie. Abbot Wala, now fifty-six years old, represented the glorious Carolingian past, which seemed jeopardized by the suspension of reform and the unilateral disposition of the inheritance. He coined the slogan *pro principe contra principem*. The conspirators, to whose numbers belonged almost all the previously leading personalities, exploited for their ends the expedition against the Bretons which the Emperor and his new adviser, Bernard of Barcelona, had set for Holy Thursday, 14 April 830, with no regard for Holy Week. The *coup d'état* succeeded. The Emperor again took Lothar, who was hurrying back from Italy, as coemperor. The Empress Judith and her brothers were sent to monasteries and their adherents were banished.

The change of government of 829 had been annulled, but new rivalries erupted among the victors. The Abbot of Corbie, who strove honourably for the continuation of the great reform work in Empire and Church, lost control of events. The upshot was a complete *volte-face* at the imperial assemblies of Nijmegen in October 830 and Aachen in February 831. The leaders of the conspiracy were imprisoned and Lothar was sent back to Italy. Wala's "imperial revolution" had been shattered on the person of the Emperor and the egoism of the magnates.

The imperial authority had been compromised by the events of 830–31, while the inner conflicts had been aggravated. But the die was not cast until 831, when Louis abandoned the *ordinatio* and divided the Empire outside of Italy among his three younger sons, Pepin, Louis, and Charles, on the basis of the kingdoms of 817 and the duchy of 829. The result was a fragmentation of *Francia*, which Charles the Great had left intact in 806. Although appeal was made to Charles in order to justify the principle of division — the text of the *divisio* of 831 closely followed that of the *divisio* of 806 — the specific details offended against a basic conception of the first Emperor of the Franks. A stabilizing of the situation did not follow from the new disposition of the inheritance. Instead there were new conflicts with Pepin of Aquitaine and Louis of Bavaria, who now allied with Lothar.

Differing from Wala's *coup d'état* of 830, the revolt of the sons in 833 could only be turned directly against the old Emperor. Lothar, as coemperor, assumed the leadership of the opposition and succeeded in involving Pope Gregory IV as guarantor of the *ordinatio*. The legal basis was provided by the right of resistance, justified in both Christian and Germanic thought. For by annulling the *ordinatio* and disinheriting Pepin, as he planned to do in 832, Louis the Pious had violated dynastic and imperial law. The aim of the opposition was to restore the *ordinatio* and Lothar's coregency and to guarantee the hereditary rights of Pepin and Louis, whose portions were to be enlarged in comparison with the arrangement of 817. The Pope envisaged his role as one of arbitration between the father and the sons. In April he sent an embassy across the Alps to act in accord with this idea.

Louis the Pious had learned of the conspiracy in February 833. He left Aachen for Worms in order to be ready for an attack from Italy and Bavaria and summoned there the higher clergy and the host. But the movement of revolt spread quickly. Lothar marched into Burgundy, where Archbishops Agobard of Lyons and Bernard of Vienne joined him. Even Wala, who was again at Corbie since the revolt of King Louis, decided after much hesitation to follow Lothar's embassy. Agobard wrote a manifesto in defence of the right of the sons against their father. Meanwhile, the bishops who had gathered round the old Emperor sent a sharp resolution to the Pope. They declared the papal intervention to be unlawful and reminded Gregory IV of his oath of loyalty. The Emperor, they said, had modified the *ordinatio* "iuxta rerum opportunitatem", and this modification was irrevocable. The Emperor would explain its justification to the Pope. Finally, they threatened a renunciation of obedience. At the same time the Emperor called upon his sons to submit to him. He placed the chief blame on Lothar. Louis the Pious and his magnates cited the paternal power of coercion and the oath of vassalage taken by the sons and the magnates.

The mutual recriminations made the Pope hesitate. Wala had to remind him that he was a judge only and could not himself be judged. This applied, of course, only to the religious sphere, but the old Emperor had actually rendered himself guilty of sin in the eyes of the conspirators by annulling the *ordinatio,* issued "divina inspiratione". In his rejoinder to the bishops Gregory IV stressed that he had come, not as a partisan of Lothar, but on his own initiative as an arbiter of peace. He justified this by his ecclesiastical office, whose special task and higher dignity he underscored in the spirit of Gelasius. To the duty of unconditional obedience as understood by the bishops loyal to Louis he contrasted the Christian view of the oath of loyalty, which obliged him also to rebuke the Emperor for offences against the unity of the Church and Empire. A decision in regard to the *ordinatio,* he said, could not be rendered by one faction, but only by all, who had also the right to reconsider unilateral decisions of the Emperor. But a withdrawal of obedience from the Pope would mean schism.

It is beyond doubt that the arguments in the papal reply corresponded to the spirit of the imperial legislation preceding the crisis — but Louis the Pious had abandoned just this foundation. An award by battle seemed inevitable. The two armies faced each other near Colmar on 24 June 833. In this situation the papal mediation now became appropriate. The Pope proceeded to the Emperor and returned with peace proposals to the sons' camp. But it was too late. In the meantime the rebels' propaganda had its effect, and the army of Louis the Pious deserted to the other side. The old Emperor went with the Empress to the camp of the sons. Before long Gregory IV could not fail to understand that he had been used, and he returned, "grief stricken", to Rome.

There occurred what Wala had foreseen with resignation: the loss of all power by the old Emperor. The three older brothers disposed of the Empire as they pleased in a new division which excluded the ten-year-old Charles. He was supposed to become a monk at Prüm. This time there was a real division, with an immediate taking of possession. The shares of Pepin and Louis did not correspond to the *divisio* of 831 but were larger than had been the case in 817. The strict subordination of the Kings to the Emperor ceased, but a loose imperial suzerainty was maintained. The family of their father was naturally turned over to Lothar. He had Louis the Pious taken to Saint-Médard de Soissons, the Empress Judith to Tortona, and young Charles to Prüm.

Lothar held a general assembly of the Empire at Compiègne in October. The leading men in his council still included Hugh, Matfrid, and Lambert, but not Wala and Hilduin, whose places had been taken by Ebbo of Reims and Agobard of Lyons. They urged the deposition of Louis the Pious, which could not be avoided after all that had happened, even if Wala and Hilduin refused to have anything to do with such a sentence. Since there was no precedent for the deposition, the legal basis had to be first created. For almost twenty years the imperial office had been understood, in Schieffer's words, "as a divine commission and as an ecclesiastical function". A legal basis for a process existed, so it could be concluded, if the Emperor denied the duties of his *ministerium,* the realization of *pax et concordia* in the Christian world. Whether this was actually the case could be determined only by the bishops as the "appointed representatives of the Church". And so, during the assembly of Compiègne, the episcopate assembled at nearby Soissons. The accusations, which were made by Ebbo of Reims, comprised *sacrilegium, homicidium,* and *periurium.* Louis the Pious, it was said, had broken the promise made to Charles the Great in 813 by his evil treatment of his relatives and by allowing the killing of Bernard in 818. He had cancelled the *ordinatio* and frivolously made sport of the divisions of the Empire and the oaths of the people. He had profaned Lent, disregarded the obligations he had assumed in 830, permitted the Empress to commit perjury, and led his army against Christians. The Emperor confessed that he had unworthily administered the office of ruler that had been entrusted to him. He handed the clergy a list of his failures, laid aside his arms, and was garbed as a penitent. The purpose of this procedure was to render the Emperor unqualified for his office.

The proceedings were a logical development from the idea of the *Imperium christianum,* but the indictment was a distortion by factional politics. By piling up the charges, the Emperor's enemies were depriving the decisive arguments of any weight. Louis could not be reproached with the events of 814 and 818, for which he had long before done voluntary penance. The combination of ecclesiastical penance and deposition in the proceedings was open to attack. In his *Liber de reverentia filiorum* Rhabanus Maurus put his finger on the critical points. Excommunication, he said, could not result from crimes which the Emperor had not committed, for the punishment of traitors was imperial law; ecclesiastical penance could never lead to deposition, for he who performed it was by that very fact restored to the communion of the Church. Rhabanus dodged the central problem — the revocation of the *ordinatio* and the disinheriting of Pepin. But his explanation of ecclesiastical penance hit the mark. In actuality there was only one way of rendering the Emperor disqualified for office, and that was entrance into the cloister. Lothar's faction wanted to persuade Louis the Pious to take this step. But the old Emperor refused to acquiesce by declining to come to a decision before his personal liberty had been restored. Lothar could not agree to this condition, since the deposition of the father had produced a change of mood in the Empire, and so Louis the Pious remained for the moment in the custody of his oldest son.

The situation became the more intolerable, the longer it endured. Pepin and Louis the German did not recognize the deposition of their father. They were in an easy situation, since without prejudice to their own interests they could evade the final consequences of the revolt of 833. And so all the odium of the rebellion fell ultimately on Lothar. In addition, new rivalries broke out between Lothar's advisers, Matfrid and Lambert. Wala sought in vain to set the reform of the Empire in motion again.

The adherents of the old Emperor gathered around Louis the German, who in December 833 demanded the release of the father. Once more there was a full reaction. Lothar was forced back to Italy in 834, and Wala and the leading spiritual and secular magnates followed. Louis the Pious, after his solemn restoration to the throne in February 835, had the archbishops who were the most seriously compromised deposed — those of Reims, Lyons, Vienne, and Narbonne — but refrained from any new disposition of the inheritance. He sought peace with Lothar, which Wala especially advocated on the part of the coemperor. But the Abbot of Corbie was not to witness the reconciliation of the two Emperors, for he died in an epidemic in 836. His death, even under the changed circumstances, was another serious loss for the Carolingian Dynasty and Empire. The tragedy of the Empire was fundamentally the tragedy of Wala, since from the place where he was standing he was not able to halt fate, but rather by his initiative accelerated it. "Virum magnum fuisse constat", said Leibniz concerning him, "sed Catonis fato mala publica acrioribus remediis exasperasse".

The establishing of a portion for his youngest son Charles remained a chief concern of the old Emperor. The death of Pepin of Aquitaine opened the way for a new arrangement of the inheritance. At Worms in 839 Louis the Pious divided the Frankish Empire between Lothar and Charles. Pepin's sons were disinherited, and Louis the German was restricted to Bavaria. Peace did not thereby return, for the injured parties revolted. But the opposition was clearly defeated, and had to remain defeated, if Lothar and Charles stayed together. In this expectation Louis the Pious died on 20 June 840, on an island in the Rhine near Ingelheim.

SECTION FIVE

The Western Church from the Death of Louis the Pious to the End of the Carolingian Period

Chapter 19

The Frankish Empire from 840 to 875

The judgment that history would render on the future of the Frankish Empire lay with Lothar I. The Emperor could have been satisfied with the partition of 839 and, so far as can be ascertained, could have enforced it even against Louis the German. Thus the Carolingian Empire would have been spared the rude shocks of the next years. But Lothar, who was then forty-five years old and a mature man, was not inclined to recognize his brother Charles, scarcely seventeen years old, as an equal partner and resumed the struggle over the *ordinatio.* In this struggle he met defeat. On 25 June 841 Louis the German and Charles the Bald gained the upper hand on the bloody field of Fontanet near Auxerre, concerning which Regino of Prüm said later that it broke the power of the Franks. The higher Frankish nobility pressed for an understanding. The three brothers met on 5 June 842 at Mâcon, where they concluded an armistice. Long and stubborn negotiations at Metz and Koblenz finally produced the Treaty of Verdun at the beginning of August 843. The *regna* of Italy, Bavaria, and Aquitaine constituted the point of departure for the partition of Verdun. The other territories of the *Imperium* were distributed on the basis of *aequa portio,* but probably from the start it had been settled that Lothar, as Emperor and head of the dynasty, should receive the *sedes* of Aachen. Such was the origin of Lothar's Middle Kingdom, which comprised Italy, the Provençal-Burgundian districts between the Alps, the Rhone, and the Saône, *Francia media* between the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, and Frisia. Louis received Germany, except for Frisia, and, to the left of the Rhine, the districts of Mainz, Worms, and Speyer, with their rich domains.

The kingdoms created at Verdun lacked internal cohesion. This has always been stressed with reference to Lothar's Middle Kingdom, but it is true also of the East and the West Frankish Kingdoms. For the great linguistic families were not yet relevant to nationality; important in this regard were rather the older tribal and territorial communities of which the Carolingian Empire was composed. Their amalgamation into larger nationalities was now a task rather than a fact. The East Frankish Kingdom possessed a relatively archaic structure, as yet hardly affected by the Carolingian theocracy. In various sections an abandonment of Carolingian institutions, termed a "process of de-Frankization" by Tellenbach, can be ascertained. Louis the German and his successors issued no East Frankish capitularies, the *missatica* and the comital organization decayed and were transformed. The episcopate, still preoccupied with missionary work in Saxony, appeared as assistant to the kingship but not as an autonomous political factor. A change here did not get under way until toward the end of the ninth century.

In contrast to the East Frankish Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom and the West Frankish Kingdom had extensive coasts, which from the outbreak of war among the brothers became more and more the goal of Viking and Muslim pirates. The instability of both these kingdoms was in contrast to the relative stability of the East Frankish Kingdom. The West Frankish Kingdom had the most difficult start. Nowhere was the position of the Frankish imperial aristocracy and of the episcopacy so strong as it was in western *Francia* and in western Burgundy, where the ideas of the days of Louis the Pious made their strongest impact. The West Frankish Kingdom took shape in conflicts between King, episcopate, and secular magnates. Here the peace-concept of the older capitularies was developed further into the peace agreement among the magnates and between the King and the magnates. Even in 843 Charles the Bald had to conclude the Treaty of Coulaines with the magnates, in which the *honor ecclesiae,* the *honor regis,* and the *honor fidelium* were defined and guaranteed in writing. The West Frankish Kingdom became a juridical association based on the totality of the *fideles*. The consent of the magnates to the capitularies became obligatory.

Charles sought to compensate for the weakness of the royal authority by a new religious enhancement of the kingship. When he decided to recover Aquitaine he had himself anointed at Orléans in 848 by the Archbishop of Sens. This anointing was followed by a second in 869, performed by the Archbishop of Reims at Metz and regarded as consolidating Charles's claims to the Kingdom of Lothar II. The Carolingian notion of Empire and State acquired a profound expression in the rich symbolism of the coronation ritual. Hincmar of Reims drew up this ritual and gave it its definitive form in the coronation *ordo* of 877. According to Schramm, "The King was thereafter a *christus Domini,* separated from the laity, anointed like a priest". Nevertheless, he was not an absolute ruler, for Hincmar included in the *promissio* of his ritual the obligations of the King as first specified at Coulaines; in this *promissio* the King bound himself to the duties of his office. The *ordo* of 877 continued in use for more than two centuries; even later it was merely adjusted to circumstances rather than changed in its basic features. It became the exemplar for the drawing up of the coronation ritual in Spain, England, and Germany.

"De-Frankization" in the East, elaboration of the Carolingian political theory in the West, stagnation in the Middle Kingdom — these were the characteristics of a process of individuation. But it must not be forgotten that, despite this, the Frankish *Imperium* was still regarded as a unity even in the late ninth century. The treaty sealed the defeat of the Carolingian imperial office, but people still held to the idea of one *Imperium* and of one *populus christianus*. The brothers ruled, not separate states, but parts of the one Empire, which was henceforth represented by the *corpus fratrum*. The juridical connection that ensued was expressed in the Treaty of Verdun by the words *amicitia, pax,* and *mutuum adiutorium*. It consisted in a mutual right of succession and in a common domestic and foreign policy, which should be determined from time to time at the "Frankish Diets", regular meetings of the Carolingian partners in government. Furthermore, the community of the several kingdoms was expressed also in the gatherings of the episcopate and in the possessions, rights, and relationships of the imperial aristocracy, which at first encompassed the entire *Imperium*.

Lothar did not straightway in 843 inter the idea of a supremacy of the Emperor. In the West the situation was not yet calm, and so the Emperor aspired to isolate the Western King by diplomatic means and to renew his own supremacy in a roundabout way by exploiting the Church. At Lothar's request Drogo of Metz in 844 obtained the post of papal vicar north of the Alps with the right to convoke councils of the three kingdoms, control provincial councils, supervise all bishops and abbots, and act as intermediate tribunal in appeals to Rome. However, the papal delegation remained ineffectual and the attempt to separate Louis the German from Charles the Bald miscarried. The Frankish Diet of Thionville of October 844 was due to the initiative of Louis. In their *communiqués* the three Carolingian rulers stressed the notion of *fraternitas;* they ordered the restoration of Church property and of the Church's rights and threatened the Western opposition with a common enforcement.

Charles the Bald gathered in the harvest of Thionville by arranging the election in April 845 of the monk Hincmar of Saint-Denis as Archbishop of Reims. The election was a masterstroke. Earlier, on the occasion of Wala's *coup d'état,* Hincmar had remained loyal to Louis the Pious. But he had also stood up for his teacher and friend, Abbot Hilduin of Saint-Denis, to whom Lothar had given the archbishopric of Cologne in 842 and the office of archchancellor in 843. Thus the new Archbishop of Reims may have appeared as the proper intermediary between Charles and Lothar. As a matter of fact, Lothar dropped Ebbo in 845, but again took up his complaints the next year. He obtained from the Pope the convoking of an imperial synod to Trier (846), where the problem of Reims should be treated again. The Carolingians met for a second Frankish Diet at Meersen in February 847. After the Meersen meeting Lothar gave up any idea of an imperial restoration and at Péronne in 849 became definitely reconciled with Charles the Bald.

The Viking peril, which threatened equally the Middle and the West Frankish Kingdoms, may have been one reason for the reconciliation of the brothers. But there were other reasons too. Lothar I was growing old and thinking of putting his affairs in order. In 850 he had his oldest son, Louis II, crowned Emperor by the Pope. He needed the agreement of his brothers for the regulation of the inheritance that he was planning. The third Frankish Diet, held at Meersen in 851, marked the climax of the *fraternitas*. In their common capitulary the brothers spoke only of the one *Regnum Francorum*. Each of them bound himself not to disturb the authority of the partners, by propaganda or interference, in the future, and the agreement was expressly extended to include the heirs of each. The twenty-year-old strife seemed definitely to have been laid to rest. The clergy in particular placed great hopes on the Diet of Meersen, for they anticipated a renewal of ecclesiastical life in the entire Empire and the resumption of the reform of Louis the Pious.

In the late summer of 855 Lothar I divided his dominions among his three sons, Louis II, Lothar II, and Charles. The coemperor Louis had to be content with Italy, which he had been governing since 840. Lothar II received *Francia media* with the capital Aachen and neighbouring Frisia and northern Burgundy (the ecclesiastical provinces of Besançon and Geneva). Charles obtained southern Burgundy (provinces of Lyons and Vienne) and Provence. By this partition of his inheritance Lothar I set the seal on his renunciation of the idea of imperial unity. Following the disposal of his lands he entered the monastery of Prüm, where he died a few days later, on 29 September 855. In the same year occurred the deaths of Pope Leo IV and Drogo of Metz, imperial archchaplain and papal vicar beyond the Alps. Lothar's Archchancellor Hilduin, former Abbot of Saint-Denis, entered Prüm with the Emperor and thereby withdrew from the stage of the great world. He did not long survive his imperial master at Prüm. Thus with Lothar I disappeared the last fighters for one *Imperium Francorum*. It now had to be seen whether *fraternitas* could supply for the *Imperium*.

The years between the Treaty of Verdun and the death of Lothar I later seemed to be an interlude in the process of Frankish decay. Lothar I was both Emperor and senior member of the dynasty, but his death completely altered this situation. The partition of his inheritance wrecked the equilibrium of the partner-kingdoms and complicated the relations of the partner-kings. Imperial dignity and seniority parted company. The senior member of the dynasty was now Louis the German. The imperial office, having passed to Louis II, King of Italy, forfeited all authority within the Carolingian family, though its influence on the papacy persisted.

Of the five partner-kings Lothar I's youngest son, the sickly Charles of

Provence, retired from any real activity, leaving the political game to be played by two uncles, Louis the German and Charles the Bald, and two nephews, Louis II of Italy and Lothar II of Lotharingia. Doubtless the most powerful of the four was Louis the German, although the rising Moravian state gave him trouble from 855. In 858 he received an appeal from a faction of the West Frankish nobility, who, in agreement with Archbishop Wenilo of Sens, invited the head of the dynasty into the country against Charles the Bald. Charles's position seemed desperate at first, but the loyalty of the episcopate of the provinces of Reims and Rouen finally saved his crown. Louis the German had to withdraw in January 859 — the abortive effort ruined his prestige in the entire Empire. At a synod held at Metz in May 859 and comprising the West Frankish and Lotharingian episcopates, his action was sharply condemned as a breach of *fraternitas* and an attack on the unity of the Church. Hincmar of Reims and Gunthar of Cologne delivered the synodal letter to the East Frankish King. Louis the German fell back upon his own episcopate and counteracted a complaint lodged with the Pope by his imperial nephew. Lothar II effected a reconciliation between the uncles. At Koblenz on 5 June 860, *fraternitas* was restored at a Frankish Diet on the basis of the Meersen decrees of 851. The attempt of the senior Carolingian to establish his pre-eminence in the *Imperium* had failed.

The marriage of Lothar II produced further confusion. Lothar II seems to have married Theutberga, sister of the powerful Duke Hubert of Transjurane Burgundy — the districts of Geneva, Lausanne, and Sion — for political reasons only. The marriage remaining childless, he soon returned to his former mistress, Waldrada, by whom he had a son, Hugh, and a daughter, Gisela. Hugh and Gisela were to be legitimated by his marriage with Waldrada, for in the course of the reform the ecclesiastical view had been upheld — that only legitimate children were entitled to inherit. The dispute over the royal marriage first took place before Lotharingian courts in 858 and 860. After an extorted confession of guilt, Queen Theutberga was condemned by the episcopate of Lothar's kingdom to public penance for incest. But in the fall of 860 she succeeded in fleeing to Charles the Bald. Once free, the unhappy Queen appealed to Rome, whereupon Lothar also sent an embassy to the Pope.

The marriage case had, as mentioned, not only a religious and ecclesiastical but also a political aspect. Lothar II could count on the sympathy of his brothers, who were likewise without male heirs, especially since he approached them with territorial cessions in 858–59. He thought he had bound his two uncles to himself by his mediation of peace in 859–60. But Charles the Bald wrecked the Carolingian solidarity and supported Theutberga's appeal. The papal reply was some time in coming, and Lothar II decided to act. A third Synod of Aachen, in April 862, authorized him to remarry. He communicated the decision to the Pope and requested papal sanction also. He did not, however, await the papal decision, but married Waldrada in the same year, 862.

The West Frankish King continued to support Theutberga. He agreed to the demand of Hincmar of Reims that the question of the marriage should be examined at a general Frankish synod. Pope Nicholas I did not intervene in the marriage case until November 862. He delegated Bishops Radoald of Porto and John of Cervia to investigate the matter at a new synod at Metz, in which the kingdoms of Louis the German, Charles the Bald, and Charles of Provence should each be represented by two bishops. Since Charles of Provence died in January 863 and the partition of his lands between his brothers, the Emperor Louis II and King Lothar II, took time, the March date that had first been decided could not be adhered to. Meanwhile, the Pope had received news of Lothar's remarriage. In a letter he called upon the Frankish episcopate in Gaul and Germany to condemn the King to ecclesiastical penance. But events at first followed an entirely different course. The synod convened at Metz in June 863, but no bishops represented the East and the West Frankish Kingdoms. The legates, bribed by Lothar, published the papal instructions only in a distorted form. The synod ratified the annulment of Lothar's marriage with Theutberga and declared the lawfulness of his marriage with Waldrada. Archbishops Gunthar of Cologne and Theutgaud of Trier were commissioned to convey the synodal decrees to the Pope.

Nicholas I could not but have been furious at the course of events, but he prepared his countermeasures in the greatest secrecy, perhaps out of concern about complications with the Emperor Louis II. In October 863 the two archbishops were summoned to an assembly of clergy and laity at the Lateran. There the Pope delivered a staggering blow. Not content to annul the Metz decrees, he deposed the Archbishops of Cologne and Trier and forbade the filling of the now vacant sees without his consent.

The Pope's sentences hit the two archbishops like a bolt from the blue. They had recourse to the Emperor, who appeared in Rome with troops at the beginning of 864. Nicholas I had formally put himself in the wrong, since his summary procedure against Cologne and Trier was irregular from the point of view of canon law. But the moral position of Lothar II's accusers was extremely weak. Hence Louis II gave up the idea of using force against the Pope, who, however, had to accept the imperial man of confidence, Arsenius of Orta, as permanent *apocrisiarius* in Rome. The two archbishops remained deposed.

The two uncles were not observing the course of events idly. On 9 February 865 they met at Thuzey near Toul, where they confirmed the Koblenz *fraternitas* and in a common message advised their nephew to make his peace with the Church. But they also turned down the papal invitation to a Roman synod. It was clear that Lothar for his part must now submit to the Pope. He again took back Theutberga and handed over Waldrada to the papal legate.

Waldrada, to be sure, escaped and returned to Lothar. The game was resumed, but the Pope remained firm and excommunicated Waldrada. In May 867, or possibly June 868, Louis the German and Charles the Bald met again, this time in the old royal city of Metz. Here they not only renewed the decrees of Thuzey; they also came to an agreement in regard to the eventual partition of the kingdoms of both nephews and their common assumption of the protection of the Roman Church. The days of the imperial office and of the Middle Kingdom seemed numbered. The East Frankish and the West Frankish Kings, who had once allied for defence against the imperial aspirations of the lord of Aachen and of Rome, now joined to partition the kingdoms of Rome, or at least of Pavia, and of Aachen.

The situation of their northern nephew looked desperate. Lothar II announced a journey to Rome. The Pope stated his preconditions: dismissal of Waldrada, full rights for Theutberga, and canonical elections at Cologne and Trier. At this dramatic moment the unexpected occurred: on 13 November 867 Pope Nicholas I died. His successor, Hadrian II, was regarded as being a rather saintly man, and it was expected that his hand would be gentler in the great ecclesiastical affairs. By the mediation of the Emperor Louis II and of the Empress Engelberga, Lothar met Hadrian at Montecassino on 1 July 869. The Pope even gave him communion — but in a manner equivalent to an ordeal. A Roman council, attended by the episcopate of all the Frankish kingdoms, was to take up the whole question anew in the spring of 870. But this did not happen, for Lothar II died at Piacenza on 8 August 869, on his return from Italy.

The death of the unfortunate prince ended a long conflict, but sealed the fate of the line of Lothar I, which was now represented only by the Emperor Louis II, who had no son. The Emperor was fighting against the Muslims in South Italy. Even before he could lay claim to his brother's inheritance, his uncle, Charles the Bald, appeared in Metz, where he had himself crowned King of Lotharingia on 9 September 869. Louis the German, immobilized by illness, did not put in an appearance until 870. At Meersen in August 870 the two uncles partitioned the inheritance of Lothar II, in conformity with the agreement of 867. The Emperor's protest against the *fait accompli* was seconded by the Pope but remained ineffective. In a personal discussion with the Empress Engelberga in May 872 Louis the German did indeed cede his share of Lotharingia to his imperial nephew, but this purely formal concession, probably made with an eye to the succession to Italy, did not affect the actual situation. To the Emperor a united Christian front in South Italy appeared finally as more important than a quarrel over inheritance in his own family. He consumed his strength in the struggle against the Muslims and died on 12 August 875. With him expired the male line of the family of Lothar I, in which the imperial dignity had been hereditary. The Frankish kingdoms entered a new phase of their history.

CHAPTER 20

Spain and the British Isles
The Muslim and Viking Attacks on the West

The Frankish *Imperium* represented Western Christendom into the ninth century. Not that its boundaries embraced the entire West. But even under Louis the Pious Carolingian influence still extended to Spain and England. It was the crisis of the *Imperium* that first produced a decline of Frankish prestige.

King Alfonso II of Asturias (791–842), who rejected the claim of the Emir of Córdoba to tribute, had to resist serious Islamic attacks in 791–96, which placed the very existence of his state in peril. He had to rely upon the friendship of the Franks. The Frankish alliance proved good in the years from 797 to 822; Islamic attacks slackened and finally ceased entirely. At this time the Franks were able to push their frontier beyond the Pyrenees. They established the March of Spain and a suzerainty of Basque Navarre, annexing Pamplona around 796–98. Frankish rule in Pamplona remained precarious, it is true, and in 824 Navarre became independent under Iñigo II of the House of Asturias. Thus arose a second, though very small, Christian kingdom in Spain. But even in 828 the Christians in remote Mérida applied not only to the Asturians but also to Louis the Pious for help in a revolt against the Emir of Córdoba. The Christians of Asturias had then withstood a second Islamic offensive (823 – c. 828), which was to be followed by a third (839–41). Both tides of this holy war sent waves also against the Franks. But they died down before the Pyrenees and the Asturo-Cantabrian mountains. Alfonso II had saved Asturias.

Sources from the late ninth century report that the King re-established the *ordo Gothorum*. Alfonso II restored the capital, Oviedo, following its destruction by Islamic troops in 794 and 795. He had himself anointed as King in 791 on the model of the Visigothic Kings, the first Asturian ruler to do so. He reorganized the central administration in imitation of the former royal court at Toledo and set up a provincial administration under *comites* and *iudices*. The *Lex Visigothorum* again became the national law, and the *Collectio Hispana* formed the basis for the reorganizing of the Church. Even the beginnings of the great sanctuary of Santiago go back to the time of Alfonso II. Relics of the Apostle James the Greater had perhaps been carried to safety from Mérida to the church of Our Lady at Compostela near the Galician episcopal city of Iria in 711–12. James the Greater became the patron of the Christians in the struggle for the existence of Asturias against Córdoba, and Alfonso II had the first church of Santiago de Compostela built.

The King left his successors a still small but already firmly established kingdom, which laid claim to all of Spain as the continuation of the Visigothic

Kingdom. The realization of this claim was, of course, in the still distant future. *Al Andalus,* the Emirate of Córdoba, was then experiencing its summertime under the Umayyads Abd-ar-Rahman II (822–52) and Muhammad I (852–86). The Arabic civilization of Andalusia was in flower and attracted many Christians, so that conversions to Islam increased. The Mozarab Christians enjoyed religious freedom, but as a tolerated ghetto community to which any public activity was prohibited. While the religion of the numerically relatively small conquering class was subject to no restrictions, all propaganda was forbidden to the Church. The death penalty was inflicted for efforts at conversion.

The bishops, who had to be confirmed by the conquerors, submitted, but toward the end of the 840's there was opposition in the ranks of the lower clergy, the monks, and the laity of Córdoba, the capital, to the increasing assimilation. Between these groups and the Muslims there occurred spirited confrontations in the decade 850–59. The integralist Christians did not evade discussions on the divinity of Jesus and Muhammad's office as a prophet. They even provoked them and accepted death in return. The episcopate of the province of Seville condemned their actions in 852 at a synod in Córdoba under the presidency of the metropolitan, Reccafrid. The leader of the Córdoba opposition, which had the sympathy of the overwhelmingly Christian population of Mérida and Toledo, was the priest Eulogius. He was imprisoned for having concealed a Muslim woman who had become a Christian and was finally executed in 859, after the Toledans had pointedly elected him their metropolitan, useless though this was. The Córdoba martyrdoms reverberated even in the Frankish Empire. Audradus of Sens expected a Frankish intervention under the patronage of Saint Martin of Tours to liberate Spanish Christianity, but of course Charles the Bald was unable to appreciate such hopes and maintained peace with the emirate. On the strength of this peace the monks of Saint-Germain-des-Prés asked and obtained relics of the Córdoba martyrs.

In default of the Franks, it was the Asturians who continued to embody the *Reconquista.* Under Alfonso III (866–910) they reached beyond the Asturo-Cantabrian mountains and, despite the resistance of the Emirs, resettled the no-man's-land, created as a defensive measure by Alfonso I (739–57), as far as the Douro. Viseu and Lamego, León, Zamora, Simancas, and Burgos came to life again as cities or strongholds. Among the colonists were many Mozarabs from the emirate, especially from Toledo. The size of the kingdom was doubled by the newly erected Marches of León and Castile, which soon became the chief protagonists of the *Reconquista.* Alfonso III did not remain content with this, but turned his court into an intellectual centre of the country, in this imitating the Carolingians. Still, one cannot speak of a Spanish branch of the Carolingian Renaissance, since the Spanish development was overwhelmingly focused on its Visigothic past. This clearly appears in the court historiography, which resumed the historiography of the Visigothic period, interrupted around 700, and strongly emphasized the continuity of the Kingdoms of Toledo and Oviedo. Alfonso III established a new policy of friendship for Navarre, but still insisted on the recognition of the Asturian hegemony. He thought of acquiring a *corona imperialis* from the treasure of Saint-Martin de Tours, which would have given a symbolic expression to his position of leadership. In a letter of 906 to the abbey he styled himself *Rex Hispaniae*. It cannot be decided with certainty whether he introduced the imperial title to express his claim to all of Spain.

The continuous rise of Asturias in the ninth century was unparalleled in Western Christendom. England at this time shared the fate of the Carolingian Empire. The supremacy of the Kings of Mercia had reached its climax under Offa (757–96) and came to an end in 825. Like the Carolingians, the Mercian Kings had convoked assemblies composed of both ecclesiastics and laymen, which met usually at the royal residences from 746 to 816 and regulated especially gifts of land to the Church, but also questions of the ecclesiastical order — the bishops' right and duty of supervision, monasticism, the proprietary church, liturgy and feast days, marriage and economic morality. Offa fostered the shrine of the chief British martyr, Alban of Verulam, which lay within his narrow sphere of power. The Mercian ecclesiastical province of Lichfield that he established lasted only a short time, from 788–802. And an attempt by his successor, Cenwulf (796–821), to transfer the southern English metropolitan see to London failed. Canterbury remained the metropolis of the southern province, which extended to the Humber. The assimilation of the Anglo-Saxon to the Frankish Church, which was inaugurated under Offa by a papal legation of 786–87, made further progress after Offa's death. Archbishop Wulfred of Canterbury (805–32) introduced the *vita canonica* in his cathedral. Vernacular religious literature, which had begun with Caedmon in Bede's time, was continued by the Mercian Cynewulf in the ninth century and thematically enriched by the incorporation of legends, homilies, biblical commentaries, and liturgical poetry. However, the promising development of the Anglo-Saxon Church came to a premature end because of the invasions of the Vikings.

Mercia's great age was past when the fury of the Vikings hit England. At the middle of the ninth century four independent Anglo-Saxon kingdoms coexisted: Wessex, Mercia, Northumbria, and East Anglia. The first Viking expeditions, proceeding from politically fragmented Norway in the late eighth century, had only grazed England. The main storm centre of the Norwegian Vikings had fallen upon the group of islands in the North Sea and had flooded over to Scotland and Ireland. Lindisfarne was sacked in 793, Jarrow in 794. In 795 the Vikings destroyed the grave and church of Saint Columba on the island of Rechru; in 798 they ruined Saint Patrick's in Galloway and in 820 occupied the Isle of Man. Thereafter arose Viking states on the Orkneys, the Hebrides, and in Ireland at Dublin, from which the Norwegians also attacked the Scottish and British western coasts. They soon sailed the old sea-routes from Ireland to the west coast of Gaul and appeared early at the mouths of the Loire and the Garonne. Here they encountered the Danes.

Unification of the state had begun earlier in Denmark than in Norway. King Göttrik had opposed Charles the Great. King Horik (c. 825–54), a descendant of Göttrik, showed himself to be well disposed toward Anschar's mission, though he himself remained a pagan. But in 854 he fell in battle against his nephew Guthrum, and with him the Danish Kingdom came to an end for the time being. The Scandinavian mission, already badly hurt by the destruction of Hamburg in 845, now suffered a second and seemingly mortal blow. Archbishop Anschar, to whom Louis the German had assigned Bremen as see, clung to his missionary assignment until his death in 865, but the few mission stations which continued to exist in Denmark and Sweden under his successor Rembert (865–88) were doomed to destruction.

The great Viking expeditions of the Danes began in 834–35 and were directed against both the Frisian-Frankish and the Anglo-Saxon coastal districts. In Britain it was Kent that was the most exposed, but the Vikings soon extended their operations to East Anglia and Lindsey. The situation was aggravated when around 850 they proceeded to winter in their areas of activity. The crisis reached its height when the various enterprises were coordinated under the leadership of Ivar and Halfdan, sons of Ragnar Lodbrok, and the "Great Army" prepared to overwhelm England in 865. One after the other, Northumbria, East Anglia, and Mercia fell into the hands of the Danes, who proceeded to settle down and established kingdoms of their own. Only Wessex stood firm. Alfred the Great (871–99) assumed the government of Wessex at the beginning of the crisis. Matters hung by a thread for almost a decade until 879, when Alfred achieved the decisive victory of Edington over the Viking King Guthrum, who had himself baptized as an admission of defeat. The mutual boundaries were established in the peace of 886. Alfred claimed the territories south of the city of London, but north of the Thames only the southwestern part of the former Kingdom of Mercia, which now became a province of Wessex. The reconquest of the Danish part of England, the Danelaw, began only with the victory of Tettenhall in 910 under Alfred's son Edward.

After a half-century of struggle and of the occupation of extensive parts of England by the Danish Vikings, complete chaos reigned in the ecclesiastical sphere. The Northumbria of Bede, Willibrord, and Alcuin no longer existed, and in the other territories also the cathedrals were burned and the monasteries destroyed. Bishops and abbots, with their clergy and communities, often led a fugitive existence for years, and many sees remained vacant for years, some for decades. Still, in the end the Church did not perish, even in the Danelaw, and only a few episcopal sees, such as Lindisfarne, were so thoroughly destroyed that they could not be reoccupied. The immigrant Scandinavian pagans could be gradually assimilated. But the intellectual and moral retrogression was enormous, for the dispersal of chapters and religious communities meant the disappearance of the *élite* that had taken care of the candidates for the clerical state.

Alfred the Great recognized this critical situation and sought to remedy it. He summoned men to his court from areas that had been least affected by the devastation: his friend and biographer Asser from Wales; Waerferth and Plegmund, who became Bishops of Worchester and Canterbury, from eastern Mercia; and from the continent the Gallo-Frank Grimbald and the Old Saxon John. To the last mentioned he entrusted the abbey of Athelney, his "Saint-Denis". The King, who felt it to be a defect that in his youth he had received no training in the *artes* and theology, had fundamental texts of Christian literature translated into Anglo-Saxon: the *Regula pastoralis* and the *Dialogi* of Gregory the Great, *De consolatione philosophiae* of Boethius, Augustine's *Soliloquia,* which was expanded into an anthology on immortality, and finally the historical works of Orosius *(Adversus paganos)* and Bede *(Historia ecclesiastica)*. In the prologue of his law code Alfred referred to the Jewish-Christian law. Bede and other sources formed the basis for the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* a history of Britain from Caesar to Alfred in Old English. What was here hinted in its basic idea — the claim to an imperial hegemony in Britain — was stated *expressis verbis* by Asser in his Latin biography of the King.

Alfred the Great became the founder of Old English prose literature through the literary work of his court circle, in which, like his contemporary, Alfonso III of Asturias, he personally participated. In his translations the King had in mind the free youth of his kingdom, who in the future were to acquire a knowledge of reading and writing in the vernacular at the schools. The higher Latin education was prescribed for the clergy. In this field the Wessex court circle produced nothing, and hence its limits become visible here. Wessex did not experience a comprehensive intellectual and spiritual reform, such as that of Charles the Great; it lacked the external presuppositions in an age which had not yet recovered from severe struggles.

The sufferings of the Frankish Empire were not less than the trials of Britain and Ireland, especially since at the same time the Carolingians had to fight also against the Muslims, who, like the Vikings, made their appearance in pirate bands and launched their attacks against the mouths of the great rivers. The Vikings who invaded the Frankish Empire were entirely of Danish origin, like those operating in England. At times there were even mutual relations between the enterprises in the Frankish Empire and in Britain: the plundering bands concentrated at a given time at the points of least resistance.

The first goal of the Danish Vikings on the continent was Frisia. Dorestad was plundered annually from 834 to 837. Following a brief pause, caused by the last effective defence measures of Louis the Pious, new plundering raids began in 841 during the war among the royal brothers. Lothar I handed over the County of Zeeland to the Dane Rorik and thereby made him "custodian" of the mouths of the Meuse and the Scheldt. In the same year another Danish band appeared at the mouth of the Seine and burned Rouen. In 842 it was the turn of Quentovic, the most important centre for the transit trade to and from England. The Danes established themselves at the Seine mouth in 845 and at the Loire mouth in 846. From the latter place they dislodged a Norwegian group that had already destroyed Nantes in 843. Bordeaux went up in flames in 848. An iron ring extended along the Frankish coast from the Rhine to the Garonne.

At first the Frankish defence broke down completely. Lothar I did not succeed in ridding himself of his troublesome Danish vassal in Zeeland after the Treaty of Verdun. Dorestad, the chief Carolingian centre for commerce with Scandinavia, was ruined in these struggles, having endured its seventh and final sack in 863. Rorik established a Dano-Frisian domain, which on his death passed to his countryman Gotfrid, possibly a relative.

In the years 856–62 western *Francia* experienced a great invasion staged by the Seine Vikings. Paris, already sacked in 843, was taken again in 856 and 861. The invasion first centred on the territory between the Loire and the Seine, then on the districts on the Somme, where its effects were particularly severe, since these areas had received the fugitives from the Seine. The great Carolingian abbeys of Saint-Wandrille, Saint-Riquier, Saint-Bertin, and Saint-Omer went up in flames. Only with the aid of a group of Vikings whom he recruited was Charles the Bald finally able to redress the situation.

In the meantime, however, other Viking bands, which had returned from a Mediterranean expedition, fell upon the districts between the Loire and the Garonne and in 862–6 pushed deep into the interior, to Orléans and Clermont. Especially hard hit was Aquitaine, where numerous episcopal sees were abandoned and long remained vacant, including the metropolitan see of Bordeaux. On the Loire the Franks were more successful under the leadership of Robert the Strong, ancestor of the Capetians. In the Edict of Pîtres in 864 Charles the Bald ordered the building of fortresses in the country and established marches on the Seine and the Loire. When the Frankish resistance stiffened, the Vikings departed for England, and the West Frankish Kingdom knew a full decade of quiet.

The final and most difficult trial for the Carolingian kingdoms began when numerous Vikings, with their wives and children, streamed back again to the continent from England after the victories of Alfred the Great. The chief blow by the "Great Army" was first directed at the area between the Rhine and the Somme. In 879 the "Great Army" entered the Scheldt. In 880 the Saxons suffered a severe defeat and toward the end of 881 the chief Viking forces pushed up the Meuse to Liège, Maestricht, and Aachen. From there they moved on to the Rhine and destroyed Cologne, Andernach, and Koblenz. But the news that the East Frankish King was massing troops in the district of Mainz caused them to proceed up the Moselle. Trier fell in ruins at the beginning of 882. The resistance of Count Adalard and of Bishop Wala of Metz at Remich induced the Vikings to withdraw to the middle Meuse. In 885 they transferred the centre of their attack to Paris. The Emperor Charles the Fat purchased their departure by assigning them areas in Burgundy for the winter of 886–87 and thereby delivering a hitherto untouched land for plunder. Only the victory of the East Frankish King Arnulf near Louvain in November 891 brought a turning point and induced the chief groups to depart for England. From there in 896–97 a group again moved to the continent; their leader, Rollo, became the founder of Normandy.

On their voyages between 859 and 862 the Vikings also advanced far into the Mediterranean. They sacked Nîmes, Arles, and Valence in 860, Pisa and Fiesole in 861. But the Mediterranean remained the domain of the Muslims, who from Spain and Africa terrorized the Christian lands. Their first expeditions were aimed at the Byzantine Empire. They got under way with an accidental success of the Spanish Muslims, who occupied Crete in 825. In 827 began the officially organized attack of the Aghlabids of Tunis on Sicily, a struggle that was protracted for a half-century. The Muslims' first success was the conquest of Palermo in 831. Messina fell in 843, but the old Sicilian capital, Syracuse, held out until 878. Palermo became the seat of the Arabic administration. Toarmina continued until 902 as the final, but isolated, Greek base.

Even before the Sicilian war had ended, Muslim bands also crossed to South Italy, at first as mercenaries in the pay of the mutually hostile Christian states. Internal struggles weakened the Lombard Principality of Benevento from 839 and led in 847 and 858 to the separation of the Duchies of Salerno and Capua. During these disturbances the Muslims seized Bari and then also Taranto. Muslim vessels appeared before Ancona in 840, before Ostia in 846. The amazing attack on Rome was of no particular consequence, and a second attack on the capital of Christendom in 849 was successfully warded off. But at the same time a Muslim state with Bari as capital arose in Apulia. Emperor and Pope contrived to stabilize the situation in Central Italy, but in South Italy all the exertions of the Emperor Louis II finally foundered on the disunity of the South Italian principalities. After the death of Louis II in 875 the Western Empire ceased to count as a factor for order. The Muslims entrenched themselves between Capua and Gaetà on the Garigliano, and from there they devastated Central Italy and the Papal State. They destroyed Montecassino in 882. As during the Viking attacks on England and Aquitaine, so now also many sees and abbeys in South and Central Italy were left desolate. Effective assistance came only from the Greeks, who under the important general, Nicephorus Phocas, recovered Calabria in the 880's and in addition conquered the parts of Apulia and Lucania that had been occupied by the Muslims. Under papal leadership the Christians in Central Italy finally formed a coalition, which liberated the countryside in the decisive victory on the Garigliano in 915.

While African Muslims were afflicting South and Central Italy, Spanish Muslims were operating on the Gallic and North Italian coasts. More serious raids began here too around 840, but the brigands did not become a real threat until toward the end of the 860's, when they proceeded to establish permanent centres on La Camargue. In the 890's the Muslims erected La Garde-Freinet, their most famous fortress, in the diocese of Fréjus. From here they desolated Provence and the district around Genoa, took possession of the Alpine passes, and extended their expeditions into the Valais and Sankt Gallen. The trials of the regions afflicted by them only reached their climax in the 920's. Here too many churches and monasteries were destroyed. Sees of the provinces of Aix, Embrun, and Arles remained vacant for decades.

Only North Italy, the East Frankish Kingdom, and southern Lotharingia were spared serious devastations by the Vikings and Muslims in the second half of the ninth century. But these regions were to fall prey to the Magyars, who broke into the Western world in the tenth century. Thus the storm created by Muslims, Vikings, and Magyars well nigh left the whole German-Roman West desolate. Of course, not all lands were equally affected. Naturally, the interiors had less to suffer than the coastal and frontier provinces. But even in the districts which were directly exposed to the fury there were differences of degree in proportion to the effectiveness of the defence. Thus the starting point of reconstruction differed at any given moment when the great storm let up. The differing situations led to a displacing of the political and cultural centres of gravity within the West. Another circumstance, however, was of still greater importance for the future. While in southern Europe the Christian and Islamic worlds remained strictly separated and in consequence the Muslim invasion had a purely destructive effect, in northern Europe there finally resulted a symbiosis with the Vikings, who accepted Christian civilization. In Central Europe a similar situation occurred, since missionaries soon found a way to reach even the Magyars. The men and the forces which kept alive the substance of German-Roman civilization in the catastrophe of the late ninth and early tenth centuries made ready, under severe trials, the incorporation of Scandinavia and East Central Europe into the Western world.

CHAPTER 21

The Papacy and the West from 840 to 875

The history of the Roman Church reached a climax in the ninth century in the pontificates of Nicholas I (858–67), Hadrian II (867–72), and John VIII (872–82). Fundamental changes in the relations between the papacy and the imperial office were under way. They were conditioned by the partition of Verdun and later by the extinction of the male line of the family of Lothar I.

The Emperor's suzerainty of the Papal State, the basis for which was the *Constitutio Romana* of 824, continued unaltered. Efforts at Rome to loosen imperial control were fruitless. When there was the threat of a double election in 844, Sergius II was consecrated before the imperial confirmation had been obtained. But Lothar I dispatched his archchaplain, Drogo of Metz, and his son Louis to Rome with a large escort, and Drogo insisted on a reexamination of the proceedings by a synod. Thereafter a papal election was to take place only when authorized by an imperial *iussio* and in the presence of imperial *missi*. This method was actually not followed in 847 on the plea of the danger from the Muslims, but for the future it was observed. The imperial consent was even noted in the official biographies of the *Liber pontificalis*. The imperial authority was also made good within Rome. The throwing of a wall around the Leonine City was ordered by Lothar I in 846 and carried out by Pope Leo IV in 848–52.

The Emperor Louis II intervened in papal elections even more vigorously than had Lothar I. In 855 his *missi* tried to procure the elevation of the Cardinal Priest Anastasius the Librarian to the papacy; he was a highly cultured man but had been deposed by Leo IV. The effort failed, since Anastasius, on account of his having been deposed by the dead Pope, was unacceptable even to Roman circles that were amenable to compromise, and so Benedict III was chosen. The election of Nicholas I in 858 took place in the Emperor's presence. Hadrian II was not the Emperor's candidate in 867, but he was chosen following a reconciliation with Louis II. We have no precise information as to the election of John VIII.

A change of great importance set in as a result of the connection of the elevation to the imperial office with the imperial coronation by the Pope, a connection that made its appearance after the Treaty of Verdun. When the Frankish "monarchy" fell apart and the Emperor became only one sectional ruler among others, the protectorate over Rome remained the only sign which distinguished the Emperor from the Kings. The sanction afforded the Carolingian imperial line by the Pope thereby acquired an enhanced importance. Lothar I's oldest son, Louis II, was crowned King of Italy by Sergius II in 844 and coemperor by Leo IV in 850. Since, unlike his predecessors, Lothar I had not himself been crowned, the coronation at Rome had a legalizing effect, and Nicholas I regarded it as the decisive juridical element. In 871, in a polemic exchange with the Greeks, Louis II appealed to his dominion over Rome and his anointing at the hands of the Pope. Thus the imperial coronation by the Pope became a constitutive element of the elevation of the Western Emperor, which, of course, took effect historically only after the extinction of the family of Lothar I.

In Frankish politics the Popes and the Emperor disagreed in the marriage case of King Lothar II. Like other great imperial decrees, the Treaty of Verdun seems to have been sent to Rome. Sergius II bestowed the office of papal vicar on Drogo of Metz. Leo IV likewise supported the imperial policy. Benedict III ratified the Emperor's settlement with Reims, and he mediated the quarrel among the sons of Lothar I in regard to the inheritance.

South Italy had been a field of common papal and imperial interest since the days of Charles the Great. Great changes occurred here when Muslim mercenaries were employed in the conflict between Benevento and Naples (834–39) and in the struggles over the succession to Benevento (839–47) and eventually established the Sultanate of Bari. At this same time the Carolingians were disabled by their own succession quarrels, and so the earliest steps toward arranging a united Christian front came from the Greeks. In 839, 842, and 843–44 they negotiated with the Western Emperors in regard to an alliance against the Muslims, that was to be confirmed by the marriage of a Byzantine princess to Lothar's son Louis II. Although Lothar I accepted these offers in a friendly manner, they came to nothing. The Franks did not become active until the Muslims suddenly attacked Rome in 846. In 847 Louis expelled the Arabs from the city of Benevento and mediated a peace between the two Lombard pretenders, which led to the definite division of the principality into the Duchies of Benevento and Salerno. But the Arabs maintained themselves in much of South Italy and before long Capua detached itself from Salerno to become the third Lombard principality. Renewed Frankish interventions in 852, 860, and 863 were only partial successes.

It was not until 866 that Louis II succeeded in regulating matters in South Italy and in establishing a united Christian front. In 867–68 there were further negotiations for an alliance with Byzantium, but they ended in new disagreements in 871. Just the same, Louis II managed to take Bari in February of that year. The son of Lothar I was at the height of his power, when a conspiracy of the South Italian princes imperilled all the successes he had achieved. On 31 August the conspirators arrested the Emperor at Benevento and did not set him free until 17 September, after he had sworn not to attack them. From Taranto the Muslims again poured into the South Italian principalities. From Salerno and Capua requests for aid again reached the Emperor, who rescued both cities in 873. But Benevento and Naples continued to be hostile to him. The Duke of Benevento sought and found help among the Byzantines. In 873 he acknowledged the suzerainty of the Eastern Emperor Basil I, to whom the Lombards even delivered Bari. The power of Louis II was broken. He left South Italy in the autumn of 873 and died on 12 August 875. The Byzantines came forward in the place of the Franks as the leading power in the defence against the Muslims.

In South Italian politics the Popes staunchly supported Louis II, in particular his exertions for the establishing of a united Christian front, even though they continued to distrust the Greeks. On the other hand, the marriage case of Lothar II led to dissension between Emperor and Pope when, at the end of 863, Nicholas I quashed the acts of the Synod of Metz and deposed the Archbishops of Trier and Cologne. Louis II increased his control of the Papal State but avoided imposing any solution of the crisis by force, even though in 867, at the height of the quarrel with Photius, the Byzantines suggested that he depose the Pope. For his part, Nicholas I abstained from any intervention in the secular sphere. He held to the Gelasian theory of the two powers, which had been roused to new life by the Frankish episcopate in 829. It is true that he understood the imperial coronation as the autonomous right of the Roman Church and thus, according to Knabe, he "regarded the papal authority as being the equal of legitimate birth as a source of imperial power", but he recognized the crowned Emperor as his temporal ruler and claimed no *potestas in temporalibus.*

The death of Nicholas I on 13 November 867 resolved the crisis in the relations between Emperor and Pope. Close cooperation was resumed under Hadrian II, who in 872 released Louis II from his oath to the South Italian rebels and repeated his imperial coronation in order to wipe out the ignominy of the imprisonment at Benevento. Hadrian also supported his imperial master in the question of the inheritance of Lothar II. Only in one point did the views of Emperor and Pope differ: whereas Louis II destined as his successor Louis the German or the latter's oldest son, Carloman, at the papal court the succession of Charles the Bald was favoured.

After 840 and *a fortiori* after 855 the imperial office no longer corresponded to the Frankish Empire, but the Frankish Empire, now as earlier, constituted the nucleus of Western Christendom and, as such, continued to be the Pope's proper field of action. Rome's relations with the non-Frankish states of the West were not intense or frequent. Nothing is known of contacts with Ireland. On the separation of Brittany from the Frankish Empire the Breton ecclesiastical province of Dol was established against the will of the Popes. When Asturias grew strong under Alfonso III, Pope John VIII may have consented to the elevation of Oviedo to metropolitan status in 876 and ordered the consecration of Santiago de Compostela and the holding of a Spanish council.[1] The old connections between Rome and England did not cease, but they were impeded by the Viking attacks. Papal letters to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York of around 874 and to Canterbury of 878 and 891–96 are extant. They came from a period when Wessex was surmounting the crisis and the situation in South England was gradually re-establishing itself. Around 875 Burgred of Mercia retired to the city of the Apostles, after he had lost his kingdom in the struggle against the Danes. As early as 853 King Aethelwulf of Wessex (839–58) had sent his son Alfred to Rome, where Pope Leo IV honoured the boy with the insignia of the consulship. Alfred accompanied his father when, two years later, he undertook a pilgrimage to the tombs of the Apostles because of the Viking peril. In 884, at the request of Alfred the Great, Pope Marinus I freed the *Schola Saxonum* near Saint Peter's from tolls and taxes. But in the great mass of papal charters and letters the items for England and Spain are not of great importance. The consolidation of the papal primacy of jurisdiction was completed within the Western *Imperium*. Initial efforts in this direction appeared under Leo IV (847–55) but were first developed under Nicholas I.

---

[1] The letter of John VIII referring to this is probably not authentic. See *Wattenbach-Levison* 4, 454, no. 291.

Ravenna, former residence of the Emperors, the Ostrogothic Kings, and the Exarchs, formed a counterpole to Rome within the Papal State. The capital of the provinces of Emilia and Flaminia had probably once belonged to the Roman ecclesiastical province, but, in any event, in the fifth and sixth centuries it was in closer dependence on Rome than were other metropolises. In the Byzantine period the prelates of Ravenna sought to throw off this dependence. The Emperor Constans II, during the Monothelite controversy, granted them in 666 a privilege making their see autocephalous, but they naturally had to renounce this at the restoration of ecclesiastical peace in 680–82. Thereafter, as before, the metropolitans of Ravenna were again consecrated at Rome, but they acquired greater freedom in the governing of their province. When the Franks intervened in Italy, they endeavoured with Carolingian aid to establish an ecclesiastical state of their own. They were unsuccessful, but thereafter the old rivalries were intensified by "the new political envy . . . in regard to possessions and territorial rights in Romagna and the Pentapolis" (Brandi). Under Leo IV there was open conflict in 853, since the exarchate was virtually autonomous politically under Duke George, brother of Archbishop John, and the Archbishop was usurping Roman ecclesiastical property. The question was regulated at a synod which the Pope held in the Emperor's presence in Ravenna. The controversy flared up again in 861. Nicholas I summoned the Archbishop to Rome, excommunicated him in March 861, and subsequently went to Ravenna. Archbishop John submitted at the Roman synod in November. He had to oblige himself to come to Rome every two years henceforth, to consecrate his suffragans only with papal assent, and not to prevent their going to Rome. According to Brandi, "If the submission of [861] was merely a sacrificing of autonomy, . . . it extended, in the case of this second serious defeat, according to the mind of the ninth century, especially to the suffragan sees, whose relationship to Ravenna was weakened, while it was strengthened in regard to Rome".

Brandi felt that at Ravenna Rome "first tested her own supremacy and the forms of subordination". This is to be taken *cum grano salis,* for the canonical presuppositions for the papal jurisdiction over Ravenna and over the Frankish metropolises were of different sorts. In the case of Ravenna it was possible to appeal to an historical right. In the case of the Franks it was necessary to go back to the inalienable right of the primacy of Peter. For the traditional canon law was not acquainted with a central ecclesiastical government, such as Nicholas worked for — as a system it was first developed by pseudo-Isidore. It is true that the bond between Rome and the metropolitan sees was strengthened in the West by the introduction of the archiepiscopal pallium, and even before pseudo-Isidore the canonical effects of the papal primacy were familiar and hardly to be distinguished from basic statements of the False Decretals. "Sunt qui Gallicanos canones aut aliarum regionum putent non recipiendos, eo quod legati Romani seu imperatoris in eorum constitutione non interfuerint", wrote Agobard of Lyons in his *De dispensatione rerum ecclesiasticarum.*[2] If the Emperor were here expunged, which was very natural, then one would obtain the statement of pseudo-Isidore that all conciliar decrees need Roman authorization.

The determining of the moment when the False Decretals first became known in Rome is made more difficult by the circumstance that one must reckon with the fluctuating interpretations of things of this sort. A papal letter of January 865 to the West Frankish episcopate, containing clear references to pseudo-Isidore, establishes the *terminus ad quem.* But since Nicholas remarks in this "that the Roman Church 'penes se in suis archivis et vetustis rite monumentis recondita veneratur' the papal letters, including forged letters".[3] Hauck suspects that the False Decretals had been in Rome for some time. Haller feels that the first traces of a use by Leo IV can be demonstrated. It is not impossible that the opposition to Hincmar at Reims in 853 may have brought the forgeries to Rome, but the papal letter to Hincmar that refers to this matter does not contain an unequivocal allusion to pseudo-Isidore. Hence it must remain on open question whether Nicholas already knew the forgeries when in 863 he deposed the Archbishops of Cologne and Trier.

More probable is the assumption that Rothad of Soissons first brought the *corpus* of pseudo-Isidore to Rome. Rothad was one of the bishops of the Reims province who had acknowledged the deposed Archbishop Ebbo during his temporary restoration by Lothar I in 840–41. Open conflict between him and Hincmar broke out in 861, when Hincmar demanded the reinstallation, after the performance of penance, of a cleric whom Rothad had deposed. The Archbishop had his recalcitrant suffragan excommunicated at a provincial synod. Rothad appealed to Rome, but then agreed to answer to an episcopal tribunal, which in 862 deposed him and sentenced him to detention in a monastery. The matter was nevertheless brought before the Pope and in the autumn of 863 Nicholas finally demanded that Rothad be sent to Rome. In January 865 he annulled the deposition at a Roman synod. The proceedings were conducted entirely according to the rules of the False Decretals, to which Nicholas alluded in his letter to Hincmar.

---

[2] *PL* 104, 241, A/B. Cf. *Fournier-LeBras* 124ff.

[3] *MGEp* VI, 394.

It was to no purpose that Hincmar pointed out that, according to the existing canon law, the Pope could indeed accept an appeal, but the case had to be referred back to an episcopal tribunal. The Archbishop and the King, who had likewise opposed Rothad, bowed to Rome's judgment. Around the same time there occurred an estrangement between Hincmar and Charles the Bald. Wulfad, one of the clerics of Reims who had been ordained by Ebbo, had won favour at court, and the King wanted to promote him to the archiepiscopal see of Bourges. Since the episcopate did not lightly regard the synodal decision of 853, Charles the Bald sought to force the restoration of Wulfad through Rome. In the spring of 866 Nicholas I gave the Archbishop of Reims the alternative of pardoning Ebbo's clerics or of submitting the case to a new synod, by which Wulfad's appeal would be accepted. Hincmar, who perceived that the canonical grounds of his own position would thereby be jeopardized, was willing neither to grant the amnesty nor to set in motion a new process. The synod, meeting at Soissons in August, declined, under his influence, to take up the case again and recommended that the Pope himself grant the amnesty. Charles the Bald did not even wait for the papal decision and had Wulfad consecrated Archbishop immediately. In December 866 Nicholas I decreed the restoration of Ebbo's clerics. In a very ill-humoured letter he left it up to Hincmar to prove within a year the lawfulness of the depositions decreed by him and called for all of Ebbo's records. The Pope or his advisers apparently intended to force a Roman process on Hincmar. The Archbishop of Reims had no difficulty in proving the lawfulness of his election and of his official activity, but he did so with bitterness of heart. A second memorandum, based on the records, was drawn up at the imperial synod which met at Troyes on 25 October 867. The assembled Frankish bishops urged the Pope to determine anew the rights and duties of metropolitans and their suffragans and to explain the principle of the competency of the Roman court in the cases of bishops. The juxtaposition of the old and the new law had produced so much perplexity that a papal statement of principles seemed necessary. But this did not take place. Nicholas did not receive the message of the council. Just before his death he had declared himself satisfied with Hincmar's justification and had thereby ended the conflict.

The third and last quarrel between Reims and Rome occurred in the pontificate of Hadrian II. The Archbishop's nephew and namesake, Hincmar of Laon, was summoned before a royal tribunal in the summer of 868 for having deprived royal vassals of fiefs belonging to his see of Laon. The Archbishop of Reims at first intervened in support of his nephew and brought it about that the younger Hincmar was cited before an ecclesiastical court and took an oath of loyalty to the King. But before his uncle's intervention, the nephew had already appealed to Rome. Before the end of the same year Hadrian II demanded the annulment of the confiscation of the property of the church of Laon, as ordered by the King, and the dispatch of the appellant to Rome. The King did not yield, but in April 869 summoned the Bishop to the Synod of Verberie. Hincmar of Laon decreed as a precautionary measure an interdict on his diocese in the event that he should be arrested. Just the same, Charles the Bald had Hincmar of Laon arrested, while Hincmar of Reims lifted the interdict that had been ordered. Again the old and the new canon law confronted each other. The correspondence with Rome assumed a very bitter form, but King and Archbishop did not budge. The Bishop of Laon was deposed at the Synod of Douzy in August 871. Finally, Charles the Bald played off the Pope against the papal chancery. He decided that it was not Pope Hadrian but Anastasius the Librarian who was speaking in the sharp notes. When in 872 he applied directly to the Pope through his *missus,* he received a conciliatory reply in a secret letter: The King might send Hincmar of Laon to Rome, and the Pope would then appoint judges according to the old canon law. In addition, Hadrian declared that after the death of Louis II he would accept no one but Charles "in regnum et imperium Romanum". The Pope not only yielded; he had made an amazing change of course. The ten-year-old struggle between Rome and Reims ended with a victory for the old canon law — the hour for a centralized papal government of the Church had not yet struck.

Ecclesiastical conflicts of the type of the collisions with Cologne, Trier, and Reims did not take place between Rome and the East Frankish episcopate. In the East Frankish Kingdom there were, it is true, only three metropolitan sees, and of these only two, Mainz and Salzburg, really counted. The church of Hamburg was seriously damaged by the destruction wrought in 845. Louis the German hoped to provide for the missionary work by giving Anschar also the see of Bremen, a suffragan of Cologne. The union was decreed at the Synod of Mainz in 848, and a few years later it received the consent of Archbishop Gunthar of Cologne. Pope Nicholas I approved the uniting of the two sees in 864 and at the same time detached Bremen from the Cologne province. Archbishops Anschar (d. 865) and Rembert maintained the mission stations of Schleswig and Rügen in Denmark and of Birka in Sweden. But the Scandinavian mission was lacking in any power of expansion, and in the 880's it completely collapsed.

Quite different was the situation with regard to the Slavic mission in the southeast, which was maintained by Regensburg, Passau, Salzburg, and Aquileia. Since the 830's it had expanded to Bohemia and Moravia and also included Croatia, where the Roman Christian influence had earlier been recognized *via* Dalmatia. The Slavonic princes who acknowledged Frankish suzerainty also accepted Christianity. The Moravian Prince Pribina had himself baptized in 835 at Traismauer in the diocese of Salzburg and received from Louis the German a Slovene domain on the Zala and on Lake Balaton. Ten Bohemian *duces* received baptism at Regensburg in 844–45. The Serbo-Croatian region south of the Drave was a mission territory of Aquileia. We learn that the Archbishops of Salzburg in the 840's and 850's built thirty-two churches in Pannonia, including Pettau, Szalavár (Moosburg), and Pécs, for the most part in Pribina's Slovene principality. In his Moravian homeland Pribina founded the church of Neitra. The mission must also have made much progress in Moravia proper, for at the Synod of Mainz in 852 the Moravian people were regarded as newly converted. In the same year the Croatian bishopric of Nic, in Aquileia's mission field, first emerged into the light of history.

Meanwhile, it had not been possible to incorporate all of the wider area of the former Avar realm into the Frankish Empire. In the 830's there arose a new Slavonic state on the March River. The union of the Moravian tribes was probably the work of the Duke Moimir, from whom the Moravian Prince Pribina fled to the Franks between 830 and 835. The overthrow of Moimir and the installing of his Christian nephew Rastislav (846–70) were achievements of Louis the German, who thereby re-established Frankish suzerainty over Moravia. But Rastislav did not intend to put up with Frankish overlordship, and in 855 there began under his leadership a war for Moravian independence. In 861 Rastislav was in possession of the area as far as the Gran with Neitra, but in 870 he fell into the hands of Louis the German, who had him blinded and sent him to a monastery. The new Duke of the Moravians, Svatopluk (870–94), who had taken the place of his uncle, Rastislav, by virtue of an agreement with the Franks, quickly shook off Frankish suzerainty again. In 871 Bohemia also came within the Moravian sphere of influence. In the Peace of Forchheim in 874 Louis the German recognized the independence of Moravia in return for tribute, while in 890 King Arnulf also admitted Moravian domination of Bohemia in the Peace of Omuntesberg. Thus was there created north of the Danube a great Moravian state, which included the Slavonic tribes as far as Silesia and Galicia within its frontiers.

The Moravian Duke Rastislav was a ruler of importance. He recognized that the new state would be consolidated by the acceptance of Christianity. Were Moravia, as a Christian kingdom, to be admitted into the Western community, its permanence could no longer be questioned. On the other hand, however, complete independence could not be achieved so long as Moravia remained a part of the Bavarian ecclesiastical province of Salzburg. And so it was that in 862–63 Rastislav applied to the Byzantine Emperor for priests.

The Greek missionaries arrived in the Moravian state in 863–64. At their head were two brothers from Thessalonica, Constantine-Cyril and Methodius. Constantine, the younger of the two, had been born in 827. In 842 he had gone to study at Constantinople, where Leo of Thessalonica and Photius were his teachers. When Photius was summoned to court, Constantine took over his professorship. But the younger scholar soon entered the service of the Church and became a deacon and perhaps a priest. In 860 he went as imperial envoy to the Chazars in what is today the Ukraine. After his return he received the commission to proceed to the Moravians. His brother Methodius, who accompanied him, had been born in 815. Around 840 he had been made imperial *strategos* on the Strymon, but had then entered a monastery and had been made abbot. As natives of Thessalonica, the brothers were familiar with the Slavonic language; this was true especially of the former *strategos,* Methodius. Since as yet the Slavonic dialects differed little among themselves, they were able to address Rastislav's Moravians in their mother tongue. Unlike the Western Church, the Byzantine Church did not know any single ecclesiastical language, and so Constantine and Methodius had no hesitation about translating, not only the Bible, but the liturgical texts, including the Roman Mass, known as the Liturgy of Saint Peter, into the vernacular. For this purpose they created the Glagolithic script, which was based on the Greek minuscule with the addition of a few signs for specifically Slavonic sounds.

For three full years the brothers taught in Rastislav's realm, and their successes soon pushed the Bavarian mission into the background. But, since they were not bishops, they were unable to confer ordination on the Slavonic candidates for the priesthood whom they were training. Hence they decided to journey to Constantinople and proceeded to Venice, where in 867 they received from Nicholas I an invitation to come to Rome. When the brothers reached Rome, Nicholas was dead, but Hadrian II prepared a triumphal reception for them, since Constantine was bringing along the relics of Saint Clement of Rome, which he had found in the Crimea at the time of his journey to the Chazars.

But opposition to the Greek missionaries was not wanting. It was not especially the Greek liturgy that was contested — in Rome there were plenty of Greek monasteries, which followed their own way of life — but rather the introduction of the vernacular into the Mass. Already in Venice Constantine had had to defend himself on this score, and the same charges were heard in Rome. Some circles would admit only three sacred languages — Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, sanctified by the inscription on Christ's cross.

But Pope Hadrian was free from any narrow-mindedness. He had the Slavonic liturgy celebrated in Roman churches, ordained Methodius a priest, and had some of the Slavonic disciples of the brothers ordained priests and others deacons. Constantine died in Rome on 14 February 869, and Methodius returned to the Slavonic mission lands with papal recommendations. The only restriction imposed on him was that he should read the Epistle and the Gospel in Latin before proclaiming them in Slavonic.

Since a political change had taken place in Moravia in 869–70, Methodius at first laboured in the Slovene principality on Lake Balaton, where Kocel had succeeded his father, Pribina, in 861. Methodius very soon returned to Rome, where in 870 Hadrian II consecrated him Archbishop of Sirmium (Mitrovitza near Belgrade). The new ecclesiastical province was to embrace the entire Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, and Moravian mission territory. It was an event of special importance, for just at that moment Bulgaria was threatening to slip away from Rome, since Nicholas I had, for canonical reasons, denied the Khan's wish that Formosus of Porto be made missionary bishop of the Bulgars. Bulgaria returned to the Byzantine obedience in February 870. By making Methodius Archbishop of Sirmium, Pope Hadrian was underlining Rome's right to Illyricum, whose capital had once been Sirmium. But actually Methodius was unable to establish himself in the destroyed late Roman capital of Illyricum. He returned to Kocel and for the time being resided in his chief fortress, Szalavár.

The Archbishop's moving into a territory which belonged to the East Frankish Pannonian March, had been assigned by Leo III to Salzburg, and was already being evangelized by Salzburg could not but lead to a collision with the Metropolitan of Bavaria. The Salzburg archpriest who was functioning in Pannonia returned home in 870. Methodius was apparently arrested in the Moravian part of his diocese by Carloman, son of Louis the German, and in November 870 brought before a Bavarian synod, meeting probably at Regensburg. The Archbishop of Salzburg saw to the composing of the *Libellus de conversione Bagoariorum et Carantanorum,* a comprehensive account of the founding and missionary activity of his church. Methodius appealed to the Pope's inalienable right, but was taken to Swabia, possibly to Ellwangen, and imprisoned. The protests of Hadrian II were fruitless, but John VIII intervened energetically. He demanded and obtained the release of the Archbishop but forbade him to use Slavonic in the liturgy. Methodius departed for the Moravians, who achieved their independence in 874. He became the Apostle of the Moravians, although John VIII also subjected to him in ecclesiastical matters the Serbian Duke Montemir of Slavonia. The principality of Kocel, who died at this same time, remained under East Frankish suzerainty and a mission district of Bavaria.

It is not unthinkable that the papal *rapprochement* with Charles the Bald already effected by Hadrian II was motivated by the clashes between Rome and the Bavarian episcopate in 870–73. The great project of making good the loss of Illyricum, of the papal vicariate of Thessalonica, by the establishing of an extensive Slavonic ecclesiastical province had been conceived by Nicholas I and pushed forward on a grand scale by Hadrian II. It was hurt by the loss of Bulgaria and the Bavarian opposition in Pannonia. But the founding of a Moravian Church was an important success. Methodius must be placed alongside Boniface in his effectiveness. In the Moravian Prince Svatopluk (870–94), whose morals he severely criticized, he did not find the support which Rastislav had given him, but he enjoyed the confidence of Pope John VIII, who upheld him against Svatopluk and the latter's favourite, Bishop Wiching of Neitra, and who lifted the prohibition of the Slavonic liturgy in 880. In 882 Methodius journeyed to Constantinople, where he was cordially received by Emperor and Patriarch. He died on 6 April 884.

The death of the Apostle of the Slavs brought about a crisis. Pope Stephen V summoned to Rome Gorazd, whom Methodius had recommended as his successor, forbade the Slavonic liturgy, and named Wiching administrator of the metropolitan see. The small group of Methodius's disciples were unable to maintain themselves and in 885 they escaped to Bulgaria. There they reverted to the Byzantine rite, but in the Slavonic language. By a new adaptation to the Greek alphabet they transformed the Glagolithic script into the Cyrillic, which is still used by the Orthodox Slavs.

Meanwhile, in Moravia Wiching fell out with Svatopluk, who expelled him in 893. The ecclesiastical reorganization, for which Pope John IX (898–900) sent legates, collapsed, since in 906 the Moravian state fell to pieces under the blows of the Magyars. Ecclesiastical centres were maintained in Bohemia, which had again come under East Frankish suzerainty in 895, and apparently also at Cracow and in parts of Hungary (Slovakia and Esztergom). The Croats, whose Prince Domagoj threw off Frankish suzerainty on the death of Louis II, also remained loyal to the Slavonic Roman liturgy. When in 925 their Prince Tomislav was elevated to the royal dignity, their churches were attached to the Dalmatian province of Spalato.

Chapter 22

The Degradation of the Papacy and the Empire (875 to 904)

The death of the Emperor Louis II presented contemporaries with difficult problems of law. The revived Western Empire was hereditary in the senior Carolingian line until 875, though since 850 coronation by the Pope had played a constitutive role. In this regard the *ordinatio imperii* of 817 retained its validity — even in the Frankish domestic chaos the right of Lothar I and his heirs to the imperial crown was never debated. Only on the extinction of the line of Lothar did the question come up: Who was to award the imperial crown? At the same time the succession to the Kingdom of Italy was opened. At Metz in 867 or 868 the royal uncles, Louis the German and Charles the Bald, had reached an understanding in regard to the eventual partition of the inheritance of Lothar and the common assumption of the protectorate over the Roman Church. But in 872 Louis II had designated as his successor Louis the German's son, Carloman of Bavaria, while at the same time Pope Hadrian II had held out the prospect of the imperial crown to Charles the Bald. In so doing the Pope may have been relying not only on the ancient right of the *populus Romanus* and the papal right of coronation but also on the regulation of the *ordinatio imperii* that, in the event of Lothar I's death without sons, the *populus christianus* should appoint a successor in the imperial office from the surviving brothers.

At the death of the Emperor Louis II the Holy See was occupied by John VIII, third and last of the important Popes of the ninth century. John had already exercised great influence as archdeacon under Nicholas I. By convoking the clergy and senate of Rome in August 875 and having them acclaim Charles the Bald as Emperor he created a *fait accompli*. On 29 September Charles appeared at Pavia, where a part of the Italian magnates did homage to him. He proceeded to Rome, and there on Christmas 875 John VIII gave him the imperial crown. On 2 January 876 the Pope made Archbishop Ansegis of Sens his vicar for Gaul and Germany. As Lothar I had once done, so now Charles the Bald apparently contemplated the gaining of new importance for the imperial office throughout the Frankish Empire by means of the Church. The Pope was especially interested in greater independence in the Papal State and defence against the Muslims. Charles the Bald annulled the stipulation that the papal election had to take place in the presence of imperial *missi* and turned over the direction of the policy in regard to South Italy to John VIII. Louis II had already given seven cities of the Duchy of Spoleto and Byzantine Gaetà to the Roman Church and had promised to restore the papacy's South Italian and Sicilian *patrimonium*. Charles the Bald made over to the Pope the revenues of the three great monasteries of Farfa, Rieti, and Sant'Andrea on Monte Soracte, subjected to him the Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, and "gave" him the Byzantine Duchies of Naples and Calabria.[1] In February 876 he received the homage of the Italian magnates at Pavia, entrusted the government of Italy to his brother-in-law Boso, and then returned to the West Frankish Kingdom.

It soon became plain that, despite the concessions of Charles the Bald, the Pope could not control the situation in South Italy, and so John VIII did what he could to make possible an effective imperial operation against the Muslims. A general Frankish synod was to meet at Ponthion and restore harmony in the Empire. But of the bishops of the kingdom of Louis the German only Willibert of Cologne appeared, and the opposition of Hincmar of Reims obstructed the vicariate of the Archbishop of Sens even in the West Frankish Kingdom. Despite everything, Charles the Bald managed to have himself recognized as Emperor by the West Frankish magnates by their selection of him as their imperial *advocatus*.

---

[1] For the concessions made by Charles the Bald, which can only be reconstructed from later versions of the imperial privileges, cf. E. E. Stengel, *Die Entwicklung des Kaiserprivilegs*. See ibid. also for the concessions made by Louis II.

The death of Louis the German on 28 August 876 delivered the new Emperor from his most dangerous adversary. The sons of the East Frankish King partitioned their father's kingdom: the oldest, Carloman, received Bavaria, Louis the Younger acquired Franconia, and the third son, Charles the Fat, obtained Swabia. Since the three East Frankish Kings were by no means in harmony, it would now have been possible for Charles the Bald to intervene in Italy. But the Emperor thought that the opportunity had come for him to restore the unity of the Empire, and so, in September 876, he marched against Louis the Younger by way of Aachen and Cologne. But his exaggerated hopes were quickly dashed to the ground: on 8 October nephew routed uncle at Andernach, and the imperial prestige received a staggering blow. But the defeat had no political repercussions, for the opposition among the East Frankish brother-kings was greater than the opposition of uncle and nephew.

A second journey to Rome could not be avoided, because of the turbulent state of Italy. In April 876 John VIII condemned *in absentia* the leaders of his opponents among the nobility and the Cardinal Bishop Formosus of Porto, who was connected with this faction. In South Italy Naples and Benevento, which were unwilling to submit to papal direction, were secretly supported by the Spoletans. The governor of Italy, Boso, was recalled by Charles the Bald after he had eloped with Irmingard, only legitimate descendant of the line of Lothar I, in the summer of 876, following an understanding with the Dowager Empress Engelberga. Carloman of Bavaria had already invaded Italy in September 875 and was now preparing a new campaign. At the beginning of August 877 John VIII held a large synod at Ravenna, at which 150 bishops ranged themselves behind him and the Emperor. Soon afterwards Charles the Bald crossed the Alps. Emperor and Pope met at Vercelli and at the beginning of September proceeded to Pavia, where they received the news that Carloman of Bavaria had crossed the Alps with a large army. Since the Emperor had brought along only a small retinue and the requested reinforcements from the West Frankish magnates had not arrived, he found himself compelled to return to the West Frankish Kingdom. *En route* he died on 6 October 877.

In this situation the Pope had no choice but to establish contact with Carloman, to whom the Italian magnates had already done homage at Pavia. However, the King of Bavaria postponed his journey to Rome till the following year. He was never to see the Eternal City. Taken seriously ill on his return across the Alps, this oldest son of Louis the German continued to be incapacitated until death freed him from his sufferings in 880. John VIII left Rome at the end of April 878 and went by ship to Genoa. From there he invited the Carolingians to a general Frankish synod. His original plan was probably to offer the imperial dignity to Louis the Stammerer. But while he was in Provence, where he had proceeded from Genoa, he discovered that the health of the West Frankish King was poor. At that time the Pope seems to have given serious consideration to the candidacy of Boso as a possible solution. By virtue of his marriage to the Princess Irmingard, Boso had become the representative of the line of Lothar I and he was in possession of solid political power in Provence. John supported Boso's candidacy until March 879, when the sickness and, on 10 April, the death of Louis the Stammerer gave events another twist. On 15 October 879 Boso had himself proclaimed King by his vassals and the episcopate of the provinces of Vienne, Lyons, Besançon, Tarentaise, Aix, and Arles, following the rules of the *ordinatio* of 817. And so the line of Lothar I turned up again — not in Italy, but in Burgundy.

The question of the succession threw the West Frankish Kingdom into internal confusion, since the East Frank, Louis the Younger, also came forward as a candidate. This favourable moment gained for him western Lotharingia, while Louis III and Carloman, sons of Louis the Stammerer, finally divided the remainder of their father's inheritance. The West Frankish and the East Frankish Carolingians united against Boso and Lothar II's bastard Hugh, who had been claiming Lotharingia since 878. The common action against the two pretenders of the line of Lothar I eventually prepared the way for the devolution of the entire Carolingian Empire on the youngest son of Louis the German, Charles III the Fat, who fell heir to his brother, Louis the Younger, in 882 and to his West Frankish cousins in 885. Boso alone maintained his independence in his firmly unified Burgundian-Provençal kingdom.

John VIII had turned to the East Frankish line in April 879 and had first of all approached Charles the Fat. But the situation in *Francia* did not at the outset permit any of the sons of Louis the German to intervene in Italy. Not until the autumn of 879 did Charles the Fat appear in Pavia; he met the Pope at Ravenna in January 880. This move yielded to the King of Swabia only the Italian royal crown. Only on his second Italian journey, lasting from December 880 to March 881, was there found time for his imperial coronation at Rome on 21 February 881. The Pope obtained as little real assistance then as he did on the occasion of a third encounter at Ravenna in February 882. At that very moment the Muslims were establishing themselves on the Garigliano, from where they terrorized Rome. The ghastly murder of John VIII on 15 December 882 indicates how low the imperial authority had fallen. It was also an omen of an approaching dark epoch in papal history.

John VIII was followed in rapid succession by Marinus I (882–84), Hadrian III (884–85), and Stephen V (885–91). Marinus was the first Pope to have been a bishop before his accession to Saint Peter's see. This violation of the canons was also a sign of the breakdown of the old rules. The new Pope pardoned the opposition of 876 and gave back to Formosus his see of Porto. In 883 Marinus obtained from the Emperor the deposition of the Margrave Guy of Spoleto, but this merely produced further confusion. In the pontificate of Hadrian III it seemed as though the situation of the Empire was finally improving. The Emperor obtained successes against the Vikings and sought to profit from this to assure the succession of his bastard, Bernard. The Pope — such is the irony of history — was ready to assist him in this project but died *en route* to the East Frankish Kingdom, and matters took a turn for the worse again. Hadrian's successor, Stephen V, was selected against the will of the Emperor. When Charles the Fat in 887 demanded his cooperation in regulating the succession in the Empire — the still underage grandson of Louis II, Louis of Vienne, Boso's son, was selected as heir — the Pope declined and perhaps thereby hastened the dissolution of the Empire. The fall of Charles the Fat must have left Stephen V indifferent.

The deposition and death of the Emperor Charles the Fat mark an epoch in the history of the Carolingian Empire. Regino of Prüm underscores this turning point with the statement that now for the first time non-Carolingians were raised to the kingship in the subkingdoms. Under Carolingian rule remained only the East Frankish Kingdom, including Lotharingia, and the lower Burgundian Kingdom of Vienne, whose King Louis, still a minor, represented the line of Lothar I by virtue of his being a grandson of the Emperor Louis II. The new East Frankish King, Arnulf of Carinthia, was a bastard of Carloman of Bavaria. The Robertian Eudes established himself as King of the West Franks; the Welf Rudolf, as King of Upper Burgundy, the province of Besançon. The Italian crown was disputed between Berengar of Friuli and Guy of Spoleto. Empire and dynasty had parted company. A last but weak bond of imperial unity remained in the suzerainty of the East Frankish King, which was recognized by all the partner-kings except Guy of Spoleto. For the moment Arnulf could not give a thought to the imperial dignity, because of the Viking peril and the struggle now being resumed with the Moravians. In 890 Stephen V did ask his aid against "mali christiani" and "imminentes pagani", but on 21 February 891 he had to give the imperial crown to Guy of Spoleto.

Stephen's successor in the Holy See was Formosus of Porto (891–6), even though his elevation was likewise contrary to the ancient rule that no bishop was allowed to pass from his see to another. His opponents accused Formosus of ambition; his personal conduct was above reproach, and he was a man of strict, even ascetical life. He too had put up with the Spoletan Dynasty; in fact, he even had to crown Guy's son Lambert as coemperor on 30 April 892.

But Formosus was not happy with this state of affairs and as early as the fall of 893 a first appeal for help was sent to Arnulf. Arnulf's Italian expedition did not materialize. The Emperor Guy died in 894, and in September 895 a new papal appeal for help was sent to the East Frankish King. Arnulf appeared in Pavia in December 895 and from there moved against Rome. The East Franks took the Leonine City by storm, and the Empress-Mother Agiltrudis evacuated Rome. In mid-February 896 Arnulf received the imperial crown from Pope Formosus. But the campaign planned against Spoleto had to be cancelled, for the new Emperor was suddenly overtaken by the hereditary illness of the East Frankish Kings. Arnulf returned northward, as though in full flight, in April, but even before he had reached the Alps, Pope Formosus died on 4 April 896.

Death spared Formosus severe trials but not a *damnatio memoriae* of a gruesome sort. In January 897 his corpse was disinterred and, in full pontificals, brought before a synod, where a deacon, as his proxy, confessed his guilt. The synod acknowledged the nullity of his elevation to the papacy and of his official acts. Finally, his corpse was cast into the Tiber. It was recovered by a hermit, who reinterred it. The gruesome trial was not unavenged. In the same year 897 the adherents of Formosus in Rome rose and Pope Stephen VI was deposed and eventually strangled. But the Formosans were not very lucky with the next two Popes: both Romanus and Theodore II died in quick succession. Encouraged by this, the anti-Formosans seized the initiative and in the spring of 898 brought about the election of Bishop Sergius of Caere as Pope. The fact that, by this change of see, Sergius was violating an ancient ecclesiastical prohibition probably did not much concern the Romans, for three promotions of bishops to the papacy within a brief period had virtually nullified the opposing rule. Hence it was not for canonical reasons but for reasons of party politics that the Formosans forcibly expelled the newly elected Sergius and elevated John IX (898–900). John's first efforts were directed to the restoration of order in conjunction with the Emperor Lambert. A Roman Synod, attended also by North Italian bishops, condemned the sentence passed against Formosus, anathematized those who violated corpses and the leaders of the anti-Formosans, especially Sergius, and sought to guarantee future papal elections by decreeing, among other things, that, as earlier, they must take place in the presence of an imperial *missus*. Then the Emperor Lambert and John IX held another synod at Ravenna, which confirmed the Roman decrees and provided for appeal to the Emperor in the event of conflicts among the Romans, thus renewing the *Constitutio Romana* of Lothar I.

All that was expected of the future was frustrated by the sudden death of the young Emperor. In Lambert the Roman Church lost its last support. No help could be expected from the Emperor Arnulf, who succumbed to his incurable illness on 8 December 899 at Regensburg, nor from his successor as King of Germany, Louis the Child. John IX's successor, Benedict IV (900–3), did, it is true, give the imperial crown to young King Louis of Provence in 901, but the latter was defeated in his struggle with Berengar of Friuli; blinded, he returned to Provence in 905. But, before this, important events had occurred at Rome. On the death of Benedict IV there ensued a split in the still dominant Formosan faction. After about two months, in September 903, the priest Christopher overthrew the legitimate Pope Leo V and usurped his place. But the intruder was not to enjoy his success. At the beginning of 904 Sergius of Caere marched on Rome with an armed force and seized power. His pontificate marked an epoch, not so much because of the now final elimination of the Formosans as because of the connections which Sergius had with influential families. With him began a new period of Roman history, that of the domination of the city and the papacy by the nobility.

Chapter 23

Reform, Theology, and Education under the Later Carolingians

The Carolingian Renaissance did not come to an end with the end of imperial unity, but achieved its third and final climax under the grandsons of Charles the Great. Its effects were first clearly discernible in Rome in this phase. In the Frankish Empire decentralization, which had begun under Louis the Pious, made further progress after the Verdun partition. Instead of the single imperial court there now existed three and later even five courts of equal rank; but these were in no sense the only or even the outstanding centres of education in the partner-kingdoms. Only the court of Charles the Bald, at which was the great Irish scholar, John Scotus (before 845 to after 867), polarized the cultural life of the West Frankish Kingdom to a certain degree.

An adherent of Lothar I celebrated in song the battle of Fontanet. The history of the war among the royal brothers was written by Nithard, who was not only a vassal of Charles the Bald but, through his mother, a grandson of Charles the Great. There are also other testimonies of the education of the lay aristocracy, such as the *Manuale* of Dhuoda, wife of Bernard of Barcelona, for her son William, and the catalogues of the libraries of the Margrave Eberhard of Friuli and Count Eckehard of Mâcon. But war and inner chaos led in the next decades to an ever growing barbarism among the imperial aristocracy. Nithard's work had no sequel, and the initial efforts for a lay education atrophied.

The sons of Louis the Pious, who had had the benefit of a first-rate education, were, like their father, interested in theological questions. The Emperor Lothar I, to whom Walafrid dedicated two works in 841 and Wandalbert of

Prüm his martyrology in 848, asked Rhabanus and Angelomus of Luxeuil for scriptural commentaries. The *praeceptor Germaniae* dedicated some of his writings also to Louis the German, who, following the estrangement during the war among the brothers, made him Archbishop of Mainz in 847. The East Frankish King consulted Hincmar of Reims on Genesis and the Psalms and acquired the works of Saint Ambrose. Sedulius Scotus, who was closely connected with the court of Aachen but also had ties with the other Carolingians, probably wrote his "mirror for princes" for Lothar II. The widest range of intellectual interests was possessed by Charles the Bald, to whom some fifty contemporary writings were dedicated. The West Frankish King himself commissioned authoritative theological opinions.

The most important link between the court and the great ecclesiastical centres of culture at this time was still the royal chapel. The chapels at Aachen, Frankfurt, Regensburg, and Compiègne were made collegiate churches. Thereby the Kings fulfilled a long-standing desire of the Church reformers. The canons continued to be members of the palace clergy, but, in contradistinction to the chaplains, who were from now on bound to service in the immediate retinue of the King, they had a fixed residence and an ecclesiastical status. Moreover, in Lotharingia and Provence a closer connection between the chapel and the most outstanding ecclesiastical metropolises was in preparation. In the East Frankish Kingdom the same process appeared in the latter part of the reign of Louis the German. Likewise, with the assigning of the highest spiritual functions at court to the most distinguished metropolitans in their realms the Kings seem to have acceded to the desire of the reformers for the inclusion of the palace clergy in the existing Church order. In the West Frankish Kingdom, as earlier, the archchaplains and archchancellors were provided with abbeys, such as Saint-Denis, Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Saint-Martin de Tours. In Italy at this time no association of specific churches with court officers can be determined.

A number of large monasteries were closely attached to the several royal courts as the endowment of queens, princes, and princesses. From the chapels and the royal monasteries abbots and, especially in the West Frankish Kingdom, bishops thereafter proceeded. But new educational centres seldom arose as a result of direct action by the court clergy. More clearly than in the preceding period the episcopate appeared as the representative of education. The bishops even took charge of the quasi-official historiography, which had hitherto been the province of the chapel.

The various lands of the Frankish Empire did not all participate in equal measure in the later Carolingian Renaissance; in an age of growing external perils several older centres ceased to be active. Saxony had not yet fully opened itself up to Carolingian culture. Provence remained on the fringes and had to suffer early from the attacks of Muslim pirates. Aquitaine was disturbed by inner confusion, and its coasts were afflicted by the Vikings. Only the sees of Bourges and Poitiers continued to have rather close relations with *Francia*. But even in *Francia* the ecclesiastical provinces of Tours and Rouen, severely tried by the struggles with Vikings and Bretons, became less prominent. In the third quarter of the ninth century the centres of intellectual life were in the provinces of Sens and Reims, Lyons and Vienne, Trier and Cologne, Mainz and Salzburg. And, alongside the Frankish centres, Rome emerged again as an intellectual centre in this period.

Compared with the age of Louis the Pious, the third phase of the Carolingian Renaissance was full of variety and colour. The *artes* were represented not only by grammarians but also by philologists and "humanists" of universal knowledge, such as Lupus of Ferrières (diocese of Sens), Heiric of Auxerre, and John Scotus. Nor was the age lacking in gifted poets: Sedulius Scotus, Milo of Saint-Amand, Gottschalk, and Wandalbert of Prüm. Most writers did not confine themselves to the *artes* but also tried their hand at scriptural exegesis. Even Otfrid's poem on the life and sufferings of Christ, which introduced the fourfold final rhyme of the contemporary Latin poetry into Old High German, was a scholarly and to a great extent exegetical work. History and hagiography were likewise cultivated. The new type of "historical" martyrologies originated at Lyons and Vienne, where Florus and Ado revised Bede's martyrology. Recourse to them was had by the Paris monk, Usuard of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, whose martyrology, compiled in 875 at the request of Charles the Bald, was soon widely circulated and finally became the basis of the *Martyrologium Romanum*.

A mastery of Greek was acquired by two Irishmen, John and Sedulius Scotus, at the West Frankish and the Lotharingian courts, and by the papal librarian, Anastasius. John Scotus and Anastasius translated into Latin the writings of pseudo-Dionysius, which were to be of the greatest importance for the later intellectual formation of the West and already inspired the philosophical and theological concepts of John Scotus. This teacher at the court of Charles the Bald had no equal as an original thinker in his day. In his chief work, *De divisione naturae,* composed in 867 at the request of Archbishop Wulfad of Bourges, he describes the creation of the world, *natura creata et non creans,* by God, *natura creans et non creata,* through the agency of ideas, *natura creans et creata,* and its return to God as its final end, *natura nec creans nec creata,* through the mediatorship of Christ. The Christian teaching on creation and redemption was here given a Neoplatonic interpretation with no toning down of its dogmatic content.

For John God remains ultimately inaccessible — theology of negation — to the extent that he has not revealed himself directly or indirectly by means of ideas and creation. Man ascends to him by his senses, reason, and intellect. Sense knowledge became a necessary preliminary to rational knowledge only because of the fall; but it is at the same time a remedy for sins in so far as it leads from the sensuous external to the intellectual. *Ratio* is not comprehended as separate from faith, but as a God-given force for the illuminating of faith. It conducts to intellectual knowledge, that is, to the vision of God, which for its part presupposes a theophany. The return of man to God is possible only through Christ, God's self-revelation, and his grace. Sin is explained neoplatonically as perseverance in the present state; its punishment lies in itself. Death appears as progress to the higher form, as return to the ideas, which are to be understood, not as emanations from God, but as an expression of the divine will, and which have their eternity in the Logos. To the extent that ideas exist virtually also in man's mind, the entire creation is also redeemed together with man by Christ.

John Scotus was one of the most important representatives of Carolingian intellectual life in the West Frankish Kingdom, but he was not its only witness. Carolingian theology reached its climax simultaneously in the discussion on the Eucharist and on predestination. In Christian antiquity the Eucharist had been understood as the "representation *(anamnesis)* of Christ's real person and of the salvation connected with it". The great mystery was left undefined. The presence of the Redeemer in the Sacrament was referred to the Logos, to the historical Jesus, and to the *Corpus Christi mysticum,* all at the same time, but the various theological schools stressed different aspects. The occasion for the Eucharistic controversy of the ninth century may have been provided by Amalarius, who in his explanation of the Mass in 821 interpreted also the *fractio panis,* relating the parts of the Host to the *triforme corpus* of the Lord — that is, the body born of Mary and glorified in the resurrection, the *ecclesia militans,* or community of the living, and the *ecclesia triumphans,* or community of the dead. This concretizing of the mystery was attacked by Florus and condemned at the Synod of Quierzy in 838.

But even before Quierzy Paschasius Radbertus of Corbie had composed his *De corpore et sanguine Domini* in 831–33 for the edification of his confrères at Corvey. In this he stressed the full identity of the Eucharist with the body of Christ that was born of Mary and expounded the reality of the Mass as the repetition of Calvary. The work did not attract the interest of theologians until Radbertus offered it in a revised and expanded form to Charles the Bald. The Abbot of Corbie followed Ambrose, whereas Carolingian theology was under the standard of Augustine, who had, it is true, understood the Eucharist as the "substantial image of the *res ipsa*", but at the same time stressed its "function of sign as *sacramentum corporis* at a distance from the *res ipsa*". The first opposition to Radbertus came after 845 from Rhabanus Maurus, who defined communion as union with Christ into one body by faith. Likewise the Saxon monk Gottschalk, otherwise an opponent of Rhabanus, adopted a stand against the Abbot of Corbie in a work composed around 850. He likened the presence of Christ in the bread and wine to the hypostatic union of the two natures of the Son of God, just as John Damascene had done a century earlier. Hence Gottschalk saw in it an objective reality, but only in the form of a divine power inherent in the Eucharist. He rejected the interpretation of the Mass as a real repetition of Calvary. Gottschalk's fundamental notion was shared by his friend and teacher, Ratramnus of Corbie, who, like several early Christian theologians, compared the presence of Christ in the Eucharist to the operation of the Holy Spirit in the baptismal water.

Paschasius Radbertus defended his doctrine in his commentary on Matthew, resumed after 853, and in a letter to Fredegard of Saint-Riquier. He again maintained his explanation of the Mass, but defended himself against misinterpretations springing from a far too materialistic idea of the Lord's glorified body, and especially rejected the thesis attributed to him of a dismembering of Christ's body in communion. He wanted transubstantiation to be understood as a mysterious re-creation, repeated at any given moment, of the body and blood of the Lord. With this the controversy came to an end and was only taken up again, under different circumstances, in the eleventh century.

The discussion of the Eucharist had been confined to a relatively small group. Matters were far more stormy in the controversy over the teaching of the monk Gottschalk on predestination, in which even the episcopate took sides. Son of a Saxon Count Bern, Gottschalk was born around 804 and as a child was offered to the monastery of Fulda. Before 824 he was sent to complete his studies at Reichenau, returning to Fulda around 827 in the company of Walafrid, his fellow student. He now met Lupus of Ferrières, who was then studying in the foundation of Saint Boniface. Before long the Saxon monk came into conflict with his Abbot Rhabanus, since he demanded his release from the monastery and the return of the property donated by his father. In June 829 at a synod at Mainz Archbishop Otgar granted him a release on condition of his renouncing the dowry presented to the monastery. Neither party was satisfied, and Rhabanus appealed to the Emperor. The decision of Louis the Pious has not come down to us, but the Saxon must have been released from the vows made as an *oblatus*.

Gottschalk thereupon left Fulda but then returned to the monastic life. The stops on his journey might quite well have been Corvey, Corbie, Hautvillers, and Rebais. Finally he entered the monastery of Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons, where he was ordained a priest between 835 and 840. After a pilgrimage to Rome he went *via* Friuli, where he stayed for a while at the court of the Margrave Eberhard, as missionary to the Croats and Bulgars. In 848 he returned to *Francia*.

Already in Italy Gottschalk, as a biased but highly gifted interpreter of Augustine, had expounded his doctrine of double predestination to salvation and to damnation, of the limitation of the redemption to the elect, as appears from letters written by Rhabanus in 840 and 845–46. After his return to *Francia* he was summoned in October 848 before a synod at Mainz, which was presided over by Louis the German. Here he defended his teaching against Rhabanus, now Archbishop of Mainz, but was condemned as a heretic and a vagabond monk, whipped, and sent back to Orbais. Rhabanus notified the metropolitan, Hincmar, who the next year summoned the monk to the Synod of Quierzy, which had been convoked by Charles the Bald. Here too Gottschalk refused to retract, was again flogged, perpetually silenced, and conveyed to the monastery of Hautvillers in the archdiocese of Reims, since Hincmar distrusted the proper local Ordinary, Rothad of Soissons.

Detention in a monastery was not the same thing as imprisonment. It is true that Gottschalk lived in a penitentiary apart from the monastic community proper, but in regard to maintenance and clothing he seems to have been treated like his confrères. He continued to write and found friends who would circulate his works. Hincmar opposed them with a brief treatise on predestination, and thereby began the great controversy. Ratramnus of Corbie entered the lists on behalf of his pupil and friend. Hincmar turned to five highly esteemed theologians, among them Amalarius of Metz, Prudentius of Troyes, and Lupus of Ferrières. But Prudentius and Lupus ranged themselves, apart from slight differences in detail, on the side of Gottschalk, who for his part dispatched a lengthy memorandum to the participants in the Synod of Quierzy. Even the court took notice, and Charles the Bald asked Lupus and Ratramnus for their opinion. Both complied in 850 with detailed discussions, Lupus in *Liber de tribus quaestionibus,* Ratramnus in *De praedestinatione.* Rhabanus and Hincmar had admitted only a predestination to good. Lupus adhered to double predestination, even though he made a distinction between *praedestinatio ad gloriam* and *praedestinatio ad poenam* and expressed himself cautiously on the question of the limiting of the redemption to the elect. Ratramnus characterized predestination to glory as a free act of the divine mercy, predestination to punishment as a being left in the state of reprobation.

Hincmar, theologically isolated, sought help from John Scotus. But Neoplatonic philosophy proved unable to solve the great theological mystery, and John's inadequate effort called the metropolitans of Sens and Lyons into the fray. Wenilo of Sens entrusted the refutation of the Irishman to his suffragan Prudentius, who presented his views in a new treatise written in 851–52. In the name of the Church of Lyons, whose Archbishop Amolo had thus far occupied an intermediate position, Florus attacked the doctor of the West Frankish court. Hincmar thereupon sought to play off Amolo against Florus, but Amolo died in 852 and was succeeded by Remigius. The new Archbishop of Lyons had a second treatise written, and this was directed chiefly against his fellow Archbishop of Reims.

Gottschalk was now almost forgotten as the quarrel moved to another plane. The controversy centered on the four *capitula* which Hincmar, with the aid of Charles the Bald, had had ratified by a small group at Quierzy.

In these *praedestinatio ad poenam* was interpreted as *praescientia,* the recovery of free will was explained, in accord with tradition, as a gift of the grace of redemption, and God's salvific will and the redemption were expressly referred to all mankind, in opposition to the prevailing Augustinianism. Hincmar's *capitula* encountered criticism in a new polemical work from Lyons and in the Synod of Valence in 855, the canons of which specified the viewpoint of the episcopate of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles, which in many respects differed from that of Hincmar. In 856 the episcopate of the province of Sens expressly committed the newly elected Aeneas of Paris to the traditional Augustinian doctrine. A collision between the Lyons and the Reims factions occurred at the Frankish Diet of Savonnières in 859. The question had to be removed from the agenda. Hincmar again expressed himself in a third and final treatise, into which he incorporated the teaching of the Greek Fathers, who were more in accord with his view than was Augustine. And so the discussion was resumed in 860 at the Frankish Diet of Thuzey, whose irenic *communiqué* adopted some of Hincmar's views but did not reconcile the fundamental differences. In 859 the Rhône bishops had referred the question to the Pope. Nicholas I had Hincmar and Gottschalk summoned to the Synod of Metz in 863, but neither of them appeared. The initiative of the Pope, who was apparently inclined toward the Augustinian view, aroused the hopes of Gottschalk's friends, and in 866 the monk Guntbert secretly left Hautvillers for Rome with Gottschalk's writings. But the fronts had already become obscured in the West Frankish Kingdom, and Hincmar commissioned Archbishop Egilo of Sens to act as his proxy. Nicholas I, at that time heavily burdened with other kinds of anxieties, issued no decision — he died in the autumn of 867.

Around the same time, between 866 and 870, the monk Gottschalk also died. He was a fascinating personality of great brilliance. No innovator, he was a man of the most profound inner fervour, to whom worship and doctrine became so personal an experience that even deep mysteries appeared to him as evident truths. The bluntness which is frequently found in the nature of men of his type grew in the course of his detention into a psychosis. But the experience of divine grace also strengthened the unhappy monk at the height of his sufferings, and Gottschalk gave expression to this in poetry that will never die.

The Eucharist and predestination were not the only problems occupying the theologians of the third Carolingian generation. The doctrine of the Trinity and questions referring to the nature of the soul and the vision of God were likewise discussed — and by the same persons: Gottschalk, Hincmar, and Ratramnus. More important apparently was the movement stimulated in the West by the Synod of Constantinople of the summer of 867 with its excommunication of Pope Nicholas I. The Pope mobilized the Frankish episcopate also against Byzantium. He applied to Hincmar of Reims, who entrusted Eudes of Beauvais with the refutation of the traditional Greek accusations against the Latins. On behalf of the province of Sens Aeneas of Paris wrote *Adversus Graecos*. The East Frankish Kingdom expressed itself at the Synod of Worms in 868. But Ratramnus of Corbie eclipsed the bishops with his *Contra Graecorum opposita,* in which he replied to the grievances of the East in detail. He especially took up the old controverted question of the *processio Spiritus Sancti* and defended the papal primacy against Byzantium. The renewed Greek-Latin controversy of 867–68 formed the final act of the great theological discussions which had begun after the Treaty of Verdun and had been conducted from the start predominantly, and, after the death of Rhabanus, exclusively, by the diocesan and regular clergy of Western *Francia* (the provinces of Reims and Sens) and of the Rhône region (the province of Lyons).

It was also in the West Frankish episcopate that the political impulses in questions of Empire and Church, coming down from the days of Louis the Pious, produced their strongest effects. The last great representative of the Carolingian "great church" was Hincmar of Reims, the most loyal assistant of Charles the Bald and his successors, for whom, nevertheless, the unity of the Empire in the form of a *fraternitas* continued to possess validity. The intimate cooperation of the Archbishop with the crown began early in the 850's, when Charles wanted to free himself from the at first overpowering influence of his lay aristocracy. It survived the difficult crisis of confidence between King and Archbishop in 865–67 and eventually also the tension evoked a decade later by Charles's Italian policy. The theocratic political ideology of the Carolingian period received its final formulation from Hincmar. The Archbishop proceeded from the Gelasian teaching of the two powers, which had impressed itself on the consciousness of the Franks in the reign of Louis the Pious. He clearly distinguished the political sector, the *res publica,* from the ecclesiastical. He defined the royal power, which in his view occupied the central place, as a *ministerium* instituted by God. But he rejected the unconditional duty of loyalty, especially for bishops, whom he wanted to keep uninvolved by feudal ties. Bishops, he said, owed fidelity to the King not "in omnibus" but "iuxta ministerium", on the basis of their office. That Hincmar was not concerned to challenge the obligations of the episcopate to the state is seen in his conduct in the conflict between the King and his suffragan of Laon, in which the Archbishop acknowledged the ruler's competence in matters of ecclesiastical feudalism.

In his doctrine of the two powers Gelasius had attributed more importance to the *auctoritas sacrata pontificum,* with respect to its greater responsibility before God, than to the *regalis potestas*. Hincmar also based the higher authority of the bishops on the anointing of the King, the ritual for which he himself composed. The anointing was not only an external sign of the divine institution of the royal office but also a raising of the King above the laity. To attack the Lord's anointed was an especially serious crime. But by virtue of his anointing the King became no more irremovable than was the bishop, who, like him, was a *christus Domini*. The question of whether, in the case of tyranny, of serious offences by the ruler against the law of God, the bishops were competent to act as judges had been posed as early as 833. Hincmar answered affirmatively in principle. As appears from his attitude toward Louis the German in 858–60 and Lothar II in 860–83, he saw in the imperial synod, that is, in the all-Frankish council, the court before which Kings had to answer and which, in a case of necessity, could even depose a King. Whether Hincmar ever concretely considered deposition proceedings remains very doubtful.

In all the subkingdoms Kings and bishops continued to depend upon one another. Following the end of the war among the royal brothers the episcopate expected a resumption of the reform endeavours of the days of Louis the Pious. The higher clergy again met regularly at the Frankish Diets, at the assemblies of individual kingdoms, and at the imperial synods. In the West Frankish Kingdom there was soon a considerable amount of ecclesiastical legislation, while in the East Frankish Kingdom the death of Rhabanus marked a turning point. But great reform gatherings with a program of significance no longer took place in the West either. Among the regularly recurring themes were the questions of ecclesiastical property, the proprietary church, the penitential discipline, and the Church's matrimonial law. In their totality they dealt with the inner improvement of dioceses and the authority of the episcopate *vis-à-vis* clerics, monks, and laity.

In addition to imperial assemblies and councils there were also provincial and diocesan synods, which dealt with a group of themes that were on the whole similar. It seems that the many claims made on the episcopate by the imperial service interfered with provincial synods to a great extent. However, synods of the great ecclesiastical provinces, in whose convocation or decisions the King had a direct share, were hardly different from imperial councils. The detailed activity in the dioceses was probably more noteworthy than the meagre sources would indicate. Diocesan statutes were issued in the bishoprics of Reims, Bourges, Tours, Toul, Le Mans, Orléans, Châlons, and Soissons. The network of parishes was further extended in the second half of the ninth century, and the struggle against the *chorepiscopi* was successful. The former large parishes under an archpriest had already been replaced here and there in the West by deaneries. The deans supervised the life and official acts of the clergy of their districts and thereby strengthened the authority of the bishop over the rural proprietary churches. The name is first attested in the diocese of Le Mans around 840, but the institution was soon found in Champagne. In 852 Hincmar of Reims had instructions compiled for the deans of his diocese. Around the same time regional archdeaconries were also established, which often probably conformed to the former territories of *chorepiscopi*. The archdeacons supervised the delimiting and financial administration of parishes and controlled the archpriests and deans. The first evidence for them comes from the sees of Langres (870), Orléans (871), and Reims (874). With deanery and archdeaconry the mediaeval diocese acquired its shape. But it still required considerable time before these institutions were everywhere established.

If one's glance shifts from the parochial and diocesan organization to the monasteries and chapters, the balance is far less favourable. The abuse of the lay abbacy increased first in the West Frankish Kingdom under Charles the Bald and then in the subdivisions of the Middle Kingdom, and many an old *abbatia* was ruined, either temporarily or even permanently. But it must not be overlooked that many of these churches, even if not exactly the richest and most famous, remained in the possession of the episcopate. The reform introduced under Louis the Pious did not die out entirely, and the later Carolingians also confirmed free abbatial election and the division of the *mensa*. Charles the Bald in 853 and the Emperor Louis II in 865 ordered their *missi* to undertake a monastic visitation.

Although provincial synods were largely supplanted by synods of the several kingdoms, still the metropolitans played an important role in the ninth century. Since the time of Charles the Great they bore the title of archbishop and wore the pallium as the insignia of their rank. The assemblies and synods of the various kingdoms were dominated by certain archbishops — those of Sens and Reims in the West Frankish Kingdoms, those of Cologne and Trier in Lotharingia, of Lyons in Provence, of Mainz in the East Frankish Kingdom, and of Milan and Aquileia in Italy. The typical archbishop of the day, who energetically defended the rights of metropolitans against both rebellious suffragans and Rome, was Hincmar of Reims.

According to the ancient canon law the metropolitan was not the superior of the bishops of his province; he exercised over them only a right of supervision. He convoked and directed provincial synods. He confirmed the elections of his suffragans, thus possessing a right of veto, and had a right to be asked for his approval of the important decisions of his suffragans. From the time that metropolitans wore the pallium as archbishops, a right originally belonging only to the Metropolitan of Arles as papal vicar, they were also regarded as representatives of the Pope — competent *in partem sollicitudinis* in a sense not defined in more detail in law. On the other hand, they were also intermediaries between the episcopate and the Emperor and were frequently appointed *missi* in their provinces. As such they had the task of publishing the capitularies and supervising their implementation in their provinces. But their powers were encroached upon in regard to the choosing of bishops, in which they had been concerned since the sixth century.

Strengthened by the reform of Empire and Church, the archbishops of the ninth century had frequently exerted themselves to transform the old right of supervision into a power of direction. Hincmar made a distinction between metropolitans with and those without the pallium. According to him, metropolitans without the pallium were on occasion subject to a patriarch or primate, whereas those with the pallium were directly subject to Rome. The archbishops of the Frankish Empire, he said, had obtained, along with the pallium, the rights of the Vicar of Arles: they were answerable to no one in instituting their suffragans and in convoking provincial synods. Thus were the ancient rights of metropolitans in the Frankish Empire defined and extended. According to Hincmar, an archbishop had the right to convoke provincial synods, which he directed, to a place of his choice and to punish absent bishops, to appoint visitors during the vacancy of sees, to arrange the new election and consecration, to examine and confirm the bishop-elect, and to decide a disputed election. The suffragan was to be bound by the archbishop's authorization not only for the alienation of Church property but also for the acceptance of functions and for journeys outside the province. Appeal could be made to the archbishop from the decisions of the bishop or of the diocesan synod. According to Hincmar the archbishop could also summon cases to his own tribunal and interfere at will in the administration of his suffragans. Appeal to Rome, however, was possible only after a provincial synod had passed sentence. The Pope had to look into it, but, according to the ancient canon law as determined by the Council of Sardica, he had to refer the case to the synod of a neighbouring province. In Hincmar's view ecclesiastical legislation was the business of general councils; he conceded to the decretals only a function of clarifying and implementing.

The exalted opinion which Hincmar had of his office led to conflicts with his suffragans, Rothad of Soissons in 856–64 and Hincmar of Laon in 869–72. The tensions in the province of Reims were aggravated by the opposition of the clerics and monks who had been ardained by Ebbo during his temporary restoration in 840–41 and whom Hincmar had suspended. To all appearances the Reims opposition was intimately connected with the great forgery *atelier,* from which proceeded the capitularies of pseudo-Benedictus Levita and the decretals of pseudo-Isidore. Of course, the intentions of the forgers were not simply identical with the aims of Hincmar's opponents; they were far more comprehensive and sought to guarantee the Carolingian reform work, threatened as it was by political developments.

The Carolingian reform had produced a uniform organization in the dioceses and provinces and had elevated the level of intellectual and religious education and moral consciousness, but it had been unable completely to disengage the Church from its involvement in the world. The restoration of the secularized Church property ceased. The proprietary church was regulated by law but thereby legalized. The lay abbacy was merely checked, not abolished.

Despite the privileges granted by Louis the Pious, elections to high ecclesiastical offices were not really free. Since the confusion of the 830's retrogression was again noticeable in all these spheres. The moral deterioration of the lay aristocracy threatened the Church's marriage law, and episcopal authority over the clergy belonging to proprietary churches remained problematic. New secularizations struck at the material foundations of the Church, and in wide areas of the Empire the lay abbacy was again gaining ground. The higher clergy were deeply implicated in the Carolingian factions, and political passions and accusations jeopardized legal safeguards. The main items of the reform program of the forgers corresponded to the ever recurring themes of the imperial assemblies: security of Church property from usurpation and secularization, freedom of the clergy for their religious and ecclesiastical duties, legal safeguards for the episcopate and the lower clergy by means of respect for canonical processes, and the extending of the *privilegium fori* to all clerics. But the forgers emphasized that the guarantor of the reform was no longer the Emperor since the Treaty of Verdun but the Pope. For them he ranked as the supreme judge in all *causae maiores,* that is, especially in the cases of bishops. In their view all synods received their authority from Rome, so that no conciliar decree possessed validity without the express or tacit consent of the Pope.

It is only possible to understand the forgeries when they are inserted into their historical context. Already in the ninth century Rome was regarded as the mother of many Gallic churches. Legends of apostolic foundations had spread from Arles throughout the south of Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries, while in the early eighth and the early ninth centuries they can be traced in the Gallo-Frankish north, at Paris, Châlons, Trier, and Cologne. The Roman Church had supplied the doctrinal, liturgical, and canonical norms for the reforms of Pepin and Charles the Great. Persons had rights confirmed and exemptions granted by the Holy See. As Ullman says, "The forgers invented, not the ideology, but the decrees which were to act as the historical basis for the ideology". In the Middle Ages reform was always understood as a return to the ancient law. And so the ninth century forgers regarded themselves, not as innovators, but as renewers. And so also they dressed up their ideas in capitularies of the great Carolingians and in decretals of the ancient Popes. The hand of the forgers is to be detected first in the interpolated *Hispana* of Autun. Then from the same *atelier* proceeded in quick succession: the *Capitula Angilramni,* allegedly sent by Hadrian I to Angilram of Metz; the *Capitularies* compiled allegedly by Benedictus Levita at the suggestion of Archbishop Otgar of Mainz; and the *Decretals* of the so-called Isidorus Mercator.

The forgeries were made between 847 and 852. For in 847 occurred the death of Archbishop Otgar of Mainz, already referred to as dead in the *Capitularies,* and 1 November 852 is the date of the diocesan statutes of

Hincmar of Reims, in which some of the False Decretals are quoted for the first time. At approximately the same time, between 851 and 853, Archbishop Theutgaud of Trier claimed the primacy of Gallia Belgica, the ecclesiastical provinces of Trier and Reims, a thing he could have done only on the basis of forgeries. Pseudo-Isidorean ideas appear in some documents from Le Mans, that is, in a bull falsely attributed to Gregory IV, in the *Gesta Aldrici,* and in the *Actus pontificum,* but these last were already completed in 841 and 836–38 respectively. Benedictus Levita was first quoted in West Frankish capitularies in 857, and from then on the examples become more frequent. Pseudo-Isidore played a big role in the processes of Rothad of Soissons (861–64) and especially of Hincmar of Laon (869–72). The immediate occasion for the making of the forgeries was probably provided by the royal assembly of Épernay in 846, at which the West Frankish episcopate and its reform program suffered a serious defeat at the hands of the imperial aristocracy. According to the oldest witnesses the forgers' *atelier* is to be sought in the ecclesiastical province of Reims. The setback at Épernay affected primarily Hincmar of Reims, and it may have given a temporary advantage to Ebbo's adherents. The curious office of primate, which the forgers inserted between Rome and the metropolitan as a "passive court of appeals", to use Fuhrmann's expression, seems to have been expressly invented in the interests of Ebbo's faction, who sought to find in the Archbishop of Trier support against their own metropolitan. It should be borne in mind that Theutgaud of Trier was the first and for a long time the only Archbishop who laid claim to a primacy in the meaning of pseudo-Isidore.

The effects of the False Capitularies and False Decretals were limited in the ninth century. The forgeries provided Nicholas I with important tools but they did not give his pontificate its special character. It has been rightly stressed that the forgeries, far from establishing papal power, presupposed it. But they did give to Rome's authority a juridical form and in the eleventh century they became an essential instrument in the papal government of the Church, a basis of the Roman primacy of jurisdiction.

The great controversies of the Carolingian Age died out in the 860's, while the growth of canon law came to a standstill in the 880's and 890's. Pseudo-Isidore was admitted into the *Collectio Anselmo dedicata,* an Italian canonical collection of 882–96, and into the acts of the East Frankish Synod of Tribur in 895. The forgeries also played a role in the Formosan troubles, but then they withdrew entirely into the background. Synodal legislation ceased in West Frankland at Fîmes and Ver in 881–84, in Italy at Pavia in 891, in Burgundy at Vienne in 892, and in East Frankland at Tribur in 895.

At Rome intellectual life reached its peak in the pontificates of Nicholas I, Hadrian II, and John VIII. The outstanding scholar was Anastasius the

Librarian, who was on friendly terms with the Emperor Louis II[1] and in 855 even came forward as the imperial antipope, but afterwards again had *entrée* to the Lateran. He wrote the *vita* of Nicholas I in the *Liber pontificalis* and, "as a sort of private secretary from 861 or 862", acquired great influence over papal policy. Hadrian II entrusted him with the direction of the chancery by making him librarian. Anastasius became famous not least of all for his translations from Greek — lives of saints, acts of the general councils of 787 and 869–70, documents of the ecclesiastical history of the seventh century, pseudo-Dionysius, and Theophanes. His interest in Church history was shared by John the Deacon, who, it is true, did not complete a church history that he had planned in cooperation with Anastasius, but composed a *vita* of Gregory the Great and began a *Vita Clementis,* important for the history of the Apostle of the Slavs, Constantine-Cyril, which was completed before 882 by the one who commissioned it, Bishop Gauderic of Velletri. The quarter-century of cultural flowering at Rome also became significant for the development of the medieval idea of the Eternal City. It was ended by the collapse of the Carolingian papacy, made visible in the discontinuance of the traditional papal *vitae* in the *Liber pontificalis.* Already there were in the *Liber pontificalis* no *vitae* of the murdered John VIII and his short-lived successors, Marinus I and Hadrian III. The last Bishop of Rome to receive a biography of the old type was Stephen V (885–91), predecessor of Formosus.

Ravenna, which belonged in law to the Papal State but was in fact more closely connected with the Carolingians, produced in Agnellus (d. after 846), author of the *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatensis,* an historian of the first rank. In South Italy the court of Benevento under Arichis had become a centre of culture at the height of the Carolingian Age, but after the mid-century it lost its importance with the disintegration of the principality. The archabbey of Montecassino was connected not only with the Lombard Princes of Benevento but also with the Carolingians and the Byzantine Emperors. The monastery's historiography, which began with a monastic chronicle in 867, was resumed at Capua after the destruction of the abbey by the Muslims in 882. At Capua the monk Erchempert (d. after 904) wrote his continuation of the *History of the Lombards* by Paul the Deacon. Brought down to 889, it is characterized by anti-Frankish sentiment. In the later ninth century Benevento and Capua were eclipsed by Naples, which, like Venice, was politically a part of the Byzantine Empire but in reality was independent and maintained close relations with Rome. The historiography of the bishopric began in Naples around the middle of the ninth century and developed in the following period. Here too there arose in the last decades of the ninth century a literature of translations from Greek, which made the city a focus of Graeco-Latin culture. Eugenius Vulgarius and Auxilius, writers at Naples at the turn of the century, were the spokesmen of the Formosans and, as such, testify to a connection with Rome.

---

[1] Anastasius composed the famous letter of Louis II to Basil I of 871, which based the "genuine" imperial office on Rome and the coronation by the Pope and thereby marked an epoch in the development of the Carolingian imperial idea. Anastasius was perhaps also the teacher of the Imperial Princess Irmingard; cf. (also for what follows) H. Loewe in *Wattenbach-Levison* IV, 394ff., 460ff., 465ff., 472.

Following the deaths of the Emperor Louis II in 875, Louis the German in 876, and Charles the Bald in 877, the Carolingian courts gradually lost their cultural importance. However, the *artes* and law were still cultivated at Pavia, which had a great tradition as the "capital" of Lombard-Frankish Italy and was one of the great school centres organized by Lothar I. At Milan, which in the Carolingian Age became a powerful rival of Pavia, a group of Irish monks, from whose circle came an encomium of Lothar I, even pursued Greek studies. In 877 Andrew of Bergamo, following Paul the Deacon, wrote a history of Carolingian Italy, which was not entirely free from reservations with regard to the Franks. From Verona, next to Pavia the most important educational centre of North Italy, where law was also taught, came the *Carmen de Adelardo episcopo* (c. 900), containing a lament for Louis II, Charles the Bald, and John VIII. In the circle around the Emperors of the Spoletan house was composed the *Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma,* a sharp protest against the alienation of imperial rights by the last Carolingians. The *Gesta Berengarii* glorified the deeds of the Friuli antiking. The last mirrors for princes were from the West Frankish Kingdom: Hincmar wrote them for Louis the Stammerer (877–79) and his sons, Louis III and Carloman. As *laudator temporis acti,* the great Archbishop of Reims, shortly before his death (882), composed the treatise *De ordine palatii* for the young King Carloman and his magnates. In this he was following the example set by Adalard of Corbie. In a different manner Notker of Sankt Gallen in 884 with his *Vita Karoli* held up to Charles the Fat the image of his great ancestor. Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in his epic, *De bello Parisiaco,* celebrated the resistance of Paris to the Vikings. Imperial historiography ceased in West Frankland in 882, in East Frankland in 891.

The Viking invasion of 879–91 had also seriously affected the very heart of Carolingian *Francia.* In Champagne, however, the continuity of the schools of Laon was undisturbed. From Laon came Manno, the last teacher of the court of Charles the Bald; assuming office in 864, he survived his lord until 893. A group of Irish grammarians worked toward the close of the century in the strong city, whose walls defied every assault. In 893 Archbishop Fulk commissioned Remigius of Auxerre and Hucbald of Saint-Amand to restore the intellectual life in his diocese of Reims. Remigius, a relative of Abbot Lupus of Ferrières, was the last in the series of the great "humanists" of Auxerre. As successor of his master Heiric, he taught at Auxerre from 876 until his call to Reims. After the assassination of Archbishop Fulk in 900 he went to Paris, where he died in 908. Hucbald (c. 840–930) had studied under his uncle Milo and under Heiric. His literary connections reached from Soissons to Utrecht and Mainz. The abbey of Saint-Amand in Hainaut had maintained its position in the midst of destruction and collapse. It was famed not only for its scriptorium but also as a refuge of the *artes:* from here proceeded the sequences, so significant for poetry and music. The abbey's central location between Champagne and the lower Rhine is revealed in its surviving manuscripts. From Saint-Amand came not only the Eulalia Sequence, the oldest poem in French, but also the Old High German song in praise of the West Frankish King Louis III, the victor of Saucourt (891).

In the likewise severely tried province of Cologne the most important late Carolingian culture centre was the abbey of Werden, which had not been affected by the devastation and maintained close connections with Hainaut. It was the place of origin of the *Musica enchiriadis* of Abbot Hoger (d. 902). The schools of Liège experienced a new development under Bishop Stephen (901–20), who, like Radbod of Utrecht, had studied at the West Frankish court under Manno of Laon.

Abbot Regino (892–99) undertook the reorganization of the abbey of Prüm, frequently sacked by the Vikings. When, because of struggles with the nobility, Regino finally had to leave the monastery in the Eifel mountains, Archbishop Radbod of Trier (883–915) gave him the monastery of Saint Martin at Trier, which had also been destroyed, and there the scholarly Abbot died in 915. The ecclesiastical restoration at Trier was aided by a textbook of harmony, with which Regino took his place beside Hoger of Werden and Hucbald of Saint-Amand, and by the manual of canon law, *De synodalibus causis,* which was completed in 906 and dedicated to Archbishop Hatto of Mainz. Regino lived on among posterity especially as the author of a world chronicle, finished in 908, which represented an uncommon achievement for this period.

In the East Frankish Kingdom Saxony first came into the light in the closing phase of the Carolingian Renaissance. Literary production, it is true, was limited to the missionary bishopric of Bremen-Hamburg, with the *Vita Anscharii* and the *Vita Rimberti,* and to the imperial abbey of Corvey, where Abbot Bovo I (879–90) was himself a writer. In the monastery on the Weser the "Poeta Saxo" composed around 890 an epic to glorify Charles the Great, and the monk Agius wrote a *vita* of Hathumod of Gandersheim, a daughter of the ancestor of the Liudolfings.

The real centres of intellectual life in the East Frankish Kingdom lay thereafter in Franconia, Swabia, and Bavaria. Under Charles the Fat there existed a close relationship between the royal chapel and the monasteries of Sankt Gallen and Reichenau on Lake Constance. Under Arnulf the imperial annals were continued at Regensburg and Niederaltaich. Sankt Gallen then experienced its first flowering with three luminaries, Ratpert (d. 890), Tutilo, and Notker (c. 840–912). In *Casus sancti Galli* Ratpert wrote the history of his monastery. Tutilo was an important artist and musician, noted for his tropes. But both were eclipsed by Notker Balbulus, who, despite a defect in speech, was a gifted poet. He determined the liturgical function and poetical laws of the sequence and showed himself to be a master of narration in his *vita* of Charles the Great, composed around 884. Sankt Gallen and Reichenau also appear at this time as centres of religious poetry in the Old High German dialect, which was carried to Freising by a pupil of Sankt Gallen, Waldo, brother of Solomon III of Constance. Thus the monasteries on Lake Constance then replaced Fulda and Weissenburg in their function in connection with East Frankish education and German literature, for which the "more deeply historical" designation of *teutonica lingua* (in place of *theodisca lingua*) became customary at Sankt Gallen and Mainz around 880. Apparently from a Rheno-Franconian or upper Rhine family came Gerald, an epic poet of equal stature with the lyric poet Notker. Gerald, probably in the last years of the ninth century, dedicated his Latin poem *Waltharius* to Ercanbald, Bishop of Eichstätt (c. 882–912).[2] The heroes of the epic — the Visigoth Waltharius and the Frank Hagano — appear in Gerald's work not only as skilled in the use of weapons but also as men educated in the *artes,* like the ninth-century Carolingian magnates from the families of William of Toulouse and Eric of Friuli.

Seen as a whole, the accomplishment of the fourth Carolingian generation was not inconsiderable, even though it was confined to the *artes*. Especially in poetry works of high merit appeared. No less important than the individual achievements were the continuity of the schools in several old educational centres, the work of reconstruction that soon began in the great metropolitan sees, and the springing up of new educational centres in Saxony. Thus it came about that even under the most severe trials intellectual life did not die out, and the legacy of the Carolingian reform and renaissance was substantially preserved for a new age.

---

[2] Schaller disagrees. He goes back to the older view of the Waltharius epic.

SECTION SIX

The Byzantine Church in the Age of Photius

Chapter 24

The Byzantine Church from 843 to 867

Despite the ending of the quarrel over images, the Church in the Byzantine Empire knew no peace in the succeeding decades. Whether the iconoclast faction was still so strong that it was able to contribute to the unrest may be disputed. But the opposition between the monks, or, more correctly, between the monastic "zealots" and a moderate Church policy represented especially by the imperial court and the higher, non-monastic clergy — an opposition incarnate shortly before in the two outstanding figures of Theodore of Studion and the Patriarch Nicephorus — continued to smoulder and flared up again and again. The new Patriarch Methodius (d. 847) was obliged as early as 845–46 to excommunicate the Studites.[1] In recent years these monks had formulated their own notion of the role of monasteries in the Church. They regarded themselves as the tribunal with authority to control the Patriarch and the guardians of the canons; they were especially the sworn enemies of any policy of adjustment, of any *oikonomia*.

From the outset Methodius could not be a patriarch of the Studites; he saw himself faced with a difficult situation. He was concerned to purge the episcopate of iconoclast elements and of any type of compromised clerics. This course was followed more strictly than had been the case under Tarasius. Whoever had weakened during the second period of Iconoclasm was deposed, as was also everyone who had received orders from such a bishop.[2] But how were the resulting great gaps to be filled up? As a moderate churchman, Methodius could not be interested in filling all episcopal sees with Studites. On the other hand, there was a lack of candidates who now fulfilled all the canonical requirements. To Methodius it seemed a lesser evil to let *epikeia* operate in regard to irregularities, but this evoked the strongest opposition from the Studites. Methodius did not put up with it for long, but demanded of them the condemnation of everything that had been written against the recourse to *epikeia* on the part of the Patriarchs Tarasius and

---

[1] *Grumel Reg,* no. 434.

[2] Ibid., no. 435.

Nicephorus.[3] This amounted to no less than the censuring of quite a number of pieces written by the Studites' hero, Theodore. Schism resulted, and Methodius died before the quarrel could be ended.[4]

It was now important for the monks to obtain as Patriarch a person belonging to their faction and to direct him according to their views. The choice of the Empress Theodora fell on the monk Ignatius, son of the former Emperor Michael I Rhangabe. The adherents of the dead Methodius, especially Gregory Asbestas, Archbishop of Syracuse, who had escaped from the Muslims to Constantinople and under Methodius had been prominent in Church government, opposed this choice. But the Empress had her way, apparently by not allowing any election by the synod. Asbestas and his friends bowed to the imperial will. But Ignatius insulted the Archbishop during the very rite of his consecration, and shortly afterwards deposed and excommunicated him, the pretext probably being some sort of irregularities in regard to ordinations that Gregory had performed on orders of the Patriarch Methodius. This deposition produced Ignatius's first quarrel with Rome, for the Curia reserved the case of Asbestas to itself, since he had had recourse to the Holy See.[5]

The case would probably have been forgotten, had not Ignatius especially excelled in making enemies, even at court. The Empress Theodora was not capable of governing independently. She gave all her confidence to the Logothete Theoctistus, who succeeded in removing dangerous rivals from the regency council, notably the Empress's brother, Bardas. The proclamation of the attainment of his majority by the Emperor Michael III was again and again postponed and his preparation for assuming the administration was criminally neglected. Bardas exploited all this to acquire a decisive influence. Ignatius was hardly concerned about the Emperor; in fact, he was all the more favourably disposed to the Empress. Then in 856 there occurred a *coup d'état:* Theoctistus was assassinated, Michael was declared by the Senate to have reached his majority, Theodora was deprived of influence, and Bardas assumed the direction of affairs. It goes without saying that Ignatius thereby lost his influence at court — a situation that he did not intend to put up with. When the rumour suddenly made the rounds that Bardas was living in incest with his widowed daughter-in-law, the Patriarch believed it without any proof and refused Bardas communion.[6] Bardas soon discovered an opportunity for retaliating. The ex-Empress, unhappy with her enforced inactivity, seems to have hatched a conspiracy, and the Patriarch was perhaps not entirely ignorant of it. Bardas compelled Theodora to enter a convent, and Ignatius himself was to give her the veil. But Ignatius refused, and in this Bardas saw an admission of his complicity. Shortly after, when a conspiracy against the government was discovered, the leaders of which were again sought for in the highest circles, Ignatius tried to protect the plotters. To Bardas this amounted to treason and he had the Patriarch deported to the island of Terebinthos in October 858.

---

[3] Ibid., no. 432.

[4] In regard to the Studite schism the article by E. von Dobschütz, "Methodios und die Studiten" in *ByZ* 18 (1908), 41–105, and the critical notes by V. Grumel in the supplement to *Reg,* no. 436, should be compared.

[5] The case of Asbestas has to a great extent remained unclarified. Cf. V. Grumel, "Le schisme de Grégoire de Syracuse" in *ÉO* 39 (1941 f.), 257–67. It does not seem to me to be certain that Gregory was rehabilitated by the synod in the interval between Ignatius and Photius nor is this to be deduced from the words of Pope Nicholas I (*MGEp* VI, 498 f.), for, to the Pope's question, "Quibus documentis?" Byzantium would have been able to reply with the protocol of the synodal discussion. More probable to me seems to be an informal but striking rehabilitation by Photius when he appointed him to officiate at his consecration.

What happened in the succeeding months continues to be rather obscure, despite all the research thus far undertaken.[7] With some probability the course of events can be summarized somewhat as follows. Ignatius was prepared to resign under certain conditions. He declared that he agreed to a new election, with the provision that the Patriarch-elect should bind himself to recognize the legitimacy of Ignatius's patriarchate, maintain communion with him, and respect his measures as Patriarch. In other words, he was prepared to recognize a successor who belonged more or less openly to the monastic party. The search for a candidate was not a simple matter, but finally a compromise was reached and the choice fell on Photius.

Photius was recommended in several respects. His parents had acquired the aura of confessors by enduring persecution for their devotion to images. The Patriarch Tarasius had been his uncle. A daughter of the Empress was his sister-in-law. He had enjoyed the confidence of the minister Theoctistus and was regarded as the greatest scholar of his day. At the moment of his election, he was head of the imperial chancery, nominated not by Bardas but by Theoctistus, and thus he was in an exposed position in the administration, but apparently not yet involved in ecclesiastical politics. He was prepared to agree to Ignatius's conditions, and so he could be consecrated *per saltum* — he was a layman when elected — and enthroned before Christmas of 858.

Everything seemed to be in order, but it took only a couple of months for strife to break out openly again in the Church. That Archbishop Gregory Asbestas had consecrated Photius may have been a determining factor. In any event it was an indiscretion, if not in regard to Ignatius, certainly in regard to the Holy See, where, unfortunately, Gregory's case was still pending. But the fundamental cause of the difficulties was probably the basically different interpretation of the election agreement, that is, of the concessions to the resigning Patriarch. Photius probably saw in them a respecting of the honour due to his predecessor, a protecting of Ignatius against further measures. But the Ignatians apparently regarded Photius as little more than the executor of their policy, whose being or non-being depended on to what extent he proved to be an "Ignatian". Photius would in no event now condescend to this. Very soon the Ignatians saw the compromise as having been broken, and so, in February 859, they met in Hagia Eirene, deposed Photius, and declared Ignatius to be the sole legitimate Patriarch. Photius replied to this open declaration of war with a synod of at least 170 bishops in the church of the Holy Apostles, probably in March 859.[8] He regarded himself as no longer bound by the compromise. Reference was made to the particular circumstances under which Ignatius had become Patriarch, especially the dispensing with an election, and he was formally deposed.

---

[6] However one may evaluate the rumours, we hear nothing of any process of purgation or the like which Ignatius would first have had to demand.

[7] Cf. V. Grumel, "La génèse du schisme photien" in *StudiBiz* 5 (1939), I, 177–85; P. Stéphanou, "Les débuts de la querelle photienne vus de Rome et de Byzance" in *OrChrP* 18 (1952), 270–80; id., "La violation du compromis entre Photius et les Ignatiens", ibid. 21 (1955), 291–307; F. Dvornik, "Le premier schisme de Photius" in *Izvestija Bulgar. Archaeol. Inst.* 9 (1935), 301–25.

The circumstance that on the occasion of his resignation Ignatius had so emphatically insisted on the acknowledgment of the legitimacy of his patriarchate shows that the sore spot had already been detected here quite early. But if this argument was so clearly pressed now, years later, this fact alone proves that Photius was not prepared to give in, for, in general, irregularities of this sort in a patriarchal election were not taken too seriously at Byzantium. Against the will of Photius Bardas's government supported the synodal measures against the Ignatians with brute force.

The schism was now public, and so Photius was ready to send his formal notice of enthronement to his colleagues in the patriarchate and to the Roman See. In this there was mention, apparently in pretty general terms, of the "retirement" (ὑπεξελϑόντος) of Ignatius.[9] The embassy which carried this letter to Rome also presented to Pope Nicholas I a letter from the Emperor Michael III,[10] in which he asked for the dispatch of papal legates to a council being planned in Constantinople for the liquidation of the remnants of Iconoclasm.[11] The Pope[12] acknowledged the orthodoxy of Photius's synodical, but found the case of Ignatius a bit unclear and sent his legates, Radoald of Porto and Zachary of Anagni, not only to take part in the council but also with the duty of investigating the case of Ignatius. The Pope reserved the decision to himself personally, but he gave Photius to understand that, despite the lack of interstices in his ordinations, he could still obtain recognition.

---

[8] *Grumel Reg,* no. 459.

[9] Text in *PG* 102, 585–93. Cf. *Grumel Reg,* no. 464. The letter to the oriental patriarchates in *PG* 102, 1017–24.

[10] *Dölger Reg,* no. 457.

[11] On Iconoclasm in the time of Photius see F. Dvornik, "The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm" in *DOP* 7 (1953), 67–97; also G. Ladner in *Tr* 10 (1954), 591.

[12] *MGEp* VI, 433, 439.

The synod met in the church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople in April 861 in the presence of the papal legates.[13] The *acta* are lost but we have a Latin extract in the collection of Deusdedit. We do not know what was decided in regard to the iconoclasts, but the case of Ignatius was again opened. The legates let themselves be convinced that he had become Patriarch contrary to canon law and declared his deposition. Thereby they doubtless exceeded their instructions, but just the same the Holy See became through their agency the deciding factor in the schism within the Byzantine Church, and it was probably this success which induced Nicholas I not to punish them particularly at first. The legates also brought forward the papal demand for the return of Illyricum to the Pope. But in this matter they were unsuccessful, and it may be suspected that this failure, linked with the problem of the Bulgar mission, unnecessarily complicated matters.

Photius did not yet cease his exertions at Rome. He wrote to the Pope in the summer of 861.[14] It was of course easy for him to justify his elevation from the lay state to the episcopacy by means of historical examples. If the Pope's demands in regard to Illyricum had not been fulfilled, this was not his fault, he said, but due to the Emperor's refusal; he, for his part, would have acquiesced without more ado. Finally, he asked the Pope, in conformity with the canons, not to receive any self-styled "pilgrims" from Constantinople without letters of recommendation from the appropriate bishop. The Pope's reply was evasive.[15] It demanded new evidence of the guilt of Ignatius and a new process. Byzantium circumvented these demands by silence; it would perhaps have been difficult to state what was to be regarded as new matter. But because of this the request of Photius that no pilgrims from Constantinople be received without credentials was made in vain. Agents of the Ignatians, headed by the Abbot Theognostus, gave the Pope a version of the events which was certainly no closer to the truth than that which he had heard from the mouth of his legates.[16]

---

[13] On the state of the sources, see the general bibliography for this chapter. See also *Hefele-Leclercq* IV, 1, 225–77; *Grumel Reg,* nos. 466–68. For the canons of the synod see footnote 14.

[14] *PG* 102, 593–617. The references to local canons which rejected the consecration of a layman *per saltum* but were not accepted in Constantinople were probably to the Council of Sardica, canon 10, a synod whose decree in this question was adopted in canon 17 of the synod of 861 but whose general validity was not undisputed in Byzantium, even if Photius failed to mention canon 2 of the Trullan Council. The passage in regard to the letter of recommendation can refer to the Council of Antioch, canon 7, but also to Sardica, canon 9.

[15] *MGEp* VI, 443, 447.

[16] There is a report by Theognostus in *Mansi* XVI, 296–301, and *PG* 105, 856–61. To what extent this report was authorized by Ignatius or can even be regarded as his work must remain undecided. The fact is that even as late as 861 Ignatius refused any appeal to Rome and would not permit Rome to intervene.

Now, suddenly, there was no further mention of an objective examination of the records of Ignatius. Probably in August 863 the Pope held at the Lateran a synod which deposed both Asbestas and Photius, declared the deposition of Ignatius null and void, and, after a delay of two years, punished the papal legates.[17] This new attitude of the Pope brought to the stage the Emperor Michael III, who in a haughty letter treated the Pope as a subject and declared that his request for the presence of papal legates at the Council of 861 and the renewed examination of the records of Ignatius at that synod were due merely to a desire to be accommodating.[18] Equally haughty was the reply of the Pope;[19] it is easy, due to its words on the question of the primacy, to overlook the incompatibility of its other expressions. All the more surprising, then, was the conclusion that fully accredited agents of the two Byzantine parties and of the Emperor should again reopen the whole complex of questions in Rome, a conclusion understandable only if one reflects that the question of the Bulgar mission urged the Pope not to burn all his bridges. And yet it was exactly this question that brought about the decisive break.

The Pope was interested in the Bulgar mission, not least of all, because he incorrectly regarded the Bulgarian principality as belonging apparently in its entirety to Illyricum. The Greek mission in Bulgaria in 864–66 could not be to his liking. Then the change of heart in Prince Boris, who was concerned for the autonomy of his young Church, which Photius was not prepared to grant — nor was the Pope for that matter — gave new hope to Nicholas I. Here was the prospect of coming closer to the possession of Illyricum in a roundabout way. The masterly character of the *Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum* has been extolled from the missionary and pastoral point of view. At the same time it is easy to forget the grave fact that it was Pope Nicholas I who, without any regard for the duties of his office, was here attacking the rites of the Greek Church, even exposing them to ridicule.[20] Nevertheless, he was so happy over his success that in a new letter to Constantinople of 28 September 865 he made a further offer of negotiations, but on the basis of the decrees of the Lateran Synod of 863 — that is, with the understanding that Photius had become Patriarch unlawfully and that Ignatius, now as before, was the sole legitimate Patriarch.

But neither Photius nor his Emperor Michael III was prepared to negotiate again. Quite the contrary. Photius decided on the strongest — perhaps it should be termed desperate — counterstroke, unprecedented in history since Dioscorus of Alexandria had suppressed the statement of Leo I at the Rubber Synod of 449, only for this very reason to be deposed by an ecumenical council two years later. The first and quite understandable countermove[21] was the defence of the Byzantine rites with a view to the attitude of the Roman missionaries in Bulgaria. In this Photius was standing on a not unjustified defensive. But, unwilling to let it go at that and in spite of the convictions that he had earlier expressed, he now himself made a question of faith and orthodoxy out of a question of rites. Above all, there now emerged the charge of heresy in the matter of the *Filioque* — that is, Photius condemned, not only the addition to the creed, but the content of the addition.

---

[17] The events can best be reconstructed from the *Narrationis ordo de Photii repulsione* (*MGEp* VI, 556–61).

[18] *Dölger Reg,* no. 464. This can be reconstructed only in fragments from the Pope's letter (*MGEp* VI, 454–87). It cannot be proved that Photius composed the Emperor's letter.

[19] See the previous note. If now the Emperor was denied the right to convoke the synod of 861, this was hardly compatible with the fact that the Pope was represented at it.

[20] On the *Consulta* see now G. T. Dennis, "The 'anti-Greek' Character of the Responsa ad Bulgaros of Nicholas I" in *OrChrP* 24 (1958), 165–74. I do not think that the *responsa* can be exculpated so simply. In any event, Photius and his Church saw in them a general attack on their rite.

All this was brought to the knowledge of the oriental Patriarchs in the spring or summer of 867 in the solemn form of an encyclical. Out of the quarrel in matters of mere ecclesiastical discipline and canon law there proceeded, now *ex professo,* a secular question of faith. Even this was not enough. In August or September of the same year Photius convoked a synod, concerning which we are informed very inadequately and only tendentiously. But in any event it deposed the Pope and decreed anathema against him.[22] Photius must have been sure of the consent of his Emperor or otherwise he would not have dared to turn to Louis II and Engelberga with the request that they risk everything in order to topple Nicholas from his throne. The circumstance that at this time the Western imperial pair were hailed at Byzantium as βασιλεῖς fits into the details of this coalition policy.[23] Photius's procedure proves that he was not a great politician but allowed himself to be carried away by his ill humour. Apparently he had no idea of the development of the doctrine of the primacy in the West, just as he also apparently had only an inadequate notion of the independent life of the Western Church. But he likewise overestimated his own position at Constantinople and did not know how to read the signs of the times. His most powerful protector, the Caesar Bardas, had already been assassinated on 21 April 865. The Emperor Michael III had thus escaped from a tutelage on the part of his minister that was perhaps too self-assured but was nevertheless purposeful, only to fall into the hands of an unscrupulous adventurer, Basil the Macedonian, who for his part had the Emperor killed a few weeks after the deposition of the Pope and himself mounted the throne. This change of sovereign, for which Basil had to seek legitimation and propaganda support from those who had hitherto formed the opposition, meant the overthrow of Photius and the reinstatement of Ignatius in his former rights on 23 November 867.

---

[21] *Grumel Reg,* no. 481; *PG* 102, 721–41.

[22] *Grumel Reg,* no. 482.

[23] On this see F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal 1953), 312–15.

CHAPTER 25

The Byzantine Church from 867 to 886

The unscrupulous adventurer Basil changed very quickly into the outstanding and diplomatically skilled Byzantine Emperor of the old school. The change from Photius back to Ignatius was a first necessity in domestic politics, but it could not suffice. To rely on the Ignatians alone would have amounted to ruling without an adequate majority in the clergy, or actually with a minority. Hence it was important to reassure the Photians also and, in addition, to come to terms with the papacy, without whose cooperation a genuine pacification of the Byzantine Church was unthinkable. As a conclusion to all the negotiations Basil from the start envisaged a great council, which alone could supply the authority necessary in view of the complicated problems.

At first the Emperor briefly informed the Pope about events.[1] The Pope who replied, however, was no longer Nicholas I but Hadrian II (867–72). He immediately addressed the Emperor and the new Patriarch.[2] He declared his intention to adhere to his predecessor's policy, recommended the Ignatian Theognostus, who had been staying in Rome till then, and was surprised merely that Ignatius had not yet sent him his synodical. Since the arrival of the papal embassy at Constantinople was delayed and the Emperor was greatly concerned to expedite matters, the latter[3] and now also the Patriarch[4] wrote to Rome a second time. The Emperor's course can easily be determined from the extant letter. He referred to the last offer of Pope Nicholas — who of course had known nothing of his deposition by Photius — that the two ecclesiastical factions should again explain their case to the Pope. In such a procedure it was unthinkable that the overthrow of Photius might eventually be annulled. It was a question rather of the supporters of Photius, of the fate of those ordained by him and of those who had signed the acts of the Council of 867. Here the Emperor urgently recommended the exercise of moderation. All protestations of leaving the affair to the Pope's judgment were in effect connected with a sort of preliminary investigation by the Pope, for, in the final analysis, the question was to be discussed at the council in Constantinople. This interpretation may not have been immediately clear from the tone of the imperial letter, but the events that followed abundantly confirm it. In order really to enable the Roman preliminary inquiry to arrive at a judgment, representatives of both the Patriarch Ignatius and the deposed Photius went to Rome by the Emperor's command. Photius was represented by Peter of Sardis, who was, however, shipwrecked and drowned *en route*. A monk in his suite named Methodius, who managed to be saved, refused, on arriving in Rome, to defend Photius's case.

---

[1] The letter is not extant. In *Dölger Reg* it is not mentioned or else it is confused with the second letter of the Emperor in its date.

[2] *MGEp* VI, 747–50.

[3] *Dölger Reg,* n. 474.

[4] *Grumel Reg,* n. 489; resume in *Mansi* XVI, 325–28. Complete text in the Latin translation by Anastasius in *Mansi* XVI, 47–49.

Thus in the summer of 869 there met at Saint Peter's a synod which strove less for the pacification of the Byzantine Church, as desired by the Emperor, than for retaliation against the Synod of 867.[5] There was no longer any question of a hearing of both parties. Photius was solemnly condemned and deposed. If repentant, he could at most be admitted to communion as a layman. Anyone who had signed the synodal acts of 867 could only be absolved by the Pope personally. Persons ordained by Photius were to be regarded as deposed. Bishops who had been consecrated by Ignatius but had later, understandably, recognized Photius were to be reinstated only when they had signed a *libellus satisfactionis* that was being drawn up in Rome. The synod ended with a solemn burning of the *acta* of 867; it was regarded as miraculous, since the documents burned despite a downpour.

Pope Hadrian sent to Constantinople the Bishops Donatus and Stephen and the Deacon Marinus, later Pope. The legates were instructed to preside over the Council of Constantinople and to direct its course in such a way that the questions would not be opened again but the Roman decrees would be unconditionally implemented. This, however, was not how Basil had conceived of the synod. His aim was certainly that a preliminary inquiry should take place in Rome and perhaps even a preliminary decision should be reached, but the real solution should be realized by the ecumenical council. It may safely be assumed that Ignatius also was little inclined to let the case be decided definitively by Rome.

The legates arrived in Constantinople and the synod was opened on 5 October 869.[6] But the atmosphere was tense. Twelve Ignatians constituted the episcopal representation at the opening session. The presidency was assumed, not by the papal legates, but by a deputy, the Patrician Baanes, representing the Emperor in accord with the ancient synodal law. The number of participants was only sixty-six bishops at the ninth session and had reached 103 only by the final session. This meant that the signing of the *libellus* encountered the greatest resistance. But whereas the legates Radoald and Zachary had gone wrong through tractability in 861, the present legates made up for this weakness by an extremely rude inflexibility. Without any *discretio spirituum* they demanded the signing of the *libellus,* whose basic component, the *formula Hormisdae,* had once been composed in order to administer an orthodox profession of faith to heretics. The demand became embarrassing when Byzantine bishops declared that in 860 — hence, long after the change in the patriarchate — Pope Nicholas I had been in communion with them and appealed to the legate Marinus as a witness to this. He apparently tried to make the best of a bad job by a subtle distinction. In order to salvage at least a remnant of genuine conciliar activity, the Emperor finally declared that he would not sign the *acta* unless Photius was heard. The ex-Patriarch was summoned but wrapped himself in contemptuous silence. When a bishop undertook to discuss the case for the ex-Patriarch, the legates stopped him short. At length their obstinacy carried the day entirely, though their success was in no sense gratifying. Canon 21, for example, which again put Constantinople in the second place, behind Rome, and condemned the attempt of Photius to depose the Pope, and then at the same moment provided the other Patriarchs with immunity in a similar manner, can hardly have been conceived in the Roman meaning, as the notion of the pentarchy clearly comes out of the *acta* of the council.

---

[5] Session VII of the Council of 869–70 summarized the acts of this synod; see *Mansi* XVI, 121–31, 372–80.

[6] *Hefele-Leclercq* IV, 481–546; *DThC* III, 1273–1307 (M. Jugie).

But the legates had to endure their real failure shortly after the close of the council (28 February 870). A Bulgar delegation had taken part in the last session. It had come to ask the council for a decision as to which patriarchate, Rome or Constantinople, the young Bulgarian Church really belonged, now that Rome too had denied the Bulgar Prince an archbishop of his choice. The Byzantines saw to it that this question should be decided outside the council, under the Emperor's presidency and in consultation with the representatives of the oriental patriarchates alone. The legates protested vigorously but in vain. The conference decided without them that Bulgaria belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Only now did the papal legates produce a letter in which Pope Hadrian forbade Ignatius to intervene in Bulgaria in any manner. Now that the council was ended, Ignatius declined to take any notice of this letter,[7] and Bulgaria was long lost to the Roman Church. Despite everything, Photius could be content. Naturally, Pope Hadrian protested to the Emperor and to Ignatius against the proceedings in Bulgaria, where the Roman mission now had to take its departure. Ignatius, however, was able to point out that Rome had begun this procedure, and Hadrian had to admit it.[8] It is not certain whether he broke off communion with Ignatius over this matter, but in any event it is probable that he never anathematized his adversary at Constantinople publicly and solemnly, as he had anathematized Photius.

But even in unimportant matters Ignatius could not now count on any Roman effort to be accommodating;[9] in fact, it often seemed that in Rome people had become convinced that the stubbornness of Photius had been a degree less. Still, Ignatius must have urgently needed Rome's aid. The vacancies in the lower and the higher clergy, put there by Rome's inconsiderate measures — how were they to be filled? Rome did not allow even a lector ordained by Photius to become a priest. The old bishops who had been consecrated by Ignatius but in 858 had sworn fidelity to Photius in good faith had a hard time forgetting that they had been forced to sign the *libellus satisfactionis* and certainly blamed Ignatius for allowing things to proceed so far. But those bishops who had now been entirely disqualified for having signed the *acta* of the Council of 867 must have powerfully excited opinion against Ignatius. A great part of the Byzantine higher clergy regarded the Council of 869–70 not as an ecumenical synod but as a case of humiliation of the Byzantine Church and of a betrayal of its freedom to Rome.

---

[7] *Liber pontificalis* II, 182–85.

[8] *Grumel Reg,* n. 505. The letter of the Patriarch can be inferred from the Pope's reply (*MGEp* VI, 762).

[9] Thus Rome did not even accede to his request that lectors ordained by Photius might be ordained priests nor to the request of others for the rehabilitation of Bishop Paul of Caesarea,

And the fortunes of Photius were again on the rise. For, as Emperor, Basil had to be careful, now as before, not to cause the Photian opposition to harden, quite apart from the fact that Photius was much too shrewd a tactician not to gradually supplant Ignatius in the Emperor's favour. Ignatius seems to have recognized the signs of the time and to have become reconciled with Photius toward the end of his life.[10] Meanwhile, Photius had returned from exile and had risen to be tutor of the imperial princes. He may also have resumed his position as a professor.

When Ignatius died on 23 October 877, Photius was able to reoccupy the patriarchal throne without difficulty. Apparently Ignatius had never doubted the validity of Photius's episcopal consecration and, once his relations with Rome had become chilled, saw no further reason to regard the laicization of the ex-Patriarch by Hadrian II as relevant. Even before the death of Ignatius the Emperor had begun new negotiations with Rome[11] in order to have the differences between Ignatians and Photians settled by means of a review of the trial of Photius. Pope John VIII was not unfavourable. Byzantine aid against the Muslim peril in Italy was desired, and no practical experience compelled the Pope to share with conviction the views of the intransigent Ignatians, unhappy with their master's attitude toward Photius, especially since John had no more satisfactory experiences with Ignatius than Nicholas I had had with Photius. And so the Pope sent the Bishops Paul and Eugene to Constantinople with letters to the Emperor and Ignatius and the commission to establish peace.[12]

---

who had indeed been consecrated by Photius but very soon had gone over to the party of Ignatius (*MGEp* VI, 760f.).

[10] It is very uncertain whether Ignatius asked absolution for Photius at Rome, as Bishop Stylian of Neocaesarea later wrote to Pope Stephen V (*Mansi* XVI, 432). Stylian lets it be understood that the letter was composed by Photius himself in Ignatius's name (cf. *Grumel Reg*, n. 506).

[11] *Dölger Reg*, n. 496.

[12] *MGEp* VII, 64.

The envoys, however, found not Ignatius but Photius. For this eventuality they had no instructions, and it was left to their resourcefulness how to deal with this complicated situation. And first they decided not to act at all but to get the Emperor to apply again to the Pope. He requested the recognition of Photius and the convoking of a new synod.[13] A letter from the clergy of Constantinople informed the Pope of the unanimous acceptance of the new Patriarch in his episcopal city. The Pope consulted his closest collaborators and then wrote to the Emperor that he was disposed to recognize Photius in spite of everything, if he would apologize for his earlier deeds in the presence of the future synod. He said that he absolved Photius and his episcopate by virtue of the supreme apostolic authority, but he still demanded as a condition that Photius should refrain from any pastoral activity in Bulgaria. If these conditions should be met, the Pope would excommunicate anyone who did not recognize Photius as Patriarch.[14]

The Pope's legates received from Rome a *commonitorium* which made them conversant with the new situation and which was read at the synod and signed by the participants. The *commonitorium* was brought by Cardinal Peter, who was to reinforce the papal embassy. Under these circumstances the great synod could finally be opened at the beginning of November 879 under the presidency of the Patriarch Photius.[15] There were seven sessions. Almost 400 bishops took part — an impressive testimony to the number of Photius's adherents when compared with the 103 bishops who, after much delay, could be mustered for the final session of the anti-Photian Synod in 870. There was basically not much to discuss. For Photius it was of the greatest importance to be able to appear before the Fathers of the Council not as Patriarch by virtue of Rome's indulgence but as Bishop of Constantinople again installed and never legitimately deposed. It is possible that even before the session the papal legates had learned that for this reason Photius would hardly preside over the synod as a repentant sinner. And if the Pope had demanded as a *conditio sine qua non* of a rehabilitation of the Patriarch a full renunciation of the Bulgarian Church, it was not difficult for Photius to point to his accommodating attitude to Nicholas I in this question and to transfer the responsibility to imperial policy. Whether or not the *commonitorium* was corrected in this regard even before the beginning of the synod, in any event the Fathers listened to a text in which there was no mention of apologies by the Patriarch, and the Pope's commands in the matter of Bulgaria seemed to have been altered to requests and recommendations. The other Roman documents also were read rather in "stylized" paraphrases than in a translation that reproduced the original.[16] Either the legates did not notice or they kept quiet from tactical considerations. For without a doubt they desired peace in conformity with the mind of the Pope, even a peace with concessions to the mentality of the Byzantines, provided that the Bulgarian question was not again decided to the detriment of Rome and that the anticipated imperial aid against the Muslims in Italy was not jeopardized. They were in no way equal to the extraordinarily clever management displayed by Photius.

---

[13] *Dölger Reg,* n. 497.

[14] *MGEp* VII, 166–87, together with the letters written at the same time to Photius, to the clergy of Constantinople, and especially to the Ignatians.

[15] *Hefele-Leclercq* IV, 585–606. On the question of the authenticity and integrity of the acts, see V. Laurent, "Le cas de Photius dans l'apologétique du patriarche Jean XI Bekkos" in *ÉO* 29 (1930), 396–415; M. Jugie, "Les actes du synode photien de Sainte Sophie" in *ÉO* 37 (1938), 88–99; also, F. Dvornik, *Le schisme de Photius,* 543–53; id., "Les actes du synode photien et Georges le Métochite" in *ÉO* 37 (1938), 99–106.

But the conduct of the legates was not undignified. Under all circumstances they upheld the doctrine of the papal primacy and emphasized, despite all the contrary assertions of the Photianist bishops, that it was Pope John VIII, who, by virtue of his supreme authority, again installed Photius in the office of Patriarch. They did not fail to stress that they regarded the assumption of the patriarchate by Photius before the arrival of the papal decision as an illegitimate procedure. As regards Bulgaria, Photius stressed his good will at the synod and declared that he had not undertaken any official actions in Bulgaria. Thus was this condition of papal absolution satisfied. The annulling of the Synod of 869–70 by the legates may perhaps have been prescribed in the Latin original of the *Commonitorium,* although this point must remain controverted. The decrees of the Synod — it passed a series of canons, including one against the elevation of laymen to the episcopate, and declared the Synod of 787 to be ecumenical — were signed by all the participants in the fifth session on 26 January 880.

There were two further sessions, the authenticity of which has been incorrectly doubted. The first, in a small group in the imperial palace, promulgated the *horos* of the Synod, a profession of faith with an appendix which anathematized any addition to the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, without discussing the dogmatic question of the *Filioque.*[17] The protocol of this session was promulgated at a solemn gathering of the Council Fathers at Hagia Sophia in mid-March and with this the Synod ended. Still unresolved at the Council was the question of Bulgaria, for which the Fathers had declared themselves to be incompetent. But outside the Synod it seems that a compromise was prepared in the sense that Bulgaria should be subject to the Roman jurisdiction but no difficulties should be caused to the Greek missionaries there. The compromise, it is true, did not take effect, but the fault lay with the Bulgars themselves, who, in their striving for an autonomous Church, opposed any interference by Rome.

---

[16] V. Grumel, "Les lettres de Jean VIII pour le rétablissement de Photius" in *ÉO* 39 (1940), 138–56.

[17] Cf. V. Grumel, "Le filioque au concile photien de 879–80 et le témoignage de Michel d'Anchialos" in *ÉO* 29 (1930), 257–63; id., "Le décret du synode photien de 879 à 880 sur le symbole de la foi" in *ÉO* 37 (1938), 357–72; also, M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin,* 127f., and F. Dvornik, *Le schisme de Photius,* 537–39.

Pope John VIII ratified the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, but with the somewhat two-edged postscript that he rejected everything which the legates might have done contrary to the apostolic prescriptions.[18] He no longer insisted on the demand that Photius should apologize and limited himself to expressing amazement that so much had happened otherwise than he had intended. The Pope cannot have been satisfied with the course of the discussions. His accepting of them may have been facilitated by the circumstance that meanwhile a Byzantine fleet had freed the Papal State for some time from the Muslim peril. But it seems to me that the Pope's real greatness lies beyond anything political and consists in the fact that, despite opposition from his own officials, especially from Marinus, legate in 869–70, he disregarded any concern for mere prestige in order to guarantee peace to the Byzantine Church. He understood that Photius could not be managed, and once Photius showed himself inclined to recognize the authority of the Holy See — and he often did so during the Synod — he saw no compelling reason to reject him. Furthermore, he apparently realized that not a few of the *gravamina* of the former Ignatians were mere faction squabbles. The fact that Ignatius had become reconciled with Photius likewise favoured the latter.

Basically, John VIII recognized what Nicholas I was not prepared to admit, namely, that Rome was confronting not so much as an individual adversary at Constantinople as the spirit of a Church, which jealously guarded its old rights, genuine and imaginary, which was always basically prepared at any time, in spite of any discord, to make common cause against Rome — compare the attitude of the two Patriarchs in the Bulgarian question — and that the *summum bonum* of Church unity could only be assured if the problems were solved in the spirit of Christian charity and less in the spirit of authoritative thought.

How little this sympathetic attitude of the Pope was esteemed in Rome appears in the fact that his recent adversary, Marinus, was elected his successor. The new Pope certainly did not regard Photius as a legitimate Patriarch. But it is not demonstrable and not very likely that he officially excluded him from his communion. There seems to have been no "second Photian Schism".[19] Pope Stephen V also,[20] who was perhaps less receptive to the Orthodox world, certainly did not officially break off relations with Photius, but rather left things alone. Not much time would have been available to him for such a step, for Photius suffered a second overthrow in 886. Apparently no ecclesiastical politics are to be looked for behind this event. Instead, it may be accepted that entirely personal reasons induced the new Emperor Leo VI to remove Photius, his former and perhaps somewhat too pedantic teacher, and replace him with the younger imperial brother, Stephen (886–93). The date of death of Photius, who probably retired to a monastery, is uncertain. Perhaps the year was 891.

---

[18] *MGEp* VII, 227f.

[19] V. Grumel, "Y eut-il un second schisme de Photius?" in *RSPhTh* 32 (1933), 432–57, and, independent of it, F. Dvornik, "Le second schisme de Photius — une mystification historique" in *Byz (B)* 8 (1933), 425–74; V. Grumel, "La liquidation de la querelle photienne" in *ÉO* 33 (1934), 257–88.

[20] V. Grumel, "La lettre du pape Étienne V à l'empereur Basile I^{er}" in *RÉB* 11 (1953), 129–55.

Chapter 26

Photius: Work and Character

Whereas Ignatius found a secure place in the Byzantine calendar of saints and, in addition, a hagiographer,[1] prejudiced though he was, Photius was denied the latter altogether and the former to a great extent. Traces of his cult are sparse, even if not insignificant. It can easily be shown that the fathers of the great break of 1054 hardly based their claims on Photius and that his council, the Synod of 879–80, for a long time had no prospect of being recognized as ecumenical, and, in fact, has never completely obtained such recognition. He became a chief Byzantine witness to the doctrinal differences between East and West relatively late, probably in the twelfth century, and even then partly because of cheap pseudepigrapha, as represented by the *Opusculum contra Francos*.[2]

The most recent age has gone a step further: it has demonstrated the absence of any grounds for postulating a second Photian Schism, if not absolutely, at least so as to offer an extremely probable case. Some have gone farther and have set as their goal a complete rehabilitation of the Patriarch, but because of the state of the sources it has not been possible to follow them blindly in this. That Photius cannot be called the one solely responsible for the Schism is certain. The way in which Rome tried to deal with his case was not distinguished in the final analysis by the amalgamating of the circumstances — the question of the Patriarch's legitimacy on the one hand, the Bulgar mission on the other — which were placed in a relation to each other which did not befit them. But Photius, with his encyclical of 867 and the synod of the same year, at which he excommunicated and deposed the Pope, risked a step which no apologetic has yet been able to cope with. And he never condescended to utter a public word of regret for this serious wrong. The sense of innocence, which he expressed in regard to it, can only with difficulty have convinced even his adherents. Considered from the angle of historical developments, the Schism can be understood as the colliding of two concepts of the nature of the Church, which had long developed separately without persons becoming aware of this on the one side or the other: the "Constantinian" Byzantine idea, carried along by the idea of the "pentarchy" of patriarchates[3] and intimately bound up with imperial supremacy in ecclesiastical questions, and the new Roman idea, characterized by a strongly emphasized consciousness of the primacy of the *Sedes Romana.* The proponents of these ideas were two personalities, Photius and Nicholas I, neither of whom measured up to the high demands of his pastoral office, since neither felt himself to be nor acted as the *servus servorum Dei.*

---

[1] See the sources, p. 515.

[2] For the whole complex of his posthumous life one should consult the excellent chapter which Dvornik has included in *The Photian Schism,* 383ff.

In regard to Photius there is, in addition, a further question, which is more important than that of the reality of the "second" Schism: whether he made peace with Rome merely from the standpoint of *oikonomia,* that is, from considerations of expediency, or whether he actually disavowed his encyclical and did not see in the dogmatic and disciplinary accusations only something that could be manipulated. The celebrated question of the *Filioque,* in so far as it concerned an addition to the Creed, was a purely disciplinary matter, but it was capable of being posed dogmatically, that is, with regard to the content of the article. Photius discussed both problems in his encyclical. He rejected any addition to the Creed. But he also repudiated the doctrine of the *Filioque,* seeing in it a destruction of the Father's role as sole principle in the Trinity and hence a heresy. This was not especially an attack on the Roman Church, which did not at that time admit the *Filioque* into its own liturgical use. Nor was the "false doctrine" laid at the door of the Roman Church. Photius was attacking the Latin missionaries in Bulgaria, but no one knew better than Photius where they came from. Hence the charge made in this regard offered the opportunity for a subtle diplomatic game. It is remarkable that the anti-Photian Synod of 869–70 did not take up this point at all.[4] But even the great Photian propaganda Synod of 879–80 completely excluded the dogmatic question and contented itself with prohibiting additions to the Creed. Even so, there were two qualifications here which have usually been too little noticed. The prohibition did not apply if there was a question of disposing of a heresy; and the prohibition spoke of the adding of "false words". In this connection it did not expressly mention *Filioque,* but it thereby created an opportunity which could be seized upon at the proper time. In a purely formal sense there was no need for the papal legates to refuse their assent, since the faith of the Roman Church was not directly concerned and the Roman discipline was not touched.

---

[3] The theory of five more or less autonomous patriarchates, whose teamwork constitutes the unity of the Church. Dvornik, *op. cit.,* 220, shows how strong the idea of the pentarchy already was at the Council of 869–70.

[4] Although Pope Nicholas was fully aware of its import.

The controversy was again taken up by Photius around the mid-880's in a letter to the Archbishop of Aquileia.[5] In this also it was not only the addition but the doctrine of the *Filioque* which was rejected. Again the accusation of error was not directed against Rome; instead, it was raised precisely by having recourse to the Roman version of the Creed. Rome became Photius's oath-helper. The *Mystagogia*[6] is probably also to be interpreted in this sense. Accordingly, the dogmatic question remained in abeyance. From the viewpoint of the history of dogma it may be said that the burden of proof for the *Filioque* fell upon those who had introduced it into the Creed. Earlier than the Latin synonyms, the terms "from", "to proceed", and so forth in Byzantine theology had received a restricted, specifically Trinitarian meaning, in the light of which the somewhat confused linguistic usage of Latin theology, when viewed by Byzantium, could not but appear suspicious. It required roughly 300 years and more for people to begin to have a mutual understanding. To be sure, Photius's grasp of the theology of the Trinity was not up to date. His recourse to the teaching of the Greek Fathers was, whether consciously or unconsciously, insufficient; it must be called into question even in the case of so dedicated a student of patristics as he was. Documents such as the Creed of the Synod of 787 with the formula *per filium* carried no weight with him. Thus his theology was not a happy point of departure for any evaluation of the Byzantine viewpoint.

There remains the question of the relationship of Photius to the papal primacy. The contention that the doctrine of the papal primacy had been unknown in Byzantium and was first introduced when Nicholas threatened Photius has often been repeated, but it is a foolish legend. The accents of Pope Nicholas were stronger, the extent of his demands was greater, but the substance of the demands was known to Byzantium and in properly spaced intervals, when the Byzantine Church found itself in an embarrassing situation, it was acknowledged and exploited. The fact that Photius deposed a Pope and thereby despised the basic rights of the primacy cannot be explained away by any good will toward the Patriarch, cannot even be passed off as a political *faux pas*. Even though good will may be appealed to in order to dismiss this episode as something transitory, the question remains as to whether Photius did not persist in his standpoint in this particular matter and create an arsenal that he himself indeed never used but that was nevertheless more representative of his deepest convictions than were the official utterances in regard to Rome from his second patriarchate. But here philological clarity is still somewhat lacking. Involved is a work entitled *Against those who assert that*

---

[5] *PG* 102, 793–821. Cf. *Grumel Reg,* n. 529.

[6] *PG* 102, 263–391.

Rome is the Primatial See.[7] The arguments of Gordillo[8] and Dvornik[9] against its authenticity are no stronger than those of Hergenröther,[10] Dölger,[11] and Jugie[12] for it. A comprehensive analysis is still unavailable. *In dubiis pro reo.*

More interesting is a work that is undoubtedly by Photius, *Collectanea on the Episcopal and Metropolitan Office and Related Questions from Synods and Historical Works.*[13] Here there seems to be involved, not a polemic, but a collection of historical notes. These notes, however, contain, carefully arranged, whatever in the opinion of the collector the history of the papacy displays in the way of mistakes and errors. Such a collection would be planned only by one who felt a need of using it. In other words, the impression is unavoidable that, in the conviction of the Patriarch, both the Trinitarian teaching of the West, of that West whose leader was Rome, and also the doctrine of Rome's primacy offered sensitive areas which it was important to determine in order to be able to go into action with a wealth of historical arguments in case of need. So long as Rome recognized him, he saw no reason to dip into his arsenal; but he tended it and occasionally opened the gates in order to allow his adversary of tomorrow to see his riches. Basic questions in regard to the Church and theology thereby obtained the character of something to be manipulated. Politics triumphed.

Whether Photius thought also of a universal primacy of the Church of Constantinople seems to me to be another question.[14] We know nothing about his dreams. It probably cannot be proved that he had favoured the primacy *expressis verbis,* if one does not fail to note that a strict interpretation of the term "first see" must first reckon with the primacy within the Eastern Church, while its extension to the Universal Church would have to be formulated separately. In my opinion, no such notion of the primacy can be sifted especially from the *Epanagoge,* the introduction and first part of which are certainly from Photius; in this connection it is of no particular importance for the Patriarch's views whether the *Epanagoge* was ever published as a law code or not. Not even the Constantinian ecclesiastical system was destroyed by the treatise on the patriarchal power, and no authentic papalism can be deduced from it. The insistence on the full authority of the Patriarch is stronger than one is accustomed to in Byzantine Church history, but the principle of the old imperial authority continues.[15] In the ups and downs of the fundamentally still obscure constitutional relationship between Emperor and Patriarch, the *Epanagoge* represents only one phase, during which an imposing Patriarch sought to establish in writing the influence that he actually exercised. In this work there is no reference to the universal primacy. Not even in the encyclical of 867 — and where would it have been more appropriate? — did Photius raise such claims. As regards the Latin polemics of a Ratramnus and his associates, these are without difficulty explained by the reproaches of Pope Nicholas, for whom the obstinacy of Photius sufficed in order to accuse him of such attempts.

---

[7] *Rhallis* IV, 409–15, and M. Gordillo, "Photius et primatus Romanus" in *OrChrP* 6 (1940), 1–39.

[8] See the preceding footnote.

[9] *The Photian Schism,* and id., *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), 253.

[10] *Photius* I, 622ff.; III, 171.

[11] *ByZ* 40 1940), 522–25.

[12] "L'opuscule contre la primauté romaine attribué à Photius" in *Mélanges L. Vaganay,* II (Lyons 1938), 43–66.

[13] *PG* 104, 1219–32.

[14] Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal 1953), 101–5, especially stresses this tendency of Photius. The passage from the *Quaestiones Amphil.* cited by him speaks of κοινὸν κράτος which was transmitted to Byzantium; but this means the universal Empire, not the ecclesiastical primacy.

Thus the portrait of the Patriarch remains unclear. In pure hypothesis one may conclude that Photius was principally concerned for the recognition of his position as Patriarch. In order to achieve this, the recognition of the Roman primacy served just as well as its denial and limitation. But he thereby proved that he would always remain a controversial figure in Church history. Even the Byzantines have recognized, or at least sensed, this. The case of Photius has become a model in Byzantine Church history. Meagre as were the effects of his schism on the events of 1054, if direct connections are sought, still the precedent of his schism was, as such, an example.

What is amazing in this personality is that one cannot do justice to it with an evaluation of his policy in regard to the internal schism and in regard to Rome. This is true of the history of the Greek Schism as a whole. An ecumenical writing of Church history cannot be satisfied to let fall on the Byzantine Church and her prelates only one cone of light that illuminates the relations of East and West. Photius was the most universal *savant* of his age, and this erudition was not only an apanage of classical philology. His famous *Library* deals for more than fifty per cent with authors of Christian antiquity and has thereby preserved an enormous amount of material for patrology, material that would have been lost without him. In his *Quaestiones disputatae*, the so-called *Amphilochiana*,[16] he pours before us a treasure of excerpts, which shows him to have been a theologian of the broadest interests and especially a "theologian of taste". His real forte seems to have been exegesis. The "Antiochene" method of his biblical interpretation combined philological precision and theological insight and so stood in the most favourable contrast to the involved allegorizing of his contemporaries and successors in East and West. He deliberately tackled not a few problems which were not taken up again until modern times by theologians, who then boasted of their own discoveries.[17] But one of the most pleasant surprises is provided by Photius as preacher. It goes without saying that he too sacrificed to the genius of Byzantine rhetoric, but this never concealed the basic concern for exhortation and edification. He found tones which could touch directly and which revealed a solicitous shepherd far from politics.[18]

---

[15] Cf. A. Esser, "Die Lehre der Epanagoge und eine oströmische Reichstheologie" in *FZThPh* 10 (1963), 63ff.

[16] *PG* 101, 45–1172.

It is in this context that the Byzantine mission work in the time of Photius should be placed. His initiative may be inferred in the mission to the Chazars as well as in those to the Bulgars and Moravians, and we know of his exertions to gain the Armenians back to Orthodoxy. And finally his numerous letters and patriarchal *acta* must be mentioned.[19] Care for the moral purity of the clergy induced him time and again to take up his pen. Just as often he sought to protect the people against the caprice of officials: he sharply censured the encroachments of these latter, not only in the case of lesser revenue officers or distant governors but also in regard to high officials, such as the heads of the urban administration of Constantinople. But from his writings always emerges his striving to give peace to the Church and to come to an understanding even with those who were not inclined to become "Photians". Apart from the Schism, Photius could have entered into history not only as a great scholar but also as an important Patriarch. One is almost tempted to close a basically imperfect circle and say: Photius is simply the Byzantine. In any event, he authentically represents the Byzantine Church of his day, its doings and its dreams, its glory and its danger.

---

[17] Cf. K. Staab, *Die Pauluskommentare der griechischen Kirche* (Münster 1933), and J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (Berlin 1957).

[18] Edited by S. Aristarches, 2 vols. (Constantinople 1900f.); some in *PG* 102, 548–76. Important is C. Mango, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, English Translation, Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958).

[19] Summary in *Grumel Reg,* n. 508–89.

SECTION SEVEN

The Church and the Western Kingdoms from 900 to 1046

CHAPTER 27

The New Kingdoms

The Church and the Carolingian *Imperium* had come together because of an inner affinity. Because both institutions strove for a supranational unity resting on their Christian character, the universality of the Church had contributed to the consolidation of the Empire, and, conversely, the wide expanse of the Empire had made possible a uniform organization of the ecclesiastical situation, oriented to the Roman tradition. The disintegration of the Empire, accompanied in France and Italy by the collapse of the royal authority, could not but hurt the Church especially seriously. The victory of the private powers caused her to fall more strongly than before under the influence of German-Roman juridical notions. Forced to adjust herself to the varying regional ways of life, she lost much of her own intrinsic energy, based on her unity and universality. And since scholarship needed supra-provincial cooperation, the theological studies that had been happily initiated decayed.

For that very reason the Church historian is not wrong when he calls the tenth century a *saeculum obscurum* or *ferreum*. But he should connect with it not so much the idea of decay as of transformation and reorientation, and be aware that much of what at first acted destructively helped to rebuild the new West and the new Church.

France

The West Frankish Kingdom had relatively little to suffer from outside enemies in the tenth century. The Magyar raids, beginning toward the close of the ninth century, seldom got farther west than Lotharingia.[1] The Muslims, established at Freinet from about 888, chiefly harassed the neighbouring lands. And it was possible gradually to master the various groups of Northmen from the time when the Seine Vikings, under Rollo, had received land in fief from King Charles the Simple, and, giving up their way of life, their language, and their religion, began to settle down.[2] But West *Francia* had to endure internal warfare, for there was no longer a strong crown which would have been able to curb the anarchy. The process of dissolution of the royal power, which had already started under Charles the Bald (840–77), went on all the more unchecked in the tenth century when the West Carolingian family could maintain its claim to legitimacy only with the greatest difficulty against the far more powerful Robertians, who were seeking the crown. A change occurred only after the death of the childless Louis V in 987. The Robertian who was then elected his successor, Hugh Capet, founded a dynasty which was to reign in the direct line until 1328 and in collateral lines until 1848. Hugh Capet did, it is true, take over a kingdom that was already smashed to pieces. While the independent principalities had already reached the considerable number of twenty-nine at the beginning of the century, this had grown to fifty by 987.

---

[1] Cf. R. Lüttich, *Ungarnzüge in Europa im 10. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1919); G. Fasoli, *Le incursioni ungare in Europa nel secolo X* (Florence 1945) and *CCivMéd* 2 (1959), 17–35; on the Magyars see also Chapter 31.

The result for the Church was a very ticklish situation. Since the feudal princes — counts, marquises, or dukes — gradually usurped all rights of sovereignty, a considerable portion of the French bishoprics fell under their control. At the time of the Investiture Controversy the Capetians disposed of only twenty-five of the total of seventy-seven bishoprics. The princes' ecclesiastical sovereignty assumed to some extent the legal character of the proprietary church system and led, especially in the Midi, to serious abuses. Like any other object of value, bishoprics there could be given, in whole or in part, to members of the family, including wives and daughters, or sold to outsiders. Furthermore, they were useful to the princes who controlled episcopal elections as means of providing for their sons, with the result that in some dioceses there was an invariable dynastic succession for a long time.

Not rarely the churches became the playthings of political power struggles. The archbishopric of Reims, which was, strictly speaking, directly under the King, had a particularly difficult time.[3] Allied to the Robertian antiking, Raoul, the powerful Count Herbert of Vermandois was able in 925 to have his five-year-old son Hugh elected Archbishop and himself entrusted with the administration of the church property. A quarrel that soon broke out induced King Raoul in 931 to promote the monk Artaud to the see; he maintained himself also under the Carolingian Louis IV until 940, when Count

---

[2] W. Vogel, *Die Normannen und das fränkische Reich* (Heidelberg 1906); H. Prentou, *Essai sur les origines et la fondation du duché de Normandie* (Paris 1911); D. Douglas, "Rollo of Normandie" in *EHR* 57 (1942), 417–36.

[3] Cf. A. Dumas, "L'église de Reims au temps des luttes entre Carolingiens et Robertiens" in *RHÉF* 30 (1944), 5–38; H. Zimmermann, "Frankreich und Reims in der Politik der Ottonen" in *MIÖG, ErgBd,* 20 (1962f.), 122–46.

Herbert of Vermandois and Count Hugh of Neustria, enemies of the King, took Reims and enthroned Hugh of Vermandois as Archbishop. But the German King Otto I, who was protecting Louis IV of France from his vassals, restored Artaud to Reims by armed force in 948. The attempt of the sons of Herbert of Vermandois to recover the first French see for their brother at least after Artaud's death in 961 failed.

There was further chaos under King Hugh Capet. In 988 he entrusted the see of Reims to Arnulf, a bastard of the second last Carolingian, but in 991 had him deposed by a synod for having betrayed the city to his uncle, Duke Charles of Lotharingia. The Reims *scholasticus,* Gerbert of Aurillac, later Pope Silvester II, was elected as Arnulf's successor. The canonical quarrel that then ensued ended only with Arnulf's reinstatement. Because of the participation of the papacy and of the Emperor Otto III it acquired an importance that extended beyond France and hence will be treated in another context. In any event, Hugh Capet's conduct corresponded throughout to the views of the time. By virtue of the tie of vassalage linking the bishops to their princes, felony was regarded as a valid ground for deposition.

Nevertheless, the situation of the churches of France was better than one might think at first glance. The victory of particularism had as a consequence that the bishops and abbots did not, as in Germany, come into possession of important new rights of sovereignty. Hence they were less engrossed with the new forms of government. On the contrary, the arbitrary actions of so many lords of churches strengthened the forces of resistance of which the French churches disposed on the basis of a long tradition. Thus the old canon law did not fall into oblivion. Just as the French crown at the period by no means renounced its claim to supreme authority despite its actual powerlessness, churchmen also held firmly to certain basic principles, for example, to the right to free canonical election. Since they were not linked, for better or for worse, with a system of government, they were also able much more easily to develop a religious and ecclesiastical initiative of their own, and in this they not infrequently had the backing of pious princes. Here one need only recall the reform work of Cluny or the peace movements. And so when in the eleventh century the papacy had recourse to forces within the Church for the great reform, no country was so open to its exertions as France. It was not only the religious and ecclesiastical sense that had grown up among clerics and lay persons that contributed to this, but also the sovereignty over the Church as divided among King and princes. The princes were not powerful enough to maintain their rights against pressure from the reformed papacy, and the King could decide upon renunciation more easily than the German monarch could, because the political rights of the French ecclesiastical princes had a less pretentious range.

Italy's political and ecclesiastical situation provides an especially bewildering picture. The Lombard Kingdom, once again in the possession of Berengar of Friuli since the death of the Emperor Lambert in 898, was so weak that Berengar could defend it only with difficulty from occupation, first by King Louis of Provence, who went back to his homeland, blinded, in 905, and then, from 921, by King Rudolf II of Transjurane Burgundy. The assassination of Berengar in 924 smoothed the way for Rudolf, but he had to make way for Hugh of Vienne. Hugh firmly maintained his authority for about twenty years, until the opposition of the Margrave Berengar of Ivrea and his followers compelled him to flee. When Hugh's son and successor Lothar died in 950, a native prince, Berengar of Ivrea, finally gained the crown again. But a year later the German King Otto I seized the Lombard Kingdom and thereby determined the fate of mediaeval Italy. In addition to the kingship there also arose great dynastic principalities in North and Central Italy, such as those of the Margraves of Tuscany, Ivrea, Friuli, and that of the Aledramids of Piedmont. Farther south, the independent remnants of the Lombard Kingdom — the Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, the Principality of Salerno, the County of Capua — maintained themselves. After the death of the Emperor Louis II (875) the Byzantines had again established themselves in an energetic struggle with the Muslims and were again able to combine their themes of Calabria and Langobardia. Gaetà, Naples, and Amalfi were under nominal Byzantine suzerainty.

The political chaos invited enemies in. The Magyars invaded from 899 and soon extended their frequent plundering expeditions to the south also. From Freinet the Spanish Muslims infested the northwest, while the Sicilian and African Muslims attacked South and Central Italy. Freinet could have been taken in 942 by King Hugh of Italy and the allied Byzantines, if Hugh had seriously desired this; it did not fall until 983. In the south the North African Aghlabid Dynasty was able to complete in 902 the conquest of Sicily, begun in 827, but its push into South Italy, undertaken in 900–02, was unsuccessful. The Muslim bands which had established a stronghold on Monte Argento at the mouth of the Garigliano, not far from Gaetà, were in no dependence on Sicily or North Africa. From this camp they collected blackmail until the combined forces of the Byzantines, the Princes of Capua, Salerno, and Spoleto, and Pope John X and the Romans put an end to their operations in 915.[4]

In the devastated and fragmented country the Church found conditions that differed from one territory to the next. This was true even of the Byzantine holdings: the churches in the theme of Langobardia were, apart from the Terra d'Otranto, for the most part Latin and did not belong to the patriarchate of Constantinople, whereas those of the theme of Calabria belonged to the Byzantine sphere of liturgy and law.[5] Of course all of them were strictly dependent on the imperial government. Entirely different conditions prevailed in the north. Since inner feuds as well as the incursions of the Magyars forced the cities to self-defence, the Lombard bishops gained a preeminent position through the expanding of the power of *missi,* which in 876 Charles the Bald had granted to all Italian bishops for the territory of their cities. By incorporating important parts of the rural area into the urban territory, soon also gaining comital rights over the city or even over whole districts, and forcing the secular nobility into vassalage, they developed real city-state territories. The city rights of the bishops of Central Italy were less extensive. In the great maritime cities, such as Venice, dominion was acquired by a secular patriciate.

---

[4] For the Magyars, see *supra,* footnote 1. For the Muslims of South Italy in the ninth and tenth centuries, see N. Cilento in *Archivio della storia della provincia Napoletana* 77 (1959), 109–22; M. Amari, *Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia,* revised by C. A. Vallino, II–III (Catania 1933–39). For the Battle on the Garigliano, see P. Fedele in *ASRomana* 22 (1899), 181–211; O. Vehse in *QFIAB* 19 (1927), 181–204.

In Rome there was in preparation a development similar to that in the territories of Benevento, Capua, and Naples, where the rulers of the moment disposed of the bishoprics. The anarchy getting under way from 882 had constantly increased the influence of the Roman aristocracy and of the neighbouring princes. The crowning of powerless Emperors, Louis of Provence in 901 and Berengar of Friuli in 915, amde no difference; Rome had to take care of itself.

The first step toward a greater concentration of strength was taken in 904. In that year there returned to the Eternal City Sergius III, elected in 897 but forced to yield to the Formosan John IX. His return was effected by the aid of the Frankish upstart, Duke Alberic of Spoleto, and of a faction of the Roman nobility led by Theophylact. The intruder Christopher, who in 903 had overthrown the recently installed Pope Leo V, experienced the fate of his predecessor. He was imprisoned and probably killed together with Leo.

The pontificate of Sergius III meant the final victory of the anti-Formosans. They compelled the Roman clergy, all assembled in synod, to declare invalid the ordinations conferred by Formosus. This measure, which took effect far beyond Rome and even in South Italy, evoked sharp protests and malicious charges on the one hand, while on the other it posed the theologically important question of the validity of the ordinations, which was discussed with real competence especially by the Formosan Auxilius, a Frank living in Naples.[6] But Sergius III was too firmly in control to have to worry about his opponents, who lived outside Rome. Belonging to the Roman nobility, he relied on Theophylact, since 904 financial director *(vestararius)* of the Holy See and at the same time commander of the Roman militia *(magister militum)*. Theophylact's preeminence, which is difficult to define but was expressed in titles such as *dux, senator Romanorum, consul et dux,* was reinforced by the marriage of his daughter Marozia to Alberic of Spoleto and assured peace in Rome for some time.

---

[5] Thus W. Holtzmann, "Papsttum, Normannen und griechische Kirche", 71 f., cited *infra,* 538, with the other literature.

[6] E. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Papsttums im Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig 1866).

The papacy's position at first still depended on the ability of the Roman Bishop of the moment.[7] The energetic Sergius III was followed by Anastasius III (911–13) and Lando (913–14), of whom we know virtually nothing. The next Pope, John X (914–28), transferred to Rome from the archiepiscopal see of Ravenna, was without doubt a strong personality. The accusation that John had previously lived in an illicit union with Theophylact's wife, Theodora, comes from Liutprand of Cremona, whose obsession was with discovering love affairs, and may be believed as little as the liaison, also reported by him, between Sergius III and Marozia. John X, who, with Theophylact and Alberic of Spoleto, was one of the chief promoters of the league against the Muslims and took part personally in the battle on the Garigliano in 915, was not subservient to the Roman nobility. After the deaths of Theophylact and Alberic (c. 924), he even began to pursue an independent policy, allying with King Hugh of Italy, to whom he promised the imperial crown, and seeking to assure the greatest possible power to his own brother, Peter. But here he ran afoul of Marozia, now head of the house of Theophylact and, since 926, wife of the Margrave Guy of Tuscany. Peter was killed in 927; in 928 John X was shut up in prison, where he died, probably strangled. His successors, Leo VI (928–29), Stephen VII (929–31), and finally Marozia's own son, John XI (931–36), were of no importance: the papacy had lost its freedom.

Marozia's fall brought no change. Free to marry again because of the death of Guy of Tuscany, she offered her hand and, with it, rule of Rome to Hugh of Italy, who was then at the height of his power. The ambitious plan, to which Hugh consented, was incompatible with the Romans' consciousness of their freedom. Incited by Alberic, son of Marozia and Alberic of Spoleto, they stormed the Castel Sant'Angelo, where the wedding was being celebrated. Hugh fled ignominiously, Marozia landed in prison, and Alberic assumed power, which, outdoing the achievement of his grandfather, he brought to its peak (932–54). Merely the titles used by him — *senator omnium Romanorum, patricius,* perhaps granted by the Byzantine Emperor, and finally *princeps* — and then his coinage, bearing his own name and that of the Pope, reveal the enhanced and now undisguised claim to princely authority. Thanks to a shrewd policy, which was not oriented to expansion or to recovery of territory, except for the Sabine country, but to the security and order of the existing territorial possessions, Alberic's position remained unshaken. Even the condition of the Church was improved. Personally pious, the *princeps* called upon no less than Odo of Cluny to reform the monasteries in and around Rome and on his family property built the monastery of Santa Maria all'Aventino. Naturally, he kept the Popes in strict dependence.[8] But it was clear to Alberic that this situation could not continue forever, because of the uncontestable right of the papacy to rule Rome and the *Patrimonium*. In an effort to assure his family the rule in the future also, shortly before his death he had the Romans swear to select his son Octavian as the next Pope. This was agreed to, and, after the death of Agapitus II (946–55), Octavian mounted the throne of Peter, putting aside his original name[9] and styling himself John XII (955–64). In this union of *princeps* and *pontifex* Alberic's goal seemed to have been realized.

---

[7] Cf. G. Buzzi, "Per la cronologia di alcuni pontefici dei secoli X–XI" in *ASRomana* 35 (1912), 611–22; P. Fedele, "Ricerche per la storia di Roma e del papato", ibid. 33 (1910), 174–247; 34 (1911), 75–115, 393–423 (important for the destruction of the "pornocracy" legend); L. Duchesne, "Serge III et Jean XI" in *MAH* 33 (1913), 25–64; T. Venni, "Giovanni X" in *ADRomana* 59 (1936), 1–136.

And yet his calculations included an error. Oriented to the dimensions of a city-state, they caused the universal element, and hence the real essence of the Eternal City, to come out the loser. The Christian West still looked upon Rome as its capital, as the seat of the *vicarius Petri,* who was entrusted with the care of the Universal Church, and at the same time as the place where an Emperor, to be anointed by the Pope, had to assume the protectorate of Christianity. Since the imperial office was vacant and the papacy had fallen prey to the Roman nobility, the call for a *renovatio imperii* gained momentum. As soon as a strong ruler answered it, Alberic's system was done for. That ruler appeared in the King of Germany, Otto I.

Germany

When the East Carolingian Dynasty expired in the person of Louis the Child, and Conrad I (911–18) was raised to the throne, the royal authority was in the process of dissolution in Germany. The East Frankish tribal nobility, all along not particularly devoted to the crown, set about the intensive cultivation of its immune districts by means of colonization and the founding of churches and monasteries, which it endowed with its patrimonial goods. The ancient way of life peculiar to the German tribes had developed further and found its support in the "later" tribal dukedom, which had risen to power through the wars with Vikings, Slavs, and Magyars. If the crown intended to enforce its authority, it had to have recourse to the Carolingian legacy of the unity of the state and so to the Frankish State Church. This attempt did not succeed at once. The struggle waged by Conrad I with the aid of the Church[10] against the tribal dukedom was a failure.

---

[8] W. Sickel, "Alberich II. und der Kirchenstaat" in *MIÖG* 23 (1902), 50–126; O. Vehse, "Die päpstliche Herrschaft in der Sabina bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts" in *QFIAB* 21 (1929f.), 120–75; A. Rota, "La riforma monastica del 'princeps' Alberico" in *ADRomana* 79 (1956), 11–22 (this probably overstresses the political motives).

[9] Before him Mercurius had taken the name of John II (533–35); John XII's gesture, imitated by John XIV, became the rule from Gregory V; cf. F. Krämer, "Über die Anfänge und Beweggründe der Papstnamenänderungen im Mittelalter" in *RQ* 51 (1956), 148–88.

His successor, Henry I (919–36), founder of the Saxon Dynasty, at first followed a different course[11] because of Conrad's failure. Henry avoided the alliance with the Church and sought a federal union of the tribes under Saxon leadership. But he slowly came around again to the Carolingian policy, especially after the recovery in 926 of Lotharingia, which in 911 had gone over to France. It was important to the Church that Henry again instituted the politically important palace chapel and regained the disposal of all the bishoprics, except those of Bavaria, whose duke did not have to renounce his ecclesiastical sovereignty until the reign of Otto I. The Carolingian tradition came to life again in full force under this same Otto the Great, Henry's son. The severe struggles which Otto had to endure with the nobility and the tribal dukes may be passed over here. But they had an effect on the Church too. Motivated by the understanding that the crown would not master the inner political opposition without a complete domination of the Church, Otto, in the words of Mitteis, proceeded "to make the Church the central institution of the kingdom". What he began, the succeeding rulers of the Saxon and Salian Dynasties continued.

The King's will was regarded as virtually unlimited in the State Church that thus came to birth. The nomination of the bishops, who were mostly not connected with the tribes, was determined by political viewpoints. Usually they were men who had been brought up in the royal chapel and trained in the service of the chancery or in other functions. In order to be able to demand of the churches achievements of greater consequence for the state, the rulers were sparing neither in donations of crown property nor in privileges of immunity, which gave the bishops full jurisdiction, even over serious criminal cases, and hence made the ecclesiastical *advocatia* the equivalent of a countship. From the time of Otto III even whole counties with all their rights were bestowed upon episcopal sees or royal abbeys. Usually connected with jurisdiction were other profitable rights — tolls, market, ban — so that the Ottonian privileges laid the foundation on which an episcopal territorial power could be erected. The celibacy of the ecclesiastical princes made it possible to regrant vacated offices freely, as the occasion arose.

---

[10] M. Hellmann, "Die Synode von Hohenaltheim (910). Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis von Königtum und Kirche im ostfränkischen Reich zu Beginn des 10. Jahrhunderts" in *HJ* 73 (1954), 127–42; also, H. Fuhrmann in *ZBLG* 20 (1954), 136–51.

[11] Cf. C. Erdmann, "Der ungesalbte König" in *DA* 2 (1938), 412–41; M. Linzel, *Heinrich I. und die fränkische Königssalbung* (Berlin 1955).

So strict a dependence of the prelatial churches on the King was conceivable only in an age which did not yet know the essential distinction between state and Church, but merely the functional distinction between *Sacerdotium* and *Regnum*. Since both powers, as members of one superposed unity under the rule of Christ, regarded themselves as bound to the same religious and political goal, royal service, secular administration, and divine service could all be conceived as one and the same religious and moral accomplishment.[12] The ruler, from whose hand the bishops, at their investiture by ring and staff, received, not only the property and the secular rights of sovereignty, but also the ecclesiastical function, was in the view of that age not simply a layman. His anointing, which, given the state of contemporary theology, could be regarded as a Sacrament, raised him to the sphere of *vicarius Christi* and made him, according to the anointing formula in a Mainz *Ordo,* a participant in the episcopal office and an intermediary between clergy and people.[13] Thus the theocratic form of dominion, elaborated under the Carolingians, gained new force and validity. It reached its climax in the religious and political ideas of Otto III and motivated both Henry II and Henry III to serious reform efforts.

Since at the time there was no free Church, it was basically more advantageous for the bishops to be under the rule of a king rather than of a prince. The theocratic king pursued an objective religious and political general policy, whereas the princes were motivated by selfish interests. Hence the German episcopate in the tenth and eleventh centuries presented on the whole a really favourable picture; in fact, there were in it not a few exemplary and saintly ecclesiastical princes. Naturally, the Ottonian system could not last forever. As soon as the Western mind began to distinguish more carefully and hence to surmount the primitive phase of the relationship, the Church had to lay her hand again on the episcopal office and attack the theocratic form of investiture. The collapse of the Ottonian State Church that actually occurred weakened the crown considerably. For the German bishop continued to be a Prince of the Empire until 1803 and from the time of the Concordat of Worms (1122) was on the way to constructing his territorial power in competition with the secular princes and to the disadvantage of the imperial power.

---

[12] O. Köhler, *Das Bild des geistlichen Fürsten in den Viten des 10., 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1935); J. Fleckenstein, "Königshof und Bischofsschule unter Otto dem Grossen" in *AKG* 38 (1956), 32–62; H. W. Klewitz, "Cancellaria" in *DA* 1 (1937), 44–79; id., "Königtum, Hofkapelle und Domkapitel im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert" in *AUF* 16 (1939), 102–56.

[13] Texts in P. E. Schramm, "Die Krönung in Deutschland bis zum Beginn des salischen Hauses" in *ZSavRGkan* 55 (1935), 319f.; on the Mainz *ordo,* cf. also C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt,* 54–91; on the theocracy, cf. 516, the bibliography to this section, and E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton 1957), 42–86; also F. Kempf in *RQ* 54 (1959), 204–06.

The Ottonian-Salian State Church was never a real national or territorial Church. The presuppositions for the concept of a national state were then lacking, particularly in the Carolingian successor states, in which the awareness of the earlier unity disappeared only slowly.[14] Otto I intended to be, not so much a German King, as successor of Charles the Great. For this reason it was in the Aachen chapel, the burial place of the great Charles, that he had himself acclaimed and anointed as King and seated upon Charles's throne, with its many relics. It is true that Charles's *Imperium* could not be re-established, but the Western concept of unity, fed by the Carolingian and the Christian traditions, impelled Otto beyond the German area of his authority, as his position of hegemony expanded and consolidated itself. It was more than a national deed when, outdoing his father's victory near Riate in 933, he so decisively defeated the Magyars on the Lechfeld near Augsburg in 955 that their raids ceased. Widukind's report that the victorious German army thereupon proclaimed Otto Emperor[15] may have been invented, but all of Western Christendom looked upon him as its liberator.

The struggles in the north and east also and the related political expansion did not concern merely Germany. A new missionary movement, conducted by German and other priests, expanded the Church's territory, as will be described later. Otto apparently did not intend to attack the independence of the neighbouring Western states, but he occasionally intervened in their affairs. Thus he saved the crown for Conrad of Burgundy, the underage son of King Rudolf II, who had died in 937. Conrad was brought to Otto's court and kept there for a while; in this way was frustrated the plan to annex Burgundy that had been concocted by King Hugh of Italy. Hugh had married the widowed Queen of Burgundy and had arranged the engagement of his son Lothar to Rudolf's daughter Adelaide. And in France Otto supported the Carolingian, Louis IV, once the latter had renounced Lotharingia, against the Robertian, Hugh of Neustria, not only in several campaigns but also by his exertions to have the Reims schism settled at the Synod of Ingelheim in 948 in accord with Louis's desires.

The position of hegemony which elevated the German King above the Western monarchs hinted of itself at a final enhancement, at its sanction by the Pope in the imperial anointing and coronation. Since this presupposed the possession of Italy, the politics of the Saxon Dynasty was oriented to the conquest of the Lombard Kingdom. Henry I had probably thought of an expedition to Italy and Rome in his last years. Perhaps it was for this reason that, probably in 935, he acquired at great cost from King Rudolf II of Burgundy the holy lance, a relic adorned with nails from the cross of Christ, which was thought to be Constantine's lance; it was therefore regarded as a symbol of imperial authority and could signify a claim to Italy.[16] In any event, Otto I was thereafter determined to acquire the Italian royal crown and the Roman imperial crown.

---

[14] A. Schulze, *Kaiserpolitik und Einheitsgedanke in den karolingischen Nachfolgestaaten 876–962* (dissertation, Berlin 1926); O. Ebding, *Der politische Zusammenhang zwischen den karolingischen Nachfolgestaaten* (typed dissertation, Freiburg im Breisgau 1950); G. Tellenbach, "Von der Tradition des fränkischen Reiches in der deutschen und französischen Geschichte" in *Der Vertrag von Verdun,* ed. by T. Mayer (Leipzig 1943); W. Kienast, *Deutschland und Frankreich in der Kaiserzeit 900–1270* (Leipzig 1943).

[15] Widukind, III, 49 (ed. Hirsch-Hohmann, 128f.); cf. also H. Beumann, *Widukind von Korvei. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Ideengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Weimar 1950), 228–65; C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt,* 44–46; J. A. Brundage, "Widukind of Corvey and the 'Non-Roman' Imperial Idea" in *MS* 22 (1960), 15–26.

Nationalistic minded historians of the nineteenth century chalked this up to him as a serious mistake. The scholars' quarrel started by them seems strange to us, and yet its arguments, derived more from the modern than from the mediaeval viewpoint, are to some extent to be heard even today.[17] The Italian policy of the Dukes of Swabia and Bavaria, so runs the explanation which favours Otto, forced the German King to lay hands on Italy and then on Rome; furthermore, he had to control the Pope in order to keep the German Church dependent and to carry through his missionary plans in the east and north. These and other considerations, however, stress only more or less correct partial aspects. Otto's real motives originated in intellectual and spiritual strata which are scarcely accessible to us today. Aspirations for power, the Christian universalist idea of a *renovatio imperii Francorum,* and a magic and religious appreciation of the imperial anointing probably fused here, but in such a way that it is not possible to determine exactly the share of the individual elements.

---

[16] W. Holtzmann, *Heinrich I. und die heilige Lanze* (Bonn 1947); M. Lintzel in *HZ* 171 (1951), 303–10; H. E. Mayer in *DA* 17 (1961), 507–17; M. Uhlirz, "Zu den heiligen Lanzen der karolingischen Teilreiche" in *MIÖG* 68 (1960), 197–208; P. E. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik,* II (Stuttgart 1955), 492–537.

[17] H. Hostenkamp, *Die mittelalterliche Kaiserpolitik der deutschen Historiographie seit von Sybel und Ficker* (Berlin 1934); F. Schneider, *Die neueren Anschauungen der deutschen Historiker über die deutsche Kaiserpolitik des Mittelalters und die mit ihr verbundene Ostpolitik* (Weimar, 5th ed. 1942); L. Hauptmann, "Universalismus und Nationalismus im Kaisertum der Ottonen" in *Festschr. K. G. Hugelmann,* I (Aalen 1959), 189–211; W. Smidt, *Deutsches Königtum und deutscher Staat des Hochmittelalters während und unter dem Einfluss der italienischen Heerfahrten. Ein 200jähriger Gelehrtenstreit* (Wiesbaden 1964); other literature, especially Litzel and Rörig, in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 28

Rome, the Papacy, and the Empire: 962 to 1002

The desire of Otto I, King of Germany, to gain the Lombard royal crown and the Roman imperial crown was entirely within the realm of the possible. It was important only to wait for the proper moment. This seemed to have arrived when, after the death of King Lothar of Italy in 950, his young widow, Queen Adelaide, daughter of Rudolf II of Burgundy, was unwilling to give way to Berengar of Ivrea, who had forced himself into power; she was therefore thrown into prison. Probably appealed to for aid, Otto entered Lombardy with a strong army, assumed the royal authority at Pavia, unelected and uncrowned, and married Adelaide (951). Envoys sent on to the Pope discussed the question of the imperial coronation with him, but the ruler of Rome, Prince Alberic, did not want a new Emperor, and so Pope Agapitus II had to refuse.

His attention claimed by difficulties within Germany, Otto soon relinquished even the Lombard Kingdom, assigning it to Berengar of Ivrea and his son Adalbert in exchange for vassalage, except for the northeastern part of Lombardy, which was placed under the Duke of Bavaria. Without knowing it, Otto had thereby smoothed his route to Rome. For Berengar, involved as early as 956, because of a violation of the territorial arrangements, in a war which was directed by Otto's son Liudolf and which was temporarily ended by Liudolf's death in 957, constantly extended his sphere of power. By conquering the Duchy of Spoleto in 959 and, in that connection, plundering or occupying small frontier districts belonging to the Papal State, Berengar became a threatening neighbour of Pope John XII. The youthful Pope had to fear Berengar's expansionist drive all the more, since his own position had been shaken by a foolish and miserably ruined attempt against Capua and by his religiously frivolous and even immoral life. In his distress, therefore, he sent two agents to Germany in 960 to ask Otto's help and to invite him to receive the imperial crown in Rome. Some Lombard princes and bishops also appeared at the German court and demanded war.

Otto made the most of the propitious hour. In a treaty concluded with the papal envoys he promised on oath, apparently in imitation of a formula submitted to Charles the Fat in 881, to protect the person of the Pope and the *Patrimonium Petri,* the territorial extent of which was to remain inviolate, without the advice of the Pope neither to sit in judgment nor to issue orders in Rome which would affect the Pope or the Romans, and to oblige the future regent of the Lombard Kingdom to defend the *Patrimonium.*[1] He then made ready his journey to Rome. To guarantee the succession he had his six-year-old son and namesake elected and crowned King. In the late summer of 961, accompanied by Queen Adelaide, he appeared in Lombardy with a strong force, restored his sovereignty there temporarily almost without striking a blow, and at the beginning of the new year set out for Rome. On 2 February 962, he and Adelaide received the imperial anointing and were crowned in Saint Peter's.[2]

---

[1] Cf. K. Hampe, "Die Berufung Ottos des Grossen nach Rom durch Papst Johannes XII." in *Festschrift für K. Zeumer* (Weimar 1910), 153–67; on the oath, see E. Eichmann, *Kaiserkrönung,* II, 165–83.

This solemn act bound Church, Empire, and Christendom into a unity heavy with consequences for the future. In so far as the altered circumstances would allow, the *renovatio imperii Francorum* had become a reality. The extensive territory under his rule, comprising two kingdoms, his position of hegemony, and his victories over the neighbouring pagan peoples had pointed out Otto as the successor of Charles the Great and had led him to Rome to have his pre-eminence ratified sacramentally. Except for certain rights in Rome and in the Papal State, the imperial coronation could add nothing to his power of government, which remained fundamentally his power as King, even if, because of the possession of two kingdoms — to which in 1033 Conrad II would be able to add a third, that of Burgundy — it had a quasi-imperial character. Hence, Otto and his successors did not, by virtue of their imperial title, demand any subjection from the other Christian Kings of the West. The rights of suzerainty which they acquired from time to time over neighbouring rulers to the north or the east were the results of a policy independent in itself of the imperial office. But the anointing and coronation at Rome transmitted the imperial title and the imperial dignity.

The conferring of the imperial dignity, of course, would not have meant much unless it was destined for a ruler endowed with power. Here there was involved a fundamentally important double relationship. The quasi-imperial power of the German monarchs and its hegemonial radiation gave importance and esteem to the imperial dignity, while the imperial dignity surrounded what was basically a royal power with a mysterious glamour supported by a genuine symbolic force and made it appear as an imperial power. Surpassing all other rulers in dignity and authority, the German Emperor appeared to occupy the throne of the world and to be charged by God in the first place to espouse the cause of Christianity, just as he was entrusted in a special manner with the protection of the Pope, the father of Christendom. The universal characteristic, present in the Christian essence of the imperial office, would be consolidated by the fact that the German Empire would be more and more regarded as the continuation of the world-wide Roman Empire. This development owed its origin to the rivalry, soon to begin, with the Byzantine Emperor as well as to the current ideas of renewal, harking back to antiquity and Rome, and to the theology of the four world-empires.[3]

---

[2] According to H. Decker-Hauff, "Die 'Reichskrone'", P. E. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik,* II (Stuttgart 1955), 560–637, the "Vienna Crown" had been made before 962 for the imperial coronation; this is denied by J. Deér, "Otto der Grosse und die Reichskrone" in *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte und Archäologie des Mittelalters,* Akten zum 7. internationalen Kongress für Frühmittelalterforschung (Graz–Cologne 1961), 261–77; on the coronation, see E. Eichmann, *Kaiserkrönung,* I, 129–49.

On the juridical questions posed by the union of the German kingship and the Roman imperial office Otto I and his successors, except Otto III, seem to have had no misgivings. Things developed, so to speak, automatically. It is true that the anointing and coronation at Rome, since 850 the unique means of imparting the imperial dignity, continued to be reserved entirely to the Pope as his prerogative, but it lost its importance by virtue of the fact that the Popes could no longer, as John VIII once did, select an Emperor from among the Western Kings. In his own lifetime Otto I had his son and namesake crowned as Emperor in 967 and enhanced the imperial prestige of his house by the marriage of Otto II to the Greek Princess Theophano, probably a niece of the Byzantine Emperor John I Tzimisces.[4]

Although the elevation of the heir to the throne to the rank of coemperor did not take place after that, still the power substantially claimed by the German monarchs of the tenth and eleventh centuries guaranteed, even and especially in Imperial Italy, the claim to the imperial dignity and made it slowly into a *ius ad rem,* into a legal reversion. *Regnum* and *Imperium* became thereby so correlated that the election and anointing of the German King already implied the elevation of the future Emperor, and, conversely, the imperial anointing denoted the climax and finale of the progressive elevation of the German monarch. So long as the Saxon and early Salian theocracy endured, the imperial office was, for all practical purposes, not subject to the influence of Pope or Romans. If one disregards the ideas of Otto III, it was not the Romans but the Germans who appeared as the Imperial Nation. The German kingship and its power assumed an imperial character, and the Pope, in the imperial coronation that was his right, had only to ratify sacramentally what had already been decided and acted upon in ruling.

Of course there is question here merely of one of several possible views, but one that was favoured by the circumstances of the time. The imperial office was a much too ambiguous creation, subject to various interpretations, for its relationship to the *Regnum* to be unequivocally pinpointed. While the

---

[3] On the Roman content of the imperial idea, see especially P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio, passim,* and C. Erdmann, "Das Ottonische Reich als Imperium Romanum" in *DA* 6 (1943), 412–41. But there was also a non-Roman imperial idea; for it, see E. E. Stengel, "Kaisertitel und Souveränitätsidee" in *DA* 3 (1939), 1–56, 16 (1960), 15–72 (*Imperium* among the Anglo-Saxons); C. Erdmann, *Forsch. zur politischen Ideenwelt,* 1–16, 31–43; on the Ottonian imperial office, ibid., 43–51. On the relevant theology: E. Kocken, *De theorie van de vier wereldrijken en van de overdracht der wereldheerschappij tot op Innocentius III* (Nijmegen 1935); P. van den Baar, *Die kirchliche Lehre der Translatio Imperii Romani* (Rome 1956); W. Goez, *Translatio imperii* (Tübingen 1958).

[4] M. Uhlirz thinks otherwise: cf. here *JbbDG: Otto III.,* 1f. (with bibliography).

Germans, like the Franks before them, might have felt that their rulers owed the *Imperium*, next to God, to their own inherent strength,[5] the Romans and the Pope clung to the conviction that the *Imperium* was at their disposal. The Roman people were unable to carry their claim, but the Pope had a strong basis for his. It was he who conferred the imperial dignity by the anointing and coronation, and, according to Roman and ecclesiastical tradition, this meant, not an action to be undertaken, as it were, blindfolded, but an act somehow free and presupposing the examination of the one to be anointed—the doing of a favour. Thus supported, the papacy, once it had acquired its freedom in the Investiture Controversy and had assumed the leadership of Western Christendom, was to make demands which, because of the entanglement of the *Imperium* with the German *Regnum*, touched the foundations of German rule and contributed to the dramatic conflict with the Hohenstaufen.

Soon after his imperial coronation, Otto I, following the example of the preceding Emperors, issued a *privilegium* for the Roman Church in his own name and that of his son.[6] Despite the disappearance of almost all the earlier imperial *privilegia*, the regulations of the *Ottonianum* may safely be traced back to one text, which was slowly elaborated in the pacts of the ninth century and eventually reached its final form, probably in the pact of Charles the Bald of 876, from then on to pass, virtually unaltered, from one imperial *privilegium* to another, as, in the words of Stengel, "the pale shadow of the once living power notions of both parties". The producing of one or more such pacts may have induced Otto in the first part of his *privilegium* to confirm in favour of the Roman Church a downright fantastic territorial possession involving about two-thirds of Italy, although the poorly composed text contained obvious contradictions.[7]

The to a great extent utopian statements need not, of course, have troubled the Emperor. He was, however, bound to procure its property for the Roman Church only to the extent that he was able. It would take years for Otto to control Italy to some degree and to be able to think of restitution. The more he became conversant with the territorial situation in Italy, the more exactly he learned to distinguish, even in the *privilegium,* between appearance and reality, between the never realized wishful thinking and the genuine legal claims of the Roman Church in regard to territorial possessions. But even in the restitutions that were to be effected in justice, there was no question of an absolute alienation. The Emperor remained the sovereign lord even in the Papal State. The regulations of the second part of the charter, which, among other things, provided for an oath of loyalty to be taken before his consecration by the Pope, who was to be freely elected, and envisaged the Emperor as the final tribunal for complaints against papal officials, admit of no doubt. Most probably they belonged to the constant elements in imperial privileges, once they had been validly formulated in a *privilegium,* no longer extant but probably drawn up in 825 following the *Constitutio Romana* and other measures taken by Lothar I in 824.[8] John XII was quickly to learn what they meant for Otto I.

---

[5] Widukind of Corvey is an especially important witness for the time of Otto I; see Chapter 27, footnote 15.

[6] *MGConst* I, no. 12. T. Sickel, *Das Privilegium Ottos I. für die römische Kirche* (Innsbruck 1883); E. E. Stengel, "Die Entwicklung des Kaiserprivilegs für die römische Kirche 817–962" in *HZ* 134 (1926), 216–41, revised in Stengel, *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Cologne–Graz 1960), 218–48; H. Zimmermann in *MIÖG, ErgBd,* 20 (1962), 147–90 (on the history of the critical problem).

[7] The basis was the still extant privilege of 817, issued by Louis the Pious. To the possessions there described, comprising especially the Duchy of Rome, the Pentapolis, and the exarchate, were added in the course of time in more important grants: the territory of Naples, Gaetà, and Fondi, seven Spoletan cities, and then, probably by Charles the Bald, through the insertion of the promise of Quierzy, going back to Pepin and renewed by Charles the Great: Corsica, Venetia, Istria, the Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, and a large area extending beyond Tuscany and into Lombardy with its frontier from Luni to Monselice. Opposed to the view given in the text and defended by Stengel is that of *Haller* II, 208–10, 551–53, who holds that the immense extent of the Papal State is proper to the *Ottonianum*. According to him, John XII, greedy for expansion, outwitted the naive Germans. Cf. also Stengel's reply in *Abhandlungen,* 243–45.

Back in Lombardy, Otto began the struggle against Berengar, who fell back upon a castle in the former exarchate. When, during the siege, the Emperor brought the neighbouring populations under his sovereignty, John XII regarded his rights as having been violated and, disregarding the oath of loyalty he had sworn to the Emperor, conspired with Berengar's son Adalbert. Otto thereupon returned to Rome in 963. The Romans had to swear for the future not to elect a Pope without the authorization of the Emperor. Then, contrary to the fundamental legal principle that the Pope can be judged by no one, Otto had John, now in flight, summoned before a synod and, on his non-appearance, deposed. Leo, *protoscriniarius* of the Roman Church, was then raised to the papacy as Leo VIII. This notorious violation of the law not only led to an uprising but, following Otto's departure, also enabled John XII to take hold of the reins again. A few months later he was carried off by a stroke, allegedly in a liaison. As his successor the Romans elected the blameless Benedict V. But once again might prevailed: Otto forced Leo VIII on the Romans and banished Benedict V to Hamburg. John's perfidy had cost the Roman Church dearly. The Emperor's new right to confirm the papal election reduced the Bishop of Rome to a momentous dependence.[9]

---

[8] The bold thesis of W. Ullmann, "The Origins of the Ottonianum" in *CambrHJ* 11 (1953), 114–28, that the entire second part was added in 963 in a new version interpolated by the imperial side, is probably wrong. Cf. also O. Bertolini, "Osservazioni sulla 'Constitutio Romana' e sul 'sacramentum cleri et populi Romani' dell' 824" in *Studi medievali in onore di A. De Stefano* (Palermo 1956), 43–78; K. Hampe, "Berufung Ottos des Grossen", *loc. cit.*, and Stengel, *Abhandlungen*, 222–25.

[9] H. Zimmermann, "Die Deposition Johanns XII., Leos VIII. und Benedikts V." in

In addition to the Emperor, the papacy had also from now on to reckon with the Roman nobles and their rivalries. A first revolt, of short duration, against John XIII (965–72) was severely punished by the Emperor (966). It was followed by a second, after Otto's death in 973, led by Crescentius de Theodora. Pope Benedict VI was overthrown in 974 and replaced by Boniface VII, who had Benedict strangled. Then, hard pressed by the imperial *missus,* the usurper fled to the Byzantines with the Church's treasury. His attack on Rome in 980–81, by which he intended to strip the reformer, Pope Benedict VII (974–83), of power, failed. But when the Emperor Otto II died at the end of 983, the adventurer emerged victorious against the unloved John XIV (983–84), who had been transferred from the see of Pavia at the Emperor's wish. John XIV was starved or poisoned in prison, while the hated and despised Boniface died in 985.[10] The next Pope, John XV (985–96), relied strictly on the nobles, to the dissatisfaction of the lower clergy. Under him the two sons of Crescentius de Theodora, John and Crescentius II, rose to high position. John was entrusted with the administration of the Church's property and bore the title *patricius.* The power-mad and avaricious Crescentius II did not hold any office but, especially after his brother's death, exerted a tyrannical pressure on the Roman Church.[11]

The tragic end of Benedict VI and John XIV indicated once again how badly the Popes, threatened by Roman factional strife, needed protection. But the German Emperors were certainly to be preferred as protectors to a Roman noble family that had gained power. The Ottos assisted the papacy out of its difficulties at Rome and brought it back into a larger context. And if the imperial protectorate also encroached upon the freedom of the papal election and of papal political activity, still, apart from the different course of Otto III, it did not attack the papacy's power of spiritual leadership in itself, quite in contrast to the rule of Charles the Great, who to a great extent had united the supreme direction of Church and Empire in his person and allowed the Pope hardly more than the position of a supreme Imperial Bishop. The German Imperial Church never attained to the compactness of the Carolingian territorial Church. More firmly even than before, it was to become a

---

MIÖG 68 (1960), 209–25, and "Papstabsetzungen" in *MIÖG* 69 (1961), 247–61; there, on page 254, footnote 42, the noteworthy view that in the deposition of John XII the attempt was made to neutralize the Pope's judicial immunity, which continued in force "nisi a fide devius", by accusing him of apostasy.

[10] On Boniface VII see M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.,* 58–60; Zimmermann, "Papstabsetzungen", *loc. cit.* 266–69.

[11] On the Crescentian family: the works of Kölmel and Gerstenberg (see the bibliography for Chapter 27); G. Bossi, *I Crescenzi. Contributo alla storia di Roma 900–1012* (Rome 1915); id., *ASRomana* 41 (1918), 111–70 (Crescentians in the Sabine district, 1012–1106); P. Brezzi, *Roma* (see bibliography for Chapter 27), disputes with Gerstenberg the origin of the Crescentians from the house of Theophylact (pp. 148–52); he also holds that the family of John XIII can no longer be determined, ibid. 142–44.

part of the Universal Church, once the Church's centre of gravity at Rome showed itself more markedly along with the renewed imperial office.

Otto I and his successors not infrequently had important questions affecting the German Church decided at papal synods, meeting in Rome or elsewhere in Italy, now and then even in a sense opposed to the wishes of the German prelates. And even the wishes of the Emperors did not have to be unconditionally complied with. Thus John XIII, in his *privilegium* of 967, seems to have restricted the jurisdictional sphere of the archbishopric of Magdeburg, about to be established, out of consideration for the Poles and contrary to the intentions of Otto I. Brought face to face with entirely new missionary problems by the German Emperor in his struggles with pagan frontier peoples, the papacy began to focus its gaze beyond the Empire on nations with which it had hardly concerned itself earlier. This matter will be taken up later. Now the Pope not infrequently had to deal with the spiritual affairs of France, because they were referred to him no longer only from France but also, in specific cases, by the German monarchs.

Italy naturally constituted an especially important topic of discussion between the two chiefs of Christendom. When in 964 Otto I captured and exiled Berengar, his authority in Italy was so little established that, after his return to Germany, a rising engineered by Berengar's son Adalbert had to be put down. Only his third Italian expedition (966–72), which put the Emperor in touch with the Lombard princes of South Italy and enabled the imperial frontier to be assured *vis-à-vis* the Byzantines, produced a somewhat orderly situation. This finally made it possible gradually to restore to the Roman Church, at least partially, the districts usurped by Italian nobles. The restitutions, begun in 967 and continued by Otto II, had to do with Ravenna and the counties of the old exarchate.[12] John XIII, to be sure, seems to have again turned over Ravenna and Comacchio to the Empress Adelaide, and later Gregory V had to cede the greatest part of his rights in the exarchate to the Archbishop of Ravenna.

The Roman Church lacked the means of administering a somewhat extensive territory with its own resources. In the tenth century things were in a bad way in general with regard to the landed property of the Italian churches. The German Emperors observed with great anxiety how everywhere great and petty lords were taking possession of ecclesiastical property in an increasing measure. So long as this involved monastic property, the bishops also helped themselves. Further losses occurred because of the widespread disregard of celibacy. Bishops, abbots, and priests provided for their illegitimate children as far as possible with clerical property. For political reasons alone the Ottos came out for the preservation and restitution of ecclesiastical property, especially in the strategically important zones and in the royal monasteries, which were bound to the imperial service. From 967 they treated of Church property at synods and diets. They issued laws, such as the *Capitulare de duello iudiciali* of 967, which introduced the duel as the method of proof in conflicts over property and excluded the sons of those obliged to celibacy from holding public offices, and the *Capitulare de praediis ecclesiasticis* of 998, which set a time-limit to the enfeoffing of property. They granted monasteries the right of inquisition, privileges of immunity, charters of protection, and confirmations of their property, and brought the complaints of plundered monasteries before their tribunal.[13] Meagre as this reform was in regard to depth, the problem of reform that was thereby thrown open was to have further effects in Italy.

---

[12] The fundamental study by M. Uhlirz, cited in the bibliography, on the restitution includes, among other things, an important attempt to clarify the frontier line Luni—Monselice see footnote 7, *supra*).

Meanwhile, another danger loomed in the south. Provoked by a Byzantine raid on Messina, the Sicilian Muslims, under their Emir Abul Kasim, attacked Calabria and Apulia from 976. The Byzantine Emperor Basil II was too much preoccupied with the revolt of Bardas Sclerus to be able to help. Since Pandulf Iron-Head, the mightiest lord in the Lombard area, unfortunately died in 981, Otto II assumed charge of the defence against the infidel. From this time on he designated himself as Emperor of the Romans, in open rivalry with the *Basileus,* with whom he had been on bad terms ever since the death of John I Tzimisces. His campaign ended with defeat at Cape Colonna in Calabria in July 982, but the battle cost Abul Kasim his life and hence induced the leaderless Muslims to quit the mainland. Otto had already decided on a second military expedition, but in 983, at the age of twenty-eight, he was carried off by a sickness at Rome and was buried in the atrium of Saint Peter's. (Today he rests in the grottoes.) He left a son of the same name, not yet four years old but already crowned as King. The regency was conducted by Theophano and, after her death in 991, by Adelaide, until the young King was declared of age in 994.

In 996 Otto III set out on a journey to Rome. Pope John XV had come into conflict with Crescentius II and had been compelled to leave the city, but at the news of Otto's coming he had been called back, only to die soon after.[14] The Romans sent envoys to consult Otto about the imminent papal election. To their surprise he designated a German cleric, his relative Bruno, son of Otto of Carinthia, as Pope. He ascended the throne of Peter as Gregory V (996–99). Having received the imperial crown, the young ruler was ready with a second surprise. He declined to renew the *pactum* which Otto I had issued in his own name and that of his son, and would have nothing to do with the restitution of the Pentapolis, which Gregory V asked for.

---

[13] 967: *MGConst* I, no. 13; see M. Uhlirz, "Die italienische Kirchenpolitik der Ottonen" in *MIÖG* 48 (1934), 231 f. (with bibliography); 998: *MGConst* I, no. 23; see Uhlirz, *op. cit.* 288–92; *JbbDG: Otto III,* 276–9.

[14] F. Schneider, "Papst Johann XV. und Ottos III. Romfahrt" in *MIÖG* 39 (1923), 193–218.

But he did bring Crescentius II to trial for his acts of violence against John XV and the Romans and condemned him to exile. The Pope secured his pardon, a charity that Crescentius was to repay ill. Back in power after Otto's departure for Germany, he seems to have expelled the German Pope from Rome in the autumn of 996. It so happened that about the same time Otto III's former teacher, the Calabrian Greek John Philagathus, Bishop of Piacenza, who had gone to Byzantium to seek a bride for Otto, landed in Italy with the Byzantine envoy Leo. While Gregory V was living in Lombardy, where he held a synod at the end of January and the beginning of February 997, Crescentius, with the cooperation of the Byzantine Leo, who was staying in Rome, had Philagathus proclaimed Pope as John XVI.[15] This bold game called for fearful vengeance as soon as Otto III returned to Rome in 998. After the Castel Sant'Angelo had been taken by storm, Crescentius was beheaded there and, with twelve associates, suspended from the gallows, while John XVI, horribly mutilated by his enemies, had to endure, not only deposition by a synod, but a derisive parading through Rome, finally to be sentenced to life-long detention in a monastery.

Remaining in Rome, Otto III began in earnest the *renovatio imperii,* as he conceived it. The highly gifted ruler, just eighteen years of age, was in no sense a well rounded personality. His ascetical bent and almost fanatical piety made him welcome Odilo of Cluny as gladly as he sought out the great Italian hermits, Nilus and Romuald, and cultivate an intimate friendship with Adalbert of Prague. This friendship continued even when Adalbert, torn between the peace of the monastery and the apostolate, devoted himself to the mission to the east of Germany and in 997 suffered martyrdom in pagan Prussia. On the other hand, the young Emperor possessed an exalted consciousness of his position as ruler, aiming at universal recognition, political passion, and an enthusiasm for the *Imperium Romanum* that was nourished by his literary pursuits. Not the least influence on him was that exercised by Gerbert of Aurillac, his friend and the greatest scholar of the day.[16]

Educated in his monastery of Aurillac, then at Vich in mathematics and science, and finally at Reims, and appointed *scholasticus* of the Reims cathedral school, Gerbert had made such a name for himself through an amazing mastery of all branches of the trivium and the quadrivium that in 980 he was asked by the intellectually curious Emperor Otto II to engage in a scholarly disputation at Ravenna with the learned German, Otric. In 982 he was appointed Abbot of Bobbio. Because of the impossible situation in his monastery he returned to Reims in 984 and acted as adviser of Archbishop Adalbero (969–89). When Adalbero's successor, Archbishop Arnulf, was deposed in 991, Gerbert was elected. The controversy thereby sparked, to be discussed later, brought him in 996 to Rome, where the Emperor Otto III got to know and admire him. This determined his future. When in 997 he fled from Reims, Otto III welcomed him at his court. In 998 he had him chosen as Archbishop of Ravenna and in 999, on the death of Gregory V, as Pope. Gerbert called himself Silvester II. He thereby fell in exactly with the renovation idea of his imperial friend. Set at the head of Christendom, Otto and Gerbert strove, as the new Constantine and the new Silvester, to lead the corrupt world back to its origin, to the idealized times of the first Christian Emperor and the contemporary Pope.

---

[15] M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.,* 511–14; P. E. Schramm, *ByZ* 25 (1925), 89–105 (travel letters of the Byzantine envoy Leo), and "Kaiser, Basileus und Papst in der Zeit der Ottonen" in *HZ* 129 (1924), 424–75; on the execution of Crescentius, reported in what follows, see M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.,* 526–33.

[16] For Gerbert's letters, see the bibliography for this chapter (under "Sources") and P. E. Schramm, "Die Briefe Ottos III. und Gerberts aus dem Jahre 997" in *AUF* 9 (1926), 87–122; M. Uhlirz, *JbbGD: Otto III.,* 560–65 (letters and charters of Silvester II); H. Glaesener, "Les rapports du moine Gerbert avec les Ottonides et Notger de Liège" in *Revue du Nord* 31 (1949), 126–36; F. Eichengrün, *Gerbert (Silvester II.) als Persönlichkeit* (Berlin 1928); J. Leflon, *Gerbert. Humanisme et chrétienté au X^e^ siècle* (Saint-Wandrille 1946); O. G. Darlington, "Gerbert the Teacher" in *AHR* 52 (1947), 456–76.

This cooperation occurred, it is true, in the form rather of a subordination than of an equality of the Pope. The mere fact that Otto III established his permanent abode in Rome[17] could not fail to encroach painfully on the freedom of the Roman Church. If the autonomy once aspired after by Stephen II and his successors, which had found expression in the *Constitutum Constantini,* had remained in force only to a limited degree since the imperial coronation of Charles the Great, the basic principle proclaimed in the *Constitutum,* that authority over Rome was abandoned to the Popes, and the Emperor had to reside elsewhere, had been recognized time and again in the imperial *privilegia* of the ninth and tenth centuries. But Otto III felt that he was bound neither by the *Constitutum* nor by the imperial *privilegia.* He even declared the *Constitutum* a forgery, appealing to the deceptive maneuvre of the Cardinal Deacon John, who had shown Otto I, at a time and for a purpose that can no longer be determined, a magnificent, especially prepared document of the donation as an allegedly genuine charter. And he did not hesitate to accuse the Roman Church of having bartered away the property of Saint Peter and then seeking to recoup her fortune with the Emperor's goods and rights. He bestowed not on her but on the Church of Ravenna the last three counties of the exarchate which had not so far been restored, and, spontaneously and with an express protest against any obligation of restitution, he bestowed on Saint Peter in the person of his successor, Silvester II, those eight counties which constituted the greatest part of the Pentapolis and which Gregory V had demanded in vain on the basis of the *Ottonianum*. The constitutional sovereignty which Otto III vindicated in regard to the papacy, to a higher degree than had his predecessors, was not without consequences in the spiritual sphere. On occasion the Emperor participated in purely ecclesiastical discussions. On one occasion, for example, he signed, together with the *iudices* and the Pope, a judicial charter regarding the nomination to the see of Vich.[18] While he may have claimed no real jurisdiction in such cases, still there were also questions in which not only the papacy but also the *Imperium* had a substantial interest.

---

[17] P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio,* I, 105–15, II, 17–33; K. Hampe, "Otto III. und Rom" in *HZ* 140 (1929), 513–33; C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt,* 92–111 (on the dignity of *patricius* and the Roman officialdom); C. Brühl, "Die Kaiserpfalz bei St. Peter und die Pfalz Ottos III. auf dem Palatin" in *QFIAB* 34 (1954), 1–30.

Thus Otto III had certainly played a decisive role in the establishing of contact with the Christian West by Poland and Hungary. Unfortunately, we are only inadequately informed about these important occurrences. In the winter of 999–1000 the Emperor undertook a pilgrimage to the tomb of his friend, the martyr Adalbert, who was buried in Gniezno. That the carefully discussed journey was intended to satisfy not merely personal devotion but at the same time expressly political and religious goals is clear especially from the devotional formula, "Servus Iesu Christi", which Otto attributed to himself in the charters issued during the journey. Assumed by the Apostles, it must probably be placed parallel to the Byzantine imperial attribute of *isapostolos*. Like the Byzantine Emperors, Otto III was claiming an apostolic mission. As a matter of fact, he brought along for the Polish Duke Boleslas a papal privilege which made Gniezno the metropolitan of a Polish territorial Church that was yet to be constituted, and thus drew Poland, in the first stages of its Christianization, into the sphere of the Roman Church. But Otto was also thinking of an expansion of his *Imperium*. Regardless whether he granted the Duke the dignity of *patricius* or intended to elevate him to royal rank but did not carry out his plan because Boleslas refused to give up Adalbert's remains, Boleslas was still presented by Otto with a replica of the holy lance, was accepted as *frater et cooperator imperii* into the rank of an ally and *feodalis imperii* and thereby was somehow incorporated into the Western *Imperium*.[19]

After Otto's return a similar decision was to be made for Hungary. In 1000 or 1001 Silvester II established the metropolitan see of Esztergom, with the right to found a Hungarian ecclesiastical province. Furthermore, the ruler, Vajk-Stephen, was honoured with the royal dignity, possibly along with the dispatch of a royal crown. To whom the last mentioned act is to be attributed from the juridical point of view — to Emperor or to Pope or to both — may continue to be controverted, but it is probably going too far to deny any share of the Emperor or even of the Pope.[20] And so a second country was definitely gained for the West.

---

[18] *Jaffé*, no. 3888; facsimile in *Pontificum Romanorum diplomata papyracea* (Rome 1929), plate X.

[19] P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, I, 135–46; M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.*, 310–26, 538–59 (with ample bibliography); against the thesis of Uhlirz, that Otto intended to confer the royal dignity on Boleslas see R. Wenskus in *ADipl* 1 (1955), 250–56; for Poland, see the bibliography for Chapter 31.

Otto's plans went still farther. If the young Emperor visited the Doge of Venice, Peter II Orseolo, incognito in 1001, the real reason may probably be sought in the victorious naval expedition which had gained for Venice the rule of the Dalmatian coastal cities. Apparently Otto wanted somehow to add to his *Imperium* the growing area of Venetian domination, which pertained to Byzantium, but he did not find the Doge kindly disposed to the idea. The oldest Russian chronicle reports furthermore for 1001 about envoys of Otto who arrived in Kiev, while at the synod held at Todi at Christmas 1001 it was decided that Bruno of Querfurt should be consecrated as Archbishop in charge of the missions to the east. The consecration occurred at Rome in the autumn of 1002.

The exalted position occupied by Emperor and Pope in 1001 in the Christian West, which had now expanded eastward, reposed on a base that was much too weak. Neither the Germans nor the Romans were sympathetic with Otto's imperial ideas. In fact his eastern policy, which was supported by the imperial idea, differed considerably from his grandfather's course, which was directed to the interest of the German Kingdom, and encountered resistance in Germany, especially from the Archbishop of Magdeburg. Far more questionable, however, was the shifting of the centre of the *Imperium* to Rome. The decisive element in the *Imperium* being now the German royal power, this could be maintained only by a ruler moving about in the Empire, not by one residing in Rome. Quite as dissatisfied as the Germans were the Romans, for the presence of Otto III in Rome was incompatible with their right to relative autonomy. A conspiracy was hatched and in February 1001 Pope and Emperor were forced to leave the city. The revolt would probably have been crushed eventually, but the Emperor, calling for reinforcements, fell seriously ill and died on 24 January 1002, at the castle of Paterno near Città Castellana, at the age of twenty-two. Perhaps if he had lived longer he would have better adapted his imperial idea to the existing realities, but the *renovatio imperii* that he so eagerly pursued was a failure. The collapse of his system was also to hurt the Roman Church. The Crescentians immediately seized control again and made the Popes their creatures.

And yet the footprints of Otto III and Silvester II were not simply effaced. With the incorporation of Poland and Hungary the Roman Church had achieved a permanent gain. The prestige of the Holy See had increased, and its supranational task had been clearly stressed through the elevation of two non-Italian Popes. And even though the Emperor had sought, by exploiting the Roman Church's possibilities of universal radiation, to consolidate his imperial position as "sanctarum ecclesiarum devotissimus et fidelissimus dilatator" and as "servus apostolorum", the pre-eminence of the Church was by the same token admitted by him in principle, however unintentionally. To the extent that the Christian West formed a unity at all, this rested on the *imperium spirituale et ecclesiasticum* of the Roman Church. As yet the Popes were in no position to do without an Emperor. However, as soon as they were able to use freely the power belonging to them and make it respected by the Christian peoples, the leadership of the Christian West would fall to them. Then the pontificate of Silvester II would appear in a new light: no less a person than Gregory VII reminded the Hungarians of the relationship of their first Christian King to this predecessor of his.

---

[20] M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.*, 374–76, and discussion of the problems with reference to the literature, 566–82; for Hungary cf. Chapter 31.

Chapter 29

The Church in Spain, Ireland, and England: 900 to 1046

So long as the states that emerged from the fragmented Carolingian *Imperium* had to fight for their existence, Spain, Ireland, and England were left, even more than before, to their own devices. Now and then, of course, there were contacts, but it was the ecclesiastical reform, only getting under way around 1050, that released the energies which were to affect also the churches on the periphery and incorporate them into Western Christendom, then in process of reconstruction.

Spain

From the time when the small Christian Kingdom of Asturias began to regard itself as the successor of the Visigothic Kingdom and the flourishing cult of Santiago at Compostela provided it with the conviction that it was under the heavenly protection of an Apostle, there had germinated the idea of the *Reconquista*. Conceived in the reign of Alfonso II (791–842) at a time of perpetual defensive against Muslim attacks, it was soon to produce its earliest fruits. The opportunity was provided by a dangerous political crisis into which the Emirate of Córdoba fell in the last quarter of the ninth century, the result of political, religious, and probably also social causes. Prominent families at Seville broke with the government at Córdoba and set up an oligarchy, which was, however, soon ruined by inner dissensions. They were not alone: revolt broke out everywhere, and as a consequence the power of the Emir Abd-Allah (888–912) was often confined to the limits of his capital. The revolt was the work especially of *Muwallad,* that is, of Spaniards who had adopted Islam. In the hill country between Roda and Málaga a purely Spanish state could be founded. Its ruler, the *Muwallad* Oma ibn Hafsun, deepened the opposition to the foreign rulers by returning to the Christian faith of his ancestors in 899.

The Asturian Christians did not let the favourable opportunity slip unexploited. Not content with sending aid to rebellious Toledo, they proceeded themselves to a frontal attack. Under the leadership of Alfonso III (866–910), they enlarged the kingdom in the west, in what became Portugal, to the Mondenego, in the centre to the Douro; in Castile, to the east, they gained so much ground that there too they reached the Douro under Alfonso's first son, García. Then King Ordoño II (914–22) was able to transfer the capital from Oviedo to León. It is probably in connection with these relatively great successes that, from this time, the imperial title appears occasionally in the historical sources for the Kings of León. But it is still disputed whether one may attribute any great significance at that period to a designation that is difficult to define, unofficial, and constitutionally irrelevant.[1]

Settlers poured into the conquered territory — Asturians and Basques and also Mozarabs, that is, Christians from al-Andalus who wished to exchange the Islamic yoke for Christian rule. Since freer economic methods could develop in the new area than in tradition-bound Galicia, it became the supporting pillar of the kingdom. Castile acquired special importance: here arose an individual and high-minded people, who were to play a decisive role in the future history of Spain.

The other districts of northern Spain that were under Christian rule also slowly acquired energy. In Navarre, already long independent, the Arista ruling family, that was related to the *Muwallad* family of the Banu Quasi, which ruled the middle Ebro valley independently and by which it was supported, was replaced in 905 by a new dynasty that was hostile to the neighbouring Muslims. And the counties of the Spanish March, rendered independent by the collapse of the Carolingian Empire, found their interest more and more in events within Spain.

The weakness of the Emirate did not continue. The government at Córdoba emerged victorious from a stubborn fight that did not end until the subjugation of Toledo in 932. Under the great ruler Abd-ar-Rahman III (912–61), who, imitating the Fatimids of Africa, even assumed the title of Caliph in 929, al-Andalus flourished and an amazing civilization developed.[2] Even though the Caliph Hisham II (972–1009) was not very strong personally, there ruled in his stead the powerful viziers, Ibn Abi Amir (978–1002) and al-Musafar (1002–08). Once the Caliphate of Córdoba began to master the internal crisis, it resumed the struggle with the Christian North. In Ramiro II of León (931–50) it found a worthy opponent. But then civil wars disorganized the Kingdom of León and enabled the powerful Count of Castile, Fernán González, to gain autonomy. Hence the disunited Christian front could not stand firm when the Muslim commander of genius, the vizier Ibn Abi Amir, attacked. He quite rightly called himself al-Mansur, the victorious. León, Pamplona, Barcelona, the national shrine at Compostela itself fell into his hands and were destroyed. The Douro frontier was lost. What was left to the Christians was a ravaged territory.

---

[1] R. Menéndez Pidal, *El imperio hispánico y los cinco reinos* (Madrid 1950); P. E. Schramm, "Das kastilische Königtum und Kaisertum während der Reconquista (11. Jahrhundert bis 1252)" in *Festschrift für G. Ritter* (Tübingen 1950), 87–139; H. J. Hüffer, "Die mittelalterliche spanische Kaiseridee und ihre Probleme" in *Saeculum* 3 (1952), 425–43; A. Saitta, *RSIt* 66 (1954), 377–409; C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt*, 31–37; H. Löwe in *HZ* 196 (1963), 552–55. In any event, for the earlier period there is hardly any question of a claim to hegemonic pre-eminence, such as later (from 1077) Alfonso VI of Castile would officially claim with the expanded title *imperator totius Hispaniae*, and Alfonso VII as *Hispaniae imperator* in 1135 would use for a short time in the sense of an imperial suzerainty.

[2] For political reasons relevant to the Fatimids and to Italy Abd ar-Rahman III in 951 offered an alliance of friendship to the German King Otto I. Impeded by expressions of religious hostility which first the Caliph and then Otto used in their letters, the negotiations seem to

This final display of Muslim power was followed by a sudden crash. After 1009 the Umayyad realm slowly broke up into numerous small principalities — the age of the wrens, the *reyes de taifas,* had arrived. The *Reconquista* received a new opportunity. As a matter of fact, Castile was able to gain back its part of the Douro frontier and even to advance a bit beyond it. But a grand-scale *Reconquista* was prevented by dissensions among the Christians. The fact that so powerful a monarch as Sancho III of Navarre proceeded to the annexation of Christian districts instead of moving against the Muslims might have made sense if his expanded dominion had remained intact, but he divided it up at his death in 1035. Besides León, whose King recovered the part that had been taken from him, and Navarre, there were now, as a consequence of the partition, two new kingdoms: the former Counties of Castile and Aragón, that had come into Sancho's possession. The balance of power was upset when Ferdinand I of Castile (1035–65) conquered León and united it with Castile in 1037. Rendered powerful by a wise administration of the two territories, Ferdinand slowly resumed the *Reconquista* from 1054, but he often preferred to accept tribute from the Muslim *taifas* instead of engaging in wars of conquest. His work was to be continued successfully by his second son, Alfonso VI (1065–1109), who, after an ill-starred division of the kingdom, managed to become sole ruler. Meanwhile, the Count of Barcelona had become the most powerful person in the Spanish March, without, however, having yet achieved the full political unification of Catalonia. He too now attacked the Muslims with a growing determination.

Entirely oriented to Spain, the idea of the *Reconquista* differed in more than one respect from the crusading idea that developed in the West in the eleventh century. Whereas the crusaders took the field against infidels of a different race, in order to expel them from the Christian lands of the East and to free

---

have been fruitless. The interesting but, unfortunately, incomplete report of the experiences of the monk, and later Abbot, of Gorze, John, whom Otto sent to Córdoba in 954, is in the *Vita Johannis Gorziensis,* cc. 115–136 (*MGSS* IV, 369–77); on the whole question see R. Holtzmann, *Geschichte der sächs. Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 4th ed. 1960), 969–74.

the Holy Land, the Spanish Christians and their Muslim opponents were racially distinct only in a slight degree. The *Reconquista* did not seek to expel or exterminate the Muslims; it sought rather to subjugate them and, without forcing conversion, make them serve the Christians. With reference to the Muslims Alfonso VI styled himself "Emperor of the two religions", and the crusaders, mostly French, and the Cluniac and eventually the Cistercian monks who came into the country were shocked at the liberties enjoyed by the subjected Muslims, or *Mudéjares,* in Christian Spain. On the other hand, of course, the religious motive of doctrinal conflict played a decisive role in the *Reconquista,* especially for propaganda. And yet in all this it was a question not so much of belief as such as of its concrete embodiment in Spain: by the subjugation of the Muslims people wanted to recover the Spanish mode of life as developed before the Islamic period; while entirely permeated by the Christian religion, it went beyond the sphere of the purely religious.

Wherever Christian rule was established, the Church flourished once more. Ancient extinct bishoprics were restored and new monasteries were founded. Attention was devoted to the continuity of the Church's inner life. The Spanish Church had its own, the so-called Mozarabic, liturgy, an important synodal legislation coming down from the Visigothic period, and a theological literature. The Muslim civilization, which developed so grandly in the tenth century, was transmitted especially by immigrant Mozarabs; it especially stimulated ecclesiastical learning in the branches of the quadrivium. The slow rise of the Spanish Christian civilization can be read, not least of all, in the Visigothic script, which came into use in the eighth and ninth centuries and reached its zenith in the next two centuries.

At first, of course, Christian Spain lived its own life. This isolation is the probable explanation of the fact that a synod meeting at Compostela in 959 decided to free the bishoprics of Catalonia from the archiepiscopal see of Narbonne, to which they had been subjected after the fall of the Visigothic Kingdom, and named Abbot Caesarius of Montserrat as Archbishop of Tarragona. It thus sought to restore the ancient Spanish ecclesiastical province of Tarragona, or at least the part of it that was under Christian rule; the city of Tarragona was still in Muslim hands. This measure, which in itself pertained to the Pope[3] and was in any event fruitless, was obviously to be guaranteed by the authority of the Apostle Santiago, at whose grave the synod met. Since Compostela belonged to the diocese of Iria, the Bishops of Iria bedecked themselves with the proud title: *episcopus sedis apostolicae.* In so doing they were probably thinking less of any competition with the Pope than of a pre-eminence among the bishops of Christian Spain.

Their hopes were to be destroyed when, in the eleventh century, Spain emerged from its isolation. Compostela itself had contributed to this by attracting pilgrims from France, England, Germany, and Italy.[4] The influx seems to have been not inconsiderable around 950, and it grew beyond all limits in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Furthermore, from the turn of the tenth century Cluniac monks crossed the Pyrenees and steadily gained influence in the Christian kingdoms,[5] especially in regard to Church reform, which had begun there and found expression at important reform synods.[6] Spanish Kings formed marriage alliances with princely dynasties of France, and the crusade notion, slowly awakening outside Spain, induced French knights to participate in the *Reconquista* in the second half of the eleventh century. Hence, Christian Spain was adequately prepared when Alexander II and the succeeding reform Popes sent legates to organize the Spanish Church according to Roman and Catholic principles and thereby to draw it into the great community of Western Christendom. This, of course, led to the re-establishment of the ecclesiastical provinces. Since Braga demanded its former metropolitan position, the Bishops of Iria-Compostela, to whom Pope Leo IX had refused the title of *episcopus sedis apostolicae* at the Synod of Reims in 1049, ran into difficulties: they had to be satisfied with being exempted from Braga and finally with becoming Archbishops.

---

[3] In 971 John XIII made Vich an archbishopric, but this measure ceased to be effective in the same year, following the murder of the new Archbishop; see P. Kehr in *AAB* 1926, no. 1, 13ff.

Ireland

The situation of the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon Christians was fundamentally different from that of their Spanish coreligionists. Whereas, from 711 on, Islam conquered almost all of Spain in a rapid victorious march and in the following centuries yielded only a step at a time to the Christian *Reconquista,* the expansion of the Vikings, beginning in the ninth century, had a far less powerful military as well as intellectual impact. Wherever they obtained a foothold in the Christian West, the Northmen, confined to relatively small areas, had to incorporate themselves slowly into the surrounding civilized world.

---

[4] A. López Ferreiro, *Historia de la santa A. M. iglesia de Santiago de Compostela,* 3 vols. (Santiago 1898–1900); L. Vázquez de Parga – J. M. Lacarra – J. Uría Riu, *Las peregrinaciones a Santiago de Compostela,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1948f.); H. J. Hüffer, *Sant'Jago. Entwicklung und Bedeutung des Jakobuskultus in Spanien und dem röm.-deutschen Reich* (Munich 1957); T. O. Kendrick, *Saint James in Spain* (London 1960).

[5] G. de Valous, "Les monastères et la pénétration française en Espagne du XI^e au XIII^e siècle" in *RMab* 30 (1940), 77–97; M. Defourneaux, *Les Français en Espagne aux XI^e et XII^e siècles* (Paris 1949); for the earlier period, cf. C. J. Bishko, "Salvius of Albelda and Frontier Monasticism in Xth Century Navarre" in *Speculum* 23 (1948), 559–90.

[6] J. Zunzunegui, "Concilios y sínodos medievales españoles" in *HS* 1 (1948), 125–33; very important for the history of early mediaeval canon law in Spain is A. García Gallo, *El concilio de Coyanza* (Madrid 1951); J. Maldonado y Fernández del Torco, "Las relaciones entre el derecho canónico y el derecho secular en los concilios españoles del siglo XI" in *Anuario del derecho español* 14 (1942f.), 227–381.

Of course, during the ninth century this was scarcely discernible in Ireland. At that time the island not only had to suffer from the general Viking danger, but also had to endure the establishing of a small kingdom at Dublin. But from 873 this caused no great concern. It was only at the beginning of the tenth century that matters became really critical. The Vikings launched new attacks and thereby inaugurated a hundred years' war (914–1014). On the entire coast extending from Liffey to Shannon there arose Norwegian colonies with the fortified towns of Dublin, Wexford, Waterford, Cork, and Limerick. Dublin was one of the busier ports of the worldwide northern trading area. Since the intruders came into closer relations with the Irish through marriages, political agreements, and cultural assimilation, the endless wars ceased to follow any clear lines. Finally two men broke the power of the foreigners: in the north the King of Meath, Mael Seachlainn, in the south the national hero, Brian Boru. The latter ruled all of Munster from 976, and in 1002 he acquired the High Kingship of Ireland, until then a monopoly of the Ui Néill family. In 1014 at the Battle of Clontarf he forever put an end to the Viking terror, but at the cost of his own life.

Although the Norwegians even after 1014 retained the small coastal Kingdom of Dublin and the cities of Waterford, Limerick, and Cork, and by no means completely gave up their national peculiarities, they still incorporated themselves into the Irish community in language, civilization, and politics. This naturally implied their total Christianization. Missionary efforts had long been made, particularly from England. The Irish Vikings were in closer connection with England from the time they conquered Cumberland, and the princely family dominant in Dublin had succeeded also in ruling the Danish Kingdom of York for a short time. King Sihtric died in 927. His son, Olaf Cuaran, was prevented by King Aethelstan of Wessex from succeeding in York. In 940 he left Dublin for England again and gained a footing there, but with varying success. During this time, in 943, he had himself baptized at the court of King Edmund of Wessex, who acted as his godfather. Although he had to seek out Dublin again the very next year, he remained true to the faith. Anglo-Saxon monks who came along with him preached the Gospel in the territory of Dublin with much success.

The contact thus established with the Anglo-Saxon Church led to closer ties, but just when is uncertain. In any event the first known Bishop of Dublin, Duncan, was consecrated and obliged to obedience by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1028.[7] This connection of the young Church of Dublin with the see of Canterbury, first evident in 1028, fell in the reign of

---

[7] Cf. A. Gwynn, "The First Bishops of Dublin" in *Repertorium Novum*. Dublin Diocesan Historical Record 1 (1955), 1–26 (Dublin 1955ff.).

Knut, whose extensive realm, embracing England, Denmark, and Norway, provided the English Church with unique possibilities for the evangelization of the North. Hence it was in accord with the existing situation that on the one hand the Archbishop of Canterbury should bestow his attention on the Dublin Viking state, and on the other hand the new Christians in Dublin, mindful of their Nordic origin, should prefer to have their Church established by an Anglo-Saxon metropolitan rather than by Irish abbots. What thus developed was, of course, different from that to which people in Ireland were accustomed. Organized according to the principles of Roman canon law, the Church of Dublin represented a genuine diocese, administered by diocesan priests and bishop and having clear territorial limits. An important assignment thus devolved upon it. The more the Dublin political creation expanded into an all-Irish kingdom, the more carefully was the Roman and Catholic form of its Church to be considered by the Irish reformers.

As a matter of fact, Church reform was urgent in Ireland. The Celtic monastic system had become antiquated. Many flourishing monasteries and monastic libraries had been reduced to ruins by the Vikings. The brutalization of spirits, a consequence of the ceaseless struggle, likewise fostered a movement of secularization, which had begun independently of the Viking peril. It was connected with the increasingly wealthy holdings of the monasteries, which must have enticed especially the founding families. For these possessed the right of having one of their members elected as abbot. In the event that they could not produce a qualified candidate, the law provided for the electing of another monk, but the founding families gradually expanded their privileged position into a real hereditary right. Unconcerned about the qualities required by the high office of abbot, they installed in their monasteries one of their members. He did not have to be a monk, and it actually came about that by far the greater number of monasteries were ruled by lay abbots. This development affected the very heart of the Irish Church, for the entire care of souls had become the province of the monasteries. Monks exercised priestly functions in a defined area belonging to the monastery; bishop-monks officiated at ordinations and consecrations; and ecclesiastical jurisdiction was in the hands of the abbots. Since the abbot did not necessarily have to be a bishop, and very often was not, all authority, including ecclesiastical jurisdiction, now belonged to numerous lay abbots, most of them probably married. Celtic family law had stifled canon law and created a situation that could hardly be tolerated any longer.[8]

The founding of the Church of Dublin must be seen against this background. The advantages which the diocesan and parochial organization there set up offered in comparison with the now problematic Celtic monastic system were not to be overlooked. Since the only too firmly consolidated right of the laity did not give hopes of a reform of the monastic constitution, the Church of Dublin seemed to point out the only possible remedy. Not merely receptive Irishmen, but also the Archbishops of Canterbury were interested in a reform; these last hoped in this way to be able to extend their metropolitan and primatial authority to all of Ireland. Once the Gregorian Reform was encouraged in England more powerfully than earlier by William the Conqueror, the Archbishops of Canterbury, Lanfranc and Anselm, sought to introduce it also on the neighbouring island. Though their exertions were ineffectual, a native Irish reform movement got under way. Making progress only laboriously, it was presented with a new situation by the Anglo-Norman invasion of 1172, which violently closed the "Celtic" period of Irish history. Unjustly as the conquerors at first dealt with the Irish Church, they forced it to incorporate itself definitively into the Universal Church.

---

[8] Cf. the unprinted dissertation of J. G. Sheehy, *The Proprietary Church in Pre-Norman Ireland* (Rome, Univ. Greg. 1951).

Since the daughter Church of Scotland was organized according to the same Celtic monastic system, it knew the same portentous development. However, it had the good fortune to find a reform-minded Queen in the Anglo-Saxon Princess Margaret, who had fled to Scotland after the Battle of Hastings (1066) and there married King Malcolm III. It was due to her energetic efforts and those of her sons that Scotland exchanged the outdated Irish-Scottish ecclesiastical organization for the Roman.

England

Under the concentrated attacks of the Vikings in the second half of the ninth century, Anglo-Saxon England had far more to suffer than did Ireland. Without the heroic struggle of Alfred the Great, King of Wessex-Sussex-Kent (871–99), the whole country would probably have fallen to the conquerors, mostly Danes. But there continued to be a Viking Zone, known as the Danelaw because of the Danish law there prevailing, under Guthrum of East Anglia and Halfdan of Northumbria, and an Anglo-Saxon area claimed by Alfred; the frontier ran right through Essex and Mercia. But Alfred had not merely saved southern England; he had also united it more efficiently by strengthening the power of the state and by awakening a genuine national spirit. Sustained by these forces, his descendants in the tenth century were able to gain back what had been lost and to construct a strong single Anglo-Saxon Kingdom.[9]

The reconquest began under his son, Edward the Elder (899–924).

---

[9] On the Anglo-Saxon state, see R. H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1952); F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1947).

Danish rule was pushed back to the mouth of the Humber, and hence to Northumbria. In 927, on the death of Sihtric of Dublin, Alfred's grandson, Aethelstan (824–39), acquired the Kingdom of York. His authority, now expanding through Northumbria, was endangered when a nephew of Sihtric, Olaf Guthrithson, crossed over from Ireland and was supported by the Scots, the Britons of Strathclyde, and the Danes of Cumberland and Northumbria, but Aethelstan's victory at Brunanburh in 937 crushed the resistance. There were still other attempts to render all or part of Northumbria independent, but they had no lasting success and from 954 they ceased completely. Thus King Edgar (959–75) was able to complete in peace the work of his predecessors — the inner organization of the Anglo-Saxon state.

We must pass over what had been accomplished since Alfred for the government, the administration of justice, and the constitution. Growing consistently stronger, the kingdom, even in the first half of the tenth century, gained a position of hegemony *vis-à-vis* the other peoples living on the island. This found significant expression in the title *imperator totius Britanniae,* which the royal chancery not infrequently used in this or a variant form for the charters of its rulers from the time of Aethelstan.[10] The Dynasty of Wessex was so highly esteemed on the continent that politically important family ties were formed. Count Baldwin II of Flanders married a daughter of Alfred the Great; King Charles the Simple of France, a daughter of Edward the Elder. Aethelstan gave one of his sisters in marriage to Duke Hugh of Neustria, another to King Otto the Great. The son of Charles the Simple, Louis IV d'Outremer, lived at the English court from early childhood until his elevation to the French throne.

The Vikings who attacked England were pagans. If they preferred to direct their attacks against churches and monasteries, this was not merely for the sake of the treasures accumulated there, but also because of a hatred for Christianity. King Edmund of East Anglia had to pay for his loyalty to his faith by a cruel martyrdom in 870. But the blessing which, from the days of Alfred the Great, obviously rested on the military and political enterprises of the Anglo-Saxons made the Vikings reflect that the God of the Christians proved to be the greater bringer of prosperity and peace. Guthrum of East Anglia, whom Alfred forced to make peace, became a Christian, but just how many of his fellow Danes imitated him in this cannot be determined. But during the tenth century Christianity made progress irresistibly in the Danelaw; it merely needed time. As already mentioned, Olaf Cuaran, who had been baptized in England, was accompanied back to Dublin by Anglo-Saxon missionaries, who began to preach there. When Haakon the Good or Olaf Tryggvason crossed from England to Norway to assume the throne they took English priests along. This missionary activity in Scandinavia, originating in the initiative of Nordic rulers, will be treated in the next chapter.

---

[10] See E. E. Stengel, "Imperator und Imperium bei den Angelsachsen" in *DA* 16 (1960), 15–72; also H. Löwe in *HZ* 196 (1963), 548–52.

The rise of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom would hardly have prospered without the cooperation of the Church. It was for this very reason that the Kings took an interest in the reform of religious and ecclesiastical life. Mention has already been made of the exertions of Alfred the Great, which went beyond the purely religious sphere to include education in general and hence even provided for the translating of Latin works into Old English. However, the time was not yet ripe for such a grand-scale undertaking. Hence Alfred's successors sought more accessible goals: they continued the ecclesiastical legislation, had extinct dioceses restored, and made gifts to the churches.

With the betterment of ecclesiastical conditions the inner forces also began, of course, to move and to press for a reform of both monasticism and the diocesan clergy and of the care of souls. The desolate state of the monasteries — most of them had been abandoned or destroyed or had passed to the possession of more or less easy going canons — affected the Anglo-Saxon Church all the more unfavourably since it had previously been a monastic Church to a great extent. Receptive prelates, such as the Dane Oda, Archbishop of Canterbury (942–60), and Aelfheah, Bishop of Winchester (934–51), thus had high hopes of a revival of the monastic spirit. What they dreamed of was carried out by younger men whom they inspired — Aelfeah's pupils, Dunstan and Aethelwold, and Oda's nephew, Oswald. All three became monks. Dunstan ruled the monastery of Glastonbury from 942; Aethelwold, that of Abingdon from around 954; Oswald, probably in the early 950's, a monastic house of his own at Winchester, which he soon gave up. In their serious efforts for a renewal of the Benedictine way of life they encountered difficulties. The venerable Anglo-Saxon monastic tradition, which had meanwhile decayed, was in some respects out of date, and so the three young reformers obtained inspiration from the new monastic movements in France and Lotharingia. The sources of this inspiration were, on the one hand, Fleury-sur-Loire, reformed by Odo of Cluny in the 930's, and, on the other hand, Ghent, with the two monasteries of Saint Peter and Saint Bavo, which from 954 bore the clear stamp of Gorze with a strong admixture of the customs of Brogne. Dunstan eagerly studied the Lotharingian reform when he spent a period of exile lasting until 956 with the Ghent Benedictines. Oswald and Aethelwold sought a more exact knowledge of the customs introduced at Fleury, Aethelwold by sending his pupil Oscar there, whereas Oswald himself spent several years at Fleury.

Hardly had Anglo-Saxon monasticism in this way resumed contact with the monastic reform movements on the continent when its great hour struck. King Edgar, a zealous reformer, assumed the government and placed the three monks in leading positions. Dunstan first became Bishop of Worcester, then of London, and finally Archbishop of Canterbury (960–88) and chief adviser of the King. Oswald received the see of Worcester in 961 and from 971 to 992 was Archbishop of York. Aethelwold was Bishop of Winchester from 963 to 984. Monastic renewal, already begun and chiefly promoted by Glastonbury and Abingdon, now moved at full speed. Existing monasteries were reformed, new ones were founded. In an effort to provide a more secure orientation for the now flourishing monastic life, a council meeting at Winchester between 965 and 975 drew up the celebrated *Regularis Concordia,* probably at Oswald's urging. This was an *ordo monasticus,* probably formulated by Aethelwold and going into minute details. In it Dunstan and his two friends, after long consultation with bishops, abbots, and monks, took up the Lotharingian and the Cluny-Fleury reform initiatives and adapted them to Anglo-Saxon monasticism.[11]

The reform was by no means confined to the monasteries. Since originally the majority of the Anglo-Saxon sees had been connected with monasteries, it seemed natural to restore the old situation. Overzealous monk-bishops, such as Aethelwold, abruptly expelled from their cathedrals the canons who had established themselves there, while Dunstan and other Benedictine bishops sought to bring them back to a monastic mode of life or introduced monks among them, but avoided the use of force. In any event the monastic element was systematically strengthened in the English episcopate by King Edgar and Dunstan in an effort to get on with the urgently necessary reform of clergy and people. What had been prepared by Archbishop Oda of Canterbury and others was continued by Dunstan, who did all he could to put an end to clerical marriage, which had become almost the rule, and to remedy the defective education of priests and the abuses in the care of souls. Edgar seconded him by means of an extensive legislative activity that regulated both ecclesiastical and religious life, even in details. His cooperation was of course indispensable. A wholesome influence on clergy and people could, it is true, be expected from the monasteries and their schools — a hope which Aelfric, monk of Cerne, for example, sought to satisfy toward the close of the century by his masterly Anglo-Saxon version of homilies and of parts of Scripture[12] — but the King and the episcopate continued to be the real leaders of reform.

Hence it was profoundly significant that Dunstan composed his celebrated coronation *ordo* for the unusually long delayed coronation of King Edgar in 973, a rite that was to be used again and again in England, and thereby stressed the religious functions of kingship in a rich symbolism, borrowed from Anglo-Saxon and continental customs.[13] Edgar's death two years later and the subsequent collapse of the Anglo-Saxon Dynasty could only have shaken him all the more. The family of Alfred the Great had more and more lost its vitality since the death of Aethelstan, a fact that it was only too easy to conceal during Edgar's prosperous reign. The doom now approaching did not come without warning. The egoism of the magnates, the incompetence of Aethelred II, who in 978 had taken the place of his murdered half-brother Edward, and the new Viking invasions beginning in 991 — all these so weakened the kingdom that in 1013 Aethelred fled to his brother-in-law, Duke Richard II of Normandy, while the Danish King Svein Forkbeard, who had undertaken the conquest of England, took possession of the throne (1013–14). Aethelred and his son Edmund Ironside both died in 1016, whereupon Svein's son, Knut, was able definitely to secure the throne for himself (1016–35). This mighty monarch, who also ruled Denmark from 1018 and Norway too from 1028, did not regard himself as the conqueror of England but as its lawful ruler, bound by the laws of his predecessors. Neither the magnates nor the people nor the Church — Knut was loyally attached to her — could complain.

---

[11] *Regularis Concordiae Anglicae nationis monachorum sanctimonialiumque,* ed. T. Symons (London 1953); on the reform influences from Lotharingia and France, see K. Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny,* II (Rome 1951), 874–91, 959–83; H. Dauphin in *RBén* 70 (1960), 177–96; E. John, *ibid.* 197–203 (denies any real influence from Lotharingia).

[12] M. M. Du Bois, *Aelfric: sermonaire, docteur et grammairien* (Paris 1943).

Shrewd as it was to rule England according to its own laws, the forces which since Edgar's death were effectively undermining the state would have had to be fought more energetically. Knut's failure to do so would soon take its toll. His sons, Harold I (1035–40) and Harthacnut (1040–42), had a difficult time with the magnates. Their stern rule led on the death of Harthacnut to separation from Denmark. The English recalled Aethelred's son, Edward the Confessor, who was living in Normandy, and made him King (1042–66). The pious but scarcely qualified monarch was pretty much helpless against the higher nobility, which had become independent. The opposition grew when, following continental models, he sought to establish a central administration and as far as possible filled offices at court and in the Church with Normans or other Frenchmen. It was not very helpful that he succeeded in banishing his chief opponent, Earl Godwin of Wessex, for a short time, for the victory of the Norman faction that was thereby achieved gave a new impulse to the national opposition. Behind the national faction stood Godwin's son, Earl Harold; behind the Norman party, Duke William of Normandy. Since Edward was childless, both of these princes sought the crown. Following the King's death on 5 January 1066, Harold took it in a *coup d'état* and so brought on a war with Duke William, which was to bring England henceforth under Norman rule and thus into closer contact with the continent.

---

[13] P. E. Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums im Lichte der Krönung* (Weimar 1937), E. T.: *History of the English Coronation,* trans. by L. G. Wickham Legg (Oxford 1937); P. E. Schramm, "Die Krönung in England" in *AUF* 15 (1938), 305–91; H. G. Richardson, "The Coronation in Medieval England" in *Tr* 16 (1960), 111–202.

Edgar's death in 975 hurt the English Church even more than the state. The opponents of the monastic reform immediately raised their heads. Magnates took possession of monasteries, canons demanded the restoration of the position they had previously occupied in the cathedrals. Under Aethelred II Dunstan and his friends lost their influence at court. And so the reform that was in progress stopped half-way. While here and there it may have continued to operate quietly, as a whole it was wrecked, and the English Church to a great extent dropped back to the earlier level. Its strong dependence on the Kings and the earls led after Knut's death to serious abuses. Bishops were arbitrarily installed and deposed. Pluralism in high ecclesiastical offices and brazen simony were not rare. The state of stagnation made itself all the more conspicuous when the reform movements on the continent accelerated their rhythm from the beginning of the eleventh century and in 1049 the papacy assumed the leadership of the great reform. The English Church had fallen into a state of isolation.

Edward the Confessor had apparently sensed this and perhaps that is why he filled high Church offices with Normans and other Frenchmen. But he merely succeeded in enkindling a national English opposition to the foreign prelates. The most hated among them, Archbishop Robert of Canterbury, had to flee the country in 1052 and helplessly allow Bishop Stigand of Winchester to take his place. Naturally, the reform papacy, to which Robert appealed, could not tolerate such a violation of the law. Leo IX probably and his successors certainly sent legates to England to suspend Stigand. This disciplinary action was not without its impact on the English bishops, but Stigand himself remained defiant and even accepted the pallium from the antipope, Benedict X. The importance of this conflict is clear only if, disregarding Stigand's personal interests, the larger context is kept in mind. The closer the life of the childless Edward drew to its end, the more pressing became the choice between the two claimants to the throne, Earl Harold, chief of the national English party, and Duke William of Normandy. Stigand clearly belonged to Harold's faction. His defiant attitude could only confirm the view of the reform papacy that nothing could be expected from Harold and his adherents with regard to the renewal of the English Church. And so the future decision was prepared. In 1066 the Roman Church supported William's invasion in order to enable the continental reform to penetrate the Church in England.

CHAPTER 30

The Spread of Christianity among the Scandinavians in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries

The more the Christian West achieved inner consolidation in the course of the tenth century, the more powerfully was it able to act again on the pagan peoples living to the north and the east. It is true that missionary activity was now less systematic than it had been at the time of Charles the Great. Apart from the Ottonian mission policy, which affected the approaches to the Empire, the initiative lay to a great extent with those princes who wanted to elevate to a higher cultural, social, and political level their people, still clinging to their old gods and in general to the traditional primitive way of life. They could hardly achieve this goal without the Church's orderly structure and educational accomplishment. Moreover, their position within and without their own country was strengthened when they were accepted on equal terms into the great family of Christian rulers. In what follows, then, attention will have to be directed time and again to the political elements and their varying effects according to peoples and times.

It was probably overpopulation especially that caused the Northmen to take to their vessels in order to seek their fortune in the outside world by means of pillaging, trading, or territorial annexation. Occasionally, special causes also intervened. Thus, for example, the extension of the royal authority over all of Norway by Harold Fairhair (d. 933) and its definitive establishment in 872 motivated many of the dissatisfied to emigrate. Most of them went to Iceland, only recently discovered, others to their countrymen who had meanwhile settled the Faroes, the Hebrides, the Orkneys, and the Shetlands. Besides the migrations to foreign lands that slowly absorbed the intruders, the groups that returned should probably be regarded as connecting links in the Viking movement between the North and Christian Europe: merchants, pirates for a time, and kings' sons returning home from exile and reaching out for power.

In general, the Scandinavian expansion moved westward and eastward at the same time. What the Vikings, especially the Danes and the Norwegians, accomplished in the western sector has already been explained. A brief account of what was accomplished in the east, in particular by the Swedes, remains to be told. Gotlanders and East Swedes had established themselves in the southeast corner of the Baltic Sea as early as the seventh and eighth centuries. At the beginning of the Viking Age they penetrated into the interior of Russia, established colonies on important waterways that bound them together through routes for their ships, and opened up a regular eastern trade with the lands of the Chazar Kingdom, the Caliphate of Baghdad, and the Byzantine Empire. The Viking Rurik built up from Novgorod a state, which, after his death, probably in 873, his relative Oleg extended as far as Kiev. Despite immigration from Scandinavia, the Principality of Kiev was basically not a Swedish but an East Slavonic political creation, whose population gradually absorbed the foreigners. This process, together with the political turmoil in the Chazar and Muslim states, caused the eastern trade slowly to stagnate. For this reason, from the turn of the millennium the Swedes more and more concentrated their energies on the Baltic area.

The political development of the three Scandinavian countries can be learned only partially from the meagre sources. In the second half of the ninth century East Sweden at least must have constituted a political unity with the larger islands on its periphery. Whenever the other parts of the country were incorporated, the Swedish Kingdom was probably more or less completed by the beginning of the eleventh century. Norway had already been constructed in the ninth century by King Harold Fairhair, already mentioned, but after his death it suffered from struggles over the throne, which pitted Harold's descendants among themselves and at times also against the princely house of the Jarls of Trondheim. Denmark was in a state of weakness around 900. Thus the Swedes were able to conquer the important port of Haithabu (Schleswig) and establish a small state in South Jutland, which was extended at the expense of Germany. Connecting the Schlei with the Eider by means of a trade route, they gained an easy transit route for their North Sea trade. In 934 King Henry I restored the German March, recovered Haithabu, and forced King Gnupa to accept baptism.

But soon the Dane Gorm (d. c. 945), who ruled North Jutland, swept away the Swedish state in South Jutland.[1] The political unification of Denmark that he began was continued by his son, Harold Blue Tooth, who even succeeded in subjecting South Norway for a short time. He also took part in a Swedish civil war. His expansionist policy inaugurated a difficult period of struggle. King Eric of Sweden defeated and conquered Denmark around 988 and compelled Harold's son, Svein Forkbeard, to take up the life of a Viking. After Eric's death around 995, Svein returned home to resume his father's expansionist policy on a grand scale. Norway, defended by King Olaf Tryggvason at the cost of his own life (d. 1000), was partitioned between Svein and his ally, the Swedish King, and perhaps also the Norwegian Eric Jarl, while England was conquered by Svein on his own. His son, Knut, reached the summit of power when, to the possession of England and Denmark, he added also in 1028 the rule of Norway, which had become free in 1015.[2] But at his death in 1035 the unorganic structure fell apart. England withdrew in 1042. In Norway Magnus, son of that King Olaf the Saint who had been expelled by Knut and had then fallen in the struggle that he resumed in 1030, seized the government in 1035 and in 1042 was even able to succeed Harthacnut in Denmark. The union of the two kingdoms induced the Swedish King Anund Jakob to support Knut's nephew, Svein Estrithson, in Denmark and Harold Hardrada, half-brother of Saint Olaf, in Norway against Magnus. After Magnus's death in 1047 both men succeeded to the royal power in their homeland. But Harold did not stay at home. Having set out for the conquest of England in 1066, he lost battle and life, and with him ended the Viking Age, characterized by so much waste. The political consolidation of Europe now forced the Scandinavians finally to complete the inner construction of their world, begun long before, and their incorporation into the great community of the Christian West.

---

[1] H. Jankuhn, *Die Frühgeschichte Schleswig-Holsteins vom Ausgang der Völkerwanderung bis zum Ende der Wikingerzeit* (Neumünster 1955); O. Scheel, "Haithabu in der Kirchengeschichte" in *ZKG* 50 (1931), 271–314.

[2] L. M. Larson, *Canute the Great and the Rise of Danish Imperialism during the Viking Age* (New York 1912).

One of the most essential presuppositions for this was the acceptance of Christianity. The missionary activity had already begun again in the tenth century; it was conducted on the one hand by German and on the other by English priests. Henry I's victorious campaign against King Gnupa of South Jutland had opened the gate to German preachers in 934. Archbishop Unni of Hamburg–Bremen went to Denmark and then, following in Anschar's footsteps, to the Swedish city of Birka, where he died in 936, but the real reconstruction only began under his successor, Archbishop Adaltag (937–88). It was at first restricted to Jutland. In the port cities of Haithabu (Schleswig), Riba, and Aarhus arose the first suffragan sees of Hamburg–Bremen around 948, the first permanent congregations in the country. The young Church, which soon numbered Danes among its priests, sent apostles to the Danish islands, to southern Scandinavia in the wake of Harold Blue Tooth's expansion, and finally to the Wagrians living in Holstein. These successes would scarcely have been possible without the protection of the Danish and the German rulers. In contrast to his decidedly pagan-minded father, Gorm, Harold Blue Tooth behaved at first in a friendly though reserved manner in regard to the mission and finally, around 960, was himself converted. To what extent his change of religion was determined by regard for Otto the Great can no longer be determined.

Otto the Great certainly favoured the spread of Christianity to Denmark for political reasons and in particular kept his protecting hand over the rising Church of Jutland, but his greater interest was centred on the broad area just outside the Empire that was inhabited by the Wends, which he aimed to open up to the Church through the two mission centres, Magdeburg and Hamburg–Bremen. It soon appeared fortunate that the Danish mission was less intimately connected with the Ottonian imperial policy. The Wendish Revolt broke out in 983, triggering a pagan reaction in Denmark also. They were promoted by Svein Forkbeard, who raised revolt against his father — Harold Blue Tooth died in flight in 985–86. But the young Danish

Church survived the blow, and when King Svein, who had been banished by Eric of Sweden, returned, he became a friend of Christianity. Under his protection and that of his son Knut the Christian religion permeated Denmark. But both monarchs had recourse chiefly to the English Church for aid. Avoiding the German mission centre, the bishops for the new sees established on the Danish islands were consecrated in England, until finally Archbishop Unwan of Hamburg–Bremen obtained the recognition of his metropolitan rights, not only from a travelling Danish bishop, but also from King Knut.

The evangelization of Norway followed a somewhat different course. There Christianity owed its victory to the Kings, and chiefly to those descendants of Harold Fairhair who lived in foreign countries, accepted Christianity there, and then, on their return home, acquired power. The first Christian King was the son of Harold Fairhair, Haakon the Good, who had been educated at the English royal court; when, following his father's death in 933, he landed in Norway to expel his half-brother, Eric Blood Axe, he brought English priests along. But neither he nor his successor, Harold Grey Fur (960–75), Eric Blood Axe's son, who came from York and had been baptized there, had any substantial missionary successes to record. The spell was first broken, with ruthlessness, by Olaf Tryggvason (995–1000), from a third branch of the royal house. His work was completed, at least to a degree, by Saint Olaf (1015–28; d. 1030).[3] The compulsion resorted to by the two Olafs was in great part politically oriented. When the rising kingship wiped out the cult of Asen and Vanen, it struck at the deepest roots of the resistance of the leagues of kinships and *things,* which clung to their old laws. Of course, merely an external change had been achieved by compulsory baptism. The real acceptance of the Christian faith, as this had been realized, at least partially, in the peaceful Danish and German missionary work in the southern districts of Norway, did not yet take place in the greatest part of the country. Though the miraculous phenomena occurring at the grave of Saint Olaf deeply impressed the Norwegians, the cult of Olaf, zealously fostered by King Magnus, promoted the magical belief in the King's healing power rather than the Christian religion. In both Norway itself and in Iceland, where the conversion had taken place in 1000, not without concessions to paganism,[4] there was needed an activity that would deepen the understanding of the new religion while organizing it. Such a work was actually undertaken, chiefly by English priests. Immigration from England increased even in the second half of the eleventh century, since the Norman ecclesiastical policy of William the Conqueror disenchanted many Anglo-Saxon clerics with their homeland. English canon law, English architecture and manners came to Norway with them. Still, since the days of Saint Olaf there persisted a loose connection with the archbishopric of Hamburg–Bremen.

---

[3] A. Wolf, *Olav Tryggvason und die Christianisierung des Nordens* (Innsbruck 1959); C. Riederer, *Saint Olaf* (Avignon 1930); O. Kolsrud, "Nidaros og Stiklestad" in *Norwegia Sacra,* X (Oslo 1937).

[4] On the Christianization of Iceland, cf. E. Krenn in *NZM* 4 (1948), 241–51; on the concept of power in the reports of conversions, E. Krenn in *ZRGG* 7 (1955), 127–42; Saint Olaf did away with concessions to paganism. Christianity from the time of Olaf Tryggvason was also able to penetrate the islands around Scotland that were occupied by Norwegians. It was brought by Icelanders to Greenland, which was colonized from the end of the tenth century, and from there it probably reached the Viking colonies which must have existed in North

Paganism held out the longest in Sweden. Archbishop Unni's visit to Birka was a mere episode. Only the Christianization of Denmark and Norway, along with that of Russia and Poland, and Sweden's more active participation in the power struggles in the Baltic area created a more favourable situation. Danish, German, English, and probably even Russian apostles followed different routes. Under Olaf the Tax King (995–c. 1022), who was baptized around 1008, Christianity spread especially in West and East Gotland, and around 1014 the first Swedish bishopric was established at Skara. Olaf's son, Anund Jakob (d. 1050), worked in the same spirit. Although not a few of the succeeding Kings favoured Christianity, still a pagan resistance flared up again and again and could not be broken until toward the end of the eleventh century.

The more the Danish Church flourished in the eleventh century — it counted nine bishoprics around 1060 — the more urgent became the desire for an archbishopric of its own. Archbishop Adalbert of Hamburg–Bremen (1043–72), important and highly meritorious for his missionary work, received from Pope Leo IX in 1053 the title of Papal Legate and Vicar for the North. He did not actually reject the plans of the Danish King Svein Estrithson in regard to a Danish archbishop, but wanted to secure for his church the higher position of a primatial or patriarchal see. In the march of romantic and nationalistic interpretations of history the importance of this plan is often overestimated and, in addition, it is probably not presented entirely to the point.[5] Adalbert took it along to his grave. The future belonged to fully autonomous Scandinavian provinces. Denmark began with the archbishopric of Lund in 1104; Norway followed with that of Nidaros–Trondheim in 1152; Sweden obtained that of Uppsala in 1164.

America from the first decades of the eleventh into the fourteenth century. On the discovery of Greenland, cf. R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae,* II (Leiden 1937), 253–8; on the discovery of America, *ibid.,* 262–67, 277–95. See R. A. Skelton, Thomas E. Marston, and George D. Painter, *The Vinland Map and the Tartar Relation* (New Haven–London 1965).

[5] H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlicher Patriarchate III" in *ZSavRGkan* 72 (1955), 120–70, 177f. (with more bibliography), shows that Adalbert probably held the pseudo-Isidorean view of Patriarch-primate. His intention of gaining twelve bishoprics by dividing the diocese probably had a connection with the plan for a patriarchate only in so far as he intended to create for the archiepiscopal see of Hamburg–Bremen a system of suffragans, "which, after the withdrawal of the Danish territories, would do justice to the strict requirements of canon law" (ibid. 177).

CHAPTER 31

Evangelization of the Slavs and the Magyars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries

The extensive area settled by the Slavs, extending from the Dnieper to the Elbe and the Saale and comprising Bohemia, Moravia, parts of the Danube basin and the Balkan peninsula, had been affected by missionary work in the ninth century only in the southeast and as far as Moravia and Bohemia. Just as among the Scandinavians, so here too the much reviled *saeculum obscurum* brought the decisive turning point. Broad sections of the Slavonic East opened themselves up to Christianity and from then on grew into the European cultural community of the Latin West or of the Byzantine-Slavonic East. The by no means uniform process requires a separate treatment according to countries and peoples.

The Wends

As the immediate neighbour of the Slavs, Germany acquired a special political and religious task, to be fulfilled in its own interest as well as in that of the West. The first Kings of the Saxon Dynasty were of course concerned to provide better protection especially for their Saxon homeland from the nearby Wends. To this end Charles the Great had already created a zone of tributary dependence beyond the Elbe. Since it had disappeared in the ninth century, Henry I restored it by means of several campaigns. Otto the Great had a more ambitious aim: all the Wends living between the Elbe, the Saale, and the Oder were to be subjugated. He succeeded somewhat in the case of the Hevellians, Sprevanes, and Lebusans and in that of the Sorbs, while he did not really touch the Liutizians (or Wilzi) in the Peene district and merely exacted tribute from the Obodrites bordering them to the west.

Otto sought to permeate the subjugated areas not only politically by means of establishing marches and burgwards but also ecclesiastically. Thus as early as 948 the sees of Brandenburg and Havelberg were founded, while in 968 there followed in the Sorb territory those of Meissen, Merseburg, and Zeitz, the last named being transferred to Naumburg in 1030. For the Wagrians and the Obodrites it was possible to establish the see of Oldenburg, probably in 968; from that date, in any event, it was subject to the archbishopric of Hamburg–Bremen, whose sphere of activity accordingly embraced not only the Scandinavians but also the Wends living farthest to the west. The other dioceses just mentioned were subject to the archbishopric of Magdeburg. Pope Agapitus II had already around 955 agreed to Otto's plan of transforming the monastery of Saint Maurice that he had founded at Magdeburg in 937 into a metropolitan see in charge of the mission to the Slavs; John XII had done likewise in a charter drawn up soon after the imperial coronation. But the plan encountered sharp resistance, first of all from Otto's son, Archbishop William of Mainz, with whom the Emperor must have come to terms to some extent in 962, and then from Bishop Bernard of Halberstadt. But in 967 John XIII at the Synod of Ravenna definitively ordered the establishing of the metropolitan see; the death of both adversaries made it possible to carry out the decree in 968. On this occasion the new archbishopric was provided with rich honorary privileges for its clerics and with the primatial rank of honour among all churches to the right of the Rhine. Just how far the area of its jurisdiction was to extend to the northeast was apparently not determined precisely. In any event bulls of John XIII and Benedict VII (981), in enumerating the suffragan sees, do not mention the diocese of Poznań, founded around 968 in what was then the capital of the Duke of the Poles. It is true that Magdeburg then made good its claims to Poznań, but lost the see forever after the death of the second Bishop of Poznań, Unger, a German.[1]

The missionary work was too closely connected with political goals to be able to win the approval of the Wends. Hence when the Liutizians set in motion the great revolt of 983, the ecclesiastical work accomplished beyond the Elbe entirely collapsed along with the dioceses of Havelberg, Brandenburg, and Oldenburg. It held out in the Sorb territory and could be continued. The mission also continued among the Obodrites, who had taken part in the revolt, but in 1018 it was interrupted for a year and in 1066 for the most part wiped out by the still existing pagan reaction. The Liutizians remained unrelenting opponents; their league had included the tribes on the Havel and in Prignitz, probably loosely, during the revolt.[2] Since the Liutizians had no tribal prince of their own, they could long cling to their pluralistic organization in a league and to their polytheistic religion. Into the twelfth century this area was as good as closed to the mission.

Quite different was the course of events in Bohemia, Poland, and the Kievan state, for there large-scale political creations came into existence, whose rulers, for reasons of domestic and foreign politics, favoured Christianity either from the outset or at least in the course of time.

---

[1] Latest critical summary in W. Schlesinger, *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens,* I, 21–32; K. Uhlirz, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg* (Magdeburg 1887); P. Kehr, "Das Erzbistum Magdeburg und die erste Organisation der christlichen Kirche in Polen" in *AAB* (1920), no. 1; G. Sappok, *Die Anfänge des Bistums Posen und die Reihe seiner Bischöfe 968–1498* (Leipzig 1937); A. Brackmann, *Magdeburg als Hauptstadt des Ostens im frühen Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1937); cf. also id., *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Weimar 1941), 140–53, 154–87, 188–210; on the older papal charters for Magdeburg and the question of Poznań, cf. H. Beumann – W. Schlesinger in *ADipl* 1 (1955), 163–207; good bibliography on the beginnings of German-Polish relations in M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.,* 549f.

[2] W. Brüske, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Lutizenbundes* (Cologne–Graz 1955); W. H. Fritze, "Beobachtungen zu Entstehung und Wesen des Lutizenbundes" in *Jb. für Geschichte Mittel- und Ost-Deutschlands* 7 (1958), 1–38.

Thanks to the work done in the ninth century, Bohemia and Moravia were no longer mission lands in the strict sense, but the tenth century brought a new situation in so far as the destruction of Greater Moravia by the Magyars shifted the initiative in both Church and state to Bohemia. Solely because of the Magyar peril, the Bohemian princes, of whom the Přemyslids exercised the ducal power in the western,[3] the Slavnikings in the eastern part of the country, regarded it as advisable to rely on Germany and in this way to achieve full incorporation into the Western Christian civilization. Though they were first in contact with Bavaria, their Dukes were bound to the German crown by Henry I and Otto the Great, a dependence that in no sense prevented their extending their rule over Moravia and Slovakia, over Silesia and the remnant of Chrobatia around Cracow and hence re-establishing in a sense the destroyed Greater Moravian state. The large and to a great extent already Christian territory, hitherto cared for chiefly by the Bishops of Regensburg, now needed a Church organization.

The ninth-century missionary work, carried on by the Bavarian Church and by the Apostles of the Slavs, Cyril and Methodius, has already been discussed. Here and there pagan resistance may still have been encountered in Bohemia at the beginning of the tenth century. This resistance or a broader dissatisfaction, not connected merely with pagan opposition, but aroused by the all too friendly attitude toward the Church displayed by the young Přemyslid Duke Wenceslas, who was under the influence of his grandmother Ludmilla, perhaps contributed to the assassination, first of Ludmilla in 921, then of Wenceslas in 929. Both were very soon honoured as martyrs and saints by the Czechs. But the real reasons for these acts of violence are to be sought in personal and political tensions existing between Wenceslas and an opposition rallying around his mother Drahomira and his brother Boleslas.[4] In any case, the next Přemyslid Dukes, Boleslas I (d. 972) and his son, Boleslas II (d. 999), adhered firmly to Christianity and even contributed to its consolidation.

The Church could be all the more intimately connected with the country since the two liturgies that had been introduced there lived side by side in peace instead of in their earlier rivalry, even though the Latin rite did firmly push back the Slavonic rite, especially in Bohemia. Instead there were other problems to solve. The Bohemian Dukes entertained the understandable desire for a diocese of their own, directly dependent on Rome. If Pope John XIII actually was asked in 966 for the establishment of autonomous churches by the Bohemians as well as by the Polish Duke, Otto the Great would have effectively frustrated at least the Bohemian plans. To him, the political overlord, it was obvious from the start that the Bohemian sees that were to be founded should be incorporated into a German ecclesiastical province, either Magdeburg or Mainz. Salzburg was not considered, since the Ottos wanted as far as possible to eliminate any Bavarian influence on Bohemia, which had been cared for ecclesiastically by Regensburg up to now and unchallenged. And so the see of Prague, definitively established in 976, was placed under the archbishopric of Mainz;[5] in this way probably Mainz was to be indemnified for its exclusion from the Wend mission territory. Moravia also obtained a bishop at that time, but probably he had no fixed see as yet, and his position was soon abolished at the request of the second Bishop of Prague, the Slavniking Voytech-Adalbert.

---

[3] W. Wostry, "Die Ursprünge der Primisliden" in *Prager Festschrift für Th. Mayer* (Feilassing–Salzburg 1953), 156–253.

[4] F. Dvornik, *S. Wenceslas, Duke of Bohemia* (Prague 1929); J. Pekař, *Die Wenzels- und Ludmilla-legenden und die Echtheit Christians* (Prague 1906); also *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 321 f.

Among the Bishops of Prague this Adalbert deserves special consideration.[6] Political tensions, originating in Poland's expansionist policy, between his brother, the Slavniking Duke Sobleslas and the Přemyslid Boleslas II forced him to leave Prague. Following his pious inclinations, he entered the Roman monastery of Sant' Alessio. Recalled to Prague in 992, he encountered failure again after three years, for the same political reasons. While his family was almost wiped out by Boleslas II and forever deprived of authority, he worked as a missionary, first at the court of young Stephan of Hungary and then, after rather long journeying and a brief stay with the Polish Duke, among the pagan Prussians, only to suffer martyrdom there in 997. Adalbert was by no means the only one who carried the Christian religion from Bohemia to the neighbouring peoples. Before and after him Czech or German and other missionaries who had reached Bohemia went to the surrounding pagan lands. Their work was especially fruitful in Poland.

Poland

In the time of Otto the Great Poland, under the Piast Prince Mieszko I (d. 992), emerged from a past that eludes our grasp into the light of history. Mieszko's considerable power, based on cavalry and castles, quickly spread.[7] It is true that the Duke was forced to pay Otto the Great an annual tribute for his territory as far as the Warthe and to promise personal fealty, but he remained essentially independent. After the death of Otto II he extended his rule over Pomerania as far as the mouth of the Oder, where the important commercial city of Wollin fell into his hands, subjugated the tribes living in old Chrobatia, and took from Bohemia Silesia and the area around Cracow. His son and successor, Boleslas Chrobry (992–1025), obtained Lower and Upper Lusatia in fief from Henry II, and, appealed to by the Bohemians against their brutal Duke Boleslas III, had himself proclaimed Duke at Prague in 1003. Since he refused to perform the feudal homage that he owed the German King for Bohemia, there broke out a war which lasted, with frequent interruptions, till 1018, and in which Henry II even made use of pagan allies, the Liutizians. Boleslas Chrobry had to relinquish Bohemia, but he retained the two Lusatias, Moravia, and Slovakia. Proceeding to Kiev in 1018, he was able to annex Red Russia also. Having reached the height of his fame, he had himself crowned King shortly before his death in 1025.

---

[5] On Henry IV's charter (*MGDD* VI, 2, no. 390), H. Beumann – W. Schlesinger in *ADipl* 1 (1955), 236–50.

[6] H. G. Voigt, *Adalbert von Prag* (Berlin 1898); J. Loserth, "Der Sturz des Hauses Slavnik" in *Abhandlungen für österreichische Geschichte* 65 (1895).

[7] H. Ludat, *Die Anfänge des polnischen Staates* (Cracow 1942); A. Gieysztor, *Die Entstehung des polnischen Staates im Lichte neuer Forschungen* (Marburg 1956); Z. Wojciechowski, *Mieszko and the Rise of the Polish State* (London 1936); M. Hellmann, *Slavisches Herrschertum,* 260–62. There are no convincing proofs for Mieszko's descent from a Viking family.

Under his son, Mieszko II (1025–34), there ensued a sudden collapse. Red Russia was recovered by Kiev, Moravia by Bohemia, the Lusatias by Germany, while the Hungarians took possession of Slovakia, which they retained until 1918. After the death of Mieszko II Pomerania detached itself from Poland. Bretislas I of Bohemia (1034–55) occupied Silesia and devastated Poland as far as Gniezno (1038), but he had to abandon his plan of conquest, since the Germans restored Duke Casimir, son of Mieszko II, to his country; in 1052 Bretislas was forced to cede Silesia to Poland, which, it is true, had to pay an annual tribute. Casimir transferred his residence from Gniezno, destroyed in 1038, to Cracow; as a consequence Poland acquired an orientation that was rather toward Kiev and Hungary.

The amazingly fast rise of the Polish state was accompanied by an equally spectacular series of baptisms. The impressive missionary success is in great measure to be attributed to the circumstance that, following the marriage in 965 of Duke Mieszko I with Dobrawa, daughter of the Přemyslid Duke Boleslas I, preachers came especially from neighbouring Slavonic Bohemia. What an important influence the Czechs actually exerted on the Polish Church then coming into existence appears on the one hand from linguistic studies and on the other from the Slavonic rite, which, alongside the Latin rite, came from Moravia and Bohemia especially into southern Poland.[8] Mieszko had himself baptized as early as 966. Soon, in 968 at the earliest, the first Polish bishopric was established in what was then his residence, Poznań, probably without any direct participation by the archiepiscopal see of Magdeburg and perhaps at first even without any dependence on it as a suffragan. In any event, Mieszko I entered into such close contact with the papacy that around 990 he presented his realm to Saint Peter for better protection against Germany and Bohemia.[9] Behind this gesture was, of course, the aim of gaining Rome to the idea of a Polish ecclesiastical province. We know virtually nothing of the negotiations. But Mieszko's son, Boleslas Chrobry, must have pushed them more energetically just before the turn of the millennium.

---

[8] B. Stasiewski, "Zur Verbreitung des slavischen Ritus in Südpolen während des 10. Jahrhunderts" in *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 7 (1959), 7–25.

He had reasons for his hurry. Archbishop Giseler of Magdeburg was exerting himself to extend his province throughout Poland, by claiming Poznań as a suffragan see and having the Silesian district as far as the Oder, that was under Polish rule, included in his suffragan see of Meissen by Otto III in 995. Boleslas Chrobry seems to have been successful with Gregory V in frustrating Magdeburg's plans at Rome and in carrying his own desire.[10] Since Otto III was also eventually won over, the actual decrees were probably drawn up in 999. By virtue of the papal charter of 1000, which Otto brought along on his pilgrimage to Gniezno, already described, Poland obtained its own ecclesiastical organization, with the metropolitan see of Gniezno, then the ducal residence, and the suffragan sees of Cracow, Wroclaw, and Kolberg, founded at the same time. Before long the diocese of Poznań would also be added. As remote as Otto III's imperial idea was from reality in many respects, as little as its universal characteristic was in accord with the purely Polish oriented efforts of Boleslas Chrobry, at Gniezno it displayed a surpassing farsightedness. The powerful push eastward, to be observed from the time of Mieszko, could have induced a Poland, disillusioned with the Christian West, to seek ecclesiastical and cultural incorporation into Eastern Christianity, which was under the guidance of Byzantium. Pope and Emperor met this danger just in time. Not too much, of course, was accomplished by the founding of bishoprics. Christianity still needed a long time to affect the peoples united in the Polish state not merely by the act of baptism but also inwardly. Unfortunately, we know little about this process. However, in the chaotic years 1034–40 the Polish Church was to experience painfully that paganism was still holding out stubbornly. And even in the second half of the eleventh century much still had to be done to complete its organization.

Russia

The Principality of Kiev or of the "Ros" (in Greek *Rhosia*)[11] owed its origin to the Vikings, or Varangians, and more precisely to the Varangian family of

---

[9] The charter, handed down in Deusdedit, *Collectio canonum,* III, 199 (ed. Wolf von Glanvell, p. 359), is very much controverted; cf. W. Leitsch, "Deusdedit und die Urkunde 'Dagone iudex'" in *Studien für ältere Geschichte Osteuropas* 2 (Graz 1959), 166–85 (with further bibliography).

[10] See W. Schlesinger, *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens,* I, 71–73; for Otto III at Gniezno, see *supra,* Chapter 28, footnote 19.

[11] The origin of the name "Ros" is disputed. It is derived from: 1) the Iranian Ruxs, who very early migrated to South Russia (this is still maintained by Vernadsky); 2) a Slavonic

Rurik. Centring, north to south, on the trade route from the Gulf of Finland and Lake Ladoga to the Black Sea, the principality embraced, with its two political centres, Novgorod and Kiev, an area which extended westward, except for the Baltic coast, as far as the western Bug, the San, and the Carpathians, and was bounded on the east by the Volga Bulgars, while in the steppe to the southeast and the south, especially exposed to nomads' attacks, the expansion differed, depending on the time. The Prince of Kiev, Sviatoslav (964–72), already had extraordinarily great power at his disposal. He destroyed the Chazar Kingdom in 969, attacked the Volga Bulgars and plundered their capital, and then, at first in an understanding with Byzantium, fell upon the Danube Bulgars. He even transferred his capital to Bulgaria until he was expelled by the Byzantines.

Under his son and grandson, Vladimir I (978–1015) and Jaroslav the Wise (1036–54), both of whom succeeded only after many struggles in becoming sole ruler, the state was consolidated by means of better defence against the Patzinaks, who were definitively routed in 1036, and by inner political measures. Vladimir introduced Christianity; Jaroslav promoted artistic and literary endeavours and displayed an important legislative activity. After his death the state disintegrated into individual principalities ruled by his sons and made progressively smaller by further divisions among heirs. But the house of Rurik somehow managed, despite ceaseless provocations, to hold together under its head, the Grand Prince of Kiev. When in 1139 Kiev lost its special position for good, a new phase of Russian history began.

At the time when the Russian state was founded, the East Slavonic subjects, like their Scandinavian rulers, were still pagans, even though the Gospel had already been announced to them here and there. A first concrete report of missionary successes comes from the Byzantine Patriarch Photius in 867, but we are not informed about the outcome.[12] Certainly there was a Christian church in Kiev in 944, but it does not have to be traced back absolutely, or at least not exclusively, to Byzantine priests. When Prince Igor died a year

---

form of the Finnish "Ruotsi", which is said to contain an Old Swedish linguistic root and to have denoted the immigrating Vikings (held by many scholars outside the Soviet Union); 3) the word "rod", originating in the common Slavonic language, meaning family, kinship, descent, and not correctly understood because of its manifold sense. This last is the view of the Soviet historian, B. D. Grekov, *Kievskaja Rus'* (Moscow 1949), cited by M. Hellmann, *Slavisches Herrschertum,* 248, footnote 15. Hellmann, for his part, would prefer to understand the word in the sense of "rule of the princes, as a body, of the house of the Scandinavian Varangians" (ibid. 264). This philological controversy is only one question in the discussion, now 200 years old, on the role of the Varangians in the forming of the Kievan state. See the bibliographical data in Hellmann, *op. cit.* 264, footnote 40.

[12] M. de Taube, *Rome et la Russie avant l'invasion des Tartares, I: Le prince Askold, les origines de l'état de Kiev et la première concession des Russes 856–882* (Paris 1947); G. von Rauch, "Frühe christliche Spuren in Russland" in *Saeculum* 7 (1956), 40–67.

later, the Princess Olga took over the government for her son Sviatoslav, still a minor. She was baptized either at Constantinople in 957 or at Kiev earlier. In any event there is reason to believe that after her return from Byzantium she asked Otto the Great for missionaries in 959–60. Apart from purely political reasons, this step was due to the fact that there were already long existing relations between the West and the Christian community of Kiev. Otto, of course, did not let slip the promising opportunity, but the bishop whom he sent, Adalbert, a monk of Sankt Maximin at Trier, consecrated at Mainz, had to leave Kiev after a brief stay (961–62); in 968 he became the first Archbishop of Magdeburg. Olga's influence had not sufficed to overcome the pagan opposition; furthermore, her son, who was devoted to paganism, now took charge of the government. For a while yet the Russian Christians had to get along without the aid of the ruling dynasty. However, the political relations of the Grand Princes with Christian rulers of the West and the East may have provided them with a certain support.[13] Jaropolk I, who in 973 sent envoys to Otto I, even received messengers of Pope Benedict VII in 977.

As the Russian state assumed a more stable shape after the adventurous conquering expeditions of Sviatoslav, the more clearly appeared the advantages connected with admission into the Christian community of nations. The decision was actually forced upon the Grand Prince Vladimir, when, as payment for military aid, he demanded from the Byzantine Emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII their sister, the Porphyrogenneta Anna, as his wife. After some difficulties he got his way, but in return he had to be baptized (988–89). Now, for his part, he was solicitous for the baptism of his people.[14]

So began the Russian Church. Who actually constructed it is still a matter of controversy.[15] Probably both Western and Byzantine and Slavonic missionaries took part. In fact, certain characteristics, such as the law of the tithe and a knowledge of the Bohemian Saints Ludmilla and Wenceslas and of Saint Vitus, the patron of Prague, clearly point to the West.[16] But the Byzantine-Slavonic element prevailed from the start. Since the Russians did not know Greek, the Greek Christian intellectual heritage reached them on the one hand by means of the Slavonic liturgy, going back to Cyril and Methodius, which was still in use, in Bohemia and Moravia to some extent, and especially in Bulgaria, where it had been elaborated, and on the other hand by means of Slavonic translations of Greek works, made in Bulgaria and before long in Russia itself.

---

[13] F. Dvornik, "The Kiev State and its Relation with Western Europe" in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* series IV, 29 (1947), 27–46.

[14] N. de Baumgarten, *S. Vladimir et la conversion de la Russie* (Rome 1932); N. Zernov, "Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church" in *Slavon. and East Europ. Rev.* 28 (1949f.), 123–38, 425–28.

[15] On the much discussed question cf. G. Stökl, *Slavenmission,* E 85, with copious and critically classified bibliography in footnotes 8–16 on pp. 86f.

[16] H. F. Schmid, "Byzantinisches Zehntwesen" in *JÖByzG* 6 (1957), 45–110; F. Dvornik, "Die Benediktiner und die Christianisierung Russlands" in *BM* 35 (1959), 292–310.

The beginnings of the ecclesiastical organization are obscure and disputed.[17] Although the few attested priests and bishops, occasionally called archbishops, must have been more closely connected with the Byzantine Church, relations with the Roman Western Church were not lacking. Vladimir and Popes John XV and Silvester II, for example, exchanged envoys. For the ecclesiastical hierarchy then coming into existence there was as yet no question of whether it should attach itself to Constantinople or to Rome. And even though the first certain Metropolitan of Kiev, the Greek Theotemptos, attended a synod at Constantinople in 1040 and thereby acknowledged himself to be a member of the Byzantine Church, some of his immediate successors time and again displayed a certain openness toward Rome and Western Christendom, especially since at that time the Grand Princes of Kiev, related by marriage with western ruling houses, were not inaccessible to Latin and Western influences.[18] Nevertheless, the ecclesiastical dependence on the Patriarch of Constantinople, already existing under Theotemptos, could hardly have been annulled now. The Schism beginning in 1054, but made final only after decades, excluded any further rivalry between East and West: with no formal break, but irresistibly, the Russian Church separated itself from Rome.

The Yugoslavs

The South Slavs of the Balkan peninsula became Christians without any official evangelization. Situated between the Eastern and the Western Churches, the Serbs, after a rather long wavering, decided for the Byzantine Slavonic sphere.[19] What especially attracted them there was the form of the Slavonic national Church, as it had been found in Bulgaria, due to the efforts of the disciples of Methodius, expelled from Moravia in 885, and further developed during the brilliant reign of the Tsar Simeon (893–927). The Croats of Dalmatia, on the other hand, whose Prince Branimir had made himself politically independent with the aid of the papacy around 880, belonged to the sphere of the Latin Church. The conversion of the Slovenes has already been treated. This work, which had made pretty good progress, collapsed under the Magyar storm, only to start over again after about a century, and not merely in the districts reconquered by Bavaria and protected by marches and colonization, but in Hungarian territory too. In the German part the archbishopric of Salzburg and the bishoprics of Freising and Passau interested themselves in the building of the Church.

---

[17] Cf. G. Stökl, *Slavenmission*, E 86f., footnotes 10–12.

[18] N. de Baumgarten, *Généalogies et mariages occidentaux des Rurikides russes du X^e au XIII^e siècle*, 2 numbers (Rome 1927, 1934).

[19] A. Schmaus, "Zur Frage der Kultorientierung der Serben im Mittelalter" in *Südostforschungen* 15 (1956), 149–201.

The Magyars

When in 895–6 the Magyar tribes, under the leadership of Prince Arpad, crossed the Carpathians in order to occupy the Danube-Theiss plain and the entire Carpathian valley, what had taken place under the Huns and the Avars seemed to be repeating itself: a people from the steppe of eastern Europe moved into the most vulnerable spot in Central Europe. The foreigners came from the area between the Volga and the Don, where they had earlier been under Chazar and before that under Onugur Bulgar rule and where they had developed the unique Magyar character. Belonging to the Ugrian tribes, to the then southernmost branch of the great Finno-Ugric family of peoples, they had entered into relationships of blood and at the same time of way of life with their masters, so that they constituted a people of Finno-Ugric speech but of Bulgar-Turkish culture. Under pressure from the Patzinaks, they had slowly moved westward until they found a new home on the middle Danube. One can speak only with qualification of real settlement, however. Their nomadic way of life impelled them to plundering raids on neighbouring lands.[20]

Only after more than a half-century was a stop put to their frightfully destructive hordes from two sides. The growing strength of the German Kingdom, demonstrated by Otto the Great in the overwhelming victory on the Lechfeld in 955, barred them from the West. And in the East, where the Magyars directed their attacks against Constantinople, the Russian state altered the situation. It cut off the connection which the Magyars had maintained with their former home, especially with the Magyar tribes that had moved eastward. When, in addition, Sviatoslav of Kiev annihilated the Chazar Kingdom in 969, he deprived the Magyars of the Chazar market, on which they had unloaded their booty. Hence they had only the alternative of sharing the fate of earlier mounted pastoral peoples and perishing or of finding a way of life that allowed them, while approximating the surrounding civilization, to retain their identity. That they succeeded in choosing the second alternative was due to the Arpad Geza (d. 997) and to his great son, Vajk-Stephen (d. 1038).

Following Arpad's death in 907, political power had devolved upon many individual princes. Geza paved the way for undivided rule when, as Attila once did, he almost wiped out the clan of Arpad and accumulated so considerable a power that Vajk-Stephen was able to complete the work by definitively subjugating South Hungary and Transylvania. Stephen's political creation, which organically combined the Magyar individuality with German, Latin, and Slavonic elements, cannot be treated here, but the process of Christianization, now begun, does concern us. That Geza fostered it and Vajk-Stephen systematically pursued it was a necessity, for only thus could the Hungarian rulers free their people from their isolation.

---

[20] R. Lüttich, *Ungarnzüge in Europa im 10. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1910); G. Fasoli, *Le incursioni ungare in Europa nel secolo X* (Florence 1945).

Overtures for evangelization came from the Bulgar-Byzantine as well as from the Latin side. As early as about 950 the "Gyula" of Transylvania had been baptized,[21] but Geza's and Stephen's area of authority had its centre of gravity in Pannonia and hence was oriented to the Latin West. Thus Geza and Vajk-Stephen got German knights, colonists, and missionaries to pour into the country.[22] The marriage of Vajk-Stephen with Gisela, daughter of the Duke of Bavaria, perhaps the direct occasion of his baptism,[23] further strengthened the tie with the West. Under Geza Bishop Pilgrim of Passau (d. 991) had devoted himself with special zeal to the Hungarian mission, and with it he had connected a plan to gain for his see metropolitan authority over Hungary and Moravia. Although he even forged papal documents, which made Passau appear as the legitimate heir of the Roman bishopric of Lorch an der Enns, falsely turned into an archbishopric by Pilgrim, he could not carry his private designs.[24] Stephen, who made the Christianization of Hungary his life's work, naturally desired his own ecclesiastical province. He had the good fortune to find full sympathy in the Emperor Otto III and Pope Silvester II. The decision was made in 1000 or 1001: Stephen himself was honoured by Pope and Emperor with the royal dignity, and Esztergom was established as the ecclesiastical metropolis,[25] to which Stephen added a group of suffragan sees in 1009. But already around 1006 he had the archbishopric of Kalocza set up beside it for the eastern part of Hungary. And he probably handed over his country to Saint Peter, as Mieszko of Poland had done.

In this way the Magyars had made contact with the Christian community of peoples of the West. Stephen, venerated as a saint since the last decades of the eleventh century, energetically accomplished the Christianization of Hungary. His laws enjoined the building of churches, the sanctification of Sundays and holy days, and fasting and regulated ecclesiastical jurisdiction. There is question here, to be sure, of an initiative which was at first still rejected by large groups of the Hungarian people. The pent up bitterness against the Christian religion, against the foreigners brought into the country, and against the new form of government in general, was to break out in fearful uprisings after Stephen's death in 1038. Since his only son, Emmeric, had died in 1031, Stephen had designated as his successor the son of the banished Doge of Venice, Peter Orseolo, but he soon had to flee to Henry III of Germany. After a victorious struggle with the rebels, Henry put him back on the throne, but the feudal homage that Peter had to do to the German King so provoked the Hungarians that they not only overthrew the King in 1046 and eventually cruelly murdered him but in general they turned violently on everything that had been constructed since the days of Geza and Stephen. The Church was severely hurt by this frenzied outbreak of resentment; among the victims was Stephen's important assistant, Bishop Gerard.[26] Just the same, Stephen's work did not disappear. Andrew I (1046–61), scion of the line going back to Geza's brother, had fled from Stephen to Kiev and had become the son-in-law of Jaroslav the Great. He now gained the Hungarian crown and continued Stephen's policies, even forbidding the exercise of the pagan religion on pain of death. Bela I (1061–63) so thoroughly put down the last manifestation of the pagan reaction that thereafter the danger was non-existent. The Hungarian Church flourished under King Saint Ladislas (1077–95) and King Koloman (1095–1116) and at the beginning of the twelfth century came into contact with the Gregorian Reform.

---

[21] F. Dölger, *Ungarn in der byzantinischen Reichspolitik* (Leipzig 1942); G. Moravcsik, "Die byzantinische Kultur und das mittelalterliche Ungarn" in *SAB* (1955), no. 4; id., "The Role of the Byzantine Church in Medieval Hungary" in *The American Slavic and East European Review* 6 (1947), 134–51; E. von Ivánka, "Griechische Kirche und griechisches Mönchtum im mittelalterlichen Ungarn" in *OrChrP* 8 (1942), 183–94; B. Fehér, *Bulgarisch-ungarische Beziehungen in den 5.–11. Jahrhunderten* (Budapest 1921).

[22] K. Schünemann, *Die Deutschen in Ungarn bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (Berlin–Leipzig 1923).

[23] On the question of Stephen's baptism, with sources and literature, cf. M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.*, 503–10.

[24] On the Passau charters of Otto III, cf. M. Uhlirz, *op. cit.* 471–7; footnotes 11 f. on page 477 for the bibliography on the forgeries; also H. Fichtenau, "Zu den Fälschungen Pilgrims von Passau" in *Festgabe A. Hoffmann* (Graz 1964), 8–100.

[25] M. Uhlirz, "Die Weihe des Aschericus zum Erzbischof ad Sobottin" in *JbbDG: Otto III.*, 566–71.

The bewilderingly varied picture afforded by the Christianization of the individual countries in the North and the East acquires unity as soon as one observes the relations of these peoples to one another. To a great extent these came about by means of the northeast trade, which not merely connected Scandinavia and the Baltic area with the Chazar Kingdom and with the Muslim and Byzantine lands, but also extended to Bohemia, with Prague as the international market, to Moravia, to Poland, and to Hungary. The economic progress thus facilitated, the establishing of personal relations transcending commerce, and other circumstances caused the peoples to advance beyond their old primitive cultural level and enabled their princes to seek new roads. Also important were ties of blood. Scandinavian princes expelled from their homeland could stay in Kiev, just as, conversely, Vladimir had found refuge from his brother Jaropolk in Sweden. And when Jaroslav of Kiev placed troops at the disposal of his son-in-law Andrew, who was returning to Hungary, he was acting from a sentiment of kinship, which was taken for granted by the young Eastern peoples and was often enough effective politically.

---

[26] *Vitae S. Gerardi ep. Chanadensis* in *SS rerum Hung.*, II, 461–506; on the dating of the "Legenda maior" (ibid. 480–506), cf. E. Pásztor in *BIStIAM* 73 (1962), 113–40. Perhaps Gerard, a Venetian and tutor of Stephen's son Emmeric, was the author of the *Libellus de institutione morum* in *SS rerum Hung.*, II, 611 ff., a sort of mirror for princes. The hagiographical literature, which originated toward the close of the eleventh century, is connected with Gregory VII's instruction (c. 1083) to venerate the relics of all who took part in the conversion of Pannonia; cf. E. Pásztor, *loc. cit.* 113f.

All these connections substantially promoted the missionary work. Bruno of Querfurt went as a preacher of the faith to Hungary, then after a short stay in Kiev to the Patzinaks, next stayed with Boleslas Chrobry in Poland, sent missionaries from there to Sweden, and died as a martyr in Prussia.[27] His life must have indicated to what extent the missionary movement was fundamentally a whole. Wherever the messengers of the Gospel worked and from whatever lands they came, they somehow worked hand in hand, even without knowing it. Of course, the favourable situation, as such, would have meant little, if it had not been made use of in the heroic efforts of so many apostles of the faith and in the far-seeing policy of the papacy and of Otto III. Western Christendom now spread beyond its Carolingian frontiers to that varied community of peoples which was to determine its future history.

Chapter 32

The Papacy and the Empire from 1002 to 1046

After the death of Otto III the situation both at Rome and in the Lombard Kingdom gradually reverted to what it had been before the days of the Ottos: domination by the nobles at Rome, and an Italian kingship handed over to the Margrave Arduin of Ivrea. In Germany too there were not lacking efforts to transfer the government to other hands, but the last scion of the Saxon Dynasty, going back in the direct male line to Henry I, Duke Henry of Bavaria, was able to enforce his claim and, as King Henry II (1002–24), to strengthen the Empire again by recourse to the sound principles of Otto I. Not Rome and the universal *Imperium* were regarded by him as the foundation of his throne, but rather the royal authority in Germany, in Italy, and eventually in Burgundy. The crown of Burgundy was only to devolve upon his successor, Conrad II, in 1033, but this was prepared for the German kingship by Henry II through an agreement on the inheritance with his uncle, King Rudolf III of Burgundy, and by the assumption of feudal suzerainty. Since the royal power in Italy was really quite limited, as the elevation of Arduin showed, and the Burgundian kingship promised little increase of real power, though it did assure the Alpine passes, Germany remained the essential basis. Henry II built it up solidly, especially by having recourse to the Church.

---

[27] H. G. Voigt, *Bruno von Querfurt* (Stuttgart 1907); R. Wenskus, *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt* (Münster–Cologne 1956); H. D. Kahl, "Compellere intrare. Die Wendenpolitik Brunos von Querfurt im Lichte hochmittelalterlichen Missions- und Völkerrechts" in *Zeitschrift für Ostforschungen,* 4 (1955), 161–93, interprets Bruno's celebrated encouragement to the war, not as a war against pagans in the sense of forced conversion, but as a war against apostate Christians.

The Ottonian State Church, as the essential prop of the kingship, has already been discussed, but until the reign of Henry II there were really only rudimentary stages in constructing it. He was the first to develop it logically and to connect it to a system. As none of his blood relatives before him, he monopolized the nomination to episcopal sees and forced upon the electors candidates he designated, chosen mostly from the royal chapel, so that there was very little of that free assent which constitutes the essence of the *electio canonica*. On several occasions he convoked synods or intervened in ecclesiastical matters. Episcopal sees were subjected to the additional burden of hospitality, which Henry claimed to a greater degree than had been the earlier practice, for himself and his court on his ceaseless journeys.

The royal monasteries had to put up with more serious interference, for in their regard the King was acting as the lord of proprietary churches. Abbots were deposed or installed without regard for the right of election of the communities concerned, and Henry disposed of the monastic property as of any other goods of the Empire. He assigned abbeys or parts of their property to other churches, usually to cathedrals; all monasteries had to pay fixed dues, the *servitium regale,* and even the enfeoffment of secular vassals with monastic property was at times ordered. In these measures the personally pious monarch was motivated not solely by the material interest of the Empire but by a genuine desire for reform. A monastic reform movement had begun long before in Lotharingia and had radiated into the interior of Germany. Influenced by it, Henry II sent at first South German and Bavarian and later Lotharingian reform monks, of the Gorze and Saint-Vannes schools, as abbots to not a few royal monasteries. The friendship which the Ottos had cultivated with the great monastic personages of their day became under Henry II a co-operation in the top echelon in Germany. Behind this religious and political activity there stood, of course, the early mediaeval theocratic idea of kingship. Under Henry II and then under Henry III it experienced an exaltation that was to have a decisive effect on the reform of the Church.

His attention claimed by inner and outside struggles, Henry II left it to Duke Otto of Carinthia to go to Italy and attack Arduin of Ivrea. Only Otto's ill luck caused him to cross the Alps himself and to proclaim his taking possession of the Lombard Kingdom by being solemnly crowned at Pavia.

Since Arduin had retired without fighting to a powerful castle, he was undefeated but his rival kingship was based on such a weak foundation that it posed no serious danger for Henry. At the moment Henry was not yet in a position to think of a journey to Rome and the obtaining of the imperial crown. The son of Crescentius, John, who conducted the city government under the proud title of *patricius,* must have heartily welcomed this temporary waiver. His rule was so well established that after the death of Otto III he could allow Pope Silvester II to return to Rome and quietly await his death. The succeeding Popes, John XVII (1003), John XVIII (1003–09), and Sergius IV (1009–12), were, understandably, once again Romans by birth. They lacked the time for displaying an activity of any importance, and also the basis which the bond with the imperial office had afforded.[1]

The restored rule of the nobility at Rome led of necessity to rivalries among the families. As a matter of fact, power was wrested from the Crescentians by the comital house of Tusculum, which went back in the female line, through the sister of Marozia, to the house of Theophylact. The occasion was provided by the virtually simultaneous deaths of Sergius IV and the *Patricius* John on 12 and 18 May 1012. The Counts of Tusculum thereupon had their brother Theophylact acclaimed as Pope Benedict VIII, whereas the Crescentians chose a certain Gregory.[2] Defeated in the ensuing struggle, Gregory went to Germany. Henry II promised to make an investigation as soon as he should go to Rome, but then he recognized Benedict VIII. Whether or not Gregory experienced this decision, we hear nothing further of him. The victory of the Tusculans was complete. For decades now they ruled Rome and the *Patrimonium* as a sort of hereditary principality. Unlike Alberic they based their power, not on that of a *princeps,* but on that of the Pope; a member of the family assumed it each time and then assigned the most important secular functions to his brothers. Since other noble families, including the Crescentians, were given a share in the administration, there were no disturbances.

The Tusculans were smart enough not to oppose in principle the *Imperium* that had been restored in 962. And so, after preliminary negotiations, Henry II was able to receive the imperial anointing and coronation at Saint Peter's on 14 February 1014. Just how he and Benedict VIII then defined their respective competence is not known. It is probably to be attributed chiefly to the Pope that the imperial *privilegium* of Otto I was not renewed at that time. The rights of sovereignty there assigned to the Emperor may have been annoying to Benedict VIII. But on the other hand, Henry II did not renounce every right in Rome. The judicial sessions which he held during his brief stay show this, and it is probably not an accident that the title *patricius,* usurped by the Crescentian John, no longer appeared officially among the Tusculans. Basically, however, Henry II, Conrad II, and Henry III allowed a completely free hand to the Tusculans, who ruled until 1045. And the right of approval, which Otto I had acquired for papal elections and which his successors had augmented to a right of designation, apparently played no role in the elevation of John XIX and in that of Benedict IX, both of them falling in the time of Conrad II. The spirit of a really independent Rome was expressed in the *Graphia aureae urbis Romae,* the archeological and political work, written around 1030, of an unknown adherent of the Tusculans, probably a layman but in any event a scholar, who sought to recall to memory the glory of the ancient Roman Empire and, in Schramm's words, "to take the government of the city out of the hands of the Emperor and transfer it to those of a deputy, of a Roman *patricius*".[3]

---

[1] Of some significance is an encyclical of Sergius IV in *Jaffé* 3972 (regarded as spurious), *PL* 139, 1498; in it knights are invited to travel to Syria on Italian vessels in order to avenge in blood the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem by the Caliph Hakim as well as to re-establish the Church there. P. Kehr, *Ital. Pont.*, VI, 2, p. 322, no. 1, and C. Erdmann, in *QFIAB* 23 (1931 f.), regard the letter as authentic; A. Gieysztor, "The Encyclica of Sergius IV" in *Mediaevalia et Humanistica* 5 (1948), 3–23; 6 (1950), 3–34, would seem to have shown that it is a forgery which appeared at the monastery of Saint-Pierre de Moissac, not far from Toulouse, in 1096, a year after Urban II's call for the crusade.

[2] H. Zimmermann, "Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters" in *MIÖG* 59 (1961), 280–84.

Without disturbing each other, Henry II and Benedict VIII pursued their goals. Both on his journey to Rome and later Henry sought to tighten his control of the Lombard Kingdom. Since in Lombardy and in Central Italy he had especially favoured ecclesiastics, after his return to Germany there occurred a revolt of the secular princes, which drew Arduin of Ivrea from his lair and had him assume leadership. But Boniface of Canossa, in alliance with the loyal bishops, so thoroughly defeated the rebels that Arduin finally renounced his shadowy kingship for good in 1014 and entered the monastery of Fruttuaria, dying in 1015. But Henry had little power in Italy. He strengthened it by beginning systematically to fill the episcopal sees with Germans, first of all in the metropolitan provinces of Aquileia and Ravenna.

It cannot be determined whether Benedict VIII came to the papacy from the clerical or the lay state. But no matter: his ability quickly brought him prestige and influence. It is true that his interests were chiefly in politics and administration. After he had crushed the early opposition of the Crescentians and other families with the aid of his brothers, things in the *Patrimonium* could be put in some kind of order. But his glance went beyond the *Patrimonium*. The Muslims were causing anxiety in the Tyrrhenian Sea. Pisa was plundered in 1004 and 1011, and in 1015 Spanish Muslims under the Emir Mogehid conquered Sardinia. When in 1016 they destroyed the old maritime city of Luni from there, Benedict VIII intervened. Pisan, Genoese, and papal troops boarded ships, defeated the Muslims in a sea battle, and freed Sardinia. The Pope, moreover, paid close attention to the revolts which broke out against Byzantine rule in 1009 at Bari and elsewhere. Put to flight in 1011, the leaders of the revolt, Melo and his brother-in-law Dattus, not only obtained support from Benedict, who put Norman knights at their disposal,[4] but also from the South Italian Lombard princes, and hence in 1017 Melo was able to conquer northern Apulia. The victory of the Catapan Basil Bojoannes near Cannae in 1018 brought a turning point: the Byzantines advanced into Lombard territory and threatened Rome. Melo and, soon after, Benedict himself thus went to see Henry II in order to ask help. At Easter of 1020 Pope and Emperor took counsel at Bamberg in regard to their common tasks. On this occasion the Pope received from Henry an imperial *privilegium,*[5] which reproduced the *Ottonianum* word for word and added a few gifts, and also the promise to go to Italy. Melo was enfeoffed with Apulia, but he died at Bamberg. His brother-in-law, who had stayed in Italy, was captured and killed by the Byzantines.

---

[3] P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio,* I, 193–217, II, 34–44, 68–111 (text edition).

Henry II finally set out for Italy in the autumn of 1021, and in the following year moved directly south in three army columns. He managed to take the Byzantine frontier fortress of Troia, though it was soon lost again, captured Pandulf of Capua, who had gone over to the Byzantines, and again attached Waimar of Salerno to the Empire, but in comparison with the cost this was a meagre success. The Pope had to be content that at least the progress of the Byzantines came to a stop.

Of greater importance was the reform synod which the Pope and the Emperor held at Pavia in March 1022 before the campaign. The Ottos had earlier exerted themselves to protect ecclesiastical and monastic property from expropriation, and in 1014 Henry II had returned to the subject at the Synod of Ravenna, arranged by him together with Benedict, by commanding the churches to draw up an inventory of their property. A Roman Synod immediately after the imperial coronation, whose decrees are unknown, may have discussed similar questions. But at Pavia in 1022 more radical decrees were prepared, at the urging of the Pope. They insisted strictly on the ancient requirement of celibacy for the subdiaconate and higher orders, a law that had to a great extent fallen into oblivion, and decreed that the sons of unfree ecclesiastics should remain in the father's condition. Involved here was not the inner reform of the Church but the preservation of Church property, which all too easily devolved by means of clerical marriage on the children. But, once formulated, the decrees were to gain momentum as the desire for inner reform grew strong.

Neither Pope nor Emperor was permitted to do much more. Benedict VIII died in April 1024, Henry II three months later. The good memory which people in Germany retained in regard to the Emperor, notwithstanding isolated reproaches, for example because of his alliance with the pagan

---

[4] See E. Joranson, "The Inception of the Career of the Normans in Italy" in *Speculum* 23 (1948), 353–96.

[5] *MGDD,* III, *Dipl. Heinrichs II.,* 427 (*MGConst* I, 65, no. 33).

Liutizians against the Poles, was enhanced into a cult by the zealous cooperation of the episcopal see of Bamberg, founded by him and charged with tending his grave, so that in 1146 Eugene III undertook his canonization. While this exaltation was based less on authentic historical than on idealizing and legendary tradition, it concerned a man who had taken seriously the Christian ideal of a king of his day.[6]

Benedict VIII was succeeded by his brother, the Tusculan John XIX (1024–32); the childless Henry II, by the founder of the Salian Dynasty, Conrad II (1024–39). There is little enough to say about John. Coming directly from the lay state, made Pope for the sake of his family's position of power, he apparently never achieved an inner relationship to his high office. Conrad II, on the other hand, showed himself to be equal to the task entrusted to him. Henry II's constructive work was now to produce its real fruits. In 1027 Conrad received the imperial crown at Rome in the presence of King Knut of England and Denmark and of King Rudolf III of Burgundy. It acquired greater importance through the gaining of the Burgundian Kingdom in 1033 and the consolidation of the imperial power in Italy. While the Emperor contented himself in South Italy with the homage of the Lombard princes and only perforce, during a second journey to Italy, deprived the rebel Pandulf of the rule of Capua, transferring it to Waimar of Salerno, he acted more vigorously in both Lombardy and Tuscany. But, differing from Henry II, he did not chiefly favour the spiritual princes at the expense of the secular. In fact in 1037 he especially singled out the lesser vassals among the secular nobles, the so-called *vavassores,* and because of them came into conflict with the Lombard bishops, above all with Archbishop Aribert of Milan.

In accord with some unfavourable sources from the eleventh century, some writers like to represent Conrad as a merely worldly-minded power-politician, without any feeling for the spiritual tasks of the Church. This picture probably needs correcting. Though less devout than Henry II, the first Salian substantially maintained the ecclesiastical policy of his predecessor, on the one hand promoting the Lotharingian monastic reform, on the other hand bringing to a completion the constructing of a German State Church. His effort to place the Church as much as possible at the service of the Empire caused him, as Henry II earlier, to require a money payment in the filling of wealthy episcopal sees. This was not a sale-purchase of the churches concerned and hence it was not really simony. Rather it was an effort, legally possible in the feudal structure, to connect the investiture with the paying of a *servitium regale.* To be sure, the more the religious conscience became refined in the course of the reform movement, the more sharply it reacted against this practice, so that soon Conrad II was listed among the simonists. The change becoming evident in the standard of values was the expression of a deep-seated turning point: the West was preparing to enter upon a new phase in its development. The Church reform movements were among the most important progressive forces. If the German monarch intended to maintain his leading position, he had to remain in vital contact with them. Conrad II probably lacked the true instinct for this, but such was not the case with his young son and successor, Henry III. Taking up the reform on his own, Henry was to release a movement heavy with consequences.

---

[6] R. Klauser, *Der Heinrichs- und Kunigundenkult im mittelalterlichen Bamberg* (Bamberg 1957); P. Pfaff, *Kaiser Heinrich II. Sein Nachleben und sein Kult in Basel* (Basel–Stuttgart 1963).

Few early mediaeval rulers were so convinced of the sublimity of the theocratic kingship and of the heavy burdens connected with it as was Henry III (1039–56). His very exertions in the first years of his reign for a general peace in the Empire revealed this. While in France the Church rather than the then quite feeble crown fought against private warfare and developed the idea of the Peace of God, Henry III made use of the religious demands for peace in complete consistency. Guided by a correct understanding that justice must be united with mercy and pardon if genuine Christian peace is to prevail, he did not rest content with a mere peace edict. At the Synod of Constance of 1043 he proclaimed pardon to all his enemies from the ambo or the altar of the cathedral and urged those present to do the same. He made a like declaration at Trier. In 1044 he won a victory over Hungarian rebels, adherents of the usurper Aba, thereby enabling Stephen's lawful successor, Peter Orseolo, to recover the throne for a short time. Henry caused this triumph to end up, on the very battlefield of Menfö, as an impressive celebration, combining thanksgiving, penance, and general pardon. All this had nothing to do with weakness. Secular princes sensed the aim of a ruler intent on the constant extension of the royal power. And when Henry did not approve the canonically controvertible deposition of Archbishop Aribert of Milan, as decreed by his father, and made peace with Aribert, he stood forth in the sight of the bishops with all the authority of the theocratic ruler. In fact, he invested them no longer with the staff alone but also with the ring, the symbol of the spiritual marriage between the bishop and his church.

His monastic policy was his own. Whereas Henry II liked to subject abbeys to bishops, Henry III was so favourable to monastic efforts for liberty that he withdrew a group of monasteries from the power of their episcopal or noble proprietors and took them under his direct protection. Of course, this protection also meant domination, but the domination of the supreme religious and political power, which was to assure the monasteries of freedom, for to mediaeval man freedom meant also the state of subjection and service, ultimately to God, and so Henry could designate the subjection of the abbeys under his obedience as their freedom.[7] Much as this protectorate aimed at making financial sources of aid accessible to the imperial authority, its real and more fundamental goal consisted for Henry III in the maintaining and furthering of monastic discipline. Not in vain were Henry and his second wife, Agnes of Poitou, who as the daughter of William V of Aquitaine came from a house closely linked with Cluny, in intimate contact with the leaders of the monastic reform, the Cluniacs, the Lotharingians, and the hermits of Central Italy; Abbot Hugh of Cluny was even the godfather at the baptism of the heir to the throne, the future Henry IV, in 1051. The deep effect produced on the King by the reform ideas of the time appears especially in his renunciation of the fees which not a few kings or princes of his day did not hesitate to demand of bishops or abbots who were to be invested. He regarded them as simony. Certain happenings in Rome soon gave him the opportunity to enforce even outside Germany his strict views, fashioned in the spirit of the reformers.

---

[7] On Henry III's concept of liberty, see G. Ladner, *Theologie und Politik,* 63–70; on the mediaeval idea of liberty as such, see G. Tellenbach, *Libertas,* 2–33, 48–76 *(passim)*. H. Grundmann, "Freiheit als religiöses, politisches und persönliches Postulat im Mittelalter" in *HZ*

John XIX was succeeded by his nephew Theophylact, who became Benedict IX (1032–45). Although the reports concerning his having assumed the papacy at the quite uncanonical age of twelve and concerning his wicked life must have been at least greatly exaggerated, still Benedict did not measure up to the papacy as Christendom in its restless religious state was expecting. But his spiritual inadequacies had less to do with his downfall than did movements within Rome against the Tusculan domination. An uprising in September 1044 compelled the Pope to flee. He was replaced, but probably not until January 1045, by the Bishop of Sabina, Silvester III, who was supported by a collateral branch of the Crescentians. After a few months Benedict was able to drive him out again, but he found in Rome so dangerous a situation that he was prepared to abdicate in the event that someone would reimburse him for the money that he had distributed to make sure his own election. What ensued is, unfortunately, very obscure. Probably Benedict discussed the financial settlement with a rather small group of men who were on friendly terms with him and apparently respectable, including his godfather, the pious Archpriest John Gratian of San Giovanni a Porta Latina, and, before or after his official abdication, received the hard cash from the hands of the Jewish Christian Baruch, called Benedict after his conversion.[8] Then John Gratian was made Pope under the name of Gregory VI (1045–6). He encountered no resistance in reform circles, if Peter Damiani, Prior of Fonte Avellana, may act as an example. On the contrary, he found

---

183 (1957), 23–53, attacks a specifically mediaeval idea of liberty, but his polemic is not wholly convincing.

[8] On the question of the relationship of Baruch-Benedict with Gregory VI on the one hand and with Gregory VII on the other, cf. G. B. Picotti, *AstIt* 100 (1942), 2–44 (with bibliography); id., *ADRomana* 69 (1946), 117–130, with the subsequent reply of R. Morghen; *Haller* II, 573 f., 578–80; G. Marchetti-Longhi in *StudGreg* II, 287–333; good critical summary in P. E. Schramm, *GGA* 207 (1953), 67–70.

enthusiastic assent, which, it is true, cooled off or, as in the case of Peter Damiani, became the very opposite, once the story of the money transaction leaked out.

At first Henry III also recognized Gregory VI. When he crossed the Alps in the autumn of 1046, he was probably motivated only by the intention of visiting the pacified Lombard Kingdom and of receiving the imperial crown at Rome. Regardless whether he learned the details of Gregory's elevation before or during his journey, they led him to decide upon a radical intervention. The Synod of Pavia, held in the autumn under his presidency, must already have prepared for what was to come by a general prohibition of simony.[9] Subsequently, Henry met Gregory VI at Piacenza, but we are not informed about the discussions that took place there. In any event, on 20 December a synod met at Sutri, near Rome, to sit in judgment on the three claimants, notwithstanding the fact that Benedict IX and Silvester III had long before retired. Silvester III and Gregory VI were deposed at Sutri; three days later Benedict IX was deposed at a Roman Synod. At Henry's suggestion Bishop Suitger of Bamberg was then elected. Enthroned on Christmas 1046 under the name Clement II, the new Pope conferred the imperial anointing and coronation on Henry III and Queen Agnes.

These happenings have occupied scholars to our own day. A chief subject of controversy is the deposition of Gregory VI. That Gregory or his friends paid money would seem to have been established, despite Fliche,[10] and even the important reasons that are adduced, for example by Borino and Poole, to exclude a sale-purchase or similar simoniacal intrigues do not solve the problem: much as they may exonerate Gregory VI personally, they do not therefore put his judges in the wrong. Aversion to simony had now so increased that in the filling of an ecclesiastical office any mention of money was interpreted simoniacally, as has been noted in regard to Conrad II. As a matter of fact, all the reports, even the virtually contemporary sources, accept the fact of simony in the case of Gregory VI. Wherever criticism was expressed, it was aimed at the deposition by the unqualified Henry III — thus the unknown, probably French author of *De ordinando pontifice* — or it insisted on the Pope's immunity from judgment — thus Bishop Wazo of Liège.[11] Perhaps Gregory VI even acknowledged his own guilt and resigned his office, but in regard to the latter the renunciation was probably not made without pressure and hence it must have hardly differed from a deposition.

---

[9] See G. Tellenbach, *Libertas,* 210–12.

[10] A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* I (Louvain–Paris 1924), 107f.; refutation of this thesis by D. Freymans in *Revue belge de phil. et hist.* 11 (1932), 130–37; Amann in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 92–95, is also influenced by the highly unfavourable picture which Fliche draws of Henry III in *op. cit.,* I, 104–113, despite the allowances he makes.

[11] *De ordinando pontifice* in *MGLiblit* I, 8–14; for Wazo, see *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium* II, 65, *MGSS,* VII, 228f; on both authors cf. also *infra,* Chapter 41.

But what may Henry III, the real actor in all this, have aimed at by the deposition? It would make little sense to present individually the various interpretations,[12] which are not always free from indignation, but it would be good from the outset to take note of the entanglement of the religious and political goals, without which the typically theocratic intervention here under consideration is unintelligible. The Emperor was concerned — there can be no doubt about it — with the reform of the Roman Church, of the spiritual pivot of Christendom. But, as the quasi-priestly ruler, he did not merely want to protect a movement of renewal radiating from Rome to the Universal Church; he wanted to guide and lead it, so far as he could.

The preliminary condition was that the papacy should be freed from domination by the Roman nobility. Hence Henry again had recourse to the old right of participating in the papal election, established by Otto I. It is true that from 1046 on he was careful to discuss the appointment of a new successor of Peter with Roman envoys, but it was he who made the designation and accordingly determined the subsequent election by the clergy and people of Rome. In order legally to establish this practice, which had not been made use of since Otto III, in 1046 he had the Romans confer upon him the patriciate, which the earlier masters of Rome had exercised at least *de facto,* occasionally while bearing the title of *patricius.*[13] The second innovation was that the Emperor was not to designate a single Roman, not even an Italian, as Pope. In this he resumed the policy of Otto III, but even more pointedly, in that he nominated only German bishops. He had no intention of incorporating the papacy into the German State Church, despite the theory of P. Kehr.[14] Henry III fully recognized the unique primatial position of the Pope, once he had been installed, and did not meddle in the administration. However, the provenience of the new Bishops of Rome from the German episcopate was intended not only to assure the reform better; it was also to bind the papacy as closely as possible to the *Imperium.* At the same time the Emperor must have expected from the German Popes a furthering of his imperial policy in Italy, although this viewpoint was probably not to the fore in 1046, because of the then prevailing peaceful situation.

Henry III's reform initiative has been harshly condemned at times. Church historians spoke of a tyrannical assault on the Church's liberty; profane historians, of an inexcusable myopia in unleashing a reform that would soon inflict the most serious damage on the power of the state. One witness from that period may verify on what unhistorical presuppositions such verdicts are based. He followed the events at Sutri and Rome as an unassuming and scarcely noticed Roman cleric and then accompanied to Cologne the deposed Pope Gregory VI, whom Henry sent into exile for safety's sake. This was Hildebrand, who later was to mount the throne of Peter as Gregory VII and take up the conflict between *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium*.[15] From a man who was on principle an opponent of theocratic rule, who even bore the pain of banishment with Gregory VI, one really ought to expect a violent repudiation of Henry III. In actuality, however, he preserved a kind memory of the Emperor throughout his life and in this he was in agreement with almost all the leading reformers of his generation. Hence Henry III's reform initiative must have been regarded by these circles as an action that favoured the Church, and Henry's theocracy, despite criticism expressed here and there, must have corresponded so well with the views of his time that the future radical development, furthered by his all too early death and other adverse circumstances, could not be foreseen. During the Investiture Controversy itself William the Conqueror could govern theocratically in Normandy and England, just like Henry III, without coming into conflict with Gregory VII, a proof of how slowly the intellectual change beginning in the second half of the eleventh century was completed.

---

[12] Thus especially Fliche and Borino; the latter is rightly criticized by C. Violante, *La pataria;* in regard to the problem of Sutri as such, besides the work of Zimmermann cited in the literature, still valuable are the critical remarks of G. Tellenbach, *Libertas,* 212–17.

[13] On Henry III's patriciate, cf. P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio,* I, 229–238.

[14] Thesis of P. Kehr, *Vier Kapitel;* criticism by Tellenbach in *Libertas,* 206–10.

---

[15] Cf. G. B. Borino, "Invitus ultra montes cum domno papa Gregorio abii" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 3–46.

SECTION EIGHT

Constitution of the Church, Worship, Pastoral Care, and Piety: 700 to 1050

Chapter 33

Diocesan Organization

The more Germanic, Roman, and, to a degree, even Celtic ways of life in the Christian West blended into one distinct early mediaeval culture, the more powerfully did new institutions, based on Germanic and Roman juridical ideas, have to be developed in the Church. These relaxed the strictly hierarchical structure of the ancient Christian Roman episcopal constitution, and partly even dissolved it or covered it over. Prepared as early as the Merovingian period, this process got fully under way from about the eighth century. Accordingly, a new period of Church history, characterized *par excellence* by Germanic law, began. It lasted until about the end of the Salian Dynasty. It is true that even in the age of the Gregorian Reform there appeared a reaction, based on Roman constitutional principles, but it required serious work before a synthesis could be discovered in the rising canon law, in the *Decretum Gratiani* that was completed around 1140. This gave preference to the Roman element, so that in the future the Germanic influence was pushed back, even though it was never eliminated.

Rural Churches

The creative juridical initiative of the Germano-Roman nations had its roots essentially in a rural and feudal way of life that was different from the urban culture of antiquity. Even in late antiquity, the proprietary spheres of influence established by the senatorial nobility introduced a development unfavourable to the city, and this received a powerful stimulus from the wanderings of the peoples. Among other things, new churches arose everywhere in the country. The circumstance that they were built, endowed, and maintained by the owners of the property or by cooperative groups relieved the bishops of a duty which they would hardly have been able to satisfy, considering the means at their disposal, but at the same time it presented them with serious problems.

For since the founders of those churches asserted rights of ownership, there developed a new juridical form, opposed to the Roman constitution of the Church — the institution of the "proprietary church". It was probably not of specifically German origin. There had been more or less developed proprietary churches both in the West, for example in Gaul, and in the East of the Roman Empire — in the Byzantine Empire even with a centuries-long development culminating in the so-called *ktitoren* right — and finally, again in a special form, among the Slavs.[1] In the West, however, the Germanic peoples were undoubtedly the propelling element. Wherever they lived — in Spain, in Lombard Italy, in England, in Scandinavia, in Frankland — proprietary church types developed, whereas among the strata of the Romance populations the principles of the Roman ecclesiastical constitution became even stronger.[2] In Visigothic Spain, which, as is well known, to a great extent clung to continuity with Roman law, from the end of the sixth century up to the Islamic invasion the bishops carried on a constant fight against proprietary church usages. And while throughout the early Middle Ages the baptismal church organization, on a late Roman foundation which to a great extent preserved episcopal rights, maintained itself in Italy, nevertheless from the ninth century legal principles that may have been influenced by the proprietary church system made their way in.

In any event, the strongest influence proceeded from the Frankish proprietary church. In the Merovingian period there had been no lack of resistance in regard to the principle on the part of bishops. The little that had been accomplished by this means disappeared in the chaos that crept in from 639. When, at the turn of the seventh and eighth centuries, ecclesiastical property was secularized on a grand scale, even the baptismal churches that were still dependent on the bishop fell for the greatest part into lay hands. In order to guard against further losses, the bishops too now adopted the proprietary church system for the churches still left to them. And since the monasteries did likewise, and in fact even tried to increase the number of proprietary churches as much as possible, soon there was no church in the Frankish Kingdom without a secular or a spiritual proprietor. The more or less successful exertions of the Carolingians, summarized in the ecclesiastical capitularies of Louis the Pious of 818–19, for a juridically acceptable form and the recognition of the proprietary church, both by the Carolingian episcopate, despite repeated protests, and by Popes Eugene II and Leo IV — these points have already been described. Here we are concerned merely to look at the legal institution as such and at its effects.

---

[1] The proprietary church was derived either from the Germanic family priesthood (Stutz) or from the lordship of the manor as such (A. Dopsch especially) or from both. *Feine RG,* paragraph 18, still holds to the Stutz thesis but in certain cases is prepared to accept an Indo-Germanic root; on it cf. also R. Höslinger, "Die 'alt-arische' Wurzel des Eigenkirchenrechts in ethnologischer Sicht" in *ÖAKR* 3 (1952), 267–73. The theory of the lordship of the manor, proposed by A. Dopsch, for example in *Wirtschaftliche und soziale Grundlagen der europäischen Kulturentwicklung aus der Zeit von Cäsar bis auf Karl den Grossen,* II (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1924), 230–49, is defended by many investigators within and especially outside the German-speaking world, each in his own way. The attempt of H. von Schubert to connect the proprietary church with the Arianism of the East Germans would probably no longer endure discussion.

[2] It is scholars of Romance lands especially, then, who have much to object to in the theory of U. Stutz. See the literature in *Feine RG,* paragraph 18, II, no. 4 (France), no. 6 (Italy), no. 7 (Spain). A good look at the difficulties is given by R. Bidagor, *La iglesia propia en España* (Rome 1933), and the exhaustive discussion by Wohlhaupter in *ZSavRGkan* 55 (1935), 367–77, and by Vincke in *AkathKR* 114 (1934), 308–18. A new attack on Stutz has been made by G. Martínez Díez, *El patrimonio eclesiástico en la España visigoda. Estudio histórico-jurídico* (Madrid 1959).

The proprietary church was a product of property law. It was reduced to juridical form by virtue of the stone altar firmly connected with the earth. For the church bulding and its equipment, rectory and cemetery, the landed property donated to the church with its peasants, the income from the tithe, offerings, and stole fees, in short whatever the altar attracted around itself belonged to it as its appurtenances and was, like the altar itself, the property of the landlord. From the time of Charles the Great this estate could no longer be taken from the Church. It was destined first of all to serve the Church and her function. But since the surplus revenues belonged to the proprietor, the proprietary church was exposed to the danger of exploitation. To be able to carry out its function, it needed a priest, just as the mill which the landlord set up on his property, usually with compulsory use by his peasants, needed a miller. Not the bishop but the proprietor of the church appointed this priest. If it so suited him, he took him, just like the miller, from the ranks of his serfs or slaves and in any event he laid down conditions which assured him the greatest possible usufruct and often even humiliated the priest. Proprietary rights over churches could be conveyed to other persons, both in the form of a loan (according to the law of benefice or libellar) and by means of inheritance or of sale, gift, mortgage, and the like. Although the church property was supposed to remain a whole and passed in its entirety to several heirs, greed brought it about that the proprietor reserved to himself, at least partially, especially lucrative revenues, in particular the tithe and the offerings, by either receiving them himself or selling the right to them, in whole or in part. Once this inclined plane had been set foot on, no stop was possible thereafter: during the eleventh and twelfth centuries the institution of the proprietary church clearly fell apart into a loose bundle of individual rights. The process was expedited, not least of all, by the reform movement in the Church.

In several respects the proprietary church was opposed to the ecclesiastical constitution, as this had earlier been developed with the aid of Roman law. To be sure, the power pertaining to the bishop of disposing of church property had earlier become less comprehensive in so far as donations were made to individual churches, but churches that had become holders of their own property had still been incorporated absolutely into the episcopal constitution. For, in accord with Roman law, the Church represented an institution of public law. Its virtually monarchical direction was in the hands of the bishop. He ordained his helpers — priests, deacons, and clerics — and appointed them to the ecclesiastical ministry with delegated power. Obliged to support them, he provided them with *stipendia* or with church property in the form of a loan.

So centralized an organization could not but appear strange to the Germanic peoples, who had different ideas and were on a more primitive level of culture. Since they knew neither the underlying Roman legal distinction between *ius publicum* and *ius privatum* nor the Roman form of the offfcial positions and constructed both state and society less from above than from below, private and property law obtained preponderance in their proprietary churches. In order to carry out an economic enterprise the proprietor took a cleric into his service. The priesthood was for him a means to an end, whereas in the ancient Christian Roman constitution of the Church the opposite relationship prevailed: the property bestowed upon the church was supposed to serve the needs of the priesthood.

The proprietary church was too deeply rooted in early mediaeval culture to be extirpated; only its excesses could be curtailed. The reform laws of Charles the Great and his son solved this problem to a degree.[3] With the compromise then achieved between the interests of the laity and those of the clergy the Frankish proprietary church system was directed to a road which it was to cling to despite ceaseless violations of the law. Even though the church continued to belong to the proprietor, it was up to the bishop to supervise its maintenance. Furthermore, the priests of a proprietary church were expressly made subject to the bishop's jurisdiction. Not only did their appointment or removal require the bishop's assent, but the priests were obliged to make an annual report and to attend synods and court sessions. It was even more important to lessen the dependence of the clergy on the proprietors. And so, on the one hand, there was required for priests the condition of freedom and the consequent right of not being deposed except by the sentence of a court, and, on the other hand, the rent-free use of at least one hide of glebe, usually thirty acres, of the necessary structures with garden, of a portion of the tithe, and of the offerings. In return they had to carry out the ecclesiastical functions, while rights of use over and above this had to be reimbursed through payments of taxes, special services, and so forth.

This relationship between a loan and compulsory service basically amounted to the Frankish feudal system that had meanwhile come into existence.

---

[3] Especially important is the Capitulary of Louis the Pious of 819 in *MGCap* I, 276, cc. 6, 9–12, 29; cf. also ibid. 78, c. 54; 304, c. 5; *MGCap* II, 35, c. 18; 39, c. 32; *MGEp* IV, 203f.; the opinion of Hincmar of Reims, *De ecclesiis et capellis,* in *Mirbt* 126–28; the Roman Council of 826 in *MGConc* II, 576, c. 21.

Hence it was natural in the installing of the priests to have recourse to the current Frankish loan in benefice. Ordinarily, though this did not apply everywhere in France especially in the eleventh century, the proprietor thereby renounced the vassalage of commendation so that the priest, because he was not affected by the change of lord, acquired a right to a life-long usufruct. In the early Middle Ages the object of the loan was the proprietary church with all its appurtenances, so that a tax-free use should accrue to the priest for one portion of the undivided property in the sense of the capitulary of Louis the Pious. Accordingly, the Frankish proprietary church contributed in no small measure to the forming of the ecclesiastical benefice system, though the ecclesiastical benefice in the strict sense only grew out of the already mentioned decay of the unity of the proprietary church's property in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, for then the loan relationship to the benefice property, which was specified for the support of the priest, became obsolete.[4] In Frankish territory north of the Alps induction took place by word of mouth; to be more specific, by investiture with ecclesiastical symbols — book, staff, stole, bell rope, and the like. In return the priest had to make a gift *(exenium)* or pay a fee. The right to the offerings, the tithe, and the stole fees continued to be disputed, but often, especially in France, there was established the custom of dividing these into three parts, which usually yielded two-thirds to the proprietor. If the church fell vacant, the proprietor acquired the usufruct until there was a new appointment, a right which was transferred also to the higher ecclesiastical offices, in which connection it was termed *ius regaliae*. Despite the opposition of the clergy the proprietors were also able to secure the *ius spolii,* that is, the right to confiscate the movable property left by the deceased priest, either in whole or in part.

In Italy there also grew up a benefice system, but from other and older roots, while the Frankish type infiltrated only very slowly and incompletely. Already for a long time Italian bishops had endowed priests dependent on them, especially the rectors of the great baptismal churches *(plebes baptismales)*, with the goods belonging to a rural church in the forms of loan customary there, but without any prejudice to the basic principle that the conferring of the office was performed by the bishop. But in Italy also in the ninth century the element of property law gained the upper hand. The appointment of the *plebanus* now took place by means of a contract of loan and lease, most often in the form of the libellar lease; indeed, even richly endowed churches were not infrequently granted to lay persons, who then, for their part, according to the circumstances, had to appoint a priest. In contrast to the Frankish priest of a proprietary church, the *plebani* of well-to-do churches had to pay a high tax. The contract, which was usually in writing, did not only regulate economic matters; it often specified exactly the official rights and duties of the priest. The ecclesiastical authorities — bishop, archdeacon, dean — retained their claims to fees and their right of supervision and jurisdiction over the priests. Without doubt, the tradition of the Roman ecclesiastical organization was more influential here than it was on the Frankish benefice system.

---

[4] Thus *Feine RG,* paragraph 20, I, no. 3; cf. there also the other theories on the origin of the Church benefice.

Since the profit element in the proprietary church depended to a great extent on the tithe, the offerings, and the stole fees, their proprietors strove to acquire, as far as they could, the rights hitherto reserved to the baptismal churches: the right to the principal Sunday Mass, to burial, to baptism, and so forth. And they obtained them little by little. Of especially great consequence was the acquiring of the right to the tithe.[5] The demand for the tithe, appearing in the fifth century and thereafter often urged by the Church, gained general validity in the Frankish Kingdom when it was made into law by the Carolingians, first by Pepin the Short and then definitively by Charles the Great in the Capitulary of Herstal of 779. Regarded as compensation for the great secularization of Church property, the tithe at first benefitted only the baptismal churches and those built on royal land. But under Louis the Pious this important source of income was also unlocked to the proprietors of churches, so that now the old and already riddled system of baptismal churches was even further weakened. Now, however, the bishops had to define the new limits of tithing. They did so in the so-called determining by ban, that is, in charters which, by virtue of the episcopal ban, assured to the church concerned the rights and revenues belonging to it.

And so there arose, especially in France, more slowly in Germany, many rather small parish territories, comprising a few places or even only one village, with more or less defined rights. The parish territory was based on the parish ban, a productive right which bound the parishioners to their church in regard to the reception of the Sacraments, attendance at Mass, and the paying of the tithe, offerings, and stole fees, just as specified groups were bound by the mill, oven, and occupation *banalités*. Italy had not, or only slightly, taken part in the dissolution of the baptismal church system. The old mother churches in the south resisted the most tenaciously. But the bishops took care also of the growing population of Central and North Italy chiefly through new baptismal churches, in which there was not infrequently constituted a collegially organized clergy with *vita communis* and a department *(schola)* of its own for the administration of the total property. The proprietary churches appearing beside them could, it is true, gain many parochial rights, but ordinarily they had to leave the baptismal fonts to the old *plebes*.

---

[5] E. Perels, *Die kirchlichen Zehnten im karolingischen Reich* (Berlin 1904); E. Lesne, "La dîme des biens ecclésiastiques au IX^e et X^e siècle" in *RHE* 13 (1912), 477–503, 659–73; 14 (1913), 97–112, 489–510; E. Widera, "Der Kirchenzehnt in Deutschland zur Zeit der sächsischen Kaiser" in *AkathKR* 110 (1930), 33–110; E. O. Kuujo, *Das Zehntwesen in der Erzdiözese Hamburg-Bremen* (Helsinki 1949); C. E. Boyd, *Tithes and Parishes in Medieval Italy* (New York 1952); other literature in *Feine RG,* para. 19, I, no. 3d.

The development taken by the rural parishes in the early Middle Ages has now probably become understandable in some degree. One must proceed from the ancient baptismal churches, which had been merged by means of territorial division, from the seventh century in Spain and Gaul, from the eighth century in Central and North Italy, into a system of large parishes. In tradition-oriented Italy they continued on, though of course not without modifications, into the high and late Middle Ages, whereas the Germanic peoples, while they retained the original form of the large parishes in many cases and even brought it to Scandinavia as late as the tenth and eleventh centuries, in the case of the old baptismal churches loosened the essential connection with the bishop to a far greater extent then was true of Italy. The churches belonging to larger or smaller associations constituted a special type, extending, apart from England, from the Lombard South to Scandinavia and varying in rights and customs. But the more the country was settled and included in pastoral activity, the less the large churches sufficed. Hence, strongly promoted by the proprietors of churches, there arose smaller parishes, mostly with defined rights, wrested from the baptismal and original churches. The result was a variety no longer clear: each church had its proper history, and represented an individual juridical creation that could be classified only imperfectly.

Urban Churches and Chapters

The urban churches were also in movement, but they had a different development. From time immemorial not only the cathedrals but also other rather large urban churches were served by several clerics, who from the close of the fourth century began here and there to lead a common life under the influence of monastic ideals. The notion of a community of clerics obtained a stable form from Augustine, but because of the meagre evidence supplied by the sources it cannot be determined how far its influence extended. The first organizations in Gaul go back to the sixth century. The term *clerici canonici* came into use in the West at that time to denote the bishop's clergy, and it was slowly applied to the members of the communities now arising, the so-called canons.[6] The *vita canonica* will be discussed later. Here we are concerned merely with the organizational merger into cathedral and collegiate chapters of canons. The terms *capitulum* and *capitularis* originated in the rule, which was read publicly, chapter by chapter, day after day. The origin of the early medieval chapters of canons is disputed. Probably one must assume several roots, for example, the households of bishops or of high ranking clerics, associations of priests under the bishop for administrative or liturgical purposes, and, above all, monastic communities established in the episcopal see, which enabled the bishop to call upon qualified members for assistance and thus gradually caused a cathedral chapter to take shape. In any event, by the eighth century there must have been a whole group of more or less clearly defined chapter-like communities. Clarity finally came out of the great reform legislation of Louis the Pious in 816–7: chapters and monasteries were clearly separated, and fixed rules were decided upon for both.[7]

---

[6] Originally all were termed canons who, as the bishop's clerics, were entered in the official list *(canon)* in contradistinction to the proprietary church priests who did not appear there. Later, the designation referred also to the canonical prescriptions followed by the "canons" or the *officium canonicum* discharged by them.

The cathedral chapters occupied the first rank.[8] Their pertaining to the cathedral, the centre of all the churches of the diocese, procured for them an increasing influence in the government of the diocese, which, however, was only fully developed from the thirteenth century. Cathedral chapters were at first under the archdeacon, then the provost *(praepositus)*, and, for disciplinary matters, the dean, who was later virtually to assume the entire direction. As in every ordered community, there were special offices for specific functions. The *Primicerius* or *cantor* took care of the liturgy and the sacred rites; the *scholasticus* directed the cathedral school and sometimes the schools of the entire diocese; the church's treasure was confided to the *custos,* but his office could be divided between the *thesaurarius* and the *sacrista;* and the provost, responsible for the administration, was assisted by *camerarius* and *cellerarius.*

Along lines similar to those of the cathedral chapters, there were formed in the other larger churches both of the episcopal city and of other cities in the diocese collegiate chapters, as the collegial manner of life of diocesan priests flourished, especially during the eighth and ninth centuries in Lombardy, and spread even to the rural clergy. For all their monastic emphasis — common table, common property, choir service — the collegiate chapters had at the same time to see to the care of souls. This was the duty of the provost, who was later inclined to have the *custos* act in his place. The canons officiated at the liturgy by weekly turns; during his week a canon was known as *hebdomadarius.* At times the double function of care of souls and choir service led to the constructing of double churches. In the event that the cathedral chapters were obliged to the care of souls, cathedral parishes, often with their own churches, were established.

In certain regions — South and West Germany, France, here and there in

---

[7] For the monastic legislation, see *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum,* ed. by Kassius Hallinger, I (Rome–Siegburg 1963): *Legislatio Aquisgranensis,* ed. by J. Semmler, 423–582; for the capitulary for the canons, see *infra,* Chapter 39 (sources).

[8] In addition to the works cited in the Literature for this Chapter, there are many studies of individual chapters; cf. also *Feine RG,* para. 19, II, 31, III, no. 2, and for Germany A. Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte der deutschen Kirche im Mittelalter* (Leipzig–Berlin 1913), 143–52.

North Italy — there arose not a few chapters of canonesses,[9] always attached to a chapter of canons. The proximity of chapters of canons to the monastic life had as a consequence that monasteries could be transformed into chapters and *vice versa*.

In the cities the bishops could better hold together the ecclesiastical property than was the case in the country until in the ninth century the process of dissolution set in. Since the considerable demands made by the secular rulers, and at times also arbitrariness on the part of the bishops, jeopardized the support of the canons, there occurred a division of the property between the episcopal table *(mensa episcopalis)* and that of the chapter; a third part was sometimes set aside for the obligations imposed by the royal service. But even the *mensa canonicorum* was in time divided between the chapter as a whole, for the common purposes, and the provost and canons. A new situation arose when, from about the tenth century, many canons gave up the *vita communis* and therefore had their share of the income from the common property delivered to their houses. This right to an individual usufruct of the still commonly administered capitular property led to the notion of the prebend: every chapter from then on possessed a fixed number of canonical prebends. As time went on they were more and more conferred, no longer by the bishop, but by the chapter, at times subject to the bishop's confirmation, and from the middle of the tenth century the one to be installed had to pay a *xenium* or *venditio*. Thus the chapters too entered into the benefice system. They would not have been able to take this road if private property had not been permitted to the canons. The reform movement of the canons regular in the second half of the eleventh century was to start with precisely this central point.

The nobility was especially interested in the chapters of canons. Although in the abstract every priest of a proprietary church was supposed to be in a condition of freedom, his social position remained depressed, and hence in that feudal-minded age it was all but impossible for a nobly born person to act as pastor of a lesser church. He entered either a monastery or a chapter. We do not know just how strong was the aristocratic element in the early mediaeval chapters. In any event, in the course of time prebends were very much sought by the nobility as means of support for younger sons, and there even began the tendency to exclude non-nobles here and there. As a matter of fact, from the late Middle Ages there were, in addition to those of common folk, some noble chapters and a somewhat larger number of mixed chapters.[10]

---

[9] K. H. Schäfer, *Die Kanonissenstifter im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1907); id., *RQ* 24 (1910), 49ff.; J. Gampl, *Adelige Damenstifte* (Vienna 1960); new interpretations against those of Schäfer are defended by J. Siegwart, *Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften* 42–48.

[10] Still basic is A. Schulte, *Der Adel und die deutsche Kirche im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1910); other literature in Werminghoff, *op. cit.* 111–18; L. Santifaller, *Reichskirchensystem,* 123–57, gives synopses of the social classes of bishops and cathedral canons.

Although the bishops no longer disposed of churches and clergy as absolutely as they once had and even had to have recourse to the forms of loan and lease pertaining to private law for the estate belonging to them and consisting in no small measure of proprietary churches and proprietary monasteries, still their authority over their dioceses remained substantially intact. In the Frankish Empire, of course, it had to be again enforced by the Carolingian reform. In the *capitula episcoporum,* as issued in the ninth century by Theodulf of Orléans, Haito of Basel, Hincmar of Reims, and others, one obtains a really vivid picture of the activity of a Frankish bishop.[11] By virtue of the *potestas ordinis* he ordained and confirmed and at Easter and Pentecost he also baptized; he prepared the holy oils and consecrated churches, altars, and sacred vessels. As *magister ecclesiae* he had to see to the education of the clergy, preach, and extirpate superstition and pagan customs. As possessor of the *potestas iurisdictionis,* he determined the holy days and imposed the attendance at Mass, the observance of fasting, the duty of tithing, and other commandments of the Church. Furthermore, he took care of the poor, widows, orphans, and the unfree, supervised the morals of clergy and laity, and officiated as ecclesiastical judge, if necessary by imposing penalties, which could include excommunication and, in the case of malfeasance on the part of clerics, even suspension and deposition. In the last case, however, appeal to the synod or to the King was allowed.

The bishop made a visitation journey annually and in this connection he held the ecclesiastical court. Furthermore, he gathered the clergy for diocesan synods, an institution attested since the sixth century; it was supposed to be held once or twice a year. Lay persons, especially the episcopal vassals and officials, also took part.[12] Although all possible questions of law, administration, and trials could be dealt with at the synod, the chief stress was on legislation. In the Carolingian period this consisted mainly in the application of the general capitularies, decreed by imperial and provincial synods, to the diocese in question.

This picture, drawn from Carolingian sources, of the rights and duties of the bishop remained standard for the succeeding period. It in no way implied a diminution of the episcopal power when from the middle of the ninth century it was understood in Frankish territory as *bannus episcopalis,* paralleling the royal and the comital ban. This meant the right to command and to forbid under penalty, so that, just as in secular law, a distinction may be made between the episcopal decree, court, peace, and administrative bans. The highest penalty, the great excommunication, is especially to be noted among the penalties of the ban, and in German it has retained the descriptive term "Kirchenbann". Since it could be threatened in connection with all instructions, it went beyond the sphere of the penitential system, of the penal and disciplinary law, became a clear parallel to the Germanic outlawry, and, by this extension, fell into the danger of being too much legalized and hence too formalized.

---

[11] For the prescriptions of individual bishops cf. the lists by A. Werminghoff in *NA* 26 (1901), 665–70; 27 (1902), 576–90; see also E. Seckel in *NA* 29 (1904), 287–94.

[12] Benedict XIV, *De synodo dioecesana libri VIII* (Rome 1748); editio aucta libri XIII (Rome 1756); see also in the literature for this chapter H. Barion, C. de Clercq, and *Feine RG,* para. 21, II.

To be able to take care of his manifold duties, the bishop, in addition to the cooperation of all the clergy, needed special assistants as well as a division of the diocese into smaller areas. *Chorepiscopi* had only a brief importance. Appearing in isolated cases in the West before the eighth century, without it being possible to demonstrate a connection with the *chorepiscopi* that had appeared in the East in the fourth century and worked in the country *(chora)*, they increased in number in the Carolingian period. Their activity depended on the circumstances; they could help the bishops in ordaining and consecrating, in missionary work, or in administration, and in the large dioceses they could even receive their own special territory. Rivalries that could hardly be avoided induced the West Frankish episcopate to liquidate the institution entirely in the second half of the ninth century, whereas the German bishops let it continue into the tenth century.

Among the diocesan clergy the clerics active in the cathedral naturally stood closest to the bishop, at their head the archdeacon and the archpriest. Responsible for disciplinary matters, the administration of property, and the care of the poor, the archdeacon (of the more ancient form) accompanied his bishop on visitations. The archpriest, on the other hand, saw to the liturgy and care of souls at the cathedral and hence was more connected with the city.

The more the diocese grew in size as a consequence of more active colonization and of the permeation of the countryside by the Church, the more necessary it became to break up the diocesan territory into smaller districts. Thus was developed in the seventh and eighth centuries the system of territorially defined baptismal churches, whose direction was entrusted by the bishop to a rural archpriest. But as soon as many smaller parish territories appeared alongside the ancient baptismal churches — there has already been mention of this — they had to be combined in a new unity: hence the origin of the deaneries *(decaniae)*, often in connection with the boundaries of the old baptismal churches. Named by the bishop or the archdeacon, with the participation of the deanery clergy, the dean gathered his priests in the so-called "calendar chapters" to discuss pastoral and disciplinary questions, especially matters of penance. Wherever the old baptismal and original churches remained, a later form of the rural archpresbyterate developed. This was distinguished from the older form by the fact that it comprised a number of smaller parishes with limited rights. In Anglo-Saxon England and in Saxony there was no division into archpresbyterates or deaneries.

Above the deaneries, for matters of jurisdiction and later also of administration, were the archdeaconries, which were to limit the episcopal power of jurisdiction sharply. The more the zeal for reform lagged in the ninth century, the more oppressive the bishops felt the burden of their office to be — a burden they now had to bear on the part not only of the Church but also of the state. From the end of the ninth century they therefore proceeded to appoint archdeacons as ecclesiastical judges in several strictly defined territories and hence in specially created archdeaconries. The process began in the West and then moved slowly eastward until in the twelfth century it reached Salzburg in one direction and Saxony in the other and in the thirteenth century Poland. The new institution was introduced into England by William the Conqueror. The number and size of archdeaconries varied much. Cologne had four, Trier five, Constance ten, Mainz eventually twenty-two, Augsburg eight, but Münster thirty-four, Hildesheim forty, and Halberstadt thirty-eight, for in the Saxon bishoprics the original parishes were usually made archdeaconries. There might also be one single archdeaconry, as in Canterbury. There was an equal variety in regard to the appointing of the archdeacons. In the West German bishoprics, for example, the office was often attached to that of cathedral provost or cathedral dean and the provostship of the great collegiate chapters.

Archdeacons of the later type rose to considerable power. Because important revenues were connected with the judicial system, their office could be regarded as a profitable right and hence as a benefice that could be conferred and handed over by investiture; as a matter of fact investiture did take place in the eleventh century. Once established, the conferring of the office and the ban assured the archdeacon the autonomous position of a *iudex ordinarius,* who possessed his own proper archidiaconal ban and disposed of a staff of officials *(missi, officiales)*. In consequence of his right of visitation he gradually intervened in matters of administration, so that he became a real competitor to the episcopal jurisdiction. It was only from the fourteenth century that the power of archdeacons could be slowly undermined by the bishop with the aid of canon law and finally broken.

Chapter 34

Prelacies and the Secular Powers

The State Church which Constantine the Great and his successors had set up did not simply disappear in the Germanic kingdoms of the period of the migrations but was assimilated to the political and social conditions of the individual countries. In the strict sense, of course, this is true merely of the bishoprics and abbeys, for the papacy stood outside the Germanic political world until the alliance with the Carolingian monarchs and even after the imperial coronation of Charles the Great lost only a part of the autonomy that it had meanwhile acquired. Hence, its juridical position requires separate consideration.

Bishoprics and Abbeys

As with the lesser churches, so also in the case of the greater churches the development must be studied as it occurred in the area of Carolingian Frankish power. When the Carolingian *Imperium* collapsed, the essential had already been achieved: the elaboration of the forms which firmly enclosed bishops and abbots, with their churches, in the political organism. The occasions for this had been, and were to continue to be, on the one hand the state's claims to supremacy, and on the other hand the titles to proprietary churches. The last mentioned applied especially to monasteries, whereas bishoprics, because of their continuing position in public law, could only with difficulty become a part of the proprietary church system. Among the institutions that exerted influence on the incorporation of the greater churches into the political structure three were especially prominent: immunity, royal protection, and *advocatia.* They were all connected with the Church's real estate and manorial lordship.

As a Roman institution that freed the imperial domains from specific payments and public services, the immunity passed to the Frankish royal property and from there, once again in connection with late Roman forms, to other estates that were in the hands of the spiritual and temporal aristocracy and was extended without there having been any declaration as to the positive content of this extension. Privileges of immunity usually included merely the prohibition for state officials to enter the immune district *(introitus),* to collect taxes there *(exactiones),* and to employ the public authority against the inhabitants *(districtio).* There naturally had to be a positive aspect, corresponding to this negative side — the immunist had to exercise certain rights of his own, especially judicial, within his territory. When there was a question of a secular lord, he probably enforced a protectorate which was based on autogenous Germanic law. Hence it was not derived from the crown and from the beginning bore within itself the tendency toward high justice, even though the Merovingian kingship succeeded in restricting it at first to low justice. On the other hand, the rights of lordship of ecclesiastical immunists had a less uniform origin. And even though the Merovingian and early Carolingian monarchs quite often confirmed the immunity of the prohibition of *introitus* in writing, they did not thereby grant any of the state's rights of sovereignty.

But a definitive change appeared under Louis the Pious. From his time immunity and royal protection were connected in charters of immunity. The royal protection elevated the freed churches to a juridical position which was equivalent to that of the secular immunity endowed with autogenous right, but at the same time fitted them into the system of the feudal state. Hitherto the greater number of bishoprics and monasteries that possessed immunity had not stood in the protection or proprietorship of the ruler. But now, by virtue of the connection of royal protection and immunity, they all fell under the dominion of the King, who could thereafter assert a supreme right of ownership, attenuated though it was. From the royal rights over the Church, thus prepared, was to emerge, at least in German territory, the greater churches' position as direct royal vassals and the spiritual principality.

This process began probably in the second half of the ninth century. It was stopped by the counts and princes in West *Francia* from the end of the century, but in Germany Otto the Great and his successors took it up again and continued it consistently. If the immunity of churches had hitherto been restricted to the scope of the lordship of property, thereafter ecclesiastical immunists obtained public rights of a judicial and financial nature, even in places (markets, episcopal cities) and in districts (forests, occasionally entire counties) which they did not possess as manorial lords or possessed only in part. Thus alongside the manorial immunity appeared the ban immunity, which was to contribute substantially to the building of the Church's territorial sovereignty. Furthermore, the immune jurisdiction was strengthened. Its powers were clothed in the forms of the royal ban and slowly led toward sovereign jurisdiction, at first for cases which were expiable by money payments, and probably only from the middle of the twelfth century in the full sense, including criminal justice.[1] Hence, to be an immunity judge became in time a really rewarding and, accordingly, coveted duty. Attended to by the Church's *advocati,* it had a development of its own, differing according to the country.

Already in Roman imperial law the churches had to be represented in court by *advocati,* who, with the decline of the *Imperium,* more and more became episcopal officials. But in the Frankish German world they increased in importance as soon as the protective function proper to the office — in the late Roman period it had been related to the concept of *patronus* — brought into effect the Germanic notion of the *mund* or protectorate. In order to furnish the full protection of rights, the *advocatus* had to be a man capable of bearing arms and fighting and hence a layman; the bearing of arms was forbidden to clerics. Hence in 802 Charles the Great prescribed to all bishops and abbots the naming of *advocati.* As *advocati, agentes, defensores, causidici,* they represented the church in question and its real estate in matters of personal as well as of property rights before the public authority, protected it from without, and exercised the justice pertaining to the church over the peasants. Charles the Great had their activity, like that of the counts, supervised by his *missi.* Nevertheless, the Church's *advocati* functioned, not yet by virtue of the royal or of their own right, but at the order of the bishop or abbot. It was not until the mid-ninth century that the Carolingian *advocatia* of officials began slowly to change into the mediaeval *advocatia* of lords or nobles, for it was then that nobles, often powerful princes, assumed the function, partly asked to do so by churches that needed protection, partly motivated by the desire to extend their power in this way.

---

[1] Thus T. Mayer, *Fürsten und Staat,* 169–84, against H. Hirsch, who had the possession of criminal justice begin with the eleventh century; in the case of poor criminals, who could not raise the considerable expiatory payments, the death penalty, according to Mayer, had indeed been exacted earlier.

Their protection, of course, meant at the same time domination. It is true that this involved a territorially limited development. Italy, except for a few localities in the north under German influence, and West *Francia* south of the line Lyons–Bourges–Orléans–Chartres played no role in it; there the *advocati* remained restricted to their traditional task of representing their churches before the court. And in Normandy the greater power of the Dukes did not permit *advocati* to appear at all. But in the rest of West *Francia* and, from the end of the ninth century, in Germany noble *advocati* exercised various sovereign functions, not seldom to the detriment of the churches concerned. France took the lead but pretty soon found tolerable solutions. The more successfully the princes there constructed their territorial authority, the more willing were they from about the end of the eleventh century to let the *advocatia* of churches become a general grant of protection *(custodia, garde),* in which they strictly bound the sub-*advocati* appointed by them to their rights and duties, with a curtailing of their jurisdiction, and supervised their activity. In Germany, on the other hand, especially in the south and west, economic feudalism reached such a peak that the peasant had almost nothing more to do with the state judge but rather with the *advocatus* of the manorial, spiritual, or temporal immune district and in this way the *advocatia,* both as protective and as judicial *advocatia,* became the dynamic element in the constitutional history of the tenth to the twelfth centuries. Hence, kings as well as spiritual and temporal princes showed an interest in the ecclesiastical *advocatia,* which was regarded as an hereditary fief from the middle of the eleventh century. The German Kings sought to make at least the judicial *advocatia* dependent on a grant by them. The ecclesiastical immunists had especially to come to an understanding with the immediate *advocati.* To a great extent the formation of the future territorial state depended on whether the Church's secular means of power, conferred with the *advocatia,* assisted the noble *advocatus* in the building up of his own political power or the spiritual immunist when the latter withdrew the *advocatia* and had the administration conducted by officials.

Monasteries especially had to suffer much from *advocati*. During the period of the Gregorian Reform, it is true, a quite large number of them succeeded in placing themselves under papal protection and in restricting the hereditary *advocatia* of the founding families, still continuing in practice, to judicial rights, but this by no means ended the struggle. This is attested by the numerous forged charters of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, with which German monks sought to attack, first the *advocatia* system and the proprietary church, then the spiritual proprietors of churches. The new Orders had an easier time. The Cistercian abbeys, for example, were founded without *advocati* from the outset and were placed under the general protectorate, customary in France, of the King or territorial prince.

But the power struggle with the *advocati* had already recommended the appointing of nobles as bishops and abbots. Other circumstances also favoured this. The rising position of the prelates of the realm because of the granting of rights of sovereignty, the strongly graduated social sensitivity, the family policies of the dynasts, and the state policy of the kings — all these conspired to bring it about that in territories of German law the direction of the dioceses and of the important abbeys should regularly be entrusted to a noble.[2]

Nevertheless it is clear enough how different the juridical situation of the bishoprics and abbeys could be. The German royal bishoprics represented something quite different from those under the Capetians or the French princes, and these in turn were distinguished from the South French bishoprics, which were sold, given away, bequeathed, or granted in fief by the counts or viscounts as ordinary proprietary churches. There was a similar gradation among the monasteries, but the situation was the reverse for them. Whereas proprietary bishoprics in the strict sense were confined to the Midi, ordinarily every early mediaeval monastery, at least from around 700, had a proprietor, either from the lesser, middle, or higher nobility, all the way to the king, or from the ecclesiastical hierarchy — bishop or Pope. The higher the rank of the proprietor, the higher became the right, the so-called "liberty", of the churches subject to him.[3] Because of the slight power which the Kings of France possessed in the tenth and eleventh centuries, it made little difference at that time whether a bishopric or monastery depended on him or on a great magnate. In Germany, on the other hand, it really meant something to be directly under the King, to be a church subject to the crown only. For since, after the extinction of the East Carolingians, the entire Carolingian inheritance, regardless whether it was patrimonial or royal property, passed to the now emerging German Kingdom and was entrusted for its administration to the currently reigning King, the Carolingian East Frankish Church, embracing all the bishoprics and the immune abbeys that were under the royal protection, entered as a whole into the new German tribal federation, so that these churches were not property but a part, a member, of the realm and their chiefs later acquired the position of princes of the Empire. It is true that in the Saxon and Salian period, up to 1045, new monasteries were placed under the royal protection, but these royal monasteries, likewise direct royal vassals, did not completely attain the privileged position of the old royal abbeys coming from the Carolingian hereditary estate. Apart from the provost of Berchtesgaden, their abbots did not later become princes but prelates of the Empire.

---

[2] See Chapter 33, footnote 10; L. Santifaller, *Reichskirchensystem,* 123–33, gives a survey of the class relationships of the German bishops.

[3] On the notion of liberty, see *supra,* Chapter 32, footnote 7.

The dependence of the greater churches is probably clearest in the election of the bishops and abbots, for it was precisely here that important sovereign rights had been elaborated in Frankish territory since Merovingian times. Ecclesiastical circles, of course, appealed time and again to the ancient canonical principle of the election of the bishop by clergy and people, *electio canonica,* which was occasionally expressly confirmed in writing for individual churches, especially abbeys, as free election, and in Germany had been granted to all bishoprics. But in early mediaeval society something quite specific had been made out of *electio canonica.* In the late Roman period an effort had been made to subject it to the control of the metropolitan and his suffragans. This in itself happy beginning of a guarantee by the authority of the hierarchy was, however, virtually lost in the Merovingian period and could not be revived under the Carolingians, despite some attempts by the West Frankish archbishops in the ninth century. And so the place of the higher ecclesiastical authority was taken by the King or, in West *Francia* from the end of the ninth century, often by a prince.

From the body of electors, clergy and people, which had become strongly differentiated both socially and juridically, there stood out prominently the cathedral canons and influential lay nobles and vassals of the see. If a real election took place at all, they made the decision, while people and clergy were restricted in practice to giving consent. The more select electoral group was in competition with the ruler who had an interest in the election. Since he belonged to the nobility, his fellow members represented not merely and not always the interests of the church in question but often also those of specific dynastic families and hence were, according to circumstances, more egoistically minded than a ruler concerned for the welfare of the state.

The absence of strict rules permitted a really varied practice, dependent on the concrete situation. Powerful princes virtually had full control of the election of a bishop. When the widowed church was to be again filled depended on their decision, and at times this took place by a mere act of nomination. But if there was an election, then the ruler could determine it by designation or by vindicating a right of confirmation after it had taken place; not infrequently the right of confirmation involved a rejection of the one elected and then, according to circumstances, an arbitrary naming of the bishop. Still, even for the princes there was an insurmountable legal barrier. Since the business of the election was still regarded as a full, active process in which clergy and people participated, an unwanted chief pastor could not be forced upon the diocesans. Regardless of the manner in which clergy and people assented, their assent had to be given somehow; otherwise, the election was uncanonical, invalid.[4]

The situation in regard to abbatial elections was similar and yet different. On the one hand, the real electors, the monks, represented a much more closed corporate body than did clergy and people in episcopal elections, even if the monastery's vassals also had a word to say. On the other hand, an abbey ordinarily depended not merely on the proprietor but also on the diocesan bishop. The abbatial election turned out according to the way in which the various interested parties made their influence prevail. Here the local bishop appointed the new abbot, there the proprietor of the monastery, while only a right of assent was left to the monks. But it also happened that both cooperated with the community or that the monks freely elected their abbot, eventually with the subsequent confirmation of bishop or proprietor, or that the abbot in office designated his successor. Naturally, from time immemorial the monks had exerted themselves for the two last mentioned forms, and they often carried their point wholly or in part, a tradition which the Cluniac reform movement energetically fostered.[5]

Election was followed by installation in office and consecration, two separate acts, which in themselves could be carried out by different representatives of the law. Naturally only bishops were taken into consideration as consecrators, whereas installation in office and in possession presupposed an authority which held rights of domination or of property in regard to the church concerned. In the case of bishoprics these were the kings or the princes who had taken their place; in regard to monasteries, in so far as they had no privileged position, they were the proprietors, that is, kings, princes, nobles, or bishops.

The fact that there was so strong a dependence in law on secular institutions was connected with the circumstances of the time. The more the feudal-vassalage institutions were elaborated and combined into the feudal system under the Carolingians, the more were the bishops and abbots drawn into this system. The important functions which they exercised even in the political field of themselves suggested the idea of binding them to the crown by means of vassalage. A welcome pretext could be found in the royal protection, which was granted to the immune churches from the time of Louis the Pious. As a matter of fact, from then on all bishops and the royal abbots had to commend themselves to the King and in the customary form of the giving of self — the placing of the clasped hands in the open clasping hands of the lord, — which was then followed by the oath of fealty.[6]

---

[4] According to P. Schmid, *Begriff der kanonischen Wahl,* the early mediaeval idea of election must be distinguished from that appearing during the Investiture Controversy by the fact that it held an *electio ex ipsa ecclesia* as necessary. But this principle, coming down in tradition and again inserted into electoral privileges, had more and more lost importance from the end of the ninth century and hence could be infringed by the Ottonian and the early Salian Emperors without any great scruples.

[5] On the efforts of monks to free the election and investiture of the abbot from every outside influence as far as possible, cf. the important treatment, involving all the diplomatic material, by K. Hallinger, "Cluniacensis s. religionis ordinem elegimus. Zur Rechtsfrage der Anfänge des Klosters Hasungen" im *Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz* 8 (1958–1960), 244–60.

But the other propelling force of the feudal system, the *beneficium,* was also to be seen. Not merely Church property but also the office of bishop or abbot was drawn into the wake of the benefice system. Just as in the course of the ninth century, over and above the fiscal goods belonging to the endowment of an office, the very function of count was regarded as a *beneficium* to be conferred by the King and eventually hereditary and was by preference termed *honor,* so also in the ninth century the episcopal function became a profitable right, a domain, an *honor.* This materialization made it possible for the ruler thereafter to convey the *episcopatus,* that is, the office of bishop, with all its rights of ownership, administration, and usufruct, after the manner of a *beneficium* by delivering the symbol of the office, the pastoral staff — the ring was added under Henry III.[7] In the course of time, regularly from the end of the tenth century, this act was termed "investiture". It is true that its juridical character remained a problem, despite the existing undoubted parallel to investiture with a fief. The religious and ecclesiastical essence of the episcopal office was here overlaid by the Germanic law process of materialization, but it was not annulled, so that the Gregorian Reform was able to expose it again to view and limit the crown's right to a mere investiture with the *regalia.* The early mediaeval investiture of bishops and of royal abbots could the more easily appear in a feudal law sense when the vassalage acts of homage and oath of fealty were connected with it. Examined in detail, the causal connection was missing. The vassalage entered into by the higher prelates was not the juridical basis for the conferring of the *beneficium,* but in the tenth and eleventh centuries, when the concept of feudal law was more and more permeating the state and society, who would have distinguished these things carefully?

In a development similar to that of bishoprics, in the case of monasteries the investiture of the abbot by the proprietor came into use, but not a few abbeys succeeded in avoiding an outside investiture. In the latter event, either one of the monks — *praepositus, prior, decanus* — presented the abbot's staff or the newly elected abbot himself took it from the altar.

---

[6] On this development, see, for example, F. L. Ganshof, *Feudalism* (New York, 2nd ed. 1961), 54 ff.; there also the formula of an oath of fealty and a description of the attitude which Hincmar of Reims took to commendation; on the *beneficium* and *honor,* see ibid., 52–56.

[7] V. Habhart, *Zur Rechtssymbolik des Bischofsrings* (Cologne–Graz 1963); P. Salmon, *Mitra und Stab. Die Pontifikalinsignien im römischen Ritus* (Mainz 1960); id., *Études sur les insignes du pontife dans le rit romain. Histoire et liturgie* (Rome 1955); id., "Aux origines de la crosse des évêques" in *Mélanges Mgr. Andrieu* (Strasbourg 1956), 373–83.

Investiture would cost something. Secular vassals on succeeding to their hereditary fiefs ordinarily had to pay to their feudal lord an inheritance fee, the *relevium,* the amount of which was at first decided by an agreement, but later became a fixed charge. In the Germanic notion of law there was no reason to stop short with the investiture of bishops and abbots and to exempt them from the demand for payment. As a matter of fact, such payments were often made. However, canon law was opposed to them; it forbade any introduction of money in the conferring of ecclesiastical offices and denounced it as simony.

Whoever had the right of investiture could, at the death of bishop or abbot, easily claim special rights to the property of the widowed church or of the deceased prelate. In fact, it was often in the interests of the church in question that the use of its property during the vacancy should not be exposed to arbitrariness but should lie in the hands of the King in accord with a somewhat orderly procedure. Difficult as it is to lay hold of the exact juridical origin, still, appropriate rights were developed and took shape as the so-called *regalia* and *spolia.* Already exercised earlier, they were to play a not unimportant role in the twelfth century. Churchmen naturally felt the *ius spolii,* or right to the movable estate of a deceased prelate, to be particularly oppressive, but the *ius regaliae,* or right to the enjoyment of the church revenues during the vacancy, also contained dangers, in so far as the rulers were tempted to postpone the new appointment to the church for an excessively long time for the sake of the income. The Church thus tried to persuade rulers to renounce these claims and was successful to a great extent; Frederick II, for example, did so for the Empire in 1216, except for the revenues from the Empire's rights of sovereignty. But the rights as such were not annulled thereby. They were transferred to ecclesiastical offices and were to acquire a great importance for the papal financial system that was fully developed in the fourteenth century in the claim to *spolia,* to the income during a vacancy, and to annates.

The bonds created by homage on the one hand and investiture on the other gave rise to the performance of services, both personal and real. Just as secular vassals were, so too were the royal prelates bound to fealty to their lord and to provide him with *consilium* and *auxilium,* while the Church property that had been conferred upon them was regarded as belonging to the kingdom and hence as burdened with definite duties. We may summarize all these under the notion *servitium regis.* Bishops and royal abbots were bound to attend court and supply their military contingent, and they had to be prepared to act as envoys of the King, as his chancellor, and the like. Their churches had to bear the expenses of all this. In like manner the royal churches had to supply all the palace clerics who were occupied in chancery and chapel with benefices.[8] A record of 981, luckily preserved, shows how considerable were the army contingents to be supplied by the prelates. For the reinforcements of 2,090 mailed horsemen whom Otto II had requested from Germany twenty lay persons and thirty-one ecclesiastical institutions were enumerated; the lay vassals were to send only 586, the prelates 1,504 men.[9] Another example is also illuminating: When Bishop Wazo of Liège (d. 1048) was reproached for not having fulfilled his military duty in a specific case, he offered in atonement the payment of 300 pounds of silver. Of course, the royal churches were able to comply with their military obligations only by having vassals of their own. The King's right to be lodged by the royal churches on his travels could be very burdensome. Resorted to in Germany only from the time of Henry II but with increasing consistency, it led to the ruler's monopolizing all the rights of sovereignty — court, toll, coinage, customs — during his stay in an episcopal city. Such rights were first limited substantially by Frederick II in 1220. As other burdens could be added annual presents and, in the case of monasteries, precisely fixed annual payments.

So singular a development, running partly counter to the ancient Christian Roman episcopal organization, encountered certain opposition in its earliest phase, and hence in the Carolingian period. Thus in the reign of King Louis III (879–82) the West Frankish episcopate, Hincmar of Reims at its head, fought, not without success, for free episcopal elections. But on the other hand Hincmar fully recognized a royal right of consent, just as he regarded it as a duty of rulers in general to be concerned for the orderly elevation of qualified prelates. In 844–6 Frankish synods granted the King even the right to nominate the bishops to be elected.[10] A like vacillating attitude was taken in regard to the act of installation. It did not occur to Hincmar of Reims to reject commendation as such, but he must have opposed the *immixtio manuum* that was customary in it. And if he wanted the episcopal property to be maintained undiminished by the *oeconomus* during the vacancy, in his view it was still subject to the royal power, was to be handed over by the ruler to the newly elected bishop, and was regarded as a sort of royal *beneficium*. The Popes of that period also did not follow a uniform policy. To their not infrequent declarations in favour of the old electoral regulations, which in some few charters from the end of the ninth century, granting the right of election, among other things attacked the dominant share of Kings, there was opposed the recognition of positive royal rights, for example, the right to permit the election to take place or to permit the consecration — these were acknowledged by Hadrian II and John VIII. And so that John X could declare solemnly that, according to ancient custom, the conferring of a bishopric on a cleric pertained solely to the King and without his command the episcopal consecration might not take place.[11]

---

[8] S. Görlitz, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der königlichen Hofkapelle im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier bis zum Beginn des Investiturstreits* (Weimar 1936); H. W. Klewitz, "Königtum, Hofkapelle und Domkapitel im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert" in *AUF* 16 (1939), 102–56.

[9] *MGConst* I, 632.

[10] Synods of Yütz, Meaux, and Paris, *MGCap* II, 114, 399; on the whole question, cf. K. Voigt, *Staat und Kirche*, 369–78, 388–97.

No doubt the papacy and the West Frankish episcopate were so compliant because in those difficult times, gradually becoming chaotic, the Church needed secular protection and as a matter of fact was always best provided for under a King. But the incorporation of the higher clergy, as it had begun in the ninth century and was thereafter steadily brought to completion, cannot be explained in this way alone. It would hardly have succeeded, had not the royal theocracy furnished the supporting foundation. The theocratic idea not only did not disappear with the dissolution of the Carolingian *Imperium*, but it was even consolidated in the coronation *ordines* which appeared in the ninth and tenth centuries, just as in the iconographic tradition and in general in the thought and feeling of contemporary men. Thietmar of Merseburg reproduced a very widespread sentiment in placing kings above bishops but protesting against any other dependence on the part of bishops, whom Christ has raised up as princes of this earth.[12]

The Papacy and Papal Institutions

The constitutional status of the Pope differed substantially from that of the bishops and abbots. But this does not mean that the Roman Church was entirely independent. We have already discussed the imperial confirmation of the papal election, a right that was originally Byzantine and then was found again under the Carolingians Lothar I and Louis II; likewise the right of the German Emperors to participate in the election discussions in an authoritative manner that was capable of becoming actual designation. However, it must not be forgotten that in the institution of a Roman Bishop the imperial rights did not go beyond the electoral act. No Emperor installed a Pope in his office by means of investiture, not to mention tried to bind him as a vassal by commendation. The views of sovereignty and proprietorship which in the Frankish world more and more fitted bishops and abbots into the political organization were not applied to the Roman Church. Since there was for the Emperors no adequate legal pretext for nullifying the juridical immunity pertaining to the Pope, the above mentioned depositions effected by Otto I and Henry III remained only episodes. Though the Popes may have fallen on occasion into serious dependence, they held to the principle that they stood not under but beside the Emperor. They even possessed an important right in the imperial anointing and coronation, and from 850 on there was no other act whereby the imperial dignity could be transmitted.

---

[11] *Jaffé* 3564, 3565, given in *PL* 132, 806–08, and Santifaller, *Reichskirchensystem*, 118–22.

[12] *Chron.* I, 26, *MGSS rer. Germ.*, ed. Holtzmann, 33f.; on the theocracy, see the literature for Section VII and G. Tellenbach, *Libertas*, 70–76, 85–93.

What enabled the Roman Church to maintain her political freedom was, most important of all, the Papal State, that Central Italian remnant of Byzantine rule, which let the papacy take the place there of the *basileus* and even claim imperial symbols of sovereignty, such as robes of state or tiara and imperial court ceremonial.[13] It is true there was a correlation involved: While the Papal State and the adoption of imperial characteristics greatly preserved the papacy from political subordination, the spiritual authority of the *vicarius Petri* protected the existence of the Papal State, for the motivation of the *Constitutum Constantini* — that the earthly Emperor must possess no power in that place where the heavenly Emperor had installed the head of the Christian religion — had an importance all its own.

Despite imperial protectorate and despotic control by the Roman nobility, the Roman Bishops and their co-workers never gave up the notion of autonomy. This is indicated, for example, by the expression *sacrum palatium Lateranense,* which appeared in the ninth century alongside the customary term *patriarchium* and in the second half of the tenth century even came to the fore. Behind it, of course, were the ideas of the *Constitutum Constantini.* They likewise lived on in the catalogues of judges, — the "older", composed probably between 867 and 877, and the "later", from the first half of the eleventh century, — two literary works which aimed to make the papal dignitaries equal to the officials of the Byzantine imperial court.[14] The clearest sign for the claim to quasi-imperial and hence to an autonomous position must probably have been the imperial symbol of the tiara, expressly mentioned in the *Constitutum.* Sergius III (904–11) is portrayed with it on a silver *denarius,*[15] and there is no basis for regarding the use of it by Sergius as an exception. It was precisely under Sergius III that the domination by the Roman nobility began, but the idea embodied in the tiara was to outlast it and overcome it. Liberated in the period of the Gregorian reform, the Roman Church set about elaborating a thoroughgoing claim to sovereignty over Rome and the Papal State.

Tenaciously as the Roman Church clung to the idea of the Papal State, the reality of the situation was pitiable for by far the greatest part of the period here under consideration. Of course, much may have been let go by default on the part of the Popes, but the chief cause of the failures lay in the existing circumstances. The struggle beginning in the late Roman Empire between the centralization of an imperial official bureaucracy and the decentralizing tendency of a new class of landowners rising through social restratification had led in the Eastern Empire to a predominance of the bureaucratic and in the West of the landowning element. In this a striking middle position had devolved upon the Roman Bishop: as the owner of many *patrimonia* scattered in and outside Italy, he properly belonged among the landlords, while his position of public law, early drawn into the service of the Empire, obliged him to assume specifically political functions for the city of Rome to an increasing extent. So long as Byzantine rule lasted, the extending of the papal rights caused no discord with the Italian landowners, particularly since these were aspiring likewise to lay hands on as many political rights as possible in the territories accessible to them. The change came with the Papal State, for then the hatred of the landed aristocracy was directed against the papal claims to sovereignty, which had replaced the imperial central power. In the struggle that began immediately and lasted until about the death of the Emperor Lambert (898) it was obvious that insufficient secular instruments of power were at the disposal of the Roman Church. Perhaps a firmly unified central government would have been able to solve the difficult problem, but such was simply non-existent.

---

[13] The inner connection between the programme of an autonomous ecclesiastical state, consisting of the remnant of Byzantine rule, and the claim to the symbols of imperial power clearly follows from the *Constitutum Constantini.* For the *Constitutum,* see *supra,* Chapter 10; the text quoted in what follows from the *Constitutum Constantini* in *Mirbt* p. 112, no. 18.

[14] Both lists in P. E. Schramm in *ZSavRGgerm* 49 (1929), 198–232; for the older list a possible dating as late as 962 is discussed by R. Elze in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 29–33.

[15] S. Déer in *ByZ* 50 (1957), 420–27, especially 425.

We are unfortunately very poorly informed about the administrative organization at the Lateran. The *iudices de clero* or *iudices ordinarii* or *iudices palatini* are readily mentioned as the leading departmental heads — a slowly growing group, counting six officers at the beginning of the eighth century and seven in the ninth century, and unified as a college, consisting of the *primicerius, secundicerius, primus defensor, arcarius, saccellarius, nomenculator,* and *protoscriniarius.*[16] Originally these men took care of strictly circumscribed tasks, but in the course of the eighth century they must have become at times less interested in concrete administrative work and more in general policy. An exact dividing up of the work according to departments cannot be demonstrated. What the sources do mention are diplomatic mandates carried out in the name of the Pope and judicial activity in Rome in cases of contentious and voluntary jurisdiction. Furthermore, some palatine judges often played a leading role in Roman insurrections, now as opponents, now as assistants of the then reigning Pope. Likewise in regard to other high officials, such as the *vestararius,* who administered the wardrobe and the uncoined precious metals, or the *vicedominus,* the curator of the Lateran Palace, it must be asked whether their functions did not lose their original character somewhat as early as the eighth century. This in no way excludes the possibility of acquiring important power: in the ninth and tenth centuries the *vestararius* exercised important functions not connected with his office as such.

---

[16] On the first six judges, see *supra,* Chapter 1; the original function of the last palatine judge, the *protoscriniarius,* is disputed. According to H. Breslau, I, 205–08, he was the chief of the urban *tabelliones;* according to Kehr in *AAB* (1926), no. 2, 21, and others, the technical director of the papal chancery. In any event in the tenth and early eleventh centuries he wrote personally a few papal charters. On the problem, see P. Rabishauskas, *Die römische Kuriale,* 69 f.

The constituting of a strong central administration encountered the further insurmountable difficulty that there was no reliable nobility of office. Of course young nobles were expressly trained for the higher administrative career in the *sacrum cubiculum* and enrolled among the clerics by receiving the tonsure or even the lower orders,[17] but this half-clericate remained in final analysis a mere form. It did not prevent the ones concerned from marrying or from pursuing a thoroughgoing family policy, which could very easily include the interests of their blood relatives in the territorial aristocracy. The most profound cause for the weakness of the Papal State is ultimately to be sought in the papacy itself. The Popes would not have been able to force the disintegrated Byzantine provinces into a unity without disavowing their priestly ideals and exalting the desire for power above everything else. The papal election saw to it that such purely worldly-minded men did not ordinarily ascend the throne of Peter; it was concerned chiefly with the Bishop of Rome and not with the secular prince. It goes without saying that political and economic interests also played a great role in it, again to the detriment of the Papal State. At almost every change of pontificate they altered the balance of power. The attendant internal discords undermined the power of the central government. A consistent policy in the Papal State was virtually impossible.

This is the background against which must be viewed the history of the Papal State as it has already been narrated according to the individual epochs up to the middle of the eleventh century. Already under Leo III inner discords led to the reestablishment of an imperial protectorate. Up to a certain point the ninth-century Emperors actually fulfilled the task intended for them, even though Louis II and then more crudely the Spoletan Dynasty more than once injured the interests of the Papal State. The catastrophe approaching from the death of Louis II in 875 set in completely with the death of the Emperor Lambert in 898. When Sergius III returned in 904 after a six-years' exile, the Roman landed aristocracy was definitely victorious. In all branches of the administration, so we may assume, the powers of government were, little by little, wrested from the hands of the Popes, while the manorial-feudal principle gained ground and was consolidated under Alberic. Thereafter the Roman Church was able to manage directly only a few fragments of the old patrimony, situated close to the city; almost all other estates and territories passed in actuality under the control of the nobility. The German Emperors were unable to change this situation; in fact, they probably did not even understand what had recently happened. For they ruled the German Kingdom, a feudally organized political association of persons, on principles different from those which the Byzantine and then the papal bureaucracy sought to apply in the territory of the Papal State.

---

[17] On the *sacrum cubiculum* and the *schola cantorum (orphanotrophium),* see L. Duchesne, *L'état pontificale,* 103–05.

Thus the Roman Church saw herself faced with a new situation. So long as Roman noble families exercised the secular power — by no means always to the detriment of the Church — the papacy had to let things take their course; the interesting effort of Silvester II to introduce feudal bonds in law remained an isolated and ineffective attempt. But in the Pope's own house, the Lateran Palace, the collapse of the old order in the Papal State so hurt the prestige of the traditional offices that the Popes had to come to terms at least there with the exigencies of a changed age. This occurred most fully in the period of the Gregorian reform, but certain initial steps go back to the turn of the tenth and eleventh centuries. They concerned first of all the papal chancery.

As a matter of fact the history of the papal chancery reflects with special clarity the development of the early mediaeval administrative organization in the Lateran. There is no need to discuss here its origin, which perhaps goes back to the third century. The chancery staff was furnished by the ecclesiastical notaries, who had gradually merged into a *schola* under the direction of the *primicerius* and of his deputy, the *secundicerius*. The two chiefs of the *schola* and notaries who were probably expressly selected took care of the chancery business. In the first place were specifically ecclesiastical matters. But the more the patrimony grew and the Roman Church was entrusted with political functions for the city of Rome, the more frequently were questions of secular administration involved; not infrequently ecclesiastical notaries received the management of patrimonies. The notaries obtained their training in the *schola cantorum* or *orphanotrophium*. Although tonsured, they must ordinarily have led the life of married laymen.

The seventh and eighth centuries were an especially productive period for the chancery. The book of formularies, or *Liber diurnus*, must have been drawn up at the beginning of this period in its first version, later to be repeatedly expanded.[18] At the same time much effort was expended on a special official hand; the final form was achieved in the eighth century, hence at the time of the separation from Byzantium, in the so-called *littera Romana*, or "curial hand", a special calligraphic type of the Roman cursive minuscule, which in its solemnity in a sense competed with the Byzantine imperial chancery hand. Probably already well developed before Hadrian I in its essentials, it was used exclusively for papal charters to the end of the tenth century, then in the next century alongside the triumphantly advancing Carolingian minuscule, until eventually it was given up.

---

[18] Editions: of the Vatican codex by T. Sickel (Vienna 1889); of all three codices by H. Foerster (Bern 1958); the best guides to the many studies and the problems are L. Santifaller in *HZ* 161 (1940), 542–58, and, in *Wattenbach-Levison*, the supplement by R. Bucher, "Die Rechtsquellen", 55–57.

Thanks to the *privilegia,* a form of charter introduced under Hadrian I and standing in contrast to the letters, the chancery personnel moved out of anonymity. For in them the writer named himself — *notarius, scriniarius, notarius et scriniarius sanctae romanae ecclesiae,* or, later, *sacri Lateranensis palatii* — and so did an official of higher rank, who with his own hand added the great final dating and thus affixed to the privilege a sort of official recognition. He was either one of the above mentioned palatine judges or the *bibliothecarius,* whose office began at the end of the eighth century. Ordinarily, the *bibliothecarius* was a bishop, though, by way of exception, the celebrated Anastasius, who was appointed by Hadrian II but had already participated in the composing of letters under Nicholas I, was an abbot. It is not possible that seven palatine judges and a librarian who was in competition with them could have directed the papal chancery in the strict sense. In order to understand their functions we must probably diminish the far too elevated ideas which are entertained even today about the operation of the papal chancery at that time. The *notarii et scriniarii* must have done the real work, while the high ranking *datores* added the final official touches to the engrossed charter and hence performed a formal act that was indeed honourable and finally profitable but required little knowledge. Such an organization quite easily proved to be inadequate as soon as the charters or letters to be formulated went beyond the sphere of the routine. This was true especially of difficult ecclesiastical matters. The chancery officials, who, except for the librarian, actually belonged to the laity, were certainly not sufficiently equipped to deal with them. But if the *dictatores* of charters and letters were most probably appointed according to circumstances, regardless whether they pertained to the chancery or not, then the chancery must to a great extent have lacked inner cohesion.

Patrimonial and political duties of administration had enabled the lay element in the chancery to rise. Hence the more the worldly property of the Roman Church declined, the greater the difficulties which the palatine judges and notaries must have encountered. Probably in decline as early as the ninth century, the palatine judges were entirely deprived of their position at the Lateran in consequence of the domination by the Roman nobility that was then beginning, so that toward the end of the tenth century they lost even the right to the dating of privileges, which they had hitherto maintained, though at times with difficulty, *vis-à-vis* the competing librarian. What they saved was, on the one hand, trivial honourary rights in the papal court ceremonial and, on the other hand, their judicial competence for Roman civil trials, which they exercised to the end of the twelfth century.

The process of decay affected the institution of chancery notaries in so far as there was at times less to do. Hence the officials began at the same time to compose Roman private documents and thus gradually to turn into the *schola tabellionum urbis*. Whenever this development began, in the tenth century or earlier, in any case it caused the end of the ecclesiastical and papal notariate, so that now the papal chancery definitely approximated the primitive situation then existing in the chanceries of secular rulers. Since thereafter it did not dispose of a completely organized staff, it all the more urgently needed a man who would concern himself with the current business and have sufficient authority to put his assistants in motion. At the royal court this person was the chancellor. Hence it should be noted that at the end of the tenth century a *cancellarius sacri palatii* likewise appeared in the Lateran Palace.

There have been many conjectures as to the origin and competence of this new official.[19] Like the chancellor functioning at secular courts, he is probably to be regarded as the actual director of the entire business of papal diplomatics, who left to the librarian little more than a sort of honourary presidency, so that in 1023 Benedict VIII could, without difficulty, grant the library to Archbishop Pilgrim of Cologne. Apparently, the chancellor saw to everything: the dictating; the fair copy, which at times he took care of personally, but ordinarily entrusted to a select urban *scriniarius,* who was perhaps in a loose relationship of employee, or, in cases where secrecy was to be maintained under certain circumstances, to a palatine cleric; and finally the official engrossment. Actually, the great dating, in itself the right of the librarian, was not infrequently added by the chancellor. The attempt of the Bishop of Silva Candida to secure the direction of the chancery for his see forever led in 1037, after Pilgrim's death, to a fusion of library and chancery, but the stipulated connection with Silva Candida fortunately was not permanent. Except for brief interruptions, the chancellor-librarians continued to be named by the reigning Pope; they were dedicated deacons or priests, who slowly built up a new chancery organization conducted by clerics and developed new types of charters. In this way the urban *scriniarii* were left completely behind. They were, it is true, still called upon for the engrossing of papal privileges issued in Rome, but this regard for a traditional right had to come to an end some day, and it did so when in April 1123 the Frenchman Aimeric assumed the chancellorship.

Chapter 35

Metropolitans, Primates and Papacy

The groupings of the ecclesiastical hierarchy above the diocesan level in the West fell victim to a great extent to the political chaos of the seventh and eighth centuries. The struggle with Slavs and Avars had dreadful consequences in Noricum, Pannonia, Illyricum, Thrace, and Greece, while in Gaul under the last Merovingians the churches were so ruthlessly plundered by the magnates that the metropolitan groupings crumbled and not a few bishoprics remained unoccupied. Western Christendom suffered its cruellest blows from Islam, whose domination produced in time the total ruin of the episcopal organization in North Africa and later in Sicily and its partial collapse in Spain. The withdrawal of Africa and Spain, with their self-conscious churches governed by their respective primates, meant for the Christian West the loss of a good bit of ancient Christian tradition. All the more strongly then there moved into the field of vision the institution which had held to its ancient right not merely in principle but had impressively emphasized it in the Anglo-Saxon, Frisian, and Central German mission field by the founding of bishoprics, and in England even of metropolitan sees: the papacy. Of course it was unable to develop freely. More than ever before, the crown drew the ecclesiastical hierarchy into the service of the state, and even in the purely inner ecclesiastical sphere there was no lack of forces that opposed the Roman claims. Hence, in the period to be discussed here, the relations between the papacy and the episcopate were subject to a certain amount of conflict. And yet substantial decisions were made at that time. Whereas the passage of time greatly weakened the ancient rights of metropolitans and did not permit any genuine supermetropolitan organizations, such as territorial primacies, to appear at all, it could do nothing that was essentially detrimental to the papacy, based on divine right. And so there was made ready the ecclesiastical development that was to begin with the Gregorian reform.

---

[19] For what follows, R. Elze in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 38–40; P. Rabishauskas, *op. cit.* 89–100.

Metropolitan Organization

The ancient Christian metropolitan organization emerged, as such, out of the collegiality of the episcopate in the apostolic succession, without any direct action on the part of the Holy See, even though it had to be in communion with the successor of Peter and to that extent the unifying function of the Roman primacy was given recognition. Through this autogenous origin the metropolitan organization differed essentially from the apostolic vicariates of Thessalonica and Arles, which the papacy set up in the fifth century as its deputy courts with delegated authority and which had virtually ceased to operate in the sixth and seventh centuries. The metropolitan organization was, at least in the West, preponderantly collegial. The highest tribunal was the provincial synod, at which the metropolitan was not much more than the chairman. He convoked it, directed it, and supervised the implementation of its decrees. But his right of supervision could be extended so that he visited the bishoprics and controlled the administration of a widowed diocese. The Western provincial synods were competent for legislation as well as for administration and justice. For example, they erected new dioceses, played a decisive role in the instituting of new bishops, in exceptional cases permitted the transfer of a bishop to another see, brought accused *episcopi comprovinciales* before their court, and, according to circumstances, deposed them. However, their activity could be limited by higher tribunals. In Italy the Pope's position as territorial primate conferred preponderance on the Roman Synods; in North Africa the same was true of those convoked by the Bishop of Carthage. A supermetropolitan synodal practice had also developed powerfully in Visigothic Spain.[1] In addition to and above all these groupings there was, of course, the Holy See, bearer of the universal primacy and at the same time of the patriarchate of the West.

This juridical situation, now sporadic to a great extent, had to be put in motion again as soon as, in the Carolingian *Imperium,* the ecclesiastical provinces were restored in the heart of the Christian West or were established for the first time, as in Austrasia. The mere fact that Charles the Great carried out the hierarchical organization in agreement with the Holy See indicates how very much the situation had changed. Whereas in Christian antiquity dioceses and provinces were set up by the episcopate, in the future they resulted from the cooperation of the secular and of the papal authority, and in this the juridically decisive act, the canonical erection, pertained to the Holy See. The Carolingians probably saw the advantage of ecclesiastical provinces to lie chiefly in the fact that the episcopate was organized and hence could more easily be fitted into the unity of the Empire. To them what mattered most in the final analysis was an imperial episcopate as compact as possible. They summoned it to the great imperial synods to regulate there the more important ecclesiastical questions. The result was that provincial synods declined in importance; in fact the Western practice of meeting once a year was allowed more and more to fall into desuetude.

As has already been explained, the decay of the Carolingian Empire induced the rulers to an even greater degree to make the instituting of bishops dependent upon themselves. They thereby deprived the metropolitan group of an important right. As late as the time of Hincmar of Reims the Frankish metropolitans used to dispatch one of their suffragans to the widowed diocese as visitor, and the election took place under his supervision. There followed the examination of both the election and the elect by metropolitan and suffragans, confirmation by the metropolitan, and finally consecration. At that time the West Frankish episcopate even sought to establish a sort of right of devolution: in the event of a misuse of the right of election by clergy and people, metropolitan and suffragans were to be permitted to designate the new bishop themselves.[2] This claim was aimed chiefly at the designation by the King, which had meanwhile made its appearance. Although on occasion it could be enforced by strong personalities of the type of Hincmar, all such efforts were rendered ineffectual by the constantly growing chaos. The naming of the bishops became of so much importance for the secular princes in their power struggle that it virtually passed into their hands, while the rights of the metropolitan group were restricted in practice to the consecration of the bishop-elect, who had already been invested, and to the related ceremony of the *scrutinium*.

---

[1] On Carthage and Toledo, cf. H. Fuhrmann, "Patriarchate" in *ZSavRGkan* 70 (1953), 139–47; on the above mentioned vicariates of Arles and Thessalonica, cf. ibid. 147–76.

Not only the secular rulers but also the bishops contributed to the weakening of the metropolitan constitution. The decline of the practice of holding synods on the one hand and, on the other, the enhanced prestige which the metropolitans possessed by virtue of the new title of archbishop and of the pallium, now pertaining to them, caused the West Frankish archbishops to try to consolidate their position in the sense of a superiority of jurisdiction with regard to the *episcopi comprovinciales,* for whom the significant expression *suffraganei,* or assistants, began to come into use from the close of the eighth century. The conflict erupting between Hincmar of Reims and his suffragans, some of whom appealed to the Pope, would have acquired no very special importance, had it not left its mark in the letters of the Popes, especially of Nicholas I, and above all in the pseudo-Isidorean decretals. The compilers of pseudo-Isidore were at pains to limit the powers of archbishops from below and at the same time from above: from below, by making the synodal procedure for the trials of suffragans as difficult as possible; from above, by enhancing the papal authority. Referring to the Council of Sardica, which had provided the Holy See as the court of final appeal for accused bishops, and to the demand of Innocent I that all *causae maiores* were to be sent to Rome, they had recourse to forged texts to make the right precise in the sense that the bishop could appeal to the Holy See at any stage of the process, and the Pope thus appealed to could at once summon the case before his tribunal, that synodal judgments handed down in regard to bishops needed to be approved by the Pope, and that, by *causae maiores,* for which Rome was to be competent, were to be understood especially matters affecting bishops. They installed a further guarantee by giving the widest possible interpretation of the claim long made by the papacy to the convoking and confirming of general councils and thereby subordinated much that had to do with synods to the Holy See.[3] Nicholas I did not neglect to make use of the new principles, which approximated his own ideas. Neither he nor pseudo-Isidore had his own way, but their claims continued to be influential. They left more or less strong, direct or indirect traces in almost every pre-Gregorian canonical collection, outside South Italy, not to mention the Gregorian reform movement, which took up pseudo-Isidore and to some extent the letters of Nicholas I and gave them special prominence.

---

[2] Important texts from the works of Hincmar of Reims in *PL* 126, 190–97 (especially 194 C–D, 260 C–D), 311 D; on Hincmar, see H. G. J. Beck in *CHR* 45 (1959f.), 273–308; on the whole question, P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les élections épiscopales,* 195–209. Toward the end of the century individual archbishops tried to get full control of the elections of their suffragans; cf. also Dumas in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 212–15. The basic idea of creating a right of devolution was taken up by the Roman Synod of 1080; see the *Registrum* of Gregory VII, 14a, no. 6 (Caspar's edition, 182).

Finally, the metropolitan right was turned in a new direction by the stronger connection of the archbishops with Rome by means of the pallium. This liturgical mark of honour, probably originating in the Byzantine court ceremonial, in the West belonged properly to the Pope, but was given by him to other individual bishops as a special mark of favour.[4] Originally it possessed no juridical significance. It is true that the evangelization of the Anglo-Saxons led Gregory the Great, Boniface V, and Honorius I to grant the pallium to the archbishops designated as heads of the mission and, in connection with it, the right to consecrate their future suffragans. And Gregory III referred to this practice in connection with the appointing of Saint Boniface as missionary archbishop.[5] But these were special measures, which had nothing to do with the ordinary form of conferring the pallium. It was only the custom, appearing from the end of the eighth century, of honouring all metropolitans with both the archiepiscopal title and the pallium, on the Anglo-Saxon model, that led to changes. The papacy now transformed the bestowing of the pallium on archbishops into an act which was the equivalent of confirmation and afforded the possibility of deriving the metropolitan authority from that of the Pope.

The new norms drawn up by Rome obliged every newly elevated archbishop to ask for the pallium within three months and in that connection to submit his profession of faith. Before the reception of the pallium — and we here touch the decisive point — he was neither to officiate at the consecration of suffragans nor to occupy the throne. The juridical sense of the last mentioned requirement cannot be determined exactly from the extant ninth-century sources, but in the tenth century several pallium privileges make known that by this symbol the Pope intended to grant the right to consecrate suffragans. In the same manner the right to the title of archbishop was also occasionally connected with the granting of the pallium, and in a privilege granted by John XIX rights typical of legates were appended for the first time: to have the cross borne ahead of one, to ride a horse caparisoned in red on feast days, to decide urgent cases that pertained of themselves to the Holy See.[6] Thus the pallium developed in time more clearly into a symbol of metropolitan authority. The conferring of the pallium made the archbishop seem ever more like the Pope's deputy with a delegated share in the universal primacy, a view which was in fact slowly to establish itself after the middle of the eleventh century. Before then it did not achieve general acceptance. John VIII complained about West Frankish archbishops who consecrated suffragans before obtaining the pallium,[7] and the chaos that followed him was certainly not the time for enforcing a better discipline. On the whole, this was of little importance. No movement of opposition in principle, based on ideas, resulted. The majority of the archbishops must have observed the Roman prescriptions. Even the idea, appearing with the conferring of the pallium, of a participation in the primacy seems to have been assimilated by them. It appears thus in a forged papal privilege, drawn up under Archbishop Frederick of Salzburg, probably in 974–77:[8] "Petri Apostoli successores per loca . . . constituerunt archiepiscopos qui eorum vices tenerent in ecclesiis." The identification, here realized, of archbishop and apostolic vicar must have shown that a characteristic feature of the ancient Christian metropolitan constitution, that is, its autogenous origin, based on the collegiality of the episcopate, had disappeared from the living consciousness of Western Christendom. The victory of the Roman idea was only a question of time.

---

[3] On pseudo-Isidore and Nicholas I, see the bibliography in *Feine RG,* para. 17, II (end); the forgers probably intended to concede to the Pope in principle a right to convoke national synods but confined this, in regard to provincial synods, to specific cases, especially to synodal processes against bishops; thus H. Barion, *Synodalrecht,* 370–73; cf. also ibid., 377–82, and S. Kuttner, *StudGreg,* II (1947), 392, footnote 20.

[4] Indispensable for the pallium, even though not always to the point, is J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung in Occident und Orient* (Freiburg 1907), 620–76; C. B. Graf von Hacke, *Die Palliumverleihungen bis 1143* (Göttingen 1898); on the origin in the Byzantine court ceremonial, see T. Klauser, *Der Ursprung der bischöflichen Insignien und Ehrenrechte* (Krefeld n. d.), 18–22.

[5] *Jaffé* 1829, 2006, 2020, 2239.

Primates, Apostolic Vicars, Legates

The missionary activity of Willibrord and Boniface and the beginning of a Frankish Church reform induced the Popes in the eighth century to bestow on individual bishops the supermetropolitan dignity of archbishop and the authority of a vicar. These expedients became unnecessary when Charles the Great re-established the metropolitan organization: metropolitan function and archiepiscopal dignity were united. The creating of supermetropolitan tribunals was thereafter thwarted, even though two Carolingian Emperors and later several archbishops tried it. It was probably due to the initiative of the Emperor Lothar I that in 844 Sergius II entrusted Bishop Drogo of Metz with a vicariate over all the transalpine ecclesiastical provinces, and

---

[6] *Germania Pontificia,* I, no. 37; *Salzburger Urkundenbuch,* II, no. 74.

[7] *MGEE* V, no. 120, 110; no. 99, 93; Synod of Ravenna, c. 1, *Mansi* XVII, 337; P. Grierson, "Rostagnus of Arles and the Pallium" in *EHR* 49 (1934), 74–83.

[8] *Germania Pontificia,* I, no. 35, *PL* 135, 1081; on the forgery, see A. Brackmann in *Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Germania Pontificia,* I (Berlin 1912), 93–103.

Charles the Bald, after his imperial coronation, secured a similar privilege for Archbishop Ansegis of Sens from John VIII. Both arrangements at once collapsed on the resistance of the episcopate. In the very lifetime of Ansegis, Rostagnus of Arles requested and obtained the vicariate for Gaul. In the tenth century also other prelates received by papal charters the supermetropolitan authority of a primate, apostolic vicar, or legate, or claimed a primacy on their own. Thus the following claims were confirmed by the Holy See: that of Mainz to the vicariate and legateship for Germany and for Lotharingian Gaul; that of Trier for the same; that of Magdeburg for the primacy in the lands to the right of the Rhine and for equality with the other archbishops in the lands to the left of the Rhine. Sens is said to have claimed the primacy granted to Ansegis over Gaul and Germany to the end of the tenth century, but this is doubtful. And in 1049 the Archbishop of Reims came forward with the claim that he was the primate in Gaul. But the very opposition in which the charters or the claims stood to one another shows the unimportance in practice of the prerogatives contained in them. Besides, any clear juridical form was absent from the primatial rank that was sought at a given time.

Fundamentally, there was only a single consistently constructed doctrine in regard to primates, and it was based on the fabrication of the pseudo-Isidorean forgeries. The better to limit the power of metropolitans from above, it created from nothing a primate-patriarch as a supermetropolitan court of appeal with very few rights. Its fabricated examples were taken from the ancient Roman provincial divisions contained in the *Notitia Galliarum*. Since every province was divided into subdivisions, for example, Belgica Prima and Belgica Secunda, the bishop of the *sedes prima,* that is, the metropolitan of the first subdivision, was declared to be the primate-patriarch over the metropolitans of the other subdivisions. Theutgaud of Trier, whose see was indeed the metropolis of Belgica Prima, at once seized upon this idea. But he was outfoxed by Hincmar of Reims, who now, in a smooth reversal of the pseudo-Isidorean idea, had himself confirmed by the Popes as primate of Belgica Secunda, that is, of his own province. Not until 200 years later did the wish of the forgers seem to be fulfilled — their primatial construction was accepted and realized. But, of course, the churches so distinguished obtained nothing or very little more than an honourary rank.

The Papacy

The more the Eastern and the Western halves of the Church drew apart, politically and intellectually, in the eighth and ninth centuries, the more clearly was the Roman Church confined to the Germanic-Romance West. This implied a decisive turn in the development of the Roman Primacy. In the West there was no longer an Emperor nor was there a Patriarch who could have played the role of a rival ecclesiastical authority *vis-à-vis* Rome. Due to the patriarchate of the West and at the same time to the universal primacy, which eclipsed and, so to speak, absorbed the patriarchal authority, the Roman Bishop occupied, without challenge, the first place within the Western hierarchy. The Germanic peoples felt a special veneration for the successor of Peter. From the fifth century there had developed, inside and outside Rome and not least of all in Merovingian Gaul, a Peter cult, which centred around the Petrine power of binding and loosing and honoured the Prince of the Apostles as the gatekeeper of heaven; this cult was carried to the Anglo-Saxons by the Roman missionaries. Though not of specifically Germanic, not to mention Anglo-Saxon, origin,[9] it had an especially powerful appeal for the ingenuous Germans. Furthermore, it was of advantage to the Roman Church to be regarded as mother of all Western churches. The notion, already expressed by Innocent I[10] and quickly elaborated into legend in ecclesiastical Gaul, included many churches of Neustria and, in Austrasia, especially Trier and Cologne in the eighth and ninth centuries. All of them attributed their founding to men whom either Peter or his successor Clement had sent out or to disciples of Paul, until in the tenth century individual West Frankish sees proceeded to derive their origin, no longer from Rome, but from the group of the Lord's seventy-two disciples.[11]

The legends pointing to Rome were able to attest virtually nothing, and the cult of Peter very little that was definite, in regard to the prerogatives of the Holy See. Even the universal primacy, based on divine right and resolutely defended by West Frankish theologians against Photius,[12] needed a more exact formulation by the positive *ius ecclesiasticum* promulgated by man.[13]

---

[9] Thus T. Zwölfer, *Sankt Peter, Apostelfürst und Himmelspförtner. Seine Verehrung bei den Angelsachsen und Franken* (Stuttgart 1929), and, following him, *Haller* I, ixf., 467–71, with the thesis of the Germanic cult of Peter originating among the Anglo-Saxons, which was grafted like a strange shoot on to the idea of the primacy and thus revived it. Both authors were corrected by K. Hallinger, "Römische Voraussetzungen der bonifatianischen Wirksamkeit im Frankenreich" in *St. Bonifatius. Gedenkgabe* (Fulda 1954), 320–61; E. Ewig, "Der Petrus- und Apostelkult im spätrömischen und fränkischen Gallien" in *ZKG* 71 (1960), 215–51; id., "Die Kathedralpatrozinien im römischen und fränkischen Gallien" in *HJ* 79 (1960), 1–61; F. Susman, "Il culto di S. Pietro a Roma dalla morte di Leone M. a Vitaliano 461–672" in *ADRomana* 84 (1961), 1–192; cf. also J. Szöverffy, "St. Peter in Medieval Latin Hymns" in *Tr* 10 (1954), 275–322.

[10] *Jaffé* 311; *PL* 20, 551f.

[11] For France, Dumas in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 179–86; cf. also E. Ewig, "Kaiserliche und apostolische Tradition im mittelalterlichen Trier" in *Trierer Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst* 24–26 (1956–58), 147–86; *Geschichte des Erzbistums Köln,* I, revised by W. Neuss and F. W. Oediger (Cologne 1964).

[12] Ratramnus, *Contra Graecorum opposita* in *PL* 121, 334–46; Aeneas of Paris, *Liber adversus Graecos,* cap. 187–209 in *PL* 121, 748–59.

[13] Whoever of the mediaeval authors had in view the primatial privileges of positive law did not at all have to deny the divine-law basic character of the Roman Primacy. The absolute antithesis of the two views in the form of a "Leonine" and of a "Cyprianic" type in the work

Here slight time-conditioned circumstances or even fundamental differences of opinion were influential. The papacy experienced this when, under Nicholas I, it not only took up the old tradition in its entirety but also tried energetically to carry it on. It aimed to assimilate the primatial claim to the new situation upon which it had entered at the beginning of the Carolingian period.

That this initiative was up-to-date is shown by the pseudo-Isidorean decretals, which, independently of Rome, were driving in the same direction. And still, insurmountable obstacles stood in the way. Even if the bishops did not presume to deny the basis in the divine law of the pre-eminence claimed by Nicholas, they were still aware that, as successors of the Apostles, they possessed a power which likewise went back to Christ. Thus was revived the ancient question, not clarified in early Christian times, of the relationship between the primatial and the episcopal power. The intellectual abilities then at hand were not in a position to solve it. The new claims of the Pope found all the less sympathy in that men of the early Middle Ages had a static juridical interpretation, which stubbornly defended the old law. Then, when, with the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire, political chaos set in, the successor states were established, and the papacy, humiliated under the domination of the Roman nobility, was deeply degraded, the initiative of Nicholas I became a thing of the past. But the past could continue to have influence. It certainly did in this case, even though to a degree that differed according to countries and personalities.

If we examine the canonical collections of that period,[14] two South Italian works, influenced by Greek notions of the Church, stand out as foreigners: the *Collectio IX librorum* (c. 920–930), and the *Collectio V librorum* (c. 1020). The typically Western compilations ordinarily hold fast to the Roman tradition; that is, they recognize in the Pope an ecclesiastical supremacy that was established by Christ. But with regard to the concrete rights of the papacy, they display considerable differences. Thus, for example, the *Collectio Anselmo dedicata,* compiled at Milan soon after 882, interprets the papal power as broadly as possible, following pseudo-Isidore, whereas Burchard of Worms in his decree (1025) observes definite limits determined by the claims of the episcopate; this in turn induced the probably South German compiler of the *Collectio XII partium* to stress the primacy more strongly. In the substantial treatises which Auxilius composed at the beginning of the tenth

---

of Klinkenberg cited in the Literature is therefore inadmissible in method, not to mention the scarcely convincing interpretations of individual passages; cf. also the criticism by H. Keller in *DA* 20 (1964), 354, footnote 134.

[14] On the mostly unpublished canonical collections, see *Fournier-LeBras* I (Paris 1931); Burchard's *Decretum* in *PL* 140, 537–1058; cf. A. M. Koeniger, *Burchard von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit* (Munich 1905); on the manuscript circulation of the *Decretum,* O. Meyer in *ZSavRGkan* 55 (1935), 141–83; F. Pelster, *MiscMercati,* 114–57; *StudGreg* I (1947), 321–51; on the acceptance of the *Decretum* in Italy, C. C. Mor, *ibid.* 197–206.

century in defence of the Formosan ordinations[15] there are even two views of the papal primacy to be met — an extremely papalist and a moderate.

In order to find a firm support in the confusing picture, the viewpoint of Burchard of Worms, and hence of the most successful author, should be briefly sketched. Despite a disputed passage[16] there can be no doubt that Burchard did not represent an episcopalist system but accepted a genuine Roman primatial power as founded by Christ. In his view the Pope was the highest tribunal for *causae maiores* and in particular in regard to controversies among bishops; his decretals occupied a special place among the sources of the law; he had the right to summon and confirm general councils; the tradition of the Roman Church was binding; canonical books were subject to her approval; synodal judgments on bishops were subject to the reservation, *salva in omnibus apostolica auctoritate;* bishops could appeal to the Holy See, and the Pope could depose or appoint bishops; transfers of bishops needed the consent of the provincial episcopate or of the Holy See. On the other hand, Burchard was unwilling to admit a direct papal power of jurisdiction over the individual faithful, except to a limited extent.

Other collections went further, teaching, for example, the infallibility of the Roman Church; the immunity of the Pope from judgment unless he was a heretic;[17] his right, in case of need, to modify old canons or to lay down new norms, to ordain the clerics of any church whatsoever, to absolve from all sins and from oaths, and so forth. Furthermore, the inherited sanctity of the *vicarius Petri* must have had defenders at the time of Auxilius, since he wrote against it.[18] What we are here listing concisely from sources of differing worth and of differing content must have shown at least that the stream of tradition relevant to the Roman Primacy divided to form a delta, but flowed on and, to a great extent, together with pseudo-Isidore and other more ancient sources, emptied directly into the Gregorian reform movement.

The canonical collections were the works of scholars, which did not by any means have to be in accord with juridical practice. Only the concrete activity of the Holy See can give us an idea of what the primacy then actually meant. Mention has already been made of a powerful increase in Rome's authority. While the endeavour, beginning in the ninth century, to bind the archbishops more firmly to the Holy See by means of the pallium was not a complete success, the papacy became the ecclesiastical court which, together with the secular rulers, decided the founding of episcopal and metropolitan sees, not always to the satisfaction of the episcopate. Thus the Synod of Tribur in 895 referred harshly to the "iugum vix ferendum", which it said the Holy See imposed,[19] not least of all because the Roman decisions in regard to the archbishopric of Hamburg-Bremen were displeasing to the Archbishop of Cologne and his friends.

---

[15] Auxilius, *In defensionem sacrae ordinationis papae Formosi,* ed. E. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius* (Leipzig 1866), 59–105; *De ordinationibus a Formoso papa factis* in *PL* 129, 1059–74; to be supplemented by E. Dümmler, *ibid.* 107–16; *Infensor et defensor* in *PL* 129, 1074–1102. At least the second work was known to both Peter Damiani and Humbert of Silva Candida; cf. J. Ryan, *Saint Peter Damian and his Canonical Sources* (Toronto 1956), 162–64.

[16] I, c. 3, *PL* 140, 549f.; better than the episcopalist interpretation of Koeniger (*supra,* footnote 14), 60, is that of P. Fournier, "Le Décret de Bourchard de Worms" in *RHE* 12 (1911), 470, footnote 1.

[17] The heresy stipulation was expressed clearly at the Roman Council of 869 and in Auxilius; cf. also J. Ryan in *MS* 20 (1958), 222–24, and S. Lindemanns, *La primauté du pape.* Nicholas I regarded the decrees of his predecessors as binding only in so far as they were orthodox at death; thus A. Greinacher, *Die Anschauungen des Papstes Nikolaus I.* (Berlin–Leipzig 1909), 15.

[18] Auxilius, *In defensionem sacrae ordinationis papae Formosi,* ed. Dümmler, 81–84; from the cited work of Lindemans, with his kind permission.

Growing prestige no doubt brought about the relationship which the Holy See gained with regard to the monks. Even in antiquity the incorporation of the monastic communities into the diocesan organization had brought on difficulties with the bishops. It was universally recognized that the Church's sacramental and disciplinary power in regard to monks pertained to the episcopate; until the turn of the tenth to the eleventh century there was probably not a single monastery, not excepting Bobbio and Fulda, that had been withdrawn by a papal privilege of exemption from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the *ordinarius loci*.[20] But from about the seventh century the Popes had issued charters of protection to individual monasteries in order to guarantee their property against alienation or pillage. Rulers did the same. It has already been explained how very much Louis the Pious strengthened his rule over bishoprics and monasteries by the combining of immunity and royal protection. The more the West Frankish royal power now declined, the more often did the monasteries of that kingdom seek papal protection; some of them, by commendation, even became the property of the Roman Church. This example was imitated. In the course of the tenth and especially of the eleventh century Italy, France, Germany, and the March of Spain were covered with a network of monasteries under papal protection or papal ownership. The initiative was taken, not by Rome, but by the monks, who especially looked for assistance against interference by bishops. Then, when around 1000 the papacy began to exempt individual favoured monasteries from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop, Rome's primatial claim and monasteries' efforts for exemption coalesced into a real community of interests. In the monastic world, especially of France and to some extent of Italy, there now arose particularly zealous defenders of the Roman prerogatives. Abbot Abbo of Fleury (988–1004) is a typical example. Not only in his struggles for the privileges of his monastery, which he fought out with the episcopate, but also in the troubles at Reims, to be discussed later, and in his writings, above all his *Compilatio canonum,* he again and again stressed the authority of the Holy See.

---

[19] Tribur, c. 30, *Mansi* XVIII, 147; *MGCap* II, 230f.

[20] Thus Schwarz, *ZSavRGkan* 76 (1959), 34–98. It would not be surprising, then, that Burchard of Worms passed over in silence in his *Decretum* the exemptions that first appeared in his time.

An innovation of the utmost importance appeared in the field of cult at the end of the tenth century. In 993 Bishop Ulric of Augsburg (d. 973) was canonized by Pope John XV at a Roman Synod. Soon after, John XVIII canonized Martial of Limoges, and then Benedict IX did the same for the Trier hermit, Simeon of Syracuse. Thereafter the Popes elevated saints in increasing numbers to the honours of the altar; bishops and synods continued to do the same until under Innocent III the Holy See reserved this right to itself and firmly established it in the decretals of Gregory IX (1234). This was the final result of a two-centuries' development, which belief in Peter, living on in the papacy, had prepared. How powerful this belief must have been, when it looked to the papacy, precisely at the period of its deepest humiliation, for the first time as the especially secure guarantor of the cult of new saints!

The veneration of Peter had long been active in the penitential discipline. Not a few Christians felt themselves drawn irresistibly to Rome to ask absolution of their sins from the vicar of the keeper of the keys and of the gate of heaven. If there was question of serious crimes, bishops were glad to send the guilty to the Pope, because they attributed to him a more certain judgment or even a greater authority. Basically they acknowledged thereby that the Holy See possessed a jurisdiction over all the faithful. Of course, strict legal norms were lacking; there were neither sins that were reserved to the Pope at that time nor a rule about cases already decided by the local bishop and then sent to Rome. This led to a sharp collision between Benedict VIII and Archbishop Aribo of Mainz.[21]

After the marriage of the Count of Hammerstein had been dissolved by a synodal decree on account of consanguinity, and excommunication had been decreed against the recalcitrant couple, the Countess Irmingardis appealed to the Pope in 1023. Thereupon Archbishop Aribo had the Synod of Seligenstadt issue a decree in 1023 to the effect that no penitent was allowed to seek absolution at Rome or to appeal there before he had performed the penance imposed at home; anyone who wished to appeal had to obtain the permission of his own bishop and get from him a document which would explain the facts to the Pope.[22] Although this decree strongly emphasized the disciplinary authority of the bishop concerned and made recourse to Rome difficult, in accord with pseudo-Isidore, it was probably directed neither against the Holy See's power to absolve nor against the right of the faithful to appeal. The right adjudged to the local bishop involved a delicate limiting of the primatial power of the Pope, which embraced all the faithful. The relationship between papacy and episcopacy was so far from being clarified here that Benedict VIII now proceeded against Aribo, forbidding him the use of the pallium, while Aribo, energetically defended by his suffragans, persisted in his defiance. Benedict's death in 1024 ended the quarrel, and Aribo, under pressure from the new King Conrad II, was able to discontinue the process against the Countess Irmingardis without any substantial loss of prestige. But the problem persisted. John XIX had to annul the absolution of the Count of Auvergne, whom his bishop had excommunicated for adultery, and in a similar case a French synod confronted him with principles corresponding to the attitude taken at Seligenstadt.

---

[21] D. von Kessler, *Der Eheprozess Ottos und Irmingards von Hammerstein* (Berlin 1923).

[22] Synod of Seligenstadt, c. 18 in *MGConst* I, 633–39. Since Burchard of Worms took part in the synod and advocated a similar stand in his *Decretum,* the canon was probably formulated with his assistance. On the interpretation of the canon, see *Hauck* III, 536 (with footnote 1) – 538.

Rome was not infrequently involved in difficulties occasioned by the deposition or installation of bishops. Ordinarily the initiative proceeded from one of the parties. Since almost always political interests were directly or indirectly involved, the secular rulers had an important and often a decisive word to say. In spite of this burdensome dependence in both the decisions and their execution, Rome turned her intervention to advantage. At the same time it was a further reminder of the primatial claims. Occasionally the Popes went quite far in this. Thus in 881 John VIII consecrated at Rome the Emperor's candidate for the see of Lausanne and seems eventually to have established him in preference to King Boso's adherent, whom the Archbishop of Vienne had consecrated. In the same way in 889 Stephen V thwarted the attempt of Archbishop Aurelian of Lyons, a partisan of King Eudes, to impose on the church of Langres a person agreeable to him in place of the bishop already elected, a sympathizer of Charles the Simple.[23] In cases of this sort the Popes were glad to send legates who took care to preside over the synods that were summoned and thereby secured greater respect for the claims made by Rome to summon and direct synods.[24]

Just how matters stood with regard to the Pope's competence in the trials of bishops was to appear toward the end of the tenth century. At issue was the tangled situation at Reims, brought about by the political treason committed by the Carolingian, Archbishop Arnulf of Reims, in 989 and his condemnation by the Synod of Senlis in 990 at the instigation of King Hugh Capet. According to pseudo-Isidore the synodal sentence required papal confirmation. The principle must have been clearly recognized at the time, for both synod and King wrote to ask the assent of John XV. It was only when the Pope neglected to reply that many French bishops and several abbots met in the monastery of Saint-Basle at Verzy in 991 and definitively deposed Arnulf. Gerbert of Aurillac was chosen Archbishop of Reims in his stead.

---

[23] T. Schieffer, *Legaten,* 28–30; on papal interventions from 900, see Dumas in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 215–17.

[24] On legates, see H. Barion, *Synodalrecht,* 386–91; on the Pope's right of convoking and directing, ibid., 370–86.

The decision was preceded by a long discussion.[25] The abbots present, including Abbo of Fleury, protested because of the lack of papal approval. They were answered by Bishop Arnulf of Orléans with ideas very likely suggested by Gerbert. He did not rest satisfied merely with referring to the recourse to Rome that had taken place and to the emergency produced by the Pope's silence; he also posed the question of principle, of the value of the papal right. In his view a synod could judge bishops without Rome, if — here he took up an idea of Hincmar of Reims — the case were clear and its treatment were determined by law; he also referred to the African Church, which he said had never known a Roman judicial supremacy over bishops. Furthermore, in his decisions the Pope was bound by right and by Church law, and hence he could merely ratify the deposition of Arnulf. In the event that he intended to quash it, no one needed to obey him. Power alone did not make a judge; he had to dispose also of the requisite intellectual and moral qualities. It was just these presuppositions which were not present at that time in criminal and venal Rome — there followed a dreadful indictment of the tenth-century papacy. The arguments of the Bishop of Orléans were repeated by Gerbert at the Synods of Mouzon and Reims in part and more moderately and in some letters in detail and more pointedly.

The challenge laid down at Verzy naturally set Rome in motion. John XV sent Abbot Leo of Sant'Alessio all'Aventino as legate and finally summoned the two Capetian Kings, Hugh and Robert II, and the bishops to Rome. The only result was that a new synod, meeting at Chelles probably in 994, declared that Roman decrees which contradicted the decrees of the Fathers were null and void; for a Pope who should presume to act thus, the sentence of the Apostle applied: "haereticum hominem et ab ecclesia dissentientem penitus evita".[26] The Roman Church was equally unbending. In 995 Gerbert was suspended by the Legate Leo at the Synod of Mouzon. The same sentence overtook the participants of the Synod of Verzy, who had been summoned by Gregory V to the Synod of Pavia in 997 but had not presented themselves. Nevertheless, the papacy would have accomplished little, had not the Capetians, threatened in their already insecure position by the aligning of Rome alongside Otto III and the German episcopate, been ready to yield. Abbo of Fleury acted as their intermediary. Robert II, sole King since October 996, was even less able to fight longer because he was compromised by an unlawful marriage, and Gerbert encountered such serious difficulties in Reims that he fled to Otto III. And so in the summer of 997 the church of Reims was given back to Arnulf. As Pope Silvester II, Gerbert was to bring the matter to a definite end. In a charter he recognized Arnulf. The Archbishop, he said, had offended, but he could be reinstated "romanae pietatis munere", because his deposition had not obtained Rome's assent.[27] What Gerbert, as Arnulf's rival, had declared to be wicked and invalid, he had unhesitatingly done as Pope.

---

[25] A. Olleris, *Œuvres de Gerbert* (Paris 1867), 173–236; *PL* 139, 289–338.

[26] *Richeri Historiarum libri IV*, IV, 89, ed. R. Latouche, in *ClassHist* 17, 290–92; on chronological problems of the controversy, Gerbert's call to the service of Otto III, and the reinstatement of Arnulf, see M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.*, 478–86, 487–93, 518–25.

The importance of the controversy lay, not in Rome's actual victory, which depended essentially on political circumstances, but in the attitude adopted by the French episcopate. It throws a clear light on the forces of opposition which could be brought to bear in regard to Rome by the bishops of the time. The basic standpoint represented at Verzy and Chelles touched upon the worth of the good old law; set down in the canons of the past, it should bind the Pope too. Since there was here involved a general principle, applied to the secular authority in a similar manner, the position assumed by the bishops declared a limit which the old fashioned concept raised — the impossibility of conceiving of a monarch able to dispose of positive law as its sovereign. If it is added that the episcopal authority is of divine law and that the relationship between the college of bishops and the papacy was not sufficiently clear, the resistance that was offered becomes even more intelligible. It was not directed against the primatial power as such, at least not in the sense of a genuine episcopalism, not to mention a conciliarism. All involved, Gerbert included, were convinced that the vicar of Peter had received the universal primacy from Christ. And within the sphere of positive law in which even the primacy had to find its concrete elaboration, they fully recognized Rome's right to confirm synodal judgments on bishops, as demanded by pseudo-Isidore, and hence they conceded to the Holy See a very extensive supreme judicial sovereignty.

The anti-Roman reactions of particular groups of bishops are, then, not to be overestimated. If one examines the constitutional position taken by the hierarchy during the Carolingian and Ottonian periods, the picture favours the episcopate less than it does the papacy. Deep as was the papacy's humiliation, it still imperturbably kept the idea of its universal primacy before its gaze as its guiding idea. The concept of collegial unity, on the other hand, on which was based the canonical position of the bishops, had at that time been weakened to a considerable degree. It is true that under the Carolingians there was an imperial episcopate which, after the decay of the *Imperium,* survived energetically at least in Germany, but what mattered was not this old fashioned institution, mainly supported by imperial law. Far more important were the episcopal groupings fashioned by the ancient Church, and it was precisely these which, as has been seen, were unable to develop properly. And so the papacy was much better prepared for the coming development of the Church that was to be set in motion by the Gregorian reform.

---

[27] *Jaffé* 3908; *PL* 139, 273f.; J. Havet, *Lettres de Gerbert* (Paris 1889), 239f.

CHAPTER 36

The Sacraments and the Mass

At the beginning of the Carolingian period liturgical life in the individual areas of the West displayed that wide diversity which had developed in the centuries of transition. In addition to the Roman liturgy, which was also used in England since the evangelization of the Anglo-Saxons as well as in the greater part of Italy, there were the Old Spanish, the not very uniform Gallican, the Ambrosian, and the Irish-Scottish or Celtic, consisting for the most part of borrowings. All of the preceding were in the Latin language. Frequently they were contrasted with the Roman liturgy under the collective name of Gallic liturgy.

The suppression of these liturgies started in Gaul, where bishops and abbots, in view of the chaos in their own liturgy since the seventh century, began to prefer texts from the orderly Roman liturgy. These texts circulated in the form of *libelli,* which contained particular formularies, and also in the form of the *Sacramentarium Gelasianum,* which obtained a new revision on Gallic soil around the middle of the eighth century: the so-called later *Gelasianum.* The general change took place under King Pepin, who around 754 prescribed the transition to the Roman liturgy, and definitively under Charles the Great, who obtained a Gregorian Sacramentary for himself from Rome around 785–6; it was imposed at Aachen as the obligatory model. Roman chant books, lists of pericopes, and *ordines* had long been eagerly copied in Frankish *scriptoria,* but the ritual directions of the Roman *ordines* experienced not unimportant adaptations to the established proper usages.

Since the Roman liturgy now prevailed in the Frankish Empire, it also advanced into Spain with the *Reconquista* that moved forward from the north. The recovery of Toledo in 1085 and, even earlier, the pressure exercised by Gregory VII brought about the decline of the Old Spanish liturgy, called "Mozarabic" ("arabicized") since the time of the Muslim conquest, which from now on survived only in vestiges.

In Scotland the Celtic liturgy yielded to the Roman at the instigation of Queen Margaret (d. 1093), in Ireland in consequence of a decree of the Synod of Cashel in 1172. Only the Ambrosian held its ground in the face of all threats by Peter Damiani and Gregory VII; it adopted only particular features of the Roman liturgy.

The development within the Frankish Empire became of decisive importance for the future. On the one hand, the texts contained in the liturgical books were taken over with great fidelity — all the feast days of local Roman saints were retained — and, on the other hand, consciously and unconsciously various additions from the local tradition and adaptations to local needs were made, which later passed on to the Universal Church. In particular, the Gregorian Sacramentary received from Alcuin a supplement which was gathered from Gelasian, Spanish, and local material and in the later manuscripts was at once blended with the Sacramentary itself. The tenth-century Fulda Sacramentary can be regarded as typical of the definitive amalgamation.

A significant work brought about the maturity of the German Church in the age of the Ottos for the Pontifical Mass. A monk of Sankt Alban at Mainz around 950 created the Roman-German *Pontificale,* which, among other things, included the renowned *Ordo Romanus Antiquus* as a part of it. This is the *Pontificale* which is the basis of the later *Pontificale Romanum.* Liturgical usage was put together in it from the West and the East Frankish Churches and expanded by special additions. Liturgical manuscripts from the northern lands then enjoyed a great reputation, even in their technical achievements. When in 998 Gregory V confirmed in writing various privileges of the abbey of Reichenau, he demanded in return on specified occasions the delivery of an *epistolarium,* an *evangeliarium,* and a *sacramentarium.*

The administration of baptism was only slightly affected by the changes. It should take place, as Charles emphasized in a decree of 789, "secundum morem Romanum". Making an inquiry among the bishops, he received from them around 811 a more or less clear and in part detailed explanation of the rite as carried out in their territories,[1] which in fact corresponded with the Roman tradition. Following the *exsufflatio,* the signing with the cross, and the proffering of the salt, the *scrutinia* occupied a good bit of space. Theoretically it was even prescribed that in this matter, as in the Roman *ordo scrutiniorum,* there had to be seven stages of preparation, distinct from one another in time, which, furthermore, consisted almost exclusively of exorcisms, even at Rome since the cessation of adult baptism, apart from the *traditio symboli et orationis dominicae.* The just mentioned *Ordo Romanus Antiquus* still gave the seven *scrutinia.* In the actual practice of the Carolingian Church, probably even at the time of that inquiry, as various signs indicate, apart from special occasions the bulk of the *scrutinia* were combined in a single preparatory act on the Wednesday of the fourth week of Lent, which was followed only by the concluding rites, with the baptism. In fact, Holy Saturday and the Vigil of Pentecost were now regarded as the only permissible days for the baptism of children, whereas these days had originally been set aside for the baptism of adults. Baptism itself was administered by immersion.

---

[1] Detailed reports are extant from Leidrad of Lyons (*PL* 99, 853), Theodulf of Orléans (*PL* 105, 223–40), and Amalarius (*PL* 99, 893–901).

The missionary work on the eastern frontier of the Frankish state brought it about that the baptism of adults continued to be a source of lively concern. After the unhappy experiences with forcible mass baptisms among the Saxons, people were ready to listen to Alcuin's voice, calling for an orderly procedure, without compulsion and with previous instruction. Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus* was to serve as model for the instruction. The missionary conference on the Danube, arranged by Charles's son Pepin after the overthrow of the Avars in 796, accordingly required a preparation of forty, or at least of seven, days, with real instruction, and then seven days of direct ascetical and liturgical preparation. The preparatory instruction was to be concerned with the articles of faith. It was felt, with appeal to Matthew 28:20, that moral instruction could be left substantially to the time after baptism.[2] In such a manner and with a subsequent acclimating did the conversion of the Germans proceed.

Important changes occurred in this period in regard to the administration of the Sacrament of penance. For serious public offences, *causae criminales,* public ecclesiastical penance, directed by the bishop, remained in use throughout this time. It began with the inauguration of the penance on Ash Wednesday. The Roman tradition was made even stricter under the influence of oriental canons. On Ash Wednesday the penitents were not merely excluded from Mass; they were expelled from the Church, "as once Adam from paradise", — see the Adam door of the Bamberg cathedral — and the church was forbidden to them until Easter, or in serious cases for a longer period, as prescribed by the Synod of Worms in 868; only individual churches, which had received the privilege, remained accessible to them. Strict fasting was especially taken into consideration as a penance, and it was to be connected with specific exercises of prayer.

But commutations now played an important role. By this term was meant the possibility of "buying oneself off" from the severe penance imposed by substituting easier and shorter penitential works. In their beginnings the commutations accompanied the oldest Irish penitentials of the sixth century and only disappeared with the eventual suppression of these and the discontinuing of their "scale of penances" in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Originally they were allowed only in justified cases, such as sickness or difficult work, but they soon became the general practice; often the possible substitutions were already given in the penitential itself. Most favoured was the converting of the strict fast into the praying of psalms; for example, three days of fasting could be represented by three times fifty psalms, which were usually connected with one genuflection each. According to Regino of

---

[2] Bishop Paulinus of Aquileia reported on the conference (*MGConst* II, 172–76). Even as to belief, in the collection of catechetical writings of Sankt Emmeran, belonging to this occasion, the mystery of Christ is treated in an extremely summary manner; J. M. Heer, *Ein karolingischer Missionskatechismus* (Freiburg 1911).

Prüm, one fast day could be commuted into 100 prostrations. Alms and pilgrimage were also taken into consideration. The pilgrimage to Rome was popular, but for it the consent of the bishop was required by the Synod of Seligenstadt in 1023. The far-reaching depersonalization of penance became clear when the *Poenitentiale Bedae* of the eighth century even allowed one to be represented by a substitute, who would perform the penance. While the Synod of Tribur in 895 even recognized money commutation, other synods fought with little success against commutations or particular forms of them.

In accord with Roman tradition, the public ecclesiastical penance was concluded on Holy Thursday by means of the reconciliation, the rite for which continued on at the cathedrals in an elaborate form throughout the whole of this period. The penitents were conducted before the bishop during the singing of *Venite, filii,* and he restored them to the community of the faithful with the imposition of hands and prayer.

For the rest of the faithful, confession once a year was now the general rule. A first testimony to this is provided by England around 670. Around the turn of the eighth century it was mentioned as a strict prescription for the Frankish realm by Theodulf (*Capitulare* I, 36). Confession was to be made before the beginning of Lent. In England the day preceding Ash Wednesday thus acquired the name Shrove Tuesday, from "to shrive", that is, "to hear confessions", because the penance imposed according to the penitentials and also the name of the penitent had to be "written". As the pattern for the examination of conscience were mentioned the seven or eight capital sins, "without which hardly anyone is able to live". If there were no serious offences, the penitent was at first dismissed with a blessing, an *absolutio,* whose sacramental character is not clear. In other cases, and in the ninth century even generally, after the corresponding penance one had to appear on Holy Thursday for reconciliation. In accord with the tendency to transfer forms of public penance to all, thereafter the ashes were also imposed on all on Ash Wednesday. From the end of the ninth century excuses were more and more sought that would permit the reconciling of individual penitents at once, before the performing of the penance. This practice became general around the turn of the tenth century, and thus confession was no longer connected with Lent.

In the period under consideration the Anointing of the Sick becomes clearer. In fact it appeared in connection with the penance of the sick, that is, with the forms of public ecclesiastical penance that were adapted for the sick, which everyone was careful to receive on his deathbed, but which, because of the heavy obligations connected with them, were postponed by the faithful as long as possible. The Anointing of the Sick was inserted into the penance of the sick between the assigning of the penance and the reconciliation; but from the tenth century it was frequently imparted only after the reconciliation, as the "last anointing". If possible, several priests should participate.

A considerable change took place also in the forms of ordination. Of the lesser orders, in the age of the Carolingian reform almost universally only the subdiaconate and the order of acolyte, or, instead of the latter, sometimes that of lector, continued in use, and these as real functions. But in books the old list of seven orders continued to be given, and they were now explained as developments of a general order. In the tenth century persons began to understand them as a ladder, on which the individual ascended to the higher orders. Leo VIII, chosen Pope as a layman in 963, hurried through them in a few days. The *traditio instrumentorum,* long customary for the lesser orders, was now adopted also for the higher orders. Ordination to the subdiaconate already approximated that to the diaconate in the Roman-German *Pontificale,* except that before the twelfth century the subdiaconate was not reckoned as a major order.

In matrimony, which, in accord with the forms of Germanic law, took place in such a way that the father or guardian of the bride handed her over to the bridegroom, there was no ecclesiastical rite in this period except in so far as the married couple then attended the nuptial Mass and received the priest's blessing. However, there first had to be an ecclesiastical investigation to determine whether there was any matrimonial impediment. Especially because of the degrees of relationship these constituted an important object of synodal decisions.

Despite complete fidelity to the text of the traditional Roman prayers, a grand-scale adaptation took place in the very heart of the liturgy, the celebration of Mass. Dramatic elements were added — incensations, changing position of the candlesticks, the giving of special prominence to the Gospel by means of a solemn procession and the place of its proclamation. The simple popular chants of the ordinary, now usually tended to by a choir of clerics, were musically enriched and provided with tropes, that is, with texts which corresponded, syllable for syllable, to the notes of the melody. The *jubilus* of the Alleluia was elaborated into the sequence, and there immediately occurred the springtime of sequence writing, especially with Notker Balbulus (d. 912). The praying of the Canon in silence, attested around 800, was also esteemed as a dramatic element: following the model of the Old Testament, only the priest was to enter into the sanctuary of the Canon. The Gallican pontifical blessing after the Lord's Prayer continued in use. And the kiss of peace was expressly encouraged. According to the prescriptions of Charles the Great, all present were to receive it. It was often regarded as a kind of substitute for communion. However, the custom soon developed that it was received only by the communicants and in such a way that it now proceeded from the altar and was passed on. Communion was still received under both species. As a rule the Host was only dipped into the Precious Blood *(intinctio);* or, only wine was administered, which was "sanctified" by contact with the sacred Host. Although in the Carolingian reform the effort was made to impose communion on Sundays, at least in Lent, for the majority of the faithful it was soon necessary to be satisfied with the number of times required for communion by the canon of Agde in 506 — on Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. This canon was inculcated by many ninth-century synods. But even this norm was little observed, and still less when at the same period there was raised a demand for confession each time.

The national character of the northern peoples had a share in bringing about the changes just mentioned in the liturgy. Individual usages arose directly out of the Germanic language of symbols, such as praying with hands folded, or the related custom that the newly ordained priest placed his folded hands within the hands of the bishop at the promise of obedience, or the blow on the cheek at confirmation. But the greater prominence given to the sensible and the tangible in the adopting of the Roman liturgy was connected with the circumstance that the Latin of the liturgy was no longer comprehensible to even the Romance-speaking part of the population. To disturb the traditional liturgical tongue and change to one of the national languages, as Cyril and Methodius did farther to the east, was regarded in the West as unthinkable, for it was defended as a principle that in the liturgy it was permissible to use only the three languages of the inscription on the cross — Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; it had to be expressly stressed at the Synod of Frankfurt in 794 that one may at least pray in any language. And so people and altar drew farther apart, soon in the very church building itself. The altar was ordinarily situated near the back wall, in the place that had hitherto been allotted to the bishop's *cathedra* in cathedrals.

Nevertheless, in the Carolingian Renaissance it was still insisted, without lasting success, that the faithful should respond to the priest and sing the *Gloria Patri* of the Introit, the *Kyrie,* and the *Sanctus.* However, these chants soon passed everywhere to the clergy. In fact, there was regularly a group of priests to take care of Mass in the larger churches.

The distance from the daily life of the people was emphasized also by a change in the kind of bread. The pure white form of unleavened bread came more and more into vogue from the ninth century. It was soon brought to the altar in already prepared particles for the communion of the people. The sacred Host was then no longer handed to the recipient but placed in his mouth.

For all that, the Carolingian reform was not indifferent to the task of making the liturgy meaningful to the people. In a capitulary of 802 Charles the Great declared it to be a duty of the clergy to explain to the faithful "totius religionis studium et christianitatis cultum". It is characteristic that one of the explanations of the Mass appearing at this time, *Quotiens contra se,* obviously with an eye to the people, interpreted only those parts of Mass which were audible to the people, and hence it omitted the Canon. Certain of these explanations of the Mass, such as that of Walafrid Strabo, were characterized by a sober clarity. But only that type of liturgical exegesis which Amalarius of Metz methodically constructed, especially in his *Liber officialis,* appearing in various editions from 823 — the allegorical interpretation — became standard for the future. In this the Mass is explained as a synopsis and copy of the whole of salvation history, beginning with the call of the prophets of the Old Testament, who were heard in the Introit and *Kyrie,* and the *Gloria* of the angels, down to the last blessing of the Lord on his disciples at the Ascension, to which the conclusion of the Mass corresponded. The powerful attack which the Deacon Florus of Lyons opened on this manner of interpreting the Mass and even the formal condemnation by the Synod of Quierzy in 838 were unable to halt its victorious progress through the Middle Ages.

Thus in the details of its development did the Mass become exclusively the priest's business. Correspondingly, now also prayers were inserted into the Mass which were rather to foster his personal devotion and hence were to be said silently. A first sketch of this sort is attested by the ninth-century Amiens sacramentary, with its silent prayers on the way to the altar, at the incensation, at the offertory, at communion, at the end of Mass. Sketches with other texts followed. In particular there now appeared the so-called *apologiae,* wordy self-accusations, in which the priest at various places, but especially in the first part of the Mass, confessed his unworthiness and implored God's mercy. A moderate selection of silent prayers, with a limit to the *apologiae* and the addition of psalms — Psalm 42 at the beginning of the Mass appears here for the first time — was provided by the Rhine *ordo* of the Mass, which originated at Sankt Gallen around the mid-tenth century and from Mainz finally established itself everywhere as the basis of other forms.

Connected with the greater independence of the celebrant was the growth in frequency of the private Mass. The faithful wanted votive Masses for their special needs. In the monasteries, whose monks were now for the most part priests, the prayer brotherhoods, with the obligation of repeated Masses for a deceased member, operated in the same direction. Persons also celebrated Mass several times a day and frequently even without a server. This last point was censured by various synods as early as the ninth century as a serious abuse. Individual bishops as well as the reform Synod of Seligenstadt in 1023 finally specified three Masses a day as the absolute limit. Then Alexander II (1061–73) declared the single Mass as the rule. In the period under consideration the daily Conventual Mass at the hour of Terce was ordinarily, in most monasteries, the climax of the liturgy, while in other places Lauds in the early morning retained its preponderance and was attended by the faithful.

In this period the calendar of feasts also experienced a not unimportant enrichment. At the beginning of the ninth century in the Carolingian Empire the days of precept in addition to Sundays were, in accord with various synods, among others those of Aachen in 809 and Mainz in 813, and also the *Statuta Bonifatii,* the following: Christmas, the three following days, the octave day, Epiphany, all the days of Easter week and Pentecost week, or at least the first three days, the Ascension, two feasts of Mary — that on 15 August and that on 2 Februar or 8 September — the feasts of John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, and Andrew. In addition, at times the anniversary of the dedication and the patronal feast might be included. Only a part of the lists of this period included Michael, Martin, Remigius, Lawrence, and All Saints. Alcuin is thought to have established the last named feast. In 799 it is in the list of the Synod of Reisbach, but it does not appear generally among the holy days until toward the middle of the ninth century. Two hundred years later, in the *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms, all the feasts mentioned, except Remigius, belonged to the general list of holy days. To them were added Silvester, the three Rogation days, and, in conformity with a decree of the Synod of Erfurt in 932, the feast day of each Apostle.

It is clear that in the details of liturgical life, even apart from the continuing influence of the earlier non-Roman liturgies in the various countries, there was no strict uniformity. Still, Burchard of Worms in the *Decretum* emphasized the principle that one should conform to one's metropolitan church. In addition, we find all the more frequently, for example, in Fulbert of Chartres (d. 1029), a saying that goes back to Gregory the Great[3]: If the faith is the same, differences of usage can do no harm.

All these developments in the practice of the liturgy and of the sacramental life occurred substantially in the eighth to the tenth centuries in the northern lands. Then they quickly gained acceptance by the whole Church. For after previously isolated liturgical usages had found the way southward, a double stream of powerful intellectual and institutional influence moved from the north toward Italy and the centre of Christianity in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The one was constituted by the Italian expeditions of the German Emperors from Otto the Great; in their retinue many clerics came south. The other proceeded from Cluny; as many manuscripts show, Montecassino was an important place of reshipment for the liturgical tradition from the north. And through the Normans also liturgical usages were transmitted from Normandy to the south.

CHAPTER 37

The Clergy and the Care of Souls

Once the development of the rural and urban churches and the subdividing of the diocese into smaller districts have been described, the question arises as to what concrete forms the life and work of the priest took in the early mediaeval bishopric. One of the most urgent problems was decidedly that of bringing the rural clergy together as far as possible. The danger of isolation was especially present in the case of the priests of proprietary churches, and it was above all they who were in need of constant supervision and encouragement, because of their very deficient training and their dependent status, both for liturgical and pastoral functions and for their moral conduct. Even this problem was capable of solution only if the demands made were reduced to the most necessary.

---

[3] Gregory the Great, *Ep.*, I, 43 (*PL* 77, 497): "in una fide nil officit Ecclesiae consuetudo diversa".

At first the situation of the urban clergy was better. Certainly the above described association in collegiate chapters favoured the preservation of a religious spirit, though on the other hand, of course, it led to a distribution of offices, which withdrew the larger number of canons from real pastoral activity. Permitted by the authoritative Aachen rule of 816 to possess private property and, with few exceptions, not very much burdened with work, the canons not seldom lost the religious spirit and even partly gave up the common life and set up their own houses. Nevertheless, the basic idea proved to be so fruitful that it was taken up even outside the chapters. In the cities there were occasionally associations of clerics with a less strict organization than that of the chapters. Well known is a Paris confraternity of clerics of the ninth to the eleventh centuries, which was called the *societas duodecim apostolorum*. It met weekly for Mass, prayer, and a fraternal meal — a forerunner of those chapters of canons, newly founded or reformed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which were restricted to twelve members or to double or one-half of that number.

The principle of union also found application among the rural clergy. As a sort of makeshift, occasionally in the eighth and ninth centuries the *chorepiscopi* had arranged associations there and had exercised a certain supervision. Now, with the deaneries already described, a new order was established. The priests of each deanery now had to meet at the beginning of each month, *per Kalendas,* as specified in detail in a capitulary issued by Hincmar of Reims in 852. On this occasion, later referred to as a calend, Mass was first celebrated for the group; then followed the conference *(collatio)* under the presidency of the dean. Hincmar took the opportunity to admonish that the common meal which came next must not turn into a sumptuous banquet or a drinking bout. We learn from later prescriptions that the following subjects were treated at the conferences: the official duties of priests, parish activity, the Sacraments, questions of faith and of the spiritual life, correction of negligent colleagues. In particular, according to Hincmar, each time there should be a report on the public penitents of each congregation and their behaviour and the bishop should be notified. Common prayer, with intercession for the King, the ecclesiastical authorities, and the living and the dead, also pertained to the programme.

An important means of improving the care of souls, from which at the same time we learn details of its practice, were visitations. Great stress had been laid on them again since Carloman's capitulary of 742. Every year the bishop visited the places specified for this, usually the old parishes. This was, of course, every time a festival for the place in question, but it could also be a serious burden on the host, and for that reason various canons set limits to the expenses. The bishop administered confirmation, preached, and, assisted by the archdeacon or archpriest, who could also deputize for him, examined the state of the congregation. This examination became around 800 the synod or synodal tribunal, in which the assembled congregation or later selected synodal witnesses, were put under oath and invited to express themselves, even against the priest.

Toward the end of the ninth century the visitation of the priest was separated from it. For these visitations and synodal tribunals Abbot Regino of Prüm wrote his *De synodalibus causis* in two books. The first book is devoted to the visitation of the clergy. In the second are assembled legal regulations which were taken into consideration in regard to the laity and were of use in examining the moral and spiritual life of a congregation. We obtain abundant information on pastoral conditions, especially in the ninety-six visitation questions with which the first book begins and to a degree also in the parallel questions of the second book. The requirements expressed there coincide to a great extent with the *Admonitio synodalis,* originating around the mid-ninth century, also called the *Homilia Leonis* (Pope Leo IV), which from then on — and, incidentally, in an expanded form, still today in the *Pontificale Romanum* — was passed on as the bishop's closing address at synods. It contains material from Carolingian capitularies and synods and especially from Hincmar's regulations. Its content to a great extent reappears in the *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms.

Duties to which the priests were referred concerned the integrity of the parish property, the condition of the buildings, and the cleanliness of the church, which was not to be used as a granary, the neatness and care of vestments and vessels; the atrium of the church had to be inclosed, and women's dances were not to be permitted there. The pyx, with the Blessed Sacrament, lay on the table-shaped altar for the communion of the sick. Otherwise, only the four Gospels and, in contrast to the custom of previous centuries[1], relics of saints in a worthy setting were also on the altar.

Every day the priest had to rise for Lauds and during the day pray the canonical hours at the proper times, at each of which the bell was to be rung — Regino mentions Prime, Terce, Sext, and None. He was to have a cleric to sing the psalms with him and to read the Epistle and make the responses at Mass. He was to offer Mass daily at Terce, and then remain fasting until noon in order to be able to celebrate again for pilgrims who might arrive. The faithful were to attend Lauds, Mass, and Vespers on Sundays and holy days. In individual villages trusted men, called *decani,* were appointed to remind the others of this duty and of the obligation of ceasing from labour, which had to be observed *a vespera ad vesperam.* Even shepherds — *porcarii et alii pastores* — had to come to Mass on Sunday. Before Mass the pastor was to bless holy water and sprinkle the faithful. At the offertory the faithful were to present their offering; they gave candles and the like earlier. If there was no deacon or subdeacon present, the priest himself had to cleanse the vessels at the end of Mass. After Mass he was to distribute blessed bread *(eulogias)* from the offering of the people.

---

[1] In the early Carolingian period in such cases a sort of sarcophagus was attached to the back of the altar; see *Braun* II, 548–55.

Books that the priest had to own were the sacramentary (or missal), lectionary, antiphonary (for the Mass chants), and homiliary, and also an orthodox explanation of the creed and the Lord's Prayer and a martyrology, in order to announce to the people the occurring feasts. Wherever possible, he should have the forty homilies of Gregory the Great. He had to know the psalms by heart and also the unchanging Mass prayers, the creed *Quicumque,* and the formula for blessing holy water. He should at least be able to read the other texts without making mistakes. He should also be capable of explaining to the people on Sundays and feasts something from the Gospel, the Epistle, or elsewhere in Scripture. He was to see to it that all knew the creed and the Lord's Prayer by heart. Children were to learn them from their godparents. The priest was to take care that no child died without baptism and communion; hence he should always take the holy oils and the Eucharist with him on excursions.[2]

The penitential system played a not insignificant role. The pastor had to summon the faithful to confession at the beginning of Lent. To avoid imposing penance arbitrarily, he should possess a penitential — a somewhat surprising demand in view of the decisive rejection of penitentials, with their inflexible and often inconsistent tariffs and their often frivolous commutations of penance, by various synods: "quorum errores certi, auctores sunt incerti", as Radulf of Bourges (d. 868), among others, described them.[3] The priest was warned not to let himself be bribed by public sinners whom he ought to report for ecclesiastical penance. On the other hand, he must not invite public penitents to eat or drink without at the same time making amends by an alms.

---

[2] This prescription relating to the Eucharist at least is found in the *capitula* of Ghaerbald of Leiden (*MGCap* I, 244) and in the *Statuta Bonifatii,* II, 4 (*Mansi* XII, 383f.).

[3] The oldest penitentials, as yet without any orderly arrangement, appeared among the Irish in the sixth century. Of Anglo-Saxon origin were new penitentials compiled in a systematic order, which go under the names of Cummean, Theodore, Bede, Egbert. Both types spread on the continent from the eighth century and were there combined with traditional penitential prescriptions; this made their inconsistency still more marked. When the elimination of the penitentials proved to be impossible, new penitentials were drawn up as a consequence of the Carolingian reform synods. Among them those of Halitgar and of Rhabanus Maurus were outstanding; c. 1010 appeared that of Burchard of Worms (*Decretum,* Book XIX). A clear arrangement was not realized even by them.

It goes without saying that good example was especially impressed upon the priest. He was warned not to have a *mulier subintroducta* in his house. He must not bear weapons, a prescription that was certainly not insisted upon by many an episcopal lord. He must not find diversion with dogs and falcons or visit taverns. He was asked whether he had pawned the church vessels to the innkeeper or a dealer. He must not take part in weddings. At wakes he was not to let himself be induced to drink to the guests in honour of the saints and become intoxicated. He should always wear his clerical dress, even on journeys, at least the stole. If a priest without a stole was killed, only the customary *wergeld* had to be paid for him, not the triple *wergeld*. The priest should be especially concerned for the poor, and he should be hospitable to travellers passing through. He should visit the sick, absolve and anoint them, and bring them the viaticum personally, not through a lay person.

It is clear that with this mirror of duties, which was held up to the priests at diocesan synods and on parish visitations in the ninth and tenth centuries, at first only a programme was outlined that could leave the actuality far behind, but nevertheless a programme behind which stood the full authority, not only of the Church, but also of the contemporary state.

This much is certain: pastoral activity moved in primitive forms but it had firm outlines. The traditional forms of the Mass and the Sacraments constituted the supporting framework for the guidance of what was especially a liturgical care of souls. In order to guarantee to a degree at least this aspect of religious education, Carloman had already, in agreement with Saint Boniface, ordered at the *Concilium Germaniae* in 743 that every year each priest had to account to his bishop in a formal examination, especially in regard to the rite of baptism and Mass, a rule that, among others, was renewed by Hincmar in 852. A number of literary commissions that were produced for this examination, usually in the form of question and answer, have come down to us.[4]

There was no ecclesiastical catechism for children. The religious initiation and guidance of the young must have taken place substantially by way of custom. However, parents and godparents were directed to impress on the children the creed and the Lord's Prayer, and, according to Regino, at the annual confession the priest should begin by having each penitent recite them. Elsewhere the priest, according to the testimony of the confession *ordines,* asked at least the two questions about faith in the three Persons in the one God and in the resurrection of the body for judgment on good and evil. The sermon, which was required on all Sundays and holy days, could only have been extremely jejune, if it was given at all, considering the level of education of the clergy. At the Synod of Aachen of 789 the following were mentioned as subjects which the sermon should especially deal with, in addition to the explanation of the scriptural pericopes: that there is one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that the Son become man; that the dead rise; and which sins bring one to hell.

---

[4] Examples of this literature, which was termed *Ioca episcopi ad sacerdotes,* in A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1902), 342f., 411f.

The lack of an extensive preaching of the faith must have been all the more detrimental to the education of the people when the language of the liturgy was no longer understood. Nevertheless, the reform synods of 813 and the Synod of Mainz in 847 had expressly demanded that the priest must preach to the people "secundum proprietatem linguae" and translate the models of homilies "in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Theotiscam". For the intercessory prayers for the living and the dead, which in Regino were added after the sermon in several series, the use of the vernacular is probable at least in so far as the invitation to prayer each time was uttered in the vernacular, whereupon everyone was to recite the Lord's Prayer silently. The use of translations of the *Confiteor* as frankly acknowledged guilt in the same place at the public Mass cannot be proved before the twelfth century, whereas such texts for use in the confession of the individual *(Glaube und Beicht)* go back to the Carolingian period.[5]

But the people knew they were somehow included in the Mass. Bishop Herard of Tours presupposed in his *capitulare* of 858 that the people sang the *Sanctus* and only admonished the priest to sing it with them. The *Kyrie eleison,* as a repeated supplication, had then already become the starting point of the "Leise", from which later would grow the German liturgical song. If then, under Charles the Great and at his instigation, various explanations of the baptismal rites and especially of the Mass had appeared, this probably also found an echo in the instruction of the people. Finally, the celebration of the feasts of the liturgical year, emphasized by the cessation of work, must have deeply impressed the popular awareness. But with this we are already in the sphere of the spiritual life in the narrower sense.

Chapter 38

Forms of Devotion

A first task in the religious instruction of the people was constituted, even as late as the turn of the millennium, by the fight against the remains of paganism and against superstition. The penitentials down to that of Burchard of Worms are quite clear in this regard. Those remnants extended from women who, while spinning and weaving, uttered secret sayings and from the wake at which "diabolical songs" were sung to real magic and to pagan sacrifices at wells, stones, and crossroads.

---

[5] E. von Steinmeyer, *Die kleineren althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler* (Berlin 1916), 309–64.

It was not to be expected, by reason of the condition of the preaching of the faith, that a religious life based on real spirituality was to be found in the broad masses of the people. The force of popular instruction lay in the institutional element. It had to be enough if what was indicated in law and prescription was observed. A religious impetus could be expected only gradually, through the example of monasteries and chapters, whose piety alone is in some degree accessible to us.

Like the cultural life in general, the devotional life of this period bore a monastic allure. This is true of the clergy, but even lay persons sought in associations of prayer, the forerunners of the later confraternities, contact with a monastery. The monastery was so much the model for the collegiate chapters of diocesan clerics that at that time it was not too unusual for a foundation of the canonical life to pass to the monastic life and conversely. The Synod of Cloveshoe in England in 747, brought about by Saint Boniface, was the first to require for all churches that everywhere the complete series of seven canonical hours, with psalmody and chant according to the usage of the Roman Church, that is, of the Roman basilical monasteries, had to be celebrated. This was something new. For in both East and West the diocesan clergy had been bound only to Lauds and Vespers, which were celebrated together with the people, and even in the bishoprics in the neighbourhood of Rome, as the *Cautio episcopi* of the *Liber diurnus* in the sixth and seventh centuries shows, the only other office required was the "Vigil" preceding Lauds, corresponding approximately to the present Matins. This requirement of the full monastic office, following the precedent of the Synod of Aachen of 816, was from now on repeated everywhere on the continent and, as we saw, was also applied to parish churches, but frequently private recitation by those who were impeded was not demanded.

The common choral office made available an important factor of religious formation — common spiritual reading. The readings were substantially longer than in the succeeding age of breviaries. In the Cluniac monasteries stress was laid on the importance of reading the entire Bible every year. In addition there came from the writings of the Fathers, from hagiography, and from the passions of the martyrs whatever the monastic or chapter library could offer. The reading in choir was frequently continued in the refectory. The spiritual reading of the individual was of secondary importance because of the cost of books. But it was cultivated and was especially recommended as *lectio divina,* reflective reading, which also contained the elements of contemplative prayer.

Alongside the reading in the choral office was the psalmody. The psalms occupied an important position even outside the choral prayer. Whoever learned to read learned it by means of the psalms, and this was so true that *psalmos discere* meant "to learn to read". Among the most important ascetical works of the ninth century was the *De psalmorum usu,* attributed to Alcuin, which, in a spirit of genuine enthusiasm for the subject, gives directions how one could have recourse to the praying of psalms for the most varied concerns and use them on the most varied occasions. The ancient practice of adding a collect or other kind of prayer to each psalm was, though no longer practised in choir, not forgotten, as, among other works, the commentary on the psalms by Bishop Bruno of Würzburg (d. 1045) shows. That persons were able to set the psalms in the light of their New Testament fulfillment and thus to make them something that could be prayed all the better by the Christian is apparent not only from this commentary but also from the many manuscripts of the psalter, extending into the high Middle Ages, which assign to every psalm a significant inscription as "vox Christi" or "vox Ecclesiae".[1] At least selected psalm verses and bits of psalms must have played a certain role in popular devotion also. In any case, collections of appropriate psalm verses were widespread. They had been early transmitted under the title of *capitella de psalmis.* In the *De psalmorum usu* they are called "post Dominicam orationem versus". They are the versicles, some of which survive in the *preces* of our breviary.

Around the turn of the millennium the psalms began to lose their popularity. The obligation of prayer that was imposed on a penitent was no longer expressed in psalms — 50 psalms, 150 psalms, with an equal number of genuflections. Instead of psalms there was assigned the same number of times the one psalm "Miserere" or even only one petition, such as "Miserere mei, Deus" or simply the Lord's Prayer. By means of the repetition of the Lord's Prayer 150 times there came about the "Pater noster psalter", which, after a certain popularity, was gradually supplanted by the Marian psalter, based on the Hail Mary, and by its definitive form, the rosary.

In this period there also began the history of the prayer book, which of course at that time could belong to few only. The Book of Cerne, of the eighth or ninth century, has come down in Ireland; it is a collection of the most varied types of prayers. Best known from the Carolingian world is the prayer book of Charles the Bald;[2] it is striking because of its effort to assist the royal suppliant to take part in the public liturgy. Two other collections of prayers of the ninth century, which go under Alcuin's name, also display strong dependence on the liturgy: the already mentioned *De psalmorum usu* and the *Officia per ferias,* as well as some other collections of the same time, which Wilmart has made known in detail. They borrow from the liturgy and from the Fathers, and the psalms are abundantly used. And then more personal viewpoints also came to the fore — *apologiae* and prayers for specific virtues occupy much space. Texts were provided in honour of the most holy Trinity and of the individual divine Persons. Of special fervour were the prayers in honour of the cross, which might be regarded as the most outstanding object of devotion of those centuries, next to the relics of the saints. A great wealth of texts was compiled, especially for the adoration of the cross on Good Friday, which even made their way into the liturgical books, just as in general a constant mutual exchange between those oldest prayer books and the contemporary liturgical books can be established.

---

[1] P. Salmon, *Les "tituli psalmorum" des manuscrits latins* (Rome 1959).

[2] Charles the Bald's prayer book was edited by Felician Ninguarda, *Liber precationum* (Ingolstadt 1583). Cf. also *DACL* III, 865f.

In the piety of this rough epoch external exercises had a much greater importance than at other times. Instructors in this were the Irish monks. The genuflection, fifty times in connection with fifty psalms or repeated in a multiple of this number, praying for hours with outstretched arms, standing in cold water through entire nights, and in addition the ascetical roaming and the pilgrimage to holy spots were favourite exercises of great men of prayer and at the same time accomplishments prescribed for penitents.

If we would characterize the devotion of the epoch as it becomes evident in these and like forms, we may term it a piety of transition. On the one hand, strong forces of the tradition from Christian antiquity were still active. These revealed themselves perhaps most clearly in ecclesiastical art. Romanesque, and all the more the age preceding it, breathes the spirit of a firm, objective order with clear relationships. It is the art which, for all its autonomy, was in the most perfect harmony with the Roman liturgy. In the principal apse of many churches of this period the *maiestas Domini,* Christ royally enthroned, was represented. Even the representation of the Crucified, which appeared quite often now, was still far removed from a realistic reproduction of the event on Golgotha. The Crucified was still surrounded by angelic figures, as in Irish art, or by other symbolic attendant figures — Church and Synagogue, symbols of the evangelists, sun and moon — as in the manuscript illumination on the continent, and these pointed to the deeper meaning of the event. And then was elaborated the Romanesque crucifix, in victorious attitude, with the royal crown on the head, as at Gerokreuz around 976 and at Innichen in the eleventh century. The cross as a symbol of victory, already illuminated by the glory of Easter, was a favourite theme of Carolingian designers and versifiers,[3] just as it was a favourite subject of devout prayer.

With what force this manner of thinking was still effective is shown by a small feature, which, in the education of the people, was able to be of great importance: in the evangelization of the Slavonic and Baltic peoples and of the Magyars the interpretation of the Christian week culminating in Sunday as the day of the resurrection prevailed in the naming of the days of the week.

---

[3] Cf. the acrostic poetry and drawings of Rhabanus Maurus, *De laudibus s. Crucis* in *PL* 107, 133–294. Similar ideas in Alcuin; cf. H. B. Meyer, "Crux decus es mundi. Alkuins Kreuzfrömmigkeit" in *Paschatis Sollemnia* (Freiburg 1959), 96–107.

In place of the enumeration adopted from Judaism, which began with Sunday and hence designated Monday as the second day of the week and culminated in the Sabbath and which Christian antiquity had presumed to Christianize only by again counting Sunday as the eighth day, there appeared an enumeration in which Monday appeared as the first and Sunday as the last and crowning day of the week.[4]

But the transitional character of this epoch is seen, and very impressively, on the other hand, in the prominence of a new type of piety, one which came to maturity later in the Middle Ages and is still active in the popular piety of the present. In the interpretation of the Christian week Alcuin was already the representative of a change. In the series of weekly votive Masses that he drew up, Alcuin left undisturbed the traditional theme of the cross on Friday, but on Sunday, which he placed at the beginning of the week, the thought of the resurrection was now dislodged by its dedication to the most holy Trinity. The image of Christ which now came more and more to the fore was, as has been aptly said, no longer the "Christus passus et gloriosus" of early Christianity, but the "Christus patiens", in any event Christ on the borders of the Gospel reports.

It is amazing with what force the mystery of the Trinity began to dominate consciousness at this time. The Christian faith was termed with predilection *fides sanctae Trinitatis*. Alcuin composed his chief work under that title: *De fide sanctae Trinitatis*. In the abbey of Theodulf of Orléans (d. 821) the creed *Quicumque* formed part of the daily office. Not the mystery of Christ but the doctrine of the Three Divine Persons appeared now as the central object of faith.

This is in accord with the circumstance that at times Christ often stood simply for God and *vice versa*. Much as the human of the Gospels now came to the fore, and in this sense one could speak of a growing esteem of the Lord's humanity, his total figure was understood as a manifestation of divinity. In the Carolingian model catecheses, which have come down as sermons of Saint Boniface (*PL,* 89, 842–872), it is simply God who was born of the Virgin and was crucified for us. May he who created us, so ends one catechesis, lead us to everlasting joy, Christ our Lord. It is the same simplifying manner of thinking which we meet in the Old High German poetry, especially in the *Heliand,* where also the Germanic ideal of the hero determines the portrait. Christ is the God King, to whom one renders the service that one swore to him in baptism.

The force of this manner of thinking is to be recognized by this, that it even had a modifying effect on the Roman liturgy. The conclusion of the Roman oration, *Per Dominum nostrum,* emphasizing Christ's mediatorship based on his humanity and extolling his glorified life with the Father and his reign, was not infrequently replaced by *Qui vivis,* which only left his divinity more in the field of vision. It was a necessary consequence of a presentation shortened in such a way that the obscuring of Christ's humanity also obscured the awareness of the nearness of God's grace, into which the Christian was admitted through the God-Man. The features of the family of God also faded in the picture of the Church, and the hierarchical lines became all the more prominent. The distance between priest and people was so magnified that if the reference in the canon of the Roman Mass to the faithful, "qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis", was not expunged, it was still felt that it was necessary to supplement it by "pro quibus tibi offerimus". Church and Christian order now appeared above all as a matter of law, not unlike the political order, from which the Church was distinguished only by vague boundary lines, and behind the law stood the divine tribunal. The already mentioned progress of vehement self-accusations in the *apologiae,* which, for example in the so-called *Missa Illyrica* of the eleventh century, penetrated the entire Mass liturgy like a climbing plant, thus becomes understandable. Christianity acquired a moralizing feature and a melancholy mood.

---

[4] Thus, for example, in Lithuanian Monday is called *pirmadienis* (that is, *prima dies*) and, correspondingly, the other days till Saturday; J. A. Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie* (Innsbruck 1941), 220f.

On the other hand, if the one mediator Christ Jesus withdrew to some extent from sight in the glory of his divinity, afflicted man had all the more to look for other helpers. The early Middle Ages are the period of a greatly intensified cult of relics. Princes and prelates, among them even Charles the Great and Rhabanus Maurus, zealously exerted themselves to acquire relics from Rome and Italy and elsewhere, and in this persons were not always fastidious about the means. Transfers of the bodies of martyrs were now among the great feasts of Christianity. Countless are the forms in which precious reliquaries were produced and scarcely comprehensible the names by which they were known.[5] From the remains of saints persons expected protection and aid for body and soul.

In addition to and above the martyrs the cult of the Mother of God acquired an increasing importance. A great many of the new churches, including the palace chapel at Aachen, were dedicated in her honour. Pictures of the *Theotokos,* coming from the East, were now much copied. One day of the week, Saturday, first appears in Alcuin as Mary's day. In particular the Cluniac movement fostered the cult of Mary, the *mater misericordiae,* as she was now called with predilection. In every monastery at least one chapel was dedicated to her. It is reported of Saint Ulric of Augsburg by his biographer that, after the common office, he also prayed three shorter additional offices — one of the holy cross, one of all saints, and one of Mary. The daily *officium parvum beatae Mariae Virginis* was already widespread in the eleventh century. From this time also the *hymnus akathistus* from Byzantium, with its long series of honourary titles for Mary, exerted a growing influence, which manifested itself from then on in a springtime of Marian poetry and later, among other ways, was consolidated in the Marian litanies.[6]

---

[5] J. Braun, *Die Reliquiare des christlichen Kultes und ihre Entwicklung* (Freiburg 1940).

How did this striking shifting of stress, or, to use the language of the Fathers, this different sort of illumination of the one world of faith, come about? For it is clear that no new content of belief is involved; in the same period the mere appearance of a deviation from the traditional statements of faith was able to produce the greatest excitement, as, for example, the events connected with Iconoclasm and the *Libri Carolini* or with the formulation of the Eucharistic presence by Radbert and Ratramnus show. Here we encounter the effects of that great agitation which had been evoked at the end of Christian antiquity by Western Arianism. The source of that tremor, whose vibrations continued through the centuries, must, in fact, be sought in Visigothic Spain in the sixth century. The conversion of the Visigothic nation to the Catholic Church, which was sealed at the national council of 589, had been preceded by repeated severe struggles and intellectual discussions, in which there was question of the correct Christology. To the Arian denial of the consubstantial divinity of the Son and its reference to the mediation formula, *Per Christum,* which had been used from time immemorial also in the Catholic liturgy and which was alleged to indicate a subordination of the Son in his divinity, the Catholic defence opposed the equally positive emphasizing of the oneness of essence of the Father with the Son, the unity of the divine being in the trinity of Persons, and this not only in the carefully sharpened definitions of the Trinitarian formula of faith but also in the formulation of liturgical prayer, and not least of all in the practical abandonment of the misunderstood mediation formula. The reaction on the Catholic way of thinking had to be all the more lasting, since the flexible Spanish liturgy was then undergoing a phase of active development and then definitively stabilized itself in this phase. Creedal struggles of a similar kind were, as we learn from Gregory of Tours, among others, also fought out on Gallic soil, but the decisive influence must have proceeded from Spain, whose Church experienced a period of flowering in the seventh century with Saint Isidore of Seville and others and thereby assumed the leadership in Christianity.

However, the Gallo-Frankish Church was not so much affected by the intellectual movement of the neighbouring country in direct transmission but rather in a roundabout way through the British Isles. "Spanish symptoms" have been detected more than once in the Irish-Scottish liturgy, and hence influences of Spain on Ireland in the seventh and eighth centuries, which must soon have been communicated to the Anglo-Saxon Church.[7] Boniface and Alcuin were then the great exponents of Anglo-Saxon influence on the continent and thereby on the religious culture of the Carolingian Renaissance, which became decisive for the remaining centuries of the Middle Ages. The way which the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople travelled — from Spain, to which it had come from the oriental original homeland of the Christological controversies, to Ireland, from there to the Anglo-Saxons, through Alcuin from England to the palace chapel of Charles the Great, and, finally, on the occasion of the journey of Henry II to Rome in 1014, from Germany to the centre of Christendom — this is also the route on which the new mediaeval piety was formed and established.

---

[6] G. G. Meerssseman, *Der Hymnos akathistos im Abendland* (Fribourg 1958).

[7] Cf. the chapter "Spanish Symptoms" in E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford 1918), 165–210.

If the religious life of the early Middle Ages lost, through the development just sketched, not a little of the freshness and confidence of earlier centuries, we can still identify signs of a new flowering on the new foundation. The more the Easter range of ideas with the glorified Christ was deemphasized, all the more did the devout soul turn to the manifestation of the earthly Christ. Christmas with its cycle of feasts gained in importance and popularity, and the earthly and visible element in the Easter mystery of redemption especially occupied the devout person. This last now became the favourite subject of imitative performances. Already in the Roman-German *Pontificale* of about 950 the Palm Sunday procession was a dramatic event. Around the same time it was reported of Saint Ulric that on Good Friday he laid the Eucharist in the "grave" and on Easter morning solemnly carried it back to its place. A similar rite, but with a crucifix, was also in use at the same time in the Frankish and English Churches, in accord with the *Regularis Concordia,* or collection of monastic rules of the tenth century. The *Quem quaeritis* of Easter Matins became at that time the point of departure of the Easter drama, which early found loving encouragement, especially at Sankt Gallen; traces of it are to be found as early as the eleventh century in the entire West, from Silos in Spain to Melk on the Danube.[8] Of a later date were the Passion play and the religious plays at Christmas and on other occasions, but they lay on the prolongation of the route adopted.

Even if the sacred representation and making present of salvation were no longer encountered fully understood, still, by means of such plays that looked back and reproduced and the celebrations corresponding to them during the Church's year, an intimate contact with the mysteries of faith was imparted in another way to the people's soul, and in the following centuries this would stabilize itself in a growing fervour.

---

[8] K. Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church,* I (Oxford 1933), 577f.

SECTION NINE

Renewal and Reform from 900 to 1050

Chapter 39

The Renewal of Monastic and Canonical Life

Four principal causes had in the course of the ninth century led to an extensive decay of the monastic and the canonical life: secularizing usurpations by rulers, squandering of the property by lay abbots, lack of protection because of the growing weakness of the royal power, and the devastation wrought by Vikings, Muslims, and finally Magyars. But the vitality of Western Christianity was unbroken. There slowly arose monastic centres of strength whose effects soon reached beyond the cloister. The canons also were affected by the movement of renewal, though to a lesser degree.

Monastic Renewal

North of the Alps the impulse proceeded, on the one hand, from Lotharingia — Brogne, Gorze, Verdun, — and on the other hand, from France — Cluny in the Duchy of Burgundy and other abbeys, for the most part influenced by its spirit. While the Lotharingian centres influenced the German Empire particularly, Cluny and the other French reform centres spread to all the surrounding lands. A special initiative was displayed by Italian hermits. To about 1050 monasticism was so powerfully on the move that it began to go beyond its achievement to seek new forms and thus entered a new epoch of its history. At the beginning of the tenth century most monasteries were living on the intellectual legacy of Benedict of Aniane,[1] which of course had been modified here and there and was to be still further modified in the future, so that in the long run with regard to the constitution and the *consuetudines* various groups were formed. The differences that soon appeared were at first only nuances of one and the same striving for renewal; only later, especially after 1050, were they at times to cause conflicts among them.

---

[1] P. Schmitz, "L'influence de Saint Benoît d'Aniane dans l'histoire de l'ordre de Saint-Benoît" in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo,* 401–15.

The Lotharingian and German Area

The first efforts for a monastic renewal in Lower Lotharingia are connected with the name of Gerard of Brogne (d. 959). A member of a not especially powerful noble family, Gerard, probably in 913 or 914, founded on property of his own a monastic community, for which he acquired the relics of Saint Eugene from the French monastic cell of Deuil. The history of the founding is as veiled in obscurity as is that of Gerard's monastic formation.[2] In any event, Brogne under Gerard's direction must have been of some consequence, for in 931/32 Duke Giselbert of Lotharingia presented the Abbot with the totally decayed monastery of Saint-Ghislain in Hainaut, perhaps inhabited by canons. The work of reconstruction accomplished there moved Marquis Arnulf of Flanders (918–65) to entrust Gerard with the revival of the Flemish abbeys, those of Saint-Bavo and Saint-Pierre de Mont-Blandin at Ghent and Saint-Bertin at their head. Thus in Flanders Gerard stepped into a position similar to that which had earlier fallen to Benedict of Aniane in the Carolingian Empire. And if Benedict's initiative weakened after his death, the same fate befell Gerard's life-work and for the same reason. Supported, not by a monastic reform centre, but by the personality of one ruler and one abbot, the renewal came to an end with the disappearance, first of Gerard, then of Arnulf.

The connection with specific persons is also to be observed in the monastic regeneration which began in Upper Lotharingia and soon operated in Lower Lotharingia and in Germany. Almost always it was produced, partly from religious, partly from economic reasons, by the proprietors of monasteries, laymen and bishops. The promoters in Upper Lotharingia can, for the most part, be reduced to a few families of the upper nobility. In Germany the royal monastery policy of the Ottos and the early Salians played a great role. And still there was a great difference from the above mentioned restoration endeavours of Arnulf of Flanders. While Arnulf depended essentially upon Gerard of Brogne, the Lotharingian and German proprietors could have recourse to a whole group of abbeys where the monastic life was flourishing. In 933 Bishop Adalbero of Metz had been able to establish at Gorze a real centre, full of ascetical seriousness. In like manner, in 934 Bishop Gauzelin of Toul founded one in the Toul monastery of Saint-Evre. Monks of both houses, especially of Gorze, were requested for the renewal of other monasteries. The radiation of Gorze extended beyond the dioceses of Metz, Toul, and Verdun to Trier, Liège, and beyond. Ideas of Gorze were even carried from the Ghent monastery of Saint-Pierre de Mont-Blandin by Dunstan, who stayed there in 956, to England and used in the Anglo-Saxon *Regularis Concordia*.

---

[2] Gerard's *vita* in *MGSS* XV, 2, 654–73; fundamental study by J. M. De Smet, "Recherches critiques sur la Vita Gerardi abbatis Broniensis" in *RBén* 70 (1960), 5–61; earlier works, to the extent that they make use of the *vita,* are to be checked with De Smet, e.g., E. Sabbe, "Étude critique sur la biographie et la réforme de Gérard de Brogne" in *Mélanges F. Rousseau* (Brussels 1958), 497–524; J. Wollasch in *RBén* 70 (1960), 62–82 (on Gerard's founding of the monastery), 224–31 (on Gerard's place in the reform monasticism of his day).

Closely connected with Gorze was the monastery of Sankt Maximin at Trier, founded in 934 by Duke Giselbert. Otto the Great made use of the Trier monks. He made one of them Abbot of Sankt Moritz in Magdeburg; another, Adalbert, to whom he had earlier given the abbey of Weissenburg, was made first Archbishop of Magdeburg; and he had several royal monasteries reformed by Sandrad. When Bishop Wolfgang of Regensburg separated the collegiate church and the monastery of Sankt Emmeran, from Sankt Maximin he got Ramwold as Abbot of Sankt Emmeran. Because of his friendship with Duke Henry, the later Emperor Henry II, Ramwold became the centre of a Bavarian movement of monastic renovation. On reaching the throne, Henry II had a whole group of royal monasteries reformed: the abbeys of Prüm and Reichenau by Abbot Immo of Gorze; Lorch, Fulda, and Corvey by Poppo, who was probably from Sankt Emmeran; Hersfeld by Ramwold's friend, Abbot Godehard, whom Henry when Duke had appointed to Niederaltaich and Tegernsee and had learned to esteem because of the great successes he had had there. It was probably Conrad II who appointed the Niederaltaich monk Richer (d. 1055) as Abbot of Leno near Brescia, and he certainly gave him Montecassino in 1038, so that the Benedictine mother house under Richer's direction was given the stamp of Niederaltaich.[3]

The happily inaugurated movement of renewal stimulated greater achievements at the beginning of the eleventh century. Thus the Bishops Adalbero II of Metz and Berthold of Toul gave some of the monasteries subject to them, including Gorze, to the great reformer, William of Dijon, even though the abbeys did not need a real reform. Thus a branch under strong Cluniac influence took root in Upper Lotharingia, though it was unable to make much progress. But there now arose in the monastery of Saint-Vanne de Verdun, under the strong leadership of Abbot Richard (1005–46), a new Lotharingian reform centre, which united the Cluniac and the Lotharingian monastic customs in its own way. Called upon for monastic reform in the dioceses of Metz, Verdun, Liège, and Cambrai and in the nearby French bishoprics, Saint-Vanne became the mother of a monastic congregation counting more than twenty houses.

Although Richard from time to time returned their independence to the monasteries confided to him, with a few exceptions, he still had the abbots and *praepositi* whom he had appointed come to Saint-Vanne annually in order to maintain the spirit of the order. Several of his pupils had as far-reaching an influence as he did, especially Poppo of Stavelot. Richard had brought him from Saint-Thierry to Saint-Vanne and then entrusted him successively with the direction of Saint-Vaast and Beaulieu. But in 1020 he had to relinquish him to Henry II, who confided to the experienced man the royal monasteries of Stavelot and Malmedy and in 1022 also Sankt Maximin at Trier. Conrad II went even further. He not only bestowed on the reform Abbot his dynastic monastery of Limburg on the Hardt, but had a whole group of royal abbeys directed or at least supervised by him: Echternach, Saint-Ghislain, Hersfeld, Weissenburg, and Sankt Gallen. Since not a few proprietors followed the royal example, Poppo became the most powerful Abbot in the Empire. With Richard's death in 1046 and Poppo's in 1048, the Lotharingian-Cluniac mixed observance lost its driving force. Other impulses took its place; they will be treated in Chapter 52.

---

[3] W. Wühr, "Die Wiedergeburt Montecassinos unter seinem ersten Reformabt Richer von Niederaltaich" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 369–450.

The success of the Lotharingian and German waves of renewal must not be either overestimated or underrated. Monastic reform centres here were less influential in turning the scale than the proprietors, whose ideas were not always uniform. Among them eagerness for reform stood alongside indifference, religious motives could be compromised by strong economic interests and by state and family politics, and now this, now that reform tendency was preferred. Just the same, the serious, increasing rather than diminishing exertions for renewal on the part of so many proprietors demands respect. The radiating strength of individual reform centres, moreover, found its limit in the Benedictine constitutional principles that were preserved in Lotharingia and Germany. The great goal of binding all abbeys to a single rule and *consuetudo* and of controlling the spirit of the order had been what Benedict of Aniane had sought to effect by means of the unity of the Carolingian Empire. His premature death and the decay of the Empire prevented success. For the future the relations of the monasteries to one another were based on the principle of autonomy, which was to maintain itself in the East Carolingian Kingdom.

In contrast to Cluny, in Lotharingia and Germany there were no congregations during the Ottonian and early Salian periods, but at most rather loosely constructed monastic groups, based on the notion of observance and on the association of prayer, which could be reorganized or even dissolved. The lack of any institutional stability had its drawbacks, of course; but in a movement of renewal it was not the organization that was ultimately decisive but the spirit, and many Lotharingians and Germans were affected by it.[4] A further distinction from Cluny and other French reform monasteries lay in the relationship to the diocesan bishop. The lack of protection on the part of the public authority in France aroused among the monks there the desire to escape episcopal jurisdiction as far as possible and be directly subordinate to the papacy. Such a striving for exemption, proceeding from an unpropitious situation, was virtually non-existent in the Lotharingian and German monasteries, which were legally better guaranteed. This circumstance had little to do with the reform; of itself alone, exemption was in no sense able to preserve from decadence.

---

[4] Irish and Scottish monks who came to the continent during the tenth century also took part in the renewal; cf. Sackur, *Cluniacenser,* I, 181–86, II, 124f.; B. Bischoff in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo,* 137f.

France

From unassuming beginnings the abbey of Cluny in French Burgundy developed into the most important reform centre. It owed its establishment in 910 to William the Good, Duke of Aquitaine and Count of Auvergne. In the very foundation charter the monastery's property was removed from the clutches of every power, secular and spiritual, the abbey was placed under the protection of the Holy See, and the free election of its abbot was granted. William gave it to Berno, Abbot of Gigny and Beaume, well known as a father of monks because of his monastic austerity. Other lords did likewise; Berno received three other monasteries — Déols and Massay in the County of Berry and Ethice in Burgundy. Shortly before his death in 927 he divided the six houses between his nephew Guy, who obtained Gigny, Beaume, and Ethice, and his disciple Odo, who received Cluny, Déols, and Massay, with the obligation of preserving the same observance.

Under Odo (927–42) Cluny's still rather small monastic community quickly gained influence. Not a few proprietors of monasteries called upon its Abbot for the renewal of old and the direction of newly founded monastic houses, especially in Aquitaine.[5] When Odo made personal contact with the Popes, he was even entrusted by Prince Alberic with the reform of Roman and nearby monasteries. The seventeen houses which were subject to him in 937 were, it is true, united only very loosely by the abbatial function *(abbatia)* which he exercised, even though one or the other house, such as Romainmoutier, was given to Cluny forever. Odo probably did not even seek the formation of a real union. Administered in Odo's spirit by the capable Aymard (942–54), Cluny was prepared for the prosperity which it was to experience, due to the superb qualifications and the extraordinarily long tenures of the next three Abbots. Mayeul (954–93), Odilo (993–1048), and Hugh (1049 to 1109) brought their monastery world-wide fame. Directly or indirectly, the Cluniac observance not only affected a large part of the French abbeys, but obtained entrance into Italy, with the beginning of the eleventh century into Spain, and from around 1050 into Lotharingia, Germany, and England.

Actually Cluny held to the same tradition that had been established by

---

[5] J. Wollasch, "Königtum, Adel und Klöster im Berry während des 11. Jahrhunderts" in *Neue Forschungen,* 17–165.

Benedict of Aniane and was followed by the Lotharingian centres of renewal. It did not add new intellectual or ascetical ideas, but continued certain basic tendencies of Benedict of Aniane, such as stricter observance of silence and lengthening of the choral office. The liturgy, elaborated in the direction of solemnity, became the dominant element. Precious vestments and vessels and splendid architecture heightened the brilliance. The piling on of additional prayers brought it about that, according to Odo's biographer, more than 138 psalms were prayed every day. The ritualistic excess left the monks little time for study, and manual labour all but disappeared. Because of the last mentioned circumstance even a highly born lord could be comfortable at Cluny, especially since clothing, food, cleanliness, and sanitation were suitably provided. The extraordinarily careful attention devoted to the remembrance of the dead must have attracted well-to-do families to make gifts and to show their good will in other ways.[6] Two elements in the constitution especially prevented a relaxation of monastic discipline: the right of the Abbot to designate his successor, and thus to assure continuity, and the forming of a monastic order.

The beginnings of the Cluniac Order have not yet been cleared up. However, Cluny succeeded in bringing a great part of the monastic houses that were committed to renewal into a more or less strong dependence. The principal element contributing to this was the priory system. For the most part the priories resulted from small monastic communities situated on estates of the motherhouse and called *cellae*. Even when they grew up to the size of a monastery or even founded priories of their own — la Charité-sur-Loire owned fifty, as far away as England — Cluny let them remain as far as possible in their subordinate position under a prior, whom the Abbot appointed and replaced at will. Besides the priories, there were subject to the motherhouse a group of abbeys, some almost entirely so, others to a certain degree. The dependent superiors had to make an oath of loyalty into the hands of the Abbot, like a vassal to his feudal lord. For all members of the order the ordination of monks, not their profession, was arranged at Cluny from the end of the eleventh century.

All in all there was question here of an imperfect type, soon outmoded by the Cistercians; its unifying bond consisted of the person of the Abbot. In a sense it recalls the manner in which a noble combined far scattered properties or rights, amassed in juridically different ways, into one estate in his person. And as a matter of fact the Cluniac union was constituted to a great extent for economic reasons. Without centralization it was impossible to avoid the fragmentation of property which began in France and Italy at the end of the tenth century. Of course, beside economic interests stood reform concerns:

---

[6] Around 1030 Abbot Odilo required all dependent houses to introduce the Commemoration of All Souls; cf. Sackur, *op. cit.* II, 245.

incorporated into the order, the monasteries of monks could be kept under discipline by the Abbot by means of visitation and other measures.

It is still a subject of controversy whether Cluny strove for a comprehensive reform of the Church over and above the monastic world and hence was at least one of the causes of the great movement that got under way around 1050. In the complex problem a distinction must be made between the non-ecclesiastical and the ecclesiastical spheres. Cluny probably did not aim at a transformation in principle of the early mediaeval world. Great as were the liberties granted it by the founder, Duke William, there is little reason for interpreting them as a demonstration against the existing juridical order. And if Cluny had no *advocatus,* it must be borne in mind that the *advocatia* of the nobility was not customary in all of southern France up to where Cluny lay, whereas in northern France even Cluniac houses could have *advocati,* and here and there even wanted them. With all their exertions for guaranteeing the monastic spirit of the houses entrusted to them, the Abbots of Cluny were able on occasion to accommodate themselves to the legal claims of proprietors. They understood their concerns. Since they did not have their many estates worked by their monks and only later, from around 1100, as far as possible by lay brothers, their economic system in the period here under consideration differed in no way from that of the feudal lords. A very special connection was signified by the proprietary churches which the Cluniacs acquired, even from lay persons, in an increasing degree during the tenth and eleventh centuries. For rounding out their possessions they even had no difficulty in buying up entire churches or partial rights to them. The contradiction to the principles appearing in the Gregorian reform was plain here. It showed how much Cluny was bound up with the Carolingian and Ottonian epochs. The occasional criticism of the then prevailing situation by isolated monks even in the tenth or eleventh century does not yet prove an opposition in principle to feudalism or theocracy; besides, such expressions, uttered, for example, by Abbo of Fleury or William of Dijon, came mostly from circles not directly belonging to Cluny. However, the indirect influence of the Cluniacs on the coming great reform of the Church is to be highly rated. In addition to monastic renewal as such, especially effective was the educational activity which the Cluniacs exercised, thanks to their friendly relations with the leading elements in society.

Within the Church, on the other hand, Cluny directly prepared for the Gregorian reform in one particular aspect: by its connection with Rome. From the first contact made by Abbot Odo, the papal protection envisaged in the foundation charter was again and again confirmed by the Holy See and as far as possible acted upon. Gregory V went beyond this by granting what became typical rights of exemption:[7] only bishops invited by the Abbot were to be qualified to consecrate, ordain, or celebrate Mass at Cluny, and the monks could receive orders wherever it pleased the Abbot. When, for this very reason, a controversy erupted in 1025 with the Bishop of Mâcon, to continue with interruptions, until the pontificate of Calixtus II a century later, John XIX not only confirmed the decree of Gregory V, but also exempted the monks of Cluny from episcopal excommunication and interdict.[8] Thus the motherhouse achieved full exemption. Other Cluniac houses sought to copy this, but only realized various successes or even none at all. Hence, the Cluniac Order did not form a closed exemption block, which cut vertically through the horizontally arranged diocesan system and, with its pyramid culminating in the Abbot and subject to the Pope, establish on the one hand the strength of the union in an order and on the other the papal supremacy over the orders. Nevertheless, the striving for exemption was of great significance: the hopes in this regard that were centred on the Holy See made the Cluniacs the promoters and defenders of the idea of the primacy before and during the Gregorian reform.

---

[7] *Jaffé* 3896 (undated); M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG: Otto III.,* 287, dates it 999.

Cluny's radiation was by no means restricted to houses belonging to the order. Monasteries that were directed by Cluny's Abbots only for a short time and then given their autonomy also retained to a great extent a Cluniac stamp with the addition of their own special characteristics and transmitted this spirit to other monastic communities. Thus the monastery of Saint Benedict at Fleury-sur-Loire, renewed by Abbot Odo in 930, became a separate reform centre, to which recourse was even had for the monastic renewal in England by Dunstan's friends, Aethelwold and Oswald. Even farther extended the influence of Saint-Bénigne de Dijon, since the introduction there of Cluniac asceticism in an even stricter form by Mayeul's pupil, William of Volpiano, a Lombard noble, who became Abbot in 990. William's reform movement reached beyond its principal field of activity in France into North Italy, where his foundation of Fruttuaria was to be especially prominent, and into Normandy. The Norman monasteries, closely bound to the Duke, were also in some degree accessible to the influence of Richard of Saint-Vanne. Other groups were established by the monasteries of Aurillac, Marmoutier, and Molesme, which had been reformed by Cluny. There were also monastic centres which were not directly affected by Cluny. Of these the most prominent was Saint-Victor de Marseille. From the time the first monastery became subject to it in 1034, Saint-Victor in quick succession attracted a whole group of monasteries of the Midi and then of Catalonia and Spain, where it vied with Cluny,[9] and extended its influence as far as Sardinia.

---

[8] *Jaffé* 4079; re-edited text in L. Santifaller in *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 1 (1956f.), 55f., with historical introduction; cf. also *Jaffé* 4083, 4080–81. On Cluny's exemption see, besides the works mentioned in the Literature by Lemarignier, who probably overestimates the importance of Cluny's exemption, and by C. Violante, also A. Hessel, "Cluny und Macon" in *ZGK* 22 (1901), 516–24; G. Tellenbach, "Der Sturz des Abtes Pontius von Cluny und seine geschichtliche Bedeutung" in *QFIAB* 42/43 (1964), 13–55.

Italy

The Cluniac movement first gained a firm footing in Italy with Mayeul of Cluny and William of Saint-Bénigne de Dijon. The dependent houses that both centres then established were for the most part in the North. Abbot Odilo, probably on the urging of Otto III, was able to take up again Odo's reform work in Rome. At the same time the important royal monastery of Farfa, on its own initiative and with the reserving of its liberty, accepted the Cluniac usages.[10] And when around 1011 Odilo's pupil Alferio returned to his homeland in order to found the abbey of Cava dei Tirreni with the aassistance of Waimar of Salerno, Cluny's spirit was finally operative in the South also, for Montecassino was never really touched by it. Independently of Cluny, Cava was to form from 1050 a large congregation reaching to Sicily.[11]

Meanwhile, there grew up in Italy a special, eremitically oriented form, which was to release new impulses. Itself the origin of Christian monachism in general and heroic realization of the *fuga mundi,* the eremitical life always and everywhere attracted high-minded persons, such as the little group in Lotharingia who in 933 revived Gorze and later Richard of Saint-Vanne. Although the Benedictines permitted individual members, with the consent of the abbot, to live as recluses or hermits,[12] they were on the whole dominated by the cenobitical idea. Wherever the latter was renewed and realized with strict discipline, eremitical inclinations went into eclipse; at Cluny, for example, they are only demonstrable after the death of Abbot Hugh at a time of inner crisis. On the other hand, Eastern monachism gave the eremitical element a much greater scope. Hence it was no accident that the attraction to eremitism was especially alive in Italy, where the Latin and Byzantine cultures were in direct contact. Two great personalities gave it a special stamp: the Calabrian Nilus and Romuald of Ravenna.

Nilus was the embodiment of the Italo-Greek type.[13] South Italy was full of numerous monastic communities that for the most part lived according to Saint Basil's rule. Their number was increased in the ninth and tenth centuries by Sicilian monks, fleeing from the Muslims. An especially important centre, itself influencing the East, was constituted by the monastic heptarchy of Mercurion, a district between Orsomarso, Aieta, the river Lao, and the sea.[14] Nilus, born at Rossano around 905, had stayed there twice for his formation. In 950 he founded a settlement near Rossano, but then, in consequence of the Muslim invasions, he went to Campania, where he established Valleluce on Cassinese soil. Striving for greater solitude, he went to the territory of Gaetà, where the monastery of Serperi arose. Personal contacts with Otto III induced him first to accept the Roman abbey of Tre Fontane and finally to found that of Grottaferrata, still existing. He died there in 1004. Despite his surpassing personality and a fine ascetical as well as intellectual and cultural formation, such as was typical of Greek monachism, Nilus did not greatly influence the Latin world. Even his special preference for the eremitical life at most contributed to strengthen tendencies which had long been present in Central and North Italy and took shape in Romuald.

---

[9] For the penetration of Spain by the two monastic centres, cf. the Literature to Chapter 29, footnote 5.

[10] G. Antonelli, "L'opera di Odone di Cluny in Italia" in *Benedictina* 4 (1950), 19–40; for the Roman monasteries (fifth to tenth century), G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries* (Vatican City 1957), must always be consulted; cf. also J. Schuster, *L'imperiale abbazia di Farfa* (Rome 1921) and *RBén* 24 (1907), 17–35, 374–402 (on Farfa's renewal).

[11] On Cava dei Tirreni, cf. L. Mattei-Cerasoli in *L'Italia benedittina,* ed. by P. Lugano (Rome 1929), 155–227; G. Colavolpe, *La congregazione Cavense* (Badia di Cava 1923).

[12] L. Gougaud, *Ermites et reclus* (Ligugé 1928); O. Doerr, *Das Institut der Inclusen in Süddeutschland* (Münster 1934).

[13] Bartholomew of Grottaferrata, *Vita S. Nili* in *PG* 120, 15–165; Italian translation by G. Giovanelli (Grottaferrata 1942).

If one accepts the more probable chronology, Romuald, son of the Duke of Ravenna, entered the monastery of Sant'Apollinare in Classe around 972, when about twenty years of age, in order to atone for a murder committed by his father.[15] Dissatisfaction with the spirit prevailing there drove him into solitude. He spent the first years under the care of a hermit in the swampy district near Venice, then went with his teacher and a couple of Venetians to the Catalonian monastery of Cuxá, in the vicinity of which he lived for about ten years with his friends as a hermit. Having returned to Italy around 988, his unusual and charismatic personality excited amazement and the desire to follow him. Otto III, his enthusiastic admirer, had little success when in 998 he had him elected Abbot of Classe; a year later Romuald literally laid the crozier at his feet. Even later he could not bear to remain anywhere for long. Wandering restlessly through Central Italy, he reformed existing monasteries or founded new colonies of hermits, among them the at first still unimportant Camaldoli. At his death in the solitude of Val di Castro in 1027, he left neither a written rule nor an organizational summary of the eremitical communities that he had founded, several of which quickly disintegrated. If, in spite of this, his work continued, this was in great measure due to Peter Damiani, who in 1034 entered Fonte Avellana and in 1043 became its prior; he died in 1072. Peter gave the Italian hermit movement both a theological and a firmer organizational and economic basis, even though the congregation he constructed included not many more than ten settlements. Under

---

[14] B. Cappelli, "Il Mercurion" in *Archivio storico per la Calabria e Lucania* 25 (1956), 43–62.

[15] Bruno of Querfurt, *Vita quinque fratrum* in *MGSS* XV, 709–738, is more trustworthy in his reports of Romuald, whose pupil he was, than is Peter Damiani, *Vita B. Romualdi* in *FontiStIt* 94, ed. G. Tabacco (1957).

Prior Rudolf (1074–89) began the rise of Camaldoli; there the tradition going back to Romuald was defined in the *Eremiticae Regulae*.

Basically, Romuald strove for nothing more than a monastic way of life, intensified to extreme austerity but somehow continuing in the framework of the Benedictine rule. Hence he was interested in Benedictine reform centres and their *consuetudines,* especially those of Cluny, which he highly esteemed. There could be no question of an opposition in principle: Benedictines in the old tradition did not exclude the eremitical life, and Romuald and his disciples did not exclude the cenobitical life. In addition to the *eremus,* an isolated district with separate hut-like dwellings and a church in their midst, there was a monastery in Romuald's foundations. From the viewpoint of worth, of course, to Romuald's followers the eremitical life was incomparably higher than the cenobitical; the superior in charge of both communities had to be a hermit. Neither Romuald nor Peter Damiani regarded the monastery as the preparation for the *eremus* — both allowed fit disciples to be hermits from the outset — but rather they assigned it the function of intercepting the noise of the world and managing the economic affairs.

No doubt this shift of stress contained new and even revolutionary elements. Here the demands present in cenobitism, of fitting oneself into the whole, were less important than the personal striving of the hermit to find God in an heroic struggle against his own nature and the demons, in an excess of fasting, mortification, and prayer. From so subjectively oriented a training of the spirit issued fearless men who severely flayed the failings of the age. Their criticism struck at the monasteries with their great wealth as well as at the life of the laity and of the clergy, high and low, wherever it gave scandal. Small though the number of hermits was, the excitement which they caused was great. Basically, they were both driving and driven — driven, in so far as Western Christendom with increasing uneasiness was going to meet the great change that was becoming visible with the Gregorian reform. Thereby the hermits became a dynamic element. What they had been making ready in Italy since before 1050 was to be frequently repeated elsewhere, especially in France, and to lead to new monastic communities, both within and without the Benedictine family.

The Canons

By means of the reform legislation of Louis the Pious the *vita canonica* was separated once for all from the *vita monastica* and in the Aachen *Institutio canonicorum* of 816 it was defined even in regard to details. In all this there were adopted the essential points which were contained in the rule for canons composed earlier by Bishop Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766). As with the monks, the chief duty of canons was to consist of the choral liturgy, and their life was to be bound up with cloister, including common dormitory and refectory, and with the prescriptions of the rule. They were distinguished from monks by better clothing (linen), by the differentiation of the community according to orders received, and by the right to private property; furthermore, under certain circumstances they were permitted to live in individual dwellings within the cloister.

The concession of private ownership did not please all who took part in the Synod of Aachen; perhaps it must be ascribed to their dissatisfaction that the Aachen rule carries a text from Augustine which forbids private ownership.[16] But the ideal of poverty did not for that reason simply fall into oblivion. It could be taken seriously especially in those cathedrals, German mostly, where cathedral chapter and cathedral monastery were not yet separated and hence the possibility remained of urging a poverty relating to monasticism. Of course, if canonical elements insisting on the Aachen rule carried the day, the cathedral monastery incurred the danger of losing its monastic character with the dissolution of the principle of poverty or even of degenerating. Which tendency gained the victory depended on the local conditions, which can for the most part no longer be pinpointed. The far greater number of chapters did, in any event, permit private ownership by the canons.

Generally speaking, the Aachen canonical rule proved to be a centennial achievement. Not it but the circumstances of the time are the reason why many chapters fell into decay in the course of the ninth century. Once the West set about a reconstruction, the *vita canonica* flourished again. The renewal of the chapters ran parallel to that of the monasteries in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. Previous research did not recognize this fact clearly enough, since it accepted too uncritically the disparaging judgments which overtook the secular canons in the world of monks and later also in that of canons regular, and on the other hand failed to collect carefully the few positive testimonies scattered here and there. Although many monographs are still needed, a really favourable picture is now available.[17] In France, Lotharingia, Germany, and North and Central Italy — in the last mentioned especially from the beginning of the eleventh century — many cathedral and collegiate chapters can be identified, where both choral liturgy and common life in fidelity to the rule were carefully cultivated. The canons rendered inestimable service in the cathedral schools. And if from about 920 new foundations of chapters constantly occurred, the *vita canonica* must have been displayed in many places in a form worthy of credence, though it was often economic interests that settled matters.

Chapter reforms ordinarily originated with bishops or even rulers, such as the Emperor Henry II. As has already been shown, this was also the case with not a few monastic reforms, but there the renewed spirit was assured more easily through the monarchical position of the abbot or even because of the formation of a congregation than it could be among the canons. The collegial organization among the canons limited the power of the provost, and unions similar to congregations were made virtually impossible by the juridical structure of the chapters. To this extent the great continuous progress was missing from the canonical movement of renewal. The deterioration of a chapter took place almost of necessity when it was no longer in a position to see to the adequate support of its members. And since from the end of the tenth century an extensive fragmentation of property and rights began in France and Italy, not a few smaller chapters, for the most part foundations of the lower nobility, fell into economic distress, which undermined discipline, whereas monastic congregations, such as the Cluniac and others, overcame the economic crisis; in fact they were even able to absorb rural collegiate chapters that faced ruin. The wretched condition of many communities of canons of the Midi and Italy is certainly one of the reasons why the reform movement of the canons regular began precisely there and not, for example, in German territory. Wherever the chapters lived in secure conditions, there was little occasion to depart from the Aachen rule, and it would be unfair to view this clinging to a tried tradition through the eyes of canons regular, striving for something higher, as an apostasy from the authentic spirit.

---

[16] C. 112 (*MGConc* II, 386); cf. also c. 113 (ibid. 389).

[17] Many individual data in C. Dereine, *DHGE* 12, 366–75; for Germany in Siegwart, *Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften,* 95–230.

Chapter 40

Education and Learning

When persons set to work in the tenth century to restore monasteries and chapters or to found new ones, studies, which had also fallen into decay, were stimulated. Great achievements, however, were not to be expected. The time when scholars from all parts of the Carolingian *Imperium* made their way to the imperial court to work on greater themes in common belonged to the past. More than ever, scholarly effort withdrew into monastic and cathedral schools. It was they that, in a silent work of reconstruction, were preparing the future development of Western scholarship.

Every monastery possessed a school, at least for its own recruits. At the same time, however, not a few abbeys maintained a school for externs, in which pupils who were entrusted to them, but were not destined for the monastic life, were instructed. The teaching continued the Carolingian tradition. Among the masters who handed it on, three were outstanding at the turn of the ninth century: Remigius of Auxerre (d. 908), Notker the Stammerer of Sankt Gallen (d. 912), and Hucbald of Saint-Amand (d. 930). The greatest was Notker. Sankt Gallen owed it especially to him that it remained an important intellectual centre for the next century. Revived or new monasteries had to start from the beginning. Their attitude to studies varied. Cluny, for example, brought to scholarship a less comprehensive interest that did Fleury-sur-Loire or Lotharingian and German monasteries.

Less numerous but not of less quality were the cathedral schools operated by the canons. The cathedral school of Reims reached its climax under Gerbert of Aurillac.[1] His pupil Fulbert (d. 1029) established the fame of Chartres;[2] what he began as teacher and fostered as bishop was to outlive him, and as late as the twelfth century the school of Chartres still had its own special character. The German cathedral schools owed their flowering to the exertions of Archbishop Bruno of Cologne and his brother, Otto the Great. By preference it was in the cathedral schools that the Ottos and the Salians trained their future chaplains, chancery notaries, and bishops.[3] Italy was a country of too ancient a culture for studies to be able to die out. In the tenth century they lived on especially in the Lombard Kingdom. Cathedral and urban schools, like those of Pavia, Milan, Vercelli, Parma, Verona, and also Ravenna, maintained a high level.

The details of scholarship were set into the traditional framework of the seven *artes liberales.* The *trivium,* consisting of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric, was followed by the *quadrivium* — arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy. Concentration was on the *trivium* and, more specifically, on grammar. By hard work persons advanced from the *Ars minor* to the *Ars maior* of Donatus and eventually to Priscian's *Ars grammatica.* Manuals for dialectics, which followed, were Porphyry's *Isagoge* in the translations of Victorinus and Boethius, Aristotle's *Categories* and *Peri ermeneias* according to Boethius, Cicero's *Topics,* the *Logic* of Boethius, and so forth. An introduction to rhetoric was provided by various works of Boethius, the reading of ancient poets and prose authors, and then Cicero's *De inventione* and other systematic works. Ancient authors who were read included: Virgil, the *Ilias latina* (a crude, abbreviated translation of the first century after Christ), Martianus Capella, Horace, Persius, Juvenal, Boethius, Statius, Terence, Lucan; of the ancient historians Sallust was preferred.

Far less happy was the situation of the mathematical disciplines of the *quadrivium.* Apart from the relevant sections of Martianus Capella, the works of Boethius on arithmetic and geometry were especially used. Gerbert of Aurillac, who once visited Catalonia and made his own the relatively advanced mathematical knowledge imparted by Muslim Spain, was the first to go beyond this. He was even able to rediscover and use pertinent works of antiquity. Music offered a particular difficulty. It was studied as *musica*

---

[1] J. Leflon, *Gerbert, humanisme et chrétienté au X^e siècle* (Paris 1946); O. G. Darlington, "Gerbert the Teacher" in *AHR* 52 (1947), 456–76.

[2] L. C. MacKinney, *Bishop Fulbert and Education at the School of Chartres* (Notre Dame 1957).

[3] J. Fleckenstein, "Königshof und Bischofsschule unter Otto dem Grossen" in *AKG* 38 (1956), 38–62.

speculativa, theoretica, practica.[4] Gerbert, the Reichenau school, and others still took into account the mathematical elements, but in the eleventh century the theory of music more and more gave way to practical instruction in singing and composing. One of the great didactic achievements of the time was the new system of lines attributed to Guido of Arezzo.

All these studies, for which, in addition to pagan authors, the Church Fathers, especially Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, then Isidore of Seville, Bede, and the Carolingian authors were called into service, found expression in a series of treatises. They were too much the product of their age to require discussion here.[5] Only very rarely did the mind move on from dialectics to authentic philosophical problems. Thus Gerbert, by means of a disputation which he had held at Ravenna in 980 with the Saxon Otric in the presence of Otto II, was motivated to compose the not uninteresting *Libellus de rationali et ratione uti,* dedicated to Otto III.[6] Reflecting on the logical connection between subject and predicate, he there touched upon the Aristotelian speculation on act and potency in analyzing the use of reason, but without venturing beyond the logical sphere into the rarer atmosphere of metaphysics.

Theology was in a pretty sorry state.[7] It lived on the store laid up in the Carolingian age. What Gregory of Tortona wrote on the Eucharist, with Christological digressions, toward the end of the tenth century, he took for the most part from Paschasius Radbertus, adding passages from a few reports of miracles. The Eucharistic treatise of Abbot Heriger of Lobbes is to be more highly esteemed. The scarcely original work of Abbot Adso of Montiérender (d. 999), *De adventu antichristi,* did not really deserve the influence which it was actually to exercise on the eschatological works of the following period. The few biblical commentaries composed at this time were also in the nature of compilations: Atto of Vercelli (d. 961) on Paul's Epistles, Bruno of Würzburg (d. 1045) on the Psalms, Theodoric of Fleury on the Catholic Epistles (c. 1000). Gerard of Czanád's *Deliberatio supra hymnum trium puerorum* does not fit into this category because of its prolixity and is more like a sermon. Basically, theological efforts were geared to the practical. Abbot Bern of Reichenau (d. 1048) discussed the Ember Days, the four Sundays of Advent, questions of music and singing, and the liturgy of the Mass. Odo of Cluny (d. 942) assembled from the opinions of the Fathers a meditation on the evil in the world, the so-called *Collationes,* which is dominated by monastic thought.

---

[4] In the work *Artes liberales* cf. K. G. Fellerer, "Die Musica in den Artes liberales" (33–49), and H. M. Klinkenberg, "Der Verfall des Quadriviums im frühen Mittelalter" (1–32); on the latter, K. Reindel, "Vom Beginn des Quadriviums" in *DA* 15 (1959), 516–22.

[5] On them see *Manitius* II, 638–725 (trivium) and 726–87 (quadrivium).

[6] *PL* 139, 159–68.

[7] The individual authors and their works in *Manitius* II, 18–81 (with copious bibliography).

Three theologians must be given special prominence. Bishop Atto of Vercelli (924–61) has left an account of a very extensive pastoral activity in his writings.[8] Besides his letters, including a pastoral letter to his people and clergy, sermons, and a collection of canons, entitled *Capitulare,* for the clergy of his diocese, he wrote an original work, *De pressuris ecclesiasticis.* Vividly and dramatically he described the encroachments of the mighty, especially in appointments to churches and sees and during the vacancies of bishoprics, and, with abundant citation of canons, contrasted all this with the rights of churches. Even more realistic is his *Polipticum quod appellatur perpendiculum,* a pitiless presentation of political abuses and their fateful consequences, leading to imposed outside rule.

The work of Rathier of Verona falls in about the same period.[9] Born at Liège around 887, he was educated in the famed school of the monastery of Lobbes (Laubach in Hainaut) and became a monk there. In 926 he went to Italy with Abbot Hilduin and in 931 succeeded him as Bishop of Verona. The foreign monk, lacking in inner balance, was not equal to a task that would have been difficult in any event. Imprisonment at the hands of King Hugh of Italy, banishment, return to Germany, brief interlude in Verona (946–8), Bishop of Liège (952–5), Abbot in Lower Lotharingia, Bishop of Verona for the third time (961–8), return home and death (974) — such were the chief stages in his agitated life.

Highly gifted as a writer and unusually conversant with the literature of pagan antiquity and the patristic theological works, Rathier unfortunately composed most of his writings either to justify himself or to accuse himself in tormenting self-reflection. His letters, sermons, and treatises are a real mine for a knowledge of the time. His most outstanding works are the *Praeloquia*[10], which could be called a great moral and sociological discussion. The entire citizen body of an Italian city there passes before us: artist, merchant, lawyer, judge, official, noble, lord and slave, teacher and pupil, rich man and beggar. There follows a mirror for kings, then one for bishops, while the last book is again directed to the generality, in order to give comfort and to awaken men spiritually. Rathier's *Excerptum ex dialogo confessionali* is of value for pastoral theology, as is also his *Synodica,* in which he gave the quite inferior clergy of Verona an elementary instruction in their official duties. His *De nuptu illicito* deals with celibacy and especially with marriages between priests and priests' daughters, while *De contemptu canonum* explains to the refractory clergy of Verona the rights of the Bishop.[11]

---

[8] Works in *PL* 134, 27–894; *Polipticum,* ed. G. Goetz in *AAL* 37, 2 (1922); on the work cf. P. E. Schramm in *ZSavRGgerm* 49 (1929), 180–98. Biographies: J. Schultz (dissertation, Göttingen 1885); E. Pasteris (Milan 1925); R. Ordano (Vercelli 1948).

[9] *PL* 136, 9–758; the letters, edited by F. Weigle, in *MG Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 1 (1949). A. Vogel, *Ratherius von Verona und das 10. Jahrhundert,* 2 vols. (Jena 1854), is still indispensable; G. Monticelli, *Raterio di Verona* (Milan 1938); G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie,* II, 2 Frankfurt 1955), 519–650; on the deposition process at Verona, cf. F. Weigle, *Studi storici Veronesi* 4 (1953), 29–44, C. G. Mor, ibid. 45–56, and V. Cavallari, *Studi giuridici in onore di M. Cavallieri* (Padua 1960), 41–99.

[10] *PL* 136, 143–344.

The third author who came to grips with the abuses of his day as theologian and canonist, Abbot Abbo of Fleury (988–1004), wrote from the standpoint of monasticism. In fact, his two most important works, dedicated to Kings Hugh and Robert II of France, the *Apologeticus* and the *Collectio canonum,* were substantially geared to the struggles then getting under way between episcopate and monasteries.[12] Despite this one-sided tendency they provide a wealth of interesting ideas coloured by the desire for reform. The necessity of a strong royal power and the duty of rulers to protect the faith are as prominent as the ecclesiastical law on matrimony, the classes within the Church, social groups, simonical abuses, encroachments of bishops on monasteries, and so forth.

The predominantly practical interest called forth in the tenth century a relatively large number of works on canon law. The best of these appeared at the beginning and the end of the century. Thus Auxilius and Vulgarius defended the validity of the Formosan ordinations against Pope Sergius III with a profound knowledge of canon law and theology.[13] Even more highly to be esteemed is Regino of Prüm's work, appearing around 908, on the practice of the synodal tribunal; it was a successful attempt to explain in writing the actual procedure corresponding to Germanic law.[14]

We may skip over the canonical compilations that followed these works. All were surpassed by the *Decretum* of Bishop Burchard of Worms (1000–25), composed in 1008–12.[15] Geared to the requirements of practice, this canonical collection, divided into twenty books, instructed bishops on all questions of spiritual jurisdiction. It was no mere chance that the time of its origin fell during the reign of Henry II. The ecclesiastical juridical situation had stabilized itself and posed quite special reform problems; there was question here of a reform, which despite certain tensions to be noticed at times even in Burchard, still regarded *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium* as a unity. Inner balance and usefulness assured the work a circulation previously unprecedented in the entire Christian West. Burchard's practical sense becomes further evident in his *Lex familiae Wormatiensis,* concerned with a manorial law composed around 1020, which sought to protect the peasants of the see of Worms from oppression and at the same time guard the financial interests of the Church.

---

[11] *Excerptum ex dialogo confessionali* in *PL* 136, 391–444; *Synodica,* ibid. 551–68; *De nuptu illicito,* ibid. 567–74; *De contemptu canonum,* ibid. 485–522.

[12] Works in *PL* 139, 418–578; *Apologeticus,* ibid. 461–72; *Collectio canonum,* ibid. 472–508; P. Cousin, *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire* (Paris 1954).

[13] Partly edited by E. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius* (Leipzig 1866); otherwise in *PL* 129, 1059–1112. O. Pop, *La défense du pape Formose* (Paris 1933).

[14] Regino of Prüm, *Libri duo de synodalibus causis,* ed. by Wasserschleben (Leipzig 1840); *PL* 132, 185–370; on the synodal court, see *supra,* Chapter 37.

[15] Burchard's *Decretum* in *PL* 140, 537–1058; the Worms *Hofrecht* in *MGConst* I, 640–44. A. M. Koeniger, *Burchard von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit* (Munich 1905); on the spread of the *Decretum,* cf. O. Meyer in *ZSavRGkan* 60 (1940), 141–83; F. Pelster in *MiscMercati* II, 114–57; id., *StudGreg* I (1947), 321–51; C. G. Mor, ibid. 197–206, on the *Decretum* in Italy before the Gregorian reform.

The rise in the quality of studies stands out especially clearly in the field of historical writing.[16] Not until more than a century after the death of Regino of Prüm did an unknown monk of Reichenau again venture upon a chronicle of the world and of Germany (1040 or 1044); [17] it is known to us today only through those authors who copied it. On it is based, for example, the widely circulated brief world chronicle (to 1054) of Hermann of Reichenau. The history of the Saxon dynasty, produced in the reign of Otto I by Widukind of Corvey (to 957–8, with appendices to 973), found in Thietmar of Merseburg a new reviser, who made use of Widukind and other sources and carried the account to 1018, while Wipo's *Gesta Chuonradi imperatoris* describes the history of the Empire from 1024 to 1039. All the authors mentioned maintain a respectable level.

Among the numerous biographical works of the Ottonian and early Salian period the following are outstanding for their content: the work of Ruodger on Bruno of Cologne (d. 968–9), of Gerard on Ulric of Augsburg (d. 973), of Abbot John of Saint-Arnulf de Metz on John of Gorze (d. 974).[18] Adalbert of Prague (d. 997) found as biographers the Roman Abbot John Canaparius and Bruno of Querfurt;[19] Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim (d. 1022), his former teacher Tangmar.[20] The series was continued in the next period. In addition to the excellent *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* (to 948) by Flodoard (d. 966), there appeared in the first half of the eleventh century the precious histories of the sees of Cambrai and Liège, the former by an unknown writer, the latter by the canon Anselm (d. 1056).[21] In France the *Historiarum libri IV* of Gerbert's pupil, Richer of Saint-Remi at Reims, merits notice, despite its inaccuracy and subjectivism; Richer tried, while abandoning the annalistic form, to write a synthetically organized history of the French Kingdom from 862 to 995. In the French monastic world especially deserving of mention are two monks who worked at Fleury-sur-Loire, Aimoin and Andrew. Among other works, the first of these left a life of Abbo of Fleury (d. 1004);

---

[16] In what follows only those historical works are cited which are not mentioned in the sources for Chapters 27, 28, and 32.

[17] According to R. Buchner in *DA* 16 (1960), 389–96, Hermann of Reichenau was the author, and the work was the first version of his world chronicle.

[18] *MGSS* IV, 337–77 (incomplete, to 956).

[19] The *vitae* of Adalbert are mentioned in the sources for Chapter 31.

[20] *MGSS* IV, 757–82. F. J. Tschan, *St. Bernward of Hildesheim,* I–III (Notre Dame 1942–52).

[21] *Gesta Pontificum Cameracensium* in *MGSS* VII, 402–25; on the author's patron, Bishop Gerard I, cf. T. Schieffer in *DA* 1 (1937), 323–60. On Anselm's history, cf. the sources for Chapter 32.

the other, a life of Abbo's successor as Abbot and later Archbishop of Bourges (d. 1040–41).[22] Odo of Cluny (d. 942) found a qualified biographer in his pupil John. [23] A remarkable work, sober in the spirit of Cluny but not very reliable in details, is the *Historiarum libri V*, which the unstable monk Raoul Glaber began at Cluny and completed at Saint-Germain d'Auxerre in 1045. Earlier a monk at Saint-Bénigne, he is also the author of a biography of William of Dijon.[24] Italy, represented in the reign of Otto the Great by the excessively partisan but still important Liutprand of Cremona, was not particularly noted for historical works until the period of the Investiture Controversy.[25]

Scholarly interchange and practical activity induced several learned men to engage in a brisk correspondence. Gerbert of Aurillac seems to have been the first to have his many letters — 220 for the years 983–997 — collected in a private registrum.[26] A collection of those of his pupil, Fulbert of Chartres, has also been preserved. In Germany Froumund of Tegernsee kept a consecutive letter book (993–c. 1008), which was continued by his pupil, Abbot Ellinger of Tegernsee. Abbot Bern of Reichenau (1008–48) likewise left a collection of letters. The older Worms collection of letters was a product of the school but it includes political letters; those that are dated belong to the 1030's. In the next period letter-writing slowly became a special art, cultivated by special schools, and in the intellectual and political struggles from the period of the Gregorian reform people at times made greater use of it than of weapons. In the period under consideration there is no trace as yet of such a tendency, but the fact that people began at all to make collections of letters is important. It shows a growing awareness of the value of a literary influence and of intellectual interchange.

The peaceful picture presented by education and scholarship is not entirely in accord with the reality. In the first half of the eleventh century a certain uneasiness proceeded from the *artes liberales.* If around 1000 the grammarian Vilgardus at Ravenna preferred the pagan views of the ancient authors to Christian dogma, he was probably pretty much alone in doing so. The real danger threatened from the dialecticians. Thus, a sophistical attempt to show the doctrine of the *Verbum caro factum* as a logical contradiction had to be refuted by Bishop Wolfgang of Regensburg (d. 994). Similar dialectical attacks on Christian dogmas followed in increasing numbers in the course of the eleventh century; they presented Christian scholarship with the problem of the relations between faith and reason, theology and philosophy, and prepared the way for the new scholastic dialectic method.

---

[22] Aimoin, *Vita Abbonis* in *PL* 139, 387–414; Andrew, *Vita Gauzlini*, ed. P. Ewald in *NA* 3 (1878), 349–83; on the other works of both men, see *Manitius* II, 239–246.

[23] Cf. the sources for the preceding chapter; among the *vitae* of Mayeul there cited, that by Odilo is the better; on the *vitae* of the Abbots of Cluny, see *Manitius* II, 130–55.

[24] Glaber's historical work is cited *supra* in the sources for Chapter 27; the *Vita Wilhelmi* in *ActaSS Ianuarii*, I, 57–67. P. Rousset in *RHÉF* 36 (1950), 5–24 (Glaber as interpreter of the contemporary outlook); A. Michel in *HJ* 70 (1951), 53–64 (division of world empires and churches); M. Vogelsang in *SM* 67 (1956), 24–38, 277–94 (Glaber as historian of Cluny); cf. also P. Lamma, *Momenti di storiografia cluniacense* (Rome 1961).

[25] For Italy see *Manitius* II, 166–75 (Liutprand); 179–81 (Benedict of Sant'Andrea); 197–203 (Chronicle of Salerno); 246–53 (Venetian sources); 294–99 *(Chronicon Novaliense)*; also *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 313–44.

[26] Editions of Gerbert's letters in the sources for Chapter 28; cf. the studies of F. Weigle in *DA* 10 (1953), 19–70; 11 (1955), 393–421; 14 (1958), 149–220; on the content and date, M. Uhlirz, *Schriften der Historischen Kommission der Bayerischen Akademie* 2 (Göttingen 1957). On the collections mentioned in what follows and the publications as such, cf. *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 415–26 (with bibliography); on Bern of Reichenau, F. J. Schmale, *Edition der Briefe* (Stuttgart (1961) and the work in *ZKG* 68 (1957), 69–95.

CHAPTER 41

Heretical and Reform Movements Among Clergy and Laity (1000 to 1050)

There is an unmistakable sign that, with the eleventh century, the Christian West was slowly entering upon a new phase of development. For the first time in its history heretical groups cropped up in various places: at Mainz in 1012, six and ten years later in Aquitaine, at Orléans in 1022, at Arras in 1025, soon after at Monteforte near Turin and in Burgundy, in the diocese of Châlons-sur-Marne in 1042–48, at Goslar in 1051. They probably had no connection with one another. And if one regards as their real source the lowest strata of the population, as does R. Morghen, or Italian merchants who are supposed to have taken up heretical ideas coming from the East and then to have borne them to French trade centres, as does E. Werner, these are unprovable hypotheses. Still, though, we find the carefully attested communities in Arras to have consisted of *rustici,* those of Orléans of clerics, and those at Monteforte of lay nobles. The contemporary chroniclers include them mostly under the term "Manichaeans", but nowhere is the properly ontological Manichaean dualism to be found. Instead, there is present an ascetical and moral dualism, which in individuals could go as far as the rejection of marriage, of the eating of fleshmeat, or even of killing animals.

The heretics took their religious and moral requirements to a great extent from the New Testament and did not hesitate to attribute their scriptural interpretation to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The essential point of the Gospels — faith in Christ, Son of God and Saviour — definitely took second place to the personal striving to lead a pious life, and could even disappear entirely from one's mental horizon. With such an outlook, any appreciation of the Church's sacramental life was of necessity lost. In the intellectually noteworthy centres of Orléans and Monteforte, as a matter of fact, the religious dynamism, with the abandonment of the Trinitarian and Christological dogmas, was directed merely toward God the Father as creator, and in almost all groups baptism, the Eucharist, confession and penance, holy orders, consecration of churches and altars, and the cult of saints, the cross, and relics were regarded as useless; here and there the imposition of hands, whereby the Spirit was imparted, was retained.

The intellectual source of these movements, difficult to grasp, differing among themselves in individual points, yet containing much that was common, is controverted. One who holds to the road taken by Flacius Illyricus will see the basic tendency as a spontaneous Western striving for evangelical and apostolic ideals of life; this is the stand of R. Morghen. Others, with Baronius and like-minded scholars, incline rather to pay attention to the doctrinal content and to derive it, in this case, from the Bulgarian Bogomiles, so far as possible; this is the view of P. Dondaine.[1] The truth probably lies in between. Any influences of the Old Bogomiles, who likewise represented a predominantly ethical and religious moralism[2] in opposition to the radical dualistic tendency, appearing in the eleventh century, of the "Dragovisian" Church, must have penetrated *via* Italy into the West; without them the many similarities of the heretical groups, which of themselves were not connected, are probably inexplicable. On the other hand, the heretics proceeded from a situation proper to the West. Since the development of the West had progressed to a definite maturity, gradually in all aspects of life new efforts to continue the progress of early mediaeval culture began. Hence, one must not be surprised if religiously oriented natures found the official Church unsatisfying and set about preparing a spirituality of their own. In certain respects, many men did the same even within the Church; especially in the monastic world the inclination to stricter asceticism increased, not to mention the hermit individualists, whose numbers now grew constantly. The heretical movement was only one, in a sense the negative side of a religiosity inclining to radicalism, which at that time took hold of Western Christianity.

---

[1] A. Borst, *Die Katharer* (Stuttgart 1953), 27–58, provides a good survey of research in the history of heresy since the Reformation.

[2] The Bogomiles, appearing from around the mid-tenth century, get their name from the Bulgarian (or Macedonian?) village priest Bogomil, who lived around that time. He represented a dualism in so far as he attributed dominion over the world to the devil, whom he regarded as son of God and brother of Christ, and hence he demanded separation from the world. At least the more intimate circle of his adherents, the so-called theorists, were to lead a pure "apostolic" life, avoid marriage, manual labour, and the use of flesh-meat and wine, pray, fast, and go on pilgrimage. The Bogomiles attacked ecclesiastical pomp and worldly possessions and power. They spread in the Balkan peninsula, especially in Bulgaria, and, after the subjugation of Bulgaria by the Emperor Basil II in 1018, also in Constantinople, and obtained a stable organization. In time their doctrines became differentiated. When the specifically Manichaean distinction between a God of heaven and an evil creator of this world entered their teaching and to what extent the Paulicians, transported from Armenia to Thrace, had an influence on this can no longer be precisely determined. In any event, in the eleventh century there were two main tendencies: alongside the older and more moderate dualism of the "Bulgarian Church" stood the radically dualistic "Dragovisian Church" — Dragowitsa was a Thracian country district. D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge 1948); D. Angelov, "Der Bogomilismus auf dem Gebiete des byzantinischen Reiches" in *Annuaire Univ. Sofia,* Fac. hist.- phil., 44, 46 (1947, 1950), and, in Bulgarian, with a strong social and political emphasis, the second edition of id., *Das Bogomilentum in Bulgarien* (Sofia 1961); a good summary in: H. Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters,* II, G 24f., A. Schmaus, "Der Neumanichäismus auf dem Balkan" in *Saeculum* 2 (1951), 271–99; E. Werner, "Die Bogomilen in Bulgarien, Forschungen und Fortschritte" in *StudMed,* third series, 3 (1962), 249–78.

The more men were attracted by religious and ascetical ideals, the more clearly did certain moral abuses of the early mediaeval Church enter into the reflexive awareness. Criticism was directed especially against clerical marriage and against simoniacal or quasi-simoniacal practices.

In actuality, celibacy, to which the Western Church had bound major clerics since the fourth and fifth centuries, had to a great extent fallen into oblivion. In almost all countries the rural priests cohabited with women, either in concubinage or in a real marriage. Not a few clerics or canons attached to urban churches followed their example. There were even isolated cases of bishops or, in decayed monasteries, monks, who had wife and children. Concubinage on the part of a bishop, monk, or canon was pretty generally held to be intolerable, whereas in regard to the rural clergy it was to a great extent tolerated. Their lower origin, inadequate theological and spiritual formation, a very limited supervision by the ecclesiastical superiors, the fact that rural life was extremely difficult without a woman's aid — all these circumstances had contributed to alienate the rustic priests from the idea of celibacy; it was too lofty to be understood by them and by a great many of their parishioners. If isolated bishops, such as Atto of Vercelli, Rathier of Verona, and Dunstan of Canterbury, or even synods, and finally the Council of Bourges (1031) again enjoined the obligation of celibacy, they were to a great extent speaking to the wind. The solicitude of the official Church was concerned in this regard not least of all for Church property, for as far as possible it was made use of to provide for priests' children. To meet this danger most of all the Synod of Pavia in 1022 issued strict decrees at the instigation of Pope Benedict VIII. Economic motives were, of course, powerless in the face of so elementary an impulse as lay behind clerical marriage. Celibacy had to be sincerely approved by more extensive strata of Christendom; its violation had to be abhorred. And this is exactly what gradually took place. Though the movement at first may have found only a few followers, it slowly grew to such strength that it could be applied by the reformed papacy in the second half of the century. At the same time "Nicolaitism", meaning "lechery", appeared as the shibboleth for clerical marriage.[3]

Simony constituted a very complex problem. From Simon Magus, who wanted to obtain from the Apostles by money the power to impart the Spirit (Acts 8:18–24), simony was and still is understood as the buying or selling of spiritual goods. If in Roman times and the early Middle Ages fees were not infrequently required for consecrations, the sacraments, burials, the taking possession of office, and so forth, this was to a great extent connected with legal customs. There was, to be sure, the danger of slipping in this way into real simony. Hence, from the fourth century synods and councils issued strict prohibitions; they even condemned payments connected with temporal goods that belonged to the Church. Gregory the Great went a step farther. He distinguished three rather than merely one form of simony: the *munus a manu* (money or gift), *munus ab obsequio* (services, favours), *munus a lingua* (intercession). He likewise energetically took up the notion, already developed, of *haeresis simoniaca*: whoever sinned against the Holy Spirit by simony should be regarded as a heretic.

---

[3] On the origin of the word, cf. *LThK* VII, 975 ("Nikolaiten").

Despite so universal a condemnation, the real situation could be controlled all the less when the young Germanic nations developed for Church administration forms that corresponded to their agrarian culture and were expressed in the institutions already described: proprietary church, investiture, and the rest. They slowly reversed the original relationship between function and ecclesiastical property. Whereas, according to the Roman and the ecclesiastical idea the function was in the centre and the Church property constituted an appendage specified for the support of the minister and for other tasks, in the canon law as stamped by Germanic notions the property law aspect moved into first place, the priest necessary for the function of the Church into second place. As a consequence, churches could be sold or otherwise alienated in whole or in part and payments could be demanded in making an appointment to a church. Since investiture at the same time handed over the function, the payments connected with it had at least the appearance of simony.

How far the materialistic feature could lead is shown especially clearly by the taking possession of the archbishopric of Narbonne in 1016. The Count of Cerdagne laid 100,000 gold shillings on the table on behalf of his ten-year-old son, in order to outbid the other competitor, the Abbot of Conques, who had become financially powerful through the sale of the monastery's goods; the lords who had the decision, a count and a viscount, agreed to this and divided the money. So shameless an example of jobbery was the exception, but more or less fixed fees must have existed ordinarily for the investiture of the more important churches.[4]

With each investiture was involved the acceptance of specified services. According to circumstances additional obligations were also required, and often enough the candidates made use of the intercession of influential persons. Accordingly, the three varieties of simony as defined by Gregory the Great were everywhere in use. Since those invested cherished the understandable desire to recover their expenses from church and office, not a few demanded money for purely spiritual official acts and hence fell into real simony. Whoever applied the strict standards of Gregory the Great and of the ancient synodal laws could not but regard the simoniacal heresy as one of the worst ills of the time.

---

[4] On the entire practice, cf. *Haller* II, 269f., *Fliche-Martin* VII, 466–71.

Hence, there was no lack of warning voices. Atto of Vercelli and Rathier of Verona called for correction. Abbo of Fleury even more decisively took up the ancient ecclesiastical legislation and Gregory the Great's statements against simony; he was actually the first to enter into the juridical problem. To the distinction, complete in his day, between the altar as the sphere of the bishop and the proprietary church as the sphere of the proprietor and the resulting conclusion that the financial operations had nothing to do with the grace of the Holy Spirit but with the ecclesiastical property, Abbo opposed the inseparable unity of altar and church; any commercial activity within this entire holy field was, in his view, simony.[5] The more the conscience became refined, the more sharp was the reaction against the juridical forms of the age.

When William of Volpiano, the later Abbot of Saint-Bénigne de Dijon, was supposed to take the customary oath of loyalty to the officiating bishop before his ordination as a deacon at Locedia, he rejected it as a simoniacal demand. An ordination, he said, must not be purchased by anything, not even by an oath of loyalty. His disciple and successor, Abbot Halinard of Saint-Bénigne, at his elevation to the archbishopric of Lyons refused the oath of loyalty which he had to take to King Henry III. If he appealed to the prohibition of an oath in the Gospel and in the rule of Saint Benedict, and in the latter also to the duty of keeping oneself from worldly actions, fear of the taint of simony was probably included. In any case, William of Volpiano, from the time he ruled Saint-Bénigne and made it the centre of a reform group, propagated his own special hatred of simony not only among his monks but on the outside.[6] And he was not alone. Monastic circles, hermits, heretical communities — all contributed to the forming of an antisimoniacal movement. Their criticism found an increasing response in areas which were especially susceptible in regard to abuses, above all in Italy. Not by chance did whole groups of people rise up against simonists in Tuscany, Romagna, and Lombardy from around 1050. Earlier, around 1035, the Florentine John Gualbert sounded a first alarm. Since he was preaching to still deaf ears, he left the city, formed a monastic community at Vallombrosa, founded in 1036, and in other monasteries, and in the reform period, especially from 1062, used them as weapons against the simoniacal heresy. Vallombrosa's fighting spirit, bordering on fanaticism, was to eclipse even such determined antisimonists as the Italian hermits and to fill Peter Damiani with a not unjustified anxiety.[7]

---

[5] *Apologeticus* in *PL* 139, 464f.; cf. also A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* I (Louvain–Paris 1924), 48–59.

[6] On William and Halinard, see H. Hoffmann, "Von Cluny zum Investiturstreit" in *AKG* 45 (1963), 174–81; in the work as such the question is probably treated somewhat onesidedly.

The danger from simony did not come merely from lay persons; clerics, high and low, even monastic circles contributed to it. Still, there was a distinction: clerics or monks could more easily be subjected to the ecclesiastical norms than could laymen. Hence a thorough reform could not escape a confrontation in principle with the rights of domination which the nobility, headed by the kingship, had acquired over many churches. Here basic principles of the Roman ecclesiastical constitution had been covered over with institutions of the Germanic type of canon law. Once persons became more keenly aware of this, the religious and political world of the early Middle Ages began to totter. Deep realization of the sort tends to mature slowly, and so in the period under consideration only isolated voices were heard in criticism. Hence Henry III and the German bishops could only feel that Halinard's refusal of the oath of loyalty was virtually an attack on the royal theocracy and the Imperial Church. It is to Henry's honour that, at the request of Lotharingian bishops, he dispensed Halinard from the oath.

Wazo of Liège also had ideas of his own.[8] At the deposition of Archbishop Witger of Ravenna, which Henry carried out at a synod of German bishops in 1044, Wazo remonstrated with him that such a measure pertained, not to the King, but to the Pope. When the Emperor, after the death of Clement II, questioned the episcopate in regard to a new Pope, Wazo came out for the still living Gregory VI; his deposition at Sutri, he held, was invalid, since a Pope can be judged by no one. And when Henry III insisted on the royal anointing, Wazo, in the spirit of political Augustinianism, observed that the episcopal anointing was higher: a bishop has to impart life, whereas to the King belongs the lesser function of fighting evil with the death-dealing sword.

Shortly after the Synod of Sutri the unknown author of *De ordinando pontifice*[9] began the most radical attack on the royal theocracy in general, especially that of Henry III. No lay person, according to him, might appoint clerics and dispose of Church goods — not even the Emperor; the election of Clement II, occurring at Henry's instigation, was invalid; moreover, the power of the sword belonging to kings pertained to the sphere of the devil rather than of God; in any event, Emperors were subject to the bishops and, like all the laity, to Church discipline. Even if this treatise were not of French but of Lotharingian provenance, it would be difficult to include it in the intellectual *milieu* constituted by Wazo, for it goes far beyond Wazo's attitude, which, despite everything, was loyal to the crown. A Lotharingian school of law that was making ready the struggle for the freedom of the Church, as postulated by Fliche, or other opposition groups cannot be demonstrated, at least for that time. There was probably none as yet, but here and there a mentality was coming to birth which was to become deeper, to spread, and finally, under papal leadership, to overcome the early mediaeval theocracy.[10]

---

[7] R. Davidsohn, *Geschichte von Florenz*, I (Berlin 1896), 163–70, 178–81, 226–51; id., *Forschungen zur älteren Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin 1896), 41, 47–60; other literature on Gualbert and Vallombrosa *infra*, Chapter 52.

[8] *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, II, 65, 58 in *MGSS* VII, 228–30, 224.

[9] *De ordinando pontifice* in *MGLiblit* I, 8–14; in regard to F. Pelster, "Der Traktat 'De ordinando pontifice' und sein Verfasser Humbert von Moyenmoutier" in *HJ* 61 (1941), 88–115, cf. the probably justified criticism of A. Michel in *StudGreg* I (1947), 87f.

How much the Church was able to display of the new initiative from the turn of the millennium was apparent in the movement of the Peace of God and of the Truce of God. The Midi was their place of origin. The process of political decomposition, which was especially active there, which fragmented the counties into power districts of viscounts, *châtelains,* and lords and furthered club-law, caused the bishops to intervene. The first to undertake self-help was the Bishop of Le Puy. At a synod in 975 he compelled the nobility by force to promise under oath not to attack the goods of the Church and of the *pauperes* and to give back what they had taken. We hear nothing more about similar efforts until the Council of Charroux in 989, representing the ecclesiastical province of Bordeaux. With it began the long series of synods which were to exert themselves for peace throughout the entire eleventh century and into the twelfth and partly even into the thirteenth. Although the goal was sought in various ways, certain basic trends can be isolated. The eleventh century efforts were welcomed, on the one hand, by the great princes and the King and, on the other hand, by the lesser folk; the middle and lower nobility, on the contrary, from whose ranks proceeded to a great extent the brigandage and violence complained about, held back and, according to circumstances, offered resistance. Occasionally, such peace synods were convoked, not directly by the bishops, but by secular magnates.

The powerful popular participation gave to not a few councils the character of a mass demonstration. Monks or clerics took care to bring along the relics of the titular saints of their churches in solemn procession, miraculous cures took place, a religious enthusiasm seized hold of the crowd and broke out into the cry, "Pax, pax, pax", while the bishops, in confirming the peace decrees, raised their croziers to heaven. This has been correctly called the first popular religious movement.

The masses went along, because the proclaimed peace was to protect not merely the churches and their ministers but also the bodies and property of the peasants and at times also of tradesmen. The Church brought her spiritual penal authority to bear against violators of the peace. The interdict, laid on the territory ruled by the guilty person, proved to be an effective collective penalty. Entirely new was the peace oath, which many synods required of the nobility. Furthermore, there was taken up at various times the obvious idea of having legal proceedings take the place of the feud. People did not even shrink from recourse to compulsion by war. This measure was not merely decided on here and there, as, for example, at the Synod of Poitiers, convoked by William V of Aquitaine between 1000 and 1014; there also arose peace militias prepared for war. Probably no one exerted himself so much for them, at least until 1050, as did Archbishop Aimo of Bourges, and with their aid he put a stop to the activities of many a robber knight. It is true that in 1038 his territorial militia, despite numerical superiority, suffered a frightful defeat at the hands of Eudes of Déols, but the institution of a diocesan army continued to exist. The slogan "war on war" was successfully taken up in many places in the second half of the century.

---

[10] Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* I, 113–128; the explanation given by G. Tellenbach, *Libertas, Kirche und Weltordnung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart 1936), 123–27, with the bibliography for Wazo and for the author of *De ordinando pontifice* in footnotes 16 and 15, is probably more correct. C. Dereine, "L'école canonique liégeoise et la réforme grégorienne" in *Annales du congrès archéologique et historique de Tournai* (1949), 1–16, accepts a Lower Lotharingian school of law but sees its special character in a moderate attitude, differing from that of the author of the above mentioned treatise and similar to that of Burchard of Worms before the reform and to that of Ivo of Chartres toward its end.

The Truce of God constituted a special form of the general peace movement. It consisted of the prohibition of feuds on specified days of the week. In most cases the suspension of hostilities was to last from Wednesday evening till early on Monday, but there were also briefer periods of respite. Attempts to extend it to longer periods, for example from Advent to the octave day of the Epiphany of from the beginning of Lent to Low Sunday, as well as to special feasts had little success. In themselves the decrees issued for the protection of clerics and peasants remained in force, but the old and frequently recalled duty of carrying conflicts over property before the judge steadily declined.

The origin of the Truce of God is obscure. We first meet it in 1027 in the acts of the Council of Toulouges (Roussillon). The idea spread quickly in the 1030's, first in Burgundy and Aquitaine and from there throughout France. It entered Spain, chiefly by way of Catalonia, while in 1037 and 1042 appeals made by the French episcopate and the propaganda of Odilo of Cluny propagated it in northwest Italy; Germany accepted it only toward the end of the century. However one prefers to interpret the Truce — as a giving way, in the guise of a compromise, *vis-à-vis* the all too tense earlier efforts, or simply as a new initiative alongside the other exertions — in any event it gave the peace movement fresh stimulation, especially since recourse was had both to the commitment under oath and to warlike compulsion.

Although the movement of the Peace and Truce of God attained its real goal only very imperfectly and even then only for a limited time, it was of importance as a pioneer. The fact that the French episcopate not only, as earlier, supported the crown in its care for the public order, but also worked for peace on its own authority gained it a new relationship to the Christian world. In itself this had long been based on the religious and political cultural unity of the early Middle Ages and the resulting cooperation of *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium*, but up till now the *Sacerdotium* had had to leave the constructing of a Christian world first of all to the crown, for only a hard fist could create order. Meanwhile, however, the ratio of forces had shifted: in France the *Regnum* had become weak, while the *Sacerdotium* had increased in authority as a consequence of the continually growing Christianization of the West. Its endeavours for peace found all the more assent in that, for mediaeval men, standing under Augustine's intellectual influence, *pax* and *iustitia* were rooted ultimately in the religious and supernatural and so directly concerned the *Sacerdotium*. And since, on the one hand, at that time the awareness of natural law began to lose its force in connection with the land and the people and, on the other hand, the secular, rational law that could be effectively enforced by a sovereign was still to be created[11], people and princes were especially amenable to the religious guarantee provided for the peace. Thus in the question of peace the French episcopate was able to stress a law fundamental for the Church's future position of leadership: the competence of the *Sacerdotium* for the spiritual and political goals of Western Christendom. Also pointing to the future was the practice now appearing whereby the Church summoned high and low alike to arms against violators of the peace and set in motion small or large armies. Thus the idea of the holy war was already present basically and with it the legal claim of the *Sacerdotium* to be allowed to exercise armed compulsion by means of laymen when essential interests of Christianity were threatened.

The idea of the holy war was to find powerful expression in the crusades. These, it is true, especially concerned knights, but the Church began even in the tenth century to assume a new attitude toward this social class. If previously the liturgical prayers had envisaged the King as the defender of the Christian religion, and even occasionally the army which he led, they were slowly applied also to the knight and to his vocation to war and found expression above all in the blessing of the sword with which the young knight was girded at his investiture. Formulas appearing in the second half of the tenth century assigned to the individual knight the protection of churches, widows, and orphans, as well as the defence of Christendom against pagans — hence specific royal duties — and in direct imitation of the texts of the anointing of a King. Soon after, at the latest in the eleventh century, there was a transition from the blessing of the sword as a thing to a dedication of the person of the knight; then regular liturgical *ordines* were composed, in which the knight was solemnly inducted into his armed vocation. This development, completed in various countries, and especially in Germany, could not but acquire an up-to-dateness of its own by means of the initiative of the French episcopate in the Peace of God. However, the Church in France more and more disregarded the hesitations which opposed the notion of war by recourse to the oldest Christian tradition, despite the protests of individuals, such as Fulbert of Chartres. In the emerging idea of the holy war ideals lay at hand which were able to inspire knighthood so long as it was directed to the great aim — the defence of Christendom from Islam. The crusade idea was in the making.

---

[11] Cf. the stimulating brief study by V. Achter, *Über den Ursprung des Gottesfriedens* (Krefeld 1954); in this, among other things, the fact that the Peace of God appeared so late in Germany and that the old secular penalties were retained in all their severity alongside it is traced to the stubbornness of the old German Christian legal and political order.

If one surveys the exertions for reform and renewal in the Ottonian and early Salian period, there becomes clear a decided upward movement, which quickened its tempo from the turn of the millennium and engendered a growing uneasiness. What was then being concentrated was to burst forth in the coming great reform age. There is no doubt that the reform was brought about by abuses that had crept in, but its real motivating power was to be sought at a deeper level. Simony, clerical concubinage, a piety that was too external and too much oriented to a legalistic view of achievements, and other maladies had long been connected with Western Christendom. That there occurred a sharper reaction against them in the eleventh century was the consequence of a process of maturation: the West was slowly moving from the early into the high Middle Ages.[12]

Until around 1000 the Roman-Germanic community of nations was in the stage of coherence typical of early cultures. It was permeated with spiritual and secular forms of life: *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium,* law, morality, religion. Man felt himself to be hidden in this world, all-integrating, sacral-sacramental, even interspersed with magical notions, so long as it corresponded to his own inner condition and he accepted it without discussion as objective reality handed down by the ancestors. But as soon as he began to become intellectually more awake, he entered into a new historical stage: into that of diastase. This occurred from the turn of the millennium.[13] The old unity of culture was not destroyed, but the eye now took in its individual components. In a constantly growing process of differentiation they became more clearly distinct, were contrasted with one another, were slowly completed as special spheres. Naturally, this did not occur without tensions and struggles. The first voices of the dissatisfaction with the *status quo* have been recorded earlier in this section. The more powerful they grew, the more urgent became a reform which would seriously confront the problems of the day.

---

[12] On what follows, cf. A. Mayer-Pfannholz, "Phasen des Mittelalters" in *Hochland* 36, 1 (1938f.), 180–94.

[13] That the approach of the year 1000 put Western Christendom into a state of anxiety in regard to the end of the world, Antichrist, and the Last Judgment cannot be maintained in this general form. There were eschatological frames of mind here and there, both before and after the turn of the millennium; to some extent they could have been an accompanying phenomenon of the transition which became ever more noticeable in the West, but they probably had no far-reaching effect. Cf. F. Duval, *Les terreurs de l'an mille* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1908); E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser,* II, 223–26; E. Pognon, *L'an mille* (Paris 1947).

PART TWO

The Struggle for the Freedom of the Church

SECTION ONE

The Gregorian Reform

Chapter 42

Beginning of the Reform: the German Popes (1046 to 1057)

There can be no doubt that the Gregorian reform began with the German Popes. Even the unusual names assumed by Clement II, Damasus II, and Victor II revealed the desire to return to the old, pure Church, but this wish was directed merely to a moral renewal which attacked simony and Nicolaitism. It never entered the mind of these Popes, designated by the Emperor and loyally devoted to him, to undermine the foundation of the Carolingian-Ottonian cultural unity. And yet, once the reform got under way, it was to produce something like an avalanche. The future development was already in preparation under Leo IX.

The first two German Popes did not really get into action. A reform synod arranged by Clement II and Henry III did actually come out against simony on 5 January 1047, threatening the sale of ecclesiastical offices and consecrations with anathema and imposing the moderate penalty of a forty-days' penance on priests who knowingly let themselves be ordained by simonists,[1] but for the time being its decrees remained merely a programme. The Pope accompanied the Emperor on his expedition through South Italy, then returned to Rome, and in the summer heat caught malaria. As a consequence, on a journey into the Romagna and the Marches of Ancona he died at the monastery of San Tommaso in the province of Pesaro on 9 October. The Tusculans and Boniface of Tuscany were delighted, and Benedict IX returned to Rome, but the Romans sent envoys to Henry III. The nomination of Poppo of Brixen at Christmas 1047 proved to be another disappointment. Poppo, who styled himself Damasus II, succumbed to Roman fever on 9 August 1048, twenty-three days after his enthronement.

The new negotiations, at first probably centring on Halinard of Lyons,[2] ended at Christmas 1048 with the designation of Bruno of Toul. A more fortunate choice could hardly have been made. The nominee was highly gifted and only forty-six years old. Born of the Alsatian family of the Counts of Egisheim, that was related to the Salian Dynasty, he was educated at Toul, of which he was made Bishop in 1026. He had been tested and proved in the service of both the Empire and Church reform. On 12 February 1049, he entered the Eternal City in the dress of a pilgrim, and, having been elected by clergy and people, ascended the throne of Peter as Leo IX; the reform thereby finally got under way.

---

[1] *MGConst* I, 95, no. 49; cf. *Hauck KD* III, 594.

[2] Despite Haller's doubt, *Papsttum,* II, 578, he was perhaps suggested after the death of Clement II; see the chronicle of Dijon in *MGSS* VII, 237.

The very election somehow indicated this, for Bruno had declared to the Emperor that he could enter upon the new post only if the Romans unanimously accepted him as Bishop. As little as this demand actually involved anything new — no contemporary doubted that a designation without an election following was contrary to canon law — it was still unusual to say as much to the Emperor. Bruno probably did not thereby intend to come out against the right of nomination but rather, in an authentic Lotharingian awareness of the freedom of the Church, to express that the election was an essential institution of canon law, binding in conscience, and not a mere formality.[3] In the same spirit he caused the necessity of canonical election to be insisted upon universally at the Council of Reims in 1049. Neither here nor in his much discussed monastic policy did he display any taking of a stand against the laity or even a project of a Papal Church as opposed to the Imperial Church.[4] Leo did not strive for any overthrow of the constitution but he was well aware of the independence of the ecclesiastical juridical order and hence of his own position.

The new Pope immediately collected around him a group of capable co-workers, whom he got mostly from Lotharingia and neighbouring areas. Apart from Halinard, who remained Archbishop of Lyons but was always at the disposal of the friendly Pope, these men were incardinated into the diocese of Rome and assigned functions. It was they who, even after Leo's early death, energetically pushed the reform work. It must suffice to name only the most important: Humbert, from the monastery of Moyenmoutier, in the diocese of Toul, Cardinal Bishop of Silva Candida from 1050; Frederick, son of the Duke of Lotharingia and Archdeacon of Liège, Chancellor of the Roman Church from 1051 to 1055, and eventually Pope as Stephen IX; Hugh the White, from the monastery of Rémiremont in the diocese of Toul, later Cardinal Priest; and Hildebrand, whom Bruno had brought with him to Rome,[5] perhaps as the contact with the Roman reform circles, and there ordained a subdeacon and entrusted with the administration of the property of the monastery of San Paolo *fuori le mura*. Without knowing it, Leo IX thereby made ready a fateful development. While he and his successors involved outstanding officials of the Roman clergy ever more actively in the reform of the Universal Church over and above their liturgical duties, there slowly developed the stable institution of the College of Cardinals, as the liturgical functions connected with the titular churches and the papal Masses were de-emphasized.

---

[3] Cf. Tritz in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 257–59; the interpretation does not absolutely depend on the question of who composed the *vita* (see the sources for this chapter).

[4] Cf. *Haller* II, 581–83, with the probably justified criticism of the views of Fliche and P. Kehr; also, R. Bloch, "Die Klosterpolitik Leos IX. in Deutschland, Burgund und Italien" in *AUF* 11 (1930), 176–257; A. Waas, "Leo IX. und das Kloster Muri" in *AUF* 5 (1913f.), 241–68.

[5] Sources in Steindorff, *JbbDG: Heinrich III.*, II, 72–75; on Hildebrand's entry into Cluny cf. G. B. Borino in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 441–56; the credibility of Bonizo, *Liber ad amicum*

Another innovation also appeared more clearly. Unlike his predecessors, Leo IX did not reside in Rome. Restless, like the secular rulers of the day, he travelled from country to country. From 1050 South Italy saw him every year, and his three long journeys across the Alps took him not only in all directions through imperial territory but as far as Reims and in 1052, in order to mediate peace, even to the Emperor's camp before Bratislava. Reform synods interrupted his movements. Apart from Rome, where he held synods in 1049, 1050, 1051, and 1053, he deliberated with bishops at Pavia, Reims, and Mainz in 1049, at Siponto, Salerno, and Vercelli in 1050, and at Mantua and Bari in 1053; the date of the Bari synod is uncertain and may have been 1050. Since the Pope was everywhere approached for privileges but the chancery was localized in Rome, new methods of documentary authentication had to be found, which gradually detached the chancery from the city of Rome and allowed it to become an independent administrative organ of the papacy. And finally Leo's journeys meant incalculable gain for papal authority. While people had already always regarded the Bishop of Rome as head of the Universal Church, now this idea took on flesh and blood; a great part of Christendom looked at the Pope with its own eyes and let itself be captivated by the spell of his very being.

Three heavy tasks were imposed upon Leo IX: the reform of the Church, the struggle with the Normans of South Italy, and the confrontation with the Byzantine Church, which was to end in schism. Only the first two will be discussed here; the Schism will be dealt with later.

Reform centred on simony and Nicolaitism. Because the disregard of celibacy was so widespread, especially among the lower clergy, whom the Pope could reach only with difficulty, Leo took rather strong action only in Rome and its environs, forbidding the faithful by means of Roman Synods to have anything to do with incontinent priests and having the concubines of Roman priests reduced to slavery for the service of the Lateran Palace. Otherwise he was content, as, for example, at the Synods of Rome and Mainz in 1049, with general prohibitions of clerical marriage. His real fight was with simony. Simoniacal bishops of France and,

---

in *MGLiblit* I, 587, according to which Hildebrand bluntly condemned the method of designation in a conversation with Leo IX, is doubtful.

to some extent, also of Italy — in Germany Leo evidently relied upon the Emperor's opposition to simony — learned by experience the total seriousness of the synodal decrees of Rome, Reims, and Mainz (1049). The investigations, punishments, and depositions that now began were not to stop for decades.

The struggle was by no means always successful. That it did not flag but was waged with increasing exasperation was due to a special reason. Leo IX and his friends were concerned with something much deeper than the extirpation of a vice: the substance of the faith and the sacramental life seemed to them to be in jeopardy. Their refined religious conscience was dead serious about the denunciation, familiar since the fourth century, of simony as heresy, regardless whether, with Humbert, they believed that the divinity of the Holy Spirit was directly denied in the selling of holy orders and offices or, with Peter Damiani, assumed only an indirect attack on the faith.[6] Moreover, they saw the mystery of the Church betrayed. The simonists, they complained, obstructed the free operation of the Spirit, falsified the correct relationship of Christ to the Church, and degraded the *sponsa Christi* to a prostitute, while the Nicolaites dishonoured the spiritual marriage of the priest and the bishop with his church. Leo IX was especially distressed for the pastoral care of the souls of the faithful. Convinced, with Humbert of Silva Candida, that a simoniacal bishop could not confer valid orders, he wondered whether in the Church, so infected with simony, there were still enough priests who were able to dispense to the faithful the Sacraments that were necessary for their salvation. His attempt in 1049 to have all simoniacal ordinations declared invalid collapsed on the opposition of the Roman Synod, but, to be on the safe side, he not infrequently had simoniacally ordained bishops and priests "reordained".[7] However exaggerated or incorrect the theological motives of the reformers in their struggle were to some extent, they did not spring from blind fanaticism but from an honestly endured anxiety, which was justified to this extent that a whole network of economic and political interests had fallen upon the great and the lesser churches.

Leo's reordinations called theologians into the arena. Peter Damiani wrote his *Liber gratissimus,* in which he developed the theologically correct view of the validity of simoniacal ordinations, while Humbert of Silva Candida maintained their nullity in the first two books of his *Adversus simoniacos*.[8] Thus sacramental theology fell again into a state of flux; it complicated the problem of simony and was complicated by it. It was no accident that shortly before this Berengarius of Tours had precipitated the Eucharistic controversy, in which Leo intervened in 1050 against Berengarius at the Synods of Rome and Vercelli. The problem of simony was only one facet of a complete revolution: the forms of the life of the early mediaeval religious and political world had become questionable, so that from various sides the duty was imposed on the Church of exploring more exactly her proper activity in the world by virtue of the Sacraments and of their ministers.

---

[6] On the position of both theologians, cf. G. Miccoli in *StudGreg* V (1956), 77–81; theological motives in the struggle against simony and Nicolaitism in G. Tellenbach, *Libertas,* 152–59; in the *Liber Gomorrhianus* (*PL* 145, 159–90), composed in 1049, Peter Damian sketches a fearful picture of the low sexual morality in wide circles of the Italian clergy.

[7] Thus, probably correct is the view of L. Saltet, *Les réordinations* (Paris 1907), 183–86; A. Schebler, *Die Reordinationen* (Bonn 1936), 219–23; A. Michel in *RQ* 46 (1938), 46, 41f.; id., *StudGreg* I (1947), 20, footnote 73; but a different opinion is held by A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* I, 133, footnote 2, and F. Pelster in *Gr* 23 (1942), 73, footnote 19.

In another matter also the reform of itself led beyond the purely moral sphere. Forced by the struggle against simony to use the papal rights more energetically, Leo IX opened a new period in the history of the primacy. Other circumstances intervened favourably. The decree of the Council of Reims reserving to the Bishop of Rome the designation "universalis ecclesiae primas et apostolicus" concerned only a title,[9] but the conflict with the Byzantine Church gave to Leo's adviser, Humbert of Silva Candida, the opportunity to expound vigorously to Michael Cerularius the greatness of the Roman Church in two works of which only fragments are extant and in a long doctrinal treatise. The canonical collection in seventy-four titles, *Diversorum sententiae patrum,* composed in Leo's lifetime or soon after, perhaps also goes back to Humbert. It took up the reform ideas in their entirety, reorganized them, and elaborated the leading position of the papacy.[10]

The reform so happily introduced was soon overshadowed by the anxiety caused to the Pope by the Normans of South Italy. Ever since Benedict VIII had introduced Norman warriors to the South Italian Melo, in revolt against Byzantine rule, more and more knights had come from Normandy across the

---

[8] *Liber gratissimus* in *MGLiblit* I, 15–75; *Libri tres adversus simoniacos,* ibid. 95–253. The opponent in the first book of Humbert's work is not Peter Damiani but Auxilius, *De ordinationibus a Formoso papa factis;* Peter Damiani had earlier made use of the same author; cf. J. Ryan, *Saint Peter Damiani* (Toronto 1956), 162–64, with further literature. Also important is the letter on simoniacal ordinations in *MGLiblit* I, 1–7, which in the manuscripts is often ascribed to a Pope Pascasius or Paschalis, but by scholars usually to Guido of Arezzo, though A. Michel in *RQ* 46 (1938), 25–41, decides for Humbert of Silva Candida.

[9] The Reims decree (*Mansi* XIX, 738) was probably directed against the Bishop of Compostela, whom the Council even excommunicated because of his use of the title *apostolicus;* whether it was intended also to strike at the primatial ideas which were current in France, as Amann holds (*Fliche-Martin* VII, 102), is questionable.

[10] A. Michel, *Die Sentenzen des Kard. Humbert, das erste Rechtsbuch der päpstlichen Reform* (Stuttgart 1943); the above mentioned fragments, *De s. Romana Ecclesia,* transmitted in Deusdedit, *Collectio canonum,* I, 306, have been re-edited by A. Michel in P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio,* II (Berlin 1929), 120–36; also now the important study of J. Ryan in *MS* 20 (1958), 206–38; on the letters and acts relevant to the Schism, see A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1924–30).

Alps to seek their fortune in the service now of one, now of another lord. They slowly established themselves, first Rainulf in Aversa, then William Iron Arm, son of Tancred of Hauteville. With his band William conquered the northern part of the Byzantine theme on the Adriatic and from 1042 styled himself Count of Apulia; his dependence on the Lombard Prince Waimar of Salerno was probably a mere formality. When in 1047 Henry III ceded the territory of the rebel Prince of Benevento to the Normans, whom he probably confirmed in their holdings, they attacked and by 1059 brought the greater part of the principality under their power.

At first Leo IX was not hostile to them, and in 1050 he had even accepted their homage in his own name and that of the Emperor. In the justified hope of recovering by their aid the jurisdiction over South Italy and Sicily that had been lost to the Roman Church since the Emperor Leo III, he then named Humbert as Archbishop of Sicily. But in the long run he could not remain deaf to the complaints of the population about the injustices of the Norman lords. He succeeded in gaining, at least for the Beneventans, the protection of Waimar of Salerno and of Count Drogo of Apulia, brother and successor of William Iron Arm. But when both of these died violent deaths, Drogo in 1051 and Waimar in 1052, he saw no other possibility than an effort to drive out the Normans forever, preferably in union with the Byzantines. Their governor, a South Italian and son of Melo, who had failed tragically, had offered an alliance.[11]

And so in 1052 Leo sought out the Emperor in Germany. Henry fell in with his plans and, in exchange for the cession of his rights of proprietorship to the see of Bamberg and to Fulda and other monasteries, gave him the Principality of Benevento and other imperial holdings in Italy, either as his own or at least for the exercise of the imperial authority. He even wanted to send an imperial army against the Normans, but let himself be dissuaded from this project by the objections of his chancellor, Bishop Gebehard of Eichstätt. Since Leo thought that he could not wait any longer, he recruited a small army of German knights at his own expense, combined it with Italian troops, and led his men south.[12] Before his army could join the Byzantines, it was overwhelmed near Civitate, south of the Frento, on 16 June 1053, and the Pope became the Normans' prisoner.

---

[11] On the South Italian policy and Leo's war against the Normans, see the special study by O. Vehse, "Benevent als Territorium des Kirchenstaates" in *QFIAB* 22 (1930f.), 87–99; P. Kehr's thesis that Leo wanted to free himself from the Empire and the Imperial Church, in *AAB* (1930, no. 3), 56, is contradicted, probably correctly, by Haller, *Papstgeschichte,* II, 582f. The fact that Leo in his letter to Michael Cerularius, c. 12–14, in *PL* 143, 752–55 (the whole letter, ibid. 744–69, and in C. Will, *Acta et scripta de controversiis eccl. graecae et latinae s. XI,* 65–85), made use of the *Constitutum Constantini* was not intended to demonstrate his territorial power, much less his claims to South Italy, but rather his primatial position. See E. Petrucci, "I rapporti tra le redazioni latine e greche del Costituto" in *BIStIAM* 74 (1962), 68–76.

[12] Leo IX gave his campaign the character of a holy war; see C. Erdmann, *Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 109–12, 107–09; see also *infra,* Chapter 51.

The miserable failure of the campaign, anxiety about reform, and the conflict with the Patriarch of Constantinople, which, with the departure of the papal legates, was now moving toward misfortune, broke the Pope's spirit. Escorted back to Rome, Leo IX died on 19 April 1054.

After long negotiations Henry III definitely designated as Pope his chancellor, Gebehard of Eichstätt, in March 1055. Styling himself Victor II, he took possession of the Roman Church on 13 April. Although he was more directly involved in imperial politics than his predecessor, Victor energetically championed the reform. Together with the Emperor he held a reform synod at Florence in 1055 and on other occasions also took energetic action with authoritative measures. In France in 1056 important reform councils were organized by the Archbishops of Arles and Aix, in their capacity as legates, at Toulouse, and by the Roman legate Hildebrand, probably at Chalon-sur-Saône. Hildebrand's appointment shows that the new Pope did not disregard the co-workers of Leo IX who were still in Rome; Humbert's influence even grew constantly. But the chancellor, Frederick of Lotharingia, had to escape the clutches of Henry III, because of the political tensions between his brother Godfrey and the Emperor, by entering Montecassino. Godfrey the Bearded, for years at loggerheads with the Emperor, had married Beatrice of Tuscany, widow of the assassinated Marquis Boniface, and thereby provoked the Emperor to make an Italian expedition. Godfrey fled to safety.

His intimate relationship with the Emperor enabled Victor to gain the administration of the duchy of Spoleto and of the marquisate of Fermo. While the vested rights of the Roman Church to specific territories there may have played a role, the Emperor was especially influenced by the motive of enlarging the area under the rule of the German Pope in the interests of the Empire *vis-à-vis* Tuscany and the Normans. The death of Henry III on 5 October 1056 was to involve Victor still more powerfully in imperial politics. Entrusted by the dying Emperor with the care of the Empire and of his son, not yet six years old but already elected King, Victor managed through his diplomatic skill to assure the succession of Henry IV and the appointment of the boy's mother as regent; for the Empress he also gained the right to designate a successor in the event of the death of her son, a service which Gregory VII was later to make use of.[13] That he furthermore made peace between the imperial house and Godfrey the Bearded, by having Lower Lotharingia and Tuscany restored to Godfrey, gained the Duke's friendship for him and for the Roman Church. It was soon to be of the greatest use to the reformers.

---

[13] W. Berges, "Gregor VII. und das deutsche Designationsrecht" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 189–209.

When Victor returned to Italy in February 1057 his days were numbered. Visiting Central Italy after a Roman reform synod, he died at Arezzo on 28 July. With him ended the series of German reform Popes. His successor belonged also to the Empire, it is true, but his election took place under other conditions.

Chapter 43

Progress of the Reform: the Lotharingian and Tuscan Popes (1057 to 1073)

The unexpected death of Victor II confronted the reformers with the question of how they could preserve the papacy from a new Tusculan domination. The only one who was able to assure them of effective help — Henry IV and his weak mother, the Empress-Regent, were not considered — was Godfrey the Bearded, Duke of Upper Lotharingia and Marquis of Tuscany. The reformers knew how to gain his support. They chose his own brother as Pope and then selected the next two Popes from the Tuscan episcopate.

Nothing so clearly reflects the insecure situation of the Roman Church as does the elevation of the three Lotharingian and Tuscan Popes. The first election was the smoothest. The reformers forestalled any manoeuvre on the part of the nobility by quick action. Three days after receiving the news of Victor's death they elected Frederick of Lotharingia, who happened to be in Rome, and then had him consecrated and enthroned as Stephen IX on the next day, 3 August 1057. Time did not allow a consultation with the German court; apart from the emergency, the King's minority may have been a further excuse. In any event this unauthorized procedure was probably not based on the intention of excluding for the future any participation by the German ruler in the election. In the autumn Stephen IX sent Hildebrand to Germany; it may with good reason be assumed that he was supposed to justify the unusual papal election before the royal court and obtain its belated approval.

With Stephen IX there came to power a man from the school of Leo IX. After Henry III's death Victor II had brought him out of obscurity again, forced his election as Abbot of Montecassino, and made him Cardinal-Priest of San Crisogono. In accord with his most recent past, the new Pope strengthened the monastic element among the reformers. For decades thereafter Montecassino rendered valuable services to the Roman Church, and the hermit movement, especially at home in Central Italy and so important for the reform, now acquired an official influence in the sense that Stephen made its most important representative, the Prior of Fonte Avellana, Peter Damiani, Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia. But the pontificate was too brief for anything decisive to have taken place. Of a Roman Synod arranged in 1057 only strict decrees against clerical marriage are known today. The Pope entertained great plans for South Italy: resuming the policy of Leo IX, he thought of expelling the Normans. An embassy headed by Desiderius of Montecassino was to leave for Constantinople when, during a journey through Tuscany, Stephen died at Florence on 29 March 1058.

Having a foreboding of his death, Stephen, before leaving Rome, had had the clergy and people swear not to proceed to the election of his successor until Hildebrand had returned from Germany. This, however, did not prevent the Tusculans, right after receipt of the news of Stephen's death, from tumultuously elevating Bishop John of Velletri as Benedict X and, because Peter Damiani refused, having him enthroned by the Archpriest of Ostia. The reformers did not recognize the election. After Hildebrand's return they agreed, with the support of Godfrey of Lotharingia, on Bishop Gerard of Florence, a Burgundian by birth, and obtained the assent of the German court. The official election took place at Siena, but it is disputed whether it occurred before or after the royal consent. Finally, the Pope-elect, who styled himself Nicholas II, escorted by the Tuscan army under Godfrey's command, set out for Rome with the cardinal-bishops and with Guibert, imperial chancellor of Italy, who was probably sent by the German government. He excommunicated the Antipope at a synod held at Sutri, and, because Benedict X fled, was able to enter the Eternal City, where he was enthroned on 24 January 1059.

With Nicholas II a new trend in the reform began to show itself. Five cardinal-bishops had dared, contrary to custom, to elect a Pope outside Rome in alliance with a few friends of reform and with the German ruler. In the third book of *Adversus simoniacos,*[1] probably composed in 1058, Humbert of Silva Candida shows that this was more than an exceptional case, that among the reformers the realization was then gaining ground that, for the sake of the freedom of the Church, they must be prepared to eliminate traditional juridical rights. If in the earlier books he had sought to demonstrate the invalidity of simoniacal ordinations and the absolutely heretical character of simony, he now investigated the causes of this evil.

What actually made it impossible to eradicate simony was its involvement with the contemporary world. The simoniacal gift, *munus a manu,* as well as the services and the interventions connected with the attaining of an office, which since Gregory I had been reckoned as simony, *munus ab obsequio* and *munus a lingua,* were not based really on a simoniacal intention but on juridical and lifelong habits, conditioned by the times and bound up with the proprietary church system. Selecting the chief cause, then, Humbert condemned lay investiture as an unlawful abuse and as a perversion of the proper relationship between priests and laity. He stressed the perversion especially in regard to episcopal elections: Whereas, according to the ancient rules, first the clergy, in agreement with the view of the metropolitan, then the people with the subsequent assent of the prince, were to elect, now the decision of the prince came first, and the rest of the electors, with the metropolitan in the last place, had to conform blindly. Humbert thereby indicated the aims of the reform, which were directed not merely at moral and religious abuses but against the religious and political world of the early Middle Ages in general. Despite specific differences, his attitude was also shared by other reformers. It led to a greater freedom of the Roman Church and to a more radical fight for moral reform.

---

[1] *MGLiblit* I, 198–253; the literature on simony will be found in that for Chapter 41.

The freedom of the Roman Church was arranged by the papal election decree, which Nicholas II issued at the Roman Synod of 1059 in order to legalize his own election and to guarantee future papal elections.[2] It provided for a threefold act of election: the cardinal bishops deliberated and then brought in the cardinal clerics; the rest of the clergy and the Roman people assented to the decision reached by them. Just as Humbert assigned to the metropolitan the first place in the carrying out of an episcopal election, the papal election decree put the cardinal bishops in the leading place, calling them, significantly, quasi-metropolitans. Their right was so extensive that, in the event of a substantial encroachment on the freedom of the election by the Romans, they could arrange the papal election outside Rome, having recourse to a few religious clerics and lay persons; the Pope thus elected, even if he had not yet entered Rome and been enthroned there, possessed the full governing authority. With the new law, which again conceived of the Church as a hierarchically arranged authority, running from the top down, the papacy broke away in principle from its connection with the people of the city of Rome. During the vacancy, the real representatives of the Roman Church were the quasi-metropolitan cardinal-bishops. Wherever they and the Pope then elected stayed, whether in or outside Rome, there was the Roman Church. Although the decree was not always observed in the future, still the basic idea expressed in it was established and led in the twelfth century to the exclusive right of the College of Cardinals to take part in the papal election.

By this decree Nicholas II obviously intended only to regulate the specifically Roman situation; he spoke only incidentally of a right belonging to Henry IV and his successors, which he conceded to Henry IV through the intervention of Guibert, Chancellor of Lombardy, and which succeeding rulers were on occasion to secure for themselves. The content of the right was taken for granted. It certainly involved the imperial right of assent. We do not know whether it had to do with the candidate to be elected or with the already elected Pope; perhaps this point played no particular role in the then universal form of an elevation proceeding by stages, which was juridically not very clear. In any event, the claim in the decree that the Pope had to grant specially to each succeeding German ruler such a right as a sort of privilege was new. There was here no thought of any arbitrary grant but rather of a confirmation of an old traditional prerogative, which it was not easy to annul. But since privileges could be forfeited, at least by misuse, the hierarchical feature of the decree again came to light in the papal grant of an imperial right: ecclesiastical authority was to be ultimately responsible for everything that concerned the papal election.

---

[2] The substantially genuine (or "papal") and the forged (or "imperial") versions in *MGConst* I, 537–46; cf. also the critical remarks of A. Michel and H. G. Krause in their works cited in the Literature for this chapter. Michel's assumption of a pact formally concluded with the German court probably goes too far, but the opposing widespread view that the reformers had all along intended to exclude any participation of the German ruler in the papal election and hence kept the paragraphs dealing with the King in the decree intentionally obscure is probably wrong; cf. also the excellent study by Krause, which, however, insists too much on the political importance of the decree and disregards its basic intention that depends on the hierarchical notion; the study by F. Kempf, cited in the Literature, deals with this very point.

Naturally, the law alone was not enough. Benedict X, protected by the Count of Galeria, maintained himself in the vicinity of Rome. Since Godfrey of Lotharingia supplied no help, the Roman Church had to look elsewhere. Her distress induced her, probably at the urging of Abbot Desiderius of Montecassino and of Hildebrand, to make a decision of great portent. Visiting South Italy in the summer of 1059, Nicholas II received feudal homage and the oath of fealty from the Normans, Richard of Aversa, since 1058 Prince of Capua, and Robert Guiscard, Duke of Apulia and Calabria, and in return invested them with the territories they had conquered. The new vassals turned over to the Pope the churches of their lands together with the estates and bound themselves to loyal aid and, in the event of a disputed papal election, to the support of the "better cardinals". They paid feudal *census* merely for the parts of the *terra sancti Petri* that they occupied, and Robert Guiscard also for his own property.[3] Richard of Capua immediately took his duties seriously; he destroyed castles and strongholds of Roman nobles, including Galeria, and delivered Benedict X as a prisoner to the Pope.

Hence at one stroke the Roman Church had gained feudal suzerainty over much of Italy. German historiography is accustomed to chalk this up to her as a serious wrong. As a matter of fact, the Pope granted in fief lands which before the Norman conquest had belonged in part to the Emperor's sphere of authority,[4] but it is by no means established that Nicholas intended simply

[3] Robert Guiscard's oath of vassalage in Deusdedit, *Collectio canonum,* III, 285 (ed. Glanvell, I, 394); that of Richard of Capua, ibid. III, 288 (ed. Glanvell, I, 395); the latter of these is from the time of Alexander II but is probably essentially the same as that of 1059; see especially Kehr, *Belehnungen,* 22–26, 20f.

[4] In 1059 there was question of imperial possession merely in the case of the Principality of Capua; at that time Salerno was not yet in Norman hands, and Henry III had turned over Benevento to the Roman Church (cf. Chapter 42). It is true that the Empire had long claimed all of South Italy.

to exclude an imperial suzerainty of the former Lombard principalities. In 1073, for example, Gregory VII obliged Richard of Capua to swear fealty also to the German King. The idea of a condominium was not unfamiliar; already in 1050 Leo IX had accepted the homage of the Normans in his own name and in that of the Emperor. For almost a decade the Roman Church had been exposed to the pressure of the Norman conquest, without having obtained sufficient support from the German rulers. Hence it can at least be understood that she accepted the voluntarily proposed feudal suzerainty and thus turned Norman hostility into a legitimate bond of vassalage.[5]

The royal German court, it is true, could from its standpoint have regarded the unauthorized Norman policy of the Pope as a violation of the law and reacted accordingly. Perhaps this was the deeper reason — the papal election decree probably played no role — why in 1061 (probably not in 1060) serious tension arose, but perhaps the reason is to be sought merely in a difference between Rome and Anno of Cologne. In any case, a synod at court condemned Nicholas and declared his decisions null. Cardinal Stephen, whom the Pope then sent to the Empress, was not received.[6] The break thus effected brought about a rather dangerous schism after the death of Nicholas II on 7 July 1061.

This time the Roman opposition acted more sensibly, sending to Henry IV the insignia of the dignity of *patricius* and asking for a new Pope. On the other hand, the reformers, led by Hildebrand — Humbert was now dead — on 30 September elected Anselm of Lucca, a Milanese by birth, who called himself Alexander II, and on the next day enthroned him with the aid of the troops of Richard of Capua. Then, at the end of October 1061, Bishop Cadalus of Parma was chosen Pope at the German court, in association with the Roman envoys and with Lombard bishops, at the instigation of the Chancellor of Lombardy, Guibert. He called himself Honorius II. The struggle between the two rivals for possession of Rome led to no decision, so that Godfrey of Lotharingia was able to intervene and induce both to retire to their dioceses until a definite decision should be rendered by the King.

Contrary to expectations, the decision favoured Alexander, for the *coup d'état* of Kaiserswerth, which removed Henry IV from his mother and made the reform-inclined Archbishop Anno of Cologne the real power, meant a change of policy. The Synod of Augsburg of October 1062, for which Peter Damiani composed his *Disceptatio synodalis,*[7] sent to Italy an investigating commission that was well disposed to Alexander. Hence in 1063 Alexander II was able to enter Rome with Godfrey's aid. Cadalus's desperate attack on Rome was shattered on the weapons of Tuscan and Norman warriors. A synod meeting at Mantua at Pentecost of 1064, in which Anno of Cologne and other German bishops took part, definitively recognized Alexander. Till his death in 1072 Cadalus continued to regard himself as the legitimate Pope, but he was of no further importance.

---

[5] The assertion often made, that for the acquisition of feudal suzerainty the *Constitutum Constantini* served the Roman Church as her legal title, remains pure conjecture, demonstrable neither from the sources nor from inner necessity. In general, the territorial and political aspect, which later played so great a role in the relations between the papacy and South Italy, should be abandoned for 1059; the reformed papacy was concerned not so much for territorial possession as for vassals who could be called upon for military aid.

[6] Cf. H. G. Krause, "Das Papstwahldekret von 1059 und seine Rolle im Investiturstreit" in *StudGreg* VII (1960), 126–41.

[7] *MGLiblit* I, 76–94; also Kempf in *ArchHP* 2 (1964), 82–85.

Having emerged victorious from the struggle for her freedom, the Roman Church was able to dedicate herself to reform with redoubled zeal. The pontificate of Nicholas II had prepared for this with important decrees. Thus at the Roman Synod of 1059 clerics and priests were forbidden to acquire a church from lay persons, no matter whether with or without the payment of money. This first attack, undertaken in Humbert's spirit, against lay investiture — it is disputed whether is was supposed to affect merely the lesser churches or also bishoprics — was, it is true, only in the nature of a programme: the decree lacked any sanctions.[8] And so the Cardinal Legate Stephen, sent to France in 1060, did not try to apply it. Alexander II also, who renewed the prohibition in 1063, did not venture upon an open struggle. All the more sternly did the Synod of 1059 proceed against Nicolaitism. Its prohibition of attending the Mass of a married priest must have been all the more effective since already some of the faithful in Lombardy had risen up against Nicolaitism. Another decree suspended those clerics bound to celibacy who had retained a concubine since the regulations of Leo IX. A third law, issued at Hildebrand's urging, commanded the *vita communis et apostolica* for the clerics of one and the same church, thereby fostering the movement of the canons regular, that was destined to be so important.

Simony especially was to be the concern of the two following synods.[9] The decree probably issued in 1060 distinguished among simonists: between those ordained simoniacally by simonists, those ordained simoniacally by non-simonists, and those ordained non-simoniacally by simonists. One who belonged to the first two classes was to lose his office, but clerics of the third class, considering the difficulties of the time, might continue in office. Certain obscurities probably moved the Roman Synod of 1061 to explain this decree more precisely and especially to insist that the concession granted to the third class was valid only for persons already ordained and would not hold for the future. Hence, despite Humbert's radical position, the synod left open the theological question of the validity or invalidity of simoniacal ordinations.

---

[8] The 1059 synodal decrees in *MGConst* I, 546–48. Despite G. B. Borino, "L'investitura laica dal decreto di Nicolò II al decreto di Gregorio VII" in *StudGreg* V (1956), 345–59, one must hold to a prohibition of investiture.

[9] The decrees dated 1060 in *MGConst* I, 549–51, must be assigned to two synods: c. 1–3 probably belong to 1061, c. 5 to 1060; see. G. Miccoli, "Il problema delle ordinazioni simoniache e le sinodi Lateranensi del 1060 e 1061" in *StudGreg* V (1956), 33–81.

Nicholas II reigned too briefly to apply the decrees fully, but a relatively long pontificate (1061–73) was granted to Alexander II, the first reform Pope of whom this is so. Under him the reform reached an unprecedented intensity and expansion. In France, since Leo IX the favourite battle field, papal legates proceeded with synods and processes from 1063 on in almost uninterrupted succession. But even the proud German bishops, who were also vulnerable in consequence of the reintroduction of simoniacal practices by Henry IV, now learned to feel the Pope's heavy hand. Even the young, immature King considered it advisable to abandon the planned repudiation of his wife, Bertha of Turin, when Peter Damiani, sent specifically for this purpose, opposed him and was supported by a German synod.

England too was affected by the reform. The political and ecclesiastical situation at the close of the reign of King Edward the Confessor has already been described. There were two rivals for the succession: Earl Harold of Wessex and Duke William of Normandy. William thought that he could support his claim on an express promise made by Edward. After Edward's death on 5 January 1066, Harold at once had himself raised to the throne, whereupon William invoked the Pope's judgment, accusing Harold of perjury. The difficult legal question was probably less decisive for the Roman Church than the consideration of which of the two claimants supported her in her reform exertions and to that extent was the more fit. From this point of view the choice had to be for William and against Harold, for William had distinguished himself by his zealous promotion of reform in Normandy, without in any way relaxing his control, whereas Harold, in consequence of the earlier related usurpation of the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury, carried out by his partisan, Bishop Stigand of Winchester, and maintained in defiance of specially dispatched papal legates, gave the Roman reformers little or no reason for confidence. Advised by Hildebrand, then, Alexander II decided for the Norman and even sent him a specially blessed banner of Saint Peter for the expedition. Under this banner William and with him the Roman Church were victorious in the Battle of Hastings in 1066.

Alexander's expectation that William would now give England to the Roman Church in fief was not realized, but the King paid Peter's Pence, which had fallen into oblivion, and laid the foundation for a new development of the English Church. That three legates came to England at his request in 1070, held synods, and gave the Anglo-Saxon sees to Norman clerics, and the archbishopric of Canterbury to Abbot Lanfranc of Caen, was, it is true, only an initial success, for William and his immediate successors allowed Rome no great influence, but the closer contact then gained with the Church of the continent remained a fact that was not lost and was capable of being further developed.

The papacy realized still another success in Spain. The monastic reform movement of Cluny and Marseilles had been able to penetrate slowly from the beginning of the century, and now Rome followed. From 1065 to 1067 the Cardinal Legate Hugh the White held reform synods in Castile, Navarre, and Aragón. King Sancho of Aragón went a step further; he commended his country to the Pope in 1068 and introduced the Roman liturgy in 1071, whereas the other Christian kingdoms clung for the time being to the traditional Mozarabic liturgy, despite the zealous efforts of Roman legates. At the moment Christian Spain was in the process of gaining ground at Islam's expense. Rome accompanied this *Reconquista* with all the more active interest when French knights began to cross the Pyrenees and in 1064, together with the Spaniards, occupied the important fortress of Barbastro, which was, however, soon lost again. An expedition, prepared in 1072 by the French Count of Roucy, was discussed in Rome. Alexander blessed the undertaking and granted to every participant who confessed his sins a remission of penance. The anticipated conquests were to become fiefs of the Roman Church. But the expedition seems not to have been a success.

Portentous decisions occurred in South Italy too. With the capitulation of Bari in 1071 the Byzantines lost their last foothold. Robert Guiscard had already ventured the crossing to Sicily and had taken Messina in 1061; Palermo followed in 1072. Robert's brother Roger, to whom Alexander had sent a banner of Saint Peter in 1063, was to subjugate the island bit by bit and thereby open up to the Roman Church a new sphere of jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, struggles of a different sort were occurring in Lombardy. The upward development of this blessed land had produced a general ferment that affected the religious sphere also, especially in the cities, flourishing by virtue of their trade and industry. Instead of seizing upon the religious currents and leading them into the correct course, the urban clergy, belonging to the nobility and mostly married, persisted in their worldly manner of life and hence provoked the criticism of many of the faithful. This was a criticism supported by a genuine desire for reform, which of itself had nothing to do with tendencies related to class struggles, anticlericalism, or even heresy. In Milan it produced the revolutionary movement of the *Pataria*.[10] Under the leadership of the priest, Ariald of Varese, and of the Milanese noble, Landulf Cotta, a revolt broke out there on 10 May 1057, in which priests were forcibly obliged to celibacy. Stephen IX, approached by both sides, directed Hildebrand, who went to Germany as legate in the autumn of 1057, to go to Milan and gather information. The Pope waited for this, while the opposing groups at Milan consolidated their positions. A synod of bishops at Fontaneto condemned Ariald and Landulf *in absentia,* while the *Patarini* swore not to recognize any married or simoniacal priest. They could feel that they were confirmed in their opposition when in 1059 the Roman Synod issued severe decrees against Nicolaitism.

---

[10] In addition to the studies cited in the Literature for this chapter, cf. also Miccoli, "Il problema delle ordinazioni" (preceding footnote), and F. J. Schmale in *HZ* 187 (1959), 376–85. The name *Pataria,* appearing later and disputed in regard to its meaning, is probably connected with the Milan rag-fair. The important question whether Anselm I of Lucca (Pope Alexander II), of the Milanese family of the Baggio, took part in the formation of the *Pataria* or was even its intellectual author, is still unsolved.

Nicholas II was well aware of the dangers connected with the *Pataria,* and so toward the end of 1059 he sent to Milan Peter Damiani and Anselm of Lucca; the latter at least sympathized with the *Pataria.* Peter Damiani, by a brilliant exposition of the Roman primacy, succeeded in overcoming the initial resistance of the citizens, who insisted on the special position of the Ambrosian Church, and in establishing order. The clergy swore to give up simoniacal and incontinent ways and obediently accepted the mild penalties imposed for their simoniacal procedures. But Peter had ventured too much. In a clear correction of his too gentle method the Roman Synod of 1060 issued the above mentioned decrees against simony, but it ratified the peace that had been gained by favouring Archbishop Guido, who was present, and rejecting Ariald's complaints.

This submission of the Archbishop was not merely a valuable victory of the idea of the primacy but the best solution of Milan's reform problem. The hierarchically minded reformers could only regard a revolution rising from below as an emergency measure. But since the weak Archbishop Guido let things return to the old groove, the *Pataria,* under the impassioned leadership of Erlembald, a brother of the now dead Landulf, let loose bloody struggles in the summer of 1066 and gained its first martyr in Ariald, who was killed during them. Other cities were also agitated. The people of Cremona drove out married and simoniacal priests; those of Piacenza, their bishop. The peace proclaimed by papal legates in 1067 did not last long. When in 1070 Guido, weary of his office, sent his ring and staff to Henry IV, the King at once invested the distinguished priest Godfrey. This notorious disregard of their right of election induced the Milanese to war against Godfrey, in which Erlembald displayed the banner of Saint Peter that the Pope had sent him. After Guido's death the priest Atto was elected Archbishop of Milan in 1072 under the presidency of a cardinal legate. Schism was the result. Since Henry IV clung to Godfrey, the Pope at the Roman Synod of 1073 excommunicated five royal councillors on a charge of simony.

This conflict between the Pope and the German King, in which the Investiture Controversy was already intimated, showed clearly the development that had occurred between 1057 and 1073: the struggle against simony and Nicolaitism had brought on the more serious struggle over the principle of the freedom of the Church. The signs pointed to the storm when Alexander II died on 21 April 1073, for now there mounted the throne of Peter the man who had guided Alexander's policy — the Archdeacon Hildebrand.

CHAPTER 44

Pope Gregory VII (1073 to 1085)

The reform entered its critical stage with Gregory VII, who, on 22 April 1073, during the very burial of the deceased Alexander II, was acclaimed as Pope by the Romans in the Lateran basilica and only then was elected at San Pietro in Vincoli by the cardinals and urban clergy and enthroned. For now one of the greatest of Peter's successors took charge of it and breathed his own spirit into it, without altering its substance or goal.

Gregory's age and provenance cannot be precisely determined. Born in Roman Tuscany, possibly at Soana, between 1019 and 1030, the son of Bonizo, who was probably not poverty-stricken but was likewise not of the nobility, Hildebrand went while still young to Rome, where he was educated in the monastery of Santa Maria all'Aventino, ruled by his uncle, and in the *palatium Romanum,* which cannot be more precisely defined. Having received the lower orders, he served Gregory VI, who was on friendly terms with him, as a cleric and accompanied him into exile in Germany. Set at liberty by the death of the deposed Pope in the autumn of 1047, he probably entered Cluny or a Cluniac monastery, but after a few months was summoned by Leo IX, brought back to Rome, and entrusted with the administration of San Paolo *fuori le mura.* The rise of his prestige among the reformers is attested by legations to France in 1054 and 1056 and Germany in 1057 and by his appointment as archdeacon in the autumn of 1059. Under Nicholas II he was regarded as one of the chief advisers, under Alexander II as the most powerful man in the Lateran.[1]

It is not entirely correct to speak of Gregory VII as the monk on the papal throne. Reluctant though he may have been to abandon the monastery — he continued to wear the monastic habit — and willingly as he made use of monks for the work of reform, he devoted himself resolutely to the apostolic activity imposed upon him; in fact he placed it above the purely monastic ideal in frank criticism of the excessively monastic concept of, for example, Peter Damiani or Hugh of Cluny. For Gregory was profoundly convinced that, ultimately, the great concern in the world was with the struggle between God's Kingdom and that of the devil, with the warlike efforts of God's children that peace, justice, and the love of God might fill as many men as possible. All Christians were summoned to this struggle, but especially the spiritual and secular rulers. Gregory clung to the old view of the world throughout: God's Kingdom was the *ecclesia universalis* with the powers of the *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium* instituted by the

---

[1] On his family, cf. the critical survey of the bibliography in Schramm in *GGA* 207 (1953), 67–70; on his entry into Cluny, G. B. Borino, "Ildebrando non si fece monaco a Roma" in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 441–56 (with the other literature).

Lord; but he intended that God should be again able to act freely in his Kingdom.

Since priests were primarily responsible for divine things, for him the two powers were not simply side by side; the *Sacerdotium* possessed the higher rank, and Gregory did everything to free it again for God's work and to guarantee the authority belonging to it, but one alone could, in his view, claim to be the proper interpreter of the divine will — Peter's vicar in Rome. For Christ, who gave Peter supreme authority and bade him establish the Roman Church, prayed for Peter's faith so that the Roman Church cannot err, and Peter lives on by entering, as Gregory firmly believed, into a sort of personal union with every successor and elevating him, by virtue of his own merits, to a better and holier being.[2] Hence all Christians must obey the Pope, who is responsible for their salvation, and under his leadership fight for the Kingdom of God, not only priests and monks who are subject to his superepiscopal authority, but also secular rulers.

With this claim, oriented to the spiritual sphere, Gregory did not intend to strip the *Regnum* of power or to expel it from the *ecclesia universalis;* he only demanded that the ruler really belong to the *corpus Christi.* If by his evil deeds the ruler revealed himself as a member of Satan's Kingdom, then basically he was depriving himself of power; for then he was commanding, no longer in God's name, but in that of the devil, and this contradicted the nature of the *ecclesia universalis.* From this Gregory deduced the radical and then even unheard of conclusion: by virtue of the papal right to decide ultimately who is of God and who is of the devil, he claimed that he could depose an unworthy ruler and free his subjects from their oath of allegiance.[3]

Persons have sought, incorrectly, to trace Gregory's thought directly to Augustine. The great Pope knew little of Augustine and, except for Gregory the Great, had likewise no relationship with the other Fathers. All the more directly did Scripture interest him, especially the New Testament and there, by preference, Saint Paul, a kindred spirit. In addition, he was naturally committed to the ideas which the ecclesiastical *milieu,* with its Augustinian colouring, and the contemporary reform movement brought him, but, apart from the claim to deposition, he neither enriched them with new ideas nor articulated them into a consistent reform programme, let alone into a new world-view in anticipation of the future. Withal, Gregory's greatness is to be sought, not in his ideas, but in his religious, perhaps mystically gifted, personality, in the abundance of the divine experience given to him, taken up by his genius, and converted into action.

---

[2] Reg., II, 55a (no. 23), VIII, 21; in Caspar ed., 207, 561; W. Ullmann, "Dictatus Papae 23 in Retrospect and Prospect" in *StudGreg* VI (1959–61), 229–64, would like to have it that the sanctity refers merely to the office and not to the person of the Pope, but he does not bear in mind that a personally inherited holiness was championed in the Formosus controversy and was rejected at that time by Auxilius (cf. *supra,* Chapter 35, footnote 18). Perhaps Gregory VII was familiar with the relevant passage of Auxilius, in which the citation of Ennodius is missing; it is demonstrable that other writings of Auxilius were used by the reformers; cf. J. Ryan, *Saint Peter Damiani,* 162–65, 200. Further, despite Ullmann's objection, Gregory's *mystique* of Saint Peter probably entered here.

[3] *Reg.,* II, 55a (no. 12, 27), IV, 2, VIII, 21; in Caspar ed., 204, 208, 293–97, 544–63; for Gregory's political doctrine and that of his friends, see Chapter 50.

It would be going too far to say that the measure of his thought and activity could be deduced merely from his personal, religious experience. That Gregory intended to follow ecclesiastical tradition appears in his calling for the drawing up of new compilations of the law, which were to work out the authentic and venerable statements of ecclesiastical tradition that were inspired by the Holy Spirit. Before this wish could be more or less satisfactorily fulfilled by his friends, headed by Anselm of Lucca, he had himself collected canonical material dealing with the Roman primacy, mostly taken from pseudo-Isidore, arranged it in sections, and for each section composed a concise sentence, suggesting the chapter headings of a canonical collection. Thus originated the famed *Dictatus papae,* which was put into Gregory's *registrum* of letters.[4] There in twenty-seven sentences were summarized the most important primatial rights, with no systematization but with the already mentioned prerogatives of the Roman Church — her foundation by Christ and infallibility — and of the papacy — the inherited personal sanctity of the Pope and his right of deposition: the honorary privileges, including that of having his foot kissed and the exclusive right to use the imperial insignia, this last probably directed against the Byzantine Patriarch; the supreme legislative and judicial power and its effects; superepiscopal authority with regard to the deposition and institution of bishops, ordaining of clerics, determining of diocesan boundaries, and so forth; and excommunication and absolution from oaths as a consequence of the papal coercive power. The listing was not oriented to a concrete goal, connected with the reform or with negotiations for union. It was supposed merely to provide a synopsis of the primatial rights as they could be identified in tradition. Its use depended on the situation of the moment, that is, on the question, to be constantly investigated anew in the concrete case, whether and to what extent the interests of God's Kingdom required an intervention.

Gregory's election was charged with the tensions in regard to Henry IV which, because of the Milanese question, had clouded the last days of Alexander II. They probably did not permit an application to the young King for his approval of the election. Since Henry continued to associate with the excommunicated advisers and hence fell under the ban himself, no notice of the election was probably sent to him.[5] It remained to be seen whether the King would react, but he did not. And, when the Saxon revolt broke out, he threw himself, so to speak, at the Pope's feet in an extravagantly humble letter in which he acknowledged his failings. Gregory could breathe freely and turn to the great concern of his heart, the reform.

---

[4] *Reg.,* II, 55a; in Caspar ed., 201–08; basic is K. Hofmann, *Der "Dictatus Papae" Gregors VII. Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Erklärung* (Paderborn 1933). The various theories on the origin and aim of the *Dictatus* in K. Hofmann, "Der 'Dictatus Papae' als eine Indexsammlung?" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 531–37; the theory of an index of a collection was advanced by G. B. Borino, "Un'ipotesi sul 'Dictatus Papae' di Gregorio VII" in *ADRomana* 67 (1944), 237–52; its utility with regard to form is demonstrated by S. Kuttner, "Liber canonicus. A Note on 'Dictatus Papae' c. 17" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 387–401. Borino's assumption of a mere index of a collection that had nothing at all to do with Gregory's ideas is as little correct as is Haller's view in *Papsttum,* II, 382f., that it was a revolutionary reform program going far beyond the assembled sources.

The Reform

The first Roman Reform Synod, that of 1074, renewed the old rules, decreeing exclusion from the ministry for simony, suspension for Nicolaitism. The synod of the following year drew the reins tighter: for simonists it now decreed permanent deposition, while in regard to incontinent priests it referred to the regulation of 1059, calling for a boycott by the people. Resistance was not lacking; in particular the requirement of celibacy encountered widespread rejection.[6] Polemical writings appeared, and there were scenes of violence at Rouen and in several places in Germany. But Gregory was unmoved. The Roman Synod in the autumn of 1078 obliged every bishop, under pain of suspension, not to tolerate any *fornicatio* among his clergy. Furthermore, priests who sold their official functions were suspended. The most decisive blow had to do with ordinations. The spring Synod of 1078 declared all ordinations performed by the excommunicated to be legally invalid *(irritas)*; the autumn synod of that year decreed the same thing for ordinations which were imparted for money or as a result of petition or services or without the consent of clergy and people and without the approval of the proper ecclesiastical superiors.[7] Although both decrees most probably did not intend to decide the dogmatic question of the sacramental validity or invalidity of such orders, their obscure wording increased the existing uncertainty. This is to be observed in Gregory VII himself. On the one hand, he avoided taking a stand on the dogmatic question; on the other hand, he allowed his legate, Amatus of Oléron, to have his own way when at the Synod of Gerona in 1078 he declared the absolute nullity of simoniacal ordinations. Hence it should cause no surprise that the question came up in the polemics and in general caused much unrest.

But the question of investiture made the conflict more bitter. Here Gregory was probably led into a quarrel that he had not sought. At first he entirely disregarded the decree promulgated by Nicholas II and renewed by Alexander II but never enforced. He did not have recourse to it until the Lenten Synod of 1075.[8] Even if he is supposed to have then duly published the decree,[9] this was probably done at first without great emphasis. The reasons for this caution are unknown to us, but there is reason to believe that about the same time he had the above mentioned *Dictatus papae* entered into the *registrum* of his letters. Just as he intended to use the rights there summarized only to the extent that it seemed necessary to him, he probably planned to apply the investiture prohibition according to the circumstances. Perhaps it would have played no great role in Gregory's reform work, had not something unforeseen intervened — Henry IV's extravagant counterattack in 1076, to be discussed below. For then Gregory became inexorable. He not only insisted on the prohibition for Germany. He had it promulgated in France by his legates in 1077 and more precisely formulated at the Roman autumn Synod of 1078: it was forbidden to clerics, under penalty of excommunication and annulment of the completed action, to accept from a layman the investiture of bishoprics, abbeys, and churches. The Lenten Synod of 1080 decreed the same but expressly extended the prohibition to lesser ecclesiastical functions and now also visited excommunication on the investing layman.[10] The Investiture Controversy that thereby erupted but by no means affected all countries was not to be settled for decades.

---

[5] Thus G. B. Borino in *StudGreg* V (1956), 313–43; less convincing is A. Michel, *Papstwahl und Königsdekret,* 211–16.

[6] For the council's decrees see C. Erdmann, *Studien zur Briefliteratur,* 227, footnote 3.

[7] *Reg.,* V, 14a, VI, 5b; in Caspar ed., 372, 403f.; on the dogmatic question, see A. Schebler, *Die Reordination,* 235–45; A. Nitschke in *StudGreg* V (1956), 153–55; G.B.Borino, ibid., 411–15.

Gregory was here concerned, not for a question of power, and far less for economic interests, but for reform, which, in his view, could only be achieved when the appointing of priests and bishops, freed from the smothering influence of kings and proprietors of churches, again took place according to the canonical rules, which gave scope to the divine activity. The free election envisaged by the old canon law required, of course, a further guarantee, and Gregory did not hesitate to set it up. A decree of the Lenten Synod of 1080 not only enjoined the control of elections provided by the old law, which was now to be exercised by a bishop named as visitor, and the confirmation of the election by the metropolitan or the Pope. It also laid the foundation for the hitherto unknown right of devolution: in the event of an uncanonical election the electors' right to fill the office was to pass to the metropolitan or to the Pope.[11] What the papal election decree of 1059 had imperfectly attempted, by empowering the quasi-metropolitan cardinal-bishops to choose the new Pope outside Rome in an emergency, was in 1080 perfectly achieved for the instituting of bishops. The final decision no longer lay with the electors, among whom the secular ruler had spoken the decisive word, but with the ecclesiastical authority: the hierarchical principle, already applied in 1059, had gained a new and portentous victory.

---

[8] C. Erdmann, *Studien zur Briefliteratur*, 254, footnote 2, doubts whether the synod was at all concerned with the decree.

[9] Actual publication is defended by G. B. Borino, "Il decreto di Gregorio VII contro le investiture fu promulgato nel 1075" in *StudGreg* VI (1959-61), 329-48; cf. there the opposing opinions, rejected by Borino with noteworthy but not always sound reasons, which either deny publication outright or restrict it to a definite circle of persons. In an earlier study of the problem, *StudGreg* V (1956), 345-59, Borino went farther: Nicholas II, he claimed, issued no prohibition of investiture and consequently Alexander II did not renew it; its author was Gregory VII.

[10] 1078 (*Reg.*, VI, 5b); 1080 (*Reg.*, VII, 14a); in Caspar ed., 403, 480f.

The autumn Synod of 1078 also risked a first attack on the right of the proprietors of churches by desiring to enlighten the laity as to how much danger for the salvation of souls was involved in the possession of churches and tithes. In the same year the reform Synod of Gerona stated that lay persons must not really possess churches; wherever this could not be avoided, at least the taking of the offerings was forbidden. The moderate attitude of the reformers could count all the more on partial successes, since already for some time there had been in progress a movement that was seeking to transfer proprietary churches from the lay to the ecclesiastical hand.[12]

Gregory VII did everything to translate his reforming laws into fact. Like his predecessors he made use of legates for this purpose but introduced an important innovation. While he entrusted hitherto customary legates, dispatched only for a specified time, merely with particular tasks or visitations of remote lands, he had the real reform activity attended to by standing legates, usually taken from the country in question. Thus in 1075 he named Hugh of Die for France and Amatus of Oléron for the Midi and Spain; in 1079 Cardinal Richard of Saint-Victor de Marseille for Spain; in 1080 Bishop Altmann of Passau for Germany; and in 1081 Anselm of Lucca for Lombardy. In this group, all of whom were bishops except Richard of Saint-Victor, a great activity was especially displayed by Hugh and Amatus. Many provincial synods convoked by them imposed Gregory's reform decrees. There was a shower of penalties on simoniacal bishops or those failing otherwise, and even the proud Archbishop Manasses of Reims had to accept his own deposition. Since Gregory reserved the final decision to himself, there were frequent appeals to Rome. The Pope had many important cases decided by the Roman reform synods, which annually proclaimed a series of excommunications, suspensions, and depositions. The final struggle with Henry IV naturally took the personal direction of the reform work more and more out of Gregory's hand.

There is no doubt that Gregory's pontificate was a turning point in the history of the Roman primacy. It is not to no purpose that people speak of the "Hildebrandine Church" that was now beginning. But if the individual activities are looked at, they show little that was fundamentally new. The widespread view that Gregory sought to undermine the position of bishops and metropolitans is not borne out by the sources. The often cited right of devolution, prepared in 1080, in no way excluded the right of the metropolitan. And the further argument, that the primacy of Lyons was set up in 1079 in order, on the one hand, to replace the earlier form of the vicariate with a virtually meaningless primacy, and, on the other hand, to strike at Archbishop Manasses of Reims or the champions of lay investiture, has been shown to be untenable. When Gregory complied with the request of Gebuin of Lyons, he honestly believed he was restoring an ancient institution, without realizing that he was actually converting an invention of pseudo-Isidore into reality for the first time.[13] If he were concerned merely for centralization, he would have ignored Gebuin's request and thus spared himself the intermediate tribunal.

---

[11] *Reg.*, VII, 14a; in Caspar ed., 482.

[12] *Reg.*, VI, 5b, no. XXXII; ibid., the prohibition of possessing tithes (no. XVI and c. 7); in Caspar ed., 402, 401, 404f.; Synod of Gerona, c. 3–5, *Mansi* XX, 519; also H. E. Feine, "Kirchenreform und Niederkirchenwesen" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 505–24 (with the other literature); T. Mayer, "Gregor VII. und das Eigenkirchenrecht. Die ältesten Urkunden von Hirsau und Muri" in *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte* 28 (1948), 145–76.

Actually, Gregory sought no constitutional changes for the benefit of the Roman primacy. What he contributed of his own was his *mystique* of Saint Peter, already mentioned. Profoundly convinced that no Christian could be saved who was not bound to Peter's vicar in unity, harmony, and obedience, he used all the rights assembled in the *Dictatus papae* to the extent that he regarded as necessary. Such a religious dynamism, entirely oriented to the personal responsibility of the Pope, brought about the definitive turning point. While Gregory's own personal charism may have been extinguished with his death, the monarchical form of government of the Roman Church had become a reality. There remained merely the task of justifying it more precisely and guaranteeing and perfecting it.

Gregory's *mystique* of Saint Peter affected not only priests but also the laity. He expected the princes especially to be loyal adherents of Saint Peter and his vicar. Words such as *fidelitas, fidelis, miles Sancti Petri* or *sanctae romanae ecclesiae* or *sanctae apostolicae sedis* constantly recur in his letters. As early as the time of Alexander II Counts William of Burgundy, Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Amadeus of Savoy, and others had bound themselves by a solemn oath to defend the *res Sancti Petri*. Gregory did not fail to make use of Christian princes for the interests of religion and of the Church. Thus he authorized some of them to proceed with force against unworthy bishops who defied ecclesiastical penalties or he asked for their help when the Roman Church or specific areas of the Christian world were threatened. Convinced that genuine love demanded that the machinations of the *corpus diaboli* be obstructed by force of arms and that life be risked for the brothers, he had no hesitation about summoning the laity to a holy war. In fact, he even established a troop of his own, the *militia Sancti Petri,* and sought to turn it into a real army in times of crisis, by voluntary enlistments, by military aid which he claimed from bishops or vassals, or by mercenaries.

---

[13] H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Patriarchate" in *ZSavRGkan* 71 (1954), 61–84 (especially 79f.); see *supra*, Chapter 35.

Hence it was very important to him to augment the loyalty of the *fideles Sancti Petri.* Since *fidelitas* was based on the religious connection with Peter and hence lacked a clear juridical form, he strove to strengthen it further in the most varied ways — simple promises of obedience, payment of *census,* pledge of military aid, vassalage. All possibilities were used by him, often with appeal to genuine rights or rights so regarded.[14] This very lack of any systematization and of juridical clarity should indicate how little Gregory was concerned for a secular system of government. It is true that his effort to make use of the princes somehow as co-workers led to a real entanglement of reform and politics. Hence, in what follows the two spheres, which in his view were not to be separated, will be discussed together.

Reform Policy in the Various Countries

Characteristic of Gregory VII's broad view, embracing all Christendom, was his alert interest in the northern missionary area, where at last the definitive decision was made in favour of Christianity in Sweden also. How carefully he followed the development appears from his pastoral letters of 1080–81 to Olaf III of Norway and to the Swedish Kings Inge and Alsten, which, in addition to instruction on the faith and on the royal office, contained the suggestion that clerics be sent to Rome for study. Already Christianized Denmark, which counted nine sees around 1060, had secured closer ties with the Roman Church under Alexander II. King Svein Estrithson had at that time expressed the desire for an archbishopric of his own and for the *patrocinium Petri* and had begun to pay Peter's Pence. Like Alexander, Gregory too was entirely favourable to the idea of a Danish archbishopric, without presuming a decision; in addition, he sought to strengthen the friendly relations thus inaugurated. If he gladly clarified the *patrocinium Petri* suggested by Svein, he further proposed that one of the King's sons should come to Rome with a military force in order to be set over a rich province on the sea — Dalmatia was probably meant — and there to undertake the defence of Christendom. The letter, sent in 1075, did not find Svein alive. The discord then ensuing in Denmark among his sons induced the Pope to urge neutrality on the Norwegian King.[15]

---

[14] C. Erdmann, *Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 185–211, 134–65; P. Zerbi, "Il termine fidelitas nelle lettere di Gregorio VII" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 129–48. W. Wühr, *Studien zu Gregor VII.,* 52–66, discusses succinctly the political and juridical dependence of particular countries as demanded by Gregory.

[15] *Reg.,* II, 51, 75; in Caspar ed., 192–94, 237f.; other letters to the King of Denmark in *Reg.,*

There was also no dearth of connections with the countries to the east of Germany. Boleslas II of Poland paid voluntary tribute, Vratislav of Bohemia continued to pay the *census* which Nicholas II had stipulated when he allowed Duke Spitignev to wear the mitre. Gregory VII was concerned with Bohemia chiefly because of the controversy between the Bishops of Prague and Olomouc. But his essentially good relationship with Vratislav cooled because of the loyalty which Vratislav observed toward Henry IV, whom the Pope had excommunicated and deposed. Boleslas II of Poland recommended himself to Gregory by his receptiveness to the papal reform wishes. In 1075 the Pope sent legates who were especially to improve the organization of the Polish Church. The Roman influence declined when Boleslas lost his crown because of the assassination of Bishop Stanislas of Cracow in 1079.

Relations with Hungary were overshadowed by the struggle for the throne between Solomon and Geza. For the sake of better protection, Solomon became Henry IV's vassal. Gregory regarded this as an injustice to the Roman Church, to which King Stephen had once given the kingdom as her own. Hungary, he said, must continue in the liberty proper to it and must not be subjected to any ruler of another realm, but only to the Roman Mother, the church which treats her subjects, not as servants, but as sons.[16] But the opportunity for deducing concrete rights from this claim was lacking, for Geza, favoured by the Pope but also relying on Byzantium, was, after his victory over Solomon, not interested in any further protection by the Pope, as was true also of his successor, Ladislas. All the greater was the success achieved in the Kingdom of Croatia-Dalmatia. The new ruler, Demetrius-Zwonimir, Geza's brother-in-law and zealous for reform, had himself crowned King at a reform synod presided over by papal legates in 1076 and presented with the banner of Saint Peter; in this connection he took an oath of loyalty to the Pope, which was modelled on the formula of an oath of vassalage.[17] The relationship thus established, which, at least in the Roman interpretation, must have been one of feudal law, was used by Gregory to prepare for an improvement of the state of the Church.

Contact with Kiev was established in a curious way. Demetrius-Izjaslav, brother-in-law of Boleslas of Poland, was forced in 1073 to flee to Poland for the second time. Since Boleslas not only did not aid him, but even robbed him of a part of his treasures, he turned for help to Henry IV and then, when this was of no avail, to the Pope, to whom he offered his kingdom through his son, Peter Jaropolk. After some waiting, Gregory bestowed the kingdom on Jaropolk, sent him back to his parents with legates, and got Boleslas to return the treasures. The hopes which he set on this bond, probably understood

---

I, 4, V, 10, VII, 5, 21; to the King of Sweden in *Reg.*, VII, 5, 21; to the King of Norway in *Reg.*, VI, 13. For earlier developments in the North see Chapter 30.

[16] *Reg.*, II, 13, 63; in Caspar ed., 144–46, 218f.

[17] Deusdedit, *Collectio canonum*, III, 278, ed. Wolf von Glanvell, 383.

by him as one of vassalage but not clearly defined, were not fulfilled, when in 1076 Izjaslav recovered his kingdom with Polish aid. Although Izjaslav and his successor Jaropolk continued to be friendly toward the Roman Church, Greek influence, which had never yielded and grew constantly stronger, definitely became preponderant after Jaropolk's death in 1086.

Gregory consciously included the Byzantine Church in his care for Christendom. Despite the Schism the Popes had been in direct relations with the Emperor until the investiture of the Normans with South Italy. Under Alexander II concrete negotiations for union must have been begun. Probably connected with them was the Byzantine embassy which Gregory received a few months after his election and which he reciprocated in Byzantium through the Patriarch Dominic of Grado. Before Dominic's return, Gregory, probably on his own initiative, decided in the spring of 1074 to send a Western army to the East to free the Christians of Asia Minor from the Seljuk threat. By means of this assistance he hoped to realize the reunion of the Church. Toward the end of the year letters again went out to summon the *fideles* of Saint Peter to the holy war in Asia Minor, which the Pope would direct personally.[18] But the tension with the French King and soon with Henry IV caused the Pope to drop the as yet premature plan. He remained in friendly contact with the Emperor Michael VII; this was all the more possible, since Robert Guiscard, whom the Greeks hated, had been excommunicated.

But Michael had to yield in 1078 to Nicephorus III, and the latter in 1081 to Alexius I Comnenus. The first of these changes on the throne gave Robert Guiscard the notion of crossing over to the Balkan peninsula and attacking the Byzantines, as the alleged avenger of Michael VII. Gregory VII, who in the meantime had become reconciled with Robert, supported the undertaking, while the new Emperor Alexius, continuing the war with Robert, still regarded the Pope as an opponent of the Norman and sought to gain him to his side. Gregory, who seems to have even excommunicated Alexius, had profoundly miscalculated. Robert's Balkan adventure, happily inaugurated by the victory of Durazzo, ended in a complete fiasco. The Antipope Clement III, set up meanwhile by Henry IV, did not fail to establish good relations with the Byzantine world. Only the need of Alexius I and the surpassing diplomacy of Urban II led again to a *rapprochement* between the reform papacy and Byzantium.

In a class by itself was Gregory's attitude to the English Church and its master, William the Conqueror. The new King rejected the homage of vassalage which Gregory seems to have once demanded through legates, but he paid Peter's Pence and promoted the politically necessary reform of the Church, supported by Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury. Numerous reform synods saw to improved conditions. To what extent it was possible to combine serious efforts with sensible moderation appears, for example, from the Synod of Winchester of 1076, which left married priests in office but forbade any future marriage. Furthermore, the English Church prepared to move into Ireland. As early as about 1028 the Bishop of Dublin had been consecrated at Canterbury and had obliged himself to obedience. Lanfranc of Canterbury and his successor Anselm considered the Irish Church as under their jurisdiction. Gregory VII's attention must have been called by Lanfranc to the reform tasks at hand in Ireland and under the circumstances he must have been motivated to send a pastoral letter to King Toirdelbach and the Irish. It was a small token but full of future promise. Under Paschal II papal legates were to attend a first Irish reform synod.

---

[18] *Reg.,* I, 46, 49, II, 31, 37; in Caspar ed., 69f., 75f., 166f., 172f.

Since Gregory saw that what was essential was being achieved in England, he came to terms with William's outlook, which was that of a State Church now coming clearly into the light. The King named the bishops, invested them — there was no Investiture Controversy in England and Normandy during the entire eleventh century — confirmed synodal decrees, and decided the limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The reform ideal of William and Lanfranc obviously continued in the old conservative notions, as these had inspired the Emperor Henry III and the German bishops. Only on one point did the Pope remonstrate: William did not permit the English bishops to go to Rome or to have any contact with the Pope without his knowledge. In this matter a serious conflict might have occurred. To the King it may have been only proper that Lanfranc was intent on maintaining his ecclesiastical rights against Rome and did not love the troublesome Pope.[19] After the capture of Rome by Henry IV in 1084, Lanfranc even made contact with the Clementists. Without a real break actually occurring, the English Church for years maintained a neutral attitude in regard to the schism.

Spain had become accessible to the Roman reform under Alexander II. Gregory energetically carried the happy beginnings further by means of standing legates. Reform councils, such as that of Gerona in 1078 and that of Burgos in 1080, especially attacked simony and Nicolaitism. Gregory achieved his greatest enduring success when the Mozarabic rite was now replaced by the Roman even outside Aragón. Rome's reforming and liturgical initiative awakened among the Spanish Cluniacs the fear that they would lose their influence. Hence Robert, Abbot of Sahagún, their most important monastery, began to intrigue against the legate and to gain King Alfonso VI. Gregory VII became so exasperated that he threatened the King, not only with excommunication, but with war. The conflict, which cost Robert of

---

[19] Literature on Lanfranc in Chapter 53, footnote 11; for Lanfranc's relationship to the forgeries which were produced to prove the primatial position of Canterbury with regard to York, cf. R. W. Southern, "The Canterbury Forgeries" in *EHR* 73 (1958), 193–226.

Sahagún his office, ended at once, and the Council of Burgos in 1080 became a complete triumph for the legate.

Spain was in the very thick of a phase of the *Reconquista.* As in the days of Alexander II, knights, full of crusading ardour or of mere lust for booty, were still hurrying from France to render assistance. Thus two princes who were zealous for reform, Hugh I of Burgundy and William VI of Aquitaine, supported the enterprises of the King of Aragón. In the battles, fought with varying fortune and varying alignments — Muslims could take the field along with Spanish Christians and vice versa — Alfonso VI succeeded in capturing Toledo in 1085. If the hope of now subjugating all of Andalusia was frustrated by the invasion of the Almoravids, still a decisive victory had been gained.

At the beginning of his pontificate Gregory VII took special pains with regard to the French knights. He was at the same time pursuing a material goal. Just as Ebolus of Roucy had done, they were to recognize the lands to be conquered as the property of the Roman Church; according to very ancient law, he said, Spain belonged to Saint Peter. Some years later he communicated the same view to the Spanish kings and magnates in a pastoral letter: "ex antiquis constitutionibus" the realm had been given to the Roman Church as her own.[20] The papal admonition had only one success: Count Bernard of Besalú acknowledged himself to be *miles sancti Petri* and agreed to a feudal *census.*

In no country was the reform so energetically pushed as in France, but even here its successes were modest. The Midi proved to be relatively willing; several of the South French princes had earlier sworn special fealty to Saint Peter, and now Count Bertrand of Provence entrusted his territory in 1081 and Count Peter de Melgueil the country of Substantion in 1085 to the Roman Church as fiefs. Not a few feudal lords and their clerical relatives renounced their proprietary rights over churches, for the sake of their salvation or out of fear of excommunication.[21] Things were more difficult in the area ruled by King Philip I. The anarchic situation as such, and the blackmail extorted from merchants and pilgrims going to Rome in particular, induced Gregory in 1074 to threaten him not merely with excommunication and interdict but with deprivation of his authority. Despite these and other tensions a break never occurred. The unflagging energy of the standing legates, on occasion mitigated by the Pope, and the resistance, now stronger, now weaker, but always moderate, of the King and of some of the bishops and nobles produced a general ferment, though as yet the end of the reform struggle could not be predicted. Even the prohibition of investiture, urged in 1077, did not lead to any struggle over principle.[22]

---

[20] *Reg.,* I, 7, IV, 28; in Caspar ed., 11f., 343–47. What Gregory meant by the "antiquae constitutiones" is not clear. For his claim the following have been mentioned: arrangements made by Recared with Gregory I but no longer known; the *Constitutum Constantini;* documents now lost, which can no longer be specified as to time; legal claims to the land taken from the Muslims; an idea of Gregory's concerning universal leadership and having as its aim religious dependence. No interpretation is convincing. For the literature see especially B. Llorca, cited in the Literature for this chapter.

[21] L. de Lacger, "Aperçu de la réforme grégorienne dans l'Albigeoise" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 211–34.

Italy caused the Pope great anxiety. When he went south in 1073 he was able to take possession of Benevento and to renew his feudal relationship with Richard of Capua, but Robert Guiscard held aloof. He and Richard intended to bring the few remaining territories under their rule. Robert conquered Amalfi in 1073 and Salerno in 1076. In 1077 he besieged Benevento, while Richard tried in vain to take Naples. The attack on Benevento was not the sole act which violated the territorial rights of the Roman Church. The two princes had during this whole time taken possession of papal property within and without the Papal State. The Pope had to look on helpless. Excommunication, several times pronounced, had no effect on Robert, and the war planned against him in 1074, in alliance with Gisulf of Salerno, Beatrice and Matilda of Tuscany, and Godfrey of Lotharingia, to which Gregory summoned the South French *fideles* of Saint Peter, without finding any response, got no farther than wretched beginnings. Only the Treaty of Ceprano in 1080 prepared the way for peace. Not only did Gregory have to accept the conquests tacitly; Robert guaranteed the *terra sancti Petri* only in so far as the Roman Church could prove her rights. The *census* was regulated as in 1059 and 1062.[23]

Beyond the continent Gregory's attention was directed to Sardinia and Corsica. Since he regarded both islands as the property of the Roman Church by virtue of the *privilegium* of Louis the Pious, he sought to vindicate this claim in cautious letters and through his legates.[24]

His chief supports were the Marchionesses of Tuscany, Beatrice (d. 1076) and especially Matilda, wife of Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia. Between

---

[22] Hard pressed by Henry IV, Gregory, probably in 1081, had Peter's Pence collected in France by specially dispatched legates, relying on a forged charter of Charles the Great, which he regarded as genuine; see the instruction for the legates in *Reg.*, VIII, 23, in Caspar ed., 565–67. The tradition for a Gallic Peter's Pence has long been demonstrable; see C. Erdmann, *Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 203. Furthermore, Gregory claimed rights to Brittany; cf. A. A. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé in *StudGreg* I (1947), 189–96; Erdmann, *op. cit.* 359–61; mentioned in a privilege granted by Gregory to a monastery, the claim was based on Breton testimonies; whether there is here an allusion to the *Constitutum Constantini* and, if so, to whom it should be ascribed, the Bretons or Gregory, is not certain.

[23] *Reg.,* VIII, 1a–c; in Caspar ed., 514–17.

[24] E. E. Stengel, "Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung des Kaiserprivilegs", in his *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Cologne - Graz 1960), 234f., 246, footnote t, doubts that the passage of the *Pactum Ludovicianum* referring to Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily was interpolated later, at the time of Gregory VII; he regards the passage as probably authentic. Cf. also A. Dove, "Corsica und Sardinien in den Schenkungen an die Päpste" in *SAM* (1894), 223ff.; Wühr, *Studien zu Gregor VII.*, 54; Erdmann, *op. cit.* 201.

1077 and 1080 Matilda even made over her considerable property to the Roman Church and received it back for her free disposal and lifelong enjoyment. Her life became the mirror of the reform struggle. Put under the ban by Henry IV in 1081, she lost a good part of her dominions for more than a decade.

The difficult situation in Italy obstructed Gregory VII in any effective reform activity. If the south had to be counted out almost entirely, because of the political chaos, in Central and North Italy the opposition of the clergy hostile to reform stiffened as the tension with Henry IV increased. The head of the opposition was Archbishop Guibert of Ravenna, who was excommunicated in 1076 and ineffectively deposed in 1078. On the other hand, the protagonist of reform, the Lombard popular movement of the *Pataria,* noticeably lost strength from 1075 when Erlembald perished in a fight in Milan; with Henry IV's Italian expedition in 1081 it moved entirely into the background. Not the opposition of Robert Guiscard but that of Henry IV ultimately determined Gregory's reform policy in Italy. The first dramatic conflict of 1076, which forever estranged the Pope and the King, blazed forth on questions affecting the Church in North and Central Italy.

The relations of Gregory VII to Germany and the German King were objectively weighed down by the Ottonian-Salian Imperial Church system. The Church, gathered around the theocratic monarch, had thus far withstood every intervention of any importance by the reform papacy. Even Alexander II had not achieved more than individual successes and in the Milan conflict he had experienced how little he could enforce his wishes. Henry IV's yielding in the autumn of 1073, motivated by the Saxon revolt, caused Gregory to hope for a change in principle, and so in 1074 he sent two legates to Germany to hold a reform council. The project failed, not because of Henry IV, whom the legates restored to the Christian community, but because of the juridical standpoint of the German episcopate. If the head of the opposition, Archbishop Liemar of Bremen, had not possessed the courage to go to Rome and appease the enraged Pope, there would have been a collision. Henry IV restrained himself, although at the Lenten Synod of 1075 five of his councillors were again excommunicated and the prohibition of lay investiture was made known to him; in fact he even entered into negotiations as suggested by Gregory on the investiture question and in the autumn of 1075 abandoned the simoniacal Bishop of Bamberg.

In reality he did not intend to comply with the Pope's reform wishes. This was to be revealed by the Italian policy that he inaugurated after his victory over the Saxons on 9 June 1075. One of the excommunicated councillors, Count Eberhard, crossed the Alps, intervened in Lombardy against the *Patarini,* and negotiated with Robert Guiscard, unsuccessfully, about a bond of vassalage to the German King. Then Henry assumed a more severe tone. Contrary to the promises made in 1073, he invested as Archbishop of Milan, not Godfrey, who had been first appointed but had not made any progress, but another Milanese cleric, Tedald, and designated for the sees of Fermo and Spoleto, disregarding Rome's metropolitan rights, men whom the Pope did not even know. Gregory quite rightly felt that he had been deceived and challenged. He sent Henry a letter of admonition which, in addition to the uncanonical appointment of the three Italian bishops, referred also to the unlawful association with the excommunicated councillors; by word of mouth the King was threatened with excommunication.

Neither Henry IV nor the German episcopate showed themselves equal to the strained but in no sense inextricable situation. Incited by the disgusting slanders of the disloyal Cardinal Hugh the White and labouring under the delusion that Gregory's position was not only undermined in Christendom and in Italy but even in Rome, where on Christmas of 1075 Cencius de Prefecto had perpetrated an assault on him, the German bishops at the Diet of Worms of 24 January 1076 sent the Pope a formal letter of defiance, while Henry IV, in a letter of his own, by virtue of his office of *patricius* declared that Gregory had forfeited his authority and called upon him to renounce his dignity. A recast manifesto proceeded from the royal chancery to the German clergy. At Piacenza the Lombard bishops joined with the German episcopate.

Gregory answered the extravagant attack when, at the Roman Lenten Synod, in a solemn prayer to Saint Peter, he suspended Henry from governing, annulled oaths of loyalty made to him, and excommunicated him.[25] The condemning of the King, something unprecedented, was not to fail in producing its effect. It mattered little that Henry, for his part, had Gregory excommunicated. His political opponents, the princes of Saxony and South Germany, now met for common action. Their meeting at Tribur in October involved the King, who had come with an army and was encamped at Oppenheim, in even greater difficulties as a consequence of a growing defection, when a radical group of princes worked for an immediate new election.[26] Gregory, who wanted to force Henry to obedience but not to sacrifice him, had sent two legates, whose mediation produced a compromise. A new election was prevented, and Henry even seems to have succeeded in evading the delicate question of investiture, but he had to dismiss the excommunicated councillors and in writing promise the Pope obedience and penance. For their own safety, the princes agreed not to recognize Henry as King if he had not been released from the censure by the anniversary of the excommunication and invited the Pope to the Diet of Augsburg, called for February 1077, where he should settle their quarrel with Henry.

---

[25] *Reg.*, III, 10a; in Caspar ed., 270; the writings connected with the Worms meeting in *MGConst* I, 106–13, now better in Erdmann, *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV.*, no. 11–12 and Appendix A. The critical problems in K. Jordan, *Gebhardt-Grundmann* I, para. 86, footnote 3. On the disloyal cardinal see F. Lerner, *Kardinal Hugo Candidus* (Munich - Berlin 1931).

[26] On Tribur and the scholarly controversy concerning it, cf. K. Jordan, *Gebhardt-Grundmann* I, para. 87.

Gregory accepted and set out. Henry, who wanted at any price to prevent a coalition between Pope and princes, now hurried boldly across the Alps in order to obtain absolution from Gregory. On three days he appeared in penitential garb before the castle of Canossa, to which Gregory had withdrawn as a precaution, while inside the castle Matilda of Tuscany and Henry's godfather, Abbot Hugh of Cluny, implored the Pope for clemency. Despite justified misgivings and the great prospect of the court of arbitration, Gregory eventually decided to discharge his priestly office. On condition that Henry should give satisfaction to the princes and grant the Pope a safe conduct for his visit to Germany, Henry was received back into the Christian community. Whether he was thereby also to be restored to the royal dignity and the oaths of loyalty were again to apply was apparently an incidental question to the Pope, who thought along spiritual rather than juridical lines.[27] In any event he employed the royal title for Henry thereafter. Henry could, then, be satisfied with what he had achieved, but the act of submission, the complete reversal at Canossa of the early mediaeval relationship of *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium,* cannot properly be measured against this success of his. With the turning point at Canossa there was announced a new epoch in Western history, whose problems were to be thrashed out in the succeeding period, extending to Boniface VIII.

From the political viewpoint, Gregory had acted unwisely. His opponent, for so the King, struggling for his rights, remained, was free of his fetters; the King's adversaries, the princes, who had intended to make use of the Pope merely for their own ends, now went their own way. Having abruptly decided on a new election, at Forchheim in March 1077 they chose Duke Rudolf of Swabia as King, making him renounce hereditary right and the nomination of bishops to be elected, but probably not their investiture.[28] As early as the autumn of 1076, when a new election was being considered, Gregory had reminded the princes of the right of designation which in 1056, at the suggestion of Victor II, they had granted on oath to the Empress Agnes in the event of an election of a successor to Henry IV and which Gregory, as successor of Victor II, intended to exercise together with the Empress if a new election were to take place.[29] Since at Forchheim the princes had silently ignored this right and since Gregory was not interested in the elevation of an Antiking, he did not recognize Rudolf's election, although the legates he had sent to Forchheim took part in it and Rudolf offered all assurances.

---

[27] Bibliography and critical evalution in Schramm in *GGA* 207 (1953), 93–95; also, G. Miccoli, "Il valore dell'assoluzione di Canossa" in *Annali di Scuola Norm. di Pisa* 27 (1958), 150–57; K. F. Morrison, "Canossa. A Revision" in *Tr* 18 (1962), 121–48.

[28] H. Hoffmann in *DA* 15 (1959), 398f.

[29] W. Berges, "Gregor VII. und das deutsche Designationsrecht" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 189–209.

The neutrality that he now maintained for years, connected with his claim to act as arbiter, gained him, then as now, much blame. Gregory did not let himself be guided by strictly political views. In his judgment, that one should be king on whose side was *iustitia,* and hence God himself. This religiously determined attitude alienated both factions. The princes, pursuing their selfish aims, feared that Gregory might decide for Henry; Henry would have had to make ecclesiastical concessions which he regarded as irreconcilable with the rights of the crown, if the Pope should act as arbiter.

And so the arbitration court did not materialize. Henry especially was able to prevent it time and again, and the time thus gained worked in his favour. The Antiking, virtually confined to Saxony, constantly lost ground. The stronger Henry grew, the more emphatically did he maintain his ecclesiastical rights. Gregory had to come to a decision; the adherents of reform in Germany no longer understood his hesitation, and both claimants to the throne pressed him for a judgment. The envoys sent by Henry in 1080 must have settled the question. If Bonizo's report can be trusted, they held out the threat of an Antipope if Rudolf were not excommunicated. Gregory finally gave his verdict at the March Synod of 1080. In a solemn prayer to the Princes of the Apostles he again excommunicated Henry and deposed him.[30] Firmly convinced that he had carried out the judgment of God and of the Princes of the Apostles, at Easter he even prophesied that Henry's ruin was to be expected by the feast of Saint Peter in Chains. Matters were to turn out quite differently.

Henry, behind whom stood the greatest part of the German and Lombard episcopates, caused the Synods of Bamberg and Mainz to renounce obedience to the Pope and then at Brixen in June 1080 had Guibert of Ravenna elected as Antipope.[31] When in the autumn his rival Rudolf remained on the battlefield after an encounter, Henry could make ready for armed conflict with Gregory. The phantom King, Count Hermann of Salm, who was not elevated until August 1081, presented no danger.[32] As early as the spring of 1081 Henry went to Italy and at once marched on Rome, his Lombard friends having opened the way by their victory at Mantua the previous fall over the troops of Countess Matilda. His efforts to take Rome, made only for brief periods, failed in this and the next year, but in 1083 at least the Leonine City fell to him.

---

[30] *Reg.*, VII, 14a; in Caspar ed., 483–87; Bonizo's account in *Liber ad amicum*, l. 9, in *MGLiblit* I, 612–20; cf. Meyer von Knonau in *JbbDG* III, 242f.

[31] Synod of Brixen, *MGConst* I, 117–20; Henry IV's letter in Erdmann, *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV.*, Appendix C.

[32] While Gregory probably did not demand a vassal status from Rudolf, he went very far in regard to Hermann of Salm; cf. *Reg.*, IX, 3; in Caspar ed., 575f. On the whole question and Fliche's theory of interpolation, see Wühr, *Studien zu Gregor VII.*, 62–66.

Gregory's situation became increasingly hopeless. Matilda of Tuscany could not help, Robert Guiscard was carrying out his Balkan campaign, and Jordan of Capua had submitted to the German King in 1082. Henry IV, scattering Byzantine coins among the Romans, began negotiations. A synod held in Rome with his approval led to no result, since, having become suspicious, he not only sent no representative but even obstructed it. In any event, he was prepared to sacrifice the Antipope, if Gregory would give him the imperial crown. His moderate offer captivated all who thought along political lines, but for Gregory it was not a political question but a question of conscience. Henry in his view remained an enemy to the divine order so long as he did not do penance and did not thus disavow his acts. This unyielding attitude, heedless of danger, drove thirteen cardinals and other prelates as well as warriors into the enemy's camp in the spring of 1084 and induced the Romans to open the gates to Henry. While Gregory remained in the impregnable Castel Sant'Angelo, the Roman clergy and people on Henry's motion elected Guibert as Pope; he called himself Clement III and at Easter gave Henry the imperial crown.

Still, Gregory was not lost. Robert Guiscard approached with a powerful army. Henry abandoned the city, which Robert took at his first assault. But a new misfortune now occurred: as a result of the looting a great part of Rome went up in flames. Gregory could not stay. To the curses of the population he left the city with the Normans and, accompanied by a few loyal persons, went to Salerno, where he died on 25 May 1085. His well attested last words were: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."[33]

Gregory VII, whom the Church canonized in 1606, rises up for all times as a sign of veneration and of contradiction. Even a scholarship intent on the utmost objectivity probably cannot settle the controversy. This undying figure requires more than historical understanding, important as it is to free its real nature from the outmoded wrappings of mediaeval thought, which is so alien to us; it demands faith in the possibility that God's care can, at specific times, summon men, who, discharging the prophetical office, are to tear down and to build up, and that Gregory was sent for this purpose. But even then there remains the question, for the most part exceeding our reasoning power, to what extent Gregory was the pure or the humanly tarnished instrument of the divine will. Gregory himself probably suffered from this uncertainty. One thing, however, is not to be doubted: the Pope felt himself to be one seized upon by God and acted accordingly. If, even in the most extreme distress, he made no dishonourable compromise with Henry IV, it was not obstinacy that guided him but his faith, able to move mountains, in his mission. He assisted the reform in its critical hour to a definitive breakthrough; the opposition, driven to extremes, had to be worn out. Gregory's heroic example called forth the religious forces of resistance and animated them for the struggle. The defeated Pope conquered in his successors, fashioned the face of the West for more than two centuries, and determined the figure of the Church into our own day.

---

[33] See G. B. Borino, "Storicità delle ultime parole di Gregorio VII" in *StudGreg* V (1956), 403–11.

CHAPTER 45

Stubborn Fight and Victory: From Victor III to Calixtus II

Victor III

For the reform party Gregory VII's death was a severe blow. It was only after a year that it was able seriously to consider the succession at Rome, now abandoned by Clement III, and to elect Desiderius of Montecassino on 24 May 1086. Desiderius, who came from the house of the Lombard Princes of Benevento, was certainly an important personality. To him Montecassino owed a flowering never again attained, and, made a cardinal by Stephen IX, he had rendered a number of services to the reform Popes, especially in their dealings with the Normans. But even he seemed doubtful that his nature, more inclined to diplomacy than to struggle, and also sickly, was equal to his new tasks. Threatening struggles in Rome and perhaps even a dissatisfaction with his election in his own camp induced him to return to Montecassino without having been consecrated. Eventually meeting again with the reformers at Capua, he decided on 21 March 1087, after excited scenes caused especially by Hugh of Lyons, to accept his election and to call himself Victor III.[1] The consecration could take place at Saint Peter's tomb under the protection of the Normans, but Victor soon had to leave the Eternal City. A second attempt, undertaken with the aid of Tuscan troops, to establish himself in Rome failed. What plans the new Pope may have had in mind — his name, probably connected with Victor II, points to a readiness for reconciliation, despite the perhaps renewed excommunication of Henry IV — there was no time to realize them. Scarcely had a first synod, held at Benevento, ended, after excommunicating not merely the Antipope but also the dissatisfied Gregorians, Hugh of Lyons and Richard of Saint-Victor de Marseille, and probably renewing the earlier prohibitions of simony and investiture, than Victor III was carried off by death on 16 September 1087.

---

[1] On the difficulties connected with Victor's elevation, cf. Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, 78–90.

Urban II

Half a year elapsed before the reformers elected the Cardinal-Bishop Eudes of Ostia as Pope under the name of Urban II on 12 March 1088, at Terracina, where they immediately enthroned him. Born about 1035 at Châtillon, the son of a noble, he was educated for the clergy in the school of Saint Bruno at Reims and there he was appointed archdeacon between 1055 and 1060. Probably between 1067 and 1070 he entered Cluny and rose to be prior. Abbot Hugh, from whom Gregory VII had asked for some monks in 1078, had to give him up in 1079–80.[2] The Pope made him Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and in 1084 sent him as legate to Germany. His election to the papacy, recommended by Gregory VII as well as by Victor III, was to prove fortunate. Fully assenting to Gregory's principles, but elastically adapting their implementation to the present situation, Urban II led the reform papacy out of the narrow pass and toward victory.

Nothing reflects the situation facing the new Pope better than the relatively well transmitted polemical literature of the day. If in 1074–75 the prescribing of celibacy and of a boycott of married priests had stirred intellects,[3] since the decisions of 1076 and 1080 there were other themes for debate: Gregory VII's integrity, his right to depose and excommunicate Henry IV and to absolve from oaths of loyalty to him, his recourse to armed force, the strict prohibition of associating with the excommunicated, the juridical immunity of the anointed King, Henry's patriciate, the raising up of the Antipope, and so forth. Most deserving of mention of the German defenders of the kingship were: Wenrich of Trier, Wido of Osnabrück, and an anonymous monk of Hersfeld, author of *De unitate ecclesiae conservanda,* which probably appeared in 1092–93. Outstanding among the Gregorians were: Gebhard of Salzburg, Bernold of Sankt Blasien, and Manegold of Lauterbach, the last mentioned famous for his so-called doctrine of "popular sovereignty", which interpreted the kingship as an office transmitted by the people and hence terminable in the case of a defaulting ruler.[4]

But more decisive were the accomplishments of the Italian authors. In the Antipope's own city of Ravenna appeared the work of the jurist Peter Crassus, which traced the irremovability of the King to the Roman law of inheritance. Here too another jurist fabricated false papal privileges, allegedly for Charles the Great and Otto the Great, and had Ulpian's *lex regia* worked in, in the sense of an irrevocable transmission of the authority of the Roman people to the Emperor, in favour of Henry IV. From the discussion of the schism, revived with the death of Gregory VII, proceeded the work of the Clementist Guido of Ferrara, which, gratifying by its moderate judgment of Gregory and its positive exertions in regard to the investiture question, was in great contrast to the approximately contemporary hate-productions of Cardinal Beno and of Bishop Benzo of Alba. Of the Gregorians no less than Anselm of Lucca, Cardinal Deusdedit, and Bonizo of Sutri intervened in the last part of the controversy, but their real achievement, which gave their party the intellectual superiority, was in canon law. Anselm's highly significant canonical collection, compiled under Gregory VII, was now followed by the important collections of Deusdedit and Bonizo, undisturbed by the bleak situation.[5]

---

[2] The dates, differing somewhat from those of earlier studies, are in Becker, *op cit.,* 24–53.

[3] For the polemics cf. the bibliographical citations in the sources for this section. Celibacy was especially condemned by the so-called pseudo-Ulric, probably composed in Germany, and by Sigebert of Gembloux, and was defended by Bernold of Sankt Blasien; see *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 395f.

[4] Sources and literature in *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 396–409; H. Weisweiler, "Die päpstliche Gewalt in den Schriften Bernolds von St. Blasien" in *StudGreg* V (1956), 129–47.

Urban II had no need to despair. So profound an intellectual movement as the reform could not be suppressed by armed force; in fact, the opposing camp itself was accessible to it. It was really only a relative opposition. Clement III fought simony and Nicolaitism straightforwardly. But since he approved of the old, ever more outdated, Imperial Church system and was burdened by the flaw of an uncanonical elevation, he maintained a position which was basically a lost cause. Some Clementists, not to speak of bishops who were labouring under the censures of the reformed Church outside the territory under German control, hence cherished the tacit wish to be united with the successor of Gregory VII.

Urban knew this and sought to accommodate them. Thus, in his announcement of his election he professed the goals of Gregory VII and had the prohibitions of simony, clerical marriage, and lay investiture renewed at the Synod of Melfi in 1089, but as early as March 1089 he instructed his legate in Germany, Bishop Gebhard of Constance, to be generous. Relying on his power of dispensation, he himself went to the limits of what was then possible. In individual cases he recognized bishops who had been invested by their king, including Archbishop Anselm of Milan, who had been canonically elected but invested by Henry IV. Milanese whom Archbishop Tedald, never recognized by Rome, had ordained could retain their function if their ordination had not been simoniacal and if Tedald's simony was not known to them, and the Masses of priests ordained in the Catholic Church who had gone over to the schism were not to be molested. The old zealots, Hugh of Lyons,

---

[5] On the Italian authors, see *Manitius* III, *passim;* K. Jordan, "Ravennater Fälschungen aus den Anfängen des Investiturstreites" in *AUF* 15 (1938), 426–48; id., "Der Kaisergedanke in Ravenna zur Zeit Heinrichs IV." in *DA* 2 (1938), 85–128; G. A. Krause, *Papstwahldekret,* 234–54. The relatively late and not very abundant polemical literature from France in *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 772–74.

Amatus of Oléron, and Richard of Saint-Victor, lost their function of legate and no new standing legates were named to replace them. And recourse to armed force met with little sympathy from Urban. Residing on the Tiber island at Rome from the autumn of 1088, he had in the succeeding summer taken the city by storm and, following the coronation Mass, was solemnly conducted through the streets, but the meagre successes which the victory brought him caused him to renounce further struggles with the Roman Clementists. Money gained him entrance to the Lateran Palace in 1094 and it was probably the same means that won him Castel Sant'Angelo in 1098.

The first years of the pontificate were lived under the pressure of the imperial predominance. Urban sought to impair this by arranging in 1089 the marriage of his loyal comrade in arms, the forty-three-year-old Matilda of Tuscany, with the seventeen-year-old Welf V, son of the deposed Duke Welf IV of Bavaria, thereby producing an almost unbroken stretch of territory from South Germany to Tuscany, but this outcome only induced Henry IV to go to Italy and seek a definitive solution. Urban experienced the King's successfully conducted campaigns against Matilda's troops in 1090–92 to the extent that he had to flee to the Normans from Clement III, who now again took possession of Rome.[6] But then catastrophe overtook Henry. It came about after a defeat suffered near Canossa in 1092 and the formation of a league of hostile cities — Milan, Cremona, Lodi, Piacenza — with the defection in 1093 of his own son, Conrad, who had himself crowned King of the Lombards at Milan. Betrayed by almost all, even by his wife Praxedis, and cut off from Germany, Henry remained locked up in the territories of Padua and Verona until he was reconciled with Welf IV in 1096 — the unnatural marriage between Welf V and Matilda had broken up — and could go to Germany in 1097.

Urban II, who definitively returned to Rome at the end of 1093 and in 1094 again appointed the inexorable Hugh of Lyons as standing legate in France, now took hold of the reins resolutely. As early as 1094 he set out on a two-year journey via Tuscany and Lombardy to France. As a matter of fact the reform needed thoroughgoing consultation. Urban's mildness had especially caused a revival of the tiresome question of the validity of simoniacal and schismatic ordinations. Bonizo of Sutri, Deusdedit, Bruno of Segni, Bernold of Sankt Blasien — all wrestled with it in that decade, but only Bernold succeeded in solving the difficult theological problem to some extent. It was all the more urgent to establish binding norms, at least for practical action. This was done at the well attended Council of Piacenza, meeting under Urban's presidency in March 1095. With regard to schismatics it decreed the nullity of all orders conferred by Guibert of Ravenna since his condemnation and of the orders conferred by his adherents who had been excommunicated by name and by all bishops who had usurped the see of a Catholic bishop, unless the cleric ordained knew nothing about the condemnation of the ordaining prelate; on the other hand, orders obtained from originally Catholic bishops who had later gone over to the schism retained their validity. The Council proceeded more strictly against simoniacal ordinations. It declared them all to be invalid, except the orders of those clerics to whom the simony of the ordaining bishop was not known.[7] It is obvious that the decrees, which were open to varying theological interpretations and were lacking in consistency, left the dogmatic problem unsolved.

---

[6] According to Klewitz in *QFIAB* 25 (1934f.), 120f., Urban stayed in Rome from the end of October 1088 to July 1089 and from the end of 1089 to around the end of July 1090, the rest of the time in South Italy.

As early as 1089 Urban had renewed the prohibition of investiture at Melfi. He returned to it at Clermont, where on 28 November 1095 he opened another brilliant synod. Not only were the appropriate decrees of Gregory VII repeated; the synod now forbade bishops and clerics to become the vassals of the King or of any other layman, thereby advancing the demand of the *Sacerdotium* for freedom to a point which not even Gregory VII's legislation had ventured to take up.[8] This new prohibition was renewed by several French synods — Rouen in 1096, Poitiers in 1100, Troyes in 1107, and so forth. Urban had it recalled to mind in a somewhat modified form in his last Roman Synod in 1099. The same synod also made stricter the prohibition of investiture, by threatening with excommunication, not only the one investing and the one invested, but also the one ordaining a person who had received lay investiture. Thus the reform struggle centred more and more on the problem of investiture.

The Cluniac Pope's special love and gratitude belonged to monasticism, as numerous privileges attest. Although Urban seldom granted full exemption, he was happy to lessen the authority of the local bishop and in addition placed many monasteries under papal protection. With a sure instinct for the spiritual forces of his age, he also assured the canons regular their due place in the Church by placing their ideal of the *vita apostolica* on par with the monastic ideal of perfection and forbidding the canon regular from entering a monastery without the permission of his community and his provost.[9]

Urban intended to be more than a mere reformer working inside the

---

[7] Cc. 8–10, 3–4, in *MGConst* I, 561 f.; for the theological problem see Chapter 53.

[8] C. 17, in *Mansi* XX, 817; on the other hand, cf. Gregory VII's *Reg.*, V, 5, in Caspar ed., 353: "quod ad servitium et debitam fidelitatem regis attinet, nequaquam contradicere aut impedire volumus". Also important are cc. 29–30, in *Mansi* XX, 818, which forbid lay persons to retain tithes, altars, or churches.

[9] C. Dereine, "L'élaboration du statut canonique des chanoines réguliers, spécialement sous Urbain II" in *RHE* 46 (1951), 534–65; for the canons regular see Chapter 52. Fliche's opinion, *Fliche-Martin* VIII, 292, that Urban permitted monks to engage in the care of souls is connected with the question whether cc. 2–3 of the Council of Nîmes (*Mansi* XX, 932) are genuine, which Dereine denies in *Studia Gratiana,* II (Bologna 1954), 317f. On the whole question of the relations between monachism and the episcopate in Urban's day, cf. C. Violante, *Il monachesimo cluniacense,* 206–18.

Church. And so he did not shrink from proclaiming the Peace of God, which had been instituted in France and promoted by the Cluniacs, for South Italy at the Synods of Melfi in 1089 and Troia in 1093 and universally at Clermont in 1095. Likewise at Clermont he covered with the Peace of God not only clerics, monks, and women, but the person and goods of crusaders, even on days when it was lawful to fight. The Council of Clermont is especially famed for a creative initiative of the Pope, incalculable in its effect on the immediate and later times — the summons to the First Crusade.[10] While the Emperor, shut up in a corner of Italy, was in a sense forgotten, the Pope, spontaneously acknowledged by the faithful as the true leader of the Christian West, with no participation by kings, set in motion a supranational army for the defence of the Christian East and for the conquest of the Holy Land. From then on the final victory of the reform papacy was only a question of time, and this victory was permanent. For two centuries the Vicar of Christ, eclipsing the power of the Emperor and of kings with his spiritual authority, was to preside over Western Christendom.

The causes and the course of the Crusade will be discussed later, as will also the relations which the Pope instituted right after his elevation with the Emperor Alexius I and the Byzantine Church for the liquidation of the Schism. But it is time to examine his relations with the Western monarchs. The reform policy encountered little difficulty in Spain, especially since the Pope did not prevent the Spanish Cluniacs from recovering their old influence and sent Roman cardinals in place of the former standing legate, Richard of Saint-Victor. He elevated the new Archbishop of Toledo, a monk of the Cluniac monastery of Sahagún, to the dignity of primate, but at the same time he encouraged, with the Count of Barcelona, the reconstruction of the city and metropolitan see of Tarragona. Thus began the new ecclesiastical division of Spain.

The Pope had to deal with no slight difficulties in England. On the death of King William I in 1087 his lands were divided between two sons — Robert acquired Normandy, while William II became King of England. Normandy recognized Urban II, but William II maintained neutrality and gave such free rein to his lust for money and power at the expense of the English Church that the fruits of reform achieved under his father were imperilled. Lanfranc's death in 1089 suited him very much. Only a serious illness moved the King in 1093 to fill the archbishopric of Canterbury again with Abbot Anselm of Bec. This great theologian, trained in Lanfranc's school, had no intention of simply accepting William's acts of caprice. After some lesser clashes he forced the King to a decision in the question of the schism by demanding to be allowed to receive the pallium from Urban II. When an attempt to have Anselm deposed failed, William dealt directly with the Pope, who sent the Cardinal Legate Walter of Albano to England. Walter obtained the definitive recognition of Urban but in return had to make all sorts of concessions, in particular to acknowledge the special law that papal legates could come to England only at King William's desire. Anselm took no part at all in the negotiations. He was summoned to court only after their conclusion to receive the pallium which the legate had brought along. It was suggested by some of the courtiers that he should take it from William's hand, but this manner of receiving it would have made the King seem to be a papal vicar, and so Anselm courageously refused. He carried the point that he should take the pallium from the altar and put it upon himself.

---

[10] There is no official version of the summons; the sources are summarized in A. Waas, *Kreuzzüge*, I, 71, footnote 241.

Urban seems not to have entirely approved the all too elastic proceedings of Walter of Albano. In 1096 a new legate tried with no success to gain better conditions for the Church.[11] William is said to have obtained a postponement of the controversial questions in Rome by a part-payment of Peter's Pence. Soon Anselm came into a greater conflict. Indicted by the King for having supplied unfit troops, he reproached him for the secularization of ecclesiastical property and for his lack of a will to reform and intended to appeal to the Pope. Since he refused to take the oath demanded of him, that he would never appeal to the Pope, he had to leave England, while William confiscated the goods of his church. Anselm went first to Lyons and then to Rome. Urban did not permit him to resign and even had the quarrel discussed at the Synods of Bari in 1098 and Rome in 1099, but could not bring himself to take serious action until death relieved him of the decision he had finally promised.

Urban also displayed the greatest prudence in regard to Philip I of France when in 1092 the King repudiated his wife and presumed to marry Bertha of Montfort, wife of the Count of Anjou. The scandal of this double adultery was punished by Hugh of Lyons at the Synod of Autun in 1094 with anathema, to which personal interdict was added in 1097. Urban only confirmed the excommunication in 1095 at the Council of Clermont and thereafter allowed himself to be gained to mildness time and again by Philip's empty promises, but without yielding in principle. When Urban died, the King had again incurred excommunication. His marriage affair allowed Philip no intensive struggle against the demands for reform. From this point of view the Pope could be satisfied with France in general; in no other country, despite rather frequent interventions, did he find so much obedience.

In South Italy, the refuge that he sought time and again till 1093, Urban interested himself in the Church organization so far as the fluid political situation following the death of Robert Guiscard in 1085 allowed. Robert's son, Duke Roger of Apulia, who in 1089 became Urban's vassal, was too young and insignificant to keep the rebellious barons in check. And the rule of Richard II of Capua — Jordan had died in 1090 — was on so fragile a foundation that in 1098 he had to call for the help of Roger of Apulia and in return place his principality under the latter's feudal suzerainty. Thus the political centre of gravity shifted to Sicily, where Robert Guiscard's brother, Roger I, captured the last pocket of Muslim resistance in 1091 and set out to construct a firmly consolidated state. Hence Urban established especially close relations with Roger I, which led to a fruitful cooperation in rebuilding the Sicilian Church. It is true that Roger tolerated no independent action by Rome, and the nomination of Bishop Roger of Troina as legate without his consent even caused a conflict. It was settled by the portentous privilege of 5 July 1098, in which Urban renounced, during the reigns of Roger and Roger's successor, any appointment of legates without an understanding with the rulers, granted them legatine delegation, and left it to Roger's discretion whether to be represented at Roman synods.[12]

---

[11] Besides Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, 210–12, cf. also J. Deér, "Der Anspruch der Herrscher des 12. Jahrhunderts auf die apostolische Legation" in *ArchHP* 2 (1964), 171–76.

Relations with Henry IV remained unsettled. Urban considered peace even less when in 1095 he had met Henry's rebellious son Conrad at Cremona, received from him an oath of safety, held out the prospect of the imperial crown, and arranged the engagement of the young King with a daughter of Roger of Sicily. Henry's return to Germany in 1097 hardly affected the ecclesiastical situation. The Emperor did, indeed, succeed in re-establishing his political authority, but he was unable to prevent the dissolution of the Clementist unified front in the episcopate and the defection of individual bishops to the Gregorians. Urban's policy of the open door bore its fruits. To this was added the propaganda directed by the German Gregorians at the masses of the population, carried to them especially by the preachers sent out from around 1080 by Hirsau and the monasteries under its influence. Thus also in Germany the reform party was slowly making progress when, on 29 July 1099, two weeks after the taking of Jerusalem by the crusaders, Urban II departed this life.

Paschal II

Sixteen days later Cardinal Rainerio, born at Bieda in Romagna, became Pope under the name of Paschal II. He had been a monk of an Italian monastery, which cannot now be identified but was probably not Cluniac,[13] before being made Cardinal-Priest of San Clemente by Gregory VII. The new Pope was basically different from his worldly-wise predecessor in his simpler nature, partly inflexible, partly timid. Inclined to intransigence, he was rather to stress than to reconcile the antitheses in the problems of the age, but actually in that way to prepare for their later solution.

---

[12] *Jaffé* 5706; *ItalPont* VIII, Regnum Norman., no. 81; to the Literature cited for the chapter add: J. Deér, *loc. cit.* 125–33. Urban's privilege led to the celebrated controversy over the *Monarchia Sicula,* extending from the beginning of the sixteenth century until the time of Pius IX, that is, the royal claim to legatine rights and to absolute authority over the Church.

[13] On the Pope's home and family: March, *Liber Pontificalis Dertusensis,* 91–95; on his monastery, ibid. 154, footnote 3; the opinion there defended, that it was a monastery in the Abruzzi, is not convincing, since the authority, Ordericus Vitalis, by the monastery of "Vallis Brutiorum", ordinarily would seem to mean Vallombrosa.

It was the question of investiture that was especially at stake. It had been pretty generally established as a principle that simony and Nicolaitism were to be fought against. And the death of the aged Guibert of Ravenna on 8 September 1100 settled the difficulties inherent in the schism, for the two Antipopes set up by the Roman Clementists in 1100, the schismatic Bishops Dietrich of Santa Rufina and Albert of Sabina, were captured in turn and confined in South Italian monasteries, while the Archpriest Maginulf, proclaimed as Silvester IV in 1105, had to flee Rome after a few days, despite the armed assistance of the Marquis Werner of Ancona; but he did not renounce the dignity until 1111. Thus at the Synod of Guastalla in 1106 Paschal II was able to declare the restoration of unity and let all schismatic ecclesiastics retain their office, provided that there were no simoniacal or other offences involved. There remained only the prohibition of investiture as a still unresolved problem; in fact, since the tightening of the regulations by Urban II it had acquired an actuality which it had not had under Gregory VII or under Urban. A settlement could no longer be avoided; the Investiture Controversy in the strict sense was now just beginning.

It is distinctive of the new state of affairs that now a real Investiture Controversy even broke out in England, occasioned by the change on the throne following the death of William II in August 1100. In order to secure his own succession, which was not beyond question, the new King Henry I, himself also a son of William the Conqueror, called Archbishop Anselm back from banishment, only to experience the surprise that Anselm refused to do the customary vassal's homage, appealing to the Roman Synod of 1099 that he had himself attended. Anselm, it is true, was concerned less for the question of investiture than for obedience to the laws of the Roman Church. Hence he supported the King's effort to obtain for England a papal dispensation from the prohibition of investiture and went to Rome for this purpose. Paschal, who had just renewed the prohibition in 1102, denied the request. Henry then refused to readmit Anselm, returning from Rome, into England (1104) until the excommunication of English ecclesiastics who had accepted investiture and of the royal councillors, announced by Paschal in 1105, moved him to come to terms with Anselm. The settlement, approved by Paschal, between the two men, who held each other in esteem, was ratified at a meeting of the Great Council in London in August 1107: Henry renounced investiture with ring and crosier but retained the right to receive homage from the bishops before their consecration. Furthermore, he maintained his influence on the elections of bishops by being present in person.

In France too, meanwhile, a practical solution had been prepared, without there having been open conflict or an official concordat, as in England. In France, however, there ceased not only investiture with ring and crosier, but, differing from England, also the homage of vassalage; the French King was satisfied with an oath of loyalty. Just the same, he renounced neither his power to dispose of the temporalities of sees, with the legal consequences — usufruct during vacancies, possible seizure of the administrative authority, and so forth — nor the customary services, and hence he conveyed the temporalities by means of an informal act, termed a *concessio,* to the bishop elected with his permission.[14]

Thus in both France and England there was first made a distinction between ecclesiastical office and possession of temporalities. In itself the idea was not new,[15] but the merit of having first pondered deeply over the investiture question and of having led to a solution belongs to the great canonist, Ivo of Chartres. The handing over of the episcopal office, so he explained, was certainly to be refused to the laity, since it implied a sacramental act; on the other hand, the *concessio* of the temporalities could be granted to the King without difficulty, for it was a purely secular act, to be performed in any desired manner, to which the King could make a certain claim in so far as, according to Augustine, property is based on constitutional law and hence the churches owed their goods to distribution made by the King. Ivo's ideas, expounded as early as 1097 in a letter to Hugh of Lyons, had an influence in France on the new arrangement that was in preparation, but they also won importance for the English Investiture Controversy, since at that time Ivo's pupil, Hugh of Fleury, made use of them in his important *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate,* dedicated to the English King.[16]

Paschal was wise enough to tolerate the two compromises that had been reached without his direct participation. They did not actually mean a genuine juridical solution. In England the real problem, investiture with the temporalities, had been evaded, and the *concessio* of the French King was open to various interpretations. But the essential thing, the renunciation of investiture with the office, was achieved, and the rights conceded to the kings to the customary services of the bishops could be entirely reconciled with the inner union of ecclesiastical office and property as demanded by the reformers. But for Germany the compromises thus far reached, and tolerated rather than accepted by the reformers, did not suffice. Considering the great damage that the royal authority had suffered at the hands of the secular princes since the death of Henry III, the German ruler not only could not renounce the rights of sovereignty which the more important churches had received in the greatest abundance since the days of the Ottos; he had to insist, with regard to the reform, on a clear regulation of his relations to the churches and their goods. For the reform principle of the inseparable unity of office and ecclesiastical property could not be applied here without a careful distinction. If it were a question only of the goods donated by private persons and of purely ecclesiastical income, such as offerings, stole fees, and tithes, then the principle could probably have been carried. But what had counties, margraviates, and even duchies, what had important political rights of usufruct to do with the churches? No king with a sense of responsibility could admit that they simply became inviolable church property in the sense of irrevocable gifts.

---

[14] The new practice can probably not be ascribed to 1098, the opinion of Haller and Schwarz; it was not prepared until the first decades after 1100, according to Becker, *Studien zum Investiturproblem,* 104–22 (with bibliography).

[15] Development of the notion up to Ivo of Chartres in Hoffmann in *DA* 15 (1959), 394–405.

[16] Ivo's letter in *MGLiblit* II, 642–47; Hugh of Fleury, *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate,* ibid., 472–94. For the ideas see Becker, *Studien zum Investiturproblem,* 143–53; Hoffmann, *loc. cit.* 405–18, with valuable special literature. Hoffmann rightly denies the existence of a strictly organized or even definitive "théorie chartraine"; however he must have underestimated Ivo's teaching to some extent, at times missing its meaning; thus, Ivo hardly displayed a real contradiction when on the one hand he quoted Augustine (Hoffmann, 107f.) and on the other hand made use of a passage from Justinian's *Institutes* (Hoffmann, 108f.), for the latter refers to a special question which did not concern Augustine — the inalienability of ecclesiastical property.

These difficult questions were to be presented to Paschal as soon as he was confronted, no longer by Henry IV, who had been again excommunicated at the Roman Synod of 1102, but by his son, Henry V. (The rebel, King Conrad, had died in 1101.) Henry V's revolt in 1104, the perfidious imprisonment and forced abdication of his father at the end of 1105, the Diet of Mainz with its recognition of Henry V at the beginning of 1106, the struggle that then flared up and only ended with the father's death in the summer of 1106 — this tragedy of the Salian Dynasty concerns us here in so far as Paschal II espoused the cause of the young King, who posed as a protagonist of reform, by absolving him from his oath not to intervene in the government without his father's consent and sending legates to the Diet of Mainz. He himself departed for the north in the spring of 1106 in order at last to establish peace between papacy and *Imperium.* He was to be disillusioned: Henry V's envoy, who found him during the Synod of Guastalla in 1106, insisted on the right of the Empire. Thereupon, the Pope did not go to Germany, as people were expecting, but to France, where in fact he could anticipate only the best reception. In 1104 Philip I had finally yielded on the marriage question and had adequately met the desires of the reformers by the renunciation in practice of investiture with ring and crosier. He and his son, Louis VI, now concluded an alliance with the Pope at Saint-Denis in 1107. France and the papacy had come together in a friendship that was to endure for centuries. All the more obstinate, then, was Paschal's attitude in his conference at Châlons-sur-Marne with Henry V's embassy. To the German demand for the royal right of investiture he replied with a blunt refusal, which he then had ratified at the subsequent Synod of Troyes, just as he had done a year earlier at Guastalla, by a repetition of the prohibition of investiture.

Nevertheless, the cleavage was not completely irreconcilable. Thus in 1109 a perhaps semiofficial memorandum, composed in the Empire, probably under the direct influence of Ivo's ideas, distinguished between the spiritual function and the secular property and, while adhering to the right of investiture, declared that the form of investiture was unessential.[17] This already more differentiated outlook was to influence the negotiations which Henry V undertook when in the summer of 1110 he began his journey to Rome. Paschal indeed again rejected investiture but recognized a royal claim to the *regalia,* that is, to the goods and rights of the Empire which had been transferred to the bishops, and hence he proposed the radical solution of leaving to the churches as their property only the purely ecclesiastical revenues, such as tithes and so forth, and goods originating in private gifts, while all *regalia* were to be given back in accord with a papal command; in return, Henry was to renounce investiture.

Well meant as the proposal was, it was a stranger to reality. As though a peremptory order from the Pope, opposed to the will, not only of the bishops who had an interest in the *regalia,* but also of the secular princes, who feared the overgrowth of the royal power that would accompany such a restitution, could have annulled so deeply rooted a political order! Henry V must have clearly seen through it; but since he wanted the imperial crown, he declared his acceptance and had the secret treaty that had been agreed to, the content of which was to be published before the imperial coronation, ratified at Sutri on 9 February 1111. When on February 12 Paschal began the coronation rite in Saint Peter's and had the reciprocal charters read, a real tumult broke out. Bishops and princes indignantly rejected the papal command, whereupon Henry V demanded the imperial crown and the right of investiture. Since Paschal refused both, Henry denounced the treaty, arrested Pope and cardinals, and led them prisoners out of Rome, which was in a state of wild excitement and filled with the clash of weapons. After two months he succeeded in the Treaty of Mammolo in extorting from the Pope investiture with ring and crosier, to take place after the canonical election and before consecration. In addition, Paschal had to promise never to excommunicate Henry and to put the concession of investiture in the form of a written *privilegium* and crown Henry as Emperor on 13 April.[18] On the way back to Germany Henry won a further prize. Meeting Matilda of Tuscany, he had himself appointed heir of her patrimonial goods, which had been enfeoffed to the Roman Church, though in this a recognition of the papal right of proprietorship could hardly have been avoided.

---

[17] *Tractatus de investitura episcoporum* in *MGLiblit* II, 501–04; *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 411f.

[18] The *acta* for 1111 in *MGConst* I, 134–52; Paschal's privilege was valid for Henry V, not for his successors.

With his brutally gained victory over Paschal Henry had won nothing. The Pope might have been weak, but the reformed Church, growing into a supranational power structure, tolerated no exception for the *Imperium*. Besides, the Emperor had committed the serious psychological error of clinging to ring and crosier as symbols of investiture, though he related investiture merely to the *regalia*.[19] It was this that produced the greatest commotion among the reform circles of Italy and France. Even in the College of Cardinals harsh things were said about Paschal. There was a demand for the repudiation of the "pravilegium" and the excommunication of the "heretical" Emperor. The Pope, mindful of his oath, could not assent to the excommunication, and he was unwilling either to approve expressly or to reject the anathema which a synod meeting at Vienne under Archbishop Guy in 1112 and two cardinal legates in Germany in 1115 hurled at the Emperor, but he probably agreed to the annulling of the privilege by the Roman Synod of 1112. Having become more firm with the passage of time, he himself condemned the concession at the Roman Synod of 1116 and renewed the prohibition of investiture and the threats of excommunication included in it.

And yet an important decision had been made in 1111. The Roman Church could no longer revoke the recognition, given at Sutri, of the royal right of *regalia,* the idea of which was then more exactly defined for the first time. Thus a certain readiness for an understanding became evident in the Gregorian polemical writings that soon appeared. Even the intransigent Placid of Nonantula, who, like Guy of Vienne in 1112, condemned the royal investiture with the temporalities and clung firmly to the churches' free right of ownership, was willing to concede to the Emperor not only the due services of the bishops but also investiture with the special political rights, using of course other symbols than ring and staff, and the possibility of confirming by charter their possession by a bishop already consecrated. Even more clearly did the *Disputatio vel defensio Paschalis papae,* originating at the Curia, distinguish between *temporalia* and *spiritualia,* proposing for the investiture with the temporalities the symbol of the sceptre, which was actually used later. And if Godfrey of Vendôme at first raged fiercely against lay investiture as being heretical and simoniacal, even in him there grew at least the recognition that an investiture with the temporalities made after consecration could be accepted.[20]

---

[19] Cf. the papal report in *MGConst* I, 149: ". . . quamvis ille (Henry) per investituras illas non ecclesias, non officia quelibet, sed sola regalia se dare assereret"; T. Schieffer, "Nochmals die Verhandlungen von Mouzon" in *Festschrift für E. E. Stengel* (Münster-Cologne 1952), 336.

[20] Placid of Nonantula, *Liber de honore ecclesiae,* especially Chapters 37, 93, 82, 118, in *MGLiblit* II, 575–639, especially 585, 615, 605, 625. *Disputatio vel defensio Paschalis papae* in *MGLiblit* II, 659–66, especially 666. Godfrey of Vendôme in *MGLiblit* II, 680–700, especially 691 f. Rangerius of Lucca was quite intransigent in his polemical poem, *De anulo et baculo,* especially verses 879 f., 891 ff., 901 ff., in *MGLiblit* II, 508–33. The imperial viewpoint was energetically

The adjustment thus prepared in learned discussion could not be translated into reality under Paschal. The Pope insisted ever more strongly on the disavowal of the privilege. Neither the threatening proximity of the Emperor, who came to Italy in 1116 to enter into the inheritance of the Countess Matilda — she had died in 1115 — nor Henry's efforts at negotiations were able to divert him from that. Then a revolt had broken out in Rome because of the growing power of the Pierleoni, who supported the papacy. Paschal regarded it as advisable to leave the city in the spring of 1117, whereupon, summoned by the opposing faction, the Emperor came to the city for a few months. It was only at the beginning of 1118 that Paschal could dare to fight his way back. Scarcely had he done so when he died in the stronghold of the Pierleoni on 21 January 1118.

Gelasius II

The election of Paschal's successor, occurring on 24 January, fell on the chancellor John,[21] of a distinguished family from Gaetà, a former monk of Montecassino, who had directed the papal chancery since the time of Urban II and was on friendly terms with Paschal. Gelasius II, as he styled himself, was to learn sadly how powerless he was in Rome. Ill treated and imprisoned, immediately after his election, by Cencius Frangipane for personal reasons that elude us, but soon set free by the Romans, he had to flee on 1 March to Gaetà from the Emperor, who had occupied the Leonine City and was searching for him. In his absence the opposing party, in an understanding with the Emperor, set up an Antipope. Archbishop Maurice of Braga accepted the nomination as Gregory VIII, a figure scarcely to be taken seriously, to whom the Romans gave the nickname "Burdinus", stupid ass. Gelasius, it is true, was able to return to the Lateran after Henry V's departure, but his situation remained extremely precarious, all the more as now the whole family of the Frangipani was against him. Their attempt to seize him misfired, but it induced him to leave the city. Accompanied by a few cardinals, Gelasius sailed to France, fell ill, and died at Cluny on 29 January 1119.

Calixtus II

It was providential that the Bishop of Rome had left his church a widow while he was abroad, for in the hopeless situation the reform papacy needed outside help. The cardinals surrounding the death bed of Gelasius were therefore well advised when they at once proceeded to the new election at Cluny and selected as Pope on 2 February, not a Roman cardinal, but Archbishop Guy of Vienne. Since the curialists who had remained behind in Rome with

---

defended in the Farfa *Orthodoxa defensio imperialis* in *MGLiblit* II, 535–42. See Schieffer, *loc. cit.* 336–38.

[21] On his family see March, *Liber Pontificalis Dertusensis,* 181, footnote 2.

their staffs approved the election, the new Pope, who took the name Calixtus II, was universally recognized. Son of the Count of Burgundy, whose family was related to the Salians and other royal houses, a zealous bishop for thirty years, filled with the reform ideas, far-sighted and energetic, Calixtus was the right man both to settle the Roman situation and to solve the German question.

Even before his journey to Rome he extended the hand of peace to the Emperor, whom Gelasius had excommunicated together with the Antipope. Henry V had too great difficulties in the Empire not to accept it. The negotiations begun at Strasbourg between him and the papal envoys, William of Champeaux and Pons of Cluny, reached a preliminary conclusion in the charter of a treaty which two cardinals drew up with the Emperor; it lacked only ratification. For this purpose Calixtus proceeded, during the Council of Reims, which he had just opened, to Mouzon, where the Emperor awaited him. Since there had been a failure in the preliminary negotiations, apparently on both sides, to expound the controverted points with the necessary clarity, Calixtus demanded of Henry the express renunciation of investiture with the temporalities and of the right to take possession of church property. Hence at the last moment he gave him to understand that he intended to allow him merely the French practice, that is, the continuation of the services owed to the King, but the abolition of any investiture, even with the temporalities. Henry V, on the other hand, sought at least the vassalage of the bishops as tolerated for England and, in addition, an investiture with the *regalia*. Hence he did not agree to the newly formulated papal demand, but called for a postponing of the decision. Thereupon the deeply disillusioned Pope rode back to the council, where he was to find another surprise. While the participants, convinced of the Emperor's guilt, decreed anathema on Henry and his adherents, they could not make up their minds to extend the prohibition of investiture, demanded by Calixtus, also to church property. Merely investiture with bishoprics and abbeys was forbidden, while the disposal of tithes that happened to be in lay possession and of ecclesiastical fiefs was left an open question. Calixtus did not become soured. He now knew the controverted points and was willing to consider them in new negotiations for peace.

Meanwhile, he was carefully preparing for his journey to Rome. After a really triumphal progress through Lombardy and Tuscany, he was joyfully welcomed by the Romans in the summer of 1120. At last they again had a ruler, under whose authority the factional quarrels would become silent. Not until April 1121 did Calixtus, who had visited South Italy, dispatch troops to Sutri to capture the Antipope, who was entrenched there. Stripped of his episcopal dignity, Burdinus vanished into a South Italian monastery. Now peace with the Emperor was not long in coming. Unnerved by civil strife, Henry decided in the autumn of 1121 to entrust the starting of the negotiations with Rome to the German princes. Calixtus agreed to this and sent three cardinals, including the future Pope, Lambert of Ostia, to Germany. After two weeks of complicated deliberations the Investiture Controversy was brought to an end by the Concordat of Worms on 23 September 1122.

In it Henry renounced investiture with ring and staff but retained the right to investiture with the *regalia* by means of the sceptre, to be performed in Germany immediately after the election, but in the case of the Burgundian and of the Italian sees within six months after consecration. He also granted canonical election and free consecration. However, in German territory he retained a substantial influence on the election — it was to take place in his presence or in that of his authorized representative and in the event of a dissenting outcome it was to be decided by him, with the cooperation of the metropolitan and the suffragans, in favour of the *sanior pars*. The Roman Church's sphere of influence, the *Patrimonium Petri,* was excepted from the regulations of the concordat.[22]

The concordat, which despite certain shortcomings ranks with the best negotiated settlements of Western history, consisted of two documents: the one contained the concessions made by the Emperor to Calixtus and the Roman Church; the other, those made by the Pope to Henry V. It should be noted that the papal concessions were made to Henry alone, a circumstance which in ecclesiastical circles favoured the opinion that the papal privilege would cease with Henry's death. This thesis, entirely defensible under the formal aspect, and even maintained by a few modern historians, could not, however, prevail against the more deeply based nature of the treaty now concluded. In the *Calixtinum* there was involved not the granting of papal favours but an old imperial right, which the Pope, once harmony had been achieved, had to acknowledge along with the Church's juridical claims. Though later the representatives of the Church as well as the Emperors, according to the status of the power situation, might try to alter the arrangements in their favour, the substance of the concordat proved to be a stable juridical basis.

Measured by the compromises reached in England and France, Calixtus granted the Emperor more for Germany and less for Burgundy and Italy. Henry could accept the last point: in Burgundy the King played no great role, and in Italy the bishops were being more and more eclipsed by the growing power of the cities. But in Germany too the royal power had been essentially impaired. Basically the Ottonian imperial constitution fell to pieces with the concordat. The dependence of the bishops and of the royal abbots, assured not merely by the rights conceded in the *Calixtinum,* but also by homage, not mentioned there but actually performed, was weakened by the fact that the prelates, in the process of German constitutional development, were changed from royal officials into vassals of the crown, into spiritual princes of the Empire, who aspired to strengthen their secular power, based on law and something that could no longer be arbitrarily taken away, and thus they came together with the secular princes in a community of interests. As holders of an ecclesiastical office, whose juridical identity Henry V had to recognize by renouncing investiture with the office, they also belonged to the supranational body of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. And since the papacy was ever more strongly making the Church into a genuine monarchy, they had two lords to serve for the future. Thus an entirely new relationship, founded on the principle of the distinction in the two public-law spheres of the state and the Church, was being prepared, and its difficulties were to become clear in the following 180 years.

---

[22] *MGConst* I, 159–61. The deciding of contested elections by the King should take place "metropolitani et conprovincialium consilio vel iudicio". On the obscure formulation, D. Schäfer, "Consilio vel iudicio" = "mit minne oder mit rehte" in *SAB* 37 (1913), 719ff.

Both contracting parties had the treaty ratified within their juridical spheres — the Emperor by the secular princes at the Diet of Bamberg in 1122, the Pope by the Lateran Council of March 1123. Calixtus overcame the resistance which he found there among the strict Gregorians by declaring that the concessions made to Henry were not to be approved but tolerated for the sake of peace. Everything depended on how persons acted in the future in regard to the problems inherent in the treaty, problems that as yet could not be mastered by ideas. From the old fighters for reform, who thought in now bogged down categories, there was not to be expected the elasticity which the new age, announced in the concordat, required. The Roman Church needed younger energies that would push forward. Calixtus seems to have at least suspected as much, for shortly before the council he elevated, among others, the Frenchman Aimeric to the rank of cardinal-deacon and around the same time, before 8 May, entrusted to him the weightiest curial post, that of chancellor. This important man, friend of Saint Bernard and of the Carthusian Prior Guigo, was to lead the Roman Church into a new stage of the reform and, to achieve this goal, even to accept the responsibility for the Schism of 1130.

The Lateran Council of 1123 brought to an end the numerous general synods which the Popes since Leo IX had arranged, in order to issue, in union with the bishops of the various countries, decrees universally binding. Without being essentially different from them, it alone has been recognized as ecumenical, and as the ninth ecumenical, First Lateran Council, inaugurated a new period in this sense, that thereafter the Popes decided the more important ecclesiastical questions in consistory, with the cardinals and bishops who happened to be present, and only rarely convoked general councils. The definitive character of this Council also appears clearly in the decrees. What the reform had decreed earlier against clerical marriage, against simony and lay domination of churches and church goods, what it had decreed in regard to the Peace of God or the rights and duties of crusaders — all was here summarized impressively. In the decrees relevant to the care of souls and the administration of the Sacraments, what is striking is how much the power of the diocesan bishop was taken into account both in regard to his own clergy and in regard to monks, to whom pastoral work was forbidden. The age of the emergency, which had required so much intervention by the reform Popes against the rights of the local bishop and the granting of privileges to the monks who were fighting for the reform, was past. If the reform was to continue, it needed the cooperation of the bishops and of new forces emerging from the clergy and from monasticism.[23]

In reality there was still much to do. Nowhere, not even in France, had a definitive result been obtained. Germany and, with it, Italy only opened themselves up completely to the reform from 1122. The Church in Spain was in the process of reconstruction. In England the State Church system had by no means been overcome: Henry I clung more firmly than ever to his remaining rights and after the death of Anselm of Canterbury in 1109 cut off the bishops from communication with Rome, regardless of the protests of Paschal II. Ireland found itself in a first irresolute change, after the Synods of Cashel in 1101 and Rath Breasail in 1111 had begun to free the Church from its entanglement with the lay powers; the second of these synods had even provided for a definite hierarchy with twenty-six bishoprics and two metropolitan sees, one of the metropolitans to be also the primate.[24] Of the Scandinavian Kings, Eric of Denmark succeeded in obtaining in principle from Urban II, against Liemar of Bremen, the right to a Danish archbishopric, and hence a legate sent by Paschal II was able to elevate the see of Lund to metropolitan status in 1104. This arrangement actually continued in force, even when Archbishop Adalbero II of Bremen again obtained from Calixtus II and from Innocent II the confirmation of his metropolitan rights in the North. It was now only a question of time till Norway and Sweden received their own archbishoprics. The Christianization of the North could only direct missionary interest to the still pagan Baltic peoples. The evangelization of the Wends was resumed: Adalbero of Bremen set about advancing toward Mecklenburg, Boleslas III of Poland had Bishop Otto of Bamberg go with German priests to Pomerania. Poland again made contact with the reform in 1103, when Paschal II sent a legate who held a reform synod at Gniezno. In Hungary too, whose King Koloman had made his renunciation of investiture at the Synod of Guastalla (1106), a connection was also made, especially through the important reform councils of Esztergom in 1104 and 1112.[25]

---

[23] F. J. Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130* (Cologne - Graz 1961), 43–48 and *passim.*

[24] A. Gwynn, "The First Synod of Cashel" in *IER* 66 (1945), 81–92; 67 (1946), 109–22; MacErlean, "The Synod of Rath Breasail" in *Archiv. Hibernic.* 3 (1914), 1–33.

[25] On King Koloman and his ecclesiastico-political ideas, see J. Deér, "Der Anspruch der Herrscher des 12. Jahrhunderts auf die apostolische Legation", *ArchHP* 2 (1964), 156–62; on the reform, E. Pásztor, "Sulle origini della vita comune del clero in Ungheria" in *La vita comune del clero,* II, 71–78.

Hence the spirit of the reform had found entry everywhere; with it had arrived a new way of considering and moulding the world. For the reform struggle that has just been described must be understood as the expression of a much more profound change affecting all facets of life, which the Christian West was then experiencing. A later section will explain this to the extent that it affected the Church.

SECTION TWO

The Byzantine Church from 886 to 1054

Chapter 46

The Byzantine Church from Photius to the Tetragamy

The forced abdication of the Patriarch Photius in 886 still did not give a hint that the confusion within the Byzantine Imperial Church would end. The new Patriarch Stephen I (886–93), brother of the Emperor Leo VI, was unable to obtain recognition by the intransigent Ignatians, led by the Metropolitan Stylian Mapas, because he had received the diaconate from Photius. Again and again Stylian tried to win Rome to his side, but we are unable to say in each case what position the Pope took, since the papal letters in the famous collection of documents of the anti-Photians, in so far as they are authentic, probably did not keep that form in which they had left the Roman Chancery. Pope Formosus seems to have made an effort toward union by sending legates to Constantinople in 892, making a distinction between the invalidity of the ordinations of Photius's first patriarchate and the validity of those of the second patriarchate. The attempt failed, but it had no further consequences.

Reconciliation finally occurred under Pope John IX. It was probably the Patriarch Anthony Cauleas (893–901) who was able to convince Stylian of the senselessness of his opposition. Furthermore, the new Patriarch had been enrolled in the clergy, if not under Methodius, then at the latest under Ignatius, and hence he was not vulnerable in the way that Stephen was. We do not know whether a papal letter[1] prepared or only ratified the reconciliation of the factions, nor can we say for certain whether it took place in the presence of papal legates.[2] In any event, Rome and Constantinople now recognized "Ignatius, Photius, Stephen, and Anthony" as lawful Patriarchs, that is, at least the second patriarchate of Photius was no longer under attack.[3] Stylian accepted the formula, and only a few of his former adherents persisted in schism.

Anthony Cauleas died not long after the conclusion of peace in 899. There now occured what seemed to be a belated recognition of Photius, when, as a result of the Emperor's initiative, there mounted the patriarchal throne a relative of Photius, though possibly only by spiritual ties, in the person of Nicholas I Mysticus (901–7, 912–25).[4] Nicholas was unquestionably one of the great Patriarchs of Constantinople, and much in his character and activity is reminiscent of Photius. He too had first followed an administrative career in the service of the state. The fall of Photius made him dread disgrace at the hands of the friend of his youth, Leo VI, and so he withdrew to a monastery. But eventually the Emperor recalled him to court, where he became *mystikos,* or private secretary.

---

[1] *Mansi* XVI, 457 AB.

[2] Cf. F. Dvornik, *Le schisme de Photius,* 364ff.

[3] *Grumel Reg,* no. 596.

As Patriarch he displayed an uncommon zeal, and the dossier of his correspondence is among the most bulky in the patriarchal chancery.[5] In his patriarchate the Byzantine Church extended its frontiers far to the East. Abasgia and Alania, in the Kuban region, accepted Christianity, and Byzantium sent an archbishop to this mission territory. Far from the centre of Byzantine civilization and in perpetual confrontation with the surviving remains of barbarian paganism in his jurisdictional area, he needed constant encouragement from the Patriarch.[6] In several circles in Armenia there was discernible a turning from Monophysitism to Byzantine Orthodoxy, which the Patriarch followed with interest.[7] The Christianizing of the Chazars is said to have been furthered from Cherson.[8] The Patriarch even directly contacted the Muslim Emir of Crete to obtain relief for the Christians of the southern Aegean;[9] he finally turned also to the Caliph of Baghdad and assured him of the protection of the mosque in Constantinople and of the free exercise of their religion by Muslim war prisoners in the capital.[10] Together with the Emperor he regulated the important relations of rank of the bishoprics of the Empire by including the ancient bishoprics of Illyricum and South Italy in the official *Notitiae episcopatuum*[11] and sought to control the ecclesiastical system of fees. He gradually became the convinced champion of *oikonomia,* of clemency, of yielding, of patient waiting in all fields. It has rightly been pointed out that earlier historiography has not done justice to this Patriarch, because to the observer it is always Nicholas the politician who is in the foreground.

There were three situations especially in which Nicholas had to show himself as a politician. The first had to do with his role in the treason of Andronicus Ducas; the next with the revolt of the latter's son, Constantine Ducas. The reports on the Patriarch's connection with these events go back to sources in which great confidence has been reposed without subjecting them to criticism.[12] In addition, the political background of the first of these revolts is entirely unclear. A judgment in regard to the Patriarch's attitude is not possible in view of the present state of our knowledge.

---

[4] On Nicholas Mysticus, cf. *Beck* 550; *LThK* VII, 995 (Baus); C. de Boor, *Vita Euthymii,* 160–88. There is no really comprehensive evaluation of the Patriarch.

[5] The texts in *PG* 111, 9–392.

[6] *Grumel Reg,* nos. 599, 609, 610, 619, 715.

[7] Ibid., nos. 647, 648, 649, 716.

[8] Ibid., nos. 676, 680.

[9] Ibid., nos. 600, 646.

[10] Ibid., nos. 659.

[11] Ibid., nos. 598. The authentic text in H. Gelzer, "Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatuum" in *AAM* XXI, 3 (Munich 1900), 550–59.

More important was the famous Tetragamy Controversy.[13] In 901 Leo VI had lost his third wife by death, and he still had no son. But before long he was presented with a son and heir by his mistress, Zoe Carbonopsina; Leo was willing to legitimate this son, the future Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, and designate him as his successor. The Patriarch Nicholas was prepared to administer solemn baptism, which he did on Epiphany of 906, and also to recognize the baby prince as legitimate, contrary to all state and ecclesiastical regulations, which of themselves were directed against a third marriage, not to mention a fourth. But the Patriarch laid down as a condition that Leo must separate from his leman. At first Leo agreed, but after a short time he broke his promise, married Zoe, and elevated her to the dignity of Augusta.[14] The Patriarch thereupon forbade the Emperor to enter a church.

Leo countered by consulting Rome and the oriental Patriarchs as to the permissibility of a fourth marriage. In view of such an infringement of his autonomy, Nicholas seems to have been inclined to offer the Emperor a dispensation *motu proprio,* but the Emperor was no longer disposed to bow to his Patriarch.[15] Rome sent legates — whether Nicholas held himself aloof from them or the Emperor kept them away from him is not known — who brought the papal reply that there were no canonical considerations contrary to a fourth marriage. The legates of the oriental Patriarchs delivered the same verdict. Nicholas had to go into exile and submit his resignation.[16]

---

[12] *Grumel Reg,* no. 733.

[13] Cf. *DThC* IX, 365–79; *LThK* IX, 1381f. The most important older presentation is undoubtedly that in the commentary by de Boor on the *Vita Euthymii.* There is a Russian commentary on the *Vita* by A. P. Každan in *Dve bizantijskie chroniki X veka* (Moscow 1959). Meanwhile, research has disclosed as the special theorist of the controversy the famed Metropolitan of Caesarea, Arethas, a theorist who also accomplished a decisive change of fronts. His many works on the theme have now been published to a considerable extent; cf. R. J. H. Jenkins - B. Laurdas, "Eight letters of Arethas on the Fourth Marriage of Leo the Wise" in Ἑλληνικά 14 (1956), 293–372; P. Karlin-Hayter, "New Arethas Texts" in *Byz(B)* 31 (1961), 273–307; 34 (1964), 49–57.

[14] A third marriage had already been forbidden by the Empress Irene *(Dölger Reg,* no. 359); the Emperor Basil I had expressly forbidden a fourth marriage (*Rhallis* V, 252) and Leo VI himself in his twenty-second novel had basically recognized only the first marriage as fully legitimate and in his ninetieth novel had given his judgment of a third marriage.

[15] Nicholas now sought to secure himself by a pact with his metropolitans, which threatened with anathema and perpetual deposition all who would yield in the question; *Grumel Reg,* no. 611.

[16] *Grumel Reg,* nos. 612–14.

Once again a "case" had been manufactured. It is easy to defend Rome's position by reference to the primatial idea, but more difficult to justify the absence of any regard for the development of canon law in the Byzantine Church. No adjustment and no understanding were attempted; each side exerted itself to carry its own viewpoint just as it was. The representatives of the oriental Patriarchs, heaven knows under what presuppositions, joined themselves to the Roman view.

Leo's confessor, the monk Euthymius, succeeded Nicholas as Patriarch, and the Byzantine Church split into the unyielding factions of Nicholaites and Euthymians, even though the position adopted by Euthymius differed little from that of his predecessor. He regarded the Roman decision as a dispensation in a particular case, which in no way bound him to recognize a fourth marriage in principle.[17] With his synod he rejected such a request and also declared that any third marriage was unlawful. He deposed the priest Thomas, who had blessed the Emperor's fourth marriage, and was unwilling to review this judgment even on the intervention of the Empress.[18] He refused to perform the religious coronation of the Empress.[19] Hence the schism within the Byzantine Church cannot be fastened onto the canonical outlook of Euthymius; it is connected rather with the fact that Nicholas was compelled to abdicate, contrary to the rules of the canons. And so Euthymius had to pay after the death of Leo VI in 912.

Leo's brother and successor, Alexander, restored Nicholas to his rights[20] and drove the disgraced Euthymius into exile. For his part, Nicholas decreed anathema and deposition for the adherents of his supplanter. This judgment quite needlessly affected all those whom Euthymius had ordained.[21] In a letter to Pope Anastasius III[22] Nicholas reproached the Latin Church with having encouraged unchastity by tolerating a fourth marriage, contrary to the Apostle Paul. He demanded that the Pope excommunicate the authors of the Roman decision; not of course Pope Sergius III, who was already dead, and also not Leo VI, since, according to Nicholas, he had repented. As Rome did not go along with these demands, the Pope was deleted from the diptychs.

---

[17] Ibid., no. 626.

[18] Ibid., nos. 625, 629.

[19] Ibid., nos. 627, 628.

[20] There is a text, alleged to come from Leo VI, in which he repents of his fourth marriage and designates Nicholas as his Patriarch, who is to be reinstated in all his rights. The text has stirred up a controversy, especially in regard to the question of whether it was Leo or only Alexander who restored the Patriarch. It would probably be difficult to label the text as a clever forgery by the Patriarch. It is quite possible that on his deathbed Leo wanted to make peace with the Nicholaite faction and that the present text is a formulation of the Emperor's ideas, put in writing by Nicholas. But everything indicates that its implementation, that is, the reinstatement of Nicholas, was only carried out by Alexander. Cf. N. Oikonomides, "La dernière volonté de Léon VI au sujet de la tétragamie" in *ByZ* 56 (1963), 46–52; also, P. Karlin-Hayter in *Byz(B)* 32 (1962, appeared 1963), 317–22; again, N. Oikonomides, "La 'préhistoire' de la dernière volonté de Léon VI au sujet de la tétragamie" in *ByZ* 56 (1963), 265–70; P. Karlin-Hayter in *Byz(B)* 33 (1963), 483–86.

[21] *Grumel Reg,* nos. 630, 631, 632.

[22] Ibid., no. 635.

Meanwhile there fell to the Patriarch duties which deeply involved him in the most urgent questions of Byzantine foreign policy.[23] It is possible that after the death of the Emperor Alexander in 913 he wanted to place at the side of the little Constantine VII a vigorous guardian and coemperor in the person of Constantine Ducas, but in the meantime he found out that he had himself been appointed regent together with a few senators. In any event, he first had to deal with the insurrection of Constantine Ducas. He contrived to ruin it, but he thereby forfeited considerable public sympathy. And the mother of the child-emperor, the widowed Empress Zoe, challenged his political influence. But worst of all was his meeting with the victorious Tsar Simeon of the Bulgars, who was quite frankly reaching for the Byzantine imperial crown. This invasion of the Bulgars called for all of the Empire's defensive forces, including those of a united Church.

And so the call for peace and unity was heard throughout the second patriarchate of Nicholas Mysticus. But, as always in Byzantium, imperial pressure was finally required in order really to establish it. The pressure was due to Romanus Lecapenus, who had already made himself guardian and father-in-law of the Emperor.[24] In 920 there at length took place a Synod of Union. The document issued at its close[25] is of noteworthy good sense: the cause of the controversy, the fourth marriage of Leo VI, was entirely excluded. New regulations were issued only for the future: from the eighth indiction of the year of the world 6428, that is, from 1 September 920, a fourth marriage was forever forbidden, while a third was possible but only with reservations and subject to ecclesiastical penance.

Union was effected without Rome's participation. The question was: what would be Rome's attitude to it? Shortly after the synod Nicholas condescended to write again to Rome, this time to Pope John X.[26] He requested the sending of legates to condemn fourth marriages in accord with the common faith of all Christendom. But Rome would not agree to any stipulations. Again Nicholas had to give way: in a new letter he only proposed that at Rome the Roman permission for Leo VI to enter into a fourth marriage be regarded as pure *oikonomia,* for, according to him, thus did Pope Sergius III understand his position.[27] There was apparently no reply to this nor to a third letter.[28] Only a fourth letter, in which no conditions were laid down, was successful. Papal envoys arrived in Constantinople, probably in the spring of 923. What was discussed is known only from a letter of the Patriarch to the Tsar Simeon, according to which the Roman legates condemned the tetragamy and solemnly made peace with the Byzantine Church.[29] It is unlikely that Rome should have so suddenly changed its position or that once again its legates should have exceeded their mandate without there being some information to this effect in the Roman sources. To me it seems possible that the legates recognized the legislation of the synod of 920 as particular law binding the Byzantine Church.

---

[23] Cf. J. Gay, "Le patriarche Nicolas Mystique et son rôle politique" in *Mélanges C. Diehl,* I (Paris 1930), 91–100.

[24] This easily follows from the letter of the Patriarch to Lecapenus of 919–20 (*Grumel Reg,* no. 665) in *PG* 111, 273–77.

[25] *Grumel Reg,* no. 669; *Rhallis* V, 4–9.

[26] *Grumel Reg,* no. 671.

[27] Ibid., no. 675.

Once again a serious quarrel had been eventually adjusted. Apparently Rome had not given way on any point, and in Byzantium it was clear that a genuine ecclesiastical peace was unthinkable without Rome's participation. Rome had won, and more clearly than in the Photian affair. But the triumph had been purchased at a price that was to become increasingly expensive in the succeeding decades, a lack of interest on the part of the Byzantine Church in crossing the path of the Roman Church. Each held itself aloof, the alienation grew, and the later break was nothing more than drawing the final line.

Chapter 47

The Road to Schism

In the further course of the history of the Byzantine patriarchate in the tenth century there appear historical figures who, on the one hand, amazingly resemble the contemporary Popes, and, on the other hand, once again make very clear the special characteristic of the "Constantinian" ecclesiastical system — the intimate connection between Church policy and the politics of a ruler who regarded himself as Emperor of the world. In other words: the history of these decades cannot be understood apart from the violent quarrels between East and West over questions of the "Roman" imperial office, and it is not going too far to state with M. Michel that "the schismatic tendencies in New Rome [acted as] a barometer for German influence in Old Rome".

The Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus (919–44) aspired by means of an unscrupulous family policy to supplant the Macedonian Dynasty represented by his ward, Constantine VII. He also intended to reserve the patriarchal throne for his house. So long as his son Theophylact was still a child, he appointed two successive Patriarchs, Stephen II (925–8) and Tryphon (928–31), who were regarded only as caretakers and, accordingly, remained in total anonymity. When Theophylact was barely sixteen years old, his father appointed him Patriarch (933–56), and Pope John XI — according to Liutprand, under compulsion from Alberic — made himself a party to the farce, solemnly legalizing the grotesque canonical situation by the presence of his legates. It is not improbable that the same Pope by written explanations of the rank of the see of Constantinople furthered still more the striving for autonomy at Byzantium.[1]

---

[28] Ibid., no. 711.

[29] Ibid., no. 712.

What is related of the way of life of the young Patriarch corresponds pretty closely to what is reported of Pope John XII. It is amazing that his church enjoyed the confidence of the Bulgarian Tsar Peter, who consulted it on the treatment of the sect of the Bogomiles, which had only recently appeared. The detailed doctrinal explanation which thereupon left the Patriarch's chancery and is one of the most important documents for the history of the sect, originated, of course, not in the Patriarch's theological scholarship but in that of the *chartophylax* John.[2]

It is characteristic of the regenerative powers of the Byzantine Church that the pontificate of Theophylact was a mere interlude. In the person of the monk Polyeuctus (956–70) he obtained a successor of surpassing repute. Fearless in regard to all authorities, austere and unpolished, and concerned to maintain the purity of ecclesiastical discipline, he defended the notion of the charismatic character of the imperial office but at the same time opposed any "identification" of political with purely canonical and religious interests. He denied to the victorious Emperor Nicephorus II the satisfaction of venerating as martyrs Byzantine soldiers who had fallen in the struggle against Islam;[3] he prevented the marriage of this Emperor with the widow of the Emperor Romanus II, the notorious Theophano, so long as there remained the suspicion of a spiritual relationship between the two of them;[4] and after the assassination of Nicephorus he denied entry into the churches and imperial coronation to the new Emperor John I Tzimisces, who had inspired the crime, so long as Theophano remained at court and the murderers were unpunished.[5] He laid down another condition for Tzimisces: no coronation would take place until Tzimisces declared null the "Caesaropapist measures" of his predecessor, that is, a law which made any episcopal consecration dependent on the Emperor's permission.[6] And all the Emperors bowed to the man's harshness and determination.

[1] Liutprand of Cremona, *Legatio,* 62.

[2] New edition and commentary by I. Dujčev, "L'epistola sui Bogomili del patriarca costantinopolitano Teofilatto" in *Mélanges E. Tisserant,* II (Città del Vaticano 1964), 63–91.

[3] *Grumel Reg,* no. 790.

[4] Leo the Deacon, 50 (Bonn).

[5] Ibid. 98.

[6] *Grumel Reg,* no. 793: the Patriarch demanded the restoration to the synod of a *nomos* of the Emperor Nicephorus II of *ca.* 964 (*Dölger Reg,* no. 703), in which it was enacted that no episcopal election was valid without the Emperor's assent; cf. *Dölger Reg,* no. 726.

The tocsin in regard to the situation of the Empire and of the Church in foreign policy was rung with the imperial coronation of Otto the Great in 962,[7] that is, the recurrence of an event which had already led to severe shocks in 800, because it was at the same time the sign of the determining influence of a rival "non-Roman" imperial power on the papacy, which thereby abandoned the relatively independent, and for Byzantium tolerable, position between the two world powers. It is not surprising that the representatives of Rome's papal aristocracy, expelled and hamstrung by the Germans, turned to Byzantium. In view of the obscurity of the canonical situation at Rome, it would be presumptuous to label as schismatic every supporting of such an expellee by Byzantium. It could likewise be no more than a consequence of this same obscurity in the rapid succession of Popes if the mention of these Popes by name in the Byzantine liturgy — their admission to the diptychs — was gradually taken quite lightly. Byzantium's reaction was more sensitive when the new Emperor of the German nation reached out for the Byzantine possessions in South Italy, and the Roman Church in his train raised its ancient patriarchal claim to this territory. The most striking countermove of the Byzantine Church was the elevation of Otranto to metropolitan status with the right to consecrate the Bishops of Acerentila, Turcicum, Gravina, Macceria, and Tricarium.[8] The succeeding conflicts in South Italy, not very happily managed by either side, which eventually led to the marriage of the Emperor Otto II and the Byzantine Princess Theophano, somewhat relaxed the ecclesiastico-political situation, but mistrust remained the dominant attitude.

The circumstance that the usurper of the papacy, Boniface VII, escaped with the treasure of Saint Peter's from the German Count Sicco to Constantinople and acted from there as his headquarters could not but strengthen this outlook. Ten years later (984) Boniface succeeded in recovering Rome. The role of the Byzantine court and patriarchate in the following disturbances at Rome was probably of no great importance. And the Antipope John XVI (997–8), the celebrated John Philagathus of Rossano, pertained rather to the conflict between the Crescentians and the Saxon Dynasty than to the intrigues of the Byzantine court.

At this time the Patriarch of Constantinople was Sisinnius II (996–8), who is said to have sent the encyclical of the Patriarch Photius, with its serious charges against Rome's faith and discipline, to the oriental Patriarchs in a new edition.[9] To those who hold this thesis, the overthrow of the "Byzantine" Pope John XVI was a sufficient motive for such a step by the Patriarch, although it should be borne in mind that the encyclical as such was in no way concerned with the drastic events in Rome and must have appeared hopelessly out of date in regard to its principal content, the complaint about the Roman mission to Bulgaria. As regards the external evidence, if the arguments against authenticity are not entirely convincing, neither are those in favour of it. It is probably advisable, in the hypothetical state of the question, not to make any fuss about it. Be that as it may: peace with Rome was again a fact in the days of Pope John XVIII (1003–09). However, it was not lasting. There is a tradition, though not of unimpeachable testimony, according to which the Patriarch Sergius II (1101–19) again struck the Pope out of the diptychs.[10] The support given by Pope Benedict VIII to the Norman opposition to Byzantine rule in South Italy is more likely to have been the reason for this than a synodical of Pope Sergius IV, containing the *Filioque*. The combining of papal policy with the purely political interests of the Normans and of the German Emperor in South Italy produced in this area a new situation, which would continue to be decisive for the entire period of the crusades and would really only reach its climax under Charles of Anjou.[11] On the other hand, the reaction of the Byzantines confused ecclesiastical and secular just as perversely as did the policy of their papal opponents. And this is the basis from which the Byzantine Patriarch Michael Caerularius drew his strength.

---

[7] On the problem, cf. W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim 1947), 62ff., and A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, I (Paderborn 1925), 9ff.

[8] *Grumel Reg*, no. 792.

[9] Cf. A. Michel, *op. cit.* 16f., and the contrary view in *Grumel Reg*, no. 814; Michel's reply in

Michael was the successor of a Patriarch, Alexius the Studite (1025–43), who brought to the patriarchal throne little of the old spirit of his monastery. His patriarchal *acta*[12] are full of canonistic notifications of a laudable reform zeal, but in fact he bowed, in the age of the decay of the last Macedonians on the imperial throne, to every public violation of the rights of the Church without protesting, so far as is known. And just as Theophylact was followed by a Polyeuctus, so now Alexius was followed by the masterful figure of Michael Caerularius (1043–58), who, characteristically, referred the *Constitutum Constantini* to his see[13] and from it deduced quasi-imperial rights. It is difficult to do him justice, for his headstrong, not to say revolutionary, personality

---

ByZ 38 (1938), 454ff. Grumel's negative view is also that of M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin,* 158, footnote 1.

[10] A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* I, 19ff.; cf. *Grumel Reg,* nos. 818, 819.

[11] According to Raoul Glaber, *Historiae sui temporis,* IV, 1 (*PL* 142, 670–72), Pope John XIX had received an embassy from the Byzantine Patriarch Eustathius (1019–25), which asked him to declare the Church of Constantinople to be the primatial Church of the entire East, just as the Roman was the patriarchal Church of the whole world (cf. *Grumel Reg,* no. 828, and *Dölger Reg,* no. 817). Implied here was certainly no request for the Pope to sell the Roman primacy, as Michel in *ByZ* 54 (1952), 414, holds — quite the contrary. Jugie, *op. cit.* 168f., made this clear. On the other hand Michel's arguments in "Weltreichs- und Kirchenteilung bei Rudolf Glaber" in *HJ* 70 (1951), 53–64, against Glaber's reliability are very noteworthy.

[12] *Grumel Reg,* nos. 829–55.

[13] But probably only later (cf. *Skylitzes* II, 643). The *Donatio,* as to its text, was probably not known at Byzantium until 1054. Cf. E. Petrucci in *BIStIAM* 74 (1962), 45–106.

represents an exception in the history of the Byzantine patriarchate. It is historically impossible to gauge him by the standards of the Church reform just getting under way in the West, for he summarized an ecclesiastical development which was not alien to the papacy of that day and for which the notion of reform, even in the West, was not the only sponsor.

As a young aristocrat, Michael had already been implicated in a revolt, and it was reported that he was seeking the crown. The enterprise was discovered, and, as so often, the monastery was his only salvation. But this was not the end. He became a cleric and under the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus (1042–55) soon rose to influence on policy. As *synkellos* of the Patriarch he acquired the expectation of the succession, which he actually obtained in 1043. The ecclesiastical situation between East and West which he encountered can hardly be described as one of formal schism, but as one of a growing ecclesiastical independence of the patriarchate of Constantinople *vis-à-vis* the unstable condition of Rome, as one of deliberate mutual withdrawal. It was more dangerous that the political estrangement had led also to a "ritual" estrangement, that people in Byzantium were more and more of the opinion that only in New Rome were religious customs, the religious life in its totality, and finally religious faith unimpaired or, to put it perhaps better, had been preserved unharmed. The idea of the primacy, which in Byzantium had never become a universal conviction equal to any trial of strength, was weaker than ever and had been so for some decades. Now, in addition, the papacy had linked itself with the competing imperial power in the West and, recently, even with the most dangerous foes of the Empire in South Italy, the Normans. It was precisely this question of the Normans that was to start the stone rolling.[14]

The good services rendered by these intruders to the papacy soon changed into the opposite, and the Popes themselves were interested in again getting rid of the spectre. Here, then, Byzantine and papal policy suddenly agreed again on something. But the resources of both were, by themselves, too little to deal with the danger, and so the idea of a great alliance of the two Empires and of the papacy began to stir. One of the strongest advocates of this idea was that very Byzantine who had to be the best informed about the situation, Argyros, *catepan* of the Byzantine Empire's Italian possessions. The Emperor Constantine IX could be gained for the plan without difficulty, but in Michael Caerularius it found an implacable opponent.

The reasons for this opposition were probably complex in nature. Argyros was the son of that Melo who in 1009 had fought against Byzantium in Apulia under papal and German protection. The son had been raised in Byzantium but belonged to the Latin rite and at the beginning of the 1040's played a highly ambiguous role as Byzantine commander in South Italy. If not by virtue of his rite, then because of his political background and past, Argyros could impress a convinced Byzantine as someone quite suspicious.[15] Michael hated him. And it was probably worth considering who would finally gather the fruits of a victory over the Normans — the Pope, the German Emperor, the Byzantine Emperor, or a *dux et princeps Italiae,* as Argyros had had himself proclaimed in 1041. Furthermore, it was to be suspected that a coalition with the Pope would again only give rise to a control by the Roman Church over the Byzantine. The self-willed Patriarch was in no way inclined to bow to such as that.

---

[14] See A. Michel, "Schisma und Kaiserhof im Jahre 1054" in *L'Église et les églises,* I (Chevetogne 1954), 352–440.

And so he began a campaign of discriminating against the Roman Church, of an acidity not attained even by that of Photius. Michael was not concerned about proceedings on the highest plane, such as an encyclical to the oriental Patriarchs, who did not have much to say, but with a tumult in the capital against the new direction of imperial policy. His propaganda had to do with ecclesiastical ritual, especially the use of unleavened bread in the Latin Church, its custom of fasting on Saturdays, and so forth. Thanks to his meagre theological culture he only discovered the *Filioque,* so to speak, at the eleventh hour.[16]

In any event, he began with drastic measures in his own episcopal city. On his orders the churches of the Latins were closed; the upshot was disorderly scenes, in which even the consecrated Hosts were not always spared. Propagandist for the Patriarch was Archbishop Leo of Ochrida, with his circular to the Bishop of Trani, a Latin. Fundamentally it was directed at the Pope and demanded no less than the removal from the Latin Church of all rites which were displeasing to Byzantium. It is noteworthy, however, that this letter expressed no anathema.[17] The Bishop of Trani sent it on to the Curia, and Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida was commissioned to reply. Michael Caerularius thereby found an opponent who was his match and whose temperament vied with that of the Patriarch. The eventual elimination of Pope Leo IX by death left the field to two warriors, between whom no compromise was now possible. Humbert's reply[18] to the Greek circular contained all the claims of the reformed papacy, but distorted by historically questionable amplifications, by the incorporating of the *Constitutum Constantini,* and by the claims of the papacy to South Italy. The Cardinal charged the Greek Church with "more than ninety heresies". Willingness for an understanding was, it is true, expressed formally, but the violence of the tone left little hope.

---

[15] Ibid. 366f.

[16] At least substantially authentic, the so-called *Panoplia* of the Patriarch attests the violence of these struggles. Edited in A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* II (Paderborn 1930).

[17] Text in Will, *Acta et scripta de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae* . . . (Leipzig 1861), 52–64, and *PG* 120, 836–44.

[18] Will, *op. cit.,* 65–85, the so-called first letter of Pope Leo IX to Michael; it came from Humbert's pen. Cf. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* I, 44ff.

Meanwhile, the situation in South Italy had reached a crisis. Pope Leo managed to collect a contingent of troops, and at their head he marched against the Normans. Shortly before, Argyros had had to accept a reverse from these very Normans at Siponto, and he was unable to bring his troops to join those of the Pope. Leo IX suffered a severe defeat and became the Normans' prisoner in June 1053; from captivity he tried to take care of the Church's affairs as best he could. The Pope's defeat was by implication a defeat for Byzantine interests in South Italy. The alliance desired by Argyros was more urgent than ever, and the imperial court could only bow to this line of argument. The Emperor Constantine IX wrote to the Curia and expressed his desire for peace in the Church as the precondition of a political alliance,[19] and even Michael Caerularius had to yield to pressure and make known to the Pope in moderate tones his wish for an understanding.[20]

The Curia now decided to send an embassy to Constantinople to bring about peace. It was headed by Humbert, who was accompanied by the Roman Chancellor, Frederick of Lotharingia, and Archbishop Peter of Amalfi. Before the departure for Constantinople Humbert conferred at length with Argyros, who was probably not sparing with warnings against the Patriarch. In Constantinople the embassy was honourably received by the Emperor, whereas its visit with the Patriarch was more than chilly. The Romans felt that they were not properly honoured, the Patriarch that he was not greeted according to protocol. The scene ended, so to speak, with a silent handing over of the papal letter, which, again written by Humbert, was not capable of banishing the Patriarch's fears that the political alliance could impair his authority in the Byzantine Church. There was no conversation, and Humbert devoted himself all the more zealously to political propaganda. He had his polemic against the Greeks translated, plunged into further polemics, and finally attacked the aged monk, Nicetas Stethatos, who had dared to write against unleavened bread. Humbert's pressure on the Emperor led to a miserable disputation in Nicetas's monastery on 24 June 1054, after which Nicetas had to recant and his treatise was committed to the flames.[21]

In this situation the Patriarch, in a violent polemic which did not spare the court, succeeded in making propaganda in his own favour, and the legates decided to leave without having accomplished their purpose, but not without first, in a solemn act, having laid a bull of excommunication of the Patriarch and his accomplices on the altar of Hagia Sophia on 16 July 1054.

---

[19] *Dölger Reg,* no. 911.

[20] *Grumel Reg,* no. 864.

[21] For the literature, see *Beck* 535f.

Its text[22] went much too far. It anathematized the "pseudo-Patriarch" Michael Caerularius, Archbishop Leo of Ochrida, and other adherents of the Patriarch as simonists, Arians, Nicolaites, Severans, Pneumatomachoi, Manichaeans, Nazarites, and so forth, and thereby subjected to anathema not merely the Greek doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit, for example, but also such things as the marriage of Greek priests and other legitimate Greek usages.

Pope Leo IX had been dead for three months; whether the legates knew this cannot be determined. The questionable nature of their proceedings is underscored by the unspeakable misuse of dogmatic deductions. After this act the legates took their departure of the Emperor in a very amicable fashion — as always, he was helpless — and set out on their return journey. It may be that at the time of their leaving the translation of the bull had not yet been laid before the Emperor or he had not yet reflected on its import. But this was quickly rectified, and Constantine IX was induced to call back the envoys, probably to discuss the complex of questions in a common meeting. This was not in the interest of the Patriarch. He rallied the people and proposed a session under circumstances in which the legates could have felt themselves to be in personal danger. The effort to calm spirits thus misfired, and now the Emperor suggested to the legates on his own that they leave, after the mob had even begun to besiege the imperial palace. The Emperor ceased to resist and bowed to the Patriarch's propaganda: Argyros was sacrificed, and the Emperor's closest advisers had to leave the palace.

What followed was only the epilogue. On Sunday, July 24, the Emperor convoked a synod, whose *semeioma* presented the events in its own fashion. The legates were disqualified as being legates of Argyros, the text of their bull of excommunication was incorporated into the *semeioma* as a horrible example, it was interpreted as an excommunication of the entire Orthodox Church. The excommunication was turned back on the legates and their supporters.[23]

This, then, was the celebrated Schism of 1054. The historical evaluation scarcely needs to be covered over with the juridical. Whether the excommunication was legal, now that the Pope was long dead and as yet had no successor, is controverted.[24] In regard to its content, it was to a great extent an unlawful amplification of Humbert's own personal resentments, even if the central question was included. But in form it did not, in any event, attack the Orthodox Church as such, and not its head, the Emperor, but only Michael and his abettors. Similarly, Michael did not excommunicate the Pope or the Roman Church, but only the legates and their backers, as Argyros and his circle were alleged to be. What was meant by both sides was, in any case, something different, and of this there can be scarcely any doubt. According to the formalities of law, no acts had been performed which would permit one to speak of a schism in the strict sense. But the vehemence in word and act was new and unprecedented, the repertory of mutual recriminations had been substantially enlarged in comparison with the Photian Schism, and the generalizations were grotesque. The cold war between the two hierarchies could only be substantially reinforced, whatever consequences were drawn from the occurrences, and rearming on both sides was energetically pushed again — a situation hardened, to which eventually no one would be able to say what name should be attached.

---

[22] Latin text of the bull in *PL* 143, 1002–04. The Greek translation was incorporated into the synodal protocol to the Greek counteranathema, *PG* 120, 736–48; cf. Will, *op. cit.* 153–68. There can scarcely be any question of a falsification of the Latin text of the bull in this *semeioma* (*Grumel Reg,* no. 869), but the situation is different with regard to the reporting of events in Michael's letter to the oriental Patriarchs (*Grumel Reg,* no. 870–72); cf. A. Michel, "Die Fälschung der römischen Bannbulle durch Michael Kerullarios" in *ByzNGrJb* 9 (1932f.), 293–319.

[23] *Grumel Reg,* no. 869; cf. the preceding footnote.

[24] Its nullity is upheld by M. Jugie, "Le schisme byzantin" in *DThC* XIV, 1356, and to a degree by E. Herman in *OrChrP* 8 (1942), 209–18; its validity by A. Michel in *ByZ* 42 (1943–49), 193–205. On 7 December 1965, simultaneously at Rome and Istanbul, the mutual excom-

The term "schism" cannot be rejected out of hand, but it would be false to designate the situation as hopeless from then on. Even then the Emperor was still basically in control of the government of the Church, and there remained the question whether another Emperor than the weak Constantine IX would not have suddenly changed course again. Besides, in Byzantium the violent character of the Patriarch was well known, and the extent to which all the events were the result of his own vehement policy was hardly underrated. And, finally, it was not to be excluded that in time Rome might enter upon a path which would no longer adhere to the subjective line of a Humbert

The oriental Churches did not follow the policy of the Ecumenical Patriarch throughout with flying colours. Above all it was the Patriarch Peter III of Antioch, a former cleric of Constantinople, who pursued his own course and was not inclined to wheel around to Michael's direction.[25] For a long time churchmen almost universally took no more notice of this "Schism" than did Byzantine historiography.

---

munications were cancelled by Pope Paul VI and the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I (translator).

[25] On Peter III of Antioch and his letters, cf. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* II, 416ff., and *Beck* 535.

CHAPTER 48

The Inner Life of the Byzantine Church between Photius and Caerularius

It is becoming ever clearer that the charge of hostility to culture, which was raised in regard to the iconoclasts, sprang to a great extent from the polemics against the heretics and that, on the contrary, an Emperor like Theophilus, the last iconoclast, was one of the significant protagonists of a self-realization of the Greek mind after generations of stagnation. So too the Patriarch Photius, as the scholar of his age, must at the same time be considered as the first great representative of this self-realization, to which pertained love for the treasures of ancient civilization along with impartiality of thought, confidence in reason, and enthusiasm for form and its classical setting. In this regard, classicism for Photius referred to the pagan writings of antiquity as well as to those of the Church Fathers. This movement culminated in Photius but did not end with his downfall. Its tracks are found everywhere, and a generation after his death a circle of busy philologists and encyclopedic compilers formed around the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (912–59). It stored up much, even if in epitome, in the granary of tradition and perhaps even reduced to the form of a means of education what in Photius had served education more impartially and more freely. This movement also prevailed in theology.

A philologist of great importance, a philologist of ecclesiastical literature too, was especially Photius's pupil, Arethas, Metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia, a scholarly glossator and scholiast, not only of classical literature but also of the Bible and of the earliest Christian literature — Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement, and so forth.[1] A younger contemporary of Photius, Nicetas Byzantios, opponent of the Armenian Monophysites, of Islam, and of the Latins, and, as such, scarcely original, still surprises by a scholastic method of argumentation, which for that epoch seems almost rationalistic.[2] His type is encountered a century later in the Metropolitan Stephen of Nicomedia, author of brief summaries on philosophical propaedeutics and on particular questions of theology. He is of interest most of all because the opposition of the pneumatics and enthusiasts, represented by the great mystic, Simeon the New Theologian, caught fire on his works.[3] And here may be mentioned a special sort of work, the Χιλιόστιχος θεολογία, composed around the turn of the tenth century by Leo Choirosphactes, in whom Arethas saw an odious "Hellene". We are referring to an exposition of theology in verse, which seems to feed entirely on the Hellenistic mystery theology and neo-Platonic terminology.[4] Even the work of encyclopedic compilation that was going on around Constantine VII found expression in theological literature. Theodore Daphnopates, a high official under the Emperor Romanus II (959–63), produced the Chrysostom eclogues, extracts from the sermons of this Church Father, which, in the form of homilies on the most varied virtues and vices, like the excerpts of Constantine VII from profane literature, summarized the thought of John Chrysostom.[5] To this group also belonged Simeon Metaphrastes, with his eclogues from Basil, Chrysostom, and homilies of pseudo-Macarius.[6]

---

[1] Still available on Arethas is the monograph by S. Kugeas, Ὁ Καισαρείας Ἀρέθας καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ (Athens 1913). More recent bibliography in *Beck* 591–95, where are to be found also data on the widely scattered editions. More recent editions by Karlin–Hayter and others are mostly related to the struggles in the Tetragamy Controversy. Cf *Byz* 28–34 (1958–64).

[2] *PG* 105, 588–841; J. Hergenröther, *Monumenta graeca ad Photium eiusque historiam spectantia* (Regensburg 1869), 84–138; *Beck* 531f.

This Simeon owes his name Metaphrastes to his hagiographical activity. With this we reach a field of theological writing that was more intensively cultivated in this period than ever before. The sufferings endured in the age of Iconoclasm gave this *genre* an unexpected upsurge. Already in the period between the two iconoclast epochs a deacon, Stephen, had written the life of the most important martyr of the cult of images, Stephen the Younger, monk of Mount Auxentius.[7] Immediately after the death of Theodore the Studite in 826, his merits were celebrated by his successor, Naucratius, in a circular, which found entry into the saint's memorial liturgy.[8] A deacon, Ignatius, later Metropolitan of Nicaea, wrote, probably around the middle of the ninth century, the *vitae* of the confessors and Patriarchs, Tarasius and Nicephorus.[9] Probably the famous outlaw of the Photian Schism, Archbishop Gregory Asbestas, was the author of the life of the Patriarch Methodius.[10] But a whole group of other confessors, John Damascene,[11] Joannikios,[12] Peter of Atroa,[13] George of Mitylene,[14] and others, had their panegyrists. Patriarchal biography found revisers, who, abandoning the *genre* of real hagiography, became the chroniclers and pamphleteers of their age, so agitated in ecclesiastical politics: for example, Nicetas David, with a very biased biography of the Patriarch Ignatius, in which Photius does not have a redeeming feature,[15] and an anonymous monk, with a *vita* of the Patriarch Euthymius, in which the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus suffers the same fate as Photius did at the hands of Nicetas David.[16] In addition the edifying hagiographical romance, without any historical background, is represented by, among other works, the *vita* of Saint Theoctiste of Lesbos by a Magister Nicetas,[17] or, under the auspices of the monastic interchange between East and West, by a Greek version of Saint Gregory the Great's account of Saint Benedict of Nursia,[18] or, as evidence of a national hagiography within the framework of the Empire, by the life of the Georgian Hilarion[19] — a variegated wealth, partly of undifferentiated encomia, partly of fanciful stories, partly of still naive reporting in the spirit of the hagiography of the early seventh century.

---

[3] His works have not yet been critically edited. On him and his conflict with Simeon the New Theologian, cf. I. Hausherr, *Un grand mystique byzantin: Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien* (Rome 1928), li ff.; *Beck* 531 f.

[4] The work is found in Vat. gr. 1257. Cf. *Beck* 594.

[5] *PG* 63, 567–902; *DHGE* XIV, 80–82 (J. Darrouzès).

[6] Some of them published in *PG* 32, 1115–1382, and *PG* 34, 861–965.

[7] *BHG* 1666, 1666a.

[8] Ibid. 2311.

[9] Ibid. 1698, 1335.

[10] Ibid. 1278.

[11] Ibid. 884.

[12] Ibid. 935.

[13] Ibid. 2364 f.

[14] Ibid. 2163.

[15] *PG* 105, 488–574, and *Mansi* XVI, 209–92.

But it was exactly this last type which was to achieve its destiny in the period under consideration, and indeed in the name of classicism of rhetorical form, for which the scholars of the age, including the theologians, became ever more enthusiastic. And it is not unlikely that the plan of producing a complete *menologion* of this style originated with Constantine VII. The task was performed by a high imperial official, Simeon, who died around the close of the millennium and entered history as *metaphrastes,* the "translator" of the old *vitae* into the rhetorical style. As regards the external form the work is uneven: the summer months of the calendar of saints are dealt with substantially more briefly than the winter months, perhaps for liturgical reasons. The feasts of the Lord are omitted, probably with regard for the available "panegyrists". Metaphrastes adopted some ancient texts almost unaltered, and some he created entirely, but in most cases he produced a version in keeping with the taste of the age. Metaphrastes thereby created a standard Byzantine work, which, while not free from contamination and admixture, permanently dominated the aspect of hagiography. The tradition of the old, naive *vitae* thereafter often fell into oblivion. This may be regretted, but the appreciation of the achievement of Metaphrastes must start from what he intended and what accorded with the taste of his age.[20]

At least as important as the contribution of this period to hagiography was its contribution to the history of Byzantine mysticism. In Simeon the New

---

[16] Edited by C. de Boor (Berlin 1888) and P. Karlin-Hayter in *Byz(B)* 25–27 (1955–57), 8–152: Commentary with Russian translation, by A. P. Každan, *Dve bizantijskie chroniki X veka* (Moscow 1959).

[17] *BHG* 1723.

[18] Ibid. 273.

[19] Edited by P. Peeters in *AnBoll* 32 (1913), 236–69.

[20] The *Menologion* of Metaphrastes has still not been entirely published. Most of the texts, strongly mixed with non-Metaphrastean texts, in *PG* 114–16. On the sifting, cf. *Beck* 572–75. On the transmission, see especially *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche,* especially I, 2 (Leipzig 1938); id., "Symeon Metaphrastes und die griechische Hagiographie" in *RQ* 11 (1897), 531–53; H. Zilliacus, "Zur stilistischen Umarbeitungstechnik des Symeon Metaphrastes" in *ByZ* 38 (1938), 333–50.

Theologian it acquired a prophet of a unique sort. Merely from the viewpoint of phenomenology, his importance is based on his having made the breakthrough from the mystical treatise to the entirely personal mystical confession or even hymn. As regards the sociology of his mysticism it should be noted that he always sought to prepare the way whereby it should move out of the monastery to the laity in the Church. But in regard to context he pursued a course which had probably never been unfamiliar in Byzantium but at first had difficulty in asserting itself *vis-à-vis* the strict line of Evagrian mysticism: the mysticism of the metaphysical feeling, of the αἴσθησις νοερά. That Messalian ideas stood as sponsors here can be disproved with difficulty, but in Diadochus of Photice the doctrine of the empirical nature of the mystical grace found an orthodox herald, and the introduction of the so-called Macarius homilies of Messalian origin into the treasure of the tradition of orthodox mysticism did more than was necessary.[21] The impetus of this mysticism, which wanted to "experience", and that as quickly as possible, united early with the method of the so-called "Prayer of Jesus", which was likewise not foreign to Simeon.[22] It culminated in light visions, which were so uniquely formulated in Simeon's language that one is induced and forced to seek their locale in an area midway between spiritual and corporal, which can scarcely be defined. Because Simeon was a hymnographer and ecstatic confessor and not a theorist, areas of the classical mysticism, such as the so-called "physical theory", the contemplative effort to penetrate, in patience and hope, into the divine *rationes* of creation and of history, certainly come off badly — something doubtless understandable in the case of the hymnographer, who only wants to express his last experience, but dangerous for the systematizers of the later period, who do not adequately take into consideration the literary character of Simeon's avowal.

In Simeon that enthusiasm of the old monachism again breaks out, which the hierarchy, probably incorrectly, thought had been expelled, the conviction of the special mediating role of the monk as the bearer of the Spirit between God and the sinner.[23] In this connection it is of only superficial interest to state that Simeon developed his own peculiarities fully after he had broken with the monastery of Studion, which, thanks to its strongly cenobitic outlook and hierarchical organization, apparently was remote from such trains of thought. For conflict with the hierarchy did not fail to occur: two interpretations of theology, an enthusiastic and irrational and a scholastic, opposed each other intransigently, because apparently neither Simeon nor his direct opposite, the above mentioned Stephen of Nicomedia, was willing to admit the limitations of his own "method", and, correspondingly, two mutually exclusive interpretations of the nature and significance of the *charisma* in the Church. In the course of time the antitheses were smoothed away but their traces could not be entirely obliterated.[24]

---

[21] Cf. I. Hausherr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualité hésychaste" in *OrChrP* 1 (1935), 114–38; F. Dörr, *Diadochus von Photike und die Messalianer* (Freiburg 1937).

[22] On the origin of this method, cf. I. Hausherr, *Noms du Christ et voies d'oraison* (Rome).

[23] He was the author of the little work on confession, falsely attributed to John Damascene, *PG* 95, 283–304; cf. K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt* (Leipzig 1898).

If in Simeon's lifetime there was already evident the withdrawal from the Studites' cenobitic ideal, interested in ecclesiastical politics and living in an alternating relationship of friendship and hostility to the hierarchy, on the other hand this period meant "topographically" a shift of the centre of gravity of the Byzantine monastic world from Bithynia to Athos, the holy mountain of the future.[25] With the Muslim raids into Bithynia around the turn to the ninth century there apparently began a devastation of the monastic settlements on and around Olympus. And when as a consequence of the Byzantine offensive of the tenth century this danger could also be exorcised, the Seljuk invasion in the second half of the eleventh century again brought new and intensified dangers. The progress of monasticism on Athos is certainly connected with this.

The origins of the Athonian monastic colonization are covered with a darkness which is ever more transfigured by legend. Colonies of anchorites more or less entered the light of history in the ninth century. Rarely of any size, they eventually joined in a loosely organized community and discussed the most pressing community matters under a *protos*. A significant turning point in this development came with the founding of the so-called "Great Laura" on Athos by Saint Athanasius. Athanasius was born in Trebizond. Encouraged by his patron, the Emperor Nicephorus II Phocas, around 961 he built the first large monastery on Athos and gave it a rule, which conformed to that of the Studites but also borrowed from that of Saint Benedict. Athanasius not only succeeded, thanks to the imperial authority, in establishing his monastery devoted to the common life on the mountain, against the ill will of the anchorites already there, but in 971 or 972 he was able to induce Nicephorus's successor, the Emperor John I Tzimisces (969–76), to grant the whole monastic territory a *magna carta*, the so-called *Tragos*, extant in the original. In this the existence of a new large abbey in the overall structure of the administration of the mountain was duly taken into account.[26] Other foundations arose — of these the national monastery of the Georgians, the *Iberon,* should be mentioned — which also followed the cenobitic ideal, and a charter of the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus of 1046 confirmed in general, despite all still existing opposition, the regulation of the community made by John I. Thus was the foundation laid for the amazing development of a monastic republic, which was soon to become the protagonist of Orthodoxy.

---

[24] *PG* 120, 321–687, contains the hymns only in Latin translation. The German translation by K. Kirchhoff. *Licht vom Licht* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1951), while a poetical work, does not reproduce much of the unique nature of Simeon's poetry. A collection of his works in the critical edition by V. Krivoshein, in the *Sources chrétiennes,* by now comprises three volumes (Paris 1963–65). Of the literature, besides Holl's book mentioned in the preceding footnote and Hausherr's in footnote 22, worthy of special mention are: H. M. Biedermann, *Das Menschenbild bei Symeon dem Jüngeren, dem Theologen* (Würzburg 1949), and D. L. Stathopulos, *Die Gottesliebe bei Symeon dem neuen Theologen* (dissertation, Bonn 1964); other data on the literature in *Beck* 583–87.

[25] An Athos bibliography of no less than 2634 titles is given by I. Doens, *Le millénaire du Mont Athos,* II (Venice–Chevetogne 1965), 336–495. Deserving of special mention are: F. Dölger (ed.), *Mönchsland Athos* (Munich 1943), R. M. Dawkins, *The Monks of Athos* (London 1936), and E. Amand de Mendieta, *La presqu'île des caloyers* (Bruges 1955).

Besides these very promising beginnings of a new monastic territory, the monastic idea at this period also experienced the most serious injuries, which can be summarized under the juridical notion of charistikariate — the presenting of monasteries to lay persons by bishops or Patriarchs and Emperors. In some cases there may have been no doubt that the intention of the *charistikarioi* was, through the assumption of the monastery, to assure it a protection against oppression from all sides, especially from that of the *fiscus,* to correct evils that arose, and, with the best of intentions, to relieve the monks of the burden of secular business. But more frequently such a gift ministered only to greed. And in its origin the charistikariate must be seen as a secondary aspect of the attempt by the magnates, the *dynatoi,* to extend their possessions and also to invade the small holdings of the free peasant communities — an attempt with which imperial legislation had to contend again and again in the tenth century. The movement proceeded both from the top down and from the bottom up, that is, occasionally the peasants purchased the protection of a magnate from the pressure of taxation and the harshness of the state's impositions by a voluntary renunciation of their freedom and entry into a tenant relationship. And likewise in the case of the commendatory monasteries, at first the desire of the monasteries seems occasionally to have been directed to a protector. In any event, the movement established itself and led to serious harm to discipline in the monasteries and even to the monasteries' material substance.

The Abbot's power disappeared as the monks looked rather to the *charistikarios* than to their spiritual superior. The *charistikarios* now determined the number of monks in the monastery, the maximum provision for their material life, the necessities for the monastery's library and liturgy, ordinarily in the interest of his own income, which he intended to draw from the monastery. The invasion of the small farms of the peasants by the *dynatoi* could be achieved by some kind of legal fiction, such as adoption or bequest, but in the case of monastic property an ecclesiastical legal formality was needed, and this was supplied by the charistikariate. At first the grant was for a time, but it goes without saying that the *charistikarioi* sought to make the property hereditary. Thus were developed the intermediate forms, "for three lives", which only thinly concealed the yielding of the ecclesiastical authorities, whom one must probably regard as themselves allied to the *charistikarioi* by family ties. *De iure,* of course, there was never a transfer of ownership but only of authority. But since, despite some initial opposition, the right of the founders to the ownership of their churches was more and more firmly established even in the central Byzantine period, and the founder (*cf.* κτήτωρ = κτίστης) was more and more identified with the "benefactor" and "restorer" *(charistikarios),* the rights of ownership of the founder, even when conditioned by the purpose of the foundation, were easily transferred to the *charistikarios.*[27] A Patriarch as energetic as Sisinnius II (996–8)[28] flatly forbade any such donation, but a successor, Sergius II (1009–19), had to annul this regulation and recognize the charistikariate with slight restrictions.[29] The Patriarch Alexius the Studite (1025–43) did indeed complain in great distress about the situation, but his regulations did not attack the roots of the evil and were content rather with quite general precautions.[30] And so the situation persisted and came to flower under the Comneni.

---

[26] Two *vitae* of Athanasius: a) ed. by L. Petit, in *AnBoll* 25 (1906), 5–89; b) ed. by M. J. Pomjalovskij (St. Petersburg 1895). Rules, last will, and charters can most conveniently be consulted in P. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athos-Klöster* (Leipzig 1894).

The power of the Patriarch grew, not with regard to the internal affairs of his Church, but in connection with the neighbouring churches and, in extent, through the gaining of new territories. The Byzantine advance against the Islamic East brought territorial gains of great importance. Ancient sees, which for centuries had figured only formally on the lists, could now be occupied again, and others, as new capitals of political provinces, were elevated also in ecclesiastical rank. In this process not even the frontiers of the ancient patriarchates were observed, but rather the primacy of the "Ecumenical Patriarch", who adopted this title even on his seal from the time of Caerularius, was powerfully stressed. Here imperial and patriarchal policy went hand in hand. If the Bulgarian archbishops had obtained autocephaly from Byzantium under their powerful Tsar Simeon (893–927), the victorious campaigns of the Byzantine Emperor Basil II (976–1025) put an end to it. Now the Archbishop of Ochrida was again subject to the Patriarch, and what autonomy he enjoyed was due to the Emperor's favour rather than to anything of his own. Any rights of Rome in ancient Illyricum were ignored by Byzantium now as before.[31] The Syrian Emperors seem to have removed Seleucia in Isauria from the patriarchate of Antioch, by exploiting the political situation, and even when Antioch itself was again a part of the Empire there seemed to be no necessity for making a change. Coloneia became the new metropolitan see of the Armenian upland between 1020 and 1035; it had previously belonged to the ancient metropolis of Sebaste, but was now the theme capital. Melitene also, the capital of old Armenia Secunda, the much contested Euphrates fortress, was again occupied by a metropolitan in the tenth century, but its connection with the Empire did not survive the Seljuk invasion. Other new metropolises were, for example, Kamachos in the Mesopotamian Theme, Keltzene, Taron, and Arsamosata, all in Armenia and all owing their ecclesiastical rank solely and briefly to their importance as frontier fortresses of the Empire. A consequence of the continuing rehellenization was also the establishing of metropolises in the Peloponnesus, such as Sparta in 1081–82 and, even earlier, Christianupolis.

---

[27] The fundamental study of the institution is E. Herman, "Ricerche sulle istituzioni monastiche bizantine" in *OrChrP* 6 (1940), 293–375. Valuable as an introduction is R. Janin, "Le monachisme byzantin au moyen âge: Commende et typica" in *RÉB* 22 (1964), 5–44.

[28] *Grumel Reg,* no. 809; the text is lost.

[29] *Grumel Reg,* no. 821; cf. Balsamon, *Rhallis* II, 614.

[30] *Grumel Reg,* no. 833; text in *Rhallis* V, 20–24, and *PG* 119, 837–844.

As we have seen, it was Antioch especially that had to endure the encroachments of an Ecumenical Patriarch, thinking in terms of a primacy, on territories not his own. Following the reconquest of 969 the Emperors at first installed Patriarchs here at their discretion and had their candidates approved by the *Synodos endemusa* in Constantinople. The Patriarch John III (996–1020) even had himself consecrated at Constantinople, contrary to canon law, and then, as consecrated Patriarch, bestowed this right of consecration in principle on the see of Constantinople. Peter III (1052–56), who had made his career in the patriarchal service at Constantinople, protested against this spurious right, but unsuccessfully.[32] The jurisdictional primacy of the Ecumenical Patriarch was advancing under the shadow of the imperial authority.

---

[31] Cf., for example, J. Snegarov, *La fondation de l'église orthodoxe bulgare*, Εἰς μνήμην Σ. Λάμπρου (Athens 1935), 278–92; H. Gelzer in *ByZ* 2 (1893), 41 ff.

[32] Cf. V. Grumel, "Les patriarches grecs d'Antioche sous la seconde domination byzantine" in *ÉO* 33 (1934), 130–47.

SECTION THREE

Changes within the Christian West during the Gregorian Reform

CHAPTER 49

The New Shape of the Church: Law and Organization Before Gratian

The struggle for the *libertas ecclesiae* aimed at something more comprehensive than a mere liberation from the power of the laity. The reformers wanted to find the way back to the ancient, pure Church, to the free play of the forces proper to her. For the sake of clarity it was especially necessary to investigate the juridical sources. Since the usual collections, especially that of Burchard of Worms, did not suffice for this purpose, they extracted from the papal *registra,* the *Ordines romani,* the *Liber diurnus,* from conciliar acts, from the writings of the Fathers and historical works, from imperial *privilegia* and the law of Justinian a wealth of hitherto unused texts, not to mention the pseudo-Isidorean forgeries, regarded as genuine, whose content was now for the first time entirely exploited. The material, combined into unsystematic collections, no longer extant — the *Collectio Britannica* is the nearest to them — seems to have been at the disposal of several canonists working from the time of Gregory VII; of itself it called for systematically arranged collections.

Thus, throughout the reform period new canonical compilations were coming into existence. They began, to mention only the more important, with the still unpublished Collection in Seventy-Four Titles, *Sententiae diversorum patrum,* which is probably to be ascribed to Humbert of Silva Candida and to the period before Gregory VII.[1] From the time of Gregory VII, Cardinal Atto composed the *Breviarium* or *Capitulare;* Anselm of Lucca, Gregory's friend and co-worker (d. 1086), in the last years of his life the much used and important *Collectio canonum;* Cardinal Deusdedit around 1087 a likewise noteworthy collection of canons, which was oriented rather to the Roman Church; a few years later Bonizo of Sutri, another strict Gregorian, the *Liber de vita christiana;* and finally, between 1105 and 1113, Cardinal Gregory, the *Polycarpus.* In France the great canonist, Ivo of Chartres, published three collections between 1094 and 1096: the *Collectio trium partium,* the *Decretum,* based on it and on Burchard of Worms, and the shorter, more practical, and hence more widespread *Panormia.* In Spain there appeared between 1110 and 1120 the *Collectio Caesaraugustana,* which borrowed from Ivo and at the same time from the Gregorian collections and on which other compilations depended.

---

[1] For the bibliography on the collections, see the Sources and the Literature for this chapter. Michel's view as to the time of the "Collection in Seventy-Four Titles" finds support in the fact established by M. L. Levillain, "Saint-Denis à l'époque mérovingienne" in *BECh* 87 (1926), 299–324, that Saint-Denis possessed a manuscript of the collection even before 1065. Reference by C. Dereine, "L'école canonique liégeoise" in *Ann. du congrès arch. et hist. de Tournai* (1949), 2, footnote 2.

The authors of these private works were confronted with the difficult problem of separating the authentic from the false or from what was valid only locally. Although in the general view the norm lay with the papacy, it still needed a more precise definition. The demand of a few radicals, that only those laws which had been issued or approved by the Popes should be adopted, proved to be inadequate. Hence the more judicious recognized all texts which did not contradict the laws of the Roman Church; accordingly, they envisaged the idea of a *ius commune* as the totality of a somehow coherent legal system that culminated in the authority of the Holy See, without implying that every particular had to be positively decreed by the papacy.[2] Naturally in this abundantly unclear principle of choice there were some contradictions among individual canons. To solve them became at times the more urgent task. For this the canonists were not merely satisfied with a hierarchical gradation of individual texts; they also worked out important rules of textual criticism and eventually instituted the dialectical method in order to cancel the contradictions with distinctions and subdistinctions. Bernold of Sankt Blasien, Ivo of Chartres, and finally Alger of Liège were especially concerned with establishing a method of concordance. The science of canon law began slowly to pervade intellectually the source material at hand in the collections, but the sought for *concordantia discordantium canonum* was not achieved until around 1140 with the *Decretum* of Gratian.

The struggle for an ecclesiastical legal system, motivated by the understanding that for canon law the early mediaeval awareness, rooted in customary law, did not suffice, announced a new age. Its onward pressing *élan* assured the Church a wide lead over what was possible to the states. Gradually recognized by all Christian countries of the West, the canon law, always assuming more stable forms, fashioned the Church into a truly supranational power structure. This had as a consequence that the supreme guardian and interpreter of ecclesiastical law, the Pope, grew to overshadow the ruling position of the Emperor and the kings, a position which from the time of Alexander III was consolidated and extended by a steadily increasing decretal activity. Nevertheless, it would be ill-advised to see the development of ecclesiastical law as directed merely to the exaltation of the papal power. What the reformers stressed, not without sharp criticism of the early Middle Ages, was the fundamental hierarchical principle of the Church, in no sense restricted to the Pope. By making it the juridical form of the Church, they achieved a sharper separation between laity and priesthood and prepared for a more compact and, so to speak, corporative association of clerics as the real representatives of the Church.

---

[2] Cf. S. Kuttner, "Liber canonicus. A note on 'Dictatus Papae' c. 17" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 389–97; J. M. Salgrado, "La méthode d'interprétation du droit en usage chez les canonistes d'origine à Urbain II" in *Revue d'Université d'Ottawa* 22 (1952), 23*–35*; R. Losada Cosme, "La unificación interna del derecho y las colecciones anteriores a Graziano" in *Rev. Españ. de derecho canón.* 10 (1955), 353–82.

Despite the clericalization now getting under way, the laity did not simply become hearers and flunkies. Besides their right to the administration of certain Sacraments, which was ever more elaborated by the canonists, they possessed not inconsiderable powers in questions of the clergy or of ecclesiastical administration. Thus, for example, it pertained to the so-called synodal witnesses, as spokesmen of the people, publicly to criticize the holders of ecclesiastical office and their activity to the visitor. Not a few parish congregations acquired an effective share in ecclesiastical life by certain locally different rights of control. And if the people in the long run lost their now meaningless right to elect the bishop, they still elected their pastor in many more places than earlier research admitted. In the flourishing cities, with their growing number of parishes, the citizens were able to gain not only the right of presentation or nomination but also influence on the administration of ecclesiastical property and control of the property of foundations.

Proprietorship of churches was, it is true, taken away from the laity, at least in principle, after the attempt, made occasionally in the reform period, to distinguish between the temporalities *(ecclesia)* and the spiritualities *(altare)* in regard to the lesser churches also had failed. The first two Lateran Councils thus held to the principle that lay persons must not possess any ecclesiastical property and that the lesser benefices were to be granted by the bishop. This claim was favoured by the decay of the right of proprietorship of churches, which had meanwhile got under way, its fragmentation, through supersaturation, into purely individual rights — into the *ius fundi,* the *ius regaliae* and *ius spolii* (that is, the right to the revenues during a vacancy and the right to the estate of the dead cleric), into rights to particular ecclesiastical revenues, such as tithes and offerings, into the right of nomination and conferring of benefices, into the right of bestowing ecclesiastical office. Thus Gratian and his sucessors down to Alexander III were able to bring about a solution in keeping with the hierarchical principle. They replaced the right of proprietorship with the *patronatus* subject to ecclesiastical legislation as *ius spirituali annexum* (Alexander III). On the one hand this maintained the Church's right of proprietorship; on the other hand, out of gratitude for the foundation, it conceded to the previous proprietor the right of presentation of the cleric to be instituted and specified honorary rights, but it likewise imposed obligations, such as a subsidiary construction burden. Actually the whole thing remained to a great extent mere theory; in practice the old right of proprietorship lived on everywhere, more or less energetically.

The history of the proprietary church system probably shows how laboriously the reform made its way to the lower levels of the ecclesiastical organization. Thus the lesser clergy remained essentially bound by the old relationships, despite their greater dependence on the ecclesiastical offices above them. The hierarchical principle had a graduated operation: whereas it produced its full effect in the case of the papacy, its force was already diminished in regard to the bishops. Free episcopal election was undoubtedly a lasting achievement of the reform. The amount of influence still allowed to rulers could be eliminated later in some countries — by Innocent III in England and Germany. The people's share became insignificant during the twelfth century, so that the election was carried out chiefly by the diocesan clergy and, from the end of the century, by the cathedral chapter alone. And yet the frequent disputed elections, often due not to oppositions within the church but to those springing from state and family politics, show how much the election still depended on secular factors.

And the bishop's own authority was strictly limited. Competing with it was the growing power of archdeacons, reaching its peak in the thirteenth century, not only in jurisdiction but also in important administrative tasks, such as visitation of and appointments to parishes, holding of synods, and so forth. Episcopal authority suffered a more painful, because enduring, loss at the hands of the cathedral chapter, which was able in the thirteenth century to secure a share in the government of the diocese. Bishops would certainly not have completely excluded these rivals of theirs, but perhaps they would have been better able to limit them if they had not been distracted, especially in Germany, by state and territorial political interests. Thus they found themselves in no position to keep pace adequately, through the systematic completion of their own proper hierarchical position, with the new development of the ecclesiastical organization, beginning about the time of Alexander III, which was powerfully to display the Pope's monarchical power.

In the early twelfth century, now under consideration, the relations between Pope and bishop were as yet no real problem. Although the reform Popes had often dealt sternly enough with individual bishops, these emergency measures must not be regarded as aimed at episcopal power as such. The more the Investiture Controversy neared its end, the more the Popes endeavoured to show regard for the rights of the bishops. Not only the First Lateran Council, already discussed, but the noteworthy prudence of Calixtus II and his immediate successors in regard to monastic exemption clearly indicate this. And is it not characteristic of the spirit of the age that the mightily flourishing new Orders of the Cistercians and the canons regular wanted to be subject to the local bishops, the canons regular because of their natural bond with the episcopate, the Cistercians because of the idealism of their period of foundation, and idealism that would quickly fade?[3] In any event there could be as yet no question of a tendency to bind the whole episcopate directly to Rome as far as possible. If the Pope occasionally decided the disputed election of a bishop not directly subject to him, if he officiated at the consecration and then required the customary oath of obedience, the initiative here lay usually with the bishop and his faction.

Much less favourable was the position of the metropolitans. From the Carolingian period it had become the custom that they requested the pallium from the Pope. Proceeding from this, the reform Popes began soon after the middle of the eleventh century to demand that new archbishops receive the pallium in person. With its solemn investiture was included gradually, more commonly from Paschal II, the taking of an oath of obedience, modelled on the oath of vassalage, that is, of an oath which earlier the suffragans of the Roman Church and a few other, mostly Italian, bishops had had to take according to an older formula. The new formula included also the obligation of the periodic *visitatio liminum apostolorum*.[4] The new development meant the triumph of the old Roman view, already to be discerned in the later Carolingian period, that the exercise of the metropolitan right of consecration depended on the possession of the pallium. The connection with Rome, secured symbolically and juridically, made it easy to regard the metropolitan authority as a participation in the universal authority of the Pope. This did not necessarily involve a diminution of archiepiscopal powers. As a matter of fact, at first most rights remained intact, and they were even extended by the right of devolution, established in 1080 for irregular episcopal elections. Just the same, metropolitans meant less in practice than they had meant in the early Middle Ages. The reason must be sought in the bishops rather than in the Popes. Out of the old opposition supported by the spirit of pseudo-Isidore, many bishops preferred, in juridical matters, to apply directly or by appeal to the Holy See.

The primates making their appearance from the time of Gregory VII possessed virtually no influence. Mention has already been made of this institution, which was conceived as a voluntary tribunal of appeals. Its origin was a scholarly pseudo-Isidorean invention, which, having recourse to the Roman provincial divisions in Gaul, ascribed to the metropolitans of the respective "first" provinces, such as *Lugdunensis Prima,* the position of primate or patriarch over the metropolitans of the subordinate provinces of the same name, for example, *Lugdunensis Secunda* and so forth. The idea did not acquire reality until the reform period. The initiative probably proceeded not from the papacy but from French archbishops of a *prima sedes,* who, on the basis of pseudo-Isidore, regarded as genuine, thought that they could reclaim an ancient right. Once Gebuin of Lyons had obtained the primacy for his see in 1079, the erecting of other primatial sees, at least in France, was only a question of time: they came into existence for Narbonne in 1097, for Bourges under Paschal II, for Vienne in 1119. Outside France the Popes elevated to the same position the churches of Toledo in 1088, Salerno in 1098, Pisa in 1138, Grado in 1155; Canterbury's claim foundered on York's opposition. It is true that honorary precedence was gained rather than real power. Little interest was displayed for the envisaged possibility of appeal. And if recourse was had to it, the metropolitans thus affected offered active or passive resistance.

---

[3] G. Schreiber, *Kurie und Kloster im 12. Jahrhundert,* I (Stuttgart 1910), 100–08, 83–91; on the Pope's regard for episcopal rights, cf. ibid. 58–63, 65–74, 77f., 112f., 177–79; F. J. Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130* (Cologne–Graz 1961), *passim.*

[4] T. Gottlob, *Der kirchliche Amtseid der Bischöfe* (Bonn 1936); E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton 1957), 348–50; J. B. Sägmüller, "Die Visitatio liminum bis Bonifaz VIII." in *ThQ* 82 (1900), 69–117. On the pallium, see Chapter 35, footnote 4.

Accordingly, since the bishops were not interested in a strong metropolitan authority nor the metropolitans in any kind of primatial authority, even only a weak one, the hierarchical principle, with its striving for a comprehensive juridical unity of the Church, especially benefited the summit — the papacy. The reform period brought the definitive change. In the struggle for the *libertas ecclesiae* the Roman Church had finally been able to realize the freedom proper to her, that is, her primatial claims based on genuine or what was regarded as genuine tradition. These comprised especially: free papal election, now sufficiently assured both in regard to the German ruler, who in the course of the Investiture Controversy lost the right of consent as recognized earlier by Nicholas II, and in regard to the Roman people and clergy, who still shared in the election but were restricted and slowly pushed aside by the prerogatives of the cardinals; then, the exclusive right to convoke general synods, which were arranged by the reform Popes at Rome or elsewhere in place of the earlier Roman provincial synods and constituted the preliminaries to the general councils of the Middle Ages — Innocent III was the first to identify the Fourth Lateran Council intentionally with the ancient ecumenical councils; and, finally, the principle of supreme legislative, judicial, and administrative authority, to the extent that it was possible to seize upon it in tradition.

In the present state of research it is not always easy to define the extent of this by no means unlimited fulness of power, further developed by the decretal law, for the period of the reform and the early twelfth century. If, for example, Gregory VII claimed to change ancient canons in cases of necessity, he was not claiming any properly legislative right;[5] only the development begun with Gratian created the presuppositions for this. And the right of granting privileges and dispensations, despite some initial starts, as with Ivo of Chartres for papal dispensation, was not yet adequately clarified. More or less the following rights were then valid for the supreme judicial power: the Pope's immunity from trial, except in the case of heresy,[6] his judicial competence both for exempt monasteries and for all bishops and, in general, for all *causae maiores,* and, finally, the position of the Roman Church as the supreme court of appeals. The primatial administrative rights comprised chiefly the basic supreme supervision, the establishing, defining, and suppressing of dioceses, the transfer of a religious community to another Order, the granting of exemption to monasteries, the exerting of influence on the filling of sees, made possible by a process instituted at the Holy See or by use of the right of devolution, which the Roman Synod of 1080 had granted to the Pope as well as to the metropolitan for the case of irregular episcopal elections. Further possibilities of intervention were added from the end of the twelfth century by the legal stabilization of episcopal elections. In like manner, the rights to the filling of lesser benefices and the constituting of a papal sovereignty over finance and the religious Orders belong to the later development beginning with the decretal law.

---

[5] Cf. S. Kuttner, *op. cit.* 396, footnote 42; G. Ladner, "Two Gregorian Letters" in *StudGreg* V (1956), 225–42.

If the papal monarchy was completed only later, still the reform assisted it toward the break-through and brought to an end the extensive independence of the early mediaeval episcopate. All the more should it be observed how little resistance it encountered in this. To be sure, there was no lack of angry protests in regard to particular measures or even in regard to the basic attitude of Gregory VII, who, according to the repudiation of 1076, sought to wrest all power from the bishops so far as he could; particular rights of the Pope were questioned in principle; and even reformers like Ivo of Chartres occasionally wished for a careful defining of papal competence. But, on the whole, friends and foes were agreed, and strict anti-Gregorians recognized the Roman primacy as much as did its direct defenders.[7] Only one writer was bold enough to lay the axe to the roots: the Norman Anonymous.[8] According to him, the primacy was not a divine institution but one created by men because of Rome's being the capital of the world, and hence in no sense was it something necessary for salvation; all bishops were vicars of

---

[6] According to the clear demonstration by J. Ryan, "Cardinal Humbert: De s. Romana ecclesia. Relics of Roman-Byzantine Relations 1053–1054" in *MS* 20 (1958), 206–38 (especially 219–24), the heresy clause was not coined by Humbert, as W. Ullmann, "Cardinal Humbert and the Ecclesia Romana" in *StudGreg* IV (1954), 111–27, stated, but was taken by him from the ecclesiastical tradition of the late Carolingian period, without his having interpreted it in the strict sense. For the late Carolingian tradition, cf. Chapter 35, footnote 17.

[7] Cf. K. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.* (Leipzig 1894), 553.

[8] Especially in Treatises III, V–VI, in *MGLiblit* III, 656–62, 679–86; on the author, cf. H. Scherrinski, *Untersuchungen zum sogenannten Anonymus von York* (Würzburg 1940); P. de Lapparent, "Un précurseur de la réforme anglaise, l'Anonyme de York" in *AHD* 15 (1946), 149–68; G. H. Williams, *The Norman Anonymus of 1100* A.D. *Towards the Identification and Evaluation of the so-called Anonymus of York* (Cambridge, Mass. 1951).

Christ and thus to be judged by no one. The real mother of all the churches was not Rome but Jerusalem. Whoever sought to create a higher authority split the one Church. This language was so unprecedented that it faded away into empty space.

It was not so much the principle of the primacy as such as its practical application that the reform established. That this occurred was to a great extent due to the papal legates. Already in the earliest periods the Roman Church had dispatched legates with particular commissions, and from the fifth to the eighth century it had even maintained permanent representatives, the *apocrisiarii,* at the imperial Byzantine court and at that of the Exarch in Ravenna. Furthermore, it had elevated Boniface and other heralds of the Gospel as missionary legates and as early as the fifth and sixth centuries had entrusted outstanding bishops of remote lands with an apostolic vicariate. This stream of tradition, almost choked off, was put to use from about 1056 by the reform Popes for the system of legates.

While it is true that the old principle remained in force — that legates should receive as much authority as their assignment required — still, since the comprehensive reform work demanded general powers, the legates appointed for this, usually cardinals or local bishops, were made vicars of the Pope and disposed of the full primatial authority to the extent that this was then claimed by Rome. Of course, there were also legates with special tasks; they were chosen preponderantly from lower clerics. The activity of reform legates consisted principally of visitations and the holding of synods, in connection with which the opposition was often broken by stern punishments, even deposition, and by interventions in the filling of sees. The Popes seem not yet to have reserved certain details of jurisdiction to themselves, as they did later, but they still did not feel bound by the decisions of their legates. The legates' activity, competing with episcopal and metropolitan functions, was restricted to the extent that the reform produced results and that the Popes could count on the co-operation of the bishops. Calixtus II's instruction to the legate in Germany, William of Palestrina, to proceed "inoffensa caritate", must have ranked as a guiding principle for the early twelfth century.

A real differentiation of classes of legates had not yet been made. It began only with Alexander III and amounted to the following groups: *legati a latere,* equipped with a wealth of special rights, which developed into a *iurisdictio ordinaria; legati missi,* with less authority; *nuntii apostolici* for particular assignments; *vicarii apostolici* or *legati nati,* who were local archbishops and bishops.

Still more decisive was to be the effect of another product of the reform — the College of Cardinals. Its origin is disputed.[9] From the fifth century the priests of the Roman titular churches had to provide a weekly liturgical ministry for the cemeterial basilicas of San Pietro, San Paolo, and San Lorenzo, and then also for Santa Maria Maggiore and San Giovanni in Laterano. In the eighth century probably, this service was altered to the extent that thereafter it was attended to in the Lateran basilica by seven bishops of the nearby dioceses and in the other four basilicas by the priests of the titular churches which had been increased, in groups of seven, to the number of twenty-eight. Since from the time of Gregory the Great clerics who were employed in, or incardinated into, another church than that from which they came were called *cardinales,* this title was now used also for the bishops and priests who were made use of in the Roman weekly ministry. Their functions were purely liturgical, and so they made no claim to any special position of authority in the Roman Church.

---

[9] The following is based on the trail-blazing study by Klewitz and the work of Kuttner that continued it; see the Literature for this chapter.

There were now also "cardinals" in many churches inside and outside Italy; they must not be confused with the Roman cardinals. The most important group among them was made up of the so-called *presbyteri de cardine;* their precedence consisted in this, that their churches, as opposed to private oratories and proprietary churches, belonged to the bishopric or to the cathedral and hence were attached to the pivot *(cardo)* of the diocese.[10] Both ideas must be borne in mind in the formation of the College of Cardinals. Since the Popes had to provide the enthusiasts for reform whom they gathered around themselves with important Roman churches, they usually enrolled them among the cardinal bishops and cardinal priests. Occupied with reform duties, the new cardinals naturally dissociated themselves from the duties of the hebdomadal ministry, to which of itself the possession of their churches obliged them. As co-responsible representatives of the Roman Church, the pivot of the Universal Church, they thus became *episcopi* or *presbyteri cardinis romani.*

The beginning was made by the Cardinal-Bishops; the papal election decree of 1059 elevated them for the period of the vacancy to be the actual representatives of the Roman Church. The Cardinal-Priests, no less zealous assistants in the reform struggle, won their position in the time of the Antipope Clement III and of Pope Urban II. For virtually only the Gregorian Cardinal-Priests had gone over to Clement, with whom they acquired such influence that Urban II had to have the same consideration for the Cardinal-Priests who adhered to him. Finally, Cardinal-Deacons also made their appearance under both claimants, and in the time of Paschal II they numbered eighteen. How this came about is controverted. The deacons originally numbered seven but the suppression of the archdeacon reduced them to six.

---

[10] This idea was not entirely foreign to early mediaeval Roman and papal sources. Other "cardinals" were of liturgical origin. Thus the Popes granted to a few cathedrals, the first being Magdeburg in 968, a cardinal clergy with liturgical prerogatives, while something similar occurred in France by virtue of customary law. See S. Kuttner in *Tr* 3 (1945), 165–72.

They had long pertained to the Lateran basilica and performed both liturgical and administrative functions for the Pope. In the course of the general development they acquired the rank of cardinals. There is, however, less insight into why with them were associated the twelve so-called regionary deacons, all the more since we know nothing for certain about this group. The origin of this last mentioned body, which cannot be fixed as to time, was somehow connected with the new regionary division of the city, which probably occurred in the tenth century.

Under Paschal II the College of Cardinals reached its final complement with seven (later six) bishops, twenty-eight priests, and eighteen deacons. International in composition, it thereafter stood at the Pope's side as an advisory and assisting institution and was able to strengthen its influence in the succeeding period, especially during the Schism of 1130–38, but at the same time no clear regulation of its right as co-speaker with relation to the papacy was reached. The cardinals' advisory function became so important, at least in consistory, that the Popes felt they could dispense with more frequent general synods. The more stable organization that was slowly being prepared included a treasury belonging to the college and administered by the Cardinal *Camerlengo* and a more precise regulation of the revenues.

The centralizing exertions of the reform papacy necessarily had to transform the old administrative organs. The history of the papal chancery has already been discussed. Now it gradually freed itself from any connection with Rome's *scriniarii.* The frequent papal travels, beginning with Leo IX, of themselves brought it about that the documents to be issued *en route* were engrossed by the chaplains accompanying the Pope — the *scriniarii* concerned with Roman private documents naturally did not come along — or by scribes of the country in question. The next step quickly followed: the librarian-chancellor appointed one and later two and on occasion more clerics of the Lateran palace as permanent *scriptores* and thus laid the ground for an official college of clerical *scriptores,* which in the long run, and definitively from the assumption of office by the Chancellor Aimeric in April 1123, deprived the urban *scriniarii* of any possibility of participating and even of the engrossing of solemn *privilegia* issued in Rome, hitherto allowed them. The new development also revolutionized papal diplomatics. The curial hand employed by the *scriniarii* was replaced by the Carolingian minuscule, soon elaborated to meet the chancery's requirements. A new formal language, resuming the forgotten rhythmic rules of the *cursus latinus,* arose and new types were added to the old, remodelled charters. When in 1118 the Chancellor John of Gaetà ascended the papal throne as Gelasius II, the new chancery tradition was firmly established, thanks to his thirty-years' activity. Its membership drawn from the Catholic world, headed by a cardinal until toward the close of the twelfth century and from time to time more carefully organized, into the fourteenth century the chancery represented the most important administrative office of the papacy.

Furthermore, the financial system was reorganized. Following the model of Cluny, Urban II subordinated it to a *camerarius* and thereby founded the *Camera apostolica*. The at first modest office acquired around 1140, in addition to the administration of the treasury, that of the library and archives, and Hadrian IV's *camerlengo,* Cardinal Boso, assumed the care of papal property in the Papal State. From then on progress was continuous. The *camerlengo* acquired the rank of highest papal court official, and in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the *Camera* was at least to limit the importance of the chancery, if it did not entirely surpass it.

There were perhaps papal chaplains even before the reform, but one may probably speak of a papal *capella* in the strict sense only from the end of the eleventh century. This institution, modelled on that of royal and episcopal courts, affected the development of the Roman Curia to the extent that the clerics associated in it could be employed in any service and in any newly created office. Thus the Pope at last had a separate court of his own, detached from the city of Rome, which he could organize at his discretion. Hence it was not pure accident that, from the end of the eleventh century, in place of the old terminology, *sacrum palatium Lateranense,* the term still current, *Curia Romana,* established itself. It placed the papal court on a footing of equality with the Germanic-Romance *Curia Regis.* The equality was so consistently aspired after that the Popes from Urban II even introduced the court offices of steward, cupbearer, and so forth, though these acquired no importance. With the possibility of the free development of its administrative apparatus, the reform papacy had taken a decisive step forward.

Chapter 50

The New Relationship of the Church to Western Christendom

The hierarchical principle of the reform had to do, not with the Church such as we understand her today as an institution distinct from state and society, but with the *ecclesia universalis* coming down from the early Middle Ages and including state and society. The reformers clung throughout to this religious and political structural unity, but in it they sought to bring eventually to full prominence the aspect of religious value. And since priests were responsible for religious matters, they demanded that the *Sacerdotium,* through its hierarchical summit, the Pope, should lead the Christian world.

They thus established a new relationship to Christian kingship. The theocracy exercised by secular rulers appeared to them to pervert the right order; it contradicted the higher value and the higher function of the priestly office. As proofs were again brought forth the ancient notions stressing priestly pre-eminence: the comparison of gold with lead, of sun with moon, of soul with body, or the distinction between the life-giving priestly function and the royal function linked with the terror of the sword, or the directly divine origin of the priesthood *vis-à-vis* kingship, made necessary by original sin, established by men merely with God's assent, and often misused under the influence of original sin. But all of this would have profited little, had not the sacramental character of the anointed kingship, in the sense of a specific participation in the priesthood and the kingship of Christ, been denied by the reformers. For them, thinking in strictly hierarchical categories, the secular ruler was a layman, who, even though he was the holder of an important function in the *ecclesia universalis,* had to stand, not over, not beside, but below priests.

Just how this relation of dependence was to be explained concretely was not systematically worked out by Gregory VII and his friends — this was only done in the succeeding two centuries — but they claimed for the priesthood the right to decide on the qualifications of a ruler, especially if he proved to be intolerable because of a godless, tyrannical government. For this case Gregory VII demanded the judicial competence of the Pope, as the supreme shepherd of souls, endowed with the power to bind and loose, and also the right to excommunicate, to absolve from oaths of loyalty, and to depose. While his ideas were not unchallenged, they pretty generally prevailed, apart from the claim to depose, which encountered serious doubt even in ecclesiastical circles and was not again put into practice by a Pope until 1245. Nevertheless, rulers affected by the Church's coercive power again and again refused obedience.[1]

The incisive initiative of the reform could not but shake violently the structure of the Western world. The adherents of kingship naturally showed fight. To the extent that they were defending the old theocracy, as especially the Norman Anonymous at the beginning of the twelfth century sought to do in far too bold dialectics,[2] they were, of course, fighting a lost battle. The theocracy had become antiquated. But the West was in the process of outgrowing the early mediaeval stage of development of the coherence and of perfecting new, differentiated social forms.

---

[1] Gregory VII was not a systematic thinker. His undoubtedly Augustinian outlook lacked precision. Although he did not know a proper sphere of what belonged to the state, still he derived the political power of a Christian king from God; on the doctrine of the diabolical origin of secular rule, attributed to him, cf. A. Nitschke in *StudGreg* 5 (1950), 190f. From such an attitude, hierocratically oriented but spiritualistic and not sufficiently differentiated, opposed conclusions can be drawn, and they were drawn as soon as one began, from the time of Gratian, to investigate the problem of the relations between *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium* more precisely. The two letters containing Gregory's claim to depose are in *Reg,* IV, 4, VIII, 21; in Caspar's ed., 293–97, 544–63. On Gregory's political doctrine, cf. the Literature for Chapter 44. On the doctrine of the reformers in general, cf. Voosen (in the Literature for this chapter), *passim* (with further bibliography); A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* 3 vols. (Louvain 1924–37), *passim;* C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.* (Leipzig 1894); A. Fauser, *Die Publizisten des Investiturstreites* (Munich 1935).

This process had an effect on the reform. The West was not disposed merely to accept a papal hierocracy in exchange for the obsolete royal theocracy, and Gregory VII's radically religious impetus moved without any doubt in a hierocratic direction. Gregory himself released the counterforces which now appeared. In his one-sided spiritual thought what mattered basically was merely the spiritual and political will of the *ecclesia universalis,* and for it the ecclesiastical authority should thereafter be responsible. He thereby unintentionally split the striving for a uniform goal on the part of the earlier *ecclesia universalis;* for, previously, spiritual-political and secular-political aims had been so intimately interwoven that even a secular ruler could see to the religious and political total goal. Gregory, to be sure, wanted to preserve unity by demanding that kings entirely subordinate their interests to the spiritual-political goal, but the rulers agreed to this only under conditions. For their part, they now took up the secular-political aim and developed it to relative autonomy.

The course of the Investiture Controversy, the at times clearer distinction achieved by rulers between spiritual office and *temporalia,* is an example of what the development amounted to. Despite their only too conservative clinging to outdated theocratic rights, the German and Italian defenders of Henry IV showed a good instinct for the difficulty of their time when to the claim of the reformers they opposed the traditional Gelasian principle, never given up even in the early Middle Ages, of the twofold division of power and stressed that not only the priest but also the king received his power directly from God. Their position, which was by no means irreconcilable with that of Gregory VII and his followers, was further strengthened from time to time in the future.

Good assistance in this connection was provided by Roman law; already made use of in the Investiture Controversy, it would be further exploited by the schools of legists soon to flourish. And so the *Regnum* slowly transformed its earlier rule, based on anointing and service to the *ecclesia universalis,* into a kingship by divine right, into a rule over an autonomous sphere of law and action, to be governed by virtue of the *potestas* directly conferred by God, which it from time to time systematically built up during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and began to lead toward sovereignty. Here it was competing basically with that striving of the papacy, becoming ever clearer in the post-Gratian period, to bring the juridical sphere subordinate to it together as firmly as possible into a *regnum ecclesiasticum* under its monarchical power. Rulers were unwilling simply to be inferior even in regard to the sacred. Their being degraded to the lay state within the Church caused them to elaborate a theory of divine right, which was no longer based on a specifically ecclesiastical foundation but was even partly fed by originally pagan forces, as these survived, on the one hand, in Roman imperial law with its sanctification of ruler, law, and Empire, and, on the other hand, in the Germanic magical ideas of the royal "healing power", attached to the royal family.[3]

---

[2] To the Norman Anonymous the Church is the bride, not of *Christus Sacerdos,* but of *Christus Rex.* Since both priests and kings are elevated by sacramental consecration above the natural person-being to a grace-bestowing person, they represent the God-Man Christ in the sense that the priest is associated with the human, suffering nature of Christ, but the king with the divine, glorified nature of the Redeemer. On the basis of these two premises the author assigns to the secular ruler the highest position in the Church: the king has to institute priests and transmit to them, by virtue of his sacramentally established right, both the administration of Church property and the power to govern God's people; he summons and directs councils; in general he presides over the Church as *pastor, magister, custos, defensor, ordinator, liberator.* Cf. the treatises IV–V in *MGLiblit* III, 662–79, 684–86.

The process of the separation of *Regnum* and *Sacerdotium* took its time. If the early mediaeval "two-in-oneness" of the two powers, only functionally distinct and understood as if they were professions, was now slowly replaced by the sharper antithesis between two powers directly from God and ruling autonomous spheres of public law, the West still had to travel a long stretch before being confronted at the beginning of modern times with the ontologically distinct communities of Church and state. Despite a progressive decay, the unity of the *ecclesia universalis,* or *christianitas,* overlapping and embracing both spheres of law, remained throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a basic fact of social and political life.

Before the Investiture Controversy the German Emperors, in spite of the indifferent or even negative attitude generally assumed outside Germany, had somehow represented the unity of the West. Afterwards they continued to insist that they were the leaders of Christendom, at least within the secular sphere, but the change that had meanwhile come over the West made their claim ever more questionable. The *regna,* growing stronger from the twelfth century and concerned for their autonomy, allowed the Emperor merely an honorary precedence but no encroaching jurisdictional power. And his relationship to the Roman Church had been reversed in the Investiture Controversy: the Emperor thereafter possessed no further rights over the

---

[3] F. Kern, *Gottesgnadentum,* 94–120, 213–16; M. Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges* (Strasbourg 1924); P. E. Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich,* I (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1960), 145–55; id., *Geschichte des englischen Königtums,* 122–26. It is no accident that the first evidence for cures of scrofula by French and English Kings and for oil from heaven are from the early twelfth century. On royal curing powers, cf. K. Hauck, "Geblütsheiligkeit" in *Liber Floridus, Festschrift für P. Lehmann* (St. Ottilien 1950), 187–240. On the "law-centred kingship" of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see the impressive treatment by H. E. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton 1957), 87–192.

Pope, but the Pope did over the Emperor, who stood in need of anointing and crowning and was obliged to protect the Roman Church. What the brilliance of the *Imperium* had hitherto eclipsed now emerged into full light: the unity of the West was based ultimately on the common faith and on membership in the same Church. This foundation gained from the time of the reform an entirely new solidity through the supranational unification of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the constructing of a common canon law recognized in all Christian countries. Thus the Church became the real bearer, and the papacy at her head became the leader, of Western Christendom.

Not only the supranational extent of his jurisdiction but also the nature and manner of his exercise of power lifted the Pope far above Emperor and kings. While it took a long time in most kingdoms before the power of the state adequately permeated the feudal classes to reach every subject more or less directly, the papacy had it easier from the start. Its jurisdiction extended not merely to the bishops and through them to their diocesans, but also directly to each individual Christian. Priests, monks, and lay persons turned this to account from the beginning of the twelfth century by taking their legal cases to Rome, directly or by appeal.

And if there was a secular field of law, always acquiring greater independence, still pre-eminence belonged to the spiritual field of law. The always valid principle of the Catholic doctrine of the state, whereby state and society are bound by the divine and the moral law and the interpretation of this law pertains to the Church, could not but have a much more powerful impact in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries than would be possible today. The dependence of the secular sphere of law was then so extensive that royal decrees which contradicted canon law in important matters could be declared null by the Church. In this way the Church's influence extended far into what was earthly. The Church laid down the norms for fundamental problems of human social life, for example, for the lawfulness of interest, of commercial profit, or of levying taxes. Marriage cases were subject to her authority almost exclusively; likewise, the oath, then so important for public and private life, from which the Church alone could dispense in specific cases. The educational system and many institutions of charity were under her control. Sharing responsibility for the welfare of the Christian people, the Church had always taken an interest in peace among the faithful to the extent that she was able to compete with the secular authorities. The peace initiative which the French clergy had assumed since the beginning of the eleventh century was taken up by the reform papacy under Urban II; laws dealing with the Peace of God were proclaimed at general synods. In the succeeding period the Popes took a further step: they sought from time to time to make peace among warring princes and not rarely were even invited to do so by at least one of the parties.

Finally, the Church's penal and coercive power acquired an unusually great importance. Excommunication and interdict, now decreed even against kings, produced a considerable effect in the course of the legal situation that was being stabilized. It was all the greater in that since Frankish times excommunication also involved consequences in civil law.[4] Although these prescriptions were not always observed, especially if they concerned princes, they were still recognized in principle in the secular sphere of law and were applied in their entirety against the heretics who spread so alarmingly from the twelfth century; here ecclesiastical and secular penal authority united for a pitiless struggle. During the reform period the Church had also gained the right to defend the interests of Christendom with arms: in other words, she had decisively expanded the *potestas coactiva materialis,* which had earlier belonged to her only in the lesser degrees of corporal punishment, such as the imposition of fasting, chastisement, incarceration of clerics and monks. The highest forms of penal authority were at that time comprehended under the image of the sword. While, then, the Church had previously possessed only the *gladius spiritualis* — excommunication, anathema — she thereafter wielded also the *gladius materialis* in the sense of the right to compulsion by war, either by summoning the secular rulers to use the material sword proper to them or by virtue of her own authority, as it were by the handing over of the material sword that belonged to her, calling knights and other laymen to arms.[5] How this portentous extension of the Church's coercive power arose out of causes conditioned by the age will appear from the history of the origin of the First Crusade in the next chapter.

The papacy's spiritual and political power of leadership, based on the primacy and embracing all of Christendom, was reinforced by particular secular-political rights. Thus, with the formation of the Papal State in 756 was gained the political autonomy of the Roman Church, which, while it was curtailed by the Frankish and German Emperors and by the Roman nobility, was never actually suppressed and in the reform period acquired a new importance in so far as the Roman Church's consciousness of freedom no longer tolerated any political dependence. Regardless of the complicated legal situation and of the resistance of the Roman Commune that originated in 1143 and of the Hohenstaufen Emperors, the papacy claimed full political sovereignty over Rome and the *Patrimonium* — the expression "regalia beati Petri", appearing in 1059, is most probably to be explained thus[6] — and realized it, at first slowly, then after centuries definitively. The seeking of autonomy had been expressed in the eighth century not merely in territorial demands but also in the assumption of imperial insignia and honorary rights; a justification, so to speak, had been found for both in the *Constitutum Constantini*. The reformers, headed by Gregory VII, hence acted quite logically when, for proof of the quasi-imperial, or politically independent, position of the Pope, and, in this regard, for his pre-eminence over all other bishops, they referred to the *Constitutum Constantini*. (In regard to territorial claims, however, its use in the reform period is disputed, except in the case of Urban II, who once appealed to it in regard to Corsica and Lipari.[7]) As a matter of fact, in papal ceremonial thereafter the imperial honorary rights mentioned in the forgery played a greater role than formerly, especially the tiara and the scarlet mantle. In the twelfth century the mantle became the most important symbol in the investiture of a newly elected Pope, while the tiara, adorned from time immemorial with a ring-like gold trimming, gained no new function but did acquire a greater symbolic value in the course of the growing spiritual-political authority of the Pope.[8]

---

[4] See E. Eichmann, *Acht und Bann im Reichsrecht des Mittelalters* (Paderborn 1909).

[5] See the fundamental studies of A. Stickler, "Il potere coattivo materiale della Chiesa nella riforma gregoriana secondo Anselmo di Lucca" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 235–85; id., "Il gladius negli atti dei concilii e dei Romani Pontefici sino a Graziano e Bernardo di Clairvaux" in *Salesianum* 13 (1951), 414–45; id., "Il gladius nel registro di Gregorio VII" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 89–103. That the Church here acquired a new right follows only from the vehement discussion which went on from Gregory VII and which C. Erdmann describes in *Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 212–49. What H. Hoffmann, "Die beiden Schwerter im hohen Mittelalter" in *DA* 20 (1964), 78–114, adduces against Stickler cannot detract from the new right of the Church mentioned above in the text, for the problem which he discusses concerns the quite different question of whether and to what extent, according to the teaching of churchmen, the king received from the hands of the Church the material sword which he wielded. If Hoffmann again adduces the many texts based on the traditional political Augustinianism of the Middle Ages, he is completing in a way deserving of gratitude the chiefly juridical source material used by Stickler, but he probably paid too little heed to the fact that the Augustinian texts are preserved very ambiguously and hence have been quite variously interpreted by the industrious canonists who were interested in them in the second half of the twelfth century. Cf. Kempf, "Kanonistik und kuriale Politik im 12. Jahrhundert" in *AHPont* 1 (1963), 11–52.

---

[6] J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, II (1869), 303f. For the claim to sovereignty appeal was frequently made to the *Constitutum Constantini;* see H. Löwe, "Kaisertum und Abendland" in *HZ* 196 (1963), 542–44.

[7] *Jaffé* 5448, 5449; *ItalPont* III 320; on the problem as such, cf. L. Weckmann, *Las Bulas Alejandrinas de 1493 y la teoria política del Papado medieval. Estudio de la supremacía papal sobre islas 1091–1493* (Mexico 1949); against this island theory, cf. J. Vincke in *ZSavRGkan* 67 (1950), 462–65.

[8] The tiara, called *phrygium* in the *Constitutum Constantini,* was taken directly from the Byzantine imperial ceremonial and was used by the Popes as an extraliturgical symbol of authority to be worn in specified processions; thus J. Deér, "Byzanz und die Herrschaftszeichen des Abendlandes" in *ByZ* 50 (1957), 420–27, is probably correct in his contention against P. E. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen,* 51–98, who preferred to derive the tiara from the imperial *camelaucum*. A substantial break-through in the history of the papal tiara, which Klewitz, "Die Krönung des Papstes" in *ZSavRGkan* 61 (1941), 96–130, would like to fix for 1059, has probably not been made as yet. In the procession on *Laetare* Sunday the Popes from Leo IX bore a golden rose, which they then usually gave away; cf. A. H. Benna, "Zur kirchlichen Symbolik: Goldene Rose, Schwert und Hut" in *Mitteilungen des Österr. Staatsarchivs* 4 (1951), 54–64. Connected with the Pope's quasi-imperial position was his right to elevate to royal rank, which the Popes from Gregory VII occasionally exercised without the Emperor; cf. H. Hirsch, "Das Recht auf Königserhebung durch Kaiser und Papst im hohen Mittelalter" in *Festschrift für E. Heymann,* I (Weimar 1940), 209–49.

The new self-awareness was expressed concretely: the emperor-like Pope began to pursue an independent state policy. Mention has been made earlier of the gaining of feudal suzerainty over the Normans of South Italy and of Gregory VII's attempt from the outset to attach politically to the Holy See as many countries as possible. Motivated by religious and political aims, Gregory still observed certain limits: he derived his demands, not from the primatial power, but from old juridical claims regarded as authentic and in the event of resistance let the matter drop. Hence it basically depended on the willingness of the princes whether they would enter into a relation of dependence with Rome; often enough they did so because they promised themselves political advantages as a result. Since England and Denmark were prepared only to pay Peter's Pence, and the feudal suzerainty over Croatia-Dalmatia, established in 1076, came to an end as a consequence of the union of Croatia with Hungary in 1091, the rights of the Roman Church outside Italy were restricted, on the one hand, to a few smaller territories, — the possessions of the Count of Provence, the County of Substantion with the bishopric of Maguelone, and the County of Besalú, — and, on the other hand, to Aragón and Catalonia.[9] Apart from the high tribute of 500 *mancusas* paid by Aragón — Catalonia paid only 30 *morabitini* — these acquisitions were of no great importance.

The papacy's international policy obtained an incomparably greater success in Italy. Gregory VII's claims to Sardinia and Corsica and to the Marches of Fermo and the Duchy of Spoleto were rather ineffective, it is true, and the great donation made by Matilda of Tuscany could not be taken possession of after the death of the Countess until the investiture of the Emperor Lothar III in 1136, but the feudal suzerainty over Norman South Italy continued, despite all difficulties, and for centuries to come influenced papal policy decisively. Interested originally rather in the armed protection afforded by the Norman vassals, which was necessary for the reform, the papacy was led ever more powerfully to the territorial viewpoint. The three stages of the rise of Norman power — at first the absorption of all earlier areas of political rule, then the feudal dependence of Capua on Apulia and thereby the limiting of direct Roman feudal suzerainty to the Duke of Apulia (1098), and finally the Norman Sicilian state created by Roger II from 1127 — presented the Roman Church with what were at times delicate problems. Unavoidable as the Italian territorial policy may have been, the Roman Church had to pay for it in the future with difficult struggles that would gnaw away at the religious substance.

---

[9] K. Jordan, "Das Reformpapsttum und die abendländische Staatenwelt" in *WaG* 18 (1958), 132f. assumes in both cases a transition from a relationship of protection to one of vassalage: according to him Aragón in 1068 entered into the protection relationship and in 1089 into vassalage, while Tarragona, belonging to the territory of the Count of Barcelona, acknowledged protection under Urban II but under Paschal II this was further developed and led to the feudal dependence of all Catalonia. J. Sydow in *DA* 11 (1954f.), 61, thinks that even after its extension to all of Catalonia in 1116 it was still only a relationship of protection.

The proper task, before which the feudal political and territorial policy retreated, continued to be the spiritual-political guidance of Western Christendom. Its difficulties were to preoccupy the papacy throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Their source lay in a situation that was in many respects unclarified. The Pope did not stand at the head of a universal state, despite what is still to be read in the history texts. The papacy never led the *ecclesia universalis,* or *christianitas,* to a tangible political unity, not even after the reform. The papacy's unifying power, which, besides, was more and more impeded by the establishing of the two legal spheres, rested on the ecclesiastical primatial power over the *populus christianus.* Since the *populus christianus,* because of the as yet unconsummated separation between Church and state, formed an ecclesiastical and at the same time an earthly social unity and hence sought to realize the specifically Christian values, not merely with spiritual forces that were rooted in the conscience and in ecclesiastical discipline, but also with secular-political measures, the Church's power streamed out into secular spheres also. Here, of course, it encountered limits. If at all times the ecclesiastical obedience which is based on the faith contains an element of the voluntary to the extent that faith cannot be forced, how much more, then, did the mediaeval papacy's power, taking effect in the secular sphere, depend on the good will of the faithful! Involved were rights which flowed only indirectly from ecclesiastical authority and for the most part were not even necessarily connected with the essence of the Church, and were therefore conditioned by the time. For example, the Pope could launch a crusade only if the laity answered his call. And hence, to the extent that the papal initiative embraced secular spheres, it was based, not on a real dominion, but on the living relationship, subject to the vicissitudes of the time, between the Pope as leader and the Christian people as his followers. The stronger the secular-political determination of kingship grew and the more it affected the people, the more was the spiritual-political will, attended to by the Pope, forced back to the relationship within the Church between *ecclesia congregans* and *ecclesia congregata.*

The papacy was again and again confronted with the question of how far to acknowledge the autonomy of the secular-political will and of its most important protagonist, the kingship. A decision was all the more difficult, since up to the late thirteenth century a justification of the state in natural law was lacking and the traditional teaching of political Augustinianism, which conceived the *regnum* only in its religious function, was not equal to the new uncertainty. Not a few investigators are even of the opinion that the Church of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries succumbed completely to the Augustinian ideas. According to them, she wanted Western Christendom oriented exclusively to the spiritual-political goal, conceded no autonomy whatsoever to the secular-political will, and hence, from Gregory VII to Boniface VIII, staunchly defended a hierocratic claim. Their thesis, however, does not square with the facts. A readiness to acknowledge the secular-political will of kingship, to the extent that it put forward genuine rights, was in no way lacking to the Church. Effective in the Concordat of Worms, it grew stronger in the succeeding period. From the time of the reform the relationship of the Church and of the papacy to Christendom was determined not merely by a hierocratic but also by a dualistic ingredient. The next volume will show how the cooperation and the opposition of the two elements proceeded in the uncommonly agitated twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Chapter 51

The Papacy, the Holy Wars, and the First Crusade

The papacy may be said to have assumed the leadership of Western Christendom with the First Crusade, but this was only the result of a long and by no means uniform development. Even though in earlier periods Popes, bishops, or abbots had occasionally summoned to arms for resistance to Vikings, Magyars, or Muslims, still war as such was reserved to the King. Only with the turn of the tenth to the eleventh century did the Church acquire a new relationship to war, especially through the movement, originating in France, of the Peace and the Truce of God. Compelled to self-defence, spiritual lords not infrequently conducted "holy wars" against violators of the peace.

But there also took place a transformation in the military class, the knights. There appeared a Christian ethos of knighthood, which obliged to the armed protection of churches and of oppressed fellow-Christians and hence to tasks which had hitherto been allotted to the crown. That new forces were here in readiness was discovered when the *Reconquista* began again in Christian Spain soon after 1050, reached its climax with the taking of Toledo in 1085, and was then checked by the Almoravids, coming from Africa. For from 1064 French knights took part in these struggles, which they looked upon as holy wars. Their aid became greater after the defeat of Alfonso VI of Castile at Sagrajas in 1086 and thereby, so to speak, readied France for the idea of a crusade. The Normans of South Italy were motivated by similar ideas and not merely by desire of conquest when, under the leadership of Count Roger I, they set about wresting Sicily from Islam. And the attack successfully made in 1087 on the North African pirate city of Mahdiya by the Pisans in alliance with Genoa, Rome, and Amalfi, had a crusade-like character.[1]

---

[1] On the *Reconquista,* see Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Hanover 1960), 2606–20; for the share of the French, ibid., 1720–25; on the whole question, Erdmann, *Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 51–106.

These pregnant ideas that were spontaneously making their appearance here and there were taken up by the reform papacy, which bound them together and eventually directed them to the Orient. Leo IX established the first contact when he turned the holy war, already familiar to him from Toul, to the goals of the reform, unmistakably in the little noticed proceedings against the Tusculans in 1049 and then in the large-scale campaign against the Normans "for the liberation of Christendom".[2] The enterprise failed, but the idea triumphed, despite the opposition of Peter Damiani and other reformers, and under Alexander II it acquired radiating force. No holy war was then waged in which the papacy did not have some share. The French knights who in 1063 made ready for the Spanish war for Barbastro obtained from Alexander II the first known crusade indulgence. Count Ebolus of Roucy submitted his plans for the Spanish campaign, and Alexander sent the banner of Saint Peter, which had meanwhile made its appearance, to Count Roger for the struggle in Sicily, to Duke William of Normandy as he was preparing to cross over to England, and to Erlembald, the gallant leader of the Milanese *Pataria*.

It did not matter whether the war was against unbelievers or Catholics — its religious goal was decisive. In fact, under Gregory VII the holy wars within Christendom for the benefit of the reform came entirely into the foreground and received a specifically hierarchical stamp through the idea that he entertained of an international *militia sancti Petri*. Great successes were, of course, denied Gregory; in fact, his militant outlook aroused opposition, and there ensued a lively discussion as to whether the Church or the Pope may wage war at all. This caused Anselm of Lucca to ponder the problem more deeply. Following Augustine, he expounded the lawfulness of the defensive war and the moral and religious principles to be observed in connection with it, and from this position defended the Church's right to prosecute her faithless members. He thereby laid the ground for the future teaching, developed by Gratian and the decretists, on the Church's power of material coercion in the sense of the right to armed force.[3] The expansion here present of the ecclesiastical *potestas coactiva materialis* did not really take effect for the moment, since it was applied to the pursuit of opponents of reform, branded as heretics and schismatics, and was very quickly blended with Gregory's struggle against Henry IV. So complex an initiative, calling forth opposition even from the well-intentioned, was not capable of carrying away the masses of knights or of finding support in the entire clergy. But once the papacy turned the pent up energies of Christian knighthood from crusades within Christendom to one against the infidel, it could be sure of a response on a broad front.

---

[2] For the period from Leo IX to Gregory VII, see Erdmann, *op. cit.* 107–211.

[3] Erdmann, *op. cit.* 212–49, deals with the discussion as such; the juridical problem is pinpointed by A. Stickler (see footnote 5 of the preceding chapter).

It was precisely this change that was made by Urban II. While he did make use of weapons at the beginning of his pontificate, he soon renounced this means. On the other hand, he had no hesitation about promoting with all his energy the holy war against Islam. The crisis of the age induced him to this: Christians had been forced to the defensive in both the Orient and Spain. Urban regarded the western sector as so important that he forbade Spaniards to take part in the crusade in the Orient. His special concern was for the rebuilding of strategically important Tarragona; in 1089 he granted for this work the same remission of ecclesiastical penance that was attached to a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

Gregory VII had already planned a crusade for the liberation of the Eastern Christians, which was to help in liquidating the Schism. As a matter of fact, the Christian East was in an extremely critical situation since the great victory of the Seljuk Turks over the Emperor Romanus IV at Manzikert in 1071. Little by little, virtually all of Asia Minor came under Seljuk rule. The capable Emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081–1118) could not exert himself because the Patzinaks were threatening Constantinople. In his distress he tried to hire as many Western knights as possible. Thus in 1089–90 he induced Robert the Frisian, Count of Flanders, who was returning home from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to send him 500 knights.[4] Hence it suited him very much when Urban II, soon after his election, began negotiations for union. These were encouraged by Alexius, who for his part asked for troops. Urban promised them but at first was unable to send any. Although the Emperor contrived to exorcise the threat from the Patzinaks by a brilliant victory in 1091, in 1095 he again had his request submitted to the Pope at the Council of Piacenza, according to the trustworthy report of Bernold of Sankt Blasien. Confident of his enhanced prestige, Urban now proceeded to take action: at Piacenza he called upon Christian knights to defend the Eastern Church. But this was only the overture. Once in France, he took the real step after rather long preparation by issuing the summons to the First Crusade at the Council of Clermont on 27 November 1095.

Just how Urban II reached this portentous decision is disputed. While the invitation at Clermont certainly went beyond that of Piacenza, it cannot be shown that the Pope first conceived the idea of a crusade in France and thought at Piacenza only of sending mercenaries. In certain respects the idea of aid in the form of a crusade was already in his mind at the time of his first contact with Alexius I in 1089–91. As early as 1089 he had, at least for the reconstruction of Tarragona, connected defence against the Muslims and pilgrimage to Jerusalem, two elements of decisive importance for Clermont, and in the same year he declared his intention of going to France. Possibly, then, he went there in 1095 with intentions long under consideration. At first he sought out Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy and conferred with him, since this prelate knew the East from a journey he had recently made to Jerusalem. When the summons to Clermont proceeded from Le Puy, the decision had probably been taken. Urban then met Raymond de Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse and Marquis of Provence, in order to gain him for the enterprise. Apparently he was counting on a relatively small army of knights of the Midi. His expectations were to be greatly surpassed. The fire kindled in Clermont became a conflagration that blazed up and spread to all of France and elsewhere.[5]

---

[4] F. L. Ganshof, "Robert le Frison et Alexis Comnène" in *Byz(B)* 31 (1961), 57–74.

So far as the motivating ideas are concerned, the secret of the success lay not only in the concept of Christian knighthood and struggle, developed during the previous century and already made use of in the war against pagans, but also in the taking up of the notion of pilgrimage. The journey to Jerusalem had been the tacit desire of many Christians from time immemorial; it freed one from all other penitential obligations. But penitents who were pilgrims were not allowed to bear arms. On the other hand, at the Council of Clermont Urban granted the same full remission of the canonical penalties that was gained by pilgrims to Jerusalem, and hence he proclaimed for the first time the idea of the armed pilgrimage. Its propaganda force would probably have remained limited if persons had adhered to the Clermont decree, whereby the armed pilgrimage was merely a commutation for the penitential exercises imposed by the Church, understood in the sense of the customary so-called "redemption". However, the preaching of the crusade, now getting under way and increasingly eluding the supervision of the Church, probably disregarded the moderate decree of the Council and held out to the crusaders the prospect of a plenary indulgence, that is, the remission of all penalties for sin that were to be expected from God either in this life or in the next, and in this connection there may well have been mention occasionally of forgiveness of sins in a quite crude way.

By means of the spontaneously germinating notion of the indulgence, which was to cost the theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries much sweat until it found its speculative solution in the doctrine of the Church's treasury of merits, the crusade acquired an immeasurable religious worth in the eyes of the faithful.[6] Its danger lost its terrors all the more as persons began to look upon death occurring in it as a kind of martyrdom. The association of expedition and pilgrimage was at once expressed symbolically, especially in the cloth cross which the knights even at Clermont had sewn to their garb; this was the sign of the crusade vow, a religious obligation, and at the same time the military symbol of an army resolved to fight. There also appeared a common battle cry, "Deus le volt", and a new ritual blessing, which added the sword to the old pilgrimage symbols that were retained, the staff and wallet. Inherent in all these forms was a special publicity value.

---

[5] For Urban's journey to France, see A. Becker, *Papst Urban II.* (Stuttgart 1964), 213–25, who assumes that Urban first conceived the idea of a crusade in France.

[6] This explanation follows H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), 31–46. Mayer convincingly attacks the almost universally defended view that at Clermont a plenary indulgence was proclaimed (*Mansi* XX, 815, c. 2). He also rejects Erdmann's thesis that in Urban's mind the idea of war against infidels, waged by the Church and knighthood, was in the foreground, while the notion of the pilgrimage came in only by accident. On indulgences, cf. A. Gottlob, *Kreuzzugsablass und Almosenablass. Eine Studie über die Frühzeit des Ablasswesens* (Stuttgart 1906); N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter,* 3 vols. (Paderborn 1922f.); B. Poschmann, *Der Ablass im Lichte der Bussgeschichte* (Bonn 1948).

If Urban, with a keen psychological instinct, strongly emphasized Jerusalem as the goal of the expedition, this by no means meant that he was concerned only for the holy city or the holy sepulchre. (At that time there was as yet no mention of the Holy Land.) Rather he clung steadfastly to the original purpose of liberating Eastern Christianity from the Turkish yoke. This referred not exclusively but to a great extent to the Byzantine world; the Pope intended to remain true to his promise of help to Alexius, although the nature and manner of the supplying of aid turned out quite differently from what the Emperor had desired. Selfish power projects envisaging the gaining of territories were probably remote from Urban's mind; in fact, at Clermont he specified that the churches of the conquered lands should be under the rule of the conquerors.[7] No one could deprive him of the essential success: when, disregarding the kings and relying only on his apostolic authority, he summoned the knights to the holy war and found so powerful a response that for the first time in Western history a supranational army set forth for the defence of Christendom, he became the spontaneously recognized leader of the Christian West. The contact that the reform papacy had made with the Christian knights took effect fully now for the first time and led necessarily to a special crusaders' law. Ecclesiastical legislation extended the Peace of God and the protection of the Church to the goods of crusaders; on the part of the Church encouragement was given to the effort to free the possessions of participants from taxes for the duration of the crusade; and even a moratorium on debts was provided for.

The leadership of the enterprise by Pope Urban should have been expressed visibly in the person of the Papal Legate, Adhémar of Le Puy, who was entrusted with the political direction, while the military command was originally intended for Raymond de Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse.[8] Both arrangements foundered in the swelling crusading movement. Since, besides Raymond, other great princes also took the cross and set out with their own troops, the single command failed to materialize of itself; Raymond was merely the commander of his own troops. The slack organization also caused

---

[7] Erdmann, *op. cit.* 322f.

[8] J. H. and L. L. Hill, *Raymond IV de Saint-Gilles 1041 (1042) – 1105* (Toulouse 1959); Mayer, *Bibliographie,* 1963–65.

Adhémar's eclipse. His function was restricted rather to the spiritual care of one contingent, for Urban had clearly provided a chaplain with spiritual jurisdiction for each of two other units and hence had in a sense made them legates also.[9]

Although the direction of the entire undertaking slipped from the Pope's hands, he continued to be the supreme authority for the crusaders. But Urban had no influence on the crusade movement of Peter the Hermit of Amiens.[10] One of those wandering preachers of penance who held up to the people the ideal of the *vita apostolica et evangelica,* Peter began right after Urban's appeal to arouse his followers in central and northwestern France for the armed pilgrimage. The time was more favourable than ever. Religious excitement of the masses, now probably enhanced by eschatological ideas,[11] and economic difficulties, especially among the peasantry, had built up the hope of a better life to a high degree of intensity. This tension was relaxed by Peter's summons to go to the holy city of Jerusalem with a force such as the West had never yet experienced. The mob that followed him, consisting overwhelmingly of the lower strata of the population, received so many reinforcements *en route* through Germany, from the Rhineland, Swabia, and elsewhere, that from April to June of 1096 there set out from 50,000 to 70,000 persons, including women, in five or six large batches successively. Religious fanaticism and rapacity in the uncontrolled masses led to frightful persecution of Jews in German Free Cities and in Prague.[12] Only the first two contingents, travelling via Hungary and Bulgaria, reached Constantinople. The crowds that followed, incurring hatred because of their plundering and other deeds of violence, were almost totally exterminated in Hungary. The Emperor Alexius at first received the new arrivals amicably but had so many unhappy experiences with them that he quickly transported the troublesome guests to Asia Minor. Instead of waiting for the knights, they attacked the Turks concentrated around Nicaea, against the advice of Peter of Amiens, Fulcher of Orléans, and some nobles, and as a consequence, with few exceptions, lost either life or freedom.

Urban II's appeal had been directed to knights of military experience; they were to make careful preparations for the expedition up to 15 August and then set out. Of the many noble lords who took the cross the princes were, of course, the most prominent. Each collected for himself a more or less large fighting unit. Thus in the summer a whole series of army divisions set out by different routes: either via Hungary and Bulgaria or via Italy and the Balkan peninsula, reached by ship, to Constantinople. Large armies were led by Duke Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia, son of Count Eustace of Boulogne and nephew and heir of Godfrey the Hunchback of Lower Lotharingia,[13] and by Count Raymond of Toulouse, while the brother of the French King, Count Hugh of Vermandois, to whom Urban delivered a banner of Saint Peter at Rome, Bohemond of Taranto, a son of Robert Guiscard, and Duke Robert of Normandy, Count Stephen of Blois, and Count Robert of Flanders, who travelled together, disposed of smaller units.

---

[9] H. E. Mayer, "Zur Beurteilung Adhémars von Le Puy" in *DA* 16 (1960), 547–52; Mayer, *Bibliographie,* 1936–41; J. Richard, "La papauté et la direction de la première croisade" in *Journal des savants* (1960), 49–58.

[10] H. Hagenmeyer, *Peter der Eremit. Ein kritischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des 1. Kreuzzugs* (Leipzig 1879); Mayer, *Bibliographie,* 1924–35.

[11] The eschatological motives were pinpointed in the important work by P. Alphandéry – A. Dupront, *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade,* I (Paris 1954); cf. also the restrictive remarks of Mayer, *Kreuzzüge,* 17–19.

[12] E. L. Dietrich, "Das Judentum im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge" in *Saeculum* 3 (1952), 94–131.

Alexius found himself in the greatest perplexity. His situation had improved. Following his victory over the Patzinaks in 1091, he had succeeded in inflicting a decisive defeat on the Cumans in 1095 and would now have been able to attack the Turks in Asia Minor, since with the death of Malik Shah in 1092 their sultanate had begun to crumble. Hence he was interested in Western mercenaries, not in Western armies of knights under their own commanders. In an effort to secure himself adequately against his uninvited helpers, he forced the princes into political subordination, taking some of them, according to Byzantine custom, into the imperial family as sons and requiring of all the oath of vassalage customary in the West. As a matter of fact the princes, more or less reluctantly, did enter the vassalage bond, except for Raymond de Saint-Gilles, who agreed merely to an oath guaranteeing the life and possessions of the Emperor.[14]

A first success, achieved in association with the Greeks, was the conquest of Nicaea. The authority of the Turks, who had been called upon for relief and had been defeated, thereupon collapsed in that area. Accompanied by only a few Byzantine troops — the main Greek army now concentrated on the coastal lands — the crusaders moved through Anatolia, defeated the Turks at Dorylaeum on 1 July 1097, and later at Heraclea, and then broke into smaller units. The main army detoured via Caesarea in Cappadocia to Antioch, while Bohemond's nephew Tancred and Baldwin, brother of Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia, decided on conquests of their own. Baldwin acquired a wealthy lordship around Edessa. Antioch, the next tactical objective, cost the crusaders immense toil. Only after a seven months' siege were they able to occupy the city on 3 July 1098, and then they had to beat back a great Turkish relieving army. Since the princes regarded themselves as no longer bound by the oath sworn to the Emperor because of the meagre aid, and eventually no aid at all, rendered by the Greeks, each of them sought to gain territory for himself. Bohemond took Antioch. Byzantium had never got over the loss of this important city, which the Turks had not taken until 1085. After a long delay Raymond finally managed to get the crusaders moving toward Jerusalem. An offer of help by Alexius was repulsed: the crusaders intended to keep the districts to be conquered in Syria and Palestine. Jerusalem, which the Fatimids of Egypt had lost to the Seljuks first in 1070–71 and then in 1078 and had recovered in 1098, fell to the crusaders on 15 July 1099. The victors engaged in a frightful blood bath among the local Muslims.

---

[13] J. C. Andressohn, *The Ancestry and Life of Godefroy of Bouillon* (Bloomington, Ind., 1947); Mayer, *Bibliographie,* 1942–62; the other leaders, ibid. 1966–76.

[14] On the juridical bonds, cf. F. L. Ganshof, *Mélanges M. Paul - E. Martin* (Geneva 1961), 49–63.

Raymond de Saint-Gilles was first chosen ruler, but he declined; then Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia was elected. He did not assume the title of king but that of Guardian of the Holy Sepulchre. His juridical position was weakened by the claims to an ecclesiastical state, put forward by the new Patriarch of Jerusalem, Archbishop Daimbert of Pisa, in favour, not of the Roman Church, but of the patriarchate.[15] Godfrey died in 1100 and was succeeded by his brother Baldwin (1100–18), who put an end to all vacillation. He had himself crowned King and was otherwise able to consolidate his authority. The Frankish conquest spread to the interior as well as along the coast. Almost all the coastal cities had been taken by 1111; but Tyre held out until 1124 and Ascalon till 1153. The territory that had been acquired was broken down into four rather large states, united loosely under the King of Jerusalem: the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the County of Tripolis, the Principality of Antioch, and the County of Edessa. Their preservation and defence were to cost the West more heavy sacrifices. The very first years brought great losses. During and immediately after the crusade Western pilgrims and crusaders kept setting out, but the poorly organized expeditions almost all ended miserably. In the one year 1101 three great enterprises, conducted by Lombards, Germans, and the French, were completely annihilated by the Turks in Anatolia.

Thereafter the papacy had to assume the chief responsibility for the crusader states. This brought it an enhanced prestige and, with the crusade tithe introduced under Innocent III, also financial power, but at the same time it made the limits of papal influence much clearer on occasion. The unsteady ground on which the Pope stood as leader of Christendom was perhaps never made so clear as in the history of the crusades. Momentous as was the effect of the First Crusade on the Christian West and on the papacy, its full importance in Church history can only be estimated if the reaction of the Byzantine world is understood. This will be treated in the next volume.

---

[15] J. G. Rowe, "Paschal II and the Relation between the Spiritual and Temporal Powers in the Kingdom of Jerusalem" in *Speculum* 32 (1957), 470–501.

CHAPTER 52

The "Vita Evangelica" Movement and The Appearance of New Orders

From about the middle of the eleventh century the religious state began to differentiate itself once for all. There is no doubt that the Gregorian reform contributed to this change, occasionally by direct intervention, but basically it was a spontaneous religious movement, which had its own prehistory and its own dynamics. It has already been noted how, from the beginning of the eleventh century, there gradually emerged a critical attitude *vis-à-vis* the wealthy monasteries and chapters that had been incorporated into the economic and political system of feudalism. In the final analysis this was really the same striving as that of the reform papacy, struggling for the freedom of the Church, namely, the determination to return to the original *ecclesia apostolica et evangelica,* and the consequent protest against early mediaeval forms of life, stamped to a great extent by Germanic law. In the world of monks and canons this impulse was based especially on the idea of poverty.

To high-minded men it was no longer enough that the individual monk must possess nothing, whereas the monastic community could dispose of a large income. To them poverty meant the fullest possible renunciation of earthly assurances. And so, alone or with companions, they betook themselves to remote forests in order to be entirely free for God. They earned their livelihood by the work of their hands, as occasion demanded, turning sections of forest into arable and meadow. Their radicalism could go to the extent of maintaining that the possession of proprietary churches, of rights to tithes and altars and the like, was incompatible with monasticism and even of refusing documentary authentication of the land given them. In conflicts over possession they preferred to accept injustice rather than to institute a suit. Finally, their protest was directed against the grand-scale building activity which monasteries of the old type not infrequently displayed, the lavish decoration of monastic churches and the costly vestments and vessels; their own dwellings, oratories, and churches were kept poor and bare.

This movement, spreading ever further in the second half of the eleventh century, was not represented by monks alone. The principle of poverty had already been related in patristic times to clerics, with reference to the primitive community at Jerusalem, and in particular cases had been put into practice, for example by Augustine. And even if the Aachen rule for canons of 816 allowed private ownership, the stricter interpretation was not forgotten and in the eleventh century acquired an arousing force. It is difficult to determine when and where individual canons began to institute a genuine *vita communis* with renunciation of private ownership; the meagre sources point overwhelmingly to Central and North Italy. As early as the Roman Synod of 1059 Hildebrand became their spokesman and, sharply criticizing the Aachen rule, demanded personal poverty for all canons. So radical an attack, of course, had little effect; the reform had to come from below. And in fact from time to time more canons adopted the principle of poverty and thus appeared as a special group, called canons regular, in contradistinction to the older type of canons who clung to private property. But the striving for evangelical and apostolic poverty urged to still more resolute efforts. Even diocesan clerics now sought out the *eremus*.

If till then the ideal of the *vita evangelica et apostolica* had been oriented to the poverty of cenobites or hermits, toward the end of the century it acquired a broader meaning. As Christ, with the Apostles, went from place to place to proclaim the Kingdom of God and called no place his own where he could lay his head, this most extreme self-denial for the sake of the Gospel was now translated into action by isolated monks, clerics, and hermits.

The relations between monastic centres and the laity changed considerably in the eleventh century. Since the monasteries of the older type maintained a manorial economy, they were involved, with their servants and maids, their serfs, rent-paying peasants, and vassals, with the most varied strata of the population. A special position was occupied by the so-called half-*conversi*, pious folk who settled on the edge of the cloister, renounced parts of their rights of ownership, and led a quasi-monastic life. From them emerged the institute of lay brothers during the eleventh century, especially at the instigation of hermits of Saint Romuald's type and of the Vallombrosans.[1] The cause of this new form, which flourished powerfully in the twelfth century, is to be sought in the progress toward sterner asceticism, which, in addition to monks and clerics, also embraced lay persons and prepared them to undertake poverty, celibacy, and claustral discipline as serving brothers. As a favourable circumstance was added the striving of not a few of the new communities to work their own property themselves. Such a goal could scarcely have been achieved without lay helpers living the monastic life. Basically at stake here was a spiritual concern — the more effective isolation of the cloister from the world.

This world-fleeing characteristic, however, in no way impeded an influence on the lay persons living outside. On the contrary, the very hermits and the cenobitic proponents of a stricter asceticism were in a much closer contact with the broad masses of the people than were the monasteries of the older order. To an ever greater degree their ideals appealed to the restless lay folk. Mention has already been made of the popular religious movements before and during the Gregorian reform. It will suffice here to single out the *Pataria* as an example. What it undertook against clerical incontinence and simony was done every bit as implacably, though without recourse to weapons, by the founder of Vallombrosa, John Gualbert; the *Pataria* knew this and hence requested the dispatch of Vallombrosan monks. In France and Lower Lotharingia there occurred a perhaps even closer *rapprochement* of ascetics and populace. The faithful penetrated even into the *eremus* to be edified and have their souls tended to or even to settle there. Conversely, protagonists of the *vita apostolica et evangelica* did not hesitate to leave the cloister and preach to the assembled people, sharply attacking abuses. Thus there appeared itinerant preachers toward the close of the century. How powerfully they influenced the masses was shown by the unfortunate crusade initiative of Peter the Hermit of Amiens.

---

[1] K. Hallinger, "Woher kommen die Laienbrüder?" in *Analecta S. O. Cist.* 12 (1956), 1–104; also printed separately as a book (Rome 1956). On p. 97 cf. the discussion of "conversus": It was used for two entirely different classes, namely, on the one hand, authenticated from the sixth to at least the fifteenth century, for those full-fledged monks who, in contradistinction to the *oblati* or *nutriti*, entered the monastery as mature men, and on the other hand for the rising number of lay brothers in the eleventh century. These latter were not monks in the proper sense. Even if they, for the most part, made the monastic renunciations, they did not make monastic vows until the fourteenth century.

Like many other itinerant preachers, Peter the Hermit acted without any ecclesiastical commission. No wonder that the bishops exerted themselves to correct the chaotic system of preaching. From the viewpoint of logic alone, the movement could only be neutralized by the founding of new preaching Orders, but apparently the time was not yet ripe for this, and so itinerant preaching more and more became an illicit activity, exercised by heretics. In general, within the orthodox Christian sphere the feverish search for new forms of the *vita apostolica et evangelica* slowly ceased. From time to time there emerged from the process of fermentation more clearly sketched, new religious communities, which adopted fixed customs, while other foundations did not cling to their original *élan* and reverted to the old monastic or canonical institutes. The situation was somewhat stabilized in the third decade of the twelfth century.

Differentiation in Monasticism

The search beginning in various places for new forms was not occasioned, apart from individual cases, by evil living on the part of the traditional monasticism, for this, thanks to the renewal in progress since the tenth century, was on the whole on a considerably high level.[2] Monastic centres such as Saint-Victor de Marseille and Cava dei Tirreni expanded especially after 1050. Similarly, the abbey of La Chaise-Dieu in the diocese of Clermont, founded in 1043 by the hermit, Robert de Tourlande, and to a great extent already filled with the new spirit, flourished and quickly developed into a distinguished congregation. Cluny reached its zenith at the same time under Saint Hugh (1049–1109). Its usages found entry into England, Lotharingia, and Germany, partly by the direct, partly by the indirect route. Thus the Piedmontese monastery of Fruttuaria, belonging to Saint-Bénigne de Dijon, communicated its own Cluniac stamp to the German abbeys of Siegburg and Sankt Blasien in 1068–70, which in turn became monastic reform centres. Still greater importance was gained by the abbey of Hirsau, revived in 1065, as soon as it adopted under Abbot William (1069–91) the reform ideas of Gregory VII for questions of principle and the *consuetudines* of Cluny for monastic daily life. In its steep rise, which it is true lasted only a few decades, Hirsau, with its many monks, lay brothers, and other adherents of both sexes, loosely bound to it, became not merely a centre of monastic strength but a bulwark and refuge of the Gregorian reform, struggling against clerical incontinence, simony, lay investiture, and royal theocracy. Even itinerant preachers proceeded from Hirsau, though we can no longer determine precisely the content and extent of their propagandizing.

---

[2] For what follows, see the Literature for Chapter 39; P. R. Gaussin, *L'abbaye de La Chaise de Dieu* (Paris 1962); J. Semmler, *Die Klosterreform von Siegburg* (Bonn 1959); H. Jakobs, *Die Hirsauer. Die Ausbreitung und Rechtsstellung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites* (Cologne - Graz 1961).

The movement of the *vita evangelica* had been prepared to a great extent by the followers of Romuald, who were gathered together into congregations, on the one hand by Peter Damiani, prior of Fonte Avellana, and on the other hand by the hermits at Camaldoli. The Florentine John Gualbert took a different route. Dissatisfaction with the lax spirit in the abbey of San Miniato, which he had entered in 1028, and opposition to the simony of his Abbot and of the Bishop of Florence drove John out of the monastery and the city and caused him to seek out hermits, including those of Camaldoli, until 1036 when he established himself at Vallombrosa. There he formed a cenobitic community with his companions. In his own lifetime, and hence up to 1073, there came into existence a group of daughter houses. A cenobitic manner of life, characterized, however, by eremitical austerity, the formation of lay brothers, a relentless antisimoniacal propaganda, which reached its peak in the ordeal by fire in 1068 of the Vallombrosan monk, later cardinal, Peter Igneus[3] — all this gave to John Gualbert's foundation a special actuality of its own.

The new ideas had an even stronger effect in France and Lotharingia toward the end of the century. Two examples will suffice to indicate how varied the initiatives could be and how hard it was for them to endure in the long run.[4] The group that gathered around Eudes, *scholasticus* of Tournai, first adopted the life of canons, then that of Benedictines, in a later phase they subscribed to the radical ideal of poverty, and finally, rendered cautious by famine in 1095, they were content with the customs of Cluny; the whole development lasted from three to four years. Even more instructive is the story of the monastery of Afflighem in Brabant. Founded in 1083 as a hermitage by six penitent robber knights and attached to a hospice for travellers and those seeking safe escort, the colony developed quickly, under Abbot Fulgentius, appointed in 1088, into a large community, consisting not only of monks but of male and female lay *conversi.* Fulgentius (d. 1122) and the first generation followed the strict idea of poverty, including the rejection of the possession of churches or *villae,* but under the pressure of the younger recruits they had to revert slowly to the customs of traditional monasticism.

---

[3] In addition to G. Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo* (Rome 1960), see Chapter 41, footnote 7.

[4] C. Dereine, "Odon de Tournai et la crise du cénobitisme au XI^{e} siècle" in *RAM* 3 (1947), 137–54; id., "La spiritualité 'apostolique' des premiers fondateurs d'Afflighem 1083–1100" in *RHE* 54 (1959), 41–65. The powerful influx of lay persons which Afflighem experienced is to be observed in many new eremitical foundations and occasionally even in new Benedictine monasteries, such as Hirsau; often the itinerant preachers were responsible for it. E. Werner, *Pauperes Christi* (Leipzig 1956), *passim,* would like to derive it from the economic

Only the more important of the new foundations can be singled out here from the complicated profusion. When Stephen of Thiers (d. 1124), founder of the Order of Grandmont,[5] sought the solitude of Muret near Limoges and gathered disciples around him, he was basically influenced, with regard to the community that came into existence in 1080–81, by the impressions gained when he had lived in the society of Calabrian hermits. To a great extent he rejected the forms of Western monasticism. He did not allow landed property, herds of cattle, rents, and proprietary churches, and the Gospel was for him the sole norm of monastic life; his sons were to be called neither canons nor monks nor hermits, and they were to seek their task in nothing but penance. Although Stephen did not dispense with a type of profession and choir service and hence with a certain organization of the community into monks and lay brothers, still the strongly lay characteristics of his rudimentary constitution brought it about that the lay brothers occupied a leading position, which eventually produced strife. Much as Stephen scrupulously avoided fixed constitutional forms, he must have created a living monastic spirit. Supported by it, the community, which moved to nearby Grandmont, was able to condense its unique character in a rule under the grand prior Stephen of Liciac (1139–63) and develop into an esteemed Order.

Quite different was the origin of the Order of Fontevrault.[6] Its founder, the diocesan priest, hermit, and itinerant preacher Robert of Arbrissel (d. *ca.*

---

and social situation and from class hostilities; he here touches a very important point, but the danger of perverting the picture through ideological prejudices is not always avoided; cf. the critical remarks of H. Jakobs, *op. cit.* 190–95, in regard to Hirsau.

[5] J. Becquet, "Étienne de Muret" in *DSAM* IV, 2 (1961), 1504–14; articles by the same author in *RMab* are important: 42 (1952), 31–42 (institutions); 43 (1953), 121–37 (the first reports); 46 (1956), 15–32 (the first customs); also in *Bull. de la Soc. archéol. et hist. du Limousin* 87 (1958), 9–36 (rule).

[6] R. Niderst, *Robert d'Arbrissel et les origines de l'ordre de Fontevrault* (Rodez 1952); cf. also J. Buhot, "L'abbaye normande de Savigny" in *MA,* third series, 7 (1936), 1–17; L. Raison – R. Niderst, "Le mouvement érémitique dans l'ouest de la France à la fin du XI^e^ siècle et au début du XII^e^ siècle" in *Annales de Bretagne* 55 (1948), 1–46.

1117), had such an effect on the masses that many men and women, on fire for the evangelical life, constantly accompanied him. In order to lodge them, he established double monasteries, which, shortly before his death, he united into a congregation under the direction of the first foundation, Fontevrault (1100–01). He entrusted the supreme direction to the Abbess-General: as Christ on the cross had once committed his beloved disciple to the Mother of God, so the monks of the Order, as new beloved disciples, were to be in the maternal keeping of the Abbess. From a like union of eremitical and itinerant preacher motives, but without the female element, proceeded other Orders: that of Tiron, founded by Bernard of Abbeville (d. 1117), that of Savigny, founded by Vitalis (d. 1122), and that of Cadouin, founded by Gerald of Salles (d. 1120).

Whereas itinerant preaching exercised only a passing and isolated influence on the monastic movement, *eremus* and evangelical poverty had an enduring power of attraction. Even at the end of the period here under consideration, the two ideals led in Italy to the founding of the monastery of Pulsano in Apulia in 1120 by John of Matera (d. 1139) and of Montevergine (1124) and other South Italian and Sicilian monasteries by William of Vercelli (d. 1142). Pulsano and especially Montevergine became centres of Orders.[7] But to what extent the centre of the movement was then in France is apparent from the history of Chartreuse and Cîteaux.

La Grande Chartreuse owed its origin to the diocesan priest Bruno, originally from Cologne. Around 1056 he assumed the direction of the philosophical and theological studies at the cathedral school of Reims, but he ran foul of Archbishop Manasses of Reims and of his successor and was thereby strengthened in his desire to abandon the world. For a short time he stayed with Abbot Robert at Molesme, but he then went with some companions into the solitude of Lêche-Fontaine. He soon left here with six friends and around 1084 began to live again as a hermit in the valley of Chartreuse. The founding of an Order or the like was not envisaged, and the community might even have broken up entirely when in 1090 Bruno had to obey the call of Pope Urban II, his former pupil, and go to Rome. A year later the Pope allowed him to look again for a solitude in South Italy. In the wooded district of La Torre in the diocese of Squillace he established the hermitage of Santa Maria dell'Eremo, into which in 1097–99 he incorporated the cenobitic daughter house of Santo Stefano in Bosco for sick companions.

That every trace of Bruno's earthly work — he died in 1101 — was not lost was due less to the hermits of La Torre than to those of Chartreuse, especially to the important Prior Guigues de Chastel (d. 1137), who in 1128 fixed by rule the way of life established by Bruno and probably further developed it. What characterized the Carthusian Order, which spread slowly and within a modest range, was the peculiar combination of the eremitical and the cenobitic form, an extreme austerity, which, however, was linked with a healthy instinct for what was endurable, and finally an organization corresponding to the goal, in which the two achievements of the age — the institute of lay brothers and the Cistercian constitution — were made use of. Here the spirit by which the poverty movement of the eleventh century was animated found a particular but so authentic expression that it has continued to the present in the Carthusians in its original strictness without any substantial mitigation and, a unique fact in the history of religious Orders, has never needed a reform.

---

[7] Penco, *Monachesimo in Italia,* 248–58; L. Mattei Cerasoli, *La congregazione benedittina degli eremiti di Pulsano* (Badia di Cava 1938); G. Angelillis, "Pulsano e l'ordine monastico pulsanese" in *Arch. stor. Pugliese* 6 (1953), 421–66; G. Mongelli, *Abbazia di Montevergine, Regesto delle pergamene,* 5 vols. (Rome 1956f.); A. Tranfaglia, "Montevergine" in *L'Italia benedittina,* ed. by P. Lugano (Rome 1929), 379–439.

Like Chartreuse, Cîteaux too proceeded from a love for solitude and for a stricter poverty but with a far closer adherence to the Benedictine cenobitic tradition. The founder, Robert of Molesme (ca. 1028–1112), had lived as a monk since his youth in several Benedictine monasteries without finding contentment. Even the abbey of Molesme, which he founded with some hermits in 1075, moved into the old feudal pattern as a consequence of increasing property, and so in 1098, with twenty like-minded companions, Robert left in order to build a new reform monastery in the wilderness of Cîteaux near Langres. He did not make much progress. In 1099, at the order of the papal legate, Hugh of Lyons, he returned to Molesme, but his disciples continued his work, within modest limits under Abbot Alberic (1099–1109), with growing success under Abbot Stephen Harding, an Englishman (1109–33). The individual stages of development can be determined more or less surely only when the research that has recently been in a state of flux has been concluded. That from the beginning Cîteaux opposed the traditional Benedictinism was nothing new. The renunciation of proprietary churches and of the letting out of monastic property, connected with an economy of dues and rents; the principle, supplanting the preceding, of economic operation conducted by oneself, which the adoption of the institute of lay brothers fostered; the necessity present in time-consuming manual labour of restricting the far too extended choral service of the Cluniacs and other branches; the principle of poverty, related to clothing, table, church, and its adornment — this programme linked the Cistercians to many other, in some cases older, communities. And yet they succeeded in outstripping all the monastic reform centres that were striving for the *vita evangelica* and in eclipsing the traditional monasticism headed by Cluny.

Cîteaux owed its rise especially to three circumstances: to its location in Burgundy, where a community representing the new ideas could establish itself *vis-à-vis* Cluny and the many other monasteries of the older type only with difficulty unless it had an aggressive spirit; to the entry, probably in

1112, of Bernard of Clairvaux, a charismatically gifted genius, who brought along thirty companions, the first fruits of his future impassioned recruitment; and to an elastic constitution, combining centralization with a relative autonomy of the monasteries. This constitution was based rather early on two main supports that were to be completed later: on the organic union between mother and daughter monasteries, with the duty of visitation by the abbot of the mother house, and on the annual general chapter at Cîteaux, the supreme authority for supervision and legislation. The growth of the Order will be treated in the next volume.

The Canons Regular

The spread of the canons regular — their origin has already been discussed — occurred in various ways. The most obvious idea was that of inducing the old communities, especially in the cathedral chapters, to renounce private ownership. Bishops or canons, especially in Italy and the Midi, and individuals elsewhere too, notably Archbishops Conrad of Salzburg and Norbert of Magdeburg, pushed this reform, but naturally with varying and often slight success. The situation was much more favourable if the canons who had opted for poverty withdrew and founded houses of their own. This happened everywhere. Existing houses not infrequently assisted houses that were being established to get over their first beginnings. Common customs, association of prayers, or even juridical dependence produced bonds that were sometimes loose, sometimes intimate. Additional recruits came from diocesan clerics, who sought out the desert and there formed communities. Some of them, it is true, went on to become monks, such as Bruno of Cologne, Vitalis of Savigny, and Gerald of Salles, already mentioned. But others, including Norbert, the founder of Prémontré, adhered to the *ordo canonicorum*. To enumerate all their many foundations would be tedious. But the powerful, even though overrated, flowering of the Premonstratensian Order showed how very much this initiative was in harmony with the time. A final group originated in lay communities, which in the course of time became chapters of canons regular as their lay element became more and more eclipsed. Their origin was often connected with the aim of lodging travellers on dangerous or deserted routes and, if necessary, of escorting them. The most celebrated example is the hospice on the Great Saint Bernard, the origin of which is still obscure.[8] Pilgrim routes became especially important, and canons regular acquired particular merit for their protecting of the pilgrimage to Santiago.

In contrast to Western monasticism, which possessed a Benedictine tradition that had applied to almost all monasteries since the eighth and ninth centuries, the canons regular still had to define their way of life more exactly.[9] From the closing decades of the eleventh century the rule of Saint Augustine is repeatedly mentioned as its basis, but more recent research has shown that this must be understood relatively. In the first phase of their development, the canons regular appealed to a multilayered wealth of tradition: the Aachen rule of 816, which, referring to the Acts of the Apostles, they amended in favour of the principle of poverty; conciliar decrees and patristic writings, including Augustine, especially the so-called *Regula ad servos Dei* (often called *Regula tertia* in the literature[10]); his sermons on the life of clerics; and his own *vita* by Posidius. Thus arose between 1070 and 1130 those statutes of the canons regular that were soon known as the *ordo antiquus*. If we disregard the rule, formerly ascribed to Gregory VII, whose authenticity has recently been denied,[11] they are characterized by wise moderation. For the most part still unpublished, they need further investigation. Only some of their authors are known. Ivo of Chartres compiled an *ordo* for Saint-Quentin de Beauvais, as did Peter de Honestis, prior of Santa Maria Portuensis at Ravenna, for his house and its congregation. A far more popular *liber ordinis* originated at Saint-Ruf in 1100–10.

---

[8] L. Quaglia, *La maison du Grand-Saint-Bernard des origines aux temps actuels* (Aosta 1955); A. Donnet, *Saint Bernard et les origines de l'hospice du Mont-Joux* (Saint-Maurice 1942).

But these usages were not in accord with the ascetical severity which the eremitically inclined canons regular observed. Their efforts to draw up their own *consuetudines* found an Augustinian basis of tradition in the so-called *ordo monasterii* or *Regula secunda*. Since the ascetics there found confirmation of their ideas of manual labour, fasting, abstinence, and so forth, there appeared among them the notion that this was the original rule of Augustine. Probably first used at the beginning of the twelfth century at Springiersbach in the diocese of Trier, and from there transmitted to Prémontré, the text acquired great importance. Relying on it, the eremitically living canons regular opposed to the previous practice, or *ordo antiquus,* an *ordo novus* and thus started a controversy like that between Cistercians and Cluniacs. Then mixed forms were developed in the immediately following period.

---

[9] For what follows, see Dereine in *DHGE* XII, 386–91; C. Dereine, "Coutumiers et ordinaires des chanoines réguliers" in *Scriptorium* 5 (1951), 107–13; addenda, ibid. 13 (1959), 244–46; A. Carrier, *Coutumier du XI^e siècle de l'ordre de Saint-Ruf en usage à la cathédrale de Maguelone* (Sherbrooke near Quebec 1950); J. Leclercq, "Un témoignage sur l'influence de Grégoire VII dans la réforme canoniale" in *StudGreg* VI (1959–61), 173–227; P. Pauly, "Die Consuetudines von Springiersbach" in *TThZ* 67 (1958), 106–11; J. Siegwart, *Die Consuetudines des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes Marbach im Elsass* (Fribourg 1965).

[10] Editions of the *Regula ad servos Dei* and of the *Ordo monasterii* (mentioned in the next paragraph) in *PL* 32, 1377–84; *PL* 66, 995–98 (= *PL* 32, 1449–52); D. de Bruyne in *RBén* 42 (1930), 320–26, 318f.; J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London 1950), 274–79, 273f.; Jordan of Saxony, *Liber Vitasfratrum*, ed. by R. Arbesmann – W. Hümpfner (New York 1943), LXXVI–LXXX, 485–504; concerning Augustine's authorship there has recently been a lively discussion, which has probably not yet been completed; on it cf. the critical report on the literature in J. C. Dickinson, *op. cit.* 255–72, in which Hümpfner's position (in the above mentioned edition of Jordan of Saxony) is not taken into consideration.

[11] C. Dereine, "La prétendue règle de Grégoire VII pour chanoines réguliers" in *RBén* 71 (1961), 108–18.

A further tension-loaded element sprang from the problem of the care of souls.[12] If the Aachen rule was directed principally to the choral liturgy and claustral discipline, this basically monastic feature could not but be even stronger among the canons regular, especially since many of them sought solitude. On the other hand, the inner understanding between the heralds of the *vita apostolica* and the laity involved in the religious movement led to explicitly pastoral contacts and even to itinerant preaching. Furthermore, the new chapters not infrequently obtained proprietary churches, so that the question to be answered was whether the canons regular were themselves to assume the care of souls there or were to employ diocesan priests. Many older chapters, moreover, were attached to urban parishes, and the canons at the cathedral had to undertake specific tasks of the diocesan administration. Should not the idealistic fervour permeating the canons regular be used for the urgently necessary reform of the care of souls? Various answers were forthcoming. Among both the bishops and the canons regular there were voices that regarded the ascetical principle of flight from the world as irreconcilable with pastoral activity, while others maintained that no one was better qualified for pastoral labours than the canon regular, a view shared by the reform papacy. Both views were carried into practice. In Italy and France the contemplative principle was adhered to, though not exclusively, whereas on German soil it was without difficulty combined with pastoral work.

At least at the outset the types of canonical organization displayed a great diversity.[13] Reformed chapters of canons, for example, had an organization differing from that of new eremitical or hospital foundations. In these last the lay element, consisting of *conversi* or even of *conversae,* could play an important role. If women took part, double monasteries were formed, and the male element, whose superior was usually called abbot in France, prior in Italy, and provost in the Empire, was ordinarily divided into canons and lay brothers. Here, then, were no essential differences from the Benedictine monasteries. The same was true of the forming of congregations.

---

[12] C. Dereine, *DHGE* XII, 391–5; F. J. Schmale, "Kanonie, Seelsorge, Eigenkirche" in *HJ* 78 (1959), 38–63; C. Dereine, "Les chanoines réguliers dans l'ancienne province ecclésiastique de Salzbourg d'après les travaux récents" in *RHE* 43 (1948), 902–16; id., "Le problème de la cura animarum chez Gratien" in *Studia Gratiana,* II (Bologna 1954), 305–18. The problem of the care of souls was discussed at the time precisely in connection with monks; see P. Berlière, "L'exercice du ministère paroissial par les moines dans le haut moyen âge" in *RBén* 39 (1927), 227–50; P. Hofmeister, "Mönchtum und Seelsorge bis zum 13. Jahrhundert" in *SM* 65 (1953f.), 209–73; R. Foreville – J. Leclercq, "Un débat sur le sacerdoce des moines" in *SA* 41 (1957), 8–111; C. Violante, "Il monachesimo cluniacense di fronte al mondo politico ed ecclesiastico" in *Spiritualità cluniacense,* 197–227.

[13] Dereine in *DHGE* XII, 389–401; for the individual communities, cf. ibid., from column 379 on, *passim,* as well as Heimbucher and Cottineau; in addition, P. Pauly, *Springiersbach. Geschichte des Kanonikerstifts und seiner Tochtergründungen im Erzbistum Trier von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Trier 1962).

Without entering into the juridical structure of the individual groupings, which in many cases still needs clarification, the most important centres of congregations for the period here dealt with were: in Italy, Santa Maria in Portu at Ravenna, whose founder, Peter de Honestis, died in 1119, the Lateran Canons Regular, Santa Maria del Reno at Bologna, and San Frediano at Lucca; in France, Saint-Ruf at Avignon, probably going back to 1038–39, Saint-Quentin de Beauvais, Saint-Victor de Paris, founded by William of Champeaux around 1110, and Arrouaise in the diocese of Arras (1090); in Germany, Rottenbuch in the diocese of Munich and Freising (1079), Marbach near Colmar (1087), and Springiersbach in the diocese of Trier (before 1107). All were to be eclipsed by the Premonstratensian Order, founded by Saint Norbert.

Norbert of Gennep (c. 1082–1134), scion of a noble family from the lower Rhineland, quite early became a canon at Xanten and soon after a royal chaplain at the court of Henry V. At a moment of extreme peril he underwent a complete change of life and, after receiving the priesthood in 1115, began to work as an itinerant preacher, in Germany until 1118, then in France, where he was authorized to preach by Pope Gelasius II. The claim that Calixtus II did not renew the permission in 1119 and obliged Norbert to join a congregation is at least unprovable. It is true that, at the request of the Bishop of Laon, Norbert undertook the reform of the local chapter of Saint-Martin and, when he failed, sought in 1120 a solitude not far away, where he founded Prémontré, but changes of this sort were by no means unusual for an itinerant preacher. It was only in 1121 that the eremitical life at Prémontré acquired a more stable form through the adoption of the canonical manner of life and was thereafter organized in the sense of the *ordo novus*. Though Norbert again and again went out as an itinerant preacher until his elevation to the archbishopric of Magdeburg in 1126, Prémontré, which became a double monastery because of the reception of *conversae*, retained its contemplative and ascetical character. In the daughter houses that soon appeared, however, the pastoral element frequently obtained greater recognition, especially in Germany. In any case, a preaching Order in the strict sense did not proceed from Prémontré, even though preaching was exercised in particular places, such as the Saxon "circaries".

The history of the Premonstratensians shows unmistakable parallels to that of the Cistercians. Both groups quickly spread, although the ideas they represented were not original with them. Prémontré was only one among many eremitically oriented canonicates, but in its founder, Norbert, it possessed an outstanding personality, as Cîteaux did in Bernard of Clairvaux.

An unconditioned devotion to religion, coupled with the charism of impassioned preaching, a will keenly intent on a goal, and intimate relations with nobles, princes, Emperors, and Popes provided Norbert with an uncommonly powerful influence. When he went to Magdeburg in 1126, the continuation of his work was assured. In the same year Honorius II confirmed the Order, which Norbert's pupil and friend, Hugh de Fosses, Abbot-General of Prémontré (1129–61), happily developed further, borrowing from the organizational form of the Cistercians but without adopting the notion of filiation.

The Military Orders

The above-mentioned communities, especially those composed of laymen, which were interested in conducting hospices and in caring for pilgrims, answered not merely an urgent need of the West. More than ever, Christians were seeking the Holy Land, ever since its recovery by the crusaders, and wanted to be taken care of there. From the effort to supply them with aid emerged the Templars and the Hospitallers.

Hugh of Payens (d. 1136), a knight from Champagne, joined with eight companions in 1119 in a religious community obliged to poverty, chastity, and obedience, with the added duty of providing armed protection to pilgrims *en route* from Jaffa to Jerusalem. Since Baldwin II of Jerusalem housed them in the royal palace, the so-called Temple of Solomon, the name "Templars" came to be applied to them. In their manner of life they conformed to the canons regular. The early difficulties were overcome when Hugh of Payens visited France and interested Bernard of Clairvaux. With the latter's help a religious rule was decided on at the Synod of Troyes in 1128 and the Patriarch Stephen of Jerusalem supplemented it in 1130. Bernard's propaganda — he composed for this purpose *De laude novae militiae ad milites Templi* — assured the Order a powerful growth.[14] Directed by a grand master, it was divided into three classes: knights, serving brothers, and chaplains. The more the crusade states had to maintain themselves against Muslim attacks, the more were the Templars, and soon also the Hospitallers, employed as an always available militia for their defence. This circumstance alone procured for the Templars rich gifts in all countries of the West and made them a powerful international society, conversant with finance, independent of the King of Jerusalem and of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, especially since the Holy See granted them important privileges of exemption.

Somewhat different was the history of the founding of the Hospitallers. Around 1070, and hence before the First Crusade, merchants from Amalfi, resuming earlier attempts, had founded a Christian hospital in Jerusalem and dedicated it to the Alexandrian Saint, John the Almoner, who was later unobtrusively supplanted by Saint John the Baptist. Intended for the care of the sick, the community acquired an enhanced contemporary significance after the First Crusade, under its masters, Gerard (d. c. 1120) and Raymond du Puy (1120–60). In East and West, and especially in France and the Italian port cities, arose foundations and excellently managed hospitals. Privileges of exemption granted by Popes and testimonies of favour on the part of lay persons gave the community a growing prestige. To the care of the sick was added from 1137 the duty of armed border patrol. This made the Hospitallers explicitly a military Order, divided, like the Templars, into three classes: knights, brothers, and chaplains. The hospital work was almost entirely turned over to the brothers. The new development was completed in the statutes, drawn up around 1155, and based on the life of canons regular.

---

[14] P. Cousin, "Les débuts de l'ordre des Templiers et Saint Bernard" in *Mélanges Saint-Bernard* (Dijon 1954), 41–52; Bernard's treatise is in *PL* 182, 921–40.

The period treated here meant an epoch-making change in the history of religious Orders. The concept of *vita apostolica et evangelica,* which caused the older forms of monachism to withdraw into the background, which broke the monopoly of the monks and set up Augustinian canons and lay communities beside them, retained its dynamic force. It assured the new Orders, especially the Cistercians and Premonstratensians, a brilliant development but without being bound to them. When, toward the close of the twelfth century, their fervour cooled, the *vita apostolica* again became a problem. It found the long desired up-to-date expression in the mendicants.

CHAPTER 53

The Beginnings of Scholasticism

The difficulties already set forth in regard to canon law were true to an even greater degree in philosophy and theology. The more the scholars, attached to tradition, sought to appropriate the intellectual treasures that had come down to them, the more pressing became the question of how to reconcile the differences and contradictions that were brought to light there. Even in the Carolingian period the heterogeneous material in tradition had occasionally evoked violent discussions, but the problem of methodology became more and more familiar to Western scholars only from the eleventh century. It found its solution in scholasticism.

Among the dynamic forces of the time, dialectics played a decisive role. Some of its protagonists began to travel about in the eleventh century. Thus, the Milanese cleric, Anselm of Besata, after finishing his studies under the philosopher Drogo at Parma, went from Lombardy to Burgundy and from there to Germany, finally entering the chancery of Henry III. His *Rhetori-*

machia, a curious work on rhetoric and dialectics, composed around 1050 in an affected style, treats, among other things, the principle of contradiction in so inflated and inadequate a manner that it has a painful effect. Other dialecticians had even more self-confidence. They attacked theological questions with their meagre philosophical equipment; dogmas of faith, such as the virgin birth of Christ, his redemptive death, and his resurrection or the immortality of the soul were syllogistically destroyed. Their model may have been the objections raised by Marius Victorinus in his commentary on Cicero's *De inventione,* written before his conversion.[1] How widespread this skeptical and frivolous attitude was cannot be determined, but in any event it was strong enough to call forth an antidialectical opposition in the ecclesiastical camp.

One of the spokesmen of the opposition was the Benedictine, Otloh of Sankt Emmeram at Regensburg (d. 1070). Doubts about faith, which must have cost him a great deal during his studies before he entered the monastery, moved him to a radical return to the Bible, the Fathers, and hagiography. He did not absolutely repudiate secular knowledge but frankly regarded it as not permitted to monks and sharply rejected the tendency to prefer Plato, Aristotle, or Boethius to the teaching of the Church. The canon regular Manegold of Lautenbach (d. 1103) was even more severe with secular knowledge. In his *Opusculum contra Wolfelmum,* which is based on the commentary of the Neoplatonist Macrobius on the *Somnium Scipionis,* he sought to show that the teachings of Macrobius, Pythagoras, Plato, and of the Aristotelian logic were sophistry and error, irreconcilable with Christian doctrine and a danger to salvation. In his view the dogmas of faith destroyed the ancient philosophy.

To a great extent Manegold depended on Peter Damiani (d. 1072), and, as a matter of fact, the ardent superior of the hermits occasionally did make use of weighty arguments.[2] He cared nothing for dialectical skill in proofs, once called grammar a work of the devil, warned against the *artes liberales,* which should be termed *stultitiae* rather than *studia,* and preferred to regard all human efforts for wisdom as foolish in the final analysis. To him the absoluteness and transcendence of God were above everything. They tolerated no limitation on the part of human understanding. Even the law of contradiction — Peter pushed it as far as the question of whether God could undo something that had been done, such as the founding of Rome — could not be applied *vis-à-vis* God's unlimited omnipotence. The last mentioned postulate, untenable in itself and advanced even by Peter with obvious hesitation, must not be taken seriously. That there is here discerned the danger of a double truth, as Endres holds, is an only too logical deduction which is not in keeping with Peter's thought. The whole attitude of the so-called antidialecticians must be estimated with the same caution. It in no sense consisted of absolute negation. Otloh applied dialectics to theological problems, though quite clumsily; Manegold referred expressly to the harmony between philosophy and faith, especially in ethics and the doctrine of virtue; and the warnings of Peter Damiani were meant chiefly for his hermits, to a lesser degree for the laity, and not at all for the diocesan clergy, for whom he even required a solid scholarly formation. His real concern was for the right order between the secular and the spiritual, philosophy and theology; philosophy — and here he took up an old idea — was to exercise the serving function of handmaid to theology. However, it is correct that Peter, Otloh, and Manegold contributed little to a realization of this concern. As childish as the use of dialectics may often enough have been, it was not to be stopped. The course of the Eucharistic controversy provides a clear example.

---

[1] See J. de Ghellinck, "Réminiscences de la dialectique de Marius Victorinus dans les conflits théologiques du XI^e^ et XII^e^ siècles" in *RNPh* 18 (1911), 432–35.

[2] The evidence for what follows is in F. Dressler, *Petrus Damiani,* 175–85, 200–04; for the work on the principle of contradiction, see the Sources for this chapter; the passage on philosophy as the *ancilla theologiae, PL* 145, 603 C–D.

The Eucharistic controversy did not come about by chance. The Western Church lacked a uniform Eucharistic doctrine summarizing the patristic tradition, such as John Damascene (d. c. 750) had worked out for the Eastern Church. It would have been all the more desirable in that the incompleted initial efforts of the Latin Fathers pointed in two directions. One group, going back to Ambrose, stressed rather the changing of bread and wine into the Lord's body and blood, while another group, with Augustine, gave special prominence to the dynamic symbolic power of the Sacrament, which incorporates the faithful into Christ and into the mystical body of the Church. The two viewpoints led in the Carolingian period to the doctrinal controversy, already mentioned, between the realistic and metabolistic outlook of Paschasius Radbertus and an Augustinian-oriented opposition, headed by Ratramnus. This theme engaged especially Rathier of Verona and Heriger of Lobbes in the tenth century. Though Heriger took pains with a synthesis of realism and symbolism, he basically followed Paschasius Radbertus, whose explanation pretty generally established itself in the course of time.[3] However, it was not entirely satisfactory. Since Paschasius had identified the Eucharistic and the historical body of the Lord without more precisely explaining the Eucharistic species, his teaching could and probably did promote a grossly materialistic "Capharnaitic" interpretation.

A reaction did not fail to show itself. A pupil of Fulbert of Chartres, Berengarius (d. 1088), since 1029 *scholasticus* at Tours and at the same time archdeacon of Angers, sought to restore the dynamic symbolic teaching of Augustine to prominence. The ensuing discussion differed from that of the

---

[3] In addition to J. Geiselmann, *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* (Paderborn 1926), 267–81, cf. J. Lebon, "Sur la doctrine eucharistique d'Hériger de Lobbes" in *Studia mediaevalia in hon. R. J. Martin* (Bruges 1948), 61–84.

Carolingian period, on the one hand by the much greater use of dialectic thought, progressing at times even to metaphysics, and on the other hand by the broad and deep effect which it produced: the problem never set the theologians free until it had been essentially clarified. Even in the first phase of the struggle Berengarius had to contend with a whole group of equal or even superior opponents.[4] In addition, the official Church intervened. His doctrine was condemned by Leo IX at the Synods of Rome and Vercelli in 1050 and by the Synod of Paris in 1051. On the other hand the Council of Tours in 1054, presided over by the legate Hildebrand, accepted Berengarius's explanation that the body and blood of Christ are present after the consecration. In 1059, however, Berengarius was forced at the Roman Synod to sign a formula drawn up by Humbert of Silva Candida, in which the Lord's body contained in the consecrated bread was described crudely[5] as: "sensualiter manibus tractari vel frangi aut fidelium dentibus atteri".

This introduced the second phase of the controversy. Ten years later Berengarius submitted the formula and the doctrine on which it was based to a comprehensive dialectical criticism and moved into a radically spiritualistic symbolism. The consecrated bread is body in so far as it is image, sign, pledge of the real body; it awakens a remembrance of Christ's Incarnation and Passion and leads the mind that reposes in these mysteries to mystical union with the Lord. The bread remains bread even after the consecration; that is, the substance appears in the accidents, they are the coconstitutive principle of form. In the last mentioned argument Berengarius directed the debate to the metaphysical, but without having correctly understood the Aristotelian basic ideas that he used — *materia, forma, accidens, substantia.* Nor did his opponents yet know their real meaning. Hence their achievement is to be all the more highly esteemed in that, undertaking the speculative way on their own, they explained the process of change ever more clearly in the sense of a transubstantiation. Lanfranc (d. 1089) began the task, Guitmund of Aversa (d. c. 1095) completed the doctrine.[6] When in 1079 Berengarius was again summoned to Rome by Gregory VII, he had to swear to a formula of faith that was far better thought out: "[panem et vinum] substantialiter converti in veram et propriam et vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Iesu Christi".[7] The post-Berengarian period brought nothing basically new, but only an assimilation of the individual aspects, which then found their first systematic recapitulation in the school of Anselm of Laon (d. 1117).

---

[4] For the individual authors cf. Geiselmann, *op. cit.* 299–331.

[5] Lanfranc, *De corpore et sanguine,* II, in *PL* 150, 410 D.

[6] Geiselmann, *op. cit.* 365–75 (Lanfranc), 375–96 (Guitmund), 397–444 (the other writers); add Bernold of Sankt Blasien, *De veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini,* ed. J. R. Geiselmann (Munich 1936); J. Weisweiler in *Scholastik* 12 (1937), 58–93.

[7] *Registrum* of Gregory VII, VI 17a, No. 1, *MGEp sel.* 2, ed. Caspar, 425–27.

The papacy's playing an important role in the Eucharistic controversy shows again the concentrated strength of the Gregorian reform movement. However, what was involved was rather an indirect relationship. The controversy as such was not caused by the reform, and it was the theologians who decided it, while Rome supervised its course. The situation was quite different in regard to the discussion of holy orders, which has already been frequently mentioned in connection with specific synodal decrees; this proceeded directly out of the struggle over reform. The severe measures in regard to simonists, who were branded as heretics, and the numerous excommunications, especially those hurled against antipopes and their adherents, of themselves raised the very old problem of whether heretics or schismatics could confer valid orders at all. Since Cyprian had bluntly denied that they could and Augustine had held the contrary and both views had entered into the tradition of the Church, a sure orientation was lacking. The controversy waged over the Formosan ordinations had produced excellent works at the beginning of the tenth century, especially the writings of Auxilius, who was influenced by Augustine. In the 1050's Auxilius was used by Peter Damiani and by Humbert of Silva Candida; Peter agreed with him, whereas Humbert roughly rejected him.[8] Much as Peter's *Liber gratissimus* surpassed Humbert's *Adversus simoniacos libri III* in theological depth, he too left many points unresolved. The reason lay in the unsatisfactory state of sacramental theology. Clarification would come only with the doctrine, appearing in the twelfth century, of *character sacramentalis* and the later distinction of *sacramentum, sacramentum et res,* and *res sacramenti.*

Another circumstance that impeded a solution was the fact that, in addition to the power of orders, promotion to the priesthood and the episcopate also imparted a function to which jurisdiction was attached and that at the time orders and jurisdiction had not yet been clearly enough distinguished. Through the union of the power of jurisdiction with ordination and vice versa there belonged to the Church a decisive importance in so far as incorporation into her constituted the prerequisite for the effectiveness of the priestly function. By "Church" at that time was in no sense meant, as Sohm assumed, a community of love and grace existing only in Christ, but also a corporate body, defined in regard to jurisdiction.[9] It was not merely accidental that from about 1060 canonists especially were interested in the difficulty. They no longer presumed bluntly to declare simoniacal or schismatic orders invalid, but, by virtue of the distinction between the Sacrament, which ordination communicates, and the *virtus sacramenti,* the overwhelming number of them reached the view that, if a person no longer belonged to the unity of the Church, his ordinations would have to be regarded not merely as illicit but also as ineffectual, for he did not possess the Holy Spirit. They thus required for every simonist or schismatic who returned to the Church the traditional *impositio manuum,* which they regarded as a giving of the Spirit. Only a few, such as Bernold of Sankt Blasien, explained the primitive ceremony in the sense of a reconciliation.[10] For the moment matters remained in these modest and unsatisfactory initial doctrinal efforts.

---

[8] For Auxilius see Chapter 35, footnote 15; for the recourse to him by Peter Damian and Humbert, cf. Chapter 42, footnote 8.

[9] J. Fuchs, "Weihesakramentale Grundlegung kirchlicher Rechtsgewalt" in *Scholastik* 16 (1941), 496–520; H. Barion, "Ordo und regimen fidelium" in *ZSavRGkan* 77 (1960), 112–34; R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht,* 2 vols. (Munich–Leipzig 1923); id., "Das altkatholische Kirchenrecht und das Dekret Gratians" in *Festschrift für A. Wach* (Munich–Leipzig 1918); see in this regard G. Ladner, *Theologie und Politik vor dem Investiturstreit* (Baden bei Wien 1936), 130–32 (footnote 234) and Barion *(supra);* A. Schebler, *Die Reordinationen in der "altkatholischen Kirche"* (Bonn 1936), 215–81, does not perhaps do full justice to the problem; the same may be said of the controversy between F. Pelster in *Gr* 46 (1938), 66–90, and A. Michel in *RQ*

While a whole group of talented men were going to great pains about specific timely questions, partly in harmony, partly in disagreement, what was really essential was being accomplished far away from daily strife by a lone worker: with the effortless ease proper to the nature of a genius Anselm was raising the problem of philosophy and theology to a speculative height never reached since the days of John Scotus Eriugena. Born not far from Aosta in Piedmont in 1033 and educated by Benedictines, he left his home and after three years sought the monastery of Bec in Normandy in order to study under the very famous Lanfranc of Pavia.[11] In 1060 Anselm entered Bec as a monk and soon assumed the office of teacher. He became prior in 1063 and Abbot in 1078. His promotion in 1093 to the archbishopric of Canterbury involved him in the already described conflicts with the English Kings William II and Henry I. He died in 1109.

Like all Western theologians, Anselm steeped himself in the writings of Augustine especially, but in his case there was a genuine intellectual encounter based on congeniality of soul. The celebrated guiding principles which Anselm carefully proposed for the relations between philosophy and theology, between reason and grace, are basically Augustinian. He frankly admitted his ardent wish somehow to understand the divine mysteries within the limits set for man, but he wanted to know that it was always directed only to truths which his soul already believed and loved; he did not wish to understand in order to believe, but he believed in order to understand — "neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam".[12]

---

46 (1938), 29–39, *StudGreg* I (1947), 79–84, and of J. Gilchrist, "'Simoniaca haeresis' and the Problem of Orders from Leo IX to Gratian" in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law,* ed. S. Kuttner – J. Ryan (Vatican City 1965), 209–35.

[10] On the individual authors, cf. A. Schebler, *op. cit.* 235–98.

[11] Lanfranc, born *c.* 1010, prior at Bec in 1043, Abbot of Saint-Étienne de Caen in 1063, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1070 to his death in 1089. A. J. Macdonald, *Lanfranc. A Study of his Life, Work and Writing* (London 1926); D. Knowles, *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc* (Edinburgh 1951); see also Chapter 44, footnote 42.

[12] *Proslogion,* I in *PL* 158, 227.

The idea urged inner understanding so that, according to circumstances, facts became clear to the thinking believer which were invisible in the merely accepted truth of faith, which at times could even make the faith itself clearer. The movement, summarized by Anselm in the brief formula, *Fides quaerens intellectum,*[13] thus went really beyond faith and, faith always presupposed, ended in reason. This is able at times to clarify in its existence a truth belonging to the divine sphere and hence to establish it on *rationes necessariae,* while the inner, inaccessible nature of the divine mysteries presents itself to the investigating human mind merely in image, parable, and relationship of suitability.

Anselm's speculation, proceeding from faith as a matter of principle, knew no real separation between philosophy and theology. This should be especially kept in mind in regard to his works composed at Bec. Except for *De casu diaboli,* they were all concerned with questions which would today be assigned to philosophy — *De grammatico, Monologion, Proslogion, De veritate, De libertate arbitrii.* Two of them especially stand out. In the *Monologion* Anselm tried to prove the existence of God by means of cosmology. In so doing he used the category of causality less than that of participation; however, he did not continue in a Platonic character but progressed to the sovereign divine nature, standing above all participation. All things are contained in the inner utterance of God which begot the Eternal Word, before, during, and after their created existence; everything that has become is a copy of the divine Word.

The *Proslogion* leads even more deeply into Anselm's specific thought. It contains the much admired, much attacked, so-called ontological proof. The argument presupposes an idea of God that is immanent to human thought and hence from the outset it contains an existential factor. In this idea God confronts us as the greatest that can be thought of at all. But, continues Anselm, the greatest cannot be merely in our intellect, for then another could be thought of which would be greater in so far as it really existed outside our intellect. Hence, the greatest, that is, God, must be in our mind and at the same time in external reality. Attacked on serious grounds by a contemporary, Gaunilo, monk of Marmoutier, and defended by Anselm in *Liber apologeticus,* the argument has been put to one side among the scholastics since Thomas Aquinas and, outside scholasticism, sharply rejected by Kant especially, but it has decidedly attracted some modern thinkers, such as Descartes, Leibniz, and Hegel, and is again taken seriously today.

Toward the end of his life Anselm treated specifically theological questions. In *De fide Trinitatis et de incarnatione Verbi* he stressed the distinction between the divine nature and the divine Persons against Roscelin, who, on the basis of his problematic doctrine of universals, assumed in the

---

[13] This was the original title of the *Proslogion.*

Trinity "tres res per se separatim". The *De processione Spiritus Sancti* was produced in connection with Urban II's efforts for union. *De conceptione virginali et originali peccato* and *Cur Deus homo* deal with the mystery of the Incarnation. The second of these not only displayed Anselm's method to perfection. It also made obsolete the patristic and early mediaeval theory of redemption — that of a buying back of fallen humanity by Christ from the dominion of the devil — by the deep idea that Christ became man in order to make satisfaction for all mankind to the divine honour, outraged by sin. Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction was further developed by the great scholastics of the thirteenth century and was thus firmly incorporated into Catholic theology.

Anselm has rightly been called the Father of Scholasticism. It was he who, boldly and undismayed, showed his contemporaries how dialectics and metaphysical speculation could be applied to theological questions without violating the reverence due to mysteries of faith by rationalistic arrogance. Others emulated him in this, such as Bruno of Segni (d. 1123) in his *De Trinitate* and *De incarnatione Domini* and Eudes of Cambrai (d. 1113) in *De peccato originali*.[14] And a younger generation was even then ready to extend the movement that had just experienced its break-through, to deepen it, divide it up, and arrange it systematically. With them really appeared Early Scholasticism. Anselm decisively contributed to making this possible.

Probably none of the many fruitful initiatives of the age of the Gregorian reform so definitely transformed the medieval world as did the intellectual development just sketched. Entering the stage of alert awareness, Western man began to reflect on basic questions of his essential Christian existence. While he still always looked with reverence to the tradition handed down to him, he now applied more strongly the critically distinguishing reason in order to take vital possession of the inherited intellectual property, to come to terms with it, and thereby to press on to new knowledge. The more absolutely he pursued this course, the more the minds separated. In a struggle that never again came to rest the West was thereafter to experience drastically the tensions implied in its form of existence.

---

[14] Bruno of Segni in *PL* 165, 973–84, 1079–84; on him see B. Gigalski, *Bruno, Bischof von Segni, Abt von Montecassino* (Münster 1898); R. Grégoire, *Bruno de Segni, exégète médiéval et théologien monastique* (Spoleto 1965). Eudes of Cambrai in *PL* 160, 1071–1102.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY TO VOLUMES III AND IV

Section A contains various works, some of which also pertain to the history of the Eastern Church, e.g., works on the early councils, which are not repeated in Section B.

A. The Western Church

I. SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH

1. Ancillary Sciences

For aids to study (Chronology, Paleography, Libraries, Diplomatics, Archives, Heraldry, Geography, Cartography, and Statistics) see vol. I of this Handbook, 435–46.

2. Sources

A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii aevi, Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters bis 1500,* 2 vols. (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1896; reprint Graz 1954); L. J. Paetow, *A Guide to the Study of Medieval History* (New York, 2nd ed. 1931); C. W. Previté-Orton, *The Study of Medieval History* (Cambridge 1938); *Guide to Historical Literature*, published by the American Historical Association (New York 1960), contains much on medieval Europe and the Byzantine Empire, esp. 169–232; *Repertorium fontium historiae medii aevi, primum ab A. Potthast digestum, nunc cura collegii historicorum e pluribus nationibus emendatum et auctum,* ed. by Istituto Storico Italiano and the Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia et Storia dell'Arte in Roma (cit. *RepFont*); to date vol. I: *Series collectionum* (Rome 1962); U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen-âge:* biographical, 2 vols. (Paris, 2nd ed. 1905–7); id., topographical, 2 vols. (Montbéliard 1894–1903).

The following national sources are important because of their treatment of other territories: A. Molinier, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* 6 vols. (Paris 1902–06); Dahlmann-Waitz, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte,* ed. by H. Haering, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 9th ed. 1930–31), new printing in preparation; W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts,* I (Stuttgart-Berlin, 7th ed. 1904), II (Berlin, 6th ed. 1894); Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter.* Vorzeit und Karolinger, 4 fasc. prepared by W. Levison and H. Löwe, supplement by R. Buchner, *Die Rechtsquellen* (Weimar 1952–57); Wattenbach-Holtzmann, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, Deutsche Kaiserzeit,* I: (900–1125), previously in 4 fasc. (Tübingen, 2nd and 3rd editions 1948); K. Jacob – H. Hohenleutner, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1959–61), until 1250.

3. COLLECTIONS OF THE MORE IMPORTANT GENERAL SOURCES

J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina* (to 1216), vols. 1–217: Texts; 218–21: Indices (Paris 1841–64). *Suppl.* ed. by A. Hamman (Paris 1957 seqq.). Reference for new editions and catalogue of authors in *RepFont* I, 434–54; accurate catalogue of the papal sources by *Santifaller NE,* 57–62.*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (cit. *MG*), ed. by Deutsches Institut zur Erforschung des Mittelalters (various places of publication, 1826 seqq.). The chief series are: *Scriptores, Leges, Diplomata, Epistolae, Antiquitates.* A new small series contains political writings of the late Middle Ages, sources for the cultural history of the German Middle Ages and critical studies of texts, an index to all the works with a survey on the histories of the *MG,* bibliographical guide in *RepFont* I, 466–78. *Die Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit* (German translations from the *MG*), 104 vols. (various places of publication, 1847 seqq.), indexed in the *RepFont* I, 286–90; J. F. Böhmer, *Fontes rerum germanicarum,* 4 vols. (Stuttgart 1843–68), *RepFont* I, 102; P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum,* 6 vols. (Berlin 1864–73), *RepFont* I, 349; M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France. Rerum gallicarum et francicarum scriptores,* 24 vols. (Paris 1738–1904), new ed. by L. Delisle from vols. 1–19 (Paris 1868–80), *RepFont* I, 7–9; *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres: Chartes et diplômes relatifs à l'histoire de France,* 16 vols. (Paris 1908 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 3 seq.; *Recueil des historiens de France,* with the series: *Documents financiers, Obituaires, Pouillés, RepFont* I, 9 seq.; *Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades* and *Recueil des historiens des croisades,* the last collection with several series, *RepFont* I, 4–7; *Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et l'enseignement de l'histoire,* 51 vols. (Paris 1886–1929), *RepFont* I, 161–63; *Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France,* 134 vols. (Paris 1835 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 156–60; *Les classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-âge* (with accompanying translations), 25 vols. (Paris 1923 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 130 seq.; *Les classiques français du moyen âge,* 89 vols. (Paris 1910 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 131–33; L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores,* 25 vols. (Milan 1723–51), nuova ediz., iniziata da G. Carducci e V. Fiorini, continuata a cura dell'Istituto Storico Italiano, 34 vols. in 109 fasc. (Città di Castello, then Bologna 1900 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 510–22; *Istituto Storico Italiano per il medio evo, Fonti per la storia d'Italia,* 94 vols. (Rome 1887 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 272–74; *Regesta chartarum Italiae,* 34 vols. (Rome 1907 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 606 seq.; *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores,* ed. by the Master of the Rolls (cit. *Rolls Series*), 99 vols. (London 1858–96), *RepFont* I, 612–9; *Royal Historical Society, Camden Third Series,* 90 vols. (London 1900 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 629–31; *Medieval Classics,* since 1953 = *Medieval Texts* (with accompanying translations), 16 vols. (London 1949 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 413; collected sources for other lands in *RepFont* I.

4. COUNCILS, DOCTRINAL AND CANONICAL DECISIONS, CANON LAW

J. Hardouin, *Acta conciliorum et epistolae decretales ac constitutiones summorum Pontificum,* 12 vols. (Paris 1714–15), *RepFont* I, 317; J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 31 vols. to 1440 (Florence, then Venice 1759–98); new printing with continuation to 1902 by J. B. Martin, L. Petit, 60 vols. (Paris 1899–1927), *RepFont* I, 402–04; *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta,* ed. by Centro di Documentazione Bologna (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1962); H. Denzinger, A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (Barcelona–Freiburg, 33rd ed. 1965); C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus* (Tübingen, 4th ed. 1925 = 5th ed. 1934), somewhat one-sided but worthwhile. *Corpus Iuris Canonici,* most important editions: Editio Romana iussu Gregorii XIII (Rome 1582); Aem. Richter (Leipzig 1833–39); E. Friedberg, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1879–91); *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes,* ed. by Petrus Card. Gasparri, since vol. VII by Iustinianus Card. Serédi, I–VIII plus IX: *Tabellae* (Rome 1923–39).

Works on the history of the sources of canon law: A. van Hove, *Prolegomena.Commentarium Lovaniense in Codicem Juris Canonici* (Malines - Rome, 2nd ed. 1945); A. Stickler, *Historia iuris canonici,* I: *Historia fontium* (Turin 1950); P. Fournier – G. Le Bras, *Histoire des collections canoniques en Occident depuis les fausses décrétales jusqu'au décret de Gratien,* 2 vols. (Paris 1931–32).

5. The Papacy

Liber Pontificalis, ed. by L. Duchesne, I–II (Paris, 2nd ed. 1907–15, new printing 1955), Supplementary vol. III ed. by C. Vogel (Paris 1957), containing the original lives of the popes by Pandulf extending from Paschal II to Honorius II; previously edited by J. P. March, *Liber Pontificalis prout exstat in codice Dertusensi* (Barcelona 1925). On the origin of the entire 2 vols., cf. *LThK,* VI (2nd ed. 1961), 1016 seq.; J. M. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab ex. saec. IX usque ad finem saec.* XIII Vitae, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1862), contains materials gathered from many sources; *Bullarium Romanum:* among the various editions, neither reliable nor complete, the most used is *Editio Taurinensis,* ed. by A. Tomassetti, 24 vols. (Turin 1857–72); P. Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad a. 1198,* 2^a edit. cur. S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, 2 vols. (Berlin 1885–88; reprint Graz 1958). This indispensable work is now supplemented with a territorial arrangement of papal documents (to 1198) begun by P. Kehr, commissioned by the Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. It has since 1931 been continued by the "Pius Foundation for Papal Documents and Medieval Research". The following have thus far appeared: P. F. Kehr, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, Italia Pontificia,* I–VIII, cong. P. Kehr, IX, ed. by W. Holtzmann (Berlin 1906–35; 1962), X, for Calabria and the islands in preparation. *Germania Pontificia,* I–III, cong. A. Brackmann (Berlin 1910–35), cf. *Santifaller NE,* 69.

Studies on other areas are published by the Pius-Foundation for Papal Documents and Medieval Research in the *NGG* (since 1926 the *AGG*); survey by *Santifaller NE,* 66–68. Studies for Spain by P. Kehr, for Portugal by C. Erdmann, for Germany and Switzerland by A. Brackmann, for France by W. Wiederholt, H. Meinert, and J. Ramackers, for the Netherlands and Belgium by J. Ramackers, for England by W. Holtzmann.

6. Civil Law

Codex Theodosianus: — cum perp. commentariis Jac. Gothfredi, ed. by J. P. Ritter, 6 vols. (Leipzig 1739–43); — *cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae,* ed. by T. Mommsen, P. Meyer, 2 vols. (Berlin 1904–05); — recogn. P. Krueger (Berlin 1923); — Translation by Clyde Phan, 1 vol. (Princeton 1952).

Corpus Iuris Civilis: — ed. by Dion. Gothofredus, 6 vols. (Lyons 1589); ed. by P. Krueger, T. Mommsen and others, 3 vols. (Berlin 1912–20). The Celtic and Germanic collections are for the most part published in the above supplied collections in the *Rolls Series* and in the *MGLL* (see More Important General Sources); when necessary, they are cited below for particular chapters. The documents relating to secular rulers are edited in the sources on national history; cf. *Rep Font* I. Due to the close association between the papacy and the Empire the following are of special interest: *MG Diplomata Karolinorum; regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolinorum; regum et imperatorum Germaniae;* cited individually in *RepFont* I, 475; J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii,* new edition by the Wiener Institut für öster. Geschichtsforschung in the following sections: I, *Carolingian 751–918;* II, *Saxon 919–1024;* III, *Salian 1024–1125*; detailed citation in *Santifaller NE,* 14 seq.

7. HISTORICAL-STATISTICAL WORKS WITH OR WITHOUT SOURCE EDITIONS

P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiae catholicae* (Regensburg 1873; Suppl. 1879–86); L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés,* 2 vols. (Mâcon 1935–39); *Gallia Christiana, in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa,* ed. by D. de Saint Marthe and by the monks of Saint-Maur, 16 vols. (Paris 1717–1865), *RepFont* I, 279 seq.; *Gallia Christiana novissima. Histoire des archevêchés, évêchés et abbayes de France,* 7 vols. (Montbéliard, then Valence 1899 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 280; F. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra,* 2nd ed. by N. Coleti, 10 vols. (Venice 1717–22), *RepFont* I, 753–55; *España Sagrada,* by Henrique Flórez (and continuators), 56 vols. (Madrid 1747–1879; 1918; 1950 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 252–55 with source texts; J. L. Villanueva, *Viage literario a las iglesias de España,* 20 vols. (Madrid 1803–51); W. Dugdale, *Monasticum Anglicanum,* 2nd ed. by J. Calley and others, 6 vols. (London 1817–30, 3rd ed. 1846), *RepFont* I, 236; D. Farlati – J. Coleti, *Illyricum Sacrum,* 8 vols. (Venice 1751–1819), *RepFont* I, 256 seq.; *Germania Sacra.* Historical-statistical material on German dioceses, cathedral chapters, collegiate and parish churches, monastic and other ecclesiastical institutions, ed. by the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Geschichte (now Max-Planck-Inst.); to date: *Diocese of Brandenburg* by Abb, Bünger, and Wentz (1929–41), *Diocese of Havelberg* by Wentz (1933), *Diocese of Bamberg* by Frhr. v. Guttenberg (1937), *Archdiaconate of Xanten* by Classen (1938), *Cistercian Abbey of Altenberg* by Mosler (1965), *Diocese of Würzburg,* 1 (line of bishops to 1254) by Wendehorst (1962).
The works of the "Pius Foundation" (v. supra Papacy) with important source material.

8. MONASTIC ORDERS

L. Holstenius and M. Brockie, *Codex regularum monasticarum et canonicarum,* 6 vols. (Augsburg 1759); B. Albers, *Consuetudines monasticae,* 5 vols. (Stuttgart–Vienna, then Montecassino 1900–12), *RepFont* I, 181; K. Hallinger, *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum, cura Pont. Athenaei S. Anselmi de Urbe editum;* of the 25 planned volumes to date vols. I and II (Siegburg 1963).

9. LITURGY

Cf. bibliography by H. Baus in vol. I of the Handbook 492 seqq. The following concern the medieval period: *Henry Bradshaw Society, founded in the year of our Lord 1890 for the editing of rare liturgical texts,* 92 vols. (London 1891 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 322f.; V.-M. Leroquais has collected the manuscripts on liturgical matters for France: *Les sacramentaires et missels,* 3 vols. (Paris 1924); *Les bréviaires,* 5 vols. (Paris 1934); *Les pontificaux,* 3 vols. (Paris 1937); *Les psautiers,* 2 vols. (Mâcon 1940–41); *Le Pontifical Romain au moyen âge,* ed. by M. Andrieu, *Studi e Testi,* 86, 87, 88, 99 (Vatican 1938–41); *Les ordines Romani du haut moyen âge,* ed. by M. Andrieu: *Spec. Sacr. Lovan.* (*infra* no. 11) 11, 23, 24, 28 (Louvain 1931–36); U. Chevalier, *Repertorium hymnologicum,* 6 vols. (Brussels 1892–1920); G. M. Dreves–C. Blume, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi,* 55 vols. (Leipzig 1886 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 29 seq.; *Hymnologische Beiträge,* ed. by Dreves-Blume, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1897 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 336.

10. HAGIOGRAPHY

Acta Sanctorum, ed. by J. Bolland and successors, the "Bollandists", 70 vols. (published in various places, 1643 seqq.); new printing vols. 1–43 (Venice 1734–40); vols. 1–60 with changes (Paris–Rome 1863–70); more detailed references and survey arranged according to monthly and liturgical calendar in *RepFont* I, 16 seq.; *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina antiquae et mediae aetatis,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1898–1901, Suppl. 1911, new imp. 1949) contains name-index of the *ActaSS* as well as codices and bibliography; *Martyrologium Romanum,* 3rd ed. (Rome 1949); *Martyrologium Romanum, ad formam editionis typicae scholiis historicis instructum,* ed. by H. Delehaye *et al.; ActaSS. Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris* (Brussels 1940); F. Doyé, *Heilige und Selige der röm.-kath. Kirche,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1930–32); *Bibliotheca Sanctorum,* ed. by Istituto Giovanni XXIII, an extensive Encyclopedia, to date 6 vols. (Rome 1961 seqq.).

11. PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie (since 1930: *und Theologie*) *des Mittelalters, Texte und Untersuchungen,* 39 vols., first edited by C. Baeumker, now by M. Schmaus (Münster 1891 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 59–61; *Florilegium patristicum,* since 1930: *tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectentes,* first edited by G. Rauschen, then by B. Geyer and J. Zellinger, 44 vols. (Bonn 1904–44), *RepFont* I, 261 seq.; *Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense. Études et documents pour servir* à l'histoire des doctrines chrétiennes depuis la fin de l'âge apostolique jusqu'à la clôture du concile de Trente: Université catholique et collèges O. P. et S. J. de Louvain, Paris, 28 vols. (Louvain 1922 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 711.
Textes philosophiques du moyen âge, 7 vols. (Paris 1955 seqq.); *RepFont* I, 740.

II. MATERIALS ON WESTERN HISTORY

1. UNIVERSAL HISTORY

a) GENERAL ACCOUNTS: *Peuples et Civilisations. Histoire générale,* ed. by L. Halphen and P. Sagnac (Paris 1926 seqq.), V. L. Halphen, *Les barbares, des grandes invasions aux conquêtes turques du XI^e s.* (4th ed. 1940); VI, L. Halphen, *L'essor de l'Europe, XI^e–XIII^{e}s.* (2nd ed. 1940); *Histoire Générale,* ed. by G. Glotz and others (Paris 1925 seqq.); vol. 14 begins the series "Le Moyen-Age": I, 1–2, F. Lot, C. Pfister, F. L. Ganshof, *Les destinées de l'Europe en Occident de 395 à 888* (2nd ed. 1940–41); II, A. Fliche, *L'Europe occidentale de 888 à 1125* (2nd ed. 1941); III, C. Diehl, G. Marçais, *Le monde oriental de 395 à 1081* (1944); VIII, H. Pirenne, G. Cohen, H. Focillon, *La civilisation occidentale du XI^e au milieu du XV^e s.;* IX, 1, C. Diehl and others, *L'Europe orientale de 1081 à 1453* (1945); *The Cambridge Medieval History,* planned by J. B. Bury (Cambridge 1911–36), II: *The Rise of the Saracens and the Foundation of the Western Empire* (1913); III: *Germany and the Western Empire* (1924); IV: *The Eastern Roman Empire 717–1453* (1927); V: *Contest of Empire and Papacy* (1929). Vol. II reaches to about 814, III until into the 11th cent., vol. V from about 1050–1200; *Historia Mundi,* ed. by F. Valjavec (Bern 1952 seqq.); V: *Frühes Mittelalter* (1956), with sections: Das frühe Germanentum — Die Reitervölker Eurasiens — Das frühe Slaventum — Die Araber und der Islam — Die Grundlegung des Abendlandes (Carolingian Period); VI: *Hohes und spätes Mittelalter* (1958), with sections: Das Abendland — Die byzantinische Welt — Die Welt des Islam — Ausklang und Übergang (Humanism and Renaissance); *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte,* Eine Universalgeschichte, ed. by G. Mann and A. Nitschke, V: *Islam. Die Entstehung Europas* (Berlin - Frankfurt - Vienna 1963), embracing also the high and the greater part of the later Middle Ages. Also worthwhile are: *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte,* ed. by W. Goetz, III–IV (Berlin 1932–33); *Neue Propyläen-Weltgeschichte,* ed. by W. Andreas, II (Berlin 1940); A. Cartellieri, *Weltgeschichte als Machtgeschichte, 381–911. Die Zeit der Reichsgründungen* (Munich - Berlin 1927); id., *Die Weltstellung des deutschen Reiches 911–1047* (1932); id., *Der Aufstieg des Papsttums im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte 1047–1095* (1936); id., *Der Vorrang des Papsttums zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge 1095–1150* (1941).

b) Shorter Summaries: J. Calmette, *Le monde féodal* in Clio, *Introduction aux études historiques* (Paris, 5th ed. 1951); J. Génicot, *Les lignes de faîte du moyen-âge* (Casterman, 3rd ed. 1961); R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London 1953); C. Dawson, *The Making of Europe 400–1000* (London, 2nd ed. 1951); W. von den Steinen, *Der Kosmos des Mittelalters. Von Karl dem Grossen zu Bernhard von Clairvaux* (Bern–Munich 1959); K. Hampe, *Das Hochmittelalter 900–1250* (Munich–Cologne, 4th ed. 1953); F. L. Ganshof, *Le Moyen-Âge: Histoire des relations internationales,* I (Paris 1953); N. F. Cantor, *Medieval History* (New York 1963); C. W. Previté-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History,* 2 vols. (Cambridge 1952); S. Painter, *The Feudal Monarchies* (Ithaca, New York, 1951).

c) Works on Cultural and Intellectual History: G. Schnürer, *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter,* 3 vols. (Paderborn 1924–29, I, 3rd ed. 1936); C. Dawson, *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture* (London 1950); *Histoire générale des Civilisations,* III, ed. by E. Perroy (Paris 1955); J. Bühler, *Die Kultur des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 3rd ed. 1941; new printing 1949); L. A. Veit, *Volksfrommes Brauchtum und Kirche im Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1936); Th. Steinbüchel, *Christliches Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1935); H. Meyer, *Geschichte der abendländischen Weltanschauung,* III: *Die Weltanschauung des Mittelalters* (Paderborn–Würzburg, 2nd ed. 1952); *The Medieval World 300–1300,* ed. by N. F. Cantor (New York 1962).

2. National Histories

England: *The Oxford History of England,* ed. by G. N. Clark (Oxford 1934 seqq.): II, F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (2nd ed. 1947; often reprinted); III, A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087–1216* (2nd ed. 1955); A. L. Poole, *Medieval England,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1960); C. Petit-Dutaillis, *The Feudal Monarchy in France and England from the 10th to the 13th Century* (London 1936); J. E. A. Jolliffe, *The Constitutional History of Medieval England from the English Settlement to 1485* (London, 2nd ed. 1947).

France: E. Lavisse, *Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution* (Paris 1900 seqq.): II, 1, C. Bayet, C. Pfister, A. Kleinclausz, *Le christianisme, les barbares, Mérovingiens et Carolingiens* (1903); II, 2, A. Luchaire, *Les premiers Capétiens 987 à 1137* (1901); G. Duby, R. Mandrou, *Histoire de la civilisation française. Moyen âge au XVI*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1958).

Germany: G. Gebhardt, H. Grundmann, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* I: *Frühzeit und Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 8th ed. 1954). O. Brandt, A. O. Meyer, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* I (Potsdam 1935–41), new ed. by L. Just (Constance 1952 seqq., incomplete); P. Rassow, *Deutsche Geschichte im Überblick* (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1962); *Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte,* ed. by Hist. Kommission der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (1862 seqq.). An indispensable reference work arranged chronologically according to the reigns of the individual rulers (from the beginning of the Carolingians until 1158, 1190–1233, 1298–1308); presentations proceed chronologically upon the quotation of all sources. W. v. Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* (until 1190), 6 vols., the last ed. by B. von Simson (Leipzig, I-III, 5th ed. 1881–90; IV, 2nd ed. 1877; V-VI, 1880–95); K. Hampe, F. Baethgen, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer* (Heidelberg, 10th ed. 1949).

Italy: L. M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter* (Gotha 1897 seqq.): II, 2, to IV, 1 (1903–15), unfinished, reaches from the Carolingian period until 1017. *Storia politica d'Italia,* dir. da A. Solmi, 3rd ed. (Milan 1937 seqq.): VI, G. Romano, *Le dominazioni barbariche in Italia 395–888* (1940); VII–VIII, C. G. Mor, *L'età feudale* (1952–3); *Storia d'Italia Illustrata* (Milan 1936 seqq.): III, L. Salvatorelli, *L'Italia medioevale dalle incursioni barbariche agli inizi del sec. XI* (n. d.); IV, L. Salvatorelli, *L'Italia comunale. Dagli inizi del sec. XI alla metà del sec. XIV* (n. d.); *Storia d'Italia,* ed. by N. Valeri, I: *Il medioevo* (Turin 1959).

Spain and Portugal: R. Konetzke, *Geschichte des spanischen und portugiesischen Volkes* (Leipzig–Berlin 1939); *Historia de España,* ed. by R. Menéndez Pidal (Madrid 1940 seqq.): III–IV,

E. Lévi-Provençal, *España musulmana hasta la caída del califato de Córdoba 711–1031*, Introduction by A. García Gómez (1950–57); VI, J. Pérez de Urbel, R. Arco y Garay, *España cristiana. Comienzo de la Reconquista 711–1038* (1956); R. Soldevilla, *Historia de España*, I–II (Barcelona 1952–53); L. García de Valdavellano, *Manual de la historia de España* (Madrid 1952); A. Ballesteros y Beretta, *Historia de España*, vol. II and the beginning of III (Madrid 1920, 1922), 2nd ed. from I–III in 5 vols. (Barcelona 1943–48); P. Peres, *Historia de Portugal*, I–II (Barcelos 1928–29).

For the other countries, national histories are cited in their respective sections.

3. General Church History

Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours, ed. by A. Fliche, V. Martin and others (Paris 1934 seqq.): VI, E. Amann, *L'époque carolingienne* (1947); VII, E. Amann, A. Dumas, *L'Église au pouvoir des laïques 888–1057* (1948); VIII, A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne et la reconquête chrétienne 1057–1125* (1946); XII: *Institutions ecclésiastiques de la chrétienté médiévale*, Livre I, G. Le Bras, *Préliminaires et I*$^{\text{ière}}$ *partie* (1959); XIII, A. Forest, F. van Steenberghen, M. de Gandillac, *Le mouvement doctrinal du IX*$^{\text{e}}$ *au XIV*$^{\text{e}}$ *s.* (1951); *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch*, ed. by K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf (Göttingen 1960 seqq.); for the Middle Ages (= vol. II) to date: fascicle E, G. Haendler, *Geschichte des Frühmittelalters und der Germanenmission;* G. Stökl, *Geschichte der Slavenmission* (1961); fascicle G, 1: H. Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters* (1963); B. Llorca, R. García Villoslada, F. J. Montalban, *Historia de la Iglesia católica* (Madrid 1950 seqq.), II, R. García Villoslada, *Edad media 800–1303* (2nd ed. 1958); K. Bihlmeyer, H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte*, II: *Das Mittelalter* (Paderborn, 17th ed. 1962), E. T.: *Church History* (Westminster, Md., 1963); J. Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung*, I: *Altertum und Mittelalter* (Münster, 21st ed. 1962), numerous English translations; H. v. Schubert, *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche im Frühmittelalter* (Tübingen 1921), to the end of the ninth century.

4. Church History of Individual Lands

Austria: E. Tomek, *KG Österreichs*, 2 vols. (Innsbruck–Vienna–Munich 1935–48); J. Wodka, *KG Österreichs. Wegweiser durch ihre Geschichte* (Vienna 1959); A. Maier, *KG Kärntens*, Part 2: *Mittelalter* (Klagenfurt 1953).

Belgium: E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique*, 5 vols. and supplementary vols. (Brussels 1940 seqq.), I–II: *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique des origines au XII*$^{\text{e}}$ *s.* (2nd ed. 1945).

Bohemia: A. Nägle, *KG Böhmens und Mährens* I, 1–2 (Vienna - Leipzig 1915–18), reaches only to 973.

Denmark and other northern lands: P. G. Lindhardt, *Den nordiske kirkeshistorie*, I (Copenhagen 1950); *Handbok i Svensk kirkohistoria*, I, Y. Brilioth, *Medeltiden* (Stockholm 1948); *Den Danske kirkeshistorie*, ed. by H. Koch and B. Kornerup; I, H. Koch, *Den aeldre middelalder indtil 1241* (Copenhagen 1950); G. Gustafson, *Svensk kirkehistoria* (Stockholm, 2nd ed. 1963).

England: *History of the English Church*, ed. by W. R. W. Stephens and W. Hunt, 8 vols. in 9 (London 1899–1910, later printings); II, W. Hunt, *History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest 597–1066* (1899); III, W. R. W. Stephens, *History of the English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I 1066–1272* (1901); *Ecclesiastical History of England*, ed. by J. C. Dickinson: I, H. Deannesley, *The Pre-Conquest Church in England* (London 1961); J. Moorman, *A. History of the Church of England* (London 1953); S. C. Carpenter, *The Church in England 597–1688* (London 1954); J. Godfrey, *The Church in*

Anglo-Saxon England (Cambridge 1962); *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages,* ed. by C. H. Lawrence (London 1965).

France: C. Poulet, *Histoire de l'Église de France,* 3 vols. (Paris 1946–49); A. Latreille, E. Delaruelle, J. R. Palanque, *Histoire du catholicisme en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1957–60); M. Bury, *Histoire de l'Église d'Alsace* (Colmar 1946).

Germany: K. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands,* 5 vols. (Leipzig I–IV, 4th ed. 1904–13; V/1, 2nd ed. 1911; V/2, 1920, last printing 1950 seqq.), I: to 751; II: 751–911; III: 911–1122; extends beyond Germany.
Individual German territories:
KG Bayerns by R. Bauerreiss, 5 vols. (St Ottilien 1950–5); *KG Schwabens* by H. Tüchle, 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1950–54); *Württemberg KG,* I, by K. Weller (Stuttgart 1936); *Pfälzische KG* by E. Mayer (Kaiserslautern 1939); *KG der Pfalz* by L. Stamer, 4 parts (Speyer 1936–65); *Thüringische KG* by R. Herrmann, 2 vols. (Jena 1937–47); *KG Sachsens* by W. Schlesinger, 2 vols. (Cologne–Graz 1962); *KG Mecklenburgs,* I, by K. Schmaltz (Schwerin 1935); *KG Pommerns* by H. Heyden, 2 vols. (Cologne, 2nd ed. 1957); *KG Niedersachsens* (Göttingen 1939); *Mittelalterliche KG Ostfrieslands* by H. Kochs (Aurich 1934); *KG Schleswig-Holsteins,* I, by H. v. Schubert (Kiel 1907); II, by E. Feddersen (Kiel 1938).

Ireland and Scotland: L. Gougaud, *Chrétientés celtiques* (Paris 1911), Eng. trans. *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London 1932); A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland,* 3 vols. (Mainz 1890–91); W. Delius, *Geschichte der irischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (Munich–Basle 1954); A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Schottland,* 2 vols. (Mainz 1883); W. O. Simpson, *The Celtic Church in Scotland* (Aberdeen 1935); J. H. S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (Oxford 1960).

Netherlands: R. R. Post, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland in de middeleewen,* 2 parts (Utrecht 1957).

Poland: K. Völker, *KG Polens* (Berlin 1930).

Switzerland: Th. Schwegler, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in der Schweiz* (Stans, 2nd ed. 1945).

Spain: P. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien,* 3 vols. (Regensburg 1862–79); Z. García Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España,* 3 vols. in 5 (Madrid 1929–36), until 1085.

5. Conciliar and Papal History

C. J. v. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles,* III–V (Paris 1910–15); III, 560 seqq., 692–813; IV, 814–1073; V, 1073–1250; J. Haller, *Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit,* new and completed edition by H. Dannenbauer in 5 vols. (Stuttgart 1950 seqq.); I: *Die Grundlagen* (1950), to the end of the 8th century; II: *Der Aufbau* (1952), to 1125; F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte des Papsttums,* II: *Geschichte des Papsttums im Frühmittelalter. Von Gregor dem Grossen bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1955); III: *Die Vormachtstellung des Papsttums im Hochmittelalter von der Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts bis zu Cölestin V.* (1956); E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft* (not completed), II: *Das Papsttum unter byzantinischer Herrschaft* (Tübingen 1933), reaches to about 750. Out of the papers selected by U. Gmelin: E. Caspar, *Das Papsttum unter fränkischer Herrschaft* (Darmstadt 1956 = reprint from *ZKG* 54 [1935], 132–264); W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages. A Study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power* (London 1955), extends to about 1150; cf. F. Kempf, *Die päpstliche Gewalt in der mittelalterlichen Welt* in *Saggi storici intorno al Papato* (Rome 1959), 117–69.

Rome and the Papal State: *Storia di Roma,* ed. by Istituto di Studi Romani (Bologna 1938 seqq.), IX, O. Bertolini, *Roma di fronte a Bosanzio e ai Longobardi* (1941); X, P. Brezzi, *Roma e l'impero medioevale 774–1252* (1947); XII, *Topografia e urbanistica di Roma* (1958), 189–341; C. Cecchelli, *Roma medioevale;* F. Schneider, *Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter* (Munich 1926); L. Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'État Pontifical* (Paris, 3rd ed. 1911); L. Halphen, *Études sur l'administration de Rome au moyen âge 751 à 1252* (Paris 1907).

6. Ecclesiastical Legal and Constitutional History

Systematic Presentation with Historical References: G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht,* 7 vols. (Regensburg 1845–72); VIII by F. Vering (1889); P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten,* I–VI, 1 (Berlin 1869–97); J. B. Sägmüller, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br., 3rd ed. 1914; I, 1–4, 4th ed. 1925–34).

Works on Legal History: For sources see above, bibliography I, 4; H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte. Die katholische Kirche* (Cologne–Graz, 4th ed. 1964); W. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts,* I: *Das Recht des ersten christlichen Jahrtausends. Von der Urkirche bis zum grossen Schisma* (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1960); II: *Das Kirchenrecht der abendländischen Christenheit 1055 bis 1517* (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1961); *Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident,* ed. by G. Le Bras (Paris 1955 seqq.), I, G. Le Bras, Prolégomènes (1955); see also *Fliche-Martin,* XII (Gen. Bib. II, 3); R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1892–1923); B. Kurtscheid, *Historia iuris canonici. Historia institutionum,* I: *Ab ecclesiae fundatione usque ad Gratianum* (Rome 1941); C. Munier, *Les sources patristiques de droit de l'Église du VIII^{e} au XIII^{e} siècle* (Diss. Strasbourg 1957).

For individual countries the works are cited below in the proper section; especially important are the following: A. Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte der deutschen Kirche im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1913); J. F. Lemarignier, J. Gaudemet, G. Mollat, *Institutions ecclésiastiques* in Lot-Fawtier, III (Paris 1962); J. B. LoGrasso, *Ecclesia et Status* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1952); S. Z. Ehler and J. B. Morall, *Church and State through the Centuries* (London 1954).

7. Secular Legal and Constitutional History

England: F. Pollock, F. W. Maitland, *History of English Law before the Time of Edward I,* 2 vols. (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1911); J. E. A. Jollife, *Constitutional History of Medieval England from the English Settlement to 1485* (London, 2nd ed. 1947).

France: P. Viollet, *Histoire des institutions de France,* 3 vols. (Paris 1890–1903); E. Chénon, *Histoire générale du droit français public et privé* (Paris 1926–27); F. Lot, R. Fawtier and others, *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge,* I: *Institutions seigneuriales* (Paris 1957); II: *Institutions royales* (1958); III: *Institutions ecclésiastiques;* R. Holtzmann, *Französische Verfassungsgeschichte* (Munich 1910).

Germany: R. Schröder and E. v. Künssberg, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (Berlin, 7th ed. 1932); H. Conrad, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte,* I: *Frühzeit und Mittelalter* (Karlsruhe, 2nd ed. 1962). G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte,* 8 vols. (Berlin I–II, 3rd ed. 1880–82; III–VI 2nd ed. 1883–96; VII–VIII, 1876–78), important because of their rich quotations of sources.

Italy: A. Pertile, *Storia del diritto Italiano,* 7 vols. (Turin, 2nd ed. 1928); P. S. Leicht, *Storia del diritto italiano, Diritto pubblico* (Milan, 2nd ed. 1940), *Le fonti* (1939), *Il diritto privato* (1941–44); G. de Vergottini, *Lezioni di storia del diritto italiano. Il diritto pubblico italiano nei sec. XII–XIV* (Milan, 2nd ed. 1960).

Spain: A. García Gallo, *Historia del derecho español,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1941–42; I, 3rd ed. 1945); E. Mayer, *Historia de las instituciones sociales y políticas de España y Portugal durante los siglos V a XIV,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1925–26).

For other lands literature is cited as needed.

8. Monographs on Ecclesiastical and Secular Legal History

a) State and Society: O. Gierke, *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht,* 4 vols. (Berlin 1868–1912), English extracts by F. Maitland in *Political Theories of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1900); H. Mitteis, *Der Staat des hohen Mittelalters* (Weimar, 7th ed. 1962); F. Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht im früheren Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1954), Eng. trans., *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1939); M. David, *La souveraineté et les limites juridiques du pouvoir monarchique du IX*^{e} *au XV*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1954); T. Mayer, *Fürsten und Staat. Studien zur Verfassungsgeschichte des deutschen Mittelalters* (Weimar 1950); F. L. Ganshof, *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité?* (Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957), Eng. trans., *Feudalism* (New York 1961); H. Mitteis, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt* (Weimar 1933); J. Calmette, *La société féodale* (Paris, 4th ed. 1938); M. Bloch, *La société féodale,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939–40), Engl. trans., *Feudal Society* (Chicago 1961); E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France,* 6 vols. in 8 parts (Lille 1910–43); L. Santifaller, "Zur Geschichte des ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchensystems" in *SAW Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 229, 1 (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1964); L. White, *Medieval Technology and Social Change* (New York 1962).

b) History of Political Ideas: P. E. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1954–56); R. W.-A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West,* 6 vols., the last from 1300 to 1600 (London, I, 3rd ed. 1930; II–III, 2nd ed. 1928; IV–VI, 1922–36); G. Tabacco, *La relazione fra i concetti di potere temporale e spirituale nella tradizione cristiana fino al sec. XVI* (Turin 1950); G. Pilati, *Chiesa e Stato nei primi quindici secoli. Profilo dello sviluppo della teoria attraverso le fonti e la bibliografia* (Rome 1961); M. Pacaut, *La théocratie. L'Église et le Pouvoir au moyen âge* (Paris 1957); H. X. Arquillière, *L'Augustinisme politique. Essai sur la formation des théories politiques du moyen-âge* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1955); E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton 1957); A. Dempf, *Sacrum Imperium. Geschichts- und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters und der politischen Renaissance* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1954); C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt des Frühmittelalters,* ed. by F. Baethgen (Berlin 1951); C. H. McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West from the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages* (New York 1932); J. B. Morrall, *Political Thought in Medieval Times* (New York 1958).

c) Christian Kingship: *Das Königtum. Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen, Vorträge und Forschungen,* ed. by T. Mayer 3 (Lindau–Constance 1956); *La regalità sacra. Contributi al tema del VIII*^{e} *congresso internaz. di Storia delle Religioni, Roma 1955* (Leiden 1959); A. Guinan, "The Christian Concept of Kingship" in *HThR* 49 (1956), 219–69; R. Folz, *L'idée de l'empire en Occident du V*^{e} *au XIV*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1953); E. Eichmann, *Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland,* 2 vols. (Würzburg 1942); C. A. Bouman, *Sacring and Crowning. The development of the Latin ritual for the anointing of kings and the coronation of the emperor before the eleventh century* (Groningen 1957).

9. History of Monastic Orders

General: P. Hélyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires,* 8 vols. (Paris 1714–19), from this: J. P. Migne, *Dictionnaire des ordres religieux,* 4 vols. (Paris 1847–59); H. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 2 vols. (Paderborn, 3rd ed. 1933–34); U. Berlière, *L'ordre monastique des origines au XII*^{e} *siècle* (Paris, 4th ed. 1928); *Il monachesimo*

nell'alto medioevo in *Settimane di studio del Centro Ital. di Studi sull'alto medioevo* 4 (Spoleto 1957); G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion,* 4 vols. (Cambridge 1923–50), begins at about 1000; P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoît,* 6 vols. (Maredsous, 2nd ed. I–II; III–VI, 1948–49); S. Hilpisch, *Geschichte der Benediktinerinnen* (St Ottilien 1951).
FOR INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES: D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England 943–1215* (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1949); G. Penco, *Storia del monachesimo in Italia* (Rome 1961); J. Pérez de Urbel, *Los monjes españoles en la edad media,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1933–34).

10. LITURGY

L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgie,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br., 2nd ed. 1941); M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica,* 4 vols. (Milan, I, 2nd ed. 1950; II, 2nd ed. 1955; III, 3rd ed. 1964; IV, 1955); A. G. Martimort and others, *L'Église en prière. Introduction à la liturgie* (Paris–Tournai–Rome, 3rd ed. 1965); J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* (Vienna, 4th ed. 1958), Eng. trans., *The Mass of the Roman Rite* (1950); T. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte, Bericht und Besinnung* (Bonn 1965); C. Vogel, *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire du culte chrétien au moyen âge* (Spoleto 1966).

11. LATIN LITERATURE AND GENERAL CULTURAL HISTORY

LITERATURE: M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,* 3 vols. (Munich 1911–31); I, from Justinian to the middle of the 10th century; II, to the investiture controversy; III, to the end of 12th century; C. Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie,* II (Strasbourg 1902), 97–432; J. de Ghellinck, *Littérature latine au moyen âge,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939): I, to the end of the Carolingian Renaissance; II, to St Anselm; E. R. Curtius, *European Literature in the Latin Middle Ages* (New York 1953); E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1953); id., *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1957); A. Siegmund, *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (Munich–Pasing 1949).

LIBRARIES: F. Milkau, G. Leyh, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft,* III: *Geschichte der Bibliotheken* (Wiesbaden 1955), contribution concerning the Middle Ages by K. Christ, pp. 243–498; J. W. Thompson, *The Medieval Library* (Chicago 1939); E. Lesne, *Hist. de la propriété* (see above: Gen. Bib., II, 8a), IV: *Les Livres, scriptoria et bibliothèques* (Lille 1938); reaches to the end of the 11th century.

EDUCATION: J. van den Driesch and J. Esterhues, *Geschichte der Erziehung und Bildung,* I: *Von den Griechen bis zum Ausgang des Zeitalters der Renaissance* (Paderborn 1951); W. Wühr, *Das abendländische Bildungswesen im Mittelalter* (Munich 1950); L. Maître, *Les écoles épiscopales et monastiques en Occident 768–1180* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1924); E. Lesne, *Hist. de la propriété* (see previous heading), V: *Les écoles de la fin du VIII^e siècle à la fin du XII^e* (Lille 1940); R. M. Martin, "Arts libéraux" in *DHGE* IV (1930), 827–43; H. Fuchs, "Enkyklios Paideia" in *RAC* V (1962), 365–98; *Artes liberales.* Von der antiken Bildung zur Wissenschaft des Mittelalters, ed. by J. Koch (Leiden–Cologne 1959).

12. PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY, SPIRITUALITY

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNING: *Fliche-Martin,* XIII (see above: Gen. Bib. II, 3); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1909–11); A. C. Crombie, *Augustine to Galileo. The History of Science 400–1560* (London, 2nd ed. 1957).

PHILOSOPHY: F. Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* vol. II by B. Geyer, *Die patristische und scholastische Philosophie* (Berlin, 11th ed. 1927); M. de Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale,* 3 vols. (Paris, 6th ed. 1934–47); É. Bréhier, *La philosophie du moyen âge* (Paris 1937); É. Gilson, *La philosophie du moyen âge des origines patristiques à la fin du XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1947); id., *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York 1954); id., *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (London 1936); F. B. Artz, *The Mind of the Middle Ages* (New York, 2nd ed. 1954); F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy,* II: *Augustine to Scotus* (London 1952).

THEOLOGY: H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae,* vol. I, until 1109; II, 1109–1563 (Innsbruck, I, 4th ed. 1926; II, 3rd ed. 1906); P. F. Cayré, *Patrologie et histoire de la théologie,* II (Paris–Tournai–Rome, 3rd ed. 1945); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg i. Br. 1933), Italian edition with supplements (Milan, 2nd ed. 1939). — Due to a lack of Catholic works on the history of Dogma, the following are relied upon: M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik,* 5 vols. (Munich, I–II, 5th ed. 1953–55; III, 1–2, 1940; 3rd ed. 1953; IV, 3rd ed. 1952–53; V, 1955); M. Schmaus, J. R. Geiselmann, A. Grillmeier, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1951 seqq.); A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der DG,* III, a reliable work on Protestant dogmatic history (Tübingen, 5th ed. 1932); R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der DG,* III (Leipzig, 4th ed. 1930), Eng. trans., *The History of Doctrines* (Grand Rapids, 6th ed. 1964); F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der DG,* II (Tübingen, 5th ed. 1953).

BIBLE STUDY: F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi,* 7 vols. (Madrid 1950–61); H. Rost, *Die Bibel im Mittelalter* (Augsburg 1939); B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1952); C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen-âge* (Paris 1944); H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960–61); B. Bischoff, "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter" in *SE* 6 (1954), 189–281; R. McNally, *The Bible in the Middle Ages* (Westminster, Md., 1959).

SPIRITUALITY: P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* II (Paris, 4th ed. 1924); L. Génicot, *La spiritualité médiévale* (Paris 1958); J. Leclercq, F. Vandenbroucke, L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du moyen âge* (Paris 1961) .

B. The Eastern Church

III. SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH

1. Ancillary Sciences

a) Paleography and Studies in Handwriting and Libraries: V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1913); W. Schubart, *Griechische Paläographie* (Munich 1925); E. M. Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography* (2nd ed. 1913); R. Devreesse, *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs* (Paris 1954); R. Merkelbach, H. van Thiel, *Griechisches Leseheft zur Einführung in Paläographie und Textkritik* (Göttingen 1965); L. Polites, Ὁδηγὸς καταλόγου χειρογράφων (Athens 1961); A. Dain, *Les manuscrits* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1964); M. Richard, *Répertoire des bibliothèques et des catalogues des manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1958); id., Supplément, I (Paris 1965).

b) Diplomatics: F. Dölger, *Byzantinische Diplomatik* (Ettal 1956); F. Dölger and J. Karayannopulos, *Einführung in die byzantinische Diplomatik* (Munich 1966).

c) Sigillography: G. Schlumberger, *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin* (Paris 1884); V. Laurent, *Documents de sigillographie byzantine* in *La collection C. Orghidan* (Paris 1952); id., *Les sceaux byzantins du médaillier Vatican* (Vatican 1962); id., *Le Corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin,* V seqq. (Paris 1963 seqq.).

d) Numismatics: G. Schlumberger, *Numismatique de l'empire byzantin* (Paris 1884); W. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins of the British Museum,* 2 vols. (London 1908); H. Goodacre, *A Handbook of the Coinage of the Byzantine Empire,* 3 vols. (London 1928–33); H. Longuet, *Introduction à la numismatique byzantine* (London 1962); A. Barozzi, "Byzantium and Numismatics. An Annotated Select Bibliography in *The Voice of the Turtle* 4 (1965), 229–42.

Lexicons: C. du Fresne Ducange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis* (Paris 1688); E. A. Sophokles, *Greek Lexikon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (New York 1887); G. H. W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexikon* (Oxford 1961 seqq.); Ἱστορικὸν λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης (Athens 1933 seqq.).

2. Sources

K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1897); M. E. Colonna, *Gli storici bizantini dal IV al XV secolo,* I: *Storici profani* (Rome 1956); S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina da Costantino agli iconoclasti* (Bari 1965); H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959); G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica,* I: *Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Turkvölker* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1958). Since a great deal of Byzantine history involves the Turks this work complements Krumbacher's *Literaturgeschichte;* H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der*

Kreuzzüge (Hanover 1960); W. Buchwald, A. Hohlweg, O. Prinz, *Tusculum-Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters* (Munich 1963); E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs aux XV*^{e} *et XVI*^{e} *siècles,* 3 vols. (Paris 1885–1903).

3. General Collections of Sources

J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca* (Paris 1867–76), contents in *RepFont* I, 420–29; R. Graffin, F. Nau, *Patrologia orientalis* (Paris 1903 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 302–05; *Sources chrétiennes* (Paris 1942 seqq.), *RepFont* I, 706–08; J. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense,* 4 vols. (Paris 1852–58); id., *Analecta sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata,* 8 vols. (vol.6 did not appear) (Paris 1876–88); A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio,* 10 vols. (Rome 1825–38); A. Mai, J. Cozza-Luzi, *Nova Patrum bibliotheca,* 9 vols. (Rome 1852–88); A. Demetrakopulos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, I (Leipzig 1866); A. Papadopulos-Kerameus, Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας, 5 vols. (St Petersburg 1891); A. Vasiliev, *Analecta graeco-byzantina* I (Moscow 1893); W. Regel, *Fontes rerum byzantinarum,* 2 fasc. (St Petersburg 1892–1917); C. Will, *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae graecae et latinae saeculo undecimo composita extant* (Leipzig–Marburg 1861); *Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae,* 50 vols. (Bonn 1828–97), *RepFont* I, 201–03; K. N. Sathas, Μεσαιωνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, 7 vols. (Athens–Paris–Venice 1872–74); J. B. Bury, *Byzantine Texts,* 5 vols. (London 1898–1904); *Bibliothèque byzantine,* publiée sous la direction de P. Lemerle. Documents (Paris 1952 seqq.); *Collection byzantine,* publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé (Paris 1926 seqq.); J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota graeca e codicibus regiis,* 5 vols. (Paris 1829–33); id., *Anecdota nova* (Paris 1844); S. Lampros, Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά, 4 vols. (Athens 1912–30); Μνημεῖα τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας (Athens 1932 seqq.); J. C. Wolf, *Anecdota graeca sacra et profana,* 4 vols. (Hamburg 1722–24); *Scriptores byzantini* (Bucharest 1958 seqq.); E. V. Ivánka, *Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber* (Graz - Vienna - Cologne 1954 seqq.).

4. Synodal Decisions on Doctrine and Law

E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum,* 9 vols. (Strasbourg–Berlin 1914–19), one vol. to be completed; G. Hofmann, *Concilium Florentinum,* 2 vols. (Rome 1929–30); id., *Documenta concilii Florentini de unione orientalium,* 3 vols. (Rome 1935–6); *Concilium Florentinum* (Rome 1940 seqq.); G. A. Rhallis, M. Potlis, Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων, 6 vols. (Athens 1852–59), contains the great Byzantine commentaries on canon law: Zonaras, Balsamon, and Aristenos; A. Alibizatos, Οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες καὶ οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ νόμοι (Athens, 2nd ed. 1949); P. P. Joannou, *Discipline générale antique (IV*^{e}*–IX*^{e} *siècle),* 4 vols. (Grottaferrata 1962–64); V. Beneševič, *Joannis Scholastici synagoga L titulorum ceteraque eiusdem opera iuridica* I in *AAM* NF 14 (Munich 1937); J. Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta,* 2 vols. (Rome 1864–68); J. B. Cotelier, *Monumenta ecclesiae graecae* I (Paris 1677); W. Voel, C. Justel, *Bibliotheca juris canonici vetus,* 2 vols. (Paris 1661); M. Gedeon, Κανονικαὶ διατάξεις, ἐπιστολαί, λύσεις, θεσπίσματα τῶν ἁγιωτάτων πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, 2 vols. (Constantinople 1888–89); F. Miklosich, J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi,* 6 vols. (Vienna 1860–90), esp. vols. I and II; I. Croce, *Textus selecti ex operibus commentatorum byzantinorum iuris ecclesiastici* (Vatican 1939), with an important introduction by E. Herman; J. Oudot, *Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani acta selecta* I (Vatican 1944).

5. STATE DECREES CONCERNING CHURCH AFFAIRS

K. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Ius graeco-romanum,* 7 vols. (Leipzig 1856–84); J. and P. Zepos, *Ius graecoromanum,* 8 vols. (Athens 1931); G. E. Heimbach, *Basilicorum libri LX* (Leipzig 1833–70); H. J. Scheltema, *Basilica* (Groningen–'s Gravenhage 1953 seqq.); P. Noailles, A. Dain, *Les nouvelles de Léon le Sage* (Paris 1944); G. E. Heimbach, *Constantini Harmenopuli Manuale legum sive Hexabiblos* (Leipzig 1851); C. Ferrini, J. Mercati, F. Dölger, St. Hörmann, E. Seidl, M. Κριτοῦ τοῦ Πατζῆ Τιπούκειτος. *Librorum LX Basilicorum summarium* (Vatican 1914–57).

6. HISTORICAL STATISTICAL WORKS

M. Le Quien, *Oriens christianus,* 3 vols. (Paris 1740); O. Seeck, *Notitia dignitatum. Accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et Latercula provinciarum* (Berlin 1876); G. Parthey, *Hieroclis synecdemus et notitiae graecae episcopatuum* (Berlin 1886); E. Honigmann, *Le synecdèmos d'Hiéroclès et l'opuscule géographique de Georges de Chypres* (Brussels 1939); H. Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis Romani* (Leipzig 1890); id., "Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatuum" in *AAM* 21 (Munich 1901), 529–641; id., "Ungedruckte und wenig bekannte Bistümerverzeichnisse der orientalischen Kirche" in *ByZ* 1 (1892), 245–82, and *ByZ* 2 (1893), 22–72; H. Gerland, *Die Genesis der Notitiae episcopatuum* (Chalcedon 1931); H. Gelzer, H. Hilgenfeld, O. Cuntz, *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina latine graece coptice syriace arabice armenice* (Leipzig 1898); E. Schwartz, *Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nicaea und Konstantinopel* in *AAM* NF 13 (Munich 1937); A. Pertusi, *Costantino Porfirogenito De Thematibus* (Vatican 1952); G. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio* (Budapest 1949); F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453,* 5 fasc. (Munich 1924–65); V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople,* fasc. 1–5 (Kadiköy 1932–47); R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin,* I: *Le siège de Constantinople;* III: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris 1953); id., *Constantinople Byzantin* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1964).

7. MONASTICISM

E. Schwartz, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis* (Leipzig 1939); A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgičeskich rukopisej,* I: Typika (Kiev 1895); P. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig 1894); *Actes de l'Athos* (= Vizantijskij Vremennik, Priloženie) 10–13, 17, 20 (St Petersburg 1903–13); *Archives de l'Athos* (Paris 1936 seqq.); F. Dölger, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges* (Munich 1948); id., *Sechs byzantinische Praktika des 14. Jahrhunderts für das Athoskloster Iberon* in *AAM* NF 28 (1949).

8. LITURGY

E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio,* 2 vols. (Paris 1715–16); J. A. Assemani, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universae,* 13 vols. (Rome 1749–66); H. A. Daniel, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universae,* IV (Leipzig 1853); H. Denzinger, *Ritus orientalium,* 2 vols. (Würzburg 1863); F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western,* I (Oxford 1896); A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgičeskich rukopisej,* II: *Euchologia* (Kiev 1901); I. Mateos, *Le typicon de la Grande Église,* 2 vols. (Rome 1962–63). The most important and the most used of the Greek-Byzantine liturgical books *(Euchologion, Triodion, Pentekostarion, Parakletike, Menäen)* were published in Rome (1873–91) and Venice (1862–85); E. Follieri, *Initia hymnorum ecclesiae graecae,* 5 vols. in 6

(Rome 1960–66); W. Christ and M. Paranikas, *Anthologia graeca carminum christianorum* (Leipzig 1871); P. Maas and C. A. Trypanis, *Romani Melodi carmina genuina* (Oxford 1863); J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode: Hymnes* (Paris 1864 seqq.); L. Petit, *Bibliographie des accolouthies grecques* (Brussels 1926).

9. HAGIOGRAPHY

T. Joannu, Μνημεῖα ἁγιολογικά (Venice 1884); K. Dukakes, Μέγας συναξαριστὴς πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, 13 vols. (Athens 1889–97); H. Delehaye, *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* (Brussels 1902); Bibliography of printed works: F. Halkin, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica graeca,* 3 vols. (Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957); Bibliography of manuscripts: A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche,* 3 vols. in 4 parts (Leipzig 1936–52).

IV. MATERIALS ON EASTERN HISTORY

Extensive bibliographical materials concerning the relationships between Byzantium and the Slavic and Turkish peoples may be found in Moravcsik (Gen. Bib. III, 2).

1. POLITICAL HISTORY — GENERAL CULTURAL HISTORY

J. M. Hussey, ed., *The Cambridge Medieval History,* IV: *The Byzantine Empire and Its Neighbours* (Cambridge 1966); G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Munich, 3rd ed. 1962; translated by J. Hussey; Oxford 1956); id., *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (French translation by H. Gregoire and P. Lemerle; Brussels 1954); id., "Agrarian Conditions in the Byzantine Empire" in *Cambridge Economic History of Europe,* I (Cambridge 1942); A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* (Madison, 2nd ed. 1952; paperback, Madison 1958); id., *Byzantium and the Arabs* (in Russian), 2 vols. (St Petersburg 1900); Vol. I translated by H. Gregoire and E. M. Cunard as *Byzance et les Arabes* in *Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae,* I (Brussels 1935); C. Diehl and G. Marçais, *Le monde oriental de 395 à 1081* and C. Diehl and R. Guilland, *L'Europe orientale de 1081 à 1453* (Paris 1936–45); L. Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance* (Paris 1948); J. Lindsay, *Byzantium into Europe* (London 1952); N. H. Baynes and H. S. L. B. Moss, *Byzantium* (Oxford 1948; paperback, Oxford 1961); E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätrömischen Reiches 284–467* (Vienna 1928); id., *Histoire du Bas-Empire 476–565* (Paris - Brussels - Amsterdam, 2nd ed. 1957); A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire,* 3 vols. (Oxford 1964); 2 vols. (Oklahoma 1964–66); J. B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene (395–800),* 2 vols. (London 1889); id., *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire, A.D. 802–867* (London 1912); C. Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzügen* (Leipzig 1894); K. M. Setton and M. W. Baldwin, *A History of the Crusades* (Philadelphia 1955 seqq.); S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades,* 3 vols. (Cambridge 1951–4; paperback, New York 1964–67); id., *Byzantine Civilization* (London 1933; paperback, New York 1961); id., *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge 1958, paper covers, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1960); id., *The Fall of Constantinople 1453* (Cambridge 1965); F. Chalandon, *Les Comnène* (Paris 1900–12); P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer,* 2 vols. (Rome 1955); W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant* (London 1908); id., *Essays on the Latin Orient* (Cambridge 1921); id., *Trebizond — the Last Greek Empire* (London 1926); J. Lognon, *L'empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris 1949); A. Gardner, *The Lascarids of Nicaea* (London 1912); D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); id., *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance,* Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History (New York 1966); id., "Graeco-Latin Relations on the Eve of the Byzantine Restoration; The Battle of Pelagonia 1259" in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 7 (1953); N. Baynes, *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London 1955); D. Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec de Morée,* 2 vols. (Paris–Athens 1932–53); F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit* (Munich 1953); J. P. Fallmerayer, *Geschichte des Kaisertums von Trapezunt* (Munich 1827); D. M. Nicol, *The Despote of Epiros* (Oxford 1957); H. Gelzer, *Byzantinische Kulturgeschichte* (Tübingen 1909); J. M. Hussey, *The Byzantine World* (London 1957, paperback 1961); N. Jorga, *Histoire de la vie byzantine,* 3 vols. (Bucharest 1934); W. Haussig, *Byzantinische Kulturgeschichte* (Stuttgart 1959); H. Hunger, *Reich der neuen Mitte* (Graz–Cologne 1965); L. Bréhier, *La civilisation byzantine* (Paris 1950); P. Kukules, Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός (Athens 1954); C. Diehl, *Byzance. Grandeur et décadence* (Paris 1919; E. T., New Brunswick 1957); id., "Byzantine Civilization" in *Cambridge Medieval History,* IV (New York 1927); id., *Choses et gens de Byzance* (Paris 1926).

2. CHURCH HISTORY

Due to the close relationship between Church and State in Byzantium, ecclesiastical and secular history are presented concurrently.

P. Bapheides, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία, 3 vols. (Constantinople 1884–1928); B. Stephanides, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία (Athens 1948); G. I. Konidares, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλλάδος (Athens 1954 seqq.); F. Haase, *Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen* (Leipzig 1925); C. Lagier, *L'Orient Chrétien des apôtres jusqu'à Photius* (Paris 1935); id., *L'orient chrétien de Photius à l'empire latin de Constantinople* (Paris 1950); J. Pargoire, *L'église byzantine de 527 à 847* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1905); A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (London 1907); R. M. French, *The Eastern Orthodox Church* (London 1951); G. Zananiri, *Histoire de l'église byzantine* (Paris 1954); W. de Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens* (Freiburg–Munich 1963); F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (Munich 1937); S. Bulgakov, *The Orthodox Church* (London 1935).

3. THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH COUNCILS — THE PAPACY AND THE EASTERN CHURCH

A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon,* 3 vols. (Würzburg 1951–54); J. Haijar, *Le synode permanent* (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα) *dans l'église Byzantine des origines au XI^e siècle* (Rome 1962); F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Concil* (Münster 1899); F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958); id., *Byzance et la primauté Romaine* (Paris 1964; Eng. trans. by Edwin A. Quain, New York 1966); id., *The Photian Schism — History and Legend* (Cambridge 1948); id., *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome* (Paris 1926); G. Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreits* (Breslau 1929); E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London, n. d.); *Cyrillo-Methodiana 863–1963* (Cologne–Graz 1964); A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1925–30); *1054–1954: L'Église et les églises,* 2 vols. (Chevetogne 1954); S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* (Oxford 1955); M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin* (Paris 1941); W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin 1903); W. de Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens* (Freiburg–Munich 1963); D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); B. Roberg, *Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II. Konzil von Lyon* (Bonn 1964); J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Oxford 1964); id., *Personalities of the Council of Florence and Other Essays* (Oxford 1964).

4. HISTORY OF THE INDIVIDUAL EASTERN CHURCHES

H. Grotz, *Die Hauptkirchen des Ostens von den Anfängen bis zum Konzil von Nikaia (325)* (Rome 1964); T. A. Kane, *The Jurisdiction of the Patriarchs of the Major Sees in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* (Washington 1949); C. Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgang des 4. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1901); T. E. Dowling, *The Orthodox Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem* (London, 2nd ed. 1913); C. Papadopulos, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἱεροσολύμων (Jerusalem 1910); W. Hotzelt, *Kirchengeschichte Palästinas im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge* (Cologne 1914); C. Papadopulos, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας (Alexandria 1935); J. Maspéro, *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie 518–616* (Paris 1923); C. Diehl, *L'Égypte chrétienne et byzantine* (Paris 1933); W. Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats von Alexandrien* (Leipzig 1900); P. Rohrbach, *Die alexandrinischen Patriarchen als Grossmacht in der kirchenpolitischen Entwicklung des Orients* (Berlin 1891); J. Charon, *Histoire des patriarcats melkites depuis le schisme monophysite du VI^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours,* II^1 and III^1 (Paris 1909–10); C. Papadopulos, Ἱστορία τῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀντιοχείας (Alexandria 1951); R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris 1945); M. Gedeon, Πατριαρχικοὶ πίνακες (Constantinople 1890); G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate (451–1204)* (London 1947); G. Arabazoglu, Ἱστορία τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριαρχείου, I (Athens 1953); C. D. Cobham, *The Patriarchs of Constantinople* (Cambridge 1911); G. Zananiri, *Histoire de l'église byzantine* (Paris 1954); L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin 461–506* (Paris 1949); J. Hackett, *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus* (London 1901); P. Kurites, Ἡ ὀρθόδοξος ἐκκλησία ἐν κόπρῳ ἐπὶ Φραγκοκρατίας (Leukosia 1907); M. Spinka, *A History of the Christianity in the Balkans* (Illinois 1933); S. Zankow, *Die Verfassung der bulgarischen orthodoxen Kirche* (Zürich 1918); I. Snegarov, *Istorija na Okridskata arkiepiskopija patriarchija* (Sofia 1935); F. Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX^e siècle* (Paris 1926); A. Hudal, *Die serbisch-orthodoce Nationalkirche* (Graz 1902); L. K. Goetz, *Staat und Kirche in Altrussland* (Berlin 1908); E. E. Golubinskij, *Istorija russkoj cerkvi,* 2 vols. (Moscow 1900–01); A. M. Ammann, *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); L. Müller, *Zum Problem des hierarchischen Status und der jurisdiktionellen Abhängigkeit der russischen Kirche vor 1039* (Cologne 1959).

5. LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

N. Milaš, *Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche* (Mostar, 2nd ed. 1905); A. Pavlov, *Kursus des Kirchenrechts* (Russian) (Moscow 1902); A. Coussa, *Epitome praelectionum de iure ecclesiastico orientali,* 3 vols. (Grottaferro 1948–50); A. P. Christophilopulos, Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δίκαιον (Athens, 2nd ed. 1965); N. P. Matses, Τὸ οἰκογενειακὸν δίκαιον κατὰ τὴν νομολογίαν τοῦ Πατριαχείρου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τῶν ἐτῶν 1315–1401 (Athens 1962); S. N. Troianos, Ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ δικονομία μεχρὶ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ (Athens 1964); K. E. Zachariä von Lingenthal, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts* (Berlin, 3rd ed. 1892); A. Albertoni, *Per una esposizione di diritto bizantino con riguardo all'Italia* (Imola 1927); L. Wenger, *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts* (Vienna 1953); A. Knecht, *System des Justinianischen Kirchenvermögensrechtes* (Stuttgart 1905); M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht,* II (Munich 1959); E. Seidl, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte und römisches Zivilprozessrecht* (Cologne (1962); E. Russos, Λεξικολόγιον ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ δικαίου, 2 vols. (Athens 1948).

6. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY

J. B. Bury, *The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1910); W. Ensslin, "The Emperor and the Imperial Administration" in N. H. Baynes and H. S. L. B. Moss, *Byzantium: An Introduction to East Roman Civilization* (Oxford 1948); J. Karayannopulos, *Das*

Finanzwesen des frühbyzantinischen Staates (Munich 1958); F. Dölger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der byzantinischen Finanzverwaltung bes. des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1960); D. A. Zakynthinos, *Crise monétaire et crise économique à Byzance du XIII^e^ au XV^e^ siècle* (Athens 1948); E. Kirsten, *Die byzantinische Stadt. Acts of the XI International Byzantine Congress 1958,* no. V (Munich 1960); A. Stöckle, *Spätrömische und byzantinische Zünfte* (Leipzig 1911); G. Mickwitz, *Die Kartellfunktion der Zünfte* (Helsinki 1936); A. P. Každan, *Derevnja i gorod v Vizantii IX–X vv* (Moscow 1960); P. Lemerle, "Esquisse pour une histoire agraire de Byzance" in *RH* 219–20 (1958); G. Ostrogorsky, "Die ländliche Steuergemeinde des byzantinischen Reiches im X. Jahrhundert" in *Vjschr. Social- u. Wirtschaftsgesch.* 20 (1927); id., *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels 1954); id., *Quelques problèmes de la paysannerie byzantine* (Brussels 1956); R. S. Lopez and J. A. Raymond, *Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean* (New York 1955); A. S. Atiya, *Crusade, Commerce and Culture* (Bloomington 1962); A. R. Lewis, *Naval Power and Trade in the Mediterranean* (Princeton 1951).

7. POLITICAL THOUGHT — CHURCH AND STATE

J. Straub, *Vom Kaiserideal der Spätantike* (Stuttgart 1939); W. Ensslin, "Gottkaiser und Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden" in *SAM* (1943), 3 (Munich 1943); O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell* (Jena 1938); A. Grabar, *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* (Paris 1936); H. Hunger, *Prooimion. Elemente der byzantinischen Kaiseridee in den Arengen der Urkunden* (Vienna 1964); F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Darmstadt 1964); W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im frühen Mittelalter* (Hildesheim 1947); id., *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt 1958); P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1957); H. Schäder, *Moskau — das dritte Rom* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1957); K. Voigt, *Staat und Kirche von Konstantin dem Grossen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Stuttgart 1936); J. Westbury-Jones, *Roman and Christian Imperialism* (London 1939); A. Michel, *Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche* (Darmstadt 1959); K. M. Setton, *Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the 4th Century* (New York 1941); H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser* (Zürich 1947); B. K. Stephanides, Ἔρευναι περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ βυζαντινῷ κράτει σχέσεων ἐκκλησίας καὶ πολιτείας (Athens 1923).

8. MONASTICISM

Il monachesimo orientale (Rome 1958); S. Schiwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum,* 3 vols. (Mainz 1904–38); R. Reitzenstein, *Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca* (Göttingen 1916); J. Brémond, *Les pères du désert,* 2 vols. (Paris 1927); K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt* (Leipzig 1898); A. J. Festugière, *Les moines d'orient* (Paris 1961 seqq.); U. Ranke-Heinemann, *Das frühe Mönchtum* (Essen 1964); A. v. Campenhausen, *Die aszetische Heimatlosigkeit im altchristlichen und frühmittelalterlichen Mönchtum* (Tübingen 1931); I. Hausherr, *Direction spirituelle en orient autrefois* (Rome 1955); O. Rousseau, *Monachisme et vie religieuse d'après l'ancienne tradition de l'église* (Chevetogne 1957); W. Nissen, *Die Regelung des Klosterwesens im Rhomäerreich bis zum Ende des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Hamburg 1897); P. de Meester, *De monachico statu juxta disciplinam byzantinam* (Vatican 1942); D. Savramis, *Zur Soziologie des byzantinischen Mönchtums* (Leiden–Cologne 1962).

9. LITURGY

J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus,* II, III, and Appendix (Rome 1930–32); S. Salaville, *Liturgies orientales, Le messe,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942); A. Raes, *Introductio in liturgiam orientalem* (Rome 1947); A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée* (Chevetogne, 3rd ed.

1953); id., *Die Messe im Morgenland* (Kempten–Munich, 4th ed. 1921); S. Antoniades, *Place de la liturgie dans la tradition des lettres grecques* (Leiden 1939); J. Tyciak, *Die Liturgie als Quelle östlicher Frömmigkeit* (Freiburg 1937); L. Clugnet, *Dictionnaire grec-français des noms liturgiques en usage dans l'église grecque* (Paris 1895); P. Oppenheim, *Introductio in literaturam liturgicam* (Turin 1937); J. M. Sauget, *Bibliographie de liturgies orientales, 1900–60* (Rome 1962).

10. General Literary and Educational History

a) Literature: K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1897); F. Dölger, *Die byzantinische Dichtung in der Reinsprache* (Berlin 1948); S. Impellizzeri, *La letteratura bizantina da Costantino agli iconoclasti* (Bari 1965); B. Knös, *Histoire de la littérature néogrecque. La période jusqu'en 1821* (Uppsala 1962); N. B. Tomadakes, Βυζαντινὴ ἐπιστολογραφία (Athens 1955); O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur,* 5 vols. (Freiburg 1913–32); D. S. Balanos, Οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ βυζαντινοὶ συγγραφεῖς (Athens 1951); H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theol. Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959); G. Graf, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur,* 5 vols. (Vatican 1944–53); A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn 1922); M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (Vatican 1955).

b) Libraries: V. Burr, "Der byzantinische Kulturkreis" in *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft,* III (Wiesbaden 1955), 146–87; O. Volk, *Die byzantinischen Klosterbibliotheken Griechenlands, Konstantinopels und Kleinasiens* (Diss., Munich 1955); V. Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie,* I (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1911).

c) Schools and Education: F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1926); J. M. Hussey, *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire (867–1185)* (London 1937); G. C. Buckler, *Anna Comnena* (Oxford 1929); G. C. Buckler, "Byzantine Education" in N. H. Baynes and H. S. L. B. Moss, *Byzantium* (Oxford 1948); H. Zilliacus, *Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen im oströmischen Reich* (Helsinki 1935).

11. Philosophy — Theology — Spirituality

a) Philosophy: B. Tatakis, *La philosophie byzantine* (Paris 1949); C. Zervos, *Un Philosophe néoplatonicien du XI^e siècle, Michel Psellos* (Paris 1920); P. P. Joannou, *Christliche Metaphysik in Byzanz* (Ettal 1956); P. E. Stéphanou, *Jean Italos, philosophe et humaniste* (Rome 1949); S. Salaville, "Philosophie et Théologie ou épisodes scolastiques à Byzance de 1059–1117 in *ÉO* 29 (1930), 142ff.; J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos* (Paris 1959); H.-G. Beck, *Theodoros Metochites* (Munich 1952); I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussels 1962); F. Masai, *Pléthon et le platonisme de Mistra* (Paris 1956); L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann* (Paderborn 1923); K. M. Setton, "The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance" in *Proceed. American Philos. Soc.* 100 (1956), 1–76. D. J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

b) Theology: H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theol. Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959); M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia dissidentium,* 5 vols. (Paris 1926–35); M. Gordillo, *Compendium theologiae orientalis* (Rome, 3rd ed. 1950); id., *Theologia orientalium cum latinorum comparata,* I (Rome 1960); J. Tyciak, *Wege östlicher Theologie* (Bonn 1946); F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (Munich 1937); H. Beck, *Vorsehung und Vorherbestimmung in der theologischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Rome 1937); M. Jugie, *De processione spiritus sancti ex fontibus revelationis et secundum orientales dissidentes* (Rome 1936); U. Riedinger,

Die Heilige Schrift im Kampf der Griechischen Kirche gegen die Astrologie (Innsbruck 1956); S. Guichardan, *Le problème de la simplicité divine en orient et en occident aux XIVᵉ et XVᵉ siècles* (Lyons 1933); B. Studer, *Die theologische Arbeitsweise des Johannes von Damaskus* (Ettal 1956).

c) SPIRITUALITY: M. Viller and K. Rahner, *Aszese und Mystik in der Väterzeit* (Freiburg i. Br. 1938); I. Hausherr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale" in *OrChrP* 1 (1935), 114–38; id., *La méthode d'oraison hésychaste* (Rome 1927); id., *Direction spirituelle en Orient autrefois* (Rome 1955); id., *Noms du Christ et voies d'oraison* (Rome 1960); id., *Prière de vie et vie de prière* (Paris 1965); F. Dörr, *Diadochus von Photike und die Messalianer* (Freiburg i. Br. 1937); H. Urs von Balthasar, *Kosmische Liturgie* (Einsiedeln, 2nd ed. 1961); I. Hausherr, *Un grand mystique byzantin: Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien* (Rome 1928); J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris 1959); M. Lot-Borodine, *Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIVᵉ siècle: Nicolas Cabasilas* (Paris 1958); J. Gouillard, *Petite philocalie du cœur* (Paris 1953).

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One:
The Church under Lay Domination

SECTION ONE

The Papacy's Alienation from Byzantium and Rapprochement with the Franks

SOURCES

Wattenbach-Levison (General Bibliography I, 2); *Mansi* XII (Gen. Bib. I, 4); *Liber Pontificalis* (Gen. Bib. I, 5); Papal Documents (Gen. Bib. I, 5); *MGDD imperii,* I, ed. by Pertz (Merovingian sources and also material concerning the Mayors of the Palace); F. Böhmer and E. Mühlbacher, *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Karolingern* (Innsbruck, 2nd ed. 1908); *MGDD Carolinorum* (sources from the earliest Carolingians to Charles the Great); *MGEp* III (Codex Carolinus: papal correspondence with the Carolingians); *MGLL Concilia* II (Frankish Synods) and *Capitularia* I; *MGSS rer. Langobardicarum et Italicarum* (Paul the Deacon and other Italian Sources); *MG Auct. ant.* XI 323 (Isidori Continuatio Hispana a. 754); *MGSS rer. mer.* II, 168–93 *(Cont. Fredegarii); MGSS* I and II (Carolingian Annals); *MGSS rer. Germ.* (single editions of sources including the Carolingian Royal Annals and Paul the Deacon); *MGSS* I and II (Carolingian Annals).

GENERAL HISTORY: Glotz, *Cambridge Medieval History,* Dawson, Génicot, Ganshof, see Gen. Bib. II, 1 a–c; Gebhard, Brandt-Meyer-Just, Rassow, Stenton, Hartmann, Solmi, Menéndez Pidal III, see Gen. Bib. II, 2; H. Dannenbauer, *Die Entstehung Europas* II (Stuttgart 1962); F. Lot, *La naissance de la France* (Paris 1948); G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich, 3rd ed. 1963).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL HISTORY: Mitteis, David, Kern, Ganshof, Bloch, Lesne, Schramm, T. Mayer, Arquillière, Pacaut, Bouman, Folz: see Gen. Bib. II, 8 a–c; L. Knabe, *Die gelasianische Zweigewaltenlehre bis zum Ende des Investiturstreits* (Berlin 1936); W. Ulmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (New York 1954); H. Steger, *David rex et propheta* (Nürnberg 1961); W. Mohr, *Die karolingische Reichsidee* (Münster 1962).

CHURCH HISTORY: Fliche-Martin VI, Biehlmeyer-Tüchle, Dietrich-Wolf, v. Schubert, Lortz, see Gen. Bib. II, 3; Hauck, de Moreau, Delius, Simpson, Deanesley, Godfrey, García Villada III, Rost, Bauerreiss, Tüchle, see Gen. Bib. II, 4; W. A. Philipps, *History of the Church of Ireland* (Oxford 1933); L. Biehler, *Ireland. Harbinger of the Middle Ages* (London 1963); id., *Irland, Wegbereiter des Abendlandes* (Olten–Lausanne 1961); J. Descola, *Histoire de l'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris 1951); *Le Chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'800,* 2 vols. (Spoleto 1960) [= *Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo,* VII].

CONCILIAR AND PAPAL HISTORY: Hefele-Leclercq, Haller I, Seppelt II, Caspar, Ullmann, Kempf, see Gen. Bib. II, 5; Bertolini, Cecchelli, Duchesne, Halphen, see Gen. Bib. II, 5; P. Classen, "Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz" in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben,* I (Düsseldorf 1965), 536–608.

CHURCH LAW AND LEGISLATION: Massen, Fournier – Le Bras, Stickler, see Gen. Bib. II, 4; Feine, Plöchl I, Le Bras, Werminghoff, Lot-Fawtier, see Gen. Bib. II, 6; C. de Clercq, *La législation religieuse franque de Clovis à Charlemagne* (Louvain–Paris 1936); H. Barion, *Das* *fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters* (Bonn 1931); U. Stutz, *Geschichte des kirchlichen Benefizialwesens* (new imp. Aalen, 2nd ed. 1961); K. Vogt, *Staat und Kirche von Constantin dem Grossen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Tübingen 1936).

MONASTICISM AND LITURGY: Schmitz-Räber, Hilpisch, Knowles, *Settimane di studio,* see Gen. Bib. II, 9; Eisenhofer, Righetti, Jungmann, Klauser, see Gen. Bib. II, 10.

LITERATURE AND EDUCATION: *Manitius* I, de Ghellinck I, Curtius, Raby, Siegmund, Lesne, Fuchs, see Gen. Bib. II, 11; D. Norberg, *Introduction à l'étude de la versification latine médiévale* (Stockholm 1958) [= Studia Latina Stockholmensia 5]; M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe 500–900* (London, 2nd ed. 1957); R. R. Bezzola, *Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident,* I (1944) [= *BÉH* 286]; R. Aigrain, *L'hagiographie. Ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire* (Paris 1953).

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY: Fliche-Martin XIII, Grabmann, Crombie, Geyer *(Ueberweg),* de Wulf I, Gilson, Schmaus-Geiselmann-Grillmeier, Harnack, Seeberg, de Lubac, Génicot, Copleston, see Gen. Bib. II, 12; J. Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale* (Paris 1964).

1. *Christendom at the Beginning of the Eighth Century*

LITERATURE

FOR AFRICA, SPAIN AND ITALY: C. Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine* (Paris 1896); H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne,* II (Paris, 2nd ed. 1904); España visigoda (Madrid 1940) [= R. Menéndez Pidal III, see Gen. Bibl. II, 2]; C. Diehl, *Études sur l'administration byzantine dans l'exarchat de Ravenne* (1888) [= Bibl. Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 53]; L. M. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der byzantinischen Verwaltung in Italien* (1889).

ROME, BYZANTIUM AND THE ICONOCLASTIC STRUGGLE: H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1959) [= *Handbuch der Altertumswissensch. Byz. Abt.,* III]; J. Kollwitz, "Zur Frühgeschichte der Bilderverehrung" in *RQ* 48 (1953), 1–20; E. Caspar, "Gregor II. und der Bilderstreit" in *ZKG* 52 (1933), 29–89; O. Bertolini, see Gen. Bib. II, 5; V. Grumel, "L'annexion de l'Illyricum oriental, de la Sicile et de la Calabre au patriarcat de Constantinople" [= Mélanges Lebreton] in *RSR* 40 (1952), 191–200; L. R. Ménager, "La byzantinisation religieuse de l'Italie méridionale et la politique monastique des Normands" in *RHE* 53 (1958), 747–74; ibid., 54 (1959), 5–40; A. Michel, *Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche* (Darmstadt 1959).

GREEK LANGUAGE AND GREEK MONASTERIES IN ROME: H. Steinacker, "Die römische Kirche und die griechischen Sprachkenntnisse des Frühmittelalters" in *MIÖG* 62 (1954), 28–66; *Topografia e urbanistica di Roma* (Rome 1958) [= *Storia di Roma,* XXII]; F. Antonelli, "I primi monasteri di monaci orientali in Roma" in *RivAC* 5 (1928), 105–21; A. Michel, *Die griechische Klostersiedlung in Rom bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (1953) [= *OstKSt* 1]; G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries* (1957).

EARLY HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS: J. Lestocquoy, "Administration de Rome et diaconies du 7^{e} au 9^{e} siècle" in *RivAC* 7 (1930), 261–98; J. Marrou, "L'origine orientale des diaconies romaines" in *MAH* 57 (1940), 95–142; O. Bertolini, "Per la storia delle diaconie romane nell'alto medioevo sino alla fine del secolo VIII in *ADRomana* 70 (1947), 1–145; H. W. Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums" in *ZSavRGkan* 26 (1936), 115–21; S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept" in *Tr* 3 (1945), 129–214.

GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION IN ROME: P. E. Schramm, "Studien zu frühmittelalterlichen Aufzeichnungen über Staat und Verfassung" in *ZSavRGgerm* 49 (1929), 167–232; T. Hirschfeld, "Das Gerichtswesen der Stadt Rom vom 8. bis 12. Jahrhundert" in *AUF* 4 (1912), 419–562.

2. *The Revival of the Frankish Kingdom and the Crossing of the Anglo-Saxons to the Continent*

FURTHER SOURCES

Venerabilis Bedae opera historica, ed. by C. Plummer (Oxford 1896); *Vita Willibrordi, MGSS rer. Mer.*, VII; H. A. Wilson, *The Calendar of St. Willibrord* (London 1918) [= Henry Bradshaw Society 45]; C. Wampach, *Geschichte der Grundherrschaft Echternach* I, 1 and 2 (Luxembourg 1929–30); *Vitae s. Bonifatii archiepiscopi Moguntini*, rec. W. Levison (1905), *MGSS rer. Germ.*; *Epistolae ss. Bonifatii et Lulli*, rec. Tangl, *MGEp* sel. I; lives of the companions and disciples of St. Boniface in *MGSS* XV.

FURTHER LITERATURE

H. E. Bonnell, *Die Anfänge des karolingischen Hauses* (Berlin 1866); T. Breysig, *Jbb. des fränkischen Reiches 714–741* (1869); H. Hahn, *Jbb. des fränkischen Reiches 741–752* (1863); H. Loewe, *Die karolingische Reichsgründung und der Südosten* (Stuttgart 1937); id., "Bonifatius und die bayrisch-fränkische Spannung" in *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 15 (1955), 85–127; W. Levison, *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit* (Düsseldorf 1948); id., *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford 1946); C. Wampach, *St. Willibrord. Sein Leben und Lebenswerk* (Luxembourg 1953); T. Schieffer, "Angelsachsen und Franken. Zwei Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des 8. Jahrhunderts in *AAMz* 1950, No. 20 (1951); id., *Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas* (Freiburg 1954); *St. Bonifatius. Gedenkgabe zum 1200. Todestag*, published by the city of Fulda in conjunction with the Dioceses of Fulda and Mainz (Fulda 1954); H. Büttner, "Bonifatius und die Karolinger" in *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 4 (1954), 21–36; W. Fritze, "Die Einbeziehung von Hessen und Thüringen in die Mainzer Diözese" in *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 4 (1954) 37–63; id., "Slaven und Awaren im angelsächsischen Missionsprogramm I und II" in *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 31 (1964), 316–38; *ibid.*, 32 (1965), 231–51; E. Wiemann, "Bonifatius und das Bistum Erfurt", *Herbergen der Christenheit* 2 (1957); H. Beumann, "Hersfelds Gründungsjahr" in *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 6 (1956), 1–24; H. Appelt, "Die Anfänge des päpstlichen Schutzes" in *MIÖG* 62 (1954), 101–11; W. Schwarz, "Jurisdicio und Condicio. Eine Untersuchung zu den Privilegia libertatis der Klöster" in *ZSavRGkan* 45 (1959), 34–98.

REFORM: H. Barion, *Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters* (Bonn 1931); H. Frank, *Die Klosterbischöfe des Frankenreichs* (Münster 1932) in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums* 17; T. Gottlob, *Der abendländische Chorepiskopat* (Bonn 1928); also F. Gescher, *ZSavRGkan* 19 (1930) 708–17; E. Lesne, *La hiérarchie épiscopale en Gaule et en Germanie 742–882* (Lille–Paris 1905); P. Fournier, *Le droit de propriété exercé par les laïques sur les biens de l'Église au haut moyen âge* (Lille 1943). See also the list of works given at the beginning of the section.

3. *The Founding of the Carolingian Monarchy and the Progress of the Reform*

FURTHER SOURCES

"Vita s. Pirminii" in *MGSS* XV, 17–31; *PL* 89, 1029–50 (Pirmin, Scarapsus); "De unctione Pippini regis nota monachi s. Dionysii" in *MGSS* XV, 1.

LITERATURE

FOR FRANKISH HISTORY: L. Oelsner, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reichs unter König Pippin* (1871).

FOR ROYAL CONSECRATION: E. Perels, "Pippins Erhebung zum König" in *ZKG* 53 (1934), 400–16; E. Müller, "Die Anfänge der Königssalbung im Mittelalter" in *HJ* 58 (1938), 317–60; A. Sprengler, *Gebete für den Herrscher im frühmittelalterlichen Abendland und die verwandten Anschauungen im gleichzeitigen Schrifttum* (typed dissertation, Göttingen 1950); H. Helbig, "Fideles Dei et regis" in *AKG* 33 (1951), 275–306; E. H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae. A Study in liturgical acclamations and mediaeval ruler worship* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1946) [University of California publ. 33]; B. Opfermann, *Die liturgischen Herrscherakklamationen im Sacrum Imperium des Mittelalters* (Weimar 1953); R. Elze, "Die Herrscherlaudes im Mittelalter" in *ZSavRGkan* 40 (1954), 201–23.

For Pirmin and South Germany: G. Jecker, "St. Pirmins Erden- und Ordensheimat" in *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 9–41; A. Doll, "Das Pirminkloster Hornbach" in *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 108–42; T. Mayer, "Die Anfänge der Reichenau" in *ZGObrh* NF 62 (1953), 305–52; H. Büttner, *Geschichte des Elsass* (Berlin 1939); id., "Christentum und fränkischer Staat in Alamannien und Rätien während des 8. Jahrhunderts" in *ZSKG* 43 (1949), 1–150; F. Zöpfl, *Das Bistum Augsburg und seine Bischöfe im Mittelalter* (Munich 1956); K. Reindel, "Die Bistumsorganisation im Alpen-Donauraum in der Spätantike und im Frühmittelalter" in *MIÖG* 72 (1964), 277–310; *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch. Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung* (Darmstadt 1964); J. Fleckenstein, "Über die Herkunft der Welfen und ihre Anfänge in Süddeutschland" in *Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte*, ed. by G. Tellenbach, 4 (1957), 71–136; id., "Fulrad von St. Denis und der fränkische Ausgriff in den süddeutschen Raum" in *Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte* 4 (1957), 9–39.

For the Reform of the Empire and Church: J. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, I: *Grundlegung. Die karolingische Hofkapelle* (Stuttgart 1959) [= Schriften der *MG* XII, 1]; U. Stutz, "Das karolingische Zehntgebot" in *ZSavRGgerm* 29 (1908), 180–224; E. Morhain, *Origine et histoire de la Regula canonicorum de St. Chrodegang* (1948) [= Misc. P. Paschini. Lateranum N. S. XIV]; C. Gindele, "Die gallikanischen Laus perennis-Klöster und ihre Ordo officii" in *RBén.* 69 (1959), 32–48; E. Bourque, *Études sur les sacramentaires romains*, II: *Les textes remaniés*, 1: *Le Gélasien du 8e siècle* (Quebec 1925); M. Andrieu, "La liturgie romaine en pays franc et les Ordines Romani" in *Les Ordines Romani*, II (Louvain 1948), XVII–XLIX; T. Klauser, "Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischen und der fränkisch-deutschen Kirche vom 8. bis 11. Jahrhundert" in *HJ* 53 (1933), 169–89; C. Vogel, "Les échanges liturgiques entre Rome et les pays francs jusqu'à l'époque de Charlemagne" in *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale* . . ., I, 185–295; id., *Introduction aux sources de l'histoire du culte chrétien au moyen âge*, I (Les sacramentaires), II (Les ordines, pontificaux et rituels) in *Studi medievali* 3 (1962), 1–99, *ibid.* 4 (1963) 435–569; id., "La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne" in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, II (Düsseldorf 1965), 217–32; H. Hucke, "Die Einführung des gregorianischen Gesanges im Frankenreich" in *RQ* 49 (1954), 172–87; H. Büttner, "Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreiches bis zum Tode Karls des Grossen" in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, I (Düsseldorf 1965), 454–87.

4. *The Beginnings of the Papal State*

Collection of Sources

J. Haller, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Entstehung des Kirchenstaats* (Leipzig 1907).

Literature

The best new survey: P. Classen, "Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz" in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, I (Düsseldorf 1965).

Individual Problems: P. Kehr, "Die sogenannte karolingische Schenkung von 774" in *HZ* 70 (1893), 335–441; E. Caspar, *Pippin und die römische Kirche* (Berlin 1914); id., "Das

Papsttum unter fränkischer Herrschaft" in *ZKG* 54 (1935), 132–264; R. Holtzmann, *Der Kaiser als Marschall des Papstes* (Berlin–Leipzig 1928); L. Wallach, "Amicus amicis, inimicus inimicis" in *ZKG* 52 (1933), 614–15; L. Levillain, "L'avènement de la dynastie carolingienne et les origines de l'État pontifical" in *BÉCh* 94 (1933), 225–95; P. E. Schramm, "Das Versprechen Pippins und Karls des Grossen für die römische Kirche" in *ZSavRGkan* (1938), 180–217; R. Holtzmann, "Die Italienpolitik der Merowinger und des Königs Pippin" in *Das Reich. Festschrift für J. Haller* (Stuttgart 1940), 95–132; M. Lintzel, "Der Codex Carolinus und die Motive für Pippins Italienpolitik" in *HZ* 161 (1940), 33–41; A. Brackmann, "Pippin und die römische Kirche" in *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (1941), 397–420; J. Haller, "Die Karolinger und das Papsttum" in *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des MA* (1944), 1–40; O. Bertolini, "I papi e le relazioni politiche di Roma con i ducati longobardi di Spoleto e di Benevento III" in *RSTI* 9 (1955), 1–57; id., "I rapporti di Zaccaria con Costantino V e con Artavasdo..." in *ADRomana* 68 (1955), 1–21; id., "Il primo periurium di Aistolfo verso la Chiesa di Roma" in *MiscMercati* 5 (1946) [= Studi e Testi 125], 160–205; id., "Il problema delle origini del potere temporale dei papi nei suoi presupposti teoretici iniziali: il concetto di Restitutio nelle prime cessioni territoriali alla Chiesa di Roma" in *Misc. P. Paschini* (1948), 103–71; E. Griffe, "Aux origines de l'État pontifical" in *BLE* 53 (1952), 216–31, *ibid.*, 55 (1954), 65–89; J. Deér, "Zum Patricius Romanorum-Titel Karls des Grossen" in *AHPont* 3 (1965), 31–86 (with a survey of the literature concerning the Patriciate of the Carolingians); G. Tangl, "Die Entsendung des ehemaligen Hausmeiers Karlmann in das Frankenreich im Jahre 754 und der Konflikt der Brüder" in *QFIAB* 40 (1960), 1–42; id., "Die Passvorschrift des Königs Ratchis und ihre Beziehung zu dem Verhältnis zwischen Franken und Langobarden" in *QFIAB* 38 (1958), 1–67.

SECTION TWO

The Greek Church in the Epoch of Iconoclasm

Sources

1. Chronicles and Historical Works: *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opuscula historica,* ed. by C. de Boor (Lipsiae 1880); *Theophanis Chronographia,* ed. by C. de Boor (Lipsiae 1883); *Georgii monachi chronicon,* ed. by C. de Boor (Lipsiae 1904); *Symeon Magistros u. Logothetes, Chronik, ed. sub nomine Leo Grammaticus,* ed. by I. Bekker (Bonn 1842); *Genesius,* ed. by C. Lachmann (1834); *Theophanes Continuatus,* ed. by I. Bekker (Bonn 1838); *Scriptor incertus de Leone Armeno,* ed. by I. Bekker in the edition of *Leo Grammaticus* (Bonn 1842), 335–62; H. Grégoire, "Un nouveau fragment du Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio" in *Byz(B)* 11 (1936), 417–27.

2. Hagiographic Sources: "Vita Stephani Junioris auct. Stephano diacono" in *PG* 100, 1069–1185; "Vita Nicetae Mediciensis auct. Theostericto" in *ActaSS* April 1 (1865), App. 18–27; "Vita Germani I Patriarchae", ed. by A. Papadopulos-Kerameus, Μαυρογορδάτειος Βιβλιοθήκη, Ἀνέκδοτα Ἑλληνικά (Constantinople 1884), 3–17; "Vita Nicephori Patriarchae auct. Ignatio diacono", ed. by C. de Boor in *Nicephori opuscula historica,* 139–217; "Vita s. Theodori Stud. aust. Michaele monacho" in *PG* 99, 233–328; "Vita s. Tarasii Patriarchae auct. Ignatio Diacono", ed. by I. A. Heikel, *Acta Soc. Sc. Fennicae* 17 (1891), 395–423; "Vita s. Methodii Patriarchae" in *PG* 100, 1244–61.

3. Synodal Acts (cited according to location): Sources for Emperors and Patriarchs are listed by number in: *Dölger Reg* and *Grumel Reg.*
4. Further Sources: Letters of the Patriarch Germanos in *PG* 98, 156 seqq.; Writings and Letters of Theodoros Studites in *PG* 99; The Works of the Patriarch Nicephorus in *PG* 100, 205–849; *Pitra S* I, 302–503; *ibid.* IV, 292–380.

Literature

K. Schwarzlose, *Der Bilderstreit* (Gotha 1890); L. Bréhier, *La querelle des images* (Paris 1904); E. J. Martin, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy* (London 1930); V. Grumel, "Images" in *DThC* VII, 766–844; id., "Recherches récentes sur l'iconoclasme" in *ÉO* 29 (1930), 92–100; G. Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy" in *MS* 2 (1940), 127–49.

SECTION THREE

The Age of Charles the Great (768 to 814)

Sources

See bibliography for Section One. Also *MGEp* IV.

Literature

Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben with the assistance of H. Beumann, B. Bischoff, H. Schnitzler and P. E. Schramm, ed. by W. Braunfels (Düsseldorf 1965), vol. I: *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte,* vol. II: *Das Geistige Leben,* vol. III: *Karolingische Kunst* (hereafter cited as Karlswerk I, II, III); S. Abel and B. Simson, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reichs unter Karl dem Grossen* I, II (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1888 and 1883); A. Kleinclausz, *Charlemagne* (Paris 1934); J. Calmette, *Charlemagne. Sa vie et son œuvre* (Paris 1945); L. Halphen, *Charlemagne et l'empire carolingien* (1948) [= Evolution de l'Humanité 33]; H. v. Fichtenau, *Das karolingische Imperium. Soziale und geistige Problematik eines Grossreiches* (Zürich 1949); R. Folz, *Le couronnement impérial de Charlemagne* (Paris 1964); F. Ganshof, *The Imperial Coronation of Charlemagne* (Glasgow 1949).

Short Surveys: F. L. Ganshof, "Charlemagne" in *Speculum* 24 (1949), 520–28; E. Delaruelle, "Charlemagne et l'Église" in *RHEF* 39 (1953), 165–99; P. E. Schramm, *Karl der Grosse im Lichte der Staatssymbolik* (1957) [= *Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und christlichen Archäologie,* ed. by F. Gerke III].

Individual Studies Concerning Government: M. Lintzel, *Ausgewählte Schriften,* I and II (Berlin 1961).

For the Structure of the Frankish State: E. Zöllner, *Die politische Stellung der Völker im Frankenreich* (Vienna 1950) (= *VIÖG* 13); P. Vaccari, *Studi sull'Europa precarolingia e carolingia* (Verona 1955); L. Auzias, *L'Aquitaine carolingienne* (Toulouse–Paris 1937); F. L. Ganshof, *La Belgique carolingienne* (Brussels 1958); Ewig *(Francia),* Bligny (Burgundy), Wolff (Aquitaine), Wenskus (German Tribes), Reindel (Bavaria) in *Karlswerk,* I.

For the Carolingian Imperial Aristocracy: G. Tellenbach, *Königtum und Stämme in der Werdezeit des Deutschen Reiches* (Weimar 1939); *Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte des grossfränkischen und frühdeutschen Adels,* ed. by G. Tellenbach (Freiburg 1957) [= Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte, IV]; E. Hlawitschka, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien 774–962* (Freiburg 1960) [= Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte, VIII]; Werner in *Karlswerk,* I.

For Frankland and Byzantium: W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im frühen Mittelalter* (Hildesheim 1947); id., *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt 1958); id., "Byzanz und das Abendland im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert" in *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 194–220; F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal 1953); Classen in *Karlswerk,* I.

10. *Charles the Great and Italy*

LITERATURE

FOR THE CONQUEST OF ITALY AND THE ROMAN PATRICIATE: O. Bertolini, "La caduta del primicerio Cristoforo" in *RSTI* 1 (1947); M. Lintzel, *Karl der Grosse und Karlmann* (see *supra*); E. Delaruelle, "Charlemagne, Carloman, Didier et la politique du mariage franco-lombard" in *RH* 170 (1932), 213–24; E. Griffe, "Aux origines de l'État pontifical" in *BLE* (1954), 65–89; H. Loewe, "Zur Vita Hadriani" in *DA* 12 (1956), 493–98; *ibid.*, 14 (1958), 531 ff.; P. E. Schramm, "Die Anerkennung Karls des Grossen als Kaiser" in *HZ* 172 (1951), 449–515; also J. Deér, "Die Vorrechte des Kaisers in Rom 772–800" in *Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte* 15 (1957), 5–63; id., *Patricius Romanorum-Titel* (see ch. 4); Classen, *Karlswerk*, I.

FOR THE DONATION OF CONSTANTINE: P. Scheffer-Boichorst, "Neuere Forschungen über die Constantinische Schenkung" in *Gesammelte Schriften*, I (1903), 1–62; W. Levison, "Constantinische Schenkung und Silvesterlegende" in *Aus rheinischer und fränkischer Frühzeit* (1948), 390–465; W. Ohnsorge, "Die constantinische Schenkung" in *Abendland und Byzanz* (1958), 79–110; see the criticism of R. Bork, "Zu einer neuen These über die Constantinische Schenkung" in *Festschrift A. Hofmeister* (1955), 39–56; E. Ewig, "Das Bild Constantins des Grossen in den ersten Jahrhunderten des abendländischen Mittelalters" in *HJ* 75 (1956), 1–46; W. Gericke, "Wann entstand die Constantinische Schenkung?" in *ZSavRGkan* 43 (1957), 1–88; also: H. Fuhrmann, "Constantinische Schenkung und Silvesterlegende in neuer Sicht" in *DA* 15 (1959), 523–40; S. Williams, "The Oldest Text of the 'Constitutum Constantini'" in *Tr* 20 (1964), 448–61.

11. *The Completing of the Frankish Empire*

SUPPLEMENTARY SOURCES

FOR SAXON HISTORY (in addition to the sources in *MGSS* I, II, XV, *MGCap* I): Beda (cf. chap. 2); Widukind of Corvey, *Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum libri tres*, rec. Lohmann-Hirsch (1935) [= *MGGS rer. Germ.*]; Vita Lebuini antiquior: *MGSS* XXX; Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri*, ed. by Diekamp (1881) [= *Geschichtsquellen des Bistums Münster* 4].

LITERATURE

THE SAXON PEOPLE AND THE SAXON WARS: M. Lintzel (see ch. 10), *Der sächsische Stammesstaat und seine Eroberung durch die Franken* (1933); W. Lammers, "Die Stammesbildung bei den Sachsen. Eine Forschungsbilanz" in *Westfälische Forschungen* 10 (1957), 25–57; *Der Raum Westfalen*, ed. by A. Aubin and F. Petri I, II (Münster 1952, 1955); H. Krüger, "Die vorgeschichtlichen Strassen in den Sachsenkriegen Karls des Grossen" in *Korrespondenzblatt Gesamtverein deutscher Geschichts- und Altertumsvereine* 80 (1932), 223–80; K. Brandi, "Karls des Grossen Sachsenkriege" in *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 10 (1933), 29–52; J. Ramackers, "Die rheinischen Aufmarschstrassen in den Sachsenkriegen Karls des Grossen" in *AHVNrh* 142/143 (1943), 1–27.

THE SAXON MISSION AND ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION: R. E. Sullivan, "The Carolingian Missionary and the Pagan" in *Saeculum* 28 (1953), 705–40; S. Gollub, "Zur Frage der ältesten christlichen Bestattungen in Westfalen" in *Westfälische Forschungen* 11 (1958), 10–16; K. Hauck, "Ein Utrechter Missionar auf der altsächsischen Stammesversammlung" in *Das erste Jahrtausend*, vol. of Texts II (1965), 734–45; id., "Die Herkunft der Liudger-, Lebuin- und Marklo-Überlieferung. Ein brieflicher Vorbericht" in *Festschrift für Jost Trier zum*

70. Geburtstag (Cologne–Graz 1965), 221–39; H. Wiedemann, *Die Sachsenbekehrung* (Hiltrup 1932); *Westfalia Sacra,* I, II (1948, 1950); G. Honselmann, "Die Annahme des Christentums durch die Sachsen im Lichte sächsischer Quellen des 9. Jahrhunderts" in *Westfälische Zschr.* 108 (1958), 201–19; A. K. Hömberg, "Das mittelalterliche Pfarrsystem des kölnischen Westfalen" in *Westfalen* 29 (1951); id., "Studien zur Entstehung der mittelalterlichen Kirchenorganisation in Westfalen" in *Westfälische Forschungen* 6 (1943/52), 46–108; H. E. Feine, "Die genossenschaftliche Gemeindekirche im germanischen Recht" in *MIÖG* 68 (1960), 171–96; G. Niemeyer, *Die Vita des ersten Bremer Bischofs Willehad und seine kirchliche Verehrung* (Münster 1953); A. Schröer, "Das geistliche Bild Liudgers" in *Das erste Jahrtausend,* vol. of texts I (Düsseldorf 1964), 194–215; A. Henkis, "Die Eingliederung Nordalbingiens in das Frankenreich" in *Schleswig-Holstein* 79 (1955), 81–104; H. Büttner in *Karlswerk,* I.

SPANISH EXPEDITION: R. de Abadal y de Vinyals, *La expedición de Carlomagno a Zaragoza. El hecho histórico, su carácter y su significación* (Saragosa 1956) [= Publ. de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Serie II, no. 2]; P. Aebischer, "Le rôle de Pampelune lors de l'expédition franque de 778" in *Schweizer Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 9 (1959), 305–33.

BAVARIA: Loewe (see chap. 2); Reindel in *Karlswerk,* I.

BENEVENTO: R. Poupardin, "Études sur l'histoire des principautés lombards de l'Italie méridionale et de leurs rapports avec l'empire franc" in *MA* (1907), 1–25; J. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin* (Paris 1904) [= Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome]; O. Bertolini, "Langobardi e Bizantini nell'Italia meridionale" in *Atti 30 Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto 1959), 103–24; id., *Karlswerk,* I; H. Belting, *Studien zum beneventanischen Hof im 8. Jahrhundert* (New York–Gluckstadt 1963) [= The Dumbarton Oaks Center of Byzantine Studies].

THE AVARS: G. Stadtmüller, *Geschichte Südosteuropas* (Munich 1950); A. Kollautz, "Die Awaren. Die Schichtung einer Nomadenherrschaft" in *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 129–78; W. Fritze, "Slawen und Awaren im angelsächsischen Missionsprogramm" in *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 31 (1964), 316–38; esp. J. Deér in *Karlswerk,* I.

12. *Reform of Empire and Church: The Carolingian Renaissance*

FURTHER SOURCES

PL 99 (Paulinus of Aquileia), 100 and 101 (Alcuin), 105 (Theodulf of Orléans). Also *MGEp* IV (containing among others the letters of Alcuin) and *MGPoetae* I (poets of the time of Charles the Great as well as the above mentioned authors). Cf. in *Wattenbach-Levison* and *Manitius* I.

LITERATURE

CAPITULARIES: F. L. Ganshof, *Recherches sur les capitulaires* (Paris 1958); W. E. Eckhardt, "Die capitularia missorum specialia von 802" in *DA* 12 (1956), 418–516.

CHURCH AND IMPERIAL REFORM: J. Fleckenstein, "Karl der Grosse und sein Hof" in *Karlswerk,* I, 24–50; H. Büttner, "Mission und Kirchenorganisation des Frankenreichs bis zum Tode Karls des Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* I, 454–87; F. Prinz, "Abriss der kirchlichen und monastischen Entwicklung des Frankenreiches bis zu Karl dem Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* II, 290–99; J. Semmler, "Karl der Grosse und das fränkische Mönchtum" in *Karlswerk,* II, 255–89; F. L. Ganshof, "Charlemagne et les institutions de la monarchie franque" in *Karlswerk,* I, 349–93; id., "Charlemagne et l'administration de la justice dans la monarchie franque" in *Karlswerk,* I, 394–419; id., "The Impact of Charlemagne on the Institutions of the Frankish

Realm" in *Speculum* 40 (1965), 47–62; id., *Les Liens de vassalité dans la monarchie franque* (Brussels 1958); id., *L'immunité dans la monarchie franque* (Brussels 1958); E. E. Stengel, "Grundherrschaft und Immunität" in *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Cologne 1960), 35–68; F. N. Estey, "The Scabini and the Local Courts" in *Speculum* 26 (1951), 119–29; V. Krause, "Geschichte des Institutes der Missi dominici" in *MIÖG* 11 (1890), 193–300; W. Metz, *Das karolingische Reichsgut* (Berlin 1960).

THE CAROLINGIAN RENAISSANCE: W. von den Steinen, "Der Neubeginn" in *Karlswerk,* II, 9–27; id., "Karl und die Dichter" in *Karlswerk,* II, 63–94; B. Bischoff, "Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* II, 42–62; id., "Panorama der handschriftlichen Überlieferung aus der Zeit Karls des Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* II, 233–54; F. Brunhölzl, "Der Bildungsauftrag der Hofschule" in *Karlswerk,* II, 28–41; F. Mütherich, "Die Buchmalerei am Hofe Karls des Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* III, 9–53; W. Braunfels, "Karls des Grossen Bronzewerkstatt" in *Karlswerk,* III, 168–202; J. Beckwith, "Byzantine Influence on Art at the Court of Charlemagne" in *Karlswerk,* III, 288–300; E. Lehmann, "Die Architektur zur Zeit Karls des Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* III, 301–19; P. Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters,* 5 vols. (Stuttgart 1941–62); id., "Das Problem der karolingischen Renaissance" in *Settimane di studio* . . . I (Spoleto 1954), 310–58; F. Heer, "Die Renaissanceideologie im früheren Mittelalter" in *MIÖG* 57 (1949), 23–81; H. Liebeschütz, "Wesen und Werden des karolingischen Rationalismus" in *AKG* 33 (1951), 17–44; H. Grundmann, "Litteratus — illitteratus. Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter" in *AKG* 40 (1958), 1–65; K. Hauck, *Mittellateinische Literatur: Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss,* 2nd ed. by W. Stammler (n. d.); J. Fleckenstein, *Die Bildungsreform Karls des Grossen* (1953); P. Riché, *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare, 6^e–8^e siècle* (Paris 1962); E. Lesne, *Les écoles de la fin du 8^e à la fin du 9^e siècle* [= *Hist. de la propr. eccl.,* V, see Gen. Bib. II, 8]; R. Stachnik, *Die Bildung des Klerus im Frankenreich von Karl Martell bis auf Ludwig den Frommen* (Paderborn 1956); B. Bischoff, "Das Problem der karolingischen Hofschulen" in *Beihefte zur Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* (1956), 50ff.; A. Hessel, "Zur Entstehung der karolingischen Minuskel" *AUF* 8 (1923), 201–14; D. W. Schwarz, *Die karolingische Schriftreform* (1946) [= Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte 4], 38–54; B. Bischoff, *Paläographie, Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss,* 2nd ed. by W. Stammler (n. d.).

LITURGICAL REFORM: See chap. 3. Also: E. Bourque, *Étude sur les sacramentaires romains,* II, 2. *Le sacramentaire d'Hadrien: Studi di antichità cristiana* 25 (Rome 1958); E. Heitz, *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne* (Paris 1963).

BIBLE REVISION: S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge* (Paris (1893); B. Fischer, "Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters" in *Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo,* X, *La bibbia nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto 1963), 519–600; id., "Bibeltext und Bibelreform unter Karl dem Grossen" in *Karlswerk,* II, 156–216; R. E. McNally, *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages* (Westminster, Md., 1959).

ALCUIN: A. Kleinclausz, *Alcuin* (Paris 1948); E. S. Duckett, *Alcuin* (New York 1951); L. Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne* (New York 1959); id., "The Unknown Author of the Libri Carolini" in *Didascaliae. Studies in Honor of A. M. Albareda* (New York 1961), 469–515; F. L. Ganshof, "La révision de la Bible par Alcuin" in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de Renaissance* 9 (1947), 7–20; B. Fischer, *Die Alcuinbibel* (Freiburg 1957); G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin Liturgist* (Chicago 1956); G. Hocquard, "Quelques réflexions sur les idées politico-religieuses d'Alcuin" in *Bulletin des Facultés catholiques de Lyon* 74 (1952); F. C. Scheibe, "Alkuin und die Admonitio Generalis" in *DA* 14 (1958), 221–9; id., "Alkuin und die Briefe Karls des Grossen" in *DA* 15 (1959), 181–93; id., "Geschichtsbild, Zeitbewusstsein und Reformwille bei Alkuin" in *AKG* 41 (1959), 35–62; A. Chélini, *Le vocabulaire politique et social dans la correspondance d'Alcuin* (Aix en Provence 1959) [= *Travaux et mém. Fac. Lettres d'Aix* 220]; H. B. Meyer, "Alkuin zwischen Antike und Mittelalter. Ein Kapitel frühmittelalterlicher

Frömmigkeitsgeschichte" in *ZKTh* 81 (1959), 405–54; H. Hürten, "Alkuin und der Episkopat im Reiche Karls des Grossen" in *HJ* 82 (1963), 22–49. See also Lit. on Adoptionism and the iconoclastic controversy.

Theodulf: C. Cuissard, *Théodulphe évêque d'Orléans* (Orléans 1892); H. Liebeschütz, "Theodulf of Orléans and the Problem of the Carolingian Renaissance" in *Fritz Saxl 1890–1948. A Volume of Memorial Essays*, ed. by J. Gordon, 77–92; B. Bischoff, "Theodulf und der Ire Cadac Andreas" in *HJ* 74 (1955), 92–98; D. Schaller, "Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Gedichten Theodulfs von Orléans" in *DA* 18 (1962), 13–91; Ann Freeman, "Theodulf of Orléans and the Libri Carolini" in *Speculum* 32 (1957), 663–705; id., "Further Studies in the Libri Carolini" in *Speculum* 40 (1965), 203–89. See also Lit. on the Iconoclastic controversy (III, chap. 13).

The Beginning of German Literature: H. de Boor, "Von der karolingischen zur cluniazensischen Epoche" in *Annalen der deutschen Literatur*, ed. by H. O. Burger (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1962); id., *Die deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Beginn der höfischen Dichtung 770–1170* (Munich, 6th ed. 1964) [= de Boor/Newald, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* I]; G. Baesecke, *Vor- und Frühgeschichte des deutschen Schrifttums* (Halle 1950); H. Loewe, "Arbeo von Freising" in *Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter* 15/16 (1950–51), 87–120; J. L. Weisgerber, *Der Sinn des Wortes Deutsch* (Göttingen 1949); H. Brinkmann, *Sprachwandel und Sprachbewegungen in althochdeutscher Zeit* (Jena 1931); K. F. Freudenthal, *Arnulfingisch-karolingische Rechtswörter* (Göteborg 1949); W. Betz, "Karl der Grosse und die Lingua theodisca" in *Karlswerk*, II, 300–06.

13. *Iconoclasm; Adoptionism, and Filioque*

FURTHER SOURCES

MGConc II suppl. (Libri Carolini).

LITERATURE

On the Iconoclastic Controversy: W. von den Steinen, "Entstehungsgeschichte der Libri Carolini" in *QFIAB* 21 (1929–30), 1–93; id., "Karl der Grosse und die Libri Carolini" in *NA* 49 (1932), 207–80; H. v. Fichtenau, "Karl der Grosse und das Kaisertum" in *MIÖG* 61 (1953), 257–334; Freeman and Wallach (see ch. 12 on Theodulf and Alcuin); M. Vieillard-Troïekouroff, "Tables de canons et stucs carolingiens" in *CahArch* 13 (1962), 154–78; P. Bloch, "Das Apsismosaik von Germigny" in *Karlswerk*, III, 234–61; H. Schnitzler, "Das Apsismosaik der Aachener Pfalzkapelle" in *Aachener Kunstblätter* 29 (1964), 1 seqq.; H. Schade, "Die Libri Carolini und ihre Stellung zum Bild" in *ZKTh* 79 (1957), 69–78; G. Haendler, *Epochen karolingischer Theologie. Untersuchungen über die karolingischen Gutachten zum byzantinischen Bilderstreit* (Berlin 1958).

Adoptionism: C. S. Robles, *Elipando y San Beato de Liébana* (Madrid 1935); J. F. Rivera, *Elipando de Toledo* (Toledo 1940); E. Amann, "L'adoptianisme espagnol du 8^e siècle" in *RevSR* 16 (1936), 281–317; R. de Abadal y de Vinyals, *La batalla del Adopcianismo y la desintegración de la Iglesia visigoda* (Barcelona 1949); M. del Alamo, "Los comentarios de Beato al Apocalipsis y Elipando", *MiscMercati* II in *SteT* 122 (1946), 16–33; J. Solano, "El concilio de Calcedonia y la controversia adopcionista del siglo VIII en España" in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, II (Würzburg 1953), 841–71; F. Ansprenger, *Untersuchungen zum adoptianischen Streit im 8. Jahrhundert* (dissertation Berlin 1952); D. Bullough, "The Dating of Codex Carolinus Nr. 95, 96, 97, Wilchar and the Beginning of the Archbishopric of Sens" in *DA* 18 (1962), 223–30; W. Heil, "Der Adoptianismus. Alkuin und Spanien" in *Karlswerk*, II, 95–155.

Frankfurt: F. L. Ganshof, "Observations sur le synode de Francfort de 794" in *Misc. historica in honorem A. de Meyer* (Louvain–Brussels 1946), 306 seqq.

14. *From Frankish Kingdom to Christian Empire*

Collected Sources

H. Dannenbauer, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Kaiserkrönung Karls des Grossen* (Berlin 1931).

Literature

Aachen: E. Lehmann (as ch. 12); *Karlswerk,* III, 301–19; G. Bandmann, "Die Vorbilder der Aachener Pfalzkapelle" in *Karlswerk,* III, 424–62; F. Kreusch, "Kirche, Atrium und Portikus der Aachener Pfalz" in *Karlswerk,* III, 463–533; L. Hugot, "Die Pfalz Karls des Grossen in Aachen" in *Karlswerk,* III, 534–72; W. Kämmerer, "Die Aachener Pfalz Karls des Grossen in Anlage und Überlieferung" in *Karlswerk,* I, 322–48; E. Ewig, "Résidence et capitale pendant le haut moyen âge" in *RH* 230 (1963), 25–72.

Securing the Frontiers: E. Klebel, "Herzogtümer und Marken bis 900" in *DA* 2 (1938), 1–53; A. Hofmeister, "Markgrafen und Markgrafschaften im italischen Königreich in der Zeit von Karl dem Grossen bis zu Otto dem Grossen" in *MIÖG* suppl. vol. 7 (1906); S. Pivano, "I ducati del regno italico nell'età carolingia" in *Studi di storia e diritto in onore di E. Besta,* IV (Milan 1939), 299 seqq.; C. G. Mor, "Dal ducato longobardo del Friuli alla Marca Franca" in *Memorie storiche Forogiuliesi* 42 (1956–57), 29–41; J. Dhondt, *Études sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France* (Bruges 1948); R. de Abadal y de Vinyals, *Nota sobre la locución Marca Hispánica* (Barcelona 1958); M. Bathe, "Die Sicherung der Reichsgrenze an der Mittelelbe durch Karl den Grossen" in *Sachsen und Anhalt* 16 (1940), 1–44.

The Frankish Kingdom and its Neighbours: H. Loewe, "Von Theoderich dem Grossen zu Karl dem Grossen" in *DA* 9 (1952), 353–401; id., "Von den Grenzen des Kaisergedankens in der Karolingerzeit" in *DA* 14 (1958), 345–74; J. Fischer, *Oriens Occidens Europa* (Wiesbaden 1957); J. H. Wallace-Hadrill, "Charlemagne and England" in *Karlswerk,* I, 683–98; H. Jankuhn, "Karl der Grosse und der Norden" in *Karlswerk,* I, 699–707; M. Hellmann, "Karl und die slawische Welt" in *Karlswerk,* I, 708–18.

The Question of Leo III: L. Wallach, "The Genuine and the Forged Oath of Pope Leo III" in *Tr* 11 (1955), 37–63; id., The Roman Synod of December 800 and the Alleged Trial of Leo III" in *HThR* 49 (1956), 123–42; opposing view: H. Loewe in Wattenbach-Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, Vorzeit und Karolinger,* IV, 457: H. Zimmermann, "Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters I" in *MIÖG* 69 (1961), 1–84.

Early History of the Imperial Coronation: K. Heldmann, *Das Kaisertum Karls des Grossen, Theorie und Wirklichkeit* (1928); F. L. Ganshof, *The Imperial Coronation of Charlemagne, Theories and Facts* (Glasgow 1949); W. Ohnsorge, *Abendland und Byzanz* (see ch. 10); H. Loewe, "Eine Notiz zum Kaisertum Karls des Grossen" in *Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter* 14 (1949), 7–34; C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt des frühen Mittelalters* (Berlin 1951); E. E. Stengel, "Imperator und Imperium bei den Angelsachsen" in *DA* 16 (1960), 15–72; H. Beumann, "Die Kaiserfrage in den Paderborner Verhandlungen 799" in *Das erste Jahrtausend,* ed. by V. Elbern, vol. of texts I (1962), 296–317; id., "Romkaiser und fränkisches Reichsvolk" in *Festschrift E. E. Stengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (1952), 157–80; id., "Nomen imperatoris" in *HZ* 185 (1958), 515–49; A. Borst, "Kaisertum und Nomentheorie im Jahre 800" in *Festschrift P. E. Schramm zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden 1964), 36–51; W. Mohr, "Karl der Grosse, Leo III. und der römische Aufstand" in *Archivum Latinitatis*

Medii Aevi 30 (1960), 39–98; H. v. Fichtenau, "Karl der Grosse und das Kaisertum" in *MIÖG* 61 (1953), 257–334; P. Grierson, "The Coronation of Charlemagne and the Coinage of Pope Leo III" in *Revue belge de phil. et d'hist.* 30 (1952), 825–33; Schramm and Deér (see chap. 10); R. Folz, *Le couronnement impérial de Charlemagne* (Paris 1964); P. Classen, "Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz" in *Karlswerk,* I, 537–608.

IMPERIAL TITLE: P. F. Kehr in *NA* 49 (1932), 702–3: P. Classen, "Romanum gubernans imperium" in *DA* 9 (1952), 103–21.

15. *The Development of the Carolingian Theocracy*

LITERATURE

IMPERIAL LEGISLATION AND OATHS OF FIDELITY: F. L. Ganshof, *Recherches* (see chap. 12); id., "La fin du règne de Charlemagne, une décomposition" in *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte* 28 (1948), 433–52; id., "L'échec de Charlemagne" in *Comptes rendus Acad. Inscr. et Belles Lettres* (1947), 248–54; id., "Le programme de gouvernement impérial de Charlemagne: Renovatio imperii" in *Atti della giornata internazionale di Studio per il Millenario 1961* (Faenza 1963), 63–96; F. Lot, "Le serment de fidélité à l'époque franque" in *Revue belge de phil. et d'hist.* 12 (1933), 569–82; L. Halphen, "L'idée d'État sous les Carolingiens" in *RH* 185 (1939), 59–70; C. Odegaard, "The Concept of Royal Power in Carolingian Oaths of Fidelity" in *Speculum* 20 (1945), 279–89; F. L. Ganshof, "Charlemagne et le serment" in *Mélanges Halphen* (1951), 259–70; T. Mayer, "Staatsauffassung in der Karolingerzeit" in *HZ* 173 (1952), 467–84.

MONASTIC REFORM: J. Semmler, "Karl der Grosse und das fränkische Mönchtum" in *Karlswerk,* II, 255–89.

BAGHDAD AND BYZANTIUM: F. W. Buckler, *Harunu'l Rashid and Charles the Great* (Cambridge, Mass. 1931) [= The medieval academy of America, no. 7]; W. Björkman, "Karl und der Islam" in *Karlswerk,* I, 672–82; O. Bertolini, "Carlomagno e Benevento" in *Karlswerk,* I, 609–71; Ohnsorge (see ch. 10); R. Cessi, *Le origini del ducato veneziano* (Naples n. d.) [= *Collectanea storica* 4]; F. Dölger (see ch. 10); P. Classen (see ch. 14).

THE PROBLEM OF SUCCESSION: Ohnsorge (see ch. 10); W. Schlesinger, "Kaisertum und Reichsteilung" in *Forschungen zu Staat und Verfassung. Festgabe für F. Hartung* (Berlin 1958), 9–51; id., *Karolingische Königswahlen* (Berlin 1958); W. Mohr, "Reichspolitik und Kaiserkrönung in den Jahren 813 und 816" in *Welt als Geschichte* 20 (1960), 168–86; Classen (see ch. 14).

THE CAROLINGIAN LEGACY: E. Ewig, "Karl der Grosse und die karolingischen Teilungen" in *Die Europäer und ihre Geschichte* (Munich 1961), 1–18; R. Folz, *Le souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiéval* (Paris 1950) [= Publ. Univ. Dijon, VII].

SECTION FOUR

Climax and Turning Point of the Carolingian Age (814 to 840)

FURTHER SOURCES

Survey in *Wattenbach-Levison* III; Lives of Louis the Pious in *MGSS* II, 604–48 (Astronomus); *ibid.,* 585–604 (Thegan); *MGCap* II, *Ep* V and *Poetae* II (writers and poets of the 9th cent., esp. Ermoldus Nigellus); *PL* 102 (Smaragdus), 103 (Benedict of Aniane), 104

(Agobard and Claudius of Turin), 105 (Ermoldus Niggellus, Dungal, Amalarius) 106 (Hilduin, Jonas, Fréculf), 107–12 (Rhabanus Maurus), 113–14 (Walafrid Strabo), 119 (Florus of Lyons), 120 (Paschasius Radbertus); Jonas, *De institutione regia,* ed. by Reviron (see ch. 17); Vita Anscarii in *MGSS rer. Germ.* (rec. Waitz).

16. *Reform in Empire and Church from 814 to 828*

Literature

On Louis the Pious and his Reign: H. Kuhn, *Das literarische Porträt Ludwigs des Frommen* (dissertation Basle 1930); F. L. Ganshof, "Louis the Pious Reconsidered" in *History* 42 (1957), 171–80; T. Schieffer, "Die Krise des karolingischen Imperiums" in *Aus Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von G. Kallen* (Bonn 1957), 1–15.

On the Ordinatio Imperii of 817: F. L. Ganshof, "Over het idee van het kaizerschap bij Lodewijk de Vrome tijdens het eerste deel van zijn regering" in *Mededelingen der koninklijke vlaamse Academie, Klasse der Letteren* 15 (Brussels 1953); id., "Observations sur l'Ordinatio imperii de 817" in *Festschrift G. Kisch* (Stuttgart 1955), 15–32; W. Schlesinger, *Karolingische Königswahlen* (Berlin 1958).

On the Constitutio Romana: O. Bertolini, "Osservazioni sulla Constitutio Romana e sul Sacramentum cleri et populi Romani dell' 824" in *Studi medioevali in onore di A. Stefano* (Palermo 1956), 43–78.

Ideas of State and Political Ideologies: W. Ohnsorge (see chap. 10); H. Lilienfein, *Die Anschauungen von Staat und Kirche im Staat der Karolinger* (Heidelberg 1902); R. Faulhaber, *Der Reichseinheitsgedanke in der Literatur der Karolingerzeit bis zum Vertrag von Verdun* (Berlin 1931); P. Vaccari, "L'unità carolingia" in *Annali di scienze politiche* 6/7 (1933); Lester K. Born, "The specula principis of the Carolingian Renaissance" in *Revue belge de phil. et d'hist.* 12 (1933), 583–612; H. M. Klinkenberg, "Über karolingische Fürstenspiegel" in *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 7 (1956), 82–98; J. Hashagen, "Spätkarolingische Staats- und Soziallehren" in *DVfLG* (1939).

Reform: J. Narberhaus, *Benedikt von Aniane* (Münster 1930) [= Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums 16]; J. Winandy, "L'œuvre monastique de Benoît d'Aniane" in *Mélanges bénédictins . . . à l'occasion du 14^e^ centenaire de la mort de St. Benoît* (Fontenelle 1947); A. E. Verhulst and J. Semmler, "Les statuts d'Adalhard de Corbie de l'an 822" in *MA* (1962), 92–123, 233–69; E. Lesne, "Les ordonnances monastiques de Louis le Pieux et la Notitia de servitio monasteriorum" in *RHEF* 6 (1920), 161–75, 321–38, 448–88; J. Semmler, "Traditio und Königsschutz" in *ZSavRGkan* 45 (1959), 1–33; id., "Reichsidee und kirchliche Gesetzgebung bei Ludwig dem Frommen" in *ZKG* 71 (1960), 37–65; id., "Zur Überlieferung der monastischen Gesetzgebung Ludwigs des Frommen" in *DA* 16 (1960), 309–88; id., "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816" in *ZKG* 74 (1963), 15–82; id., "Karl der Grosse und das fränkische Mönchtum" in *Karlswerk,* II, 255–89; J. Hubert, "La renaissance carolingienne et la topographie religieuse des citées épiscopales" in *I problemi della civiltà carolingia* (Spoleto 1954) [= Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, I], 219–26; id., "Évolution de la topographie et de l'aspect des villes de Gaule du 5^{e} au 10^{e} siècle" in *La città nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto 1959) [= Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, VI], 549–58; E. Lehmann, "Von der Kirchenfamilie zur Kathedrale" in *Festschrift F. Gerke* (Baden-Baden 1962), 21–37; E. Heitz (as in chap. 12).

Scandinavian Mission: E. de Moreau, *St. Anschaire, missionnaire en Scandinavie au 9^{e} siècle* (Louvain 1930).

17. *The Carolingian Renaissance under Louis the Pious*

LITERATURE

FOR THE CAROLINGIAN RENAISSANCE (see also lit. cited in chap. 12): E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours,* 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1929); S. Tafel, "The Lyons scriptorium" in *Palaeographia latina* 2 and 4 (1923, 1925) [= St. Andrews Univ. Publications 20]; F. M. Carey, *De scriptura Floriacensi* (1923) [= Harvard studies in classical philology 34]; L. W. Jones, "The Scriptorium at Corbie" in *Speculum* 22 (1947), 191–204; id., *The Script of Cologne* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932); W. M. Lindsay and P. Lehmann, "The Early Mayence Scriptorium" in *Palaeographia latina* 4 (1925); W. M. Lindsay, "The Early Lorsch Scriptorium" in *Palaeographia latina* 3 (1924); B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit,* I (1940); G. Baesecke, *Das Schrifttum der Reichenau* (1927) [= Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur 51]; G. Théry, *Études dionysiennes* 1 and 2 (Paris 1932, 1937) [= Études de phil. médiévale 16 and 19]; B. Bischoff, "Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters" in *ByZ* 44 (1951), 27–55.

MONOGRAPHS: Benedict of Aniane (see chap. 16); L. Weinrich, *Wala. Graf, Mönch und Rebell* (Lübeck–Hamburg 1963) [= Historische Studien 386]; A. Bressolles, *St. Agobard, évêque de Lyon* (Paris 1949); A. Cabaniss, *Agobard of Lyons, Churchman and Critic* (Syracuse Univ. Press 1953); id., "Florus of Lyons" in *Classica et mediaevalia* 19 (1958), 212–32; id., *Amalarius of Metz* (Amsterdam 1954); H. Peltier, *Pascase Radbert* (Amiens 1938); J. Reviron, *Les idées politico-religieuses d'un évêque du 9ᵉ siècle. Jonas d'Orléans et son De institutione regia* (Paris 1930); W. Goez, "Zur Weltchronik des Bischofs Frechulf von Lisieux" in *Festgabe für P. Kirn zum 70. Geburtstag* (1961), 93–110; R. Drögereit, "Der Heliand. Entstehungsort und Entstehungszeit" in *Das erste Jahrtausend,* vol. of texts II (Düsseldorf 1964), 762–84 (with older lit.).

18. *The Crisis of Empire and Church (828 to 840)*

FURTHER SOURCES

Paschasius Radbertus, "Epitaphium Arsenii (= Vita Walae)", ed. by E. Dümmler in *AAB* (1900), 3–98; Nithard, "Historiarum libri IV" in *MGSS* II, 649–782; *SS rer. Germ.* 1907 (ed. by Müller); *Class. Fr.* (1926) (ed. by Lauer); "Annales Bertiniani" in *SS rer. Germ.* (rec. Waitz).

LITERATURE

For Wala, Agobard, Jonas, see ch. 17; H. Zatschek, "Die Reichsteilungen unter Kaiser Ludwig dem Frommen" in *MIÖG* 49 (1935), 186–224.

SECTION FIVE

The Western Church from the Death of Louis the Pious to the End of the Carolingian Period

19. *The Frankish Empire from 840 to 875*

FURTHER SOURCES

The earlier work of Wattenbach is still reliable for the over-all coverage. The new edition *Wattenbach-Levison* IV treats only Italy and the Papacy from the Treaty of Verdun to the end of the Carolingian period. *MGDD regum et imperatorum Germaniae e stirpe Carolinorum,* I

(Louis the German); L. Levillain, *Recueil des actes de Pépin Ier et Pépin II d'Aquitaine* (Paris 1926); G. Tessier, *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve,* I–III (Paris 1946–55); *MGEp., Nithard* and *Annales Bertiniani* (see chap. 18); *Annales Fuldenses* rec. Kurze in *SS rer. Germ.; Annales Xantenses,* rec. B. de Simson in *SS rer. Germ.; Regino of Prüm, Chronicon,* rec. Kurze in *SS rer. Germ.;* see further sources in the next chapters.

LITERATURE

W. Schlesinger, "Die Auflösung des Karlsreiches" in *Karlswerk,* I, 792–857; E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches,* 3 vols. (Leipzig 1887–88); J. Calmette, *L'effondrement d'un empire et la naissance d'une Europe* (Paris 1941); *Der Vertrag von Verdun 843. Neun Aufsätze zur Begründung der europäischen Völker- und Staatenwelt,* ed. by T. Mayer (Leipzig 1943); P. E. Hübinger, "Der Vertrag von Verdun und sein Rang in der abendländischen Geschichte" in *Düsseldorfer Jahrbuch* 44 (1947), 1–16; F. L. Ganshof, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte und Bedeutung des Vertrags von Versun" in *DA* 12 (1956), 313–30; R. Schneider, *Brüdergemeine und Schwurfreundschaft. Der Auflösungsprozess des Karolingerreiches im Spiegel der Caritas-Terminologie in den Verträgen der karolingischen Teilkönige des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Lübeck–Hamburg 1964) [= Historische Studien 388]; G. Tellenbach, *Die Entstehung des deutschen Reiches* (Munich, 3rd ed. 1946); R. Parisot, *Le royaume de Lorraine sous les Carolingiens (843–923)* (Paris 1898); R. Poupardin, *Le royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens* (Paris 1901); L. M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter,* III, 1, 2 (Gotha 1908, 1911); F. Lot and L. Halphen, "Le règne de Charles le Chauve" (only to 851) in *BÉH* 175 (Paris 1909); P. Zumthor, *Charles le Chauve* (Strasbourg 1957); P. Classen, "Die Verträge von Verdun und Coulaines 843 als politische Grundlagen des westfränkischen Reiches" in *HZ* 196 (1963), 1–35; P. E. Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich. Das Wesen der Monarchie vom 9. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert,* 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1960); M. David, *Le serment du sacre du 9e au 15e siècle* (Strasbourg 1951).

THE CHURCH IN THE PARTITIONED EMPIRE: J. Schur, *Königtum und Kirche im ostfränkischen Reich* (dissertation, Berlin 1931); K. Voigt, "Die karolingische Klosterpolitik und der Niedergang des westfränkischen Königtums" in *KRA* 90/91 (1917).

THE MARRIAGE CONTROVERSY IN LOTHARINGIA: E. Perels, "Propagandatechnik im 9. Jahrhundert. Ein Originalaktenstück für Erzbischof Gunthar von Köln" in *AUF* 15 (1938), 423–25; H. Fuhrmann, "Eine im Original erhaltene Propagandaschrift des Erzbischofs Gunthar von Köln" in *ADipl* 4 (1958), 1–51; see also lit. on Nicholas I (chap. 21) and on Hincmar of Reims (chap. 23).

20. *Spain and the British Isles. The Muslim and Viking Attacks on the West*

FURTHER LITERATURE

SPAIN: M. Díaz y Díaz, "Die spanische Jacobuslegende bei Isidor von Sevilla" in *HJ* 77 (1958), 467–72; J. Pérez de Urbel, *San Eulogio de Córdoba o la vida andaluza en el siglo IX* (Madrid 1942); F. R. Franke, "Die freiwilligen Märtyrer von Córdoba und das Verhältnis der Mozaraber zum Islam" in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte Spaniens* 13 (1958), 1–170; A. Sánchez-Cadeira, *El regnum — imperium leonés hasta 1037* (Madrid 1951); *Historia de España VI. España cristiana* (Madrid 1956).

ENGLAND: Ebanon S. Duckett, *Alfred the Great* (Chicago 1956).

IRELAND: E. Curtis, *A History of Ireland* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1950).

VIKINGS: W. Vogel, "Die Normannen und das fränkische Reich (799–911)" in *Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte* 14 (1906); U. Noack, *Nordische Frühgeschichte und Wikingerzeit* (Munich–Berlin 1941); L. Musset, *Les peuples scandinaves au moyen âge* (Paris

1951); F. Lot, "La grande invasion normande 856–862" in *BÉCh* 69 (1908), 5–62; id., "La Loire, l'Aquitaine et la Seine 862–866" in *BECh* 76 (1915), 473–510.
Muslims (see also monographs on the regions concerned): J. Gay, "L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin" in *Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 90 (1904).

21. *The Papacy and the West from 840 to 875*

FURTHER SOURCES

Wattenbach-Levison IV with selected lit.; *LP*, papal documents and registers (Jaffé and Kehr) see Gen. Bib. I, 5; *MGEp* VI and VII (Nicholas I, Hadrian II, John VIII, Anast. Bib.); "Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma" in *MGSS* III 719–22. — See also chapters 19 and 23.

MISSION TO THE SLAVS: F. Grivec, *Konstantin und Method, Lehrer der Slawen* (Wiesbaden 1960); *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Leben und Wirken der Slawenapostel Kyrillos und Methodius nach den Pannonischen Legenden und der Clemensvita* . . . translated with introduction and commentary by J. Bujnoch in *Slawische Geschichtsschreiber,* ed. by G. Stökl, 1 (Graz 1958); H. Loewe, "Der Streit um Methodius. Quellen zu den nationalkirchlichen Bestrebungen in Mähren und Pannonien im 9. Jahrhundert" in *Kölner Hefte für den akademischen Unterricht, Historische Reihe* 2 (1948) with lit.; F. Dvornik, *The Slavs. Their Early History and Civilization* (Boston 1956); id., *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au 9e siècle* (Paris 1926); id., "La lutte entre Byzance et Rome à propos d'Illyricum au 9e siècle" in *Mélanges Diehl,* I (1930); id., *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance* (1933); P. Duthilleul, *L'évangélisation des Slaves. Cyrille et Méthode* (Tournai 1963); F. Zagiba, "Neue Probleme der kyrillomethodianischen Forschung" in *OstKSt* 11 (Würzburg 1962); id., "Das abendländische Bildungswesen bei den Slawen im 8./9. Jahrhundert" in *Jahrbuch für altbayerische Kirchengeschichte* (1962), 15–44; id., "Die bayrische Slawenmission und ihre Fortsetzung durch Kyrill und Method" in *Jahrbuch für Geschichte Osteuropas* 9 (1961), 1–56, 247–76; K. Bosl, "Der Eintritt Böhmens in den westlichen Kulturkreis im Licht der Missionsgeschichte" in *Collegium Carolinum,* I, *Böhmen und Bayern* (Munich 1957), 43–64; W. Fritze (see chap. 11); *Cyrillo-Methodiana. Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums bei den Slawen,* pub. by the commission of the Goerres-Gesellschaft ed. by M. Hellmann, R. Olesch, B. Stasiewski and F. Zagiba (Cologne 1964), with contributions by Bosl, Burr, Dvornik, Grivec, Hellmann, Kniczsa, Sós, Zagiba *et al.* Also Loewe's survey in *Wattenbach-Levison,* IV, 471, nn. 337, 338, 339.

LITERATURE

Dölger (see chap. 10); Ohnsorge (see chap. 10); A. Henggeler, *Die Salbungen und Krönungen des Königs und Kaisers Ludwig II.* (dissertation, Fribourg 1934); A. Lapôtre, *De Anastasio bibliothecario sedis apostolicae* (Paris 1885); E. Perels, *Papst Nikolaus I. und Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Berlin 1920); N. Ertl, "Briefdiktatoren frühmittelalterlicher Papstbriefe" (Anast. Bibl.) in *AUF* 15 (1938), 56–132; J. Haller, *Nikolaus I. und Pseudo-Isidor* (Stuttgart 1936); K. Brandi, "Ravenna und Rom" in *AUF* 9 (1926), 1–38; H. Fuhrmann, "Nikolaus I. und die Absetzung des Erzbischofs Johann von Ravenna" in *ZSavRGkan* 44 (1958), 353–58. — See also Hincmar (chap. 23).

22. *The Degradation of the Papacy and the Empire (875 to 904)*

LITERATURE

C. G. Mor, *L'età feudale 887–1024,* I: *Storia politica d'Italia* (Milan 1952); A. Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le St. Siège à l'époque carolingienne,* I (Paris 1895); H. Steinacker, "Das Register Papst Johannes' VIII" in *MIÖG* 52 (1938), 171–94; D. Pop, *La défense du pape Formose* (Strasbourg 1933); G. Arnaldi, "Papa Formoso e gli imperatori della casa di Spoleto" in *Annali Fac. Lett. e Filos. Univ. Napoli* 1 (1951), 85–104; E. E. Stengel, "Die Entwicklung des Kaiserprivilegs für die römische Kirche" in *HZ* 134 (1926), 216–41.

23. *Reform, Theology, and Education under the Later Carolingians*

Further Sources

Surveys in *Wattenbach, Manitius* and esp. (for Rome and Italy) in *Wattenbach-Levison* IV. For Notker Balbulus and the group at St. Gall (Iso, Marcellus, Ratpert, Tutilo, Hartmann, Waldo, and Salomo): W. v. den Steinen, *Notker der Dichter* (Bern 1948), 519ff.

The Writing of History (see also Poetry): *LP,* general chronicles, annals, etc. see chap. 19 and chap. 21. Also: *MGSS rer. Lang.* (Angellus of Ravenna, Erchempert of Monte Cassino, Andreas of Bergamo, Gesta epp. Neapolitanorum); G. Busson and A. Ledru, *Actus pontificum Cenomanis in urbe degentium* (Le Mans 1901); R. Charles and E. Froger, *Gesta domini Aldrici Cenom. urbis episcopi* (Mamers 1889); Flodoard, "Historia Remensis ecclesiae" in *MGSS* XIII, 405–599; "Vita Anscari und Vita Rimberti", rec. G. Waitz in *MGSS rer. Germ.;* "Notker Balbulus, Gesta Karoli Magni", rec. Hans F. Haefele in *MGSS rer Germ.,* NS 12; Agius, "Vita Hathumodae" in *MGSS* IV, 165–89.

Poetry: *MG Poetae Latini,* II (Wandalbert of Prüm), III (Paschasius Radberus, Gottschalk, Hincmar, John Scotus, Sedulius Scotus, Heiric of Auxerre, Audradus, Milo of St-Amand, Agius of Corvey, Carmen de Ludovico II imperator etc.), IV (Gottschalk, Hucbald of St-Amand, Salomo and Waldram, John The Deacon, Eugenius Vulgarius, Poeta Saxo, *Abbo de bello Parisiaco, Gesta Berengarii* etc.), VI (Gottschalk, Waltharius); G. M. Dreves, C. Blume and H. M. Bannister, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi* 7–10 34 53 (also W. v. d. Steinen, *Notker der Dichter,* 530); Notker's Sequences in W. v. d. Steinen, *Notker der Dichter,* vol. of edition (Bern 1948).

Correspondence: *MGEp* V–VIII (Amalarius, Angelomus of Luxeuil, Lupus of Ferrières, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, Hincmar of Reims; Emperor Louis II, Popes Stephen V and Formosus); see also sources for chap. 21. — Correspondance de Loup de Ferrières, ed. by L. Levillain: *Les Classiques de l'histoire de France* 10 (1927); *ibid.* 16 (1935).

Individual Authors in Migne: Rhabanus, Amalarius, Walafrid, Florus, Paschasius Radbertus, see chap. 16. Also: *PL* 75 (John The Deacon), 103 (Sedulius Scotus), 115 (Angelomus of Luxeuil, Prudentius of Troyes), 116 (Amolo of Lyons), 116–18 (Haimo of Halberstadt), 121 (Ratramnus of Corbie, Aeneas of Paris), 122 (John Scotus), 123–24 (Ado of Vienne and Usuard of St-Germain), 125–26 (Hincmar of Reims), 127–29 (Anastasius Bibliothecarius), 129 (Auxilius and Eugenius Vulgarius), 131 (Remigius of Auxerre), 132 (Hucbald of St-Amand).

Special Editions: C. Lambot, *Œuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d'Orbais* (Louvain 1945); W. Gundlach, "Zwei Schriften des Erzbischofs Hinkmar von Reims und De ecclesiis et capellis" in *ZKG* 10 (1889), 258–310. — *MGCap* II (De ordine palatii) and *MGSS rer Mer.* III (Vita Remigii); Sedulius Scotus. *Liber de rectoribus christianis* in S. Hellmann, *Sedulius Scotus,* in *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters,* I, 1 (Munich 1906), 1–91; E. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Vulgarius, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Papsttums im Anfang des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig 1866).

Sources for Law: *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni,* ed. by P. Hinschius (Leipzig 1863; new impr. Aalen 1963); Benedictus Levita, *Capitularium Collectio* in *PL* 97.

Literature

EDUCATION OF THE LAITY: E. Bondurand, *L'éducation carolingienne. Le Manuel de Dhuoda* (Paris 1887); J. Wollasch, "Eine adlige Familie des frühen Mittelalters. Ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Wirklichkeit" in *AKG* 39 (1957), 150–88; P. Riché, "Recherches sur l'instruction des laïcs du 9ᵉ au 12ᵉ siècle" in *CCivMéd* 5 (1962), 175–82; id., "Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates carolingiens" in *MA* (1963), 87–104.

PERSONALITIES: E. v. Severus, *Lupus von Ferrières, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums* 21 (Munich 1940); E. Pellegrin, "Les manuscrits de Loup de Ferrières" in *BÉCh* 115 (1957), 5–31; J. Wollasch, "Zu den persönlichen Notizen des Heiricus von St-Germain d'Auxerre" in *DA* (1959), 24–26; B. de Caiffier, "Le calendrier d'Héric d'Auxerre" in *AnBoll* 77 (1959), 392–425; M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Érigène* (Louvain 1933); H. Liebeschütz, "Texterklärung und Weltdeutung bei Johannes Eriugena" in *AKG* 40 (1958), 66–96; J. Huber, *Johannes Scotus Erigene, Beitr GPhMA* (1960); H. Peltier, *Pascase Radbert* (Amiens 1938); A. Ripberger, "Der Pseudo-Hieronymusbrief IX Cogitis me. Ein erster marianischer Traktat des Mittelalters von Paschasius Radbert" in *Spicilegium Friburgense* 9 (1962); K. Vielhaber, "Gottschalk der Sachse" in *Bonner historische Forschungen* 5 (Bonn 1956); C. Lambot, "Lettre inédite de Godescalc d'Orbais" in *RBén* 68 (1958), 41–51; H. Schrörs, *Hinkmar von Reims* (Freiburg 1884); E. Perels, "Eine Denkschrift Hinkmars von Reims im Prozess Rothads von Soissons" in *NA* 44 (1922), 43–100; G. Ehrenforth, "Hinkmar von Reims und Ludwig III. von Westfranken" in *ZKG* 44 (1925), 65–98; M. Andrieu, "Le sacre épiscopal d'après Hincmar de Reims" in *RHE* 48 (1953), 22–73; J. Devisse, "Hincmar et la Loi" in *Univ. de Dakar, Fac. des Lettres. Publications de la Section Histoire* 5 (Dakar 1962); A. Pothmann, "Altfrid. Ein Charakterbild seiner Persönlichkeit" in *Das erste Jahrtausend,* text vol. I (Düsseldorf 1964) 746–61; Van der Essen, "Hucbald de St-Amand et sa place dans le mouvement hagiographique médiéval" in *RHEF* 19 (1923), 522ff.; H. Löwe, "Regino von Prüm und das historische Weltbild der Karolingerzeit" in *Rheinisches Vierteljahrsblatt* 17 (1952), 151–79; K. F. Werner, "Zur Arbeitsweise des Regino von Prüm" in *WaG* 19 (1959), 96–116; W. v. den Steinen, *Notker der Dichter,* 2 vols. (Bern 1948); H. F. Haefele, "Studien zu Notkers Gesta Karoli" in *DA* 15 (1959), 358–92; W. v. den Steinen, "Der Waltharius und sein Dichter" in *ZdAdL* 84 (1952–3), 1–46; K. Hauck, "Das Walthariusepos des Bruders Gerald von Eichstätt" in *GRM* 35 (1954), 1–27; D. Schaller, "Geraldus und St. Gallen" in *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 2 (1965), 74–84.

ROME AND LOWER ITALY: G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide e la cultura di Giovanni VIII" in *BISIAM* 68 (1956), 33–89; U. Westerbergh, "Beneventan Ninth Century Poetry" in *Acta univ. Stockholmiensis. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia* 4 (Stockholm 1947); see also Löwe: *Wattenbach-Levison* IV.

THEOLOGY: J. Geiselmann, *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* (Paderborn 1926); id., *Studien zu den frühmittelalterlichen Abendmahlsschriften* (Paderborn 1926); C. Gliozzo, *La dottrina della conversione eucharistica in Passasio Radberto e Ratramno, Ignatianum.* Serie Teol. I (Palermo 1945); J. Brinktrine, "Zur Lehre der mittelalterlichen Theologen über die Konsekrationsform der Eucharistie" in *ThGl* 45 (1955), 188–206; R. Schulte, "Die Messe als Opfer der Kirche. Die Lehre frühmittelalterlicher Autoren über das eucharistische Opfer" in *LQF* 35 (1959); E. Aegerter,"Gottschalk et le problème de la prédestination au 9ᵉ siècle" in *RHR* 116 (1937), 187–223.

CANON LAW AND THE PSEUDO-ISIDOREAN DECRETALS: F. Lot, "Textes manceaux et fausses décrétales" in *BÉCh* 101 (1940), 5–48; *ibid.,* 102 (1941), 5–34; H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Patriarchate" in *ZSavRGkan* 40 (1954), 1–84; id., "Pseudo-Isidor und die Abbreviatio Ansegisi et Benedicti Levitae" in *ZKG* 69 (1958), 309–11; E. Seckel, "Die erste Zeile Pseudo-Isidors, die Hadrianarezension In nomine Domini . . . und die Geschichte der Invokationen in den Rechtsquellen" (completed edition of H. Fuhr-

mann) in *SAB,* Klasse für Philosophie . . . (1959), n. 4; Schafer-Williams, "The Pseudo-Isidorian Problem today" in *Speculum* 29 (1954), 702–07; Use in Rome: Löwe in *Wattenbach-Levison* IV, 464 ff.

Diocesan Constitutions: F. Gescher, "Der kölnische Dekanat und Archidiakonat in ihrer Entstehung und ersten Entwicklung" in *KRA* 95 (1919); E. Griffe, "Les origines de l'archiprêtre de district" in *RHEF* (1927), 16–50; F. Arnold, *Das Diözesanrecht nach den Schriften Hinkmars von Reims* (Vienna 1935); A. Heintz, *Die Anfänge des Landdekanats im Rahmen der kirchlichen Verfassungsgeschichte des Erzbistums Trier* (Trier 1951).

SECTION SIX

The Byzantine Church in the Age of Photius

Sources

The most important papal communications addressed to the Byzantine Emperor and the Patriarchs: Nicolai I "Epistolae" in *MGEp* VI, 257–690 (ed. by E. Perels); Hadriani II "Epistolae", *ibid.* VI, 691–765; Joannis VIII, "Epistolae", *ibid.* VII, 1–133 (ed. by E. Caspar); Stephani V "Epistolae", *ibid.* VII 334–365; "Formosi papae epistola ad Stylianum ep." in *Mansi* XVI, 456–58.

Synodal Decrees: Constantinople 861: The original Acts are lost. There are Latin extracts in the *Collection of Card. Deusdedit,* ed. by W. v. Glanvell (Paderborn 1905), 664 ff. The canons are found in *Mansi* XVI, 536–49, Rhallis II, 647–704, and *Joannou* I, 2, 447–79 — Constantinople 867: The Acts are lost. — Constantinople 869–870: The original Acts still lost; a Greek epitome: *Mansi* XVI, 320–409; the Acts in the translation of Anastasius: *Mansi* XVI, 1–208; the Canons: *Mansi* XVI, 397–406, *Joannou* I, 1, 293–342. — Constantinople 879–880: *Mansi* XVII, 373–526; Latin extracts of Deusdedit: Glanvell 610–17; Canons: *Rhallis* II, 705–12, and *Joannou* I, 2, 482–6. — An important collection of propaganda Acts by the opponents of Photius for the so-called second Photian Schism: *Mansi* XVI, 409–57. — "Anastasii Bibliothecarii epistolae" in *MGEp* VII, 395–412; „Vita Ignatii patr." in *Mansi* XVI, 209–92, *PG* 105, 487–574. Letters of the Patriarch Photius: ed. by J. N. Balettas (London 1864), *PG,* 102, 585–989; additional letters of the Patriarchs: ed. by A. Papadopulos-Kerameus (St. Petersburg 1896). Particulars will be cited in individual cases; J. Hergenröther, *Monumenta graeca ad Photium eiusque historiam pertinentia* (Regensburg 1860); A. Papadopulos-Kerameus, *Monumenta graeca et latina ad historiam Photii patriarchae pertinentia,* 2 vols. (St. Petersburg 1899–1901); G. Hofmann, *Photius et ecclesia romana. Textus et documenta,* 2 vols. (Rome 1932); J. N. Karmires, Δύο Βυζαντινοὶ ἱεράρχαι καὶ τὸ σχίσμα τῆς ʽΡωμαϊκῆς ἐκκλησίας (Athens 1951).

Selected Literature: R. Janin, "Ignace" in *DThC* VII, 713–22; V. Grumel, "Ignace" in *Catholicisme* V, 1192–95; *Grumel Reg* nn. 444–589; J. Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel,* 3 vols. (Regensburg 1867–69); M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin* (Paris 1941); F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism. History and Legend* (Cambridge 1948); E. Amann, "Photius" in *DThC* XII, 1536–1604; F. Dvornik, *The Patriarch in the Light of Recent Research. Report to the XI International Byzantine Congress* (Munich 1958), vol III, 2. Also in the same report: Responses by P. Stéphanou and K. Bonis, 17–26, and the *Proceedings of the XI International Byzantine Congress* (Munich 1961), 41–54.

SECTION SEVEN

The Church and the Western Kingdoms from 900 to 1046

SOURCES

Mansi XVIII, 249 – XIX, 620; *Hefele-Leclercq* IV, 2, 721–994; further source material in individual chapters.

LITERATURE

General treatment found in the universal history cited in Gen. Bib. II, 1, a–b, esp. *Glotz* II; *Historia Mundi* V–VI; Cartellieri, *Weltstellung des deutschen Reiches;* Hampe, *Hochmittelalter; The Cambridge Medieval History;* N. F. Cantor's *Medieval History* in an excellent analysis. For ecclesiastical history see Gen. Bib. II, 3; esp. *Fliche-Martin* VII; Gen. Bib. II, 5, above all *Haller* II and *Hauck KD* III.

STATE AND SOCIETY: Gen. Bib. II, 8, a–b, esp. Mitteis, *Staat des hohen Mittelalters* and Erdmann, *Zur politischen Ideenwelt. — Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medio evo,* II: *I problemi dell'Europa postcarolingia* (Spoleto 1955); VII: *La città nell'alto medio evo* (Spoleto 1959); *Studien zu den Anfängen des europäischen Städtewesens, Vorträge und Forschungen* IV (Lindau–Constance 1958).

THEOCRATIC IDEAS: Gen. Bib. II, 8c. H. Beumann, "Die sakrale Legitimierung des Herrschers im Denken der ottonischen Zeit" in *ZSavRGgerm* 66 (1948), 1–45; C. Erdmann, "Der Heidenkrieg in der Liturgie und die Kaiserkrönung Ottos I." in *MIÖG* 46 (1932), 129–42; J. Kirschberg, *Kaiseridee und Mission unter den Sachsenkaisern und den ersten Saliern* (Berlin 1934); H. Bünding, *Das Imperium christianum und die deutschen Ostkriege vom 10.–12. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1940).

THEORIES ON THE RENOVATION OF THE EMPIRE: P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1957), still basic; F. Heer, "Die 'Renaissance'-Ideologie im frühen Mittelalter" in *MIÖG* 57 (1949), 23–81; G. Ladner, "Die mittelalterliche Reformidee und ihr Verhältnis zur Renaissance" in *MIÖG* 60 (1952), 31–59; E. Anagnino, *Il concetto di rinascita attraverso il medio evo, V–X secolo* (Milan–Naples 1958); for further literature see chap. 28.

27. *The New Kingdoms*

SOURCES

FRANCE: Flodoard, *Annales* (919–966), *CollText* 39, ed. by M. P. Lauer (1905), *MGSS* III, 363–408; Flodoard, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* (to 948), *MGSS* XIII, 405–599; Richer, *Historiarum libri IV* (to 995 or 998, not entirely reliable), *Class Hist* 12, 17, ed. by R. Latouche (1930, 1937); *MGSS rer. Germ.,* ed. by G. Waitz (1877); Raoul Glaber, *Historiarum libri* V (1000–45; filled with fables of the miraculous and of little historical value), *CollText* 1, ed. by M. Prou (1886); Selections in *MGSS* VII, 48–72; Ademar of Chabannes, *Chronicon* (to 1028), *Coll Text* 20, ed. by J. Chavanon (1897); *MGSS* IV, 106–48; for Gerbert's letters see the following chapter. Royal documents: *Recueil des actes de Charles III,* ed. by Lauer (Paris 1949); . . . *de Louis IV,* ed. by Lauer (Paris 1914); . . . *de Lothaire et de Louis V,* ed. by M. L. Halphen (Paris 1907); see Gen. Bib. I, 3, *Académie,* etc., *Chartes et diplômes;* C. Pfister, *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux* (Paris 1885); F. Soehnée, *Catalogue des actes d'Henri Ier* (Paris 1907).

GERMANY: Widukind of Corvey, *Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum Libri III* (to 957–58: Supplement 973), *MGSS rer. Germ.,* ed. by. P. Hirsch and A. E. Lohmann (5th ed. 1935); *Continuator*

Reginonis (907–67, probably by Adalbert, then Abbot of Weissenburg, later Archbishop of Magdeburg), *MGSS rer. Germ.*, ed. by F. Kurze (1890, with Regino); *Annales Hildesheimenses* (esp. important for 974–1040), *MGSS rer. Germ.*, ed by G. Waitz (1878); *Annales Quedlingburgenses* (important for Otto III and Henry II), *MGSS* III, 22–90; *Annales Sangallenses maiores* (to 1024; continued to 1044), *MGSS* I, 73–85; Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis* (Archbishop of Cologne 953–65), *MGSS rer. Germ.*, NS 10, ed. by I. Ott (1951); Gerhard, *Vita Udalrici* (Bishop of Augsburg 923–73), *MGSS* IV, 377–428; *PL* 135, 1001–70; Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon* (to 1018), *MGSS rer. Germ.*, NS 9, ed. by R. Holtzmann (1935). — Royal and Imperial documents: *MGDD* I (Conrad I – Otto I); II (Otto II – Otto III); J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta imperii,* I (for the Carolingians to 918), new ed. by E. Mühlbacher and J. Lechner (Innsbruck, 2nd ed. 1908); II (for the Saxon house), part 1 (Henry I – Otto I), new ed. by E. V. Ottenthal (Innsbruck, 2nd ed. 1893); part 2 (Otto II), ed. by H.-L. Mikoletzky (Graz 1950); part 3 (Otto III), ed. by M. Uhlirz (Graz 1956–57). For the succeeding rulers see chap. 32. Councils: M. Boye, "Quellenkatalog der Synoden Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 922–1059" in *NA* 48 (1903), 45–96.

The Papacy: Rome – Italy: *Duchesne LP* II, pp. IX–XX, 236–64; *Watterich* I, 32—90; Benedict of St. Andrea, *Chronicon* (to 968), *FontiStIt* 50 (1020), ed. by G. Zucchetti; *MGSS* III 695–722; Liutprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis* (888–949), *MGSS rer. Germ.*, ed. by J. Becker (3rd ed. 1915); *Chronicon Salernitanum* (to 974), ed. by U. Westerbergh (Stockholm 1956), *MGSS* III, 467–561.

Royal Documents: all ed. by L. Schiaparelli, *I diplomi de Berengario I, FontiStIt* 35 (1903); *. . . de Guido e di Lamberto, ibid.* 36 (1906); *. . . di Lodovico III e di Rodolfo II, ibid.* 37 (1910); *. . . di Ugo e di Lotario, di Berengario II e di Adalberto, ibid.* 38 (1924). For more particulars on the sources see *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 1–2; *Jacob-Hohenleutner* II.

LITERATURE

France: The work of E. Lavisse, *Histoire de France,* II, 1–2 (Gen. Bib. II, 2) is standard; see monographs for individual rulers in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 11. — P. Poupardin, *Le royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens 855–933* (Paris 1901); id., *Le royaume de Bourgogne 888–1038* (Paris 1907); A. Hofmeister, *Deutschland und Burgund im frühen Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1914); F. Lot and R. Fawtier, *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge,* I: *Institutions seigneuriales* (Paris 1957); K. F. Werner, "Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Königtums" in *WaG* 18 (1958), 256–89; *ibid.* 19 (1959), 146–93; *ibid.* 20 (1960), 87–119; P. E. Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich,* 2 vols. (Weimar, 2nd ed. 1960). – Ecclesiastical history: Gen. Bib. II, 4; D. W. Lowis, *The History of the Church in France 950–1000* (London 1926); E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France du IXᵉ au XIᵉ siècle,* II: *La propriété ecclésiastique et les droits régaliens à l'époque carolingienne* (4 sections, Paris 1922–36); T. Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich 870–1130* (Berlin 1953); for the elections of bishops see chap. 35.

Germany: Gen. Bib. II, 2. — *Giesebrecht* I; JbbDG (see Gen. Bib. II, 2): for Conrad I by E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reiches,* III (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1888); for Henry I by G. Waitz (Leipzig, 3rd ed. 1885); for Otto I by R. Köpke and E. Dümmler (Leipzig 1876); for Otto II by M. Uhlirz (Leipzig 1902); for Otto III by M. Uhlirz (Berlin 1954); basic is R. Holtzmann, *Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit 900–1024* (Munich, 3rd ed. 1955); further lit. on political history: *Gebhardt-Grundmann* I, 48–65; *Hauck* III, 1–388; L. Santifaller, *Zur Geschichte des ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchensystems, SAWPhil.-Hist. Kl* 229, 1 (Vienna, 2nd ed. 1964), an excellent survey on royal and papal privileges and detailed sources and literature on the popes from 955–1057; M. Boye, "Die Synoden Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 922–1059" in *ZSavRGkan* 49 (1929), 131–284; H. Barion, *Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters* (Bonn–Cologne 1931); O. Engelmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten* *in Deutschland bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (dissertation, Marburg 1911); see also literature for chap. 28, 30, 31.

ITALY: Gen. Bib. II, 2, esp. *Hartmann* III–IV; further lit. for Italy and Rome in ch. 28; J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens,* 4 vols. (Innsbruck 1868–74); *I ad Arduino 880–1015* (Turin 1908); G. Fasoli, *I re d'Italia 888–962* (Florence 1949); A. Hof-
P. S. Leicht, *Storia del diritto pubblico italiano* (Milano 1938); S. Pivano, *Stato e Chiesa da Berengario*
meister, "Markgrafen und Markgrafschaften im italienischen Königsreich 774–962" in *MIÖG,* supplement. vol. 7 (1907), 215–435; E. Hlawitschka, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien 774–962* (Freiburg in Br. 1960); J. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin* (Paris 1904); P. Lamma, "Il problema dei due imperi e dell'Italia meridionale nel giudizio delle fonti letterarie dei secoli IX–X" in *Atti del 3° congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto medio evo* (Spoleto 1959), 155–253; G. Dilcher, "Bischof und Stadtverfassung in Oberitalien" in *ZSavRGgerm* 81 (1964), 225–66; *Vescovi e diocesi in Italia nel medioevo, sec. IX–XIII, Atti del II convegno di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* (Padua 1964); G. Musca and L. Musca, *L'Emirato de Bari, 847–871* (Bari 1964) contains excellent survey of secondary lit. on South Italian history in the ninth century.

ROME: Gen. Bib. II, 5; W. Kölmel, *Rom und der Kirchenstaat im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert bis in die Anfänge der Reform* (Berlin 1935); O. Gerstenberg, *Die politische Entwicklung des römischen Adels im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1933); A. Solmi, *Il senato romano nell'alto medioevo 757–1143* (Rome 1944); P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1957).

28. *Rome, the Papacy, and the Empire: 962 to 1002*

SOURCES

Cited for most part for sect. 7 and ch. 27; R. Elze, *Die Ordines für die Weihe und Krönung des Kaisers und der Kaiserin, MG Fontes iuris germ. antiqui in us. schol.* 9 (Hanover 1960); Liutprand of Cremona, *Historia Ottonis* (960–964) and *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana* (mission of 968) in *Luitprandi opera* ed. by J. Becker, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (3rd ed. 1915); John The Deacon, *Chronicon Venetum* (to 1008), *FontiStIt* 9, ed. by G. Monticolo (1890); *MGSS* VII, 4–38; Gerbert of Aurillac, *Lettres* (983–997), *CollText* 6, ed. by J. Havet (1889), new ed. in preparation by W. Weigle; see progress accounts in *DA* 10 (1953–54), 19–70; *DA* 11 (1954–55); 393–421; *DA* 14 (1958), 149–220; *DA* 17 (1961) 385–419; M. Uhlirz, *Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Datierung der Briefe Gerberts* (Göttingen 1957); on the *Vitae* of Adalbert of Prague see chap. 31.

LITERATURE

See sect. 7 and chap. 27. Also E. Eichmann, *Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland,* 2 vols. (Würzburg 1942); recent literature in the above cited edition of Elze. R. Folz, *L'idée d'empire en occident du Ve au XIVe siècle* (Paris 1953); on the *imperium* see also G. Ladner in *WaG* 11 (1951), 143–53; F. Kempf, *Das Königtum,* Vorträge und Forschungen 3 (Lindau - Constance 1956), 225–42; J. Spörl in *Festschr. H. Kunisch* (Berlin 1961), 331–53; W. Holtzmann, *Imperium und Nationen* (Cologne–Opladen 1953); id., in *X Congresso internazionale di scienze storiche, Relazione* III (Florence 1955), 271–303; R. Holtzmann, "Der Weltherrschaftsgedanke des mittelalterlichen Kaisertums und die Souveränität der europäischen Staaten" in *HZ* 159 (1939), 251–64; H. Beumann, "Das imperiale Königtum im 10. Jahrhundert" in *WaG* 10 (1950), 117–30; H. Keller, "Das Kaisertum Ottos des Grossen im Verständnis seiner Zeit" in *DA* 20 (1964), 325–88; H. Löwe, "Kaisertum und Abendland in ottonischer und frühsalischer Zeit" in *HZ* 196 (1963), 529–62; H. Beumann, "Das Imperium und die Regna bei Wipo" in *Festschr. Fr. Steinbach* (Bonn 1961), 11–36; W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem. Die Bedeutung des byzantinischen Reiches für die Entwicklung der Staatsidee in Europa* (Hildesheim 1947); id., "Byzanz und das Abendland im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert" in *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 194–220; *Festschr. zur Jahrhundertfeier der Kaiserkrönung Ottos d. Gr., MIÖG,* supplem. vol. 20 (1962), in section I: P. E. Schramm, State symbolism and the Saxon Emperor, E. Dupré-Theseider, Otto and Italy, H. F. Schmid, Otto and the East, W. Ohnsorge, Otto and Byzantium; *Renovatio imperii, Atti della giornata internazionale di studio per il millenario* (Faenza 1963); M. Lintzel, *Die Kaiserpolitik Ottos des Grossen* (Munich - Berlin 1943); also F. Rörig in *Festschr. E. E. Stengel* (Münster - Cologne 1952), 203–22; see also chap. 27, footnote 17; G. A. Bezzola, *Das ottonische Kaisertum in der französischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. und beginnenden 11. Jahrhunderts, VIÖG* 18 (1956); W. L. Grünewald, *Das fränkisch-deutsche Kaisertum in der Auffassung englischer Geschichtsschreiber* 800–1273 (dissertation, Frankfurt 1961); K. F. Werner in *HZ* 200 (1965), 1–60 (*imperium* in French thought from 10th to 12th cent.).

The Empire, Italy and Rome: Lit. for chap. 27; H. *Zimmermann,* "Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters, II: Die Zeit der Ottonen" in *MIÖG* 69 (1961) 241–91 (important); P. E. Schramm, "Kaiser, Basileus und Papst in der Zeit der Ottonen" in *HZ* 129 (1924), 424–75; G. Schwarz, *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und salischen Kaisern* (Leipzig–Berlin 1913); H. Pahnke, *Geschichte der Bischöfe Italiens deutscher Nation 951–1264* (Berlin 1913); M. Uhlirz, "Die italienische Kirchenpolitik der Ottonen" in *MIÖG* 48 (1934), 201–321; id., "Die Restitution des Exarchates Ravenna durch die Ottonen" *MIÖG* 50 (1936), 1–34; G. Graf, *Die weltlichen Widerstände in Reichsitalien gegen die Herrschaft der Ottonen und die beiden ersten Salier 951–1056* (Erlangen 1936); M. Uhlirz, "Die staatsrechtliche Stellung Venedigs zur Zeit Ottos III." in *ZSavRGgerm* 76 (1959), 82–110.

Otto iii: M. Ter Braak, *Kaiser Otto III.* (dissertation, Amsterdam 1928). Indispensable is P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (see lit. for sect. 7) I, 87–187; *ibid.,* I, 3–33; and *JbbDG, Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Otto III.* ed. by M. Uhlirz (Berlin 1954); cf. also M. Uhlirz, "Otto III. und das Papsttum" in *HZ* 162 (1940), 258–68; see ref. to research on the 'renovatio' idea in *Settimane di studio,* II (sect. 7), 201–9; R. Morghen, "Otto III., servus apostolorum" in *Settimane di studio,* II, 13–25.

29. *The Church in Spain, Ireland, and England: 900 to 1046*

Sources

Spain: See the bibliography by B. Sánchez Alonso, *Fuentes de Historia Española e Hispano-Americana* (Madrid, 2nd ed. 1927); *RepFont* I, 803f. (Register of source collections); P. Kehr, *Papsturkunden in Spanien,* I: Catalonia, II: Navarre and Aragón: *AGG* 18, 2 (1926), *ibid.,* 22, 1 (1928), and C. Erdmann, *Papsturkunden in Portugal, AGG* 20, 3 (1927), both with a wealth of archival and bibliographical material; M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Index scriptorum latinorum medii aevi hispanorum* (Salamanca 1958–59). — Indispensable are the geographically arranged great source works: Henrique Flórez, *España Sagrada,* and J. Villanueva, *Viage literario a las iglesias de España* (Gen. Bib. I, 7); also important, *Marca Hispanica, auctore P. de Marca,* ed. by E. Baluze (Paris 1688). C. Sánchez Albornoz, *La España musulmana, según los autores islamistas y cristianos medievales,* 2 vols. (Buenos Aires 1946); A. Huici, *Las crónicas latinas de la reconquista,* 2 vols. (Valencia 1913); M. Gómez-Moreno, *Las primeras crónicas de la reconquista: El ciclo de Alfonso III, Boletín de la Academia de la Historia* 100 (1932); J. M. Lacarra, "Documentos para el estudio de la reconquista y repoblación del valle de Ebro", *Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón,* I, II, series 2 (1946), series 3 (1947–48); A. Huici Miranda, *Colección de crónicas árabes de la Reconquista,* presently in 4 vols. (Tetuán 1951ff.); cf. *RepFont* I, 335.

Ireland and Scotland: J. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland,* I: *Ecclesiastical* (New York 1929), narrative as well as bibliographical. The most important editions found in *Rolls Series,* see *Kenney* and *RepFont* I, 803 (Register of all Irish source collections); F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonessammlung* (Giessen, 2nd ed. 1874); L. Bieler and D. Binchy, *Irish Penitentials* (Dublin 1963). W. C. Dickinson, G. Donaldson and I. A. Miller, *A Source Book of Scottish History,* I: to 1424 (London 1952); A. Orr Anderson, *Early Sources of Scottish History 500–1286,* 2 vols. (Edinburgh 1922); id., *Scottish Annals from English Chronicles 500–1286* (London 1908); A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland,* I–III in 4 vols. (Oxford 1869–78), vol. II contains the sources for Scotland to 1188 and for Ireland to 665.

England: Bibliographies by C. Gross, *Sources and Literature of English History* (London, 2nd ed. 1915); W. Bonser, *An Anglo-Saxon and Celtic Bibliography 450–1087,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1957); for the monastic reform see the survey by Eleanor S. Duckett, *Saint Dunstan;* W. Holtzmann, *Papsturkunden in England,* 3 vols. in *AGG* 25 (1930–31), *AGG,* 3rd series, 14 (1935), *AGG* 33 (1952), useful for introduction to present state for research, etc.; The collection of councils by Haddan and Stubbs III *(v. supra)* extends only to 870; B. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes, also Monumenta ecclesiastica,* 2 vols. (London 1840); F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen,* 3 vols. (Halle 1898–1916); F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche* (Halle 1851), for Ireland and England, pp. 101–352; see also W. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisziplin der Kirche,* 2 vols. (Mainz 1883–98), for the Anglo-Saxons I, 490–587 and II, 645–701; for the editions of royal documents see *Santifaller NE* 21–24. Although written in the early 12th cent. the works of William of Malmesbury and Simeon of Durham are important because of their use of lost sources: see *Historia Dunelmensis ecclesiae* and *Historia regum,* ed. by T. Arnold, *Rolls Series* 75, 1–2 (1882–85); on reform see *Memorials of St. Dunstan* (*vitae* and other material), ed. by W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series* 63 (London 1874); Aelfric, *Vita S. Aethelwoldi episcopi Wintonensis* in *Chronicon monasterii de Abingdon,* ed. by J. Stevenson, *Rolls Series* 2, vol. II (London 1858), 253–66; continued by Wulfstan, *PL* 137, 79–108; *Vita Oswaldi, archiepiscopi Eboracensis* in *Historians of the Church of York,* ed. by S. Raine, *Rolls Series* 71, vol. I (London 1879), 399–475. — "Cnutonis regis gesta sive Encomium Emmae" in *MGSS* XIX, 509–25; *Wulfstan,* collection of homilies attributed to him, ed. by A. Napier (Berlin 1883), see especially as indicative of the spirit of the time his *Sermo lupi ad Anglos* written c. 1014, in *Lives of Edward the Confessor,* ed. by H. R. Luard, *Rolls Series* 3 (London (1858).

LITERATURE

Spain: For ecclesiastical history see Gen. Bib. II, 4; Amann in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 417–27. — For profane history see Gen. Bib. II, 2; R. P. A. Dozy, *Histoire des musulmans d'Espagne jusqu'à la conquête de l'Andalousie par les Almoravides* (Leiden, 2nd ed. 1932); E. Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane,* 2 vols. (Paris 1951), the Spanish translation found in Gen. Bib. II, 2; L. de las Cagidas, *Los Mozárabes,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1946–48). J. A. Maravall, *El concepto de España en la edad media* (Madrid 1954); E. Herrera Oria, *Historia de la reconquista de España* (Madrid, 2nd ed. 1943); J. Pérez de Urbel and R. del Arco y Garay, *España cristiana. Comienzo de la reconquista 711–1038* (see. Gen. Bib. II, 2); A. Sánchez Candeira, *El 'Regnum-Imperium' Leonés hasta 1037* (Madrid 1951); J. Pérez de Urbel, *Historia del condado de Castilla,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1945); L. Serrano, *El obispado de Burgos y la Castilla primitiva desde el siglo V al XIII,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1936); R. Menéndez Pidal, *La España del Cid,* 2 vols. (Madrid, 2nd ed. 1947); J. Descola, *Histoire de l'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris 1951); P. David, *Études historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal du VI^e^ au XII^e^ siècle* (Lisbon–Paris 1947); A. Ubieto Arteta, "Las diócesis navarro-aragonesas durante los siglos IX y X" un *Pirineos* 10 (1954), 179–99; A. Durán Gudiol, "La iglesia en Aragón durante el siglo XI" in *Estudios de edad media de la Corona de Aragón* 4 (1951), 7–68; P. Kehr, *Das Papsttum und der Katalanische Prinzipat bis zur Vereinigung mit Aragón; AAB* 1 (1926); for the councils see note 6 of this chapter.

IRELAND AND SCOTLAND: For ecclesiastical history see Gen. Bib. II, 4; M. Leclercq in *DACL* VII, 1461–1552; Amann in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 404–07. — Gen. Histories: E. Curtis, *A History of Medieval Ireland* (London, 2nd ed. 1938); E. MacNeill, *Early Irish Laws and Institutions* (Dublin 1935); W. Nugent, *Church and State in Early Christian Ireland* (dissertation, Dublin 1949); L. Bieler, "Irland, Wegbereiter des Mittelalters" in *Stätten des Geistes* (Olten 1963).

ENGLAND: For ecclesiastical history see Gen. Bib. II, 4; Amann in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 407–15; F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066. A Constitutional History* (London 1963). — Poltical history: Gen. Bib. II, 2; R. H. Hodgkin, *A History of the Anglo-Saxons,* 2 vols. (London, 3rd ed. 1952); P. E. Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation* (Oxford 1937); H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1899); H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas 1218* (dissertation, Bonn 1926); D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England 940–1216* (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1949, new impression 1963); id., with R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales* (London 1953); F. Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne avant les Normands* (Paris 1909); E. John, "The King and the Monks in the 10th Century Reformation" in *BJRL* 42 (1959–60), 61–87; J. A. Robinson, *The Times of St. Dunstan* (Oxford 1923); Eleanor S. Duckett, *Saint Dunstan of Canterbury* (New York 1955); K. Jost, *Wulfstanstudien* (Bern 1950); D. Whitelock in *Transact. of the Royal Hist. Soc.,* 4. ser. 24 (1942), 25–42 (Wulfstan in homiletics and statecraft); id. in *EHR* 69 (1955), 72–85 (Wulfstan's influence in the legislation of Knut).

30. *The Spread of Christianity Among the Scandinavians in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*

SOURCES

Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum, MGSS rer. Germ.,* ed. by B. Schneider (3rd. ed. 1917), an important history composed between 1074 and 1076, later extended to 1080, esp. important for the time of Archbishop Adalbert (3rd book) and for the peoples and lands of northern Europe (4th book); Saxo Grammaticus, *Historia Danica (Gesta Danorum),* ed. by A. Holder (Strasbourg 1886); Another ed. by J. Olrik and H. Raeder in 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1931); P. Herrmann, Interpretation of the first 9 books, I: Translation (German), II: Commentary (Leipzig 1922); although not recorded until the 13th cent., the Eddas and Sagas form a valuable source of our knowledge of early Christianity in the North. Saxo's account to 1168 is based upon these. A still worthwhile account of Icelandic literature with information on texts and manuscripts is the Prolegomena to the edition of *Sturlunga saga* by G. Vigfusson (Oxford 1878); also F. Y. Powell, *Origines Islandicae* (Oxford 1905) which contains lives of bishops Jon, Pal, and Thorlak; cf. W. A. Craigie, *The Icelandic Sagas* (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1933); *Altnordische Sagenbibliothek,* ed. by G. Cederskjöld, G. Gering and E. Mogk, 18 vols. (Halle 1922–29); cf. *RepFont* I, 25, 743; D. H. May, *Regesten der Erzbischöfe von Bremen* (Hanover 1937); extends to 1306.

LITERATURE

See research report by H. Kellenbenz in *HZ* 190 (1960), 618–55. — O. Scheel, *Die Wikinger* (Stuttgart 1939); U. Noack, *Geschichte der nordischen Völker,* I: *Nordische Frühgeschichte und Wikingerzeit* (Munich 1941); L. Musset, *Les peuples scandinaves au moyen âge* (Paris 1951). H. Ljunsberg, *Die nordische Religion und das Christentum. Studien über den nordischen Religionswechsel zur Wikingerzeit,* German trans. by H. W. Schomerus (Gütersloh 1941); in contrast W. Baetke minimizes the worth of the sagas as sources, "Christliches Lehrgut in der Sagareligion" in *BAL* 98, 6 (1951); W. Lange, *Studien zur christlichen Dichtung der Nordgermanen 1000–1200* (Göttingen 1958); W. Trillmich, "Die Krise des nordgermanischen Heidentums" in *WaG* 12 (1952), 27–43.

Missions and Church History: G. Haendler in *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* II, sect. E (Gen. Bib. II, 3), E 69 to R 73 (good literature); for principal works see Gen. Bib. II, 4. — W. Trillmich, "Missionsbewegungen im Ostseeraum" in *Festgabe W. Aubin* (Hamburg 1950), 229–40; W. Göbell, "Die Christianisierung des Nordens und das Werden der mittelalterlichen Kirche bis zur Errichtung des Erzbistums Lund (1103)" in *ÖAKR* 15 (1964), 8–22, 97–102; H. v. Schubert, *Kirchengeschichte Schleswig-Holsteins,* I (Kiel 1907); K. Maurer, *Die Bekehrung des norwegischen Stammes zum Christentum,* 2 vols. (Munich 1855–56), still worthwhile; P. Zorn, *Staat und Kirche in Norwegen bis zum Schluss des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1875); J. Dehio, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Hamburg-Bremen bis zum Ausgang der Mission,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1877); J. G. Schröffel, *Kirchengeschichte Hamburgs,* I (Hamburg 1929); B. Schmeidler, *Hamburg-Bremen und Nordost-Europa vom 9. bis 11. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1918); F. J. Tschan, *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen* (New York 1959); C. J. A. Oppermann, *The English Missionaries in Sweden and Finland* (London 1937); K. Maurer, *Altnordische Kirchenverfassung und Eherecht. Vorlesungen über altnordische Rechtsgeschichte,* II (Leipzig 1908); K. Haff, "Das Grosskirchspiel im nordischen und niederdeutschen Rechte des Mittelalters" in *ZSavRGkan* 63 (1943), 1–63; T. J. Oleson, *Early Voyages and Approaches* (Toronto 1963) (excellent survey of literature on Greenland during the Middle Ages).

31. *Evangelization of the Slavs and the Magyars in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*

Sources

Wends-Bohemia-Poland: G. Jakob, *Ibrahim ibn Jaqub's Bericht über die Slavenländer aus dem Jahre 973;* Anhang zu Widukinds Sachsengeschichte, trans. by P. Hirsch in *GdV* 33 (Leipzig 1931), 177ff.; Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum* (see chap. 30); for the eastern policy of the Saxon Emperors see chap. 29: *Annales Quedlinburgenses, Hildesheimenses* and Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon;* for Adalbert of Prague: John Canaparius (?), "Vita S. Adalberti" in *MGSS* IV, 581–95; Bruno of Querfurt, "Vita et passio S. Adalberti" in *Monum. Polon. hist.,* I, ed. by A. Bielowski, 184–222 (1st version) and *MGSS* IV, 596–612 (2nd version with variations); important is Bruno's letter to Henry II in *Giesebrecht,* II (5th ed.), 702–05 and his "Vita quinque fratrum" in *MGSS* XV, 709–38; also the Vita et Passio ascribed to him in *MGSS* XXX, 1350–67; Cosmas of Prague, *Cronica Boemorum* (written about 1110, until 1125), *MGSS rer. Germ.* NS 2, ed. by B. Bretholz (1923), mostly fiction; *Annales Poloniae* (from the 11th century on) in *MGSS* XIX, 612–65; *ibid.,* XXIX, 421–70 (supplement); Anonymus Gallus, *Chronicae Polonorum* (from the 1st decade of the 12th century) in *MGSS* IX, 423–78.

Russia: Aside from the references in Byzantine and Latin sources, the old Russian Chronicles are of great value; the best edition is: *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej* [Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles] (Leningrad 1926); in vol. I the so-called Laurentius Chronicle (ed. by E. F. Karskij) is important; its oldest version, the Chronicle of Nestor, has been recently edited with commentary by D. S. Lichčev, *Povest' vremenniych let* [Stories from Bygone Years], 2 vols. (Moscow–Leningrad 1950); cf. also id., *Russkiia letopsi i ikh kulturno-istorichekoe znachenie* [Russian Chronicles and Their Cultural Significance] (Moscow–Leningrad 1947); also M. D. Priselkov, *Nestor Letopisets* [Nestor the Chronicler] (St. Petersburg 1923).

Hungary: Collected sources in *SS rer. Hung.,* ed. by E. Szentpétery, 2 vols. (Budapest 1937–38); the work of L. Endlicher, *Rerum Hungaricarum Monumenta Arpadiana* (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1931) is still indispensable for the Leges; historical writing does not appear until the end of the 11th cent.; it is mostly hagiographical; also the short *Annales Posonienses* in *SS. rer. Hung.* I, 119ff.; *MGSS* XIX, 571ff.; the remainder of the *Gesta Hungarorum* in *SS. rer. Hung.* I, 13ff.

For Bohemia-Poland-Russia-Hungary: Cf. *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 798–820; also sources in the works cited below: F. Dvornik, *The Slavs;* G. Stökl, *Slavenmission;* P. David, *Les sources de l'histoire de Pologne à l'époque des Piasts* (Paris 1924); C. M. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians. A Critical and Analytical Guide* (Cambridge 1953).

General: L. I. Strakhovsky, *A Handbook of Slavic Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949); R. Trautmann, *Die slavischen Völker und Sprachen. Eine Einführung in die Slavistik* (Göttingen 1947); F. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (London 1949); id., *The Slavs. Their Early History and Civilization* (Boston, 2nd ed. 1959); G. Stökl, *Geschichte der Slavenmission* in *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* II, section E. (Gen. Bib. II, 3), E 75 – E 91 (with good literature); O. Halecki, *The Limits and Divisions of European History* (London 1951); M. Hellmann, "Slavisches, insbesondere ostslavisches Herrschertum des Mittelalters" in *Das Königtum, Vorträge und Forschungen,* 3 (Lindau–Constance 1956), 243–77; F. Baethgen, "Die Kurie und der Osten" in *Deutsche Ostforschung,* I (Leipzig 1942), 310–39; H. Ludat, "Die ältesten geschichtlichen Grundlagen für das deutsch-slavische Verhältnis" in *Das östliche Deutschland* (Würzburg 1959), 127–60; (on the Emperor and the idea of kingship and mission cf. lit. for sec. 7 and chap. 28); T. Mayer, "Das Kaisertum und der Osten im Mittelalter" in *Deutsche Ostforschung,* I (Leipzig 1942), 291–309; W. Füllner, *Der Stand der deutsch-slavischen Auseinandersetzung zur Zeit Thietmars von Merseburg* (Jena 1937).

Wends: M. Hellmann, "Ostpolitik Kaiser Ottos II" in *Festschrift H. Aubin* (Lindau–Constance 1956), 46–76; G. Lukas, *Die deutsche Politik gegen die Elbslaven von 982 bis Ende der Polenkriege Heinrichs II.* (dissertation, Halle 1940); A. Dieck, *Die Errichtung der Havelbistümer unter Otto dem Grossen* (dissertation, Heidelberg 1944); K. Schmaltz, *Kirchengeschichte Mecklenburgs,* I (Schwerin 1935); W. Schlesinger, *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens im Mittelalter,* I: *Von den Anfängen christlicher Verkündigung bis zum Ende des Investiturstreites* (Cologne–Graz 1962); H. Herrmann, *Thüringische Kirchengeschichte,* I (Jena 1937); H. F. Schmid, *Die rechtlichen Grundlagen der Pfarrorganisation auf westslavischem Boden und ihre Entwicklung während des Mittelalters* (Weimar 1938); for criticism cf. W. Schlesinger, "Die deutsche Kirche im Sorbenland und die Kirchenverfassung auf westslavischem Boden" in *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 1 (1952), 345–71; H. Beumann and W. Schlesinger, "Urkundenstudien zur deutschen Ostpolitik unter Otto III." in *ADipl* I (1955), 132–256.

Bohemia: B. Bretholz, *Geschichte Böhmens und Mährens,* I (Reichenberg 1921); A. Naegle, *Kirchengeschichte Böhmens,* I, 1–2 (Vienna–Leipzig 1915–18); W. Wegener, *Böhmen, Mähren und das Reich im Hochmittelalter* (Cologne 1959); K. Bosl, "Der Eintritt Böhmens und Mährens in den westlichen Kulturraum im Lichte der Missionsgeschichte" in *Collegium Carolinum,* II: *Böhmen und Bayern* (Munich 1958), 43–64.

Poland: *Cambridge History of Poland from the Origins to Sobieski 1696* (Cambridge 1950); cf. F. Baethgen in *DA* 9 (1951), 240f.; K. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin–Leipzig 1930); a summary in above mentioned *Cambridge History* by P. David, 60–85; B. Stasiewski, "Die ersten Spuren des Christentums in Polen" in *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* NF 4 (1934), 238–60; *ibid.,* 5 (1935), 572–604; also L. Koczy in *Sacrum Poloniae Millennium,* I (Rome 1954), 9–69; B. Stasiewski, *Untersuchungen über drei Quellen zur ältesten Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Breslau 1933); id., *Kirchengeschichtliche Beiträge zur Entwicklung des deutsch-polnischen Grenzraums im Hochmittelalter* (Berlin 1955); P. Fabre, *La Pologne et le Saint Siège du X^e^ au XII^e^ siècle* (Paris 1896); L. Kulczycki, *L'organisation de l'église de Pologne avant le XIII^e^ siècle* (dissertation, Strasbourg 1928).

Russia: G. Stökl, "Russisches Mittelalter und sowjetische Mediävistik" in *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* NF 3 (1955), 1–40, 105–22; K. Stählin, *Geschichte Russlands,* I (Berlin–Leipzig 1923); P. Miliunow, C. Seignobos and C. Eisenmann, *Histoire de Russie,* I (Paris 1932); G. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (New Haven 1948); H. Paszkiewicz, *The Origins of Russia*

(London 1954); G. Vernadsky, *The Origins of Russia* (Oxford 1959); A. M. Ammann, *Abriss der ostslavischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); S. H. Cross, *Medieval Russian Churches* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949); G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind. Kievan Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass. 1946); M. Vladimirskij-Budanow, Germ. trans. by L. K. Goetz, *Staat und Kirche in Altrussland* (Berlin 1908); L. K. Goetz, *Kirchengeschichtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands nebst Geschichte des russischen Kirchenrechts* (Stuttgart 1905); A. Pszywyi, *Die Rechtslage der Kirche im Kiewer Staat auf Grund der fürstlichen Statuten* (typed dissertation, Graz 1950); A. M. Ammann, *Die ostslavische Kirche im jurisdiktionellen Verband der byzantinischen Grosskirche 988 to 1459* (Würzburg 1955); A. Herman, *De fontibus iuris ecclesiastici Russorum* (Vatican City 1936); R. P. Casey, "Early Russian Monasticism" in *OrChrP* 19 (1953), 373–423.

Yugoslavs: G. Stadtmüller, *Geschichte Südosteuropas* (Vienna 1950); C. Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben,* I (Gotha 1911); F. Sišic, *Geschichte der Kroaten* (Zagreb 1917) (an expanded Croatian edition in 1925); F. R. Preveden, *A History of the Croatian People,* I: *Prehistory and Early Period until 1397* (New York 1955); L. Vojnović, *Histoire de Dalmatie* (Paris 1934); A. Maier, *Kirchengeschichte von Kärnten,* Heft 2: *Mittelalter* (Klagenfurt 1953); E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs,* I (Innsbruck–Vienna–Leipzig 1925); J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich. Wegweiser durch ihre Geschichte* (Vienna 1959); F. Valjavec, *Geschichte der deutschen Kulturbeziehungen zu Südosteuropa,* I: *Mittelalter* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1953); G. Stadtmüller, "Die Christianisierung Südosteuropas als Forschungsproblem" in *Kyrios* 6 (1942–43), 61–102.

Hungary: B. Hóman, *Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters* (Berlin 1940); P. v. Váczy, *Die erste Epoche des ungarischen Königtums* (Pécs 1936); B. Hóman, *König Stephan I. der Heilige. Die Gründung des ungarischen Staates* (Breslau 1941); A. Szentirmai, "Die 'apostolische Legation' des Ungarnkönigs Stephan des Heiligen" in *ÖAKR* 8 (1957), 253–67; G. Bónis, "Die Entwicklung der geistlichen Gerichtsbarkeit in Ungarn" in *ZSavRGkan* (1963), 174–235.

32. *The Papacy and the Empire from 1002 to 1046*

Sources

See material for Section 7 and chapter 27.

For the Papacy and Italy: see Part II, Section I for the sources on the Gregorian Reform and the decades preceeding; cf. also L. Santifaller, "Chronologisches Verzeichnis der Urkunden Papst Johannes' XIX." in *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* I (1956–57), 35–76; good bibliography of sources and literature for the individual popes in L. Santifaller, *Ottonisch-salisches Reichskirchensystem* (Gen. Bib. II, 8a), 193–205.

The Empire and Germany: The imperial and royal documents: *MGDD* III (Henry II and Arduin), IV (Conrad II), V (Henry III); J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta imperii* III (Salian): Konrad II., revised by H. Appelt and N. v. Bischoff (Graz 1951); for the registers of Henry II and Henry III, cf. K. Stumpf-Brentano, *Die Reichskanzler vornehmlich des X., XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts,* II (Innsbruck 1879; reprint, Aalen 1960), 151–208; sources for the time of Henry II *supra* in chapter 27; sources for the Salian kings: Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi II imperatoris,* ed. by H. Bresslau, *Wiponis opera* in *MGSS rer. Germ.* (3rd ed. 1915, reprint 1956); Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon* (to 1054); Anselm of St. Lambert, *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium* (for the 11th cent.) in *MGSS* XIV, 108–20 (to the death of Bishop Wazo 1048).

Literature

See material for Section 7 and chapters 27 and 28; *JbbDG, Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich II.,* ed. by S. Hirsch, H. Pabst and H. Bresslau, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1862–75); *unter Konrad II.,* ed. by H. Bresslau, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1879–84); *unter Heinrich III.,* ed. by E. Steindorff, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1874–81); K. Hampe and F. Baethgen, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer* (Heidelberg, 10th ed. 1949); H. L. Mikoletzky, *Kaiser Heinrich II. und die Kirche* (Vienna 1946); T. H. Graff, *Beiträge zur deutschen Kirchenpolitik Heinrichs II.* (typed dissertation, Graz 1959); C. Violini, *Arduino d'Ivrea, re d'Italia, e il dramma del suo secolo* (Turin 1942); T. Schieffer, "Heinrich II. und Konrad II. Die Umprägung des Geschichtsbildes durch die Kirchenreform des 11. Jahrhunderts" in *DA* 8 (1951), 384–437; M. L. Bulst-Tiele, *Kaiserin Agnes* (Berlin 1933); P. Kehr, "Vier Kapitel aus der Geschichte Kaiser Heinrichs III." in *AAB* (1930), no. 3; G. Ladner, "Theologie und Politik vor dem Investiturstreit. Abendmahlsstreit, Kirchenreform, Cluny und Heinrich III." in *VIÖG* 2 (1936); G. Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1959); P. Funk, "Ps.-Isidor gegen Heinrich III. Kirchenhoheit" in *HJ* 56 (1936), 305–30; J. Gay, *Les papes du XI^e^ siècle et la chrétienté* (Paris 1926); P. Brezzi, "Aspetti di vita politica e religiosa di Roma tra la fine del sec. X e la prima metà del sec. XI" in *Bolletino di Badia greca di Grottaferrata* 9 (1955), 115–26; C. Violante, "Aspetti di politica italiana di Enrico III prima della sua discesa in Italia" in *RSIt* 64 (1952), 157–76, 293–314; A. Mathis, *Il pontefice Benedetto IX* in *CivCatt* 66 (1915), 549–71; *ibid.* 67 (1916), 285–96, 535–48; S. Messina, *Benedetto IX pontefice Romano* (Catania 1922); G. B. Borino, "L'elezione e la deposizione di Gregorio VI" in *ASRomana* 39 (1916), 141–410; R. L. Poole, "Benedict IX and Gregory VI" in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 8 (1917–18), 200–35; C. Violante, *La pataria milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica,* I (Milan 1955), 43–84 (important chapter on the religious-political Italian policies of Henry III); H. Zimmermann, *Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters,* III in *MIÖG* 70 (1962), 60–83 (with complete literature on Sutri).

SECTION EIGHT

Constitution of the Church, Worship, Pastoral Care, and Piety: 700 to 1050

33. *Diocesan Organization*

SOURCES

For the Carolingian period *MGLL* sect. II, *Capitularia regum Francorum,* 2 vols. (1883–97); sect. III, *Concilia,* 2 vols. extending to 843 (1893–1908); after 844 *Mansi* XIV, 799 to XIX, 620; for the synods of Germany and Italy 922–1059 see the catalogue of sources in M. Boye in *NA* 48 (1930), 45–96; basic is C. de Clercq, *La Législation religieuse franque,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1936, Antwerp 1958).

COLLECTIONS OF LAWS: Benedictus Levita in *MGLL,* sect. I, vol. II, 2 (Leipzig 1963); *PL* 97, 698–912; P. Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* (Leipzig 1863); on Regino of Prüm and Burchard of Worms see ch. 40; for works on the sources of ecclesiastical law see Gen. Bib. I, 4.

LITERATURE

Always reliable also for the two following chapters are the manuals of both the general history of law and of canon law, cited in Gen. Bib. II, 6–7; for practical reasons *Feine* especially is cited in what follows, but the account by A. Dumas in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 177–316 is good; for the Frankish-German synodal decrees cf. in chap. 27 the basic work by H. Barion and the study by M. Boye in lit. for Germany.

CHURCH PROPERTIES AND THE PROPRIETARY CHURCHES: J. Balon, *Jus medii aevi,* I: *La structure et la gestion du domaine de l'église au moyen-âge dans l'Europe des Francs,* 2 vols. (Namur, 2nd ed.

1963); E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France,* 6 vols. (Paris–Lille 1910–43); A. Dumas, "La notion de la propriété ecclésiastique du IX^{e} au XI^{e} siècle" in *RHEF* 26 (1940), 14–34. In spite of a certain bias the following are basic for the history of the proprietary church system: U. Stutz, *Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterlich-germanischen Kirchenrechts* (Berlin 1895); id., *Geschichte des kirchlichen Benefizialwesens von seinen Anfängen bis auf Alexander III.,* part I (Berlin 1895); id., "Eigenkirche und Eigenklöster" in *RE* 23 (1913), 363–77; id., *ZSavRGkan* 57 (1937), 1–85 (selected chapters on history), followed in somewhat different presentation by *Feine RG* X, 18, cf. also X, 19 I–II and X, 20; F. Fournier, *Le droit de propriété, exercé par les laïques sur les biens de l'église dans le haut moyen-âge* (Lille 1943); for the proprietary system in various regions cf. *Feine RG* X, 18 (with lit.); very important is H. E. Feine, "Studien zum langobardisch-italischen Eigenkirchenrecht", I–III in *ZSavRGkan* 61 (1941), 1–95; *ibid.* 62 (1942), 1–105; *ibid.* 63 (1943), 64–190.

RURAL PARISHES: P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les paroisses rurales dans l'ancienne France du IV^{e} au XI^{e} siècle* (Paris 1900); S. Zorell, "Die Entwicklung des Parochialsystems bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit" in *AkathKR* 82 (1902), 74–98; G. Forchielli, *La pieve rurale. Ricerche sulla storia della chiesa in Italia e particolarmente nel Veronese* (Rome 1931, new impr. 1938); H. E. Feine, "Die genossenschaftliche Gemeindekirche im germanischen Recht" in *MIÖG* 68 (1960), 171–96; H. F. Schmid, "Gemeinschaftskirchen in Italien und Dalmatien" in *ZSavRGkan* 77 (1960), 1–61; additional lit. for individual regions in *Feine RG* X, 19, I and X, 18, II, V.

BENEFICES: L. Thomassinus, *Vetus et nova disciplina circa beneficia et beneficiarios* (Paris 1688); in French (Lyons 1676–79); U. Stutz, *Benefizialwesen (v. supra);* id., "Leben und Pfründe" in *ZSavRGgerm* 20 (1899), 213ff., for a different interpretation see A. Pöschl, "Die Entstehung des geistlichen Benefiziums" in *AkathKR* 106 (1926), 3–121, 363–471; see also H. E. Feine, "Kirchleihe und kirchliches Benefizium nach italienischen Rechtsquellen des frühen Mittelalters" in *HJ* 72 (1953), 101–11; additional lit. cf. *Feine RG* X, 20, I.

INCOME OF RURAL PARISHES: F. de Berlendis, *De oblationibus ad altare communibus et particularibus* (Venice 1743); U. Stutz, "Stolgebühren" in *RE* 19 (1906), 67–75; G. Schreiber in *ZSavRGkan* 36 (1915), 414–83; *ibid.* 63 (1943), 191–299; *ibid.* 65 (1947), 31–171 (for fees with regard to blessings, and the position of Gregory VII on the question of Mass oblations, etc.), also G. Schreiber, *Gemeinschaftsformen des Mittelalters,* Art. IV–VI (Münster 1948); for tithes see footnote 5; for *regalia* and *spolia* see the following chapter.

URBAN PARISHES AND CHAPTERS: Cf. lit. for chap. 39; P. Schneider, *Die bischöflichen Domkapitel* (Mainz 1885); E. Mayer, "Der Ursprung der Domkapitel" in *ZSavRGkan* 38 (1917), 1–33; see also footnote 8; J. Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz vom 6. Jahrhundert bis 1160. Mit einem Überblick über die deutsche Kanonikerreform des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts* (Fribourg 1962); A. Pöschl, *Bischofsgut und mensa episcopalis,* 3 vols. (Bonn 1908–12); K. H. Schäfer, *Pfarrkirche und Stift im deutschen Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1903); additional lit. in *Feine RG* X, 19, II; for city prebends *ibid.,* X, 20, II.

DIOCESAN ORGANIZATION: J. Leclef, "Chorévêque" in *DDC* III (1942), 686–95; T. Gottlob, *Der abendländische Chorepiskopat* (Bonn 1928); critical revision by F. Gillmann in *AkathKR* 108 (1928), 712–23, by F. Gescher in *ZSavRGkan* 50 (1930), 708–17; A. Amanieu, "Archiprêtre" in *DDC* I (1935), 1004–26; P. Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Histoire du décanat rural de son commencement jusqu'au XIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1932); J. Faure, *L'archiprêtre des origines au droit décrétalien* (Paris 1911); J. B. Sägmüller, *Die Entwicklung des Archipresbyterats und Dekanats bis zum Ende des Karolingerreiches* (Progr. Tübingen 1898); A. Hamilton Thompson, "Diocesan Organization in the Middle Ages: Archdeacon and Rural Deans", Raleigh Lecture on History 1949 in *Proc. of the Brit. Acad.* 29; A. Amanieu, "Archidiacre" in *DDC* I (1935), 948–1004; A. Schröder, *Die Entwicklung des Archidiakonats bis zum 11. Jahrhundert* (Augsburg 1890); *Feine RG,* 19, III; *ibid.,* 21, I–IV (good lit.).

34. *Prelacies and the Secular Powers*

LITERATURE

Comprehensive resumé in K. Voigt, *Staat und Kirche von Konstantin dem Grossen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Stuttgart 1936); L. Santifaller, *Zur Geschichte des ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchensystems, SAW* 229, Suppl. 1 (2nd. ed. 1964) includes besides the survey a worthwhile list of election privileges of the churches, sovereign rights, etc.; A. Pöschl, *Die Regalien der mittelalterlichen Kirchen* (Graz 1928); J. Flach, "La royauté et l'église en France du IX^{e} au XI^{e} siècle" in *RHE* 4 (1903), 432–47; K. Voigt, *Die karolingische Klosterpolitik und der Niedergang des westfränkischen Königtums* (Stuttgart 1917); H. Ganahl, *Studien zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Verfassungsrechtes im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert* (Innsbruck–Vienna–Munich 1935); further lit. in the chapters in sect. 7.

IMMUNITIES, ROYAL PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY: Cf. manuals of legal and constitutional history in Gen. Bib. II, 6–7 as well as the monographs: *ibid.* II, 8a, esp. T. Mayer, *Fürsten und Staat;* E. Magnin, "Immunités ecclésiastiques" in *DThC* VII (1922), 1218–62; M. Kroell, *L'immunité franque* (Paris 1910); E. E. Stengel, *Diplomatik der deutschen Immunitätsprivilegien vom 9. bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts* (Innsbruck 1910); id., *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Cologne–Graz 1960), 30–34 (immunities), 35–68 (manorial control and immunity); J. Ficker, "Über das Eigentum des Reiches am Reichskirchengut" in *SAW* 72 (1872), 381–450; Registers and catalogues in Santifaller, *Reichskirchensystem,* 78–115; J. Semmler, "Traditio und Königsschutz" in *ZSavRGkan* 76 (1959), 1–33; A. Waas, *Vogtei und Bede in der deutschen Kaiserzeit,* 2 parts (Berlin 1919–23); H. Hirsch, *Die hohe Gerichtsbarkeit im deutschen Mittelalter* (Prague 1922); E. F. Otto, *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kirchenvogtei im 10. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1933); F. Senn, *L'institution des avoueries ecclésiastiques* (Paris 1903); H. Dubled in *Archives de l'église d'Alsace* 26 (1959), 1–88 (monastic advocacy in Alsace).

SECULAR POWER OF BISHOPS: there is no comprehensive work on this subject. *Fliche-Martin* VII, 220 contains bibliography on various dioceses as does the indispensable work on Germany, A. Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte der deutschen Kirche* § 26 and § 25; for the development of the idea of the episcopacy as an ecclesiastical benefice cf. E. Lesne, "Évêché et abbaye. Les origines du bénéfice ecclésiastique" in *RHEF* 5 (1914), 15–20; A. Pöschl, *Bischofsgut und mensa,* esp. vol. III (see lit. in ch. 33); A. Dumas in *RHEF* 26 (1940), 14–34.

For the legal position of the monasteries cf. Lit. in *Feine RG* § 18, III; also Dumas in *Fliche-Martin* VII, 293–316.

ELECTION AND INSTALLATION OF BISHOPS AND ABBOTS: G. Weise, *Königtum und Bischofswahlen im fränkischen und deutschen Reich vor dem Investiturstreit* (Berlin 1912); P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les élections épiscopales dans l'église de France du IX^{e} au XII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1891); E. Laehns, *Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland 936–1056* (dissertation, Greifswald 1909); P. Schmid, *Der Begriff der kanonischen Wahl in den Anfängen des Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart 1926); C. Magni, *Ricerche sopra le elezioni episcopali in Italia durante l'alte medio evo,* 2 vols. (Rome 1928–30); G. Schwarz, *Die Besetzung der italienischen Bistümer* (lit. for chap. 28); J. Polzin, *Die Abtswahlen in den Reichsabteien 1024–1054* (dissertation, Greifswald 1908); H. Lévy-Bruhl, *Les élections abbatiales en France* (Paris 1913); on the position of the German rulers regarding election rights, cf. H. Claus (dissertation, Greifswald 1911) and the catalogues in Santifaller, *Reichskirchensystem,* 51–58; A. Scharnagl, *Der Begriff der Investitur in den Quellen und in der Literatur des Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart 1908).

RIGHTS OF REGALIA AND SPOLIA: U. Stutz, "Regalie" in *RE* XVI (1905), 536–44; E. Lesne, "Les origines du droit de régale" in *Nouv. rev. d'hist. de droit franc. et étr.* 45 (1921), 5–52; J. Gaudement, *La collation par le roi de France des bénéfices vacants en régale des origines à la fin du*

XIV^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1935); E. Friedberg, "Spolienrecht" in *RE* XVIII (1906), 861–86; F. Prochnov, *Das Spolienrecht und die Testierfähigkeit der Geistlichen im Abendland bis zum 13. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1919); on both rights cf. G. Forchielli in *Festschr. Joh. Heckel* (Cologne-Graz 1959), 13–53; Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte*, 57–9; lit. in *Feine RG* § 19, I, a–c.

SERVITIUM REGIS: B. Heusinger, "Das servitium regis in der deutschen Kaiserzeit" in *AUF* 8 (1923), 26–159.

THE PAPACY AND THE PAPAL STATE: The works of P. Brezzi, L. Duchesne, L. Halphen in Gen. Bib. II, 5, and W. Kölmel and Gerstenberg in Lit. for chap. 27; T. Hirschfeld, "Das Gerichtswesen der Stadt Rom vom 8. bis 12. Jahrhundert" in *AUF* 4 (1912), 419–562; K. Jordan, "Das Eindringen des Lehenswesens in das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie" in *AUF* 12 (1932), 13–110; id., "Die päpstliche Verwaltung im Zeitalter Gregors VII." in *StudGreg* I (1947), 111–35; D. B. Zema, "Economic Reorganization of the Roman See during the Gregorian Reform" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 169–81 (both works offer comprehensive surveys and literature for the pre-Gregorian period); R. Elze, "Das 'sacrum palatium Lateranense' im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert" in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 27–54; M. Hartmann in *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 7 (1909), 142–58 (manorial control and bureaucracy in the Papal State); W. Sickel in *MIÖG* 23 (1902), 50–126 (Alberic and the Papal State).

THE PAPAL CHANCERY: H. Breslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien,* I (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1912), 76–78, 191–240, 226–69; *ibid.,* II, 2 (Berlin–Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1931), 518–20, 531–33; L. Santifaller, "Saggio di un elenco dei funzionari, impiegati e scrittori della cancellaria Pontificia dell'inizio all' anno 1099" in *BIStIAM* 56 (1940), 1–865; P. Rabikauskas, *Die römische Kuriale in der päpstlichen Kanzlei* (Rome 1958), contains good survey of the history of the chancery; for the 11th cent. basic are the articles by Kehr, "Scrinium und Palatium" in *MIÖG* Suppl. vol. 6 (1901), 70–112; id., "Die ältesten Papsturkunden Spaniens" in *AAB* (1926), no. 2.

35. *Metropolitans, Primates, and Papacy*

LITERATURE

METROPOLITAN CONSTITUTION: *Feine RG* §§ 6 I, 13 I, 22; E. Lesne, *La hiérarchie épiscopale. Provinces, métropolitains, primats en Gaule et Germanie, 742 à 882* (Paris 1905); useful references in P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les élections épiscopales dans l'église de France du IX*^{e} *au XII*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1891); A. Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte der deutschen Kirche im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1913) §§ 9, 11, 31, 33; P. Wagner, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Metropolitangewalt bis zum Zeitalter der dekretalen Gesetzgebung* (typed dissertation, Bonn 1917); H. Barion, *Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters* (Bonn–Cologne 1931).

PRIMATES, APOSTOLIC VICARS: H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Patriarchate" in *ZSavRGkan* 70 (1953), 112–76; *ibid.,* 71 (1954), 1–84; *ibid.,* 72 (1955), 95–183

PAPACY: *Haller* II, 235–61; Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Cambridge 1931); H. M. Klinkenberg, "Der römische Primat im 10. Jahrhundert" in *ZSavRGkan* 72 (1955), 1–57; (the following is used with permission of the author) S. Lindemans, *La primauté du pape dans la tradition littéraire de la fin du IX*^{e} *au début du XI*^{e} *siècle* (dissertation, Rome-Gregoriana 1959). — For the establishing of bishoprics by the papacy cf. the survey with literature in L. Santifaller, *Reichskirchensystem* (see lit. for chap. 34), 217–23.

PAPACY AND MONASTERIES: P. Fabre, *Étude sur le liber censuum de l'église Romaine* (Paris 1892); H. Hirsch, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des päpstlichen Schutzes" in *MIÖG* 54 (1942), 363–433; H. Appelt, "Die Anfänge des päpstlichen Schutzes" in *MIÖG* 62 (1954), 101–11; W. Szaivert, "Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der Klosterexemtion" in *MIÖG* 59 (1951), 265–98; J. F. Lemarignier, "L'exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme Grégorienne" in *À Cluny. Congrès scientifique* (Dijon 1950), 280–340; W. Schwarz, "Jurisdictio und Condicio. Eine Untersuchung zu den Privilegia libertatis der Klöster" in *ZSavRGkan* 76 (1959), 34–98; more lit. in *Feine RG* § 18, III, especially note 15.

CANONIZATION: E. W. Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church* (London 1948); R. Klauser, "Zur Entwicklung des Heiligsprechungsverfahrens bis zum 13. Jahrhundert" in *ZSavRGkan* 71 (1954), 85–101 (with lit.).

PENANCE: E. Göller, *Papsttum und Bussgewalt in spätrömischer und frühmittelalterlicher Zeit* (Freiburg 1933).

LEGATES: K. Ruess, *Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis zu Bonifaz VIII.* (Paderborn 1912); O. Engelmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (dissertation, Marburg 1913); T. Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrag in Meersen (870) bis zum Schisma 1130* (Berlin 1935).

REIMS QUARREL (989–997): *Fliche-Martin* VII, 68–75; M. Uhlirz, *JbbDG unter Otto III.* (passim); P. Cousin, *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire* (Paris 1954); on Gerbert cf. lit. in chap. 28, note 16.

36. *The Sacraments and the Mass*

SOURCES

For particulars see the manuals by Eisenhofer, Righetti *et al.;* also see Baumstark, *Missale Romanum (v. infra);* E. Dekkers, *Clavis Patrum latinorum* (Steenbrügge 1951), 325–45; K. Gamber, *Codices liturgici antiquiores* (Fribourg 1963); Continuous survey of lit. (since 1921) in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* and (since 1950) in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft.* Here only basic texts are mentioned.

SACRAMENTARIES: *Mohlberg; Lietzmann SG;* (the same Sacramentary with that of Alcuin appended:) H. A. Wilson, *The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great* (London 1915); G. Richter and A. Schönfelder, *Sacramentarium Fuldense saec. X* (Fulda 1912); C. Vogel, "Le Pontifical Romano-germanique" in *SteT* 226/7 (Rome 1963).

LECTIONARIES: S. Beissel, *Entstehung der Perikopen des römischen Messbuches* (Freiburg 1907); T. Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare evangeliorum,* I (Münster 1935); W. H. Frere, *The Roman Epistle-Lectionary* (Oxford 1935); G. Godu, "Épître" in *DACL,* V, 245–344.

CHORAL (SUNG) MASSES: *Hesbert;* for early ritual: *Andrien OR; Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia,* ed. by J. M. Hanssens, 3 vols. (Rome 1948–50); *Martène R.*

LITERATURE

Eisenhofer; Righetti; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris 1925); A. Baumstark, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie* (Freiburg 1923); H. Netzer, *L'introduction de la Messe Romaine en France* (Paris 1910); G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin Liturgist* (Chicago 1956); F. Cabrol, "Charlemagne et la liturgie" in *DACL* III, 807–25; A. L. Mayer, "Altchristliche Liturgie und Germanentum" in *JLW* 5 (1925), 80–96; I. Herwegen, *Germanische Rechtssymbolik in der römischen Liturgie* (Heidelberg 1913); T. Klauser, "Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischen und der fränkisch-deutschen Kirche vom 8. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert" in *HJ* 53 (1933), 169–89.

SACRAMENTS: A. Stenzel, *Die Taufe. Eine genetische Erklärung der Taufliturgie* (Innsbruck 1958); H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisziplin der Kirche* (Mainz 1883); id., *Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren* (Düsseldorf 1898); L. Bieler, *The Irish Penitentials* (Dublin 1963); B. Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbusse im frühen Mittelalter* (Breslau 1930); id., *Penance and the Annointing of the Sick* (New York 1964); J. A. Jungmann, *Die lateinischen Bussriten* (Innsbruck 1932); K. Ritzer, *Formen, Riten und religiöses Brauchtum der Eheschliessung in den christlichen Kirchen des ersten Jahrtausends* (Münster 1962); H. Mayer, "Geschichte der Spendung der Sakramente in der alten Kirchenprovinz Salzburg" in *ZKTh* 37 (1913), 760–804; *ibid.* 38 (1914), 1–36, 267–96; P. de Puniet, *Le Pontifical Romain,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1930–31).

MASS: A. Baumstark, *Missale Romanum. Seine Entwicklung, ihre wichtigsten Urkunden und Probleme* (Eindhoven–Nijmegen 1929); *Jungmann MS;* B. Luykx, "Der Ursprung der gleichbleibenden Teile der Heiligen Messe" in *LuM* 29 (1961), 72–119; P. Browe, *Die häufige Kommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1938); id., *Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1940); G. Nickl, *Der Anteil des Volkes an der Messliturgie im Frankenreiche von Chlodwig bis auf Karl den Grossen* (Innsbruck 1930); C. De Clercq, "Gebed en sacramenten bij 't volk ten tijde van Karel den Groote" in *OGE* 3 (1929), 278–90, 375–93.

37. *The Clergy and the Care of Souls*

SOURCES

The capitularies *(MGCap)* and councils (*MGConc aevi Karolini; Mansi* XII–XIX); Regino of Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis,* ed. by Wasserschleben (Leipzig 1840); Burchard of Worms, *Decretum* (*PL* 140, 337–1058); id., *Admonitio synodalis* (one of the original texts: *PL* 96, 1375–80).

LITERATURE

R. Stachnik, *Die Bildung des Weltklerus im Frankenreiche von Karl Martell bis auf Ludwig den Frommen* (Paderborn 1926); G. H. Hörle, *Frühmittelalterliche Mönchs- und Klerikerbildung in Italien* (Freiburg 1914); G. Flade, *Die Erziehung des Klerus durch die Visitationen bis zum 10. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1933); A. M. Königer, *Die Sendgerichte in Deutschland,* I (Munich 1907), 7–28; P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les paroisses rurales dans l'ancienne France du IVe au XIe siècle* (Paris 1900); L. Pfleger, *Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der elsässischen Pfarrei* (Strasbourg 1936); S. Zorell, "Die Entwicklung des Parochialsystems bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit II" in *AkathKR* 82 (1902), 258–89; L. Nanni, "L'evoluzione storica della parrocchia" in *SC* 81 (1953), 475–544; A. Heintz, *Die Anfänge des Landdekanates im Rahmen der kirchlichen Verfassungsgeschichte des Bistums Trier* (Trier 1951); H. Leclercq, "Chanoines" in *DACL* III, 223–48; L. Hertling, "Kanoniker, Augustinusregel und Augustinerorden" in *ZKTh* 54 (1930), 335–59; G. G. Meersseman, "Die Klerikervereine von Karl dem Grossen bis Innocenz III." in *ZSKG* 46 (1952), 1–42, 81–112; A. Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis zum Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1886); F. Wiegand, *Das Homiliarium Karls des Grossen* (Leipzig 1897); *Schnürer* II; J. B. Schneyer, "Die Predigt im MA" in *LThK* VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 708–13.

38. *Forms of Devotion*

LITERATURE

As most of this subject is treated in the chapter on the liturgy (36) only the following are listed: S. Bäumer, *Geschichte des Breviers* (Freiburg 1895); J. Stadlhuber, "Das Laienstundengebet vom Leiden Christi in seinem mittelalterlichen Fortleben" in *ZKTh* 72 (1950), 282–325.

ON THE BASIC SUBJECT OF PIETY: E. Dumoutet, *Le Christ selon la chair et la vie liturgique au moyen-âge* (Paris 1932), 1–27; R. Berger, *Die Darstellung des thronenden Christus in der romanischen Kunst* (Reutlingen 1926); *Jungmann LE* (esp.: "Die Abwehr des germanischen Arianismus und der Umbruch der religiösen Kultur im frühen Mittelalter", 3–86; "Beiträge zur Struktur des Stundengebetes", 208–64; "Der liturgische Wochenzyklus", 332–65); S. Beissel, *Geschichte der Verehrung Marias in Deutschland während des Mittelalters* (Freiburg 1909); id., *Die Verehrung der Heiligen und ihrer Reliquien in Deutschland bis zum Beginn des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg 1890).

FOR THE BEGINNINGS OF PRAYER BOOKS: A. Wilmart, *Precum libri quattuor aevi Karolini* (Rome 1940); id., *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen-âge latin* (Paris 1932); id., "Prières médiévales pour l'adoration de la Croix" in *ELit* 46 (1932), 22–65; id., "Le manuel de prières de S. Jean Gualbert" in *RBén* 48 (1936), 259–99 (with proof that it derives from the collected prayers of 9th cent. Nonantola); A. Salvini, *Manuale precum S. Joannis Gualberti* (Rome 1933); F. X. Haimerl, *Mittelalterliche Frömmigkeit im Spiegel der Gebetbuchliteratur Süddeutschlands* (Munich 1952); W. Godel, "Irisches Beten im frühen Mittelalter" in *ZKTh* 85 (1963), 261–321, 389–439; E. Iserloh, "Die Kontinuität des Christentums beim Übergang von der Antike zum Mittelalter im Lichte der Glaubensverkündigung des heiligen Bonifatius" in *TThZ* 63 (1954), 193–205; H. B. Meyer, "Alkuin zwischen Antike und Mittelalter. Ein Kapitel frühmittelalterlicher Frömmigkeitsgeschichte" in *ZKTh* 81 (1959), 306–50, 405–54; U. Berlière, *L'ascèse bénédictine des origines à la fin du XII^e siècle* (Paris 1927); L. Gougaud, *Dévotions et pratiques ascétiques du moyen âge* (Paris 1925); *Veit; Künstle.*

SECTION NINE

Renewal and Reform from 900 to 1050

39. *The Renewal of Monastic and Canonical Life*

SOURCES

RULES OF THE ORDERS: See Gen. Bib. I, 8, the editions by *Holstenius, Albers, Hallinger* I (with the newly edited Monks' Rule of Aachen). The Canons' Rule of Chrodegang of Metz is edited in *PL* 89, 1097–1120 (extended version), 1057–1108 (interpolated version); also by W. Schmitz (Hanover 1889) and Napier (London 1917); *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis* in *MGConc* II, 307–421.

CLUNY: M. Marrier, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (Paris 1614; new imp. Mâcon 1915); A. Bernard and A. Bruel, *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny,* 6 vols. (Paris 1876–1903); G. F. Ducket, *Charters and Records among the Archives of the Ancient Abbey of Cluny 1077–1534,* 2 vols. (Lewes 1890); John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* in *PL* 133, 43–89; Eng. trans. by G. Sitwell; *St Odo of Cluny (Life of St Odo by John of Salerno and Life of St Gerald of Aurillac by St Odo)* (Oxford 1958); Odilo, *Vita Maioli* in *ActaSS,* Maii II, 683–8; Nalgold and Syrus, *Vita Maioli* in *ActaSS,* Maii II, 657–83; Jotsaldus, *Vita Odilonis* in *PL* 142, 897–940; Gilo, *Vita Hugonis* in A. L'Huillier, *Vie de Saint Hugues* (Solesmes 1888), 565–618. For other centres of reform cf. *Heimbucher* I (Gen. Bib. II, 9).

LITERATURE

For the history of monasticism cf. Gen. Bib. II, 9; *Kalendarium Benedictinum. Die Heiligen und Seligen des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige,* 4 vols. (Metten 1933–39); R. Molitor, *Aus der Rechtsgeschichte benediktinischer Verbände,* 3 vols. (Münster 1928–33). For various regions cf. Gen. Bib. II, 9; also: *L'Italia benedittina,* ed. by P. Lugano (Rome 1929); P. Grossi, *Le abbazie benedittine nell'alto medioevo italiano. Struttura giuridica, amministrazione e giurisdizione* (Florence 1957); for Germany and Belgium cf. *Hauck* and E. de Moreau (Gen. Bib. II, 4); L. J. Daly, *Benedictine Monasticism. Its Formation and Development through the 12th Cent.* (New York 1965) intended for the beginner, overlooks the present controversy on early Cistercian history, contains English trans. of the so-called Rule of St Augustine, the Prologue of the Benedictine Rule and the Cistercian Carta Caritatis.

MONASTIC RENEWAL IN THE 10TH AND 11TH CENTURIES: E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts,* 2 vols. (Halle 1892–94, new impression, Darmstadt 1965), basic, on Cluny's far-reaching influence; K. Hallinger, *Gorze-Cluny. Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter,* 2 vols. (Rome 1950–51); cf. T. Schieffer in *AMrhKG* 4 (1952), 24–44; E. Werner, *Die gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen der Klosterreform im 11. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1953); on this Marxist interpretation cf. K. Hallinger in *AMrhKG* 9 (1957), 19–32; P. Doyère, "Érémitisme en Occident" in *DSAM* IV (1961), 953–82; J. Sainsaulieu, "Ermites" in *DHGE* XV (1963), 766–87; id., *L'eremitismo in occidente nei secoli XI e XII: Atti della settimana di studio, Mendola* 1962 (Milan 1965).

LOTHARINGIA AND GERMANY: E. Tomek, *Studien zur Reform der deutschen Klöster im 11. Jahrhundert,* I: *Die Frühreform* (Vienna 1910); H. Büttner, "Verfassungsgeschichte und lothringische Klosterreform" in *Festschrift G. Kallen* (Bonn 1957), 17–27; R. Blouard, *S. Gérard de Brogne* (Namur 1959); the contributions to the congress commemorating the 900th anniversary of the death of Gerard held in Maredsous in 1959 are published in *RBén* 70 (1960); for Gorze cf. esp. Hallinger, *Gorze-Cluny (supra);* H. Dauphin, *Le b. Richard, abbé de Saint-Vanne de Verdun* (Louvain–Paris 1946); H. Glaesener, "Saint Poppon, abbé de Stavelot-Malmédy" in *RBén* 60 (1950), 163–79. For Burgundy: B. Bligny, *L'Église et les ordres religieux dans le royaume de Bourgogne aux XI^e et XII^e siècles* (Paris 1960).

CLUNY: Sources *(v. supra);* K. Hallinger in *ECatt* III (1949), 1883–93; G. de Valous in *DHGE* XIII (1956), 35–174; A. Chagny, *Cluny et son empire* (Paris, 4th ed. 1949); E. Sackur, K. Hallinger *(v. supra);* G. de Valous, *Le monachisme clunisien des origines au XV^e siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1935), basic work; L. M. Smith, *Cluny in the XIth and XIIth Cent.* (London 1930); J. Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny 910–1157* (Oxford 1931); P. Lamma, *Momenti di storiografia cluniacense* (Rome 1961); W. Jorden, *Das cluniacensische Totengedächtniswesen, vornehmlich unter den ersten Äbten* (Münster 1930).

COLLECTED WORKS: *A Cluny, Congrès scientifique . . . en honneur des saints abbés Odon et Odilon* (Dijon 1950); *Spiritualità cluniacense, Convegni del Centro sulla Spiritualità Medievale,* 2 (Todi 1960); *Neue Forschungen über Cluny und die Cluniacenser,* ed. by G. Tellenbach (Freiburg 1959), cf. the collected articles by G. Schreiber, *Gemeinschaftsformen des Mittelalters* (Münster 1948), also the congress contributions of various authors in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo* (Gen. Bib. II, 9).

INDIVIDUAL STUDIES: M. Chaume, "En marge de l'histoire de Cluny" in *RMab* 29 (1939), 41–61; *ibid.* 30 (1940), 33–62; K. Hallinger, "Zur geistigen Welt der Anfänge Clunys" in *DA* 10 (1954), 417–45; continued in *RMab* 46 (1956), 117–41; H. E. Mager, "Studien über das Verhältnis der Cluniacenser zum Eigenkirchenwesen" in *Neue Forschungen über Cluny (v. supra),* 167–217; H. Diener, "Das Verhältnis Clunys zu den Bischöfen" in *Neue Forschungen über Cluny,* 219–352; J. F. Lemarignier, "L'exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme grégorienne" in *A Cluny (v. supra)*, 288–334; id., "Structures monastiques et structures politiques dans la France de la fin du X^e et des débuts du XI^e siècle" in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medio evo* (Gen. Bib. II, 9), 357–400; id., "Hiérarchie monastique et hiérarchie féodale" in *Rev. d'hist. de droit franç. et étrang.*, 4^e sér. 31 (1953), 171–74; C. Violante, "Il monachesimo cluniacense di fronte al mondo politico ed ecclesiastico (sec. X e XI)" in *Spiritualità cluniacense (v. supra)*, 155–242. On Cluny's *Consuetudines* cf. H. R. Philippeau in *RMab* 44 (1954), 141–51, and K. Hallinger in *ZSavRGkan* 76 (1959), 99–140. T. Schieffer, "Cluny et la querelle des investitures" in *RH* 225 (1961), 47–72; H. Hoffmann, "Cluny und gregorianische Reform" in *AKG* 45 (1963), 165–209.

OTHER FRENCH MONASTIC CENTRES: H. Leclercq, *Saint-Benôit-sur-Loire* (Paris 1925), and with the same title M. Thibout and J. Leclercq (Paris 1945); P. Cousin, *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire* (Paris 1954). On Dijon cf. E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser (v. supra)*, I, 257–69 and *passim;* for Fruttuaria *ibid.* II, 1–16. Normandy: good survey in H. Wolter, *Ordericus Vitalis* (Wiesbaden 1955), 17–46; J. F. Lemarignier, *Études sur les privilèges d'exemption et de jurisdiction des abbayes normandes depuis les origines jusqu'à 1140* (Paris 1937). St-Victor: P. Schmid, "Die Entstehung des Marseiller Kirchenstaates" in *AUF* 10 (1928), 176–207; *ibid.* 11 (1930), 138–52.

ITALY: P. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* (Gen. Bib. I, 5) is indispensable for individual monasteries; organized presentation by Sackur, Grossi, Lugano *(v. supra)* and esp. Penco (Gen. Bib. II, 9); cf. K. Hallinger in *AMrhKG* 9 (1957), 13–19.

SOUTHERN ITALY AND NILUS: Penco, 22–229 (with lit.); A. Boise, *Il monachesimo in Calabria, Sue origini e suo progresso* (Cosenza 1947); A. Guillou, "Il monachesimo greco in Italia meridionale e in Sicilia" in *L'eremitismo in occidente* (*v. supra:* Monastic Renewal), 355–79; A. Pertusi in *L'eremitismo in occidente,* 382–426 (organizational and cultural aspects); P. Batiffol, *L'abbaye de Rossano* (Paris 1891); for the beginnings in Rossano cf. B. Cappelli, *Bollet. d. Badia greca di Grottaferrata* in NS 9 (1955), 3–26; A. Rocchi, *La Badia di Grottaferrata* (Rome 1904).

ROMUALD: Penco, 211–19; W. Franke, *Romuald von Camaldoli und seine Reformtätigkeit zur Zeit Ottos III.* (Berlin 1913); A. Pagnani, *Vita di S. Romualdo abbate, fondatore dei Camaldolesi* (Sassoferrato 1927); id., *Storia dei benedittini Camaldolesi* (Sassoferrato 1949); G. Palazzini, "S. Romualdo e le sue fondazioni tra i monti del Cagliese" in *Studia Picena* 18 (1948), 61–76.

PETER DAMIANI: Biographical lit. in chap. 42; P. M. Della Santa, *Ricerche sull'idea monastica di S. Pier Damiani* (Camaldoli 1961); also O. Capitani in *L'eremitismo in occidente (v. supra)* 122–63; C. Roggi, "Vita e costumanza dei Romualdini del Pereo, di Fonte Avellana e di Camaldoli" in *Benedictina* 4 (1951), 69–86.

CANONS: For development and organization of the chapters *v. supra* chapter 33 with lit. — Excellent comprehensive history by C. Dereine in *DHGE* XII (1953), 353–405; cf. also L. Hertling, "Kanoniker, Augustinerregel, Augustinerorden" in *ZKTh* 53 (1930), 335–69; G. G. Meersseman, "Die Klerikervereine von Karl dem Grossen bis Innocenz III." in *ZSKG* 46 (1952), 1–42, 81–112; J. Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz vom 6. Jahrhundert bis 1160. Mit einem Überblick über die deutsche Kanonikerreform des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts* (Fribourg 1962). A. Werminghoff, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816" in *NA* 27 (1902), 605–75; O. Hannemann, *Die Kanonikerregeln Chrodegangs von Metz und der Aachener Synode von 816 und das Verhältnis Gregors VII. dazu* (dissertation, Greifswald 1914); L. Musset, "Recherches sur des communautés des clercs réguliers en Normandie au XI^e siècle" in *Bull. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de Normandie* 55 (1959–60), 5–38; scattered material on the pre-Gregorian era found in: *La vita comune del clero nei sec. XI e XII, Atti della settimana di studio, Mendola* 1959, 2 vols. (Milan 1962), esp. J. F. Lemarignier, "Aspects politiques de fondations de collégiales dans le royaume de

France en XI^e siècle", *ibid.* 19–40; G. Duby, "Les chanoines réguliers et la vie économique des XI^e et XII^e siècles", *ibid.* 72–81. H. E. Salter, *Chapters of the Aug. Canons* (Oxford 1922); E. A. Foran, *The Augustinians from St. Augustine to the Union of 1256* (London 1938); J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austins Canons and their Introduction into England* (London 1951).

40. *Education and Learning*

LITERATURE

The works cited in Gen. Bib. II, 11 are basic for Latin literature and cultural history; cf. esp. *Manitius* II; De Ghellinck, *Littérature latine au moyen âge,* II; Curtius, *European Literature,* 45–78; also E. R. Curtius, "Das mittelalterliche Bildungswesen und die Grammatik" in *Romanische Forschungen* 60 (1947), 1–26; E. Faral, "Les conditions générales de la production littéraire en Europe occidentale pendant les IX^e et X^e siècles" in *I problemi comuni dell'Europa postcarolingia* (Spoleto 1955), 247–94; A. Auerbach, "Lateinische Prosa des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts. Sermo humilis" in *Romanische Forschungen* 66 (1954), 1–64.

THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY: Contents of works and lit. in *Manitius* II, also to some extent in De Ghellinck *(supra);* for the development of teaching methods cf. basic works in Gen. Bib. II, 12.

CANON LAW: Among the works cited in Gen. Bib. I, 4 *Fournier - Le Bras* I, 268–456, is esp. important; the manuals on the history of ecclesiastical law in Gen. Bib. II, 6; further lit. for this period in *Feine RG* § 17, III.

THE WRITING OF HISTORY: In addition to *Manitius* II cf. *Wattenbach-Holtzmann,* 1–2, and *Jacob-Hohenleutner* II, 1–50.

41. *Heretical and Reform Movements among Clergy and Laity (1000 to 1050)*

LITERATURE

HERESIES: excellent summary in H. Grundmann, "Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters" in *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* (Gen. Bib. II, 3), II, G 8 – G 11 (1963); cf. also H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Berlin 1935; new impression 1961), 476–83; A. Borst, *Die Katharer* (Stuttgart 1953), 71–80; P. Ilarino da Milano, "Le eresie populari del sec. XI nell'Europa occidentale" in *StudGreg* II (Rome 1947), 43–89; R. Morghen, *Medioevo cristiano* (Bari 1951), 212–86; a criticism by A. Dondaine, "L'origine de l'hérésie médiévale" in *RSTI* 6 (1952), 47–78; R. Morghen, "Movimenti religiosi popolari nel periodo della riforma della Chiesa" in *X Congresso Internaz. di Scienze Storiche,* Relazioni III (Florence 1955), 333–56; id., "Il cosidetto neo-manicheismo occidentale del sec. XI" in *Acad. nazion. dei Lincei,* Convegno "Volta" (Rome 1957), 84–104; E. Werner, *Klosterreform* (lit. for chap. 39), 71–79; H. J. Warner, *The Albigensian Heresy* (London 1922); S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee. A Study of the Christian Dualist Heresy* (Cambridge 1946, new impression 1961); D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge 1948).

OPPOSITION TO ABUSES: *Hauck KD (passim)*; *Fliche-Martin* VII *(passim)*; A. Dresdner, *Kultur- und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert* (Breslau 1890); useful but somewhat artificial is the survey in A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* I (Louvain–Paris 1924), 1–128; G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society* (Oxford 1959) is important, esp. chapters I–III and the appendix.

SIMONY: H. Meier-Welcker, "Die Simonie im frühen Mittelalter" in *ZKG* 64 (1952–53), 61–93; A. Kupper, *Beiträge zum Problem der Simonie im 11. Jahrhundert* (typed dissertation, Mainz 1954); J. Leclercq, "Simoniaca haeresis" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 523–30; E. Hirsch, "Der Simoniebegriff und die angebliche Erweiterung im 11. Jahrhundert" in *AkathKR* 86 (1906), 3–19.

THE PEACE OF GOD AND THE TRUCE OF GOD: The earlier works by A. Kluckhohn (1857), E. Sémichon (1869), L. Huberti (1892 well documented), G. C. W. Görris (1912) *et al.* are now superseded by H. Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei* (Stuttgart 1964); a worthwhile Marxist interpretation is B. Töpfer, *Volk und Kirche zur Zeit der beginnenden Gottesfriedensbewegung in Frankreich* (Berlin 1957).

HOLY WAR AND CHRISTIAN KNIGHTHOOD: C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Stuttgart 1935); contains details on the Peace of God.

Part Two:
The Struggle for the Freedom of the Church

SECTION ONE

The Gregorian Reform

Sources

General: The polemical literature: *MGLiblit,* 3 vols.; *Manitius* III, 21–57; *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 394–414; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.* (Leipzig 1894); A. Fauser, *Die Publizisten des Investiturstreites* (dissertation, Munich 1935).

Italy: unreliable but of some value is Bonzio of Sutri, *Liber ad amicum* (—1085): *MGLiblit* I, 568–620; important is Leo of Marsica, *Chronicon s. monasterii Casinensis* (—1087), continued (—1127) by the monk Guido, revised and continued, not without falsification (-1138) by Petrus Diaconus, *MGSS* 574–844; for a survey of present research see W. Wühr in *StudGreg* III (1948), 399–401; Amatus of Montecassino, *Historia Normannorum,* old French translation in *FontiStIt,* 76 ed. by V. de Bartolomeis (1935); cf. W. Smidt in *StudGreg* III (1948), 173–231; Gaufred Malaterra, *De rebus gestis Rogerii . . . comitis et Roberti Guiscardi ducis* (—1099) in *Muratori* 2nd ed., *SS* V, 1, ed. by E. Pontieri (1925–28); William of Apulia, *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi* in *MGSS* IX, 239–98; Donizo of Canossa, *Vita Mathildis, carmine scripta, Muratori,* 2nd ed., *SS* V, 2, ed. by L. Simeoni, with other sources on the history of the marchioness (1930–40); *MGSS* XII, 348–409; Landulf the Elder, *Historia Mediolanensis* (—1085), *Muratori,* 2nd ed., *SS* IV, 2, ed. by A. Cutolo (1942); *MGSS* VIII, 32–100; more objective is Arnulf, *Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium* (—1077), *MGSS* VIII, 6–31; cf. *Manitius* III and *Jacob-Hohenleutner* II.

Germany and Lotharingia: *MGDD regum et imperatorum Germaniae,* V: *Die Urkunden Heinrichs III.* (1931; new impression 1957); *ibid.* VI, 1–2: *Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV.* (1941–59); *MGConst* I. *Die Briefe Heinrichs IV.,* ed. by C. Erdmann in *MG Deutsches MA,* 1 (1937); *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV.,* ed. by Erdmann-Fickermann in *MG Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 5 (1950); *Codex Udalrici* (—1125, with supplements —1134) in *Jaffé, Bibl. rer. germ.* (Gen. Bib. I, 3), V, 17–469; *Vita Heinrici IV* (important for the later years) in *MGSS rer. Germ.* 58, ed. by W. Eberhard (3rd ed. 1899; new imp. 1949); Bruno, *De bello saxonico* in *MG Deutsches MA,* 2, ed. by H. E. Lohmann (1937); among the World Chronicles which began to appear at this time the following are important: Hugh of Flavigny (—1102) in *MGSS* VIII, 288–502; Sigebert of Gembloux (—1111, then continued) in *MGSS* VI, 300–74; Frutolf of Michelsberg (—1101), revised and continued (—1125) by Ekkehard of Aura in *MGSS* VI, 33–265; Berthold of Reichenau, continuator of the Chronicle of Hermann the Lame (—1180) in *MGSS* V, 264–326, and XIII, 730–32; Bernold of St Blasien (—1100) in *MGSS* V, 385–467; Annals: of Niederaltaich (—1073) in *MGSS rer. Germ.* 4, ed. by E. v. Oefele (2nd ed. 1892); Lampert of Hersfeld (—1077) in *MGSS rer. Germ.* 38, ed. by Holder-Egger (3rd ed. 1894; new impression 1956). Important for the northern mission is Adam of Bremen, *Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum* in *MGSS rer. Germ.,* 2, ed. by

B. Schmeidler (3rd ed. 1917). For the problem of the sources and their worth, cf. *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I; *Jacob-Hohenleutner* II.

France (with the exception of the Crusade literature and Normandy): *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Ier (1059–1108), Chart Dipl,* ed. by M. Prou (1908); for the regesta: A. Luchaire, *Louis le Gros, Annales de sa vie et de son règne 1081–1137* (Paris 1890); Suger of Saint Denis, *Vita Ludovici Grossi* in *ClassHist* 11, ed. by H. Waquet (1929); *CollText* 4, ed. by A. Molinier (1887); Hugh of Fleury, *Liber modernorum regum Francorum* (—1108) in *MGSS* IX, 376–95. A good survey with lit. in *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 765–97.

England and Normandy: *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum 1066–1154,* vol. I, 1–2 (for William I and II), ed. by Davis and Whitwell (Oxford 1913–56); vol. II (for Henry I), ed. by Johnson and Cronne (London 1956); Eadmer, *Historia novorum in Anglia* (—1122) and *Vita Anselmi* in *Rolls Series* 81, ed. by M. Rule (1884); *PL* 159, 347–524; *PL* 158, 49–118; William of Malmesbury, *Historia regum Anglorum* (—1128 with his own additions —1140) in *Rolls Series* 90, 2 vols., ed. by W. Stubbs (1887); William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* (—1125, in 2nd redaction —1140) in *Rolls Series* 52, ed. by N. Hamilton (1870); *PL* 179, 1441–1680; Ordericus Vitalis, *Historiae ecclesiasticae libri XIII* (—1141), ed. by Le Prevost-Guérard-Delisle, 5 vols. (Paris 1838–55); *PL* 188, 15–984; critical study by H. Wolter, *Ordericus Vitalis* (Wiesbaden 1955). Cf. *Manitius* III and *Jacob-Hohenleutner.*

Bohemia, Poland, Hungary: Cf. Sources for chap. 31; good survey with lit. in *Wattenbach-Holtzmann* I, 798–820.

General Literature

For universal histories cf. Gen. Bib. II, 1a, esp. *Peuples et Civilisations,* VI; *Glotz* II, III, VIII, IX, 1; *The Cambridge Med. History,* V; *Historia Mundi,* VI, Cartellieri, *Aufstieg des Papsttums,* and *Vorrang des Papsttums;* also: K. Jordan, "Das Reformpapsttum und die abendländische Staatenwelt" in *WaG* 18 (1958), 122–37.

Ecclesiastical History: Cf. Gen. Bib. II, 3: *Fliche-Martin* VII, 92–110 and *passim* (—1057), VIII (—1125); also A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne,* 3 vols. (Louvain 1924–37); id., *La querelle des investitures* (Paris 1946); G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (Oxford, 3rd ed. 1959), trans. with intro. by R. F. Bennett; series *StudGreg,* 7 vols., for an excellent analysis of the first 6 vols. cf. P. E. Schramm in *GGA* 207 (1953), 62–140.

Councils and Papal History: cf. Gen. Bib. II, 5; *Hefele-Leclercq* IV–V; Haller, *Papsttum,* II, 283 to end; *Seppelt* III, 1–164; J. Gay, *Les papes du XIe siècle et la chrétienté* (Paris 1926), 134 to end.

Individual Problems: C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Stuttgart 1935). Simony: cf. lit. for chap. 41; Reordination: cf. lit. for chap. 53. A. Scharnagl, *Der Begriff der Investitur in den Quellen und in der Literatur des Investiturstreites,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1908–09); G. Kallen, *Der Investiturstreit als Kampf zwischen germanischem und romanischem Denken* (Cologne 1937); N. Brooke, *Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy* (Oxford 1939); H. E. Feine, "Kirchenreform und Niederkirchenwesen. Beiträge zur Reformfrage, vornehmlich im Bistum Lucca im 11. Jahrhundert" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 505–24; P. Schmid, *Der Begriff der kanonischen Wahl in den Anfängen des Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart 1926).

Germany and Imperial Italy: Cf. Gen. Bib. II, 2, esp.: *JbbDG, Unter Heinrich III.,* ed. by E. Steindorff, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1874–81), *Unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V.,* ed. by G. Meyer v. Knonau, 7 vols. (Leipzig 1890–1909); *Giesebrecht* II, 419 – III, 963; Hambe-Baethgen, *Kaisergeschichte,* 25–103; *Hauck KD* III, 522 to end; also M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Kaiserin Agnes*

(Leipzig 1933); O. Schumann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland zur Zeit Heinrichs IV. und Heinrichs V.* (Marburg 1912).

Southern Italy: L. v. Heinemann, *Geschichte der Normannen in Unteritalien und Sizilien bis zum Aussterben des normannischen Königshauses* (Leipzig 1894); F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile,* 2 vols. (Paris 1907); P. Kehr, "Die Belehnungen der süditalienischen Normannenfürsten durch die Päpste 1059–1192" in *SAB* (1934), no. 1. H. W. Klewitz, "Studien zur Wiederherstellung der römischen Kirche in Süditalien durch das Reformpapsttum" in *QFIAB* 25 (1933–4), 105–57; W. Holtzmann, "Papsttum, Normannen und griechische Kirche" in *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Hertzianae* (Munich 1961), 69–76; L. R. Ménager, "La byzantinisation religieuse de l'Italie méridionale (IX^{e}–XII^{e} siècle) et la politique monastique des Normands d'Italie" in *RHE* 53 (1958), 747–74; *ibid.* 54 (1959), 5–40; L. T. White, *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge, Mass. 1938); M. Scaduto, *Il monachismo basiliano nella Sicilia medioevale. Rinascita e decadenza sec. XI–XIV* (Rome 1947).

France: A. Fliche, *Le règne de Philippe* I^{er}*, roi de France 1060–1108* (Paris 1912); *Lavisse* II, 2 (Gen. Bib. II, 2). W. Schwarz, "Der Investiturstreit in Frankreich" in *ZKG* 42 (1923), 255–328; *ibid.* 43 (1924), 92–150; A. Becker, *Studien zum Investiturproblem in Frankreich: Papsttum, Königtum und Episkopat im Zeitalter der gregor. Kirchenreform* (dissertation, Saarbrücken 1955); T. Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrag von Meersen bis zum Schisma von 1130* (Berlin 1935); A. Fliche, "Premiers résultats d'une enquête sur la réforme grégorienne, dans les diocèses français" (completed for the ecclesiastical province of Narbonne) in *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Acad. d. Inscript. et Bell. Lettr.* (1934), 152–80.

England, Ireland and Scotland: For English national history see Gen. Bib. II, 2, and F. Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042–1216* (London 1955); for Irish and Scottish history see lit. for chap. 29 and E. Curtis, *A History of Medieval Ireland from 1086 to 1513* (Forest-Hills 1944).

For ecclesiastical history cf. Gen. Bib. II, 4; also Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy fom the Conquest to the Reign of John* (Cambridge 1932); H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1899); J. Tracy Ellis, *Anti-Papal Legislation in Medieval England 1066–1377* (dissertation, Cath. Univ. Wash. D.C. 1930); H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas* (dissertation, Bonn 1925); C. N. L. Brooke, "Gregorian Reform in Action. Clerical marriage in England 1050–1200" in *CambrHJ* 12 (1956), 1–21; A. Gwynn in *IER* 57 (1941), 213–33 (Ireland and Rome in the 11th cent.); *ibid.* 481–500, *ibid.* 58 (1941), 1–15 (Lanfranc and the Irish Church), *ibid.* 59 (1942), 1–14 (Anselm and the Irish Church).

Spain: Gen. Bib. II, 2 and 4: also R. Ménendez Pidal, *La España del Cid,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1929); L. de la Calzada, "Alfonso VI y la crisis occidental del siglo XI" in *An. de la Univ. de Murcia* 12 (1953–54), 9–86; G. Säbekow, *Die päpstlichen Legationen nach Spanien und Portugal bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhunderts* (dissertation, Berlin 1931); D. Mansilla, *La curia Romana y el reino de Castilla en un momento decisivo de su historia 1061–1085* (Burgos 1944); C. Erdmann, "Das Papsttum und Portugal im ersten Jahrhundert der portugiesischen Geschichte" in *AAB* (1928), no. 5; P. Kehr, "Das Papsttum und der Katalanische Prinzipat bis zur Vereinigung mit Aragón" in *AAB* (1926), 1–91; id., "Das Papsttum und die Königreiche Navarra und Aragón bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts" in *AAB* (1928), 1–58; id., "Wie und wann wurde das Reich Aragón ein Lehen der römischen Kirche" in *AAB* (1928), 196–233; J. Vincke, *Kirche und Staat in Katalonien und Aragón während des Mittelalters,* I (Münster 1931); id., "Der Übergang vom Eigenkirchenrecht zum Patronatsrecht bezüglich der Niederkirchen in Katalonien und Aragón" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 451–61. Cf. lit. for chap. 29 and *infra* chapters 43–44.

42. *Beginning of the Reform: The German Popes (1046 to 1057)*

SOURCES

Watterich I, 93–188; *Duchesne LP* II, 273–7, 332–4; cf. H. Tritz, "Die hagiographischen Quellen zur Geschichte Papst Leos IX." in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 191–353; the very important Vita generally ascribed to Wibert: *ActaSS* Apr. II, 648–65, *PL* 143, 465–504, is considered by Tritz to be the work of Humbert of Silva Candida; for a well supported contrary view, H. Hoffmann in *AKG* 45 (1963), 203–09. — *Mansi* XIX, 619–862; *Hefele-Leclercq* IV, 2, 995–1125; other sources in the footnotes.

LITERATURE

See literature at the beginning of this section.

PAPACY: good bibliography with lit. in Snatifaller, *Reichskirchensystem* (Gen. Bib. II, 8a), 205–16; C. Höfler, *Die deutschen Päpste,* 2 vols. (Regensburg 1839), still valuable; P. Brucker, *L'Alsace et l'Église au temps du pape Saint Léon IX,* 2 vols. (Paris 1889), E. Martin, *Saint Léon IX* (Paris 1904); L. Sittler and P. Stintzi, *Saint Léon, le pape alsacien* (Colmar 1951); Larose, *Étude sur les origines du pape Saint Léon IX* (Metz 1954); Centenaire de la mort de Saint *Léon* (Colmar 1954); J. Drehmann, *Leo IX. und die Simonie* (Leipzig 1908), not always correct; N. N. Hugghebaert in *StudGreg* I (1947) 417–32 (Leo and the struggle against simony in Verdun); G. Drioux in *StudGreg* II (1947), 31–41 (Leo and the bishops of Langres).

HUMBERT OF SILVA CANDIDA: A. Michel, "Die Anfänge des Kard. Humbert bei Bruno von Toul" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 299–319; id., "Die folgenschweren Ideen des Kard. Humbert und ihr Einfluss auf Gregor VII." in *StudGreg* I (1947), 65–92; id., "Humbert von Silva Candida bei Gratian. Eine Zusammenfassung" in *Studia Gratiana* I (Bologna 1953), 83–117; more in the footnotes.

PETER DAMIAN: F. Dressler, *Petrus Damiani. Leben und Werk* (Rome 1954); J. Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et Homme d'Église* (Rome 1960); O. J. Blume, *St. Peter Damian. His Teaching on the Spiritual Life* (Washington 1947); id., "The Monitor of the Popes: St. Peter Damian" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 459–76; J. Ryan, *Saint Peter Damiani and his Canonical Sources* (Toronto 1956); good bibliographical survey by K. Reindel in *DA* 15 (1959), 23 n. 1; further lit. *infra* in footnotes.

43. *Progress of the Reform: The Lotharingian and Tuscan Popes (1057 to 1073)*

SOURCES

Cf. sources cited at the beginning of this section; *Watterich* I, 188–290; *Duchesne LP* II, 278–81, 334–37; *Mansi* XIX, 861 - XX, 56; synods of Nicholas II also in *MGConst* I, 537–51; *Hefele-Leclercq* IV, 2, 1125–1289; for the *Pataria,* in addition to the works of Landulf and Arnulf of Milan cited at the beginning of this Sect., cf. also Andrew of Strumi, "Vita S. Arialdi" in *ActaSS* Junii, V, 281–303.

LITERATURE

PAPACY: G. Despy, "La carrière lotharingienne du pape Étienne IX" in *Revue belge de phil. et d'hist.* 31 (1953), 955–72; G. B. Borino, "L'arcidiaconato di Ildebrando" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 463–516; A. Michel, "Humbert und Hildebrand bei Nikolaus II." in *HJ* 72 (1953), 133–61; R. Scheffer-Boichorst, *Die Neuordnung der Papstwahl durch Nikolaus II.* (Strasbourg 1879); A. Michel, *Papstwahl und Königsrecht oder das Papstwahlkonkordat von 1059* (Munich 1936); id., "Das Papstwahlpactum von 1059" in *HJ* 59 (1939), 291–351; H. G. Krause, "Das Papstwahldekret von 1059 und seine Rolle im Investiturstreit" in *StudGreg* VII (1960);

F. Kempf, "Pier Damiani und das Papstwahldekret von 1059" in *ArchHP* 2 (1964), 73–89; F. Heberhold, "Die Beziehungen des Cadalus von Parma zu Deutschland" in *HJ* 54 (1934), 84–104; id., "Die Angriffe des Cadalus von Parma auf Rom 1062–1063"in *StudGreg* II (1947), 447–503; G. B. Borino, "Cencio del prefetto, l'attentatore di Gregorio VII" in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 373–410.

INDIVIDUAL LANDS: On the military action in England, Spain, Sicily and Milan and its relation to the reform papacy, cf. esp. Erdmann, *Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 116–30, 137–41, 167–9, as well as the lit. in the bibliography for this section corresponding to various lands. Further lit. on Italy: H. Glaesener, "Un mariage fertile en conséquences: Godefroid le Barbu et Béatrix de Toscana" in *RHE* 42 (1947), 379–416; A. Violante, *La Pataria milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica,* I: *Le premesse 1045–1057* (Rome 1955); G. Miccoli, "Per la storia della Pataria milanese" in *BIStIAM* 70 (1958), 43–123; id., *StudGreg* V (1956), 33–81 (see footnote 9 in this chapter). For England: T. J. Oleson, "Edward the Confessor's Promise of the Throne to Duke William of Normandy" in *EHR* 72 (1957), 221–28; cf. D. Douglas in *EHR* 69 (1953), 526–45. For Spain: P. Boissonade, "Cluny, la papauté et la première croisade internationale contre les Sarrasins: Barbastro 1063/64" in *RQH* 117 (1932), 257–301; for the Mozarabic rite cf. lit. for next chapter.

44. *Pope Gregory VII (1073 to 1085)*

SOURCES

Mansi XX, 55–630; *Hefele-Leclercq* V, 1, 13–323. — The Register of Gregory VII: *MGEp* sel. 2, ed. by E. Caspar, 2 vols. (1920–23); further letters: *Jaffé; Bibl. rer. germ.* (Gen. Bib. I, 3), II, 520 seqq.; Privileges: L. Santifaller, *Quellen und Forschungen zum Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen Gregors VII.:* I. *Quellen, Urkunden, Regesten, Facsimilia* (Vatican City 1957); W. M. Peitz, "Das Originalregister Gregors VII. im Vatikanischen Archiv in *SAW* 145, 5 (1911); E. Caspar, "Studien zum Register Gregors VII." in *NA* 38 (1913), 143–226; H. W. Klewitz, "Das 'Privilegienregister' Gregors VII." in *AUF* 16 (1939), 385–424; the well founded opinion of Peitz and Caspar that the Vatican Archives possessed an original register placed in the chancery has been recently contested by F. Bock in *StudGreg* V (1956), 243–79; G. M. Borino in *StudGreg* V, 391–402; *ibid.* VI (1959–61), 363–89; R. Morghen, "Ricerche sulla formazione del Registro di Gregorio VII" in *Annali di storia di Diritto* 3/4 (1959–60), 35–65. The latter accepts it as a selection from a memoire dictated by Gregory; the entire problem must be newly researched using the paleographical and documentary criteria of Peitz and Caspar.

BIOGRAPHICAL: *Watterich* I, 239–543; *Duchesne LP* II, 282–91; for the *Vita* of Paul of Bernried (besides Watterich *ActaSS* Maii, VI, 113–43) H. Fuhrmann in *StudGreg* V (1956), 299–312. The *Vita Anselmi ep. Lucensis* in *MGSS* XII, 13–35 is useful; Rangerius of Lucca, *Vita metrica S. Anselmi* in *MGSS* XXX, 1152–55; cf. P. Guidi in *StudGreg* I (1947), 263–80 (Rangerius's home). For Bonizo of Sutri, Donizo of Canossa and others see sources for this sect.

LITERATURE

GENERAL WORKS, see lit. at the beginning of this section; W. Martens, *Gregor VII. Sein Leben und Wirken,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1894); E. Caspar, "Gregor VII. in seinen Briefen" in *HZ* 130 (1924), 1–30; A. Fliche, *Grégoire VII* (Paris, 4th ed. 1928); W. Wühr, *Studien zu Gregor VII. Kirchenreform* und *Weltpolitik* (Munich-Freising 1930); M. J. MacDonald, *Hildebrand. Life of Gregory VII* (London 1932); J. P. Whitney, *Hildebrandine Essays* (Cambridge 1932); A. B. Cavanagh, *Pope Gregory VII and the Theocratic State* (dissertation, Cath. Univ. Wash. D.C. 1934); H. X. Arquillière, *Saint Grégoire. Essai sur sa conception du pouvoir pontifical* (Paris 1934); R. Morghen, *Gregorio VII* (Turin 1942). E. Bernheim, *Mittelalterliche Zeitanschauungen in ihrem Einfluss auf Politik und Geschichtsschreibung* (Tübingen 1918), 202–21; A. Nischke,

"Die Wirksamkeit Gottes in der Welt Gregors VII." in *StudGreg* V (1956), 115–219; H. X. Arquillière, "La signification théologique du pontificat de Grégoire VII" in *Rev. de l'Univ. d'Ottawa* 20 (1950), 140–61; G. Soranzo, "Aspetti del pensiero dell'opera di Gregorio VII e lo spirito dei tempi" in *Aevum* 22 (1948), 309–32; id., "Gregorio VII e gli Stati vasalli della Chiesa" *ibid.* (1949), 131–58; V. Ussani in *StudGreg* II (1947), 341–59 (Gregory's style); P. S. Leicht in *StudGreg* I (1947), 93–110 (Gregory and Roman law); L. F. J. Meulenberg, *Der Primat der römischen Kirche im Denken und Handeln Gregors VII.* ('s Gravenhage 1965).

THE CHRISTIAN EAST: G. Hofmann, "Papst Gregor und der christliche Osten" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 169–81; W. Ziegler, "Gregor VII. und der Kijewer Grossfürst Izjaslav" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 387–411; V. Meystowicz, "L'union de Kiew avec Rome sous Grégoire VII. Avec notes sur les précédents et sur le rôle de Pologne" in *StudGreg* V (1956), 83–108; D. Oljančyn, "Zur Regierung des Grossfürsten Izjaslav-Demeter von Kiev" in *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* NS 8 (1960), 397–410; W. Holtzmann, "Studien zur Orientpolitik und zur Entstehung des ersten Kreuzzugs" in *HV* 22 (1924), 167–99; id., *Beiträge zur Reichs- und Verfassungsgeschichte des hohen Mittelalters* (Bonn 1957), 51–78.

INDIVIDUAL LANDS OF THE WEST: Cf. at the beginning of this section.

IRELAND: A. Gwynn, "Gregory and the Irish Church" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 105–28.

SPAIN: L. de la Calzada, "La proyección del pensamiento de Gregorio VII en los reinos de Castilla y León" in *StudGreg* III (1948), 1–87; B. Llorca, "Derechos de la Santa Sede sobre España. El pensamiento de Gregorio VII" in *Sacerdozio e Regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII* (Rome 1954), 79–105; J. F. Rivera, "Gregorio VII y la liturgia mozárabe" in *RET* 2 (1942), 3–33; F. Pérez, "San Gregorio VII y la liturgia española" in *Liturgia* 3 (1948), 105–13; 323–30; A. Urbieto Arteta, "La introducción de rito romano en Aragón y Navarra" in *HS* 1 (1948), 299–324; R. B. Donovan, *The Liturgical Drama in Medieval Spain* (Toronto 1958); P. David, *Études historiques* (lit. for chap. 29), 341–439 (Gregory, Cluny and Alphonso VI).

FRANCE: O. Meyer, "Reims und Rom unter Gregor VII." in *ZSavRGkan* 59 (1939), 418–52; H. Gaul, *Manasses I., Erzbischof von Reims,* I (Essen 1940); J. R. Williams in *AHR* 54 (1949), 804–29 (Manasses and Gregory).

ITALY: G. B. Borino, "Cencio del Prefetto, l'attentatore di Gregorio VII" in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 373–440; *ibid.* 456–65 (actual time of the excommunication of Hugh the White and Guibert of Ravenna); A. Overmann, *Gräfin Mathilde von Canossa* (Innsbruck 1895); G. Nencioni, *Matilde di Canossa* (Milan, 2nd ed. 1940); L. Simeoni, "Il contributo della contessa Matilde nella lotta per le investiture" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 353–72; on the Donations: P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *Gesammelte Schriften,* I (Berlin 1903), 87 seqq.; T. Leccisotti in *StudGreg* I (1947), 306–19 (meeting of Desiderius of Montecassino with Henry IV in Albano).

GERMANY: A. Brackmann, "Gregor VII. und die kirchliche Reformbewegung in Deutschland" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 7–30; C. Erdmann, *Studien zur Briefliteratur Deutschlands im 11. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1938), 225–81 (Gregory and Germany in the years 1073–75); A. Mayer-Pfannholz, "Die Wende von Canossa" in *Hochland* 30 (1933), 385–404; R. Wahl, *Der Gang nach Canossa, Kaiser Heinrich IV. Eine Historie* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1951); W. von den Steinen, *Canossa. Heinrich IV. und die Kirche* (Munich 1957).

45. *Stubborn Fight and Victory: From Victor III to Calixtus II*

SOURCES

Watterich I, 559 – II, 153; *Duchesne LP* II, 292–326, 338–48, 369–79, III (also Gen. Bib. I, 5) 143–69. — *Mansi* XX, 629 – XXI, 318; *Hefele-Leclercq* V, 1, 325–644. Further sources pp. 536 f.

LITERATURE

See the literature cited on pp. 537f.

CLEMENT III: O. Köhncke, *Wibert von Ravenna: Papst Clemens III.* (Leipzig 1888); P. Kehr, "Zur Geschichte Wiberts von Ravenna" in *SAB* (1921), 355–68, 973–88; K. Jordan, "Die Stellung Wiberts von Ravenna in der Publizistik des Investiturstreites" in *MIÖG* 62 (1954), 155–64.

VICTOR III: A. Fliche, "Le pontificat de Victor III" in *RHE* 20 (1924), 387–412; A. Rony, "L'élection de Victor III. Conflit entre le nouveau pape et Hugues, archevêque de Lyon" in *RHEF* 14 (1928), 145–60.

PONTIFICATE OF URBAN II: All available literature contained in the basic work of A. Becker, *Papst Urban II.*, part I: *Herkunft und kirchliche Laufbahn. Der Papst und die lateinische Christenheit* (Stuttgart 1964); F. J. Gossman, *Pope Urban II and Canon Law* (dissertation, Washington, Cath. Univ. 1960); R. Crozet, "Le voyage d'Urbain II et ses négotiations avec le clergé de France 1095/96" in *RH* 179 (1937), 271–310. For southern Italy cf. literature on page 538, especially Klewitz in *QFIAB* 25 (1934–5), 105–57; also E. Caspar, *Roger II. und die Gründung der normannisch-sizilischen Monarchie* (Innsbruck 1904); E. Jordan, "La politique ecclésiastique de Roger I^{er} et les origines de la 'légation sicilienne'" in *MA* 24 (1922), 237–73; *ibid.* 25 (1923), 32–65; on his relations with Byzantium relating to the First Crusade cf. lit. for chap. 51.

PASCHAL II AND THE INVESTITURE PROBLEM: B. Monod, *Essai sur les rapports de Pascal II et de Philippe I^{er}* (Paris 1907); H. Hoffmann, "Ivo von Chartres und die Lösung des Investiturproblems" in *DA* 15 (1959), 393–440; R. Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres und seine Stellung in der Kirchengeschichte* (Stuttgart 1962); I. Ott, "Der Regalienbegriff im 12. Jahrhundert" in *ZSavRGkan* 66 (1948), 234–304; N. F. Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England 1098–1135* (Princeton, N.J., 1958); K. Pivec, "Die Bedeutung des ersten Romzugs Heinrichs V." in *MIÖG* 52 (1938), 217–25; W. Kratz, *Der Armutsgedanke im Entäußerungsplan des Papstes Paschalis II.* (dissertation, Freiburg 1933).

PONTIFICATES OF GELASIUS II AND CALIXTUS II: R. Krohn, *Der päpstliche Kanzler Johannes von Gaeta: Gelasius II.* (Berlin 1918); O. Engels, "Papst Gelasius II. als Hagiograph" in *QFIAB* 35 (1935), 1–45; C. Erdmann, "Mauritius Burdinus (Gregor VIII.)" in *QFIAB* 19 (1927), 205–61; P. David, *Études historiques* (lit. for chap. 28), 441–501 (L'énigme de Maurice Bourdin); A. Maurer, *Papst Calixt II.*, 2 parts (Munich 1886–89); U. Robert, *Histoire du pape Calixte II* (Paris 1891); T. Schieffer, "Nochmals die Verhandlungen von Mouzon" in *Festschrift E. E. Stengel* (Münster-Cologne 1952), 324–41; E. Bernheim, *Das Wormser Konkordat und seine Vorurkunde* (Breslau 1906); A. Hofmeister, "Das Wormser Konkordat. Zum Streit um seine Bedeutung" in *Festschrift Dietr. Schäfer* (Jena 1915), 64–148.

SECTION TWO

The Byzantine Church from 886 to 1054

47. *The Road to Schism*

SOURCES

C. Will, *Acta et scripta quae de controversiis ecclesiae grecae et latinae saeculo XI extant* (Leipzig 1861). Denunciation of Caerularius by Psellus = L. Bréhier, "Un discours inédit de Psellos" in *RÉG* 16 (1903), 375–416, and 17 (1904), 34–76; J. Hergenröther, *Monumenta graeca ad Photium eiusque historiam pertinentia* (Regensburg 1869), contains sources for the 11th century; A. Demetrakopulos, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, I (Leipzig 1866).

LITERATURE

L. Bréhier, *Le schisme oriental du XI^e siècle* (Paris 1899); A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1924–30); id., "Schisma und Kaiserhof im Jahre 1054" in *L'église et les églises,* I (Chevetogne 1954), 351–440; S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches During the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (Oxford 1955).

SECTION THREE

Changes in the Christian West during the Gregorian Reform

49. *The New Shape of the Church: Law and Organization before Gratian*

SOURCES OF LAW

Atto of Milan, *Breviarium,* ed. by A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio,* VI, 2 (Rome 1832), 60–102; *Anselmi episcopi Lucensis collectio,* ed. by F. Thaner (Innsbruck 1906–15), lacking here are a part of lib. XI and all of XII–XIII; *Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit,* ed. by Wolf v. Glanvel (Paderborn 1905); P. Martinucci, *Deusdedit presbyteri cardinalis collectio* (Venice 1869); Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber de vita christiana,* ed. by E. Perels (Berlin 1930); Cardinalis Gregorius, *Polycarpus,* ed. Ballerini, *De antiquis collectionibus,* IV, c. 17: A. Gallandius, *De vetustis canonum collectionibus sylloge,* I (Mainz 1790); Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum* in *PL* 161, 47–1022, *Panormia, ibid.,* 1041–1344 (Ivo's *Collectio Tripartita* remains unedited); *Collectio Caesaraugustana,* ed. by Ballerini *(v. supra)* IV, c. 18.

LITERATURE

FOR THE SOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT OF CANON LAW: Fournier – Le Bras, *Histoire des collections,* II (Gen. Bib. I, 4); Stickler, *Historia Fontium* (Gen. Bib. I, 4), 160–95; *Feine RG* § 17, III; Plöchl, *Kirchenrecht* (Gen. Bib. II, 6) II (1955), 405–11; A. Michel, *Die Sentenzen des Kardinals Humbert. Das erste Rechtsbuch der päpstlichen Reform* (Stuttgart 1943), and Michel's response to objections of J. Haller and F. Pelster in *StudGreg* III (1948), 149–61; A. Authenrieth, "Bernold von Konstanz und die erweiterte 74-Titel-Sammlung" in *DA* 14 (1958), 375–94; R. Montanari, *La "collectio canonum" di S. Anselmo di Lucca e la riforma gregoriana* (Mantua 1941); A. Fliche, "La valeur historique de la collectio canonum d'Anselme de Lucques" in *Misc. hist. in honor. A. De Meyer,* I (Louvain 1946), 348–57; U. Lewald, *An der Schwelle der Scholastik. Bonizo von Sutri und das Kirchenrecht seiner Tage* (Weimar 1938). For Bonizo also E. Nasalli-Rocca di Corneliano in *StudGreg* II (1947), 151–62; J. T. Gilchrist, "Canon Law Aspects of the 11th Century Reform" in *JEH* 13 (1962), 21–38.

ON LAYMEN IN THE CHURCH: Plöchl, *Kirchenrecht* (Gen. Bib. II, 6) II (1955), 160 seqq.; *Feine RG* § 34; both manuals contain further material in the chapters on parishes.

PATRONATUS: *Feine RG* § 24, II, § 32, II; Plöchl, *Kirchenrecht,* 368–71; U. Stutz, "Patronat" in *RE* 15 (1904), 13–26; id., "Eigenkirche", *ibid.* 23 (1913), 375–77; id., "Gratian und die Eigenkirche" in *ZSavRGkan* 32 (1911), 1–33, and 33 (1912), 342 seq.

BISHOPS, METROPOLITANS, PRIMATES: Werminghoff, *Verfassungsgeschichte* (Gen. Bib. II, 6), 118–59; *Feine RG* § 31, § 24, III (with lit.); Plöchl, *Kirchenrecht,* 126–59; H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlicher Patriarchate II–III" in *ZSavRGkan* 71 (1954), 1–84; *ibid.* 72 (1955), 95–183; A. Felbinger, "Die Primatialprivilegien von Gregor VII. bis Innozenz III." in *ZSavRGkan* 68 (1951), 15–163.

PAPACY: *Feine RG* § 28–30 (with lit.); Plöchl, *Kirchenrecht,* 20–100; R. Zoepffel, *Die Papstwahlen vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen 1872); F. Wasner, *De consecratione, inthronisatione,* *coronatione Summi Pontificis* (Rome 1936); E. Eichmann, *Weihe und Krönung des Papstes im Mittelalter* (Munich 1951); A. Hauck, "Rezeption und Umbildung der allgemeinen Synoden im Mittelalter" in *HV* 10 (1907), 465–82; E. Voosen, *Papauté et pouvoir civil à l'époque de Grégoire VII* (Gembloux 1927), 94–157 (the Primacy); H. Weisweiler, "Die päpstliche Gewalt in den Schriften Bernolds von St. Blasien" in *StudGreg* IV (1952), 129–47; K. Hofmann, *Der "Dictatus Papae" Gregors VII.* (Paderborn 1933).

PAPAL LEGATES: K. Ruess, *Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VIII.* (Paderborn 1912); important is the lit. for Part II, Section one, with works on the legations in Germany (O. Schumann), in England (H. Tillmann), France (T. Schieffer), Spain (G. Säbekow).

CARDINALS: V. Martin, *Les cardinaux et la curie* (Paris 1930); J. B. Sägmüller, *Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII.* (Freiburg 1896); H. W. Klewitz, "Die Entstehung des Kardinalkollegiums" in *ZSavRGkan* 56 (1936), 115–221, new impression in Klewitz, *Reformpapsttum und Kardinalkolleg* (Darmstadt 1957), 1–134; S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis. The History of a Canonical Concept" in *Tr* 3 (1945), 129–214; M. Andrieu, "L'origine du titre de Cardinal" in *MiscMercati* V (Vatican City 1946), 113–44; K. Ganzer, *Die Entwicklung des auswärtigen Kardinalats im hohen Mittelalter* (Tübingen 1963); further lit. in *Feine RG* § 28, II.

ROMAN CURIA: K. Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie" in *ZSavRGkan* 59 (1939), 96–152; id., "Die päpstliche Verwaltung im Zeitalter Gregors VII." in *StudGreg* I (1947), 111–35; J. Sydow, "Untersuchungen zur kurialen Verwaltungsgeschichte im Zeitalter des Reformpapsttums" in *DA* 11 (1954), 18–73; R. Elze, "Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12.–13. Jahrhundert" in *ZSavRGkan* 67 (1950), 145–204; J. Sydow, "Cluny und die Anfänge der Apostol. Kammer" in *SM* 63 (1951), 45–66; D. B. Zema, "Economic Reorganisation of the Roman See during the Gregorian Reform" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 137–68.

50. *The New Relationship of the Church to Western Christendom*

LITERATURE

For political ideologies cf. works in Gen. Bib. II, 8b; *ibid.*, II, 8a citations by Kern, *Gottesgnadentum*, David, *La souveraineté*, and O. Gierke, *Genossenschaftsrecht*, esp. vol. III, 502–644, on the publicists of the Middle Ages. Also L. Knabe, *Die gelasianische Zweigewaltenlehre bis zum Ende des Investiturstreites* (Berlin 1936); cf. Maitland's work, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1900) containing one of the sections of Gierke's *The German Law of Associations;* E. Lewis, *Medieval Political Ideas,* 2 vols. (London 1954); C. H. McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West from the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages* (New York 1932); G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society* (Lit. Sect. I), 48–76, 175–92; W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government* (Gen. Bib. II, 5) 253–412, and also F. Kempf *(ibid.)*, 135–53; E. Voosen, *Papauté et pouvoir civil à l'époque de Grégoire VII. Contribution à l'histoire du droit public* (Gembloux 1927); A. Fliche, "Les théories germaniques de la souveraineté à la fin du XI^{e} siècle" in *RH* 125 (1917), 1–67; G. Ladner, "Aspects of Medieval Thought on Church and State" in *Review of Politics* 9 (1947), 403–22; F. Kempf, "Zur politischen Lehre der früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Kirche" in *ZSavRGkan* 78 (1961), 403–22; id., "Kanonistik und kuriale Politik im 12. Jahrhundert" in *AHPont* 1 (1963), 11–52.

ON CHRISTENDOM: G. Tellenbach, "Die Bedeutung des Reformpapsttums für die Einigung des Abendlandes" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 125–49; J. Rupp, *L'idée de chrétienté dans la pensée Pontificale des origines à Innocent III* (Paris 1939); É. Gilson, *Les métamorphoses de la Cité de Dieu* (Louvain–Paris 1952); G. Ladner, "The Concepts of 'Ecclesia' and 'Christianitas' and their Relation to the Idea of Papal 'Plenitudo potestatis' from Gregory VII to Boniface VIII" in *Sacerdozio e Regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII* (Rome 1954), 49–77; F. Kempf, "Das

Problem der Christianitas im 12.–13. Jahrhundert" in *HJ* 79 (1960), 104–23; J. van Laarhoven, "'Christianitas' et réforme grégorienne" in *StudGreg* VI (1959–61), 1–98.

Imperial Insignia of the Popes: H. W. Klewitz, "Die Krönung des Papstes" in *ZSavRGkan* 61 (1941), 96–130; P. E. Schramm, "Sacerdotium und Regnum im Austausch ihrer Vorrechte" in *StudGreg* II (1947), 403–57; cf. also footnote 8 of this chapter and the lit. cited in previous chapter by Zoepffel, Wasner, Eichmann on election and enthronement.

Papacy and States: K. Bierbach, *Kurie und nationale Staaten im frühen Mittelalter* (Dresden 1938); K. Jordan, "Das Eindringen des Lehnwesens in das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie" in *AUF* 12 (1932), 13–110; id., "Das Reformpapsttum und die abendländische Staatenwelt" in *WaG* 18 (1958), 122–37; for individual states cf. lit. in section two.

51. *The Papacy, the Holy Wars, and the First Crusade*

Sources

For sources and literature H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Hanover 1960) is always reliable; cf. also A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade. Historiography and Bibliography* (Bloomington, Ind., 1962).

Documents and Letters: R. Röhricht, *Regesta regni Hierosolimitani 1097–1291* (Innsbruck 1893) with Additamentum (1904); *Epistolae et chartae historiam primi belli sacri spectantes*, ed. by H. Hagenmeyer (Innsbruck 1901); H. Hagenmeyer, *Chronologie de la première croisade* (Paris 1901).

Reports: *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*, ed. by H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg 1890), new editions by R. Hill (London 1962); Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana* in *Recueil des historiens des croisades* (Gen. Bib. I, 3: *Acad. des Inscr.*), *Historiens occid.*, III, 319–485; Radulf of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi in expeditione Hierosolymitana* in *Historiens occid.*, III, 603–716; Raymund of Aguilers, *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Hierusalem* in *Historiens occid.*, III, 235–309; Albert of Aachen, *Historia Hierosolymitana* in *Historiens occid.*, IV; Ekkehard of Aura, *Hierosolymitica*, ed. by H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg 1877); Anna Comnena, *Alexiade. Règne de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène*, ed. by B. Leib (with French translation), 3 vols. (Paris 1937–45); for Arabic, Persian, Armenian, and other sources cf. bibliography by H. Mayer and S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, I (Cambridge, 6th ed. 1962), 342–60.

Literature

General Histories of the Crusades: Mayer and Runciman *(v. supra)*; the brilliant but at times francophile work of R. Grousset, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, 3 vols. (Paris 1934–36) is now superseded by S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 6th ed. 1962), German transl. by P. de Mendelsohn, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 3 vols. (Munich 1957–60); *A History of the Crusades*, Editor-in-Chief K. M. Setton: vol. I, ed. by H. W. Baldwin: *The First Hundred Years* (Philadelphia 1955), vol. II, ed. by R. L. Wolf and H. W. Hazard: *The Later Crusades 1189–1311* (1962), three more volumes will follow; A. Waas, *Geschichte der Krezzüge*, 2 vols. (Freiburg 1956). On these three works cf. H. E. Mayer in *GGA* 211 (1957), 234–46 (critique of Waas), *ibid.*, 214 (1960), 42–63 (critique of Runciman); still valuable is P. Rousset, *Histoire des croisades* (Paris 1957); A. S. Atiya, *Crusade, Commerce and Culture* (Bloomington, Ind., 1962); H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), a critical and penetrating analysis of previous works.

The First Crusade: Mayer, *Bibliographie (v. supra)*, 1902–2007; Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, I, 342–60; F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la première croisade jusqu'à l'élection de Godefroi* *de Bouillon* (Paris 1924); C. D. J. Brandt, *Kruisvaarders naar Jeruzalem. Geschiedenis van de eerste kruistocht* (Utrecht 1950); R. Rousset, *Les origines et les caractères de la première croisade* (dissertation, Neuchâtel 1945).

Crusading Idea and the Origin of the Crusades: C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Stuttgart 1935, reprinted 1955); P. Alphandéry and A. Dupront, *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade*, I: *Les premières croisades* (Paris 1954); M. Villey, *La croisade. Essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique* (Paris 1942); W. Holtzmann, "Studien zur Orientpolitik des Reformpapsttums und zur Entstehung des 1. Kreuzzugs" in *HV* 22 (1924–25), 167–99; id., "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089" in *ByZ* 28 (1928), 38–67.

The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Other States: Mayer, *Bibliographie*, 2958–3099 and Runciman, II, 493–99; R. Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem 1100–1291* (Innsbruck 1898); J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932); D. C. Munro, *The Kingdom of the Crusaders* (New York 1935); J. Richard, *Le royaume latin de Jérusalem* (Paris 1953); J. Prawer, *History of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Hebrew) 2 vols. (Jerusalem 1963); C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche* (Paris 1940); J. Richard, *Le comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine 1102–1187* (Paris 1945); R. L. Nicholson, *Jocelin I, Prince of Edessa* (Urbana 1954); W. Hotzelt, *Kirchengeschichte Palästinas im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge 1099–1291* (Cologne 1940). For ecclesiastical history in the East cf. Mayer, *Bibliographie*, 3913–4090.

52. *The "Vita Evangelica" Movement and The Appearance of New Orders*

Sources

Editions of rules and constitutions by Holstenius-Brockie, Albers and Hallinger cf. Gen. Bib. I, 8; for individual orders or monasteries cf. sources in Heimbucher (Gen. Bib. II, 9) and Cottineau (Gen. Bib. I, 7), some references also in the literature and footnotes in this chapter.

Literature

Cf. Gen. Bib. II, 9, and lit. to chap. 39.

Vita-apostolica Movement, Hermits and Itinerant Preachers: H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1961), id., "Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der religiösen Bewegungen im Mittelalter" in *AKG* 37 (1955), 129–82, esp. 147–57; E. Mens, *Oorsprong en betekenis van de Nederlandse Begijnen- en Begardenbeweging* (Brussels 1947), contains much on the entire religious movement; E. Werner, *Pauperes Christi. Studien zu sozial-religiösen Bewegungen in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums* (Leipzig 1956), worthwhile in spite of its Marxist views; M. D. Chenu, "Moines, clercs, laïcs au carrefour de la vie évangélique (XII^{e} siècle)" in *RHE* 49 (1954), 59–89; "Érémitisme" in *DSAM* IV (1960), 953–82; "Ermites" in *DHGE* XV (1963), 766–87; *L'eremitismo in occidente nei secoli XI e XII in Atti della 2^{e} Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola 1962* (Milan 1965), esp. L. Génicot, "L'érémitisme du XI^{e} siècle dans son contexte économique et social" (45–69), G. G. Meersseman, "L'eremitismo e la predicazione itinerante" (164–79), J. Becquet, "L'érémitisme clérical et laïque dans l'ouest de la France" (182–202), E. Delaruelle, "Les ermites et la spiritualité populaire" (212–41); J. v. Walter, "Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs I" in *StGThK* 9, no. 3 (Leipzig 1903), 1–195; II as supplement to vol. 9 *ibid.* (1906); L. Spätling, *De apostolis, pseudoapostolis, apostolinis* (dissertation, Rome 1947); J. Leclercq, "La crise du monachisme aux XI^{e} et XII^{e} siècles" in *BIStIAM* 70 (1958), 19–41; N. F. Cantor, "The Crisis of Western Monasticism 1050–1130" in *AHR* 66 (1960–1), 47–67.

Vallombrosa: *L'abbazia di Vallombrosa nel pensiero contemporaneo* (Livorno 1953), contains Congress reports; B. Quilici, *Giovanni Gualberto e la sua riforma monastica* (Florence 1943);

further biographies by A. Salvini (Rome 1950) and by E. Lucchesi (Florence 1959); G. Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo* (Rome 1960), the beginning of the Congregation 133–38; S. Boesch Gajano, "Storia e tradizione Vallombrosiane" in *BIStIAM* 76 (1964), 99–215.

Carthusians: B. Bligny, *Recueil des plus anciens actes de la Grande-Chartreuse 1086–1196* (Grenoble 1958); A. De Mayer and J. M. De Smet, *Guigo's Consuetudines van de eerste Kartuizers* (Brussels 1951); Y. Gourdel, "Chartreux" in *DSAM* II (1937), 705–76 (with lit.); E. Baumann, *Les Chartreux* (Paris 1928); B. Bligny, "Les premiers Chartreux et la pauvreté" in *MA* 4 Series, 6 (1951), 27–60; id., "L'érémitisme et les Chartreux" in *L'eremitismo (v. supra)*, 248–63; H. Löbbel, *Der Stifter des Karthäuserordens, der hl. Bruno von Köln* (Münster 1899), still indispensable.

Cistercians: J. M. Canivez, *Statuta capitulorum generalium O. Cist. 1116–1787*, 8 vols. (Louvain 1933–41); J. Turk, "Carta caritatis prior" in *Analecta S. O. Cist.* 1 (1945), 11–61; id., "Cistercii statuta antiquissima", *ibid.* 4 (1948), 1–159; J. B. van Damme, *Documenta pro Ord. Cist. collecta* (Westmalle 1959). For the confusing recent source studies on the early development of the order advanced especially by J. A. Lefèvre and J. B. van Damme, cf. the critical literature survey in P. Zakar, "Die Anfänge des Zisterzienserordens" in *Analecta S. O. Cist.* 20 (1964), 103–38 and *ibid.*, 21 (1965), 138–66 (answer to van Damme); E. Pásztor in *Annali di scuola spec. per arch. e bibl.* 4 (1964), 137–44; J. M. Canivez, "Cîteaux: Abbaye; Ordre" in *DHGE* XII (1953), 852–74, 874–997; J. B. Mahn, *L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement 1098–1265* (Paris, 2nd ed., 1951); L. J. A. Lekai and A. Schneider, *Geschichte und Wirken der Weissen Mönche* (Cologne 1958); L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité de Cîteaux* (Paris 1955); F. Delehaye in *Collect. Ord. Cist. Ref.* 14 (1952), 83–106 (on Robert as founder of Cîteaux); R. Duvernay, "Cîteaux, Vallombreuse et Étienne Hardin" in *Analecta S. O. Cist.* 8 (1952), 379–495; on Bernard of Clairvaux cf. next volume; A. King, *Cîteaux and her Elder Daughters* (London 1954); P. Salmon, "L'ascèse monastique et les origines de Cîteaux" in *Mélanges Saint-Bernard* (Dijon 1954), 268–83.

Canons Regular: Cf. Literature for chap. 39. The latest research is found in a wealth of monographs and articles: basic is C. Dereine, "Chanoines" in *DHGE* XII (1953), 353–405; J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London 1950); M. Mois, *Das Stift Rottenburg in der Kirchenreform des 11.–12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich–Freising 1953); A. van Ette, *Les chanoines réguliers de Saint-Augustin. Aperçu historique* (Bressoux–Liège 1953); J. Siegwart, for Switzerland and Germany (lit. for chap. 39); *La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI–XII, Atti di Settimana di studio, Mendola 1959*, 2 vols. (Milan 1962), an excellent survey of present research and well oriented. On its contents cf. T. Schieffer in *HZ* 200 (1965), 632–41. Important particular studies are C. Dereine, "Vie commune, règle de Saint Augustin et chanoines réguliers au XI^{e} siècle" in *RHE* 41 (1946), 365–406; G. Bardy, "Saint Grégoire et la réforme canonicale" in *StudGreg* I (1947), 47–64; C. Dereine, "Le problème de la vie commune chez les canonistes réguliers d'Anselme de Lucques à Gratien", *ibid.* III (1948), 287–98; id., "L'élaboration du statut canonique des chanoines réguliers, spécialement sous Urbaine II" in *RHE* 46 (1951), 534–65; G. Schreiber, "Gregor VII., Cluny, Cîteaux, Prémontré zu Eigenkirche, Parochie, Seelsorge" in *ZSavRGkan* 65 (1947), 51–171; F. J. Schmale, "Kanonie, Seelsorge, Eigenkirche" in *HJ* 78 (1959), 38–63.

Premonstratensians: N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense*, 3 vols. (Straubing 1949–56); F. Petit, *L'ordre de Prémontré* (Paris 1926); B. F. Grassl, *Der Prämonstratenser-Orden* (Tongerloo 1934); F. Petit, *La spiritualité des Prémontrés aux XII^{e} et XIII^{e} siècles* (Paris 1947); P. F. Lefèvre, *La liturgie de Prémontré* (Louvain 1946); C. Dereine, "Les origines de Prémontré" in *RHE* 42 (1947), 352–78; id., "Le premier 'ordo' de Prémontré" in *RBén* 58 (1948), 84–92; G. Madelaine, *Histoire de Saint Norbert*, 2 vols. (Tongerloo, 2nd ed. 1928); additional biographies by A. Zák (Vienna 1930) and by W. P. Romain (Paris 1960); P. Lefèvre in *RHE* 56 (1961) on Norbert's conversion.

ON THE MILITARY ORDERS H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Hanover 1960), 3460–77 (gen. lit.); 3561–3621 (Templars); 3478–3560 (Hospitallers). Still valuable is Héliot (Gen. Bib. II, 9); G. A. Campbell, *The Knights Templars. Their Rise and Fall* (London 1937); G. Schnürer, *Die ursprüngliche Templerregel* (Freiburg 1903); J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Les Hospitaliers en Terre-Sainte et à Chypre* (Paris 1904); G. Bottarelli and M. Montersi, *Storia politica e militare del ordine di S. Giovanni di Gerusalemme,* 2 vols. (Milan 1940); E. J. King, *The Rule, Status and Customs of the Hospitallers 1099–1310* (London 1934).

53. *The Beginnings of Scholasticism*

SOURCES

DIALECTICIANS AND ANTI-DIALECTICIANS: Anselm of Besata, *Rhetorimachia,* ed. by K. Manitius in *MG Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte* 2 (1958); Otloh of St Emmeran, Complete works in *PL* 146, 27–434, esp. his *Dialogus de tribus questionibus, ibid.* 59–136, and the autobiographical work *Liber de tentationibus suis et scriptis, ibid.* 27–58; Manegold of Lautenbach, *Opusculum contra Wolfelmum Coloniensem* in *PL* 155, 147–76; Peter Damiani, Complete works in *PL* 144–45; esp. Op. 45, *ibid.* 145, 695–704, Op. 58, *ibid.* 831–38, and the work on the Principle of Contradiction, Op. 36; *De divina omnipotentia in reparatione corruptae et factis infectis reddendis, ibid.* 595–622.

EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY: *Berengarii Turonensis opera quae supersunt,* ed. by A. F.-F. T. Vischer (Berlin 1834); the work *De sacra coena adversus Lanfrancum,* here contained, is newly edited by W. H. Beekenkamp (The Hague 1941); Berengar's Letters to Adelmann in Martène-Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum,* IV (Paris 1717), 109–13, to Jocelin of Bordeaux, ed. by G. Morin in *RBén* 46 (1934), 220–6; Lanfranc, *De corpore et sanguine Domini adversus Berengarium Turonensem* in *PL* 150, 407–22; Guitmund of Aversa, *De corpore et sanguine Christi Libri tres* in *PL* 159, 1427–94; Anselm of Laon, *Systematische Sentenzen,* ed. by F. P. Bliemetzrieder in *BeitrGPhMA* 18, 2–3 (1919); additional tractus in J. Geiselmann (lit. *infra*).

QUARREL OVER ORDINATIONS: Peter Damian, *Liber Gratissimus* in *MGLiblit* I, 15–75; Humbert of Silva Candida, *Adversus simoniacos libri tres, ibid.* 95–253; for tracts written by later authors cf. A. Schebler (lit. *infra*).

ANSELM OF CANTERBURY: The earlier edition in *PL* 158–59 now superseded by *S. Anselmi opera omnia,* ed. by F. S. Schmitt, I–V in 6 vols. (London 1938–51); Schmitt previously edited *Cur Deus Homo, Monologion, De incarnatione Verbi, Proslogion* in *FlorPatr* (Gen. Bib. I, 11), 18 (1929), 20 (1929), 28 (1931), 29 (1931); also: *Cur Deus homo* (Munich 1956), Latin and Germ.

LITERATURE

For important comprehensive lit. see Gen. Bib. II, 12; esp. useful are the bibliographical accounts in *Ueberweg* II; always reliable is Gen. Bib. II, 11, esp. *Manitius* and J. de Ghellinck, also by de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (Paris, 2nd ed. 1948).

QUARREL OVER DIALECTICS AND THE BEGINNINGS OF EARLY SCHOLASTICISM: J. Endres, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der frühmittelalterlichen Philosophie* (Münster 1915); M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1909–11); A. J. Macdonald, *Authority and Reason in the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford 1933); for Peter Damian cf. lit. for chap. 42 and J. Endres, *Petrus Damiani und die weltliche Wissenschaft* (Münster 1910).

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY: J. Geiselmann, *Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik* (Paderborn 1926), basic treatment to 1100; C. E. Sheedy, *The Eucharistic Controversy of the 11th Century*

(Washington 1948); A. J. Macdonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (London 1930); M. Cappuyns in *DHGE* VIII (1935), 385–407; G. Ladner, *Theologie und Politik vor dem Investiturstreit* (Baden bei Wien 1936), 14–41; W. H. Beekenkamp, *De avondmaalsleer van Berengarius v. Tours* ('s Gravenhage 1941); N. M. Haring, "Berengar's Definitions of Sacramentum and their Influence on Mediaeval Sacramentology in *MS* 29 (1951), 109–46; O. Capitani, "Studi per Berengario di Tours" in *BIStIAM* 69 (1957), 67–173; id., "Per la storia dei rapporti tra Gregorio VII e Berengario di Tours" in *StudGreg* VI (1959–61), 99–145.

Quarrel over the Sacrament of Orders: L. Saltet, *Les réordinations* (Paris 1907); A. Schebler, *Die Reordinationen in der 'altkatholischen Kirche'* (Bonn 1936); V. Fuchs, *Der Ordinationstitel von seiner Entstehung bis auf Innozenz III.* (Bonn 1930); the latter two written from the viewpoint of R. Sohms; still useful today is E. Hirsch, "Die Auffassungen der simonistischen und schismatischen Weihen im 11. Jahrhundert", esp. for Card. Deusdedit, in *AkathKR* 87 (1907), 25–70; cf. also the useful work of M. Rosati, *La teologia sacramentaria nella lotta contro la simonia e l'investitura laica del secolo XI* (dissertation, Rome, Gregoriana, 1951).

Anselm of Canterbury: In addition to *Ueberweg* II, 192–203, 698–700 (lit.); *Fliche-Martin* XIII, 49–66; *DHGE* III (1924) 464–85; *DThC* I (1923), 1327–60; G. Ceriani, *S. Anselmo* (Brescia 1946); *Specilegium Beccense* (Paris 1959), report of the International Congress Commemorating the 900th Anniversary of Anselm's arrival at Bec; S. Vanni Rovighi, *S. Anselmo e la filosofia del secolo XI* (Milan 1949); G. Söhngen, *Die Einheit der Theologie in Anselms Proslogion* (Bonn 1938); K. Barth, *Fides quaerens intellectum. Anselms Beweis der Existenz Gottes* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1958), on 1st ed. (1931) cf. A. Stolz in *Catholica* 2 (1933), 1–24, and É. Gilson in *AHD* 9 (1934), 5–51; A. Kolping, *Anselms Proslogion-Beweis der Existenz Gottes* (Bonn 1939); J. McIntyre, *St. Anselm and his Critics. Re-Interpretation of the Cur Deus homo* (London 1954); R. Perino, *La dottrina trinitaria di S. Anselmo* (Rome 1951); J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption au début du moyen âge* (Paris 1934); A. Schmitt, "La Meditatio redemptionis humanae di s. Anselmo in relazione al Cur Deus homo" in *Benedittina* 9 (1955), 197–213; H. Ott, "Anselms Versöhnungslehre" in *ThZ* (1957), 183–99.

LIST OF POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

Antipopes are preceded by an asterisk

St. Sergius I	687–701
John VI	701–705
John VII	705–707
Sisinnius	708
Constantine I	708–715
St. Gregory II	715–731
St. Gregory III	731–741
St. Zachary	741–752
Stephen II	752
Stephen II (III)	752–757
St. Paul I	757–767
*Constantine II	767–768
*Philip	768
Stephen III (IV)	768–772
Hadrian	772–795
St. Leo III	795–816
Stephen IV (V)	816–817
St. Paschal I	817–824
Eugene II	824–827
Valentine	827
Gregory IV	827–844
*John	844
Sergius II	844–847
St. Leo IV	847–855
Benedict III	855–858
*Anastasius III	855
St. Nicholas I	858–867
Hadrian II	867–872
John VIII	872–882
Marinus I (Martin II)	882–884
St. Hadrian III	884–885
Stephen V (VI)	885–891
Formosus	891–896
Boniface VI	896
Stephen VI (VII)	896–897
Romanus	897
Theodore II	897
John IX	898–900
Benedict IV	900–903
Leo V	903
*Christopher	903
Sergius III	904–911
Anastasius III	911–913
Lando	913–914
John X	914–928
Leo VI	928
Stephen VII (VIII)	928–931
John XI	931–935
Leo VII	936–939
Stephen VIII (IX)	939–942
Marinus II (Martin III)	942–946
Agapitus II	946–955
John XII	955–964
Benedict V	964
Leo VIII	964–965
John XIII	965–972
Benedict VI	973–974
*Boniface VII (Franco)	974
Benedict VII	974–983
John XIV	983–984
Boniface VII	984–985
John XV	985–996
Gregory V	996–999
*John XVI	997–998
Silvester II	999–1003
John XVII	1003
John XVIII	1003/04–1009
Sergius IV	1009–1012
Benedict VIII	1012–1024
*Gregory VI	1012
John XIX	1024–1032
Benedict IX	1032–1045
*Silvester III	1045
Gregory VI	1045–1046

Clement II	1046–1047
Damasus II	1048
St. Leo IX	1049–1054
Victor II	1055–1057
Stephen IX (X)	1057–1058
*Benedict X	1058–1059
Nicholas II	1059–1061
Alexander II	1061–1073
*Honorius II	1061–1071/72
St. Gregory VII	1073–1085
*Clement III	1080–1100
Bl. Victor III	1086–1087
Bl. Urban II	1088–1099
Paschal II	1099–1118
*Dietrich	1100–1102
*Albert	1102
*Silvester IV	1105–1111
Gelasius II	1118–1119
*Gregory VIII	1118–1121
Calixtus II	1119–1124

GENERAL INDEX

Figures in italics denote pages where the subject receives more intensive treatment.

Aachen 40, 69, 83–88, 90f., 97–99, 101f., 104f., 108, 110, 115, 120, 122, 126, 129, 132, 139, 153, 158, 203, 300, 308, 317
— as capital 84, 87
— Diet of (818–9) 108f.
— Diet of (825) 114
— Diet of (828) 119
— Diet of (831) 121
— *placitum* of (828–9) 119
— Synod of (789) 312
— Synod of (809) 306
— Synod of (816) 106f., 308, 313, 330–2, 453f., 461f.
— Synod of (858) 130
— Synod of (860) 130
— Synod of (862) 130
Aarhus 232
Abasgia 405
Abbasid Dynasty 24, 65
abbatial election 274f.
Abbio, Saxon leader 64
Abbo, Abbot of Fleury 295, 298, 326, 336–8, 343
Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés 171
abbot, lay 109, 120, 166–8, 223, 320
abbots in the feudal system 270–9
Abd-Allah, Emir of Córdoba 127
Abd-ar-Rahman I, Emir of Córdoba 65f.
Abd-ar-Rahman II, Emir of Córdoba 134
Abd-ar-Rahman III, Caliph of Córdoba 218
Abramites 52
Abu Thawr 65
Adalard, Abbot of Corbie 74, 103f., 111, 114, 171
Adalard, Count 139
Adalbero II, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 402
Adalbero, Archbishop of Reims 214
Adalbero I, Bishop of Metz 321
Adalbero II, Bishop of Metz 322
Adalbert, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 234
Adalbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg 242, 322
Adalbert, Bishop of Prague 213, 215, 238, 337
Adalbert, King of Italy 205, 209, 211
Adalgis, son of King Desiderius 57, 59, 68
Adaltag, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 232
Adelaide, Queen of Germany and Empress 203, 205f., 211f.
Adhémar, Bishop of Le Puy 448–50
Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines (825) 113f., 120
Admonitio generalis (789) 70–3, 75, 77
Admonitio synodalis 309
Ado, Archbishop of Vienne 159
Adoptionism, Spanish 80–83
Adso, Abbot of Montierender 334
advocati 71, *271–3*, 326
advocatia 201, 270, 272f., 326
Aelfheah, Bishop of Winchester 226
Aelfric of Cerne 227
Aeneas, Bishop of Paris 163f.
Aethelred II, King of England 228f.
Aethelred, King of Northumbria 86
Aethelstan, King of Wessex 222, 225, 228
Aethelwold, Bishop of Winchester 226f., 327
Aethelwulf, King of Wessex 144
Afflighem 456 (n.), 457
Africa, Christian 3, 286f., 298
Agapitus II, Pope 200, 205, 235
Agauron 52
Agde, Synod of (506) 305
Aghlabid Dynasty 139, 197
Agiltrudis, Empress 156
Agius of Corvey 172
Agnellus 170
Agnes of Poitou, Queen of Germany and Empress 254f., 357f., 362, 382
Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons 66, 83, 105, 111, 115f., 122f., 145
Aimeric, Cardinal Deacon of Santa Maria Novella 285, 401, 435
Aimo, Archbishop of Bourges 346
Aimoin of Fleury 337
Aistulf, King of the Lombards 21–24
Aix-en-Provence 72, 140, 154, 357
Al Andalus 134, 218
Alania 405
Alberic, Abbot of Cîteaux 459
Alberic, Duke of Spoleto 198f.
Alberic, Prince 199f., 205, 249, 282, 324, 410
Albert, Cardinal Bishop of Sabina, Antipope 393
Alcuin 63, 71, 73–6, 82f., 85, 87, 89–92, 103, 105, 116–8, 136, 301f., 307, 314, 316–9
Aldgisl, King of the Frisians 9
Aldric, Abbot of Ferrières, Archbishop of Sens 105, 117

Aldric, Bishop of Le Mans 117, 169
Alemannia 8f., 12f., 16f., 78, 100
Alexander, Eperor 407f.
Alexander II, Pope 221, 306, *362–6*, 367, 370f., 373f., 376–8, 380, 446
Alexander III, Pope 427–9, 433
Alexius I, Emperor 376, 390, 447, 449–52
Alexius the Studite, Patriarch of Constantinople 412f., 424
Alferio, Abbot of Cava 328
Alfonso I, King of Asturias 134
Alfonso II, King of Asturias 81, 83, 86f., 133, 217
Alfonso III, King of Asturias 134f., 137, 143, 218
Alfonso VI, King of León-Castile 218 (n.), 219f., 377f., 445
Alfred the Great, King of Wessex *136–8*, 144, 224–6, 228
Alger of Liège 427
Al Hakam, Emir of Córdoba 86
Almoravids 378, 445
Al-Musafar 219
Alsace 17, 104, 121
Alsten, King of Sweden 374
Altmann, Bishop of Passau 372
Amadeus, Count of Savoy 373
Amalarius of Metz 76, 115–7, 160, 162, 301 (n.), 305
Amalfi 197, 379, 415, 445, 464
Amandus, Apostle of Flanders 10
Amatus, Bishop of Oléron 370, 372, 388
Amiens 104, 450, 455
— Sacramentary of 306
Amolo, Archbishop of Lyons, 116, 162
Amöneburg 11, 62
Amorbach 64
Amorion 45f.
Anastasius, Patriarch of Constantinople 29
Anastasius III, Pope 199, 407f.
Anastasius the Librarian 141, 147, 159, 169, 284
Ancona 139, 351
Andalusia 134, 378
Andernach 139, 153
Andrew I, King of Hungary 246f.
Andrew of Bergamo 171
Andrew of Crete 51
Andrew of Fleury 337f.
Andronicus Ducas 406
Angelomus of Luxeuil 158
Angilbert, Abbot of Saint-Riquier 74, 89
Angilram, Bishop of Metz 72, 168
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 137
Anglo-Saxon missionaries *9–16*, 61f., 222–4, 226, 232–4
Anglo-Saxons 3, 9–16, 86, *135–7*, 222f., *224–8*, 286, 289, 292, 300, 318f.
Angria 62, 65
Aniane 103, 117, 321, 323f.
Anna, Princess of Kiev 242
Annales Regni Francorum 18, 64, 75, 87, 93 (n.)
Annals of Lorsch 92
Anno, Archbishop of Cologne 362f.
anointing, royal 18, 164f., 202, 204, 440
Anointing of the Sick 303
Anschar, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 114, 136, 147, 232
Ansegis, Abbot of Saint-Wandrille 113
— collection of capitularies of 113
Ansegis, Archbishop of Sens 152, 291
Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury 224, 377, *390f.*, *393*, 402, *470–2*
Anselm, Archbishop of Milan 387
Anselm I, Bishop of Lucca *see* Alexander II, Pope
Anselm II, Bishop of Lucca 369, 372, 387, 426, 446
Anselm of Besata 465f.
Anselm of Laon 468
Anthony Cauleas, Patriarch of Constantinople 404
Antioch 417, 425, 451f.
— Principality of 452
Antony, Bishop of Sylaion 43
Anund Jakob, King of Sweden 232, 234
apocrisiarius 131, 433
Apologeticus 336
apologiae 306, 315, 317
Apulia 139f., 212, 251, 356, 361, 391f., 413, 443, 458
Aquileia 54, 63, 74, 82f., 85, 87, 89, 98, 148, 166, 190, 250
Aquitaine 8, 14, 24f., 66, 68, 72, 91, 95, 100f., 103–5, 138f., 158, 339
— Duchy of 254, 324, 378
— Kingdom of 60, 66, 100f., 104f., 108, 115, 117, 121f., 125–7
Aragón 219, 365, 377f., 443
arcarius 5, 281
archbishop, new meaning of 72, 166, *288–290*, 295
archdeacon 263, 265, 268f., 309, 429
archdeaconry, rural 165f., 269
archiepiscopal dignity combined with office of metropolitan 72, *288–290*, 295
archpresbyterate, rural 268f.
archpriest 165f., 268, 309
— rural 268
Arduin of Ivrea, King of Italy 247–250
Arethas, Metropolitan of Caesarea 406 (n.), 418f.
Argyros, *catapan* of Byzantine Italy 413–7
Ariald of Varese 365f.
Arianism, effects on liturgy 318
Aribert, Archbishop of Milan 252f.
Aribo, Archbishop of Mainz 296f.
Arichis, Duke (Prince) of Benevento 55, 57, 59, 67f., [170
Arles 72, 98, 139f., 154, 163, 166–8, 286, 291, 357 *see also* Provence, Kingdom of
Armagh 86
Armenia 405
Arn, Archbishop of Salzburg 85, 90f., 104
Arnulf, Archbishop of Reims 196, 214, *297–9*
Arnulf, Bishop of Metz 8
Arnulf, Bishop of Orléans 298
Arnuld, King of East Frankland 139, 148, 155f., 172
Arnulf, Marquis of Flanders 321
Arnulfings 8 *see also* Pepinids, Carolingian Dynasty
Arpad, Prince of the Magyars 244
Arras 339
Arsenius, Bishop of Orta 131
Artaud, Archbishop of Reims 195f.
Ascalon 452
Asser 137
associations of prayer 308, 313
Asturias 3, 81–3, 86f., *133–5*, 137, 143, 217f. *see also* León
Athanasius 53, 422
Athelney 137
Athenagoras I, Patriarch of Constantinople 417 (n.)

Attigny 64, 111
— Synod of (*ca.* 760–2) 19
Atto, Archbishop of Milan 366
Atto, Bishop of Vercelli 334f., 341, 343
Atto, Cardinal 426
Audradus of Sens 134
Augsburg 269, 296, 317, 337, 382
— Synod of (1062) 362
Augustine, Rule of Saint 461
Aurelian, Archbishop of Lyons 297
Austrasia 11, 13–15, 17, 72, 287, 292
Autcar, Duke 21
Autun 17f., 74, 105, 168
— Synod of (1094) 391
Auxerre 126, 159, 171, 332
auxilium 277
Auxilius 170, 198, 293f., 336, 355(n.), 368(n.), 469
Avars 63, *67–69*, 85, 148, 244, 285, 302
Aversa 356, 361, 468
Aymard, Abbot of Cluny 324

Baanes, Patrician 182
Baddilo, director of Carolingian chancery 19
Baghdad 24, 46, 65, 98f., 230, 405
— Caliphate of 230f., 405
Balaton, Lake 148, 150
Balderic, Margrave of Friuli 119
Baldwin I, Count of Edessa and King of Jerusalem 451f.
Baldwin II, Count of Flanders 225
Baldwin II, King of Jerusalem 464
Bamberg 251f., 255, 302, 356, 380, 402
— Diet of (1122) 401
— Synod of (1080) 383
ban, archidiaconal 269
— episcopal 263, 267f.
— parish 263
— royal 70, 267, 271
banalités 263
baptism, administration of 301f., 310f., 316
Barcelona 65f., 86, 121, 219, 390
Bardas, Caesar 175f., 180
Bardowiek 63f.
Bari 139, 142f., 250, 365
— Synod of (1053 or 1050) 353
— Synod of (1098) 391
Basel 17, 117, 267
Basil I, Emperor 143, 151, *180–5*, 406(n.)
Basil II, Emperor 212, 242, 340(n.) 424
Basques 66, 133, 218
Baugulf, Abbot 64
Bavaria 8, 11–14, 17, 54, 61, 66–68, 72, 77f., 85, 100, 104, 108, 115, 122, 150
— Duchy of 201, 204f., 237f., 243, 245, 247, 322, 388
— Kingdom of 104, 108, 121, 125f., 152f., 155, 172
Beatrice, Marchioness of Tuscany 357, 379
Beatus, Abbot of Liébana 81, 83
Beauvais 164, 461, 463
Bec 390, 470f.
Bede of Jarrow 116, 135–7, 159, 334
Bela I, King of Hungary 246
Benedict, Abbot of Aniane *103–7*, 111, 320f., 323f.
Benedict II, Pope 4
Benedict III, Pope 141f.
Benedict IV., Pope 157
Benedict V, Pope 209
Benedict VI, Pope 210
Benedict VII, Pope 210, 236, 242
Benedict VIII, Pope *249–52*, 285, 296f., 341, 355, 412
Benedict IX, Pope 250, 254f., 296, 351
Benedict X, Antipope 229, 359, 361
Benedict, Rule of Saint 17, 20, 76f., 97, 103, 106, 330, 343, 422
Benedictus Levita, pseudo- 167–9
benefice 262f., 266, 269, 278, 428
beneficium 70, 84, 96f., 119, 276, 278
Benevento 6, 20, 22, 24, 55, 58f., 66f., 85f., 88, 98f., 102, 139, 142f., 152f., 170, 197f., 356, 361(n.), 379, 385
— Synod of (1087) 385
Beno, Cardinal 387
Benzo, Bishop of Alba 387
Beornrad 73f.
Berchtesgaden 274
Berengar of Friuli, King of Italy and Emperor 155, 157, 171, 197f.
Berengar of Ivrea, King of Italy 197, 205, 209, 211
Berengarius of Tours 355, 467f.
Bern, Abbot of Reichenau 334, 338
Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux 460, 463f.
Bernard, Archbishop of Vienne 122
Bernard, Bishop of Halberstadt 236
Bernard, Count of Besalú 378
Bernard, King of Italy 101, 104, 108, 111, 123
Bernard, son of Charles the Fat 155
Bernard of Abbeville 458
Bernard of Barcelona 121, 157
Berno, Abbot of Cluny 324
Bernold of Sankt Blasien 386, 388, 427, 447, 470
Bernward, Bishop of Hildesheim 337
Berny-Rivière, assembly of 22
Bertha of Montfort, Countess of Anjou 391
Bertha of Turin, Queen of Germany 364
Berthold, Bishop of Toul 322
Bertrada, Queen of the Franks 55, 73, 103
Bertrand, Count of Provence 378
Besançon 129, 154f.
bibliothecarius 5, 284f., 435
biography in the 10th–11th centuries 337f.
Birka 147, 232, 234
bishops, functions of 267–9
— and the reform papacy 429f., 432
— secular duties of 109f., 165, 198, 202, 248, 266, *269–72*, 277f.
Bithynia 31–34, 51f., 422
Bjorn, King of Sweden 114
Bobbio 116, 214, 295
Boethius 137, 333, 466
Bogomilism 340, 410
Bohemia 148, 151, 235f., *237f.*, 239f., 242, 246, 375
Bohemond of Taranto, Prince of Antioch 451
Boleslas I, Duke of Bohemia 237, 239
Boleslas II, Duke of Bohemia 237f.
Boleslas III, Duke of Bohemia 239
Boleslas I, Duke and King of Poland 215, 239f., 247
Boleslas II, King of Poland 375
Boleslas III, King of Poland 402
Boniface (Winfrid), Apostle of Germany 9, *11–16*, 17–19, 61, 71f., 78, 114, 117, 151, 161, 289f., 311, 313, 316, 318, 433
Boniface, Margrave of Canossa 250, 351, 357
Boniface V., Pope 289

Boniface VII, Pope 210, 411
Boniface VIII, Pope 382, 445
Bonizo of Sutri 383, 387f., 426
Bordeau 138, 345
Boris, Khan of the Bulgars 179, 183
Boso, Cardinal *Camerlengo* 436
Boso, King of Provence 152–5, 297
Bourges 72, 146, 159, 165, 272, 310, 338, 346, 431
— Synod of (1031) 341
Bovo I, Abbot of Corvey 172
Braga 221, 398
Brandenburg 235f.
Branimir, Prince of Dalmatia 243
Bratislava 353
Bremen 65, 136, 147, 172, 232–5, 295, 380, 402
Bretislas I, Duke of Bohemia 239
Bretons 68, 91, 102, 121, 159
Breviarium of Atto 426
Brian Boru 222
Brittany 143
Brixen 351, 383
Brogne 226, *320f.*
brothers, lay 326, 454, 456f., 459, 463
Bructeri 10, 12, 61
Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne 333, 337
Bruno, Bishop of Segni 388, 472
Bruno, Bishop of Toul, *see* Leo IX., Pope
Bruno, Bishop of Würzburg 314, 334
Bruno, founder of the Carthusians 386, *458–60*
Bruno of Querfurt 216, 247, 337
Bulgaria 150f., 183, 185–7, 241–3, 340, 408, 410, 424, 450f.
Bulgarians 37, 42, 68, 85, 161, 183, 187, 241, 244
— conversion of *178–80,* 183, 188f., 193, 411
Büraburg 13, 15f., 62
Burchard, Bishop of Worms 293f., 307, 309, 312, 336f., 426f.
Burchard, Bishop of Würzburg 17
Burgos 134
— Synod of (1080) 377f.
Burgred, King of Mercia 144
Burgundy 8f., 14, 16, 100, 115, 121f., 127, 129f., 139, 154, 206, 339, 346, 400, 465
— County of 373, 378, 399
— Duchy of 320, 324, 459
— Kingdom of 248, 252
— Kingdom of Lower Burgundy (Vienne, Arles, Provence) 155, 169, 197
— Kingdom of Transjurane Burgundy 155, 197, 203–5
Byzantine Empire 4–7, *26–53,* 139, 142f., 170, *174–193,* 197, 207, 211, 230, 250f., 259, 280f., 355, 365, 376, *404–425,* 449, 452
Byzantium 23f., 39, 41, 60f., 69, 88, 98f., 101, 113, 163f., 177f., 180, 190, 213, 216, 240–2, 283, 317, 375f., 405, 408–11, 413f., 417, 424, 451; *see also* Constantinople

Cadalus, Bishop of Parma, *see* Honorius II, Antipope
Cadouin 458
Caedmon 135
Caen 364, 470(n.)
Caesarius, Abbot of Montserrat 220
Calabria 7, 140, 152, 197f., 212, 361
calend (calendar chapter) 268, 308
Calixtus II, Pope 327, 397, *398–402,* 429, 433, 463
Camaldoli 329f., 456
Cambrai 117, 322, 337, 472
camera apostolica 436
camerlengo 435f.
Campulus, *saccellarius* 90f., 94
cancellarius sacri palatii 285
canon law in the 10th–11th centuries 336f.
— in the 11th–12th centuries 426–8, 440
canonesses 106f., 266
canonical hours 309f., 313
canonization 296
canons regular 266, 308, 331f., 363, 389, 429f., 454, *460–4,* 465
— *ordo antiquus* 461f.
— *ordo novus* 462f.
canons, secular 106f., 109, 119, 135, 226f., 229, *264–6,* 308, 313, *330–2,* 453f., 457
Canossa 250, 382, 388
Canterbury 72, 135, 137, 144, 222–4, 226f., 229, 269, 341, 364, 376f., 390, 402, 431, 470
Capetian Dynasty 195, 273
Capitula Angilramni 168
capitula of Quierzy (853) 162f.
Capitulare de duello iudiciali 212
Capitulare de imaginibus 79
Capitulare de praediis ecclesiasticis 212
Capitulare de villis 85
Capitulare ecclesiasticum (818–19) 109f., 113, 120, 260, 262
Capitulare Saxonicum 85
capitularies 14, 70f., 77, 84, 96f., 110f., 113, 117, 127, 129, 166, 168f., 260, 262, 267, 305, 308f., 312
Capitularies of pseudo-Benedict 168
Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae 63, 70
Capua 67, 139, 142, 170, 383
— Duchy of 139, 142, 197f., 205, 251f., 361f., 379, 384, 392, 443
cardinal bishops 5, 359f., 434
cardinal deacons 54, 434f.
cardinal priests 5, 54, 434
Cardinals, College of 353, 360, 397, *433–5*
cardinals, non-Roman 434
Carinthia 66, 155, 212, 248
— Carinthia-Pannonia, March of 85
Carloman, King of Bavaria 143, 150, 152–5
Carloman, King of the Franks 22, 25, 54–56
Carloman, King of West Frankland 154, 171
Carloman, Mayor 9, 13–15, 17, 22f., 84, 309, 311
Carloman, son of Charles the Great, *see* Pepin, King of Italy
Carolingian Dynasty 16–173, 195, 326; *see also* Arnulfings, Pepinids
Carolingian script 75, 284, 435
Carthusians 458f.
Cashel, Synod of (1101) 402
— Synod of (1172) 300
Casimir I, Duke of Poland 239
Castile 134, 217–19, 365
— March of 134
Catalonia, County of 86, 119, 219f., 327, 329, 333, 346, 443; *see also* March of Spain
Cathwulf 75, 87
Cava dei Tirreni 328, 455
celibacy, disregard of 211, 251, 336, 341, 348, 353, 358, 363, 365f., 386, 401, 455f.; *see also* Nicolaitism

Cella Jüsten 65
Cella Leuze 65
Cencius de Prefecto 381
cenobitism, Byzantine 52f., 421-3
census 361, 374f., 378f.
Cenwulf, King of Mercia 135
Ceprano, Treaty of 379
Cerne, Book of 314
Chalon-sur-Saône 98, 103
— Synod of (1056) 357
Châlons-sur-Marne 22, 65, 165, 168, 339, 395
chancery, papal 283-5, 353, 398, 404, 435f.
Chancor, Count of the Rheingau 17
chapel, court 19, 119f., 158, 172, 201, 278
chaplain, papal 435f.
— royal 19, 119f., 158, 333
chapter 264-6, 330-2
— cathedral 264f., 274, 331, 429, 460, 462
— collegiate 264f., 308, 313, 331f., 453
charistikariate 423f.
Charles, Duke of Lotharingia 196
Charles, King of Provence 129-31
Charles, son of Charles the Great 69, 95, 100f.
Charles Martel 4, 8-13, 16f., 20
Charles the Bald, King of West Frankland and Emperor 112, 115, 121, 123, 125-32, 134, 138, 143, 146f., 150, 152f., 157-60, 162, 164, 166, 171, 195, 208, 291, 314
Charles the Fat, King of East Frankland, Italy, and West Frankland and Emperor 139, 153-5, 171f.
Charles the Great, King of the Franks and Lombards and Emperor 18-20, 22, 25, 34, 37, 39f., 47f., *54-102,* 103, 115f., 118f., 121, 123, 136f., 142, 157, 166, 168, 171-3, 203, 206, 210, 214, 230, 235, 260f., 263, 270-2, 287, 290, 300-2, 304f., 312, 317, 319, 387
— and King Desiderius 55-59
— sole King 56
— appeal of Hadrian I 56
— first visit to Italy (773-4) 57f.
— donation of 58f.
— expanded royal title 59
— second visit to Italy (775-6) 59f.
— third visit to Italy (780-1) 60f.
— wars of conquest 57-69
— and the Saxons 61-65, 68f.
— and Muslim Spain 65f., 85f.
— and Bavaria 66f.,
— and Benevento 67f., 86, 88, 98f.
— fourth visit to Italy (786-7) 67
— and the Avars 68f., 88
— and the crisis of 792-3 68f.
— and reform 70-78, 84-86, 97f.
— and education 73-78, 85
— and Nicaea II 78-80, 88
— and Spanish Adoptionism 80-82
— and the *Filioque* 82f., 97
— legislation 84f., 97
— economic measures 85
— marches 85f.
— and England 86
— and Asturias 86f.
— as "Pater Europae" 87
— as "Novus David" 87
— and imperial dignity 87f., 91-3
— and Byzantine Empire 88, 98f.
— and Pope Leo III 89-95
— and Papal State 89f.
— and Vikings 91
— fifth visit to Italy (800-01) 92-95
— protector of Eastern Christians 92f.
— imperial coronation 93f.
— overlord of Papal State 94
— imperial style 94
— imperial theocracy 95-98
— and internal peace 95-97
— imperial succession 98, 100f.
— recognized by Emperor Michael I 40, 99
— imperial question 99-102
— death 102
Charles the Simple, King of France 195, 225, 297
Charroux, Synod of (989) 345
Chartres 272, 307, 338, 348, 394, 427, 432, 461, 467
— cathedral school of 333
Chazars 149, 193, 230f., 241, 244, 246, 405
Chelles, Synod of (994) 298f.
Childebrand 9, 16f.
Childric II, King of the Franks 8
chorepiscopi 165f., 268, 308
Christ, devotion to 316f., 319
Christopher, Antipope 157, 198
Christopher, *primicerius* 25, 54f.
Chrobatia 237, 239
Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz 17-21, 71f., 97, 106, 116, 330
Chur 17
church, baptismal 259, 262-4, 268
Church, constitution of the 258-300
Church, lay domination of the 195f., 198, 201, 211
Church, leadership of the, in the West 346f.; *see also* papal leadership of the West
church, rural 258-64
— urban 264-6
Cistercians 220, 273, 325, 429f., 458, *459f.,* 462-5
Citeaux, Order of *see* Cistercians
Cividale 98
— Synod of (796-7) 83
Clairvaux 460, 463f.
Claudius, Bishop of Turin 113, 116
Clement II, Pope 255, 344, 351
Clement III, Antipope 359, 361f., 376, 380, 383-8, 393, 434
clergy, rural 308, 341
Clermont 138, 455
— Synod of (1095) 389-91, 447-9
Clontarf, battle of 222
Cloveshoe, Synod of (747) 313
Cluny 196, 200, 213, 220f., 226f., 253, 275, 307, 313, 317, 320, 322f., *324-8,* 330, 332-4, 338, 346, 364, 367, 377, 382, 386, 390, 398f., 436, 456f., 459, 462
— and Church reform 326f.
Collectio Anselmo dedicata 169, 293
Collectio Britannica 426
Collectio Caesaraugustana 427
Collectio canonum of Abbo of Fleury 336
— of Anselm of Lucca 426
Collectio XII partium 293
Collectio Hispana 18, 133, 168
Collectio IX librorum 293
Collectio V librorum 293
Collectio trium partium 427
collegiality of the episcopate 286, 290, 293, 299

Colmar 123, 463
Cologne 14–16, 62, 64f., 72, 78, 91, 104, 128, 130–2, 139, 143, 145, 147, 153, 159, 166, 168, 172, 257, 269, 285, 292, 295, 333, 337, 362f., 458, 460
Comneni Dynasty 424
Compiègne 158
— Diet of (833) 123
— Synod of (757) 19
Compilatio canonum 296
computus 115
Concilium Germaniae (743) 13, 311
confessio Sancti Petri 57, 88
Connaught 86
Conrad, Archbishop of Salzburg 460
Conrad, King of Burgundy 203
Conrad I, King of Germany 200f.
Conrad II, King of Germany and Emperor 206, 248, 250, 252f., 255, 297, 322, 337
Conrad, son of King Henry IV 388, 392, 395
consilium 277
Constance 17, 173, 269, 387
— Synod of (1043) 253
Constans II, Emperor 144
Constantine, Bishop of Nacolia 28
Constantine I, Emperor 59f., 89, 95, 100f., 107, 119, 204, 214, 269
— Donation of, *see Constitutum Constantini*
Constantine V, Emperor 21, 23f., *29–32,* 39f., 42, 50, 52, 58f.
— persecution of monks by 31
— theology of 30f.
Constantine VI, Emperor 32, 34, 36, 37–39, 60, 67, 88
Constantine VII, Emperor 406, 408f., 418–20
Constantine VIII, Emperor 242
Constantine IX Monomachus, Emperor 413, 415–17, 423
Constantine I, Pope 6
Constantine II, Antipope 25, 54
Constantine-Cyril, Apostle of the Slavs *149f.,* 170, 237, 242, 305
Constantine Ducas 406, 408
Constantinople 4, 6, 21, 24, 28, 36, 42, 45, 52, 60, 68, 78, 87f., 93, 98–101, 113, 149, 151, 175, 178, 180–5, 187, 193, 198, 242–4, 357, 359, 404f., 409–11, 413, 415, 417, 425, 447, 450f.; *see also* Byzantium
— Fourth Ecumenical Council of (869–70) 181–4, 185f., 189
— school of 149
— Synod of (843) 47
— Synod of (859) 177
— Synod of (861) 178f.
— Synod of (867) 163, 180, 181f., 184, 188
— Synod of (879–80) 185–7, 188f.
— Synod of (920) 408f.
Constitutio Romana (824) 112f., 141, 156, 209
Constitutum Constantini 60, 100f., 214, 280, 362(n.), 412, 414, 442
conversi 454, 457, 462f.
Corbeny 56
Corbie 57, 64, 74, 76f., 103f., 111, 114, 117, 119–22, 124, 160f., 164, 171
Córdoba 4, 65, 81–3, 86f., 98f., 133f., 217–9; *see also* Emirate of Córdoba
— Caliphate of 219
— Synod of (852) 134
correspondence in the 10th–11th centuries 338
Corsica 379, 442f.
Corvey 114, 160f., 172, 322, 337
Cosmos the Melode 51
Coulaines, Treaty of 127
court, ecclesiastical 267; *see also* synodal tribunal
court "academy" 74f., 115
Covadonga, battle of 3
Cracow 237, 239f., 375
Cremona 366, 388, 392
Crescentius I (de Theodora) 210
Crescentius II 210, 212f., 249
Crete 139, 405
Croatia 148, 375, 443
Croats 85, 150f., 161, 243
cross, devotion to the 315f.
Crusade, First 390, *447–52,* 464f.
Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem 452, 464
cubicularius 55
Curia, Roman 436
curial hand 283, 435
Cuxá 329
Cynewulf 135
Cyril, *see* Constantine-Cyril
Cyrillic script 151
Czechs *see* Bohemia

Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa and Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem 452
Dalmatia 99, 148, 216, 243, 374f., 443
Damascus 65
Damasus II, Pope 351
Danelaw 136f., 224f.
Danes 63, 95, 98, 136–9, 144, 222, 224f., 230, 232; *see also* Northmen, Vikings
deacons, regionary 5, 435
dean 263, 268, 308
— of chapter 265, 269
deanery 165f., 268f., 308
Decretum of Burchard of Worms 336f., 426f.
— of Gratian 258, 427
— of Ivo of Chartres 427
Demetrius-Izjaslav, Prince of Kiev 375f.
Demetrius-Zwonimir, King of Dalmatia 375
Denmark 114, 136, 147, 223, 228, 231–4, 252, 374, 402, 443
De ordinando pontifice 344f.
De ordine palatii 111, 171
De pressuris ecclesiasticis 335
Desiderius, Abbot of Montecassino *see* Victor III, Pope
Desiderius, King of the Lombards 24f., 54–57, 59, 67
De synodalibus causis 172, 309, 336
Deusdedit, Cardinal, canonical collection of 178, 387f., 426
Deventer 62
devolution, right of 288(n.), 371–3, 430, 432
devotional life 312–19
Dhuoda 157
Diadochus of Photice 421
dialectics 333f., 339, 465–8, 472
Dictatus papae 369, 371, 373
Dicuil 115
Dietrich, Cardinal Bishop of Santa Rufina, Antipope 393
Dijon 103, 322, 326–8, 338, 343

diocesan organization 258–69
Dionysius Exiguus, canonical collection of 71, 73
Dionysius, pseudo- 113, 117, 159, 170
Dionyso-Hadriana 73, 76, 97
diplomatics, imperial 94f.
— papal 58, 89f., 94, *283–5,* 353, 435
districtio 270
Diversorum sententiae patrum 355, 426
Divisio imperii of 806 100–2, 121
Dobrawa, Duchess of Poland 239
Dokkum 16
Dol 143
Domagoj, Prince of the Croats 151
Dominic, Patriarch of Grado 376
Donar 61
Donation of Constantine *see Constitutum Constantini*
Donatus 333
Donatus, Bishop of Ostia 182
Dorestad 138
Dortmund 62
Dorylaeum 451
Douzy, Synod of (871) 147
Drahomira 237
drama, religious 319
Drogo, Archbishop of Metz 104, 111, 115, 128f., 141f., 290
Drogo, Count of Apulia 356
Drogo, philosopher 465
Drogo, son of Carloman 15
Dublin 136, 222–5, 377
duchies, tribal 201
Duncan, Bishop of Dublin 222
Dungal the Irishman 73, 113, 115
Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury *226–9,* 322, 327, 341
Durandus 105
Durazzo 376
dux of Rome 54

East Anglia 135f., 224f.
East Fankish Kingdom 126–8, 130–2, 139f., 147, 150f., 153–6, 158, 164–6, 169, 171–3, 200, 273, 301, 323; *see also* Germany
East March 85
Eastphalia 61, 65, 95
Ebbo, Archbishop of Reims 105, 114f., 123, 128, 145f., 167, 169
Eberhard, Count 380
Eberhard, Margrave of Friuli 157, 161
Ebolus, Count of Roucy 365, 378, 446
Echternach 10, 64, 73f., 323
Eckehard, Count of Mâcon 157
Ecumenical Patriarch, increase of the power of 424f.
Eddo, Bishop of Strasbourg 17
Edessa, County of 451f.
Edgar the Peaceable, King of England *225–8,* 229
Edington 136
Edmund, King of East Anglia 225
Edmund, King of Wessex 222
Edmund Ironside, King of England 228
education, Carolingian 74, 77f., 158, 171–3, 267, 333f.; *see also* schools, Carolingian
— study of classical and patristic authors 75f., 333f.
education, religious 311–13
Edward the Confessor, King of England 228f., 364
Edward the Elder, King of Wessex 136, 224f.
Edward the Martyr, King of England 228
Egbert 10
Egfrith, co-King of Mercia 86
Egila 66, 80f.
Egilo, Archbishop of Sens 163
Eichsfeld 62
Eichstätt 13, 356f.
Eigil, Abbot of Fulda 117
Einhard 66, 73–5, 86, 88, 93f., 104f.
election of prelates 109, 116, 119, 166f., 248, *274f., 278f.,* 287f., 352, 359f., 371, 393, 400, 429
Elipandus, Metropolitan of Toledo 81–3
Ellinger, Abbot of Tegernsee 338
Embrun 72, 140
Emirate of Córdoba 65, 81–3, 86, 99, 133f., 217f.
Emmeric, Prince 246
Engelberga, Empress 132, 153, 180
England 86, 133, *135–7,* 138f., 143f., 217, 221–3, *224–9,* 231–4, 252, 257, 259, 264, 269, 286, 300, 303, 313, 319, 322, 324f., 327, 364, *376f., 390f., 393f.,* 399f., 402, 429, 443, 456
Epanagoge 191f.
Épernay, assembly of (846) 169
Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis 51
Epistola de litteris colendis 85
Erchempert 170
eremitical movement *328–30,* 358, 454, 457–9
Eresburg 62, 69
Erfurt 13, 15f., 62
— Synod of (932) 307
Eric Blood Axe, King of Norway 233
Eric I, King of Denmark 402
Eric, King of Sweden 231, 233
Eric, Margrave of Friuli 69, 88, 173
Erlembald 366, 380, 446
Ermoldus Nigellus 115
Essex 224
Esztergom 215, 245
— Synod of (1104) 402
— Synod of (1112) 402
Etherius, Bishop of Osma 81, 83
Eucharistic controversy in the 9th century 117, 160f., 467
— in the 11th century 355, 467f.
Eudes, Bishop of Beauvais 164
Eudes, King of West Frankland 155, 297
Eudes of Cambrai 472
Eudes of Châtillon, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia *see* Urban II, Pope
Eudes of Tournai 456f.
Eugene, Bishop of Ostia 184
Eugene II, Metropolitan of Toledo 81
Eugene II, Pope 112f., 260
Eugene III, Pope 252
Eulogius of Córdoba 134
Eustachios 52
Euthymius, Patriarch of Constantinople 407, 419
Eutychius, Exarch 6
exactio 270
Exarch 5f., 20, 24, 57f., 107
Exarchate 20f., 23, 54, 56, 58f., 209, 211, 214, 433
excommunication 268, 441
exemption, monastic 295, 323f., *326f.,* 429, 432, 464f.
exenium 262, 266

False Decretals 145f., *167–9*
Fardulf, Abbot of Saint-Denis 68, 73f.
Farfa 328
fealty, oath of 276f.
Felix, Bishop of Urgel 82f., 92
Ferdinand I, King of Castile 219
Fernán González, Count of Castile 219
Ferrières 105, 117, 159, 161f., 171
feudalism, episcopal 196, *270–9*
fideles Sancti Petri 373f., 376, 378f.
fiefs, ecclesiastical 273, 276
Filioque *82f.*, 97, 164, 180, 186, 189f., 412, 414
Flanders 225, 321, 447
Flavigny 17
Fleury-sur-Loire 226f., 295, 298, 326f., 333f., 336f., 343, 394
Flodoard 337
Florence 359, 456
— Synod of (1055) 357
Florus, deacon of Lyons 116, 159f., 162 306
Fontanet, battle of 126, 157
Fontaneto, Synod of (1057) 365f.
Fonte Avellana 254, 329, 358, 456
Fontevrault 457f.
Forchheim 382f.
Formosus, Pope (Bishop of Porto) 150, 153, *155f.*, 170, 198, 294, 336, 368(n.), 404, 469
Fortunatus, Patriarch of Grado 98
France 194–6, 203, 211, 221, 225f., 253, 262f., 265, 271–4, 295, 299, 320, 323, 325–7, 330–2, 337, 346–8, 353, 357, 363–5, 367, 371f., 376, 378f., 388, 390f., 394–6, 398, 400, 402, 431, 445, 447f., 450, 455f., 458, 460, 462–5; *see also* West Frankish Kingdom
Francia 15, 18, 100–2, 105, 117, 121, 126f., 129, 138, 154, 159, 161, 164, 171, 195, 271f., 274
Franconia 115, 153, 172
Frangipane, Cencius 398
Frankfurt 158
— Synod of (794) 69, 82–84, 87, 89, 305
Frankish Church, reform of *13–15,* 19f., *70–78,* 84–86, 97f., *103–7,* 109f., 113f., 117, *165–8*
— under Charles Martel 8f.
Frankish Diet 128, 165
— of Thionville (844) 128
— of Meersen (847) 128
— of Meersen (851) 129
— of Savonnières (859) 163
— ob Koblenz (860) 130f.
— of Thuzey (860) 163
Frankish Kingdom 7–9, 10, 13–15, 18, 22f., 59, 100, 259f., 263, 270, 300, 303
Fréculf, Bishop of Lisieux 115
Fredegard of Saint-Riquier 161
Frederick, Archbishop of Salzburg 290
Frederick of Lotharingia *see* Stephen IX, Pope
Freinet *see* La Garde Freinet
Freising 13, 77, 115, 117, 173, 244
Fridugis, imperial chancellor 105
Frisia 8, *10f.,* 16, 54, 62, 64, 69, 72, 100, 126, 129, 138, 286
Fritzlar 11–13, 15, 62
Friuli 59, 68f., 85, 88, 119, 155, 157, 161, 171, 173, 197f.
Froumund of Tegernsee 338
Fruttuaria 250, 327, 456
Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres 307, 333, 338, 348, 467
Fulcher of Orléans 450
Fulda 15f., 62, 64f., 77, 115, 117f., 161, 173, 295, 322, 356
— Sacramentary of 301
— school of 117f., 173
Fulgentius, Abbot of Afflighem 457
Fulk, Archbishop of Reims 171
Fulrad, Abbot of Saint-Denis 15, 17, 19, 22, 24

Gaetà 139, 152, 197, 329, 398, 435
Galicia 218
Galloway 135
Gandersheim 172
García I, King of León 218
Garigliano, Muslim stronghold 139f., 154, 197, 199
Gascony 54, 66
Gauderic, Bishop of Velletri 170
Gaunilo of Marmoutier 471
Gauzbert, Bishop of the Swedes 115
Gauzelin, Bishop of Toul 321
Gebehard, Bishop of Eichstätt *see* Victor II, Pope
Gebhard, Archbishop of Salzburg 386
Gebhard, Bishop of Constance 387
Gebuin, Archbishop of Lyons 373, 431
Geismar 12
Gelasianum (Gelasian Sacramentary) 73, 76, 300f.
Gelasius I, Pope 120, 122, 164, 438
Gelasius II, Pope 398f., 435, 463
Gellone 103
Geneva 56, 129f.
Gengenbach 17
Genoa 140, 154, 445
Gentilly, Synod of (767) 19, 25
George, Byzantine envoy 23
George, Duke 144
George, Exarch 6
George of Cyprus 29
George of Mitylene 419
Gerald, poet 173
Gerald of Salles 458, 460
Gerard, Abbot of Brogne 321
Gerard, biographer 337
Gerard, Bishop of Czanád 246, 334
Gerard, Bishop of Florence *see* Nicholas II, Pope
Gerard, master of the Hospitallers 465
Gerberga, Queen 56f., 59
Gerbert of Aurillac 196, *213f.,* 298f., 333f., 337f.; *see also* Silvester II, Pope
German Empire *see* Holy Roman Empire, Germany
German language 77f., 118, 159, 173, 312, 316
Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople 6, 27–29
Germany 126, 131, 196, *200–16,* 221, 235, 237, 239, 244, 246, *247–57,* 263, 265, 268f., 271–4, 278, 283, 286, 291, 295, 298f., 301, 319, 321, 323f., 331, 333, 335, 337f., 346f., 354, 359, 361, 364f., 367, 370–2, 377, *380–4,* 386–8, 392, *395–7, 399f.,* 402, 429, 433, 439, 450, 456, 462f., 465; *see also* East Frankish Kingdom, Holy Roman Empire
Gerold, Prefect of Bavaria 67, 69, 85
Gerona 65
— Synod of (1078) 370, 372, 377
Gewiliob, Bishop of Mainz 15
Geza I, King of Hungary 375
Geza, Prince of the Magyars 244–6
Ghent 226, 321f.

Gisela, daughter of King Lothar II 130
Gisela, Queen of Hungary 245
Gisela, sister of Charles the Great 74
Giselbert, Duke of Lotharingia 321f.
Giseler, Archbishop of Magdeburg 240
Gisulf, Duke of Salerno 379
Glagolithic script 149, 151
Gniezno 215, 239f.
— Synod of (1103) 402
Gnupa, King of South Jutland 231f.
Godehard, Abbot of Niederaltaich and Tegernsee 322
Godescalc evangeliary 75, 80(n.)
Godfrey, Archbishop of Milan 366, 381
Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lotharingia and Guardian of the Holy Sepulchre 451f.
Godfrey of Vendôme 397
Godfrey the Bearded, Duke of Upper Lotharingia 357–9, 361–3, 379
Godfrey the Hunchback, Duke of Lower Lotharingia 379, 451
Godwin, Earl of Wessex 228
Gorazd 151
Gorm, King of North Jutland 231f.
Gorze 17, 219(n.), 226, 248, *320–2,* 328
Goslar 339
Gotfrid 138
Göttrik, King of Denmark 114, 136
Gottschalk 159–63
Grado 7, 54, 98, 376, 431
Grandmont 457
Gratian 258, 427f., 431, 439, 446
Gratiosus, *dux* 54
Greece 7, 28, 56, 286
Greek, knowledge of 159
Greenland 233(n.)
Gregorianum (Gregorian Sacramentary) 73, 76, 87, 300f.
Gregory, Bishop of Tours 318
Gregory, Bishop of Utrecht 11, 16
Gregory, Cardinal 427
Gregory, claimant to the papacy 249
Gregory I, Pope 5, 72(n.), 79, 85, 89, 137, 170, 289, 307, 310, 334, 342f., 359, 368, 420, 434
Gregory II, Pope 5–7, 11f., 20
Gregory III, Pope 7, 12f., 20f., 289
Gregory IV, Pope 122f., 169
Gregory V, Pope 211–4, 240, 298, 301, 326f.
Gregory VI, Pope 254f., 257, 344, 367
Gregory VII, Pope 217, 257, 300, 357, 362, *367–85,* 386f., 389, 393, 426, 430–2, 437f., 441(n.), 442f., 445–7, 456, 461, 468
— reform measures 370–4
— and Scandinavia 374
— and Poland 375
— and Bohemia 375
— and Hungary 375
— and Kiev 375f.
— and the Byzantine Empire 376
— and England 376f.
— and Ireland 377
— and Spain 377f.
— and France 378f.
— and Italy 379f.
— and Henry IV 380–5; *see also* Hildebrand
Gregory VIII, Antipope 398f.
Gregory IX, Pope 296
Gregory Asbestas, Archbishop of Syracuse 175f., 179, 419
Gregory of Tortona 334
Grifo 9, 13, 17
Grimbald 137
Grimo, Abbot 20
Grimo, Archbishop of Rouen 15
Grimoald, Duke of Benevento 68, 88, 99
Grimoald, Mayor 18
Grottaferrata 329
Guastalla, Synod of (1106) 393, 395f., 402
Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna *see* Clement III, Antipope
Guido, Archbishop of Milan 366
Guido of Arezzo 334, 355(n.)
Guido of Ferrara 387
Guigues, Prior of La Grande Chartreuse 401, 459
Guitmund of Aversa 468
Gunthar, Archbishop of Cologne 130f., 147
Guthrum 136, 224f.
Guy, Archbishop of Vienne *see* Calixtus II, Pope
Guy, Margrave of Tuscany 199
Guy of Spoleto, King of Italy and Emperor 155f.

Haakon the Good, King of Norway 225, 233
Hadrian I, Pope 33f., 36, 41, *56–61,* 67, 71, 73, 78f., 81–3, 86, 88, 90, 113, 168, 283f.
Hadrian II, Pope 132, 141, 143, 147, 149–52, 169f., 181–4, 279, 284
Hadrian III, Pope 155, 170
Hadrian IV, Pope 436
Hadrianum see Gregorianum
Hagia Sophia 43, 415
hagiography, Byzantine 419f.
Haito, Bishop of Basel 267
Halberstadt 65, 236, 269
Halfdan 136, 224
Halinard, Archbishop of Lyons 343f., 351f.
Halitgar, Bishop of Cambrai 117
Hamburg 65, 114, 136, 147, 172, 209, 232–5, 295
Hardrad, revolt of 68
Harold I, King of England 228
Harold II, King of England 228f., 364
Harold Blue Tooth, King of Denmark 231f.
Harold Fairhair, King of Norway 230f., 233
Harold Grey Fur, King of Norway 233
Harold Hardrada, King of Norway 232
Harold, pretender to Danish throne 114
Harthacnut, King of Denmark and England 228 232
Harun-ar-Raschid, Caliph 98
Hastings, battle of 224, 364
Hautvillers 117, 161–3
Havelberg 235f.
Hebrides 136
Heden, Duke of Thuringia 11
Heiric of Auxerre 159, 171f.
Helisachar, Chancellor 103–5, 107, 111
Helladic Theme, revolt of 28
Henoticon 4
Henry I, King of England 393, 402, 470
Henry I, King of Germany 201, 204, 231f., 235, 237, 247
Henry II, King of Germany and Emperor 202, 239, *247–52,* 253, 278, 319, 322f., 331, 336
Henry III, King of Germany and Emperor 202, 246,

248, 250, *253–7,* 276, 279, 343f., 351, 354, 356–8, 361 (n.), 377, 395, 465
Henry IV, King of Germany and Emperor 254, 357f., 360, 362, 364, 366, 369–72, 375–7, 380f., *382–8,* 390, 392, 395, 438, 446
Henry V, King of Germany and Emperor *395–401,* 463
Heraclea 451
Herard, Bishop of Tours 312
Herbert, Count of Vermandois 195f.
heretical groups (10th–11th centuries) 339–41
Heriger, Abbot of Lobbes 334, 467
Hermann, Count of Salm and Antiking 383
Hermann of Reichenau 337
Hersfeld 62, 64, 322f.
— Anonymous of 386
Herstal, capitulary of (779) 70f., 263
— villa 84
Hessians 11–13, 15, 62
Hetti, Bishop of Trier 105
Hiereia, Synod of (754) 24, *30f.,* 33f., 42f., 50
Hildebald, Archchaplain and Archbishop of Cologne 74, 91, 104
Hildebrand 257, 352f., 357–9, 361–6, 454, 468; *see also* Gregory VII, Pope
Hildebrand, Duke of Spoleto 57
Hildegar, Bishop of Cologne 16
Hildesheim 65, 114, 269, 337
Hilduin, Abbot of Saint-Denis 104, 111, 113, 115, 117, 123, 128f.
Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims 73, 127f., 130f., 145–7, 153, 158, 162–7, 169, 171, 267, 278, 287f., 291, 298, 308f., 311
Hincmar, Bishop of Laon 147, 164, 167, 169
Hirsau 392, 456
Hisham II, Caliph of Córdoba 219
Hispana 76
Hispana Gallica 76
history (in 10th–11th centuries) 337
Hoger, Abbot of Werden 172
Holstein 61, 95, 114, 119, 232
Holy Roman Empire *206–8,* 210f., 213, 215f., 279, 283, 320, 337, 380–5, 397, 399, 401, 409, 411–3, 439, 442, 463; *see also* Germany
homage 276f., 389, 393f., 400
homiletics, Byzantine 51
honor 276
Honorius I, Pope 289
Honorius II, Antipope 362f.
Honorius II, Pope 400, 464
Horik, King of Denmark 114, 136
Hornbach 17, 116
hospitality 278
Hriustri, County of 114
Hrodgaud, Duke of Friuli 59, 73
Hubert, Duke of Transjurane Burgundy 130
Hucbald, Duke of Bavaria 12
Hucbald of Saint-Amand 171f., 332
Hugh, Abbot of Cluny 254, 324, 328, 367, 382, 386, 456
Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons (*olim* Bishop of Die) 372, 385, 387f., 391, 394, 459
Hugh, Archbishop of Reims 195f.
Hugh, Bishop of Die *see* Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons
Hugh I, Count of Burgundy 378
Hugh, Count of Tours 105, 119, 123
Hugh, Count of Vermandois 451
Hugh, Marquis of Neustria 196, 203, 225
Hugh, son of Charles the Great 104, 111
Hugh, son of King Lothar II 130, 154
Hugh Capet, King of France 195f., 297f., 336
Hugh de Fosses, Abbot of Prémontré 464
Hugh of Fleury 394
Hugh of Payens 464
Hugh of Vienne, King of Italy 197, 199, 203, 335
Hugh the White, Cardinal Priest 352, 365, 381
Humbert of Moyenmoutier, Cardinal Bishop of Silva Candida 352, 354–7, 359f., 362f., 414f., 417, 426, 468f.
Hungary 68, 215f., 238f., 243, *244–7,* 253, 375, 402, 443, 450f.; *see also* Magyars
Hussain, Ibn Yahya 65f.
hymnography, Byzantine 51
hymnus akathistus 317f.

Ibn Abi Amir al-Mansur 219
Iceland 230, 233
Iconoclam 6f., 19, 23f., *26–53,* 88, 113, 174, 177f., 318, 418f.
— first phase 26–36
— origin 27f.
— earliest measures 28
— official action 28f.
— persecution of iconodules 29
— and the Holy See 29, 54
— justification 30, 43f., 50
— monastic opposition 31f., 52
— first restoration of icons 32–36
— opposition to restoration 34
— condemnation in 787 36
— second phase 41–47
— episcopal opposition 44
— foreign influences 46
— Synod of (815) 43f., 46
— persecution of iconodules 45f.
— end of 46f.
— second restoration of icons 47
— theology in the age of 48–51
— as a political theology 51
— attitude of Charles the Great 78–80
— attitude of Louis the Pious 113
icons 26, 42f.
— justification of 29, 35f., 43, 46, 48f., 51, 54
— in theology of the Incarnation 50
— in theology of Theodulf of Orléans 79
Ignatius, Metropolitan of Nicaea 419
Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople 175–85, 187f., 404, 419
Igor, Prince of Kiev 241
Ildefonso, Metropolitan of Toledo 81
Illyricum 7, 33, 150f., 178f., 286, 405, 424
images in the early Church 26f.
— Armenian opposition to 27, 46
— opposition in Asia Minor 27f.
— Eastern theology of 30, 44, 48–51
— Western theology of 36, 79, 113, 116
immixtio manuum 276, 278
Immo, Abbot of Gorze 322
immunity 70f., 98, 106, 201, 212, *270–2,* 274, 276, 295
imperial coronation and the papacy 141–3, 151f., 203, 205–8, 280, 440
Imperium christianum 87, 102, 124

Inden 104
indulgence 446–8
Inge, King of Sweden 374
Ingelheim 67, 114, 125
— Diet of (828) 119
— Synod of (948) 203
Iñigo II, King of Navarre 133
Innocent I, Pope 288, 292
Innocent II, Pope 402
Innocent III, Pope 296, 429, 431, 452
installation of prelates 275, 278
introitus 270
investiture, lay 202, 253, 262, *276f.*, 342, 359, 363, 370f., 373, 377, 379–82, 386f., 389, 393–7, 399–402, 456
Investiture Controversy *393–401*, 429, 431, 438f.
Ireland 86, 135–7, 143, 217, *221–4*, 225, 300, 314, 318f., 377, 402
Irene, Empress *32–34*, 36f., *39–42*, 58(n.), 60, 67, 80, 88, 90f., 98, 100, 406(n.)
Iria 133, 220f.
Irmingard, Queen of Provence 153f.
Irmingardis, Countess of Hammerstein 296f.
Isidore, Bishop of Seville 19, 77, 318, 334
Isidore, pseudo- 145, *167–9*, 288f., 291, 293f., 296f., 299, 369, 373, 426, 430f.
Istria 22f., 54, 58f., 68, 85, 88
Italy 59f., 66f., 85, 88, 95, 100f., 104, 108, 111f., 114, 116, 121f., 124, 126, 129, 132, 139f., 152–5, 158, 166, 169, 171, 194, 197–200, 203–13, 221, 247f., 250–2, 256, 259, 262–4, 266, 272, 287, 295, 300, 307, 317, 324f., 327, 328–30, 331–3, 335, 338, 340, 343, 346, 354, 358f., 362, 379–81, 383f., 388, 390, 396, 398, 400, 402, 434, 443, 451, 454, 460, 462f., 465; *see also* Lombard Kingdom, Italy, South
Italy, South 139, 142f., 152f., 170, 197f., 211f., 250–2, 264, 289, 293, 328f., 351, 353–6, 358, 361, 365, 376, 379f., 390–3, 399, 405, 411–15, 443, 445, 458
iudices 5, 215
— *cleri (de clero, ordinarii, palatini)* 58, 215, 281, 283f.
— *militiae* 25, 54, 56, 58
ius fundi 428
ius regaliae 262, 277, 428; *see also regalia*
— *spolii* 262, 277, 428; *see also spolia*
Ivar 136
Ivo, Bishop of Chartres 394, 396, 427, 431f., 461
Ivrea 197, 205, 247f., 250

Jaropolk I, Prince of Kiev 242, 247
Jaroslav, Prince of Kiev 241, 246f.
Jarrow 135
Jeremias, Archbishop of Sens 104f.
Jérez de la Frontera, battle of 3
Jerusalem 392, 433, 447–50, 452f., 464f.
Jesse, Bishop of Amiens 104
Joannikios 419
John, Abbot of Saint-Arnulf 337
John, Archbishop of Ravenna 144
John, Bishop of Cervia 131
John, Bishop of Velletri *see* Benedict X, Antipope
John I Tzimisces, Emperor 207, 212, 410, 422f.
John III, Patriarch of Antioch 425
John V, Pope 5
John VII, Pope 5
John VIII, Pope 141, 143, 150–5, 169–71, 184–7, 207, 279, 290f., 297
John IX, Pope 113, 151, 156f., 198, 404
John X, Pope 197, 199, 279, 408f.
John XI, Pope 199, 410
John XII, Pope 200, 205f., 209, 235, 410
John XIII, Pope 210f., 220(n.), 236f.
John XIV, Pope 210
John XV, Pope 210, 212f., 243, 296–8
John XVI, Antipope 213, 411
John XVII, Pope 249
John XVIII, Pope 249, 296, 412
John XIX, Pope 250, 252, 254, 290, 297, 327
John, Saxon teacher in Wessex 137
John, *silentiarius* 21
John Canaparius, Abbot 337
John Crescentius, son of Crescentius I 210
John Crescentius, son of Crescentius II 249f.
John Damascene 6, 29–31, 35, *48–50*, 51, 160, 419, 467
John Gualbert, Abbot of Vallombrosa 343, 455f.
John Hylilas, Patriarch of Constantinople 43, 45–47
John of Gaetà *see* Gelasius II, Pope
John of Matera 458
John of Vandières, Abbot of Gorze 219(n.), 337
John Scotus Eriugena 157, 159f., 162, 470
John the Deacon 170
Jonas, Bishop of Orléans 83, 105, 113, 115–7, 120
Jordan, Prince of Capua 384, 392
Joseph, priest 38–40
Joseph the Scot 73
Judith, Empress 111, 121, 123f.
Julian, Metropolitan of Toledo 81
Jülich 65
justice 270
Justianian I, Emperor 3, 52, 426
Justinian II, Emperor 5f.
Jutland 231f.

Kalocza 245
Kent 136, 224
Kiev 216, 231, 236, 239–44, 246f., 375f.
kingship, Christian 18f., 248, 252, 437f., 444f.
Kitzingen 12
knighthood, Christian 347f., 445f., 448f.
Knights Hospitallers 464f.
Knights Templars 464f.
Knut, King of England, Denmark, and Norway 223, 228f., 231–3, 252
Koblenz 126, 130, 139
— Frankish Diet of (860) 130f.
Kocel, Prince 150
Kolberg 240
Koloman, King of Hungary 246, 402
Komárno 68

La Camargue 140
La Chaise-Dieu 455f.
Ladislas, King of Hungary 246, 375
La Garde-Freinet 140, 194, 197
La Grande Chartreuse *see* Carthusians
laity in the Church 428f.
Lambert 123f.
Lambert, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia *see* Honorius II, Pope
Lambert of Spoleto, Emperor 155f., 197, 281f.
Lando, Pope 199
Landulf Cotta 365f.

Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury 224, 364, 376f., 390, 468, 470
Langobardia 197f.
Langres 166, 297
Laon 117, 147, 164, 167, 169, 171f., 463, 468
Lateran basilica 57, 90, 131, 367, 434f.
Lateran Canons Regular 463
Lateran Ecumenical Council, First (1123) 401f., 429
Lateran palace 280–5, 353, 367, 388, 398, 435
Latin, mediaeval 75, 159
latreia 36
laudes 18f., 58, 93
Lauds 306, 309f., 313
Lausanne 297
lay brothers *see* brothers, lay
Lebuin, Anglo-Saxon missionary 62
Lechfeld 203, 244
legate, papal 290f., 372, 392, 433
Leidrad, Archbishop of Lyons 83, 103, 301(n.)
Le Mans 117, 165, 169
Leo, Abbot of Sant'Alessio 298
Leo, Archbishop of Ochrida 414, 416
Leo, Archbishop of Ravenna 55f.
Leo, Byzantine envoy 213
Leo III, Emperor 4, 6f., 20f., *27–29,* 32, 356
Leo IV, Emperor 32, 37, 44, 60, 67
Leo V, Emperor 42–45, 113
Leo VI, Emperor 188, 404–8
Leo III, Pope 39f., 83, *88–95,* 97, 100, 107, 150, 282
— and Charles the Great 89–95
— revolt against 90–92, 94
— self-purgation 92
— and imperial coronation of Charles the Great 93f.
— second visit to Frankland 100
Leo IV, Pope 129, 141f., 144f., 260, 309
Leo V, Pope 157, 198
Leo VI, Pope 199
Leo VIII, Pope 209, 304
Leo IX, Pope 221, 229, 234, *351–7,* 358, 362–4, 367, 401, 414–6, 435, 446, 468
Leo Choirosphactes 419
Leo of Thessalonica 149
Leodegarcella 17
León, Kingdom of 218f.,
— March of 134
Leonine City 141, 156, 384, 398
Le Puy 345, 448f.
Les Estinnes, Synod of (744) 13f.
Lex Frisonum 97
Lex Romana Visigothorum 81
Lex Salica 19, 111
Lex Saxonum 97
Lex Thuringorum 97
Lex Visigothorum 133
Liber de vita christiana 427
Liber diurnus 283, 313, 426
Liber pontificalis 141, 170
liberal arts 74, 115, 118, 159, 171–3, 333f., 339, 466
Libri Carolini 36, 79f., 82, 87, 89, 113, 318
Lichfield, province of 86, 135
Liébana 81
Liège 15, 64, 117, 139, 172, 255, 278, 322, 335, 337, 344, 352, 427
Liemar, Archbishop of Hamburg–Bremen 380, 402
Lindisfarne 135, 137
Lindsey 136
Lippspringe, Diet of (782) 63
Lisbon 87
littera Romana 283
liturgical books 73, 76, 301, 310
— language 149f., 305, 312
— reading 49, 313
liturgy, Ambrosian 300
— Celtic 300, 318
— Gallican 20, 73, 75, 83, 300, 304
— Mozarabic 81, 83, 220, 300f., 318, 365, 377
— Roman 72f., 76, 80, 97, 106, 116, 237, 239, *300–7,* 315f., 365, 377
— royal 18f.
— Slavonic 149–51, 237, 239, 242
Liturgy of Saint Peter 149
Liudger 65
Liudulf, Duke of Swabia 205
Liutberga, Duchess of Bavaria 67
Liutizians 235f., 239, 252; *see also* Wilzi
Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona 199, 338, 410
Liutprand, King of the Lombards 6, 20f.
Lobbes 334, 467
Lodi 388
Lombard Kingdom 6, 20, 23–25, 59, 65, 101, 247f., 250, 252, 255, 259, 265, 333, 343, 361–3, 365f., 372, 380f., 388, 399, 465; *see also* Italy
London 135f., 227, 393
Lorch 322
Lorsch 17, 62, 77
Lothar I, King of Italy and Emperor 104f., 108, 111f., 114f., 121–5, 126–9, 132, 138, 141f., 145, 151–7, 171, 209, 279, 290
Lothar II, King of Italy 197, 203, 205
Lothar II, King of Lotharingia 127, 129, 130–2, 142f., 154, 158, 165
— marriage case of 130–2, 142f.
Lotharingia 127, 129f., 132, 140, 154f., 158f., 166, 194, 196, 201, 203, 226f., 248, 291, 320–5, 328, 331, 333, 335, 344f., 352, 357–9, 361f., 379, 415, 451f., 455f.
— monastic reform centres 321–4
Louis II, King of Italy and Emperor 129–32, 139, 141–3, 147, 151f., 155, 166, 170f., 180, 197, 279, 282
Louis III, King of West Frankland 154, 171f., 278
Louis IV, King of France 195f., 203, 225
Louis V, King of France 195
Louis VI, King of France 395
Louis the Blind, King of Provence and Emperor 155, 157, 197f.
Louis the Child, King of East Frankland 157, 200
Louis the German, King of East Frankland 104, 108, 111, 121–5, 126–32, 136, 143, 147f., 150, 152–4, 158, 161, 165, 171
Louis the Pious, King of Aquitaine and Emperor 60, 65f., 68, 76, 91, 97, 100–2, *103–25,* 127–9, 133, 138, 157, 159, 161, 164–6, 168, 260–3, 265, 271, 276, 295, 330, 379
— crowned Emperor 101
— accession 103
— and Benedict of Aniana 103–7
— and reform 103–7, 109f., 113f., 117
— advisers and officials 104f., 111
— administration of justice 106
— crowned again by Stephen IV 107
— imperial title 107f.

— unity of the Empire 108
— and the Church 109f., 119f.
— penance of (822) 111
— and Papal State 112
— and Iconoclasm 113
— and Scandinavia 114f.
— and the Carolingian Renaissance 115–8
— crisis of the Empire 118–25
— provision for Charles the Bald 121
— *divisio* of 831 121, 123
— conflict with older sons 122–5
— deposition of 123f.
— restoration 124
— death 125
Louis the Stammerer, King of West Frankland 154, 171
Louis the Younger, King of Franconia 153f.
Louvain 139
Lucania 140
Lucca 362, 366, 369, 372, 387, 426, 446, 463
Lucerne 17
Ludmilla 237, 242
Ludovicianum 107, 379
Luitgardis, Queen 91
Lul, Archbishop of Mainz 15f., 71
Lund 234, 402
Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières 159, 161f., 171
Lusatia 239
Lyons 83, 103, 105, 115, 122–4, 129, 145, 154, 159, 162–4, 166, 272, 297, 306, 343, 351f., 373, 385, 387f., 391, 394, 431, 459
— cathedral school of 115f.
— Synod of (829) 120

Macedonia 7
Mâcon 126, 157, 327
Magdeburg 65, 211, 216, 232, 235f., 238–40, 291, 322, 434(n.), 460, 463f.
Magnaura 33, 36
Magnus, King of Norway 232f.
Magyars 140, 151, 194, 197f., 201, 203, 237, 243, *244–7,* 315, 320, 445; *see also* Hungary
Mahdiya 445
Mainz 15f., 62, 64f., 69, 71f., 76–78, 92, 98, 114f., 117, 126, 139, 147, 158f., 162, 166, 168, 172f., 236, 238, 242, 269, 291, 296, 301, 306, 339
— Diet of (1106) 395
— Synod of (813) 306
— Synod of (829) 120, 161
— Synod of (847) 312
— Synod of (848) 147, 161
— Synod of (852) 148
— Synod of (1049) 353f.
— Synod of (1080) 383
Malcolm III, King of Scotland 224
Malik Shah, Sultan 451
Malmédy 90, 323
Mammolo, Treaty of 396
Man, Isle of 135
Manasses, Archbishop of Reims 372f., 458
Manegold of Lautenbach 386, 466f.
Manichaeism 29, 339
Manno 171f.
mantle, papal 442
Mantua 383
— Synod of (1053) 353
— Synod of (1064) 363
Manzikert, battle of 447
march 62, 71, 85f., 119, 133f.
March of Spain 133, 218f., 295
Marches of Ancona 351
Margaret, Queen of Scotland 224, 300
Marinus I, Pope 144, 155, 170, 182f., 187
Marozia, Senatrix 199, 249
Marseilles 23, 327, 364, 372
Martin I, Pope 5
Mary, devotion to 317f.
Mary the Paphlagonian, Empress 37f.
Mass *304–7,* 308–10, 311f., 316f., 334
— explanation of the 305f., 312
— private 306
Matfrid, Count of Orléans 105, 111, 117, 119, 123f.
Mathilde, Queen of Germany 64
Matilda, Marchioness of Tuscany *379f., 382–4,* 388, 396, 398, 443
Matildine lands 380, 396, 398, 443
matrimony 304, 440
Maurdramnus Bible 76
Maurice, Archbishop of Braga, *see* Gregory VIII, Antipope
Maursmünster 104
Maximus Confessor 49
Mayeul, Abbot of Cluny 324, 327f.
Meath 86
Mecklenburg 402
Meersen 128f.
— Frankish Diet of (847) 128
— Frankish Diet of (851) 129
— Partition of 132
Meissen 235, 240
Melfi, Synod of (1089) 387, 389f.
Melo 251, 355f., 413
menologion 420
mensa canonicorum 266
— *episcopalis* 266
— *fratrum* 110, 166
Mentana 92
Mercia 86, 135–7, 144, 224
Mercurion 329
Mérida 133f
Merovingian Dynasty 8, 18, 270, 286
Merseburg 235, 279, 337
Messina 139, 365
Methodius, Archbishop of Sirmium and Apostle of the Slavs *149–51,* 237, 242f., 305
Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople 46f., 174f., 404, 419
metropolitan organization 286–90, 299
metropolitans in the 9th century 166f., 274
— in the 11th century 430
Metz 17, 20, 65, 71f., 106, 116f., 126–8, 130, 132, 139, 141f., 152, 162, 168, 290, 305, 321f., 330, 337
— Synod of (859) 130
— Synod of (863) 131, 143, 163
Michael I, Emperor 40, 42, 99, 113, 175
Michael II, Emperor 45, 113
Michael III, Emperor 47, 149, 175, 177–80
Michael VII, Emperor 376
Michael, Patrician of Sicily 91
Michael Caerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople 355, 357, *412–17,* 424

Middle Kingdom 126–9, 132, 166

Mieszko I, Duke of Poland 238–40, 245

Mieszko II, Duke of Poland 239

Migetius 81

Milan 166, 171, 252f., 293, 333, 365f., 370, 380f., 387f.

military orders 464f.

Milo, Bishop of Trier 15, 17

Milo of Saint-Amand 159, 172

Minden 63–65

ministerium 113f., 123, 164

missatica 71, 97, 110, 127

missi 23, 55, 61, 68, 71, 83, 89–91, 96f., 106, 109, 112, 120, 141, 147, 152, 156, 166, 198, 210, 272

— *dominici* 71

missionary methods, Carolingian 63, 85

Modoin, Bishop of Autun 74, 105

"Moechian" Controversy 38–40

Moimir, Duke of Moravia 148

Molesme 327, 458f.

monasteria diaconiae 4f.

monasteries, secular obligations of 109f., 248, 253f., *270–2,* 277f.

monastery, double 458, 462f.

monastic reform in 10th century

— Lotharingian 248, 252–4, *321–4*

— Cluniac 254, *324–8*

— in Italy 328–30

monastic renewal in 11th–12th centuries 453f., *455–60*

monasticism, Anglo-Saxon 135, 226f., 229

— Benedictine 103, 106f., 117, 166, 226f., 229, 453f., 460, 463

— uniform observance prescribed 106f., 117

— new types 455–8, 459f.

— Byzantine 31f., *51–53,* 174, 328f., *421–4*

— Celtic 223f., 315, 323(n.)

Monophysitism 7, 29, 81, 405, 418

Monothelitism 3, 81, 144

Mons Jovis 57

Mont-Cenis 23, 57

Montecassino 9, 15, 74, 76, 132, 139, 170, 307, 322, 328, 357–9, 361, 385, 398

Monteforte 339

Monte Mario 57

Montemir, Duke of Slavonia 150

Monte Soracte 9, 152

Montevergine 458

Montserrat 220

Moravia *148–51,* 235, *237f.,* 239, 242f., 245f.

Moravians 85, 130, 155, 193

Mount Athos 53, 422f.

Mount Auxentius 31, 52, 419

Mouzon 399

— Synod of (995) 298

Mozarabs 134, 218

Muhammad I, Emir of Córboda 134

mund 271

mundeburdis 106

Münster 62, 65, 269

Munster 222

Münsterdorf 114

Murbach 17, 77

Muret 457

Musa 3

Muslim attacks on the Byzantine Empire 3f., *139f.,* 142, 212, 329

— on the Carolingian Empire 95, 102, 127, 132, 137, *139f.,* 158, 194, 197, 320

— on Central Italy 250, 445

— on Christian Spain 217, 219

— on the Frankish Kingdom 8f.

— on Lombard South Italy 142, 152, 154, 170, 197

Muspilli 77

Mystagogia 190

mystikos 405

mysticism, Byzantine 420f.

Nantes 138

Naples 61, 68, 142, 152f., 170f., 197f., 379

Narbonne 86, 124, 220, 342, 431

Naucratius, Abbot of Studion 419

Naumburg 235

Navarre 66, 133, 135, 218f., 365

Neitra 148, 151

Neustria 8f., 11, 15f., 196, 225, 292

Neuweiler 17

Nicaea 450f.

Nicaea, Second Ecumenical Council of (787) 26, *33–36,* 37f., 40f., 43, 67, 78, 80, 82, 88, 113, 186, 190

— Latin translation of the *acta* 36, 78f., 82

Nicephorus I, Emperor 39f., 42, 98f.

Nicephorus II Phocas, Emperor 410, 422

Nicephorus III, Emperor 376

Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople 28f., 39f., 43–45, 47, 50f., 174f., 419

Nicephorus Phocas, Byzantine general 140

Nicetas, Magister 420

Nicetas, Patrician of Sicily 88

Nicetas Byzantios 418

Nicetas David 419f.

Nicetas Stethatos 415

Nicholas I, Pope 130–2, 141–6, 147, 149–52, 163, 169f., 175(n.), 177–81, 183–5, 187–90, 192, 284, 288f., 293

Nicholas II, Pope *359–62,* 363f., 366f., 371, 375, 431

Nicholas Mysticus, Patriarch of Constantinople 405–9, 419

Nicolaitism 341, 351, 353f., 363, 366, 370, 377, 387, 393; *see also* celibacy, disregard of

Niederaltaich 172, 322

Nijmegen 111

— Diet of (830) 121

Nilus 213, 328f.

Nîmes 139

Nithard 157

Noirmoutier 104

nomenculator 5, 54, 281

Norbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg 460, 463f.

Nordalbingia 69

Noricum 286

Norman Anonymous 432f., 437

Normandy 139, 228f., 257, 272, 307, 327, 355, 364, 377, 390, 446, 451, 470

Normans in South Italy 251, 353, *355–7,* 359, 361f., 376, 384f., 388, 412, *413–5,* 443, 445f.

Northmen 62f., 64, 194, 221, 230; *see also* Vikings

Northumbria 86, 91, 135f., 224f.

Norway 135f., 223, 225, 228, 230–4, 374, 402

Norwegians 135f., 138, 222, 230, 233; *see also* Northmen, Vikings

notarius 284f.
Notker Balbulus 171–3, 304, 332
Novgorod 230, 241

oath to the Emperor (802, 805) 96
oblati 106, 454(n.)
Obodrites 69, 95, 114, 235f.
Ochrida 414, 416, 424
Ochsenfurt 12
Octavian *see* John XII, Pope
Oda, Archbishop of Canterbury 226f.
Odilo, Abbot of Cluny 213, 324, 325(n.), 328, 346
Odilo, Duke of Bavaria 12f.
Odo, Abbot of Cluny 200, 226, 324–8, 334, 338
Offa, King of Mercia 86f., 135
offerings 260–3, 372, 395, 428
Ohrdruf 12
oikonomia 38f., 41, 174, 189, 405, 408
Olaf, King of Norway 232–4
Olaf Cuaran 222, 225
Olaf Guthrithson 225
Olaf the Tax King, King of Sweden 234
Olaf Tryggvason, King of Norway 225, 231, 233
Olaf III, King of Norway 374
Oldenburg 235f.
Oleg 231
Olga, Princess of Kiev 242
Olympus in Bithynia 51f., 422
Omurtag, Khan of the Bulgars 42
Oppenheim 381
Orbais 161f.
ordeals 111, 116, 132
orders, holy 304f., 469f.
Ordinatio imperii (817) 108, 111, 121–4, 126, 151f., 154
Ordo Romanus antiquus 301
Ordoño II, King of León 218
Orkneys 136
Orléans 72, 74, 77, 97, 103–5, 108, 113, 116f., 119f., 127, 138, 165f., 267, 272, 298, 316, 339, 450
orphanotropium 282(n.), 283
Orthodox Church 47f., 51, 405, 416f., 423
Osma 81
Osnabrück 62–65, 386
Ostia 139, 358f., 386, 400
Oswald, Archbishop of York 226f., 327
Otfrid 159
Otgar, Archbishop of Mainz 161, 168
Otloh of Sankt Emmeran 466f.
Otranto 411
Otric 214, 334
Otto, Bishop of Bamberg 402
Otto, Duke of Carinthia 248
Otto I, King of Germany and Emperor 64, 196f., 200f., *203f., 205–11,* 212, 214, 218(n.), 225, 232, 235–8, 242, 244, 247, 249f., 256, 271, 279, 307, 322, 333, 337f., 387, 411
Otto II, King of Germany and Emperor 207, *210–2,* 214, 239, 278, 334, 411
Otto III, King of Germany and Emperor 196, 201f., 207, 210, *212–7,* 240, 245, 247, 249, 256, 298f., 328f., 334
Ottonian State Church *see* theocracy
Ottonianum 208f., 212, 215, 249, 251
Oviedo 83, 86, 133, 135, 143, 218

Paderborn 64f., 90
— Diet of (777) 62, 65
Paderborn Epic 87, 91
Padua 388
palace school 77, 104f., 115, 159, 171
Palermo 139, 365
pallium 15, 72, 145, 166f., 288–90, 295, 297, 390f., 430
Pamplona 66, 133, 219
Pandulf, Duke of Capua 251f.
Pannonia 69, 148, 245, 286
— March of 119, 150f.
Panormia 427
papacy, alienation from Byzantium *3–25,* 29, 47
papacy, constitutional status of *279–85,* 286f.
— administrative offices of 281–5
papacy, *rapprochement* with the Franks *7–25,* 29
papal election, regulations for 54, 107, 112, 141, 152 156, 209, 250, 256, 279, *360f.,* 372, 431, 434
papal hierocracy 438–45
papal institutions 281–5, 433–6
papal leadership of West *436–45,* 449, 452; *see also* Church, leadership of the
papal patrimonies, confiscation of 7, 25(n.)
papal primacy 286, *291–300,* 327, 355, 366–9, 373, 407, 413, *413–3,* 444f.
— controversy over 163f., 180, 190–2, 286, 297–9
papal protection of monasteries 295
Papal State 23, 58f., 88f., 94, 107, 112, 139, 141, 143f., 152, 170, 187, 199f., 205f., 249f., *280–3,* 361, 379, 400, 436, 441
— definitive shape of 61
— fragmentation of 282f.
— sovereignty of 58, 60, 88f., 94, 107, 112, 152, 205, 209f., 250, *279–81,* 441f.
Paris 138f., 163f., 168, 171, 308
— Synod of (825) 113
— Synod of (829) 117, 120f.
— Synod of (1051) 468
parish 165f., 263f., 268f., 308f.
parish churches 110, 313
Parma 333, 465
Paschal I, Pope 107, 112
Paschal II, Pope 377, *392–8,* 402, 430f., 434f.
Paschal, *primicerius* 90f., 94
Paschasius Radbertus, Abbot of Corbie 117, 119, 160f., 318, 334, 467
Passau 13, 85, 148, 244f., 372
pastoral activity 308–12, 462
Pataria 365f., 380, 446, 455
patricius 22, 24, 59, 68, 88f., 199, 210, 215, 249f., 256, 362, 381, 386
patronatus 428f.
Patzinaks 241, 244, 247, 447, 451
Paul, Bishop of Ancona 184
Paul, Exarch 6
Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople 33
Paul I, Pope 24f., 76
Paul VI, Pope 417(n.)
Paul Afiarta 55f.
Paul the Deacon 73f., 76, 170f.
Paulicians 27, 46, 340(n.)
Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia 63, 73f., 82f., 85, 87, 89, 302(n.)
Pavia 21–24, 55–59, 61, 103, 115f., 132, 152–5, 169, 171, 205, 210, 248, 333, 470

— Synod of (997) 298
— Synod of (1022) 251, 341
— Synod of (1046) 255
— Synod of (1049) 353
peace, Christian 95–97, 253
peace militia 346
peace oath 346
Peace of God 253, *345f.,* 348, 390, 401, 440, 445, 449
penance, administration of 302f., 305, 310f., 314f.
penitentials 98, 117, 302, 310, 312, 314
penitents, public 308
Pentapolis 6, 23, 56, 144, 212, 214
Pepin, King of Aquitaine 104f., 108, 111, 115, 117, 121–5
Pepin, King of Italy 60, 68f., 85, 88, 99–101, 301
Pepin, son of Carloman 55
Pepin, oldest son of Charles the Great 68
Pepin of Herstal 8, 10
Pepin of Landen 8
Pepin the Short, King of the Franks 9, *14–25,* 54, 59, 61f., 67, 73, 76f., 84, 120, 168, 263, 300
— Donation of 22, 58
Pepinids 8–17; *see also* Arnulfings, Carolingian Dynasty
Péronne 129
Peter, Archbishop of Amalfi 415
Peter, Cardinal Priest 185
Peter, Count of Melgueil 378
Peter II, Patriarch of Antioch 417, 425
Peter, Saint, cult of 292, 296, 368, 373
Peter, Tsar of Bulgaria 410
Peter Crassus 386f.
Peter Damiani, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 254f., 300, 329f., 344, 354, 358f., 362, 364, 366f., 446, 456, 466f., 469
Peter de Honestis 461, 463
Peter Igneus, Cardinal 456
Peter Jaropolk of Kiev 375f.
Peter II Orseolo, Doge of Venice 216
Peter Orseolo, King of Hungary 246, 253
Peter of Atroa 419
Peter of Pisa 73f.
Peter the Hermit 450, 455
Peter's Pence 364, 374, 376, 391, 443
Pfäffers 17
Philip I, King of France 376, 378f., 391, 395
Philippicus Bardanes, Emperor 6
Photeinodios 52
Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople 46, 143, 149, 151, *176–93,* 241, 292, 404f., 411, 414, 417–20
— and the papal primacy 190–2, 292
— "second schism" of 187–9
— writings of 190–3
Piacenza 132, 213, 255, 366, 381, 388
— Synod of (1095) 388f., 447
Piast Dynasty 238
Pierleoni 398
Pilgrim, Archbishop of Cologne 285
Pilgrim, Bishop of Passau 245
Pirmin, Apostle of Alemannia 16–18, 78
Pisa 139, 250, 431, 445, 452
Pîtres, Edict of 138
Placid of Nonantula 397
Plato, Abbot of Sakkudion 33, 35, 38f., 52
plebanus 262
Plectrudis 8
Plegmund, Archbishop of Canterbury 137
Poeta Saxo 172
Poitiers 159
— battle of 4, 8
— Synod of (*ca.* 1000/1014) 346
— Synod of (1100) 389
Poland 211, 215f., 234, 236, *238–40,* 245–7, 252, 269, 375, 402
Polipticum 335
Polycarpus 427
Polyeuctus, Patriarch of Constantinople 410, 412
Pomerania 239, 402
Pons, Abbot of Cluny 399
Ponthion, villa 22
— Synod of (876) 152f.
Pontificale 301, 304, 309, 319
Poppo, Abbot of Stavelot and Malmédy 323
Poppo, Bishop of Brixen *see* Damasus II, Pope
Poppo of Sankt Emmeran 322
Porphyry 333
Porto 131, 153, 155, 177
Portugal 218
poverty movement 453f., 457–61
Poznán 236, 239f.
Prague 213, 238f., 242, 246, 337, 375, 450
Praxedis, Queen of Germany 388
prayer book 314f.
preaching 310–3
— itinerant 455–8, 462f.
prebend 266
predestination controversy 161–3
Premonstratensians 460f., 463–5
Prémontré *see* Premonstratensians
Premyslid Dynasty 237–9
Pribina, Prince 148, 150
Priests, duties of 309–12
— manner of life of 307–9, 311
primate 286f., 291
primate-patriarch 169, 291, 373, 430f.
primicerius notariorum 5, 25, 54f., 90 281, 283
primus defensorum 5, 281
principality, ecclesiastical 201f., 271, 274, 400f.
Priscian 333
privilegium 284
— *fori* 116, 168
proceres ecclesiae 25, 54, 56
proprietary church 14, 84, 97f., 109f., 112, 135, 165, 167f., 195, 248, *258–64,* 266f., 270f., 273, 275, 277, 295, 308, 321, 323f., 326, 342–4, 359, 371f., 378, 401, 428f., 434, 453, 457, 459, 462
— priest of the 260–3, 266
protection, royal 106, 270–4, 276, 279, 295
protoasecretis 33
protoscriniarius 5, 209, 281
Provence 14, 20, 140, 154, 158
— County of 378, 443, 448
— Kingdom of 129f., 131, 154f., 157, 166, 169, 197
provincial organization 287, 294
provost 265f., 269, 332, 389
Prudentius, Bishop of Troyes 115, 162
Prüm 68, 123, 126, 129, 155, 158f., 172, 303, 309, 322, 336f.
Prussia 213, 238, 247
psalms, praying of 313f
psalterium Gallicanum 77

pueri palatini 73, 103
Pulsano 458

Quentowic 9, 138
Quierzy, Assembly of 22
— *capitula* of (853) 162f.
— *promissio* of 58
— Synod of (838) 160, 306
— Synod of (849) 162
Quinisext Synod (692) 5, 50

rachimburgi 71
Rachis, Bishop of Strasbourg 18, 76
Radbod, Archbishop of Trier 172
Radbod, King of Frisia 10f.
Radbod of Utrecht 172
Radoald, Bishop of Porto 131, 177, 182
Radulf of Bourges 310
Ragnar Lodbrok 136
Rainerio, Cardinal, *see* Paschal II, Pope
Rainulf, Count of Aversa 356
Ramiro II, King of León 219
Ramwold, Abbot of Sankt Emmeran 322
Raoul, King of France 195
Raoul Glaber 338
Rastislav, Duke of Moravia 148f., 151
Ratchis, King of the Lombards 21
Rath Breasail, Synod of (1111) 402
Rathier, Bishop of Verona 335f., 341, 343, 467
Ratpert of Sankt Gallen 172
Ratramnus of Corbie 161–4, 192, 318, 467
Ravenna 6f., 20–23, 54–56, 58f., 92, 94, 144f., 154, 170, 199, 211, 214, 250, 328f., 333f., 339, 344, 380, 383, 386, 388, 393, 433, 461, 463
— Synof of (*ca.* 854) 144
— Synod of (877) 153
— Synod of (*ca.* 899) 156
— Synod of (967) 236
— Synod of (1014) 251
Raymond du Puy 465
Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse and of Tripolis 373, 448f., 451f.
Rebais 161
Reccafrid, Metropolitan of Seville 134
Reconquista 134, 217–21, 300, 365, 378, 445
referendarius 17
Reform, Gregorian 351–403, 426–72
— from 1046 to 1057 351–8
— from 1057 to 1073 358–66
— under Gregory VII 367–85
— from 1085 to 1124 385–403
— polemical literature 386f., 397
— canon law 426–8
— and the hierarchy 429–33
— and administration 433–6
— and Western Christendom 436–45
— and crusade 445–52
— religious life 453–65
— education and learning 465–72
regalia 276f., 396f., 399f.; *see also ius regaliae*
Regensburg 13, 67f., 77, 82, 148, 150, 156, 158, 172, 237f., 322, 339, 466
Regino, Abbot of Prüm 126, 155, 172, 302, 309, 311f., 336f.
Regularis Concordia 227, 319, 322
Reichenau 17, 77, 115, 118, 161, 172f., 301, 322, 334, 337f.
Reims 13f., 65, 71, 73, 98, 105, 107, 112, 114f., 117, 123f., 127f., 130f., 142, 145–7, 153, 158f., 162–7, 169, 171, 195f., 203, 213f., 267, 278, 287f., 291, 296, 297–9, 308, 337, 353, 372f., 386, 458
— case of Archbishop Armulf 196, 214, 296, 297–9
— cathedral school of 333, 458
— Synod of (1049) 221, 352–5
— Synod of (1119) 399
Reibach, Synod of (799) 307
relevium 277
relics, cult of 315, 317
Rembert, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 136, 147
Remich 139
Remigius, Archbishop of Lyons 162
Remigius of Auxerre 171, 332
Renaissance, Carolingian *70–78,* 105, 108 *115*–8, 318, *157–73* and *passim*
renewal and reform, pre-Gregorian 320–48
— monstic 320–30
— canonical life 330–2
— Cluniac influence on 326f.
— in intellectual life 332–9
— heretical movements 339–41
— reform movements 341–8
Rhabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz 115, 117f., 124, 158, 160–2, 164f., 317
Rhaetia 121
Riba 232
Richard, Abbot of Saint-Vannes 322f., 327f.
Richard, Abbot of Saint-Victor and Cardinal 372, 385, 388, 390
Richard II, Duke of Normandy 228
Richard of Aversa, Prince of Capua 361f., 379
Richard II, Prince of Capua 392
Richbod, Abbot of Lorch 74
Richer, Abbot of Montecassino 322
Richer of Saint-Remi 337
Riculf, Archbishop of Mainz 76
Robert, Abbot of Sahagún 377f.
Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury 229
Robert the Frisian, Count of Flanders 447, 451
Robert, Duke of Normandy 390, 451
Robert II, King of France 298, 336
Robert de Tourlande 455f.
Robert Guiscard, Duke of Apulia and Calabria 361, 365, 376, 379f., 384, 391f., 451
Robert of Arbrissel 457f.
Robert of Molesme 458f.
Robert the Strong, Margrave of Neustria 138
Roderick, King of the Visigoths 4
Roger I, Count of Sicily 365, 392, 445f.
Roger, Duke of Apulia 391f.
Roger II, King of Sicily 443
Roland, Margrave of Brittany 66
Rollo, Duke of Normandy 139, 195
Romagna 144, 343, 351, 392
Roman Church as authoritative guarantee of tradition 80
Roman Church, privilege of 817 for 107
— privilege of 962 for 208f., 212
Roman Duchy 20f., 23, 54, 56, 58
Roman Patriarchate, mutilation of 7, 25(n.), 356
Romance languages 75, 78, 312
Romanesque art 315

Romanus I Lecapenus, Emperor 408f.
Romanus II, Emperor 410, 419
Romanus IV, Emperor 447
Romanus, Pope 156
Rome 4, 6f., 20–23, 25, 47, 55–58, 60, 67, 72, 78, 80–82, 87–92, 94f., 100, 107, 112f., 116f., 128, 131f., 139, 141–7, 149–54, 156f., 159, 161, 163, 166–8, 170, 175, 177–9, 181–92, 198–200, 204–7, 209–14, 216, 240, 243, 247, 249–52, 254–6, 280f., 283, 285, 288f., 292f., 295–301, 303, 313, 317, 319, 326, 328, 351–3, 357, 359–65, 367f., 372, 374, 377f., 380f., 380f., 383–5, 387f., 391–3, 396, 398–400, 402, 404, 406–9, 411–3, 417, 424, 430–3, 435f., 442f., 445, 458, 468f.
— as centre of cultural life 169f.
— Synod of (768) 25
— Synod of (769) 54, 58 (n.)
— Synod of (800) 92f.
— Synod of (826) 112
— Synod of (861) 114
— Synod of (863) 179
— Synod of (865) 146
— Synod of (869) 182
— Synod of (897) 156
— Synod of (898) 113
— Synod of (963) 209
— Synod of (993) 296
— Synod of (1014) 251
— Synod of (1046) 255
— Synod of (1049) 353f.
— Synod of (1050) 353, 355, 468
— Synod of (1051) 353
— Synod of (1053) 353
— Synod of (1057) 358
— Synod of (1059) 360, 363, 366, 370, 454, 468
— Synod of (1060), 363, 366
— Synod of (1061) 363
— Synod of (1073) 366
— Synod of (1074) 370
— Synod of (1075) 370f., 380
— Synod of (1076) 381
— Synod of (1078) 370–2
— Synod of (1080) 371f., 383, 432
— Synod of (1099) 389, 391, 393
— Synod of (1102) 395
— Synod of (1112) 397
— Synod of (1116) 397
— First Lateran Council (1123) 401f.
Romuald 213, *328–30,* 454, 456
Roncesvalles 60, 62, 66
Rorik 138
Roscelin of Compiègne 471
Rostagnus, Bishop of Arles 291
Rothad, Bishop of Soissons 145f., 162, 167, 169
Rothard, Duke 17, 22
Rotrudis, daughter of Charles the Great 34, 37, 60, 67, 74
Rouen 13–15, 113, 130, 138, 159, 370
— Synod of (1096) 389
royal healing 233, 439
Rudolf, Duke of Swabia and Antiking 382f.
Rudolf I, King of Transjurane Burgundy 155
Rudolf II, King of Transjurane Burgundy 197, 203–5
Rudolf III, King of Burgundy 248, 252
Rügen 147
rule for canons, Chrodegang's 20, 308, 330
Ruodger 337
Rurik 230, 241
Russia 230f., 234, 239, 240–3, 244

Sabine district 59, 61
sacellarius 5, 90, 281
sacrum cubiculum 282
Sahagún 377f., 390
Saint-Amand 159, 171f., 332
Saint-Basle de Verzy, Synod of (991) 297–9
Saint-Bavo 321
Saint-Bénigne de Dijon 327f., 338, 343, 456
Saint-Bertin 138, 321
Saint-Denis 9, 15–17, 19, 22, 24f., 74, 102, 104, 113, 117, 128f., 158, 395
Saint-Evre 321
Saint-Germain-des Prés 134, 158f., 171
Saint-Ghislain 321, 323
Saint-Martin de Tours 73f., 76f., 91, 103, 117, 135, 158
Saint-Médard de Soissons 123
Saint-Omer 138
Saint-Pierre de Mont-Blandin 321f.
Saint-Remi 56, 117, 337
Saint-Riquier 138, 161
Saint-Seine 103
Saint-Vaast 323
Saint-Vannes de Verdun 248, 320, 322f., 327f.
Saint-Victor de Marseille 327f., 372, 385, 388, 390, 455
Saint-Victor de Paris 463
Saint-Wandrille 113, 138
Sakkudion 33, 35, 38, 52
Salerno 67f., 328, 384, 431
— Duchy of 139, 142, 197, 251f., 356, 361 (n.), 379
— Synod of (1050) 353
Salian Dynasty 201, 252, 258, 321, 323, 337, 348, 352, 357, 395, 399
Salzburg 13, 66, 72, 85, 90f., 104, 115, 147–50, 159, 238, 244, 269, 290, 386, 460
Samoussy, villa 56
Sancho, King of Aragón 365
Sancho III, King of Navarre 219
Sankt Alban 301
Sankt Blasien 386, 388, 427, 447, 456, 470
Sankt Emmeran 322, 466
Sankt Gallen 140, 171–3, 306, 319, 323, 332
Sankt Maximin 322f.
San Miniato 456
Santa Maria all'Aventino 367
Sant'Apollinare in Classe 329
Santiago de Compostela 133, 143, 217, 219–21, 460
Sardinia 250, 328, 379, 443
Savigny 458, 460
Savonnières, Frankish Diet of (859) 163
Savoy 373
Saxnot 61
Saxon Dynasty 201, 204, 235, 247, 321, 323, 326, 337, 348, 411
Saxons 10–13, 17, 60, *61–65,* 68f., 80, 85, 139, 302
Saxony *61–65,* 69, 100, 114, 127, 158, 172f., 269, 370, 380f., 383, 463
scabini 71, 120
Scandinavia, conversion of 114f., 137, 147, *230–4*
Schism of 1054 415–7
Schleswig 114, 147, 231f.
schola cantorum 282 (n.), 283

schola tabellionum urbis 285
scholasticism 49, 339, 465–72
scholasticus 114, 213, 265
Schöningen 63
schools, Carolingian 77, 84f., 104–6, 112, 115–8, 121, 157, 171–3
schools, cathedral 85, 115f., 213f., 265, 331–3
schools, monastic 85, 104, 106, 117f., 332f.
Schuttern 17
Schwarzach 17
Scotland 91, 135f., 224, 233(n.), 300
scriniarius 284f., 435
secundicerius notariorum 5, 54, 281, 283
Sedulius Scotus 158f.
Seligenstadt, Synod of (1023) 296f., 303, 306
Seljuk Turks 376, 422, 425, 447, 449–52
Senlis, Synod of (990) 297
Sens 13f., 20, 66, 71f., 80, 105, 117, 127, 130, 134, 152f., 159, 162–4, 166, 291
Septimania 3, 17, 24, 65f., 82f., 86, 91, 103, 105
sequence, liturgical 172f., 304
Serbs 148, 150, 243
Sergius II, Patriarch of Constantinople 412, 424
Sergius I, Pope 4f., 10
Sergius II, Pope 141f., 290
Sergius III, Pope (Bishop of Caere) 156f., 198f., 280, 282, 336, 408
Sergius IV, Pope 249, 412
Sergius, *secundicerius* 54, 56
servitium regale *(regis)* 248, 252, 277
Seville 19, 134, 217, 318, 334
— Synod of (*ca.* 784) 81
Sicily 7, 25(n.), 88, 91, 98, 139, 197, 286, 328f., 356, 365, 392, 445f.
Siegburg 456
Siena 359
Sigriane 51f.
Sihtric, King of York 222, 225
Silesia 237, 239f.
Silvester I, Pope 60, 100, 214, 307
Silvester II, Pope 196, *214–7,* 243, 245, 249, 283, 299
Silvester III, Antipope 254f.
Silvester IV, Antipope 393
Simeon, Tsar of Bulgaria 243, 408f., 424
Simeon Metaphrastes 419f.
Simeon the New Theologian 419–22
simony in the Byzantine Church 40f.
— in the Latin Church 195, 229, 252, 254f., 277, 336, *341–4,* 348, 351, 353–5, 359, 363f., 366, 370, 372, 377, 386f., 393, 401, 455f.
— and the validity of the Sacraments 354f., 363, 370, 388f., 469f.
Siponto 415
— Synod of (1050) 353
Sirmium 150
Sisinnius II, Patriarch of Constantinople 411f., 424
Skara 234
Slavniking Dynasty 237f.
Slavonic peoples 63, 68, 78, 85, 102, *148–51,* 201, 231, *235–44,* 259, 285, 315
Slovakia 237, 239
Slovenes 85, 148, 150, 243
Smaragdus, Abbot of Saint-Mihiel 97, 115
societas duodecim apostolorum 308
Soissons 123, 145, 161f., 165, 167, 169, 172
— Synod of (744) 13f.
— Synod of (866) 146
Solomon, King of Hungary 375
Sorbs 64, 95, 235f.
Spain, Christian 3, 17, 80f., *133–5, 217–21,* 286, 300, 324, 328, 346, 364f., 372, 377f., 390, 402, 427, 445, 447
— March of 133, 218f., 295
— Muslim 3f., 65f., 69, 81f., 86, 134, 139, 220, 333; *see also* Córdoba, Caliphate of, Emirate of Córdoba
Spalato 151
Speyer 15, 126
Spitignev, Duke of Bohemia 375
Spoleto 6, 20–22, 24f., 57–59, 61, 85, 90, 152, 155f., 197–9, 205, 357, 381, 443
— House of 153, 155, 171, 282
spolia 277; *see also ius spolii*
Stanislas, Bishop of Cracow 375
Stauracius, Emperor 42
Stavelot 90, 323
Stephen, Bishop of Liège 172
Stephen, Bishop of Nepi 182
Stephen, Cardinal 362f.
Stephen, Count of Blois 451
Stephen, King of Hungary 215, 238, 244–6, 253, 375
Stephen, Metropolitan of Nicomedia 418, 421
Stephen I, Patriarch of Constantinople 188, 404
Stephen II, Patriarch of Constantinople 409
Stephen, Patriarch of Jerusalem 464
Stephen II, Pope 7(n.), 21–24, 25(n.), 107, 214
Stephen III, Pope 5, 25, 55f.
Stephen IV, Pope 107
Stephen V, Pope 151, 155, 170, 184(n.), 187, 297
Stephen VI, Pope 156
Stephen VII, Pope 199
Stephen IX, Pope 352, 357, *358f.,* 365, 385, 415
Stephen Harding, Abbot of Citeaux 459
Stephen of Liciac 457
Stephen of Thiers 457
Stephen the Younger, Abbot 31, 52, 419
Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury 229, 364
stole fees 260, 262f., 395
Strasbourg 14, 17f., 76, 115, 399
Studion 33, 35, 39f., 42–45, 47, 50, 52f., 174, 421
Studite monks 38–41, 43f., 52, 174, 422
Sturmi, Abbot of Fulda 11, 15, 62, 64
Stylian, Bishop of Neocaesarea 184(n.), 404
suffragens 287–90
Suitger, Bishop of Bamberg, *see* Clement II, Pope
Suleiman Ibn al Arabi 65
Süntel, battle of the 64
superstition 312f.
Sussex 224
Süsteren 10
Sutri 378f., 396f., 399, 426
— Synod of (1046) 255f., 344
— Synod of (1058) 359
Svatopluk, Duke of Moravia 148, 151
Svein Estrithson, King of Denmark 232, 234, 374
Svein Forkbeard, King of Denmark and England 228, 231–3
Sviatoslav, Prince of Kiev 241f., 244
Swabia 115, 121, 150, 153f., 172; *see also* Alemannia
— Duchy of 204, 382, 450
Sweden 136, 147, 231f., 234, 247, 374, 402

Swedes 230f.
Switbert, Anglo-Saxon missionary 10, 61
Symbola 52
synkellos 29, 34, 413
synod, diocesan 267
— provincial 286–8
synodal tribunal 309, 336; *see also* court, ecclesiastical
— witnesses 428
Syracuse 139, 175, 296

taifas, reyes de 219
Tancred, nephew of Bohemond 451
Tancred of Hauteville 356
Taormina 139
Tacitus 61
Tangmar, biographer 337
Tarantaise 71f., 154
Taranto 139, 142
Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople *33–41,* 52, 174, 176, 419
Tarik 3
Tarragona 220, 390, 447
Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria 55, 61, 66–68
Tatian 118
Tatto, Abbot of Reichenau 118
Tauberbischofsheim 12
Tedald, Archbishop of Milan 381, 387
Tegernsee 322, 338
Tertry, battle of 8
Tetragamy Controversy 406–9
Tettenhall 136
Teudila, Bishop of Seville 81
teutonica lingua 173
theocracy
— of Charles the Great 95–98, 210
— Carolingian 127, 164, 279
— Ottonian *201–3,* 207, 210, 248, 279, 326, 380, 400
— Salian *252–7,* 279, 344f., 380, 436–8, 456
Theoctistus, Logothete 47, 175f.
theodisk, theotisca, theodisca 78, 118, 173, 312
Theodora, Empress 46f., 175f.
Theodora, wife of Theophylact 199
Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury 14
Theodore, Metropolitan of Ephesus 28, 30
Theodore II, Pope 156
Theodore Daphnopates 419
Theodore of Studion 33, 35, 38–40, 42–45, 47, 50–53, 174f., 419
Theodoric of Fleury 334
Theodota, Empress 38f.
Theodosius I, Emperor 119
Theodotos Kassiteras, Patriarch of Constantinople 43f.
Theodulf, Bishop of Orléans 66, 72–74, 76–79, 82f., 97, 103f., 108, 115, 117, 267, 301(n.), 303, 316
Theognostus, Abbot 178, 181
theology in the 10th century 334–6
theology, Byzantine 48–51
— in the first phase of Iconoclasm 48–50
— in the second phase of Iconoclasm 50f.
Theophanes 28f., 32, 35, 37–39, 42, 52, 170
Theophano, Empress, wife of Otto II 207, 212, 411
Theophano, Empress, wife of Romanus II 410
Theophylact, Patriarch of Constantinople 409f., 412
Theophylact, Senator 198f., 249
Theosterictus, Abbot 52
Theophilus, Emperor 45–47, 113, 418
Theotemptos, Metropolitan of Kiev 243
Thessalonica 286
Theuderich, son of Charles the Great 104, 111
Theutberga, Queen of Lotharingia 130–2
Theutgaud, Archbishop of Trier 131, 169, 291
Thietmar, Bishop of Merseburg 279, 337
Thionville 56, 100, 111, 128
— Assembly of (821) 111
— Frankish Diet of (844) 128
Thomas, Anti-Emperor 45
Thomas, Metropolitan of Claudiopolis 28
Thomas, priest 407
Thrace 286
Thuringia 8, 11–13, 15, 61f., 68, 100
Thuzey 131f., 163
— Frankish Diet of (860) 163
tiara 280, 442
Tiron 458
tithe 20, 63, 70, 85, 110, 242, 260–3, 267, 372, 395f., 399, 428, 453
— crusade 452
Toledo 69, 81–83, 87, 133–5, 218, 300, 378, 390, 431, 445
— Synod of (589) 83, 318
Tomislav, King of Croatia 151
Tongres 15
Tortona 123
Toto, Duke of Nepi 25
Toul 131, 165, 321f., 351f., 446
Toulouges, Synod of (1027) 346
Toulouse 69, 103, 173, 448f., 451
— Synod of (829) 120
— Synod of (1056) 357
Tournai 456
Tours 14, 98, 119, 159, 165, 312, 318, 355, 467; *see also* Saint-Martin de Tours
— Synod of (813) 78
— Synod of (1054) 468
Tragos 422f.
Transylvania 245
Tribur 381
— Synod of (895) 169, 295, 303
Trier 15, 17, 65, 71, 105, 115f., 131f., 139, 143, 145, 159, 166, 168f., 172, 242, 253, 269, 291f., 296, 322f., 386, 461, 463
— Synod of (846) 128
Trinity, devotion to the 316
Tripolis, County of 452
Troia, Synod of (1093) 390
Trondheim 231, 234
trope 304
Troyes 162
— Synod of (867) 146
— Synod of (1107) 389, 396
— Synod of (1128) 464
Truce of God 346, 445
Tryphon, Patriarch of Constantinople 409
Tudun, Prince of the Avars 69
Tunis 139
Turin 113, 116, 364
Tuscany 58f., 61, 197, 199, 252, 343, 351, 357–9, 367, 379, 382, 388, 396, 399, 443
Tutilo of Sankt Gallen 172f.
Tyre 452

Ulric, Bishop of Augsburg 296, 317, 319, 337
Ulster 91
Umayyad Dynasty 65, 134, 219
Unger, Bishop of Poznán 236
Unni, Archbishop of Hamburg–Bremen 232, 234
Unwan, Archbishop of Hamburg–Bremen 233
Uppsala 234
Urban II, Pope 376, *386–92,* 393, 398, 402, 434f., 440, 442, *447–51,* 458, 472
Urgel 82, 92
Usuard 159
Utrecht 10f., 15f., 62, 64, 172

Valais 140
Valence 139
— Synod of (855) 163
Vallombrosa 343, 454–6
Varangians 240
vassalage of prelates *276–9,* 389, 399
vassals, episcopal 109, 274, 278
— royal 71, 84, 96, 122, 271
vassals of monasteries 275, 278, 454
— of the papacy 443
vavassores 252
Velletri 359
Venetia 6f., 22f., 58, 68, 98f.
Venice 149, 170, 198, 216, 246, 329
Ver, Synod of (755) 19f.
— Synod of (884) 169
Verberie, Synod of (756) 19
— Synod of (869) 147
Vercelli 333–5, 341, 343
— Synod of (1050) 353, 355, 468
Verden 64f.
— massacre of 64
Verdun 320, 322
— Treaty of (843) 126, 128f., 138, 141f., 157, 164, 168
Vermandois 195f., 451
Verona 57, 171, 333, 335f., 341, 343, 388, 467
Vespers 310, 313
vestararius 5, 199, 281f.
vicar, papal 128f., 152f., 166f., 234, 286, 290f., 373, 391, 433
vicedominus 5, 282
Vich 213, 215, 220(n.)
Victor III, Pope 351, 356, *357f.,* 382
Victor III, Pope 359, 361, *385f.*
Vienne 72, 122, 124, 129, 154f., 159, 163, 169, 197, 297, 399, 431; *see also* Provence, Kingdom of
— Synod of (1112) 397
Vikings 91, 95, 102, 127, 129, *135–9,* 155, 194f., 221–3, 230–2, 240, 320, 445; *see also* Northmen, Danes, Norwegians, Swedes
— attacks on British Isles *135–7,* 144, *222–5,* 228
— attacks on Carolingian Empire *137–9,* 155, 158f., 171f., 194f., 201
— conversion of 140, 222f., 225f.
Vilgardus 339
Vincy, battle of 8
Visigothic Kingdom 3, 18f., 133–5, 217, 220, 259, 264, 286f., 318f.
visitation, parish 309, 311
vita communis 263–6, 308, 363, 453
vita evangelica movement *453–7,* 459, 462, 465
Vitalis, founder of Savigny 458, 460
Vladimir I, Prince of Kiev 241–3, 247
Vratislav II, King of Bohemia 375
Vulgarius, Eugenius 170, 336

Waerferth, Bishop of Worchester 137
Wagrians 232, 235
Waimar, Duke of Salerno 251f., 328, 356
Wala, Bishop of Metz 139
Wala, Count, Abbot of Corbie 103–5, 111f., 114, *119–25,* 128
— reform memorandum of 119f.
Walafrid Strabo 105, 115f., 118, 157, 161, 305
Waldipert 25
Waldo of Freising 173
Waldrada 130–2
Walter, Cardinal Bishop of Albano 391
Waltharius 173
Wandalbert of Prüm 157, 159
war, holy 445–7, 449
Warin 17
Warin, Abbot of Corvey 114
Warnehar 23
Wazo, Bishop of Liège 255, 278, 344f.
week, Christian 315f.
Weissenburg 77, 173, 322f.
Welf IV, Duke of Bavaria 388
Welf V 388
Wenceslas I, Duke of Bohemia 237, 242
Wends 232, 235f., 238, 402
Wenilo, Archbishop of Sens 130, 162
Wenrich of Trier 386
Werden 62, 65, 118, 172
wergeld 311
Wessex 86, *135–7,* 144, 222, 224f., 228, 364
Wessobrunn Prayer 77
West Frankish Kingdom 126–32, 138, 145, 152–4, 157–60, 162–6, 169, 171f., 194, 268, 274, 278f., 287f., 290, 292, 295, 301; *see also* France
Westphalia 61f., 64f., 72
Wiching, Bishop of Neitra 151
Wido of Osnabrück 386
Widukind, Saxon leader 62, 64, 69
Widukind of Corvey 203, 208(n.), 337
Wigmodia 65
Wilchar, Archbishop of Sens 20, 66, 71, 80
Wilfrid, Bishop of York 9f.
Willehad, Anglo-Saxon missionary 64f.
William, Abbot of Hirsau 456
William, Archbishop of Mainz 236
William, Count of Burgundy 373
William V, Duke of Aquitaine 254, 346
William VI, Duke of Aquitaine 378
William I, King of England 224, 228f., 234, 257, 269, 364, 376f., 390, 393, 446
William II, King of England 390f., 393, 470
William, Margrave of Toulouse 69, 103, 173
William Iron Arm, Count of Apulia 356
William of Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne 399, 463
William of Palestrina 433
William of Vercelli 458
William of Volpiano, Abbot of Saint-Bénigne de Dijon 322, 326–8, 338, 342
William the Good, Duke of Aquitaine 324, 326
Willibert, Archbishop of Cologne 153

Willibrord, Archbishop of Utrecht *9–12,* 16, 61, 136, 290
Wilzi 68, 95, 235; *see also* Liutizians
Winchester 226f., 229, 364
— Synod of (1076) 377
Winfrid 11 *see* Boniface (Winfrid)
Winigis, Duke of Spoleto 90
Winigis, *missus* 68
Wipo 337
Wirund, Abbot, *missus* 90
Witbert 10f.
Witger, Archbishop of Ravenna 344
Witza *see* Benedict, Abbot of Aniane
Wodan 61
Wolfenbüttel 63
Wolfgang, Bishop of Regensburg 322, 339
Worchester 137, 226f.
Worms 62, 122, 125f., 293f., 307, 309, 312, 336–8, 426f.
— Concordat of 202, *400f.,* 445
— Diet of (829) 121
— Diet of (1076) 381
— Synod of (868) 164, 302
Wroclaw 240
Wulfad, Archbishop of Bourges 146, 159
Wulfred, Archbishop of Canterbury 135
Würzburg 13, 15, 17, 64, 77, 115, 314, 334

Yazid II, Caliph 6
York 72f., 144, 227, 431
— Kingdom of 222, 225, 233
Yugoslavs 243f.; *see also* Croats, Serbs, Slovenes

Zachary, court chaplain 92
Zachary, Bishop of Anagni 177, 182
Zachary, Pope 5, 15, 17, 21, 107
Zaragoza 65f., 80
Zeeland 138
Zeitz 235
Ziu 61
Zoe Carbonopsina, Empress 406–8

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

IV

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume IV

FROM THE HIGH MIDDLE AGES TO THE EVE OF THE REFORMATION

by

HANS-GEORG BECK

KARL AUGUST FINK

JOSEF GLAZIK

ERWIN ISERLOH

HANS WOLTER

Translated by

Anselm Biggs

CROSSROAD · NEW YORK

1982
The Crossroad Publishing Company
575 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10022

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte,* edited by Hubert Jedin
Vol. III: *Die mittelalterliche Kirche*
III/2: Vom kirchlichen Hochmittelalter bis zum Vorabend der Reformation
© Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1968

English translation © 1970 Herder KG

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by
any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. English.
History of the church.

Translation of: Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.
Vols. previously issued under title: Handbook of
church history.
Includes bibliographies and indexes.
Contents: v. 1. From the apostolic community to
Constantine / by Karl Baus — — v. 3. The church in
the age of feudalism / by Friedrich Kempf . . . [et al.] —
v. 4. From the High Middle Ages to the eve of the Reformation / by Hans-George Beck . . . [et al.]
1. Church history—Collected works. I. Jedin, Hubert,
1900- . II. Dolan, John Patrick. III. Title.
BR145.2.H3613 1982 270 82-5037
ISBN 0-8245-0317-1 AACR2

CONTENTS

Preface xi

Preface to the English Edition xiii

List of Abbreviations xv

PART ONE: THE HIGH MIDDLE AGES

SECTION ONE: THE POSTGREGORIAN EPOCH, 1124 TO 1153 (Hans Wolter) . . . 3

Chapter 1: Honorius II, the Schism of 1130, and The Second Lateran Council . 3

Chapter 2: The Reform Orders of the Twelfth Century and Bernard of Clairvaux 11
- The Cistercians 12
- The Canons Regular 16
- The Premonstratensians 16
- Bernard of Clairvaux 18

Chapter 3: The Papacy and the Western Kings in The Age of Saint Bernard . . 22
- The Empire 23
- France 24
- Anarchy in England 25
- The Iberian Peninsula 27
- Christian Expansion Eastward 28

Chapter 4: Elaboration of the Curia and Criticism of Church and Papacy . . 30

Chapter 5: The Second Crusade and the Wars in Spain and the Slavic East . . 35

Chapter 6: Monastic Humanism 39

Chapter 7: The New Theology: Abelard, Peter Lombard, Gratian 43

SECTION TWO: THE THREATS TO THE FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH, 1153 TO 1198 (Hans Wolter) 51

Chapter 8: The Popes, the Emperor Frederick I, and The Third Lateran Council 51
- Hadrian IV 52
- Alexander III 57
- The Third Lateran Council 63

Chapter 9: Thomas Becket and Henry II of England 66
The Archbishop 67
The Constitutions of Clarendon 68
Exile and Reconciliation 70
Murder in the Cathedral 72
The Sequel to the Martyrdom 73

Chapter 10: The Heritage of Alexander III 74

Chapter 11: The Third Crusade 82
Crusade Piety 86

Chapter 12: Scholasticism, Canon Law, and the Universities 89
Early Scholasticism 89
Early Canon Law 93
The Rise of the Universities 95

Chapter 13: Heresy and the Beginnings of the Inquisition 98

Chapter 14: Lay Movements of the Twelfth Century, Christian Knighthood, Pastoral Care, Popular Piety, and Mystical Theology 104
Care of Souls, Popular Devotion, and Mysticism 110
Mystical Theology 112

SECTION THREE: THE BYZANTINE CHURCH IN THE EPOCH OF THE CRUSADES (Hans-Georg Beck) 113

Chapter 15: The Byzantine Church from 1054 to 1203 113

Chapter 16: The Byzantine Church from 1203 to 1282 119

Chapter 17: The Inner Life of the Byzantine Church in the Age of the Crusades 128

SECTION FOUR: THE PAPACY AT THE HEIGHT OF ITS POWER, 1198 TO 1216 (Hans Wolter) 136

Chapter 18: Personality and Program of Innocent III 137

Chapter 19: The Spiritual Monarch as Arbiter Mundi 143
The Papal State 144
The Vassal States 145
The Empire 147
England 150
France 152
Scandinavia, Poland, and the Balkan Peninsula 153

Chapter 20: The Fourth Crusade and the Latin Empire 154

Chapter 21: Reform and the Struggle Against Heresy 159

Chapter 22: The Fourth Lateran Council 166

Chapter 23: The Mendicant Orders 172
The Dominicans 173
The Franciscans 177
Other Mendicant Orders 181
Summary 182

Chapter 24: The Western Mediaeval Hospital 183
The Military Hospital Orders 184
The Non-Military Hospital Orders 186
The Municipal Hospital 187

SECTION FIVE: THE CONTEST FOR THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WEST, 1216 TO 1274 (Hans Wolter) 188

Chapter 25: The Papacy's Victory over Frederick II 188
The First Council of Lyons (1245) 195

Chapter 26: The Veering of the Papacy to France, and the Angevin Domination in Italy 199

Chapter 27: Pope Gregory X and the Second Council of Lyons 203

Chapter 28: Heresy and the Inquisition in the Thirteenth Century 208

Chapter 29: The Missionary Work of the Church in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries 216

Chapter 30: Canon Law and the Constitution of the Church in the Thirteenth Century 224

SECTION SIX: THE CRISIS OF THE PAPACY AND OF THE CHURCH, 1274 TO 1303 (Hans Wolter) 234

Chapter 31: The Papacy Subject to Angevin Influence 234

Chapter 32: Christian Fanaticism in the Thirteenth Century 240

Chapter 33: The Flowering of Scholasticism and of the Western Universities . . 246

Chapter 34: The Cardinals and the Curia in the Thirteenth Century 260
The Curia 262
The Chancery 263
The *Camera* 264
Judicial Offices 265

Chapter 35: Celestine V and Boniface VIII 267

Chapter 36: The End of the Crusading Epoch 281

PART TWO: THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

SECTION ONE: THE POPES AT AVIGNON (Chapters 37 to 40 by Karl August Fink; Chapters 41 to 44 by Erwin Iserloh; Chapter 45 by Josef Glazik) 291

Chapter 37: The Situation After the Death of Boniface VIII: Benedict XI and Clement V 291
The Process Against the Memory of Boniface VIII 296
Ruin of the Templars. The Council of Vienne 297
Italy and the Papal State 304
Clement V and the Empire 305

Chapter 38: From John XXII to Clement VI 308
John XXII (1316–34) 308
Benedict XII (1334–42) 315
Clement VI (1342–52) 321

Chapter 39: From Innocent VI to Gregory XI 324
Innocent VI (1352–62) 324
Urban V (1362–70) 327
Gregory XI (1370–78) 330

Chapter 40: The Curia at Avignon 333

Chapter 41: Nominalism. The Universities Between Via Antiqua and Via Moderna 344

Chapter 42: Concept of the Church and Idea of the State in the Polemics of the Fourteenth Century. The Laicized State in Marsilius of Padua 355
Marsilius of Padua 359
William of Ockham 363

Chapter 43: The Spiritual Movement and the Poverty Dispute 369

Chapter 44: The German Mystics 375
Master Eckhart 377
John Tauler 381
Henry Suso 382
John van Ruysbroeck 384

Chapter 45: Missionary Work of the Mendicants Outside Europe 391

SECTION TWO: THE WESTERN SCHISM AND THE COUNCILS (Chapters 46 and 48 to 50 by Karl August Fink; Chapter 47 by Erwin Iserloh) 401

Chapter 46: The Western Schism to the Council of Pisa 401
The Council of Pisa (1409) 418
The Conciliar Idea 423

Chapter 47: The Devotio Moderna 426
Gerard Groote 426
The Brothers of the Common Life 429
The Windesheim Congregation 432
The Brothers of the Common Life in Germany 434
Opposition: Matthew Grabow 436
Literature and Spirituality 437

Chapter 48: The Nationalist Heresies: Wyclif and Hus 443

Chapter 49: The Council of Constance: Martin V 448
The Council of Constance (1414–18) 448
Martin V (1417–31) 468

Chapter 50: Eugen IV and the Council of Basle–Ferrara–Florence 473
Ferrara and Florence 479

SECTION THREE: THE BYZANTINE CHURCH: THE AGE OF PALAMISM (Hans-Georg Beck) 488

Chapter 51: From the Second Council of Lyons to the Council of Ferrara–Florence 488

Chapter 52: Hesychasm and Palamism 498

Chapter 53: Intellectual Life in the Late Mediaeval Byzantine Church 505

Chapter 54: Patriarchate – Emperor and Church – Missions – Monasticism . . 513

SECTION FOUR: FROM THE MIDDLE AGES TO THE REFORMATION (Chapters 55 to 57 by Karl August Fink; Chapters 58 to 61 by Erwin Iserloh) 521

Chapter 55: Renaissance and Humanism 521

Chapter 56: The Popes of the Early Renaissance 528
  Nicholas V (1447–55) 528
  Calixtus III (1455–58) 531
  Pius II (1458–64) 533
  Paul II (1464–71) 540

Chapter 57: The Popes of the High Renaissance 543
  Sixtus IV (1471–84) 543
  Innocent VIII (1484–92) 548
  Alexander VI (1492–1503) 550
  Pius III (1503) 557
  Julius II (1503–13) 557
  Leo X (1513–21) 561

Chapter 58: The Inner Life of the Church 566
  The Urban Parish 566
  The Liturgy 570
  Preaching 574
  Catechesis 578
  Religious Orders 580

Chapter 59: Theology in the Age of Transition 585
  Nicholas of Cusa 585
  John von Wesel 594
  John von Goch 597
  Wessel Gansfort 598
  Gabriel Biel 599

Chapter 60: The Jews in Mediaeval Christendom 603
  Jewish Philosophy and Theology 609
  Efforts to Convert the Jews 610

Chapter 61: German Humanism 614

BIBLIOGRAPHY 625

  General Bibliography 627
  Bibliography to Individual Chapters 633

LIST OF POPES 749

GENERAL INDEX 750

PREFACE

The treatment of the Church History of the High and Late Middle Ages, offered in this volume, starts from the close of the Investiture Controversy and the slowing down of the Gregorian reform and concludes with the Renaissance papacy. As explained in the prefaces to Volumes III and V, by Professors Kempf and Iserloh respectively, the original plan of the entire work, outlined by the collaborators in conferences at Trier and Freiburg in 1958–1960, envisaged a different arrangement: the Early and High Middle Ages (700–1300) were to be in one volume (III), while the Late Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Catholic Reform were to provide the content of Volume IV. External circumstances, not least of all the compass of mediaeval Church History, brought about the present arrangement of volumes, which, as Kempf and Iserloh have noted, has an equally valid basis: the Western Church in her making, her development, her crises and in her relations with the Eastern Churches is treated in Volumes III and IV, while the shattering of Western Christendom in the Reformation and in the Age of Confessionalism, together with the opening up of new lands through the voyages of discovery and the missions, constitutes the matter of Volume V.

Nevertheless, it seems appropriate to state the connecting links extending from the present volume to those preceding and following it and thereby to bring together what was externally sundered by the existing arrangement of the volumes. For the mediaeval system which was constructed in the Ottonian Age and in the Gregorian reform was brought to full maturity in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries both as regards the position of the papacy and in its intellectual and devotional life. Nevertheless, the hierarchical Church encountered a growing opposition: the poverty movement, only partially caught up and "baptized" in the mendicant orders, and the radical hostility of the Cathari. The grand theme of Western history, the confrontation of the two powers, did not come to rest with the defeat of the Hohenstaufen. The Avignon papacy fell into an oppressive dependence on France, while the papacy of the Great Western Schism, divided against itself, had to come to terms with the secular powers in order to retain the "obediences".

The causal relationship to the Reformation, it seems to me, will be even more clear in this volume. The unrealized reform of the Church, conciliarism, the decisive role of the states in liquidating the Council of Basle, the papacy's entanglement in Italian territorial politics — these were as much immediate predispositions for the Reformation as were the appearance of the new humanist education and the Renaissance and the social and economic restratifications in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The whole complex of "causes" or, more correctly, of "presuppositions" for the Reformation becomes transparent. However, the roots of the Catholic renewal in the sixteenth century also extend back to this period. From the *devotio moderna,* to which, probably for the first time, justice is amply done here, a line reaches to Ignatius Loyola; the reforms of the religious orders in the sixteenth century were frequently related to those of the Late Middle Ages; the Tridentine reform was to a great extent the carrying out of reform programs proposed in the Late Middle Ages. Without Christian humanism the development of positive theology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is unthinkable. The beginnings of missionary work in Asia, Africa and America, which belong chronologically to the present volume, are only treated in Volume V.

The Church History of the Middle Ages, which is here completed, is obliged to treat ecclesiastical events and situations in the context and the reciprocal action of the general, and especially the political, history of the Middle Ages. One cannot write the history of the papacy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries without investigating its position at the head of the Western family of nations; one cannot understand the history of the Renaissance papacy if one disregards its involvement in Italian territorial politics. However one may feel in regard to these phenomena, they are, and they remain, historical facts which must be respected. As certain as it is that Church History must never be only a factual report of the Church's past and that it must always be also a confrontation with that past, we still believe that this confrontation must not, in a handbook, lead to a constricting and contracting of the field of vision, such as would be permissible in accounts for a wider circle of readers. The readers and users of this *Handbuch* must be fully informed of the facts and contexts as they are known in the present state of research; then they can form their own judgment and draw pragmatic conclusions for the present. On this point the collaborators and the editors are in basic agreement.

In accord with the principles relating to the writing of the *Handbook,* each author is at liberty to present his own scholarly opinions; he alone assumes responsibility for the part composed by him. Hence there are certain differences in the judgments on events and persons, which the reader and user of this volume will quickly notice. The editors' task is limited to the maintaining of the total plan which was sketched by the collaborators in common.

Hubert Jedin

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

The present volume of the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* embraces a period that for many appears to have been the high-water mark of Christian civilization. The dream of a papally dominated Europe that followed Rome's triumph over the Hohenstaufen *imperium* was reflected in the Crusades, the works of the schoolmen, and the characters of the universities. Yet the very triumphs, spiritual and temporal, of the reinvigorated papacy contained the seeds of its own decline. Neither the highly legalized and centralized governing apparatus of the Church nor the proliferation of clerical corporations as agents of its authority were successful. The recovery of Hellenic philosophy, the great mediaeval synthesis, while providing a rational basis for the superstructure of revelation, fostered a mentality that diminished interest in the very font of that revelation, the Scriptures.

At the same time that the ambitions of the Vicar of Christ to direct secular affairs were blunted by nascent nationalism and the economic and social revolutions that weakened feudalism, the failure of the Crusades facilitated the resurgence of the Ottoman Turk and the eventual engulfment of Byzantium. Yet the great debates on the nature of authority, the empirical shift in philosophy and the brief contacts with the Far East created the impetus for many of the achievements of the modern world—democracy, scientific inquiry, and a sense of world mission. There can be little doubt that during this period of transition the Church in spite of its limitations was still the focal point of the historical process in Europe.

As in previous volumes of the *Handbuch* the authors have avoided the pitfalls of merely chronicling the activities of the hierarchy. The Church's successes and its failures are seen in the *plebs sancta* as well as in the *sacerdotium.*

Although limited by its very nature in scope and subject matter, the work nevertheless opens up avenues of study for historians of all hues. Its treatment of such varied subjects as Northern Humanism, Hesychasm and Palamism, the mediaeval hospital and the Jew in mediaeval Christendom are indicative of this wide spectrum. Certainly the *Handbuch* will do much to support the claim that Western history is unintelligible apart from the history of the Church. This is especially true during the period of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance when the Church, though often in open opposition to the changes taking place, nonetheless remained the most powerful spiritual and intellectual force of the age.

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The references within brackets indicate the General Bibliography of this volume.

AAB	*Abhandlungen der Deutschen* (till 1944: *Preussischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1815 ff.
AAL	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Leipzig* (till 30, 1920: *AGL),* Leipzig 1850 ff.
AAM	*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Munich 1835 ff.
AAMz	*Abhandlungen (der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse) der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur,* Mainz 1950 ff.
AAug	*Analecta Augustiniana,* Rome 1905 ff.
ActaSS	*Acta Sanctorum,* ed. Bollandus *et al.,* (Antwerp, Brussels, Tongerloo) Paris 1643 ff., Venice 1734 ff., Paris 1863 ff.
ADipl	*Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde,* Münster and Cologne 1955 ff.
ADRomana	*Archivio della Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1935 ff. (1878–1934: *ASRomana).*
AElsKG	*Archiv für elsässische Kirchengeschichte,* published by the Gesellschaft für elsässische Kirchengeschichte, edited by J. Brauner, Rixheim im Oberelsass 1926 ff.; from 1946 edited by A. M. Burg, Strasbourg.
AER	*The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Washington 1889 ff.
AFP	*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,* Rome 1931 ff.
AFranc	*Analecta Franciscana sive Chronica aliaque varia Documenta ad historiam Fratrum Minorum spectantia,* edita a Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae, Quaracchi 1885 ff.
AFrH	*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* Florence and Quaracchi 1908 ff.
AGAU	*Archief voor de Geschiedenis van het Aartsbisdom Utrecht.*
AGL	*Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Leipzig* (from 31, 1921: *AAL),* Leipzig 1850 ff.
AH	*Analecta Hymnica,* edited by G. Dreves and C. Blume, 55 volumes, Leipzig 1886–1922.
AHD	*Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge,* Paris 1926 ff.
AHPont	*Archivum Historiae Pontificiae,* Rome 1963 ff.
AHR	*The American Historical Review,* New York 1895 ff.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855 ff.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857 ff.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Münster and Cologne 1903 ff.
ALKGMA	*Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters,* edited by H. Denifle and F. Ehrle, 7 volumes, (Berlin) Freiburg im Breisgau 1885–1900.
ALMA	*Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi,* Brussels 1924 ff.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949 ff.
AnBoll	*Analecta Bollandiana,* Brussels 1882 ff.
Angelicum	*Angelicum,* Rome 1924 ff.
AnGr	*Analecta Gregoriana* cura Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae edita, Rome 1930 ff.
AnOCist	*Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis,* Rome 1945 ff.
Antonianum	*Antonianum,* Rome 1926 ff.
AnzAW	*Anzeiger der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Vienna 1864 ff.
AÖG	*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte,* Vienna 1865 ff.
APhilHistOS	*Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves,* Brussels 1932 ff.
APraem	*Analecta Praemonstratensia,* Tongerloo 1925 ff., from 1953 Averbode.
ARG	*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Gütersloh 1903 ff.
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1878–1934 (from 1935: *ADRomana).*
AST	*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia,* Barcelona 1925 ff.
AstIt	*Archivio storico Italiano,* Florence 1842 ff.
AttiPontAc	*Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Rome* 1923 ff.
AUF	*Archiv für Urkundenforschung,* Berlin 1908 ff.
AZ	*Archivalische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1876 ff.

BAC	*Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos,* Madrid 1945 ff. (thus far 138 volumes).
Baluze-Mollat	S. Baluze, *Vitae Paparum Avenionensium,* edited by G. Mollat, 4 volumes, Paris 1916–28.
Baudot-Chaussin	Baudot et Chaussin, *Vies des Saints et des Bienheureux selon l'ordre du calendrier avec l'historique des fêtes* (par les RR. PP. Bénédictins de Paris), 12 volumes, Paris 1935–56.
BÉCh	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* Paris 1839 ff.
Beck	H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich,* Munich 1959.
BÉH	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études,* Sciences philologiques et historiques, Paris 1869 ff.
Benedictina	*Benedictina,* Rome 1947 ff.
BGPhMA	*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie* (after 1930: *und Theologie) des Mittelalters.* Texte und Untersuchungen, 39 volumes, first edited by C. Baeumker, now by M. Schmaus, Münster 1891 ff.
BHL	*Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis,* ed. socii Bollandiani, 2 volumes, Brussels 1898–1901; Suppl. editio altera, *ibid.* 1911.
BiblThom	*Bibliothèque Thomiste,* Le Saulchoir 1921 ff.
BISI	*Bollettino dell'Istituto storico Italiano,* Rome.
BIStIAM	*Bollettino dell'Istituto storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano,* Rome 1886 ff.
BJRL	*The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester 1903 ff.
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* Toulouse 1899 ff.
BRN	*Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* edited by S. Cramer and F. Pijper, 10 volumes, The Hague 1903–14.
BThAM	*Bulletin de Théologie ancienne et médiévale,* Louvain 1929 ff.

Bullarium Taur.	*Bullarium Romanum,* edited by A. Tomassetti, 24 volumes, Turin 1857–72.
BullFr	*Bullarium Franciscanum,* Vols. I–IV edited by H. Sbaralea and B. de Rossi, Rome 1759–68; V–VII, by K. Eubel, Rome 1898–1904; VIII (new series, I), by U. Hüntemann, Quaracchi 1929; IX–X (new series, II–III), by J. Pou y Marti, Quaracchi 1939–49; Suppl. I, edited by F. Annibali de Latera, Rome 1780; Suppl. II, by K. Eubel, Quaracchi 1908.
BullSocAHLiège	*Bulletin de la Société d'Art et d'Histoire du Diocèse de Liège,* Liège.
BullThomiste	*Bulletin Thomiste,* Paris and Le Saulchoir.
ByZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* Leipzig 1892 ff.
Byz(B)	*Byzantion,* Brussels 1924 ff.
Byzslav	*Byzantinoslavica,* Prague 1929 ff.
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1903–29; Paderborn 1931–39; 1957 ff.

CahiersCivMéd	*Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale,* Poitiers.
CambrHJ	*The Cambridge Historical Journal,* Cambridge 1923 ff.; from 1958: *The Historical Journal.*
CCivMéd	*Cahiers de la Civilisation Médiévale,* Poitiers 1958 ff.
CH	*Church History,* New York and Chicago 1932 ff.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915 ff.
CICfontes	P. Gasparri and I. Serédi, *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes,* 9 volumes, Rome 1923–39.
Cist	*Cistercienser-Chronik,* edited by the Cistercians of Mehrerau, Mehrerau 1889 ff.
COD	*Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta,* published by the Centro di Documentazione Bologna, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2d ed. 1962.
CollFr	*Collectanea Franciscana,* Rome 1931 ff.
CollOCR	*Collectanea Ordinis Cisterciensium Reformatorum,* Rome and Westmalle 1934 ff.
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum,* Vienna 1866 ff.
CSHB	*Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae,* Bonn 1828 ff.
CTom	*Ciencia Tomista,* Madrid 1910 ff.

D	H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* Barcelona and Freiburg im Breisgau, 34th ed. 1967.
DA	*Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* (1937–43: *für Geschichte des Mittelalters,* Weimar), Cologne and Graz 1950 ff. *(cf. NA).*
Dahlmann-Waitz	F. C. Dahlmann and G. Waitz, *Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte,* 9th edition by H. Haering, Leipzig 1931–32; new edition in preparation.
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* edited by R. Naz, Paris 1935 ff.
Denzinger-Schönmetzer	*D.*
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* edited by A. Baudrillart *et al.,* Paris 1912 ff.
DölgerReg	*Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit.* Reihe A: *Regesten.* Abteilung 1: *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches,* edited by F. Dölger. 1. Teil: from 565 to 1025, Munich 1924; 2. Teil: from 1025 to 1204, Munich 1925; 3. Teil: from 1204 to 1282, Munich 1932.
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* published by Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1941 ff.

DSAM	*Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* edited by M. Viller, Paris 1932 ff.
DTh	*Divus Thomas* (before 1914: *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie;* from 1954: *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie),* Fribourg.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* edited by A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, continued by É. Amann, Paris 1930 ff.
DTh(P)	*Divus Thomas,* Piacenza 1880 ff.
Duchesne LP	*Liber pontificalis,* edited by L. Duchesne, 2 volumes, Paris 1886–92; supplementary Volume III, edited by C. Vogel, Paris 1957.
DVfLG	*Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* Halle 1923 ff.
DZGw	*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1889–98 (from 1898: *HV*).

ECarm	*Ephemerides Carmeliticae,* Florence 1947 ff.
ECatt	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* Rome 1949 ff.
Éfranc	*Études franciscaines,* Paris 1909–40; new series, Paris 1950 ff.
EHR	*English Historical Review,* London 1886 ff.
EIC	*Ephemerides Iuris Canonici,* Rome 1945 ff.
ELit	*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Rome 1887 ff.
ÉO	*Échos d'Orient,* Paris 1897 ff.
EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* Bruges 1924 ff.

FDG	*Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte,* 26 volumes, Göttingen 1860–86.
Feine RG	H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte,* I: *Die katholische Kirche,* Cologne and Graz, 4th ed. 1964.
FF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte,* Berlin 1925 ff.
Fliche-Martin	*Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* publiée sous la direction de A. Fliche et V. Martin, Paris 1935 ff. [General Bibliography, II, 3].
FlorPatr	*Florilegium Patristicum,* edited by J. Zellinger and B. Geyer, Bonn 1904 ff. (thus far 44 Hefte).
FontiStIt	*Fonti per la storia d'Italia,* published by the Istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo, 94 volumes, Rome 1887 ff.
FreibDiözArch	*Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1865 ff.
FreibGeschBl	*Freiburger Geschichtsblätter,* Fribourg.
FStud	*Franziskanische Studien,* (Münster) Werl 1914 ff.
FStudies	*Franciscan Studies,* St. Bonaventure, New York 1940 ff.
FZThPh	*Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie* (before 1914: *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie;* 1914–54: *DTh*), Fribourg.

Gebhardt-Grundmann	B. Gebhardt, *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte,* 8th edition by H. Grundmann, Stuttgart, I (1954), II (1955).
Giesebrecht	F. W. Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit,* I–V, Munich 1855–88; VI, 1895, by B. von Simson; partly in 5th edition.
Gilson-Böhner	É. Gilson and P. Böhner, *Die Geschichte der christlichen Philosophie von ihren Anfängen bis Nikolaus von Cues,* 3 volumes, Paderborn, 2d ed. 1952 f.
GlorieuxR	P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au* $XIII^{e}$ *siècle,* I–II, Paris 1933.

Glotz	*Histoire générale,* edited by G. Glotz (and his successors) [General Bibliography, II, 1].
Grabmann G	M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1933.
Grabmann MGL	M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben,* I–III, Munich 1926–56.
Grousset	R. Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades et du royaume de Jérusalem,* 3 volumes, Paris 1934–36.
Grumel Reg	V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople,* Kadiköi and Bucharest, I, 1 (1932), I, 2 (1936), I, 3 (1947).
GuL	*Geist und Leben. Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (until 1947: *ZAM*), Würzburg 1947 ff.

Haller	J. Haller, *Das Papsttum,* 5 volumes, corrected and expanded edition, Stuttgart 1950–53.
Hauck	A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands,* Leipzig, I–IV, 3d and 4th ed. 1906–14, V, 2d and 4th ed. 1929; Berlin and Leipzig, I–V, 8th ed. 1954.
Hefele-Leclercq	*Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux,* by C. J. Hefele. Translated by H. Leclercq. I–IX, Paris 1907 ff.
Heimbucher	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 3 volumes, Paderborn, 2d ed. 1907–08; 3d ed. 1932–34, *ibid.,* in 2 volumes.
Hinschius	P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland,* 6 volumes, Berlin 1869–97, reprint 1959.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* (Cologne 1880 ff.) Munich 1950 ff.
Hochland	*Hochland,* Munich 1903 ff.
Holzapfel	H. Holzapfel, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1909.
HPBl	*Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland,* edited by F. Binder and G. Jochner, 171 volumes, Munich 1838–1923.
HS	*Hispania Sacra,* Madrid 1948 ff.
HStud	*Historische Studien,* edited by E. Ebering, Berlin 1896 ff.
HV	*Historische Vierteljahresschrift,* Leipzig 1898–1937 (till 1898: *DZGw*).
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1859 ff.

IER	*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* Dublin 1864 ff.
Istina	*Istina,* Boulogne-sur-Seine 1954 ff.
IThQ	*The Irish Theological Quarterly,* Dublin 1906–22, 1951 ff.

JA	*Journal Asiatique,* Paris 1822 ff.
Jaffé	P. Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII,* Leipzig 1851; 2d ed. 1881–88 in two volumes prepared by S. Löwenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald; photographic reproduction, Graz 1956.
JbbDG	*Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte,* published by the Historische Kommission der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1862 ff.
Jedin	H. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient,* Freiburg im Breisgau, I, 2d ed. 1951, II, 1957. English translation: H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent,* translated by E. Graf, St. Louis, Mo., I, 1957; II, 1961.
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* London 1950 ff.
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies,* London 1948 ff.
JL	*JLW*

JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41 (now: *ALW*).
JÖByzG	*Jahrbuch der österreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft,* Vienna 1951 ff.
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* London 1833 ff.
JRelH	*The Journal of Religious History,* Sydney.
JThS	*The Journal of Theological Studies,* London 1899 ff.
JungmannK	J. A. Jungmann, *Katechetik,* Vienna, 2d ed. 1955.
JungmannMS	J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe,* I–II, Vienna, 3d ed. 1952. English translation: *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development,* translated by F. A. Brunner, 2 vols., New York 1951–55.
Katholik	*Der Katholik,* Mainz 1821 ff. (general index for 1821–89).
Lavisse	*Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution,* Paris 1900 ff. [General Bibliography, II, 2].
Le Bras D	*Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident,* edited by G. Le Bras, I: *Prolégomènes,* Paris 1955.
LM	*Lexikon der Marienkunde,* edited by K. Algermissen, L. Böer, C. Feckes, and J. Tyciak, Regensburg 1957 ff.
LPM	J. P. March, *Liber Pontificalis completur ex codice Dertusensi,* Barcelona 1925.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* edited by J. Höfer and K. Rahner, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2d ed. 1957 ff.
LuJ	*Lutherjahrbuch. Jahrbuch der Luthergesellschaft,* 1919 ff.
MA	*Le moyen-âge. Revue d'histoire et de philologie,* Paris 1888 ff.
MAH	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* Paris 1880 ff.
Manitius	M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters,* Munich, I (1911), II (1923), III (1931).
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio,* 31 volumes, Florence and Venice, 1757–98; reprinted and continued by L. Petit and J. B. Martin, in 60 volumes, Paris 1899–1927.
Maria	*Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge,* sous la direction d'H. Du Manoir, I–IV, Paris 1949–56.
MartèneC	E. Martène, *Veterum Scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima Collectio,* 9 volumes, Paris 1724–33.
Med et Hum	*Mediaevalia et Humanistica,* Boulder, Colorado.
MF	*Miscellanea francescana,* Rome 1886 ff.
MG	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica inde ab a. C. 500 usque ad a. 1500;* Indices by O. Holder-Egger and K. Zeumer, Hanover and Berlin 1826 ff. Sections:
MGConst	*Constitutiones.*
MGDD	*Diplomata.*
MGEp	*Epistolae.*
MGEp. sel.	*Epistolae selectae.*
MGFont. iur.	*Fontes iuris germanici.*
MGLiblit	*Libelli de lite.*
MGLL	*Leges.*
MGSS	*Scriptores.*
MGSS rer. Germ.	*Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae historicis recusi* or *separatim editi* (octavo).

MGSS rer. Germ. NS	*MG, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* Nova series.
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* (Innsbruck) Graz and Cologne 1880 ff.
MiscFranc	*MF*
Misc. Hist. Pont.	*Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae.*
MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati,* 6 volumes, Rome 1946.
Mitteis	H. Mitteis, *Der Staat des hohen Mittelalters,* Weimar, 4th ed. 1953.
MOP	*Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica,* edited by B. M. Reichert, 14 volumes, Rome 1896–1904; continuation, Paris 1931 ff.
MRS	*Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies,* London 1949 ff.
MS	*Mediaeval Studies,* published by the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto 1939 ff.
MthSt	*Münchener Theologische Studien,* edited by F. X. Seppelt, J. Pascher, and K. Mörsdorf, Munich 1950 ff.
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1950 ff.
Muratori	L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum Scriptores ab anno aerae christianae 500 ad 1500,* 28 volumes, Milan 1723–51; continued by Tartini, 1748–70, and N. G. Mittarelli, 1771; new edition by G. Carducci and V. Fiorini, Città di Castello 1900 ff.

NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichte des Mittelalters,* Hanover 1876 ff. (from 1937: *DA*).
NAG	*Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (till 1940: *NGG*), Göttingen 1941 ff.
NAKG	*Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis.*
NDB	*Neue Deutsche Biographie,* Berlin 1953 ff.
NGG	*Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (from 1941: *NAG*), Berlin 1845–1940.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Tournai, Louvain, and Paris 1879 ff.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945 ff.

OGE	*Ons Geestelijk Erf,* Antwerp and Thielt, 1927 ff.
OrChr	*Oriens Christianus,* (Leipzig) Wiesbaden 1901 ff.
OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Rome 1935 ff.
OstKSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien,* Würzburg 1951 ff.

Pastor	L. von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 16 volumes, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1885 ff. and at other times. English translation: L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages,* 40 volumes, St. Louis, Mo., I–VI, edited by F. I. Antrobus, 1891–98; VII–XXIV, by R. F. Kerr, 1908–33; XXV–XXXIV, by E. Graf, 1937–41; XXXV–XL, by E. F. Peeler, 1950–53.
PhJ	*Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* Fulda 1888 ff.
PL	*Patrologia Latina,* edited by J. P. Migne, 217 volumes and 4 index volumes, Paris 1878–90.
PotthastR	A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno 1198 ad annum 1304,* 2 volumes, Berlin 1873–75; from 1911 in Paris.
Pourrat	P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* 4 volumes, Paris 1947.
Preger	J. W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter,* 3 volumes, Leipzig 1874–93.

QFIAB	*Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken,* Rome 1897 ff.
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* edited by T. Klauser, Stuttgart 1941 (1950) ff.
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920 ff.
RBén	*Revue bénédictine,* Maredsous 1884 ff.
RDC	*Revue de droit canonique,* Strasbourg 1951 ff.
RDL	*Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte,* edited by P. Merker and W. Stammler, 4 volumes, Berlin 1925–31; 2d ed., revised by W. Kohlschmidt and W. Mohr, 3 volumes, Berlin 1955 ff.
RE	*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* founded by J. J. Herzog, edited by A. Hauck, 24 volumes, Leipzig, 3d ed. 1896–1913.
RÉB	*Revue des études byzantines,* Paris 1946 ff.
RecHistCrois	*Recueil des historiens des croisades,* 16 volumes, Paris 1841–1906.
RepFont	*Repertorium fontium historicorum medii aevi,* Rome 1962 ff.
RepGerm	*Repertorium Germanicum,* published by the Königliches Preussisches Historisches Institut in Rom, 4 volumes, Berlin 1916–43, Volumes VI and VII in preparation.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921 ff.
RFN	*Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica,* Milan 1909 ff.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876 ff.
RHÉF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France,* Paris 1910 ff.
RHD	*Revue d'histoire diplomatique,* Paris.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900 ff.
RHM	*Revue d'histoire des missions,* Paris 1924 ff.
RHPhR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921 ff.
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Paris 1880 ff.
RI	J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii* (1831 ff.), revised by E. Mühlbacher, J. Fischer, *et al.,* I, Innsbruck 1889, 2d ed. *ibid.,* 1901–08; II/1, Innsbruck 1893; II/2, Graz 1950; II/3 in preparation; III/1, Graz 1951; V–VI, VIII, IX, Innsbruck 1877–1948.
RivAC	*Rivista di archeologia cristiana,* Rome 1924 ff.
RMA	*Revue du moyen-âge latin,* Strasbourg 1945 ff.
RMab	*Revue Mabillon,* Ligugé 1921 ff.
RNPh	*Revue néoscolastique de philosophie,* Louvain 1894 ff.
ROC	*Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* Paris 1896 ff.
Rolls Series	*Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi Scriptores,* published by the Master of the Rolls, 99 volumes, London 1858–96.
RömHM	*Römische Historische Mitteilungen,* Graz and Cologne 1958 ff.
RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1887 ff.
RQH	*Revue des questions historiques,* Paris 1866 ff.
RSF	*Rivista critica di Storia della Filosofia.*
RSIt	*Rivista storica Italiana,* Naples 1884 ff.
RSPhTh	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris 1907 ff.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910 ff.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947 ff.
RThAM	*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale,* Louvain 1929 ff.
RThom	*Revue Thomiste,* Paris 1893 ff.
Runciman	S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades,* 3 volumes, Cambridge 1951–54.

SA	*Studia Anselmiana,* Rome 1933 ff.
SAB	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen* (till 1944: *Preussischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Berlin 1882 ff.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1950 ff.
SAH	*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Heidelberg 1910 ff.
SAM	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Abt., Munich 1871 ff.
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der* (from 225, 1, 1947: *Österreichischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,* Vienna 1831 ff.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica,* Milan 1873 ff.
SchmausThGG	*Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (M. Schmaus zum 60. Geburtstag), edited by J. Auer and H. Volk, Munich 1957.
Scholastik	*Scholastik,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1926 ff.
Schottenloher	K. Schottenloher, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517–85,* 6 volumes, Leipzig 1933–40, Stuttgart, 2d ed. 1956 ff.
Seppelt	F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts,* I, II, IV, V, Leipzig 1931–41; I, Munich, 2d ed. 1954, II, *ibid.,* 2d ed. 1955, III, *ibid.,* 2d ed. 1956, IV, ibid., 2d ed. 1957 (revised by G. Schwaiger).
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden bzw. zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige,* Munich 1880 ff. (from 1911, new series).
SourcesChr	*Sources chrétiennes,* edited by H. de Lubac and J. Daniélou, Paris 1941 ff.
Speculum	*Speculum. A Journal of Mediaeval Studies,* Cambridge, Mass. 1926 ff.
Stammler-Langosch	*Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon,* 5 volumes, Volumes I–II edited by W. Stammler, Volumes III–V edited by K. Langosch, Berlin and Leipzig 1933–55.
StC	*Studia Catholica,* Roermond 1924 ff.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (before 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach),* Freiburg im Breisgau 1871 ff.
Stegmüller RS	F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium commentariorum in sententias Petri Lombardi,* I–II, Würzburg 1947.
SteT	*Studi e Testi,* Rome 1900 ff.
StG	*Studia Gratiana,* edited by J. Forchielli and A. M. Stickler, I–III, Bologna 1953 ff.
StMis	*Studia Missionalia,* Rome 1943 ff.
Streit	*Bibliotheca Missionum,* begun by R. Streit, continued by J. Dindinger, (Münster, Aachen) Freiburg im Breisgau 1916 ff. (up to 1968: 26 volumes).
StRom	*Studi Romani.*
StudFr	*Studi francescani,* Arezzo and Florence 1903 ff.
StudGreg	*Studi Gregoriani,* edited by G. B. Borino, I ff., Rome 1947 ff.
StudMed	*Studi Medievali,* Turin 1904 ff., new series 1928 ff. *(Nuovi Studi Medievali,* Bologna 1923–27); 3d series, Spoleto 1961 ff.
StudMon	*Studia Monastica,* Montserrat (Barcelona).

TG	*Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis,* Groningen.
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909 ff.
ThL	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Berlin.
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig 1878 ff.

ThPQ	*Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift,* Linz an der Donau 1848 ff.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819 ff.; Stuttgart 1946 ff.
ThRv	*Theologische Revue,* Münster 1902 ff.
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel 1945 ff.
Tr	*Traditio,* New York 1943 ff.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (till 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888 ff.
Ueberweg	*F. Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie,* Berlin I, 12th ed. 1926 by K. Praechter; II, 11th ed. 1928 by B. Geyer; III, 12th ed. 1924 by M. Frischeisen-Köhler and W. Moog; IV, 12th ed. 1923 by K. Österreich; V, 12th ed. 1928 by K. Österreich.
VigChr	*Vigiliae christianae,* Amsterdam 1947 ff.
ViVr	Vizantijskij Vremennik, Leningrad 1894 ff.
VS	*La vie spirituelle,* (Ligugé, Juvisy), Paris 1869 ff.
WA	*M. Luther, Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* ("Weimar Edition"), 1883 ff.
WaTr	*D. Martin Luthers Werke, Tischreden,* 6 volumes, Weimar 1912–21.
Waas	A. Waas, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* 2 volumes, Freiburg im Breisgau 1956.
Watterich	J. B. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab exeunte saeculo IX*^{o} *usque ad finem saeculi XIII*^{i} *vitae ab aequalibus conscriptae ...,* I (972–1099) and II (1099–1198), Leipzig 1862.
Wulf	M. de Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale,* Louvain and Paris, I, 6th ed. 1934, II, 6th ed. 1936, III, 6th ed. 1947.
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,* Vienna 1887 ff.
ZAM	*Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (from 1947: *GuL*), Innsbruck, Munich) Würzburg 1926 ff.
ZBKG	*Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte,* Gunzenhausen 1926 ff.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928 ff.
ZdAdL	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur,* (Berlin) Wiesbaden 1841 ff. (till 1874: *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum).*
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851 ff.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1876 ff.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* (Innsbruck) Vienna 1877 ff.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 34 ff., Münster 1950 ff. *(Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 1–17, *ibid.* 1911–27; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 18–25, *ibid.* 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 26–27, *ibid.* 1935–37; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 28–33, *ibid.* 1938–41, 1947–49).
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948 ff.
ZSavRGgerm	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* Germanistische Abteilung, Weimar 1863 ff.
ZSavRGkan	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* Kanonistische Abteilung, Weimar 1911 ff.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für Schweizer Kirchengeschichte,* Fribourg 1907 ff.
ZSTh	*Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie,* (Gütersloh) Berlin 1923 ff.
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen 1891 ff.

PART ONE

The High Middle Ages

SECTION ONE

The Post-Gregorian Epoch (1124—53)

CHAPTER 1

Honorius II, the Schism of 1130, and the Second Lateran Council

The Concordat of Worms (1122) and its ratification by the Church at the First Lateran Council (1123), which put an end to the Investiture Controversy in Germany and Italy also, meant for Christendom the beginning of an age of peaceful growth. Now the forces of reform, as represented by the new orders, were able to develop everywhere. The relationship of the Roman Church to the Empire and to the Western Kings was under the aegis of a trusting cooperation. However, an exception was constituted by the growing area of Norman rule in South Italy that was subject to the vigorous policies of Count Roger II. Its northward expansion could not but be a source of constant anxiety for the Curia. And yet the Normans had also been, since their enfeoffment by the Pope in 1059, a support for the Roman Church when the imperial pressure from the north jeopardized the autonomy of the *Patrimonium.*

The external peace which, as has just been mentioned, the Church had won was, to be sure, affected by a severe crisis within the Roman Church's leadership, which occurred in the Schism of 1130–38 and for the settlement of which the decision of the whole of Christendom had to be invoked. Research in recent decades[1] has made it clear that there was here involved not so much any strictly Roman rivalries, such as had often decided the fate of the papacy in the holders of that office during the tenth and eleventh centuries, but rather a partisan struggle within the College of Cardinals, which in its new form had gained an important influence on the government of the Church. The new representatives of the reform movement — Cîteaux, Prémontré, and the canons regular — had already, under Calixtus II, found a friend in the college in the person of the Cardinal Chancellor Aimeric.[2] It was due to his resolute policy that within the Curia the circle of Old Gregorians, as they were called, who were inclined to continue in the ideas of the militant period of the Investiture Controversy, was faced by a growing front composed of cardinals who were linked to the concerns of the age of peace that had just been gained and to the religious reform now more strongly circulating in the new orders.

---

[1] *Cf.* the report on research (till 1961) in F. J. Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130* (Cologne 1961), 2–12. Also, G. Tellenbach, "Der Sturz des Abtes Pontius von Cluny und seine geschichtliche Bedeutung," *QFIAB*, 42 f. (1963), 13–55, and P. F. Palumbo, "Nuovi studi (1942–62) sullo scisma di Anacleto II," *BIStIAM*, 75 (1963), 71–103.

The tumultuous election following the death on 13 December 1124 of Calixtus II served as a sign of the changing situation at the Curia. Candidates for the succession were Lambert, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, and the Cardinal Deacon Saxo of Santo Stefano. Both had taken part in the discussions which had led to the concluding of the Concordat of Worms. However, the electors decided on the Cardinal Priest Theobald of Sant'Anastasia, who was invested with the red mantle under the name of Celestine II. The *Te Deum* had already been intoned when the gathering was thrown into an uproar by Leo Frangipani, and the newly elected Pope was subjected to grave indignity. The Cardinal Chancellor Aimeric, whose connection with the Frangipani was well known, was able to induce Celestine to abdicate and succeeded in uniting the votes of the electors on Lambert of Ostia on 21 December 1124, especially after Cardinal Peter Pierleoni officially renounced the candidacy which seems to have been urged upon him. The new Pope, Honorius II (1124–30), confirmed Aimeric in his office and thus facilitated his further rise. Of the ten cardinals created[3] in this pontificate, seven strengthened the chancellor's group, as would appear in 1130. For the most part men were also selected for the legations to Germany, England, Lombardy, Venice, Benevento, and Castile up to 1130 who, as the decision of that year showed, were on Aimeric's side. To the very end of the pontificate Aimeric was able to win for the "new course" a strong minority of the college, almost one-half. As a Burgundian, Aimeric came from the heartland of the monastic reforms of Cluny and Cîteaux and was himself a canon regular, as was Lambert of Ostia, whose election he had decisively brought about.

A few months after the accession of Honorius II to the papal throne the Emperor Henry V died in Germany (23 May 1125). The election of his successor in the presence of the papal legate, Cardinal Gerard of Santa Croce, and under the authoritative guidance of the electoral assembly by Archbishop Adalbert of Mainz ended in favour of the Duke of Saxony, Lothar of Supplinburg. The princes passed over Frederick of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia, who as nephew of the dead Emperor would have had the expectation of the crown by hereditary right. But it was feared that he would continue the Salian ecclesiastical policy, and Lothar, who had no son and at the age of fifty was, for those days, an old man, seemed to offer a better assurance of the princes' right of free election. The new King Lothar (1125–37) announced his election to the Pope and even asked its confirmation. But the opposition of the disregarded Hohenstaufen soon made itself known. While Duke Frederick had done homage to King Lothar, his brother Conrad had not, and at Nürnberg in December 1127 the Swabian and Franconian princes elected Conrad as anti-King. On an expedition to Italy Conrad received the iron crown of the Lombard Kingdom from Archbishop Anselm of Milan at Monza on 29 June 1128. Pope Honorius II now came out for Lothar. He sent Cardinal John of Crema to Pisa, where at a synod Archbishop Anselm was excommunicated. Thereby the Pope's repudiation of Conrad was made clear, and in 1130 the anti-King returned to Germany without having achieved his Italian aims.

---

[2] F. J. Schmale, *op. cit.*, 93–191, provides the first detailed sketch of his life.

[3] Following the method of H. W. Klewitz, *Ende des Reformpapsttums*, F. J. Schmale (*op. cit.*, 29–90) achieved searching analyses of all members of the College of Cardinals before 1130; he gives here a concise characterization of the rivals of 1130, in which the stress is definitely favourable to Innocent II.

In South Italy Honorius had to deal with Count Roger II. For when Duke William of Apulia died in 1127 the Count of Sicily aspired to enter upon the inheritance. The Curia planned an expedition against Roger, but nothing came of it. Negotiations, conducted on behalf of the Curia by Cardinal Aimeric and Cencio Frangipani and necessitated by Roger's forcible occupation of Apulia in 1128, ended with the Treaty of Benevento, a compromise which confirmed the growth of Roger's power. The Sicilian bound himself to respect the County of Capua and the papal property in Benevento. The Peace of Benevento (22 August 1128) revealed, however, where the definitive frontiers of Norman Italy would lie. It was really only an armistice, like so many peace treaties of the epoch.

More instructive for the inner Church policies of the pontificate were the proceedings in regard to Cluny and Montecassino. Abbot Pons de Melgueil,[4] who had succeeded Abbot Hugh at Cluny in 1109 and up to the time of the Concordat of Worms had been one of the prelates most favoured by the Curia, had gone to Jerusalem *via* Rome in 1122. Whether Calixtus II had succeeded in inducing him to renounce the abbacy cannot be proved. In any event the Pope allowed a new election at Cluny. The monks chose Hugh of Marcigny and, after his early death, Peter the Venerable. The return of Pons from Jerusalem was followed at Cluny by a violent struggle over the abbacy. Honorius II cited the rivals before his tribunal at Rome. Abbot Pons was condemned and died the same year, 1126, in papal custody. The most recent research sees in these events proof that the trend at the Curia "from monachism to episcopate," already discernible under Calixtus II, was growing stronger,[5] and points to the strong tensions between Cluny and the bishops, which had come to light under Pons. A similar interpretation is probably to be given to the Curia's proceedings at Montecassino, where Honorius II forced the Cardinal Abbot Oderisius to resign the abbatial office. Here too the *gravamina* of the bishops against the powerful abbey seem to have been taken seriously. A further change in the Curia's ecclesiastical policy became clear in the growing number of privileges for the canons regular.[6] But because of their recognition of episcopal jurisdiction the Cistercians and the Premonstratensians were in their first years spared from having to oppose this new direction at the Curia. The papacy had to make it its business to gain everywhere the energetic collaboration of the episcopate for the religious reform of the West.

---

[4] On this see especially Tellenbach, *loc. cit.*

At Rome this change, simultaneously involving the disappearing of a generation in the College of Cardinals, led to strains, which became worse toward the close of Honorius's pontificate because of the interference of the competing noble factions, the Frangipani, who favoured the trend represented by the Cardinal Chancellor Aimeric, and the Pierleoni, supporters of the Old Gregorians. The fateful year 1130 released these tensions, not for peace but for a schism of the type that the Church had been spared since the dark days of the feudalized papacy up to 1046. The Schism of 1130 was not imposed on the Church from without but originated within the Church's own bosom. Nevertheless, the history of this schism was to show how very much times had changed since the *saeculum obscurum*. What at first seemed to be a purely Roman confrontation between two claimants to the papacy was quickly cited before the forum of the Universal Church and there decided.

When Pope Honorius II fell gravely ill at the beginning of 1130, Cardinal Aimeric, probably recalling the tumultuous election of 1124, proceeded to make preparations[7] which should facilitate a free and canonical election. The dying pontiff was conveyed to the monastery of San Gregorio all'Aventino, which was protected by the strongholds of the Frangipani. The College of Cardinals selected from its three orders representatives who would constitute an electoral commission of eight. On this group, following the death and burial of the Pope, would devolve the election of a successor. Five members of this commission belonged to Aimeric's faction; only three came from the ranks of the Old Gregorians.[8] The church of Sant'Andrea was to be the place of the election, and the fortresses of the Frangipani were to be turned over to the College of Cardinals for the time of the election.

---

[5] *Ibid.*, 55.

[6] Under Calixtus II the ratio of privileges for Benedictines to privileges for canons regular had been 4:1; under Honorius II it became 1.6:1 and under Innocent II 1.1:1. Cf. Schmale, *op. cit.*, 139 f.

[7] In *Die streitige Papstwahl des Jahres 1130* (Innsbruck 1876), E. Mühlbacher compiled an exhaustive collection of the sources for the double election. Her criticism was retained in all later works on the schism. Most recent in importance has been the investigation by F. J. Schmale of the writings transmitted in the *Codex Udalrici*, which he was able with a high degree of probability to demonstrate as forgeries in "Die Bemühungen Innozenz' II. um seine Anerkennung in Deutschland," *ZKG*, 65 (1953 f.), 240–65.

Actually, these arrangements were not adhered to. Honorius died during the night of 13–14 February and was buried with the utmost haste in a temporary grave. The commission was unable to meet in full strength, for two of its members, Cardinals Peter Pierleoni and Jonathan, were absent. But at daybreak, with the assent of his friends and despite the protest of Cardinal Peter of Pisa, Aimeric acclaimed as Pope the Cardinal Deacon Gregory of Sant'Angelo. Invested with the red mantle of his predecessor, Innocent II (1130–43) was enthroned at the Lateran.

When during the morning of 14 February people in Rome learned what had happened during the night, Cardinal Peter Pierleoni convoked the other cardinals, the majority of the college, at San Marco, protested against the uncanonical method of the election, and invited the gathering for its part to provide Honorius II with a successor. He himself designated as a candidate the Cardinal Bishop Peter of Porto, who, however, refused to be considered and in turn nominated Peter Pierleoni. The latter was unanimously elected by the cardinals present and acclaimed by the clergy and people who were at hand. Anacletus II (1130–38) was conducted to Saint Peter's for his enthronement. And so Rome had elected two Popes on one day. Both were likewise consecrated on the same day, 23 February: Innocent II by the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia in Aimeric's titular church, Santa Maria Nuova; Anacletus II by the Cardinal Bishop Peter of Porto in the Lateran.

Both rivals were Romans. Innocent II belonged to the Papareschi of Trastevere, Anacletus II to the powerful Pierleoni.[9] The Pierleoni were of Jewish origin — hence Anacletus is known as "the Pope from the ghetto" — but they had been Christians since the days of Leo IX. They had rendered great services to the Popes up to Calixtus II inclusively and were closely bound to the Old Gregorians. Cardinal Peter, who had studied at Paris and had become a monk at Cluny, had been created a cardinal by Paschal II and had risen steadily in influence. Without any doubt he was intellectually outstanding, energetic and quick at making decisions, and, thanks to his experience at the Curia and on important legatine missions in England and France, he was also conversant with the government of the Church, and the adversary and match of the Cardinal Chancellor Aimeric. Beside Anacletus, Innocent was pale and middling. People praised his pleasing devotion and his blameless conduct. He too was experienced as a legate: he had taken part in the negotiations preceding the Concordat of Worms and together with Cardinal Pierleoni he had carried out a legatine mission in France. Neither election had taken place canonically, even if one can speak at all of an election law in force at that time. The papal electoral law of 1059 had not been in effect for a long time, if it ever had been; in any event, the guidelines and conditions previously agreed upon and sworn to had not been observed. There was no court of arbitration to which appeal could be made. And so there remained only one way, if neither rival could impose himself in Rome by excluding the other or getting him to resign: an appeal to the Universal Church, on gaining whose recognition both claimants now concentrated all their energies. Innocent II had to leave Rome, for the Frangipani abandoned him and did homage to Anacletus II. Innocent was a canon regular and hence, together with Aimeric, he was friendly toward the influential circles of the new orders. Anacletus expected to have on his side Cluny, the most powerful monastic order of the West, to which he himself belonged. But the majority decision of the Church favoured Innocent, especially since Cluny under Peter the Venerable let itself be ranged against Anacletus.

---

[8] The two Cardinal Bishops, William of Preneste and Conrad of Sabina, the Cardinal Priest Peter Rufus, and the Cardinal Deacons, Aimeric and Gregory of Saint'Angelo, belonged to the first group. The other three were the Cardinal Priests, Peter Pierleoni and Peter of Pisa, and the Cardinal Deacon Jonathan.

[9] The most thorough studies on the Pierleoni are those of P. F. Palumbo (see the bibliography for this chapter). The picture of the Cardinal's character was so distorted by the harsh polemics of the period of the schism that its real lines can be determined only with difficulty. His intellectual preeminence seems to have gained him only slight sympathy among his opponents, the majority of whom were French; they condemned him in a rare unanimity. (Here should be recalled the Cluniac Cardinal Matthew of Albano in the presentation by U. Berlière in *RBén*, 18 [1901], 113–40.) The then stirring national feeling may have played a role.

Innocent first wooed France, where Bernard of Clairvaux came out for him. Not all of France followed, it is true, for Aquitaine, Archbishop Hildebert of Tours, and Bishop Gerard of Angoulême were at first on the side of Anacletus. England too, which initially hesitated, could eventually be brought over to Innocent by Bernard's influence on King Henry I, but Scotland, both King and clergy, held to Anacletus. Spain and Portugal acknowledged Innocent. Information is lacking in regard to Scandinavia and the churches of Eastern Europe. While the crusader states and their Latin Patriarchs finally adhered to Innocent, the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople appears to have recognized Anacletus.[10]

Especially important became the stand of the German Church and of

---

[10] Both rivals boasted of the assent of the Eastern Churches; their contradictory statements were investigated by Schmale, *op. cit.*, 248, footnote 2. Complete clarification is impossible in the present state of the sources.

King Lothar. Both claimants announced their election to the King and invited him to Rome. But it was only at the Diet of Würzburg in October 1130 that Lothar acceded to the majority decision of the bishops and prelates and recognized Innocent, whom he met in person in March 1131 at the Diet of Liège; here he promised the requested journey to Rome. In Germany Innocent's cause had been especially seconded by Norbert of Magdeburg and Conrad of Salzburg, who were kept informed by Archbishop Walter of Ravenna, Bishop Hubert of Lucca, Aimeric, and Bernard of Clairvaux.

Anacletus could rely on Rome, Milan, and South Italy, in particular on Roger II, for whom he confirmed the royal title that the Count of Sicily had just assumed.[11] The connection with the Normans allowed Anacletus to continue to act as Pope from Rome until his death on 25 January 1138. On his first expedition, in 1133, King Lothar did, it is true, gain at least the Lateran basilica, where on 4 June Innocent crowned him Emperor, but, once the Germans had again left Rome, Innocent could not maintain himself and in September he went to Pisa. There in 1135 he held a synod, which was well attended from beyond the Alps; Anacletus and Roger of Sicily were excommunicated.

When, finally, thanks to the efforts of Bernard of Clairvaux, Milan was gained for Innocent, the route was open for a second journey to Italy by the Emperor (1136–37). This time also Rome could not be taken, and the campaign against Roger II ended indecisively. Lothar died on 4 December 1137, *en route* back to Germany, without having seen the end of the schism. Meanwhile, the Innocentians had undertaken negotiations with Roger. The outcome was that both rivals sent embassies to present the claims and rights of their respective principals before the King as arbiter at Salerno in November 1137, but they were unable to bring him to a definitive stand.

Success in these debates was achieved only by Bernard of Clairvaux, who contrived to get Cardinal Peter of Pisa, hitherto one of the most loyal adherents of Anacletus, to submit to Innocent.

Only the death of Anacletus II ended the schism; his successor, Cardinal Gregory Conti of Santi Apostoli, chosen in March 1138 and styling himself Victor IV, renounced the pontificate as early as 29 May of the same year. His electors and the Pierleoni now recognized Innocent II, who had thus finally won the long and arduous fight for the assent of all of Christendom. The virtually unanimous consent of the old and the new orders, the confidence of the great congregations of canons regular, the recognition accorded by the leading princes of the West and their episcopates, had especially contributed to this success. The dynamic propaganda, fully displayed in these years, of the great Abbot of Clairvaux, who effectively supported the exertions of Innocent II in all aspects, above all in regard to Italy, must not be passed over in silence.[12]

---

[11] On this *cf.* what is so far the best exposition: L. R. Ménager, "L'institution monarchique dans les États Normands d'Italie," *Cahiers de Civilisation médiévale,* 2 (1959), 445–48 (La promotion royale).

Innocent II summoned a general synod to meet at Rome in the Lateran in April 1139. Now following the model of Lateran I (1123), which had liquidated the confusion resulting from the Investiture Controversy, all problems growing out of the Schism of 1130 were to be settled. Like Lateran I, Lateran II obtained recognition as an ecumenical council only much later.[13] In attendance were more than one hundred bishops, some of them from the crusader states; the number of abbots and of superiors of chapters of canons must have been far larger but it has not come down to us. At the opening of the Council Innocent spoke on the unity of the Church, the mutilation of which he branded as a sin against the Holy Spirit. He refused to recognize any legitimacy in the pontificate of Anacletus II, since it had not obtained the assent of the Church, and so the synod declared that all acts, decisions, ordinations, and consecrations performed by Anacletus and his adherents were null and void. These adherents, including even Peter of Pisa, for whom Bernard had interceded, lost all offices and dignities. Bishop Godfrey of Chartres was made legate in France and Aquitaine to enforce these decisions. At the Council Innocent canonized Sturmi of Fulda at the request of the German episcopate. The synod's thirty decrees again comprised the reform program of the last decades and repeated the canons of Lateran I and of the Synods of Clermont (1130), Reims (1131), and Pisa (1135), but the sanctions were made more severe.

With its renewed rejection of lay investiture and of every sort of simony, with its tightening of religious and clerical discipline, with its concern for family and social morality, including its stress on the Peace of God, with its measures against simony and heresy, this Council has been called the "Epilogue of the Gregorian Age."[14]

---

[12] B. Jacqueline, "Bernard et le schisme d'Anaclet II," *Bernard de Clairvaux* (Commission d'Histoire de l'Ordre de Cîteaux, 3) (Paris 1953), 349–54, 375–77. However, this author apparently does not know the German research, and there are numerous inexact statements. Reference should be made to the account of Saint Bernard in Chapter 2.

[13] *Cf. Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, ed. J. Alberigo *et al.* (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1962), 163 (Lateran I) and 171 (Lateran II); R. Foreville, *Latran I, II, III, et Latran IV* (Paris 1965), 10–12.

[14] Thus A. Fliche in *Fliche-Martin,* IX, 1 (Paris 1944), 178.

CHAPTER 2

The Reform Orders of the Twelfth Century and Bernard of Clairvaux

The origins of the new orders, during the period of the Gregorian reform, were discussed in the preceding volume. Though in some respects the papacy contributed to their founding, fundamentally involved was a religious movement coming from below, the heroic striving of monks, canons, and laymen to realize the spirit of the Gospel and of the primitive Church in the most austere poverty, in solitude, or as wandering preachers. The fact that not a few new foundations were again satisfied with the mitigated manner of life of the older Benedictinism did not necessarily imply decadence, for the Benedictines were still at a respectable level. Some of their monasteries even displayed an openness to the new ideas, as did even Cluny, whose congregation achieved its widest extent under the important Abbot Peter the Venerable (1122–56).[1] Just the same, the future belonged to those new communities of monks and canons, who preserved more purely the ideal of the *vita evangelica* and slowly established it institutionally. Their amazingly rapid diffusion throughout the entire West, the deeply appealing seriousness of their lives, and to an extent their pastoral and missionary efforts enabled these orders to rank with the most important historical factors of this period.[2] They profoundly reshaped Christian piety, including that of the people, and in their copious literature are to be heard many *motifs* that remained vital long after this age. They were the bridges leading from the Gregorian reform to the epoch of the mendicant orders.

---

[1] G. Constable and J. Kritzek, "Petrus Venerabilis (1156–1956). Studies and Texts Commemorating the Eighth Centenary of his Death," *Studia Anselmiana*, 40 (Rome 1956). On the conflict between Cluny and Cîteaux in regard to the authentic understanding of monastic perfection, *cf.* A. Wilmart, "Une riposte de l'ancien monachisme au manifeste de S. Bernard," *RBén*, 46 (1934), 296–344, where the best known texts are analyzed; however, still other witnesses are known. See M. A. Dimier, "Un témoin tardif peu connu du conflit entre cisterciens et clunisiens," Constable and Kritzek, *op. cit.*, 81–94; "Dialogus inter Cluniacensem monachum et Cisterciensem de diversis utriusque ordinis observantiis," ed. Martène, *Thesaurus novorum anecdotorum*, V, 1569–1654, and W. Williams, "A Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian," *JThS*, 31 (1930), 164–75, and A. Wilmart, *op. cit.*, 302 f.

[2] On the development of both the Benedictine and the reform orders in the twelfth century, *cf.* B. Bligny, *L'Église et les Ordres Religieux dans le royaume de Bourgogne aux XI^e^ et XII^e^ siècles* (Paris 1960); the investigation is restricted to Burgundy, but it basically concerns the whole Church, especially since Burgundy was the heart of the West in regard to monasticism.

Hence, the development to be related here was reflected a great part of the course taken by the reform in the post-Gregorian period.

The Cistercians

No other community can give so clear an idea of the reform energies operating within the sphere of monasticism as the Cistercian Order. The beginnings and the first and decisive decades are, unfortunately, far more obscure than scholarship was aware until recently.[3] To be regarded as established are: the founding of Cîteaux by Robert of Molesme in 1098; Robert's return to his former monastery; the government of Cîteaux by Abbot Alberic and, after his death, probably in 1109, by Stephen Harding (1109–34). Born at Sherborne in England, Stephen had studied at Paris, was acquainted with Rome, and had become a monk at Molesme under Robert. The ideas of the founding generation are adequately known to us: concerned with strict poverty and a life in an isolated and poor locality. The monks of Cîteaux sought nothing different from what many other communities originating at that time were looking for. They were able to found La Ferté, the first daughter house, in 1113, not far from Cluny. Then, in quick succession, came Pontigny in 1114 and Clairvaux and Morimond in 1115. With La Ferté they constituted the group of so-called "primary abbeys," from which, in extensive ramifications, all Cistercian monasteries derived their origin. In 1119 the order counted ten houses, in 1123 there were twenty, and at the death of Stephen Harding in 1134 — he had resigned his abbacy in 1130 — the number was eighty.

This rapid growth presented Stephen Harding and the other Cistercian abbots with the question of how unity was to be preserved in so many foundations. From the bull of confirmation issued in 1119 by Calixtus II it appears that a first outline of an organization had been laid before the Pope, but we do not know its details. Undoubtedly it involved the matrix of the so-called *Carta Caritatis* and not, as was previously held, that document itself. Its original form must now be regarded as lost, and the most recent efforts to construct it from available texts have not succeeded. So long as a more certain pinpointing in time of the three extant texts, the *Carta Caritatis Prior*, its *summa*, and a *Carta Caritatis Posterior*, is not forthcoming, one must be satisfied with the following results: Until the bull of Alexander III of 5 August 1165, the *Carta Caritatis* had undergone changes, the stages of which can be pretty well established from the bulls of Eugene III in 1152 and 1153 but not, at least for the present, for the preceding period. Even after Alexander III the constitutional development did not cease. There were no further changes in the text of the *Carta* but they were expressed in the decrees of the general chapters, which, compiled at rather long intervals, were published in the *Libellus definitionum* (1202–12) and the *Institutiones capituli generalis* (*ca.* 1256, supplemented in 1298).

---

[3] On the beginnings of the Cistercian Order now see P. Zakar in *AnOCist*, 10 (1964), 103–38; the development of the constitution, the *Carta Caritatis*, is best presented by J. B. Van Damme, "Formation de la constitution cistercienne. Esquisse historique," *Stud Mon*, 4 (1962), 111–37, and *AnOCist*, 21 (1965), 128–37.

The Cistercians sought to observe the Rule of Saint Benedict in its original purity. To avoid the charge of novelty they emphasized this return to the old, to the sources. But in fact the new observance was not in all respects an adhering to the letter of the Rule. *Oblati* were no longer accepted, the institute of *conversi,* or lay brothers, was elaborated, and the limiting of the abbatial authority by the constitution was new.

New also was the annual general chapter, attendance at which was obligatory on all abbots. Presided over by the Abbot of Cîteaux, it possessed and exercised full power over the order — legislative, executive, and judicial — but left to the abbeys complete financial and administrative autonomy. Annual visitation provided supervision, even in regard to the instructions of the general chapter. Within each filiation group it was taken care of by the mother abbey. The visitation of Cîteaux pertained to the four "primary abbeys."

In contradistinction to the predominantly personal organization of the Order of Cluny, with its dependence of priors and, to a degree, of abbots on the Abbot of Cluny, the Cistercians succeeded in establishing their order on an objectively co-operative basis. Individual abbeys, autonomous in themselves, associated according to filiation groups, and corporately united in the general chapter attended by all abbots — these constitutional principles gave rise to an order in which both the rights of the individual monastery and the interests of the entire order were assured. Hence it should cause no surprise that other reform orders of the period, such as the Premonstratensians and the Carthusians, took the *Carta Caritatis* as model.

While, also contrary to the Cluniac and older Benedictine ideal, there was desired until the mid-century a subordination to local episcopal jurisdiction, there then appeared papal exemption, so that, under the Pope, the general chapter became the highest court of appeal in the order.[4] The abbeys promised one another mutual economic help, the preservation of a uniform discipline, and the cultivation of a simplified liturgy, whose externals — church buildings, vestments, vessels, chant — were to be kept as unpretentious as possible.

---

[4] Already foreshadowed in the *Privilegium Romanum* of Paschal II (1100), clearer in the confirmation of the *Carta Caritatis* by Calixtus II (1119), the exemption was made absolute by the bull of Lucius III of 21 November 1184; *cf.* K. Spahr, *Die Anfänge von Cîteaux* (Mainz 1953).

Since the order wanted to keep itself free from the feudal ties prevailing in the Cluniac system, it declined benefices and reintroduced manual labour. The white habit, the strict seclusion from the world by means of settlement in deserted areas, the austerity of the life in food, dwelling, and clothing, and the simplicity of the liturgy gave the order a great reputation as something new in the monastic world. The observance of the Benedictine rule enabled it to remain interiorly a part of this world.

The dynamism of Cistercian expansion was determined up to the mid-century by the personality of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. When he died in 1153, there were already 350 abbeys, and he alone had founded sixty-six of them. In quick succession the order was established in Italy from 1120, in Germany from 1123, in England from 1128, and in Spain from 1132. Then followed Belgium (1132), Switzerland (1133), Savoy (1134), Scotland (1136), Portugal (1138), Hungary (1142), Ireland (1142), and Poland (1143.) The order appeared in Sweden in 1143, in Denmark in 1144, in Norway in 1146. In some abbeys the number of members reached an astounding figure: at Clairvaux 700, at Rievaulx 650, at Les Dunes in Flanders 530, at Walkenried 260. But in these and other monasteries the majority of members were lay brothers.

The origin of the institute of lay brothers was treated in the preceding volume. Cîteaux made particular use of this new institution, which had long before been introduced into other communities. As elsewhere, the Cistercian lay brothers made the monastic renunciations, without thereby becoming monks in the strict sense; they had neither an active nor a passive vote in their community. They shared in the choral liturgy only on Sundays and holy days. With few exceptions they came from the ordinary folk. Their dedication to work gave the order a high economic prosperity in the twelfth century and was especially irreplaceable in the foundations penetrating the eastern frontier area with the clearings that had to be created there. The *conversi* lived in the abbey and on the granges more or less remotely surrounding it.[5] Tensions with the real monastic community were not lacking and from the middle of the century there were revolts, boycotts, and even murderous attacks on abbots and superiors. The disciplinary problem could scarcely be controlled because of the partly widely scattered groups and the large numbers — Pontigny, for example, had 100 monks and more than 300 *conversi.*

---

[5] Exemplary for the elaboration of the granges is now the work by R. A. Donkin, "The Cistercian Grange in England in the 12th and 13th Centuries, with Special Reference to Yorkshire," *StudMon,* 6 (1964), 95–144.

The new order contributed powerfully to the development of the spiritual life in the Church.[6] Important French Cistercians, in addition to Saint Bernard, were William of Saint-Thierry (d. 1148), Guerric of Igny (d. 1157), and Isaac of Stella (d. 1169), and in the thirteenth century Adam of Perseigne (d. 1221) and Hélinand of Froidmont (d. 1235). In England the outstanding name is that of Aelred of Rievaulx (d. 1167); in Germany, that of the historian, Otto of Freising (d. 1158). The literary history of the twelfth century extols not only the order's historiographers but also its poets, Hélinand of Froidmont and Theobald of Marly. Troubadours made their appearance: Bernard of Ventadour, Bertrand of Born, Fulco of Marseilles; here belong also Alain de Lille and Serlo of Wilton.

The Popes utilized the services of the order in the most varied ways, Bernard's career becoming the model here too. The wide and very thickly woven network of houses, with their regular intercommunications, especially in their general chapters, constituted an excellent medium of active and passive communication. The order was very soon represented in the College of Cardinals, and Pope Eugene III was a Cistercian. The order furnished many bishops, and outstanding members were entrusted with legatine functions, the most important of which was the combat with heresy in the Midi in the second half of the century. The preaching of the crusade was often committed to the order; here too Bernard's famed preaching of the Second Crusade supplied the inspiration. In the course of the Curia's centralization of the ecclesiastical juridical system, many Cistercian abbots were assigned tasks as judges delegate. An eventual result of this recourse to the order by the Curia was a wealth of privileges, despite Bernard's warning against this very thing. The growth of the order's exemption in the course of the later twelfth century can be read in the history of the bestowal of these privileges.

And so criticism was not absent; it came not only from the Cistercians' own ranks but also from without.[7] Well known is the polemic between Cluny and Cîteaux, represented respectively by Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux. Toward the close of the twelfth century Walter Map, archdeacon of Oxford, and Giraldus Cambrensis spoke out in biting satire against the order that was by then, of course, no longer supported by the enthusiasm of its beginnings.

---

[6] Cîteaux's alleged aversion to study and literary activity was investigated by A. Dimier, "Les premiers Cisterciens étaient-ils ennemis des études?" *StudMon,* 4 (1962), 69–91. There was no such aversion. Corresponding instructions of the general chapters have also been misunderstood.

[7] *Cf.* C. H. Talbot, "The English Cistercians and the Universities," *StudMon,* 4 (1962), 197–220, who stresses the less fortunate consequences for religious life in the monastery in the case of monks who studied at the universities.

The Canons Regular

Only after the conclusion of the Investiture Controversy could the institute of canons regular, whose beginnings were described in the preceding volume, develop freely. From the pontificate of Urban II it was already clear that it would have a great future. For the greater the number of reform-minded bishops became in the course of the Gregorian reform, the more urgent became the task of introducing the reform among clergy and people. The bishops themselves had to try to solve the problem in their dioceses, but of course they needed numerous helpers. Because of their cloister-centred lives, the Benedictines and other monastic communities were not too frequently considered for this work, and, besides, the relations between the episcopate and at least the older type of Benedictines were compromised by the monks' efforts to obtain exemption. The tensions were exposed both in the conflicts over exemption and the attempt to exclude monks from all pastoral activity. And so it was understandable that the bishops should turn to the canons regular. Here at first there were no difficulties about exemption. The reform of the higher clergy was assured for the future by the canons regular, and these could directly take part in the care of souls.

The importance of the canons regular movement was early grasped by the papacy and effectively fostered, above all from the time of Urban II. The climax of this favour came while Aimeric, who was one of them, was chancellor. Privileges were bestowed in an increasing amount. The number of votes of canons regular in the College of Cardinals grew, and, except for Celestine II and Eugene III, all the Popes from Honorius II to Hadrian IV were canons regular. They were thereby clearly distinguished from the five Benedictine Popes of the Gregorian reform, from Gregory VII to Gelasius II, because, significantly, Anacletus II, whose elevation in 1130 produced a schism, had been a monk of Cluny and accordingly could be regarded as the exponent of the old and now outdated tradition.

Together with the Popes, many bishops now also favoured the canons regular. In the new institute special prominence was achieved by the foundation made by Saint Norbert of Xanten, which was able to develop into a real order.

The Premonstratensians

Its origin, sketched in the preceding volume, was at first greatly influenced by the founder, especially after Norbert had become Archbishop of Magdeburg in 1126. In the same year he obtained from Honorius II the solemn confirmation of his order. He turned over the government of Prémontré to his disciple, Hugh of Fosses, in 1128. Norbert's friendship with Bernard of Clairvaux may explain the extensive dependence on the Cistercian *Carta Caritatis* that is to be noted in the oldest known statutes of the order, dating from about 1140. The result was that under Hugh of Fosses the desire to engage in the care of souls, otherwise a special characteristic of canons regular, was restricted and the *vita contemplativa* was more strongly emphasized. The organization knew the general chapter and a uniform direction, as in the case of Cîteaux, but the system of filiation was not adopted. Instead the order was divided into "circaries," or provinces, each headed by a *circator,* later called vicar general. Since Norbert demanded a subordination to the local ordinary in the case of Magdeburg — the circaries corresponded to the ecclesiastical provinces —, a similar relation was also imposed on many new foundations, and the Premonstratensians obtained exemption rather late, in 1409. The Abbot of Prémontré ranked as the Abbot General, and the three Abbots of Saint-Martin de Laon, Floreffe, and Cuissy were assigned to him as advisers. The original title of provost for the superior of a monastery was retained only in Saxony and Hungary. The cathedral chapters of Brandenburg, Riga, Havelberg, Ratzeburg, Börglum, and Leitomischl were made up of Premonstratensians. In addition to the general chapters at Prémontré there gradually appeared provincial chapters also. The right of visitation pertained to the Abbot General and also to the vicars general of the provinces.

In accord with Norbert's wish, all Premonstratensian foundations were originally double monasteries, in which the nuns were to occupy the position of *conversae;* and lay brothers were also envisaged. But the system of double monasteries was abolished as early as 1140. However, the now autonomous Premonstratensian nuns settled close to a community of canons, who retained their spiritual direction. In Germany the number of houses of nuns soon surpassed that of the abbeys.

The order experienced its strongest expansion in Germany, Bohemia, Belgium, and France; it was almost as widespread in England and Spain, but in other countries it was much less. Among the most important German monasteries were Steinfeld, Wadgassen, Knechtsteden, Arnstein, Roggenburg, Schussenried, Obermarchtal, Ursberg, Rot, and Weissenau; the last six of these later became royal abbeys.

Like the Cistercians, the canons regular also displayed a vigorous and special spirituality. Leadership here belonged to the school of Saint-Victor de Paris in France and to the Brothers of Reichersberg in Germany. Augustine, John the Evangelist, Paul, and Gregory the Great were held in particular veneration. Devotion to the Passion and to the Sacred Heart and a mysticism of the Cross were congenial to them; these were to some extent related to the attitude of Saint Bernard, but they are also to be viewed in the light of the crusade piety proper to the time. Especially noteworthy representatives of ascetical and mystical literature from the ranks of the canons, in addition to Norbert of Xanten and the theologians of Saint-Victor, were Luke of Mont-Cornillon at Liège and Philip of Harvengt, Abbot of Bonne-Espérance in Hainaut.

Emphasis upon the parochial care of souls especially by the Premonstratensians, who were themselves often nobles, meant a rise in the social level of the ministry in the lesser churches and at the same time the opening up of an important reservoir of recruits. Since the Premonstratensians, like the Cistercians, participated in the work of colonization and evangelization of the eastern territories, the parochial care of souls could only have contributed to the permanent effects of their exertions.

Bernard of Clairvaux

The most powerful ecclesiastical personality during the decades between 1120 and 1150 came from the Cistercian reform. With Norbert of Xanten and the Chancellor Aimeric he was one of the leaders of the late Gregorian reform and so stamped his features on his age that it has often been called the Age of Saint Bernard.

Bernard came from Dijon, almost on the frontier between the Imperial County of Burgundy and the French Duchy of Burgundy. Through his father, Tescelin Sorrel, and his mother, Aleth de Montbard, he belonged to widely ramified Burgundian knightly families.

He grew up with five brothers and one sister. He went to school with the canons of Notre-Dame de Saint-Vorles and devoted himself to literary and theological studies. His definite choice of a vocation was only made, after much hesitation, in 1111–12. It was probably determined by the strict asceticism of newly founded Cîteaux. He entered there, not by himself, but with thirty relatives and friends, whom he contrived to gain for the same ideal. For Cîteaux and its now rapidly starting expansion their entry was a turning point.

In April 1112 Bernard began his novitiate under Stephen Harding. He completed it in 1113 when Cîteaux founded its first daughter abbey, La Ferté. Its founder was a cousin of Bernard's, Josbert the Red de Châtillon. Bernard's friend, Hugh of Mâcon, became Abbot of the second daughter abbey, Pontigny, founded in 1114. Finally, in 1115 Bernard himself was entrusted with the founding of Clairvaux. Four of his brothers, his uncle Gaudri de Montbard, and his cousin Godfrey de la Roche-Vanneau followed him there.

Clairvaux was founded on the property of Bernard's uncle, the Viscount of Dijon, and lay in the diocese of Langres, 116 kilometres northwest of Cîteaux. Since Joceran, Bishop of Langres, was absent, Bernard received the abbatial blessing from William of Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, who became the most effectual patron of the young monastery.

Although Bernard was often ill and bedridden, we know of much travelling. Up to 1125 he went twice to Langres and visited Dijon, Auxerre, Foigny, Châlons, Reims, Igny, and Châteaulandon. Clairvaux was able to think of making foundations as early as 1118. In place of the Abbot, who was so often away, the community was governed by the prior, Bernard's cousin, Godfrey de La Roche-Vanneau. In 1138 he was elected Bishop of Langres.[8] Bernard was able to end the opposition to this. Hence for Clairvaux was assured the favour of the local Ordinary, while the good will of the territorial lord, Theobald of Champagne, was secured through Bernard's mediation between Theobald, the Bishops of Langres, and the Dukes of Burgundy. Clairvaux grew rapidly because of permanent foundations made by Bernard's kin and the great nobles friendly to him.

The spiritual authority of its Abbot likewise grew amazingly fast and spread far, first of all in the order itself, where he was one of the signers of Cîteaux's first organizational charter, the *Carta Caritatis*. His influence was unchallenged in the group of filiations of Clairvaux and also in the related groups proceeding from La Ferté and Morimond.

He was closely bound with the founder of Prémontré until the latter's death as Archbishop of Magdeburg and likewise with Peter the Venerable of Cluny. But the second of these friendships had to weather serious problems, for Bernard criticized the manner of life of the great Burgundian abbey and its congregation. It was to the credit of the Abbot of Cluny that he not only did not break off relations with Bernard but even allowed Bernard to influence him in reforming his congregation. Something similar occurred in the circles of canonical reform, where Bernard advocated transformation from chapters of secular canons to those of canons regular. This often came about through favouring elections which resulted in the choice of reform prelates, as at Toussaint-en-l'Isle at Châlons.

How powerful the authority of the Abbot of Clairvaux had become by 1130 appeared when he decided for Innocent II at the Synod of Étampes. Through his active role in liquidating the Schism of 1130–38 in France and Italy, through his constantly growing correspondence with the leading personalities of Western Christendom, through his ever more frequently requested and obtained intervention in ecclesiastical crises, Bernard gradually became "le personnage le plus en vue de l'Europe," as he has been termed,[9] the adviser of the great in Church and state. His friends and relatives soon occupied the most influential positions in the Church. Hugh of Mâcon, Abbot of Pontigny, became Bishop of Auxerre. For his cousin, Godfrey of La Roche-Vanneau, prior of Clairvaux, Bernard obtained the see of Langres in a successful struggle against Peter of Cluny. Hugh, Abbot of Tre Fontane, Clairvaux's first daughter house, became Cardinal Bishop of Ostia in 1150. Bernard of Pisa, Abbot of Sant'Anastasio at Rome, was eventually elected Pope as Eugene III. The brother of the French King, a monk of Clairvaux, became Bishop of Beauvais in 1149.

---

[8] On the contested episcopal election at Langres, see now G. Constable, "The Disputed Election at Langres in 1138," *Tr*, 13 (1957), 119–52.

[9] *Fliche-Martin*, IX, 1 (1944), 13–41 (Saint Bernard).

Bernard was closely connected with the Roman Curia because of his friendship with the Chancellor Aimeric.[10] His letters to Honorius II, Innocent II, and Eugene III show the Abbot's intimate relations with the reform movement of canons regular that was favoured under these Popes, especially by Aimeric. Bernard was always the friend and adviser of the congregations of Saint-Ruf d'Avignon, Saint-Victor de Paris, and Arrouaise in Artois. This was true also of the founder of Saint-Victor, William of Champeaux, and of the great theologians at Paris, Hugh and Richard. The order established by Saint Gilbert of Sempringham in England was permanently influenced in its organization by Cîteaux. To the Curia such a man, who had gained so powerful a prestige, not only in his own order, but in the Cluniac, the Premonstratensian, and the Carthusian orders, among the canons regular, and even in the world of hermits,[11] must have seemed almost irreplaceable. It is true that friction could not always be avoided between him and Roman prelates, and, in view of Bernard's temperament, this is not to be wondered at, but identity of spiritual interests constantly brought about peace again.

The preparations for the Second Crusade furnished further proof of this. Bernard had long been familiar with the world of the crusade. In 1128, at the Council of Troyes, he had collaborated on the constitution of the Knights Templars, whose first grand master was related to him, and in *De laude novae militiae* he had sketched a spiritual program for the order. It had been suggested to him that Cistercian abbeys should be established in the Holy Land but he had declined, suggesting instead Prémontré, which he regarded as better suited for this. He corresponded with Queen Mélisende of Jerusalem. When, after the fall of Edessa in 1144, King Louis VII of France decided to provide the requested armed assistance and asked Pope Eugene III to send crusade preachers, Bernard received the commission to preach the cross in France. He did so for the first time at Vézelay on 31 March 1146. But his enthusiasm led him beyond the French frontiers to Flanders and to the Rhine as far as Switzerland. At Speyer during the Christmas festivities he managed, but only after rather lengthy discussions, to gain the German King Conrad III for the crusade, though this was probably contrary to the intentions of the Pope. It was not until 6 February 1147 that Bernard returned to Clairvaux, travelling *via* Cologne, the Netherlands, and Flanders, preaching and working miracles. But as early as 13 March he took part in a Diet at Frankfurt am Main, where he was induced to approve the Wend Crusade, to declare that it deserved to be preached, privileged, and carried out, as the equal of the crusade to the East. It was only with hesitation that Eugene III confirmed the Frankfurt decisions. The extraordinary preaching journey of the saint of Clairvaux provided both contemporaries and later observers with a sharply outlined picture of the great Abbot. But the decisive depths of his spiritual being were revealed even more unambiguously in his literary work.

---

[10] F. J. Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130* (Cologne and Graz 1961), gives a cautious estimate of Bernard's relationship with the Chancellor Aimeric and even plays down his influence on the recognition of Innocent II in comparison with that of the canons regular.

[11] Bernard's relations with the various religious institutes is presented in special detail in *Saint Bernard* (Paris 1953), 193–338.

"The last of the Fathers," as Bernard has been called, left a bulky *corpus* of letters, sermons, and treatises, masterpieces of spiritual literature. Most of the treatises deal with questions of monastic spirituality, such as the *Degrees of Humility and Pride* (1124), the defense of the Cistercian ideal of life in comparison with that of Cluny (1125), several works on the love of God (1128–36), the explanation of *Precept and Dispensation* (before 1144), the *Praise of the New Knighthood* (before 1130), and the treatise on *Grace and Free Will* (before 1128). In 1135 Bernard began his chief work, the *Sermones super Canticum Canticorum,* of which he managed to finish eighty-six by the time of his death. The work of his old age, *De consideratione* in five books, was written for Pope Eugene III. Finally, he also composed the biography of his friend Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh in Ireland.

Despite the variety of literary form Bernard was basically concerned with only one thing: like the Fathers, he sought to present to his environment the teachings of Scripture, in whose world of ideas he himself lived and whose language he managed to appropriate because of an identification of spirit.[12] Students such as A. Dimier and J. Leclercq have extolled him as the clearest mirror of the spiritual life of his age. So long as he was alive and, even more, after his death there proceeded from him a far-reaching and enduring influence on the life of the entire Church.

John of Salisbury referred to Bernard without irony as the "sanctissimus abbas."[13] As a saint, Bernard of Clairvaux was a moving force of his age. From his love of God he obtained the ceaseless impulses that determined his activity as well as his contemplation. He always regarded his business as God's business. The Cistercian way of life and the faithfully observed Benedictine rule were the framework for the *schola caritatis* of strict asceticism, where the spiritual father and Abbot knew how to operate better by example than by word. He became the "holy Abbot," though he was not lacking in human frailties, which he confessed and sought to eradicate. Experiences with himself and with his monks and friends throughout the Church taught him to understand and use ever better the Benedictine *discretio*. This experience was, demonstrably, a mystical experience of the nearness of God, from which there poured out upon him the wisdom of the final knowledge of God. Its most important presupposition, he taught, was humility, which had to inform all spiritual exertions. From it begins the ascent to God and it conditions all further stages, because it is basically the attitude of Christ: "habes commendatam a Deo humilitatem in Christo." This ascent is a constant growing in love, an incessant search for union with the triune God, which Bernard has described, as though in his last will, in the final sermons on the Canticle, as a union of the spirit with the Word who is God.

---

[12] On Bernard's language and style, see C. Mohrmann, "Observations sur la langue et le style de Saint Bernard," *Sancti Bernardi Opera,* ed. J. Leclercq *et al.,* II (Rome 1958), ix-xxxiii.

CHAPTER 3

The Papacy and the Western Kings in the Age of Saint Bernard

The peace brought to the Empire by the Concordat of Worms in 1122 had been preceded in the other countries of Christendom by similar agreements between the Church and the secular authority — in England in 1106–07 and in France at the same time but without any formal treaty.[1] Following the intensive disputation of the Investiture Controversy views were to some extent theoretically clarified and even in agreement as to the function of kings and other secular powers within the Church, regarded as the Church of clerics and monks, of bishops and abbots, and of the Roman Pontiff. Protection and in particular cases even extensive defense with means suited to the secular power were meant: preservation of the order which was a legal order embracing the whole of Christendom in all its members and classes by means of a readily offered, or at least not refused, support of the ecclesiastical judgment through sanctions extending beyond purely spiritual measures and intervening in the civil sphere. Saint Bernard himself, in his letters to the Emperor Lothar and King Conrad III, discovered a formula for this, to be understood entirely in a Gregorian sense.[2]

---

[13] *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. Chibnall (London 1956), 25; *ibid.*, further judgments on Bernard: "abbatem, cuius tunc summa erat auctoritas, cuius consilio tam sacerdotium quam regnum pre ceteris agebatur" (16) and "erat religiosissimus et dissertissimus" (17).

[1] Volume III, Chapter 45. For England, see N. F. Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England* (Princeton 1958); for France, A. Becker, *Studium zum Investiturproblem in Frankreich* (Saarbrücken 1955); T. Schieffer, "Investiturstreit," *LThK*, V (2nd ed. 1960), 742–46. *Cf.* Volume III, Chapter 50, and the bibliography given there.

But in reality, even if one were to follow a stricter interpretation of Bernard's concept as Walter Ullmann sketches it,[3] bishops and Popes in their relations with Emperors, kings, and princes had to submit to the law of the politically possible. In the age of the unambiguous power of the reform spirit, which, represented by the orders of Cîteaux and Prémontré and the other congregations of canons regular, carried the day in the entire Church, and hence in the entire political field, in the crisis of the Schism of 1130—38, this law lay often in the hands of the clergy. It can be best discovered in the interventions, not always successful, it is true, but in many cases very important, of Bernard of Clairvaux[4] in conflicts, such as disputed episcopal elections, negotiations for settlements between princes and kings, the implementation of papal judgments which impinged upon the political sphere, and so forth. It is from this viewpoint that the relations now to be discussed must be examined.

The Empire

The age of Saint Bernard corresponds in German history to the reigns of the Emperor Lothar (1125–37) and King Conrad III (1138–52). Both reigns were under the influence of the prevailing reform spirit and the aegis of peace with the papacy. By his decision for Innocent II Lothar had made it clear that he was in agreement with this new tendency in the Church. In his two journeys to Italy, in 1133 and 1136–37, he complied with the desires of the Holy See, even if, especially in 1137, friction was not absent.[5] Episcopal elections in Germany were free, for example, those at Eichstätt in 1125 and Magdeburg in 1126. Lothar renounced any royal interference in ecclesiastical disputes, even though, because of the constitution of the Empire, they touched upon the crown's interests, such as those at Trier, Verdun, and Halberstadt.[6] At Würzburg he left the initiative to Archbishop Adalbert of Mainz. Gebhard of Henneberg, supported by the Emperor Henry V, and Rugger, supported by Adalbert, contended for the see, but Rugger died in 1125. After lengthy negotiations the provost Embrich of Leiningen was consecrated Bishop on Christmas 1127. An appeal by Gebhard to Lothar was ineffectual. Only in the dispute over the see of Strasbourg did Lothar impose his will, when at the end of 1129 he recognized Bruno, whom Henry V had earlier had consecrated to replace the deposed Bishop Conrad and whose position had become precarious with the death of that Emperor.[7]

---

[2] *Ep.* 139 and 140 (to Lothar), 183 and 244 (to Conrad), *PL*, 182.

[3] *The Growth of Papal Government* (London, 2nd ed. 1955), 426–37.

[4] *Bernard de Clairvaux* (Commission d'Histoire de l'Ordre de Cîteaux, 3) (Paris 1953), Table analytique II: Bernard et l'épiscopat, 627–47; Table analytique III: Bernard, les princes et la société féodale, 649–57; B. Jacqueline, *Papauté et Épiscopat selon Saint Bernard de Clairvaux* (Paris 1963).

[5] *Gebhardt-Grundmann*, I, 292; *Seppelt*, IV, 182.

At this period the activity of the papal legates[8] was devoted no longer preferably to political but rather to expressly ecclesiastical questions and revealed an intimate co-operation of the German episcopate with the Curia. They convoked and directed provincial synods, adjusted disputes among bishops, confirmed elections and consecrated bishops, visited dioceses and regulated questions of Church discipline, and transmitted papal privileges. Year after year there came at least one legate, and sometimes three or more acted at the same time. The powerful Rhenish archbishops were reprimanded, many disputes pertaining to the jurisdiction of the metropolitan were immediately sent to the Holy See, the number of exemptions increased, many bishops went to Rome to be consecrated. The election of Conrad III at Koblenz on 7 March 1138 was determined by Archbishop Adalbero of Trier. The new King also adhered to the prescriptions of the Concordat of Worms, but, unlike Lothar, he proved to be no help to the Holy See in Rome nor against the Normans of the Sicilian Kingdom.[9]

France

A map of twelfth-century France shows the royal *demesne,* where alone the King really ruled, as a strikingly small enclave in comparison with the entire Kingdom, hemmed in by the lands of the powerful Counts of Blois-Champagne. Flanders, Normandy, Brittany, Anjou, Poitou, Aquitaine (or

---

[6] *Hauck*, IV (5th ed.), 126–29.

[7] *Ibid.*, 133 f.

[8] W. Janssen, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Schisma Anaklets II. bis zum Tode Cölestins III. (1130–98)* (Cologne and Graz 1961), 1–54; J. Bachmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Skandinavien* (Berlin 1913), 21–116.

[9] H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen III. (1145–53) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner politischen Tätigkeit* (Jena 1936); see the critical remarks by E. Jordan in *RHE,* 33 (1937), 367–72.

Guienne), Gascony, Toulouse, Auvergne, and Ducal Burgundy — the great vassals of the crown — evaded the royal influence. Upper and Lower Lorraine, the County of Burgundy, and the Kingdom of Arles (Provence) pertained to the Empire. Hence, ecclesiastical life depended for its development upon a co-operation with many princes, among whom the King of France appeared as little more than one among many, and certainly not the most powerful one. This becomes clear in the correspondence of Bernard of Clairvaux with the princes of his day.

In 1137 Louis VI was succeeded by his son, Louis VII (1137–80). No Western prince was so much under the influence of the Church and the papacy as was this King, who, however, as husband of Eleanor of Aquitaine until 1152, sought at least for a time to extend the royal authority. Goaded by the Queen, he began to pursue a personal policy in various episcopal elections that was in opposition to the Roman views.[10] But the alliance of Count Theobald IV of Champagne, arranged by Bernard of Clairvaux, with the episcopate and the Curia forced him to yield. This appears in the matrimonial case of Raoul of Vermandois, who, having married a niece of Theobald's, had repudiated her for a sister of Queen Eleanor. A papal legate[11] declared the second marriage invalid, excommunicated Raoul and Petronilla, and laid an interdict on Vermandois. Urged by Eleanor, Louis declared war on Theobald, who took his niece's part. Thirteen hundred persons perished in the flames of Vitry in 1144. Bernard arranged peace between the King and Theobald; Louis abandoned Raoul and decided to submit to Rome. The Queen's influence thereafter yielded to that of the clergy, Bernard's authority was enhanced, and Suger, Abbot of Saint-Denis, acquired ascendancy. During Louis's absence on the Second Crusade Suger looked after the royal interests. (It would probably be an anachronism to speak of a real royal government.) Not the crown but the French Church, especially the new orders and the canons regular, must be regarded as the leading influences in public life.

Anarchy in England

Following the peaceful settlement of the Investiture Controversy in 1107, King Henry I contrived until his death in 1135 to control the English Church with the firm hand characteristic of his father, William the Conqueror. While one cannot speak of an English territorial Church, still both in England and in Normandy it was customary that the participation of the bishops in councils beyond the King's territory depended upon his express permission. Without the same express permission no legate of the Pope might enter his lands. By a benevolent attitude to the monasteries Henry had assured himself a favourable judgment in ecclesiastical historiography, but the Church was certainly not free as this was understood by the Gregorians. Still, it was to her advantage that the peace in a Kingdom which was vigorously governed and, in contrast to the other West European countries, was united could only be of service in the development of ecclesiastical life.

---

[10] *Lavisse,* III, 1, 1–11.

[11] The Cardinal Priest Ivo of San Lorenzo in Damaso; *cf.* W. Janssen, *Legaten,* 35–37.

The situation changed in the long period of the struggle over the throne between Henry's daughter Matilda, widow of the Emperor Henry V and wife of Count Geoffrey of Anjou, to whom her father had forced the barons to do homage by reason of heredity before his death, and Stephen of Blois, grandson of the Conqueror through his daughter Adele. A new era of political calm did not begin again until the accession of Henry II in 1154.

During the confusion of King Stephen's reign (1135–54) the Holy See guarded its authority by the conferring *permanenter* of legatine powers on the Archbishops of Canterbury, William of Corbeil (1123–36) and Theobald (1139–61), and for a time (1139–43) on Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester and brother of King Stephen. In 1138 Cardinal Alberic acted as legate with unlimited authority, even in regard to political questions. His assistant in the south was the Augustinian canon, Robert of Hereford; in the north, the Cistercian Abbot Richard of Fountains. Thanks to the struggle over the succession to the throne, the episcopate was at last able to secure its freedom and to make extensive use against the crown of that right which Henry I had conceded to it: to appeal to Rome in doubtful cases.

At the same time there occurred an influx of recruits for the Cistercians and the canons regular, which had been prepared under Henry I but only now became a mighty stream. William of Corbeil was a canon regular, as was Henry I's confessor, Aldulf, who in 1133 became Bishop of Carlisle. The first Cistercians had settled at Waverley in 1128–29 and at Rievaulx in 1131–32. Fifty-seven abbeys were founded by 1153, if the monasteries of the Congregation of Savigny are counted. In the contest for the archiepiscopal see of York[12] the Cistercians were able, following the Langres model of 1138, to impose their candidate, Henry Murdach, against William Fitzherbert, nephew of Henry of Blois, by means of the support provided by letters of Bernard of Clairvaux in both Rome and England. The Cistercian Pope Eugene III spoke the final word in 1146–47.[13]

---

[12] *Cf.* D. Knowles, "The Case of Saint William of York," *CambrHJ*, 5 (1936), 162–77, and also *The Historian and Character* (Cambridge 1963), 76–97; A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1964), 191; D. Nicholl, *Thurstan, Archbishop of York (1114–40)* (York 1964). For the analogous case of the election at Langres, in which, against the will of the King, the election, already confirmed, was quashed by Innocent II, and the prior of Clairvaux, Godfrey de la Roche-Vanneau, obtained the see in 1138, *cf.* E. Vacandard's study on Bernard of Clairvaux.

The Iberian Peninsula

In the Iberian peninsula the difficult course of the *Reconquista* was scarcely the most favourable climate for a calm development of ecclesiastical life. Aided by French knights and accompanied by the benevolent interest of the Holy See — at the First Lateran Council Calixus II empowered Archbishop Olegar of Tarragona as Papal Legate to proceed against the Muslims — Alfonso I of Aragón pushed farther to the south. After his death in 1134, Raymond Berengar IV of Catalonia managed to secure the succession in Aragón and continued the struggle against Islam, acquiring Tortosa in 1148. The papal legates of these decades seem not to have been particularly concerned with the struggles of the *Reconquista,* although Cardinal Guido of Santi Cosma e Damiano took part in the Council of Gerona in 1143. Through their ecclesiastical activity they enhanced the total European influence of the Curia in the course of the centralization of the Roman administration and jurisdiction. During the Schism of 1130 Archbishop Diego Gelmírez of Compostela was decisive in supporting Innocent II.[14] Of great importance was the withdrawal by Afonso Henriques, Count of Portugal, from his vassalage to Castile. Having assumed the royal title in 1139,[15] he in 1143 declared his land to be a fief of the papacy and took the oath of fealty in the presence of the Cardinal Legate Guido. With the aid of the crusaders of 1147 he almost managed to free the country from Muslim domination. The final confirmation of his royal title, which Lucius II did not use in his correspondence with Portugal, probably out of regard for King Alfonso VII of Castile, came only under Alexander III.

---

[13] After Eugene III, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Archbishop Henry Murdach were dead, William Fitzherbert was able again to occupy the see with the consent of Anastasius IV. He died on 8 June 1154, and in 1226 was canonized by Honorius III. Without regard for the agreement of 1107 between her father and Anselm of Canterbury, the Empress Matilda in 1141 invested William Cummin with the see of Durham by ring and staff; *cf.* A. L. Poole, *op. cit.,* 191.

[14] See Anselm G. Biggs, *Diego Gelmirez, First Archbishop of Compostela* (Washington 1949), 299–302.

[15] Afonso Henriques (1128–85), called The Conqueror. The acceptance of Portugal as a fief of the Holy See took place on 12 December 1143, through the agency of the legate, Guido de Vico. Lucius II ratified it in 1144 and at the same time recognized the royal title which Alexander III confirmed by the bull "Manifestis probatum" of 23 May 1179. *Cf.* Rui de Azevedo, *Documentos Medievais Portugueses,* I (Lisbon 1958), 114 ff.

The connection between Portugal and the papacy became ever more intimate, thanks to the work of the Cardinal Legate. Even the conclusion of peace between Castile and Portugal was due to papal initiative. Under Innocent II there was an understanding in regard to the organization of the Portuguese episcopate and the introduction of papal protection of monasteries. The canons regular constituted an important element for the development of Church life, and the most recent research proves that it was they who saw to the care of the pilgrimage route to Compostela.[16] The Congregation of Saint-Ruf d'Avignon also played a leading role.

The important and successful legatine journey of the Cardinal Bishop of Albano, Nicholas Breakspear, in 1152, to Scandinavia presupposed the cooperation of the crown and the Curia.[17]

Christian Expansion Eastward

Otto, Bishop of Bamberg, set out upon his so-called first missionary journey (1124–25) to Pomerania on behalf of Poland, under the protection of the Emperor Henry V and with papal assent, but a pagan reaction largely destroyed his success. In 1128 he was able to carry out a second missionary journey on behalf of and under the protection of King Lothar, who regarded Pomerania as belonging to the Empire. Norbert of Magdeburg had had him promise to respect the metropolitan rights of his see and insisted that the Bishop of Bamberg not undertake a mission among the pagan Liutizians, who belonged to Magdeburg's territory. The Bishop of Bamberg retained the direction of the missionary district, and Christianity was definitely assured in Pomerania, but the diocesan organization was only begun after Otto's death (1139) by Innocent II, who in 1140 established the see of Wollin. Poznań, which he had subordinated to Magdeburg, and Gniezno, which was to lose its metropolitan status, again became independent after Norbert's death in 1134. In 1136 Innocent confirmed Archbishop James as Metropolitan of Gniezno.

Association with German eastward colonization decisively favoured the missionary work. At the same time as Otto of Bamberg, Archbishop Adalbero of Hamburg-Bremen began a mission whose chief representative was Vizelin, canon and *scholasticus* of Bremen; his activity is reported in Helmold's *Chronicon Slavorum.* Beginning his work together with the canons Rudolf of Hildesheim and Ludolf of Verden and, out of the country parish which Adalbero had conveyed to him in 1125, he created the foundation at Neumünster as the base for further missionary work. The Emperor Lothar sent him help. But the Wend Crusade of 1147 halted the effort. In 1148–49 Cardinal Guido undertook a legatine journey to Poland and Moravia,[18] and in 1149 the sees of Oldenburg and Mecklenburg were once more occupied, by Vizelin and Emmenhard respectively. Vizelin received investiture from the hands of Duke Henry the Lion in 1150.[19] In 1154 this measure was approved by Frederick I, but restricted in the sense that the Duke was to give investiture, not as the territorial prince, but in the exercise of the royal power granted to him. In this question the Roman Curia seems not to have taken the part of Archbishop Hartwig of Bremen–Hamburg, who felt that as metropolitan of the Wend bishoprics he was authorized to act independently of any consent by Henry the Lion.

---

[16] F. J. Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130,* 217 f. (hitherto it was thought that the Cluniacs had provided this protection).

[17] W. Holtzmann, "Krone und Kirche in Norwegen im 12. Jahrhundert," *DA,* 2 (1938), 341–400; likewise the literature relevant to Cardinal Breakspear's legatine journey in the bibliography for this chapter.

The service of the *Imperium* and the *Regna* to the Church in these decades of the age of Saint Bernard are seen in the rapid and unequivocal decision for Innocent II, in the freedom conceded to the Church after the Investiture Controversy, especially in the matter of episcopal elections, abbatial elections, and the relations of the higher clergy to the Roman Curia, and in the legal protection which kings and princes accorded to cathedrals, abbeys, and collegiate churches.

In France the close relationship of the crown with the bishops in the great principalities was the only way by which the crown could exercise its influence beyond the limits of the *demesne.* Accordingly, it was cultivated there as a relationship of mutual service. It is well known how intimately Louis VI was bound to the Church, which assisted him and his son in the direction of the Kingdom, especially in the person of Stephen of Garlande and Suger of Saint-Denis. Bishoprics, chapters, and abbeys were richly endowed, and both Kings made a point of promoting the new orders of Cîteaux, Prémontré, Tiron, and Fontevrault. Saint-Victor de Paris received its substantial endowment from Louis VI. Both Kings afforded the Curia hospitality in the crises of the pontificates of Innocent II and Eugene III. Tensions, even with Bernard of Clairvaux, were not wanting, but the overall view showed the kingship in France in a productive cooperation with the Church of the Kingdom and with the Roman Church as the representative of Christendom. The same can be said of Germany and, with certain restrictions, of England and the Iberian peninsula. Italy, on the other hand, remained an agitated land of variety, with the constantly changing relations of the Curia to the Normans and its unstable connections with the North Italian communes and revolutionary Rome, which at the close of this period became a difficult problem in curial policy.

---

[18] R. Wenskus, "Zu einigen päpstlichen Legationen nach Böhmen und Mähren im 12. Jahrhundert," *ZKG,* 70 (1959), 141–46 (corrective of J. Bachmann, *op. cit.*); L. Spätling, "Kardinal Guido und seine Legation in Böhmen und Mähren (1142–46)," *MIÖG,* 66 (1958), 306–30.

[19] K. Jordan, *Die Bistumsgründungen Heinrichs des Löwen* (Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde, 3) (Stuttgart 1939, reprinted 1952), 81–91.

CHAPTER 4

Elaboration of the Curia and Criticism of Church and Papacy

The Gregorian reform had involved changes in the structure of the Roman ecclesiastical administration that were not completed before the middle of the twelfth century. But now the main lines of what people began to call the Curia were clearly discernible: court, household, and meeting all in one, as in the Germanic royal model, the pattern for the Roman development. Proper, that is, Roman traditional elements were added in the course of the renewal of the idea of Rome, reminiscences of the reorganization of Senate and courts by Diocletian. At the same time this Curia had a rapid expansion in size.[1]

On the occasion of the double election of 1130, there being no tribunal above the two claimants which could have decided between them authoritatively or by arbitration, it was left to the Church as a whole, to Christendom itself, to give the final judgment. The Church did so in recognizing Innocent II by a great majority. For the first time Christendom had acted as a unity, as the *corpus mysticum Christi,*[2] to use the term that persons began to apply to it in the early twelfth century. Christendom had, of course, been assisted in arriving at this knowledge of its unity by the crusade experience, which made Christians of many countries acquainted with one another; the sufferings endured in common for it and the common use of spiritual and physical energies attested one goal to be striven for by all in the same way. At the same time the crusade had impressively brought into prominence the head of the *corpus mysticum,* Pope Urban II, organizer and, in his legates, leader of the expedition. The Second Crusade confirmed the idea that Christendom still retained this experience as a lasting awareness, for people then turned to Eugene III, who, following the model of Urban II, summoned the crusade, appointed crusade preachers, named legates, and, a new element in the development, in the absence of the Kings intervened in political matters in France and Germany.[3] He there elevated, as it were, to the highest plane that protection — and thereby, according to the mediaeval view, that dominion — which the Church guaranteed at home to the absent crusader for his rights, property, and family. A logical effect of this was, of course, that the failure of this crusade was at first imputed to the Pope himself.

---

[1] See Volume III, Chapters 34, 35, and 49.

[2] For the Church as *corpus mysticum,* see E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton 1957), 194–206 ("Corpus Ecclesiae mysticum").

The new Curia served these constantly increasing functions of the papacy in the social, political, and ecclesiastical spheres; from them the Curia received the impulse to further development.[4] The change from the Roman urban clergy and administration to an instrument of government that could be used for all of Christendom was, it is true, already essentially complete at the beginning of this period. The College of Cardinals had taken shape, and the total numbers grew.

The charters now make known, in the signatures of the cardinals,[5] how the college as an advisory body assisted the Pope in the government of the Church. The chiefs of the earlier offices of *arcarius* (treasurer), *saccellarius* (paymaster), *nomenculator* (care of the poor), *protoscriniarius* (archives), *bibliothecarius* (chancery), and the two *primicerii* of the *schola notariorum* (correspondence) and the *schola defensorum* (legal matters) — the so-called *iudices de clero* or *iudices palatini* — retained only judicial functions as the College of Seven. In their places appeared the Pope's *camerlengo* (for finances) and chancellor (for correspondence). Just as at royal courts, so there were also at the Curia the *dapifer* or seneschal, the *pincerna* (cupbearer), the marshal.[6] And, like the northern courts, the Curia too was often itinerant. The broad outlines of a papal *capella* were also discernible,[7] apparently in imitation of the Frankish court chapel. While at first its members were still called *subdiaconi sanctae Romanae ecclesiae* and *subdiaconi domini nostri papae,* soon they were *subdiaconi et capellani* and in the thirteenth century merely *capellani.* A nucleus of this new structure was the *schola notariorum,* or *notarii palatini.* Under the chancellor, who united in himself the functions of the earlier *scriniarius* and of the *primicerius notariorum,* this college took charge of the Pope's correspondence. Other groups carried on the tradition of the earlier seven palatine subdeacons (liturgy), of the regionary subdeacons (social service), of the subdeacons of the *schola cantorum*. Now, as each occasion demanded, missions were also probably required of all of them in addition to their liturgical and administrative duties. They accompanied legates on their journeys. They constituted a college at the Lateran, where they lived and worked in common and were provided for by the papal kitchen. Each obtained a benefice to provide for his proper support, but, unlike the cardinals, they were not attached to titular churches. In so far as they received judicial functions as *advocati* or *auditores,* they could participate in the consistory, which in these decades replaced the earlier Roman Lenten synods and, as a regular meeting of the cardinals under the presidency of the Pope, considered and settled *causae maiores.* The overall direction of the college of subdeacons or chaplains was in the hands of the *camerlengo.* Hence the chancellor, who headed only one group of them, was subordinate to him. Probably for this reason in the thirteenth century a vice-chancellor conducted the real business in place of the chancellor, who was a cardinal. In the late twelfth century the College of Cardinals obtained its own *camerlengo* for its own financial administration, which was separating itself from that of the papacy.

---

[3] H. Gleber, *Eugen III.* (Jena 1936), who, however, exaggerates in interpreting these facts as "erstmalige Durchsetzung des päpstlichen Weltherrschaftsgedankens" (83).

[4] *Fliche-Martin,* 12, 2 (Paris 1964), 349–62).

[5] B. Katterbach and W. M. Peitz, "Die Unterschriften der Päpste und Kardinäle in den 'Bullae majores' vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert," *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle,* IV (Rome 1924), 177–274.

[6] *Fliche-Martin,* 12, 2, 359–61; E. Eichmann, *Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland,* II, 247–49.

[7] R. Elze, "Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan,* 36 (1950), 145–204.

This imposing structure grew steadily.[8] Especially from the pontificate of Innocent II the number of processes at the Roman Curia increased rapidly, over and above *causae maiores* in the strict sense. The enhanced prestige of the Pope in the whole of Christendom, the canon law that was gaining ground everywhere, the intensified drive for exemption on the part of monasteries and particular churches — all contributed to this. To the papal Curia belonged not only ecclesiastics but also, as earlier, lay persons, most of them from the great Roman families. The College of Cardinals and the *capella,* both of them together with the Pope constituting the Curia, displayed in the twelfth century, even in the lower echelons, a personnel that was remarkably international and no longer merely Roman.

Like the first reform Pope, Leo IX, the Popes of the twelfth century were often on the move, but not always voluntarily; frequently enough they were forced to this by Roman disturbances or by the general ecclesiastical situation. In this way the important contact between the Pope and Christendom was maintained and deepened, but likewise the operations of the Curia and its very personnel were exposed to the Church's critical faculty, which had been sharpened by the reform.

If for some time fault had been found with the situation at Rome[9] — during the Investiture Controversy this had, of course, been intensified by polemics — but the blame was quite often levelled rather at the Romans as such, now the reform papacy itself had to learn, from the representatives of the most important factors in this reform, how hard it was for a demand to improve the life and promote the sanctification of the people to maintain itself in this Church "of sinners and saints" if it was raised by sinners rather than by saints. The Curia, both cardinals and chaplains, and the Pope too now found themselves in the crossfire of criticism without being really able to mount a defense, because this criticism was based on quite simple and undisputed facts. The force of criticism is, of course, characteristic of reform movements, just as it is essential to the Church to reform herself so long as she is on pilgrimage. But if now the reform itself or at least some of its results encounter harsh judgments from irreproachable spokesmen, persons pay attention.

---

[8] K. Jordan, *Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie*, 148.

[9] On the beginnings, see P. Lehmann, *Parodie*, pp. 25–30.

This criticism was represented not by Arnold of Brescia, the canon regular inclining to spiritual radicalism,[10] but by Saint Bernard, by John of Salisbury and his "common sense" with its orientation to humanistic moderation, and by Gerhoh of Reichersberg with his testimonials and treatises dedicated to Eugene III and Hadrian IV. Whereas Arnold demanded that the Pope and the bishops renounce property and dominion in order to keep themselves free for the care of souls exclusively, for the others the solution lay in the human. They required the right use of institutions which were not found to be blameworthy in themselves and seem not to have taken any offense at the feudalism[11] which had established itself since 1059 in increasing measure in the life of the Roman Church. They apparently saw in them those *elementa mundi* which the Church makes use of, which indeed she must assimilate in order to remain true to her inner law as a representation of the mystery of the Incarnation. As *corpus mysticum Christi* the Church of necessity assimilates in space and time the forms of existence characteristic of this precise time and space. Arnold's radicalism, on the other hand, moved, with its spiritualism, entirely on that line whose beginnings were to be found in the poverty movement of the turn of the century — the *pauperes Christi,* the *vita apostolica* — and from which heretical extremes often enough developed and not first with Arnold.

Bernard of Clairvaux possessed a high regard for the authority of the Pope and the bishops in the Church of Christ. For that very reason he urgently warned against any misuse of this authority and combatted tendencies at the Curia,[12] for example that of becoming too liberal with privileges of exemption, which would restrict episcopal freedom and authority, as a perversion of the traditional order established by God himself. Even the system of appeals was an abomination to him, not in itself but its excess, its practical operation. He made himself the spokesman of the grievances of all the churches: abbots were withdrawn from the bishops, bishops from the archbishops, archbishops from the patriarchs. To his way of thinking appeals mainly served to circumvent the local courts, which, however, possessed a more exact knowledge of the place and the case and had often already given a judgment in accord with equity and law. In the highest court of all was sought a pardon or an advantage, and in this way episcopal authority was gravely injured. And Rome was finally overburdened with business which, for the most part or to a degree, fell entirely within the temporal and secular spheres: with questions of the payment of tithes, of building regulations in regard to the minimum distance between houses, barns, stables, with the authorization of fishing in this or that pond. The Curia, so Bernard wrote, was on the point of becoming a great secular business centre. Dealers penetrated into the temple, an army of officious lawyers and solicitors with every quarrel and controversy in Christendom. Hildebert of Lavardin, Archbishop of Tours, had already written in a similar vein.[13] To the same complaints Gerhoh of Reichersberg added the bitter remark that "apparently these appeals were not unwelcome to the Romans":[14] "Gravatur iam ecce universa terra, fastum et avariciam Romanorum non sustinens."[15] One detects the real concern, and at the same time the tactful tendency, to attribute the guilt, not to the Pope, not even to the Curia, but only to those of its personnel who were Romans. John of Salisbury demanded especially an incorrupt conduct of processes in Rome so as to avoid any exerting of influence by money or gifts. Especially in regard to the official conduct of legates, who by virtue of judicial and extensive administrative powers were able to make the government of the Curia omnipresent in Christendom, the future Bishop of Chartres sketched in the *Policraticus,* from his own experience or from excellently attested material, a picture of the contemporary Church government whose deep shadows filled even the loyal friends of the Roman Church, of the Pope, and of the Curia with great anxiety.

---

[10] For Arnold of Brescia, see Chapter 8.

[11] K. Jordan, "Das Eindringen der Lehnsidee in das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie," *AUF,* 12 (1932), 13–110.

[12] *De consideratione,* I, 4 (secular business), *PL,* 182, 732 f.; III, 2 (abuse of appeals), *ibid.,* 761–64; III, 4 (suppression of stages in appeals), *ibid.,* 766–69.

---

[13] *Epistolae Hildeberti,* II, 41, PL, 171, 265–67.

[14] *De investigatione Antichristi,* I, 52 (abuse of appeals), *MGLiblit,* III, 358 f.

[15] Here Gerhoh had in mind chiefly the insatiable Romans, whom the Pope had to accommodate for the sake of peace in the city: "Romanus Pontifex compellitur undecumque colligere, quod expendat in Romanos, plus Crasso tyranno avaros" (*Opusculum ad Cardinales,* ed. D. and O. Van den Eynde, 312); *De investigatione Antichristi,* I, 49, *MGLiblit,* III, 356 f.

CHAPTER 5

The Second Crusade and the Wars in Spain and the Slavic East

The papacy, the Curia, and the West saw themselves faced around the middle of the century with a new task, which called upon all their resources: the peril of the crusader states.[1] When word of the fall of Edessa reached Jerusalem, Queen Mélisende contacted Antioch for the dispatch of an envoy to Rome to apprise the Pope and ask for a new crusade. Bishop Hugh of Gabala (Djeble) met Eugene III at Viterbo in the fall of 1145. At the same time there arrived a delegation of Armenian bishops from Cilicia, come to gain support against Byzantium. Otto of Freising, who was present at this audience, has left a report of it.[2] The Pope decided to summon a crusade, while Hugh proceeded to France and Germany. On 1 December 1145 a bull was sent to King Louis VII of France,[3] inviting him and all the princes and faithful of the Kingdom to aid the East. Because of disturbances in Rome[4] Eugene was unable at the moment to emulate Urban II in activating the organizing process beyond the Alps, supervising it, and preaching the crusade. He did not appeal to King Conrad III of Germany, because he needed his help in Rome and against King Roger II of Sicily, and of course not to Roger, whose untrustworthiness and self-willed policy were sources of fear.[5] Also, Roger aspired to continue his undertakings in North Africa against Tripoli.

A first appeal by Louis VII from Bourges at Christmas of 1145 had little effect. The King thereupon asked the support of Bernard of Clairvaux, who was willing to comply if ordered to by Eugene III. The papal command was, of course, quickly forthcoming, and at Vézelay on 31 March 1146 Bernard began his amazingly effective crusade preaching, of which mention has already been made.[6] The Pope went to France in 1147 and at first Bernard had to reassure him in regard to the extension of the recruiting for the crusade to Germany. Eugene met twice with Louis VII — at Dijon in April, at Saint-Denis in June — but a meeting with Conrad III,[7] suggested for Strasbourg by the King, did not materialize.

---

[1] *Cf.* Volume III, Chapter 51.

[2] *Chronica,* VII, 32, ed. Hofmeister, 360 f. The meeting took place at Vetralla near Viterbo; *cf.* also *Chronica,* VII, 3, ed. Hofmeister, 363–67.

[3] E. Caspar, "Die Kreuzzugsbullen Eugens III.," *NA,* 45 (1924), 285–300; *cf.* also U. Schwerin, "Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des Heiligen Landes," *HStud* (Berlin 1937).

[4] Originating in the north, the communal movement reached Rome in 1143 (*cf.* C. W. Previté-Orton in *The Cambridge Medieval History,* V [Cambridge 1926], 208–41). In the summer the citizens proclaimed the "Holy Senate of the City" on the Capitol. After the death of Innocent II (23 September 1143) his successors, Celestine II and Lucius II, were likewise unable to suppress the movement, which was consolidated under Eugene III; he had to take up residence outside the city, at Viterbo. F. Bartolini, "Codice diplomatico del Senato Romano," *FontiStIt* (Rome 1948); *idem,* "Per la storia del Senato Romano nel secolo XII," *BIStIAM,* 60 (1946); A. Frugoni, "Sulla 'Renovatio Senatus' del 1143 e l'ordo equestris," *BIStIAM,* 62 (1950), 159–74; A. Rota, "La costituzione originaria del commune di Roma. L'epoca del commune liber (Luglio 1143–Dicembre 1145)," *BIStIAM,* 64 (1953), 19–131.

[5] E. Caspar, *Roger II.,* 370–98.

Under the leadership of the two Kings, the German army at the end of May and the French army at the end of June took the land route to the East. An offer by Roger II to transport them to the Holy Land by sea was turned down. Conrad III was in Byzantium in September, Louis VII on 4 October. Since Louis had come by the same route that the Germans had already traveled, and for this reason had not been suitably provisioned and dealt with, because of excesses by the Germans, which apparently could not have been avoided, relations between the two crusading armies were permeated with bitterness and suspicion even in Constantinople. Both were likewise not kindly disposed to Byzantium. The beginning gave little to hope for.

Louis VII was accompanied by his wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and Bishops Arnulf of Lisieux and Godfrey of Langres, of whom John of Salisbury sketches a discreditable picture in his *Historia Pontificalis.*[8] In the army of Conrad III Duke Frederick of Swabia led the nobility, Bishops Stephen of Metz and Henry of Toul the Lotharingians. Otto of Freising was later able to write a participant's account. Conrad III joined the Byzantine Emperor Manuel in a common policy against Roger II of Sicily, and Conrad's sister-in-law, Bertha of Sulzbach, married Manuel. Manuel urged haste, for the crusaders were a heavy burden on the city. Louis VII was also amicably received and had no scruples about delivering possible conquests to the Byzantines as their own property. He had all his barons swear the same sort of oath.

When at the beginning of November the French army reached Nicaea, Conrad had lost almost all of his army and all his camp provisions in the battle of Dorylaeum on 25 October. The remnant joined the French army. They went on together as far as Ephesus, where Conrad fell sick and was invited to Constantinople by Manuel. He there recovered and in March

---

[6] *Supra,* Chapter 2.

[7] Influenced by Bernard of Clairvaux, King Conrad III had taken the cross at Speyer on 27 December 1146, and with him Welf VI and many other princes and bishops. At Frankfurt in March 1147 Henry the Lion had promised that he would put aside his claims to Bavaria until the ending of the crusade. A detailed presentation of the German role is given by. W. Bernhardi, *Konrad III.* (Leipzig 1883), 503–684.

[8] *Historia Pontificalis,* ed. M. Chibnall, 54–56.

1148 was able to continue on to Palestine with his entourage on Byzantine ships. Acre was reached in mid-April. The French army, which had melted away to less than half its original strength through severe losses, made Antioch in the late spring of 1148. Here occurred the well known serious matrimonial crisis between Louis and Eleanor, provoked by the Queen's intimacy with Prince Raymond of Antioch.[9] The King compelled her to proceed with him and the army to Jerusalem; they entered the city in May and were cordially received by Queen Mélisende. Never had Jerusalem seen so brilliant a gathering of knights and ladies.

A great council was arranged for 24 June at Acre, with King Baldwin III, the Patriarch Fulcher, the Archbishops of Caesarea and Nazareth, and the grand masters of the Templars and the Hospitallers acting as hosts. It was decided to unite all the forces for an attack on Damascus. Correct as the project was from the point of view of strategy — for with Damascus a wedge would have been driven between Egyptian-African and North Syrian-Eastern Islam — it was nevertheless a political blunder, for at that moment it was of great importance to the Burid Kingdom of Damascus to maintain friendship with the Franks against the common enemy, Nur-ed-Din. But now Damascus too was driven into the Caliph's camp. The city was besieged in vain, the Western lords departed in deep humiliation, and the legend of the invincibility of the Western knights was destroyed. A new confidence awoke in the world of Islam.

On 8 September 1148 Conrad III left Acre by sea for the journey home and, at the invitation of the Emperor Manuel, spent Christmas at Constantinople, where the marriage of Duke Henry of Austria with Manuel's niece, the Princess Theodora, was celebrated. A firm alliance was concluded between the two Empires against Roger II, the partition of whose lands on the Italian peninsula was planned.

Louis VII put off his homeward journey. He wanted to keep Easter in Jerusalem and feared the inevitable confrontation with Eleanor, who was pressing for the dissolution of their marriage. Conrad's friendship with Manuel induced Louis to seek an alliance with Roger II, especially since he could thereby give vent to his dislike of Byzantium. He left the Holy Land on Sicilian vessels at the beginning of summer 1149 and met Roger at Potenza early in August. At once they decided on a new common crusade, but this time first against Byzantium — a preview of what was to happen in 1204. Pope Eugene III was not greatly impressed by the plan, but the Curia eagerly promoted it. At Paris Louis was able to convince even Abbot Suger of the reasonableness of the idea, and Bernard of

---

[9] *Ibid.*, 52 f. *Cf.* F. McNimm Chambers, "Some Legends concerning Eleanor of Aquitaine," *Speculum*, 16 (1941), 459–68. Despite many attempts, there is still no biography of Eleanor that is satisfactory to scholars.

Clairvaux, deeply disillusioned by the wretched outcome of "his" crusade, seemed ready to take up once again the burden of crusade preaching. But King Conrad, whose cooperation would have been essential, this time refused his consent. He feared the hand of Roger II, which he rightly believed he saw in the outline of the project. And so it had to be dropped.

No enterprise of the Middle Ages[10] began with more brilliant expectations. Planned by the Pope, proclaimed and fired by the golden eloquence of Saint Bernard, and led by the two chief powers of the West, the crusade had promised so much for the glory and safety of Christendom. But when it came to a shameful end with the difficult retreat from Damascus, it had done nothing but push relations between the West and Byzantium almost to the breaking point, sow distrust and suspicion between the newly arrived crusaders and the Franks who were living in the East, divide the Western princes, bring the Muslims closer together, and irreparably damage the military reputation of the Franks. A new epoch began in Syria, for now the Christians had been forced to the defensive. In the West itself the reports of the returned soldiers spread a deep distrust of the Franks of the Holy Land, resident in the crusader states, by whom they felt they had been left in the lurch. The failure of the Second Crusade had an effect on the intellectual and religious life of Latin Christendom in that the crusade idea lost its lustre. Persons no longer wanted to aid the Franks in Palestine. The indignation was even directed against the Pope and Saint Bernard, who had summoned to the expedition. The esteem of the Abbot of Clairvaux declined, at least in Germany. He wrote his *apologia*[11] in the introductory chapter to Book II of *De Consideratione,* taking himself seriously to task. In it a deep psychological need becomes apparent, betraying something that the saint was able to establish even in his own entourage: that this misfortune caused men to entertain doubts of faith.

The Wend crusade, to which Bernard had given his assent at the Diet of Frankfurt in March 1147 and to which he had issued a summons, was also a failure.[12] An inner contradiction became visible here, together with an ambiguity as to goals and planning. For some of the Slavs whom it was desired to subjugate proved to be good Christians, and hence a war against them could not be termed a crusade. Or if the Slavs who were subdued were and intended to remain pagans, it appeared senseless to destroy them and devastate their land, from which persons aspired to derive profit under their own rule. This contradicted Bernard's express instructions for the crusade. He had called for "extermination or conversion of the heathens"[13] and had forbidden a concluding of peace or of a treaty so long as the people were still pagans. The princes did not adhere to Bernard's directions.

---

[10] Thus Steven Runciman, *History of the Crusades,* II, 277.

[11] *De consideratione,* II, 1, PL, 182, 741–45. Otto of Freising also reflected on the failure in his *Gesta,* I, 65, ed. Waitz-Simson, 91–93.

[12] The Wend Obodrite Prince Niklot anticipated the attack in 1143. The projected crusade took the field against his invasion but achieved merely a feigned baptism of the Wends. *Cf.* H. Beumann, *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke,* 275–316.

An enduring success was granted only to the taking of Lisbon[14] and to the completion, thereby made possible, of the new Kingdom of Portugal. In this way the right wing of the campaign against Islam, comprising the entire Mediterranean, was consolidated. Roger II was able to establish himself in the centre sector at Tripoli, first in 1143 and then definitively in 1146.[15] Meanwhile, the left wing, the crusader states, was in increasing difficulty.

CHAPTER 6

Monastic Humanism

The twelfth century was an age of social restratification, of urban development, and of the communal movement. The horizon of the West was extended by the drive eastward in colonization and crusade, and contacts with the intellectual world of Islam became more frequent. Young clerics began to move restlessly from school to school, that is, from one celebrated teacher to another, apparently oblivious of any diocesan or territorial boundaries. Until the mid-century monastic humanism,[1] predominant from time immemorial, still maintained its primacy in the field of intellectual disputation and of literary creativity, despite the versatility of the new clerical personnel. This fact must be connected with the preeminence which the new orders of Cîteaux and Prémontré, that is, the reformed Benedictine and the reformed canonical life,[2] occupied in the second phase of ecclesiastical reform.

In this period, when the enthusiasm of the beginnings was still operative in both orders, a sociological law procured for them not only the pious but also the intellectually most active forces. While the growth of the cathedral schools and of the schools of the unreformed chapters continued,[3] the intellectual and literary achievement of Cluny, Cîteaux, and the congregations of canons regular maintained its lead, and especially among the last named group a public teaching activity was often to be found, as at Saint-Victor de Paris.[4]

---

[13] *Epp. Bernardi,* no. 457, *PL,* 182, 651 *D:* "ad delendas penitus aut certe convertendas nationes illas."

[14] Here a group of English, Flemish, and Frisian crusaders, who were *en route* to the Holy Land by sea and had sailed up the Tagus, had assisted in the siege of Lisbon, lasting several months, and had made possible the taking of the city.

[15] E. Caspar, *Roger II.*, 415–23.

[1] The term was coined by Jean Leclercq, who describes it in many individual essays and above all in *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris 1957); English translation, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York 1961).

[2] Although the canons regular and the Premonstratensians do not belong to the monastic world in the proper sense, they can be included in the same intellectual trend because of their literary works.

The cultivation of the *artes liberales* still dominated the entire educational process of the West but it was gradually restricted at the cathedral schools. In these began a sort of withering in the direction of pure utility aiming at rapid preparation for a real specialization in theology, law, and medicine. Also now apparent was the isolation of one of their elements, dialectics, as it was transformed into a special discipline with its own laws. After the mid-century John of Salisbury vigorously fought this tendency.[5]

But in the abbeys and in the chapters of canons regular, as earlier, the *artes liberales* were seen as the best way to a deeper understanding of Scripture and to a full mastery of the patristic and ecclesiastical tradition. In addition, this "humanistic" pursuit of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic suggested a fostering of those literary forms which were used with predilection by the representatives of monastic humanism: the *sermo*, the dialogue, the letter, the *florilegia*, the biography, and in fact all forms of historical writing in general. At the same time mediaeval Latin acquired that flexibility, liveliness, and poetic precision, so praised by J. de Ghellinck and P. Lehmann.[6] At the moment when vernacular languages took their first important steps toward literary expression, Latin, as the language of Western Christendom, was still enjoying a wealth of experience, whose brilliance recalls the colours of autumn.

Since this linguistically elegant dress served for the most part to express concepts of a deepened religious feeling, of mystical theology, of reform austerity, of enhanced claims in the area of the challenged freedom of the Church, the works of the monastic humanism of this epoch acquired greater importance as literary, journalistic, and theological achievements. The wealth of names can be divided among the already mentioned party-slogans: Cluny, Cîteaux, Prémontré, Saint-Victor, and so forth.

Cluny was represented especially by Abbot Peter the Venerable

---

[3] *Cf.* the next chapter.

[4] Here monastic theology continued the study of the Fathers and moved parallel to early scholasticism. *Cf.* Leclercq, *op cit.*, 1 ff., where he refers to the agreement of A. M. Landgraf.

[5] Especially in his great works: *Metalogicon* and *Policraticus*. *Cf.* H. Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* (London 1950). The *Metalogicon* has now been translated and commented on by D. D. MacGarry (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1955).

[6] J. de Ghellinck, *L'essor de la littérature latine au XII^e siècle*, II, 300–21; P. Lehmann, "Die Vielgestalt des zwölften Jahrhunderts," *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, III, 225–46, especially 228–31.

(d. 1156), in whom the reform of the famed monastic congregation found a protagonist in the spirit of the new orders. His literary work was chiefly concerned with this reform, and its greatest part, the collection of letters, clearly betrays the pen of the humanist. His apologetic treatises — *Adversus Iudaeos* and *Adversus sectam Saracenorum* — and the projected translation of the Koran and of other Arabic writings display the candour of the supreme superior responsible for a monastic union that was spread over many lands. This union involved, especially in the southern monasteries, numerous contacts with the non-Christian world which had to be intellectually assimilated.

The writing of history, alongside the letter an especially characteristic literary form of humanism, was, as earlier, cultivated within the Benedictine world, even outside the Cluniac union. Deserving of mention are: Ordericus Vitalis (d. 1142) of Saint-Évroul in Normandy, Guibert de Nogent (d. 1124), William of Malmesbury (d. 1142), Hariulf of Saint-Riquier (d. 1143), Leo (d. 1115) and Peter (d. 1140) of Montecassino, Hugh of Reading, later Archbishop of Rouen (d. 1164), Heimo of Michelsberg (d. 1139), Bernard of Morlay (d. *ca.* 1150), Suger of Saint-Denis (d. 1151), and Wibald of Stavelot (d. 1158). Only the most important have been named. All of them are at the same time representative of many others, and in the wide range of their native lands they give an idea of the intensity of the Western culture of this epoch. Both poetry and prose were cultivated.

Benedictine theology at this period found its most important name in Rupert of Deutz (d. 1129). The humanistic element in his point of departure lay in his view that an appreciation of salvation history rather than dogmatic abstraction was the proper concern of research. A visual concept determined his exegesis: a viewing of divine mysteries in the scenes of salvation history. Rupert ranks as the founder of biblical theology. As a monk at Liège and then in Siegburg and as Abbot of Deutz, he acted as a connecting link for the two most important districts along the Rhine. His influence traveled east and south and through Gerhoh of Reichersberg it moved also in the world of the canons regular.[7] With Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cistercians, Rupert had a high esteem of Holy Scripture, alongside which the Church Fathers, while important representatives of ecclesiastical tradition, possessed only a lesser probative force in theology. Bernard's relationship to Scripture was, however, much more intimate than Rupert's; his meditative study penetrated more deeply and acted more dynamically.

Mediation between Cîteaux and Cluny was undertaken not only by the irenic Peter the Venerable, but also by William of Saint-Thierry, who, like Rupert, came from Liège. He became a Benedictine at Saint-Nicaise de Reims and in 1119 Abbot of Saint-Thierry. In 1135 he entered the Cistercian Order and was active at Signy until his death in 1148. For La Grande Chartreuse he wrote the famous "Golden Letter." Thus he stood, as it were, at the centre of all the spiritual concerns of the new orders in his capacity of theologian of the mystical life.[8]

---

[7] *Cf.* P. Classen, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg*, 36–40.

What was more important for monastic humanism was life, not knowledge and doctrine, as was the case with the teachers in the urban schools. And so Bernard of Clairvaux took his place among historians with his *Vita Malachiae*, and William of Saint-Thierry became the biographer of his still living friend, Bernard of Clairvaux. Among Cistercians mention must be made of Aelred of Rievaulx (d. 1167), whose literary work has come again into esteem through modern research. The same may be said of Isaac of Stella (d. 1169), Guerric of Igny (d. 1157), Amadeus of Lausanne (d. 1159), and Gilbert of Hoyland (d. 1172), the first continuer and imitator of Bernard's *Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles.*[9]

First place among the canons regular was occupied in France by Hugh of Saint-Victor (d. 1141) and in Germany by Gerhoh of Reichersberg (d. 1169). Hugh's surpassing theological preeminence was undisputed. The encyclopedic breadth of his creativity justifies his being included in the humanism here under consideration, even though his teaching activity and the systematization of his theological works assign him also to early scholasticism. But with him too the exegetical-theological proposition revolves around a scene from salvation history. His creativity served the spiritual life, the reform of souls. Hugh and his entire Victorine school — Richard (d. 1173), Achard (d. 1171), Godfrey (d. *ca.* 1195) — combined their emphatically biblical theology with a rich spiritual experience.[10]

Gerhoh of Reichersberg came from the school of Rupert of Deutz, from whom he took the salvation-history orientation of his theology. His typological interpretation of time, his exegesis related to the present, his historical-critical method, to the extent that it can be so called, set him apart from the nascent scholastic method. He may be regarded not only as a conservative theologian but as a representative of humanism, even though he was not a monk; for the canons regular, because of their strict poverty and their claustral mode of life, were very close to the monastic style — "pene eiusdem propositi," as Urban II put it. And both types of reform orders were equally aloof from rising scholasticism.

---

[8] This was especially pinpointed by M. M. Davy; see the bibliography for this chapter.

[9] On Isaac of Stella, see L. Ott, *LThK*, V (2nd ed. 1960), 777 f., with bibliography of the works by W. Meuser, J. Beumer, J. Debray-Mulatier, and M. R. Milcamps. The works of Guerric of Igny are in *PL*, 185, 11–214. *Cf.* D. De Wilde, *De Beato Guerrico* (Westmalle 1935); "Guerric et l'école monastique," *Collectanea O. Cist. Ref.*, 19 (1957), 238–47. On Amadeus of Lausanne, see A. Dimier, *Amédée de Lausanne* (Saint-Wandrille 1949). The works of Gilbert of Hoyland are in *PL*, 184, 11–298. On the whole Cistercian school see J. Leclercq, *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne*, II, 233–72.

[10] On the Victorine school see F. Vandenbroucke, *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne*, II, 282–98.

Norbert of Xanten, the founder of Prémontré, left no writings of his own, but he communicated his attitude to pupils who attested it, among them Anselm of Havelberg (d. 1158).[11] The latter's three books on his religious discussions in Constantinople became famous. Again, as in the case of Rupert, Gerhoh, and Hugh, with Anselm there is involved a salvation-history concept of the world-mowing events of the past and the present. Also Premonstratensians were Philip of Harvengt (d. 1183), Abbot of Bonne-Espérance, and Adam the Scot of Dryburgh (d. 1212); the last named later became a Carthusian at Witham. In the *Magna Vita* of Hugh of Lincoln it is said of Adam that he possessed an "incomparanda eruditio et doctrina."[12]

Even the silent Grande Chartreuse could at least write. Its founder, Bruno of Cologne, was regarded at Reims as a *doctor doctorum,* and something of his delight in elegant diction maintained itself in his foundations. Guigues de Châtel (d. 1137), fifth prior of La Grande Chartreuse, wrote letters, a life of Saint Hugh of Grenoble, meditations, and the constitution of the order. Jean Leclercq ranks him among the most noteworthy spiritual writers of his century.[13]

CHAPTER 7

The New Theology: Abelard, Peter Lombard, Gratian

Parallel with monastic humanism there developed in the twelfth century a new theology in the world of the cathedral and chapter schools. In contradistinction to the abbeys, where theological knowledge appeared as oriented to the religious life itself, to prayer, meditation, and mystical union with God, the new theology sought to throw light on the mysteries of the faith, transmitted in Scripture and the patristic tradition, to acquire a systematic total view of the truths of faith by means of intensive rational reflection. It thereby corresponded to an urgent need of the time, in which economic, social, and political changes were forming a type of man different from that known to previous centuries. The great pilgrimages of the eleventh century and the crusades of the twelfth, the colonization getting under way on the Germanic-Slavonic frontier areas, the numerically not very important but still considerable interchange of men and institutions such as was connected with the founding of Norman states in England, South Italy, and the Levant — all this meant that in the ever expanding awareness of Western Christendom, above all through the upsetting contact with non-Christians, the vital questions of the traditional *milieu* of faith were put more critically and more anxiously.

---

[11] On Anselm of Havelberg, see F. Petit, *La spiritualité des Prémontrés,* 56–64.

[12] On Adam the Scot see J. Bulloch, *Adam of Dryburgh* (London 1958); F. Petit, *Ad viros religiosos, 14 sermons d'Adam Scot* (Tongerloo 1934); most of his works are in *PL,* 198, 20–872.

[13] J. Leclercq, *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne,* II, 193.

The new theology cannot be understood only from the mentality of its first proponents, as though here men less inclined to contemplation or scholars especially equipped for reasoning accounted for a new method of gaining insights into the faith. Far more importantly, it was entirely in accord with a more comprehensive new intellectual need, which made itself known in the questions of students and in the problems of journalism, as, for example, in the Investiture Controversy. The continuity of intellectual development precludes any surprise that the initial steps of the new theology were associated with the names of monks, that Anselm of Bec and Canterbury ranks as the father of scholasticism, that Anselm of Laon came from his school, that Abelard in turn was a student of the younger Anselm. Nor is it without symbolic significance that Abelard lived as a monk of Saint-Denis and as Abbot of Saint-Gildas and died under the protection of Cluny, in Cluny's priory of Saint-Marcel near Chalon-sur-Saône.

Later this new theology was given the name "scholasticism" and attributed as "early scholasticism" to the twelfth and as "high scholasticism" to the thirteenth century. It was called the "theology of the schools," because it was at home in the urban schools from which the universities were to develop at the turn of the twelfth to the thirteenth century and because its leading teachers founded schools which were concerned to cultivate the theological specialization of their founders. Thus one speaks of the school of Anselm of Laon, of the school of Abelard, of the school of Gilbert de la Porrée, of the school of Saint-Victor, of the schools of Orléans, Chartres, Paris, Bologna. These numerous schools emerged almost simultaneously. The earliest appeared in the eleventh century — that of Bec with its two great teachers, Lanfranc and Anselm of Canterbury. Since the school of Bec does not fall within the scope of this presentation, the closely related school of Laon may be considered first.[1]

Anselm of Laon (*ca.* 1050–1117) and his brother Raoul, both of them pupils of Anselm of Canterbury, taught at the cathedral school of Laon.

---

[1] See S. Otto, *Die Funktion des Bildbegriffs in der Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Münster i. W. 1963), 24–69, and the bibliography for this chapter.

Research has rediscovered many works of the "sentence" *genre* from their sphere of influence; John of Tours is identified, but most of the other works have come down anonymously. Among the famous students of Laon were Adam du Petit Pont, Gilbert *universalis,* Abelard, and Gilbert de la Porrée. Since students came to Laon, just as they did to Bec, from great distances, including even the Slavic lands, the manuscripts of the school of Laon, scattered over the entire West, testify to a radiation over all of *christianitas latina.* Anselm's name was denigrated for contemporaries by Abelard's cuttingly critical withdrawal from Laon; in fact, the succeeding centuries forgot him. But John of Salisbury[2] rendered a very favourable judgment on the "clarissimi doctores fratres" of Laon.[3] New in the collections of sentences of the school of Laon was the manner in which the lecture notes of the *magistri* themselves were now set beside the patristic texts; in the further course of the development these notes acquired such great authority that the patristic texts were treated rather in the framework of the *theologoumena* of the teachers. Likewise discernible were the beginnings of the famous form of the *quaestio,* the classical method of teaching and of dealing with problems in scholastic theology.

Together with Anselm of Laon there is always simultaneously mentioned William of Champeaux (1068–1122), like Abelard a pupil of Roscelin of Compiègne. William taught at the cathedral school of Paris until a dispute with Abelard in 1108 induced him to withdraw to the left bank of the Seine. He settled down at the chapel of Saint-Victor, where soon arose the canonical institute of which he was the founder. Like many another celebrated teacher of these decades, he was made a Bishop, receiving the see of Châlons-sur-Marne in 1113, and as the friend and patron of the young Abbot of Clairvaux he could later enjoy a better publicity than that which overtook Anselm of Laon. His *Sententiae vel Quaestiones,* which are not merely concerned with topics such as the problem of universals, but, bearing an Augustinian stamp, treat in an original manner especially questions of moral theology, were able to produce long-range effects through his pupils, above all in Germany.[4] Even Bernard of Clairvaux found William's outlook congenial.

Important as a connecting link between France and Germany was the school of Liège.[5] Its great age occurred, it is true, in the eleventh century, but its best known teacher was Alger,[6] who became a monk at Cluny in 1126, was ordained a priest, and died there in 1131–32. His still unpublished, but in his own day much used, *florilegium*, the *Liber sententiarum magistri Algeri*, belongs to the prehistory of the *Liber sententiarum* of Peter Lombard.

---

[2] *Metalogicon,* I, 5, ed. C. C. Webb (Oxford 1929), 18.

[3] *Historia Pontificalis,* c. 8, ed. M. Chibnall (London 1956), 19.

[4] H. Weisweiler, "Das Schrifttum der Schule Anselms von Laon und Wilhelms von Champeaux in deutschen Bibliotheken," *BGPhMA,* 33 (Münster i. W. 1936).

[5] "Les écoles liégeoises," in E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France,* V (Lille 1940), 349–61.

Of greater significance than the founder of Saint-Victor for the new theology was the young community's greatest teacher, Hugh (d. 1141).[7] He probably came from Germany, for he received his first formation at Sankt Pankraz in Hamersleben, together with his introduction to the ideals of the canons regular; by his entry into the chapter of Saint-Victor de Paris between 1115 and 1120 he definitely adopted these ideals as his own. An encyclopedic mind,[8] an esteemed teacher, an author on a broad range of subjects, Hugh, especially with his systematically organized theological works, in particular *De sacramentis christianae fidei*, his scriptural commentaries, and the *Summa sententiarum*, which originated in his school, exerted a decisive influence on the century's history of theology, even on Peter Lombard, who often followed him. In addition to the surpassing influence of the Latin patristic theology, above all that of Saint Augustine, the thought of pseudo-Dionysius also carried weight with Hugh, as his commentary on the *Hierarchia coelestis* shows. Through Richard of Saint-Victor Hugh acted as a stimulus on mediaeval mysticism down to Gerson and Dionysius the Carthusian.

Together with Hugh, Abelard was celebrated by contemporary historians as one of the two *luminaria* who lectured on theology in France before audiences from the entire West. Abelard stands beside Anselm of Canterbury as the real founder of scholastic theology — not of its doctrines but of its scientific method. The very name "theology" probably came from him; previously the expressions *divina pagina* and *sacra doctrina* had been used. Through Abelard the *ratio*, schooled in dialectics, moved up beside the *auctoritas patrum*, and with him especially began the speculative penetration of the individual truths of the traditional faith, hitherto arranged in a superficial classification according to points of view.

Just as the investigations of individuals in the past thirty years have led to new evaluation of the theological achievement of Anselm of Laon and his school, in which not only the cosmopolitan radiation and the variety of the works but also the theological certainty of the evidence and the originality of the continuing theological reflection could find their scientific recognition, so too Abelard and his theological school now increasingly find a more positive stress than previously in the history of theology.

---

[6] Peter the Venerable terms Alger, Hezelo, and Tezelin "magnos suis temporibus magistros" (*Epp.*, III, 2, *PL*, 189, 278 f.).

[7] On Hugh, see R. Baron, *Études sur Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris 1963).

[8] For Hugh's scientific teaching see R. Baron, *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris 1957), 35–96.

Born at Pallet near Nantes in 1079, Abelard emerged into the light of the history of theology with his criticism of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux. Under the cloud of his twofold condemnation at Soissons in 1121 and at Sens in 1141, his reputation was long tarnished, despite his writings and despite praise from contemporaries, by the overpowering fame of his opponent, Saint Bernard, especially since his relationship to Héloise was of more interest to a later age than was his significance within the new theological movement of the twelfth century. His name in theology owes its restored brilliance to the exertions of Denifle, Geitl, Vacandard, Geyer, and others. Modern research especially devotes its attention to his school, its personalities, and their works. J. de Ghellinck remarks that the history of theology in the twelfth century, and above all the history of Peter Lombard and his *Sentences,* could not be written without giving Abelard and his theological work an essential place within them.[9]

With Abelard and his school the climax is reached between patristic and scholastic theology. Especially in method, but also in content, as, for example, by stressing the essential position of the theology of the Sacraments in the total structure of the scientific study of the faith, they caused an advance which was capable of assuring the future of theology as a science, even though it was William of Auxerre (d. 1231) who first expressly posed and discussed the problem of "theology as a science." Research has contributed to the theological reassessment of Abelard especially by providing an exact chronology of his works and their various editions and by more clearly pinpointing the philosophical presuppositions of Abelard's thought processes, in particular his dialectic. Abelard's theological errors and daring conclusions, such as he drew in applying his method, are not eliminated by this new knowledge. Above all, the far too optimistic recourse to what must be called an almost exclusive intellectualism concealed their dangers; Bernard of Clairvaux felt obliged to meet them. Arno Borst was able to show[10] that in this matter, culminating in the Sens condemnation of 1141, there was involved an objective and not a personal confrontation and that one must not speak of bad blood between the two great theologians.

The theology of Gilbert de la Porrée was subjected to ecclesiastical judgment at almost the same time as Abelard's was. And like him,

---

[9] *Le mouvement,* 151. *Cf.* The bibliography for this chapter.

[10] A. Bornst, "Abälard und Bernhard," *HZ,* 186 (1958), 497–526. R. Klibanski, "Peter Abailard and Bernard de Clairvaux," *MRS,* 5 (1961), 1–27, independently arrived at a similar conclusion.

Gilbert,[11] who died as Bishop of Poitiers in 1154, was one of those powerful figures who founded the schools. In him speculative theology was first discernible and active in a sense proper to scholasticism. If Abelard became the dialectician of theology, Gilbert became its metaphysician. Gilbert, who came from the circle of disciples surrounding Anselm of Laon, was equally under obligation to the school of Chartres.[12] His dialectical method, already successfully resorted to by Abelard, his *Liber sex principiorum,* which established itself as a textbook, and his theological concepts made an impact through his school into the thirteenth century.

The school of Chartres,[13] where Gilbert taught, fostered by virtue of its Platonism a Christian humanism of encyclopedic scope, but also sought, with the aid of all secular sciences, to arrive at a deeper understanding of revelation. It belonged to the new theology, which was represented and enriched by all the great schools of the time. The fame of the schools of Chartres, connected with the names of the brothers Bernard and Thierry of Chartres, Bernard Silvestris, Clarenbald of Arras, and John of Salisbury, was only diminished in the second half of the twelfth century by the growing repute of the schools of Paris.

In Paris, where Hugh of Saint-Victor had taught until 1141, originated the most famous theological work of the century: the *Four Books of Sentences* of Peter Lombard. First appeared the *Summa Sententiarum,* in which the theological movements of Abelard and Hugh of Saint-Victor met and united. As a brief, precise, and systematically composed treatise on all of theology, it found an extraordinarily intensive use.

With Peter Lombard (d. 1160) and his chief work, the course of development of the new theology reached its culmination, in so far as it called for classification, for a codification, so to speak, and for an orderly synthesis of the traditional doctrine, now theologically assimilated. Theology emerged from the spell of the biblical and patristic tradition and the unique *auctoritas* into the pungent atmosphere of the critical reason and was now opening the gate to the great *summae* of high scholasticism.

Peter Lombard, who came to Paris between 1135 and 1139, was hospitably received at Saint-Victor. In Paris he may have listened to

---

[11] On Gilbert de la Porrée and his school, see S. Otto, *Die Funktion des Bildbegriffs,* 176–94, 224–50; S. Gammersbach, *Gilbert von Poitiers und seine Prozesse im Urteil der Zeitgenossen* (Cologne and Graz 1959); N. M. Häring, "Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers," *AKG,* 47 (1965), 23–47.

[12] The Council of Reims (1148) refrained from a condemnation of Gilbert's doctrine of the Trinity, which Bernard of Clairvaux had rejected.

[13] The classic work by A. Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres au moyen âge* (du V^e au XVI^e siècle) (Paris 1895) was reprinted at Frankfurt am Main in 1965; E. Lesne, *op. cit.,* V, 152–72.

Abelard, and he certainly knew his works. During a stay at the Curia (1148–50) he became acquainted with the theological work of John Damascene in the translation of Burgundio of Pisa. At the Council of Reims in 1148 he belonged to the group of theologians hostile to Gilbert de la Porrée. His *Four Books of Sentences* were probably completed in 1157.[14]

It is surprising that the author of this celebrated work, differing from his more famous contemporaries whom we have already mentioned, was hardly named by contemporary chroniclers and historians. It may be assumed that his teaching activity did not arouse an equally lively echo.[15] The first book of the *Sentences* treats of God and the Trinity; the second, of creation, the angels, the six days, original sin, and grace; the third, of the Incarnation, virtues, sins, the commandments; the fourth, of the sacraments and the last things. The work displays none of the genius of Anselm, the originality of Hugh of Saint-Victor, the keenly speculative clear-sightedness of Abelard. It adopted Abelard's method but not his *theologoumena*. Because of the lucid arrangement, the rich and well ordered fulness of its texts, and the *via media* of its theological propositions, it managed, not without first having been exposed to some criticism, to establish itself universally as a textbook for theological instruction in the West and maintained itself unchallenged until the sixteenth century. It was then replaced by the *Summa theologica* of Saint Thomas Aquinas.[16]

Before the Lombard had composed his *Sentences,* the Camaldolese Gratian compiled at Bologna his *Decretum:* the *Concordia discordantium canonum*. Finished immediately after the Second Lateran Council (1139), it appeared in the context of the new theology, for it too was characterized by a process of systematization and synthesis. With it was born the new science of canon law, which met on equal terms the new science of theology of the French schools. Like the latter, Gratian sought to master the alleged contradictions of the assembled *auctoritates* by the light of reason. He discussed, critically but with an eye to harmonization, the value of passages in the texts and drew compelling conclusions. The *Decretum* did not know a real system in the sense of the classical canon law, but rather a line of thought that was logically planned and developed. Only Gratian's pupils and commentators understood the *Decre-*

---

[14] This is now held by D. Van den Eynde, "Essai chronologique sur l'œuvre de Pierre Lombard," *Miscellanea Lombardiana* (Novara 1957), 45–64.

[15] Peter's scriptural commentaries are frequently called the *Glossa magna,* and in particular the commentary on Saint Paul was later called simply the *Glossa.*

[16] A. M. Landgraf did not regard Peter Lombard "exactly as an independent thinker" (*Einführung,* 94), while he thought that Gilbert's school "gave its own stamp to the theology of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in many points" (*ibid.,* 91).

tum as having a threefold division into persons *(ministri),* procedure *(negotia),* and Sacraments.

As the successor of Ivo of Chartres, Bernold of Constance, Alger of Liège, and Abelard, Gratian sought to resolve disagreement among the canons. This had become a burning problem the moment that the reform papacy had established itself, Christendom had become more keenly aware of its unity than earlier, and a universally accepted juridical order appropriate to it and taking precedence over particular customs and privileges seemed to be required. Since the authority of the papacy itself seemed not yet sufficiently effective everywhere, reason, or the dialectical method, came to its aid and with the new science of the decretists created a serviceable instrument.

The *Decretum* meant a substantial beginning, but for the moment only a beginning, for Gratian's wise rules of distinctions were by no means handled consistently, even by him. But, alongside the *lacunae,* defects, and inconsistencies of the *Decretum,* contemporaries saw especially its excellences: it contained everything essential in the numerous previous collections and took the place of a library. Reason reached useful conclusions and pointed out important groups of problems. The *Decretum,* assembling all texts of the Church's first millennium in an intelligible and ordered whole, fulfilled a double function: certainty was imparted and questions still open were indicated.

The new sciences, closely related through their sources, continued in this intimacy in the next stages of their development, especially since some of their topics, such as the sacraments, overlapped.[17] What was new in both was the dialectical method, by virtue of which a structured order could be introduced into the apparently formless mass of traditional texts and an impetus was to be expected for the further elucidation of the context of the teachings of faith, morals, and law. Thus Peter Lombard drew from Ivo of Chartres and from Gratian's *Decretum,* and he may have observed Gratian's work coming into being at Bologna. He accepted some of Gratian's teachings in his own work, but at the same time he energetically rectified certain conclusions of the *Decretum.*

If Gratian was less successful than the Lombard in mastering the mass of texts, it may be recalled that he had no model, whereas Peter Lombard could go back to Hugh of Saint-Victor, Abelard, the *Summa Sententiarum,* and finally to the *Decretum* itself.

---

[17] J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement,* 203–13; A. M. Landgraf, "Diritto canonico e teologia nel secolo XII," *StG,* I (1953), 371–413.

SECTION TWO

The Threats to the Freedom of the Church (1153–98)

Chapter 8

The Popes, the Emperor Frederick I, and the Third Lateran Council

Eugene III died at Tivoli on 8 July 1153, and a whole epoch drew to a close. In this Pope from the Cistercian Order in its spectacular development, the reform papacy produced its last representative. A long succession of monks and canons regular had for a whole century guided the destinies of the Roman Church, which more and more represented the Universal Church. The heirs to the successes of this century were very clearly distinguished from their predecessors. They were a new generation, stamped by the new theology and the new science of canon law, by the mentality of a cooler rationalism and a more soberly realistic political planning. The Church and the *Patrimonium Petri,* in which, as before, they saw the decisive guarantor of the freedom of the Universal Church, they intended to govern with as much centralization as possible.

Bernard of Clairvaux died on 20 August 1153, almost at the same time as Eugene III. Seldom has a new generation made its appearance in world history so unmistakably as at this moment. Henry II began his reign in England officially on 19 December 1154, though he had been designated as King after the death of Stephen's son Eustace on 17 August 1153. Roger II of Sicily died at Palermo on 26 February 1154. In these first years of the second half of the century there also died Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis (1151), Wibald of Stavelot (1158), Anselm of Havelberg (1158), Archbishop Adalbero of Trier (1152), and Gilbert de la Porrée, Bishop of Poitiers (1154).

A change occurred also on the German royal throne. Eugene III lived to see the death of Conrad III on 15 February 1152; the King had not been able to undertake the journey to Rome, urgently requested by the Pope because of the unruly state of the Eternal City and planned for the fall of 1152. Eugene had given his approval of the election of Frederick I Barbarossa on 4 March 1152; it had actually not been sought, and Frederick had merely sent an announcement. The negotiations then ensuing between Frederick and the Curia occurred toward the close of Eugene's pontificate and terminated in the novel bilateral Treaty of Constance[1] of 23 March 1153, which stipulated a strictly mutual cooperation between King and Pope. Both parties obliged themselves to political solidarity *vis-à-vis* the City of Rome and the Normans. Neither was to declare himself prepared for territorial concessions to Byzantium. Each promised to protect and guarantee the other's *honor*, that is, his sovereign rights. The Concordat of Worms was not mentioned. Frederick was, nonetheless, disposed to exercise authority over the Church of the Empire to the extent that the Worms guide-lines allowed. The Curia displayed a willingness to be accommodating when Eugene III also gave his two legates full authority to annul, on the ground of too close relationship, the childless marriage of Frederick with Adele of Vohburg, whom the King wanted to divorce for infidelity. While a suspension of Archbishop Henry of Mainz was agreeable to the King, he opposed the intervention of the legates in the question of the disputed election to Magdeburg, which he intended to settle by promoting Wichmann, Bishop of Zeitz-Naumburg. Anastasius IV finally confirmed Wichmann, who had come to Rome and there obtained the pallium.

Anastasius, a Roman, had been Cardinal Conrad of Suburra. In his brief pontificate, from 12 July 1153 to 3 December 1154, he disappointed others as well as Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who said of him: "After Eugene there was not found his like on the papal throne to keep the law of the Most High, as is proved by the letters and deeds of his successor, Pope Anastasius, a feeble old man."[2] His was a pontificate of transition and, as such, significant that a new epoch was beginning.

Hadrian IV

Hadrian IV (1154–59), who inaugurated the new age, also came from the ranks of the canons regular — he had been provost of the famed chapter of Saint-Ruf d'Avignon —, but he guided it into paths different from those hitherto trodden. His activity was determined, not by the *consideratio* called for by Bernard, the commitment of the Supreme Shepherd, derived from the depth of spiritual meditation, but rather by the awareness of the fulness of power bestowed by God, the dispassionately cool eye for the politically attainable and for the juridical claim. Ever more to the fore moved the chancellor, Roland Bandinelli, pupil of Abelard and jurist, who, by reason of his intellectual background, could not but arouse mistrust in such men of the old school as Gerhoh of Reichersberg.[3]

---

[1] Reprint of the text of the Treaty of Constance in P. Rassow, *Honor imperii* (Darmstadt 1961).

[2] *Commentarius in Ps. 65*, *MGLiblit*, III, 493 (footnotes 25–27).

Nicholas Breakspear, thus far the only Pope of English origin, had been a fellow-student and friend of John of Salisbury and, presumably, a pupil of Abelard and of Gilbert de la Porrée at Paris, as were John and Roland Bandinelli. After entering the chapter of the canons regular of Saint-Ruf d'Avignon, he rose to the position of provost. He left there, not entirely peacefully, when Eugene III made him Cardinal Bishop of Albano in 1149. His community had complained to Rome of his excessive strictness. In 1152 he was in Norway as papal legate.[4] He there convoked and directed a large council, established the archiepiscopal see of Nidaros (Trondheim), and sought to regulate the ecclesiastical situation in the spirit of the reform movement. In the spring of 1153 he presumably went to Sweden and convoked a council to Linköping. The King, bishops, and magnates took part but unfortunately the decrees are not extant. He managed to introduce Peter's Pence in both Norway and Sweden, but in the latter kingdom he did not succeed in erecting an ecclesiastical province as he had probably planned.

Immediately after his election[5] Hadrian IV displayed great firmness in Rome. By laying an interdict on the city shortly before Easter of 1155 he induced the Senate to expel Arnold of Brescia and his adherents. In January 1155 he had renewed with Frederick I the Treaty of Constance on behalf of himself and his successors. This step was of great importance for the Pope, since William I of Sicily, Roger II's successor, had meanwhile occupied Benevento and was beginning incursions into the Roman *campagna*. Hadrian excommunicated him.

At Sutri on 8 June 1155 occurred the first meeting of the Pope with Frederick, who was *en route* to Rome for his imperial coronation. The interview, which acquired notoriety because of the affair of the service of bridle and stirrup, owed by the German King but at first refused and then performed by Frederick, has been eagerly discussed by scholars.[6] Only after rather long discussions, in which older princes as well as the Curia itself referred to the purely ceremonial nature of the marshal's service "out of deference for the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul," could the incident be closed. An offer by the Romans to confer the imperial crown at the Capitol, against a payment of 5,000 pounds of gold, was rejected by Frederick, who pointed out that the *Imperium* had long since passed to the Germans. On the day of the imperial coronation, 18 June 1155, Frederick had to put down in blood a rising of the Romans. Arnold of Brescia,[7] whose extradition Frederick had achieved, was executed on the orders of the prefect of the city. Without having aided the Pope in his quarrel with the Normans, as provided by the Treaty of Constance, the Emperor, at the request of the German princes, returned home in the late summer. He had not brought Rome back under the Pope's control, though he had turned over Tivoli, which had placed itself under the Emperor's authority, to the Pope, reserving the rights of the Empire. There was no agreement on the key ideas of the Treaty of Constance, *honor imperii* and *honor Sancti Petri* (or *papatus*), nor in regard to the Normans and their Kingdom.

---

[3] *Cf.* P. Classen, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg* (Wiesbaden 1960), 156.

[4] G. Inger, *Das kirchliche Visitationsinstitut im mittelalterlichen Schweden* (Lund 1961), 222–28.

[5] 4 December 1154.

[6] *Cf.* R. Holtzmann, *Der Kaiser als Marschall des Papstes* (Berlin and Leipzig 1928); also E. Eichmann, "Officium stratoris et strepae," *HZ*, 142 (1930), 16–40, and R. Holtzmann's reply, "Zum Strator- und Marschalldienst," *HZ*, 145 (1932), 301–50.

In his disappointment over Frederick's premature return to Germany, Hadrian IV gave to his policy that turn which Frederick had aimed to prevent by the Treaty of Constance. In 1156 he concluded the Peace of Benevento with King William I of Sicily.[8] In it William's royal title, which had at first been denied him, was recognized, as was his legitimate authority over Capua, Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily. Extensive rights over the Church in his territories were conceded to him, substantially as a renewal of the privilege granted to Count Roger I for Sicily by Urban II. For his part, William acknowledged the feudal suzerainty of Saint Peter and obliged himself to a considerable annual *census* of 1,000 gold pieces to the Pope for South Italy. Naples, Salerno, Amalfi, and Marsia were awarded to William as a hereditary possession. Thanks to the peace with the Normans the Pope was able, with the assistance of the prudent and energetic Cardinal *Camerlengo* Boso,[9] to consolidate papal authority in the various *terrae Sancti Petri,* and even his return to Rome became possible in November 1156.

In order to apprise the Emperor of the Peace of Benevento the Pope then dispatched two legates, the Cardinal Chancellor Roland Bandinelli, and Bernard, Cardinal Priest of San Clemente. They were also to concern themselves with the case of the imprisoned Archbishop Eskil of Lund. While *en route* from Rome to the north, this prelate had been arrested in Imperial Burgundy and imprisoned in the expectation that he would be ransomed at a high price. Eskil, to whom Hadrian, when legate in the north, had brought the pallium and whom, when Pope, he had constituted Primate of Sweden and Legate of the North, was regarded as an enemy of the Empire, because, in his new dignities, he was in opposition to the Nordic ambitions of Hamburg–Bremen, which were supported by Frederick. These were based on old papal privileges and through them Frederick intended to assure his influence in Scandinavia. At the Diet of Besançon in October 1157 occurred the well known incident, brought on by an expression in Hadrian's letter to the Emperor, which was translated, perhaps deliberately, by Rainald of Dassel, Frederick's chancellor since 1156, as "fief". In the letter, with reference to the *beneficium* of the imperial coronation, already conferred, still further *maiora beneficia* were held out to the Emperor by the Pope, if the former should be accommodating in regard to Rome's concerns, for example, the liberation of the Archbishop of Lund and the projected visitation of the German Church by the legates. Alleging the excitement of his magnates, the Emperor sent the legates back empty-handed, but not without having thereby seriously compromised his relations with the Curia by misunderstandings and tensions.

---

[7] Arnold of Brescia (*ca.* 1100–55) became provost of a chapter of Augustinian canons in Brescia following his studies at Paris. He defended the radical poverty of the reform clergy and demanded that clergy and bishops renounce possessions, ecclesiastical property, and *regalia.* Banished in 1139, perhaps by the Second Lateran Council, he left Italy and taught at Paris but was expelled through the efforts of Bernard of Clairvaux. He went *via* Zurich to Bohemia, where the Cardinal Legate Guido of Castello received him and in 1145 arranged a reconciliation with Eugene III. He then took part in the commune's rising against the Pope and in 1147 preached in Rome against the simony and worldliness of the clergy. He remained in Rome, despite his excommunication by the Pope in 1148, and in his preaching seconded the citizens' demand for autonomy. See R. Foreville, *Latran I, II, III, et Latran IV* (Paris 1965), 86 f., 105 f., 111.

[8] Text of the Treaty of Benevento in *Constitutiones,* I, nos. 413 f.

[9] *Cf.* F. Geisthardt, "Der Kämmerer Boso." *HStud,* 293 (Berlin 1936), 41–59.

In the manifestoes sent out by the imperial chancery concerning the events at Besançon, the "Empire consciousness" in the circle around Frederick I for the first time found expression as a program. The independence of the imperial office from the Roman Church was proclaimed: the Emperor, it was maintained, owes his crown only to the grace of God and the free choice of the princes. An appeal by the Pope to the German episcopate obtained an unexpected reply: a corroboration of the imperial view and the request that Hadrian IV would appease the Emperor by another, milder letter, for the good of the Church and of the Empire. In June 1158 the Pope had such a letter delivered to the Emperor at Augsburg by two legates, the Cistercian Henry of Santi Nereo et Achilleo and Hyacinth of Santa Maria in Cosmedin. In this he stated that the term *beneficium* in the letter read at Besançon should have been translated not as "fief" but as "benefit," while the use of *conferre* in regard to the imperial crown did not mean "to confer" but "to impose". The Emperor accepted this explanation, especially since the legates were able to assure him that the Pope would continue to be concerned for the *honor imperii* and to maintain the rights of the Empire.

Just as Hadrian IV renewed his feudal relationship to the Normans and appealed to the *Constitutum Constantini* in regard to Sicily, so, according to John of Salisbury, whom he used as middleman, did he also dispose of Ireland by virtue of his authority over the western islands, investing Henry II of England with the rule of Ireland by sending him an emerald ring.[10]

Meanwhile the Emperor, having entrusted the defense of the Empire's interests on its eastern frontiers to new princely families in order to be free to devote himself entirely to the Italian problem, proceeded southward again. At the Diet of Roncaglia near Piacenza in November 1158 he again enforced the old imperial rights in the Kingdom of Lombardy, as he had had them verified by the Four Doctors of Bologna and the representatives of twenty-eight cities — that is, the crown *regalia,* which had not been claimed for decades. Milan, which had submitted on 7 September 1158, had already surrendered them. If implemented, the Roncaglia decrees would have meant, not only the restoration of the old royal authority and a loss by the cities of their freedom and autonomy, but also an excessive increase in the economic and political power of the crown. Hence Milan, Brescia, and Piacenza undertook negotiations with Hadrian IV for an alliance against the Emperor, who was now beginning to apply the Roncaglia decrees also in Tuscany and even in the north of the *Patrimonium Petri.* Hadrian allowed him a respite of forty days within which to annul these measures; otherwise he would be compelled to excommunicate the Emperor. But before the interval had expired, the Pope died at Anagni on 1 September 1159.

Shortly before his death Hadrian had had his interpretation of *honor Sancti Petri* expounded to the Emperor by the Cardinal Legates Octavian and William: the Pope's authority was unrestricted over Rome and the entire *Patrimonium Petri,* where Frederick intended to occupy a position like that of Charles the Great or Otto the Great; the Roncaglia decrees were not to be applied to the Italian bishops; and the Treaty of Constance was to be renewed, especially since the Treaty of Benevento had in no way offended against the letter and the spirit of Constance. Hadrian had naturally rejected an arbitration court, suggested by the Emperor, which would discuss and clarify the opposing views of the two powers.

Hadrian's corpse was transported to Rome and interred in Saint Peter's. He had contrived to consolidate his rule in the *Patrimonium* by means of a consistent continuation of the exemption policy of his predecessors, but in the case of abbeys and chapters reserving the rights of the bishops. He had further developed the actual government of the Universal Church by the Roman Curia. In Ireland, Scotland, and Spain he had renewed the ecclesiastical bonds and brought them more firmly into connection with

---

[10] *Metalogicon,* IV, 42: *cf.* A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta,* 303, footnote 1; P. Sheehy, "The Bull Laudabiliter," *Galway Archaeological and Historical Society Journal,* 29 (1961), 45–70.

Rome, just as he had done earlier as cardinal legate in the North. By means of Peter's Pence he had caused the unity of Christendom and the relationship of individual Christians, and not merely of princes and prelates, with the See of Peter to become more vivid in the awareness of the faithful. He had quite intentionally defended the jurisdictional primacy of the Roman Church, especially against Byzantium, and had been able to exercise it, despite manifold difficulties. Finally, toward the close of his pontificate he had sought, by means of an understanding between the Emperor Manuel and William I of Sicily in 1158, to erect a dam against Frederick I's Italian policy, which was preparing systematically to advance from Lombardy *via* Tuscany to the south. And just before the Pope's death the Emperor's moderate advisors had all died in 1158: Wibald of Stavelot in July on his last embassy to Byzantium, Anselm of Havelberg and Ravenna on 12 August, and Otto of Freising. A new phase of the Roman Church's struggle for her freedom was ushered in.

Alexander III

The double papal election of 7 September 1159[11] took place under the influence of the methodically pursued Italian policy of the Emperor Frederick I. The frontiers of the *Patrimonium* had already been violated, contact had been made with circles in Rome, and Otto of Wittelsbach lingered in the city during the election. The majority of the Sacred College, at least two-thirds, decided on the chancellor, Cardinal Roland Bandinelli; a minority, favourably disposed to the Emperor, preferred Cardinal Octavian of Monticello (Tivoli). The stormy course of the election allowed doubts to rise, as in the double election of 1130, as to the legitimacy of both claimants. Bandinelli styled himself Alexander III (1159–81), while his rival took the name Victor IV (1159–64).

Once again a judgment by the Universal Church had to decide, since there was no institutional organ qualified to clarify such cases by arbitration.[12] If the double election of 1130 had been determined by inner ecclesiastical motives, the existence in the College of Cardinals of opposing views of the tasks and methods of Church reform, this time clearly political considerations predominated. Alexander's electors wanted to continue what Hadrian IV had begun, whereas Victor's partisans displayed their agreement with the Emperor's imperial and Italian policy. Nevertheless, the developments of the next years made clear that more deeply grounded basic concepts were dialectically encountered in this double election and its consequences and pressed for a settlement in severe struggles that shook the Church. As Frederick's idea of the function of the imperial office in the Christian world was largely shaped by the revived Roman law as modified by Justinian and Christianity, so did the pontificate of Alexander III seem to be determined by a canon law, developing consistently and establishing itself in practice, which was entirely able to make methodical use of Roman juristic categories. At issue was the settlement of the question: which principle of order should have the primacy in the Christian world, *auctoritas sacrata pontificum* or *regalis potestas?* The inclusion of the celebrated statement of Gelasius in Frederick's first message to the Pope was not unpremeditated.[13]

---

[11] Since the now outdated dissertation of M. Meyer, *Die Wahl Alexanders III. und Viktors IV.* (Göttingen 1871), this topic has not been the subject of a monograph; see J. Haller, *Das Papsttum,* III (2nd ed. 1962), 503 f.

[12] See Chapter I, pp. 8 f.

The obediences were quickly distinguished. In the Council of Pavia, meeting from 5 to 11 February 1160, summoned by the Emperor and attended for the most part by the imperial episcopate of Germany, Burgundy, and Lombardy, Frederick had Victor IV recognized, while Alexander was excommunicated. In the autumn of the same year the episcopates and monastic orders of the Western countries, including Spain, met at Toulouse in the presence of Henry II of England and Louis VII of France and, after a detailed inquiry into the elections, declared for Alexander III, and, as was to be expected, excommunicated Victor. Contrary to the procedure in the Empire, the Western kings had yielded to the pressure of their clergy, who for the most part saw a kindred spirit in Alexander, pupil of Abelard and representative of the new theology;[14] certain national hesitations were also expressed in regard to a Pope acting under imperial protection, not to mention imperial pressure.[15]

In the religious orders the reaction was less uniform. Cîteaux and La Grande Chartreuse adhered to Alexander; Cluny, to Victor. Prémontré was divided. The canons regular went along with the rest of the clergy of their countries or, like Gerhoh of Reichersberg, remained neutral. And there was an Alexandrian enclave in Germany: the province of Salzburg under Archbishop Eberhard I of Biburg and Hipoltstein, a Benedictine.

---

[13] *MGConst*, I, no. 137, 192 (footnotes 7–14).

[14] J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^{e} siècle* (Bruges and Paris 1948), 250–58.

[15] John of Salisbury, Letter 124 to Magister Ralph of Sarre (June-July 1160) in *The Letters of John of Salisbury (1153–61)*, ed. W. J. Millor, H. E. Butler, C. N. L. Brooke (London 1955), 204–15. This letter, a commentary on the imperial Council of Pavia (February 1160) and referring to an analysis of the double election of September 1159, passionately took the part of Alexander III and the freedom of ecclesiastical elections: "... electio pastoris est in ecclesia a clero libere et sine mundanae potestatis praenominatione celebranda, sic eadem in ecclesia a iudicibus ecclesiastics, amotis saecularibus terribilibusque personis, libere et secundum regulas ecclesiasticas examinanda est" (208).

Since the Emperor Frederick's power continued to grow in Italy, especially with the fall of Milan on 1 March 1162, and the Norman Kingdom, in which rebel vassals declared for Victor while the King upheld Alexander, offered no effective protection, Alexander left Italy. At Milan Archbishop Eberhard of Salzburg had previously sought to bring about an understanding between Frederick and Alexander. When the effort failed, Alexander proceeded to Genoa and in April 1162 sailed for southern France. In this country, where Innocent II had sought and found help, he remained for three years. But Bernard of Clairvaux had been dead for almost ten years and Frederick was reigning in the Empire instead of Lothar. Furthermore, the loyalty of Henry II of England and Louis VII of France appeared to be quite different from that of their predecessors of 1130. For them the new schism was almost a welcome opportunity, which promised them freedom of action and various possibilities in domestic and foreign politics. Henry II could, among other things, restore the crown's diminished authority over the Church, while Louis VII could correspondingly require a price for his support.

At first Alexander stayed at Montpellier, for Louis was negotiating with the Emperor. Agreement was reached on a meeting of the monarchs on the Saône bridge at Saint-Jean-de-Losne,[16] with the rival claimants to the papacy participating. But Alexander declined to submit to the projected arbitration court. A new date had to be selected: 19 September 1162. This too came to nothing, for shortly before, on 7 September, Frederick had had Alexander again excommunicated at a synod at Dôle, presided over by Victor. Thus Louis VII alone turned up; on the bridge he met the chancellor, Rainald of Dassel. A violent exchange between them wrecked any agreement for the moment. In fact, Alexander was now able to reconcile Louis with Henry II of England. The two Kings met at Coucy-sur-Loire, south of Blois. They planned a council, which met at Tours in May 1163 and turned into an impressive demonstration in favour of Alexander. The excommunication of Victor IV, Rainald of Dassel, and others was repeated, but the Emperor was spared. Alexander resumed his efforts for an understanding. In the summer of 1163 he sent representatives to Nürnberg and in April 1164 two cardinals, Hyacinth and William, to Susa, where Frederick was residing. Both attempts failed because Frederick insisted on the idea of an arbitration court, which Alexander had repeatedly rejected as unacceptable.

When Victor IV died at Lucca on 20 April 1164, Rainald of Dassel, without awaiting a word from the Emperor, hastened to procure the election of Cardinal Guido of Crema, who became Paschal III (1164–68).

---

[16] W. Heinemeyer, "Die Verhandlungen an der Saône im Jahre 1162," *DA*, 20 (1964), 155–89.

Whether he entirely enjoyed the Emperor's approval is controverted, but Frederick subsequently ratified what his chancellor had done.

For in Upper Italy there was being formed, at the instigation of Venice, a league of Lombard cities, led by Verona, in opposition to the strict implementation of the Roncaglia decrees, especially the harsh taxation by imperial *podestàs*. Alexander got into contact with this League of Verona that together they might meet the pressure of the imperial policy — successfully, as it turned out. In addition, after Victor's death there began in Germany a crumbling of the ecclesiastical front. In Burgundy the bishops refused Rainald of Dassel's demand that they recognize Paschal III. In the summer of 1164 the new Archbishop of Salzburg, Conrad, who as Bishop of Passau had adhered to Victor, now recognized Alexander. Gerhoh of Reichersberg followed suit. Conrad of Wittelsbach, Archbishop of Mainz, on the occasion of a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela, had sought out Alexander in France. And Archbishops Hillin of Trier and Wichmann of Magdeburg gradually became alienated from the imperial policy because of the serious harm done to the churches by the schism. At the Diet of Würzburg, at Pentecost 1165, the Emperor endeavoured to compel the loyalty of the bishops by having them swear under oath never to acknowledge Alexander. He was himself the first to take the oath, and the secular princes, headed by Henry the Lion, followed. Conrad of Wittelsbach fled to Alexander in France during the night preceding the swearing, and his see was given to Christian of Buch. Conrad of Salzburg was outlawed when he refused to take the oath within the delay granted to the absent princes. The year 1165 ended with the solemn raising at Aachen of the remains of Charles the Great, whom Rainald of Dassel, as the competent metropolitan, canonized in the presence of the Emperor.

The manifestoes of 1165 showed clearly in what sense Frederick intended to have his imperial office respected in the Church: perhaps not in the crude sense of binding the episcopate and the papacy to a mere function of service to the Empire, but certainly in the sense that he intended to fulfill his service to the Church as *defensor* only if the *honor imperii* could be brought into harmony with the *honor papatus.* In practice this appeared in Frederick's eyes to imply that only the *honor imperii* was sovereign, while the *honor papatus* was at most autonomous within the unity of the universal Empire, which was regarded, at least in theory, as identical with Christendom. Here ideas were so radically different that Alexander with reason had to continue the struggle without compromise in principle, if he was concerned for the liberty of the Church. In this connection the ending of the schism itself was to be understood only as a precondition; the restored unity would require a right ordering.

Meanwhile, in April 1165 Alexander III had left Sens, where he had resided for two years, in order to return to Italy. This time he found in the Normans a strong support. Negotiations had been begun with the Emperor Manuel, who held out the offer of a union of the Greek and Latin Churches in the event that Alexander would crown him Emperor. France and the Normans were to be included in the great coalition between Rome and Constantinople. But Louis VII and William I declined for obvious reasons. And Alexander himself was not prepared to abandon the Western imperial tradition.

In view of this lively diplomatic activity by his opponents, Frederick determined to force a decision in Italy. With a large army, which included mercenaries from Brabant, he set out on his fourth expedition to Italy in the fall of 1166. In the spring of 1167 he proceeded south. He took Ancona, which was allied with the Byzantines, and on 29 May defeated the Romans near Tusculum. He occupied the Leonine City at the end of July, thereby acquiring possession of Saint Peter's. Paschal III was solemnly enthroned there and on 1 August he gave the imperial crown to Frederick's wife, Beatrice of Burgundy. Alexander had fled to the protection of the Normans in Benevento.

A few days after the celebrations at Saint Peter's malaria broke out in the imperial army. More than 2,000 knights, princes, and bishops died, including Rainald of Dassel, and the Emperor himself fell ill and returned to Germany with the rest of the army. In Lombardy there began a rapid defection from the Emperor, which spread far. Milan was rebuilt and in 1168 there was founded near Tortona a league stronghold, which was named Alessandria in the Pope's honour. Italy was lost to the Emperor; the attempt to reestablish the imperial power in Italy, against the Curia and the cities, was wrecked. It is true that Paschal III acquired a successor in Calixtus III (1168–78), but from the death of Rainald of Dassel Frederick seemed more inclined to negotiate anew with Alexander. Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg, who was accompanied by the Abbots of Cîteaux and Clairvaux, was delegated for this purpose. It was only the two Abbots who succeeded in contacting the Pope in 1169, for Bishop Eberhard did not obtain permission from the Lombard League to pass through its territory. It was not until the end of March 1170 that he was able to meet the Pope at Veroli. Since the Lombard League was not to be included in the projected peace, Eberhard's mission foundered against the Pope's loyalty to his commitment.

And so at the Diet of Fulda in June 1170 the Emperor renewed his declaration, made at Würzburg, that he would never recognize Alexander and again made diplomatic overtures to the Western powers, England and France. He met Louis VII at Vaucouleurs in February 1171 and also opened negotiations with Byzantium. However, it was only too natural that the real decision had to be sought again in Italy. Hence Frederick moved south for the fifth time in September 1174. After several military engagements with the Lombard cities had taken place, a truce was agreed to at Montebello on 10 April 1176.[17] But a definitive peace could not be achieved, for this time the Lombards insisted on including the Pope. The war continued. Since Duke Henry the Lion, whom Frederick had gone to Chiavenna to see at the end of January 1176, refused to provide armed aid, Frederick went into the final phase of the long quarrel weaker than he had expected to be, and on 29 May 1176 he lost the battle of Legnano, northwest of Milan.

Frederick exploited the long drawn out peace negotiations to acquire by diplomacy what his arms had denied him. In the preliminary treaty of Anagni, in the negotiations for which representatives of the Lombard League had not been consulted, he was able to conclude a separate agreement with the Pope, which was to serve as the basis for the definitive discussions by all qualified parties. This preliminary treaty stipulated that Frederick should recognize Alexander as the lawful Pope, hand over to him the *regalia* of the *Patrimonium,* restore the confiscated properties, and renounce the Mathildine lands in Tuscany. It was agreed that the Lombards, the Normans, and the Byzantines should be included in the general peace. The Pope would release Frederick from excommunication and recognize him as Emperor and his son Henry as King of the Romans. All ecclesiastical decisions made by Frederick and his bishops during the schism were to retain their validity.

The final negotiations took place at Venice after Alexander had exerted himself, not without difficulty, to dispel the misgivings of his Lombard allies. The very secretly conducted preliminary negotiations at Anagni caused this mistrust to appear as only too justified. The agenda were determined by the Pope. There was first to be a discussion of peace between the Emperor and the Lombard League, and simultaneously a discussion of peace between the Emperor on the one hand and the King of Sicily and the Roman Church on the other hand. Hence, when the negotiations between the representatives of the Lombards and the Emperor's envoys came to a standstill, the Pope was able to propose the compromise that was later accepted: that instead of a peace an armistice of ten years might be agreed to, and similarly a fifteen-years' armistice between the Emperor and Sicily. The preliminary peace of Anagni was ratified, except that the arrangements in regard to the Mathildine lands were suppressed; Frederick contrived to have these territories remain in his hands for a further fifteen years. The negotiations lasted from 10 May to 21 July, during which time the Emperor resided at Pomposa and then at Chioggia. From here he seemed inclined, almost at the final hour, to proceed against Alexander by force, with the aid of the Venetian *popolani.*

---

[17] W. Heinemeyer, "Der Friede von Montebello (1175)," *DA,* 11 (1954), 101–39.

But the hesitations and opposition of his own war-weary entourage induced him to drop the project.

The Emperor, having been absolved from excommunication, entered Venice on 24 July. The Pope awaited him before San Marco. Frederick prostrated himself, but Alexander lifted him up, gave him the kiss of peace, and blessed him, while the Germans present sang the „Te Deum". The next day the Pope celebrated Mass in San Marco and preached in the Emperor's presence. Before and afterwards Frederick performed the honorary service he had once objected to at Sutri. On 1 August in the episcopal palace the Emperor took an oath to abide by the peace and the armistice. Then a cardinal proceeded to Rovigo to obtain corresponding assurances from the Empress and King Henry, both of whom had been included in the Peace of Venice.

Thus was the schism ended. All of Christendom breathed a sigh of relief. While the peace did not bring a decision in principle in regard to the relations between *Imperium* and papacy, and the Emperor came out of it practically unimpeded, still Alexander may be regarded as the winner, even though he too, in order definitely to end the schism, renounced any clarification of the disputed ideologies. He had to be less concerned with that than with the peace, which at the moment contributed more for the welfare of the Universal Church than did a formal but revocable word from the Emperor.

The Third Lateran Council

A general council had been agreed upon both in the preliminary treaty of Anagni of October-November 1176 and in the Peace of Venice of 21 July 1177. Both treaties say in identical terms:

> The Lord Pope, together with the cardinals, bishops, and other devout men [abbots], who take part, will excommunicate at the council soon to be summoned, all who seek to break this peace. The same thing will then be done at the general council.

The council first mentioned took place in San Marco at Venice on 14 August. The Emperor occupied a throne beside the Pope, who pronounced excommunication on all who should violate the peace or armistice and did not present themselves for penance within forty days. At the same time Alexander renewed the excommunication of all who still adhered to the schism. When the torches were cast on the ground and extinguished, the Emperor, with the rest, cried aloud: "Fiat, fiat."

Archbishop Christian of Mainz conducted the Pope back to the *Patrimonium*. The Antipope Calixtus III was outlawed by imperial authority when he refused to submit. Alexander received a delegation of Romans at

Anagni and was able to entrust to Christian's care the conditions for the return to Rome. The city's autonomy, a result of the revolution of 1143, was maintained, but the senators had to take an oath of fealty to the Pope, restore the *regalia,* and guarantee the safety of the Pope and of the pilgrims. *Via* Tusculum Alexander at length reentered his city on 12 March 1178. He had not hurried. The Romans were apparently enthusiastic, but Alexander had no confidence in them. He soon returned to Tusculum, where on 29 August 1178 Calixtus III finally submitted.

The Emperor had already made his way back to Germany in September 1177 and held aloof from the stipulated general council. The Curia's preparations for it began with the return to the *Patrimonium.* In the autumn of 1178 several legates visited the European states in order to invite bishops and abbots to the council, which was to meet in the Lateran. The overall political situation was not unfavourable. Louis VII and Henry II had concluded peace at Nonancourt on 25 September 1177, shortly after the peace between Emperor and Pope. Baldwin IV was still reigning in Jerusalem, and seven bishops and a delegation of Templars and Hospitallers were *en route* to Rome. Sicily authorized its prelates to attend the council, while Henry II granted permission to the Irish and to six English bishops.

The Pope opened the council on 5 March 1179. The inaugural address was delivered by the Bishop of Assisi, Magister Rufinus, one of the leading canonists of the age. Present were some 300 bishops from Italy, Germany, and Burgundy, from France, Spain, England and Ireland, from Sicily and the crusader states, even from Denmark and Hungary. Among them was John of Salisbury, now Bishop of Chartres. From Germany had come the Bishops of Mainz, Bamberg, Augsburg, Constance, Worms, Speyer, Chur, Salzburg, Regensburg, Passau, Trier, Metz, Liège, Zeitz, Meissen, Brandenburg, Hamburg-Bremen, and Schwerin — an impressive witness to the peace.[18] Cologne, Magdeburg, and the Westphalian sees were not represented because the troubles between the Emperor and Henry the Lion kept them at home. Nectarius of Casula arrived as envoy of the Byzantine Church. Also present was a group of Waldensians from Lyons. If note is taken also of the uncounted abbots, priors, scholars, and attendants of bishops, it was an impressive gathering, a real representation of the Universal Church, before which, in his opening discourse, Rufinus of Assisi developed the principles underlying the primacy of the Roman Church and extolled the personality and work of Alexander III.

Unfortunately, no real conciliar acts have been preserved[19], and the notes of Archbishop William of Tyre are lost. Only the jejune remarks of historians and some allusions by participants, such as Peter of Blois, Peter Comestor, and Walter Map, inform us about this or that point.[20] Twenty-seven canons were the fruit of discussions at three sessions on 5, 14, and 19 March.[21]

---

[18] List of participants in *Mansi,* 22, 213–17, 239 f., 458–68 summarized in R. Foreville, *op. cit.,* 387–90.

[19] What is relatively the best account is given by Roger of Howden, *Chronicle,* ed. W. Stubbs, I (London 1868), 171–89 (also given in Rolls Series, 51, 1).

The formulation, the lucid and carefully chosen language of these decrees, is thought, probably correctly, to betray the hand of the jurist Pope. The diversity of their contents reflects the aim of evaluating the great events and decisions of the pontificate and having them ratified by the Universal Church. The measures agreed to in Anagni and Venice for the liquidation of the schism were confirmed. It was recalled that every cathedral was to have a school of its own, no cleric was to be without a benefice, the bishop was to look out for the welfare of his clergy. Canon 1, which regulated the papal election, was important and of permanent validity. Clearly inspired by the experience of 1159, it demanded a two-thirds majority for validity. At the same time the distinction insisted on in 1059 between bishops and non-bishops in the College of Cardinals was tacitly set aside and the election was restricted to the College exclusively, for neither the rest of the clergy nor the people was mentioned. "[It] is still in force and will probably remain so as long as Popes are elected."[22] Canons 3 and 8 became the bases on which was developed the right of devolution: if a benefice was not filled within six months, the right to fill it passed to the concurrent or next highest tribunal.

Decrees still had to be issued against simony and on celibacy (canons 7, 10, 15). Thus a century had not been long enough for correcting abuses, nor, as is well known, would the succeeding centuries suffice. Canon 18 promised exemption from fees for instruction, and Canon 25 forbade usury and traffic in war materials with infidels. Canons 24 and 25 regulated social relations of Christians with Jews or Muslims. The last canon dealt with heresy — the prelude to the trying episode now beginning, which was to find its climax in the Albigensian wars of later pontificates. Canon 27 was in effect the charter of the crusade against heretics: the privileges hitherto intended for crusaders, the indulgences, the papal privileges accorded to them and their possessions were from now on granted to those who made themselves available for the armed struggle against heresy.

---

[20] Albert of Stade, *Annales MGSS,* 16, 348 (the assertions of loyalty by Christian of Mainz and Philip of Cologne); Walter Map, *De nugis curialium,* D. 1, c. 31, ed. M. R. James (Oxford 1944), 60 f. (Peter Waldo of Lyons and his disciples); Peter Cantor, *Verbum abbreviatum, PL,* 205, 158, 235 f. (attitude of the Bishop of Chartres, John of Salisbury, at the Council).

[21] The complicated and still not fully clarified history of the transmission of the conciliar decrees is briefly sketched in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (Basel, Barcelona, Freiburg, Rome, Vienna, 2nd ed. 1962), 182–86. The decrees themselves, *ibid.,* 187–201.

[22] J. Haller, *Das Papsttum,* III (2nd ed. 1962), 242.

Alexander received the Waldensians who were present sympathetically and graciously, and praised their voluntary poverty, but he did not grant them permission to preach. The competent bishops were to decide this question. But the very first attempt at Lyons failed, since the Archbishop rejected the request and thus drove the Waldensians into opposition.

Like the case of the Waldensians, still other problems occupied the Council without being mentioned in the canons: for example, the reconciliation of schismatic bishops. The Council's measures in regard to the papal election, the right of devolution, the prosecution of heretics, and the care of lepers were of permanent validity.

CHAPTER 9

Thomas Becket and Henry II of England

In the Angevin Kingdom of England a confrontation between King Henry II and the Primate Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, ran its course between 1162 and 1170. In many ways intertwined with the eighteen-year struggle between Alexander III and Frederick I, in certain of its moments of crisis it cannot be fully understood apart from that contest. The English struggle concerned the threat to that liberty of the Church that had been firmly established since the confusion of 1135–52 over the succession to Henry I. Especially at issue were episcopal elections, communication with Rome, and ecclesiastical courts. Because of its dramatic *dénouement* and the powerfully drawn personalities who figured in it, this struggle occupied the field of vision of contemporary observers even more than did the turning-points of the schism.

On the one side was a saint, who was likewise a man of brilliant intellect, a skillful diplomat, a reliable administrator, and a socially sensitive prelate, rising from the new social strata of an urban and mercantile self-consciousness, formed in the schools of the new theology and of the just then developing science of canon law, representative of all that was striving to establish itself in the world and in the Church.

On the other side was a still young King, the husband of the most important and best known lady of the epoch, Eleanor, former wife of the French King. Of a none too praiseworthy repute because of the Second Crusade, she had brought Aquitaine along when she married the future English monarch. Henry II (1154–89) was a son of the Empress Matilda, widow of Henry V, by her second marriage with Count Geoffrey of

Anjou. Immediately after his accession to the throne in 1154 he had begun to restore the rights and claims of the crown which had been usurped during the anarchy. Among these was control of the English bishoprics and abbeys because of their importance in the feudal social and political constitution of the Kingdom. His guiding idea was to recover the position occupied by Henry I in Church and state, if not to win back the authority once exercised by William the Conqueror.

From 1155 Henry II had at his side as chancellor the archdeacon of Canterbury, Thomas Becket. Born in London in 1108,[1] Thomas had been educated by Robert of Merton, then in France by Robert of Melun, a pupil of Abelard, and at Bologna. Archbishop Theobald had made him archdeacon when that position became vacant by the election of Roger de Pont-l'Évêque as Archbishop of York. Theobald died on 18 April 1161, whereupon Henry saw to it that his chancellor Thomas was chosen Metropolitan and Primate of the English Church in a canonically proper election on 27 May 1162.[2]

The Archbishop

As chancellor Thomas Becket had been a friend of the King. But he had carefully represented the interests of the Church and had exerted himself with Henry in favour of Alexander III. While his conduct was blameless, he appeared at court and while hunting and traveling with the display appropriate to his position. But from his consecration Thomas seemed to be another man. Prayer, study, and spiritual discussions with his cultured and reform-minded clerics filled his days. He resigned the chancellorship and sent the seals back to the King at the end of 1162. People praised his grand-scale hospitality and his solicitude for the poor; the latter was enhanced by his personal participation. He also practised strict mortifications, the forms of which were in some cases discovered only after his death, such as the wearing of a hairshirt and self-flagellation. The Archbishop took his new position seriously and wanted to be only priest, bishop, pastor, theologian. Neither contemporaries nor later research has been unanimous in judging his career; to some it seemed to be a mere change of role, to others a genuine *conversio.*[3]

The King, appealing to the customary law and to precedents in the common law, intended to restore the crown's authority in the English

---

[1] R. Foreville tried to establish 21 December 1120 as the date of his birth ("Tradition et comput dans la chronologie de Thomas Becket," *Bulletin historique et philologique* [1957], 7–20).

[2] On Gilbert Foliot's opposition, which became apparent at the time of the election, see A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and His Letters* (Cambridge 1965), 147–87.

[3] *Cf.* R. Foreville, *L'église et la royauté en Angleterre,* 111–13.

Church, to limit ecclesiastical jurisdiction and keep it in check and probably to subordinate it eventually to the royal justice, and to keep royal control over appeals to the Curia.

The Archbishop, on the contrary, did not hesitate to stand up for rights and liberties of the Church hitherto acquired or won under King Stephen and to afford greater scope for the canon law that had been entering England since the appearance of Gratian's *Decretum* around 1140. But just as the reviving canon law was of great significance for the Archbishop, so too did the reviving Roman law play a great role for the King, following the example of the Emperor Frederick I, even though outwardly there was mention only of the restoration of the customs of the Kingdom. A confrontation was inevitable and it had to be all the sharper and more dramatic since both men, King and Archbishop, regarded themselves as representatives of the good and valid law, and both, for the sake of the highest goals, were prepared to make use of high intelligence, diplomatic skill, a will that expressed itself vigorously and even tempestuously, and at the same time all the intellectual, material, and personal helps which state or Church put at their disposal.

The Constitutions of Clarendon

Immediately after entering upon his office, Thomas asked for and obtained the pallium from Alexander III, who was staying at Montpellier. Along with his suffragans he was able to take part, with the King's permission, in the Council of Tours in 1163, which again strengthened Alexander's case and deepened in Thomas the awareness that the interests of the Roman Church and of the Church of Canterbury were identical. To be sure, the Council of Tours made clear the irreconcilable opposition between Canterbury and York in the question of the primacy in England. Archbishop Roger was to remain on the King's side to the last, an opponent of Thomas Becket.[4]

The conflict with the crown began with measures of the King which limited ecclesiastical jurisdiction over clerics. At a council at Westminster on 1 October 1163 Henry complained of the increase in the number of crimes committed by clerics and the leniency of the spiritual courts. In February 1162 he had had the old customary law, which had been promulgated at Lillebonne in 1080 and renewed by Henry I, again enforced for Normandy. Something analogous was to have happened at Westminster but the attempt was shattered on the united opposition of the episcopate under the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

---

[4] *Cf.* D. Knowles, *The Episcopal Colleagues,* 12–14. On the incident at Tours, see R. Foreville, *L'église et la royauté,* 277 f.

Henry II summoned the royal council to meet at the end of January 1164 at Clarendon, and here the bishops were to express themselves on the renewal of the English customary law from the time of Henry I. After long discussions Thomas was able finally to induce the episcopate to agree, and he himself gave his consent orally. But when the King intended to have the written codification of the customs signed and sealed by the bishops, Thomas was alone in his refusal. For he was able tacitly to allow or dissimulate much in practice, just as the Curia was accustomed to do, but not to approve by signature and seal measures which clearly violated the prevailing canon law.

The sixteen articles of the Constitutions of Clarendon,[5] different as were the particular points treated, aimed as a whole at nullifying the growing independence of the English Church from the crown. The feudal dependence of the episcopate was emphasized, episcopal elections were to take place under royal control, bishops-elect were to take the oath of fealty before being consecrated, bishops' rights of disposal of Church property were restricted, they were bound by the same services to the crown as were the secular vassals. Ecclesiastical courts had to accommodate themselves to the judicial procedures of the secular courts and their competence was considerably restricted, while that of the secular courts was extended to matters of debt, perjury, disputes over benefices, questions of patronage, and the criminal and civil cases of clerics. Bishops' powers of excommunication were curtailed in regard to the crown's tenants-in-chief and members of the royal household and of the courts. Every appeal from English courts to the Curia was subject to the King's examination and consent, as were also journeys by bishops to the Curia or to councils. None of this was new in regard to details, but here it was juridically formulated for the first time and made a law with the written assent of the episcopate.

Appealing to the canonical principles expressed in Gratian's *Decretum,* Thomas Becket protested this diminution of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and of episcopal liberties. In the Constitutions of Clarendon he feared a complete feudalization of the English Church, which was exposed to the danger of gradually losing both of its essential privileges, — *privilegium fori* and *privilegium canonis,* — of being excluded from the jurisdictional sphere of the Universal Church, and of experiencing a lessening of its ties with its faith and its head.

Disenchanted with his chancellor, who as Archbishop first gave up the chancellorship and then rejected the King's policy of a restoration of the royal authority, Henry in October 1164 cited him before the council at Northampton on the basis of Article 9 of the Constitutions of Clarendon.

---

[5] For the Constitutions of Clarendon see W. Stubbs (ed.), *Select Charters* (London, 9th ed. 1913; *reprint* 1921), 163–67.

The Archbishop did not accept the judgment but appealed to the Pope and thereby placed himself and his church under the protection of the Holy See. The episcopate held itself aloof. Protected by the people, who had long been grateful for the social welfare provided by the chancellor and Archbishop, Thomas left the royal castle of Northampton. The devotion of the canons regular of Sempringham enabled him to flee to the coast during the night following the judgment and then to France, where he was to spend six years.

Exile and Reconciliation

The fleeing Primate of England obtained a place of refuge from King Louis VII. Then at Sens he explained his case to Pope Alexander III and the cardinals and read to them the Constitutions of Clarendon; the Pope condemned nearly two-thirds of the articles: numbers 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15. The Pope also absolved him from the oral promise he had earlier made to observe them. He refused the Archbishop's offer to resign his office, confirmed him in it, and at the same time recognized the primatial status of Canterbury.

Thomas took up residence in the Cistercian abbey of Pontigny near Auxerre, not far from Sens. He stayed there from the end of November 1164 to November 1166. Wearing the Cistercian habit, he devoted himself to prayer and to the study of theology and canon law. Meanwhile Henry II confiscated the ecclesiastical property of Canterbury and expelled from the Kingdom the Archbishop's family and the clerics who remained loyal to him, together with their relatives. Efforts at mediation came to nothing, even when undertaken by the Empress Matilda, the Pope, and King Louis VII (at Easter 1166). Before returning to Italy Alexander III solemnly annulled the judgment of Northampton.

Since in 1165–66 there occurred a *rapprochement* on Henry's part to the imperial policy of Frederick I and at Würzburg in 1165 English envoys signed the proclamation of intransigence in regard to Alexander, it was not to be expected that the Angevin would give in. The English episcopate, it is true, declined for its part to honour these signatures, but the King was satisfied with the pressure on Alexander that was made possible by his friendship with Frederick. He demanded that the Pope either depose Thomas or assign him another see. In spite of several compromises with the English King that depended on trivial circumstances, Alexander in the end upheld the Archbishop, confirmed him as Primate on 5–8 April 1166, and on 24 April 1166 even named him legate in England, a post he had refused to Roger of York, despite the King's intervention. But in order to accommodate Henry, he made Roger legate in Scotland and removed the province of York from the territory subject to the legate in England.

At Vézelay on Pentecost 1166, Thomas as legate solemnly excommunicated the King's councillors and officials, but not Henry himself. He thereby laid claim to a right which was denied him by the Constitutions of Clarendon. Henry's answer was to bring pressure to bear on the general chapter of the Cistercians, threatening to expel all members of the order from England if Thomas continued to obtain hospitality at Pontigny. The Archbishop left Pontigny and spent the remaining years of exile with the Benedictines of Sainte-Colombe de Sens. There followed the most varied negotiations, conducted by papal legates[6] especially designated for this purpose, with Henry II; in these were at times reflected the complexities of Alexander's political situation *vis-à-vis* the threatening enterprises of Frederick I. In this connection the Pope displayed a strangely hesitant technique that was ready for compromise and to an extent even underhanded, an attitude which was even blamed by contemporaries.

From 1169 on several encounters between Henry and Thomas became possible — on 6 January at Montmirail, on 18 November at Montmartre — but there was no actual reconciliation nor adjustment of viewpoints.

On the contrary, from the beginning of 1170 Henry completely isolated England from the continent and especially from the Curia. The Constitutions of Clarendon were strictly enforced. The coronation of Henry the Younger was prepared. In defiance of the prohibition obtained from the Pope by Thomas, the Archbishop of York crowned the Prince on 14 June at Saint Peter's, Westminster, with the assistance of Bishops Gilbert Foliot of London, Jocelin de Bohun of Salisbury, Walter of Rochester, and Hugh du Puiset of Durham. It was an intentional affront by the King in the face of repeated prohibitions by the Pope, just recently renewed, and of the rights of the ancient metropolitan see of Canterbury. Henry, who now had to fear that Thomas would make use of his right to lay an interdict on England or other parts of the Angevin realm, proceeded to the continent for a personal discussion with the Archbishop, at Fréteval-en-Dunois in the Orléanais on 22 July 1170. He assured the Primate peace, safety, the return of the church and the property of Canterbury, as these last were at the time of the rupture; he promised the restoration of all the rights of the primatial see and a repetition of the coronation by Thomas. They parted, seemingly reconciled. But the King had not given sureties, and the fulfilling of the various promises seemed almost hopeless, especially since the bishops from the time of the coronation were risking everything to prevent a reinstatement of the Archbishop. Before his return to England Thomas had himself provided by the Pope with the widest powers, but he excommunicated the bishops even before setting out on his journey, for he had to reckon with the possible confiscation of his papers by the officials when he landed.

---

[6] On the legateships in connection with the strife over Thomas Becket, see H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England,* 56–72, and W. Janssen, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich,* 84–88.

His return to Canterbury in December 1170 was a profound satisfaction for the Archbishop, especially as it was celebrated by the people as a triumph. Only complications proceeded from the King and the bishops. The bishops appealed to the Pope against their excommunication and declined to make an oath of obedience to their Metropolitan and Primate. The Archbishop was forbidden to visit the young King at Winchester and was commanded to stay within the limits of his own bishopric and to keep silent about personal insults offered by royal officials and attendants. Furthermore, the excommunicated prelates proceeded at once to Henry II in Normandy. Irritated by the excommunication of these bishops, which he had not anticipated, Henry impetuously expressed his mind: "Isn't there anyone to deliver me from this hateful priest?"[7]

Murder in the Cathedral

Four knights of the King's entourage, at whose disposal Ranulf de Broc, administrator of the sequestered Canterbury property, placed a few armed men, forced their way into the episcopal residence, always open to guests and the poor, on the afternoon of 29 December 1170. They found the Archbishop in conversation with his clerics and began a long dispute with him, blaming him for having excommunicated members of the royal court without previous consultation with the King. At the hour of Vespers the Archbishop's attendants urged him to go to the cathedral, where the monks were just assembling. The Archbishop refused to have the gates barricaded behind him. The knights had departed to get their weapons. After the Archbishop and his retinue had reached the north transept, where a huge pillar upheld a gallery and there stood an altar dedicated to Saint Benedict, the knights sought to drive the prelate and his entourage out of the church. His back to the pillar, Thomas replied to the demand that he absolve the bishops from censure: "I can absolve them only when they have made satisfaction." "Then," said the four, "receive the death you deserve." "I am ready to die for my God, if thereby liberty and peace are restored to the Church."[8] They then killed him amid the glow of torches. The assassins plundered his residence and departed late that night. Only then did the monks and clerics venture forth to bury the remains of the martyr in a marble coffin in the crypt before the altar of Saint John the Baptist and Saint Augustine, Apostle of the English. The blood was carefully collected.

---

[7] *Materials,* VII, 440, 476, 443, and *Gesta regis,* I, 32 *(PL,* 190, 42 A, 97 C, 177 B).

[8] *Materials,* II, 430–40 (*PL,* 190, 46 A–47 C). See also the report by John of Salisbury to Bishop John of Poitiers, *Materials,* VII, 462–65.

The Sequel to the Martyrdom

Christendom very quickly learned of what had happened at Canterbury, and everywhere people were shocked. Responsibility for the murder was assigned to the English King, the Archbishop of York, and Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London. On 25 January 1171 the Archbishop of Sens, as papal legate, laid an interdict on the continental lands of Henry II. The King, personally shaken by the consequences of his angry words, sent to Rome a delegation which was able to prevent the laying of an interdict on England but could not stop the Pope from excommunicating on Holy Thursday all who had contributed directly or indirectly to the murder. Alexander confirmed the sentence issued by the Archbishop of Sens and punished Henry with a personal interdict; only legates who should be expressly named would be able to release him from it. The King set out on his expedition to Ireland; he was able to conquer part of the island and was hailed as King by its subkings.

Meanwhile, negotiations were taking place with the Curia in regard to the reparation to be made by the King because of Thomas's murder. He had had the expedition to Ireland declared to be a crusade, an undertaking which would subject the Irish Church to the Holy See. After his return in the spring of 1172 he met the papal legates in Normandy.[9] On 21 May Henry and the accused bishops purged themselves with an oath that they had neither commanded nor desired the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Henry further swore that he would hold 200 knights in readiness for a year for the defense of the Holy Land, that at Christmas of 1172 he would take the cross for three years and personally set out on the crusade the following summer, and that in any event he would keep himself at the disposal of the Pope. If a journey to Jerusalem should be impossible, he would carry out his vow in Spain against the Muslims. He would permit appeals to Rome in cases before ecclesiastical courts. He would disavow customs hurtful to the Church as these had been enforced under his authority. He would restore to the Church of Canterbury all its property. And finally he would receive in peace all clerics and lay persons who had remained loyal to Thomas and give back their possessions.

---

[9] Cardinals Albert of San Lorenzo *in Lucina* and Theodin of San Vitale; *cf.* H. Tillmann, *op. cit.*, 68–74, and W. Janssen, *op. cit.*, 85–88.

After Henry and his son had sworn to these promises he was absolved and reconciled with the Church.[10] The promises of Avranches were confirmed by Alexander III in a bull of 2 September and ratified on 27 September by Henry at Saint-André. The Constitutions of Clarendon were not disavowed in their entirety, but appeals to Rome were allowed, and this was of the greatest importance. For the papal decretals that were issued for England from now on in great numbers laid the basis of an English canon law within the framework of the development in the Universal Church.

The grave of the murdered Archbishop very soon became the goal of the greatest pilgrimage movement of the High and the Late Middle Ages. Alexander III solemnly canonized Thomas Becket on 21 February 1173. King Henry himself made a pilgrimage to Canterbury in July 1174 and again did penance for his share in the saint's death. At his wish the Pope sent Hugh Pierleoni[11] to England as Cardinal-Legate. He was not only able to arrange the filling of the many vacant sees but also reached a compromise with the King in regard to the disputed ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Only questions concerning clerics' fiefs and violations of the forest laws by clerics were for the future to be handled by a secular judge. The total result of the long conflict should not be estimated as meagre. The Archbishop did not die in vain.

CHAPTER 10

The Heritage of Alexander III

The Peace of Venice was only a truce, made possible by a compromise. The German Church remained in the hands of the Emperor, who continued to exploit the *ius spolii* and placed the *regalia* at the service of the Empire. Alexander's legates let matters take their course. The Pope himself mediated between Frederick and the Lombard League.[1] The League disintegrated, and such recent enemies as Milan and Alessandria allied with the Emperor. Alexander loyally observed the stipulations of the peace until his death, but he left behind as open questions the unclarified juridical and political situation of the Mathildine lands, the validity of the schismatic ordinations in Germany and Italy, and the relations of the Holy See with the Roman commune. In flight from rebellious Viterbo, he died at Cività Castellana.[2] Nevertheless, his heritage did not consist merely of unsolved difficulties. Thanks to the tenacious struggle at the time of the schism and his consistently pursued government of the Universal Church, despite his always disputed legitimacy, it also meant the establishment of the prestige of Roman legal decisions in Christendom and the recognition of the Roman See as the supreme judge and legislator. At the same time the competence of this highest jurisdiction had been enlarged, and appeals from all countries to the Holy See had increased. Like Eugene III and Hadrian IV earlier, Alexander III at the Lateran Council sought to take measures against excess in appeals, but without any noticeable effect.

---

[10] On the Concordat of Avranches, see R. Foreville, *L'église et la royauté*, 356–61.

[11] On the legatine activity of the Cardinal Deacon Hugh Pierleoni of Sant'Angelo, see Tillmann, *op. cit.*, 73–76.

[1] The Peace of Constance (25 June 1183) was Frederick's renunciation of the Roncaglia decrees. The alliance with Milan was concluded at the beginning of 1185.

The Cardinal Bishop Ubaldo Allucingoli of Ostia was elected Alexander's successor on 1 September 1181 and styled himself Lucius III (1181–85). An old and prudent Cistercian, as a friend of Bernard of Clairvaux he was so identified with the reform ideas of that saint's age that he declined to make the money gifts to the Romans that were expected at every change of pontificate, for he regarded this as an abuse. In November 1181 he arrived in Rome, where a college of twenty-five senators had control of the government. He was received cooly and remained only five months. A conflict erupted in regard to Tusculum, which the Romans wanted either to subjugate to their own rule or to destroy. Lucius appealed for aid to Archbishop Christian of Mainz, who was always close at hand. But in September 1183 he lost this helper, who ever since the Peace of Venice had loyally looked after the interests of the papacy in the *Patrimonium* and against the Roman commune. The warrior prelate succumbed to a fever before Tusculum. The Curia moved northward, for a meeting with the Emperor Frederick I had been arranged in Verona.

The Emperor had made peace with the Lombards at Constance in 1183 and, since it was important to him to settle with Alexander's successor the questions left open at Venice, he showed himself to be accommodating. Lucius III waited at Verona from 22 July 1184. The Emperor did not arrive until the end of September, after having spent some time at Milan, his new ally. The Pope profited by the presence of Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, and of the grand masters of the military orders, who, as envoys of King Baldwin IV, candidly expounded the situation of the Holy Land, to urge a crusade on the Emperor. Frederick assured him that the preparations would get under way by Christmas of that year. A uniform procedure by *regnum* and *sacerdotium* was also planned at Verona for the struggle against heretical movements, which were spreading ever more powerfully and becoming more threatening, especially in the Midi and North Italy. In the decretal "Ad abolendam" of 4 November 1184 was found the classical formula, according to which the Church was to institute proceedings against heretics and, if the occasion arose, to condemn them, leaving or recommending the carrying out of the judgment and of the penalty to the secular arm. An imperial edict, whose text is not extant, corresponded to the papal decree. This papal-imperial decision has been called the charter of the Inquisition.[3]

---

[2] 30 August 1181.

But Lucius did not obtain a definite promise of imperial assistance in his struggle for Rome, and the questions relevant to the Mathildine lands remained unclarified. On the other hand, the Pope, referring to a new council to be held at Lyons, did not give in to the imperial pressure to settle the existing ambiguity in regard to schismatic orders. Nor did Lucius decide the conflict over the see of Trier between Folmar, who had been elected in May 1183, and Rudolf zu Wied, whom Frederick had invested; instead, he summoned both claimants to the Curia. He likewise refused the Emperor's demand that his son Henry be given the imperial crown at once.[4] If it is remembered that the discussions of Verona had been suggested by the Pope himself, this emphatic reserve may cause surprise. The blame has been assigned to both the Curia and those German bishops who opposed the Emperor. The leader of this group was Philip of Heinsberg, Archbishop of Cologne, to whom Frederick had granted the Duchy of Westphalia in 1180. But the real reason must be ascribed to Frederick's making known at Verona a fundamental change in his Italian policy: his intention of reaching an understanding with the Norman Kingdom in South Italy. This was promoted by the engagement of his son Henry to Constance of Sicily, daughter of King Roger II and hence aunt of the reigning King William II. The engagement took place at Augsburg on 29 October 1184. Its consequences were not at all apparent when it was officially made known toward the end of the discussions and shortly before the Emperor's departure from Verona. The wedding was to take place at Milan, which had allied with the Empire. It was solemnized on 27 January 1186.

---

[3] "Ipse [Lucius] et Imperator Veronae convenientes, ut inter spiritualem patrem et filium miscentur colloquia, et tamquam ex duabus principalibus curiis et duobus orbis capitibus una Republica effecta, ecclesiastica simul et saecularia inter eos tractantur negotia; ubi etiam vicissim alterutrius delectati praesentia et vigore suffulti communi consilio omnium qui convenerant... contra diversas haereses et eorum auctores... insurgunt et suo eos fine condemnant." (From the decretal "Ad abolendam" of 4 November 1184; *cf.* H Maisonneuve, *Études sur les origines de l'Inquisition* [Paris, 2nd ed. 1960], 151.)

[4] As early as 1169 the Emperor Frederick had negotiated in vain with Alexander III relevant to Henry's becoming coemperor. Like Lucius III, Urban III would likewise refuse. "The Curia rejected the office of coemperor for the Western *Imperium*"; *cf.* W. Ohnsorge, "Das Mitkaisertum in der abendländischen Geschichte des frühen Mittelalters," *ZSavRG germ*, 67 (1950), 309–39; also, now, *idem*, *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt 1958), 261–99 (especially 281).

It may with great probability be assumed that Pope Lucius himself was not unwilling to regard this connection as being in the interests of peace and of the plans for a crusade, and even that he personally fostered it. Nevertheless, the Curia may have feared, even if at the moment there was really no cause to expect Constance to succeed to the throne, that such an alliance of the Empire with Sicily concealed additional threats to the existence of the *Patrimonium.*

Following the Emperor's departure from Verona the discussions between the two courts continued. But Lucius III died on 25 November 1185, without having reached any final decisions. On the very same day the cardinals elected Archbishop Uberto Crivelli of Milan, an avowed opponent of the Emperor, thereby making clear how little they agreed with Frederick's new course. He called himself Urban III (1185–87), and as Pope did not resign his archbishopric in order not to allow the *regalia* to accrue to the Empire during a vacancy. The Pope kept aloof from the Hohenstaufen-Hauteville marriage at Milan, and Henry was crowned King of Italy by the Patriarch of Aquileia. There is no doubt that this was intended as an affront to the Pope, who reacted by consecrating the anti-imperial Folmar for the see of Trier on 1 June 1186. A break between Pope and Emperor seemed inevitable. Frederick ordered his son to occupy the *Patrimonium* and so to isolate the Pope and Curia at Verona as to prevent any contact with the Church. At the Diet of Gelnhausen in November 1186 the Emperor also succeeded in paralyzing the opposition around Philip of Cologne and of isolating the Archbishop. The German episcopate was again united behind the throne.

In 1187 Frederick decided to send an embassy to Verona to submit new proposals to the Pope. But Urban avoided it. He had consecrated the city's new cathedral and had been prevented by the wary people of Verona from proclaiming Frederick's excommunication. He now left Verona for Venice but *en route* he died at Ferrara during the night of 19–20 October. The Church was thereby spared a new and disagreeable crisis.

The brief pontificate of his successor, Gregory VIII (21 October–17 December 1187) was entirely preoccupied with preparations for the crusade. As Cardinal Chancellor, Albert de Morra had founded a congregation of canons regular of an austere observance in his native city of Benevento, and, like his predecessor Lucius III, he belonged to the group representing the Bernardine reform. In accord with its leading idea, he intended to work for a renewal of the Curia, but his early death saved him from failure and disappointment. Just the same, he had been able at least to put an end to Urban III's intransigent policy toward the Empire.

In view of the organizing of the crusade, then getting under way, the election of the new Pope could fall only on a conciliatory personality, in view of the fact that the Emperor Frederick himself was to be the most important leader. The Cardinal Bishop Paul Scolari, who became Clement III (1187–91), was a Roman by birth and related to several influential families of the Eternal City. He contrived to find a compromise between the Curia and the city, while a definitive peace with the Empire was also achieved. The Trier dispute was ended when the two rivals, Folmar and Rudolf, were discarded to make way for the Imperial Chancellor John.[5]

Clement had to negotiate for quite some time with the Romans before the treaty of 31 May 1188 could be signed. With a considerable financial output and the loss of rights the Curia purchased a peace which still remained precarious and could be assured only by unending new payments.

In the Treaty of Strasbourg of April 1189 the Empire restored the *Patrimonium* to the Pope, reserving the *honor imperii,* and in return Clement held out the prospect of the imperial crown for King Henry. Again the Mathildine lands remained in the hands of the Emperor, who, however, dispensed with an express recognition of his proprietorship. In order to prepare for and carry out the crusade Clement put up with all the disadvantages of these treaties.

William II of Sicily died childless on 18 November 1189. His legitimate heir was Queen Constance, wife of Frederick's son Henry, who had just assumed the regency of the Empire for the absent Emperor.

Shortly before his death William had taken the vassal's oath to the Pope for Sicily. Would Henry, soon to succeed his father as ruler of the *Sacrum Imperium,* be prepared to do the same? While Apulia decided for Constance and Henry, the Sicilian magnates proclaimed as King a bastard cousin of William, Count Tancred of Lecce. The Archbishop of Palermo crowned him with Clement's consent.

Henry was determined to take possession of his wife's entire inheritance. Through the mediation of the Archbishop of Mainz he was reconciled with Henry the Lion at Fulda in July 1190 and, accompanied by the Duke of Saxony, set out for Italy. But the news of his father's death in Asia Minor produced a delay and it was only in January 1191 that he entered Lombardy. Meanwhile, the presence in Messina of the Kings of France and England, who had set up winter quarters there *en route* to Palestine, so strengthened Tancred's position that in April he crossed to

---

[5] M. Corsten (*née* Lönartz), "Erzbischof Johann I. von Trier (1189–1212), "*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Saargegend,* 13 (1963), 127–200. *Cf.* J. Heinrich, *Kaiser Heinrich VI.,* 193–99, 215 f., 221–23.

Apulia and began to conquer this part of the Norman Kingdom also in order to be armed for his confrontation with Henry.

Clement III died at the end of March 1191, and his successor could not avoid the fateful decisions following from the proximity of Henry, who was on his way to Rome for the imperial crown and was already at Anguillara. The aged Cardinal Hyacinth Bobone, an eighty-five-year-old curial prelate, who had belonged to the College of Cardinals for forty-seven years, was elected; he assumed the name of Celestine III (1191–98). A pupil of Abelard's, he had been critical of Bernard of Clairvaux. He had been the Curia's successful diplomat in embassies of reconciliation, notably that to Frederick I for settling the misunderstandings of Besançon and that to Henry II after the murder of Thomas Becket, and he had remained loyal to Alexander III during the schism. And so, despite his advanced age, he seemed to be the right man for a conciliatory policy toward the harsh new ruler of the Empire, who was consistently pursuing his father's Italian projects.[6]

After some initial hesitations Celestine III gave Henry VI the imperial crown on Easter Sunday, 14 April 1191. He advised him not to continue southward, where the attempt to overthrow Tancred foundered before Naples, while Salerno even delivered the Empress Constance as a prisoner to Tancred. At the end of 1191 Henry had to return to Germany empty-handed. Celestine decided to recognize Tancred. He invested him with the Kingdom of Sicily and in June 1192 concluded with him the Concordat of Gravina, that was favourable to the Curia.

Back in Germany, the Emperor Henry was asked for a decision in the disputed election to the see of Liège.[7] He rejected both claimants and in January 1192 gave the bishopric to Lothar of Hochstaden. Albert of Brabant, the choice of the majority of the chapter, proceeded to the Curia, and Celestine III confirmed his election. Since Albert was prevented from setting foot in the diocese of Liège, he had himself consecrated by the Archbishop of Reims and placed himself under his protection. At Reims he was assassinated by *ministeriales* of Liège. The blame was universally attributed to the Emperor, who took an oath of purgation but let off the assassins with a reprimand. Hence, suspicion was not allayed and the Rhenish episcopate united with some of the secular princes in opposition to the Emperor. Contact was also established with England, Sicily, and the Curia. Henry had himself been allied with King Philip II of France since the fall of 1191; they had met at Milan, when the French King was returning from the crusade. The Emperor's critical situation was corrected when Duke Leopold V of Austria delivered to him the English King, whom he had taken prisoner near Vienna.[8] Richard, who thus had to pay dearly for his tactlessness in Syria, could purchase his freedom only by promising a huge ransom and agreeing to accept England as a fief of the Empire. And the episcopal and princely opposition in the Rhineland lost its decisive support.

---

[6] *Cf.* the studies by V. Pfaff (see the bibliography for this chapter).

[7] On the double election at Liège and its outcome, see E. Moreau, *Albert de Louvain, prince-évêque de Liège* (Brussels 1946).

The vast amount of money by which Richard obtained his liberty now enabled the Emperor to resume the conquest of Sicily. Tancred had died on 20 February 1194, and his wife Sibyl had assumed the regency for her minor-aged son, William III; hence no serious opposition was to be expected. Henry set out from Trifels for Italy in May 1194 and as early as Christmas of the same year he could be crowned King at Palermo. The next day Constance gave birth to a son, who as Frederick II was destined to succeed to his father's kingdoms. The assembly of Bari in March 1195 published the new arrangement: the Empress Constance became regent of Sicily, with Conrad of Urslingen, named Duke of Spoleto by Frederick I, at her side as governor. Henry's brother, Duke Philip of Tuscany, was to administer the Mathildine lands; he had renounced in 1193 the see of Würzburg that had been given to him earlier. The High Steward of the Empire, Markward of Anweiler, became Margrave of Ancona and Duke of Romagna.

Contact with the Curia had been interrupted since the recognition of Tancred and the confirmation of Albert of Brabant as Bishop of Liège by Celestine III. In an effort to renew it, Henry VI offered to launch a well organized crusade. At the Curia it was clearly perceived that this crusade would at the same time further the Emperor's far-reaching Mediterranean projects of empire. Leo of Armenia and Amauri of Cyprus had already received their crowns as vassals of the Emperor. Hence Celestine was hesitant to enter into Henry's plan, though to reject it entirely was, of course, outside the realm of the possible. He had the crusade preached in England, Bohemia, Denmark, Poland, and Spain, thereby in a sense involving all of Christendom and eliminating the political thorn from the Emperor's crusade.

Henry's negotiations with the Curia also included his plan to have the Empire now recognized as an hereditary monarchy. He had offered the German princes extensive privileges, especially the heritability of the great fiefs, and he may have proposed to the Curia that the Empire as a whole be held as a fief of the Holy See. Protracted negotiations enabled Celestine to evade any decision on so tricky a question. Meanwhile there broke out in Sicily serious disturbances, which the Emperor succeeded in harshly suppressing in the summer of 1197. But on 6 August, before he was able to join his crusade, he fell mortally ill. During his sickness he is said to have drawn up his last will, which is not uniformly evaluated by scholars. According to this document, Sicily was to be acknowledged as a fief of the Roman Church,[9] and Constance and Frederick were to take the oath of vassalage to the Pope. If the dynasty should become extinct, the Kingdom should escheat to the Pope. Duke Philip was to evacuate the *Patrimonium* and recognize the Pope's feudal suzerainty of Ancona and Ravenna, held by Markward of Anweiler.

---

[8] K. A. Kneller, "Des Richard Löwenherz deutsche Gefangenschaft," *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, ErgH, 59 (Freiburg 1893), and the literature listed in Dahlmann-Waitz under no. 6671; also G. Bullinger, *König Richard Löwenherz und Kaiser Heinrich VI.* (typed dissertation, Tübingen 1947).

The Emperor died at Messina on 26 September 1197 and was buried in the cathedral of Palermo. A few months later, on 8 January 1198, Celestine III followed him to the grave. At Christmas he had expressed his intention of resigning the papacy if the College of Cardinals would declare its agreement to accept as Pope his designated successor, Cardinal John of San Paolo. The cardinals rejected both the abdication and the designation. The heritage of Alexander III seemed assured. If Celestine III and his predecessors, when compared with the forceful personalities of the two Hohenstaufen, had always sat on the shorter arm of the lever so far as power politics were concerned, especially since Rome was always a burden to them and never a help, they still had managed to assure the continuity of what Alexander had begun in regard to the Church Universal.

In particular Celestine's "inner pontificate" merits notice.[10] The Pope, all along an administrator rather than a politician or one endowed with charisms, possessed an outstanding coworker in Cardinal Cencio Savelli, who, thanks to the influence of the future Celestine III, had been made *camerlengo* of the Roman Church under Clement III. Under Celestine the *camerlengo's* office increased in importance, since no chancellor was appointed. To introduce order into the Church's finances, which had suffered greatly ever since the schism and the uneasy pontificates that followed, Cencio drew up a comprehensive property register of the Roman Church, such as had been long before introduced in cities, monasteries, and principalities. This *Liber censuum* became an official survey and record of all spiritual institutions — sees, abbeys, chapters — and secular lordships that were dependent on the Roman Church and owed *census* to her. It was finished in 1192 and was of amazing, though not of complete, accuracy — out of 682 actually existing dependents Cencio was able to include all but 154. Moreover, the Cardinal *Camerlengo* succeeded not only in ordering the Curia's finances but also in actually increasing them.

---

[9] The testament was transmitted in fragments in the *Gesta Innocentii III*, printed in *Constitutiones*, I, no. 379. It was not a last will valid in law, but an instruction for Markward of Anweiler in his negotiations with the Curia.

[10] Thus V. Pfaff, "Papst Cölestin III.," *ZSavRGkan*, 47 (1961), 109–28.

As in previous pontificates, legal cases streamed from all of Christendom to Rome under Celestine III, especially since he solemnly declared that anyone who felt that he was threatened by others could and should seek justice at Rome. Thus Celestine made the Curia the central office for all final legal decisions in the Church, placed the written law ahead of customary law, made his judgments up-to-date, as has been remarked, and especially exercised control over their execution. More than previously, the papal jurisdiction was exercised by judges delegate, so that the Curia's routine became less burdensome and the way was made ready for central legislation. Chancery and *Camera* obtained their stable organization, and the importance of the College of Cardinals and its share in the government of the Universal Church grew.

It was as though all the preliminaries could be said to have been created for Celestine's successor, who as Innocent III would inaugurate a new epoch in the historical process of Christianity's development.

CHAPTER 11

The Third Crusade

The Third Lateran Council, in contrast to the other general synods of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, referred only indirectly to Christendom's responsibility for the crusade. Six bishops and two abbots from the crusader states had taken part in it, but not even Archbishop William of Tyre, the most distinguished among them, intimates that the Council concerned itself in any detail with the situation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. William, chancellor of the leprous King Baldwin IV (1174–85), knew only too well the crisis produced by the energetic advance of Saladin (1171 to 1193).[1] Propagandizing in Sicily, France, and England was not neglected, and many French knights under Peter of Courtenay sailed to the East along with the prelates returning home from the Council. One might entertain the opinion that the peace between Pope and Emperor, the ending and liquidating of the schism, would have again aroused in the West the readiness for common assistance to Jerusalem. Even Alexander III, during his agitated pontificate, had attentively followed the developments in Syria and Palestine and on 16 January 1181, shortly before his death, which occurred the following 30 August, he had been able to direct an appeal to Christendom. His successors, likewise with an eye on the crusade, sought a comprehensive policy of peace in the West: between Curia and Empire, between Curia and Rome, and between kings and princes, above all between England and France. Louis VII of France had died in 1180, and his successor, Philip II, had begun his energetic reign.

---

[1] Imad ad-Din, *Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine*, ed. C. von Landberg (Leiden 1888); H. A. R. Gibb, "The Achievement of Saladin," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 35 (1952 f.), 44–60; J. Kraemer, *Der Sturz des Königreichs Jerusalem in der Darstellung des Imad al-Din* (Wiesbaden 1952); H. A. R. Gibb, "The Rise of Saladin (1169–89)," *History of the Crusades*, I (1958), 563–89; M. W. Baldwin, "The Decline and Fall of Jerusalem," *ibid.*, 590–621.

But only the catastrophe of the battle of Hattin in Galilee and Saladin's[2] capture of and entry into Jerusalem in 1187 were of a nature to shock the West so violently that the emotional presuppositions for a general European crusade were again present. The papacy once more undertook the duty of preaching the crusade but declined the actual leadership of the expedition, which was to lie in the hands of three monarchs: the Emperor and the Kings of England and France. The ephemeral pontificate of Gregory VIII (21 October — 17 December 1187) was entirely marked by this preoccupation, and the first legates proceeded at once to Germany, France, Denmark, and even Poland to preach the crusade. Clement III (1187–91) consistently continued these initial moves with his summonses of 10 February and 27 May 1188.

The Cistercian Cardinal Henry of Albano, who was accompanied by Archbishop Josias of Tyre, set to work with special zeal.[3] He contrived to bring about the English-French armistice of Gisors of 21 January 1188, on which occasion both Kings took the cross under pressure from public opinion. At Cologne he succeeded in reconciling Archbishop Philip with the Emperor Frederick I. At the "Diet of Jesus Christ" at Mainz on Laetare Sunday, where the legate and Godfrey I of Helfenstein, Bishop of Würzburg, preached, the Emperor, his oldest son and namesake, who was Duke of Swabia, and numerous princes took the cross. The expedition was to set out in the spring of 1189, and the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre was to crown the Emperor's life work. Counts Philip of Flanders and Baldwin of Hainaut agreed to take part. A crusade tax, the Saladin Tithe, was raised for the first time in France and England.[4] Scotland contributed nothing, for King William the Lion was unable to persuade his thrifty barons. The German expedition was financed by the participants. Clement III demanded a money contribution from members of the higher clergy, but the amount was not specified. This measure foreshadowed a development which in the next century led to the financing of crusades almost entirely by means of taxation of ecclesiastical incomes.

---

[2] *PL,* 200, 1294–96.

[3] Y. M. J. Congar, *Henri de Marcy,* 43–54, 77–90.

[4] For the controversial crusade tax in England and France, see F. A. Cazel, "The Tax of 1185 in Aid of the Holy Land," *Speculum,* 30 (1955), 385–92, and J. H. Round, "The Saladin Tithe," *EHR,* 31 (1916), 447–50.

Crusade preaching was supplemented by literary propaganda, notably the crusade song in both courtly and popular form.[5] The parish clergy even recruited with the aid of vivid pictures representing scenes from the Holy Land and the struggle with the Muslims in order to stimulate participation by the illiterate.

The German expedition got under way at Regensburg on 11 May 1189. It unquestionably supplied the mightiest fighting force and was praised by contemporaries for its good discipline and its careful preparation. Meanwhile, King William II of Sicily had dispatched the first assistance, thereby helping to save the cities of Tyre and Tripolis, but he died on 18 November 1189. English crusaders, in advance of the royal expedition, and Flemings and Danes went by sea. While the Emperor Frederick was moving through Hungary and the Balkans, the English and the French enterprises had bogged down because of the recent renewal of the struggle between the two Kings; it ended only two days before Henry II's death with a peace that was deeply humiliating to the English King, since his sons Richard and John were aligned with his French opponent.[6] The Emperor Frederick wintered in the vicinity of Constantinople, where the new Byzantine Emperor, Isaac II Angelus, unexpectedly created difficulties, but in the spring of 1190 he could cross over to Asia Minor. The march across the interior made slow progress. After the Cilician foothills had finally been crossed and Cilician Armenia had been reached, the Emperor met his death in the river Saleph on 10 June 1190. Saladin could rightly see in this tragedy his own salvation. The dead Emperor's son, Duke Frederick of Swabia, was unable to hold the army together. A part of it returned home, others went on by ship; he led the remnant to Antioch, where on 21 June 1190 he fell sick and died. The Emperor's remains were interred at Antioch.

King Richard I Lionheart of England assumed his father's obligation to the crusade.[7] The English and French hosts met at Vézelay on 4 July 1190 and decided to go to Syria by sea. The armies wintered on Sicily at Messina, where an English crusade fleet had turned up. *En route* to the Holy Land, King Richard managed to conquer the island of Cyprus, to which the political centre of gravity of the crusader states was later to be transferred.

---

[5] See F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Kreuzzugsdichtung des Mittelalters* (Berlin 1960).

[6] A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta,* 347 f., where the date of the agreement is given as 4 July 1189 and the place as Colombières between Tours and Azay-le-Rideau.

[7] F. J. West, *The Justiciarship in England, 1066–1232,* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 12 (Cambridge 1966), 64–74.

First of all, the English-French expedition on 13 July 1191 relieved Acre, which had been besieged for two years. Dissension then broke out among the crusaders, for the Kings, who had become enemies during the winter on Sicily, took sides in the quarrel over the succession to the throne of Jerusalem: Richard supported Guy of Lusignan; Philip, Conrad of Montferrat. But when the King of France chose to regard his crusade vow as having been fulfilled with the fall of Acre and returned home *via* Rome, where he had himself expressly absolved *ad cautelam* by Celestine III, Richard was able to assume the direction of the expedition against Saladin. Jerusalem could not be recovered, but Richard's brilliant victories near Jaffa and in the battle of Arsuf obtained for the Franks at least a military breathing-space, especially since Saladin died in 1193 and left a disintegrating state. The armistice of 2 September 1192 marked the end of the Third Crusade. Saladin assured pilgrims free access to Jerusalem and a corresponding protection, but the Holy Sepulchre remained for the time being in Muslim hands.

Only a narrow coastal strip from Beirut to Ascalon could be saved and even its political existence depended on the good pleasure of the mighty Islamic realm. Furthermore it could be maintained only in the most intimate contact with the Latin West. Hence from now on the leading monarchs of Christendom at the moment wore also the crown of Jerusalem, first the Hohenstaufen, then Saint Louis IX, and finally Charles of Anjou. The crusader states themselves, now only a collection of individual cities and castles, often administered from Cyprus, constituted from the Third Crusade the Kingdom of Acre, whose history came to a definitive end with the fall of that city in 1291.

The severe losses of the Third Crusade and the meagre results disillusioned Christendom, even if to a lesser degree than had the Second Crusade. Before the end of the century the diminished Kingdom of Jerusalem obtained further help from the West in the crusade of the Emperor Henry VI, which must be viewed in the context of his Mediterranean policy. The Kings of Cyprus and Armenia were accepted as vassals of the Empire. The Emperor could not lead the crusade in person, for he died in September 1197. His chancellor, Bishop Conrad of Hildesheim, and Archbishop Conrad of Mainz, who had been named papal legate, came with a large army from the Rhineland and the Hohenstaufen lands. Individual groups arrived in Syria from August 1197 on. It was possible to take Sidon and Beirut and to preserve the coast, but the death of the Emperor and the anarchy ensuing in Germany with the double election prematurely ended the undertaking. Before the crusaders departed, what had been a German hospital brotherhood was organized in Acre on 5 March 1198 as a military religious order, which, as the Order of the Teutonic Knights, was to face an important future, but not in the Holy Land.

Crusade Piety

A glance at a century of military operations under the sign of the cross presents the question of whether and how these events formed and developed the devotional outlook of Christians. The history of piety in the twelfth century not only encounters that enrichment which was occasioned by an intensification and further development of monastic spirituality in the new orders. There also opened up to it entirely new fields of devout deportment, of generous self-sacrifice, even of mystical experience. Alongside the monk and the canon appeared the layman,[8] not too often, to be sure, as a new spokesman in the sense of being writer or theologian, but usually as the actor, whose motives, attitudes, and prayers are disclosed only indirectly by the sources. Only when he was a poet did the layman directly give expression to the new piety.

It participated in the tendencies common to all proponents of the ecclesiastical reform movement and arose out of a longing for a *vita apostolica* and a desire to belong to the *pauperes Christi.* But its forms were determined by the fact of crusading, the great epoch of which belonged preeminently, though not entirely, to the age of Saint Bernard. The fact that the appeals to the crusades were so overwhelmingly successful among all classes of the Christian population and, in the well-nigh universal opinion of scholars, the religious motive predominated in the determination to take the cross[9] can hardly be otherwise explained than by the awakening and strengthening of a pious frame of mind, in which the elements of religious insights and decisions, to be set forth below, became effective.

There had long been pilgrimages to Compostela, Rome, and Jerusalem, motivated by penance, devotion, and vow. What was new was the armed pilgrimage, conditioned by the notion in the Latin West of the now more deeply Christianized class of knighthood. The unique origin of religious orders whose members by vocation bore arms testifies to this. Their beginnings lay also in the hospital idea,[10] which knew its richest and most spontaneous development parallel to the crusades, in the whole of Christendom, first of all in the twelfth century. Characteristic features of this preparedness for hospital work recur among the hermits, who also belong to the many-sided picture of the piety of this epoch. The binding force that united such individual tendencies, at first glance incompatible even if not entirely contradictory, was a lively devotion to Christ, of an orientation different from what it had been earlier. The preaching and the pastoral contact of monks, canons, bishops, and diocesan clerics, stamped by a greater familiarity with Holy Scripture, especially the New Testament, began to complete the change from the Lord King Christ to Jesus of Nazareth, wandering, suffering, humanly close, redeeming, and not holding sway, in the characteristic attitude to piety. This had awakened in the laity the demand for the *vita apostolica,* that is, for personal nearness to Christ, who showed them the way to salvation, made it possible, and had already lived it directly as exemplar. All catechetical instruction, as recent research shows,[11] was based from the twelfth century on the fundamental theological schema of the *via salutis.* It is no longer surprising that the concrete aspect of this *via salutis* now became the crusade. Accordingly, crusade piety appears as a characteristic form of the Christian's seeking after salvation, which he found in a threefold union: a union with God in obedient service — "God wills it" — with Christ in a suffering, dying, and triumphing imitation — for Christ and with him — with the Holy Spirit in the enthusiasm of the reorientation, esteemed as a newly experienced Pentecost.

---

[8] *Cf.* J. R. Strayer, "The Laicization of French and English Society in the Thirteenth Century," *Speculum,* 15 (1940), 76–86, who traces it to the twelfth century.

[9] Even S. Runciman, *History of the Crusades,* III, 478, holds that the "chief motive that impelled the Christian armies eastward was faith."

[10] G. Schreiber, *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, Recht und Verfassung, Kult und Frömmigkeit* (Münster 1948), 3–80.

It was above all the way of penance and prayer that led to this threefold union with God. Penance belonged to the central themes of crusade preaching and crusade piety, just as it was also predominant in the basically soteriological schema of popular catechesis. Ennobled by the idea of the imitation of Christ, the penitential desire freed itself from the sphere of a striving directed solely to one's own salvation, all the more as the crusader was filled with an awareness of doing penance as the representative of those who remained at home. For crusading as such was a duty imposed, of itself, on all of Christendom. Corresponding to this was the attitude of the homeland, which supported the *expeditio sacra* by means of alms, money and other real contributions, intercessory prayer, fasting, and freely undertaken penitential works, and thereby participated in it. This self-sanctification, viewed as participation in the *via salutis* of crusading, united all of Christendom in a common pious undertaking and made crusade piety stand out as the first uniform type of Christian lay spirituality in Church History. The *Gesta Francorum,* composed by a layman, begin with the informative sentence:

> When that time had come to which the Lord Jesus daily referred his faithful, especially when it is said in the Gospel, "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me", a powerful movement spread throughout the lands of the Franks,

---

[11] B. I. Kilström, *Den kateketiska undervisingen i Sverige under medeltiden* (Uppsala 1958), 147–62, 318 f.

> so that anyone who eagerly wished to follow God with a pure heart and mind and faithfully to carry the cross after him did not delay to enter as quickly as possible upon the route to the Holy Sepulchre.[12]

A fruit of this crusade piety was the military religious orders, which at the same time realized a predominant motive of the piety of the age in hospital service. People saw in the sick the *pauperes Christi,* saw the Lord in them, served him by serving them. The grand master of the Hospitallers described himself as *servus pauperum Christi.* William of Malavalle (d. 1157), returning from the crusade, settled as a hermit in the Silva Livallia on Monte Pisano and began the construction of a "hospitale ad dei venerationem et pauperum Christi refectionem"; by „pauperum Christi" he meant especially pilgrims going to Rome.[13] The Hospitallers of Saint Lazarus were founded at Jerusalem around 1120 and lived according to the Augustinian rule. The late twelfth century saw a whole group of lay associations for the service of the sick, such as the Brothers of Saint John the Baptist at Beauvais (before 1185), the Hospitallers of Our Dear Lady, or della Scala, at Siena (1194), the Brothers of the Order of the Holy Spirit at Montpellier (*ca.* 1180). Paul Alphandéry also places in this context the building movement, *la croisade monumentale,* which arose from the spirit of the new piety. Proceeding from Chartres, it spread through Normany and a great part of France.[14] In it too the idea of penance was the central motive. The pilgrims assembled their vehicles at the building site, as though it were a spiritual camp, and regarded themselves as an "army of the Lord". This piety, in relation to the experience of the whole Church in the crusades, also encountered stimulation in the very monasteries of the new orders, though here it was intensified and more powerfully spiritualized.

Out of a movement in many ways turbulent, determined by eschatological fear but at the same time driven by an honouring of Christ and a love of God that were deepened by the Gospel and elevated to enthusiastic surrender, a movement which especially affected the masses of Latin Christendom, there proceeded a form of popular piety which extended throughout the period of the crusades themselves and far beyond it and became the root of many forms of devotion of the following epoch.

---

[12] *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitorum,* ed. R. Hill, Nelson's Medieval Texts (London 1962), 1.

[13] K. Elm, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Wilhelmitenordens* (Cologne and Graz 1962), 11–33.

[14] *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade,* 163–65.

CHAPTER 12

Scholasticism, Canon Law, and the Universities

Early Scholasticism

Of the various works of the "sentence" type, which in the first half of the twelfth century constituted the special character of theological endeavour, especially outside the realm of monastic education, the work of Peter Lombard at Paris [1] was outstanding. With its recourse to the dialectical method that had reached its important maturity in Abelard, it was almost as though it was the last word, the ultimate norm of these expositions of theological scholarship. In it Augustine was regarded as the principal witness of theological tradition. Basically conservative, it was a systematic and clearly and precisely organized summary of all the chief truths of the Christian faith that had been hitherto discussed by theologians. To every question it brought the relevant patristic citations and reliable solutions. In a relatively long period of reception, which ended with the celebrated text of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215,[2] Peter's work became the first and for centuries the leading theological textbook. His opponents, John of Cornwall[3] and Gerhoh of Reichersberg,[4] especially rejected his Christological theses or, like Joachim of Fiore,[5] his formulation of the theology of the Trinity. More effective as journalism was the powerful indictment by the prior of Saint-Victor, Walter,[6] who in *Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae* came out against dialectical theology at the Third Lateran Council of 1179, but the reputation of the theologians whom he attacked, Peter Lombard, Gilbert de la Porrée, Peter of Poitiers, and Peter Abelard, could not be impaired with contemporaries.

---

[1] See Chapter 7.

[2] *COD,* 208 (footnotes 4–6), Constitutio 2: De errore abbatis Ioachim. "Nos autem, sacro et universali concilio approbante, credimus et confitemur cum Petro [Lombardo] . . ."

[3] John of Cornwall (1125/30–1199/1200) especially in his *Eulogium ad Alexandrum Papam III* (1177/79) against Christological nihilism; *cf.* N. M. Häring, *MS,* 13 (1951), 253–300 (edition); biographical material in E. Rathbone, *RThAM,* 17 (1950), 46–60.

[4] See P. Classen, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg* (Wiesbaden 1960), 261, where it is stressed that, despite all criticism, Gerhoh referred to the Lombard as an outstanding teacher and collector, whom he was not attacking as the head of a heretical school, as he did in the case of Abelard and Gilbert de la Porrée. On the whole question, see *ibid.*, pp. 248–72.

[5] He was condemned at the Fourth Lateran Council as an opponent of the Trinitarian doctrine of Peter Lombard; see *supra,* footnote 2, and E. Bertola, "La dottrina trinitaria di Pietro Lombardo," *Miscellanea Lombardiana* (Novara 1957), 129–35 (investigated from the viewpoint of Joachimite criticism); J. de Ghellinck, Le mouvement, 263–67.

[6] Walter of Saint-Victor (d. after 1180), prior of the community from 1173. His polemic in *PL,* 199, 1129–72, ed. by P. Glorieux, *AHD,* 27 (1952), 187–335; also, *idem,* "Mauvaise action et mauvais travail. Le 'Contra IV labyrinthos Franciae'," *RThAM,* 19 (1954), 179—93; J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* 258–63.

Dependent on Peter Lombard, there appeared up to 1200 still other collections of sentences and questions, theological *summae,* based on early excerpts from his work, and *abbreviationes,* as they were produced in this form also at Bologna by the *Decretum* of Gratian. A work by the *magister* Bandinus[7] and the *abbreviatio* "Filia magistri," which at the same time displayed dependence on the *Summa aurea* of William of Auxerre, quickly became known. In many copies of *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard, as produced by enterprising groups of copyists for school use, are marginal glosses, which were later compiled, as occasion offered, into complete and separately published commentaries. Widely scattered, and for the most part still unpublished, in many manuscript collections, at Bamberg, Munich, Rome, Paris, and elsewhere, they are witnesses of the early school of Peter Lombard.

Beside the Lombard stood another noteworthy theological scholar, Robert of Melun, who died in 1167 as Bishop of Hereford. He was one of Abelard's creative pupils and his successor in the directing of the *schola artium* at Sainte-Geneviève.[8] His *Quaestiones de divina pagina* on the text of Saint Matthew's Gospel and his *Sentences,* which appeared at the same time as those of Peter Lombard (1152–60), were praised. And the *Sentences* of *magister* Udo (1160–65) must also be mentioned. Their plan corresponded to Hugh of Saint-Victor's outline in *De sacramentis fidei.* They were excerpted, found their *abbreviatores,* and indicate to what a great extent the school of Paris developed into the leading centre of European theological learning.

Leader among the glossators of Peter Lombard, his successors in the teaching office, was *magister* Peter Comestor,[9] with his *Historia scholastica,* gloss on the Gospels, and treatise on the Sacraments. In the last mentioned work he first introduced the concept of *transubstantiatio,* later adopted by the Fourth Lateran Council. The Lombard's influence extended as far as Bologna, where it can be detected in Gandulf (after 1160).[10]

Following Peter Comestor another pupil of Peter Lombard assumed the post of master of *The Sentences* as theological *magister* at Paris. This was Peter of Poitiers (1130–1205).[11] As chancellor he was to exercise a deciding influence on the genesis of the university. His *Five Books of Sentences* appeared around 1170; more than a mere commentary on the Lombard, they became a theological compendium of a special character. To the school of Peter Lombard[12] belonged also *magister* Martin, Simon of Tournai, Prévotin of Cremona, and Peter of Capua. In a sense the century ended with the *Summa* of Prévotin (1190–94), a collection of previously separately treated particular questions.[13] So far forty manuscripts of it are known. All still unpublished and widely scattered, they also point to the unity of Western theological endeavour.

---

[7] *PL,* 192, 965–1112; J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* 270.

[8] H. Horst, *Die Trinitäts- und Gotteslehre des Robert de Melun* (Mainz 1963; bibliography).

[9] Peter Comestor (or Manducator) (*ca.* 1100–after 1179), called "Magister historiarum": *Historia scholastica* (*PL,* 198, 1053–1644, supplemented by Peter of Poitiers, *ibid.,* 1645 to 1722); S. R. Daly, "Petrus Comestor, Master of Histories," *Speculum* (1957), 62–73; bibliography in L. Hödl, *LThK,* VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 357 f.

[10] On Gandulf, see especially J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* 297–373.

Outside the circle of pupils of Peter Lombard there worked at Paris around 1170 Peter Cantor (d. 1197),[14] who left abundant writings on many aspects of theology; based on an intensive study of Scripture, they were above all oriented to moral theology. Educated in theology at the cathedral school of Reims, probably under *magister* Alberic, and familiarized by him with the thought of Anselm of Laon, Peter became a canon of Notre-Dame de Paris and in 1178 obtained the capitular post of chanter, from which he got his nickname. His works, still for the most part unpublished, pertain to dogmatic and moral theology, to the theological encyclopedia, and especially to exegesis. His chief work is his *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis.* From canon law he received important suggestions as to form and content. Most widely circulated seems to have been his *Verbum abbreviatum,* with important remarks on the method of theological research. A mine of information in regard to cultural history, it became the important source for the condition of the clergy at Paris and at the same time, thanks to his familiarity with the authors of antiquity, a late witness of the Renaissance of the twelfth century.

Martin Grabmann mentions as pupils of Peter Cantor the Benedictine Liebhard of Prüfening, Guy of Orchelles, and especially the Englishmen,

---

[11] Peter of Poitiers (*ca.* 1130–1205); his *Sentences* in *PL,* 211, 789–1280; new ed. of Book I by P. S. Moore and M. Dulong (Notre Dame 1943), of Book II by P. S. Moore, M. Dulong, and J. N. Garvin (Notre Dame 1950); P. S. Moore, *The Works of Peter of Poitiers* (Notre Dame 1936).

[12] On the Lombard's school, now see S. Otto, "Die Funktion des Bildbegriffs in der Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts," *BGPhMA,* 40, 1 (Münster 1963), 200–23.

[13] G. Lacombe, *Praepositini Cancellarii Parisiensis opera omnia,* I: *La vie et les œuvres de Prévostin, BiblThom,* 11, 1927. Praepositinus (born between 1130 and 1135 at Cremona; died at Paris in 1210), was chancellor of the University of Paris from 1206 to 1209; S. Otto, *loc. cit.,* 251–54; J. N. Garvin, *LThK,* VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 696 (bibliography).

[14] Peter Cantor (*ca.* 1130–97) was elected Bishop of Tournai but was not confirmed; the most recent treatment is that by P. Delhaye in LThK, VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 353 f. (bibliography); J. A. Dugauquier, *Pierre le Chantre. Summa de Sacramentis et animae consiliis,* so far 4 vols. (*Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia,* 4, 7, 11, 16 [Louvain and Lille 1954 to 1963]).

Robert de Courçon, William de Montibus, and Richard of Leicester, who take us into the thirteenth century, and Stephen Langton (d. 1228), Cardinal and from 1206 Archbishop of Canterbury, who was one of the most celebrated theologians of his age.[15]

Besides the theologians of the Lombard circle, scholars of the entourage of Gilbert de la Porrée[16] also taught and wrote, such as Jordan de Fantasma, the Archdeacon Ivo of Chartres, and John Beleth. Outstanding among them was Alain de Lille (1120–1202),[17] Cistercian, teacher at Paris, and later active in the Albigensian mission. With his *Regulae de sacra theologia* he wrote a much used theological compendium, a series of theses, which, established by argumentation as occasion called for, were an innovation in form alongside the previously preferred *quaestiones.* The *Distinctiones dictionum theologicalium* were a sort of theological lexicon, which collected and explained biblical expressions and especially the current theological terminology. Alain's voluminous literary work also includes poetry, treatises on penance, sermons, the much commented *Summa de arte praedicatoria,* and the *Liber poenitentialis.*

To the school of Gilbert de la Porrée also belonged Eudes (d. 1171),[18] Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Ourscamp from 1167 to 1170 and before that a teacher of theology at Paris. A shrewd dialectician, he opposed Peter Lombard in fundamental questions of theology, Christology, and the doctrine of the Sacraments. He died in 1171 as Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. Through his influence on Simon of Tournai (d. 1201)[19] his theology found a far-reaching response. Various collections of *quaestiones* from the group of his hearers prove that he founded a school. Simon of Tournai's chief work, the *Institutiones in Sacram Paginam* (1170/75), so far unpublished, displays Abelard's stock of ideas; new in Simon were the *disputationes,* which took their place beside the hitherto customary *lectiones, quaestiones,* and theses. Through him Aristotle obtained entry into theological speculation.

The *Ars catholicae fidei,* formerly attributed to Alain de Lille, was the work of Nicholas of Amiens, who thereby enlarged the la Porrée circle. Peter Cantor, already mentioned, seems also to have belonged to it because of his intellectual proximity to Alain de Lille. Dependent on Nicholas is one of the most exhaustive presentations of ethics in the twelfth century, the *Speculum universale* of Raoul Ardent,[20] a grand-scale theological encyclopedia, which remained unfinished. Abundant use was made of Gilbert de la Porrée. Thus far only a survey of the chapters of this work, famed for its originality, is in print. Raoul died before the end of the century.

---

[15] *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg 1933), 46.

[16] On the school of La Porrée, see now S. Otto, *loc. cit.,* 224–50, with reference to E. Bertola, *La scuola di Gilberto de la Porrée* (Padua 1951); N. M. Häring, "Zur Geschichte der Schulen von Poitiers," *AKG,* 47 (1965), 23–47.

[17] Alain de Lille, works in *PL,* 210; J. Longère, *Alain de Lille: Liber poenitentialis, I: Introduction doctrinale et littéraire (Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia,* 17 [Louvain and Lille 1965].

[18] On Eudes of Ourscamp, see L. Hödl, *Geschichte der scholastischen Literatur und der Theologie der Schlüsselgewalt,* I (Münster 1960), 116–41, 210–14.

[19] On Simon of Tournai, see S. Otto, *loc. cit.,* 238–50; L. Hödl, *Schlüsselgewalt,* I, 240.

Early Canon Law

Whereas *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard were able only gradually and not without opposition to establish themselves in the world of higher education, the *Decretum Gratiani*[21] succeeded very quickly and almost without effort in becoming at Bologna the basic text of the new science of canon law. Alongside the legists, who concentrated from the time of Irnerius and his four great pupils on the Roman law of late antiquity, stood the decretists, who dealt in detail, according to the scholastic method, with the *Decretum* and its content in lectures and treatises. As was true of *The Sentences* at Paris, so too here the *Decretum* obtained interlinear glosses, the textual exegesis was condensed in *summae,* legal *quaestiones* were treated, legal rules were drawn up, and in this way the practical application of the sources was taught. Complete, detailed expositions of the entire text, the so-called *apparatus,*[22] later appeared, based on the glosses and *summae.* In addition to the decretists of Bologna, there were canonists in France also, above all in Normandy.[23]

Gratian's best known pupil, Paucapalea, to whom is attributed the subdividing of Part I and Part III of the *Decretum* into *distinctiones,* began with a *summa* (1145–48).[24] The *summa,* known as *Stroma,* of *magister* Roland Bandinelli was ready in 1148, the *abbreviatio* of Ognibene of Verona around 1156. John of Faenza (d. 1190) relied on the formerly much used work of *magister* Rufinus (shortly before 1159), which was generally regarded as the first great gloss of the *Decretum.* Even before John of Faenza Stephen of Tournai (d. 1203) around 1160 had utilized both Bandinelli and especially Rufinus. Also a pupil of Gratian was Simon of Bisignano, whose *summa* was written in 1177–79. But without any doubt the "greatest of the decretists" was Huguccio of Pisa, termination and climax of the school of Bologna. His *summa* was finished in 1188–90 and he died in 1210 as Bishop of Ferrara. As a matter of fact, most of the teachers of law at Bologna became bishops, while some, such as Bandinelli, Albert de Morra, and, above all, Lothar di Segni became Popes. Rufinus obtained the see of Assisi, Ognibene Verona, John Faenza, Sicard Cremona, Stephen Tournai. Others rose to be cardinals, such as Laborans and Gratian (d. 1197), namesake of the author of the *Decretum.* The age of the jurist Popes and jurist bishops had begun.

---

[20] Raoul Ardent, homilies in *PL,* 155, 1301–1626, 1667–2118; the *Speculum Universale* (1193–1200) is still unprinted; see J. Gründel, *Das Speculum Universale des Radulf Ardens* (Munich 1961); *idem, Die Lehre von den Umständen* (Münster 1963), 204–15.

[21] See Chapter 7.

[22] S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik* (*SteT,* 71) (Rome 1937); J. Rambaud-Buhot, "Les divers types d'abrégés du Décret de Gratien," *Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel* (Paris 1955), 397–411. On the literary forms of the academic proposition *(glossa, apparatus, notabilia, generalia, brocarda, distinctiones, quaestiones, casus), cf.* G. Le Bras, C. Lefebvre, and J. Rambaud, *L'âge classique,* 270–73.

[23] S. Kuttner, "Les débuts de l'école canoniste française," *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris,* 4 (1938), 1–14; S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone, "Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century," *Tr,* 7 (1949 f.), 279–358.

The French *summae* of the *Decretum* have all come down anonymously. They are often distinguished from their Italian counterparts by their arbitrary division of the content and their method. Their titles — *Summa Coloniensis, Monacensis, Parisiensis, Lipsiensis,* and so forth — denote the location of the manuscripts, but they were not necessarily written where they were later found; thus the *Summa Coloniensis* was written at Paris around 1170, the *Summa Monacensis* in Carinthia in 1175–78. The *summa* of Sicard of Cremona (1179–81) is also reckoned as belonging to the French school. The French school (Paris and Normandy) and the wide diffusion of its manuscripts prove the rapid and general reception of the *Decretum* and its adaptations in all of Christendom. Under Alexander III the *Decretum* even came into use at the Curia.

The *Decretum* itself did not acquire any strictly legal force, but the copious literature on it, the intensive work of comparing and clarifying the law that it achieved, and its diffusion by the leading schools to all centres of ecclesiastical life laid the groundwork for the legislative accomplishment of the papal leadership, which from the time of Alexander III and especially of Innocent III showed itself as ever more universal in activity and as determining the whole ecclesiastical order.

---

[24] The older literature in A. van Hove, *Prolegomena* (Malines and Rome, 2nd ed. 1945) (Commentarium Lovaniense in Codicem Iuris Canonici, I, 1), 423–35. On the *summae* on the *Decretum* by the Bologna and French schools, see S. Kuttner, *Repertorium,* 123–207; on the *summae* of the Anglo-Norman and Cologne schools, see S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone, "Anglo-Norman Canonists" (note 23): Magister Honorius, the circle around John of Tynmouth with John of Cornwall and Simon of Southwell, Thomas of Marlborough, and others belonged to it. Richard Anglicus taught at Bologna.

The two new sciences here described, that of theoretical and practical theology and that of canon law, by the force of their attraction on students from all parts of Western Christendom and by the constantly more intensively developing cooperation of teachers and their students, especially though not exclusively at Bologna and Paris, laid the foundation for an institution whose proper history belongs to the thirteenth century, but whose beginnings occurred in the twelfth: the universities, or *studia generalia,* of the West.

In the wake of the general changes in the social, economic, and political structure, the educational system of the West also experienced a significant transformation in the twelfth century. Whereas previously clerics, monks, and lay persons had received a humanist and theological training at abbey, cathedral, or chapter schools, but, apart from a few exceptions, only the requirements of the current personnel of the monastery, chapter, or bishopric were envisaged, the picture quickly changed in the course of the twelfth century. The importance of the monastic schools yielded to the growing influence of the urban schools, because the primacy of the agrarian organization was supplanted by the development of the urban culture.

If for the moment the cathedral and chapter schools were predominant in the cities, there were already in places like Salerno, Montpellier, and Bologna schools that were not really ecclesiastical institutions. At Paris from the beginning of the century there was an increase in the number of teachers who still instructed their students on ecclesiastical premises — the cloisters of the cathedral or of Sainte-Geneviève — but neither they nor their students were included in the personnel of the cathedral or the collegiate chapter. Such groups grew especially at Paris, but also elsewhere. The number of teachers rose in proportion as a rapidly growing movement of wandering scholars set in, a movement that can hardly be reckoned in numbers but was in accord with the general intellectual restlessness. It started in all parts of Christendom but moved especially westward to Paris and southward to Bologna. What is to be said of Bec, Chartres, and Orléans in the eleventh century, though on a more modest scale, now became visible in a broad movement. Persons wandered from the Empire to Liège first, then to Reims, to Laon and Orléans, and finally to Paris especially.

It was as yet not the schools themselves as institutions which exerted the power of attraction but the names of teachers who had become renowned, such as Anselm at Laon and William of Champeaux and especially Abelard at Paris. The cities themselves expanded and offered greater possibilities as residences of teachers and students. In the second half of the century there emerged centres which were no longer dependent on the renown of an outstanding teacher but where the schools themselves became permanent institutions; the teachers changed and whole groups of teachers gathered. Extant are long lists of names for Paris, where teachers of the *artes liberales* and of theology taught in specified sections, such as the masters of arts on the Petit-Pont and on Mont-Sainte-Geneviève, and the theologians at Saint-Victor, at the cathedral, at Sainte-Geneviève, at Saint-Germain-des-Prés. The *scholasticus canonicus* or chancellor of the cathedral chapter of Notre-Dame — and this was also true of other cathedral and collegiate chapters — could give the teachers the authorization to teach; it had to be asked from him. Every qualified aspirant, so Alexander III had had the Third Lateran Council declare,[25] was to obtain it.

Accordingly, the institutional nucleus of the University of Paris was present here. The chancellor retained supervision of the teachers, who even in the twelfth century, in accord with the tendency of the age, began to unite as a gild — *societas* or, later, *universitas*. The admission of new members usually took place in such a way that the *magister* introduced through the ceremony of *inceptio*, or commencement, his pupil who had completed his study. The twofold element of an official licensing by the chancellor and an academic cooptation thus remains to be noted.

The situation developed similarly at Bologna.[26] But it is controverted whether the teachers of Roman law, Irnerius and his pupils, were allowed to teach with or without official attestation by the authorities of city and Church. In any event, the well known *constitutio* "Habita" of Frederick I, which he published at the Diet of Roncaglia in 1158, not expressly for Bologna but for all *scholares* of the Kingdom of Italy, seems to have presupposed a sort of union of the teachers of law, from which, in cases of dispute, justice could be sought in competition with the episcopal jurisdiction. It had no written statutes but lived according to rules of customary law and, as at Paris, replenished itself through cooptation by the *magistri*. Most likely the teachers of Roman law constituted a single *universitas* together with those of canon law. Only later were there also formed the unions of the students, upon which in the course of time was to devolve the control of the university as a whole. These called themselves *universitates*, while the teachers became a *collegium*. The *magistri* retained the important right of judging the scholarly qualification of those who wished to be coopted to their *collegium* in the *conventus,* which corresponded to the Paris *inceptio,* but in all else the gilds of students retained the primacy.

---

[25] Canon 18, *COD*, 196.

[26] The contributions to the *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna* (NS, 1) (Bologna 1954) elucidate the beginnings of the University of Bologna; besides the work by G. de Vergottini, mentioned in the bibliography to this chapter, U. Gualazzini reports on the origin ("L'origine dello Studium bolognese nelle più antiche vicende della licentia docendi," 97–115), G. Rossi on the relations of the students to the city ("'Universitas scholarium' e commune," 173–266), and G. Le Bras on Bologna as one of the chief intellectual cities of the West ("Bologne, monarchie médiévale des droits savants," 1–18).

Apart from a few generally observed imperial and papal decrees which were issued in the twelfth century with regard to studies, the royal and ecclesiastical, the communal and imperial privileges for particular universities began only from 1200. Until then there were found, especially at Paris, Bologna, Montpellier, Salerno, and Oxford, those communities of teachers and students out of which in the thirteenth century developed the universities, endowed especially by the papacy with specific rights. Hence they appeared as a spontaneous growth, not as an institution planned and set up by the highest authorities. Their beginnings belong to the twelfth century and its intellectual outburst, in which there became manifest not so much an interest directed to vocational training but rather the desire for a knowledge of the truth, for a knowledge transcending the needs of daily life.[27] Of course, the general rapid development of urban culture and the increased connections among nations in the wake of the crusades contributed something to this. There is no question of a continuity in Italy or in the Midi of the late classical Roman or Near Eastern educational institutions; even Byzantine or Muslim influences have not been demonstrated by research. It is true that there arose relatively early a legend of the *translatio studii,*[28] similar to the *translatio imperii,* from Athens to Rome, from there to Byzantium, and finally to Paris, traces of which are found in Alcuin and Notker in Carolingian times and which was familiar in Germany and France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but it is without any historical foundation. The early history of the universities as properly defined institutions belongs to the thirteenth century.

---

[27] Especially stressed by H. Grundmann, *Vom Ursprung der Universitäten im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1960).

[28] Allusion was made to this *translatio* by E. Gilson, *Les idées et les lettres* (Paris 1932), 183–85, then by E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 2nd ed. 1954), 388–90; by H. Grundmann, "Sacerdotium — Regnum — Studium. Zur Wertung der Wissenschaft im 13. Jahrhundert," *AKG,* 34 (1952), 5–21; then, in detail, by F. J. Worstbrock, "Translatio artium," *AKG,* 47 (1965), 1–22: "The migration of the *studium* from Greece *via* Rome to France — this view may have come to flower in the soil of the Paris schools. It was understood, as Hugh of Saint-Victor indicates, as a continuation of the ancient theories and *schemata* of translation" (18).

CHAPTER 13

Heresy and the Beginnings of the Inquisition

The epoch of the Gregorian reform had known radical preachers under the auspices of the *vita apostolica.* Their anti-ecclesiastical and anti-sacramental tendencies had found some response among the lower classes. Such demagogues had followed the reform preachers. Among them was Peter of Bruys in the Midi from around 1105; before 1126 he was burned by an enraged mob.[1] Anti-sacerdotal sentiments also characterized the preaching of Tanchelin[2] in Flanders and Brabant and were found among the peasants of Bucy-le-Long near Soissons. Similar ideas appeared at Florence in 1117 and at Orvieto in 1125 and in the bishopric of Trier in 1122. The traces were first lost at the time of the Schism of 1130, but it was curious that, while radical elements made themselves known everywhere, they were apparently independent of one another.

After 1135 a powerfully emerging new wave of heresy moved through the southern and western areas of Christendom. Henry of Lausanne[3] preached penance at Le Mans, Lausanne, Pisa, Poitiers, Bordeaux, and finally Albi till 1145. Like Peter of Bruys, he spoke against the Church and had his adherents desecrate church buildings, destroy altars, burn crosses, and beat priests. He called for an apostolic life, but the multitude of his hearers could not be permanently organized. In Brittany from 1145 Eudes de l'Étoile[4] was more effective among the ordinary folk in denouncing the Church and the monasteries and in uniting groups of believers into communities living a penitential life. His fantastic doctrine impressed theologians as the product of a sick mind. He died soon after 1148 in the prison of the Archbishop of Reims.

The most important of the radicals of this period was Arnold of Brescia (d. 1155),[5] pupil of Abelard and canon regular, who carried the reform ideas of his age to the ultimate consequences, called for an itinerant Church of apostolic poverty, and demanded contempt of the world and humility in priests and bishops. Arnold met defeat not only because his requirements were so extreme but also because of his imprudent attempt to lay the ground for them by political means. Frederick I had him arrested and turned him over to the Roman authorities, who made short work of him. His followers, like those of Henry of Lausanne and Eudes de l'Étoile, scattered. Common to them all was the fact that their preaching was not really a reaction against the Church reform but rather an exaggeration of the reform into the heretical and the radical.

---

[1] *Cf.* R. Manselli, *Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII* (Rome 1953), 25–43. Manselli prefers 1132–33 as the year of his death.

[2] W. Mohr, "Tanchelm von Antwerpen, eine nochmalige Überprüfung der Quellenlage," *Annales Universitatis Saraviensis* [Saarbrücken], 3 (1954), 234–47; most important is the letter from the Utrecht cathedral clergy to Archbishop Frederick of Cologne (1112–14) in *Codex Udalrici,* no. 168, ed. P. Jaffé, *Bibl. rer. Germ.* V, 296–300.

[3] R. Manselli on Henry of Lausanne in *BIStIAM,* 65 (1953), 1–63; *idem, Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII,* 45–67.

[4] On Eudes de l'Étoile (Eudo de la Stella), see L. Spätling, *De Apostolicis, Pseudo-Apostolicis, Apostolinis* (Munich 1947), 67–69; H. Maisonneuve, *Études,* 106–08; N. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London 1957), 38–40.

[5] C. W. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia* (Cambridge 1931); A. Ragazzoni, *Arnoldo da Brescia nella tradizione storica* (Brescia 1937); P. Fedele, *Fonti per la storia di Arnoldo da Brescia* (Rome 1938); F. Bartolini, *Codice diplomatico del senato romano (1144–1347),* I (Rome

Heresy first became a mass movement, no longer dependent on the presence of one or the other demagogic preacher, with the appearance of the Cathari[6] from 1140. As a mass movement they belonged to this century of the crusades, of penitential journeys for the building of churches in northern France, of the communal movement everywhere, in the Midi and North Italy, on the Rhine and in Flanders, and in all regions with a rapidly developing urban organization.

It was probably merchants and crusaders who first brought back Bogomile[7] ideas from the East. From Bulgaria Bogomiles had migrated to Byzantium; then, persecuted and expelled by the government of the Emperor Manuel Comnenus (1143–80), they had moved to the West. The Cathari, a name known from 1163, held as doctrine a dualism of Manichaean allure in the twofold direction of an absolute and a moderate form. The good God as creator of spirits and the evil God[8] as creator of the visible world represented orders which were intermingled by the activity of Satan. The activity of Saint Michael and of Christ, who defeated the demon and thereby redeemed souls from Satan's dominion, dualistic, existing in division, would restore the old order. This was absolute Catharism. The moderate form knew only a creator God, whose

---

1948); A. Frugoni, *Arnoldo da Brescia nelle fonti del secolo XII* (Rome 1954); A. Suraci in *AnOCist* (1957), 83–91.

[6] The authoritative monograph is by A. Borst (Stuttgart 1953), but research and exposition continue: S. Savini, *Il catarismo italiano ed i suoi vescovi* (Florence 1958); R. Nelli, *Écritures cathares. Textes originaux traduits et commentés* (Paris 1959); J. Russell, "Les cathares de 1048–54 à Liège," *BullSocAHLiège*, 42 (1961), 1–8; D. Walther, *Survey* (see the bibliography for this chapter); E. Werner, "Die Entstehung der Kabbala und die südfranzösischen Katharer," *FF*, 37 (1963), 86–89; C. Thuzellier, *Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIII*^{e} *siècle d'après le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca*, Bibliothèque de la *RHE*, 37 (Louvain 1961).

[7] A. Solovjev, "Autour des Bogomiles," *Byz(B)*, 22 (1952); *idem*, "Le symbolisme des monuments funéraires Bogomiles et Cathares," *Actes du X*^{e} *Congrès Internat. d'Études byzantines* (Istanbul 1957), 162–65; B. Primov, "Medieval Bulgaria and the Dualistic Heresies in Western Europe," *Études historiques* (Sofia 1960), 79–106. See vol. III of this *Handbook*, p. 340.

[8] H. Rousseau, *Le Dieu du Mal*, Mythes et Religions, 47 (Paris 1963).

order was disturbed by the revolt of Satan, who seduced the angels and inserted them as souls into the bodies of men. They were released from this prison of the flesh by Christ, who is not the Son of God but an angel who seemed to become man in Mary. This Christ lived, suffered, and died in an apparent body. At his baptism in the Jordan the Spirit dwelt in him and remained there until Christ's glorification. He then descended upon the Apostles. He communicated himself to believers through baptism; with the Cathari this was not a baptism of water, but an exorcism, a contact with the text of the Gospels, and an imposition of hands — the *consolamentum.* It imparted righteousness to the *perfecti,* the *élite* of leaders, while the simple *credentes* could be freed of their sins from time to time by the *apparellamentum,* a sort of penance. Death freed the angels for paradise, but it seems that a type of transmigration of souls was not excluded. The demons and the damned were to be annihilated at the end of the world, and there was no bodily resurrection. Thus God's victory was seen as all-embracing. The Trinity was denied, the Incarnation was rejected, and many early heresies, such as Gnosticism, Monarchianism, Docetism, and Manichaeism, were revived.

Perhaps even the heretics who were brought to trial at Liège in 1144 and then left for final judgment by Pope Lucius II were the first representatives of this new but soon increasingly threatening movement, for in the trial a regular hierarchy of hearers, believers, priests, and prelates was discovered among them. Similarly, Cathari bishops were active in Champagne and at Albi; they were able quietly to organize a growing membership. They cropped up in the neighbourhood of the monastery of Steinfeld in the archbishopric of Cologne; the Premonstratensian provost Eberwin corresponded on their behalf with Bernard of Clairvaux, who replied in Sermons 65 and 66 on the Canticle of Canticles. After a three-day religious discussion with the Catholics, the Cathari were burned by the people,[9] despite the resistance of the clergy. They had already gained many clerics and monks of Cologne and had their elect, believers, apostles, *continentes,* and missionaries; it was asserted that they all lived under a supreme authority, a sort of Pope of Heretics. Bernard's advice was to instruct, to warn, and finally to excommunicate heretics. If the canonical penalties did not suffice, the secular power should be asked to proceed against heretics, following advice given long before by Augustine.

From 1165 Catharism spread in North Italy, in the cities of Lombardy and Tuscany. Around 1162 it had even appeared in England. It was able to open schools at Cologne, and a great religious discussion took place at Lombez in 1165. In its radical, absolute form Catharism penetrated the

---

[9] "... tormentum ignis non solum patientia, sed et cum laetitia introierunt et sustinuerunt," wrote Eberwin: *PL,* 182, 676–80 (especially 677c).

Midi by the agency of the Bulgarian Bishop Nicetas and his Italian disciple, Mark; it was possible to hold a council at Saint-Félix de Caraman in 1167.

Independently of the Cathari, there appeared in southern France a lay movement which had been founded as a community of penance and poverty by the Lyons merchant, Peter Waldo, around 1175.[10] He had had the New Testament and several books of the Old Testament translated into Provençal and, after having provided for his wife and daughters, gave away his property. Then he turned to itinerant preaching and soon attracted numerous followers from all classes of society. In groups of two they preached apostolic poverty and the imitation of Christ on the streets and squares, in houses and churches. At the Third Lateran Council Alexander III praised Peter Waldo's call for poverty but forbade doctrinal preaching and allowed preaching on moral subjects only under the supervision of the clergy. When this consent of hierarchy and parish clergy was not obtained, Waldo and his followers declared their independence and then began to preach against the sins of ecclesiastics. They incurred excommunication at the Synod of Verona in 1184. At first they had repudiated and attacked the Cathari, but from 1184 they came under their influence. They now began to reject the Church's teaching authority and to denounce hierarchy, tradition, Sacraments, and the veneration of saints, images, and relics. They rejected indulgences, oaths, tithes, military service, and the death penalty. Their strict moral conduct, oriented to the Gospel, gained them an increasing number of adherents. They too were divided into two classes: the perfect, who were preachers, supervisors, and pastors, and the believers, who were friends, promoters, sympathizers, and ordinary followers. On his own authority Waldo ordained bishops, priests, and deacons. The spread of the Waldensians in the twelfth century was connected especially with the Poor Lombards in North Italy, where they became more radical in their anticlerical outlook than they had been in the Midi. They are mentioned early at Metz and Strasbourg, but their farthest expansion occurred in the thirteenth century.

Densely populated Flanders, flourishing commercially and industrially, became a centre of settlement for heresy. Its missionaries were active in the Rhine valley and along the Danube. The waves of this sinister movement smashed into Gascony, Burgundy, Champagne, and everywhere else in Christendom, becoming a flood that threatened the Universal Church. How was the Church to react?

---

[10] A. Dondaine, "Aux origines du Valdéisme," *AFP*, 16 (1946), 191–235; after the Third Lateran Council (1179), Waldo in 1180 made a profession of faith, probably in the presence of the Cardinal Legate Henry of Albano and Archbishop Guichard of Lyons, as reported by an eyewitness, the Cistercian Gaufrid of Auxerre, Abbot of Hautcombe; *cf.* J. Leclercq in *Analecta Monastica, 2, SA,* 31 (Rome 1953), 194–97.

The people in northern France and the Rhineland killed heretics,[11] whereas the hierarchical Church for the most part correctly instituted proceedings against them. Nevertheless, among both people and Church officials a keen instinct indicated that the movement was foreign to the faith and to the Church.

The situation was different in the Midi. Here the people remained indifferent and uninterested when they did not join in considerable numbers a movement that knew no sins, denied hell, and promised easy redemption by means of a *consolamentum* on the deathbed. If Henry of Lausanne and, before him, Peter of Bruys had been able quickly to gather a following there, this was even easier for organized Catharism. Alexander III repeatedly took a stand against it, at the Synod of Montpellier in 1162, at Tours in 1163. In his correspondence with Archbishop Henry of Reims and King Louis VII[12] he had already outlined the main features of a systematic intervention against heresy, and these were put into fixed form at the Council of Tours.[13] A definite change of methods was thereby announced. Instead of waiting for accusations to be made before officials by the people or the clergy, now the officials were themselves to proceed *ex officio* against heretics. The Inquisition was thereby sketched in principle.

In this way Alexander III, a former professor of canon law, made the teaching of Bologna the teaching of the whole Church. It called for active intervention in view of the danger to the purity of the Church's faith and the unity of her organization. It held that bishops and priests had the duty to inquire into the life and activities of heretics, to obtain information on the existence and type of their gatherings, and to proceed against them with canonical penalties. It seems certain that this last point refers to a search for heretics and the institution of a process.

Later, postponing a crusade to the Holy Land, Alexander III, under pressure from a report by Abbot Henry of Clairvaux, sought through his legate, Cardinal Peter of San Crisogono, to bring about an ecclesiastical and military action in the Midi against the Cathari.[14] Clergy, magistrates, and all orthodox citizens were invited to point out heretics. Those pointed out were excommunicated and imprisoned, their property was confiscated, their castles were destroyed; the penalties inflicted had already been envisaged by the Council of Tours. Count Raymond V of Toulouse was to carry out these measures. When the Cardinal returned to Italy, an actual Inquisition tribunal had met for three months in the County of Toulouse. The activity of the embassy of 1178 was reflected in the legislation of the

---

[11] See W. Maurer, *Bekenntnis und Sakrament* (Berlin 1939), 60–124 (especially 67–70).

[12] *Bouquet,* Vol. 15, *Epistolae Alexandri papae,* December 1162–January 1163, nos. 66, 67, 69.

[13] *Mansi,* XXI, 1177 f. (canon 4).

[14] *Cf.* H. Maisonneuve, *Études,* 129–33.

Third Lateran Council of 1179. Canon 27[15] described the religious situation in Gascony and Languedoc, admonished the princes to carry out the Church's instructions, and finally called for a crusade in the areas infected by heresy. The same indulgences were announced as for the crusade to the Holy Land. The leadership of the army was to pertain to the bishops. During the Council Alexander made Abbot Henry Cardinal Bishop of Albano and dispatched him as legate to the Midi to inaugurate the crusade. In Canon 27 there was no mention of what was the specific characteristic of the Inquisition procedure: the seeking out of heretics, the *ex officio* denunciation by the ecclesiastical authorities, and the instituting of the process. On the other hand, the cooperation of the secular and ecclesiastical powers in the effort to suppress heresy by means proper to them respectively was clearly and emphatically demanded. The legate's crusade brought only meagre and no enduring results.

In his decisions Alexander III was taking as his point of departure principles already found in Gratian and the decretists.[16] Gratian saw in heresy a serious assault on the dogmatic and social structure of the Church and an attack on the public welfare — the *bonum commune* of both Church and state. In the common defense against such an attack the secular power seems to have been subordinated to the spiritual power of direction and to have been the executor of its judgments. Gratian likewise mentioned the war against heresy as a crusade. The heretic was equated with the infidel, and war against him was meritorious, a holy war. A Christian who fell while participating in it died a martyr. Paucapalea, Gratian's pupil, defended the view that "malos ad bonum cogendos," as did also Roland Bandinelli and the *Summa* of Stephen of Tournai. Through the war on heresy the death penalty was clearly suggested for the convicted heretic.

Similarly, Rufinus in his *Summa Decretorum* defended the opinion: "Armis etiam haeretici compellendi sunt." While Huguccio, like his predecessors, commented on the *Decretum* with reference to Roman law, he nevertheless added one remark that his great pupil, Pope Innocent III, was to take up: that heresy was to be regarded as *maiestas laesa.* Sicard of Cremona regarded the death penalty as justified in the case of obstinate and hopeless heretics, but it should be carried out by the secular power. All the decretists stressed that persons should proceed against heretics not "zelo ultionis, sed amore correctionis." The holy war against them, and hence the death penalty, continued to be considered as the *ultima ratio,* but they were systematically pondered and classified into an emerging penal law for heresy.

---

[15] *COD,* 200 f.; *cf.* R. Foreville, Latran I, II, III (Paris 1965), 146–51.

[16] On what follows *cf.* Maisonneuve, *op. cit.,* 65–91.

After the Peace of Venice in 1177 and its confirmation at Verona in 1184, these beginnings received a first legislative formulation in the decretal "Ad abolendam" of Lucius III, issued 4 November 1184.[17] In it, first of all, a number of heretical groups were condemned *nominatim* by Pope and Emperor: Cathari, Patari, Humiliati, Poor Men of Lyons (Waldensians), Arnoldists, and others. Then the bishops were instructed to take penal action; but apparently it was as yet an accusing procedure rather than one of inquiring. In this respect the decretal comprised only elements of law hitherto in existence. The decretal "Vergentis in senium,"[18] issued for Viterbo by Innocent III on 25 March 1199, first carried the development further by describing heresy as "crimen laesae maiestatis." Thereby the Roman and the Germanic lines of legal transmission converged and set up the presuppositions for the creation of the Inquisition, which was completed in the thirteenth century.

It is plain that the Church clearly saw the threatening danger of an invasion by disintegrating forces into her organism and armed herself so as to meet it vigorously. This she did by inner reforms, by a crusade under her leadership, by an increasing juridical clarification of the possibilities of the penal process against heretics, by stepping up her legislation. The pontificate of Innocent III would bring into prominence the grand-scale counterattack.

CHAPTER 14

Lay Movements of the Twelfth Century, Christian Knighthood, Pastoral Care, Popular Piety, and Mystical Theology

From the beginning of the twelfth century the layman[1] became much more prominent than before, alongside the cleric, in the life of the Church. This was a product of the crusades and especially of the vigorously developing urban culture. In Western society the city community, organized in patriciate and crafts, appeared as a new element which clearly acted not entirely in opposition to the structure—made up of nobility and peasantry—

---

[17] See *supra* p. 76. *Mansi,* XXIII, 476–78; Jaffé, II (2nd ed.), 469 (nos. 15, 101); Maisonneuve, *op. cit.,* 151.

[18] *Potthast R,* no. 643, p. 61; *PL,* 214, 537.

[1] The decrees of Vatican II have given rise to a wealth of literature on the laity in the Church, both preparatory and interpretative. *Cf.* Y. Congar, "Laie," *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe,* II, ed. H. Fries (Munich 1963), 7–25, and the bibliography for this chapter.

of the feudal and agrarian organization, but was integrated with it above all in Italy and even in Germany, by means of the families of ministerial rank.[2] To the constantly growing international relations among armies, merchants, and scholars was added the migration of peasants to the cities.[3]

The great response which the preaching of itinerant clerics[4] had found around the turn of the eleventh century showed itself not only in the crowds of listeners who gathered but also in the not inconsiderable groups that attached themselves to the preachers when they moved on and, as occasion offered, settled down as colonies of ascetics. It is, therefore, not surprising that among the laity there was a desire to undertake the proclaiming of the teaching of Christ as a fulfilling of the *vita apostolica* that had been preached to them and was being practised by them in poverty and common life. It was not enough for them to proclaim by example; they now wanted "to preach to the whole world" by word also. Out of the private profession of the faith emerged the public profession in the form of preaching. If Hildebert of Lavardin[5] had pointed to the obvious realization of this aim in the family circle, where parents in a sense officially carried out an ecclesiastical proclamation of doctrine in regard to their children, soon many persons, especially those who had not founded a family or no longer had one, were demanding other fields of action. Heretical movements felt this impulse, and it is not to be wondered that, in addition to clerics, lay persons especially had a chance to speak in them.[6]

Lay activity in the ecclesiastical sphere was seen in this century especially in the cities where, within the unity constituted by an association, the various professions of merchants and artisans joined in fraternities, gilds, corporations, and lodges;[7] these, both in their purpose and even in their statutes, made clear the tendency toward a religious and ecclesiastical expression of aim. This was probably most evident among the hospital associations, in which brothers and sisters united for the exercise of charity to the sick and the aged. They were lay persons who did not thereby intend to found a new order and did not assume any such monastic obligations as vows.[8] Gerhoh of Reichersberg thus expressed what was common to all of them: "Iudices, milites, praefecti vectigalium, mercatores, rustici regulam apostolicam sequuntur."[9] The Gospel itself became for them, as later for Saint Francis, the rule of life.

---

[2] K. Bosl, *Die Reichsministerialität der Salier und Staufer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des hochmittelalterlichen deutschen Volkes, Staates und Reiches* (Schriften der *MG*, 10), 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1950 f.).

[3] E. Ennen, *Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt* (Bonn 1953); H. Planitz, "Die deutsche Stadtgemeinde," *ZSavRGgerm*, 64 (1944), 1–85.

[4] On itinerant preaching, see Volume III, Chapter 52; M. D. Chenu, "Moines, clercs, laïcs au carrefour de la vie évangélique (XII^e siècle)" *RHE*, 49 (1954), 59–89; L. Spätling, *De Apostolis, pseudoapostolis, apostolinis* (typed dissertation, Munich 1947); E. Werner, *Pauperes Christi. Studien zu sozial-religiösen Bewegungen in der Zeit des Reformpapsttums* (Leipzig 1956).

[5] Hildebert of Lavardin, *Sermo 130 ad populum, PL,* 171, 923 A; on Hildebert, see P. von Moos, *Hildebert von Lavardin (1067–1133). Humanitas an der Schwelle des höfischen Zeitalters* (Pariser Hist. Studien, 3) (Stuttgart 1965); on teaching the catechism at home, *cf.* L. Bopp, "Katechese," *LThK,* VI (2nd ed. 1961), 27–31 (especially 28).

[6] *Cf.* Chapter 13.

[7] H. Planitz, "Kaufmannsgilde und städtische Eidgenossenschaft ... im 11. und 12. Jahrhundet," *ZSavRGgerm,* 60 (1940), 1–116. K. Bosl in *Gebhardt-Grundmann,* I, 669,

In the new schools also, whose clerical character was long predominant, lay persons appeared among the teachers of medicine, law, and the liberal arts as well as among the students. In this way the laity gained something they had hitherto lacked for the most part: the possibility of expressing their concerns orally and especially in writing. The school and the city naturally aroused in lay persons especially the taste for freedom, and so one can understand why the new canon law sought, among other things, to determine more clearly the frontiers between laity and clergy.[10]

At first the distinction was stressed, and then also the subordination of the laity to the clergy. The rights of the laity in the Church appeared, in their crudest expression, as concessions made by the clergy. The layman could have possessions, but only as much as he needed for his support. He could marry, go to court, make offerings, and tithe. Lay persons had a right to ask from the clergy the spiritual aid envisaged in the order of salvation as organized by the Church. In case of necessity they could baptize and confess one another. It had now been made clearer that the contracting parties administered the Sacrament of matrimony to each other. But the laity had no share in the *ministerium verbi,* which remained reserved to the clergy. Innocent III would merely allow them to criticize the clergy to the bishop in the event of a neglect of this *ministerium.* With a clarity that had been achieved at great cost, the canon law now insisted that lay persons had no right whatsoever over ecclesiastical property and ecclesiastical persons. But at the same time there was also now developing the institute of the guardianship of churches, whereby the laity acquired a very important share of the responsibility for the administration of Church property and the care of ecclesiastical buildings and real estate.

In the eliminating of the law of the proprietary church there appeared in Gratian the initial steps in the development of the right of patronage,

---

discusses the association-building force of the gild idea as supported by the Church; P. Wilpert - W. P. Eckert, *Beiträge zum Berufsbewusstsein des mittelalterlichen Menschen (Miscellanea Mediaevalia,* 3) (Berlin 1964).

[8] *Cf.* Chapter 24, pp. 183 ff.

[9] *De aedificio Dei,* c. 43 (*PL,* 194, 1302).

[10] For what follows see G. Le Bras, *Institutions,* I, 171–77, 404–23 (*Fliche-Martin,* 12).

whereby an important right of lay persons in the Church was defined. But on the other hand they were ousted from ecclesiastical electoral bodies, from chapters, and from the sphere of ecclesiastical notaries, and above all they were now forbidden in principle to take the clergy to court — they were not permitted to denounce them nor to testify against them, to say nothing of judging them. On the whole, of course, the laity retained an important secular function in the service of the Church: the protecting of religion, especially by the Emperor and the kings as *defensores ecclesiae*, and the protecting of the moral order by the secular administration of justice to the extent that the clergy were not exempt from it by the *privilegium fori*. The position of the King or of the Emperor continued to be ambivalent for in the twelfth century the quasi-sacred status of rulers, despite the Investiture Controversy and the enduring tension between the powers, was still asserted, and hence kings should still not be reckoned merely as laymen.[11]

In general, the juridical prescriptions of the *Decretum* and the ideas of the decretists seem to imply an attitude of mistrust in regard to the laity and cause this delimitation to appear as a sort of defense against encroachments. But one probably cannot say that in the social realities of the century, despite all the canonical depreciation of the lay state and all the high esteem lavished in theological theory on the clerical state and especially on the monastic and canonical ideals, the laity were repressed, despised, or scorned. Particular study of the attitude of a Rupert of Deutz, a Bernard of Clairvaux, and others yields instead an entirely positive evaluation of the ecclesiastical mission of the laity within the limits of their profession and their vocation.[12]

This becomes clear if one looks into the Christian values of knighthood,[13] which appeared in sharp outline in this century, and its estimation by the clergy.

Western knighthood, the chief representative of the crusade movement, opened itself in a special degree to the tendency toward a sacralization of the states of life and of calling.[14]

---

[11] W. Ullmann, *A History of Political Thought: Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth 1965), 130–58; *idem, Papst und König, Grundlagen des Papsttums und der englischen Verfassung im Mittelalter* (Salzburg and Munich 1966), 34 (the king as *persona ecclesiastica* or as *rex canonicus;* refer to J. Fleckenstein, "Rex canonicus," *Festschrift P. E. Schramm,* I [Wiesbaden 1964], 57).

[12] M. Bernards, "Die Welt der Laien in der kölnischen Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts. Beobachtungen zur Ekklesiologie Ruperts von Deutz," *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter und Stände. Festschrift Kardinal Frings* (Cologne 1960), 391–416 (copious bibliography); H. Wolter, "Bernard von Clairvaux und die Laien. Aussagen monastischer Theologie über Ort und Berufung des Laien in der erlösten Welt," *Scholastik,* 34 (1959), 161–89.

[13] C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (reprint, Darmstadt 1955); F. L. Ganshof, *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité?* (Brussels, 3rd ed. 1957); *idem,* "Qu'est-ce que la chevalerie?" *Revue générale Belge,* 25 (Nov. 1947), 77–86; also, the bibliography to this chapter. A. Borst, "Das Rittertum im Hochmittelalter. Idee und Wirklichkeit," *Saeculum,*

It is true that the tension between idea and reality is unmistakable. And at no period of the Middle Ages was there a universally obligatory ideal of knighthood — beside the early fighting man there stood later the courtly knight and then the crusader, — but one can speak, at least for the age of the flowering of mediaeval knighthood (1150–1300), of uniformly constituted values, which were binding on the knights of all the lands of Christendom. In every country knighthood had its special characteristics and hence it was many-sided in its social appearance. But the values produced by the common experience of the crusade saw in the knight the fighter for God, *miles christianus,* in whom piety and the urge to do great deeds merged.

In his treatise *De laude novae militiae* Bernard of Clairvaux describes the religious outlook, even if one bears in mind the restriction that his expressions apply first of all and especially to the Templars. The Christian knight is subject to Christ as the Lord of hosts, the cross is his banner, death is his witness to the faith *(martyrium)* and his prize (certain beatitude). In this way the earlier, and not strictly ecclesiastical and Christian, demands of knightly morality — loyalty and service — were sanctified, just as weapons and standards were blessed and the ceremony of knighting became the consecration of the knight. Adolf Waas even thinks that the knight found his strictly proper character in the crusader and that, without the experience and the stake in the crusade, the Christian ideal of knighthood in the West would not have achieved its full development.[15] God's fighter protected the Church and her goods, fought against the heathen, shielded the weak, widows, and orphans, and unselfishly established God's order on earth. That the reality did not fully correspond to this ideal and not all knights felt themselves obliged by it cannot detract from the fact that in the majority, and especially in the military orders, it acted as a determining motive. Since it found an echo in all of Christendom in its theological refinement at the hands of Bernard of Clairvaux and John of Salisbury,[16] it may be regarded as a type of lay religious culture characteristic of the twelfth century, its probably most impressive form with the most enduring historical impact.

A powerful sympathy on the part of the world of women has been

---

10 (1959), 213–31, refers, like Ganshof, to the many-faceted figure of the mediaeval knight; *cf.* also S. Painter, *French Chivalry* (reprint, Ithaca, N. Y. 1957). Borst is preparing a comprehensive history of mediaeval knighthood.

[14] M. D. Chenu, *Moines, clercs, laïcs,* 77–80.

[15] *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* I, 1–52, II, 57–70.

[16] *Policraticus,* Book VI, ed. C. C. I. Webb. II, 1–89. The entire Book VI develops a detailed moral code of the knight in the royal service.

identified in the lay movement in regard to the itinerant preachers at the beginning of the century.[17] Accordingly, one must ask what role woman played in the lay participation thus far intimated in the religious and ecclesiastical life of the twelfth century. Naturally, we are not referring to women religious as such, since they belonged to the strictly monastic sphere, which must be reckoned as a third estate alongside clergy and laity, even if a certain overlapping is to be observed here, as for example in the institute of lay brothers and lay sisters.

Woman began to play a more active role in the social life of this century,[18] above all in the Midi, where the troubadours recognized her central position. A person such as Eleanor of Aquitaine, whose career was able to exert a powerful influence over almost the whole century, can be proposed as a model. The praise of woman dominated lyric poetry among both the French and Catalan troubadours and the German minnesingers. In regard also to woman's delight in education one speaks for many in the career of Héloise, pupil, wife, and intimate of Peter Abelard. Within the family and the kindred a great share of responsibility devolved upon the woman if she was of a correspondingly strong character. One thinks especially of Adele, Countess of Blois, William the Conqueror's daughter, whose picture can be drawn convincingly and impressively from the few extant letters that she received from her crusader husband. And the letters of Bernard of Clairvaux to women acquaint us with noteworthy sketches that point to woman's autonomous position in the family.

The lively tendency to forms of cultivated piety led numberless women of this century to the monasteries of the Premonstratensians and later to the Cistercian nuns. When these were no longer in a position to take care of them, groups of virgins and widows united for a common life near hospitals and leprosaria; from them arose the movement of the Beguines, which experienced its first and strongest growth in the thirteenth century. And the recluse type, in which women followed an eremitical life in cells, according to monastic tradition, often in several cells adjoining under a superioress, experienced a flowering in the twelfth century and also contributed to the beginnings of the Beguine movement.[19]

---

[17] H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 1961), is fundamental; G. Schreiber, *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters* (Munster 1948, Reg.).

[18] R. Gout, *Le miroir des dames chrétiennes* (Paris 1935); M. R. Bezzola, *Les origines et la formation de littérature courtoise en occident,* I (500–1200) (Paris 1944); M. de Montoliu, "San Bernardo, la poesía de los trobadores y la 'Divina Comedia'," *Spanische Forschungen,* first series, 12 (Münster 1956); E. Russel, "Bernard et les dames de son temps," *Bernard de Clairvaux* (Paris 1952), pp. 411–28.

[19] L. Oliger, *Speculum inclusorum* (Rome 1938); the well known English *Ancren Riwle* was frequently edited in recent times (English edition by A. C. Baugh, London 1956; Latin edition by R. M. Wilson, London 1954); C. H. Talbot, "The 'De institutis inclusarum' of Ailred of Rievaulx," *AnOCist,* 7 (1951), 167–217.

The laity's more intensive participation in ecclesiastical life did not have its origin only in changes in the social structure in the twelfth century. Rather it can be surmised that the care of souls was attended to in these changes in a more responsible manner than persons have commonly been inclined to admit for that century because of the impression created by the pastoral successes of the mendicant orders in the thirteenth century. The Christian people received religious instruction, were made receptive to the sacramental life, and through the cult of the saints and the pilgrimage had a manifold connection with the totality of the Church's piety.

Religious instruction began in the family. Hildebert of Lavardin impressively explained the duty of parents carefully to provide this initial proclamation as a participation in the teaching office of the Church. This instruction was taken up and carried further in the church building by means of worship and preaching. An abundant sermon literature also from this century attests the uninterrupted tradition, even if in the case of bishops this aspect of their official mission often yielded to other duties. Even learned theologians naturally preached to the laity in the vernacular — for example, Peter Comestor, Peter Lombard, Maurice de Sully, Peter Cantor, Stephen of Tournai and Peter of Blois. In twelfth-century England Anglo-Saxon was still used in preaching.[20] Alain de Lille, through allusions in his *Ars praedicatoria,* lets us surmise that sermons intended for particular classes were known. He supplies model sermons for *milites, advocati (oratores), principes (iudices), coniugati, viduae, virgines, sacerdotes.*[21] For the most part they were homilies or catechetical sermons. Only to persons at the universities were questions of any real theological depth addressed. A special type of popular preaching, which was very widespread and effective, must be mentioned: crusade preaching, the organizing of which got under way and developed its basic forms in this century. Organized according to dioceses, entrusted there to the most celebrated preachers, and carried out not merely in churches but also in public squares, on bridges, and at cross-roads, it aimed at as widespread and all-embracing a proclamation as possible. Because it had as its point of departure a uniform theme, through it the piety of the people in all parts of Christendom came to know a definite form, which, together with Saint Bernard's turning to the suffering Lord, can be characterized as a movement from a Christ-piety to a Jesus-piety.

The sacramental life of the people grew to the extent that private auricular confession even included the recommendation of confession to lay persons. Theology was as yet unable to arrive at any completely clear rejection of the sacramental character of such confession. Especially in battles and combats, if no priest was available, was this form of confession of sins suggested, in conformity with James 5:16: "Confess, therefore, your sins to one another . . ." Communion, on the other hand, became more rare. It was restricted to the great feasts and to a part of the rite of reconciliation, in which the parties received the broken Host. It was likewise received on solemn occasions, such as a knighting and a wedding. Baptism, formerly specified for Easter and Pentecost, now had to be conferred soon after birth, if possible on the same day. Now, as earlier, reception into a religious community, the *professio ad succurrendum,* continued to be for the nobles the method of preparation for death that was in keeping with their social position, and the question of burial in the family vault in a monastery seems to have been solved at the same time.

---

[20] Abbot Samson of Bury St. Edmunds (1182–1210) preached in the Norfolk dialect: "... anglice sermocinare solebat populo, sed secundum linguam Norfolchiae" (*Cronica* of Jocelin of Brakelond, ed. H. E. Butler, Nelson's Medieval Texts [London 1962], 40).

[21] *Summa de arte praedicatoria,* cc. 40–42, *PL,* 210, 185–89.

The cult of the saints developed remarkably in the twelfth century, and the royal saints became especially prominent.[22] Of particular interest are the political canonizations of Charles the Great in 1164, Edward the Confessor in 1161, Olav II Haraldson of Norway, and Knut of Denmark in 1100–01. The amazingly rapid spread throughout Christendom of the veneration of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Becket, assassinated in 1170 and canonized in 1173, marks the climax.[23] Together with Jerusalem, Rome, and Compostela, Canterbury became one of the most important European places of pilgrimage, followed by Vézelay with the alleged grave of Saint Mary Magdalen.[24] Since in the change from the very liberally granted commutations to the indulgence, the practice of which spread powerfully in the twelfth century and even before the end of the century knew of the "plenary indulgence," the pilgrimage, especially the crusade, was recommended as an appropriate penitential work, this form of piety became very widely known, even as a sort of by-product of the growing international commerce. Above all, pilgrimages to shrines of the Blessed Virgin sprang up everywhere,[25] probably as a consequence of the outspoken Marian devotion of the new orders. Even more strongly than in regard to Marian devotion, Saint Bernard's influence is seen in the turning of popular piety to the mysteries of the Redeemer's life and death.

---

[22] J. Schlafke, "Das Recht der Bischöfe in Causis Sanctorum bis zum Jahre 1234," *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter und Stände. Festschrift Kardinal Frings,* 417–40 (the older literature is given also).

[23] R. Foreville, *La jubilée de Saint Thomas de Cantobéry (1220–1470)* (Paris 1958).

[24] V. Saxer, *Le culte de Marie-Madeleine en occident,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959); G. Schreiber "Die heilige Maria Magdalena als Volksheilige und Bergwerksbesitzerin," *Festschrift Karl Eder* (Innsbruck 1959), 259–75.

[25] E. Baumann, *Histoire des pèlerinages de la Sainte Vierge* (Paris 1941); B. Kötting, "Wallfahrt," *LThK,* X (2nd ed. 1965), 941–46 (bibliography).

Mystical Theology[26]

At the beginning of the century Anselm of Canterbury inaugurated the series of theologians of mysticism, which reached its climax in Bernard of Clairvaux, William of Saint-Thierry, and Aelred of Rievaulx, and was cultivated in the school of Saint-Victor, especially by Richard. Philip of Harvengt (d. 1183) and Guerric of Igny (d. 1157) show that mystical theology was especially at home in the new orders, but monks and canons regular were definitely not the only ones to unite theological speculation with a certain degree of experienced love.[27]

The Church is still living on this spiritual wealth of the twelfth century. In Germany the representatives of mystical theology included especially Rupert of Deutz (d. 1130) and, in his footsteps, Gerhoh of Reichersberg (d. 1169), even though in the latter the bellicose tone often drowns out the prayer. More vigorous in expression were the women, such as Herrad of Landsberg (d. 1195) with her *Hortus deliciarum* (1159–75), and Hildegard of Bingen (d. 1179) with her mystical works that resemble revelations: *Liber Scivias, Liber vitae meritorum,* and *Liber divinorum operum.*[28] Elizabeth of Schönau (d. 1164), with her three books of visions and the *Liber viarum Dei* that was edited by her brother Ekbert, was enabled to exert a great influence through the wide circulation of these writings.[29] But without any doubt the most important contribution to the mystical theology of the twelfth century was made by the great Cistercians in France and England who were mentioned at the beginning of the preceding paragraph, especially since their works soon became the most significant elements in the theological libraries of the West. The systematic theology of the next decades was also promoted by them in essential questions.

---

[26] Monastic theology is a theology of devotion in its essence and a mystical theology in its more important propositions. The best expositions are in J. Leclercq, F. Vandenbroucke, and L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du moyen-âge* (*Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne,* 2) (Paris 1961), and in the articles that have thus far appeared in the *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (41 fascicles, Paris 1966). The literature is immense and is listed in the bibliographies of the *RHE* and elsewhere.

[27] J. Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York 1961).

[28] On Hildegard of Bingen, see *Scivias. Übersetzung und Bearbeitung* by M. Böckler (Salzburg 1954). *Gott ist am Werk. Aus dem Buch De operatione Dei,* translation and commentary by H. Schipperges (Olten-Freiburg 1958).

[29] On Elizabeth of Schönau, see *Schönauer Elisabeth-Jubiläum 1965,* ed by the Premonstratensian Canons of Tepl in the monastery of Schönau (Limburg 1965), in particular "Elisabeth von Schönau, Leben und Persönlichkeit," "Das visionäre Werk, seine Überlieferung, Verbreitung und Wirkung in der mittelalterlichen Welt," 17–46 (with bibliography), by K. Köster.

SECTION THREE

The Byzantine Church in the Epoch of the Crusades

Chapter 15

The Byzantine Church from 1054 to 1203

While the date 1054 has quite firmly established itself in historiography as that of the definitive separation of the Byzantine Church from Rome, it was, however, only slowly fixed as such in the awareness of contemporaries and of the next generation. In any event, little was at first changed in the relations of the two Churches, for such relations had lost all cordiality long before 1054. The faithful on both sides and even a large part of the clergy did not at first take note of this date. Impressive evidence for this statement can be adduced,[1] such as pilgrimages from West to East and East to West and translations of relics. The best proof of the confessional impartiality of these latter is afforded by the dossier of the conveying of the relics of St. Nicholas of Myra to Bari or the canonization by Pope Urban II of St. Nicholas of Trani, an itinerant "fool in Christ" from central Greece. Other testimonies are the unhesitating *communicatio in sacris* of pilgrims *en route* from the West *via* Constantinople to the Holy Land and back, the monastic interchange, Montecassino's position of mediator between the papacy, the Normans, and Byzantium, and the not infrequent marriages between partners of the Western and the Orthodox communions. Even the theologians experienced little desire to play up dogmatic differences. They were content to blame the disciplinary peculiarities of the Western Church and were inclined to charge the differences in belief to the Latins' defective knowledge of languages.[2]

---

[1] A good collection of material on this theme is provided by B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle* (Paris 1924). *Cf.* also the report on the literature in F. Dölger, "Byzanz und das Abendland vor den Kreuzzügen," Παρασπορά (Ettal 1961), 73–106.

[2] The chief role in the controversies of the period was played by the dispute over unleavened bread. Especially interesting for the positions on the dogmatic questions is Archbishop Theophylact Hephaestus of Ochrida in Bulgaria (d. after 1126). He was a champion of the Photian teaching of the procession of the Holy Spirit, but he condemned any disputatious dogmatic hair-splitting by his Orthodox coreligionists and all arrogance, and conceded to the Latins that in their tongue it was not possible to express all the refinements of the doctrine of the Trinity (*PG*, 126, 245–49).

Of course, the dissatisfaction existing between the heads of the two Churches could hardly be concealed, and even on the political plane there long prevailed an attitude of more than annoyance. The fault here lay with the Normans. Persons at Constantinople may have been able to understand that the Popes had to make an arrangement with these intruders, but they could only regard it as an act of hostility when, following the Synod of Melfi in 1059, Pope Nicholas II invested Robert Guiscard with territories which were former Byzantine lands and in fact were still partly under Byzantine rule. Thereby the sworn enemy of the Byzantine holdings in South Italy received the Pope's blessing on his further attacks. Furthermore, the Norman conquests in Italy meant, at least in the beginning, a systematic retreat of the Greek hierarchy and the Byzantine rite, and Constantinople had no reason not to suspect that the papacy was also behind this process.

Nevertheless, after the severe defeat administered by the Seljuk Turks to the imperial forces at Manzikert in 1071, the same year in which Bari, the last Byzantine bulwark in Italy, fell to the Normans, the Byzantine Emperor had to swallow his pride and seek peace with the Normans and the Popes in order to assure his rear in the West for the sake of the struggle in the East. Pope Gregory VII was all the more ready for such an understanding, since his own relations with the Normans were none too good. At the same time he was preoccupied with ambitious plans for a crusade, for which he could not dispense with Byzantine cooperation. Not the least significant element in these plans was the hope that in the course of such an expedition the papal claim to the primacy would be accepted at Constantinople and the separation of the Churches would be ended.[3]

In view of the Norman threat to cross over to Greece, there was nothing left for the Emperor Michael VII (1071–78) except to go along with the papal plans. He seems to have made Gregory an offer of ecclesiastical and political negotiations,[4] which induced the Pope to support the Emperor's offer of a marriage alliance to Robert Guiscard: Robert's daughter Helena was to marry the Byzantine Crown Prince Constantine, and Robert himself was to be brought into the imperial family and bind himself to fealty. Such at least is the content of a document of the Byzantine chancery, which, it is true, is not free from all suspicion.[5] From December 1074 people even had to reckon with the likelihood that Gregory VII would go to Constantinople in person.

---

[3] *Cf.* G. Hofmann, "Papst Gregor VII. und der christliche Osten," *StudGreg,* 1 (1947), 169–81; *cf.* also W. Holtzmann, "Studien zur Orientpolitik des Reformpapsttums und zur Entstehung des ersten Kreuzzuges," *HV,* 22 (1924 f.).

[4] *Dölger Reg.,* 988.

[5] *Ibid.,* 1003; text in *ViVr,* 6 (1899), 140–43. On its authenticity see *Dölger Reg., loc. cit.* The suspicions refer only to the document; the fact of the treaty is confirmed by Anna Comnena (I, 10).

The Pope's plans quickly came to nothing, but Byzantium had gained a reprieve. It is true that Michael VII was toppled in 1078 because of his incompetence, and his successor, Nicephorus III Botaneiates (1078–81), annulled the marriage treaty. Robert now prepared for war, and the Pope excommunicated the Emperor in what was the first formal break between the Curia and the Emperor in centuries. This was a serious mistake, not least of all because Rome thereby lost the possibility of carrying on the diplomatic game with two Byzantine partners — Patriarch and Emperor — who at the proper time could be played off against each other. But not even from these events were any conclusions drawn which would merit the label of a formal schism. The next years provide noteworthy proofs of this.

The successor of Nicephorus III, Alexius I Comnenus (1081–1118), was also excommunicated by Gregory VII and from 1081 to 1085 the Normans sought to make their way to Constantinople *via* the Balkan peninsula. But Gregory died and Alexius was victorious over the Normans. The prudent Urban II lifted the censure and extended peace-feelers to Byzantium. Apparently he would have been satisfied with a mention in the Byzantine liturgy, that is, if his name were included in the diptychs. His inquiry, therefore, had to do with why this had thus far been neglected and why the churches of the Latin rite in Constantinople had been closed. The Emperor caused an investigation into these complaints to be made in the *patriarchium* with the aim of determining whether a document on the separation of the two Churches could be found in the archives. The search was a failure, according to the report of the ecclesiastical authorities. In other words, it seems that the Patriarch and his synod regarded the exchange of anathemas between the Patriarch Michael Caerularius and Cardinal Humbert as a personal matter between the two prelates, without consequences for the two Churches. The difficulty, it was said, lay in disciplinary differences between the two Churches, but these could be adjusted. The failure to mention Urban in the diptychs was connected with his not having sent notice of his elevation by means of the traditional synodical. Not all of the Latin churches had been closed, but only those of the Normans, because of the acts of war. The Patriarch suggested that the Pope should send on his synodical, to which a profession of faith was customarily attached; then the inscription in the diptychs would follow and a discussion of the disciplinary differences could get under way.[6] The plan was not carried out. The Patriarch's envoy, Bishop Basil of Reggio, combined this official business with his own fight to restore the Byzantine rite in his see, and it was no longer at that time in accord with the papal idea to submit a profession of faith in such a context.

---

[6] The official documents were rediscovered by W. Holtzmann, "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089," *ByZ*, 28 (1928), 38–67 (with edition and critique). *Cf. Grumel Reg.*, 953 f.

These events occurred in 1089. It is significant that, despite this failure, relations between Urban and Alexius in no way cooled, but instead the Emperor apparently obtained from the Pope at that time the prospect of military aid. There was agreement, not on the basis of strict law or of dogma, but on the more useful basis of *oikonomia,* of mutual *laissez-faire.* And this was the basis for the common preparation of the First Crusade. And precisely this crusade had the duty and would have possessed the ability to bring the two parts of Christendom together in common distress and hope. That the Pope and the Emperor planned and prepared together can no longer be doubted—Alexius was by no means struck by the arrival of the crusaders as by a bolt from the blue.[7] And the aims and ideas of the Pope and the Emperor must have been basically the same.

But the enterprise slipped not only out of Urban's hands but also out of those of Alexius, and what would have been able to lead to peace actually produced a deepening of the schism. What was decisive in this respect was not, as has been claimed, the discrepancy of the fundamental idea — that the Byzantines were expecting auxiliary troops for their struggle against the Seljuks, while the crusaders had set as their immediate goal the capture of Jerusalem, which even for Urban II had been only a long-range goal and for Alexius was of little importance in view of the state of his diplomatic relations with the Fatimids. The trouble lay rather with the formalities. It is true that Alexius continued to assure, by means of a flexible system of feudal forms,[8] his claims to sovereignty over the territories to be conquered as far as a bit south of Antioch, but the fact that the vanguard of the crusade possessed more enthusiasm than a sense of order or a talent for organization, and indeed that whole crusade armies took the land route going north to south through the Balkan peninsula, which was not prepared for them, led to ever more irksome tests of nerves. And if Alexius finally had to send home the vanguard, which had been routed by the Turks precisely because of its lack of discipline, the *perfidia Graecorum* was there alleged as the excuse for this misfortune.

More dangerous was the fact that the old enemy of the Byzantines, Bohemond of Tarentum, began to play before Antioch a role with which neither Godfrey of Bouillon nor even Raymond of Toulouse would have had anything to do.[9] The papal legate, Adhémar of Le Puy, had been able time and again to adjust the tensions that arose between the Byzantine escort and the crusade army, acting from the notion of a Universal Church that was not torn by schism. Thus it was at first taken for granted by the crusaders that the liberated Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch should be recognized as the only Bishop of that city.[10] But when the legate died, Bohemond was able openly to promote his own policy, which amounted to a withholding of Antioch from the Byzantine Emperor. He started a deliberate propaganda against Byzantium, in which now the theme of the schism and the differences of belief played a great role. The Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch was forced to withdraw to Constantinople.[11] Daimbert of Pisa, who was determined to succeed Adhémar and was sailing to the Holy Land with a Pisan squadron which *en route* had already treated the Ionian islands as enemy territory, joined Bohemond. He supported the formation of a Latin hierarchy and the expulsion of the Greek, and he even partly excluded the Greeks from worshipping at the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Finally, Bohemond even succeeded in gaining the new Pope, Paschal II, for his idea of the *perfidia Graecorum,* and the papal legate Bruno, who accompanied Bohemond to France in 1104, received the commission to preach the holy war against Byzantium. This was both a turning point and a catastrophe. The reply of the Byzantine hierarchy was not slow in coming, the theological opposition hardened, and Latin bishops, who, passing through Constantinople, entered into theological dispute, ran into a resistance that became less and less possible to overcome.[12]

---

[7] *Cf.* C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens* (Stuttgart 1935, reprinted 1955), 299ff.; P. Charanis, "Byzantium, the West and the Origin of the First Crusade," *Byz(B),* 19 (1949), 17–36.

[8] See F. Ganshof, "Recherches sur le lien juridique qui unissait les chefs de la première croisade à l'empereur byzantin," *Mélanges M. P. E. Martin* (Geneva 1961), 49–63.

If, despite everything, the age of the Comneni was an uninterrupted series of attempts to reach an adjustment on the religious plane with the Holy See and hence with the West, these efforts almost always proceeded from the Emperors. They liked to surround themselves even with Western theological advisors, the best known being Hugh Eteriano and his brother Leo, two Pisans at the court of Manuel I.[13] The Emperors sought contacts everywhere, and when they could no longer break the resistance of their

[9] *Cf.* A. C. Krey, "A Neglected Passage in the Gesta," *The Crusades and other historical essays, presented to D. C. Munro* (New York 1928), 57–78.

[10] Albert of Aachen: "... nostrae vero latinitatis patriarcham eo vivente qui pridem ibi ordinatus fuerat, eligere vel consecrare non praesumpserunt" (*Hist.*, VI, 23).

[11] The new Latin Patriarch of Antioch was named, not after, but before the Greek Patriarch had abdicated. The latter only abdicated in Constantinople. *Cf. Runciman,* I, 307, and now P. Gautier, "Jean V l'Oxite, patriarche d'Antioche," *RÉB,* 22 (1964), 128–35.

[12] Thus, for example, Peter Grossolano of Milan in 1112; *cf.* V. Grumel, "Autour du voyage de Pierre Grossolanus à Constantinople," *ÉO,* 32 (1933), 22–33. Also, Anselm of Havelberg in 1154; see G. Schreiber, "Anselm von Havelberg und die Ostkirche," *ZKG,* 60 (1942) 354–411.

[13] *Cf.* O. Volk, *LThK,* V (2nd ed., 1960), 512 f. (with bibliography).

own hierarchy, they still reduced it for the time being to silence. To put it simply, the Emperors had to handle the successive waves of the crusade. Under all circumstances they had to prevent their own capital from becoming the goal of an attack. And they had to avoid aggravating the danger which Paschal II had opened up; hence they could not afford to have the reproach of being schismatics hurled at them by the crusaders in addition to that of being untrustworthy.

And so from the time of the Comneni the policy of union became an element in a policy of self-preservation and eventually a diplomatic weapon which persons used without paying any too much attention to its essentially religious concept. Thereby began also the game over the time-relationship between Western political and military aid and the Church union that depended on it. The help which the Emperor received in this connection from the hierarchy of his Empire was meagre. Sometimes it reluctantly obeyed, but on the whole it did whatever was possible to obstruct the concluding of a union.

Without a doubt the closest affinity to the Western mentality was displayed by the Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–80). His intensive and far-reaching political plans led finally to a special type of union endeavour. His ambition aimed at the reconquest of Byzantine Italy. His first military successes were soon followed by a serious setback: the defeat of the Byzantine troops at Brindisi by the Normans in 1156. But the Emperor did not abandon his plans and he even tried to turn the struggle between Pope Alexander III and the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa to his own advantage. In 1166 or 1167 he laid before the Pope a plan that was as grandiose as it was unrealistic: the Pope should crown him Universal Roman Emperor, since the opportunity was now favourable and he rather than Frederick had a right to this. In return Manuel promised the Pope protection and aid against Barbarossa and also an offer of union, reported by the Roman informant in the following terms: "ut sub una divinae legis observantia et uno ecclesiae capite uterque clerus et populus latinus videlicet et graecus, perpetua firmitate subsisteret."[14] The Pope could not but be greatly embarrassed by this offer, and his acceptance would have meant a complete change of papal policy. However, he did not reject the plans *a limine* but sent an embassy to Constantinople, probably to drag out the negotiations. Why the plans then failed completely cannot be determined.[15]

---

[14] On the entire matter see P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer*, II (Rome 1957), 123–43; W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim 1947), 104 ff.; A. van der Baar, *Die kirchliche Lehre der Translatio imperii romani bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Rome 1956), especially 78 ff.

[15] *Grumel Reg.*, 1121 f.; *cf.* also G. Hofmann, "Papst und Patriarch unter Kaiser Manuel I. Komnenos," 'Επετ. 'Ετ. Βυζ. Σπουδ. 23 (1953), 74–82.

With the death of Manuel I the opposition solidified in regard to Latin and especially Venetian influence in the Empire; economic and national viewpoints probably played a stronger role than religious. The point of departure for a union became ever worse, and a crusade against Byzantium itself became more and more likely. The Emperors of the House of the Angeli wavered indecisively between the various political possibilities. Whatever the reasons why the Fourth Crusade finally moved directly against Constantinople, it was certainly not Pope Innocent III who gave it this direction. The sources in any event make it clear that, for the ordinary participants in the crusade, this turn of the expedition could be sufficiently justified by the schism of the Greeks. And so the catastrophe of 1204.

CHAPTER 16

The Byzantine Church from 1203 to 1282

The Fourth Crusade brought the most important parts of the Byzantine Empire, including Constantinople, its capital, into the hands of "the Latins." This victory, destined to reveal itself as, in the words of Steven Runciman, "an act of gigantic political folly," produced no enduring advantages either for the crusade idea as such or for the security of the Frankish East, while for the notion of the reunion of the separated halves of Christendom it proved to be one of the worst hindrances. Pope Innocent III[1] at first vacillated between indignation over the "abomination of desolation" which the crusaders had perpetrated on a Christian territory and a scarcely restrained satisfaction that this Empire, which had sought to pass itself off as Christian without being actually willing to acknowledge the papal primacy, had finally been brought low. Satisfaction clearly gained the upper hand and gave birth in the Pope to a legal concept, which in this trained lawyer can be explained only in the light of that gratification and which can appropriately be reduced to the dangerous phrase, *cuius regio, eius religio.* In any event, the papal instructions for the legate, Benedict of Santa Susanna, contained the unmistakable sentence: "... translato ergo imperio necessarium, ut ritus sacerdotii transferatur, quatenus Ephraim reversus ad Iudam in azymis sinceritatis et veritatis expurgato fermento veteri epuletur ..."[2]

National and cultural differences have always been charged with responsibility for the divergent disciplines of the two Churches. But these differences only now became decisive, when the self-esteem of the Byzantines was pierced to the heart. The Greek resistance was consolidated on the frontiers of the new Latin Empire, and there arose political structures, all of which aspired to the succession to the old Byzantine Empire: Trebizond, Nicaea, and Epirus. Their rivalries prevented a unified action against the Latin Empire and delayed the recovery of Constantinople and restoration in the former geographical extension. But they were all agreed on a new, specifically Greek Orthodox national sentiment, in which "Greek" and "Orthodox" more and more became convertible terms and which, for all the recognition of the political rights of the conquerors, was directed precisely against the convertibility of the terms "Frankish" and "papal," which can be ascertained with equal ease. All efforts for union were fundamentally shattered on this fatal combination of ideas.

---

[1] *Cf.* W. de Vries, "Innozenz III. (1198–1216) und der christliche Osten," *AHPont,* 3 (1965), 87–126.

[2] *Innocentii III epp.,* VIII, 55 (*PL,* 215, 623 f.).

Little as most of the conquerors and papal agents were aware of this dangerous situation, they were equally unmindful of the ancient religious unity of the Balkan peninsula. It is true that the Bulgarian Tsar Kalojan had obtained from the Pope recognition of the ecclesiastical primacy of Tirnovo in 1203 and of himself as ruler of the "Bulgars and Vlachs" in 1204 and that he had even received the crown from the hand of a papal legate. But when he then made contact with the Latin conquerors of Constantinople, he could not fail to note that the Emperor Baldwin, the haughty successor of the Byzantine *autokrator*, made completely unrealistic territorial claims on Bulgarian Thrace and Macedonia. Under the circumstances it was not difficult for the Bulgars' old coreligionists in Orthodoxy, the Greeks, to gain the Tsar to their side. In Easter week of 1205, hardly a year after the fall of Constantinople, Kalojan inflicted on the crusaders a severe defeat at Adrianople, which cost the Emperor Baldwin his liberty and plunged the young Empire into the greatest difficulties. Baldwin's brother, Henry of Flanders, who now mounted the throne (1206 to 1216), drew from this occurrence the not unimportant conclusion that he should deal more indulgently with the sensitivities of the Greeks of his Empire than his predecessor did,[3] and so he conducted even religious discussions not so much in the spirit of the far-away Pope as with that discretion which political expediency forced on him.

And finally it must be emphasized that the papal legates who came to Constantinople with projects of union found there no fully legitimate partners for a dialogue.[4] The last Patriarch of the Byzantine Empire, John

---

[3] *Cf.* especially J. Lognon, *L'empire latin de Constantinople* (Paris 1949), 89 ff.

[4] On the following discussions of union and embassies see especially A. Heisenberg, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion*, I–III, *SAM*, 1922, 5; 1923, 2; 1923, 3 (Munich 1922 f.), and the most recent presentation in J. M. Hoeck, *Nikolaos-Nekatarios von Otranto, Abt von Casole* (Ettal 1965), 30 ff.

Kamateros, had fled at the arrival of the crusaders and could not be induced to return to Constantinople.[5] He died in 1206 in voluntary exile. This was the opportunity of Byzantine monachism, which could now pose as the spokesman of Orthodoxy without being further obstructed by the Patriarch and his attitude, always powerfully determined by political considerations. This hour of monachism remained decisive: for the future the ultimately determining word in all these questions very frequently was not that of the hierarchy. As early as 1204 the effort to organize a discussion of union, arranged by Cardinal Peter of Capua, foundered on the resistance of the monk John Mesarites. Cardinal Benedict of Santa Susanna arrived in Constantinople at the end of 1205 or early in 1206 as papal emissary. At first he organized gatherings of the Byzantine clergy, in which it seems that John's brother, the deacon Nicholas Mesarites,[6] was the Greeks' spokesman. But then, apparently in the understanding that the monks counted for more than did the diocesan clergy of the capital, he arranged a meeting of the monks, and here again John Mesarites played the decisive role.[7] The monks seem to have been prepared to a certain degree to acknowledge the Emperor Henry as their sovereign but not to recognize the Pope's primacy of jurisdiction or to yield in dogmatic questions.

A weak prospect of success showed itself when the Patriarch John Kamateros had died. The Greeks applied, not to the legate, but to the Emperor Henry for permission to elect a Patriarch. Henry seems not to have been unwilling but he still had to require a certain recognition of the Pope. Two drafts of letters to Pope Innocent III were drawn up by the Orthodox, in the second of which at least an acclamation after the liturgy was conceded to the Pope. It is doubtful that either of these letters was really dispatched,[8] but, if they were, Innocent certainly did not take them into account. A favourable opportunity was lost, for now the clergy of Constantinople contacted Theodore Lascaris, Emperor of Nicaea, and in Nicaea there took place the election of an Orthodox Patriarch, who was recognized also in Orthodox Constantinople. A further and portentous step in the consolidation of Orthodoxy had thereby been taken.

The sequel was that the next papal legate, Cardinal Pelagius of Albano, had to get into touch with Nicaea. After his arrival at Constantinople in 1214 he seems first to have tried to bring the monks to reason, if necessary by force. Now they no longer lodged their complaints with the Emperor Henry but with Theodore Lascaris. And so there was an exchange of intermediaries with Nicaea.[9] Theodore Lascaris was not averse to the negotiations, for the mere *de facto* recognition of his sovereign dignity by the papal legate was a gain at the expense of the Latin Empire. And that is all it was; there can be no question of a success. After the dead pledge, Constantinople showed itself in every discussion with Nicaea as the greatest obstacle, for the recovery of the ancient capital was for the Greek Emperor, admittedly or not, a *conditio sine qua non,* while for the Pope this Latin Empire, that was unable both to survive and to die, constituted an irritating burden. And when at length Innocent IV (1243–54) seemed ready to give up Constantinople he died before he could carry out his plans. In any event people at Nicaea could now believe with reason that the city would soon fall to the Greek Emperor like a ripe fruit.[10] Hence, in the confrontations in the eastern Mediterranean, union soon played merely the role of a political attendant circumstance, to be manipulated according to the situation of the respective opponents.

---

[5] John Kamateros never abdicated, but neither did he accept the invitation to Nicaea; *cf. Grumel Reg.*, 1202.

[6] On Nicholas Mesarites see *Beck*, 666. A report on a disputation with Cardinal Benedict in Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, II, 15–25.

[7] Report of the conference in Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, I, 52 ff.

[8] The first draft of the letter, from the pen of John Mesarites, in Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, I, 63 ff. The second draft in *PG*, 140, 291 ff. On the date see Hoeck, *op. cit.*, 51.

It was only logical, then, for an Emperor such as John III Vatatzes (1222–54) to undertake to exploit for his own ends the conflict between the Hohenstaufen Frederick II and the Pope. Authentically ecclesiastical disputes played only a slight role; enthusiasm for the crusade had long ago cooled off and a cavalier system of coalitions and countercoalitions with the single aim of one's own advantage became more widespread. The Emperor of Nicaea not infrequently gained his victories by means of Latin mercenaries, and the Latin Empire just as often was allied with the Seljuks. Religious policy in the principalities of the Latin Empire was determined less by papal directives than by the advantage of the dukes and counts who had acquired sovereignty and property. A special position was, in any event, occupied by Mount Athos, over which Innocent III himself had assumed the protectorate, even though scarcely a single monastery apart from the Iberon probably acknowledged his primacy.

In general there prevailed in the entire territory of the Empire the rule that every Greek bishop who had made the oath of obedience to the Pope could continue in office — and a group of bishops had made it. The others for the most part resigned voluntarily or sought to govern their flocks from some safer place. For the monasteries it was probably enough if they paid taxes to the new bishops, and the lower clergy on the whole very likely got off with this tangible gesture. Of course, there were so many Latin clerics in the train of the conquerors who coveted the ecclesiastical property of Orthodoxy that we must allow for a large-scale bestowal of

---

[9] Report of Nicholas Mesarites in Heisenberg, *op. cit.,* III, 19 ff.

[10] Evidence in W. Norden, *Papsttum und Byzanz,* 359 ff.

Greek benefices and a general impoverishment of the remaining Greek higher and lower clergy. On Crete, which had fallen to the Venetians, only two of ten bishops were still functioning in 1224, and they soon disappeared. And if Venice also made no serious efforts to force union upon the Cretans, neither did she let them have a hierarchy but only *protopapades* in the larger cities, while the monasteries enjoyed autocephaly. Eight Latin sees, including the archbishoprics of Patras and Corinth, were established in the Frankish Peloponnesus, and so not much room was left for the Greek hierarchy. The Greek Metropolitan of Patras sought from time to time to rule his people from the monastery of Megaspelaion. Michael Choniates directed his Athenian flock from the island of Ceos, while a Latin archbishop resided in Athens itself. These examples are typical of the entire ecclesiastical organization in the conquered territory: here and there arrangements with the conquerors, exterior submission, perhaps even opportunism, but just as often stiff resistance and involuntary exile, underground activity, missionary work from a distance. Neither Church turned out to be the victor.[11]

On 25 July 1261 Constantinople fell to the Greek Emperor. A nightmare was over, a dream fulfilled. But it soon became clear that the situation was something less than rosy, for Michael VIII (1259–82) was a usurper, and the opposition, especially that of the average and lower clergy,[12] made serious difficulties for him in the name of the dethroned Lascarids. Trebizond remained outside the restored Empire, and the "Great Comneni" there could bring themselves to show no more than marks of respect to the Emperor at Constantinople. Epirus likewise escaped more and more from Byzantine sovereignty. At most the reconquest was successful in the Peloponnesus. Worst of all for Michael was the fact that the Latin West, which had at first looked on calmly as Constantinople and the shrinking Latin Empire became ever weaker until they fell an easy prey for the Greeks, now suddenly remembered the deserted Empire again and exerted itself, from the most varied reasons, to retrieve the booty from the Greeks.[13] Above all, the Hohenstaufen Manfred pursued this aim, unmindful of the alliance between Frederick II and John III Vatatzes. A power basis which included South Italy and the Greek lands across the Adriatic seemed to him to be important for his own ambitious plans, which were intended to lead to the imperial throne. And if Genoa was prepared to side with Michael VIII, this automatically meant the dangerous hostility of Venice. And Charles of Anjou, successor of the Hohenstaufen in South Italy, assumed all the hereditary claims of Manfred and, through a skillful policy, added new ones.

---

[11] For a general view of the situation of the Orthodox Church under direct Latin rule, see Lognon, *op. cit.*, 135 ff.

[12] On this opposition see V. Laurent, "Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance: La fin du schisme arsénite," *Bulletin Soc. Hist. Acad. Roum.*, 26 (1945), 225–313.

[13] *Cf.* E. Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel im Rahmen der abendländischen Politik 1261 bis etwa 1310* (Jena 1937).

For Michael VIII there was only one possible, but difficult, ally: the Pope, who, in the ceaseless conflict with the Hohenstaufen, would, in the circumstances, be pleased with a Greek confederate. While in Charles of Anjou the papacy had found the right man to free it from the Hohenstaufen, at the same time it had to dread that there might be no limit to the aggrandizement of this new lord of South Italy. Naturally, an alliance with the papacy meant union, and so Michael VIII was quickly aware of the necessity of concluding one.[14] The point of departure may have been political, but the Emperor took his duty seriously and pursued it honestly and persistently. The difficulties never lay in his good will but always in the circumstances. The monastic world, hostile to union, was, as always, conscious of its own importance, while the hierarchy, in order not to lose the people, had to yield time and again to the monks and at most could go along with the Emperor's plans only from afar and in a diplomatically zigzag course. Despite what the Pope believed to the contrary, the Byzantine Emperor was no longer in a position to impose on his people union in matters of faith by his mere authority. And so Michael VIII went his way, more or less alone. He sought by severity and even by ruthlessness[15] to enforce the Pope's desire in his Empire; so long as he was alive, many a resistance could be eliminated, but with his death his work at once collapsed.

The greatest difficulty in regard to Rome came from the question of priorities. The Byzantine Emperor was at first mostly interested in the papacy's diplomatic and military help and argued that this would best prepare the way for union. But Pope Urban IV flatly rejected this arrangement and demanded ecclesiastical submission as the first step.[16] With Clement IV, Michael tried the promise of having all controverted points discussed at a general council, but again without success.[17] Even his offer to take part in the crusade of Louis IX of France did not dissuade the Pope from his primary requirement of ecclesiastical submission.

The situation changed only with the pontificate of Gregory X (1271–76).

---

[14] Summary of the whole problem in B. Roberg, *Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II. Konzil von Lyon* (Bonn 1964).

[15] Occasionally the severity of the persecution of anti-unionists by the Emperor Michael has been exaggerated; for example, it can be proved that there was no real persecution of the Athos monks. On this point see J. Anastasiu, Ὁ θρυλούμενος διωγμὸς τῶν Ἁγιωρειτῶν ὑπὸ Μιχαὴλ Η′ τοῦ Παλαιαλόγου (Salonika 1963), reprinted in Ἡ Ἀθωνικὴ πολιτεία (Salonika 1963), 207–57.

[16] *Cf.*, for example, Urban's letter in Tautu, no. 6, 21.

[17] Tautu, no. 69.

Whatever judgment may be rendered on this Pope, in his Eastern policy he possessed something of the greatness, the restraint, and the clarity of the Pope of the First Crusade, Urban II. Above all, he had an unfailing sympathy for the difficult situation of his Byzantine partner in dialogue, and, even if he found himself unable to yield in matters of principle, still the style of his policy was entirely in the spirit of *oikonomia.* Even Byzantine anti-unionists such as George Pachymeres frankly admitted this. It was Gregory himself who acted *motu proprio* to renew the contact with Michael VIII. It was important that the Pope offered discussions at a general council but was at the same time prepared to enter at once upon political negotiations. Furthermore, he declared that he would be satisfied if at first only a part of the Byzantine episcopate would recognize the union; a universal personal taking of the oath to the union need take place only after the full realization of a *rapprochement* at a time to be determined by the Pope. What he first regarded as necessary was not an oath but a mere promise to acknowledge the Roman faith and the papal primacy after the conclusion of peace in the secular sphere. "Agnoscere desideramus" was the formula which he proposed as his minimal demand.[18] Thereby was created a model case of a *modus procedendi* which is virtually unique in Church history.

Michael now had to work to gain at least a minority of the hierarchy for the union but he actually tried to obtain a majority. A first inventory among the higher clergy did not yield half a dozen partisans of the Emperor. The Patriarch Joseph (1267–75) demanded too much in dogmatic questions and in the disputations availed himself of the aid of a monk, Job Jasites, who was an outspoken opponent of the Latins. The Patriarch even let himself be induced to swear not to assent to union. He seems later to have regretted this oath but regarded himself as bound by it.[19] Just the same, he made it clear that he did not wish to stand in the way of union.

More serious was the fact the *chartophylax* John Beccus,[20] the most learned theologian of the day, was unwilling to support the Emperor's efforts. Since he expressed himself only too frankly, he was imprisoned; but he was allowed a small theological library that he made use of to examine his theological views. This measure produced its effect. To me it hardly seems probable that his conversion was political in nature, for we know that in prison Beccus read the works of a Byzantine theologian who died just around this time (1272), Nicephorus Blemmydes by name.[21] While vacillating in regard to ecclesiastical politics, Nicephorus in his theological writings occasionally achieved an approach to the Latin position in the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit, in which *a filio* and *per filium* were equivalent, an approach of the greatest importance. And it was this very Blemmydes to whom Beccus would later appeal. Be that as it may, he left his prison to become the skillful and theologically unbeatable champion of union, to whose writings it is due that for the future a small but important party of *Latinophrones* could no longer be disregarded in Byzantine intellectual history. The archdeacon Constantine Meliteniotes, already a staunch advocate of union, now became the closest collaborator of Beccus. The archdeacon George Metochites must also be mentioned as the third member of the group. In the higher civil hierarchy Michael VIII found a champion of his ideas in the esteemed historian George Acropolites, who, while he lacked theological depth, made his own the Christian idea of union as such. In addition there was doubtless a whole group of clerics and lay persons who intended to follow the Emperor's lead, some out of conviction, others out of indifference or opportunism. Finally, in February 1274, the imposing number of forty-four bishops, together with the higher clergy of Hagia Sophia, dispatched to the Pope a letter which recognized his primacy — "primum et summum pontificem esse et nominari" — and expressed their preparedness for union.[22] At the same time the Emperor signed with purple ink the profession of faith that had been sent to him from Rome.[23]

---

[18] Tautu, nos. 101 f. The Pope would have preferred the formula "catholicae fidei veritatem agnoscimus"; as second choice he proposed the possibility of "convenimus in suprascriptam catholicae fidei veritatem," but he was finally satisfied with "desideramus eandem fidem agnoscere, suscipere, et profiteri."

[19] V. Laurent, "Le serment antilatin du patriarche Joseph Ier (juin 1273)," *ÉO*, 26 (1927), 396–407.

[20] On Beccus and his importance see *Beck*, 681–83. V. Laurent is preparing a monograph.

The Byzantine delegation, consisting of the former Patriarch Germanus III, the Metropolitan Theophanes of Nicaea, and the grand logothete George Acropolites, set sail on 11 March 1274 and entered Lyons on 24 June. The Emperor's profession of faith, which they brought, contained the dogmatic formulas of the Latin Church, including the *Filioque*. However, the Emperor asked the Pope to avoid any altering of the Creed in regard to the Greeks and to guarantee their rites. The solemn act of union was proclaimed on 29 June.[24] The question of the addition to the Creed and of rites was presumably arranged, orally but successfully, between the Pope and the Greek delegates.

---

[21] *Beck*, 671–73.

[22] Roberg, *op. cit.*, 235–39, provides a new edition of this letter. *Cf.* also the editions in *Mansi*, XXIV, 74–77, and Tautu, nos. 124–27.

[23] *Dölger Reg.*, 2006, ed. in *Mansi*, XXIV, 67–74.

[24] *Cf.* A. Fliche, "Le problème oriental au second concile œcuménique de Lyon," *OrChrP*, 13 (1947), 475–85; A. Franchi, *Il concilio II di Lione* (Rome 1965).

Shortly afterwards the Patriarch Joseph resigned at Constantinople and on 16 January 1275 a union liturgy was solemnly celebrated in the imperial palace church. In May 1275 the Byzantine Church received, in the person of the *chartophylax* John Beccus, a new Patriarch in the spirit of the reunion of the Churches. But on 10 January 1276 death overtook Pope Gregory X, whose personality was so very necessary for the continuance of the reconciliation of the Greek Church.

Hostility to the Greeks once more gained the upper hand at the Curia.[25] If Michael VIII had approached Gregory X in a manner which pushed the complex of political questions virtually to second place behind the ecclesiastical question, Gregory's successors were disinclined to honour the situation; on the contrary, they were prepared rather to recognize the old hereditary claims of Latin princes to Constantinople. And so the agreement was preparing to collapse. It has been suspected, and not incorrectly, that behind the Curia lurked Charles of Anjou, for whom the union of Lyons could only be a hindrance. Despite all the increased demands of the next Popes, despite all the multiplied formalities and demands for oaths, Michael VIII long continued to be the classical politician of unconditional fulfillment, even though Rome gave him none of the promised aid in the sphere of foreign policy. The resistance of the ecclesiastical opposition at Constantinople became ever harder. A rather vague recognition of the primacy, of the right to appeal to Rome, and of the commemoration of the Pope in the liturgy was all that could be obtained from a majority. But now the Popes were concerned not merely for these points but also for the express addition of the *Filioque* in the Creed, which thus afforded the opponents of union the satisfaction of arguing about a papal or imperial breach of faith.

The fateful development reached its climax with Pope Martin IV, who not only made no objection to an alliance of Charles of Anjou, Philip de Courtenay, and Venice for the reconquest of Constantinople, but removed any last religious scruples when, without any plausible reason, he excommunicated the Emperor Michael VIII on 18 November 1281, and on 26 March 1282, under pain of excommunication and interdict, forbade Catholics to have any contact with Michael or to send him any war material. There can be no doubt as to who it was that so unscrupulously trampled down the weak plant of the new union, for the papal bull of excommunication affected no guilty person, but only the one Greek who, despite his political interests, had done and sacrificed the most for the union.

---

[25] V. Grumel, "Les ambassades pontificales à Byzance après le IIe concile de Lyon," *ÉO*, 23 (1924), 437–47; *idem,* "En orient après le IIe concile de Lyon," *ÉO*, 24 (1925), 321–25.

CHAPTER 17

The Inner Life of the Byzantine Church in the Age of the Crusades

Whereas in the preceding periods the Byzantine Imperial Church made its importance felt, collectively in synods or in assemblies with the Emperor, only occasionally and for the rest remained curiously amorphous as a population group and particular estate becoming distinctive only in individual personalities, from the middle of the eleventh century a profound change revealed itself. A new *esprit de corps* pervaded the clergy and even made itself noticeable in the constitutional life of the Empire.[1] The causes were varied. The manner in which, for example, the Patriarch Michael Caerularius prevailed *vis-à-vis* the imperial power was certainly due to his own high-handed personality and not to the traditions of his office. Even though he finally failed, dying in 1058 after the Emperor had had him deported, the very action taken against him betrayed his importance. The hierarchy first appeared on the political stage as a compact group under this Patriarch on the occasion of the usurpation of the throne by the Emperor Isaac I Comnenus in 1057.[2] The decisive electoral gathering which enabled Isaac to seize the capital now included not merely the earlier electoral elements — Senate, people, and representatives of the army, — but also the clergy, and it was the Patriarch who presided. And the initiative in the constitutional acclamation of Isaac was taken by a cleric, the Patriarch of Antioch. What had taken place somewhat tumultuously in 1057 was still so impressed on the memory in 1078 that it could be repeated almost as though required by protocol: Senate, people, and synod cooperated harmoniously on a footing of equality to pave the way for the candidate, Nicephorus III Botaneiates.[3] And throughout the twelfth century, whenever the succession to the throne was not assured, and of course only then, the Emperors always sought to induce not only the Senate, army, and people, but also the synod of the clergy, with or without the Patriarch, to join in the formal acclamation.[4]

When the "synod" is mentioned, it is the so-called "permanent synod," *synodos endemousa*, that is usually meant. It consisted of the highest dignitaries of the patriarchal see in deacon's orders and of all archbishops and bishops of the Empire who happened to be staying in the capital. Under the presidency of the Patriarch they regularly discussed and decided the business of the Church. The constantly increasing exemptions of bishoprics from metropolitan authority, which led to the creation of ever more "autocephalous" archbishoprics, the pernicious bent of Byzantine provincial prelates for going to the capital as often as possible and staying there as long as possible, and finally the ever growing number of prelates fleeing before the Seljuk occupation of Asia Minor to Constantinople, where they lived on some sort of income, must have caused the number of persons entitled to take part in this synod to grow remarkably at the close of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth. It was only natural that many of these unoccupied fugitive bishops should zealously throw themselves into the political bustle of the capital, which offered them a new and hitherto unknown field of activity, and that, as permanent guests of an institution which was only as such regarded as permanent, they should foster the constructing of a self-conscious *esprit de corps* — even if it was only because of the dissensions that soon appeared within the group. These last were promoted not least of all by the so-called *exokatakoiloi,* that is, the five (later six) highest deacons of Hagia Sophia, who not infrequently combined with the newly elected archbishops against the Patriarch and the representatives of the old, classical metropolitan sees in the synod.[5]

---

[1] *Cf.* H. G. Beck, "Kirche und Klerus im staatlichen Leben von Byzanz," *RÉB*, 24 (1966), 1–24.

[2] Skylitzes, II, 636 (Bonn); Attaleiates, 57 (Bonn).

[3] Skylitzes, II, 733; Attaleiates, 270.

[4] For example, Manuel I, *cf.* Nicetas Choniates, 66 f.; Alexius III, *cf.* Choniates, 601; Michael VIII, *cf.* Pachymeres, I, 74.

The weapon of these higher clerics of Hagia Sophia was not least of all the canon law, the renaissance of which is perhaps to be seen in connection with the reorganization of the higher school system of Constantinople by the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus in 1045. The first director of the law faculty,[6] which of course served especially the constitutional law and the formation of the secular officials, was John Xiphilinus, who soon became Patriarch (1064–75) and as such gave new stimulation to the canon law. The special cultivation of this branch of law then found its home above all with the Patriarch's *chartophylax,* who had meanwhile developed from librarian and archivist to being a sort of vicar general of the Patriarch, precisely because of his knowledge of law. Of the three great canonists of the twelfth century, Zonaras,[7] Aristenus,[8] and Balsamon,[9] who commented on the entire *corpus* of canonical sources, the last two belonged to the higher clergy of Hagia Sophia, and the greatest among them, Balsamon, was *chartophylax* before he was promoted to the see of Antioch. There began a scholastic and casuistic reflection on the canonical sources which, while it never led, because of the different ecclesiological development, to that sovereignty of the canonical method of thought such as the *Decretum* of Gratian introduced in the West, constituted a counterpoint to the civil law and laid the foundation for a confrontation of state and Church which the early Byzantine epoch had not known in this form. Even the greatest of these canonists, Theodore Balsamon, did not develop in this regard any harsh antithesis to imperial law, and he followed no consistent line in the distribution of powers. But he introduced a manner of investigation which, despite all assurances of the Emperor's privileges in the Church, tended to see in these privileges a concession by the Church rather than a divine right.

---

[5] Under the Emperor Alexius I the *chartophylaces* preferred to resort to this policy in order to consolidate their own position in the synod against the old metropolitans. *Cf. Dölger Reg.,* n. 1175, and J. Nicole, "Une ordonnance inédite de l'empereur Alexis I Comnène sur les privilèges du chartophylax," *ByZ,* 3 (1894), 17–20.

[6] Statute for the head of the jurists (*Dölger Reg.,* n. 863). On John Xiphilinus *cf.* K. Bonis, Ἰωάννης ὁ Ξιφιλῖνος (Athens 1938).

[7] On Zonaras see F. Dölger, *LThK,* X (2nd ed., 1965), 1402 f. (with the literature); his commentaries and those of Aristenus and Balsamon constitute Vols. II–IV of Rhallis as well as *PG,* 137 and 138.

[8] P. P. Joannou, *LThK,* I (2nd ed. 1957), 852.

[9] *Beck,* 657 f.

The number of clerics at Hagia Sophia and the other great churches in Constantinople in all probability exceeded that at any cathedral in the West. Whether they sought to kill time or to increase their incomes, in any event they provided a great part of the higher instruction in the capital.[10] It is not correct to speak of a reform of the study of theology by the Emperor Alexius I — there was no real study of theology as a discipline of higher education in Constantinople —, since the imperial decree of 1107, which called for the installing of various *didaskaloi*, referred not to the teaching profession but to preaching and catechesis.[11] Nevertheless, it can be established for the twelfth century that classical studies flourished under the care of the clergy of Constantinople, but it cannot be determined whether or not this was in any way connected with the decree. Typical in this regard was the great figure of Eustathius, commentator of Homer, Pindar, and other classical authors, and, before his promotion to the see of Thessalonica, a deacon of the great church.[12] The dogmatic controversies that filled this whole period show also that the pursuit of theology was not unfamiliar to these clerics.

Here too must be sought the starting point in the reorganization of the so-called university at the middle of the eleventh century. Alongside the teaching of law under John Xiphilinus stood the teaching of philosophy under Michael Psellus, the "consul of the philosophers," whose effort to continue the traditional instruction in the direction of a platonizing, "liberal" philosophy is unmistakable.[13] With the successor of Psellus, John

---

[10] *Cf.* F. Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel* (Leipzig 1926); R. Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," *Byz(B)*, 32 (1962), 167–202, 33 (1963), 11–40.

[11] *Dölger Reg.*, n. 1236.

[12] *Beck*, 634–36, and the Introduction of S. Kyriakides, *Eustazio di Tessalonica, La espugnazione di Tessalonica* (Palermo 1961).

[13] On Psellus see C. Zervos, *Un philosophe néoplatonicien du XI^e^ siècle: Michel Psellos*

Italus,[14] this trend, which must not be condemned as a movement toward mere verbiage, was halted by a keen logician with a marked interest in the question of universals, which probably went back to his early education in the spirit of the new scholasticism in his Italian homeland. Something of Abelard's *Sic et Non* can be detected in his method of philosophizing. Conflict with the Orthodox Church, which perceived a danger to the truths of revelation in his free philosophical investigation, did not fail to materialize. Proceedings, not unmixed with politics, were instituted against him. To some extent his pupils remained loyal to him, and they were probably not molested for some time. Without any doubt the best among them was Eustratius,[15] who later became Metropolitan of Nicaea and enjoyed the favour of the Emperor Alexius I. Going beyond his teacher, he measured his dialectical skill on questions of Christology, but without neglecting the fundamental study of the new age, the writings of Aristotle. But this led to the reappearance of the problem of nominalism, and even the Emperor's protection was unable to save him from ecclesiastical condemnation in 1117. From the purely Christological viewpoint the exertions of Eustratius can be explained thus: he aspired to lead back to a tolerable degree the theses propounded with an ever decreasing prudence by a conventional and not carefully pondered "neo-Chalcedonianism."

Despite his condemnation the Christological quarrels were not settled, and it was always basically the same problem, even though with variations, that occupied minds. Furthermore, the result of theological encounter with persons from the Latin West, who were stopping in Constantinople or settled there permanently and did not dispute only the *Filioque,* became evident. Especially worthy of mention in this connection were Peter Grossolano of Milan, Anselm of Havelberg, Moses of Bergamo, James of Venice, and the Pisans, Burgundio, Leo Tuscus, and Hugh Eteriano.[16]

A first controversy was concerned with this question: From what point of view can Christ be at the same time the one who offered and the one who accepted the Sacrifice of the Cross. Soterichus Panteugenes, a candidate for the patriarchal see of Antioch, became entangled in distinctions which gained for him the reproach that he was confusing the unity of

(Paris 1919); *Beck,* 538–42; P. P. Joannou, *Die Illuminationslehre des Michael Psellos und Joannes Italos* (Ettal 1956).

[14] P. Stephanou, *Jean Italos, philosophe et humaniste* (Rome 1949); P. P. Joannou, *Ioannes Italos: Quaestiones quodlibetales* (Ettal 1956).

[15] *Cf.* S. Salaville, "Philosophie et théologie ou épisodes scolastiques à Byzance," *ÉO,* 29 (1930), 142 ff.; F. Dölger, *LThK,* III (2nd ed., 1959), 1206 (with literature and sources).

[16] V. Grumel, "Autour du voyage de Pierre Grossolanus à Constantinople en 1112," *ÉO,* 32 (1933), 22–33; K. Fina, "Anselm von Havelberg," *APraem,* 32 and 33 (1956 and 1957) in several continuations; W. Berges, *Jb. für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands,* 1956, 39–57; A. Dondaine, "Contra Graecos," *AFP,* 21 (1951), 320–446; *idem,* "Hugues Étherien et Léon Tuscus," *AHD,* 19 (1952), 67–134.

person with the duality of natures in Christ, and in 1157 he was disqualified for any ecclesiastical dignity.[17] Implicated in his case were even a couple of bishops, in particular the one who brought on the confrontation, Nicephorus Basilakes, one of the *didaskaloi* of the patriarchal see, but of course they got off scot-free. Soon afterwards the controversy blazed forth under new auspices: Christ's saying that "the Father is greater than I." It can be proved that this dispute reflected the attacks by Gerhoh of Reichersberg on the French and Austrian Gilbertines.[18] A certain Demetrius of Lampe had returned from a diplomatic tour of the West with the relevant information and introduced the dispute into the Byzantine theological world, but we have no exact knowledge of his own position. The question was treated in a whole series of synods, and in 1166 the theological caprices of the Emperor Manuel I Comnenus finally forced a decision. It lacked precision and Hugh Eteriano termed it a sheer scandal, but at Reichersberg people were of the opinion that in it Gerhoh's theses would find support. A final echo of these controversies, called by J. Gouillard "les déviations des didascales," was heard in the theses of a monk, Michael (Myron) Sikidites, who is said to be identical with Michael Glykas. In these was broached the question of the corruptibility of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. Synods in 1199 and 1200 basically avoided these theses and reverted to positions which no one questioned.[19]

What is noteworthy in these controversies is that, in spite of certain "early scholastic" tendencies, they avoided the trend toward systematization, proving that persons did not care to have recourse to the newly discovered instrument of logic with ultimate consistency. So far as systematization was concerned, the twelfth century confined itself to the systematizing of heresies and their refutation, as proved by the great *Panoplia* of the monk Euthymius Zigabenos[20] and its revision and continuation by Nicetas choniates.[21] Of tle classical heresies, Monophysitism at most was still a living issue because the political *rapprochement* with Armenia made ecclesiastical pacification desirable. Bogomilism, on the other hand, raised its head.[22] At the very time when the higher Byzantine hierarchy in the capital was attaining to a new self-awareness, it saw itself attacked more severely than ever by the Bogomiles — and, characteristically, the opponents were found even in the ranks of the provincial bishops of Asia Minor. Alexius I himself was personally involved in the process against a certain Basil, in whom it was thought that a leader of the Bogomiles had been discovered. Its outcome was the synod's assent to death by burning (*ca.* 1110). There remain traces of the writings of a monk, Constantine Chrysomallus,[23] which point to a disdain for the Sacraments administered by the clergy. In the sees of Sasima and Balbissa in 1143 Bogomilism was even detected among the bishops themselves.[24]

---

[17] *Grumel Reg.*, nn. 1039–44.

[18] P. Classen, "Das Konzil von Konstantinopel 1166 und die Lateiner," *ByZ*, 48 (1956), 339–68; *Grumel Reg.*, nn. 1059–67.

[19] *Grumel Reg.*, n. 1195.

[20] *Beck*, 614 f.; J. Wickert, "Die Panoplia dogmatica des Euthymios Zigabenos," *OrChr*, 8 (no year), 278–388.

[21] *Beck*, 663 f.

[22] *Cf.* D. Angelov, *Der Bogomilismus auf dem Gebiet des byzantinischen Reiches*, 1, 2 (Sofia 1948–50); D. Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge 1948).

The monastic life of the time still suffered from the evil consequences of the charistikariate.[25] In the reign of Alexius I there proceeded from the pen of the resigned Patriarch of Antioch, John Oxeites, one of the most important reform writings against this institution.[26] Among the best known monastic founders of the age was Christodulus, who, after a number of attempts, finally in 1088 obtained from Anna Dalassena, mother of Alexius I, the island of Patmos,[27] where he established the celebrated monastery of Saint John, bestowing on it complete exemption from any supervision by state or Church. He also gave it a rule, in which he laid down his own strict principles. In the capital in 1136 the Emperor John II Comnenus founded the monastery of the Pantokrator, whose charitable institutions — an infirmary and a home for the aged — were among the most ambitious of any in the Middle Ages, at least according to the tenor of the foundation charter, but they were not directly administered by the monastery.[28] The other monastic foundations of the period also betray the trend to an association between themselves and charitable institutions. At the same time they appear to force the principle of "autodispotism" and to guarantee independence on all sides. The first Serbian foundation on Mount Athos belongs to the close of the twelfth century. This was Chilandarion, which Saint Savas, together with his father, the retired Kral Stephen Nemanja, made the centre of "Serbianism" in the monastic republic.

In spite of many new foundations, which cannot be enumerated here in detail, and of a steady increase of monastery property, which was accompanied by a constant granting of privileges, the moral situation of monasticism left much to be desired. Conditions on Athos again and again called for intervention by Emperors and Patriarchs. The generosity with which the Athos monks granted pasture rights to the Vlach shepherds, together with their families and herds, had as consequences a situation that was totally incompatible with the ideals of the holy mountain. The Patriarch's intervention was impeded by the way in which the monks appealed to their canonical independence; in doing so they were supported by metropolitans and bishops, who apparently intended to oppose any extension of patriarchal authority, even at the price of discipline. The Emperor too could be called upon to frustrate intervention by the Patriarch.[29] The complaints of the Metropolitan Eustathius of Thessalonica[30] cast special shame on the status of monastic culture. Above all he deplored that the recruits in the monasteries came for the most part from persons who were interested only in a guaranteed livelihood. He was especially irritated by the turning from the contemplative ideal to a strong economic activity and to the complete neglect of all intellectual interests, which even led to the squandering of the treasures of the monastic libraries. It is worthy of note that to a certain degree Eustathius excluded the monasteries of the capital. Since these monasteries were supported chiefly by pensions for the individual monks, they were probably not obliged to take up the economic reconstruction of their means of subsistence as were those houses which had been jeopardized by the charistikariate.

---

[23] *Grumel Reg.*, no. 1007. [24] *Ibid.*, nn. 1011, 1012, 1014.

[25] *Cf.* Volume III, 423 f. [26] *PG*, 132, 1117–49.

[27] *Beck*, 646 f.

[28] G. Schreiber, *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters* (Münster 1948), 1–80.

Some mention has already been made of the ecclesiastical and theological literature of the age. Among dogmatic theologians whose writings were not confined to polemics special mention must be made of Bishop Nicholas of Methone with his work, which, whatever may be thought of its originality, supplies us with a valuable testimony for the renaissance of Neoplatonism at this time through his polemic against Proclus.[31] Also to be noted is the probably never entirely completed attempt at a total exposition of the work of Christian salvation by one Doxopatres, probably Nilus, of whose great undertaking in five books the manuscripts, so far as they are available, have preserved only two with 466 chapters.[32]

While the preceding period was the great age of hagiography, characterized by the work of Simeon Metaphrastes, there now began in the great contemporary homiliaries the "codification" of the homiletic tradition. In the first place stood John Xiphilinus, nephew of the Patriarch Xiphilinus; making copious use of Chrysostom he compiled the standard homiliary.[33] The Patriarch John IX Agapetus (1111–34), following the work of Xiphilinus, compiled what is today called the "Patriarchate homiliary."[34] Italo-Greek homiletics was represented by Philagathus of Cerami,[35] whose collection of sermons was also accepted in the eastern half of the Empire. The south was represented by Neophytus Enkleistus, who founded a monastery on Cyprus and left a three-volume *Panegyrikon.*[36] The period under consideration was the climax of an extensive Byzantine scriptural exegesis; an example is the work of Theophylact, Archbishop of Bulgaria, an epitome of Saint John Chrysostom, in the form of a commentary on the books of the Bible but with a strongly pronounced *catena* characteristic.[37] The Metropolitan Nicetas of Heraclea, a contemporary of Theophylact, was the last great Byzantine catenist, whose influence not even Thomas Aquinas could escape.[38]

---

[29] P. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig 1894), especially 166–69.

[30] L. F. Tafel, *Eustathii opuscula* (Frankfurt 1832), 214–67; *PG*, 135, 729–909.

[31] *Cf.* T. Niggl, *LThK*, VII (2nd ed. 1962), 993; *Beck*, 624 ff.

[32] *Beck*, 620 f.

[33] A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche*, I, 3 (Berlin 1943), 525–59.

[34] *Ibid.*, 559–631.

[35] *Ibid.*, 631–81; G. Rossi Taibbi, *Sulla tradizione manoscritta dell'omiliario di Filagato da Cerami* (Palermo 1965).

In short, the time seemed full of most promising beginnings. How they would have developed if the Fourth Crusade had not been diverted can, of course, not be determined. The twelfth century was a period when the West was drawing closer than ever before to the Byzantine East, here and there provoking dangerously, elsewhere ready for symbiosis. The incipient economic "sell out" to the Italian maritime cities, forced by the needs of foreign policy, could not but nourish the animosity felt in many circles for all that was Western, and it is here that the reason is to be sought why Byzantine resistance was especially stiff in the spheres of theology and Church unity. This was no longer, it is true, a resistance which drew its strength from an absolute feeling of superiority. Men like Hugh Eteriano gave Byzantium an idea of the theological potentiality of the West, and hence in Byzantine theological circles of the century a not insignificant nervousness was apparent. To be regarded not as a cause but as concomitants, the to some extent painful confrontations on the already mentioned "déviations des didascales" were a reason why the distrust of whatever was regarded as "scholasticism" became stronger rather than weaker. But in this way official Byzantium permanently excluded itself from the great Western progress in scientific theology. Elsewhere, however, for example in the world of mysticism and of monastic spirituality, this Byzantine century did not dispose of those leading minds who in concentration on this field would have been able to build a counterweight equal to scholasticism, such as Hesychasm and Palamism formed — whether legitimately or not is undecided — in the late Byzantine period. And if the twelfth century made available to Byzantium for the first time a real encounter with the freer Western ecclesiastical organization, the political presuppositions were lacking for deducing sound consequences for its own ecclesiastical system. The presuppositions were not present until a generation later. Then persons would take up the experiences of the twelfth century but without having enough time left.

---

[36] Ehrhard, *op. cit.,* 681–86. [37] *Beck,* 649–51.

[38] *Ibid.,* 651–53.

SECTION FOUR

The Papacy at the Height of its Power (1198—1216)

The period known as the High Middle Ages was without any doubt dominated by the personality of the Pope whose pontificate joined the twelfth and thirteenth centuries together. In it there matured those energies in theology and canon law which had begun to unfold in the twelfth century. At the same time the main features of the thirteenth-century development appeared in the ecclesiastical decisions of this reign. Rarely has a Pope found in his contemporaries so unanimously favourable a judgment as did Innocent III,[1] and later historiography has wondered why the distinction of "the Great" has not been accorded him.[2] Most of the problems pertaining to the basic stock of the intellectual life of Church History in the High Middle Ages found under Innocent a settlement which seemed to approach a real solution. He sought to bring the relationship of *regnum* and *sacerdotium,* even in its special form of tension between the papacy and the imperial office, to a practical and a theoretical solution. The Church's commission to foster the sanctification of the world through the proclaiming of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments obtained in Innocent an extraordinarily talented pontiff, who made this commission the program of his reign. The demand for poverty, made energetically and angrily on the Church of the poor Saviour by the saints, the laity, the heretics of the twelfth century, did not die away unheard by this Pope. If the irresistible march of canon law presented the Church with a danger, with the institutionalizing of what must properly be filled by the charism of love, namely the religious life of Christendom, then Innocent sought not unsuccessfully to find the balance between law and love. Between theology as a science and the mystical knowledge of God in the imitation of Christ there was developing a tension which threatened to lead to a diastase, perhaps even to an alienation of the two. Here too Innocent could intervene as mediator. It was his great merit to see the reform needs of the Church in their full compass and in his constant exertions for them to be in accord with the justified concern of criticism, including that of heretics; at the same time he thereby made the most positive contribution to overcoming this dangerous threat to the unity and the truth of Christendom.

---

[1] Critical voices, such as that of Walther von der Vogelweide, come from the sphere of polemics. *Cf.* K. Burdach, "Der Kampf Walthers von der Vogelweide gegen Innocenz III. und gegen das vierte Lateranische Konzil," *ZKG,* 55 (1936), 445–522.

[2] *Haller,* III, 471, and *Seppelt,* III, 389.

The presupposition for these exertions was not merely a claim, but a really exercised authority over Christendom, the possession of a real *dominium orbis christiani*, with which was joined the possibility of enforcing a planning, adjusting, and clarifying will as far as the frontiers of Christendom. Hence, the motto of this unique pontificate of the High Middle Ages can be concisely stated by saying that it sought to realize a "spiritual *dominium mundi*."

CHAPTER 18

Personality and Program of Innocent III

The Cardinal Deacon Lothar dei Conti di Segni was not yet thirty-eight years old when, on the day of the death of his predecessor, Celestine III, 8 January 1198, in the Septizonium of Septimius Severus, whose ruins had been turned into a stronghold by the Frangipani, he received a majority of votes in the first balloting and all of them in the second. Accepting the election he styled himself Innocent III, probably in memory of Innocent II, whom he highly esteemed, together with Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, as a Pope of reform and the one who had convoked the Second Lateran Council.

The son of Trasimondo di Segni, he was born at the castle of Gavignano at the end of 1160 or the beginning of 1161. Through his mother, who was of the Scotti family, he was closely linked with the Roman patriciate. His family's early move to Rome enabled him to obtain his first education there. It was later entrusted to Peter Ismael, probably in the monastery of Sant'Andrea, and was then completed with his philosophical and theological studies at Paris, which lasted till 1187.

Among his teachers at Paris was Peter de Corbeil, whom he was later to appoint as Bishop of Cambrai and eventually as Archbishop of Sens. His fellow-students included Stephen Langton and Robert de Courçon, both of whom he later promoted to the cardinalate, and Eudes de Sully, who, as Bishop of Paris, was eventually his man of confidence in France.

At the Fourth Lateran Council he set up a monument to the school of Paris under the auspices of the Master of the Sentences through the mention of the Lombard in a context that gave him the highest praise. Occasional remarks in sermons and letters indicate how much Paris meant to him, even though later he did not show the same confidence in the dialectical method which he had clearly entertained during his studies. In 1187 he left Paris in order to pursue law at Bologna, especially under the most celebrated of the decretists, Huguccio of Pisa. Innocent later made him Bishop of Ferrara.

In November of the year when he transferred to Bologna Lothar received the subdiaconate from Pope Gregory VIII. In 1189 his maternal uncle, Clement III, brought him into the College of Cardinals, bestowing on him the deaconry of Santi Sergio e Bacco,[3] which Clement had himself formerly administered. Lothar's activity at the Curia, more in matters of ecclesiastical jurisdiction than in political questions of any great moment, allowed him time for literary works on ascetical and moral, dogmatic, and canonical topics. Best known and much read until the sixteenth century was his *De miseria humane conditionis*,[4] which sketches a picture of man under the shadow of sin. A corresponding treatise on the dignity of man in the light of grace, which was to round out the work by supplementing and completing it, was not finished. As Pope, he revised his *De missarum mysteriis*[5] and the *De quadripartita specie nuptiarum.*[6]

---

[3] This deaconry, also called *diaconia Fori Romani,* was suppressed by the Constitution "Religiosa" of Sixtus V of 13 April 1587; *cf. CICfontes,* I (1923), no. 160, p. 295.

[4] *PL,* 217, 701–46, now critically edited by M. Maccarone, *Lotharii Cardinalis (Innocentii III) De Miseria humane conditionis* (Lugano 1955). Maccarone was able to enumerate 435 manuscripts but still others are being discovered; *cf.* D. R. Howard, "Thirty New Manuscripts of Pope Innocent III's De Miseria humanae conditionis," *Manuscripta,* 7 (1963), 31–35. Monographs on this work by: A. Nagy, *De tractatu de miseria humanae conditionis Innocentii III* (Budapest 1943); W. Will, "Innocenz III. und sein Werk 'Über das Elend des menschlichen Daseins,'" *Humanismus, Mystik und Kunst in der Welt des Mittelalters,* ed. J. Koch (Leiden and Cologne 1953), 125–36; M. Di Pinto, "Il 'De miseria conditionis humanae' di Innocenzo III,'" *Studi medievali A. De Stefano* (Palermo 1956), 177–201; R. Bultot, "Mépris du monde, misère et dignité de l'homme dans la pensée d'Innocent III," *CCivMéd,* 4 (1961), 441–56.

[5] *PL,* 217, 763–916, under the title: *Mysteriorum Evangelicae Legis et Sacramenti Eucharistiae Libri Sex,* also called *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio.* In "Innocenzo III prima del pontificato," *ADRomana,* 66 (1943), 59–134, Maccarone established the identity of the work under these different titles.

[6] *PL,* 217, 921–68. H. Tillmann calls the work "a less personal occasional writing" (*Papst Innocenz III.,* 14). It was made use of by M. Wilks, "Chaucer and the Mystical Marriage in Medieval Political Thought," *BJRL,* 44 (1961 f.), 489–530. His works show the young Cardinal in accord with the theological tradition of the twelfth century: les with the Parisian dialectical systematization than with the Bernardine-Victorine mysticism and the conservative moral and hortatory sermon literature. The six books *De missarum mysteriis,* an allegorical and mystical interpretation of the Roman liturgy, represent a literary and

Toward the close of the pontificate of Celestine III the Cardinal Deacon Lothar must have been more active than before in the strictly political discussions and decisions of the Curia, for otherwise the attention of the electors of 8 January 1198, which was so quickly concentrated on him, is inexplicable.

Innocent III postponed his episcopal consecration and coronation till the feast of Saint Peter's Chair, 22 February, a date that naturally suggested itself because of its symbolic importance. In this he recalls Gregory VII, who after his election on 22 April 1073 waited till the feasts of Saints Peter and Paul, 29 and 30 June, for his consecration and coronation.

The electors must have observed extraordinary qualities of intellect and character in Lothar di Segni in order to give all their votes to the youngest of their number. If they had expected that he would be capable of leading the Church out of the prevailing stagnation into which a series of weak pontificates of superannuated Popes after Alexander III had led her, their hopes were confirmed by history. Innocent III took up his office in the consciousness of a divine summons, and from it apparently derived that much admired sureness of decision and the essentially invariable consistency of his administration — qualities that endured to the end. His superb theological formation enabled him in almost every one of his innumerable letters and decretals to stamp with fundamentally theological explanations a word of instruction which revealed him as the supreme herald of conservative ecclesiastical doctrine. To this was added his equally outstanding command of canon law whose methods he so perfecthy dominated both in his proceedings and his decisions and was able to carry out so masterfully that in his hand the papal judicial practice was regarded by many experts as a higher school of their discipline. Furthermore, he possessed, perhaps from his mother's Roman family, a sophistication in politics and its ways, especially the instinct for the possible, the famed "snap judgment," which "in every situation caused [him] to desire only the possible, but all of it." Innocent

> was born to rule. Fate had bestowed on him all the gifts for this purpose: an inexhaustible wealth of invention, the most skilful handling of men, an unrivalled combining of tenacity of will with flexibility in execution, the boldest energy in endeavour and the most sober calculation of the means, the vision of a genius for what was great, and painstaking diligence in details.[7]

---

theological *genre* going back to the Early Middle Ages. Innocent's manner of preaching was determined by the Paris tradition; *cf.* J. Chatillon, "Sermons et prédicateurs victorins de la seconde moité du XII^e^ siècle," *AHD,* 32 (1965), 7–60.

[7] *Haller,* III, 301 f.

From his years at Paris and Bologna — and at Bologna because of Huguccio[8] especially — he possessed a clearly reasoned notion, which would be a decisive factor in his pontificate, of the fulness of the authority pertaining to him as Pope, of its relationship to the power of secular rulers, above all to that of the Emperor, in whom authority as King in Germany, Burgundy, and Italy differed from the function and power which were his as ruler of the *Sacrum Imperium Romanum.*[9]

To speak of a program of government in the strict sense would be as much a mistake in regard to the accession of Innocent III as at any other change of pontificate. But from the decrees and letters of the first months one can form a sketch of the most important problems which, even in a survey of the entire pontificate, must be regarded as the Pope's chief concerns: order in the Papal State, its protection *vis-à-vis* the threats of expansion from south and north, intensification of the crusade idea and promotion of the project of a crusade, overcoming of the progressively stronger and more dangerous heretical movements, and, finally, what lay at the basis of all the rest and took precedence over them, the reform of the Church in head and members. No one of these four concerns nor all of them together were new. They somehow made their presence known as a program, and as an effort to do justice to the program, in all the pontificates of the twelfth century and determined the legislation of the three Lateran Councils. Innocent III again took up the themes of the Gregorian reform and sought to realize them on a lasting basis.

Celibacy was always, or perhaps even again, a remote and only defectively realized ideal in the Latin West. Simony had by no means been eradicated but again and again emerged in various forms on the lowest and the highest plane. The freedom of the lesser churches, of the bishoprics, and even of the papacy itself remained, as before, either a postulate or at most a precarious achievement. In the monastic world the Cistercian *élan,* which more than anything else had distinguished the twelfth century, was in danger of dying out; had not Alexander III already sent letters of admonition to the general chapter? The canons regular and the Premonstratensians also stood in urgent need of new impulses. The Pope may have entertained little hope that the comfortable peace of the Benedictines could be aroused to life again. Nevertheless, his letters betray a lively awareness of his expecting substantial help from the cooperation of the orders precisely for his work of renewal in the Church. In many respects Innocent III suffered especially from the political and human strife within Latin Christendom, the ceaseless quarrelling of kings and princes, and the interminable feuds of barons and knights, of cities and communes. Internal peace, not only for its own sake, but also for the sake of the external tasks on the frontiers of Christendom became one of his central concerns.

---

[8] *Cf.* M. Ríos Fernández, "El primado del Romano Pontífice en el pensamiento de Huguccio de Pisa decretista," *Compostellanum,* 6 (1961), 47–97, 7 (1962), 97–149, 8 (1963) 65–90. G. Catalano, *Impero, regni e sacerdozio nel pensiero di Uguccio da Pisa* (Milan 1959).

[9] F. Kempf, *Papsttum und Kaisertum bei Innocenz III., Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae,* 19 (Rome 1954), is fundamental. It has been further elaborated by its author in other articles, the latest being "Kanonistik und kuriale Politik im 12. Jahrhundert," *AHPont,* 1 (1963), 11–52. But Kempf's theses must be looked at together with the results of the researches of Walter Ullmann and his school and now with B. Tierney, "The Continuity of Papal Political Theory in the Thirteenth Century. Some Methodological Considerations," *MS,* 27 (1965), 227–45, and W. Ullmann, *Papst und König. Grundlagen des Papsttums und der englischen Verfassung im Mittelalter* (Salzburg and Munich 1966).

From the outset and, without interruption, to the end of his pontificate, Innocent III carried out his *officium pastorale* in the consciousness of possessing the full authority necessary for it. This corresponded to the comprehensive extent of the office, which was to bear responsibility first for the Roman Church and its property, the *Patrimonium Petri,* and then for all of Christendom. The most recent research[10] has rendered obsolete the previous idea prevailing in historiography, namely that Innocent intended to develop this office into a sort of world rule or that he felt he could exercise it only in an actual world dominion. Neither the extant texts of his official letters, his sermons, and the acts of his councils nor his legal, pastoral, and political decisions permit such an interpretation of his administration. Quite the contrary: the more profoundly they are all investigated in the context of the development of the pontificate and the individual records in their context of situation and document, there definitely emerges an essentially spiritual profile of this Pope. The *plenitudo potestatis* was understood by Innocent, just as it had been taught by his mentor Huguccio, as a *plenitudo potestatis ecclesiasticae,* not as a fulness embracing all spiritual and secular power whatever. It must be regarded as a defining of what is today termed the primacy of jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. An overlapping of this power on to the sphere of secular law was not excluded in Innocent's mind, but it happened only in a subsidiary way, when, in accord with the current theory of emergency, cases were referred to the Pope's decision in which the secular stages of appeal had broken down; for example, in a case of strife between kings, when no superior judge, deciding with authority, could be called upon. Emperor and kings received their power, as Innocent recognized, directly from God, just as the papacy did. The kingship claimed by Innocent himself as a secular dominion referred to the royal possessions of the Roman Church in Central Italy, the *Patrimonium Petri*, where he considered himself as a King among kings, and not, following the Carolingian model, as the autonomous ruler of a territory. Perhaps the claim to possess not only spiritual but also secular power referred to the coercive power of the Church intervening even in secular legal relationships, to papal intervention, by means of instructions, *ratione peccati*.

---

[10] See the works of S. Mochy Onory, *Fonti canonistiche dell'idea moderna dello stato* (Milan 1951); A. Hof, "'Plenitudo potestatis' und 'Imitatio imperii' zur Zeit Innocenz' III.," *ZKG,* 66 (1954 f.), 39–71, and the contributions of H. Tillmann, F. Kempf, A. M. Stickler, *et al. Cf.* also the summary by A. Walz, "'Papstkaiser' Innocenz III. Stimmen zur Deutung," *Sacerdozio e Regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII, Misc. Hist. Pont.,* 18 (Rome 1954), 127–38. B. Tierney, *loc. cit.,* best summarizes the state of the discussion: "Innocent III and Innocent IV expressed substantially the same opinion on problems of church and state ... their position cannot be adequately characterized by the two currently fashionable terms, 'dualistic' and 'hierocratic'" (p. 234).

Innocent had his idea concisely formulated at the Fourth Lateran Council:

> Just as we do not want the laity to usurp the rights of clerics, similarly we must see to it that clerics do not claim the rights of the laity. And so we forbid all clerics to extend their privileges to the prejudice of secular authority, under the pretext of the liberty of the Church. On the contrary, they should be content with the written law and the previously approved customs, so that what is Caesar's will be rendered to Caesar and what is God's to God, in accord with the objectively right order which is proper to each.[11]

In addition to the separation of powers, Innocent stressed the higher unity of Christendom and the consequent rights of the Holy See, and he likewise intended to maintain his own rights relevant to the Empire,[12] which in his view did not affect the principle that the imperial authority was derived directly from God. Kings, princes and magistrates within the frontiers of Christendom were to the Pope not merely bearers of an independent power of jurisdiction but at the same time outstanding members of the mystical body of the Church. As such, not only as private persons but precisely as officials, they were subject to the pastoral care of the Roman Bishop. Only thus can one interpret the official statements of emperors and kings when in their correspondence with the Pope they spoke of obedience, devotion, and readiness to carry out the mandates of the Holy See. Innocent himself defined the limits of his full authority, which lay fixed on the one hand in the *ius divinum*, on the other hand in the conscience of the individual. By its very nature as *potestas ecclesiastica* it was clearly distinct from the *potestas saecularis*. Canon law still indicates that any clearer delimitation of boundaries is not always possible in practice.[13] The decision as to whether a matter pertained to the sphere of divine or of human law, in which the Pope possessed the power of dispensing, was left by Innocent to tradition and in practice to deliberation by a council.

---

[11] *COD*, 229 (footnotes 25–31) (Constitutio 42). "Sicut volumus ut iura clericorum non usurpent laici, ita velle debemus, ne clerici iura sibi vindicent laicorum. Quocirca universis clericis interdicimus, ne quis praetextu ecclesiasticae libertatis suam de caetero iurisdictionem extendat in praeiudicium iustitiae saecularis, sed contentus exsistat constitutionibus scriptis et consuetudinibus hactenus approbatis, ut quae sunt Caesaris reddantur Caesari, et quae sunt Dei Deo recta distributione reddantur."

[12] F. Kempf, *Papsttum und Kaisertum*, 314–25.

> Under Innocent III the Pope's position in the Church did not become something basically different. But he gave to the doctrine of the primacy a strict formulation and systematic justification and deeply impressed on the consciousness of the Western Church the Roman Bishop's position as the ordinary holder of all ecclesiastical power...[14]

CHAPTER 19

The Spiritual Monarch as Arbiter Mundi

The order of Christendom — *pax et iustitia* — was entrusted to two powers, the spiritual power, which belonged in its fulness to the Pope, and the secular power, which was shared by a number of bearers: kings, princes, magistrates. Among these secular authorities, the imperial dignity was, in accord with tradition, confided to the German King. To the imperial office, because of its function as *advocatus* of the Roman Church, pertained a certain universality that had never been precisely defined.[1] The intimate interrelationship of the spiritual and the secular in the whole of Christendom in the High Middle Ages thus caused the Pope, whose plenitude of spiritual power was undisputed, to appear as its real monarch. The real power of the Emperor, on the other hand, never went beyond the bounds of those areas over which he reigned as King: Germany, Burgundy, Lombardy. Since, moreover, the spiritual power, because of the interrelationship just mentioned, maintained also in the secular areas claims which were partly of public law or of a political nature, there belonged to the monarchy of its holder an enhanced importance, which was asserted in many ways, if not always successfully, during the pontificate of Innocent III, thanks both to his statesmanlike personality and also to the total political situation at the turn of the century, which was favourable to him. Innocent did not have his gaze fixed on world domination in the strict sense of the phrase; he always acted ultimately from motives deriving from his all-embracing and universal responsibility for the welfare of all of Christendom: for *pax et iustitia.* He aspired to promote this *mundus christianus* and its peace as arbiter, able, it is true, to dispose of only a limited and by no means always effective coercive power, but also in possession of the moral power of his universally acknowledged primacy as the Vicar of Christ. Whoever confessed Christ — and this included kings, princes, and magistrates — was for that very reason subject, in respect to his thinking and acting as a Christian, to that directing authority of the Vicar of Christ[2] which Innocent made use of with amazing assurance and in countless cases everywhere throughout Christendom.

---

[13] *CIC*, c. 1553, par. 2: "...in causis in quibus tum Ecclesia tum civilis potestas aeque competentes sunt, quaeque dicuntur mixti fori, est locus praeventioni."

[14] H. Tillmann, *Innocenz III.*, 38. O. Hageneder, "Über das Sonne-Mond-Gleichnis bei Innocenz III.," *MIÖG*, 65 (1951), 340–68; *idem*, "Exkommunikation und Thronfolgeverlust bei Innocenz III.," *RömHM*, 2 (1957 f.), 9–50.

[1] *Cf.* F. J. Schmale, "Römisch-deutsches Kaisertum," *LThK*, V (2nd ed. 1960), 1247–50 (bibliography), and especially F. Kempf, "Das mittelalterliche Kaisertum," *Mainau-Vorträge*, ed. T. Mayer (Constance 1956), 225–42; T. Mayer, "Papsttum und Kaisertum," *HZ*, 157 (1959), 1–53; H. Grundmann, "Kirchenfreiheit und Kaisermacht um 1190 in der Sicht Joachims von Fiore," *DA*, 19 (1963), 353–96.

The Papal State

The freedom of the Roman Church, her Curia, and her Bishop was a presupposition for an effective exercise of this directing authority. In accord with current notions, the guarantee of this freedom was the possession and revenues of the *Patrimonium Petri,* that territorial complex whose real frontiers were always in dispute and whose constitutional structure, also involved in constant change, was at that time tending toward complete feudalization. And so Innocent began his pontificate by establishing peace and order in the *Patrimonium* and in those states that had long been vassals of the Holy See.

The *Patrimonium,* which Innocent aimed to rule with the forms of a strictly secular royal authority, had to be again subjugated because of the confusion produced under Henry VI. The Pope placed at the head of Rome's commune a senator who took an oath of loyalty to him. The barons in the Roman Duchy were prepared to follow suit. The Romans were victorious, thanks to the Pope's support, in their quarrel with Viterbo, but Innocent also contrived to bind Viterbo to himself. Basing himself on the titles of donation and privileges compiled by Cencio in the *Liber censuum,* Innocent then began his so-called policy of recovery,[3] which, not without resistance, brought again under the papacy's control the Duchy of Spoleto and the Marches of Ancona. The objections of the Archbishop of Ravenna kept Romagna from also submitting. Nor was he able to establish his authority in the Mathildine lands and the rest of Tuscany, except to recover the frontier strip around Radicofani and Montefiascone. But what was recovered lay like a bar, from sea to sea, between the Kingdom of Sicily to the south and North Italy, disputed between the cities and the imperial power. In this territory Innocent regarded himself as the sovereign lord, not even subject to the feudal suzerainty of the Emperor.

---

[2] On the use of this title, especially stressed by Innocent III, *cf.* M. Maccarone, "Il Papa 'Vicarius Christi,'" *Miscellanea Pio Paschini,* I (Rome 1948), 427–500.

[3] The recovery was started by Celestine III immediately after the death of Henry VI; *cf.* V. Pfaff, "Coelestin III.," *ZSavRGkan,* 47 (1961), 109–28.

The Vassal States

In accord with the arrangements made by the Emperor Henry VI[4] in his last will, the Empress Constance, as regent, received the Kingdom of Sicily in fief from the Pope in her own name and that of the young King Frederick. For her part she disposed by her own last will that, following her death, which occurred on 28 November 1198, the Pope should assume the regency and the wardship of Frederick, who had been crowned on 17 May 1198. Innocent carried out this office for ten years. He first of all obtained from the crown, in a concordat at the end of 1198, the renunciation of the state's ecclesiastical supremacy. The personal union of the Empire and Sicily had been dissolved when Constance, in May 1198, renounced for herself and her son the title of King of the Romans. Innocent obtained the ratification of this separation by the imperial authority. First, the envoys of Otto of Brunswick in 1198 made the appropriate promises. Negotiations with Philip of Swabia procured Philip's readiness, shortly before his assassination in 1208, to renounce the imperial claims to Sicily. The moment that the Emperor Otto IV moved to conquer the Kingdom of Sicily he was excommunicated by Innocent on 18 November 1210, and the sentence was solemnly published on 21 March 1211. Finally, Frederick II, whom Innocent declared the champion of the Church against the excommunicated Emperor, repeated in the Golden Bull of Eger on 12 July 1213 a promise given earlier to leave Sicily independent. Moreover, he swore before a cardinal legate at Strasbourg on 1 July 1216 that after his imperial coronation he would relinquish the Kingdom of Sicily to his son Henry, who had already been crowned, and renounce both the title and the royal authority there, for "the supreme power over the Kingdom belongs to the Roman Church alone."[5] To the end of his life, accordingly, Innocent was able to maintain the order that he sought in

---

[4] Now see V. Pfaff, "Die Gesta Innozenz' III. und das Testament Heinrichs VI.," *ZSav RGkan,* 50 (1964), 78–126. There is no original text of the testament and the fragment transmitted in the *Gesta Innocentii* (c. 27, *PL,* 214, III) gives reason for serious hesitations in criticism. A testament, or the draft of one, is not excluded, but what has come down to us is drawn up in an anti-imperial tone and is certainly a falsification to some extent.

[5] "... ad quam [ecclesiam Romanam] solummodo ipsius regni dominium noscitur pertinere." (*Promissio Argentinensis* of 1 July 1216, *MGLL, Const II,* no. 58, p. 72, footnotes 29, 30).

Sicily. And even after King Frederick had been declared of age on 26 December 1208, the Pope contrived in every single case to prevent him from restoring the ecclesiastical regime of his forebears.

Nevertheless, the ten-years' regency meant for Innocent a heavy financial and political burden, implicated as he was in unending struggles with the great vassals of the crown, above all with Markward of Anweiler until 1202. Genoa and Pisa exploited the chaos and gained a footing on the island of Sicily. With the support of the Pope, Walter of Brienne conquered the mainland part of the Kingdom for Frederick; he had had to bind himself under oath to do so for the young King. Despite everything, at the end of the regency Innocent could hand over to Frederick only a seriously disorganized Kingdom. This attempt at real rule, even though it was made for and in the name of another, was basically such a failure that if Innocent had really entertained the notion of a "world dominion," he would in due time have given it up.

The Holy See regarded all the Spanish kingdoms as its vassal states. Of them, Aragón under King Peter II showed itself to be especially loyal and from 1207 it forever gave up control of ecclesiastical elections. As early as 1199 Innocent had felt called upon to intervene there, when, by a treaty of peace between Sancho VII of Navarre and Peter, a marriage between Sancho's sister and the King of Aragón had been envisaged. To live up to the agreement, Peter would have had to separate from his wife, Mary of Montpellier. The consequence was a long marriage process, which was still being dragged out at the time of Peter's death in 1213.

The other Spanish kingdoms showed themselves less inclined to comply with the Pope's wishes. Thus it was only after five years that Innocent prevailed upon Alfonso IX, King of León, to separate from his wife Berengaria, daughter of his cousin, Alfonso VIII of Castile, whom he had invalidly married. It was also contrary to the Pope's wish that Sancho VII of Navarre allied with the Muslims, and, when Alfonso VIII of Castile occupied Navarre, Innocent made no protest. The Pope also proceeded unsuccessfully against the political supremacy crudely exercised by Sancho I of Portugal over the Church, but he did not refuse pardon to the penitent dying King in 1210. In other respects he worked constantly, for the sake of the *Reconquista,* to preserve peace among the kingdoms, even if occasionally he felt that he had to endanger this peace himself in order to maintain the Church's matrimonial laws. In 1214 he solemnly confirmed a treaty of peace between Alfonso VIII of Castile and Alfonso IX of León. In 1209 he obtained for young King Frederick of Sicily his first wife in the person of Constance, widow of King Emeric of Hungary and sister of King Peter II of Aragón.

Hungary was not a vassal of the Holy See in the strict sense, although Gregory VII, referring to the crowning of Stephen I with a diadem sent to him by Pope Silvester II, seems to have assumed a feudal dependence. Hence the Curia regarded itself as especially closely bound to Hungary since this Kingdom was an important route for the crusades, for which, so to speak, the papacy had a special responsibility. In the pontificate of Innocent III the country was suffering from the disorders arising on the one hand from the rival claims to the throne of Emeric and his brother Andrew and on the other hand from the tension between the Kings and the opposing nobles. After Emeric's death Innocent approved the regency of Duke Andrew for his short-lived nephew Ladislas and, after the death of Ladislas, Andrew's accession to the throne. But first he had obliged Andrew, for the pacification of the country, personally to fulfill his father's crusade vow which had not been carried out because of his death. Innocent appealed more than once to the Hungarian episcopate, which he reminded of the loyalty due to Andrew, to work for the internal peace of the Kingdom. In the other Christian lands also Innocent often and not without success called for a like cooperation of the territorial episcopate in his effort to assure the peace and order of Christendom.

A sort of vassalage relationship seemed about to be established between Bulgaria and the Holy See. Innocent had become interested in the Balkan peninsula for the sake of the reunion of the Western and Eastern Churches. The pressure of political circumstances brought about a *rapprochement* of the Serbs, Albanians, Armenians, and Ruthenians with the papacy. When the Tsar Johannitsa of Bulgaria turned to Innocent as a result of this movement, the Pope was able to write on 25 February 1204: "We appoint you King of the peoples of Bulgaria and of Wallachia."[6] In doing so he was aware that Johannitsa was already in possession of sovereign power over his people and as Tsar already bore the royal title. When the situation changed and a Latin Emperor at Constantinople adopted as his own the policy of his Byzantine predecessor in regard to these peoples, they again turned away from the West during Innocent's pontificate.

The Empire

Central in more than one sense in the Pope's thoughts, plans, and decisions throughout his pontificate was his concern for the *Imperium* and for the theoretical and practical relations between the papacy and the imperial office. The Empire became vacant on the death of Henry VI in 1197. The sequel was the double election of 1198: of Philip of Swabia on 8 March and of Otto of Brunswick on 9 July. A decision could, as always, be reached only by a clear preponderance of power on the part of one of the rivals, that is, by an appeal to arms. While Innocent was apprised of the elections he was not asked to give a decision as arbiter. In regard to the imperial crown the Pope reserved the freedom to bestow it on the one whom he would regard as the "more suited." With this crown was involved the duty of aiding the Roman Church, and so the Pope felt it was up to him to determine which claimant could best fulfill this task. When both men applied to Rome for the imperial crown, Innocent at first postponed a decision. When Archbishop Conrad Wittelsbach of Mainz returned from the crusade, Innocent had him try to induce both claimants to renounce the throne in favour of a third party, probably Frederick of Sicily, but without success.

---

[6] "...regem te statuimus eos [Bulgaros et Blacos]" (*Reg.*, VII, 1, *PL*, 215, 279 C); *cf.* R. L. Wolff, "The 'Second Bulgarian Empire.' Its Origin and History to 1204," *Speculum*, 24 (1949), 167–206 (especially pp. 190 and 198); L. Tautu, "Le conflit entre Johanitsa Asen et Éméric roi de Hongrie (1202–04)," *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, III (*SteT*, 233) (Vatican City 1964), 367–93. Innocent III's correspondence with Johanitsa Asen was edited by I. Duicev, *Innocentii III epistolae ad Bulgariae historiam spectantes* (Sofia 1942).

Meanwhile, Otto of Brunswick had made important promises, among others the recognition of the papal recovery of territory in Italy and the renunciation of the controverted *ius spolii* in Germany. Philip of Swabia, on the other hand, did not commit himself during his negotiations with the Curia. Despite the fact that in Germany the decision was already beginning to favour Philip, Innocent decided for Otto toward the end of 1200 or early in 1201. In a rather long, shrewdly thought out, and ingeniously dialectical consistorial address,[7] he made known this decision and so informed Otto on 1 March 1201.

Through Otto's relations with England, where his uncle, King Richard Lionheart, though not the latter's brother King John, supported him, and Philip's alliance with France, the quarrel assumed European proportions. Philip's prospects of establishing his claims in Germany by force constantly improved, despite the papal decision for Otto. Meanwhile, the negotiations of the Curia with the still excommunicated Hohenstaufen continued. In 1207 cardinal legates sought to get Otto to renounce his claims and absolved Philip from censure. Plenipotentiaries of both Kings went to Rome, where an understanding was reached: Otto's retirement was agreed upon and Philip's recognition as King and Emperor-elect was decided. But Philip's assassination at Bamberg on 21 June 1208 by the Count Palatine Otto of Wittelsbach eventually led to the general recognition of Otto of Brunswick in Germany, and this was ratified by his unanimous election at Frankfurt on 11 November.

---

[7] "... te in regem recipere" is supposed to mean, not that the Pope was here making an inner German decision but that, among the three kings, he regarded Otto as the "rex in imperatorem coronandus." The "Deliberatio super facto imperii de tribus electis" is in F. Kempf, *Regestum Innocentii III papae super negotio Romani imperii, Misc. Hist. Pont.,* 12 (Rome 1947), no. 29.

Otto IV received the imperial crown from Innocent III on 4 October 1209. But then, contrary to the Pope's expectations and his own earlier assurances, Otto launched an attack on the Kingdom of Sicily. The moment that the Emperor violated the Sicilian frontier, on 18 November 1210, Innocent excommunicated him; the sentence was renewed in stronger terms on the following Holy Thursday and all persons were released from oaths they had taken to the Emperor. In September of the same year, 1211, Innocent obtained the election at Nürnberg of Frederick of Sicily as King of Germany. When the latter arrived in Germany in the autumn of 1212, there ensued an unending defection of the German princes from the Emperor Otto. In November 1212 Frederick, in accord with good Hohenstaufen tradition, allied with Philip II of France against Otto, who had, for his part, allied with King John Lackland of England, under papal excommunication since 1209. The decision taken at Nürnberg was confirmed by a new election at Frankfurt in December 1212, and then Frederick was crowned at Mainz. The decision between him and the Emperor Otto was made at the battle of Bouvines on 27 July 1214, in which Otto, who had taken the field on behalf of the English, was defeated by the French. This was, at the same time, the end of the contest over the German throne, for now even the princes of the lower Rhineland accepted King Frederick II.

In the Golden Bull of Eger, on 12 July 1213, Frederick promised the Pope all that Otto IV had promised at Speyer in 1209: recognition of the recovery of papal territory in Central Italy, abandonment of the *ius spolii* and the *regalia* in regard to the spiritual princes, renunciation of intervention and participation in elections of abbots and bishops, allowing of appeals to the Curia, and, finally, aid in the struggle against heresy. The Golden Bull created imperial law, legalized the Pope's territorial policy in regard to the Papal State, and replaced the Concordat of Worms by a new regulation that was far more favourable for the Church. Frederick's position as King of Germany was confirmed by the Lateran Council of 1215.

Isolated and abandoned, but reconciled with the Church, the Emperor Otto IV died in the Harzburg on 19 May 1218. Without the Pope's knowledge Frederick had taken the cross at his second coronation at Aachen on 23 July 1215. Shortly before his death Innocent obtained from Frederick the promise that, after receiving the imperial crown, he would turn over the Kingdom of Sicily to his son Henry, who had already been crowned. In this connection Frederick again acknowledged the feudal suzerainty of the Roman Church over Sicily. Innocent probably died in the awareness of having acted, not unsuccessfully, as arbite in regard to the imperial office.

England

England had played an important role in the contest over the German throne, both because of King Richard I's active involvement in the candidacy of his nephew, Otto of Brunswick, and because of the later association of King John with Otto in his struggle against Frederick II, who was supported by Philip II of France. In an effort to strengthen Innocent's inclination toward Otto, Richard had, at the Pope's demand, concluded a five-year armistice with the French King in 1199 since peace in Christendom for the sake of the crusade was one of the Pope's basic concerns.

After Richard's death on 6 April 1199, war broke out again, since Philip II was promoting the succession of John's nephew, Prince Arthur, to the Angevin fiefs in France. In the Peace of Le Goulet (May 1200) John had to bind himself not to support Otto of Brunswick. Innocent annulled this article of the treaty and admonished the English King to give effective aid to his nephew. War between John and Philip was resumed in 1202, despite the Pope's threats, and ended with the conquest of Normandy and most of John's other French fiefs by Philip Augustus. So long as the contest over the German throne remained undecided, Innocent was indulgent toward John despite the King's brutal ecclesiastical policy, especially since John occasionally showed himself submissive in the face of papal threats. But when the Curia undertook to effect an understanding with Philip of Swabia, the Pope's forbearance in regard to John changed.

Conflict erupted over the succession to Archbishop Hubert Walter of Canterbury, who died in July 1205. The monastic chapter elected its subprior, Reginald, and asked the Pope to confirm him. The suffragan bishops who had thus been disregarded claimed that by prescription they were entitled to take part in the election. They got the King to compel the monks to drop Reginald and in his place to elect John, Bishop of Norwich, the King's candidate, who thereupon took possession and was invested with the see by the crown. In December 1206 Innocent annulled both elections and had some of the monks who were then in Rome elect a candidate of his own, the English curial Cardinal Stephen Langton. Though King John angrily rejected Langton, the Pope consecrated him in June 1207 and invested him with the pallium despite the absence of the royal approval. He intended to force his admission to Canterbury by threat of interdict. In March 1208 the Pope actually laid on England an interdict that was in general carefully observed. The King expelled the Canterbury monks, confiscated the property and revenues of clerics and bishops who obeyed the interdict, and left sees and abbeys which became vacant unfilled. Negotiations for a settlement broke down and King John was excommunicated in January 1209.

The King ruthlessly continued his oppressive policy in regard to the

Church, and the resumed negotiations collapsed in the summer of 1211. Complaints by the banished bishops induced the Pope at the end of February 1213 to absolve the King's subjects from their oaths. No actual deposition of the King, however, was pronounced, even though Innocent had threatened it, but the Pope declared the war of Philip II of France against John a crusade. Since Philip strenuously pushed forward his preparations, while John was not sure of the support of his barons, the English King accepted the papal conditions of peace on 13 May 1213: to recognize Archbishop Langton, to permit the return of the fugitive bishops, to restore all the confiscated Church property. Two days later, on his own initiative, he placed the Kingdom under the protection of the Holy See as a papal fief, promising 700 pounds sterling for England and 300 for Ireland as an annual *census*. This payment, in addition to which the customary Peter's Pence continued to be paid, was not definitely abolished until 1366.

Innocent thereupon deprived the French undertaking against England of its character as a crusade and forbade any attack on England, which was now under his protection. The ordering of the ecclesiastical situation lay in the hands of the papal agent Pandulf and Cardinal Nicholas of Tusculum. In the war with France, recently begun by John himself, which resulted in the previously mentioned battle of Bouvines, the Cardinal Legate Robert de Courçon was able, despite the French victory, to arrange a five-years' armistice on the basis of the *status quo* (18 September 1214). In the war against the rebel barons, who on 15 June 1215 compelled John to issue the *Magna carta libertatum*, which restricted the crown's feudal and sovereign rights, Innocent stood by the King, who had, moreover, taken the cross on 4 March 1215 in order to assure himself even more of the Church's protection. On 24 August 1215 Innocent declared *Magna carta* null and void. But this judgment was disregarded in England, even by Archbishop Langton, who was thereupon suspended.

In Rome Langton strove in vain for the lifting of his suspension, and the Pope forbade his return to England. At the Fourth Lateran Council Innocent renewed the excommunication of the rebel barons, laid an interdict on London, and rebuked the French King for supporting the rebels. These had offered the English throne to the French Crown Prince Louis, whose wife was a niece of John's.[8] Even though the Cardinal Legate Gualo again forbade an attack on England at the assembly of Melun, Louis landed in England on 21 May 1216. He was excommunicated by Gualo and the areas already occupied fell under interdict. While the letters in which Innocent asked the French bishops for their part to publish these sentences were *en route*, the Pope died on 16 July. John Lackland followed him to the grave on 19 October. The Cardinal Legate was able to have John's under-age son, Henry III, crowned and to induce the barons to take the oath of loyalty to him on 11 November. Louis was obliged to abandon the English enterprise, and the Cardinal Legate arranged the Peace of Kingston on 12 September 1217. Louis left England, and Henry III obtained general recognition. The unusual course of events in England, culminating in what was at least an external success on the part of Innocent III, shows the Pope in almost every phase of the dramatic succession of events not merely as the tenacious "master of politics" but also at the same time as guided by the religious concerns and motives of his pontificate: freedom of the Church, the crusade, and peace among nations.

---

[8] Blanche of Castile, daughter of John's sister Eleanor; she became the mother of Saint Louis IX.

France

The Curia and the papacy had long been bound to France by especially active and cordial relations. Alexander III had found asylum there; for a short time during the Second Crusade Eugene III had governed the West from Paris; and Innocent II had achieved his definite recognition in France. But the Church's "eldest daughter" was also her most demanding. After a long resistance King John had conceded the freedom of the Church in England; the Empress Constance had promulgated the renunciation of interference by the crown in the Sicilian Kingdom; and the contest over the throne had produced the same result in Germany. But in France the Church continued to be strictly dependent on the crown.

King Philip II Augustus (1180–1223) of France was one of the most self-willed princes who ever resisted the measures of Innocent III. He abandoned his second wife, Ingeborg of Denmark, the day following their marriage in 1193 and sought to obtain an annulment, thereby beginning a matrimonial case which clouded his relations with Innocent throughout that Pope's pontificate. Occasionally the King found himself compelled to make a seeming submission, as, for example, on the occasion of the interdict which was laid on the royal *demesne* on 13 January 1200, even though the Pope could not count on the loyalty of all the bishops there. The Pope tried several times to mediate in the ceaseless strife with England. But when Philip undertook measures against John on the basis of feudal law — the war ended with the conquest of Normandy in May-June 1204 — he resisted an intervention by the Pope and at the assembly of Mantes on 22 August 1203 made the celebrated declaration that, according to feudal law, he was not bound in what pertained to his relations with his vassals to heed the admonitions of the Holy See.[9] The Pope then expressly confirmed this. But within the royal *demesne* itself Philip was not at all willing to let the Church be governed by the Pope; he regarded himself as her master first of all and only then the Pope. Innocent's consistently affable language in his correspondence with this King, his great gentleness *vis-à-vis* the French crown, is amazing in view of the fact that in his scandalous marriage case Philip did not retreat, he did not submit to the Pope's will, and the final settlement proceeded from his free decision, based on political motives, in April 1213. The King defended his clergy against the claims of the princes and the demands of the communes, but he insisted on their subordination to the crown and the services corresponding to this. He seldom interfered in elections, but the clergy remained subject to the royal tribunal. Philip Augustus intended to be, and was, master of the Church in France, and Innocent tolerated the situation.

---

[9] "Nihil ad pontificem pertinere de negotio, quod vertitur inter reges" (*Reg.* VI, 163, *PL*, 215, 177 B C).

Scandinavia, Poland, and the Balkan Peninsula

While in Sweden Innocent III supported the legitimate King, or at least the one he regarded as legitimate, against a real, or alleged, usurper,[10] in Norway he decided against the claims of King Sverre and aided the opposition to him in the country. Whether he acted rightly can no longer be decided.[11] He commanded King Knut VI of Denmark and King Sverker II Carlsson of Sweden — "per apostolica scripta mandamus" — to support the Baglar party, which was friendly to the Church, in order to assure the protection of the churches, the freedom of the clergy, and the care of the poor.[12] The generally opposed Birkebein Sverre, however, did not yield, despite excommunication and interdict, and it was only under his successor, Haakon IV, that an agreement, based on the arrangement of 1152, was reached.

In Denmark Innocent found a sympathetic collaborator in the clever, energetic, and powerful Archbishop Absalom of Lund,[13] the founder of Copenhagen, until the latter's death in 1201. Primate of Denmark and Sweden from 1177, Absalom was one of the strongest personalities in Scandinavian ecclesiastical history.

Like Absalom in the north, in Poland the Primate, Archbishop Henry Kietlicz of Gniezno (1199–1219), a friend of the Pope from his school days in Paris, worked in close union with the Holy See. Through him

---

[10] H. Tillmann, *Innocenz III.*, 57, with reference to *Reg.*, XI, 174, *PL*, 215, 1485 f.

[11] *Ibid.*, 76.

[12] *Register*, ed. Hageneder, *Briefe*, I, 383, p. 579.

[13] Absalom, Archbishop of Lund (1177–1201), received his first letter from the Pope as early as 22 September 1198 (*Register*, ed. Hageneder, *Briefe*, I, 372, pp. 564 f.).

Innocent deprived the refractory Vladislas III of authority by excommunicating him in 1206. In 1210 the Pope even achieved the recognition of Poland's feudal dependence on the Roman Church, already prepared for earlier.

Besides the Bulgarians, already mentioned, Innocent was approached in 1198 by King Vulk of Dalmatia and Vulk's brother, the Great Zupan Stephen of Serbia. He declared that he was prepared to regulate ecclesiastical conditions in Dalmatia by erecting a separate province. The tension existing between Hungary and Serbia-Dalmatia and between Hungary and the Ruthenians of Volhynia, in addition to the political changes in Greece from the time of the Fourth Crusade, rendered impossible a continuation of the Pope's policy.

CHAPTER 20

The Fourth Crusade and The Latin Empire

Concern fort the East dominated the entire pontificate of Innocent III.[1] In the Pope were united a number of goals, the legacy of the Gregorian ideas: reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches, safety of the holy places, recovery of lost areas of the crusader states, peace among Western princes and within their respective dominions, both as a prerequisite for participation in the crusade and as a value in its own right, the *bonum pacis*, that is, as the optimum essential condition of an orderly ecclesiastical life.[2] Furthermore, the Kingdom of Jerusalem[3] was a vassal state of the Holy See, which was therefore obliged to aid it actively. In the Empire there was no Emperor and the contest for the throne monopolized all the resources of the princes. The Kings of France and England were in conflict over the succession to Richard Lionheart. The Kingdom of Sicily had been turned over by the Empress Constance to the Pope as regent and guardian of her son, Frederick. So the year 1200 appeared favourable for the arranging of a crusade as a repetition of that of Urban II a century before.

The preparations began with a letter from the Pope to the Emperor

---

[1] For the relations of Innocent III with the Eastern Church see Chapter 16.

[2] For the papacy's exertions for peace, *cf.* J. Gaudemet, "Le rôle de la papauté dans le règlement des conflits entre états aux XIII^{e} et XIV^{e} siècles," *La Paix*, II (*Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 15) (Brussels 1961), 79–106.

[3] On the fate of the crusader states after 1192, see M. N. Hardwicke in K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades*, II (Philadelphia 1962), 522–56. The Kingdom of Jerusalem had had to transfer its capital to Acre. See also S. Runciman, *History of the Crusades*, III, 78–108.

Alexius III Angelus on behalf of reunion.[4] Fulk of Neuilly preached the crusade in France, Abbot Martin of Pairis in Germany. Not the Kings but the barons and manorial lords were gained for the cause. These included great princes of France, such as the Counts of Champagne, Flanders, Blois, and Montfort, and Geoffrey de Villehardouin, historian of the expedition; in Germany Bishop Conrad of Halberstadt and Count Berthold of Katzenelnbogen with their neighbours. Great lords from North Italy also joined, the chief one being the Margrave Boniface II of Montferrat. Since the land-route through Asia Minor was not practicable, a fleet had to be provided. The Flemish vessels did not suffice and sailed off by themselves. Following the death of Theobald III of Champagne in 1201, Boniface of Montferrat was chosen leader. He was a friend of Philip of Swabia and father of the heiress of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

Egypt, as the most vulnerable part of the Ayubite Empire, had been selected as the immediate goal of the crusade. But at a meeting between Montferrat and Philip of Swabia, which was attended also by the latter's brother-in-law, Alexius,[5] it was discussed whether the expedition could not intervene *en route* to place Alexius on the Byzantine imperial throne. Meanwhile, Geoffrey de Villehardouin had concluded a treaty with Venice in regard to the means of transportation. In return for 85,000 silver marks of Cologne the Republic of Venice agreed to supply ships and provisions for one year from 28 June 1202 for 4,500 knights and their horses, 9,000 squires, and 20,000 infantry;[6] in addition, fifty galleys were promised as convoy on condition that one-half of all conquests was awarded to Venice. When the arm gathered at Venice in June 1202, the money agreed upon was not forthcoming, and so the expedition was at Venice's mercy.

The crusading army, which did not put to sea until 8 November, had first of all to recover Zara from Hungary for the Republic — an enterprise that Innocent had formally forbidden. Then it also had to winter there. Venice or, rather, the Doge Henry Dandolo, was excommunicated. Philip of Swabia now made known that responsibility for the crusaders' debt to

---

[4] *Register,* ed. Hageneder, *Briefe,* I, 353, pp. 525–28. *Cf.* the commentary on it by Haluscynsky, *Acta Innocentii III,* 105 f. Innocent put his own words, complaints, and requests into the mouth of the Christian people themselves. "Murmurat populus Christianus," he said, that the Emperor does not submit to Rome and does not aid the Kingdom of Jerusalem, that the Greek Church has separated from Rome and made herself independent. The Christian people invite the Emperor to give energetic aid for the *terra Christi* and ask him to reconcile the Greek Church with the Holy See again.

[5] Alexius IV, son of the Emperor Isaac II Angelus, who had been dethroned by his brother Alexius III Angelus on 8 April 1195, and brother of Irene, wife of Philip of Swabia.

[6] The estimated figures, on which the treaty was based, were grossly exaggerated and were never reached by the number of crusaders who actually assembled at Venice. Just the same, Venice held to the price agreed upon.

Venice would be accepted if the expedition were to make for Constantinople and enthrone Alexius; furthermore, the crusade to the Holy Land would then be provisioned and supplied with a military force of 10,000 men. Despite some hesitations and a papal warning the majority of the crusaders allowed themselves to be gained for this project.

Accompanied by the young Prince Alexius, the fleet appeared before Constantinople on 24 June 1203. While the usurper, Alexius III, fled, the officials he had deserted brought his blinded predecessor and brother, Isaac II, out of prison and reinstated him on the throne, thinking that they had thus deprived the Venetians and the leaders of the crusade, who had come to restore the deposed Emperor, of the essential motive for conquering the city. And in fact it sufficed to have Alexius crowned as co-Emperor in Hagia Sophia on 1 August 1203. His government had first bound itself to pay the Venetians the promised money, but this was impossible. Then it obliged itself to work for the recognition of Rome by the Greek Church, but the clergy and people protested. The presence of the crusaders in the city and its environs aggravated the situation.

In February 1204 a palace revolution gave the imperial throne to a new usurper, Alexius V Mourtzouphlos. Then in April the crusaders took the city, which was given over to a three-days' sack. The plundering and bloodshed reduced the vast and beautiful city to a heap of rubble. "Even the Muslims," wrote Nicetas Choniates,[7] "would have been more merciful." The Latin leaders, together with the Venetians, chose as Emperor, not Montferrat, but the weaker Count Baldwin IX of Flanders; he was supposed to become suzerain of all the conquered territory except for the areas assigned to the Doge of Venice, such as the three-eighths of Constantinople, administered by a Venetian *podestà*. Since a Frank had become Emperor, then, according to the arrangement, a Venetian had to become Patriarch; Thomas Morosini thus obtained that office. A constitution, the *Assises of Romania,* made the Emperor the chairman of an hereditary House of Lords. Almost all the European provinces of the Byzantine Empire were conquered and divided among several hundred crusade barons; the most powerful among them was Boniface of Montferrat, who became King of Thessalonica. In the remnant of the Byzantine dominions beyond the straits Greek successor states were set up[8] at Trebizond and Nicaea, and some of Epirus was preserved. The recovery was planned and carried out from Nicaea, where Theodore Lascaris, son-in-law of the Emperor Alexius III, reigned as Emperor, and from Epirus.

---

[7] *Cf.* the account of the city's fate after its conquest in F. Grabler, *Die Kreuzfahrer erobern Konstantinopel* (based on the history by Nicetas Choniates), 161–230.

[8] A. A. Vasiliev, "The Foundation of the Empire of Trebizond," *Speculum,* 11 (1936), 3–37; G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates* (Munich 1940), 298–322.

Following a first report from the new Emperor Baldwin, Innocent III gave his assent to what was happening at Constantinople, but more exact information evoked energetic protests and threats from the Pope, who was deeply shocked by the sack of Constantinople and who, as a statesman, had a presentiment of unhappy results.[9] But meanwhile his legate had dispensed all the crusaders from continuing to the Holy Land if they would oblige themselves to support for two years the new Latin Empire, which was called Romania. If, nevertheless, the Pope had hoped that the happenings at Constantinople would result in reunion with the Greek Church, the negotiations were unsuccessful, especially as the tactlessness of the Cardinal Legate Pelagius was not an appropriate means of effecting reconciliation. The city's fate and the misguided policy of the Latin hierarchy deepened the breach instead of helping to close it. The policy of imposing Latinization on Greece was a fatal mistake.

And so the ill-advised enterprise that was the Fourth Crusade turned out to be an immense folly and brought the Holy Land itself no aid but instead a further burden in so far as, from now on, many crusaders preferred to assist Romania in Greece instead of keeping alive the collapsing rule of the Franks in Palestine. With the Byzantine Empire a powerful bulwark against the advancing Turks had been almost ruined. Something that could not be erased from memory had been allowed to take place and a great hatred had been born, which was to envenom the relations of the Christian East and the Christian West for generations to come.

However, indirect help had been provided the Holy Land by the fall of Byzantium. The frightened Sultan concluded a ten-years' armistice with the Kingdom of Jerusalem. In 1210 John de Brienne married Mary, the heiress of King Amauri, and on this occasion received from both the French King and Pope Innocent the sum of 40,000 silver pounds. In 1212 he was able to have the armistice extended for five more years. Mary died giving birth to Yolande in 1212, and John, who acted as regent, married Stephanie of Armenia in 1214.

The Pope sought to mediate at Antioch between Bohemond IV and his nephew, Raymond Ruben. Bohemond remembered that Antioch was formally a fief of Byzantium, but his nephew's part was vigorously taken by King Leo of Armenia, who then entered into personal negotiations with the Pope. The long drawn out contest was left for settlement by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, since Innocent became weary of it, above all when Bohemond rejected his intervention as unjustified on the ground that a question of pure feudal law was at stake. Despite these and many other difficulties in the Christian remnant in Syria-Palestine, Innocent continued to exert himself to realize a new crusade, without being discouraged by the catastrophe of that of 1203–04.

---

[9] The contradictory approach of Innocent III to the developments in this crusade are well worked out by H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), 170–87.

That the mood of the West could still be directed to one was probably made evident to him by the singular story of the French and German Children's Crusade of 1212.[10] Many youngsters from Lower Lotharingia and the Rhineland, from ten to eighteen years of age, made their way south. They aspired to recover the Holy Land, unarmed and penniless. The undertaking has been called the "triumph and defeat of the poverty idea."[11] Nicholas of Cologne had gone as far as Rome with what was left of his band, but Innocent sent them home. The French groups under Stephen of Cloeys reached Marseilles and were then taken on board ships by merchants; some of them perished in a storm, the others were sold into slavery in Egypt and North Africa.

Pope Innocent finally utilized the Fourth Lateran Council as a new means of arousing interest in the crusade. It may characterize the intensity of his effort if one realizes that he died at Perugia as he was preparing to reconcile the maritime cities of Genoa and Pisa with each other in order to provide the crusade with a base more solid than that supplied by Venice fourteen years previously.

---

[10] On the Children's Crusade, see R. Röhricht, "Der Kinderkreuzzug 1212," *HZ*, 36 (1876), 1–9; P. Alphandéry, "Les croisades d'enfants" *RHR*, 73 (1916), 259–82; D. C. Munro, "The Children's Crusade," *AHR*, 19 (1913 f.), 516–24 (critical evaluation of the sources); J. E. Hansbery, "The Children's Crusade," *CHR*, 24 (1938), 30–38; P. Alphandéry, *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade (L'évolution de l'humanité*, 38) (Paris 1959), 115–48; G. Miccoli, "La 'crociata dei fanciulli' del 1212," *StudMed*, 3, series 2 (1961), 407–43; the best is now N. P. Zacour, "The Children's Crusade" in K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades*, II (Philadelphia 1962), 325–42, where the children's expeditions are appraised as manifestations of popular piety. There was no lack of critical reserve on the part of the clergy. H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 188–91, stresses that the children's expeditions did not have the official blessing of the Church and hence theoretically could not be termed a crusade. But they show that there was among the people a strong readiness to fight for the faith.

[11] H. E. Mayer, *op. cit.*, 189.

CHAPTER 21

Reform and the Struggle against Heresy

Like the crusade, the will for reform also dominated the thought and activity of Innocent III. The opening words of his letters contain many references to his unremitting concern to cure what is sick in the ranks of the diocesan and the regular clergy and in all classes in the Church, to assure order, to straighten up again the bent reed, and to rekindle the glowing spark.[1] This care embraced the whole Christian world. Thus, in the first year of his pontificate, Innocent wrote to Iceland[2] to admonish the episcopate and the clergy that "certain things are to be extirpated with particular effectiveness so that thorns and thistles may not suffocate the seed of the Gospel."

Canonical obedience was enjoined; prelates were urged to an exemplary life in order to facilitate such obedience on the part of their subjects; murder, arson, incontinence were mentioned as common crimes; contact with the excommunicated Norwegian usurper Sverre was denounced; the bishops were advised to display courage in rebuking, "for a shepherd who is unwilling to rebuke those who do wrong leads them to death by his silence."

Concern for the maintaining of the purity of ecclesiastical morals and discipline recurs like a leitmotif in many letters, admonishing the episcopate and religious superiors, individuals and groups, princes and magistrates. The crusades had evoked new needs and introduced an oriental and Byzantine luxury into the West. The courtly love of the troubadours had begun to exercise a destructive influence on family and marriage morality. The amendment of prostitutes and the arranging of marriages for them was clearly a problem.[3] Usury was eating into the economic and social structure like a cancer and had to be resisted. The clergy were greatly exposed to the general moral decay. Their avarice, especially among the lower clergy, who saw the worst example in the higher ranks, compromised the care of souls. Celibacy was scarcely observed any more among both the higher and the lower clergy,[4] and the hankering after luxury and a comfortable life persisted in showing itself in their ranks. Hunting, drunkenness, luxurious dress, gambling, and even dancing were among the abuses denounced. Divine worship was carelessly celebrated, the care of souls was neglected. The secularization of the higher clergy increased, and monasteries, such as those belonging to the orders of Cluny, Cîteaux, Grandmont, and Prémontré, were in need of reform.

---

[1] *Register*, ed. O. Hageneder, *Briefe*, I, 6 (Innocent subjects the monastery of Telki to Archbishop Job of Esztergom and commissions him to reform it): "Circa reformationem monasteriorum et augmentum eorum tanto potius tenemur esse solliciti et ipsorum gravaminibus precavere, quanto ad nos specialius pertinet et plantare religionem in Dei ecclesiis et fovere plantatam" (p. 13); *Briefe*, I, 22: "Pastoralis officii debitum nos invitat et ipse rationis ordo deposcit, ut ea sollicitudine utilitatibus ecclesiarum intendere debeamus, quod ipsis ecclesiis ordo debitus conservetur et clerici earum ministerio deputati, sicut ab eis stipendia militie clericalis accipiunt, ita eis obsequia militie clericalis impendant" (p. 33); *Briefe*, I, 31: "... de grege nobis commisso sollicitam curam debemus gerere et tamquam pastores seduli faciente Domino providere, ne ovis morbo infecta incurabili oves ceteras suo cogat contagio morbo simili laborare" (pp. 44 f.).

[2] *Register*, ed. Hageneder, *Briefe*, I, 320, of 30 July 1198, to the Bishops Paul of Skalholt and Brando of Holar and all the clergy of Iceland (pp. 464–66). *Cf.* G. Gathorne-Hardy, *The Royal Impostor. King Sverre of Norway* (Oslo 1956).

Innocent III inaugurated reform with himself and with the Curia. The centralization of ecclesiastical administration and legislation had in the course of the twelfth century reached a degree which began to involve an intolerable burden for the Curia. The episcopate had become accustomed to apply to the Curia for decisions even in regard to questions of detail. Innocent sought to restore the balance between episcopal administration and final recourse to the Holy See, and so he insisted on limiting or abolishing improper appeals to Rome: an appeal should be a legal remedy for the injured, not an expedient for the guilty, in view of the fact that, with an appeal, judgment was suspended. In cases that were clear any appeal to Rome was forbidden — "omni appellatione remota" — and all appeals were curtailed. Legates were sent only for limited times so that metropolitans could again intervene more vigorously. Ordinarily, legates *a latere* received exactly defined mandates. Metropolitans, on the other hand, were admonished of their duty of visitation. If there appears here a certain tendency toward decentralization of the administrative power, Innocent, very keenly mindful of his *plenitudo potestatis,* still reserved *causae maiores* to himself: the rearrangement of diocesan boundaries and jurisdiction in Spain (Compostela and Braga), in France (Dol and Tours), in Hungary (Esztergom and Kalocsa), and in Germany, where he detached Prague from the province of Mainz and created the autonomous province of Prague; the rendering of decisions in disputed episcopal elections; and the confirmation of elections. Only the Pope was qualified to approve a transfer from one see to another, only he could remove a bishop from office. Hence the episcopate was closely bound to the Holy See, but in their dioceses the bishops' freedom of action was guaranteed.

---

[3] *Register,* ed. Hageneder, *Briefe,* I, 112, of 29 April 1198, in which Innocent grants an indulgence to all the faithful who marry prostitutes and thereby rescue them from their former mode of life.

[4] H. Winterer ascertained that in Spain there was a strong reaction against the immoral conduct of clerics from the time of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215; on the marriage of priests in Spain, see *ZSavRGkan,* 52 (1966), 374 f.

Together with administrative reform the moral renewal of the Church was Innocent's weightiest concern: he simplified the living standard of the Curia, sought to revive propriety and honesty at the Curia, established an exact tariff of fees, and forbade the ecceptance of bribes. In the episcopate he was interested in the choosing of candidates of such quality that a morally sound generation could arise, and hence candidates who were too young, too little educated, or of an evil reputation were rejected. Related to this was his persistent struggle against princes and lords for the chapters' freedom of election, since their interference was the source of abuses. But admonition was not enough; it was necessary to see to it that admonitions were put into practice. Hence Innocent stressed bishops' duty of making the *visitatio ad limina* every four years in order to report on the state of their dioceses. In the event that the frequently inculcated duty of visitation was fulfilled, a report was not difficult to obtain. In admonishing negligent bishops, Innocent often resorted to fraternal reproof, given by a neighbouring bishop. In regard to erring prelates or those who had been accused in Rome, Innocent took action prudently. He first sought to clarify the actual state of affairs, either directly interrogating the person concerned or having an inquiry made. He then proceeded sternly against those really found guilty. His basic principle was expressed thus: the bishop is for the Church, not the Church for the bishop. Especially in regard to the lower clergy he demanded of the bishops a firm hand and a stubborn enforcing of law and precept. Violation of celibacy, a secularized mode of life in dress and appearance, avarice, forgery, pluralism, simoniacal practices — such were some of the offenses that had to be reprimanded and eliminated in the lower clergy. The bishop was to remember to convoke diocesan synods again; the metropolitan was to hold provincial synods.

In the lay world, Innocent made himself the defender of the indissolubility of marriage and stressed that the *consensus de praesenti* established the matrimonial bond. His procedure in regard to royal marriage cases in France, Aragón, Bohemia, and Castile proved that he made no distinction between high and low and for the sake of the sanctity of marriage put up with political difficulties and losses. He took a stand against usury and supported the bishops' measures against this widespread evil.

He wanted to lead monasteries, monks, and canons back to fidelity to their rule and their particular constitutions in order here also to pave the way for reform. The road to this reform of monasteries was indicated by means of excellent canons at the Council of Paris in 1212 under the presidency of the papal legate, Cardinal Robert de Courçon.[5] Poverty, enclosure, stability, hospitality, a fair paternal administration on the part of the superiors, and obedience were again demanded and enjoined. Innocent encouraged the founding of new orders, as, for example, the Hospitallers of the Holy Spirit,[6] which owed its origin to Guy of Montpellier (1180) and whose rule was confirmed by Innocent in 1213. For it he founded the Hospital of the Holy Spirit at Rome. He likewise encouraged John of Matha, who established the Order of the Most Holy Trinity for the ransom and exchange of captives. This society was completely in accord with the age of the crusades. Innocent had Bishop Eudes of Paris and Abbot Absalom of Saint-Victor draft its rule, which he then confirmed on 17 December 1198.[7] The growing danger from heresy, above all in France, even induced the Pope to call upon the Cistercian Order to undertake preaching even outside the monastery. However, the general chapter of 1213 found it difficult to harmonize the Pope's desire with its ideal of pure contemplation. But at this moment other assistants were already flocking to the Pope[8] and so he could drop the idea.

---

[5] The family name of the English-born Cardinal is written in various ways: Curzon, Courson, Courçon; *cf.* M. and C. Dickson, "Le Cardinal Robert de Courson. Sa vie," *AHD*, 9

The reform of the Church was the more necessary since the critical forces, which were competing in the breakdown of ecclesiastical morality and were driven even to doubt the Church herself, managed to appeal to ever wider circles in the Church and win them for themselves. Various groups had already been specified and condemned by one of Innocent's predecessors.[9] The Cathari especially became the real danger to the unity of the Church's faith around the turn of the century. Apart from the Balkan Bogomiles,[10] they were found mainly in Lombardy, Tuscany, the Marches of Ancona, Romagna, and even in the *Patrimonium*. A particularly close and well organized social class caused alarm in the Midi, especially in the County of Toulouse and the neighbouring areas. In the cities, above all Albi, which thus contributed to them the name "Albigensians," and even in the country they often enjoyed the protection of magistrates and lords. Count Raymond VI of Toulouse, however, seems never to have joined them formally. The aristocratic bishops of Narbonne, Carcassonne, Béziers, and other sees showed themselves indifferent and uninterested in fighting against error, which, spread by many preachers and

---

(1934), 61–142. On the reform of the orders at the councils held by Robert during the period of his legatine activity in France, see *ibid.*, 124–27.

[6] On the Hospital Order of the Holy Spirit, *cf.* G. Brune, *Histoire de l'ordre hospitalier du S. Esprit* (Paris 1892); P. De Angelis, *L'ospedale di S. Spirito in Saxia*, I (Rome 1960); on the Trinitarian Order, see P. Deslandres, *L'ordre des Trinitaires*, 2 vols. (Paris 1903); Antonin de l'Assomption, *Les origines de l'ordre de la Très S. Trinité* (Rome 1925).

[7] *Register*, ed. Hageneder, *Briefe*, I, 481, of 17 December 1198, pp. 703–08.

[8] See *infra*, Chapter 23.

[9] Lucius III in his decretal "Ad abolendam" of 4 November 1184; *cf. supra*, Chapter 13.

[10] On the question of the Bogomiles, see now E. Werner, "Bogumil," *Balkan Studies*, 7 (1966), 49–60. "There is no reason to doubt the historicity of the founder" (*ibid.*, 60).

effectively supported by the charitable works of the „perfect," increased powerfully in number and influence. Even monasteries of nuns were influenced. The parochial clergy were often sympathetic with the ideas of the Cathari because of daily contact with them, and hence all the decisive forces — hierarchy, religious, parish clergy, and secular powers — appeared to have broken down. Thus Innocent III, appealed to by an apprehensive minority in the district, was moved to intervene.

Innocent exerted himself in an all-embracing manner everywhere in Christendom for an energetic attack on heresy, with recourse to all the spiritual and secular means that were at his disposal. In the countries beyond the Alps, such as Bosnia, in Aragón, and in Italy, and above all in the Midi his efforts were clearly to be seen. He began with admonitions to the bishops to make themselves conversant with the increasing danger from heretical movements and to take action against them. He gave the proper example in person in the districts and cities of the *Patrimonium,* as at Viterbo in 1199. This is the background of the later celebrated decretal "Vergentis in senium," of 25 March 1199, in which for the first time heresy was equated with the *crimen laesae maiestatis* of Roman Law.[11] But he modified the strictness of the law, which judged, condemned, and punished, by expanding the Roman Law's *misericordia,* which allowed the descendants of the condemned their lives but not the confiscated family property, by restoring their possessions to these in the event of a sincere conversion. In the fight against heresy[12] the Church saw herself dependent on a close collaboration of the spiritual and secular powers, as had been envisaged at Verona by Lucius III and Frederick I in 1184.[13] But in the event that princes and cities, especially in Italy and the Midi, were either too indolent for such collaboration or were opposed to it, there was still a final, radical means: the crusade against heretics.

At first Innocent commissioned members of the Cistercian Order to proceed against heretics, as his legates to the bishops and princes, as his theologians to the heretics themselves. At Carcassonne in 1204 there occurred a public religious disputation with Bernard Simorre, one of the Cathari bishops, in the presence of King Peter II of Aragón, who acted as arbiter.

The behaviour of the Cistercians — from 1204 they were Abbot Arnaud-Amaury of Cîteaux[14] and two monks of Fontfroide, Rudolph and Peter of

---

[11] *Register,* II, 1, *PL,* 214, 537–39: "... cum longe sit gravius aeternam quam temporalem laedere maiestatem" (*PL,* 214, 539 B).

[12] On the combatting of heresy through the measures taken by Innocent III, *cf.* H. Maisonneuve, *Études sur les origines de l'Inquisition* (Paris, 2nd ed., 1960); for the areas between the Loire and the Rhine, 158–65; Bosnia, 169 f.; Aragón, 170; Italy, 171–75; the Midi, 179–97.

[13] *Cf.* the observations of H. Maisonneuve, *op. cit.,* 151–55.

[14] Arnaud-Amaury became Archbishop of Narbonne in 1212.

Castelnau — evoked criticism from Diego de Acebes, Bishop of Osma, and Saint Dominic Guzmán, who in 1206 sought out the Pope at Rome with practical proposals and, furnished by him with corresponding instructions and mandates, returned to the Midi.[15] They represented the view, long shared by the Pope too, that it was necessary to make use of those means which the heretics themselves successfully employed in their cause: preaching and, especially on the part of the preachers, a simple mode of life.

Meanwhile, the Pope himself was proceeding with disciplinary measures against the careless episcopate, which he succeeded in almost entirely renewing in the course of the years up to the Fourth Lateran Council. He then took action also against Raymond VI, Count of Toulouse, the most important prince in the French Midi. Raymond was excommunicated in 1207 because of his neutral attitude toward the heretics. When Peter of Castelnau was assassinated on 14 January 1208, the whole situation became aggravated to such an intolerable degree that the Pope felt constrained to have recourse to the ultimate means at his disposal, the crusade. Innocent had made it clear to the princes from the start of his pontificate that their fight against heresy was a crusade. He now turned to King Philip II Augustus of France, feudal suzerain of the Count of Toulouse, and requested military intervention. Innocent promised him support and for this purpose declared that the war was a crusade. He arranged crusade preaching in order to encourage enlistment and promised a plenary indulgence to the participants and the protection of the law for their possessions and their families. The King was permitted to collect a tenth and a twentieth of the annual income of ecclesiastical benefices. Nevertheless, Philip, whom the Pope had already approached for help several times since 1204, declined to participate in person because of his strained relations with England.

Nevertheless, the preaching of the crusade was so successful that Raymond VI in 1209 sought to immobilize the impending campaign by a spectacular reconciliation with the Church, agreeing to put himself, as a crusader, at the head of the approaching contingents. He intended to use the expedition especially to suppress a vassal who opposed him, Raymond-Roger, Viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne. Leadership of the expedition was formally vested, it is true, in the legates, but they needed the services of an expert for military strategy and tactics, and so they accepted Raymond VI's offer. Béziers was taken on 21 July 1209. The massacre of 7,000 women, children, and old persons in the church of La Madeleine[16] and the burning of the cathedral became ineffaceable memories of the harshness of these struggles. Carcassonne fell on 8 August 1209, and the Viscount Raymond-Roger was captured and imprisoned. His fiefs were acquired by Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, who, following the renewal of the excommunication of the Count of Toulouse at the Synod of Avignon on 6 September 1209, also received the leadership of the crusade.

---

[15] *Cf.* now the biography by M. H. Vicaire, *Geschichte des heiligen Dominikus,* I (Freiburg 1962), 86–130.

[16] The figures were probably grossly exaggerated, for the total population of Béziers at that

Raymond went to Rome to justify himself. The Pope dealt kindly with him and had his case reexamined by a legatine court in the Midi, which ratified the sentence of Avignon. Once again Innocent tried to save the Count. But at a synod held at Montpellier on 22 January 1211, in which the Count's brother-in-law, King Peter II of Aragón, took part, Raymond's excommunication was renewed, and finally, on 15 April 1211, the sentence was ratified by the Pope. On Raymond had been imposed conditions, the acceptance of which would have meant nothing less than political suicide.[17] Apparently the legates had collaborated with Simon de Montfort, who now turned the crusade against Toulouse itself. Simon was eventually able to conquer the entire county, except for the city of Toulouse itself and Montauban. In the statutes of Pamiers, of 1 December 1212, the freedom of the Church was guaranteed and a reorganization of the entire district was regulated. Nothing was said of the heretics.

Peter II of Aragón sought to obtain from the Pope an alteration of the verdict of Montpellier and of Simon's policy. Innocent admonished Simon to war in earnest against heretics rather than Catholics and to evacuate the territories of Foix, Comminges, and Béarn, which were fiefs of the King of Aragón and in which, besides, there were no heretics. At the Synod of Lavaur in January 1213, the legates succeeded in thwarting Peter's mediation and in convincing the Pope of the correctness of their procedure. Innocent thereupon definitely abandoned Raymond's cause. The King of Aragón perished at Muret on 12 September 1213, while aiding his brother-in-law to defend Toulouse. Finally the cities of Toulouse and Montauban also fell into Simon's hands. Innocent, frequently misled by his legates and probably too accommodating toward Simon de Montfort, sent the Cardinal Legate Peter of Benevento to neutralize Simon's victory and again make the war a real struggle against heretics. Though Simon was able to gain the legate Robert de Courçon to his views, the sensible attitude of Peter of Benevento prevailed and the first steps were taken toward a settlement of the enterprise. The Fourth Lateran Council was to wind up the affair.

---

time must have been no more than 9000; *cf.* A. P. Evans, The *Albigensian Crusade*, 289, footnote 14.

[17] Raymond was supposed to dismiss all mercenaries, expel or surrender heretics, raze his fortresses, assure the crusaders unrestricted permission to stay in his lands, and go to the Holy Land as a Templar; *cf. Register*, XII, 106, 107, 152, 153 *(PL*, 216, 124–28, 171, 173).

One of the religious colloquies with which it was hoped to gain converts at the beginning of the efforts to win the Cathari achieved a notable success. It took place at Pamiers in September 1207, in the castle of Count Raymond-Roger of Foix, and ended with a judgment in favour of the Catholics, rendered by the arbiter, Arnold of Camprahan.

As a consequence of this colloquy, a group of Waldensians, or Poor Men of Lyons, returned to the Church under the leadership of Durandus of Huesca. Innocent III received them sympathetically and had them swear to the same profession of faith which he had already required of the converted Poor Men of Milan. As Catholics, the Poor Men[18] spread in Languedoc, Lombardy, and Aragón under the protection of the Pope, who often had to defend them against the distrust of the bishops. Around Milan they encountered groups of similarly converted heretics, the Poor Catholics, who, likewise supported by the Pope's sensible and tactful instructions, could live undisturbed according to their prudent ideal of perfection

Innocent wanted to win back the heretics, not to exterminate them. In his decretals he did not call for their death. Far from being made stricter, this legislation was toned down by the stress on the principle of mercy in regard to the posterity of those condemned. If Innocent's pontificate appears to be compromised by the Albigensian Crusade, the high-handed proceedings of his legates and the uncontrollable truculence of the North French crusaders under Simon de Montfort were equally responsible. Despite rather small gains and the seemingly definitive conquest of the Midi, his pontificate did not really achieve a clear success in regard to the heresy, which continued to make progress. The problem long continued as an unending task, difficult to master, for his successors.

CHAPTER 22

The Fourth Lateran Council

At the very beginning of the pontificate of Innocent III, a general council was envisaged, in the correspondence between Rome and Byzantium, as a possible and desirable framework for reunion discussions.[1] These, however, were considered, not in themselves, but rather as the presupposition for the requested participation of Byzantine resources in the crusade that the Pope was planning. While he was expecting from the Eastern Church reunion as a return to the *Mater et Magistra,* to a Christendom united in and guided by the papacy, the Patriarch and, at his suggestion, the Byzantine Emperor[2] were pointing to the differences in the concept of the Church and in dogma that were to be clarified by the synod. The dialogue that had just begun stopped quickly, and the general council only met toward the end of the pontificate and in entirely changed circumstances.

---

[18] On the Poor Catholics, see H. Tillmann, *Papst Innocenz III.*, 182 f. and the editions by C. Thouzellier (see the bibliography for this chapter).

[1] *Register*, ed. Hageneder, *Briefe*, I, 353 (Innocent III to the Emperor Alexius III, August-September 1198: admonition to free the Holy Land from the Muslims and to unite the Greek Orthodox Church with the Roman), 525–28; *Briefe*, I, 354 (Innocent to the Patriarch George of Constantinople in the same sense), 528–30.

To be sure, the crusade was still, or even more, one of the determining motives for the summoning of the Synod. The occurrence of 1204 could not be regarded by anyone as a fulfilling of the program of the pontificate: the Holy Sepulchre had not yet been liberated. Together with the call for the West to make ready for a new crusade,[3] there now went out an invitation to take part in a general council,[4] which was to provide the publicizing, organizational, and legal basis for the expedition.

Over and above this, Innocent planned the Council as a summarizing of his previous reform activity, which, expressed in carefully prepared and systematically pondered legislation and ratified by the Council, could prove that it was capable of supplying constructive impulses for the future. Both the experiences of his own administrative, legislative, and disciplinary action over the years and those of all the bishops and prelates who had been invited were to contribute to the establishing of a model of renewal which should be suited for and obligatory on the Universal Church. And that is why the invitation went out so early — 19 April 1213 — and so urgently.

The whole Church was asked to meet in Rome on 1 November 1215: clergy and laity, bishops and princes, monasteries and chapters, the orders and cities of Christendom. All were to be there, either in person or, in the case of the corporate bodies — chapters, orders, cities, — by proxy.

For the bishops in particular, participation in the Council was a canonical duty, from which they were dispensed only in the event of demonstrable necessity. In each province one or the other suffragan could remain at home because of necessary pastoral work. The time before the date of convocation was to be utilized not only for zealous promoting of the crusade but also for amassing all the *gravamina,* for the settling of which the Council was summoned.

The bull of convocation, *Vineam Domini Sabaoth,* clearly outlined the Council's program. It would deal with the welfare of all of Christendom; vices were to be uprooted, virtues planted, abuses eliminated, morals renewed; heresies were to be suppressed, the faith to be strengthened; and peace was to be assured so that Christian princes and peoples could hasten to the assistance of the Holy Land. The Pope sent personal invitations to the abbots and general chapters of Cîteaux and Prémontré, to the grand masters of the Templars and Hospitallers. A new development was his emphatic request that cathedral and collegiate chapters should send proxies, for the Council was to deal with questions that especially concerned these bodies. Kings, princes, and city magistrates were invited especially because of the crusade, in regard to which the Pope stressed that he retained the responsibility for the organization and goals of the expedition.

---

[2] *Register,* II, 208–11 (*PL,* 214, 756–71).

[3] *Register,* XVI, 28 (*PL,* 216, 817–32).

[4] *Register,* XVI, 30 (*PL,* 216, 823–25).

We have no information as to details of the preparations on the diocesan level, apart from the crusade preaching. But the unusually large number of those who accepted the invitation and the wealth of problems settled at the Council, together with the extant legislative work, allow us to surmise that the ample time allowed before the opening was fully utilized.

More than 400 bishops from eighty provinces and over 800 abbots and superiors of chapters took part in this greatest medieval Council.[5] The Eastern Church, to be sure, was represented, apart from the Primate of the Maronites, only by the Latin episcopate of Greece and the crusader states. Frederick II, the Latin Emperor Henry, the Kings of France, Hungary, Jerusalem, Cyprus, and England, and Simon de Montfort sent envoys, while the Counts of Toulouse, Foix, Béarn, and Comminges and their vassals came in person.

Innocent III could rightly assume that this unique representation of the West was a ratification of his efforts over many years to bring the papal primacy to effective recognition as far as the outermost frontiers of Christendom. The seventeen Irish, four Scottish, five Polish, and eleven Hungarian bishops were an especially impressive testimony to this.

The Council completed its work in the three solemn sessions of 11, 20, and 30 November, and hence it lasted one month. Merely from the viewpoint of organization, considering the large number of participants and the relatively meagre possibilities of lodging and provisions, it must be regarded as a masterful achievement by the Curia and the Pope; the chroniclers hardly mention complaints. Some mishaps had to be put up with. Before and between the solemn sessions proceeded discussions and deliberations and even decisions on many pending disputes. Thus for England the excommunication of the rebel barons and the suspension of Archbishop Stephen Langton of Canterbury — a measure taken by the papal legates in the Kingdom — were ratified, even though Langton had gone to Rome in person. Waldemar, Archbishop-elect of Bremen, and Dietrich, excommunicated Archbishop of Cologne, who had remained loyal to the Emperor Otto IV, were not admitted to the Council, while the election of Ulric of Passau was confirmed. The see of Chiemsee, recently established by Salzburg, now obtained its recognition. The double election at Constantinople, following the death of the Patriarch Thomas Morosini in 1211, was decided in favour of Gervase, Archbishop of Heraclea, and a successor at Heraclea was immediately named. Similarly clarified was the contested succession to York, where, instead of Simon Langton, who had been elected first, the Bishop of Worcester, Walter Gray, was appointed as Archbishop.

---

[5] List of participants in R. Foreville, *Latran*, 391–95, with reference to J. Werner, "Die Teilnehmerliste des Laterankonzils vom Jahre 1215," *NA*, 31 (1906), 577, 584–92; *cf.* also J. F. Rivera, "Personajes hispanos asistentes en 1215 al IV concilio de Letrán," *Hispania Sacra*, 4 (1951), 335–55; H. Krabbo, "Die deutschen Bischöfe auf dem vierten Laterankonzil von 1215," *QFIAB*, 10 (1907), 275–300.

At the opening of the Council Innocent III delivered a sermon, transmitted by Richard of San Germano,[6] on the text: "I have greatly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer" (Luke 22:15). Reform of the Church and the crusade were stressed as the Council's chief topics. Immediately afterwards the Patriarch of Jerusalem commented on the help requested for the Holy Land, while Bishop Thedisius of Agde reported on the proceedings against the Albigensians. The majority of the Council approved Simon de Montfort and his conquests, and so Raymond VI — but not his son, Raymond VII — lost all his claims. Following tumultuous discussions in the second solemn session the decision on the imperial schism went to Frederick II, but it was not proclaimed by the Pope until the last solemn session, when he confirmed Frederick's election at Frankfurt and definitively abandoned Otto IV.

This session was begun with a solemn profession of faith (canon 1), the rejection of heresy (canon 2), and the unanimous acceptance of the decrees.[7] A general peace was proclaimed, the crusade was summoned, and the decisions already given in the affairs of England, the Empire, and the Midi were published. The *Te Deum* and the papal blessing with a relic of the true cross closed the Council.

The union with the Eastern Church, which Innocent believed had been achieved by the establishing of the Latin Empire, was indirectly ratified by canons 4 and 5.[8] The constitution *Ad liberandam* (canon 71) contained the planning of the crusade. First came the assessment of a general three-years' crusade tax, then the commission to the bishops to preach the expedition and induce the princes to agree to a four-years' armistice. There followed the laying of an embargo on commerce in war materials and the prohibition of any commerce at all with Islamic states for the next four years. No particular military enterprise, not even the continuation of the *Reconquista* in Portugal, was to interfere with the collective effort. The departure was set for 1 June 1217, and for this purpose everyone was to assemble at Brindisi in South Italy or at Messina in Sicily; hence Venice was excluded. No previous crusade had been planned in so practical a manner or sketched on so broad a basis.[9] What the Council made obligatory on all bishops Innocent III intended to realize in his fervent zeal, and in this preoccupation he died at Perugia.

---

[6] In addition to the report of Richard of San Germano, *Chronica priora,* ed. A. Gaudenzi (Naples 1888), 90–94, see now especially the Giessen fragment, edd. S. Kuttner and A. García y García, "A New Eyewitness Account of the Fourth Lateran Council," *Tr,* 20 (1964), 115–78 (text, 123–29).

[7] The latest edition of the conciliar decrees is in *COD* (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1962) 203–47, with critical introduction and the most important bibliography.

[8] Canon 9 ("De diversis ritibus in eadem fide") and canon 14 must also be considered. In canon 14 it must have been tacitly assumed that the less severe rule of celibacy operating in the Eastern Church was recognized: "qui autem secundum regionis suae morem non ab-

The other conciliar constitutions had to do with the purity of the faith and the renewal of ecclesiastical discipline. The introductory profession of faith (canon 1) repeated, almost *verbatim,* the formula which in 1210 Bernard Primus had had to swear to on behalf of himself and his adherents, the Poor Men of Lombardy; but added to it were some elements from the profession taken by Durandus of Huesca. Much space was occupied by the doctrine of the Eucharist and of the official priesthood, and into this was inserted the term *transsubstantiatio,* coined by the early scholastics. Also contained in this profession was the orthodox doctrine of baptism, penance, and matrimony. In the complementary second canon the Council rejected the ideas of Joachim of Fiore on the Trinity and the heresy of Amaury of Bène. And finally canon 3 condemned all heresies and formulated measures against them, especially stressing the collaboration of the spiritual and temporal powers for their suppression. Canon 3 included nothing new; it was merely a statement of the procedure that had developed in the Midi. The episcopal Inquisition, already introduced and in operation, was now declared obligatory for the whole Church.

In anlyzing the Council's legislation reference has been made to the preparatory work, and especially to the third of the celebrated five collections of decretals which preceded Gregory IX's *Liber Extra.* Commissioned by the Pope, *Magister* Peter of Benevento had assembled them in 1209, and Innocent sent them to Bologna for use in academic instruction. The entire experience of his long pontificate was incorporated into the conciliar decrees, which in many respects took up and further developed the synodal decisions of the twelfth century.

---

dicarunt copulam coniugalem, si lapsi fuerint, gravius puniantur, cum legitimo matrimonio possint uti" (*COD,* 218, footnotes 24–26).

[9] On the preparations for the Fifth Crusade *cf.* T. C. Van Cleve, "The Fifth Crusade," K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades,* II (1962), 377–428 (especially 377–84).

The guide-lines of the conciliar legislation affected clergy, religious, and laity, and the Church's administration and law. The responsibility of the episcopate was often stressed, especially in regard to synods, visitations, preaching, the education of priests, and the conferring of benefices. The law on ecclesiastical elections obtained its definitive regulation, whereby the role of the chapters was strengthened. Some decrees gave detailed demands in the matter of the moral discipline of the clergy. These conciliar desires for improvement applied also to monks. The institution of general chapters, which had proved their worth in the Cistercian Order, was recommended to them. The duty of reform and visitation of non-exempt monasteries was made incumbent on the bishops and specifically insisted upon. New orders and rules were rejected, but the practice of succeeding Popes was to prove that this was not regarded as an absolute prohibition.

The imposition on all Christians of the obligation of annual confession, which included a stricter inculcation of the seal, and of Easter communion are among the best known regulations of the Council.[10] The spiritual care of the sick was impressed on physicians as a duty taking precedence over their medical treatment; it was enjoined under strict sanctions, apparently against possible scruples in the physicians.

Opposing the swelling flood of appeals to Rome, the Council referred energetically to the normal juridical procedure and added clarifications on ecclesiastical processes. The important forty-second canon supplied a clear distinction of ecclesiastical and secular courts. And ecclesiastical courts were warned against extending their competence at the cost of the proper secular authorities.

In its nineteenth canon the Third Lateran Council had already demanded the immunity of the clergy in the cities from taxation, but it had urged them to make voluntary contributions in time of need to the burdens of their city. This was now confirmed in canon 46, but a previous consultation of the ecclesiastical authorities was made a necessary condition. Measures taken by excommunicated urban officials were declared null and void in this context.

In regard to matrimony, the Council limited the impediments of consanguinity and affinity, renewed the prohibition of clandestine marriages, and introduced the obligation of the banns.

The legislation on tithes was completed by references to the existing privileges of religious orders, and in this the relationship of the regular clergy and the hierarchy was more precisely defined in the sense of a strengthening of episcopal authority.

Canon 62 attacked abuses in the cult of relics and decreed that new relics could be exposed for veneration only with the express consent of the Holy See. Other decrees sought to put a stop to simony, which was still practised, and attacked the clerical vice of avarice. The concluding decrees, which took cognizance of the practice of usury[11] by Jews and prescribed for them a special dress, must be viewed in a certain connection with the previous mention of avarice. This regulation and the declaration of the Jews' second-class citizenship were not innovations of the Council.[12] They are understandable in the climate of preparation for the crusade. Racial grounds were not the determining causes of them; rather they were probably intended to prevent Christians from having social contacts with Jews because of a lack of knowledge of the difference of religion. Muslims in Christian lands were subject to similar prescriptions. Hence, there was question of a pastoral measure.[13]

---

[10] P. Browe, *Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1940).

While the Council's political decisions were not of lasting importance and soon appeared out of date because of events, its legislation persisted because it was taken into the general law of the Church. A vigorous synodal activity, instituted everywhere right after the Council, contributed to this. More important still was the adoption of fifty-nine of the seventy decrees into the law book of Gregory IX. Lateran IV holds the first place after Trent in the conciliar sources of the modern *Codex Iuris Canonici.*

CHAPTER 23

The Mendicant Orders

Throughout his pontificate Innocent III had exerted himself for a renewal of the monastic life in the Church. Not only had the Benedictine abbeys fallen, economically and religiously, into a threatening crisis, but even the reform orders of the twelfth century, Cistercians and canons regular, seemed to have succumbed to a similar loss of spiritual substance. The Pope appealed to the orders themselves, commissioned the episcopate to undertake visitations, and had his legates investigate and try to deal with emergencies. At the same time Innocent encouraged new foundations, such as the Hospitallers of Guy of Montpellier and the order established by John of Matha for the exchange of captives between Islam and the Christian nations. Furthermore, the Teutonic Knights obtained papal confirmation on 19 February 1199.

---

[11] On the problem of usury *cf.* T. P. McLaughlin, "The Teaching of the Canonists on Usury (XII, XIII and XIV Centuries)," *MS*, 1 (1939), 81–147, 2 (1940).

[12] *Cf.* the important work by S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (Philadelphia 1933).

[13] *Cf.* H. Tillmann, *Innocenz III.*, 163.

Above all, however, Innocent sought prudently to devote to the service of the Church the gift for founding communities that was manifesting itself in many areas of France and Italy in the poverty movement of his age, notably among heretical groups. He succeeded to a degree in winning back the Humiliati of Lombardy; likewise, parts of the Waldensian movement were reincorporated into the unity of the Church under Durandus of Huesca in Spain.

To this total context belong the beginnings of the two great mendicant orders, foundations which in the course of the thirteenth century were the models for other religious foundations. It should cause no surprise that both had their origin where the most dangerous centres of the crisis were found, in the Midi and Central Italy. However, contact with heresy was far more decisive for Saint Dominic than was a grasp of the corresponding phenomena in the environment of his Umbrian homeland for Saint Francis.[1]

On the one hand they attested the uninterrupted *élan* of the movement for apostolic poverty. On the other, they demonstrated the interdependence of ecclesiastical and heretical forms within this impulse toward the realization of the *vita apostolica.*

The Dominicans

The very title "Order of Preachers" indicates the origin and aim of the Dominican friars. Dominic Guzmán, born around 1170 at Caleruega in Old Castile, had, as subprior of the cathedral chapter of canons regular of Osma, accompanied his Bishop, Diego, on journeys to Denmark and Rome. Both men, apostolic in spirit and theologically well grounded, had become acquainted in the Midi with the Cathari movement, so full of peril for the Church. At first, it is true, at Rome in 1206 they asked Pope Innocent III for permission to undertake missionary work among the Cumans in Hungary, but he directed their attention to the more urgent tasks in the Midi. Diego of Osma returned home in 1207 and died there the same year. Dominic, joined by a few companions, at first took charge of the house established at Prouille by Diego for converted women, who not only continued there the common life of pious poverty which they had already followed among the Cathari, but also interested themselves thereafter in the education of girls. This tactic of taking over from the enemy his own instrument, so to speak, of grasping his own spiritual concerns and making them one's own, and, like him, of proclaiming *verbo et exemplo* the Lord's glad tidings, became the unique characteristic of the Dominican institute. Prouille[2] had to serve also as the temporary lodging of the itinerant preachers, Dominic and his companions, until they could establish a house of their own near Saint-Romain at Toulouse under Bishop Foulque. The Bishop appointed them as diocesan preachers but this did not measure up to the original *élan* of Saint Dominic, and so the Bishop and the preachers sought to obtain at Rome confirmation and encouragement of the incipient religious community from the Pope. Out of regard for canon 13 of the Fourth Lateran Council, just concluded, Innocent got them to accept the Augustinian rule and then gave the brotherhood the requested confirmation. However, official confirmation came only from Honorius III in bulls of 22 December 1216 and 21 January 1217. The first general chapter of the new order, held in Bologna at Pentecost 1220, drew up a constitution which could be supplemented and made definitive during the generalships of Raymond of Peñaforte (1241) and Humbert of Romans (1259).

---

[1] *Cf.* K. Esser, "Franziskus von Assisi und die Katharer seiner Zeit," *AFrH,* 51 (1958), 225–64; J. Toussaert, *Antonius von Padua* (Cologne 1967), 360–63.

Dominic died at Bologna on 6 August 1221. Following the first papal confirmation he had sent friars from Toulouse to Paris and Spain, thereby demonstrating his intention of now having his diocesan missionaries become preachers for the Universal Church. In the last years of his life he was tireless in his journeys from country to country in order everywhere to provide for the rapidly spreading order, which was soon in a position to found houses in Italy, Germany, and England, to acquire experience, to represent the needs of the home as well as of the foreign mission, to acclimatize the order at the universities, especially at Paris and Bologna. This last was of particular importance for Dominic. From his very first encounter with the Cathari of the Midi it had been clear to him that a solid theological formation was essential for preaching, not only for apologetics but for catechesis within the Catholic fold. The lay preacher movement, which so often ended up in heretical side-roads, had, of course, made known the need of the word of God among the faithful, but, as unsupervised proclamation, it had at the same time shown only too vividly the necessity of a clear grasp of dogmatic and moral theology in the preacher. The declared intention of pursuing a theological approach in the renewal of the preaching of Christian doctrine gained for Saint Dominic from the very start many companions from the university circles, as, for example, his successor in the government of the order, Blessed Jordan of Saxony (1222–37),[3] who had studied at Paris. Under Jordan the order spread to Syria and to Scotland.

---

[2] *Cf.* now especially *Saint Dominique en Languedoc (Cahiers de Franjeaux,* 1) (Toulouse 1966).

[3] The letters of Jordan of Saxony were edited by E. Bayonne, *MOP,* VII, German translation by J. Mubauer (Vechta 1927); biography by H. C. Scheeben (Vechta 1937).

The constitution stressed the poverty of both the individual and the community. It adopted traditional elements from the congregations of canons regular, above all the Premonstratensians, and was oriented also to the monastic life, especially the Cistercian. New, however, was the requirement of living on alms; fixed revenues and landed property were rejected. The church building was to be as unpretentious as among the early Cistercians. The first houses were founded in university cities and in episcopal and commercial cities. Here were found the hoped for fields for attracting recruits, for the care of souls, for study, and also for livelihood. Here were held the annual general chapters, by turns in all countries where the friars settled. The general chapter, apparently derived from the Cistercian model, which Innocent III had made of obligation for the other orders also at the Fourth Lateran Council in canon 12, was the supreme legislative authority in the order and elected the master general, whom it could also depose. The provincial superiors were likewise elected by the provincial chapters; in regard to them the master general had only the right of confirmation. From 1228 there were provinces in Spain, Provence, France, Lombardy, Rome, Germany, England, Hungary, the Holy Land, Greece, Poland, and Scandinavia. To the general chapter and the provincial chapters pertained the function of supervising the superiors elected by them. Hence there existed a unique and, as was to appear, a very effective combination of monarchical and democratic elements in the overall construction of the organization.

The central role of preaching in the order's program caused the legislative authority to demand for every house a lecturer in theology and a director of studies, to establish in every province a *studium generale,* and finally to have the best recruits formed at Saint-Jacques in Paris. The strict subordination to the Pope — the master general resided in Rome — and to the national episcopates was to serve the work of preaching and assured to the founding generations a far-reaching support by the local bishops and to preaching a secure place within the Church. Their strict mode of life, their poverty, fasting, abstinence, and personal penance gained for the Friars Preachers the notice of the faithful and a steadily growing number of vocations, above all in the university circles and the upper middle class.

Dominic clearly stamped his order with the traits of his own character. He lived according to "the rule of the Apostles" and was a "man of the Gospel in the footsteps of his Redeemer," as Gregory IX said in 1234 in the bull of canonization. He wanted not only to realize this evangelical outlook in his own life but also, as a "man of the Church," to establish institutionally in her the forms of the apostolic life. He knew the canon law and accepted the Pope's universal directing authority. For Dominic the Gospel and the hierarchical Church belonged together. He joined a charming humanity with a keen intellectuality, a strict asceticism of prayer and fidelity to his chosen rule with a capacity for objective, individual decision corresponding to the many-faceted apostolate. The "born preacher" forever remained the model for his brothers as well as the theologically trained disputant with heretics and the apostle faithful till the end of his life to the desire to win pagans, the Cumans, for Christ.

Under the energetic leadership of his first successors, Jordan of Saxony (1222–37), Raymond of Peñaforte (1238–40), John the German (1241–52), Humbert of Romans (1254–63),[4] the order experienced a rapid and astounding rise. At the end of the thirteenth century there were 557 convents in eighteen provinces and the number of members amounted to about 15,000. Under Humbert of Romans the constitution acquired its definitive form, a framework for the further legislative development of the order, which did not need to be changed until 1924. By 1259 a proper liturgy, within the framework of the Roman liturgical tradition, was drafted.

While at first the friars carried on a missionary apostolate among the people in a close collaboration with the bishops and the parochial clergy, from 1240 on the convents themselves appeared as pastoral centres, with preaching, administration of the Sacraments, the confraternity system, and so forth. The Popes, notably Gregory IX and Innocent IV, lavished rich privileges on the order, drew many of their advisers from it — one thinks of Raymond of Peñaforte and Gregory IX, — and made use especially of Dominicans in constructing the Inquisition.

Service on the tribunal of the Inquisition did not exclude discussions in controversial theology or preaching; on the contrary, it fostered theological scholarship. The new order's special achievement lay in this field of education, university, and theological literature. The convents at Paris, Orléans, Bologna, Cologne, and Oxford especially lodged the leading theologians of the century. Dominican missionary ardour found fields in Prussia, the Holy Land, Spain, and North Africa. In Greece it was directed, in accord with the mind of the Popes, to the problem of reunion with the Orthodox Church. Missions to the Cumans and Mongols are to be noted.

The Second Order of Saint Dominic,[5] originating at Prouille and at San Sisto in Rome, became the model for other establishments of communities of women. The constitutions of San Sisto were, alongside the rule of the Cistercian nuns, decisive for the Order of the "Penitents of

---

[4] K. Michel, *Das opus tripartitum des Humbert von Romans* (Graz, 2nd ed., 1926); *Opera de vita regulari,* ed. J. J. Berthier, 2 vols. (Rome 1888 f.); biography by F. Heintke (Berlin 1933).

[5] J. Vesely, *Il secondo Ordine di S. Domenico* (Bologna 1943); H. Wilms, *Geschichte der deutschen Dominikanerinnen* (Dülmen 1920).

Saint Mary Magdalene,"[6] which spread quickly, especially in Germany. Its founder, at the urging of the Cistercian Cardinal Conrad of Urach, was the canon Rudolf of Hildesheim (1226–27).

The Third Order of Brothers and Sisters of Penance of Saint Dominic grew out of a lay brotherhood of the *Militia Christi.*[7]

The Franciscans

Fed by similar sources and running its course before the same historical background, but obtaining its inspiration from an even more powerfully charismatic personality, the poverty and preaching movement of the Friars Minor of Saint Francis made its appearance at the same time as did that of the Friars Preachers.

Francis of Assisi, born around 1181–82, was the son of a well-to-do cloth merchant, Peter Bernardone, and of Pica, daughter of a respected French family. Baptized John, he was called "Francesco" by his father. He was of a sensitive nature, of more than average intelligence, endowed with intuition, gifted musically, open, and generous. He obtained the ordinary education of the day in the city school of Assisi. A rather long captivity due to the war between Assisi and Perugia in 1202 and a subsequent illness brought about a profound change in his religious development, the stages of which cannot easily be pinpointed. It was marked by an experience of the majesty of God the Father, by an awakening concern for the deterioration of the Church, concretely realized by the rebuilding of decayed chapels, and by the distress of the poor and the sick, especially the lepers, in the environs of wealthy Assisi. Conflict with his father in 1206–07 ended with his being disinherited. Francis placed himself as a poor man under the protection of the Bishop. To his devotion to poverty was added the desire for the apostolate, aroused by reading Matthew 10:5–16, the account of the mission of the twelve Apostles. The imitating of the Lord — poor, preaching, aiding — became the life program of Saint Francis.

Companions joined him from Assisi; they went in twos through the cities and countryside, preaching the good news. The bishops' reserve in regard to a movement so similar to the heretical lay preaching could be overcome only by papal approval. Francis, who had already visited Rome as a pilgrim in 1206, was able to obtain a verbal confirmation of his first rule from Innocent III through the good offices of the Bishop of Assisi, who was in residence there, and of Cardinal John Colonna. It is not extant and was probably only a brief collection of scriptural passages. The Pope took the friars under the jurisdiction of the Church by giving them the tonsure, and Francis himself was ordained a deacon. The brothers called themselves Friars Minor and lived part of the time at the Portiuncula, where Clare of Assisi, foundress of the Second Order, or Poor Clares,[8] also turned up with her sister Agnes in 1212. The movement was everywhere well received and the number of friars grew rapidly. Francis, who also envisaged the preaching of the word to non-Christians, left for the East in 1212 but got only as far as Dalmatia. He wanted to go to North Africa but fell sick in Spain around 1213–15, and finally joined the Fifth Crusade in 1219. He contrived to preach in person before the Sultan al-Kamil, who was not converted, it is true, but allowed Francis to preach in his lands. The latter went to Palestine before returning to Italy, probably in the fall of 1220.

---

[6] *Heimbucher,* 3rd ed., 646–48; H. Grotofend, "Die büssenden Schwestern der heiligen Maria Magdalena in Deutschland," *Mitt. des Vereins für Geschichte und Altertumskunde Frankfurt am Main,* 6 (1881), 301–16; A. Simón, *L'ordre des Pénitentes de Ste-Marie-Madeleine en Allemagne* (Fribourg 1918); J. Schuck, *Die Reuerinnen* (Paderborn 1927); O. Decker, *Die Stellung des Predigerordens zu den Dominikanerinnen* (Vechta and Leipzig 1935).

[7] *Cf.* especially the studies by G. Meersseman, "Études sur les anciennes confréries dominicaines," *AFP,* 20–23 (1950–53) (bibliography for this chapter); P. Mandonnet, *Les Règles et le gouvernement du l'Ordre de Paenitentia au XIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1902).

There awaited him the need to give an organization to his now very large brotherhood, but, quite unlike Saint Dominic, he lacked all planning and organizational ability. The Curia interested itself in the matter. The so-called Chapter of Mats in 1221, with more than 3,000 participants, promulgated the new second rule, likewise a collection of scriptural passages in twenty-four chapters. It is extant and is known as the *regula non bullata*. It was only the *Regula bullata* of 1223, more strictly juristic in character, that became the real fundamental law of the new order. Cardinal Ugolino of Ostia had played a decisive role in drawing it up. It was incorporated in its entirety into Honorius III's bull of confirmation of 29 November 1223. The home and foreign mission was mentioned as the order's chief goal, and the poverty of the individual and of the communities, including a strict prohibition of accepting money, was sternly demanded. The Chapter of Mats sent out friars to all countries of Europe.

Francis himself had already turned over the direction of the friars to one of his first companions, Peter Catanii, had asked the Pope to give the order a Cardinal Protector, and had obtained one in Ugolino of Ostia. While the *regula non bullata* knew nothing of a Cardinal Protector, the *regula bullata* required one. Hence the institution must have been projected between 1221 and 1223. Peter Catanii died on 10 March 1221 and was succeeded by Elias of Cortona. In the same year Francis founded the Third

---

[8] E. Wauer, *Entstehung und Ausbreitung des Klarissenordens* (Leipzig 1906); J. Ancelet-Hustache, *Les Clarisses* (Paris 1924); *Santa Chiara d'Assisi, Studi e Cronaca del VII Centenario* (Perugia 1954); biographies of Saint Clare by F. Casolini (Assisi 1953) and E. Schneider (Paris 1959).

Order,[9] a community of lay persons, even married, who sought to realize the Franciscan ideal of life outside a religious order.

After his return from the East, Francis had dissolved the house of studies which had been founded at Bologna. The Cardinal Protector intervened for its restoration and Francis yielded, even naming its first lecturer, Anthony of Padua.[10] The necessity of theological studies for a fruitful preaching apostolate could not have remained unknown to him, above all as more and more priests were joining the order. The beginnings proper to a trend of the apostolic lay movement seemed to have been left behind.

Francis stayed at Greccio until April 1224 and at Pentecost took part in the general chapter at which the *regula bullata* was promulgated. Then, with a few companions he withdrew to Monte Alverno for a life of prayer, penance, and contemplation, and there on 14 September 1224 he received the stigmata. Much sickness plagued his poor body. In particular he had contracted a serious malady of the eyes in the East. He had it treated, but in vain, at Rieti on the suggestion of Cardinal Ugolino and at Siena at the command of Brother Elias. From February 1226 he stayed at Assisi, where he was the Bishop's guest. He was unable to take part in the Pentecost Chapter of 1226; instead, in August of that year he wrote his "testament," which again inculcated the strictest poverty and, above all, obedience to the Roman Church. Before his death on 3 October 1226 he was able to make peace between the Bishop and the municipal council of Assisi and to complete his celebrated "Canticle of the Sun." He died in a hut near the Portiuncula and was buried in the church of San Giorgio. Pope Gregory IX, the former Cardinal Ugolino, canonized him less than two years later, on 29 July 1228. He found his last resting place in the lower church of the Assisi basilica. After previously fruitless efforts, it could be identified under Pius VII in 1818.

The figure of the *Poverello* interested his own and later ages much more than did that of Dominic, who withdrew far more decidedly behind his work. Whereas the Dominican Order was already an institution when Dominic died, the Franciscan remained even after 1226 still a sort of movement. Francis was just not an organizer, but, according to Dante, "he rose on the world like a sun." He was a mystic, poet, singer, man of prayer, but no canonist, theologian, or controversialist. Nor was he a fool, as has been supposed, but an intelligent, shrewd, and deeply religious man, who knew his limitations and hence so early desired the cooperation of the Curia. The Cardinal Protector was not forced on him; he himself asked for this "gubernator, protector et corrector." In his testament Francis declared expressly that it was the Cardinal Protector's duty, among other things, to keep from the order any shadow of heresy. At the same time he fulfilled the function of representing the order at the Curia and to the hierarchy and of smoothing its path in the Church. Such a notion hardly reveals in Francis any ignorance of the world. And the sources display much evidence of a good knowledge of men in the seraphic saint, even if this did not amount to genius. When in 1219 he travelled to the East he appointed as vicars Matthew of Narni and Gregory of Naples, who in his absence introduced new rules and instituted the house of studies at Bologna. Had Francis not perceived their attitude earlier? When he abandoned the actual direction of the order, Peter Catanii and then Elias of Cortona became his vicars general. Even if the image of Elias has been deformed by later polemics, there is still a puzzle with regard to the choice of this particular man, who likewise received the final blessing of the dying saint. Today, it is true, research transfers the activity of Elias that was injurious to the order to the period after his being voted out of office at the Chapter of 1227, which made, not him, but John Parenti the minister general, or successor of Saint Francis.[11]

---

[9] The Third Order originated in brotherhoods which united under the influence of St. Francis. Probably at Florence or Bologna Cardinal Ugolino of Ostia, perhaps after consultation with Francis or at least with recourse to an already existing version, published the official rule under the title *Memoriale propositi fratrum et sororum de paenitentia in domibus propriis existentium.* In a revised form it was confirmed by Nicholas IV in 1289. *Cf.* F. van den Borne, *Die Anfänge des franziskanischen Dritten Ordens* (Münster 1925); *idem, LThK,* IX (2nd ed., 1964), 1375 f.

[10] See now the critical monograph by J. Toussaert, *Antonius von Padua* (Cologne 1967), 348–54.

It was only then that those trends[12] which determined the destiny of the order after 1226 began to show themselves more clearly. The zealots for poverty defended the literal observance of the rule, appealing especially to the testament of the saint. In response to inquiries Gregory IX in 1230 declared that the testament possessed no legal standing. From this trend were later to spring the Spirituals.

Especially during his time as minister general (1232–39), Elias of Cortona advocated assimilation to other orders, as the model of the Dominican Order permanently gained influence in the course of the years, for example, in the assurance of the organization through the position of the minister general and in the order's turning to the cultivation of scholarship.

The middle party was represented by Anthony of Padua, Bonaventure, John Pecham, and others, who, while maintaining the original ideals so far as possible, demanded and carried through an accommodation to changing conditions of the time. The tensions among these tendencies were at first not very severe and did not become aggravated until after 1250, to develop into a serious crisis for the entire order at the beginning of the fourteenth century.

---

[11] The problem of Elias was most recently presented by R. B. Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government* (Elias to Bonaventure) (Cambridge 1959).

[12] M. D. Lambert has now made a careful study dealing with the development of the various notions of poverty held by the early Franciscans: *Franciscan Poverty, The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order (1210–1323)* (London 1961).

Until then the Friars Minor had been able to spread everywhere in the Church — to Ireland, Scotland, Scandinavia, Syria, the Holy Land — so that by 1300 they must be reckoned as having from 30,000 to 40,000 members. Due to the close ties which Francis, like Dominic, maintained from the start with the Roman Curia, the order's influence was from the beginning geared to the Universal Church. Freedom of movement, contrary to the *stabilitas loci* hitherto cultivated by the old orders, enabled all the chief convents to have an international composition. A lively exchange from country to country, in all offices of the order and for all sorts of missions, remained characteristic. The Franciscan school, especially at Oxford and Paris, was soon able to serve theological scholarship on an equal footing with the Dominican.

Naturally, the Friars Minor displayed their chief influence in the ministry of the word (popular and crusade preaching) and of the Sacraments (confession) and in fostering popular devotions centring on the Lord's Incarnation and Passion. They preached in cities, soon in their own churches, and, like Francis, in the country as itinerant preachers. The thirteenth century especially has transmitted great names: in Italy Anthony of Padua and Bonaventure of Jesi, in France Hugh of Digne and Odo Rigaldus, in Germany Conrad of Saxony and Berthold of Regensburg.

Following both the example and the desire of Saint Francis, the Friars Minor could especially take part as pioneers in the work of evangelizing pagans. As Francis, preaching before the Sultan, aspired to prepare a change from the crusade as military offensive and defense of Christian positions to a Way of the Cross as a peaceful concern for the faith of non-Christian peoples, so too the Friars Minor went as preachers to North Africa, Syria, and Palestine to the Muslims, and, under a papal mandate, to the Mongols — John of Piano di Carpine (1245–47), William of Ruysbroeck (1253–55), and John of Montecorvino (1294).[13]

For the Holy See they, like the Dominicans, meant an important assistance in Church reform, in the struggle against heresy, and in politics, such as the undertaking of embassies and interventions on behalf of peace.

Other Mendicant Orders

The two orders just discussed set the pattern for other foundations in the course of the century. In 1247 Innocent IV included the Carmelites among the mendicant orders. Simon Stock became their first general (1247–65). But their origins go back to the twelfth century, to a hermit colony, which

[13] *Cf.* Chapter 29.

the crusader, Berthold of Calabria (d. 1195), had instituted on Mount Carmel in 1185. From the Patriarch Albert of Jerusalem they had received in 1207–09 a strictly contemplative rule, which Honorius III confirmed in 1226. When, hard pressed by Islam, they emigrated to Cyprus, Sicily, France, and England and from 1238 reorganized themselves as cenobites, it was natural to give them a constitution corresponding to that of the mendicant orders.

The Order of Hermits of Saint Augustine likewise developed out of eremitical groups. First, Innocent IV in 1243 united the hermits living in Tuscany, then in 1256 Alexander IV brought all the others into one community, the Order of Hermits of Saint Augustine. But the Williamite Order, originating in the twelfth century, withdrew from the union in 1266. Peter Nolasco (d. 1256) and the Dominican general, Raymond of Peñaforte (d. 1275), were the founders of the Order of Mercedarians, which, beginning at Barcelona in 1222 as a union of pious laymen, concerned itself, like the Trinitarians, to arrange exchanges of captives. Under King James I of Aragón it became a military religious order, which Gregory IX confirmed as such in 1235. It could not be regarded as a mendicant order until 1318, when John XXII decided that only a priest might be its superior general; the knights withdrew and the order assumed an exclusively religious character.

In 1233 there appeared at Florence the Order of Servants of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or Servites. It too originated in a lay brotherhood of merchants and urban patricians. It adopted the Augustinian rule in 1240 and in 1255 was confirmed by Alexander IV, but it did not rank as a mendicant order until Martin V declared it one in 1424. The fifth superior general, Philip Benizi (d. 1285), founded a Second Order. In addition, there were tertiaries, Mantellates, living a religious life, who went back to Saint Juliana Falconieri (d. 1341). They devoted themselves especially to the care of the sick.

Summary

The mendicant orders decisively stamped the ecclesiastical and religious life of the thirteenth century, certainly more powerfully than did the reform orders of the twelfth century in their day. On the one hand, by virtue of the centralization of their organization, which was tempered by the relative autonomy of the several provinces, and, on the other hand, by the freedom of movement of their personnel on the international plane, and, especially in the case of the Friars Minor, their broad pastoral contacts with all strata of society, above all in the cities, they presented the papacy with incomparable resources for the government of the Church — many bishops and cardinals and even Popes came from their ranks as early as the thirteenth century — for the renewal of popular piety, especially through the influence of the three types of orders which they had created, and for the growth of theological scholarship, whose most important representatives at all universities were soon Dominicans and Franciscans, from Alexander of Hales to Bonaventure and Duns Scotus, from Hugh of Saint-Cher to Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. They accomplished very much, especially the Friars Preachers, in the struggle against heresy through the Inquisition and in the repeated efforts to reunite the Eastern and Western Churches. The first phase of the history of the world mission was determined by them. Ecclesiastical literature was enriched by them, with, to some extent, immortal works in all fields: homiletics, catechesis, apologetics, philosophy, theology, historiography, exegesis, liturgy, poetry.

While it is true that their integration into university life and the pastoral ministry was not achieved without friction, especially at Paris between 1250 and 1260, still the main difficulties could be surmounted, at least in principle, by papal intervention. The human shadows could in this first century of their history be steadily eclipsed by the uncontested brilliance of their accomplishments.

CHAPTER 24

The Medieval Western Hospital

In the early Middle Ages it was the canons and monks who had received the poor and the sick, the pilgrim and the traveller into their houses and cared for them. In these *hospites* was to be seen and served Christ himself, according to the prescriptions of rule and constitution. Alongside the *opus Dei* in worship, work, and self-sanctification — the *vita contemplativa* — the service of guests and the infirm had, it is true, only a secondary significance and was scarcely anywhere regarded as a central preoccupation of religious communities.

A change occurred in the age of the Gregorian reform, when there began a more active participation by the laity in the public life of the Church. Prominent among the motives of the *vita apostolica* was the example of Christ as healer and helper: the *pauperes Christi* wanted to become poor in order to succour others in their necessities. At the same time the crusades produced homelessness, sickness, physical disability, and poverty wherever they played a role, at home and abroad. *Caritas* in the hitherto familiar form was in no position to provide ample assistance in such massive need, and so new forms had to be found for dealing effectively with it.

One such form was the renewed hospital service in West and East under the auspices of chapters and monasteries, above all in cities and along pilgrimage routes. The source of this renewal in the West was, among other factors, the Augustinian rule followed by the canons regular, including the cathedral chapters. Especially among the Premonstratensians it produced a vigorous impact on hospital work.[1]

In the cities were formed hospital confraternities of men and women, at first in already available hospitals and usually connected with a chapter or monastery. However, there soon appeared a tendency to become autonomous, and this was facilitated by the expansion or transfer of the hospital. The confraternities were frequently inclined to adopt a monastic organization, and from such confraternity hospitals there developed foundations of Augustinian canons or independent monasteries of nuns.

Alongside this process in the thirteenth century, whereby confraternities became religious orders, in the cities there occurred also the so-called "communalization" of the confraternity hospital,[2] in the case of both civic foundations and already existing religious houses. Hospital service thereby became all the more urgent, when transformation into a religious order caused it to be neglected.

From the twelfth century hospitals directed by confraternities were encountered in all countries of the West in a relatively ample distribution that was favoured by the urban development then getting under way. They were even established wherever cities appeared in the colonial and missionary area beyond the Elbe by Cistercians, Premonstratensians, and the Teutonic Knights. The climax of the new foundations was achieved by the middle of the thirteenth century.

Founders of hospitals came from all classes of Christian society. The bishops for the most part revived and enlarged the old hospitals of their territory. Secular lords of the most varied strata, from kings to *ministeriales,* took part chiefly in new foundations. A founder often joined his institution as a hospital brother. Clerical or lay confraternities were formed for the administration of existing hospitals, and from them new orders sometimes developed: the military and the non-military orders of this epoch.

The Military Hospital Orders

The Hospitallers and the Templars were treated in the previous volume. Far clearer is the hospital origin of the Teutonic Knights, who proceeded from the hospital erected by citizens of Bremen and Lübeck during the siege of Acre in 1189–90. Even more impressive are the beginnings of the

---

[1] N. Backmund, "Prämonstratenser," *LThK,* VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 638–94: "... die caritative Tätigkeit des Ordens im MA war bedeutend, fast alle Stifte unterhielten Spitäler ... auch eine wahre Kette von Pilgerhospitälern in Südfrankreich und Spanien" (691).

[2] *Cf.* also S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital,* I, 196–277.

Order of Lazarus from a leprosary at Jerusalem in 1120. This hospital association likewise followed the Augustinian rule, but it did not become a military order, on the model of the others, until the thirteenth century. Since in the course of time these institutes devoted themselves especially to military service, their original hospital apostolate yielded often enough to military and economic preoccupations without, however, being entirely given up.

In their very title the Hospitallers maintained a constant connection with their original aim, and after their transformation into a military order their principal house at Jerusalem remained for a while dedicated to the care of the infirm and the poor. Their rapidly appearing houses in the West served rather for the military and economic maintenance of their warfare in the East than for the direction and growth of hospitals. Thus, for example, only a few hospitals can be discovered among their numerous German houses, but these were busy as hospices. While the competition of the Teutonic Order in the thirteenth century may be attributed in Germany to the lack of hospitals among the Hospitallers, the fact remains that the claims of the East on the homeland demanded a pooling of all available financial means with the result that there were far-reaching restrictions on the strictly charitable apostolate.

The Teutonic Order, even after its removal to the West, always maintained the care of the infirm. In fact, its first decades, up to 1230 when it assumed its fateful task in Prussia, stood expressly under the auspices of hospital work in regard to gifts, undertakings, and foundations. Care of the sick was an essential element in its constitution. This ordered that a permanent hospital should be established at the principal house, but elsewhere only if the grand master and the chapter should so decide. It knew those *hospitalia oblata,* which marked the path of its advance into Germany, and subjected them to the local commandant. Houses without hospitals might be erected as such only with the special permission of the grand master. As a matter of fact, in Germany and later in its own principality the Teutonic Order accomplished far more in the sphere of public assistance than did the other military hospital orders.[3]

Of these others, the Order of Lazarus was able to establish itself in Europe only later, after its expulsion from Syria in 1253, especially in France, where the grand master settled at Boigny near Orléans, in England, Scotland, Italy, Switzerland, Hungary, and Germany. It continued faithful to its origin in so far as it devoted itself above all to the care of lepers. In 1266 Clement IV granted it a monopoly of this apostolate, which, however, could not really be maintained in view of the wide spread of this disease.[4]

---

[3] Rule of the order, 4–6 (*Die Statuten des Deutschen Ordens nach den ältesten Handschriften,* ed. by M. Perlbach [Halle 1890], 31–34): "Von den spitâlen zu haldene," "Wie man die siechen in die spitâl entphâhe," "Wie man der sîchen phlegen sule in den spîtâlen." *Cf.* also P. G. Thielen, *Die Verwaltung des Ordensstaates Preussen* (Cologne and Graz 1965), 74 f. (Der Oberstspittler: obirster spittaler, summus hospitalarius). "The order's example was decisive also for the urban hospital system" (Thielen, *op. cit.*, 75, footnote 20).

The Non-Military Hospital Orders

At the close of the eleventh century there appeared in the Midi the Hospital Order of Saint Anthony at the church of La Motte-des-Bois at Saint-Didier. Until 1297 its hospital confraternity had to work in dependence on the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Pierre-de-Montmajeur. As early as 1247 the members had bound themselves to the Augustinian rule and adopted the organization of the Augustinian canons regular. From the beginning of the thirteenth century they spread everywhere, especially in lands of Romance speech but also in Germany: Upper Swabia, Hesse, Alsace, Mecklenburg. Their contribution, however, to strictly hospital work was relatively meagre — they had hospitals at Strasbourg, Basel, and Memmingen. Elsewhere the infirm were attended to in the houses of the order itself or by visits. On the other hand, their almsgiving was famous and made the Antonians very popular.

The Hospital Order of the Holy Spirit, which also originated in the Midi, at Montpellier, made a more significant contribution to the care of the sick. In 1198 Innocent III confirmed the order, which then had ten daughter houses and had its centre in Rome at the Hospital of Santo Spirito *in Sassia.* Its rule made the service of the poor and the infirm its first duty. Most of its houses were in Italy and France, though it had ten houses in Germany, especially South Germany, in the thirteenth century. The numerous Hospitals of the Holy Spirit found elsewhere in Germany had no connection with the order; for example, many hospitals of the Teutonic Order in Prussia were dedicated to the Holy Spirit.

The Order of Bearers of the Cross with the red star, which had grown out of a hospital association at Prague, spread in Bohemia and the adjacent countries around the middle of the thirteenth century. Like many other hospital orders, it followed the Augustinian rule. Its members made foundations also in Silesia and Poland. In the fourteenth century the apostolate to the infirm often flagged among them, as among the other hospital orders.

Finally, mention should be made here of the Order of the Brothers of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, to be distinguished from the Military Order of the Holy Sepulchre. But since the brothers did not move to the West until after the fall of Acre in 1291 — earlier they had had only isolated houses there — their activity as a hospital order belongs to the late Middle Ages.

---

[4] *Cf.* A. Englisch, *Über Leproserien in Württemberg* (typed dissertation, Frankfurt a. M. 1951); J. H. Mundy, "Hospitals and Leprosaries in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries," *Essays in Medieval Life* (New York 1955), 181–205; also, the older work by L. LeGrand, *Statuts d'hôtels-Dieu et de léproseries* (Paris 1901); also A. Viaene, *Leprozen en leprozerijen in het oude Graafschap Vlaanderen* (Bruges 1962), supplemented critically

The Municipal Hospital

The Western urban middle class, powerfully growing and aspiring to autonomy especially in the thirteenth century, made important contributions to the development of the hospital system.

The old ecclesiastical institutes proved to be inadequate *vis-à-vis* the constantly increasing city population. Consequently, the bourgeoisie itself assumed the duty of public assistance, for which it possessed amply growing means. The allotment of such means naturally implied the claim to share in or entirely to assume the direction or control of the hospital system. Thereby the bourgeoisie came into competition with the Church. However, the communalization, now beginning, of the hospital system did not involve anything such as secularization. Alongside the ever stronger pervading, in the first half of the thirteenth century, of the ecclesiastical hospitals conducted by confraternities or by religious institutes by municipal organs in the form of supervisors, there often appeared new municipal foundations. In these the connection with the Church and her apostolate to the sick was always maintained. To quote Reicke: "A hospital without accommodations for worship was unknown to the Middle Ages." The municipality assumed the secular administration and direction, the Church retained the spiritual care under the bishop's supervision.

This development got under way first of all in Italy, the Low Countries, and to a degree in France. It took place in Germany especially in the thirteenth century, though it was not completed before the fourteenth century. It can even be said that in Germany in the first half of the thirteenth century the ecclesiastical type of hospital organization was still entirely preponderant. The hospitals of confraternities and the hospital orders were to so great a degree in the public interest that even purely municipal foundations were entrusted to them for their administration.

In general, after the mid-century lay bourgeois emerged as supervisors *(procuratores)* and administrators of hospital property, especially where such institutions originated from purely municipal means. Such superintendencies possessed the future, not only in regard to hospitals but in the case of all other ecclesiastical institutes and even churches.

by H. Huyghebaert, "L'origine ecclésiastique des léproseries en Flandre et dans le Nord de la France," *RHE,* 58 (1963), 848–57. Privileges granted in favour of leproseries in the twelfth century are indicated by B. Bligny, *L'Église et les ordres religieux dans le royaume de Bourgogne aux XI^e^ et XII^e^ siècles* (Paris 1960), 433, footnote 199.

SECTION FIVE

The Contest for the Leadership of the West (1216–74)

Chapter 25

The Papacy's Victory over Frederick II

For a brief moment in world history the papacy in Innocent III had acted as the leading power responsible for order in Western Christendom; the Fourth Lateran Council could be regarded as the visible sign of this domination. With Innocent's death on 16 July 1216, the grand-scale experiment did not at once collapse, but in Frederick II the Holy See found an ever more demanding competitor, in Italy if not in the Latin West. Frederick, whose tenure of the German throne had been ratified by the Council, had not yet been crowned Emperor. Besides, at the eleventh hour, on 1 July 1216, he had promised the Pope to turn over to his son Henry, who had already been crowned King in 1212 at Innocent's bidding, the Kingdom of Sicily, whose political separation from the Empire he had guaranteed. It was now incumbent on the successors of the great Innocent to continue and bring to completion what he had achieved in this question as well as in the other policies he had formulated: crusade, reform, and fight against heresy.

Cencio Savelli, *camerlengo* of the Roman Church and compiler of the *Liber censuum,* succeeded to the papacy as Honorius III (1216–27). Aged and sickly, he was the first one to be called upon to continue and complete Innocent's work. The crusade planned and called for at the Fourth Lateran Council was an overriding task of his pontificate. To assure it he let the election of Frederick's son Henry as King of the Romans at Frankfurt in April 1220 go unchallenged and crowned Frederick Emperor in Saint Peter's on 23 November 1220. The Emperor again took the cross from the hand of Ugolino of Ostia and promised to set out on the expedition in 1221. But the settlement of the affairs of the Kingdom of Sicily, which the Emperor now turned to, probably with a view to creating an assured point of departure for the crusade, claimed more time than the brief period that had been set. Hence Honorius consented to numerous postponements, as at Veroli in April 1222 and at Ferentino in March 1223, until the Treaty of San Germano in July 1225 definitely set the term for the summer of 1227. The Emperor agreed under oath that he would regard himself as excommunicated if this date was further postponed.[1]

Meanwhile, the crusade planned by the Fourth Lateran Council had frittered away its strength in isolated operations and ended with failure in the defeat at Mansurah, for peace could be bought from Malik al-Kamil only with the evacuation of Egypt and the surrender of Damietta, the single gain in these operations. It is true that the Emperor had sent aid under Duke Louis of Bavaria and Hermann of Salza, but his intervention was fruitless. And so responsibility for the outcome was charged to him and not to the ill-starred Cardinal Legate Pelagius.[2]

Concern for the crusade also induced Honorius III to mediate between France and England. King John, dying on 19 October 1216, had left England to his minor son, Henry III, under the guidance of the Cardinal Legate Gualo, and the country was afflicted by the invading army of the heir to the French throne, Louis. Louis's defeat led to the Peace of Kingston on 12 September 1217.

Honorius had especially to continue the struggle against heresy, which had in no sense been ended by the measures of the Fourth Lateran Council but rather was spreading further, energetically and in the most varied forms. The Albigensian War flared up again. Simon de Montfort perished in the siege of Toulouse on 25 June 1218, and the Pope vainly asked King Philip II Augustus for a military intervention. Only Louis VIII, who had already intervened as heir to the throne, promised effective aid. In 1226 he conquered the Midi, except for Toulouse. The episcopate threw in its lot with the King, as did also the nobility. The Cathari among the common folk fled to the mountains, to Lombardy, and even to Aragón. However, Louis VIII died that same year on 8 November. The ending of the Albigensian War with the Peace of Paris of 12 April 1229 meant for France an extension of the power of the crown, but for the Church it in no way implied the definite overcoming of heresy in the Midi.

When Honorius III died on 18 March 1227, the preparations for the Emperor's crusade were in full swing. Gregory IX (1227–41), cousin of Innocent III and friend of Saint Francis, was, in contrast to his gentle predecessor, a high-spirited, obstinate, and energetically active personality. He took up in their true sense the program of the Innocentian ideas. His pontificate was to present the first phase of the Curia's fight against Frederick II's aspirations for hegemony, especially in Italy. The raising of the curtain came with the first excommunication of the Emperor. When in August 1227, on the date set by the Treaty of San Germano, a large crusade army, which had however been weakened by epidemics, set to sea, the Emperor became ill and returned to Pozzuoli for treatment; he had the fleet sail on without him. His excuses were not accepted by Gregory; in fact, the Pope declared on 29 September 1227 that the penalty of excommunication, as stipulated by the Treaty of San Germano, had been incurred.

---

[1] *MGConst,* II, no. 102: "Promissio de expeditione in Terram Sanctam," p. 130, 38–45.

[2] The best presentation of the crusade is now that of T. C. van Cleve, "The Fifth Crusade," in K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades,* II (Philadelphia 1962), 377–428.

Nevertheless, Frederick held to his crusade.[3] He replied to the Pope's accusing manifesto in a circular of 6 December 1227, which calmly and objectively denied Gregory's charges and declared that the Emperor would start on the crusade in May 1228. And even when on Holy Thursday, 23 March 1228, Gregory renewed the censure, this did not stop Frederick from carrying out his declaration. He left Brindisi for the voyage to the East on 28 June 1228, with forty galleys. On Cyprus he renewed the feudal sovereignty of the Empire over the island as established by the Emperor Henry VI, and on 7 September he reached Acre. After long negotiations he was able on 18 February 1229 to conclude a treaty with the Sultan al-Kamil, who had meanwhile conquered Jerusalem. By the terms of the agreement the Holy City, except for the mosque of Omar, was relinquished to the Christians, as were also Bethlehem, Nazareth, and a strip of coast from Jaffa to Acre with the pilgrim routes to Jerusalem and Nazareth. The treaty was to be in force for ten years and en visaged a mutual assistance by the contracting parties.

In Jerusalem Frederick, without any ecclesiastical solemnity, placed on his own head the crown of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, which, strictly speaking, belonged to his son Conrad through the latter's mother Yolande, the real heiress of the Kingdom. He had dispensed with any sacred rite because he was still under excommunication and was in need of an understanding with Gregory IX.

For the Pope, by no means satisfied with a renewal of the Emperor's excommunication, had had recourse to further measures. He sought to have an antiking set up in Germany, released Frederick's subjects in the Kingdom of Sicily from their oaths of loyalty, and, when Frederick's vicar in Tuscany and the Marches of Ancona, Rainald of Urslingen, Duke of Spoleto, attacked the *Patrimonium Petri,* excommunicated the latter and hastened to take military countermeasures. Papal mercenaries under John of Brienne drove out Rainald; others under Cardinal Pelagius occupied large parts of the Kingdom of Sicily.

Having returned on 10 June 1229, the Emperor was able without too much difficulty to save the situation, but without violating the frontiers of the *Patrimonium Petri.* He succeeded in entering into negotiations with

---

[3] For Frederick's crusade see T. C. van Cleve, "The Crusade of Frederick II," Setton, *op. cit.*, 429-62, and H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), 204-14.

Gregory IX; they were conducted by Hermann of Salza in Frederick's name, while Cardinal Thomas of Capua acted for the Pope. In July 1230 they ended in the Treaty of San Germano, which was ratified at Ceprano.[4] Frederick was absolved from censure on 28 August, and a meeting with Gregory IX at Anagni on 1 September sealed the reconciliation of the two universal powers. The Lombard question continued to be excluded. Frederick's extensive concessions in the Sicilian Kingdom, in addition to the Pope's military defeat and fruitless exertions in Germany, provided Gregory with the presuppositions for the Emperor's absolution. For the Emperor himself his release from the ban was an important preliminary to the realizing of his total political aspirations, which amounted basically to a unification of Italy under his rule. In this regard at least the neutrality of the Church was necessary; in any event her opposition could only mean an extremely serious hindrance.

The Peace of San Germano-Ceprano endured for almost nine years. During this period the two powers aided each other in various ways and simultaneously both found time to carry out the constructive aspect of their own administrative programs in their respective spheres. Nevertheless, they always regarded each other with suspicion, for the tension continued, despite all protestations of peace.

Frederick was successful in consolidating the basis of his power: the Sicilian Kingdom. In September 1231 he published the *Liber Augustalis,*[5] containing his Constitutions of Melfi. This grand-scale legislative work amalgamated the older constitutional and administrative law and the financial legislation of Norman origin with his own decrees. Then he consistently completed the construction of the Kingdom into a tightly organized bureaucratic state, in which only his will counted and all law proceeded from him.

In the Peace of San Germano he had exempted the Sicilian clergy from the jurisdiction of the state, freed them from general taxes, and even renounced the royal right of assent to episcopal elections — all of this obviously in opposition to the building up of a centralized state. Here, always ready, lay the centres of conflict between Emperor and Pope, for the actual exercise of Frederick's absolutist notion of the state could hardly allow so far-reaching an exemption of most important elements — there were 140 sees in the Kingdom — from his authority.

Together with the reorganization of the Sicilian Kingdom Frederick again took up the question of North Italy, the restoration of the imperial authority in Lombardy. Just as he had summoned an imperial diet to Cremona in 1226, so now he ordered one to meet at Ravenna in November 1231, and as in 1226 once again the cities resisted, whereupon Frederick laid them under the ban of the Empire. Gregory IX tried repeatedly to mediate as arbiter, but with no real success, because the demands of the two sides were mutually exclusive. With the aid of the Pope, who excommunicated the rebel King Henry in Germany for having even joined the Lombards against his father, Frederick managed to put down the revolt in the north in 1235; until his death in 1252, Henry was his father's prisoner in Apulia. From Germany the Emperor announced his campaign against the Lombards, though he knew that Gregory was seeking by diplomatic means to prevent such a war of the Empire against the cities.

---

[4] *Acta pacis ad S. Germanum anno 1230,* ed. K. Hampe (*MG Epistolae selectae,* 4) (Berlin 1926; reprint 1964).

[5] For the *Liber Augustalis cf.* the important account by E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton 1957), 97-107.

In September 1236 Frederick was able to extend the area of his rule in the eastern part of North Italy. In the summer of 1237, he proceeded with new recruits from Augsburg through the Brenner Pass, after having had his nine-year-old son Conrad elected King of Germany and King of the Romans at the Diet of Vienna in the previous February. The final negotiations between representatives of the Pope, the Emperor, and the cities had failed. At Cortenuova on 27 November Frederick defeated a Lombard army as it was returning home from Brescia. The victory appeared to secure for him domination in North Italy, but his success was ruined by his demand, made especially on Milan, for unconditional surrender. Milan, in alliance with Alessandria, Brescia, Piacenza, Bologna, and Faenza, continued the struggle. The Emperor besieged Brescia in vain for three months, until 9 October 1238. On this occasion he had managed to reinforce his German, Sicilian, and Muslim contingents with mercenaries from England, France, Castile, Burgundy, Hungary, Greece, and Egypt. The Emperor's increasing power, the fact that in October 1238 he arranged the marriage of his son Enzio to the heiress of a great part of Sardinia without consulting the Pope, who regarded himself as suzerain of the island, and that he thus seemed to be striving to assume control even in Rome in order to make it, as far as possible, the real or at least the theoretical centre of a renewed Empire — all this contributed to strengthen the opposition to Frederick in the Curia, above all by the Pope. He dispatched as legate to Lombardy Gregory of Montelongo, who brought together the anti-imperialist cities. The Pope was successful in allying Venice and Genoa and in again establishing his own authority in Rome.

When Frederick, in a decree of February 1239 against the Empire's rebels, as he termed them, issued a summons to a total war against the Lombards and to a social and economic boycott, binding all subjects of the Empire, Gregory IX decided on 20 and 24 March to renew the Emperor's excommunication. Without mentioning the Lombards he justified this step especially by referring to Frederick's ecclesiastical policy in the Sicilian Kingdom, which was contrary to the promises of the treaty of 1230, and to his efforts to establish his rule in Rome.

With this decision began the final struggle of the Curia against the Emperor and his dynasty. Frederick answered Gregory's measures with the occupation of the *Patrimonium* and the encirclement of Rome. For his part, Gregory decided to appeal to Christendom and summoned a council to meet in Rome at Easter of 1241. But Frederick countered by arresting most of the non-Italian participants, who were traveling in a Gedoese fleet, after a sea-battle near Montecristo, not far from Elba, on 4 May 1241.[6]

At the beginning of August the Emperor drew near to Rome, but his intended attack on the city did not take place, for the Pope died on 21 August 1241. Frederick returned to the Sicilian Kingdom to await the outcome of the new election.

By virtue of the official journalism of the immediately preceding years, which had striven to bring the struggle before the forum of Christendom by solemn manifestoes issued by both Pope and Emperor, the conflict between the papacy and the imperial office seemed to have been elevated to the plane of a confrontation in fundamentals. Nevertheless, Frederick had constantly stressed that there was question, not of a conflict with the Church, but with the personality of the Pope, whereas Gregory, for his part, did not attack the role of the *Imperium* in its function as universal *defensor* and *protector* of the Roman Church, but rather rejected the present holder of the office, who, instead of being a defender, attacked the Church, instead of being an orthodox Emperor, lived under the suspicion of heresy without clearing himself.

But the language of the manifestoes, with its apocalyptic hues, did nothing to alleviate the conflict. On the contrary, in its predominant motives it indicated that on both sides persons were prepared to take up the decisive principles that lay behind questions of personality, principles affecting the relationship between the secular and the spiritual powers in their claim to the leadership of the West.

The Milanese Cardinal Goffredo Castiglioni was not elected Pope until 25 October 1241; he styled himself Celestine IV, but on 10 November he died. The cardinals refused to proceed to a new election until the Emperor had released the two of their number whom he was holding prisoner since the battle of Montecristo. Otto of Tusculum was freed in August 1242, James of Praeneste in May 1243. On 25 June 1243 the Genoese Cardinal Sinibaldo Fieschi was unanimously elected Pope Innocent IV (1243–54).

---

[6] *Cf.* H. M. Schaller, "Das letzte Rundschreiben Gregors IX. gegen Friedrich II.," *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm,* I (Wiesbaden 1964), 309–21. The Pope reports to an archbishop on Frederick's violent procedure, especially the imprisonment of the prelates journeying to Rome for the council, and asks the recipient to summon the bishops and other clergy of his province in order to discuss the inclosed *capitula.* These last, probably a series of complaints against the Emperor, are not extant.

Frederick hailed the election, believing that in Innocent IV a representative of the peace party in the Sacred College had been elevated. But he soon had to realize that "no Pope [could] be a Ghibelline."[7] Innocent IV, an outstanding jurist and, as a diplomat, entirely in sympathy with his native city, shrewd, objective, tenacious, and far-sighted, took up the legacy of Gregory IX, which included not only the conflict with the Emperor but also the threat to the West from the expansion of the Mongols, concern for the disintegrating Latin Empire, and the repressing of heresy. He was determined to harmonize them with one another, including the crusade. The settlement of the conflict with Frederick presented itself as the most urgent problem. The Emperor himself initiated the negotiations,[8] which, with interruptions, were protracted for years. They almost brought about peace in Holy Week of 1244 (31 March), when Frederick's envoys solemnly swore to the stipulations of a provisional treaty. The Emperor was to be released from excommunication and in return evacuate the Papal State, perform ecclesiastical penance, give the imprisoned prelates their freedom and compensation, and assure immunity to the Church's adherents. Once again the Lombard question was left unsolved, and the mistrust between Emperor and Pope was not eliminated. In fact, both sides attempted to improve their positions. The Treaty of Rome was not ratified. Instead, Innocent decided on the decisive step of leaving Italy and convoking outside Frederick's sphere of power, even though on imperial territory, the council intended by Gregory IX but obstructed by the Emperor, in order to lay the conflict before the forum of Christendom and bring it to a binding solution.

On 28 June 1244 the Pope sailed to Genoa in a Genoese fleet that was already at hand. He fell ill and stayed there several months; then in the late autumn he crossed the Alps and at the beginning of December took up residence at Lyons with the canons regular of Saint-Just. Without his being able to anticipate it, he was to rule the Church from Lyons until the Emperor's death six years later.

How very much this step implied liberation can be inferred from the accelerated activity of the papal chancery, the lively visits to the Curia, the abundance of far-reaching decisions which occurred almost immediately after the arrival at Lyons and led in the most varied sectors of Church life to new starts and new ways of life. This showed, as would also be the case later at Avignon, that Rome could not for a long time be regarded basically as the centrally located residence of the Popes, not to speak of the continuing difficulties which the city's local politics caused — hardly the climate suited for a peaceful government.

---

[7] E. Kantorowicz, *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite*, supplement, 225: the Emperor's words, "Nullus papa potest esse Gibellinus," reported by Galvanus Flamma, are in *Muratori, Scriptores*, XI, 680.

[8] The best presentation of these negotiations is by A. Folz, *Kaiser Friedrich II. und Papst Innocenz IV. Ihr Kampf in den Jahren 1244 und 1245* (Strasbourg 1905).

The First Council of Lyons (1245)

Innocent IV announced on 27 December 1244 that he would convoke a general council, which was to meet at Lyons on 24 June 1245.[9] The invitations were sent out from 3 January 1245 to the episcopate, to cathedral chapters and abbots, to princes and cities. The matters to be treated were reform ("status debitus ecclesiae romanae"), the crusade, aid to Constantinople, measures against the Mongols, and finally the conflict with the Emperor ("de negotio, quod inter ecclesiam et principem vertitur"). Since, besides the Mongols, also "other despisers of the faith and persecutors of the Christian people" were mentioned, it may be surmised that the reference was to heretics, against whom, despite a half-century of persistent struggle, the Church still had to fight. In addition to the conflict with the Emperor, these were the classical conciliar themes of the Middle Ages.

The Emperor, the Pope wrote, had been called upon by him in his sermon of 27 December to come to the Council, not as a participant, as were the other kings and princes, but as a defendant („citavimus"), who was to justify himself ("responsurus") there to the Pope and the others.

When the reports of the severe setbacks in the Holy Land — the taking of Jerusalem by the Khwarazmian Turks and the defeat of the knights at Gaza and Ascalon — reached Italy around the end of the year through the Patriarch of Antioch, and the Emperor in a circular appealed to the Christian princes for help, there simultaneously began the final peace negotiations between Emperor and Pope, in which the Patriarch was involved. It is true that on Holy Thursday Innocent renewed Frederick's excommunication, probably because of pressure from the Archbishops of Mainz and Cologne, who kept aloof from the Emperor in Germany. Still, we possess a letter of 6 May 1245, in which the Pope declared his readiness to lift the censure if Frederick would really take his promises seriously. But simultaneous encroachments of the imperial troops in the *Patrimonium* and the Emperor's clumsy diplomatic maneuvers in England, where the Pope's request for financial help was to be thwarted, brought to nothing these attempts of the eleventh hour.

---

[9] On the preparation for the Council, its course, and its outcome *cf.* H. Wolter and H. Holstein, *Lyon I et Lyon II (Histoire des Conciles Oecuméniques,* 7) (Paris 1966).

And so the Council assembled with its program unchanged. Attendance by the bishops of lands ruled by Frederick was naturally meagre. Some exiled prelates did come, but from the Empire only the Bishops of Prague and Liège and those of the Kingdom of Burgundy. Spain, France, and England, on the other hand, were well represented. Altogether there were present 150 bishops and, in addition, abbots, the generals of the new orders, deputies of invited chapters, of cities, and of princes. Baldwin II, Emperor of Constantinople, Raymond VII, Count of Toulouse, and Raymond Berengar, Count of Provence, attended in person.

Between 26 June and 17 July 1245, there were four sessions of the Council, which of course continued its work between sessions in discussions, consistories, and committee meetings. On 28 June, in the first of the three principal sessions, which took place in the cathedral of Lyons, Innocent IV delivered the introductory address, outlining the program, after the Solemn Mass in the brief liturgical ceremony of inauguration: the decay of ecclesiastical discipline among clergy and laity ("status debitus ecclesiae"), the distress of the Holy Land because of the arrogance of the Muslims, the Greek Schism as reflected in the problem of the Latin Empire, the Mongol problem, and finally the persecution of the Church by the Emperor Frederick II.

At all the sessions the Emperor's case was pleaded especially by the Grand Justiciar, Thaddeus of Suessa, who exerted some influence on the assembly in his discourses. In addition, Frederick was championed by the Patriarch of Aquileia and the English envoys. The closing session, intended for 12 July, was postponed by the Pope till 17 July at the request of Frederick's agents in order to await the arrival of the Emperor, who was thought to be *en route* to Lyons. But he came no nearer than Turin, for he clearly had no intention of appearing in person at the Council.

And so there was handed down in the final session the decision which the Pope had previously discussed thoroughly with the prelates individually and which was approved by most of them without any objection. First of all, Innocent announced that the feast of Our Lady's Birthday, 8 September, should henceforth be celebrated with an octave by the entire Church. He then had the decisions of the Council read; issued in the form of juridical decrees and constitutions, they addressed themselves to the various problems considered, as laws, instructions, admonitions, and proclamations. The Council promoted reform by its clarification of juridical, especially procedural, problems, its tightening of administrative controls, chiefly in regard to an improvement of monastic economic management, and its more precise definition of the powers of papal legates. It tried to meet the Mongol peril by its call for intensive measures of defense. Ecclesiastical taxes were prescribed for the safety of the Latin Empire, while in regard to the crusade the decrees of Lateran IV were renewed, but, significantly, no concrete planning was attempted. Then, before Innocent could have the bull of deposition read, Thaddeus of Suessa lodged a formal appeal against it to the next Pope and to an authentic general council. Innocent calmly defended the universality of the Council of Lyons, to which, he said, all in Christendom who were qualified had been invited; he also noted that Frederick himself was the reason why certain regional episcopates had been unable to attend.

The Council's final act was the reading of the bull of deposition and its confirmation by the assembly. Because of the four crimes of perjury, breach of peace, sacrilege in imprisoning prelates, and suspicion of heresy, Frederick II was deposed as Roman Emperor, King of Germany, and King of Sicily; he was stripped of all honours and dignities, his subjects were released from their oaths of loyalty, and the German princes were invited to proceed to a new election. The Pope, with the advice of the cardinals, intended himself to decide the future of the Sicilian Kingdom.

The session ended with the *Te Deum.* Incidentally, Frederick's excommunication had purposely not been renewed, and so there was here involved what was until now the single case of an implementation of statement 13 of Gregory VII's *Dictatus Papae.*[10]

The First Council of Lyons was a turning point. Despite harsh words the Emperor did not cease, even after the Council, his efforts for peace with the Curia. But the sentence of Lyons intensified the breach between him and the Pope. The struggle for hegemony in Italy and the reaction of the Curia, which feared for its ecclesiastical independence, had now become a struggle over the continuance or non-continuance of the imperial office in the House of Hohenstaufen and at the same time over the validity of the Hohenstaufen concept of the Empire. The Pope mobilized all of his strength in Germany, Italy, and the Sicilian Kingdom in order to enforce the sentence of Lyons. Henry III of England, who was Frederick's brother-in-law, and Louis IX of France maintained a strict neutrality. The Pope contrived to win back Hungary, which had expected help from the Emperor against the Mongols. As had already been clear at the Council, Spain was entirely on the Pope's side, even though Ferdinand III of Castile remained neutral.

But the Emperor made his presence felt everywhere by means of envoys, letters, threats, demands. The journalism of 1239–42 was resumed but its tenor had changed. The question now was whether the Pope had a right to depose the Emperor. Innocent IV maintained that he did, pointing to the authority whereby he constituted the Emperor. The Pope "makes" the Emperor, he said, and hence in a given case he can again deprive him of office and dignity.[11]

---

[10] "Quod illi liceat imperatores deponere," *Reg.* II, 55a, ed. E. Caspar, 204, 5; see Volume III of this *Handbook*, p. 369 and footnote 4.

The Emperor likewise argued from principle, while coming forward with a reform plan, which relegated the Church, and in her the Pope, to properly spiritual functions, to the apostolic ideal of the Primitive Church, with its subordination to the divinely established authority of kings. Frederick's letter of February 1246[12] was, of course, not intended as a plan for a reform actually to be carried out but as an element in a journalistic confrontation. It found an echo in a manifesto of French barons of November 1246, which even led to a league of the barons against the Clergy.[13]

In Germany[14] Innocent managed powerfully to arrange the fronts in his own favour, thanks to a consistent personal policy on a high level. In the Kingdom of Sicily he had a crusade preached against Frederick. But the struggle could not be decided until Frederick's death on 13 December 1250. Innocent returned to Italy in order to oppose first Conrad IV, who died on 21 May 1254, before the Pope's death, and then Manfred.[15] But Manfred continued to cause anxiety for the papacy until his death at Benevento in 1266. When on 29 October 1268 Conradin was executed at Naples, the male line of the Hohenstaufen Dynasty was extinguished. Italy did not lay eyes on another Emperor in the thirteenth century.

---

[11] Innocent IV gave a detailed explanation of the Council's decree of deposition in his *Apparatus (Commentaria super libros quinque Decretalium)* (ed. Frankfurt 1570), lib. II, tit. XXVII, cap. XXVII, 316^{v}–317^{v}: "papa iure deponit imperatorem." Innocent developed the bold notion that Christ is the "dominus naturalis" of emperors and kings and hence can institute and depose them. Christ has fully transmitted this power to his Vicar on earth.

[12] Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica,* VI, 391 f.

[13] C. Petit-Dutaillis, *La Monarchie Féodale en France et en Angleterre, X^{e}–XIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1950), 295 f.

[14] *Cf.* P. Aldinger, *Die Neubesetzung der deutschen Bistümer unter Papst Innocenz IV. (1243–54)* (Leipzig 1900), and H. Kroppmann, *Ehedispensübung und Stauferkampf unter Innocenz IV.* (Berlin 1937).

[15] M. Finano, "La città di Napoli nelle lotte tra Innocenzo IV e Manfredo," *Studi in onore di Ricardo Filangeri,* 3 vols. (Naples 1961), I, 259–82.

CHAPTER 26

The Veering of the Papacy to France and the Angevin Domination in Italy

After the deposition of Frederick II at the Council of Lyons, Innocent IV had left the succession to the Hohenstaufen in the Empire to the qualified electors, but he had reserved the new order in the Kingdom of Sicily to himself and the cardinals.[1] The "Sicilian question" was greatly to embarrass the Curia's policy until the end of the century. There were two possibilities for solving it: The Roman Church could either undertake the administration of the Kingdom or enfeoff a new dynasty with it. At first Innocent seemed to be inclined to assume the direct rule, even though the scarcely happy experiences of his predecessor, Innocent III, as guardian of the young Frederick, with a direct administration of his sort must have been known to him. As a matter of fact, the Curia's financial, military, and personnel resources quickly proved to be too weak, and so the second possibility had to be seriously considered.

First, the Pope offered the Kingdom to Earl Richard of Cornwall,[2] and then, almost simultaneously, to the brother of Louis IX of France, Charles of Anjou, Count of Provence. Both declined, whereupon Innocent began negotiations with King Henry III of England.[3] Through *Magister* Albert of Parma he suggested that Henry should accept the Kingdom for his eight-year-old son Edmund.

After the death on 21 May 1254 of Conrad IV, the Pope felt he was in a position to incorporate Sicily into the Papal State, and hence he broke off the negotiations with England. The envisaged conquest of Sicily under the leadership of the papal nephew, Fieschi, failed. Its collapse was the last message given to Innocent IV, who died at Naples on 7 December 1254. The Hohenstaufen policy was quickly taken up and continued by Manfred, independently and successfully. Without having any support in Germany, Manfred sought to realize in their fulness the Italian plans of his imperial father.

---

[1] Bulla depositionis Friderici II imperatoris: "Illi autem, ad quos in eodem imperio imperatoris spectat electio, eligant libere successorem. De praefato vero Siciliae regno providere curabimus cum eorundem fratrum consilio, sicut viderimus expedire" (*COD*, 259, 30–35).

[2] H. Marc-Bonnet, "Richard de Cornouailles et la Couronne de Sicile, " *Mélanges L. Halphen* (Paris 1951), 483–89, points out that Innocent IV's first contacts with Richard, if they were not made as early as 1247, probably occurred at Lyons in April 1250.

[3] The best account of the English candidacy for Sicily is A. Wachtel, "Die sizilische Thronkandidatur des Prinzen Edmund von England," *DA*, 4 (1941), 98–178; *cf.* M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century (1216–1307)* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1962), 110–23, 136, 167, who labels the enterprise "the Sicilian business."

Because of this turn of events, Alexander IV, who had succeeded Innocent IV on 12 December 1254, resumed the negotiations with England. He excommunicated Manfred on 25 March 1255, and on 9 April enfeoffed Edmund with Sicily. When Henry III was unable to meet the high financial and military commitment he had contracted, Alexander cancelled the agreement in 1258, but he had no alternative solution ready. In the same year Manfred had himself crowned King at Palermo on 10 August. His influence grew steadily in Spoleto, the Marches of Ancona, and Romagna. Even at Rome the Ghibellines contrived in the spring of 1261, at the very time when Richard of Cornwall was elected Senator,[4] to secure this dignity for Manfred also.

Alexander IV died on 25 May 1261. For three months the conclave sweated over the succession, which was finally bestowed on an outsider, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, James Pantaléon, a Frenchman from Troyes in Champagne. He had taken part in the Council of Lyons as Archdeacon of Liège; then, in the service of the Curia he had got to know North and East Germany and Poland on extensive legatine journeys. An energetic, shrewd, and diplomatically patient ruler, Urban IV (1261–64), being a Frenchman, was not compromised by the problems of Italy and hence he was freer. He was determined to solve the Sicilian question in order to free his hands for the problems of the whole Church. Under him was completed the papacy's veering to France.

He first succeeded in again strengthening papal influence in North and Central Italy to the detriment of Manfred. He abandoned the English candidacy and asked Louis IX to permit one of his sons to accept enfeoffment with Sicily. The French King refused, referring to Edmund's rights and to the claims of Conradin of Hohenstaufen. Hence Urban turned to Charles of Anjou. The treaty with England was formally annulled, the consent of Louis IX was won, and on 17 June 1263 a treaty was drawn up which sketched in broad outline the Curia's ideas about the envisaged solution of the Sicilian question. South Italy and the island of Sicily were to remain united, and Charles of Anjou would be enfeoffed with the Kingdom in return for a single payment of 50,000 marks sterling. A yearly *census* of 10,000 ounces of gold was anticipated. The freedom of the Church in the Kingdom was to be assured, and Charles promised the Curia military aid. He had to oblige himself to reject any offer of the German or the imperial crown, and there was to be no question of his ruling the imperial provinces in Italy or the Papal State. Other stipulations explained the aid which the Curia expected from Charles, who was to take possession of his fief within one year. When Manfred, in view of the now clear candidacy of the Angevin, seriously harassed the Pope, Charles was easily able to have the draft of the treaty modified in his favour. Even before it was signed Charles had violated its stipulations by accepting election as Senator of Rome. Nevertheless, Urban confirmed the election, which made it obvious that there would be other complications. Before the Pope died on 2 October 1264, the Curia's treaty with Charles of Anjou had been signed. The Angevin domination had been established, not only in the Sicilian Kingdom, but, as events were to prove, also in Italy.

---

[4] From the time of his election as King of the Romans in 1257 Richard had sought coronation as Emperor. His designation as one of the two Senators of Rome, urged by Cardinals Ottobuono Fieschi and John of Toledo, was intended to induce the hesitant Pope to make a decision. *Cf.* A. Wachtel, *loc. cit.*, 165, N. Schöpp, *Papst Hadrian V. (Kardinal Ottobuono Fieschi)* (Heidelberg 1916), 72–75, and F. R. Lewis, "The Election of Richard of Cornwall as Senator of Rome in 1261," *EHR*, 52 (1937), 657–62.

The long vacancy of the Holy See, which lasted until 5 February 1265, facilitated the assuming of power by the new lord of Sicily. He prepared for this by underpinning it with a long series of alliances which he concluded with North Italian rulers and cities. Such a procedure hardly corresponded to the spirit of the treaty he had just signed with the Roman Church. But the new Pope, Clement IV (1265–68), less vigorous than his predecessor, had also, as a Frenchman, close personal ties with the House of Anjou. On 28 June 1265 he solemnly invested the new King of Sicily at Rome. Thanks to his good offices, Charles was able to make contacts with Tuscan bankers, who granted him extensive credit against a thirty-years' tithe on the French Church. In this way Tuscany became involved in the new Sicilian policy: Charles opened up his new Kingdom to economic exploitation. The confrontation with Manfred led to the decisive battle of Benevento, where on 26 February 1266, the last Hohenstaufen ruler of Sicily lost both Kingdom and life. The route into the Kingdom was now open for its new master.

But Conradin of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia and King of Jerusalem, was still alive and he claimed the succession in Sicily. After Manfred's death a diet at Augsburg in October 1266 decided on an Italian expedition by the youthful Conradin. All who were unhappy with the papacy's award to Anjou had turned to him: the Hohenstaufen faction in Sicily, the opposition in the Papal State, and the Ghibellines of Tuscany under Pisa's leadership. *Condottieri* of every sort joined him, including two *Infantes* of Spain, Henry and Frederick, brothers of King Alfonso X of Castile, who had himself been elected King of the Romans in 1257.

Papal objections had thus far prevented Conradin's election as King. Clement IV now tried to stop Conradin's expedition. He threatened excommunication and interdict, in April 1267 appointed Charles *paciarius generalis* to safeguard disinterestedly the rights of all during the vacancy of the Empire, permitted the Angevin to hold power for six years as *podestà* in Florence and other cities of Tuscany, and in the cathedral of

Verona on 18 November 1267 declared that Conradin had incurred excommunication for having disregarded the prohibition of coming to Italy; if he advanced farther, he would be deprived of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. On Holy Thursday, 5 April 1268, Clement formally deposed him from the throne of Jerusalem, had a crusade preached against him, and, finally, on 17 April, named Charles imperial vicar in Tuscany. But meanwhile Conradin moved from Verona *via* Pavia, Pisa, and Siena to Rome, where on 24 July 1268 he was elected Senator. When he set out to conquer the Sicilian Kingdom he lost the decisive battle of Tagliacozzo on 23 August. He was overtaken in flight. Charles put him on trial and had him beheaded at Naples on 29 October 1268.[5] Exactly one month later Clement IV died at Viterbo.

Charles of Anjou, now unchallenged master of the Kingdom of Sicily, in possession of Tuscany, and influential in Lombardy, prepared to gain all of Italy as heir of the Hohenstaufen. Persons had already heard of his intention of supporting the powerless Emperor Baldwin II in reconquering Byzantium, whereupon Jerusalem was to be liberated. A comprehensive imperialist scheme unfolded itself.[6]

For almost three years — from 29 November 1268 to 1 September 1271 — the Holy See remained vacant. Charles of Anjou utilized this time to suppress opposition in his Kingdom, to arrange the affairs of Tuscany as its master, to hold in check his Ghibelline opponents in North Italy. At Rome he was elected Senator for life. Hence in 1270 he seemed to rule all of Italy. The papacy saw him as its assistant, but now he had risen to become master. Innocent IV's mighty exertions had been apparently in vain.

For twenty years after its victory over the Hohenstaufen the Curia had been so seriously hampered by its concern for the succession to Sicily and by the unrest in the other parts of Italy that important tasks in the East and in the government of the Universal Church had been neglected. In 1261 Constantinople was lost, as far as the West was concerned. In the Empire the double election of 1257 had inaugurated the dark age of the Interregnum. Alfonso X of Castile never entered the Empire, while Richard of Cornwall in his brief visits could gain recognition only in the West. Christendom, which had seemed united and strong on the morrow of the papal victory over Frederick II, began to display symptoms of inner uncertainty because of a lack of firm leadership. A religious and moral deterioration in many strata of Christian society made itself felt. The territorial prince's authority over the Church was everywhere consolidated. Reform was needed and persons looked for a man who could master the confusion of the age and restore order.

---

[5] A. Nitschke did painstaking research into Conradin's fate, the "trial," and the Pope's position in regard to it in *ZSavRGkan*, 42 (1956), 25–54. H. M. Schaller, "Zur Verurteilung Konradins," *QFIAB*, 37 (1957), 311–27, challenged him in particular points, but in *QFIAB*, 38 (1958), 268–77, Nitschke was able to maintain his theses.

[6] *Cf.* E. Dade, *Versuche zur Wiedererrichtung der lateinischen Herrschaft in Konstantinopel im Rahmen der abendländischen Politik 1261 bis etwa 1310* (Jena 1937), and S. Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge 1958), 135–47.

CHAPTER 27

Pope Gregory X and the Second Council of Lyons

The election of Tedaldo Visconti on 1 September 1271 ended the longest vacancy of the Holy See in the thirteenth century. Archdeacon of Liège, he was then in the Holy Land; he arrived in Viterbo in February 1272 and was crowned at Rome on 26 March. As early as 13 April invitations went out for a general council, which once again was to meet in Lyons.[1] Reform of the Church, union with the Greeks, and aid for the Holy Land were to be the principal themes of the gathering. They were also the essential concerns of the program laid down for his pontificate by Gregory X (1271–76).

The leitmotif was the liberation of the Holy Places, and peace with Byzantium was regarded as its prerequisite. The renewal of ecclesiastical life in Western Christendom was likewise to serve this end. The schemes of Charles of Anjou with regard to Byzantium had to be stopped. While still in Syria Gregory X had initiated negotiations[2] with the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus.[3] To protect himself against the threat from Charles of Anjou, the Emperor was ready for far-reaching concessions, even for the recognition of the Roman Primacy. However, his clergy and people made it clear to the Emperor that he would find no support among them for his policy, and the Patriarch Joseph abdicated.

In Italy, Gregory, while allowing Charles of Anjou to continue as Roman Senator and as imperial vicar in Tuscany, avoided giving any appearance that the papacy was dependent on Charles. He aimed at an energetic effort to settle the strife between Guelfs and Ghibellines, which was tearing all of Italy to pieces. The principal factor in settling this difficult complex of problems was to be the election of a new Emperor. By means of a friendly cooperation with him, the Pope intended to try to restore peace to Italy. Furthermore, the growing anarchy in Germany during the reigns of the rival Kings, Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile, had done the greatest harm to the Church as well as to the nation. Richard died on April 1272. When Alfonso now sought to obtain recognition by the Pope as King of Germany, Gregory referred him to the German electoral princes, whose business it was, he said, to decide who should be King.

---

[1] Lyons was selected in order to exclude the influence of Charles of Anjou. The Pope's journey is described by A. Callebaut, "Le voyage du B. Grégoire X et du S. Bonaventure au Concile de Lyon," *AFrH*, 18 (1925), 169–80.

[2] George Pachymeres, *De Michaele Paleologo*, V, 11 (*PG*, 143, 823A).

[3] C. Chapman, *Michel Paléologue, restaurateur de l'Empire byzantin (1261–82)* (Paris 1926); also D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Paleologue and the West (1258–82). A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959), and H. D. Nicol, "The Greeks and the Union of the Churches. The Preliminaries to the Second Council of Lyons (1261–1274)," *MS*, presented to A. Gwynn (Dublin 1961), 454–80.

Since Richard's death the Electors had been concerned about the succession. As candidates there came forward King Ottakar II of Bohemia, King Philip III of France, Duke Henry of Bavaria, Conradin's uncle and heir, and the Duke's brother, the Count Palatine Louis, himself one of the Electors. However, agreement was eventually reached on the Landgrave of Alsace, Rudolf of Habsburg, who was elected at Frankfurt on 1 October 1273 and crowned at Aachen on 24 October. Ottakar had been too powerful, Philip had been rejected by the Pope, Henry had withdrawn, and no one had wanted Louis. Ottakar had not appeared for the election, and for this one occasion his vote had been awarded to the Duke of Bavaria.

The Electors informed the Pope of Rudolf's election and coronation and asked that he be given the imperial crown. Rudolf sent an embassy to Rome to convey his respects and assured the Pope of his readiness to take the cross. Ottakar protested and lodged an appeal against the outcome of the election. Gregory cordially accepted the messages from Germany but postponed a decision until the Council.[4]

The preparations for the Council were aided by testimonials on the state of the Church, which the Pope requested from everywhere. Of the extant replies the most useful were those of Bishop Bruno of Olomouc and of the former general of the Dominicans, Humbert of Romans.[5] They sketched a gloomy picture of the religious condition of both clergy and people. Bruno's reform proposal amounted to a strengthening of episcopal authority, notably *vis-à-vis* the richly privileged mendicant orders. Humbert demanded especially a reform of the Curia.

---

[4] A. Zisterer, *Gregor X. und Rudolf von Habsburg in ihren beiderseitigen Beziehungen* (Freiburg 1891); H. Otto, *Die Beziehungen Rudolfs von Habsburg zu Papst Gregor X.* (Innsbruck 1895); O. Redlich, *Rudolf von Habsburg* (Innsbruck 1903); K. and M. Uhlirz, *Handbuch der Geschichte Österreich-Ungarns*, I (Graz and Cologne, 2nd ed., 1963), 263–66, 274–78 (bibliography).

[5] The *Opus tripartitum* deals systematically with the three points of the Council's program: crusade, union with the Greeks, and reform of the Church. A fourth testimonial came from the Franciscan Fidentius of Padua; composed at the request of Gregory X, it did not become known until 1291, but it was probably written at the time of the Council. It is entitled *De recuperatione Terrae Sanctae*, ed. G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa*, II (Quaracchi 1913), 1–60. Among the works preparatory to the Council must also be included Thomas Aquinas's *Contra errores Graecorum* (1260). Thomas, invited to take part, died, as is well known, *en route* to Lyons on 7 March 1274 in the Cistercian Abbey of Fossanuova. The last edition of his work is by P. Glorieux (Tournai and Paris 1957).

The Council met in Lyons on 7 May 1274. Almost 300 bishops, sixty abbots, generals of orders, and prelates, and leading theologians attended,[6] but Thomas Aquinas had died *en route*. King James I of Aragón was the only prince to accept the invitation in person; the others were represented by envoys. The Greek embassy made its belated appearance on 24 June, and eventually a group of Mongols also arrived.

Gregory X had not desired a mass-meeting, and the monasteries and collegiate churches were originally supposed to be represented only by an abbot or provost respectively, but he probably did want a gathering that properly represented all of Christendom in all its social classes. Of the three principal topics, the most important, Church reform, for which the best preliminary work had been done, seems to have been the least discussed. The union with the Greeks was realized because the Emperor had already previously declared for it in principle. For the crusade there was at hand Michael VIII's promise to participate in it if the West would first make a lasting peace with him, a condition aimed at frustrating the projects of Charles of Anjou and Baldwin II. With the envoys of the Khan of Persia was made a treaty which provided for a common front against Islam. The Kings of France, England, Aragón, and Sicily agreed in principle to take part in the crusade. At the conciliar consistory of 6 June 1274, the Chancellor Otto swore, on behalf of King Rudolf, to maintain the privileges and promises made to the Roman Church by Otto IV and Frederick II; included was the renunciation of the Sicilian Kingdom.[7] Rudolf's recognition by the Pope was given on 26 September; it had been delayed because Gregory had hoped that Ottakar of Bohemia and Alfonso of Castile would in the meantime have dropped their claims.

In agreement with the cardinals at Lyons the Pope appointed 23 May of the following year for the imperial coronation, but the date was soon put off until 1 November 1275. By means of stubborn negotiations, Gregory X succeeded in inducing King Alfonso to renounce the imperial crown. In October 1275 the Pope and King Rudolf met at Lausanne, where Rudolf in person made the promises already sworn to by his chancellor; he also intended, if necessary, to preserve and defend the Kingdom of Sicily for the Church, but not to assume the government himself, as this is usually understood. Now 2 February 1276 was agreed upon as the date of the imperial coronation and then Rudolf, together with the princes present and 500 knights, took the cross. But this date also could not be kept, for Gregory X died at Arezzo on 10 January 1276.

---

[6] J. Guiraud, *Les Registres de Grégoire X*, no. 220, contains the list of prelates; among them, in addition to the bishops, were the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople, the Abbots of Cluny, Prémontré, Cîteaux, and Clairvaux, the generals of the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinian Hermits, and the grand masters of the three military orders.

[7] "Cum prorsus intentionis sit Romane ecclesie, ut regnum ... nullo umquam tempore imperio uniatur, ut scilicet unus Romanus Imperator et Sicilie rex existat"; thus the oath taken by Charles of Anjou on 7 October 1276 (J. Guiraud, *Registres*, no. 163).

The Council met from 7 May to 17 July, longer than any of its predecessors. The proxies of the chapters were dismissed after the second session, 18 May. The Byzantine embassy arrived a month late. The discussions between the Pope and the cardinals relative to the rules of the conclave were protracted, and the meetings with the representatives of Alfonso of Castile and of Rudolf of Habsburg claimed much time. On 4 July the Pope received the sixteen envoys of the Mongol Khan Abaga. The publication of the conciliar decrees was distributed among several sessions, and so the impression is created that the Council worked intensively. The Pope himself and his two trusted collaborators, the Franciscan Cardinal Bonaventure and the Dominican Cardinal, Peter of Tarentaise[8], which is reflected in the *professio fidei*,[9] were the preparations for the Among the results of the Council, in addition to the union with the Greeks, which is reflected in the *professio fidei*[9], were the preparations for the crusade. Provision was made for a tithe on all ecclesiastical incomes over a period of six years. No fundamentally new considerations were brought forward, but the texts of 1215 and 1245 were used. Princes and kings had promised to take part, and Michael Palaeologus also seemed ready to cooperate under certain conditions. More detailed plans were not outlined, nor was a date appointed. The Pope's early death was a severe blow to the enterprise.

The Council's decrees continued the legislative work of 1215 and 1245. First place among them belongs to the constitution *Ubi periculum*,[10] which made new rules for the papal election. Frequently revised, it is still in force today. The cardinals were not to wait more than ten days from the Pope's death for the arrival of the absent. The election was to occur in the place where the Pope died. The cardinals were to stay together, cut off from all contact with the outside world, until they had completed the election. The longer the election took, the more scanty should their provisions become. In addition, the constitution deprived the cardinals of all revenues during the vacancy. Such stern conditions explain the resistance of those affected. For the constitution was annulled by Gregory's successors and only put back into effect by Celestine V. It was included in the *Liber Sextus* by Boniface VIII and from then on was an element of the canon law that is still valid.

---

[8] For Peter of Tarentaise see M. H. Laurent, "Le bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre de Tarentaise) et son temps," *SteT*, 129 (Rome 1947); for Bonaventure see R. Ménindès, "Saint Bonaventure, les Frères mineurs et l'unité de l'Église au concile de Lyon," *La France franciscaine*, ser. II, 18 (1935), 363–92.

[9] Constitutio "Fideli ac devota," *COD*, 290; see also the comments of H. Holstein in H. Wolter and H. Holstein, *Lyon I et Lyon II*, 192–96.

[10] Constitutio "Ubi periculum," *COD*, 290-94; *cf.* E. Ruffini-Avondo, "Le origini del conclave papale," *Atti della R. Accademia delle scienze di Torino*, 62 (Turin 1927), 409–30; O. Jölson, *Die Papstwahlen des 13. Jahrhunderts bis zur Einführung der Conclaveordnung Gregors X.* (Berlin 1928).

The other decrees attacked abuses, as these were specified in the various testimonials. Excessively long vacancies, especially of benefices connected with the care of souls, were to be stopped, and only worthy and educated candidates were to be named, above all for parishes. The duty of residence was inculcated, and pluralism was made more difficult. An effort was made to eliminate abuses in elections. The Council exerted itself for the renewal of the capitular liturgy, which was deteriorating, and turned its attention to the piety of the faithful. The constitution *Religionum diversitatem*[11] repeated the prohibition made in 1215 of founding new orders and congregations and suppressed all establishments made since that time without the consent of the Holy See; the others were subjected to severe restrictions. Only the two oldest mendicant orders were excepted from this strict legislation; the Carmelites and the Augustinian Hermits had to await further instructions. The Pope reserved for a later regulation the relations of the new orders to the episcopate, especially in regard to the much disputed pastoral privileges. All the military orders were supposed to be combined into one single order, but this effort collapsed on the opposition that was to be expected from Spain. This constitution was to have a great impact on the further development of relations between the regular and the diocesan clergy.

Finally, usury was again reprobated, the penal law was made more precise, and decrees were issued for the course of trials; these last were directed especially against excessive prolonging. The Pope was unable to see to the implementation of these decrees, but they were almost all adopted into the *Corpus Iuris* and hence acquired permanent validity. In his closing address Gregory X charged the bishops especially to tackle the reform of the parochial care of souls; they should so reform themselves and, by a careful personal policy, their estate, that the anticipated overcoming of the decay of Church life, complained of and described on all sides, might now begin and its permanence might be assured. It is the tragedy of Gregory X that the union with the Greeks was not lasting, the crusade did not take place, and the sought for reform was not realized.

[11] Constitutio "Religionum diversitatem," *COD*, 302 f.

CHAPTER 28

Heresy and the Inquisition in the Thirteenth Century

Waldensians, Humiliati, Cathari — a legacy of the late twelfth century — were not regained to the unity of the Church, despite Innocent III's policy of conciliation and the measures of the Fourth Lateran Council. On the contrary, they again spread throughout Europe, apart from England. The Cathari continued to be in congenial surroundings especially in Languedoc and to a lesser degree in Lombardy.[1] Related to them were the Albanenses on Lake Garda under John di Luglio.[2] The Garatenses and Bagnolenses were regarded as moderate dualists. Groups of Cathari were formed around Vicenza and in Tuscany. Mutually hostile, they nevertheless occasionally closed ranks on the outbreak of persecution. Cathari were encountered also in Catalonia, Aragón, and Castile. They were often organized into churches: three in Languedoc, six in Italy, others in the Balkan peninsula and the Near East and in France, Germany, and Spain. In 1250 the Dominican Rainer Sacconi[3] mentioned sixteen. The Cathari often formulated their doctrine during the crusades against them and in the conflict with the Inquisition. They published Latin writings. Little of this is extant; for the most part it is known from quotations in Catholic literature.[4] The ex-Waldensian Durandus of Huesca cited a statement of doctrine composed in Languedoc in 1220.[5] The former Cathar Rainer Sacconi made use of the work of John di Luglio (1230). The *Liber de duobus principiis,* written after 1240, contains a Cathar ritual in Latin; corresponding to it is a ritual drawn up in Provençal around 1280. These works could not have contributed any new impulse to the Cathar movement itself. Following the wars in the Midi they could maintain themselves only as harmless sectaries. The last proceedings against them took place around 1300 in the Midi and North Italy.

The Waldensians, who have maintained themselves until the present, were more tenacious. As the "Poor Lombards" they began to play a role of their own in North Italy and distinguished themselves from the French "Poor Men of Lyons." They were connected with the Humiliati, flatly rejected

---

[1] *Cf.* A. Dondaine, "La Hiérarchie cathare en Italie," *AFP,* 19 (1949), 280–312, 20 (1950), 234–305.

[2] Before 1190 they had combined into a bishopric — Desenzano on Lake Garda — and belonged to the radical dualistic faction of the Cathari.

[3] Rainer Sacconi (d. 1262) grew up as a Cathar, was converted by Peter Martyr, and from 1254 was director of the Inquisition in Lombardy. His *Summa de catharis et de pauperibus de Lugduno,* composed *ca.* 1250, was edited by A. Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIII^e^ siècle. Le Liber de duobus principiis* (Rome 1939), 64–78.

[4] By these are meant the works by Peter of Verona, James de Capellis, Moneta of Cremona, Salvo Burci, and others, which are given in the bibliography for this chapter.

[5] A. Dondaine, "Durand de Huesca et la polémique anti-cathare," *AFP,* 29 (1959), 228–76.

Men of Lyons." They were connected with the Humiliati, flatly rejected the notion of Sacraments, and aspired to live, not by begging, but in communities of workers. They also refused any control of their beliefs by the French Waldensians. In Germany they made their appearance as *Runcarii,* apparently so called from John of Ronco, the first leader of the "Poor Lombards." The German Waldensians maintained a rather slight contact with the Lombard brethren and bishops and sent them money. In Lombardy, France, and Spain they were liquidated by the Inquisition. But Waldensian communities survived in Calabria and Apulia and in the Alpine valleys of Piedmont and Savoy.

The German Waldensians reached Bohemia, Poland, and Hungary in the wake of the eastern colonial movement. Berthold of Regensburg preached[6] and David of Augsburg wrote against them, but without enduring success. Around 1315 they were encountered in more than forty Austrian communities in the bishopric of Passau.

Alongside Cathari and Waldensians there everywhere emerged in the thirteenth century, at first in isolation, then in variously increasing numbers, heresies of another sort, which did not, however, organize themselves as sects. Their basic sources included theological and philosophical speculations of learned circles, while spiritualistic tendencies, above all among the women, became apparent. It should be recalled that the Fourth Lateran Council had rejected the Trinitarian doctrine of Joachim of Fiore and the teachings of the Parisian master, Amaury of Bène. Innocent III is said also to have condemned David of Dinant and Ortlieb of Strasbourg. Joachim's doctrine[7] was first popularized around the mid-century by Franciscans, by, among others, Gerard of Borgo San Donnino in 1254.[8] William of Saint-Amour, on the other hand, attacked it at Paris. Gerard's introduction to the *Evangelium aeternum* of Joachim of Fiore[9] was condemned and burned, but so also was the attack on it by William of Saint-Amour. The long dead Joachim himself was investigated by a commission of cardinals under Alexander IV, but he was not branded a heretic. His writings continued to be influential among the "Spiritual" Franciscans. The "Joachimites" were especially numerous under the general John of Parma, but Bonaventure was able to get rid of them.

---

[6] L. Casutt, *Die Handschriften mit lateinischen Predigten Bertholds von Regensburg (1210–72)* (Freiburg 1961).

[7] But *cf.* M. W. Bloomfield and M. E. Reeves, "The Penetration of Joachimism into Northern Europe," *Speculum,* 29 (1954), 772–93, where it is established that Joachim and his ideas were known and discussed beyond the Alps long before 1256.

[8] For Franciscan Joachimism see Chapter 32.

[9] For the bibliography of the strife over the *Eternal Gospel* see M. W. Bloomfield and M. E. Reeves, *op. cit.,* 772, footnote 2; especially H. Denifle, "Das Evangelium Aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni," *ALKGMA,* 1 (1885), 49–142; M. Perrod, "Étude sur la vie et sur les œuvres de Guillaume de Saint-Amour . . .," *Mémoires de la Société d'Émulation du Jura,* 7ᵉ sér., 2 (Lons-le-Saunier 1902), 61–252; A. van den Wyngaert, "Querelles du clergé séculier et des ordres mendiants à l'université de Paris au XIIIᵉ siècle," *La France Franciscaine,* 5 (1922), 257–81.

Joachim's doctrine of the Three Ages — the Old Testament as the Age of the Father, the New Testament as the Age of the Son, and an epoch of a monastically coloured spirituality as the Age of the Holy Spirit — influenced also a Parisian heretical circle of disciples of Amaury of Bène, who was first condemned in 1210. They regarded the Holy Spirit as incarnate in themselves, and a pantheistic ontology, as propounded by Amaury, became among them a fanaticism which found a response among both lay men and women. At the University of Paris a line of so-called Averroists led from David of Dinant to Siger of Brabant and others. They understood their Aristotle as a concept of being which was independent of the faith and theology, as a truth apart from theological truth — the "double truth."[10] Averroism continued to be influential among lay scholars, jurists and physicians, though it was repeatedly forbidden and the Inquisition proceeded energetically against its proponents, among others Siger of Brabant.

Analogous notions, similar to those represented by the disciples of Amaury and by David of Dinant, appeared also in Ortlieb of Strasbourg, who intended to obey only the Holy Spirit revealing himself to him most intimately. Ortlieb's followers[11] in Germany did not believe in creation, taught the eternity of the world with the Averroists, and denied the resurrection and the last judgment. They held that whoever did not join them in Noah's Ark was lost. They understood the sacraments and the articles of faith in a mystical sense and the Gospels in a moral sense, but not literally or sacramentally in the sense of tradition. Like the Waldensians and the Cathari, they rejected oaths and every form of lying and killing, but they permitted marriage and called for asceticism, in particular fasting and penance. They did not organize a sect. They were everywhere and nowhere. Wandering scholars, friars and preachers who were weary of the religious life, itinerant Beghards and Beguines may have transmitted such notions. As the opportunity arose, they were arrested, interrogated, and punished. Soon after 1270 Albert the Great wrote at Cologne an opinion on about one hundred statements of heretics in Swabian Ries near Nördlingen, which, as the *Compilatio de novo spiritu,* was included in the collection of the so-called Passau Anonymous and was there supplemented by a list of errors of this "heresy of the new Spirit."

The Beghard-Beguine movement of the thirteenth century[12] was also early infected by heretical elements, which, however, were not seen to be dangerous until the fourteenth century. Because of the wide distribution and varied organization of the Beguines, these elements could not be localized and at first seemed to be merely enthusiastic admixtures in the fabric of what was in itself a pious and orthodox organization. Still, so far as the Church was concerned, these groups had to be kept under surveillance, because they quickly settled especially in the great cities, but these centres were located in those regions where heresy was at home by predilection: Byzantium, the Danube districts, the valleys of the Rhine, Meuse, Rhone and Saône, and Loire, Champagne, Flanders, North Italy, Provence, Languedoc, and Aragón.

---

[10] A. Hödl, "Siger de Brabant," *LThK,* IX (2nd ed. 1964), 746 f., denies that Siger of Brabant ever defended the doctrine of the double truth.

[11] On Ortlieb's followers see now H. Grundmann, *LThK,* VII (2nd ed. 1962), 1256 f.

[12] On the Beguines and the Beghards see Chapter 32.

The papal reaction against these heretical movements that were spreading everywhere proved to be ineffective. The secular arm was called upon for help in France, Spain, Italy, and the Empire, and warlike methods were employed under the guise of a crusade.[13] But then the papacy developed an institution whose origins go back to the twelfth century but which first obtained its organization in the second quarter of the thirteenth century: the Inquisition. At Verona in 1184 Lucius III, in the presence of the Emperor Frederick I, took up a decision rendered by Alexander III at the Council of Tours in 1163 and made it universally binding in his bull "Ad abolendam," which was later included in the decretals of Gregory IX. According to this, the bishop, as the ordinary judge in questions of heresy, was to search out heretics in biennial visitations of his diocese in order to prosecute them on his own authority, without waiting for a formal accusation. Thus, inquisition proceedings were to replace accusation proceedings. Here were the beginnings of the Inquisition. In his bull "Vergentis in senium" of 1199 Innocent III had confirmed these directives of 1184 and their strict sanctions, declared the offense of heresy to be *crimen maiestatis,* a concept of Roman law, and regulated the penalties there provided, stressing, it is true, that the Church may not disregard her obligation to exercise mercy. The Fourth Lateran Council made these rules law for the Universal Church,[14] emphasized the lawfulness of investigations from parish to parish, demanded that processes be initiated *ex officio,* without awaiting charges, and required the confiscation of the goods and the relinquishing, not the surrendering, of the condemned to the secular power for punishment, but with the *animadversio debita.* In this way the procedure of the Inquisition was essentially determined.

Honorius III proceeded further. He first intensified the Albigensian Crusade, for which the heir to the French throne made himself available. As King

---

[13] *Cf.* A. P. Evans, "The Albigensian Crusade," and J. R. Strayer, "The Political Crusades of the Thirteenth Century," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II (Philadelphia 1962), 277–324, 343–76.

[14] *COD,* 213–15.

Louis VIII, the latter brought it to a close to the great advantage of the crown. In April 1226 Louis issued an ordinance[15] of significance for the development of the Inquisition: that every heretic condemned by the episcopal court was to be forthwith punished through the *animadversio debita,* while the penalty of infamy was to be the lot of followers and abettors. The bishop was thus the judge of heretics, and the canonical formula, *animadversione debita,* of Verona in 1184 became an element of French royal law. This ordinance of 1226 can be regarded as the model of all later legislation.

As in France, so also in Aragón Honorius III gained the help asked from the crown. At the request of the Cardinal Legate Romanus King James I forbade his vassals to receive heretics and commanded them to refuse any aid to them and their friends. But the essential support of the papal action against heresy was to be the Emperor. At his coronation Frederick II issued some laws, concerning which it has been possible to establish that they were formulated by the Curia. Among them was an edict against heretics.[16]

Heretics condemned by the Church were exiled and they and their heirs suffered confiscation of property. Persons suspected of heresy incurred, as provided by the Fourth Lateran Council, infamy, excommunication, and, in the case of the obstinate, the same penalties as heretics. City authorities were obliged under oath to expel them. If lords were involved, their land and possessions were liable to seizure, reserving the rights of the respective overlord. With this edict the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council became the law of the Empire. Frederick II sent the edict to Bologna to be inscribed in the University's register and proclaimed as the norm of instruction. A year later Honorius III did the same. In 1224 Frederick II introduced the penalty of burning. In a reply of March 1224 to an inquiry from Archbishop Albert of Magdeburg, who was acting as imperial legate in Romagna, occurs the following:[17]

> Anyone who has been convicted of heresy by the bishop of his diocese must immediately, on the bishop's demand, be arrested by the secular judicial authority and delivered up to the pyre. Should the judges mercifully spare his life, he must at least suffer the loss of his tongue, by which the Catholic faith has been assailed.

---

[15] Text of the ordinance in *Fliche-Martin,* X, 300, footnote 1: "Statuimus quod haeretici qui a catholica fide deviant, quocumque nomine censentur, postquam fuerint de haeresi per episcopum loci vel per aliam personam ecclesiasticam quae potestatem habeat condemnati, indilate animadversione debita puniantur, ordinantes et firmiter decernentes ne quis haereticos receptare vel defensare quomodolibet aut ipsos fovere praesumat, et, si quis contra praedicta praesumpserit facere, nec ad testimonium nec ad honorem aliquem de caetero admittatur, nec possit facere testamentum, nec successionem alicuius hereditate habere; bona ipsius mobilia et immobilia ipso facto [sint confiscata] ad ipsum vel ad ipsius posteritatem nullatenus reversura."

[16] *MGConst,* II, 106–09.

[17] *Ibid.,* 126 f.

This order was to rank, not as a simple rescript, but as an imperial constitution for all of Lombardy. While it is true that in 1197 Peter II of Aragón had decreed the penalty of fire, James I had not admitted it into his legislation of 1226. Likewise, in Languedoc the penalty of burning had been decreed at the beginning of the century, but the royal ordinance of 1226 did not mention it.

In Italy, however, Frederick II called for recourse to the pyre, whereas the Curia hesitated to do so. The imperial municipal councils of Rimini and Macerata in 1226 surrendered a few heretics to Frederick, who had them burned. Still, the imperial constitution of 1224 appeared neither in the *Compilatio quinta* nor in Gregory IX's collection of decretals. Hence the papacy did not adopt it officially, though it tacitly tolerated its implementation. The cities remained more than cool, especially when from 1226 they again began to unite against the Emperor.

Honorius III, acting as arbiter between Lombard League and Emperor, commanded the envoys of the cities to adopt both the papal conciliar decrees and the imperial constitutions against heresy into their municipal legislation.[18]

The Lombard cities complied in their peace proclamation of 26 March 1227. Included in the recommended imperial constitutions was certainly that of 1224, which provided death by fire for condemned heretics.

Gregory IX energetically pursued the policy of his predecessor, who had made the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council respected in France, Spain, and the Empire but had abandoned the restrictions favouring mercy as laid down by Innocent III.

Since he made the Lombards' peace formula a guiding principle and imposed it upon all cities, through him the Church officially recognized death at the stake as a penalty. Hesitant and negligent bishops in Lombardy were ordered by Gregory to procure the aid of preachers who could edify the people by word and example. Whether the new Order of Preachers was meant cannot be determined from the texts, which seem rather to refer to preachers among the diocesan clergy. However, Gregory now expressly gave the task of inquisitor to religious, for example, to the Dominican prior of Santa Maria Novella at Florence against the heretic Paterno and in Germany to Conrad of Marburg, a Premonstratensian.[19]

On 12 April 1229 there was concluded at Paris between King Louis IX and Count Raymond VII of Toulouse a peace which is to be regarded as the definitive end of the Albigensian wars. The royal ordinance of 1229, which dealt with the procedure against heretics in connection with the peace treaty, repeated the order of 1226. The collaboration of ecclesiastical and secular authorities in discovering and punishing heretics, established at Verona in 1184, sanctioned in the Empire in 1220 and 1224 and in France in 1226, was now officially recognized and confirmed by Louis IX in 1229.

---

[18] *MGEp, sec. XIII,* I, no. 327 (5 January 1227): "Constitutiones vero, leges et statuta ab Ecclesia Romana et Romanis imperatoribus et specialiter ab ipso imperatore contra haereticos, receptatores, defensores, credentes et fautores eorum, hactenus promulgata vel in posterum promulganda, recipiant et observent inviolabiliter et efficaciter exequantur."

[19] Conrad's membership in the Premonstratensian Order (Abbey of Arnstein) has been made probable by the studies of K. H. May in *Hess. Jb. für Landesgeschichte,* 1 (1951), 87–109.

Since the Emperor was thereafter often obstructed by his quarrel with the Curia, the policy with regard to heretics in France became of special importance for the further development of legislation on heresy and hence of the Inquisition. The Council of Toulouse in the year of the Peace of 1229 — in the autumn under the presidency of the Cardinal Legate Romanus — played a great role in this, since there for the first time the assembling of a permanent law court was decreed, a permanent college of judges with delegated episcopal authority, whose task consisted solely in seeking out heretics and bringing them before the court. About twenty of the Council's forty-five articles were concerned with the question of heretics.

These dealt with the episcopal Inquisition, the duties of the commission of pastors, which traced the accused and took them to the court, and the duty of all believers to put themselves at the court's disposal as witnesses.

Following the Peace of Paris and the Council of Toulouse the Cathari and other heretics went underground and open resistance ceased.

Gregory IX carried further the Curia's legislation on heretics. In January 1231 he accepted Frederick II's constitution of 1224, including the punishment by fire, into his register[20] and in February 1231 incorporated it into his own constitution "Excommunicamus,"[21] so that from then on *animadversio debita* became synonymous with the penalty of death at the stake. Elements from Verona (1184), Narbonne, and Toulouse were adopted in this constitution. Public and private discussions of faith among the laity were forbidden, and ecclesiastical burial was denied to those put to death. Immurement, or life-imprisonment for penitent heretics, prohibition of any appeal to other tribunals, denial of any legal assistance for the accused, and finally social ostracism of the descendants of the condemned — to the second generation they lost the ability to hold any ecclesiastical offices — were among the fundamental components of this legislation. Gregory also had the Roman Senate's decision in cases of the condemnation of relapsed heretics included in his register immediately after his constitution of February 1231, so that, together with his own and the imperial enactment of 1224, it constituted in a sense one *corpus*. It gave the secular arm a delay of eight days for the carrying out of the *animadversio debita*, ordered the destruction of the immovable property, assigned one-third of the goods to those making the denunciation, and expelled from the city all followers of the condemned, confiscating one-third of their possessions also.

---

[20] L. Auvray, *Registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 535.

[21] *Ibid.*, no. 539.

With the 1231 edicts of Gregory IX the basic legislation for the procedure of the Inquisition was complete. All the essential elements can be identified in it: infamy, loss of civil and political rights, banishment, deprivation of feudal holdings, and *animadversio debita* as death at the stake, so far as the series of penalties was concerned. The Pope also made universally binding the wearing of the cross by the condemned, the secrecy of trials and the withholding of the names of witnesses, the prohibition of lodging an appeal and of asking legal assistance from lawyers. The duty of maintaining prisoners was defined, and the exhuming of the remains of heretics who had gone undetected in their lifetime was ordered. The episcopal judges and those from the diocesan clergy thereby obtained their manual of penal procedure and penal law for the future. From now on there was question of its use and of the activation of Inquisition tribunals everywhere in the Church.

In addition to the episcopal Inquisition, such as it had been decided upon, though, of course, to a great extent ineffectively, at Verona in 1184, Gregory IX now appointed papal inquisitors with the permanent duty of seeking out heretics systematically, of bringing them to trial, of condemning them if they were unable to free themselves of suspicion, and of relinquishing them to the secular power for burning.

From 1232 on Gregory IX, and later his successors, turned over the Inquisition to the new orders, especially to the Dominicans, who, to quote Grundmann, "with a downright scientific zeal for the faith built up an inescapable legal procedure in their special tribunal." Textbooks and manuals for inquisitors appeared, in which were to be found fundamental, even if often one-sided and polemical explanations of heresy and the harsh methods for combatting it. But this systematically organized Inquisition, becoming everywhere effective, was unable completely to eradicate heresy. Still, because of it a keener defensive struggle was possible in the event of any deviation from the faith of the Church.

In South Germany the episcopal Inquisition and that entrusted to specified religious or to individual commissioners worked side by side under Gregory IX. The Dominicans, soon to be commissioned by preference, always had to act under the control of the bishops. It was the same in Flanders, Prussia, Bohemia, and Bavaria.

In France also, for the time being, the episcopal Inquisition continued to operate; it was effectively administered by most bishops. In the Midi, it is true, Gregory IX in 1233 named papal inquisitors such as Peter Cella and William Arnaud of Montpellier for the dioceses of Toulouse and Cahors. They were immediately subject to the Pope, control of their activity lying in the hands of papal legates.

The episcopal and the legatine Inquisition and that administered by religious were intended by the Pope to co-operate in principle, even though there were shifts of emphasis according to the various territories. Under Innocent IV occurred the completion of the Inquisition as an institution of canon law. In this connection he frequently modified the procedure, whose original severity had evoked opposition, not only in Germany and the Midi, but among princes and cities generally. A more respectable conduct of processes had been set forth in the decrees of the Synods of Narbonne (1243) and Béziers (1246), and Innocent IV confirmed these. In the struggle against Frederick II he had to be concerned about a rapid and thorough settlement of the many disturbances in the Midi, about a reconciliation with Count Raymond VII of Toulouse, and about the co-operation of the German bishops. He was able to arrange a harmonious collaboration of crown and papacy in France, and in Spain and Germany the episcopates were prepared to support the Inquisition. After the Emperor's death in 1250, Innocent IV was able to establish the Inquisition as a permanent institution in Italy. All earlier papal and imperial enactments were combined in the bull "Ad exstirpanda" of 15 May 1252.[22] The introduction of torture in the process was new. But the Pope's actual policy brought many modifications and amnesty for all who were reconciled to the Church within a year. The arrest of relatives, introduced by Gregory IX in 1231, was abolished. All this was, one might say, a return to the merciful firmness of Innocent III.

The establishing of the Inquisition and its activity, the collaboration of ecclesiastical and secular power in the fight against heresy, the harshness of the procedure, and the cruelty of the penalties — none of this can be understood apart from the assumptions of the social order in the High Middle Ages. The bond unifying them was the faith, which heresy threatened to destroy. With all the means provided by its ecclesiastical and secular powers Christendom waged a war to maintain itself against this threat. Perhaps a real Christian self-understanding was obscure in some circles. These shadows remain and should have served as a warning to coming generations. A better understanding demands a more refined but at the same time more generous judgment of the past.

CHAPTER 29

The Missionary Work of the Church in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries

The epoch of the elaboration of legal structures and of religious renewal, of theological scholarship and of mystical emotion, could not neglect a task so central to the very being of the Church as was that of announcing salvation to all peoples. This was all the more urgent as the crusade movement constantly brought new peoples into view on the frontiers of Christendom, from the Muslims to the Mongols. In addition, there took place from Scandinavia to Central Germany a constant encounter with the still pagan world of the Elbe Slavs, the Baltic Sea area, and Finland.[1] While efforts had begun there as early as the ninth and tenth centuries to press eastward,[2] and Adalbert of Prague in 997 and Bruno of Querfurt in 1009 had died as martyrs,[3] still, with the exception of Poland in 966, no North Slavic people could be won. Wends, Pomeranians, Prussians, Livs, Esthonians, and Finns were not to be incorporated into Christendom until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

---

[22] *Potthast*, 14592; text in *Bullarium Taur.*, III, 552–58.

Missionary work among these peoples was influenced by the idea then current of a *dilatatio imperii christiani* and continued necessarily to be characterized by the intimate interrelationship of political and religious motives that marked the contemporary self-awareness of the Church. The mission of the sword and the mission of the word were inextricably combined; conquest, constructing of an ecclesiastical organization, and a comprehensive pastoral activity on the part of monastery and parish succeeded one another. Protection by the state remained essential both for beginning and for continuing any Christianization The results were not due chiefly to the papacy, as one would have expected, but to the reform orders of the twelfth century — Cistercians, Premonstratensians, and canons regular — and to the mendicant orders of the thirteenth century, even though the overall responsibility remained that of the Holy See through the grant of privileges and the dispatch of legates. As regards secular powers, the initiative passed from the Emperor to the princes of the marches and the northern kings and, especially in the Baltic area, to the military orders, in particular to the Teutonic Knights in Prussia. During this entire period the crusade played a role only once and then negatively: in the Wend Crusade of 1147. Of course, the military exertions of Albert of Riga in Livonia were also authentic crusade enterprises.

The resumption of Christian evangelization in the twelfth century began in Pomerania, which King Boleslas III of Poland conquered in 1122. He asked assistance from Bishop Otto of Bamberg, who in two sojourns, 1123–24 and 1128–29, baptized and preached in Pyritz, Wollin, Stettin, Kammin, and elsewhere. The see of Wollin, founded in 1140 after Otto's death, was made subject neither to Gniezno nor to Magdeburg but directly to the Curia at Rome.

---

[1] G. Stökl, *Geschichte der Slavenmission (Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* ed. K. D. Schmidt-E. Wolf, II/E) (Göttingen 1961), 90 f.

[2] See Volume III, Chapters 30 and 31.

[3] H. D. Kahl, "Compellere intrare. Die Wendenpolitik Bruns von Querfurt im Licht hochmittelalterlichen Missions- und Völkerrechts," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung,* 4 (1955), 161–93, 260–401, now also in H. Beumann, *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters* (Darmstadt 1963), 177–274.

Not much later than in Pomerania an effort was made from Hamburg-Bremen to convert the Slavs beyond the Elbe. Archbishop Adalbero sent the Bremen canon Vizelin, who began to preach in Wagria in 1126. Northwest of Lübeck he founded the chapter of Neumünster. From the 1140's Henry the Lion of Saxony and Albert the Bear of Brandenburg especially became the decisive protectors in the marches.

The Wend Crusade of 1147[4] involved not only an interruption of the missionary endeavours but also a hardening of fronts and an impeding of later pastoral work among the Slavs. The expression, "death or baptism", as ascribed to Bernard of Clairvaux, who preached the crusade, sounded harsh but was also to be understood as a criticism of the policy thus far pursued by the princes, who seemed disposed, *vis-à-vis* an unconverted but subjugated population, to maintain a freer hand in regard to taxes and tribute. Actually, the expression was really applied in very few cases.

In questions relating to the organizing of bishoprics, which was carried on from Hamburg-Bremen and Magdeburg, there occurred a confrontation between the Archbishop of Bremen, Hartwig of Stade, and Duke Henry the Lion, who claimed the right to institute the bishops.[5] Vizelin, whom Hartwig had consecrated as Bishop of Oldenburg, accepted investiture from the Duke in 1151 after long hesitation. The Duke, in investing him, exercised a mandate from the Emperor. Besides Oldenburg, which was transferred to Lübeck in 1160, the sees of Ratzeburg and Mecklenburg, widowed since 1066, were restored; in 1161 Mecklenburg was transferred to Schwerin. Premonstratensians settled at Leitzkau and Jerichow, Cistercians at Doberan and Lehnin — to mention only the most important abbeys.

Albert the Bear's expansion policy, which, as everywhere else, was likewise one of colonization, — Hollanders and Flemings were invited to the country beyond the Elbe, — allowed the occupation of Brandenburg in 1150.[6] The old sees of Brandenburg and Havelberg had been restored since the 1130's and were administered by Premonstratensians. Particular attention was devoted to completing the parish organization; in its main lines this was achieved by 1200. But an actual consolidation of the situation was delayed until the middle of the thirteenth century.

---

[4] *Cf.* H. D. Kahl, "Zum Ergebnis des Wendenkreuzzugs von 1147. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des sächsischen Frühchristentums," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch,* 11/12 (1957 f.), 99–120, now in Beumann, *op. cit.,* 275–316. Kahl thinks he can establish "that the crusade itself ... achieved on the whole the goal set for it" (314).

[5] *Cf.* K. Jordan, *Die Bistumsgründungen Heinrichs des Löwen (Schriften der MGH,* 3) (Leipzig 1939).

[6] M. Treiter, "Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg im Mittelalter," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch,* 1 (1930), 5–73; G. Wentz, *Das Bistum Brandenburg,* I *(Germania Sacra,* I/1) (Berlin 1929).

The Augustinian canon, Meinhard of Segeberg, was active in Livonia[7] from 1180. He resided at Üxküll on the Dvina as a suffragan of Bremen. A pagan reaction put an end to this start until Albert of Buxhövden, consecrated Bishop of the Livs in 1199, organized a crusade, which was successful under his leadership. In 1201 Albert founded Riga, which became his episcopal city. He founded the Military Order of the Knights of the Sword, *Fratres militiae Christi,* with whose help he subjugated parts of Esthonia, Semigallia, Courland, and the island of Ösel. The see of Dorpat, like that of Riga, was made an imperial prince-bishopric in 1225 by King Henry, son of the Emperor Frederick II. In 1255 Alexander IV made Riga an archbishopric, the first metropolitan being Albert Suerbeer, former Archbishop of Armagh.[8] For the protection of the whole territory that was evangelized from Riga crusaders were recruited throughout the thirteenth century for the struggle against pagan attacks. Bishop Albert's dominion — it has been said that he intended to found an ecclesiastical state — was divided through the intervention of the Curia. The Bishop, the Knights of the Sword, and the city of Riga each obtained one-third. Albert had declared Livonia to be the "property of the Mother of God" and had thereby in principle subjected it to the Church. Even after the division of power this idea remained the unifying bond among Bishop, city, and knights.

Farther north the intervention of the Danes had continued the Church's missionary work among the Esths since 1170. The regions conquered were at first added to the province of Lund; the Franciscan friar Fulco became the first Bishop. Questions controverted between Danes and Germans were settled by the Papal Legate William of Modena in the Treaty of Stenby in 1237. The see of Reval remained subject to Lund, but Dorpat and Ösel-Wiek became suffragans of Riga.

Christian influence had made itself felt in Finland in the eleventh century but it required Swedish crusades, in 1157 under King Eric IX Jedvardson and in 1239 and 1295, to subjugate the country. Bishop Henry of Uppsala,[9] English by birth, accompanied Eric as missionary. He was murdered in 1160 and became Finland's patron saint. The see of Abo, founded in 1276, remained a suffragan of Uppsala. The Dominicans played a substantial role in the Christianization of Finland, and the see even adopted their liturgy.

---

[7] For Livonia see now the biography by G. Gnegel-Waitschies, *Bischof Albert von Riga* (Hamburg 1958) and the large-scale monograph by F. Benninghoven, *Der Orden der Schwertbrüder* (Cologne and Graz 1965); also the sketch by T. Grentrup, "Der Zisterzienser Dietrich in der altlivländischen Mission (1219)," *ZMR,* 40 (1956), 265–81. While Gnegel-Waitschies regards Albert as the founder of the order (66), Grentrup (268) and Benninghoven stress the decisive role of Dietrich.

[8] For Albert Suerbeer see M. Hellmann, *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter* (Münster and Cologne 1954), 176–85.

[9] For Saint Henry of Uppsala see A. Maliniemi, *De Sancto Henrico,* II (Helsinki 1942).

The first attempts at the evangelization of the pagan Prussians between the Vistula and the Memel were ordered by Boleslas I of Poland toward the end of the tenth century. But it was due to the initiative of Innocent III that the work was seriously continued. Christian of Lekno, a Cistercian, went there before 1210 and in 1215 was consecrated Bishop of the Prussians by the Pope. When the Chelmno district, which belonged to Mazovia, was conquered by the Prussians, Duke Conrad, with the consent of Bishop Christian, called upon the Teutonic Knights for assistance. Hermann of Salza, grand master from 1209 to 1239, accepted the offer; the Emperor Frederick II granted him the imperial protection, and Pope Gregory IX approved. The struggle to subjugate the Prussians lasted from 1230 to 1283. The Livonian Knights of the Sword provided military assistance, as, to a lesser degree, did also the Knights of Christ of Dobrin, founded by Bishop Christian in 1228. German peasants, especially Westphalians, were invited into the country, and the mendicant orders, again the Dominicans in particular, took charge of the pastoral work. The Papal Legate William of Modena erected sees in 1243 at Chelmno, Pomesania, Ermeland, and Samland. At first they were combined into one Archbishopric of Prussia, but when Riga was made a metropolitan see in 1255 they were incorporated into that province. Except for Ermeland, these sees became part of the territory of the Teutonic Order. The still young Order of the Hospital of Our Lady of the German House in Jerusalem — it had been founded at Acre in 1198 — had for some time been on the lookout for work outside Syria-Palestine, even though the castle of Montfort near Acre remained the residence of the grand master until 1271. At first, in 1211, it obtained from King Andrew II of Hungary the protectorate of the Burzenland in Transylvania against the pagan Cumans. Since it began to create there an autonomous territory, it had to give way in 1225. Almost at once, in 1226, arrived the call to the north. Probably at the instigation of Hermann of Salza, the Emperor Frederick II had already in 1224 placed the peoples of Livonia, Esthonia, Samland, Prussia, and Semigallia under the protection of the Empire, very likely in order to counteract Danish influence. In 1225 Pope Honorius III also placed them under his personal protection, in particular the new converts in Prussia and Livonia. In the Golden Bull of Rimini in 1226 Frederick II bestowed on the Order dominion over the territory to be conquered, and the grand master became a prince of the Empire. The territory gained by the Order was entrusted to it in perpetuity as the "property of Saint Peter" by Gregory IX in 1234. It was due to the grand master that in this matter the competing interests of Pope and Emperor did not conflict but rather proceeded in peaceful co-operation. In 1236 the remnant of the Knights of the Sword of Livonia was united with the Teutonic Order, which thus became responsible also for Livonia. Esthonia remained in the hands of the Danes. A revolt of the Prussians in 1242 could not be suppressed until 1247. In the Peace of

Christburg in 1249[10] the Prussians, thanks to the intervention of the Curia, obtained personal freedom and equality with the Germans. The legate on that occasion was James of Troyes, the later Pope Urban IV. From Livonia the Order also subjugated Courland and in 1252 founded Memel. The Lithuanians remained unconquered and for the time being unconverted, even though Prince Mindaugas received baptism in 1250 and obtained the royal title from Innocent IV. In 1260 he apostatized. Not until toward the end of the thirteenth century was the strength of the Teutonic Order's state so secure that the grand master could in 1309 transfer his residence from Venice to the Marienburg.

If the missions among the Slavs and in the Baltic area remained closely tied to conquest and domination, if here the crusade developed from a means of defense into an instrument of forcible expansion, the situation was different in the eastern Mediterranean and on the African coast. Only in the Spanish *Reconquista* can analogous developments be surmised, even if a quite different social and historical context must be considered: that of Christian communities on Islamic territory.[11]

The crusader states in Syria and Palestine, it is true, had non-Christian populations under their rule, but apart from a few indications in the twelfth century, there was very little eagerness to preach the Gospel to them. Pastoral activity, to the extent that it was taken seriously, was directed to the Christian population, which, extraordinarily mixed, — Latins and Greeks, French and Italians, long resident families and pilgrims, — resisted any systematic care. The experiences in 1216–18 of James of Vitry, Bishop of Acre, showed this only too clearly.[12]

Serious reflection to the effect that the warlike contacts with Islam, though they might have been pursued with the noblest defensive aims, could not free the West from the responsibility of seeking to preach Christianity even in Islamic territory first occurred in the thirteenth century. Well known are the attitude of Saint Francis of Assisi and his discussion from Damietta in 1219 with the Sultan al-Kamil, which at least obtained for him personally the freedom to preach.[13] He also sent friars to Morocco, where five of them were killed in 1220.[14] From now on, especially in the new orders, it was seen ever more clearly that, wherever the crusade made it possible, there was a duty to activate an evangelization. As is well known, this effort nowhere led to real successes when it had to face Islam, whose attitude was one of fundamental rejection and obstruction. Toward the end of the century the bases of the problem of the mission to Islam were grappled with by the Franciscan tertiary, Raymond Lull (d. 1316).[15] With him the holy war clearly retired in favour of an intellectual campaign to win unbelievers. On Mallorca he established a missionary college for Franciscans. Himself fluent in Arabic, he worked for the setting up of chairs of Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac at the universities. After the fall in 1291 of Acre, which settled the fate of the Crusader Kingdom, Lull sent to Pope Nicholas IV his treatise on the converting of infidels. His plan was sufficiently comprehensive: the erecting of houses for the study of languages by missionaries, a uniform direction of missionary activity by a cardinal, amalgamation of the military orders, religious renewal of clergy and laity. Naturally, the crusade itself also played a role in all this. Lull himself made extensive missionary journeys: in North Africa in 1281—82, 1292, 1307, and in 1314 until he was stoned to death in 1316; among the Jews and Arabs at Naples in 1293–94; on Mallorca in 1300–01; and on Sicily in 1313–14. He offered suggestions to Pope Celestine V in 1294 and to Pope Boniface VIII in 1296 and dedicated his *Liber de acquisitione Terrae Sanctae* to Pope Clement V. To his satisfaction, the Council of Vienne in 1311 adopted his suggestions and decreed the establishing of chairs of languages. To a great extent he too viewed conquest and conversion as one, and hence he quite approximated the practice of northern Europe.

---

[10] H. Patze, "Der Frieden von Christburg vom Jahre 1249," *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands,* 7 (1958), 39–91, now in Beumann, *op. cit.*, 417–83.

[11] For the *Reconquista* see R. Menéndez Pidal, *La España del Cid,* 2 vols. (Madrid, 4th ed. 1947); J. Goñi Gaztambide, *Historia de la bula de la cruzada en España* (Vitoria 1958; literature).

[12] *Cf.* James of Vitry, *Lettres,* ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Leiden 1960).

[13] On this *cf.* M. Roncaglia, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente Francescano,* I: *Storia della provincia della Terra Santa,* Part I: *I Francescani in Oriente durante la crociata* (Cairo 1954); for the meeting of Saint Francis and the Sultan *cf.* G. Golubovich, "San Francesco e i Francescani in Damiata (5. 11. 1219–2. 2. 1220)," *Studi Francescani,* 23 (1926), 307–30, supplemented by L. Lemmens, "De Sancto Francisco

Like the Franciscans, the Dominicans also sought to promote the mission to Islam. Raymond Lull took part in their general chapters of 1283, 1285, and 1294, and he was invited by the Franciscans in 1287, 1289, and 1295.

The actual results of such missionary activity were, it is true, meagre. The scanty reports are frequently limited to individual conversions and to work among Arabs and Muslims in lands under Christian rule. In North Africa there were only occasional contacts, for there, with the assent of the princes, the strictly pastoral activity served the Christians. If the Popes, notably Gregory IX and Innocent IV, had messages delivered by mendicant friars

---

Christum praedicante coram sultano Aegypti," *AFrH*, 19 (1926), 559–78; also M. Roncaglia, "San Francesco d'Assisi in Oriente," *Studi Francescani*, 50 (1953), 97–106.

[14] On the preaching by the Franciscans in Morocco and their martyrdom see now J. Toussaert, *Antonius von Padua* (Cologne 1967), 191–201.

[15] For Raymond Lull *cf.* the excellent article by E. W. Platzeck in *LThK*, VIII (2nd ed. 1963), 974–76, with copious bibliography. Raymond's anonymous *Vita coetana* was ed. by B. de Gaiffier in *AnBoll*, 48 (1930), 130–78; E. W. Platzeck, *Raimund Lull*, 2 vols. (Düsseldorf 1962 f.), is the most comprehensive biography.

to the Sultans of Damascus, Iconium, Aleppo, and Baghdad between 1233 and 1250, in all probability no missionary preaching could be included on these diplomatic occasions.

As early as the pontificate of Gregory IX the Curia was aware of the danger from the Mongols, who had already invaded Eastern Europe.[16] Hungarian Dominicans had gone to the Volga region to investigate the missionary possibilities. They came back with extremely upsetting news. Berthold of Andechs, Patriarch of Aquileia, had appropriate warnings read from all pulpits. The Mongol storm fell upon Poland and Hungary in 1240 to 1241. The German defeat at Liegnitz in Silesia in 1241 appeared to present the worst threat, but actually it was the turning point, for the death of the Great Khan Ogdai in 1242 caused the Mongols to evacuate Central Europe, though they remained in Russia.

It was known in the West that in Asia there had long been living Persian Nestorians, who had penetrated as far as India and China. In the eleventh century they had contrived to convert the Turcoman prince of Kerait on Lake Baikal, who then led his people to Christianity. This vassal of the Chinese Empire is to be regarded as the historical nucleus of the legend of Prester John, which arose at that time and was widely believed.[17] The view that beyond the frontiers of Europe there were Christian kingdoms in the Far East may have contributed to the Curia's determination to send messengers of its own to the East at the very moment of the farthest advance of the Mongols to the West. It could learn from previous reports that the Mongols, belonging to none of the known world religions, practised an extensive toleration toward them, including that of the Christian Nestorians. The wife of the Khan Hulagu (1259–65) was a Nestorian.

And so on several occasions Innocent IV and King Louis IX of France sent Franciscans and Dominicans to the Mongols. John of Piano di Carpine in the Abruzzi went in 1245–47 *via* Russia to Karakorum, chief residence of the Great Khan; William of Ruysbroeck in Flanders also went there, *via* Anatolia, in 1253–55. Probably there was no question of missionary activity; inquiries and contacts were envisaged. The mission in the sense of a preaching of the faith was first taken up by the Franciscan John of Montecorvino, who from 1294 to 1328 worked at Cambalu (Peking) among Nestorians and Buddhists with a group of confrères, notably Arnold of Cologne and Odoric of Pordenone. He was named Archbishop by Clement V in 1307. Of the many auxiliary bishops sent to him from the Franciscan Order only four reached Peking. The end of the Mongol domination in China and the assumption of power by the Ming Dynasty in 1368 destroyed the Peking mission.[18]

---

[16] H. Dörrie edited the relevant texts: *Drei Texte zur Geschichte der Ungarn und Mongolen. Die Missionsreisen des Fr. Julianus O.P. ins Uralgebiet (1234/35) und nach Russland (1237)* (Göttingen 1956).

[17] For Prester John *cf.* F. Zarncke, *AGL,* phil. Kl., 7 (1879), 827–1030, 8 (1883), 1–186; R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae,* II (Leiden, 2nd ed. 1950), 438–60.

Missionary zeal was kept aglow among the Dominicans, especially by the master general Humbert of Romans (1254–63). Toward the close of the thirteenth century the Order established the *Societas fratrum peregrinantium propter Christum,* which was active particularly in the lands around the Black Sea and in Asia Minor.[19]

In general it can be established in regard to the Church's missionary endeavour in this period that, in connection with the political opening up of the Baltic countries for the West, Christianity was also able to take root there. The encounter with Islam continued, because it was for the most part of a military and political nature, to be without particular impact because of its exclusion of any religious propaganda, if one disregards the catechetical efforts in the reconquered parts of Spain. The advance in the countries under Mongol rule was merely casual, except for the Franciscan mission in Peking.

CHAPTER 30

Canon Law and the Constitution of the Church in the Thirteenth Century

Since the appearance of Gratian's *Decretum* around 1140 the scientific study of canon law had developed at Bologna and Paris and later also at Montpellier, Oxford, and Salamanca. Applying the scholastic method, the decretists had prepared the material in glosses, *quaestiones,* treatises, and *summae* for use in academic instruction and the courts. The collaboration of theory and practice gave rise to what Gabriel Le Bras calls the "new law." The legislative activity of the papacy in the decretals and of councils in constitutions contributed the most to this development. These new decisions became especially numerous from the pontificate of Alexander III. Collections were made, at first privately,[1] then with papal authorization. More than eighty such collections have been discovered; the best known are the five great compilations made between 1191 and 1226. Two of them were officially approved: the *Compilatio tertia* of Peter of Benevento by Innocent III in 1209 and the *Compilatio quinta,* perhaps of Tancred, by Honorius III in 1220; they were sent to the courts and schools for their use. Gregory IX decided to unify the decretal legislation of the last century. He entrusted Raymond of Peñaforte with the codification in 1230 and it was published by the Pope on 5 September 1234. Thus Gregory IX's *Liber Extra (Liber decretalium extra decretum vagantium)* became the first "official, authentic, uniform, universal, and exclusive" law book of the Church. Innocent IV, Gregory X, and Nicholas III then published collections of decretals *(novellae)*, and other private and inadequate compilations also appeared. Once again the legal situation became so complicated that at the end of the century Boniface VIII decided to publish a law book that would include all collections made since the *Liber Extra.* A commission of three, under William of Mandagout, Archbishop of Embrun, produced this work, which contained not only 108 decretals of his predecessors but 251 decretals of Boniface himself and the canons of the two Councils of Lyons. The Pope published this *Liber Sextus* on 3 March 1298; Gregory IX's *Liber Extra* retained its legal force. These two codifications of the thirteenth century stimulated and provided the models for the legislation of kings and princes that was now everywhere in process.[2]

---

[18] On the Chinese mission in the Middle Ages see now C. W. Troll, *FStud,* 48 (1966), 109–50, 49 (1967), 22–79.

[19] R. Loenertz, *La Société des Frères Pérégrinants. Étude sur l'Orient dominicain* (Rome 1937).

[1] *Cf.* C. Duggan, *Twelfth-Century Decretal Collections and their Importance in English History* (London 1963).

The methods employed in systematic instruction in canon law were similar to those developed at the theological faculties, above all that of Paris. In addition to the lecture *(lectio, praelectio, lectura), disputatio* was also practised. In it the *quaestiones* already treated in the lecture were discussed again between teachers and students, mostly in an analytical and exegetical manner. Both found expression in the literature as *lecturae* composed by the teacher himself or as *reportatio* (student's notes) or *quaestiones (disputatae)* respectively. As in theology, the works of the glossators — collections of glosses, later apparatus — became important. Eventually there appeared the great *summae,* real commentaries, intended as texts and manuals for practice. Among them the *summae* of apparatus had special prestige. Innocent IV had composed one, which gained him the title of *princeps iuristarum.* The commentaries dealt to some extent only with restricted fields, such as matrimonial law, judicial procedure, penal law, electoral law. Also noteworthy were the *summae* of confession, or penitential *summae,* whose importance was more and more in the field of moral and pastoral theology, so that their strictly canonical character was obscured.

The decretalists of the thirteenth century were concerned first of all with the five great compilations: those of Bernard of Pavia (d. 1213), Tancred (d. 1234–36), John Teutonicus (d. 1245–46), and James of Albenga (d. *ca.* 1273). England produced a group of scholars, such as Richard Anglicus (d. 1237), Gilbert Anglicus, Alan Anglicus, and others, as did Spain with Lawrence Hispanus (d. *ca.* 1248), Vincent, and Peter Hispanus. Even Hungary was represented by Damasus, who was a professor at Bologna between 1210 and 1220. The Golden Age of the decretalists began with the promulgation of the *Liber Extra* in 1234 and included the career of the celebrated John Andreae (1270–1348). Hence it lasted a century and was at the same time the expression of the most vigourous period of the constructing and consolidating of the ecclesiastical organization of the High Middle Ages and of the acceptance by the West of the canon law as the universally valid and effective legal order of Christendom.

---

[2] *Cf.* S. Gagnér, *Studien zur Ideengeschichte der Gesetzgebung* (Uppsala 1960), 288–340; criticism in W. E. Brynteson, "Roman Law and Legislation in the Middle Ages," *Speculum,* 41 (1966), 420–37.

To the decretalists of this period — they are also called the "later" decretalists — belonged, to name only a few, Raymond of Peñaforte (d. 1275), Godfrey of Trani (d. 1245), Bernard de Botone of Parma (d. 1266), Sinibaldo Fieschi (Pope Innocent IV, d. 1254), and, the most celebrated among them, Henry of Susa (Hostiensis, d. 1270). Many decretalists worked and wrote also in France, Spain, and Germany. The canonists did not develop a comprehensive theory of the Church as legislator; rather, they presupposed this, so to speak, and in their lectures, disputations, and commentaries were more concerned with the thousand particular problems that resulted from the ceaseless alteration of structures. Theology also knew no real treatise on the Church but understood quite well that the legislative Church of the jurists was to be identified with the Church experienced in faith, which, as the *corpus Christi mysticum,* to use an expression of Aquinas, constituted the proper ontological basis for all ways of life in Christendom that became visible in the law. The historical development led to this, that the hierarchical order of divine institution gained preeminence in the thought and action of the High Middle Ages, while the concept of the Church as the "people of God on earth," which was engaged in its journey to God, retired to the background. And so there was sketched a picture of the constitution of the Church in this period which was determined by one of the stable institutional elements in her. In this connection it must, of course, be remembered that all of them and every particular aspect of them, by virtue of the dynamics of historical transformation, changed, withdrew, were renewed, and occasionally, by the exaggerating of their functions, improperly displaced others or at least crippled them.

The great epoch of classical canon law was at the same time the epoch of the papacy as the authoritative guide of the destinies of Christendom, from Innocent III to Boniface VIII.[3] Neither before nor after was the papacy able to raise its claim so effectively, thanks precisely to the successful activity of canon lawyers and their students in the various offices — the papacy itself, the Curia, bishoprics, abbeys, and chapters — which converted theory into practice, to act and to lead as the universally acknowledged teacher, judge, and guide of *christianitas*.

---

[3] See now J. A. Watt, *Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century* (London 1965). M. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1963), looks back to the thirteenth century development.

The fundamental lines of the ecclesiastical organization did not change in the thirteenth century. The distinction between the power of orders and the power of jurisdiction in the one *potestas ecclesiastica* was worked out more clearly, again chiefly by Aquinas. The legislative power was exercised more firmly and more consciously, especially by the Pope. In the case of the Pope it found its limits in the divine law, both positively revealed and naturally known, but it could be developed beyond the conciliar law of earlier centuries. The Pope's sovereignty *vis-à-vis* the Council remained undisputed so long as he did not fall into heresy, which meant that he ceased to be Pope. He summoned general synods, directed them and promulgated their decisions as his decrees. There was no longer any question of an essential co-operation of the laity, such as the Emperor.

The papal right to legislate included the right to bestow privileges and grant dispensations from papal and universal as well as from particular law. Celestine II (1143–44) had introduced the legal reservation *salva Sedis Apostolicae auctoritate.*[4] To be sure, in the case of unrestrained exercise of the right to dispense there lay grave dangers for the security of the legal structures, but for the time being these did not seem to be threatening.

All clerical and non-clerical members of Christendom were subject to the supreme judicial authority. There had developed, in particular since the time of Alexander III (1159–81), the institution of delegated jurisdiction. Judges delegate undertook especially the investigation of disputed cases but occasionally also received authority to render decisions. Certain legal and penal cases were reserved exclusively to the Pope.

The Pope's supreme administrative rights were completed. To them belonged the right of supervision for the Universal Church. The canonization of saints was reserved to the Holy See from Alexander III and definitively by a regulation of Gregory IX. The system of ecclesiastical indulgences was concentrated in the Curia and restricted in regard to bishops. The Pope also had a leading role in the educational system of the age through the founding of universities and the conferring of privileges on them. The most important division of administration was that dealing with the filling of offices, in which there began a development leading to the Pope's universal right to fill all ecclesiastical benefices. At first specific classes were reserved. A vigorous opposition, which flared up because of the practice of Innocent IV during his struggle with the Hohenstaufen, was overcome. The Curia more and more made its own appointments, bestowed expectatives to benefices that were yet to be vacated, developed a right of devolution, and received postulation from everywhere. This universal competence of the Pope in the disposing of all offices and benefices in the Church was, however, not fixed in law until later.

---

[4] *Cf.* G. Le Bras, *L'âge classique* (Paris 1965), 487–506.

The papal election law, first regulated under Nicholas II in 1059, was modified by Alexander III at the Third Lateran Council in 1179 in the sense that now the election was declared to be the exclusive prerogative of all the cardinals. If unanimity could not be achieved, a two-thirds majority was to suffice. There was no mention of any assent or participation by Emperor or by clergy and people of Rome. And the election did not have to take place in Rome. The one elected could exercise the papal rights as soon as he had accepted the election. While all clerics had a passive vote, still, with few exceptions, only cardinals were elected. At the Second Council of Lyons in 1274 the law was extended to include the rules for the conclave, which probably had its model in the Italian communes or the electoral constitution of the Dominicans. The arrangement was suspended by John XXI (1276 to 1277) but it was reintroduced, this time for good, by Celestine V (1294). The two-thirds majority and the conclave were maintained with a few modifications and proved their worth in the succeeding centuries.

To the general councils, convoked and held under papal control, were invited, in addition to the cardinals, the metropolitans, bishops, abbots, and the deans of cathedral and collegiate chapters. Only cardinals and bishops had a deliberative vote; all others were competent in an advisory function only, which pertained also to princes and representatives of cities who were present. There was no strict regulation for councils but it became the practice that statements of principle were heard and decrees were promulgated in a few solemn sessions; they were prepared in consistories and in committee consultations that took place between sessions. The final decision in regard to conciliar decrees lay with the Pope, who was under no obligation to accept them. Councils which were summoned by legates in connection with their function could also be regarded as papal synods. In its canon 6 the Fourth Lateran Council had ordered the annual meeting of provincial councils, which especially saw to the promulgating and implementing of the decrees of ecumenical synods and at the same time served, as earlier, for the further growth of particular law proper to their area.

The papal registers of the thirteenth century reveal the constant contacts between the Holy See and the Western episcopate. These were due, not only to the increasing prestige of the papacy, the completing of a universally valid canon law, and the regular meeting of general synods, but also to the emancipation of the bishops from control by the princes. It is true that the legal and spiritual concentration of ecclesiastical power in the Pope's hands restricted the position of the bishops, but it could not but be important to the Pope that he should strengthen the position of the bishop within each diocese. As successor of the Apostles, the bishop retained unchallenged, even in the epoch of the canon law, the autonomous right to act within his bishopric as chief priest, judge, and ruler of his people.[5] The erecting, dividing, or suppressing of a see had become a papal prerogative, which extended also to an ecclesiastical province, but within the boundaries of this diocese the bishop governed according to his own decrees, but, of course, in conformity with the requirements of the general canon law. The circumstances of jurisdiction were naturally more complex in those bishoprics where the temporal endowment was involved with state functions, as in the bishoprics in the Empire and some of those in France (Sens, Langres), England (Durham), and Spain. Often the boundaries of the barony pertaining to the bishopric did not coincide with those of the diocese.

The institution of *Chorepiscopus* was suppressed; on request, neighbouring bishops rendered assistance as auxiliaries. Often they were even bishops expelled from the crusader states or from the Eastern colonial areas. From this situation later developed the so-called auxiliary bishops, whose territory lay *in partibus infidelium.* They had only spiritual functions to perform. If he were impeded by sickness, absence, or activity outside his diocese, a bishop could be given a coadjutor. Boniface VIII laid down the basic rules for this. The right of succession did not necessarily belong to the coadjutor but, if requested, it could be granted by the Pope.

During the crusade centuries patriarchs of the Latin rite were appointed at Jerusalem, Antioch, and from 1204 at Constantinople. They functioned either alone or parallel with the corresponding Greek patriarch. After the collapse of the crusader states these functions continued as merely titular offices.

In the West many a metropolitan sought the rank of primate, but the instituting of such primates did not achieve any uniform and weighty significance in the history of canon law.[6] The dignity of primate became a mere title, often connected with that of *legatus natus.* It existed at Mainz, Cologne, Trier, Magdeburg, and Salzburg, at Saint Andrew's in Scotland, Armagh in Ireland, Lund in Scandinavia, Gniezno in Poland, Toledo and Tarragona in Spain, and Esztergom in Hungary.

As metropolitans these archbishops had the right to confirm the election of their suffragans and to consecrate them. They had to summon and direct them at provincial synods, to be held annually. Their right of visitation was undisputed, but Innocent IV decreed in 1246 that they were not allowed to exercise it until they had visited their own dioceses. Furthermore, a visitation of the whole province required the consent of the *comprovinciales.* In cases of failure of duty, jurisdiction devolved on the metropolitan, whose court was also that of second instance in orderly judicial procedure. The metropolitan possessed no direct power of jurisdiction over the subjects of his suffragans. He was supposed to request the pallium in person from the Pope, who occasionally granted it to simple bishops.

---

[5] On the relationship of the episcopate to the secular power and its efforts, necessary even in the thirteenth century, to preserve the freedom of the Church *cf.* W. R. Jones, "Bishops, Politics, and the Two Laws: the Gravamina of the English Clergy (1237–1399)," *Speculum,* 41 (1966), 209–45.

[6] *Cf.* G. Le Bras, *Institutions,* 536 f. (literature); A. Felbinger, "Die Primatialprivilegien für Italien von Gregor VII. bis Innocenz III.," *ZSavRGkan* (1951), 95–163; A. Matamic, *De origine tituli "Dalmatiae et totius Croatiae primas"* (Rome and Subiaco 1952); J. F. Rivera Recio, "La primacía eclesiástica de Toledo en el siglo XII," *Anthologia annua 1962,* 11–88.

Many bishops were bound to the Pope in law by their oath of obedience. The growing papal legislative activity, especially the right to dispense, could not but limit the bishop's rights within his diocese. The custom, originating earlier in a visit of devotion to the tombs of the Apostles, of regularly calling on the Pope and reporting to him became of obligation from Gregory IX as the *visitatio liminum.* If impeded, bishops could perform it by means of accredited proxies.

In the course of the consolidation and completion of the judicial and administrative system larger dioceses were divided into districts which were directed by archdeacons. Originally the archdeacon had been the closest collaborator and even the other self of the bishop, but as director of a district he became in the thirteenth century a prelate with quasi-episcopal power, to whom were subject the clergy of his territory. Possessing ordinary jurisdiction, though the development varied by countries, the archdeacon conducted the annual visitations and supervised the discipline of the clergy, their manner of life, financial administration, and performance of duty. Several times a year the clergy met for the archidiaconal chapters. Even parts of the episcopal judicial authority were handed over to the archdeacon. There gradually occurred among the bishops a reaction against this institution that threatened their autonomy. The episcopal rights of reservation were more firmly stressed, such as nomination of rural deans, visitation of monasteries, jurisdiction in the external forum and in the forum of conscience in serious offenses of clerics and laity, jurisdiction over religious, in disputes over property, and in marriage cases. Bishops appointed an *officialis* for the judicial system and a vicar general for administration as their personal official representatives, thereby reducing the competence of the archdeacon. The period of the decline of the archdeacon's office began with the end of the thirteenth century.

Rural deaneries, which comprised several parishes, were in part subdivisions of archdeaconries, in part subject immediately to the bishop. The dean, also called archpriest, had to intervene in various ways between bishop and parishes, make known episcopal regulations, visit his deanery, and supervise the discipline of the clergy. Like the archdeacon, he convoked meetings of the clergy of the deanery several times a year. In the gild-conscious thirteenth century the parochial clergy also organized into rural chapters. The number of parishes grew because of the dividing up of cities.[7] Even parochial associations of persons — gilds, confraternities, national groups, especially in Eastern Europe and the crusader states — were temporarily established, but only the territorial organization of parishes endured. Their erection lay with the bishop. The care of souls — administration of the Sacraments, preaching, ministry to the sick, burial — was incumbent on the pastor, who, as the prelate over his church, possessed also a power of jurisdiction to a certain extent.

The pastor obtained his post through appointment by the bishop or the one enjoying the *ius patronatus*, and not infrequently also by election by the congregation. All three elements might co-operate. If a pastor was not resident, he had to name and pay a vicar. This duty was incumbent upon the chapter or monastery in the case of parishes incorporated with such bodies. To be distinguished from these vicars were the assistants necessary in larger parishes and known as *capellani, viceplebani, socii in divinis*. In the thirteenth century they were appointed by the pastor, who could even call them from another diocese. Apart from the parish, other chaplains served in a particular pastoral capacity as court chaplains, chaplains in the castles of nobles, in hospitals, and in subsidiary churches.

In this organization of the Church the clergy occupied a position superior to that of the laity, constituted a special *ordo*, and regarded themselves as an *élite*. Besides special duties they also had special rights[8] and, thanks to the subdivision of Church property into an enormous number of benefices, were quite secure economically.

Associations of clerics, grouped around the various functionaries already mentioned, did not fit in the strict sense into the hierarchical order of pastors, bishops, metropolitans, and Pope. They extended from the College of Cardinals downward, through cathedral chapters and deanery chapters, to the gilds of vicars that would later be organized in the large urban churches. Since the College of Cardinals will be discussed later, reference must now be made to the significantly growing power of the cathedral chapters at this period. An outgrowth of the *presbyterium*, the cathedral chapter already had a long history. In the High Middle Ages it perfected its legal structure and influence and became an integral element in the diocesan organization. Naturally, in the 800 dioceses of Christendom its concrete forms displayed much variety, but the decretal law sketched a common plan for all of them. The cathedral chapter consisted of canons, who were responsible for the liturgy, canonical hours and Mass, in the cathedral and service in the episcopal administration. They elected the bishop. Thanks to the Roman law, received since the twelfth century, they became a corporation, a legal person. As such they had rights of ownership and of property, could enter into contracts, could be represented in court. Their common property increased considerably. Their chapters were presided over by their elected dean. They had a seal of their own and regarded themselves as constituting, alongside the bishop, an autonomous legal structure, with their own statutes and proper jurisdiction over the capitulars. Direction belonged to a provost or, more commonly, to the dean. Elected by the chapter, he had to belong to it and be a priest. To him pertained pastoral authority over all the cathedral clergy. He had his own seal, and occasionally his income exceeded that of the bishop. There were also a chanter, a *camerarius*, a treasurer, and in the large chapters the subdean and subchanter substituted for the dean and chanter. When absent, capitulars had to appoint vicars for the choir service. In Germany the cathedral chapters were often reserved to nobles. They also possessed the special right of co-optation but usually had to share it with the bishop as the *ius simultaneae collationis*. Candidates were selected early, sent to famous universities, and well prepared.

---

[7] K. Fröhlich, "Kirche und städtisches Verfassungsleben im Mittelalter," *ZSavRGkan*, 22 (1933), 188–287; *cf.* also the chapter on the urban parish in *Feine*, 414–27 (bibliography).

[8] The survey in G. Le Bras, *Institutions*, 150–71, must be supplemented by what he says on the autonomy of the clergy within Christian society (271–82). The *privilegium fori* and the *privilegium canonis* are the bases of the special rights of the clergy.

From the time of Alexander III the consent of the cathedral chapter was required for the alienation of the goods of the bishopric and from that of Clement III for exchange of goods. Innocent III decreed that the cathedral chapter was to be heard in cases of the conbining of benefices. This development finally reached the point where Boniface VIII decreed that an aging or sick bishop could ask for a coadjutor only with the consent of the chapter. Thus the rights of the cathedral chapter grew, especially since the administration of the bishopric, *sede vacante*, fell to it. An indication of its enhanced importance was its right to be represented at the provincial synod and, through its dean, to be invited to general councils. The amazingly extensive correspondence between the Holy See and the cathedral chapters in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries shows the consistently increasing importance of these corporations, which was even occasionally displayed in their exemption from the bishop and direct subordination to the Holy See. At this period the cathedral chapter became a real power in the Church and in civil society.

The laity, the mass of the Christian people, were apparently taken less into consideration in ecclesiastical legislation than the privileged class that was the clergy,[9] and finally canon law came to look like a clerical law.

---

[9] Y. M. Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* (Paris 1953), provides historical material for the laity's position in the mediaeval Church; L. Leitmaier, "Der Laie in der Kirche im Mittelalter und im 20. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan*, 39 (1953), 28–45; R. J. Cox, *A Study of the Juridic Status of Laymen in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists* (Washington 1959).

However, this law often regulated the relations of the layman to the clergy; many of its decrees referred to all Christians, not exclusively to the clergy. One of the five books of the decretals had to do with matrimonial law. And, in addition to the written law, the customary law, valid in very many areas, also served the laity. In the thirteenth century, which in many aspects of social life experienced a rapid upsurge of new, educated, wealthy, and politically active strata among the urban bourgeoisie, the ecclesiastical self-awareness of the laity also increased. It not infrequently revealed itself in opposition to the clergy.

Still, despite the great separation from the clergy, who reserved to themselves the *magisterium* in the Church and extended their jurisdiction over the laity to purely secular spheres, the rights of the laity were real and could grow. Lay persons administered the Sacraments of baptism and matrimony; lay confession continued to be controverted. In regard to the clergy the laity had a positive right to pastoral care in all its forms: Sacraments, preaching, burial. They were especially active in the administration of Church property, above all in the cities. In the replacing of the proprietary church right by the *ius patronatus*, from the time of Gratian, the laity retained a determining influence on personnel policy in the Church. The contemporary tendency to form associations led to many such groups of lay persons, the confraternities, with a well developed religious orientation — direction of hospitals, defence of the faith, piety — and a gradually growing autonomy.

Despite many a dispute and much tension between clergy and laity the basic feature of the age was the peaceful co-operation and common exertions for the spiritual, economic, and social welfare of *christianitas*, into which all were equally incorporated by baptism and which intended for all the same goal of sanctification and perfection.

SECTION SIX

The Crisis of the Papacy and of the Church
(1274 — 1303)

CHAPTER 31

The Papacy Subject to Angevin Influence

Gregory X died on 10 January 1276, too soon to be able to continue with the energy proper to him the things the Second Council of Lyons had initiated and the program of his pontificate. His immediate successors, Innocent V (1276), Adrian V (1276), and John XXI (1276–77), were in no position to do anything decisive because of the brief time allowed them on Saint Peter's throne. The aims of Gregory X were not taken up again and an effort made to shield the independence of the Curia against the expanding imperialism of the House of Anjou until the pontificate of Nicholas III (1277–80). But since, immediately after him, the French Martin IV (1281 to 1285) turned the helm completely around and placed himself unreservedly at the service of the interests of Anjou, even to the extent of terminating the reunion of the Churches that had been agreed upon at Lyons, this final phase of the Church's development in the thirteenth century was under the sign of dependence on Anjou and France.

Innocent V, formerly Peter of Tarentaise, was French, even though born within the frontiers of the Empire, a scholar, and, as the first Dominican to ascend the papal throne, a proof of the importance which the Order of Preachers had achieved in the Church. He confirmed Charles of Anjou in his functions as Senator of Rome and Imperial Vicar in Tuscany and thereby seemed to indicate a return of curial policy to the line abandoned by Gregory X. The election of his successor, Adrian V, Ottobono Fieschi, was a result of the pressure of Charles of Anjou on the conclave, which took place in Rome. His sole administrative act was the annulment of Gregory X's rules on the conclave. John XXI, Peter of Spain, did the same, even though he cannot be regarded as a creature of Charles of Anjou.[1] But because of the brevity of their pontificates neither was able to issue a new electoral constitution. As a consequence, the next conclaves were again to be of intolerable duration. The election of John Gaetano Orsini as Nicholas III meant a return to the policy of Gregory X. As a Cardinal, it is true, he had supported the invitation of the Angevin into the Hohenstaufen Kingdom of Sicily, but when he perceived in King Charles's struggle for power a threat to the freedom of the Papal State he conformed himself to Gregory X's resistance and was inclined as Pope to act as Gregory had. Like the latter he intended to find in a collaboration with Rudolf of Habsburg, King of Germany, a counterweight to Anjou and to weaken Charles's position in Italy itself. Negotiations with the German King secured Romagna as a part of the Papal State, while Rudolf on 14 February 1279 renounced the imperial interests in that province. A series of charters of the German princes, requested and granted, supported this important decision. King Rudolf was again promised the imperial crown. With Romagna the Papal State definitively rounded out its frontiers, as thy were to be maintained until 1860.

---

[1] The cancelling of Gregory X's conclave regulations was due to the severity of the conclave that elected Adrian V. Adrian's charter is not extant but it seems to have been used in the corresponding constitution of John XXI: *Reg.* no. 159, ed. E. Cadier, 51 (30 September 1276); *cf.* N. Schöpp, *Papst Hadrian V.* (Heidelberg 1916), 300 f.

In Rome Nicholas III was able to induce Charles of Anjou, when the King's office as Senator of Rome expired on 16 September 1278, not to seek it again. Shortly before, an electoral regulation had provided that for the future no outside king or prince might be elected as Senator; instead, the dignity was to be held by Romans for a year at a time, and on assuming office they had to take an oath of loyalty to the Pope. Actually, Nicholas had the dignity of Senator conferred upon himself for his lifetime, and appointed his relative, Matthew Orsini, to act as his deputy. Thus began the papal *signoria* over Rome; the one or two Senators were only the deputies of the Pope, who at his election also assumed the dignity of Senator of Rome.

In Lombardy and Tuscany, where Charles of Anjou had been able to consolidate his position, Nicholas likewise sought to check his influence. In this aim he was assisted by the renewal of the Ghibelline opposition at Genoa and in Piedmont, in co-operation with King Alfonso X of Castile, and the assumption of power at Milan by the Visconti, which was likewise of a Ghibelline hue. In Tuscany Charles made himself leader of the Guelf faction. Nicholas first induced the King of Sicily to resign the imperial vicariate. He then devoted himself to relaxing the various tensions among factions and cities in the province in order not to provide the King with any reason for further interference. At Florence, for example, where the Guelfs had come to power in 1267, the diplomacy of the Pope's nephew, Cardinal Latino Malabranca, contrived a reconciliation at the end of 1279 and the beginning of 1280. The exiled Ghibellines were allowed to return.

In the interests of an agreement between Charles of Anjou, leader of the Italian Guelfs, and Rudolf of Habsburg, presumptive leader of the Italian Ghibellines, Nicholas worked for the realization of a project already discussed under Gregory X. Rudolf's daughter Clementia was to marry Charles Martel, grandson of Charles of Anjou, and to receive the Kingdom of Arles as her dowry. In 1280 Rudolf actually enfeoffed Charles of Anjou with the Counties of Provence and Forcalquier, and in March 1281 Clementia was handed over to Charles's envoys at Orvieto. But on 27 August 1280 the Pope died during the negotiations.

Simon de Brie was elected Pope as Martin IV on 22 February 1281, after a six-months' vacancy and a conclave that was powerfully influenced by pressure from Charles of Anjou. He not only abandoned the policy of his predecessor but was prepared to make the most far-reaching concessions to the Angevin. This most French of all the thirteenth-century Popes had risen in the service of the French crown, as a Cardinal had played a substantial role in the transfer of power in Italy to Charles of Anjou, and as Pope was to be a willing tool in the hand of the King of Sicily. He placed himself wholly at the service of the Guelfs and their leader, believing that he was thereby serving the interests of the French Kings. Far from concealing his antipathy toward Germany and the Ghibellines, he availed himself of every opportunity to show it.[2]

He first named Charles Senator of Rome and delivered the Papal State to him by appointing officials of Charles as rectors of the provinces. In the faction struggles in Romagna he supported the Guelfs, removed his predecessor's nephew from the rectorate, and appointed a Frenchman from Charles's retinue. This man, John d'Eppe, obtained at the same time investiture as *generalissimo* of the papal troops. The Pope named as vicar general the French canonist, William Durandus,[3] who became the political adviser of the new rector before he went to France to recruit troops for Charles. The army, made up of mercenaries from all Western countries, suffered a defeat at the hands of the Ghibelline leader, Guy of Montefeltro, on 1 May 1282. If the latter had not, oddly, withdrawn from the conflict in 1283, the Ghibellines would have acquired control of Romagna.

Charles of Anjou took no part in these confrontations, for he was again preoccupied with his far-reaching plans in regard to the East. When Martin IV in 1281 excommunicated the Byzantine Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus and thus undid the reunion accomplished by the Second Council of Lyons, he was serving the Eastern policy of the King of Sicily. It is true, of course, that since 1274 it had been ever clearer that the Union of Lyons was not accepted by the people. Gregory X had urged it for the sake of the crusade; Michael VIII, to hamstring Charles of Anjou.[4] While the union had been proclaimed at Constantinople in April 1277, the Greek bishops had been unwilling to take the personal oath of loyalty required by Gregory X and had refused to insert the *Filioque* in the Creed, as had been agreed.

---

[2] The Pope's pro-French attitude was criticized in the writings of the Cologne canon, Alexander of Roes (*cf.* bibliography for this chapter).

[3] William Durandus the Elder, Bishop of Mende (*ca.* 1230–96), was one of the most important canonists of the thirteenth century. His *Speculum iudiciale,* an exposition of the entire canon law in the framework of court procedure (A. M. Stickler), had an enduring influence. *Cf.* L. Falletti, "Guillaume Durand," *DDC,* 5 (1953), 1014–75.

[4] On 15 October Charles had given his daughter Beatrice in marriage to Philip de Cour-

When Nicholas III in October 1278 demanded the taking of the oath by the bishops and also by the whole of the Greek clergy and at the same time hinted that he intended to tolerate the Byzantine rite only to the extent that it could be brought into harmony with the current canon law of the Latin Church, the tensions became worse. Meanwhile, Charles of Anjou was treating with the heir of the Emperor Baldwin and with the *Signoria* of Venice. A papal notary drew up a treaty at Orvieto on 3 July 1281; this act implied the consent of Pope Martin IV. Hence the excommunication of the Byzantine Emperor in the autumn of the same year came as no surprise. It had at the same time the aim of deterring King Peter III of Aragón from an alliance with the Emperor Michael, which the latter sought to conclude as a counterweight to the alliance between Charles and Venice. Instead of being a crusade for the liberation of the Holy Land, Charles's expedition against Byzantium now assumed, with the Pope's co-operation, the character of a holy war.

In 1277 Charles had purchased from the heiress of Jerusalem, Mary of Antioch, her claim to the Kingdom. He assumed the title of King of Jerusalem and sent to the East the Count of Marseilles, Roger of San Severino, as his *bailli.* Hugh III of Cyprus had in practice given up his claim to Jerusalem and returned to his island. With Conradin the last legitimate King of Jerusalem died in 1268. Charles maintained friendly commercial relations with the Sultan of Egypt. In the Balkan peninsula he was Lord of Albania, he had taken over the administration of the County of Achaia in the name of his daughter-in-law, and he had imposed himself as suzerain on the Duke of Athens and other Latin princes. And so, in 1281, after the signing of the treaty which bound Venice to him, Charles appeared to be on the point of reestablishing the Latin Empire of Constantinople.

The Sicilian Vespers of Easter Monday, 30 March 1282, wrecked all these plans. This revolt of Sicily brought the island under the rule of the King of Aragón, restricting Charles of Anjou to the mainland, thereafter usually known as the Kingdom of Naples. But Pope Martin upheld Charles. He and his immediate successors did all they could, though in vain, to procure for the Angevins their rights. In reality the revolt delivered the papacy from the peril presented by Angevin imperialism, which was thereafter able to gain influence only during the brief pontificate of Celestine V. Boniface VIII would get rid of it entirely.

---

tenay, who, following the death soon after of his father Baldwin, the last Latin Emperor of Constantinople, assumed the imperial title himself. In the marriage agreement it was provided that Charles should invade the Empire before the summer of 1274; *cf.* Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers,* 137.

Steven Runciman has now definitively presented the history of the Sicilian Vespers. The absolute rule, exercised by Frenchmen for the absent King, had pushed the Sicilians into a revolt in which Aragón, aiming to establish an extensive domination in the western Mediterranean, came to their aid. The Kingdoms of Mallorca and Valencia had served as a bridge to Sicily since 1250. King Peter III had married Constance, daughter of King Manfred of Sicily, and had thereby announced his claim to the succession of the Hohenstaufen. In 1281 Peter made an alliance with the Emperor Michael VIII, whom Charles of Anjou was threatening by his treaty with Venice. Peter kept in constant touch with Sicily through refugees, representatives of the national pro-Hohenstaufen party.

The Sicilian revolt was directed against Charles, not against the papacy, to which the rebel government, representing a communal union of the most important cities of the island, offered itself in vassalage. Martin IV rejected the offer, called upon the island to submit to Charles, and promised the King his assistance in recovering it. Cardinal Gerard of Parma, the papal legate, intended to act with this aim at Messina, but neither the proposal of a modified constitution nor the intercession of the Pope was successful, and so Charles had no alternative to winning back the island by force. Meanwhile, the Sicilians had proffered the crown to King Peter of Aragón. He sailed with his fleet and on 1 September 1282 had himself crowned at Palermo. Charles of Anjou raised the blockade of Messina because he was afraid of being cut off from Naples by the Aragonese fleet. He thereby abandoned this part of his Kingdom forever. In prolonged guerilla fighting Peter of Aragón tried to conquer Calabria, but he was excommunicated by Martin IV, who threatened, in the event of disobedience, to deprive him of his Kingdom of Aragón. His deposition[5] was proclaimed by the Pope on 21 March 1283, and the Kingdom was offered by Martin to the King of France, Philip III, for his younger son, Charles of Valois.

When Charles of Anjou died in January 1285, his son and heir, the Prince of Salerno, Charles the Lame, was being held prisoner by the Sicilian Aragonese, who had twice thwarted his attempts to reconquer the island. Calabria was in their hands and revolt was threatening in the rest of the Kingdom around Naples. Charles died a thoroughly beaten man. He had designated as heir his twelve-year-old grandson, Charles Martel, for whom Robert of Artois was to act as regent. He governed the Kingdom of Naples, by papal mandate, together with the Papal Legate Gerard of Parma, until 1289, when Charles II returned from captivity. Pope Martin died on 28 March 1285, three months after his friend, leaving to his successor the irksome legacy of the Sicilian question. The Roman James Savelli, who styled himself Honorius IV (1285 to 1287), was elected on 2 April in order to free the Curia from the Angevin connection. The position of Senator of Rome was given to him for life and he had his brother, Pandulf Savelli, act as his deputy. He abandoned the warlike policy of his predecessor in Romagna, pacified the Ghibellines, and received the submission of their leader, Guy of Montefeltro, to whom he granted Asti as his residence.

---

[5] O. Hageneder, "Das päpstliche Recht der Fürstenabsetzung: seine kanonistische Grundlegung (1150–1250)," *AHPont*, 1 (1963), 53–95.

King Philip III of France had accepted Martin IV's proposal that he take possession of Aragón, of which the Pope had solemnly deprived Peter III, for his son, Charles of Valois. A real crusade was made ready in France for this purpose.[6] Honorius IV did not feel able to withdraw from this undertaking and so he supported it financially and through crusade preaching. The crusade itself was a disaster. Philip III died at Perpignan and his son, Philip the Fair, declined to continue the enterprise. The captive Charles II the Lame was prepared to renounce Sicily to obtain his freedom. The event that contributed most to solve the Sicilian question, however, was the death of Peter III of Aragón on 10 November 1285. He named his oldest son, Alfonso, as his successor in Aragón; his second son, James, in Sicily. It was expected that Honorius IV would lift the excommunication of Alfonso, especially since Edward I of England had intervened and, thanks to him, an armistice had been arranged between France and Aragón. The Pope had ratified this agreement, but he would not consent to the lifting of the censure. He continued obstinately to insist that Sicily belonged to the House of Anjou. When James had himself crowned at Palermo on 2 February 1286, the Pope, far from recognizing him, excommunicated him and his mother Constance. Neither did he accept the treaty whereby Charles the Lame had obtained his freedom by renouncing Sicily and the Calabrian archbishopric of Reggio. Meanwhile, the two regents were governing the remnant of the Kingdom around Naples.

Honorius IV resumed contact with King Rudolf of Germany, in the sense of a renewing of the policy of Gregory X. It was decided that the imperial coronation should take place on 2 February 1287. The embassy of Cardinal John of Tusculum was intended as a preparation for the King's journey to Rome, but it encountered complete defeat at Würzburg in March 1287. The opposition, led by Archbishop Siegfried of Cologne, rejected the Legate's demand for money. It was feared that, after the imperial coronation, Rudolf's son Albert would be made King of the Romans and that the princes' freedom of election would be curtailed. There were rumours of a plan to make the Empire hereditary; the friendship between the Habsburgs and the papacy would allow it to be realized. The Legate had to leave Germany; the imperial coronation was again postponed and did not even take place under the new

---

[6] See now J. B. Strayer, "The Crusade against Aragon," *Speculum*, 28 (1953), 102–13; *idem*, "The Political Crusades of the Thirteenth Century," in K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades*, II, 343–75, especially 367–75.

Pope, Nicholas IV. Rudolf died in 1291 without having worn the imperial crown.

With Nicholas IV (1288–92), who was elected on 22 February 1288, after a rather long vacancy, a Franciscan, formerly Jerome of Ascoli, for the first time succeeded to the papal throne. Under him the Sicilian question continued without a solution and in 1291 Acre, the last Christian outpost in the Holy Land, fell. On 25 July 1287 Charles II the Lame had acquired his freedom again and at Rieti on 29 May 1289 Nicholas crowned him King of Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia. The excommunication of Alfonso of Aragón was lifted when, in a treaty with Charles II and with Philip IV of France, he bound himself not to assist his brother James in Sicily. But Alfonso died on 18 June 1291, thus opening up the whole situation again. For now James was King of both Aragón and Sicily; he appointed his brother Frederick as governor of the island. The Aragonese forced James to accept the Treaty of Figueras with Charles II in December 1293; according to it Sicily was to be returned to the Pope, who could dispose of it only by agreement with Aragón. Frederick was to be compensated elsewhere for the loss of Sicily. The Pope promised to lift James's excommunication and to annul the grant of Aragón to Charles of Valois. It was left to Celestine V to ratify this treaty.

Chapter 32

Christian Fanaticism in the Thirteenth Century

The Cathari and Waldensians were defeated by the Church's determined defensive. The crusade, the mendicants' preaching, and the Inquisition had finally overcome this extremely dangerous crisis, even if only by long stages that were marked by losses. In addition to organized heresy with its doctrinal and sectarian opposition to the institutional Church, there also emerged certain movements that advocated devotional practices not in accord with accepted norms. They were resident in those ranks of the mendicants, especially of the Franciscans, that were most responsive to the people, and in the quasi-religious associations among the laity, the Beghards and the Beguines. The basic source of these tendencies was, as it had been from time immemorial, the awareness that one must make one's own the requirements of the *vita apostolica* in order really to take seriously the imitation of Christ. However, the fanatical element of the movement lay rather in its view and purpose not to limit this strict standard only to those charismatically endowed but to prescribe it for all of Christendom. Wherever this standard was lightly esteemed, there was an apostasy from Christianity which had to be condemned and repelled.

And so the demand was often heard that the legal and institutional Church must be left behind, if not superseded, by an *ecclesia spiritualis,* which would be radically serious about the requirements of the Gospel, especially the sermon on the mount. In this demand were encountered the most varied intellectual traditions, among which one of the more recent became especially influential: the apocalyptic theology of history of Joachim, founder and Abbot of San Giovanni at Fiore (d. 1202). According to this tradition, the Age of the Father, the Old Testament, of the carnal man of marriage, was followed by the Age of the Son, the New Testament, of the carnal minded man, especially of clerics, and this was now to be replaced by the Age of the Holy Spirit, the Eternal Gospel, of the spiritual and pneumatic man, who would find the proper form of his existence in monachism. While this idea lacked any anti-hierarchical tone in Joachim, now views were to be propounded which, carried to their ultimate conclusion, aimed at an invisible Church, without hierarchy, Sacraments, and external worship, and in which the spirit of poverty, of peace, and of a spiritual understanding of Scripture was to prevail. The year 1260 was calculated as the time between the Age of the Son and the arrival of that of the Holy Spirit. Joachimite ideas were found especially in broad circles of the Friars Minor, where they were connected with the disputes over the interpretation of the ideal of poverty proper to the order. John of Parma, minister general from 1247 to 1257, was regarded as especially interested in Joachim's ideas. Even if the extreme work of the Paris lector, Gerard of Borgo San Donnino, *Introductorius in evangelium aeternum* (1254), had been published without his knowledge and against his will, its censure by the University of Paris in 1255 and his consequent ambiguous condemnation of Joachim's ideas could not but damage the reputation of the minister general. In 1257 he resigned, but, because of his integrity and the esteem in which he was held in all circles in the Church and the order, he was allowed to name his successor: Saint Bonaventure.[1] The wide circulation of Joachimite ideas, of which, moreover, traces can be found even in Bonaventure's writings, was thereafter promoted also by popular prophecies which appeared in these decades. Even outside the Franciscan Order, they succeeded in fostering in various strata and groups of people an overenthusiasm in religious notions and expectations, they also increased the general disquiet with regard to an official Church that was involved in the power struggles of the time, they incited criticism of her riches, her clerical leadership, her unconcern *vis-à-vis* the spiritual needs of the people.

In the closing decades of the century the Franciscan "Spirituals" became the important spokesmen of the tendency. The beginnings of the Spiritual movement went back to the generation of Saint Francis. At first it had to do with the consistent realization of the founder's concept of poverty, of his rule, and his testament. But Gregory IX's bull "Quo elongati" of 1230 had denied the testament any legal binding force and had directed the order's development in a more moderate line, which Brother Elias also championed at that time. The stricter disciples of the founder retired, frequently into hermitages, hostile to learning, living for contemplation, avoiding the pastoral apostolate.

---

[1] H. Denifle, "Das Evangelium aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni," *ALKGMA,* 1 (1885), 49–142; *cf.* also J. Ratzinger, *Die Geschichtstheologie des heiligen Bonaventura* (Munich 1959).

Almost reconciled under John of Parma but less pleased with Bonaventure's compromise statutes of 1260 at Narbonne,[2] their fears for the purity of the order's poverty increased when it was rumoured that the Second Council of Lyons intended to do it still greater damage than the previous papal privileges had already done. And so now groups were formed in Provence, where Hugh of Digne (d. 1255)[3] was regarded as their "father," in the Marches of Ancona, where as early as the 1240's Crescentius of Jesi had had difficulties with them, and in Tuscany. From now on they often succumbed to the pressure of the majority in the order, known as the Conventuals. The latter had to be concerned for a uniform interpretation of the ideal of poverty that could be shared by all members of the order. But instead of guaranteeing to the dissidents their own special corporate rights, they took disciplinary measures against them, sought to distribute them among remote houses, and sent them to far-off mission areas; thus the Spirituals in the Marches of Ancona were sent to Cilicia to King Hethum II of Armenia. Their leaders, Peter of Macerata, nicknamed Liberatus, and Angelus of Clareno,[4] the chronicler of the movement, returned in 1293 to Italy, where they joined Jacopone da Todi and Conrad of Offida. Under Celestine V they succeeded in becoming autonomous as the "Pauperes Eremitae Domini Coelestini." But this short-lived arrangement soon fell victim to the general quashing of all of Celestine's administrative measures, which Boniface VIII undertook as soon as he became Pope. The earlier unrest spread, and the measures of the Conventuals became more harsh. Some of the Spirituals fled to Greece.

The group in the Midi found their own spokesman in Peter John Olivi (d. 1298),[5] who as lector at Florence in 1285–89 at the order's house of studies also exercised influence on the Tuscan Spirituals. Together with his pupil and collaborator at Florence, Ubertino da Casale, he managed to give the whole movement a theological identity of its own. Many of the Tuscan Spirituals fled to Sicily.

---

[2] "'Diffinitiones' Capituli Generalis Narbonensis (1260)," ed. F. M. Delorme, *AFrH,* 3 (1910), 491–504.

[3] Hugh of Digne, "De Finibus Paupertatis," ed. C. Florovsky, *AFrH,* 5 (1912), 277–90.

[4] L. von Auw, *Angelo Clareno et les Spirituels Franciscains* (Lausanne 1952).

[5] F. Ehrle, "Petrus Joannis Olivi, sein Leben und seine Schriften," *ALKGMA,* 3 (1887), 409–552; G. Fussenegger, "'Littera septem sigillorum' contra doctrinam Petri Joannis Olivi edita," *AFrH,* 47 (1954), 45–53; R. Manselli, *La "Lectura super Apocalipsim" di P. di G. Olivi* (Rome 1955); L. Hödl, *Die Lehre des P. J. Olivi von der Universalgewalt des Papstes* (Munich 1958).

The Spirituals found support in the royal houses of Aragón and Anjou.[6] The influential lay theologian, Arnald of Villanova, also sought to assist them. As the successful personal physician of the Kings and of Boniface VIII, who was himself no friend of the Spirituals, Arnald was able to hold up threatening ecclesiastical measures. Only the Council of Vienne in 1311 and John XXII with his decisions of 1317 and 1318 were able so to confine the living space of the Spiritual movement that only the road to schism and heresy appeared open to it. The conflict over the theory of poverty, which finally emerged from the movement on the theological plane, belongs to the next period of Church History.

The Spiritual movement remained for the most part limited to the order and acted only incidentally on public opinion in the Church. The situation was different with regard to the Apostolics of Gerard Segarelli of Parma,[7] who were constituted from a penitential brotherhood in the Joachimite year 1260. From it proceeded the first flagellant processions, which, full of apocalyptic expectations, carried the summons to penance through city and country. These persons demanded a return to the poverty ideal of the primitive Church and united to this a loud criticism of the wealthy Church of the present, which was acting like a state. Four penitential brothers were burned at Parma in 1294. Gerard Segarelli was imprisoned and in 1300 was also sent to the stake. Leadership was then assumed by Fra Dolcino of Novara, who addressed the faithful in circulars. He proclaimed that the Age of the Spirit had dawned and condemned the Church of the clergy, in which he included even the mendicant friars, because through their possessions they belonged to the carnal Church. Dolcino rejected any subjection to rules that opposed the freedom of the Spirit and demanded apostolic poverty from all. The final age of the world, he said, had begun and people had to hasten it, so to speak, by their actions and contribute to its realization. Dolcino was able to win thousands of adherents. Pursued by the Inquisition, many withdrew into the mountains of northern Lombardy to await the appearance of the Emperor of Peace and of the Angel Pope, from whom they expected help. Against them was organized a crusade, which at Novara in March 1307 brought the movement to a bloody end. One hundred and forty Apostolics were captured and executed along with Fra Dolcino.

---

[6] M. van Heuckelum, *Spiritualistische Strömungen an den Höfen von Aragón und Anjou während der Höhe des Armutsstreites* (Berlin and Leipzig 1912).

[7] F. Tocco, "Gli Apostolici e Fra Dolcino," *AstIt*, V/19 (1897), 241–75; J. C. de Haan, "De secte der apostolici en haar leiders," *TG*, 42 (1927), 1–31, 144–66; B. Töper, *Die Apostelbrüder und der Aufstand des Dolcino: Städtische Volksbewegungen des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Deutsche Historiker-Gesellschaft 1960, 62–84); E. Anagnine, *Dolcino e il movimento ereticale all'inizio del trecento* (Florence 1964).

Here the cult of poverty and an apocalyptic expectation of a Joachimite hue were associated with dangerous social revolutionary tendencies. One of these Apostolics, Bentivenga of Gubbio, who had become a Franciscan, founded the "Sect of the Spirit of Freedom" in Umbria.[8] His fanatical piety was unmasked as heretical by Saint Clare of Montefalcone in 1306. Ubertino da Casale, prominent among the Spiritual Franciscans, was deputed to interrogate him and was able to convict Bentivenga of heresy. The latter and many of his adherents were condemned at Arezzo in 1307 to perpetual incarceration. They were quietists, who believed themselves to be sinless because all that they did God did in them. They felt bound by no laws of the Church nor by a rule, morality, or conscience. Of course, they did not represent a strictly Joachimite ideology.

From all these trends of fanatical extremism other groups were to develop in the following century, such as the Fraticelli and the adherents of Michael of Cesena.

Subjected together with the Spirituals of the Midi to ecclesiastical disciplinary measures were also the Beguines, who could be regarded as secular followers of the left-wing Franciscans. The Beguines were able to look back to a longer history, not at first affected by the impulse to fanaticism, a history beginning early in the thirteenth century.

There were associations of devout women, virgins and widows, who wished to lead a community life without the vows of religion and established themselves especially in cities. The houses of canonesses were reserved to the nobility, as were also many convents of Benedictine nuns. The reform orders of the twelfth century had at first allowed for the ascetical aspirations of many women by means of their double monasteries, such as Fontevrault and Prémontré. But Prémontré had abandoned the double monastery around 1140 and let the nuns become independent. Cistercian nuns did not appear until late in the twelfth century, because of the aloofness in principle which Cîteaux maintained in regard to the pastoral care of women religious, but then foundations occurred rapidly and everywhere. But whatever the different orders permitted in convents of nuns, it was insufficient by far to take care of the constantly growing number of women who asked for a life according to a religious rule and a common ascetical existence. This female movement, based on economic and religious and mystical motives, almost spontaneously created a form for itself in the Beguine system, whose origins must be sought in the institute of recluses of earlier epochs. The provenance of the name is still unclear, but it is now thought that the gray dress of the sisters spread it. The Humiliati and the Franciscans also wore gray (*bigio*, beige).

---

[8] L. Fumi, *Eretici e ribelli in Umbria* (Todi 1916); L. Oliger, *De secta spiritus libertatis in Umbria saec. XIV (Storia e Letteratura,* 3) (Rome 1943).

The first communities came into being in Flanders and Brabant, under Lambert the Stammerer at Liège (*ca.* 1175), at Mont-Cornillon, at Huy (*ca.* 1182), where Blessed Ivetta was friendly with them, at Willamsbroux near Nivelles (*ca.* 1192) under the influence of Blessed Mary of Oignies, at Nivelles (*ca.* 1207) together with Blessed Ida. These women, like the Cistercian nuns, belonged to the sphere of crusade piety. The spiritual director and biographer of Blessed Mary of Oignies, James of Vitry, an Augustinian canon, then Bishop of Acre, in 1216 obtained from Honorius III a verbal recognition of the new communities, which often took care of a hospital or a leprosary. Thereafter they spread fast and in some cases constituted very large communities. They were in France and Germany, especially on the lower Rhine and in Bavaria, and in almost the whole of Europe. They lived partly by begging, partly by manual labour, and in the course of time on the income from their growing property. Settled, so to speak, between the religious house and the world, they lived under the control of the bishop according to an organization which he had given them or as it had been outlined in the foundation statutes. Varying from the very small house to settlements analogous to cities, the Beguine houses found acceptance in almost all the cities of the countries just mentioned. Without vows, they obliged themselves to daily spiritual exercises, to fasting, and to regular reception of the Sacraments. The uniform gray dress distinguished them from the middle-class women. The government was in the hands of a mistress with her council, while discipline was supervised in a weekly chapter of faults. Procurators or *provisores* often took charge of the economic administration.

The communities of Beguines were often entrusted to the pastoral care of the mendicant orders in Germany and France. If they had their own churches, these orders supplied the rector, if no special chaplain was appointed.

Wherever the pastoral care of Beguines was able thus to move in the proper paths, the institute of Beguines remained free of the suspicion of fanaticism. Nevertheless, after the mid-century the shadows of such a suspicion began to gather around them. The reason for this was probably that at this very time the term Beguine was applied generally to all women and men who devoted themselves to the life of piety outside a type of religious community and gave themselves a special gray dress, as, for example, the Brothers of the New Spirit, male and female recluses, Spirituals who were refugees from their monasteries, and begging and preaching laymen. Since these persons were correctly suspected of fanaticism, through them the very name Beguine acquired a pejorative sound.

While James of Vitry (d. 1240)[9] took the Beguines under his protection even as a Cardinal, — he knew they were called Beguines in Flanders and

---

[9] James of Vitry, *Lettres*, ed. R. B. Huyghens (Leiden 1960).

Brabant, Papelardes in France, and Bizocche in Italy, — at Paris William of Saint-Amour[10] in his works against the religious orders attacked, among others, also the Beguines. The Franciscan Simon of Tournai warned the Second Council of Lyons of their doings. Even provincial synods began to find fault with them, notably those of Béziers in 1299 and Cologne in 1310. Finally, in 1311 the Council of Vienne issued a prohibition against Beguines[11] but it was only published by John XXII. They were accused of a quietist, pantheistic mysticism and were said to feel themselves above all human and divine laws. Such a prohibition, affecting all without distinction, could of course hardly be enforced, especially as the right boundaries between heretical and orthodox Beguines could be drawn only with difficulty. The honourable and orthodox Beguines, who surely could not have been meant by the prohibition, had to be exempted. The occasion of the prohibition had been, not the Beguines as such, but their sisters in the Midi with their veneration of the Spiritual theologian, Olivi, who had died at Narbonne in 1298. Persons went as pilgrims to his grave, believed they experienced miracles there, and promoted a sort of popular canonization precisely in Beguine circles. The controverted theological evaluation of Olivi's writings affected also the judgment on the Beguines who were his adherents. Olivi's explanation of the Apocalypse, favoured by the fanatics, was subjected to examination by a tribunal and was condemned as heretical, though only by John XXII in 1326. Meanwhile, the fanatical Beguines of the Midi were exposed to the measures of the Inquisition, whose procedures were able to purge them of possible heresy in the course of the first decades of the fourteenth century.

Little has been reported of any persecution of the other French, Netherlandish, and German Beguines at this period.

Chapter 33

The Flowering of Scholasticism and of the Western Universities

The classical period of mediaeval intellectual culture reached its perfection in the thirteenth century. Three factors especially contributed to its construction. The first of these was the making available and the reception of the entire *corpus* of Aristotle by translation, commentary, and assimilation into Christian philosophy and theology. This took place in confrontation with Arab commentators, Jewish thinkers, and, after 1260, Greek commentators, notably Proclus. The second was the rapidly progressing development of the universities in this century, in particular at Paris, Oxford, and Bologna. Finally, there was the decisive contribution of the mendicant orders, whose members, from the middle of the century, played an outstanding role at Paris and Oxford in the growth of scholarship.

---

[10] P. Glorieux, "Le conflit de 1252–57 (à l'université de Paris) à la lumière du Mémoire de Guillaume de Saint-Amour," *RThAM*, 24 (1957), 364–72. Bibliography of William of Saint-Amour in *Glorieux R*, I, nos. 343–46.

[11] "Das Dekret gegen die Beginen," *COD*, 350; in French in J. Lecler, *Vienne (Histoire des Conciles oecuméniques*, 8) (Paris 1964), 195 f.

Educational centres of European stature had been formed in the twelfth century, above all at Chartres, Paris, Reims, Laon, Bologna, Salerno, and Toledo. Some of them, however, later lost their importance, as the chief interest of both teachers and students was concentrated on Paris, Oxford, and Bologna. In addition, thanks to princely and papal initiative, there simultaneously appeared *studia* at Naples, founded in 1224 by Frederick II for the Kingdom of Sicily, in Spain, where to Toledo were added Palencia, Léon, and especially Salamanca (1243 and 1254), and finally at the Curia, where in 1244–45 Innocent IV instituted lectures on theology, canon law, and Roman law. Not here, however, but at Paris, Bologna, and Oxford developed the structures that determined the notion of the university of the High Middle Ages.

They were related to and similar to the co-operative organizations formed in the great cities to take care of the social and economic tasks of a population that was constantly undergoing an increasing differentiation of function. Thus at Bologna, where the professors were already integrated into the citizen body, there arose for the students the *universitates* of Lombards, of *ultramontani,* of Romans. City and papal statutes in the course of the thirteenth century regulated the organization of Bologna, where various conflicts between city and student-body had frequently led to emigrations. From 1224 the Holy See managed to establish its control of the university, for which it remained characteristic that the students and not the professors were constituted as gilds. The organization, originally determined by lay persons, was altered by the Holy See in the sense that all, professors and students, clerics and laymen, were strictly subordinated to the jurisdiction of the local bishop, who appointed an archdeacon as chancellor. From 1245 the *universitates* of students could also be incorporated into the city organism. There were now two of them: the Italian or cismontane and the foreign or ultramontane. Each elected its own rector, before whom was made the important oath of obedience, the formality incorporating the student into the *universitas.* Their autonomy was guaranteed by the Holy See.

At Paris the situation developed differently from that at Bologna. Professors and students combined in opposition to the citizens and the local bishop; in 1200 they were exempted by King Philip II Augustus from secular jurisdiction and between 1212 and 1222 also from that of the bishop. The Curia, which, through the Cardinal Legate Robert de Courçon, gave a statute "universis magistris et scolaribus Parisiensibus" in 1215, maintained its supervision of the "university," as the institution was called for the first time in 1219. Originating in the cathedral school of Norte Dame, springing directly from the amalgamation of the communities of professors and students, the University of Paris was complete in its essential characteristics by 1222. Four faculties were to be distinguished: theology, medicine, the liberal arts, and the *Decretum,* that is, canon law. Theology, as the first of them, obtained an autonomous organization in 1219, with its own seal, and the others followed this example. In addition, the university was divided into four nations.[1] The Dominicans settled near the university from 1217, the Franciscans from 1219; in 1224–26 they were more closely linked to it. After a rather long conflict with the chancellor, Philip, and the Bishop, William of Auvergne, as well as with the townspeople, the university left Paris in 1229; its members scattered to Toulouse, Angers, Reims, Orléans, England, Italy, and Spain. By means of the bull "Parens Scientiarum" of 13 April 1231, Gregory IX managed to restore peace and conferred new privileges on the university. During this crisis the position of the theologians belonging to religious orders could be consolidated, so that after 1231 three of the twelve theological chairs were occupied by religious, the cathedral chapter of Notre Dame provided three others, and the remaining six continued to be reserved to diocesan clerics.

Innocent IV confirmed the so-called "foundation bull" issued by Gregory IX in 1231 and in 1245–46 gave the university its own seal and hence full legal existence. The favour and protection of the French Kings enabled it to develop freely. But in the 1250's there occurred a crisis in the theological faculty when the diocesan clergy challenged the teaching of the mendicants. It was ended under Alexander IV in favour of the orders.

Beside Paris, preeminent in theology, and Bologna, which maintained its leadership in law, other universities which received papal privileges in the thirteenth century could play only a far less active role: Padua (1222), Orléans (1229), Angers (1231), and Siena (1246). The medical University of Montpellier also received a statute from the Curia in 1220; it was renewed in 1240. The university established at Toulouse in 1229 during the Albigensian troubles was renewed on the model of Paris in 1245.

The University of Oxford developed in England as the third outstanding higher educational centre alongside Paris and Bologna. Out of the numerous religious houses and particular schools there had arisen there toward the close of the twelfth century an important centre of instruction, where just at that time Aristotelianism was establishing itself. In 1214 the Cardinal Legate

---

[1] French, Picards, Normans, and English; to the English nation belonged also the Germans and Scandinavians; *cf.* P. Kibre, *The Nations in the Medieval Universities* (Cambridge 1950). Only later was there a separate German nation; *cf.* P. Perdrizet, *Le Calendrier de la Nation d'Allemagne de l'ancienne Université de Paris* (Strasbourg 1937).

Nicholas of Tusculum settled the conflicts between the town and the institutes of study and granted privileges to the Oxford *studium* just as Robert de Courçon did in 1215 to that of Paris. The incipient university was subjected to the Bishop of Lincoln, who was to direct it through a chancellor, consistently selected from the ranks of the professors of theology. Under the chancellor the university was able slowly to develop its autonomy. The emigration from Paris in 1229–31 brought to the young university a considerable growth, at the invitation of King Henry III. When Robert Grosseteste, who had himself been chancellor, became Bishop of Lincoln in 1235, he further elaborated the chancellor's position. In contradistinction to Paris, at Oxford the chancellor became a member of the university corporation. Oxford received its statutes from Grosseteste in 1252–53. To the efforts of the King and of the successor of Grosseteste at Lincoln to curtail the university's liberties Innocent IV countered with a grant of privileges in 1254 and now named the Bishops of London and Salisbury as the official protectors of the university.

Differing again from Paris, the mendicant orders, above all the Franciscans, had no difficulty in entering the Oxford theological faculty, where they soon occupied a leading position. The number of nations at Oxford, apart from the English, was restricted to two: the Scots or *Boreales* and the Irish or *Hibernenses.*

Cambridge, which had branched off from Oxford in 1209, likewise profited by the Paris exodus of 1229–31. King Henry III especially favoured Cambridge.

Common to all the universities mentioned was a basic structure which recalled their origins in the cathedral schools. First of all there was the chancellor; at Bologna he was a decretist, at Paris and Oxford a theologian, but with authority and possibilities of influence that differed from one place to another. The nations under the direction of elected rectors gained extensive autonomy. At Bologna they even received the oath which was the binding element in all the gilds. At Paris the members of the arts faculty, thanks to their numerical superiority, assumed leadership in the nations. The nations were led by procurators, who in turn decided on the rector; he held office for three months. In 1245 he was head of the university council, which included all the masters, had the right to make its own statutes, and in cases of conflict could appoint arbiters. From the mid-century on the head of the arts faculty was rector of the entire university. The statutes of the arts faculty, regulating the course of instruction and of studies, became a model for all the faculties at all the contemporary universities, except for the faculty of theology, which had its own special regulations. The intellectual connection of the arts with theology was maintained by the circumstance that almost all the theologians had first taught in the arts faculty, which developed in the course of the century into a real faculty of philosophy because literary culture was less and less emphasized and, except at Oxford, the *quadrivium* was also neglected. Since it was less under the magisterial control of the Holy See than were the theologians, it was able, alongside this stronghold of orthodoxy, to exert for the future a decided influence on the development of philosophical movements in the West.

Life at the universities, for which Paris and the Parisian style were always standard, was lived in an ecclesiastical environment, since almost every student was a cleric. And, except at Bologna, the professors had to belong to the clergy. Among masters and students were formed communities that lived together, and, because the students were attached to a specific teacher, there was also a sort of common life within the framework of the *universitas magistrorum et scholarium.*

Instruction was to be imparted basically free of charge, at least in the faculties of the arts and theology. Payment was demanded in the faculties of law and medicine. But gradually it became the custom that fees were required; this can be demonstrated in regard to examination fees, for example. Ecclesiastical benefices were assigned to the masters for their support. Students also, particularly the foreigners, found a similar means of support later.

Financial need and lack of space prevailed, especially at the large university centres, where the numbers were in the thousands; the lack of room applied both to lodgings and to places of instruction. In so far as students did not live in private houses or with teachers they were accommodated in hospitals, which were enlarged for this purpose. But there soon appeared, especially for the poor students, foundations where they could be lodged and take their meals, as, for example, the College of the Eighteen, which Jocius of London, a wealthy Englishman, endowed at Paris. The religious houses included boarding facilities for foreign students, even if they did not belong to the order; their organization served as a model for the rapidly growing number of burses or colleges. Thus in 1257 Robert de Sorbon[2] founded his college, later to become so famous; it was intended for diocesan clerics, who entered it as masters of arts in order to study theology. Such houses were rarer at Bologna, but at Oxford the development was similar to that at Paris. Balliol College was founded at Oxford in 1263, Merton in 1264.

In the thirteenth century, as the monastic schools and those of the canons declined, the universities became the centres of predilection for philosophical and theological scholarship, for scientific medicine, and for the pursuit of both laws. The lively interchange among the faculties was one of the causes of the investigation, becoming more intensive and more methodical from generation to generation, of theoretical as well as of more practical sciences. Exercising an impact in the field of philosophy and, influenced and stimulated by it, of theology in this thirteenth century was the imparting of a stock of ideas, in the centre of which stood the complete *corpus* of Aristotle.

---

[2] P. Glorieux, *Les origines du Collège de Sorbonne* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1959).

Toledo and Naples were of particular importance in this regard, since both of them lay at the intersection of Christian and Arabic civilization and the Aristotelian legacy was passed on to Western scholarship by means of Arabic and Jewish channels. Authoritative Arabic and Jewish works were translated into Latin at Toledo, which had returned to Christian hands in 1085. Dominic Gundisalvi, John of Spain, Gerard of Cremona, Alfred Sareshel,[3] and Michael the Scot distinguished themselves in this undertaking in the twelfth century, but in the thirteenth they were supplanted by Hermann the German (1240–50), Peter Gallego (d. 1267), and others. The translators wrote their own commentaries too, for example, Gundisalvi's *De divisione philosophiae,* suggested by Alfarabi's *De scientiis.* Michael the Scot treated the same theme. Nicholas of Damascus composed a commentary on the allegedly Aristotelian *De plantis.* But no creative ideas are to be found among these men.

Translation and the pursuit of philosophy likewise characterized the new (1224) University of Naples. Arabs, Jews, and Latins worked together there in harmony. Peter of Ireland commented on Aristotle and Porphyry. Michael the Scot, coming from Spain, became court astrologer in 1220 and as the director of a whole team of co-workers translated the writings of Averroes into Latin. People were still translating here from Arabic and Greek into Latin as late as the time of Manfred (from 1254); for example, William de Luna, Theodore of Antioch, Bartholomew of Messina, John de Dumpno, and others. At the University of the Roman Curia, founded by Innocent IV, Thomas Aquinas, who lectured there from 1259 to 1265 and from 1267 to 1268, met the great translator of Aristotle, his fellow Dominican, William of Moerbeeke.[4] At Oxford the work of translating was fostered by the chancellor, Robert Grosseteste, who himself knew Greek; he interested in it his Franciscan friend, Adam Marsh.

The result of this activity was an almost limitless output of literary works from hitherto inaccessible sources. They included writings of Arabic and Jewish philosophers, who had become acquainted with Aristotle, especially the *Organon,* through the agency of Syrians. In addition, there was a group of commentaries on Aristotle: those by Alexander of Aphrodisias, Porphyry, Themistius, and Ammonius, for the most part Neoplatonists. The Arabs also made use of other Syriac translations: of Theophrastus, Galen, Hippocrates, Euclid, Archimedes. This Aristotelian and Neoplatonic stock of ideas and its literary transmission were independently assimilated by the

---

[3] C. Baeumker, *Die Stellung des Alfred von Sareshel (Alfredus Anglicus) und seine Schrift "De motu cordis" in der Wissenschaft des beginnenden 13. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1913).

[4] M. Grabmann, *Guglielmo da Moerbeke e le sue traduzioni d'Aristotele* (Rome 1946).

Arab philosophers. Only the most important names can be mentioned here: Alfarabi (d. 950) and Ibn Sina (Avicenna, d. 1037). More Aristotelian than Avicenna was Ibn Rushd (Averroes, d. 1198) of Córdoba. To these must be added the Jewish philosophers, who had already been influenced by the Arabs and made use of an Aristotle infected by Neoplatonism: Solomon Ibn Gebirol (Avencebrol or Avicebron, d. 1070), with his *Fons vitae,* which advocated a pantheistic emanationism, and Moses Maimonides (d. 1204), whom Aquinas highly esteemed and who was dependent on Alfarabi and Avicenna. Like Averroes, these Jewish philosophers lived in Spain. Hence the translators' school at Toledo was so important for their transmission.

But Aristotle came to the Western universities also in direct translations from the Greek. If persons had thus far learned to study an Aristotle who was for the most part understood in a Neoplatonic refraction through the Syriac, Arabic, and Jewish translations, now the genuine Aristotle became known: his hitherto lacking logical treatises — thus far only the so-called Old Logic was known —, his entire metaphysics, ethics, politics, and natural philosophy. And early commentators on Aristotle also found translators: Alexander of Aphrodisias, Simplicius, Eustratius, Aspasius, Michael and John Philoponus, and others.[5]

The scholastic reception of Aristotle has its own history, which of course can be sketched here only in its essential factors. It took place at Oxford with less difficulty than at the University of Paris, where as early as 1210 a provincial council, meeting in Paris, forbade the reading of Aristotle's writings on natural philosophy and their commentaries. The prohibition was repeated in 1215 and extended to the metaphysics, when the legate, Robert de Courçon, gave the university its basic statute. The traditional study of Aristotle was not affected. Perhaps the prohibition is explained by the condemnation, at this same time, of the Neoplatonic-inspired pantheism of Amaury of Bène and David of Dinant. For the Aristotle handed down by the Arabs and Jews was, in fact, of a Neoplatonic colouring. Aristotle was not forbidden at Toulouse, and there, as at Oxford, persons were thereafter preoccupied with the new Aristotle. At Paris, on the other hand, the prohibitions were renewed in 1231 and 1245 and they were mentioned as late as 1263. But they were apparently quickly forgotten, for the reception proceeded apace. Gregory IX had already modified his prohibitions when he entrusted to a commission of theologians the examination of the natural philosophy. Even if this did not meet, people understood the envisaged adjustment as an ecclesiastical permission for the study, especially since only the official, not the private use of Aristotle had been forbidden.

---

[5] M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliche lateinische Übersetzungen von Schriften der Aristoteleskommentatoren Johannes Philoponos, Alexander von Aphrodisias und Themistios* (Munich 1929).

In the Paris arts faculty, in any event, persons were keenly interested in the new ideas, whereas in theology this tendency began to make itself felt only around the middle of the century with Albert the Great. At Paris, for the time being, only the *Organon* and the *Ethics* of Aristotle were commented and lectured on, while at Oxford this activity extended also to his natural philosophy and *Metaphysics*. Deserving of special mention are: John Pagus (*ca.* 1230), William of Shyreswood (before 1240), Peter of Spain (before 1246). The last named died as Pope John XXI in 1277; his *Summulae logicales* became the most popular manual of logic at the Western universities.[6] His *Liber de anima* combined Aristotelian with elements recalling Augustine and Avicenna. Among the members of the Paris arts faculty, some of them to become well known theologians, were especially William of Saint-Amour (1236–47),[7] who was to be the sharpest opponent of the theologians of the religious orders in the university crisis of the 1250's, Robert Kilwardby (1237–45), the future Dominican Archbishop of Canterbury,[8] Lambert of Auxerre (until 1250), Nicholas of Paris (until 1263), and a whole group, now anonymous, of their colleagues and students.

Robert Grosseteste translated and commented on Aristotle's *Ethics* at Oxford, while from 1245 the Franciscan Roger Bacon was working on the controverted *libri naturales*. In an effort to overtake Oxford, William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris, allowed their study at Paris after the death of Gregory IX. Boethius, Avicenna, and Averroes were also esteemed as authorities in philosophy. After 1250 there appeared in the arts faculty the so-called Latin Averroism, a heterdox Aristotelian, under Siger of Brabant. Theologians of all camps strenuously opposed it.

The new philosophy put itself at the service of theology, but without supplanting the Augustinian tradition. At first it was used in an eclectic manner and in the event of conflict the primacy of theology was unreservedly guaranteed. Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas were the first to rethink Aristotle and to use, very critically of course, the Arabic and Jewish commentaries.

The theology of the early thirteenth century was divided into the conservative wing of the school of Peter Lombard, represented by Peter of

---

[6] J. P. Mullally has edited the *Summulae logicales* of Peter of Spain (Notre Dame, Ind. 1945); *Tractatus Syncategorematum and Selected Anonymous Treatises by Peter of Spain*, translated by J. P. Mullally (Milwaukee 1964).

[7] For William of Saint-Amour see P. Glorieux, "Le conflit de 1252–57 à la lumière du Mémoire de Guillaume de Saint-Amour," *RThAM*, 24 (1957), 364–72 (literature); Y. M. J. Congar, "Aspects ecclésiologiques de la querelle entre mendiants et séculier," *AHD*, 28 (1961), 35–151. There is no real history of the conflict. P. Michaud-Quantin, "Le Droit universitaire dans le conflit Parisien de 1252–57," *Studia Gratiana*, 8 (1962), 577–99.

[8] E. M. F. Sommer-Seckendorff, *Studies in the Life of Robert Kilwardby* (Rome 1937); W. A. Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars* (Rome 1951), 374–86; A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, II (Oxford 1958), 1051–69.

Poitiers, lecturing till 1205, Stephen Langton till 1206, Robert de Courçon till 1210, Peter of Capua till 1219, the chancellor Prévotin of Cremona till 1210, and Thomas Gallus of Saint-Victor till 1218, and the progressive wing of the school of Gilbert de la Porrée, represented by Simon of Tournai till 1203, the chancellor Philip till 1236, William of Auxerre till 1228, and William of Auvergne till 1228, when he became Bishop of Paris, dying in 1249. Their extensive writings are in many cases still unpublished and uninvestigated. Included are scriptural commentaries of an increasingly systematic character and commentaries on *The Sentences,* such as those of John of Saint-Gilles (before 1228) and of Hugh of Saint-Cher, a Dominican (1229–30).[9] Theological *summae* were already drafted by Prévotin of Cremona (1206–10), Master Martin, and Godfrey of Poitiers (1213–15), the *Summa aurea* of William of Auxerre (1215–20), the *Summa Duacensis* (*ca.* 1230), the *Summa de Bono* of the chancellor Philip (after 1230), and the *Summa de virtutibus et vitiis* of William of Auvergne (before 1228), as well as his *Magisterium divinale* (1233–40), which includes a critically constructed philosophical system. The *Summa universae theologiae* of the Franciscan Alexander of Hales constituted one climax of this production of theological *summae.* In addition innumerable smaller works of a liturgical, homiletic, and pastoral character, sermons and sermon collections, were composed. Apologetically oriented was the *Summa contra haereticos* of Prévotin (between 1184 and 1210), while controversial theology gave rise to the *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses* of Moneta of Cremona (d. 1260) and the *Summa de Catharis et Leonists* of Rainer Sacconi (d. 1262).

This wealth of academic and literary production proved the growing importance of the University of Paris, which, by virtue of the activity, shortly to begin, of scholars from the mendicant orders, was to be led to the classic peak of achievement. These scholars succeeded in realizing the long sought synthesis of theology with the new philosophy of the century.

In regard to the Franciscans Martin Grabmann distinguishes three phases. The first was that of Alexander of Hales and the beginnings of the Franciscan school with his pupils, John of Rupella, Odo Rigaldus, and William of Melitona, at Paris. A development of its own must be ascribed to Oxford. These beginnings were carried further under Bonaventure, whose pupils included William de la Mare, John Pecham, Eustace Buisine, and Walter of Bruges, but his greatest student was Matthew of Aquasparta (d. 1302). To a second, somewhat younger generation of Bonaventure's pupils belonged Roger Marston, Richard of Middleton, Guibert of Tournai, and, critically, Peter John Olivi. The transition to the third phase, which centred on Duns Scotus, was constituted by Peter de Trabibus, William of Ware, the minister general Gonsalvus de Vallebona, and Vitalis de Furno. John Duns Scotus himself (*ca.* 1270–1308) stood on the threshold of the new age.

---

[9] *Cf.* J. Fisher, "Hugh of St. Cher and the Development of Mediaeval Theology," *Speculum,* 31 (1956), 57–69.

The older Dominican school began with Roland of Cremona (d. 1259) and the well known exegete, Cardinal Hugh of Saint-Cher. To it belonged Peter of Tarentaise (d. 1276 as Pope Innocent V). These scholars still followed the paths of a doctrine that was determined by Augustinianism. The Aristotelian orientation was established by Albertus Magnus (*ca.* 1193–1280). In a comprehensive Aristotelian encyclopedia, which also cited pseudo-Aristotelian works, he laid the ground for a Christian Aristotelianism. Albert obtained the scholastic title of *doctor universalis,* because not only was his knowledge of the sources universal but his scholarship was able to master all fields of philosophy, natural science, and theology. And his influence in the academic world became universal. He commented on all the books of Aristotle, on *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard, on the *De divinis nominibus* of pseudo-Dionysius. His *Summa theologiae* remained unfinished; more famous became the *Summa de creaturis,* which included, among other things, a systematic ethics, a doctrine of the Sacraments, and an eschatology. Many lesser works discussed dogmatic questions of Mariology, the Eucharist, and much else. The earliest pupils of Albert were Hugh Ripelin of Strasbourg and Ulric Engelberti of Strasbourg. Ulric of Strasbourg (d. 1277) created a monumental theological *summa,* called by Grabmann "the greatest and most complete work of German Neoplatonism proceeding from Albert."

Thomas Aquinas (1225–74) ranks as the chief representative of classical scholasticism. He was Albert's pupil at Paris, and followed him to Cologne, where he studied from 1248 to 1252. He himself taught at Paris from 1252 to 1259, then at the University of the Roman Curia from 1259 to 1268, at Paris again from 1268 to 1272, and finally at Naples from 1272 to 1274. He died, *en route* to the Second Council of Lyons, at the Cistercian abbey of Fossanuova near Naples, on 7 March 1274.

His vast literary output can be arranged under six headings. First are the philosophical commentaries on Aristotle's most important works and on the *Liber de causis,* for which William of Moerbeeke supplied him with a reliable text. With these he was able to improve on the inadequate commentaries on Aristotle by Averroes and by Albertus Magnus. The second category includes scriptural commentaries on many books of the Old and the New Testament. His *Catena Aurea* was a collection of patristic texts on the four Gospels, probably intended as a handbook for preachers. Next come theological commentaries on the works of Boethius *(De Trinitate, De hebdomadibus),* pseudo-Dionysius *(De divinis nominibus),* and Peter Lombard *(Liber sententiarum).* The *Scriptum super sententiis* was reckoned among the great works of theological synthesis for which we are indebted to Thomas. The fourth class consists of works of theological synthesis. The *Summa contra gentiles* was begun at Paris in 1258 and completed in Italy under Pope

Urban IV (1261–64). There followed the great and uncompleted *Summa theologica;* Thomas spent seven years on it, and Reginald of Priverno finished it by adding material from the *Scriptum super sententiis.* To his friend and pupil Reginald Thomas dedicated the likewise incomplete *Compendium theologiae.* Next come the notes for academic disputations, the *Quaestiones disputatae* and *Quaestiones quodlibetales.* These provide a mirror of the ideas and controversies of the age. Finally, there are the lesser works, for the most part occasional pieces of the most varied content. Some deal with philosophical questions, such as *De ente et essentia, De aeternitate mundi, De unitate intellectus, De substantiis separatis;* some with theology, including *De articulis fidei et Ecclesiae sacramentis, De regimine Iudaeorum;* some are apologetic: *De rationibus fidei contra Saracenos, Graecos et Armenos* and *Contra errores Graecorum;* and defense of the position of the mendicant orders at the university: *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum, De perfectione vitae spiritualis,* and so forth. Finally, there are works of a devotional, liturgical, canonical, and homiletic content, the most important being the office for the feast of Corpus Christi and the *Expositio de Ave Maria.*

Thomas Aquinas possessed an exhaustive knowledge of the patristic tradition. His exegesis, however, was hindered by his unfamiliarity with Hebrew and Greek. For all his critical method he was, like his contemporaries, tied to the theological acquaintance with the sacred text that the patristic writers and the early scholastics had cultivated, because of the deficiency of his historical horizon, of his knowledge of the auxiliary sciences, and of a technically perfect philology. His definitive achievement lay in the field of speculative theology and of the unique intellectual accomplishment whereby he placed the philosophy of Aristotle's genius at the service of revealed doctrine and of its conceptual presentation. Research during recent decades has especially stressed that Thomas Aquinas was a master of the spiritual life precisely in the scientific dress of his theology.

The point of departure in the method of his speculative theology was, it is true, challenged as early as three years after his death, when Bishop Stephen Tempier of Paris included twenty-one texts from Thomas's works among the 219 condemned propositions of 1277; he thereby rejected the rationalism and naturalism of heterodox Aristotelianism, then a threat at the university. The canonization of Thomas by John XXII in 1323 effaced this shadow from the Church.

The tendency in thought that was really attacked in Bishop Tempier's condemnation was at home in the arts faculty and hence concerned philosophical rather than theological errors. Toward the middle of the century Averroes had supplanted Avicenna in the scholarly world as *the* commentator of Aristotle. The turning of the philosophers to him developed at Paris into a vigorous movement. The doctrine of the eternity of the world, the proposition of the double truth, and monopsychism became characteristic of it. Its leader was Siger of Brabant (1235–84), one of the most important interpreters of Aristotle of that time, independent in judgment and of constructive intellectual powers. He later freed himself from an originally radically Averroistic understanding of Aristotle through the influence of the works of Aquinas and accepted the latter's interpretation of the Stagirite. He abandoned monopsychism and never formally defended the doctrine of the double truth. If he had earlier been a determinist, in his later years he defended the freedom of the will.

Condemned in 1277 along with his doctrines was Boethius of Dacia, in whom was found a more Aristotelian and purely this-worldly paganism. Far more moderate were the masters James of Douai, Raoul the Breton, Peter of Auvergne, Henry of Brussels, and in England Simon of Taversham (d. 1306). This Averroistic movement was felt also at Bologna and Padua.

England's contribution to the history of High Scholasticism matched that of France. Especially in the Franciscan Order were found many scholars of English nationality. One need only recall Alexander of Hales, founder of the Franciscan school at Paris. There and even more at Oxford was established a school of a unique character. Robert Grosseteste, who introduced the Franciscans to Oxford, was also the one who founded that university's fame in science. He was chancellor of the university until his promotion to the see of Lincoln. At first profoundly influenced by mediaeval Augustinianism, he was the first Englishman to adopt Aristotle's philosophical system and sought to assimilate the whole wealth of the onrushing stream of science in the Greek, Arabic, and Jewish tradition. In contradistinction to the Paris scholars he also placed great stress on the cultivating of the sciences of the *quadrivium,* above all mathematics. His scriptural study was bound strictly to the text, his knowledge of Greek being here of use to him, and was critically oriented. On the other hand, like his contemporaries, he was not a humanist. As first regent of the Franciscan house of studies he was succeeded first of all by diocesan priests, Peter, later Bishop of Aberdeen, Roger Welsham, and Thomas of Valais. It was not until 1247 that Franciscans took over the direction of their own house of studies. The first to do so was a close collaborator and friend of Grosseteste, Adam Marsh. His third successor was Thomas of York, whose philosophical *summa,* the *Sapientiale,* became famous. Like Grosseteste he was versed in Arabic and Jewish philosophy. From 1256 Thomas of York directed the Franciscan house of studies at Cambridge. At Oxford he was succeeded by Richard of Cornwall and then John of Wales, who, as author of the *Summa de Poenitentia,* was more outstanding in theology than his predecessors. Following him in the directing of the school was a leading exegete, Thomas Docking of Norfolk.

The greatest name among the English Franciscans was that of Roger Bacon (*ca.* 1214–92). Influenced by Grosseteste, Adam Marsh, Thomas of York, and other Oxford scholars, Bacon himself was not a professor and perhaps not even a priest. He turned from speculation to encyclopedic, comprehensive research in the field of mathematics, natural science, and social science. He pursued positive science not only for its own sake but for the service of theology. Independent and self-willed, intuitively gifted and endowed with critical precision, in his literary works he developed ideas whose significance in intellectual history must be seen not so much in themselves as in their ability to stimulate others. He deplored the separation between speculative thought and experimental science and the uncertainty involved in the uncritical use of traditional texts. An unstable wanderer, he was commissioned by Clement IV to draw up a plan for the reform of ecclesiastical studies; but he made so many enemies that he spent more than ten years, till shortly before his death, under house arrest. His chief work was the *Opus maius,* in which he asked that science be put at the service of practical life. Revolutionary was his demand for the introduction of experiment. In theology he remained bound to the Augustinian tradition.

The great importance of English scholars of the mendicant orders is especially to be seen in the two eminent personalities who successively ruled the archbishopric of Canterbury: the Dominican Robert Kilwardby (*ca.* 1210–79) and the Franciscan John Pecham (*ca.* 1220–92).[10]

After the Paris judgment of 1277, which Pecham also adopted for England, the Thomist school and the Franciscan followers of Saint Bonaventure drew farther apart. The leading English Thomist at Oxford, after Richard Knapwell, was especially Thomas of Sutton. But in intellectual brilliance they were surpassed by the Franciscan Richard of Middleton, who taught at Paris from 1280 to 1295. He is perhaps to be regarded as a precursor of the greatest English theologian, John Duns Scotus (*ca.* 1266–1308), whose beginnings and early death belong in this period. He studied and taught at Oxford and Paris in turn. He was sent to Cologne in 1307, and died there the next year. As a Franciscan he remained attached to the Augustinian tradition, but his eclectic Aristotelianism went far beyond what Bonaventure and Pecham had allowed. The Oxford school gave him his interest in mathematics and in experiment. His keen critical faculty likewise distinguished him from the Augustinian and Thomist-Aristotelian visual range. But he too applied himself to the unity of faith and knowledge, to a synthesis of metaphysics and theology.

In Paris and elsewhere on the continent the great condemnation of Aristotelianism in 1277 meant a splitting of minds. While a certain trend toward a conservative reaction displayed itself, on the whole the development continued on the routes previously pointed out by the great masters of synthesis.

Scholarly life became even more intense and richer and a great number of noteworthy teachers and investigators appeared, who devoted themselves to philosophical and theological problems in a personal, independent, and critical method.

---

[10] D. L. Douie, *Archbishop Pecham* (Oxford 1952).

Shortly after 1277 appeared the *Correctorium fratris Thomae* of William de la Mare,[11] the manifesto, so to speak, of the neo-Augustinian Franciscan school, in which 117 Thomistic theses were critically examined. Richard of Middleton belonged to this school, even though he approached Thomas in his epistemology. Vitalis de Furno should be mentioned and, even more, William of Ware, one of the teachers of Duns Scotus. Also to be counted in the Franciscan school at Paris was Peter John Olivi (d. 1298), already discussed in connection with the Spiritual movement. However, he did not teach at Paris but, among other places, at Florence. He left very many theological writings. As is well known, the Council of Vienne (1311–12) spoke out against him in favour of the doctrine of the soul as the *forma corporis* of man. In general he remained faithful to his order's traditional intellectual orientation.

In the train of Pecham in his reaction against Thomism was also Henry of Ghent (d. 1293), who showed himself to be a neo-Augustinian in his vigourous dispute with Giles of Rome and Godfrey of Fontaines. He developed a Neoplatonic metaphysics, which was clearly influenced by Avicenna.

Parallel to this neo-Augustinian tendency, represented mostly by Franciscans, there grew up the young Thomist school, whose spokesmen belonged mainly to the Dominican Order. Remarkably enough, Saint Thomas's immediate disciples were not very prominent in it, except for Ptolemy of Lucca in Naples. The most important scholars of the Thomist school were the Augustinian Hermit Giles of Rome (d. 1316), Godfrey of Fontaines (d. 1306), the diocesan priest Peter of Auvergne (d. 1304), and Henry Bate of Malines (d. after 1310).

The thirteenth century can be summarized as an epoch of philosophical and theological culture, and Maurice de Wulf called it the Golden Age of Metaphysics. Through it theology became speculative without losing its contact with Holy Scripture and the patristic tradition. It not only enriched the Greek-Jewish-Arabic legacy; it also made it capable of confronting the world of Judaism and Islam in apologetics.

The literary culture of the twelfth century was replaced by the cultivation of the particular disciplines, which formed their own languages. While the great scholars, especially Bonaventure and Thomas, mastered a distinct literary style, it did not achieve the rich brilliance and vivacity of the twelfth century.

---

[11] *Declarationes Magistri Gulielmi de la Mare O.F.M. de variis sententiis S. Thomae Aquinatis,* ed. F. Pelster (Münster 1956); V. Heynck, "Zur Datierung des 'Correctorium fratris Thomas' Wilhelms de la Mare. Ein unbeachtetes Zeugnis des Petrus Johannis Olivi," *FStud,* 49 (1967), 1–21.

A certain ambivalence of the age revealed itself in the development of a heterodox Aristotelianism in the arts faculty: the danger of rationalizing naturalism made itself felt. Siger of Brabant became its exponent and against him Bonaventure, Pecham, and Aquinas entered the lists. But Aquinas himself did not escape criticism on the part of almost the entire theological faculty of Paris. By means of his critical study and assimilation of the Aristotelian stock of ideas, especially its concept of knowledge, he had created the first original Christian philosophy, but it was precisely here that, according to his critic, John Pecham, the future dangers lay for theology; he felt that in Thomas there could be detected a surrender to Siger's positions — too far-reaching concessions to a heathen philosophy. And yet from the historical viewpoint the figure of Saint Thomas dominated his century. His work presupposed the exertions of the first century and a half and built on them. The philosophical and theological disputes which filled his lifetime stimulated his thought and promoted its development. The violent reaction against his total view and the sharp criticism of Duns Scotus compelled his pupils and successors to penetrate his work more deeply and make it better understood. The enduring and timeless value of Thomas's synthesis, however, was not to be appreciated fully for centuries. In this sense are to be understood Gilson's words: "This solitary scholar did not write for his own century, but the future was to belong to him."

CHAPTER 34

The Cardinals and the Curia in the Thirteenth Century

The Emperor Frederick II had addressed the cardinals as "successors of the Apostles" when in 1239 he suggested to them the summoning of a council at which his quarrel with Gregory IX should be arbitrated. And at the end of the century King Philip IV of France used the same phrase in an analogous context. Even if the canonists soon stressed the distinction between a "succession" of that sort and the recognized position of the bishops as *successores apostolorum*, it became clear in other ways how exalted a rank the cardinalate[1] had acquired in the awareness of the age together with the papacy in its rise in esteem. The origins of the cardinalate from the Roman clergy belonged to the remote past. Innocent IV said without affectation that the cardinals possessed the authority of senators. As the Pope's advisers and participants in the government of the Church they met under the Pope's presidency in the consistory, which had replaced the Roman synods. They were early called *pars corporis papae,* as the princes of the Empire were regarded as *pars corporis imperatoris.* While the *Descriptio sanctuarii Lateranensis* (*ca.* 1100) still knew fifty-three cardinals, — seven bishops, 28 priests, 18 deacons, — this number fell in the thirteenth century to less than twenty and occasionally to even less than ten. Furthermore, by virtue of the corporative thought of the age, the cardinals appeared ever more clearly as a *collegium* and a corporation.[2] The beginnings of their own financial administration went back to the pontificate of Calixtus II (1119–24). In the thirteenth century it was directed by a Cardinal *Camerlengo,* who should be distinguished from the chief of the papal *Camera.* In 1289 Nicholas IV granted the college one-half of the income of the Holy See. Especially in view of the prolonged vacancies during this period — together they amounted to almost ten years in the thirteenth century — it was not possible to evade the question of what authority pertained to the college in the government of the Church. The leading decretalist, Hostiensis, himself Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and hence *prior et decanus* of the college, held that the college and the Pope constituted a unity, "unum et idem est," and hence it participated in the *plenitudo potestatis.*[3] Others, however, limited the cardinals' proper authority to their right and duty of electing the Pope, while all other authority came to them from the Pope, for they are what they are through the Pope, who named them, bestowed their privileges, assigned their duties, and, if necessary, deprived them of their dignity. As a matter of fact, during the vacancies of the Holy See the cardinals acted so consistently in regard to decisions of law and of administration that they did not lay claim to the papal primatial power. In the consistory they were advisers but not real codetermining participants, even if there was often, though not always, mention in papal charters that decisions were arrived at "de fratrum nostrorum consilio" (or "consensu"). Research is today agreed that neither was the necessity of consultation meant nor did the consent of the cardinals give validity to the papal decrees. The cardinals' signatures on especially solemn papal decrees must be similarly understood. Whatever accrued to the cardinalate in authority and dignity came through a grant by the Pope and was therefore of positive ecclesiastical law. The cardinals received no order and were not necessarily bishops, even though they outranked bishops in the course of time and, like them, had a seat and a vote at councils.

---

[1] S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis, the History of a Canonical Concept," *Tr*, 3 (1945), 129–214; M. Andrieu, "L'origine du titre de cardinal dans l'Église romaine, " *MiscMercati*, V (Rome 1946), 113–44.

In the thirteenth century, as earlier, the Pope made extensive use of the cardinals in the government of the Church and of the *Patrimonium,* where they obtained the most important rectorships, that is, the administration of the provinces. When acting as legates they received far-reaching powers, including judicial, and on such occasions appeared in almost papal dress and with papal ceremonial. In 1245 Innocent IV granted them the red hat. At Rome they became a sort of council of state during the Pope's lifetime and they assumed the government after his death.[4] Their honorary rights began to multiply. The Pope was their only judge, and, placed on an equality with the electors in the secular sphere, they ranked immediately after him.

---

[2] For the canonical view of the relationship of Pope and cardinals see B. Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge 1955), 68–84.

[3] Tierney, *op. cit.,* 149–53, gives the opinion of Hostiensis.

If the cardinals, under the direction of the Pope in the consistory, represented, in a sense, the highest organism for justice and administration in the Church, the Curia developed on its own alongside the college. The departments of the Curia, so far as they were constituted in the thirteenth century, were by no means directed by cardinals, except for the *Penitentiaria.* Perhaps the number of cardinals was too small; some of them were absent from Rome for rather long periods as legates. Perhaps the Popes felt that in this way they could retain the organization of the Curia directly at their own disposal. The exertions of the College of Cardinals to insert itself, on an equal footing and as an essential partner, into the supreme direction of the Church cannot be mistaken in the thirteenth century, even if they only later came to light.

The Curia

The epoch of the great jurist Popes, from Innocent III to Boniface VIII, brought to the elaboration of the Curia[5] a growth and at the same time a simplification. It became the administrative and judicial organ of a spiritual commonwealth, to which the development of canon law, especially through the codifications of the thirteenth century from the decretals of Gregory IX to the *Liber Sextus* of Boniface VIII, had given a uniform order applying to all lands in Christendom. To watch over and perfect it became one of the more essential tasks of the Curia, which thus had to carry out governmental, administrative, and judicial functions. The final decision, of course, lay always with the Pope, who usually reached it in consistory.

The administration fell under the two offices of chancellor and *camerlengo.* Judicial matters were divided between the *Penitentiaria* for the forum of conscience and the *Audientia causarum* or *Audientia Sacri Palatii,* from which was to emerge the *Sacra Rota Romana* from the end of the thirteenth century. Besides these offices, whose activities could not as yet always be clearly distinguished, the papal court also disposed of the *capella,* whose development had been similar to that of its secular counterpart. While destined for divine worship, the *capellani,* a group that was becoming ever more numerous, had, of course, to be prepared for other duties, in particular diplomatic. Secular dignitaries, officials, and employees took care of the lodging, maintenance, and order of this vast community, whose members were frequently on the road and demanding appropriate provisions.

---

[4] G. Le Bras, *Institutions,* I (Paris 1959), 346; *cf.* the entire chapter (340–48).

[5] For the origin of the Curia see *supra,* Chapter 4.

The Chancery

The name *cancellaria* appeared as early as 1182. Basically, the chancery was supposed to take care of all the correspondence between the Pope and Christendom. However, separate records for the *Penitentiaria* and for the *Camera* soon branched off. From 1187, except for brief intervals, there was no chancellor. Honorius III definitely abolished the office and replaced it with that of vice-chancellor. The vice-chancellor was not a cardinal until the end of the thirteenth century. The organization of the chancery was still in full process of development at this time. Under the vice-chancellor worked the notaries, the *corrector,* the *auditor litterarum contradictarum,* the *abbreviatores,* the *scriptores,* and the *bullatores.* The seal had to be left with the *camerlengo* over the weekend. From around the middle of the thirteenth century the notaries' chancery activity slowly declined, while the vice-chancellor, previously merely *primus inter pares,* increased his authority.

In addition to charters, which corresponded to initiatives of the Pope himself, the chancery especially took care of petitions, *supplicia,* coming in writing to the Curia from everywhere; they dealt with questions from the most varied aspects of ecclesiastical law. They were received and examined in the so-called *Data communis;* the more important were then revised in concise form and submitted to the Pope for a decision. In the event that a favourable decision was there granted, an outline of a letter *(minuta)* was drawn up; a fair copy was made under the supervision of the *corrector* or other officials, such as the vice-chancellor or a notary, and it was sealed by the *bullatores.* If Pope, Curia, or petitioner so desired, the charter was entered in the register and then delivered. If such letters of right or of grace were contradicted and challenged by the parties concerned, the case was sent to the *audientia litterarum contradictarum.* But in the thirteenth century this curial department was not yet fully organized.

The heaviest burden in the chancery lay on the vice-chancellor and his six (at most seven) notaries, who presented the more important petitions to the Pope; later the *referendarius* assumed this function. They had to send back *supplicia* that were improperly composed and expedite those that were granted. Each notary employed his own *abbreviatores* for the drawing up of the drafts of letters. The less the notaries were concerned from around 1250 with the current everyday work, the more the *abbreviatores* came under the direction of the vice-chancellor himself. As earlier, the *camerlengo* continued to be the keeper of the seal. The chancery had close connections with the *Camera;* it obtained its materials, such as parchment, lead, and silk, from the *Camera,* while the *Camera* participated in those charters and *acta* that were concerned with money questions or with the administration of the Papal State. The extant or registered charters do not supply a full picture of the achievements of the chancery, for only a fraction of them was retained or registered. In 1302 the chancery disposed of the material for 11,000 charters but only 1,036 written pieces for that year can be identified.

The *Camera*

The *Camera* provided the financial administration of the Holy See. The Pope had had to assume immense tasks, above all in regard to the organizing of the crusades, in the conflicts between the Holy See and the Empire, and in the matter of subsidies, which proved to be necessary everywhere because of the tensions within Christendom. Furthermore, there was the increasing burden of supporting so expanding an administrative organism as the Curia itself. Hence a special bureaucracy for financial administration became necessary. Cluny was perhaps the model for the origins of the *camera apostolica.*[6] The revenues came from the tax yield of the *Patrimonium,* from the proceeds of Peter's Pence,[7] from the gifts brought by prelates visiting the Curia. From Innocent III these last were converted into fees and specific services. *Servitia communia,*[8] amounting to one-third of a year's income, were payable on the occasion of the nomination and confirmation of bishops and abbots, and the dispatch of chancery *acta* was connected with the payment of various fees. From the crusade tithes there gradually evolved a system for a general taxation of Christendom.

The direction of the *camera* always pertained to a bishop and occasionally even to a cardinal, who should not be confused with the *camerlengo* of the College of Cardinals. Under him were the collectors, sent out to gather on the spot the monies due or, in the case of taxes paid in kind, to convert them into money and to remit them. When, from the middle of the thirteenth century, to the *servitia communia* for the higher benefices were added for the lower benefices the annates,[9] or one's year income, usually paid in kind, the work of the collectors was increased.

---

[6] J. Sydow, "Cluny und die Anfänge der Apostolischen Kammer," *SM,* 63 (1951), 45–66.

[7] K. Jordan, "Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," *QFIAB,* 25 (1933 f.), 61–104; C. Daux, *Le Denier de saint Pierre* (Paris 1907).

[8] A. Gottlob, *Die Servitientaxe im 13. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1903).

[9] J. Vincke, "Die Krone von Aragón und die Anfänge der päpstlichen Annaten," *RQ,* 40 (1932), 117–82.

Since there was as yet no distinction between the direction of the papal treasure and that of the Church, such as that between *mensa abbatis* and *mensa conventus* and between *mensa episcopi* and *mensa capituli,* the *camerlengo* was one of the Pope's closest collaborators. His correspondence was recorded since the days of Urban IV in the *camera* register; *camera* clerics took care of the correspondence, examined contracts, and checked the receipts of the collectors. The *camera* had its own judicial officials — *auditor,* fiscal procurator, advocates — as the number of processes increased. For the exchange of money the *camera* made use of the banking firms of Florence, Genoa, and elsewhere, whose agents in Rome were called *mercatores curie romane.* Under the *camerlengo* was the actual administrator of the treasure, *thesaurarius,* who guarded the cash on hand.

Judicial Offices

Whereas in the twelfth century the consistory, presided over by the Pope, was able to settle disputed cases and appeals, in the course of the thirteenth century special offices were constituted, which were not fully established until the fourteenth century. The first was the *Penitentiaria,* for the forum of conscience. For a long time, perhaps from the seventh century, the Pope had made use of the services of a *penitentiarius,* but the latter's activity had grown so extraordinarily by virtue of the frequency and abundance of reservations and dispensations that he had to receive corresponding assistance. Delegations too had so increased since the pontificate of Alexander III (1159–81) that now the Cardinal *Penitentiarius* had to have a staff of coworkers. Thus appeared the *Penitentiaria,*[10] whose structure was organized under Gregory IX (1227–41) and constantly perfected into the fourteenth century.

From the formulary of Thomas of Capua under Honorius III we learn that the *Penitentiaria* absolved from sins and censures that were reserved to the Pope, granted dispensations from irregularities and marriage impediments, could quash illegal and unfair decisions, dispense from vows, commute them, or postpone their fulfillment, dispatched indults, conferred privileges, mitigated penances. The grand *penitentiarius* was the confessor of the cardinals and of prelates staying at the Curia. Under Boniface VIII there were as many as twelve *sub-penitentiarii;* often they were religious of various nations.

The public administration of justice pertained to the *Audientia Sacri Palatii,* from which the *Rota* developed in the fourteenth century. When in the course of the twelfth century the legal cases which reached the Curia directly or by means of appeal grew more and more in number, even more *auditores* were commissioned to introduce the processes and lay them before the Pope, together with the cardinals, for decision; sometimes they were themselves authorized to render decisions. *Auditores* were selected from the cardinals, the bishops, and perhaps even from papal *capellani.* Around the middle of the thirteenth century there were general *auditores, — auditores generales causarum palatii,* — as many as fourteen under Boniface VIII. They constituted a college: the *Audientia Sacri Palatii.* This was concerned with all civil and penal cases which fell within the competence of the Holy See. The Pope also reserved *causae maiores* and disputes over elections to himself and the cardinals. This papal judicial office only obtained a stable organization in 1331 in the bull "Ratio iuris"; it was later called the *Rota.*[11]

---

[10] E. Göller, *Die päpstliche Pönitentiarie von ihrem Ursprung bis zu ihrer Umgestaltung unter Pius V.,* I: *Die päpstliche Pönitentiarie bis Eugen IV.* (Rome 1907); T. Majic, "Die Apostolische Pönitentiarie im 14. Jahrhundert," *RQ,* 50 (1955), 129–77.

Alongside it worked the so-called *Audientia litterarum contradictarum,* which belonged to the chancery. Authorized by Innocent III, it was concerned with legal documents and with grants of favours by the Curia which had been challenged by opponents of the recipients. In general, it was intended to create order in the extensive legal mechanism of the Curia, to exclude foolish issues from the outset, and to seek an arbitrated compromise before the starting of a process. This could be achieved by revision of records and elimination of bureaucratic chicanery and of delays in trials. While it thus regulated or reformed the course of business in the interests of peace, chancery rules and legal structures were set up and published by the *Audientia publica.* With the increase in the proper legal forms for conducting trials in the thirteenth century the *Audientia litterarum contradictarum* also became interested in the regulating and systematizing of rescripts and the examining of the challenges, especially those that were of a delaying nature. It was supposed to be of assistance to the parties in the selecting of judges.[12]

In addition to the offices of the Curia in the strict sense there appeared the college of papal *capellani.* These devoted themselves not only to the liturgy at the papal court[13] but also to various types of diplomatic and judicial tasks. Already numerous in the twelfth century, their number increased to almost 200 under Innocent IV. At first subdeacons and later also deacons and priests, they came from Roman patrician families and often from the Pope's kindred. They served as *penitentiarii,* distributors of alms, sacristans; they were also chamberlains, treasurers, or lectors in the circle closest to the Pope.

---

[11] E. Schneider, *Die römische Rota* (Paderborn 1914); C. Lefèbvre, "Rote romaine," *DDC,* 7 (1961), 742–71 (bibliography).

[12] G. Mollat, "Contribution à l'histoire judiciaire de l'Église romaine au XIV^e siècle," *RHE,* 32 (1936), 877–928.

[13] R. Elze, "Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan,* 36 (1950), 145–204.

The special palace offices were performed by laymen, and in addition there were the rather numerous personnel of the kitchen, stable, household, police, and messengers.

A mighty mechanism for the business of ecclesiastical law and administration, which of course also had to perform corresponding functions in the government of the Papal State, made it clear toward the end of the thirteenth century how extensive the practical direction of the Church by the Pope had become. Weighed down by all the weaknesses of large bureaucracies, but also distinguished by astonishing achievements in tribunal, *camera,* and chapel, the thirteenth-century Curia was one of the most impressive phenomena of Church life in the High Middle Ages.

CHAPTER 35

Celestine V and Boniface VIII

The Second Council of Lyons in 1274 was, in its achievement if not in its enduring effect, a convincing sign of the still unruffled ecumenical prestige of the papacy, above all of course in the West. The entanglement with Anjou, intensified by the Sicilian Vespers of 1282, compromised the Curia for the future in a way that was as undesired as it was unexpected. All efforts at a settlement collapsed and simultaneously diminished the repute of the Holy See. The rapid succession of brief pontificates made it clear at the same time that even in the College of Cardinals there was no really effective grasp of the threatening situation. The small number of cardinals and their keen partisanship *vis-à-vis* the persons concerned in the Mediterranean tensions prevented agreement on a Pope, who, like Gregory X, coming from outside their numbers, uniting breadth of vision and freedom from factional ties, would have been able to direct the helm toward greater goals. As a matter of fact, the election of 5 July 1294, two years and three months after the death on 4 April 1292 of Nicholas IV, fell on a man who did not belong to the college, where the rivalry of Colonna and Orsini would not allow anyone to obtain the required two-thirds majority. But it was not a happy choice. Piety could certainly be expected in the hermit, Peter of Murrone, and this was probably what motivated the Franciscan Cardinal Latino Malabranca to suggest him. The Pope-elect had been a Benedictine, but later, as a hermit, he had founded an eremitical community, which had been incorporated into the Benedictine Order by Urban IV. The members later called themselves Celestines, from the name which the Pope from their midst had assumed. He only accepted the election under much pressure and despite his own great hesitations. A year earlier the founder, more than eighty-years old, had relinquished to others the direction of his community, whose principal monastery was Santo Spirito near Sulmona. In the Spiritual circles the new Pope was hailed as the "Angel Pope" expected by the Joachimite movement; it was believed that a new era was beginning for the Church. Extraordinary as the election was, the end of the brief pontificate was equally extraordinary: at the end of the same year, Celestine V abdicated.

Charles II the Lame, King of Naples, who had already exercised a determining influence on the conclave, believed himself authorized to exert the decisive impact during the pontificate. He was not only able to prevent the new Pope from transferring his residence to Rome, as the cardinals wanted; he even succeeded in having him take up residence at Naples in the Castel Nuovo, placed at his disposal by the King. Celestine V had been crowned on 29 August 1294 at Aquila in Santa Maria di Collemaggio, a church of his own congregation. Charles II induced him to renew Gregory X's strict rules for the conclave and had himself appointed guardian of the next conclave. The Pope named twelve cardinals. Charles nominated many of them, in particular the seven Frenchmen, four of whom were from Charles's own Kingdom. Two of the cardinals belonged to the Celestine congregation.

Against the opposition of the cardinals the Curia moved from Aquila to Naples, arriving on 5 November. The most important posts were occupied by Charles's creatures, who also succeeded in taking over the key positions in the Papal State. The overhasty measures of the pontificate included the rich grant of privileges to the Celestine congregation, whose confirmation the Pope renewed. The actual administration of the Church fell into hopeless confusion, especially since an insight into the situation was not granted to the Pope and he did not have the strength to exercise supervision. Benefices were given simultaneously to several petitioners. Efforts were made to incorporate the greater abbeys into the Celestine congregation; even Montecassino was threatened. Charles II obtained a ratification of the peace with Aragón and the grant to himself of the tithes from France and Burgundy for four years and from England, Ireland, and Scotland for one year. He was eventually also named Senator of Rome. When the cardinals, to whom Celestine allowed no say, came with their grievances and complaints, the Pope became aware of his very difficult situation. After having consulted with Cardinal Benedict Gaetani, he had it ratified in consistory that abdication was possible. On 10 December he issued a constitution dealing with abdication by a Pope and decreed the legal validity of Gregory X's conclave regulation also for the case of resignation. Then, on 13 December, he laid down his office.

His successor did not permit him to return to his old hermitage, rightly fearing that his own opponents and Celestine's disillusioned friends might exploit the person of the resigned Pope to bring about a schism in the Church. At first, to be sure, Celestine did manage to flee, but he was overtaken and placed in honourable confinement in the Castel Fumone near Ferentino, where he died on 19 May 1296. He was buried in the church where he had been crowned. Clement V canonized him in 1313 under pressure from King Philip the Fair in the course of the struggle over the memory of Boniface VIII. The dream of an Angel Pope had dissolved. Pious asceticism was not enough to qualify one to rule the Universal Church. But in addition Celestine had lacked attributes which would have made possible a fruitful influence to the bearer of the *plenitudo potestatis:* shrewdness, experience, ruling authority, strength, and a statesman's ability to make decisions. All of these qualities were brought to the papacy by Celestine's immediate successor, Boniface VIII.

The conclave following Celestine's abdication began on 23 December — there was a ten days' interval, just as at the death of a Pope. Cardinal Matthew Rosso Orsini was first elected, but he declined. Then Benedict Gaetani was unanimously chosen. Boniface VIII (1294–1303), as he styled himself, came from a Roman family that had branched far out, to Anagni, where he was born, to Pisa, and to Spain. His mother was a niece of Alexander IV, and the mother of Nicholas III was also related to him. He was also connected with the houses of Orsini and Colonna. Born at Anagni around 1240, he was raised by his uncle, the Bishop of Todi, and studied law at Bologna. He became a notary at the Curia and, as secretary, accompanied the future Popes Martin IV and Adrian V on embassies to France and England. He was entrusted with important business at the Curia and, despite the Ghibelline tradition of his family, was oriented toward France, and hence Martin IV created him a Cardinal, first as deacon of San Nicolà and then as priest of San Martino. His legateship in France in 1290–91 became his most important activity. He succeeded in mediating the Treaty of Tarascon with Aragón and in preventing the outbreak of a war with England and restoring good relations between France and the Curia. At the University of Paris he stood up for the rights of the mendicant orders; it had been charged by the diocesan clergy and the University that their excessive privileges disturbed the orderly care of souls in parishes. As a friend of popular piety — he was not a specialist in theology — the Cardinal inclined to the ideal of the mendicant orders. His harsh and intemperate manner of speaking gained him no friends. If, nevertheless, his fellow cardinals elected him, they did so because of the qualities which made him seem suited for the papacy, so seriously compromised by Celestine V: trained intellect, knowledge of the world, experience in business, intrepid boldness, an iron will, and amazing energy.

The new Pope dismissed the curial officials imposed by Charles II and moved to Rome, where he was crowned on 23 January. He had annulled all favours granted by his predecessor; only the prelates appointed by Celestine retained their dignity. All grants of benefices that had not yet been effected and all expectatives were also cancelled. The administration of the Curia's finances was transferred to three Florentine banking firms; hence the *Camera* became only an accounting office, and abuse and suspicion on the part of both payers and receivers were eliminated. The financial administration was tightened and regulated, the returns from public finance increased, and at the end of the pontificate there was an important cash reserve on hand. The city of Rome remained calm under Boniface VIII and the Papal State felt his strong hand. Risings in the Marches could be put down, Orvieto submitted within a year, and only Romagna continued restless. In many places the Pope had himself elected as city lord. The Papal State had not had a more powerful master since Innocent III.

Boniface first tried to solve the problem of Sicily. At the end of 1293 Charles II had arranged by treaty with James of Aragón the evacuation of Calabria and after three years the restoration of Sicily to the Pope; in return James received Charles's daughter as his wife. Sicily would then be given back to Charles. Frederick, who was holding Sicily for James, was to marry Catherine of Courtenay, heiress to the Latin Empire of Constantinople. His advisers, Manfred Lancia, John of Procida, and Roger Loria, made corresponding arrangements with Boniface on 20 June 1295, which included the peace between Charles and James that had been ratified by Celestine V. According to these James would have had to evacuate Calabria, turn over Sicily to the Pope, and receive Charles II's daughter together with a large dowry, Charles of Valois would have renounced Aragón, and the Church would have granted James full pardon. This would have been a satisfactory solution for the Curia, and Boniface set himself energetically to achieve it. But it collapsed on the opposition of France, which refused to allow Catherine of Courtenay to marry, and of Frederick and the Sicilians, who, out of fear of Anjou, elected Frederick as King and had him crowned at Palermo on 26 March 1296. The disillusioned Boniface annulled both the election and the coronation and intended to conquer Sicily with James's assistance. But James procrastinated, negotiated, and demanded Sardinia and Corsica as papal fiefs and corresponding financial help. Meanwhile, from Sicily Frederick conquered Calabria and most of Apulia. Boniface joined James, Naples, and Queen Constance in an alliance against Frederick; a campaign was decided for the summer of 1297.

At the same time a war was in progress between England and France. France was concerned about the English King's fiefs on the continent, Guienne and Gascony. As a Cardinal, Boniface in 1290 had been able to prevent the outbreak of hostilities for some time, but during the long vacancy of the Holy See from 1292 to 1294 war had come. Despite various efforts to gain German and Spanish allies, Edward I was losing. Boniface at once sent legates to Germany, France, and England, but only in Germany was there any willingness to give in. In the summer of 1296 Boniface was asked to mediate, not in his capacity as Pope but personally as an arbiter. Both Kingdoms had demanded taxes from the clergy for the prosecution of the war. Since on the outbreak of war a Pope had not yet been elected, the necessary consent of the Curia, as provided by the Fourth Lateran Council for taxation of the clergy, had not been sought. When at the beginning of 1296 new tithes had been announced for a year, two for the North and four for the South, the clergy, led by the Cistercians, had protested, but the bishops had not. Boniface complied with this protest in the bull "Clericis laicos" of 24 February 1296, which was entered in the chancery register as "Statute on Ecclesiastical Freedom." It renewed the enactment of the Fourth Lateran Council and made it stricter in the sense that any tax not expressly authorized incurred the penalty. Promulgated as a general law, it was directed equally at France and England and intended to make unambiguous a law that had become doubtful. Thereby the Pope intervened as legislator in important areas of the life of the state, which was becoming ever more keenly conscious of its autonomy. In practice kings in their wars would have become dependent on the good will of the Pope, who could permit the paying of war taxes.

Did Boniface intend to further his peace efforts by this decree? In any event, the English clergy refused further contributions, appealing to the bull, and the barons followed their example. There ensued a constitutional conflict, which, as in 1215, ended in 1297 with the submission of the King and the confirmation of Magna Carta. In France the episcopate at first withdrew its consent to the tithe, but at an assembly at Paris in June 1296 it asked the Pope for authorization. At the same time Boniface was asked by both belligerents to mediate personally in the war. Surprisingly, there quickly followed, on 18 August 1296, a prohibition of the export from France of precious metal, money, and bills of exchange. This was explained as an ordinary war measure, but the Pope was the one chiefly affected by it, for his budget was dependent on French dues. He reacted on 20 September with a sharp note to King Philip the Fair. He accused him of violating the liberties of the Church and reminded him that the edict contained nothing new; it authorized the Pope to protect the clergy but by permitting particular taxes it did not exclude support for the King. Boniface had always been particularly friendly to France, but the letter ended with certain threatening admonitions: the Pope would see himself compelled to have recourse to extraordinary means in the event that France did not comply. There then began in France a journalism, probably managed by the court, which discussed in a polemical fashion fundamental questions of the relations between laity and clergy within the Church, understood as Christendom. The French Church, it was said, had special obligations toward the "political" community because of its wealth, which came from the laity, and the penalties threatened by the Curia were felt to be unjust. In the widely circulated *Dialogue Between A Cleric and A Knight*[1] it was admitted that the secular was bound to assist the spiritual, but the superiority, deduced from this, of the spiritual power to the secular power was denied. The Church of the clergy was advised to undertake an extensive spiritualizing process: the word and the Sacrament and Sacrifice were her vocation, and she should be concerned for the heavenly rather than the earthly kingdom. The territorial Church was obliged to aid the King, since he was constituted as her protector.

---

[1] On the "Disputatio inter clericum et militem," see R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik*, 333–52.

In the course of this polemic the political powers regrouped themselves. Flanders, threatened by France, allied with England. The Burgundian princes again made contact with Germany. An understanding with the Pope rather than a fight against him now seemed to be what was needed by the French crown and its advisers. The non-arrival of the French dues so crippled the Curia's policy, especially that against Sicily, that it too was for an understanding. A Florentine banker, John Francesi, nicknamed Musciatto, undertook to make the contacts. In a letter to the French King, Boniface declared that the bull "Clericis laicos," as a universal law, was not directed specially against him, complained of the export prohibition, and stated that he was prepared to accommodate the King. An accompanying interpretation of the law explained that voluntary contributions by the clergy were not bound by the requirement of authorization and that, in emergencies, when the Pope could not be approached in time, such authorization was to be presumed.

When there arrived a petition from the French episcopate that special contributions be approved, Boniface granted them for one year. The French clergy thereupon expressed themselves in favour of a two-years' tithe to the King. The crown was not satisfied with this consent. An embassy led by Peter Flotte, the chancellor, went to Rome for negotiations, since a favourable situation had arisen there: from May 1297 the Pope was occupied with the revolt of the House of Colonna.

The occasion was supplied by the private property policy of the Pope, who invested his cash resources in land and in so doing conflicted with the interests of the Colonna. The conflict became concrete over the village of Ninfa, adjoining the lordship of Norma, which had already been almost entirely acquired by Boniface. At the same time the Colonna Cardinals, James and Peter, were working against the Pope's Sicilian policy; they had long belonged to the Aragonese faction, but just the same they received an annual contribution from Naples. They had also supported the rebel Frederick. Both points — the property policy of the family and their political outlook — may have motivated the Pope to annul the acquisition of Ninfa by the Colonna and to dislodge them by purchasing the farms there for his own family. The money for the purchase was seized by Stephen Colonna while it was being transported from Anagni to Rome. The indignant Pope demanded the return of the money, the surrender of the culprit, and, as surety for the future, the handing over of the Colonna castles in the Campagna. Word came from the Colonna that they were prepared only to give back the money. When nothing more happened after three days, the Pope struck, moved especially by the fact that the Colonna had joined the Spiritual opposition against him. The Spirituals, to whom as such Boniface was not unfriendly, had been angered by the abdication of "their" Pope, behind which, not entirely without reason, they suspected Cardinal Gaetani. But when their opposition increased, Boniface declared invalid their separation by Celestine from the Conventuals and reincorporated them into the entire Franciscan Order. This intensified their hostility to him. There began a vast campaign of calumny against the Pope, in which all his enemies took part. The opposition developed into a Colonna-led conspiracy against the Pope. This explains the harshness of the action of 9 May 1297. The Colonna sent back the stolen money, but on 10 May Boniface deprived the two cardinals of their rank and excommunicated them. Corresponding penalties were visited on the family and its adherents in the ecclesiastical and secular state.

All this took place *consensu fratrum* but without any judicial procedure and corresponding judgment; this had been reserved, in the event that the cardinals concerned should, as Boniface had demanded, personally arrange for proceedings. The Colonna undertook counter-measures. On the altar at Saint Peter's they laid a solemn protest, in which it was stated that Boniface was not a legitimate Pope; the judgment of a general council was demanded, at which Boniface should be called to account for the murder of his predecessor. On 23 May the Pope renewed his sentence on the Colonna, and on 9 July the Inquisition was directed to begin a process against them and two of their adherents. The resistance of the Colonna to the Pope's measures found support in the French crown. In a comprehensive memorial they summarized all the charges against the Pope and invited the Universal Church — kings, princes, prelates — to have a general council decide on the punishment and removal of the Pope. Copies were sent everywhere. The French embassy, mentioned earlier, was informed of it. The memorial provided it with a favourable point of departure in its negotiations with the Curia. These could be concluded to the advantage of France on 31 July. It was agreed that the bull "Clericis laicos" did not apply to France. The crown was qualified to decide when an emergency existed which made recourse to the Pope pointless. A group of further privileges was added, and the canonization of Louis IX was promised. The extraordinary success of the French agents can only be grasped if one assumes that they had threatened to join the Colonna in the event that the Curia should not return a favourable answer. And despite the restoration of friendly relations with France this shadow remained.

The price of the understanding had to be paid by the Colonna, who now did not find in France the expected support. Peter Flotte held himself aloof from them. The front that had been forming against Boniface fell to pieces.

The cardinals were ready to declare their solidarity with Boniface. The minister general of the Franciscans demanded submission from his subjects. The Dominicans were commanded by their general publicly to recognize Boniface as true Pope. At the same time they were forbidden to join the Colonna. A crusade was preached against the Colonna. It lasted only until October 1298, when their chief fortress, Palestrina, fell and was razed to the ground. The Colonna submitted, but when the two Cardinals were freed only from excommunication and not from the other penalties, they again took up resistance. However, it did not become a reality until they allied with France after the beginning of the new century. The Pope's harsh proceedings against the Colonna very seriously damaged his reputation in the public opinion and led to those slanders that have so darkened his memory in history.

The enterprise against the refractory Frederick of Sicily went on without success throughout 1297 to 1299, since King James of Aragón, despite the great financial assistance he received from the Curia — he had become, among other things, the salaried standard-bearer of the Church, with an annual allowance of 100,000 florins, — made no serious efforts to weaken his brother's position. Not until Boniface began seriously to negotiate with Charles of Valois, the pretender to the throne of Aragón, for help did James finally take action. The outcome was the Aragonese naval victory off Cape Orlanda on 5 July 1299. But the victory was not followed up; Frederick escaped, and it was said that his brother helped him to do so. Boniface was disillusioned and provoked and relations with Aragón were at a breaking point. While Boniface was making peaceful overtures to Sicily through two legates, Naples decided on military measures, but they were thwarted by Frederick's victory at Falconaria on 1 December. The Sicilian problem had to be tackled again, so to speak. But despite efforts to unite Aragón, France, and Naples, in addition to all available Italian resources, such as the cities and the military orders, for it, all was in vain.

In vain also were the Pope's exertions to mediate between Venice and Genoa and to intervene with the English King on behalf of Scotland and in Hungary to secure the succession for the House of Anjou.

Imperial Italy played an important role in his relations with Germany. Boniface was less interested in Lombardy than he was in Tuscany, which he would have liked to incorporate into the Papal State. In this aspiration he was in accord with a traditional claim of the Curia, deriving from the Carolingian promises and the Mathildine Donation. Boniface had close ties with the chief city of Tuscany, Florence. Important Florentine banking houses were in the service of the Curia. In Florence the Blacks and the Whites vied for control of the government; both factions belonged to the wealthy class, which had imposed its rule on the lesser folk. The Pope decided for the Blacks, who included the papal bankers.

Adolf of Nassau had been King of Germany since 5 May 1292. But in the course of the years he had so alienated his electors that in June 1298 he was deposed. Duke Albert of Austria, son of King Rudolf I and centre of the opposition to Adolf, was chosen to succeed him. In the struggle for the crown, Adolf perished on 2 July 1298 in the cavalry battle of Göllheim. The Electors announced Albert's elevation to the Pope and asked him to summon their choice for coronation as Emperor at a suitable opportunity. Boniface stressed his right to examine the fitness of the Emperor-elect and even the legitimacy of a unanimous election. He held himself aloof from Albert, because of his behaviour toward King Adolf, and there ensued years of negotiations, during which the Pope demanded the cession of Tuscany in return for recognition. Since Adolf for his part had been on terms of friendship with England, Albert in opposing him had established good relations with France, and as King he consolidated these by the Friendship Treaty of Quatrevaux in the fall of 1299. In April 1301 the Rhenish Electors revolted against Albert and the Pope supported them. But when the final conflict with France became intensified, Boniface yielded, especially since the King had also defeated the electoral opposition. On 30 April 1303 in the bull "Aeterni Patris" he solemnly recognized Albert as King of Germany and future Emperor. Albert now broke off his alliance with France and bound himself not to appoint an imperial vicar in Lombardy and Tuscany for the next five years without the Pope's consent and after that to name only a vicar acceptable to the Pope. Herein lay a recognition by the Curia that this was imperial property. On 13 July 1303 the King renewed the oath taken by his envoys.[2] This was no formal oath of vassalage but a promise of obedience according to a formula often used at the Curia. The Curia regarded it as an oath of security, such as had been customarily taken in similar cases. It acquired no practical political significance.

The Jubilee of 1300 formed a sort of caesura in the pontificate of Boniface VIII, at least in regard to the relationship with France, which had calmed in this year. Rumours at the end of 1299 had told of ample grants of indulgences which persons could gain at the beginning of the new century in Saint Peter's. And so from the start of the year great crowds of pilgrims arrived in Rome. Only because of these was the Pope induced, after consultation with the cardinals, to issue the bull "Antiquorum habet fidem" on 22 February 1300. Anyone who in this year, a year of jubilee, such as was thereafter to be celebrated every hundredth year, should, after contrite confession, visit the basilicas of the two Princes of the Apostles, — Romans thirty times, foreign pilgrims fifteen times, — received a plenary indulgence for the temporal punishment due to his sins. Enormous crowds of pilgrims came, attracted by this indulgence, hitherto not granted. A great need for expiation, penance, and conversion seemed to fill Christendom. At Rome arrangements had to be made to take care of the stream of visitors. The pilgrims' offerings were considerable; they profited not the papal coffers but those of the churches visited. For the Pope the jubilee brought a gain in prestige *vis-à-vis* the Western kings with whom he was engaged in a political confrontation. The unchallenged esteem of the Apostolic See and its religious authority found an unexpected confirmation. The self-assurance of Boniface VIII increased. It also led him to disregard a proper judgment of the political reality. This would soon be made crystal clear in the renewal of the conflict with France.

---

[2] The King promised to protect the Pope and render him loyal obedience; he intended to be "fidelis et oboediens" to him. *Cf. Gebhardt-Grundmann,* I, 410–12, with a detailed discussion of the promise, "which resembled less the oaths of security made by earlier Emperors than that of the subjects and officials in the Papal State." The text is in *MGConst,* IV, no. 181.

An insignificant incident started it. Bernard Saisset, provost of the collegiate chapter of Saint-Antonin, had become first Bishop of Pamiers, created by Boniface VIII in 1295. The King had not been consulted, nor had the Bishop of Toulouse, from whose diocese Pamiers had partly been carved. As provost the new Bishop had had difficulties with the King on account of the patronage of Pamiers, which he exercised in condominium with the Count of Foix. An understanding had been reached, but when King Philip the Fair again transferred to the Count of Foix the patronage which the crown had temporarily assumed, Bishop Saisset appealed against this to the Pope. Boniface had protested in vain to the King and had then proceeded against the Count with ecclesiastical penalties. Careless remarks by the Bishop that were critical of the King led to Bernard's being cited before the *conseil* after his property had been sequestered on 24 October 1301. He was prosecuted under the direction of the chancellor, Peter Flotte, on charges of defamation of the King, sedition, high treason, simony, and heresy. He was judged guilty and turned over to his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Narbonne, for imprisonment. The Pope was informed of the outcome and asked to depose and punish the Bishop of Pamiers. Without studying the dossier, Boniface demanded the Bishop's release on 5 December 1301. By the bull "Salvator Mundi" he withdrew the privileges granted to the King, because the freedom and immunity of the Church had been violated. In effect, the bull "Clericis laicos" was again made binding for France. The Pope summoned the French episcopate, the deans of the cathedral chapters, and the doctors to a special synod, to be held at Rome on 1 November 1302. The King was also invited. The bull "Ausculta Fili" contained all the grievances of the Church against the crown and its agents. They were to be the object of the discussions at the synod. There was also mention of the unconditional superiority of the papal over every secular power. Hence, involved was, beyond any concern for the question of Pamiers, a confrontation on fundamentals. A notary carried the bulls to Paris. Instead of justifying himself, King Philip had decided to fight. It was forbidden to publish the bull "Ausculta Fili." In its place Peter Flotte circulated a forgery, "Deum Time," in which, over the Pope's name, the content of the suppressed bull was made known in a distorted and sharpened manner. At the same time an alleged reply of the King was sent out with it — "Sciat maxima tua fatuitas." This maintained that in secular matters the King was subject to no one. Thus was French public opinion formed. In order to win the leading circles of the nation, a meeting of the Estates General was summoned to Paris; in addition to the nobility and prelates the cities were invited for the first time. The meeting took place on 12 April 1302. Peter Flotte read "Deum Time" and defended the King's case. The estates were persuaded to defend the King and to write to Rome in this sense. Only a few of the bishops attended, but they conformed after some hesitation. The nobility and the cities received a reply from the cardinals; the episcopate received theirs from the Pope. A consistorial discourse exposed and condemned the intrigues of Peter Flotte. It then declared that the Pope claimed no feudal suzerainty in France but could take the King to task *ratione peccati.* However, he threatened Philip with deposition and repeated the summons to the announced synod.

In spite of a royal prohibition, thirty-nine prelates appeared, but no decrees were issued. The bull "Unam Sanctam" may have been discussed, for it was published soon after, on 18 November 1302.[3] It became the most debated document of this pontificate, perhaps even of the mediaeval papacy in general. There is only one Church, so it explained, outside which there is no salvation, with only one head, who is Christ, and his vicar Peter and Peter's successors. Both swords, the spiritual and the temporal, are in the power of the Church, the spiritual wielded by her, the temporal wielded by the hand of the king but according to the priests' instructions. The spiritual power surpasses every secular power in dignity. The spiritual power can institute the secular[4] and judge it, if it transgresses. The highest spiritual power can be judged only by God. Whoever opposes it resists God. Hence it is necessary for the salvation of every man that he be subject to the Roman Pontiff.

---

[3] Text in *Denzinger-Schönmetzer* (34th ed. 1967), nos. 870–75, pp. 279–81; see here the critical introduction, which points to a consistorial address by the Pope on 24 June 1302. It makes clear how little it was the Pope's intention to claim a limitless and direct power in the sphere of the secular, that is, of kings: "quasi Nos mandaverimus regi, quod recognosceret regnum a Nobis. Quadraginta anni sunt, quod Nos sumus experti in iure, et scimus, quod duae sunt potestates ordinatae a Deo; quis ergo debet credere vel potest, quod tanta fatuitas, tanta insipientia sit vel fuerit in capite Nostro? Dicimus quod in nullo volumus usurpare iurisdictionem regis, et sic frater noster Portuensis dixit." The Cardinal Bishop of Porto, here referred to, was Matthew of Aquasparta.

[4] The text reads: "Nam Veritate testante, spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem *instituere* habet et iudicare"; here the word "instituere" can mean both "institute" and "instruct." English trans. in *Church and State through the Centuries,* ed. S. Ehler and B. Morrall (Westminster 1954), 89–92.

None of this was new. The celebrated concluding sentence comes from Thomas Aquinas.[5] The bull's train of thought followed the treatise *De ecclesiastica potestate* by the Augustinian Hermit, Aegidius Romanus (Giles of Rome), which had appeared only shortly before.[6] In 1295 Boniface had promoted this master of theology at Paris, who had become general of his order, to the archiepiscopal see of Bourges. However, not he but the Franciscan Cardinal Matthew of Aquasparta was probably the one who drew up the bull.[7] The violent reaction to this document was directed, not especially against the theological and canonical doctrines of the century just ended which were summarized in it, but against the supposed political program which persons thought they had to see in it. Dogmatic significance attaches only to the concluding sentence, which obtained its importance through its confirmation by the Fifth Lateran Council.[8]

Attempts to reach a compromise with the French King continued even after the promulgation of the bull. Cardinal Le Moine, or John the Monk, was commissioned as legate to lay the Pope's demands before the King. At first Philip refused to commit himself, but then he decided on a more vigorous fight; he would attack the Pope's person, his good name, and the legitimacy of his position. Responsible for this turn was William of Nogaret, who had taken the place of Peter Flotte after the latter had perished in the battle of Courtrai, which France had lost to the Flemings on 11 July 1302. Through Nogaret the Colonna cardinals now gained influence on the further course of events. And the legate, Le Moine, now abandoned the side of the Pope, one of whose most trusted advisers he had been, and treacherously joined the French faction. In the *conseil* on 12 March 1303 Nogaret brought forward the grievances against Boniface VIII, which were substantially the same as the accusations made by the Colonna in their memorials. The King's consent was obtained. There was propaganda for a general council at which the Pope would have to justify himself. Nogaret received authorization for an expedition to Italy. Apparently the plan was to arrest the Pope and take him to France, where it was intended that he should be presented to the projected council.

Boniface considered inadequate the French reply to his demands as made known by Cardinal Le Moine, and on 13 April 1303 he declared the excommunication of the King. The bearer of the document was imprisoned in France, and the information was suppressed. In mid-June Philip again had charges brought against the Pope before the Estates General, this time by William of Plaisians. The King declared the necessity of a council and spoke in favour of convoking one. The consent of the assembly was general, though there was some reservation among the bishops. The record of the discussions was circulated, and meetings to obtain consent were held. Only the Cistercians and a few houses of mendicants refused. Even imprisonment and banishment were resorted to. A great popular gathering at Paris on 24 June 1303 was prepared to give consent, letters were dispatched to foreign princes and to the cardinals, and a messenger even went to the Pope. From Anagni Boniface rejected the charges, issued a series of bulls against Philip and his councillors on 15 August 1303, and finally began work on the bull "Super Petri Solio," in which the solemn excommunication of the King was proclaimed and his subjects were released from their oath of loyalty. It was to be published on 8 September 1303.

---

[5] *Contra errores Graecorum*, ed. P. Mandonnet, *Opuscula omnia*, III (Paris 1927), 325.

[6] Ed. R. Scholz (Weimar 1929).

[7] Thus I. B. Grasso, *Ecclesia et Status: De mutuis officiis et iuribus fontes selecti* (Rome 1939), no. 430.

[8] *COD*, 620 (Session XI, 19 December 1516).

On the previous day occurred the well known attack at Anagni, perpetrated by Nogaret in association with Sciarra Colonna, head of that family of enemies of Boniface. The residences of the cardinals and the papal palace were stormed. It was demanded that the Pope should lay down his office, restore offices and possessions to the Colonna, turn over the treasure of the Church to several older cardinals, and submit to imprisonment. Boniface rejected the demand and even offered his life. Nogaret did not permit Sciarra Colonna to go along with this suggestion; he was concerned only for the living Pope, who was to be judged in France. In the city, which at first had aided the conspirators, the mood changed, Boniface was rescued, and the conspirators were driven out. Boniface left insecure Anagni for Rome, and the Orsini undertook to protect him. He arrived there on 25 September but on 12 October he succumbed at the Vatican to his sufferings and the disillusionment of Anagni. He was laid to rest in the chapel of Saint Peter which he had constructed, in a tomb which he had had built by Arnolfo di Cambio in his lifetime.

His political measures turned out for the most part unsuccessfully or critically for the Curia. On the other hand his activity within the Church was to survive the pontificate: first, the publication of the *Liber Sextus,*[9] a supplement to Gregory IX's collection of decretals, then the introduction of order into the chaotic state of affairs in the curial administrative system, brought about in the previous pontificates, and finally the decision in the question of the relations between the mendicant orders and the diocesan clergy in the bull "Super Cathedram" of 18 February 1300.

The mendicants were permitted to preach freely in their own churches and in public squares, but in parish churches only with the permission of the pastor. They had to ask faculties for hearing confessions from the local bishop, and these were limited to the territory of his see. The number of confessors thus licensed was determined by the needs of the diocese. The denial of such faculties by individual bishops could, if necessary, be righted by a papal decision. In regard to reserved cases the mendicants were not to have more authority than the parish priests. The right of burial was conceded them; that is, they were allowed to bury in their churches whoever asked this, but one-fourth of the fees falling due pertained to the proper pastor as his canonical share. This was a carefully weighed regulation, distinguished by impartiality. The respective legal competences were exactly determined. The preeminence of an orderly care of souls was assured, and the orders gave extraordinary assistance which was to be understood as supplementary. No doubt Boniface VIII disappointed the mendicants by this decree, but he was not their enemy; he raised too many members of orders to the episcopate to permit one to believe that. After a brief setback under the Dominican, Benedict XI, who annulled it, the bull was renewed by Clement V and even today it is substantially the law.

---

[9] For the legislative work of Boniface VIII see now the detailed study by S. Gagner, *Studien zur Ideengeschichte der Gesetzgebung* (Uppsala 1960), 121–287.

In June 1303 the Pope founded a university at Rome, the later Sapienza, as a *studium generale.* He bestowed careful attention on the library and archives of the Vatican. A university was also to come into being at Avignon.

The fate of the Pope was not decided by his death, and the process concerning him did not preoccupy only the succeeding pontificates. It has been said that even today his records are not yet closed. His outstanding juristic and administrative gifts, his energetic direction of the Curia, the intensive work which he demanded of himself and of his co-workers — these remain unchallenged. His broad education and his knowledge of Holy Scripture were famed. But his arrogant bearing, which people labelled pride and contempt, made him no friends. The failures of his political enterprises raised the suspicion of a lack of judgment, which seemed to plague him even in the formulating of his fundamental bulls. His nepotism placed him beside many of his predecessors, but with him everything assumed immoderate forms: he aimed to create for the Gaetani a principality, if not a kingdom even, in Tuscany. As a legislator and judge he remained for all contemporaries a vast and enduringly influential figure, but people were unable to venerate him as the Father of Christendom. The Spirituals continued to be hostile to him because of Celestine, although in the long run his legislation served the mendicants better than the extensive privileges granted by his predecessors. His memory remained overclouded by the unrestrained propaganda of his opponents and the repeated attempts to have him tried posthumously as a heretic. He was not guiltless in regard to some charges, which, however, were completely distorted in the light of an excessive hostility. Things that can more easily be twisted in regard to a fellow citizen are not expected in a Pope: a harsh word, an impatient turn of phrase, violent anger. All things considered, he was an important Pope, worthy to be mentioned together with Innocent III and Innocent IV.

CHAPTER 36

The End of the Crusading Epoch

The fall of Acre in 1291 ended the rule of the crusaders in Syria and Palestine. After the taking of the city in May the Sultan al-Ashraf Khalil, with his Mamelukes, completed the mopping up: Tyre was taken as early as 19 May, Sidon at the end of June, Beirut surrendered in July, and the Templars handed over their remaining strongholds, Château Pèlerin and Tortosa. Nothing was left to the Franks; only the small and waterless island of Ruad, off Tortosa, was retained for twelve more years. One who sees the epoch of the crusades as conditioned by the fate of Frankish rule in the Holy Land must admit that it ended with the definitive collapse of 1291, even though the crusade and the crusading idea did not necessarily disappear then from the awareness and the affairs of Christendom.

There remains the astonishing fact that the conquests of the First Crusade — the Kingdom of Jerusalem and its vassal principalities — could be maintained at all for almost 200 years, even though in a constantly diminishing extent. Pilgrims, merchants, knights, princes, and kings had travelled beyond the sea almost without interruption. The classical crusades were only moments of special energy in this movement. What is most astounding is that in the crusader states, small lordships in the sphere of influence of port cities, the circumstances of government had to be constantly revised and kept in balance in accord with the model of Western feudal relationships, a strong kingship was for the most part lacking, the military orders did not co-operate, and the commercial colonies of Venice, Genoa, and Pisa at Acre, Haifa, Beirut, and Tripolis were basically concerned only for assuring their own mercantile interests. If Islam itself had not been often handicapped by the tensions between Damascus and Cairo, if in the thirteenth century the invasion of the Mongols had not brought the Franks a breathing-space, if help had not poured in from the homeland from decade to decade, the crusader states could hardly have lasted for two centuries. Despite all the disappointments of the past, the thirteenth century also had its crusades.

More than ever, the crusade dominated the program of councils from the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 to that of Vienne in 1311–12. It had become a virtually essential task of the Popes to be concerned for its continuation, to plan great expeditions, to organize them, to help finance them, and occasionally to assume even their direction. Anxiety over the maintaining of the Latin Empire (1204–61) was drawn into the papal crusade policy, even though it constantly compromised the accumulated effort on behalf of the Holy Land. Despite the fact that, now too, as really unceasingly earlier, the large and the small expeditions usually ended with serious misfortunes, the zeal of the Popes seemed not to flag. The generosity of broad classes of the Christian peoples could be successfully appealed to again and again. They were ready to place money, goods, and men at the service of the crusade, to make heroic efforts, to go to meet that martyrdom which, for the majority of all participants, was still the real reward that awaited them. Even though hopes of adventure, economic expectations, and political motives again and again interfered, what was decisive for most crusaders was, as earlier, the appeal which crusade preaching had directed to them.

At the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 Innocent III had endeavoured to mobilize all the resources of the West in order to make good the failure of 1204. He died in 1216 during the proximate preparations, and so the implementation of his project had to be left to his successor, Honorius III. The mighty enterprise that was the Fifth Crusade, in which almost all the nations of Christendom took part, with in some cases very large contingents, lasted from 1217 to 1221. The first to set out were King Andrew II of Hungary and Duke Leopold VI of Austria with German nobles and bishops; later came those from the Lower Rhineland and Frisia, under the direction of the successful crusade preacher, Oliver, *scholasticus* of the Cologne cathedral. Then came Flemings, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Scots, and finally Italians from the cities and the knightly class. From 1218 the enterprise was directed by the Cardinal Legate Pelagius. His big success was the taking of Damietta, the key to Egypt, on 5 November 1219. But in August 1221 the legate was responsible for the defeat at Mansurah, which ruined the earlier achievement. The history of this crusade became a tragedy of Christian disunity, of heroic effort, and of diplomatic folly. At times the Sultan al-Kamil had been ready to surrender the entire Holy Land in return for peace, but the obstinate greed for conquest in the Spanish Cardinal Legate led to the breakdown of all offers and hopes. Never again would the century be able to assemble such a mass levy of crusaders.

The often promised and just as often postponed crusade of the Emperor Frederick II — a part of his forces had taken part in the Fifth Crusade — was finally led in 1228 when the Emperor had already incurred excommunication. Negotiations with the Sultan al-Kamil were successful, and Jerusalem, Nazareth, and Bethlehem were restored, together with a corridor to enable pilgrims to reach the coast. A ten-years' armistice was concluded in 1229.

A further territorial gain accrued from the curious double crusade, expressly forbidden by Gregory IX, of Count Theobald of Champagne, King of Navarre, and Earl Richard of Cornwall:[1] Galilee was recovered from

---

[1] S. Painter, "The Crusades of Theobald of Champagne and Richard of Cornwall (1239 to 1241)," in K. M. Setton, *A History of the Crusades*, II, 463–86.

Damascus. The public crisis between Gregory IX and Frederick II had impeded the preparation and implementation. The two phases of this crusade of 1239–41 followed in such a manner that the two leaders did not meet, but Richard managed to conclude favourably the negotiations prepared by Theobald with the Sultans of Damascus and Cairo. While there was fighting at various times, there were no crucial battles. The model of the Emperor in 1228–29 was decisive.

A few years later, in 1244, all was again lost. Jerusalem fell, this time forever, and the hosts of the military orders and crusaders were overwhelmed at Gaza. The First Council of Lyons in 1245 concerned itself, as expected, with the distress of the Holy Land, but the needs of the Latin Empire obtained preference in the discussions. And, even after the Council, the quarrel with the Emperor Frederick II continued to eclipse all other concerns of Innocent IV.

King Louis IX of France, representing, as it were, a Christendom which was implicated in so many other distractions, assumed the duty of assisting the Holy Land.[2] The expedition, which he carefully prepared for years and on which he set out in 1248, was the last grand-scale crusade of the century. Damietta was captured; then followed, as in 1221, an overwhelming defeat at Mansurah, in which Louis IX was captured. Set free on the payment of a high ransom, he stayed until 1254 in the Holy Land in order to do what he could to regulate the political situation and to unify the rival resources of tradesmen, knights, and orders on the one goal of defense. Only so long as he was there, personally intervening, reconciling, and punishing, was there the appearance of inner peace. It ended as soon as he had departed.

Once more, in 1270, Louis went on crusade. He landed in Tunis, but pestilence and hunger destroyed his army, and the King himself died on 25 August 1270. His brother, Charles of Anjou, arrived in time to liquidate the enterprise in a peace advantageous to his Kingdom of Sicily. Other expeditions of this century were without importance. These were the groups, half pilgrim, half warrior, organized time and again between the classical crusades of the age, which went to the East to fulfill vows or to seek their fortune.

The *reconquista* in the Iberian peninsula[3] had long borne the character of a crusade, so that during the Second Crusade the Frisians *en route* to the

---

[2] J. R. Strayer, "The Crusades of Louis IX," *ibid.*, 487–521. The most important source is Jean de Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. Natalis de Wailly (Paris 1874); the latest edition is that of E. Jarry (Angers 1942); R. Sternfeld, *Ludwigs des Heiligen Kreuzzug nach Tunis (1270) und die Politik Karls I. von Sizilien* (Berlin 1896); F. Jammes, *Saint Louis ou l'esprit de croisade* (Paris 1941); L. Buisson, *König Ludwig IX. der Heilige und das Recht* (Freiburg 1954); T. Michaux, *Die Hauptentscheidungen des 1. Kreuzzugs Ludwigs IX. in ihrer politischen Bedingtheit* (dissertation, Cologne 1954); J. Levron, *Saint Louis ou l'apogée du moyen âge* (Paris 1957).

[3] For the *Reconquista* see J. Goñi Gaztambide, *Historia de la bula de la cruzada en España* (Vitoria 1958, literature).

Holy Land could, with a good conscience, take part in it at Lisbon. From the time of Innocent III the struggles for the conquest of the Baltic area were also endowed with crusade privileges, on the model of the Wend Crusade of 1147–48. At the same time there was added the Albigensian Crusade to overcome the serious threat from the Cathari in the Midi. This crusade turned into a war and finally a merely political affair of the French crown. Here too was obvious that expanding of the idea of the crusade, that giving it a political character, which especially marked it in the thirteenth century. The Stedinger crusade (1232–34) of Archbishop Gerard II of Bremen against peasants on both sides of the lower Weser for non-payment of tithes is an example.[4] Gregory IX issued the requisite bulls and granted the crusaders the "great crusade indulgence." More hotly disputed by contemporaries were the crusades of Innocent IV against the excommunicated and deposed Emperor, in which Germany, Lombardy, and Sicily were summoned to participate. For this Innocent III had already created a precedent with his expedition against Markward of Anweiler in 1199, while on the occasion of the Albigensian War he had developed the theory and practice of the political crusade. But Gregory IX, in the last phase of his quarrel with Frederick II, was the first to permit his legates in Lombardy and Germany to preach the crusade in order to be able to raise troops for the fight against the Emperor. Following his example, Innocent IV, after the First Council of Lyons (1245), had recourse to this means against Frederick II in Germany and Italy. And he also had a crusade preached in Germany against Conrad IV in 1253 and 1254.

Urban IV granted boundless crusade privileges to Charles of Anjou for the latter's struggle to gain the Kingdom of Sicily from Manfred, and in order to finance it and to make up for losses sustained he had the crusade preached in France and Italy. He took similar steps against Byzantium in 1263 and against Manfred's friends in Sardinia. Clement IV continued this policy, notably during the expedition of young Conradin to Italy and the Sicilian Kingdom in 1268.

The Sicilian Vespers of 30 March 1282 made the island a bone of contention between the Houses of Anjou and Aragón. Pope Martin IV, a Frenchman, opposed Aragón and deprived King Peter III of his crown, which was held in fief of the Holy See. Charles of Valois, a son of King Philip III of France, was to receive it and to conquer the Kingdom. The expedition of 1285 was financed and endowed with privileges, just like a crusade.

---

[4] The basic work is H. A. Schumacher, *Die Stedinger* (Bremen 1865); C. Woebken, "Die Schlacht bei Altenesch und ihre Vorgeschichte," *Oldenburger Jbb.*, 37 (1933), 5–35; L. Deike, *Die Entstehung der Grundherrschaft in den Hollerkolonien an der Niederweser* (Bremen 1959).

The last of these political crusades was raised by Boniface VIII in 1298 against the Colonna.

The original idea of the crusade was determined by the wish to defend the Christians of the East, who were hard pressed by Islam. Hence the crusade became a war against Muslims (the "infidel"), wherever Western and Eastern Christianity had their frontiers. If the evangelization by the sword in Central Germany and the Baltic area assumed a crusade character, the enterprise remained basically true to the original notion of military defense of the faith, even though the element of extending the sphere of the faith had been added. Here the unforgotten duty of proclaiming the faith was put forward in forms suitable to the age. Even the political crusades of the thirteenth century, just mentioned, were theoretically justified as struggles for the faith. This was more apparent in the Albigensian Crusades than in those against Frederick II. But here too it must not be overlooked that the concept of heresy at that time included obstinate opponents of the Roman Church.

The crusade organization drawn up by Innocent III stood the test, especially with regard to the preparing of planned journeys. A plenary indulgence, presupposing sincere repentance, confession, and satisfaction, was promised on setting out. Efforts were made to raise money in the form of income taxes, testamentary bequests, and even commutation of crusade vows. From all this developed the crusade taxes, laid first on the clergy, then on the laity also. The deciding of the amount pertained to councils and also to the Pope in agreement with kings and princes. The collecting of these taxes brought into being a real financial organization, which became useful not only to the Curia but also to state administrations. Toward the end of the century, when real crusades to the Holy Land had long since ceased to materialize, the taxes were still repeatedly demanded, especially by King Philip IV of France, and their levying was granted. This preoccupation of the crusade idea with finance contributed greatly to the decay of the notion.

Legates were named and preachers were commissioned specifically for the propaganda preparation of the crusade. The history of preaching was thereby greatly enriched. The Dominican Humbert of Romans created a *summa* of crusade preaching with his treatise *De predicatione crucis* (1268). Its theme was provided by the appeals of the Popes for the liberation of the Holy Land. Entrusted ever more in the thirteenth century to the mendicant orders, this preaching developed into the popular mission in a liturgically oriented *milieu.* The success of this preaching, even though in particular cases it is difficult to show it because of the meagre information in the sources, was sufficiently extensive and profound to cause the flow of pilgrims and fighters to continue without interruption till the end of the real age of the crusades and to revive and deepen the crusade spirituality of both those who undertook the journey and those who remained home.

The growing number of voices expressing disillusionment and doubt, criticism and abhorrence, was basically unable to change much of this. Disillusionment grew by virtue of the failures, especially of the big expeditions, whose returns seemed in no way to correspond to the mighty output in money and manpower. Doubt was expressed chiefly because in these failures people felt they were abandoned by God, whose business they had undertaken to defend in the crusade vow. Criticism was directed not only against poor leadership and the disunity of the political authority in the Holy Land, where there was a readiness to ally with the infidel and thereby the impression was created that in the Holy Land there was at stake not the preservation of the holy places but the constructing of positions of political power. But criticism was also turned on the growing preoccupation of the crusaders with finance and the Curia's share in creating this atmosphere. The more frequently the crusade tithe was diverted from its proper purpose, whether it was devoted to the needs of the Latin Empire or withheld for the political enterprises of the Popes or, finally, was granted in great part to the royal coffers, the less were persons willing to pay it and the more difficult it was to collect it. There was likewise a growing readiness on the part of the Curia to commute the taking of the cross into corresponding sums of money. In the long run this could not but undermine the seriousness of people's willingness to submit to such sacrifices at all.[5]

It is astonishing that the collapse of Frankish rule in the Holy Land still evoked a flood of literary propaganda, as though persons in the West regarded such an outcome as shameful. But at the same time one can see in it an aspect of the reflection that seems to follow every period of emphatic action.[6] No longer the preachers but scholars and writers took the floor. As late as 1291 the Franciscan Fidentius of Padua published his *Liber de Recuperatione Terre Sancte* for Nicholas IV. Evoked by the fall of Acre was the treatise of Thaddeus of Naples, which powerfully indicted the West and summoned Pope, princes, and faithful to save the Holy Land, the inheritance of Christ and of Christians. In 1294 the Genoese Galvano of Levanti, physician at the papal court, dedicated an essay of a similar sort to King Philip IV of France. Special importance belonged to the writings of Raymond Lull (1232–1316), who in many memoranda presented to the Popes practical plans for the fight against Islam. His *Liber de Fine* (1305), with its far-reaching suggestions for strategy, became famous. Two years later the Armenian Prince Hethum, now Premonstratensian prior at Poitiers, published his *Flos Historiarum Terre Orientis,* which recommended a collaboration with the Armenians and the Mongols. For the sphere of French influence the works of the jurist, Peter Dubois, intended as memoranda for the French crown, were particularly influential. In these the crusade appeared chiefly as a means of assuring the hegemony of King Philip the Fair and of ameliorating the royal finances. It was suggested that the Order of the Templars be forbidden, that its property be seized, and that an inheritance tax be imposed on the clergy. Pope Clement V in 1307 had the grand masters of the Templars and the Hospitallers prepare memoranda for him. In 1310 he also received an unsolicited testimonial from William of Nogaret, the chief adviser of the French crown, which, however, had to do mainly with questions of finance. These literary works, partly stimulated by the Curia, partly coming to it from all sides, played an important role in the preparations for the Council of Vienne (1311–12).

---

[5] On the relationship of crusade and mission see *supra,* Chapter 29.

[6] For what follows *cf.* J. Lecler, *Vienne (Histoire des conciles oecuméniques,* 8) (Paris 1964), 68–76.

It may be held that, with this chiefly meditative pursuit, which was at the same time an examination of conscience and a planning, the strictly classical Age of the Crusade had come to an end, only to make ready the epochs of the late mediaeval expeditions against the infidel.

PART TWO

The Late Middle Ages

SECTION ONE

The Popes at Avignon

CHAPTER 37

The Situation after the Death of Boniface VIII: Benedict XI and Clement V

When, a few weeks after the outrage at Anagni, Boniface VIII died in Rome, the city and the Papal State were filled with unrest, and the strife between the Gaetani and the Colonna was raging even more violently than before.[1] But the supporters of the dead Pope in the College of Cardinals, led by Matthew Rosso Orsini, succeeded in opening the conclave at Saint Peter's on the expiration of the appointed interval and in rejecting the demand of the deposed Cardinals, James and Peter Colonna, to take part in the election. The French envoys and Nogaret actively supported the Colonna, but King Charles II of Naples used his troops to thwart all attempts to enter the Eternal City by force. Hence, from the outset, the validity of the papal election was placed in doubt.

Despite serious difficulties, due to the existence of two factions of equal strength in the conclave, the election was completed on the first ballot, when the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Nicholas Bocassini of Treviso, former master general of the Dominicans, was chosen Pope.[2] But this did not resolve the severe tensions nor close the split between the quarrelling groups. Quite the contrary: the situation required of the new Pope discretion and strength, qualities in which Benedict XI was not especially outstanding. His having begun to reconcile opponents was often construed as weakness. But how would he have been able to act otherwise in view of the excessive influence of France throughout Italy and of the agitation in the Papal State? These, however, were only the external difficulties. Boniface VIII's new style had altered the papacy as an institution and evoked opposition which went far beyond the political sphere, as would become evident in the process against him and the repeated demands for a council. To oblige France as far as possible without total surrender seemed to the new Pope to be politic, but it involved great risks. Following the advice of the French envoys, he sent notice of his election, thus far postponed, absolved King Philip IV from all censures he might have incurred, and freed the Colonna Cardinals from the ecclesiastical penalties imposed by Boniface VIII, though without completely restoring their functions, dignities, and possessions. When he was able to leave his restless capital and find more security in stable Perugia, Nogaret and his closest accomplices in the outrage of Anagni were excommunicated.[3]

---

[1] H. Finke-M. Gaibrois y Ballesteros, *Roma después de la muerte de Bonifacio VIII* (Madrid 1924).

[2] H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII.*, 275 ff.; *Haller*, V, 218 f.; A. M. Ferrero, *Benedetto XI papa domenicano* (Rome 1934).

As a Cardinal, the new Pope had clearly been a success in the capacity of legate and had behaved courageously at Anagni. But he was not quite equal to the demands of his new, burdensome office. If he would do nothing without the cardinals, he was presumably returning to a collegial administration of the Church and thus abandoning the methods of the Gaetani Pope. Insecurity and narrowness are evident in the fact that the three cardinals created by him were Dominicans and in the further fact that he spoke "only to Dominicans and Lombards."[4] When Arnald of Villanova, Boniface VIII's physician and an ardent Spiritual, sent him admonitions and threats in apocalyptic dress, he had this opponent of Thomistic philosophy imprisoned without trial.[5] But Arnald's prophecies were fulfilled. On 7 July 1304, after an eight-months' pontificate, the Pope died at Perugia and was buried there in the church of his order.[6]

In an extremely difficult situation, the cardinals, according to regulations, entered the conclave ten days after the death of the unhappy Benedict XI and in the place where he had died. Contemporaries were, of course, in no position to grasp the full significance of this conclave, which was to be one of the most momentous in Church History, for it was to result in the Avignon residence and eventually in the Great Schism. Hence the history of this conclave has been the object of ever more research.[7] When it opened in the summer of 1304 it comprised nineteen members, eight of whom were religious. In the course of its eleven months four cardinals left because of sickness but they remained in the city and were kept informed of the proceedings. Fifteen cardinals took part in the actual election. The two Colonna Cardinals, deposed by Boniface VIII and only partially restored by Benedict XI, were again denied entry. Of the two almost equally strong factions, one demanded the energetic punishment of the criminals of Anagni, not excepting the French King, and the safeguarding of the memory of Boniface VIII, still under attack after his death. The leader of this faction, the worthy Cardinal Dean Matthew Rosso Orsini, was considered its candidate from the start. His nephew, the Cardinal Deacon Napoleone Orsini, leader of the opposing group, regarded respect for French might and hence reconciliation with the Colonna as necessary; in this outlook he was supported by the French King and loaded with gifts of every sort. Common to both factions was the desire, it seems, that the tiara should not go again to so strong a personality as Boniface VIII, for, in disciplining the Colonna, he had obviously carried his independence of the oligarchic college too far. Since the Colonna were also regarded as friendly to reform, the mendicant friars in the Sacred College were on the side of Napoleone Orsini.

---

[3] By the bull "Flagitiosum Scelus," in Grandjean, *Registre*, no. 1276.

[4] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, 162: "quia vix aperit iste papa os suum nisi ad Predicatores et ad Lombardos."

[5] R. Manselli, "Arnaldo de Villanova e i papi del suo tempo," *Studi Romani*, 7 (1959), 146 ff.

[6] The Aragonese envoys knew nothing about the alleged poisoning (H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, 173: "lo papa es mort de disinteria e durali tro en XV dies"). R. Manselli, *op. cit.*, 152, rightly points out that, in the event of poisoning, Arnald of Villanova would probably not have been able to boast of the complete fulfillment of his prophecies.

[7] A list of the sources in *Baluze-Mollat*, II, 31. The most important sources are the reports of the Aragonese envoys in H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I, 169–95, III, 128–39. Accounts in H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII.*, 279–90; *Haller*, V, 225–27; 392; C. A. Willemsen, *Kardinal Napoleon Orsini* (Berlin 1927), 13–24; E. Dupré-Theseider, *I papi di Avignone*, 3–8; R. Morghen, "Il conclave di Perugia nel 1305 e la lettera di Dante ai cardinali," *L'Umbria nella storia, nella letteratura, nell'arte* (Bologna 1954), 103–24; *idem*, "La lettera

After the experiences of past decades, this division in the college could result in a speedy election only by means of a strict enforcement of the prescriptions for the conclave, and at first the municipal council of Perugia was apparently determined on this. But the question of the cardinals' competence, *sede vacante,* to maintain or to alter the rules was at the time a subject of lively discussion. And so before long the originally strict regulations were relaxed and, when the prospects of a quick agreement faded, preparations for the winter were made. Almost every time that the cardinals met for the business of election, — and such gatherings were not numerous, — there were violent quarrels between the two Orsini. Toward Christmas of 1304 it was plain that no member of the college could muster the required two-thirds of the votes and hence it was necessary to seek candidates from the outside more earnestly than ever, while external influences grew stronger or at least became more evident.

Shortly after the beginning of the conclave, in August 1304, the cardinals had sent the Patriarch of Jerusalem to King Charles II of Naples to ask him to come, for he was regarded as *advocatus ecclesiae* and a neutral mediator. When, toward the end of February 1305, he finally arrived, he was enlisted in the French ranks. But he was admitted to the conclave only after a prolonged delay. After a stay of three days with the cardinals and many conversations he was evidently able to accomplish nothing, for the faction

di Dante ai cardinali italiani," *Bollettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e Archivio Muratoriano,* 68 (1956), 1–31; G. Fornaseri, "Il conclave Perugino del 1304–05," *RSTI,* 10 (1956), 321–44, together with supplementary material by R. Morghen, "Ancora sulla lettera di Dante ai cardinali," *Bollettino . . . e Archivio Muratoriano,* 70 (1958), 513–19.

of the cardinals favourable to Boniface VIII now regarded him as too biased. At this time there also appeared a French embassy, which, according to its official declarations, was supposed to conduct discussions between the Gaetani and the Colonna for reconciliation and settlement of their differences over their possessions in the southern part of the *campagna.* It lingered in Perugia for several months, and the city officials could not but be concerned with its suspicious behaviour.

In the first weeks of the conclave the name of the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Bertrand de Got, had been brought up by someone of the "Bonifacian" party, possibly by Matthew Rosso Orsini. He was regarded as one to whom the memory of Boniface VIII was sacred and who would not go too far in appeasing the French King. Napoleone Orsini had not forgotten this name; on the contrary, in the utmost secrecy he had got in touch with him, probably through the French embassy that was staying in Perugia. Apparently his inquiries turned out favourably, and the Bonifacians were tricked in a subtly devised scheme after the aged Matthew Rosso had had to leave the conclave because of sickness.[8] In his famous letter to the cardinals Dante reproached the acting leader of the Bonifacians, James Gaetani Stefaneschi of Trastevere, for not having adequately defended the interests of Rome and Italy.[9] By exactly a two-thirds majority Bertrand de Got was elected on the Vigil of Pentecost, 5 June 1305, in spite of the emphatic protest of the remaining five Bonifacians, who then accepted the result.

Following this curious conclave of eleven months, who was the newly elected Pope on whom the direction of the Church was laid in so uneasy a time? Bertrand de Got was from Gascony in southwestern France. His older brother, Bérard, had been Archbishop of Lyons and had been made Cardinal Bishop of Albano by Boniface VIII. Bertrand himself had become Bishop of Comminges in 1295 and Archbishop of Bordeaux in 1299; since 1303 his city had again come under English rule. He could be regarded as an adherent of Boniface VIII, because for a short time he had belonged to the household of Cardinal Francis Gaetani and he had attended the Roman Council of 1302. But Napoleone Orsini knew very well that, in the person of this man, he had provided the French King with a compliant Pope.[10]

The newly elected Pope accepted the notification made to him at the end of June, styled himself Clement V, and prepared for the journey to Rome

---

[8] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 191 f.: "Ispanus respondit quod placeret sibi, set quod volebat loqui cum domino Napoleone, sic quod iverunt ad locum, ubi deponebant superflua, quia alibi secrete loqui non poterant ... Unde cum scrutinium legeretur per dictum dominum Franciscum et X predicti apparerent concordes, alii inceperunt clamare, quod non poterat fieri, eo quod decepti erant et quod modo patebant consilia latrinarum." D. Mansilla, "El cardenal 'Petrus Hispanus,' obispo de Burgos (1300–03)," *HS,* 9 (1956), 27 ff.

[9] R. Morghen, "La lettera di Dante," *loc. cit.,* 18.

[10] B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale,* pp. 156 f., footnote 333 (genealogy of Clement V).

via Provence. But then he ordered six cardinals to attend his coronation at Lyons on All Saints.[11] During the solemn coronation procession on 14 November a wall collapsed, killing several persons of high rank; the Pope fell from his horse, and the most expensive jewel in the tiara was lost. People read these happenings as an evil omen.[12]

Now was the time to set out for Italy. Again and again plans for the journey were announced, and it is said that embassies from Rome and Tuscany arrived to expostulate with the new Pope. The Romans' threat, traditionally dated for the end of December 1305, that, because of the Pope's delay, they intended to elevate someone as Emperor, is to be accepted only with reserve.[13] It is not to be doubted that at the beginning of his pontificate and even later Clement did intend to go to Rome. In any case he never considered transferring the seat of the Curia from Rome. His inability to make up his mind during the nine years of his reign was due to his weakness and the ever increasing pressure of the French King. His first creation of cardinals, in December 1305, makes this clear enough: nine, including four nephews, were French and one was English. Thus the Sacred College, long overwhelmingly Italian in composition, had changed its appearance. It abandoned the Roman tradition for the narrowness of a region hitherto hardly noticed. And the Pope was even more confined to his homeland: he continued to be a Bishop of the Midi or, more properly, a Bishop of Gascony. He was not familiar with curial procedure, of which his electors were masters; and at first he was even without the very mechanisms of the Curia.

After his coronation he stayed for quite a long time in his native plains, in Poitiers alone for sixteen months.[14] It was not until 1309 that he went to Avignon, because of its proximity to Vienne, where the Council was soon to meet. Still, Avignon was not his permanent residence. From 1309 till his death he spent most of his time outside the city on the Rhone. French scholars have rightly referred to the absence of a *stabilitas loci* in the thirteenth-century Popes. But there is a difference between the Roman Popes who, when not in Rome, resided in the strongholds of the Papal State — Viterbo, Perugia, Orvieto, Anagni — and Clement V wandering about Gascony and Provence. If he was no Roman Pope, neither was he an Avignon Pope. A sick man, always dependent on place and season, always in search of the spot most advantageous to his health, for weeks at a time he granted no audiences and only the Cardinal-nephews could speak with him. He touchingly endowed his former see of Bordeaux and the churches and chapels of his homeland with spiritual and secular favours. His army of relatives brazenly exploited their kind uncle, as will be noted elsewhere. The riddle of his personality lies in its hypochondriac nature. Though intelligent to the point of craftiness and at times even obstinate, he was basically a good-natured and vacillating man.[15] This weak personality was forced to deal with men such as Philip the Fair and his councillors. In his relations with France the Pope's dependence was especially clear in two matters: the process against the dead Boniface VIII and that against the Templars.

---

[11] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 196–98, III, 139; *idem, Gesammelte Aufsätze,* IV (1933), 448.

[12] *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 61.

[13] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* II, 512.

[14] E.-R. Labande, "Clément V et le Poitou," *Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest,* Series 4, 4 (1957), 11–33, 83–109.

The Process against the Memory of Boniface VIII

The process instituted by the French king and the crown jurists against Boniface VIII was intimately connected with the very obvious collision of the two powers in the outrage of Anagni.[16] Nogaret, excommunicated by Benedict XI, was especially interested in it and had to be, for his fate — condemnation or rehabilitation — depended on the settlement with the deceased Boniface. Since, according to the general opinion, only a council could judge the Pope, efforts to hold one had been made ever since Anagni. But outside France voices were raised against a defamation of the memory of the great Gaetani Pope. As early as the coronation in Lyons a council and proceedings against Boniface were discussed, and again during the brief meeting of Clement and Philip at Poitiers in April 1307. Several extant memoranda make clear how painstakingly the matter was prepared. For example, it was to be emphatically demanded of the Pope that all measures of Boniface VIII against France and against his assailants at Anagni be annulled, that full compensation be made to the Colonna, that the corpse of the Pope be disinterred, and that the sentences issued by Benedict XI be recalled. Precise directions were even given for the formulating of the bull to be issued by the Pope. If these demands were met, then the case could rest for some time. At the Curia the demands caused consternation. A committee of six cardinals was set up and after much deliberation a bull was sketched, but it was not actually drawn up.[17]

In the long interview between King and Pope, again at Poitiers a year later, the topic of discussion was chiefly the Order of the Templars. As an introduction to the conversations the King had his entire program submitted: permanent settling of the Curia in France, condemnation of the Templars who had been cross-examined in France, holding of the projected general council in France, canonization of Celestine V, condemnation of Boniface VIII, burning of his remains, and absolution of Nogaret.[18] If the Pope at first vigorously refused any procedure against Boniface VIII, a little later he specified that the process should begin in the spring of 1309. But it was still another year before it opened at Avignon. We need not concern ourselves further with the contents of the indictment, since most of it had already been brought forward in the last year of Boniface's reign.[19] Evidently neither side had any interest in a speedy conducting of the trial. The case was discussed in many consistories and again and again adjourned. Several committees were concerned with hearing witnesses of very doubtful provenience; they had been recruited in Italy for the public spectacle. The most dangerous accusation, that of heresy, revealed the political intent of the process: to render the weak Pope pliable for other purposes. It was probably the influential Enguerran de Marigny who proposed the discontinuance of the trial, once the Pope, in the Bull "Rex Gloriae" of 27 April 1311, had acknowledged the King's praiseworthy zeal in his proceedings against Boniface and had absolved Nogaret *ad cautelam.*[20] The cancellation in the official register of the bulls issued by Boniface VIII against France was a serious humiliation. The *factum Bonifacianum* cropped up again at the Council of Vienne but it was only cursorily dealt with.[21]

---

[15] B. Guillemain, *op. cit.*, 114, 129, 151, 174ff.; J. Bernard, "Le népotisme de Clément V et ses complaisances pour la Gascogne," *Annales du Midi*, 61 (1948f.), 369–411; R. Gaignard, "Le gouvernement pontifical au travail. L'example des dernières années du règne de Clément V, 1er août 1311–20 avril 1314," *ibid.*, 72 (1960), 169–214. For a complete evaluation, see H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens*, I, 97–110; *idem, Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII.*, LXXXIII–IC; *Haller*, V, 295–301.

[16] *Haller*, V, 262–70, 399ff.; A. Corvi, *Il processo di Bonifacio VIII. Studio critico* (Rome 1948).

[17] R. Holtzmann, *Wilhelm von Nogaret* (Freiburg 1898), 137ff.; H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens*, I, 128–39.

Ruin of the Templars: The Council of Vienne

The downfall of the Order of Knights Templars was one of the most dramatic happenings in the Church History of the early fourteenth century. To contemporaries the loss of Acre, the last Latin foothold in the Holy Land, in 1291, did not imply the end of the crusades. The idea above all persisted, even though in actual fact it served only as an excuse for prescribing tithes in most states. Even before the pontificate of Clement V the French King had been concerned with the Templars. He had planned the merging of all the military religious orders, with himself as grand master, and in Lyons, at the time of the Pope's coronation, he had brought forward his complaints. Complaints were also expressed by others.

---

[18] H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens,* I, 224.

[19] H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII.,* 227–68.

[20] R. Holtzmann, *op. cit.,* 176–206; J. Favier, *Un conseiller de Philippe le Bel, Enguerran de Marigny* (Paris 1963), 135; F. Merzbacher, *Enguerran de Marigny, Minister Philipps des Schönen von Frankreich: Speculum historiale* (Freiburg and Munich 1965), 479–85.

[21] E. Müller, *Das Konzil von Vienne,* 184–90. The demand for the canonization of Celestine V was a weapon against the memory of Boniface VIII. After long discussion it was finally proclaimed on 5 May 1313.

The real motive for the prosecution and destruction of the Templars eludes us to a great extent. Certainly the independence of the military orders and their great wealth in landed property and money were irksome to the growing power of the so-called national states. No doubt they were defamed to some degree. Evil rumours were nourished by Esquiu de Floyran, the well-known betrayer of the order, who first denounced it to the King of Aragón and then, with more success, to Philip IV of France, and by the spies introduced into the order by Nogaret. Damaging reports about the order were also carried to the Pope, who became quite worried. But there was general consternation when, early on 13 October 1307, all French Templars were arrested at the King's order and then subjected to strict interrogations by royal officials, who made abundant use of torture. In this way were extorted confessions, the repudiation of which could lead to the pyre, in accord with the procedure of the Inquisition. Somewhat later, inquisitors continued the investigation, while accepting for the most part the numerous confessions already obtained.

What did the tortured Templars admit? Rejection of and spitting on the cross, indecent kissing and exhortations to commit sodomy, and even the adoration of an idol in the ceremony of admission to the order. Matters were further complicated at the end of the month by the confession of the grand master, James de Molay, and his circular to the imprisoned knights, who were also asked to confess.[22] These avowals were handed to the Pope. Impressed by them, he ordered the arrest of the Templars in all countries. In so acting he had no doubt kept in mind that it belonged to the Church and its head to pass judgment on an exempt order of such importance and under so serious an accusation and to control the disposal of its property. But when he had been apprised of the nature of the proceedings and of the repudiation of many of the confessions, he suspended the delegated authority of the bishops and inquisitors in February 1308. Nevertheless, the imprisoned Templars remained under the custody of the King and his officials.

A story from this period relates that the ten cardinals thus far created by Clement came to him to give back their red hats. In accepting them, they said, they had incorrectly thought that, like all previous Popes, he was the lord of the world, superior to the Emperor and to kings; but actually he was the servant of the King of France, who in his arrogance had committed a grave injustice against the renowned order. Incidents in the consistory may have been here fantastically exaggerated, but the report affords a good insight into the tangled situation.[23]

---

[22] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* III, 168 ff.

[23] H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens,* II, 110 f.; *idem, Gesammelte Aufsätze,* IV (1933), 454, 535.

It was necessary to start again in order to achieve the goal: the extermination of the order. The celebrated meeting at Poitiers in the summer of 1308 followed upon accusations against the Pope as an abettor of heresy, notably at the Estates General of Tours. Accompanied by the delegates of the estates, the King arrived in Poitiers on 26 May and remained there until 20 July. In solemn consistories the Pope was shockingly attacked in speeches outlined by Nogaret and was overwhelmed by threats. And carefully selected Templars repeated their previous confessions in the presence of Pope and Curia. On the other hand, the King did not allow the grand master and the chief officials of the order to come to Poitiers; they were questioned in the vicinity by accommodating cardinals, with, of course, the expected result.

At Poitiers the Pope's will to resist was completely broken. He had to agree to hold a council in France, to open the process against the memory of Boniface VIII, and to lift the suspension of the authority of bishops and inquisitors in regard to the Templars. It seems pretty certain that he gradually came to doubt the order's innocence. And so he cited the Templars before the Council, which was to meet at Vienne on 1 October 1310, and appointed two investigating committees. One of these, a papal commission to deal with the entire order, was to operate in larger areas; the King nominated its members for the investigations, not in France alone, but also abroad. These commissions were to concern themselves with the guilt of the order as such and with its highest ranking dignitaries. The Templars were to be interrogated as individuals in every diocese on more than a hundred questions by means of the episcopal commissions, and the material thus amassed was to be laid before the provincial council. The King also had an influential voice in the composition of the local commissions. Many fragments survive of the activity of these two committees. They give a manifold picture of the proceedings, in which as far as France was concerned the goal was clear: to extort confessions and prevent the repudiation of previous avowals by threat of the stake for the relapsed. When, especially outside France, confessions were slow in coming, the Pope ordered the universal application of torture. Just the same, in many places there were heroic scenes, when whole groups of imprisoned Templars publicly declared their innocence and that of the order. Thereupon, the new Archbishop of Sens, a brother of the almighty royal minister Enguerran de Marigny, in May 1310 sent fifty-four of them to the stake on a single day and later several small groups. Even in the flames they repudiated their previously extorted admissions. Since material was arriving only slowly, the opening of the Council was postponed a year, till 1 October 1311, in order meanwhile to be able to prepare from the urgently requested records summaries for its deliberations.[24]

---

[24] Synopsis of all the acts of the trial in E. Müller, *op. cit.*, 32 f.; also A. J. Mur, "Aportación al estudio del proceso contra el Temple en Castilla", *Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos,* 69 (1961), 47–100.

Outside the Kingdom of Philip the Fair we are especially well informed about the proceedings against the Templars in Aragón. King James II eagerly seized the opportunity to take possession of the order's many strong castles, but in an opaque and not entirely unobjectionable manner. At the news of the start of the prosecution, the Aragonese Templars put their castles in a state of defense, and their resistance was broken only after a long siege and starvation.[25] Occasionally torture was resorted to here also, but recent evidence from Barcelona shows that, despite repeated torture, confessions could not be extracted.[26] In the other countries of Europe, such as Italy, Germany, and England, and especially at its headquarters on Cyprus, the order's innocence was unquestioned, despite the use of torture. Because of his proceedings against the few Templars in his territory the Archbishop of Magdeburg incurred the indignation of the other German bishops. Thus, nothing had been definitively decided when the Council convened at Vienne on 16 October 1311.

The Council had been summoned chiefly because of the affair of the Templars; other tasks mentioned in the bull of convocation — crusade and reform — were only platitudes.[27] The summons was formally directed to all possessed of jurisdiction in the Church, but only those bishops were supposed to come who were specified by name. Indicative of the King's interest in those invited is the list preserved in the royal archives, presumably a rough draft or preliminary step for the later papal list. Whether the King demanded it or it was submitted to him by the Curia *motu proprio* cannot now be determined.[28] Of importance is the summoning of all archbishops, usually with one or two of their suffragans, who should then represent the Universal Church — an idea to be met again at the period of the reform councils. For the strengthening of the Pope's stand it must have been of importance that at least those bishops who were personally invited should actually come. But outside France there was little desire to cooperate in such an affair. The number of participants amounted to about 120 patriarchs, archbishops, bishops and mitred abbots; with the proxies of absent bishops and of chapters and monasteries, the total was around 300.[29]

At the opening session on 16 October, Clement referred to the settlement of the question of the Templars as the chief task. At the Pope's suggestion the Council selected from among its members a large committee, to which the records and summaries were submitted for examination. A smaller working committee saw to the necessary preliminaries. In addition, a committee of cardinals seems to have concerned itself with the special problems of the Templars, and there was frequent discussion of the subject in consistories. The appearance of several Templars before the full committee brought up the question of the order's defense. An oral and written questioning of the members of the committee by the Pope showed that at least four-fifths were in favour of granting the order the possibility of defending itself, to the great chagrin of the Pope and the anxiety of the Council Fathers on account of the King's "intense anger." For Clement, out of regard for the King, had by now apparently decided to dissolve the order in any case. While the Council, awaiting the further development of the case of the Templars, was preoccupied with plans for a crusade and was granting extensive tithing authority to the French King in anticipation of it, secret negotiations were in progress between the Curia and the *conseil;* they represent the climax of the "conciliar activity." The French envoys, headed by Enguerran de Marigny, contrived, presumably by threatening to renew the process against Boniface VIII, to extract from the Pope the suppression of the order by an administrative action, a result probably gratifying to both parties, in view of the mood of the Council. Immediately following, there occurred at Lyons a meeting of the Estates General — the customary means with the customary result. Accompanied by the estates and by his own large retinue, the King then arrived at Vienne on 20 March. Two days later the large committee met — and by a large majority accepted the Pope's proposal that the order should be dissolved by an apostolic decree. Finally, on 3 April, in the Council's second public session, the suppression was announced by the Pope.

---

[25] H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens,* I, 282–306; *idem, Gesammelte Aufsätze,* IV (1933), 380–91.

[26] A. Mercati, "Interrogatorio di Templari a Barcellona (1311)," *Gesammelte Aufsätze,* IV (1933), 240–51.

[27] E. Müller, *op. cit.,* 13–19.

[28] H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens,* II, 303–06; E. Müller, *op. cit.,* 663–70, gives the two lists in parallel columns.

[29] E. Müller, *op. cit.,* 68–84.

Then began the struggle for the Templars' property. Most prelates wanted it to be transferred to a new military order, yet to be founded. But the Pope and the French government, influenced by Marigny, the official expert in this matter, were for assigning it to the Hospitallers.[30] From the Aragonese diplomatic dispatches we are well informed about the discussions concerning the Templars' fortresses. On 2 May, shortly before the close of the Council, the transfer of the Templars' property to the Hospitallers, except in Castile, Aragón, Portugal, and Mallorca, was published.

Several dogmatic discussions were occasioned by the continued discord between the two Franciscan factions. They centred on the person and teaching of Peter John Olivi, whom the so-called Conventuals had long persecuted and whose condemnation they aspired to extort from the Council. It seems that an effort was made to dispose of the difficulties by a suitable compromise. The Constitution "Fidei catholicae fundamento," read in the closing session on 6 May, proclaimed:

---

[30] J. Favier, *op. cit.*, 143.

> The side of Christ was not opened until after the Lord's death. The substance of the rational human soul is, of itself, really the form of the human body. Children and adults obtain in baptism sanctifying grace and the virtues in the same manner.

Since Olivi was not named in the decree, violent quarrels would later arise in regard to the import of these words. But the difficulties could not be eliminated because of the unfavourable state of the transmission of the sources.[31] Furthermore, the quarrels in the Franciscan family over the meaning of *usus pauper* occupied much space. A committee was appointed to settle them, and its testimonial has recently come to light.[32] The controversy ended with the publication of the Apostolic Constitution "Exivi de Paradiso," also in the closing session of the Council. It prudently followed the middle path and gave a detailed explanation of the rule, without touching the dogmatic side of the controversy.

Opinions vary as to whether the Council of Vienne can be termed a "reform council" in the same way as others of the late Middle Ages. The Council does not seem to have been summoned for the sake of reform, but from the start the Pope had asked for testimonials on the subject. Some fragments that have been preserved allow us to infer rather ample matter. For receiving complaints and proposals Clement in the first solemn session appointed a commission of cardinals, which then undertook to edit the many-layered material. Occasionally the Pope personally took part in the discussions. For the most part they were concerned with eliminating the many interferences of the organs of the state in the Church's judicial procedure — these were frequently described in great detail — and also with the degree of exemption of religious, in particular of the mendicants. Since the Council ended right after the settlement of the affair of the Templars, the consultations on reform had to be broken off abruptly. Only a few decrees were ready. These were read on 6 May in the third and final session. A subsequent reading and putting into force at a later time were announced for all reform decisions. A reading actually did take place at a public consistory in the Château Monteux four weeks before the Pope's death. Since certain decrees or outlines of decrees were already in circulation, there was much uncertainty until John XXII brought clarification by officially publishing them and sending them in the usual way to the universities. Thereafter, the decrees, partially revised after the Council, formed part of the *Corpus Iuris Canonici* as the "Clementines."[33] Prominent in the reform material are several testimonials of general importance, which will be mentioned later in another context. Of significance for the missionary work of the late Middle Ages were the decisions issued, at the urging of Raymond Lull, in regard to establishing schools of languages.

---

[31] E. Müller, *op. cit.*, 352–86; J. Koch, "Das Gutachten des Aegidius Romanus über die Lehren des Petrus Johannis Olivi. Eine neue Quelle zum Konzil von Vienne, 1311–12," *Scientia Sacra, Festgabe Kardinal Schulte* (Cologne and Düsseldorf 1935), 142–68; A. Emmen, "Doctrina Petri Johannis Olivi de baptismi parvulorum effectibus," *Antonianum*, 37 (1962), 350–92; *COD, 336 ff.*

[32] G. Fussenegger, "Relatio commissionis in concilio Viennensi institutae ad decretalem 'Exivi de paradiso' praeparandam," *AFrH*, 50 (1957), 145–77.

In accord with the instructions of the Council, the property of the Templars should have been turned over to the Hospitallers, but the execution of this regulation proceeded very slowly and was dragged out for decades. In France the greatest part of it apparently landed in the King's hands, since he claimed an adequate compensation for having brought the case to a conclusion. The fate of the high dignitaries had been reserved by the Pope to himself. When they were to repeat their confession of guilt in front of Notre-Dame de Paris and accept their sentences of life-imprisonment, the grand master and the grand preceptor of Normandy recovered their sense of duty. They publicly repudiated all confessions and swore to the order's innocence. On the same day both were burned without regard for the Pope.

To determine responsibility for the gruesome fate of so famous an order has again and again been the preoccupation of research and of historical journalism. Today it is generally agreed that the order as a whole was guiltless of the crimes attributed to it. In addition to H. Finke, outstanding specialists in that period, such as G. Mollat and J. Haller, defend the order's innocence and strongly condemn the machinations of Philip the Fair.[34] Still, a legitimate question has been recently posed: To what extent does the enigmatic King bear personal responsibility and could he have possibly acted from pure religious motives?[35] It is true that he was overawed by the grandeur of the French crown and the consciousness of being specially chosen and he was filled with a deep and even fanatical piety, but the means here resorted to cannot be defended even for the Middle Ages. Before the court of history Philip bears the chief responsibility for the ruin and death of the Templars. William de Nogaret's share of guilt is hardly less, for the diabolical nature of the proceedings corresponds in almost every respect to methods otherwise used by him.[36] The estimation of the grand master, James de Molay, varies in the judgment of historians, just as his own conduct on the outbreak of the storm varied. At first he confessed, then he repeatedly retracted his confessions, and again he confessed. The explanation lies in the frightful pressure brought to bear on him. Whether he was subjected to physical torture is an open question, for the sources still extant following the disappearance of the secret acts are not entirely clear.[37] Perhaps he sought, by means of the scarcely plausible confession of a denial of the cross of Christ at admissions into the order, to come before the Church's tribunal and staked all on the hope of revealing the true state of affairs before the Pope and the cardinals.[38] That he did not succeed in this constitutes his great tragedy and also the serious guilt of the Pope, who, slowly, step by step, allowed the defense of the order to be wrested from him.

---

[33] S. Kuttner, "The Date of the Constitution 'Saepe,' the Vatican Manuscripts and the Roman Edition of the Clementines," *SteT* (1964), 427–52.

[34] H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens*, 326–44; G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (first Harper Torchbook ed., New York 1965), 242–46; *Haller*, V, 395 f.

[35] His exoneration is attempted especially by R. Fawtier, *Histoire du moyen âge*, VI: *L'Europe occidentale de 1270 à 1328* (Paris 1940), 298–302. To a great extent he is followed by C. H. Peyer, "Philipp IV. von Frankreich und Dante," *Dante und die Mächtigen seiner Zeit* (Münchener romantische Arbeiten, 15) (Munich 1960), 58–74.

[36] G. Mollat, *op. cit.*, 245 f.

Italy and the Papal State

In an effort to justify the stay of Clement V and his successors at Avignon the political situation in Italy and in the Papal State has been depicted in the blackest colours. But it was scarcely worse than it had been in the decades following the downfall of the Hohenstaufen. The House of Anjou was in firm control of the south, except for Sicily, where under Frederick II, of the House of Aragón, a new type of government was developing. And under Robert of Naples the Angevin influence extended far beyond the Papal State into Central and Upper Italy. In addition to Florence, Milan especially had become a power centre of great attraction with an incessant change of conditions and relationships virtually impossible to estimate.[39] This is especially true of the internal life of the numerous cities, of the rapid changes of government and the consequent difficult problem of the exiled. The strongest external influences came from France, but on the other hand the seizure of Corsica and Sardinia stands out in the execution of the investiture of James II of Aragón, arranged by Boniface VIII as far back as 1297.[40]

For the new Pope the situation in the Papal State was, of course, of special importance. For a long time it had not been a real state at all, but a conglomeration of many lordships. There were striking differences between the baronial feudal *Patrimonium*, including Rome, and the Marches of Ancona and Romagna, with their new *signorie.*[41] Boniface VIII made allowances for this state of affairs in a series of excellent reforms, which, however, were cancelled in the brief reign of his successor.[42] The sequel was revolts lasting for years, and Clement V had to try to crush them. The pacification of the northern parts of the Papal State was one of his principal tasks, and he devoted himself to it with energy and some success.[43] That he first inclined to the Ghibellines, only to rely later almost exclusively on the Guelfs, is a theory that goes too far in simplifying the tides of history. Very damaging to an orderly administration was his unrestrained nepotism in filling the important and lucrative rectorships in the provinces.[44] In the war with Venice over Ferrara, which had long been ruled by the House of Este and which the Pope at a favourable opportunity claimed for the Papal State by virtue of the alleged Donation of Constantine, Clement displayed a really inhuman harshness. He succeeded in acquiring the city and the territory of Ferrara and in humiliating proud Venice, but his achievement was of brief duration.[45]

---

[37] The following maintain the use of torture: A. Trunz, *Zur Geschichte des letzten Templermeisters* (Diss. phil., Freiburg 1920), 40, and Posch in *LThK*, V (2nd ed. 1960), 843f. The contrary is held by: W. Schwarz, "Die Schuld des Jakob von Molay, des letzten Grossmeisters der Templer," *Die Welt als Geschichte*, 17 (1957), 259–79, and H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens*, I, 169, 187f. But Finke is more reserved in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, IV (1933), 387–91.

[38] This opinion has been recently maintained again by W. Schwarz, *op. cit.*, and is also that of A. Busson, *MIÖG*, 9 (1888), 496–515.

[39] *Storia di Milano*, V (1955).

[40] V. Salavert y Roca, *Cerdeña y la expansión mediterránea de la corona de Aragón*, 2 vols. (Madrid 1956).

Clement V and the Empire

After the new Pope had called upon the German King to go on crusade, a solemn embassy was sent to Lyons by Albert I to request his imperial coronation and to ask that the tithes collected in Germany not be spent elsewhere (that is, not in France) and that persons suspected by the King be excluded in the filling of German sees.[46] Like Boniface VIII, Clement could not but see in the Empire and in the German King a support against the overmighty influence of France. But this was possible only so long as France itself did not assume the *Imperium* — an idea toyed with by Philip and his advisers. The question became pressing when in 1308 Albert was assassinated. Now the pressure on the Pope increased greatly, especially during the discussions at Poitiers in the summer of 1308, and it seems that only by some stratagem did he evade an effective direct recommendation of Charles of Valois.[47]

The new King Henry VII, of the House of Luxembourg, brother of

---

[41] D. Waley, "Lo stato papale nel tredicesimo secolo," *RSIt,* 73 (1961), 429–72; G. Marchetti-Longhi, "La carta feudale del Lazio nella mostra permanente del Lazio meridionale in Anagni," *QFIAB,* 36 (1956), 324–27.

[42] M. Seidlmayer, "Papst Bonifaz VIII. und der Kirchenstaat," *HJ,* 60 (1940), 78–87.

[43] A. Eitel, *Der Kirchenstaat unter Klemens V.* (Berlin 1907).

[44] *ALKGMA,* 5 (1889), 141: "per predones potius quam per rectores est spoliata et confusa."

[45] A. Eitel, *op. cit.,* 170–205; H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* II, 641–60; V. Salavert y Roca, "Notas sobre la política italiana de Clemente V y sus repercusiones en Aragón," *Storia e letteratura,* 71 (Rome 1958), 255–98.

[46] *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 66 f.; H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* III, 144.

[47] E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens,* 1–35.

Archbishop Baldwin of Trier, also came from the French sphere of influence, but, with all his deference to France, he always honourably defended the interests of the Empire.[48] He was able to obtain recognition in the manner of the Habsburg submission of the *Imperium* to the Roman Church. The Pope intended to officiate personally at the imperial coronation, perhaps in 1312,[49] but only after the settling of outstanding ecclesiastical matters, such as the Council of Vienne. However, the Emperor-elect's journey to Rome was decided in the summer of 1309 and began in the autumn of the following year. At first joyfully received in Italy, the German King quickly came of necessity into conflict with the interests of Anjou and hence of France, a situation that could lead to trying developments, especially if the new Emperor should lay claim to the customary imperial rights in Italy. When at last he reached Rome, a part of the city, including Saint Peter's, was occupied by the troops of Robert of Naples. The coronation was performed by three cardinals in the Lateran on 29 June.[50] Meanwhile, the Pope had succumbed to French pressure also in this area. When after his coronation the Emperor moved against Robert of Naples and instituted proceedings against him, the Pope openly espoused the cause of the Guelfs. Once again a great controversy of theory concerning the power of the Emperor and the imperial institution itself began to keep public opinion busy. Expert opinions and memoranda were issued by both sides.[51] Because of his depth of thought, Dante deserves, unchallenged, the first place in these considerations. Having rapturously hailed the King on his journey to the "garden of the Empire," he discussed in the three books *De Monarchia*, which was probably composed at this time, the theological necessity of the *Imperium* and the legitimacy of Rome's claims to the imperial office and then demonstrated the direct dependence of the *Imperium* on God, without any mediation of the Pope. The aim of his great work was to prove the Emperor's independence in the political field.[52] On the other hand, in the Neapolitan opinions the *Imperium*, as *de facto* German, was attacked and repudiated as an institution, and, with many historical citations, proven to be the source of numerous evils.

---

[48] F. Schneider, *Kaiser Heinrich VII.* (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1943).

[49] W. Bowsky, "Clement V and the Emperor Elect," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 12 (1958), 52–69.

[50] F. Bock, *Reichsidee und Nationalstaaten*, 125–45; W. M. Bowsky, *Henry VII in Italy* (Lincoln 1960); W. Bowsky, "Florence and Henry of Luxembourg, King of the Romans," *Speculum*, 33 (1958), 177–203; F. J. Heyen, *Kaiser Heinrichs Romfahrt. Die Bilderchronik von Kaiser Heinrich VII. und Kurfürst Balduin von Luxemburg* (Boppard 1964).

[51] *MGConst*, IV, 2; F. Bock, "Kaisertum, Kurie und Nationalstaat," *RQ*, 44 (1936), 110 ff.; M. Seidlmayer, *Geschichte Italiens* (Stuttgart 1962), 202–15.

[52] F. Schneider, *Dante, sein Leben und sein Werk* (Weimar, 5th ed. 1960); the latest comprehensive evaluation of Dante is that in "Alighieri, Dante," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 2 (Rome 1960), 385–451 (for *De Monarchia*, see 418–20; bibliography, 447 f.). H. Conrad, "Dantes Staatslehre im Spiegel der scholastischen Philosophie seiner Zeit," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, 27 (1948), 43–80; M. Seidlmayer, *Dantes Reichs- und Staats-*

After the early death of the Emperor at Buonconvento near Siena on 24 August 1313, Clement made his position clear in the famous bull "Pastoralis Cura," written between the fall of 1313 and the spring of 1314, probably with the assistance of Robert of Naples. He carried further the theocracy of Boniface VIII by declaring null the imperial sentence against Robert and claiming for himself the right to name imperial vicars during the vacancy of the Empire. Significant in this decretal is the limitation of the *Imperium* in extent and hence the denial of its universality.[53] Then in 1314 he named Robert as imperial vicar for all of Italy.[54] When, *en route* to his beloved Gascony, Clement died at Roquemaure near Carpentras on 20 April 1314, the unlucky Pope bequeathed an evil legacy to his successor: Rome abandoned, the government of the Church shamefully dependent on France, a College of Cardinals consisting mostly of Frenchmen, and a Curia bloated and plundered by narrow nepotism.

---

lehre (Heidelberg 1952); M. Maccarrone, "Il terzo libro della 'Monarchia'," *Studi Danteschi*, 33 (1955), 5–142; H. Löwe, "Dante und das Kaisertum," *HZ*, 190 (1960), 517–52; Grundmann-Herding-Peyer, *Dante und die Mächtigen seiner Zeit* (Münchener romanistische Arbeiten, 15) (Munich 1960), especially O. Herding, "Über Dantes Monarchia," *ibid.*, 37–57.

[53] Text in *MGConst*, IV, 2, no. 1166; M. Delle Piane, "Intorno ad una bolla papale, la 'Pastoralis cura' di Clemente V," *Rivista di storia del diritto italiano*, 31 (1958), 23–56. A recently discovered view of the Ghibelline position in K. Pivec - H. Heimpel, "Neue Forschungen zu Dietrich von Niem," *NAG* (1951), no. 4, pp. 97–122; K. Hitzfeld, "Die letzte Gesandtschaft Heinrichs VII. nach Avignon und ihre Folgen," *HJ*, 83 (1964), 43–53.

[54] F. Baethgen, "Der Anspruch des Papsttums auf das Reichsvikariat," *Mediaevalia*, Teil I, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae, 17/I (1960), 159–68.

CHAPTER 38

From John XXII to Clement VI

John XXII (1316–34)

The difficult situation of the cardinals at Carpentras was due to the factions within the college — ten or eleven Gascons, six other French or Provençaux, and seven Italians. The creations of Clement V had contributed not only an excessive growth of French influence in general, but so strong a group of relatives and tightly knit countrymen as had never existed previously. Scarcely had the business of the election got under way before the conclave was blown apart by the adherents of Clement V, who assaulted the Italian curialists and threatened the Italian cardinals. The Italians had great difficulty in escaping from the city. Not until two years later was it possible to bring the cardinals together again at Lyons, where the Count of Poitiers, brother of the French King, contrary to his oath to assure freedom of movement, locked them up in the Dominican monastery and gave them the names of four candidates. After weeks of efforts to reach an agreement, it was once again Napoleone Orsini who brought three of his countrymen over to the Gascon faction and thereby determined the election.

On 7 August 1316 accord was reached on the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, James Duèse of Cahors, seventy-two years old and seemingly in poor health.[1] Throughout his life he remained closely bound to his restricted homeland, as his unbounded preference for Cahorsins shows. He had become Bishop of Fréjus in 1300, was chancellor of Charles II of Naples from 1308 to 1310, was made Bishop of Avignon in 1310, and received the red hat in 1312. Of vast experience in all questions of politics and administration, he found the papal Curia in utter chaos, as a result of the weak, not to mention confused, government of his predecessor and of the two-years' vacancy. His fear of assassination seems to imply a strong opposition to his election.[2] His coronation, performed at Lyons on 5 September, was more solemn than was customary and was attended by the French King. The new Pope arrived in Avignon in October. At first he resided in the Dominican monastery and later in the episcopal palace, after elevating the former Bishop to the cardinalate and arranging for an administrator to manage the diocese.[3]

With good reason qualified judges have termed this period the age of the avowedly political papacy, adding that little time for things purely religious was left to the Popes.[4] With the election of John XXII the choice was made for the priority of politics over every other point of view. And on that, as would become apparent, depended the decision whether a return to Rome was seriously considered or whether persons were willing or forced to continue the provisional arrangement bequeathed by Clement V. If Clement was always in need of being pushed, John brought an entirely different sort of personality to the government, which successfully influenced the course of history during his long pontificate. Certainly the new Pope did not from the first exclude a return of the Curia to Rome or Italy; he repeatedly expressed the desire, even before the close of the year in which he had been elected, to go to Rome. But, captivated by the notion of a Guelf-French Italy, he regarded a return as possible only after this aim had been realized. The longer the delay lasted, the more serious became the psychological difficulties confronting a transfer of the Holy See. As would later appear, the situation in Italy could have been corrected only by a Pope functioning in the Papal State.[5]

---

[1] On the election of John XXII see *Haller,* V, 302ff., 405ff. (with bibliography). The chief source is a report to the King of Aragón in H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII.* (Münster 1902), LXVII f.

[2] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* III, 336.

[3] L. H. Labande, *Le palais des papes,* 18 f.

At the very centre of this pontificate, too, loomed always its relationship with France and its Kings and with the Angevin Dynasty that dominated South and Central Italy. Efforts to settle France's long war in Flanders and quarrel with England and the dubious agreement with Aragón in regard to the occupation of Sardinia were motivated by the desire for a stronger France, necessary if the Pope was to realize his contemplated goals.[6] This end was served also by the numerous but not always satisfactory interventions in French dynastic matters, in questions of administration, and by the profuse grants of Church tithes and subsidies that were dubiously accounted for. The aim was obvious: the continuation of the curial policy, followed from the latter half of the thirteenth century, of consolidating Angevin power throughout Italy and, correspondingly, of routing and eliminating the *Imperium* and Frederick of Sicily. If we want to employ the then current terms for the political factions — Guelfs and Ghibellines — John XXII was certainly the Guelf chief, far more effectively than was Robert of Naples, whose attitude and activity did not always meet with the Pope's approval.[7]

The situation in the Empire was not unfavourable to the new Pope. The premature death of Henry VII at Buonconvento was followed by a double election, with Louis the Bavarian and Frederick of Habsburg claiming the throne. Both applied to the Pope, who treated both as Kings-elect and claimed the right to give the decision. His first measures in Italy were based on his duty to mediate a general peace, but before long the Pope referred in a constitution to the claim made by his predecessor to act as imperial vicar and forbade the vicars appointed by the late Henry VII to exercise their functions. He then made Robert of Naples Senator of Rome and Imperial Vicar of all Italy.[8]

---

[4] H. Finke, *op. cit.*, I, pp. XVI f.

[5] On the return to Rome see H. Finke, *op. cit.*, I, 217; E. Dupré-Theseider, *I papi di Avignone*, 48 ff.; F. Bock, "Roma al tempo di Roberto d'Angiò," *ASRomana*, 65 (1942), 171, 187.

[6] Abundant material in H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia*, I–III, and the appendices.

[7] G. Tabacco, *La casa di Francia*, 129 ff.

Matters did not remain in the realm of theory. There now began strong measures against all who were not in agreement with the papal policy, in the form of canonical Inquisition processes with various degrees of penalties, including the branding of persons as heretics and the laying of interdict on cities and territories.[9] A relative of the Pope, Cardinal Bertrand du Poujet, appointed legate for Lombardy in 1319, entered upon his assignment in the summer of the next year.[10] Until his unhappy departure in 1334, he had as his task to topple the tyrants, a term used by the Pope to denote all non-Guelfs. The wars now erupting dragged themselves out for years, with rapidly changing political groupings but without any real decision.[11] Of particular importance were the interventions of French troops in North Italy. Moreover, vessels which had been provided for the crusade participated in the wars. Though the French government regarded a change in the political views of the Visconti as possible and worth seeking, the Pope inexorably demanded the forcible overthrow of their authority in Milan and Lombardy. He went so far as to grant the crusade indulgence "contra hereticos et rebelles partium Italiae." All bishops were required to proclaim it and to provide separate collection boxes for this purpose.[12] The cardinals were apparently not consulted about these measures and not all of them approved.[13] It is hard to determine how seriously John XXII took the idea of a genuine crusade, but it is difficult to avoid the impression that to a great extent he used it as a pretext for strengthening the papal finances and French predominance. For such an undertaking was possible only under the leadership of the French King, and Philip VI seems to have been well disposed.[14]

---

[8] F. Baethgen, *Der Anspruch des Papsttums auf das Reichsvikariat,* 169; G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon,* 80; F. Bock, "Kaisertum, Kurie und Nationalstaat," *RQ,* 44 (1936), 184 ff.; C. Erdmann, *Vatikanische Analekten,* 44.

[9] On the gist of the procedures see F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 181 ff.; on individual procedures see *idem,* "Studien zum politischen Inquisitionsprozess," *QFIAB,* 26 (1935 f.), 21–142; also, *idem,* "Processi di Giovanni XXII contro i ghibellini italiani," *ASRomana,* 63 (1940), 143; *Storia di Milano,* V (1955), 148–54.

[10] F. Bock, "Kaisertum, Kurie und Nationalstaat," *loc. cit.,* 188 ff.; *DHGE,* 8 (1935), 1068–74 (Mollat).

[11] *Storia di Milano,* V, 131 ff.

[12] F. Bock, "Studien zum politischen Inquisitionsprozess," *loc. cit.,* 48 f.; P. Gasnault, "La perception dans le royaume de France, du subside solicité par Jean XXII 'contra haereticos et rebelles partium Italiae,'" *MAH,* 69 (1957), 273–319.

[13] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 377.

[14] F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 339 f.; G. Dürrholder, *Die Kreuzzugspolitik unter Papst Johann XXII.* (diss., Strasbourg 1913); G. Tabacco, *op. cit.,* 213 ff.; J. Goñi Gaztambide, *Historia de la bula de la cruzada en España* (Vitoria 1958), 282 ff.; *Runciman,* III, 472: "till

It was quite extraordinary to find one of the German claimants, Frederick of Habsburg, on the side of the Guelfs in Italy. In 1322 his brother Henry appeared with an army before Brescia to support this gravely threatened Guelf city, but then, to the great annoyance of the Pope, he withdrew, presumably influenced by the diplomacy of the Visconti, who pointed out to Frederick the consequences for the *Imperium* of such action.[15] Far more portentous and decisive for events in Italy till the end of the pontificate was the intervention of Louis the Bavarian after the battle of Mühldorf in 1322, which was supposed to have established him as sole King. But the Pope in no way changed his earlier alleged neutrality; so far as he was concerned, Louis was still only King-elect. Since the King, now triumphant in Germany, laid claim to the customary royal rights, which also covered Italy in varying degrees, there once more broke out a bitter war between *Imperium* and *Sacerdotium,* but now the *Sacerdotium,* no longer in Rome, was in the immediate vicinity of France and strongly dependent on it. Approached for help by the Ghibellines, King Louis in the spring of 1323 dispatched a delegation to Italy. Having first bound several wavering Ghibelline leaders by oath, it contributed decisively to the relief of Milan, besieged by the legate's army. Thereby were ruined the Pope's prospects for an imminent victory over the Visconti.[16] Hence his violent wrath and his proceedings against Louis from the autumn of 1323, despite the strong opposition of some of the cardinals, are understandable.[17] Following the Italian model, the German King was now warned, then cited and entangled in the procedure of canonical trials with the aim of excluding him from the throne and of introducing another, perhaps French, candidacy.[18]

Only after long hesitation did Louis decide to resist. First at Nürnberg in December 1323, and then, following his excommunication in March 1324, at Sachsenhausen near Frankfurt in May, in the Chapel of the Teutonic Knights, Louis lodged an appeal against the Pope's rebukes and sentences.[19] He first protested against the reproach of illegally bearing the royal title and exercising the royal rights and then against the charge of patronizing heretics, and concluded with the request for the convoking of a general council. More calculated for a public reaction against the adroitly publicized papal proceedings was the so-called Declaration of Sachsenhausen, which charged the Pope with a prejudiced recourse to ecclesiastical censures for the

---

at last the Crusade came to mean any war against the enemies of Papal policy, and all the spiritual paraphernalia of indulgences and heavenly rewards was used to support the lay ambitions of the Papal See."

[15] F. Bock, "Kaisertum, Kurie und Nationalstaat," *loc. cit.*, 195–203.

[16] F. Bock, "Studien zum politischen Inquisitionsprozess," *loc. cit.*, 53 ff.

[17] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 391 ff. "Per Deum! Et furiam invenient et iterum furiam invenient" (*ibid.*, 395).

[18] F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 212 ff.; G. Tabacco, *op. cit.*, 337 ff.

[19] F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 201 ff.

struggle against his political opponents and in particular branded as clear heresy John's stand in regard to the Spirituals' ideal of poverty. Here were the accusations of heresy, familiar since the days of Philip the Fair, for which even a Pope could be prosecuted by the whole Church at a council. Recent studies establish strong resemblances to the Ghibelline stock of ideas in the content and formulation of the Declaration. The extent of Franciscan participation cannot as yet be exactly determined.[20]

The conflict became more acute when Louis, invited by Ghibelline circles, began in 1327 to intervene personally in Italy. In many respects his journey to Rome differed from previous journeys of German kings and emperors. He did indeed go to Rome but found there no ecclesiastical dignitaries who would officiate at his coronation. Appealing to the imperial idea of antiquity, old Sciarra Colonna conferred the crown on him in the Lateran. More serious, and certainly a political blunder, was the setting up of an Antipope in the person of the Franciscan, Peter di Corvaro, who called himself Nicholas V. Of no great personal significance and merely a tool of an inept policy, he quickly disappeared after the Emperor's departure from Italy and at Avignon made his peace with the very accommodating Pope.[21] On the other hand, the Franciscan superiors who had fled from Avignon and joined Louis at Pisa were of great assistance in the literary conflict with the Curia.[22] The Pope's reaction was not confined to a renewal and intensification of the processes. As he had earlier done, now again he urged the deposition of Louis, but a new election, suggested by him and agreed to by some of the Electors, did not take place.[23] By means of a fictitious plan of abdication Louis contrived to master the difficulties in both Germany and Italy, though, after his departure from Italy, the Visconti drew near to the Pope.

---

[20] *MGConst,* V (1909–13), 722ff. On the content of the declarations see F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 201ff.; on the textual problem, *idem,* "Die Appellationsschriften König Ludwigs IV. in den Jahren 1323/24," *DA,* 4 (1940), 179–205; on the authors, *idem,* "Politik und kanonischer Prozess zur Zeit Johanns XXII.," *ZBLG,* 22 (1959), 1–12, in which the participation of Michael of Cesena is made probable; K. Bosl, "Der geistige Widerstand am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern gegen die Kurie. Die politische Ideenwelt um die Wende vom 13./14. Jh. und ihr historisches Milieu in Europa," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* 9 (Constance 1965), 99–118.

[21] On the journey to Rome see H. Otto, "Zur italienischen Politik Johanns XXII.," *QFIAB,* 14 (1911), 140–265; F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 225–85.

[22] F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 321–26; H. Kämpf, "Die Codices latini 4008–10 der Vatikanischen Bibliothek," *QFIAB,* 26 (1935f.), 143–70 (Cod. Vat. Lat. 4009 contains documents in the hand of Michael of Cesena); H. S. Offler, "Meinungsverschiedenheiten am Hof Ludwigs des Bayern im Herbst 1331," *DA,* 11 (1954), 191–206; K. Bosl, "Die 'geistliche Hofakademie' Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern im alten Franziskanerkloster zu München," *Der Mönch im Wappen. Aus Geschichte und Gegenwart des katholischen München* (Munich 1960), pp. 97–129; F. Hofmann, *Der Anteil der Minoriten am Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern gegen Johann XXII. unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Wilhelm von Ockham* (diss. phil., Münster 1959); H. J. Becker, "Zwei unbekannte kanonistische Schriften des Bonagratia von Bergamo in Cod. Vat. Lat. 4009," *QFIAB,* 46 (1966), 219–76 (literature).

[23] E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens,* 36–59; G. Tabacco, *op. cit.,* 341ff.

But the last years of John XXII saw new complications. In 1331 there appeared in Lombardy the young King John of Bohemia, son of the Emperor Henry VII. Feigning an understanding with Emperor and Pope — *rex pacificus, filius ecclesiae, et vicarius imperii* — he apparently intended to establish his own rule. The Pope also considered the French King's plan of holding Lombardy in fief from the Holy See in order thus to exclude the German Kings from Italy for good. And in his last year John even thought of going to Bologna, but not as a result of any accord with France. All these projects collapsed when in 1333 Guelfs and Ghibellines allied against foreign domination and forced the Bohemian King to withdraw and the papal legate to flee from Italy.[24] The enormous sums which John sacrificed from the Church's treasury on his Italian schemes were squandered for nothing.[25]

The Pope's harsh stand in the controversy over poverty not only exasperated the Spirituals and made him implacable enemies but likewise incensed wide circles of ecclesiastics and lay persons against him, notably King Robert of Naples and Queen Sancia.[26] Grave dissensions ruined hitherto intimate relations, especially when differing political views arose in regard to domination in North Italy. In addition, the Pope became embroiled with a part of the Sacred College, which, led by Napoleone Orsini, tried earnestly to have a general council put him on trial and got into contact with the Emperor Louis and the German bishops.[27] Toward the close of his pontificate the Pope even gave scandal in the purely dogmatic field by defending in his preaching a quite unusual view of the beatific vision but one not unknown to early Christian thinking: that the souls of the just do not enjoy the full vision of God immediately after death but only after the general judgment. The ensuing controversy affected a large audience, and the greater number of theologians opposed John. These problems were discussed in many meetings and extensive disputations, and a series of expert opinions were handed down. In Paris the government unequivocally opposed the Pope and threatened to prosecute him for heresy. On the eve of his death he is said to have abandoned his peculiar opinion.[28]

---

[24] G. Tabacco, *op. cit.*, 297 ff.; A. Mercati, "Dall'archivio Vaticano I. Proposte di Giovanni, il francofilo re di Boemia, a Giovanni XXII," *MAH*, 61 (1949), 195–209; C. Dumontel, "L'impresa italiana di Giovanni di Lussemburgo re di Boemia," *Pubblicazioni della facoltà di lettere e filosofia*, IV, 3 (Turin 1952).

[25] E. Göller, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.* (Paderborn 1910), 133.*

[26] Literature on the poverty controversy in Chapter 43.

[27] O. Bornhak, *Staatskirchliche Anschauungen und Handlungen am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern*, 37 ff.

[28] G. Hoffmann, *Der Streit über die sel. Schau Gottes, 1313–38* (Leipzig 1917); D. Douie, "John XXII and the Beatific Vision," *Dominican Studies*, 3 (1950), 154–74;

It has long been known that the Pope liked to preach and often did so in the presence of cardinals, bishops, and curial prelates, using this opportunity to make known his theological views and positions, which were further publicized by official transcripts. It has recently been shown that he carefully studied collections of sermons and annotated them for his own use. And we know of more than thirty of his sermons, some *verbatim*, others in outline. As regards content, they deal mostly with the Blessed Virgin, including unambiguous remarks against the Immaculate Conception, and with political views, as is to be expected from the greatest politician in Avignon. Many extant codices of his personal library and of the papal library prove him to have been an attentive reader, as the marginal notes on requested expert opinions indicate. They also reveal a thorough knowledge of the theology of Thomas Aquinas, in preparation for his canonization. On the whole, the Pope favoured the collecting of material and possessed many such *tabulae*. Probably most important in his eyes were legal questions, and a group of these in his own hand has survived.[29] While in general the only fourteenth-century papal autographs that we have are the notes of approval on the few extant original petitions, the scarcely legible hand of John XXII has been preserved in many places, for example, in his outlines for political writings of great importance. They show the Pope at work, the repeated efforts of the aged and trembling hand for a new wording; he even took part personally in the composing of weighty political *cedulae*, using a cipher.[30]

If any Pope deserves the label of politician, it is John XXII. In the years when his own views were being formed and were acquiring their constituents, he was at the Angevin court in Naples. Is he to be blamed for never having given up the there dominant Guelf doctrines? As Pope, he certainly ought to have acted differently, but the question remains whether he could have. Thus he established the Angevin political style even for his successors and thereby caused untold harm. For achieving his ends he ruthlessly made use of all the means at his disposal as Pope. He stubbornly continued along the road taken by Innocent IV and Boniface VIII in the high-handed setting up

---

M. Prados, *El papa Juan XXII y las controversias sobre la visión beatífica* (Granada 1959); A. Maier, "Die Pariser Disputation des Geraldus Odonis über die Visio beatifica Dei," *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà*, 4 (1965), 213–51; F. Wetter, "Die Lehre Benedikts XII. vom intensiven Wachstum der Gottesschau," *AnGr*, 92 (Rome 1958), with the literature.

[29] A. Maier, "Zwei Vatikanische Handschriften und ihre Besitzer," *RSTI*, 12 (1958), 262–80; E. Pásztor, "Una raccolta di sermoni di Giovanni XXII," *Bollettino dell'Archivio paleografico italiano*, Nuova serie, 2–3 (1956), parte II, 265–89; A. Maier, "Annotazioni autografe di Giovanni XXII in codici Vaticani," *RSTI*, 6 (1952), 317–32; T. Käppeli, "Predigten am päpstlichen Hof von Avignon," *AFP*, 19 (1949), 388–93.

[30] F. Bock, "Die Geheimschrift in der Kanzlei Johanns XXII.," *RQ*, 42 (1934), 279–303; A. Mercati, "Dagli Instrumenta Miscellanea dell'archivio segreto Vaticano," *QFIAB*, 27 (1936 f.), 137–67.

of new rights and through his decretals became the prototype of the brutally political Pope.[31] The rights claimed by the Curia from the thirteenth century in the matter of matrimonial dispensations were exploited by John XXII in a completely biased manner for his political goals, the advice of the cardinals being sought only to cover up a refusal.[32] The imposition of ecclesiastical censures on purely political grounds and the arbitrary granting or refusing of dispensations were garnished as *necessitas et utilitas ecclesiae* or *utilitas publica*, in an arrogant identification of his politics with the Church, of the hierarchy with religion. His irresponsible dealing with benefices and with the Church's financial system for the completion of the administrative primacy will be examined later. His pontificate was the climax of the hierocratic system. Whoever regards this as something positive can admire in John XXII one of the most important of the Popes.[33]

Benedict XII (1334–42)

The conclave, meeting in the episcopal palace at Avignon at the appointed time after the death of John XXII, faced not only personal but also great material decisions. On it depended a return to Rome or a staying on for the time being at Avignon. It is perhaps an exaggeration that the Cardinal of Comminges declined to give his word that he would not go to Rome and therefore was not elected, but the story throws a penetrating light on the situation. The quickly accomplished election of the "White Cardinal" on 20 December 1334 is said to have caused surprise. Perhaps, following the anxiety caused by the *dilettante* theologian, a real specialist was desired, and such was James Fournier, who became Benedict XII. As a youth he had entered the Cistercian Order, in which his uncle was an abbot, and in 1311 he became his successor at Fontfroide. In 1317 he was Bishop of Pamiers, in 1326 of Mirepoix, and in 1327 a Cardinal. In Paris he had engaged in profound studies and had earned the degree of master in theology. As Bishop and even as Cardinal he paid special attention to the fight against heresy.[34] Significant also was his activity as a theological expert. Our present knowledge of his views in the process against the *postille* on the Apocalypse of Peter John Olivi,[35] against William of Ockham and Master Eckhart, has been extended by new discoveries.[36] He took a stand early in the dispute over the beatific vision. John XXII entrusted him with a study of the question, the result of which is found in a large unprinted work.[37] He presided at the trial of the Dominican Thomas Waleys.[38] This thorough familiarity with problems facilitated for him as Pope the settling and provisional ending of the discussions in the usual manner.[39]

---

[31] H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 231, 395.

[32] A. Esch, "Die Ehedispense Johanns XXII. und ihre Beziehung zur Politik," *HStud,* 183 (Berlin 1929); H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 409, 415.

[33] Characterization in H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* I, 216, 395, 414 f., III, 315, 342, 351 f.; J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform,* 90 ff.; G. Tabacco, *op. cit.,* 334 ff.; F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 171 f., 364 ff.

[34] J. Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier évêque de Pamiers, Benoît XII* (Toulouse 1964).

[35] R. Manselli, *La "lectura super apocalipsim" di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi* (Rome 1955).

Difficult to assess is his position in regard to the return of the Curia to Rome, in particular whether he was really in earnest when he held out to the envoys of the Roman people the prospect of a speedy return and yet in the first months of his pontificate undertook the building of the great palace at Avignon. Thereby an important decision had in effect been made and no more thought was given to a departure for Italy. Rather detailed reports give information about the exertions for order in the Papal State. Archbishop Bertrand of Embrun, sent to Central Italy by John XXII, continued his activity under Benedict until 1337. He was followed by John de Amelio as *reformator generalis,* who is known chiefly for his having transported the papal archives to Avignon. Repeated peace edicts endeavoured to check the quarrels in Rome between Colonna and Orsini over the Tiber bridges and fortresses in the city.[40] It is false to say that the Pope could not return because of the anarchy in Italy and Rome. The disorders continued precisely because the Curia did not combat them on the spot.

Benedict too had to travel the way of dependence on France, marked out by John XXII. His great reserve in the granting of tithes for the crusade or his reclamations because of the non-fulfillment of promises made no difference. After long negotiations on this subject and a visit of the French King Philip VI to Avignon, the Pope gave in. The French Church was again and again seriously burdened for the political needs of the government, a situation that repeatedly gained for the Curia the reproach of partiality as the war against England got under way. Furthermore, Avignon's intelligence service was at the disposal of the French King. In an effort to mediate peace the Pope sent two cardinals to England, but they obtained only transitory results.[41] To the people of northern France, severely tried by the war of devastation in 1339–40, the Pope sent generous financial help.[42] Throughout his pontificate Benedict was unable to free himself from the strong bonds linking him to French policy.

---

[36] J. Koch, "Der Kardinal Jacques Fournier (Benedikt XII.) als Gutachter in theologischen Prozessen," *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter und Stände* (Cologne 1960), 441–52.

[37] F. Wetter, "Die Lehre Benedikts XII. vom intensiven Wachstum der Gottesschau," *AnGr,* 92 (Rome 1958).

[38] T. Käppeli, *Le procès contre Thomas Waleys O.P.* (Rome 1936).

[39] Constitution "Benedictus Deus" of 29 January 1336.

[40] H. Otto, "Benedikt XII. als 'Reformer' des Kirchenstaates," *RQ,* 36 (1928), 59–110; A. Mercati, "Nell'Urbe dalla fine di settembre 1337 al 21 gennaio 1338", *Misc Hist Pont,* 10 (1945), 1–84; G. Mollat, "Construction d'une forteresse à Bénévent sous les pontificats de Jean XXII et de Benoît XII," *MAH,* 62 (1950), 149–64; G. Tabacco, "La tradizione guelfa in Italia durante il pontificato di Benedetto XII," *Studi di storia medievale e moderna* (Rome 1958), 95–148.

Peaceable remarks at the beginning of his reign awakened the hope of a settlement of the strife with the *Imperium.* In any event, as early as the spring of 1335 the Emperor got into contact with the Curia in order to ascertain the conditions for a peaceable solution of the affair, which was having a progressively worse effect on public opinion. We are rather exactly informed about these negotiations by the preservation of a portion of the detailed formulations within the frame of the canonical process, the so-called procurations.[43] Despite much yielding on the part of the imperial envoys no agreement was reached, for it was not in accord with the political line of Philip VI, who was kept abreast of the complicated discussions by the Pope in all details.[44] On the whole, Benedict was even more subservient to French policy than his predecessor had been. And so there had to be a new break, after the imploring speeches of the envoys in consistory, sharply condemning the policy of John XXII, had failed to accomplish anything.[45]

But the attitude in Germany was now quite different from what it had been under Benedict's predecessor. Many Imperial Estates — Electors, nobility, the higher clergy, and especially the cities — were alienated by this policy of the Curia.[46] The desertion of the papally provided Archbishop of Mainz, Henry von Virneburg, was of great advantage to the Emperor's cause. At the end of March 1338 a synod of the province of Mainz at Speyer rallied many bishops around the Emperor and interceded in his behalf with the Curia, only to receive the reply that the Pope was unwilling to throw his cardinals to bears and lions.[47] Important rallies rapidly followed one another this same year. In May at the first Diet of Frankfurt was published the celebrated manifesto "Fidem Catholicam," produced with the vigourous co-operation of the Franciscan court theologians.[48] It solemnly proclaimed that the imperial authority derives directly from God and not from the Pope, and that the Emperor-elect, even without having been crowned, can rule the Empire. Accordingly, John XXII's institutive proceedings were unjust and must not be obeyed. The Empire itself took its stand in the declarations made by the Electors around the royal throne in Rhense, where, after uniting in the Electoral Union for the protection of their traditional rights, they made the following proclamation with legal force: the one elected King of the Romans by the Electors, or by a majority of them, needs no nomination, approbation, confirmation, consent, or authorization of the Apostolic See for administering the property and rights of the Empire or for assuming the royal title.[49] A second Diet of Frankfurt in August of the same year produced the imperial law "Licet Iuris," which, expanding the Rhense decrees, conceded also the imperial dignity to the one properly elected, without the need of any approval or confirmation by the Pope.[50] The Franciscans of the "Munich Academy" had shared in the preparation of these momentous proclamations by numerous opinions and day-to-day consultation.[51] There immediately followed, in September, the Diet of Koblenz, where the alliance with King Edward III of England was concluded, despite the opposition of the Curia. Five imperial laws prescribed the implementation of the great decrees of this year.[52]

---

[41] F. Trautz, *Die Könige von England und das Reich 1272–1377* (Heidelberg 1961), 263 f.

[42] L. Carolus-Barré, "Benoît XII et la mission charitable de Bertrand Carit dans les pays dévastés du nord de la France, Cambrésis, Vermandois, Thiérache 1340," *MAH*, 62 (1950), 165–232.

[43] F. Bock, *Reichsidee*, 367 ff.; *idem*, "Die Prokuratorien Kaiser Ludwigs IV. an Papst Benedikt XII.," *QFIAB*, 25 (1933 f.), 251–91; H. S. Offler, "Über die Prokuratorien Ludwigs des Bayern für die römische Kurie," *DA*, 8 (1951), 461–87.

[44] F. Bock, *Reichsidee*, 409; F. Trautz, *op. cit.*, 264.

[45] F. Pelster, "Die zweite Rede Markwarts von Randeck für die Aussöhnung des Papstes mit Ludwig dem Bayern," *HJ*, 60 (1940), 88–114.

[46] Konrad von Megenberg, *Planctus ecclesiae in Germaniam*, ed. by R. Scholz, MG Staatsschriften des späteren Mittelalters, II, 1, 1941. Latin-German edition prepared by H. Kusch, Leipziger Übersetzungen und Abhandlungen zum Mittelalter, series A, vol. 1 (Berlin 1956). *Kaiser, Volk und Avignon. Quellen zur antikurialen Bewegung in Deutschland in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, ed. and trans. by O. Berthold, Leipziger Übersetzungen, series A, vol. 3 (Berlin 1960).

[47] E. E. Stengel, *Nova Alamanniae*, 352 f.: "Papa dixit, quod suos cardinales nollebat ursis et leonibus destinare."

In the face of this unexpected development in the Empire, the Pope, in the interests of France, sought to resume and drag out the discontinued negotiations and especially to dissuade the English King from the German alliance.[53] Anti-curial feeling in Germany was growing, and the announcement of trials and observance of censures imposed were almost out of the question. In the spring of 1339, again at a Diet of Frankfurt, the Electors, in a new proclamation, went beyond the Rhense formulation and unconditionally acknowledged Louis's imperial dignity.[54] Even present was Archbishop Baldwin of Trier, known for his ambiguous policies; from his chancery are preserved reflections on the war of the Empire against France and its effect on Avignon.[55] Louis's eventual withdrawal from the English alliance and his *rapprochement* with France hardly changed the situation. Even the unfortunate matrimonial barter with Margaret Maultasch over Tirol did not gravely damage the Emperor's position. The ecclesiastical anarchy grew worse than before. Differing from the tactically more clever John XXII, Benedict scarcely allowed any suspension of the interdict. And so now, to a far greater degree than before, there was recourse to self-defense, to the very great prejudice of the ecclesiastical authority. The state of affairs is described in chronicles of that age, for example in those of John of Winterthur, Matthias of Neuenburg, and the Constance Canon Henry of Diesenhofen. And in his exhortation to Charles IV the Dominican John of Dambach sketches a shocking picture in an effort to induce the King to negotiate with Rome for the purpose of obtaining general absolution for all territories affected by censure — not only in Germany — and a definite clarification of who is to be regarded as *vitandus.*[56]

---

[48] Text and German translation in *Kaiser, Volk und Avignon,* 248–71; H. J. Becker, *op. cit.,* 246 ff.

[49] E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens,* 112–53; *idem, Baldewin von Luxemburg. Ein grenzdeutscher Staatsmann des 14. Jh.,* 207 f.; F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 398 ff.; *Kaiser, Volk und Avignon,* 274 f.

[50] Text and German translation in *Kaiser, Volk und Avignon,* 282–85; H. Lieberich, "Kaiser Ludwig der Baier als Gesetzgeber," *ZSavRGgerm,* 76 (1959), 173–245.

[51] C. Schmitt, *Benoît XII et l'ordre des frères mineurs,* 197–249; K. Bosl, "Die 'geistliche Hofakademie' Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern im alten Franziskanerkloster zu München," *loc. cit.*

[52] F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 436; F. Trautz, *op. cit.,* 361; F. Bock, "Das deutsch-englische Bündnis von 1335–1342, I, Quellen," *Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen Geschichte,* NF, XII (Munich 1956).

[53] For the mission of Arnald de Verdalla see E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens,* 170 ff.; F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 443 ff.

Benedict XII is reckoned among the reform Popes, not because of the customary statements on the subject at the outset of his pontificate but because he actually started a comprehensive reform activity. A few days after his coronation he sent back to their benefices all ecclesiastics who could not satisfactorily justify their sojourn at the Curia.[57] In the government of the Curia he took up and extended the principles of his predecessor but differed from him in a strict control of the full authority to issue decrees in order to avoid the many abuses that had crept in. He abolished the unfortunate and odious system of expectatives and the *commenda* for high ecclesiastical dignitaries other than cardinals. The examination he introduced to determine the suitability of petitioners for benefices was well meant but in practice it was ineffectual. Contrary to the prodigality of his predecessor, he was sparing in the granting of dispensations.[58]

The religious orders were the special concern of the Pope, who as a Cardinal had continued to wear his Cistercian habit, and his most important and most thorough reform measures were devoted to them, but not to their great joy. In the bull "Fulgens sicut Stella" he began with his own order, which had already preoccupied John XXII. The bull for the reform of the Benedictines, "Summi Magistri," whose importance was for long a subject of controversy, has recently been judged more soberly. The Dominicans very skillfully contrived to escape the Pope's zeal for reform. On the other hand, the bull "Redemptor Noster" for the Franciscans, drawn up in an authoritarian tone, produced great alarm, above all because of the unprecedented character of the Pope's stand, which displayed no particular regard for the order's tradition and insufficient insight into its internal difficulties and a situation that had been exacerbated by John XXII's rough dealings with the Spirituals. Prepared by a commission of specialists — including not only cardinals and bishops but expert theologians, — it was felt by many contemporaries to be too monastic because of its regulation of even small details and it was cancelled in part by Clement VI. Incorrect is the widespread view that, after the death of its author, the reform bull was rejected by the general chapter at Marseilles in 1343. Many of its prescriptions, changed in their wording, were preserved essentially in the statutes of the order or were of significance for all religious orders, such as the directions in regard to the fostering of studies and the central training of the novices.[59]

---

[54] E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens,* 174 ff.; F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 451 f.

[55] On the role of Baldwin of Luxembourg, see E. E. Stengel, *Baldewin von Luxemburg,* 207–14; F. Bock, *Reichsidee,* 398–405.

[56] A. Auer, "Eine verschollene Denkschrift über das grosse Interdikt des 14. Jh.," *HJ,* 46 (1926), 532–49.

[57] *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 217.

[58] Examples and further details in Chapter 40.

Estimates of Benedict XII's personality vary.[60] No one denies that he was inspired by lofty motives. His manner of life seems to have been unpretentious, and the words *bibamus papaliter,* attributed to him, are found in only one of his eight *vitae,* but the seventh *vita* expresses itself in similar vein. Very likely these reproaches emanated from hostile Franciscan circles.[61] In his first "*sine nomine*" letter Petrarch judges him quite severely, characterizing him as a totally unfit, drowsy, and drunken helmsman of the ship of the Church.[62] He is alluding especially to Benedict's continued stay at Avignon, his momentous erecting of the palace, his dependence on the French government, and his scarcely flexible, often even unwise policy. In regard to theology he was rightly considered scholarly but of inquisitorial harshness.[63] Ockham may be exaggerating when he characterizes him as master over the faith, even against the authority of Scripture.[64] He unflinchingly fostered the growth of papal power in the government of the Church — a spiritual autocrat but a firm preserver of legality.

---

[59] C. Schmitt, *op. cit.*

[60] Most recent characterization in B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale,* 134 ff.

[61] *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 236 f., 234.

[62] P. Piur, "Petrarcas 'Buch ohne Namen' und die päpstliche Kurie," *DVfLG,* series 6 (Halle 1925), 165 f., 317–24. But John E. Wrigley, "A Papal Secret Known to Petrarch," *Speculum,* XXXIX (1964), 613–34, shows that Clement VI better fits what Petrarch has to say (translator).

[63] *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 223: "hic iustus et durus erat"; 232: "hic fuit homo durus et constans."

[64] "Tractatus contra Benedictum," *Opera Politica,* III (1956), 244 f.

King Philip VI of France sent his son, the Duke of Normandy, to Avignon for the election of a successor to Benedict XII. A direct influence on the election of Peter Roger cannot be proved, but certainly a candidate unacceptable to France could have been stopped.[65] The election of the Cardinal from the Limousin took place on 7 May 1342, his coronation on 19 May.

At an early age he had become a Benedictine at La Chaise-Dieu, and extended studies at Paris had equipped him with a broad education. Known early for his oratorical gifts, he was soon regarded as one of the best speakers of his time, but this reputation refers to form rather than to content. Many testimonies are extant in regard to his course of studies and his literary activity. Hundreds of "pages in his autograph" fill in details of the picture of Clement VI, something true of hardly any other person of the age.[66] After a brief period as Abbot of Fécamp, he became Bishop of Arras, Archbishop of Sens, and finally, as a royal councillor, he obtained the wealthiest of all French benefices, the archbishopric of Rouen. Thanks to his gifts in speech and diplomacy he was entrusted by the government with numerous tasks, he was the spokesman of the episcopate in the negotiations over nominations to and taxation of benefices, and he was the official preacher of the crusade, once again in prospect. Created a Cardinal in 1338, he soon occupied an important position at the Curia.

Even more than his predecessors at Avignon, Clement VI was a French Pope, and, altogether apart from the intensification of the opposition between England and France at the beginning of his pontificate, a return of the papacy to Rome was not to be expected from him. Like his predecessors, he exerted himself, chiefly in the interests of France, for a settlement of the conflict. He was unable to prevent military engagements, but through his legates he played a decisive role in achieving the truce of Malestroit in 1343; the long negotiations were conducted at Avignon. By means of loans, grants of tithes and subsidies, and the making over of crusade contributions, occasionally in very great amounts, he embraced the French cause.[67] The very active relations between Clement and King Philip retained a personal stamp. Most of the harshness in the disputes over the freedom and privileges of the Church and most of the success were on the side of the royal government.

In this state of affairs a reconciliation with Louis the Bavarian was unthinkable, unless he totally renounced his rights as recognized by Electors and Empire. Apparently Clement's demands on the Emperor were not made more severe, as was once generally held. The evidence for this is a recently published talk delivered by the Pope on Holy Thursday of 1343.[68] On the other hand, he was deeply interested in the deposition of Louis and the holding of a new election in Germany after there had been a rumour that Louis was planning a new journey to Rome. In 1346 the papal-Luxembourg party contrived to have the young Bohemian King Charles elected by a part of Electoral College. Louis's death in the following year soon brought general recognition of Charles IV. His subservience to the Curia gained him the nickname of the "Priests' King," but not quite fairly. Naturally, at the beginning of the negotiations he abandoned the prevailing attitude in regard to papal claims to approve the election and made very extensive concessions. Then he slowly but consistently took them back by means of a very cunning diplomacy.[69] This development in Germany was made possible by the course of the war with England, which was unfavourable to France, and by events in Italy.

---

[65] The seven *vitae* in *Baluze-Mollat*, I, are rather colourless.

[66] A. Maier, "Der literarische Nachlass des Petrus Rogerii (Clemens VI.) in der Borghesiana," *RThAM*, 15 (1948), 332–56, 16 (1949), 72–98; J. Barbet, *François de Meyronnes-Pière Roger. Disputatio 1320–21* (Paris 1961).

[67] F. Trautz, *op. cit.*, 317–19.

In Italy Clement at first followed the method of negotiations with varying success. When the warlike Archbishop and *Signore* of Milan, John Visconti, invaded Piedmont and was threatening Provence, Clement too passed to the offensive. In the struggle for the possession of Bologna, however, he was the loser in dealing with the more cunning Visconti. His asking the aid of Charles IV and urging the formation of an Italian league against Milan were of as little advantage as were ecclesiastical procedures and censures. In a treaty concluded after stubborn bargaining the Visconti submitted to the Pope but received Bologna from him in fief for twelve years — and was the real winner.[70]

In the pontificate of Clement VI occurred an event important not alone for Rome and Italy but for the history of ideals in the Middle Ages: the appearance of Cola di Rienzo, tribune of the people. A few months after the Pope's election there arrived in Avignon a large Roman embassy to offer him, as a private person according to the established custom, the highest offices in the city and to ask the reduction of the jubilee from every one-hundredth to every fiftieth year. The proferred dignities were accepted in a most solemn manner and the grant of the jubilee for 1350 was proclaimed in a public consistory in 1343.[71] Present was a man whose character has been much discussed — and variously interpreted as psychopath or actor or cultured though fantastic renewer of Rome's past greatness.[72] At first closely linked to the papal vicar, on Pentecost 1347 Cola di Rienzo took over the administration of the city amid exotic rites. He then planned further: the sovereignty of the Roman People after the suppression of barons and foreign mercenaries, independence of Pope and Emperor, unification of all inhabitants of the peninsula under a ruler of Italian blood. He came to grief in the seventh month of his tribuneship after the Curia had recognized the dangerous nature of his program, and in Rome and the Papal State the old chaos soon returned. However, the Jubilee of 1350 could be celebrated without too great difficulties, with a large influx of pilgrims and considerable revenues for the city.[73]

---

[68] H. S. Offler, "Über die Prokuratorien Ludwigs des Bayern für die römische Kurie," *DA*, 8 (1951), 477, 480; *idem*, "A Political 'collatio' of Pope Clement VI, O.S.B.", *RBén*, 65 (1955), 126–44.

[69] E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens*, 206–08.

[70] *Storia di Milano*, V, 306–54.

[71] H. Schröder, "Die Protokollbücher der päpstlichen Kammerkleriker 1329–47," *AKG*, 27 (1937), 228.

The news of the purchase of Avignon and of the Comtat Venaissin from Queen Joanna I of Naples by Clement in 1348 and the magnificent construction of the *palais des papes* disappointed all Italian hopes of a return of the Curia. The death in 1343 of King Robert of Naples was followed by a seriously troubled state of affairs during the long reign of his granddaughter, Joanna I. Her first husband, Andrew of Hungary, was not acceptable to the Curia, and the papal legate received orders to crown only the Queen. This is understandable, for a future occupation of South Italy by an outside power was contrary to the interests of the Papal State. The murder of Andrew was followed by an expedition for revenge led by his brother, King Louis I of Hungary. As a result, Joanna, who had meanwhile married Louis of Taranto, fled to Avignon. Her return was made possible by a great Italian league in which the Pope took part.[74] Louis of Taranto repeatedly attacked Aragonese Sicily, and the Pope sought to mediate. But his peace efforts in the war between Aragón and Mallorca and in that between Aragón and Genoa were equally fruitless. On the other hand, despite great difficulties, the marriage of the King of Castile with the daughter of the Duke of Bourbon, urged by French policy and hence also by the Pope, materialized. It is probably an exaggeration to say that interest in the East contributed much to the Western policy of Clement VI.[75]

Clement ranks as the most splendid representative of the Avignon regime, if by this expression are understood grand-scale expenditures, a court of princely luxury, and unbridled favouritism of relatives and countrymen. With him begins the age of three Limousin Popes, who gave to the papacy a South French stamp even stronger than had been the case in the first half of the century.[76] Under Clement the Curia was scarcely to be distinguished from a secular court. He delighted to display his sovereign power through a gorgeous retinue, quite in accord with the saying ascribed to him — that his predecessors had not known how to be Popes.[77] For the honour of his name, no petitioner should go away discontented. The consequences in finance and administration are treated elsewhere. Charges against his morals are not explained away by recent attenuations.[78] Not a man of great determination and stern accomplishment, he endeavoured to master difficulties by wily diplomacy in the sense of temporizing. His pontificate bore a worldly character and even contemporaries saw divine judgment in the Black Death that fell upon all of Europe in 1347 to 1352.

---

[72] P. Piur, *Cola di Rienzo, Darstellung seines Lebens und seines Geistes* (Vienna 1931); E. Dupré-Theseider, *Roma dalla comune di popolo alla signoria pontificia,* 517–608.

[73] P. Brezzi, *Storia degli anni santi* (Milan 1949), 43–62.

[74] E. G. Léonard, *Histoire de Jeanne I^{ère} reine de Naples* (Paris 1932–37).

[75] F. Giunta, "Sulla politica orientale di Clemente VI," *Studi di storia medievale e moderna in onore di Ettore Rotta,* Biblioteca storica, 3 (Rome 1958), 149–62.

CHAPTER 39

From Innocent VI to Gregory XI

Innocent VI (1352–62)

The conclave following the death of Clement VI, in which twenty-five cardinals took part, lasted only two days. Hence there was no need to have recourse to the mitigation of the strict prescriptions for the conclave, enacted the previous year by the deceased Pope.[1] It seems scarcely credible that the election of the Prior General of the Carthusians, ignorant of the ways of the world, was only prevented by the worldly-wise Cardinal Talleyrand de Périgord.[2] More important is the information concerning the first known election capitulation, which was intended to assure the growing influence of the College of Cardinals in the government of the Church and was sworn to by all the cardinals, in some cases with reservations. According to it, the Pope could create no more cardinals until their number had dropped to sixteen and there could be no more than twenty of them. The Pope was bound in this matter by the consent of all or at least of two-thirds of the cardinals; such consent was also required for any procedure against individual cardinals and for the alienation of any part of the Papal State. The revenues allotted by Nicholas IV to the College were to be guaranteed. The consent of the cardinals was to be obtained in filling the higher administrative posts, in granting tithes and subsidies to kings and princes, and in demanding tithes for the benefit of the *Camera Apostolica.* The Pope was not to hinder the cardinals' free expression of opinion. As was to be expected, half a year after his election the new Pope, following consultation with some of the cardinals and with legal experts, declared this capitulation null, as being incompatible with the *plenitudo potestatis.*[3]

---

[76] B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale*, 137–40.

[77] H. Schröder, *loc. cit.*, 179–92. Philip Hughes, *A History of the Church*, III (New York 1947), 143, calls Clement VI "as near an approach to Aristotle's magnificent man as the order of St. Benedict has ever known" (translator).

[78] G. Mollat, "Clément VI et la vicomtesse de Turenne," *MAH*, 73 (1961), 375–89; also, P. Piur, "Petrarcas 'Buch ohne Namen' und die päpstliche Kurie," *loc. cit.*, 349, 376 f.; J. E. Wrigley, "A rehabilitation of Clement VI. Sine nomine 13 and the kingdom of Naples," *Archivum historiae pontificiae*, 3 (1966), 127–38.

[1] *Clément VI. Lettres se rapportant à la France*, no. 5137 (6 December 1351).

[2] N. P. Zacour, "Talleyrand the Cardinal of Périgord, 1301–64," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new series, vol. 50, part 7 (1960), 21 ff.

The choice of the conclave, Stephen Aubert, from the Limousin, had studied canon law and had become Bishop of Noyon and Clermont. In 1342 his countryman, Clement VI, made him a Cardinal and later Bishop of Ostia and grand penitentiary.[4] Judged by the brilliant show of the previous pontificate, he was considered a "rough Pope," and his health was not too good. If he began at once with reforming the papal court, sent many curialists back to their benefices, reduced the size of his retinue, and intended to be a thrifty steward of ecclesiastical property, still his reform endeavours have often been exaggerated by comparing him with his predecessor. His reforms affected the orders also, especially the mendicants and the Hospitallers. He was clearly unlucky in his Eastern policy. He sought to aid Smyrna in its affliction and untiringly endeavoured to make peace between the warring maritime cities of Genoa and Venice, but he was very niggardly in his financial assistance and regarded the indispensable union with the Eastern Church as possible only in a total subjection to the papacy and the Western Church.[5] If his attitude to the question of the so often projected crusade was lacking in grandeur, his undertakings in Italy were all the more successful, and they were his real preoccupation.

Since the mid-century the idea of a return to Rome had acquired momentum, stimulated by the deteriorating situation in the Papal State and throughout Italy as well as by the serious threat posed by wandering mercenary bands to the hitherto so peaceful stay in Provence. For protection from surprise attacks and plundering, Avignon was surrounded from 1357 by strong walls and fortifications covering a wide area, and even clerics were called upon for contributions and services. As a rule it was possible to induce the companies to depart on payment of blackmail or to hire them for the papal armies in Italy.[6] Soon after his election the Pope had decided to send there a vigorous personality, and he did so in selecting the former Archbishop of Toledo, now Cardinal of San Clemente, Gil de Albornoz.

---

[3] *Innocent VI. Lettres secrètes et curiales,* no. 435 (6 July 1353); on this point see W. Ullmann, "The Legal Validity of the Papal Electoral Pacts," *EIC,* 12 (1956), 246–78.

[4] B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale,* 140 f.; Innocent's genealogy, *ibid.,* 161, footnote 356.

[5] F. Giunta, "Sulla politica orientale di Innocenzo VI," *Storia e letteratura,* 71 (1958), 305–20.

[6] B. Guillemain, *op. cit.,* 615–25.

Provided with almost unlimited authority, the Cardinal set out in August 1353.[7] He was to spend thirteen years in Italy, with a brief interruption, and, in spite of the Pope's lack of political judgment and the Curia's failure to supply funds, to become the second founder of the Papal State. He began the work of reconstruction in the *Patrimonium* proper, and at first had to deal with the most detested opponent of papal authority, the Prefect di Vico, labelled by the Pope *abominationis ydolum.*[8]

Cola di Rienzo had set out for Italy close on the heels of the Cardinal Legate.[9] Following his deposition from his six-months' tribuneship in December 1347, Rienzo had stayed in the Papal State and the Kingdom of Naples, usually in hiding with the Fraticelli of Monte Majella, before seeking out Charles IV at Prague in July 1350. He was there imprisoned and in the summer of 1352 turned over to the Curia, where, as a prisoner in the papal palace, he survived a trial. Innocent VI evidently placed his hopes for the pacification of the Eternal City on Rienzo's appearance as Senator, especially since repeated requests for the tribune's return came to the Curia from Perugia and Rome. After much hesitation Albornoz also let him have his way, but following a second tribuneship of only nine weeks, Rienzo met an inglorious end.[10]

Once the *Patrimonium* had been gained, Albornoz devoted himself to the Duchy of Spoleto and then to the Marches of Ancona and Romagna, where success was possible only after years of effort. Through the intrigues of the Visconti the legate even had to withdraw from Italy for a while, but after the renewal of his commission he won back for the Papal State the important city of Bologna. If the papacy could now be restored from Avignon to Rome, this was due to the military and administrative gifts of the Cardinal. The *Constitutiones Aegidianae,* or *Liber constitutionum sanctae matris ecclesiae,* published at the Parliament of Fano in 1357, provided a sure legal basis for administration, while the many fortifications erected at his orders were adequate strongholds for suppressing local risings. The Spanish College that he established at Bologna testifies to his interest in learning. According to all information, however, he never set foot in the Eternal City.[11] But the prematurely aged, sickly, and indecisive Pope could no longer realize his often expressed desire to go to Rome. He died at Avignon on 12 September 1362.

---

[7] *Innocent VI. Lettres secrètes et curiales,* no. 352–432 (30 June 1353). For Albornoz see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani,* II (Rome 1960), 45–53 (with copious bibliography); "Il card. Albornoz nel VI centenario delle 'Constitutiones' 1357–1957," *Studia Picena,* 27 (1959); J. Glénisson-G. Mollat, *Gil Albornoz et Androin de la Roche 1353/67* (Paris 1964).

[8] *Innocent VI. Lettres secrètes et curiales,* no. 887.

[9] *Ibid.,* nos. 559, 563, 564, 566, 568.

[10] P. Piur, *Cola di Rienzo* (Vienna 1931), 195–216.

[11] V. Fanelli, "Roma e il cardinale Albornoz," *Studi Romani,* 6 (1958), 413–21.

The factional division in the Sacred College was apparently so complicated that the candidacy of a cardinal seemed hopeless. There is a probably not too reliable report of the election of Cardinal Hugh Roger, brother of Clement VI, who, however, did not accept. And there was talk of seeking to come to an agreement by compromise. William d'Aigrefeuille seems to have directed the attention of the electors to the Abbot of Saint-Victor de Marseille, who was thereupon chosen after a conclave of five days.[12] Since at the moment he was acting as legate in Naples, it was necessary to recall him before obtaining his consent to the election and publishing the result.

William Grimoard, from the vicinity of Avignon, was regarded as a fine canonist. He had been a professor at Montpellier and Avignon and shortly before his election had become Abbot of Saint-Victor.[13] The new Pope retained his monastic habit and even more so his monastic way of life. He understood the importance of studies, which he promoted by founding colleges and burses, while a large number of students were indebted to him, even for information. It should cause no surprise that he took steps against the luxury of the papal court and sent many curialists packing.[14] As a monk and never a cardinal, he found it difficult to maintain a frank relationship with the self-assured College of Cardinals and was often insecure *vis-à-vis* the great lords. This explains his frequently abrupt expressions and measures, for example, the creation of young William d'Aigrefeuille at Marseilles immediately before the departure for Italy. To the remonstrances of several members of the Sacred College he rejoined that he had even more cardinals in his capuche.[15] A man of a deep interior life and somewhat ignorant of the world, he did not always see through the diplomatic game and, curiously enough, fell prey to the allurement of political power. His predecessor had already had to deal with the wandering mercenary companies. Urban was deadly serious in seeking to end the scourge; but his burning appeals against them went abroad without great success and his efforts to divert these certainly experienced fighters to the crusade or to the East in general were in vain. There were also voices which did not expect much of such "crusaders."[16]

---

[12] N. P. Zacour, *op. cit.*, 64 f.

[13] B. Guillemain, *op. cit.*, 142 ff.; genealogy of the Grimoard family, *ibid.*, 164, footnote 375.

[14] *Baluze-Mollat*, I, 376 ff.

[15] *Baluze-Mollat*, I, 403; G. Pirchan, *Italien und Kaiser Karl IV. in der Zeit seiner zweiten Romfahrt*, II (Prague 1930), 159*–62*.

[16] A. Theiner, *Codex dipl. dom. temp.*, II, no. 410; *Baluze-Mollat*, I, 352, 357; P. Piur, "Petrarcas 'Buch ohne Namen' und die päpstliche Kurie," *loc. cit.*, 97 ff.; A. Cretoni, "Il Petrarca e Urbano V," *Studi Romani*, 9 (1961), 629–46.

At the beginning of Urban's reign the situation in Italy was not unfavourable, but only because of Albornoz, whom he confirmed in office. As Abbot of Marseilles and even earlier he had known the state of Italian affairs to some extent from several missions and he had personal experience of the despotic rule of the Visconti. Hence he immediately resumed the proceedings against Bernabò Visconti, uttered all possible condemnatory sentences against him in March 1363, and summoned a crusade against him.[17] It quickly became clear to him that only in Italy could he realize his great plans — elimination of the mercenary companies, crusade, union with the Greek Church, — once Italy had been pacified and all the forces of the peninsula brought together. Thus he made a change of policy, contrary to that followed by the great soldier and politician Albornoz.

The new policy involved secret negotiations with the Visconti behind the back of the Cardinal Legate and the appointment of Cardinal Androin, former Abbot of Cluny, an opponent of Albornoz and friend of the Milanese. The resulting peace with the Visconti burdened the Church with enormous payments to Bernabò for the evacuation of Bologna and was felt even by contemporaries to be pernicious and unworthy. The next task — a league to expel or exterminate the mercenaries — was also unsatisfactorily executed, for it forbade only future arrangements with them, and furthermore Florence held aloof. A meeting of Pope and Emperor at Avignon in the spring of 1365 was intended to further the achieving of the goals and, by means of an imperial journey to Rome, to assure the return of the Curia. Urban, however, quickly adopted the plan of going to the Eternal City without the Emperor. Objections to the Pope's intended journey to Italy came from all sides — from France and from the College of Cardinals — but he could not be dissuaded. After changing the date of departure several times he left Avignon on 30 April 1367 and on 4 June landed at Corneto in the Papal State, to be welcomed by the one who had restored his principality. After a brief rest the Pope proceeded to the security of Viterbo in preparation for entering Rome, with a strong military escort, on 16 October.[18] Earlier, on 23 August, had occurred the death of the great Cardinal who had so often been permitted to experience the gratitude of the prince.

In Italy the Pope's political aims quickly changed.[19] In an extensive league of the Curia with the smaller Lombard states the Visconti was defied. The Emperor, the Queen of Naples, and even several cities of Tuscany joined, but not Florence. It would be an exaggeration to say that the otherworldly monk had now become a politician, but he did not want to tolerate any great power besides his own on Italian soil. This was no secret from Florentine diplomacy, which for that reason was not especially happy over the Pope's return. The Visconti tried to meet the threatening danger by an attack on the important territory of Mantua. Since, despite the concentration of a large army, the league had no successes in the field, the Emperor, who had meanwhile come to Italy, contrived to establish peace in accord with his policy of compensations, even against the real aims of the Pope, who had sought the complete subjugation of the Visconti.

---

[17] *Storia di Milano,* V, 420 ff.; *Urbain V. Lettres secrètes et curiales,* no. 414.

[18] *Baluze-Mollat,* IV, 131–37: "Iter italicum Urbani V Romani Pontificis."

[19] G. Pirchan, *Italien und Kaiser Karl IV. in der Zeit seiner zweiten Romfahrt,* 2 vols. (Prague 1930), with abundant literature.

The Pope, finally residing in Rome after many decades, devoted special attention to the repair and adornment of the Roman churches, especially the Vatican and Lateran basilicas. In the summer of 1368 he went to Viterbo and then for several months of that and the following years he stayed in the higher altitude of Montefiascone on the Lake of Bolsena.[20] In October the Emperor came to Rome, where his Queen received the imperial crown. There were long discussions of the political situation in North and Central Italy. The Pope's intention of exercising greater influence in Tuscany was only reluctantly encouraged by the Emperor and it was observed by Florence with much anxiety. In general, in conformity with the Emperor's policy, the delineation of the power system continued as it had been since the middle of the century. For the Pope this was a great disappointment, and gradually he became obsessed with the notion of a return to Provence.

The great creation of cardinals at Montefiascone in September 1368 was a bad omen: five Frenchmen, one Englishman, one Italian. Disorders in Rome and Viterbo, the hostile attitude of Perugia and of the Visconti, the disintegration of the papal league, and the recent flaring of the Hundred Years' War were assigned as reasons for this change. In vain did Catherine of Siena, Birgitta of Sweden, and Peter of Aragón — all of them regarded as supernaturally gifted — advise against it. French influences, above all that of the cardinals, were stronger, and the miscarriage of the Pope's political plans was the chief motive for his giving in. "The Holy Spirit led me here, and now he is leading me back for the honour of the Church." Thus he may have reassured himself, but to contemporaries it was a terrible disillusionment and, as became clear later, a serious mistake and a measure very difficult to understand.[21] Urban left Italy on 5 September 1370 and on the twenty-seventh of the month reentered Avignon. He was not long to enjoy that city's jubilation, for on 19 December he died. Not until five centuries later was he beatified.

---

[20] M. Antonelli, "La dimora estiva in Italia di Urbano V," *ASRomana,* 65 (1942), 153–61.

[21] *Baluze-Mollat,* IV, 136: "Sanctus Spiritus duxit me ad partes istas, et reducet me ad alias ad honorem sancte Ecclesie."

The conclave, which began on 29 December with seventeen cardinals, ended the following morning with the election of Cardinal Peter Roger, nephew of Clement VI. Gregory XI was crowned on 5 January 1371 and, in contrast to his predecessor, appeared on horseback in a colourful procession in Avignon.[22] Thus the so-called Limousin faction had provided its third Pope.[23] Elected at the age of forty-two, Gregory had been in the Curia for more than twenty years and so had ample opportunity of training and activity in ecclesiastical policies. When only nineteen, he had been made a Cardinal-Deacon by his uncle in 1348, but he continued his studies and acquired a solid and comprehensive education.[24] As Pope he too remained strongly attached to family and homeland. Of the twenty-one cardinals he created, eight were from his own land; there were eight other Frenchmen, two Italians, and one each from Geneva, Castile, and Aragón.[25]

Judgments of his personality and character vary greatly. In poor health and very sensitive, he is said to have been an indecisive brooder, a weak and easily influenced man, who liked especially to seek the solution of difficult problems in mystical enlightenment. All this was certainly present in this rich personality, but there were also other traits, including tenacity and energy and even unrelenting severity, as in his procedures against Milan and Florence, which can hardly be understood from a religious viewpoint.[26]

Gregory was experienced enough to comprehend, from the beginning of his pontificate, the necessity of the papacy's return to Rome, whether the report that he had earlier made a vow in this regard is true or not. But the abortive effort of his predecessor was an oppressive legacy. This catastrophe could always be brought up by the many, far too many, who held out for remaining at Avignon. But to the reasons hitherto in favour of Rome was now added the growing insecurity in the Midi because of the Hundred Years' War, and from 1372 official announcements of the impending journey to Rome were multiplied. But first the situation in North Italy had to be clarified. Gregory soon was resolved to make a clean sweep of the Visconti, as the chief enemies of the Papal State.[27] A great league against Milan was ormed in August 1371, a new cardinal legate proceeded to Lombardy, and Amadeus VI of Savoy assumed command of the troops, which were to be reinforced by a contingent from France under the Pope's brother, the Viscount of Turenne.

---

[22] Account of the election in *Gregoire XI. Lettres secrètes et curiales relatives à la France,* no. 1 (no date); G. Mollat, "Relations politiques de Grégoire XI avec les Siennois et les Florentins," *MAH,* 68 (1956), 335–76.

[23] B. Guillemain, *op. cit.,* 144–48; genealogy, *ibid.,* 160, footnote 345.

[24] The contention that, after his elevation, he pursued studies at Perugia (G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon,* 59, and B. Guillemain, *op. cit.,* 118 ff.) does not seem to follow from *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 460.

[25] B. Guillemain, *op. cit.,* 187.

[26] E. Dupré-Theseider, *I papi di Avignone,* 193–99; G. Mollat, "Grégoire XI et sa légende," *RHE,* 49 (1954), 873–77; A. Segre, *I dispacci di Cristoforo da Piacenza,* 89.

[27] *Cristoforo da Piacenza,* 40: "valde animosus ad guerram "

The institution of processes against the Visconti was proclaimed at the beginning of 1373 and then a crusade was preached against them. Considerable sums were demanded of cardinals and curialists, and contributions were imposed on all countries. Milanese envoys, whose instructions were intercepted, tried negotiations in vain; even the intercession of the Duke of Anjou was futile, and most of the cardinals were not in favour of yielding.[28] The journey to Italy now seemed to the Pope necessary for the destruction of the Visconti, and the spring of 1375 was considered. Many cardinals arranged lodging for themselves in Rome, the Pope's *magister hospitii* was sent there, and galleys were requested from Venice and Naples for September.[29] The Pope's tenacity attracted general attention, as when, in the consistory of 7 February 1375, the Duke of Anjou in a powerful speech advanced ten reasons why the Curia should remain at Avignon. The reply, made by Cardinal James Orsini, referred emphatically to the Papal State as the Pope's country and maintained that its confused situation was due to its sovereign's tarrying abroad.[30] Even the pleas of the Pope's closest relatives and of the people of Avignon were ineffectual; but the date of departure was postponed in August until Easter of 1376.[31]

Earlier, in June 1375, the Curia had been obliged to make peace with Milan because of the defection of several of its allies, but presumably the Pope did not regard it as a real peace. No good was to be expected of the league made between Milan and Florence in the summer of the same year. Florence succeeded in gaining many cities of Tuscany and parts of the Papal State and in inciting revolt against papal rule, for the extravagant demands for subsidies had contributed seriously to a lowering of morale.[32] In addition to Viterbo, Perugia, and Città di Castello, many other cities and territories were in open revolt. Nevertheless, the Pope held to his plan and, as he put it, if at least a foot of ground in his state was left, he intended to be in Italy in the spring.[33] Therefore, extensive preparations were made, mercenary captains were hired, long consistories were held, and all-out war against Florence was decided. The preparations included the issuing of a bull on annates, pawning of papal treasures, and extensive striking of coins in Avignon.[34] In the summer the direst threats were directed at Florence: interdict, prohibition of clerics' staying there, suppression of the episcopal see and deprivation of civil rights, confiscation of all property of Florentine citizens in foreign lands, and hence the paralyzing of commerce.[35] Meanwhile, *taxatores domorum* and the papal *capella* set out for Rome. The final strong exertions of the cardinals, the Dukes of Anjou and Burgundy, and the Pope's relatives, who appeared in black as a sign of grief, were unable at the last moment to dissuade Gregory from his purpose. On 13 September he left Avignon forever.[36]

---

[28] *Ibid.*, 56: "nullo modo sperandum est de pace vivente isto papa."

[29] *Ibid.*, 74: "prima die septembris intrabit mare et ibit infallibiliter ad urbem, nisi mors ipsum impediat."

[30] *Ibid.*, 71.

[31] *Ibid.*, 76; G. Mollat, "Relations politiques de Grégoire XI," *loc. cit.*, 369.

[32] J. Glénisson, "Les origines de la révolte de l'état pontifical en 1375," *RSTI*, 5 (1951), 145–68.

[33] *Cristoforo da Piacenza*, 83.

The question of the influence of Saint Catherine of Siena on Gregory's return to Rome has received answers greatly differing from one another. Caterina di Jacopo Benincasa was active as intermediary between Florence and the Pope, though with no official commission from the city on the Arno. From the middle of June 1376 she spent three months at Avignon and presumably she conferred with the Pope. Without falling into the too common error of overestimating her importance in the politics of her time, it may perhaps be said that, by her repeated written admonitions to Gregory, who often wavered and was seeking a sign from heaven, she confirmed him in his resolve. In this matter she was more successful than in her propaganda for the crusade. But the total silence of the envoys of Mantua and Siena, reporting from Avignon, in regard to her activity is striking.[37]

On 2 October 1376 the papal fleet at Marseilles put to sea, but persistent storms forced frequent landings, and it was not until 6 December that Gregory reached the Papal State at Corneto. With thirteen cardinals he made his solemn entry into Rome on 17 January 1377.[38] It was high time. Revolts and general unrest had reached dangerous proportions. Hatred against the foreign governors and their fortresses had broken out with unlooked-for violence, nourished by the probably exaggerated dread of the establishing of an Angevin State in Lombardy and Tuscany. The possibility of the loss of the entire Papal State and Rome and even of an ecclesiastical schism in this very papacy was not out of the question. The worst, then, could at least be prevented. Florence, affected less in the spiritual than in the commercial sphere, utilized the mediation of Milan, and the Pope followed suit. A great congress was summoned to Sarzana for February 1378. But before it had completed its work death overtook the Pope on 27 March, and the conclusion of peace with Florence and Milan was reserved for his successor in Rome, Urban VI.

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 86 f.; H. Hoberg, *Die Inventare des päpstlichen Schatzes in Avignon* (Rome 1944), 535 ff.

[35] G. Mollat, "Préliminaires de la guerre des otto santi (1371–75)," *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, comptes rendus des séances* (1955), 113–17; G. A. Brucker, *Florentine Politics and Society 1343–78* (Princeton 1962), with all the literature; M. B. Becker, "Church and State in Florence on the Eve of the Renaissance 1343–82," *Speculum*, 37 (1962), 509–27.

[36] *Cristoforo da Piacenza*, 94 f., G. Mollat, "Relations politiques de Grégoire XI," *loc. cit.*, 371–74.

[37] E. Sommer von Seckendorff, *Die kirchenpolitische Tätigkeit der hl. Katharina von Siena unter Papst Gregor XI. 1371–78* (Berlin-Leipzig 1917); R. Fawtier, *Sainte Catherine de Sienne, Essai de critique des sources*, I (Rome 1921), II (Rome 1930); E. Dupré-Theseider, *Epistolario di santa Caterina da Siena*, I (Rome 1940); Catherine of Siena, *Politische Briefe. Übertragung und Einführung* by F. Strobel (Einsiedeln and Cologne 1944); R. Fawtier-L. Canet, *La double expérience de Catherine Benincasa (sainte Catherine de Sienne)* (Paris 1948); A. Levasti, *Santa Caterina da Siena* (Turin 1947); I. Taurisano, *Santa Caterina da Siena* (Rome 1948); E. Dupré-Theseider, "La duplice esperienza di s. Caterina da Siena," *RSIt*, 62 (1950), 533–74; L. Zanini, "Bibliografia analitica di santa Caterina da Siena 1901 al 1950," *Pubblicazioni dell'università cattolica del s. Cuore*, 58 (1956), 325–74, 62 (1958), 265–367 (thus far 670 of 1044 projected numbers).

CHAPTER 40

The Curia at Avignon

Avignon, on the banks of the Rhone in Provence, occasioned the expression "Babylonian Exile." For almost seventy years it was the papal residence, though the seat of the papacy was never transferred there. The term "Babylonian Exile" refers to the desolation of Rome and implies an accusation, but recent investigations of the Avignon period have produced a certain mitigation of earlier judgments.[1] In the immediate vicinity of the French Kingdom as it then existed, the city, by its size and favourable location, afforded a respectable site for a court. And, following the purchase of the city and of the surrounding territory by Clement VI in 1348, Avignon was considered a part of the Papal State.

The *palais des papes* was erected over a period of two decades at the mid-century. Begun by Benedict XII soon after his election, at first a gloomy, monastery-like fortress, it was completed by Clement VI as a princely palace. The mighty exterior was designed by French architects; the interior was decorated mostly by Italian artists.[2] The cardinals and the high curial officials and their offices were at first lodged in leased or sequestered houses.[3] But there was soon much constructing of palaces, monasteries, hospitals, hospices, business houses, and the now greatly expanded city was protected and defended by a powerful ring of walls. The summer heat could be easily endured in the neighbourhood, famed for its natural beauty, as in John XXII's summer residences at Pont-Sorgue and Châteauneuf-du-Pape. Close by, on the other side of the Rhone, Villeneuve-lès-Avignon offered Pope and cardinals a pleasant and secure abode.

---

[38] *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 440 f.; P. Ronzy, *Le voyage de Grégoire XI ramenant la papauté d'Avignon à Rome (1376–77),* suivi du texte latin et la traduction française de l'Itinerarium Gregorii XI de Pierre Ameilh (Florence 1952); also, *Baluze-Mollat,* II, 714. Relations between Pope and Emperor were strained because of the election of Wenceslas as German King; *cf.* H. Helbling, *Saeculum Humanum* (Naples 1958), 148–68 (Niccolò dei Beccari to Charles IV); R. Folz, "Der Brief des italienischen Humanisten Niccolò dei Beccari an Karl IV.," *HJ,* 82 (1963), 148–62.

[1] B. Guillemain, "Punti di vista sul papato Avignonese," *AstIt,* 111 (1953), 181–206.

[2] The best account is still L. H. Labande, *Le palais des papes et les monuments d'Avignon au XIV^e siècle,* 2 vols. (Marseilles 1925), with its copious bibliography; A. Pelzer, *Ad-*

The large incomes of the cardinals were used not only for maintaining princely courts but for art and learning and the building and adorning of churches and chapels in Avignon. The account books of the *Camera Apostolica* occasionally provide glimpses of the carefree life and bustle at this ecclesiastical court. If the extent or excess of the princely household depended on the personality of the reigning Pope, in any event there gradually developed an elegant, even magnificent, style, which was at its best in the great Church solemnities, in consistories, and in the reception of numerous kings, princes, and ambassadors. For the city of Avignon the papal stay meant great structural changes, a large increase in population, an extraordinary stimulus to commerce, and a cosmopolitan mode of life.

In it the Papal Curia constituted a special state in stark contrast to the city population, despite common interests and mutual influence. There was a Curia in the sense of a princely court at Rome already in the High Middle Ages; the household of Boniface VIII is known in detail. But now it was further enlarged and, more important, we have exact information about it. At first Italians still predominated in the higher posts and offices, but the middle and lower personnel were at once recruited from countrymen of the reigning Pope.[4] Thus, Clement V enlisted a sort of bodyguard from his immediate homeland. The systematizing mind of John XXII applied itself even to the household and regulated everything more exactly, but his prescriptions were again and again modified by his successors. More than in the case of other princely courts, a change of pontificate involved a change of personnel and practice, even in the operation of the offices. But in general the style of the *officiales curie* strongly resembled that of the French royal court.[5]

---

denda et Emendanda ad F. Ehrle historiae bibl. Rom. Pont., tomus I (Rome 1947), 167–78; E. Castelnuovo, *Un pittore italiano alla corte di Avignone, Matteo Giovanetti e la pittura in Provenza nel secolo XIV* (Turin 1962); F. Enaud, "Les fresques de Simone Martini à Avignon," *Les monuments hist. de la France*, 9 (1963), 115–71.

[3] For housing at the Curia and especially in Avignon see P. M. Baumgarten, *Aus Kanzlei und Kammer* (Freiburg 1907), 54 ff.

[4] G. Mollat, "Clément VI et le Limousin," *Journal des Savants* (1959), 16–27; B. Guillemain, "Les Français du Midi à la cour pontificale d'Avignon," *Annales du Midi*, 74 (1962), 29–38.

[5] B. Guillemain, "Les carrières des officiers pontificaux au XIV^e siècle," *MA*, 69 (1963), 565–81.

The management of the Apostolic Palace was the charge of the *Magister hospitii papae. Clerici capelle* and *cantores* took care of the liturgical rites in the papal *capella.* The *capellani commensales,* whose duties were not always strictly defined, were influential persons, who were frequently promoted to episcopal sees. In immediate attendance on the Pope were the *cubicularii,* among whom physicians were specified, and the *Magister sacri palatii,* usually a Dominican. The division of the household administration into four basic functions — kitchen, food, drink, stable — was already old. They were retained, even though circumstances changed and new divisions were created, such as the *magister aquae, magister cere,* and *magister folrarie.* Even in periods of severe financial strain the office of almoner *(panhota)* got large contributions from the papal chest for feeding and clothing many hundreds of poor persons. All these functions were performed by clerics, even though lay persons could have done as well or better. In addition, there was a lay personnel of probably the same number: porters *(hostiarii maiores et minores),* soldiers and police *(servientes armorum),* and a sort of Noble Guard (*scutiferi* and *domicelli*). Some 500 persons were employed in the household.[6] Many offices were life-grants, while others, especially those in closest touch with the Pope, ended at his death. Only a portion of these courtiers were *familiares* of the Pope; this title was regarded as a distinction and it was also useful for obtaining benefices. To satisfy the conceit of many ecclesiastics there was an increasing number of honorary nominations as papal chaplains — for the period from John XXII to Benedict XIII the number is estimated as 3,000.[7]

The French orientation is seen clearest in the College of Cardinals.[8] Shortly after his coronation at Lyons, Clement V created ten new cardinals — nine Frenchmen and one Englishman. The ratio of preponderance was thereby decisively shifted to the disadvantage of the Italians and so it remained. In his three promotions Clement V created twenty-four cardinals. Of twenty South French thirteen were from his native Gascony; three of the others were from northern France, one from England, none from Italy or the Empire. Matters were similar in the succeeding pontificates. From 1316 to 1375 the figures were: ninety French, fourteen Italians, five Spaniards, one Englishman. Particularly obtrusive in all the Avignon pontificates, except that of Benedict XII, were relatives and countrymen from Gascony, Quercy, and the Limousin. A representation of the Universal Church was out of the question; the influence of the French crown was constant and unabated, and several members of the Sacred College had formerly been in the service of that crown. In the Avignon period the revenues of the College were considerable, especially those accruing from prodigal gifts at papal elections and from numerous benefices, but on the outbreak of the Great Schism they declined.

---

[6] G. Mollat, "Règlement d'Urbain V sur les insignes des sergents d'armes des portiers et des courriers de la cour pontificale," *SteT,* 235 (1964), 165–69.

[7] B. Guillemain, "Les chapelains d'honneur des papes d'Avignon," *MAH,* 64 (1952), 217–38.

[8] G. Mollat, "Contribution à l'histoire du sacré collège de Clément V à Eugène IV," *RHE,* 46 (1951), 22–112, 566–94; H. Hofmann, *Kardinalat und kuriale Politik in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (diss. phil., Leipzig 1935).

Participation of the cardinals in the government of the Church was manifested principally in the consistory, in judicial commissions, and in legations. Several examples are known of open expression of opinions in consistory, as well as of weak giving in. The effort of the conclave of 1352 to bind the future Pope in law to the demands of the College, by means of a written election capitulation, failed in part. However, in general the Pope's freedom of action was restricted by the College of Cardinals. The number of cardinals stayed at about twenty. Most of them maintained a large house with a numerous retinue and dependents, and the Popes quite often had to urge them to moderation. The extant last wills of several cardinals show that they had the disposal of great wealth. Especially well known figures who held the cardinalatial dignity for decades were Napoleone Orsini,[9] James Stephaneschi,[10] William de Longis,[11] and Talleyrand de Périgord.[12]

The term "Avignon Papacy" connotes also the centralized system of Church government, which was decidedly different from the previous regime and created new forms in the ecclesiastical constitution and the papal system of finance and an unqualified Church bureaucracy. Together with the excessive favouring of countrymen and relatives in the conferring of benefices, it evoked strong criticism then and later and became an important ingredient of the *gravamina* for several centuries. In spite of all reform efforts, important elements of this papal absolutism are still in force.

The juridical basis for the *plenitudo administrationis* had been laid in the thirteenth century. The Popes at Avignon accepted it and developed it in masterful fashion in the so-called reservations. If the notion of "vacant at the Curia" was extended by Boniface VIII to mean a distance of two days' journey from Rome, Clement V extended the reservation to the benefices of bishops who had been consecrated at the Curia or whose resignation, transfer, or exchange of benefice had taken place at the Curia. John XXII went still further in his Constitution "Ex Debito" of 1316, by including under a vacancy at the Curia the deposition of a benefice holder, the annulment of an election, the rejection of a postulation, and resignation into the hands of the Pope; also comprised were the benefices of cardinals and of almost all curial officials. Furthermore, probably for political reasons chiefly, the more important benefices in the Papal State and in Central and North Italy were reserved for two years and this term was again and again extended. A year later, in his Constitution "Execrabilis," the Pope turned to the subject of pluralism. For the future it was permitted only to retain one benefice having the care of souls and one other without it; all others were to be resigned to the bishops, but the benefices thus vacated were all reserved to the Holy See. Benedict XII's Constitution "Ad Regimen" of 1335 comprised all previous reservations and some new ones. It should come as no surprise, then, that, with such precedents, Urban V in 1363 reserved to the Holy See the filling of all patriarchal and episcopal sees and of all monasteries of men and women of a specified income level. Thereby was attained in theory the complete bureaucratic supremacy of the Curia.[13]

---

[9] C. A. Willemsen, *Kardinal Napoleon Orsini 1263–1342* (Berlin 1927).

[10] A. Frugoni, "La figura e l'opera del cardinale Jacopo Stefaneschi, 1270–1343," *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei,* serie ottava, Rendiconti classe scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, 5 (1950).

[11] G. Marchetti Longhi, *Il cardinale Guglielmo de Longis di Adraria di Bergamo* (Rome 1962).

[12] N. P. Zacour, "Talleyrand the Cardinal of Périgord, 1301–64," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society,* new series, vol. 50, part 7 (1960).

The implementation of these important constitutions required numerous offices and a powerful civil service.[14] The Apostolic Chancery was responsible for the technical aspect. Its chief, the vice-chancellor, belonged to the College of Cardinals. The regulations and rules of the chancery determined even the details of its routine. Its personnel comprised *notarii, referendarii, abbreviatores, scriptores, correctores, registratores, bullatores,* and the *auditor litterarum contradictarum.* Procurators and agents managed the business of their clients, for they alone were at home with the extremely complicated routine.

Ordinarily, every piece of business, and especially questions of benefices, began with the submitting of a petition which, according to the degree of its importance, had to be referred to the Pope, the vice-chancellor, or one of the *referendarii* for approval (signature). Then followed the dating, which was decisive for all that followed. The majority of approved petitions were, probably from the time of Benedict XII, registered for easier verification. After the perhaps necessary examination of the candidate, the petition proceeded to the *abbreviatores,* who prepared the rough draft. Then followed the fair copy, the assessing of the fee, the placing of the seal, the posting in the *registrum* of bulls, the making of the payments due to the *Camera*

---

[13] E. Göller, *Die Einnahmen Johanns XXII.,* 93; *Rep Germ,* I (1916); Barraclough, *Papal Provisions;* B. Guillemain, *La politique bénéficiale du pape Benoît XII, 1334–1342* (Paris 1952); C. J. Godfrey, "Pluralists in the Province of Canterbury in 1366," *JEH,* 11 (1960), 23–40; D. E. R. Watt, "University Clerks and Rolls of Petitions for Benefices," *Speculum,* 34 (1959), 213–29; G. Brucker, "An unpublished Source on the Avignonese Papacy. The letters of Francisco Bruni," *Tr,* 19 (1963), 351–70.

[14] E. von Ottenthal, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiregeln von Johannes XXII. bis Nicolaus V.* (Innsbruck 1888); M. Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200–1500* (Innsbruck 1894); F. Bock, "Einführung in das Registerwesen des avignonesischen Papsttums," *QFIAB,* 21 (1941); P. Herde, *Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen im 13. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1961).

Apostolica, the appointing of executors to carry out the papal directive. The formal part was now completed.

But it was seldom that a papal order realized its goal at once. The case was relatively simple if a benefice was vacant because of the death of the previous incumbent, but there were ordinarily several persons seeking it. The usual reasons for the vacancy of a benefice were different: resignation, acquiring of another benefice, failure to obtain ordination in benefices involving the care of souls, marriage of a cleric in minor orders, illegitimate birth, lack of the required age, bodily defects, pluralism without a proper dispensation. If difficulties arose, a suit was instituted before the *auditores sacri palatii* (the *Rota*), again beginning with the filing of a petition and including many steps and much time, and even then often unsuccessfully.[15] All these proceedings involved fees, perquisites, and considerable gratuities.

In spite of many losses, the series of registers of the Vatican Archives for the fourteenth century include hundreds of thousands of such documents — for example, for John XXII about 65,000 in the local registers alone, for Clement VI about 90,000, for Innocent VI 30,000, for Urban V 25,000, for Gregory XI 35,000. The enormous quantity of written documents proceeding from the Curia, especially the routine affairs of the Apostolic Chancery, posed serious problems in regard to their dispatch. A great part, possibly half, was taken along by the petitioners themselves; a further considerable percentage by persons traveling from Avignon to the areas in question. Neither sort went at the expense of the Curia. Much was conveyed by means of the world-wide business connections of banking firms which had an establishment in Avignon.

Only in regard to especially important documents, chiefly political and urgent, was recourse had to the Pope's *cursores* or to high ecclesiastics or religious, chiefly Dominicans. The *cursores papae* were employed for ceremonial summonses rather than for ordinary carrying. In the Avignon period there were on the average about fifty of them, gathered into a sort of college under the *magister cursorum* and enjoying a position of trust. They belonged to the higher ranks of the curial personnel and to the more stable element around the Pope, especially when of advanced age. They made purchases for the papal palace and its kitchen and cellar. In addition to these *cursores papae* there were also *cursores curiam sequentes,* who for the most part had connections with the *mercatores curie* and acted as a sort of postal service. Weighty political communications were often prepared in duplicate and forwarded separately. The use of ciphers, usually as *cedulae interclusae,* was resorted to in the interests of secrecy; such documents were often written by the Pope personally or by the *camerlengo* and, it seems, were rarely registered. Moreover, messages were frequently delivered to the Curia by word of mouth, guaranteed by the proper credentials.[16]

---

[15] W. Engel, "Würzburg und Avignon. Kurienprozesse des Würzburger Domkapitels im 14. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan,* 35 (1948), 150–200; J. Reetz, "Kuriales Prozesswesen um 1340. Nachrichten aus Avignonesischen Akten in Hamburg," *ADipl,* 9/10 (1963 f.), 395–414.

The most important administrative body was the *Camera Apostolica.*[17] It was presided over by the *camerlengo,* usually an archbishop, who in the past had been employed in the Curia and as collector outside. The *camerlengo* and a small staff of cameral clerks and secretaries took care of political correspondence, and the personnel of the papal court took the oath of office in his presence. We know relatively little about the *Camera's* secret policies but a great deal about its administration of finance. The ledgers were the "Introitus et Exitus," that is, income and expenditure, and the accounts of the collectors, who, as *nuntii et collectores,* collected throughout Christendom the moneys owed to the *Camera.*[18] In addition, there was a whole series of special registers for tithes, revenues of vacant benefices *(fructus medii temporis),* procurations, payments due, and payments received. The register of division dealt with the receipts from *servitia,* visitations, and *census,* which since the thirteenth century had been divided equally between Pope and cardinals.

The most important types of income were *servitia,* annates, tithes, subsidies, and *spolia.* Since the High Middle Ages Pope and cardinals had received an increasing amount of money gifts, which were gradually stabilized and regarded as of obligation. Registers of *servitia* due are extant from 1295. Bishoprics and monasteries having an annual income of more than 100 gold florins were bound to the *servitium* on the occasion of a nomination made by the Curia. This amounted to one-third of the first year's income and could be required only once in a year. The methodical development of the system of reservations constantly increased the number of those thus obliged, and from the middle of the fourteenth century almost all consistorial benefices were included. One half of the *servitium* went to the Pope, the other to the College of Cardinals; the cardinals present in consistory at the conferring of the benefice received equal shares. Likewise, five *servitia minuta,* in the amount of five cardinalatial shares, were assigned to the curial officials, in accord with a complicated method. The registers of dues at first served for the determining of the amount of the income, but from the end of the century this was taken care of by the *Liber Taxarum* of the *Camera Apostolica.*[19]

---

[16] Y. Renouard, "Comment les papes d'Avignon expédiaient leur courrier," *RH,* 180 (1937), 1–29; G. Mollat, "Correspondance de Clément VI par cédules," *Bollettino dell'Archivio paleografico italiano,* nuova serie, II–III (1956 f.), parte II, 175–78.

[17] P. M. Baumgarten, *Aus Kanzlei und Kammer* (Freiburg 1907); *idem, Von der apostolischen Kanzlei* (Cologne 1908); G. Mollat, "Contributions à l'histoire de la chambre apostolique au XIVᵉ siècle," *RHE,* 45 (1950), 82–94; P. Gasnault, "Notes et documents sur la chambre apostolique à l'époque d'Urbain V," *MAH,* 70 (1958), 367–94. List of *camerlenghi* and treasurers in K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.,* 5–7.

[18] J. P. Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen Kollektorien in Deutschland während des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn 1894); J. Favier, "Le niveau de vie d'un collecteur et d'un souscollecteur apostolique à la fin du XIVᵉ siècle," *Annales du Midi,* 75 (1963), 31–48.

Annates first made their appearance at the Curia when in 1306 Clement V demanded the first year's income of all benefices, vacant or to be vacated, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, without regard to the type of nomination. He based this on the classical statement: *quia quod postulat inferior, potest etiam superior.* The Council of Vienne raised strong opposition and demanded a sufficient income for the one who obtained the benefice. John XXII also prescribed annates, sometimes for almost all of Europe, at other times for several ecclesiastical provinces or countries. In 1326 he decreed that annates were due from all benefices vacated at the Curia and continually repeated these reservations. The amount of annates fluctuated in the fourteenth century but for the most part corresponded to the assessment of tithes. "Annata, seu medii fructus primi anni," was a favourite definition from the end of the century. Considered bound to annates were benefices with an income in excess of twenty-four gold florins. Since annates went to the papal treasury in their entirety, they constituted the surest source of income and in most cases equalled the *servitia* in their amount.[20]

Compared with the previous century, the proceeds from the still frequently demanded tithes had greatly decreased.[21] The great crusade tithes of the Second Council of Lyons and those of Boniface VIII had still not been entirely paid and settled when the Council of Vienne demanded from all Christendom another crusade tithe for six years. John XXII did the same at the end of his pontificate, but Benedict XII countermanded the tithe and ordered the return of the money already collected. Clement VI, Innocent VI, and Urban V again prescribed general tithes but without much success. In the course of the century demands for tithes were very frequently made in particular territories but the proceeds had to be shared with the local lords. The Kings of France received most of the crusade tithes, without having to account for them or pay them back when no crusade materialized.

Originally a spontaneous donation in return for a specific thing, the

---

[19] E. Göller, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.*, 20*–52*; *idem*, "Der liber taxarum der päpstlichen Kammer," *QFIAB*, 8 (1905), 113–73, 305–43; H. Hoberg, "Taxae de communibus servitiis ex libris obligationum ab anno 1295 usque ad annum 1455 confectis," *SteT*, 144 (1949); J. Favier, "Temporels ecclésiastiques et taxation fiscale, le poids de la fiscalité pontificale au XIVᵉ siècle," *Journal des Savants* (1964), 102–27.

[20] J. P. Kirsch, *Die päpstlichen Annaten in Deutschland während des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn 1903); F. Baix, *La chambre apostolique et les "Libri annatarum" de Martin V, 1417–1431,* première partie (1947), with full details of the literature.

[21] E. Hennig, *Die päpstlichen Zehnten aus Deutschland im Zeitalter des avignonesischen Papsttums und während des Grossen Schismas* (Halle 1909).

subsidium caritativum was regulated in the fourteenth century in regard to the amount and made obligatory. For the most part it was collected in locally restricted areas, chiefly for the unending wars in Italy. A *subsidium* demanded in French bishoprics by John XXII brought in between 200,000 and 300,000 florins.[22] Seizure of the estates *(spolia)* of cardinals and higher prelates who had died at the Curia was an old practice, but from the fourteenth century it was demanded on the basis of special reservations until finally Urban V reserved to himself the estates of all bishops, abbots, deans, provosts, and rectors.

The direction of the treasury at the Curia was the duty of the *thesaurarius*, whose office was sometimes shared by two men. Working closely with the treasurer were the *depositarii*, the representatives of the banking firms which gave credit and made loans and saw to the transfer of money. In spite of the imposing mass of account books for the fourteenth century, the question rises whether they afford a complete picture of the Curia's conduct of finances and its background. Lately the opinion has been maintained that they do not represent a balance but rather serve as receipts for sums paid in and as vouchers to the credit of the acting officials; hence, basically they noted only that which had to be ascertained.[23] In any case, in addition to the ordinary administration there were secret funds, which were also called the Pope's privy purse. Clement V had a *liber tam de secretis receptis quam expensis* and records of *dona data domino* and *servitia secreta*, which he had destroyed shortly before his death. For the war in Lombardy John XXII contributed more than 400,000 gold florins "ex coffinis suis," "de bursa sua."

It has been estimated that John XXII had an average annual income of 230,000 gold florins, Benedict XII 165,000, Clement VI 190,000, Innocent VI 250,000, Urban V 260,000, and Gregory XI 480,000. The finances of Clement V are the least clear. Of course, he had received out of the treasure left in Perugia by Boniface VIII and Benedict XI only what he was able to have sent to Lyons for his coronation. Shipments arranged later were plundered at Lucca and Assisi. Just the same he left large sums of money — not to the Church but to his relatives. The treasure amassed by John XXII amounted to about 1,000,000 gold florins; that of the frugal Benedict XII to about 1,500,000. On the other hand, at the death of the very hospitable and generous Clement VI only a small estate remained. The treasure was stored in the mighty fortress at Avignon in secure vaults of the great towers close to the papal bedrooms. Inventories surviving from this period list many coffers of gold and silver coins, then gold and silver vessels and *objets*

---

[22] P. Gasnault, "La perception, dans le royaume de France, du subside solicité par Jean XXII 'contra haereticos et rebelles partium Italiae,'" *MAH*, 69 (1957), 273–319.

[23] J. Favier, "Introitus et Exitus sous Clément VII et Benoît XIII, problèmes de diplomatique et d'interprétation," *Bollettino dell'Archivio paleografico italiano*, new series, II–III (1956 f.), part I, 285–94.

d'art, many expensive gold rings with precious stones, probably accruing for the most part from the *spolia* of cardinals and bishops, costly fabrics, mitres, and books. Cash in the treasure grew steadily less from the mid-century, and frequently valuables of precious metals had to be converted into coin to defray the expenses of the wars in Italy.[24]

In the ledgers of the central administration expenses were classified under the following heads: kitchen, food, drink, stables, clothing and fabrics, *objets d'art* and finery, library, construction, the official seal, extraordinary wages and armaments, *pro cera et quibusdam aliis* (chiefly war expenses), salaries, real estate and houses, alms, and miscellaneous. The average annual expenses of John XXII were computed as 233,000 gold florins, of Benedict XII 96,000, of Clement VI 165,000, of Innocent VI 260,000, of Urban V 300,000, and of Gregory XI 480,000. But it is to be noted that we are insufficiently informed about extraordinary revenues and expenditures. The wars in Italy consumed vast sums — sixty-three percent of the expenses in the pontificate of John XXII and then especially in those of Innocent VI and Gregory XI. Between ten and twenty per cent went for the salaries of officials, and to these must be added the expenses for the maintenance of the court and the curialists. The household of the Popes at Avignon was furnished essentially by the local area, but expenditures for imported luxuries still accounted for from five to ten percent of the annual budget, and the expenses for Clement VI's coronation banquet amounted to over 15,000 gold florins.

Unlike the government of individual states, the Curia had a thoroughly international character with a ceaseless coming and going, to and from all parts of Christendom. And these transactions had been developed since the thirteenth century largely out of great business undertakings, but only on the part of those who had close political connections with the Curia, especially the Florentine wholesale merchants: Bardi, Peruzzi, Acciaiuoli, Bonacorsi, and Alberti. Only Clement V, immediately after his election, broke off all relations with banks and had the money administered by clerics and deposited in monasteries. In view of his personality this is not surprising. Though the rapid development of the curial financial system really began in his pontificate, his inconstant nature and his prolonged wanderings rendered banks out of the question as institutes of credit. But later Avignon became a first-class commercial centre as probably the third city in size at that time, with some 30,000 inhabitants, where most of the great commercial houses set up offices. After the collapse of Florentine high finance around the middle of the century other banking houses, including Italian firms with Guelf sympathies, were temporarily made use of until it was possible to resume business with the Florentine bankers. Not only money transactions in the strict sense were handled by the commercial houses. They were also forwarding agents for the mails and were known as suppliers of commodities and news.[25] Under John XXII and Benedict XII income exceeded expenditures and made possible the investing of the reserve, which had to be drawn upon for the higher expenses under Clement VI and Innocent VI. Urban V and Gregory XI contrived to keep abreast of continually mounting expenditures only by means of loans. Though the revenues of the Curia were smaller in comparison with those of the Kings of France, England, and Naples, they were nevertheless always imposing sums.

---

[24] H. Hoberg, "Die Inventare des päpstlichen Schatzes in Avignon, 1314–76," *SteT*, 111 (1944); P. Guidi, "Inventari di libri nelle serie dell'Archivio Vaticano, 1287–1459," *SteT*, 135 (1948).

It is difficult to resist the impression that at Avignon the Curia felt free to dispose at its discretion of the money gathered from the whole Christian world. Clement V especially, *pastor senza legge*, was outstanding for such caprice. Even the incomplete financial data of his pontificate show clearly that he dealt irresponsibly with the Church's material treasure. Of the 1,000,000 gold florins at his disposal at the close of his reign more than 800,000 went to a nephew, the Viscount of Lomagne, for whom he had already purchased the Château Monteux for the custody of his money and treasure. To the Kings of France and England he made over huge sums in tithes with no obligation of accounting for them. John XXII, elected after a vacancy of two years, received only 70,000 gold florins, half of which was the share of the College of Cardinals. The suit instituted by John XXII, after much patient waiting, against the heirs of Clement V lasted for years, but the Pope was able to recover 150,000 gold florins.[26]

This state of affairs did not escape criticism from those affected. The Council of Vienne summed up much that earlier had been expressed only by complaining voices. Throughout the century, especially during the Great Schism, bishops and abbots and even entire ecclesiastical provinces sought to defend themselves against being rendered impotent by the Curia. Above all, the unceasing and inconsiderate demands for money and the defective administration of the systems of benefices and finances gave scandal. It is true that the initiative did not always lie with the Curia, yet it did bear the responsibility when it yielded to the often very importunate and menacing wishes of kings and princes in nominations to offices and in demands for tithes. Every possibility for the obtaining of money was exploited ruthlessly. For example, benefices often remained vacant for a year or longer to enable the Curia to acquire the revenues during this period; or high-ranking prelates had to assume all the still unpaid *servitia* of their predecessors. Particularly irresponsible was the manipulation of ecclesiastical censures when payments promised under oath were not made on time. The infliction of suspension, excommunication, and interdict followed automatically. Thus on 5 July 1328 it was announced that one patriarch, five archbishops, thirty bishops, and forty-six abbots had incurred suspension, excommunication, and interdict for non-payment of *servitia.* In three charters of the *Camera Apostolica* between 1365 and 1368 seven archbishops, forty-nine bishops, 123 abbots, and two archimandrites in France and Spain are listed as under censure or guilty of perjury.[27]

---

[25] Y. Renouard, "La consommation des grands vins du Bourbonnais et de Bourgogne à la cour pontificale d'Avignon," *Annales de Bourgogne*, 24 (1952), 221–44; R. Delort, "Note sur les achats de draps et d'étoffes effectués par la chambre apostolique des papes d'Avignon (1316–1417)," *MAH*, 74 (1962), 215–88.

[26] F. Ehrle, "Der Nachlass Clemens' V. und der in Betreff desselben von Johann XXII. (1318–34) geführte Prozess," *ALKGMA*, 5 (1889), 1–158.

The unclerical management of the Avignon government, which was continued and multiplied during the Great Schism in two and then in three obediences, led to a serious decline of confidence in the Curia and in ecclesiastical authority.[28] Thus the bitter reproaches hurled at Popes and cardinals during the Schism and the obstinate struggle for a true reform of the Church at Constance and Basel become intelligible. For, if not directly simoniacal, these money transactions were at least incompatible with the predominantly spiritual character of the papacy and introduced a dangerous secularization of the highest Church posts. Did John XXII perhaps feel this when, a few hours before his death, he annulled all reservations?

Chapter 41

Nominalism:
The Universities Between Via Antiqua and Via Moderna

The beginning of the fourteenth century marked a turning point in philosophy and theology. In general this can be characterized as the dissolution of the universalism and objectivism which had found their imposing expression in the *summae* of High Scholasticism. The philosophical and theological syntheses were supplanted by the critical investigation of individual problems. If everything had hitherto been referred to the universal in which individual things participated, interest was now concentrated rather on the concrete thing; it is perceptible directly and does not stand in need of the roundabout recourse to the universal. The individual was more strongly stressed, and the perceiving subject became its own object to a much greater extent. Precedence was given to reasoning and, in contradistinction to doctrinal authority and tradition, the right of criticism was claimed more than hitherto. Epistemology and formal logic thus attained to greater importance. In fact, the great achievements of the century lay in the field of logic. Recognition of this fact is not incompatible with the view that this shift from metaphysics to logic implies the dissolution of the Middle Ages.

---

[27] E. Göller, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.*, 45* f.; P. M. Baumgarten, *Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera collegii cardinalium* (Leipzig 1898), CLXXVII–CLXXXV; P. M. Baumgarten, "Exkommunikation von Prälaten im Jahre 1390 wegen Nichtzahlung der Servitien," *RQ*, 22 (1908), 47–55.

[28] A. Esch, "Bankiers der Kirche im Grossen Schisma," *QFIAB*, 46 (1966), 277–398.

After Duns Scotus, the critical attitude was especially clear in the Dominican Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (d. 1334) and the Franciscan Peter Aureoli (d. 1322), both of whom turned against the great authorities of their respective orders, Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) and Duns Scotus (d. 1308). For human authority should be given little weight in comparison with clear rational knowledge. For it no principle of individuation is needed to bring the individual into existence, no species to recognize it. Peter Aureoli distinguished the thing *in rerum natura* and the thing in so far as it is grasped by our intellect (*res apparens in intellectu*). The universal concept is the product of our cognition (conceptualism).

What was, so to speak, in the air and was variously advertising its presence received its definite impetus, and the form that would characterize the future, in William of Ockham. We are accustomed to label the attitude brought about by him as nominalism, but it is much disputed whether Ockham was a nominalist.[1] A crass nominalism, such as Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109) attributed to Roscelin of Compiègne (*ca.* 1050–1120), was hardly thinkable in the fourteenth century. The great tradition of the thirteenth century had left an imprint which was too deep and strong to allow it.[2] More important is the fact that, in the term nominalism, the epistemological aspect, that is, the controversy over universals, is too much in the foreground, whereas the mentality characterizing it operated with even more serious consequences in metaphysics, ethics, and sociology, and was even more destructive in theology than in philosophy. To speak simply of Ockhamism is equally not permissible, for a certain nominalist trend was inherent in all theology in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and characterized not only Ockham's pupils but also many a theologian actually belonging to the schools of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. Thus, characteristic views of Ockham, such as those of the sovereign omnipotence of God, the acceptance of man, or the act of natural and of supernatural love, were expressed before him and in an even more extreme form by contemporaries, such as the Dominican Peter de Palude (*ca.* 1280–1342) or Scotus's pupil, John de Bassolis (d. 1347).[3]

---

[1] P. Böhner, "The Realistic Conceptualism of William Ockham," *Traditio*, 4 (1946), 307–35; G. Martin, "Ist Ockhams Relationstheorie Nominalismus?", *FStud*, 32 (1950), 31–49; E. Hochstetter, "Nominalismus?", *FStudies*, 9 (1949), 370–403; H. Oberman, "The Theology of Nominalism," *Harvard Theological Review*, 53, 47—79.

[2] *Cf.* Maurice De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy* (London, 3rd. ed. 1909), 425 f.

[3] W. Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre von Duns Scotus bis Luther* (Münster 1963), 289 f.

The nominalism of the fourteenth century is described correctly but not adequately, by designating "as its essence an unrestrained craving for novelty allied to a strong inclination toward a purely skeptical and destructive criticism."[4] This description is too formal and too unsatisfactory in regard to content. For the epistemological starting point of nominalism, which implied a separation of thought and essence, affected all other fields much more directly than at first it seemed to. The often presumptuous speculation with its subtle and hair-splitting questions, which characterized the thinking of the age, was the result of a science which was concerned only with ideas, not with essence. The more the ideas lost ontological significance, the more easily could they be manipulated and the less persons felt the obligation of examining the results of thought in the reality. The separation of thought and essence led in theology to a preference for the investigation of all imaginable possibilities on the basis of the *potentia dei absoluta* and to a neglect of the way of salvation, which was effectively pointed out and binding in the sources of revelation. If the genuine symbolic nature of word and idea was surrendered, soon there was no further place whatsoever for symbols. Thus the approach to a deeper understanding of the Sacraments was barred. In ethics a radical separation of essence and duty and the allied formalism and voluntarism indicated the main feature of nominalism. And in Church-State quarrels criticism would often have been less immoderate, claims would have been championed with less exaggeration, if reality had been kept in mind to a greater degree.[5]

William of Ockham represents in its original radicalism that which characterized the two following centuries but which, as they ran their course, was variously covered over or set straight by the traditional theology of the schools. Born in England around 1285, he became a Franciscan and in 1306 was ordained a subdeacon.[6] In regard to his higher studies at Oxford we can determine only that around 1317–18 he prepared an *ordinatio* on the first book of *The Sentences* and in 1318–20 lectured on *The Sentences;*[7] the commentaries on Books II–IV are preserved. As *baccalaureus formatus* he had fulfilled the requirements for *magister regens* but never took the degree and hence found his way into history as *venerabilis inceptor.* His career was interrupted when his philosophical and theological teaching became the subject of a violent controversy at Oxford. John Lutterell, chancellor of the University, sought to end Ockham's teaching by disciplinary measures.

---

[4] F. Ehrle, *Die Scholastik und ihre Aufgaben in unserer Zeit* (Freiburg, 2nd ed. 1933), 21.

[5] E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie,* 3.

[6] According to a document discovered by C. Walmesley. *Cf. Guillelmi de Ockham Opera Politica,* ed. by J. G. Sikes (Manchester 1940), 288.

[7] C. K. Brampton, "The Probable Date of Ockham's Lectura Sententiarum," *AFrH,* 55 (1962), 367–74, decides for 1318.

Perhaps out of concern for their academic freedom, the professors induced the Bishop to deprive Lutterell of the chancellorship. Then, in an extensive polemical treatise Lutterell in 1323 accused Ockham to the Curia at Avignon of heretical or at least dangerous doctrines. Proceeding from the scriptural text, "see to it that no one deceives you by philosophy and vain deceit" (Col. 2:8), Lutterell charged Ockham with misuse of logic. In so doing he himself employed logic as an instrument of theological proof, aware that this was regarded as a peculiarity of English theologians.[8] His charges in regard to content were especially directed against immoderate speculation *de potentia dei absoluta* in Ockham's teaching on the Eucharist, man's acceptance, and grace.

Pope John XXII summoned the *venerabilis inceptor.* He appeared at Avignon in 1324 and had to defend himself before a commission, which filed two expert opinions against him. Apparently, however, the judges, including so controversial a figure as Durandus, could not agree, and the case was drawn out. By his flight on 26–27 May 1328 to Louis the Bavarian at Pisa, along with Michael of Cesena and Bonagrazia of Bergamo, who were being detained at Avignon because of the poverty controversy, Ockham escaped the court. No condemnation of his philosophical and theological views would be forthcoming, for thereafter the question of poverty and the quarrel between Louis the Bavarian and John XXII claimed the Curia's interest. And Ockham's writings would now be exclusively preoccupied with these matters until his death at Munich in 1349 or 1347.[9] He was never reconciled with the Curia. Thus the philosophical and theological works of the *venerabilis inceptor* all appeared before 1324 or, at the latest, 1328.[10] In addition to the commentary on *The Sentences,* or rather the *Quaestiones on the Sentences of Peter Lombard,* and the *Quotlibeta septem,* there were the *Summa logicae,* the exposition of the logical treatises of Aristotle, published in 1496 as the *Expositio aurea,* the writings on physics,[11] and several smaller treatises, including two *De sacramento altaris* or *De corpore Christi.*

---

[8] In the *Epistula de Visione* he wrote: "Sed mihi opponitis quod nobis Anglicis frequenter hic opponunt: Ecce secundum logicum respondisti. Tolle, tolle! Secundum theologiam responde!" In F. Hoffmann, *Die Schriften des Oxforder Kanzlers Joh. Lutterell* (Leipzig 1959), 117, no. 20.

[9] Against the sources, including the grave inscription, R. Höhne, "Wilhelm Ockham in München," *FStud,* 32 (1950), 142–55, accepts 1349 as the year of his death; C. K. Brampton, "Traditions Relating to the Death of William of Ockham," *AFrH,* 53 (1960), 442–49, clings to 1347.

[10] E. Iserloh, "Um die Echtheit des 'Centiloquium,'" *Gregorianum,* 30 (1949), 78–103, 309–46, and especially page 102; A. Maier, "Zu einigen Problemen der Ockhamforschung," *AFrH,* 46 (1953), 161–94, especially page 163.

[11] *Summulae in libros Physicorum; Expositio super libros Physicorum; Quaestiones super libros Physicorum.*

According to Ockham we have a direct intuitive knowledge of the particular thing. As soon as we make statements we make use of ideas which our mind forms. No universality in things, no universal nature corresponds to universal concepts. At first Ockham looked upon universal ideas as mere figments of thought *(ficta, figmenta)*, but later he identified them with the act of knowing. In the passive intellect the particular thing produces an image similar to itself. The universal is the things imagined and inheres in the soul as its subject. Thus ideas are based on the reality, not of universal substances, but of the particular things. There is no need of a third element, of a means of knowing between subject and intellect and it is precisely in the fact of the passivity of the intellect that the objectivity of knowing is assured.

In his teaching on God Ockham especially stresses God's freedom and omnipotence. He can do whatever does not involve a contradiction. God's will is bound neither externally nor internally. He acts when and as he will. The almighty divine will suffices to explain the *de facto* situation. The good is what God ordains, and even in regard to the order established by him he is entirely free. He could annul the commandments and command theft, unchastity, even hatred of himself. In the *Centiloquium,* a collection of 100 very pointed theses, whose authenticity is today disputed by Ockham's admirers, objection is made to a divine command to hate God as being incompatible with the principle of contradiction, for one who, at God's command, hated him would be loving him by fulfilling his command. Obedience to a divine command and hatred of God are mutually exclusive (*Cl.* 5 and 7).

If God's own action is subject to no necessity, it was the more repugnant to Ockham to assume that God should in any way be bound by man's being and conduct. Even if he strongly emphasized the freedom of man and was confident of man's natural capability, — for example, that man can of himself love God above all things, — in doubt he would always decide in favour of the sovereignty of God. God can save a man in sin and condemn a person in the state of grace. More than once Ockham used the following example for the transition *a contradictorio in contradictorium* by the mere lapse of time: God can decide that all who today are at a specified place will be damned and that all who are there tomorrow will be saved. Now if anyone stays there two days, he who was yesterday rejected is today accepted into favour, without himself or anything in him having been changed (*IV Sent.,* q. 4, L ad 2).

But God has bound himself by his dispositions, which he observes and which acquire their necessity for man from God's *fiat.* What God can do in the abstract, he cannot do in consequence of the order decreed by him; what he can do *de potentia sua absoluta,* he cannot do *de potentia sua ordinata.* In the effort to make clear the contingency of the actual order, Ockham found delight in showing the possibilities which exist on the basis on the *potentia absoluta dei* and deducing further possibilities from them. In these daring speculations concerning *potentia dei absoluta,* which often went beyond the limits of what could be tolerated, he developed a theology of the "as if" and lost sight of the way of salvation actually traced out by God. Moreover, no attempt was made to establish this way of salvation nor to inquire reverently into the wisdom of the ways of God. The presentation of sacred history gave way to the discussion of mere possibility, and theology became a practising ground for logical and dialectical dexterity.

It is in keeping with this attitude that Ockham preferred extreme cases or exceptions and deduced further possibilities. Since God can produce directly whatever he can produce by secondary causes, it can, for example, not be proved that something was produced by a particular secondary cause. Only a *post hoc* but no *propter hoc* can be established. For example, from the fact that, on being brought into contact with fire, something burns, it cannot be proved that fire was the cause of the burning. For God can arrange precisely that, whenever anything is brought into contact with fire, he alone produces the burning, just as he has arranged in regard to the Church that at the uttering of specified words grace is effected in the soul (*II Sent.,* q. 5, R).

Hence one can speak of a causality of the Sacraments only in so far as the sign is a mere condition of the direct action of God. Furthermore, these signs were established quite arbitrarily. God could link the grace of baptism to contact with a piece of wood and determine that confirmation should be conferred with baptismal water (*IV Sent.,* q. 1, G).

The reaching of conclusions by means of exceptions becomes especially clear in Ockham's teaching on the Eucharist, which he restricts to the doctrine of transubstantiation, in fact to the discussion of questions of natural philosophy, such as the relationship of substance and quantity. Ockham would prefer the coexistence of the bread and the body of Christ, for this doctrine in his view opposed neither reason nor Scripture. In fact, he held, it was *rationabilior* and easier to reconcile with the principle of economy, according to which as few miracles as possible were to be posited. For then the greatest difficulty would disappear: the existence of accidents without a supporting substance (*IV Sent.,* q. 6, D). But since the judgment of the Church requires it, Ockham clung to transubstantiation. The accompanying miracle of the continued existence of the accidents after the destruction of the substance became for him the chief proof that corporeal substance is extended in itself and has no need of a really distinct accident of quantity. For if, so he argues, God can permit accidents to exist of themselves, then he can also certainly destroy them and preserve the substance without any local motion of its parts. But then substance would be extended without quantity (*De sacramento altaris,* cap. 25). Furthermore, if God can destroy the accidents of the bread and preserve the body of Christ, the latter must be in the place directly and not by means of the species (*IV Sent.,* q. 4, N, Resp. ad 2 dubium).

Another case of the suspension of the *causa secunda,* namely that God produces in me the intuitive knowledge of something non-existent, became the point of departure for the proof of the possibility of seeing Christ in the Sacrament in a natural manner (*IV Sent.,* q. 5, D).

For Ockham there was no basic distinction between a natural and a supernatural act; they are "eiusdem rationis" (I *Sent.,* d. 17, q. 1, K). By purely natural power man can love God above all things. In this and in his extravagant speculation to the effect that, in the abstract, habitual grace is not necessary for salvation, Ockham incurs the suspicion of Pelagianism. On the other hand, he claimed to be protected from any Pelagian tenet because, according to him, God is independent of every created thing, is no one's debtor, and nothing in man, neither anything good nor anything evil, and no supernatural form inhering in the soul can compel God to save or to damn anyone (*I Sent.,* d. 17, q. 1, M; q. 2, E; *III Sent.,* q. 5, L; *Quotl.,* VI, q. 1). No act is meritorious because of any quality proper to it, even though it may have been produced by God; it is meritorious only on the basis of divine acceptance.[12] Only a theologian who had lost sight of Scripture and a nominalist who no longer asked what intrinsic value there is in a concept could so entirely disregard the objective and subjective importance of *caritas* and regard as possible the simultaneous existence of the state of sin and infused love. Conversely, only such a person could so completely tear asunder habitual grace, or love and beatitude, and no longer realize that one who participates in the divine life, and is not just called a child of God but is one (1 Jn. 3:1), is included in the love with which God necessarily loves himself. For Ockham grace is not a power which is communicated to man, renews him, and qualifies him for meritorious actions, but God's indulgence, whereby he accepts man or not, as he pleases.[13]

Hence the importance of Ockham and his impact on future generations lie not so much in his particular teaching, daringly formulated rather than really original, as in the nature of his theological speculation. The significant and passionate logician failed to place his skill at the service of theology. Instead, theology furnished the occasion for showing off his acrobatics in logic. An inner relationship to the subject was wanting. Theology was no longer the doctrine of salvation, and the theologian could the more easily abandon himself to daring speculations, the less he regarded his salvation as at stake in his theological endeavours.[14]

---

[12] "... solum [actus] est meritorius per potentiam dei absolutam acceptantem" (*Quotl.,* VI, q. 1); "... ut deus per nullam rem possit necessitari ad conferendum unicuique vitam aeternam et sic ista [propria] opinio maxime recedit ab errore Pelagii" (*I Sent.,* d. 17, q. 1, L quanto); *cf.* E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie,* 127.

[13] W. Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre,* asserts against me that one cannot rightly claim that Ockham understood grace merely as the good pleasure or favour of God (271 f., 284, 286). I have not denied but rather have demonstrated in detail (*Gnade und Eucharistie,* 104–26) that Ockham regarded habitual grace as necessary in the existing order. But that is a Church doctrine accepted by him; as Dettloff himself repeatedly stresses, it is of no great weight with Ockham.

In Ockham's own lifetime a school of thought was attributed to him which quickly captivated the universities, Paris at their head; but this school of thought was likewise quite early violently attacked as an innovation. Its adherents were called *nominales* or *moderni* in contradistinction to the *reales*, and the method they represented was called *via moderna*. Immediate disciples of Ockham were Adam Wodham (d. 1358) and John Buridan (d. after 1358). The latter maintained a moderate attitude and, as rector of the University of Paris, even signed a condemnation "of the new teachings of certain Ockhamists" in 1340. He was especially preoccupied with the Ockhamist logic and took up the new efforts for a natural science. The Dominican Robert Holkot (d. 1349), on the other hand, became prominent under the spell of Ockham for his extreme radicalism in the use of nominalist principles and delighted in oversubtle formulations. He questioned the validity of Aristotelian logic in the realm of faith and regarded the existing order as based solely on God's free determination.

Around the middle of the fourteenth century the Ockhamist method had established itself at the University of Paris. As early as 1339 and 1340 the faculty of arts was induced to proceed against abuses of Ockhamism,[15] and the Parisian masters, Nicholas of Autrecourt (d. after 1350) and John of Mirecourt, were personally condemned. The first named became in 1340 the subject of a process at Avignon, which ended in 1346 with the condemnation of sixty propositions. He was especially charged with denying the principle of causality.[16] At the same time a papal bull was directed against the luxuriant growth of disputations in formal logic. Theologians were exhorted to keep to the texts of the old masters and not to neglect the Bible and the Fathers in favour of entirely useless philosophical questions, subtle disputations, and suspected doctrinal views.[17]

The Cistercian John of Mirecourt was denounced for sixty-three suspected propositions in his commentary on *The Sentences*. Despite his written justification, forty-one of his theses were condemned at Paris in 1347 because of their exaggeration of God's arbitrariness and the dangerous consequences resulting for ethics.[18]

---

[14] According to W. Dettloff, *op. cit.*, 290, the negative importance of Ockham lies in this, "that he displays a marked preference for daring theses but hardly any grasp of the subjects of his speculations, neither of God nor of grace nor of the divine economy of salvation." Can there be a more devastating judgment on a theologian? Why, then, his criticism (*op. cit.*, 288) of my evaluation of Ockham?

[15] Denifle-Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, II (Paris 1891), nos. 1023, 1042; for the explanation *cf.* E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie*, 6 f.

[16] Denifle-Chatelain, *op. cit.*, II, 576–87; *Denzinger-Schönmetzer*, nos. 1028–49.

[17] Denifle-Chatelain, *op. cit.*, II, 587, no. 1125.

[18] *Ibid.*, II, 610–14.

Nominalist tendencies in epistemology and harsh anti-Pelagianism in the doctrine of grace characterized Gregory of Rimini, general of the Augustinians, who died at Vienna in 1358. He had studied and taught at Paris, where he became a master in 1345. In the doctrine of acceptance he showed his dependence on Ockham, whose optimism, however, in regard to naturally good works he did not share. Here, as in the doctrine of original sin, he was fascinated by the "founder" of his order, Saint Augustine. Without a special divine aid man cannot overcome temptation to sin, do any naturally good work, or even know what constitutes a morally good life.[19]

Already from the middle of the fourteenth century onwards, the originally excessive radicalism gave way to a more moderate view. Characteristic of the second half of the century, the epoch of the establishing of universities in Germany,[20] were German theologians, such as Marsilius of Inghen (d. 1396) at Heidelberg, Henry Heinbuche of Langenstein (d. 1397) and Henry Totting of Oyta (d. 1396), both of whom eventually taught at Vienna, and their pupil and successor, Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl (d. 1433). They were eclectics, who "were able to deflect the pernicious tendency of nominalism and, almost unnoticed, to regain the connection with the scholastic traditions."[21] And such a series of important theologians is found in this period that one can refer to it as the climax of nominalist-influenced scholasticism, "a climax the more important in that it was followed only by extracts and epitomes in the fifteenth century, which turned into current coin the achievements of the fourteenth century."[22]

In addition, the fifteenth century was, in Harnack's term, decidedly "untheological." Edifying writings, practical moral instruction, and the treatment of rubrical and canonical questions became predominant. Characteristic of this change was the transition at Paris from Peter d'Ailly (d. 1420), a leading representative of "undiluted Ockhamism," to his pupil, John Gerson (d. 1429), who in 1395 succeeded him as chancellor of the University. "It was this nominalist, with his edifyingly scholarly writings, his combination of mystical, Ockhamist, and Thomistic ideas, who became the prototype of an extensive, half-popular, syncretistically inclined theological literature, which was characteristic of the whole fifteenth century."[23] He directed sharp criticism at theological scholarship, with its sophistical-logical ballast, and attacked those who dealt with useless and sterile doctrines while neglecting the truths necessary for salvation and scorning Scripture. He assailed the one-sided preoccupation with the first book of *The Sentences,* which offered more scope for interest in logic and purely formal theologizing, and demanded full treatment of the second to fourth books with the mysteries of salvation history.[24] Considering the need of the age and the danger to souls, it was wrong, he said, to take delight in playing with or even indulging in reveries of superfluous things. No one should deem it beneath him to instruct the uneducated simple people in the faith. It was no mere chance that this nominalist, strictly geared to practice, who stressed the preeminence of mystical over scholastic theology but also warned against the dangers of a too presumptuous mysticism, stood up for the *devotio moderna* at the Council of Constance.

---

[19] II *Sent.*, d. 26–28; P. Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination* (Paris 1934), 154ff.; W. Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre*, 320; *ECatt*, VI, 1156f.

[20] Prague, 1348; Vienna, 1365; Heidelberg, 1386; Cologne, 1388; Erfurt, 1392; Leipzig, 1409.

[21] A. Lang, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta* (Münster 1937), 244.

[22] F. Ehrle, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia* (Münster 1925), 78.

[23] G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik*, II (Heidelberg 1922), 133.

Characteristic of his century was the great compiler, Dionysius the Carthusian (*ca.* 1402–71) from Rijkel in Belgian Limburg. The mere size of his output — the modern edition comprises forty-four bulky volumes — shows him to have been every bit as diligent as he was unoriginal. With great ardour he gathered the fruits of the works of the great philosophers, Fathers, and scholastics and aspired to render them useful for practical piety. Besides a detailed commentary on the Bible (Volumes 1–14) and theological works, he left a large number of sermons (Volumes 29–32) and treatises (Volumes 33–41), which deal especially with questions of the spiritual life, asceticism, and mysticism. In this field he exerted a great influence going beyond his age and the Low Countries. In keeping with his education at Cologne and the fact that he copied and commented on the great men of the past, he is to be assigned to the *via antiqua;* but on the other hand, his work also indicates how party lines became more and more obscured in the fifteenth century.

At the universities, of course, the conflict between the two "ways" was prolonged throughout the fifteenth century. In the course of these developments the *via antiqua* recovered ground. For example, at the University of Cologne, founded in 1388, both ways were allowed by the statutes, but at first nominalism predominated. As early as 1414 the faculty of arts had to resist the efforts of the *antiqui* to suppress the modern methods.[25] But, soon after, the adherents of the *via antiqua* acquired the ascendancy. In 1425 the Electors urged the city of Cologne to reintroduce the modern methods at the University. They regarded Thomas, Albert, and the other teachers of the old school as profound but too difficult for the students, who would be seduced by a lack of understanding into errors and heresies, as the chaos at Prague testified.[26] Tactfully but decisively the University refused, and under men like Henry of Gorkum (d. 1431) became the forerunner of a Thomistic renaissance, which gradually replaced *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard with the *Summa theologiae* as the textbook. In his *Compendium Summae theologiae Sancti Thomae,* printed in 1473, Henry of Gorkum gave an excellent summary of its arrangement and content.[27] Quarrels in the camp of the realists produced temporarily at Cologne a third doctrinal school, the Albertists, whose chief representative was Heymeric van de Velde (de Campo; d. 1460), a pupil of the Parisian master John de Nova Domo. The Albertists denied the real distinction between essence and being and maintained a Neoplatonic dynamic notion of being.[28]

---

[24] *Epistula secunda de reformatione theologiae ad studentes collegii Navarrici, Opera omnia,* ed. by Du Pin, I (Antwerp 1706), 123.

[25] A. G. Weiler, *Heinrich von Gorkum* (Hilversum and Einsiedeln 1962), 57 f.

[26] F. Ehrle, *op. cit.,* 355–58.

Vienna and Erfurt were the only German universities that were exclusively nominalist. Others had been so at first but later opened their doors to the realists. At Heidelberg, where the realist John Wenck (d. 1460), rector in 1435, 1444, and 1451, demanded a sober biblical theology, free from all sophisms and inventions of human ingenuity, the Elector Palatine in 1452 decreed the admission of the *via antiqua* and the equalization of the two ways. This was achieved at Basel in 1464, but at Freiburg not util 1484.[29]

Like Cologne, the Universities of Cracow, Leipzig, Greifswald, Ingolstadt, Tübingen, and Wittenberg gave equality to both ways. If the arts faculty was nominalist, then the theological faculty did not have to be. Here the pressure of tradition was stronger and the influence of professors bound by the school of their order operated in many ways. Indeed, "many teachers who were devoted to the innovation in logic remained conservative in theology."[30] At Paris the conflict of the ways led toward the close of the fifteenth century to the prohibition of nominalists. By a royal decree of 1 March 1474 they were banished from the University and the confiscation of their writings was ordered. However, these measures were annulled in 1481.

In the course of time the originally basic philosophical opposition in epistemology, especially in the solution of the problem of universals, played a more subordinate role, which in many ways was merely artificially maintained. More important were differences in the content of instruction and in the method followed. In the faculties of a nominalist hue more value was set on "terminist" logic. Following the *Summulae* of Peter of Spain (d. 1277), presented in the revision of John Buridan, this logic regarded the concept rather than the judgment as the central point of reflection and in the exposition of a text was not content with presenting the actual content but was more logically concerned with the terms employed. "Nos imus ad res, de terminis non curamus" was a favourite slogan of the realists against the "terminists."

---

[27] M. Grabmann, "Hilfsmittel des Thomasstudiums aus alter Zeit," *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben,* II (Munich 1956), 440–43.

[28] G. Meerssemann, *Geschichte des Albertismus,* 2 vols. (Paris 1933; Rome 1935); R. Haubst, *Studien zu Nikolaus von Kues und Johannes Wenck* (Münster 1955).

[29] *Cf.* J. J. Bauer, *Zur Frühgeschichte der Theol. Fakultät der Univ. Freiburg (1460–1620)* (Freiburg 1957), 118 ff.

[30] A. Lang, *op. cit.,* 159.

The *via antiqua* brought the text of Aristotle, of Peter Lombard, or of Aquinas again into the foreground and was content with an exegesis or paraphrase instead of debating in subtle details special problems in the questions on the text. If the *moderni* could be accused of sophistry and a craze for novelty at any price, the *antiqui* could be reproached for having renounced independent study of the thought contained in the "ancients" and for failure to develop ideas of their own. The orientation to the text and the simplification of theological teaching methods were not the exclusive property of the *via antiqua;* at the middle of the fifteenth century they were shared also by humanism and the Church reform efforts of the age and to some extent by the *devotio moderna.* In any event, humanism did not level its criticism at a scholasticism characterized by special radicalism and the subtlety of its theses — in this respect the climax had been reached *ca.* 1350. Rather, it attacked a school theology already groaning "under the weight of the literary tradition which in the course of the centuries had accumulated an immense mass of 'authorities,' opinions, and controversies, whose eternal ruminations, comparisons, and manipulations for new, and yet basically old, 'conclusions' [had] become an unending business." [31]

CHAPTER 42

Concept of the Church and Idea of the State in the Polemics of the Fourteenth Century: The Laicized State in Marsilius of Padua

The claims of Boniface VIII and John XXII to authority in the secular domain were excessive and not in accord with the doctrine of the two powers developed from the time of Pope Gelasius I (492–96) and still accepted by Innocent III. According to this theory, the ecclesiastical and secular powers are mutually independent but related to each other; the spiritual power is nobler but it is not possessed of superior authority. The pretensions of Boniface VIII and John XXII were likewise historically obsolete, for the West had achieved maturity and the age of a universalism and clericalism occasioned by the situation was past. In 1286 the Dominican John Balbi of Genoa (d. 1298) in his lexicon of the liberal arts could still define the layman as *extraneus a scientia litterarum*, lacking in a literary education.[1] In the meantime, in that very thirteenth century, a far-reaching process of individualization was under way; the individual had been discovered in the universal, and vast intellectual, artistic, and religious forces had been released. Related to this were the awakening of a responsible laity, the growth of cities, and the formation of national states. There was no longer a question solely of the relations of Emperor and Pope, but of the clerical and lay community and the place of man, who was both believer and citizen, in them.

---

[31] G. Ritter, *op. cit.*, II, 98.

The question was to what extent the Church was able to yield to the new claims and how far her religious nature was adequate to bind these driving forces individually and collectively to her own centre. Mere resistance was no solution; an exaggeration of her own position was bound to produce a contrary effect. Statements such as Boniface VIII employed in the introduction to the bull "Clericis Laicos" (1296), "that the laity are hostile to the clergy is proved abundantly by antiquity and is clearly taught by the experiences of the present," did not do justice to reality. It was to be feared that developments, in themselves legitimate, which the Church failed to take promptly into account and in fact opposed, would forcibly find a place for themselves. In this respect the arrest of Boniface VIII at Anagni in 1303, in which the national state and the lay world represented by Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna acted jointly, was a warning signal. If Popes offered the political forces a legitimate ground for resisting them on account of obsolete and exaggerated claims, then it was obvious that the fight would soon be directed against the papacy itself. This struggle was not merely literary, but it was to a great extent prepared and waged by polemical writings and bulky treatises.

On behalf of Pope and Curia the polemic was especially conducted by the Augustinians Aegidius Romanus (1243/47–1316) in *De ecclesiastica potestate* (1302), James of Viterbo (d. 1308) in *De regimine christiano* (1302), and Augustinus Triumphus (1243–1328) in *Summa de potestate ecclesiastica* (1320).

According to Aegidius Romanus, or Giles of Rome, the Church has universal dominion. If she does not ordinarily exercise this directly over worldly things, no fundamental limitation is to be inferred from this fact. At any time she could monopolize secular dominion.[2] In ordinary circumstances, in accord with 2 Timothy 2:4, the sword is to be wielded, not by the Church, but for her and at her bidding (III, 11, p. 205). Outside the Church there exists no right in the full sense. Only baptism makes one a lawful ruler and owner of earthly things. Outside the Church no one can possess in full right a field or vineyard or anything else (III, 11, p. 201). In brief, "the secular power is established through the ecclesiastical and by the Church and for the attaining of the Church's ends."[3]

---

[1] *Summa quae vocatur Catholicon* (ed. Nürnberg 1486), fol. ee, I, ra.

[2] *De ecclesiastica potestate*, Liber III, c. 2, ed. R. Scholz, 149; III, 4, *ibid.*, 161–64.

The work of Aegidius Romanus acquired a far-reaching importance, since it served as the basis of the bull "Unam Sanctam." James of Viterbo did not adopt these extravagant theses of his confrère in *De regimine christiano,* despite his effort to justify the policy of Boniface VIII. In his eyes the secular power does not stand in need of any consecration by the Church to gain legitimacy. It is certainly formed and perfected by the spiritual power.[4] But if the spiritual power is the form of the secular power, as light is the form of colour, then, despite all of James's efforts to maintain the legitimacy of the secular power according to natural law, the door is opened to unilaterally curialist conclusions.

In addition, it is to be realized that we are at the beginning of the fourteenth century, when formal logic acquired a leading role. An excessive confidence in the accuracy of their logic induced the two Augustinians, like many of their contemporaries, to push to extremes, even to "absurd conclusions,"[5] hitherto current axioms, which had been prudently and carefully applied earlier with regard to a living reality, and then not even to test the result of thought by the reality. This is to be regarded also as nominalism, or at least as conceptualism. Major terms of this sort were, for example, the principle of the subordination of the imperfect to the perfect, of the body to the soul, of the temporal to the eternal, of the secular power to the spiritual power, and of the unity of social life. The comparison of secular and spiritual powers to body and soul acquired an entirely different impact after the decision by the Council of Vienne (1311–12) that the soul is the single immediate essential form of the body. For in accord with this the secular power would be an authentic power only through the spiritual power. Thus the same image could acquire in the fourteenth century a significance entirely different from what it had in Augustine, for example, or in the eleventh century. From the "one Lord . . . one God" of Ephesians 4:5, James of Viterbo deduced "unus princeps, unus principatus, unus rector, una res publica,"[6] and Aegidius Romanus concluded:

---

[3] "Bene itaque dictum est, quod terrena potestas est per ecclesiasticam et ab ecclesiastica et in opus ecclesiasticae constituta" (II, 5, p. 59).

[4] "Institutio potestatis temporalis materialiter et inchoative habet esse a naturali hominum inclinatione, ac per hoc a Deo inquantum opus naturae est opus Dei, perfective autem et formaliter habet esse a potestate spirituali quae a Deo speciali modo derivatur. Nam gratia non tollit naturam sed perficit eam et format et similiter, id quod est gratiae non tollit id quod est naturae, sed id format et perficit" (II, 7, ed. Arquillière, 232).

[5] R. Scholz, Introduction to *De ecclesiastica potestate,* p. x; G. de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au declin du Moyen Age,* I (Louvain-Paris, 3rd ed. 1956), 196.

[6] *De regimine christiano,* I, 3, p. 118.

> In the Church Militant there can be only one source of power, only one head, which possesses the fulness of power . . . and both swords, without which its power would not be complete. From this source all other powers are derived.[7]

In opposition to Aegidius Romanus, Augustinus Triumphus in *Summa de potestate ecclesiastica* stressed the independence of the natural order. But it is oriented to the order of grace and is enlisted in its service. The Pope does not establish the secular power but involves it in the economy of salvation by virtue of his spiritual power. However, he can do so only on the basis of the relationship of the princes or citizens concerned to the Church. The state as such does not become a part of the Church, but, to the extent that its members belong to the Church and render the Church's standards operative in it, it becomes a social structure in the *populus christianus.* In the worldly sense the king has no superior (q. 45, 1 ad 2), but only in so far as his power as a Christian authority is an integral part in the economy of salvation. This latter is Augustinus Triumphus's real concern, and his papalist claims are to be understood from this point of departure. It is a question of the "inclusion of the secular order in the economy of salvation and of the proper permeation of the world by the redemption."[8]

The extreme formulation of the curial viewpoint encouraged the development of the contrary doctrine of the independence of the state and of its claims to direct the Church. Of the writings of the legists, that is, of those who sought to shore up the position of the French King, the most important are: *Disputatio inter clericum et militem,*[9] the treatises *Antequam essent clerici*[10] and *Rex pacificus,*[11] and, as the voice of moderation, the *Quaestio in utramque partem.*[12] The legists likewise proceeded from the oneness of power and in this they were supported by Roman Law. The power attributed by it to the Emperor they ascribed to the King of France, who "is Emperor in his Kingdom."[13] The supreme power of emperor or king respectively is inalienable. Therefore, the Donation of Constantine is to be regarded as unauthentic and the privileges of the clergy in regard to taxation and courts are to be abolished. The clergy, who "have become fat and obese because of the piety of princes," must have their recompense. But if the laity place the means at their disposal, then the laity must be permitted to supervise them to see whether such means are used properly. As a matter of principle they state that "Holy Mother Church consists not only of clerics but also of lay persons."[14] Did Christ not die for all the faithful? Among the laity the French King performs a special function, for according to Peter Dubois, he is "the most Christian King, the defender of the Church," and France is the *directrix veritatis.*[15]

---

[7] *De ecclesiastica potestate,* III, 2, p. 152; *cf.* the bull "Unam Sanctam": ". . . Unum caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum . . . Uterque ergo [gladius] est in potestate ecclesiae."

[8] W. Kölmel, "Einheit und Zweiheit der Gewalt," *HJ,* 82 (1963), 143.

[9] Ed. M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* I (Hanover 1612), 13–18; *cf.* R. Scholz, *Publizistik* (Stuttgart 1903), pp. 333–52; J. Rivière, *Le problème* (Paris 1926), pp. 253–62.

[10] Text under a wrong title in P. Dupuy, *Histoire du différend d'entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel* (Paris 1955), 21–23.

[11] P. Dupuy, *op. cit.,* 262–71; *cf.* J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* 135–37, 262–71; R. Scholz, *Publizistik,* 252–75.

[12] M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* II (Frankfurt 1614), 95–107; R. Scholz, *Publizistik,* 224–51.

[13] *Quaestio in utramque partem,* M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 98.

If the Pope has an indirect power in the temporal sphere, then, according to John of Paris (d. 1306), an advocate of the doctrine of the two powers, the king has the same in the spiritual domain. He can "indirectly" excommunicate an unworthy Pope and *per accidens* depose him, by himself or through the cardinals.[16]

Laity and state emerged from these disputes with a more vivid sense of their independence and a growing awareness of their rights and duties, even with regard to the spiritual. Whereas the defenders of the Curia, frequently in a most presumptuous manner, advocated an abstract system that did not correspond to the Church's past nor take account of her future, and thus missed the reality and the opportune moment, the representatives of the state registered such elementary rights as sovereignty over property and persons, judicial supremacy, autonomy in legislation, and a certain control of the intellectual life of the nation.[17] Though individual demands may have been expressed obscurely and exaggerated, a justified concern was present in them and the future was to belong to it.

Marsilius of Padua

The struggle of the legists, in the name of princes and cities, for the autonomy and independence of the secular power against encroachments of the spiritual did not terminate in a separation of Church and State in the modern sense but rather in a State Church or at least an extensive control of Church life by the secular power. In the *Defensor pacis* of Marsilius of Padua this attitude led to the total destruction of the ecclesiastical power and the total control of all aspects of life, including the Church, by the purely secular laicized state, so called because in final analysis deprived of authoritative values.

It is assumed that Marsilius was born at Padua between 1275 and 1280 and there began his studies. The first certain date is that of his rectorship as master of arts from December 1312 to March 1313 at the University of Paris. As a partisan of the Ghibellines he seems to have taken part in the Italian factional strife from around 1314, and he carried out diplomatic tasks for Can Grande della Scala and Matthew Visconti. Between times he tried to obtain a benefice at the Avignon Curia. From 1320 he again concentrated on study at Paris in natural philosophy, medicine, and perhaps theology. Here he was intimately associated with the leader of the Parisian Averroists, John of Jandun (d. 1328), who probably inspired the *Defensor pacis* but cannot be called its coauthor.[18] Marsilius completed this, his chief work, in June 1324, shortly after the Sachsenhausen Declaration of Louis the Bavarian. This great book was probably intended from the outset to play a role in the antipapal activity to which had rallied Ghibellines, cardinals of the opposition, and Spirituals.[19] But it was not until 1326 that Marsilius fled with John of Jandun to the court of Louis the Bavarian in Germany, probably because his authorship had become known. At first Louis apparently did not want to compromise his case with the work of these men, who were to be condemned as heretics on 3 April 1327.[20] But during the Emperor's journey to Rome (1327–29) Marsilius and his friend were the influential advisers. Events such as the imperial coronation in the name of the Roman people and the installing of the Antipope appear to be the realization of the basic ideas of *Defensor pacis.*[21] Following the collapse of the Emperor's Italian policy, Marsilius lived at Munich as a physician. His influence seems to have been insignificant in comparison with that of the more moderate William of Ockham and the other Franciscans. At this time he wrote the *Tractatus de translatione Romani imperii,* the opinion on *The Imperial Jurisdiction in Matrimonial Cases,* and the *Defensor minor* (1342). His death must have occurred soon after the appearance of the last named work, for on 10 April 1343 Clement VI referred to him as lately deceased.

---

[14] *Antequam essent clerici*, ed. P. Dupuy, *op. cit.*, 21 f.

[15] The King himself said in 1303: "Cum in talibus et similibus casibus semper directrix veritatis exstiterit regia domus nostra"; *cf.* P. Dupuy, *op. cit.*, 124 f.; G. de Lagarde, *op. cit.*, I, 207.

[16] *De potestate regia et papali*, c. 13, ed. J. Leclercq (Paris 1942), 214.

[17] G. de Lagarde, *op. cit.*, I, 210.

According to the *Defensor pacis,* peace, the principle of order in the state and the basic presupposition for human happiness, is greatly disturbed. In an effort to inquire into the causes of this and to indicate the fundamental principles for the assuring of peace, Marsilius develops his theory of state and society. In this he is guided by his experiences in the North Italian city states, the writings of the French legists, and the Averroist interpretation of the Aristotelian political doctrine. According to him the fundamental evil is the papal pretension to the fulness of power, to a *vis coactiva* over Church, princes, and kingdoms; as a matter of fact, that, in addition to the state, another principle of power should claim the right to exist. Opposing this, Marsilius stresses the unity of power. "The multiplicity of sovereign powers . . . is the root and origin of corruption" (II, 23, 11; *cf.* I, 17, 1–9).

---

[18] Ed. R. Scholz, li ff.; A. Gerwirth, "John of Jandun and the Defensor pacis," *Speculum,* 23 (1948), 167–72.

[19] Ed. R. Scholz, lvii.

[20] Bull "Licet iuxta;" *MGConst,* 6, 1, 265, no. 361.

[21] O. Bornhak, *Staatskirchliche Anschauungen und Handlungen am Hofe Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern* (Weimar 1933).

The state is the union of men for the sake of a satisfying existence (*sufficienter vivere*, I, 5, 5). What the individual cannot do, the state accomplishes in its various professions. Among these is included also the priesthood, for the state must assure the earthly and the supernatural welfare of man. "The legislator or the first and specific efficient cause of law is the people or the totality of citizens or a majority of them" (I, 12, 3). The people, as *legislator humanus,* commits the exercise of power to a ruler *(princeps),* who has to preserve and guarantee peace, which makes possible the good life for the citizens.

Every other power, and hence that of the Church, is delegated. Inasmuch as priests and bishops exercise power, they receive it from the believing human legislator, that is, from the lay hand. The Church is "the totality of the faithful, who believe in Christ's name and invoke him" (II, 2, 3).

> Therefore all Christ's faithful are churchmen *(viri ecclesiastici)* in the truest and most proper meaning and must be so called, priests and those not priests, for Christ has acquired and redeemed all by his blood . . .; hence bishops or priests and deacons are not exclusively the Church, which is the bride of Christ (II, 2, 3).

The priesthood is a divine institution. "Christ gave priestly power to the Apostles and he still gives it today, whenever one of them invests his successors with full powers through the imposition of hands" (II, 15, 3). "This power, inseparable from the priest as priest, . . . this priestly character is possessed by all priests in the same manner, and neither the Bishop of Rome nor any other possesses any more comprehensive power than any so-called simple priest" (II, 15, 4; *ibid.,* 15, 5, 7). Hence the hierarchy is of human law; "not God directly but the human will and mind" (I, 19, 8; II, 15, 6) created it for the sake of order, "like the other offices of the state." The attempt to deduce a special dignity of the Bishop of Rome from the Petrine succession runs aground on the impossibility of proving Peter's being in Rome (II, 16, 15). No real external power is, however, given along with the priestly character bestowed by God. In confession the priest can merely "declare to whom God has retained or pardoned sins" (II, 6, 7). He has no *vis coactiva,* for offenses against the divine law are not punished in this world (II, 9, 3–10; III, 2, 3), unless they are also forbidden by human law. But then it is the business of the state to prosecute and excommunicate the heretic. At the most the priest is called upon as a specialist for an opinion.

In disputes over doctrinal questions or uncertainties as to the meaning of a scriptural passage the decision pertains "to a council of all the faithful or of their delegates" (II, 18, 8). As the rule of faith Marsilius laid down:

"Only the divine or canonical Scripture and every interpretation that is convincingly deduced from it and that which is handed down by a general council is true; it is necessary for eternal salvation to believe these" (III, 2, 1). But the council is not an autonomous body beside the state; on the contrary, it is instituted in it, so to speak, as an organ for definite questions. Only "the believing human legislator or the one who rules through it by proper authority" has the power "to convoke or direct a council, to choose and determine suitable persons for it, command the observance of the conciliar decrees, and punish transgressors" (II, 21, 1; II, 18, 8). The decisions of the council have their truth from the Holy Spirit, "but from the human legislator the authority which enforces their acceptance and their propagation by priests" (II, 19, 3). If, "by a council or the believing human lawgiver," a bishop or a church is appointed as head and ruler of the others, then this bishop together with the college of priests assigned to him by the legislator, can, in case of necessity, ask for the summoning of a council (II, 22, 6).

Accordingly, there exist no clerical person and no college which were not delegated by the *legislator humanus,* that is, by the totality of citizens. The frequently recurring phrase, *concilium generale vel fidelis legislator humanus,* shows to what an extent *universitas fidelium* and *universitas civium* are identical for Marsilius and that the council is not a separate entity. For Marsilius, the Church is directed neither monarchically by a Pope nor collegially by the episcopate nor democratically by a council. She is also not purely spiritualized but fully disintegrated. She is devoid of any character as a society and has become a mere function of the state. From this arise two difficulties. For Marsilius the universal state is not the ideal; in his view peace and the public welfare are better guaranteed in several states (*cf.* for example, II, 28, 15). But if the *universitas civium* and the *universitas fidelium* are to him identical, then the council, which is conceived as a universal institution, must have its counterpart in a realm which unites all Christendom and in which the conciliar decrees have the force of law. Can the prince of a national state be the "believing human lawgiver, who recognizes no higher power,"[22] or is an emperor or a world state still postulated? Marsilius ignores this question. But he does not wish to pass over the second question in silence (II, 22, 12). If the believing human lawgiver alone renders the Church capable of functioning, if he summons the council, appoints priests, looks after worship, and so forth, who assumes these tasks when believers are subjects of unbelieving lawgivers? In the age of the persecutions, so Marsilius claims, the Church was charismatically guided. Believers were prepared to obey the bishops, and in particular the Roman Bishops, who excelled in love of God and exemplary poverty, in order to preserve the unity of faith and peace. For this could "be achieved neither by coercive power nor in any more appropriate manner, because the human legislator was at that time almost everywhere an unbeliever" (II, 25, 3). Hence, the Primitive Church was a state of emergency, which was only ended by Constantine.

---

[22] "... fidelis legislator humanus superiore carens" (II, 19, 3, p. 386). *Cf.* R. Scholz, "Marsilius und die Genesis des modernen Staatsbewusstseins," *HZ,* 156 (1937), 88–103 (especially page 102).

On 23 October 1327 five propositions of the *Defensor pacis* were condemned as heretical: 1. That Christ by paying the tribute money intended to testify to his subordination to the secular power. 2. That Peter had no more authority than the other Apostles. 3. That the Emperor can appoint, depose, and punish the Pope. 4. That all priests are equal in degree. 5. That priests have no penal authority of themselves but only by grant of the Emperor.[23] Despite this condemnation the book and its ideas continued to be influential. Louis the Bavarian had it read to himself[24] and his Italian policy determined by it. However, a moderating tone gained ground at the court of Munich with the Franciscans Michael of Cesena and Ockham. And the German jurists who were fighting for the independence of the German kingship, for example Lupold of Bebenburg (d. 1363) and Conrad of Mengenberg (d. 1374), did not share Marsilius's radical principles on the relations of Church and state. In the fifteenth-century struggles over the constitution of the Church the *Defensor pacis* again became influential. While the heretic and determined foe of the papacy was rejected and his doctrine of the laicized state was not accepted, his historical and moral criticism of the abuses in the Church were. This is true of Dietrich of Niem (d. 1418) in his *De modis uniendi et reformandi ecclesiam in concilio universali* (1410)[25] and of Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464) in his great reform treatise *De Concordantia Catholica* (1432–33).[26] In summary it can be stated that the *Defensor pacis* was too radical to exert an immediate influence, but indirectly it had a great and far-reaching effect.

William of Ockham

It was not until his Munich period that William of Ockham was concerned with the poverty dispute and the relations between the spiritual and the secular powers. His philosophical and theological works appeared before his flight from Avignon in 1328; his fifteen ecclesiastico-political writings,[27] without exception, after it. "Emperor, protect me with your sword; then I will defend you with my pen," he is alleged to have said as a refugee in the train of Louis the Bavarian.[28]

---

[23] D (32nd ed. 1963), nos. 941–46.

[24] *Compendium maius,* R. Scholz, *Streitschriften,* II, 184.

[25] *Cf.* Dietrich of Niem, *Dialog über Union und Reform der Kirche 1410,* ed. by H. Heimpel (Leipzig and Berlin); H. Heimpel, *Studien zur Kirchen- und Reichsreform des 15. Jahrhunderts,* Part I, "Eine unbekannte Schrift Dietrichs von Niem über die Berufung der Generalkonzilien (1413/14)," (Heidelberg 1929); *idem, Dietrich von Niem* (Münster 1932).

[26] R. Scholz, "Marsilius von Padua und Deutschland," *Marsilio da Padova. Studi Raccolti,* ed. by A. Cecchini et al., 3–35.

The Pope had already taken a final stand in the poverty dispute with "Quia Vir Reprobus" (1329),[29] the *Defensor pacis* had appeared, and the decisive events had taken place during Louis the Bavarian's journey to Rome — the imperial coronation and the appointment of the Antipope — when Ockham intervened in the discussion in 1333–34 with his *Opus nonaginta dierum*, so called because he claims to have composed the voluminous work in ninety days. Ockham could merely establish and defend what was already an accomplished fact. He was and continued to be a philosophical and theological thinker, accustomed to pursue questions to their ultimate possibilities in a critical and biased speculation and as far as possible to go back to principles and sources. Although he was unable to deny his own opposing stand and its origin in the polemics of the day, he did not get stuck in them.

The great ecclesiastico-political writings, the *Opus nonaginta dierum* (1333–34), his extensive but still incomplete principal work, *Dialogus inter magistrum et discipulum de imperatorum et pontificum potestate* (1333–38), and the *Super potestate summi pontificis octo quaestiones* present the difficulty that the author does not clearly come forth with his own opinion but lets the several sides speak and refers to himself only as the narrator. For the sake of the disputation, a sort of school exercise, he can expound the most audacious theses without identifying himself with them and he cannot be tied down to them.[30] As evidence for Ockham's view these writings can be used only with caution. He expressed himself more directly, in a more exact form, and, as to content, more clearly and more moderately in the *Breviloquium de principatu tyrannico super divina et humana* (1342) and in *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate* (1347), the final and comprehensive exposition of his views on Church politics.

As with his image of God and man, Ockham's doctrine of state and

---

[27] According to the count of R. Scholz, who cites the second and third parts of the *Dialogus* separately, there are seventeen; *cf. Breviloquium*, p. 7, footnote 1, with the indication of the editions.

[28] John Trithemius (d. 1516), *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Cologne 1546), 233.

[29] *Bull Fr*, V, no. 820, 408–49.

[30] In the *Dialogus* the "pupil" says: "Neque asserendo neque dubitando aliquid sis dicturus sed solummodo recitando, sicut pro toto isto Dialogo peractum est inter nos" (Goldast, *Monarchia*, II, 771) or "Nolo, ut quod tenes in mente, reveles, sed responsiones aliquas, quae cogitari vel teneri potuerint a quocunque, non differas recitare" (*ibid.*, 504). On the other hand Ockham observes in the *Breviloquium:* "Porro, quia in hoc opere non tantummodo recitando, sicut in praedicto dialogo et quibusdam aliis operibus, sed in aliqua asserendo constanter, aliqua absque assertione temeraria opinando, verborum faleras relinquendo procedam. . ." (ed. R. Scholz, 40).

Church and of their mutual relations is determined by freedom — the freedom of the individual in Church and state and the freedom of the secular ruler *vis-à-vis* the Pope. The principle of economy of his philosophy attests the sociological doctrine that no more obligations and norms should be permitted than the public welfare requires. In particular it is important to safeguard freedom against "the Church of Avignon, which stubbornly maintains errors, indeed manifest heresies, . . . and is currently guilty of the gravest injustices against the rights and the liberties of the faithful, great and small, lay and cleric . . ."[31]

Opposing the monism of both the curialists and Marsilius of Padua, Ockham defends a theory of the two powers, in which both powers are mutually complementary, are even "allied in a mutual dependence."[32] Apart from the divine law, Emperor and Pope in their respective spheres have no such absolute power that it could not be limited by the freedom of the individual and by the public welfare. Ockham firmly emphasizes the independent status of the secular power. There was a lawful worldly order before Christ and before the Church. The Empire was not first made legitimate by the baptism of Constantine; the pagan Roman Empire already had real jurisdiction and hence was acknowledged by Christ and the Apostles (*Breviloquium,* IV, 10; III, 2). Like private ownership, the political order also, "the power to appoint rulers who have secular powers of government," is derived from the divine arrangement. After the fall the liberty of the primeval condition, like the absence of ownership, could not be maintained any longer, and for the sake of *bene et politice vivere* governmental power was necessary (*Brev.,* III, 7). And though this is transmitted by means of men, it comes from God. "All mortals who were born free and have not been subjected to another by human law derive from God and nature the right freely to elect a ruler" (*Brev.,* IV, 10). If peoples are forcibly subjugated, dominion becomes legitimate only through their inner assent. Ockham is unable to say when such was the case, for example in the Roman Empire. Anyhow it is true that "the power to make laws and establish human rights lay first and originally in the people, who transferred it to the Emperor" (*Brev.,* III, 14). But the transmission of power by the totality of the citizens does not include the right to terminate allegiance. And if the authority of princes is termed dominative, in contrast to the ministerial office of the Pope (*De potestate,* c. 6 and 7), it is still not unlimited. It finds its limits in the liberties of man, which are of an earlier origin than the state, and in the public welfare, for which authority is instituted (*Brev.,* II, 5).

The Church is the community of all the faithful. To the nominalist, who does not recognize the relation as real and for whom the totality is only the

[31] *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate,* c. 1, ed. R. Scholz, 454.

[32] W. Kölmel, *W. Ockham und seine kirchenpolitischen Schriften,* 223.

sum of its parts, the Church is a multiplicity of individuals. In fact, she is a phantom and a chimera. To be exact, just as there is not an order apart from the Franciscans subject to the law of poverty but only a *persona repraesentata,* which possesses a *ius utendi,* so it is a fiction to speak of the Church as a legal person.[33] As the community of the faithful, she has, according to Christ's will, a monarchical form of government. He appointed Peter as his vicar. Differing from Marsilius of Padua, Ockham concedes to the Pope real power transmitted by Christ. "Christ would not have taken sufficient care of the Church and would have neglected something necessary" (*De potestate,* c. 8), if he had not given her in the Pope the principal who should see to all things necessary for the salvation of the faithful and guide them. But Christ did not invest Peter with full power, either in the secular or in the spiritual sphere (*De potestate,* c. 2). It is entirely clear that he did not give him absolute power *in temporalibus,* for otherwise he would have made slaves of all and there would no longer be any "evangelical liberty" *(De potestate,* c. 1). But the spiritual power also has its limits. Ockham speaks of the "ancient boundaries" (*De potestate,* c. 15, 1) to which the Church of Avignon should be again reduced. The Pope is not allowed to command everything which is not contrary to the divine precept and natural law *(De potestate,* c. 1). For example, he is bound to respect the legitimate titles of kings, whether Christian or non-Christian. Furthermore, liberty must not be unnecessarily restricted. The Pope's full authority extends only to what is necessary for the salvation of souls and the guidance of the faithful. "All else, even though it be spiritual, he must not command, lest the law of the Gospel become a law of slavery" (*De potestate,* c. 10; *Brev.*, II, 4). The Pope's power is one, not of dominion, but of service.[34]

Despite the rigorous inclination to confine the Pope within his limits, Ockham foresees the case in which he directly assumes secular duties. In an emergency, when the proper authorities fail or break down, the Pope may and should intervene in worldly affairs for the sake of the common welfare.[35] Without using the expression, Ockham is thereby championing the theory of the *potestas indirecta in temporalibus.* There are no rules for such a case. The greatest discretion is indicated and the counsel of experienced and impartial men is necessary (*De potestate,* c. 13).

Eminent as is the Pope's dignity as Christ's deputy, above him is the *Ec-*

---

[33] "... hoc dicunt fantastice dictum: quia ordo est verae personae, sicut ecclesia est verae personae" *(Opus nonaginta dierum,* c. 62, Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 1108).

[34] "... principatus non dominativus, sed ministrativus" (*De potestate,* c. 6); "Papa autem est pater fidelium, et principatus eius non assimilatur principatui despotico, sed paterno; ergo non habet talem plenitudinem potestatis" (*Breviloquium,* II, 6).

[35] "In casu autem necessitatis ... quando omnes alii, ad quos spectarent, deficerent, posset et deberet temporalibus se immiscere" *(De potestate,* c. 10; *cf. Dialogus,* III, 1, 1, c. 16, Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 785 f.).

clesia Universalis. Not to be identified with the contingent aspect of *Ecclesia Romana* or *Avionica,* she will never fall into error. But every individual in her can err, Pope as well as layman. Even a council is not protected from error. This *Ecclesia Universalis,* guided and kept free of error by the Holy Spirit, could eventually be represented in an individual man, a woman, or even in children under age.[36] Accordingly, Ockham cannot, without more ado, be termed a precursor of conciliarism. He did not himself travel the road of the council and in his writings, except for the *Dialogus,* the council plays no special role. In any event, it cannot be an absolute standard in matters of faith. Final resort is Holy Scripture and reason. Pope, clergy, and council must answer to them.[37]

If in *De corpore Christi* (*ca.* 1323) Ockham had asserted that his faith was that of the Roman Church, that he intended to maintain only what she taught and observed,[38] still in the *Breviloquium* he is unwilling to submit to anyone's correction whatever is made certain by Scripture, by rational insight, or in some other way.[39] In his last work, *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate,* he appeals to the public, because there could no longer be any question of the Pope as a judge and the "Church of Avignon" had succumbed to the greatest heresies. He does not want to submit to the majority but only to rational insight and the clear testimony of Scripture. The crowd, he said, has quite often erred and more than once in the history of the Church truth has been found in an individual (c. 1). Here Ockham is that individual. But it can also be the Emperor. In a state of emergency in the Church the Emperor can intervene in the spiritual realm, just as the Pope in cases of necessity can intervene in the temporal. For example, the Emperor can convoke a council or even depose the Pope. But he can do so, not by virtue of his office, but only as a believing member of the Church (*De potestate,* c. 12). For if the clergy fail, the laity bear responsibility for the Church. But there is no tribunal to decide when they must intervene on behalf of the faith and of the public good.

---

[36] "Fides etiam beati Petri, pro qua Christus rogavit, nequaquam deficeret, quia reperiretur in parvulis. Parvuli enim habent habitum fidei; ergo errante tota multitudine Christianorum usum rationis habentium, possunt salvari promissiones Christi per parvulos baptizatos; ergo temerarium est asserere, quod numquam tota multitudo Christianorum usum rationis habentium contra fidem errabit" (*Dialogus,* I, 5, c. 35, Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 506); *cf.* G. de Lagarde, *op. cit.,* V (1963), 151.

[37] G. de Lagarde, *op. cit.,* V, 53–86; Ockham is no conciliarist nor does the principle of popular sovereignty dominate his ecclesiology, as Seeberg, III (Darmstadt, 5th ed., 1963), 589, maintains.

[38] "... me nihil asserturum nisi quod Romana tenet et docet ecclesia" (prologue); "Quicquid enim Romana ecclesia credit hoc solum et non aliud vel explicite vel implicite credo" (c. 1; ed. Strasbourg 1491, fol. C, I, ra.); G. de Lagarde, *op. cit.,* V, 139.

[39] "Quae autem per scripturas sacras vel per rationem evidentem aut quocumque modo sunt certa, nullius correctioni subicio" (prologue, ed. R. Scholz, 40).

In case of necessity the Emperor may, on his own authority, requisition Church property for worldly tasks.[40] Ockham distinguishes between the temporal property necessary for the support of clerics — this belongs to the Church *iure divino* — and whatever, over and beyond this, is entrusted to the Church *iure humano*, from the generosity of kings and laity, *ad pias causas:* care of the poor and strangers, construction of churches, and so forth. The donor can determine the use, and the Pope has no authority over this. On the other hand, the King can dispose of the Church property donated by himself or his predecessors without consulting the Pope. He can "on his own authority in case of need demand subsidies from the churches for pious ends" (*De potestate*, c. 24). According to the treatise *An rex Angliae*, among these *piae causae* is included the defense of the country, for the welfare of the fatherland is superior to that of its poor. Now the clergy must make the goods of the Church available for the poor and hence all the more for the defense of the fatherland.[41] It is more religious to defend the fatherland than to care for the poor. Urgent cases in which it is even unlawful to ask the Pope or to observe his prohibition include danger to the King's life, his capture, the release of prisoners, and bridge-building.[42]

Ockham's efforts for a definition of the competence of the secular and spiritual powers are noteworthy. In emphasizing their mutual independence in reciprocal assistance he could have prepared for an adjustment in accord with reality. But his polemical stand in the struggle for the Emperor's rights against the Curia and the opinion he championed in the poverty dispute, according to which the Church, emulating Christ's poverty and powerlessness, should, as far as possible, renounce all functions in the world, caused him to underestimate the danger of state absolutism and so to expand the absolute powers of the secular authority that he promoted an *étatisme*. He stressed the liberty of the individual and of princes, but on the other hand did not even concede to the Pope the defense of the liberty of the Church as a justification of his actions, "for the liberty of the Church and her honour in this world are to be reckoned among the least important goods" (*De potestate*, c. 23). "*Libertas evangelica* comes to a halt in a certain sense before the thrones of kings in the service of their expansion of power."[43]

---

[40] *De potestate*, c. 24; *cf.* the treatise *An rex Angliae pro succursu guerrae possit recipere bona ecclesiarum*, R. Scholz, II, 432–53.

[41] *An rex Angliae*, c. 8; R. Scholz, II, 444.

[42] *Ibid.*, c. 11.

[43] W. Kölmel, *W. Ockham und seine kirchenpolitischen Schriften*, 150 f.

CHAPTER 43

The Spiritual Movement and the Poverty Dispute

In the very lifetime of Saint Francis there had begun among his friars a vehement struggle over the ideal of absolute poverty. In it victory had soon gone to the circles which, because of the necessity resulting from the order's world-wide expansion and in the interests of a fruitful care of souls, modified the saint's ideal by means of papal privileges and interpretations of the rule to such an extent that absolute poverty was abandoned. In 1245 Innocent IV (1243–54) had declared[1] the movable and immovable property of the Franciscans to be the property of the Roman Church, and in 1247 he had allowed them procurators who could take care of legitimate business affairs according to the will of the friars, that is, "they are permitted to collect, sell, exchange, alienate, trade, spend, ... and use for the needs of the friars."[2] If this development was necessary, it was also ominous and the source of criticism and unrest that officially the founder's ideal was adhered to and the order claimed to practice the poverty desired by Francis. It was only a matter of time until the friars would be reproached on the ground that their poverty was a legal fiction.

Around the same time, at the middle of the thirteenth century, the spiritualism of Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202) gained a foothold in Franciscan circles. Gerard of Borgo San Donnino (d. 1276) in his *Liber Introductorius* (1254) published the three chief writings of the Calabrian Abbot as the "Eternal Gospel," which was supposed to be preached by the Franciscan Order from 1260 in place of the old Gospel. The order, he said, was the prophesied Spiritual Church, which would replace the property-holding Priestly Church. Pope Alexander IV had the *Introductorius* burned in 1255, and Gerard was imprisoned. But his opponent, the Master William of Saint-Amour, who had attacked the mendicant orders as such in the controversy at the University of Paris and had condemned poverty as morally evil, was also condemned by the Pope in 1256. Saint Bonaventure, minister general of the order from 1257 to shortly before his death in 1274, had thus to defend Franciscan poverty *(Quaestio de paupertate)* and at the same time to fight the Joachimite apocalyptic currents in the order. He sought to save the ideal of poverty and to restrict the use of property as much as possible. In accordance with Bonaventure's ideas, Pope Nicholas III (1277–80) issued an authentic explanation of the rule in the Constitution "Exiit qui seminat" of 14 August 1279.[3] It stressed the sanctity of evangelical poverty and the obligation to its observance on the basis of the rule, but, by distinguishing between property or the right of usufruct and simple use (*usus moderatus*), enabled the Franciscans to retain their houses and the use of their properties. As a result the stricter element was rendered all the more unhappy, for even this modified ideal of poverty was not observed by a great part of the order and since the death of Bonaventure a decline of discipline was becoming widespread. Hence the dispute over poverty continued.

---

[1] "Ordinem vestrum" of 14 November 1245, in *Bull Fr,* I, no. 114, p. 401.

[2] "Quanto studiosius" of 19 August 1247, in *Bull Fr,* I, no. 235, p. 487.

[3] *Bull Fr,* III, no. 127, p. 404.

Spokesman was Peter John Olivi (d. 1298). The point in controversy was not whether there could be property or not, but the restricted use of earthly goods, the question whether an *usus pauper* was desirable and whether it was implied in the order's vow. Olivi gave his support for it and demanded this "use of things in a spirit of poverty" even by bishops belonging to the order. Renunciation of earthly possessions without a real life of the poor was, he said, similar to matter without form and brought the members of the order the scorn of the world.[4] Olivi had to vindicate himself at the general chapter in Montpellier (1287). Nevertheless, in Provence and in Italy a growing circle of zealots for poverty was forming around him. People were beginning to call them the "Spirituals" in contradistinction to the "Conventuals," who tried to adapt themselves to the situation and to achieve a mitigation based on the interpretations of the rule by Gregory IX and Nicholas III. The Conventuals were thereafter in a difficult position because all abuses were laid at their door and they were held responsible for the decline of fidelity to the rule, although they also struggled against it.

With the pontificate of Celestine V (1294) the Spirituals felt they had achieved their goal. He permitted a group of them under Angelus of Clareno and Peter of Macerata ("Liberatus") to live the rule in its full austerity according to the last will of Saint Francis, as a special branch of the order. Great was their disappointment when this "Angel Pope" gave way to the totally different Boniface VIII. Ubertino da Casale, who became leader of the Spirituals after Olivi's death in 1298, later branded the new Pope as the beast of the Apocalypse, the "mystical Antichrist." Boniface abolished the privilege of exemption granted by Celestine and in 1295 deposed the general, Raymond Gaufridi (d. 1310), who was friendly to the Spirituals.

The quarrel in the order continued. The harsh proceedings of the Conventuals, under the general Gonsalvo de Valboa (1304–13), against the Spirituals and the latters' charges against their persecutors and the presence of their influential patrons among princes and cardinals made it impossible for Clement V not to concern himself with the poverty question. As spokesman of the Spirituals at the Avignon Curia, Ubertino da Casale in his memorandum "Sanctitas Vestra"[5] at the end of 1309 emphasized that the order had declined profoundly because of various offenses against the letter and the spirit of the rule, particularly the view that the *usus pauper* was not binding on the basis of the vow of poverty. He asked the Pope that those who wished to practise poverty in all strictness should be allowed to live in peace and that the others should at least abide by the papal interpretations of the rule. Ubertino therefore urged the separation of the Spirituals from the Conventuals.

---

[4] Qu. 9 of the poverty treatise of summer 1279, ed. by F. Ehrle, *ALKGMA*, III (1887), 507–14 (especially page 508). Similarly in the treatise "De Usu Paupere," *ibid.*, 514–17.

[5] Ed. by F. Ehrle, *ALKGMA*, III (1887), 51–89.

In view of the favourable attitude toward the Spirituals at the Curia and the not unjustified reproach of laxity in the observance of the rule, the Conventuals were now hard pressed. In a counterattack they accused Peter John Olivi, already twelve years dead, of heresy and the Spirituals of fostering his heretical doctrines. The Pope wanted to have these questions, for the most part purely dogmatic, discussed by the approaching Council. Thus the poverty dispute came before the Council of Vienne (1311–12), which on 5 May 1312 decided in general in favour of the stricter view. According to the bull "Exivi de Paradiso,"[6] the precepts of the rule were binding under serious sin. Prescriptions which were regarded as equivalent to such precepts were individually specified. "The friars, by virtue of their profession, are obliged to a truly poor use (*ad arctos usus seu pauperes*) in those things which are expressly specified as such in the rule." Individually and as a community they were not capable of receiving inheritances, they were not permitted to bring suit, possess vineyards, or build storehouses, and they were to be content with unpretentious churches and monasteries. The bull intended to provide a practical decision. The effort to connect the friars' poverty with the dogmatic question of the import of Christ's poverty and to brand the opposing view as heretical, according to whether one regarded the *usus pauper* as included in the vow of evangelical poverty or not, was expressly designated as "presumptuous and insolent."[7] The bull said nothing about a return of the Spirituals to their original convents under obedience to the superiors of the order.

This omission led to new difficulties. Michael of Cesena, elected minister general in 1316, tried, with the assistance of John XXII, to reduce to obedience high-handed and refractory Spirituals in Tuscany and Provence. The Pope summoned a number of them to Avignon and in the Constitution "Quorumdam Exigit" of 7 October 1317[8] forbade the Spirituals all unauthorized actions. He stated that obedience was superior to poverty and that the superiors of the order had the final say in regard to clothing and stocks of provisions. Obstinate Spirituals were handed over to the Inquisition and on 7 May 1318 four of them were burned at Marseilles. In other writings John XXII again dealt with the Spirituals, whom he labelled *fraticelli,* and deprived them of their own monasteries, among other things.

---

[6] 6 May 1312, in *Bull Fr,* no. 195, pp. 80–86; G. Fussenegger, "Ratio commissionis in Concilio Viennensi institutae ad decretalem 'Exivi de Paradiso' praeparandam," *AFrH,* 50 (1957), 145–77.

[7] "Dicere autem, sicut aliqui asserere perhibentur, quod haereticum sit, tenere usum pauperem includi vel non includi sub voto evangelicae paupertatis, praesumptuosum et temerarium iudicamus" (*ibid.,* 85).

[8] *Bull Fr,* V, no. 289, pp. 128–30.

But soon the Pope was destined to oppose the entire order and even to discipline men who, like Bonagrazia of Bergamo and Michael of Cesena, were hitherto the opponents of the Spirituals. In this conflict, the dispute over the theory of poverty, the question at issue was whether Christ and the Apostles, individually or as a group, had possessed property. Thus the poverty dispute affected all Christendom much more deeply and acquired a direct bearing on the relationship, then a subject of controversy, between the spiritual and the secular powers. If Christ as man had renounced property and the exercise of authority over men and things and had subjected himself to Caesar, then this had to have consequences for his vicar on earth and for all who exercised spiritual authority in his name. It was further controverted whether private ownership had come into existence only as a result of the fall or was in accord with a divine ordinance from the very beginning.

The Dominican John of Belna, as inquisitor, had declared as heretical in a trial of Beghards the proposition that Christ possessed absolutely nothing. The Franciscan Berengar of Perpignan protested against this decision, citing Nicholas III. Thus the question came before the papal tribunal. When in the bull "Quia Nonnumquam" of 26 March 1322[9] John XXII annulled Nicholas III's prohibition of discussing "Exiit qui seminat," the Franciscans became afraid that he would decide the question according to the interpretation of the Dominicans. The general chapter at Perugia, under the direction of Michael of Cesena, anticipated such a papal decision by declaring in an encyclical of 6 June 1322 to all Christendom that "it is sound, Catholic, and orthodox teaching that Christ and the Apostles owned nothing as their own." In doing so it cited Nicholas III, Clement V, and even John XXII himself.

The indignant Pope's first reaction was to renounce ownership of the order's property and forbid the naming of procurators.[10] Bonagrazia of Bergamo was imprisoned for protesting this measure. In the bull "Cum inter Nonnullos" of 12 November 1323[11] John XXII declared heretical the assertion that Christ and the Apostles had possessed neither as individuals nor as a group. The entire order was enraged, and some of the members labelled the Pope a heretic. The situation became all the more inflamed when Louis the Bavarian adopted this charge in his Declaration of Sachsenhausen on 22 May 1324.[12] However, the majority of the Franciscans returned to loyalty and the Pentecost Chapter at Lyons in 1325, under Michael of Cesena appealed for respect for the papal decrees. But the Pope apparently did not feel sure of the attitude of the minister general. He summoned him to Avignon in 1327[13] and, not finding him submissive, detained him there. He did not permit him to take part in the Pentecost Chapter at Bologna in 1328[14] but was unable to obtain the election of another minister general there. During the night of 26–27 May, 1328, Michael of Cesena succeeded in escaping from Avignon together with Bonagrazia of Bergamo and William of Ockham. The last named had had to defend his philosophical and theological teachings at the Curia. At Pisa they joined Louis the Bavarian, in whose retinue was already Marsilius of Padua. Thus Louis's quarrel acquired much more an ideological character through becoming involved with the poverty dispute.[15]

---

[9] *Ibid.*, no. 464, pp. 224 f.

[10] Constitution "Ad Conditorem canonum" of 8 December 1322, in *Bull Fr,* V, no. 486, pp. 233–46.

[11] *Bull Fr,* V, no. 518, pp. 256–59.

Michael of Cesena preached against John XXII and from Pisa released voluminous and scholarly appeals against the Pope, who on 6 June 1328 had deposed[16] and on 20 April 1329 had excommunicated[17] him along with his companions. In the bull "Quia Vir Reprobus" of 16 November 1329 John XXII gave a definitive expression of his views against Michael of Cesena. He stressed that Christ had had a *dominium* over worldly goods. Even in Paradise property was assigned by God to our first parents; it was not a mere human institution after the fall. At that time it required only a regulation by positive law.[18] A general chapter at Paris declared the deposition of Michael of Cesena legitimate and elected Geraldus Oddonis as his successor.

Geraldus wanted to dispense from the prohibition of money and other precepts of the rule. Hence both he and the Avignon Curia were bitterly reproached by Michael of Cesena during the rest of his life in numerous polemical pamphlets, in which he had the assistance of Bonagrazia of Bergamo and William of Ockham.[19]

---

[12] Text ed. by J. Schwalm, in *MGConst,* V, no. 909, pp. 722–44, no. 910, pp. 745–54.

[13] "Cum pro certis" of 8 June 1327, in *Bull Fr,* V, no. 667, pp. 325 f.

[14] *Bull Fr,* V, no. 706, p. 343, footnote to the register.

[15] K. Bosl, "Die 'Geistliche Hofakademie' Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern im alten Franziskanerkloster zu München," *Der Mönch im Wappen* (Munich 1960), 97–129; *cf.*, however, H. S. Offler, "Meinungsverschiedenheiten am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern," *DA,* 11 (1954), 193, footnote 5.

[16] *Bull Fr,* V, no. 714, pp. 346–49.

[17] *Ibid.*, no. 786, pp. 383 f.

[18] *Bull Fr,* V, no. 820, pp. 439 ff.; *cf.* Michael's appeal of 26 March 1330 (*Bull Fr,* V, no. 820, 426 f., footnote) and his letters to the order of 24 January 1331 (*ibid.*, pp. 427–38, footnote) and 25 March (*ibid.*, pp. 497–500, footnote 7).

[19] *Cf.* the writings reproduced in M. Goldast, *Monarchia S. Romani Imperii,* II (Frankfurt 1614), 1236–1361: *Tractatus contra errores Johannis XXII* (1331), *Litterae deprecatoriae,* and *Littera ad omnes fratres Ordinis* (1333).

In his *Literas plurium*, which he sent to the general chapter at Perpignan, Michael declared that he was an orthodox Franciscan and the legitimate general and that John XXII was a heretic. Unfortunately, the Pope was destined to provide further substance for this charge in his teachings on the beatific vision. The chapter expelled from the order the Franciscans at the court of Munich. There they were more and more involved in the ecclesiastico-political struggle and became champions of the lay power against the Avignon papacy. Thus, almost exactly a century after its establishment, a part of the Franciscan Order became the chief prop of resistance to the Holy See. They were fighting with justification against the worldly and un-Christian spirit which was widespread at the Curia as well as in their order, but their struggle was in many ways a mockery of the ideal which they claimed they were renewing.

> Those men did not have the power to defend this ideal as Francis had done: silently, patiently, obediently. In their religious fanaticism they proceeded into active rebellion.[20]

The poverty dispute itself, the further decline of the ideal of poverty, and the universal abuses evident in Christendom, such as the prolonged interdict occasioned by the quarrel between Pope and Emperor, the Hundred Years' War (1337–1453), and the Western Schism produced a further decay of the order. The endeavour to supply as quickly as possible for the inroads of the plague (1348–52) — it is said that two-thirds of the members of the order fell victim to the Black Death — did nothing to advance religious discipline. But it is a testimony to the vitality of the order and the strength of its ideal that, in an effort to correct evils, reform circles were established again and again and in all the provinces. Thus there occurred in the second half of the fourteenth century and in the fifteenth the Observant movement, which led to the dividing of the order into Observants and Conventuals. While the former clung to the non-possession of property even by the community and wanted to renounce any regular income and real estate, the latter accepted common property, income, and estates.

The Council of Constance (1414–18) granted to the Observants of France their own provincial vicars and a vicar general. Continuing efforts to reform the order as a whole and thus to preserve its unity were futile. Saints Bernardine of Siena (d. 1444) and John of Capestrano (d. 1456) laboured for this purpose in Italy. In 1443 Pope Eugene IV gave the Observants two vicars general, one for their cismontane and one for their transmontane communities, and their own chapter. In 1446, at the suggestion of John Capestrano, he made the position of these vicars general so independent of the minister general that in actuality the Observants had become independent, even though the legal connection was still maintained. The complete division of the order occurred in 1517 when the Observants already constituted a majority. At the general chapter Leo X excluded the Conventuals from the election of the minister general and united all branches of the Observants as the *Ordo Fratrum Minorum Regularis Observantiae.* The new arrangement was confirmed in the bull "Ite et vos in vineam" of 29 May 1517, and on 1 June a new minister general was elected, to whom the minister general hitherto in office had to surrender the seal of the order. The Conventuals elected their own general, who, at the command of the Pope, had to assume the title of master general.

---

[20] J. Lortz, *Der unvergleichliche Heilige* (Düsseldorf 1952), 24.

CHAPTER 44

The German Mystics

In the scholasticism of the thirteenth century speculative discursive theology, which Bernard of Clairvaux had felt called upon to assail as arrogant learning (*stultilogia*) in Peter Abelard, had carried off the victory. Just the same the tide of the theology of practical acquisition and prayerful achievement (*théologie monastique*), advocated by Bernard, never ceased.[1] Neoplatonism too continued to exert its influence beside and within the Aristotelian trend of thought. Indicative of Neoplatonism's increased influence at the close of the thirteenth century is the translation of the *Institutio theologica* of Proclus (d. 485) by William of Moerbeeke in 1264.[2]

In addition, the increasing coming of age of the laity brought along a great yearning for education and a religious interest which had to be met more fully and more deeply. In particular, women made widows as a consequence of the crusades, other wars, and plague, and unmarried women longed for religious and theological instruction. Many religious houses for women were founded in the thirteenth century, especially for Dominican nuns. In Strasbourg alone there were seven. Decrees of Pope Clement IV in 1267 and of the German provincial, Hermann of Minden, in 1286–87, entrusted Dominican friars, especially lectors and masters,[3] with the care of souls in the order's houses of women. Thus was called into being a more practical theology, cultivating the spirituality of the heart and leading directly to union with God. Naturally, it was expressed in the German tongue. The presupposition for the rise of German mysticism was, then, the "combination of Dominican theology and pastoral care, vernacular preaching, feminine piety, and Germany's special position in the religious movements of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries." [4] It presented itself as a doctrine of the experimental knowledge of God in the soul, as a guide to this, and as a witness of the mystical experience itself. We must not understand too narrowly the circle of persons termed mystics. In the fourteenth century we may include among them not only those favoured with extraordinary gifts and visions but all who wrote on piety in the vernacular.

---

[1] *Cf.* J. Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York 1961).

[2] *Cf. Grabmann, MGL,* II, 413–23.

[3] Text in Denifle, *ALKGMA,* II, 649 f., who, however, according to H. C. Scheeben ("Zur Biographie Johannes Taulers," *Johannes Tauler, Gedenkschrift zum 600. Todestag,* ed. by E. Filthaut [Essen 1961], 25 f.), understands too narrowly the *fratres docti* in the decree of Hermann of Minden. Scheeben holds it is a question not of masters and lectors, not even of scholars, but of capable and experienced preachers.

The Dominican Henry of Halle collected from 1250 the notes of Mechtilde of Magdeburg (*ca.* 1212–85 or 1294), who, after a penitential life of more than thirty years as a Beguine, spent her last days in the Cistercian convent of Helfta. This collection, *Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit* (*The Streaming Light of the Godhead*), is the first great mystical work in German. Its Low German original is lost and has come down to us only in a free Latin translation and in the High German text of Henry of Nördlingen (d. after 1379). In daring but fervent images, determined by the *Minnesang*, Mechtilde beholds in her meditations, sayings, and verses the birth of the soul from God the Father, beyond the whole world and all time. The supernatural union with God is thus the vital element, the true "nature" of the soul (I, 44). Christ is the bridegroom destined for it, to whom it surrenders itself without disguising or reserving anything, and the Holy Spirit is the "lavish outpouring of the Father and the Son" (VI, 32), "the blessed gushing fountain of love" (VII, 24). The soul living in the streaming light of divine grace breaks out of its bounds, belongs to Christendom and to the world, lives and suffers for them. Unlike the Neoplatonic formula of purgative, illuminative, and unitive ways, for Mechtilde love is fulfilled in this earthly life in suffering, in patient longing, even in descent with Christ into hell. "It is the nature of love that it first proceeds in sweetness, then becomes rich in perception, and, thirdly, becomes desirous of and eager for abandonment" (IV, 20).

Under the influence of Mechtilde of Magdeburg at Helfta were Mechtilde of Hackeborn (1241–99), author of the *Liber specialis gratiae*, and Gertrude the Great (1256–1302), who wrote the *Legatus divinae pietatis* and *Exercitia spiritualia.* Gertrude's visions, written down in German and Latin, deal especially with the Eucharist and the Sacred Heart in connection with the liturgy. She is regarded as the herald of devotion to the Sacred Heart in the Middle Ages.

In Italy Angela of Foligno (1249–1309), who as a Franciscan tertiary led an austere penitential life in poverty and prayer, had mystical experiences which her confessor wrote down in the *Book of Visions and Instructions* as dictated by her.

---

[4] H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1961), 527.

Among the Dominicans who combined the intellectual treasures of scholasticism with strongly Neoplatonic elements to render it fruitful for mystical piety and communicated it to nuns were John and Gerard Sterngassen[5] and Ulric of Strasbourg (d. 1277), the last named being the author of *De summo bono,* and, above all, Dietrich of Freiberg (d. after 1310). His mystical sermons, praised by contemporaries, have not been preserved, but they were probably treatments of metaphysics and cosmology. He stressed the great importance of experience in natural science and wrote *De iride et radialibus impressionibus* with an explanation of the rainbow, but otherwise he was under the spell of Neoplatonism. He explains the *emanatio* as creation, to which corresponds the *reversio* to the One. He identifies the *intellectus agens* with the Augustinian *memoria interior*, the *abditum mentis*, the basis of the soul, the heart of the soul, the divinely formed in man, in which truth is present. Dietrich of Freiberg exerted a great influence on Master Eckhart, Berthold of Moosburg, and John Tauler.

Master Eckhart

Master Eckhart was the most important and most daring representative of speculative German mysticism. He was German in the deep fervour of his thought, in the radicalism, even extravagance, with which he sought to carry his speculations to their ultimate consequences, even to paradox, and in the vigorous style with which he was able to express them in German. Born at Hochheim in Thuringia around 1260, he became a Dominican and, following studies at Cologne and Paris, was made, while still young, prior at Erfurt and vicar of the provincial, Dietrich of Freiberg, for Thuringia. As such he delivered to the young members of the order the *Reden der Unterscheidung (Discourses on Discrimination).* In these he outlined the criteria of genuine piety and taught "the total divesting of self for God" in obedience. Thus was sounded the keynote of his later preaching: solitude as the prerequisite of union with God. In 1302 he became master of theology at Paris, and, after the division of the German province, provincial of the new Saxon province (1303–11), with forty-seven houses of friars and more than seventy of nuns. In addition, he became vicar general of the Bohemian province in 1307. When Eckhart's election as provincial of the South German province was annulled, the general sent him to Paris as master for the school years 1311–12 and 1312–13. From 1314 he was at Strasbourg, his headquarters for supervising the spiritual care of the convents of nuns in Alsace and Switzerland until 1322. During the last five years or so of his life he was director of studies at the house in Cologne and a zealous preacher.

---

[5] *Grabmann, MGL,* I, 392–404; N. Appel, *Gerhard von Sterngassen und sein Pratum animarum* (Diss. theol., Bonn 1934).

Transcripts of his German sermons provided the material which induced Archbishop Henry von Virneburg to institute a process in 1326 because of the propagation of false teaching. Eckhart declared on 26 September 1326 that the archiepiscopal court had no jurisdiction over him as a Dominican and a master, but he nevertheless answered the charge in an "essay of vindication." On 13 February 1327, in the church of the Dominicans, he protested his orthodoxy and his readiness to repudiate ascertained errors. In spite of the rejection of his appeal on 22 February 1327, the case was referred to Avignon, where he personally undertook his defense. It was only after his death, which occurred before 30 April 1328, that seventeen propositions were condemned as heretical and eleven declared suspect in the bull "In agro Dominico," issued by John XXII on 27 March 1329. Only the third part of the projected *Opus tripartitum* was finished: scriptural exegesis — Genesis, Exodus, Wisdom, and Saint John's Gospel (Lat. WW, I–III) — and sermons on biblical texts (IV). More controversial, but also more influential, were his German writings: *Reden der Unterscheidung, Buch der göttlichen Tröstungen* (*Book of the Divine Consolations*), with the sermon "Von dem edeln Menschen" ("On the Noble Man"), and some 160 sermons which have been handed down only in transcripts; it is difficult to prove that all are genuine.

With a grandiose partiality Eckhart repeats some fundamental notions of God as the basis of all being, of the birth of the Son from the Father in the spark of the soul, and of solitude of soul whereby it is able to contain God.

> When I preach, I am accustomed to speak, first, of solitude and that man should be devoid of self and of all things; second, that one should be re-formed into the one good, which is God; third, that one should be aware of the great nobility with which God invests the soul in order that man may thereby enter into the wonderful life of God; fourth of the purity of the divine nature (F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker* [= Pf.], 91).

Proceeding from the scriptural texts, "I am who am" (Exodus 3:14) and "In the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1), Eckhart stresses perceiving as the basis of God's existence. If existence follows the divine perceiving, God is something higher than existence. "And hence whatever is always in God is above existence itself and is exclusively perception" (Lat. WW, V, 44). Thus Eckhart is able to say "that in God non-existence is still existence," for he is the source of all existence. "Accordingly, existence is not within God's province, unless you should wish to term such purity existence." That which perceives this knowing, supporting and embracing all existence, is its own self, which the Father beholds and expresses in his Word, the Son. At the same time he comprehends in it all ways in which creatures can portray his essence. "The Father perceives nothing except this same Word and himself and the whole divine nature and all things in this same Word, and whatever he perceives in it is equal to the Word and is the same Word by nature in truth" (Pf., 290; J. Quint, *Meister Eckhart* [= Qu.], 25).

Thus Eckhart endeavours to safeguard God's distinction from the world and at the same time to make clear his presence in the world. God calls creatures to himself out of nothing, and hence they obtain and have existence in him and only in an enduring relationship to him. Because their being depends on God's presence, they are nothing if left to themselves. Thus Eckhart can say in exaggeration that all creatures "are pure nothingness" (Germ. WW, I, 80). But if the existence of creatures depends on God's presence, then there must be a point of contact with him. In man this is located in the depths of the spiritual soul in the state of grace. Here man is responsive not only to God's action but to God himself.

> I have a power in my soul which is fully responsive to God (Qu. 323). God is in all things; but ... nowhere so really as ... in the innermost part and the highest part of the soul (Qu. 356). It is the castle which Jesus enters, more according to his existence than according to his activity: by giving to the soul a divine and godlike existence through grace, which is oriented to essence and existence, according to the text: By the grace of God I am what I am ...[6] God has no more fitting abode than a pure heart and a pure soul; there the Father brings forth his Son, as he brought him forth in eternity, neither more nor less (Qu. 175).

Hence on man is enjoined the duty of becoming "God's son by grace."[7] "The image of God, the Son of God is in the soul as a living fountain." It must be freed of all concealing layers. Man must separate himself from all that is not God, especially from his own will. "That is pure which is detached and separated from all creatures, for all creatures defile, since they are nothingness" (Qu. 175). Man is he "who submits himself to God with all that he is and has, obeys him, and gazes upward at God" (Qu. 145). In keeping with the Gospel (Mark 8:35, and elsewhere), man must practise humility, poverty, resignation, seclusion, and self-denial in order to become free for the encounter with God in the depth of the soul. He must progress from distraction to recollection, from diversity to unity.

> Hence I say: If man renounces himself and all created things — to the extent that you do so, you will be united and blessed in the soul's little spark, which knows neither time nor place. This spark rejects all creatures and wants nothing but God, revealed as he is in himself (Qu. 315f.).

---

[6] "Rechtfertigungsschrift," ed. by A. Daniels, *BGPhMA*, 23 (1923), 60; O. Karrer-H. Piesch, 129; G. Théry, 258.

[7] *Buch der göttlichen Tröstung*, Germ. WW, V, 37 f.

Though mystical union in the depth of the soul is the highest stage that man can attain to, he is not permitted to remain satisfied with it. No creature can be man's beatitude and perfection, and so he must keep himself aloof from finite being in order to permit himself to be seized upon by God. But once man has become aware of God, then he can rightly know and love his fellowmen and things. In fact, whoever is most intimately united to God, "whoever does right," finds God in all things and deeds. "Such a man bears God in all his works and in all places" (Qu. 59). "Whoever thus has God in his existence understands God as God, and God radiates on him in all things; for in all things there is for him the taste of God, and the image of God becomes visible to him in all things" (Qu. 60). Virginity must be realized in the fecundity of woman. "It is good that man receives God in himself and in this receptiveness he is a virgin; but for God to become fruitful in him is better, for to become fruitful with the gift is the only gratitude for the gift, and the spirit lies in gratitude returned ..." (Germ. WW, I, 27). Contemplation and the active life thus call for each other. Mary at the Lord's feet was only at the beginning.

> For when she was [still] sitting at our Lord's feet, she was not [yet the true] Mary; she may have been in name but not [yet] in her being. For she [still] sat in pleasant feeling and sweet sensation and was being taken in hand and was [now] learning life. But Martha was fully real there (Qu. 288).
>
> If a man were in ecstasy as was Saint Paul and knew of a sick man who wanted a bit of broth from him, I would deem it far better for you to surrender the ecstasy out of love and serve the needy one in greater love (Qu. 76).

The condemned propositions extracted from Master Eckhart's works, in so far as they clearly reflect his views, can be shown to be orthodox in the context of his doctrine. We must also bear in mind the difficulty of the mystic, who must express subtle knowledge and experiences of the spiritual life in human speech, particularly in a vernacular hardly developed for this. Yet, the charge of "having propounded many doctrinal propositions which laid a smoke screen over the true faith in many hearts, which he taught above all in his sermons to simple people, and which he also put in writing,"[8] is not wholly wrong. The cause here lay in his boundless and ever more extravagant eagerness to express himself even to excess and in paradox, which in his exalted solitude saw no need to have regard for the many who did not understand him, who in fact could not but misunderstand him. "If, however, there is anyone who understands this word incorrectly, what can be done by one who correctly utters this word which is correct?" (Qu. 139). But if truth is to be expressed in love (Ephesians 4:15), the theologian, and in particular the preacher, must be guided by a pastoral consideration. It was also dangerous that Eckhart in his speculation on the Logos lost sight of the historical Christ and did not accept the literal sense of Scripture as his standard, while the Church and the Sacraments, though not denied, were not given their proper place. At that very time the Church was concerned with rejecting the extravagances of the nominalists. It is significant of the risks to which theology was then exposed that William of Ockham, who had to justify himself at the papal tribunal in Avignon at the same time that Eckhart did, for his part regarded the views of the Dominican as absurd.[9]

---

[8] John XXII, bull "In Agro Dominico," *ALKGMA*, II (1888), 636.

John Tauler

Master Eckhart's most important disciples were John Tauler (*ca.* 1300–61) and Henry Suso (1295–1366). While avoiding bold formulation, they aimed to make clear the orthodoxy of Eckhart's ideas and to prevent their being misused by enthusiasts.

The claim that John Tauler heard the lectures of Master Eckhart and of Nicholas of Strasbourg along with Suso at Cologne in 1325–29 is not confirmed by the sources. On the contrary, Tauler was probably never a lecturer and hence it is unlikely that he attended the *Studium generale* at Cologne.[10] He probably studied at Strasbourg or elsewhere in southern Germany. He may have known of Eckhart through his writings, which were available to him in 1339 at Cologne or Strasbourg. Perhaps he met the master personally when the latter was on the upper Rhine carrying out his function in the order. From 1330 Tauler was a preacher in Strasbourg, his native city. In the conflict between Louis the Bavarian and John XXII the city sided with the Emperor and hence lay under interdict from 1329 to 1353. When the conflict reached its critical stage and Louis ordered the public celebration of Mass, Tauler and his community withdrew to Basel in 1338–39. Here he was in touch with Henry of Nördlingen and the "friends of God." He spent some time in Cologne in 1339 and 1346. In 1342 he must have returned with his community from Basel to Strasbourg, where thereafter he was chiefly concerned with popular preaching and the spiritual care of nuns and Beguines. He died at Strasbourg on 16 June 1361.

There is still no critical edition of Tauler's works. Only his German sermons are undeniably authentic, and only about eighty of the 144 ascribed to him. His mysticism is based on Eckhart's speculations but it has a more ethical and psychological orientation, is far more practically concerned for day-to-day living, and places more strongly in the foreground the exertion of the will in the purgative way. In Tauler the divine birth is not so much a participation in the divine knowing as an assimilation to the divine will after the example of the suffering and life of Christ. Tauler, the practical mystic, pastor of souls, and cheerful master, gained through his preaching enthusiastic listeners in the circles of the "friends of God."

---

[9] *Dialogue,* III, 2, 2, c. 8, ed. M. Goldast, *Monarchia Sacri imperii,* II (Frankfurt 1614), 909.

[10] H. C. Scheeben regards "it as out of the question that he studied at Cologne" ("Zur Biographie Taulers," *loc. cit.,* 23).

> You know there is many a woman in the world who has a husband and children and many a man makes shoes, and they seek God [in their work] and try in this way to feed themselves and their children. And many a poor man in the village carts manure and earns his morsel of bread in hard and bitter work. And it may be that all these manage a hundred times better while following [God's] call unpretentiously... These men live humbly and in the fear of God in their poverty, and follow the call in simplicity... The most sublime, the supreme way of [God's] call consists in following, outwardly and inwardly, the loving example of his beloved Son, actively and passively, with the aid of images or in contemplation apart from all images. And whoever imitates this [model], with pure heart and totally, will attain to the highest and sublimest goal.[11]

Tauler frequently admonishes that contemplation should be rendered effective in active love. The active life, then, is not merely a preparation for the contemplative life but just as much its fruit.

> You should know that, if I were not a priest and did not live in an order, I would regard it as a great thing to be able to make shoes and I would do it better than anything else and would be happy to earn my bread with my hands... I know one of the most honoured friends of God. He has been a farmer all his days, more than forty years, and that is what he still is. He once asked our Lord whether he should stop work and go to the church. But the Lord said: No, he should not do that; he should earn his bread in the sweat of his brow in honour of the Lord's precious blood.[12]

Henry Suso

If daring and lonely speculation was characteristic of Eckhart and practical ethical striving of Tauler, Henry Suso was noteworthy for the warmth and depth of his feeling. He was born around 1295 at Constance of a knightly family. Having become a Dominican at the age of thirteen, he studied at the house in Constance and then around 1322 was sent to the *Studium generale* at Cologne. Here he was an enthusiastic disciple of Eckhart and was with him during his trial. From around 1327 he acted as lecturer at Constance, but around 1330 he was reprimanded for his association with Eckhart. Hence he did not continue his academic career but devoted himself entirely to the care of souls, chiefly in the houses of nuns on the upper Rhine and in Switzerland. He was in contact with the "friends of God" and engaged in a lively correspondence with them and with his spiritual women disciples, especially Elsbeth Stagel, who edited his autobiography. In the *Büchlein der Wahrheit (Little Book of Truth)* Suso defended Eckhart's mysticism and sought to protect it against misunderstandings. In the *Büchlein der ewigen Weisheit (Little Book of Eternal Wisdom),* and its expanded and widely disseminated Latin version, the *Horologium Sapientiae,* Suso provided a practical mysticism of the following of the suffering Christ and union with his Mother beneath the Cross. He expresses his mystical doctrine in the words: "A detached man must put off the image of the creature, be formed into the image of Christ, and be further formed into the image of the Godhead."[13] Thus Suso was in the school of Eckhart. But in the manner of his mystical way, with its orientation to the tangible events and situations of the life of Christ, accessible to contemplation and actual imitation, he is far removed from his master. This moulding and this very detailed description of sacred history call directly for artistic representation. Thus Suso's mysticism stands in an especially close, perhaps reciprocal, relation to the pictorial art of his age.[14] As the minnesinger and poet among the mystics, he combined sensitivity and warmth of feeling with chivalrous magnanimity. This investing of the "mystical devotion to God with the symbolism of courtly love," to use the words of Kunisch, caused him to stress clearly the relation to the beloved "thou" and preserved him from a pantheistic misunderstanding.

---

[11] Ed. F. Vetter, *Predigt*, no. 53, p. 243; G. Hofman, no. 65, p. 507.

[12] Ed. F. Vetter, no. 42, p. 179; G. Hofman, no. 47, pp. 361, 364.

Mysticism was not confined to the few great masters from the ranks of the Dominicans. But the diocesan priest Henry of Nördlingen (d. after 1379) lacked their independence and depth. His significance lay in his tireless activity in many places, as leader and adviser of the "friends of God" in the world and in the cloister, for the spread of the notions and practice of the mystical life. His correspondence with Margaret Ebner (d. 1351) and her circle is the oldest extant collection of letters in German. It affords a glimpse into the life of the mystical circles of the fourteenth century.

Strong reminiscences of the mystics appear in sermon material relating to the lives of the saints which the layman Hermann of Fritzlar put in writing in 1343–49. A far-reaching influence, extending to the *Exercises* of Saint Ignatius Loyola and to Saint Teresa of Ávila, was exercised by Ludolf of Saxony (d. 1378) in his *Meditationes vitae Christi,* a *summa* of the life of Jesus with expositions by the Fathers, meditations, and exhortations.[15]

---

[13] Suso's *Life,* chapter 49, ed. K. Bihlmeyer, 168; N. Heller, 155.

[14] *Cf.* the references of K. Bihlmeyer in his edition of Suso, 45–62, and U. Weymann, *Die Seusische Mystik und ihre Wirkung auf die bildende Kunst* (Berlin 1938).

The "Engelberg Preacher," an unknown diocesan or religious priest, whose identification with Bartholomew Friedauer is disputed, shows far more of Tauler's than of Eckhart's influence in his lively style.[16]

John van Ruysbroeck

In the area of the Netherlands and Flanders German mysticism reached its peak in John van Ruysbroeck (Ruusbroec). He was born in 1293 in the village of Ruysbroeck between Brussels and Hal. After his ordination in 1318 he acted as vicar of Saint Gudula at Brussels, but at the age of fifty (1343) he withdrew with some like-minded canons into the solitude of Groenendael. They lived here as a community of hermits until 1350 when they adopted the rule of the Augustinian canons. Ruysbroeck became prior of the new monastery. He was in close relationship with mystics and reform circles, and Gerard Groote and perhaps also Tauler came to see him. He died in 1381 at the age of eighty-eight.

His eleven authenticated writings were composed in great part while he was still a diocesan priest. The urban population of the economically and culturally highly developed Netherlands was prepared for a deeper religious life in keeping with its greater maturity and independence and set higher standards for itself as well as for preaching and pastoral care. This is evident in the numerous communities of Beguines and Beghards. Men and women of deep religious sensitivity but of insufficient theological training were exposed to the danger of falling victim to an unenlightened heretical exuberance in their mystical religious aspirations. If in addition it was not always easy to distinguish between genuine religious striving and experience and an ecstatic pseudo-mysticism, it was especially hard to determine the boundaries between, on the one hand, Beguines and Beghards, who, unlike the orders, were not clearly indicated by organization and theological education, and, on the other, such heretical groups as the "Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit." Time and again the former had been confused with these sectaries, who subscribed to a monistic pantheism, aimed to participate in the vision of God even in this world by being merged into the universal oneness of God, and fancied themselves to be above all laws and sinless. Closely connected with them was the visionary Blommaerdine (d. 1336), who in Ruysbroeck's day caused a great stir at Brussels through her teaching and writing and was idolized by her followers.

---

[15] N. Paulus, *AElsKG,* 2 (1927), 207–22; M. I. Bodenstedt, *The Vita Christi of Ludolf the Carthusian* (Diss., Washington 1944, with the literature).

[16] S. Beck, *Untersuchungen zum Engelberger Prediger* (Fribourg 1952); W. Muschg, *Die Mystik in der Schweiz* (Frauenfeld and Leipzig 1935), 310–32.

The young vicar of Saint Gudula sought by his writings to satisfy the genuine hunger for spiritual guidance and at the same time to counteract Blommaerdine's false mysticism. Hence in 1330 he wrote his treatise *Von dem Reich der Liebenden (The Kingdom of Lovers)* and soon after his most admired work, *Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit (The Spiritual Espousals).* To this period of his pastoral activity at Brussels belong also the works *Vom glänzenden Stein (On the Sparkling Stone), Von den vier Versuchungen (The Four Temptations),* and *Vom Christenglauben (On the Christian Faith),* an explanation of the creed for the use of priests. The very large *Buch von den geistlichen Tabernakeln (Book of the Spiritual Tabernacles)* was completed at Groenendael. It was strongly critical of the Church and clergy of the day. *Von den sieben Einschliessungen (On the Seven Enclosures)* was intended for nuns. In the *Spiegel der ewigen Seligkeit (Mirror of Eternal Happiness)* Ruysbroeck provides a comprehensive instruction in the spiritual life. The *Buch von den sieben Stufen auf der Treppe geistlicher Minne (Book of the Seven Steps on the Ladder of Spiritual Love)* strongly emphasizes asceticism, while *Das Buch von den zwölf Beginen (Book of the Twelve Beguines)* is a collection of pious meditations. In order to counteract all misunderstandings, Ruysbroeck, when almost seventy, once more took up his pen and, at the request of friends, gave a condensed explanation of his doctrine in *Samuel oder das Buch von der höchsten Wahrheit (Samuel or the Book of the Sovereign Truth).*

The starting point and the final goal of Ruysbroeck's mysticism is God, one and three-in-one. His idea of the world and of man and even more his doctrine of grace and the spiritual and mystical life are oriented to the Trinity. God's being exceeds all limits, is *wijselos,* is "inaccessible height, abysmal depth, incomprehensible breadth, eternal length, a gloomy silence, a sumptuous desert." [17] But his nature

> is fecund. Hence it does not remain in the oneness of fatherhood but must generate unceasingly the Eternal Wisdom, the Son of the Father . . . Since the Father beholds his Son, the Eternal Wisdom, and all things in this same Wisdom, he was born and is a different person from the Father.

However, this self-contemplation of Father and Son is at the same time a mutual affirmation of self, is love. From the fact

> that the Son is born as a different person from the Father, since the Father beholds him as born and all things in him and with him, as a life of all things, and that the Son in turn beholds the Father as giving birth and fecund and himself and all things in the Father, proceeds a love,

---

[17] *Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit,* II, 38; WW, I, 181.

> which is the Holy Spirit and the bond from Father to Son and from Son to Father. This giving birth and returning to unity is the work of the Trinity — unity of nature, trinity of persons.[18]

This union of fruitfulness of nature and singleness of essence, of becoming and being, of activity and blessed enjoyment, of overflow into multiplicity and discharge into oneness, of beginning and completion, is the goal of the mystical life.

> The Holy Trinity has created us according to this eternal image and this parable. Hence God intends that we move out of ourselves in this divine light and seek to attain supernaturally to this image, which is our real life, and possess it with him, working and enjoying in everlasting blessedness.[19]

As image, as mirror of the Triune God,

> the substance of our soul [has] three properties, which according to their nature are one. The first property is the formless and essential nakedness *(blooetheit)* whereby we are like the Father and his divine nature and united with him. The second property can be called the higher reason of the soul. It is a reflecting clarity in which we receive God's Son, the Eternal Truth. In the clarity we are like him, in receiving him we are one with him. The third property we call the spark of the soul; it is a natural inclination of the soul for its origin, in which we receive the Holy Spirit, the love of God. In the inclining we are like the Holy Spirit, in the receiving we become one spirit and one love with God.[20]

These three properties are at the same time the organs of the efficacy of the divine persons on the soul. We are created "to" the image of God, that is, the essence of the image is both giving and surrendering. "God has created us that we may find, know, and possess this image in our being and in the purity of the depth of our soul *(in puerheit onser ghedachten).*"[21] In the spark of the soul God touches man, so that man feels himself drawn by God and begins his return to the purity and oneness of the spirit. This return to God in grace and the virtues, in the contemplative life and moral exertion, follows in three stages, the "active," the "intimate," and the "contemplative" life. These stages roughly correspond to the three ways of mysticism in general, and hence in Ruysbroeck the practical and personal feature is especially stressed.

In the "active" life there is question not so much of acquiring and practising various virtues as of the "advent of Christ," to whom the pious person is betrothed, and of union with and likeness to the manner and work of Christ.

---

[18] *Ibid.*, WW, I, 60 f.

[19] *Ibid.*, III, 5; WW, I, 245.

[20] *Spiegel des ewigen Heiles*, c. 8; WW, III, 167 f.

[21] *Sieben Stufen der Liebe*, c. 13; WW, III, 264.

The aim and end of the "intimate" exercise is the mystical recognition of the bridegroom as he is in himself and the mystical union with him in the depth of the soul, which is made ready by the grace of God and the virtuous deeds of the "active life."[22]

Likeness to and union with the Son leads to the Father, the source of the Godhead. Just as the Son proceeds from the Father in the eternal birth and flows back in love to unity, so does he speak to the soul united to him: "Follow me to my Father."[23] Hence all holiness and beatitude consist in our being led to the Father, that is, to repose in the essential oneness.[24] But as God, by virtue of his unity, abides in blessed repose and, by virtue of his trinity, works in active love, so the loving soul in the "God-seeing life" is one with God in repose and like him in works of love.[25] In connection with Psalm 41:8 it is said:

> And the abyss [of God] calls to the abyss ... This calling is an outpouring of the essential light, and this essential light causes us to lose ourselves in the embrace of an unfathomable love and to escape into the wild darkness of the Godhead. And hence, one with God's spirit in a direct union, we can meet God through God;[26] that is, like God and made in his image by God himself, by union and likeness with the Holy Spirit, the Son, and the Father, we can now take possession of God also in his oneness and repose, and hence of the divine nature as such.[27]

To this contemplation, this nearness of the depths of the soul with the depths of the Godhead,

> no one can attain by means of learning and cleverness nor by any sort of practice. But only he whom God wishes to make one with his Spirit and to illuminate with himself can seize upon God in contemplation — no one else.[28]

This doctrine of God-seeing love in the third book of *The Spiritual Espousals,* according to which "the soul receives the clarity which is God" and "it becomes itself the clarity which it receives,"[29] and similar pantheistic-sounding sentences were attacked by John Gerson soon after 1400.[30] But from the first Ruysbroeck anticipated reproaches of this sort, by often emphasizing in his later writings, as protection against misinterpretations, that this oneness of being with God must be understood as

---

[22] G. Dolezich, *Die Mystik Johannes van Ruysbroecks,* 92.

[23] *Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit,* II, 65; WW, I, 213.

[24] *Ibid.,* II, 60; WW, I, 207.

[25] *Ibid.,* II, 66; WW, I, 216.

[26] *Ibid.,* II, 70; WW, I, 223.

[27] G. Dolezich, *op. cit.,* 115.

[28] *Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit,* III, 1; WW, I, 239.

[29] WW, I, 242.

[30] "Epistola ... ad Fr. Bartholomaeum Carthusiensem," *Opera Omnia,* ed. Du Pin, I (Antwerp 1706), 59–63, and A. Combes, *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson,*

> one with him in his love but not in his nature. For otherwise we would be God, annihilated in ourselves, which is impossible.[31] Indeed, we are further formed by the Spirit of God, as iron by fire, so that, as far as there is iron, there is also fire, but the fire does not become iron and the iron does not become fire.[32]

The relationship of this mystical speculation to Master Eckhart is easy to establish. But whether there is a direct dependence, or the resemblance to the common sources, such as Dionysius the Areopagite, the Victorines, and others, is sufficient explanation, is difficult to say. The style of the Fleming is more intense in feeling, bolder, and more down to earth, and he is also more concerned with actually living the truths contemplated. But his mystical doctrine is less oriented to actual realization and verification in daily life than was that of the great Rhenish mystics. And a quietistic trend is unmistakable.

To what extent mysticism, as a movement of renewal, embraced large circles appears from numerous memoirs and *vitae* from the monasteries of women of the period. The most precious of these accounts of mystically gifted nuns are those of the sisters of Töss near Winterthur by Suso's friend, Elsbeth Stagel (d. *ca.* 1350–60), and of the nuns of Engelthal, which Christine Ebner (d. 1336) relates in the *Büchlein von der Gnadenüberlast (Little Book of Overflowing Grace).*

Naturally, the powerful spread of mysticism contained the danger of superficiality and falsification. The larger the circle in search of mystical experience became, and the more mysticism became a form of religious existence which people wanted to teach and learn, so much the sooner did vision become the rule, individual experience become the fashion, and eventually there resulted a craze to imitate, sterile reflection, and exaggerated analysis of occurrences within the soul. Lack of self-criticism and self-discipline then led easily to sensuous emotional excesses, to self-deception, and to extravagances in poor taste. John Gerson (d. 1429) came out against such aberrations in the mysticism of his time. In his chief work, *De mystica theologia* (1408),[33] he gave to mystical theology preeminence over scholastic theology and termed it the source of the complete knowledge of God. But he

---

I (Paris 1945), 615–35. Defense by John von Schoenhoven (d. 1432) in Du Pin, I, 63–78; A. Combes, *Essai,* I, 716–71.

[31] *Spiegel des ewigen Heiles,* c. 24; WW, III, 219; *cf.* c. 25, WW, III, 216 f.

[32] *Von den zwölf Beginen,* c. 14; WW, IV, 26; *Buch von der höchsten Wahrheit,* c. 8; WW, III, 286 f.

[33] Ed. A. Combes (Lugano 1958).

warned against a deviation of mystical love into sensuality and feasting on sweetness and showed the way to a practical piety.[34]

How men who were concerned for miracles and extraordinary mystical occurrences but were lacking in really mystical gifts seized upon mystification in order to reassure themselves and to emphasize their claim before others is made clear in the figure of the layman Rulman Merswin (1307–82). With the consent of his second wife, this distinguished Strasbourg merchant and banker renounced the world at the age of forty, got into contact with Tauler, Henry of Nördlingen, Margaret Ebner, and other "friends of God," and in 1367 acquired from the Benedictines the monastery on the Grünenwörth near Strasbourg to lead a retired life there with others of like mind. Even after the transfer of this foundation of his to the Hospitallers in 1371 he secured for himself a determining influence, in fact the actual direction. He passed himself off as the middleman of a secret "great friend of God from the up-country." After his death in 1382 a number of writings in his hand were found, treatises and letters, which were attributed to the mythical "friend of God from the up-country." In a tedious style, rich in pious platitudes, their author indulges in complaints over the maladies of Christendom and extols in stories of conversions the mode of life of the "friends of God," in proper contrast to the lives of the clergy. After long and heated discussion there is today agreement that the figure of the "friend of God from the up-country" is a fiction and that these writings are fabrications of Merswin himself (Denifle, Strauch, Oehl) or at least of his confidant, the Hospitaller priest, Nicholas of Louvain (Rieder). They were intended to procure for Merswin greater esteem and assure the form desired by him for his foundation or give it permanence.

The mystical and ascetical writings of the Benedictine, John of Kastl (d. *ca.* 1410), a reform abbey in the Upper Palatinate, extended into the fifteenth century. Martin Grabmann proved that the widely known *De adhaerendo Deo,*[35] attributed to Albertus Magnus, was John's work.[36]

Of the Dominicans who kept up with the spiritual legacy of their order in the fifteenth century, John Nider (d. 1438) is especially noteworthy.[37] In his writings, for example *Vierundzwanzig guldin Harfen (Twenty-Four*

---

[34] *De distinctione verarum visionum a falsis,* ed. Du Pin, I, 43–59; "potest fieri, ut amor a spiritu incipiat, sed vehementer formidandum est, ne per blanditias sensim carne consumatur" (*ibid.,* 55).

[35] German translation, ed. by W. Oehl, *Dokumente der Religion,* II (Paderborn 1923).

[36] *Grabmann, MGL,* I, 489–524; for all of Kastl's works see J. Sudbrack, *Die geistliche Theologie des Johannes von Kastl,* 2 vols. (Münster 1967).

[37] K. Schieler, *Magister Johannes Nider aus dem Orden der Predigerbrüder* (Mainz 1885); J. Geiraths, "Nider Johannes und die Mystik," *DTh,* 321–46; *idem,* "Johannes Tauler und die Frömmigkeitshaltung des 15. Jahrhunderts," *Johannes Tauler, Gedenkschrift zum 600. Todestag,* 422–34.

Golden Harps), published at Strasbourg in 1493, and *Formicarius* (Strasbourg 1517), are found many phrases and ideas from fourteenth-century mysticism and resemblances to Henry Suso and John Tauler especially. But precisely because of the far-reaching agreement, the quite different attitude of the fifteenth century and the change in meaning of basic ideas become especially clear. Mystical speculation has yielded to guidance for pious living, determined by the care of souls. This turning to the ethical, the practical, and the concrete, joined to a stricter withdrawal from the world, is characteristic of the fifteenth century in general.

In the first half of the century a so far unknown "priest and guardian of the Teutonic Knights at Frankfurt," as the introduction styles him,[38] provided in his *German Theology* a "summary of the intellectual output of German mysticism" (J. Bernhart). Prudent in speculation, he was, like Tauler, concerned for the practical and pastoral. He would like, as a defense against "unauthentic, false, free spirits, who are harmful to Holy Church," to lead to the true and proper "friendship of God." In this book, which Luther edited for publication in 1516 and 1518, German mysticism acquired a direct influence on the reformer and on Lutheranism.

In mysticism we have before us a first initial effort of some importance toward a German theology, that is, the attempt to penetrate revelation on the part of German thinkers and with the possibilities of the German tongue. This endeavour did not get beyond the first starts, imposing as they are. Eckart was condemned; Tauler was slandered in connection with the Reformation and in 1559 put on the Index.[39] Then the stream of German mysticism was sealed off, at least within the Catholic Church, and the chasm between spirituality and theology in the West became deeper still. At the Council of Trent and thereafter theology acquired an exclusively Romance colouring, and in it and in the liturgy the Latin language virtually took on the character of orthodoxy.

---

[38] R. Haubst, *Scholastik,* 33 (1958), 375–98, holds that John of Frankfurt is to be considered the probable author of "Eyn deutsch Theologia." John was professor of theology at Heidelberg and preacher at the Holy Spirit Monastery. He died in 1440. Accordingly, the "Theologia Deutsch" must have originated between 1420 and 1440.

[39] The revised edition of Tauler's works, in Dutch, that appeared at Frankfurt in 1565 was placed on the Antwerp appendix to the Trent Index of 1570. From there it was adopted in the Index of the Spanish Inquisitor General, Quiroga (1583/84) and then in the Roman Index of Sixtus V in 1590; this last forbade "Jo. Taulerii Sermones et Institutio passionis Domini, donec corrigatur." *Cf. H. Reusch, Der Index der verbotenen Bücher,* I (Bonn 1883), 523; *idem, Die Indices librorum prohibitorum des 16. Jh.* (Tübingen 1886), 317. The Jesuit general, E. Mercurian (1573–80), forbade his subjects to read the works of Tauler and other mystics. The Belgian Capuchins followed this example.

CHAPTER 45

Missionary Work of the Mendicants outside Europe

It was especially the two great mendicant orders, Dominicans and Franciscans, who were most responsible for carrying missionary work beyond Europe. As the first founder of an order, Francis of Assisi devoted to the missions a special chapter in his "Regula prima."[1] Dominic "only gradually advanced into the great commitment of a world-embracing action" (Altaner), but the Preaching Friars were sent forth to evangelize not much later than the Friars Minor (1217–18). At first the mendicants apparently played no particular role in the deliberations of the Curia. Unlike that of the Trinitarians in 1199,[2] their founding was not made known to the Sultan of Morocco. And in his general bull on the missions[3] Honorius III was still counting especially on the Cistercians for the evangelization of the pagans, even though his predecessor in 1212 had had to remind the general chapter not to impede individual monasteries in their mission activity.[4] As late as 1219 an Hospitaller was dispatched with a message from the Pope to the *Miromomelinus* (for the Arabic *Emir-el-mumenin*, "the ruler of the believers").[5]

When in 1219–20 Francis of Assisi proceeded to the camp of the Sultan of Egypt in order to preach Christianity to him,[6] his action stimulated the emergence of the realization, slowly awakening during the crusades, that Christianity should not be spread by force of arms but only by preaching and love. At any rate, the missionary concept moved on equal terms alongside the crusading idea, even though it still needed a long time before its implications were fully clarified. Thus Roger Bacon (d. 1294) represented the view that it is better to convert infidels by means of knowledge and wisdom than by wars, whereas his confrère, Duns Scotus (d. 1308), demanded the severest punishment of idolators and allowed princes the right to spread God's Kingdom by force. In his *Defensor pacis* (1324) Marsilius of Padua taught that the Church has no coercive power against heretics and infidels, but the Council of Basel still held that Jews could be compelled to listen to Christian sermons.

Like theory, practice oscillated between the extremes. The mendicant orders offered their services not only for evangelization but for crusade preaching as well. Again and again events tempted Christendom to take up the sword. The victory of Alfonso VIII of Castile over the Muslims at Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212 was an inducement to transfer the war to African soil, and Honorius III granted the same indulgences as for a crusade.[7] And the appearance of the Mongols raised the hope of finding in them allies against the Muslims. People regarded their Khans as successors of Prester John, whose image had excited the West for centuries.[8] This legend was in circulation long before the time of Otto of Freising (*Chronicon*, VII, 33). An Ethiopian priest-king, John, was known to Italian seafarers before the crusades.[9] Deficient geographical data — Ethiopia was identified with India — explain why the rumour of a Christian king in Ethiopia could be confused with the news of the victory of a Christian Kerait prince over the Muslim Khwarazmians in 1141. (When, later, the error was realized, people looked for Prester John in Africa again into the sixteenth century.)

---

[1] O. van der Vat, *Die Anfänge der Franziskanermissionen im nahen Orient und in den mohammedanischen Ländern während des 13. Jahrhunderts,* 9–25.

[2] *PL,* 214, 544.

[3] "Ne si secus" (25 March 1221), in *Potthast R,* 6599; *Streit,* XV, 50; *cf.* Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts,* 1 f.

[4] *Potthast R,* 4573.

[5] *Streit,* XV, 24; *Potthast R,* 6121.

[6] *Golubovich,* I, 1–104; *Streit,* XV, 41.

Against public opinion, the mendicant orders gave preference to the missions. It is true that in North Africa and the Near East their activity was missionary in intention rather than in reality. For in North Africa it was restricted to caring for the needs of Christian merchants, mercenaries, and slaves. Neither the Popes nor the Christian commercial city states could obtain from the sultans more than freedom of worship for Christians.[10] Preaching to Muslims remained forbidden, and when the preachers violated the prohibition they risked their lives, as did the first Franciscan martyrs in Morocco, who even felt that they could preach as they did in Italy and harshly refuted the teachings of Islam.[11] A like fate befell the Franciscans at Tunis in 1225 and at Ceuta in 1227. Still, the two sees of Morocco and Fez could be erected in North Africa.[12]

In the Near East the mendicants were chiefly interested in bringing back the schismatics and they were so successful that Gregory IX in 1238 admitted that it is just as good to lead unbelievers to the praise of God as to overcome them by armed force. This activity among schismatic Christians[13] was regarded as preliminary to missions among Muslims, and the Popes supported the mendicants in this view. They even gave them letters for the sultans in which the Christian faith and its messengers were commended. We thus hear of mission journeys to Aleppo, Damascus, Cairo, and Iconium. That successes were not lacking is certified by William of Tripolis, who claims to have baptized more than a thousand Saracens in his lifetime.[14]

---

[7] *Streit*, XV, 21.

[8] F. Zarnke, "Der Priesterkönig Johannes," *AGL*, philos.-hist. Kl, 7 (1879), 827–1030, 8 (1883), 1–186; R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae*, II (Leiden 1937), 361–76.

[9] R. Lefèvre, "Riflessi etiopici nella cultura del Medioevo e del Rinascimento I," *Annali Lateranensi*, 8 (Rome 1944), 9–89.

[10] T. Grentrup, "Das Missionsprotektorat in den mohammedanischen Staaten Nordafrikas vom 12.–15. Jh.," *ZMR*, 8 (1918), 88–96; *idem*, *Jus missionarium*, I (Steyl 1925), 361–69.

[11] H. Koehler, *L'Église chrétienne du Maroc et la mission franciscaine 1221–1790* (Paris 1934), 22 f.

[12] A. López, *Obispos en el África septentrional* (Tangiers 1941).

[13] This explains the term Eastern "mission."

Such numerical data are unusual. William based them on an indication of his method: he had obtained his successes "by the simple Word of God, without philosophical arguments and without force of arms." This allusion was not unintentional, and it contradicted the prevailing opinion that Muslims could not be converted. The mission work of the mendicants among them made it clear that the reasons for the sterility of efforts thus far made were to be sought not only on the side of Islam but equally in the missionaries. Since a command of languages is the first requirement for properly facing the missionary project, the mendicants, and in particular the Dominicans, established their own schools of languages and eagerly pursued Islamic studies.[15] Such language schools were in existence in the Holy Land from 1237, and in 1250 the *Studium Arabicum* was founded at Tunis at the suggestion of Saint Raymond of Peñaforte. Following the unfortunate outcome of the last crusade, schools of Arabic and Hebrew were opened in Spain. Prominent as writers were the Dominicans William of Tripolis *(Tractatus de statu Saracenorum,* 1273), Raymond Martí *(Pugio fidei contra Mauros et Iudaeos,* 1278), Ricoldo da Monte Croce *(Contra legem Saracenorum,* better known as *Confutatio Alcorani),* and others. In this connection can be mentioned Aquinas's *Summa contra gentiles.*[16] Among the Franciscans Raymond Lull (1234–1315)[17] is especially deserving of mention. Through various memoranda to the Popes, the King of France, and the University of Paris, he exerted himself to appeal to the conscience of Christendom and to draw attention to the duty to the missions. Besides the erecting of mission colleges, he suggested the founding of a supreme missionary authority, which, directed by a cardinal, should co-ordinate the mission efforts of the various orders. At his request the Council of Vienne in 1312 prescribed the setting up of two chairs of oriental languages in the most important universities.[18] But the decree was not implemented. Once again, in 1434 the Council of Basel called attention to it, but to no purpose.

---

[14] *Tractatus de statu Saracenorum* (1273), conclusion.

[15] *Cf.* the works of B. Altaner, *ZMR,* 21 (1931), 113–26, 23 (1933), 233–41, 26 (1936), 165–71; *BZ,* 21 (1933 f.), 288–308; *ZKG,* 53 (1934), 469–79, 55 (1936), 83–126; *OrChrP,* 2 (1936), 437–52.

[16] M. Grabmann, "Die Missionsidee der Dominikanertheologen des 13. Jahrhunderts," *ZMR,* 1 (1911), 137–46; B. Altaner, "Zur Geschichte der anti-islamischen Polemik während des 13. und 14. Jh.," *HJ,* 56 (1936), 227–333.

[17] R. Sugranyes de Franch, *Raymond Lulle, Docteur des Missions* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1954) (literature).

[18] B. Altaner, "Raymundus Lullus und der Sprachenkanon (can. 11) des Konzils von Vienne (1312)," *HJ,* 53 (1933), 190–319; *idem,* "Die Durchführung des Vienner Konzilsbeschlusses über die Errichtung von Lehrstühlen für orientalische Sprachen," *ZKG,* 52 (1933), 226–36. *Cf. Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta* (2nd ed., 1962), 355 f., 459.

The appearance of the Mongols in Eastern and Central Europe contributed directly to the expansion of mission work outside Europe. At first consideration was given to meeting them also with crusade methods. But once the gravest danger seemed to have been warded off from the West – after their victory at Liegnitz in 1241 the Mongols returned to Central Asia to arrange the succession to the khanate, — other ways of reaching them were sought. The finding of a *remedium contra Tartaros* was for Innocent IV one of the motives for summoning the First Council of Lyons.[19] Even though, shortly before, the Mongols had been regarded as fiends — "Tartari, imo Tartarei!"[20] — now they were sought as allies against the Muslims. To this end the Pope sent the Franciscans Lawrence of Portugal and John of Piano di Carpine to the Mongols before the opening of the Council. Lawrence's task was purely missionary; his instructions contained only a catechetical exposition of the Christian faith. Other embassies were more of a diplomatic nature. John was supposed to urge peace, while two Dominicans, Ascellin (or Anselm) and Andrew of Longjumeau, were to prepare the desired alliance against the Muslims. But the journeys produced no tangible results, even though embassies were dispatched by the Mongols to the Pope and to Louis IX. Among those who set out for the Mongols in the course of the following years, the most important was William of Ruysbroeck, who reached Karakorum and left a detailed account of his travels, which is generally reliable and valuable.[21] The missionary aims of all these journeys are unmistakable,[22] but in the final analysis they were not the appropriate means of effecting lasting conversions. Even Innocent IV seems to have been convinced of the fruitlessness of these endeavours. William of Ruysbroeck had not yet returned when the Dominicans and the Franciscans, with papal encouragement, undertook direct missionary work. To what extent the mendicant friars were regarded as the real representatives of the Church's missionary work is shown by the resolution of the Cistercian general chapter to ask prayers for the heralds of the faith who were going to the Tartars. Not incorrectly has this directive been termed "the order's charter of resignation of its missionary activity."[23]

Of special importance for the effectiveness of the mendicant orders was the jurisdictional organization of their mission work. Not only did the authority to dispose of the individual friars no longer lie with the respective superiors of the several houses but rather with the generals of the orders; the friars who chose the missionary vocation themselves constituted special missionary communities within their order. Even so, the ecclesiastical mission was received, not by these groups but by the order as such. The general handed over the mission by appointing prefects or vicars, who, at the orders of the general and as his representatives, were to supervise its implementation. Hence, unlike the later vicars apostolic, these prefects or vicars were not ecclesiastical authorities but religious officials. This arrangement is especially striking among the Franciscans. Their mission fields were divided into six vicariates: those of Tataria Aquilonaris, Tataria Orientis, and Cathay, embracing the lands of the Mongols, the Vicaria Marocchii for North Africa, and those of Bosnia and Russia for Southern and Eastern Europe. The Dominicans adhered in their mission territories to their familiar division into provinces. But toward the close of the thirteenth century there arose the *Societas fratrum peregrinantium propter Christum in gentes,*[24] which seems to have included chiefly the Dominicans working in the Orient. The first documented information about it is from 1304. A similar missionary society of Friars Minor is first referred to under Urban V. Little is known of its organization, except that a home missionary society, the Confraternity of Saint Francis, was attached to it, which supported especially the Franciscans in Eastern Europe.[25] It was approved by Martin V in 1421.

---

[19] *Potthast R,* 11493; *Hefele,* V, 981–1002.

[20] Frederick II to Edward of England, in Matthew Paris, *Historia Anglorum,* II (London 1886), 820, quoted in *Streit,* IV, 1.

[21] *Sinica Franciscana* [= *SF*], I, 164–332.

[22] C. Schollmeyer, "Die missionarische Sendung des Fr. Wilhelm von Rubruk," *OstKSt,* 5 (1955), 138–46; *cf. ZMR,* 40 (1956), 200–05.

[23] B. Altaner, *Dominikanermissionen,* 2, following F. Winter, *Die Cisterzienser des nördlichen Deutschlands bis zum Auftreten der Bettelorden,* I (Gotha 1868), 294.

Activity among the unfamiliar peoples of Eastern Europe must be regarded as the starting point for the mission in the interior of Asia. As early as 1211 King Andrew II of Hungary had called upon the Teutonic Knights for protection from the invading Cumans. Their successes justified the establishment of a special Cuman bishopric. When, as a consequence of conflicts with the King, the Knights left Hungary, the Dominicans took their place. They were able to push forward to the Dnieper and to convert the Cuman Prince Bortz, who was baptized by the Archbishop of Esztergom in 1227. The Dominican Theoderic was consecrated Bishop of the Cumans, his bishopric being directly subject to the Holy See. Several thousand Cumans must have embraced the faith, but the Mongol fury completely wiped out the mission. Ninety missionaries were killed, and the Cumans were scattered throughout the Balkans.

It was not until 1253, after the diplomatic visits to the Mongols, that the missionary journeys to Eastern Europe were resumed. The first quarter-century of this new start is shrouded in darkness and only in 1278 do we discover efforts to reestablish the Cuman bishopric in connection with an account of the Franciscan missionaries working in Qipčaq, the Khanate of the Golden Horde.[26] In 1287 we hear of several Franciscan houses in the Crimea and in Sarai, the capital of Qipčaq.[27] The Franciscans succeeded in baptizing the "Empress" Yailaq and eventually even the Khan Toqtai (1300–12) and several members of his household.[28] Around 1320 Franciscans were working even among the Bashkirs,[29] but unfortunately the conversion of the Khan Uzbek (1312–40) to Islam soon forced the greatest part of the Golden Horde to embrace the religion of The Prophet. At the beginning of his reign the Vicariate of Tataria Aquilonaris counted seventeen settlements and between 1318 and 1321 Sarai became the see of a Latin bishop.

---

[24] R. Loenertz, *Société des Frères Pérégrinants* (Rome 1937).

[25] A. Groeteken, "Eine mittelalterliche Missionsgesellschaft," *ZMR*, 1 (1911), 1–13.

Political events contributed substantially to the development of the mission in Tataria Orientis, where the Mongols' originally hostile attitude to Islam roused great hopes. The incentive was provided by the taking of Baghdad in 1258 by Hulagu, a brother of the Great Khan Mangu. The Abbasid Caliphate in Persia came to an end, and Hulagu established the dynasty of the Il-khans (1256–1335). His empire embraced Iran, parts of Turkestan, Armenia, and eastern Anatolia, and Azerbaijan and Iraq. His warfare was aimed chiefly at the Mameluks of Egypt. Thus he established numerous contacts with the Christians of Syria and as a consequence there were missionary undertakings in the empire of the Il-khans and the neighboring lands. Christian Mongol princesses, such as Soyorgatani Baigi, mother of Mangu, Kublai, and Hulagu, and Hulagu's wife, Dokuz Khatun, played a prominent role in all this.

Less stress was laid on the conversion of Muslims and pagans than on reunion with the Nestorian Church, which had benefited by Mongol toleration to reorganize itself in Asia. Efforts for union reached their climax when in 1287 the Catholicos Jahballahā III of Baghdad (1281–1317), an Ongüt, sent his confidant, the Uigur Bar-Sauma, to Rome.[30] Bar-Sauma had no scruples about recognizing the papal primacy and in 1304 Jahballahā followed suit. But matters proceeded no further. Under the Il-khan Gazan (1295–1305) Islam gained the upper hand and the conflicts between Shi'ites and Sunnites contributed to the decline of the Il-khan empire. From 1295 the preaching of the faith to Muslims caused persecutions and bloody martyrdoms. But the fact remains that in 1314 Dominicans and Franciscans each had fifteen monasteries in these areas.

Greater significance attaches to the missionary work on the farthest edge of the then known world, in China. The earliest contacts with the Mongol dynasty in China were made by Venetian merchants, the Polos, in 1261–69. They delivered to the Pope a message from the Great Khan Kublai (1260–94), in which he asked for 100 missionaries. But two expeditions sent by the papacy did not reach their goal. The first to arrive in China was the Franciscan John of Montecorvino,[31] dispatched by Nicholas IV in 1289. He was the first to select, not the land route through the interior of Asia, but the sea route from the Persian Gulf. He delivered the papal letter to Kublai's successor Timur (Ch'eng-tsung, 1294–1307) and then began his apostolate, first among the Nestorian Ongüt in Northern Tenduc. He was able to bring their King George into union with Rome and in the latter's capital built a church,[32] where the Latin Mass was celebrated in the Mongol tongue. Unfortunately, George died in 1298 and the strong opposition of the Nestorians induced John to seek out Khanbaliq, "City of the Khan," later Peking, where he began missionary work in the proper sense. After some setbacks he was able to establish a numerous community of Mongols and Chinese. In a letter of 1305[33] he recounted his successes and asked for assistance. In regard to mission procedure the letter is unusually rich in information. John emphasized catechetical and liturgical formation and excelled in intelligent and generous adaptation. His achievements induced Clement V to name John Archbishop of Peking in 1307, with Khanbaliq as metropolitan see for all the Mongol missions.[34] Six bishops were sent by the Pope to China to consecrate John and then to be assigned by him to the suffragan sees of Zaitun (Fukien), Almaligh (Jagatai), Kaffa, Sarai, Tana, and Kumuk (Qipčaq). John directed the mission until 1328. At his death Catholic Christianity in China counted some 30,000 faithful, including about 15,000 Alans, whom the Mongols had transferred from the Caucasus to China. (The first Chinese plenary council, held at Shanghai in 1924, proposed the beatification of John of Montecorvino.)

---

[26] *Streit,* IV, 48.

[27] *ibid.,* 50.

[28] *Golubovich,* III, 170–77.

[29] *Streit,* IV, 130.

[30] J. B. Chabot, *Histoire du Patriarche Mar Jabalaha III et du Moine Bar Çauma* (Paris 1895).

John's accomplishments stand out in even greater relief when it is remembered that for years he worked alone. It was not till 1303 that he obtained an assistant in Arnold of Cologne,[35] the first German missionary in China. When John was appointed Archbishop, many mendicant friars tried to hurry to his aid, but how many of them reached their goal is not known. Still, there must have been several monasteries in China. An amazing account of this period is given by the Franciscan Odoric of Pordenone, who spent three years in Khanbaliq and then took the land route back to Europe *via* Tibet.[36]

---

[31] A. van der Wyngaert, *Jean de Mont Corvin* (Lille 1924); J. de Ghellinck in *RHM*, 5 (1928), 506–44.

[32] Namio Egami, "Olon-süme et la découverte de l'église catholique romaine de Jean de Montcorvin," *JA*, 240 (1952), 154–67.

[33] *SF*, I, 345–51.

[34] *Streit*, IV, 97–100.

[35] *ibid.*, 107.

In the meantime Pope John XXII had reorganized Church affairs in Asia.[37] In 1318 he erected the province of Sultaniyah, to which he assigned six suffragan sees, entrusting them to the Dominicans.[38] His principal concern here was the promoting of reunion with the schismatic Armenians. Monks of the monastery of Qrna, having returned to Rome in a body, formed a special community and, with reference to their aim, called themselves the *Fratres Unitores.*[39] They were loosely connected with the Order of Preachers and existed into the eighteenth century.

To the province of Sultaniyah belonged two sees located outside the area just referred to. One was Samarkand, in the province of Sogdiana in the Khanate of Jagatai; its first bishop was the Dominican Thomas Mancasole of Piacenza.[40] The other was Quilon (Kollam) in South India, which owed its origin to the circumstance that missionaries *en route* by sea to China transferred here to Chinese junks. The interval was filled with missionary work. First Bishop of Quilon was the Dominican Jordan Cathala of Sévérac,[41] who gave up his journey to China and remained in India when his four Franciscan traveling companions were martyred by fanatical Muslims at Tana (near modern Bombay).[42] From Quilon arose the first connections with Ethiopia, and the Dominican William Adam may have reached East Africa south of the equator.[43]

Our last detailed information about the two provinces of Sultaniyah and Khanbaliq is provided by the report of the journey of the Papal Legate John de Marignolli of Florence,[44] who visited all of Asiatic Christendom between 1338 and 1353. Then disaster overtook the late mediaeval missionary work. The Black Death, which in 1348 carried off almost all the missionaries in Persia, on its progress through Europe also depopulated the monasteries of the homeland so that it became impossible to supply the required number of apostles for distant lands. To this was added the unceasing Islamization of the Mongols, forcibly completed under Timur-Leng (1336–1405). The religious toleration practised by the Mongols was succeeded by intolerant Sunnite fanaticism, which met all missionary endeavours with bitter hostility.

---

[36] *SF,* I, 411–95.

[37] A. Fliche, "L'action missionnaire du Pape Jean XXII," *Bulletin des Missions,* 22 (Bruges 1948), 1–8.

[38] *Streit,* IV, 121 f.

[39] *Cf.* the series of articles by M. A. van den Oudenrijn in *Het Missiewerk,* 17–19 (Nijmegen 1935 f.–1937 f.).

[40] *Streit,* IV, 166.

[41] *ibid.,* 167 f.

[42] *ibid.,* 132–35.

[43] R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae,* III (Leiden 1938), 144–47.

[44] *SF,* I, 524–60.

In addition, all travel was prevented by the wars with which Timur-Leng filled Asia for a whole generation.

For the Church in China matters were decided when in 1368 the Mongol Dynasty was overthrown by the nationalistic Ming. Until the beginning of the fifteenth century occasional reports concerning Christianity in China are found, but thereafter the final remnants seem to have perished. In 1410 the archbishopric of Sultaniyah was united with Khanbaliq, but in 1473 the Venetian Contarini found there neither churches nor Christians.

Success had been achieved neither in direct missionary work among the Muslims of North Africa nor in the endeavour to gain the Mongols as allies against Islam. On the contrary, the barrier which Islam had erected between Europe and Africa had been extended from the Near East into Central Asia when the Mongols turned to Islam. More than ever Christendom was eager to breach this barrier, and to do so became the goal of a community of Portuguese Knights who had united after the suppression of the Templars and in 1319 had been recognized by John XXII as the "Militia Iesu Christi."[45] The bull "Ad ea ex quibus cultus"[46] is not only the Magna Carta of the Order of the Knights of Christ. It is equally the basis for Portugal's colonial expansion, for ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the conquered territories, and for the future Portuguese royal *padroado* in the missions.

In contrast to the other military orders, the Order of Christ had to conduct the war against the Muslims chiefly on the sea. Since Southern Spain was still under the rule of the Moors, it was important to gain a foothold in North Africa and attack the enemy from the rear. This tactical idea was maintained when Prince Henry the Navigator (1394–1460), after the victory of Ceuta (1415), laid the ground for the Portuguese voyages of discovery. The Holy See did everything possible to promote these undertakings.[47] In 1418 Martin V summoned all of Portugal to the crusade against the Muslims and to the spread of the faith.[48] In 1443 Eugene IV awarded all islands, conquered or to be conquered (!), to the Order of Christ.[49] In the bull "Romanus Pontifex"[50] Nicholas V gave voice to the expectations of all Christendom: that the voyages of discovery on the African coast should help to find the sea-route to India, to enter into an alliance with the Saint Thomas Christians living there, and to lay hold of the Muslims from behind. The bull awarded Portugal a monopoly of conquest and trade on all seas and islands. In return, Portugal had to do all in its power for the spread of the faith. A protest by Castile was rejected by Calixtus III in 1456 and quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over all lands still to be conquered was given to the Order of Christ in perpetuity.[51] This was to be of exceptional significance for evangelization in the following epoch, since all authority granted for the mission was to be regarded only as delegated authority. The vicars and prefects of the contemporary sources were not ecclesiastical officials but deputies of the Order of Christ. This meant also that missionary activity could develop only on the Portuguese firing line.

---

[45] A. Jann, *Die katholischen Missionen in Indien, China und Japan* (Paderborn 1915), 1–63.

[46] *Streit,* XV, 271.

[47] Sixty-nine papal bulls are known between 1415 and 1500; *cf.* C. M. de Witte, "Les Bulles pontificales et l'expansion portugaise au XV^e siècle," *RHE,* 48 (1953), 683–718, 49 (1954), 438–61, 51 (1956), 413–53, 809–56, 53 (1958), 4–46, 440–471; F. Mateos, "Bulas portuguesas y españoles sobre descubrimientos geográficos," *Missionalia Hispanica,* 19 (Madrid 1962), 5–34, 129–68.

[48] *Streit,* XV, 373; J. Goñi Gaztambide, *Historia de la Bula de la Cruzada en España* (Vitoria 1958).

[49] *Streit,* XV, 460.

[50] 8 January 1455; *cf. Streit,* XV, 512–14.

---

[51] *Streit*, XV, 523; F. Pérez Embid, *Los descubrimientos en el Atlántico y la rivalidad castellano-portuguesa hasta el Tratado de Tordesillas* (Seville 1948).

SECTION TWO

The Western Schism and the Councils

Chapter 46

The Western Schism to the Council of Pisa

The premature death of Gregory XI placed the Church in a difficult situation. The Curia, back in Rome, and in particular the many French cardinals were not yet acclimated to Italy, and six cardinals were still at Avignon. The anxiety of the Romans lest they might again lose the recently recovered papacy makes it easy to understand their exertions to obtain a Roman or at least an Italian as the new Pope. These exertions were not confined to requests and expostulations; they took on the forms of violence.

Even during the obsequies for Gregory XI there were riots in the city, and after the sealing off of the conclave in the Vatican Palace on the evening of 7 April 1378 the excitement and pressure increased notably. Thousands of Romans noisily demanded someone from Rome or at least a native of Italy as Pope. It was only with great effort that armed bands could be removed from the area of the conclave. On the same evening the desire for an Italian Pope was presented to the sixteen cardinals — eleven French, four Italians, and one Spaniard — by the heads of the urban "regions." The cardinals gave them an evasive reply.

Even apart from these external troubles, the usual factional groupings gave reason to expect that the course of the business would be unpleasant. The strongest faction comprised the so-called Limousins, who were interested in continuing the tradition of the three recent Limousin Popes. Opposed to them was the small so-called French faction, determined to thwart this project at any cost. With this in mind, outside candidates had already been mentioned, including the Archbishop of Bari, Bartholomew Prignano, regent of the papal chancery, since the actual vice-chancellor was still at Avignon. He may have seemed acceptable to both French and Italians, for he came from Angevin Naples and had spent many years at Avignon.

A proper election procedure soon proved to be impossible. The very next morning, following a restless night, the disturbances were renewed. Again and again the guardian of the conclave, the Bishop of Marseilles, had to send for the seniors of the three orders of cardinals to have them calm the mob by holding out the prospect of a Roman or an Italian Pope in the course of the day. In the early morning a part of the cardinals decided to vote for Prignano. Whether this was with a general reservation is not entirely certain, but it is attested for a few cardinals. In the afternoon, some, but not all, of the cardinals sought to repeat the voting in regard to Prignano and to question the candidate, who had meanwhile been sent for, as to his acceptance of the election. But they were unable to finish, for then ensued an invasion of the conclave. It was calmed for the moment when it was declared that the aged Roman Cardinal Tebaldeschi had been elected. Despite his resistance he was enthroned before the altar of the chapel by the mob. The other cardinals profited by the break to flee, six to Castel Sant'Angelo, the others to their residences or outside Rome. On the next afternoon twelve cardinals returned voluntarily or were called to the Vatican to complete the election procedure.

The real problem begins after this very dubious election, since the cardinals took part in the enthronement, treated Urban VI (1378–89) as Pope, at least outwardly, presented their petitions to him, and sent notification of the election to the princes. Thereby, so one often reads, tacit consent was given and the cardinals lost their right of protest against "pressure" in the election.

The elucidation and evaluation of the events in Rome in the weeks from the election to the open defection of the cardinals in June are among the most difficult problems of late mediaeval Church History. Among the many double papal elections of the Middle Ages, that of 1378 occupies a special position, because a quick political decision did not liquidate the theoretical considerations, as had frequently been the case previously. There was no lack of endeavours to dissipate the uncertainty as to the legitimate Pope. No other occurrence of this period left behind such an amount of written material; in no other burning question were so many inquiries instituted and so many witnesses called.

Consideration must be given above all to the collection of about sixty manuscripts preserved in the Vatican archives under the title *Libri de schismate.* This comprises a many-layered material, which goes from the beginning of the Schism to the turn of the century and was compiled by a loyal adherent of Benedict XIII, Martin de Zalva, Bishop of Pamplona and Cardinal. Later it passed into the possession of Benedict XIII, who had a *tabula* prepared for ready use. Hence the collection served the practical purpose of defending legitimacy, but it was more far-reaching and took the opposing side into full consideration. It is a kind of source-material which is otherwise hardly to be found in such an intact state among medieaval documents, and makes us regret the loss of other source-material of equal value. It has often been utilized, and is the basis of a variety of interpretations, especially by Raynald and Baluze and, more reliably, by Gayet, Ehrle, Valois, and finally by Seidlmayer and Přerovský.[1]

A substantial portion of these *Libri de schismate* consists of the testimony of witnesses concerning the origin of the Schism, especially the election of Urban VI and the ensuing weeks until the election of Clement VII. Hence they are at first concerned with the so-called *factum.* In general, the persons interrogated decided, according to the two obediences, in the contemporary terminology, for the *primus electus* or the *secundus electus,* but they were not merely partisan and made many neutral declarations concerning the events.

The first really important hearings took place in Rome in March 1379 and were in favour of Urban. A second hearing was arranged at Barcelona in May and September 1379 by the royal council, and it supported Clement. The twenty-three witnesses interrogated at Rome in November 1379 decided for Urban. We are best informed about such efforts in the Iberian peninsula, and in most detail for Castile, where King Henry II was kept very well informed by his envoys then staying in Italy; in view of the difficult circumstances the strictest secrecy and the utmost circumspection were maintained. Then, by order of the new King John I, extensive hearings were conducted at Avignon in May 1380 and at Rome in the following July as the basis for the great judicial procedure at Medina del Campo from November 1380 to May 1381; further written material was submitted here and oral testimony received. More than 100 declarations of all tendencies were here considered and, after months of deliberations, they resulted in the Kingdom's deciding for Clement VII.[2] Much later, in the summer of 1386, the King of Aragón had forty more persons questioned at Avignon, and, as expected, they pronounced in favour of the Pope there resident. These late declarations also, despite the great lapse of time and the consolidation of the obediences, are not without value, but the organization of the process in Castile excels all the others.

What, then, is the result of these efforts to ascertain the *factum*? This *dubium in facto* was examined from all points of view with the aim of investigating the events in Urban's election down to the least detail and, as far as possible, the intention of the electors. The opinion of the election is virtually unanimous. The election was not free but resulted from *impressio,* from *metus qui cadit in constantem virum,* neither absolutely valid nor absolutely null, but in any event controvertible. If an effort is made to form a picture out of this thicket of numberless declarations (*depositiones*), it does not favour Urban, not merely in view of the events of the election and his personality but also in regard to the period immediately after the election.

---

[1] M. Seidlmayer, "Die spanischen 'Libri de schismate' des Vatikanischen Archivs," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 8 (1940), 199–262.

[2] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Lat. 11745; on the manuscript see *Baluze-Mollat,* II, 800–12; N. Del Re, "Il 'consilium pro Urbano VI' di Bartolomeo da Saliceto (Vat. lat. 5608)," *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. card. Albareda,* I, *SteT,* 219 (1962), 213–63; L. Saggi, "Bartolomeo Peyroni O.Carm., vescovo di Elne, e la sua testimonianza circa il conclave del 1378," *AHPont,* 4 (1966), 59–77.

The first reports reaching the outside carried chiefly only the news of the completion of the election and with it the acceptance or recognition of the one elected. But, before long, details of the happenings in Rome were known in various places, and these urged caution if not reserve in regard to recognizing the new Pope. At Rome itself, two days after the election, doubts as to its validity were expressed in a sermon at Ara Coeli.[3] And official letters sent by cardinals to princes, whose wording was occasionally approved by the new Pope, were accompanied by secret messages which read differently from the official text.[4] Everything now depended on how the new Pope conducted himself and whether the defects in the election could be eliminated by actual subsequent consent.

But matters did not turn out that way at all. Soon there were quarrels and collisions with the envoys of princes, with cardinals, bishops, and curial functionaries, and politically very unwise behaviour toward such persons as Queen Joanna I of Naples and the German King Wenceslas. Furthermore, basic reforms were at once announced — to begin with the cardinals. It was not so much the question of reform that was important but rather of the unfortunate style and method of an authoritarian, dictatorial government by a hitherto subordinate curial *archiepiscopellus*, as one cardinal called him to his face,[5] of a morbidly exalted notion of his new office, no longer corresponding to the actual status of the papacy, and of an offensive arrogance gushing from this. All this confirms the impression of a pathological personality.[6] Not long ago this *incapacità* was profoundly investigated. The outcome was an interesting and subtle question: Can the cardinals retract their vote if they notice that the one elected by them is unable to carry out his function in a reasonable manner; in other words, that a grave mistake has been made in regard to the person and his qualities?

What had previously been active only in the background and had been expressed only with the utmost caution quickly put in an appearance after the beginning of the summer *villeggiatura*. In quick succession the cardinals left Rome in June with the Pope's permission and came together at Anagni.

---

[3] O. Přerovský, *L'elezione di Urbano VI*, 42.

[4] M. Seidlmayer, *Die Anfänge des grossen abendländischen Schismas*, 243, 288, 332.

[5] *Ibid.*, 280.

[6] O. Přerovský, *op. cit.*, 65 ff., 182 ff. Particulars in M. Seidlmayer, Anfänge, 8–18. A member of the Consiglio of Florence said: "Singulariter et precipue seipsum destruit" (*Archivio storico per le provincie Napoletane*, 45 [1920], 40).

The Curia had been transferred there and the Pope intended to follow. Now voices were multiplied, speaking of an invalid election, of new discussions to take place at Anagni, of a second election under normal circumstances, and also of a council and of a sort of tutelage for the not completely qualified Pope. These voices did not remain concealed from Urban; even cardinals now made known to him their misgivings. Though he was not fully aware of the gravity of the situation, he put off going to Anagni and at the end of July went to Tivoli. Shortly before this there had appeared in Rome an official representative of the cardinals assembled at Anagni to make known to him their opinion: that he had no right to the papal dignity and would either be reelected or otherwise provided for.

The three Italian cardinals, still in Rome and as yet undecided, were thereupon sent by Urban to Anagni with compliant proposals that betrayed weakness. But before long he returned to his usual obstinacy and rejected the considerations put forth by a new embassy from the cardinals as well as those of the Italian cardinals, who returned to him at Tivoli. He would not consent to one or more coadjutors who would cover up his incapacity, but demanded unconditional recognition of the validity of his election. In the very lively exchange of proposals throughout July a council occupied a special place. The chief advocates of this idea were the Italians, and, above all, Orsini.[7] The declaration of the French cardinals of 20 July with regard to the nullity of the election and hence of the vacancy of the see rendered further negotiations complicated, while the three Italians, who continued to regard a council as the final remedy, did not return to the Pope again but maintained relations only in writing. Submission on Urban's part was less and less to be looked for.

Decisive discussions among all the cardinals took place in mid-September at Fondi. Once again the Italians referred to a council, which need not include all bishops but could consist of representatives of each province. Venice, Pisa, and Naples were suggested, or even the Piedmontese area because of its proximity to France. These considerations foundered on the difficulties attendant upon the convocation and the interim administration, and it required decades of discussions before the matter was clarified.

These consultations at Fondi concluded with a new election. Presumably, the Italians had been given reason for hope and so they took part in the conclave of 20 September. None of them, however, was elected, but instead Cardinal Robert of Geneva, who had long been considered. If one so desired, one could see in him a neutral, between France and Italy. He was elected on 20 September, the election was proclaimed on the twenty-first, and on 31 October he was crowned as Clement VII (1378—1394). The Schism was a reality.

---

[7] M. Seidlmayer, *Anfänge*, 179 ff.

A careful weighing of all the facts gives the impression that Urban's election can by no means, and the so-called tacit consent only in a highly questionable manner, support the legitimacy of the beginnings of his pontificate; his *incapacità* was too notorious. The cautious judgment of Valois is, from the historical viewpoint, still probably the correct stand, and so eminent a specialist of our own day as G. Mollat has adopted this opinion.[8] Decisions as the Schism began, however, were made at first on political grounds.

As regards the Curia and its staff, Robert's election was for the most part hailed. Whoever could escape from Rome did so, along with official books, registers, and the impressions for the seals. The highest ranking officials of the curial administration went over to Clement VII and hence Urban's position appeared very precarious. Both claimants endeavoured by means of numerous letters and embassies to kings, princes, bishops, universities, and cities to prove their legitimacy and to acquire recognition. At first the political climate seemed to favour Clement, but he was unable to take possession of Rome and of Urban's person. On the contrary, following the victory of Urban's mercenaries near Marino on 29 April 1379 and his acquiring of Castel Sant'Angelo, Clement had to withdraw from Italy, in spite of the support of the Queen of Naples, and retire to Avignon in May 1381. From this last point persons have rashly inferred a close understanding with the French King at the time of the events in Anagni and Fondi. But at the start France seems to have held back, even if its sympathies were with Clement.[9]

For Urban it was important to organize a new Curia. He began with the promotion of twenty-nine cardinals but not all those selected accepted. Urban was almost universally recognized in Italy, with its many large and small lordships. To be sure, there was much vacillating and changing, always in accord with high politics, and neutrality was not rare. When a quick decision between the *primus electus* and the *secundus electus* and the holding of a council did not materialize, the Great Schism began to come clearly into view. It was consummated mainly under political aspects. On Urban's side, in addition to Italy, were ranged especially the Empire and King Wenceslas, the eastern and Nordic countries and Hungary, and, of the western states, England, the enemy of France. After a brief neutrality France became Clement VII's chief support, along with its dependent territories, Burgundy, Savoy, and Naples, and Scotland, the foe of England.

There were likewise political areas where a decision for one claimant or the other did not occur so rapidly. Since the call for a council, raised early, could not be realized, or at least not soon, efforts were made to form a judgment on the basis of the most exact possible examination of the facts.

---

[8] *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 1166 f.

[9] M. Seidlmayer, *Anfänge*, 19, 69. For Clement VII see *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 1162–75.

The careful endeavours in Castile have already been mentioned; they resulted in the recognition of Clement VII in 1380. More so than in previous schisms an attitude of reserve appeared, the so-called indifference, which does not mean unconcern or a lack of interest, but a neutral waiting for a universally acceptable solution of the extremely difficult canonical questions. Meanwhile, the administration of Church benefices and finances in the "indifferent" territories required a competent authority. It was not merely financial aspects which led in Aragón especially to the organizing of a royal *Camera Apostolica;* in many places a similar expedient was resorted to. Aragón was rather for Urban, but when Peter de Luna came to the Kingdom as Cardinal Legate there was soon a change of atmosphere. However it was almost ten years before the new King John I decided for the Avignon obedience.[10] But Aragonese Sicily was subject to Rome. Portugal at first remained passive, but declared for Avignon in 1380, changed to Urban in 1381, returned to Clement in 1382, and went over definitely to Urban in 1385.[11] The King of Navarre did not declare for the Avignon obedience until 1390, after a long "indifferent" period.[12] More so than in these large states there were difficulties on the frontiers of the obediences, where the Schism often assumed bizarre forms, above all on the western boundary of the Empire, which did not even present a stable line and hence produced frequent changes.

At the beginning of the Schism Clement displayed a feverish activity in an effort to secure influence in Germany, an area lacking a strong central power. Many provisions, expectatives, and interventions in disputed cases have come down to us but we do not always know the outcome. Still, the material made available by E. Göller shows a great uncertainty in the delimitation of the obediences and indicates numerous adherents of the Avignon claimant in all German bishoprics. The upper Rhine sees of Constance, Basel and Strasbourg, Duke Leopold of Austria, Count Eberhard of Wirtemberg, Margrave Bernard of Baden, and lower Rhine princes and cities inclined to Clement.[13] But apart from the borderlands, the Roman obedience clearly consolidated itself in the Empire, chiefly through the activity of King Wenceslas and the Urbanist alliance brought about by the efforts of the Count Palatine Rupert I, as well as by the successful legation of Cardinal Pileo da Prata. But not even all the German bishops entered the Urbanist alliance; in spite of the prevailing sympathy for Urban, imperial unanimity was unthinkable.[14]

---

[10] M. Seidlmayer, *Anfänge,* 65–118; *idem,* "Peter de Luna (Benedict XIII.) und die Entstehung des grossen abendländischen Schismas," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 4 (1933), 206–47; J. Zunzunegui, "La legación en España del Card. Pedro de Luna 1379–90," *Miscellanea Hist. Pont.,* 7 (1943), 83–137; J. Vincke, "Der König von Aragón und die Camera apostolica in den Anfängen des Grossen Schismas," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 7 (1938), 84–126; *idem,* "Die Berufung an den römischen Stuhl während der 'Indifferenz' König Peters IV. von Aragón," *ibid.,* 8 (1940), 263–79; *idem,* "Die Krone von Aragón und das grosse abendländische Schisma," *Staatl. Akademie zu Braunsberg,* Personal- und Vorlesungsverzeichnis, summer semester 1944; A. Boscolo, *Medio evo Aragonese,* chapter "Isole mediterranee, chiesa e Aragona durante lo scisma d'occidente," (Padua 1958); J. Morera Sabater, "Una curiosa correspondencia del año 1386 relativa al cisma de Occidente," *Ges. Aufsätze zur Kulturgesch. Spaniens,* 22 (1965), 202–16.

[11] M. Seidlmayer, *Anfänge,* 24; J. C. Baptista, "Portugal e o cisma de occidente," *Lusitania sacra,* 1 (1956), 65–203.

[12] J. Zunzunegui, *El reino de Navarra y su obispado de Pamplona durante la primera época del cisma de occidente. Pontificado de Clemente VII de Aviñón 1378–94* (San Sebastián 1942).

The split also affected the centrally organized religious orders, which soon had a duplication of superiors and of general chapters. For the same reason there was schism in the cathedral and collegiate chapters, and dissension even invaded families, though, of course, we do not know much about the distress of consciences. Much is made of the fact that on both sides saints ardently defended the Pope they recognized at a given moment. That is of no particular importance and is only further proof that there was no universally recognized Pope, no *papa indubitatus.* Revealing is the attitude of the influential and scholarly Archbishop Peter Tenorio of Toledo, who in the Canon of the Mass replaced the name of the Pope with the phrase *pro illo qui est verus papa.*[15] It is useless to argue whether in the decisions for one or the other claimant more weight should be attributed to the political or the religious aspect. Even in predominantly theological considerations there was need of political measures for making convictions prevail. There were, to be sure, even clerics who, in order to acquire benefices, addressed themselves to both Curias, but the change of high ranking personalities from one obedience to the other depended most of all on political circumstances, just as the opinions of experts were guided by the political situation of the moment. Examples of renunciation of obedience are the Franciscan Cardinal Leonard Giffoni and Pileo da Prata, called the Cardinal of the Three

---

[13] E. Göller, *RepGerm,* I (Berlin 1916), 99*–170*; C. Schmitt, "Le parti clémentiste dans la province franciscaine de Strasbourg," *AFrH,* 55 (1962), 82–102; K. Schönenberger, *Das Bistum Konstanz während des Grossen Schismas* (Fribourg 1926); *idem, Das Bistum Basel während des grossen Schismas* (Basel 1928); J. Rott, "Le grand schisme d'occident et la diocèse de Strasbourg," *MAH,* 52 (1935), 366–95; A. Largiadèr, "Zum Grossen abendländischen Schisma von 1378 bis 1415," *Mélanges offerts à M. Paul-E. Martin* (Geneva 1961), 199 to 212; G. A. von Asseldonk, *De Nederlanden en het western schisma tot 1398* (Utrecht 1955); J. Paquet, "Le Schisme d'Occident à Louvain, Bruxelles et Anvers," *RHE,* 59 (1964), 401–36.

[14] H. Weigel, "Männer um König Wenzel. Das Problem der Reichspolitik 1379–1384," *DA,* 5 (1942), 112–77; *idem,* "König Wenzels persönliche Politik. Reich und Hausmacht 1384–1389," *DA,* 7 (1944), 133–99; P. Stacul, *Il cardinale Pileo da Prata* (Rome 1957).

[15] F. Ehrle, *Martin de Alpartils cronica actitatorum* (Paderborn 1896), 519.

Hats.[16] Only in the field of international finance was there little evidence of the split in Christendom, since most banks served both obediences.[17]

Clement VII, an extremely able politician, was not content with drawing up the Mass *De schismate tollendo* and arranging processions for ending the evil; he stubbornly strove for the *via facti*. Even before leaving Italy he had invested Louis I of Anjou with a large slice of the northern part of the Papal State by bulls issued at Sperlonga in April 1381, thereby proposing a Kingdom of Adria. In this way Italy would have come entirely under French rule or influence. But Louis was unable to make headway against Charles of Durazzo.[18] Here again it was high politics that impeded the realization of the *via facti*, above all the opposition between England and France, which had its effect also on the situation in Italy.

At scarcely any other period of the peninsula's history was it so confused and were alliances and treaties so fragile. This was the age of the greatest ascendancy of the Visconti at Milan, especially under Gian Galeazzo. He was opposed by Florence, which had the greatest reasons for fear, whereas Venice held aloof. Virtually all undertakings of the Italian *signorie* took place under the proud banner of *Italianità*, but in reality this mostly constituted the trimmings for selfish political ends. But interventions by France and the German King had to be avoided if a balance of power was to be maintained.

The two papal claimants were to a great extent mere figures in the high politics of Europe and of the small Italian states. Again and again one comes across a readiness to switch obediences at a favourable opportunity. But the situation existing shortly after the outbreak of the Schism was maintained for a long time. Because of his unfortunate policy Urban VI repeatedly ran into difficulties, for example, when he fell out, first with Queen Joanna I of Naples, and then also with his protector, Charles of Durazzo. His expedition to Naples, undertaken from considerations of nepotism in addition to other reasons, ended with his being detained at Nocera. He escaped to Genoa only by great exertions and there had some discontented cardinals cruelly executed. After a long absence he returned to Rome in 1388 and died there a year later.[19]

---

[16] C. Schmitt, "La position du card. Léonard de Giffoni O.F.M. dans le conflit du Grand Schisme d'Occident," *AFrH*, 50 (1957), 273–331, 51 (1958), 25–72, 410–72; P. Stacul, *op. cit.* More examples of the uncertainty in F. Babudri, "Lo scisma d'occidente e i suoi riflessi sulla chiesa di Brindisi," *Archivio storico Pugliese*, 8 (1955), 85–120; *idem*, "Oria e lo scisma d'Occidente," *ibid.*, 9 (1956), 145–53; G. G. Meerssemann, "Études sur l'ordre des frères Prêcheurs au début du Grand Schisme," *AFP*, 25 (1955), 213–57, 26 (1956), 192–248, 27 (1957), 170–99.

[17] A. Esch, "Bankiers der Kirche im Grossen Schisma," *QFIAB*, 46 (1966), 369 ff.

[18] M. De Boüard, *La France et l'Italie au temps du grand schisme d'occident* (Paris 1936), 38–41; P. Brezzi, "Lo scisma d'occidente come problema italiano," *ADRomana*, 67 (1944), 404; J. Zunzunegui, "Las cuentas de las galeras enviadas por Juan I de Castilla en favor de Clemente VII de Aviñón," *Anthologica Annua*, 5 (1957), 595–652.

When the prescribed interval after Urban's death had ended, the conclave began at Rome without any serious consideration of postponing an election. Neither Poncello Orsini nor Angelus Acciaiuoli — the latter supported with all the means available to Florence — could achieve two-thirds of the votes, and, after a few days, agreement was reached on the still youthful Neapolitan Cardinal Peter Tomacelli, who became Boniface IX (1389–1404).[20] He at once turned against Louis II of Anjou and hence against France, from where loomed the gravest danger in the repeatedly projected campaigns into Italy, now in agreement with Milan, now with Florence. Many cities in the north of the Papal State were openly sympathetic toward Avignon, and even Viterbo was for a while Clementine.[21] But Boniface IX contrived to establish himself in Rome and then in the Papal State. His pontificate was without great significance in the general field of politics. Much as he frequently and willingly had recourse to arguments common to Italians, a large or decisive role in the maintenance of the balance of power can probably not be ascribed to him.[22] A very grave situation seemed to be created when in 1392–93 the former project of a Kingdom of Adria was revived by France. But this time Clement VII, with regard for the cardinals, was not so eager to accept it, though he did offer to invest the Duke of Orléans with the Marches of Ancona, Romagna, Ferrara, Ravenna, Bologna, Perugia, and Todi. However, he died on 16 September 1394, during the negotiations, and the plans were not pursued further.[23]

Two weeks after the death of Clement VII, the Avignon College of Cardinals elected a successor on 28 September 1394, even though the desire of the French government that there be no election immediately had been made known to the cardinals while still in conclave by protagonists of the *via cessionis.* Peter de Luna, now elected and styling himself Benedict XIII (1394–1423), was certainly the most outstanding figure in the Avignon College and fully conversant with all the theological and canonical problems of the Schism. With most of his colleagues in the conclave he had signed under oath a statement that he would devote himself to union with all zeal and would even abdicate in the event that the cardinals should regard this as necessary.[24] This *via cessionis* had for years been prominent in discussions and considerations for the ending of the Schism. It had been frequently brought up under Clement VII and possessed a notable majority in both Colleges of Cardinals.

---

[19] Theodorici de Nyem, *De schismate,* 78–123; *Cosmidromius* Gobelini Person, 97–126.

[20] *DHGE,* 8 (1935), 909–22 (E. Vansteenberghe).

[21] P. Stacul, *op. cit.,* 195 ff.

[22] P. Brezzi, "Lo scisma d'occidente," lays special emphasis on the importance of Boniface IX in Italian policy.

[23] *Storia di Milano,* VI (1955), 6–9.

[24] For Benedict XIII see *DHGE,* 8 (1935), 135–63 (Jadin); the statement is in F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA,* V (1889), 403, and *Baluze-Mollat,* I, 541 f.; F. Ehrle, *Alpartil,*

In many respects Benedict XIII was the heir of the policy of Clement VII, such as in his confidence in the *via facti,* that is, the settling of the question in a practical manner by a campaign in Italy. But Benedict displayed an incomparably greater energy and diplomatic skill. In his first close contacts with the court of Paris for the liquidation of the Schism in October 1394 he was very courteous, but in January 1395 he precisely stated his views and later rejected the decrees of the first Council of Paris, held in the spring.

After there had been discussions at Paris for years on the ways of restoring unity, there began also at Avignon a feverish activity in this direction. An abundance of suggestions is mentioned; committees of cardinals were busy with them, and the cardinals set forth their individual views in writing. Opinions and pamphlets circulated, predominantly in the sense of the *via discussionis (conventionis, compromissi, iustitiae),* but also of the *via cessionis* as a last resort.[25] Meanwhile, the so-called first Council of Paris (3–8 February 1395), under the influence of a few cardinals and of the extreme factions at the University, had declared abdication to be the only way to be adopted. This was contrary to the moderate proposals of d'Ailly, who returned from an embassy to the Pope, and it was adopted in a not entirely clear voting procedure.[26] Then in the summer of 1395 (22 May–9 July) there appeared at Avignon a "high embassy," consisting of the King's uncles, the Dukes of Berry and Burgundy, and his brother, the Duke of Orléans, with many experts and delegates of the University. In several audiences they made known to the Pope the King's vigorously formulated desire but were able, of course, to obtain from Benedict only an evasive reply which rejected the *via cessionis.* The embassy had more success with the cardinals, most of whom in personal interviews consented to the *via cessionis.*[27] The government at Paris exerted itself in numerous embassies to the German princes and to Kings Wenceslas and Sigismund, to King Richard II of England, and to Spain to gain support for this plan.[28]

A second synod of the French clergy at Paris, from 16 August to 15 September, was again preoccupied with the unsatisfactory situation. In accord

---

217; F. Stegmüller, "Die Consolatio Theologiae des Papstes Pedro de Luna (Benedikt XIII.)," *Ges. Aufsätze zur Kulturgesch. Spaniens,* 21 (1963), 209–15.

[25] F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA,* V (1889), 406 f.; *idem,* "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA,* VI (1892), 148–62; *idem,* Alpartil, 14, 439–61; C. Schmitt, *op. cit.*

[26] N. Valois, *La France et le grand schisme d'occident,* III, 27–44; F. Ehrle, *Alpartil,* 468–74.

[27] *Martène C,* VII, 466–72; N. Valois, *op. cit.,* III, 44–67; F. Ehrle, *"Afterconcil," ALKGMA,* V (1889), 408–21; *idem, Alpartil,* 14 f., 449 f.

[28] F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA,* VI (1892), 200 f.

with the royal instructions the deliberations were to deal, no longer with the *via cessionis,* but only with the best method of realizing it. The majority favoured a withdrawal of obedience, but one more admonition should be directed to the Pope before suitable measures were taken.[29] Meanwhile, he had not been idle. He eagerly sought to promote the *via conventionis* by negotiations with the Roman claimant and even more to effect the elimination of his rival by the *via facti.* Already in 1395 embassies had proceeded from Avignon to Rome and one from the Roman claimant to Avignon. Benedict's envoy, the Bishop of Elne, did not succeed in getting to Rome *via* the territory of the Count of Fondi and Marino, which belonged to the latter, but he was able to bring about a dangerous conspiracy against Boniface IX. The Bishop of Tarazona, received at Rome as Benedict's ambassador in the summer of 1396, had very interesting discussions with Boniface and a few cardinals, including the events in the election of Urban VI, in which he had taken part as a conclavist. The repeated offers for an encounter of the two rivals or at least for negotiations by plenipotentiaries were repulsed by Boniface.[30] Concerning the activity of the envoys he sent to Avignon the same year we have no more precise information than that they reported on the imminent *démarche* of the French government and advised against concessions. Boniface's apprehensions were not unfounded, for Benedict had many adherents in Italy and enjoyed much sympathy even in Rome. Several mercenary captains were in his service in the northern part of the *Patrimonium,* and for many years he maintained a strong garrison in the fortress of Soriano to the east of Viterbo. The possibility of an occupation of Civitavecchia in a plot with Roman circles and the Count of Fondi was left untried by Benedict in the summer of 1396.[31]

En route from Sicily to Aragón, King Martin I had visited Benedict at Avignon and had been won to his policy. Hence he participated in Benedict's efforts to enter into serious discussions with his rival or to reach a decision by the *via facti.* The Aragonese King, loyal to Benedict, wanted to gain also the King of Castile for this policy, but without success, since political developments bound Castile ever more strongly to France.[32] And in the meantime France had succeeded in finding sympathy for the *via cessionis* in England, hitherto belonging to the Roman obedience. To what degree politics decided ecclesiastical questions is evident from this procedure of England, which resulted automatically from its *rapprochement* with France.

---

[29] N. Valois, *op. cit.,* III, 104–23; F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA,* VI (1892), 193–241; *idem, Alpartil,* 475–91.

[30] F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA,* VI (1892), 162, 193; *idem, Alpartil,* 19–23; N. Valois, *op. cit.,* III, 88–96.

[31] F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA,* VII (1900), 9–13; *idem, Alpartil,* 23–25, 533–41.

[32] F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA,* VII (1900), 1–15; *idem, Alpartil,* 252–66, 509–20.

Envoys of the Kings of England, France, and Castile went to Avignon and Rome but could accomplish nothing definite.[33]

Of great importance for theory and practice was the third Council of Paris, which sat from the middle of May till the beginning of August 1398 and decreed the withdrawal of obedience. Estimates of it differ greatly, but two notions seem especially pertinent. By being deprived of his income from France the Pope should be forced to resign and on this pretext the influence of the government in the administration of the French Church, naturally including the financial aspect, should be further strengthened. The result of the voting — 247 to thirty-four or thirty-eight — is incorrectly represented as falsified by the government. And the deliberations were much more solid than has hitherto been supposed, even if many of the questions that came up, notably in regard to implementation in practice, had to remain unsettled.[34] The decree of withdrawal was dated 27 July, and on the following day it was solemnly published by the King. In the next weeks instructions were issued to the officials. Almost no one in the Kingdom resisted the decrees of the synod, and at Avignon itself eighteen cardinals, one after another, abandoned the Pope and betook themselves to French territory at Villeneuve-lès-Avignon. There they made preparations for impeding Benedict in the exercise of his office and for getting him into their power if possible.

Thus began the memorable siege of the papal palace, which the Pope had some time before converted into a fortress, well provided with all war equipment. The shelling and assaults made in the fall of 1398 by the troops of the mercenary Captain Boucicaut, engaged by the cardinals, were at first without effect. Though a fleet sent by the King of Aragón was unable to get as far as Avignon, there ensued a truce in May 1399 and the departure of the greater part of the garrison. However, Benedict was isolated in the palace by a zone of stockades until 1403 and only scantily supplied, despite several safe-conducts which the Duke of Orléans had secured from the King. By secret protests in the summer of 1399 Benedict had in law repudiated all concessions wrung from him.[35] On 12 March 1403 he made a fantastic escape from the papal palace down the Rhone to the Château-Renard in the territory of the Count of Provence. With this there began a new episode in the troubled history of the Western Schism.

---

[33] E. Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le grand schisme d'occident* (Paris 1933), 352–87.

[34] N. Valois, *op. cit.*, III, 150–82; F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA*, VI (1892), 115–49; J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform* (Berlin 1903), 228–37, 535–43; G. Barraclough, "Un document sur la soustraction d'obédience en 1398," *RHE*, 30 (1934), 101–15; G. Mollat, "L'application en France de la soustraction d'obédience à Benoît XIII jusqu'au concile de Pise," *RMA*, 1 (1945), 149–63.

[35] F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA*, V (1889), 425–29; *idem*, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA*, VI (1892), 302–08; *idem*, *Alpartil*, 38–81, 213–17; G. Mollat, "Épisodes du siège du palais des papes au temps de Benoît XIII, 1398–1399", *RHE*, 23 (1927), 489–501; J. Rius Serra, "Galeres catalanes al servei de Benet XIII," *AST*, 11 (1935), 333–41.

An almost incalculable number of discussions and embassies had prepared, accompanied, and effected this result. Even during the siege Benedict was in contact with the disloyal cardinals and Paris.[36] There the difficulties attendant upon the withdrawal had become greater and greater in the administration of benefices and in the Church's financial system. If the bishops had expected more independence by virtue of the "liberties of the Gallican Church," they felt greatly deceived. The court and the government took the place of the papal Curia. Wide circles doubted the legitimacy of the proceedings against one who till now had been defended as the only lawful Pope, and his inflexibility created a profound impression. Apparently he was not to be subdued by military measures. Withdrawal by the government and siege by the College of Cardinals were not regarded as legitimate means for liquidating the unsatisfactory state of things. For this a judgment of the Church, and hence a council, was qualified. And representatives of the French government discussed such a council at Metz and Mainz with Rupert of the Palatinate, elected King of Germany on the deposition of Wenceslas.[37]

Provence had returned to Benedict in 1402 and in Paris Castile was working for a restitution of obedience as the best way out of the hopeless situation. To Château- Renard went the cardinals, to obtain reconciliation with Benedict. Then faithless Avignon also submitted to the now liberated Pope. Two cardinals proceeded to Paris to expedite the matter of obedience, and on 28 May it was decreed by the King under the influence of the Duke of Orléans. But still certain concessions on Benedict's part had to be discussed with the Duke at Tarascon. Absolution was granted to the King *ad cautelam* and the new peace was sealed by a compact of the Pope with the King, the Queen, and the Duke.[38]

Soon after his liberation, Benedict sent important proposals to Rome: 1) for a meeting of the two rivals on the borders of their respective obediences or in Italy, for example in the territory of Genoa; 2) for negotiations by plenipotentiaries in the event that the claimants could not meet personally; 3) for resignation. All of this was rejected by Boniface with subterfuges and feeble arguments.[39] Even considering the tendencies of the reports that have come down to us in a biased form, Boniface does not cut a fine figure. His death, occurring while the Avignon envoys were in Rome, interrupted the contact, and the new Pope Innocent VII, Cosimo Migliorati (1404–06), did not take part in discussions.

---

[36] F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA*, V (1889), 425–87.

[37] A. Mercati, "Dall'archivio vaticano II. Un'ignota missione francese nel 1401 presso Roberto del Palatinato eletto re dei Romani," *MAH*, 61 (1949), 209–25; H. Finke, "Zur Korrespondenz der deutschen Könige und Fürsten mit den Herrschern Aragóns im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens*, 5 (1935), 458–505; also important in regard to Aragonese efforts to gain King Wenceslas for Avignon, and likewise Rupert.

[38] F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien," *ALKGMA*, VII (1900), 278–310; J. Schoos, "Der Machtkampf zwischen Burgund und Orléans unter den Herzögen Philipp dem Kühnen, Johann ohne Furcht von Burgund und Ludwig von Orléans," *Publications de la section historique de l'Institut G.-D. de Luxembourg*, 75 (Luxembourg 1956).

[39] F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA*, VII (1900), 580–84; *idem, Alpartil*, 147 f.

In consultations at Villafranca near Nice in 1405 with King Martin I of Sicily, Louis II of Anjou, claimant to the Kingdom of Naples, and Duke Louis of Bourbon, Benedict made known the plan of a great expedition to Italy. But the project did not materialize, for both the King of Aragón and the French government refused consent. However, Benedict stubbornly pursued his projects in missions to Sicily and to many Italian cities and lordships. He gained for his obedience a great part of the Riviera with Genoa, which was then ruled by Marshal Boucicaut, and proceeded as far as Genoa, but was then forced by the outbreak of an epidemic to return to Marseilles. In Paris this move into Italy was regarded with a certain amount of fear that the Pope, if successful in his Italian schemes, might be able to reside in Rome.[40]

The death of Innocent VII in 1406 seemed to open up another solution when Benedict asked the Roman cardinals not to proceed to an election. But before his envoys arrived the new Pope had been elected: the Venetian Angelus Correr, who became Gregory XII (1406–15). Just as earlier at the election of Benedict XIII at Avignon, now too each cardinal had bound himself, in the event of his election, to resign if the same thing were to happen on the opposing side; specific regulations concerned the naming of new cardinals in order to maintain both colleges at numerical equality. This was a step in the direction of a meeting of the two rivals or at least of the two Colleges of Cardinals.

During the night following his election Gregory had solemnly accepted these stipulations and in numerous letters to kings, princes, and cities he had proclaimed his willingness to resign.[41] Then on 21 April 1407 was signed the Treaty of Marseilles, in which, as its principal item, the meeting of the claimants at Savona near Genoa on Michaelmas was agreed to.[42] But from now on Gregory's behaviour is difficult to understand and so far there has been no satisfactory explanation. His postponing the fulfillment of the treaty, in fact his downright refusal to do so, has been interpreted as due to the unfortunate influence of his nephews. But the danger of his position was sufficiently well known to him and his fear of a trap was not entirely groundless. His words and deeds, however, hardly display greatness in comparison with the dignified, learned, and very skilfull diplomatic procedure of Benedict, who was apparently more profoundly convinced of his legitimacy and of the success of his plans. To be sure, despite a vacillating obedience in France, Benedict was in a far better situation than Gregory. The King of Aragón, with his considerable strength in the Mediterranean, clung loyally to him, and in the Midi he had many adherents. An embassy from the French government, led by the Patriarch Cramaud, was supposed to have Benedict confirm by a bull his readiness to yield and obtain from him a decree that after his death the cardinals must not proceed to a new election but should bring about a reunion with the cardinals of the Roman claimant in order to elect a new Pope by common action in the given situation — a proposal such as was later realized at Pisa. Benedict was ready only with proposals to the cardinals. In the reports of the negotiations the mutual regard of the two rivals is astonishing and perhaps implies secret arrangements; such at least was the reproach often hurled at both pretenders at the Council of Pisa.[43]

---

[40] F. Ehrle, *Alpartil,* 149 f.

[41] J. Vincke, *Schriftstücke zum Pisaner Konzil,* 27–29.

[42] Hefele-Knöpfler, VI (1900), 890 f.; F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA,* VII (1900), 594–623; *idem, Alpartil,* 160 f.

Not until the beginning of August did Gregory quit Rome, indecisive and already too late to reach Savona at the date agreed upon. He was with his Curia at Siena from the beginning of September till January 1408. The advance of King Ladislas of Naples on Rome created for Gregory a really threatening situation, for then the Romans themselves applied to Benedict for subsidies. The fleet that had put to sea on his orders arrived too late to prevent the capture of Rome, and it probably had other assignments than merely that of supplying the Romans with money.[44] In conformity with the stipulations of the Treaty of Marseilles, Benedict set out, arrived at Savona before the appointed day, and left half the city for Gregory. From the latter came messages with excuses and requests for another place of meeting. Meanwhile, Benedict sailed with his galleys to Portovenere, while Gregory appeared at Lucca at the end of January 1408. Negotiations were drawn out for months, and French delegations of various tendencies visited both rivals. It is downright tragic to observe how the two claimants got within a few leagues of each other and then neither met in person nor effected an agreement through deputies. As other places of meeting were mentioned Portovenere, Pietrasanta, Carrara, Lucca, Livorno, and finally Pisa and Livorno.

The negotiations, unceasing and unsuccessful, dragged themselves out but then came to a sudden end with the defection of Gregory's cardinals and the simultaneous renewal of proceedings against Benedict by France. Gregory's cardinals had long been unhappy over his delaying tactics. The creation of four new cardinals was regarded as a violation of his election commitments and induced most of his cardinals to abandon him and to flee to Pisa in May 1408. Gregory thereupon withdrew to Siena and the meeting of the rivals suffered shipwreck. Wide circles in Christendom had familiarized themselves with the notion of neutrality and council. And so, after their departure from Lucca, the cardinals of the Roman obedience at once appealed to a council, but without destroying all bridges to their Pope. Relations with Benedict's cardinals now became more intense, especially after the new withdrawal of obedience by France. The assassination of the Duke of Orléans in 1407 had deprived Benedict of his strongest supporter. When in the spring of 1408 France resumed its neutrality, Benedict replied in April with the publication of the long ready bull of excommunication. It seems that the French envoys, led by the Patriarch Cramaud, intended to seize Benedict's person. Benedict then decided to leave Portovenere, after he had summoned a council to meet at Perpignan on the coming All Saints' Day. On 15 July his fleet put to sea and, after some unfriendly treatment at the Riviera ports, made its way to Perpignan at the end of the month. Most of his cardinals had not followed him and in August they joined Gregory's cardinals.[45]

---

[43] F. Ehrle, *Alpartil,* 161, 163; A. Bossuat, "Une relation inédite de l'ambassade française au pape Benoît XIII en 1407," *MA,* 55 (1949), 77–101.

[44] F. Ehrle, *Alpartil,* 541–45.

When all of Gregory's attempts for a resumption of negotiations had collapsed, his rebel cardinals had resolved, probably as early as the beginning of June, on a council which they would summon. February of 1409 was proposed as the date; the territory of the Margrave of Este or the Principality of Montferrat, as the place. But once Florence had disavowed Gregory, Pisa was decided on as the place of the council. Publicity for the council was undertaken in the grand manner. Thousands of documents were sent to princes, the hierarchy, and cities. Each College of Cardinals sent out its own propaganda missions.[46]

Meanwhile, Benedict's council got under way at Perpignan in November 1408; it was mainly occupied with the reading of the *informatio seriosa*, a detailed exposition of Benedict's efforts for unity. Though drawn up in accord with his viewpoint, it is, by reason of the vast number of documents, one of the most precious sources of the period. The Council of Perpignan was well attended from Spain and the Midi; besides numerous bishops, there were more than 120 abbots or their proxies, superiors of religious houses, and representatives of cathedral chapters, universities, and the military orders. In spite of all the admonitions to the Pope to resign, the only tangible result was the dispatch of an embassy to the Council of Pisa. Then, on 26 March 1409, the session was interrupted and again and again prorogued into 1416.[47]

---

[45] F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA,* VII (1900), 623–52; *idem, Alpartil;* 165–69.

[46] J. Vincke, *Briefe zum Pisaner Konzil,* 216–38.

[47] F. Ehrle, "Afterconcil," *ALKGMA,* VII (1900), 652–94 (lists of participants, 669–91). A further tradition of the *informatio seriosa* in *Baluze-Mollat,* IV, 391–408; F. Ehrle, *Alpartil,* 173–91.

The exertions of the united College of Cardinals for a good attendance at the announced Council were a complete success. In addition to twenty-four cardinals and four patriarchs, there were more than eighty archbishops and bishops, an equal number of abbots, the proxies of more than 100 bishops and over 200 abbots, many deputies of princes and universities, the generals of the important orders, and numerous doctors of theology and canon law.[48] Pointedly absent were the German King Rupert and the kingdoms of the Iberian peninsula. On 25 March the Council was opened with the traditional solemnities in the cathedral of Pisa.

In view of the fact that the cardinals rather than the papal rivals had convoked the Council, the external conduct of business naturally differed from preceding mediaeval councils. Furthermore, the purpose of the gathering was to institute proceedings against both *pro papa se gerentibus* and thus the trial formalities were in the foreground. This was evident right after the opening, with the appointing of the officials: two marshals, two auditors, four advocates, four procurators, and twelve notaries. Most often mentioned was the consistorial advocate, Simon of Perugia, who had charge of the technicalities in almost all of the sessions. Documents were prepared at need by the notaries. The question of the Council's presidency was solved in a very different manner. The College of Cardinals in its entirety was regarded as holding this office, but this was not emphasized. As representative of the College, Malesec, the ranking Cardinal Bishop, received the oaths of the officials appointed by the full Council and proposed the introduction of the process against the two pretenders. But the most important personality was the leader of the French delegation, Simon de Cramaud, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was often attended by two other patriarchs in his official appearances. After the papal election it goes without saying that the new Pope assumed the direction of the Council.

The assembly completed its work in twenty-two sessions, usually following close upon one another. In preparing for them the members met in what they called "nations" — German, French, English, Italian, and a small Provençal "nation" — while the cardinals met as a college, frequently with representatives of the "nations."[49] At the first session, on 26 March, the Cardinal of Milan delivered the opening sermon, which propounded sixteen important propositions on the cardinals' right to convoke the Council in view of the refusal of the papal rivals — theses which reproduced what had been held and taught by a great many theologians and canonists, for years and decades now, as the correct doctrine of the constitution of the Church.[50]

---

[48] *Hefele-Leclercq*, VII, 1 (1916); *Mansi*, XXVI, 1193–1256, XXVII, 331–56 (with important additions); J. Vincke, *Schriftstücke zum Pisaner Konzil*, 178–205; Graziano di S. Teresa, "Un nuovo elenco dei participanti al concilio di Pisa," *ECarm*, 16 (1965), 384–411.

[49] F. Stuhr, *Die Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Pisaner und Konstanzer Konzils* (Diss., Berlin 1891); L. Schmitz, "Zur Geschichte des Konzils von Pisa 1409," *RQ*, 9 (1895), 351–75; H. Finke, "Die Nation in den spätmittelalterlichen allgemeinen Konzilien," *HJ*, 57 (1937), 327 f.

The Council's principal task, the process against the two pretenders, was provided for by the appointment of an investigating committee, which was resolved in the seventh session, on 4 May, at the suggestion of the "nations" and of the envoys of princes, prelates and universities.[51] But before the process began there arrived envoys of the German King Rupert, a loyal adherent of the Roman obedience, who protested both in lengthy speeches and in writing and at once left the city. Later appeared envoys of King Martin of Aragón and of Benedict XIII, who were also heard.[52] The process displayed the usual involved and cumbersome methods with which we are already acquainted from the endless interrogations at Medina del Campo and which we shall likewise encounter in the proceedings against John XXIII at Constance. The thirty-seven articles of accusation against both claimants were publicly read at the fifth session, on 24 April, and the introduction of the process was moved. Later, further articles were added. On 4 May, in the seventh session, the proposed committee was approved by the Council. It consisted of two cardinals, four representatives of the German nation, five of the French, one of the English, five of the Italian, and one of the Provençal.

As early as 7 May occurred the public citation of the witnesses, who were sworn by the committee on 9 May in the sacristy of the Carmelite church. At first there were sixty-six witnesses, and later eleven more. The hearing of the witnesses began on the same day; a total of sixty-two witnesses were interrogated on the chief points. In a laborious procedure the articles with their subdivisions were read aloud to them word for word. The committee did its work in several groups. The hearings were often in the residence of one of the cardinals of the committee, and the cardinals themselves, almost all of whom testified, could do so in their dwellings. Several gave their information in writing, such as Cardinals Brancaccio and Orsini — the latter likewise made written depositions at Constance — and the most prominent figure at the Council, Simon, Patriarch of Alexandria. In addition, many documents were submitted as corroborative evidence.

On 22 May the Archbishop of Pisa began his report on the result of the inquiries. Since such processes pursued a definite goal, in this case the deposition of both rivals, their lack of an intention to resign was especially emphasized — matters which had been long known and whose notoriety was to be made clear and stressed. Of course, in this process, as in that against John XXIII at Constance, a great deal of gossip was in circulation and some common views or impressions were transmitted only by hearsay. But among the witnesses were many prominent men, persons in high positions of responsibility at both Curias, who reported things in which they had participated. Above all, many of the things now brought forward belonged to the quite recent past, and so were different from a part of the investigations into the events of 1378.

---

[50] *Mansi,* XXVII, 118 ff.; these theses are in J. Vincke, *Acta concilii Pisani,* 91 ff. The second declaration of legitimacy on 10 May in the eighth session had been brought about by a motion on 24 April in the fifth session; *cf.* J. Vincke, *Acta concilii Pisani,* 133, 149 f.

[51] J. Vincke, *Acta concilii Pisani,* 140–43.

[52] *Ibid.,* 129–36, 305–07.

The long duration of the Schism, notwithstanding many attempts at a settlement, was blamed, perhaps too much, on the individual papal claimants, and the confusion of the situation was treated too lightly. Too little account was also taken of the psychological state of the respective Popes, who, as Cardinals in conclave, had, like their colleagues, sworn to resign, but of course in regard to this serious step wanted to wait for the most favourable moment. Quite apart from this was the fact that the personal conviction of legitimacy could only make resignation very painful.

Benedict, of course, never seriously considered abdication, though as a Cardinal he had been energetically in favour of it and in the conclave had obliged himself to it under oath. But it is reported that in the first year of his pontificate he had stated that he would rather have himself burned than resign. It was claimed that he dismissed all advocates of the *via cessionis* and advanced those who said what he wanted to hear. The *Magister sacri palatii,* who in a Good Friday sermon urged him to resign, was removed from office and imprisoned for two years. Witnesses claimed to have seen the authentic documents in which, following the withdrawal of obedience, he had declared his readiness to resign, but he had not made good his promise. He imprisoned officials who refused to draw up documents according to his wish by expunging the article on resignation in the negotiations with the Roman cardinals after the death of Boniface IX. To Gregory's clear offer to resign he returned evasive replies. At Portovenere he was said to have first agreed to the plan for a general council, then to have rejected it, only to retire to Perpignan and summon a council there. There were many specific charges: acts of violence, execution of clerics in major orders, arrest of priests and of superiors of orders for service on his galleys, favouring of heretics, and of course magic, which finds a place in all the contemporary trial material.

And Gregory XII was no different. He once planned to go on foot to Paris, if thereby the Schism could be settled, and then he took it amiss when his advisers suggested the land route to Savona in the event that vessels were not at his disposal. A long list of omissions and intrigues was laid to his charge. In place of Charles Malatesta it was Gregory's nephew Anthony who was sent to Benedict; he alone was provided with the secret instructions, and the other envoys were duped. Time and again Gregory mentally disavowed Savona, despite the opinions given by the cardinals. In a public consistory at Lucca he termed the *via cessionis* "diabolica et damnata," branded it as heretical, and said, "I intend to die as Pope." Advocates of resignation were also ill-treated and imprisoned by him. At Lucca he made arrangements to put the cardinals in irons and was only prevented by the *signore*. The Cardinal of Liège, who had fled from Lucca, was to be brought back dead or alive. Money and valuables of churches and parts of the Papal State went to his nephews.

All these charges probably have an historically true basic element, but they must have been often exaggerated in the drawing up of the accusations and in the depositions of the witnesses. Quite rightly did Gregory's confidant, Cardinal Dominici, complain later in his behalf. Some things were pure fabrications, others were reported inexactly, torn from their context, and thus altered.[53] On one very weighty point, the so-called *collusio*, or secret dealings and understandings between the two rivals, full clarity will never be obtained. The many secret conferences in the dead of night in the rooms of the claimants or in the cathedral sacristy at Siena between Gregory's nephews and Benedict's envoy supplied plenty of material for fantastic conjectures. But what Leonard Bruni, Gregory's secretary and a renowned humanist, was able to report is of interest. According to him, it had been planned to imprison the cardinals, bar them from the election, and entrust it to a committee of four, composed of two representatives of each obedience. The Cardinal of San Marco, who remained even longer with Gregory and did not go to Pisa for the conclave until 16 June, contributed to the record in writing on 5 August that Gregory had later regretted not having accepted the offer; he entertained the really childish idea that he would have delegated his nephews, who were accustomed to privation, and they, having been inclosed with the other two, would have compelled them by hunger to give in and hence to elect him.

A quick winding up of the hearings was agreed to by the Council because of the threat from King Ladislas and on 1 June the accepting of reports ceased, while copies were made accessible for further information. Meanwhile, the two papal claimants had been repeatedly cited by the Council and on several occasions solemn deputations proceeded to the doors of the cathedral to call in a loud voice the pretenders or their representatives — everything according to the precise rules of trial procedure. Then the process was quickly concluded and in the fifteenth session, on 5 June, the judgment was publicly read by the Patriarch of Alexandria, sitting as judge and attended by the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Gregory XII and Benedict XIII were cast out of the Church as notorious schismatics, promoters of schism, and notorious and obdurate heretics and perjurors, obedience was withdrawn from them, and the vacancy of the Holy See was confirmed.[54] The sentence was signed by almost all members of the Council; the list of signatures comprises 213 entries, including twenty-four cardinals.[55]

---

[53] H. Finke, *Acta concilii Const.*, I (Münster 1896), 273 f.

At once preparations were made for the conclave. Part of its task should be to bind the future Pope to a wise and adequate reform of the Church at this very Council. Apparently an agreement had been made among the cardinals that for the validity of the election at least two-thirds of the votes of the cardinals of each obedience were necessary. The conclave began on 15 June in the archiepiscopal palace and ended on 26 June with the unanimous election of the Cardinal of Milan, Peter Philarghi, who called himself Alexander V (1409–10). The electoral protocol, with the signatures of all the cardinals, was read in the next session.[56]

Peter Philarghi, born in northern Crete of Greek parents and educated by Franciscans, had entered the Franciscan Order. He soon went to Italy, then to Oxford for study, and later to Paris and Pavia. To this period belong his widely known commentary on *The Sentences* and his reputation as a humanist. Galeazzo Visconti arranged his promotion to the sees of Piacenza, Vicenza, and Novara in succession. From 1392 he carried out diplomatic missions for the Visconti and in 1395 procured the ducal title for him from King Wenceslas. In 1402 he became Archbishop of Milan, in 1405 a Cardinal and Legate in North Italy.[57] He had taken a prominent part in arranging the Council of Pisa, and his election as Pope had been strongly promoted by Cardinal Baldassarre Cossa.[58] Though the French court had relinquished its demand for a French candidate and for residence at Avignon, the new Pope owed his elevation to France.[59] After his coronation on 7 July the Council quickly finished its business. And first of all, the Pope confirmed in favour of the adherents of the Council all measures taken during the Schism in the administration of benefices. A reform committee did not actually take up any business; for this purpose a new council was announced for 1412 and provincial and diocesan synods were directed to prepare for it. The Council ended on 7 August.[60]

---

[54] J. Vincke, *Acta concilii Pisani,* 295–98.

[55] J. Vincke, *Schriftstücke zum Pisaner Konzil,* 177–205.

[56] J. Vincke, *Acta concilii Pisani,* 309–14.

[57] *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani,* II (1960), 193–96; G. D. Oltrona Visconti, "Ancora sui natali di Pietro Filargo, vescovo di Novara poi papa Alessandro V," *Bollettino storico per la provincia di Novara,* 51 (1960), 119–29.

[58] *Duchesne LP,* II, 511 f.

[59] J. Vincke, *Schriftstücke zum Pisaner Konzil,* 176 f.

[60] J. Vincke, "Zu den Konzilien in Perpignan und Pisa. 2. Ein auf dem Konzil von Pisa diskutierter Reformvorschlag, Pisa etwa Mitte Juli 1409," *RQ,* 50 (1955), 91–94.

An assessment of the Council of Pisa depends upon whether one adheres to the contemporary viewpoint or considers the matter in the light of later developments. According to the second alternative, Pisa was a failure, it is stigmatized as a pseudo-council or rump council, and it is denied the rank of a general council.[61] But when judged by the views of contemporaries it cannot be denied recognition as a general council. Even in regard to the participants, it surpassed in numbers and especially in the question of representing the Universal Church in the Lateran Councils, except the fourth, that of Vienne, and the first two periods of Trent. Since it dealt primarily with a process against the two claimants to the papacy, there were few theological discussions and scarcely anything to record in regard to the theory of Conciliarism. Conciliar notions were first expressed in their entirety at Constance. But Pisa had taken the road to the complete liquidation of the Schism with much success, and without this Council the happy ending of the division can hardly be imagined.

The Conciliar Idea

More recent research has contributed substantially to our understanding of the importance of the general council in the central and late Middle Ages. But it was already known that the general council occupied an important place in the constitution of the Church at that time. It is true that the varied concepts of the external structure and the distribution of powers were hardly ever presented in a compact system, but were widely scattered in the glosses of decretists and decretalists. That is why very contradictory theses are often to be met in the same author. Ockham and Marsilius of Padua no longer rank as the only ancestors of what is called Conciliarism. Theories labelled with the catchwords "papalism," "conciliarism," "corporation system," "oligarchy," can be detected everywhere. Less happy were the efforts to establish a biblical basis for the theory of the moment, but this did not hinder their having a historical reality of tremendous influence.

Following the outbreak of the Western Schism and the first unsuccessful efforts to end it, it was natural to look about for a fundamental remedy for the now disjointed *corpus politicum* of the Church. Then the conciliar idea suggested itself as an aid. In an almost limitless profusion of still mostly unprinted treatises and testimonials the council was again and again recommended as the saviour in the emergency. But it should finally be admitted that most of the testimonials, memoranda, and theological treatises were predominantly political in character and, despite all the scholarly embellishments, had to conform to their current sphere of influence. First of all, the Italian cardinals demanded the convoking of a council, before which Urban VI should appear, and then also Clement VII after his election at Fondi. Even Peter de Luna, who later as Benedict XIII was bluntly to reject a council as a means of uniting the two or later the three obediences, is said to have desired a council at the beginning of the Schism. The conciliar idea encountered powerful opposition from Clement VII's cardinals, especially from the important jurists Flandrin and Amelii. But there were demands for a council in Castile and Aragón, notably by the forceful inquisitor Nicholas Eymerich and the fiery Vincent Ferrer. Best known are the treatises *Epistola pacis* (May 1379) and *Epistola concilii pacis* (summer of 1381) of the Paris professor, Henry von Langenstein, and the opinions of the provost of the Worms cathedral, Conrad von Gelnhausen, expressed in *Epistola brevis* (August 1379) and *Epistola concordiae* (May 1380).

---

[61] *Pastor*, I (St. Louis, 2nd ed. 1899) 178–91. Likewise in the more recent literature, for example A. Favale, *I concili ecumenici* (Turin 1962).

At the basis of the conciliar idea, which found at times stronger and at times weaker expression, according to the political situation, lay the concept that the Pope is not the absolute master of the Church. In normal conditions he or the *Ecclesia Romana* in the narrower sense governs the visible Church. But in special cases — schism, heresy, "contra bonum commune ecclesiae" — the Universal Church comes to the fore — *ecclesia universalis, congregatio fidelium, corpus Christi mysticum* — in accord with the frequently recurring proposition: "quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet" or "maior est auctoritas totius orbis quam urbis alicuius."[62] According to this opinion, the power of the whole Church is greater, and she alone is infallible. Numerous concepts sought to clarify the complicated problem of the *plenitudo potestatis, potestas actualis* and *habitualis.* The favourite set of terms, *potestas — exercitium,* generally meant that the *exercitium,* the *potestas actualis,* is ordinarily vested in the Pope and Curia — *minister, dispensator, procurator, caput ministeriale* — but in emergencies the greater *potestas, habitualis* of the Universal Church is actualized in the council as the great regulator.

The emphasis on the extremes, papalism — conciliarism, which was up to this time often the favourite approach, caused the broad middle course to fade into the background. According to it the Pope's will is not the supreme law of the Church; or, the Pope is really the Church, but his power is hemmed in by the higher power of the Universal Church. But this is not to be understood in the sense that he has nothing further to say and has only to execute the conciliar decrees. From this body of theories the proper means had to be selected and applied on the occasion of the first great practical case, the double election of 1378 and the subsequent years, in the event that a quick political solution should prove to be impossible. There was no doubt that the Pope or, now, the two claimants could be examined by the Universal Church in regard to legitimacy. But who sets the Universal Church in motion? Who acts for her? How will she appear and act? The hoped for convocation of a council by Urban VI, or by Urban VI together with Clement VII, was unfulfilled.

---

[62] A. Marongiu, "Il principio della democrazia e del consenso (Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet)," *StG,* 8 (1962), 553–75.

Among the views on the distribution of powers in the Church a very great importance was attributed to the College of Cardinals, at least at the beginning of the Schism, when there was question of finding a supreme authority for judging the legitimacy of the elections. In the great and, despite their length, important treatises of the cardinals of Clement VII, the College itself was the competent judge of the papal election. The comparison of the bishop and his chapter and the widely held opinion that the cardinals, and not the bishops, are the successors of the Apostles served as the basis for this view.[63] The authority to convoke the council had occasionally been attributed also to the patriarchs and, to a much greater degree, to the princes, especially to the Emperor or the King of the Romans. Just as the secular princes must force the cardinals to elect a Pope, so in a case of schism they must force the Church to hold a council.[64] Various kinds of councils are to be distinguished here: a general council in each obedience or the *conventio universalis utriusque partis* or the *congregatio universalis* under the direction of the College of Cardinals. And the idea of a council made up of cardinals alone was mentioned more than once, as was also one consisting of a few but well chosen representatives of all ecclesiastical provinces.

Furthermore, there was need of a council for the already long overdue reform of the Church. As early as the Council of Vienne Durandus the Younger had demanded the holding of a general council every ten years. It became an increasingly universal conviction that reform could not be realized without a council.

And so there was a variety of opinions in regard to the council and the constitution of the Church. Therefore, it will not do to speak of an exclusively correct "divinely willed monarchical structure" of the Church in the late Middle Ages.

---

[63] O. Přerovský, "Le idee oligarchiche nei diffensori di Clemente VII," *Salesianum*, 22 (1960), 383–409.

[64] H. Heimpel, "Studien zur Kirchen- und Reichsreform. Eine unbekannte Schrift Dietrichs von Niem über die Berufung der Generalkonzilien 1413/1414," *SAH*, 1929, 1. Abhandlung.

CHAPTER 47

The Devotio Moderna

Devotio moderna is the descriptive term, occurring already in Thomas à Kempis (1380–1471) and John Busch (1399–1479),[1] for the spiritual movement which began in the Low Countries at the end of the fourteenth century and spread throughout Europe, especially Germany, during the fifteenth century. This form of piety was "modern" in its orientation to practical experience, in its activation of the affective powers, and in its instruction for self-control. It "would rather feel compunction than know its definition" (*Imitation of Christ,* I, 1, 9). In this empirical trait the *devotio moderna* takes its stand in the *via moderna* of late scholastic nominalism. But simultaneously disgust with nominalism's extravagant speculation, unrelated to life, led in the *devoti* to an estrangement from theology in favour of virtue made good in humdrum day- to-day living.

> Of what use is it to discourse loftily on the Trinity, if you lack humility and hence displease the Trinity? Truly, lofty words do not make one holy and righteous, but a virtuous life makes one dear to God (*Imitation,* I, 1, 7 f.).

With this in itself sound and justified criticism of a decadent scholasticism was opened up a chasm between theology and piety in the Western Church.[2] The devout even rejected the speculative mysticism of a Master Eckhart and sought intimacy with God on the path of active penance and love. However, the ideas of the great mystics were variously utilized and made productive in circles which had no access to lofty speculations.

Gerard Groote

The father of the new devotion was Gerard Groote (1340–84). Born at Deventer in 1340, the son of a draper patrician, he became a rich orphan at the age of ten, as a result of the plague. He soon found the Latin school of his native town inadequate and in 1355 went to the University of Paris, where in 1358 he became master of arts. The study of law, medicine, and theology was now open to him. In his eager thirst for knowledge and in his own impetuous manner he seems to have devoted himself to all three and in addition to have occupied himself with magic. But he concentrated on canon law. As a student, fond of all intellectual as well as sensual delights, and in diplomatic missions he spent time not only at Paris but at Prague, Cologne,

---

[1] *Cf.* the title of Part II of the *Chronicon Windeshemense:* "Liber de origine devotionis modernae" (ed. K. Grube, 245–375).

[2] F. Vandenbroucke, "Le divorce entre théologie et mystique," *NRTh,* 82 (1950), 372–89.

Avignon, and Aachen. At Aachen he sought a canonry in 1362 and obtained one in 1370; he acquired other benefices at Soest, Nordmünster, and Utrecht. But even these honours and successes were as little satisfying to him as had been his restless studying and life previously. "There is no happiness in it," observed his biographer, Peter Horn.[3]

An encounter after 1370[4] with his friend of student days, Henry Eger of Kalkar (1328–1408), prior of the Carthusian monastery of Monnikhuizen near Arnheim, produced a profound change. The Carthusian showed him the way to a spiritual life. As a consequence, he spent a few years in Eger's monastery, where, as a *donatus,* or brother without vows, he laid the foundations of the new devotion in useful work and reading, especially the mystics Hugh of Saint-Victor, Henry Suso, Gertrude of Helfta, Master Eckhart, Ludolf of Saxony, and John Ruysbroeck. But in the long run his way to becoming one with God was to include the active life in the world; for him self-sanctification was to be connected with the service of his fellowmen. "It would be wrong, for the sake even of contemplative prayer, devotion, and righteousness, to disregard what cannot be done by another and the good of your neighbour, which is pleasing to God," he wrote in his notes "Resolutions and Intentions, Not Vows."[5]

Gerard Groote resigned his benefices and made over his town house at Deventer in September 1374 to some pious, God-seeking ladies, who aimed to lead a quasi-monastic life under a superioress and also support themselves by the labour of their hands. Groote did not give away all his property, but retained what he needed, including two rooms in this house, and from here he tended to his foundation. To this community, the nucleus of the Sisters of the Common Life, he gave in 1379 an organization or, in a sense, a rule.[6] Particularly in such a loosely constructed community it was important to assure discipline and orthodoxy and to protect the members from being mistaken for the "Brothers of the Free Spirit" and other enthusiasts.

At the same time a similar community of brothers was formed at Deventer in the vicarage of Florens Radewijns (1350–1400). After studying in Prague, the latter had been converted in 1380–81 as a result of a sermon by Gerard Groote. He was the only one to whom the master suggested ordination to the priesthood; he sent him for this purpose to Worms in order to find a bishop with clean hands.[7] Groote himself received only the diaconate (*ca.* 1379) in order to be able to preach in public. He shrank from the priesthood because of his unworthiness and in view of the simony and concubinage prevailing among the priests of his day. As a preacher of penance he led a strong fight against superficial piety, the immorality of the cities, the heretical movements — Bartholomew of Dordrecht and the Brothers of the Free Spirit, — against simony and concubinage in the clergy, and against the disregard of the vow of poverty by religious *(proprietarii).* When in 1379 Florens of Wewelinghoven became Bishop of Utrecht, Groote at first obtained his support. He received a personal license to preach and was appointed synodal preacher, and as such, on 14 August 1383,[8] delivered his *Sermo de focaristis.* In the form of a pamphlet, it became his most widely known work. Together with the Prague canonist, Conrad of Soltau (d. 1407), he held it to be a mortal sin to attend the Mass of a notorious concubinary, even if a bishop allowed such a priest to celebrate Mass. The opposition of the clerics concerned and of the mendicant orders, which saw themselves threatened by the rejection of begging and by the new way of life of the brothers and sisters, became so stiff that the Bishop had second thoughts. Apart from his rigourism of manner, no charges could be brought against Groote and so he was indirectly silenced by a prohibition against preaching by deacons. This was sufficient to bring down on the master and his brethren the stigma of heresy. Groote had a *protestatio fidei* posted on church doors at Deventer and Zwolle and asked Pope Urban VI for a personal license to preach. Until it was granted he could only live according to his sermon on painful obedience (*Imitation,* III, 19; III, 49, 18–27). He induced Florens to stay at Deventer[9] and thus prevented a dispersal of his community of brothers.

---

[3] *Vita Magistri Gerardi Magni,* ch. 1, ed. W. J. Kühler, *NAKG,* 6 (1909), 333.

[4] According to R. Post ("Wanneer heeft G. Groote zich bekeerd?" *StC,* 17 [1941], 293 to 312), his conversion occurred in 1374 or at the earliest in 1372 and the period of his stay at Monnikhuizen from 1376 to 1379 (R. Post, "H. Eger von Kalkar en Gerd Groote," *StC,* 21 [1946], 88–92; *idem, De Moderne Devotie,* 12). According to J. van Ginneken *(Geert Groote's Levensbeeld,* 134), the conversion began soon after 1370, and Gerard Groote spent the next years to 1373 in the monastery, leaving when H. Eger ceased to be superior there.

[5] Transmitted by Thomas à Kempis, *Opera,* ed. J. Pohl, VII (1929), 87–97 (especially page 97).

[6] R. Post, "De statuten van het Mr.-Geertshuis te Deventer," *AGAU,* 71 (1952), 1—46.

Groote died of the plague on 20 August 1384, without having been rehabilitated. The new devotion that he had established was developed in the communities of brothers and sisters of the Common Life and in the Augustinian Canons of the Windesheim Congregation. He gave their spirituality its characteristic stamp. But his austerity, inclining to rigourism, was of less significance than his practical style and his following of Christ in daily life, determined by the unremitting contemplation of the life and sufferings of Jesus.

---

[7] Rudolf Dier van Muiden, *Scriptum de magistro Gherardo Groote:* "Dominus Florentius ... quem magister Gherardus fecit ordinari presbyterum, mittens eum ad episcopum Wormatiensem, credo ad vitandam symoniam ..." (ed. G. Dumbar, *Analecta,* I, 7).

[8] According to J. van Ginneken, *Geert Groote's Levensbeeld,* 305. But S. Axters, III, 39, assigns the sermon to 14 August 1381; R. Post, *Kerkgeschiedenis,* I, 294, to 14 May 1381. Probably Gerard Groote delivered two synodal sermons, the first in connection with Bernard's "Sermon on Acts 9:4," as John Busch reports (ed. K. Grube, 252).

[9] Ep. 62, *De patientia,* ed. W. Mulder, 232–43.

The Brotherhood of the Common Life was already so firmly established by the death of Gerard Groote that its continued existence was assured and its further growth made good progress. In the spirit of their master, who rejected begging and regarded manual labor as an aid to virtue, the brothers, following the example of Saint Paul, earned their common livelihood — in their case, by copying and binding books.[10] Hence they had at the same time the opportunity for spiritual reading, did not have to leave the community or the house, and contributed to the spread of Christian doctrine and education. However, there was not much possibility of exterior apostolic work. Perhaps that is why Gerard Groote in 1383 had accepted an endowment for the support of two or three priests who would be active in the care of souls. Otherwise, the seeking of the priesthood was regarded at first as contrary to humility. Much as it was desired to promote the salvation of others, the brothers were glad to be able to devote themselves more freely to their own perfection without the burden of the priesthood. They aspired to help their fellowmen by prayer, silent example, and encouragement.[11]

Spiritual reading, chiefly of Scripture, meditation, and prayer occupied their day in addition to manual labour. Fraternal correction and common examination of conscience were intended to aid in observance of the rule and to foster humility. Radewijns advised his disciples: "Persevere in humble simplicity, and Christ will be with you."[12] The following of the humble Christ was the central idea of their piety. In the midst of the late mediaeval urban middle class they wanted to live the life of the fathers of the desert in prayer and work.[13] Differing from the Beguines and the Beghards, the Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life had all property in common. Middle-class is the prosaic, calculating characteristic of this piety, its systematic and methodical struggle against faults, and its strong consciousness. Everything that exceeded a sound golden mean was regarded with suspicion. There was a preference for reaching not so high, but for persevering. An abundance of ideal programs which had remained unrealized were in clear view in late mediaeval religious life. Following the example of their master's "Resolutions and Intentions," many brothers drew up their own rule of life and wrote spiritual diaries with the results of their edifying reading *(rapiaria)*. A great part of the devout literature was composed or compiled as such, in the first place for edification, or consisted of letters intended to introduce others to the spiritual life.

---

[10] "Volo enim, quod, qui gratiam habent laborandi, laborent manibus suis... labor mirabiliter homini necessarius est et reductivus mentis ad mundici[ti]am et diminuendam immundici[ti]am" (*Ep.* 32), ed. W. Mulder, 138.

[11] *Vita Florentii:* "...ut non tantummodo sibi, sed et proximis suis proficerent ad salutem" (J. Pohl, VII, 133). "Tertia temptatio est, quando clericus et litteratus anhelat ad sacros ordines et praelaturam aut aliquam dignitatem" (*ibid.*, 184). "Nam nisi iussus et compulsus pro communi utilitate, nemo hoc acceptare audebat: quia omnes altiorem statum fugiebant et in humiliori loco et officio minori manere eligebant. Unde dominus Florentius qui erat gemma sacerdotum fertur aliquando dixisse. Si non essem sacerdos, nec curam aliorum haberem, tunc possem me perfecte emendare" (*ibid.*, 291).

[12] J. Pohl, VII, 190.

[13] F. Radewijns, *Tractatus devotus*, ed. M. Goossens (Haarlem and Amsterdam 1954), 331; *Imitatio*, I, 18, 6.

From the *Exercitium* of John Kessel (d. 1398), a lay member of the Deventer community, which comprised four priests, eight clerics, and a few lay brothers, we can obtain a picture of the order of the day. The day began with meditation at 3: 00 A.M., followed by Matins and scriptural reading. To guard against drowsiness it was recommended that the brothers make notes. At 5: 00 o'clock each went to his work, which lasted until the bells of the parish church rang for Mass. On the way the brothers prayed the psalms of Terce; returning, those of Sext. During Mass they were to meditate on the life and sufferings of Christ. Back home, they resumed their work. The common meal was not eaten before 10: 00 o'clock, accompanied by reading. Then each retired to his cell until None. The time between None and Vespers was again devoted to work, and after Vespers there was meditation. The work that followed until Compline was interrupted by the common supper, the second meal. The day ended at 8: 00 o'clock with the examination of conscience, in which each jotted down the day's faults. Bedtime was at 9: 00 P.M.[14] unless, in conformity with the example of the desert fathers, they engaged at night in spiritual discourses.[15] According to Thomas à Kempis, the model of this life was the fraternal community of the Primitive Church.[16]

The *devoti* had no regard for the beauty of creation. There are no traces of a Christian humanism in their spirituality, at least in the earliest period, even though by study and the diffusion of the Bible and the Fathers they did foster the new trends in education.

With reference to the saying attributed to John Gerson, "if the Church must be reformed, this cannot happen with greater ease than through men who have been prepared for it in the flower of youth by good morals and the practice of virtue,"[17] the apostolic work of the Brothers of the Common Life was oriented to the young student. To be sure, they did not themselves found and accept schools but they devoted themselves to the religious education of pupils apart from their formal lessons.[18] Nevertheless, they acquired an influence on the educational system of the age. Gerard Groote was a friend of the headmasters at Deventer, Kampen, and Zwolle. It was not until the second half of the fifteenth century that the Brothers of the Common Life participated directly in education in a few cities, such as Utrecht, Liège, and Groningen and, in Germany, Magdeburg and Trier.

---

[14] J. Pohl, VII, 309–12; R. Post, *De Moderne Devotie,* 41.

[15] J. Pohl, VII, 238 f.

[16] "Secundum primitivae ecclesiae formam, et sanctorum patrum laudabilem consuetudinem ab apostolis introductam" (J. Pohl, VII, 486).

[17] G. Dumbar, *Analecta,* I, 184; C. van der Wansem, *Broederschap,* 126.

[18] R. Post, *Scholen en Onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de Middeleeuwen* (1954).

If any of their pupils were thinking of the priesthood or the religious state or were suited for them, they were admitted into their houses. Others they lodged with reliable townsmen. They gathered the pupils for spiritual conferences *(collationes)* and were at their disposal for discussions and confession.[19] When in 1391 the brothers at Deventer were able to acquire a larger house of their own, they adapted the one hitherto used as a house for the pupils. The brothers' house at Deventer under the direction of Florens Radewijns became a model for many others but it can hardly be said to have contributed directly to their establishment. In fact, it was still without ecclesiastical approbation. In Kampen and Zwolle citizens affected by Gerard Groote's sermons founded similar religious houses. In 1394 Florens sent Gerard Scadde to Zwolle as rector. Under its second rector, Dirc van Herxen (1381–1457), the "father of all the *devoti*," this house acquired great prominence and after 1420 was the site of the annual chapter. Other communities arose at Almelo, Hoorn, and Amersfoort. In addition, there were houses of sisters at Deventer, Zwolle, Delft, Amersfoort, Hoorn, Hasselt, Leiden, Rhenen, and Utrecht.

But the ecclesiastical status of the new communities was still not settled. The brothers were not an order — the Lateran Council of 1215 had forbidden the founding of new orders — but they lived a quasi-monastic life. They had no vows but they observed the evangelical counsels, and they earned their livelihood by the work of their hands. Learned treatises, ill-disposed and well-disposed, on the lawfulness of this way of life went to and fro. The most important product of the dispute was the *Libellum super modo vivendi hominum simul commorantium*[20] of Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen (1367–98), who sought to prove that, despite the deviation from the traditional form of monastic observance, the life of the brothers was a school of perfection. It was only in 1401, after the death of Florens Radewijns (24 March 1400), when the direction of the house had passed to Emil van Buren, that the long sought confirmation of the Brotherhood of the Common Life was forthcoming in an apostolic mandate obtained by the Bishop of Utrecht, Frederick von Blankenheim.[21] The brothers were permitted to maintain their common meals, to make common property out of their possessions and the proceeds from their work, and perform pious exercises together, but they could not found a new order or adopt a new habit.

---

[19] *Cf.* the pedagogical treatises of Dirc van Herxen; for example, *Tractatus de iuvenibus trahendis ad Christum* (see under footnote 38).

[20] Ed. by A. Hyma, *AGAU*, 52 (1926), 1–100.

[21] Text in J. Hofmann, "De broeders van het Gemene Leven en de Windesheimse kloostervereinigung," *AGAU*, 2 (1875), 229–36, and P. Frédéricq, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Nederlandicae*, II (Ghent and The Hague 1896), 190–93.

The Windesheim Congregation

In addition to the association of the Brothers of the Common Life, which represented something new between cloister and world, the *devotio moderna* led to a monastic reform movement. If we can rely on Thomas à Kempis, Gerard Groote, following his visit to Ruysbroeck at Groenendael, had already given thought to the establishment of a cloister for canons for such of the brothers as inclined to the monastic life.[22] As a matter of fact, in 1382 he recommended Berthold ten Have, of the Deventer house, to the provost of Emstein for reception into that community. In view of the difficulties of 1383–84 it was natural to seek support in one of the old orders and to assure the continuance of the movement of the *devoti* by means of a monastery. Accordingly, John Busch relates in the *Windesheim Chronicle* that Groote, on his death bed, recommended to his brothers the founding of a monastery in which all the brothers and sisters could find refuge, aid, and protection.[23] The so-called Augustinian rule presented itself as the most appropriate for this purpose. Certain as it is that Gerard Groote, Florens Radewijns, and other brothers purposely rejected the official monastic form of life for themselves and aimed at closer contact with the world, apparently there were also among their pupils some who felt themselves called to the religious state. For many the brothers' houses became places of preparation for the cloister. This prevents us from regarding the criticism levelled by Gerard Groote and his pupils at religious who did not take their vows seriously as a fundamental rejection of the monastic life, or, as it were, an anticipation of the Reformation.

To provide models of true claustral life and also to preserve the special character of their own form of life, it was natural to found a monastery for the brothers with an inclination to the religious state. Within its shelter they could assure protection for the real offshoot of the *devotio moderna*, in still so precarious a situation in regard to canon law and the recipient of so much enmity.

And so from Deventer occurred the founding of the Canons of Windesheim near Zwolle. On 17 October 1387 the church was consecrated and six pupils of Gerard Groote made their vows. Previously they had familiarized themselves with the traditions of the Augustinians at the monastery of Emstein, founded from Groenendael in 1382, where at the same time they had come into contact with the spirituality of John Ruysbroeck. Before long, in 1392, two more monasteries were founded, at Marienborn near Arnheim and at Neulicht near Hoorn. With these and Emstein Windesheim established a congregation under the "Prior Superior," John Vos van Heusden (1391 to 1424), in 1395. By 1407 twelve monasteries belonged to it, including Agnetenberg, of which Thomas à Kempis was a member. Union with the chapters of Groenendael (1417) and Neuss (1430) brought a great increase in numbers. By 1500 this number was to grow to eighty-seven houses. The spirit was purely contemplative. The very location of Windesheim and other houses outside cities indicates that they were not adapted to pastoral work, and in the statutes from the pre-Reformation period we find no reference to apostolic or educational activity, apart from the copying of books and monastic reform.

---

[22] *Vita Gerardi*, chapter 15, ed. J. Pohl, VII, 77 f.

[23] "Verumtamen aliqui vestrum ordinem ab ecclesia approbatum debent assumere, ad quos omnes devoti utriusque sexus in cunctis suis necessitatibus securum habere debent recursum consilium et auxilium defensionisque presidium petentes receptari" (*Chronicon Windeshemense*, II, c. 5, ed. K. Grube, 263).

The last mentioned became the specific historical achievement of the Windesheim Congregation in the fifteenth century. In 1435 the Council of Basel entrusted Windesheim with the reform of the German Augustinian monasteries. On this mission the later chronicler of the Congregation, John Busch (d. 1479/80),[24] came to Wittenburg, west of Hildesheim, in 1437 as subprior, reformed Sylte, and in 1447 became provost of Neuwerk near Halle. In 1451 the papal legate, Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, named him visitor of the Augustinian monasteries of Saxony and Thuringia. On his visitations Busch unhesitatingly made use of the secular arm against the refractory. Superiors were deposed and religious were expelled or transferred. This was not only done to insure new respect for the vows or to enjoin inclosure again, but even, when the introduction of the Windesheim usages was involved, the adopting of a certain habit or a method of chanting.

If in persons like John Busch we note the absence of proper religious depth, and if external fidelity to the rule apparently replaced the pious sentiment which characterized men like John Vos and his successor, Willem Vornken (1425–54), still the Windesheim Congregation, even in the latter half of the century, represents a flourishing and vigorous monastic life, which acted as a model for other communities.

The monasteries, gathered into so compact a congregation, were naturally much stronger and more secure in regard to their institutions than the less firmly united houses of the brothers. Entirely on their own, they moved into the foreground, assumed leadership, and represented themselves in literature, with Thomas à Kempis and John Busch, as the true heirs of Gerard Groote.

---

[24] *Cf.* K. Grube, *Des Augustinerpropstes Johannes Busch Chronicon Windeshemense und Liber de reformatione monasteriorum* (Halle 1886).

On the other hand they afforded support and protection to the communities of the brothers. Thus, on 19 March 1395, the superiors of the monasteries of the Windesheim Congregation issued a solemn declaration on the orthodoxy and proper manner of life of the Deventer brothers.[25]

The Brothers of the Common Life in Germany

The "Brother Movement" in Germany also originated at Deventer. In April 1400, soon after the death of Florens Radewijns, Henry von Ahaus d. 1439), vicar of the Münster cathedral, visited Deventer. He was deeply impressed by the primitive Christian spirit in the house and shared its life for more than a year. Having returned home, he founded at Münster on 26 October 1401 the first house of the Brothers of the Common Life. According to the foundation charter, "two or more priests, with a few clerics and one or more lay brothers" should live in it permanently with common ownership of books and other property; they should be such as "were unable to enter an order because of some impediment or did not regard that as their vocation, but, remaining in the house to the end and living in humility, chastity, and the other virtues, were desirous of serving God and assisting one another in a common life."[26] Henry seems not to have been the rector at first of this still loosely organized community. It took him perhaps fifteen years to consolidate the house in the Deventer spirit and to overcome the opposition of the "rude and uncouth Westphalians" ("groven ende onbesnedenen Westphalen"). But in the later fifteenth century Westphalians were the chief representatives of the German aspect of the movement. At that time they were found in all the houses of western and central Germany.

Henry von Ahaus founded another house at Cologne in 1416, which he directed for three years until his return to Münster in 1419. Shortly before his death he founded one at Wesel in 1435. In addition, there were houses of sisters at Borken, Coesfeld, Wesel, Dinslaken, Lippstadt, Schüttorf, and Münster. Henry von Ahaus was not satisfied with the founding of individual houses. It was important to assure their existence and to maintain the proper spirit in them. To these ends he worked for a union *(confederatio)* among the houses, and in 1425 it was realized in the case of Münster and Cologne. From it developed the so-called Münster Colloquy of 1431. Every year, on the Wednesday preceding "Cantate" Sunday (the fourth Sunday after Easter), the superiors of the houses of brothers and sisters in northwest Germany were to meet at Münster to discuss common affairs, such as the installing of rectors, the appointing of confessors and visitors, new foundations, and so forth. The connection with the brothers in the Netherlands was maintained by the interchange with the Zwolle Colloquy of two representatives of each group. Later attempts of the Münster house to establish its position of supremacy as the regular place for holding the colloquy in order to effect a stricter organization and a uniform observance in the twenty-six German houses foundered on the resistance of the other houses, notably Hildesheim. From 1479 Hildesheim instituted a colloquy of its own with Kassel and Magdeburg. Aspirations for union finally led in 1499, under the influence of Jasper (d. 1502), rector of Deventer, to a general chapter. Whether the general statutes were actually adopted here and the union thereupon came into being is uncertain.

---

[25] J. Hofmann, *AGAU,* 2 (1875), 225–29; P. Frédéricq, *Corpus documentorum,* II, 156–58; E. Barnikol, *Studien,* 158 f.

[26] K. Löffler, *Heinrich von Ahaus,* 793.

The growth of the Brothers of the Common Life in Germany presents itself in four centres, which are to some degree definable in time and geography.

1. The West German or Münster circle, with houses at Münster (1401), Cologne (1416), and Wesel (1435). Not established by Münster, but closely connected with it, were Osterberg near Tecklenburg (1409–27), Osnabrück (1410–30?), and Herford (1426). Later Rostock (1462) and Marburg (1477) were founded from Münster, and Emmerich (1467) from Deventer.

2. The Hildesheim circle, with the central German, chiefly Hessian, houses: Hildesheim (1440), Kassel (1455), Kulm (1472), Magdeburg (1482), Berlikum in Friesland (1483), and Merseburg (1503). Of these, Kulm and Berlikum, like Emmerich, were at first oriented to Holland.

3. The Middle Rhine circle, proceeding from Cologne: Marienthal in the Rheingau (1463), Wiesbaden (1465, but it probably never actually came into existence), Königstein (1466), Butzbach in South Hesse (1468), Wolf on the Moselle (1478), and Trier (1499).

From 1471 these Middle Rhine foundations formed, against Münster, a special union with its own general chapter, which in 1477 was joined also by the Württemberg houses. The communities of this "South German" union strongly resembled the communities of canons. Their members were "Canons of the Common Life" and the term was not a camouflage. They were headed by provosts; Gabriel Biel, for example, was provost of Butzbach in 1477 and of Urach in 1479.

4. The Württemberg circle. From Butzbach, Gabriel Biel (d. 1495) founded Urach in 1477 on the initiative of Count Eberhard the Bearded. Then arose Herrenberg (1481), Tübingen (1482), Dettingen (1482), Dachenhausen (1486), and Einsiedel in the Schönbuch (1491). Gabriel Biel exerted the decisive influence in the establishing and in the internal and external organization of the Württemberg houses. And even when he was no longer provost of Urach, this house occupied a leading position among those of Württemberg.

To these twenty-six German houses of the brothers are to be added the even more numerous houses of sisters, which were under the pastoral care of the brothers. Because of their cowl, the brothers were often referred to as Kogelherren or Kugelherren or, in Württemberg, as Kapuziaten or Kappenherren.

Opposition: Matthew Grabow

The new form of life, between world and cloister, encountered various kinds of lack of understanding and opposition. These came from the old orders, especially the mendicants, who felt themselves under criticism or even defamed because of the rejection of begging; from the diocesan clergy, who at times were unwilling to relinquish to the brothers the care of souls in the sisters' houses; and from trade circles, who saw an unwanted competition in the brothers and sisters who lived from the proceeds of their labour.

Offense was also given by the translating of the Bible into the vernacular and the using of such versions in the houses of the brothers and sisters. Gerard Groote had spent the last days of his life in translating parts of the breviary in order to make possible for the sisters and others who were uneducated a meaningful participation in the liturgy. At the monastery of Windesheim there was a special *Librarius teutonicorum librorum.*[27] To what extent the *devoti* thus fell under suspicion is clear from the *apologiae* attributed to Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen (d. 1398), *De libris teutonicalibus* and *De Precibus vernaculis,* or the opinion handed down by Abbot Arnold, of the Dutch Benedictine monastery of Dickeninge, on 2 December 1397, in favour of the brothers. In it the question, is it lawful to read and to have books of the Bible in the vernacular, was answered in the affirmative.[28]

The opposition to the Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life found expression in principle in the work of the Dominican Matthew Grabow. A member of the friary at Wismar, he was a lector in theology at Groningen and in 1400 is mentioned as inquisitor. He delivered to the parish priest of Deventer a treatise against the brothers, of which only the conclusions are extant.[29] The brothers defended themselves in a counter-complaint to the Bishop of Utrecht, who condemned Grabow. He thereupon brought the case before the Council of Constance. Here Peter d'Ailly and John Gerson attacked his thesis, that no one can meritoriously or even sincerely observe the universal counsels of obedience, poverty, and chastity if he remains outside the true and recognized religious orders. Appealing to Thomas Aquinas, Grabow held that the renunciation of all ownership in the world was sin and murder. In 1419 his theses were repudiated by Martin V at Florence, his writings were consigned to the flames, and he was himself condemned to imprisonment. Despite his abjuration,[30] he was still confined in Castel Sant'Angelo as late as May 1421.

---

[27] *Chronicon Windeshemense,* ed. K. Grube, 125.

[28] L. Korth, "Die ältesten Gutachten über die Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben," *Mitteilungen aus dem Stadtarchiv Köln,* 13 (1887), 1–27 (especially pages 14 f.).

[29] "Conclusiones contra devotarios extra congregationem approbatam viventes."

How difficult it was to understand the special character of the Brothers of the Common Life and how natural to count them among the traditional orders or how necessarily they had to sail under the "standard of a false canon law"[31] in order to obtain recognition is evident from the bull of 18 April 1439, in which Eugene IV granted papal confirmation to the houses in Münster, Cologne, and Wesel.[32] In this the houses are declared to be monasteries of canons, the brothers become canons, their rector a provost.

In view of similar misconceptions or centralizing tendencies and out of an anxiety to maintain their original character, Peter Dieburg (d. 1494), superior and chronicler of the Hildesheim house, declared on 13 May 1490 in a letter to the rector of Münster: "We are not religious; our endeavour and purpose is to live piously in the world."[33]

It is with reference to such manifold difficulties that the repeated efforts of the brothers for express sanction of their manner of life by the competent authorities and the custom of placing at the head of their lists of benefactors princes of the Church who had approved their house are to be understood.

Literature and Spirituality

The *devotio moderna* produced no great theologians. It aimed to avoid theological disputations, held speculation in no esteem, and even in regard to mysticism was on the whole reserved. Its significance lay in the practice of the spiritual life, and its literary output served this end. The communicating of one's spiritual practical experience in letters, diaries, or rules of life for the guidance of others occupied a large place. There were also *rapiaria* and idealizing biographies of the founders, whom the brothers wished to emulate in the following of Christ.[34] In addition to Scripture and the Fathers, especially Augustine, Gregory the Great, pseudo-Dionysius, and John Cassian *(Collationes)*, the *devoti* preferred as the sources of their spirituality the works of Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), the Franciscans Bonaventure (d. 1274), especially his *De triplici via,* and David of Augsburg (d. 1272), in particular his *Profectus religiosorum* and *Speculum monachorum,* Henry Suso, and the *Life of Christ* by Ludolf of Saxony (d. 1378).[35]

---

[30] Thus S. Wachter, "Matthäus Grabow, ein Gegner der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Lehen", *Festschrift zum 50jährigen Bestandsjubiläum des Missionshauses St. Gabriel* (Vienna-Mödling 1939), 289–376, especially 348–51 and 362, against H. Keussen, "Der Dominikaner Matthäus Grabow," *Mitteilungen aus dem Stadtarchiv Köln,* 19 (1890), 103.

[31] E. Barnikol, *Studien,* 32.

[32] Document no. 1729 of the Münster diocesan archives, Abt. Generalvikariat (Fraterhaus).

[33] "Non sumus religiosi, sed in saeculo religiose vivere nitimur et volumus" (H. Doebner, *Annalen,* 113).

[34] *Cf.* Thomas a Kempis, *Dialogi noviciorum,* ed. J. Pohl, VII, 1–329; Rudolf Dier (d. 1458), *Scriptum de magistro G. G., domino Florencio et multis aliis devotis,* ed. G. Dumbar, *Analecta,* I, 1–11; John Busch, *Liber de viris illustribus* in *Chronicon Windeshemense,* ed.

The centre and root of the *devotio moderna* was the Christ of history. "Our first effort should be to become absorbed into the life of Jesus" *(Imitation,* I, 1, 3). "The life of our Lord Jesus Christ, which he has held up as an example to us, is the source of all virtues and the model of all sanctity," declares the *Epistola* attributed to John Vos van Heusden.

The aim was to nourish oneself by meditation "on the soul's true food of the most holy life of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is above all important to imitate his humility, his obedience in the degradation of his Passion.[36] The imitation of the humanity of Christ gives access to his divinity.[37] One should want "to know Jesus from within." Florens Radewijns' books, *Omnes, inquit, artes* and *Multum valet,* provide a series of meditations on Christ. Especially worthy of mention are the *Devota exercitia passionis* of Dirc van Herxen (d. 1457). In *De duplici modo se exercendi* he is said to have composed a plan of meditations for individual days and hours.

This attention to systematic meditation and the development of its method characterized the *devotio moderna.* In it were sought, not transporting ecstasy nor even mystical union, but rather the simple narrating and experiencing in loving contemplation of the life of Christ and the sorrows and joys of his Mother. Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen (d. 1398), the most prolific author among the Brothers of the Common Life, in *De spiritualibus ascensionibus* provided guidance in reflecting on what had been heard and read and in applying it to one's own life in the practice of love and humility. He arranged in detail the subject and time of the meditation.

The special care of the *devoti* for the young was expressed in the four pedagogical writings of Dirc van Herxen: *Tractatus de iuvenibus trahendis ad Christum, De innocentia servanda, Libellus de parvulis trahendis ad Christum,* and *Libellus de laudabili studio eorum trahentium.* The first two

---

K. Grube; *Vita Johannis Brinckerinck, NAKG,* NS, 1 (1900), 314–54. Likewise, the "Frensweger Handschrift" (Univ. Utrecht, Ms 8, L. 16, ed. by W. Jappe Albertz and A. L. Hulshoff [Leiden 1958]) contains mostly biographies of *devoti.*

[35] *Cf.* Gerard Groote, *De sacris libris studiendis,* ed. J. Pohl, VII, 97 f.; a similar list of books is provided by Florens Radewijns (*Collationes Brugenses,* 14 [1909], 89) and John Mombaer in the *Rosetum* (P. Debongnie, *Jean Mombaer* [Louvain 1928], 320–31).

[36] J. Mak, "Christus bij de moderne devoten," *OGE,* 9 (1935), 105–66. *Cf.* John Busch, *Chronicon Windeshemense,* chapter 4: "... Super fundamentum sancte paupertatis, verecunde simplicitatis ac profunde humilitatis originaliter se fundabant" (ed. K. Grube, 15).

[37] G. Groote, *Ep.* 9, ed. W. Mulder, 31; *cf.* the *Rosetum* of John Mombaer: "Est enim meditatio humanitatis sc[h]ala qua pervenitur ad contemplationem divinitatis" (ed. Basel 1504), 135.

are addressed to the young to induce them to seek Christ and preserve virtue. The last two are intended rather for their instructors.[38]

Of the Windesheim canons, in addition to John Vos (d. 1424) and Thomas à Kempis (d. 1471), mention should be made of Hendrik Mande (d. 1431), with his twelve works in the Dutch language which are heavily indebted to Ruysbroeck, and of Gerlach Peters (d. 1411). The last named developed a strongly emotional, practical, Christ-oriented piety in his *Breviloquium*, in two letters to his sister, and especially in his *Soliloquium*. This spiritual literature of the *devotio moderna* originated for the most part in the communities, was destined for their aims, for example, biographies for reading matter during the common meals, and was regarded as their common property. Hence our notion of authorship cannot in numerous cases be applied to it strictly. This explains the anonymity of so much of the literature and probably also the fact that even in regard to works so well known and influential as the *Imitation of Christ* and the *Epistola de vita et passione Christi* the authorship is disputed.

The Letter on the Life and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ and other devout exercises, according to which the brothers and laymen at Windesheim are accustomed to arrange their exercises has come down to us in a Latin translation as Part III of the *Chronicon Windeshemense* of John Busch.[39] John Vos, the "Prior Superior" of the Windesheim Congregation, was long considered to be its author. In any event, he recommended the letter to the *devoti* entrusted to him and based his own exercises on it. The *Epistola* is intended as a handy guide for the weekly religious exercises of persons practising this devotion. The material for meditation is arranged for the week. Three meditations are provided for each day. In the first, one considers a mystery from the youth of our Lord; in the second, from his passion and death; while in the third attention is centred on a saint.

> What is sweeter, more comforting, more pleasing to God, more salutary for the simple dove than to dwell devoutly in the cleft of a rock, that is, in the wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ? May your sweet Lord and lovable bridegroom grant you the favour not merely to dwell there daily and to repose in joy but also to die daily, while still alive, in the same love with which he accepted wounds and death.[40]

---

[38] P. H. J. Knierim, *Dirc van Herxen*, 105–12.

[39] Ed. K. Grube, 226–44. The original text of the *Epistola* has recently been edited by C. de Bruin, "De Dietse oertekst van de anonieme 'Epistola de vita et passione domini nostri Jesu Christi et aliis devotis exercitiis,'" *NAKG*, 34 (1944 f.), 8–23. On the question of authorship see J. G. R. Acquoy "Is de Windesheimsche prior Joh. van Heusden de schrijver van de 'Epistola de vita . . .,'" *Handelingen en Mededeelingen van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden, 1891–1892* (Leiden 1892), 95–97 (especially page 96). S. van der Woude, *Joh. Busch Windesheimer kloosterreformator en kroniekschrijver* (Edam 1947), 150.

[40] Ed. K. Grube, 242; *cf. Imitatio*, II, 1, 21 f.

Here is indicated the same *via regia* of meditation on and following of the passion of Christ as in *The Imitation of Christ.*

The Imitation, comprising since 1427 four perhaps originally independent works, is not only the best known book of the *devotio moderna* but, after the Bible, of world literature in general. We know 700 manuscripts of it alone — of Book I from 1424, of Books I–IV from 1427. It has been translated into ninety-five languages and has gone through more than 3,000 editions. It has come down anonymously. In the 1441 autograph (MS 5855 to 5861 of the Bibliothèque Royale of Brussels) Thomas à Kempis designates himself merely as scribe and in the same words with which he ends a Bible manuscript that he prepared.

Contrary to the intention of the author (*cf.* I, 5, 6) there began in the fifteenth century a violent dispute, even involving politics, over the authorship. More than thirty-five names, including Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventure, Ludolf of Saxony, John Tauler, Henry Suso, Dionysius the Carthusian, and John Gerson were brought on the field. Favourites in this dispute, exacerbated by national feeling and rivalry of religious orders, were for centuries, besides Thomas à Kempis, a Benedictine Abbot John Gersen, who allegedly lived in the thirteenth century at Vercelli in North Italy, and John Gerson (d. 1429), the defender of the Brothers of the Common Life at the Council of Constance. But language and spirituality point to the Low Countries and today almost all scholars agree that the author of *The Imitation of Christ* is to be sought in the ranks of the *devotio moderna.* There is also agreement that Thomas à Kempis was the last to take the work in hand. To what extent Gerard Groote had anything to do with the wording is less clear. Did he merely inspire it or can he be called the author of a first draft which would then have been revised by others, last of all by Thomas à Kempis? The question of authorship is of significance only to the extent that it is not unimportant for an evaluation to ascertain whether the author was a worldly-wise and active man like Gerard Groote, who had experienced the temptations of the world in his own body and was calling for renunciation of the world, or an awkward, introverted, pious man, ill at ease in the world, who like Thomas à Kempis had proved to be useless in practical business and for whom activity in the world was never a serious temptation. More important is the question of the content and spirituality of the work. It offers no systematic doctrine of piety or even of the mystical life. It is rather a spiritual diary or, better, a collection of pithy sayings about the spiritual life, a so-called *rapiarium.* The author seems to have written it over a somewhat long period of time, chapter by chapter, without being particularly concerned for their coherence and logical order.

Book I aims to lead to humility and inner peace through contempt of the world and of vain knowledge, through self-control and contrition of heart. A glimpse of death and judgment is intended as a further aid. Book II shows how we "must enter the kingdom of God through much affliction" (II, 12, 62). This kingdom of God is within us; hence the admonition, "Despise what is external, surrender yourself to what is within, and you will see the kingdom of God grow in you" (II, 1, 2). The devout man feels that he is unjustly treated by men; he is disappointed in them. He finds comfort in the friendship of Christ (II, 8, 18ff.). For the sake of this friendship sufferings are glorified (II, 3, 19), cheerlessness and loneliness are accepted (II, 9), the cross is loved. But, despite all longing for inner consolation, the devout man of *The Imitation* knows also that mature love for Christ proves itself in cheerlessness, when one perseveres with Jesus in the abandonment of the cross (II, 11, 1–11).

Books III and IV are in the form of a conversation which the Lord has with his servant, Christ with his disciple. If the human will is stressed in Book I, grace is predominant in Book III. Man of himself has nothing that is good (III, 49). The more he is stripped (III, 37, 6, 16) and abandons himself (III, 37, 17 ff.; 42, 9; 49, 9 ff.; 54), he acquires true liberty in grace. Book IV presents "pious exhortations for holy communion" in three exercises (chapters 1–5, 6–11, 12–18). *The Imitation,* like mysticism, wants to lead to union with God (III, 31, 5 ff.). But this union is genuine and real only if it grows out of virtue (II, 10, 5 f.) and it does not absolve from persevering moral effort. The unassailed, peaceful possession of God is reserved for the next world; here the *militia Christi* is our portion (III, 25, 8; 6, 27). In this struggle Christ under his cross is both model and help (III, 56, 28). Seeking God's will and concern for a pure conscience take precedence over contemplation in this world (I, 3, 23; 20, 14). In addition to this strongly ethical orientation, the mysticism of *The Imitation* is dominated by the opposition between the spiritual and the material, the internal and the external.

> Be intent on setting your heart free from an inclination to the visible and raising it to the invisible. Whoever follows his senses stains his conscience and loses God's grace (I, 1, 20).

For the sake of this inner life, external exercises of piety are underestimated, and pilgrimages and the cult of relics are criticized (I, 11, 13; 23, 25; III, 58, 9 f.; IV, 1, 38 f.). By virtue of this criticism of the externalization of late mediaeval piety through the multiplying of external forms at the expense of depth and the mean, by virtue of this struggle against a piety of good works and for a better inner righteousness, *The Imitation* is in the lineage of both the Catholic Reform and the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

But because its intensification of inner feeling was connected with a disregard for the mystery of creation as well as of the Incarnation, the piety of *The Imitation* threatened to lose its context to the world. In contradistinction to German mysticism, the "imitation of Christ" did not see that the dignity of things is based on creation. They are experienced only as seductive glamour and not as symbols pointing to God. The world is fit only to impede the glimpse of God. "If you look at creation, the creator withdraws from you" (II, 42, 10).

The idea of the "following of Christ" does not become the prevailing viewpoint. Above all, union with Christ is not seen in its essentially sacramental basis. It is confined to the example of the historical Christ, whose sufferings bring us comfort and strength. There is no mention of the mediatorship of the God-Man, of "through Christ in the Holy Spirit to the Father." Hence the mystery of the Church is not envisaged, let alone seen as the basis and subject of piety.[41] *The Imitation* can be termed Christocentric at the most in regard to the individual, but he does not perceive that his love of God can be full only when it extends to love of neighbour and apostolate. A synthesis of self-sanctification and apostolate is not to be found, and even the missionary obligation of the pious person plays no role. What is important is flight from the world; the strength is lacking to bring the world back to Christ and to exorcise the danger of secularization.

Toward the close of the century one encounters a union of mysticism, humanism, and *devotio moderna* in one of the Münster brothers, John Veghe (d. 1504). After a short time at Rostock, he became rector of the brothers' house at Münster in 1475 and in 1481 of the local Niesink convent of the Sisters of the Common Life. In his Low German treatises, *Gheystlike jagd, Lectulus noster floridus,* and *Wyngaerden der sele,* and his sermons or conferences, twenty-four transcripts of which are extant in Low German, he offers, in connection with the Canticle of Canticles, a mysticism directed to practical ends and thus makes the teaching of the mystics fruitful for the various levels of Sisters of the Common Life. All are called to be God's brides. "God has created mankind that he may make use of it." This union with God, the participation in the divine joys, begins already in this life but finds its fulfillment only in the next. Man must exert himself to achieve it. This blessed union of man with God in love is explained by Veghe under the symbol of sacramental communion and of the union of spouses.

The last important spiritual writer from the Windesheim circle was John Mombaer (Johannes Mauburnus). Born at Brussels around 1460, around 1480 he became a canon at Sankt Agnetenberg. Important and entirely too little esteemed is his significance as a monastic reformer in France at the end of the century. There he became Abbot of Livry in 1501, but he died at Paris soon after, possibly on 29 December of the same year. Like Wessel Gansfort (d. 1489) and following his example, Mombaer wanted to indicate ways to the interior life, especially to devotion during the canonical hours, at the reception of holy communion, and in meditation — in other words, the most important spiritual exercises of the *devoti.* But in so doing he developed the method of the spiritual life to such a degree that the danger of mechanical routine, which he, like the *devotio moderna* in general, aimed to combat, became acute again in a new form. In the *Venatorium sanctorum ordinis canonicorum regularium* he defended the customs of his order, while in the *Rosetum exercitiorum spiritualium et sacrarum meditationum* (Zwolle [?] 1494; Basel 1504; Paris 1510) he provided a *summa* of the spiritual doctrine and practice of the *devotio moderna.* A sort of *rapiarium,* the *Rosetum* gives an abundance of the spiritual experiences of the writer and his circle and the fruits of an uncommonly wide acquaintance with religious literature.

---

[41] *Cf.* E. Iserloh, "Die Kirchenfrömmigkeit in der Imitatio Christi," *Sentire Ecclesiam* (Freiburg 1961), 251–67.

As an aid to the memory the rules of meditation and its content were put in verse. These were arranged in groups of seven for the days of the week or the seven canonical hours or in "rosaries" of 150 points. To aid the canons in a devout chanting of the psalms during the Office, Mombaer gave them, in the *Chiropsalterium,* a further mnemonic aid.

Through the *Rosetum,* the *devotio moderna* acquired a stronger influence in France and, *via* France, in Spain, for example, on Abbot García Jiménez de Cisneros (d. 1510) of Montserrat. His writings, which aimed to provide a help for the interior performance of the choral liturgy *(Directorium horarum canonicarum,* Montserrat 1500) and for meditation (*Exercitatorium spirituale,* Montserrat 1500), are strongly dependent on the *Rosetum.* Whether Ignatius Loyola obtained the stimulus for his method of meditation through this Benedictine Abbot or directly from John Mombaer cannot be definitely determined. In any case, at Manresa he had *The Imitation of Christ* at his side and thereafter is said to have preferred it to any other devotional book.[42] Thus was established the direct connection of the *devotio moderna* with the Catholic Reform of the sixteenth century.

CHAPTER 48

The Nationalist Heresies: Wyclif and Hus

Ideas regarded as heretical, which were maintained in England and Bohemia toward the end of the fourteenth and at the beginning of the fifteenth century, acquired a universal importance because they expressed revolutionary views in the quarrels over the constitution, structure, and life of the Church.

John Wyclif, born near York around 1330, spent most of his life at Oxford as master of theology following his studies at that University and held several lucrative benefices. While he has until now been regarded chiefly as a philosopher and politician, numerous recent studies point up his interest as primarily theological and especially biblical. Though he has often been referred to as a nominalist, an emphasis on his extreme realism seems to correspond better to reality.[1] Detailed commentaries on Holy Scripture and the treatise *De veritate sacrae scripturae* gained him the title *Doctor evangelicus*. After he had become professor of theology, he composed a sort of theological *summa* in several treatises: *De dominio divino, De civili dominio, De officio regis, De ecclesia*. Moved by the deplorable situation of ecclesiastical administration and by the insecurity consequent upon the outbreak of the Western Schism, he now came forward as a reformer of more aggressiveness than had been indicated in his biblical exegesis. His theses, regarded as dangerous, gave the competent ecclesiastical authority the excuse to intervene, especially since denunciations came from several quarters. An interrogation before the Bishop of London at Saint Paul's in February 1377 took him to task for nineteen articles extracted from *De civili dominio*, but his patron, the Duke of Lancaster, prevented any severe action.[2] Likewise fruitless were the bulls sent by Gregory XI in May of the same year to the King, the bishops, and the University of Oxford.[3] The next year a hearing at Lambeth before several bishops obtained from Wyclif a partial recantation or at least an evasive interpretation of the nineteen articles.[4] His Eucharistic theory of *remanentia* in his *De Eucharistia* was attacked by the mendicant friars, the Chancellor of Oxford, and a part of the masters; against them he drew up a *Confessio*.[5] He took no direct part in the disturbances of 1381 and spoke out against the insurgents. In May 1382 Archbishop Courtenay of Canterbury (1381–96) convoked a provincial council at the Dominican house in London — the "Earthquake Synod." In prolonged discussions twenty-four propositions were branded, some as heretical, some as erroneous,[6] and a synod at Oxford in November of the same year approved these proceedings.[7] Wyclif had to give up his teaching position and retired to his parish of Lutterworth, where he remained unmolested until his death on 31 December 1384. To this period belong a group of important writings, such as the *Trialogus*. When Urban VI cited him to the Curia he replied in a work that was hardly submissive[8] and then in his *De citationibus frivolis.*

---

[42] "Tagebuch des Pater Gonçalves," *Monumenta Ignatiana,* IV, I (Rome 1944), 200.

---

[1] R. Kalivoda, "Johannes Wyclifs Metaphysik des extremen Realismus und ihre Bedeutung im Endstadium der mittelalterlichen Philosophie," *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, 2 (Berlin 1963), 716–23.

[2] J. H. Dahmus, *The Prosecution of John Wyclif* (New Haven 1952), 7–34.

[3] The five papal bulls, with English translation, in Dahmus, *op. cit.*, 39–49; the bull to the University of Oxford in *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, 242 ff., with the date 31 May 1377.

[4] Dahmus, *op. cit.*, 35–73.

[5] *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, 105 f.

[6] *Mansi*, XXVI, 695–722; Dahmus, *op. cit.*, 89–128; *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, 277–82.

[7] *Mansi*, XXVI, 811–20; Dahmus, *op. cit.*, 136 f.

Wyclif's criticism of Church and theology soon found a response in wide circles and imitation through the so-called "Poor Priests." Recently, however, their connection with Wyclif and their importance and diffusion are less emphasized than they were in earlier presentations. After Wyclif's adherents at the University of Oxford had been expelled by the Archbishop and the state officials or had submitted, a cruder Wyclifism remained active in the middle and lower strata of the population for several decades more. They went into the catalogue of heretics under the old label "Lollards," and the translation of the Vulgate into the vernacular, suggested by Wyclif, was called the "Lollard Bible."[9] Energetic steps were taken by state and Church to prevent the survival of Wyclif's doctrines. Thus in 1397 Archbishop Arundel (1396–1414) at a provincial synod condemned eighteen propositions from the *Trialogus.* At the beginning of the fifteenth century the German master, John Hübner, at Prague added twenty-one other propositions to the twenty-four that had been condemned at London in 1382.[10] In Bohemia in 1412 the defending of these forty-five articles and of seven others was forbidden, theological censures being added to each article.[11] And at Oxford in 1411 the Archbishop, after a visitation of the University, obtained the compiling of a list of 267 false opinions of Wyclif; he then transmitted this to Rome. The at first strong opposition to the visitation was less an advocacy of Wyclif than a protest in favour of the University's freedom. At Rome on 10 February 1413 John XXIII's bull of 2 February was published in the single solemn session of the Council of Rome. This contained the condemnation of all Wyclif's writings, especially the *Dialogus* and the *Trialogus,* and also the demand that anyone who intended to defend Wyclif's memory had to appear at the papal court within nine months.[12] At Constance, right after the opening of the Council in 1414, persons were also concerned with Wyclif and Hus.[13] On 4 May 1415, in the eighth session, the Council condemned the forty-five propositions after they had been examined in detail in expert opinions;[14] discussion was also begun on the 260 theses which had been condemned by Oxford University but it was then postponed. There followed the decree that Wyclif's remains were to be removed from consecrated ground. In the twelfth session, on 29 May, there was discussion of 266 articles of Wyclif[15] and on 6 July the fifteenth session confirmed the verdict of the Roman Synod after fifty-eight of the 260 articles had been read.[16] While yet at Constance the new Pope, Martin V, issued a series of decrees on the religious situation in Bohemia, which included an enumeration of Wyclif's forty-five articles and thirty articles of John Hus; these too were condemned in the fifteenth session. Also issued was a questionnaire with thirty-nine questions, which were to be presented to suspected persons.[17] He addressed himself to England in repeated documents and demanded the destruction of Wyclif's writings and the suppression of his errors. Finally, in December 1427 the Bishop of Lincoln was commanded to have Wyclif's remains disinterred and burned; this was carried out.[18]

---

[8] *Fasciculi zizaniorum,* 341 f.

[9] K. B. McFarlane, *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity* (London 1952); M. E. Aston, "Lollardy and Sedition 1381–1431," *Past and Present,* 17 (1960), 1–44; M. Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge 1920).

[10] F. Palacký, *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam et controversias de religione in Bohemia annis 1403–1418 motas illustrantia* (Prague 1869, reprinted Osnabrück 1966), 327–31.

[11] *Ibid.,* 451–57; also in M. Spinka, *John Hus' Concept of the Church* (Princeton 1966), 397–400.

[12] H. Finke, *Acta concillii Constanciensis,* I, 123 f., 162 f., IV, 643; *Calendar of entries in the Papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Papal letters,* VI (London 1904), 174, 343 f.

[13] H. Finke, *op. cit.,* IV, 17.

An evaluation of Wyclif's personality was from the start a cause of dispute, since his strictly scholastic style, a certain obscurity in his caustic criticism, and the frequent repetition of his pet ideas impeded the study of his writings. If he was long regarded as a typical "pre-reformer," today persons incline rather to include him in the front ranks of the reformers. It must be said, however, that he did not rest content with a criticism of external and superficial things, such as the veneration of relics and saints, auricular confession, purgatory, indulgences, and monasticism, but, proceeding from the *lex Dei* in Scripture, attacked the theological bases of the mediaeval Church and hence was regarded as one of the worst enemies of the hierarchy. As an extreme Augustinian he represented in a radical manner a Church of the predestined in which there was no room for the hierarchy and ecclesiastical property in their contemporary form; to the Church of his day — *lex ecclesiae, epistulae papales* — he opposed the ancient Church in his indictment. If the papal bulls compared him to Ockham and Marsilius of Padua, this probably referred less to his philosophy than to the practical danger he implied for the structure of the late mediaeval Church. The frequently defended view that he was especially favoured or even protected by the English government because of his hostile attitude to Rome and the bishops has justifiably been contradicted.[19] New interpretations of his Eucharistic doctrine have also made their appearance. Many aspects of his teaching and the meaning of his enigmatic personality thus need a thorough and unpolemical clarification.

---

[14] H. von der Hardt, *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense concilium,* III (Frankfurt 1698), 168–211 ("Theologorum Constantiensium brevis censura XLV articulorum Wiclefi"), 212–335 ("Theologorum Constantiensis concilii diffusa condemnatio XLV articulorum Wiclefi").

[15] H. Finke, *op. cit.,* II, 362.

[16] The numerical data in regard to the Oxford articles fluctuate between 260 and 266: *Acta concilii Constanciensis,* II, 34, 40, 48. The fifty-eight articles that were read are in *Mansi,* XXVII, 748–52, and *COD,* 398–402.

[17] "Inter cunctas" of 22 February 1418, in *Hefele-Leclercq,* VII, 511–28.

[18] *Calendar of entries. Papal letters,* VII (London 1906), 21–23.

A powerful reform movement was in progress in Bohemia from the middle of the fourteenth century, even before Wyclif's ideas became known and obtained a wide circulation there. As everywhere else, the usual reproaches were directed against the wealth and privileges of the clergy. Protagonists of such reform ideas were quite numerous among the theological masters of the University. Hence it is not difficult to understand that Wyclif's doctrines and writings fell on a well prepared soil. Through the marriage of Anne, sister of King Wenceslas IV of Bohemia, to King Richard II of England intellectual interchange, especially through the activity of Bohemians studying at Oxford, became very lively. It is significant that more manuscripts of Wyclif are found in Bohemia than in England.

Into this situation, politically excited by the opposition between Germans and Czechs, came John Hus, who was born around 1370. He had obtained the master's degree in the Prague arts faculty and, after receiving the priesthood in 1400, devoted himself to the study of theology. The period up to his public appearance is obscure. His scholarship and theological originality are controverted, as is also his whole character, especially since it became involved in the Bohemian nationalist movement and, most recently, in the Marxist interpretation of history. In the first years of the new century he appeared as one friend of reform among many. Appointed by the Archbishop of Prague as synodal preacher, he began with remarkable asperity to denounce the vices of the clergy and in the Bethlehem Chapel, established for vernacular preaching by some lay enthusiasts for reform, he addressed the ordinary people. Earlier research pointed to his far-reaching dependence, both as to content and as to text, on Wyclif and accordingly greatly restricted Hus's originality. But his independent elaboration and politically shrewd use of Wyclif's ideas, expressed by the Englishman in ponderously scholastic fashion, is justly stressed.[20] He rejected the wholesale condemnation of Wyclif, since, he said, there was much that was orthodox in his formulations. He played no leading role in the decree of Kutná Hora, which in 1409 annulled the previous privileges of the German nation at the University.[21] Minor collisions with the Archbishop and the University were followed by a process against Wyclif's adherents, instituted by the Prague curia in accord with the instructions of Alexander V, the public burning of his writings, and the forbidding of preaching in private chapels. The result was an open break and Hus's excommunication. As he had done earlier, he now appealed to the new Pope, John XXIII. The matter was turned over to Cardinal Colonna for consideration and decision; he approved the Archbishop's measures and sent Hus an invitation to appear at the Curia; he rejected the excuses submitted by proxies and in February 1411 excommunicated Hus. Before long an interdict was laid on Prague. The Pope, however, named a new commission of four cardinals, but only Cardinal Brancaccio busied himself with the affair. King Wenceslas now intervened more forcefully in the disputes in order to put an end to the unrest and, in the expectation of recovering the imperial dignity, to present his Kingdom as free from heresies. But then Hus's preaching in the summer of 1412 against the crusade indulgence which John XXIII had offered because of King Ladislas of Naples brought the strife to a climax. A great part of the clergy, many masters of the University, and finally even the King withdrew their earlier support. Cardinal Brancaccio renewed Hus's excommunication and threatened his followers with excommunication and interdict. Hus had to leave the city and stayed with friendly Bohemian nobles. At this time he composed a work entitled *De ecclesia.* In this unsystematic polemic, which also borrowed from Wyclif, against the Prague theological faculty the Englishman's notion of the Church as the community of the predestined was very prominent, and hence the prevailing structure of the hierarchical Church and the obedience due to her were brought into question. It is not surprising, then, that there was a powerful opposition to it and that most of the points of the indictment could be taken from this document. The situation in the Bohemian Kingdom was now so tense that even King Sigismund, as heir of Bohemia, looked to the coming Council for the solution of the political and ecclesiastical difficulties and suggested to Hus that he appear there.

---

[19] J. H. Dahmus, "John Wyclif and the English Government," *Speculum*, 35 (1960), 51–68; L. J. Daly, "Walter Burley and John Wyclif on Some Aspects of Kingship," *SteT*, 234 (1964), 163–84.

[20] P. De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Hus*, 75 ff.; J. Kejř, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Hussitentums*, 52; G. A. Benrath, *Wyclif und Hus*, 197 f.

[21] F. Seibt, *Hussitica*, 65–77.

Chapter 49

The Council of Constance: Martin V

The Council of Constance (1414–18)

In spite of the great successes of the Council of Pisa union had not yet been entirely achieved, especially in the obedience of Benedict XIII in the Iberian peninsula. Once again politics determined the further development of ecclesiastical matters. The fate of the envisaged synod hung upon the attitude of the European states.

The extremely complicated prehistory of the Council of Constance is best grasped in the activity of the German King Sigismund. Already as King of Hungary he had early taken the part of the Council of Pisa and its Popes, Alexander V and John XXIII. Since his unanimous election as German King in June 1411, his actions and influence had concentrated especially on the unity of Christendom.[1] It was clear to him from the start that, despite the extensive Pisan obedience, only a radical solution, namely the withdrawal of all three pretenders, could lead to the desired goal. For no success attended the Council of Cividale, held by Gregory XII in the summer of 1409. It was opened on 6 June and, after eight or nine sessions, was secretly abandoned by the Pope on 6 September. The attendance was slight, for the greatest part of the Italian bishops responded to the summons to Pisa. It was further impeded by the Patriarch of Aquileia, who supported Pisa, and in comparison with Benedict XIII's Council of Perpignan it ended wretchedly.[2] The difficulties connected with union lay chiefly in the political field. So long as John XXIII, elected at Bologna in 1410 as successor of Alexander V, was able to maintain himself in Italy, any rapid progress on the road to union was out of the question. This crafty man, who was not particularly choosy about means, succeeded in establishing himself in Rome through the instrumentality of Louis of Anjou and in expelling the Pope of the Roman obedience from South Italy. Thus Gregory XII had only a few adherents in the lordship of Prince Charles Malatesta of Rimini and, in Germany, in the territory of the Count Palatine of the Rhine and in the dioceses of Trier, Worms, Speyer, and Verden.

In conformity with the decrees of Pisa, John XXIII summoned a council to meet at Rome on 1 April 1412. But this was announcement rather than fulfillment, although the peace made with Ladislas of Naples in June 1412 introduced a brief interval of peace in Italy's agitated political situation. Especially France, but also Italian circles, Malatesta in particular, displayed great interest in the meeting; the Pope was less interested. After the opening on 14 April there took place, apart from several rather insignificant sittings, only one solemn session, in which occurred the condemnation of Wyclif's propositions. When in March 1413 this gathering was adjourned, a new council was simultaneously announced but without any mention of where it would meet. As early as June, however, the Pope, again seriously menaced by Ladislas, had to abandon Rome in great haste. He found shelter outside the gates of Florence, while his Curia was lodged in the city.

---

[1] J. Leuschner, "Zur Wahlpolitik im Jahre 1410," *DA*, 11 (1955), 506–33; A. Gerlich, *Habsburg-Luxemburg-Wittelsbach im Kampf um die deutsche Königskrone. Studien zur Vorgeschichte des Königtums Ruprechts von der Pfalz* (Wiesbaden 1960).

[2] L. Schmitz, "Die Quellen zur Geschichte des Konzils von Cividale 1409," *RQ*, 8 (1894), 217–58; J. Petersohn, "Papst Gregors XII. Flucht aus Cividale (1409) und die Sicherstellung des päpstlichen Paramentenschatzes," *ibid.*, 58 (1963), 51–70.

Now Sigismund's hour had arrived. The developments in Central Italy caused John to look around for a protector, since Ladislas was beginning to push northward *via* Rome, and even Florence decided to seek a *rapprochement* with the King of Naples. It would be incorrect to regard Sigismund as the sole saviour of this emergency, but in regard to the place for the council the German King obtained the upper hand. After lengthy consultations with his Curia, John XXIII at the end of July 1413 announced the dispatch of cardinals for negotiations in regard to the time and place of the future council. Cardinals de Chalant and Zabarella were thereupon commissioned. Also envisaged was a meeting with the King at Genoa or Nice. But then the cardinals met with the King at Viggiù near Como from 13 to 31 October. The outcome of these detailed conversations was the announcement by Sigismund on 30 October of a council which was to meet on 1 November 1414, at Constance, as Sigismund had proposed. On 31 October a notarial instrument dealing with this agreement was prepared, and a meeting of the Pope with Sigismund at Lodi within forty days was decided upon. Negotiations began there on 25 November and lasted throughout December; then they were continued in Cremona until the middle of January. On 9 December the Pope issued the bull convoking the council to Constance. Thus, from the political viewpoint, Sigismund had quite rightly sided with the Pope with the largest obedience and for a long time had seemingly avoided any connection with Gregory XII, even inviting him to Constance very late. For a capitulation could more easily be obtained from the Roman Pope, either by kindness or by force.

In contrast to Gregory XII, Benedict XIII was a dangerous rival; his obedience was still solid and he was planning to enlarge it and even to invade Italy, with the assistance of King Ferdinand I of Aragón, who wanted to marry his second son, John, to the heiress of Naples, Ladislas's sister Joanna. And so the intermediaries sent by Sigismund, by the French King, and by John XXIII to the Iberian peninsula at first had a difficult time. Only the Aragonese King's eagerness for union brought about the great gathering at Morella on the frontier between Catalonia and Valencia. The participants were Benedict XIII, Ferdinand of Aragón, and envoys of the Kings of Castile, France, and Germany. In the discussions, lasting from June to September 1414, Benedict and his Spanish obedience showed themselves to be unprepared to yield, despite many obliging words. Nevertheless, envoys of the Pope and of the King of Aragón were sent to Sigismund with the suggestion of a meeting of Benedict and Ferdinand with the German King. The previous crude refusal was now succeeded by a close contact and as a result very much was gained. Following these circumspect preparatory steps, everything now depended on whether the states, especially the great powers, would really take part in the Council. For this Sigismund had to display all his mastery of politics and diplomacy. The greatest difficulty was the war, or at least the hostility, between England and France, together with the changing and uncertain attitude of Burgundy. Even before issuing the official invitation to the Council, Sigismund had simultaneously conducted negotiations for an alliance with England and France; then, in June 1414, he had signed with France the secret Treaty of Trino, directed less against England than against Burgundy. The usual rapid change in the coalitions at this period was already apparent in September in France's *rapprochement* with Burgundy in the Peace of Arras. Although the negotiations and the plans for an alliance with England were more in keeping with Sigismund's policy, here too the idea of the Council held the first place. Accordingly, it was a question of preventing the outbreak of hostilities until the Council could get under way and then of preventing the forsaking of the Council by the powers. Sigismund's diplomacy and his temporizing were successful in both matters and so to him belongs the chief merit for having brought the Council into being and for its accomplishments.[3] His policy before the Council was as important as that at the Council. The Council of Constance was essentially a political event and can be understood and appreciated only from this viewpoint.

It was due to the powerful pressure from the cardinals that, after the sudden death of King Ladislas of Naples on 6 August 1414, John XXIII did not devote himself to winning back the Papal State but set out for Constance. In order to safeguard himself, he allied with Duke Frederick of Habsburg and with the Margrave of Baden. He entered Constance on 28 October and on 5 November solemnly opened the Council. At first the number of participants was slight, because many wanted to see whether the Council would meet at all. The German King arrived at Constance on Christmas, and with the new year, 1415, the attendance rapidly grew: cardinals, archbishops and bishops, abbots, generals of orders, the grand masters of the military orders, many proxies of the higher clergy, deputies of chapters, professors of theology and of canon law, envoys of kings, princes, free cities, cities, and, not least, universities. The lay element was very strongly represented, especially the German princes, counts, and other nobles. Another class appeared in large numbers at a general council for the first time since Pisa: the scholars, for since the High Middle Ages the universities, Paris at their head, had assumed the tasks of the *magisterium ordinarium.* Many thousands gathered in the city of the Council, even if the numerical data given by the Constance chronicler, Ulric Richental, in his work, which is so significant for cultural history, are exaggerated. By virtue of John XXIII's creations the College of Cardinals displayed a group of outstanding personalities, as did also the body of curialists. Present at this greatest congress of the Middle Ages was the whole of contemporary Christendom, including the Eastern Church. The importance of this gathering of peoples for the spread of humanism can scarcely be overestimated. A new style made its appearance in sermons, treatises, and especially pamphlets. All the weighty questions of the age were treated at the Council. In its three-and-one-half years there occurred forty-five solemn sessions and hundreds of general congregations and meetings of the nations and of the various committees. The Popes, John XXIII and then Martin V, presided over the Council. From the spring of 1415 voting in the solemn sessions was by nations, the College of Cardinals occupying the position of a nation. In the nations themselves, following the precedent of Pisa, voting was by heads.[4]

---

[3] E. Göller, *König Sigismunds Kirchenpolitik,* 166; H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.,* I, 170; H. Heimpel, *Aus der Kanzlei,* 136.

By contemporaries themselves the tasks of the Council were designated pointedly in the brief summation: *causa unionis, reformationis, fidei.* All three tasks continuously occupied the Council, sometimes in the foreground of the discussions, sometimes only in committees, depending on the political situation. Unquestionably, the restoration of unity was the most important and most pressing task. The difficult struggle for it was not lacking in drama. John XXIII and his large Italian retinue came to Constance with the intention of having the Pisan decrees against Gregory XII and Benedict XIII confirmed and then of dissolving the Council. This would have been significant only if all states would have complied with this decree, but this was not to be expected. Although the legitimacy of the Council of Pisa and of the election of John XXIII was recognized almost unanimously, only the resignation of the Pisan Pope also and of the two deposed at Pisa seemed to give hope of success. This was also Sigismund's plan and that of most of the nations. The Council's journalists pressed for the Pope's resignation with menacing accusations. John finally yielded to the pressure and held out the prospect of abandoning his claims, but he bargained for a week about the proper formulation. Then, in the night of 20—21 March 1415, he left the city secretly and in disguise and, under the protection of Frederick of Habsburg, went to Schaffhausen; from there he fled to Freiburg and to the Rhine, where, on the other side, Burgundian knights were awaiting him. He intended that his flight should disrupt the Council, but the German King kept it together with all the means at his disposal. In these fateful days, when the existence or non-existence of the Council and hence of union was at stake, the assembly, in the fifth session on 6 April, promulgated the decrees, later so controversial, on the superior power of the general council in the Church.[5]

---

[4] H. Finke, "Die Nation in den spätmittelalterlichen allgemeinen Konzilien," *HJ*, 57 (1937).

[5] *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta,* 385: "Haec sancta synodus Constantiensis generale concilium faciens, pro exstirpatione praesentis schismatis, et unione ac reformatione ecclesiae Dei in capite et membris fienda, ad laudem omnipotentis Dei in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata, ad consequendum facilius, securius, uberius et liberius unionem ac reformationem ecclesiae Dei ordinat, diffinit, statuit, decernit et declarat, ut sequitur. Et primo de-

It then instituted the process against the fugitive Pope. He was brought back as a prisoner and deposed on 29 May in the twelfth solemn session. He accepted the Council's sentence, but until 1419 he remained in the custody of the Count Palatine of the Rhine.

The proceedings against John XXIII belong in the series of famed papal processes of the Middle Ages. From the many abominations noised about in the Council seventy indictments were compiled in all haste, and in barely two weeks numerous interrogations of cardinals, bishops and high ranking prelates of the Curia took place. Some of the officials and notaries employed in the process had had a similar experience at Pisa. Out of the official records of the indictment and of the interrogations, as well as from the libels of the German curialist, Dietrich von Niem, emerges a dreadful picture of the Pope, from his youth and through his clerical and curial career up to the cardinalate and the papacy. He was accused of immorality of the worst sort, of having poisoned his predecessor, Alexander V, of having squandered the property of the Church and of the Papal State, of simony, and of intolerable avarice in appointing to benefices. As was customary in such processes, some articles referred to facts already well known, which were supposed to be attested by as many witnesses as possible. Much else was reported only by hearsay. Even if some points were then dropped, still the defamation was general and uncontested, and that is what especially mattered.[6]

What is to be thought of this trial and the shocking accusations? First of all, the desired goal of a quick elimination of the Pope stands out clearly in the hasty and perhaps even precipitate procedure. A qualified specialist in this period puts it thus:

> He was no better and no worse than his contemporaries... But when at the Council of Constance he had to be sacrificed to the aspirations of the Christian nations after unity, all the guilt and sins of the age were heaped on his head, so that he could be deposed from his position with an appearance of legality. Thus he had to be tossed out of Peter's bark and a faithful and skilled pilot had to be installed in his place.[7]

---

clarat, quod ipsa in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata, generale concilium faciens, et ecclesiam catholicam militantem repraesentans, potestatem a Christo immediate habet, cui quilibet cuiuscumque status vel dignitatis, etiam si papalis exsistat, obedire tenetur in his quae pertinent ad fidem et exstirpationem dicti schismatis, ac generalem reformationem dictae ecclesiae Dei in capite et membris. Item declarat, quod quicumque cuiuscumque conditionis, status, dignitatis, etiam si papalis exsistat, qui mandatis, statutis seu ordinationibus, aut praeceptis huius sacrae synodi et cuiuscumque alterius concilii generalis legitime congregati, super praemissis, seu ad ea pertinentibus, factis, vel faciendis, obedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignae poenitentiae subiiciatur, et debite puniatur, etiam ad alia iuris subsidia, si opus fuerit, recurrendo."

[6] H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.*, III, 11–29, 157–209, IV, 758–891.

[7] G. Erler, *Dietrich von Nieheim* (Leipzig 1887), 341, 384.

But this judgment is certainly too favourable. Still, much was charged to him for which his predecessors and the system were responsible. Deposition followed because of "unworthy life, notorious simony, incorrigibility, misgovernment of the Church, fostering of the Schism, and much scandal given to the Church." Hence he was regarded as an unworthy but not as an unlawful Pope.

Envoys of Gregory XII had arrived in Constance very soon after the opening of the Council. It was more than a trifling incident that the arms of their Pope, displayed at their lodgings, were torn down. It gave rise to a spirited discussion about the retirement of all three claimants in a kind of cancellation of the Pisan sentences. But then Gregory would be unable to come to a synod convoked by John XXIII; rather, he must summon it himself. This was granted to him. In the fourteenth solemn session, 4 July, his Cardinal John Dominici convoked the Council, whereupon Charles Malatesta announced Gregory's resignation. The Council appointed him Cardinal Bishop of Porto and Legate of the Marches of Ancona.

All these events lay within the bounds prescribed by politics. Following the now realized union of the Roman and Pisan obediences, there still remained the definitive elimination of Benedict XIII and the winning of his adherents in Spain and the Midi. Here too the Council wanted to complete the job before proceeding to the election of a new Pope.

Quite soon after the opening of the Council, envoys of Benedict XIII and of King Ferdinand of Aragón had appeared in Constance. They held out the prospect of a meeting with Sigismund at Nice. But it was not until July that a large delegation from the Council, Sigismund at its head, set out for Perpignan. Long and stubborn negotiations were unable to move Benedict to retire, but the kingdoms of the Iberian peninsula were won for the Council in the Treaty of Narbonne of 13 December 1415. The form of a reciprocal invitation betrays the primacy of politics here too. Thereby the Council, which had already been in session at Constance for more than a year, was to become a lawfully convoked Church gathering also for the former obedience of Benedict XIII. Even so, it was almost two years before all the Spanish states were represented at the Council as the fifth nation. The withdrawal of obedience also proceeded slowly and it was only in the thirty-seventh session, on 26 July 1417, that Benedict XIII was deposed, following a detailed process in which ninety charges figured. Till his death in 1423 the aged Pope, in his fortress of Peñíscola near Tortosa, regarded himself as the only legitimate successor of Peter.

The political amalgamation of all the former obediences finally opened up the way for the election of a new Pope. In the long and bitter debates of the summer of 1417 the point at issue was the priority of the papal election or of reform. Both viewpoints are understandable, even though the subsequent course of history may gain more sympathy for the call to reform. The form of the election was already the subject of detailed discussions. It had been said for some time that, in the event of the vacancy of the Holy See during a council, this council should certainly take part in the election of the new Pope. In view of the political structure of the Council of Constance, the cardinals were in no sense considered as the sole papal electors. The College had already made concessions in this regard in the deposition of John XXIII and in the resignation of Gregory XII, but it now sought to recover as much influence as possible. And so at Pentecost 1417 it submitted the celebrated *cedula* "Ad laudem," which, by way of exception, proposed the admission of representatives of the individual nations, with the proviso that, in comparison with the College of Cardinals, they must constitute a minority. Two-thirds of the votes in each of the two groups would be required for the validity of the election. Meanwhile, the German King succeeded in achieving the deposition of Benedict XIII and in assuring Church reform by a conciliar decree to the effect that what had so far been accomplished in regard to reform would be promulgated in a decree and the future Pope would be obliged to further reform before the close of the Council. This much had been achieved when the French nation submitted its new proposal for conducting the papal election. The new Pope, as the Pope of the now reunited Universal Church, should be elected by the College of Cardinals and six representatives of each of the five nations. His position would be politically unassailable, for the customary two-thirds would be required not only from the College of Cardinals but also from the representatives of each individual nation. The election thus carried out would be assured against any later objection. And so it was decided. This method of election was decreed in the fortieth session, on 30 October, and the opening of the conclave was set for within ten days.

In rapid succession occurred the selecting of the deputies in the nations, — not always without difficulties, — the appointing of the guardians of the conclave, the preparing and sealing off of the place of the election in the Merchants' Hall on the lake. The electors entered the conclave on 8 November and on the following day they began the deliberations. Faithful to the political mandate, the election could not be secret. On the reading of the ballots aloud, each elector was carefully asked whether it was his ballot and whether he wished to vote thus.

The first voting took place on 10 November, the votes being rather widely scattered. In the afternoon it was decided to allow the customary *accessus*, but only in writing. The decision was reached as early as 11 November. Serious candidates were the Cardinals of Ostia and Saluzzo, Colonna, and the Bishop of Geneva. If Colonna obtained only eight votes from the cardinals, he also had votes from each nation and the required number from the Italians and the English. While the *accessus* was taking place, the daily procession came to the conclave and sang the "Veni Creator Spiritus." Even the dull chroniclers mention the emotions thereby produced and the admonition to unity. Before noon Cardinal Oddo Colonna obtained two-thirds of the votes of the cardinals and of the delegates of each nation, accepted the election, and took the name of Martin V in honour of the saint of the day. No one had expected so quick an election, considering the extremely difficult mode of election. All the greater, then, was the general rejoicing in the conciliar city. Following his ordination to the priesthood, the new Pope was consecrated a Bishop and crowned on 21 November. From now on the Council was under his direction.

To the area of the *causa fidei* belong the controversial granting of the chalice to the laity, the attitude toward Hus and Wyclif, the question of the lawfulness of tyrannicide, and the dispute between the Teutonic Order and Poland.

The method of administering communion, actually a question of liturgical practice, acquired the greatest political importance because of special circumstances. Well into the High Middle Ages the Eucharist was ordinarily administered to the faithful under both species, but from about the middle of the thirteenth century for the most part under the species of bread. Apparently the introduction of communion *sub utraque* in Bohemia can be dated rather exactly to the autumn of 1414 and can be ascribed chiefly to the Prague master, James of Mies.[8] Hus was not involved. But on being questioned by his followers in his first weeks at Constance, he expressed himself prudently in favour of it in the pamphlet "De sanguine Christi sub specie vini a laicis sumendo." Later he came out publicly for it.

The treatment of this question proceeded together with the process against Hus. Reports on the granting of the chalice in Bohemia had piled up and the Council occupied itself with the question in the spring of 1415. On 15 June, in the thirteenth session, the lay chalice was forbidden by a synodal decree. When the report of this reached Bohemia together with the news of the condemnation and execution of Hus, the really disciplinary question of the chalice became a prominent sign of opposition and also, for wide circles, an intelligible symbol of the Hussite Revolt. After long negotiations and internal discussions the University of Prague — now the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in Bohemia — approved the lay chalice in the spring of 1417. This decision, together with an extensive historical demonstration of communion under both species, was transmitted to the Council through the good offices of King Sigismund. This was, then, an effort to induce the Council to a reexamination of the decision already rendered. But it took place only by means of the obtaining of further testimonials, for example, from Gerson and Nicholas von Dinkelsbühl, and these were naturally in conformity with the conciliar decree. This negative attitude was then confirmed by the bulls "Inter Cunctas" and "In Eminentis" of the new Pope on 22 February 1418. It took the frightful experiences of the Hussite wars to bring the Council of Basel to an accommodation.

---

[8] F. Seibt, "Die revelatio des Jacobellus von Mies über die Kelchkommunion," *DA*, 22 (1966), 618–24.

The Bohemian reformer, John Hus, set out on 11 October 1414 and arrived at Constance on 3 November. The journey passed without incident, even though Hus had not yet received the royal safe-conduct. From the outset he did not find the atmosphere favourable at Constance. His chief Bohemian opponents, Stephen Paletsch and Michael de Causis, referred with great prudence to the presence of one who had been excommunicated and was suspect of heresy. Cardinals Colonna, Zabarella, and Stefaneschi and curial *auditores* had already been concerned with Hus for years and had laid censures on him. To Gerson and many doctors of Paris he was a dangerous heretic, against whom measures had to be taken. Out of regard for the King, John XXIII was mild, lifted the censures, and allowed Hus to celebrate Mass. But already at the end of November, despite energetic protests by the knights who were guarding him under the King's commission and despite an appeal to the royal safe-conduct, he was imprisoned. Attempts to treat his case in a small committee and to settle it there were frustrated by his demand to speak before the whole Council. The committee appointed on 4 December to handle his case consisted of the Patriarch of Antioch and the Bishops of Castellammare and Lebus. It set to work at once, relying on the often dubious charges of his Bohemian adversaries; many of these articles were later rejected by the committee. Until John XXIII's flight Hus was in custody in the Dominican monastery on the island, busy with replies to the questions of the members of the committee.[9] After the Pope's escape, the Bishop of Constance had to take charge of the prisoner; he let him stay at his castle of Gottlieben.

The King's demand that Hus be given a public hearing was complied with at the beginning of June. On 5, 7, and 8 June he stood before numerous prelates and theologians in the Franciscan refectory. While the first session was stormy, the two others were devoted to the quiet interrogation of the master. Hus rejected many articles that were falsely attributed to him, especially in regard to the Eucharist, but without much success, for, now just as earlier, he was regarded as Wyclifite. This was all the more unfortunate, since shortly before, in the eighth session on 4 May, the forty-five articles of Wyclif, his writings, and an additional 260 articles, earlier condemned by the University of Oxford, were again condemned. Hus refused to accept the judgment of the Council, and the King's kind exhortations were unsuccessful. Thus his fate was sealed, despite many efforts to get him to change his mind.

---

[9] On his attitude to the forty-five articles of Wyclif that were submitted to him *cf.* A. Molnár, "Les réponses de Jean Huss aux quarante-cinq articles," *RThAM*, 31 (1964), 85–99.

The decision was reached in the fifteenth session on 6 July, before the King's departure for Perpignan. Several previous attempts to save him foundered on his opposition. On the very eve of the session Cardinals d'Ailly and Zabarella, with many prelates and doctors from all the nations, submitted to him a very moderate formula of abjuration, but Hus rejected it. That evening there arrived, by order of the King, Duke Louis of Bavaria and the Count Palatine, with the Bohemian knights who were his friends, to persuade him to yield, but in vain. And so fate took its course. After the Mass preceding the solemn session, Hus was led into the cathedral to hear the reading of the indictment and the sentence. Again and again he interrupted the solemn action with challenges, protests, and prayers, but he gave no sign of submission. Two sentences had been prepared, one for the case of his recantation, the other for that of his persisting in his previous attitude. It was the second that was read. Hus was immediately degraded and surrendered to the secular arm, and the judgment was thereupon executed by burning. Hus died a martyr to his convictions.

The position of the German King has often been investigated and usually blamed.[10] There is no doubt that he intended by means of the Council and the anticipated justification of John Hus to master the difficulties in Bohemia. He had probably not given a thought to an unfortunate outcome and had long sought earnestly to prevent one. He thus protested energetically against the imprisonment and forced the three great interrogations and the submitting of the authentic and unfalsified writings of the master. It was some time before he became convinced of heresy, and still longer in regard to dangerous fanaticism. Only for a time was it possible to insist, against the verdict of the Council, on the promised safe-conduct. He could not and would not protect a heretic, as a testimonial of Dietrich von Niem shows.[11]

---

[10] The safe-conduct consisted of: 1) a personal escort, appointed already in the spring of 1414, of two Bohemian nobles delegated by the King; 2) a letter of safe-conduct drawn up in Latin and German. Only the Latin version, dated 28 October 1414, is extant (F. Palacký, *Documenta,* 237 f.). Hus undertook the journey to Constance without the letter of safe-conduct, as he himself repeatedly wrote to Prague, but under the protection of the two Bohemian knights. Apparently no special safe-conduct was supplied to Hus by Pope or Council, but at first he was under the general safe-conduct of persons going to the Council. Opinions differ as to the import of the royal safe-conduct. The letter was probably no more than an ordinary passport. But from the sharp reaction of the knights accompanying Hus and the repeated protests of many Bohemian nobles it may be surmised that Sigismund had given extensive assurances of a safe return-journey. *Cf.* A. Hall, *Siegmund und Hus* (Diss. phil., Freiburg 1912); H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.,* IV, 495.

[11] H. Heimpel, *Dietrich von Niem,* 343–49; also, H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.,* IV, 662 f.

The figure and the fate of the Bohemian master have found many interpretations — nationalist, heretic, martyr for freedom of conscience, to name only the most important. That he went voluntarily to Constance attests his courage, but also a remarkable misunderstanding of his situation. He came, not as a free participant in the Council, but as one accused and excommunicated, who was to answer before it. If he was willing to be taught by discussion and to be convinced of the incorrectness of his theses, he confused the sovereign authority of the General Council with a scholastic disputation. Especially unfortunate for him were the insurrection in his homeland, which was blamed on him, and the spiteful attacks of his countrymen. Until the bitter end he rejected the misinterpretation of his intentions by the Council. He said that he had not defended the greatest part of the articles attributed to him, or not as they appeared, and that hence he could not abjure them. Recently the exhaustive research of P. De Vooght, based on the sources, has prepared the way for a substantially milder evaluation, not to say rehabilitation. Accordingly, caution is called for in regard to all the earlier claims, both at Constance and in later historians, of a strong dependence on Wyclif. Erroneous theological views are to be found only in the notion of the Church and in the doctrine of the papacy. Not only misunderstandings in terminology but two different ideas confronted each other. Hus exhibited rather an ethical and spiritual understanding of the Church, of a strong Augustinian stamp, whereas the juristic and institutional element prevailed among the Council Fathers. A tragic fate obscures the indomitable but enigmatic personality of the Bohemian reformer.

A year after Hus's death, Jerome of Prague also had to mount the pyre at Constance. Less a theologian than his master, on many academic travels he acquired a comprehensive knowledge of philosophy and brought Wyclif's works from Oxford to Bohemia and Poland. His propaganda activities got him into various difficulties, and he was expelled from universities or took to flight. As a Czech nationalist and patriot he defended Hus at Constance but left the city, was arrested *en route* to Bohemia, and was brought back to the Council. After a first submission he disavowed his action and was burned on 30 May 1416.[12]

In the area of the *causa fidei* the question of the lawfulness of tyrannicide occupied the Council the longest and agitated it the most. To begin with, it concerned a problem of urgent political relevance. The occasion went back some years, to the assassination of Duke Louis of Orléans, brother of the French King Charles VI, in the fall of 1407 at the instigation of John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy. In the following spring the Parisian master, John Petit, a Franciscan, justified this deed in the presence of the court and of an illustrious gathering in his famous, and soon to be infamous, *Iustificatio ducis Burgundiae.* When there occurred a change in France's internal politics a synod at Paris and the Bishop of Paris, at Gerson's urging, condemned the *Iustificatio* in the spring of 1414, whereupon the Duke of Burgundy appealed to John XXIII at the beginning of March. The Pope entrusted the case to Cardinals Orsini and Zabarella and the Cardinal of Aquileia. Since there was no immediate decision, this matter also came before the Council. Here too it was unable to achieve a quick settlement, since too much regard had to be taken for political considerations and it was not permitted to endanger the chief business, that of union.

---

[12] S. Šmahel, "Leben und Werke des Magisters Hieronymus von Prag. Forschung ohne Probleme und Perspektiven?" *Historica*, 13 (1966), 81–111.

And so the problem was not brought up until after the deposition of John XXIII. It is true that the commission of cardinals, instituted earlier, was still competent, but soon the committee on the faith became interested. The result was the condemnation of the thesis "Quilibet tyrannus" in a general form, with no mention of John Petit, in the decree of the fifteenth session, 6 July 1415. The struggle of the two factions continued during the preparation of this decree and, even more, afterwards until the end of the Council. The Burgundian party and its leader, Bishop Martin Porré of Arras, took a firm stand against attributing the controverted extracts to Petit and against including him with the condemned theses. On the other side Gerson had for years taken the lead in numerous treatises and memoranda to the committee on the faith, demanding the condemnation of Petit's theses.

The majority of the testimonials requested by the committee and still known to us belong to the period from the autumn of 1415 to the spring of 1416. However, in a question of such political significance and such dogmatic importance, it is remarkable that a strong majority opposed Gerson: sixty-one opinions against condemnation and only twenty-six for it.[13] Of course it would have been best, so many felt, if a decision were postponed to the next council. The annulment of the Parisian verdict, pronounced by the committee of three cardinals on 15 January 1416, was in accord with this frame of mind. Hence the outcome was a retreat, without any direct approval of either side. This, however, only gave rise to new exertions for a clear verdict by the Council, but neither the Council nor the new Pope was able to render one. The difficulties were not only political. The fundamental texts were disputed at Constance, just as they had been earlier at Paris. The particular case defended by Petit had been made into a universal in order thereby to arrive more easily at a condemnation and still to spare the Duke of Burgundy. If by "tyrant" Petit apparently understood only a traitor, then in addition there was a widely divergent terminology. Not without significance for the obstinacy of the conflict was the peculiar development of the French notion of kingship. Viewed from without, it is especially striking how very useful the scholastic form of politics had become in the endless controversy in word and writing, how it believed it could prove all things and everything. The testimonials were often of political rather than dogmatic relevance — a thing already familiar from the beginning of the Schism.

---

[13] On the treatises see H. Heimpel, "Dietrich von Niems Gutachten gegen die Sätze Jean Petits vom erlaubten Tyrannenmord 28. Juni (1415)," *Studien zur Kirchen- und Reichsreform,* 62–64.

The quarrel between the Teutonic Order and Poland also led to a dispute over principles. The Peace of Toruń (1411) was followed in 1414 by a new conflict, which was temporarily ended by the armistice of Strasbourg. As in all great and undecided questions, here too the Council was supposed to be the final and highest court, especially since the attack on the order and its justification of its existence had been introduced on a broad theoretical front by Paul Wladimiri, a member of the Polish delegation at the Council, shortly after the opening. As in the case of the other business, here too a series of testimonials was submitted by the parties and called for by the officials. Just the same, the order's procurator, Peter of Wormdith, obtained the confirmation of its most important privileges by the Council and thus recognition of its past and future activity. The quarrel was aggravated by the *Satyra* of the Prussian Dominican, John Falkenberg, which was very hostile to the Polish King and nation. All motions by the Polish delegation, which also enjoyed Sigismund's support toward the close of the Council, for the condemnation of the Falkenberg theses as heretical were fruitless. The matter was often discussed in the committees and in the nations, but no conciliar decree materialized, not even when the Poles, in the last solemn session on 22 April, directly before the announcement of the ending of the Council, sought tempestuously to force one from the Council or the new Pope. Falkenberg himself, whose writings were condemned as dangerous and to be burned but not directly as heretical by a committee of cardinals appointed by Martin V, remained in the custody of the Curia until he recanted in 1424.

To the subjects treated at Constance in regard to faith belonged also the case of another Dominican, Matthew Grabow, a native of Wismar. He was active in Utrecht and had repeatedly lodged serious charges against the Brothers of the Common Life and all similar groups. He appeared before the Council with his accusations but was forced into the defensive by the accused and had to remain at the Council to justify himself. He submitted his views to the new Pope, but they were rejected by several who studied them, including d'Ailly and Gerson, and branded as heretical. By order of the Pope the Cardinal of Verona and, after the latter's death, the Cardinal of Aquileia had to deal with the matter. However, it was not settled at Constance but during Martin V's long stay at Florence. Condemned on 6 May 1419, Grabow recanted on 22 October. He was taken to Rome with

Falkenberg and was long detained in Castel Sant'Angelo. Nothing is known of his later fate, but he is said to have died in prison.[14]

If reunion was certainly the most important, even though a strictly limited, task of the Council, the reform of the Church or at least of the Curia was the broadest program. It was the special theme of the late Middle Ages and not merely a vague or mystical notion. For, according to the idea of contemporaries, unity could be assured only by the long demanded and desired reform. The notions of council and reform were inseparably linked in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and, following the achieving of reform, even reunion with the Greek Church was supposed to take place.

This reform was no revolution but a restoration of the old order. But no reform without a council. This proposition was realized in a fateful manner. Reform of the Church seemed possible only if the general council was regarded as the fundamentally sovereign organ of the Church. The great memoranda represented this standpoint almost unequivocally. If at the Council of Vienne Durandus the Younger had already demanded the holding of general councils at least every ten years, this thesis was vigorously taken up at the beginning of the Schism and continued into the fifteenth century, especially around the turn of the century and between the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel. There were many proposals in regard to the interval between councils: every five, seven, ten, thirty, or even fifty years. Every Pope should hold one at least once in his pontificate. The Universal Church, all the provinces, should be represented, and because of the ignorance of many bishops the attendance of *periti* was necessary. At each council the date for the next was to be determined, so that the Pope could not change or transfer place or date. The council alone, but not the Pope, could dispense from the conciliar decrees. Apart from the proposals for the improvement of morals, especially those of the clergy, at the next council after Pisa a revision of Holy Scripture and of canon law should be undertaken and brief summaries of the doctrine of faith and morals should be approved and distributed to all metropolitans and bishops. What were lacking were theologians; there were too many jurists and canonists at councils. It was due to the previous refusal of reform and to the simony of the Roman Curia that heresies had arisen, especially in England and Bohemia. Regarded almost universally as causes of abuses and of the Schism were the failure to hold general councils, the forsaking of the old canons and of a more synodal constitution of the Church, and the exaggerated growth of papal power. Reference was made again and again to the old rules, which had been abandoned to the benefit of a growth of juristic abuses and had contributed to the hypertrophous development of the curial system. The luxury of the papal court, of the cardinals and curialists, of bishops and prelates was a favourite theme of reform writings and reform preachers, but only the external aspects were dealt with. The system of benefices and of finance, reservations and provisions, as the effluence of a falsely understood *plenitudo potestatis,* must be regarded as the basic evil. A reform writing of 1406 says:

---

[14] S. Wachter, "Matthäus Grabow, ein Gegner der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben," *St. Gabrieler Studien,* 8 (1939), 289–376; see also Chapter 47.

> The *plenitudo potestatis* resides only in God — not in an individual man, not even in the Pope. The Pope has no absolute and full authority; he is not allowed to call himself *summus pontifex* but only *primae sedis episcopus.* His reserving all the business of his subjects to himself, his conferring of dignities and benefices, is a recent invention of the Latin Church and contrary to the canons ... Since Clement V three great evils have prevailed: Curia, *Camera,* and *potestas plenaria.* Since then all churches have been tributary. Tithes, *subsidia,* procurations, reservations, accumulation of benefices, exemptions, the arbitrary sale of plenary indulgence to the rich, provisions, commutation of penances for money payments — all this in the hands of a single man! Only Christ and the Universal Church in a general council are permitted to have such power.[15]

And in Dietrich von Niem's work, which summarized all reform proposals, there occurs in several places the statement, short and to the point: "concilium ergo generale ... limitet ac terminet potestatem coactivam et usurpatam papalem."[16] This meant the abolition or at least an extensive curtailing of expectatives, reservations, dispensations, exemptions, the *commenda,* annates, tithes, *subsidia,* and *spolia* in order to avoid simony and the simplification of the curial administration and of the chancery rules. Reform must begin at the top, for now there is no longer the *servus servorum Dei* but rather the *dominus dominorum.*

This brief glance at the universal desire for reform is necessary for an understanding of the Constance reform. The desire for reform was expressed previous to the Council in the *De squaloribus Romanae curiae* (*ca.* 1404) of Matthew of Cracow, Bishop of Worms, in the *Aureum speculum de titulis beneficiorum,* in the reform work, already mentioned, of the Bishop of Senez (*ca.* 1406), in the pamphlet *De ruina et reparatione ecclesiae* by

---

[15] R. Scholz, "Eine Geschichte und Kritik der Kirchenverfassung vom Jahre 1406. Nach einer ungedruckten Reformschrift." *Papsttum und Kaisertum, Paul Kehr zum 65. Geburtstag* (Munich 1926), 609, 616.

[16] Dietrich von Niem, *De Modis* (ed. H. Heimpel), 43, 47; 46: "Ideo sacrum universale concilium reducat et reformet ecclesiam universalem in iure antiquo et abusivam papalem in decreto et decretalibus, Sexto et Clementinis nec non extravagantibus papalibus pretensam limitet potestatem."

Nicholas of Clémanges, in Andrew of Escobar, in the *Capitula agendorum*, and in the pamphlet *De materia concilii generalis* by Cardinal d'Ailly. At the Council itself it was heard in numerous sermons and motions, above all in the *Avisamenta* of Dietrich von Niem and in Gerson's treatises *Tractatus de simonia* and *Ad reformationem contra simoniam.*[17]

Reform writings also criticized the form of the papal election. Not only the cardinals should have a vote; in alternate elections there should be another electoral college, to be determined by the Council. The Pope must not be always chosen from the same nation; and under no circumstances might two Popes in succession come from the same nation. It would be best to alternate between cisalpine and transalpine candidates. Intimately connected with the preceding was the reform of the College of Cardinals, which, according to some very critical voices, should be entirely abolished. The cardinals should not always come from the same country but from the various ecclesiastical provinces; from no nation should there be enough to give it a majority of the votes. The number of cardinals should be decreased, so that there should be, for example, between eighteen and twenty-four and never more than thirty. Their creation should take place by means of a vote in consistory, and for the future they should no longer obtain the *commenda* but only minor benefices. The income allowed them fluctuated between three and four thousand gold florins.

The Council of Constance was very much preoccupied with this reform program, only selections from which are here given, and the old and often repeated assertion that it did little for the reform of the Church is completely unjustified. Three commissions and, according to need, a group of smaller committees were instituted for handling reform questions. They corresponded to the momentary political situation of the Council. The first commission, with eight members from each of the four nations and three cardinals, met from August 1415 to the summer of 1417. The second, consisting of five delegates of each of the five nations, could function only from the summer of 1417 to the election of the new Pope in the fall of that year. Following the election of Martin V, in the same month of November a third commission was instituted, comprising six representatives of each of the five nations and six cardinals.

---

[17] For the reform literature *cf.* the general survey in *Fliche-Martin,* 14, 892; J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform.* On the Bishop of Senez, Scholz, *op. cit. (supra,* footnote 15). On Nicholas of Clémanges, *LThK,* VII (2nd ed. 1962), 983 f., and the edition of A. Coville, *Le traité de la ruine de l'église de Nicolas de Clamanges* (Paris 1936). On Andrew of Escobar see E. Candal, *Concilium Florentinum, Documenta et scriptores,* series B, vol. IV, fasc. I (1952), XVIII–LXXVII, and V. Beltrán de Heredia in *CTom,* 80 (1953), 335–40; A. D. De Sousa Costa, *Tribulações de Mestre André Dias, apreciado poligrafo de Quatrocentos* (1964). The "Capitula agendorum" are in H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.,* IV, 539–83. The *Tractatus de materia concilii generalis* in B. Meller, *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peter von Ailly,* 289–336, is incomplete; complete edition in F. Oakley, *The Political Thought of Pierre d'Ailly,* 244–342. Gerson's writings in Jean Gerson, *Œuvres complètes,* VI (1965), 167–74, 179–81.

Out of the wealth of reform proposals, what was decreed by the Council? Here, more than in the other tasks of the Council, general politics were the determining factor. When, following thorough preliminary work by the first and second reform commissions, much material was ready for formulation and voting, the reform got bogged down in the so-called "priority controversy" in the summer of 1417.

It is entirely understandable that at last, following the deposition of Benedict XIII, persons wanted to proceed to the election of a new Pope, especially since the Council was already in its third year. Equally understandable are the exertions of Sigismund and his adherents somehow to bring reform to a conclusion, since only through reform did it seem possible to avoid a new schism. The outcome was a compromise: the reform articles already approved by all the nations were to be published by a conciliar decree and put into effect before the papal election. This was done on 9 October 1417, in the thirty-ninth session.

The following points were covered: *De conciliis generalibus. Provisio adversus futura schismata praecavenda. De professione facienda per papam. Ne praelati transferantur inviti. De spoliis et procurationibus.* In the five decrees under these headings were contained these regulations: the holding of a general council, at first after five, then after seven, and thereafter every ten years; precautions against the future occurrence of a schism; the making of a profession of faith by every newly elected Pope; the non-transferability of the higher clergy; and the suppression of *spolia* and procurations. Moreover, in the compromise the future Pope, soon to be elected, was obliged to Church reform "in capite et curia Romana" at this very Council.

On 30 October, in the fortieth session, the Council decreed the implementation of these stipulations and specified the details in eighteen subtitles: *De numero, qualitate et natione dominorum cardinalium. De reservationibus sedis apostolicae. De annatis, communibus servitiis et minutis. De collationibus beneficiorum. De causis in Romana curia tractandis vel non. De appellationibus ad Romanam curiam. De officiis cancellariae et poenitentiariae. De exemtionibus et incorporationibus tempore schismatis factis. De commendis. De confirmationibus electionum. De fructibus medii temporis. De non alienandis bonis Romanae Ecclesiae et aliarum ecclesiarum. Propter quae et quomodo papa possit corrigi vel deponi. De extirpatione simoniae. De dispensationibus. De provisione papae et cardinalium. De indulgentiis. De decimis.*

The activity of the third reform commission was under omens different from those of its predecessors, since now the Pope also had something to say. In conformity with the obligation imposed on him, he treated with the commission and the individual nations. The difficulty of adjusting general decrees to the peculiar wishes of the nations was solved in such a way that seven reform decrees were promulgated by the Council in the Pope's name in the forty-third session on 21 March 1418. These were the reform articles that had found general acceptance: *De exemtionibus, De unionibus et incorporationibus, De fructibus medii temporis, De simonia, De dispensationibus, De decimis et aliis oneribus,* and *De vita et honestate clericorum.* In addition, the concordats agreed upon by the Pope with the individual nations but not yet formally concluded were read at this time.

The reform decrees were approved *conciliariter,* the concordats *nationaliter,* and the execution of the version agreeable to the Pope was certified. The separate arrangements with the five nations were drawn up in three versions, with the German, the English, and the three Romance nations. All except the English concordat were concluded for a period of five years, namely until the next council, at Pavia, which was to continue the work of reform.[18] Already in the autumn of 1416 the Bishop of Lodi had demanded that, in order to continue the reform discussion and to prepare for the next council, a commission, to be set up now, should obtain opinions from the universities on important questions; the representatives of the universities should then report at the next council.[19] Naturally, not all reform aspirations were fulfilled by the decrees and the concordats, but the Council had done good work. However, very much or everything depended on the attitude of the new Pope and his successors to the decree "Frequens."

The importance of the Council of Constance has been variously estimated down to the present, and the evaluation extends from full or partial recognition to rejection. The Council of Constance, like that of Basel, was not contained in the enumeration of the general councils current from Bellarmine on. This computation sprang, not from scholarship, but from a preponderantly apologetic effort and hence it has little claim to objectivity. Constance and Basel belonged to the group of synods that were only partially to be recognized, because they did not correspond to the canon provided for an evaluation of the past. But a part of the decrees of Constance are contained in the fourth volume of the *Editio Romana* (1612), the official Roman edition which was prepared in a congregation set up for this express purpose.[20] This onesided viewpoint and the effort to decide historical facts by ecclesiastical authority were opposed by scholars who were less apologetically oriented.[21] The evaluation depends especially on the attitude to the so-called "decree on superiority" of the fifth session. [22] It would be preferable now not to gauge this decree by the constitutions of Vatican I, but rather to proceed in the opposite direction and thereby to do justice to the historical development.[23] Then the question withdraws behind the perhaps necessary and express approval of the decrees by Martin V and Eugene IV.[24] That the new Pope exerted himself to maintain the position gained in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is understandable,[25] but his strivings found a limit in the almost universal teaching of the theological world on the higher power of the general council. It would be incorrect to accept only the extreme tendencies as the expression of the time; different views stood beside one another. But there is no doubt that the higher position of the general council had already been represented for a long time and by a much larger portion of theologians. The flight of John XXIII was only the occasion for actualizing and confirming, at this very moment, the previously more habitual power of the council. Everything connected with reform — "without a council, no reform" — points in this direction, especially the decree "Frequens." From the viewpoint of the contemporary political and intellectual situation, the Council of Constance in its entirety must be regarded as ecumenical and its decrees as universally binding.

---

[18] *Raccolta di concordati su materie ecclesiastiche,* ed. A. Mercati (Rome 1919), pp. 144–68.

[19] H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.,* IV, 712f.

[20] V. Peri, "Il numero dei concili ecumenici nella tradizione cattolica moderna," *Aevum,* 37 (1963), 430–501; K. A. Fink, "Konziliengeschichtsschreibung im Wandel?" *Theologie im Wandel: Festschrift zum 150jährigen Jubiläum der kath.-theol. Fakultät der Universität Tübingen* (Munich 1967), 179–89.

[21] K. A. Fink, "Zur Beurteilung des Grossen abendländischen Schismas," *ZKG,* 73 (1962).

---

[22] It is advisable to speak of the decree of the fifth session instead of the decree "Haec sancta." About a dozen decrees of Constance begin with "Haec sancta"; they have not in general been transmitted accurately in regard to the opening words.

[23] *Cf.* H. Riedlinger, "Hermeneutische Überlegungen zu den Konstanzer Dekreten," in Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 214–38; August Franzen, "The Council of Constance: Present State of The Problem," *Concilium, 7, Historical Problems of Church Renewal* (Glen Rock, N. J. 1965), 29–68; A. Franzen, "Das Konstanzer Konzil. Probleme, Aufgaben und Stand der Konzilsforschung," *Concilium,* 1 (1965), 555–74; P. De Vooght, *Les Pouvoirs du concile et l'autorité du pape au concile de Constance* (Paris 1965); W. Brandmüller, "Besitzt das Konstanzer Dekret Haec sancta dogmatische Verbindlichkeit?" *RQ,* 62 (1967), 1–17; B. Tierney, "Hermeneutics and History. The Problem of Haec sancta," *Festschrift für Bertie Wilkinson* (Toronto 1967); J. Gill, "Il decreto Haec Sancta Synodus del Concilio di Costanza," *RSTI,* 21 (1967), 123–30; R. Bäumer, "Die Interpretation und Verbindlichkeit der Konstanzer Dekrete," *ThPQ,* 116 (1968), 44–52; I. H. Pichler, *Die Verbindlichkeit der Konstanzer Dekrete* (Vienna 1967).

[24] On the actual recognition see K. A. Fink, *Die konziliare Idee im späten Mittelalter. Vorträge und Forschungen,* 9 (Constance 1965); P. De Vooght, *Les Pouvoirs,* 55–80.

[25] Here belongs the evaluation of Martin V's intended prohibition of an appeal from the Pope to the council in connection with the appeal lodged by the Poles. In the final session the Pope had refused to allow the condemnation of Falkenberg by a conciliar decree, since the matter had been dealt with *nationaliter* rather than *conciliariter.* Thereupon the Poles appealed to the next council. In consistory the Pope caused the reading of the sketch of a bull with a prohibition of such appeals, but the bull was not published. Gerson sharply attacked the Pope's contemplated step *(Œuvres complètes,* 6 [1965], 283–90). Several authors consider the question as pertaining only to the Poles' conflict with the Pope. But R. Bäumer, "Das Verbot der Konzilsappellation Martins V. in Konstanz," in Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 187–213, maintains, with copious recourse to the literature, the universal validity of the prohibition. No matter how this question is decided, it in no way alters the fact that quite different views were then defended and that the later prohibitions by Pius II and Julius II were vain, because in them persons rightly saw only a partisan stand.

Martin V (1417–31)

The first and only Pope from the Colonna family was a Roman in the full sense of the word. Always at the Curia, as a Cardinal from 1405, under Popes Boniface IX, Innocent VII, and Gregory XII he had abundant opportunity to become conversant with the confused situation in political and ecclesiastical life. But the stayed aloof from it, except in the preparations for the Council of Pisa, when he displayed great zeal to make it possible. He went to Constance with John XXIII, stayed with the refugee Pope for a short time, and then returned to the Council. Busy on many committees, he was not very prominent to outsiders and in the conclave he was regarded as one who, while perhaps having few friends, had scarcely an enemy; hence he was a genuine compromise candidate. With his election the Council acquired a new appearance, for, in accord with tradition, the Pope assumed its direction. This was very difficult, however, since it was not easy to distinguish what was the Council's business and what pertained to the Pope and his Curia.

The Pope proceeded at once to construct a Curia. Enough persons from the three now reunited obediences were at his disposal but not much money. Furthermore, in keeping with the conciliar decrees, the number of officials had to be reduced. The new curialists came predominantly from the Avignon obedience, which had the advantage of a longer and less interrupted tradition. As has already been said, the reform, discussed at length and in detail, was settled to a certain extent when the generally accepted motions were enacted as decrees and the more special questions were adjusted in the concordats with the nations. The announcements of the election were received in a friendly manner for the most part, though in some cases their reception left something to be desired. In a skilful, reserved, and apparently accommodating manner Martin V had achieved a great deal without any great conflicts. The general exhaustion of the Council did the rest, so that some still unsettled questions could be postponed until the next council, to meet in five years. Until then, therefore, the Pope was able to save a considerable part of his current rights and revenues. His task was now to salvage as much as possible from the new situation, and for this he needed a certain independence in ecclesiastical and political matters.

But how was this to be achieved? From the political viewpoint, Martin V was the right man for the papacy. Since he was regarded as Pope of the Germans and the English, he had to repulse all of Sigismund's efforts to keep him in imperial territory for a while. From the start of his pontificate he pushed for a return to Rome; Avignon was for him out of the question, though persons there were expecting him. He felt that only in Rome could he escape the often overwhelming influence of the states and the predominance of the Council. In addition, for a merely relative independence a financial basis was required, and only one territory offered it. But almost insuperable obstacles stood in the way of a quick return to Rome. During the Schism and especially since the death of Boniface IX the Papal State had fallen into a critical situation. One could hardly speak any more of the Papal State, for the real lords were King Ladislas of Naples up to the opening of the Council of Constance and then, during it, the first great *condottiere,* Braccio of Montone, who ruled all of Central Italy and was subjugating more and more territories. If the Legate appointed by the Council was seemingly the ruler in Rome under Neapolitan influence, in reality the local powers ruled there, just as in the many smaller states and territories. Toward the end of the Council and at the beginning of Martin V's pontificate there loomed the possibility of an invasion of South Italy by Benedict XIII.

Together with the establishing of a Curia and the sending of cardinal legates to Aragón and France, Martin's first instructions had to do with the situation of the Papal State, where he appointed rectors and officials. The Council and the new Pope had issued decrees on the administration of the Papal State, the recovery of the lost territories, and the duration of the vicariates.[26] The goal — the reestablishment of papal sovereignty — was clear, but it was difficult to realize, especially from afar. Hence, for all his seeming patience, Martin worked for the quick liquidation of the Council and his departure from Constance. There began at once a vigorous diplomatic activity, which was to last throughout the pontificate. In view of the rapidly changing balance of power in Europe and especially in Italy at that time, this meant a ceaseless tension, which filled the entire reign.

The first task was to clear the road to Italy. When on 16 May 1418 Martin V left Constance and went through western Switzerland toward Geneva, the remainder of his route was not yet visible; at Avignon it was expected that he would come there. After a stay of several weeks at Geneva and some lively political activity, at the beginning of September the Curia proceeded *via* the Mont-Cenis to Upper Italy, where stops of several days were made at Turin, Pavia, and Milan. For more than three months at Mantua it was not clear whether the route to Rome should be selected *via* Pisa or Florence, since rebellious Bologna was unwilling to receive the Pope. By way of Ferrara, Ravenna, and Forlì the procession moved to Florence, where the Pope had to wait for almost one and a half years before he could finally enter the Eternal City on 28 September 1420. These details should make clear how difficult was the new Pope's situation.

---

[26] B. Hübler, *Die Constanzer Reform und die Concordate von 1418* (Leipzig 1867), 39, 99, 144, 238.

The chief difficulty was the *condottiere* in the grand style, Braccio of Montone, with his supremacy in Perugia and far beyond Umbria; a great part of the Papal State had become financially subject to him. That the Colonna Pope could only take a dim view of Braccio's "state" was clear to the *condottiere,* and so recognition came only reluctantly in the areas dependent upon him. While still at Constance the Pope began the process of isolating Braccio by making contact with Milan, Florence, Naples, and many smaller *signorie.* From the outset he decided to get rid of the dangerous *condottiere* by military action, especially when the first negotiations were not very favourable. Only the extensive promises which Martin had to make at Florence in February 1420 opened the road to Rome.[27] But they implied no more than an armistice, and the great confrontation was yet to come. Uprisings at Bologna, which Martin suppressed with armed force, and the struggle for Naples postponed the reckoning with Braccio. It occurred in May 1424, when Braccio was defeated and found death at the siege of Aquila. The Pope at last had a free hand in domestic matters and could turn with more success to the recovery and reorganization of his state.

His relationship with Naples was of great importance.[28] In order to bring about the evacuation of Rome, which was occupied by Neapolitan troops, the Pope made great concessions in this regard too while still at Constance, including even the coronation of Queen Joanna II. Domestic difficulties in the Kingdom induced the Curia to turn again to the French House of Anjou and to enfeoff Louis III with the crown of Naples and the right to the succession after the Queen's death. But this led to a countermeasure when Joanna adopted the young King of Aragón, Alfonso V, who presented a danger to the Curia. Then Braccio went over to the Aragonese faction. When in the summer of 1421 Alfonso entered Naples, the situation became very critical for the Pope and for a Papal State that was in process of reconstruction. Whatever money could be raised was diverted to the levying of great military companies, for the Pope was firmly determined to take up the struggle. The strength of his forces saved him from defeat in the field and, through the good offices of Florentine envoys, there occurred in the fall of 1421 an armistice, which was followed by further negotiations. In the spring of 1424 the King of Aragón left Naples, only to return with more luck under Martin's successor. The Pope had succeeded in keeping the Aragonese great power away from Italy and the Papal State.

In addition to diplomacy, of which the Pope was a real master, he also displayed, as we have seen, an occasional resort to force, as in Bologna's first great revolt in 1420 and in the second, which involved all of Upper Italy in 1428–29. By means of a considerable military levy he compelled the refractory city to yield and thus retained the important northern pillar of his state.[29] This state was not a centrally administered territory in the modern sense. A variety of bonds held it together: direct subjection to the Curia by means of legates, governors, and rectors, and short-term enfeoffments with vicariates. The decisive factor, however, was that the finances of these areas were largely at the disposal of the Curia. To the extent that the sources provide reliable information, two-thirds of the income of the pontificate came from the Papal State — and were in turn expended on it. Because of the importance of finance, the *Camera Apostolica* was the highest administrative department of the Papal State. Rome, formerly so restless, was under the Pope's absolute rule from the time of his entry there, even though the forms of administration might appear otherwise. In return, the dilapidated city was splendidly renovated, especially the great basilicas, streets, and bridges and the fortifications of the city and its immediate vicinity. It goes without saying that the Colonna family in its many offshoots was much used in the administration of the Papal State. Considering the uncommonly difficult situation in which the Pope found himself after his return from the Council, he needed absolutely trustworthy people if he was to realize his plans. But this nepotism and its attendant enrichment went too far, led to conflicts with other great families, especially the Orsini, and was the motive for reprisals after the Pope's death.

---

[27] Text of the treaty in Valentini, "Lo stato di Braccio," *ASRomana,* 52 (1931), 121–28 (the offprint).

[28] K. A. Fink, *Martin V. und Aragón* (Berlin 1938), 60–112.

Thus far we have spoken only of political enterprises which served for the restoring of the Curia's secular power. What about the spiritual power, the relationship to Church and council? In many respects the Council of Constance had sketched the further development, but the details were not yet visible. Following the achievements thus far it was natural that here too the Pope would take matters into his own hands in the sense of restoration — nothing less could be expected of a Colonna. This was obvious in the prudent but unambiguous efforts at the close of the Council. In the limits drawn by the conciliar decrees he tried to regain as much as possible in rights before the new general council, to be convoked in about five years, could undertake new measures. The customary chancery rules were published at Geneva with the traditional dating from the day of coronation. But a beginning had already been made at Constance with the granting of expectatives. In this context belong also the less well known reform proposals of two commissions of cardinals; for the most part they were rejected by the Pope. They were made before the Councils of Pavia and Basel, probably to anticipate the tumultuous reform desires that were to be expected.[30] If Martin V was not a friend of conciliar reform which might lay a hand on the organization that he was defending, he did everything to guide the implementation of the rights pertaining to him in orderly paths; hence a reform of administration. He honestly exerted himself to see to it that the cardinal legate in Germany observed the principles communicated to him in regard to the filling of benefices.[31] This is apparent in several reform decrees for the curialists and the curial offices and can be demonstrated from the numerous volumes of registers of his pontificate. On the expiration of the concordats after five years he reverted without more ado to the old system of reservations and provisions in so far as no general decrees of the Council stood in the way and the countries concerned were agreeable. Thus the revenues of the *Camera Apostolica* from *servitia* and annates were not inconsiderable.

---

[29] *Idem,* "Martin V. und Bologna," *QfdAB,* 23 (1931 f.), 182–217; also B. Partner, *The Papal State under Martin V* (London 1958), 92.

[30] J. Haller, *Concilium Basiliense,* I (1896), 107–10, 163–83.

With regard to the Council he observed the decree "Frequens," even though he was reluctant and was forced by public opinion. Accordingly, the Council that was due to take place in five years was summoned to Pavia but it was soon transferred to Siena. The attendance was quite small and the political situation was extremely dangerous. It cannot now be determined whether the Pope seriously intended to go to the Council. The fear that, in the midst of the Neapolitan conflict, it would be used by the King of Aragón as a means of pressure was certainly not unfounded. Determined not to tolerate any revival of the Council at the height of the crisis with Braccio, he proceeded to dissolve it before it could show its possibilities. Decrees on lessening the Curia's income were at this point unacceptable to him. Hence all conciliar discussions were deferred for seven more years, since the letter of "Frequens" had been sufficiently respected.[32] Shortly before his death Martin summoned, but not voluntarily, the Council of Basel and appointed Cardinal Julian Cesarini as president with authority to dissolve it. Hence it came about that a continuous curial administration was and is more than a match for a council meeting only at infrequent intervals. The Pope greatly exploited this advantage. It makes little sense to deduce from this procedure a theological concept, just as it would seem hopeless to include Martin in one of many tendencies and to label him, for example, a moderate conciliarist. He was only a politician, though a great politician with a bent for power, and such was what the Church and the Curia needed in order to be able to exist again, in the old style, after the confusion of the Western Schism and the Council of Constance. A man of very simple life, he used all the means which his state and the government of the Universal Church offered him for reestablishing the Papal State, whose third founder he is rightly called.[33] If his sepulchral inscription in the Lateran extols him as *temporum suorum felicitas,* this may be correct for Rome and the Papal State. When he died on 20 February 1431 he left to his successor, despite all the tensions, a state in relatively good order and hence a basis on which the Roman Curia could look forward to further political and conciliar developments more calmly than had been possible hitherto. But it is not permissible to conclude, as has often been done, that this was right and divinely willed.

---

[31] K. A. Fink, "Die politische Korrespondenz Martins V. nach den Brevenregistern," *QFIAB*, 25 (1933 f.), 184, no. 33: "[circumspectio tua] que animum et propositum nostrum novit et quanto studio laboremus Romanam curiam a priorum temporum immoderata licentia et consuetudine revocare; quod enim de firmitate nostra loquuntur dicant ut velint; nos vero non intelligimus, ubi possint ostendere aliquid nostra scientia atque consensu iniuste aut turpiter factum esse"; 185, no. 37: "quia intentio nostra est, ut omnia cum equitate et iustitia disponantur, ut nemo iuste querele causam habere possit."

[32] W. J. Koudelka, "Eine neue Quelle zur Generalsynode von Siena 1423–1424," *ZKG*, 74 (1963), 244–64.

Chapter 50

Eugene IV and The Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence

While Martin V at his death on 20 February 1431 had left a Papal State that was in a peaceful condition, still the conclave that met to choose his successor heralded new difficulties. The cardinals gathered in Santa Maria *sopra Minerva,* but not all of them were present. Despite the binding instructions of the Colonna Pope, the majority prevented Dominic Capranica, who had not yet been proclaimed, from taking part in the election, which on 3 March fell on Gabriel Condulmer, a Venetian and nephew of Gregory XII. He called himself Eugene IV (1431–47); his pontificate was not one of the happiest. Since the cardinals had been dissatisfied with Martin V's authoritarian administration, an election capitulation had been decided upon and signed by all the cardinals. It demanded not so much a change in the constitution of the Church, as has often been said, as it did an implementation of the Council of Constance. In it were unequivocally expressed the aspirations of the College of Cardinals for a share in the government of the Church. But current demands were just as clearly registered: reform of the Curia in head and members; general reform at a general council; consent of the College for a transfer of the Curia; observance of the rules issued at Constance in regard to the nomination of cardinals; a sharing by the College in the income, in accord with the arrangements of Nicholas IV, and in the government of the Papal State; no proceeding against the person and property of a cardinal without the consent of the majority; and, whenever the formula "de fratrum nostrorum consilio" was in a decree, the listing by name of the consenting cardinals. This election capitulation was again sworn to by Eugene IV after his election and confirmed by apostolic constitutions after his coronation.[1]

---

[33] H. Zimmermann, "Thomas Ebendorfers Schismentraktat," *AÖG,* 120. Band, 2. Heft (1954). Here, pages 71–74, the Pope is represented as primitively greedy and in general is badly treated, but the matters are reported only from hearsay and do not stand firm against examination.

Martin V had been skillful as a politician and as ruler of the Papal State. His successor, Eugene IV, a former canon regular, was to an equal degree incompetent. His rash proceedings against the Colonna produced long lasting troubles in all parts of the Papal State. Risings in individual provinces and in Rome itself could be put down only by great exertions. In 1434 the Pope had to flee from the Eternal City; he found refuge at Florence and then at Bologna. He was not able to return to Rome until 1443.

The pontificate of Eugene IV was entirely overshadowed by the Council of Basel. The date of its opening had been determined by Martin V, and the new Pope at once confirmed the appointment of the Cardinal Legate in Germany, Julian Cesarini, as legate and president of the Council. Since Cesarini was still involved in the anti-Hussite campaign, he had the Council opened at Basel on 23 July 1431 by his vicars, John of Ragusa and John of Palomar. The number of those present was still quite meagre when Cesarini reached Basel in September. Contrary to the election capitulation that he had sworn to observe, Eugene IV opposed the Council from the start. Following the example of Martin V, who had managed to dissolve the previous Council of Siena, Eugene, through his unsure, vacillating, and even dishonest conduct, led himself, the Curia, and all of Christendom into the worst difficulties.

In the bull "Quoniam alto" of 12 November 1431, which only ten cardinals signed, he dissolved the Council and summoned a new synod, which was supposed to meet in Bologna eighteen months later. The legate was ordered to carry out the dissolution and depart. But before anything could be done at Basel, the Pope, at the consistory of 18 December, published the bull of dissolution, even though some of the cardinals were not in agreement with this procedure and challenged the Pope's right to dissolve a legitimately meeting Council. Meanwhile, the first solemn session had taken place at Basel on 14 December, with the reading of the decree "Frequens" and of the bull of convocation. The legate declined the mandate committed to him, and so a member of the household of the Bishop of Parenzo, who had brought the bull, intended to publish it on 13 January. He was prevented by an exodus on the part of the Fathers. The Council organized itself in the second session, held on 15 February 1432, following the pattern of the Council of Constance and the decree "Frequens." The Pope was pressed to withdraw the dissolution and it was demanded that he and the cardinals must appear at Basel.

---

[1] J. Lulvès, "Päpstliche Wahlkapitulationen," *QFIAB*, 12 (1909), 212–35; W. Ullmann, The Legal Validity of the Papal Electoral Pacts," *ECI*, 12 (1956), 246–78; W. Brandmüller, "Der Übergang vom Pontifikat Martins V. zu Eugen IV.," *QFIAB*, 47 (1967), 596–629.

To appreciate the situation it is important to note that the majority of the cardinals adhered to the Council; only six out of twenty-one were on the Pope's side. From then on Pope and Council were hostile to each other, and, as at Constance, the future fate of the Synod depended essentially on the politics of the various states. On the Council's side were at first the King of the Romans, France, England, Scotland, Castile, Burgundy, and Milan. At this time the Pope could count on only Venice and Florence as loyal adherents. But the attitude of the powers to the Council continually changed. During the tedious negotiations with the Pope the Council, now better attended, arranged its own organization and personnel. As at Constance, it was desired also at Basel to organize by nations, but the very uneven participation — the Germans and the French were the strongest in representation – compelled the setting up of permanent committees, the so-called "deputations," with the College of Twelve as the group of presidents. The political situation, above all the unrest in the Papal State, forced the Pope to give in, although King Sigismund of Germany, because of his impending coronation as Emperor, gave him assistance and restrained the Council from precipitate measures. Since a new schism was becoming a distinct possibility, most states advised yielding and compromise. The Council was unmoved, and the Pope had to agree entirely with Cesarini's proposals and, in the withdrawal of the bull of dissolution, required by the Cardinal President, substitute "decernimus et declaramus," in speaking of the legitimate continuance of the synod, for his own formula, "volumus et contentamur." This he did in the bull "Dudum sacrum" of 15 December 1433. The presidents sent by the Pope were admitted only with great restrictions and took the required oath to the decrees of Constance.[2] The long and unpleasant jockeying had led to an armistice rather than to peace; it had also led to a hardening of positions, in particular on the part of the Council Fathers. The Pope was mostly to blame for the situation that had arisen.

The question of union with the Greek Church decided the contest between Council and Pope. Martin V had reached an agreement with the Byzantine court relevant to a council in the West, and in the first year of his pontificate Eugene IV obtained assurances of Greek attendance at a Western council, for example in Bologna. Aware of the political importance for whichever succeeded in restoring union between the separated Churches, both Pope and Council took great pains in regard to the Greeks. From the spring of 1433 embassies of the Council as well as of the Pope went to Constantinople, and

---

[2] J. Haller, *Conc. Basil.*, I, 22 f.

Greek envoys travelled to the West. The means resorted to in order to gain the Byzantine Emperor and to outdo the other side were not exactly edifying. Conflict over the meeting place of the union council went on for years. While the Pope and most Greeks favoured, apart from Constantinople, a city in Italy, the Council for obvious reasons insisted on Basel itself, Avignon, or Savoy. The final voting produced a schism. More than two-thirds of the members held to the proposal of the Council. Despite many efforts for an understanding, a memorable scene took place on 7 May 1437: each group promulgated its decision in the Basel cathedral, but only that of the majority was sealed. Nevertheless, the Pope, in the bull "Salvatoris et Dei nostri" of 30 May 1437, confirmed the minority decision, and, after long debates and recourse to not unobjectionable means, his envoys at Constantinople succeeded in winning the Greeks for the minority and hence for the holding of the council in Italy. On 18 September 1437, in the bull "Doctoris gentium," recognizing the minority as the *pars sanior*, Eugene IV transferred the Council to Ferrara. Thus ended the first phase of the Council of Basel. The question of what it achieved naturally presents itself.

The repeated defeats of the anti-Hussite crusade armies suggested the idea of negotiations. Hence it is not surprising that after the defeat at Domažlice in August 1431 the Cardinal Legate and one so familiar with the Hussite danger as John of Ragusa pressed for an invitation to the leaders of the Hussite factions. As early as 15 November 1431, and hence shortly after the opening of the Council, there was issued a message to appear in Basel. Many discussions relevant to safety and free discussion led to the very accomodating letter of safe-conduct of 20 June 1432, in the fourth session. An imposing embassy of some 300 persons appeared on 4 January 1433 and, after the customary formal greetings, the discussions got under way between Rokycana and Procop for the Hussites and John of Ragusa, Henry Kalteisen, Aegidius Charlier, and John of Palomar. The Bohemians left Basel on 14 April, but the negotiations were continued at Prague and led to agreement on the four articles of Prague, which had in the meantime been frequently modified, concerning the chalice for the laity, free preaching, the punishment of those guilty of serious sins, and a far-reaching renunciation of ecclesiastical property. This agreement, the so-called Prague *Compactata*, was promulgated on 5 July 1436 in the presence of the Emperor at the Diet of Iglau, and was ratified by the Council of Basel on 15 January 1437. The *Compactata* were not ratified by the Curia and were annulled in 1462. But this settlement of the Bohemian affair was a great success for the Council. If there could have been an accommodation at Constance in regard to the chalice, Christendom would probably have been spared much anguish.

Despite some accomplishments, the reform of the Church could not be brought to a conclusion at Constance. A glance at the enormous reform literature makes this clear, and the decree "Frequens" had been issued for the very purpose of assuring the reform. And there have come down proposals which envisaged the thorough study of specific matters, such as union with the Greeks, by commissions of cardinals and university professors in the interval till the next council.[3] Since the Council of Siena, where the reform proposals had hardly been considered, had been dissolved, persons were looking to Basel for decisive progress. As was the case with the Council of Constance, three tasks were assigned to that of Basel in Martin V's bull of convocation of 1 February 1431: concern for the Christian faith, the restoration of peace in Christendom, and the reform of the Church. It is beyond doubt that the last of these was regarded as the most important.[4] If, later, the conflict with Eugene IV dominated any estimation and evaluation of the Council, reform must still be considered the real and most significant achievement of the Synod. But with the treatment of reform there began the breach which lasted throughout the Council and led for some time to schism.

Soon after the opening of the Council a reform commission of twenty-four members was set up. The well known eighteen articles of the Constance reform demand had been discussed and passed only in part. This work was now resumed at Basel, but it required a long time before any order could be discerned in the reform motions, while again and again the effort for reform was interrupted by the conflict with Pope and Curia.

Following the expiration of the concordats and the disappointing outcome of the Council of Siena, the filling of the higher benefices was once more an open question. In addition, a group of proposals and memoranda were soon presented to the Council with the aim of completely eliminating papal reservations. This was a theme that had been for decades at the very centre of *reformatio capitis et curiae Romanae* and was intended to lead back to the ancient law. The French and the Germans were the ones chiefly interested in the total eradication of the papal right of collation, while the English, Italians, and Spaniards were of the contrary opinion, since their governments were able to protect them from the clutches of the Curia. The so-called election decree, published on 13 July 1433, in the twelfth solemn session, is rightly termed moderate. It abolished general and specific reservations of bishoprics and monasteries and prescribed election by the qualified bodies according to earlier usage. The Pope could decide otherwise only in exceptional cases and with a precise listing of his reasons. Upon assuming office each Pope had to bind himself under oath to observe the decree. Since Eugene IV paid no heed, even though his presidents had declared that the Pope was prepared to accept every reform measure of the Council, a more precise version of the decree was substituted in the twenty-third session, in March 1436.

---

[3] H. Finke, *Acta conc. Const.*, IV, IV, 712 f.

[4] *Mon. conc. general.*, II, 700: "... ad reformacionem faciendam principaliter fuerat congregata."

The question of the payments made to the Curia, summarized under the term "annates," had also to begin over again. Here too there was a two-way split: Germans and French opposed annates, while Spaniards and Italians were uninterested, because they were in a position not to be molested, or at least not seriously, by curial demands and in the prospective event of a general taxation of ecclesiastical benefices for the benefit of the Curia they were afraid of being required to pay. The outcome was tedious consultations and many proposals, in which the question of indemnification of the Curia for the loss of annates occupied an important place. In view of the Pope's very difficult, even if not unmerited, situation this was understandable. The discussion was heightened and also prolonged by the preparation of a fundamental decree on simony with the decisive participation of the Cardinal Legate. The decree on annates, of the twenty-first session on 9 June 1435, peremptorily forbade all payments at the filling of benefices by either the Curia or the ordinaries. Thus was the late mediaeval development ended and, above all, a serious blow was given to the Curia. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that Cesarini himself, as the expert on sentiment beyond the Alps, spoke very energetically in favour of the decree.

Long in need of reform was the curial system of procedures, which had assumed a downright colossal magnitude. Since not much had been accomplished in this area at Constance, the old demands for limiting the Roman jurisdiction in favour of the ordinary courts were renewed at Basel. In several decrees of the Council there was enacted a restriction to *causae maiores* as in the old law, appeals were curtailed, and precautions were taken against the harassing of occupants of benefices.

Of special importance in the reform of the Curia were the decrees on the papal election and the College of Cardinals. If one were unable to go back to the reform proposals before, during, and after the Council of Constance, the Basel decrees would have to be regarded as far-reaching. Precisely considered, they were a balanced product of earlier reform literature and searching consultation. Whereas the election of the Pope of unity at Constance took place outside what had hitherto been customary and the prescriptions laid down by conciliar decrees and papal directives for their implementation, the Council of Basel reverted to the old practice, allotting the election once again to the cardinals alone, despite many contrary voices. New, however, was the rule in regard to voting: that at most three candidates might be named; if more than one candidate was written on the ballot, one of those named had to be a non-cardinal. In this way the much complained of inbreeding in the College would be at least theoretically limited.

To what extent Basel was strictly a continuation of Constance appears above all in the oath to be taken by the newly elected Pope. The proposals at Constance required, besides the making of the so-called profession of faith of Boniface VIII, a whole series of promises relating to the government of the Church and of the Papal State. There is no question that here the College of Cardinals was keenly interested in the formulating of the oath, and the election capitulation of 1431 points in the same direction. The Pope's oath as prescribed by the Council of Basel retained completely the brief version used at Constance except that, understandably, it included also the General Councils of Constance and Basel and their decrees, especially in regard to the observance of the decree "Frequens." From the experiences of the fourteenth century and of the most recent decades there proceeded the listing of guidelines for the carrying out of their functions by the Popes.

The decrees of the twenty-third session *de numero et qualitate cardinalium* likewise adhered closely to the Constance proposals, reform acts, and concordats. The number of cardinals was to be at most twenty-four and they were to be doctors of theology or of canon or civil law. The Constance prescriptions that cardinals must no longer be elevated merely by oral expression of opinion were extended at Basel to include the requirement of a written consent of a majority of the College. The so difficult and much discussed problem of the representation of all countries in the Senate of the Church was prudently decided in the sense that no nation might have more than one-third of the cardinals at any one time.

Ferrara and Florence

The Council that Eugene IV had summoned to Ferrara was opened in January 1438, though without the Greeks. They only arrived at Ferrara at the beginning of March. Having reached Venice at the beginning of February, they had finally decided, on the advice of the Doge, to attend the Pope's Council. While the Curia pressed for quick action, the Greeks worked for delay in order to await the Western princes or their envoys. And so an interval of four months was first agreed upon. The hopes of the Pope and of the Byzantine Emperor John VIII for representatives of the Western states were not realized; only the Angevins and the Duke of Burgundy sent official envoys. In June began the theological discussions. The forms of the discussions were quite varied. There were few general sessions; for the most part the work was done in committee discussions, in which prepared *cedulae* were debated by experts of both groups, often in a very sharp fashion. Joseph II, Patriarch of Constantinople, was favourable to union but he died before the publication of the union decree at Florence.

Because of an alleged danger of pestilence, but really for financial reasons, the Synod was transferred to Florence in January 1439. The expenses of the conciliar meetings were a burden on the Curia. After long and fruitful discussions, conversations between Emperor and Pope, and repeated threats of departure by the Greeks, there finally took place on 6 July 1439 the promulgation in both languages and signing of the union decree "Laetentur coeli."[5] Soon after the Greeks left, and on the very return voyage many of those among them who had taken part in the Council withdrew their consent. The union was scarcely acknowledged in the East, even though other smaller groups of Oriental Christians — Armenians, Copts, Syrians, Chaldees, and Maronites — reached an understanding with the Curia.[6] On the Pope's return to Rome in 1443 the Council was transferred to the Lateran; it quickly declined in importance and was never officially concluded.

The points of theological controversy were the *Filioque*, purgatory, the matter and form of the Eucharist, and the interpretation of the papal primacy. For the Greeks the *Filioque* was the most important and really decisive point. Nevertheless, the theological conversations first took up the doctrine of purgatory; there were long discussions on it at Ferrara and Florence. The Greeks especially took issue with the Latin notion of a purifying fire, since Scripture and the Fathers had nothing to say about it. The union decree evaded an exact definition and confined itself to the statement that the souls in question had to undergo a cleansing penalty after death: "penis purgatoriis post mortem purgari."

The question longest discussed was the *Filioque*, which had been inserted into the Nicene Creed in the early Middle Ages. The debates began at Ferrara in September and were prolonged until December without success; then they were resumed in Florence at the beginning of March 1439 and were concluded in June. The Greeks took as their point of departure the decree of the Third Ecumenical Council at Ephesus, according to which the creed was not to be altered by additions; in the *Filioque* they saw a modification in content. In the long and bitter discussions, which included frequent interventions by the Emperor, the difference in the development of the two halves of the Church was clearly exposed. The Greeks especially rejected the scholastic deductions of the Western theologians. It was easier to convince them on the basis of patristic theology that the addition they so disliked had a certain basis in the Eastern and Western Fathers. But since they regarded the *Filioque* as the cause of the Schism, their resistance was stubborn. Again and again they said they would sooner depart than yield. The axiom, theologically doubtful but enthusiastically hailed as a way out, that "between the Western and Eastern Fathers there can be no contradiction, since they are all illuminated by the Holy Spirit," quickly produced agreement but no solution of the theological question. In the decree of union the accord and the permissibility of the accepting of the *Filioque* into the creed were defined with many words but it was not said who could lawfully make such an addition, and the Greeks were not obliged to insert the Western addition.

---

[5] Text of the decrees of union in *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta* (Freiburg 1962), 499–567.

[6] For the fate of the union, see Chapter 51.

There were likewise grave difficulties in the discussions on the Eucharist, although there seemed to be reasonably close agreement as to essentials. A compromise got around the difficulties by recognizing unleavened and leavened bread as the matter but there was no decision relevant to the form, that is, to the words of consecration and the *epiclesis.*

The papal primacy came up as the final topic of discussion at the demand of the Latins and especially of Eugene IV, but too hastily. The Emperor opposed the discussion but in the interests of union he had to exert considerable pressure on the Greek participants. The Greeks regarded as the highest tribunal in the constitution of the Church the pentarchy, the traditional Five Patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. They were fully prepared to concede to the Patriarch of Old Rome the privileges he had enjoyed before the outbreak of the Schism. There could be no question of a primacy of jurisdiction. But in barely three weeks the Greeks were compelled to yield on a broad front. However, this was not a genuine solution, as the various possibilities of interpretation showed and still show.

Even if the importance of the dogmatic discussions and decisions must not be detracted from, still it must be noted that they took place in a politically conditioned climate and that the participants kept fully concrete political goals before their eyes. Pope and Emperor needed the union. The Emperor wanted the military assistance of the West in exchange for the slightest possible dogmatic concessions; the Pope wanted aid against Basel and hence demanded recognition of the primacy. The confrontation between the Curia and the Council of Basel was also of great influence on Ferrara-Florence. It seems as though the Council of Basel was expecting from the Greeks' concept of the ancient councils a support for its own conciliar theory. Both at Basel and in the papal camp persons entertained ideas in regard to the Byzantine Church that were erroneous because they were preponderantly idealistic. But the Pope and Curia displayed greater skill, made many otherwise unusual concessions, and played off union against Basel. The title of the tendentious work by Syropoulus, *Vera historia unionis non verae,* in many respects hit the nail on the head. More important than the subsequent "union" was the exposition of standpoints and the constant referring by the Greeks to Scripture and the Fathers as the unique source *vis-à-vis* the Latins' deductive theology. Although Greeks and Westerners regarded one another as schismatics, if not as heretics also, there were no abjurations at the end.

It goes without saying that the ecumenical character of the Council of Ferrara-Florence was accepted on account of the personal attendance of

Pope and Emperor. But it must be noted that relatively few bishops, and those almost entirely Italians, represented the Latin Church. The few bishops from France were also partly Italians or not in possession of their dioceses. In addition there were three Spaniards, two Irish, and one bishop each from Portugal and Poland, but none from the Empire and from England. Furthermore, several bishops were at the Curia as *electi.*[7] Of the states only Burgundy and the Angevins had sent an official embassy to the Council. And so there could be no question of a representation of the Universal Church or of the European states, and that at a time when Basel again obtained recognition from numerous quarters.

The position of France in regard to Basel was important for the reason that most of the participants and the most influential personalities came from France, and from them came, to a great extent, the proposals for the reform discussions. Even if one admits annoyance over the loss of the papacy after the Council of Constance as a powerful stimulus to the anti-curial policy, without the Neapolitan question the changing attitude of the French King would be inexplicable. If France had favoured a transfer to a French city, the *rapprochement* with the Curia began in 1435 when Eugene IV made the enfeoffment of René of Anjou as King of Naples dependent on his abandoning the Council of Basel. But the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1438 was the reply to the miscarriage of this plan. In this the French Church in twenty-three articles adopted, with some modifications, the reform decrees of Basel, in particular "Frequens" and the decrees on the authority of the Council: the election decree, that on the abolition of annates, and a group of prescriptions on reform of the liturgy and of the clergy. But the suspension of the Pope was not recognized and relations with the Curia were not broken off; in fact, a few years later they were again rather lively. But attendance at the Council of Ferrara was not permitted; on the other hand, while France had no share in the deposition of Eugene IV, any molestation of the Council at Basel was forbidden.

At first Aragón was represented at Basel only by one envoy as an observer. It was not until the death of Joanna II of Naples in 1435 had opened the question of the succession and Alfonso V of Aragón, after the battle of the Pontiae Islands, had become first the prisoner and then the ally of Milan that a rather large embassy arrived at the Council. Since the Pope apparently wanted to confiscate the escheated fief and incorporate it into the Papal State, the task of the Aragonese embassy consisted chiefly in inciting the Council to sharp measures against the Curia. When the effort, sanctioned by the Council, to deprive the Pope of the Papal State misfired, the Aragonese at Basel at least worked eagerly for the trial, suspension, and deposition of Eugene. Only thus can one understand the frequently changed roles of the French and Aragonese embassies, both of which sought to achieve a decision for their respective sides by supporting the Council against the Pope.[8]

---

[7] Signatures of the union decree in *Conc. Flor. Documenta et scriptores,* series A, *Epistolae,* II (1944), 68–79, and series B, II, 1 (1942), 115–20. See also A. Mercati, "Il decreto d'unione del 6 luglio 1439 nell'Archivio segreto Vaticano," *OrChrP,* 11 (1945), 5–44.

The policy of Castile was strictly dependent on France. John II inclined to the Council but no embassy went to Basel until 1434. In the struggle with England for the place after the French in June 1434 Castile was victorious. From 1437 Castile's attitude was one of reserve, although the Fathers at Basel went to great pains to be accommodating. The envoys left the city in 1438 and, after visiting the new German King Albert II at Breslau and attending the Diet of Princes at Mainz in 1439, returned home. Thereafter Castile was on the side of Eugene IV.[9]

Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, was for a long time neutral. He made promises to both sides and obtained the approval of the Treaty of Arras from both Eugene and the Council of Basel. From 1435 he inclined to the Curia, recalled his embassy from Basel, and was represented at the Council of Ferrara. But his policy was always very cautious.

England did not play a decisive role in the history of the Council of Basel. Its championing of the Curia was to a great extent determined by opposition to France, even though the Fathers at Basel tried again and again to draw the English King to their side. Yielding to the insistence of the Council, a small but highly qualified embassy appeared at Basel in 1433, probably chiefly motivated by the hope of bringing back the Hussites to the Church. However, the envoys did not permit themselves to be incorporated and demanded an organization by nations, as at Constance. A second embassy came in 1434 to discuss peace with France. English prestige suffered a severe blow at Basel in the strife with Castile over precedence. The deposition of Eugene IV and the election of Felix V were not recognized in England. What France and Germany adopted of the reform decrees the English King had long ago attended to on his own.[10]

And so from 1438 there faced each other two mutually hostile general councils, and each was exerting itself to obtain recognition by the states. If the Western Schism had to do with the *papa indubitatus*, so now the problem was the *concilium indubitatum*. Since the Council of Basel was meeting in Germany, the attitude of the German King and of the German Church was not unimportant. Until his death in 1437 the Emperor Sigismund worked constantly for an adjustment between Pope and Council, though his sympathies lay rather with the Council.

---

[8] E. Dupré-Theseider, *La politica italiana di Alfonso d'Aragona* (Bologna 1956); G. F. Ryder, "La politica italiana di Alfonso d'Aragona 1442–58," *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane,* N. S., 38 (1959), 45–106; A. Javierre Mur, "Aportación documental a las relaciones entre Alfonso V de Aragón y el ducado de Milán," *IV congreso de historia de la corona de Aragón. Actas y comunicaciones,* I (Palma de Mallorca 1959); *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani,* II (1960), 323–31 (with the literature); W. Küchler, "Alfons V. von Aragón und das Basler Konzil," *Ges. Aufsätze zur Kulturgesch. Spaniens,* 23 (1967), 131–46.

[9] L. Suárez Fernández, *Castilla, el cisma y la crisis conciliar 1378–1440* (Madrid 1960), 112, documents, 347–438; V. Laurent, "Les ambassadeurs du roi de Castille au concile de Bâle et le patriarche Joseph II février 1438," *RÉB,* 18 (1960), 136–44.

[10] J. Haller, *Piero da Monte* (Rome 1941), 43 ff.; A. N. E. D. Schofield, "The First English Delegation to the Council of Basel," *JEH,* 12 (1961), 167–96.

After his disappearance the ecclesiastical question was treated at numberless diets, but, despite detailed discussion by representatives of both sides, it remained undecided. The indecision found expression in what was called neutrality, which was extended from meeting to meeting. The proclamation of neutrality was intended especially as a protection against the censures of both Pope and Council and a means of preventing unrest among the faithful and of assuring the possession of benefices. The Mainz *instrumentum acceptationis* of 1439, in which, following the French model, the Council's reform decrees were declared valid with certain modifications, was a taking of a stand for the Council and its teaching but without an adopting of the Council's policy. Since, as earlier, both the Curia and the Council were applied to by the higher and the lower clergy, there could be no question of strict neutrality. Thus the representation of German sees at Basel reached its high point around 1440, while suits at the Curia strongly declined. The ecclesiastical Electors of Mainz and Cologne supported Basel and were unsuccessfully deposed by the Curia in 1446. An escape from the complicated situation seemed to be offered by the plan for a new, third council, which was eagerly defended in Germany; but, despite a seeming willingness, it was rejected by the Curia. Since the Council, in contrast to the Pope, possessed no real power, its importance steadily declined. No change was made by the promulgation on 16 May 1439, in the thirty-third session, of earlier formulated propositions as *veritates catholicae:* The proposition concerning the power of the Council over the Pope and every other person among the faithful is a truth of the Catholic faith; the proposition that the Pope cannot dissolve a general council without its consent is a truth of the Catholic faith; whoever obstinately opposes these truths in word, deed, and writing is to be regarded as a heretic.

The Council of Basel deposed Eugene IV in June 1439. In November it elected as Pope Duke Amadeus VIII of Savoy, who styled himself Felix V (1439–49). He was able to obtain recognition only in a very restricted area.[11] The Council continued at Basel until 1447, when it was transferred to Lausanne.[12] The greatest danger for the Curia was over when King

---

[11] On Felix V, see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, II (1960), 749–53 (with the literature).

[12] *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, 17 (1963), 624 f.

Alfonso V of Aragón, after conquering Naples, went over to the Pope in 1443 in exchange for far-reaching concessions and recalled his bishops from Basel. And the new German King, Frederick III, let himself be won over by the promise of the imperial crown and much ecclesiastical patronage. It was more difficult to reach an agreement with the Electors, the real imperial government. Their demand for the reinstatement of the Archbishops of Mainz and Cologne, recognition of the Basel reforms and of the decrees of Constance and Basel, and the convocation of a third council was accepted in the Concordat of the Princes in 1447 in a veiled form that still remains obscure. To the same twilight belongs the secret document signed by Eugene IV three weeks before his death, according to which he did not intend to approve anything that was contrary to the faith of the Fathers or was to the detriment of the Holy See.

Eugene died on 23 February 1447, just after envoys of the German King and of some German princes had taken the oath of obedience to him. His successor, Nicholas V (1447–55), at once ratified the settlement with the German Church. More adroit than his predecessor, he reached an agreement with Frederick III in the so-called Concordat of Vienna and was able to effect considerable modifications in the Basel reforms. Negotiations for the ending of the schism were conducted by France as early as 1447, first at Bourges, then at Lyons and at the Curia. But it was only in 1449 that it was possible to induce Felix V to retire and the Council of Basel to decree its own dissolution after it had been allowed to elect Nicholas V. Without any condemnation of the theological views, the mutual censures and processes were annulled, the possession of benefices was confirmed, some of the cardinals of the Basel obedience were admitted into the Roman College of Cardinals, and Felix V was allowed to exercise papal rights in his former obedience.

The great quarrel was thereby ended for the moment, not by a theological solution of the vexing questions but under political auspices. The difficulty and also the political importance of the long struggle clearly revealed themselves in a group of personalities. If on the side of the Council of Basel there unflinchingly stood men such as Cardinal Louis d'Aleman, John of Segovia, Nicholas of Tudeschi, Archbishop of Palermo, John Schele, Bishop of Lübeck and royal envoy, Henry Toke, Thomas Ebendorfer, John of Ragusa, and Peter of Rosenheim, just as firm on the other side were John of Torquemada, John of Palomar, and Ambrose Traversari.[13] The often recurring switching of loyalty and of faction, the fear of being caught, despite precautions, between the two millstones, depended on so many factors that one should not, without more ado, speak of opportunism. As clearly classical examples could be mentioned Julian Cesarini, Nicholas of Cusa, and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini.[14]

---

[13] G. Pérouse, *Le cardinal Louis d'Aleman, président du concile de Bâle, et la fin du grand schisme* (Paris 1904); *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, II (1960), 145–47 (with the literature); H. Ammon, *Johannes Schele, Bischof von Lübeck, auf dem Basler Konzil* (Diss. phil., Erlangen 1931); A. Lhotsky, *Thomas Ebendorfer, ein österreichischer Geschichtsschreiber, Theologe und Diplomat des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart 1957); W. Jaroschka, "Thomas Ebendorfer als Theoretiker des Konziliarismus," *MIÖG*, 71 (1963), 87–98; H. Schmidinger,

From the political viewpoint the Council of Basel, a gathering of solely intellectual power, was more dependent than the Roman Pontiff on the princes, who sought to extract as much as possible from both sides. Not only were political disputes brought before the Council, but in its competition with the Pope the Council sought political successes by mediating peace or, especially clearly, by arranging union with the Greeks. Always dependent on the good will of the secular lords, great and small, the Council had to move very circumspectly in its administration. A good example is the wearisome struggle over the see of Trier.[15] Reform questions were important at Basel because of the time limit in the Constance concordats. The real difficulties appeared much more clearly than at Constance in the long drawn out discussions: the very different situation in individual states and territories, which called for a practical solution. The discussions and treatises, though theologically and philosophically sound, could change nothing there, since the envoys and proxies had to uphold the changing policies of their lords and did so with great skill. It is to be regretted that the carefully considered and moderately formulated reform became an object of political transaction. In this controversy, conducted by both sides with distasteful means, the Curia managed to a very great extent to rescue its situation. This was a considerable political achievement, but far removed from a genuine reform will. It purchased its own recognition by means of great compromises and withdrew into the Papal State as one of the *cinque principati* of Italy. In this way its world-wide impact was powerfully obstructed and reform was frustrated. It is a failure to grasp the spirit of the age when the conciliar idea is regarded as something false and there is talk of Basel's radicalism. But one must distinguish between adhering to the Council of Basel and defending the conciliar idea. The Council of Constance presented so many complications to the Roman *Congregatio super editione conciliorum generalium*

"Begegnungen Thomas Ebendorfers auf dem Konzil von Basel," *Festschrift O. Vasella* (Fribourg 1964), 171–97; A. Krchnák, *De vita et operibus Joannis de Ragusio, Lateranum,* N. S., 26 (Rome 1961); F. Thoma, "Petrus von Rosenheim," *Das bayerische Inn-Oberland,* 32 (1962), 97–164; C. Somigli, *Un amico dei Greci: Ambrogio Traversari* (Arezzo 1964).

[14] P. Becker, *Giuliano Cesarini* (diss. phil., Münster 1935); J. Gill, *Personalities of the Council of Florence,* 95–104 (Cesarini). For Nicholas of Cusa, see *infra,* Chapter 59. B. Widmer, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini in der sittlichen und politischen Entscheidung* (Basel 1963); L. M. Veit, "Pensiero e vita religiosa di Enea Silvio Piccolomini prima della sua consecrazione episcopale," *Analecta Gregoriana,* 139 (Rome 1964). For other literature, see *infra,* Chapter 56.

[15] E. Meuthen, *Das Trierer Schisma von 1430 auf dem Basler Konzil* (Münster 1964).

that the congregation decided to remove the Council of Basel from the list of general councils. Such a procedure attests, not a scholarly outlook, but bias.[16]

The person of Eugene IV must be evaluated in the same manner. Judgments by contemporaries were in general quite reserved. He was blamed for the harshness of his procedures, his quick recourse to force, and the incessant stressing of his position as ruler of the Church. If, as J. Haller says, we do not encounter "in the annals of this Venetian Pope anything out of the Piombi of his native city," there was still enough of what was unseemly for the Pope and Curia. De Vooght has rightly pointed to his insecurity, the vacillation of his teaching and policies.[17] While, with Pastor and Gill, one may be happy to regard him as the papacy's saviour from the danger of "conciliarism," the failure of reform is also his responsibility, for it had become all too clear that without a council there could be no reform. From the viewpoint of Church history the decisive turning from the Middle Ages to modern times occurs around the middle of the fifteenth century. Rome had prevented reform and in return soon received the Reformation.

---

[16] V. Peri, "Il numero dei concili ecumenici nella tradizione cattolica moderna," *Aevum*, 37 (1963), 430–501; C. Leonardi, "Per la storia dell'edizione Romana dei concili ecumenici 1608–12," *SteT*, 236 (1964), 595; K. A. Fink, "Konziliengeschichtsschreibung im Wandel?" *Theologie im Wandel. Festschrift zum 150jährigen Jubiläum der kath.-theol. Fakultät der Universität Tübingen* (Munich 1967), 179–89.

[17] D. Caccamo, "Eugenio IV e la crociata di Varna," *ADRomana*, 79 (1956), 54 ff.; P. De Vooght, *Les pouvoirs du concile et l'autorité du pape* (Paris 1965), 81–103. In the funeral oration Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini stated: "Alti cordis fuit. Sed nullum in eo magis vitium fuit, nisi quia sine mensura erat, et non quod potuit, sed quod voluit aggressus est" *(Muratori*, III, 2, 861).

SECTION THREE

The Byzantine Church: The Age of Palamism

CHAPTER 51

From the Second Council of Lyons to the Council of Ferrara-Florence

Probably at no other period were relations between the Orthodox Church of the Byzantine Empire and the papacy in so deplorable a state as during the long reign of the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II (1282–1328). The great gamble of his father, Michael VIII, to assert power *vis-à-vis* Charles of Anjou depended on his playing with high stakes — the policy of reunion, — even if one is not justified in denying an inner sympathy on the part of the Emperor, who had grown up in an atmosphere favourable to union. With Michael's death in 1282 the game ended for a long time, for his successor did not have to play.[1] The Sicilian Vespers[2] had relieved the Empire for years to come from a severe direct pressure. And so Andronicus annulled the union, even though he had subscribed to it under oath as recently as 1279. His decision was, to be sure, no mere caprice. Michael VIII, who had concluded the Union of Lyons on his own, had never contrived to break popular resistance. Part of the higher clergy had adopted a passive attitude, and the Patriarch John XI Beccus, favourable to the union and a theologian of importance, had known how to remove many obstacles. But all the more obstinate was the opposition from monastic circles, whose influence prevailed not only with the people in the streets but to a degree even with members of the imperial family. Furthermore, the Popes plainly cherished false views of the Emperor's real power and in their demands actually recognized and furthered that very Caesaropapism which the union was supposed to eliminate. They showed little understanding of the Emperor's difficult position, often perceived bad will in circumstances in which Michael was compelled to hesitate and to resort to tactics, and failed to make themselves clear in their ritual demands on the Greeks, until finally Pope Martin IV, completely under the influence of the House of Anjou, excommunicated Michael and his associates for schism and heresy.

For the Emperor the situation was all the more dangerous in that the opposition to the union was secretly associated with repudiation of the legitimacy of the imperial house. When he seized the throne, Michael VIII had first reduced the lawful heir, John IV Lascaris, to second place and then, by blinding him, had disqualified him for the imperial office. Arsenius, then Patriarch (1255–60 and 1261–63), at first assumed a vacillating attitude to the situation. But under pressure from a strong opposition in Asia Minor to the Palaeologi and in favour of the Lascarid, he finally became the leader, at least passively, of this very group. There was formed the Arsenite faction[3] with no real program except to keep faith with Arsenius and to reject all new patriarchs. But it replenished its members with dangerous and nameless forces — the higher clergy were almost totally absent from the ranks of the Arsenites — whose hunger for position was insatiable and who knew no scruples in the choice of means. This was a symptom of the restratification of Byzantine society which came to light as a consequence of the impoverishment of the Empire on the one hand and of the related disintegration of the central imperial power on the other. The theory of the Emperor as master of the Church remained unquestioned in official circles, the practice of communication between palace and *patriarchium* was unchanged, but both Emperor and bishops had to admit in the end their powerlessness against pressure from the masses led by the monks. It is a characteristic of the new Emperor's insight that he gave the Arsenite problem his full attention. He made several attempts to induce the faction to a more reasonable attitude but they always collapsed on the fundamental point that the demands of the Arsenites would have thrown the entire hierarchy into chaos. Not for some decades were they inclined to make peace. In 1310 the schism was ended by a detailed pact, sealed by a macabre scene in Hagia Sophia, in which the corpse of the Patriarch Arsenius, a bull of absolution in his hand, freed his opponents from anathema.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches,* IV (Munich 1960); hereafter, Dölger, *Reg.*

[2] Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge 1958).

Meanwhile, affairs in the West had worked to the benefit of the Byzantines. The Popes were still trying to keep alive the crusading idea, and again and again the planning of the crusade advocated by them was directed against Constantinople for the restoration of the destroyed Latin Empire. And there was no dearth of French princes, who, as heirs of the dethroned Emperors of Constantinople, placed themselves at the service of such ideas with purposeful interest. But the preaching of the crusade evoked no response. Acre, the last foothold of productive activity in Syria, fell in 1291. The commercial interests of the Italian cities were more concerned with the *status quo* than with the risks of a campaign. The indulgence found hardly any response, and the Western kings were too much engrossed in the consolidation of their national states to listen with both ears to the preaching of the Pope and his legates. Theorists, it is true, were not satisfied. Men like Raymond Lull, William d'Adam, and Peter Dubois squarely faced the possibilities of a crusade in very well informed tracts, but the meagre success they achieved belied even this recital of the situation.[5] If the expedition planned by Charles of Valois, who through his marriage to Catherine of Courtenay had become pretender to the throne of the Latin Empire, had already come to a standstill in Tuscany (1302) and the greatest part of the crusade obol had made its way into the pockets of Frederick the Handsome, the first Avignon Pope, Clement V (1305–14), had no greater success to record. He did indeed renew the excommunication of Andronicus and grant the Holy Land indulgences to armies, that would proceed against Constantinople, but the "prince without a principality," Charles of Valois, did not get out of Italy despite an alliance with the Kral of Serbia, Stephen Urosh II, and the latter's offer of union with Rome and even though the Catalan Company had sworn loyalty to him. His captain general, Theobald of Cépoy, took the island of Euboea but before long the Catalans made themselves independent. They contributed at least as much to the weakening of Frankish might in Greece as to the weakening of Byzantine power, and Theobald had to return to the West empty-handed in 1309–10.[6] Charles had overplayed his hand. Other undertakings, led by Philip of Taranto, one of Charles the Lame's sons, who maintained hereditary claims in Epirus, had been started as early as 1306, but it was not until 1323, after numerous failures, that he contrived a real expedition. But it was never to reach Constantinople. In these and similar undertakings, which served, not the crusading idea, but the dynastic policies of *la France outremer*, Andronicus could wait calmly for the opposing forces in Achaia to dissipate themselves. The danger again assumed a serious nature with the more extensive plans of Charles IV of France (1322–28) in favour of the Kingdom of Armenia. That this expedition could have been diverted to Constantinople was not to be denied. And so Andronicus reverted to his father's policy, proposing negotiations for union. But with the fading of the danger and because of the civil war between Andronicus and his grandson they were soon shelved.[7]

---

[3] On the Arsenite schism see I. Sykutres, in Ἑλληνικά, 2 (1929), 267–332, 3 (1930), 15–44, 5 (1932), 107–26 (Greek); summarized in V. Laurent, "Les grandes crises religieuses à Byzance. La fin du schisme arsénite," *Bulletin Sect. Hist. Académie Roumaine,* 26/2 (Bucharest 1945), 225–313.

[4] Dölger, *Reg,* 2321 and 2323.

Meanwhile, circumstances occurred which forced upon the Curia a reorientation of its reunion policy and, in fact, caused all interested Western powers to look for an entirely new approach in the Eastern policy. It suffices to mention the key phrase, "the Turkish danger," to indicate a factor which remained in the foreground of Church History for the next four centuries.[8]

---

[5] Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, III, 432 f.

[6] H. Moranville, "Les projets de Charles de Valois sur l'empire de Constantinople," *BÉCh*, 51 (1890), 63 ff.; J. Petit, *Charles de Valois* (Paris 1900).

[7] Dölger, *Reg*, 2492, 2556, 2557; H. Omont, "Projet de réunion des églises grecque et latine sous Charles le Bel en 1327," *BÉCh*, 53 (1892), 254–57; G. Dürrholder, *Die Kreuzzugspolitik unter Papst Johannes XXII.* (Freiburg 1913).

The capture of Constantinople by the Byzantines in 1261 and the return of the imperial court had again necessarily shifted the emphasis in Byzantine policy much more sharply toward the West. After the reconquest there were not sufficient forces to keep a determined and watchful eye on the East at the same time. Asia Minor was neglected, the frontiers were left exposed. The welfare of the eastern provinces, energetically promoted by the Emperor John III Vatatzes (1222–54) especially, yielded to general decline, and the Lascarid legitimists reduced the provinces to disorder. Danger from the Seljuks was no longer serious, since their power had been broken by the Mongols in 1243. But a result of this event was the rise on the edges of the Seljuk empire of Turkish tribes which made themselves independent and on their own not only threatened the dominions of the Sultan but also pressed against the inadequately tended frontiers of the Byzantine Empire. One of the leaders of these various tribes was Osman, son of Ertogrul, founder of the Ottoman State. Like an avalanche, Ottomans and Seljuks fell upon the Byzantine provinces in Asia Minor. Around 1300 virtually all of the countryside had become Turkish and it was not long before the famous old metropolises of Asia Minor fell to them: Prusa in 1326, Nicaea in 1331, Nicomedia in 1337. Meanwhile there occurred the first offensives against the Aegean islands, Thrace, and the environs of Constantinople. At first only desultory raids, these expeditions were soon systematically managed, and in 1354 Kallipolis (Gallipoli), the key to the Dardanelles, became a firm Turkish foothold in Europe. Adrianople (Edirne) became Turkish in 1362, and there, around 1365, the Ottoman Sultan established his capital, about 100 kilometres to the rear of Constantinople.

Since the Arab attack in the seventh century no invasion had brought greater losses to the Church than that of the Ottomans. In the earlier onset Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Africa had been lost and the Christian communities in those lands could maintain themselves only in precarious circumstances. But now the ancient Christian metropolises of Asia Minor were swallowed in the Islamic desert and before long the Balkans would share their fate. In these circumstances the political problem of the Western powers was not so much to reestablish the Latin Empire, for which it was difficult to find a serious aspirant, but rather to defend Europe from the infidels in union with the beleaguered Greeks. Such an association would inevitably involve discussion of Church union, but now with far less political justification. And for the Greeks the difficulty no longer consisted in keeping the Latins out of the Sea of Marmora but in gaining them as auxiliaries, even at the price of union. So long as the danger was only dimly in the consciousness of the West, it was felt that the idea of union could not be disregarded, and political circles in the Byzantine Empire reckoned with this condition. But they also recalled the Second Council of Lyons, which was rejected in the East mostly because it had been attended only by delegates of the Emperor, not by any of the Orthodox Church. And so this time the East insisted on a truly ecumenical council, a suggestion now more strongly supported in the West, not at first by the Popes but by those circles representing the conciliar movement. Unfortunately, the problem of union thereby became a political question between papacy and conciliarism.[9]

---

[8] *Cf.* W. L. Langer - R. P. Blake, "The Rise of the Ottoman Turks and its Historical Background," *AHR*, 37 (1932), 468–505; P. Wittek, *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire* (London 1938); G. Georgiades Arnakes, Οἱ πρῶτοι 'Οθομανοί (Athens 1947); N. Jorga, "Latins et Grecs d'Orient et l'établissement des Turcs en Europe 1342–1362," *ByZ*, 15 (1906), 179–222.

Despite everything, the difficulties remained almost insuperable. To a great extent they were psychological. The East until now knew Westerners either as conquerors who, with a cross on their shoulders, wanted to establish a domain of their own and for whom the problems of Church union, if they were important at all, were to be solved in the manner of conquerors, or as mercenaries, adventurers, and traders, who with skill and money had deprived the Byzantines of all positions of commerce and trade.[10] The intellectual forces of the West were virtually unknown to the East until the middle of the fourteenth century. Potentially effective influences, such as the activity of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, were unrealized because of reciprocal charges of heresy. And the information that the West had concerning the East derived almost exclusively from those who represented the West in the East. Relations thus revolved on a not very high plane. The standard bearers of Orthodox theology compiled long lists of heresies which were prevalent in the West and multiplied them further by several enticing new numbers, such as the questions of the *epiclesis* and purgatory. With equal ardour their Western counterparts made the Greeks responsible for dozens of heresies, and no one can explain how Guy Terrena of Perpignan (d. 1342), for example, arrived at his catalogue of twenty-five Greek heresies in his *Summa de haeresibus*, unless the fact is taken into consideration that, for the Latin, the Greek had become the prototype of heretic.

The amazing thing in all this is that the Union of Florence was eventually achieved. To be sure, it took a whole century. The initial stage is best indicated by the mission of the Calabrian Orthodox monk and later convert, Barlaam, to the court of Avignon in 1339.[11] He suggested to Pope Benedict XII the alternatives of convincing either only the learned Byzantine theologians of the truth of Latin doctrine or of convincing both people and theologians. The former, he thought, would not be difficult, for the experts would quickly reach an understanding, but on their return home they would be exposed to a strong opposition which would exploit the ever effective argument: "Let us not be robbed of the faith we have inherited from the Fathers!" But if union of East and West were to take place at a truly ecumenical council, attended by accredited representatives of all the patriarchates, the Greek people, with their tremendous regard for an ecumenical council, would also accept it. The contrary argument of the cardinals, that truths once defined do not admit of further discussion, was countered by Barlaam with the point that even an established truth can stand clarification. If this argument found little support, even less did Barlaam's claim that military aid for Constantinople must precede union and that only such a favour would render union palatable to the Greek people. The Pope had the cardinals answer this: Quite the contrary! If the aid brought success, the Greeks would quickly be no longer willing to hear of a union.

---

[9] *Cf.* G. Hofmann, "Papato, Conciliarismo, Patriarcato," *Miscell. Hist. Pont.*, 2 (1940), 1–82.

[10] Especially informative is the judgment in Demetrios Kydones, *Autobiographie*, German version of H. G. Beck in *OstKSt*, 1 (1952) 208–25, 264–82.

[11] *PG*, 151, 1331–42; C. Giannelli, "Un progetto di Barlaam Calabro per l'unione delle chiese," *MiscMercati*, III (1946), 157–208; J. Meyendorff, "Un mauvais théologien de l'unité au XIV^e siècle," *L'Église et les églises*, II (Chevetogne 1954), 47–64.

Thus Barlaam, who amazingly foresaw much of what would eventually happen, failed, but behind his mission stood the grand chamberlain John Cantacuzene, who, as the Emperor John VI (1347–54), further pursued his lofty goal. Around 1350 one embassy after another set out for Avignon. The council, according to the Emperor's wish, ought to meet at a place equally distant from Rome and Constantinople. Pope Clement VI was not at first opposed to the idea, but eventually the plan miscarried and in this connection the rebellion of Cola di Rienzo and the war between France and England were certainly not decisive. However, Cantacuzene did not cease his exertions and his successor, John V Palaeologus (1354–91), walked in his footsteps, though probably without much genuine dedication. New discussions took place in 1367, with the co-operation of the former Emperor Cantacuzene, the Latin Archbishop Paul, papal legate and titular Patriarch of Constantinople. The outcome appeared favourable, and even the Patriarch Philotheus Coccinus of Constantinople (1353–54 and 1364–76) seems to have accepted it. In any event, the first moves for convoking the council were made.[12] But, unfortunately, John V had in the meantime decided, like Michael VIII, to go it alone. In 1369 he became a Catholic at Rome, a step which certainly enhanced the Pope's prestige in regained Rome but without significance in the overall picture of the relations between the Churches, if indeed, as it is described, it could have had any significance.[13] In an encyclical to the Churches the Pope once more rejected the idea of a council on the ground that it was absurd to make defined truths a subject of controversy again.[14]

---

[12] J. Gay, *Le pape Clément VI et les affaires d'Orient* (Paris 1904); R. J. Loenertz, "Ambassadeurs grecs auprès du pape Clément VI (1348)" *OrChrP*, 19 (1953), 178–96; J. Darrouzès, "Conférence sur la primauté du pape à Constantinople en 1357," *RÉB*, 19 (1961), 76–109; J. Meyendorff, "Jean- Joasaph Cantacuzène et le projet de concile œcuménique en 1367," *Akten XI. Internat. Byzant.-Kongr.* (Munich 1960), 363–69; *idem*, "Projet de concile œcuménique en 1367. Un dialogue inédit entre Jean Cantacuzène et le légat Paul," *DOP*, 14 (1960), 149–77.

But before long the Western Schism and the resulting Conciliar Movement produced a change along the entire front. Now the West almost forced a council upon the East and the retarding factor was the Byzantine Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus (1391–1425). A genuinely religious man, he knew exactly how difficult, if not impossible, it would be to make union palatable to his people. A miscarriage would aggravate the schism and deliver Byzantium to the mercy of the Turks, whereas the threat of union would continue to be a means of impressing the Turks.[15] Hence the Emperor was determined *a priori* not to draw the final conclusion from the union discussions but to seek the Empire's safety in the purely political sphere. But meanwhile the situation had become still more threatening and he may have hoped that it would open the eyes of the Western princes. Bulgaria became a vassal state of the Turks in 1371. In 1389 occurred the celebrated First Battle of Kossovo, which made the Turks masters of the entire Balkan peninsula. The remnant of the crusading states in Greece had long been dependent on the favour of the Turkish overlord. Theological prolegomena were now too late. Still, chiefly on the initiative of the French King Charles VI and of King Sigismund of Hungary, an army of crusaders was actually assembled, but the Battle of Nicopolis on 26 September 1396 was a Turkish victory and proved, to quote Runciman, "that the Crusaders had learned nothing in all the centuries."[16]

In these circumstances the Byzantine Emperor Manuel made a desperate attempt to arouse the Christian West to a new expedition by means of a personal visit to Western Europe, which took him *via* Venice to Paris and as far as London. But in spite of the brilliant reception everywhere accorded him, the actual result was at most a vague promise here and there.[17] That Byzantium did not then become the spoil of the Turks was due solely to the fact that at that very moment (1402) the Mongols under the Khan Timur-Leng decisively defeated the Ottoman Sultan Bajazet at the Battle of Ankara and thereby gave the Empire a breathing spell.

---

[13] O. Halecki, *Un empereur de Byzance à Rome* (Warsaw 1930).

[14] Raynaldus, *Annales eccl.*, 1370, no. 3.

[15] This may have been the content of Manuel's "testament" to his son, John VIII, reported by Sphrantzes, *Chron. maius*, II, 13 (*PG*, 156, 784 f.).

[16] A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade of Nicopolis* (London 1934); *Runciman*, III, 460.

[17] A. A. Vasil'ev, "Putešestvie vizantijskogo imperatora Manuila II Paleologa po zapadnoj Evrope," *Zurnal Ministerstva Narod. Prosv.*, NS, 39 (1912), 41–78, 260–304; M. Jugie, "Le voyage de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue en occident," *ÉO*, 15 (1912), 322–32; G. Schlumberger, "Un empereur de Byzance à Paris et à Londres," *Byzance et croisades* (Paris 1927), 87–147, 361 f.; M. A. Andreeva, "Zur Reise Manuels II. nach Westeuropa," *ByZ*, 34 (1934), 37–47, 351.

The project of a union of the Churches was now more animated in the West than in the East. Manuel was invited by the cardinals to send delegates to the Council of Pisa (1409). The Emperor Sigismund informed his colleague in Constantinople that the Council of Constance (1414–18) aimed "contra infideles paganos et praecipue Turcos remedia vobisque et predicte civitati Constantinopolitane ... providere" and invited him to send representatives.[18] Manuel complied, but his highly esteemed agent, Manuel Chrysoloras, died at the Council in 1415[19] and since the Synod soon realized the impracticability of its too detailed program the *reductio Graecorum* was put on the waiting list.

But in the interval new imperial envoys had arrived. They submitted thirty-six articles in which the Greeks had specified their notions of the preparations for union.[20] The embassy seems to have been optimistic in all regards. To its superiors it painted in glowing colours the readiness of the Council and of the Curia to meet every advance half-way and with the same palette depicted the inclination of the East to return to Rome's obedience in both faith and ritual. It must have been these brilliant hues that induced the new Pope, Martin V, to agree to the Greeks' demand that he be represented at a union council to be convoked to Constantinople by the Emperor, just because in such a council he apparently saw nothing more than the solemn framework for the ratification of a unity already established *de facto*. Cardinal Fonseca was supposed to represent the Pope at this ceremony. But the realization was slowed down, because in the thirty-six articles it was stipulated that the Pope should finance the undertaking and at the moment he did not have the necessary means. And once the papal till had been replenished, a Turkish attack on Constantinople thwarted the projected meeting (1422). Hence Martin V first sent a nuncio to Constantinople, the Franciscan Anthony da Massa, to make the preparations. At that time, however, it soon became clear how misleading had been the optimism of the Byzantine envoys. The Greeks were far from agreeing to an unscrutinized union and had no intention of viewing an ecumenical council as a mere backdrop for submission. The Emperor flatly disavowed his envoys and demanded a council at which the disagreements between the Churches should be taken up point by point.[21] Thereupon, quite understandably, the Pope's readiness for what was basically a Greek Council at Constantinople with a single representative of the Latin Church quickly disappeared.

---

[18] H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constanc.*, I (Münster 1896), 491.

[19] About him *cf.* G. Cammelli, *Manuele Crisolora* (Florence 1941).

[20] The chiefs of the embassy were Nicholas Eudaimonoioannes and Joseph Bladynteros. The articles are not extant.

[21] Da Massa's report is given in Raynaldus, *Annales eccl.*, 1422, nos. 5–15, and *Mansi*, XXVIII, 1063–68. Other documents (Greek translation and the position of the Byzantine

Just the same, the way was opened for a compromise. Martin V, however, died and his successor, Eugene IV, had his hands full in dealing with conciliarism, which now exploded at the Council of Basel. But eventually it was this very power struggle — *risit Oriens,* remarked Aeneas Sylvius of this favourable moment — that brought the idea of union to maturity. For both sides the gaining of the Greeks could only mean a powerful rise in prestige and so both sides wooed them. All cities that were adequate were suggested as the meeting place; Constantinople was repeatedly considered, as were Vienna and Buda and finally preference was given to Avignon or Florence or Ferrara. Even just before the departure of the Greeks it was not clear whether they would board the squadron sent by the Council of Basel or that sent by the Pope, and when at last they reached Venice in the papal flotilla it was even then probably only the political advice of the Most Serene Republic that definitely induced them to go to Ferrara.[22]

The story of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39) is related elsewhere.[23] For an appreciation of the fate of the union in the East only what follows need be noted here. Since the victory of Eugene IV over his opponents at Basel, far from being achieved at the beginning of the Council, needed a real union to crown it, the Pope was prepared for every imaginable concession. The Synod was a papal epic *par excellence.* Any forced union, any lack of freedom of debate, even any cutting short of disputes by means of dictation from Rome was out of the question. It was the sort of council the Greeks had always wanted.[24] But the pressure of political circumstances? With this the Emperor John VIII (1425–48) had primarily to reckon. He took part in the Council in person and switched signals on several occasions. But one almost feels that, the longer the Council lasted, the more precisely he got to know the Pope's financial difficulties and mortgaging, and the more disillusioned he must have become because of the slight participation of the secular princes, so much the less was he convinced of the political success of a Church union. Even at the very end he hinted

synod) in V. Laurent, "Les neufs articles du Pape Martin V et la réponse inédite du patriarche de Constantinople Joseph II," *RÉB,* 20 (1962), 5–60.

[22] J. Zhishman, *Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen der orientalischen und römischen Kirche seit dem Anfang des 15. Jh. bis zum Conzil von Ferrara* (Vienna 1858); M.-H. Laurent, "L'activité d'André Chrysoberges O.P. sous le pontificat de Martin V," *ÉO,* 34 (1935), 414–38; A. N. Diamantopulos, 'Απόπειραι πρὸς ἕνωσιν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὸν ιε' αἰῶνα (Athens 1924).

[23] See *supra,* Chapter 50.

[24] *Cf.* especially J. Gill, "Greeks and Latins in a Common Council," *OrChrP,* 25 (1959), 265–87, and B. Schultze, "Das letzte ökumenische Einigungskonzil theologisch gesehen," *OrChP,* 25 (1959), 288–309.

at his readiness to return to Constantinople without a settlement. And his later attitude does not give the lie to this impression. At last, on 6 July 1439, the union was promulgated in the decree "Laetentur Caeli"[25] and all the Greeks who were entitled to do so signed it, except the Metropolitan Mark Eugenicus of Ephesus. The signatures were not coerced and were probably sincere.

Nevertheless it is impossible to maintain that one side had convinced the other by arguments. If, for example, both *a filio* and *per filium* were considered valid and accepted as expressing one and the same dogmatic truth, this happened not from philological and primarily also not from dogmatic considerations, but because both formulations were found in recognized Fathers and because all held to the axiom that the Fathers of the Church, being inspired, could not err and accordingly the different formulations had to mean the same thing. Even Mark Eugenicus could not escape this argument, and hence he again and again hinted that the writings of the Latins were probably falsified. Thus, except for men like Bessarion of Nicaea and Isidore of Kiev, the Greeks were coerced by the possibility of union to a "notional assent," but they were unenthusiastic over the achievement of union, because the last inner resistances had by no means been broken — a mood that could not long withstand the cool reception that was theirs at Constantinople in February 1440. More serious was the fact that the Emperor himself died in 1448 without having been able to decide to promulgate the union,[26] although both successors of the Patriarch Joseph II,[27] who had died at Florence, Metrophanes II (1440–43) and Gregory III (1443–51), constantly urged him to do so.

Yet the achieving of union had, in the meantime, brought about even political consequences. As seldom before, it now seemed possible to end Turkish rule in the Balkans. A joint expedition of Hungarian, Venetian, and papal forces, combined with a Byzantine shielding maneuver, was to force the issue. But the Battle of Varna (1444) ended as one more defeat. The union had not fulfilled its political aim.[28] The new, and last, Byzantine Emperor, Constantine XI Dragases (1448–53), a man of political ability, saw in the union, in spite of everything, a better basis of further exertions for the defense of Constantinople than had been the case with the delaying tactics of his dead brother, John VIII. At first there were severe tensions, as a result of which the Patriarch Gregory III abandoned his see and went into voluntary exile in Rome, but finally, on 12 December 1452, a solemn liturgy with a commemoration of the Pope could be celebrated in Hagia Sophia, and during it the decree "Laetentur Caeli" was promulgated.[29] But this had no effect on the fate of Constantinople. And the first Patriarch under Muslim rule, Gennadius Scholarius, governed the remnant of his church as though the act of 1452 had never taken place.

---

[25] The original is in the Laurenziana in Florence; *cf.* A. Mercati, "Il decreto d'unione del 6 luglio 1439 nell'Archivio Segreto Vaticano," *OrChrP*, 11 (1945), 5–44.

[26] J. Gill, "John VIII Palaeologus. A Character Study," *Silloge Bizantina in onore di S. G. Mercati* (Rome 1957), 152–70.

[27] J. Gill, "Joseph II, Patriarch of Constantinople, " *OrChrP*, 21 (1955), 79–101.

[28] O. Halecki, *The Crusade of Varna* (New York 1943).

Chapter 52

Hesychasm and Palamism

Once again, before the history of the Byzantine Empire came to an end, the structure of the Imperial Church was convulsed by a quarrel that recalls the iconoclast strife of the eighth and ninth centuries. It was a dispute in regard to a mysticism, fought out on dogmatic grounds. Hesychasm may be understood as Byzantine mysticism in its entirety, with its striving for *apatheia* (resignation) and peace of soul. By reason of expediency in regard to terminology, however, it is best to restrict the term Hesychasm to one facet of this mysticism, which cannot be separated from the whole but shows specific trends.[1] In the classical threefold ascent to God — practice (asceticism), "natural theology" (comprehension by means of meditation and contemplation of the ultimate cause of things and of their history in God), and *theoria* or *theologia* (union with God) — the emphasis shifts slowly but constantly. The great ascetical subject of "practice" is displaced, not completely but nevertheless energetically, by a psycho-physical technique of recollection and prayer. The rhythmic repetition, carried out in a Yogi-like position, of a prayer formula — the "monologue" usually called the "Prayer of Jesus" today[2] — has the task of completely "emptying" the mind, of transcending not only every meditative representation of the imagination but also every λογισμός, every formation of concepts, to arrive at full "nakedness" of mind upon which shines the vision of the Godhead in light, a vision which seizes upon the whole man and comes to rest in an undefined sphere between corporal visibility and invisibility. That which the classical

---

[29] The "acts" of a synod in Constantinople in 1450, in which the union is supposed to have been solemnly repudiated, are a forgery. *Cf.* Chr. Papaioannou, 'Εκκλησ. 'Αλήθεια 15 (1895–96), 16 (1896–97), in several sequences, and S. Petrides, *ÉO*, 14 (1911), 204–07.

[1] *Cf.* I. Hausherr, "Les grands courants de la spiritualité orientale," *OrChrP*, 1 (1935), 114–38.

[2] *Cf.* I. Hausherr, *Noms du Christ et voies d'oraison* (Rome 1960); J. Brian-Chaninov, *On the Prayer of Jesus* (London 1952); B. Schultze, "Untersuchungen über das Jesusgebet," *OrChrP*, 18 (1952), 319–43; G. Wunderle, *Zur Psychologie des hesychastischen Gebets* (Würzburg 1949).

Byzantine mystics, and especially Maximus Confessor, had cultivated, "natural theology," declines more and more in importance, even if it is dragged into the terminology.[3] There thus disappears one of the chief connections between mysticism and Christian humanism, because this natural theology was the sphere of a spiritualized universal sympathy, a universal embrace, a universal emotion. The Hesychasts' impatience could not endure stopping at this level.

The age of the first Emperors of the House of Palaeologus was the period of the triumphant progress of this method of prayer, which possessed the inherent desire to establish itself absolutely. There appeared treatises explaining, revealing, and concealing this method, for example, by Nicephorus,[4] a monk of Mount Athos and contemporary of Michael VIII, and especially by Gregory Sinaites, known as the father of this mysticism, though he was certainly its most cautious theorist.[5] The masters gained disciples. Political difficulties on Athos — raids by the Turks, arguments with the Serbs, and so forth — again and again led masters and disciples to more distant surroundings, especially to Thessalonica. Devout circles were formed, in which the Hesychasts passed on their method, and quarrels with the still active Bogomilism intruded themselves. The more this mysticism spread, naturally the more it was exposed to misinterpretation and misuse. The terminology of the masters, going back to Simeon the New Theologian[6] and even to a Messalian origin, in regard to the vision of light strongly scintillated between metaphor and matter and thus gave support to those who were inclined, contrary to the counsels of Gregory Sinaites, to identify every light experience and every by-product of their rigorous psychotechnique with a specific grace of God and his own proper light.

Conflict was not long in coming.[7] It found its occasion at last in the susceptible vanity of the protagonists. The monk Barlaam of Calabria, born in Orthodoxy and raised a Greek, but even so hailing from the "Latinizing" fringes of the Empire — this was one of the chief reasons for the antipathy that he encountered everywhere — had energetically defended the Byzantine view in his treatises on the procession of the Holy Spirit, but a monk of

---

[3] I. Hausherr, "A propos de spiritualité hésychaste," *OrChrP*, 3 (1935), 260–72.

[4] *PG*, 147, 945–66. Older is the most celebrated of the methods, attributed to Simeon the New Theologian; see I. Hausherr (ed.), *La méthode d'oraison hésychaste* (Rome 1927), with French translation and commentary; *cf.* also M. Jugie, "Les origines de la méthode d'oraison des hésychastes," *ÉO*, 30 (1931), 179–85.

[5] His works in *PG*, 150, 1240–1345.

[6] K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt* (Leipzig 1898) is still the best work on him; *cf.* also the long introduction in I. Hausherr and G. Horn, *Un grand mystique byzantin: Vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien* (Rome 1928).

[7] *Cf.* especially J. Meyendorff, "L'origine de la controverse palamite," *Théologie*, 25 (1954), 602–27; *idem*, "Les débuts de la controverse hésychaste," *Byzantion*, 23 (1953), 87–120.

Athos, Gregory Palamas, took exception to the form of his syllogistic reasoning. Barlaam, easily offended and greatly infatuated with his Aristotelian education, thereupon attacked Palamas's method of argument — perhaps, in the situation, not without reason. The quarrel rapidly and noticeably became envenomed and Palamas soon fell back upon a fundamentally anti-dialectical procedure, that is, to a type of theology that is no longer rational but purely mystical in nature. Thereupon, Barlaam felt obliged to throw light on his opponent's intellectual background and in so doing he quickly met something of which he had hitherto been unaware — Hesychasm, of which Palamas was an ardent protagonist. He was told by Hesychasts — by immature pupils, so the Palamites later claimed — that they were in possession of an infallible method which helped them to see with bodily eyes that uncreated light which suffused Jesus on Mount Tabor and is identical with the divinity itself. They told him about their exercises of concentration and their technique of prayer — and soon Barlaam knew enough. In the Hesychasts he saw a return of the old Messalians, people who apparently sought the seat of the soul somewhere in the region of the navel — that is why he gave them the derisive label of "Omphalopsychists," — above all, men who either materialized God in order to see him or introduced an unlawful distinction between God's essence and operations.

A friend of both Barlaam and Palamas, the Athos monk Gregory Akindynos, warned the Calabrian against rash attacks on the sacrosanct Athonian monachism but Barlaam refused to be deterred any longer and from 1338 proceeded to denounce this mysticism in treatises and at a synod in Constantinople. Palamas took this deeply to heart and in a steadily rising spiral developed an anti-Barlaamite pamphlet literature, the essence of a theology that was fittingly termed "Palamism." At intervals this theology also had recourse to syllogisms but fundamentally it recognized as the basis of theology only the tradition of the Fathers and the personal mystical inspiration of the theologian. Central, precisely in order to safeguard the light visions of the Hesychasts, is the real distinction between God's completely inaccessible essence, invisible even to the blessed in heaven, and his operations, the chief of which is *gratia increata* and to which belongs the light of Tabor, identical with it. Nothing was farther from Palamas's thought than to introduce a "division" in God but he merely succeeded in establishing an antinomy between unity and real distinction. The attempt to trace this doctrine to the patristic tradition was based, at least as regards the much quoted Maximus Confessor,[8] on a misinterpretation, even if occasionally the strongly rhetorical and emphatic diction of Orthodox preachers and hymnographers can be properly bent in favour of Palamas without too great difficulties. But his adherents were basically by no means hesitant to waive the proofs from tradition and to expound their theology as something new: a legitimate continuation of the New Testament revelation through their inspired master.

---

[8] E. v. Ivánka, "Palamismus und Vätertradition," *L'Église et les églises,* II (Chevetogne 1954), 29–46.

Barlaam submitted his writings to the Patriarch John XIV Calecas (1334 to 1347), a theologically indecisive and politically wavering prelate, who doubtless found Palamas's theology intrinsically foreign, although he was not favourably disposed toward Barlaam. He wanted to dispose of the quarrel and understood exactly how dangerous it would be to run afoul of the Athonians. Monachism had indeed become a dread power, especially since the Second Council of Lyons and the abortive union, and in comparison with it the union of patriarchal and imperial authority counted for rather little. Meanwhile, inspired by Palamas himself, a large majority of the Athonians had issued a *tomos,* a dogmatic manifesto, which set forth the basic tenets of the Palamite doctrine as the original proper ingredient of Orthodoxy and anathematized Barlaam as a heretic.[9] The matter pressed for a decision.

Details of the two synods held in Constantinople in June and August 1341 escape us, for the evaluation of the extant official documents will remain disputed. The first session took place on 10 June in Hagia Sophia, with the Emperor Andronicus III (1328–41) presiding. Barlaam was not permitted to advance his dogmatic contentions, since, as he was told, this was the affair of the hierarchy. Palamas, on the other hand, was absolved of the charge of ditheism, the doctrine of the real distinction between God's essence and operation was considered rather *en passant* than expressly, and the reproaches levelled at the Hesychasts' method of prayer were rejected. The questions were in no sense probed by the members of the synod, but Barlaam observed that he could count on no sympathy and submitted to the prohibition of again attacking Palamas and the mystics. Thereupon the session ended, and the Emperor died a few days later. Barlaam now felt no longer bound by his promise, but he returned to the West and eventually became a Catholic and Bishop of Gerace. He died in 1350.

A new opponent, who remained behind, was Gregory Akindynos. He had not become disloyal to the monastic ideals of the Athonians but he now rejected the theological argumentation of his friend Palamas. The synod again met, presided over by the grand chamberlain John Cantacuzene, a member of the Council of Regency for the Emperor John V Palaeologus, who was under age. But political complications began to play a role. In the Council of Regency the Patriarch and the grand chamberlain were struggling for the decisive influence, and above them both stood the widowed Empress, Anne of Savoy. This rivalry, rather than any particular internal affinity, may have been the reason why Cantacuzene now resolutely embraced the Palamite faction *vis-à-vis* the half-hearted Patriarch. And thus Palamism was dragged into the conflict about to explode between Cantacuzene and the Palaeologi and at the same time into the corresponding social struggles in the Empire; yet no inner connection can be established. At any rate, Akindynos was condemned (August 1341). Then the synodal decree *(tomos)*[10] of both sessions was to be prepared, but the Patriarch refused to participate unless action was limited to a *tomos* which would ignore the August session, over which, in his opinion, Cantacuzene had unlawfully presided, and the condemnation of Akindynos. The *tomos* was drawn up anyhow, but displayed great restraint. It was not really a far-reaching decision, but merely a prohibition of further discussion of the subject. The struggle in the Council of Regency continued to smoulder, and the Patriarch joined with Alexius Apokaukos in an effort to hamstring Cantacuzene. When a campaign kept the grand chamberlain away from the capital, Apokaukos and the Patriarch finally usurped power. Palamas had reason to fear that in these circumstances the successes of 1341 would be lost to him, and so he definitely joined the faction of Cantacuzene, who thereupon had himself acclaimed as Emperor on 26 October 1341. He obviously found in the Palamites a suitable instrument for his plans and thereafter energetically favoured them, though he had originally supported Barlaam.

---

[9] The so-called Τόμος ἁγιορειτικός in *PG,* 150, 1225–36.

Palamas continued to develop his theories in writings, thereby affording the Patriarch an opportunity to charge him with violating the *tomos* of 1341. On the other hand, he allowed Akindynos more and more leeway for his attack on Palamas. At several conferences in 1342 and 1344 the writings of Palamas, who was arrested at the behest of Calecas, were condemned and he was personally anathematized. But the Patriarch's days were numbered. Cantacuzene approached the capital in a menacing mood, and Anne of Savoy considered sacrificing the Patriarch and reaching an amicable settlement with Cantacuzene. Only in this way could the Palamites be won over and the Dynasty of Palaeologus saved. Since Calecas had meanwhile raised Akindynos, who had earlier been condemned, to the diaconate, there was at hand a canonical reason for deposing him. This took place the day before Cantacuzene triumphantly forced his way into the capital on 2 February 1347 and was crowned Emperor.[11] At once Palamas was set free and Akindynos was excommunicated. Isidore, former Bishop of Monembasia, a staunch Palamite, was chosen Patriarch (1347–50).

Still, the victory of Palamism was not yet assured. The opposition was active. Not a few prelates and clerics regarded the theology of Palamas as merely an unlawful *neoterismos,* and not a few monks were unwilling to be identified with the behaviour of the Hesychasts. One may suspect that this was the position of the cenobites, to whom it was clear that Hesychasm implied the destruction of the cenobitic ideal. And finally, the opposition had its chief centre in the intellectuals and humanists of the capital. These circles must not for that reason be charged with "agnosticism." They were as orthodox as their opponents claimed to be, but in Hesychasm and Palamism they saw threats to far too many values which had hitherto flourished peacefully in the shadow of Orthodoxy.[12] Thus all questions were supposed to be settled at a general synod which met on 28 May 1351 in the imperial palace. John VI Cantacuzene presided. He had probably gone to great pains to see to it that the opposition was only meagerly represented. Its leadership had meanwhile been assumed by the historian and polyhistor, Nicephorus Gregoras. The opposition was heard, but there is no doubt that it presented its case clumsily and failed to concentrate on the essentials of the dispute. Finally, at the fifth session, all were excommunicated who refused to recognize the orthodoxy of the Palamite doctrine. A long synodal *tomos* was drawn up, which contained an account of the proceedings and the dogmatic decisions. On 15 August it was published over the signatures of the Emperor John Cantacuzene and the Patriarch, and later that of the coemperor, John V Palaeologus, was added.[13] One further solemn act occurred. In the *synodicon* for the annual celebration of the Sunday of Orthodoxy new anathemas were inserted against all who opposed the teachings of Palamas.[14] It was the greatest triumph which Palamas, who had in the interval become Metropolitan of Thessalonica, could have hoped for. Hardly ever had Orthodoxy so identified its doctrine with a single person as it did in this case. And hardly ever had it put its fundamental principle of traditionalism to so severe a test as now. No change in the situation occurred when Cantacuzene, the protector of the Palamites, had to give place to the legitimate Palaeologus in 1354. John V could scarcely afford to antagonize the large Palamite party by an opposing religious policy and besides he was apparently uninterested in theology. Furthermore, Cantacuzene, as earlier, was still a towering personage, whom John V could not ignore. Hence the Palamite hierarchy, headed by the Patriarch Philotheus Coccinus (1353–54 and 1364–76),[15] had a free hand.

---

[10] *PG*, 151, 679–92, and Miklosich-Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, I (Vienna 1860), 202–16.

[11] J. Meyendorff, "Le tome synodal de 1347," *Zbornik radova Vizant. Inst.*, 8 (1963), 209–27; *cf.* also G. T. Dennis in *JÖByzG*, 9 (1900), 51–55, and P. Wirth in *ByZ*, 56 (1963), 16–23.

---

[12] *Cf.* especially, H. G. Beck, "Humanismus und Palamismus," *XII*^{e} *Congrès Intern. des Études byzantines,* Ohrid 1961, Rapports III (Belgrade 1961), 63–82.

[13] *PG,* 151, 717–63, and *Mansi,* XXVI, 127–99; F. Dölger, "Ein byzantinisches Staatsdokument in der Universitätsbibliothek Basel," *HJ,* 72 (1953), 205–21; also E. Honigmann, *ByZ,* 47 (1954), 104–15, and R. J. Loenertz, *ByZ,* 47 (1954), 116.

[14] F. Uspenskij, *Sinodik v nedělju pravoslavija* (Odessa 1893), 30–38.

[15] On Philotheus, see V. Laurent, *DThC,* XII/2, 1498–1509.

In no sense was Palamism, as has been said repeatedly, the result of a conflict between Latin scholasticism — Barlaam was not a Latin scholastic — and Greek patristic thought. Its victory was easy for the very reason that its strongest opponents, Barlaam and Akindynos, were quickly reduced to silence and thereafter the opposition lacked qualified leaders. The situation did not change until, through the translations of Demetrius Kydones and his brother Prochorus, the writings of Thomas Aquinas and other scholastics became known in Byzantium and exercised an influence. Aquinas's rigid theology provided the opponents of Palamas with strong weapons not available in the limited arsenal of fourteenth-century Byzantine theology. It is true that Prochorus Kydones, a monk of Athos, did not escape excommunication at the hands of the Patriarch Philotheus (1368), but from the *tomos*[16] condemning him it is evident how far Prochorus had driven his opponents into a corner, and from the writings of Demetrius Kydones it appears that the victory was not achieved by the Palamite doctrine exclusively. Other theologians, John Kyparissiotes and especially Manuel Calecas, stiffened the opposition. Then the Palamites themselves abandoned certain daring formulations — even Cantacuzene, who had meanwhile become a theological author in his monastic retreat. The light of Tabor played an ever less prominent role, the teaching on the distinction was made more refined, and scholars have referred to a *palamisme mitigé* among the later Palamites. Furthermore, a man such as Cantacuzene, even as a monk still a politician, clearly perceived the urgency of Church reunion and was smart enough not to aggravate further the points of controversy between East and West by anything so serious as the Palamite teaching on God. Thus intransigent Palamism was recalled from the front line of battle and intentionally kept outside the negotiations with Rome, especially at the Council of Ferrara-Florence.[17]

But the mystics, including the Hesychasts in the strict sense, had fundamentally no need of the support of Palamism. Palamism proper almost completely died out for centuries around the middle of the fifteenth century, while mysticism, the source for its rise, continued on undisturbed.

A comprehensive evaluation of the movement is difficult to reach, since as yet too few sources have been edited and published and we are only meagerly informed about its sociological stratification. Palamas undoubtedly had recourse to an ancient basic concern of Eastern theology and in addition possessed a refined sensitivity to the limits of theological testimony. But neither he nor his age was in a position to grasp mystical facts of a parapsychological nature and reduce them to their contingency. His mistake was to have ignored — or not to have taken seriously enough — the warnings of the classical Byzantine mystics against such phenomena. And his mystical polemic urge kept him from appreciating the proper scope of a rational theology. That he decisively influenced Orthodox theology, that he again opened up recourse to the mystical sources and heightened the skepticism in regard to rational theology cannot be denied. He gave to Orthodoxy a colouring which has become integral to it.

---

[16] *PG*, 151, 693–716. The synod canonized Palamas, who had died in 1359.

[17] *Cf.* J. Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge 1961), 205 f. and 267.

CHAPTER 53

Intellectual Life in the Late Mediaeval Byzantine Church

The great doctrinal controversy over union of the Churches in the second half of the thirteenth century had summoned theologians of all trends and shades to the battle field and had finally exhausted them. Thus at the beginning of the fourteenth century there was everywhere an unmistakable lack of interest in dogmatic questions and several contemporary representatives of the Byzantine intelligentsia made no secret of this. On the other hand, these decades were a great and auspicious age of Christian humanism in Byzantium. It was not only that in this period the output of studies dealing with ancient authors was especially large, as evidenced by the manuscripts extant. This was no mere accident but an expression of the pains taken by the intellectuals. Far more significant is the fact that the pagan cultural tradition was now interpreted and made available in terms of Christian standards by means of new ideas, a new receptiveness, and new theological categories. In other words, the mere acknowledgment of these treasures, their existence in mutual isolation, gave way to a synthesis, however risky this may have been in individual cases. For the first time in Byzantine intellectual history even churchmen no longer regarded the legacy of antiquity as mere decoration in comparison with the strictly Christian inheritance, something merely tolerated for possible use. This was the age when the term "Hellene" no longer referred almost exclusively, as earlier, to pagans but was used proudly by the "Romaioi" as an expression of their history and of their zeal for education.[1]

Many names could be given. Let it suffice, however, to treat of Maximus Planudes, Theodore Metochites, and Nicephorus Gregoras, while mentioning at least some others in passing. Their activity was versatile, each was something of a polyhistor, and as a group they formed a not unimportant class of sensitive humanists, who, guided by Christian categories of thought, allowed the abundance of the legacy to take its effect on themselves, not, however, forcing a compromise but striving for it by means of a calm development — *viatores in hoc saeculo.*

---

[1] *Cf.* D. S. Balanos, "Kirche und Nation in der orthodoxen Kirche," *ZKG*, 57 (1938), 554–65; F. Dölger, *Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner: Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal 1953), 70–115; S. Runciman, "Byzantine and Hellene in the Fourteenth Century," Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἁρμενοπούλου (Thessalonica 1952), 27–31; K. Lechner, *Hellenen und Barbaren* (Munich 1954).

With Maximus Planudes (d. *ca.* 1305)[2] we are not merely in the very midst of the best period of the transmission of classical literature but likewise at the start of a vast extension of the content and horizon of culture, achieved by the reception of the Latin heritage also. Planudes translated into Greek not only the *Somnium Scipionis,* not only Ovid and Macrobius, but Boethius's *De consolatione Philosophiae* and Augustine's *De Trinitate.* It is revealing that the last mentioned translation had no direct connection with the theological controversies of the day but, together with the other translations, was an expression of a happy curiosity, stirred by a universal interest in the good and the beautiful, even though this emanated from a "Church" which till then had been faced as something foreign.

Nicephorus Chumnus (*ca.* 1250–1327),[3] for years imperial chancellor and high court dignitary, frequently wrote, it is true, against Plato's seductive tricks and regarded Aristotle as the genuine philosopher of humanism; but this was more a warning against those doctrines of Platonism and Neoplatonism that were irreconcilable with Christianity than a war against Platonism as such. He too lived to a great extent on the heritage of antiquity, even though he was certainly prudent and petulantly guarded. And in fact the many controversies in which he found himself involved because of his writings[4] show how actively problems engaged the minds of the age. His chief opponent, Theodore Metochites (*ca.* 1260–1332),[5] belonged, like Chumnus, to the lay class which was the backbone of public service and of culture. He too made his career at the court of the Emperor Andronicus II and rose to the highest dignity, that of *megas logothetes.* No systematizer, his thought unfolded itself in the *aperçu,* his literary form was the essay. More than is true of the other Byzantines, his literary output was marked by the prevailing internal insecurity and frequently he could not offer more than to set one solution in opposition to the others. The problematic order of precedence between *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa* permeated his entire creative activity and obviously his very existence, to the prejudice of the policy of his Emperor, for which he must bear responsibility to a great extent — a central problem of any intellectual history, but an absolutely elementary problem of Greek Orthodoxy. His views on the value and prestige of practice were more progressive than those of his contemporaries and, without even making mention of it, he had attained, better than they, to the proper balance postulated by Christianity, not least because he left the balance there, exposed and with all its susceptibility. He was not a theologian, but he did theolgy a service precisely because he did not presume to force this system of thought into the theological categories of his Church, to which he was devoted. In view of the nature of this terminology, such a situation would have involved the collapse of the desired intellectual progress *a priori.*

---

[2] C. Wendel, "Maximos Planudes," *Pauly-Wissowa,* XX/2, 2202–53; A. Pertusi, "La fortuna di Boezio a Bisanzio," *APhilHistOS,* 11 (1951), 301–22; M. Gigante, "La cultura latina a Bisanzio nel secolo XIII," *La Parola del Passato,* 82 (1962), 32–51.

[3] J. Verpeaux, *Nicéphore Choumnos, homme d'État et humaniste byzantin* (Paris 1959).

[4] I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussels 1962).

[5] H. G. Beck, *Theodoros Metochites: Die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im 14. Jh.* (Munich 1952); H. Hunger, "Theodoros Metochites als Vorläufer des Humanismus in Byzanz," *ByZ,* 45 (1952), 4–19.

Metochites refers again and again gratefully and respectfully to the monk Joseph, known as the Philosopher (*ca.* 1280–*ca.* 1330),[6] author of a broadly planned "Encyclopedia." In this work he gave full recognition to the individual fields of knowledge, but then in treating of the four cardinal virtues he directed these fields to the contemplation of God and of the Trinity.

Metochites's pupil, Nicephorus Gregoras (1295–*ca.* 1360),[7] belonged to the period when the halcyon days of Byzantine intellectual history were already over. He is first and by predilection the historian of his age. And if he was not at his best as protagonist of the anti-Palamites, he nevertheless proved himself to be a humanist who, in defense of his intellectual ideals, entered the arena against Palamite intransigence. Particularly, his rich output in hagiography demonstrates that these humanists wanted to operate within the Church and using the Church's means.

But if the great generation of humanists was buried with him, this was surely not due primarily to the victory of Palamism. Equally responsible was the hopeless situation of the Empire: civil strife, social revolution, and the steadily increasing danger from the Turks. The intellectual forces were, it is true, powerfully engaged by the Palamite controversy. But in the very midst of this struggle occurred an event of far-reaching importance: the translating of Latin theologians into Greek. In this respect *facile princeps* was Demetrius Kydones (*ca.* 1324–*ca.* 1398),[8] a highly cultured citizen of Thessalonica, for many years chancellor of Emperors and the leading personality of the second half of the century. Dependent in the foreign ministry on the inadequate knowledge of Latin possessed by his interpreters, he decided to learn Latin himself and studied under a Dominican, who made him thoroughly familiar first of all with the *Summa contra Gentiles.* Struck by the lucidity of this Latin, he set about translating it and on 24 December 1354 completed the task in an equally lucid classical Greek. Then he took up parts of the *Summa theologica,* besides the brief *Ad cantorem Antiochenum* and other short works. Delight led him on to Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury, Peter of Poitiers, and Ricoldo da Monte Croce. At first Kydones had no theological aim in mind. And when people discovered the treasures of Greek thought in Latin dress, the translations were a huge success. John Cantacuzene, Neilus Kabasilas,[9] and others were enraptured.

---

[6] *Cf.* G. Vitelli, "Indice de' codici greci Riccardiani," *Studi Ital. di Filol. Class.*, 2 (1894), 490–92; M. Treu, "Der Philosoph Joseph," *ByZ*, 8 (1899), 1–64; N. Terzaghi, *Studi Ital. di Filol. Class.*, 10 (1902), 121–32.

[7] R. Guilland, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras. L'homme et l'oeuvre* (Paris 1927).

[8] M. Jugie, "Démétrius Cydonès et la théologie latine à Byzance aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles," *ÉO*, 27 (1928), 385–402; M. Rackl, "Demetrius Kydones als Verteidiger und Übersetzer des hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Katholik*, 95, I (1915), 21–40; *idem*, "Die ungedruckte Vertei-

But it was not long before the theological content was discovered, before advocates of union ascertained how valuable an alliance they had found and enemies of union how difficult it would probably be to argue against them. The translations thus intensified the Byzantine discord — from the time of the Second Council of Lyons there had been a not insignificant group of "Latinophrones" — and the controversy could only become worse. The wealth of Latin scholasticism now saw service in the conflict with the Palamites, and Demetrius bore the entire brunt. While it is true that he was not personally attacked, he had to look on while his brother Prochorus, who had shared the work of translating and was the first to draw the theological conclusions, was accused of heresy, while his many other students, several of whom thus found the way to the Catholic faith, had to go into exile, and he himself was driven into an increasing isolation. His autobiographical writings[10] are the deeply human expression of the intellectual situation in dying Byzantium.

In John Kyparissiotes, one of the most important of the anti-Palamites, an acquaintance with the Kydones translations probably exerted very little influence. But Manuel Calecas (d. 1410),[11] a pupil of Kydones, followed in the steps of his master and composed a brief *Summa* of the faith, in which Augustine and Aquinas obtain full recognition. It is significant for the extent of the interchange that Ambrose Traversari now translated his work against the heresies of the Greeks into Latin, just as it is no longer a matter for surprise that Calecas died a Dominican after imitating Kydones by

---

digungsschrift des Demetrius Kydones für Thomas von Aquin," *DTh,* 7 (1920), 303–17; H. G. Beck, "Der Kampf um den thomistischen Theologiebegriff in Byzanz," *DTh,* 13 (1935), 1–22.

[9] *Beck,* 727 f.

[10] H. G. Beck, "Die 'Apologia pro vita sua'," *OstKSt,* 1 (1952), 208–25, 264–82 (German translation).

[11] R. J. Loenertz, "Manuel Calécas, sa vie et ses œuvres," *AFP,* 17 (1947), 195–207; *Beck,* 740 f.

translating Anselm, Aquinas, and other Latin writers. Still to be mentioned are the brothers Chrysoberges. Of these, Maximus (d. *ca.* 1429),[12] a pupil of Kydones, also became a Catholic and a Dominican; Andrew (d. 1456)[13] was interpreter of the Greek envoys sent to Pope Martin V, worked tirelessly for union, acted as papal nuncio to the Emperor John VIII, and finally became Archbishop of Nicosia on Cyprus. And by no means least of the pupils of Kydones was the famed humanist Manuel Chrysoloras (d. 1415), the first teacher of Greek in Florence.

Opposition to the Kydones translations grew slowly. The most striking example is provided by Neilus Kabasilas, Metropolitan of Thessalonica (d. *ca.* 1363), Kydones's deeply revered teacher. On the appearance of the first translations of Aquinas he had nothing but praise for his pupil's achievement. But when he recognized that here was an arsenal which the Byzantines could match only with great difficulty, he tried to dissuade Kydones from his undertaking. In this effort he brought forward the patriotic argument that would become increasingly decisive in the course of the next years: Whatever may be thought about the opinion of the Latins, one must not on their account sacrifice the teaching inherited from one's ancestors; "it is not safe to take up arms against Emperor, Patriarch, and people." When this argument proved unavailing, Kabasilas undertook to compose a voluminous refutation of Aquinas, which included a sharp attack on the scholastic method altogether.[14] Other treatises followed, from the pens of Joseph Philagrius, Angelus Panaretus, George Boilas, and Angelus Aeidarus. Demetrius Chrysoloras, friend of the Emperor Manuel II, wrote a dialogue in which he had Thomas Aquinas, Neilus Kabasilas, Kydones, and himself take part.

The sequel to all this was a great uneasiness. Some simply rejected the scholastic method.

> Go ahead and use your syllogisms and unsheathe them against us.... If I so wished, I could hold far better syllogisms against your sophistic considerations. But I do not care to. I obtain proofs from the Fathers and their writings. You come with Aristotle and Plato; I oppose you with the Galilean fishers and their candid word. The cross has not yet lost its power, even though for some it is regarded as folly to preach it (Simeon of Thessalonica).[15]

Others suffered greatly from the inferior state of theological refinement in

---

[12] *Beck,* 742; R. J. Loenertz, *Correspondance de Manuel Calécas* (Città del Vaticano 1950), 57–63.

[13] R. J. Loenertz, "Les dominicains byzantins Théodore et André Chrysobergès," *AFP,* 9 (1939), 5–61, 128–83; M.-H. Laurent, "L'activité d'André Chrysobergès," *ÉO,* 34 (1935), 414–38.

[14] Partially edited by E. Candal, *Nilus Cabasilas et theologia s. Thomae* (Città del Vaticano 1945).

[15] *PG,* 145, 140.

Byzantium and reproached their fellow countrymen for this. George Scholarius, for example, did so expressly at the Council of Florence:

> There are people with no qualifications who want to compete with the Latins in theology and philosophy. For among us matters are not at their best. A person can attain to the highest posts even if he knows just enough theology not to give the impression of a complete lack of education. You see, classrooms are lacking, zeal for study has disappeared, and what does take place is subject to the circumstances.[16]

And even Syropulus, the antiunion historian of the Council of Florence, wrote incidentally:

> I know our prelates. Except for one or two, of what worth are they? I have no desire to follow persons whose theology cannot produce anything better.[17]

Kydones himself expressed the uneasiness of the opposite side:

> We exhaust ourselves with these quarrels and make it clear to the others that they should keep at a distance so that they will not be infected by contact with us. . . Is there anything imposing about our Empire — the only thing we can do is to complain![18]

If intellectual life in the Byzantine Empire had more and more to suffer from the growing malice of external circumstances, this situation was still unable to cripple its intellectual powers, and it may be emphasized that in this very period churchmen gave increasing thought to their social tasks. In this connection, for example, should be mentioned the preaching activity of the Metropolitan Isidore Glabas of Thessalonica (1380–96) in the face of the political difficulties of his flock. Most important were the social and ethical treatises of the great mystic Nicholas Kabasilas (d. before 1391),[19] nephew of Neilus Kabasilas. He preached against usury and exerted himself at the imperial court for a more equitable system of taxation. In a long squib he also attacked the judicial deterioration evident in state and Church.[20] Also to be mentioned is Joseph Bryennius (d. *ca.* 1431),[21] who, as a missionary of Orthodoxy on Crete and Cyprus, not only energetically defended Orthodox doctrine against the Latins but just as zealously lashed out against the moral degeneration of clergy and people, so that the nickname "terror of priests" stuck to him. The abridged collection of his missionary sermons is one of the most eloquent sources for the cultural history of the age.[22]

---

[16] L. Petit - M. Jugie - X. A. Siderides, *Œuvres complètes de Georges (Gennade) Scholarios,* I (Paris 1928), 299.

[17] S. Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non verae* (The Hague 1660). 274.

[18] G. Mercati, *Notizie,* 374–76.

[19] His chief works are *Explanation of the Liturgy* (*PG,* 150, 368–492) and *On the Life in Christ* (*PG,* 150, 493–725); *cf. Beck,* 780–83; M. Lot-Borodine, *Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIV*^{e} *siècle: Nicolas Cabasilas* (Paris 1958).

[20] Against usury in *PG,* 150, 727–50; on taxation in R. Guilland (ed.), Εἰς μνήμην Σπ. Λάμπρου (Athens 1933), 269–77; on the deterioration in state and Church in I. Ševčenko (ed.), "Nicolas Cabasilas' 'Anti-Zealot' Discourse," *DOP,* 11 (1957), 81–171.

[21] N. Tomadakes, Ὁ Ἰωσὴφ Βρυέννιος (Athens 1947); *idem,* Σύλλαβος βυζαντινῶν μελετῶν καὶ κειμένων (Athens 1961), 491–611.

Even in the domain of mysticism neither the Palamite controversy nor Hesychasm held a monopoly. In fact, it really seems as though the oversimplification of Hesychasm and Palamism evoked a reaction connected with the name of Nicholas Kabasilas.[23] This lay theologian did on occasion display a curt and scanty respect for Palamism, but his system sprang from an entirely different soil. His aim too was participation in God and deification, but the road leading to this included everything that fared badly with the Hesychasts, not only "natural theology," that is, mystical absorption in the world of creation, but especially the liturgy and not least an active mystical union with Christ. Meditation on the life of Christ, the imaginative submersion into his teaching, life, and example in a Franciscan fervour, the conscious contemplative junction with all phases of the liturgical celebration — all these elements clearly made his mysticism appear as necessarily antipodean to the Hesychasts' abrupt seeking of God. It preserved both the human nature of Christ and Christian humanism.

The Empire's closing decades encroached day by day upon the foundations of its intellectual life without bringing it to destruction. The intensified controversy with the West brought ever new impulses, and the gravest danger finally induced recourse to desperate means. Three representatives of this period brought this into clear awareness: Bessarion of Nicaea, George Scholarius, and George Gemistus Plethon.

Bessarion (*ca.* 1403–72)[24] was the Byzantine who, in exile, did most, next to Plethon, to keep alive the intellectual treasure of his nation. His development from the convinced Orthodox to the Catholic and the Cardinal was accomplished without any break, in a healthy, slow movement, and because his breadth of knowledge was already that of a Renaissance-type. Pupil and intimate of the paganizing Plethon, his heart was centred on Church union not only for political but for theological and religious reasons. His intellect submitted to the Latin arguments, but even as a Cardinal he never forgot the distress and the need of his homeland. His work *Contra calumniatores Platonis* attempted to do for Plato nothing less than what Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas had actually done centuries earlier for Aristotle.

George Scholarius (*ca.* 1405–*ca.* 1472)[25] went the opposite way. Active first as a teacher and a lawyer, he soon became an imperial supreme judge and councillor and in this capacity accompanied John VIII to Florence. In their fulness his literary works show what the Byzantine mind was still capable of. Aquinas was scarcely less important to him than to Kydones. He translated the *De ente et essentia* and epitomized the *Summa contra Gentiles* and parts of the *Summa theologica,* he wrote the most distinguished Byzantine treatises on divine providence and predestination, and attacked simony, Judaism, and atheism. His formation was solid and he deplored nothing so much as the intellectual decay of his country. The sarcasm to which he gave vent at the Council of Florence was not directed against the Latins. He said that some persons had come to Florence convinced that they would have an easy time with the ignorance of the Latins, but matters had actually turned out quite differently. The Latins had brilliantly defended their faith; the Greeks could contribute only words which were without any importance. Why, then, should they not simply yield and conclude the union? And yet, at the death of Mark Eugenicus in 1445, this same Scholarius assumed the leadership of the antiunionists. His desperate patriotism clung to the "faith of the Fathers" as to the only thing left to the Byzantines, and his old love of Aquinas caused him now to exclaim, "O Thomas, if only you had been a Greek!"

---

[22] Volume III of the edition printed in Leipzig in 1784.

[23] See footnote 19.

[24] L. Mohler, *Kardinal Bessarion als Theologe, Humanist und Staatsmann* (Paderborn 1923); *idem, Aus Bessarions Gelehrtenkreis* (Paderborn 1942); *idem, In Calumniatores Platonis* (Paderborn 1927).

[25] The extensive edition of his works, L. Petit - M. Jugie - X. A. Siderides, *Œuvres complètes*

The most singular road of all was that travelled by George Gemistus Plethon (d. 1452).[26] He belonged to one of those families which by custom held the high patriarchal posts at Hagia Sophia. He had to leave Constantinople quite early because of ideas which he had spread among his pupils, but he found refuge at the court of the Despots in Mistra, where Hellenism could still breathe somewhat freely. No less than Scholarius did he suffer from the misfortunes of his homeland, but, born reformer that he was, he thought to find in Hellenic antiquity enough material for a religious and political rebirth of the Greeks. Thus the road led him away from Christianity, especially from the monastic Byzantine Christianity of his day, to a Plato interpreted from the point of view of politics and reform. His aim was to establish a new state on the Platonic model, his central idea was that of fate, a *heimarmene,* which controls the hierarchy of gods and from which he expected a strengthening of the self-consciousness of his fellow-countrymen similar to that of the Muslims in regard to kismet. All this was no frivolous ideas with which he toyed in the comfort of Mistra but a serious and carefully planned reform project. We know that Plethon was not alone; he was able to gather around him a not unimportant circle of enthusiastic disciples.

---

de Georges (Gennade) Scholarios, I–VII (Paris 1928–36), gives for each separate part a topical introduction and biographical notes. *Cf.* also S. Salaville, "Un thomiste à Byzance au XV^e siècle," *ÉO,* 23 (1924), 129–36; *idem,* "Georges Scholarios et St. Thomas d'Aquin," *Mélanges Mandonnet,* I (Paris 1930), 423–40.

[26] F. Masai, *Plethon et le platonisme de Mistra* (Paris 1956).

Furthermore, similar paganizing tendencies were to be observed in other parts of the Empire. They had no future, but they are of historical interest because they drew an arc whose ends often moved apart only in appearance throughout the Byzantine centuries.

CHAPTER 54

Patriarchate — Emperor and Church — Missions — Monasticism

The collapse of the Empire, in progress during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, involved frightful losses for the Orthodox Church.[1] Not every Seljuk or Ottoman conquest of a strip of territory meant the annihilation of Orthodoxy and the elimination of Church government, but the unceasing raids of undisciplined tribes and the changing religious policy of the conquerors produced great insecurity and complete impoverishment. We constantly hear of complaints that now even great and wealthy ancient cities were no longer able to maintain a cleric, let alone a bishop. From time immemorial the Greek metropolitans had preferred residence in the capital rather than in their own provinces. What had once been a pretext had now become a necessity. In the *Notitiae episcopatuum,* which in their several revisions reflect the actual importance of the sees, we learn how one after another of the metropolitan sees of Asia Minor had to be transferred to dioceses that had not been especially important earlier but were more fortunately located. *De facto,* however, the synod at Constantinople for the most part had no alternative but to unite two or more bishoprics under one bishop, even if they were far apart, so that the more abundant resources of the one might provide for the administration of the other. These grants and combinations, regarded as temporary, fill the patriarchal registers of the age. The ruin of the churches in the conquered territory could thereby be arrested for a while, but in many cases the course of events could be retarded no longer. In addition, some communities made use of the political advantages connected with accepting Turkish rule and, not infrequently, even of Islam, or at least they made accomodations in the externals of their religious life — a state of things rejected with horror by the Orthodox. Even clergy and bishops who remained behind adapted themselves to circumstances here and there, and thus the total picture of the Orthodox Church in Asia Minor grew ever more bleak.

---

[1] On the expulsion of the Greeks from Asia Minor, see K. Amantos, Ὁ ἑλληνισμὸς τῆς Μ. Ἀσίας κατὰ τὸν μεσαιῶνα (Athens 1919); A. Wächter, *Der Verfall des Griechentums in Kleinasien im XIV. Jh.* (Jena 1903); I. K. Bogiatzides, Ἱστορικαὶ μελέται (Thessalonica 1933), 1–60; P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Mentesche* (Istanbul 1934).

In a great part of the interior of Asia Minor celebrated metropolises such as Sebaste, Euchaita, Iconium, Mocissus, and Nazianzus were without their own bishop for decades. Impossible though it was, their administration was entrusted to a single person, the Metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia. This happened in 1327, and by 1365 the situation was virtually unchanged.[2] Better off were the cities on the northern fringes of Asia Minor, in particular Trebizond, which was actually under the protection of an Emperor of its own, and Amaseia and Sinope in Helenopontus. But here also long vacancies of sees occurred again and again. Special efforts were made to keep the ancient apostolic see of Ephesus alive. This bishopric contrived to have a bishop throughout almost the entire fourteenth century but only by amalgamating most of the sees of its former extensive province, which for decades and even centuries had been autonomous metropolitan or archiepiscopal sees.[3] The destruction of Christianity in Sardis must have begun as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century, for around the mid-century Philadelphia, the last Byzantine stronghold in Asia Minor, took its place, at first temporarily but in 1369 definitively.[4] Likewise, at the very beginning of the century Smyrna had to be governed for a time from the Island of Chios. In 1347 a crusading army occupied the city and established a Latin hierarchy. Then, sometime later, a Greek metropolitan could have been installed again, but no person could make up his mind to accept the office.[5] The Bithynian countryside came into Ottoman possession early in the century, but the most important cities held out until the beginning of the fourth decade. At the same time the inhabitants of Nicaea seem to have gone over to Islam in large numbers. In 1338 the Patriarch offered to accept them back into the Church if they were repentant. He even went so far as to dispense them from the public exercise and the public profession of Christianity in so far as fear of the Turks made such behaviour seem necessary — something unique in Orthodoxy.[6]

The Patriarch was scarcely in a position to support the needy churches financially. Hagia Sophia had, as a result of the Fourth Crusade, lost most of its real estate and had been given back only a small amount since 1261. In 1324 the metropolitan and archiepiscopal sees, Monembasia at their head, pledged themselves to support the Patriarch by special contributions.[7] The more the metropolitan sees themselves now ran into difficulties, the less effective was this resolution. As early as 1381 the complaint was heard that no metropolitan see of the Orthodox Church was poorer than the "Great Church."[8]

---

[2] Miklosich-Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi*, I (Vienna 1860), 143 ff., 468 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, II, 103 ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 270, 509.

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 447.

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 183.

[7] *Ibid.*, I, 126–29.

But despite everything, to the last Constantinople did not fail to recall emphatically the territorial, juridical, and spiritual rank of its Church.

The smaller the actual extent of the patriarchate grew and the more vigorous the dispute over the Roman primacy became, the more strongly did Constantinople move toward a concept of centralization that was nourished by reflection on the universal primacy of its own church. On this point too the patriarchal records of the age are clear. The concept of a pentarchy, that is, the idea that the essence of the constitution of the Church consists of a loose co-operation of five actually autocephalous patriarchates, is found not only in the middle but also in the late Byzantine age.[9] But more and more the Patriarchs of Constantinople stressed their special position, using for this purpose a papal vocabulary, so to speak. The Church of Christ has its head in Constantinople, the foundation of Andrew, the "first called." The Bishop of Constantinople is "the common father of all Christians on earth"; the metropolitans are his vicars. Every Christian has the right to appeal to him. He is also the "universal teacher" of the world and vicar of Christ, on whose throne he sits.[10]

In all this, his relationship to the Emperor had scarcely changed in theory. *In hoc discrimine rerum* the two powers were more than ever bound to work together. Perhaps the practical experience gained from the Second Council of Lyons, in which the Emperor had achieved union without the participation of the hierarchy as such, made it more and more clear to him that in fundamental ecclesiastical matters he must rely ever more strongly on the Patriarch and his synod. As people became more familiar with the situation in the West, the more they adjusted themselves in the discussions to the Western body of ideas on the relations between Church and state. The best example of this is the attitude of the Emperor John VIII at the Council of Ferrara-Florence. While never letting the control of the conduct of negotiations out of his own hands, he allowed the Patriarch and the bishops more freedom in the theological discussion than any of his predecessors had and did not object when churchmen insisted on the independence of their authority. Nevertheless, to Pope Eugene IV the position of the Church *vis-à-vis* the Emperor seemed deplorable, and the Patriarch Joseph II had hopes of strengthening the Church's liberty with the Pope's assistance by establishing the union.[11] Likewise, in bishops and high Church officials, such as Simeon of Thessalonica and Silvester Syropulus, resentment over the Church's lack of freedom increasingly made itself felt. Moreover, the Church had to acknowledge in writing this absence of freedom in this very period. The Emperor John V demanded of the patriarchal synod between 1380 and 1382 a decree which sanctioned the principal rights thus far exercised by him in matters of Church government.[12] The crucial point was, of course, that now, contrary to the legalist theories of the past, the Emperor's rights were specified as a privilege granted by the Church rather than as innate rights, but the irony that the Emperor could compel such a grant of privilege shows the real distribution of powers. But it can be said that, obstinately as the Emperors clung to their rights over Church government, they more and more yielded the rights hitherto made use of in matters of faith and dogma, guaranteed by the proviso of 1380–82 that the synod and the Patriarch could not excommunicate the Emperor and court.

---

[8] *Ibid.*, II, 35.

[9] See *Beck*, 33 f.

[10] Evidence in *Beck*, 35.

[11] S. Syropulus, *Vera historia unionis non verae* (The Hague 1660), 92, 100.

Once again it should be stressed that, in spite of all the dissentient voices which imperial interference evoked at this time, the situation of Church and state required the avoidance of conflict as far as possible. A separation of powers would have seriously affected both of them. We sense the Patriarch's anxiety in regard to developments in Russia, where voices were heard which, while desiring to maintain ecclesiastical union with the patriarchate of Constantinople, rejected the legal connection between Church and Empire. In 1393 the Patriarch Anthony wrote anxiously to the Grand Duke Vasilij:

> You say: We have a Church, but we accept no Emperor. But that is out of order. The sacred Emperors occupy an important place in the Church, for from the very beginning they have supported and maintained Christian life in the entire world. Christians cannot possibly have a Church without an Emperor. Both are most intimately united and cannot be separated![13]

But even this fervent stand could not halt the Russian development. And from the moment that there was no longer a Byzantine Emperor Moscow would seek and realize ecclesiastical autonomy.

The activity of the patriarchs at this period did not envisage merely the prestige of their own position. It also followed attentively the consolidation and extension of Orthodoxy wherever there remained such a possibility. At times it seemed that parts of the Mongol dominion, which extended far into former imperial territory, might become Christian. The Mongols of Persia, in particular, were inclined toward Christianity, especially in its Nestorian form, from the time of the Khan Hulagu (1256–65). The Orthodox benefited from this toleration, and at the beginning of the fourteenth century Constantinople could even send Gregory Chioniades to Tabriz as Bishop.[14] Even if this success was not lasting — Chioniades seems soon to have been imprisoned — the Patriarch applied himself all the more energetically to that former imperial territory where the weakening and incipient collapse of Latin rule gave great hopes to Orthodoxy, especially Crete, Cyprus, and the Peloponnesus.

---

[12] V. Laurent, "Les droits de l'empereur en matière ecclésiastique," *RÉB*, 13 (1955), 5–20.

[13] Miklosich-Müller, *op. cit.*, II, 191.

[14] J. B. Papadopulos, "Une lettre de Grégoire Chioniadès, évêque de Tabris," *Mélanges Ch. Diehl*, I (Paris 1930), 257–62, *cf.* also R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes* (Paris 1952), 420 ff.

On Crete the Greek Church was nominally united to the Latin Church,[15] but the Venetians would not allow a Greek bishop on the island. The direction of the Greeks was in the hands of the archpriest *(protopapas)* of Chandax, who was responsible to the Latin Archbishop of the island. No ecclesiastical relations with Constantinople were permitted and, after being examined by the Latin bishops of Crete, Greek clerics were ordained by Greek bishops of the Venetian possessions, Modon and Croton, in the Peloponnesus. Just the same, Orthodoxy maintained an uninterrupted existence and even contrived to gain not a few Venetian colonists in the interior of the island. Constantinople again and again undertook efforts for direct influence. Thus the mission of Bishop Anthimus to Crete in the second half of the fourteenth century was probably connected with the Greek rising against the Most Serene Republic in the sixties.[16] And soon afterwards Joseph Bryennius (d. *ca.* 1430) went to Crete for twenty years,[17] doubtless at the order of the Patriarch, though this was not stated publicly. At that time Crete was the refuge of a number of Catholic converts who had left Constantinople, and Bryennius exerted himself to check their influence as well as to encourage the Orthodox, especially monks and clerics, in their moral life, which, in the twilight zone between the two confessions, apparently needed a vigorous strengthening. Orthodox circles not in sympathy with his moral earnestness seem to have obtained his expulsion.

The situation of the Orthodox Church on Cyprus was desperate.[18] It managed as well as it could under the legal provisions of the *Bulla Cypria* of Pope Alexander IV of 1260. There were four Greek bishops but each had his Latin counterpart and the one metropolitan was the Latin Archbishop. A newly elected bishop was examined and approved by the Latin hierarchy and had to take an oath of loyalty to the Pope. Diputes between Orthodox clerics were decided by an Orthodox court but had to be reported to the Latins, while mixed cases fell exclusively under the canonical judgment of the Latin hierarchy. Thus the Greeks on the island were not only fully dependent on the Latins but were held in contempt by the Orthodox world, and especially by the patriarchate. Under these circumstances the Greek bishops at the beginning of the fifteenth century resolved, though not unanimously, to become again subject to Constantinople. Joseph Bryennius, acting again as the Patriarch's deputy, went to the island and held a synod.[19] His instructions demanded that the Cypriot bishops should renounce obedience to the Pope and discontinue their collaboration with the Latin bishops. When the bishops, from fear of their masters, proposed a secret understanding with the Patriarch with no change in externals, Bryennius recommended that the synod renounce the union.

---

[15] N. B. Tomadakes, "'Ορθόδοξοι ἀρχιερεῖς ἐν Κρήτῃ ἐπὶ 'Ενετοκρατίας", 'Ορθοδοξία 27 (1952), 63–75; *idem,* "Οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι παπάδες ἐπὶ 'Ενετοκρατίας", Κρητικὰ Χρονικά 13 (1959), 39–72; G. Hofmann, "Wie stand es um die Frage der Kirchenunion auf Kreta im XV. Jh.?" *OrChrP,* 10 (1944), 91–115; *idem,* "Nuove fonti per la storia profana ed ecclesiastica di Creta nella prima metà del secolo XV," 'Ελληνικά, Παράρτημα 9 (1955), 462–69; M. J. Manusakas, "Μέτρα τῆς Βενετίας ἔναντι τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ ἐπιρροῆς τοῦ πατριαρχείου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως", 'Επετηρίς 30 (1960), 85–144.

[16] See I. Dyobuniotes, 'Επετηρὶς 'Εταιρ. Βυζαντ. Σπουδῶν 8 (1931), 30–41, 9 (1932), 53–55.

[17] For Bryennius, see *supra,* Chapter 53, footnotes 21 and 22.

[18] G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus,* II (Cambridge 1948).

In the Peloponnesus Orthodoxy made real progress.[20] The successful campaigns of the Despots of Mistra enabled the Greek hierarchy to take effective possession of several of the great ancient metropolitan sees such as Patras and Corinth. The reorganization of the church of Patras had been under way for decades when the city again became Greek in 1429–30. In the meantime the Metropolitan was forced to rule the see from the Mega Spelaion Monastery. Corinth became Greek once more in 1395. The restoration of the metropolis around the middle of the fourteenth century did not fail to bring about serious disputes over rank with Monembasia, which in the interval had become important and now energetically resisted the ancient privileges of the first see in the Peloponnesus. Mistra too, in the course of these decades, presented itself as a new centre of Orthodoxy with full external splendour. Here lived the Bishop of Sparta; here sprang up new churches and monasteries. Around 1300 arose the imperial Brontochion Monastery, the Zoodotu Monastery, and the Pantanassa. In the other districts of the Despotate also a new surge of monastic foundation is established, as in Monembasia, Messene, Kernitza, and elsewhere. Mistra was also the stage of a brisk intellectual life in which theology played a role and of a rising Greek nationalism with regenerative strength — until Muhammad the Conqueror brought it to an end.

The victory of the Palamite theology in the fourteenth century was at the same time a victory of Hesychast monachism and, *a potiori*, a victory of Byzantine monachism in general. The controversy, it is true, showed that this monasticism was even at that time a sort of sacrosanct national institution and that the condemnations then uttered were often based, not on an exact analysis of the theological views of the anti-Palamites, but simply on the fact of *crimen laesae religionis.* But anti-Palamism, notably as expounded by Barlaam, but also by Gregoras, was precisely an attack, though the final one, on Athos. Simultaneously the victory meant an enhanced political influence, if such were possible. This development had been in the making for many decades. In places where the Greek hierarchy had been expelled by the Latin conquerors, the Greek monks frequently remained. For within the Byzantine Empire they had been cultivating their ideals in a substantially greater independence of externally monastic ways of life than was the case, for example, in the contemporary West. Hence, in the occupied part of their homeland they could easily submerge themselves in order to supervise the resistance to Latin rule in administrative and Church matters, as leaders and advisors of the people. And they carried the resistance into the interior of the Empire, against the Emperor or the higher clergy and Patriarch, as often as there appeared an inclination to come to an agreement with the Western Church. They often claimed themselves to be the heroes of Orthodoxy and were able to do so the more easily because they frequently lacked any education, including theological knowledge. The esteem the monks enjoyed did not preserve them from severe ridicule and satire. Both were basically innocuous and played merely that compensatory role to be observed in every strongly clericalized culture. The prestige of the monks was shored up by the great landed wealth and small farms, accruing for years to most of the monasteries from pious donations, demonstrations of imperial favour, solicited patronage, and clever economic policy. However, the economic position of the Emperor and the higher nobility was, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, no longer such that the number of great monasteries could be substantially increased. What foundations there were seem to have been all of quite modest proportions.

---

[19] Acts edited by A. Papadopulos-Kerameus, "Ὁ ἐν Κω/πόλει Φιλολ. Σύλλογος", Παράρτημα to Volume 17 (1886), 48–51.

[20] *Cf.* D. A. Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec de Morée,* II (Athens 1953), 270 ff.

In the fourteenth century occurred the chief phase of that development which gradually led to the victory of *idiorrhythmia* in the older monasteries.[21] This word had long formed part of the terminology of asceticism and meant self-will bound by no yoke of obedience — always an evil. In this later period the idea retained this meaning, judged now favourably, now unfavourably, while acquiring also in the strict sense the meaning of a form of monastic life resulting from the decay of the *koinobion*. The great monastic family broke up into very small groups, which, apart from the general outlines of the monastic ideal, regulated their own life, acquired property, bequeathed it, and scarcely needed an abbot. In his place soon appeared the so-called *epitropia*, a directing committee made up of representatives of these tiny communities and headed by a person soon called the *dikaios*, who was only *primus inter pares*. In legal literature this situation is first found in the *typikon* which the Emperor Manuel II issued for Athos in 1394.[22] The text rejects this manner of life but with so little emphasis as to arouse the suspicion that the author entertained very little hope.

---

[21] P. Meyer, *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster* (Leipzig 1894); *idem*, "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der neueren Geschichte und des gegenwärtigen Zustandes der Athos-Klöster," *ZKG*, 11 (1890), 395 ff.; P. de Meester, *De monachico statu juxta disciplinam byzantinam* (Città del Vaticano 1942), 78–80, 380 f., and *passim*.

[22] Meyer, *op. cit.*, 195–203.

The most varied theories have been advanced to acccount for the origin of this manner of life, but not to be overlooked are the facts that strict cenobitism always encountered resistance in Byzantium and that neither the Emperor Justinian nor Athanasius of Athos ventured to rule out some forms of anchoritism. The numerous monastic *vitae* indicate again and again that the actual state of affairs far exceeded what legislators allowed. And the growth of the Hesychast mysticism could not but directly favour the tendency toward *idiorrhythmia.* Just as the liturgy, the "psalmody", played at most a nominal role in the life of the Hesychasts, and was actually rejected by many enthusiasts, so could a small group of Hesychasts break up the cenobitic life altogether. Their mysticism was incompatible with the formation of larger groups in which the idea of the community ought to be predominant. Hardly had Byzantium fallen when voices multiplied in rejecting *idiorrhythmia,* and they were episcopal voices, but it seems that no one grasped the connection between Hesychasm and *idiorrhythmia.*

But there was one voice in late Byzantium which wanted to make a clean sweep of this and every kind of monasticism, the voice, however, of an outsider, Gemistus Plethon. His reform writings, dedicated to the Palaeologi, were meant to reorganize the Byzantine State.[23] To the monks, "who on the pretext of spiritual contemplation lay claim to a rich share of state property," he denied any right to it, "because they contribute nothing to the common welfare." They should work for their own support rather than extort it from others. "If the state's total income scarcely suffices to defray the expenses of defense, what will be left if a swarm of drones has to be fed, of whom some allegedly devote themselves to spiritual contemplation and others are idle."

Whatever may be thought of this judgment, monasticism was not at its best in Byzantium's final age. Flexible criteria must be sought in determining the social contribution of the Byzantine or any other monasticism to the life of people and state. But whenever Byzantine monachism intervened in Church-State questions of the time, it did so stubbornly and intransigently, with the result that, from the start, legitimate reflection, rational absorption in the question, and a balanced judgment were all lacking.[24]

---

[23] S. Lampros, Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά III (Athens 1926), 257.

[24] Also an Orthodox voice: D. Savramis, *Zur Soziologie des byzantinischen Mönchtums* (Leiden and Cologne 1962), especially pages 92 f.: "The individual morality of Byzantine monks never achieved an adjustment with social morality... Their conservative spirit shielded the Greek world from negative Western influences but likewise contributed to the fact that the positive Western influences have always encountered a hostile resistance in the East."

SECTION FOUR

From the Middle Ages to the Reformation

CHAPTER 55

Renaissance and Humanism

The events of the mid-fifteenth century — the end of the Council of Basel, the reassurance appearing in the European states, especially in Germany, as a result of Nicholas V's willingness to oblige, the restoration of the Papal State, with the abandoning of a genuine reform of Church and Curia, — point to a decisive turning point in the history of the Church. The age now getting under way, that of the Renaissance and of the Renaissance papacy, led rapidly from the Early to the High Renaissance. This revolutionary change on a vast scale was attended by phenomena of critical importance and has been variously estimated in presentations of Church History.

The investigation of the Renaissance and of humanism has made tremendous progress in recent decades, with a quantity of studies that can scarcely be mastered and its own periodicals and series of publications. They are devoted to an exposition of an extremely lively century, especially in regard to philology and the history of art, civilization, and government. All these questions must be left to one side here, and only ecclesiastical matters, especially the development of the papacy, will receive consideration. From the time that Pastor chose to speak of "good" and of "evil" humanists the problem of the religious and ecclesiastical character of the humanists and other leading figures of the Renaissance has never come to rest. If on the one side Toffanin, for example, probably overstressed their faith, on the other hand we hardly have a right to speak of their widespread paganism.[1]

The beginnings of the Renaissance and of humanism as literary movements are variously stated; in the designations of a Christian or un-Christian

---

[1] G. Toffanin, *La religione degli Umanisti* (Bologna 1950); C. Trinkhaus, "Humanist Treatise on the Status of the Religious: Petrarch, Salutati, Valla," *Studies in the Renaissance,* 11 (1964), 7–45; C. Angeleri, *Il Problema religioso del Rinascimento, Storia della Critica e Bibliografia* (Florence 1952); M. Seidlmayer, "Religiös-ethische Probleme des italienischen Humanismus," *Wege und Wandlungen des Humanismus* (Göttingen 1965), 273–94; a survey of the ideas of the Renaissance in E. Hassinger, *Das Werden des neuzeitlichen Europa* (Braunschweig 1959), 23–50.

Renaissance of believing or unbelieving humanists the evaluation fluctuates from a condemnation as being anti-Christian to the notion of a reform movement. The turning from Aristotle and the late Scholasticism and the trend to Plato and Augustinianism could in many respects signify a renewal. The Renaissance of classical studies was at first a predominantly Italian affair. From Florence, Rome, and the petty princely courts of fifteenth-century Italy it became, in its radiation over all Europe, a new bond, which might have substituted for the bond of the Christian Empire that had weakened as a consequence of the rise of national states.

The humanist movement in Italy was strongly fostered by Greek scholars who came to the West around the turn of the fourteenth century, at the time of the reform councils, and after the fall of Constantinople: Chrysoloras, Gemistus Plethon, Bessarion, and others. But so-called Christian humanism acquired its special importance from figures such as Lawrence Valla, Marsilius Ficinus, Pico della Mirandola, and the Platonic Academy at Florence. Lawrence Valla (1407–57), a Roman by birth, was active at Pavia for some years until a quarrel with local jurists forced him to leave. He then spent eleven years at the court of the great patron of humanists, King Alfonso the Magnanimous of Naples, and during the pontificate of Nicholas V returned to Rome. The most richly endowed of the Italian humanists of the first half of the fifteenth century, he was not satisfied with the philological discussion of texts already known or recently discovered but drew conclusions in the philosophical and theological sphere. He became especially well known for his acrid and clever attacks, based on Nicholas of Cusa, on the *Donation of Constantine, De falso credita et ementita Constantini donatione declamatio* (1440), with its demand for the renunciation of the papacy's secular power. If this frontal attack on the Roman Church in her contemporary structure can be brought into connection with the Neapolitan King's war against Pope Eugene IV, the *Declamatio* also expresses a great understanding of the religious concerns of the reform synods, above all of the Council of Basel.[2] The denunciation, usual among the humanists, of the avarice of the clergy and the duplicity and wickedness of the monks proceeded in Valla's *De voluptate, De vero bono,* and *De professione religiosorum* from a deep layer of genuine religious feeling and true Christianity.[3] Like Nicholas of Cusa, he wanted religious peace, *pax fidei,* in the one religion, even though this religion might be characterized by different rites. From the many philological disputes grew a critical historical sense, which turned away from the traditional scholastic theology, led back to Saint Paul and the Church Fathers, understood the new religious needs of its time of change, and also extended to the noblest Christian transmission, the New Testament. The comparison of the Vulgate with the Greek text in the *Collatio Novi Testamenti* of 1444 yielded a wealth of new theological knowledge and questions, which were to exert an influence for a long time. The *Annotationes,* first published by Erasmus in 1505, went through numerous editions and were of great influence on the biblical criticism of the sixteenth century. Of course, they encountered strong resistance and were placed on the Index by Paul IV in 1559; the other works were consigned there in 1590.[4] But by then they had made their impact, brought about a new type of discussion, and awakened a zest for life that was opposed to the *miseria humanae conditionis* of the Middle Ages.

---

[2] G. Antonazzi, "Lorenzo Valla e la Donazione di Costantino nel secolo XV con un testo inedito di Antonio Cortesi," *RSTI*, 4 (1950), 186–234.

[3] G. Radetti, "La Religione di Lorenzo Valla," *Medioevo e Rinascimento,* 2 (Florence 1955), 595–620; G. Zippel, "La defensio 'Quaestionum in philosophia' di L. Valla, e un noto processo dell'Inquisizione Napoletana," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico Italiano per il Medio Evo,* 69 (1957), 319–47.

But, despite the exertions of Nicholas V and the grand-scale patronage of humanists by Sixtus IV, Rome did not continue to be the centre of humanism and of the Renaissance, at least not in the purely intellectual field. At Florence Christian humanism came to full development as Platonism. Even the first half of the fifteenth century witnessed a lively scholarly activity in the city on the Arno with Coluccio Salutati, Poggio Bracciolini, Leonard Bruni, and others. At first, it is true, Aristotle was still reckoned as the real teacher; he was explained especially by John Argyropulos, who had fled to Italy and been given a position at the Florentine studio. The Academy, fostered by Cosimo de' Medici, arose soon after the mid-century and at once devoted itself almost exclusively to Platonism.[5] Even though Plato's writings had already been translated into Latin,[6] there now came to the Academy, especially through Marsilius Ficinus (1433–99), a philosophizing philologist who had pledged himself in the entirety of his teaching and manner of life to the Athenian philosopher. Besides the translation of almost all the writings of Plato and of the Neoplatonists there appeared his chief work, *Theologia Platonica seu de animorum immortalitate* (1469–74). Hence the interest of this Academy embraced not only Plato in the stricter sense but the intellectual currents of antiquity and late antiquity that he had stimulated and was not restricted to philosophy properly speaking. "Platonism meant rather a manner of speaking and a relish than fixed doctrines; finally, if one wills, a mode which in various ways penetrated everywhere, into literature, the representational arts, the sciences, morals, and customs. Hence it is possible to understand its unique importance and the difficulty of determining its image" (Garin). According to the general view, the Florentine Academy reached its high point under Ficinus's pupil, John Pico della Mirandola (1463–94), who in his brief career sought to combine the religious traditions of all peoples and to use them for an understanding of the Christian religion; this was the aim of his *Heptaplus* and *De ente et uno*. Best known was the discourse on human dignity, *De hominis dignitate*, with which he intended to inaugurate the congress that he had planned for 1486 in Rome for a disputation on 900 theses.[7] The esoteric, the hermetic, the Cabala, and the Areopagite played a big role in his train of thought. His non-dogmatic outlook, which frequently rejected the Church's teaching authority, gained him the reputation of being a syncretist and a man living outside the Church, but this is probably refuted by his close relations with Savonarola. Here, as elsewhere in this period, it should be noted that paganizing formulations of Christian truths sought especially to provide proof of a classical education and not to act as a religious profession of the ancient gods. As regards radiation and continued influence, he was the most important figure in Christian humanism. To see in him and his incisive questions to the mediaeval Church and theology a precursor of the sixteenth-century reformers does not in any sense deprive him of his religious stature and Christian uniqueness.

---

[4] A. Morisi, "A proposito di due Redazioni della Collatio Novi Testamenti di L. Valla," *ibid.,* 78 (1967), 346–81.

[5] V. R. Giustiniani, *Alamanno Rinuccini 1426–1499* (Cologne and Graz 1965), 19 f.

[6] E. Garin, "Ricerche sulle Traduzioni di Platone nella prima metà del sec. XV," *Medioevo e Rinascimento,* 1 (Florence 1955), 339–74.

Irrespective of this religious striving, which must be taken seriously, at Rome the Papal State more than ever appeared as the representative of the Church. The Pope thus became chiefly the ruler of a territory which, like the other Italian states, was developing from a feudal state into a *signoria* but with considerable differences from the Italian and foreign dynasties. While it is true that *condottieri* often obtained permanent princely rank, at the Curia it usually happened that the death of the reigning Pope produced a new faction; hence the too frequent changes of political orientation and the so much deplored but mostly misunderstood nepotism. In the nationalist Italian view it was the duty even of the Papal State to keep the great European powers, especially France and Spain, out of the peninsula or not to tolerate an increase of their existing territories. This became particularly clear in the pontificates of Alexander VI and Julius II. Within Italy itself it was important to maintain the balance of power of the *cinque principati* that had been achieved by the Peace of Lodi in 1454. And so the Papal State was compelled to co-operate in this subtle diplomatic game with its ceaseless change of treaties and alliances in the hope of outwitting the partners of the moment. In addition the Curia had at its disposal a superior weapon, that of ecclesiastical censures, which, employed rapidly and ruthlessly, probably caused little spiritual harm. But, even as spiritual weapons, they could be quite effective in the temporal sphere, if the laying of an interdict led to an interruption of commerce and a seizure of the property of outsiders by competitors.

---

[7] Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, *Über die Würde des Menschen, ausgewählt und übertragen von H. W. Rüssel* (Amsterdam 1940).

The enemy from the East, the Turks, kept the Popes preoccupied and it is misleading to speak of a "collaboration of the Popes with the Turks."[8] More than all other powers, the Curia sought to halt the advance of the Christians' born enemy, though not always with the utmost exertion. The old crusading spirit had died out in the age of the nationalist states and no one could fan it to new life.

In comparison with politics the papacy's proper religious tasks retired shockingly into the background. If since the fourteenth century the autonomy of the states with regard to the Church had powerfully increased, in the following century the celebrated phrase, "superiorem non recognoscens," achieved its complete practical form and implementation in England, France, Spain, Venice, Milan, Florence, Naples, and some German territories. Since the greatest part of the revenues now came from Rome and the Papal State, this situation could be endured and it made the Curia quite independent, but with regard to the so-called spiritual income there was still question of large sums. These spiritual revenues consisted chiefly of *servitia* and annates, though these were greatly reduced in comparison with the age of the reform councils. The falling off of many sources of income from the Universal Church forced the reorganization of the fee-system and of the *Dataria*, now functioning as the most important financial department, with its often quite dubious compositions. Through the higher assessment of vacant benefices and the increasing of the fees for dispensations further gains could be made in extraordinary cases. The great multiplication of marketable posts, *officia vacabilia*, which were to be regarded as a sort of state loan, endeavoured to keep the mounting debt balanced. In the pontificate of Leo X there were about 2,000 marketable posts with a capital value of about 2½ million gold florins and an interest of 300,000 gold florins. A real reform of the curial administration was rendered impossible by this system. Statements concerning the Curia's financial administration differ considerably from pontificate to pontificate and were always dependent on the political situation, and the same is true of the income from the Papal State. But these last always constituted more than half of the total yield of money. The alum mines discovered at Tolfa in the pontificate of Pius II were an unexpected and copiously flowing source; as a monopoly industry they brought in important sums and were supposed to be applied to the Turkish war. We know very little about the secret funds that were always available. Since the costs of the building activity and especially of the even more expensive political and military enterprises were often defrayed from them, they must have been considerable.[9]

---

[8] H. Pfeffermann, *Die Zusammenarbeit der Renaissancepäpste mit den Türken* (Winterthur 1946).

As an Italian princely court, the Curia had its full share in the so-called Renaissance culture. Because of the extravagant display, the papal household became a very costly business, with the usual expenditures on building, works of art, books, music, the theatre, and gorgeous festivities, with the salaries for the large number of *curiales,* who also obtained part of their support from benefices. This tendency toward display was a universal phenomenon of the age, but it must be asked whether it was lawful for the Renaissance Popes to conform to a characteristic of the time in such a degree.[10]

The College of Cardinals occupied a special position. The Western Schism and the reform councils had greatly tarnished its reputation, but the much demanded reform did not materialize, despite numerous splendid reform drafts. The return of the Holy See to the Papal State, made by Martin V, also assured the existence of the College of Cardinals in its traditional form, even if now and then, under pressure from foreign powers, persons less suited to the tastes of the College had to be accepted. The outlook of the College as a corporation was reflected in the election capitulations, which, while they have not come down to us for every conclave, can always be assumed. If they were perhaps not always fixed in writing, they were at least secret oral agreements. They were concerned first of all with the safeguarding of real or alleged rights of the College against encroachment at the hands of the new Pope. In order to enhance the influence of the individual cardinals it was necessary to keep the number of cardinals as low as possible and so the creation of new members had to be subjected to the consent of the College. Related to this was the guaranteeing of corresponding revenues for the princely mode of life which was considered to be appropriate. In the text of the decrees and arrangements of the Council of Constance these ideas constantly recur: the obliging of the future Pope to summon a crusade against the Turks; reform of the Curia, which, taken up three months after the coronation, must be carried through and observed for the future; the holding of a general council within the space of three years or "quam primum commode fieri potest"; at it the summons to the crusade must be given and the reform of the Universal Church introduced; the number of cardinals must not exceed twenty-four, only one of them could be a relative of the Pope, each creation must have obtained the consent of two-thirds of the College, the nominees must be more than thirty years old, the incomes and possessions of the cardinals and their share in the administration of the Papal State must be guaranteed; war or alliance with foreign princes for war against another prince must have the consent of two-thirds of the College; the most important fortresses of the Papal State, especially the Castel Sant'Angelo, must be commanded, not by relatives of the Pope, but only by ecclesiastics, and by these for no longer than two years. Of great importance could have been the concluding decrees, if they had been observed: that the capitulations were to be read in the first consistory of every month, and later of each quarter of the year, in the presence of the Pope, and the cardinals were to ascertain twice a year, on 1 November and 1 May, whether the stipulations were being observed by the Pope; if they were not, he was to be remonstrated with to a third time. No further sanctions were mentioned, but it is clear that then a council could take cognizance of the matter.[11]

---

[9] W. von Hofmann, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der kurialen Behörden vom Schisma bis zur Reformation,* 2 vols. (Rome 1913 f.); P. Partner, "The 'Budget' of the Roman Church in the Renaissance Period," *Italian Renaissance Studies,* ed. by E. F. Jacob (London 1960), 256–78.

[10] On Renaissance display *cf. Les Fêtes de la Renaissance,* I (Paris 1956), ed. by J. Jacquot.

More recent research has shown that the income was subject to severe fluctuations, that there were rich and poor cardinals, that benefices and the *commenda*, protectorates and pensions often did not suffice to assure the income of four to six thousand gold florins that was considered necessary. In such cases the Pope was supposed to grant monthly subsidies of from one to two hundred gold florins from the resources of the Church and of the Papal State. But because of a decline in papal cash such allowances often had to be discontinued.[12] In this connection it can be asked whether it was necessary to support an entourage of hundreds of persons, to ride to the Vatican with a large retinue, to build huge palaces or palatial fortresses, and to organize noisy festivities.

The election capitulations contained also a group of general commitments, which in time were often included in a merely schematic way and placed at the beginning: Turkish war, reform of the Curia, calling of a general council within a short time. But it is a serious mistake to speak of a collapse of the conciliar idea. To be sure, because of the successfully managed restoration of the Papal State the Curia was able to a great extent to evade the danger of the conciliar discussion and to thwart the summoning of a general council as threatened by the states from mostly political considerations. But the conciliar idea was still alive within the ecclesiastical sphere itself; several of the prohibitions issued by the Curia against appealing from the Pope to a general council were interpreted only as the opinion of a faction. Renowned canonists stressed the superiority of the council, at least in some important cases, into the sixteenth century. Through the

---

[11] J. Lulvès, "Päpstliche Wahlkapitulationen. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Kardinalats," *QFIAB*, 12 (1909), 212–35; *idem*, "Die Machtbestrebungen des Kardinalkollegiums gegenüber dem Papsttum," *MIÖG*, 35 (1914), 455–83.

[12] D. S. Chambers, "The Economic Predicament of Renaissance Cardinals," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, III (1966), 289–313.

Reformation the conciliar idea obtained a different ecclesiastical and political importance.[13]

A special source of irritation was the persistent disregarding of the undisputed decree of the Council of Constance on the periodic holding of general councils, the celebrated decree "Frequens," according to which a council should have been summoned every ten years from the middle of the fifteenth century at the latest. Even Popes saw in the neglect of this conciliar decree the real cause of the crisis in the Church and of the secularization of the Curia. If the age of the Renaissance is weighed from religious and ecclesiastical viewpoints, one cannot but agree.

CHAPTER 56

The Popes of the Early Renaissance

Nicholas V (1447–55)

When Eugene IV died on 23 February 1447, he left a heavy legacy. While a group of questions had been settled in a manner satisfactory to the Curia shortly before his death, there was still needed a person of moderate views to bring about a suitable adjustment. The conclave again met in Santa Maria *sopra Minerva;* whether an election capitulation was drawn up or that of 1431 was renewed is unknown. The traditional strife between Colonna and Orsini prevented the election of Prospero Colonna, who lacked only two votes for the necessary two-thirds majority. To his own and the general surprise Thomas Parentucelli, the Cardinal of Bologna, was elected in a compromise solution;[1] he had been a member of the Sacred College only a few months.

A native of Sarzana and the son of a physician, after studies pursued amid severe privations he was long in the entourage of the famed Cardinal Albergati. After his patron's death he stayed on at the Curia and in 1444 became Bishop of Bologna, but, because of political troubles, he was unable to enter upon his duties. He was esteemed as highly educated without being a real scholar, as a friend of humanists and of humanistic studies, and, above all, as a lover of peace. The Church and the Roman Curia needed such a man in order to make good the blunders of Eugene IV.

---

[13] Jedin, I, 1–92 (English translation, I, 5–116); J. Klotzner, *Kardinal Dominikus Jacobazzi und sein Konzilswerk* (Rome 1948); O. de la Brosse, *Le Pape et le Concile. La comparaison de leurs pouvoirs à la veille de la Réforme* (Paris 1965).

[1] Sources for the conclave in *Pastor,* II, 6–12.

In Rome and the Papal State he began with pacification and in a short time succeeded in calming the quarreling factions and in winning back a number of cities, among them the important town of Jesi, which he repurchased from Sforza.[2] The political situation in Italy was upset some months after the Pope's election by the death of Philip Mary Visconti, Duke of Milan, in August 1447. The question of the succession was of the greatest importance for all Italy, even the Papal State, since, in addition to France and Naples, Venice and the *condottiere* Francis Sforza laid claim to it. At first, it is true, there occurred the proclamation of the short-lived Ambrosian Republic (1447–50).[3] France and Naples, as foreign powers, would have been in a position to wreck the laboriously achieved balance of power, and especially in the case of Aragonese Naples the Papal State would have been encircled in north and south. The question whether Visconti had actually made King Alfonso of Naples his heir in his last will was long controverted but now it must apparently be answered in the affirmative.[4] In an effort to forestall a French seizure and to challenge Sforza's usurpation, Venice and Naples began war against Milan. The Pope remained prudently aloof, but from the start he was on Sforza's side because only thus could the *status quo* be to some degree maintained. The situation became dangerous when the alliance of Milan and Florence asked French support. And so in 1453 the Pope summoned a congress to Rome for the settling of the smouldering crisis and the pacification of Italy, since, with the fall of Constantinople, it was important to husband all resources. The meeting's lack of success must not be charged to Nicholas alone.[5] At length, secret negotiations between Venice and Milan led to the Peace of Lodi, 9 April 1454; Florence also joined, after long hesitation, and later so did the Neapolitan King, though with some reservations.[6] Despite his annoyance that he had thus far been ignored, the Pope in February 1455 adhered to the comprehensive treaty as *Protector et Custos.*[7]

---

[2] Pleyer, *Die Politik Nikolaus' V.*, 46–54.

[3] *Storia di Milano,* VI (1955), 387–448.

[4] A. J. Mur, *Aportación documental a las relaciones entre Alfonso V de Aragón y el ducado de Milán (IV Congreso de historia de la Corona de Aragón). Actas y comunicaciones,* I (Palma de Mallorca 1959); *idem,* "Alfonso V de Aragón y la República Ambrosiana 1447–1450," *Boletín de la real Academia de la historia,* Madrid, 156 (1965), 191–269; A. F. C. Ryder, "Alfonso d'Aragona e l'Avvento di Francesco Sforza al ducato di Milano," *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane,* 80 (1962), 9–46; on Alfonso of Aragón see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani,* II (1960), 323–31 (with bibliography); A. Boscolo, "Ferdinando I e Alfonso il Magnanimo nella storiografia," *Medio Evo Aragonese* (Padua 1958).

[5] Pleyer, *op. cit.*

[6] F. Antonini, "La pace di Lodi ed i segreti maneggi che la prepararono," *Archivio storico Lombardo,* 57 (1930), 231–96.

[7] A. Theiner, *Cod. diplom. dom. temp.*, III, 379–86; *Storia di Milano,* VII, 56–81; G. Soranzo, *La Lega Italica 1454–1455* (Milan 1924); *idem,* "Studi e Discussioni su la Lega

The Treaty of Lodi was intended to assure the inner peace of Italy in accord with the current state of territorial holdings and to protect the peninsula from outside interference. Fixed troop contingents, the creating of courts of arbitration, the peaceful settling of all conflicts, and the avoiding of foreign intervention were the chief points of the treaty, which appears so modern. In the midst of this political tangle occurred the journey to Rome of the German King, Frederick III, for his imperial coronation in 1452. It had only a slight impact on the Italian situation, and the Pope's fears proved to be groundless.[8] The end of the Council of Basel, the agreements with the German Electors, and the Concordat of Vienna have already been discussed. In these Nicholas V showed himself to be a good politician, to whom what especially mattered was peace and who, to achieve this goal, made great concessions. And so in 1450 he could solemnly celebrate the year of jubilee and display the Pope's spiritual power to the Christians who flocked to Rome in great numbers.

How complicated the situation at Rome still was appears in Stephen Porcaro's conspiracy. This native Roman, a spiritual descendant of Cola di Rienzo in his ideas of ancient Rome and, for this reason, an enemy of ecclesiastical rule, had occupied a series of high administrative posts in the Papal State and had been relegated to Bologna because of an insurrection. He returned secretly to Rome and, with his band of conspirators, planned for 6 January 1453 an attack on the Vatican and the Pope. The miscarriage of the romantic undertaking led to his execution. Because of the jubilee the Pope inaugurated a series of important reforms and measures, which began to alter the structural appearance of mediaeval Rome, but only a small part of his great project for the papal city could be realized because of the brevity of his pontificate and the vastness of his plans. He regarded especially the Leonine City and the Vatican palace as a gigantic centre of resistance against dangerous uprisings; from it unrest could be controlled and its inner area could be adorned according to the new methods.[9] To Nicholas goes back also the grandiose plan of replacing the ancient and dilapidated basilica of Constantine by a new construction of splendid proportions.

Ample justice has been done to this Pope's concern for humanistic studies. At his court he gathered hundreds of scholars, who were especially to devote themselves to the translating of Greek authors into Latin. This undertaking was promoted by the many Greeks who fled to the West after the fall of

---

Italica del 1454–1455," *Studi storici in onore di G. Volpe* (Florence 1958), 969–95; V. Ilardi, "The Italian League, Francesco Sforza, and Charles VII (1454–1461)," *Studies in the Renaissance. Publications of the Renaissance Society of America,* New York, VI (1959), 129–66.

[8] H. Quirin, "König Friedrich III. in Siena, 1452," *Aus Reichstagen des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen 1958), 24–79, gives a good survey.

[9] A. M. Frutaz, *Il Torrione di Niccolò V in Vaticano* (Vatican City 1956; bibliography).

Constantinople. In this regard Nicholas and King Alfonso of Naples rank as the greatest Maecenases of their century. The Vatican Library can look to Nicholas as its real founder. He avoided no expense for the purchase of manuscripts, and in a short time his collection became Italy's greatest treasury of books. It was pointed out to him that he might have used this money better for the defense of the East.[10] But he tried again and again to bring about a union of princes for resistance to the ceaseless advance of the Crescent. The realization of this goal was denied him and most of his successors. An obstacle was the priority which was attributed to Church union.[11] The Pope never failed to supply money for the support of the Hungarians and of the heroic Skanderbeg. But a great part of the crusade contributions remained in the hands of the Western princes and was spent in civil strife.

Nicholas was greatly hindered in the last year of his pontificate by a chronic illness. With him died the first Renaissance Pope, but he was a Renaissance Pope in the best sense.

Calixtus III (1455–58)

Nicholas V died during the night of 24–25 March 1455. The next conclave was again overshadowed by the rivalry of Colonna and Orsini but it could be held in the Vatican. Its outcome was totally unexpected. The seventy-seven-year-old Catalan Cardinal, Alfonso Borgia, obviously a compromise and intended as a "caretaker" Pope, was elected; he called himself Calixtus III. As a young professor at Lérida he had been regarded as an eminent jurist and especially as an outstanding canonist and he had distinguished himself at the court of Alfonso V of Aragón through his management of affairs and his diplomatic skill. He had contributed decisively to the settling of the Western Schism and was rewarded by the Aragonese King with the wealthy see of Valencia.[12] He later brought about the reconciliation of his King, who had meanwhile conquered Naples, with Pope Eugene IV — an accomplishment that greatly weakened the Council of Basel and caused its collapse and enabled the Pope, then an exile in Florence, to return to Rome. In return Borgia was admitted to the College of Cardinals in 1444.

The chief activity of the new Pope, who reigned only three years, was devoted to the crusade. With an energy amazing in a man of his advanced age he tirelessly directed all his thoughts and endeavours to this duty. Well known is the vow he made on assuming office: not to rest until he had taken

---

[10] Pleyer, *op. cit.*, 108–18.

[11] *Cf.* Chapter 51.

[12] K. A. Fink, *Martin V. und Aragón* (Berlin 1938; reprint, Vaduz 1965), 113–41.

Constantinople from the enemy of the Christian faith, had liberated the imprisoned Christians, and had exalted the faith. Resounding appeals, the dispatch of legates to the most important countries and to threatened frontiers, and the proclamation of ample indulgences for all participants in the campaign against the Turks are always recorded. In particular he himself began preparations. Thus at Rome the keels of large vessels were laid on the Ripa and the matter was entrusted to a commission of competent cardinals.[13] Great sums of money were constantly sent to the Balkans, Hungary, and Albania, and many gold and silver works of art from the papal treasure ended up in the furnace. Two such important figures as Cardinal Caravajal[14] and John of Capestrano[15] carried the Pope's enterprising spirit into the various lands, but the response to their ardent preaching was for the most part inadequate or only ephemeral. The Pope was permitted to experience one great success: the relief of the Serbian capital, Belgrade, which was besieged by Muhammad II with a great army and was close to falling. Significant for the crisis of Christian awareness is the fact that in this case and elsewhere Christians, and not under compulsion, served in the Turkish army and that the cannon-founders, the cannoneers, and the builders of siege machines were almost always Westerners; there is no need to mention the secret intrigues of the Italian port cities at the Sultan's court. In July 1456 a motley army led by John Hunyadi and John of Capestrano succeeded in breaking the ring around the besieged stronghold and in forcing the Sultan to a retreat that resembled flight.[16] This really great success was much exaggerated and was not exploited, even though the Pope through legates called for a decisive struggle. Internal unrest in Hungary stood in the way and, since John Hunyadi and John of Capestrano died in the following weeks, the decisive momentum was lacking. Likewise in the summer of 1456 a papal squadron under the command of the Cardinal Patriarch of Aquileia, Louis Trevisan, Cardinal *Camerlengo,* was able to enter the Aegean Sea in order to display there the Christian standard, but the enterprise had no enduring success.[17] And, over and above his military plans, the Pope showed a warm, though perhaps not always enlightened, interest in Christians under Turkish rule and in reunion with the remnants of Eastern Christendom.[18]

His relations with his former master, King Alfonso V of Aragón and

---

[13] P. Paschini, "La flotta di Callisto III," *ASRomana,* 53–55 (1930–32), 177–254.

[14] A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini," *RömHM,* 124, footnote 62.

[15] J. Hofer, *Johannes Kapistran. Ein Leben im Kampf um die Reform der Kirche.* New edition by O. Bonmann, 2 vols. (Rome 1966).

[16] Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer,* 146–51.

[17] P. Paschini, *Ludovico cardinal Camerlengo † 1465, Lateranum,* N. S., V, 1 (Rome 1939).

[18] G. Hofmann, "Papst Kalixt III. und die Frage der Kircheneinheit im Osten," *SteT,* 123 (1946), 209–37.

Naples, were from the first not good and they grew increasingly worse, for the King did not share the Pope's zeal or in any event pursued other goals in the East. Alfonso died a few weeks before Calixtus, who rejected the succession of the King's natural son, Ferrante. It was said that he intended to confiscate the Kingdom as a fief of the Holy See in order to confer it on his nephew, Peter Louis. In any event, the last named was enfeoffed with Benevento and Terracina in the last days of the dying Pope. Against the *condottiere*, Piccinino, who had been rendered unemployed by the Peace of Lodi and intended to pursue his calling before Siena, Calixtus sent an army and thereby preserved peace in the peninsula. To be on the safe side, he garrisoned most of the castles and strongholds of the Papal State with Catalan commanders, while his nephew, Peter Louis, became Captain General of the Church and governor of Sant'Angelo. Peter Louis was a younger brother of Rodrigo Borgia, whom the Pope had admitted along with another nephew into the Sacred College in February 1456.

In comparison with his predecessor and his successor, the first Borgia Pope seems not to have been devoted to the Muses, but he was not uneducated.[19] His interest and his passion concerned other things, which he regarded as more important, and for them he unsparingly employed the energy left to his old age.

Pius II (1458–64)

The death of Calixtus III was followed by a prosecution of the Catalans who occupied many posts in Rome and the Papal State. After the death, shortly before, of the most promising candidate, Cardinal Dominic Capranica, the conclave was from the start overshadowed by the French Cardinal d'Estouteville, who was able to gain a considerable number of votes because of his enormous wealth.[20] By contrast the candidate of the other Italians, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Cardinal of Siena, could offer only his education and experience; but he was a widely travelled man and knew most of the European countries from many political tasks he had performed for the Council of Basel, the Emperor, and later the Roman Curia. After a short but tense course of balloting he was elected on 19 August 1458 and took the name Pius II, not from religious but from classical considerations. An election capitulation that was in some respects borrowed from that of 1431 was decided on and sworn to in the conclave. First came the obligation to continue the Turkish war and the reform of the Roman Curia. There followed decrees on the share of the cardinals in important ecclesiastical measures and in the filling of the higher benefices, a sort of coregency in the administration of the Papal State, and an adequate maintaining and observing of the Constance decrees on the naming of new cardinals. Once a year the College was to meet and to examine whether the Pope had observed the election capitulation and, if necessary, to admonish him. Before the proclamation of the election the newly chosen Pope had to confirm the election capitulation and later have a bull issued on this matter. All of this Pius did.[21]

---

[19] F. Martorell, "Un inventario della biblioteca di Callisto III," *SteT*, 41 (1924), 166–91.

[20] The most important source is the report in the *Commentarii* (ed. Cugnoni, 185), where the discussions "apud latrinas" are again mentioned.

The previous career of the humanist Pope had long interested his contemporaries. In the retinue of Cardinal Capranica, who was seeking justice at Basel, and later as secretary of the Pope set up by the Council of Basel, he came forward as champion of the conciliar idea and was repeatedly sent by the Council to several European states and to German diets; then he passed over to the imperial chancery and, at the opportune moment, to the Curia. He successfully conducted the negotiations for the ending of the Electors' neutrality and was rewarded with the bishoprics of Trieste, Ermland, and Siena. In 1456 he was created a Cardinal. In general, his election to the papacy was well received.

On the very first day of his pontificate he made it clear that he intended to adopt and to intensify his predecessor's zeal for the crusade. Scarcely a month after his coronation he summoned a European Congress to Mantua or Udine for the following summer and issued a crusade bull that, with regard to style, was unusually impressive. From his youth he had been conversant with questions relating to the Turkish war and in powerful discourses before Pope and Emperor and at German diets he had called for a struggle against the infidel. But, for all his knowledge of the political situation in Italy and the rest of Europe, he probably did not reckon with the great disappointment that was in store for him at Mantua. Venice had rejected Udine as the place of meeting. At Rome persons tried to detain the Pope with the gloomiest predictions, but no remonstrances, even in regard to his weak state of health, were able to divert him from his plan. First, however, the political tension had to be relaxed.[22]

Entering upon his pontificate, Pius II adopted the violent hostility of the Curia for Ferrante of Naples, natural son of the conqueror of Naples, King Alfonso V of Aragón. This claimant, not yet fully recognized in his Kingdom, was especially supported by Francis Sforza, Duke of Milan, from quite obvious reasons, for by conquering that realm France could not but threaten Milan also. The new Pope was now faced with the choice of Sforza and Ferrante or France; he decided for the Italian solution and the keeping of the foreigner at a distance. For this reason he has been praised for his Italian nationalist spirit, but his decision was a political act, springing from the justified fear of the hemming in of the Papal State. His attitude was also in conformity with the Peace of Lodi, which had achieved a balance of power in the Italian peninsula. And so, under strong pressure from Sforza, the Pope chose Ferrante and arranged his enfeoffment and coronation and the engagement of the papal nephew, Anthony Piccolomini, to a natural daughter of the new King. This decision was of great importance and, despite frequent vacillation in extremely critical situations, Pius remained faithful to it throughout his pontificate. It brought him first of all a diminution of the danger to the Papal State from the enterprising *condottiere*, Piccinino, but at the same time it also involved the bitter opposition of the French Kings, Charles VII and Louis XI.[23]

---

[21] J. Lulvès, "Päpstliche Wahlkapitulationen, " *QFIAB*, 12 (1909), 216 f.

[22] Babinger, *op. cit.*, 178 ff.

As early as the end of January 1459 the Pope left Rome for Mantua; Nicholas of Cusa remained behind as *Legatus Urbis*. The party moved slowly through the Papal State. Pius spent two months in his native Siena; there was a longer stay at Florence and a somewhat shorter one in unruly Bologna.[24] He entered the city of the Gonzaga on 27 May and on 1 June opened the Congress. One disappointment after another awaited him. Months later no prince had appeared, and only a few envoys gradually arrived for the Congress; the first session could not be held until the end of September. Again and again the Pope sent earnest appeals to the Italian and foreign princes to meet in view of the threatening peril. But the Emperor and the King of France had already declined, and the Duke of Burgundy, who was supposed to assume the leadership, then went back on his crusade vow. Of the Italian powers none thought seriously of taking part, and even the collecting of the tithe from the clergy, the twentieth from the Jews, and the thirtieth from the laity, agreed to in the face of great opposition, was rejected in most countries and city states. The attitude of Venice was generally blamed and branded as treason against Christian interests. After long hesitation and repeated unambiguous demands envoys of the Most Serene Republic came to Mantua. Shortly before Venice had made peace with the Sultan. The excuses offered by Picotti for the delay are really striking.[25] Without the Venetian fleet an undertaking of any magnitude was unthinkable, but Venice was the most seriously threatened, especially in its trade, which was after all the backbone of the state, and in its Greek possessions. If it were to begin the war alone, it would have to face the vengeance of the Sultan alone. Hence, while the policy of sensible reserve was not very heroic, it did correspond to the political situation. And, despite his alliance with the Pope, Francis Sforza, Duke, or "Tyrant," of Milan, continued his double-dealing. He finally appeared in Mantua in September and made great promises. In his case the fear of a French invasion of his territory was understandable. Florence was entirely uncooperative, Genoa had come under French rule, and Naples was justified by its really difficult situation. The Italian states took a realistic view: one feared another, and before a genuine reconciliation the risk of a crusade was too great. "The Mantua Congress did not fail because Venice spitefully wrecked it, but because they were all dispirited and, even worse, insincere."[26] France, once the proud champion of the crusade idea, refused any cooperation with the Pope, his Congress, and his eloquent and fervent appeals. As earlier and as in the succeeding decades, it was a question of Naples, of the expulsion of the Aragonese and the restoration of the Angevin. When at length French envoys came to Mantua they first demanded the investiture of John of Anjou before there was any discussion of the crusade. During the Congress itself a squadron, prepared in Genoa for the crusade voyage, set sail with the French King's permission for the conquest of the Neapolitan Kingdom. And so the Congress moved slowly to its conclusion without any visible success. Nevertheless, the papacy had sought to place itself at the head of Europe and had registered its claim to leadership.

---

[23] G. Peyronnet, "La politica italiana di Luigi Delfino di Francia," *RSIt*, 64 (1952), 19–44.

[24] G. B. Mannucci, "Il viaggio di Pio II da Roma a Mantova 22 gennaio – 27 maggio 1459," *Bullettino Senese di storia patria*, N. S., 12 (1941), 62–65; other literature in Strnad, *loc. cit.*, 162, footnote 42.

[25] Picotti, *La dieta di Mantova*, 387–94.

After his return from the Congress of Mantua Pius II found himself involved in the usual disputes with unruly *signori* and Roman barons. Sigismund Malatesta of Rimini, who has been too unfavourably judged by Pastor, rebelled against the papal temporal authority and could be subdued only with difficulty; in this quarrel considerations of nepotism played a decisive role, for a part of the holdings of the Malatesta was intended for the nephew Anthony.[27] With the Pope's aid Ferrante finally established himself at Naples and compelled the Angevin to withdraw, but Pius now had to experience the hostility of Louis XI of France. As dauphin Louis had opposed his father and had to flee to Burgundy; he there promised the Pope that he would annul the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges when he succeeded to the throne. The annulment actually took place in the autumn of 1461. But it was purchased by the creation of two French cardinals and was intended to win the Pope from his alliance with Ferrante. It was reintroduced in practice by a royal ordinance.

His anxiety for the Papal State and his involvement in Italian politics did not cause the Pope to forget the chief task of his pontificate: the crusade. He again appealed for a crusade in October 1463 and appointed Ancona as the place of gathering in the next summer. Despite his poor state of health, he said that he would himself take part. His appeal found a response among the lower classes throughout Europe. They set out for Ancona in considerable numbers but soon had to turn back. There was no response from the princes, on whom the matter chiefly depended. At Venice the Council had to force the reluctant Doge to give up his opposition and set sail with the fleet. Meanwhile, on 18 June 1464 the seriously ill Pope left the Eternal City and, with many cardinals and curialists, made his way to Ancona. To his great disappointment he found there only a few crusaders and eagerly awaited the arrival of the Venetian galleys. As they came in sight, he died on 14 August and the great enterprise was ruined.

---

[26] H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, II (Gotha 1920), 369.

[27] G. Soranzo, *Pio II e la politica italiana contro i Malatesta* (Padua 1911).

In the period beginning with the autumn of 1461 occurred the work on a remarkable document by the Pope: the so-called letter to Muhammad II. The content and fate of this long treatise are still a puzzle. What could have motivated the Pope to compose, in addition to a detailed refutation of the Koran, an exposition of Christian truth and to urge the Sultan to convert to Christianity and, on his reception of baptism *(pauxillum aquae),* to offer him the crown of the Eastern Empire? Presumably, the "letter" was never sent and never reached the addressee. If Nicholas of Cusa's treatise *Cribratio Alchorani* has hitherto been regarded as the important model, now the preference is given to Torquemada's *Contra principales errores perfidi Machometi,* which appeared between October 1458 and January 1459. In an age when, despite the insecurity, a crusade summons could still be expected to have an impact, the Pope in his vision of Europe moved into the regions of Utopia and of illusion and sketched a grand-scale picture and program of the universalism that haunted him. The letter to Muhammad is an extremely important document for an explanation of the personality of Pius II.[28]

In the pontificate of Pius II began the long quarrel with Bohemia and its King, George of Podiebrad.[29] As always, this struggle was dependent on the political situation in Italy, the Empire, Poland, and Hungary. When in 1458 Podiebrad obtained the Bohemian royal crown, he took in the presence of the two Hungarian bishops who crowned him and of a small group of witnesses an oath, whose not entirely clear text apparently denied the further validity of the *Compactata* of Prague, which had granted free preaching, the lay chalice, the abolition of the temporal authority of the clergy, and the punishment of mortal sin.[30] In view of the religious situation in Bohemia and Moravia this promise could hardly be kept. And when Podiebrad in 1462 applied for the confirmation of the *Compactata,* the Curia annulled them. But since they had been agreed to by the Council of Basel, no further confirmation was needed. Thus was the break made complete and shortly before the Pope's death the King was cited to Rome.

---

[28] G. Toffanin, *Introduzione a Pio II (Enea Silvio Piccolomini), Lettera a Maometto* (Naples 1955); F. Gaeta, "Sulla 'Lettera a Maometto' di Pio II," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo e Archivio Muratoriano,* 77 (1965), 127–227 (with bibliography), 195–227 (edition of the autograph sketch of Part I, according to *Cod. Vat. Regin. lat.,* 1995); Babinger, *op. cit.,* 211 ff.

[29] *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder,* I (1967), 537–61, with very copious bibliography; A. Strnad, "Die Breslauer Bürgerschaft und das Königtum Georg Podiebrads," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung,* 14 (1965), 401–35, 601–40; R. Kalivoda, "Die hussitische Revolution und die Podiebrader Epoche," *Cultus Pacis,* 167–78.

In 1462–64 Podiebrad came forward with a great project, which Pastor disposes of too quickly in his *History of the Popes.* In the twenty-three chapters of the text, that has now been published according to a good Warsaw source, it was proposed that a sort of European League of Nations, under the motto *Pax et Iustitia,* should be formed for a successful attack on the Turks. It is clear that in this plan the initiative was to be removed from the two swords, the Pope and the Emperor, precisely because the text exhibits a form that frequently recalls curial documents. Beside the program of Pius II there now stood a great vision of a united and pacified Europe, with a board of directors consisting of representatives of the league — *congregatio, pax, unio, fraternitas, amicitia* — which was to have its seat, for periods of five years each, first at Basel, then in France, and next in Italy. However, the noteworthy project was denied any great political impact.[31] Gregory Heimburg, well known as a bitter enemy of the Curia, was active as advisor and envoy in the quarrel with the Pope, especially in the next pontificate; he also played an important role in the revolt of Dieter von Isenburg, Archbishop of Mainz.[32]

Pius II is justly regarded as a reform-minded Pope. More than any other Pope of his century he had the opportunity to become acquainted with the *gravamina* against the Curia in all of Europe and to inform himself on the anti-curial sentiment. He had viewed the reform work of the Council of Basel from close at hand and had worked eagerly for its implementation. Right after his election he began comprehensive preparations for general reform and for the reform of the Roman Curia, called for expert opinions, and worked hard on the drawing up of a great reform bull, which, however, did not succeed in being promulgated in his lifetime. In it he did not exhibit any great difference from his predecessors and successors, but he cannot be denied the genuine reform will which was quite often lacking in other Popes. His ideas of reform, especially in regard to the constitution of the Church, had changed very much since the Council of Basel, and it was only natural that as Pope he no longer defended views pertaining to the conciliar theory but rather intended to maintain his primatial prerogatives. In this context belongs his prohibition of appealing to a council in the bull "Execrabilis," a measure which was intended to control the widespread practice, even approved by canonists, of appealing to a council against the Pope. But the prohibition meant only the reaction of a party, and no one who intended to appeal felt himself bound by it, even in the succeeding period. And the question was not settled by the bull, despite what one often finds in print.

---

[30] The text of the oath of 6 May 1458 is preserved in Vat. Archiv AA Arm., I–XVIII, no. 639, in a notarial instrument of 10 November 1466, which King Matthias of Hungary sent to the Curia; printed in A. Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia,* II (1860), no. DLXXX.

[31] V. Vaněček, "Eine Weltfriedensorganisation nach den Vorschlägen des böhmischen Königs Georg von Podiebrad und nach den Ideen des Johannes Amos Comenius," *SAB,* Kl. für Philosophie, Geschichte, Staats-, Rechts- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften, 1962, no. 3 (Berlin 1963); *The Universal Peace Organization of King George of Bohemia. A Fifteenth Century Plan for World Peace 1462/1464* (Prague 1964); *Cultus Pacis. Études et Documents du "Symposium Pragense Cultus Pacis generalis 1464–1964." Commemoratio pacis generalis ante quingentos annos a Georgio Bohemiae rege propositae* (Prague 1966).

[32] P. Joachimsen, *Gregor Heimburg* (Bamberg 1891).

In the outline for the bull "Pastor aeternus" the two still extant testimonials of Dominic de' Domenichi and Nicholas of Cusa were abundantly used, as were passages from earlier election capitulations and especially from the reform ordinances of the Councils of Constance and Basel and the reform decrees since Martin V. The sketch dealt thoroughly with the office and person of the Pope and with his Curia. The cardinals, as the most important rank in the Church, were treated in special depth, and then the individual offices or posts in the Curia: the grand *penitentiarius,* vice-chancellor, protonotaries, *referendarii,* chamberlains, auditors of the *Rota,* papal subdeacons, advocates, secretaries, *cubicularii,* and subordinate court positions. The conclusion consisted of general regulations on the curialists' manner of life, on pluralism, and on the appointing of three *officiales honestatis* to supervise the rules that had been issued. This projected reform bull was very much in accord with the concerns of the age, but, like almost all the reform demands of the fifteenth century, it remained merely a sketch.[33] Reforms affected also the City of Rome and its administration and the Papal State. To safeguard his position Pius II was forced to admit several relatives to the College of Cardinals and to confide important posts to Sienese fellow countrymen.

Hardly any other Pope has so engaged the attention of historians and of others as has Pius II, chiefly because until the most recent period we do not know as much about the personal lives of the Popes as we do about his. A group of treatises, poems, numerous letters, reports, and the *Commentarii* afford a good insight into the interior of this man, who was not only a patron of humanism, as was Nicholas V, but was himself a humanist as this word was understood in the fifteenth century. Since the one-sided and almost always unfavourable presentation by Voigt many interpretations have appeared, and in our own day his picture has been drawn in a more friendly manner, often inclining to the opposite extreme. A man of broad, though not always deep, scholarship, with an eye alert for nature, beauty, and form, he was able to do justice to the demands and expectations of his time and had in his heart "room for varied strata and ideas." Thus his passage from the Council of Basel and its Pope to the other camp was not accomplished without its guarantee. But behind all the vicissitudes of this interesting life there stood, especially in its maturer years, a manifestation of unity, a grandly conceived universalism, which reached full stature in the idea and project of the crusade. In this lay the distinction from his predecessor's *reconquista* concept. With the strength of his intellect and the fluency of his linguistic formation he proclaimed a united Christian Europe and the superiority of its culture, and yet he was aware that his message was utopian, he knew from bitter experience that his lofty plans and soliloquies were bound by the realities of the Italian and European political systems, by which they were decisively checked. His passing at Ancona was the tragic end of a magnanimous soul.

---

[33] R. Haubst, "Der Reformentwurf Pius' II.," *RQ,* 49 (1954), 188–242; E. Iserloh, *Reform der Kirche bei Nikolaus von Kues* (Wiesbaden 1965), and Chapter 59 *infra.*

Paul II (1464–71)

The preparations for choosing a successor to Pius II began in Ancona. Before his death the Pope had decreed that the new election should occur in the place where he died. But the conclave met in Rome and, after some negotiations, in the Vatican. On the first ballot the Venetian Cardinal Peter Barbo, a nephew of Eugene IV, obtained the required majority; after toying with the idea of calling himself Formosus II or Mark II, he assumed the name Paul II. Once again the election was preceded by the drawing up of a capitulation, which to a great extent utilized the text of the previous capitulation, but, because of the experience with Pius II, it included more detailed regulations.[34] Its content is, in short, as follows: continuation of the Turkish war and use of the great alum mines discovered near Tolfa under Pius II for the expenses of the crusade, reform of the Curia within three months of the assumption of the papacy and continuation of the general reform, keeping the chancery fees in line with the prescriptions of the chancery rules of John XXII, keeping the Curia at Rome instead of moving about from place to place, no nomination of cardinals because of requests from outside, respect for the number of twenty-four cardinals as laid down at Constance, observance of the other decrees of Constance, the summoning of a council within the next three years, the paying of 100 florins monthly to cardinals who did not have an annual income of 4,000 florins, filling of the higher benefices only in consistory, the granting of presentations or nominations to benefices only with the consent of a majority of the Sacred College, the prosecuting of cardinals only with the consent of a majority, obligatory consultation in regard to enfeoffments in the Papal State, renunciation of the exercise of *ius spolii* at the deaths of cardinals, express consent of the College for military enterprises, no changing of the amount of taxes and no deals with princes on the taxation of the clergy, the taking of an oath by officials of the Papal State to relinquish their posts *sede vacante*, and the prohibiting of relatives of the Pope from governing strongholds in the Papal State: Civitavecchia, Tivoli, Narni, Spoleto, Soriano, Viterbo, Roccacontrada, and Fano. No bull contradicting these regulations was to be drawn up. These chapters were to be read in the first consistory of every month, and the cardinals were to investigate twice a year how they were being observed. The new Pope was required to ratify the chapters before the election was promulgated. Pastor's estimation of the election capitulation is unfounded, especially in regard to the regulation concerning the government of the Papal State. The prompt observance of the reform prescriptions would have been able to put a halt to the excesses of the period of the so-called Renaissance papacy. The Pope, authoritarian and suspicious by nature, immediately declined to acknowledge the election capitulation, even though he had sworn to observe it. It is clear that the requested testimonials turned out to favour him, but the problem was not and is not thereby solved. The election capitulation, as later altered in some decisive points, was recognized under strong pressure by most of the cardinals, but confidence in the Pope's loyalty had disappeared.

---

[34] *Pastor,* IV, 9 f., 20 ff.; J. Lulvès, *loc. cit.,* 217 f.; *Storia di Milano,* VII (1956), 202, footnote 4, gives an Italian version in twenty-two chapters, from the end of August 1464.

Certainly it was difficult to be the successor of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, and the judgments of the envoys on the new Pope were not exactly friendly in regard to his intelligence and manners. He had been admitted to the Sacred College by his uncle, Eugene IV, when he was only twenty-three and was still lacking in personal merit. As is often true of those of mediocre talents, he tried to get his way by force and hence was feared rather than loved. On the other hand he exerted himself to win the lesser folk by splendid entertainments. As a Cardinal, he had used his immense wealth to begin constructing the huge Palazzo Venezia and planned great collections. He was not uneducated but he was likewise not a narrowly literary type. An aesthete and bibliophile, he pursued predominantly antiquarian interests and laid great stress on magnificent display. He issued a series of practical rules for the administration and care of Rome and the Papal State.

An insuperable distrust of humanists and literary men brought him into a serious conflict with the then modern educational level and damaged his memory. He abruptly abolished the seventy posts of *abbreviator* which Pius II had created as marketable offices; he thereby made bitter enemies out of a large number of humanists. When their spokesman, Bartholomew Platina, protested in violent turns of expression and threatened to appeal to a council, he was consigned to Sant'Angelo and tortured. Paul, probably incorrectly, regarded the so-called Roman Academy of Pomponius Laetus, with its antiquarian democratic ceremonial, as a band of heathen conspirators and resorted to measures which bore no relationship to the situation. The forbidding of the ancient classical authors in the schools likewise did not contribute to his posthumous fame.

As sometimes happens, there occurred at the change of pontificate also a change in the leading personalities and in politics. While in ecclesiastical matters Paul II did not enjoy good relations with his native city, he was at first devoted to it and also to Florence in Italian politics and abandoned the former close connection with Milan and Naples. The death in 1466 of Francis Sforza brought a new uncertainty into the well known instability of the Italian leagues. His son, Galeazzo Maria, managed to secure the succession, but Venice decided to exploit the favourable opportunity. Opposed to Venice was an alliance of Florence, Naples, and Milan that had been concluded at Rome, with the Pope's cooperation, in January 1467. The general of the Most Serene Republic, Colleoni, first moved against Florence, where the Medici were menaced by a great internal opposition. But they contrived to suppress a rising. The Pope intervened in the dispute and commanded peace in a manifest overestimation of his effective power. Gradually the Italian states adhered to the peace but only for a short time. A new quarrel erupted over the cities of the Malatesta, which the Curia was unwilling to let slip from its hold, but it encountered resistance from Milan and Florence. A general alliance, concluded at Rome in 1470 under pressure from the Turkish threat, brought a temporary calm. But the spirit of Lodi could not be reawakened, and, despite his claims, the Pope played a subordinate role.[35]

Shortly before his death Pius II had summoned the Bohemian King, George of Podiebrad, to Rome. With the accession of Paul II the affair came to a standstill and at first efforts were made to settle it amicably. The Emperor, powerfully supported in his difficulties by Podiebrad, interceded for him, as did a group of German princes. However, after the Bohemian had quarrelled with the Emperor and with King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary, the Pope pronounced his excommunication and deposition at the end of December 1466 and called for a crusade against the heretic.[36] Despite threats from within and without, the Bohemian King managed to maintain himself until his death in March 1471, when at Rome there was a willingness to reach an agreement through negotiations.[37]

When Negroponte (Euboea), the last bulwark of Venice in the Levant, was taken by Muhammad II in 1470, the Pope issued a new general summons to the crusade against the Turks and sent invitations to a congress at Rome. But nothing more than the previously mentioned league of Italian states came into being.[38]

---

[35] *Storia di Milano,* VII (1956), 246–49.

[36] K. A. Fink, "Der Kreuzablass gegen Georg Podiebrad in Süd- und Westdeutschland," *QFIAB,* 24 (1932 f.), 207–43.

[37] *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder,* I (1967), 549–54 (with bibliography).

The project of a general council became ever more prominent under Paul II in his constant disputes with France. In his election capitulation the holding of such a council within three years had been demanded. It was not only the understandable dislike of the Curia for a council, which it feared would seek reform of the head, that posed obstacles; with Peter Barbo there was added his own authoritarian and aristocratic concept of his office. When in 1468 the Emperor Frederick III paid a private visit to Rome, he suggested to Paul the organizing of a general assembly, with the participation of Pope and Emperor, at Constance, but he could get only the vain promise of a congress of envoys at Rome.[39] Quite unexpectedly the Pope died in July 1471 at the age of only fifty-three.

Chapter 57

The Popes of the High Renaissance

Sixtus IV (1471–84)

With the pontificate of the former minister general of the Franciscans, Francis della Rovere, one may correctly say that the High Renaissance had begun. For, contrary to all expectations, this son of Saint Francis did not emulate his master. This appears in the election itself, which occurred on 9 April 1471 after a conclave of three days. The election capitulation is extant and offers the usual picture of the last two decades.[1] These regulations, though sworn to by the one elected, were hardly observed by the Popes, and Sixtus IV was no exception. His election was especially promoted by the Duke of Milan, and rich presents were made to him and all the electors.[2] The Franciscan, a native of Liguria, was regarded as an outstanding theologian, who successfully devoted himself to timely controversies, and was a well known and much sought preacher. People were thus all the more amazed at the rapid change in his views, at the preeminence of politics which could not be reconciled with the papacy's religious tasks, at the making of the Papal State into an Italian principality by recourse to all means, lawful and unlawful, and at the unseemly promoting of the Pope's relatives.

---

[38] Babinger, *op. cit.*, 299–308.

[39] H. Jedin, "Sánchez de Arévalo und die Konzilsfrage unter Paul II.," *HJ*, 73 (1954), 95–119; other literature in A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini," *loc cit.*, 213, footnote 21.

[1] U. Manucci, "Le capitolazioni del conclave di Sisto IV, 1471," *RQ*, 29 (1915), 73–90.

[2] For the balloting see *Pastor*, IV, 505–07.

As early as two weeks after his election, the Pope, in flagrant disregard of the sworn election capitulation, raised two nephews, the Franciscans Peter Riario and Julian della Rovere, to the cardinalate; they had already been richly endowed with bishoprics and abbeys. In the election capitulation of 1471 there had been included a tightening of the regulations in regard to additions to the Sacred College. If the Pope were to make creations against the will of the cardinals, at the Pope's death such persons were to lose their dignity and their active and passive vote. If the creation of Julian della Rovere, later Pope Julius II, can be defended, the papal favour shown to Peter Riario fell upon one who was unworthy, who after a life of luxury and vice died in 1474. His position of influence was assumed by still another nephew, Jerome Riario, who became the Pope's evil genius. Married to Catherine Sforza, a natural daughter of Galeazzo Maria Sforza, Duke of Milan, and raised to the rank of Count, he obtained the territories of Imola and Forlì in Romagna, thus anticipating the later Borgia policy. He bears most of the guilt for a policy that was unbecoming to a Pope and that was also unfortunate.

The Pope's strained relations with Florence, which could only regard the consolidation of the neighbouring ecclesiastical political power with opposition and suspicion, came to a climax in the so-called Pazzi conspiracy.[3] Under pressure from his nephew, Jerome Riario, he supported the Florentine banking family of the Pazzi, who were hostile to the Medici, and Siena, which was menaced by Florence. In accord with the manner of the age, the heads of the Medici family were to be disposed of by a *coup de main* during a visit to Florence by the eighteen-year-old Cardinal Sansoni-Riario, a relative of the Pope, and their rule was to be overthrown by attacks on their territory from various quarters. The question whether the Pope had agreed to the intended assassination of Lawrence and Julian Medici can probably be answered in the negative. But he did not keep himself sufficiently aloof from these dangerous plans and he shares complicity in the infamous deed that was perpetrated in the cathedral of Florence during High Mass on 26 April 1478. Julian was killed, but the wounded Lawrence managed to escape. The rising was put down and the adherents of the Medici took a fearful vengeance; among the victims was the young Archbishop of Pisa, Francis Salviati, who was involved in the conspiracy. This violation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the imprisonment of the Cardinal induced the Pope to excommunicate the Medici and later to lay Florence under an interdict. Even though the deploying of troops against Florence accomplished little, the political situation worsened and forced Lawrence to conclude peace with Naples, to the great irritation of the Pope, who was little influenced by the serious remonstrances of Italian and foreign princes.

---

[3] Angelo Poliziano, *Della congiura dei Pazzi a cura di A. Perosa* (Padua 1958), standard edition with important appendixes; F. Morandini, "Il conflitto tra Lorenzo il Magnifico e Sisto IV dopo la congiura de' Pazzi. Dal Carteggio di Lorenzo con Girolamo Morelli, ambasciatore Fiorentino a Milano," *AstIt*, 107 (1949), 113–54.

Two groups now stood in confrontation: Florence, Naples, Milan, and Ferrara on the one side, and on the other the Pope, Venice, and the Angevins, who now renewed their old claims to Naples with favourable prospects. And Jerome Riario, who, like the Borgias later, intended to construct for himself in Romagna a state of his own that should, so far as possible, survive the death of his uncle, was once again the author of a new war in Italy. Once he had added Forlì to Imola, he cast his glance on Ferrara, in which Venice also was interested. The year 1482 saw almost all the Italian powers engaged in the new war.[4] The victory of the papal and Venetian troops under Robert Malatesta at Campo Morto in the Pontine Marshes in the summer of 1482 brought no decision, for in this period political negotiations were almost always more successful than military operations. A conference at Cremona in 1483 was unable to end the disputes, and the Pope, once again rapidly changing his allies, proceeded against Venice with spiritual penalties. The Peace of Bagnolo in 1484 confirmed the *status quo* and brought the Pope and his nephew, not the expected acquisition of territory in Romagna, but instead dangerous risings in Rome and Latium and strife between Colonna and Orsini. The eventful years 1482–84 also witnessed the threat of an attempt to convoke a council.

The election capitulations made it clear that the decrees of the reform Councils of Constance and Basel were not forgotten, even though here too they gradually became a *topos*. The opinions on the conciliar idea that were often defended in the course of the fifteenth century, the numerous appeals to a council, and the efforts to convoke one also showed this. The papal prohibitions made no difference, for they were rightly regarded as the measures of one faction and a council could be prevented by them at any time. The threat of a reform council was one of the means resorted to in the political struggle with the papacy and the Papal State, but it seldom materialized.[5] However, it did go that far in the pontificate of Sixtus IV. Andrew Zamometič, titular Bishop of Granea, near Saloniki, tried to revive the

---

[4] R. Cessi, "Per la storia della guerra di Ferrara, 1482–1483," *Notizie degli Archivi di Stato,* 8 (1948), 63–72; G. Coniglio, "La participazione del Regno di Napoli alla guerra di Ferrara 1482–1484," *Partenope* (Naples), 2 (1961), 53–74.

[5] *Jedin,* II, 73–79 (English translation, I, 92–100); *idem, Giovanni Gozzadini, ein Konziliarist am Hofe Julius' II. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge,* II (1966), 17–74; *idem,* "Sánchez de Arévalo und die Konzilsfrage unter Paul II.," *HJ,* 73 (1954), 95–119; K. A. Fink, "Die konziliare Idee im späten Mittelalter," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* 9 (1965), 119–34.

Council of Basel, which in his view had not yet been concluded.[6] His summons, proclaimed in the Basel Münster in March 1482, with its citation of the Pope, was anything but politically clever, and what induced him to make it has never been clarified. By origin a South Slav, he entered the Dominican order in his youth and studied at Padua, where he became a friend of Francis della Rovere. For some time he acted in a diplomatic capacity for the Emperor Frederick III but became unpopular because of his sharp criticism of the Curia and for a time was detained in the Castel Sant'Angelo. He apparently decided that the Pope's embarrassment in the Ferrara War was the proper moment for taking action on the council that had so often been called for, for deposing the Pope, and for finally undertaking and carrying through the reform of Curia and Church. The survival of the conciliar idea was not without the assent and encouragement of all the opponents of the Rovere Pope, who laid an interdict on Basel. The council did not actually materialize and the Emperor, after some wavering, finally came out against both the council and the conciliar city and had Zamometič imprisoned. The Bishop died at Basel two years later, probably by suicide.[7]

The first task of the new Pope mentioned in the election capitulation of 1471, the crusade against the Turks, was taken very seriously by Sixtus IV in the first years of his pontificate, and immediately after his accession he issued a solemn summons and dispatched five cardinal legates to all the greater states of the West. A fleet was equipped at great expense, but after modest successes on the coast of Asia Minor it returned to Italy. The succeeding undertakings were not in keeping with the great plans at the beginning, and the hope aroused by the marriage at Rome of the Great Prince of Russia, Ivan III, and the niece of the last Byzantine Emperor in regard to union with the Russian Church remained only a wish. That nothing really decisive occurred at a time so favourable for an attack on Muhammad II — the Sultan was seriously threatened in the eastern part of his realm by the Turcoman chief, Usun Hasan — was due to the lack of determination in the commanders of the Venetian fleet and especially to the failure of the Emperor and the other Western princes to participate and must not be blamed on the Pope. This procrastinating attitude of the West did not change during the remainder of his pontificate, and Italian politics and the effort to provide for his importunate relatives claimed his energies to an ever greater degree. The outcome was actually a landing of Turkish troops in Apulia, where Otranto was occupied by them for more than a year. The news of the Muslim invasion of the Italian peninsula aroused fear and dread. However, even this extremely grave situation was unable to induce Western Christendom to a common energetic action against the infidel, especially since the great Sultan died in 1481 and the peril now seemed to have been exorcised for some time.[8]

---

[6] J. Schlecht, *Andrea Zamometič und der Basler Konzilsversuch vom Jahre 1482* (Paderborn 1903); A. Stoecklin, *Der Basler Konzilsversuch des Andrea Zamometič vom Jahre 1482* (Basel 1938); *Jedin*, I, 101–06 (English version).

[7] Sixtus IV's interest in the reform councils, understandable in view of the circumstances of the time, is reflected in his notes on *Cod. Vat. lat.* 1335; see H. Finke, *Acta conc. Constant.*, IV (1928), p. XIX.

From the religious viewpoint also the pontificate of Sixtus IV cannot be described as fortunate. The thirty-four cardinals — six of them were his nephews — whom he created contrary to the electoral capitulations were for the most part hardly worthy men and carried further the secularization of the papacy and of the Sacred College. Consequently, the Rovere Pope bears a heavy responsibility for the history of Christianity and of the Church. The reckless multiplication of curial posts and the increase of the Roman court also belong to the shady side of his reign. The Curia's fiscality mounted rapidly under Sixtus IV, as the need for money for the numerous costly undertakings and the paying of the mercenaries required for these, the expenditures on art and luxury, on the maintenance of the court, and on providing for the papal relatives increased just as rapidly.[9] The instituting of many new marketable posts and the frequent granting of indulgences brought in important revenue.[10] The financial administration, in particular the extraordinary, came more and more into the hands of the *Datarius,* who thereby became the most powerful figure in the Curia. His competence included the money for the crusade, the sale of offices, and indulgences, and the composition, or "deal," acted essentially as his method of procedure. In such a system it is obvious that much was possible. On the other hand, one must not fail to mention the care, reminiscent of Nicholas V, for humanists and men of letters and for scholarship, the refurnishing of the Vatican Library, and the establishing of the Vatican archives; the most important documents of *privilegia* were taken to Sant'Angelo.[11] With the name of Sixtus IV is forever connected the transformation of mediaeval Rome into a Renaissance city. This includes the new streets, as the need for these was made clear by the crowds of pilgrims in the Jubilee of 1475, the Ponte Sisto over the Tiber, the churches of Santa Maria del Popolo, burial place of the della Rovere, and Santa Maria della Pace, the new hospital of Santo Spirito, numerous palaces of cardinals and other high prelates, and especially the great new palace chapel in the Vatican, the Sistine Chapel, which received its first decorations from the Umbrian masters. The Pope's bronze monument by Pollaiuolo, now in the crypts under Saint Peter's, is one of the finest of papal graves.

---

[8] F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer,* 430–35; O. Halecki, "Sixte IV et la Chrétienté orientale," *SteT,* 232 (1964), 241–64, seeks to give greater stress than has hitherto been accorded to Sixtus IV's interest in the East.

[9] C. Bauer, "Studi per la storia delle finanze papali durante il pontificato di Sisto IV," *ASRomana,* 50 (1927), 319–400; P. Partner, "The 'Budget' of the Roman Church in the Renaissance Period," *Italian Renaissance Studies,* ed. E. F. Jacob (London 1960), 256–78.

[10] E. Göller, "Deutsche Kirchenablässe unter Papst Sixtus IV.," *RQ,* 31 (1923), 55–70.

[11] K. A. Fink, *Das Vatikanische Archiv* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1951), 2.

The stressing of the personal goodness and piety of Sixtus IV cannot prevent our seeing in him the one who upset the Italian balance of power by his unfortunate political enterprises. And he bears the chief guilt for the further progress of the Roman Curia into unbridled nepotism and worldliness.

Innocent VIII (1484–92)

The death of Sixtus IV was followed in Rome by a storm against the "Genoese," who, so the Romans and the inhabitants of the Papal State thought, had occupied all the good positions under the Ligurian Pope; it was a repetition of what had happened earlier to the "Catalans" and the "Sienese" on the deaths of Calixtus III and Pius II. The chroniclers do not tire of reporting the insecurity, the unrest, the plundering, and the street fighting during the vacancy, but these lasted throughout the reign of the new Pope. The hitherto all powerful Jerome Riario was away from Rome, campaigning against the Colonna, but his undaunted wife, Catherine Sforza, seized the Castel Sant'Angelo and thereby maintained his rule for a while. After lengthy negotiations between the Sacred College and the mutually hostile groups it was possible to remove the many troops from Rome, and the conclave could begin in the Vatican. It lasted only from 26 to 29 August. Twenty-five cardinals took part, and they were again split into two factions: on the one side was the Vice-chancellor Borgia, the Orsini, Milan, and Naples; on the other side, Julian della Rovere with the Colonna and Venice. The election capitulation, transmitted by the master of ceremonies, Burckard of Strasbourg, differs in form from earlier ones by its strict distinction between the general arrangements in regard to a council, the Turkish War, and reform of Church and Curia and the special regulations for the cardinals, but in content it scarcely deviates from the previous rules.[12] After it had become clear that he had no prospects, Cardinal Julian della Rovere managed to carry the election of Cardinal John Baptist Cibò, Bishop of Molfetta, who belonged to a Genoese noble family and was sickly and totally dependent on him. His having signed the petitions of several cardinals in his cell on the night before his election can scarcely be regarded as other than transparent bribery and simony.[13] Formally elected on the following morning, he called himself Innocent VIII, thereby acknowledging the Roman line of claimants in the Western Schism. From the period preceding his entry into the clergy he had several bastards, who, in accord with the new style, were now suitably provided for by marriage into Italian princely houses.

---

[12] *Burckardi Liber notarum*, ed. Celani, I, 30–43.

[13] *Ibid.*, 47: "facte sunt diverse practice et tandem XVII vel circa, rr. morum dd. cardinalium vota addicta in favorem r.mi d. cardinalis Melfitensis, qui in nocte sequenti, ante horam sextam noctis, incepit in camera sua signare supplicationes ad instantiam quorundam cardinalium; genuflexus super uno genu, supplicationes super quodam forzerio ante se positas signabat, cardinalibus aliquibus circumstantibus, qui signaturas huiusmodi expectabant."

In politics the Pope, who was a lover of peace, opposed the great league of Naples, Milan, Florence, Siena, Lucca, Spain, and the Orsini, while Venice remained neutral. His most bitter opponent was Ferrante of Naples, who created anxiety for the Pope by the threat of a council, by risings in the Papal State, and by stirring up the Hungarian King, Matthias Corvinus, after Innocent had allied with the rebel barons of the Neapolitan Kingdom in a manner that was both awkward and not welcome to the other powers. Appeals to France for help were unsuccessful and so in the summer of 1486 the Papal State had to accept a peace that was scarcely favourable. The marriage of Maddalena, daughter of Lawrence de' Medici, with the Pope's son, Franceschetto, brought about a temporary reconciliation with Florence. But the smouldering opposition to Naples led in 1489 to a new war and to the imposing of ecclesiastical censures on the King and his territory. Peace and an understanding with Naples were reached shortly before the Pope's death in 1492.[14]

The chronically ill Pope was subject to the influence, really to the domination, of the strong personality of Julian della Rovere. Only during the Cardinal's absence from Rome did the Pope make any decisions of his own, and for the most part these sought weakly to effect compromise. The constant lack of money could not be corrected even by the multiplying of marketable offices and similar practices. Thus the traditional six posts in the ancient College of Apostolic Secretaries, which had become renowned because of the humanist culture of their holders, were increased to thirty and disposed of in return for appropriate payments.

A remarkable figure arrived at the Curia in the person of the Turkish Prince Dschem, son of Muhammad II and brother of the reigning Sultan Bajazet II. He fled from snares laid by his brother, who rightly saw in him a rival to his authority, first to Rhodes and, at the price of a cardinal's hat for the grand master of the Hospitallers, was handed over to the Pope as an extremely valuable political pawn. The Sultan paid a large sum annually to keep him confined and abstained from direct undertakings against Italy. It is going too far to say that this arrangement meant an alliance with infidels. A conference at Rome in 1490, which was intended to unite the West for a crusade against the Turks, was without results. The reign of the Cibò Pope was almost constantly filled with disturbances in Rome, and it was necessary to fortify the Vatican and the palaces of the cardinals. On the whole it was an unfortunate and weak pontificate in an age which needed a strong, reform-minded personality.

---

[14] P. Fedele, "La pace del 1468 tra Ferdinando d'Aragona e Innocenzo VIII," *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane,* 30 (1905), 480–503; R. Palmarocchi, "La politica italiana di Lorenzo de' Medici. Firenze nella guerra contro Innocenzo VIII," *Biblioteca storica Toscana,* 8 (Florence 1933); E. Pontieri, "L'atteggiamento di Venezia nel conflitto tra papa Innocenzo VIII e Ferrante I d'Aragona, 1483–1492," *Archivio storico Napoletano,* 81 (1962), 197–324.

Alexander VI (1492–1503)

Innocent VIII died on the night of 25–26 July 1492. Because of his poor health and his repeated sicknesses there had been much concern about the succession in both the Sacred College and the chanceries of Europe. Among the twenty-three cardinals who entered the conclave at the Vatican on 6 August there can be discerned two factions, one of them centring on Ascanius Sforza and the Vice-Chancellor Rodrigo Borgia, the other on Sixtus IV's nephew, Julian della Rovere, who had exercised the greatest influence on Innocent. In these factions was reflected the rivalry between Louis *il Moro* of Milan and King Ferrante of Naples. Pretty reliable reports tell of the availability of large sums for the conclave in various quarters. No election capitulation has thus far come to light; apparently the Sacred College was satisfied with the detailed capitulation of the previous conclave and made a few alterations. The votes in the three ballotings of 8 to 10 August have come down to us, even though the lists must be used with great care. In any event they show that neither faction could expect a quick achieving of the two-thirds majority. But then, in the late evening of 10 August, the election of the Vice-chancellor was assured for the following morning. Since the Dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal Borgia, was not at first regarded as a serious candidate — though from national rather than moral considerations, — an explanation of the sudden turn of events is desired. It is hardly possible to doubt that simoniacal intrigues produced the change. Even if in earlier cases, following the completing of an election, gifts that were at times of considerable value were distributed among the electors, it appears to have become customary in the second half of the fifteenth century to reach precise agreements beforehand in regard to money, benefices, and curial posts in return for the gaining of votes, and this is certainly simony. In this election simony was openly admitted by contemporaries and was mentioned as a possible point of attack on the new Pope in case of need.[15]

Not much exception was taken to his moral defects in the conclave and just as little in the chanceries of kings, princes, and cities when the outcome of the election was made known. The obedience and joy over this election, as expressed by numerous embassies, indicate, even while taking into consideration the formalities and flattery usual on this occasion, the gratification that, after the sickly Innocent VIII, an important politician and a capable statesman was elected. If difficulties should occur, one could always go back to the simoniacal election and the unspiritual manner of life.[16]

---

[15] Soranzo, *Studi intorno a Papa Alessandro VI,* 1–33: "L'assunzione al pontificato del cardinale Rodrigo Borgia"; F. La Torre, *Del conclave di Alessandro VI, papa Borgia* (Florence and Rome 1933); Picotti, *Nuovi studi,* 181–207, lists of balloting, 243–47.

Alexander VI, as he styled himself, was born around 1430 at Játiva near Valencia; a nephew of Cardinal Borja (Borgia in Italian), he came to Italy and studied at Bologna. When his uncle had become Pope Calixtus III, he was admitted to the Sacred College, with the assent of all the cardinals present, in the very first year of the pontificate, and a year later he obtained the very lucrative post of Vice-Chancellor of the Roman Church. Because of the large number of his benefices, among them several bishoprics and rich abbeys, he was regarded as being the richest Cardinal of his time next to the French Cardinal d'Estouteville. Corresponding to this wealth was a mode of life that was decidedly not exemplary, the sort that had, it is true, become widespread at the Curia and especially among the cardinals and other high prelates since the pontificate of Sixtus IV. Since, as Cardinal and even as Pope, he had no concern for popular gossip, the curiosity of those responsible for the *chronique scandaleuse* then and later could amply occupy itself with the alleged or real number of his children. In the years 1462–71 were born to him Peter Louis, Jerónima, and Isabella, the names of whose mothers have not come down to us. Best known are those born of his liaison with Vannozza de Cattaneis, Caesar, John, Geoffrey, and Lucretia, who, after his election to the papacy, were at once provided for in the manner of princes and who claimed an excessive share of the Pope's interests.[17] John, born in 1476, became, after the early death of his brother Peter Louis, Duke of Gandía in Spain and then, despite his unfitness, was given honorary posts in Rome, made captain general of the papal troops in the struggle against the Orsini, and enfeoffed with the Duchy of Benevento, which was detached from the Papal State. His sensational assassination in 1497 has never been cleared up, though suspicion was directed against Cardinal Ascanius Sforza, the Orsini, and later even Caesar Borgia.

Most pernicious of all was Caesar's influence on the Pope. Born in 1475, he was richly endowed with benefices while still a youth by Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII. After his father's election as Pope he obtained at the age of eighteen several bishoprics, including the wealthy see of Valencia, and in

---

[16] G. Soranzo, "Documenti inediti o poco noti all'assunzione al pontificato di Alessandro VI," *Archivi*, serie II, 19 (1952), 157–78.

[17] On the order of births of Vannozza's children — Caesar, John, Lucretia, Geoffrey — see Bellonici, 27, 71, Schüller-Piroli, 179, 559. On Vannozza's tombstone, formerly in Santa Maria del Popolo, now in San Marco, see A. Ferrua, "Ritrovamento dell'epitafio di Vannozza Cattaneo," *ASRomana*, 71 (1948), 139–41.

1493 he was made a Cardinal. On the death of his brother John he resigned the cardinalate, without serious objections from the Sacred College; he had advanced only to the diaconate. He now became Duke of Valentinois and married a French princess. His sphere of action was especially Romagna, where, supported by copiously flowing streams of money from the Curia and given the title of Duke of Romagna by the Pope, he began to bring together the small petty lordships into a large territorial state and threatened Tuscany. Caesar's administration was esteemed by the inhabitants but distrusted by the nearby city states, since an alteration of the balance of power was feared. These enterprises helped to centralize the Papal State and could later be regarded as a model for the policy of Julius II. Just the same, this grand-style nepotism involved the danger that such territory would be severed from the ancient possessions of the Roman Church. The Pope's death caused Caesar's star to fade rapidly, and the unscrupulous and brutal man found a soldier's death in Navarre in 1507 after various changes of fate.[18]

The favourite daughter, Lucretia, was born in 1480 and was destined for a princely future through great projects of marriage. After earlier engagements to various Spanish nobles she first contracted marriage in 1493: the Count of Pesaro, a relative of the House of Sforza, was chosen for political reasons. A declaration of nullity because of the husband's alleged impotence brought about the dissolution of the marriage in 1497. This was soon followed by Lucretia's marriage to the Neapolitan, Alfonso, Duke of Bisceglie. With the changing of papal policy in the direction of France, he was murdered by Caesar's minions in the Vatican palace during the Holy Year 1500. The next year saw Lucretia's third marriage, this time to Alfonso d'Este of Ferrara. The Pope's daughter survived the ruin of the House of Borgia until her death in 1519.[19]

Vannozza's youngest child, Geoffrey, was born in 1482. In 1494 he married Sancia of Aragón, a bastard daughter of Alfonso II of Naples, and became Prince of Squillace. He died in 1517.

Great difficulties await any effort to pass judgment on Alexander's relationship with Julia Farnese, sister of Cardinal Alexander Farnese, the later Pope Paul III. As a Cardinal he had himself blessed her marriage to Orsino Orsini. Soranzo's attempt to prove that Rodrigo Borgia's connection with "la bella Giulia" while he was a Cardinal and when he was Pope was innocent is probably not successful, despite the ingenuity devoted to the interpretation of the Pope's celebrated letters.[20] And the two boys born during

---

[18] C. Fusero, *Cesare Borgia* (Milan 1958); Schüller-Piroli, 319–97.

[19] M. Bellonci, *Lucrezia Borgia,* German trans. *Lucrezia Borgia, nicht Teufel, nicht Engel, nur Weib* (Berlin, Vienna, and Leipzig 1941).

[20] G. Soranzo, "Orsino Orsini, Adriana di Mila sua madre, e Giulia Farnese, sua moglie, nei loro rapporti con papa Alessandro VI," *Archivi,* 26 (1959), 119–50; *idem, Studi intorno a papa Alessandro VI,* 92–129: "Il presunto scandalo di Giulia Farnese e papa Alessandro

Alexander's pontificate, John, the *Infans Romanus*, in 1498 and Rodrigo in 1503, very probably had the Pope for their father; but these continue to be open questions, since such matters, for obvious reasons, lacked clarity from the outset.[21]

Alexander's policies as ruler of the Papal State were generally shrewd. This was of great importance, since in the epoch of the Renaissance papacy, far more so than previously or later, the administration of the Papal State was regarded as a standard for evaluating a pontificate. The Italian peninsula was the site where the great European contests were decided. The political entities of Italy were, despite their widely divergent interests, deeply concerned for the preserving of the laboriously achieved balance of power and reacted very sensitively to outside interference. As interference must be understood the constant wrangling between Spain and France, which had gained a footing in Naples and Milan. After first inclining toward the Sforza of Milan, the Pope veered to Naples and maintained this position when Charles VIII of France in 1494–95 undertook his famous but ill-starred expedition through Italy *en route* to Naples. Although the French King put strong pressure on the Pope at Rome, Alexander did not yield to the demand for investiture with the Neapolitan Kingdom; he alone energetically represented an Italy free from foreigners. When the French army decided to withdraw because of the concluding in March 1495 of the Holy League between the Pope, Venice, Milan, the Emperor Maximilian I, and Spain, the Pope avoided a meeting with the foreign King and vanished into the strongholds of Orvieto and Perugia. In the second half of his pontificate he moved ever closer to France under Caesar's influence and agreed to the partition of Naples between France and Spain. The enduring quarrels of the petty lords in the Papal State, especially the rivalries of the Roman families of Colonna, Orsini, and Savelli, caused him great difficulties. Quite often the Pope had to seek shelter in Sant'Angelo, and he did not hesitate to proceed with severe ecclesiastical penalties against the disturbers of peace. He was not prudish in his choice of means and in this respect conformed to the style of other princely courts. This is the explanation of his dealings with the Turkish Sultan Bajazet II to keep the French out of South Italy.[22]

VI"; G. Gasca Queirazza, *Gli scritti autografi di Alessandro VI nell' "Archivum Arcis": Studi intorno alla Lingua* (Quaderni di filologia Romanza, 3 [Turin 1959]).

[21] G. Soranzo, "La più grave accusa data a papa Borgia," *Archivi*, 28 (1961), 179–88.

[22] G. Soranzo, *Il tempo di Alessandro VI papa*, 53–157: "Papa Alessandro VI e la discesa di Carlo VIII, re di Francia, in Italia"; H. Pfeffermann, *Die Zusammenarbeit der Renaissancepäpste mit den Türken* (Winterthur 1946), 93–121, where the case is overstated; *cf.* F. Babinger, "Mehmed II., der Eroberer, und Italien," *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante*, 1 (1962), 172–200, especially 185; A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini," *RömHM*, 8/9 (1964–66), 373, footnote 78, with copious bibliography; G. Soranzo, "Due singolari giudizi sul governo temporale dei Papi

With regard to the figure of the Prior of San Marco at Florence, Jerome Savonarola, persons are greatly divided, and on their interpretations depends to a great extent their judgment of the Borgia Pope. A learned and mystically gifted theologian and ardent advocate of a strict religious discipline, he was drawn into politics as a passionate preacher of reform and was especially involved in a leading capacity in the upheavals at Florence in the last decade of the fifteenth century. His prophetic preaching, originating in a consciousness of a special mission, seemed to be confirmed in the French King's expedition to Italy and the ensuing overthrow of the House of Medici. The religious and democratic system of government that he brought about at Florence and the conversion of large groups to an edifying life were, however, of only brief duration. His clash with the Pope had political rather than theological causes, namely his support of the refusal by the Florentine *signoria* to join the great Italian league against France. For the King of France was intended, in a total misunderstanding of reality, the task of reforming Church and Curia by the convoking of a general council and of replacing Alexander by a more worthy Pope. After long and patient waiting the Curia took action by excommunicating Savonarola and threatening Florence with interdict. The disregard of the ecclesiastical censures and the ordeal by fire, which was tensely awaited by the public but which did not materialize, produced a quick revulsion and imprisonment, torture, and execution in May 1498, after an obliging ecclesiastical court had condemned Savonarola as a heretic. The controversial Dominican was obviously a victim of the rapidly changing sympathy of the Florentine masses, of the hostility of some of his own confrères, and of the rivalry of other orders. If Pastor has judged him one-sidedly, especially on the question of his obedience or disobedience to the Curia, and has rendered too superficial a decision, more recent critics incline to regard him as a martyr and, in the query whether he was a heretic or a saint, to opt for the latter.[23]

---

della fine del secolo XV e dei primi anni del secolo XVI," *Studi Romagnoli* (Faenza), 11 (1960), 335–47.

[23] *Edizione nazionale delle opere di Girolamo Savonarola* (Rome 1955 ff.); M. Ferrara, *Savonarola, Prediche e scritti commentati e collegati da un racconto biografico*, 2 vols. (Florence 1952), II, 75–234, bibliografia ragionata; J. Schnitzer, *Savonarola. Ein Kulturbild aus der Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Munich 1924); S. Merkle, "Der Streit um Savonarola," *Hochland*, 27, 2 (1929 f.), 462–85, also in S. Merkle, *Ausgewählte Reden und Aufsätze* (Würzburg 1965), 177–98; R. Ridolfi, *Studi Savonaroliani*, 2 vols. (Florence 1935); *idem*, *Vita di G. Savonarola*, 2 vols. (Florence 1952); *Studi Savonaroliani: Deputazione provinciale Ferrarese di storia patria, Atti e memorie*, Nuova serie, vol. 7 (1952), parte prima; M. Ferrara, *Discorso*, parte seconda: I. Farneti, *Luoghi e tempi di edizioni e di raccolte Savonaroliane; Accademia d'Oropa. Alessandro VI e Savonarola. Brevi e lettere* (Turin 1950), various contributions, 217–45: Saggio bibliografico; M. de la Bedoyère, *The Meddlesome Friar* (London 1958); G. Soranzo, *Il tempo di Alessandro VI Papa e di Fra G. Savonarola* (Milan 1960); G. Picotti, *Alessandro VI, Savonarola*, etc., 60–67; G. Gieraths, *Savonarola. Ketzer oder Heiliger* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1961, with bibliography);

Despite all the evil that can be said of Alexander VI, in the external ecclesiastical sphere he can seldom be taken to task. Well known is his predilection for magnificent liturgical displays, to which his imposing figure gave particular splendour. The Jubilee of 1500 was celebrated in Rome with many ecclesiastical rites in which the Pope usually took part. The ceremonies of the opening of the holy door at the beginning of the Jubilee Year go back to him. The assassination of his favourite son, John, and the collapsing of a ceiling in the Vatican palace during a severe storm, with great danger to the Pope, provided the occasion for taking up the long discussed questions of Church reform. Alexander appointed a reform commission of worthy and learned cardinals and competent theologians. It worked hard and drew up an admirable program for reform of head and members, but the reform bull that was prepared was never issued. Its draft holds an important place in the long series of reform testimonials. Patronage of the religious orders, especially of the Augustinians and the Minims, lay very close to the Pope's heart.

The drawing of the famous line of demarcation 100 leagues west of the Azores between Spanish and Portuguese possessions and newly discovered areas confirms the prestige enjoyed by the Holy See and even by Alexander. Agreements over the lands wrested from the Muslims and the recently discovered islands had been reached earlier by the two seafaring powers and were ratified by the Curia. The bulls issued in 1493, shortly after the discovery of America by Columbus, dealt with what was clearly an act of investiture in favour of Castile, and in 1494 this was followed by the important Treaty of Tordesillas. An expert knowledge of the questions at stake seems not to have been present at the Curia or anywhere else.[24]

E. Garin, *G. Savonarola: La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano* (Florence 1961), 183–212; G. Schwaiger, "Savonarola und seine Zeit," *MThZ*, 12 (1961), 210–14; R. Elia, "Precisazioni sulla figura del Savonarola," *Sapienza*, 17 (Rome 1964), 545–50; C. Loubet, *Savonarole prophète assassiné?* (Paris 1967).

[24] P. de Leturia, *Relaciones entre la S. Sede e Hispanoamérica*, I (*An Gr* 101, Rome 1959), especially 153–204; *Las grandes bulas misionales de Alejandro VI, 1493* (with very detailed literature), 511–19: "La bula Alejandrina 'Inter coetera' del 4 de mayo de 1493 (with literature); E. Staedler, "Die 'donatio Alexandrina' und die 'divisio mundi' von 1493," *AkathKR*, 117 (1937), 363–402; *idem*, "Die Urkunde Alexanders VI. zur westindischen Investitur der Krone Spaniens von 1493," *AUF*, 15 (1938), 145–58; *idem*, "Die sog. westindische Schenkung Alexanders VI. von 1493 als kirchengeschichtliches Rechtsproblem," *ZKG*, 62 (1943 f.), 127–63; *idem*, "Die westindischen Lehnsedikte Alexanders VI. (1493)," *AkathKR*, 118 (1938), 337–78; *idem*, "Zum Datierungsproblem der vier vatikanischen Westindien-Urkunden vom 3. und 4. Mai 1493," *AUF*, 18 (1944), 196–209; C. de Witte, "Les bulles pontificales et l'expansion portugaise au XV^e siècle," *RHE*, 48 (1953), 683–718, 49 (1954), 438–61, 51 (1956), 413–53, 809–36, 53 (1958), 5–46; A. García Gallo, *Las bulas de Alejandro VI y el ordenamiento jurídico de la expansión portuguesa y castellana en África e Indias* (Madrid 1958); A. de la Hera, "El tema de la bulas indianas de Alejandro VI," *Estudios Americanos*, 19 (1960), 257–68.

In regard to the Pope's death in August 1503, following a severe fever, there are varying reports and varying interpretations. A mix-up in a poisoned drink destined for the host at a garden party is said to have resulted in the Pope's death a few days later, while the equally ill Caesar escaped with his life. Many historians, however, defend the more probable view that the dangerous Roman fever was the cause of death.[25]

No other pontificate has evoked so much lively discussion and disagreement. Of fundamental importance is the question of the reliability of the data in the diary of the papal master of ceremonies, Burckard of Strasbourg. If he has been only too easily trusted in the past and his often exaggerated accounts have been taken literally, today he is evaluated with considerably more caution and with attention to his pathological traits. His statements on Alexander were certainly prompted by hatred and hence require a careful investigation to the extent this is possible from the sources.[26] If one disregards the many fictitious writings, composed to satisfy the need for the sensational and historically worthless, there is still left a sufficient quantity of literature that is to be taken seriously. During Alexander's own pontificate there were many critical voices, which, it is true, often had a political origin. In more recent times the dispute broke out especially because of Pastor's estimation of Savonarola in his *History of the Popes,* and a group of critics made their appearance. In addition, several Catalan and Spanish authors sought to refute the charges against their countryman, but without great success. Ferrara's book, appearing in many editions, took the easy way out by passing off as later fabrications the for the most part undoubtedly authentic documents in the Vatican archives. Thus, while his attempted rehabilitation may contain occasional correctives, it loses its credibility.[27]

The vindication of Alexander by Olmos y Canalda is of even less value. On the other hand, the dispute that went on for years between two Italian historians, Soranzo and Picotti, is of great importance. Soranzo's many studies deal with almost all the charges against the Pope, but, while they correct numerous details, they are unable to avoid an apologetic warmth. Picotti seems to come closer to historical truth, but one will always have to take both authors into consideration in order to arrive at a judgment.

The Renaissance papacy reached its climax in the remarkable personality of Alexander VI, for evil practices that had been hitherto customary were now present in abundance and were tolerated by the cardinals: a failure to observe celibacy even as Pope, dissolution of marriages from purely political motives, granting of high ecclesiastical office, including the cardinalate, in return for considerable sums, extremes of nepotism in the providing for children to the detriment of the Papal State, the administering of the apostolic palace by the Pope's daughter Lucretia, who was also regent of Spoleto for a year, — and yet Rodrigo Borgia refused to be outdone by anyone in the firmness of his faith.

---

[25] J. Schnitzer, *Der Tod Alexanders VI., eine quellenkritische Untersuchung* (Munich 1929); *idem,* "Um den Tod Alexanders VI.," *HJ,* 50 (1930), 256–60; *Seppelt-Schwaiger,* IV (1957), 387.

[26] J. Lesellier, "Les méfaits du cérémonier Jean Burckard," *MAH,* 44 (1927), 11–34; Picotti, *Nuovi Studi,* 173–80: II. "La tradizione manoscritta e il valore storico dei 'Libri' di Giovanni Burckard"; F. Wasner, "Eine unbekannte Handschrift des Diarium Burckardi," *HJ,* 83 (1964), 300–31, indicates Burckard's tendentious reporting in regard to Alexander VI, especially in the interpolations, from a hitherto unknown codex in Naples.

[27] See the titles in the bibliography for this chapter.

Pius III (1503)

The unexpected death of Alexander VI produced much commotion in Rome and the Papal State. The opponents of the Borgia saw that their hour had struck, especially since Caesar lay seriously ill. But he still exercised a great influence and he intended to use it. The College of Cardinals contrived to induce him to leave Rome, and hence the conclave of 16–21 September could proceed calmly with its business in the Vatican. This time, however, the election capitulation of 1484 was adopted with the express injunction that a general council had to be convoked within two years, and then one was to meet every five years, especially for the reform of the Church. Apparently these details in regard to time in what was otherwise a general formula in every election capitulation came from the Sienese Cardinal Piccolomini, who also inserted the maximum of twenty-four cardinals, which was contained in the reform decrees and agreements of the past century. The candidates with the best prospects were Julian della Rovere and the French Cardinal George d'Amboise, Archbishop of Rouen. But since neither could gain the required number of votes, Pius II's nephew, Francis Todeschini-Piccolomini, who was seriously ill, was elected as a "caretaker" Pope. The pontificate of Pius III lasted only twenty-six days. Contemporaries and posterity regarded the briefness of his reign as a great misfortune, since the convoking of a general council and serious reform measures could have been expected from him.[28]

Julius II (1503–13)

Matters were to turn out quite differently and a man was to obtain the tiara who would be reckoned among the forceful and great Popes, at least from a worldly viewpoint: Julius II.

The few days of the pontificate of Pius III did not suffice to alter the general situation and so the same groups confronted each other in the new conclave. But now Julian della Rovere, whom people on all sides wanted as Pope, succeeded in outwitting the crafty Caesar Borgia while assuring him of his good will. This got him the votes of the Spanish cardinals. They, like many others, were won by generous bribes, so that without doubt the election must be called simoniacal. One of the shortest conclaves in papal history ended on the very first day with the election of della Rovere, who styled himself Julius II. Although, as was customary after the completion of the election, he swore to abide by the arrangements of the Sacred College, he had no intention of keeping these and other promises, as Caesar Borgia especially was to learn. With a firm grip the new Pope took hold of the reins and inaugurated a pontificate which was filled with great policies and military enterprises such as no other could claim. He was now sixty years old and had been made a Cardinal by his uncle, Sixtus IV, as long ago as 1471 when he was a young Franciscan. He had had great experience in all secular affairs and ways of life and was brilliantly gifted. Under Innocent VIII he was regarded as the reigning Pope, but under Alexander VI he left Italy for France, only to return for a short time with the French King on his expedition to Naples.

---

[28] A. A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini," *RömHM*, 8/9 (1964/66), 101–425.

Building on the political successes of the Borgia in the Papal State, his goal was the consolidation of his state — something which could be achieved only by keeping the great powers out of Italy. His policy was pursued in three stages: the assuring of papal authority in Rome and the Papal State, the winning back of lost territories, and the expelling of the "foreigners" from the Italian peninsula. And so he is regarded in Italian historiography as a proponent of Italian unification. In the very first year of his reign he undertook the celebrated expedition to wrest the two important cities of Perugia and Bologna from their local tyrants, the Baglioni and the Bentivogli. It was more difficult to persuade Venice to give back the areas occupied in Romagna on the collapse of the Borgia power.[29] When all negotiations and threats came to nothing, the Pope resorted to force and in 1509 allied with France, the Emperor Maximilian, and the Swiss, the old enemies of the Most Serene Republic, in the League of Cambrai. The frightful defeat of Agnadello in 1509, the blackest day in the history of Venice, induced the Republic to give up the cities it had seized and ostensibly to abandon its state Church policy. It also induced the Pope, in order not to weaken too severely one of Italy's *cinque principati,* to make a new alliance with Venice and Spain in the Holy League of 1511 against the French. But the winning of Parma, Piacenza, and Reggio-Emilia was too dearly purchased, for France replied to the papal offensive in the ecclesiastical sphere by renewing the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges and getting Francophile cardinals to summon a council to Pisa in the summer of 1511, with the aim of deposing the Pope. To counter the threatening danger, especially since even the Emperor Maximilian showed himself favourable to the Council of Pisa, the Pope now summoned the Fifth Lateran Council to meet at Rome in 1512.[30]

---

[29] F. Seneca, *Venezia e papa Giulio II* (Padua 1962).

This year did not at first grant the Holy League the desired success. Quite the contrary: under the leadership of the young and capable Gaston de Foix the French inflicted a severe defeat on the Spanish and papal army at Ravenna on Easter Sunday, and the papal legate, Cardinal John de' Medici, was captured. But luck changed sides after the death of the French general, and some months later the troops of France had to leave Italian soil. The Medici returned to power at Florence, Maximilian Sforza, son of Louis *il Moro,* at Milan, and the Emperor deserted the Council of Pisa and recognized the Lateran Council. The latter continued in several sessions until 1517, but with the collapse of the schismatic synod it had really accomplished its intended task.

To what extent politics dominated all else appears in the Pope's relations to the Emperor Maximilian. Julius sought in every way to keep him out of Italy and from his imperial coronation, even if he occasionally had to ally with him for the sake of his Italian policy. He was not displeased by the obstacles which Venice put in the way of a journey to Rome. He agreed when in 1508 Maximilian had himself designed as "Roman Emperor-elect" at Trent.[31] The Emperor was unwilling to renounce the rich provinces of Italy and the financial power of the German Church and hoped to achieve his goal in the ecclesiastical sphere. Hence a matter which has received very different evaluations becomes understandable: the Emperor's plan of acquiring the tiara. If until recently it has been necessary in this question to depend upon a tradition which left room for doubt, new finds have confirmed the seriousness of the plan and of the steps taken. When in the summer of 1511 the Pope became seriously ill and his end was expected, Maximilian, like everyone else, readied himself for the impending conclave, but in such a way that he himself appeared as a candidate. An old desire seemed about to be fulfilled. Since as early as the last decade of the fifteenth century persons had heard of Maximilian's intention of controlling at least the German Church, on the French model, either through a reform council or through a withdrawal of obedience and a schism.[32] The schismatic Council of Pisa was a favourable opportunity for such an undertaking. But now, with the serious illness of the Pope, it was important to act quickly in order "to arrive at the papacy" or at least to acquire the disposal of the rights and finances of the German Church. In a detailed letter, whose authenticity has recently been proved, several possibilities emerge: that Maximilian should become the coadjutor of the reigning Pope or of an Antipope, that he should himself become Antipope or even, and this was hardly probable, the lawfully elected Pope after the death of Julius II. There were long discussions on the subject with France and Spain, with the intention on both sides of outwitting the other partner. The masterful diplomacy of the Spanish court, *vis-à-vis* the imperial intermediary, Bishop Matthew Lang of Gurk, succeeded in dragging out the business and, after the Pope's recovery, in detaching the Emperor from the alliance with France and from supporting the Council of Pisa.[33]

---

[30] *Jedin,* I, 106–12 (English version).

[31] H. Wiesflecker, "Maximilians I. Kaiserproklamation zu Trient (4. 2. 1508). Das Ereignis und seine Bedeutung," *Österreich und Europa. Festgabe für Hugo Hantsch* (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1965), 15–38; W. Stelzer, "Konstantin Arianiti als Diplomat zwischen König Maximilian I. und Papst Julius II. in den Jahren 1503–1508," *RQ,* 63 (1968), 29–48.

[32] H. Wiesflecker, "Neue Beiträge zur Frage des Kaiser-Papstplanes Maximilians I. im Jahre 1511," *MIÖG,* 71 (1963), 311–32; J. M. Doussinague, *Fernando el Católico y el cisma de Pisa* (Madrid 1946).

In an attempt to extol the Pope's ecclesiastical activity a group of individual items has been compiled: participation in solemn liturgical services, procedure against heretics, reform of monasteries and orders, and edicts against duels and the pillaging of wrecks. All this, however, pertains to the normal duties of the papal office and of the Curia. Hence it hardly modifies the well known remark of the Florentine historian, Guicciardini, that Julius II had nothing of the priest except the dress and the name. The four solemn sessions of the Fifth Lateran Council in his pontificate were devoted essentially to combatting the Council of Pisa and counteracting its encouragement by France. In this connection one must not forget that, as a Cardinal, Julius had suggested to the French King the convoking of a council to depose Alexander VI. The important prohibition of simony in future papal elections would have acquired a great significance if it had been heeded.[34]

Although he was personally neither a theologian nor a man of letters, the Pope acquired immortal fame as a Maecenas. The rebuilding of Saint Peter's and the ruthless tearing down of the venerable Constantinian basilica, the painting of the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel by Michelangelo, and the frescoes of Raffael in the *stanze* of the Vatican palace must especially be mentioned here. The plan for his tomb in Saint Peter's can be called gigantic but also daring; of it there survives the always impressive monument in his former titular church of San Pietro in Vincoli with the figure of Moses, in which is materialized the overwhelming personality of the Pope. The homage which Pastor pays to his hero can apply only to the politician. And even there reservations must be made. If the Papal State became temporarily through the policy and military abilities of its kingly ruler the first power in Italy and for a while played a leading role in European politics, this situation changed in the last weeks of the second Rovere Pope with the

---

[33] H. Wiesflecker, *loc cit.*, 315, footnote 23.

[34] *Pastor*, VI, 440.

rapprochement of Venice to France and the growth, dangerous for the "freedom of Italy," of Spanish influence. To style Julius II, as Pastor does, the "saviour" of the papacy will not do. For the tasks of the papacy lie not in politics, however clever, successful, mighty, and violent, but in an intellectual and spiritual ministry that follows the example of Christ.

Leo X (1513–21)

Julius II left a conflicting legacy: on the one hand, the Papal State in a position which again deserved the name of state and a considerable treasure in the Castel Sant'Angelo; on the other, the enmity with France and an ecclesiastical opposition, called into being for political reasons but not without its dangers. In addition was the fact that really nothing had yet been done in the ecclesiastical sphere for the reform that was so urgently necessary and was being energetically demanded on all sides.

Twenty-five cardinals took part in the conclave, which began in the Vatican palace on 4 March 1513; the schismatics of Pisa, whom Julius had deposed, were not admitted. As had long been customary, an election capitulation was first decided and sworn to by all the cardinals present. The great concerns and tasks that had persisted for decades recurred here in their traditional form: efforts for peace among Christian nations and states so that the war against the Turks could at length be taken up, reform of the Church and of the Curia, and continuation of the Fifth Lateran Council. The special regulations concerning the College of Cardinals must be understood with reference to the authoritarian rule of the dead Pope: the necessary assent of two-thirds for proceedings against cardinals, for the naming of new members, and for important measures in the Papal State and in foreign policy. In addition, there was so large a number of particular promises as to money, offices, and benefices that the new Pope could not do justice to all desires. Two factions, the "old" and the "young," confronted each other. But agreement quickly occurred, and on 11 March the thirty-seven-year-old John de' Medici was elected. The fact that he was carried into the conclave ill and at once had to undergo an operation is said to have made it easier to gain the assent of the old cardinals; but, more than this acute illness, the zealous but probably not simoniacal activity of his secretary, Bibbiena, seems to have gained the decision for him.[35] His great political experience and his activity as ruler of Florence made him probably the most qualified candidate.

---

[35] G. L. Moncallero, *Il cardinale Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena, Umanista e Diplomatico 1470–1520* (Florence 1953), 333–43; *idem, Epistolario di Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena,* I, *1496–1513* (Florence 1955).

His home was Florence, his father was Lawrence *il Magnifico*. Admitted to the clerical state by receiving the tonsure at the age of seven, he soon obtained a series of lucrative benefices, including the abbey of Montecassino. When not yet fourteen he was secretly named a Cardinal by Innocent VIII and in his seventeenth year, as the Pope had arranged, he entered the Sacred College. The letter which his father sent him at Rome on this occasion is, in its lack of genuine religious sentiment and its refined worldliness, a striking mirror for a cardinal of this epoch.[36]

Because of a careful education the young Cardinal had the aristocratic culture and manners of a Renaissance prince. And such he remained when, following the death of the forceful Julius II, he was elected Pope. He was above all the prince in politics, the chief activity of a Pope in the age of the Renaissance. Not without skill in all the arts of diplomacy, he sought to keep the Papal State and his own Florence out of the struggle of the great European powers, France, Spain, and Austria, over Italy and to acquire for his family at the favourable moment a position of predominance in Italy, even outside Florence. The ceaseless changes in high politics forced him to adapt himself to and to take part in rapidly alternating alliances. The aim of the papal and Florentine policy was to prevent the uniting of Naples with Milan, which was disputed and often changed lords, and to maintain and assure the rule of the Medici in Florence. Hence throughout most of his pontificate the Pope also conducted the government of often refractory Florence, and the members of his family, such as Lawrence *il Pensieroso,* who acted there in administrative capacities were only his agents.[37] If his political practices — simultaneous negotiations and alliances with different and mutually hostile partners and equivocal treaties — were often condemned, still, despite deceit and double dealing, the concern for peace in his balance of power policy was prominent. He deviated from it only in a few cases. And his wavering and hesitation, his postponing of urgent decisions have often been represented merely as weakness and too little notice has been taken of his statesmanship and the successes it achieved.

At his accession the Papal State belonged to an anti-French coalition. Leo accepted this situation without sincerely agreeing to it and without openly supporting the alliance against France. From the outset he was concerned to preserve the independence of Milan with the aid of the Swiss and not to let it fall into the hands of a foreign power. To this corresponded his great exertions for an Italian league, but they were unsuccessful because of the opposition of Venice and of the great powers. French reverses in North Italy and the new anti-French alliances as well as the Pope's willingness to oblige led to an understanding and especially to the abandonment of the Council of Pisa and the acceptance of the Fifth Lateran Council. New difficulties arose when in 1515 Francis I ascended the throne and at once prepared for an expedition to Italy. Only after long hesitation did the Pope join a large league against France, but, after the French King's victory at Marignano, he was forced to make important concessions in the Treaty of Viterbo. At a meeting of the Pope and the King at Bologna in December 1515 the Papal State had to surrender Parma and Piacenza, territories that had been destined for the Medici family, and the King seems even to have obtained the prospect of investiture with Naples. From the ecclesiastical viewpoint the discussions at Bologna were of special importance because of agreement on a concordat and the annulling of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. The concordat made hitherto unprecedented concessions to the French crown. The King obtained the full right of nomination to almost all benefices that were conferred in consistory, that is, bishoprics and abbeys. The Pope could fill only a small number of lesser benefices. Expectatives and reservations were abolished for France, and only *causae maiores* could be carried to the Curia. In addition, the King personally received a number of privileges.[38] The Pope had great difficulty in having so far-reaching a concordat approved in consistory, and only the fear that the French Church would separate itself entirely from Rome facilitated the consent of the cardinals. Nevertheless, the French *parlements* were not satisfied with the concordat. In the course of the pontificate and especially in its last years relations with France grew worse. Apart from Venice it was chiefly the French King who obstructed Leo's serious efforts for a crusade against the Turks, even though he collected large sums in crusade tithes and managed to use them for his enterprises in Italy. The religious situation in Germany brought the Pope to an understanding with the new King of the Romans, with the result that the French troops in North Italy were compelled to withdraw.

---

[36] *Pastor,* V, 358–61.

[37] H. Reinhard, *Lorenzo von Medici, Herzog von Urbino 1492–1515* (Diss. phil., Heidelberg 1935).

After his earlier mishaps, especially in the war against Venice, the Emperor Maximilian had been able to take only a slight part in the struggle for predominance in Italy. When the question of the imperial succession became acute, the Curia acquired an important role because the candidates were Francis I of France and Charles I of Spain. Because of their great power and their position in Italy both presented a danger to the Papal State, especially Charles as ruler of Naples. Hence Rome desired a candidate from among the German princes and thought of the Elector Frederick of Saxony. When he declined, the three spiritual Electors were to be gained for the French King by tempting offers. Not until Charles's election was certain did the Curia yield. The Pope's simultaneous treaties of alliance with Francis and Charles have gone down in history as masterstrokes of diplomacy.[39]

---

[38] Mercati, *Raccolta di concordati,* 233–51.

The importance attaching to high politics also explains the enigmatic hesitations in the proceedings against Martin Luther and the delaying of the process that had been instituted. Politics also determined the continuation and conclusion of the Fifth Lateran Council, convoked by Julius II as a political chess move against France and the rebel cardinals.[40] The sixth session took place on 27 April 1513, a few weeks after Leo's election. As already noted, Leo contrived an understanding with France and hence the submission of the schismatic cardinals and the acknowledgement of his own Council. The twelfth and final session was held on 16 March 1517. It cannot be denied that in the discussions of the reform commission, lasting for years, and in the great reform bull of the ninth session on 5 May 1514 considerable work was accomplished, but mostly in theory only. Of the few other decrees the definition of the individuality of the human soul and the condemnation of the doctrine of the double truth deserve mention.[41] If one looks at the meagre participation and the routine, it was a papal Council, but with no representation of the Universal Church in the manner now customary for centuries. Activities on the part of the few episcopal participants for solidarity in maintaining their rights were rejected as attacks on the divinely intended monarchical constitution of the Church. Interest in having the Council attended by representatives from Germany, France, and Spain was not very great. Quite the contrary: the Pope feared from such a Council too thoroughgoing a reform in head and members. Hence it is difficult to assign to this Fifth Lateran Council the rank of a general council.

A great sensation was produced by the proceedings against several cardinals on the charge of conspiracy. The Sienese Cardinal Alfonso Petrucci was alienated by the expulsion in 1516 of his brother from Siena, in which the Pope had played a role, and he was soon regarded as the head of a dangerous *fronde* of cardinals. He is said to have tried to have the Pope poisoned by a Florentine physician. As a result of confessions obtained by torture from Petrucci's servants, he and Cardinal Sauli were arrested as they entered the Vatican and imprisoned in the dungeons of Sant'Angelo, and later the Dean of the Sacred College and *Camerlengo* of the Roman Church, Cardinal Riario, was also incarcerated there. Long and stormy discussions in several consistories attended the rather murky process. Petrucci was executed; the other accused cardinals were deprived of their dignities, benefices, and revenues for a long time and punished with enormous fines. The financial aspect of the matter occasioned the widespread view that it was merely a pretext for getting money, together with the immediately subsequent great creation of cardinals, to which the intimidated Princes of the Church had to assent. Recent studies take a more serious view of the conspiracy and approve the Pope's proceedings, which have so often been condemned as inhuman.[42]

---

[39] G. L. Moncallero, "La politica di Leone X e di Francesco I nella progettata crociata contro i Turchi e nella lotta per la successione imperiale," *Rinascimento*, 8 (1957), 61–109.

[40] *Mansi*, XXXII; *Hefele-Leclercq*, VIII, 297–558; *Pastor*, VIII, 384–410; J. Klotzner, *Kardinal Dominikus Jacobazzi und sein Konzilswerk* (Rome 1948); A. Deneffe, "Die Absicht des V. Laterankonzils," *Scholastik*, 8 (1933), 359–79.

[41] S. Offelli, "Il pensiero del concilio Lateranense V sulla dimostrabilità razionale dell'immortalità dell'anima umana," *Studia Patavina*, 1 (1954), 7–40, 2 (1955), 3–17; new summary by F. Favale, *I concili ecumenici nella storia della chiesa* (Turin 1962); *Jedin*, I, 102–10; O. de la Brosse, *Le Pape et le Concile. La comparaison de leurs pouvoirs à la Veille de la Réforme* (Paris 1965).

Church History has taken Leo X severely to task for his nepotism. Since he was actually ruling Florence also, his concern for the Medici family is understandable. He rejected many demands of his relatives, such as their claims to Piombino and Siena. That he wanted to obtain Parma, Piacenza, Modena, and Reggio, and perhaps Ferrara also, for his brother Julian can be regarded as means of guaranteeing the Papal State, but less can be said for his covetous glances at Naples.[43] The war over Urbino on behalf of his nephew Lawrence was a great political and financial misfortune. The property expropriated from the Medici at the time of their expulsion was repurchased with money belonging to the Church and the Papal State. The finances of the Papal State endured an enormous burden because of the gigantic expenses for politics, for the luxurious court, and for the grand-scale patronage of art and scholarship. According to a contemporary saying, he squandered the treasure amassed by his predecessor, the income of his own pontificate, and that of his successor's reign. Through highly questionable financial practices the administration of the Papal State and of ecclesiastical benefices was further demoralized, the number of vendible offices was irresponsibly increased, and even admittance to the College of Cardinals was made dependent on the payment of large sums. Objections to such methods cannot be invalidated by reference to the immortal achievements of Michelangelo and Raffael. Leo X was an almost unfathomable personality, a refined gourmet, a Maecenas, but without creative qualities. From genuine artist and inspired man of letters to buffoon — all were represented at his court. He took particular delight in festive cavalcades and pageantry. The theatrical performances in the papal palace did not, for the most part, correspond to a spiritual mode of life, and Leo's predilection for hunting has often been censured. And yet the blame affects not so much his person as the system that he took over and further developed, a system which could not be justified from a religious viewpoint.

---

[42] F. Winspeare, "La congiura dei cardinali contro Leone X," *Biblioteca dell'Archivio storico italiano,* 5 (Florence 1957); A. Mercati, "Minuzie intorno ad una lettera di Pietro Bembo," *RSTI,* 9 (1955), 92–99; A. Schiavo, "Profilo e testamento di Raffaele Riario," *StRom,* 8 (1960), 414–29.

[43] E. Dupré-Theseider, *I papi Medicei,* 295 ff.

CHAPTER 58

The Inner Life of the Church

The Urban Parish

The Church life of the late Middle Ages, like that of the early Church, once again was centred around the urban parish. Cities had experienced a vigorous growth in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. If there were some 250 cities in Germany around 1200, about 800 more were founded during the thirteenth century alone, and by the close of the Middle Ages approximately 3,000 places possessed city rights. The European city owes its growth to commerce rather than to the trades. As soon as and so long as commerce linked the lesser economic systems to an extensive area — the Hansa is the prime example, — cities flourished, whereas they stagnated wherever the gilds with their efforts for self-sufficiency prevailed. All the more the small political units of the territorial principalities impeded the development of cities at the end of the Middle Ages.

> In the place of the proud and erect bearing of a *bourgeoisie,* master of its destiny and acting upon wide areas, appeared the small, congested, submissive bearing of the subject of later centuries... In and among territories the German cities from now on eked out an unassuming life, until the Thirty Years' War ruined for most of them a still considerable prosperity.[1]

Notwithstanding their importance, their inhabitants were not numerous. Of the 3,000 German cities, 2,800 had less than 1,000 inhabitants, and 150 between 1,000 and 2,000. Only the remaining 50, with more than 2,000 citizens, were of real significance for the economy. A mere fifteen of them exceeded a population of 10,000; the largest, Cologne, surpassed 30,000. Then came Lübeck with about 25,000. Next, probably only Nürnberg, Strasbourg, Danzig, and Ulm reached a figure of 20,000. In 1493 the population of Erfurt was reckoned as about 18,500, whereas that of Leipzig was estimated as only 4,000 in 1474.[2] Among the inhabitants of the cities women predominated. "In cities like Nürnberg, Basel, and Rostock in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, for each 1,000 men there were 1,207, 1,246, and even 1,295 women."[3] The causes of this were male military service, greater male licentiousness, and the greater susceptibility of males to contagious diseases. Also responsible is the fact that a relatively large number of males were out of the question as far as marriage was concerned because they were diocesan or religious priests — Lübeck's 300 to 400 were less than the average. With this surplus of females the convents and, in the case of the middle and lower classes, the houses of Beguines had a considerable social importance as places for the support of unmarried women. Between 1250 and 1350 some 100 Beguine houses are said to have been founded in Cologne, and they provided shelter and a meaningful life for at least 1,000 women. If, as places devoted to the fostering of a specific kind of religious life, they had a great significance for the life of devotion in the mediaeval city, on the other hand the deficiencies in religious spirit, the idleness and laxity of morals in the convents and Beguine houses could only have increased the alarmingly great spread of public lewdness at the close of the Middle Ages.

---

[1] F. Röhrig, *Die europäische Stadt im Mittelalter* (Göttingen n. d.), 124.

[2] *Ibid.,* 75 f.

The large number of priests and religious in the cities, constituting as much as one-tenth of the total population, gave rise to serious social and economic problems. Clerics and religious claimed immunity from taxation for themselves and for the property of their church or monastery. Yet they not infrequently possessed as much as half of the real estate in a city. They claimed the advantages of urban life, for example its security and commerce, without contributing a corresponding share to bearing the city's burdens. Hence, after 1300 the cities' defensive measures to halt the expansion of the untaxable property of monasteries and churches were stepped up. Further acquisitions of real property in mortmain were either forbidden or it was established that citizens' properties should remain subject to taxation when they passed to ecclesiastical ownership. In the country too efforts were made to restrict the exemption of ecclesiastics from taxation or at least to guard against its consequences. Thus, for example, it was forbidden for the only son of a tax-paying peasant to become a cleric, and churchmen were excluded from acquiring peasant property, or it was expressly stipulated that such property should remain taxable. Hence in the fifteenth century clerical privileges declined increasingly in importance.[4]

Special grounds for conflict developed in the episcopal cities. In contrast to most secular princes, bishops resided in cities and sought to maintain their supremacy against the townsmen's aspirations for freedom. Probably no episcopal city was spared a struggle with its bishop. Cologne obtained its independence in 1288 as a result of ceaseless bitter quarrels with its archbishops, but only in 1475 was it formally recognized as a Free Imperial City by Frederick III. By the close of the thirteenth century most of the important cities of Germany and of the Low Countries had self-government. The administration of bishops or other city lords was supplanted by that of the council as organ of the urban upper class. Some spiritual lords contrived to maintain their influence, as, for example, at Trier and Bamberg, where, even in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the council remained dependent on the episcopal justices of the peace, who participated in the sessions of the council.[5] As in the case of immunity from taxation, the conflict in the cities was concerned also with clerical freedom from lay courts. On the other hand, in the thirteenth century a growing number of complaints were heard at synods in regard to the violence and encroachments of which lay persons, authorities and private individuals, were guilty.[6]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, 78 f.

[4] F. X. Künstle, *Die deutsche Pfarrei und ihr Recht zu Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart 1905), 28.

The fight against the privileges of the clergy was conducted under the auspices of quite modern principles, such as public safety and general welfare. While a lay authority was established, there was no abdication of an interference in ecclesiastical matters. On the contrary, cities sought more and more to assume control of Church life.

The development of the parochial system in the cities was essentially complete in the thirteenth century. For a long time the cathedral had ceased to be the only parish church in the city. Collegiate churches and at times even abbeys had obtained parochial rights in the cities and their own parishes. But the self-reliance of the now independent *bourgeoisie* went beyond this to demand its own parish churches or at least its own priest from its own ranks (*plebanus,* people's priest). This priest and often also the pastors were frequently considered to be city officials, like the justice of the peace, schoolmaster, and councillors; they formed part of the *officiales civitatis,* as the Bern municipal law of 1218 expressed it. This led logically to the demand on the part of the citizens or of the party in political control in the cities to elect their pastor like other officials. The right of electing the pastor was granted especially to newly founded cities. But, much as this did occur, it was not universally established. Frequently the citizens contrived to acquire patronage over their city churches and hence the right to name or to present the pastor. The citizens took care of their churches and in accord with the cooperative principle wanted a share in the administration and supervision of church property. For this purpose they made use of the church custodian, whose function more and more became part of the urban administrative system and was subject to the council. Cities made the building of their churches and the administration of the church property their own monopoly and responsibility.[7] The Würzburg Synod of 1287 complained "that in a number of places, on the pretext of improving the economic administration of the Church, lay persons are appointed by lay persons, without the consent of prelates and chapters, to receive the offerings and the income from other sources."[8]

---

[5] W. Neukamm, "Immunitäten und Civitas in Bamberg von der Gründung des Bistums 1007 bis zum Ausgang des Immunitätsstreites 1410," *78. Bericht und Jb. 1922/24 des Hist. Vereins für die Pflege der Geschichte des ehem. Fürstbistums Bamberg* (n. d. [1925]), 189 to 369 (especially pages 337–41).

[6] *Cf.* the Cologne Synod of 1266 (*Mansi,* XXIII, 1140).

But the city council not only supervised the church plant and controlled the offerings and other donations of the faithful through the custodian. It also exercised a decisive influence on the appointment of clerics to Mass benefices and the administration of the endowment funds. Like the monasteries, the canonries, vicarships, pastorships, and benefices to provide Masses and hospital chaplains were means of support for younger children. If the canonries were reserved to the city patriciate, then the rest of the citizens and the artisans sought to provide for their sons as pastors or Mass-priests. Hence there existed quite often a close bond of life and interests between *bourgeoisie* and clergy.[9]

The absorption of the ecclesiastical organization into the *bourgeoisie* included also the school and the care of the poor and the sick. These passed increasingly into the hands of the laity or of the secular officialdom. The hospital organization was probably the starting-point of this development. The office of the city hospital custodian appears to be older than that of the church custodian.[10] The close connection of hospital and religious corporation or monastery dissolved. Hospitals became autonomous, and hospital fraternities assumed care of them. The Council of Vienne (1311–12) called for the appointing, not of clerics, but of efficient and experienced laymen for the direction of hospices and hospitals. They were to be under the bishop and answerable to him.[11] The development often proceeded further, however, and led to the transformation of the church hospital into a municipal institution. The administration frequently passed exclusively to the city council, which appointed the supervisor and had the right to present and to remove the hospital chaplain.[12]

The establishing of city schools meant that the school system also passed from the clergy to control by the city. But even so, the post of schoolmaster, like that of town clerk, frequently continued to be filled by clerics. Cities founded universities by papal privilege: Cologne in 1389, Erfurt in 1392, Basel in 1460, and Breslau in 1507. At Trier the university was able to become a reality in 1473, once the Archbishop had ceded to the city the right of foundation granted to him by the Pope in 1454.

---

[7] *Feine, RG,* I, 371; in almost all cities new parish churches appeared or old ones were rebuilt in the late Middle Ages: e.g., at Munich Sankt Peter (thirteenth century, rebuilt in 1368) and the Frauenkirche (1468–88); at Nürnberg Sankt Lorenz (1439–77) and Sankt Sebaldus (choir 1361–79); at Ulm the Münster (1377–1452); at Münster Sankt Lamberti (1350–1450).

[8] *Mansi,* XXIV, 863 f.

[9] K. Fröhlich, "Kirche und städt. Verfassungsleben im Mittelalter," *ZSavRGkan,* 22 (1933), 188–287 (especially pages 252 ff.).

[10] S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital und sein Recht im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1932), I, 200.

[11] E. Müller, *Das Konzil von Vienne* (Münster 1934), 575 f.

[12] *Hauck,* IV, 57 f.; *Feine, RG,* I, 371 f.

Even "the monasteries became more *bourgeois*."[13] The cities increasingly secured control of monastic property and in many cases monasteries were regularly included in the sphere of city government. In the pastoral care of the city populations great credit belongs to the mendicant orders of Franciscans and Dominicans, whose houses were to be found in every city of any importance. Because they carried out their care of souls among the people without regard to the boundaries of dioceses or parishes, they came into conflict with bishops and diocesan clergy. When Martin IV in the bull "Ad Fructus Uberes" of 13 December 1281 even authorized mendicants delegated by their superiors as confessors or preachers to fulfill their office without the consent and even against the will of bishops and pastors, a violent quarrel ensued. In particular the French bishops and the University of Paris attacked the bull in the interests of an orderly and proper care of souls. As Cardinal Legate, the future Boniface VIII rejected the complaints, but as Pope he had to cancel the privileges to a great extent in the bull "Super Cathedram" of 18 February 1300. The mendicants should be permitted to preach freely in their churches and in the public squares outside the hours of parochial services, but, like the diocesan clergy, they needed the bishop's authorization for hearing confessions. The less the parish priests took into account the new needs and, because of pluralism and disregard of the duty of residence, did not even carry out their traditional obligations, the mendicant orders gained popular favour.

The Liturgy

The Church's worship, with the Mass as its centre and climax, underwent a further elaboration, not in the sense of a real enrichment but rather of a multiplication and continuation of the existing rite. New starts cannot be ascertained, but, all the more, a proliferation of external forms. The personal and the subjective elements came into prominence, the tangible and concrete and the particular that could be counted were stressed. The community nature of the celebration of the Eucharist became constantly less clear, and the "private" Mass more and more preempted the field. It gradually determined the very form of the solemn Mass.

From the thirteenth century, when the complete missal superseded the sacramentary, the priest had also to read, for himself, the parts sung by the choir and soon even to read the Epistle and the Gospel while they were being sung by the sacred ministers. The liturgy was no longer understood as the service of the whole Church, whose membership was expressed in the distribution of functions among priest, choir, and community, but was a clerical or even a priestly liturgy. Only what the priest did was "valid," and hence he had to recite everything himself. The people were even debarred from the readings. No effort was made to translate them, and frequently they were drowned out by the playing of the organ. Even in parish churches, for example at Breisach, a rood-screen separated the sanctuary from the nave of the laity and kept the community from participating in the solemn liturgy. The Mass had ceased to be a proclamation of the word. The unintelligible language barred any approach by the people to an understanding. All the more importance was attached to the ritual — the external ceremonies and the sacramental signs — but without the word this threatened to become a splendid but empty covering. The liturgy became a performance — beautiful and intricate but really mute. From outside it efforts were made, by means of allegory, to give it an artificial voice. Sermons on the Mass, which could have unlocked the mystery, were inadequate as regards both number and content.[14] Thus the Eucharistic celebration, called by the missal the "source of all sanctity," was able to exercise a fruitful influence on popular piety only in a very limited sense.

---

[13] E. Schiller, *Bürgerschaft und Geistlichkeit in Goslar (1290–1365)* (Stuttgart 1912), 124.

Popular piety invented substitutes for the liturgy, and these succumbed all the more easily to the danger of superficiality to the extent that they were no longer connected with the centre of the mystery. What was unfamiliar and inaccessible had to be praised. Sermons and speculation on the fruits of the Mass and the value of attendance at Mass dominated the otherwise jejune theology of the Mass and the instruction in it. The fruits of the Mass were understood at the close of the Middle Ages in an increasingly massive and this-worldly manner.[15]

If there was nothing to listen to, even greater prominence was given to seeing. Popular devotion at Mass concentrated on gazing at the Host at the elevation following the consecration, and this became of the greatest importance from the thirteenth century. William of Auxerre (d. 1230) had already taught: "Many prayers are answered while looking at the Lord's body, and many graces are poured out."[16] Synods urged priests to elevate the Host so high that it could be seen by the people. But soon measures had to be taken against those who all too often complied with popular demand

---

[14] A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1902), 676.

[15] *Ibid.*, 40.

[16] *Summa aurea* (Paris 1500), 260. Quoted in E. Demoutet, *Le désir de voir l'hostie* (Paris 1926), 18; *cf.* P. Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (Munich 1933).

and increased the number of elevations to three or continued the elevation for an excessively long time.[17] The elevation acquired such importance that in some places "to go to Mass" meant to arrive for the consecration and to look at the Host. At the end of the fifteenth century the describing of the effects resulting from gazing at the Host became ever more extravagant and superstitious. This led to the nonsense of running from one altar to another, in churches that had several, to catch a glimpse of the elevation. The popular demand for looking was met from the fourteenth century by numerous Eucharistic processions, exposition, and benediction with the Sacrament. All of this caused the Eucharistic celebration as sacrifice and banquet to retire more and more into the background.

In the fifteenth century there were not lacking voices protesting the multiplication of processions and expositions. The Papal Legate Nicholas of Cusa emphasized that the Eucharist "was instituted as food and not for show,"[18] and in his reform decrees he forbade processions and expositions outside the octave of Corpus Christi.[19] His prohibition of venerating bleeding Hosts and of the pilgrimage to Wilsnack foundered on the resistance of local authorities, which obtained support at the Curia.

Abuses and superstition in regard to the Blessed Sacrament could spread all the more since the word, the *verbum sacramenti* in the strict sense and that of the liturgy in general, was not only not understood but was not even heard. The word is of course intended to remove from the sensible element its ambiguity and elevate it to the clarity and precision of the intellect.[20] Without the accomplishing of the word there is the risk of missing the meaning of the Sacrament or even of falsifying it. The word, not understood by the layman and often only pitifully by the priest, became paralyzed in formalism. Too easily what took place became congealed into a thing or ran the risk of magic. A thing can be reproduced at pleasure, something not possible to processes in life and personal actions.

As a matter of fact, in the later Middle Ages the Mass was stamped by individualization and multiplication. Every gild and confraternity, even a family which thought highly of itself, wanted to have its Mass and, so far as possible, at its own altar. This striving was encouraged by a theology which taught the finite value of the Mass and defended the view that an *a priori* determined number of Mass fruits was divided among the participating group; hence it was better to live in a smaller parish because then the share in the Mass offered by the pastor on Sundays for his flock was greater.[21]

---

[17] P. Browe, *op. cit.*, 49–69.

[18] A. Krautzius, *Metropolis* (Frankfurt a. M. 1576), XI, c. 39; P. Browe, *op. cit.*, 170.

[19] J. Koch, *Der deutsche Kardinal in deutschen Landen* (Trier 1964), 15.

[20] *Cf.* Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 60, a. 6.

[21] *Cf.* E. Iserloh, "Der Wert der Messe in der Diskussion der Theologen vom Mittelalter bis zum Ausgang des 16. Jahrhunderts," *ZKTh*, 83 (1961), 44–79 (especially page 61).

To satisfy all these demands the number of Masses and of altars had to be greatly multiplied. This also led to an unhealthy growth in the number of Masspriests — those who had nothing else to do but celebrate Mass and on occasion take part in the choral office. Parish churches, like cathedrals and collegiate churches, had a large number of altars, for which to some extent several priests were beneficed. For example, "the Constance cathedral at the close of the Middle Ages possessed fifty-four endowments for Mass-priests; the Ulm Münster, the largest parish church in the diocese, more than sixty; 122 Mass-priests occupied forty-seven altars at Breslau's Elisabethkirche; while at the Magdalenenkirche there were fifty-eight altars and 114 Mass-endowments."[22] A place like Breisach had at the parish church, besides the pastor and curates, sixteen chaplaincies for twelve altars.[23]

The duties of Mass-priests were not sufficient to keep them occupied, and the income was not enough to assure them adequate support. The only natural attempt to escape pauperization by means of pluralism led to further abuses. Mass-benefices were subject to the surveillance of the pastor and the bishop and often of the secular patron. Ever greater became the influence of the city officials on the conferring of Mass-benefices at the city churches and on the administration of the capital endowment.

The multiplication of Mass-endowments made necessary a rapid succession of the most varied services. If there was a question of chanted Masses, then, even with so many altars, it was difficult to celebrate them. Hence there arose abuses such as "curtailed Masses," that is, sung Mass became a low Mass from the Creed to enable another sung Mass to begin, or *Missae bifaciatae* or *trifaciatae* were held. In these several "liturgies of the Word" were combined with one sacrificial Mass. The "dry Mass", that is, Mass without the Canon and the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist, which had some meaning as the administering of communion in a sick-room, was debased in order that a priest might accept a stipend without having celebrated the consecration and communion. In Thuringia, around 1470, preachers of indulgences had to be reprimanded for finishing the Mass as a "dry Mass" when they were informed before the sacrificial part that the collection of indulgence alms did not come up to their expectations.[24]

Criticism of the practices in regard to Mass was not wanting. John Gerson (d. 1429) took preachers to task who hoodwinked the people into believing that on the day of attending Mass a person did not become older, could not lose his sight, and would not die a sudden death. Such a thing, he said, was a temptation to Judaism and superstition.[25] This notion of the Mass, connected with the characteristic late mediaeval inclination to the individual and the subjective, led to the endeavour to put it as far as possible at the service of the individual's needs and desires. The result was a tremendous increase in the number of votive Masses.

---

[22] *Feine, RG*, I, 373.

[23] W. Müller, "Der Wandel des kirchlichen Lebens vom Mittelalter in die Neuzeit, erörtert am Beispiel Breisach," *FreibDiözArch*, 82/83 (1962–63), 227–47 (especially page 229).

[24] L. A. Veit, *Volksfrommes Brauchtum und Kirche im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1936), 25.

> There were votive Masses of the twenty-four patriarchs or elders; of the fourteen, fifteen, and more "holy helpers"; of the seven joys and sorrows of Mary; votive Masses against sicknesses, including one against pestilence, one of Holy Job against syphilis, one of Saint Christopher against sudden death, one each of Saint Roch and Saint Sebastian against pestilence, one of Saint Sigismund against fever; votive Masses for special requests: in honour of the Archangel Raphael or of the Three Magi for a safe journey, a Mass to keep away thieves and to recover stolen property, a Mass before a duel or ordeals, one against Hussites and Turks and against witches; the seven-day, thirteen-day, or thirty-day Masses of emergency, which had to be offered by one priest for seven, thirteen, or thirty days respectively, at the end of which interval guaranteed liberation from sickness and distress was expected, and in addition the three Masses of Saint Nicholas for needs.[26]

These last mentioned series of Masses, which increased to forty-five in number for all possible concerns, were all the more dubious in that they held out the prospect of a guaranteed outcome for the living and the dead. On the eve of the Reformation the gloomy statement is true, that

> The holiest of the Church's possessions remained, it is true, the centre of genuine piety. But alas, the clouds and shadows surrounding this centre brought matters to such a pass that the Institution of Jesus, that well of life from which the Church had drawn for fifteen hundred years, became an object of scorn and ridicule and was repudiated as a horrible idolatry by entire peoples.[27]

Preaching

If, because of the Latin language, the liturgy itself was in no position to introduce the faithful to Christian doctrine, this assignment became the monopoly of preaching. There was much preaching in the late Middle Ages, perhaps more than in more recent ages. Preaching in German on Sundays and holy days, during or before Mass, was probably the rule in city and country.[28] In addition there often were also special afternoon preaching services. Before or after the sermon the feasts of the coming week and the annual commemorations were announced, the names of the dead and of benefactors were read out, prayers of intercession for all classes in the Church, the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Creed, and the ten commandments were recited. To the sermon were added, though in some places only on specified days, a general confession of sins and absolution.[29] There was preaching on week-days too, especially on the Wednesdays and Fridays of Advent and Lent. The duty of preaching on the part of clerics occupied in the care of souls goes without saying, but the frequent insistence on this duty by synods[30] proves that it was not seldom neglected, less in cities than in the country. "The poor peasants ask for bread but rare are the pastors who break it for them," complained Cornelius de Suckis around 1500.[31] If it was demanded time and again that the priest must recite the Our Father, the creed, and the commandments to the people in their vernacular on Sundays,[32] then we should probably not entertain any high expectations of pastoral preaching. It is difficult to form a picture. The material left by diocesan priests is naturally scanty. Complaints extend from the charge of scholastic sophistry and a mania for distinctions to indignation over the absurdities and banalities of the preachers.

---

[25] *Opera*, ed. by Du Pin, II (Antwerp 1706), 521–23.

[26] L. A. Veit, *op. cit.*, 26; A. Franz, *op. cit.*, 169–217.

[27] Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, I, 132.

[28] R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter* (Detmold 1879), 674.

The basic source of these shortcomings was the inadequate education of priests, especially of the poorly paid vicars, by whom the frequently absentee holders of pastoral benefices had their functions performed. The dearth of a priestly spirit and of a pastoral sense of responsibility in the bishops had an especially unhealthy effect in this regard. It was left to the individual, after attending the Latin school in his town, to acquire the necessary knowledge from a pastor or in a monastery. One could obtain ordination from a bishop, usually without any special examination. The cathedral *scholasticus,* and in the fifteenth century also a special cathedral preacher, had charge of the instructing of clerics and of the examining of candidates for ordination. Only a small percentage of clerics attended a university; a high estimate gives one-fifth. But most of these did not continue the study of the liberal arts more than one or two years, and so they obtained no special preparation for the clerical office.

Shockingly slight was the indispensable minimum of knowledge which thirteenth-century theologians required of the priest and with which persons were probably satisfied in practice. The Dominican Ulric of Strasbourg

---

[29] J. U. Surgant, *Manuale curatorum praedicandi praebens modum* (1506), Liber II, Consideratio 3–6; 16. *Cf.* E. Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie in der Darstellung des Johannes Eck* (Münster 1950), 255 f.; Jungmann, *op. cit.*, I, 480–94.

[30] F. W. Oediger, *Über die Bildung der Geistlichen im späten Mittelalter* (Leiden and Cologne 1953), 115, footnote 5.

[31] *Ibid.*, 116, footnote 1.

[32] *Der Katholik*, 71 (1891), II, 383 f.; F. W. Oediger, *op. cit.*, 51, footnote 5.

(d. 1277) expressed it in the following manner and this was adopted by the canonists:

> To the extent that the priest is obliged to the celebration of the worship of God, he must know enough grammar to be able to pronounce and accent the words correctly and to understand at least the literal sense of what he reads. As minister of the Sacraments he must know the essential form of a Sacrament and the correct manner of administering it. As teacher he must know at least the basic doctrine of faith proving itself effective in charity. As judge in matters of conscience he must be able to distinguish between what is sin and what is not and between sin and sin.[33]

It was certainly no mere chance that the mendicant orders, which were especially concerned for the extensive theological education of their members, assumed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the task of preaching, rendered more urgent by the enhanced religious interests of the city populations and because of the sects. From the end of the fourteenth century they were joined by educated priests from the diocesan clergy. At that time in many places, especially in South Germany, a few preaching offices were created for them by private bequests or by action of a city council. They were supposed to satisfy the more rigorous claims of their listeners and hence as far as possible were to have earned a degree in theology. But this *sine qua non* stipulation again made it difficult, considering the educational status of priests, to fill the posts. These preachers were not to replace the customary preaching in the parochial liturgy. Frequently in the foundation charters a defining of rights and duties was envisaged or it was specified that this preacher had to withdraw if the pastor himself wanted to preach. When the canons would not accept John Eck, presented for the preaching office at Sankt Moritz on 29 January 1518, James Fugger wrote: "A parish is in greater need of preaching and hearing confessions than of the choral chanting of the entire chapter."[34] He thereby expressed vividly the esteem in which preaching was held by the upper *bourgeois* and the responsibility which they felt for it.

In addition to the principal categories of sermons for Sundays *(de tempore)* and for feasts of saints *(de sanctis)*, in the late Middle Ages there appeared sermons on the Passion, Lenten sermons, and catechetical sermons, that is, on the various points of Christian doctrine which were later compiled in the catechism under the headings: articles of faith, prayers, the ten commandments, and the seven Sacraments. There were also sermons on the seven capital sins, the cardinal virtues, and other moral questions. The sermon based on the scholastic method was fostered by scholars such as

---

[33] *Summa de bono*, 6, tr. 4, c. 24; quoted in F. W. Oediger, *op. cit.*, 55 f.

[34] G. von Pölnitz, *Jakob Fugger*, I (Tübingen 1949), 381.

Henry Heinbuche von Langenstein (d. 1397), Francis de Maironis (d. 1328), Robert Holcot (d. 1349), John Gerson (d. 1429), Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl (d. 1433), Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464), and Gabriel Biel (d. 1495). More popular and more adapted to ordinary Christian life were the great itinerant preachers of penance, like Vincent Ferrer (d. 1419), Bernardine of Siena (d. 1456), John of Capestrano (d. 1456), Robert Caracciolo (d. 1495), Olivier Maillard (d. 1502), Gabriel Barletta (d. 1480), and Jerome Savonarola (d. 1498), probably the most powerful and ardent preacher of the Middle Ages. To precision of thought Savonarola joined mystical depth and warm emotion. Disregarding all scholarly and ornamental formality, he preached Holy Scripture and with unheard of prophetical frankness arraigned before its tribunal life in the world and in the Church. In the area of German speech the most important popular preacher at the end of the Middle Ages was Johannes Geiler von Kaysersberg (d. 1510). Before going to the Strasbourg Münster as preacher in 1478, he had taught at Freiburg (1465–70) as a master of philosophy and had received the doctorate in theology at Basel in 1476. He understood both life and man and had the special gift of expressing himself in a clear and down-to-earth and oftentimes coarse manner. With great frankness he condemned the immorality of the people and that of persons of high rank in Church and State, humorously but frequently with biting irony and devastating ridicule. In him the proclaiming of the faith very definitely took a second place after moral teaching — something characteristic of late mediaeval religious instruction generally.

An influence was exercised on preaching by various reference books for homiletics: preaching cycles, collections of topics and examples, lives of saints, and postils. Particularly important were those by such authors as James a Voragine (d. 1298), author of the *Legenda aurea* and *Sermones super Evangelia,* Jordan of Quedlinburg or of Saxony (d. *ca.* 1380), an Augustinian Hermit, John Nider (d. 1438), Dominican and author of *Formicarius* and *Sermones aurei,* John of Werden (d. 1437), Franciscan, author of *Dormi secure,* John of Herolt (d. 1468), a Dominican, and others. Furthermore, textbooks of homiletics were not lacking. Widely circulated were the *Tractatus de modo discendi et docendi ad populum sacra seu de modo praedicandi* (printed, among other places, at Landshut in 1514) of Jerome Dungersheym (1465–1540) and the *Manuale curatorum praedicandi praebens modum* (1503 and later) of John Ulric Surgant (1450–1503),[35] pastor and professor at Basel. From Surgant has come down one of the first baptismal registers, which he kept as pastor of Sankt Theodor in Basel from

---

[35] Reproduced in substance and in part *verbatim* in *Katholik,* 69 (1889), II, 166–86, 302–22, 432–44, 496–523. *Cf.* D. Roth, *Die mittelalterliche Predigttheorie und das Manuale Curatorum des Joh. U. Surgant* (Basel 1956).

1490 to 1497. While church records were kept in Italy and the Midi already in the fourteenth century, this was not the practice in Germany. At the end of the fifteenth century synods more and more frequently admonished or obliged pastors to keep lists of the baptized, the dead, those going to confession, and the excommunicated. But it was not until the Council of Trent that it became a duty to keep records of baptisms and marriages.[36]

Catechesis

The baptism of infants put an end to the catechumenate of adults, but in the Middle Ages no regular Church instruction of children took its place. Only sporadically and rather late do we find synodal decrees that oblige pastors to instruct the young in faith and morals,[37] for this was regarded as the duty of parents and godparents. They were supposed to teach the children the creed and the Our Father, and in the late Middle Ages care was taken to include the Hail Mary and the ten commandments. Works of edification, such as the *Himmelsstrasse (The Way to Heaven)* of the Vienna provost, Stephen of Landskron (d. 1477), and the *Christenspiegel (The Mirror for Christians)* of Dietrich Kolde (1435–1515), urged parents to carry out this duty. The *Seelenführer (Director of Souls)* charges the mother: "You must bless your child, teach him the faith, and bring him early to confession, instructing him in all he needs to know in order to confess properly." Hence even the preparation for confession and communion was the business of the parents. The Middle Ages knew no special instruction for these two Sacraments.[38] Add to this that the role of the school in direct religious instruction was slight. There was no separate subject of religious education, but in the other aspects of instruction much religious knowledge was probably imparted in a practical manner, for example, by teaching to read the Our Father and other prayers. But the school comprised only a part of the city youth, while country youngsters seldom had an opportunity to go to school. How meagre religious knowledge was can be gathered from the fact that Nicholas of Cusa, as Cardinal Legate in Germany in 1451–52, felt obliged to have wooden tablets giving the Our Father, the creed, and the ten commandments set up in the churches for the religious instruction of the people.[39]

---

[36] H. Börsting, *Geschichte der Matrikeln von der Frühkirche bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg 1959); M. Simon, "Zur Entstehung der Kirchenbücher," *ZBKG*, 28 (1959), 129–42; F. W. Oediger, *op. cit.*, 119 f.

[37] Béziers, 1246 *(Mansi,* XXIII, 693); Albi, 1254 *(Mansi,* XXIII, 837); *cf.* Decretals of Gregory IX, 1. 3, t. 1, c. 3.

[38] P. Browe, "Der Beichtunterricht im Mittelalter," *ThGl*, 26 (1934), 427–42.

[39] *Pastor,* II, 123. Reproduction of tablet and text in J. Koch and H. Teske, "Die Auslegung des Vaterunsers in vier Predigten," *Cusanus-Texte,* I, *Predigten,* 6 (Heidelberg 1940), 280–85.

Because of this lack of direct and systematic instruction, this "catechetical vacuum of the Middle Ages," [40] people were for the most part left to learn the Christian faith by life and experience in a Christian environment. The paintings on the walls, in the windows, and on the altars were the Bible of the illiterate. Mystery plays, Christmas, Holy Week, and Easter plays, and other dramatic presentations brought sacred history to men and held up to their gaze morally good conduct. An abundance of religious customs attended the day-to-day life of the individual and the community from cradle to grave. The educative power of Christian morality and a Christian *milieu* must certainly not be underestimated. But there is also no question that such a Christianity of mere custom, without adequate clarification by knowledge and understanding, was particularly susceptible to mass-suggestion and superstition and was hardly a match for serious crises.

The vast deficiency in personal instruction and formation of consciences lent an enhanced importance to the annual confession, the preparation for it, and the actual making of the confession. Helps were provided by the outlines for examining the conscience and, at the end of the Middle Ages, the confession brochures.[41] In Latin or in the vernacular, these were aids for the proper administration and the fruitful reception of the Sacrament of penance. About fifty printings of such little books are known for the period 1450 to 1520. This clearly indicates the new possibilities for religious instruction latent in the invention of printing. The same is true of other works of prayer and edification and above all of the brief summaries of Christian doctrine and morality which Luther later called the catechism. There had already earlier been such compilations of the chief catechetical points for the use of pastors and teachers, such as the *Opus tripartitum de praeceptis decalogi, de confessione et de arte moriendi* of John Gerson (d. 1429),[42] or the *Discipulus de eruditione Christifidelium* of the Dominican John of Herolt (d. 1468). The latter work was printed twelve times between 1490 and 1521. In his translation of Gerson's *Opus tripartitum,* Geiler of Kaysersberg admonished priests, parents, schoolmasters, and hospital directors to see to it that the doctrine of this brief book is inscribed on tablets and hung up in public places, such as churches, schools, and hospitals; but now the art of book printing made it possible to provide the pupil with works of this sort as his textbook. In such works of the fifteenth century the form of a catechism is not yet clearly developed. They are equally prayerbooks and books of edification, as is evident from such titles as *Der Seele Trost (Consolation of Soul), Die Himmelsstrasse (The Way to Heaven),* and *Spiegel der Laien*

---

[40] R. Padberg, *Erasmus als Katechet* (Freiburg 1956), 27.

[41] F. Falk, *Drei Beichtbüchlein nach den Zehn Geboten* (Münster 1907); C. H. Zimmermann, *Die deutsche Beichte vom 9. Jahrhundert bis zur Reformation* (Veida 1934), with the literature; R. Rudolf, *Ars moriendi* (Cologne and Graz 1957); *LThK,* II (2nd ed. 1958), 126.

[42] *Opera,* ed. by Du Pin, I (Antwerp 1706), 425–50.

(Mirror for the Laity).[43] The best known of these popular books is *Der Christenspiegel (The Mirror for Christians)* by the Franciscan Dietrich Kolde (d. 1515), which appeared in many editions from 1470.[44]

Printing was of special importance for the spread of the Bible. Around 100 printings of the Vulgate had appeared by 1500. From the first printed German translation in 1461, or at the latest in 1466,[45] until Luther's edition of the New Testament in 1522 fourteen High German and four Low German complete Bibles appeared in print, in addition to a large number of German psalters, other printings of parts of Scripture, and editions of Gospels and Epistles (postils and *plenaria*). In France there appeared after 1200 the so-called "Bible History," following an abridgement of biblical historical material, the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor (d. 1179). Greatly enlarged, this came out in print in 1477 and 1487. And the first printed Bible in Dutch, at Delft in 1477, was a Bible History of this sort. Two separate Italian translations appeared at Venice in 1471.

Religious Orders

The religious institutes of the late Middle Ages were in a state of decay, arising from many causes. Its progress in the individual orders was also quite varied and did not follow one pattern. When the mendicant orders experienced their tremendous growth early in the thirteenth century, the Benedictine family was in decline, and it was the mendicants that responded to the needs of the new situation. Hence they exerted a powerful attraction on the young, whereas the old orders were in no position to proclaim and to live their ideal in a manner adapted to gaining in any great numbers young men of deep religious convictions. In Germany at the beginning of the twelfth century there were about 260 Benedictine monasteries. Thereafter there were no new foundations, and from the twelfth to the fifteenth century a large number of houses disappeared because of secularization or of transformation into communities of canons. Too closely identified with feudalism, the order had as slight a connection with the new social and economic conditions as with the new educational system of *studia generalia* and universities. In a sense the Benedictines retired from religious, intellectual, and cultural life without their wealthy and imposing monasteries ceasing to offer material inducements. The nobility saw them as places for providing for younger sons. But these wanted to continue in the monastery to live the life of their own social class and frequently disregarded the vow of poverty as well as inclosure. It became more and more common for the monastic property and income to be divided between abbot and community, with the abbacy and the claustral offices being regarded as benefices and the monks being allowed to have property (*peculium*) for their personal use. Abbeys were conferred *in commendam* on cardinals, bishops, and even lay persons, who drew the income without being concerned for the internal life of the monasteries.

---

[43] P. Bahlmann, *Deutschlands katholische Katechismen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1894), 12–23.

[44] *Der Christenspiegel des Deutschen Katechismus von Münster,* ed. by C. Drees (Werl 1954); in High German in C. Moufang, *Katholische Katechismen des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz 1881), I–L; on the editions see A. Groeteken, "Der älteste gedruckte deutsche Katechismus und die Volksbücher Dietrich Koldes," *FStud,* 37 (1955), 53–74, 189–217, 388–410.

[45] J. Mentel, *Strassburg;* new ed. by W. Kurrelmeyer, 10 vols. (Tübingen 1904–15).

The Black Death of 1348 involved grave material distress in most religious communities and carried off a large number of the members. In general it produced a serious breakdown of religious and moral discipline. Monks who had fled from the plague and had lived in freedom in the world were no longer willing to submit to the rule as formerly. In an effort to replenish the thinned ranks people ceased to be very particular about accepting candidates. Before long the Western Schism gave rise to serious shocks in the orders as well as in the Church at large. The split showed itself in the orders and at times in individual monasteries. At Montserrat the monks recognized Rome, whereas the Abbot looked to Avignon. In other monasteries each faction elected its own abbot; at Korvey, for example, the two rival abbots engaged in violent struggle.[46] Some orders, like the Carthusians, Cistercians, and Carmelites, split into two branches, each with its general.

All this naturally caused grave damage to the spiritual life and discipline of the monasteries. Under these circumstances reform was not possible, because its opponents contrived to play off the one authority against the other. But reform efforts were made in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Mention has already been made of the quarrels in the Franciscan family, which resulted in 1517 in the separation of the Conventuals and the Observants, and also of the reform congregation of the Windesheim Augustinians. In other orders, too, observant circles were formed to live the rule in its original austerity. Among the Augustinian Hermits the reformed houses united into a special reformed congregation directly subject to the general.

Benedict XII (1334–42) seriously sought a reform of the orders. He tried first of all to bring back his own Cistercian Order to its former spirit. In the constitution "Fulgens sicut Stella" (1335) he issued detailed regulations on claustral life, the monks' theological studies, and the management of monastic property. He made a deep inroad into the traditional structure of the Benedictine Order in the bull "Summi Magistri Dignatio" (1336), called for short the "Benedictina." In this he aimed to assure the economic basis of the monasteries by a definitely regulated administration and, aware of the value of a good education and of serious intellectual discipline for monastic observance, enacted regulations for the monks' studies. The centralization of the order which he decreed was thorough. The order was to be divided into thirty-six precisely defined provinces. Provincial chapters were to meet every three years. At these the visitors elected by the chapter were to make their report and the accounts of each monastery were to be examined. Although the Pope personally tried to implement his reform decrees in practice, he had no success. The reform not infrequently collapsed in the face of the resistance of the secular rulers, who forbade abbots to attend the provincial chapters for fear lest decrees would be issued which would run counter to the lord's interests.

---

[46] J. Evelt, "Die Anfänge der Bursfelder Benediktiner-Congregation," *Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte und Altertumskunde Westfalens* (3rd series), 5 (1865), 125–27.

Benedict XII had no greater luck with his endeavours for a reform of canons regular, and serious disputes arose with the Dominicans and Franciscans. The reason was not merely the absence of a desire for reform in the orders, but also the fact that the Pope's regulations were often lacking in a correct understanding of the peculiar nature of each order.

If the "Benedictina" had had hardly any effect, the idea of merging individual monasteries into provinces or congregations remained alive, and all reform efforts of the fifteenth century were characterized by it. From Santa Giustina at Padua Abbot Louis Barbo founded in 1419, under Martin V, a reform congregation which obtained its definitive form in 1432 under Eugene IV. All authority was vested in the annual general chapter of delegates and superiors of the monasteries. The individual abbey was a member of the congregation and was administered by it. The abbots were elected for life but they changed monasteries every year and later every six years. The monks were professed for the congregation rather than for a particular monastery and could be transferred to another monastery by the president of the congregation or the visitor. Thereby the abbatial dignity and the claustral offices were stripped completely of their character as benefices and the abuses of *commenda* and prebends were effectively obviated. In the course of time almost all the Italian monasteries, including Montecassino, Subiaco, La Cava, and Cervara, themselves reformed houses, joined the Congregation of Santa Giustina. And though it continued to be restricted to the peninsula, it still exercised a great influence on the organization of many other congregations.

In Germany the reform movement received a stimulus from the Council of Constance, in which, among the numerous regulars, many Benedictines took part. Under the very eyes of the Council Fathers, as it were, there took place at the Abbey of Petershausen near Constance in 1417 a chapter attended by the Benedictines present in Constance and the superiors of the Mainz-Bamberg province. The "Benedictina" was to be again observed and, above all, poverty and the common life were again enjoined. Furthermore, the chapter issued decrees against the nobility's monopoly of certain monasteries. But there was no central tribunal to see to the implementation of the decrees. Many abbeys resisted the reforms, and some sought to escape them by having their monks transformed into secular canons. Just the same, the idea of reform had awakened. Centres of renewal were the abbeys at Kastl in the Upper Palatinate, Melk on the Danube, Sankt Matthias in Trier, Tegernsee, the Vienna Schottenkloster, and Bursfeld on the Weser.

The customs of Kastl, which, in addition to the liturgy, especially stressed silence, poverty, and obedience, determined the monastic reform decrees of the Petershausen Chapter and of the Council of Basel. Twenty-five abbeys were revived by Kastl, directly or indirectly. But neither this reform nor that of Melk resulted in the establishing of a congregation. This work was initiated by German monks from Subiaco and spread from Melk to monasteries in Austria, Bavaria (Tegernsee), Swabia, and Hungary. The starting point of reform in North and West Germany was the monastery of Bursfeld near Göttingen, where John Dederoth became Abbot in 1433. During a stay in Italy he had come to know the Congregation of Santa Giustina and as Abbot of Clus had introduced the reform. In 1434 he went to Trier to visit Abbot John Rode of Sankt Matthias, who as a Carthusian monk had assumed the direction of this Benedictine monastery in 1421 and had drawn up new statutes for it after lengthy study. The Council of Basel had appointed him reformer and visitor of the monasteries of southwestern Germany. From him the new Abbot of Bursfeld, John Dederoth, obtained the reform statutes and four of his best monks. Thus Bursfeld was able to experience a new flowering and to become under the direction of Abbot John von Hagen from 1439 the nucleus of a strictly organized congregation with a chapter that met annually from 1446. In 1469 thirty-six monasteries, including Hirsau, belonged to it; in 1530, ninety-four. The abbots had to take an oath to be loyal to the union and to follow or introduce the Bursfeld observance in their monasteries. The Bursfeld reform received stimulation and encouragement from the Provost John Busch (d. 1479) and the Cardinal Legate Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464).

Religious life in France sank to its nadir in the fifteenth century as a consequence of the Hundred Years' War and the far-reaching encroachments of the secular authorities, notably through the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1438. Within the Benedictine Order there were reform endeavours at Cluny, Tiron, and especially Chezal-Benoît in the diocese of Bourges. But the Concordat of 1516 hurt reform by giving the King the right to name the abbots.

In Spain the monastery of Valladolid, founded as recently as 1390, became the centre of a reform congregation which almost all the Spanish monasteries joined. To avoid the abuses of *commenda* the abbatial title was abolished and the duration of office of the claustral appointments was restricted to a few years.

In the Cistercian Order the symptoms of decay were not so alarming, and the twenty-four new foundations of the fifteenth century testify to a certain vitality. The Carthusian Order experienced a real flowering in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Despite numerous afflictions and persecutions at the hands of Hussites and Turks, in 1510 there were 195 charterhouses in seventeen provinces. Of great significance for the spiritual life of the late Middle Ages beyond the limits of their order were Ludolf of Saxony (d. 1378), Henry of Kalkar (d. 1408), Henry of Coesfeld (d. 1410), and Dionysius the Carthusian (d. 1471).

The founding of new orders and of communities and confraternities resembling orders proves that the seeking of Christian perfection was still alive. In addition to the Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life, still other lay confraternities were formed to devote themselves to active charity for the neighbour in the care of the poor and the sick and the burial of the dead. The Alexians, also called Cellites, Lollards, or Rollbrüder (Burial Brothers), came together after the Black Death of 1348–49 in Flanders and on the Lower Rhine. Those of Aachen made vows in 1469. In 1472 Sixtus IV gave them the Augustinian rule.

Originally a lay confraternity founded by John Colombini at Siena in 1360, the Jesuates aimed to devote themselves to the salvation of their fellowmen by prayer, mortification, and the care of the sick. They lived at first according to the Benedictine rule but later adopted that of the Augustinians. They were called "Apostolic Clerics of Saint Jerome," after their patron.

As patron of hermits he also gave his name to the Hieronymites, who followed the Augustinian rule as expanded by ideas from Jerome. There were originally four congregations in Italy and Spain. In Castile they united under Peter Fernández Pecha. Confirmed as an order in 1373, they were subordinated in 1415 to a superior general in Spain.

The Minims are a mendicant order founded in Calabria in 1454 by Francis of Paula under the title of "Hermits of Saint Francis." Their rule is the Franciscan, but made more austere in regard to diet. Referred to as Paulans from their founder, they were called "Bons hommes" in France and "Fratres de Victoria" in Spain in connection with the victory over the Muslims. In 1520 they had around 450 monasteries.

The Birgittines, or Order of the Saviour, were founded by Saint Birgitta of Sweden (1303–73). She lived a happy married life with a noble to whom she bore eight children, among them Saint Catherine of Sweden. Following a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela (1341–42), her husband retired to a Cistercian monastery, where he died in 1344. Around this time began the "heavenly revelations," which she recorded in the Swedish language and which her confessors translated into Latin. She founded the first monastery at Vadstena in 1346 and in 1349 went to Rome to secure the establishment of her order. She spent the last twenty-four years of her life in the Eternal City. In burning words she lashed out at the abuses in the Church and implored the Popes in the name of Christ to return to Rome. The constitutions of her foundation were confirmed by Urban V in 1370; but the definitive approval did not come until 1378, after her death, when Urban VI added them as a supplement to the Augustinian rule. Like Vadstena, the houses were to be double monasteries, both being under the direction of an abbess. For sixty nuns there were to be thirteen monks, four deacons, and eight lay brothers. The order spread quickly throughout Europe and is said to have soon comprised seventy-nine monasteries, which were of great religious and cultural importance, especially for Scandinavia. Birgitta died at Rome in 1373, after a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. She was canonized by Boniface IX in 1391.

CHAPTER 59

Theology in the Age of Transition

Nicholas of Cusa

At the point where the Middle Ages gave way to modern times there was in Nicholas of Cusa a mind which, with headstrong and obstinate will power to create a whole, compelled the antagonistic forces of his day into a "Catholic concordance" and at the same time held out the creative beginnings of a possible bridge connecting with a new age.

Son of the sailor Henne Krebs (Chryfftz), Nicholas was born in 1401 at Kues (Cusa) on the Moselle. It cannot be proved that he attended the school of the Brothers of the Common Life in Deventer, nor is it likely that he did so. He matriculated at Heidelberg as a *clericus* as early as 1416 and became bachelor of arts in 1417. In the same year he took up the study of canon law at Padua, where he became acquainted with the doctrine of consent elaborated by Francis Zabarella (d. 1417). According to this, what affects all must be approved by all. At the same time he came in contact with Italian humanism, gained the friendship of Paul del Pozzo Toscanelli, and studied mathematics, physics, and astronomy. In 1423 he became *doctor decretorum*. Back home he obtained the parish of Altrich in 1425, without having received the priesthood.[1] From Easter 1425 he lectured on canon law and studied theology at Cologne. His teacher, or rather his stimulating friend, was Heymeric de Campo, the chief protagonist of the Albertists, a strongly Platonic version of scholasticism, which gave him the intellectual treasures of pseudo-Dionysius and Raymond Lull and probably of Master Eckhart.

---

[1] He was still a deacon in 1436 and received the priesthood before 1440. *Cf.* E. Meuthen, *Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanusgesellschaft,* 2 (Mainz 1962), 33 f.

The discovery of twelve comedies of Plautus and of other Latin classics, his demonstration of the spuriousness of the Donation of Constance by a critical investigation of its sources, and his doubts as to the identification of the highly esteemed Dionysius with Dionysius the Areopagite made him a pioneer of German humanism.

His services to the Archbishop of Trier yielded a number of benefices, including in 1427 the deanery of the Stift Sankt Florin in Koblenz. He made this his residence. At the beginning of 1433 he went to the Council of Basel to uphold the claims of Ulric von Manderscheid to the archbishopric of Trier.[2] Here he finished his *De concordantia catholica.* Originally this seems to have been projected only as a "Libellus de ecclesiastica concordantia," which was to treat in two books of the Church, her nature, her reform, and the tasks of the council. The adding of a third book on reform of the Empire produced a significant work on the all-embracing Christian concord in Church and Empire.[3] In accord with the pattern of Neoplatonic anthropology — spirit, soul, body — Nicholas developed the exemplar of a Christian order, in which "the one Church of all believers in Christ" displays "a harmonious accord of the divine Spirit, the priestly soul, and the body of believers."[4]

In the *Concordantia catholica* and in the testimonial "De auctoritate praesidendi in concilio generali" (1434),[5] Nicholas of Cusa was a moderate conciliarist. "The Roman Pontiff, who is a member of the Church, even though the highest ranking in administration, is subject to the general council" (p. 24). The council represents the Universal Church more truly than does the Pope alone. The Pope represents the Church only in an indefinite manner ("confuse"). Hence the Church, "for the sake of her own welfare or in urgent need, [can] dispose of the papacy at her discretion" (p. 26). The Pope holds the first place at the council and must be regarded as its head and judge. Hence he or his legates must be allowed to participate in the council.

---

[2] See also E. Meuthen, *Das Trierer Schisma von 1430 auf dem Basler Konzil* (Münster 1964); *idem,* "Nikolaus von Kues und der Laie in der Kirche," *HJ,* 81 (1962), 101–22 (especially pp. 110 f.).

[3] *Cf.* G. Kallen, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der "Concordantia catholica" des Nikolaus von Kues* (Heidelberg 1963).

[4] "Deus enim spiritus est, qui per medium sacramentorum, quorum ministri sunt domini sacerdotes, tamquam per animas corpori id est fideli populo gratiose coniungitur, ut homo sit in deo" (III, 41).

[5] Ed. by G. Kallen, *Cusanus-Texte,* II, 1 (Heidelberg 1935); the quotations that follow are taken from here.

In fact, if he wishes to attend and is able to do so, no council can take place without him (p. 32).

The unity, or *consensus,* of pope and council is for Nicholas the sign of truth. And so his sudden *volte-face,* his change from the Council of Basel to Eugene IV, was not so radical as it seemed, for the Pope offered a Council which promised unity with the East, whereas at Basel controversy and uproar became increasingly open. To leave Basel meant to decide for Pope and Council. Because unity is the proof of truth, and the Council of Basel on the other hand was working for a schism, "the Holy Spirit could not be there."[6]

For Nicholas the unity of the Church was more and more guaranteed in her single head. "The Christian people, united to the one Shepherd of the one *Cathedra Petri* and to the one High Priest, constitutes the one Church, just as man is one because all his members are united to one head."[7] His previous view, that the unity of the Church is the result of the orderly cooperation of the various degrees of the one priesthood and of the consent of all believers (*concordantia catholica*), was replaced, in connection with the philosophical insights of the *Docta ignorantia* (1440) in the sign of the double concept "complicatio-explicatio," by the knowledge that plurality is the unfolding (*explicatio*) of unity, which precedes everything as *complicatio.* Folded up in unity in God is everything that in the world is unfolded in plurality and differentiation. Because all things are in him as their effective and formal cause, though not in their multiplicity but in unity, he is the "coincidentia oppositorum." He, however, does not comprise the contradictories in their opposition; rather he is above every opposition. "God is not the root of the contradiction but the unity before every root."[8] This one and first before all else is beyond our intellect.

> Where all plurality is abolished in unity, all definability by means of otherness ceases, and the contradictories fall together, there, so to speak, the intellect loses all the ground under its feet. There begins that unknowing, which is at the same time the single possibility for the human mind to somehow behold anywhere the infinite, to "touch" the incomprehensible "incomprehensibly."[9]

Just as now the plural is explained only by the one, and the beneath can be understood only by the above, so the unity of the Church is based also on the one supreme head. His authority is the *complicatio* of all powers requisite for the maintenance and guidance of the Church.[10]

---

[6] Discourse at Mainz in 1441, *RTA,* 15, 643: "... legittimum esse Florentinum concilium constaret ex effectu unionis Graecorum, quia 'arbor bona fructus bonos faceret,' ex fine vero Basiliense illegittimum, quia scisma fecisset, et ubi scissio, non poterat esse spiritus sanctus." *Cf. Cusanus-Texte,* IV, 1, ed. by J. Koch (Heidelberg 1944), 46.

[7] Letter of 1439 to a Carthusian monastery, in *Cusanus-Texte,* IV, 1, p. 38.

[8] "Nam non est radix contradictionis Deus, sed est ipsa simplicitas ante omnem radicem" (ed. Basel, 339; ed. A. Petzelt, 206).

[9] J. Stallmach, "Zusammenfall der Gegensätze," *Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanusgesellschaft,* 1 (Mainz 1961), 52–75 (especially p. 62).

Nicholas distinguishes the mystical body of Christ as the invisible Church, which is nothing other than the unfolded grace of Christ, from the visible Church, the *ecclesia coniecturalis.* The latter embraces good and bad, but it can be recognized as the Holy Church, and to some extent comprehended, by its marks. It possesses a visible head in the Pope. In him the Church is given *complicative*, and, vice versa, the Pope is in her in so far as she has developed on the basis of Peter's confession and preaching.[11]

"The Hercules of the Eugenians" — so he was called by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II, — Nicholas of Cusa in the succeeding years fought for the recognition of the papal authority and at imperial and princely diets came out for the reconciliation of Pope and Empire. His exertions had their successful conclusion at the Princely Diet of Aschaffenburg in 1447, where Nicholas V obtained general recognition and the Vienna Concordat of 1448 was arranged. The tireless interventions of the legate for the restoration of the unity of the Church as understood by the papacy were rewarded by his elevation to the cardinalate in 1448 and his promotion to the bishopric of Brixen in 1450. But in his see he had to wage a protracted and less successful struggle to assure or restore respectively the spiritual and temporal independence of the prince-bishopric *vis-à-vis* the efforts of Archduke Sigismund, Count of Tirol, to consolidate an independent state and a territorial Church.

However, the Cardinal was not to assume the government of his diocese until April 1452. Before doing so he traveled through the Empire as papal legate for a year and a quarter, from Vienna to Brussels, from Magdeburg to Trier, preaching the jubilee indulgence. To effect in clergy and people a religious and moral renewal, to visit monasteries, to make peace, to summon aid against the Turks, in brief to reform the German Church and activate its forces — such was his task. The Cardinal Legate began the work of reform in February 1451 at Salzburg,[12] where he held a provincial council and prepared for the reform of the monasteries. At Easter he held a diocesan synod at Bamberg, while in May he held at Würzburg a chapter at which seventy Benedictine abbots obliged themselves to the reform of their monasteries within a year (24 May 1451). At Magdeburg monastic reform involved chiefly the Augustinians. John Busch, provost of Neuwerk and historian of the Windesheim Congregation, was an energetic and competent assistant in this. In the Benedictine monasteries of Erfurt, Hildesheim, and Minden, Nicholas enabled the Bursfeld Reform to achieve a break-through. At the provincial councils of Magdeburg (18–28 June 1451), Mainz (14 November–3 December), and Cologne (23 February–8 March 1452) he proclaimed the jubilee indulgence, emphasizing that the important thing was, not the indulgence, but a genuine and sincere conversion, which must begin with a worthy reception of the Sacrament of penance. The Legate strictly forbade the accepting or offering of money for absolution. The amount of the alms given to gain the indulgence was to be left to the conscience of the individual. The decrees published at the synods ordered prayers for Pope and Bishop at Mass, gave directions for the dignified celebration of the liturgy and the honouring of the Eucharist, forbade the founding of new confraternities, the venerating of bleeding Hosts, and the laying of an interdict in order to collect debts, attacked simoniacal intrigues in the conferring of benefices, clerical concubinage, and the disregard of the inclosure of nuns, and required in general a reform of religious orders by strict fidelity to the rule within one year. Jews were to make themselves known by special badges and thereafter they were no longer to engage in lending money to Christians.[13] In his numerous sermons the Cardinal insisted upon a deepened and intensified religious feeling. He denounced the excessive attention given to pilgrimages, especially to the bleeding Host of Wilsnack, and the superstitious veneration of images and saints. He dispensed from pilgrimage vows and ordered those thus dispensed to visit instead the Blessed Sacrament in their parish church; here divine power really lay concealed.

---

[10] "Et hoc est iuxta regulam intellectualem doctae ignorantiae in pontifice esse ecclesiam complicative et ipsum esse pariter in ecclesia" — letter of 1442 to Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo, ed. by G. Kallen, *Cusanus-Texte,* II, 1 (Heidelberg 1935), 111; cf. J. Koch, *Nikolaus von Cues und seine Umwelt,* 22.

[11] "Sensibilem enim ecclesiam sensibile caput habere convenit. Et ob hoc caput huius ecclesiae sensibile est pontifex... In quo est haec ipsa ecclesia complicative... et ob hoc Petrus a confessione petrae, quae Christus est, nomen accipiens, complicatam in se ecclesiam explicavit verbo doctrinae primo omnium..." (G. Kallen, *Cusanus-Texte,* II, 1, 108).

[12] For the itinerary of the legatine journey *cf.* Koch, *op. cit.,* 111–52.

Nicholas had carefully prepared for his legatine journey in the hope of achieving or at least starting a far-reaching religious reform of the German people. A profound success was granted him only where a will to be reformed was present, as in Archbishop Frederick of Magdeburg, Provost John Busch, and the monks of the Bursfeld Congregation. The Cardinal's at times stubborn views, out of touch with the reality of the situation, were responsible for some failures. The questionable measures against the Jews, for example, were wrecked by economic necessities, as is clear from the Pope's annulling of the prohibition of money transactions at the urging of the Emperor and of the Archbishop of Salzburg.[14] Religious superiors frequently promised reform but thought no more of implementing it.

---

[13] Koch, *op. cit.*, 112.

[14] J. Uebinger, "Kardinal Nicolaus Cusanus in Deutschland 1451/52," *HJ*, 8 (1887), 639.

But the Legate did not only encounter hidden resistance. The opposition in Liège was especially serious. The Cardinal had been solemnly received there on 13 October 1451, but on the very next day the canons of Maastricht and an abbess complained of the severity of his reform and he soon saw himself involved in a heated controversy with the clergy. Serious accusations against his person were uttered.[15] The clergy of Utrecht appealed to Rome against his reform decrees. In a letter of admonition the Cardinal Legate severely rebuked the clergy and stressed how different they were from the faithful. Whereas the latter were hurrying back to Christ, the clergy, "who drew fat incomes from the blood of Christ and of the martyrs," persisted "in their war against Christ."[16] Among the religious orders the Legate met opposition especially from the mendicants. When he required those in Cologne and Trier to adopt reform they appealed to the Pope and insisted on their exemption. As already in regard to the decree on the Jews and the prohibition of the Wilsnack pilgrimage, here too the Pope decided against his Legate, who, he said, had exceeded his authority.

If the refractory refused to change their mind, Nicholas threatened with the secular arm. In general he had few reservations in regard to calling upon political power for the sake of reform, though he must have known from his own bishopric that to allow the secular authorities to intervene within the ecclesiastical sphere was to draw a two-edged sword. In the next years monastic reform in Brixen would be tedious and finally collapse, precisely because circles unwilling to be reformed, such as Verena von Stuben, Abbess of Sonnenburg, found support in the territorial nobility and especially in Archduke Sigismund against the Bishop. On the other hand, Nicholas had to restore his own territorial authority as a Prince-Bishop if he wished to carry out his reform. This in turn entangled him in a disastrous political power struggle.

In these very years of controversy over his bishopric (1453–60), a time of exasperating disputes over reforms and feudal rights, over spiritual and secular judicial supremacy, which were carried on by means of force on the one side and excommunication and interdict on the other, Nicholas of Cusa found time and leisure for speculative writings such as *De visione Dei* (1453), *De Beryllo* (1458), and *De principio* (1459). The fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the impotence of divided Christianity, made clear in the event, provided Nicholas with a sad opportunity to ponder more deeply *On Peace and Unity in the Faith* (1453). In a vision he has seventeen representatives of the various nations and religions discuss the differences and similarities of all religions before the throne of God. In them is sought, in different ways and under manifold names, the one God, who remains concealed and ineffable in his true essence. The aim of this is the understanding, made possible by the mercy of God, "that amidst the diversity of religious customs there is only one religion" (chapter 1).

---

[15] Koch, *op. cit.*, 46.

[16] *Cusanus-Texte*, IV, 1, p. 64.

> It may, then, be enough to fortify peace in faith and in the commandment of love, but to tolerate the various customs on both sides (chapter 17). For to strive for exact uniformity in everything would be rather to disturb peace ... Where a uniformity cannot actually be realized, the nations may retain their own forms in the exercises of piety and ceremonies, to the extent that faith and peace are preserved (chapter 20).

In all forms of divine adoration the one true God of Jesus Christ is meant and in Christianity the religious concerns of all are capable of realization. Nicholas later sought to prove this in regard to Islam. According to his *Cribatio Alchorani* (1461) the Koran contains the Christian message, but distorted and abridged; it needs only a "sifting."

With the pontificate of Pius II (1458–64) Nicholas of Cusa obtained the opportunity to escape from the increasingly hopeless guerilla warfare over his bishopric and to make his energies and reform will available to the entire Church. As early as the beginning of 1457 he had received from Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, just made a Cardinal, the pressing invitation to come to Rome so that they might bear the burden of responsibility together. The future Pope wrote:

> Unacceptable is the excuse, "I am not listened to, when I urge to what is right." Fortunes change, and he who was once scorned is now especially honoured. Come then, I implore you, come. For it is precisely your strength that must not languish there, inclosed in snow and dark vales. I know that there are many who wish to see, hear, and follow you, among whom you will always find me as your obedient listener and pupil.[17]

On 30 September 1458, after the accession of Pius II, Nicholas arrived in Rome. Frustrated in his bishopric, he seemed to have come to his exile, but in reality he experienced at the side of Pius II a climax in his ecclesiastical and reform activity. He was a member of the reform commission of cardinals, bishops, and prelates, appointed by the Pope in the autumn of 1458 to determine and report on what needed changing and reforming at the Curia. Of the deliberations and testimonials there are extant only the *De reformationibus romanae curiae* of Dominic de' Domenichi, Bishop of Torcello,[18] and Nicholas's *Reformatio generalis*, a sketch of a reform bull.[19] Pius II's reform program in the bull "Pastor aeternus" was based on the latter,[20] but because of the Pope's death it was never published.

---

[17] Letter of 27 December 1456, in E. Meuthen, *Die letzten Jahre des Nikolaus von Kues*, 133; *cf. ibid.*, 15.

[18] On the manuscripts and their content *cf.* H. Jedin, "Studien über Domenico de' Domenichi (1416–78)," *AAMz*, 5 (Wiesbaden 1957), 117–300 (especially pp. 247 ff.).

[19] Edited by S. Ehses in *HJ*, 32 (1911), 281–97; cf. E. Iserloh, *Reform der Kirche bei Nikolaus von Kues* (Wiesbaden 1965).

As early as 11 December 1458, Pius II, before his departure for the Congress of Princes at Mantua, had confided the reform of the Roman clergy to Nicholas of Cusa by naming him *Legatus Urbis* and governor of the part of the Papal State south of the Apennines. The Cardinal had at once taken up the task at a synod but he was hardly successful.[21] Failure, however, was unable to break his reform will. In order to gain a free hand with regard to France and Germany, in 1461 he recommended a council at Mantua, which should deal with crusade and reform.[22] If as Legate in Germany he had impressed upon visitors always to begin the reform of a monastery with its superior, so, according to the *Reformatio generalis,* the reform of the Universal Church should begin with the "Church of Rome and the Curia."[23] Nicholas knew only too well to what extent since the beginning of the fifteenth century the opinion had gained ground that the Popes and the Curia were chiefly responsible for the decay of the Church and how little the self-reform of the Curia was trusted. How justified this mistrust was he had himself abundantly experienced already.[24] The visitors should not even hesitate to visit the Pope. Though he is the Vicar of Christ, he is also a sinful and mortal man.[25] The cardinals should be exemplary men and faithful advisers of the Pope, subject to no one. As a continuing council in miniature, at the Pope's disposal, the College should have a share in the government of the Church.

The general rules given to the visitors aimed to lead every member of the Church, from the baptized Christian through monk, priest, canon, and cardinal, to Pope, to the manner of life which his name signifies and which he assumed in solemn promise. Steps should especially be taken against any pluralism, which impedes the celebration of the liturgy and the care of souls, against embezzlement of the property of hospitals and parishes, against humbug on the part of indulgence dealers, against false relics and allegedly miraculous Hosts, invented for the sake of indecent profit.

> It should be sufficient for Christians to have Christ really in their churches in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. In it they have everything that they can desire for their salvation (p. 291).

Nicholas sought, not radical changes, but reform, a leading back to Christ, the archetype of all Christians. "We who wish to reform all Christians can provide them with no other model for their imitation than Christ, from whom they have obtained their name" (p. 285). God the Father, so we read at the very beginning of the introduction to the reform treatise, has revealed himself in the Word, his beloved Son, full of grace and truth, in order to enable all who accept him to share in his life.

---

[20] R. Haubst, "Der Reformentwurf Pius' II.," *RQ*, 49 (1954), 188–242.

[21] E. Meuthen, *Die letzten Jahre des Nikolaus von Kues,* 32.

[22] *Ibid.,* 78, 84, 250–53.

[23] Edition of S. Ehses, 286.

[24] *Cf.* the statements quoted by E. Meuthen, *Die letzten Jahre des Nikolaus von Kues,* 81, 108; for example, "When I at last speak of reform in the consistory, they laugh at me."

[25] Edition of S. Ehses, 292.

> The Father's only commandment is to believe in his Son and ambassador, who is his Word . . . This faith bestows all sanctity, wisdom, justice, and beatitude. For he who truly believes this keeps his commandments and does not sin . . . He knows that true life is found only in the promises of Christ and no one is justified whom he does not justify by the merit of his death. He can say with the Apostle that he knows only Christ, and him crucified, in whom he achieves the highest and perfect faith, the faith whereby the just man lives (p. 282).

If a person seizes hold of Christ

> as the unique teacher of life, to him he gives in faith and work the figure which qualifies him for eternal life . . . However, Christ must impart and give it . . . For we are appointed out of grace to the inheritance. We can acquire it only by justice [based on] the merits of Christ . . . Hence he became justice for us . . . And so it is only from him that we have everything necessary for perfect bliss, whether it be grace or justice. And he is the sole mediator in whom is everything and without whom we cannot possibly be truly happy (pp. 284 f.).

Justification by faith can probably not be more clearly formulated, rejection of all justification by works cannot be more firmly stated. This is especially noteworthy in a summons to reform, in which one would expect to find stress placed rather on human activity. There is no question here of any isolated expression in Nicholas. For example, there occurs in *De pace fidei* (1453): "For man's justification consists in this — that he obtains the promise on the sole ground that he believes God and hopes for the fulfillment of God's word" (chapter 17).

If it is desired to represent the Cardinal as a reformer before the Reformation because of this teaching of his on justification by faith,[26] then it must be said simultaneously that at that time the Reformation was still a Catholic possibility.

Impressed with the stamp of a realistic scholasticism that was influenced by Platonism, Nicholas of Cusa freed himself in method from the Procrustean bed of the questions, objections, and responses of the philosophy of the schools and its cult of authorities. Related to humanism in this respect as well as in his renewed connection with antiquity and in his inclination to historical criticism, on the other hand he pressed too much for a speculative grasp of being in its unity and totality to be satisfied with the world of rhetorical literature of the humanists as he had encountered these in Italy. With Nicholas the philosophy of being became a philosophy of consciousness, of knowledge, even of the knowledge of not knowing. In this reflecting of the mind upon itself, in the question of one's own subjectivity and of the personal mind seizing hold of and touching upon everything, Nicholas probably most unambiguously showed himself to be a modern thinker. Furthermore, he took up the initial steps, later on so significant, toward mathematical and scientific thought in late scholasticism and in the Byzantine mathematicians and carried them forward creatively.

---

[26] The Hesse reformer John Kymeus (d. 1552) included the section quoted from *De pace fidei* in his pamphlet *Des Babsts Hercules wider die Deutschen* (1538, ed. by O. Menzel in *Cusanusstudien,* VI, 6 [Heidelberg 1941]). Chapter 4 reads: "That in regard to our justification, Cardinal Cusanus has written contrary to the Pope's views and in conformity with our Gospel."

Above all, Nicholas of Cusa was a churchman, for whom the receptacle of all philosophy, all exertions of the mind, was theology; in the final analysis they had to serve to conduct man and history back to their divine origin. On the other hand he also again and again withdrew himself from the leisure of speculation in order to intervene in a responsible fashion in the exasperating real world of Church and Empire, though here compromises were at most to be expected. He stood in the "autumn of the Middle Ages," but also in the spring of the modern world. He proved that it would have been possible for the latter to come forth in continuity with the Middle Ages and in harmony with the Church and that, accordingly, the revolution was as yet not an unconditional historical necessity. It was all the more portentous that, after Pius II, began the series of Renaissance Popes in the bad sense and the papacy long refused to have anything to do with the reform that was so urgently demanded.

Johannes von Wesel

Compared with Nicholas of Cusa, the men who, like Johannes von Wesel, Johannes von Goch, and Wessel Gansfort, have been called "reformers before the Reformation," seem small in regard to religious depth, reform *élan,* and inner proximity to Luther, unless the essence of the reform movement is understood simply as criticism of the Church. As has already been said, the fifteenth century was characterized by a looking back to tradition. Aquinas and the *via antiqua* experienced a renaissance. People were weary of the extravagant sophistries of the *via moderna* and found it painful that what had been achieved should again and again be questioned. In particular the second half of this century was under the sign "of romantic restoration tendencies."[27] Furthermore, if one reckoned oneself in the Ockhamist school, one strove to bring all radical theses into harmony with pedantic orthodoxy. Problems became superficial, contradictions were smoothed over. The *collectorium,* the anthology, and collections of maxims from available works became the desirable literary *genre;* the repeating of the "ancients" in paraphrase became the customary method. If the German universities already had displayed the most timid hesitation in regard to the radical tendencies of the Council of Basel, people were especially suspicious and aloof in regard to whatever seemed to be connected with the Hussite disturbances. What was to be read in fourteenth century treatises, such as those of Marsilius of Padua or William of Ockham, could no longer be repeated without opposition, just as it was, and even less could it be withdrawn from the sphere of academic disputation and set before the mob.

---

[27] G. Ritter, *Spätscholastik,* III, 4.

This explains the fate of a mind, hardly original and rather mediocre, condemned by the Inquisition and regarded by later generations as a "reformer before the Reformation":[28] Johannes Rucherath von Oberwesel. From 1441 he studied at Erfurt, where he became master of arts in 1445 and doctor of theology in 1456. Immediately afterwards he was rector of the University. From his Erfurt period came his commentaries on the *Physics* of Aristotle and on *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard, which offered a simple and shallow Ockhamism. "The infinite mass of learned ballast drives out the spirit at the same time."[29] For unknown reasons Johannes von Wesel went to Worms, where in 1460 he was a canon. In the spring of 1461 he took up at Basel a professorship in theology that had been offered him. But he soon (1463) returned to Worms as cathedral preacher. In addition to his preaching activity, he published a series of popular theological works, in which the practical pastor of souls answered questions of moral theology and canon law. They dealt with the artificial discharge of the semen for reasons of health, the obligations of a husband whose wife had made a vow of chastity before marriage, the Immaculate Conception of Mary; they opposed astrology, the instituting of the feast of Mary's presentation in the temple, and indulgences. The author directed an often bold and challenging criticism to Church life and institutions, but there is no trace of a deeper religious concern, not to mention the proclaiming of a new, reforming sense. Decisive for him were the Ockhamist viewpoints of the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man. This caused him to write against astrology and above all to place limits to the legislative authority of the Church. He clearly expounds the difference between the divine and the merely ecclesiastical law. God bestows grace in absolute freedom; but he can even grant it when man does not do "what is in him." Grace places man in a position to gain eternal life. God acts directly in the Sacraments if the priestly minister effects the sign. Johannes von Wesel rejects indulgences because the temporal punishments for sin, such as sickness, age, death, and the pains of purgatory, have to be endured and only God can dispose of the merits of the saints. The establishing of the temporal punishments of sin must be left to him alone. According to God's determination, the Church's power of the keys refers only to the guilt of sin. To conclude from the *de facto* instituting of indulgences by the Church a justification of the practice is unlawful, for the Church, like councils, can err. Only the Church of Christ, contained in the Universal Church but not empirically demonstrable, is holy and immaculate.[30] According to Matthew 28: 20, Christ himself is always with his Church and guiding her. He needs no vicar, and he alone, in the final analysis, has the power of the keys. The Pope is the executor of his commands. For the building up of the Church he has a certain authority in the framework of positive law. He can establish feasts and order fasts and other things, but he cannot impose them under pain of mortal sin. Ultimately authoritative is the truth recorded in Holy Scripture. This truth is authority; in comparison with it knowledge acquired by reason and revelation by means of miracles have only a secondary importance. What is necessary for salvation is contained in the Bible.[31]

---

[28] C. Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation,* I (Gotha, 2nd ed. 1866), 202–346.

[29] Ritter, *op. cit.,* III, 9.

According to Johannes von Wesel, a scriptural proof of transubstantiation cannot be given. Though, like Ockham, he inclined to consubstantiation, also like Ockham he held to the substantial change as being the teaching of the Church. And he adhered to the Ockhamist school also in the doctrine of original sin. With Anselm he saw its essence in the absence of the justice of the original state of man, with no further injuring of nature which would be transmitted by procreation. Because original sin is thus the mere lack of something not of itself belonging to man, Johannes von Wesel could designate it as a "nothing";[32] but this does not imply that he denied it, as G. Ritter and others have said of him.[33] Apart from the denial of the *Filioque*, for which he saw no scriptural basis, in his trial for heresy he could not really be charged with any formal heresies,[34] but only with brazenly formulated opinions which had already been expounded for decades. But is was fatal to him that, as Wessel Gansfort complained,[35] he brought everything into the pulpit before the people and brought suspicion upon himself through his relations with the Hussites.

---

[30] "Ecclesiam Christi sic intelligit: Ecclesia est collectio omnium fidelium caritate copulatorum, iuxta opinionem suam motus verbis sequentibus in evangelio, 'Et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam' (Mt. 16:18). Et credit eandem esse Christi ecclesiam quam nemo sciat nisi deus" — in O. Clemen, "Über Leben und Schriften des Johannes von Wesel," *DZGw*, NF, 2 (1898), 143–73 (especially p. 170).

[31] "In quibus mysteria salutis plurima et fortassis omnia ad salutem necessaria continentur" — "Disputatio gegen die Ablässe," ed. by Walch, *Monimenta medii aevi*, I, 1, pp. 111–56 (especially p. 113).

[32] ". . . quidam ponunt aliquid reale parvulos contrahere a parentibus alii autem ponunt nihil reale esse peccatum originale, sed tantum esse privacionem iusticie originalis debite inesse. De numero eorum ego sum, qui dico: Peccatum originale nihil est" — Ritter, *op. cit.*, III, 88.

[33] O. Clemen, "Zu dem Ketzerprozess Johannes' von Wesel," *DZGw*, NF, 2 (1898), 168, speaks of a "denial of the doctrine of original sin"; so does G. Ritter, *Spätscholastik*, III, 18. He is followed by R. Samoray, *Johannes von Wesel* (typewritten diss., Münster 1954), who makes also the serious mistake of always translating "iustitia originalis" as "natural justice" (e. g., 60 f., 66, 68).

In 1477 he was dismissed from his posts as cathedral preacher and canon at Worms, but found temporarily a situation as rector of the cathedral at Mainz; however, he was soon again accused of heresy and of relations with the Hussites. In February 1479 he had to defend himself before a tribunal of the Inquisition, consisting of professors from the Universities of Heidelberg, Cologne, and Mainz and of members of the Mainz cathedral chapter. The presidency was exercised by the Cologne Dominican and Inquisitor Gerard von Elten, together with the Dominican James Sprenger, the future coauthor of the *Malleus Maleficarum* (Cologne 1489). After almost fourteen days of discussion, when he had recanted nineteen propositions that had been branded as heretical and his books had been burned, he was condemned on 21 February 1479 to life-imprisonment among the Mainz Augustinians. There he soon died, probably in 1481, after reception of the Sacraments.

Johannes von Goch

In contrast to the frequently challenging criticism of Johannes von Wesel, Johannes Pupper von Goch remained in the sphere of a "theology of calm edification" in the spirit of the *devotio moderna.*[36] Born at Goch on the lower Rhine early in the fifteenth century and educated by the Brothers of the Common Life, as a priest he studied law at Cologne, perhaps in 1454. In 1459 he founded near Mechlin the Augustinian monastery of Thabor for canonesses, which he governed until his death on 28 March 1475. His works were circulated in manuscript and did not appear in print until after 1520. Opposing every institutional rigidity, he stressed the free operation of the Holy Spirit in the free activity of the man of a pious disposition. Tradition has authority only in so far as it is close to the Bible.

> Faith without doubt and authority without opposition belong only to the canonical Scripture. The writings of the ancient Fathers have authority to the extent that they conform to the canonical truth . . . The writings of modern teachers, especially of those from the mendicant orders, . . . serve rather empty show than truth *(Epistola apologetica).*

---

[34] This is also the opinion of the glossator of the report of the trial; *cf.* Ritter, *op. cit.*, III, 25, 10; O. Clemen in *DZGw*, NF, 2 (1898), 167–69.

[35] Letter to Ludolf van Veen, *Opera* (Groningen 1614), 920 f.; Ritter, *op. cit.*, III, 28.

[36] G. Ritter, "Romantische und revolutionäre Elemente," *DVfLG*, 5 (1927), 363.

But the Church attests to Scripture; John agreed with Augustine's statement that he would not believe the Gospel if he did not believe the Church. However, incontestable authority belongs to the Church only in matters of faith and not in practical directions. Hence John could criticize monasticism and vows. The evangelical counsels must, in a sense, be observed by all Christians as means for the observing of the commandments. They call upon us to do good works out of pure love.

As a nominalist, Johannes von Goch separated philosophy and theology, but he rejected the thesis of the double truth. The one truth can be recognized only in the light of faith. His doctrine of acceptance leaned heavily on Augustinian thought. It rests with God's discretion whether to behold and accept man's works with forbearance or to regard them as they actually are, as a bloodstained clout (Is 64:6). Finally, Johannes von Goch was a mystic, concerned for union with God in love. Man must let himself be filled by the divine love and arrive, by means of love of God and neighbour, at likeness to God and union with him. The permeation of the human will by the divine love leads to the *fruitio dei,* which is not an act of knowledge but of will, namely, the ability for the highest love.

Wessel Gansfort

Like Johannes von Goch, the more important and bolder Wessel Gansfort (1419–89) came from the world of the *devotio moderna.* Born at Groningen, he studied there with the Brothers of the Common Life and then taught at Zwolle (1432–49). His profound uneasiness drove him into the world. He studied first at Cologne (1449) and then at Heidelberg (1456–57); in 1458 he was in Paris and around 1470 he went to Italy. He zealously applied himself to languages, learning Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. But he found as little satisfaction in early humanism as he had in scholasticism. He had started out as a champion of Cologne Neo-Thomism; then, one after another, he took up all the schools of the existing universities and learned to scorn them all together.[37] Externally he included himself in the Ockhamist school, without sacrificing his independence to a professorial chair. He was critical of the authority of Pope and council, of the Church's power of binding and loosing, of indulgences and purgatory, of the efficacy of the Sacraments. Only Scripture is binding. The apostolic traditions interpret the content of the canonical Scriptures. We believe with the Church, not in the Church.[38]

It cannot be said that Wessel Gansfort in his teaching overstepped the limits of what was then possible within the Church. He actually proved how much latitude there was in the fifteenth century or how extensive was the dogmatic uncertainty. After long years of travelling — he had to leave Paris in 1475, probably because of the royal prohibition of nominalism — he returned to his point of departure, the world of the *devotio moderna.* From 1477 to 1482 he lived on the Agnetenberg, enjoying the protection of Bishop David of Utrecht. In his last years he devoted himself at Groningen to study and meditation.

---

[37] *Ibid.*, 372.

[38] *Opera* (Groningen 1614), 888.

Though a layman, he composed for the pious canons of Agnetenberg a series of treatises as an introduction to prayer and meditation. These were, among others, *De Oratione,* with an explanation of the Our Father, *Scala Meditationis, Exempla scalae Meditationis, De magnitudine Dominicae Passionis,* and *De Sacramento Eucharistiae.* He was concerned about the encounter with Christ, especially with him crucified, in the faith given by God. "God has been pleased to impart justice to those who believe, to bestow on them a greater righteousness and integrity than the justice of the angels."[39] Also in the Eucharist Christ wants to be received in faith. Hence a purely spiritual communion in faith and love can produce more fruit than a sacramental reception which is lacking in disposition, in a real spiritual hunger and thirst. Through his introduction to meditation Wessel Gansfort became one of the teachers of the *devotio moderna,* especially influencing John Mombaer (d. 1501) and his *Rosetum.* Luther felt a spiritual relationship with him. In 1522 Luther published *Farrago rerum theologicarum,* a collection of essays, and remarked in the introduction that the malicious might be able to think that he had taken everything from Wessel Gansfort, "so much were both minds in accord" (*WA,* 10, II, 317). But we have to see in Wessel Gansfort a connecting link from the *devotio moderna* to criticism of the Church and to the spiritualistic Bible Christianity of Erasmus.

Gabriel Biel

Gabriel Biel (d. 1495) represents the direct connection between late mediaeval theology and piety and the modern age. He ranks as the "last of the scholastics" of the Middle Ages and exercised a strong influence on both Luther and Luther's Catholic opponents. At the same time as Luther was doing so at Erfurt, his future opponent John Eck was lecturing at Freiburg (1509–10) on *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard, following Biel.

Gabriel Biel was born at Speyer around 1410. As morning sacristan of Sankt Peter there, he matriculated at Heidelberg in 1432, becoming master of arts in 1438. In 1442–43 and again in 1452 he was on the theological faculty at Erfurt and in 1453 on that at Cologne. It cannot be determined where he obtained his licentiate in theology. In any case, he got to know not only Ockham at Erfurt but also Aquinas and Albert at Cologne. At the beginning of the sixties he became vicar and cathedral preacher at Mainz. In the struggle over the see between Dieter von Isenburg and Adolf von Nassau, he supported the latter and hence the Pope. He justified his position in *Defensorium oboedientiae apostolicae ad Pium Papam II* (1462). Around 1468 he joined the Brothers of the Common Life at Marienthal in the Rheingau and soon became provost of Sankt Markus, their house at Butzbach. From 1476 he collaborated with Count Eberhard the Bearded in the Württemberg Church reform initiated by the latter, and in 1479 he became provost of Eberhard's foundation, the monastery at Urach. On 22 November 1484 he assumed a professorship at the University of Tübingen, founded in 1477; he made possible there the break-through of the *via moderna.* Following his retirement in 1491, he directed the new house of the Brothers of the Common Life, Sankt Peter at Einsiedel in the Schönbuch near Tübingen, and there he died on 7 December 1495.

---

[39] *De magnitudine passionis,* chapter 45, *Opera,* 551.

Gabriel Biel was not especially independent. He communicated to his epoch the nominalist theology in a form supplemented and toned down in accord with a pastoral outlook. His works are compilations, very popular because of their practical usefulness. His dependence on the topic of the moment is apparent, for example, in the fact that, in his commentary on *The Sentences,* in the doctrine of the Eucharist he in no way discusses the Mass as a sacrifice, but in the *Expositio* he allows it much space.

The commentary on *The Sentences* is a summary of and addition to Ockham's *Quaestiones in IV libros Sententiarum* and hence is also called the *Epitome* or *Collectorium.* According to F. Stegmüller it became "the classical work of theological nominalism." Biel finished the first book before 1 May 1486 and the third on 13 August 1488, while the fourth probably preoccupied him until his death.

But the crucial point of Biel's work is found in the religious and pastoral sphere, in his sermons and his explanation of the Canon of the Mass. His lengthy sermons prove a high opinion of the dignity and importance of the word of God. He who does not devote a proper attention to preaching is no less guilty than one who out of carelessness lets the body of Christ fall to the ground. Preaching is really more important than the Blessed Sacrament, for the former leads to faith and penitence and hence is necessary for salvation, whereas the latter only increases grace.[40] The *Canonis missae Expositio,* completed on 4 November 1488, is a lecture, closely dependent on the discourses which his friend, Master Egeling Becker of Braunschweig, had delivered at Mainz at the close of the 1450's. Biel claims he omitted only a little but "added or changed some." A comparison of both texts shows "that more than three-fourths of the *Expositio* belongs to Master Egeling."[41] This work, at the reading of which Luther had felt his heart bleed from emotion,[42] stands between scholastic theology — for those untrained in "scholastic subtleties" Biel published an abridged version, the *Epitome* — and pastoral theology.

---

[40] *Sermones dominicales* (Hagenau 1510), 59 D; *cf.* H. A. Obermann, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963), 23.

In his theology Biel closely follows Ockham. But he does not propound it so defiantly and takes care that its philosophical permeation does not undermine faith. Throughout, he has rather the actual way of salvation in mind. *De potentia dei absoluta* God can accept anyone for salvation without *caritas creata,* but conversely he does not have to bestow eternal life on anyone who possesses *caritas.* He is absolutely free and not bound by any form or available gift. Thus Biel, like Ockham, seeks to exclude any Pelagianism.[43] The divine will has no superior rule to which it must conform itself. A thing is right and just because God wills it to be so.[44] He can do something which in itself is unjust. If he were to do it, then it would be just for it to happen.[45] One can rightly speak here of a "divine caprice." But actually God has bound himself. Since Biel now discusses the actual way of salvation in more detail and treats the question of preparation for grace by applying the proposition: "God does not deny grace to one who does his best," he succumbs to the danger of Semipelagianism. For now the initiative lies with man. *Facere quod est in se* is understood as natural activity with the exclusion of actual grace. Man for his part is in the position of doing his first duty, and God, because he has so bound himself, is obliged to give his grace to everyone who does his best.[46] Thus, grace is "not the root but the fruit of the preparatory good works,"[47] God's reply to man's free act. Here Gabriel Biel finds himself opposing Gregory of Rimini, who credits man's free will with too little (II *Sent.*, d. 28, q. 1, A). Man does his best if he loves God above all. As Ockham had already taught, this love lies in the possibility of man's natural powers. All the more must man struggle for it or be anxious about possessing it. Accordingly, in such a strongly Pelagian system anxiety over salvation is not less but greater. "The dialectic between fear and love is [also] the general topic of Biel's preaching."[48] Thus Gabriel Biel became Luther's chief opponent in the latter's "Disputation against Scholastic Theology" of 4 September 1517, in which Luther sought to prove that modern theology was Pelagian. "All the antitheses which dealt directly with the theological theme of the disputation were either directly taken from Biel's *Collectorium* or at least are to be found there."[49]

---

[41] A. Franz, *Messe im Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1902), 553. That this dependence is not clear in the edition of H. A. Obermann and N. J. Courtenay is a serious defect.

[42] "Gabriel scribens librum super canonem missae, qui liber meo iudicio tum optimus fuerat; when I read it, my heart bled. Bibliae autoritas nulla fuit erga Gabrielem" (*WA, Tr,* III, no. 3722).

[43] "Et hoc dictum maxime recedit ab errore Pelagii..." (1 *Sent.,* d. 17, q. 1, a. 2, F); L. Grane, *Contra Gabrielem* (Copenhagen 1962), 149–53.

[44] "Non enim habet aliam regulam, cui teneatur se conformare, sed ipsa divina voluntas est regula omnium contingentium. Nec enim quia aliquid rectum est aut iustum, ideo deus vult, sed quia deus vult, ideo iustum et rectum" (1 *Sent.,* d. 17, q. 1, a. 3, L).

[45] "Deus potest aliquid facere, quod non est iustum fieri a deo; si tamen faceret, iustum esse fieri" (1 *Sent.,* d. 41, a. 1, E); *cf.* W. Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre von Duns Scotus bis Luther* (Münster 1963), 357 f.

[46] *Canonis missae Expositio,* Lect. 59 P: "Ex quo hoc elicitur, quod iste facit quod est in se, qui illuminatus lumine rationis naturalis aut (!) fidei vel utroque cognoscit peccati turpitudinem et proponens ab ipso resurgere desiderat divinum adiutorium quo possit a peccato mundari et deo suo creatori adhaerere. Haec facienti deus gratiam suam tribuit necessario, necessitate non coactionis sed immutabilitatis." *Cf.* Obermann, *op. cit.,* 132 ff. On Ockham see E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie* (Wiesbaden 1956), 126–33.

In his explanation of the Canon of the Mass Biel emphasizes that the Mass is not a repetition of the sacrifice once directly offered by Christ on the cross, but a calling to mind and representation of it.[50] The related concepts, *memoria, recordatio,* and *repraesentatio,* are not explained with regard to content. There is no question in all this of an identity with the sacrifice of the cross but of a difference in the manner of offering. The Mass is a symbol of the sacrifice of the cross, a recalling of the historical past as a psychological representation. The "moment of truth" and the unity of the sacrifice are based on the sacrificial gift which is offered by the Church in the Mass. Since the Mass is "only" a symbol, in value it is far inferior to the sacrifice of the cross.[51] Biel understands the "once for all" of Hebrews (7, 27; 9, 11; 10, 10) to refer to the bloody sacrifice on the cross and not to the daily sacrifice under the appearances of bread and wine.[52] Hence it is unexplained how the Church can have a sacrifice without the unity of the New Testament sacrifice being jeopardized — a question which, a few decades later, would come decisively between Luther and the Church.

---

[47] Obermann, *op. cit.*, 141, 176; Grane, *op. cit.*, 214–22; II *Sent.*, q. 1, a. 2, concl. 1: "Item voluntas ex suis naturalibus potest se disponere ad gratiae dispositionem"; *Sermones dominicales,* 99 F: "peccator disponens se recipit gratiam."

[48] Obermann, *op. cit.*, 133. He reaches a conclusion which at most can be toned down but can hardly be refuted: "It is therefore evident that Biel's doctrine of justification is essentially Pelagian" (177).

[49] Grane, *op. cit.*, 46.

[50] "In cruce enim Christus se immediate obtulit, factus verum sacrificium ... In officio autem missae idem sacrificium est et oblatio, non per iteratam mortem sed per mortis semel passae rememorativam repraesentationem" (Lect. 27 K). "Unde nostra oblatio non est reiteratio suae oblationis sed repraesentatio" (Lect. 53 U). "... illius sacrificii veri et immolationis sanctae factae in cruce repraesentativa est et memoriale ... imago quaedam est passionis Christi repraesentativa, quae est vera eius immolatio, ideo et ipsa immolatio nominatur" (Lect. 85 F).

[51] "Quis autem dubitat esse maioris efficaciae mortem semel in sanguinis effusione ... quam tantum mortis semel passae memoriam" (Lect. 27 K).

[52] "Quamvis autem semel oblatus est Christus in aperta carnis effigie, offertur nihilominus quottidie in altari velatus in panis vinique specie" (Lect. 85 F).

CHAPTER 60

The Jews in Mediaeval Christendom

Despite national and political variety, Western Christendom was, until the beginning of modern times, united in the one faith in Christ in the one Church. Paganism and especially Islam were thought of as both a foreign threat and a religious danger. In day-to-day consciousness the world as a reality determined and formed by religion was identical with Christianity.

The Jews were an exception, constituting a special religious and national group and, as such, exposed to all prejudices and resentments. Unintelligible rites, not open to everyone, increased the mistrust and dread. In the abstract Judaism was far closer to Christianity than was paganism. According to the mosaics in the apses of Christian basilicas, the Christian congregation even in the early Middle Ages regarded itself as the Church of Jews (Jerusalem) and pagans (Bethlehem). In crucifixion scenes in manuscript illuminations and on the portals or in the narthex of Gothic cathedrals the synagogue proclaimed through the majesty of her aspect the dignity of the Chosen People, while the blindfold and the broken lance indicated that this people missed its destiny and in its obstinacy called down the blood of the Messiah upon itself and its children. The less this understanding was dominated, in the course of the Middle Ages, by the Pauline message that God had not retracted his promise to Israel but rather that finally this nation, whose "rejection had brought the reconciliation of the world," would be saved as a whole, and the less people took to heart with Gregory the Great the reflection that the death of Jesus was caused by all mankind, the accusation of deicide became the root of a religiously determined anti-Semitism.

Patristic theology established the notion of Jewish servitude *(servitus Iudaeorum)*. According to Augustine,[1] who was here following Tertullian and Justin, the older (Esau) shall, according to Genesis 25:23, serve the younger (Jacob), and the Jewish people, having forfeited its inheritance, had become the slave of the younger Christian people.[2] This idea was adopted by mediaeval theologians, including Rupert of Deutz (d. 1129), Peter the

---

[1] *Epistolae*, III, 196, *PL*, 33, 897, *CSEL*, 57, 226 f.; *Sermones de script.*, 5, *PL*, 38, 56; *De civit.*, XVI, c. 35, *CSEL*, 40 II, 187, *PL*, 41, 513.

[2] G. Kisch, *Forschungen*, 64 f.

Venerable (d. 1156), Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), and Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274). The Jews were scattered among the nations as witnesses to the prophecies and are reserved for the end. They are "bookkeepers of the Christians,"[3] as slaves they carry the Holy Scripture for them but without understanding it. Thus the pagans cannot assert that the Christians had invented the prophecies. These theologians envisaged only individual conversions; the people as a whole will not be converted and will persist in its blindness and slavery till the end of the world as witness of Christ's death, and hence no one is allowed to do violence to it.

At first this "servitude of the Jews" was valid only in the spiritual and not the legal sense. Decisions in Roman Law in regard to the Jews, made last of all under Justinian (527–65), were transmitted into the Middle Ages and were not expressly abolished. According to these, religious toleration was basically accorded them, but it was subjected to various restrictions. Conversion to Judaism was forbidden. The Jews were free and could possess property, but they were excluded from public office and military service and could not keep Christian slaves or domestics. At first in the Middle Ages they could freely engage in commerce and industry and did not have to reside in ghettos. Perhaps the common practice of their religion in a hostile environment induced the Jews on their own to live in special residential quarters. But it was only in the late Middle Ages that the Jewish quarter became a ghetto, walled in and sealed off by gates. In the early Middle Ages Christians and Jews lived together on relatively friendly terms; the anti-Semitic writings of Agobard of Lyons (d. 840) and of Claudius of Turin (d. *ca.* 827) were an exception and were motivated by local frictions. Bishops and kings issued letters of safe-conduct for the Jews, who in return paid fees. Thus privileges were granted to the Jews of Speyer by Bishop Rüdiger in 1084 and to those of Worms and Speyer by the Emperor Henry IV in 1090.

Shortly afterwards severe persecutions of Jews occurred in connection with the crusades. As early as 1063 when aid was being hurried to the Christians of Spain in their war against Islam, *en route* attacks were made on Jews. Pope Alexander II censured the blind passion which then raged against those whom the divine goodness perhaps destined for salvation.[4] And the same Pope cited greed as the motive for persecution of Jews. Frightful excesses took place when the crusaders from northern France moved up the Rhine toward the southeast. In the Jews people saw "enemies of Christ" who had to be liquidated in one's own country before the Holy Land could be set free. The chronicler Ekkehard of Aura, who took part in the crusade in 1101, reported:

---

[3] Augustinus, *Enarrationes in Ps.* 56, 9, *PL*, 36, 666; *CSEL*, 39, 699 f.; P. Browe, "Die Judengesetzgebung Justinians," *Miscellanea iuridica Iustiniani et Gregorii IX*, ed. by the Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana (Rome 1935), 109–46 (especially pp. 140 f.).

[4] "Epistola ad omnes episcopos Hispaniae": "Illi quippe stulta ignorantia, vel forte caeca cupiditate commoti, in eorum necem volebant saevire, quos fortasse divina pietas ad salutem praedestinavit" (*PL*, 146, 1386 f.).

> In all cities through which they went they either completely exterminated or forced baptism on the remnants of the wicked Jews, those internal enemies of the Church. But very many of them returned to their former faith, as the dog to his vomit.[5]

These excesses became still worse in the next crusades. The Cistercian Radulf, who was inciting religious fanatics and the economically discontented to murder the "enemies of the Christian religion," encountered opposition at Mainz from Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. According to the latter, the Jews must be neither persecuted nor banished; for they are living witnesses of our redemption, who set the Lord's sufferings before our eyes.

Bishops and Emperors undertook the protection of Jews and in times of persecution placed their castles and strongholds at their disposal. They punished extravagances. The public peace promulgated at Mainz in 1103 subjected any attack on the life and property of Jews to the threat of punishment, including the death penalty.[6] On the occasion of the pogroms in connection with the Third Crusade, Frederick I issued an edict whereby the hand that injured a Jew was to be cut off and murder of a Jew was to be punished by death.[7] This Emperor considered the Jews as belonging to the imperial fisc.

In the thirteenth century the legal situation of the Jews deteriorated. Their "servitude," originally understood as spiritual, became legal, and, as "slaves of the imperial chamber," the Jews were placed under a particular law.[8] The privilege of the Emperor Frederick II for Vienna in 1237 states:

> Faithful to the obligations of a Catholic prince, we exclude the Jews from public office so that they may not exploit the power of office to oppress Christians. For the imperial authority from time immemorial has imposed perpetual servitude on the Jews as punishment for Jewish crime.[9]

As slaves of the chamber the Jews and their belongings were the possession of the Emperor, taxable by him and at the same time under his protection. In 1342 Louis the Bavarian demanded a tax of a florin, the *guldin pfenning*, from every Jew at least twelve years of age and imposed on them a regular poll-tax, "in return for which he intended to protect the Jews so much the better."[10] Protection of the Jews thus became a source of revenue, which, with the decay of the central power, was claimed by bishops and princes also or was regularly sold or pawned to them. In the fourteenth century the right to protect the Jews became more and more an object of traffic.

---

[5] *MGSS*, VI, 208, *PL*, 154, 959.

[6] Kisch, *op. cit.*, 57.

[7] I. Ellbogen *et al.*, *Germania Judaica*, I, 182.

[8] Kisch, *op. cit.*, 59 ff.

[9] J. Aronius, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland bis zum Jahre 1273* (Berlin 1902), no. 509; Kisch, *op. cit.*, 67.

The Jews' route into bondage from the thirteenth century onward was accompanied by fearful pogroms, for which the charge of ritual murder and of desecration of the Blessed Sacrament supplied the pretext. According to this the Jews were said to have given vent to their hatred of Christians by outraging the Host and innocent members of Christ's body. The first case referred to by name of an alleged ritual murder was that of William of Norwich (d. 1147), a twelve-year-old tanner's apprentice. The Jews were supposed to have enticed him into a trap in order to repeat on him the crucifixion of Christ, including the crowning with thorns and the piercing of the side. Other well-known cases were the murder of a boy at Blois in 1171, of Richard of Paris in 1179, of five children at Fulda in 1235, of Hugh of Lincoln in 1255, of Werner of Oberwesel in 1287, of Rudolf of Bern in 1294, of Andrew of Rinn in 1462, and of Simon of Trent in 1475. In the case of Werner of Oberwesel the two themes, murder and desecration of the Host, coalesced in the process of the development of the legend. The Jews were supposed to have wanted to obtain possession of the Host received by the boy; when they failed in this, they vented their fury on the mystical rather than the real body of Christ and tortured the youngster to death.[11]

Besides religious fanaticism and naked greed, which afforded a pretext for the pillaging of Jewish property or for the cancelling of debts, superstition led to this charge of murder. From Innocent IV (1243–54) the Popes had repeatedly opposed this, but their voices, like the voices of Emperors and bishops, went unheeded. They could not prevent persons "from maliciously charging the Jews with murder whenever a corpse was discovered" or from

> stirring fury against them by these and many other atrocity stories, depriving them of all their property without accusation, confession and conviction ... against God and justice, oppressing them with hunger, imprisonment, and many tortures and torments ... and condemning as many as possible to a shameful death.[12]

In the often renewed bull "Sicut Iudaeis" the Popes assured the Jews of freedom of religion, forbade compulsory baptism, and under threat of excommunication demanded unqualified respect for property and life.[13] Thus at the end of the Middle Ages the Jews in Italy were relatively very secure.

---

[10] M. Wiener, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland während des Mittelalters* (Hanover 1862), no. 137, p. 44; Kisch, *op. cit.*, 89.

[11] E. Iserloh, *Werner von Oberwesel*, 274 f.

[12] Pope Innocent IV on 5 July 1247 (*MGEp*, saec. XIII, II, 298); M. Stern, *Die päpstlichen Bullen über die Blutbeschuldigungen* (Munich 1900), 10–13; S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews*, 268–71.

However, at most the Church tolerated the Jews; in other respects she restricted them as far as possible. There could be only one synagogue in one place and this had to be as unassuming as possible.[14] Ecclesiastical regulations which sought to prevent endangering Christians by means of Jewish teaching and the association of Jews and Christians, above all in mixed marriages, contributed much to the hatred of Jews. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) decreed that "Jews and Saracens of both sexes in every Christian country and at all times should be distinguished in public from other persons by their dress, especially since Numbers 15:37–41 has already imposed this on them."[15] These prescriptions in regard to dress were not applied in Germany, however, before the fifteenth century. Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa had them prescribed during his legatine journey of 1451–52 by the provincial councils of Salzburg, Bamberg, Magdeburg, Mainz, and Cologne as canonical regulation and as the legal usage in Rome and at the same time had all money-lending by Jews to Christians forbidden.[16]

As a result of the remonstrances of the Emperor and the Archbishop of Salzburg this last prescription was annulled by the Pope, because it was too harmful to their private interests. For money-lending, to which the Jews were reduced after they had been excluded from the wholesale trade and in the late Middle Ages also from acquiring real estate, was thoroughly exploited for the public treasury by the Emperor and the princes, not excluding the bishops. These last often determined the excessive interest which branded the Jews as usurers. The Bishop of Minden, for example, in 1270 decided the maximum interest for the week as four pfennig in the mark — that is, 2.7 percent or 140 percent per year.

In the fifteenth century the Jews were almost completely annihilated in the Rhineland and many cities of South Germany. As early as the mid-fourteenth century frightful pogroms had occurred throughout Germany. The occasion was, among other things, the Black Death of 1348–49, which was attributed to the poisoning of wells by the Jews. In addition, flagellants on their journeys stirred up a blind religious hatred, which was whipped into a mass hysteria and in regard to which the exhortations of the Emperor

---

[13] *Decret. Greg. IX*, 1. 5, t. 6, c. 9, Friedberg, II, 774.

[14] P. Browe, *Die religiöse Duldung der Juden*, 34 ff.; *Decret. Greg. IX*, 1. 5, t. 6, c. 7, Friedberg, II, 773.

[15] *Decret. Greg. IX*, 1. 5, t. 6, c. 15, Friedberg, II, 776 f.

[16] J. Koch, "Nikolaus von Kues und seine Umwelt," *SAH* 1944/48, 2 (Heidelberg 1948), 112; J. Uebinger, "Kardinal Nicolaus Cusanus in Deutschland," *HJ*, 8 (1887), 638 f.

Charles IV (1346–78) and Pope Clement VI (1342–52) were of no avail. The real cause was envy and greed and the driving forces were often the gilds. In Basel the city council was forced to burn the Jews, and in Strasbourg the majority of the approximately 2,000 Jews were delivered to the flames in their cemetery. This example was followed at Speyer, Worms, Cologne, and many other places. At Mainz, which had the largest Jewish community in Germany, the Jews, after a fruitless defense, surrendered themselves to the fire. Although many cities again allowed them to take up residence and even exerted themselves to this end for the sake of financial gain, the Jewish communities never recovered after the Black Death. They were unable to cope with financial demands from three quarters: king, territorial prince, and city. Controversy between bishop and city council in regard to the protection of Jews led to new expulsions of Jews at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century: from Strasbourg (1386), the Palatinate (1390), Freiburg (1401 and 1424), Speyer (1405 and 1435), Trier (1418), Mainz (1420 and several times later), and Cologne (1423). The Emperor Frederick III (1440–93), who because of concern for taxes on Jews wanted to keep on the good side of his slaves of the chamber and therefore undertook their protection against princes and cities, was unable to prevent their extermination. Many of the Jews who were banished from western and southern Germany settled in lands east of the Elbe and in Italy.

Jews were expelled also from England, France, and especially Spain. After the fall of Granada in 1492 the *reyes católicos* enacted a law whereby everyone who did not attend proselytizing sermons and was unwilling to receive baptism within four months had to emigrate.[17] Some 50,000 may have avoided loss of home and property by means of baptism, but the majority left Spain. Feigned baptisms, however, were the source of new misgivings and of suspicions which went so far as to call for Inquisition procedures.

The Popes of the Renaissance, especially those of the Medici family, were kindly disposed to the Jews, and Leo X took Reuchlin under his protection. But a reaction began under Julius II when there was mention of a condemnation of the Talmud. It was completed by Paul IV, who in the bull of 14 July 1555 confined the Jews of Rome and of all other cities of the Papal State to ghettos, forbade them to possess real estate, and forced them to wear the yellow "Jewish hat."[18]

---

[17] P. Browe, *Die Judenbekämpfung*, 357.

[18] *Pastor*, XIV, 272; P. Rieger - H. Vogelstein, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, 2 vols. (Berlin 1895 f.).

Of special significance for the intellectual life were the Jews of Provence and Spain, where Christian and Muslim cultures were in contact and where especially Jewish and Arabic intellectual endeavours were in competition. Not only Arabic philosophers such as Averroes (d. 1198) but also Jews handed on to the West the writings and intellectual legacy of Aristotle. The philosopher and religious poet Avicebron or Solomon Ibn Gabirol (d. *ca.* 1070), who was born at Málaga around 1020, provided in a strongly pantheistic system a farrago of Jewish religious doctrines with Aristotelian and Catholic ideas. He influenced both high and late scholasticism through his chief work, *Fons Vitae,*[19] very well known in the Middle Ages. Against him Aquinas wrote *De substantiis separatis.*

The most significant representative of Jewish theology and philosophy in the Middle Ages was Moses Maimonides, who was born at Córdoba in 1135 and died at Cairo in 1204. He sought by means of commentaries on the Talmud and systematic presentations *(Recapitulation of the Law)* to explain Jewish doctrine and make the simple Jew acquainted with it. In his chief philosophical work, *Guide of the Wavering,*[20] he wanted to demonstrate the reasonableness of the faith of their fathers to those of his fellows who had been made unsure of it by Arabic philosophy. Philosophical knowledge, whose highest authority is Aristotle, is independent of revealed faith; it does not contradict it but rather helps to grasp it more deeply. Himself strongly affected by the Arabic Aristotelian philosophy, Maimonides acquired an influence on thinkers and mystics such as Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Master Eckhart, and Nicholas of Cusa.

Chasdai ben Abraham Crescas (1340–1412) in his *Light of God* definitely rejected Moses Maimonides and his Aristotelianism. For Crescas God is especially the supreme love and not the supreme reason. The route to God leads, for man, not by way of knowledge but of love.

Opposed to the rationalism of a Maimonides was likewise the *Cabala,* or tradition, a mystic and theosophic secret doctrine of Judaism. It originated in Provence between 1150 and 1250, spread to Spain, and, following the expulsion of 1492, became a national religious movement. Its chief work, *Zohar* ("Brilliance"), was attributed to the doctor of the law, Simon bar Jochai, of the second century, but must be regarded as composed by Moses de León (d. 1305) from Castile. According to it, the hidden God ("En Soph," the infinite, the first cause) reveals and unfolds himself in the ten "Sephirot" (spheres). Through them, as though through doors, the devout one, by proper fulfillment of the law, prayer, and contemplation, can gain access to the mystery of God and contribute to the restoration of the fallen world. In itself the world was created according to the model of the Sephirot and hence is a mirror of the divine wisdom revealing itself in them. Man and world are evil only to the extent that they have broken the connection with divine love and grace and depend upon themselves alone. The expanding of the *Cabala* from an esoteric teaching to a national movement after 1492 gave a new stimulus to messianism and contributed to intensification of internal life, but it also led to magic and to abuses of superstition. Beyond Judaism, the *Cabala* also influenced humanists such as Pico della Mirandola (d. 1494) and John Reuchlin (d. 1522).

---

[19] Hebrew and German, ed. by S. Munk (Paris 1859; new edition 1927); Latin translation by John of Spain, ed. by C. Baeumker (Münster 1895); French translation by F. Brunner (Paris 1950). Bibliography in G. Vajda, *Jüdische Philosophie* (Bern 1950).

[20] S. Munk, *Le guide des égarés* (Arabic with French translation), 3 vols. (Paris 1856–66; 2nd ed. 1960, French only); German translation by A. Weiss (Leipzig 1923 f.).

Efforts to Convert the Jews

With all the persecuting of the Jews, efforts were made time and again to win them to Christian truth. One means of this was the religious discussion. Far too often, it is true, this became an argument or dispute in which the important thing was to vanquish the opponent rather than to understand and win him over. Occasionally, especially in the earlier Middle Ages, there were real discussions. Abbot Gilbert Crispin of Westminster (1084–1117) tells that he had engaged in one with a friendly London Jew and thereupon another Jew of the city had been converted and had entered a monastery.[21] In discussions of this sort Archbishop Bruno of Trier (1102–24) succeeded in convincing his Jewish physician Josuah and in inducing him to be baptized.[22] The most celebrated example of such a conversion was Hermann Judaeus. He had money transactions with the Archbishop of Cologne and thereby came into contact with Abbot Rupert of Deutz. This led to exhaustive religious discussions. After severe struggles he had himself baptized, became a Premonstratensian at Kappenberg, and finally was made first prior of Scheda, founded in 1143. In his account of his conversion he laments that Christians' hatred for Jews kept Jews from belief in Christ.[23]

---

[21] Disputatio iudaei cum christiano, *PL,* 159, 1006; P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 61; according to Z. Werblowsky, "Crispins Disputation," *JJS,* 11 (1960), 69–77, it was only a fictional discussion.

[22] *Gesta Treverorum,* c. 21; *MGSS,* VII, 195; *Die Taten der Trierer,* ed. by E. Zenz, I (Trier 1955), 68.

[23] *De conversione sua opusculum, PL,* 170, 805–36; an amended text in J. Greven, "Die Schrift des Herimannus quondam iudaeus, 'De conversione sua opusculum,'" *AHVNrh,* 115 (1929), 111–33; G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie,* III, part 2/1 (Frankfurt 1959), 505–22.

From the thirteenth century ecclesiastical authorities regarded religious discussions between Jews and Christians with an ever growing distrust. Jews were often ahead of Christians in a knowledge of the Old Testament, and they did not find it difficult at all to refute irresponsible charges by means of the Talmud. Hence the Trier Provincial Council of 1227 forbade uneducated priests ("sacerdotes illiterati") to engage in such conversations.[24] Alexander IV's prohibition of disputes by the laity with heretics, which in 1298 became a part of the common law,[25] covered also colloquies with Jews. Rules of this sort were not intended to prevent disputations in which persons who had studied theology and clerics familiar with Hebrew and with the Talmud took part and which held out the prospect of demonstrating the superiority of the Christian faith. Particularly in Spain such public disputations took place in the high and late Middle Ages. Famous were that at Barcelona in 1263 and that at Tortosa. This last was spread out over sixty-nine sessions, from 7 February 1413 to 13 November 1414, most of which were guided by Benedict XIII, Peter de Luna, himself. The discussion was rather an invitation to conversion than a real and candid dispute. Just the same, the most famed Aragonese rabbis and scholars upheld the Jewish side, while the Christian side was chiefly represented by the converts Andrew Bertram (Mosse) and Jerome de Sancta Fide (Josua Halorqui).[26] In his bull on the Jews Benedict XIII gives the number of Jews converted following the disputation as 3,000.

Polemical writings were often not real dialogues, even though they were often so called. The Jewish participants were for the most part invented in order to demonstrate the truth of the Christian faith by their objections. In the *Annulus sive Dialogus inter Christianum et Iudaeum*[27] Rupert of Deutz aims to prove from the prophecies of the Old Testament the truth of the Christian faith, in particular the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. For him the Jew was the older brother, to whom the Father was still offering the ring, the mark of faith. Saint Hildegarde of Bingen in her visions argued in a similar fashion, using the same religious and conciliatory language. But the farther we get from the early Middle Ages, the more inconsiderate, contemptuous, and ironical becomes the tone of the discussion. "This is especially true of the disputations introduced into the dramatic presentations of the later period, the Passion Plays, Corpus Christi Plays, and Shrove Tuesday Plays, which were presented for the amusement of the audience."[28]

---

[24] *Mansi,* XIII, 32.

[25] *Liber Sextus Decret.,* 1. 5, t. 2, c. 2.

[26] P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 79–85.

[27] *PL,* 170, 559–610.

[28] P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 113; *cf.* here (pp. 99–110) the list of polemical works composed from the seventh century to 1560.

Of greater importance among polemical writings were the chief work of the Dominican Raymond Martí (d. 1286), *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Iudaeos;* the religious discussion, *Liber de gentili et tribus sapientibus,* by the learned missionary Raymond Lull (d. 1315/16), which avoided all invective; the *Pharetra fidei Catholicae contra Iudaeos,* attributed to the Paris Dominican Theobald; and the strongly anti-Jewish *Fortalitium fidei* of the Spanish Franciscan convert Alfonso de Spina (d. 1491). The *Tractatus contra perfidos Iudaeos* and *Der stern Meschiah* by the Dominican Peter Schwarz (Petrus Nigri, d. 1481) were widely circulated.

Mediaeval theologians and canonists forbade Jews to attend Christian worship. For Thomas Aquinas it was not fitting that infidels and Jews should look at the sacred Host.[29] Jews were, however, allowed to hear sermons. In 1278 Pope Nicholas III asked the superiors of the Franciscans and Dominicans to select qualified preachers who would be able to bring the Jews to the truth of the Gospel. If necessary, they should enlist the aid of the secular authorities in this. Not much came of this decree. Only in Spain did persons go to great trouble from the thirteenth century to convert Muslims and Jews and to fit them into Christian society. Since they did not come voluntarily, the authorities resorted to force. These compulsory sermons, occurring several times a year in churches, public squares, or even in synagogues, had, understandably, only slight and, for the most part, merely external success, especially when the preachers, annoyed by their failure, began to revile the Jews.

Sermons of this sort are not heard of in Germany until the fifteenth century. On the occasion of his legatine activity against the Hussites, John of Capestrano (d. 1456) preached also to the Jews at Vienna and Nürnberg. They were required to attend. Otherwise we know only of the grand-scale but likewise fruitless proselytizing effort of the Dominican Peter Schwarz. At Regensburg in 1474 and at Frankfurt, Worms, Bamberg, and Nürnberg later, he delivered lectures in the Hebrew and German languages which the Jews had to attend. In fifteenth-century Italy proselytizing attempts of this sort were undertaken by great preachers, such as John of Capestrano and Bernardine of Siena (d. 1444). But in their exertions to alleviate the economic misery of the people they seem to have preached rather against the Jews and their usury than for their conversion. This contributed to stir up excesses, hardly known before in Italy, against the Jews, so that the Popes had to call the preachers to order. Under the influence of Spanish bishops, the Council of Basel decreed in 1434 that several times a year bishops should have the Christian faith preached to the Jews; all Jews should be compelled under penalties to hear these sermons. The Council also admonished the bishops and preachers to behave so that they might win the Jews not only by means of the truth but also by works of charity.[30] In Germany, however, except for the already mentioned efforts of Peter Schwarz, nothing came of this.

---

[29] *S. th.*, III, q. 80, a. 4.

If the number of converts remained extremely slight, the explanation is not to be sought only in the curious missionary methods or lack of a genuine missionary spirit in accord with the Gospel among Christians nor in the loyalty and love of the Jews for the faith of their ancestors and their tradition. Not the least important reason is the fact that their conversion was opposed to the financial interests of the princes, not excluding the bishops, and these made it almost impossible by legal measures. The source of revenue which every Jew represented on the basis of the right of protection and especially of the cameral servitude dried up with his baptism. To balance matters converts were to renounce their property. Already in 1090 the Emperor Henry IV had demanded this of the Jews of Worms and Speyer who desired to became his brothers in the faith. In his privilege for the Jews of Vienna Frederick II decreed:

> If one, for his part, desires baptism, . . . he shall give up his inheritance, just as he has abandoned the law of his fathers.[31]

Naturally, this total loss of property kept many from being baptized. That from Alexander III in 1179 the Popes took measures against this practice and threatened excommunication for those who caused converts to lose their inheritances or confiscated their property[32] seems to have had little effect. It seems sheer mockery that Archbishop Kuno II of Trier (1362–88) granted an indulgence of twenty days to those who assisted a Jewish family, which, after receiving baptism, had deposited before the church door all that it had possessed in Judaism.[33] At Constance Cardinal d'Ailly protested that people did not leave the converted Jews even the necessities of life, with the result that they fell away and accused the Christians of uncharitableness.[34] The Council forbade under excommunication the seizing of the goods of the newly converted. Nevertheless, the confiscation of property after baptism remained a sort of prescriptive right, and in 1542 Paul III had to forbid it again.[35]

---

[30] *Mansi,* XXIX, 98.

[31] *MGConst,* I, 228; P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 180, 144.

[32] *Decret. Greg. IX,* 1. 5, t. 6, c. 5, Friedberg, II, 773; *Extravag. comm.,* 1. 5, t. 2, c. 2, Friedberg, II, 1290; for other examples see P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 188 f.

[33] A. Goerz, *Regesten der Erzbischöfe zu Trier* (Trier 1861), 120.

[34] J. Gerson, *Opera,* ed. Du Pin, II (Antwerp 1706), App. 915; P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 193.

[35] P. Browe, *Die Judenmission,* 183, 195.

CHAPTER 61

German Humanism

Much more so than south of the Alps, in Germany humanism was a matter of education, the concern of scholars and restricted circles. Hence it appears more independent in comparison with the general cultural movement of the Renaissance, of which it was actually the effect in the field of literary culture, language, and education. Indeed, German princes and German cities also made use of the writers, jurists, and medical men trained by the new lay education, but this did not result in a Renaissance state or a Renaissance society as in Italy, or a corresponding political theory similar to that of Machiavelli. In regard to German territory one cannot speak of a "Renaissance culture" but of German humanism.[1] The connection with antiquity was not so direct here; there was no unbroken continuity. Therefore the encounter with antiquity was also not so elementary but rather the object of the educational endeavour, and the temptation to paganism was less real than in Italy. In art Gothic was so deeply rooted and still so alive that the new style had a difficult time establishing itself.

Already at the Council of Constance (1414–18) and especially at Basel (1431–49) closer contacts were made with Italian humanism. Here, and through his later diplomatic and courtly career, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, the later Pope Pius II, became, in Joachimsen's words, the "Apostle of German humanism." The new education had its first centre, not at the universities, but in the chanceries of princely courts and cities, the living quarters of scholars, the monasteries, and a number of city schools. The universities were too institutionalized and too dominated by the traditional scholasticism. The liberal arts were above all preparatory stages for the other sciences, especially theology. Little wonder that homeless poets and *rhetores,* who as itinerant teachers gave only occasional lectures and courses, as for example Peter Luder (d. after 1474) and Samuel Karoch of Lichtenberg in Upper Franconia, became the most active opponents of scholasticism. It was not until the turn of the century that special chairs were established within the faculty of arts or even special courses in poetry were given, as at Vienna under the direction of Conrad Celtis (1459–1508). This "German arch-humanist," as David Frederick Strauss termed him, the vintner's son, Conrad Bickel of Wipfeld near Würzburg, was crowned at Nürnberg in

---

[1] The term "humanism" was coined in 1808 by the Bavarian educational reformer, F. J. Niethammer. In fourteenth-century Italy the expression *studia humanitatis* is found, borrowed from Cicero, for the study of rhetoric and politics. The teachers of these arts were called *oratores* and *poetae.* The term *umanista* is found only from the end of the fifteenth century.

1487 by the Emperor Frederick III with the laurel of the poet, the first German to be so honoured. In the course of his restless wandering he founded learned societies *(sodalitates litterariae)* in many places, such as Cracow, Prague, Bratislava, Buda, Heidelberg (1491), and Vienna (1497). At Vienna he also established, at the request of the Emperor Maximilian I, a college of poetry and mathematics in 1502, and as its president he had the right of conferring the poet's laurel. From his journeys he expected to obtain material for a "Germania illustrata," in which he apparently intended to describe Germany in four books according to the four points of the compass. But only the *Norimberger* (1495) was published, — a song of praise to the city of Nürnberg. In poetic form some of his planned work was issued in the *Quatuor libri Amorum secundum quatuor latera Germaniae* (1502), a mixture of love lyric and description of countries and peoples. With his edition of the *Germania* of Tacitus and the discovery of the *Tabula Peutingeriana,* of the works of Roswitha of Gandersheim, and of the Barbarossa epic *Ligurinus,* Celtis laid the foundation for the study of German history and antiquities. He is an early example of the manner in which the German humanists, in a sort of hate-love for Italy, which had handed on to them the treasures of ancient civilization, came to extol extravagantly the value of German nationality and of German history in order to give the lie to the charge of barbaric origin. His polemic against abuses in the Church, against indulgence fraud and "stinking cowls," was conditioned by the struggle against the foreign spiritual domination and material exploitation by the Roman Curia.

As willingly as he, like many other humanists, abandoned himself to pagan ideas and took delight in frivolity, a break with the Church never entered his mind. Above all, what the circle of the initiated was free to choose to do and think should remain forbidden to "the people." "For if the masses were to understand certain secrets as we philosophers do, it would then be difficult to keep their turbulence under control."[2]

The men who in Italy became enthusiastic over antiquity, its language, art, and way of life, and sought to pass on these treasures to their countrymen were first in the circles of the patrician class of the cities. These were the Augsburg merchant Sigismund Gossembrot (d. after 1488); the Augsburg city physician Hermann Schedel, who died at Nürnberg in 1485; Niklas von Wyle (d. 1478), town-clerk of Esslingen; the Ulm city physician Henry Steinhövel (d. 1482); Albert von Eyb (d. 1475), canon of Eichstatt and Augsburg; and the jurist and diplomat Gregory von Heimburg (d. 1472). Through the stimulation they provided and their work the Free Cities of South Germany became centres of humanism.

At Nürnberg Willibald Pirkheimer (1470–1530) was the celebrated leader of a humanist circle. Liberally educated, he was as much at home in law, history, and geography as in theology. He translated ancient and patristic Greek authors and wrote a geography of ancient Germany dominated by a nationalistic enthusiasm, and the *Description of the Swiss War,* in which he had led the Nürnberg contingent. In other respects too his interest in scholarship and art was not that of a dilettante. Versatile as he was, Pirkheimer devoted himself to the public service of his city as a diplomat and promoter of schools.

---

[2] Ingolstadt inaugural lecture of 31 August 1492, ed. by J. Rupprich (Leipzig 1932), 8.

The most important humanist among the patrician middle class of Augsburg was Conrad Peutinger (1465–1542). In the controversy concerning interest and monopoly he took the side of early capitalism. His history of the Emperors and collecting and publishing of the sources of German history served the imperial patriotic endeavours of the circle surrounding the Emperor Maximilian I.

The strongly pedagogical character of German humanism is made clear in a group of scholars from the Netherlands and Westphalia, who were often closely connected with the *devotio moderna.* The Frisian Rudolf Agricola (1444–85) had studied philosophy at Erfurt, Cologne, and Louvain in the traditional way, then had concentrated on humanistic studies in Italy, and finally in 1484 went to Heidelberg. Here he delivered talks and lectures in connection with the University, learned Hebrew, and developed a program for the reform of university studies. He himself never sacrificed his freedom as a man of letters to a set teaching assignment, regarded marriage as an intolerable restraint, and even considered his obligation to his benefactor, Bishop Dalberg of Worms, as a grievous slavery.

Alexander Hegius (1433–98) learned Greek from Agricola. According to his pupil Erasmus, Hegius raised the school at Deventer from a barbaric educational establishment to a humanistic school. He was one of the early Christian humanists, who emphatically sought the association of scholarship and religion. He considered any "knowledge injurious which [was] gained at the cost of integrity."

Rudolf von Langen (1438–1520) effected the reform of the cathedral school of Münster along humanistic lines and summoned Hegius's pupil, John Murmellius (1480–1517), to be associate director. The Westphalian Hermann von dem Busche (1468–1534)[3] was a pupil of both Hegius and Agricola. In the course of his restless existence as an itinerant teacher he came into contact with the Erfurt humanistic circle and belonged to the group of humanists whose path led away from the Church.

Through the Westphalian Louis Dringenberg, director of the school at Schlettstadt from 1441 to 1477, the association with the humanism of the upper Rhine, having its centres at Schlettstadt, Strasbourg, Freiburg, and

---

[3] *Cf. LThK,* II (2nd ed. 1958), 800.

Basel, was established. The patriotic tendency in German humanism found a congenial environment especially in Alsace. In addition to the pleasure derived from collecting the antiquarian and historical evidence of the German past and criticism of the Roman Curia, here in the west the resistance to French claims afforded a special stimulus to enthusiasts for German greatness and the declaration of national interests. The poet and journalist Sebastian Brant (1457–1521), born in Strasbourg, who had served in his native city as legal adviser and clerk from 1500, was still strongly attached to scholasticism. In popular legal collections (*Layenspiegel* of 1509 and *Klagspiegel* of 1516), in religious poems *(Carmina in laudem beatae Mariae)*, and in moral treatises he developed a heavily didactic method. He became famed for his *Narrenschiff* (1494), in which, in popular language, he provided a mirror of the failings and vices of all contemporary classes and professions.

The diocesan priest James Wimpheling (1450–1528) became the herald of German national greatness in his *Germania* (1501); the German translation bore the title *Tutschland zu Ere der Statt Strassburg und des Rinstroms.* He sought to prove that the left bank of the Rhine had never formed part of Gaul, that the Vosges and not the Rhine formed Germany's boundary, and that all Roman Emperors since Charles the Great had been Germans. Moreover, he composed the first extensive history of the German people, placing great emphasis on the history of the Emperors and of culture: the *Epitome rerum Germanicarum* of 1505. Wimpheling devoted the second part of his *Germania* to his reflections on schools and education. He called for a "Fechtschul," which, after elementary school, should prepare for the university, thereby developing the program of the later Latin *Gymnasium.* It should envisage not only the future clergy but should also take care of young men who intended to devote themselves to a "middle-class, knightly, or towncouncillor's career." Hence, the curriculum should include, among other things, history, public administration, military science, architecture, and agriculture.

It was hardly sympathy for the French or concern for the existence of monastic schools but rather a humanist's delight in polemics and satire that caused the Strasbourg Franciscan, Thomas Murner (1475–1537), in *Germania Nova* pitilessly to tear to shreds Wimpheling's pompously patriotic but uncritical arguments. The language of the popular preacher, satirist, and poet Murner was merciless and blunt, not so solemn and ponderous as Wimpheling's, but therefore all the more to the point. In his moral satires, influenced by Brant's *Narrenschiff* — *Narrenbeschwörung* (1512), *Schelmenzunft* (1512), *Mühle von Schwindelsheim* (1515), and *Gäuchmatt* (1519) — he skilfully developed it and used it as a weapon against abuses and vices of all classes. In his *Geistliche Badenfahrt* (1514), an edifying rhymed poem, and in the first translation of the *Aeneid* into German verse he demonstrated his linguistic skill more seriously. Both Wimpheling and Murner were not sparing in criticism of conditions in the Church. Doubtless, in the heat of the attack, they may often have gone too far. That they remained in the Church is beyond doubt. In 1510, at the request of the Emperor, Wimpheling published the Pragmatic Sanction and the "Grievances of the German Nation" of 1455–57, more or less unchanged. It was in this connection that at first he welcomed the reformer in Luther. But it was equally consistent that, like Murner, he turned against him when Luther shattered the doctrinal structure of the ancient Church. The Alsatians Geiler von Kaysersberg (1445–1510), Sebastian Brant, Thomas Murner, James Wimpheling, and Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547) are thus to be regarded as representatives of a moralizing humanism, which was concerned not only for the reform of the Church but equally for the maintaining of the old order.

Wimpheling's friends included the Freiburg jurist Ulric Zasius (1461 to 1536) and Abbot John Trithemius (1462–1516), a Benedictine of Sponheim and later of Würzburg. In his works, dealing with history and the history of literature, such as *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* (1494) and *De viris illustribus Germaniae* (1495), Trithemius collected abundant material which is still of value today. However, when his sources failed him, he often gave free rein to his imagination. In his enthusiasm for the greatness of Germany he went so far as to "discover" in "Hunibald" an historian of the origins of the Franks, who was supposed to have attested the existence of a Frankish kingdom, independent of Rome, 500 years before the birth of Christ.

The anticlercial spirit and radical criticism, aloof and sarcastic, gained the firmest foothold in the humanist circle at Erfurt. Here Peter Luder (*ca.* 1460) and Conrad Celtis (1486) had worked and Mutianus Rufus (Conrad Muth, 1470–1526) had studied. The last named, after a rather long stay in Italy and close contact with Florentine Platonism, returned in 1503 to Gotha as a canon and from there took care of the Erfurt circle, to which Eobanus Hessus (1488–1540), Euricius Cordus (1486–1535), Ulric von Hutten (1488 to 1523), Crotus Rubeanus (1468–1534), Justus Jonas (1493–1555), and George Spalatin (1484–1545) belonged. In order to live "beata tranquillitas," Mutianus declined every professorship and wrote no books, just as "Socrates and Christ." He expressed his convictions exclusively in letters, which, in his opinion, were open only to the small circle of the initiated and unsuited to be exposed to the mob. He made all the more fun of the follies and weaknesses of men, especially the narrow-mindedness of the devout and most of all the hypocrisy and narrowness of monks. For him Christianity was the same as monotheism, but this can have numerous forms.

> There are only one God and one Goddess, but many forms and names, such as Jupiter, Sol, Apollo, Moses, Christ, Luna, Ceres, Proserpina, Tellus, Mary. But be on your guard against uttering this. For, like the mysteries of the Eleusinian goddesses, it must be cloaked in silence. In

> matters of religion one must make use of fables and veils of images . . . The one I call Jupiter I know as Christ and as true God . . .[4]

He read Paul through the spectacles of the Stoa and gave him a moral interpretation.

The occasion for open war against scholasticism and the hollow ecclesiasticism was provided by the Reuchlin dispute. Born at Pforzheim in 1455, John Reuchlin (d. 1522) had, while pursuing studies at Paris and Basel in 1474, learned Greek through association with Byzantine emigrants, and, after 1482, Hebrew also from Jews in Italy. Through his *Rudimenta linguae Hebraicae* (1506) he became the founder of Hebrew linguistics in Germany. He took great pains with the study of the *Cabala,* to which he devoted his treatises *De verbo mirifico* (1494) and *De arte cabbalistica* (1517). In 1482 he entered the service of Count Eberhard V of Württemberg as a jurist, accompanied him to Italy, and served him as adviser and agent. From 1499 he lived at Stuttgart as a private scholar and was acting as a judge of the Swabian League (1502–13) when his name became the war-cry of the younger humanists in the struggle against scholasticism.

The convert's zeal of the ex-Jew, John Pfefferkorn, baptized at Cologne in 1507, was not satisfied with working for the conversion of his former co-religionists by writings only. In 1500 he secured an imperial order for the confiscation of all Jewish works of a theological content. In an opinion sent to the Emperor in 1510 Reuchlin proposed that only those Jewish writings should be destroyed which contained clear defamation of Christianity. The Talmud and the *Cabala* could be used to support the Christian faith. Against this Pfefferkorn wrote the *Handspiegel,* to which Reuchlin replied with the *Augenspiegel.* Meanwhile, the theological faculty of Cologne had become involved in the question. In the Dominican Inquisitor James von Hoogstraeten (1460–1527) an important man sided with Pfefferkorn. He declared the *Augenspiegel* heretical and instituted a process against Reuchlin. The Pope referred it to the Bishop of Speyer. The humanist was acquitted at this tribunal and silence was imposed on his opponents (1514), but Hoogstraeten appealed to the Pope.

In the meantime attention was less centred on Jewish writings, for in Reuchlin the humanists saw themselves and the new style of thought and scholarship attacked. As proof of his integrity, Reuchlin in 1514 published under the title *Clarorum virorum epistolae* letters which the most illustrious minds of the day had written to him. The preface was written by his great-nephew and pupil, Philip Melanchthon. More attention was attracted the next year by another collection of letters, the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (1515–17), addressed to Master Ortwinus Gratius, spokesman of the Cologne scholastics. These "letters of obscure men" are fictitious and composed in barbarous "kitchen Latin." They were supposed to make Reuchlin's opponents look ridiculous and to present them as uneducated and hypocritical. Ultimately all monks appeared as stupid, vain, untruthful, and lewd, and theologians got their delight in empty and ridiculous subtleties. In coarse and obscene humour the Church and what is sacred were exposed to ridicule, along with the orders, relics, and indulgences. Here humanism stood in hostility to the Church, but this hostility was originally foreign to it. Thus, as Lortz says, the Reuchlin dispute became an "immediate prelude to the Reformation." The authors of the "letters of obscure men" belonged to the Erfurt circle: Crotus Rubeanus, who contributed letters 1 to 41, and Ulric von Hutten, responsible for the seven additional letters of the second edition (Cologne 1516) and the sixty-two letters of Part II (1517). The proceedings against Reuchlin were long drawn out and were finally affected by the case against Luther. Hence the *Augenspiegel* was condemned under Leo X in 1520. Nevertheless, Reuchlin, who was active in his last years as professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt (1520–21) and Tübingen (1521–22), remained loyal to the ancient Church. He died at Stuttgart on 30 June 1522.

---

[4] Letter of 1505 to the Cistercian H. Urban, in *Der Briefwechsel des Mutianus Rufus,* ed. by C. Krause (Kassel 1885), 28.

German humanism reached its zenith in Desiderius Erasmus. The second illegitimate son of the priest Rotger Gerard, he was born at Rotterdam on 28 October 1466[5] (or 1469). At about the age of fourteen he lost his parents. The taint of illegitimacy, which he never overcame, and the lack of family and home contribute much to make his restlessness, his suspicious withdrawal, his fear of committing himself, his sensitivity, and his need to be accepted understandable. The description of himself as a citizen of the world, "civis totius mundi," cannot completely conceal this homelessness. His last words in his otherwise unused mother tongue, "Lieve God," can be understood as a cry for security and a home on the lips of the man whom through years and decades seven European states considered it an honour to have lodged. Even in regard to the chronic anxiety about his "frail little body" more was involved than concern for an easily upset stomach, a nausea produced by the smell of fish, kidney stones, and insomnia. Erasmus did not get away from himself. For example, again and again he encountered the painful reminder of his birth when he had to obtain a dispensation in order to acquire a benefice.

His schooling at Deventer and 's-Hertogenbosch was marked by the spirit of the *devotio moderna.* He claims that he was forced by his guardian to enter the Augustinian monastery at Steyn near Gouda (1486–88). However, his enthusiastic friendship with a former fellow student from Deventer and the opportunity for abundant reading of the ancient and patristic authors at first reconciled him to the monastery. Jerome became his ideal as a synthesis of Christianity and classical culture. Later (1496) he adopted the name of Jerome's friend, Desiderius. Soon after his ordination to the priesthood on 25 April 1492, Erasmus became secretary of Henry von Bergen, Bishop of Cambrai. The trip to Italy, which he had hoped for as the Bishop's companion, did not materialize, but the Bishop made it possible for him to study at Paris from the autumn of 1495. The barbarous severity at the Collège Montaigu pleased Erasmus as little as did scholasticism and its "barbarous" Latin. His humanist writings, which were printed later, *Antibarbari* (1520), *Adagia* (1500), *Colloquia* (1518), and others, took form in these years. Following a wandering life Erasmus went to England in 1499. This first stop there was of decisive importance, for in men such as John Colet (1466–1519), Dean of St. Paul's at London, Thomas More (1478–1535), and John Fisher (1469–1535), he met a Christian humanism and a theology based on the Bible and the Church Fathers. His enthusiasm found expression in the words: "For one who knows England a journey to Italy is superfluous." Erasmus achieved a conscious turn to theology. The importance of the biblical languages became clear. Thereafter he wanted to "apply himself with all his heart to Holy Scripture" and to "dedicate the rest of [his] life" to it. He refused a call to Louvain (1502), just as later he never renounced his independence.

---

[5] Thus E. W. Kohls, "Das Geburtsjahr des Erasmus," *ThZ,* 22 (1966), 96–121, against R. R. Post, "Geboortejaar en opleiding van Erasmus," *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschapen,* N. R. 16, Afdeling Letterkunde (1953), 327–48, who, contrary to what Erasmus himself says, regards 1469 as the year of his birth.

The first result of his turning to theology was the *Enchiridion militis Christiani* (1503), the manual or small weapon of the Christian warrior, intended as an introduction to Christian life for the laity. For piety and even perfection are not monopolies of clergy and monks. Only the reprintings from 1515 gained for this work a wider circle. The edition of 1518, with a foreword addressed to Abbot Paul Volz, made it a huge success. In the foreword Erasmus summarizes the basic ideas of the *Enchiridion* and gives an insight into his own religious outlook. For the simple man, who is unable to pour over the thick and detailed volumes of the scholastics, but for whom also Christ died, one should "condense the entire philosophy of Christ in its fundamental traits from the purest sources of the Gospels and the Apostles, from the most trustworthy exegetes, and this should be simple but scholarly, brief but clear."[6] Clarity, simplicity, and purity through going back to the sources, Holy Scripture and the Fathers — such are the goals of Christian humanism as Erasmus advocated it.

> The goal is thus one: Christ and his holy teaching . . . No type of vocation is excluded from this goal . . . One must not stain the heavenly

---

[6] *Desiderius Erasmus, Ausgewählte Werke,* ed. by H. Holborn (Munich 1933; reprinted 1964), 7.

> philosophy of Christ with man's work . . . He who kindles love for Christ teaches the essence of Christian piety.

Christian perfection is not a matter of subtle reflection but of a loving act. "It manifests itself in warmth of feeling, not in a special state [monasticism], in the heart, not in holy garments or foods."[7] All ceremonies are only helps for those not of age; the perfect is the invisible, the religion of the heart. The spiritual man no longer needs the aid of the external. In Erasmus the effort for biblical simplicity and inwardness is connected with a Platonic spiritualism, which underestimates external form and the corporeal and hence cannot do justice to the Incarnation, the mystery of the Church, and the Sacraments. All the more reckless is his criticism of the numerous ceremonies, theology, and the morals of the clergy and monks.

This criticism was expressed in a particularly clever manner, but also especially frivolously and maliciously, in the "intimate conversations" which Erasmus had written at Paris in 1500 but which only appeared in Basel in 1518 under the title *Familiarium colloquiorum formulae.* This work was intended as a school textbook; as a collection of Latin idioms and of examples of cultured conversation it was to instruct the pupil in Latin eloquence and impart to him proper conduct of life. The Italian sojourn of 1506–09, during which he became doctor of theology at Turin, did not have for the great humanist the significance that we might suppose. It was only the finishing touch in his humanist education. At the beginning of his third visit in England (1509–14) Erasmus wrote *Encomium Moriae* (1511), the *Praise of Folly,* in the house of Thomas More, who was bound to him in a close friendship. In it folly has its say. This literary artifice made it possible to say serious things without committing oneself. If the author even wanted to express risky views, he could not be pinned down but always had an alibi. It was only folly speaking. This "cunningly indirect procedure," as Meissinger calls it, promoted a levity which could not but operate destructively in the religious field.

As early as 1504 Erasmus had discovered Lawrence Valla's *Adnotationes* to the New Testament, which he published in 1505. Thereafter he had eagerly studied Greek and preoccupied himself with the text of Scripture. These studies bore fruit when in 1514 he moved to Basel for two years and in John Froben found a qualified printer and publisher for his *Novum Instrumentum.* Appearing in 1516, this was the Greek text of the New Testament with notes and a Latin translation differing from the Vulgate. In the introduction, under "Paraclesis, Methodus, Apologia," Erasmus outlined a biblical theology, his "Philosophia Christi," which, as "renascentia," that is, as "the renewal *(instauratio)* of the originally good nature," should be simple, clear, devout, and practical. In the dedicatory letter to Leo X he wrote:

---

[7] *Ibid.,* 12.

> .... since I see that that doctrine of salvation is found much purer and more alive in the veins themselves, from which sources it is drawn, than from pools or drained-off streams, I have revised the entire Greek New Testament in fidelity to the original text, not frivolously or with slight exertion but by recourse to several Greek and Latin manuscripts, and those that are the oldest and the best, not those that are entirely more agreeable.[8]

In the "Paraclesis," the admonition to the pious reader, he wrote:

> At best few can be scholars, but everyone can be a Christian, everyone can be devout, yes, I will boldly add, everyone can be a theologian. What is in conformity with nature easily becomes common property. But what is Christ's philosophy, which he himself calls a rebirth *(renascentia),* but a renewal of the originally good nature?[9] ... That rich and genuine philosophy of Christ is obtained nowhere more happily than from the Gospels and the other Apostolic writings.[10]

In "Methodus," Erasmus demands:

> The young theologian must learn to quote well from Sacred Scripture, not from manuals, musty tomes, or God knows what kind of *collectanea,* which have already been shaken together and hodge-podged hundreds of times, but according to the sources themselves.[11] ... Make your own heart a library of Christ; from it, as from a treasury, bring forth new or old, as the matter requires. That which flows live from the heart penetrates much more vitally into the heart of the hearer than what has been picked up from someone else's crib.[12]

With the edition of the New Testament and that of the works of Jerome (1517 ff.), "by far the first and most learned" of the Church Fathers, Erasmus moved into the front rank of theologians of his day. At the same time, having taken up residence in the Netherlands again in May 1516 and having become a princely councillor, he entered upon the political scene with his *Institutio principis christiani* (1516) for the future Charles V and with the *Querela pacis* (1517). Through his English connections in 1517 he obtained from Rome the privilege of living free in the world without his religious habit and of accepting benefices unimpeded by his illegitimate birth.[13] In accord with his demand that theologians should open up Scripture instead of treating silly questions, he wrote paraphrases of Romans (1517), the other Epistles (1517–21), the Gospels (1522 ff.), and Acts. At the same time he worked on the writings of the Fathers. Their printed editions were to occupy the rest of his life: Cyprian (1521), Arnobius (1522), Hilary (1523), Irenaeus (1526), Ambrose (1527), Origen (1527), Augustine (1527–29), and Chrysostom (1530).

---

[8] *Opus epistularum,* edited by P. S. Allen, II (Oxford 1910), 185.

[9] *Ausgewählte Werke,* 145.

[10] *Ibid.,* 146.

[11] *Ibid.,* 158.

[12] *Ibid.,* 160.

[13] Leo X's brief of dispensation (26 January 1517) in *Opus epistularum,* nos. 517 f.

In the years 1516–18 Erasmus was at the height of his reputation. By means of scholarship and education and more particularly through his exertions in regard to the text of the Bible and of the Fathers — *"ad fontes!"* — he expected to bring about renewal, and not a few contemporaries looked to him as the man of the longed-for reform. Then, with the appearance of Luther, forces emerged which were strange and even repugnant to the prince of humanists in their elemental power and existential importance, especially since they did not remain within the sphere of the "good sciences" but appealed also to the man in the street and demanded of Erasmus, "vir duplex,"[14] a clear taking of sides.

---

[14] Martin Luther, *WA, Tr,* 1, no. 131.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. The Western Church

I. SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH

1. Ancillary Sciences

For the ancillary sciences (Chronology, Palaeography, Libraries, Diplomatics, Archives, Heraldry, Geography and Cartography, Statistics) see Volume I of this *Handbook,* 435–46.

2. Sources

See Volume III, 475. Also: R. C. van Caenegem and F. L. Ganshof, *Kurze Quellenkunde des westeuropäischen Mittelalters* (Göttingen 1963). K. Jacob and H. Hohenleutner, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter,* III: *Das Spätmittelalter.* Edited by F. Weden (Berlin, 2d ed. 1968).

3. The More Important General Collections of Sources

See Volume III, 476.

4. Councils, Doctrinal and Canonical Decisions, Canon Law

See Volume III, 476 f. Also: J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des kanonischen Rechts von Gratian bis auf die Gegenwart,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1875–80); Fr. Maasen, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des kanonischen Rechts im Abendland bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters,* I (Graz 1870); G. Le Bras, *Prolégomènes* (Vol. I of *Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident* [Paris 1955]).

5. Papacy

See Volume III, 477. Also: S. Baluze, *Vitae Paparum Avenionensium,* ed. G. Mollat, 4 vols. (Paris 1916–28); A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum inde ab anno 1198 ad annum 1304,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1874 f., reprinted Graz 1957). A collection of documents hitherto unprinted, and hence not in Potthast, is in progress; it will cover the years 1198–1417 and will appear in *Index Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio III usque ad Martinum V electum. Registra* of papal letters are continuous only from Innocent III; the various editions in L. Santifaller, *Neuere Editionen mittelalterlicher Königs- und Papsturkunden* (Vienna 1958), 40–43; *ibid.,* 43–58, list of the more important territorial collections from the papal *registra.*

6. Secular Law and Concordats

See Volume III, 477. Also: A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la S. Sede e le autorità civili (1098–1954),* 2 vols. (Rome, 2d ed. 1954).

7. HISTORICAL-STATISTICAL WORKS WITH OR WITHOUT SOURCE EDITIONS

See Volume III, 478. Also: C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi,* 3 vols., new ed. by L. Schmitz-Kallenberg (Münster, 2d ed. 1913–23; reprinted Padua 1960).

8. RELIGIOUS ORDERS

See Volume III, 478. Also: *Bullarium Franciscanum,* I–IV, edited by H. Sbaralea and B. de Rossi (Rome 1759–68); V–VII, by K. Eubel (Rome 1898–1904); VIII (new series, I), by U. Hüntemann (Quaracchi 1929); IX–X (new series II–III), by J. Pou y Marti (Quaracchi 1939–49); Suppl. I, by F. Annibali de Latera (Rome 1780); Suppl. II, by K. Eubel (Quaracchi 1908). *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum vel ad Ordinem quoquomodo pertinentia,* I–V (Rome 1882–86), VI ff. (Quaracchi 1887 ff.); L. Wadding, *Annales Ordinis Minorum,* 8 vols. (Lyons 1625–54); continued by J. M. Fonseca *et al.*, 25 vols. (Rome, 2d ed. 1731–1886); continued by A. Chiappini *et. al.*, thus far 30 vols. (Quaracchi, 3d ed. 1931 ff.). *Bullarium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum,* ed. T. Ripoll and A. Bremond, 8 vols. (Rome 1729–49); *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica,* ed. B. M. Reichert, 14 vols. (Rome 1896–1904); continued, Paris 1931 ff. K. Eubel, *Die avignonesische Obedienz der Mendikanten-Orden sowie der Orden der Mercedarier und Trinitarier zur Zeit des Grossen Schismas. Beleuchtet durch die von Clemens VII. und Benedikt XIII. an dieselben gerichteten Schreiben. Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* (Paderborn 1900), published by the Görres-Gesellschaft; K. Hallinger, *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum,* cura Pont. Athenaei S. Anselmi de Urbe editum; of the approximately 25 vols. planned 3 have thus far appeared (Siegburg 1963–67).

9. LITURGY

See Volume III, 478.

10. HAGIOGRAPHY

See Volume III, 478 f.

11. PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

See Volume III, 479. Also: *Bibliotheca Franciscana scholastica medii aevi,* cura PP. collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas, 23 vols. (Quaracchi and Florence 1903 ff.); *RepFont,* I, 73 f.

12. CRUSADES

A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade. Historiography and Bibliography* (Bloomington, Ind. 1962); H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Hanover, 2d ed. 1965); *Recueil des historiens des croisades,* ed. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: *Historiens occidentaux,* 5 vols. (Paris 1844–95); *Historiens orientaux,* 5 vols. (Paris 1872–1906); *Historiens grecs,* 2 vols. (Paris 1875–81); *Documents arméniens,* 2 vols. (Paris 1869–1906); *Lois. Les Assises de Jérusalem,* 2 vols. (Paris 1841–43).

13. HISTORY OF THE MISSIONS

Bibliotheca Missionum, ed. R. Streit, IV: *Asiatische Missionsliteratur (1245–1599)* (Aachen 1928; reprinted Freiburg im Breisgau 1964); G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca Bio-Bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente francescano,* 5 vols. (Quaracchi 1906–27); *Sinica Franciscana,* Vol. I, ed. A. van den Wyngaert (Quaracchi 1929).

II. ACCOUNTS OF WESTERN HISTORY

1. Universal History

a) Larger Works: See Volume III, 479. Also: *Peuples et Civilisations. Histoire générale,* ed. L. Halphen and P. Sagnac (Paris 1926 ff.), VII, 1: H. Pirenne *et al., La désagrégation du monde mediéval* (1931 and at other dates); *Histoire générale,* ed. G. Glotz (and successors) (Paris 1925 ff.), IV, 1: E. Jordan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles* (1939); IV, 2: C. Petit-Dutaillis and P. Guinard, *L'essor des états d'occident* (2d ed. 1944); VI, 1–2: R. Fawtier and A. Coville, *L'Europe occidentale de 1270 à 1380* (1940 f.); D. J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West* (New York 1967).

b) Shorter Summaries: R. Morghen, *Medioevo cristiano* (Bari 1951); J. Le Goff, *Das Hochmittelalter* (Frankfurt am Main 1965); E. Hassinger, *Das Werden des neuzeitlichen Europa (1300–1600)* (Braunschweig, 2d ed. 1966); W. K. Ferguson, *Europe in Transition, 1300–1520* (New York 1962); E. P. Cheyney, *The Dawn of a New Era, 1250–1453* (New York 1936); *Cambridge Medieval History,* Vols. VII and VIII (Cambridge 1932, 1936); G. Mattingly, *Renaissance Diplomacy* (Boston 1955); D. M. Vaughan, *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances, 1350–1700* (Liverpool 1954); J. W. Thompson, *Economic and Social History of Europe* (New York 1931; reprint 1960); *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe,* Vol. II: *Trade and Industry in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1954); D. Hay, *Europe in the Forteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London 1966); B. H. Slicher van Bath, *Agrarian History of Western Europe* (London 1963).

c) Works on Cultural and Intellectual History: K. Bosl, *Frühformen der Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Europa* (Munich and Vienna 1964); J. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (London 1924); R. Stadelmann, *Vom Geist des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Halle 1929); A. Ehrhard, *Das Mittelalter und seine kirchliche Entwicklung* (Munich 1908); G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages,* 2 vols. (Manchester 1967); *Klassiker des Protestantismus,* I: *Wegbereiter der Reformation,* ed. G. A. Benrath (Bremen 1967).

2. National History See Volume III, 480 f.

England: *The Oxford History of England,* ed. G. N. Clark (Oxford 1934 ff.); IV: F. M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century 1216–1307* (2d ed. 1962); V: M. McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century (1307–1399)* (1959); VI: E. F. Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century (1399–1485)* (1961); A. R. Myers, *England in the Late Middle Ages, 1307–1536* (Baltimore 1952); B. Wilkinson, *The Constitutional History of Medieval England, 1216–1485* (New York 1948–1964); S. B. Chrimes, *English Constitutional History,* 2d ed. (Oxford 1953); V. H. H. Green, *The Later Plantagenets* (London 1955).

France: E. Lavisse, *Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution* (Paris 1900 ff.), III, 1: A. Luchaire, *Louis VII, Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII 1137–1226* (1901); III, 2: C. de Langlois, *Saint Louis, Philippe le Bel, les derniers Capétiens directs 1226–1328* (1901); IV, 1: A. Coville, *Les premiers Valois et la Guerre de Cent Ans (1328–1422)* (1902); IV, 2: C. Petit-Dutaillis, *Charles VII, Louis XI, Charles VIII (1422–1492)* (1902).

Italy: N. Valeri, *L'Italia nell'età dei principati dal 1343 al 1516* (Verona 1949); *Storia d'Italia,* ed. N. Valeri, I: *Il Medioevo;* II: *Dalla crisi della libertà agli arbori dell'illuminismo* (Turin 1959).

Spain and Portugal: H. V. Livermore, *A History of Portugal* (Cambridge, Mass. 1947); J. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América,* 2 (Barcelona 1957);

J. H. Mariejol, *The Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella,* ed. B. Kenn (New Brunswick, N. J. 1961); R. B. Merriman, *The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New* (New York 1918); Burgundy: R. Vaughan, *Philip the Bold* (Cambridge 1962); *idem, John the Fearless* (New York 1966). For other lands their national histories are cited, as occasion demands, in their respective chapters.

3. General Church History

P. Hughes, *A History of the Church,* Vol. III: *The Revolt against the Church* (London 1947); A. C. Flick, *The Decline of the Medieval Church* (London 1930); *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin (and their successors) (Paris 1934 ff.), IX: A. Fliche, R. Foreville, and J. Rousset, *Du premier concile du Latran à l'avènement d'Innocent III (1123–1198),* in 2 parts (1946–53); X: A. Fliche, C. Thouzellier, and Y. Azais, *La chrétienté romaine (1198–1274)* (1950); XIV: É. Delaruelle, R. Labande, and P. Ourliac, *L'Église au temps du Grand Schisme et de la crise conciliaire (1378–1449),* in 2 parts (1962–64); XV: R. Aubenas and R. Ricard, *L'Église et la Renaissance (1449–1517)* (1951); B. Moeller, *Spätmittelalter* (Göttingen 1966); M. A. Schmidt and K. Goldammer, *Scholastik/Christliche Kunst im Mittelalter* (1968); García Villada Zaccarias, *Historia eclesiástica de España,* 5 vols. (Madrid 1926–36); G. de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque du moyen âge,* 5 vols. (Louvain 1956–63); V. Martin, *Les origines du Gallicanisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939); G. Falco, *Geist des Mittelalters* (Frankfurt 1958).

4. Church History of Individual Lands

Belgium: E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique,* 5 vols. and suppl. (Brussels 1940 ff.), III: *L'Église féodale 1122–1318* (1945), Tome complémentaire I (Texte) (1948); IV (1949).

England: *History of the English Church,* ed. W. R. W. Stephens and W. Hunt, 8 vols. in 9 (London 1899–1910, frequently reprinted), III: W. W. Capes, *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (1909); W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge 1955); *Ecclesiastical History of England,* ed. J. C. Dickinson (London 1961).

France: N. Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident,* 1–4 (Paris 1896–1902); A. Latreille, *Histoire du catholicisme en France,* 2 (Paris 1960).

Portugal: P. Miguel de Oliveira, *Historia eclesiastica de Portugal* (Lisbon, 2d ed. 1948).

5. Conciliar and Papal History

See Volume III, 482 f. Also: C. J. von Hefele and H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* V: 1073–1250; VI: 1250–1409; VII: 1409–1447; *Histoire des conciles œcuméniques,* ed. G. Dumeige (Paris 1961 ff.); G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon,* translated by Janet Love (London and New York 1963); F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte des Papsttums,* IV: *Das Papsttum im Spätmittelalter und in der Zeit der Renaissance,* revised by G. Schwaiger (Munich, 2d ed. 1957).

Rome and the Papal State: *Storia di Roma,* published by the Istituto di Studi Romani (Bologna 1938 ff.), XI: E. Dupré-Theseider, *Roma dal comune di popolo alla signoria Pontificia 1252–1377* (1952); D. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century* (London 1961); P. Paschini, *Roma nel Rinascimento* (1940).

6. Ecclesiastical Legal and Constitutional History

See Volume III, 483. Also:

Legal History: G. Le Bras, C. Lefèbvre, and J. Rambaud, *L'âge classique 1140–1378. Sources et théorie du droit* (Paris 1965).

7. Secular Legal and Constitutional History

See Volume III, 483 f.

8. Monographs on Ecclesiastical and Secular Legal History

See Volume III, 484. Also:

b) History of Political Ideas: F. A. von der Heydte, *Die Geburtsstunde des modernen Staates. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Völkerrechte, der allgemeinen Staatslehre und des politischen Denkens* (Regensburg 1952); F. Calasso, *I glossatori e la teoria della sovranità* (Milan, 2d ed. 1957); S. Mochi Onory, *Fonti canonistiche dell'idea moderna dello Stato* (Milan 1951).

9. History of Religious Orders

See Volume III, 484 f. Also: P. Cousin, *Précis d'histoire monastique* (Paris n. d. [1958]); L. Lekai and A. Schneider, *Geschichte und Wirken der weissen Mönche* (Cologne 1958); B. Grassl, *Der Prämonstratenser-Orden* (Tongerloo 1934); H. Holzapfel, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens* (Freiburg 1909); R. M. Huber, *A Documented History of the Franciscan Order (1182–1517)* (Milwaukee 1954); A. Léon, *Histoire de l'Ordre des Frères Mineurs* (Paris 1954); T. Nyberg, *Birgittinische Klostergründungen des Mittelalters* (Leiden 1967); A. Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome, 2d ed. 1948); A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs* (Paris 1903 ff.).

For Individual Lands: D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1961); T. W. Parker, *The Knights Templar in England* (Tucson, Ariz. 1963); J. Hasenberg and A. Wienand, *Das Wirken der Orden und Klöster in Deutschland* (Cologne 1957).

10. Liturgy and Hagiography

See Volume III, 485. Also: F. Doyé, *Heilige und Selige der römisch-katholischen Kirche*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1930–32); F. G. Holweck, *A Biographical Dictionary of the Saints* (St. Louis and London 1924); *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, published by the Istituto Giovanni XXIII (Rome 1961 ff., thus far 9 vols.).

11. Literature and General Cultural History

Literature: See Volume III, 485. Also: W. Stammler and K. Langosch, *Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, 5 vols. (Berlin and Leipzig 1933–55); A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, *Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vols. I and II (Cambridge 1908); G. Paris, *La littérature française du Moyen Âge, XI^{e}–XIV^{e} siècle* (Paris 1913); F. Flora, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. I: *Dal medio evo alla fine del Quattrocento* (Milan 1955).

SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES: H. Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (Berlin 1885); G. Kaufmann, *Die Geschichte der deutschen Universitäten*, I: *Vorgeschichte* (Stuttgart 1888); S. d'Irsay, *Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères*, I: *Moyen Âge et Renaissance* (Paris 1933); H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, 3 vols. (Oxford 1936).

12. PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY, SPIRITUALITY

See Volume III, 485 f. Also:

PHILOSOPHY: H. H. Heimsoeth, *Die sechs grossen Themen der abendländischen Metaphysik und der Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 3d ed. 1954).

THEOLOGY: K. Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Vienna 1881–87); G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik*, 3 vols. (Heidelberg 1921–27); H. Obermann, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology, Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963); *idem*, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (New York 1966).

SPIRITUALITY: S. Axters, *Geschiedenis van de vroomheid in de Nederlanden*, 3 vols. (Antwerp 1950–56).

13. CRUSADES

R. Grousset, *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, 3 vols. (Paris 1934–36); S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1951–54); A. Waas, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1956); *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton; the following volumes have thus far appeared: I: *The First Hundred Years*, ed. M. W. Baldwin (Philadelphia 1955), II: *The Later Crusades*, ed. R. L. Wolff and W. Hazard (Philadelphia 1962); H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965).

14. HISTORY OF THE MISSIONS

J. Schmidlin, *Katholische Missionsgeschichte* (Steyl n. d. [1925]); A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte. Die Ausbreitung des katholischen Glaubens* (Regensburg 1960); T. Ohm, *Wichtige Daten der Missionsgeschichte* (Münster, 2d ed. 1961); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, II: *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty (500–1500)* (New York and London 1938); *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques*, ed. S. Delacroix, I: *Les missions des origines au XIV*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1956).

B. The Eastern Church

See General Bibliography, Volume III, 487–95.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part one: The High Middle Ages

SECTION ONE

The Post-Gregorian Epoch: 1124-1153

Sources

Mansi, XXI: *Hefele-Leclercq,* V, 645–847; *MGLiblit,* III; *Duchesne LP,* II and III; *Watterich,* II, 157–322; *Jaffé,* nos. 7182–9942; *Bullarium Taur.,* II, 349–621. Papal documents in Germany, Italy, France, England, and Portugal: see Gen. Bibliog., I, 5; also M. P. Sheehy, *Pontificia Hibernica,* 2 vols. (Dublin 1962). Letters of the Popes in this period: Honorius II, *PL,* 166; Innocent II, *PL,* 197; Anacletus II, *PL,* 179; Celestine II, *PL,* 179; Lucius II, *PL,* 179; Eugene III, *PL,* 180; Anastasius IV, *PL,* 188. *Acta* and documents of emperors and kings: Lothar, *MGDD,* 8; *MGConst,* I; H. C. W. Davis, *Regesta regum anglo-normannorum,* II (Henry I), ed. C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne (Oxford 1956); A. Luchaire, *Louis VI, Annales de sa vie et de son règne* (Paris 1890); J. F. Böhmer, *Regesten des Kaiserreiches* (Frankfurt am Main 1831), 108–23; K. F. Stumpf-Brentano "*Die Reichskanzler,*" 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1868–72). Important are the collections of letters: *Reinhardsbrunner Briefsammlung,* ed. Peeck, *MGEp. sel.,* 5 (1952); *Epistolae Wibaldi,* ed. P. Jaffé, *Bibl. rer. germ.,* I, 76–616 (Gen. Bibliog., I, 3); *Codex Udalrici* (in the appendix letters from 1125–34), ed. P. Jaffé, *ibid.,* V, 17–469; also now F. J. Schmale, "Die Bemühungen Innocenz' II. um seine Anerkennung in Deutschland," *ZKG,* 65 (1953 f.), 240–65; letters of Bernard of Clairvaux in *PL,* 182 (a critical edition is still wanting); letters of Peter the Venerable in *PL,* 189; letters of Hildebert of Lavardin in *PL,* 171; *Briefwechsel der heiligen Hildegard von Bingen,* ed. A. Führkötter (Salzburg 1965).

Narrative Sources

Germany: Annalista Saxo (to 1139), *MGSS,* 6, 553–777; *Chronica S. Petri Erfordensis,* ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS,* 30/1, 335–457; *Chronica Regia Coloniensis,* ed. G. Waitz, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (1880); in the *Gesta Treverorum* the *Vita Adalberonis archiepiscopi Trevirensis, MGSS,* 8, 243–60; the Annals of Paderborn, ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst (1870); *Gesta archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium, MGSS,* 14, 361–484; Otto of Freising, *Chronica,* ed. A. Hofmeister, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (2d ed. 1912); *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris,* ed. A. Schmidt and F. J. Schmale (Darmstadt 1965); also *Otto von Freising, Gedenkgabe zu seinem 800. Todesjahr,* ed. J. A. Fischer (Hist. Verein Freising 1958); *Lauterberg Chronicle (Chronicon Montis Sereni), MGSS,* 23, 138–226; *Gesta pontificum Leodiensium, MGSS,* 25, 1–129; lives of Otto of Bamberg, *MGSS,* 12, 746–902; the *Kaiserchronik* (to 1147), *MG, Deutsche Chroniken,* 1 (1892), and now E. Nellmann, *Die Reichsidee in deutschen Dichtungen der Salier- und frühen Stauferzeit. Annolied-Kaiserchronik-Rolandslied-Eraclius,* Philologische Studien und Quellen, 16 (Berlin 1963).

Italy: Caffaro, Annals of Genoa, I (1099–1174), ed. L. T. Belgrano (1890), *Fonti per la storia d'Italia,* 11; Romuald of Salerno, *Chronicon* (to 1178), ed. C. A. Garufi, *SS Rer. Ital.*

(2d ed. 1935), *MGSS,* 19, 398–461; Alexander of Telese, *De rebus gestis Rogerii Siciliae regis* (to 1136), ed. G. Del Re, *Cronisti e scrittori sincroni napolitani,* 1 (Naples 1845); *ibid.,* also Falco of Benevento, *Chronicon;* Peter the Deacon, *Chronica monasterii Casinensis* (to 1139), *MGSS,* 7, 574–844, *PL,* 183, 479–978 (for the period under consideration there is question only of the continuation of the *Chronicle* of Leo Marsicanus by Peter the Deacon); Annals of Pisa, *MGSS,* 19, 236–66; Annals of Ceccano, *MGSS,* 19, 275–302. On Alexander of Telese see now M. Reichenmiller, "Bisher unbekannte Traumerzählungen Alexanders von Telese," *DA,* 19 (1963), 339–52.

England: William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum,* ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton (London 1870), *Rolls Series,* 52; *idem, Gesta regum Anglorum and Historia novella,* ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols. (London 1887–89), *Rolls Series,* 90; the *Historia Novella,* text, translation, and commentary by K. R. Potter, Nelson's Medieval Texts (London 1955); *Gesta Stephani* (to 1154), ed. R. Howlett, *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I,* III, *Rolls Series,* 82 (London 1884), text, translation, and commentary by K. R. Potter, Nelson's Medieval Texts (London 1955); Robert of Torigny, *Chronicle,* ed. W. Stubbs (see *supra*), Vol. 4, there also as Vol. 1, William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum anglicarum* (to 1198); Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica* (to 1141), ed. A. Le Prévost and L. Delisle, 5 vols. (Paris 1838–55), in the edition by A. Duchesne also in *PL,* 188; see H. Wolter, *Ordericus Vitalis* (Wiesbaden 1955); Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum* (to 1154), ed. T. Arnold, *Rolls Series,* 74 (London 1879); John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis* (to 1152), ed. R. L. Poole, with translation and commentary, ed. M. Chibnall, Nelson's Medieval Texts (London 1956).

France: Ordericus Vitalis (see *supra); Vita Ludovici Grossi von Suger von Saint-Denis,* ed. H. Waquet (Paris 1929); *Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium,* ed. J. Boussard (Paris 1957); *Chronicle of Morigny* (to 1147), ed. A. *Duchesne, PL,* 180, 131–76; M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens de la France,* Vols. 12–15 (Gen. Bibliog, I, 3); Herman of Tournai, *De restauratione monasterii S. Martini Tornacensis, MGSS,* 14, 274–327; *Chronicle of Saint-Bertin* (extracts in *MGSS,* 25, 747–866, ed. O. Holder-Egger).

Other lands: Helmold of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum,* ed. B. Schmeidler (ed. tertia), *MGSS rer. Germ.,* 32 (Hanover 1937); *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris* (to 1147), H. Flórez, *España Sagrada,* 21, 320–409, *RepFont,* I, 254; William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, RecHistCrois, HistOcc,* 1 (*PL* 201); Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum,* ed. J. Olrik, H. Raeder, *et al.,* 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1931–57); John, prior Haugustaldensis ecclesiae, *Historia de regibus Anglorum et Danorum,* ed. T. Arnold, *Symeonis monachi opera,* 2, *Rolls Series,* 75 (London 1885), *MGSS,* 27, 14–16; *Historia Compostellana,* ed. H. Flórez, *España Sagrada,* 20 *(PL,* 170, 889–1236), translated into Spanish by Manuel Suárez, with notes and introduction by José Campelo (Santiago de Compostela 1950).

GENERAL LITERATURE

Historia Mundi, VI; *The Cambridge Medieval History,* V; L. Halphen; H. Pirenne, G. Cohen, and H. Focillon (see Volume III, 479, Gen. Bibliog., II, 1, a). A. Cartellieri, *Der Vorrang des Papsttums zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge 1095–1150* (Munich and Berlin 1941); *Gebhardt-Grundmann,* I; O. Brandt, A. O. Meyer, and L. Just, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* I; P. Rassow, *Deutsche Geschichte im Überblick; Giesebrecht,* IV (2d ed. 1877) (Gen. Bibliog., II, 2); K. Hampe and F. Baethgen, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer* (Heidelberg, 11th ed. 1963); F. Heer, *Aufgang Europas,* 2 vols. (Vienna and Zurich 1949); *idem, Die Tragödie des Heiligen Reiches,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart

1952); W. von den Steinen, *Der Kosmos des Mittelalters. Von Karl dem Grossen zu Bernhard von Clairvaux* (Munich 1959); R. Folz, *L'idée d'empire en Occident du Vᵉ au XIVᵉ siècle* (Paris 1953); E. E. Stengel, *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisergedankens im Mittelalter* (Cologne 1965); F. L. Ganshof, *Le moyen âge. Histoire des relations internationales,* I, ed. P. Renouvin (Paris, 2d ed. 1958); E. Jordan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie aux XIIᵉ et XIIIᵉ siècles,* G. Glotz, *Histoire du moyen âge,* VI, 1 (Gen. Bibliog. II, 1, a) (Paris 1939). A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087–1216* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1955, reprinted 1964); *idem, Medieval England,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 2d ed. 1960); D. M. Stenton, *English Society in the Early Middle Ages* (1066–1307) (Harmondsworth, 4th ed. 1965); G. Barraclough, *The Medieval Empire, Idea and Reality* (Historical Association, Series G, 17) (London 1960); H. W. C. Davis, *England under the Normans and Angevins* (London, 13th ed. 1961); A. Luchaire, *Les premiers Capétiens (987–1137)* (Paris 1901); *idem, Louis VII-Philippe Auguste-Louis VIII (1137–1226)* (Paris 1902); *Lavisse,* II, 2, III, 1; J. Le Goff, *La civilisation de l'Occident mediéval* (Paris 1964); *Storia politica d'Italia,* dir. da A. Solmi, IV (see Volume III, 480, Gen. Bibliog., II, 2); R. Soldevilla, *Historia de España* (see Volume III, 481, Gen. Bibliog., II, 2); P. Peres, *Historia de Portugal,* 2 vols. (Barcelos 1928 f.) (see Volume III, 481, Gen. Bibliog., II, 2).

Fliche-Martin, IX, 1; R. García Villoslada, *Edad media 800–1303* (Madrid, 2d. ed. 1958); *Hauck,* IV (5th ed. 1925); R. W. Southern, *The Medieval Church* (Harmondsworth 1966); *The English Church and* the *Papacy,* ed. C. W. Lawrence (London 1965). For further literature on the Church History of individual lands see Gen. Bibliog., II, 4. J. Haller, *Das Papsttum, Idee und Wirklichkeit,* III, ed. H. Dannenbauer (Esslingen, 3d ed. 1962); *Seppelt,* III: *Die Vormachtstellung des Papsttums von der Mitte des 11. Jahrhunderts bis zu Cölestin V.* (Munich 1956); K. Bierbach, *Kurie und Nationalstaaten im früheren Mittelalter (1032–1245)* (Dresden 1938); R. Foreville, *Latran I, II, III et Latran IV, Histoire des conciles œcuméniques,* 6 (Paris 1965). Further literature in the individual chapters.

1. *Honorius II, The Schism of 1130, and The Second Lateran Council*

Sources

For Honorius II: *PL,* 166, 1217–1320 (letters); *Jaffé,* I, 2d ed., nos. 823–39, II, 755; *Duchesne LP,* II, 327 f., 379, III, 136 f., 170 f., *LPM,* 203–17 (Pandulf's *Vita* from the *Liber Pontificalis Dertusensis); Watterich,* II, 157–73; *Hefele-Leclercq,* V, 645–75. For Innocent II: *PL,* 179, 21–674 (letters); Jaffé, I, 2d ed., nos. 840–911; *Duchesne LP,* II, 379–85, 449, III, 138; *Watterich,* II, 174–275. For Anacletus II: *PL,* 179, 687–732; *Jaffé,* I, 2d ed., nos. 911–19; *Duchesne LP,* II, 319, 328, 379 f., 382 f.; Arnulf of Lisieux, *Tractatus de schismate Petri Leonis orto post Honorii papae decessum,* L. d'Achéry, *Spicilegium,* I, 2d ed., 152 ff., *PL,* 201, 173–194; *Historia Compostellana, España Sagrada,* XX, 513–17.

Literature

G. Tellenbach, "Der Sturz des Abtes Pontius von Cluny und seine geschichtliche Bedeutung," *QFIAB,* 42/43 (1963), 13–55; L. M. Smith, *Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (London 1930); J. Leclercq, *La vie de Pierre le Vénérable* (Paris 1946); A. Wilmart, "Deux pièces relatives à l'abdication de Pons abbé de Cluny en 1122," *RBén,* 44 (1932), 351–53; H. V. White, "Pontius of Cluny, the Curia Romana and the End of Gregorianism in Rome," *Church History,* 27 (1958), 195–219; U. Berlière, "Le cardinal Matthieu d'Albano," *RBén,* 18 (1901), 113–40, 280–303.

U. Balzani, *Italia, papato e impero nella prima metà del secolo XII (1124–1167)* (Messina 1930); *JbbDG:* W. Bernhardi, *Lothar von Supplinburg* (Leipzig 1879); *idem, Konrad III.* (Leipzig 1883); J. Bachmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Skandinavien (1125–1159)* (Berlin 1913); W. Janssen, *Die päpstlichen Legaten vom Schisma Anaklets II. bis zum Tode Coelestins III.*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 6 (Cologne 1961).

The Schism of 1130: R. Zoepffel, "Die Doppelwahl des Jahres 1130" (appendix to his *Die Papstwahlen vom 11. bis zum 14. Jahrhundert* [Göttingen 1871]); E. Mühlbacher, *Die streitige Papstwahl des Jahres 1130* (Innsbruck 1876, reprinted *ibid.* 1966); H. W. Klewitz, "Das Ende des Reformpapsttums," *DA*, 3 (1939), 372–412 (now also H. W. Klewitz, *Reformpapsttum und Kardinalkolleg* [Darmstadt 1957], 209–59); P. F. Palumbo, "Lo scisma del MCXXX, i precedenti, la vicenda Romana e le ripercussioni europee della lotta tra Anacleto ed Innocenzo II col regesto degli'atti di Anacleto II," *Miscellanea della Reale Deputazione di Storia Patria* (Rome 1942); *idem,* "La cancelleria di Anacleto II," *Scritti di paleografia e diplomatica in onore di V. Federici* (Florence 1944), 79 ff. (now also: *Studi Salentini*, 17 [1964], 5–52); H. Bloch, "The Schism of Anacletus and the Glanfeuil Forgeries of Peter the Deacon," *Tr*, 8 (1952), 159–264; F. J. Schmale, "Die Bemühungen Innocenz' II. um seine Anerkennung in Deutschland," *ZKG*, 65 (1954), 240–65; *idem, Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130, Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht*, 3 (Cologne and Graz 1961); *idem,* "Papsttum und Kurie zwischen Gregor VII. und Innocenz II.," *HZ*, 193 (1961), 265–85; P. F. Palumbo, "Nuovi studi (1942–1962) sullo scisma di Anacleto II," *BIStIAM*, 75 (1963), 71–103.

The Normans: F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile*, 2 vols. (Paris 1907, reprinted New York 1960); G. Pepe, *I normanni in Italia meridionale (1060–1194)*, ed. G. Musca (Bari 1964); D. Clementi, "Alexandri Telesini 'Ystoria serenissimi Rogerii primi regis Sicilie,' Lib. IV, 6–10 (Twelfth Century Political Propaganda)," *BIStIAM*, 77 (1965), 105–26; J. R. Ménager, "L'institution monarchique dans les états normands d'Italie," *CCivMéd*, 2 (1959), 303–31, 445–68 (important); J. Béraud Villars, *Les Normands en Méditerranée* (Paris 1951); E. Caspar, *Roger II (1101–1154) und die Gründung der normannisch-sicilischen Monarchie* (Innsbruck 1904, reprinted Darmstadt 1963); P. F. Kehr, "Belehnungen der Normannenfürsten durch die Päpste (1059–1192)," *SAB*, 1934, 1; W. Holtzmann, *Il regno di Ruggero II e gli inizi di un sistema di stati europei, Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi Ruggeriani* (Palermo 1955); J. Déer, "Der Anspruch der Herrscher des 12. Jahrhunderts auf die apostolische Legation," *AHPont*, 2 (1964), 115–86; W. Holtzmann, "Papsttum, Normannen und die griechische Kirche," *Miscellanea Bibl. Herzianae* (Munich 1961), 68–76; P. Andrieu-Guitrancourt, *Histoire de l'empire normand et de sa civilisation* (Paris 1952); A. de Stefano, *La cultura in Sicilia nel periodo normanno* (Bologna, 2d ed. 1954); L. T. White, *Latin Monasticism in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge, Mass. 1938); L. R. Ménager, "Les fondations monastiques de Robert Guiscard, duc de Pouille et de Calabre," *QFIAB*, 39 (1959), 1–116; *idem,* "La 'byzantinisation' religieuse de l'Italie méridionale et la pratique monastique des Normands d'Italie," *RHE*, 53 (1958), 747–74, 54 (1959), 5–40; H. Niese, *Die Gesetzgebung der normannischen Dynastie im regnum Siciliae* (Halle 1910); E. Pontieri, *Tra i normanni nell'Italia meridionale* (Naples, 2d ed. 1964). *Roger II: Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi Ruggeriani*, 2 vols. (Palermo 1955); H. Wieruszowski, "Roger II of Sicily, Rex Tyrannus, in Twelfth-Century Political Thought," *Speculum*, 38 (1963), 46–78; R. Elze, "Zum Königtum Rogers II. von Sizilien," *Festschrift P. E. Schramm*, I (Wiesbaden 1964), 102–16; W. Holtzmann, "Maximilla regina, soror Rogeri regis," *DA*, 19 (1963), 149–57.

Lateran II: Latran I, II, III, et Latran IV, Histoire des conciles œcuméniques, 6 (Paris 1965); R. L. Poole, "The English Bishops at the Lateran Council of 1138," *EHR*, 38 (1923), 61–63; C. Leonardi, "Per la tradizione dei concili di Ardara, Lateranensi I–II e Tolosa," *BIStIAM*, 75 (1963), 57–70.

2. *The Reform Orders of the Twelfth Century and Bernard of Clairvaux*

Cistercians

SOURCES

J. Laurent, *Cartulaires de l'abbaye de Molesme*, I (Paris 1907); *Vita Roberti*, ed. K. Spahr, *Das Leben des heiligen Robert von Molesme* (Fribourg 1944); J. Marlier, *Chartes et documents concernant l'abbaye de Cîteaux (1098–1182)* (Rome 1961); J. Turk, *Cistercii statuta antiquissima* (Rome 1949); J. Wacquet, *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Clairvaux* (Troyes 1950); J. B. Van Damme, *Documenta pro Cisterciensis Ordinis historiae ac iuris studio* (Westmalle 1959); "Exordium Cistercii nach Ms. 1207 von Ste-Geneviève-Paris," ed. J. A. Lefèvre, *CollOCR*, 16 (1954), 96–104; "Exordium parvum," ed. C. Noschitzka, *AnOCist*, 6 (1950), 6–22; *Nomasticon Cisterciense seu antiquiores Ordinis Cisterciensis constitutiones*, ed. H. Séjalon (Solesmes, 2d ed. 1892); *Statuta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis 1116/1786*, 8 vols., ed. J. M. Canivez (Louvain 1933–41); C. de Visch, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ordinis Cist.* (Cologne, 2d ed. 1656); M. A. Dimier, *Recueil de plans d'églises cisterciennes*, 2 vols. (Paris 1949); M. Aubert, *L'architecture cistercienne en France* (Paris 1955); *Menologium Cisterciense* (Westmale 1952); C. H. Talbot, "A Cistercian Commentary on the Benedictine Rule," *Analecta monastica*, V, *Studia Anselmiana*, 43 (Rome 1958), 101–58.

LITERATURE

L. J. Lekai, *Les moines blancs* (Paris 1957); J. B. Mahn, *L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement des origines au milieu du XIII^e^ siècle* (Paris, 2d ed. 1951); G. Müller, *Vom Cistercienserorden* (Bregenz 1927); G. Schreiber, "Studien zur Exemptionsgeschichte der Zisterzienser," *ZSavRGkan*, 4 (1914), 74–116; old, but still indispensable is F. Winter, *Die Cistercienser des nordöstlichen Deutschland*, 3 vols. (Gotha 1868–71); M. Gloning, "Verzeichnis der deutschen Cistercienser-Abteien und -Priorate", *SM*, 36 (1915), 1–42; R. Ohle, *Die Bedeutung der Zisterzienser für die Besiedelung der Mark Brandenburg* (Prenzlau 1922, polemical); J. Eicheler, *Die Kongregationen des Zisterzienserordens* (diss., Fribourg 1931); J. Rambaud-Buhot, "L'Abbaye normande de Savigny, chef d'Ordre et fille de Cîteaux," *MA* (1936), 1–19, 249–72; A. A. King, *Cîteaux and Her Elder Daughters* (London 1954); L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité de Cîteaux* (Paris 1955). On the origin of the *Carta Caritatis:* D. Knowles, "The Primitive Cistercian Documents," *Great Historical Enterprises. Problems in Monastic History* (London 1963), 197–224, with a report on the studies of J. Turk and J. A. Lefèvre (to 1956) and the research continued by J. B. Van Damme, "Formation de la Constitution Cistercienne. Esquisse historique," *StudMon*, 4 (1962), 111–37 (completed in July 1961); J. M. Canivez, "L'Abbaye de Cîteaux," *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 852–74; *idem*, "L'Ordre de Cîteaux," *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 874–997 (sources, literature, and maps); C. Bock, *Les codifications du droit cistercien* (Westmalle 1955); K. Spahr, "Die Zisterzienser," *LThK*, X (2d ed. 1965), 1382–87; annual bibliography in *CollOCR* (Westmalle), *AnOCist* (Rome), *Cist* (Mehrerau and Bregenz), *Cîteaux in de Nederlanden* (Westmalle), *Cistercium* (Palencia), *RBén* (Bulletin d'histoire bénédictine) (Maredsous); L. Janauschek, *Originum Cisterciensium*, I (Vienna 1877); P. Zakar, "Die Anfänge des Zisterzienserordens," *AnOCist*, 20 (1964), 103–38; J. B. Van Damme in *AnOCist*, 21 (1965), 128–37 (criticism and supplement); B. Schneider, "Cîteaux und die benediktinische Tradition," *AnOCist*, 16 (1960), 160–254, 17 (1961), 73–114; S. Roisin, "L'efflorescence cistercienne et le courant féminin de piété au XIII^e^ siècle," *RHE*, 39 (1943), 342–78. On devotion to Mary: *Maria*, II, 581–624, and *LM*, 710–20. On liturgy: S. Marosszeki, "Les origines du chant cistercien," *AnOCist*, 8 (1952), 1–179; M. Cocheril, "Le 'Tonale Sancti Bernardi' et la définition du 'ton,'" *Cîteaux*,

13 (1962), 35–66. On the pursuit of study: A. Dimier, "Les premiers Cisterciens étaient-ils ennemis des études?" *Los Monjes y los Estudios* (Poblet 1963), 119–46. On economic history: H. Wiswe, "Grangien niedersächsischer Zisterzienserklöster," *Braunschweig, Jb.*, 34 (1953), 5–134 (bibliog.); R. A. Donkin, "The Cistercian Grange in England in the 12th and 13th Centuries, with Special Reference to Yorkshire," *StudMon,* 6 (1964), 95–144 (maps); F. Van Der Meer, *Atlas de l'ordre cistercien* (Haarlem 1965).

Canons Regular

Sources

E. Amort, *Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium et saecularium* (Venice 1747); *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis,* ed. A. Werminghoff, *MGLL,* s. III, *Concilia,* 3 *(Concilia aevi karolini,* pars I) (Hanover 1906), 307–421; Arno of Reichersberg, *Scutum canonicorum, PL,* 194, 1493–1528; A. Carrier de Belleuse, *Coutumier du XI^e siècle de l'Ordre de Saint-Ruf en usage à la cathédrale de Maguelone, Études et documents sur l'Ordre de Saint-Ruf,* 8 (Sherbroke 1950); C. Dereine, "Saint-Ruf et ses coutumes au XI^{e} et XII^{e} siècle," *RBén,* 59 (1949), 161–82; *Die Chronik des Klosters Petershausen,* ed. and trans. O. Feger, *Casus Monasterii Petrishusensis, Schwäbische Chroniken der Stauferzeit,* 3 (Lindau and Constance 1956); A. Hänggi, *Der Rheinauer Liber Ordinarius, Spicilegium Friburgense. Texte der Geschichte des kirchlichen Lebens,* 1 (Fribourg 1957); C. Hoffmann, "L'abbaye de Marbach et le nécrologe de 1241," *Bulletin de la société pour la conservation des monuments historiques d'Alsace – Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Erhaltung der geschichtlichen Denkmäler im Elsass,* 2d series, 20 (Strasbourg 1902), 67–230 (list of confreres and obituary).

Literature

F. Bonnard, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale et de l'ordre des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Victor de Paris,* 2 vols. (Paris 1907); J. Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften in der deutschen Schweiz vom 6. Jahrhundert bis 1160. Mit einem Überblick über die deutsche Kanonikerreform des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts, Studia Friburgensia,* new series, 30 (Fribourg 1962), with ample bibliographical citations for the entire reform movement; important are the results of the studies of C. Dereine, summarized up to 1953 in his article "Chanoines," *DHGE,* 12 (1953), 353–405; A. Smith, "Chanoines réguliers," *DSAM,* 2 (1953), 463–77; J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London 1950); C. Dereine, *Les chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant Saint Norbert* (Brussels 1952); F. A. Goehlinger, *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Marbach* (Colmar 1954); T. Humpert, *Chorherrenstift, Pfarrei und Kirche St. Stephan in Konstanz* (Constance 1957); J. Mois, *Das Stift Rottenbuch in der Kirchenreform des XI. bis XII. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Ordensgeschichte der Augustinerchorherren, Beiträge zur altbayerischen Kirchengeschichte,* 3d series, 19 (Munich 1953); C. Giroud, *L'ordre des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Augustin et ses diverses formes de régime interne* (Martigny 1961).

Premonstratensians

J. Le Paige, *Bibliotheca Ordinis Praem.* (Paris 1633); C. L. Hugo, *S. Ordinis Praemonstratensis annales,* 2 vols. (Nancy 1734–36); P. Winter, *Die Prämonstratenser des 12. Jahrhunderts und ihre Bedeutung für das nordöstliche Deutschland* (Berlin 1865); L. A. Goovaerts, *Dictionnaire bio-bibliographique des écrivains, artistes et savants de l'Ordre de Prémontré,* 4 vols. (Brussels 1900–09); G. Schreiber, *Kurie und Kloster,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1910, reprinted Amsterdam 1965); R. van Waefelghem, *Les premiers statuts de Prémontré* (Louvain and Brussels 1913); A. Zak, *Der Prämonstratenserorden in den alten deutschen Metropolen* (Vienna 1919); U. Berlière, *Les monastères doubles aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles, Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique,* 18 (Brussels 1923); F. Petit, *L'ordre de Prémontré* (Paris 1927); H. Heijman, *Untersuchungen über die Prämonstratensergewohnheiten* (Tongerloo 1928); B. Grassl, *Der Prämonstratenserorden* (Tongerloo 1934); G. Schreiber, "Prämonstratensische Frömmigkeit," *ZKTh,* 64 (1940), 181–201; *idem,* "Prämonstratenserkultur des 12. Jahrhunderts," *APraem,* 16 (1940), 41–108, 17 (1941), 5–33; *idem,* "Gregor VII., Cluny, Cîteaux, Prémontré zu Eigenkirche, Parochie und Seelsorge," *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters* (Münster 1948), 283–370; P. Lefèvre, *Les statuts de Prémontré* (Louvain 1946); F. Petit, *La spiritualité de l'ordre de Prémontré aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles* (Paris 1947); C. Dereine, "Les origines de Prémontré," *RHE,* 42 (1947), 352–78; *idem,* "Le premier ordo de Prémontré," *RBén,* 58 (1948), 84–92; H. M. Colvin, *The White Canons in England* (Oxford 1951); *Monasticon Praemonstratense,* ed. N. Backmund, 3 vols. (Straubing 1949–56; rich bibliography); annual bibliography in *Analecta Praemonstratensia* (Tongerloo; from 1953: Averbode); R. van Waefelghem, *Répertoire des sources imprimées et manuscrites relatives à l'histoire et à la liturgie des monastères de l'ordre de Prémontré* (Brussels 1930); A. Huber, *Die Prämonstratenser* (Baden-Baden 1955); P. Lefèvre, *La liturgie de Prémontré* (Louvain 1957); N. Backmund, "Die Prämonstratenser," *LThK,* VIII (2d ed. 1963), 688–94; H. L. Martin, *Initia historico-iuridica Capituli Generalis Ordinis Praemonstratensis* (diss., Rome 1964).

Bernard of Clairvaux

BIBLIOGRAPHY

L. Janauschek, *Bibliographia Bernardina* (to 1890), *Xenia Bernardina,* 4 (Vienna 1891, reprinted Hildesheim 1959); M. Bernards, "Der Stand der Bernhardforschung" (to 1955), *Bernhard von Clairvaux. Mönch und Mystiker.* Internationaler Bernhardkongress Mainz 1953, *Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für europäische Geschichte,* 6 (Wiesbaden 1955), 3–43; J. de la Croix Bouton, *Bibliographie Bernardine (1891–1957), Commission d'histoire de l'ordre de Cîteaux,* 5 (Paris 1958); J. Leclercq, the chief representative of the studies stimulated by the 1953 jubilee of Bernard's death, gives a critical report on the results in "Les études bernardines en 1963," *Bulletin de la Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale,* 5 (1963), 121–38.

WORKS

Sancti Bernardi Opera, ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais: *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum,* I (Rome 1957), II (Rome 1958), Treatises, III (Rome 1963). All other works, especially the letters, are in *PL: Sermones, PL,* 183 and 184, Letters, *PL,* 182, Parables and Sentences, *PL,* 183 and 184. Other works, hitherto unprinted, have been edited by J. Leclercq, P. Séjourné, G. Hüffer, A. Wilmart, C. H. Talbot, *et al.; cf.* the list in D. Farkasfalvy, "L'inspiration de l'Écriture Sainte dans la théologie de Saint Bernard," *Studia Anselmiana,* 53 (Rome 1964), 18 f. For Bernard's correspondence: D. Van den Eynde, "La correspondance de Saint Bernard de 1115 à 1126," *Antonianum,* 41 (1966), 189–259 (with further bibliography). Bernard's attitude to Peter Abelard: "Capitula haeresum Petri Abaelardi," *PL,* 182, 1049–54, "De erroribus Abaelardi," *PL,* 182, 1053–72, "Sermo de conversione ad clericos," *PL,* 182, 833–56; *Briefe des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux,* trans. H. Michel (Mainz 1928); *Schriften des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux,* 6 vols., trans. A.

Wolters and H. Michel (Wittlich 1935–38); B. Scott James, *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (London 1953); H. M. Rochais, "Inédits bernardins dans le manuscrit Harvard 185," *Studia Anselmiana,* 50 (n. d.), 53–175; *idem,* "Enquête sur les sermons divers et les sentences de saint Bernard," *AnOCist,* 18 (1962). A glance at the several aspects of research is provided by the Congress reports and the jubilee writings of 1953 (J. de la Croix Bouton, *Bibliographie Bernardine,* 709–75), especially by the Mainz collection (Wiesbaden 1955), cited *supra;* the *Mélanges Saint Bernard* (Congress of Dijon) (Dijon 1954); *San Bernardo* (Congress of Milan) (Milan 1954); *Saint Bernard Théologien* (Second Congress of Dijon), *AnOCist,* 9 (Rome 1953), fascicles 3–4; the important collection *Bernard de Clairvaux, Commission d'histoire de l'Ordre de Cîteaux,* 3 (Paris 1953); the commemorative publication of the Dutch Cistercians, *Sint Bernardus van Clairvaux* (Achel and Rotterdam 1953); and the commemorative issue of the *Collectanea OCistReform, 1953* (Westmalle); the *Festschrift der österreichischen Cistercienserkongregation, Österreichische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Cistercienserordens* (Vienna 1953), *cf.* F. Grass, "Das Bernhardjubiläum 1953 im Spiegel des Schrifttums," *ZSavRGkan,* 41 (1955), 415–21; J. Leclercq, *Études sur Saint Bernard et le texte de ses écrits, AnOCist,* 9 (Rome 1953), fascicles 1–2; K. Spahr, "Festgabe und Festgaben zum Bernhardsjubiläum," *Cist,* 61 (1954), 43–52, 108–15, 62 (1955), 35–48, 84–94; J. Leclercq, *Recueil d'études sur saint Bernard et ses écrits* (Rome 1962); J. Leclercq, "Aspects littéraires de l'œuvre de saint Bernard," *CCivMéd,* 1 (1958), 435–50; D. Van den Eynde, "Les débuts littéraires de Saint Bernard," *AnOCist,* 19 (1963), 189–98; J. Leclercq, "Nouveaux aspects littéraires de l'œuvre de Saint Bernard," *CCivMéd,* 8 (1965), 299–326; *idem,* "L'art de la composition dans les traités de Saint Bernard," *RBén,* 76 (1966), 87–115.

BIOGRAPHY

BHL, 1207–38; the oldest piece is *Fragmenta Gaufridi de Vita et Miraculis S. Bernardi,* ed. R. Lechat, *AnBoll,* 50 (1932), 83–122; the first important source is the *Vita Prima,* by William of Saint-Thierry, Arnold of Bonnevale, and Godfrey of Auxerre, in *PL,* 185, 225–466; see A. H. Bredero, "Études sur la 'Vita prima' de S. Bernard," *AnOCist,* 17 (1961), 3–72, 215–60, 18 (1962), 3–59, as the basis for a critical edition of the oldest biographies; P. Sinz, *Das Leben des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux ("Vita Prima"),* ed. and trans. (Düsseldorf 1962); the classic biography by E. Vacandard, 2 vols. (Paris, 4th ed. 1910), is still important for chronology and routes of journeys, even though in some particulars it is outdated. For the older biographies, by A. Neander and S. M. Deutsch, G. Hofmeister, A. Luchaire, A. K. Luddy, and others, see M. Bernards *(supra),* 24, footnote 29. There are many popular accounts, by R. Linhardt, H. Höver, G. Goyau, P. Miterre, A. Martin, J. Schuck, and fictional romances, such as those by J. Weingärtner, K. Vogt, J. Schenk, E. Schmidt-Pauli, and others. More important for the scholar are: É. Gilson, *La théologie mystique de Saint Bernard* (Paris 1932); W. W. Williams, *S. Bernard of Clairvaux, Publications of the University of Manchester,* Historical Series, 69 (Manchester, 2d ed. 1953); J. Calmette and H. David, *S. Bernard, Les grandes études historiques* (Paris 1953); A. Dimier, *Saint Bernard, "Pêcheur de Dieu"* (Paris 1953); A. Dimier, "C'est en 1174, et non en 1175, que Saint Bernard fut canonisé," *Cîteaux,* 12 (1961), 79–85; I. Vallery-Radot, *Bernard de Fontaines, abbé de Clairvaux, ou les noces de la grâce et de la nature. Les années de formation (1090–1130)* (Paris 1963); J. Leclercq, "Saint Bernard, le dernier des Pères," *La spiritualité du moyen âge* (Paris 1961), 238–49; *idem, Saint Bernard mystique* (Paris and Bruges 1948); E. Bertola, *S. Bernardo e la teologia speculativa* (Padua 1959); M. Dumontier, *Saint Bernard et la Bible* (Bruges and Paris 1953); P. Delhaye, *Le problème de la conscience morale chez Saint Bernard* (Namur 1957); A. van den Bosch, *La personne du Christ dans l'œuvre de Saint Bernard* (Rome 1957); R. Fritegotta, "De vocatione christiana

S. Bernardi doctrina," *Studia Antoniana*, 15 (Rome 1961); A. H. Bredero, "Studien zu den Kreuzzugsbriefen Bernhards von Clairvaux und seine Reise nach Deutschland im Jahre 1142," *MIÖG*, 66 (1958), 331–43; R. Kereszty, "Die Weisheit in der mystischen Erfahrung beim heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux," *Cîteaux*, 16 (1963), 6–24, 105–34, 185–201; the work, cited *supra*, by D. Farkasfalvy (Rome 1964); P. Zerbi, "Bernardo di Chiaravalle," *Bibliotheca sanctorum*, 3 (Rome 1963), 1–37; B. Jacqueline, *Papauté et Épiscopat selon Saint Bernard de Clairvaux* (Paris 1963); K. Knotzinger, "Das Amt des Bischofs nach Bernhard von Clairvaux. Ein Traditionsbeitrag," *Scholastik*, 38 (1963), 519–35; L. Grill, "Bernhard von Clairvaux und die Ostkirche," *AnOCist*, 19 (1963), 165–88; R. Bultot, *S. Bernard, la Somme, le Roi et le double idéal antique de la magnanimité* (Westmalle 1964).
Bernard and Gilbert de la Porrée: N. M. Häring, "Dialogus Ratii et Everardi," *MS*, 15 (1953), 243–89; *idem*, "Everard von Ypern als Autor des gen. Dialogs," *MS*, 17 (1955), 143–72; S. Gammersbach, *Gilbert von Poitiers und seine Prozesse im Urteil der Zeitgenossen* (Cologne and Graz 1959).
Bernard and Peter Abelard: A. M. Landgraf, "Probleme um den heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux," *Cist*, 61 (1954), 1–16; A. Borst, "Abälard und Bernhard," *HZ*, 186 (1958), 497–526; R. Klibansky, "Peter Abailard and Bernard of Clairvaux. A Letter by Abailard," *MRS*, 5 (1961), 1–27; J. R. Sommerfeldt, "Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux," *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters*, 46 (1961), 493–501; P. Zerbi, "I rapporti di san Bernardo di Chiaravalle con i vescovi e le diocesi d'Italia," *Vescovi e diocesi in Italia nel medioevo* (Padua 1964), 219–314; K. H. Esser, "Der Kirchenbau des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux," *AMrhKG*, 5 (1953), 195–222.

3. *The Papacy and the Western Kings in the Age of Saint Bernard*

SOURCES

Mansi, XXI, 540–785; *Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 747–847; *Duchesne LP*, II and III. For Celestine II: *Watterich*, II, 276–78; *Duchesne LP*, II, 385, 449, III, 138; *Jaffé*, II, 2d ed., 1–7, 716, 758; *PL*, 179, 765–822. For Lucius II: *Watterich*, II, 278–81; *Duchesne LP*, II, 385 f., 449, III, 138; *Jaffé*, II, 2d ed., 7–9, 717, 758; *PL*, 179, 819–938. For Eugene III: *Watterich*, II, 281–321; *Duchesne LP*, II, 386 f., 449, III, 138 f., *Jaffé*, II, 2d ed., 20–89; supplements in H. Gleber (see *infra*), 191–208; John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis*, ed. R. L. Poole (1927), English translation by M. Chibnall (London 1956); Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione*, ed. J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera Omnia*, III (Rome 1963), 379–493; and the narrative sources listed in the bibliography for this section *(supra)*. For Anastasius IV: *Watterich*, II, 321 f.; *Duchesne LP*, II, 388, 449, III, 139; *Jaffé*, II, 2d ed., 89–102.

LITERATURE

In addition to the works already listed for Chapter 1: J. Bachmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Skandinavien (1125–59), HStud*, 115 (Berlin 1913); G. Säbekow, *Die päpstlichen Legationen nach Spanien und Portugal bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhunderts* (diss., Berlin 1931); H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas (1218)* (diss., Bonn 1926); L. Spätling, "Kardinal Guido und seine Legation in Böhmen-Mähren (1142–46)," *MIÖG*, 66 (1958), 306–30; R. Manselli, *Alberico, cardinale vescovo d'Ostia e la sua attività di legato pontificio, ADRomana*, 78 (1955); O. Kolsrud, *Kardinal-legaten Nicolaus av Albano i Norge 1152* (Oslo 1943–46); A. O. Johnsen, *Studier vedrørende kardinal Nicolaus Breakspears legasjon til Norden* (diss.,

Oslo 1945); A. Gwynn, "Papal Legates in Ireland during the Twelfth Century," *IER*, 63 (1941), 361–70.

H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen III. (1145–53) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner politischen Tätigkeit* (Jena 1936); review of the preceding by E. Jordan in *RHE*, 33 (1937), 367–72, which supplies a more sober perspective; G. Del Guerra, N. Caturegli, and G. L. Bentivoglio, *Il beato Eugenio III* (Pisa 1954); the bibliography on Saint Bernard is given in that for Chapter 2; P. Rassow, *Honor Imperii* (Munich 1940); P. Brezzi, *Roma e l'impero medioevale* (Bologna 1947); P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer*, 2 vols. (Rome 1955–57); G. Edelsbrunner, *Arnold von Brescia. Untersuchungen über die weltliche Herrschaft der Kurie und die häretischen Bewegungen um die Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts* (typed diss., Graz 1958). (More detailed bibliography on Arnold of Brescia *infra*, for Chapters 8 and 13.)

The Curia and England: A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1964), 190–96; H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (to 1154) (Leipzig 1899; standard); Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Cambridge 1931); D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 2d ed. 1963); C. R. Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries (1100–1250)* (Manchester 1950); L. Voss, *Heinrich von Blois, Bischof von Winchester (1129–71)* (Berlin 1932).

The Curia and France: Lavisse, III/1, 1–11; E. R. Labande, "Pour une image véridique d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine," *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*, 4th series, II (1952), 175–234; M. Pacaut, *Louis VII et les élections épiscopales dans le royaume de France* (Paris 1958); C. Petit-Dutaillis, *La monarchie féodale en France et en Angleterre (X^{e}–XIII^{e} siècles)* (Paris 1933).

The Curia and Germany: Hauck, IV, 5th ed., 114–95; *Gebhardt-Grundmann*, I, 285–301; R. Holtzmann, "Der Kaiser als Marschall des Papstes," *SAB*, 1928; E. Eichmann, "Das Officium stratoris et strepae," *HZ*, 142 (1930), 16–40; R. Holtzmann, "Zum Strator- und Marschalldienst," *HZ*, 145 (1932), 301–50; G. Ladner, "I mosaici e gli affreschi ecclesiastico-politici nell'antico Palazzo Lateranense," *RAC*, 12 (1935), 265–92. On the situation in South Italy at the time of the Emperor Lothar's second Italian expedition: P. F. Kehr, *Italia pontificia*, 8 (1935), 40–43; *idem*, "Die Belehnungen der süditalienischen Normannenfürsten durch die Päpste," *SAB*, 1934; H. Zatschek, "Wibald von Stablo. Studien zur Geschichte der Reichskanzlei und Reichspolitik unter den älteren Staufern," *MIÖG*, suppl. vol. 10 (Vienna 1928), 237–92; W. Ohnsorge, "'Kaiser' Konrad III.," *MIÖG*, 46 (1932); F. Geldner, "Zur neueren Beurteilung König Konrads III.," *Monumentum Bamburgense. Festgabe für B. Kraft* (Munich 1955), 395–412; P. Acht, "Die Gesandtschaft König Konrads III. an Papst Eugen III. in Dijon," *HJ*, 74 (1955), 668–73.

The Curia and Spain: J. Vincke, *Staat und Kirche in Katalonien und Aragón* (Münster 1931); G. Säbekow *(supra)*.

Eastward expansion: M. Bünding, *Das Imperium Christianum und die deutschen Ostkriege vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert, HStud*, 366 (Berlin 1940); H. Beumann, "Kreuzzugsgedanke und Ostpolitik im hohen Mittelalter," *HJ*, 72 (1953), 112–32; *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*, ed. H. Beumann (Darmstadt 1963).

4. *Elaboration of the Curia and Criticism of Church and Papacy*

SOURCES

M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain au moyen âge*, I: *Le Pontifical Romain du XII^{e} siècle, SteT*, 86 (Rome 1938); R. Elze, *Die Ordines für die Weihe und Krönung des Kaisers und der Kaiserin, MGFont. iur.*, 9 (Hanover 1960); *Duchesne LP*, I–III; P. Fabre, L. Duchesne, and G. Mollat, *Le Liber Censuum de l'Église Romaine*, 3 vols.; Bernard of Clairvaux, *De* *consideratione libri quinque,* ed. J. Leclercq and H. M. Rochais, *Sancti Bernardi Opera Omnia,* III (Rome 1963), 379–493 (*PL,* 182, 727–808); *Sancti Bernardi Sermo de conversione ad clericos, PL,* 182, 833–56 (a more concise redaction of this sermon in J. Leclercq, "Deux sermons de S. Bernard selon une rédaction inédite," *Analecta monastica,* I [Rome 1948], 127–33); Gerhoh of Reichersberg: E. Sackur, *MGLiblit,* III, 131–525, supplies extracts from his works with a political content; *Gerhohi Praepositi Reichersbergensis Opera inedita, Tractatus et Libelli,* ed. D. and O. Van den Eynde and P. A. Rijmersdael (Rome 1955), 309–50 ("Opusculum ad Cardinales"; extract in Sackur, *MGLiblit,* III, 400–11); most of Gerhoh's works are accessible in *PL,* 193 and 194, while P. Classen (see *infra*), 407–44, lists new and supplementary editions; John of Salisbury, *Policraticus (Joannis Saresberiensis Episcopi Carnotensis Policratici sive de nugis curialium libri VIII),* ed. C. C. J. Webb, 2 vols. (Oxford 1909); *The Letters of John of Salisbury,* I (1153–61), ed. W. J. Millor, H. E. Butler, and C. N. L. Brooke, *Nelson's Medieval Texts* (London 1955); A. Frugoni, *Arnaldo da Brescia nelle fonti del secolo XII* (Rome 1954).

LITERATURE

For the elaboration of the Curia: B. Rusch, *Die Behörden und Hofbeamten der päpstlichen Kurie des 13. Jahrhunderts, Schriften der Albertusuniversität,* Arts Series, 3 (Königsberg and Berlin 1936); K. Jordan, "Die Entstehung der römischen Kurie, Ein Versuch," *ZSavRGkan,* 28 (1939), 97–152; *idem,* "Das Eindringen der Lehnsidee in das Rechtsleben der römischen Kurie," *AUF,* 12 (1932), 13–110; *idem,* "Zur päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert," *QFIAB,* 25 (1933 f.), 61–104; J. Sydow, "Untersuchungen zur kurialen Verwaltungsgeschichte im Zeitalter des Reformpapsttums," *DA,* 11 (1954), 18–73; F. Salerno, "Problemi costituzionali nelle vicende storiche della Curia Romana," *Rev. it. Sc. Giur,* 10 (1959–62), 327–96; C. Bauer, "Die Epochen der Papstfinanz," *HZ,* 133 (1928), 457–504; R. Elze, "Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan,* 36 (1950), 145–204; E. Eichmann, *Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland,* II (Würzburg 1942), 210–79 (Palatium Lateranense); for particular offices see the bibliography in *Feine RG,* 287–89.

For criticism of the Curia: P. Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 2d ed. 1963), 25–68 (against the Roman Curia and the higher clergy); B. Jacqueline, *Papauté et Épiscopat selon Saint Bernard de Clairvaux* (Paris 1963); E. Meuthen, *Kirche und Heilsgeschichte bei Gerhoh von Reichersberg* (Leiden and Cologne 1959), 94–110 (Chapter 6, "Regnum und Sacerdotium: Die moralische Beurteilung der Reformträger"); P. Classen, *Gerhoh von Reichersberg. Eine Biographie* (Wiesbaden 1960), standard, 141–49 (Zion and Babel), 173–83 (against the innovations of this age), 215–33 (vestiges of Antichrist), and much else; C. C. J. Webb, *John of Salisbury* (London 1932); H. Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* (London 1950); see also the introductions to the editions listed *supra; cf. Haller,* III, 104–15 (criticism and self-criticism).

5. *The Second Crusade and the Wars in Spain and the Slavic East*

SOURCES

The chief Latin source for the Second Crusade is Odo of Deuil, *La croisade de Louis VII Roi de France,* ed. H. Wacquet (Paris 1949); Suger of Saint-Denis, *Vie de Louis le Gros* (which includes also his history of Louis VII), ed. A. Moliner (Paris 1887); Suger's correspondence is found in his *Œuvres complètes,* ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris 1867); Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive Historia de duabus civitatibus,* ed. A. Hofmeister, *MGSS* *rer. Germ.* (Hanover and Leipzig, 2d ed. 1912); *idem, Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris,* ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson (Hanover and Leipzig, 3d ed. 1912); Wibald of Stablo, *Epistolae,* ed. P. Jaffé, *Bibl. rer. germ.,* I (Berlin 1864); Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistolae, PL,* 182, 67–716; William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum,* ed. *RecHistCrois, Hist. Occ.,* 1 (an edition is being prepared by R. B. C. Huygens and H. E. Mayer), English trans. by E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey, 2 vols. (New York 1943); Osbern, *De expugnatione Lyxbonensi,* ed. with English trans. by C. W. David (New York 1933). *For William of Tyre: Cf.* A. C. Krey, "William of Tyre. The Making of an Historian in the Middle Ages," *Speculum,* 16 (1941), 149–66; *The Chronicle of Morea (Crusaders as Conquerors),* ed. and trans. by H. E. Lurier (New York 1964); John of Salisbury, *Historia pontificalis,* ed. M. Chibnall (London 1956; based on R. L. Poole's edition of 1927); Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *Die investigatione Antichristi,* ed. E. Sackur, *MGLiblit,* III, 304–95 (extracts), complete edition by F. Scheibelberger, 2 vols. (Linz 1875); *The First and Second Crusades from an Anonymous Syriac Chronicle,* ed. A. S. Tritton and H. A. R. Gibb, *JRAS,* 1933, 69–101, 273–305; *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, ed. J. B. Chabot, 4 vols. (Paris 1899–1924); John Konnamos, *Epitome historiarum,* ed. A. Meinecke (Bonn 1836; Migne, *Patrologia graeca,* 133), extracts with Latin translation as *De secunda expeditione, RecHist Crois, Hist Grecs,* 1; Nicetas Choniates, *Historia,* ed. I. Bekker (Bonn 1835; Migne, *Patrologia graeca,* 139), extracts with Latin translation as *De secunda tertiaque expeditionibus, RecHistCrois, HistGrecs,* 1; the Arab, Syriac, and Armenian sources are listed and discussed by V. G. Berry, "The Second Crusade," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, I (Philadelphia 1955), 463, footnote.

LITERATURE

H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie der Kreuzzüge,* nos. 2015–61; B. Kugler, *Studien zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges* (Stuttgart 1866); *idem, Analekten zur Geschichte des zweiten Kreuzzuges* (Tübingen 1878); *idem, Neue Analekten* (Tübingen 1883); G. Hüffner, "Die Anfänge des zweiten Kreuzzugs," *HJ,* 8 (1887), 391–429; F. Chalandon, *Les Comnènes: Jean II Comnène (1118–43) et Manuel I Comnène (1143–80)* (Paris 1912); H. Cosack, "Konrads III. Entschluss zum Kreuzzug," *MIÖG,* 35 (1914), 278–96; P. Rassow, "Die Kanzlei St. Bernhards von Clairvaux," *SM,* 34 (1913), 1–62, 201–42; E. Caspar, "Die Kreuzzugsbullen Eugens III.," *NA,* 45 (1924), 285–300; J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem (1100–1291)* (Cambridge 1932); H. Gleber, *Eugen III.* (Jena 1936); E. Pfeiffer, "Die Cistercienser und der zweite Kreuzzug," *Cist,* 47 (1935), 78–150; H. Conrad, "Gottesfrieden und Heersverfassung in der Zeit der Kreuzzüge," *ZSavRGgerm,* 61 (1941), 71–126; C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté d'Antioche* (Paris 1940); E. Delaruelle, "L'idée de croisade chez Saint Bernard," *Mélanges de Saint Bernard* (Dijon 1953), 53–67; A. Seguin, "Bernard et la seconde croisade," *Bernard de Clairvaux* (Paris 1953), 379–409; E. Willems, "Cîteaux et la seconde croisade," *RHE,* 49 (1954), 116–51; *P. Lamma, Comneni e Staufer,* 2 vols. (Rome 1955–57); V. G. Berry, "The Second Crusade," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, I (Philadelphia 1955), 463–512; S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades,* 3 vols. (Cambridge 1951–54), II, 247–88; R. Grousset, *Histoire des croisades,* 3 vols. (Paris 1934–36), II, 225–70; A. Waas, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1956), I, 166–82; R. L. Nicholson, *Jocelyn I, Prince of Edessa* (Urbana, Ill. 1954); H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), 96–108.
Crusades in Spain and the Slavic East: F. Kurth, "Der Anteil der niederdeutschen Kreuzfahrer an den Kämpfen der Portugiesen gegen die Mauren," *MIÖG,* Suppl. Volume 8 (1911), 133 ff.; H. A. R. Gibb, *English Crusaders in Portugal: Chapters in Anglo-Portuguese Relations,* ed. E. Prestage (London 1935); G. Constable, "The Route of the Anglo-Flemish

Crusaders," *Speculum,* 28 (1953), 525 f.; M. Bünding, *Das Imperium christianum und die deutschen Ostkriege vom 10.–12. Jahrhundert, HStud,* 366 (Berlin 1940); H. Beumann (ed.), *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters* (cooperative work) (Darmstadt 1963).

6. *Monastic Humanism*

SOURCES

The sources for this chapter are mostly the works of the writers and theologians mentioned in it. The old editions of them were collected by J. P. Migne, *PL,* but since his time unremitting labour has produced new editions and made other manuscripts available. Worthy of special mention are, among others: *Studia Anselmiana* (Rome 1933 ff.); *Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin* (Washington 1933 ff.); *Studies of the Warburg Institute* (London 1936 ff.); *Textes philosophiques du moyen âge* (Paris 1955 ff.); *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters* (Münster i. W. 1891 ff.); *Medieval Classics-Medieval Texts* (London 1949 ff.); *Sources chrétiennes* (Paris 1942 ff.); *cf.* Volume III, 485, Gen. Bibliog., II, 11.

LITERATURE

See Volume III, 485, Gen. Bibliog., II, 11. C. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass. 1927); R. W. Southern, "The Place of England in the Twelfth Century Renaissance," *History,* 45 (1960), 201–16; *Ueberweg,* II (Berlin, 11th ed. 1928); *Manitius,* III (Munich 1931); F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1953); *idem, A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1957); J. de Ghellinck, *L'essor de la littérature latine au XII^e^ siècle,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1946); E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York 1953; reprint 1963); R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London 1953); P. Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters, Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze,* 5 vols. (Stuttgart 1959–62); G. Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie,* III: *Das Mittelalter,* 2: *Das Hochmittelalter,* 2 vols. (Frankfurt 1959–62); M. D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle* (Paris 1957); J. Leclercq. *L'amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu* (Paris 1957), English translation: *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (New York 1961); J. Leclercq, F. Vandenbroucke, and L. Bouyer, *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne,* II: *La spiritualité du moyen âge* (Paris 1961); M. N. Scivoletto, *Spiritualità medioevale e tradizione scolastica nel secolo XII in Francia* (Naples 1954); P. Vignaux, *La philosophie au moyen âge* (Paris 1958); *Artes liberales. Von der antiken Bildung zur Wissenschaft des Mittelalters,* ed. J. Koch (Leiden and Cologne 1959).

Peter the Venerable: works in *PL,* 189; G. Constable and J. Kritzeck, "Petrus Venerabilis (1156–1956): Studies and Texts commemorating the Eighth Centenary of his Death," *SA,* 40 (Rome 1956); J. Leclercq, *Pierre le Vénérable* (Saint-Wandrille 1946); D. Knowles, "Peter the Venerable," *BJRL,* 39 (1956), 132–45; J. Leclercq, "Cluny fut-il ennemi de la culture?" *RMab,* 47 (1957), 172–82; P. Lamma, *Momenti di storiografia cluniacense* (Rome 1961); G. Vinay, *Spiritualità cluniacense* (Todi 1960).

Ordericus Vitalis: Historia ecclesiastica, PL, 188, ed. A. Le Prévost and L. Delisle, 5 vols. (Paris 1838–55) (M. Chibnall is preparing a new edition); H. Wolter, *Ordericus Vitalis. Ein Beitrag zur kluniazensischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden 1955).

Guibert de Nogent: works in *PL,* 156; edition of the autobiography by G. Bourgin (Paris 1907); G. Misch (see *supra),* III/2/1, 108–62.

William of Malmesbury: works: ed. W. Stubbs in *Rolls Series,* 90 (London 1887–89); ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton in *Rolls Series,* 52 (London 1870); ed. R. R. Darlington, *Vita Wulfstani* (London 1928); H. Farmer, "William of Malmesbury's Commentary of Lamentations," *StudMon,* 4 (1962), 283–311.

Hariulf of Saint-Riquier: works in *PL,* 174; Chronicle, ed. F. Lot (Paris 1894); H. Wolter, "La Chronique de l'abbaye de Saint-Riquier, témoin de l'humanisme bénédictin," *Saint-Riquier, Études concernant l'Abbaye depuis le huitième siècle jusqu'à la Révolution,* I (Saint-Riquier 1962), 68–86.

Rupert of Deutz: works in *PL,* 167–70; in regard to the spurious character of the *Chronicon* see H. Silvestre, *Le Chronicon s. Laurentii Leodiensis* (Louvain 1952); M. Magrassi, *Teologia e Storia nel pensiero di Ruperto da Deutz* (Rome 1959); M. Bernards, "Die Welt der Laien in der kölnischen Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts. Beobachtungen zur Ekklesiologie Ruperts von Deutz," *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter und Stände. Festschrift Kardinal Frings* (Cologne 1960), 391–416 (bibliography). There is no modern study of Rupert's life and works; *cf.* P. Classen, *Gerhoch von Reichersberg,* 36–40; R. Haacke is preparing a new edition; see *idem,* "Die Überlieferung der Schriften Ruperts von Deutz," *DA,* 16 (1960), 397–436.

William of Saint-Thierry: works in *PL,* 180, 184, 185; M. M. Davy, *Théologie et Mystique de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry* (Paris 1954); the best bibliography in M. M. Davy, "Wilhelm von St-Thierry," *LThK,* X (2d ed. 1965), 1150–52.

Aelred of Rievaulx: works in *PL,* 195; *Sermones inediti,* ed. C. H. Talbot (Rome 1952); *Speculum charitatis,* ed. A. Hoste, *SourcesChr* (Paris 1958); his life was written by Walter Daniel, ed. F. M. Powicke (London 1950); A. Hallier, *Un éducateur monastique: Aelred de Rievaulx* (Paris 1959).

Hugh of Saint-Victor: works: index in R. Baron, *Études sur Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris 1963), 261–67; *PL,* 175–77; *Didascalicon,* ed. C. H. Buttimer (Washington 1939); *De contemplatione,* ed. R. Baron (Toulouse and Paris 1958); L. Ott ,"Hugo von St-Victor," *LThK,* V (2d ed. 1960), 518 f. (bibliography); R. Baron is preparing further editions.

Gerhoh of Reichersberg: works: index in P. Classen, *Gerhoch von Reichersberg, eine Biographie. Mit einem Anhang über die Quellen, ihre handschriftliche Überlieferung und ihre Chronologie* (Wiesbaden 1960), 407–44; *PL,* 193–94; E. Meuthen, *Kirche und Heilsgeschichte bei Gerhoch von Reichersberg* (Cologne 1959). Classen's biography is standard.

Premonstratensians: F. Petit, *La spiritualité des Prémontrés aux XII^{e} et XIII^{e} siècles* (Paris 1947); H. M. Colvin, *The White Canons in England* (London 1951); P. Lefèvre, *La liturgie de Prémontré* (Louvain 1957).

Guigues du Châtel: works in *PL,* 153; *Meditationes,* ed. A. Wilmart (Paris 1936), German translation by P. A. Schlüter, *Guigo von Kastell, Tagebuch eines Mönchs* (Paderborn 1952); C. A. de Meyer and J. M. de Smet, "Notes sur quelques sources littéraires relatives à Guiges I^{er}," *RHE,* 48 (1953), 168–95; G. Hocquard, "La vie cartusienne d'après le prieur Guiges I^{er}," *RevSR,* 31 (1957), 364–82.

7. The New Theology: Abelard, Peter Lombard, Gratian

General Literature

See Volume III, 485 f., Gen. Bibliog., II, 11 and 12, especially *Fliche-Martin,* XIII; Z. Alszeghy, "Frühscholastik," *LThK,* IV (2d ed. 1960), 433–38; M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1909–11, reprinted Graz 1956); *Ueberweg,* II (11th ed. 1928, reprinted 1951); *Wulf;* J. Hirschberger, *Geschichte der Philo-*

sophie, 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 8th ed. 1965); F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy, II: Mediaeval Philosophy* (Westminster, Md., 4th ed. 1957); *Grabmann MGL; Grabmann G;* O. Lottin, *Psychologie et morale aux XII^{e} et XIII^{e} siècles*, 6 vols. (Louvain 1942–60); M. D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle, Études de philosophie médiévale*, 45 (Paris 1957); A. M. Landgraf, *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Frühscholastik* (Regensburg 1948); Spanish translation with supplements: *Introducción a la historia de la literatura teológica de la escolástica incipiente* (Barcelona 1956); *idem, Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*, I/1–IV/2 (Regensburg 1952–56); S. Otto, *Die Funktion des Bildbegriffs in der Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts, BGPhMA*, 40, 1 (Münster i. W. 1963) (copious bibliography on Anselm of Laon, Abelard, Robert of Melun, and their schools, the Victorines, Gilbert de la Porrée, Peter Lombard, and their schools, and the monastic theologians [*cf.* preceding chapter]: Rupert of Deutz, William of Saint-Thierry, Hugh of Amiens, Aelred of Rievaulx).

Anselm of Laon: E. Michaud, *Guillaume de Champeaux et les écoles de Paris au XII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1867); G. Lefèvre, *Anselmi Laudunensis et Radulphi fratris eius sententiae excerptae* (Évreux 1895); *idem, Les variations de Guillaume de Champeaux et la question des universaux* (Lille 1898); J. de Ghellinck, "The Sentences of Anselm de Laon and their Place in the Codification of Theology during the Twelfth Century," *IThQ*, 6 (1911), 427–41; F. Bliemetzrieder, *Anselms von Laon systematische Sentenzen, BGPhMA*, 18, 2–3 (Münster i. W. 1919); *idem*, "Autour de l'œuvre théologique d'Anselm de Laon," *RThAM*, 1 (1929), 435–83; *idem*, "Trente-trois pièces inédites de l'œuvre théologique d'Anselme de Laon," *RThAM*, 2 (1930), 54–79; *idem*, "Gratian und die Schule Anselms von Laon," *AkathKR*, 112 (1932), 37–63; H. Weisweiler, "L'école d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux," *RThAM*, 4 (1932), 237–69; F. Bliemetzrieder, "L'œuvre d'Anselme de Laon et la littérature théologique contemporaine, I: Honorius d'Autun," *RThAM*, 5 (1933), 275–291, II: "Hugues de Rouen," *RThAM*, 6 (1934), 261–83, 7 (1935), 28–51; H. Weisweiler, *Das Schrifttum der Schule Anselms von Laon und Wilhelms von Champeaux in deutschen Bibliotheken, BGPhMA*, 33, 1–2 (Münster i. W. 1936); A. M. Landgraf, "Werke aus dem Bereich der Summa Sententiarum und Anselms von Laon," *DTh*, 14 (1936), 209–20; O. Lottin, "Aux origines de l'école théologique d'Anselme de Laon," *RThAM*, 10 (1938), 101–22; E. Lesne, *Les écoles de la fin du VIII^{e} siècle à la fin du XII^{e} siècle* (Lille 1940); R. Silvain, "La tradition des Sentences d'Anselme de Laon," *AHD*, 22/23, (1947 f.), 1–52; H. Cloes, "La systématisation théologique pendant la première moitié du XII^{e} siècle," *EThL*, 14 (1958), 277–328; H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsweise der sogenannten Sententiae Anselmi," *Scholastik*, 34 (1959), 190–233; *idem*, "Paschasius Radbertus als Vermittler des Gedankenguts der karolingischen Renaissance in den Matthäuskommentaren des Kreises um Anselm von Laon," *Scholastik*, 35 (1960), 363–402. Bibliography and treatment of this school and its works in S. Otto in *BGPhMA*, 40, 1, 24–69 *(supra)*.

School of Saint-Victor: L. Ott, *Untersuchungen zur theologischen Briefliteratur der Frühscholastik, BGPhMA*, 34 (Münster i. W. 1937); J. Châtillon, "De Guillaume de Champeaux à Thomas Gallus. Chronique d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de l'école de Saint-Victor," *RMA*, 8 (1952), 139–62; R. Baron, "L'influence de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *RThAM*, 22 (1955), 56–71; *idem, Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris 1957); *idem, Études sur Hugues de Saint-Victor* (biographiques, critique chronologique, stylistique, doctrinale [Le Commentaire de la 'Hierarchie Celeste'], textes inédites) (Paris 1963); D. Van den Eynde, *Essai sur la succession et la date des écrits de Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Rome 1960); H. R. Schlette, *Die Nichtigkeit der Welt. Der philosophische Horizont des Hugo von St. Viktor* (Munich 1961); H. Weisweiler, "Die Arbeitsweise Hugos von St. Viktor," *Scholastik*, 24 (1949), 59–87, 232–67; *idem*, "Sakrament als Symbol und Teilhabe—Der Einfluss des Ps-Dionysius auf die allgemeine Sakramentenlehre Hugos von St. Viktor," *Scholastik*, 27 (1952), 321–43.

Richard of Saint-Victor: C. Ottaviano, *Riccardo di S. Vittore. La vita, le opere, il pensiero* (Rome 1933); G. Dumeige, *Richard de Saint-Victor et l'idée chrétienne de l'amour* (Paris 1952); C. Kirchberger, *Richard of St. Victor* (London 1957). Godfrey of Saint-Victor must be listed as witness for the Victorines' connection with the school of Chartres: P. Delhaye, *Godefroy de Saint-Victor, Microcosmus, Mémoires et travaux publiés par les professeurs des Facultés catholiques de Lille,* fasc. 56 (Lille 1951).

Peter Abelard: works: *Œuvres inédites d'Abélard,* ed. V. Cousin (Paris 1836); *Petri Abaelardi Opera,* ed. V. Cousin, 2 vols. (Paris 1849–59); *PL,* 178; *De unitate et trinitate divina,* ed. R. Stölzle (Freiburg 1891); *Theologia "Summi Boni,"* ed. H. Ostlender, *BGPhMA,* 35, 2–3 (Münster i. W. 1939); *Dialectica,* ed. L. M. de Rijk (Assen 1956); *Historia calamitatum,* ed. J. Monfrin (Paris 1959); *Abaelards philosophische Schriften,* ed. B. Geyer, *BGPhMA,* 21, 1–4 (Münster i. W. 1919–33); *Scito te ipsum,* Italian translation by M. Dal Pra (Vincenza 1941); *Œuvres choisis d'Abélard,* M. de Gandillac (Paris 1945); *Hymnarius,* ed. G. Dreves, *AH,* 48 (1905), 141–232; *Astrolabius, Gedicht Abälards an seinen Sohn,* ed. H. Brinkmann, *Münchener Museum für Philologie,* 5 (1928–33), 168–201; *Epistola consolatoria,* ed. J. T. Muckle *(Abelard's Letter of Consolation to a Friend), MS,* 12 (1950), 163–213; *Heloissae epistola,* ed. J. T. Muckle, "The Personal Letters between Abelard and Heloise," *MS,* 15 (1953), 47–94; *Epistolario completo di Pietro Abelardo,* ed. C. Ottaviano (Rome 1934); *Petri Abaelardi Dialogus inter Philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum,* ed. F. H. Rheinwald (Berlin 1831); *Petri Abaelardi Sic et Non,* ed. E. L. T. Henke and G. S. Lindenkohl (Marburg 1851); P. Ruf and M. Grabmann, *Ein neu aufgefundenes Bruchstück der Apologie Abaelards, SAM* (1930), no. 5; *Abaelards Leidensgeschichte und Briefwechsel mit Heloisa,* German translation by E. Brost (Heidelberg, 2d ed. 1954); "Epistola Petri Abailardi contra Bernhardum Abbatem," ed. J. Leclercq, *Études sur saint Bernard et le texte de ses écrits, AnOCist,* IX, 1–2 (Rome 1953); 104 f.; T. P. McLaughlin, "Abelard's Rule for Religious Women," *MS,* 18 (1956), 241–92.

Literature: H. Reuter, *Die Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter* (Berlin 1875); S. M. Deutsch, *Peter Abälard. Ein kritischer Theologe des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig 1883); E. Portalié in *DThC,* I (1903), 36–55; E. Vacandard in *DHGE,* I (1912) 71–91; *Fliche-Martin,* XIII, 93–105; R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought and Learning* (London, 2d ed. 1920), 116–45; É. Gilson, *Héloïse und Abaelard, zugleich ein Beitrag zum Problem von Mittelalter und Humanismus* (Freiburg, 3d ed. 1955). The best biography is that by J. G. Sikes, *Peter Abailard* (Cambridge, 2d ed. 1946). M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* II, 168–229; *Manitius,* III, 105–12; J. de Ghellinck, *L'essor* (see bibliog. for Chapter 6), I, 41–50; *idem, Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (Bruges, 2d ed. 1948), 149–75; A. M. Landgraf, *Einführung (supra),* 62–72.

Monographs: H. Denifle, "Die Sentenzen Abaelards und die Bearbeitungen seiner 'Theologia' vor der Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts," *ALKGMA,* I (1885), 402–624; B. Geyer, "Die Stellung Abaelards in der Universalienfrage nach neuen handschriftlichen Texten," *Festgabe Bäumker, BGPhMA,* Suppl. I (1913), 101–27; W. Betzendörfer, "Glauben und Wissen bei Peter Abälard," *ZSTh,* 3 (1925), 334–52; J. Rivière, "Le dogme de la Rédemption chez Abélard," *RevSR,* 12 (1932), 355–88; J. Cottiaux, "La conception de la théologie chez Abélard," *RHE,* 28 (1932), 247–95, 533–51, 788–828; H. Weisweiler, "Eine neue Bearbeitung von Abaelards 'Introductio' und der Summa Sententiarum," *Scholastik,* 9 (1934), 346–71; B. Schmeidler, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen Abälard und Heloïse als eine literarische Fiktion Abälards," *ZKG,* 54 (1935), 323–38 (this view is no longer defended, following É. Gilson's attack on it); A. Borst, "Abälard und Bernhard," *HZ,* 186 (1958), 497–526; R. Oursel, *La dispute et la grâce. Essai sur la Rédemption d'Abélard, Publications de l'Université de Dijon,* 19 (Paris 1959); R. Klibanski, "Peter Abailard and Bernard de Clairvaux," *MRS,* 5 (1961), 1–27 (without reference to A. Borst); J. Jolivet, "Abélard et la philosophie," *RHR*, 164 (1963), 181–89; *idem*, "Sur quelques critiques de la théologie d'Abélard," *AHD*, 30 (1963), 7–51; M. Buytaert, "Thomas of Morigny and the 'Theologia Scholarium' of Abelard," *Antonianum*, 40 (1965), 71–95; R. Thomas, *Der philosophisch-theologische Erkenntnisweg Peter Abaelards im Dialogus inter Philosophum, Judaeum et Christianum, Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte*, new series, 6 (Bonn 1966).

Abelard's School: A. M. Landgraf, *Écrits théologiques de l'école d'Abélard*. Textes inédits (Louvain 1934); *idem, Commentarius Cantabrigiensis in Epistolas Pauli e schola Abaelardi*, 2 vols. (Notre Dame 1937–48); H. Ostlender, "Die Sentenzenbücher der Schule Abaelards," *ThQ*, 117 (1936), 208–52; A. M. Landgraf, "Beiträge zur Erkenntnis der Schule Abälards," *ZKTh*, 54 (1930), 367–405; H. Ostlender, "Die 'Theologia scholarium' des Peter Abälard," *BGPhMA*, Suppl. III, 1 (Münster i. W. 1935), 263–81; A. M. Gietl, *Die Sentenzen Rolands, nachmals Papstes Alexander III.* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1891); L. Ostlender, *Sententiae Florianenses, FlorPatr*, 19 (Bonn 1929); *idem, Peter Abaelards Theologia und die Sentenzenbücher seiner Schule* (Breslau 1926).

Peter Lombard: works: *Petri Lombardi Libri IV Sententiarum*, ed. studio et cura PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2 vols. (Quaracchi 1916); *PL*, 192, 521–962; *Commentarius in Psalmos, PL*, 191, 55–1296; *Collectanea in Epistolas Pauli, PL*, 191, 1297–1696; *PL*, 192, 9–520; 29 *sermones* (scattered among the *sermones* of Hildebert of Lavardin) in PL, 171, 339–963; fragments of exegetical works in B. Smalley and G. Lacombe, "The Lombard's Commentary on Isaias and Other Fragments," *The New Scholasticism*, 5 (1931), 123–62; F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium commentariorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi*, 2 vols. (Würzburg 1947), and supplement by V. Doucet (Quaraccchi 1954); F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, thus far 7 vols. (Madrid 1953–61).

Literature: J. de Ghellinck in *DThC*, 12 (1935), 1941–2019 (bibliography); *idem, L'essor* (see bibliog. for Chapter 6), I, 70–76; *idem, Le mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (Bruges, 2d ed. 1948), 213–77; *idem*, "La carrière de Pierre Lombard," *RHE*, 27 (1931), 792–830, 30 (1934), 95–100; I. Brady, "Peter Lombard, Canon of Notre-Dame," *RThAM*, 32 (1965), 277–95; A. M. Landgraf, *Einführung*, 93–109; F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum* (see *supra*), IV, nos. 6624–69; *Miscellanea Lombardiana* (Novara 1957) (acts of the centenary congress with contributions by L. Ott, "Pietro Lombardo: Personalità e opera"; D. Van den Eynde, "Essai chronologique sur l'œuvre de Pierre Lombard"; F. Pelster, "Petrus Lombardus und die Verhandlungen über die Streitfrage des Gilbertus Porreta in Paris [1147] und Reims [1148]"; N. M. Häring, "Petrus Lombardus und die Sprachlogik in der Trinitätslehre der Porretanerschule"; G. Le Bras, "Pierre Lombard, prince du droit canon"; A. Gambaro, "Pier Lombardo e la civiltà del suo secolo"; *et al.*); from 1957 there also appears in Novara a periodical: *Pier Lombardo*. For Peter Lombard's method see J. Schupp, *Die Gnadenlehre des Petrus Lombardus* (Freiburg 1932), 289–98; E. M. Buytaert, "St. John Damascene, Peter Lombard and Gerhoh of Reichersberg," *FStudies*, 10 (1950), 323–43; L. Ott, "Walter von Mortagne und Petrus Lombardus in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander," *Mélanges J. de Ghellinck*, II (Gembloux 1951), 646–97; H. Weisweiler, "La 'Summa Sententiarum' source de Pierre Lombard," *RThAM*, 6 (1934), 143–83; L. Ott, "Die Trinitätslehre der 'Summa Sententiarum' als Quelle des Petrus Lombardus," *DTh*, 21 (1943), 159–86; P. Delhaye, *Pierre Lombard* (Montreal and Paris 1961). For Peter Lombard's piety see F. Vandenbroucke, *Histoire de la spiritualité du moyen âge* (Paris 1961), 280–83. For the more than 500 commentators see F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium* (see *supra*); A. M. Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik* (Regensburg 1952–56), *passim; Fliche-Martin*, XIII, 157–60.

Gratian's Decretum: until the projected new edition appears the standard work is still that of E. Friedberg (Leipzig 1879, reprinted 1955); the centenary congress at Bologna in 1952 resulted in the *Studia Gratiana* (from 1953), thus far 7 vols., ed. G. Forchielli and A. M. Stickler; *Fliche-Martin*, XII, 1 (1959): G. Le Bras, *Institutions ecclésiastiques de la chré-*

tienté médiévale, 45–55; G. Fransen, "La date du Décret de Gratien," *RHE,* 51 (1956), 521–31; P. Pinedo, "Intorno al titulo del Decreto de Graziano," *Anuario de Historia del Derecho español,* 25 (1955), 845–68; preparations for a critical edition: *Tr,* 11 (1955), 12 (1956), etc., as annual report. J. F. McCarthy, "The Genius of Concord in Gratian's Decree," *EIC,* 19 (1963), 105–51, 259–95; C. Munier, "Droit canonique et Droit romain d'après Gratien et les Décrétistes," *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel Le Bras* (Paris 1965), 943–54.

Biography of Gratian by S. Kuttner, *StG,* I (Bologna 1953), 15–29. For the content, structure, and importance of the *Decretum* see A. M. Stickler, *Historia Iuris Canonici Latini,* I: *Historia Fontium* (Turin 1950), 200–16; S. Kuttner, "Zur Frage der theologischen Vorlagen Gratians," *ZSavRGkan,* 23 (1934), 243–68; *Feine RG,* I, 276–82; G. Le Bras, *Histoire du Droit et des Institutions de l'Église en Occident, 7: L'âge classique (1140–1378),* by G. Le Bras, C. Lefèbvre, and J. Rambaud (Paris 1965), 52–99.

SECTION TWO

The Threats to the Freedom of the Church: 1153-1198

8. *The Popes, the Emperor Frederick I, and the Third Lateran Council*

Sources

Mansi XXI, 786–1222, XXII, 1–686; *Hefele-Leclercq,* V, 849–1178; *Duchesne LP,* II, 351–446 (Boso, *Gesta pontificum Romanorum),* III, 139; *Watterich,* II, 321–748; *Jaffé,* II, nos. 9736–17679; *Bullarium Taur.,* II, 596–836, III, 7-112. Letters and documents of the Popes of this period: Anastasius IV and Hadrian IV, *PL,* 188; Alexander III, *PL,* 200; Lucius III, *PL,* 201; Urban III and Gregory VIII, *PL,* 202; Clement III, *PL,* 204; Celestine III, *PL,* 206. *Acta* and documents of kings and emperors: *MGConst,* I; J. F. Böhmer, *Regesten des Kaiserreiches* (Frankfurt am Main 1831); K. F. Stumpf-Brentano, "*Die Reichskanzler,*" 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1868–72, reprinted 1960); J. F. Böhmer and J. Ficker, *Acta imperii selecta* (Innsbruck 1870); E. Winkelmann, *Acta imperii inedita,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1880–85); K. Jordan, *Die Urkunden Heinrichs des Löwen* (Stuttgart 1949, reprinted 1960); *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Babenberger in Österreich,* ed. H. Fichtenau and E. Zöllner, I: *Die Siegelurkunden der Babenberger bis 1215* (Vienna 1950); *Dahlmann-Waitz,* 76–90; L. Delisle and E. Berger, *Recueil des actes de Henri II,* 3 vols. (Paris 1909–27); L. Landon, *The Itinerary of King Richard I* (London 1935), Pipe Roll Society, new series, 13; H. F. Delaborde, E. Berger, C. Petit-Dutaillis, J. Monicat, and C. Bunel, *Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste, roi de France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1916–43).

Chronicles, Annals, and Letters: Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *Gesta Frederici I Imperatoris,* ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover, 3d ed. 1912); *Otto Morena et continuatorum Historia Frederici I,* ed. F. Güterbock, *MGSS rer. Germ.,* new series, 7 (Berlin 1930); Helmold of Bosau, *Slawenchronik,* ed. B. Schmeidler, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (2d ed. 1937); *Chronica regia Coloniensis,* ed. G. Waitz, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (1880); Hugh of Poitiers, *Liber de libertate monasterii Vizeliacensis, MGSS,* 26, 143–50; John of Salisbury, *Letters* (see bibliog. for Chapter 4), I (1153–61); *Gilbert Foliot, The Letters and Charters,* ed. A. Morey and C. L. N. Brooke (Cambridge 1966), *cf.* A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and his Letters* (Cambridge 1965); the "Ligurinus" (Frederick's acts to 1160), ed. C. G. Dumgé (1812), new edition in preparation, *PL,* 212, 327–476; E. Assmann, "Bleibt der Ligurinus anonym?" *DA,* 12 (1956), 453–72 (Gunther of Pairis in Upper

Alsace is now regarded as the author); Godfrey of Viterbo, *Gesta Frederici* (to 1181), ed. G. Waitz, *MGSS rer. Germ.*, 30 (Hanover 1870); *Lauterberg Chronicle (Chronicon Montis Sereni)*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, *MGSS*, 23, 138–226; for other chronicles and annals of the period see K. Jacob and H. Hohenleutner, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter*, II (1961), 100–19; also important are the *Annals of Genoa* by Caffaro (to 1163), by Obertus (to 1173), by Ottobonus (to 1196), *MGSS*, 18, 11–356 (Leipzig 1863), and the edition of L. T. Belgrano *et al.*, *FontiStIt*, 11–14, 5 vols. (Rome 1890–1929); Bernardo Marago, *Chronicle of Pisa* (to 1181), continued to 1192, *MGSS*, 19, 236–66, ed. M. Lupo Gentile (Muratori, 2d ed., VI/2) (Bologna 1930–36); Romuald of Salerno, *Chronicle* (to 1178), ed. C. A. Garufi (Muratori, 2d ed., VII/1) (Bologna 1935); Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronicle*, ed. J. M. Lappenberg, *MGSS rer. Germ.*, 14 (reprinted 1930, new edition in preparation).

LITERATURE

Gen. Bibliog., II; *Historia Mundi*, VI; F. L. Ganshof, *Le moyen-âge*, I (Paris 1953); *Giesebrecht*, IV (2d ed. 1877), V (1880), VI, ed. B. von Simson (Leipzig 1895); A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1964); *Lavisse*, III/1, ed. A. Luchaire (Paris 1902); N. Valeri, *Storia d'Italia*, I: *Il medioevo* (Turin 1959); R. Soldevilla, *Historia de España*, 2 vols. (Barcelona 1952 f.); P. Peres, *Historia de Portugal*, 2 vols. (Barcelos 1928 f.). *Fliche-Martin*, IX/2; for handbooks see Gen. Bibliog., II, 3; *Hauck*, IV (Leipzig, 5th ed. 1925), 196–685; for the more recent histories of the Church in various lands see Gen. Bibliog., II, 4; C. W. Lawrence, *The English Church and the Papacy* (London 1965, cooperative work); *Histoire du catholicisme en France*, by A. Latreille, E. Delaruelle, and J. R. Palanque, 2 vols. (Paris 1957–60); *Haller*, III (Darmstadt, 2d ed. 1962), 116–295; *Seppelt*, III, 213–318 (bibliography); B. Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State (1050–1300), with selected documents* (Englewood, N. J. 1964); J. G. Rowe, "The Papacy and the Ecclesiastical Province of Tyre (1100–1187)," *BJRL*, 43 (1960), 160–89; M. Schwarz, "Heiligsprechungen im 12. Jahrhundert und die Beweggründe ihrer Urheber," *AKG*, 39 (1957), 43–62.

Hadrian IV: Epistolae et privilegia, *PL*, 188, 1349–1644; *Duchesne LP*, II, 388–97 (Boso); *Jaffé*, II (2d ed.), 102–45, 720 f., 760 f.; H. Schrörs, *Untersuchungen zu dem Streite Friedrichs I. mit Hadrian IV.* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1916); E. M. Almedinger, *Hadrian IV* (London 1925); A. O. Johnsen, *Studier vedrørende Kardinal Nicolaus Breakspears Legasjon til Norden* (Oslo 1945); O. Kolsrud, *Kardinal-legaten Nicolaus av Albano i Norge (1152)*, *Hist. Tidskrift Oslo*, 33 (1945), 485–512; W. Ullmann, "Cardinal Roland and the Incident at Besançon," *Misc. Hist. Pont.*, 18 (Rome 1954); *idem*, "The Pontificate of Hadrian IV," *CambrHJ*, 11 (1955), 233–52; P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer*, I (Rome 1955); M. Maccarone, "La coronazione imperiale di 1155," *Studi Romani*, 6 (1958), 16–38; P. Lamma, "Adriano IV," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, I (1960), 330–35; M. Maccarone, *Papato e Impero dalla elezione di Federico I alla morte di Adriano IV (1152–59)* (Rome 1959); M. P. Sheehy, "The Bull Laudabiliter: a Problem in Medieval Diplomacy and History," *Galway Archaeological and Historical Society Journal*, 29 (1961), 45–70; *idem*, *Pontificia Hibernica*, I (Dublin 1962), no. 4, pp. 15 f.; G. Inger, *Das kirchliche Visitationsinstitut im mittelalterlichen Schweden* (Lund 1961; bibliography).

Alexander III: Epistolae et privilegia, *PL*, 200; *Duchesne LP*, II, 397–446; *Jaffé*, II (2d ed.), 145–431; *Watterich*, II, 377–649; *Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 916–1114; *Die Summa Magistri Rolandi nachmals Papstes Alexander III.*, ed. F. Thaner (Innsbruck 1874, reprinted Aalen 1962); G. Möser-Mersky, "Das österreichische 'Chronicon rhythmicum,'" *MIÖG*, 73 (1965), 17–38; W. Holtzmann and E. W. Kemp, *Papal Decretals in the Diocese of Lincoln in the Twelfth Century* (Lincoln 1954) (363 out of 713 decretals of Alexander were directed to

England); M. Pacaut, *Alexandre III. Étude sur la conception du pouvoir pontifical dans sa pensée et dans son œuvre* (Paris 1956), in regard to which see F. Kempf in *RHE*, 52 (1957), 932–37; *idem*, "Louis VII et Alessandre III," *RHÉF*, 39 (1953), 5–45; there is no modern biography of Alexander III but mention must be made of the outdated work by H. Reuter, *Geschichte Alexanders III. und der Kirche seiner Zeit*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1860); W. Ullmann in *Misc. Hist. Pont.*, 18 (1954), 107.

B. W. Scholtz, "The Canonisation of Edward the Confessor (1161)," *Speculum*, 36 (1961), 38–60; J. Schlafke, "Das Recht der Bischöfe in causis Sanctorum bis zum Jahre 1234," *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter, Festschrift Kardinal Frings* (Cologne 1960), 417–33; G. Miletti, "Il monumento di Alessandro III nella Basilica Lateranense," *Saggi d'istoria dell'architettura in onore [di] V. Fasolo* (Rome 1961), 269–72; N. M. Häring, "The Eulogium ad Alexandrum Papam tertium of John of Cornwall," *MS*, 13 (1951), 253–300.

J. M. Brixius, *Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130–1181* (Berlin 1912); J. Bachmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Skandinavien 1125–1159* (Marburg 1913); H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas* (Bonn 1926); W. Ohnsorge, *Die Legaten Alexanders III. im ersten Jahrzehnt seines Pontifikats (1159–1169)* (Berlin 1928); G. Dunken, *Die politische Wirksamkeit der päpstlichen Legaten in der Zeit des Kampfes zwischen Kaisertum und Papsttum in Oberitalien unter Friedrich I.* (Berlin 1931); I. Friedländer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Italien am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts (1181–98)* (Berlin 1928); W. Ohnsorge, *Päpstliche und gegenpäpstliche Legaten in Deutschland und Skandinavien 1159 bis 1181* (Berlin 1929); M. Pacaut, "Les légats d'Alexandre III (1159–81)," *RHE*, 50 (1955), 821–38; K. Ruess, *Die rechtliche Stellung der päpstlichen Legaten bis Bonifaz VIII.* (Paderborn 1912); K. Walf, *Die Entwicklung des päpstlichen Gesandtschaftswesens in dem Zeitabschnitt zwischen Dekretalenrecht und Wiener Kongress (1159–1815)*, *MthSt*, Kan. Abt., 24 (Munich 1966); W. Janssen, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Schisma Anaklets II. bis zum Tode Cölestins III.*, *Kölner Historische Abhandlungen*, 6 (Cologne and Graz 1961).

The Schism of 1159: Sources: S. Tengnagel, *Vetera Monumenta contra Schismaticos* (Ingolstadt 1612); John of Salisbury, letter to *Magister* Ralph of Sarre (June–July 1160), *The Letters of John of Salisbury* (see bibliography for Chapter 4), I, 204–15; Anonymous, *Tractatus de Schismaticis*, ed. J. Dieterich and H. Böhmer, *MGLiblit*, III, 109–30; Gerhoh of Reichersberg, *De investigatione Antichristi* (1160–62), *PL*, 194, 1445–80, ed. H. Böhmer, *MGLiblit*, III, 309–95; Rahewin, *Dialogus de Pontificatu sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae inter Victorem IV et Alexandrum III*, ed. H. Böhmer, *MGLiblit*, III, 526–46; Abbot John of Santa Maria in Trastevere, *De vera pace contra schisma sedis apostolicae*, ed. A. Wilmart, *Lateranum*, new series (Rome 1938). Literature: in addition to the older works, such as M. Meyer, *Die Wahl Alexanders III. und Viktors IV., ein Beitrag zur Kirchenspaltung unter Kaiser Friedrich I.* (Göttingen 1871), and W. Ribbeck, "Der Traktat über die Papstwahl des Jahres 1159," *FDG*, 25 (1885), 354–64, see also I. Schnack, *Richard von Cluny, seine Chronik und sein Kloster in den Anfängen der Kirchenspaltung von 1159. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Anschauungen vom Kardinalkolleg und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1921); P. Kehr, "Zur Geschichte Viktors IV.," *NA*, 46 (1926), 53–85; W. Holtzmann, "Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Friedrich Barbarossas," *NA*, 48 (1930), 284–413; J. Engel, *Das Schisma Barbarossas im Bistum und Hochstift Freising (1159–1177)* (dissertation, Freiburg im Breisgau 1930); M. Preiss, *Die politische Tätigkeit der Cisterzienser im Schisma von 1159–1177* (Berlin 1934); R. Jordan, *Die Stellung des deutschen Episkopats im Kampf um die Universalmacht unter Friedrich I. bis zum Frieden von Venedig (1177)* (Würzburg 1939); L. J. Barmann, "The Papal Election of 1159," *AER* (1963), 37–43.

Lateran II: *COD*, 181–201; *Hefele-Leclercq*, V, 1086–1112; Roger of Howden, *Chronicle*, ed. W. Stubbs (London 1869), *Rolls Series*, 51/2, II, 173–89; *Gesta regis* (once attributed to

Benedict of Peterborough, now regarded as probably a redaction of the *Chronicle* of Roger of Howden), ed. W. Stubbs (London 1867), *Rolls Series,* 49/1, I, 222–38; letters of convocation: *Jaffé,* 13097–99, 13070; S. Löwenfeld, *Epistolae pontificum Romanorum ineditae* (Leipzig 1855), 154 f., no. 271; *PL,* 200, 1357 f.; signatures in *Mansi,* 22, 213–17, 239 f.; *cf.* G. Tangl, *Die Teilnehmer an den allgemeinen Konzilien des Mittelalters* (Weimar 1922), 196–201, 210–19; G. Morin, "Le discours d'ouverture du concile général de Latran (1179) et l'œuvre littéraire de maître Rufin, évêque d'Assise," *AttiPontAc,* Ser. III, Memoire, 2 (Rome 1928), 116–20. The canons can be best consulted in *COD,* 187–201; see the introductory comments on them and their sources in the decretal collections; S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik (1140–1234), SteT,* 71 (Rome 1937); the holding of the Council was based on an *Ordo Romanus,* ed. M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical romain au moyen âge,* I, *SteT,* 86 (Rome 1938), 255–60; the best account is now that by R. Foreville, *Latran I, II, III, et Latran IV, Histoire des conciles œcuméniques,* 6 (Paris 1965), 116–62, 194–223 (Text).

The Emperor Frederick I: H. Haimpel in *NDB,* 5 (1961), 459–78; *Dahlmann-Waitz,* 6330–33, 6557–6619; P. Kehr, "Der Vertrag von Anagni im Jahre 1176," *NA,* 13 (1888), 75–118; H. Simonsfeld, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Friedrich I.,* 1 *(1152–1158)* (Leipzig 1908); K. Hampe and F. Baethgen, *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer* (Heidelberg 1949); K. Hampe, *Herrschergestalten des deutschen Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 6th ed. 1955); W. Kamlah, "Der Ludus de Antichristo," *HV,* 28 (1933), 53–87; E. Rundnagel, "Die Ehescheidung Friedrich Barbarossas," *Festschrift R. Holtzmann* (Berlin 1933), 145–59; H. H. Jacobs, "Friedrich Barbarossa und Heinrich der Löwe," *Die Grossen Deutschen,* I (1935), 94–123; W. Föhl, "Bischof Eberhard von Bamberg, ein Staatsmann Friedrichs I.," *MIÖG,* 50 (1936), 73–131; F. Böhm, *Das Bild Friedrich Barbarossas in den ausländischen Quellen seiner Zeit* (Berlin 1937); T. Mayer, K. Heilig, and C. Erdmann, *Kaisertum und Herzogsgewalt im Zeitalter Friedrichs I., Schriften des Reichsinstituts für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde,* 9 (Stuttgart 1944, reprinted 1952); F. B. Koeppler, "Frederick Barbarossa and the School of Bologna," *EHR,* 54 (1939); E. F. Otto, *Friedrich Barbarossa* (Potsdam 1940); *idem,* "Friedrich Barbarossa in seinen Briefen," *DA,* 5 (1941 f.), 72–111; P. Rassow, *Honor imperii* (Munich 1940, reprinted Darmstadt 1961); *idem, Der Prinzgemahl, ein Pactum matrimoniale aus dem Jahre 1188* (Weimar 1950); P. Brezzi, *Caratteri, momenti e protagonisti dell'azione politica di Federico Barbarossa, RSIt,* 5 (Naples 1940); W. Ohnsorge, "Das Mitkaisertum in der abendländischen Geschichte des frühen Mittelalters," *ZSavRGgerm,* 67 (1950), reprint in *Abendland und Byzanz* (Homburg v. d. Höhe 1958), 261–87; K. Langosch, *Politische Dichtung um Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa* (Berlin 1943); K. Bosl, *Die Reichsministerialität der Salier und Staufer,* 2 vols., Schriften der *MG,* 10, 1–2 (Stuttgart 1950 f.); F. Heer, *Die Tragödie des Heiligen Reichs* (Stuttgart 1952), commentary (*ibid.,* 1953); E. Maschke, *Der Kampf zwischen Kaisertum und Papsttum, Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* ed. Leo Just, I (1957), 4. Abschnitt; W. Heinemeyer, "Der Friede von Montebello (1175)," *DA,* 11 (1954), 101–39; P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer,* 2 vols. (Rome 1955–57); G. de Vergottini, *Lo Studio di Bologna, l'Impero, il Papato, Studi e Memorie Stor. Univ. di Bologna,* new series, 1 (1956); H. Büttner, "Erzbischof Heinrich von Mainz und die Staufer (1142–53)," *ZKG,* 69 (1958), 247–67; K. Jordan, *Friedrich Barbarossa, Kaiser des christlichen Abendlandes, Persönlichkeit und Geschichte,* 13 (Göttingen 1959); H. Appelt, "Der Vorbehalt kaiserlicher Rechte in den Diplomen Friedrich Barbarossas," *MIÖG,* 68 (1960), 81–97; P. Klopsch, *Zum Kaiserhymnus des Archipoeta, Euphorion,* 54 (1960); W. Heinemeyer, "Die Verhandlungen an der Saône im Jahre 1162," *DA,* 20 (1964), 155–89; J. Y. Mariotte, *Le comté de Bourgogne sous les Hohenstaufen (1156–1208), Annales littéraires de l'université de Besançon,* 56 (Paris 1963); H. J. Kirfel, *Weltherrschaftsidee und Bündnispolitik. Untersuchungen zur auswärtigen Politik der Staufer, Bonner Historische Forschungen,* 12 (Bonn 1959); J. Déer, "Die

Siegel Kaiser Friedrichs I. Barbarossa und Heinrichs VI. in der Kunst und Politik ihrer Zeit," *Festschrift H. R. Hahnloser,* ed. E. J. Beer, P. Hofer, and L. Mojon (Basel and Stuttgart 1961), 47–102; H. Appelt, "Friedrich Barbarossa und das römische Recht," *RömHM,* 5 (1961 f.), 18–34; P. Munz, "Frederick Barbarossa and the 'Holy Empire'," *JRelH,* 3 (1964 f.), 20–37; W. Ohnsorge, "Zu den aussenpolitischen Anfängen Friedrich Barbarossas," *Abendland und Byzanz* (Bad Homburg v. d. Höhe 1963), 411–33; *idem,* "Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Manuels I. von Byzanz," *Abendland und Byzanz (ibid.* 1963), 387–410; F. Kempf, "Der 'favor apostolicus' bei der Wahl Friedrich Barbarossas und im deutschen Thronstreit (1189–1208)," *Festschrift Spörl, Speculum historiale. Geschichte im Spiegel von Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsdeutung,* ed. C. Bauer (Freiburg im Breisgau and Munich 1965), 469–78; J. Ficker, *Rainald von Dassel, Reichskanzler und Erzbischof von Köln* (Cologne 1855, reprinted Aalen 1966); R. M. Herkenrath, *Rainald von Dassel, Reichskanzler und Erzbischof von Köln* (typed dissertation, Graz 1962).

9. *Thomas Becket and Henry II of England*

SOURCES

Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, canonized by Pope Alexander III, A.D. 1173, ed. J. Craigie Robertson (Vols. 1–6) and J. C. Robertson and J. Brigstocke Sheppard (Vol. 7), *Rolls Series,* 67 (London 1875–85); they contain the biographies by William of Canterbury (Vol. 1), Benedict of Peterborough, John of Salisbury, Alan of Tewkesbury, Edward Grim (Vol. 2), William Fitzstephen and Herbert of Bosham (Vol. 3), anonymous authors and the *Quadrilogus* (Vol. 4), letters from and to Becket (Vols. 5–7); this work supersedes the two-volume edition by J. A. Giles (Oxford and London 1845), which was reprinted in extracts in *PL,* 190, 1–745. E. Magnússon edited the Icelandic *vita, Thómas saga erkibyskups. A life of Archbishop Thomas Becket in Icelandic, with English translation, notes and glossary,* 2 vols., *Rolls Series,* 65 (London 1875–83). A French *vita* in verse was edited by E. Walberg, *La vie de S. Thomas le Martyr par Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence* (Lund 1922). *Cf.* E. Walberg, *La tradition hagiographique de Saint Thomas Becket avant la fin du XII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1929). A *vita,* no longer extant, by Robert of Cricklade, was reconstructed by M. Orme, "A Reconstruction of Robert of Cricklade's *Vita et Miracula S. Thomae Cantuariensis,*" *AnBoll,* 84 (1966), 379–98; *BHL,* 8170–8248; P. G. Foote, "On the Fragmentary Text Concerning Thomas Becket in Stock. per. fol. nr. 2," *Saga-Book,* 4 (1961), 407–50; an Anglo-Norman poem on Thomas Becket by the monk Benedict of St. Alban's, ed. B. Schlyter, *La vie de Thomas Becket par Benoît, Études romanes de Lund,* 4 (Lund 1941). Also important are the collections of the letters of contemporaries: Gilbert Foliot *(The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot,* ed. A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke [Cambridge 1966], *PL,* 190, 739–1068, ed. J. A. Giles [Oxford 1845]); Arnulf of Lisieux *(The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux,* ed. F. Barlow, Camden Society, Third Series, 61 [London 1939], *PL,* 201, 17–152); John of Salisbury *(The Letters of John of Salisbury,* ed. W. J. Millor, H. E. Butler, and C. N. L. Brooke, 1, *Nelson's Medieval Texts* [London 1956]; this edition extends only to 1161; the rest are in the edition by J. A. Giles, 2 vols. [Oxford 1845–48], *PL,* 199, 1–378). *Annales monastici,* 5 vols., ed. H. R. Luard, *Rolls Series,* 36 (London 1864–69); *Historia et Cartularium monasterii sancti Petri Gloucestriae,* 3 vols., ed. W. H. Hart, *Rolls Series,* 33 (London 1863–67); the historical writings of Ralph of Diceto were edited by W. Stubbs, 2 vols., *Rolls Series,* 68 (London 1876); the works of Gervase of Canterbury were also edited by W. Stubbs, 2 vols., *Rolls Series,* 73 (London 1879 f.); Walter Map, *De nugis curialium,* ed. T. Wright, Camden Society, Old Series, 50 (London 1850), English translation by M. R. James, with commentary by J. E.

Lloyd, ed. E. Sidney Hartland, *Cymmrodorion Record Series,* 9 (1923); Roger of Howden, *Gesta Henrici Secundi* and *Gesta Ricardi,* ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., *Rolls Series,* 49 (London 1867); Stubbs attributed the preceding *Gesta* to Benedict of Peterborough, but D. M. Stenton in *EHR,* 68 (1953), 574–82, proved that their author was Roger of Howden; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera,* 8 vols., ed. J. S. Brewer and J. F. Dimock, *Rolls Series,* 21 (London 1861–91); William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum anglicarum: Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I,* ed. R. Howlett, *Rolls Series,* 82, I (London 1884). On the sources see the detailed presentation in R. Foreville, *L'Église et la Royauté en Angleterre sous Henri II Plantagenet (1154–1189)* (Paris 1943), XI–XXXV.

Literature

L. B. Radford, *Thomas of London* (Cambridge 1894), important for Becket's youth; T. F. Tout, "The Place of St. Thomas of Canterbury in History," *BJRL,* 6 (1921), 244–58; D. M. Stenton, "England: Henry II," *The Cambridge Medieval History,* V (Cambridge 1926), 554–91, 895–900; Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Cambridge 1931); C. R. Cheney, *From Becket to Langton* (Manchester 1956); J. Boussard, *Le gouvernement d'Henri Plantagenet* (Paris 1956); J. Haller, "Die Tragödie des Thomas Becket," *Die Welt als Geschichte,* 4 (1938), 97–124; *Haller,* III, 200–24; the most detailed treatment is in the above mentioned work by R. Foreville, 77–428, with a comprehensive bibliography up to 1943, 565–84; R. Foreville in *Fliche-Martin,* IX/2, 83–126; A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1964), says that Foreville's work displays exhaustive scholarship but is "marred by bias and lack of judgement" (500), whereas David Knowles, *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket* (Cambridge 1951), 4, regards it as indispensable, despite certain limitations. D. Knowles has written the best character study in "Archbishop Thomas Becket," *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 35 (1949), 177–205, now also in *The Historian and Character and Other Essays* (Cambridge 1963), 98–129; A. Duggan, *Thomas Becket* (London 1952), is a popular account; T. Borenius, *The Iconography of St. Thomas of Canterbury* (Oxford 1929); P. A. Brown, *The Development of the Legend of Thomas Becket* (Philadelphia 1930); R. Foreville, *Le Jubilé de Saint Thomas Becket du XIII^{e} au XV^{e} siècle (1220–1470). Études et documents, Bibliothèque Générale de l'École des Hautes Études,* VI^{e} Section (Paris 1958); *cf.* L. Buisson in *ZSavRGkan,* 46 (1960), 536–39; *idem,* "Tradition et comput dans la chronologie de Thomas Becket," *Bulletin historique et philologique ... du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques 1955/56* (1957), 7–20; M. Barth, "Zum Kult des heiligen Thomas Becket im deutschen Sprachgebiet, in Skandinavien und Italien," *FreibDiözArch,* 80 (1960), 96–166; S. A. Morey, *Bartholomew of Exeter, Bishop and Canonist* (Cambridge 1937); A. Saltman, *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London 1956); A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and his Letters, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought,* new series, 11 (Cambridge 1965); C. Duggan, "The Becket Dispute and the Criminous Clerks," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 35 (1962), 1–28; F. J. West, *The Justiciarship in England (1066–1232), Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought,* new series, 12 (Cambridge 1966); H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas 1218* (Bonn 1926); R. A. L. Smith, *The Canterbury Cathedral Priory* (Cambridge 1943); C. R. Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries (1100–1250)* (Manchester 1950); M. Pacaut, "Les légats d'Alexandre III (1159–1181)," *RHE,* 50 (1955), 821–38.

10. *The Heritage of Alexander III*

SOURCES

Watterich, II, 650–748; *Liber censuum Romanae Ecclesiae* (drawn up in 1192 by Cencius Savelli, *Camerlengo* of the Curia and later Pope Honorius III), ed. P. Fabre and L. Duchesne, 3 vols. (Paris 1889–92); *Annals of Montecassino,* ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGSS,* 19 (Hanover 1866); Annals of Marbach, ed. H. Block, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover 1907); *Gesta Treverorum* (continuatio III), *MGSS,* 24, 384–90; Arnold of Lübeck, continuation of the *Chronica Slavorum,* ed. J. M. Lappenberg, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (2d ed. 1930); *Gesta Henrici* by Roger of Howden (see bibliog. for Chapter 9); Robert of Torigny, *Chronicon* (see bibliog. for Chapter 1); *Chronica regia Coloniensis* (see bibliog. for Chapter 8); Ralph of Diceto, *Chronicon* (see bibliog. of Chapter 9); *Annals of Pegau;* William of Newburgh (see the bibliog. for Chapter 9); *Chronicle of Laon* (see the bibliog. for Section Two); *Cronaca di Pisa di Raineri Sardo,* ed. *FontiStIt,* 99 (Rome 1963); *Constitutiones,* I; K. F. Stumpf-Brentano, "*Die Reichskanzler,*" 3 vols. (Innsbruck 1865–81, reprinted Aalen 1964); R. Ries, "Regesten der Kaiserin Konstanze," *QFIAB,* 18 (1926), 30–100.

LITERATURE

Fliche-Martin, IX, 2, 189–230; *Hefele-Leclercq,* V, 1114–78; *Hauck,* IV (5th ed. 1925), 307–24, 686–711; *Gebhardt-Grundmann,* I (8th ed. 1954), 322–40; F. L. Ganshof, *Le Moyen-Age* (Paris, 3d ed. 1964); *idem, Das Hochmittelalter: Propyläen Weltgeschichte,* ed. G. Mann and A. Nitschke, V (1963), 395–488, esp. 435–55; J. T. Appleby, *England without Richard (1189–1199)* (London 1965); M. Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy (1189–1204)* (Manchester, 2d ed. 1961); A. Marongiu, "A Model State in the Middle Ages: The Norman and Swabian Kingdom of Sicily," *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 6 (1963 f.), 307–20; A. Cartellieri, *Philipp II. August, König von Frankreich,* 4 vols. (Leipzig 1899–1921); *idem,* "Das deutsch-französische Bündnis von 1187 und seine Wandlungen," *HV,* 27 (1932), 111–23; M. Jallut, *Philippe Auguste, fondateur de l'unité française* (Paris 1963); G. Falco, *La Santa Romana Repubblica, Profilo storico del Medio Evo* (Naples, 4th ed. 1963), English translation: *The Holy Roman Republic: A Historical Profile of the Middle Ages* (London 1964); L. Salvatorelli, *L'Italia comunale del secolo XI alla metà del secolo XIV* (Milan 1940); E. Jordan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie au XII^{e} siècle, Glotz,* III (Paris 1939); K. Bosl, "Das Hochmittelalter in der Deutschen und Europäischen Geschichte," *HZ,* 194 (1962), 529–67 (good structural analysis, especially of the twelfth century).

Seppelt, III (1956), 213–318; *Haller,* III (3d ed. 1962), 225–95; *Giesebrecht,* VI; W. Lehnel, "Der Konstanzer Friede von 1183 und die italienische Politik Friedrichs I.," *HZ,* 128 (1923), 189–261; K. Wenk, "Die römischen Päpste zwischen Alexander III. und Innocenz III. und der Designationsversuch Weihnachten 1197," *Papsttum und Kaisertum. Festschrift P. Kehr.* (Munich 1926), 415–74; F. Güterbock, "Kaiser, Papst und Lombardenbund nach dem Frieden von Venedig," *QFIAB,* 25 (1933 f.), 158–91; H. Müller, *Die Mitglieder des Kardinalskollegiums von 1181–1216* (typed dissertation, Göttingen 1941); H. Grundmann, "Die Papstprophetien des Mittelalters," *AKG,* 19 (1928), 77–138; M. Maccarone, "Il Papa 'Vicarius Christi,'" *Miscellanea P. Paschini,* I (Rome 1948), 437–500; I. Friedländer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Deutschland und Italien (1181–1198)* (Berlin 1928); G. Säbekow, *Die päpstlichen Legationen nach Spanien und Portugal bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhunderts* (dissertation, Berlin 1931); W. Janssen, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich (1130–1198)* (Cologne and Graz 1961); V. Pfaff, "Die Einnahmen der römischen Kurie am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozialwissenschaft und Wirtschaftsgeschichte,* 40 (1953), 97–118; P. Zerbi, *Papato, Impero e "respublica Christiana" dal 1187 al 1198*

(Milan 1955); J. A. Yunck, "Economic Conservatism, Papal Finance and the Medieval Satires on Rome," *MS,* 23 (1961), 334–51; G. V. Scammel, *Hugh de Puiset, Bishop of Durham (1153–95)* (Cambridge 1956); P. L. Feser, "Bischof Berthold von Livland (1196–98)," *FreibGeschBl,* 27 (1963 f.), 101–28.

Lucius III: PL, 201, 1067–1380; *Jaffé,* II (2d ed.), 431–92, 725 f., 766–69; S. Kuttner, "Pope Lucius III and the Bigamous Archbishop of Palermo," *MS, Festschrift für A. Gwynn* (Dublin 1961), 409–53; J. Ramackers, "Eine Kassation von Papstbriefen unter Lucius III," *HJ,* 55 (1935), 547–51.

Urban III: PL, 202, 1331–1534; *Jaffé,* II (2d ed.), 492–528, 726, 769 f.; P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *Kaiser Friedrichs I. letzter Streit mit der Kurie* (Berlin 1866); H. Kauffmann, *Die italienische Politik Kaiser Friedrichs I. nach dem Frieden von Konstanz (1183–89)* (dissertation, Greifswald 1933); M. C. de Fischer-Reichenbach, *Urban III et Barberousse et les trois cardinaux Crivelli* (Bern 1940).

Gregory VIII: PL, 202, 1537–64; *Jaffé,* II (2d ed.), 528–35; C. D. Fonseca, "La professione canonicale del cardinale Alberto de Mora," *RSTI,* 16 (1962), 136 f.; P. Kehr, "Papst Gregor VIII. als Ordensgründer," *Miscellanea F. Ehrle,* II, *SteT,* 38 (Rome 1924), 248–76, supersedes the older works by G. Kleemann, *Papst Gregor VIII. (1187)* (Bonn 1912), and P. Nadig, *Gregor VIII.* (Basel 1890); W. Holtzmann, "Die Dekretalen Gregors VIII.," *MIÖG,* 58 (1950), 113–23.

Clement III: PL, 204, 1273–1506; *Jaffé,* II (2d ed.), 535–76, 727, 770; R. Foreville in *DHGE,* 12 (1953), 1096–1109; J. Geyer, *Papst Clemens III. (1187–91)* (dissertation, Bonn 1914).

Celestine III: PL, 206, 863–1280; *Jaffé,* II (2d ed.), 577–644, 727, 771 f.; R. Mols in *DHGE,* 12 (1953), 62–77 (bibliography); J. Leinenweber, *Studien zur Geschichte Cölestins III.* (dissertation, Jena 1905); O. Thielepape, *Das Verhältnis Papst Cölestins III. zu den Klöstern* (dissertation, Greifswald 1913); V. Laurent, "Rome et Byzance sous le pontificat de Célestin III," *ÉO,* 39 (1940), 26–58; V. Pfaff, "Die Kardinäle unter Papst Cölestin III. (1191–98)," *ZSavRGkan,* 41 (1955), 58–94; *idem,* "Pro posse nostro. Die Ausübung der Kirchengewalt durch Papst Cölestin III.," *ZSavRGkan,* 43 (1957), 89–131; *idem,* "Feststellungen zu den Urkunden und dem Itinerar Papst Cölestins III.," *HJ,* 78 (1959), 110–39; *idem,* "Die soziale Stellung des Judentums in den Auseinandersetzungen zwischen Kaiser und Kirche vom 3. zum 4. Laterankonzil," *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozialwissenschaft und Wirtschaftsgeschichte,* 52 (1965), 168–206; W. Holtzmann, "La 'Collectio Seguntina' et les décrétales de Clément III et de Célestin III," *RHE,* 50 (1955), 400–53; V. Pfaff, "Papst Cölestin III.," *ZSavRGkan,* 47 (1961), 109–28.

The Emperor Henry VI: JbbDG; T. Toeche, *Heinrich VI.* (Leipzig 1867), which, though old and useful only as incomplete collection of materials, was reprinted at Darmstadt in 1965; J. Haller, "Heinrich VI. und die römische Kirche," *MIÖG,* 35 (1914), 384–454, 545–669 (reprinted Darmstadt 1962); W. Wohlfahrt, *Kaiser Heinrich VI. und die oberitalienischen Städte* (Heidelberg 1939); E. Perels, *Der Erbreichsplan Heinrichs VI.* (Berlin 1927); V. Pfaff, *Kaiser Heinrichs VI. höchstes Angebot an die römische Kurie (1196), Heidelberger Abhandlungen,* 55 (Heidelberg 1927); E. Jordan, "Henri VI a-t-il offert à Clément III de lui faire hommage pour l'empire?" *Mélanges F. Lot* (Paris 1925), 285–306; M. C. E. Perrin, "Les négociations de 1196 entre l'empereur Henri VI et le pape Célestin III," *Mélanges L. Halphen* (Paris 1951), 565–72; W. Leonhardt, *Der Kreuzzugsplan Kaiser Heinrichs VI.* (dissertation, Giessen 1913); J. Heinrich, "Kaiser Heinrich VI. und die Besetzung der deutschen Bistümer," *RQ,* 51 (1956), 189–227. On Henry's coronation see P. Zerbi in *Miscellanea G. Belvederi* (Rome 1954), 517–28; D. Clementi, "Calendar of the Diplomas of the Hohenstaufen Emperor Henry VI Concerning the Kingdom of Sicily," *QFIAB,* 35 (1955), 86–225; E. Moreau, *Albert de Louvain, prince-évêque de Liège* (Brussels 1946); G. Bullinger, *König Richard Löwenherz und Kaiser Heinrich VI.* (typed dissertation, Tübingen 1947); W. Holtzmann, *Das Ende des Bischofs Heinrich von Chur. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte von Reich und Kirche in den Zeiten Heinrichs VI., Zeitschrift für Schweizer Geschichte,* 29 (1949); D. von der Nahmer, *Die Reichsverwaltung in Toscana unter Friedrich I. und Heinrich VI.* (Aalen 1966); H. Grundmann, "Kirchenfreiheit und Kaisermacht um 1190 in der Sicht Joachims von Fiore," *DA,* 19 (1962), 353–96; D. Clementi, *Some Unnoticed Aspects of the Emperor Henry VI's Conquest of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily, BJRL,* 36 (1954).

11. *The Third Crusade*

SOURCES

Anonymi Chronicon Terrae Sanctae (to 1187), ed. H. Prutz, *Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Danzig 1876); Nicetas Choniates, *Historia* (to 1206), ed. I. Bekker, *CSHB* (Bonn 1835), also *RecHistCrois, HistGrecs,* I, 319–37, German translation of selections in F. Grabler, *Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber,* 7/9 (Graz and Cologne 1938); for the Arabic sources see H. A. R. Gibb, "The Arabic Sources for the Life of Saladin," *Speculum,* 25 (1950), 58–72; *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I. (Historia de expeditione Friderici imperatoris, Historia peregrinorum, Epistola de morte Friderici imperatoris, Narratio itineris navalis ad Terram sanctam),* ed. A. Chroust, *MGSS rer. Germ.*, new series, 5 (Berlin 1928); *cf.* A. Chroust, *Tageno, Ansbert und die Historia peregrinorum* (Graz 1892); some information in Arnold of Lübeck, *Chronica Slavorum, MGSS,* 21, ed. I. M. Lappenberg, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover 1868), and in the *Chronicle* of Otto of Sankt Blasien, ed. A. Hofmeister, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover and Leipzig 1912); Ambroise, *L'estoire de la Guerre Sainte,* ed. G. Paris, English translation and commentary by M. J. Hubert, *The Crusade of Richard Lionhearted* (New York 1941); L. Landon, *The Itinerary of King Richard I,* Pipe Roll Society, 51 (London 1935); *Das Itinerarium peregrinorum. Eine zeitgenössische Chronik zum 3. Kreuzzug in ursprünglicher Gestalt,* ed. H. E. Mayer, Schriften der *MG,* 18 (Stuttgart 1962); on the preceding see the review by M. L. Bulst in *HZ,* 198 (1964), 380–87, the reply by H. E. Mayer in *DA,* 20 (1964), 210–21, and the refutation by M. L. Bulst in *DA,* 21 (1965), 593–606; Roger of Howden, *Gesta regis Henrici II* and *Chronica* (report of an eyewitness), ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 49, 51 (London 1867–71); Richard of Devizes, *De rebus gestis Ricardi primi,* ed. R. Howlett, *Rolls Series,* 82 (London 1884–89), *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I,* 3; Ralph of Diceto, *Opera historica,* 2 vols., ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 68 (London 1876); Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti,* ed. H. F. Delaborde (Paris 1871), *Œuvres de Rigord et Guillaume le Breton,* 1; Baha-ad-Din's biography of Saladin in *RecHistCrois, HistOr,* III; H. A. R. Gibb, "The Achievement of Saladin," *BJRL,* 35 (1952 f.), 44–60; J. Hartmann, *Die Persönlichkeit des Sultans Saladin im Urteil der abendländischen Quellen, HStud,* 239 (Berlin 1933); M. Salloch, *Die lateinische Fortsetzung Wilhelms von Tyrus* (dissertation, Berlin 1934); Sicard of Cremona, *Chronicle, MGSS,* 31, 22–185; *cf.* E. Brocchieri, *Sicardo di Cremona e la sua opera letteraria* (Cremona 1958).

LITERATURE

H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), bibliography, nos. 2066–2188.

For the Crusade of Richard and Philip Augustus: K. Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart* (London 1924); A. Cartellieri, *Philipp II. August,* 2 (Leipzig 1906); Y. M. J. Congar, "Henri de Marcy, abbé de Clairvaux, Cardinal-évêque d'Albano," *SA,* 43 (1958), 1–90; M. W. Baldwin, *Raymond III of Tripolis and the Fall of Jerusalem* (Princeton 1936);

F. Groh, *Der Zusammenbruch des Reiches Jerusalem (1187–89)* (Jena 1909); E. Jamison, *Admiral Eugenius of Sicily. His Life and Work* (London 1957); L. Usseglio, *I marchesi di Monferrato in Italia ed in Oriente durante i secoli XII e XIII*, 2 vols. (Turin 1926); H. Bettin, *Heinrich II. von Champagne, seine Kreuzfahrt und Wirksamkeit im Heiligen Lande (1190–97)* (Berlin 1910).

For the Crusades of Frederick I and Henry VI: K. Fischer, *Geschichte des Kreuzzugs Kaiser Friedrichs I.* (Leipzig 1870); S. O. Riezler, "Der Kreuzzug Kaiser Friedrichs I.," *FDG*, 10 (1870), 3–149; R. Röhricht, "Die Rüstungen des Abendlandes zum dritten grossen Kreuzzuge," *HZ*, 34 (1875), 1–73; *Giesebrecht*, VI; A. Fürst, *Der Kreuzzugsbrief Kaiser Friedrichs I. an Saladin*, Programm zum Jahresbericht des Königlichen Neuen Gymnasiums in Regensburg 1907/08 (Regensburg 1908); H. E. Mayer, "Der Brief Kaiser Friedrichs I. an Saladin vom Jahre 1188," *DA*, 14 (1958), 488–94; K. Zimmer, "Der Friede von Adrianopel (Februar 1190)," *ByZ*, 11 (1902), 302–20; *idem*, "Der deutsch-byzantinische Konflikt vom Juli 1189 bis Februar 1190," *ByZ*, 12 (1903), 42–77; P. Scheffer-Boichorst, "Barbarossas Grab," *Gesammelte Schriften von Paul Scheffer-Boichorst, 2, HStud*, 43, 2 (Berlin 1905), 154–64; E. Traub, *Der Kreuzzugsplan Kaiser Heinrichs VI. im Zusammenhang mit der Politik der Jahre 1195–97* (Jena 1910). The other literature will be found in the bibliography for Chapter 10.

A History of the Crusades, ed. K. M. Setton *et al.*, II (Philadelphia 1962): H. Wieruszowski, "The Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Crusades," 3–44; S. Painter, "The Third Crusade: Richard the Lionhearted and Philip Augustus," 45–86; E. N. Johnson, "The Crusades of Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI," 87–122; S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, III (Cambridge 1954), 3–75; R. Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades*, III (Paris 1936), 1–121; A. Waas, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, I (Freiburg im Breisgau 1956), 184–225; copious bibliography in H. E. Mayer, *Das Itinerarium peregrinorum*, XI–XXXIV; F. Kurth, "Der Anteil niederdeutscher Kreuzfahrer an den Kämpfen der Portugiesen gegen die Mauren," *MIÖG*, suppl. Vol. 8 (1911), 131–252; C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des croisades et la principauté franque d'Antioche*, Institut de Damas. Bibliothèque orientale, 1 (Paris 1940); *idem*, "Selğukides, Turcomans et Allemands au temps de la troisième croisade," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 56 *(Festschrift H. W. Duda)* (1960), 21–31; A. Cartellieri, "Landgraf Ludwig III. von Thüringen und der dritte Kreuzzug," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für thür. Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, 42 (new series, 34) (1940), 42–64.

Crusade Piety: H. E. Mayer *(Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, supra)*, bibliography, nos. 1735–97, 4091–4111, 5291–5311; F. Vandenbroucke, *La piété des laïcs au XII^e siècle;* J. Leclercq, F. Vandenbroucke, and L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du moyen âge* (Paris 1961), 299–344; H. Wolter, *Elemente der Kreuzzugsfrömmigkeit in der Spiritualität des heiligen Ignatius;* F. Wulf, *Ignatius von Loyola. Seine geistliche Gestalt und sein Vermächtnis* (Würzburg 1956), 111–150; C. Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*, 6 (Stuttgart 1935); P. Alphandéry, *La Chrétienté et l'idée de Croisade*, I: *Les premières croisades* (texte établi par A. Dupront) (Paris 1954); P. Rousset, "L'idée de croisade chez les chroniqueurs d'Occident," *Relazioni del X congresso internazionale di Scienze storiche, 3. Storia del Medio Evo* (Florence 1956), 547–63; Y. M. J. Congar, "Henri de Marcy, abbé de Clairvaux, Cardinal-évêque d'Albano et légat pontifical," *SA*, 43 (1958), 1–90 (esp. pages 77–90); A. Waas, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, I, 1–53; F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, "Kreuzzugsidee und mittelalterliches Weltbild," *DVfLG*, 30 (1956); *idem, Geschichtliche und dichterische Wirklichkeit in der deutschen Kreuzzugslyrik, Festschrift J. Lortz*, 2 (Mainz 1958); *idem, Die Kreuzzugslyrik des Mittelalters* (Berlin 1960).

12. *Scholasticism, Canon Law, and the Universities*

SOURCES

General Bibliography, I, 11; H. Denifle and A. Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis,* I (Paris 1889); the works of the theologians and canonists named in this chapter.

ACCOUNTS

General Bibliography, II, 11 and 12, in particular the works of F. Ueberweg and B. Geyer, M. de Wulf, É. Bréhier, É. Gilson and P. Böhner, P. F. Cayré, M. Grabmann, F. Stegmüller, H. Rost, B. Smalley, C. Spicq, H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale,* now complete in 4 vols. (Paris 1960–64); in General Bibliography, II, 6, the works of H. E. Feine, G. Le Bras, B. Kurtscheid, A. Van Hove, *Commentarium Lovaniense in Codicem Iuris Canonici,* I/1, *Prolegomena* (Malines and Rome, 2d ed. 1945); A. M. Stickler, *Historia Iuris Canonici Latini,* I: *Historia Fontium* (Turin 1950); *Fliche-Martin,* XIII (Paris 1951), 147–78; the best introduction to the early science of canon law is G. Le Bras, C. Lefèbvre, and J. Rambaud, *L'âge classique (1140–1378), Sources et théorie du droit, Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident,* 7 (Paris 1965), 266–91; S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik (1140–1234), Prodromus Corporis Glossarum,* I, *SteT,* 71 (Rome 1937).

For the beginnings of the universities: General Bibliography, II, 11 (works of J. van den Driesch, W. Wühr, L. Maître, E. Lesne); also: G. Paré, A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XII^{e} siècle. Les écoles et l'enseignement* (Ottawa 1933); S. d'Irsay, *Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères des origines à nos jours,* I: *Moyen-âge et Renaissance* (Paris 1933); H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,* ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, 3 vols. (Oxford 1936); H. Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (Berlin 1885), is still valuable; G. Post, "Alexander III. The licentia docendi and the Rise of the Universities," *Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by Students of C. H. Haskins* (Boston 1929), 255–77; P. Delhaye, "L'organisation scolaire au XII^{e} siècle," *Tr,* 5 (1947), 211–68; F. Battaglia, "L'unità del sapere nelle prime Università occidentali," *Rivista internazionale di filosofia del diritto* (1955), 190–201; H. Grundmann, *Vom Ursprung der Universitäten im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2d ed. 1960, supplements); R. Meister, "Beiträge zur Gründungsgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Universitäten," *AnzAW,* Phil-hist. Kl., 49 (1957), 27–50; S. Stelling-Michaud, "L'histoire des universités au moyen-âge et à la renaissance au cours des vingt-cinq dernières années," *Rapport I Comité International des Sciences historiques, XI^{e} Congrès Internat. Stockholm* (1960), 97–143.

Bologna: C. Calcaterra, *Alma Mater Studiorum* (Bologna 1948); G. de Vergottini, *Lo studio di Bologna, l'Impero, il Papato, Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna,* new series, 1 (Bologna 1954).

Paris: L. Halphen, *Les origines de l'Université de Paris: A travers l'histoire du moyen-âge* (Paris 1950); S. Kuttner, "Les débuts de l'école canoniste française," *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris,* 4 (1938), 1–14; *Fliche-Martin,* IX/2, 371–81; E. Behler, "Die Entstehung der mittelalterlichen Universität von Paris," *Perennitas. Festschrift für Thomas Michels,* ed. H. Rahner and E. von Severus (Münster 1963), 294–321; A. L. Gabriel, "Les écoles de la Cathédrale de Notre-Dame et le commencement de l'Université de Paris," *RHÉF,* 50 (1964), 73–99.

13. *Heresy and the Beginnings of the Inquisition*

Sources

Ekbert of Schönau, *Sermones adversus Catharorum errores (ca.* 1163), *PL,* 195, 11–98; on the preceding, A. Borst, *Die Katharer* (Stuttgart 1953), 6 f.; Alain de Lille, *De fide catholica contra hereticos sui temporis praesertim Albigenses, PL,* 205, 306–430; Bonacorsi, *Manifestatio heresis Catarorum, PL,* 204, 775–94, ed. Ilarino da Milano, "La 'Manifestatio heresis Catarorum quam fecit Bonacursus,' secondo il cod. Ott. lat. 136 della Bibl. Vaticana," *Aevum,* 12 (1938), 281–333; *idem, L'eresia di Ugo Speroni nella confutazione del Maestro Vacario. Testo inedito del secolo XII con studio storico e dottrinale, SteT,* 115 (Rome 1945); E. Turdeanu, "Apocryphes bogomiles et apocryphes pseudo-bogomiles," *RHR,* 138 (1950), 22–52, 176–218; A. Dondaine, "Aux origines du Valdéisme. Une profession de foi de Valdès," *AFP,* 16 (1946), 191–235; *idem,* "Nouvelles sources de l'histoire doctrinale du néo-manichéisme au moyen-âge," *RSPhTh,* 28 (1939), 465–88; Peter the Venerable, *Epistola sive tractatus adversus petrobrusianos* (1139–42), *PL,* 189, 719–850; Hugh of Amiens, *Contra hereticos sui temporis sive de Ecclesia et eius ministris, PL,* 192, 1141–1352; Bernard of Fontcaude, *Adversus Waldenses Liber, PL,* 204, 793–840; *Epistola Evervini* (provost of Steinfeld) to Bernard of Clairvaux, *PL,* 182, 676–80; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones 65 et 66 super Cantica Canticorum,* ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, and H. M. Rochais, *S. Bernardi Opera,* II (Rome 1958), 172–88; *Epistola Leodiensis ecclesie ad papam Lucium II* (1144–45), *PL,* 179, 937 f.; Letters of the Cardinal Bishop Henry of Albano and of Cardinal Peter of San Crisogono (1178), *PL,* 199, 1120–24, 204, 235–40; *Epistola Henrici VI Romanorum imperatoris ad Coelestinum III papam de legatis et haereticis, MGConst,* I, no. 370, p. 519; Walter Map, *De nugis curialium,* ed. T. Wright, Camden Society, Old Series, 50 (London 1850), translation and commentary by M. R. James and J. E. Lloyd, ed. E. S. Hartland, *Cymmrodorion Record Series,* 9 (1923); Roger of Howden, *Chronica,* ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 51 (London 1871); see the bibliography for Chapter 8 for Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici,* and Hugh of Poitiers, *Liber de Libertate Monasterii Vizeliacensis; Akten des Albigenserkonzils von Saint-Félix de Caraman,* ed. A. Dondaine, *MiscMercati,* V (1946), 326 f.; analysis of the sources in J. Guiraud, *Histoire (infra),* I, XI–XLIII, and A. Borst, *Die Katharer* (Stuttgart 1953), 3–12; C. du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus qui ab initio XII seculi usque ad annum 1735 in Ecclesia proscripti sunt et notati,* 3 vols. (Paris 1724–36); I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters,* II: *Dokumente vornehmlich zur Geschichte der Valdensier und Katharer* (Munich 1890); P. Frédéricq, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae,* 5 vols. (Ghent 1889–1906).

Literature

C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter, besonders im 11., 12. und 13. Jahrhundert,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1845–50); H. Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1875–77); F. Tocco, *L'eresia nel medio evo* (Florence 1884); H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages,* 3 vols. (London 1888, reprinted New York 1955); on the preceding see J. Dalberg-Acton in *EHR,* 3 (1888), 773–88; P. Frédéricq, *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden (1025–1528)* (Ghent 1892); A. S. Turberville, *Medieval Heresy and the Inquisition* (London 1920, reprinted London 1964); G. Volpe, *Movimenti religiosi e sette ereticali nella società medioevale italiana sec. XI–XIV* (1922, 2d ed. 1926, reprinted Florence 1961); H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Berlin 1935, reprinted with supplement Darmstadt 1961); J. Guiraud, *Histoire* *de l'Inquisition au moyen-âge*, 2 vols. (Paris 1935–38); A. Aegerter, *Les hérésies du moyen-âge* (Paris 1939); W. Nigg, *Das Buch der Ketzer* (Zürich 1949); G. Welter, *Histoire des sectes chrétiennes des origines à nos jours* (Paris 1950); R. Morghen, *Medioevo cristiano* (Bari 1951, 2d ed. 1958), 204–81; L. Sommariva, "Studi recenti sulle eresie medioevali," *RSIt*, 64 (1952), 237–68; E. Dupré-Theseider, *Introduzione alle eresie medioevali* (Bologna 1953); P. Ilarino da Milano, "Le eresie medioevali," *Grande Antologia Filosofica*, II/4 (Milan 1954), 1599–1689; R. R. Betts, E. Delaruelle, H. Grundmann, R. Morghen, and L. Salvatorelli, "Movimenti religiosi popolari ed eresie del Medioevo," *Relazioni del X Congresso Internazionale di Scienze storiche*, III (Florence 1955), 305–541; H. Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters* (Göttingen 1963), fasc. 2 G, 1, of *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte*, ed. K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf; J. Russell, "Interpretations of the Origins of Medieval Heresy," *MS*, 25 (1963), 26–53; E. Van der Vekené, *Bibliographie der Inquisition. Ein Versuch* (Hildesheim 1963), and, in regard to it, B. A. Vermaseren, "Een bibl. over de inquisitie," *Tijdschr. v. Geschiedenis*, 77 (1964), 472–77; C. Pozo, "La noción de 'herejía' en el derecho canónico medieval," *Misc. Pérez Goyena* (Madrid 1960), 235–51; H. Flatten, *Der Häresieverdacht im Codex Iuris Canonici, Kan. Studien und Texte*, 21 (Amsterdam 1963); H. Grundmann, "Oportet et haereses esse. Das Problem der Ketzerei im Spiegel der mittelalterlichen Bibelexegese," *AKG*, 45 (1963), 129–64; *idem*, "Der Typus des Ketzers in mittelalterlicher Anschauung," *Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, Festschrift für W. Goetz* (Leipzig 1927), 91–107.

The Cathari: E. Broeckx, *Le Catharisme* (Hoogstraten 1916); S. Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (Cambridge 1947); A. Borst, *Die Katharer*, Schriften der *MG*, 12 (Stuttgart 1953); F. Niel, *Albigeois et Cathares* (Paris 1955); E. Delaruelle, "Le Catharisme en Languedoc vers 1200, une enquête," *Annales du Midi*, 72 (1960), 149–67; P. de Berne-Lagarde, *Bibliographie du catharisme languedocien*, Institut des Études cathares, Collection de textes et documents, 1 (Toulouse 1957); D. Walther, "A Survey of Recent Research on the Albigensian Cathari," *Church History*, 34 (1965), 146–77; C. Thouzellier, *Catharisme et valdéisme en Languedoc à la fin du XII^{e} et au début du XIII^{e} siècle. Politique pontificale. Controverses* (Paris 1966).

The Waldensians: A. Armand-Hugon and G. Gonnet, *Bibliografia valdese* (Torre Pellice 1953); G. Gonnet, *Enchiridion fontium Valdensium* (Torre Pellice 1953; Vol. I to 1218); *idem, Il Valdismo medioevale, Prolegomeni* (1942); A. Dondaine, "Aux origines du Valdéisme," *AFP*, 16 (1946), 191–235, 17 (1947), 85–194, 29 (1959), 228–76; G. Gonnet, "Waldensia," *RHPhR*, 33 (1953), 202–54; G. Koch, "Neue Quellen und Forschungen über die Anfänge der Waldenser," *FF*, 32 (1958), 141–49; W. Mohr, "Waldes und das frühe Waldensertum," *ZRGG*, 9 (1957), 357–63; H. Wolter, "Aufbruch und Tragik der apostolischen Laienbewegung im Mittelalter. Die Anfänge der Waldenserbewegung," *GuL*, 30 (1957), 357–69; S. Dupré-Theseider, "Gli eretici sul mondo comunale italiano," *Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi*, no. 114 (1963), 3–23.

The Humiliati: H. Tiraboschi, *Vetera Humiliatorum monumenta* (Milan 1766–68); A. de Stefano, "Le origini dell'Ordine degli Umiliati," *Riv. stor.-crit. delle scienze teol.*, 2 (1906), 851–71; *idem.* in *Arch. Roman.*, 11 (1927), 31–75; P. Guerrini, "Gli Umiliati a Brescia," *Miscellanea P. Paschini*, I (1948), 187–214; G. Mercati, "Due ricerche per la storia degli Umiliati," *RSTI*, 11 (1957), 167–94.

The beginnings of the Inquisition: H. Maisonneuve, *Études sur les origines de l'Inquisition, L'Église et l'État au Moyen-Age*, ed. G. Le Bras, 7 (Paris 1960); H. C. Lea, *The Inquisition of the Middle Ages: Its Organisation and Operation. With an historical introduction by W. Ullman* (London 1963); Y. Dossat, "Les débuts de l'Inquisition à Montpellier et en Provence," *Bull. Phil. et Hist. du Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques* (1961), 561–79; M. Bévenot, "The Inquisition and its Antecedents," *Heythrop Journal*, 7 (1966), 257–68, 381–93, 8 (1967), 52–69.

14. *Lay Movements of the Twelfth Century, Christian Knighthood, Pastoral Care, Popular Piety, and Mystical Theology*

LITERATURE

Lay Movements: G. Le Bras, *Fliche-Martin,* XII, 2 parts (Paris 1959–64); Y. M. J. Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* (Paris 1953), with many historical references; J. Fichet, *Histoire du laïcat dans l'Église: Le rôle des laïcs dans l'Église* (Carrefour 1951, Montreal 1952); L. Leitmaier, "Der Laie in der Kirche im Mittelalter und im 20. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan,* 39 (1953), 28–45; H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter. Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und den religiösen Frauenbewegungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik,* 2d ed., expanded and supplemented, with a report on the research by the Tenth International Congress of Historians at Rome in 1955 (Darmstadt 1961); *idem,* "Literatus, illiteratus . . .," *AKG,* 40 (1958), 1–65; G. Volpe, *Movimenti religiosi e sette ereticali nella società medioevale italiana* (Florence 1961); A. Auer, *Weltoffener Christ. Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Laienfrömmigkeit* (Düsseldorf 1960).

Confraternities: G. Le Bras, "Les confréries chrétiennes," *RHD* (1940 f.), 310–363; *idem* in *Études de sociologie religieuse,* II (Paris 1956), 432–62; P. Dubarc, "Confréries du Saint-Esprit et communautés d'habitants au moyen-âge," *RHD* (1958), 349–67; *Fliche-Martin,* IX/2 (Paris 1953), 317–29; C. Petit-Dutaillis, *Les communes françaises, caractères et évolution des origines au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1947); E. C. Lodge, "The Communal Movement, especially in France," *The Cambridge Medieval History,* 5 (1926), 624–57, 903–08 (bibliography).

The ius patronatus: S. Schröcker, *Die Kirchenpflegschaft* (Paderborn 1934); F. Fournier, *Le droit de propriété exercé par les laïcs sur les biens de l'église dans le haut moyen-âge* (Lille 1943); F. J. Schmale, "Kanonie, Seelsorge und Eigenkirche," *HJ,* 78 (1959), 38–63; V. Chomel, "Droit de patronage et pratique religieuse dans l'archevêché de Narbonne," *BÉCh,* 115 (1957), 58–137.

Knighthood: C. Cohen, *Histoire de la chevalerie en France au moyen-âge* (Paris 1949); H. Naumann, *Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter des Rittertums, Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte* (Potsdam 1938); *idem, Der staufische Ritter* (Leipzig 1936); G. Fliegner, *Geistliches und weltliches Rittertum im Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad* (dissertation, Breslau 1937); W. Berges, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters,* Schriften der *MG,* 1 (Leipzig 1938); W. Kleineke, *Englische Fürstenspiegel vom Policraticus des Johannes von Salisbury bis zum Basilikon Doron Jakobs I.* (Halle 1937); G. Ehrismann, "Die Grundlagen des ritterlichen Tugendsystems," *ZdAdL,* 56 (1919), 137–216; E. R. Curtius, "Das ritterliche Tugendsystem," *DVfLG,* 21 (1943), 343–68; F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, "Ritterliche Lebenslehre und antike Ethik," *DVfLG,* 23 (1949), 252–73; F. Maurer, "Das ritterliche Tugendsystem," *DVfLG,* 23 (1949), 274–85; *idem,* "Zum ritterlichen 'Tugendsystem'," *DVfLG,* 24 (1950), 526–29; E. Neumann, "Der Streit um das ritterliche Tugendsystem," *Festschrift K. Helm* (Tübingen 1951), 137–55; S. Pivano, "Lineamenti storici e giuridici della cavalleria medioevale," *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino,* series 2, 55, *Scienze morali* (Turin 1905), 255–336; K. E. Löfqvist, *Om Riddarväsen och Frälse i Nordisk Medeltid* (Lund 1935); Z. Wojciechowski, *Das Ritterrecht in Polen vor den Statuten Kasimirs des Grossen, Bibliothek geschichtlicher Werke aus den Literaturen Osteuropas,* 5 (Breslau 1930); C. Sánchez-Albornoz, *Entorno a los orígenes del feudalismo,* 2 vols. (Mendoza 1942); P. B. Wessels, *Der höfische Ritter, ein Wanderer zwischen zwei Welten* (Nijmegen and Utrecht 1952); U. T. Holmes, *Daily Living in the Twelfth Century. Based on Observations of Alexander Neckam in London and Paris* (Madison 1952); P. Alphandéry, *La* *chrétienté et l'idée de croisade,* II: *Recommencements nécessaires (XII^{e}–XIII^{e} siècles)* (Paris 1959); D. Zorgi, *Valori religiosi nella letteratura provenzale. La spiritualità trinitaria* (Milan 1954); E. R. Labande, "Le 'Credo' épique. A propos des prières dans les chansons de geste," *Recueil M. C. Brunel* (Paris 1955), 62–80; J. P. Ritter, *Ministérialité et chevalerie. Dignité humaine et liberté dans le droit médiéval* (typed dissertation, Lausanne 1955); R. Coulborn *et al., Feudalism in History* (Princeton 1956); S. Painter, *French Chivalry, Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Medieval France* (new printing, Ithaca, N. Y., 2d ed. 1957); O. Brunner, *Feudalismus, Sb. Mainz 1958,* 10 (Wiesbaden 1959); H. de Boor, *Die höfische Literatur* (Munich 1964), *passim;* H. J. Koppitz, *Wolframs Religiosität. Beobachtungen über das Verhältnis Wolframs von Eschenbach zur religiösen Tradition des Mittelalters, Abhandlungen zur Kunst-, Musik- und Literaturgeschichte,* 7 (Bonn 1959); A. Borst, "Das Rittertum im Hochmittelalter," *Saeculum,* 10 (1959), 213–31 (bibliography); D. M. Stenton, *English Society in the Early Middle Ages (1066–1307)* (Harmondsworth, 4th ed. 1965), 60–99; H. Kuhn, *Rittertum und Mystik* (Munich 1963); A. Waas, *Der Mensch im deutschen Mittelalter* (Graz and Cologne 1964); E. H. Massmann, *Schwertleite und Ritterschlag, dargestellt auf Grund der mittelhochdeutschen literarischen Quellen* (dissertation, Hamburg 1932); induction into knighthood: M. Andrieu, *Le Pontificat romain au moyen-âge,* III, *SteT,* 88 (Rome 1940), 447–50, 549 f.; F. M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism (1066–1166)* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1950); H. Spranaym, "Zu Hartmanns Kreuzzugslyrik," *DVfLG,* 26 (1952), 162–77.

Pastoral Care: Sacraments: D. Van den Eynde, *Les définitions des sacrements (1050–1240)* (Rome 1950); A. M. Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik,* III (Regensburg 1954 f.); A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1902); F. Gillmann, *Die Siebenzahl der Sakramente bei den Glossatoren des Gratianischen Dekrets* (Mainz 1909); J. de Ghellinck, "Über den Sakramentsbegriff des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Mélanges Mandonnet,* II (Paris 1930), 79–96; H. Weisweiler, *Die Wirksamkeit der Sakramente nach Hugo von Sankt Viktor* (Freiburg 1932).

P. Browe, "Die Kinderkommunion im Mittelalter," *Scholastik,* 5 (1930), 1–45; J. Baumgärtler, *Die Erstkommunion der Kinder bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Munich 1929); C. Clinton, *The Paschal Precept* (dissertation, Washington 1932); P. Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (Munich 1933); *idem,* "Die Elevation in der Messe," *JLW,* 9 (1929), 20–66; *idem, Die häufige Kommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1938); *idem,* "Die Kommunionvorbereitung im Mittelalter," *RKTh,* 56 (1932), 375–415; *idem,* "Die eucharistischen Verwandlungswunder des Mittelalters," *RQ,* 38 (1929), 137–69; *idem, Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1940); *idem,* "Die Kommunion der Heiligen im Mittelalter," *StdZ,* 117 (1929), 425–37; *idem,* "Mittelalterliche Kommunionriten—Die Sterbekommunion," *JLW,* 15 (1941), 23–66; E. Maffei, *La réservation eucharistique jusqu'à la Renaissance* (Brussels 1942); E. Dumoutet, *Le désir de voir l'Hostie et les origines de la dévotion au S. Sacrement* (Paris 1926); *idem, Le Christ selon la chair et la vie liturgique au moyen-âge* (Paris 1932); A. L. Mayer, "Die 'heilbringende' Schau in Sitte und Kult," *Festschrift I. Herwegen* (Münster 1938), 234–61; M. Andrieu, *Le Pontificat romain au moyen-âge,* 4 vols. (Rome 1938–41), *SteT,* 86–88, 99.

P. Schmoll, *Die Busslehre der Frühscholastik* (Munich 1909); J. A. Spitzig, *Sacramental Penance in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Washington 1947); P. Anciaux, *La théologie du sacrement de Pénitence au XII^{e} siècle* (Louvain 1947); R. Blomme, *La doctrine du péché dans les écoles théologiques de la première moitié du XII^{e} siècle* (Louvain 1958); N. Paulus, *Die Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter,* 3 vols. (Paderborn 1922 f.), basic work; B. Poschmann, *Der Ablass im Lichte der Bussgeschichte* (Bonn 1948); A. Teetaert, *La confession aux laïques dans l'Église latine du VIII^{e} au XIV^{e} siècle* (Bruges 1926); F. Billmann in *AkathKR,* 107 (1927), 360–78, and H. Weisweiler in *Scholastik,* 3 (1928), 574–80.

H. Thurston, *Familiar Prayers. Their Origin and History* (London 1953), Chapter VI; L. Gougaud, *Dévotion et pratiques ascétiques du moyen-âge* (Maredsous 1925); A. Wilmart, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen-âge latin* (Paris 1932); J. Leclercq, "Dévotion privée, piété populaire et liturgie au moyen-âge," *Études de pastorale liturgique* (Paris 1944), 149–83; F. Vandenbroucke, "La piété des laïcs au XII^e siècle," *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne,* II (Paris 1961), 299–344.

Pastoral Care: Preaching: J. B. Schneyer, "Die Predigt im Mittelalter," *LThK,* VIII (2d ed. 1963), 708–10, 713; W. Wackernagel, *Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete* (Basel 1876); L. Bourgain, *La chaire française au XII^e siècle* (Paris 1879); R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter* (Detmold 1879); A. Lecoy de la Marche, *La chaire française au moyen-âge* (Paris, 2d ed. 1886); A. Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Ausgang des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1886); G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Oxford and Cambridge, 2d ed. 1926); *idem, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1961); H. Caplan, *Mediaeval Artes Praedicandi. A Handlist* (Ithaca, N. Y. 1934), supplementary volume (1936); T. M. Charland, *Artes Praedicandi. Contributions à l'histoire de la rhétorique au moyen-âge* (Paris and Ottawa 1936); J. B. Schneyer, *Wegweiser zu lateinischen Predigtreihen des Mittelalters* (Munich 1965); J. Châtillon, "Sermons et prédicateurs victorins de la seconde moitié du XII^e siècle," *AHD,* 32 (1965), 7–60.

Devotion to Mary: Maria, Études sur la Sainte Vierge, ed. H. du Manoir, 7 vols. (Paris 1949–64); T. Meier, *Die Gestalt Mariens im geistlichen Schauspiel des deutschen Mittelalters* (Berlin 1959); R. W. Southern, "The English Origins of the 'Miracles of the Virgin,'" *MRS,* 4 (1958), 176–216; H. Graef, *Maria. Eine Geschichte der Lehre und Verehrung* (Freiburg 1964), Chapter 5; E. Baumann, *Histoire des pèlerinages de la Sainte Vierge* (Paris 1941); M. V. Gripkey, *The Blessed Virgin Mary as Mediatrix in the Latin and Old French Legend prior to the Fourteenth Century* (Washington 1938).

Mystical Theology: J. Leclercq, F. Vandenbroucke, and L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du moyen-âge* (Paris 1961), 161–298; M. N. Scivoletto, *Spiritualità medioevale e tradizione scolastica nel secolo XII in Francia* (Naples 1954); M. D. Chenu, *La théologie au XII^e siècle* (Paris 1957); P. Wolff, *Die Viktoriner mystischen Schriften* (Vienna 1936); R. Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu et théologie symbolique d'après 'In Hierarchiam coelestem' de Hugues de Saint Victor: De la connaissance de Dieu," *Recherches de philosophie,* III–IV (Paris 1958), 187–266; R. Javelet, *Psychologie des auteurs spirituels du XII^e siècle* (Épinal 1959); D. Lasic, *Hugonis a S. Victore theologia perfectiva, eius fundamentum philosophicum ac theologicum* (Rome 1956); G. Dumeige, *Richard de Saint-Victor et l'idée chrétienne de l'amour* (Paris 1952); *Liber exceptionum,* ed. J. Châtillon (Paris 1958); J. Beumer, "Richard von St. Viktor, Theologe und Mystiker," *Scholastik,* 31 (1956), 213–38; Godfrey of Saint-Victor, *Microcosmus,* ed. P. Delhaye, 2 vols. (Lille 1951), with a theological interpretation. The best introduction to Rupert of Deutz is now M. Bernards, "Die Welt der Laien in der kölnischen Theologie des 12. Jahrhunderts. Beobachtungen zur Ekklesiologie Ruperts von Deutz," *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter und Stände, Festschrift Kardinal Frings* (Cologne 1960), 391–416; comprehensive treatment of Gerhoh of Reichersberg in P. Classen's biography (Wiesbaden 1960).

SECTION THREE

The Byzantine Church in the Epoch of the Crusades

15. *The Byzantine Church from 1054 to 1203*

LITERATURE

F. Chalandon, *Essai sur le règne d'Alexis I Comnène* (Paris 1900); *idem, Jean Comnène et Manuel Comnène* (Paris 1912); S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades,* 3 vols. (Cambridge 1951–54); *idem, The Eastern Schism* (Oxford 1955); *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, I–II (Philadelphia 1955–62); P. Lamma, *Comneni e Staufer,* I–II (Rome 1955–57); A. Frolow, *Recherches sur la déviation de la IVe croisade vers Constantinople* (Paris 1955); W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin 1903; reprint 1965).

16. *The Byzantine Church from 1203 to 1282*

LITERATURE

A. Heisenberg, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion,* I–III, *SAM,* 1922, 5; 1923, 2; 1923, 3 (Munich 1922 f.); W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant* (London 1908); J. Lognon, *L'empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris 1949); S. Lampros, Αὐτοκρατόρων τοῦ Βυζαντρίου χρυσόβουλλα καὶ χρυσᾶ γράμματα ἀναφερόμενα εἰς τὴν ἕνωσιν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν: Νέος Ἑλληνομήμων 11 (1904), 94–128, 241–54; A. L. Tautu, *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X* (Vatican City 1953); A. Gardner, *The Lascarids of Nicaea* (London 1912); D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959).

17. *The Inner Life of the Byzantine Church in the Age of the Crusades*

SECTION FOUR

The Papacy at the Height of Its Power: 1198-1216

SOURCES

Mansi, XXII–XXIV; *Hefele-Leclercq,* V, 2 (Paris 1913); *Potthast R; Liber Censuum Romanae Ecclesiae,* compiled by Cencius Savelli (Pope Honorius III), ed. P. Fabre, L. Duchesne, and G. Mollat, 3 vols. (Paris 1889–1952), and, in regard to it, V. Pfaff in *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte,* 44 (1957), 87–96, 105–20, 220–42, 325–51; J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii,* V (1198–1272), revised by J. Ficker and E. Winkelmann, 5 parts (Innsbruck 1881–1901), supplements by P. Zinsmaier, *ZGObrh,* 102 (1954), 183–273; *MGConst,* II (1198–1272); A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Frederici Secundi,* 12 vols. in 6 (Paris 1852–61, reprinted Turin 1963); *MG Epistolae s. XIII e regestis Pontificum Romanorum selectae* (Honorius III to Clement IV), ed. C. Rodenberg, 3 vols. (Hanover 1883–94); *Regesta Honorii Papae III,* ed. P. Pressuti, 2 vols. (Rome 1888–95);

the École française de Rome has edited the *registra* of the Popes following Honorius III (see the respective chapters). *Chronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam* (1168–1287), ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS,* 32 (Hanover 1905–13), German translation by A. Doren, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1914), *cf.* O. Holder-Egger in *NA,* 37 (1912), 163–218, 38 (1913), 469–81; Salimbene's *Chronicle* is now also edited by G. Scalia, *Scrittori d'Italia,* 232/233, 2 vols. (Bari 1966); Burchard of Ursperg, *Chronicle* (1126–1225), ed. O. Holder-Egger and E. von Simson, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover, 2d ed. 1916); Roland of Padua, *Liber chronicorum in factis et circa facta Marchie Treviciane, Muratori,* 8, 169–360; Richard of San Germano, *Chronica regni Siciliae, Muratori,* 7, 967–1052; *Annales Placentini* (1012–1235), ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover 1901); Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora,* ed. H. R. Luard, *Rolls Series,* 57, 7 vols. (London 1872–83); Walther von der Vogelweide, *Gedichte,* ed. K. Lachmann, 10th ed. by C. von Kraus (Berlin and Leipzig 1936); Martin of Troppau (Polonus), *Chronica summorum Pontificum Imperatorumque de VII aetatibus mundi* (to 1277, but often legendary), ed. L. Weiland, *MGSS,* 22, 377–475, and, in regard to it, H. Grundmann, *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter* (Göttingen 1965); Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum maius (historiale)* (to 1250) (Douai 1624); continuation of the *Chronica Regia Coloniensis* (to 1220), ed. G. Waitz, *MGSS rer. Germ.,* 18 (1880); Annals of Marbach (to 1238), ed. H. Bloch, *MGSS rer. Germ.,* 9 (1907); continuation of the *Casus S. Galli* (1203–33 by Conrad of Fabaria), ed. G. Meyer von Knonau, *St. Gallische Geschichtsquellen,* IV (1879); *Saxon World Chronicle,* in Low German (to 1248), *MG Deutsche Chroniken* II, 65–258 (Hanover 1877); T. Rymer, *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cuiuscumque generis acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis,* 6 vols. (London 1816–30), ed. A. Clarke, J. Caley, and F. Holbrooke; L. Landon, *The Itinerary of King Richard I,* Pipe Roll Society, new series, 13 (London 1935); *Monasticon Anglicanum,* ed. J. Caley *et al.* (London 1849); Ralph of Diceto, *Imagines Historiarum,* ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 68 (London 1876); Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera historica,* ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 73, 2 vols. (London 1879 f.); Ralph of Coggeshall, *Chronicon Anglicanum,* ed. J. Stevenson, *Rolls Series,* 66 (London 1875); Walter of Coventry, *Memoriale,* ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 58 (London 1873); Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum,* ed. H. O. Coxe, English Historical Society (London 1841 f.), adopted and polished by Matthew Paris in his historical works, *cf.* V. H. Galbraith, *Roger Wendover and Matthew Paris* (Glasgow 1944); *Histoire des ducs de Normandie et des rois d'Angleterre,* ed. F. Michel, *Société de l'histoire de France* (Paris 1840); Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera,* ed. J. S. Brewer, 4 vols. (London 1861–65); *Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal,* ed. P. Meyer, 2 vols. (Paris 1891–1901); *Epistolae Cantuarienses,* ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 38 (London 1865); *Gesta Philippi Augusti* by Rigord and William the Breton, ed. H. F. Delaborde (Paris 1882); *Philippide* of William the Breton, ed. H. F. Delaborde (Paris 1885); H. F. Delaborde, E. Berger, C. Petit-Dutaillis, J. Monicat, and C. Bunel, *Recueil des actes de Philippe Auguste, roi de France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1916–43); Robert of Auxerre, *Chronicle* (to 1211), ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS,* 26, 226–87.

LITERATURE

Fliche-Martin, X (Paris 1950); *Kirchengeschichte,* ed. P. J. Kisch, II, 2: J. Hollnsteiner, *Die Kirche vom Anfang des 13. bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg 1940); *Seppelt,* III (Munich 1956); *Haller,* III–IV (Esslingen, 2d ed. 1962); E. Delaruelle *et al., Histoire du catholicisme en France,* II (Paris 1960); *Lavisse,* III, 1–2 (Paris 1901); A. Cartellieri, *Philipp II. August,* IV (Leipzig 1921 f.); R. Davidsohn, *Geschichte von Florenz,* I–IV, 3 (Berlin 1896–1927); F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter,* ed. W. Kampf, 3 vols. (Darmstadt 1953–57); K. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin 1930); B. Hóman, *Geschichte des ungarischen Mittelalters,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1940–43); *idem, König*

Stephan I. der Heilige. Die Gründung des ungarischen Königtums (Pécs 1935); G. Stadtmüller, "Die ungarische Grossmacht des Mittelalters," *HJ*, 70 (1951), 65–105; K. Hampe, *Das Hochmittelalter* (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne, 5th ed. 1963), with an epilogue by G. Tellenbach; *Hauck*, IV, 686–776 (Leipzig, 5th ed. 1925, reprinted Berlin 1954); A. L. Poole, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1964); M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century (1216–1307)* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1962); J. E. A. Joliffe, *Angevin Kingship* (London, 2d ed. 1963); C. Duggan, "From the Conquest to the Death of John," *The English Church and the Papacy*, ed. C. H. Lawrence (London 1965), 63–115; L. Salvatorelli, *L'Italia medioevale: L'Italia comunale dal secolo XI alla metà del secolo XIV* (Milan 1940); J. Ficker, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, 4 vols. (Innsbruck 1864–74); F. Soldevilla, *Historia de España*, 3 vols. (Barcelona 1952–54); D. Peres, *Historia de Portugal*, 8 vols. (Barcelos 1928–37); *idem*, *Como nasceu Portugal* (Barcelos 1938); D. Mansilla, *Iglesia castellano-leonesa y Curia Romana en los tiempos del Rey San Fernando* (Madrid 1945); O. H. Green, *Spain and the Western Tradition. The Castilian Mind from El Cid to Calderón* (Madison 1963; rich bibliography); C. Erdmann, *Das Papsttum in Portugal im 1. Jahrhundert der portugiesischen Geschichte*, *AAB* (1938), no. 5; M. de Oliveira, *Historia eclesiástica de Portugal* (Lisbon, 3d ed. 1958); L. Musset, *Les peuples scandinaves au moyen-âge* (Paris 1951); H. Koch, *Danmarks Kirke i den begynende Højmiddelalder*, 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1936).

18. *Personality and Program of Innocent III*

Sources

Letters, Documents, Works: *PL*, 214–217; *Regestum super negotio Romani Imperii*, ed. W. M. Peitz (Rome 1927), W. Holtzmann (1947 f.), F. Kempf (Rome 1947); selections in German translation by G. Tangl (Leipzig 1923); Innocent's *registra* are now critically edited by the Österreichisches Kulturinstitut in Rome under O. Hageneder and A. Haidacher, *Die Register Innozenz' III.*, I, Publikationen der Abteilung für Historische Studien des Österreichischen Kulturinstituts, published in connection with the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften by L. Santifaller, II Abteilung, Quellen, first series (Graz and Cologne 1964); on the preceding see H. Tillmann in *RQ*, 61 (1966), 228–36, with important corrections of the historical commentary. Studies and preparatory work are reported by the *MIÖG* and the *RömHM*. On the investigation of the *registra* see, among other works, H. Tillmann in *QFIAB*, 23 (1931 f.), 53–79, R. von Heckel in *HJ*, 57 (1937), 258–89, F. Bock in *AZ*, 50/51 (1955), 329–64; F. Kempf, *Die Register Innocenz' III.* (Rome 1945); *idem* in *QFIAB*, 36 (1956), 86–137; E. Pásztor, *Annali della Scuola Speciale per Archivisti e Bibliotecari dell'Università di Roma*, 2 (1962), 287–304; A. Haidacher, *Sachkommentar zur Edition des ersten Jahrgangs der Register Papst Innocenz' III. Vorarbeiten aus dem Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* (Vienna 1965). For further bibliography see P. Arató, "Bibliografia Historiae Pontificiae," *AHPont*, 1 (1963), 465–719, 4 (1966), 401–669 (thus far the best bibliography for the history of the papacy and of the Church); *Pontificia Hibernica. Medieval Papal Chancery Documents concerning Ireland (640–1261)*, I (Dublin 1962), 91–182, ed. M. P. Sheehy; F. J. Dunning, "The Letters of Innocent III to Ireland," *Tr*, 18 (1962), 229–53; *Selected Letters of Pope Innocent III concerning England (1198–1216)*, ed. C. R. Cheney and W. H. Semple (London 1953); C. R. Cheney, "The Letters of Pope Innocent III," *BJRL*, 35 (1952), 23–43; *Acta Innocentii Papae III (1198–1216)*, ed. T. Haluscynsky, Pontificia Commissio ad redigendum codicem iuris orientalis, *Fontes*, series III, Vol. II (Vatican City 1944). *Gesta Innocentii III papae* (anonymous, to 1208), ed. L. G. O. F. de Bréquigny and F. J. G. La Porte du Theil (Paris 1791), *PL*, 214, XVII–CCXXVIII, and H. Elkan, *Die Gesta Innocentii III. im Verhältnis zu den Registern* *desselben Papstes* (dissertation, Heidelberg 1876); Y. Lefèvre, "Innocent III et son temps vu de Rome. Étude sur la biographie anonyme de ce pape," *MAH,* 61 (1949), 242–45, regards the *Gesta* as a collection of materials; V. Pfaff, "Die Gesta Innocenz' III. und das Testament Heinrichs VI.," *ZSavRGkan,* 50 (1964), 78–126. There is no adequate scholarly edition. Sermons: *PL,* 217, 313–688, and, in this connection, J. Scuppa, *I sermoni di Innocenzo III* (dissertation, Lateran, Rome 1962). *De sacro altaris mysterio, PL,* 217, 763–964, and, in regard to it, M. Maccarone, "Innocenzo III teologo dell'Eucharistia," *Divinitas,* 10 (1966), 362–412. *De contemptu mundi sive de miseria conditionis humanae, PL,* 217, 701–46. *Biographies and Monographs:* F. Hurter, *Geschichte Innocenz' III. und seiner Zeitgenossen,* 4 vols. (Hamburg, 3d ed. 1841–43); A. Luchaire, *Innocent III,* 6 vols. (Paris 1904–08); C. H. C. Pirie-Gordon, *Innocent the Great. An Essay on his Life and Times* (London 1907); J. Haller, *Innocenz III.,* "Meister der Politik," I (Stuttgart, 2d ed. 1923), 517–59; M. Florin, "Innocenz III. als Schriftsteller und als Papst," *ZKG,* 45 (1926), 344–58; L. E. Binns, *Innocent III* (London 1931); J. Clayton, *Pope Innocent III and his Times* (Milwaukee 1940); C. E. Smith, *Innocent III, Church Defender* (Baton Rouge 1951); S. Packard, *Europe and the Church under Innocent III* (New York 1927); S. Sibilia, *Innocenzo III* (Rome 1951); H. Tillmann, *Papst Innocenz III., Bonner Historische Forschungen,* 3 (Bonn 1954); F. Kempf, *Papsttum und Kaisertum bei Innocenz III., Misc. Hist. Pont.,* 19 (Rome 1954); E. F. Jacob, "Innocent III," *Cambridge Medieval History,* 6 (1926), 1–43, 857–62; M. Maccarone, "Innocenzo III prima del suo Pontificato," *ADRomana,* 66 (1943), 59–134; A. Fliche in *Fliche-Martin,* X, 11–216; G. Martini, *Il pontificato d'Innocenzo III* (Rome 1952); R. Schneider, *Innocenz der Dritte* (Munich 1963, poetical interpretation); J. M. Powell, *Innocent III. Vicar of Christ or Lord of the World?* (Boston 1963).

E. W. Meyer, *Staatstheorien Papst Innocenz' III.* (Bonn 1920); G. Martini, "Traslazione dell'Impero e donazione di Costantino nel pensiero e nella politica d'Innocenzo III," *ASRomana,* 56/57 (1933 f.), 219–362; E. von Strube, *Innocenz' III. politische Korrespondenz und die religiöse Weltherrschaftsidee der Kurie* (dissertation, Berlin 1936); M. Maccarone, *Chiesa e Stato nella dottrina del papa Innocenzo III* (Rome 1941); H. Tillmann, "Zur Frage des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat in Lehre und Praxis Papst Innocenz' III.," *DA,* 9 (1951), 136–81; A. M. Stickler, "Imperator vicarius papae," *MIÖG,* 62 (1954), 165–212; A. Hof, "'Plenitudo potestatis' und 'Imitatio Imperii' zur Zeit Innocenz' III.," *ZKG,* 66 (1954 f.), 39–71; P. A. Van den Baar, *Die kirchliche Lehre der Translatio Imperii Romani* (Rome 1956); W. Goez, *Translatio Imperii* (Tübingen 1958); O. Hageneder, "Über das Sonne-Mond-Gleichnis bei Innocenz III.," *MIÖG,* 65 (1957), 340–68; *idem,* "Exkommunikation und Thronverlust bei Innozenz III.," *RömHM,* 2 (1959), 9–50; *idem,* "Das päpstliche Recht der Fürstenabsetzung (1150–1250)," *AHPont,* 1 (1963), 53–95; D. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century* (London 1961); H. Hoffmann, "Die beiden Schwerter im hohen Mittelalter," *DA,* 20 (1965), 78–114 (Innocent's contribution to the theory); B. Tierney, "The Continuity of Papal Political Theory in the Thirteenth Century. Some Methodological Considerations," *MS,* 27 (1965), 227–45; J. A. Watt, *The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century* (London 1965).

19. *The Spiritual Monarch as Arbiter Mundi*

Sources

Innocent's *gesta* and *registra* (see bibliography for Chapter 18).

Literature

The Papal State: G. Ermini, *La libertà comunale nello Stato della Chiesa,* 2 vols. (Rome 1926 f.); H. Tillmann, "Das Schicksal der päpstlichen Rekuperationen nach dem Friedensabkommen zwischen Philipp von Schwaben und der römischen Kirche," *HJ,* 45 (1931), 341–65; J. Seeger, *Die Reorganisation des Kirchenstaates unter Innocenz III. Grundlagen und Durchführung* (dissertation, Kiel 1937); G. Ermini, "Caratteri della sovranità temporale dei papi nel secolo XIII e XIV," *ZSavRGkan,* 27 (1938); many of Ermini's works have to do with the material treated in this chapter, *cf.* the list in D. Waley *(infra),* 332 f.; B. Bartolini, "Per la storia del Senato Romano nei secoli XII e XIII," *BIStIAM,* 60 (1946); D. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century* (London 1961). Waley, 325–31, also lists the written sources for local history.

The Vassal States: F. Baethgen, *Die Regentschaft Papst Innocenz' III. im Königreich Sizilien, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte,* 44 (Heidelberg 1914); R. Ries, "Regesten der Kaiserin Constanze, Königin von Sizilien, Gemahlin Heinrichs VI.," *QFIAB,* 18 (1926), 30–100; T. C. van Cleve, *Markward of Annweiler and the Sicilian Regency* (Princeton 1937); L. Böhm, *Johann von Brienne, König von Jerusalem, Kaiser von Konstantinopel* (Heidelberg 1938); N. Kamp, *Istituzioni comunali in Viterbo nel Medioevo,* I: *Consoli, Podestà, Balivi e Capitani nei secoli XII e XIII, Biblioteca di Studi Viterbesi,* 1 (Viterbo 1963); A. Sacchetti-Sassetti, "Rieti e gli Urslingen," *ADRomana,* 85/86 (1962 f.), 3–24; A. Marongiu, "A Model State in the Middle Ages: the Norman and Swabian Kingdom of Sicily," *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 6 (1963 f.), 307–24.

Spain: D. Mansilla, "Innocencio III y los reinos hispanos," *Anthologica annua. Publicaciones del instituto español de estudios eclesiásticos,* 2 (1954), 9 ff.; J. Vincke, "Estado e Iglesia en la historia de la Corona de Aragón (siglos XI–XIV)," Ponencias VII. *Congreso de Historia de la Corona de Aragón* (Barcelona 1962), 289–326; D. Mansilla, "El Cardenal hispano Pelayo Gaitán (1206–1213)," *Anthologica annua,* 1 (1953), 11–66; J. Vincke, "Der Eheprozess Peters II. von Aragón (1206–1213)," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 5 (Münster 1935), 108–89.

Portugal: A. Herculana, F. L. Gonzaga de Azevedo, and D. M. Gomes dos Santos, *Historia de Portugal* (to 1250), 6 vols. (Lisbon 1940–44), especially Vols. IV and V; H. V. Livermore, *A New History of Portugal* (Cambridge 1966), 50–99; *Cronica dos sete primeiros reis de Portugal,* ed. C. Silva Tarouca, 3 vols. (Lisbon 1952 f.); *Cronica de cinco reis,* ed. A. Magalhãis Basto (Oporto 1945); C. Erdmann, *Papsturkunden in Portugal* (Göttingen 1927); *idem,* O *Papado e Portugal* (Lisbon 1935); D. Mansilla, "Disputas diocesanas entre Toledo, Braga y Compostela en los siglos XII al XV," *Anthologica annua,* 3 (1955).

Hungary: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia,* 2 vols. (Rome 1859 f.); W. Fraknói, *Monumenta Vaticana historiam Hungariae illustrantia,* 6 vols. (Budapest 1884–91); *idem, The Ecclesiastical and Political Relations of Hungary with the Holy See,* 3 vols. (Budapest 1901–03, in Hungarian).

The Bulgarian Question: see the introduction to T. Haluscynsky, *Acta Innocentii papae III. (1198–1216)* (Rome 1944).

England: see the bibliography for this section. Also: K. Norgate, *John Lackland* (London 1902); E. Gütschow, *Innocenz III. und England* (Berlin 1905); K. Norgate, *Richard the Lion Heart* (London 1924); H. Tillmann, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in England bis zur Beendigung der Legation Gualas 1218* (Bonn 1926); Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Cambridge 1931); F. M. Powicke, *Stephan Langton* (Oxford 1935); M. D. Knowles, "The Canterbury Election of 1205/6," *EHR,* 53 (1938), 211–30; H. G. Richardson, "The Morrow of the Great Charter," *BJRL,* 28 (1944), 422–43, 29 (1945), 184–200; F. M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1947); C. R. Cheney, "King John and the Papal Interdict," *BJRL,* 31 (1948), 295–317; S. Painter, *The Reign of*

King John (London 1950, Baltimore 1949); *Acta Stephani Langton*, ed. K. Major, Canterbury and York Society, 118 (Oxford 1950); C. R. Cheney, "King John's Reaction to the Interdict on England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 31 (1949), 129–50; *Magna Carta Libertatum*, ed. H. Wagner (Bern 1951); C. R. Cheney, "The Letters of Pope Innocent III," *BJRL*, 35 (1952), 23–43; *idem*, "The Eve of Magna Carta," *BJRL*, 38 (1956), 311–41; J. C. Holt, "The Making of the Magna Carta," *EHR*, 72 (1957), 401–22; *idem*, *The Northerners. A Study in the Reign of King John* (Oxford 1961); W. L. Warren, *King John* (London 1961); J. C. Holt, *King John* (London 1963).

The Empire: F. Kempf, *Papsttum und Kaisertum bei Innocenz III. Die geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen seiner Thronstreitpolitik* (Rome 1954), basic; *idem*, *Regestum Innocentii III papae super negotio Romani Imperii*, *Misc. Hist. Pont.*, 9 (Rome 1947); *idem*, "Die zwei Versprechen Ottos IV. an die römische Kirche," *Festschrift für E. E. Stengel* (Münster and Cologne 1952), 359–84; J. Haller, "Innocenz III. und Otto IV.," *Papsttum und Kaisertum, Festschrift P. Kehr* (Munich 1926), 475–507; H. Hirsch, "Das Recht auf die Königserhebung durch Papst und Kaiser im hohen Mittelalter," *Festschrift E. Heymann* (Weimar 1940), 209–49; H. Mitteis, *Die deutsche Königswahl. Ihre Rechtsgrundlagen bis zur Goldenen Bulle* (Munich and Vienna, 2d ed. 1944, reprinted Darmstadt 1965); A. Stickler, "Imperator Vicarius Papae. Die Lehren der französisch-deutschen Dekretistenschule des 12. und beginnenden 13. Jahrhunderts über die Beziehungen zwischen Papst und Kaiser," *MIÖG*, 62 (1954), 165–212; R. Folz, *L'idée d'empire en Occident* (Paris 1953); W. Winkelmann, *König Philipp von Schwaben (1197–1208)*, *JbbDG* (Leipzig 1873, reprinted Darmstadt 1963); *idem*, *Kaiser Otto IV. von Braunschweig (1208–18)* (Leipzig 1878, reprinted Darmstadt 1963); F. Baethgen, "Die Exkommunikation Philipps von Schwaben" (first 1913), *Mediaevalia*, I (Stuttgart 1960), 85–92; *idem*, "Kaiser Friedrich II. (1194–1250)" (first 1956), *Mediaevalia*, I (Stuttgart 1960), 93–109; A. J. Walter, *Die deutsche Reichskanzlei während des Endkampfes zwischen Staufern und Welfen* (Innsbruck and Leipzig 1938), and, in this connection, the sources and literature for Chapter 25.

France: see the bibliography for this section. Also: O. Cartellieri, *Die Schlacht bei Bouvines (27. Juli 1214) im Rahmen der europäischen Politik* (Leipzig 1914); R. H. Tenbrock, *Eherecht und Ehepolitik bei Innocenz III.* (dissertation, Münster 1933); A. Hadengue, *Bouvines, victoire créatrice* (Paris 1935); C. Petit-Dutaillis, *The Feudal Monarchy in France and England from the Tenth to the Thirteenth Century* (reprinted London 1964); R. Davidsohn, *Philipp II. August von Frankreich und Ingeborg* (Stuttgart 1888), and E. Michael in *ZKTh*, 14 (1890), 562–69; M. Jallut, *Philippe-Auguste, fondateur de l'unité française* (Paris 1963).

Scandinavia, Poland, and the Balkan Peninsula: G. Inger, *Das kirchliche Visitationsinstitut im mittelalterlichen Schweden* (Lund 1961); *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana. Analecta Vaticana 1207–1366*, ed. L. Ptasnik, 2 vols. (Cracow 1903–04); K. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin and Leipzig 1930), 37–41; N. Banescu, *Un problème d'histoire médiévale: création et caractère du second empire bulgare (1185)* (Bucharest 1943); R. L. Wolff, "The 'Second Bulgarian Empire.' Its Origin and History to 1204," *Speculum*, 24 (1949), 167–206; L. Tautu, "Le Conflit entre Johanitsa Asen et Émeric roi de Hongrie (1202–04). Contribution à l'étude du problème du second empire valaque-bulgare," *Mélanges Eugene Tisserant*, III, *SteT*, 233 (Rome 1964), 367–93.

20. *The Fourth Crusade and the Latin Empire*

SOURCES

Geoffrey of Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, edited and translated by E. Faral, *Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-âge*, 2 vols. (Paris 1938 f.); Robert of Clari, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. P. Lauer, *Classiques de l'histoire de France au*

moyen-âge (Paris 1924); Gunther of Paris, *Historia Constantinopolitana,* ed. P. Riant (Geneva 1875); P. Riant, *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae* (Geneva 1877), contains, among other things, the brief reports of the Anonymous of Halberstadt, *De peregrinacione in Graeciam,* of the Anonymous of Soissons, and of the Anonymous of Langres; C. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin 1873), gives (93–98) a Latin translation of a section of the Russian *Chronicle of Novgorod* on the conquest of Constantinople, which is presumably the work of a Russian eyewitness. Accounts of the Fourth Crusade are also given in the chronicles already cited in the bibliography for this section: *Chronica Regia Coloniensis,* Alberic of Trois-Fontaines, Rigord's *Gesta Philippi Augusti,* Roger of Howden, etc. Important sources are also the *Gesta Innocentii III* and that pope's letters (bibliography for this section). The most important Greek source is the work of Nicetas Choniates, ed. J. Bekker, *Historia, CSHB* (Bonn 1835), selections from which are translated into German, with introduction and commentary, by F. Grabler, *Die Kreuzfahrer erobern Konstantinopel, Byzantinische Geschichtsschreiber,* 9 (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1958); *Crusaders as Conquerors. The Chronicle of Morea,* translated and edited by H. E. Lurier (New York 1964), and, in this connection, P. Topping in *Speculum,* 40 (1965), 735–42.

LITERATURE

H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* bibliography, nos. 2119–59; A. Luchaire, *Innocent III: La Question d'Orient* (Paris 1907); C. Diehl, "The Fourth Crusade and the Latin Empire," *Cambridge Medieval History,* 4 (1923), 415–43; 850 f., new ed., IV, 1 (1966), 275–330; *Grousset,* III (1936), 169–77; *Runciman,* III (1954), 107–131; E. H. McNeal, "The Fourth Crusade," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II (1962), 153–85; S. de Mundo Lo, *Cruzados en Byzancio. La cuarta cruzada a la luz de las fuentes latinas y orientales* (Buenos Aires 1958); J. Lognon, *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroi de Villehardouin* (Paris 1939); H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig,* 2 vols. (Gotha 1905–20); A. Frolow, *Recherches sur la déviation de la IV^e croisade vers Constantinople* (Paris 1955); R. Cressi, "Venezia e la quarta crociata," *Archivio Veneto,* 81 (1951), 1 ff.; W. M. Daly, "Christian Fraternity, the Crusaders and the Security of Constantinople," *MS,* 22 (1960), 43–91 (especially 78–91); B. Primov, "The Papacy, the Fourth Crusade and Bulgaria," *Byzantino Bulgarica,* 1 (1962), 183–211; D. E. Queller, "Innocent III and the Crusader-Venetian Treaty of 1201," *Med et Hum,* 15 (1963), 31–34.

The Latin Empire: Sources: the same as those for the Fourth Crusade. Also: Henry of Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'Empereur Henri de Constantinople,* ed. J. Lognon (Paris 1948); A. Heisenberg, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion, AAM* (1922 f.).

Literature: H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* bibliography, nos. 2771–88; J. Lognon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris 1949); E. Gerland, *Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreichs* (Homburg v. d. Höhe 1905), only Vol. I, extending to 1216, appeared (reprinted Darmstadt 1966); R. L. Wolff, "Romania. The Latin Empire of Constantinople," *Speculum,* 23 (1948), 1–34; *idem,* "Baldwin of Flanders and Hainaut, First Latin Emperor of Constantinople. His Life, Death and Resurrection (1172–1225)," *Speculum,* 27 (1952), 281–322; *idem,* "Mortgage and Redemption of an Emperor's Son. Castile and the Latin Empire of Constantinople," *Speculum,* 29 (1954), 45–84; *idem,* "The Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204–1261)," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II (1962), 187–234; L. Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des lateinischen Patriarchats von Konstantinopel* (Weimar 1938); R. L. Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople (1204–1261)," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers,* 8 (1954), 225–303; *idem,* "The Organisation of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople," *Tr,* 6 (1948), 33–60; P. L'Huil-

lier, "La nature des relations ecclésiastiques gréco-latines après la prise de Constantinople par les croisés," *XI. Intern. Byzantinisten-Kongress* (Munich 1958), 314–20; A. Gardner, *The Lascarids of Nicaea. The Story of an Empire in Exile* (Amsterdam 1964); J. Folda, "The Fourth Crusade, 1201–1203. Some Reconsiderations," *Byzslav,* 26 (1965), 277–90; W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant: A History of Frankish Greece, 1204–1566* (London 1908; reprint 1964).

21. *Reform and the Struggle against Heresy*

SOURCES

The Albigensian Crusade: Peter of Les Vaux-de-Cernay, *Hystoria Albigensis,* ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon, 3 vols. (Paris 1926–39), the best eyewitness report (the author was a nephew of Abbot Guy of Les Vaux-de-Cernay, who in 1212 became Bishop of Carcassonne); French translation of the preceding, *Histoire Albigeoise,* by P. Guébin and H. Maisonneuve (Paris 1951); William of Tudela, *Chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois,* ed. P. Meyer, 2 vols. (Paris 1875–79) (a new edition by E. Martin-Chabot [Paris 1931–57] is available thus far in 2 vols., bringing text and a new French translation down to 1217; William of Tudela narrates to the summer of 1213, when an anonymous writer continues the story); William of Puylaurens, *Cronica* or *Historia Albigensium,* latest edition by Beyssier, "Guillaume de Puylaurens et sa chronique," *Troisième Mélange d'histoire du moyen-âge* (Paris 1904), 85–175; on the preceding see Y. Dosset, "Le Chroniqueur Guillaume de Puylaurens," *Annales du Midi,* 65 (1953), 343–53; the chronicle goes to 1272, and it is thought that William composed the parts on the crusade *ca.* 1250. Important are the letters of Innocent III and Honorius III. The conciliar *acta* are in *Mansi,* XXII and XXIII. Also to be consulted are A. Molinier, "Catalogue des actes de Raimond VI et de Raimond VII," *Histoire générale de Languedoc,* VIII, 1940–2008, and *idem,* "Catalogue des actes de Simon et d'Amauri de Montfort," *BÉCh,* 34 (1873), 153–203, 445–501.

LITERATURE

Reform: Fliche-Martin, X, 139–93; H. Tillman, *Papst Innocenz III.* (Bonn 1954), 152–85; M. Maccarone, "Riforma e sviluppo della vita religiosa con Innocenzo III," *RSTI,* 16 (1962), 29–72; U. Berlière, "Les chapitres généraux de l'ordre de saint Benoît," *RBén,* 18 (1901), 364–71; *idem,* "Innocent III et la réorganisation des monastères bénédictins," *RBén,* 32 (1920), 22–42, 145–59; J. B. Mahn, *L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement des origines au milieu du XIII^e^ siècle (1098–1265)* (Paris 1945); P. Viard, *Histoire de la dîme ecclésiastique dans le royaume de France aux XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles (1150–1313)* (Paris 1912); D. W. Robertson, "Frequency of Preaching in Thirteenth-Century England," *Speculum,* 24 (1949), 377–88; H. Winterer, "Zur Priesterehe in Spanien bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters," *ZSavRGkan,* 52 (1966), 370–83.

The Albigensian Crusade: basic is the *Histoire générale de Languedoc,* by C. Devic and J. Vaissette, vols. 6–8 in the edition by A. Molinier *et al.* (Toulouse 1879–1904); A. Luchaire, *Innocent III: La Croisade des Albigeois* (Paris, 3d ed. 1911); P. Belperron, *La Croisade contre les Albigeois et l'union du Languedoc à la France (1209–49)* (Paris 1942); A. P. Evans, "The Albigensian Crusade," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II (Philadelphia 1962), 277–324, with bibliography for particular questions.

The Cathari and the Waldensians: see the bibliography for Chapter 13. Also: A. Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIII^e^ siècle: Le Liber de duobus principiis, suivi d'un fragment*

de rituel cathare, Institutum Historicum Fratrum Praedicatorum (Rome 1939); C. Thouzellier, "La profession trinitaire du vaudois Durand de Huesca," *RThAM,* 27 (1960), 267–89; *idem,* "Controverses vaudoises-cathares à la fin du XII^{e} siècle," *AHD,* 35 (1960), 137–227; *idem, Un traité cathare inédit du début du XIII^{e} siècle d'après le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca, Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* 37 (Louvain 1961); *idem, Une somme anti-cathare. Le Liber contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense,* 32 (Louvain 1964), and, in regard to it, B. Töpfer in *ThL,* 92 (1967), 118–20; *Hauck,* IV (Leipzig, 5th ed. 1925), 891–910.

22. *The Fourth Lateran Council*

SOURCES

A critical edition of the conciliar texts is still lacking; those collected in *Mansi,* XXII, 953–1086, must be examined individually in regard to their trustworthiness. The last edition, by C. Leonardi in *COD* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 2d ed. 1962), 203–47, is not definitive. The decrees were transmitted especially by the *Compilatio IV* of Johannes Teutonicus (1216), which gives all of them except canon 42; from here they were all adopted into Gregory IX's *Liber Extra,* except canons 42 and 49. Their impact on the provincial and diocesan synods of the thirteenth century can be demonstrated by means of the relevant editions. For France see O. Pontal, *Statuts synodaux des diocèses de l'ancienne France du XIII^{e} à la fin du XVIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1964); for Poland, J. Sawicki, *Concilia Poloniae,* 9 vols. (Warsaw, Lublin, Poznań, and Breslau 1943 ff.); for England, F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney, *Councils and Synods with other Documents relating to the English Church,* II, 1 (Oxford 1964), continuation of *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents,* ed. A. West Haddan and W. Stubbs, 3 vols. (Oxford 1871–73).

For lists of participants: A. Luchaire, "Un document retrouvé," *Journal des Savants,* new series, 3 (1905), 557–67; S. Ketrzynski, "Wiadomosc o udziale Polski w IV soborze Lateranenskim," *Przeglad Historyczny,* 3 (1906), 139–42; J. Werner, "Die Teilnehmerliste des Laterankonzils vom Jahre 1215," *NA,* 31 (1906), 577–92; J. F. Rivera, "Personajes hispanos asistentes en 1215 al IV concilio de Letrán," *Hispania Sacra,* 4 (1951), 335–55.

Contemporary Reports: Richard of San Germano, *Chronica priora,* ed. A. Gaudenzi (Naples 1888), 90–94, ed. C. A. Garufi, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores,* VII, 2 (2d ed. 1938), 61–73; the Anonymous of Giessen, "A New Eyewitness Account of the Fourth Lateran Council," ed. S. Kuttner and A. García y García, *Tr,* 20 (1964), 123–29, together with commentary, 115–78; English voices in: Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora,* II, ed. H. R. Luard, *Rolls Series,* 57 (London 1874); Walter of Coventry, *Memoriale,* ed. W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series,* 58 (London 1865); *Gesta abbatum S. Albani,* ed. H. T. Riley, *Rolls Series,* 28 (London 1865).

The treatise of Joachim of Fiore on the Trinity is lost, but one should consult *Joachimi abbatis Liber contra Lombardum. Scuola di Gioacchino da Fiore,* ed. C. Ottaviano (Rome 1934); *Scritti minori,* ed. E. Buonaiutti, *FontiStIt,* 78 (Rome 1936); F. Russo, "Un documento sulla condanna di Gioacchino da Fiore nel 1215," *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania,* 20 (1951), 69–73.

The discussions dealing with the Albigensian problem: *Chanson de la croisade albigeoise,* ed. P. Meyer, II (Paris 1879) (Société de l'Histoire de France au moyen-âge); Peter of Les Vaux-de-Cernay, *Hystoria Albigensis,* ed. P. Guébin and E. Lyon. Société de l'Histoire de France, 3 vols. (Paris 1926–39), French translation, *Histoire Albigeoise,* by P. Guébin and H. Maisonneuve (Paris 1951).

LITERATURE

Hefele-Leclercq, V, 1316–18; A. Luchaire, *Innocent III: Le concile de Latran et la réforme de l'Église* (Paris 1908); M. Gibbs and J. Lang, *Bishops and Reform, 1215–1272, with Special Reference to the Lateran Council of 1215* (Oxford 1934); H. Tillmann, *Innocenz III.* (Bonn 1954), 152–68; A. García y García, "El concilio IV de Letrán (1215) y sus comentarios," *Tr,* 14 (1958), 484–502; M. Maccarone, "Il IV Concilio Lateranense," *Divinitas,* 5 (1961), 270–98; R. Foreville, *Latran I, II, III et Latran IV, Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques,* 6 (Paris 1965), the best presentation thus far.

Participants: G. Tangl, *Die Teilnehmer an den allgemeinen Konzilien des Mittelalters* (Weimar 1922); H. Krabbo, "Die deutschen Bischöfe auf dem 4. Laterankonzil von 1215," *QFIAB,* 10 (1907), 275–300; M. and C. Dickson, "Le Cardinal Robert de Courson. Sa vie," *AHD,* 9 (1934), 53–142.

Preparation: J. W. Baldwin, "The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals," *Speculum,* 36 (1961), 613–36; B. Tierney, "'Tria quippe distinguit iudicia.' A Note on Innocent III's Decretal 'Per Venerabilem'," *Speculum,* 37 (1962), 48–59.

The Decrees: E. Friedberg, *Die Canones-Sammlungen zwischen Gratian und Bernhard von Pavia* (Leipzig 1887); F. Gillmann, "Der Kommentar des Vincentius Hispanus zu den Kanones des vierten Laterankonzils (1215)," *AkathKR,* 109 (1929), 223–74; S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik,* I (Vatican City 1937), 369–71; *idem,* "Johannes Teutonicus, das vierte Laterankonzil und die Compilatio Quarta," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati,* V, *SteT,* 125 (Rome 1946), 608–34; F. Gillmann, "Hat Johannes Teutonicus zu den Konstitutionen des 4. Laterankonzils (1215) als solchen einen Apparat verfasst?" *AkathKR,* 117 (1937), 55–68; A. García y García, "Los comentarios de los canonistas a las constituciones del Concilio IV de Letrán (1215)," *Congrès de droit canonique médiéval de Louvain et Bruxelles (22–26 juillet 1956)* (Louvain 1959), 151–60; C. R. Cheney, "The Decretal Collections before Compilatio IV, Pragensis, Palatina I and Abrincensis II," *Tr,* 15 (1959), 464–83; H. J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (Saint Louis 1937), 236–96.

Effect of the Decrees: M. Maccarone, "Riforma e sviluppo della vita religiosa con Innocenzo III," *RSTI,* 16 (1962), 29–72; U. Berlière, "Les chapitres généraux de l'ordre de Saint Benoît," *RBén,* 18 (1901), 364–71; *idem,* "Innocent III et la réorganisation des monastères bénédictins," *RBén,* 32 (1920), 22–42, 145–59; J. B. Mahn, *L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement des origines au milieu du XIIIᵉ siècle (1098–1265)* (Paris 1945); P. Viard, *Histoire de la dîme ecclésiastique dans le royaume de France aux XIIᵉ et XIIIᵉ siècles (1150–1313)* (Paris 1912); D. W. Robertson, "Frequency of Preaching in Thirteenth-Century England," *Speculum,* 24 (1949), 377–88; K. G. Hugelmann, "Der Sachsenspiegel und das vierte Lateranische Konzil," *ZSavRGkan,* 13 (1924), 427–87; J. Dauvillier, *Le mariage dans le droit classique de l'Église depuis le Décret de Gratien (1140) jusqu'à la mort de Clément V (1314)* (Paris 1933); M. Peuchmaurd, "Le prêtre ministre de la parole dans la théologie du XIIᵉ siècle," *RThAM,* 29 (1962), 52–76; A. McDevitt, "The Episcopate as an Order and Sacrament on the Eve of the High Scholastic Period," *FStudies,* 20 (1960), 96–148; P. A. Kirsch, "Der sacerdos proprius in der abendländischen Kirche vor dem Jahre 1215," *AkathKR,* 84 (1904), 527–37; A. Teetaert, *La confession aux laïques dans l'Église latine depuis le VIIIᵉ jusqu'au XIVᵉ siècle ...* (Paris 1926); P. Browe, *Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1940); G. G. Meerssemann, *Dossier de l'ordre de la pénitence au XIIIᵉ siècle* (Fribourg 1961); R. Foreville, "L'idée de Jubilé chez les théologiens et les canonistes (XIIᵉ–XIIIᵉ siècles) avant l'institution du Jubilé romain (1300)," *RHE,* 56 (1961), 401–23; P. Michaud-Quantin, *Sommes de casuistique et manuels de confession au moyen âge XIIᵉ–XVIᵉ siècles, Analecta Mediaevalia Namurcensia,* 13 (Louvain 1962); R. von Heckel, "Das Aufkommen der ständigen Prokuratoren an der päpstlichen Kurie im 13. Jahrhundert," *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle,* II, *SteT,* 38 (Rome 1924), 290–321.

Effect of the Decrees on Provincial and Diocesan Synods: C. R. Cheney, *English Synodalia*

of the Thirteenth Century (Oxford 1940); *idem*, "The Earliest English Diocesan Statutes," *EHR*, 50 (1935), 198–216; L. Guizard, "Recherches sur le texte des statuts synodaux d'Eudes de Sully, évêque de Paris," *Bulletin d'Information de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes*, 5 (1956), 53–59; P. C. Boeren, "Les plus anciens statuts du diocèse de Cambrai (XIII^e siècle)," *RDC*, 3 (1953); O. Pontal, "Les plus anciens statuts synodaux d'Angers et leur expansion dans les diocèses de l'Ouest de la France," *RHÉF*, 46 (1960), 54–67; O. Dobiache-Rojdestvensky, *La vie paroissiale en France d'après les actes épiscopaux* (Paris 1911); E. Diebold, *La pratique religieuse d'après les statuts synodaux (du IV^e concile du Latran au concile de Trente). Mémoire de l'École pratique des Hautes Études* (Paris, n. d.); *idem*, "L'application en France du canon 51 du IV^e concile du Latran d'après les anciens statuts synodaux," *L'année canonique*, 2 (1951), 187–95.

23. *The Mendicant Orders*

Francis of Assisi

SOURCES

Opuscula S. Francisci, ed. L. Lemmens (Florence and Quaracchi, 2d ed. 1941); H. Boehmer, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Franciscus von Assisi* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904, 2d ed. 1930); K. Esser and L. Hardick, *Die Schriften des heiligen Franz von Assisi* (Werl, 2d ed. 1956); K. Esser, *Das Testament des heiligen Franz von Assisi, Vorreformationsgeschichtliche Forschungen*, 15 (Münster 1949); *idem*, "Der Brief des heiligen Franziskus an den heiligen Antonius von Padua," *FStud*, 31 (1949), 135–51; Vittorio Branca, "Cantico di Frate Sole," *AFrH*, 41 (1949), 1–87; *Canticle of the Sun* in German translation by O. Karrer (Zürich 1942); G. Sabatelli, "Neue Literatur zum Sonnengesang," *AFrH*, 51 (1958), 3–24; Thomas of Celano, *Vita I* (1228) *et Vita II* (1247) *S. Francisci Assis.* and *Tractatus de miraculis S. Francisci, AFranc*, 10 (Quaracchi 1926–28); Bonaventure, *Legendae duae de vita S. Francisci* (1263), *Opera S. Bonaventurae*, 8 (Quaracchi 1898), published separately 1941; *Testimonia minora saeculi XIII de S. Francisco Assis.*, ed. L. Lemmens (Quaracchi 1926); *Legenda trium sociorum*, ed. G. Abate, *MF*, 39 (1939), 375–432; *Speculum perfectionis, auctore fratre Leone*, ed. P. Sabatier (Paris 1898); in 2 vols., *British Society of Franciscan Studies*, 13, 17 (Manchester 1928–31); also, ed. L. Lemmens (Quaracchi 1901); *Actus S. Francisci et sociorum eius*, ed. P. Sabatier (Paris 1902); *I Fioretti di San Francesco*, ed. P. Sabatier (Paris 1902); also ed. G. Pagnani (Rome 1959); A. G. Little, *Some Recently Discovered Franciscan Documents* (London 1926); *idem*, *Franciscan Papers, Lists and Documents* (Manchester 1943); criticism and account of the problems raised by the sources especially in A. Fortini, *Nova Vita di San Francesco*, 4 vols. (Assisi, 2d ed. 1959); J. R. H. Moorman, *The Sources for the Life of St. Francis* (Manchester 1940).

LITERATURE

Biographies: P. Sabatier (Paris 1893, last ed., Paris 1931); C. Schnürer (Mainz, 2d ed. 1907); J. Jørgensen (Copenhagen 1907 and later); C. Cuthbert (London 1912); A. Fortini (Milan 1926); *idem*, *Nova Vita di S. Francesco*, 4 vols. (Assisi, 2d ed. 1959); J. R. H. Moorman (London 1950); O. Englebert (Paris, 2d ed. 1957); H. Felder, *Die Ideale des heiligen Franz von Assisi* (Paderborn, 4th ed. 1951); P. Sabatier, *Collection d'Études et de Documents sur l'histoire religieuse et littéraire du moyen-âge*, 8 vols. (Paris 1898 ff.); W. Goetz, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte des heiligen Franziskus* (Gotha 1904); J. Campbell, *Les écrits de s. François devant la critique* (Werl 1954).
The Stigmata: *cf.* F. van den Borne in *FStud*, 6 (1917), 67–71, with bibliography; A. Groeteken, *Franz von Assisi in der Poesie der Völker* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1912); E. Scott

Davison, *Forerunners of St. Francis* (Boston 1927); A. Styra, *Franz von Assisi in der neueren deutschen Literatur* (Breslau 1928); F. van den Borne, "Een rondgang langs de moderne F.-biografieën," *Franciscana* (St. Truiden 1949, 1950); K. Esser, "Franziskus von Assisi und die Katharer seiner Zeit," *AFrH*, 51 (1958), 225–64; O. Bonmann, "Franziskus von Assisi," *LThK*, IV (2d ed. 1960), 231–34.

Iconography: H. Thode, *Franz von Assisi* (Vienna, 4th ed. 1934); V. Facchinetti, *L'Iconografia Francescana* (Milan 1924); B. Kleinschmidt, *St. Franziskus in Kunst und Legende* (Mönchen-Gladbach, 5th ed. 1926); B. Bughetti in *AFrH*, 19 (1926), 636–732; M. Villain, *St. François et les peintres d'Assise* (Paris 1941); L. Cellucci, *Le leggende francescane del secolo XIII nel loro aspetto artistico* (Modena, 2d ed. 1957).

Spirituality: H. Felder, *Die Ideale des heiligen Franziskus von Assisi* (Paderborn, 4th ed. 1951); J. Leclercq and F. Vandenbroucke, *La spiritualité du moyen-âge* (Paris 1961), 299–344; E. Longpré, "Saint François d'Assise," *DSAM*, 5 (1964), 1268–1303, with comprehensive bibliography. Up-to-date bibliographies in *AFrH, FStud, MF, AnBoll, RHE;* complete from 1931 in *CollFr;* also in individual editions.

The Friars Minor

SOURCES

BullFr; Bullarii Franciscani Epitome, ed. C. Eufel (Quaracchi 1908); L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, 8 vols. (to 1540) (Lyons and Rome, 1625–54), 2d ed., 25 vols. (to 1622) (Rome, Naples and Quaracchi, 1731–1886), reprinted as Editio III auctior et emendata, 31 vols. (Quaracchi 1931–56); *Annales Minorum continuati*, by A. Chiappini *et al.*, Vols. 26–31 (1623–70) (Quaracchi and Rome 1933–56); *Documenta antiqua Franciscana*, ed. L. Lemmens, 3 vols. (Quaracchi 1901 f.); L. Wadding, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (Rome, 3d ed. 1906), Supplementum, 2 vols., ed. J. H. Sbaralea (Rome 1805 f.); Wadding-Sbaralea, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*, nova editio (to 1780), by A. Nardecchia and A. Chiappini, 4 vols. (Rome 1906–36); *Chronologia historico-legalis seraphici ordinis*, 4 vols. (Naples, Venice, and Rome 1650–1795); *Analecta Franciscana* (chronicles, etc.), 10 vols. (Quaracchi 1885–1951); *Chronica Fratris Jordani de Jano, Collection d'études et de documents*, 6, ed. H. Boehmer (Paris 1908); *Chronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam* (to 1272), ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS*, 32 (1905–13), and O. Holder-Egger in *NA*, 37 (1912), 163–218, 38 (1913), 469–81; ed. F. Bernini, 2 vols. (Bari 1942), and, in this connection, *AFrH*, 48 (1955), 436–41; F. Ehrle, "Die ältesten Redaktionen der Generalkonstitutionen des Franziskanerordens," *ALKGMA*, 6 (1892), 1–138; D. Mandic, *De legislatione antiqua Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, I (1210–21) (Mostar 1924).

LITERATURE

Heimbucher, 3d ed., I, 656–828, II, 661–63; K. Müller, *Die Anfänge des Minoritenordens und der Bussbruderschaften* (Breslau 1885); H. Felder, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden bis um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg 1904); H. Holzapfel, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1909); A. Léon, *Histoire de l'ordre des Frères Mineurs* (Paris 1954); Gratien de Paris, *Histoire de la fondation et de l'évolution de l'Ordre des Frères Mineurs au XIII^e siècle* (Paris 1928); P. M. Sevesi, *L'ordine dei frati minori*, 3 vols. (Milan 1942–60); A. Gemelli, *Il Francescanesimo* (Milan, 7th ed. 1956); A. Zawart, *A History of Franciscan Preaching and Preachers (1209–1927)* (New York 1928); A. Masseron, *Les Franciscains* (Paris 1931); F. Vernet, *Les ordres mendiants* (Paris 1933); E. Benz, *Ecclesia spiritualis, Kirchenidee und Geschichtstheologie der franziskanischen Reformation* (Stuttgart 1934); F. de Sessevalle, *Histoire*

générale de l'Ordre de S. François, Part I: *Le Moyen-Age*, 2 vols. (Paris 1935–37); R. M. Huber, *A Documented History of the Franciscan Order (1182–1517)* (Milwaukee 1944); A. Matanic, *Compendio di storia dell'Ordine dei frati minori*, I (Rome 1956); D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, I (Cambridge 1948); L. Cassut, *Die älteste franziskanische Lebensform* (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1955); S. Clasen, "Franziskaner," *LThK*, IV (2d ed. 1960), 273–79; B. Mathis, *Die Privilegien des Franziskanerordens* (Paderborn 1927); B. von Wolfenhagen, "Das franziskanische Privilegienrecht," *CollFr*, 4 (1934), 337–62; R. B. Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government* (Elias to Bonaventure) (Cambridge 1959); P. Gemelli, "Giacomo da Vitry e le origini del movimento francescano," *Aevum*, 39 (1965), 474–95; K. Esser, *Anfänge und ursprüngliche Zielsetzungen des Ordens der Minderbrüder, Studia et documenta franciscana*, 4 (Leiden 1966); R. de Nantes, "La première prédication franciscaine," *Éfranc*, 30 (1913), 357–77; A. Murith, "Pour l'histoire de la prédication franciscaine," *MF*, 39 (1939), 433–48; L. Zarncke, *Der Anteil des Kardinal Ugolino an der Ausbildung der drei Orden des heiligen Franz* (Leipzig 1930).

Periodicals: *Éfranc; AFrH; FStud; MF; CollFr; Antonianum; Analecta ordinis minorum capuccinorum* (1937 ff.); *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* (Düsseldorf 1934 f.); etc.

Spread of the Order: *Provinciale ordinis fratrum minorum vetustissimum*, ed. C. Eubel (Quaracchi 1892); *Die Chroniken der Minderbrüder Jordan von Giano und Thomas von Eccleston*, ed. L. Hardick (Werl 1957) (Germany and England); *Bavaria Franciscana antiqua*, ed. J. Glatz (Ulm 1954 ff.); *Alemania Franciscana antique*, ed. J. Glatz (Ulm 1956 ff.); C. Eubel, *Geschichte der oberdeutschen Minoritenprovinz* (Würzburg 1886); *Thomas de Eccleston, Liber de adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam*, ed. A. G. Little and J. R. H. Moorman (Manchester, 2d ed. 1951); V. Green, *The Franciscans in Medieval English Life (1224–1348)* (Paterson, N. J. 1939); J. R. H. Moorman, *The Grey Friars in Cambridge (1225–1538)* (Cambridge 1952); M. Schoengen, *Monasticon Batavum*, I (Amsterdam 1941); M. Roncaglia, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Ordine Francescano*, I, *Storia della provincia della Terra Santa*, 1: *I Francescani in Oriente durante la crociata* (Cairo 1954); E. Lempp, *Frère Élie de Cortone, Étude biographique, Collection d'études et de documents*, 3 (Paris 1901); S. Attal, *Frate Elia, Compagno di San Francesco* (Rome 1936); C. L. Sagui, *Frate Elia e la lotta fra la Chiesa e l'Impero nel tredicesimo secolo* (Assisi 1928); J. Toussaert, *Saint Antoine de Padoue*, German translation by S. Summerer and G. Kurz, *Antonius von Padua. Versuch einer kritischen Biographie* (Cologne 1967).

Dominic Guzmán

SOURCES

B. Altaner, *Der heilige Dominikus. Untersuchungen und Texte* (Breslau 1922); M. H. Vicaire, *S. Dominique de Caleruega d'après les documents du XIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1955); *Bullarium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, I, ed. A. Bremond (Rome 1729); *Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de S. Dominique*, ed. Balme, Lelaidier, and Colomb, 3 vols. (Paris 1893–1901); M. H. Laurent, *Historia Diplomatica S. Dominici, MOP*, XV (Paris 1933); *Libellus, Legenden und Kanonisationsverfahren, MOP*, XVI (Rome 1935); Gérard de Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum, MOP*, I (Louvain 1896); *Anecdotes historiques et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, dominicain du XIII^{e} siècle*, ed. A. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris 1877); Thomas de Cantinpré, *Bonum universale de apibus* (Douai 1605); Sister Cécile, *Miracula beati Dominici*, ed. A. Walz, *Miscellanea Pio Paschini* (Rome 1949), 306–26; Étienne de Salagnac, *De quatuor in quibus Deus praedicatorum ordinem insignivit*, ed. T. Kaeppeli, *MOP*, XXII (Rome 1949); Dietrich of Apolda, *Life of Saint Dominic, ActaSS*, Augusti I, 558–628.

LITERATURE

Biographies: H. D. Lacordaire, *Vie de S. Dominique* (Paris 1841); H. Petitot, *Vie de S. Dominique* (Saint-Maximin 1926); H. C. Scheeben, *Der heilige Dominikus* (Freiburg 1927); P. Mandonnet, M. H. Vicaire, and R. Ladner, *S. Dominique, l'idée, l'homme et l'œuvre,* 2 vols. (Paris 1938); L. A. Getinom, *Santo Domingo de Guzmán . . .* (Madrid 1939); M. H. Vicaire, *Histoire de S. Dominique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1957); W. J. Koudelka, "St. Dominicus," *Biblioteca Sanctorum,* 4 (1964), 692–727; *Saint Dominique en Languedoc, Cahiers de Fanjeaux,* 1 (Toulouse 1966); P. M. Amato, G. G. Palmieri, F. Frassetto, *et al., Le reliquie di S. Domenico. Storia e leggende, ricerche scientifiche, recostruzione fisica* (Bologna 1946). Iconography: M. C. Nieuwbarn, *Verherrlichung des heiligen Dominikus in der Kunst* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1906); F. Ferretti, *S. Domenico. Biografia e Iconografia* (Florence 1921); L. G. Alonso-Getino, *Santo Domingo en el arte* (Madrid 1922); G. Bazin, *S. Dominique* (Paris 1937); G. Kaftal, *St. Dominic in Early Tuscan Painting* (Oxford 1948); M. H. Vicaire and L. von Matt, *S. Dominique* (Paris 1957); A. Walz, "Zur dominikanischen Ikonographie," *AFP,* 35 (1965), 255–63.

The Order of Preachers

SOURCES

T. Ripoll and A. Bremond, *Bullarium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum,* 8 vols. (Rome 1729–40); *Epitome Bullarii OP,* ed. V. Ligiez and P. Mothon (Rome 1898); *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica,* 14 vols. (Louvain and Rome 1896–1904), Vols. 15 ff. (Rome 1933); *Analecta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* (Rome 1893 ff.); *AFP;* J. Quétif and J. Échard, *Scriptores OP,* 2 vols. (Paris 1719–21), editio altera emendata, aucta . . ., ed. R. Coulon and A. Papillon (Paris 1909–34).

LITERATURE

Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 469–536; D. A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs,* 8 vols. (Paris 1903–20); A. M. Walz, *Compendium historiae OP* (Rome, 2d ed. 1948); H. Denifle, "Die Constitutionen des Prediger-Ordens vom Jahre 1228," *ALKGMA,* I (1885), 165–227; *idem,* "Die Constitutionen des Predigerordens in der Redaction Raimunds von Peñafort," *ALKGMA,* V (1889), 530–64, and now R. Creytens, "Les Constitutions des Frères Prêcheurs dans la rédaction de S. Raymond de Peñafort," *AFP,* 18 (1948), 5–68; H. C. Scheeben, *Die Konstitutionen des Predigerordens unter Jordan von Sachsen* (Cologne 1939); G. R. Galbraith, *The Constitution of the Dominican Order (1216–1360)* (Manchester 1926); J. Meyer, *Liber de illustribus viris OP,* ed. P. Loe, *Quellen und Forschungen* (see *infra*), 12 (Leipzig 1918); B. Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Habelschwerdt 1924); R. C. T. Zeller, *La vie dominicaine* (Paris 1927); O. Decker, *Die Stellung des Predigerordens zu den Dominikanerinnen (1207–67)* (Vechta 1935); R. F. Bennet, *The Early Dominicans* (London 1937); J. Guiraud, *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Prouille,* 2 vols. (Paris 1907); H. C. Scheeben, *Die Anfänge des zweiten Ordens des heiligen Dominikus,* 2 (1932), 284–315; P. Mandonnet, *Les règles et le gouvernement de l'Ordre de Paenitentia au XIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1902); G. Meersseman, "Études sur les anciens confréries dominicaines, I: Les confréries de Saint-Dominique," *AFP,* 20 (1950), 1–113, "II: Les confréries de Saint-Pierre Martyr," *AFP,* 21 (1951), 51–196, "III: Les congrégations de la Vierge," *AFP,* 22 (1952), 5–176, "IV: Les milices de Jésus-Christ," *AFP,* 23 (1953), 275–308; R. L. Oechslin, "Les origines du Tiers-Ordre et les Milices de Jésus-Christ," *Vie dominicaine,* 18 (1959), 57–65, 83–87; *Quellen und Forschungen zur Ge-*

schichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland, ed. P. von Loe, B. M. Reichert, H. Wilms, *et al.* (Leipzig and Cologne 1907 ff.); H. D. Simonin, R. L. Oechslin, *et al.,* "La spiritualité des Frères Prêcheurs," *DSAM,* 5 (1964), 1422–1524.
Individual Lands: B. Jarrett, *The English Dominicans* (London, 2d ed. 1937); W. A. Hinnebusch, *The Early Friars Preachers* (Rome 1951); D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England,* I (Cambridge 1948); J. Gallén, *La province de Dacie de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Helsinki 1946); N. Pfeiffer, *Die ungarische Dominikanerprovinz (1221–42)* (Zürich 1913); M. D. Chapotin, *Histoire des Dominicains de la province de France. Le siècle des fondations* (Rouen 1898); M. Aron, *Un animateur de la jeunesse au XIIIe siècle. Vie, voyages du bienheureux Jourdain de Saxe* (Paris 1930); A. Zucchi, *Roma domenicana. Note storiche,* I (Florence 1938).

The Carmelites

SOURCES

E. Monsignani, *Bullarium Carmelitanum,* 4 vols. (Rome 1715–68); B. Zimmermann, *Monumenta historiae Carmelitana,* I (Lérins 1907); *Acta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Fratrum B. V. Mariae de Monte Carmelo,* I (1318–1593), ed. G. Wessels (Rome 1914); Cosmas de Viliers, *Bibliotheca Carmelitana,* 2 vols. (Orléans 1752), new edition by G. Wessels (Rome 1927); B. M. Xiberta, *De scriptoribus scholasticis saeculi XIV ex ordine Carmelitarum* (Louvain 1931).

LITERATURE

Heimbucher, II (3d ed.), 54–95; André de Sainte-Marie, *L'Ordre de Notre-Dame du Mont Carmel* (Bruges 1910), translated into English and enlarged, *The Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel* (Bruges 1913); Benoît Marie de la Sainte Croix (i. e., B. Zimmermann), *Les saints déserts des Carmes déchaussés* (Paris 1927); L. Van den Bossche, *Les Carmes* (Paris 1930); Melchior de Sainte-Marie, "Carmel," *DHGE,* 11 (1949), 1070–1104, with bibliography ("L'histoire de cet ordre est encore à faire," 1070); P. McCaffrey, *The White Friars* (Dublin 1926); Silverius a S. Teresia, *Historia del Carmen Descalzo,* 14 vols. (Burgos 1935–43); G. Mesters, *Geschichte des Karmeliterordens* (Mainz 1958).
Germany: H. Koch, *Die Karmeliterklöster der niederdeutschen Provinz (13. bis 16. Jahrhundert)* (Freiburg 1889); C. *Martini, Der deutsche Karmel,* 2 vols. (Bamberg 1922); G. Mesters, *Die rheinische Karmeliterprovinz während der Gegenreformation* (Speyer 1958).
England: L. Sheppard, *The English Carmelites* (London 1943); D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England,* I (Cambridge 1948).
France: Antoine M. de la Présentation, *Le Carmel en France,* 7 vols. (Toulouse 1936–39).
Spirituality: Jérôme de la Mère de Dieu, *La tradition mystique du Carmel* (Paris 1929); Gabriel a S. Magdalena, *Les plus vieux textes du Carmel* (Paris 1945); T. Brandsma, *Das Erbe des Propheten* (Cologne 1958); *idem, Karmel. Gesetz und Geheimnis* (Cologne 1960); *idem,* "La spiritualité de l'ordre des Carmes," *DSAM,* 2 (1953), 156–71.
Periodicals: *Analecta Ordinis Carmelitani* (Rome 1909 ff.); *Études carmélitaines* (Paris 1911 ff.); *Rivista storica Carmelit,* 3 vols. (Florence 1929–32); *Carmelus* (Rome 1954 ff.); *Ephemerides Carmeliticae* (Rome 1947 ff.); *Carmel* (Tilburg 1948 ff.).

The Hermits of Saint Augustine

SOURCES

L. Empoli, *Bullarium Ordinis Eremitarum S. Augustini* (Rome 1628); *Jordani de Saxonia Liber Vitasfratrum,* ed. R. Arbesmann and W. Hümpfner (New York 1943); Henry of Friemar, *De origine et progressu ordinis . . .,* ed. R. Arbesmann, *Augustiniana,* 6 (1956), 37–145; P. M. Vélez, *Leyendo nuestra Crónicas,* 2 vols. (Escorial 1932), gives critical notes on all the chronicles.
Bibliography: A. Perini, *Bibliographia Augustiniana,* 4 vols. (Florence 1929–35); A. de Meijer and R. Kuiters, "Licet Ecclesiae Catholicae. Text, Commentary," *Augustiniana,* 6 (1956), 9–36; A. Zumkeller, *Manuskripte von Werken der Autoren des Augustiner-Eremiten-Ordens in mitteleuropäischen Bibliotheken, Augustiniana,* 11–16 (1961–66), especially I. Anhang, "Manuskripte zur Geschichte des Augustinerordens," *ibid.,* 15 (1965), 73–130.

LITERATURE

Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 537–70; T. Kolde, *Die deutsche Augustiner-Kongregation* (Gotha 1879); A. Sans, *Historia de los agostinos españoles* (Madrid 1948); W. Hümpfner, "Äussere Geschichte der Augustinereremiten in Deutschland," *Festschrift St. Augustinus* (Würzburg 1930), 147–96; U. Mariani, *Gli Agostiniani e la grande unione del 1256* (Rome 1957); V. Maturana, *Historia general de los Eremitanos de San Agostín,* 6 vols. (Santiago de Chile 1912–31); A. C. de Romanis, *L'Ordine Agostiniano* (Florence 1935); E. van Moé, "Recherches sur les Ermites de Saint Augustin entre 1250 et 1350," *RQH,* 60 (1932), 257–316; F. Roth, "Die Augustiner-Generale des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Cor Unum,* 8–9 (Würzburg 1950); *idem,* "Cardinal Richard Annibaldi, First Protector of the Augustinian Order (1243–76)," *Augustiniana,* 2–4 (1952–54); J. Hemmerk, "Die Augustiner-Eremiten in Bayern," *Augustiniana,* 6 (1956), 385–490; S. Rennhofer, "Augustinerklöster in Österreich," *Augustiniana,* 6 (1956), 491–536; A. Zumkeller, "Zur Frühgeschichte der Augustiner in Deutschland," *Augustiniana,* 9 (1959), 93–104; *700 Jahre Augustiner-Eremiten in Würzburg (1263–1963)* (Würzburg 1963); E. Braem and N. Teeuwen, *Augustiniana Belgica Illustrata* (Louvain 1956); F. Roth, "A History of the English Austin Friars," *Augustiniana,* 8 (1958), 16 (1966); D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England,* I (Cambridge 1948).
Spirituality: D. Gutiérrez, "Ermites de Saint-Augustin," *DSAM,* 4 (1960), 983–1042.

Other Mendicant Orders

Williamites: F. Roth, "Die Wilhelmiten," *Cor Unum,* 8 (1950), 78–81; K. Elm, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Wilhelmitenordens* (Cologne and Graz 1962); P. Janssens, "De Wilhelmieten en de Magna Unio Augustiniana," *Augustiniana,* 12 (1962), 451–72; K. Elm, "Die Bulle 'Ea quae iudicio' Clemens' IV. (30. 8. 1266). Vorgeschichte, Überlieferung, Text und Bedeutung," *Augustiniana,* 14 (1964), 500–22, 15 (1965), 54–67, 493–520, 16 (1966).
Servites: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 576–88; A. Morini and P. Soulier, *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum S. Mariae,* 20 vols. (Brussels and Florence 1897–1930); A. P. M. Piermejus, *Memorabilium S. Ordinis Servorum B. M. V. Breviarium,* 3 vols. (Rome 1927–31); A. M. Rossi, *Man. di Storia dell'Ord. dei Servi di Maria* (Rome 1956); *Studi storici sull'Ord. dei Servi di Maria* (Rome 1933 ff.); P. Soulier, *Vie de S. Philippe Benizi* (Paris 1886); A. M. Wimmer, *Der heilige Philipp Benizi* (Freiburg 1932); M. Courayville, *Giuliana Falconieri* (Florence 1938).
Mercedarians: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 571–76; M. Even, *L'ordre de la Merci* (Rome, 2d ed. 1918); G. Vázquez Núñez, *Manual de Historia de la Orden de N. Señora de la Merced* (Toledo 1931); F. Gazulla, *La Orden de Nuestra Señora de la Merced* (Barcelona 1934);

M. Aime-Anizan, *Le quatrième vœu, Notre-Dame de la Merci et les captifs* (Paris 1958); P. N. Pérez, *San Pedro Nolasco* (Barcelona 1915); J. Rius Serra, *S. Raymundo de Peñafort. Diplomatario* (Barcelona 1954).

24. *The Western Mediaeval Hospital*

Sources

Chronicles and cartularies of cities, monasteries, hospitals, religious orders, and confraternities, tax books, transcripts, episcopal *registra*, etc.

Literature

L. Le Grand, *Statuts d'hôtels-Dieu et de léproseries* (Paris 1901); A. Hauck "Wohltätigkeitsanstalten," *RE*, XXI (3d ed. 1908), 435–52; W. Schönfeld, "Die Xenodochien in Italien und Frankreich im frühen Mittelalter," *ZSavRGkan*, 12 (1922), 1–54, basic; W. Liese, *Geschichte der Caritas*, 2 vols. (Freiburg 1922), with bibliography; D. L. Mackay, *Les hôpitaux et la charité à Paris au XIII^e siècle* (Paris 1923); G. Schnürer, *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter*, II (Paderborn 1926), 456–78; F. Meffert, *Caritas und Krankenwesen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Freiburg 1927); S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital und sein Recht im Mittelalter, Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen*, 111–114, 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1932), with bibliography; supplementary to the preceding is J. Sydow, "Kanonistische Fragen zur Geschichte des Spitals in Südwestdeutschland," *HJ*, 83 (1964), 54–68; S. Reicke, "Stiftungsbegriff und Stiftungsrecht im Mittelalter," *ZSavRGgerm*, 53 (1933), 247–76; W. J. Marx, *The Development of Charity in Medieval Louvain* (New York 1936); J. Imbert, *Les hôpitaux en droit canonique, L'Église et l'État au moyen âge*, 8 (Paris 1947); G. Schreiber, "Byzantinisches und abendländisches Hospital," *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters* (Münster 1948), 3–80; P. de Angelis, *L'arci-confraternità ospitaliera di S. Spirito in Saxia* (Terni 1951); E. Nasalli-Rocca, *Il diritto ospedaliero nei suoi lineamenti storici* (Milan 1956); *Atti del primo congresso italiano di storia ospedaliera (1956)* (Reggio d'Emilia 1957); B. Tierney, *Medieval Poor Law* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1959); *Fliche-Martin*, XII, 2 (Paris 1964), 472–75; *Atti del primo Congresso Europeo di Storia Ospitaliera (1960)* (Reggio d'Emilia 1962); J. H. Mundy, "Charity and Social Work in Toulouse (1100–1250)," *Tr*, 22 (1966), 203–87; D. Jetter, *Geschichte des Hospitals*, I: *Westdeutschland von den Anfängen bis 1850* (Wiesbaden 1966); R. M. Clay, *The Mediaeval Hospitals of England* (New York, 2d ed. 1966).

Particular Hospitals (only a few of the more recent works will be listed out of an extensive special literature): F. F. Schäfer, *Das Hospital zum Heiligen Geist auf dem Domhofe zu Köln* (Cologne 1910), with a list of the German Hospitals of the Holy Spirit, supplemented by G. Schreiber in *HV*, 15 (1912), 136 f.; O. Ulm, *Das Heilig-Geist-Hospital zu Überlingen am Bodensee im Mittelalter* (Heidelberg 1913); J. Kuhn, *Aus der Geschichte des Heiliggeistspitals zu Freiburg im Breisgau* (Hildesheim 1914); H. Kluge, *Das Heilig-Geist-Hospital zu Schondorf* (Marbach 1936); A. Englisch, *Über Leproserien in Württemberg* (typed dissertation, Frankfurt am Main 1951); B. Zeller, *Das Heilig-Geist-Spital zu Lindau im Bodensee, Schwäbische Geschichtsquellen und Forschungen*, 4 (Lindau 1952); E. Wyde-Leemann, *Rechtsgeschichte des alten Spitals in Zürich* (Zürich 1952); W. D. von Kunatowski, *St. Leonhard vor Braunschweig, Braunschweiger Werkstücke*, 23 (Braunschweig 1958); P. Gradauer, *Spital am Pyhrn in Oberösterreich* (Linz 1957), and, in this connection, H. E. Feine in *ZSavRGkan*, 45 (1959), 622 f.; V. M. I. Ottazzi, "Le principali fondazioni ospitaliere d'Italia nei loro statuti dal secolo XI fino al secolo XIV," *Atti del* *primo congresso italiano di storia ospedaliera (1956)* (Reggio d'Emilia 1957), 508–22; G. Strodel, *Das Heiliggeistspital von Ravensburg* (typed dissertation, Tübingen 1958); R. van der Made, *Le grand hôpital de Huy* (Louvain 1960); P. de Angelis, *L'ospedale di Santo Spirito in Saxia,* I: *Delle origini al 1300* (Rome 1960); W. Haug, *Das St.-Katharinen-Hospital Esslingen a. N.* (typed dissertation, Tübingen 1961); A. Stollenwerk, *Zur Geschichte des Heilig-Geist-Hospitals in Boppard* (Boppard 1961); R. Kleiminger, *Das Heilig-Geist-Hospital in Wismar* (Weimar 1962); K. Wellschmied, *Die Hospitäler der Stadt Göttingen, Studien zur Geschichte der Stadt Göttingen,* 4 (Göttingen 1963); W. Berweck, *Das Heilig-Geist-Hospital zu Villingen im Schwarzwald* (Villingen 1963); H. Muschel, *Das Spital der Reichen Siechen zu St. Katharina in Ulm, Forschungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ulm,* 5 (Ulm 1965).

The Hospitallers: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 615–17; J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Die Anfänge des Johanniterordens in Deutschland* (Berlin 1899); J. Delaville Le Roulx, *Cartulaire générale de l'ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem,* 4 vols. (Paris 1894–1906); *idem, Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre (1100–1310)* (Paris 1904); *idem, Les Hospitaliers à Rhodos* (Paris 1913); M. Ambrazicjute, *Studien über die Johanniterregel* (Fribourg 1929); E. J. King, *The Rule, Statutes and Customs of the Hospitallers (1099–1310)* (London 1934); C. H. C. Flugi van Aspermont, *De Johanniterorde in het Heilige Land (1100–1292)* (Assen 1957); S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 93–111.

The Teutonic Knights: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 617–20. Only a select few of the virtually countless number of source publications and presentations can be listed here: R. ten Haaf, *Kurze Bibliographie zur Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens (1198–1561)* (Kitzingen 1949); J. Rink, *Die christliche Liebestätigkeit im Ordensland Preussen bis 1525* (Breslau 1911); M. Tumler, *Der Deutsche Orden im Werden, Wachsen und Wirken bis 1400* (Vienna 1955), bibliography, 631–72; P. G. Thielen, *Die Verwaltung des Ordensstaates Preussen, vornehmlich im 15. Jahrhundert* (Cologne and Graz 1965), with bibliography; see also the bibliography for Chapter 29.

Order of Lazarus: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 612f.; E. Sauer, *Der Lazariter-Orden und das Statutenbuch von Seedorf* (Freiburg 1930); P. Bertrand, *Histoire des Chevaliers-Hospitaliers de St-Lazare* (Paris 1932); S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 132–48.

Order of Saint Anthony: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 611–15; V. Advielle, *Histoire de l'ordre hospitalier de Saint-Antoine de Viennois* (Paris 1883); H. Dijon, *L'église abbatiale de Saint-Antoine en Dauphiné* (Grenoble and Paris 1902); L. Maillet-Guy, *Les origines de Saint-Antoine* (Valence 1908); other monographs by Maillet-Guy on the parishes, priories, grand masters, and commendatory prelates of the order in the Midi appear in the *Bulletin de la Société archéologique de la Drôme* and in *RMab* (1926–28); *idem, Les commanderies de l'ordre de Saint Antoine de Viennois* (Ligugé 1928); A. C. Wand, "La chiesa di S. Antonio Abbate sull'Esquilino," *RivAC,* 10 (1933), 71–104; H. Chaumartin, *Le Mal des Ardents et le Feu St. Antoine* (Vienne 1946); J. Rauch, "Der Antoniterorden in Deutschland," *AMrhKG,* 9 (1957), 33–50; A. Mischlewski, "Der Antoniterorden in Deutschland," *AMrhKG,* 10 (1958), 39–66; J. Rauch and H. Becker, "Geschichte des Antoniterhauses Rossdorf-Höchst," *AMrhKG,* 11 (1959), 76–159, with bibliography; S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 156–66.

Order of the Holy Spirit: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 417–19; S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 166–81; K. Hofmann, "Hospitaliter," *LThK,* V (2d ed. 1960), 492–94; P. Brune, *Histoire de l'ordre hospitalier du Saint-Esprit* (Paris 1892).

Bearers of the Cross: Heimbucher, I (3d ed.), 419–22; F. Jacksche, *Geschichte des ritterlichen Ordens der Kreuzherren mit dem roten Stern* (Prague 1904); S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 182–89.

Brothers of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem: F. Pasini, *Il sacro militare ordine Gerosolimitano del santo Sepolcro* (Pisa 1888); S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 189–95.

Hospital Confraternities: S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital* (see *supra*), I, 48–71; G. Le Bras "Les confréries chrétiennes. Problèmes et propositions," *Études de sociologie religieuse,* 2 (Paris 1956), 423–62; G. Schreiber, "Religiöse Verbände in mittelalterlicher Wertung," *HJ,* 62–69 (1949), 284–358; also the abundant bibliography for the various lands.

SECTION FIVE

The Contest for the Leadership of the West: 1216-1274

25. *The Papacy's Victory over Frederick II*

SOURCES

Mansi, XXII–XXIV; *Hefele-Leclercq,* V, 1409–1759, VI, 1–228; P. Pressutti, *Regesta Honorii Papae III,* 2 vols. (Rome 1888–95); L. Auvray *et al., Les Registres de Grégoire IX,* 4 vols. (Paris 1896–1955); E. Berger, *Les Registres d'Innocent IV,* 4 vols. (Paris 1884–1921); C. de la Roncière, J. de Loye, and P. de Céneval, *Les Registres d'Alexandre IV,* 3 vols. (Paris 1902–59); J. Guiraud, *Les Registres d'Urbain IV,* 4 vols. (Paris 1901–58); E. Jordan, *Les Registres de Clément IV* (Paris 1893–1945); J. Guiraud, *Les Registres de Grégoire X* (Paris 1892–1960); C. Rodenberg, *Epistolae Saeculi XIII e regestis Pontificum Romanorum, MG,* 3 vols. (Berlin 1883–94); *Corpus Iuris Canonici,* ed. E. Friedberg (Freiburg 1881), in Volume II Gregory IX's *Liber Extra; Innocentii IV Commentaria super Libros quinque Decretalium,* Apparatus (Frankfurt am Main 1570); Hostiensis (Henry of Susa), *Summa aurea* (Basel 1573); *idem, Lectura seu commentaria* (Venice 1581); J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii,* V, 1–2, ed. F. Ficker (Innsbruck 1881 f.); *idem, Regesta Imperii,* V, 3–5, ed. J. Ficker and E. Winkelmann (Innsbruck 1892–1901); *MGConst,* II, ed. L. Weiland (Hanover 1896); E. Winkelmann, *Acta Imperii inedita a saeculis XIII et XIV,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1880–85); J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici II,* 6 vols. (Paris 1852–61, reprinted Turin 1963); *idem, Vie et correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne, ministre de l'empereur Frédéric II. Avec une étude sur le mouvement réformiste au XIII^e^ siècle* (Paris 1864, reprinted Aalen 1966); T. Rymer, *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et cuiuscumque generis acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios quosvis,* ed. A. Clarke, J. Caley, and F. Holbrooke, 6 vols. (London 1816–30).

Eike of Repgow, *Die sächsische Weltchronik* (to 1248), ed. L. Weiland, *MG deutsche Chroniken,* II, 65–258 (Hanover 1877); Alberic of Troisfontaines, *Chronicon* (to 1241), ed. P. Scheffer-Boichorst, *MGSS,* 26, 226–950; Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* (to 1250) (Douai 1624), in *Speculum maius,* and, in this connection, A. L. Gabriel, *The Educational Ideas of Vincent of Beauvais* (Notre Dame, 2d ed. 1962); Martin of Troppau, *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum* (to 1277), ed. L. Weiland, *MGSS,* 22, 377–475; Martinus Minorita, *Flores temporum* (to 1292), *MGSS,* 24, 230–50; Albert of Stade, *Annals* (to 1256), *MGSS,* 16, 283–378; *Gesta Treverorum* (to 1259), especially for the time of Archbishop Arnold II, *MGSS,* 24, 376–414, translated into German by E. Zenz, *Die Taten der Trierer,* Teil 3 (1152–1259) (Trier 1959); under Frederick II the Italian sources are especially important: Rolandin of Padua, *Chronicle* (to 1262), *MGSS,* 19, 38–147, and *Muratori,* new edition, VIII, 1; Albert Milioli (Reggio) (to 1285), *MGSS,* 31; Salimbene de Adam, *Chronica* (to 1287), *MGSS,* 32; Thomas of Pavia, *Gesta imperatorum et pontificum* (to 1278), *MGSS,* 22, 490–528; Richard of San Germano, *Chronica Regni Siciliae* (to 1243), *MGSS,* 19, and *Muratori,* new edition, VII, 2 (1938); Roger of Wendover, *Flores historiarum* (to 1235), ed. H. G. Howlett, *Rolls Series,* 84, 3 vols. (London 1886–89); Matthew Paris,

Chronica maiora (to 1259), ed. H. Luard, *Rolls Series*, 57, 7 vols. (London 1872–84), with extracts in *MGSS*, 27, 107–473; see also R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought*, new series (Cambridge 1958), and H. V. Galbraith, *Roger Wendover and Matthew Paris* (Glasgow 1944).

LITERATURE

Historia Mundi, VI; *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte*, V; *The Cambridge Medieval History*, VI; *Peuples et Civilisations*, VI (see Vol. III, Gen. Bibliog., II, 1, a); *Glotz*, VIII; see the General Bibliography, II, 1, a–c, and the works listed for Section I on national history; *Fliche-Martin*, X; *Hauck*, IV and V, 1; R. García Villoslada, *Edad media (800–1303)* (Madrid, 2d ed. 1958); *The English Church and the Papacy*, ed. C. H. Lawrence (London 1965); *Seppelt*, III; *Haller*, IV, ed. H. Dannenbauer (Esslingen 1962); H. Wolter and H. Holstein, *Lyon I et Lyon II, Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques*, 7 (Paris 1966). Further bibliography in the individual chapters.

Honorius III: Potthast R, I, 468–679; Böhmer-Ficker, *Regesten*, V, 3 (Innsbruck 1892), 1120–70; *Honorii III Opera*, ed. C. A. Horoy, *Medii aevi bibliotheca patristica*, 5 vols. (Paris 1879–83); letters in *MGEp saec. XIII*, I, 1–260; *Regesta*, ed. P. Pressutti, 2 vols. (Rome 1888–95); A. L. Tautu, *Acta Honorii III et Gregorii IX* (Rome 1950); D. Mansilla, *La documentación pontificia de Honorio III (1216–1227)* (Rome 1965), *Monumenta Hispaniae Vat. Registros*, 2; J. Clausen, *Papst Honorius III. (1216–1227)* (Bonn 1895); W. Knebel, *Kaiser Friedrich II. und Honorius III.* (Münster 1905); N. Mengozzi, *Onorio III e le sue relazioni col regno d'Inghilterra* (Siena 1911); A. Keutner, *Papsttum und Krieg unter dem Pontifikat Honorius' III.* (dissertation, Münster 1935); S. Kuttner, "Papst Honorius III. und das Studium des Zivilrechts," *Festschrift für Martin Wolff* (Tübingen 1952), 79–101; R. Manselli, "Onorio III e Federico II (Revisione d'un giudizio?)," *StRom*, 11 (1963), 142–59.

Gregory IX: Potthast R, I, 680–942; Böhmer-Ficker, *Regesten*, V, 3 (Innsbruck 1892), 1170–1258; *Vita e curia* and *Vita* by Bernard Guidonis, ed. *Muratori*, III, 575–87; G. Levi, *Registro del Card. Ugolino d'Ostia* (Rome 1890); L. Auvray *et al.*, *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*, 4 vols. (Paris 1896–1955); H. Golubovich, "Disputatio seu Relatio Apocrisiariorum Gregorii IX de gestis (1234)," *AFrH*, 12 (1919), 418–70; J. Felten, *Papst Gregor IX.* (Freiburg 1886); E. Brem, *Gregor IX. bis zum Beginn seines Pontifikates* (Heidelberg 1911); W. Fuchs, *Die Besetzung der deutschen Bistümer unter Gregor IX. und bis zum Regierungsantritt Papst Innocenz' IV. (1243)* (dissertation, Berlin 1911); W. Reich, *Die Besetzung der sizilischen Bistümer unter Friedrich II.* (Heidelberg 1923); G. A. Donner, *Kardinal Wilhelm von Sabina, Bischof von Modena (1222–34). Päpstlicher Legat in den nordischen Ländern († 1251)* (Helsingfors 1929); L. Zarncke, *Der Anteil des Kardinal Ugolino an der Ausbildung der drei Orden des heiligen Franziskus* (Leipzig 1930); B. Zöllig, *Die Beziehungen des Kardinal Hugolin zum heiligen Franziskus und seinem I. Orden* (Münster 1934); G. Marchetti-Longhi, "Ricerche sulla famiglia di Gregorio IX," *ADRomana*, 67 (1944), 275–307; C. Thouzellier, "La légation du cardinal Hugolin en Lombardie (1221)," *RHE*, 45 (1950), 508–42; H. M. Schaller, "Die Antwort Gregors IX. auf Petrus de Vinea, I, 1, 'Collegerunt pontifices,'" *DA*, 11 (1954), 140–65; S. Sibilia, *Gregorio IX (1227–1241)* (Milan 1961).

Innocent IV: Potthast R, II, 943–1285, 2110–24; Böhmer-Ficker, *Regesten*, V, 3 (Innsbruck 1892), 1260–1407; E. Berger, *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, 4 vols. (Paris 1884–1921); Nicholas of Calvi, *Vita Innocentii IV Papae*, ed. F. Pagnotti, *ASRomana*, 21 (1898); P. Vogel, *Nikolaus von Calvi und seine Lebensbeschreibung des Papstes Innocenz IV. mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Friedensverhandlungen zwischen Papst Innocenz IV. und Kaiser Friedrich II. in den Jahren 1243/44* (dissertation, Münster 1939); G. Abate, "Lettere secrete d'Innocenzo IV," *MF*, 55 (1955), 317–73; P. Sambin, *Problemi politici attraverso* *lettere inedite di Innocenzo IV* (Venice 1955); *Acta Innocentii PP. IV (1243–1254) e regestis vaticanis,* ed. T. T. Haluscynskyj and M. M. Wojnar, Pontificia commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis, *Fontes,* series III, IV, 1 (Vatican City 1962); F. Bock, "Studien zu den Registern Innozenz' IV.," *AZ,* 52 (1956), 11–48. There is no critical biography of Innocent IV; H. Schulz in *RE,* IX (Leipzig, 3d ed. 1901), 122–30, assembled the pertinent sources from the contemporary chronicles; F. Bernini, "Innocenzo IV e il suo parentado," *Nuova Rivista storica,* 24 (1940), 178–97; G. von Puttkamer, *Papst Innocenz IV. Versuch einer Gesamtcharakteristik aus seiner Wirkung* (Münster 1930); J. A. Cantini and C. Lefèbvre in *DDC,* VII (Paris 1958–62), 1029–62; K. Hampe, "Ein ungedruckter Bericht über das Konklave von 1241 im römischen Septizonium," *SAH* (1913), 1; K. Wenck, "Das erste Konklave der Papstgeschichte (August bis Oktober 1941)," *QFIAB,* 18 (1926), 101–70; W. de Vries, "Innozenz IV. und der christliche Osten," *OstKSt,* 12 (1963), 113–31; P. L. Pisanu, *L'attività politica d'Innocenzo IV e i Francescani, Annuario dell'Istituto superiore di scienze e lettere Santa Chiara* (Naples 1957); J. A. Cantini, "De autonomia iudicis saecularis et de romani pontificis plenitudine potestatis in temporalibus secundum Innocentium IV," *Salesianum,* 23 (1961), 407–80; H. Weber, *Kampf zwischen Innocenz IV. und Kaiser Friedrich II. bis zur Flucht des Papstes nach Lyon* (Berlin 1900); A. Folz, *Kaiser Friedrich II. und Papst Innocenz IV. Ihr Kampf in den Jahren 1244 und 1245* (Strasbourg 1905); C. Rodenberg, "Die Friedensverhandlungen zwischen Friedrich II. und Innocenz IV. 1243–1244," *Festgabe für Gerold Meyer von Knonau* (Zürich 1913), 165–204; P. Aldinger, *Die Neubesetzung der deutschen Bistümer unter Papst Innocenz IV. (1243–54)* (Leipzig 1900); H. Kroppmann, *Ehedispensübung und Stauferkampf unter Innocenz IV.* (Berlin 1937); R. Morghen, *Il tramonto della potenza sueva in Italia* (Rome 1936); F. Bernini, "Come si preparò la rovina di Federico II," *RSIt,* 60 (1948), 204–49; C. Rodenberg, *Innocenz IV. und das Königreich Sizilien (1245–1254)* (Halle 1892); K. Hampe, "Papst Innocenz IV. und die sizilische Verschwörung von 1246," *SAH* (1923); W. Gross, *Die Revolutionen in der Stadt Rom (1219–1254)* (Berlin 1934); E. Berger, *Saint Louis et Innocent IV* (Paris 1893); W. Meyer, *Ludwig IX. von Frankreich und Innocenz IV. (1244–1247)* (dissertation, Berlin 1915); G. Martini, *La politica finanziaria dei papi in Francia alla metà del secolo 13* (Rome 1950); L. Dehio, *Innocenz IV. und England* (Leipzig 1914).

The Emperor Frederick II: acta in Huillard-Bréholles *(supra)* and *MGConst,* II, 54–389; Böhmer-Ficker, *Regesten,* I, 1–2 (Innsbruck 1881 f.), 153–692; E. Sthamer, "Die sizilischen Register Friedrichs II.," *SAB* (1925); *Dahlmann-Waitz,* 6713–96; the standard scholarly biography is that by E. Kantorowicz, *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite* (Berlin 1927, 4th ed. 1936), supplementary volume (Berlin 1931, reprinted 1963), English translation: *Frederick II* (New York 1957); E. Winkelmann, *Kaiser Friedrich II., JbbDG,* 2 vols. (to 1233) (Leipzig 1889–97); K. Hampe, *Kaiser Friedrich II. in der Auffassung der Nachwelt* (Stuttgart 1925); W. E. Heupel, *Der sizilische Grosshof unter Kaiser Friedrich II.* (Leipzig 1940); A. de Stefano, *L'idea imperiale di Federico II* (Florence, 2d ed. 1952); F. Cognasso, *Il pensiero e l'opera politica di Federico II* (Turin 1951); A. de Stefano, *La cultura alla corte di Federico II* (Palermo, 2d ed. 1951); G. Vergottini, *Studi sulla legislazione imperiale di Federico II in Italia* (Milan 1952); R. M. Kloos, "Kaiser Friedrich II.: Literaturbericht 1950–1955," *Tr,* 12 (1956), 426–56; *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi federiciani 1950* (Palermo 1952); recent biographies by E. Mogliano, *Federico II. di Svevia* (Milan and Verona 1948); M. Brion, *Frédéric II de Hohenstaufen* (Paris 1948); E. Pontieri, *Federico d'Hohenstaufen e i suoi tempi* (Naples n. d. [1959]); H. M. Schaller, *Kaiser Friedrich II., Persönlichkeit und Geschichte,* 34 (Göttingen 1964); *idem,* "Friedrich II.," *NDB,* 5 (1961), 478–84; *Stupor Mundi. Zur Geschichte Friedrichs II. von Hohenstaufen,* ed. G. Wolf, *Wege der Forschung,* 101 (Darmstadt 1966).

Political Propaganda: F. Graefe, *Die Publizistik in der letzten Epoche Kaiser Friedrichs II.* (Heidelberg 1909); W. von den Steinen, *Das Kaisertum Friedrichs II. nach den Anschau-*

ungen seiner Staatsbriefe (Berlin and Leipzig 1922); O. Vehse, *Die amtliche Propaganda in der Staatskunst Kaiser Friedrichs II.* (Munich 1929); H. Wieruszowski, *Vom Imperium zum nationalen Königtum. Vergleichende Studien über die publizistischen Kämpfe Kaiser Friedrichs II. und König Philipps des Schönen mit der Kurie* (Munich and Berlin 1933, reprinted Aalen 1965); P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser Friedrichs II. Herrschaftszeichen* (Göttingen 1955); H. M. Schaller, "Die Kanzlei Friedrichs II.," *ADipl,* 3 (1957), 207–86, 4 (1958), 264–327; F. Fehling, *Kaiser Friedrich II. und die römischen Kardinäle (1227–1239)* (Berlin 1901); B. Sütterlin, *Die Politik Kaiser Friedrichs II. und die römischen Kardinäle in den Jahren 1239–1250* (Heidelberg 1929); E. and O. Schönbauer, "Die Imperiumspolitik Kaiser Friedrichs II. in rechtsgeschichtlicher Bedeutung," *Festschrift K. G. Hugelmann,* II (Aalen 1959), 523–59.

The Fifth Crusade: H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* Bibliog., 2171–80. Sources: James of Vitry, *Letters,* ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Leiden 1960); James of Vitry, *Historia Hierosolimitana,* ed. J. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos,* I, 1047–1124 (Hanover 1611); Oliver Scholasticus, *Historia Damiatina,* ed. H. Hoogeweg, *Die Schriften des Kölner Domscholasters, späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und Kardinal-Bischofs von S. Sabina, Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart,* 202 (Tübingen 1894), 159–282; R. Röhricht, *Quinti belli sacri scriptores minores* (Geneva 1879); *idem, Testimonia minora de quinto bello sacro* (Geneva 1882); *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le trésorier,* ed. L. de Mas Latrie (Paris 1871). Literature: T. C. van Cleve, "The Fifth Crusade," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II (Philadelphia 1962), 377–428; H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965), 188–203; *Grousset,* III, 196–245; *Waas,* I, 258–73; *Runciman,* III, 132–70; H. L. Gottschalk, *Al-Malik al-Kamil von Ägypten und seine Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1958); R. Röhricht, *Studien zur Geschichte des fünften Kreuzzugs* (Innsbruck 1891); J. P. Donovan, *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade* (Philadelphia 1950); D. Mansilla, "El Cardenal hispano Pelayo Gaitán (1206–1230)," *Anthologica Annua,* 1 (1953), 11–66; L. Böhm, *Johann von Brienne, König von Jerusalem, Kaiser von Konstantinopel* (Heidelberg 1938); G. Golubovich, "San Francesco e i Francescani in Damiata, 5. Nov. 1219–2. Febr. 1220," *StudFr,* 23 (1926), 307–30; L. Lemmens, "De Sancto Francisco Christum praedicante coram Sultano Aegypti," *AFrH,* 19 (1926), 559–78; M. Roncaglia, "San Francesco d'Assisi in Oriente," *StudFr,* 50 (1953), 97–106.

The Crusade of Frederick II: H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* Bibliog., 2181–95. Sources: there is no special account of this crusade; the reports must be gathered from the general sources for the period (*supra,* for this section and chapter). Literature: T. C. van Cleve, "The Crusade of Frederick II," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II (Philadelphia 1962), 429–62; H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* 204–14; *Grousset,* III, 271–326; *Waas,* I, 274–89; *Runciman,* III, 177–93; see also the literature on Frederick II *(supra);* an important monograph is R. Röhricht, *Die Kreuzfahrt Kaiser Friedrichs des Zweiten* (Berlin 1872), expanded in *Beitr. zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge,* I (Berlin 1874), 1–112; Philip of Novara, *The Wars of Frederick II against the Ibelins in Syria and Cyprus,* ed. J. L. La Monte (New York 1936); H. Heimpel, "Hermann von Salza," *Der Mensch in seiner Gegenwart* (Göttingen 1954), 87–108; for the older literature see T. C. van Cleve, "The Crusade of Frederick II" *(supra),* 429 f.

Lyons I: Decrees: *COD,* 249–77, with critical introduction to the sources; for the course of the Council see the "Brevis Nota" of the Curia, *MGConst,* II, 513–16, and M. Tangl, "Die sogenannte Brevis Nota über das Lyoner Concil von 1245," *MIÖG,* 12 (1891), 246–53; Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora,* ed. H. R. Luard, IV, 430–37, 445, 456–78, also the edition of F. Liebermann, *MGSS,* 28, 250, 256–68; a few texts on the Council are also in H. Cole, *Documents illustrative of English History in the Thirteenth-Fourteenth Centuries* (London 1884), 351–56; T. von Karajan, "Zur Geschichte des Concils von Lyon 1245," *SAW* (1851), 67–118; A. Folz, *Kaiser Friedrich II. und der Papst Innocenz IV. Ihr Kampf in den Jahren*

1244 und 1245 (Strasbourg 1905); S. Kuttner, "Die Konstitutionen des ersten allgemeinen Konzils von Lyon," *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris*, 6 (1940), 70–131; *idem*, *L'édition romaine des conciles généraux et les actes du premier concile de Lyon, Misc. Hist. Pont.*, III, 5 (Rome 1940); P. J. Kessler, "Untersuchungen über die Novellengesetzgebung Papst Innocenz' IV., ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des kanonischen Rechts," *RSavRGkan*, 31 (1942), 142–320, 32 (1943), 300–83, 33 (1944), 56–128; H. Wolter and H. Holstein, *Lyon I et Lyon II, Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques*, 7 (Paris 1966).

26. *The Veering of the Papacy to France and the Angevin Domination in Italy*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

Alexander IV: Potthast R, 1286–1473, 2124–29; Böhmer-Ficker-Winkelmann, *Regesten*, V/3, 1407–41; *registra* (see the bibliography for this section); *Registro degli atti e delle lettere di Gregorio de Monte Longo (1233–69)* (Rome 1965); *Acta Alexandri PP. IV*, ed. T. T. Haluscynskyj and M. M. Wojnar (Rome 1966); F. Tenckhoff, *Papst Alexander IV.* (Paderborn 1907); S. Sibilia, *Alessandro IV (1254–61)* (Anagni 1961); J. Haller, "Die Herkunft Papst Alexanders IV.," *QFIAB*, 32 (1942), 254–59; S. Andreotta, "La famiglia di Alessandro IV e l'Abbazia di Subiaco," *Atti e Memorie della Società Tiburtina di Storia e d'Arte*, 35 (1962), 63–126, 36 (1963), 5–87.

Urban IV: Potthast R, 1474–1542; *RI*, V/3, 1441–65; *MGEp s. XIII*, III, 474–626; *registra* (see the bibliography for this section). W. Sievert, "Das Vorleben des Papstes Urban IV.," *RQ*, 10 (1896), 451–505, 12 (1898), 127–61; K. Hampe, *Urban IV. und Manfred (1261–64)* (Heidelberg 1905); *AAM*, 27 (Munich 1912); R. Davidsohn, "Beiträge zur Geschichte Manfreds," *QFIAB*, 17 (1914–24), 78–107; H. Grauert, "Magister Heinrich der Poet in Würzburg und die römische Kurie," *VII Centenario della Bolla "Transiturus" (1264–1964). Studi eucaristici* (Orvieto 1966); F. Callaey, "Documentazione eucaristica liegese, dal vescovo di Liegi Roberto di Torote al Papa Urbano IV (1240–64)," *Miscellanea Pio Paschini*, I (Rome 1948), 215–37; F. Schneider, "Manfreds Versöhnungspolitik," *QFIAB*, 15 (1913), 17–52.

Clement IV: Potthast R, 1542–1650; *RI*, V/3, 1465–1512; *MGEp s. XIII*, III, 627–726; *registra* (see the bibliography for this section). P. Brayda, *La responsabilità di Clemente IV e di Carlo I d'Anjou nella morte di Corradino di Svevia* (Naples 1900); U. Bünger, *Ludwig IX. von Frankreich und die Kurie (1265–68)* (Berlin 1898); J. Heidemann, *Papst Clemens IV., Vorleben und Legationsregister* (Münster 1903); E. Horn, "Le rôle politique de Clément IV," *Comtes rendues de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques 1925*, 273–300; G. Mollat, "Clément IV," *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 1109–15; K. Elm, "Die Bulle 'Ea quae iudicio' Clemens' IV. (30. 8. 1266). Vorgeschichte, Überlieferung und Bedeutung," *Augustiniana*, 14 (1964), 500–22, 15 (1965), 54–67, 492–520, 16 (1966), 95–145.

The Last Hohenstaufen: Conrad IV: H. Hartmann, "Die Urkunden Konrads IV.," *AUF*, 18 (1944), 108–32; G. Zeller, *Konrad IV. in Italien 1252–54* (Strasbourg 1907); W. Puhlmann, *Konrad IV. im Lichte der augustinisch-eschatologischen Geschichtsauffassung* (Greifswald 1914); K. G. Hugelmann, *Die Wahl Konrads IV. zu Wien 1237* (Weimar 1914); E. Michael, "Innocenz IV. und Konrad IV.," *ZKTh*, 18 (1894), 457–72. Manfred: A. Bertmann, *König Manfred von Sizilien (1264–66)* (Heidelberg 1909); O. Cartellieri, *König Manfred* (Palermo 1910); K. Hampe, "Zum Manifest Manfreds an die Römer vom 24. Mai 1265," *NA*, 36 (1911); C. Brückner, *Die Auffassung des Staufers Manfred und seiner Gegner im Licht der augustinisch-eschatologischen Geschichtsauffassung* (Greifswald 1914); P. F. Palumbo, "Per una biografia di Manfredi," *Studi Salentini*, 15 (1963), 193–205; H. M. Schaller, "König Manfred und die Assassinen," *DA*, 21 (1965), 173–93. Conradin: K.

Hampe, *Geschichte Konradins von Hohenstaufen* (Innsbruck 1894), with an appendix by H. Kämpf (3d ed. 1942); K. Pfister, *Konradin. Der Untergang der Hohenstaufen* (Munich 1941); A. Nitschke, "Der Prozess gegen Konradin," *ZSavRGkan,* 42 (1956), 25–54; on the preceding *cf.* H. M. Schaller in *QFIAB,* 37 (1957), 311–27, and A. Nitschke in *QFIAB,* 38 (1958), 268–77; L. Oelenheim, *Konradin von Hohenstaufen, König von Jerusalem und seine Vermählung auf der Coburg 1266* (Coburg 1930); R. Kohlrausch, *Herrschaft und Untergang der Hohenstaufen in Italien* (Jena 1926); J. Maubach, *Die Kardinäle und ihre Politik um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn 1902); H. L. Gottschalk, "Der Untergang der Hohenstaufen," *WZKM,* 53 (1957), 267–82, shows the keen sympathy of the Islamic world for the fate of the last Hohenstaufen; P. F. Palumbo, "L'età sveva: i protagonisti," *Studi Salentini,* 13 (1962), 3–37.

Charles of Anjou: G. del Giudice, *Codice diplomatico del regno di Carlo I e II,* 3 vols. (Naples 1863–1902); R. Sternfeld, *Karl von Anjou als Graf der Provence (1245–65)* (Berlin 1888); E. Jordan, *Les origines de la domination angevine en Italie* (Paris 1909); F. Kern, *Die Anfänge der französischen Ausdehnungspolitik bis zum Jahre 1308* (Tübingen 1910), with bibliography; E. Sthamer, "Die verlorenen Register Karls I. von Anjou," *AAB* (Berlin 1923); R. Trifone, *La legislazione angioina* (Naples 1921); R. Filangieri, *I registri della cancelleria angioina,* 13 vols. (Naples 1950–59); G. M. Monti, *Da Carlo I a Roberto di Angiò, Ricerche e documenti* (Naples 1932); A Cutolo, *Gli Angioini* (Florence 1934); R. Morghen, *Il tramonto della potenza sueva in Italia (1250–66)* (Rome 1936); C. W. Previté-Orton, "Italy (1250–90)," *Cambridge Medieval History,* VI (Cambridge 1929, reprinted 1957), 166–204, bibliography, 869–74; E. G. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris 1954); C. Rodenberg, *Innocenz IV. und das Königreich Sizilien* (Halle 1892); F. Baethgen, "Der Anspruch des Papsttums auf das Reichsvikariat," *ZSavKGkan,* 10 (1920), 168–268, now also in *Mediaevalia, Gesammelte Aufsätze von F. Baethgen,* I (Stuttgart 1960), 110–85; A. Wachtel, "Die sizilische Thronkandidatur des Prinzen Edmund von England," *DA,* 4 (1941), 98–178; N. Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall* (Oxford 1947); H. Marc-Bonnet, "Le Saint-Siège et Charles d'Anjou sous Innocent IV et Alexandre IV (1245–61)," *RH,* 200 (1948), 38–65; *idem,* "Richard de Cornouailles et la Couronne de Sicile," *Mélanges L. Halphen* (Paris 1951), 483–89; A. Hauss, *Kardinal Oktavian Ubaldini, ein Staatsmann des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg 1913); F. Reh, *Kardinal Peter Capocci, ein Staatsmann und Feldherr des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1933); N. Schöpp, *Papst Hadrian V. (Kardinal Ottobuono Fieschi)* (Heidelberg 1916).

The Interregnum: Dahlmann-Waitz, 7033–35, 8351, 7025–31, 7040. W. Neumann, *Die deutschen Königswahlen und die päpstlichen Machtansprüche während des Interregnums (1257–73)* (Berlin 1921); M. Lintzel, "Die Entstehung des Kurfürstenkollegs," *AAL,* 99/2 (Berlin 1952); I. Llampayas, *Alfonso X-El hombre, el rey y el sabio* (Madrid 1947); N. Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall* (Oxford 1947); W. von Schoen, *Alfons X. von Kastilien* (Munich 1957); A. de Bouard, *Le régime politique et les institutions de Rome au moyen âge (1253–1347)* (Paris 1920); P. Schmitthenner, *Die Ansprüche des Adels und des Volkes der Stadt Rom auf Vergebung der Kaiserkrone während des Interregnums (1250–73)* (Berlin 1923); E. Dupré-Theseider, *Roma dal Comune di popolo alla signoria pontificia* (Bologna 1952).

27. *Pope Gregory X and The Second Council of Lyons*

Gregory X: Potthast R, 1651–1703; *RI,* VI/1; J. Guiraud and L. Cadier, *Les Registres de Grégoire X (1272–76)* (Paris 1892–1960); P. Glorieux, "Autour des registres de Grégoire X," *RSTI,* 5 (1951), 305–25; F. Bock, "Autour des registres de Grégoire X," *RSTI,* 7 (1953), 307–36; A. L. Tautu, *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X (1261–76),* Pontificia commissio ad redigendum Codicem Iuris Canonici Orientalis, *Fontes,* series III, V/1 (Vatican

City 1953); F. Walter, *Die Politik der Kurie unter Gregor X.* (Berlin 1894); H. Otto, *Die Beziehungen Rudolfs von Habsburg zu Papst Gregor X.* (Innsbruck 1895); R. Diaccini, "Gregorio X e i domenicani," *Memorie domenicane,* 43 (1926), 22–29; J. Müller, *Studien zur Geschichte Gregors X.* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1929); *idem,* "Die Legationen unter Gregor X.," *RQ,* 37 (1929), 57–135; E. Nasalli-Rocca, *Problemi religiosi e politici del Duecento nell'opera di due grandi italiani* (Piacenza 1938); W. Hotzelt, "Gregor X., der letzte Kreuzzugspapst," *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart,* III (Cologne 1941), 92–110; V. Laurent, "La croisade et la question d'Orient sous le pontificat de Grégoire X," *Revue historique du Sud-Est européen* (Bucharest 1945), 105–37; L. Gatto, *Il pontificato di Gregorio X* (Rome 1959); R. Pasini, *Un sommo conciliatore (Gregorio X)* (Milan 1962); B. Roberg, "Die Abdankung Alfons' X. von Kastilien als deutscher König," *HJ,* 84 (1964), 334–51.

Lyons II: J. B. Martin, *Conciles et bullaires du diocèse de Lyon* (Lyons 1905); *Mansi,* XXIV, 61–68; A. Franchi, *Il Concilio II di Lione (1274) secondo la Ordinatio Concilii Lugdunensis* (text and notes) (Rome 1965); Humbert of Romans, *Opus tripartitum,* ed. P. Crabbe, *Concilia omnia,* II (Cologne 1551), 967–1003; the shorter redaction is in *Mansi,* XXIV, 109–32; K. Michel, *Das Opus tripartitum des Humbertus de Romanis O. P. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kreuzzugsidee und der kirchlichen Unionsbestrebungen* (Graz, 2d ed. 1926); "Das Memorandum des Bischofs von Olmütz, Bruno von Holstein-Schaumburg," ed. *MGLL,* IV/3, 589–94; Gilbert of Tournai, *Collectio de scandalis,* most recently edited by A. Stroick, *AFrH,* 24 (1931), 35–62; on the preceding see J. Auer, *Studien zu den Reformschriften für das II. Lyoner Konzil* (Freiburg 1910); A. Stroick, "Verfasser und Quellen der 'Collectio de scandalis Ecclesiae,'" *AFrH,* 23 (1930), 3–41, 273–99, 433–66; further documents on the Council in B. Roberg, "Die Union zwischen der griechischen und der lateinischen Kirche auf dem II. Konzil von Lyon (1274)," *Bonner historische Studien,* 24 (Bonn 1964). Decrees of the Council in *COD,* 279–307; *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils,* ed. H. J. Schroeder (Saint Louis and London 1937), 324–64, 595–606; S. Kuttner, "Conciliar Law in the Making. The Lyonese Constitutions (1274) of Gregory X," *Miscellanea Pio Paschini,* II (Rome 1949), 39–81; H. Finke, *Konzilienstudien zur Geschichte des 13. Jahrhunderts. Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu Hefele-Knöpfler, "Conciliengeschichte" V und VI* (Münster 1891); *Hefele-Leclercq,* VI, 153–218; *Fliche-Martin,* X, 487–503; H. Wolter and H. Holstein, *Lyon I et Lyon II, Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques,* 7 (Paris 1966), with copious bibliography.

The Union with the Greeks: see the bibliography for Chapter 16, *supra;* D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West (1258–1282). A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959).

28. *Heresy and the Inquisition in the Thirteenth Century*

Heresy: see the bibliographies for Chapters 13 and 21, in particular C. du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum,* I. von Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte,* and P. Frédéricq, *Corpus documentorum.* The best survey so far is the concise work by H. Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters, Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* ed. K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, II, G, 1 (Göttingen 1963), with its rich bibliography; L. Zanoni, "Valdesi a Milano nel secolo XIII," *Archivio storico lombardo,* IV/17 (1912), 5–22; H. Haupt, *Waldensertum und Inquisition im südöstlichen Deutschland* (Freiburg 1890); A. E. Schönbach, "Das Wirken Bertholds von Regensburg gegen die Ketzer," *SAW,* 147 (1904), 99–107; W. Preger, "Der Traktat des David von Augsburg gegen die Waldenser," *SAM,* 14/2 (1879), 181–235; G. Biscaro, "Inquisitori ed eretici lombardi (1292–1318)," *Misc. di Storia Ital.,* series 3, 19 (1922), 445–557; *idem,* "Eretici ed inquisitori nella Marca Trevisana (1280–1308)," *Archivio Veneto,* series 5, 11 (1932), 148–80; R. Manselli, "Per la storia dell'eresia catara nella Firenze del tempo di Dante," *BISI*, 62 (1950), 123–38; E. Dupré-Theseider, "L'eresia a Bologna nei tempi di Dante," *Studi storici in onore di G. Volpe*, 2 (1958), 383–444; E. Renan, *Averroès et l'averroïsme* (Paris 1852, 4th ed. 1882); P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIII^e siècle* (Louvain 1908–11); F. van Steenberghen, *Siger de Brabant d'après ses œuvres inédits* (Louvain 1931–42); *idem*, "Averroismus," *LThK*, I (2d ed. 1957), 1144–46; A. C. Shannon, *The Popes and Heresy in the Thirteenth Century* (Villanova 1949).

The Inquisition: Sources: C. Douais, *Les sources de l'histoire de l'Inquisition dans le midi de la France* (Paris 1882); Bernard Guy, *Practica officii inquisitionis haeretice pravitatis*, ed. C. Douais (Paris 1886), ed. G. Mollat (Paris 1926); *Manuel de l'inquisiteur*, ed. G. Mollat and G. Drioux, 2 vols. (Paris 1937); A. Dondaine, "Le manuel de l'inquisiteur," *AFP*, 17 (1947), 85–194; P. Frédéricq, *Corpus documentorum* (see bibliog. for Chapter 13); A. Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIII^e siècle. Le Liber de duobus principiis* (Rome 1939); J. N. Garvin and J. A. Corbett, *The Summa contra haereticos, ascribed to Praepositinus of Cremona* (Notre Dame 1958); G. Lacombe, *La vie et les oeuvres de Prévostin* (Paris 1927); James de Capellis, *De erroribus catharorum*, ed. De Bazzocchi, *L'eresia catara* (Bologna 1920), in the appendix; *De heresi catharorum in Lombardia*, ed. A. Dondaine, *AFP*, 19 (1949), 280–312; on the *Tractatus de hereticis* by Anselm of Alessandria see A. Dondaine, *AFP*, 20 (1950), 234–324 (text 308–24); Peter Martyr of Verona, *Summa contra Paterenos*, ed. T. Kaeppeli, *AFP*, 17 (1947), 295–335; on the preceding see A. Dondaine, "S. Pierre Martyr," *AFP*, 23 (1953), 66–162; Moneta of Cremona, *Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses*, ed. T. A. Ricchini (Rome 1743); Rainer Sacconi, *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, ed. A. Dondaine, *Un traité néo-manichéen (supra)*, 64–78.

Literature: *Hinschius*, V, 449–92, VI, 328–96 (reprinted Graz 1959); J. Ficker, "Die gesetzliche Einführung der Todesstrafe für Ketzerei," *MIÖG*, 1 (1880), 177–226; H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (New York 1888, reprinted 1955); P. Frédéricq, *Geschiedenis de Inquisitie in de Nederlanden*, 2 vols. (Ghent 1892–98); C. Douais, *L'Inquisition, ses origines, sa procédure* (Paris 1906); R. Gandrille, *L'Organisation de l'Inquisition en France de 1233 à 1500* (Paris 1908); H. Maillet, *L'Église et la répression sanglante de l'hérésie* (Liège 1909); C. Vacandard, *L'Inquisition* (Paris 1912); H. Köhler, *Die Ketzerpolitik der deutschen Könige und Kaiser (1152–54)* (Bonn 1913); R. Schmidt, *Königsrecht, Kirchenrecht und Stadtrecht beim Aufbau des Inquisitionsprozesses* (Munich 1915); E. Tuberville, *Mediaeval Heresy and the Inquisition* (London 1920); C. H. Haskins, "Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France," *AHR*, 7 (1902), 437–57, supplemented in *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford 1929), 193–244; L. Förg, *Die Ketzerverfolgungen in Deutschland unter Gregor IX.* (Berlin 1932); J. Guiraud, *Histoire de l'Inquisition au moyen âge*, 2 vols. (Paris 1935–38), important; G. della Veneria, *L'inquisizione medioevale e il processo inquisitorio* (Milan 1939); B. Llorca, *La Inquisición en España* (Madrid, 2d ed. 1946, 3d ed. 1954); Y. Dossat, *Les crises de l'Inquisition toulousaine* (Bordeaux 1959); H. Maisonneuve, *Études sur les origines de l'Inquisition* (Paris 1942, 2d ed. 1960); *Fliche-Martin*, X, 291–340; J. Lecler, "Inquisition," *Catholicisme*, 5 (1963), 1682–93; H. Grundmann, "Ketzerverhöre des Spätmittelalters als quellenkritisches Problem," *DA*, 21 (1965), 519–75; M. Bévenot, "The Inquisition and its Antecedents," *The Heythrop Journal*, 7 (1966), 257–68, 381–93, 8 (1967), 52–69, 152–68.

29. *The Missionary Work of the Church in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*

See Vol. III, bibliographies for Chapters 30 and 31. J. Schmidlin, *Katholische Missionsgeschichte* (Kaldenkirchen 1925), English translation (expanded) by M. Braun, *Catholic Mission History* (Techny, Ill. 1933); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of*

Christianity, II: *The Thousand Years of Uncertainty (500–1500)* (London 1938), 150–222; *Hauck,* IV (5th ed. 1925), 576–685; *Dahlmann-Waitz,* 6872–6963; P. David in *The Cambridge History of Poland,* ed. W. F. Riddaway, J. H. Halecki, and P. Diboski (Cambridge 1950), Chapter 4; S. Delacroix, *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques,* I: *Les missions des origines au XVI^{e} siècle* (Paris 1956).

EASTERN EUROPE

R. Kötzschke, *Quellen zur Geschichte der ostdeutschen Kolonisation im 12./14. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 2d ed. 1931); K. Hampe, *Der Zug nach Osten, die kolonisatorische Grosstadt des deutschen Volkes im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 5th ed. 1939); A. Hofmeister, *Der Kampf um die Ostsee vom 9.–12. Jahrhundert* (Greifswald 1931); M. Seidlmayer in *RQ* (1935), 187–204; F. Baethgen, "Die Kurie und der Osten im Mittelalter," *Mediaevalia,* I (Stuttgart 1960), 51–70; B. Stasiewski, "Ostmission," *LThK,* VII (2d ed. 1962), 1289–92, with bibliography; H. Beumann, "Kreuzzugsgedanke und Ostpolitik im hohen Mittelalter," *HJ,* 72 (1953), 112–32, now in *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters,* ed. H. Beumann (Darmstadt 1963), 121–45; M. Bünding-Naujoks, "Das Imperium Christianum und die deutschen Ostkriege vom 10. bis zum 12. Jahrhundert," *ibid.,* 65–120; H. D. Kahl, "Zum Geist der deutschen Slawenmission des Hochmittelalters," *ibid.,* 156–76; *idem,* "Zum Ergebnis des Wendenkreuzzuges von 1147. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des sächsischen Frühchristentums," *ibid.,* 275–316; W. Berges, "Reform und Ostmission im 12. Jahrhundert," *ibid.,* 317–36.

Pomerania: Pommersches Urkundenbuch, 8 vols. (Stettin and Cologne 1868–1961); H. Heyden, *Verzeichnis von Büchern zur Kirchengeschichte Pommerns* (Blomberg 1952); *Vita* of Otto of Bamberg by Wolfger of Prüfening, ed. A Hofmeister (Greifswald 1924), German translation by A. Hofmeister (Leipzig 1928); M. Wehrmann, *Die Lehr- und Predigttätigkeit des Bischofs Otto von Bamberg in Pommern, Baltische Studien,* 26 (Stettin 1924); W. Kümmel, *Die Missionsmethode des Bischofs Otto von Bamberg und seiner Vorläufer in Pommern* (Gütersloh 1926); P. Grosskopf, *Otto von Bamberg, der Pommernapostel* (Berlin, 2 ed. 1932); P. David, *La Pologne et l'évangélisation de la Pomeranie au XI^{e} et XII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1928); H. Heyden, *Kirchengeschichte Pommerns,* I (Cologne, 2d ed. 1957).

The Wends: Helmold of Bosau, *Chronica Slavorum* (to 1171), ed. B. Schmeidler (Leipzig, 3d ed. 1937); H. von Schubert, *Kirchengeschichte Schleswig-Holsteins,* I (Kiel 1907); F. Hestermann, *St. Vizelin* (Dülmen 1926); W. Lammers, *Geschichte Schleswig-Holsteins,* ed. O. Klose, IV (Neumünster 1961 ff.), 3d issue; W. Brüske, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Liutizenbundes* (Münster and Cologne 1955); G. Labuda, *Fragments for the History of the Western Slavs* (in Polish), 2 vols. (Poznań 1960–64); H. D. Kahl, "Heidnisches Wendentum und christliche Stammesfürsten," *AKG,* 44 (1962), 72–119, with bibliography.

Livonia: Sources: Scriptores rerum Livonicarum, I (Riga and Leipzig 1853); *Liv-, est- und kurländische Urkundenregesten bis zum Jahre 1300,* by F. G. von Bunge, with supplements by L. Arbusow, new edition by F. Benninghoven (Hamburg 1959); *Urkundenbuch der alten sächsischen Franziskanerprovinzen,* ed. members of the Saxon and Silesian Province, I: *Die Observantenkustodie Livland und Preussen,* revised by L. Lemmens (Düsseldorf n. d. [1913]); *Heinrichs livländische Chronik,* reedited by L. Arbusow and A. Bauer, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover 1955); Henry of Latvia, *Livländische Chronik,* new German translation by A. Bauer (Darmstadt 1959); Hermann of Arthberge, *Chronicon Livoniae,* ed. E. Strehlke (Leipzig 1863); "Hartmann von Heldrungen, Hochmeister des deutschen Ordens, Bericht über die Vereinigung des Schwertordens mit dem deutschen Orden und über die Erwerbung Livlands durch den letzteren," ed. E. Strehlke, *Mitteilungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte Liv-, Est- und Kurlands,* 11 (1868), 76–90; *Die ältere livländische Reimchronik,* ed. L.

Meyer (Paderborn 1876); Bartholomäus Hoeneke, *Die jüngere livländische Reimchronik,* ed. K. Höhlbaum (Leipzig 1872); *Livonica, vornähmlich aus dem 13. Jahrhundert im Vatikanischen Archiv,* ed. H. Hildebrand (Riga 1887).

Literature: P. von Goetze, *Albert Suerbeer, Erzbischof von Preussen, Livland und Estland* (St. Petersburg 1854); L. Arbusow, *Grundriss der Geschichte Liv-, Est- und Kurlands* (Riga, 4th ed. 1918); H. Laakmann, "Zur Geschichte Heinrichs von Lettland und seiner Zeit," *Beiträge zur Kunde Estlands,* 18 (1933), 57–102; P. Johansen, *Die Estlandliste des Liber Census Daniae* (Copenhagen and Reval 1933); L. Arbusow, "Zur Würdigung der Kultur Altlivlands im Mittelalter," *HZ,* 151 (1935), 18–47; A. M. Ammann, *Kirchenpolitische Wandlungen im Ostbaltikum bis zum Tode Alexander Newskis* (Rome 1936); M. von Taube, "Internationale und kirchenpolitische Wandlungen im Ostbaltikum und Russland zur Zeit der deutschen Eroberung," *Jbb. für Geschichte Osteuropas,* 3 (1938), 11 ff.; L. Arbusow, *Livland—Mark des Reiches (1207–1561)* (Riga 1944); P. Johansen, *Nordische Mission, Revals Gründung und die Schwedensiedlung in Estland* (Stockholm 1951); M. Hellmann, *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter* (Münster and Cologne 1954); P. Johansen, "Lippstadt, Freckenhorst und Fellin in Livland. Werk und Wirkung Bernhards II. zur Lippe im Ostseeraum," *Veröff. des Prov.-Inst. für westf. Landes- und Volkskunde, 7: Westfalen, Hanse, Ostseeraum* (Münster 1955), 97–160; A. Bauer, "Der Livlandkreuzzug," *Baltische Kirchengeschichte,* ed. R. Wittram (Göttingen 1956), 26–34; B. Abers, "Zur päpstlichen Missionspolitik in Lettland und Estland zur Zeit Innocenz' III.," *Commentationes Balticae,* 4/5 (1956 f.) (Bonn 1958), 1–18; H. Biezais, "Der friedliche Zeitabschnitt der katholischen Mission in Lettland bis zum Jahre 1196," *Kyrkohistoriksk Arsskrift* (Uppsala 1956), 13–29; T. Grentrup, "Der Zisterzienser Dietrich in der altlivländischen Mission," *ZMR,* 40 (1956), 265–81; G. Gnegel-Waitschies, *Bischof Albert von Riga. Ein Bremer Domherr als Kirchenfürst im Osten* (Hamburg 1958); M. Hellmann, *Die Verfassungsgrundlagen Livlands und Preussens im Mittelalter. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Verfassungsgeschichte* (Munich 1958); E. Weise, "Über die Herkunft Erzbischof Friedrichs I. von Bremen-Hamburg und Bischof Bertolds von Livland," *Stader Jb. 1959,* 95–101; A. von Transche-Roseneck, *Die ritterlichen Livlandfahrer des 13. Jahrhunderts, eine genealogische Untersuchung,* ed. W. Lenz (Würzburg 1960); F. Benninghoven, *Der Orden der Schwertbrüder, Fratres milicie Christi de Livonia* (Cologne and Graz 1965), with bibliography.

Prussia: J. Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens* (to 1525), 9 vols. (Königsberg 1827–39), standard; W. Roth, *Die Dominikaner und Franziskaner im Ordensland Preussen bis 1466* (Königsberg 1919); P. Ostwald, *Das Werk des Deutschen Ritterordens in Preussen* (Berlin 1926); F. Blanke, "Die Missionsmethode des Bischofs Christian von Preussen," *Altpreussische Forschungen,* 4 (1927), 3–25, now in H. Beumann, *Heidenmission (supra),* 337–63; F. Blanke, "Die Entscheidungsjahre der Preussenmission (1206–1274)," *ZKG,* 47 (1928), 18–40, or H. Beumann, *Heidenmission (supra),* 389–416; E. Maschke, *Der Deutsche Orden und die Preussen. Unterwerfung und Bekehrung* (Berlin 1928); *idem,* "Polen und die Berufung des Deutschen Ordens nach Preussen," *Ostländische Forschungen,* 4 (Berlin 1934); *idem, Der Deutsche Orden* (Jena 1939); G. A. Donner, *Kardinal Wilhelm von S. Sabina, Bischof von Modena* (Helsingfors 1929); W. Loos, *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Deutschen Ordensstaat und Pommern* (Königsberg 1937); E. E. Stengel, *Hochmeister und Reich* (Weimar 1938); G. Kunze, *Glaube und Politik. Zur Idee des Deutschen Ordens* (Jena 1938); K. Forstreuter, *Preussen und Russland im Mittelalter (13.–17. Jahrhundert)* (Berlin 1938); *idem,* "Die Gründung des Erzbistums Preussen," *Jb. der Albertus-Universität in Königsberg,* 10 (1960), 9–31; *Festschrift Kurt Forstreuter: Preussenland und Deutscher Orden* (Würzburg 1958).

Hermann of Salza: A. Lorck, *Hermann von Salza, sein Itinerar* (Kiel 1908); E. Caspar, *Hermann von Salza und die Gründung des Deutschordensstaates* (Tübingen 1924); W. Cohn, *Hermann von Salza* (Breslau 1930); E. Maschke, "Die Herkunft Hermanns von

Salza," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für thüring. Geschichte und Altertumskunde,* new series, 34 (1940), 372–89; H. Heimpel, *Der Mensch in seiner Gegenwart* (Göttingen 1954), 87–108.

The Teutonic Order: Scriptores rerum Prussicarum, Die Geschichtsschreiber der preussischen Vorzeit, ed. T. Hirsch, M. Toeppen, and E. Strehlke, 5 vols. (Leipzig 1861–74); *Preussisches Urkundenbuch,* ed. F. Philippi, C. P. Woelky, *et al.*, I–III/2 (Königsberg and Marburg 1882–1958); E. Joachim and W. Hubatsch, *Regesta Ordinis S. Mariae Theutonicorum,* 4 vols. (Göttingen 1948–50); R. ten Haaf, *Kurze Bibliographie des Deutschen Ordens* (Göttingen 1949); M. Hellmann, "Neue Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens," *HJ,* 75 (1956), 201–13; W. Kuhn, "Ritterorden als Grenzhüter des Abendlandes gegen das östliche Heidentum," *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft,* 6 (1959), 7–70; M. Hellmann, "Über die Grundlagen und die Entstehung des Ordensstaates in Preussen," *Nachr. der Giessener Hochschulgesellschaft,* 31 (1962), 108–26; B. Poschmann, "Bistümer und Deutscher Orden in Preussen," *Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands,* 30 (1962), 227–356; H. H. Hofmann, *Der Staat des Deutschmeisters. Studien zu einer Geschichte des Deutschen Ordens im Heiligen Römischen Reich deutscher Nation* (Munich 1964); E. Weise, "Der Heidenkampf des Deutschen Ordens," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung,* 12 (1963), 420–73, 622–73, 13 (1964), 401–20; I. Matison, "Die Lehnsexemtion des Deutschen Ordens und dessen staatsrechtliche Stellung in Preussen," *DA,* 21 (1965), 194–248; O. Engels, "Zur Historiographie des Deutschen Ordens im Mittelalter," *AKG,* 48 (1966), 336–63.

ASIA

R. Streit, *Bibliotheca Missionum,* IV (Aachen 1928), 1245–1599; R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae,* II–III (Leiden, 2d ed. 1950–53); *Sinica Franciscana,* I: *Itinera et Relationes Fratrum Minorum saec. XIII et XIV,* ed. A. van den Wyngaert (Quaracchi 1929); J. Becquet and L. Hambis, *Jean de Plan Carpin, Histoire des Mongols,* traduit et annoté (Paris 1965); H. Matrod, *Miscellanea nel 7. centenario della sua* [John of Piano di Carpine] *morte* (Assisi 1952); William of Ruysbroeck, *Reisebericht,* translated into German by F. Risch (Leipzig 1934); F. Soldi, *Undecima hora. La missione di Bartolomeo da Cremona al Gran Khan di Karakorum nel 1254* (Cremona 1954); H. Dörrie, *Drei Texte zur Geschichte der Ungarn und Mongolen. Die Missionsreisen des Fr. Julianus O. P. ins Uralgebiet (1234/35) und nach Russland (1237) und der Bericht des Erzbischofs Peter über die Tartaren, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften Göttingen 1956,* 6 (Göttingen 1956); D. Sinor, "Les relations entre les Mongols et l'Europe jusqu'à la mort d'Arghum," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale,* 3 (1956), 39–62; G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia* (New Haven 1953); C. Cahen, "The Mongols and the Near East," *A History of the Crusades,* ed. K. M. Setton, II, 715–34, with bibliography.

The Papacy and the Mongols: P. Pelliot, "Les Mongols et la papauté," *ROC,* 23 (1922 f.), 3–30, 24 (1924), 225–335, 28 (1931 f.), 3–84; G. Soranzo, *Il papato, l'Europa e i Tartari* (Milan 1930); G. Rocheau, "Innocent IV devant le péril tartare. Ses lettres à Daniel de Galicie et à Alexandre Nevsky," *Istina,* 6 (1959), 167–86; H. Serruys, "Early Mongols and the Catholic Church," *NZM,* 19 (1963), 161–69.

China: B. Altaner, *Die Dominikanermission des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Habelschwerdt 1924); J. de Ghellinck, *Les Franciscains en Chine au XIII^e et XIV^e siècle* (Louvain 1927); J. Stewart, *Nestorian Missionary Enterprise* (Edinburgh 1928); L. Lemmens, *Geschichte der Franziskanermissionen* (Münster 1929); A. C. Moule, *Christians in China before 1550* (London 1930); L. E. Browne, *The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia from Muhammed till the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge 1933); O. van den Vat, *Die Anfänge der Franziskanermission ... während des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Werl 1934); M. d'Elia, "Katholische Kirche in China 635/1294/1948," *StMis* (1950 f.), 3–67; P. S. Hsiang, *The Catholic Missions in China 1294–1368* (Washington 1949); F. Soldi, *Undecima hora (supra);* C. Cary-Elwes,

China and the Cross (London 1957); C. W. Troll, "Die Chinamission im Mittelalter," *FStud,* 48 (1966), 109–50, 49 (1967), 22–78, with bibliography.

30. *Canon Law and the Constitution of the Church in the Thirteenth Century*

Sources

The five great compilations: ed. E. Friedberg, *Quinque compilationes antiquae* (Leipzig 1882); the Decretals of Gregory IX, *Liber Extra:* last edition by E. Friedberg (Leipzig 1881, often reprinted); on this edition *cf.* A. M. Stickler, *Historia Iuris Canonici Latini,* I: *Historia Fontium* (Turin 1950), 249 f.; Innocent IV's collection of *novellae:* latest edition by P. J. Kessler, "Untersuchungen über die Novellen-Gesetzgebung Papst Innocenz' IV. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des kanonischen Rechts," *ZSavRGkan,* 31 (1942), 142–320, 32 (1943), 300–83, 33 (1944), 56–128; the Decretals of Gregory X (almost exclusively the constitutions of Lyons II): ed. J. H. Böhmer, *Corpus Iuris Canonici,* II, Anhang 4; Nicholas III's collection of *novellae:* partly edited by F. von Schulte, *SAW,* 55 (1867), 718–22; Boniface VIII's *Liber Sextus:* last edition by E. Friedberg (Leipzig 1881) (see *supra*).

Literature

Feine RG, I, 283–92; G. Le Bras, C. Lefèbvre, J. Rambaud, *Histoire du Droit et des Institutions de l'Église en Occident,* VII: *L'âge classique (1140–1378)* (Paris 1965), 133–351; H. Singer, *Neue Beiträge über die Dekretalen-Sammlungen vor und nach Bernhard von Pavia, SAW,* 171 (Vienna 1914), and, in connection with this work, the discussion by F. Heyer in *ZSavKGkan,* 3 (1913), 615–42, 4 (1914), 583–608; on the collections between Gratian and Gregory IX *cf.* S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik, SteT,* 71 (Rome 1937), 272–385; on the five great compilations *cf., inter alia,* G. Fransen, "Les diverses formes de la Compilatio Ia," *Scrinium lovaniense,* Mélanges historiques E. van Cauwenbergh (Louvain 1961), 235–53; C. R. Cheney, "Three Decretal Collections before Compilatio IVa," *Tr,* 15 (1959), 464–83; S. Kuttner, "Johannes Teutonicus, das vierte Laterankonzil und die Compilatio IVa," *MiscMercati,* V, *SteT,* 125 (Rome 1946), 608–34; on the *Liber Extra: Feine RG,* I, 287; *Le Bras D,* 233–43; on the *novellae* of Innocent IV: P. J. Kessler, *Untersuchungen* (see *supra*); on the *Liber Sextus: Feine RG,* I, 288 f.; *Le Bras D,* 247–51. S. Gagner, *Studien zur Ideengeschichte der Gesetzgebung* (Uppsala 1960), is an important work on the legislative achievements of the thirteenth-century Popes.

The Decretalists: Bernard of Pavia, *Summa decretalium,* ed. E. A. T. Laspeyres (Regensburg 1860); Sinibaldo Fieschi (Innocent IV), *Apparatus in V libros Decretalium* (Frankfurt am Main 1570; editio princeps, Strasbourg 1477); Henry of Susa (Hostiensis), *Summa super titulis Decretalium* (Rome 1473); A. Rivera Damas, *Pensamiento político de Hostiensis* (Zürich 1964). Only the most famous have been listed; a distinction is made between the older decretalists (up to the *Liber Extra*) and the later. On the *apparatus* and glosses *cf. Le Bras D,* 292–301; on Innocent IV as a canonist *cf.* J. A. Cantini and C. Lefèbvre in *DDC,* 7 (1958–62), 1029–62; on Henry of Susa *cf. Le Bras D,* 312–14; G. Le Bras, "Théologie et droit canonique dans l'oeuvre de Henri de Suse," *Études Didier* (Paris 1961), 195–204.

Constitution of the Church: the following are the most important works: *Hinschius;* J. B. Sägmüller, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts,* I (Freiburg, 4th ed. 1934); W. M. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts,* II: *Das Kirchenrecht der abendländischen Christenheit 1055–1517* (Vienna, 2d ed. 1961); *Fliche-Martin,* 12/1; *Feine RG.* All the works just mentioned include a comprehensive bibliography for individual chapters and problems.

The Papacy: W. Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 2d ed. 1962); *idem, Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages* (London 1961); *Hinschius,* I, 163–308; *Feine RG,* 299–321; *Le Bras D,* 305–333; M. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1963), especially 354–407; criticism of Ullmann by F. Kempf, "Die päpstliche Gewalt in der mittelalterlichen Welt," *Saggi storici intorno al papato* (Rome 1959), 117–69; on the dispute whether the thirteenth-century Popes were "hierocrats" or "dualists" *cf.* now the important remarks by B. Tierney, "The Continuity of Papal Political Theory in the Thirteenth Century," *MS,* 27 (1965), 227–45; M. Pacaut, "L'autorité pontificale selon Innocent IV," *MA,* 66 (1960), 85–119; M. Maccarone, *Vicarius Christi. Storia del titolo papale* (Rome 1952); D. P. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century* (London 1961); J. H. Hackett, "State of the Church. A concept of the medieval canonists," *The Jurist* (1963), 259–90.

Councils: A. Hauck, "Die Rezeption und Umbildung der allgemeinen Synode im Mittelalter," *HV,* 10 (1907), 465–82; H. Fuhrmann, "Das ökumenische Konzil und seine historischen Grundlagen," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht,* 12 (1961), 672–95; F. Dvornik, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris 1962); G. Tangl, *Die Teilnehmer an den allgemeinen Konzilien des Mittelalters* (Weimar 1922); B. Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge 1955); J. Leclercq, *Jean de Paris et l'ecclésiologie du XIII^e^ siècle* (Paris 1942).

Bishops: Hinschius, II, 1–48, also I, 538–632; *Feine RG,* 366–69; *Le Bras D,* 365–76. There is a copious literature on the history of dioceses in Germany, France, England, and Spain, which usually also treats questions of organization. Important biographies of English bishops have recently appeared: D. L. Douie, *Archbishop Pecham* (Oxford 1952); D. A. Callus, *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop* (Oxford 1955); C. M. Fraser, *A History of Antony Bek, Bishop of Durham* (Oxford 1957); C. H. Lawrence, *St. Edmund of Abingdon, Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford 1960). Special problems are treated in: K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *Episkopat und Primat* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1961); G. Barraclough, "The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages," *CHR,* 19 (1933), 275–319; P. Hofmeister, "Die kanonischen und nichtkanonischen Wahlen," *ZKTh,* 77 (1955), 432–71; A. Desprairies, *L'élection des évêques par les chapitres au XIII^e^ siècle* (Paris 1922); A. Diegel, *Der päpstliche Einfluss auf die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland während des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1932); R. L. Benson, *The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office* (Princeton 1968); R. Brentano, *Two Churches: England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century* (Princeton 1968); J. J. Smith, *The Attitude of John Pecham toward Monastic Houses under His Jurisdiction* (Washington 1949).

Archdeacons: J. B. Sägmüller, *Lehrbuch* (see *supra*), 1 467–69, with the older literature; *Hinschius,* II, 183–204; *Feine RG,* 369–75; *Le Bras D,* 391–94. The series of monographs on the archdeaconry begins with N. Hilling for Münster (1902) and Halberstadt (1902), after which come those by H. Bastgen for Trier (1906), E. Baumgartner for the Rhenish dioceses (1907), G. Gescher for Cologne (1920), J. Machens for Hildesheim (1921), A. Schröder for Augsburg (1925), B. Panzram for Silesia (1937), M. Hannappel for Erfurt (1941), H. Mulders for Utrecht (1943), and A. Szentirmai for Hungary *(ZSavRGkan,* 43 [1957], 132–201); J. Frieg, *Kampf der Bischöfe gegen die Archidiakonate im Bistum Würzburg* (Stuttgart 1914); A. Franzen, *Die Kölner Archdiakonate in vor- und nachtridentinischer Zeit* (Münster 1953), with bibliography.

Parishes: Hinschius, II, 261–328; *Feine RG,* 391–427; *Le Bras D,* 404–23. The older bibliography is in *Feine RG,* 411–14 and 424–27 (urban parish). A. Schultze, "Stadtgemeinde und Kirche im Mittelalter," *Festschrift Rudolf Sohm* (Munich and Leipzig 1914), 105–42, and, in connection with this essay, K. Frölich in *HV,* 20 (1920), 37–46; R. A. R. Hartridge, *A History of Vicarages in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1930); K. Frölich, "Die Rechtsformen der mittelalterlichen Altarpfründen," *ZSavRGkan,* 20 (1931), 457–544, with bibliography; *idem,* "Kirche und städtisches Verfassungsleben im Mittelalter,"

ZSavRGkan, 22 (1933), 188–287; L. Pfleger, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pfarr-Instituts im Elsass* (Strasbourg 1936); G. Mollat, "Le droit de patronage en Normandie du XI^e au XV^e siècle," *RHE,* 33 (1937), 464–84, 725–88, 34 (1938), 21–69; B. Panzram, *Geschichtliche Grundlage der ältesten schlesischen Pfarreiorganisation* (Breslau 1940); L. Manni, *La parrocchia studiata nei documenti lucchesi dei secoli VIII–XIII* (Rome 1948); H. T. Hoederath, "Forensis Ecclesia," *ZSavRGkan,* 36 (1950), 390–99; H. Lentze, "Die Rechtsform der Altarpfründen im mittelalterlichen Wien," *ZSavRGkan,* 37 (1951), 221–302; E. O. Kuujo, *Die rechtliche und wirtschaftliche Stellung der Pfarrkirchen in Alt-Livland* (Helsinki 1953); J. Nylander, *The Origins of the Office of Churchwarden* (York 1954); G. H. Cook, *The English Medieval Parish Church* (London 1954); H. B. Noser, *Pfarrei und Kirchgemeinde. Studie zu ihrem rechtlichen Begriff und grundsätzlichen Verhältnis* (Fribourg 1957); H. E. Feine, "Kirche und Gemeindebildung," *Recht und Kirche, ausgewählte Abhandlungen,* ed. F. Merzbacher (Aalen 1966), 101–18.

Cathedral Chapters: Hinschius, II, 49–160; *Feine RG,* 379–91; *Le Bras D,* 376–90; A. Schulte, *Der Adel und die deutsche Kirche* (Darmstadt, 3d ed. 1958); G. von Below, *Die Entstehung des ausschliesslichen Wahlrechts der Domkapitel* (Leipzig 1883); P. Schneider, *Die Entwicklung der bischöflichen Domkapitel* (Mainz 1892); E. Mayer, "Der Ursprung der Domkapitel," *ZSavRGkan,* 7 (1917), 1–33. Monographs on the history of cathedral chapters in Germany, France, England, Ireland, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, and Poland are listed in *Fliche-Martin,* 12, 377, footnote 3; L. Santifaller, *Das Brixener Domkapitel in seiner persönlichen Zusammensetzung im Mittelalter,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1924 f.); A. Hamilton-Thompson, *The Cathedral Churches of England* (Oxford 1925); P. Hofmeister, *Bischof und Domkapitel nach altem und nach neuem Recht* (Neresheim 1931); J. Oswald, *Das alte Passauer Domkapitel* (Munich 1933); M. Gibbs and J. Lang, *Bishops and Reform (1215–1272)* (London 1934); R. Samulski, *Untersuchungen über die persönliche Zusammensetzung des Breslauer Domkapitels im Mittelalter* (to 1341) (Weimar 1940); E. Fournier, *Nouvelles recherches sur les curies, chapitres et universités de l'Église de France* (Arras 1942); L. Santifaller, *Urkunden und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Trienter Domkapitels im Mittelalter,* I (Vienna 1948); C. N. L. Brooke, "The Composition of the Chapter of St. Paul's (1086–1163)," *CambrHJ,* 10 (1951), 111–32; J. Szymanski, "Les recherches sur l'histoire des chapitres polonais effectuées de 1945 à 1960," *RHE,* 57 (1962), 484–92.

SECTION SIX

The Crisis of the Papacy and of the Church: 1274 - 1303

SOURCES

Mansi, XXIV and XXV; *Hefele-Leclercq,* VI/1, 229–467; *Bullarium Taur.,* IV, 35–174; *Potthast R,* 1704–2024; *Duchesne LP,* II, 457–71; *MGConst,* III and IV, ed. J. Schwalm (Hanover and Leipzig 1904–11); E. Winkelmann, *Acta Imperii inedita saec. XIII et XIV (1198–1400),* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1880–85, reprinted Aalen 1964). Papal *registra:* Gregory X and John XXI, ed. J. Guiraud and E. Cadier (Paris 1892–1960); Nicholas III, ed. J. Guy and S. Vitte (Paris 1938); Martin IV, ed. M. Olier-Martin (Paris 1901–35); Honorius IV, ed. M. Prou (Paris 1888); Nicholas IV, 2 vols., ed. E. Langlois (Paris 1905); Boniface VIII, 4 vols., ed. G. Digard, M. Faucon, A. Thomas, and R. Fawtier (Paris 1907–39). *Regesta Imperii,* VI/1 (Rudolf of Habsburg), ed. O. Redlich (Innsbruck 1898); *Regesta Imperii,* VI/2 (Adolf of Nassau), ed. V. Samanek (Innsbruck 1948); there is not yet available a new revision for Albert I, but A. Hessel, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter König Albrecht von Habsburg* (Munich 1931, with all the literature), should be consulted; Y.

Lanhers, *Le dossier d'Albert d'Autriche aux Archives et à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Festschrift . . . des Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchivs,* I, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs,* supplementary Volume 2 (Vienna 1949); F. Kern, *Acta Imperii, Angliae et Franciae* (Berlin 1911); H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* 3 vols. (Berlin 1908–22), supplemented by *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 4 (1933), 355–536; J. Vincke, *Documenta selecta mutuas civitatis Arago-Cathalaunicae et Ecclesiae relationes illustrantia* (Barcelona 1936). Most of the historical writing of this period—frequently the work of mendicant friars—is confined to particular territories, but the compendia of Martin of Troppau and Martinus Minorita (see the bibliog. for Section V) are more comprehensive.

The continuations of the Italian annals are valuable: of Piacenza to 1284, *MGSS,* 17, 457–81 (Ghibelline); of Genoa to 1294, *MGSS,* 18, 11–356; of Parma to 1335, *MGSS,* 18, 664–790; of Albert Milioli (Reggio) to 1285, *MGSS,* 31, 336–668; Tolomeo of Lucca, *Historia ecclesiastica nova* (to 1294), ed. *Muratori,* XI, 753–1216; Saba Malaspina, *Rerum Sicularum libri VI* (1250–76) and Continuatio (to 1285), ed. *Muratori,* VIII, 785–874; Bartholomew of Neocastro, *Historia Sicula,* ed. G. Paladino (Bologna 1921 f.).

Germany: the Great Annals of Marbach (to 1305), *MGSS,* 17, 142–80; Ottakar's *Österreichische Reimchronik,* ed. J. Seemüller, *MG Deutsche Chroniken,* 5 (Hanover 1890–93); the Chronicle of Colmar (to 1304), *MGSS,* 17, 183–270; the Annals of Altaich, with their continuations, ed. F. von Oefele, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover 1891); the Chronicles of Erfurt (to 1355), ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS rer. Germ.* (Hanover 1899); the Chronicle of Reinhardsbrunner (to 1338), ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGSS,* 30, 490–656; see K. Jacob and F. Werden, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte im Mittelalter,* III (Berlin 1952), 22–42.

England: Chronicles of Bury St. Edmunds (to 1301), latest edition by V. H. Galbraith, *EHR,* 53 (1943), 51–78 (important); Bartholomew Cotton of Norwich, *Historia Anglicana* (to 1298), ed. H. R. Luard, *Rolls Series,* 16 (London 1859); monastic annals are numerous and in this field also the mendicants undertook the writing toward the close of the century, as, for example, the Lanerost Chronicle (1201–1346), ed. J. Stevenson, Bannatyne Club (1839), translated by W. Maxwell, introduction by J. Wilson (London 1913); the Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough (formerly: Walter of Hemmingford) (to 1312), ed. H. Rothwell, Camden Society, Third Series, 89 (London 1957); for other English sources *cf.* F. M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1962), 730–43.

France: especially important is the Chronicle of William of Nangis (1113–1300), ed. H. Géraud, 2 vols. (New York and London 1964).

Spain: James I, *Crónica,* ed. J. M. Casacuberta *et al.*, 9 vols. (Barcelona 1926–62); B. Desclot, *Libre del rey en Pere de Aragó e dels seus antecessors passats,* ed. M. Coll i Alentorn (Barcelona 1949); R. Muntaner, *Crónica,* ed. E. Bagué (Barcelona 1927), and, in connection with it, F. Soldevilla, *Les gestes de Pere el Gran* (Barcelona 1926).

Literature

See the works already listed for Section Five. Also: H. Heimpel, *Deutschland im späteren Mittelalter, Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte,* ed. L. Just, I, V. Abschnitt (Constance 1957); E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique,* III (Brussels 1945); E. G. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris 1954); F. M. Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century (1216–1307)* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1962); *idem, King Henry III and the Lord Edward,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1947); *The Cambridge Medieval History,* VII (London 1932, reprinted 1957); *Lavisse,* III/2; H. Hantsch, *Die Geschichte Österreichs,* I (Vienna, 4th ed. 1959).

31. *The Papacy Subject to Angevin Influence*

LITERATURE

Seppelt, III, 534–80; *Haller,* V, 42–89.

Innocent V: H. M. Laurent, *Le bienheureux Innocent V et son temps, SteT,* 129 (Rome 1947); E. A. van Moe, "L'envoi des nonces à Constantinople par les papes Innocent V et Jean XXI (1276)," *MAH,* 47 (1930), 39–62; H. M. Laurent, "Georges le Métochite, ambassadeur de Michel VIII Paléologue auprès d'Innocent V," *MiscMercati,* 3 (Rome 1956), 136–56; L. F. Barmann, "Peter of Tarentaise, a Biographical Study," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* 31 (1961), 96–125; *Beatus Innocentius Papa V (Petrus de Tarantasia). Studia et documenta* (Rome 1943).

Adrian V: R. Graham, "Letters of Cardinal Ottoboni," *EHR,* 15 (1900), 87–120; N. Schöpp, *Papst Hadrian V. (Kardinal Ottobuono Fieschi)* (Heidelberg 1916).

John XXI: R. Stapper, *Papst Johannes XXI. Eine Monographie* (Münster i. W. 1898); *Obras filosóficas,* 3 vols., ed. M. A. Alonso (Madrid 1941–52, Barcelona, 2d ed. 1961); *Summulae logicales,* ed. J. P. Mullally (Notre Dame 1945); V. Ludovisi, "Vocabor Joannes. Il papa Giovanni [XXI] nel periodo ducentesco della sede Viterbese," *Viterbo città dei papi* (Viterbo 1961), 9–16; *Peter of Spain, Tractatus syncategorematum and Selected Anonymous Treatises,* translated by J. P. Mullally, with introduction by J. P. Mullally and R. Houde (Milwaukee 1964).

Nicholas III: A. Demski, *Papst Nikolaus III.* (Munich 1903); R. Sternfeld, *Der Kardinal Johann Gaetan Orsini (Papst Nikolaus III. 1244–77)* (Berlin 1905); E. Dupré-Theseider, *Roma dal Comune di popolo alla Signoria pontificia* (Bologna 1952); G. Barraclough, "The Chancery Ordinance of Nicholas III," *QFIAB,* 25 (1933 f.), 192–250; F. Baethgen, "Ein Pamphlet Karls I. von Anjou zur Wahl Papst Nikolaus' III.," *SAM* (1906–07); R. J. Loenertz, "Mémoire d'Ogier protonotaire, pour Marco et Marchetto nonces de Michel VIII Paléologue auprès du pape Nicholas III 1278," *OrChrP,* 31 (1965), 374–408.

Martin IV: N. Backes, *Kardinal Simon de Brion* (Breslau 1910); R. Sternfeld, "Das Konklave von 1280 und die Wahl Martins IV.," *MIÖG,* 31 (1910), 1–53; J. R. Strayer, "The Crusade against Aragon," *Speculum,* 28 (1953), 102–13; A. Fabrega Grau, "Actitud de Pedro III el Grande de Aragón ante la propia deposición fulminada por Martín IV," *Sacerdozio e regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII, Misc. Hist. Pont.,* 18 (Rome 1954), 161–80; R. Kay, "Martin IV and the Fugitive Bishop of Bayeux," *Speculum,* 40 (1965), 460–83.

Honorius IV: B. Pawlicki, *Papst Honorius IV.* (Münster 1896); G. von Gaisberg-Schöckingen, *Das Konzil und der Reichstag von Würzburg 1287* (Marburg 1928).

Nicholas IV: O. Schiff, *Studien zur Geschichte Papst Nikolaus' IV.* (Berlin 1897); G. I. Bratianu, "Autour du projet de croisade de Nicolas IV: la guerre ou le commerce avec l'Infidèle," *Revue historique du Sud-Est européen,* 22 (Bucharest 1945), 250–55.

The Angevins and Sicily: see the bibliography for Chapter 26. Also: V. Nicolini, *Codice diplomatico sui rapporti veneto-napoletani durante il regno di Carlo I d'Angiò* (Rome 1965); O. Cartellieri, *Peter von Aragón und die sizilianische Vesper* (Heidelberg 1904); E. Sthamer, "Aus der Vorgeschichte der sizilischen Vesper," *QFIAB,* 19 (1927), 262–372; H. Wieruszowski, "Der Anteil Johannes von Procida an der Verschwörung gegen Karl von Anjou," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* I/5 (Münster 1935), 230–39; *eadem,* "Le corte di Pietro d'Aragona e i precedenti dell'impresa siciliana," *AstIt,* 96 (1938), I, 141–62, II, 200–17; G. La Mantia, "Studi sulla rivoluzione siciliana del 1282," *Archivio storico per la Sicilia,* 6 (1939), 97–140; M. Amari, *La guerra del Vespro Siciliano* (Mazara 1947); S. Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge 1958); A. Nitschke, "Karl von Anjou und Peter von Aragón. Ihre Stellung zur sizilianischen Bevölkerung," *Fest-*

schrift P. E. Schramm, I (1964), 322–33; *idem*, "Der sizilische Adel unter Karl von Anjou und Peter von Aragón," *QFIAB*, 45 (1965), 241–73.

Spain: J. Vincke, *Staat und Kirche in Katalonien und Aragón während des Mittelalters* (Münster 1931); H. J. Chaytor, *A History of Aragon and Catalonia* (London 1933); J. B. Strayer, "The Crusade against Aragon," *Speculum*, 28 (1953), 102–13; J. M. Pou y Martí, "Conflictos entre el Pontificado y los reyes de Aragón en el siglo XIII," *Sacerdozio e regno da Gregorio VII a Bonifacio VIII, Misc. Hist. Pont.*, 18 (Rome 1954), 139–60; H. Wieruszowski, "Politische Verschwörungen und Bündnisse König Peters von Aragón gegen Karl von Anjou am Vorabend der Sizilianischen Vesper," *QFIAB*, 37 (1957), 136–91; F. Soldevilla, "L'ambaixada de Pere el Gran a l'emperador Rudolf de Habsburg," *Homenaje a Aime Vicens Vives*, I (Barcelona 1965), 651–59.

Germany: O. Redlich, *Rudolf von Habsburg. Das deutsche Reich nach dem Untergange des Kaisertums* (Innsbruck 1903, reprinted Aalen 1965); the older literature in *Dahlmann-Waitz*, 7581–97; F. Baethgen, "Ein Versuch Rudolfs von Habsburg, die Reichsrechte in der Toskana wahrzunehmen," *HV*, 22 (1924 f.), 70–75. For the plan to make the Empire hereditary: W. Neumann, "Reichsreformpläne im 13. Jahrhundert," *Festschrift für Hermann Reincke-Bloch* (Breslau 1927), 37–47; H. Hempel, "Alexander von Roes und das deutsche Selbstbewusstsein des 13. Jahrhunderts," *AKG*, 26 (1935), 19–60; *Die Schriften des Alexander von Roes*, ed. and trans. H. Grundmann and H. Heimpel (Weimar 1949); H. Grundmann, "Über die Schriften des Alexander von Roes," *DA*, 8 (1950), 154–237; *idem*, "Sacerdotium—Regnum—Studium," *AKG*, 34 (1951), 5–21; H. Heimpel, "Über den Pavo des Alexander von Roes," *DA*, 13 (1957), 171–227; H. Otto, *Die Beziehungen Rudolfs von Habsburg zu Gregor X.* (Innsbruck 1895); A. Demski, *Rudolf von Habsburg und die römische Kaiserkrone unter Nikolaus III.* (Breslau 1906); H. Roeder, *Rudolf von Habsburg als römischer König* (Bonn 1926); H. Rössler, *Ein König für Deutschland* (Munich 1960); K. and M. Uhlirz, *Handbuch der Geschichte Österreich-Ungarns*, I (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne, 2d ed. 1963), 263–66, 274–78, with bibliography; V. Samanek, *Studien zur Geschichte König Adolfs I, SAW*, 20 (Vienna 1929); G. Barraclough, "Edward I and Adolf of Nassau," *CambrHJ*, 6 (1940), 225–62; F. J. Schmale, "Eine thüringische Briefsammlung aus der Zeit Adolfs von Nassau," *DA*, 9 (1952), 464–93; W. H. Struck, "Eine neue Quelle zur Geschichte König Adolfs von Nassau," *Nassauische Annalen*, 63 (1952), 72–105; F. Baethgen, "Zur Wahl Adolfs von Nassau," *DA*, 12 (1956), 536–43; the older literature in *Dahlmann-Waitz*, 7598–7602; O. Herding, *Das Römisch-Deutsche Reich in deutschen und italienischen Beurteilungen von Rudolf von Habsburg zu Heinrich VII.* (Erlangen 1937).

32. *Christian Fanaticism in the Thirteenth Century*

LITERATURE

H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter. Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und den religiösen Frauenbewegungen im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Darmstadt, 2d ed. 1961), in the appendix: "neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der religiösen Bewegungen im Mittelalter," also in *AKG*, 37 (1955), 129–82; E. Dupré-Theseider, *Introduzione alle eresie medioevali* (Bologna 1952); H. Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters* (Göttingen 1963); G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Manchester 1967).

Joachim of Fiore: Works: *Concordia novi ac veteris testamenti* (Venice 1519); *Expositio in Apocalypsim* (Venice 1527); *Psalterium decem chordarum* (Venice 1527); *Tractatus super quatuor evangelia*, ed. E. Buonaiuti (Rome 1930); *De articulis fidei*, ed. E. Buonaiuti (Rome 1936); *Liber figurarum*, ed. L. Tondelli (Turin, 2d ed. 1953); *De vita et regula S.*

Benedicti, ed. C. Baraut, *AST*, 24 (1951), 33–122; *De septem sigillis*, ed. M. Reeves and B. Hirsch-Reich, *RThAM*, 21 (1954), 211–47; *Adversus Iudeos*, ed. A. Frugoni, *FontiStIt*, 95 (Rome 1957). Literature: F. Russo, *Bibliografia gioachimita* (Florence 1954), and, in connection with it, *RThAM*, 24 (1957), 27–44; M. W. Bloomfield, "Joachim of Fiore, a Critical Survey," *Tr*, 13 (1957), 249–311, with bibliography; H. Denifle, "Das Evangelium aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni," *ALKGMA*, 1 (1885), 49–142; H. Grundmann, *Studien über Joachim von Fiore* (Leipzig 1927); biographies by. H. Bett (London 1931) and E. Buonaiuti (Rome 1931); E. Benz in *ZKG*, 50 (1931), 24–111, 51 (1932), 415–55; *idem*, *Ecclesia spiritualis* (Stuttgart 1934); J. C. Huck, *Joachim von Floris und die joachitische Literatur* (Freiburg 1938); H. Grundmann, *Neue Forschungen über Joachim von Fiore* (Marburg 1950); M. W. Bloomfield and M. Reeves, "The Penetration of Joachim into Northern Europe," *Speculum*, 29 (1954), 773–93; F. Russo, *Gioacchino da Fiore e le fondazioni florensi* (Naples 1959); H. Grundmann, "Zur Biographie Joachims von Fiore und Rainers von Ponza," *DA*, 16 (1960), 437–546 (*Vita beati Ioachimi abbatis*, 528–44); R. Manselli, "L'attesa dell'età nuova e il gioachimismo," *L'attesa dell'età nuova nella spiritualità della fine del medioevo* (Todi 1962), 145–70.

The Spirituals: E. Benz, *Ecclesia spiritualis. Kirchenidee und Geschichtstheologie der franziskanischen Reformation* (Stuttgart 1934); L. Oliger, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Spiritualen, Fratizellen und Clarener in Mittelitalien," *ZKG*, 45 (1926), 215–42; J. M. Pou y Martí, *Visionarios, beguinos y fraticelos catalanes (siglos XIII a XV)* (Vich 1930); D. Douie, *The Nature and the Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (Manchester 1932); L. von Auw, *Angelo Clareno et les Spirituels Franciscains* (Lausanne 1952); M. D. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty. The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order (1210–1323)* (London 1961).

Arnald of Villanova: Obras catalanes, ed. M. Batllori and J. Carreras, 2 vols. (Barcelona 1947); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*, 2 vols. (Madrid 1880–82), ed. Madrid, *BAC*, 1956, I, 539–76; R. Verrier, *Études sur Arnauld de Villeneuve*, 2 vols. (Leiden 1947–49); J. A. Paniagua, *Estudios y notas sobre Arnau de Vilanova* (Madrid 1963); P. Diepgen, *Arnald von Villanova als Politiker und Laientheologe* (Berlin 1909); R. Manselli, "La religiosità d'Arnaldo da Villanova," *BIStIAM*, 63 (1951), 1–100; *idem*, "Arnaldo da Villanova e i papi del suo tempo tra religione e politica," *Studi Romani*, 7 (1959), 146–61.

Beguines and Beghards: basic is E. W. MacDonnell, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture with Special Emphasis on the Belgian Scene* (New Brunswick 1954); J. Greven, *Die Anfänge der Beginen* (Münster 1912); H. Grundmann, "Zur Geschichte der Beginen im 13. Jahrhundert," *AKG*, 21 (1931), 296–320; A. Mens, *Oorsprong en betekenis van de nederlandse Begijnen- en Begardenbeweging* (Brussels and Antwerp 1947); R. Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini in Provenza* (Rome 1959); E. G. Neumann, *Rheinisches Beginen- und Begardenwesen* (Meisenheim 1960); J. Koch, *Frauenfrage und Ketzertum* (Berlin 1962), Marxist interpretation; in addition, there are many studies on the history of local Beguine houses.

33. *The Flowering of Scholasticism and of the Western Universities*

Literature

See the General Bibliography I, 11, and II, 11 and 12, and the bibliographies for Chapters 7 and 12, especially *Fliche-Martin*, 13, *Ueberweg-Geyer*, *Wulf*, J. Hirschberger, *Grabmann G*, *Grabmann MGL*, É. Gilson, *Stegmüller RS*, O. Lottin, H. de Lubac, F. Copleston, P. Glorieux, L. Bréhier, F. Cayré; for the universities, especially the works of S. d'Irsay, Rashdall-Powicke-Emden, H. Denifle, H. Grundmann, S. Stelling-Michaud. Also: H.

Mayer, "Über den klerikalen Charakter der mittelalterlichen Universität," *FreibDiözArch*, 36 (1935), 152–83; N. Schachner, *The Medieval Universities* (New York 1938); M. Bechthum, *Beweggründe und Bedeutung des Vagantentums in der lateinischen Kirche des Mittelalters* (Jena 1941); P. Kibre, *The Nations in the Medieval Universities* (Cambridge 1950); F. Pegues, "Ecclesiastical Provisions for the Support of Students in the Thirteenth Century," *Church History*, 26 (1957), 307–17; H. Wieruszowski, *The Medieval University* (New York 1966); G. Ajo and C. M. Sáinz de Zuñiga, *Historia de las Universidades Hispánicas*, I: *Medievo* (Ávila 1957), II: *Carlu Cario* (Ávila 1960).

Paris: H. Denifle, E. Chatelain, *et al.*, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 vols. (Paris 1889–97), *Auctarium*, 5 vols. (Paris 1894–1952); P. Perdrizet, *Le Calendrier de la Nation d'Allemagne de l'ancienne Université de Paris* (Strasbourg 1937); M. Fournier, *Les statuts et privilèges des universités françaises*, 4 vols. (Paris 1890–94); P. Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres au moyen âge*, 3 vols. (Paris 1894–96); M. Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230/31* (Paris 1931); P. Glorieux, *Les origines du Collège de Sorbonne* (Notre Dame 1959); A. L. Gabriel, *Student Life in Ave Maria College* (Paris) (Notre Dame 1955).

Bologna: Chartularium Studii Bononiensis, 12 vols., ed. L. Nardi and E. Orioli (Imola and Bologna 1909–41); F. Ehrle, *I più antichi statuti della facoltà teologica dell'università di Bologna (1364)* (Bologna 1932); A. Sorbelli, *Storia della università di Bologna*, I (Bologna 1940); C. Calcaterra, *Alma mater studiorum* (Bologna 1948); G. Le Bras, "Bologne, monarchie médiévale des droits savants," *Memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna* (1956), 1–18; G. Masi, "L'università di Bologna al suo primo albeggiare," *Rivista di storia del diritto italiano*, 31 (1958), 269–331.

Oxford: C. E. Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, 3 vols. (London 1924–26); A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols. (Oxford 1957–59).

The Aristotelian Corpus: G. Théry, *Tolède, ville de la renaissance médiévale, point de jonction entre la philosophie musulmane et la pensée chrétienne* (Oran 1944); Dominic Gundisalvi, *De divisione philosophiae*, ed. L. Bauer, *BGPhMA* (1903); H. Bédoret in *RNPh*, 4 (1938), 374–400. On the schools of translators at Naples see *Fliche-Martin*, 13, 180. É. Gilson in *AHD*, 4 (1929), 5–107, treats the Greek and Arabic sources of scholasticism; for Latin Averroism see M. Grabmann in *SAM* (1931 f.), and *Notes et textes sur l'Averroïsme latin* (Paris 1934); *Aristoteles latinus* (Rome, Cambridge, and Paris 1939 ff.); M. Grabmann, *Forschungen über die lateinischen Aristoteles-Übersetzungen des 13. Jahrhunderts*, *SAM* (1916); *Grabmann MGL*, III, 36–231; M. Grabmann, *I divieti ecclesiastici di Aristotele sotto Innocenzo III e Gregorio IX* (Rome 1941); *idem*, *Methoden und Hilfsmittel des Aristoteles-Studiums im Mittelalter* (Munich 1939); *idem*, *Guglielmo da Moerbeke e le sue traduzioni d'Aristotele* (Rome 1946). F. Ehrle, *Xenia Thomistica*, III (Rome 1925), discusses Aristotle and Augustine in thirteenth-century scholasticism; S. D. Wingate, *The Medieval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus* (London 1931); E. Franceschini, *Aristotele nel medio evo* (Padua 1935); D. A. Callus, *Introduction of Aristotelian Learning to Oxford* (London 1944); F. van Steenberghen, *Aristotle in the West* (London 1955).

Franciscans: H. Felder, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden bis um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg 1904); on the Franciscan school in general see B. Vogt in *FStud*, 9 (1922), 137–53; on this school at Oxford, A. G. Little in *AFrH*, 19 (1926), 803–74, and D. E. Sharp, *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford 1930); on the Franciscan masters at Paris, V. Doucet in *AFrH*, 26 (1933), 257–81, 27 (1934), 531–64, 585–89; G. Bonafede, *Il pensiero francescano nel secolo 13* (Palermo 1952); on the beginnings of the Franciscan school and Thomism, H. a Krizovljan in *CollFr*, 31 (1961), 133–75.

Dominicans: see P. Mandonnet in *DTC,* 6 (1924), 863–924; R. M. Martin in *RSPhTh,* 9 (1920), 556–80, treats of the Dominican theologians at Paris and Oxford from 1229 to 1279; F. Ehrle in *Miscellanea Dominicana* (Rome 1923), 85–138, discusses the Dominican *studium* at Paris; E. Filthaut, *Roland von Cremona († 1259) und die Anfänge der Scholastik im Predigerorden* (Vechta 1936).

Alexander of Hales: Works: *Summa theologica,* 5 vols. (Quaracchi 1924–48); *Glossa in 4 libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi,* 4 vols. (Quaracchi 1951–57); *Quaestiones disputatae,* 3 vols. (Quaracchi 1960); J. A. Endres in *PhJ* (1888), 24 f., 203–25, 257–96, discusses the life and the psychological doctrine of Alexander of Hales. Literature: up to 1948 in V. Doucet, *Prolegomena ad Summam,* IV (Quaracchi 1948), supplemented to 1951 in the introduction to the *Glossa;* A. Hufnagel, "Über das Wesen der Person bei Alexander von Hales," *FZThPh,* 4 (1957), 148–74.

Bonaventure: Works: *Opera omnia,* 11 vols. (Quaracchi 1882–1902); *Opera theologica selecta,* 5 vols. (Quaracchi 1934–64); *De reductione artium ad theologiam,* ed. E. T. Healy (New York 1940); German translation of his mystical and ascetical works by S. J. Hamburger, I (Munich 1923); German translation of the *Breviloquium* by F. Imle (Werl 1931); German translation of the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum* by J. Kaup and P. Böhner (Werl 1932); *Obras de san Buenaventura,* 6 vols., ed. L. Amoros *et al., BAC* (Madrid 1946); *De triplici via,* edited and translated by K. Ruh (Munich 1957); *Soliloquium,* Latin and German, by J. Hosse (Cologne 1958); *Itinerarium mentis in Deum,* Latin and German (Munich 1961); *Collationes in Hexaemeron,* Latin and German (Munich 1964). Literature: biographies by L. Lemmens (Munich 1909), V. Breton (Paris 1943), E. Bettoni (Brescia 1945), and R. Lazzarini (Milan 1946). O Righi, *Il pensiero e l'opera di S. Bonaventura* (Florence 1932); É. Gilson, *La philosophie de saint Bonaventure, Études de philosophie médiévale,* IV (Paris, 2d ed. 1943); É. Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Bonaventure* (London 1935); Eng. A. Borak, *Philosophia S. Bonaventurae* (Rome 1956); F. Imle and J. Kaup, *Die Theologie des heiligen Bonaventura* (Werl 1931); J. Kaup, *Das geistliche Leben nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura* (Werl 1939); J. F. Bonnefoy, *Une somme bonaventurienne de théologie mystique* (Paris 1949); J. Ratzinger, *Die Geschichstheologie des heiligen Bonaventura* (Munich and Zürich 1959); J. G. Bougerol, *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Bonaventure* (Paris 1961).

Duns Scotus: Works: *Opera omnia,* ed. L. Wadding (Lyons 1639, Paris 1891–95); critical edition, thus far 9 vols. (Rome 1950–66); on the critical edition *cf.* C. Balič, *Ratio editionis criticae operum omnium J. Duns Scoti,* 3 vols. (Rome 1939–51); *A Treatise on God as First Principle,* ed. A. B. Wolter (Chicago 1966). Literature: E. Longpré, *La philosophie du B. Duns Scot* (Paris 1924); P. Minges, *J. Duns Scoti doctrina philosophica et theologica* (Quaracchi 1930); É. Gilson, *Jean Duns Scot. Introduction à ses positions fondamentales* (Paris 1952); H. Mühlen, *Sein und Person nach Johannes Duns Scotus* (Werl 1954); W. Pannenberg, *Die Prädestinationslehre des Johannes Dun Scotus* (Göttingen 1954); bibliography by O. Schäfer (Rome 1955); J. F. Bonnefoy, *Le vénérable Jean Duns Scot* (Rome 1960); C. Bérubé, "L'année scotiste et le septième centenaire de la naissance de Jean Duns Scot" (report of research), *CollFr,* 37 (1967), 145–85.

Siger of Brabant: Works: *De aeternitate mundi,* ed. R. Barsotti (Münster 1933); *Questions sur la Physique d'Aristote,* ed. P. Delhaye (Louvain 1941); *Questions sur la metaphysique,* ed. C. A. Graiff (Louvain 1948). Literature: report of research by A. A. Mauer in *Speculum,* 31 (1956), 49–56; P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'Averroïsme latin au XIII^{e} siècle,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1908–11); F. van Steenberghen, *Siger de Brabant d'après ses œuvres inédites,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1931–42), basic. On the question whether Siger maintained the double truth see J. P. Müller in *Studia Anselmiana* (1941), 35–50; M. Grabmann, "Siger und Dante," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch 1939,* 109–30; G. Sajó, *Un traité récemment découvert de Boèce de Dacie "De aeternitate mundi"* (Budapest 1954). H. a

Krizovljan in *CollFr,* 27 (1957), 121–65, treats the relationship of the Franciscans to Siger.

Albertus Magnus: Works: the critical *editio Coloniensis,* 40 vols., by B. Geyer *et al.,* published by the Albertus-Magnus-Institut (Cologne) from 1951; *Ueberweg-Geyer* (12th ed. 1951), 402, 739–43 (bibliography); regular reports in *RThAM* and *BThAM* from 1929; M. H. Laurent and Y. Congar, "Essai bibliographique albertienne," *RThom,* 36 (1931), 260–92; F. J. Catania, "A Bibliography of St. Albert the Great (1931–1958)," *The Modern Schoolman,* 37 (1959), 11–28. Literature: H. Wilms, *Albert der Grosse* (Munich 1930); G. Meersseman, *Introductio in opera omnia B. Alberti Magni* (Bruges 1931); H. C. Scheeben, *Albert der Grosse* (Vechta and Leipzig 1931); *idem, Albertus Magnus* (Cologne, 2d ed. 1955); B. Geyer, "Albertus Magnus," *Die Grossen Deutschen,* I (Berlin 1956), 201–16. *Festschriften: RThom,* 36 (1931), 225–468; *DTh,* 10 (1932), 1–304; *Angelicum,* 9 (1932), 2d and 3d Hefte; *Serta Albertina* (Rome 1944); *Studia Albertina, Festschrift B. Geyer* (Münster 1952); M. Gorce, *L'essor de la pensée au moyen âge, Albert le Grand et Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris 1933); H. C. Scheeben and A. Walz, *Iconographia Albertina* (Freiburg 1932); A. Wendehorst, "Albertus Magnus und die Kirchenreform," *MIÖG,* 64 (1956), 241–61; G. Meersseman, *Geschichte des Albertismus,* 2 vols. (Rome 1933–35); D. Salman, "Über Albert den Grossen und den Averroismus," *RSPhTh,* 24 (1935), 38–64; on the same topic, M. Feigl in *PhJ,* 63 (1955), 131–50; A. Schneider, *Die Psychologie Alberts des Grossen,* 2 vols. (Münster 1903–06); H. Doms, *Die Gnadenlehre des seligen Albertus Magnus* (Breslau 1929); W. Arendt, *Die Staats- und Gesellschaftslehre Albertus des Grossen* (Jena 1929); J. Goergen, *Des heiligen Albertus Magnus Lehre von der göttlichen Vorsehung und von dem Fatum* (Vechta 1932); K. Schmieder, *Alberts des Grossen Lehre vom natürlichen Gottwissen* (Freiburg 1932); F. Haberl, *Die Incarnationslehre des heiligen Albertus Magnus* (Freiburg 1939); J. M. Vosté, *S. Albertus Magnus Sacrae Paginae Magister,* 2 vols. (Rome 1932 f.); U. Daehnert, *Die Erkenntnislehre des Albertus Magnus* (Leipzig 1934), with bibliography; B. Korosak, *Mariologia S. Alberti Magni eiusque coaequalium* (Rome 1954); A. Hufnagel, *Die Wahrheit als philosophisch-theologisches Problem bei Albert dem Deutschen* (Bonn 1940); R. Erni, *Die Herz-Jesu-Lehre Alberts des Grossen* (Lucerne 1941); A. Piolanti, *Il corpo mistico e le sue relazioni con l'Eucaristia in S. Alberto Magno* (Rome 1939); J. Rinna, *Die Kirche als Corpus Christi mysticum beim heiligen Albertus* (Rome 1940); L. Brandl, *Die Sexualethik des heiligen Albertus Magnus* (Regensburg 1955); H. Balss, *Albertus Magnus als Zoologe* (Munich 1928); *idem, Albertus Magnus als Biologe* (Stuttgart 1947); R. Liertz, *Die Naturkunde von der menschlichen Seele nach Albert dem Grossen* (Cologne 1933).

Thomas Aquinas: P. Mandonnet, *Bibliographie thomiste* (Le Saulchoir, 2d ed. 1960). Works: *Opera omnia,* 18 vols. (Rome 1570–71, *Editio Piana)* 25 vols. (Parma 1852–1873); 34 vols., ed. L. Vivès (Paris 1871–90); *Editio Leonina,* thus far 26 vols. (Rome 1882–1967); *Opuscula omnia,* ed. P. Mandonnet, 5 vols. (Paris 1927), ed. J. Perrier (Paris 1949 ff.); *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi,* ed. P. Mandonnet, 3 vols., Vol. IV, ed. M. F. Moos (Paris 1929–47); *Quaestiones disputatae et quodlibetales,* ed. R. Spiazzi *et al.* (Turin 1949); *Expositio super librum Boethii de Trinitate,* ed. B. Decker (Leiden, 2d ed. 1959); *The Summa Theologica,* 22 vols. (London 1912–26); *The Summa contra Gentiles,* 5 vols. (London 1928–29); *The Catechetical Instructions of St. Thomas* (London 1939); *The Most Devout Exposition of the Lord's Prayer* (London 1927); *Basic Writings of St. Thomas,* 2 vols. (New York 1945); *On the Governance of Rulers* (Toronto 1935). V. J. Bourke, *Thomistic Bibliography:* 1920–1940 (St. Louis, Mo., 1945); R. Erni, *Die theologische Summa des Thomas von Aquin in ihrem Grundaufbau,* 4 vols. (Lucerne 1947–50); R. J. Deferrari and M. I. Barry, *Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Washington 1948–54). *Fontes vitae S. Thomae Aquinatis,* ed. D. Prümmer and H. M. Laurent, 6 vols. (Saint-Maximin [Var] 1911–37); "Processus canonizationis S. Thomae

Aquinatis," *RThom,* 39–41 (1934–36). Biographies by A. D. Sertillanges, 2 vols. (Paris 1910), M. Grabmann (Munich 1949), É. Gilson (Paris 1925), A. D. Sertillanges (Paris 1931), A. Cresson (Paris 1942), A. Walz (Basel 1953), M. D'Arcy (London 1954), F. Copleston (London 1955), K. Foster (London 1959), P. Novarina (Louvain and Paris 1962). Chronology and authenticity of his works: P. Mandonnet, *Des écrits authentiques de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Fribourg, 2d ed. 1910); M. Grabmann, *Die Werke des heiligen Thomas von Aquin* (Munich, 2d ed. 1949); J. Destrez, *Études critiques sur les œuvres de S. Thomas d'Aquin d'après la tradition manuscrite,* I (Paris 1933), and, in regard to this work, A. Pelzer in *BullThomiste,* 11 (1934), 225–40; A. Dondaine, *Secrétaires de S. Thomas,* 2 vols. (Rome 1956). Introductions: M. Grabmann, *Einführung in die Summa Theologica des heiligen Thomas von Aquin* (Munich, 2d ed. 1928); R. Sineu, *Initiation à la théologie de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Tournai 1953); M. D. Chenu, *Introduction à l'étude de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 2d ed. 1954); J. Pieper, *Hinführung zu Thomas von Aquin* (Munich 1958); A. Michelitsch, *Kommentatoren zur Summa Theologica des heiligen Thomas von Aquin* (Graz and Vienna 1924). Thomism: É. Gilson, *Le Thomisme* (Paris, 5th ed. 1945), Eng. *The Philosophy of St. Thomas* (Cambridge 1937); J. Maritain, *Le docteur angélique* (Paris 1930), Eng. *St. Thomas Aquinas* (London 1946); G. M. Manser, *Das Wesen des Thomismus* (Fribourg, 3d ed. 1949); P. Wyser, *Der Thomismus* (Bern 1951); J. Ude, *Die Autorität des heiligen Thomas von Aquin als Kirchenlehrer und seine Summa theologica* (Salzburg 1932). *Festschriften: Mélanges thomistes* (Le Saulchoir 1923); *Xenia thomistica,* ed. S. Szabó, 3 vols. (Rome 1925). Philosophy: A. D. Sertillanges, *La philosophie de S. Thomas* (1907, Paris, 3d ed. 1955); H. D. Gardeil, *Initiation à la philosophie de S. Thomas,* 4 vols. (Paris 1952 f.); G. Siewerth, *Der Thomismus als Identitätssystem* (1938, Frankfurt am Main, 2d ed. 1961); L. Legrand, *L'univers et l'homme dans la philosophie de S. Thomas,* 2 vols. (Brussels and Paris 1946); L. B. Geiger, *Le problème de l'amour chez S. Thomas* (Montreal and Paris 1952); B. Lakebrink, *Hegels dialektische Ontologie und die thomistische Analektik* (Cologne 1955); R. J. Henle, *St. Thomas and Platonism* (The Hague 1956); A. Hayen, *La communication de l'être d'après S. Thomas,* 2 vols. (Paris and Louvain 1957–59); C. Fabro, *Participation et causalité selon S. Thomas* (Louvain and Paris 1961); F. J. Kovach, *Die Ästhetik des heiligen Thomas* (Berlin 1961); A. Antweiler, *Die Anfangslosigkeit der Welt nach Thomas und Kant,* 2 vols. (Trier 1961); B. Montagnes, *La doctrine de l'analogie de l'être d'après S. Thomas* (Louvain and Paris 1963); W. Kluxen, *Philosophische Ethik bei Thomas von Aquin* (Mainz 1964). Theology: H. Meyer, *Thomas von Aquin, Sein System und seine geistesgeschichtliche Stellung* (Paderborn, 2d ed. 1901); M. D. Chenu, *S. Thomas et la théologie* (Paris 1959); I. Backes, *Die Christologie des heiligen Thomas und die griechischen Kirchenväter* (Paderborn 1931); H. Bouillard, *Conversion et grâce chez S. Thomas* (Paris 1944); H. Lais, *Die Gnadenlehre des heiligen Thomas in der Summa contra Gentiles* (Munich 1951); P. Vanier, *Théologie trinitaire chez S. Thomas. Évolution du concept d'action notionelle* (Paris 1953); A. Horvath, *Studien zum Gottesbegriff* (Freiburg 1954); Q. van Roo, *Grace and Original Justice according to St. Thomas* (Rome 1955); A. Mallet, *Personne et amour dans la théologie trinitaire de S. Thomas* (Paris 1956); R. Guindon, *Béatitude et théologie morale chez S. Thomas* (Ottawa 1956); R. Völkl, *Die Selbstliebe in der Heiligen Schrift und bei Thomas* (Munich 1956); O. Schweizer, *Person und hypostatische Union bei Thomas* (Fribourg 1957); S. Pfürtner, *Triebleben und sittliche Vollendung nach Thomas* (Fribourg 1958); H. Christmann, *Thomas als Theologe der Liebe* (Heidelberg 1958); T. Bonhoeffer, *Die Gotteslehre des Thomas als Sprachproblem* (Tübingen 1961); M. Seckler, *Instinkt und Glaubenswille nach Thomas* (Mainz 1961); B. Duroux, *La psychologie de la foi chez S. Thomas* (Toulouse 1963); M. Seckler, *Das Heil in der Geschichte, Geschichtstheologisches Denken bei Thomas* (Munich 1964); G. Ebeling, "Der hermeneutische Ort der Gotteslehre bei Petrus Lombardus und Thomas von Aquin" *ZThK,* 61 (1964), 283–326; H. Vorster, *Das Freiheitsverständnis bei Thomas und Martin Luther* (Göttingen 1965); U. Kühn, *Via caritatis. Theologie des Gesetzes bei Thomas* (Göttingen 1965); H. O. Pesch, *Theologie der Rechtfertigung bei Martin Luther und Thomas von Aquin* (Mainz 1966).

Robert Grosseteste: Works: *Epistolae,* ed. H. R. Luard (London 1861); philosophical works, ed. L. Baur (Münster 1912); S. H. Thomson, *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste* (Cambridge 1940); U. Gamba, *Il commento di Roberto Grosseteste al "de mystica theologia" del Ps. Dionigi Areopagita* (Milan 1942). Literature: B. C. Boulter, *Robert Grosseteste* (London 1936); D. A. Callus, F. M. Powicke, *et al., Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop. Essays in Commemoration of the Seventh Centenary of his Death* (Oxford 1955); A. C. Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of the Experimental Science* (Oxford 1953); S. Gieben, "Robert Grosseteste on Preaching (with the edition of the 'sermo ex rerum initiatarum' on redemption)," *CollFr,* 37 (1967), 100–41.

Roger Bacon: Works: *Opus maius sive de utilitate scientiarum,* ed. J. H. Bridges, 2 vols. (Oxford 1897); *Opera quaedam hactenus inedita (Opus tertium, Opus minus, Compendium philosophiae),* ed. J. S. Brewer (London 1859); *Opera hactenus inedita,* ed. R. Steele, A. G. Little, E. Withington, F. M. Delorme, 16 fasc. (Oxford 1905–40); R. B. Burke, *The Opus Maius of Roger Bacon,* 2 vols., Eng. (Philadelphia 1928); *Compendium studii theologiae,* ed. H. Rashdall (Aberdeen 1911); *Summa Grammatica,* ed. R. Steele (London 1940); *Moralis Philosophiae,* ed. E. Massa (Rome 1953). Literature: *Roger Bacon Essays,* ed. A. G. Little *et al.* (Oxford 1914); T. Crowley, *Roger Bacon. The Problem of the Soul* (Dublin 1950); F. Alessio, *Mito e scienza in R. Bacone* (Milan 1957); E. Heck, *Roger Bacon, ein mittelalterlicher Versuch einer historischen und systematischen Religionswissenschaft* (Bonn 1957). R. Carton, *La synthèse doctrinale de Roger Bacon* (Paris 1929).

34. *The Cardinals and the Curia in the Thirteenth Century*

LITERATURE

The Cardinals: A. Ciaconius, *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium ab A. Oldonio recognitae,* I (Rome 1677); *Hinschius,* I, 309–72 (cardinals), 373–497 (curia); J. P. Kirsch, *Die Finanzverwaltung des Kardinalskollegiums im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert* (Münster 1895); J. B. Sägmüller, *Die Thätigkeit und Stellung der Cardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII.* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1896); P. M. Baumgarten, *Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera Collegii Cardinalium für die Zeit von 1225 bis 1437* (Leipzig 1898); J. B. Sägmüller, "Die oligarchischen Tendenzen des Kardinalskollegs bis Bonifaz VIII.," *ThQ,* 83 (1901), 45–93; J. Maubach, *Die Kardinäle und ihre Politik um die Mitte des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn 1902); J. Lulvès, *Die Machtbestrebungen des Kardinalats bis zur Aufstellung der ersten päpstlichen Wahlkapitulationen* (Rome 1910); *idem,* "Die Machtbestrebungen des Kardinalskollegiums gegenüber dem Papsttum," *MIÖG,* 35 (1914), 455–83; E. Schelenz, *Studien zur Geschichte des Kardinalats im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert* (Marburg 1913); B. Katterbach and W. M. Peitz, "Die Unterschriften der Päpste und Kardinäle in den 'Bullae maiores' vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert," *Misc. F. Ehrle,* IV (Rome 1924), 177–274; H. Hofmann, *Kardinalat und kuriale Politik in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (dissertation, Leipzig 1935); E. Kartusch, *Das Kardinalskollegium (1181–1227)* (dissertation, Vienna 1948); enlightening in retrospect is G. Mollat, "Le Sacré Collège de Clément V à Eugène IV," *RHE,* 46 (1951), 22–112, 566–94; K. Ganzer, *Die Entwicklung des auswärtigen Kardinalats im hohen Mittelalter. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kardinalskollegiums vom 11. bis 13. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen 1963); C. G. Fürst, "Die 'geborenen' Kardinäle," *ZKTh,* 88 (1966), 51–74; P. Hofmeister, "Die Titelkirchen der Kardinäle," *MThZ,* 17 (1966), 13–23.

The Curia: Liber diurnus, ed. H. Foerster (Bern 1958); M. Tangl, *Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200–1500* (Innsbruck 1894); J. Teige, "Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzleiwesen des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts," *MIÖG*, 17 (1896), 408–39; P. M. Baumgarten, *Aus Kanzlei und Kammer* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1907); W. V. Hofmann, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der Kurialbehörden* (Rome 1914); R. L. Poole, *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery down to the Time of Innocent III* (London 1916); R. Göller, "Die Kubikulare im Dienste der päpstlichen Hofverwaltung vom 12. bis 15. Jahrhundert," *Festschrift P. Kehr* (Munich 1926), 622–44; C. Bauer, "Epochen der Papstfinanz," *HZ*, 133 (1928), 457–504; F. Baethgen, "Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Hof- und Finanzverwaltung unter Bonifaz VIII.," *QFIAB*, 20 (1928 f.), 114–95, also in *Mediaevalia*, I, 228–95; G. Barraclough, "The Chancery Ordinance of Nicholas III," *QFIAB*, 25 (1933 f.), 192–250; H. Göring, *Die Beamten der Kurie unter Bonifaz VIII.* (dissertation, Königsberg 1934); W. E. Lunt, *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (New York 1934); L. Nina, *Le finanze pontificie nel medioevo*, 3 vols. (Milan 1929–32); B. Rusch, *Die Behörden und Hofbeamten der päpstlichen Kurie des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Königsberg and Berlin 1936); G. Felici, *La Reverenda Camera Apostolica* (Rome 1940); R. Elze, "Die päpstliche Kapelle im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan*, 36 (1950), 145–204; R. Brentano, *York Metropolitan Jurisdiction and Papal Judges Delegate (1279–96)* (Berkeley 1959); P. Herde, *Beiträge zum päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Urkundenwesen im 13. Jahrhundert* (Kallmünz 1961); J. Sayers, "Canterbury Proctors at the Court of 'Audientia litterarum contradictarum,'" *Tr*, 22 (1966), 311–45; C. R. Cheney, *The Study of the Medieval Papal Chancery* (Glasgow 1966); W. Ullmann, "On the Heuristic Value of Medieval Chancery Products with Special Reference to Papal Documents," *Annali della Fondazione italiana per la storia amministrativa*, 1 (Milan 1964), 117–34; P. Herde, "Marinus von Eboli 'Super revocatoriis' und 'De confirmationibus,'" *QFIAB*, 42/43 (1964), 119–264.

35. *Celestine V and Boniface VIII*

LITERATURE

Celestine V: ActaSS, Maii IV (1685), 419–61; P. M. Baumgarten, *Il regesto di Celestino V* (Chieti 1896); F. X. Seppelt, *Studien zum Pontifikat Cölestins V.* (Berlin 1910); *idem*, *Monumenta Coelestiniana* (Paderborn 1921); J. Hollnsteiner, "Die 'Autobiographie' Cölestins V.," *RQ*, 31 (1923), 29–40; F. Baethgen, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Coelestins V.* (Halle 1934); P. Laurelli, *Dante e Celestino V* (Isernia 1939); F. Baethgen, *Der Engelpapst* (Leipzig 1943); R. Mols, "Célestin V," *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 79–101, with bibliography; A. Frugoni, *Celestiniana, Studi storici*, 6–7 (Rome 1954); G. Celidonio, *S. Pietro del Morrone (Celestino V)* (Pescara, 2d ed. 1954); G. Marchetti-Longhi, "Considerazione sull'accettazione e la rinunzia di Celestino V al pontificato," *Benedictina*, 11 (1957), 219–33; *idem*, "Castel Fumone e la prigione di Papa Celestino V," *Strenna Ciociaria* (Rome 1965), 81–90; I. Hösl, *Kardinal Jacobus Gaetani Stefaneschi* (Berlin 1908). Cardinal Stefaneschi composed an *opus metricum* on Celestine V, ed. F. X. Seppelt, *Monumenta Coelestiniana*, 3–146, see also R. Morghen in *BIStIAM*, 46 (1931), 1–39. Celestine's abdication: A. Graf, "Il rifiuto di Celestino V," *Miti, leggende e superstizioni del Medio Evo*, II (Bologna 1965), 223–35 (reprint of the Turin edition of 1893); J. Leclercq, "La renonciation de Célestin V et l'opinion théologique en France du vivant de Boniface VIII," *RHÉF*, 15 (1939), 183–92; S. García Palou, "El Beato Ramon Llul y la cuestión de la renunciabilidad de la Sede romana," *AST*, 17 (1944), 67–96; W. Ullmann, "Medieval Views concerning Papal Abdication," *IER*, 71 (1949), 125–33; F. Schneider, "Der grosse Verzicht Cölestins V.," *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, 33 (1954), 212–14.

Boniface VIII: H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII. Funde und Forschungen* (Münster 1902, reprinted Rome 1964); R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz' VIII., ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Anschauungen des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart 1903, reprinted Amsterdam 1962); M. Brosch, "Bonifaz VIII. und die Republik Florenz," *ZKG,* 25 (1904), 233–47; K. Wenck, "War Bonifaz VIII. ein Ketzer?" *HZ,* 94 (1904), 1–66; R. Holtzmann, "Papst Bonifaz VIII. ein Ketzer?" *MIÖG,* 26 (1905), 488–98; R. Scholz, "Zur Beurteilung Bonifaz' VIII. und seines sittlichen Charakters," *HV,* 9 (1906), 470–515; H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia,* 3 vols. (Berlin 1908–22); P. Fedele, "Per la storia dell'attentato di Anagni," *BISI,* 41 (1921), 195–232; J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Église et de l'État au temps de Philippe le Bel* (Louvain and Paris 1926); G. Caetani, *Domus Caetana,* I (Sancasciano and Pesa 1927); F. Baethgen, "Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Hof- und Finanzverwaltung unter Bonifaz VIII.," *QFIAB,* 20 (1928 f.), 114–95, now also in *Mediaevalia,* I, 228–95; T. S. R. Boase, *Boniface VIII* (London 1933), hitherto the latest scholarly biography; H. K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages,* 18 (London 1932); G. de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du moyen âge,* I: *Bilan du XIII^e siècle* (Louvain and Paris, 3d ed. 1956); F. M. Powicke, "Pope Boniface VIII," *History,* 18 (1934), 307–29; G. Digard, *Philippe le Bel et le Saint-Siège de 1285 à 1304,* 2 vols. (Paris 1936); R. Fawtier, *Introduction* [to the completed volumes of papal chancery registers] (Paris 1939); *idem* in *Glotz,* VI/1; M. Seidlmayer, "Papst Bonifaz VIII. und der Kirchenstaat," *HJ,* 60 (1940), 78–87; F. Bock, *Reichsidee und Nationalstaaten vom Untergang des alten Reiches bis zur Kündigung des deutsch-englischen Bündnisses* (Munich 1943), 82–116; A. de Stefano, *Correnti politiche,* I: *La polemica bonifaciana* (Palermo 1948); R. Fawtier, "L'attentat d'Anagni," *MAH* (1948), 153–79; S. Sibilia, *Bonifacio VIII* (Rome 1949), survey with no new research; M. Melville, "Guillaume de Nogaret et Philippe le Bel," *RHÉF,* 36 (1950), 56–66; G. Le Bras, "Boniface VIII, symphoniste et modérateur," *Mélanges Louis Halphen* (Paris 1951), 383–94; *Seppelt,* IV (2d ed. 1957), 9–55; S. Gagner, *Studien zur Ideengeschichte der Gesetzgebung* (Uppsala 1960), 121–79; R. Foreville, "L'idée de jubilé chez les théologiens et les canonistes avant l'institution du jubilé romain (1300)," *RHE,* 56 (1961), 401–23; *Haller,* V (2d ed. 1962), 91–216; P. Dupuy, *Histoire du différend d'entre le Pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel Roy de France* (Paris 1655, reprinted Tucson 1963), basic as a collection of sources; H. Wieruszowski, *Vom Imperium zum nationalen Königtum. Vergleichende Studien über die publizistischen Kämpfe Kaiser Friedrichs II. und König Philipps des Schönen mit der Kurie* (Munich 1933, reprinted Aalen 1964); H. Schmidinger, "Ein vergessener Bericht über das Attentat von Anagni," *Mélanges Tisserant, SteT,* 235, V (1964), 373–88.

Boniface VIII and France: the works listed *supra* by Dupuy, Wieruszowski, Schmidinger, Rivière, Digard, Fedele, Fawtier, and Melville. Also: F. Kern, *Die Anfänge der französischen Ausdehnungspolitik bis zum Jahre 1308* (Tübingen 1910); W. Kienast, "Der Kreuzkrieg Philipps des Schönen von Frankreich gegen Aragón," *HV,* 28 (1934), 673–98; M. Curley, *The Conflict between Pope Boniface VIII and King Philip IV the Fair* (dissertation, Washington 1927); Y. Renouard, "Les papes et le conflit franco-aragonais en Aquitaine de 1259 à 1337," *MAH,* 51 (1934), 258–92; R. Holtzmann, *Wilhelm von Nogaret* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1898); Y. Dossat, "Guillaume de Nogaret, petit-fils d'hérétique," *Annales du Midi,* 53 (1941), 391–402; M. Delle Piane, "Vecchio e nuovo nelle idee politiche di Pietro Dubois," *Studi Senesi,* 65 (1953), 299–349, 454–91; J. M. Vidal, "Bernard Saisset, évêque de Pamiers (1232–1311)," *RSR,* 5 (1925), 416–38, 565–90, 6 (1926), 50–77, 177–98, 371–93; A. Baumhauer, *Philipp der Schöne und Bonifaz VIII. in ihrer Stellung zur französischen Kirche* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1920); *idem,* "Die Gründung des französischen Bistums Pamiers in Zusammenhang mit dem Streit zwischen Philipp dem Schönen und Papst Bonifaz VIII.," *ZKG,* 45 (1926), 358–69; B. A. Poquet de Haut Jussé, "Le second différend entre Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel," *Mélanges A. Dufourcq* (Paris 1932), 73–108; F. Bock, "Musciatto dei Francesi," *DA*, 6 (1943), 521–44; *idem*, "Bonifacio VIII nella storiografia francese," *RSTI*, 6 (1952), 248–59.

Boniface VIII and Sicily: H. E. Rohde, *Der Kampf um Sizilien in den Jahren 1291–1302* (Berlin 1913); E. Haberkorn, *Der Kampf um Sizilien in den Jahren 1302–37* (Berlin 1923); A. de Stefano, *Federico II d'Aragona, re di Sicilia (1296–1337)* (Palermo 1937); J. Vincke, "Krone, Kardinalat und Kirchenpfründe in Aragón zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts," *RQ*, 51 (1956), 34–53.

Boniface VIII and the Colonna: H. Denifle, "Die Denkschriften der Colonna gegen Bonifaz VIII.," *ALKGMA*, 5 (1889), 403–520; L. Mohler, *Die Kardinäle Jakob und Peter Colonna. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Zeitalters Bonifaz' VIII.* (Paderborn 1914); R. Neumann, *Die Colonna und ihre Politik von der Zeit Nikolaus' IV. bis zum Abzuge Ludwigs des Bayern aus Rom* (Berlin 1914); A. Maier, "Due documenti nuovi relativi alla lotta dei cardinali Colonna contro Bonifacio VIII," *RSTI*, 3 (1949), 344–64.

Boniface VIII and the Poets: H. Grundmann, "Bonifaz VIII. und Dante," *Dante und die Mächtigen seiner Zeit* (Munich 1960), 1–27; F. Schneider, "Dantes Hass und Verachtung gegen Papst Bonifaz VIII.," *HZ*, 193 (1962), 574–80; F. Brambilla Ageno, "Sull'invettiva di Iacopone da Todi contro Bonifacio VIII," *Lettere Italiane*, 16 (1964), 373–414; F. Grisi, "Iacopone da Todi contro Bonifacio VIII," *Nuova Antologia*, 100 (1965), 362–77; S. Nessi, "Iacopone da Todi al vaglio della critica moderna," *MiscFranc*, 64 (1964), 404–32.

V. Fenicchia, "Il sepolcro del vescovo Pietro Caetani, qui nutrivit dominum Bonifacium pp. VIII," *RSTI*, 2 (1948), 338–61; R. Weiss, "Cinque lettere inedite del Card. Benedetto Caetani," *RSTI*, 3 (1949), 157–64; P. H. Schmidt, *Bullarium Anni Sancti* (Rome 1949); A. Frugoni, "Il giubileo di Bonifacio VIII," *BIStIAM*, 62 (1950) 1–121; *idem*, *De centesimo anno seu jubileo liber (Il libro del card. Stefaneschi)* (Brescia 1950); C. Stange, "Der Jubelablass Bonifaz' VIII. in Dantes Commedia," *ZKG*, 63 (1950f.), 145–65. C. Paulus, *Welt- und Ordensklerus beim Ausgang des 13. Jahrhunderts im Kampf um die Pfarr-Rechte* (Essen 1900); B. Mathis, *Die Privilegien des Franziskanerordens bis zum Konzil von Vienne (1311)* (Paderborn 1928); K. L. Hitzfeld, "Krise in den Bettelorden im Pontifikat Bonifaz' VIII.?" *HJ*, 48 (1928), 1–30; K. Schleyer, *Anfänge des Gallikanismus im 13. Jahrhundert. Der Widerstand des französischen Klerus gegen die Privilegierung der Bettelorden* (Berlin 1937); G. Ladner, "Die Statue Bonifaz' VIII. in der Lateranbasilika und die Entstehung der dreifach gekrönten Tiara," *RQ*, 42 (1934), 35–69, and, in this connection, P. E. Schramm in *HZ*, 152 (1935), 307–12.

Iconography: C. Sommer, *Die Anklage der Idololatrie gegen Papst Bonifaz VIII. und seine Porträtstatuen* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1920); C. Ricci, "I ritratti di Bonifacio VIII," *L'Italia artistica industriale*, I (Rome 1893), fasc. 4; S. Sibilia, "L'Iconografia di Bonifacio VIII," *Boll. della Sezione di Anagni della Soc. Rom. di Storia Patria*, 1 (1951), 10–13; C. Mitchell, "The Lateran Fresco of Boniface VIII," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 14 (1951), 1–6.

36. *The End of the Crusading Epoch*

See the bibliographies for the individual crusades in the preceding chapters. Also: G. Mazzoni, *La crociata alla fine del secolo XIII ed al principio del secolo XIV* (Urbino 1938); A. S. Atiya, *The Crusades in the Later Middle Ages* (London 1938); *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*, ed. H. Beumann (Darmstadt 1963); A. S. Atiya, *Crusade, Commerce and Culture* (Bloomington 1962); H. E. Mayer, *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Hanover, 2d ed. 1965); *idem*, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart 1965); *idem*, *Idee und Wirklichkeit der Kreuzzüge* (texts) (Germering 1966).

Part Two: The Late Middle Ages

SECTION ONE

The Popes at Avignon

SOURCES

Baluze-Mollat; G. Mollat, *Étude critique sur les Vitae Paparum Avenionensium d'Étienne Baluze* (Paris 1917); *idem,* "Baluze," *DHGE,* 6 (1932), 439–52; *MGHConst,* IV–VI; H. Finke, *Acta Aragonensia. Quellen zur deutschen, italienischen, französischen, spanischen, Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte aus der diplomatischen Korrespondenz Jaymes II. 1291–1327,* I and II (Berlin and Leipzig 1908), III (Berlin and Leipzig 1922). Appendices and supplements to the *Acta Aragonensia* (I–III): *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* IV (1933), 355–536. For the correspondence of the German Kings and princes with the rulers of Aragón in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: *Gesammelte Aufsätze,* V (1935), 458–505. Appendices and supplements to the *Acta Aragonensia,* I–III. On the cultural importance of the royal Aragonese archives: *Gesammelte Aufsätze,* VII (1938), 326–46. E. E. Stengel, *Nova Alamanniae. Urkunden, Briefe und andere Quellen besonders zur deutschen Geschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts vornehmlich aus den Sammlungen des Trierers Notars und Offizials, Domdekans von Mainz Rudolf Losse aus Eisenach in der ständischen Landesbibliothek zu Kassel und im Staatsarchiv zu Darmstadt,* I (Berlin 1921), II, 1 (Berlin 1930); T. Mommsen, *Italienische Analekten zur Reichsgeschichte des 14. Jahrhunderts, 1310–1378, Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae historica,* 11 (1952); K. A. Fink, *Das Vatikanische Archiv. Einführung in die Bestände und ihre Erforschung* (Rome, 2d ed. 1951).

LITERATURE

Glotz, VI, 1 and 2; M. McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century 1307–1399, The Oxford History of England,* V (Oxford 1959); E. F. Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century 1399–1485, The Oxford History of England,* VI (Oxford 1962); E. Perroy, *The Hundred Years War with an Introduction to the English edition* by D. C. Douglas (London 1951); E. R. Labande, *L'Italie de la Renaissance. Duecento-Trecento-Quattrocento. Évolution d'une société* (Paris 1954); N. Valeri, *L'Italia nell'età dei principati dal 1343 al 1516* (Verona 1949); L. Simeoni, *Storia politica d'Italia,* VII: *Le signorie,* I (Milan 1950); *Storia d'Italia,* I: *Il Medioevo,* ed. G. Arnaldi, C. Violante, P. Lamma, E. Christiani, and N. Valerie (Turin 1959); M. Seidlmayer, *Geschichte Italiens. Vom Zusammenbruch des römischen Reiches bis zum ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart 1962); D. Hay, *Geschichte Italiens in der Renaissance* (Stuttgart 1962); G. Peyronnet, "Les relations politiques entre la France et l'Italie, principalement au XIV^e et dans la première moitié du XV^e siècle," *MA,* 55 (1949), 301–42, 56 (1950), 85–113; A. Latreille, E. Delaruelle, and J. R. Palanque, *Histoire du catholicisme en France,* II (Paris 1960); E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens. Forschungen zur Geschichte des Kampfes um das Recht am Reich in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Weimar 1930); F. Bock,

Reichsidee und Nationalstaaten. Vom Untergang des alten Reiches bis zur Kündigung des deutsch-englischen Bündnisses im Jahre 1341 (Munich 1943); F. Trautz, *Die Könige von England und das Reich 1272–1377* (Heidelberg 1961); E. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris 1954); A. de Stefano, *Federico II d'Aragona re di Sicilia 1296–1337* (Palermo 1937); R. Davidsohn, *Geschichte von Florenz*, III (Berlin 1912); G. A. Brucker, *Florentine Politics and Society 1343–1378* (Princeton 1962); *Storia di Milano*, V, VI (Milan 1955); F. Cognasso, *I Visconti* (Milan 1965); *Storia di Brescia*, I (Brescia 1963); G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (London and New York 1963; reprinted New York 1965); E. Dupré-Theseider, *I papi di Avignone e la questione Romana* (Florence 1939); *idem*, *Roma dal comune di popolo alla signoria pontificia 1252–1377* (Bologna 1952); *idem*, *Problemi del papato avignonese* (Bologna 1961); Y. Renouard, *La papauté à Avignon* (Paris 1954); B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale d'Avignon 1309–1376* (Paris 1962); *Runciman*, III (Cambridge 1954); J. Goñi Gaztambide, *Historia de la bula de la cruzada en España* (Vitoria 1958); P. Piur, *Petrarcas "Buch ohne Namen" und die päpstliche Kurie. Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte der Frührenaissance* (Halle 1925); V. Martin, *Les origines du Gallicanisme*, 2 vols. (Paris 1939); G. Mollat, "Les origines du gallicanisme parlementaire aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles," *RHE*, 43 (1948), 90–147; J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Église et de l'État au temps de Philippe le Bel* (Louvain and Paris 1926); M. Pacaut, *La théocratie, l'église et le pouvoir au moyen âge* (Paris 1957); F. Merzbacher, "Wandlungen des Kirchenbegriffs im Spätmittelalter. Grundzüge der Ekklesiologie des ausgehenden 13., des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts," *ZSavRGkan*, 39 (1953), 274–361; H. Helbling, *Saeculum Humanum. Ansätze zu einem Versuch über spätmittelalterliches Geschichtsdenken* (Naples 1958); M. J. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1963); J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform*, I (Berlin 1903); L. Buisson, *Potestas und Caritas. Die päpstliche Gewalt im Spätmittelalter* (Cologne and Graz 1958).

37. *The Situation after the Death of Boniface VIII: Benedict XI and Clement V*

SOURCES

C. Grandjean, *Le registre de Benoît XI* (Paris 1905); *Regestum Clementis papae V ex Vaticanis archetypis ... nunc primum editum*, cura et studio monachorum OSB, I–IX (Rome 1885–92), appendices, I (1892); *Tables des registres de Clément V* publiés par les Bénédictins, *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, 3d series (Paris 1948), includes a chronological list of bulls, a list of *incipit*, and the itinerary of Clement V; *Tables des registres de Clément V* publiées par les Bénédictins, établies par Y. Lanhers, C. Vogel sous la direction de R. Fawtier et G. Mollat (Paris 1957); T. Lecisotti, "Note in margine all'edizione dei regesti di Clemente V," *SteT*, 235 (1964), 15–45; "Benedetto XI papa," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 8 (1966), 370–78.

LITERATURE

"Benoît XI," *DHGE*, 8 (1935), 106–16; "Clément V," *DHGE*, 8 (1935), 1115–29; H. Finke, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz' VIII.* (Münster 1902); K. Wenck, *Philipp der Schöne von Frankreich, seine Persönlichkeit und das Urteil seiner Zeitgenossen* (Marburg 1905); G. Lizerand, *Clément V et Philippe le Bel* (Paris 1910); M. Delle Piane, "Vecchio e nuovo nelle idee politiche di Pietro Dubois," *Studi Senesi*, 65 (1953), 299–349, 454–91; E. Müller, *Das Konzil von Vienne 1311–1312, Seine Quellen und seine Geschichte* (Münster 1934); J. Lecler, *Vienne, Histoire des Conciles Œcuméniques*, 8 (Paris 1964); G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (1965), 3–8.

The Templars: H. Finke, *Papsttum und Untergang des Templerordens,* 2 vols. (Münster 1907), the standard work; R. Gilles, *Les templiers sont-ils coupables? Leur histoire, leur règle, leur procès* (Paris 1957); G. Charpentier, *L'ordre des Templiers* (Paris, 2d ed. 1961); H. Neu, *Bibliographie des Templer-Ordens 1927–65* (Bonn 1965).

38. *From John XXII to Clement VI*

SOURCES

S. Reizler, *Vatikanische Akten zur deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern* (Innsbruck 1891); C. Erdmann, "Vatikanische Analekten zur Geschichte Ludwigs des Bayern," *AZ,* 41 (1932), 1–47; H. Schröder, "Die Protokollbücher der päpstlichen Kammerkleriker 1329–1347," *AKG,* 27 (1937), 121–286.

LITERATURE

E. Déprez, *Les préliminaires de la guerre de Cent Ans* (Paris 1902); E. E. Stengel, *Avignon und Rhens* (see the bibliography for this section); *idem,* "Baldewin von Luxemburg, ein grenzdeutscher Staatsmann des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Cologne and Graz 1960), 180–215; O. Bornhak, *Staatskirchliche Anschauungen und Handlungen am Hofe Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern* (Weimar 1933); K. Bosl, "Die 'geistliche Hofakademie' Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern im alten Franziskanerkloster zu München," *Der Mönch im Wappen. Aus Geschichte und Gegenwart des katholischen München* (Munich 1960), 97–129; C. K. Brampton, "Okham, Bonagratia and the Emperor Lewis IV," *Medium Aevum,* 31 (1962), 81–87; H. S. Offler, "Über die Prokuratorien Ludwigs des Bayern für die römische Kirche," *DA,* 8 (1951), 461–87; Conrad of Megenberg, *Klagelied der Kirche in Deutschland (Planctus ecclesiae in Germaniam),* ed. H. Kusch, *Leipziger Übersetzungen und Abhandlungen zum Mittelalter,* series A, I (Berlin 1956); *Kaiser, Volk und Avignon. Ausgewählte Quellen zur antikurialen Bewegung in Deutschland in der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts,* edited and translated by O. Berthold, *Leipziger Übersetzungen,* series A, III (Berlin 1960); F. Bock, "Roma al tempo di Roberto d'Angiò," *ASRomana,* 65 (1942), 163–208; *idem,* "Bemerkungen zur Beurteilung Kaiser Ludwigs IV. in der neueren Literatur," *ZBLG,* 23 (1960), 115–27.

John XXII: G. Mollat, *Lettres communes analysées d'après les registres dits d'Avignon et du Vatican,* 16 vols. (Paris 1904–46); A. Coulon and S. Clemencet, *Lettres secrètes et curiales du pape Jean XXII relatives à la France,* 8 fasc. (Paris 1900–65); G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (1965), 9–25; N. Valois, "Jacques Duèse, pape sous le nom de Jean XXII," *Histoire littéraire de la France,* 34 (1915), 391–630; B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale d'Avignon,* gives detailed bibliography; H. Otto, "Zur italienischen Politik Johanns XXII.," *QFIAB,* 14 (1911), 140–265; G. Tabacco, *La casa di Francia nell'azione politica di papa Giovanni XXII, Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo. Studi storici,* fasc. 1–4 (Rome 1953); G. Dürrholder, *Die Kreuzzugspolitik unter Papst Johann XXII.* (dissertation, Strasbourg 1913); F. Bock, "Studien zum politischen Inquisitionsprozess Johanns XXII.," *QFIAB,* 26 (1935 f.), 21–142; *idem,* "Processi di Giovanni XXII contro i ghibellini italiani," *ASRomana,* 63 (1940), 129–43; *idem,* "Die Appellationsschriften König Ludwigs IV. in den Jahren 1323/24," *DA,* 4 (1940), 179–205; *idem,* "Politik und kanonischer Prozess zur Zeit Johanns XXII.," *ZBLG,* 22 (1959), 1–12.

Benedict XII: J. M. Vidal, *Lettres communes,* 3 vols. (Paris 1903–11); C. Daumet, *Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1899–1920); J. M. Vidal and G. Mollat, *Lettres closes et patentes intéressant les pays autres que la France,* 8 fasc.

(Paris 1913–52); *DHGE*, 8 (1935), 116–35, with detailed bibliography; G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (1965), 26–36; K. Jacob, *Studien über Papst Benedikt XII.* (Berlin 1910); B. Guillemain, *La politique bénéficiale du pape Benoît XII (1334–1342), BÉH*, 299 (Paris 1952); C. Schmitt, *Un pape réformateur et un défenseur de l'unité de l'église. Benoît XII et l'ordre des frères mineurs* (Florence and Quaracchi 1959), with detailed bibliography; B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale d'Avignon*, gives detailed bibliography; F. Wetter, "Die Lehre Benedikts XII. vom intensiven Wachstum der Gottesschau," *AnGr*, 92 (Rome 1958); H. Otto, "Benedikt XII. als Reformer des Kirchenstaates," *RQ*, 36 (1928), 59–110; F. Bock, "Die Prokuratorien Kaiser Ludwigs IV. an Papst Benedikt XII.," *QFIAB*, 25 (1933 f.), 251–91; "Benedetto papa XII," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 8 (1966), 378–84.

Clement VI: E. Déprez, J. Glénisson, and G. Mollat, *Lettres closes, patentes et curiales se rapportant à la France*, 3 vols. (Paris 1901–61); E. Déprez and G. Mollat, *Lettres closes, patentes et curiales intéressant les pays autres que la France*, 3 fasc. (Paris 1960 f.); T. Gasparini Leporace, *Le suppliche di Clemente VI* (Rome 1948); *DHGE*, 12 (1953), 1129–62; G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (1965), 37–43; B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale d'Avignon*, gives detailed bibliography; A. Pélissier, *Clément VI le magnifique, premier pape limousin* (Brive 1951); G. Mollat, "Le St-Siège et la France sous le pontificat de Clément VI (1342–1352)," *RHE*, 55 (1960), 5–24; *idem*, "Clément VI et la péninsule ibérique," *Journal des Savants* (1960), 122–29.

39. *From Innocent VI to Gregory XI*

SOURCES

Innocent VI: P. Gasnault and M. H. Laurent, *Lettres secrètes et curiales* (Paris 1959 ff.). *Urban V:* M. H. Laurent, P. Gasnault, and M. Hayez, *Lettres communes* (Paris 1954 ff.); P. Lecacheux and G. Mollat, *Lettres secrètes et curiales se rapportant à la France* (Paris 1902–55). *Gregory XI:* L. Mirot, H. Jassemin, J. Vielliard, G. Mollat, and E. R. Labande, *Lettres secrètes et curiales relatives à la France* (Paris 1935–57); G. Mollat, *Lettres secrètes et curiales intéressant les pays autres que la France* (Paris 1962–65); A. Segre, "I dispacci di Cristoforo da Piacenza, procuratore Mantovano alla corte pontificia 1371–83," *AstIt*, V series, 43 (1909), 27–95, 44 (1909), 253–326; G. Mollat, "Relations politiques de Grégoire XI avec les Siennois et les Florentins," *MAH*, 68 (1956), 335–76.

The publications of the series of *registra* in the Vatican Archives for the individual lands and copious bibliography are given in B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale d'Avignon*, 11–13.

LITERATURE

G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (1965), 44–63; *Storia di Milano*, VI (Milan 1955); J. P. Kirsch, *Die Rückkehr der Päpste Urban V. und Gregor XI. von Avignon nach Rom* (Paderborn 1898); L. Mirot, *La politique pontificale et le retour du Saint-Siège à Rome en 1376* (Paris 1899); A. Pélissier, *Innocent VI le réformateur, deuxième pape Limousin* (Tulle 1961); G. Mollat, "Grégoire XI et sa légende," *RHE*, 49 (1954), 873–77; A. Pélissier, *Grégoire XI ramène la papauté à Rome, troisième pape Limousin* (Tulle 1962); G. Pirchan, *Italien und Kaiser Karl IV. in der Zeit seiner zweiten Romfahrt*, 2 vols. (Prague 1930).

40. *The Curia at Avignon*

Sources

Vatikanische Quellen zur Geschichte der päpstlichen Hof- und Finanzverwaltung 1316–1378, published by the Görres-Gesellschaft (Paderborn): I: E. Göller, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.* (1910), II: K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII., nebst den Jahresbilanzen von 1316–1375* (1914), III: K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII., Klemens VI. und Innocenz VI., 1335–1362* (1914), IV: E. Göller, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Benedikt XII.* (1920), V: L. Mohler, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Klemens VI.* (1931), VI: K. H. Schäfer, *Die Ausgaben der apostolischen Kammer unter den Päpsten Urban V. und Gregor XI., 1362–1378, nebst Nachträgen und einem Glossar für alle drei Ausgabenbände* (1937), VII: H. Hoberg, *Die Einnahmen der apostolischen Kammer unter Innocenz VI.* (1955). Publications of the *registra* of the Popes are listed under the respective pontificates.

Literature

B. Guillemain, *La cour pontificale d'Avignon, 1309–1376. Étude d'une société* (Paris 1962), gives a broad presentation, with charts, statistics, and a copious bibliography. F. Lot and R. Fawtier, *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge.* III: *Institutions ecclésiastiques* (Paris 1962); C. Lux, *Constitutionum apostolicarum de generali beneficiorum reservatione ab anno 1265 usque ad annum 1378 emissarum, tam intra quam extra corpus iuris exstantium, collectio et interpretatio* (Breslau 1904); G. Mollat, *La collation des bénéfices ecclésiastiques à l'époque des papes d'Avignon, 1305–1378* (Paris 1921); G. Barraclough, *Papal Provisions* (Oxford 1935); G. Mollat, "La diplomatie pontificale au XIV^e^ siècle," *Mélanges Louis Halphen* (Paris 1951); Y. Renouard, *Les relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378* (Paris 1941); C. Bauer, "Die Epochen der Papstfinanz," *HZ*, 138 (1928), 457–503; P. D. Partner, "Camera papae: Problems of the Papal Finance in the Later Middle Ages," *JEH*, 4 (1953), 55–68; R. de Roover, *The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank* (Harvard 1963); G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon* (1965), 279–342; A. Esch, "Bankiers der Kirche im Grossen Schisma," *QFIAB*, 46 (1966), 277–398 (important also for the period preceding the Schism and supplying bibliography); T. Majic, "Die apostolische Pönitentiarie im 14. Jahrhundert," *RQ*, 50 (1955), 129–77.

41. *Nominalism. The Universities Between Via Antiqua and Via Moderna*

Literature

K. Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, II–IV (Vienna 1881–87); *Ueberweg*, II; *Wulf*, III; *Gilson-Böhner; Fliche-Martin*, 13, 417–73; F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy* (Westminster, Md., 2d ed. 1959); *Grabmann G;* G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik*, I–III (Heidelberg 1921–27); *idem*, *Die Heidelberger Universität* (Heidelberg 1936); F. Ehrle, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia* (Münster 1925); P. Vignaux, *Justification et prédestination au XIV^e^ siècle* (Paris 1934); *idem*, *Nominalisme au XIV^e^ siècle* (Montreal 1948); *Stegmüller RS;* A. Maier, *Studien zur Naturphilosophie der Spätscholastik*, 5 vols. (Rome 1949–58); G. de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque*, 5 vols. (Paris, 3d ed. 1956–63); W. Dettloff, *Die Entwicklung der Akzeptations- und Verdienstlehre von Duns Scotus bis Luther* (Münster 1963); H. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology. Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963).

William of Ockham: Works: P. Böhner, "Die unpolemischen Schriften Ockhams," *FStud,* 32 (1950), 156–63; *De sacramento altaris,* ed. T. Bruce Birch (Burlington 1930); *Quaestio prima principalis Prologi in I Sent.,* ed. P. Böhner (Paterson 1939); *Centiloquium,* ed. P. Böhner, *FStudies,* 1 (1941), 2 (1942); *Summa logicae,* I–III/I, ed. P. Böhner (St. Bonaventure, N. Y., 2d ed. 1957–62); *Philosophical Writings,* selections edited and translated by P. Böhner (Edinburgh and London 1957); *Quodlibeta septem* and *Tractatus de sacramento altaris* (Strasbourg 1491, facsimile Louvain 1962); *Opera plurima* (Lyons 1494–96, reprinted London 1962). Literature: W. Heynck, "Ockham-Literatur 1919–1949," *FStud,* 32 (1950), 164–83; R. Guelluy, *Philosophie et théologie chez Guillaume d'Ockham* (Paris 1947); L. Baudry, *Guillaume d'Ockham, sa vie, ses œuvres, ses idées sociales et politiques,* I: *L'homme et les œuvres* (Paris 1950); *idem, Lexique philosophique de Guillaume d'Ockham* (Paris 1958); T. Barth, "Wilhelm von Ockham und die Philosophie der Ordnungen," *PhJ,* 60 (1950), 323–34; *idem,* "Nuove interpretazioni della filosofia di Ockham," *StudFr,* 52 (1955), 187–204; C. Vasoli, *Guillaume d'Ockham* (Florence 1953); W. Kölmel, "Von Ockham zu Gabriel Biel," *FStud,* 37 (1955), 218–59; E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie in der philosophischen Theologie des Wilhelm von Ockham* (Wiesbaden 1956); H. Shapiro, *Motion, Time and Place according to William Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, N. Y. 1957); P. Böhner, *Collected Articles on Ockham,* ed. E. Buytaert (St. Bonaventure, N. Y. 1958); F. Hoffmann, *Die erste Kritik des Ockhamismus durch den Oxforder Kanzler Johann Lutterell* (Breslau 1941); *idem, Die Schriften des Oxforder Kanzlers Johann Lutterell* (Leipzig 1959).

Nicholas of Autrecourt: J. Lappe, *Nikolaus von Autrecourt* (Münster 1908); J. R. O'Donnel, "Nicholas of Autrecourt," *MS,* 1 (1939), 179–280, 4 (1942), 97–125; J. R. Weinberg, *Nicholas of Autrecourt* (Princeton 1948); E. Maccagnolo, "Metafisica e gnoseologia in Niccolò d'Autrecourt," *RFN,* 45 (1952), 36–53.

John of Mirecourt: F. Stegmüller, "Die 2 Apologien des Johanns de Mirecourt," *RThAM,* 5 (1933), 46–78, 192–204; A. Franzinelli in *RSF,* 13 (1958), 319–40, 415–19.

Robert Holkot: A. Meissner, *Gotteserkenntnis und Gotteslehre nach dem englischen Dominikanertheologen Robert Holkot* (Limburg 1953); P. Molteni, *Robert Holkot. Dottrina della grazia et della giustificazione* (typed dissertation, Bonn 1962).

Gregory of Rimini: Super I et II Sent. (reprinted St. Bonaventure, N. Y. 1955); M. Schüler, *Prädestination, Sünde und Freiheit bei Gregor von Rimini* (Stuttgart 1934); *ECatt,* VI, 1156 f.; D. Trapp in *Augustiniana,* 6 (1956), 182 ff., 8 (1958), 425 ff.

Marsilius of Inghen: G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik,* I: *Marsilius von Inghen und die okkamistische Schule in Deutschland* (Heidelberg 1921); A. Lang, *Die Wege der Glaubensbegründung bei den Scholastikern des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1930); W. Möhler, *Die Trinitätslehre des Marsilius von Inghen* (Limburg 1949).

Henry Heinbuche of Langenstein: A. Lang, "Die Katharinenpredigt Heinrichs von Langenstein," *DTh,* 26 (1948), 123–59, 233–58, 361–94; A. Emmen, "Heinrich von Langenstein und die Diskussion über die Empfängnis Mariens," *Schmaus ThGG,* 625–50.

Henry Totting of Oyta: A. Lang, *Heinrich Totting von Oyta* (Münster 1937); F. Rosenthal, "Heinrich von Oyta and Biblical Criticism in the Fourteenth Century," *Speculum,* 25 (1950), 178–83.

Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl: A. Madre, *Nikolaus' von Dinkelsbühl Leben und Schriften* (Münster 1965).

Peter d'Ailly: B. Meller, *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre des Peters von Ailly* (Freiburg 1954); M. Liebermann, "Gerson et d'Ailly," *Romania,* 78 (Paris 1957), 433–62, 79 (1958), 339–75, 80 (1959), 289–336, 81 (1960), 44–98.

John Gerson: Œuvres complètes, Introduction, texte et notes, ed. P. Glorieux, thus far 6 vols. (Paris, Tournai, Rome, and New York 1960–66); J. B. Schwab, *J. Gerson* (Würzburg 1858); W. Dress, *Die Theologie Johanns Gerson* (Gütersloh 1931); A. Combes, *Jean Gerson: commentateur dionysien* (Paris 1940); *idem, Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson,* 3 vols. (Paris 1945–59); L. Mourin, *Jean Gerson prédicateur français* (Bruges 1952); G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, *J. Gerson zijn kerkpolitiek en ecclesiologie* ('s-Gravenhage 1963); further literature in the bibliography for Chapter 44.

John Wenck: E. Vansteenberghe, Le "De ignota litteratura" (Münster 1910); R. Haubst, *Studien zu Nikolaus von Kues und Johannes Wenck* (Münster 1955), and, in connection with the preceding, *RQ,* 53 (1958), 81–88.

Henry of Gorkum: A. G. Weiler, *Heinrich von Gorkum († 1431). Seine Stellung in der Philosophie und Theologie des Spätmittelalters* (Hilversum and Einsiedeln 1962).

Dionysius the Carthusian: Opera omnia, 1–44 (Montreuil and Tournai 1896–1935); *DHGE,* XIV, 256–60, with bibliography; A. Mougel, *Dionysius der Kartäuser* (Mülheim an der Ruhr 1898); E. Ewig, *Die Anschauungen des Kartäusers Dionysius von Roermond über den christlichen Ordo in Staat und Kirche* (Bonn 1936); H. Pohlen, *Die Erkenntnislehre Dionysius' des Kartäusers* (Leipzig 1941); M. Beer, *Dionysius des Kartäusers Lehre vom Desiderium naturale* (Munich 1963).

42. *Concept of the Church and Idea of the State in the Polemics of the Fourteenth Century, The Laicized State in Marsilius of Padua*

Sources and Literature

M. Goldast, *Monarchia S. Romani Imperii,* 3 vols. (Hanover and Frankfurt 1611–14, reprinted Graz 1960); S. Riezler, *Die literarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern* (Leipzig 1874); R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz' VIII.* (Stuttgart 1903); *idem, Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern,* 2 vols. (Rome 1911–14); J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Église et de l'État au temps de Philippe le Bel* (Louvain 1926); U. Mariani, *Scrittori politici Agostiniani del secolo XIV* (Florence 1930); O. Bornhak, *Staatskirchliche Anschauungen und Handlungen am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern* (Weimar 1933); V. Martin, *Les origines du gallicanisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939); G. de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du moyen âge.* 5 vols. (Louvain and Paris, 3d ed. 1956–63); F. Merzbacher, "Wandlungen des Kirchenbegriffs im Spätmittelalter," *ZSavRGkan,* 39 (1953), 274–361.

Aegidius Romanus (Giles of Rome): De ecclesiastica sive summi pontificis potestate, ed. R. Scholz (Weimar 1929, reprinted Aalen 1961); discussion of the preceding in R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik,* 46–129, J. Rivière, *Le problème,* 191–228, and G. de Lagarde, *La naissance,* I, 230–41; G. Santonastoco, *Il pensiero politico di Egidio Romano* (Florence 1939); *E. Moody,* "Ockham and Aegidius Romanus," *RStudies,* 9 (1949), 417–42; R. Kuiters, *De ecclesiastica sive de summi pontificis potestate secundum Aegidium Romanum* (Rome 1948), with bibliography.

James of Viterbo: De regimine christiano, ed. H. X. Arquillière (Paris 1926); discussion of the preceding in R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik,* 131–52, and J. Rivière, *Le problème,* 228–52.

Augustinus Triumphus: D. A. Perini, *Bibliographia Augustiniana,* IV (Florence 1935), 20–28; R. Scholz, *Die Publizistik,* 172–89; *idem, Unbekannte Streitschriften,* I, 191–96, II, 481–90; R. van Gerven, *De wereldlijke macht van den paus volgens Augustinus Triumphus in het licht van het politiek Augustinisme* (Louvain 1946); F. Merzbacher, "Wandlungen," *loc. cit.;* M. J. Wilks, "Papa est nomen iurisdictionis: Augustinus Triumphus and the Papal Vicariate of Christ," *JThS,* 8 (1957), 71–91; W. Kölmel, "Einheit und Zweiheit der Gewalt im Corpus Mysticum. Zur Souveränitätslehre des Augustinus Triumphus," *HJ*, 82 (1963), 103–47.

Marsilius of Padua: Works: *Defensor pacis,* ed. C. W. Previté-Orton (Cambridge 1928); R. Scholz, *MG Fontes iuris,* 2 vols. (Hanover 1932 f.); A. Gewirth (New York 1956), with English translation; H. Kusch, 2 vols. (Darmstadt 1958), with German translation and bibliography; *Defensor minor,* ed. C. K. Brampton (Birmingham 1922); *Tractatus de translatione Romani imperii,* M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 147–53; *Tractatus de iurisdictione imperatoris in causis matrimonialibus, ibid.*, 1383–91. Literature: F. Battaglia, "Marsilio da Padova e il Defensor pacis," *Rivista internazionale di filosofia del diritto,* 4 (Rome 1924), 398 ff.; *idem, Marsilio e la filosofia politica del medio evo* (Florence 1928); J. Haller, "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Marsilius von Padua," *ZKG,* 48 (1929), 166–99; M. Grabmann, "Studien über den Einfluß der aristotelischen Philosophie auf die mittelalterlichen Theorien über das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat," *SAM,* 2 (1934), 41–60; R. Scholz, "Marsilius und die Genesis des modernen Staatsbewusstseins," *HZ,* 156 (1937), 88–103; A. Checchini and N. Bobbio (ed.), *Marsilio da Padova, Studi raccolti nel VI centenario della morte* (Padua 1942); A. Dordett, *Der geistliche Charakter der kirchlichen Gerichtsbarkeit* (Vienna 1954); A. Gewirth, *Marsilius and Medieval Political Philosophy* (New York 1951); J. Heckel, "Marsilius und Martin Luther," *ZSavRGkan,* 75 (1958), 268–336; H. Segall, *Der "Defensor pacis" des Marsilius* (Wiesbaden 1959); P. Mikat in *LThK,* VII (2d ed. 1962), 108–10; G. de Lagarde, "Marsile de Padoue et Guillaume d'Ockham," *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel Le Bras,* I (Paris 1965), 593–605.

William of Ockham: Works: *Opera plurima* (Lyons 1494–96, reprinted London 1962); M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* I, II; R. Scholz, *Unbekannte Streitschriften,* II; *Guilielmi de Ockham opera politica,* ed. J. G. Sikes *et al.*, 3 vols. (Manchester 1940–56); *Opus XC dierum,* M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 993–1236, and Sikes, I and II; *Dialogus,* Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 398–957 (continuation in R. Scholz, *Unbekannte Streitschriften,* II, 392–95); *Monumenta politica,* ser. I, no. I, ed. L. Firpo (reprinted Turin 1959); *Octo quaestiones,* M. Goldast, *Monarchia,* II, 314–91, and Sikes, I, 12–221; *Breviloquium de principatu tyrannico,* ed. R. Scholz (Leipzig 1944, reprinted Stuttgart 1952) and V. L. Baudry (Paris 1937); *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate,* R. Scholz, *Unbekannte Streitschriften,* II, 453–80 (continuation in W. Mulder, *AFrH,* 16 [1923], 469–92, 17 [1924], 72–97), ed. C. K. Brampton (New York 1927). Literature: H. Köhler, *Der Kirchenbegriff bei Wilhelm von Ockham* (dissertation, Würzburg 1937); A. Hamman, "La doctrine de l'église et de l'état d'après le Breviloquium d'Occam," *FStud,* 32 (1950), 135–41; W. Kölmel, "Das Naturrecht bei Wilhelm von Ockham," *FStud,* 35 (1953), 35–85; *idem, Wilhelm Ockham und seine kirchenpolitischen Schriften* (Essen 1962), with bibliography; E. F. Jacob, "Ockham as a Political Thinker," *Essays in the Conciliar Epoch* (Manchester 1953), 85–105; B. Tierney, "Ockham, The Conciliar Theory and the Canonists," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 16 (1954), 40–70; *idem, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge 1955); F. Hofmann, *Der Anteil der Minoriten am Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern gegen Johannes XXII., unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Wilhelms von Ockham* (dissertation, Münster 1959); E. K. Brampton, "Ockham, Bonagratia and the Emperor Lewis IV," *Medium aevum,* 31 (1962).

43. *The Spiritual Movement and the Poverty Dispute*

LITERATURE

BullFr, I–V; *ALKGMA,* II–IV; *Holzapfel;* K. Balthasar, *Geschichte des Armutsstreites im Franziskanerorden* (Münster 1911); L. Oliger, *Documenta inedita ad historiam Fraticellorum specantia* (Quaracchi 1913); *idem,* "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Spiritualen, Fratizellen und Clarener im Mittelalter," *ZKG,* 45 (1926), 215–42; *idem,* "Bonagratia de Bergamo et eius Tractatus... de paupertate," *AFrH,* 22 (1929), 292–335, 487–511; *cf. AFrH,* 23 (1930), 57–69, 106–71, 32 (1939), 274–411; L. Oliger, *De secta spiritus libertatis in Umbria* (Rome 1943); M. Bierbaum, *Bettelorden und Weltgeistlichkeit an der Universität Paris* (Münster 1920); P. Gratien, *Histoire de la fondation et de l'évolution de l'ordre des Frères Mineurs au XIII^e siècle* (Paris 1930); E. Müller, *Das Konzil von Vienne* (Münster 1934); E. Benz, *Ecclesia spiritualis* (Stuttgart 1934); F. Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de s. François* I, 1–2 (Paris 1935–37); R. M. Huber, *A Documented History of the Franciscan Order (1182–1517)* (Milwaukee 1944); A. Léon, *Histoire de l'ordre des Frères Mineurs* (Paris 1954); E. Wagner, *Historia constitutionum generalium OFM* (Würzburg and Rome 1954); H. S. Offler, "Meinungsverschiedenheiten am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern," *DA,* 11 (1954), 191–206; K. Bosl, "Die 'Geistliche Hofakademie' Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern im alten Franziskanerkloster zu München," *Der Mönch im Wappen* (Munich 1960), 97–129; M. D. Lamtert, *Franciscan Poverty* (London 1961); Thaddeus of New Durham, *The Doctrine of the Franciscan Spirituals* (Rome 1963); *LThK,* I (2d ed. 1957), 886 f., and IX (2d ed. 1964), 974 f.

44. *The German Mystics*

TEXTS

F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts,* 2 vols. (Göttingen, 2d ed. 1906–07, reprinted Aalen 1962); A. Spamer, *Texte aus der deutschen Mystik des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts* (Jena 1912); F. Schulze-Maizier, *Mystische Dichtung aus 7 Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig 1925); O. Karrer, *Die grosse Glut. Textgeschichte der Mystik im Mittelalter* (Munich 1926); W. Oehl, *Deutsche Mystikerbriefe des Mittelalters* (Munich 1931); W. Stammler, *Gottsuchende Seelen* (Munich 1948); J. Quint, *Textbuch zur Mystik des deutschen Mittelalters* (Tübingen and Halle, 2d ed. 1957); M. Kunisch (ed.), *Eckhart, Tauler, Seuse. Ein Textbuch aus der altdeutschen Mystik* (Hamburg 1958).

LITERATURE

Stammler-Langosch; C. Greith, *Die deutsche Mystik im Predigerorden* (Freiburg 1861); *Preger;* H. Denifle, "Über die Anfänge der Predigtweise der deutschen Mystiker," *ALKGMA,* 2 (1886), 641–52; J. Bernhart, *Die philosophische Mystik des Mittelalters* (Munich 1922); J. Quint, "Mystik," *RDL,* IV (1933), 65–88; W. Muschg, *Die Mystik in der Schweiz 1200–1500* (Fravenfeld and Leipzig 1935); *Pourrat;* F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Deutsche Mystik zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Tübingen 1947); H. Dénifle and O. Spiess, *Die deutschen Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Fribourg 1951); E. von Ivánka, "Wanderung und Wandlung eines stoischen Terminus," *ZKTh,* 72 (1950), 149–55; H. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2d ed. 1961); *idem,* "Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik," *DVfLG,* 12 (1934), 400–29; K. Ruh, "Altdeutsche Mystik," *Wirkendes Wort,* 7 (1957), 135–46, 211–31 (report of research); K. Ruh (ed.), *Altdeutsche und altniederländische Mystik* (Darmstadt 1964).

Mechtilde of Magdeburg: Texts: G. Morel, *Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit* (Middle High German) (1863 Darmstadt, 2d ed. 1963), partial printing in accordance with a recently discovered manuscript, ed. W. Schleussner (Mainz 1929); *Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechtildianae,* II (Poitiers 1877), 435–707; M. Schmidt (trans.), *Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit* (Einsiedeln 1956). Literature: *Stammler-Langosch,* III, 323–26; H. Stierling, *Studien zu Mechthild von Magdeburg* (dissertation, Göttingen 1907); G. Lüers, *Die Sprache der deutschen Mystik des Mittelalters im Werke der Mechthild von Magdeburg* (Munich 1926); M. S. C. Molenaar, *Die Frau vom anderen Ufer* (Heidelberg 1946); H. Neumann, "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte des 'Fliessenden Lichts' und zur Lebensgeschichte Mechthilds von Magdeburg," *NAG* (1954), no. 3, 28–80.

Mechtilde of Hackeborn: Texts: *Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechtildianae,* II (Poitiers 1877), 1–442; J. Müller, *Leben und Offenbarung der heiligen Mechthild,* 2 vols. (Regensburg 1880 f.); H. U. von Balthasar, *Mechthild von Hackeborn. Das Buch vom strömenden Lob* (Einsiedeln 1956), with bibliography. Literature: *Stammler-Langosch,* III, 321 ff.; C. Vagaggini, *Cor Iesu,* II (Rome 1959), 31–48.

Gertrude: Texts: *Revelationes Gertrudianae,* I (Poitiers 1875); *Exercitia spiritualia,* Latin and Italian, ed. R. Medici (Praglia 1924); P. Doyère (ed. and trans.), *Le mémorial spirituel de Ste Gertrude* (Books I and II of the *Legatus divinae pietatis)* (Paris 1954); Gertrudis Sancta, *Œuvres spirituelles,* Latin and French, ed. J. Honlier and A. Schmitt (Paris 1967). Literature: G. Ledos, *Ste Gertrude* (Paris 1901, 6th ed. 1916); A. Vollmer, *Die heilige Gertrud die Grosse* (Kevelaer 1937); *Baudot-Chaussin,* IX, 520–36, with bibliography; C. Vagaggini, *Cor Iesu,* II (Rome 1959), 29–48.

Dietrich of Freiberg: E. Krebs, "Meister Dietrich," *BGPhMA,* 5 (1906), 5 f.; *idem* in *RNPh,* 18 (1911), 516–36; J. Würschmidt (ed.), *De iride, BGPhMA,* 12 (1914), 5; F. Stegmüller, "Meister Dietrich von Freiberg über die Zeit und das Sein," *AHD,* 13 (1942), 153–221; A. Maurer in *MS,* 18 (1956), 173–203; A. Wallace, *The Scientific Methodology of Theoderic of Freiberg* (Fribourg 1959); W. Eckert in *LThK,* III (2d ed. 1959), 384.

Master Eckhart: Texts: German works ed. J. Quint, I (Stuttgart 1958), V (Stuttgart 1963), Latin works ed. J. Koch, E. Benz, K. Weiss, *et al.,* IV (Stuttgart 1956); F. Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker,* II (Leipzig 1857, reprinted Aalen 1962); J. Quint (ed. and trans.), *Meister Eckhart. Deutsche Predigten und Traktate* (Munich 1955); E. K. Pohl (trans.), *Meister Eckhart. Von der Geburt der Seele. Predigten und Traktate* (Gütersloh 1959). Acts of his trial: A. Daniels (ed.), "Eine lateinische Rechtfertigungsschrift," *BGPhMA,* 23 (1923), 5; G. Théry, "Édition critique des pièces relatives au procès d'Eckhart," *AHD,* 1 (1926), 129–268; O. Karrer and H. Piesch, *Meister Eckharts Rechtfertigungsschrift* (Erfurt 1927); M. H. Laurent, "Autour du procès de Maître Eckhart," *DTh(P)* (1936), 331–48. Literature: *Stammler-Langosch,* I, 485–502, V, 163–71, with bibliography; H. Denifle, "Meister Eckharts lateinische Schriften und die Grundanschauungen seiner Lehre," *ALKGMA,* II (1886), 417–562, 672–87 (reprinted 1956); O. Karrer, *Meister Eckhart. Das System seiner religiösen Lehre und Lebensweisheit* (Munich 1923); *idem, Das Göttliche in der Seele bei Meister Eckhart* (Würzburg 1928); E. Seeberg, *Meister Eckhart* (Tübingen 1934); A. Dempf, *Meister Eckhart* (Leipzig 1934, Freiburg 1960); W. Bange, *Meister Eckharts Lehre vom göttlichen und geschöpflichen Sein* (Limburg 1937); O. Bolza, *Meister Eckhart als Mystiker* (Munich 1938); H. Ebeling, *Meister Eckharts Mystik* (Stuttgart 1941); H. Piesch, *Meister Eckharts Ethik* (Lucerne 1935, 2d ed. 1948); H. Hof, *Scintilla animae* (Lund 1952); K. Weiss, *Meister Eckharts Stellung innerhalb der theologischen Entwicklung des Spätmittelalters* (Berlin 1953); M. Bindschedler, "Meister Eckharts Lehre von der Gerechtigkeit," *Studia philosophica,* 13 (Basel 1953), 58–71; B. Schmoldt, *Die deutsche Begriffssprache Meister Eckharts* (Heidelberg 1954); J. Kopper, *Die Metaphysik Meister Eckharts* (Saarbrücken 1955); J. Ancelet-Hustache, *Maître Eckhart et la mystique rhénane* (Paris 1956); J. M. Clark, *Meister Eckhart* (London 1957); U. M. Nix and R. Öchslin (ed.), *Meister Eckhart der Prediger* (Freiburg 1960); V. Lossky, *Théologie negative et connaissance de Dieu chez Maître Eckhart* (Paris 1960); *NDB,* IV, 295–301; *DSAM,* IV, 93–116.

John Tauler: Texts: the only authentic works are the sermons and one each of the letters to E. Schappach and M. Ebner. Printings: Leipzig 1498, Basel 1521, Cologne 1543 (ed. P. Vanisius *et al.*); F. Vetter, *Die Predigten Taulers* (Berlin 1910); A. L. Corin, *Sermons de J. Tauler,* 2 vols. (Paris 1924–29); J. Quint, *Textbuch zur Mystik des deutschen Mittelalters* (Tübingen, 2d ed. 1957). Literature: *Stammler-Langosch,* IV, 375–86, V, 1078; G. Siedel, *Die Mystik Taulers* (Leipzig 1911); A. Vogt-Terhost, *Der bildliche Ausdruck in den Pre-*

digten Taulers (Breslau 1920); J. Zahn, "Taulers Mystik in ihrer Stellung zur Kirche," *Festschrift J. G. von Sachsen* (Freiburg 1920), 120–46; E. Hugueny, "La doctrine mystique de Tauler," *RSPhTh*, 15 (1921), 194–291; D. Helander, *Johannes Tauler als Prediger* (Lund 1923); T. Absil, "Die Gaben des Heiligen Geistes in der Mystik Taulers," *ZAM*, 2 (1927), 254–64; A. Korn, *Tauler als Redner* (Münster 1928); K. Grunewald, *Studien zu Johannes Taulers Frömmigkeit* (Leipzig 1930); C. Kirmsse, *Die Terminologie des Mystikers Johannes Tauler* (dissertation, Leipzig) (Engelsdorf 1930); E. Holzmair, *Eckhart und Tauler* (Vienna 1931); F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Studien zur Lebenslehre Taulers* (Berlin 1940); P. Wyser, "Der 'Seelengrund' in Taulers Predigten," *Lebendiges Mittelalter* (Fribourg 1958), 204–311; M. de Gandillac, "De Jean Tauler à Henri Seuse," *Études Germaniques*, 5 (Lyons 1950), 241–56; *idem, Valeur du temps dans la pédagogie spirituelle de Jean Tauler* (Paris 1956); E. Filthaut (ed.), *Johannes Tauler, Gedenkschrift zum 600. Todestag* (Essen 1961), with bibliography; I. Weilner, *Johannes Taulers Bekehrungsweg* (Regensburg 1961).

Henry Suso: Texts: *Büchlein der ewigen Weisheit, Büchlein der Wahrheit, Grosses und Kleines Briefbuch,* K. Bihlmeyer (ed.), *Heinrich Seuse, Deutsche Schriften* (Stuttgart 1907, reprinted Freiburg 1961); in New High German, M. Diepenbrock (Regensburg 1829, 4th ed. 1884), H. S. Denifle (Munich 1876–80), N. Heller (Heidelberg 1926), W. Lehmann, 2 vols. (Jena, 2d ed. 1922). Literature: *Stammler-Langosch,* IV, 164–80, V, 1047; H. Lichtenberg, "Le mysticisme allemand," *Revue des Cours et Conférences,* 18 (Paris 1909), 600–12, 19 (Paris 1910), 683–95; A. Niklas, *Die Terminologie des Mystikers Heinrich Seuse* (dissertation, Königsberg 1914); C. Heyer, *Stilgeschichtliche Studien über Heinrich Seuses Büchlein der ewigen Weisheit* (dissertation, Kiel 1915); R. Senn, *Die Echtheit der Vita Heinrich Seuses* (dissertation, Bonn 1930); R. Schwarz, *Das Christusbild des deutschen Mystikers Heinrich Seuse* (Greifswald 1934); M. A. Fischer, *Die Heilige Schrift in den Werken des deutschen Mystikers Heinrich Seuse* (Speyer 1936); D. Planzer, *Das Horologium Sapientiae des seligen Heinrich Seuse* (Rome 1937); C. Gröber, *Der Mystiker Heinrich Seuse* (Freiburg 1941); J. Bühlmann, *Christuslehre und Christusmystik des Heinrich Seuse* (Lucerne 1942); J. A. Bizet, *Henri Suso et le déclin de la scholastique* (Paris 1946), with bibliography; *idem, Suso et le Minnesang ou la morale de l'amour courtois* (Paris 1947); D. Planzer, "Henry Suso on the Spiritual Life," *Cross and Crown,* 2 (St. Louis 1960), 58–79; J. Schwietering, "Zur Autorschaft von Seuses Vita," *Mystik und höfische Dichtung im Hochmittelalter* (Darmstadt 1960), 107–22; J. Ancelet-Hustache, "Le problème de l'autenticité de la vie de Suso," *La mystique rhénane* (Paris 1963), 193–205; E. Filthaut, *Heinrich Seuse. Studien zum 600. Geburtstag (1366–1966)* (Cologne 1966).

The Friends of God: R. Egenter, *Die Lehre von der Gottesfreundschaft in der Scholastik und Mystik des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts* (Augsburg 1928); *idem,* "Die Idee der Gottesfreunde im 14. Jahrhundert," *BGPhMA,* Suppl. III (Münster 1935), 1021–36; P. Strauch (ed.), *M. Ebner und Heinrich von Nördlingen* (Freiburg and Tübingen 1882); H. Wilms (ed.), *Der seligen Margarete Ebner Offenbarungen und Briefe* (Vechta 1928); J. Prestel (ed.), *Die Offenbarungen der Margarete Ebner und Adelheid Langmann* (Weimar 1939); A. Walz, "Gottesfreunde um Margarete Ebner," *HJ,* 72 (1953), 253–65.

John van Ruysbroeck: Works: ed. J. B. David, 6 vols. (Ghent 1858–68), according to the standard edition of Groenendael ed. by the Ruusbroec-Gesellschaft at Antwerp, 4 vols. (Cologne, 2d ed. 1950), Latin ed. L. Surius (Cologne 1552), French translation ed. by the Benedictines of St-Paul des Wisques, 6 vols. (Brussels 1912–38); German translation, *Zierde der geistlichen Hochzeit* by F. A. Lambert (Leipzig 1901), W. Verkade (Mainz 1922), F. Hübner (Leipzig 1924); J. Kuckhoff, *J. van Ruysbroeck. Einführung in sein Leben. Auswahl aus seinen Werken* (Munich 1938). Literature: *Jan van Ruusbroec, Leven, werken,* ed. by the Ruusbroec-Genootschaft (Malines 1931), with bibliography; A. Auger, *Étude sur les mystiques des Pays-Bas au moyen-âge* (Brussels 1892); A. Wautier d'Aygalliers, *Ruysbroeck l'Admirable* (Paris 1923); L. Reypens, *Ruusbroec* (Brussels 1926); *idem,* "Ruusbroec-studien," *OGE,* 12 (1938), 158–86, 392–411; M. d'Asbeck, *La mystique de Ruysbroeck l'Admirable* (Paris 1930); G. Dolezich, *Die Mystik Johannes van Ruysbroecks des Wunderbaren* (Habelschwerdt 1926); M. J. Smits van Waesberghe, *Katholieke Nederlandse Mystiek* (Amsterdam 1947); A. Ampe, *Kernproblemen uit de leer van Ruusbroec,* 3 vols. (Tielt 1950–57); P. Henry, "La mystique trinitaire du bienheureux J. Ruysbroeck," *RSR,* 40 (1952), 335–68, 51 (1953), 51–75; A. Combes, *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson,* 3 vols. (Paris 1945–59); S. Axters, *Geschiedenis van de vroomheid in de Nederlanden,* II: *De eeuw van Ruusbroec* (Antwerp 1953); F. Hermans, *Ruysbroeck l'Admirable et son école* (Paris 1958); B. Fraling, *Der Mensch vor dem Geheimnis Gottes* (Würzburg 1967); L. Moereels, *Ruusbroec en het rel. Leven* (Tielt and The Hague 1962).

Sisters' Lives: F. Vetter (ed.), *Das Leben der Schwestern zu Töss* (Berlin 1906); C. Schröder (ed.), *Der Nonne von Engelthal Büchlein von der Gnadenüberlast* (Tübingen 1871), German translation by W. Oehl (Paderborn 1924); M. Weinhandl (ed.), *Deutsches Nonnenleben. Das Leben der Schwestern zu Töss und der Nonne von Engelthal Büchlein von der Gnaden Überlast* (Munich 1921); W. Blank, *Die Nonnenviten des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg 1962).

John Gerson: Texts: *Opera omnia,* ed. L. E. Du Pin, 5 vols. (Antwerp 1706); *Œuvres complètes,* ed. P. Glorieux (Paris 1960 ff.); *Initiation à la vie mystique,* ed. P. Pascal (Paris 1945); *De mystica theologia,* ed. A. Combes (Lugano 1958). Literature: J. L. Connolly, *John Gerson, Reformer and Mystic* (Louvain 1928); J. Stelzenberger, *Die Mystik des Johannes Gerson* (Breslau 1928); W. Dress, *Die Theologie Johannes Gersons* (Gütersloh 1931); C. J. Corcoran, *John Gerson, Champion of Parish Priests* (Washington, D. C., 1944); P. Glorieux, "La vie et les œuvres de Gerson," *AHD,* 18 (1950 f.), 149–92; A. Combes, *La théologie mystique de Gerson,* 2 vols. (Rome 1963 f.); further literature in the bibliography for Chapter 41.

Rulman Merswin: Texts: F. Lauchert (ed.), *Des Gottesfreundes im Oberland Buch von den zwei Mannen* (Bonn 1896); P. H. Strauch (ed.), "Schriften aus der Gottesfreund-Literatur," *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek,* nos. 22, 23 (Halle 1927), no. 27 (Halle 1929). Literature: H. Denifle in *ZdAdL,* 24 (1880), 200–19, 280–324, 463 ff., 25 (1881), 101 ff.; *RE,* XVII, 203–27; K. Rieder, *Der Gottesfreund vom Oberland* (Innsbruck 1905); A. Chiquot, *Histoire ou légende* (Strasbourg and Paris 1922); W. Oehl, *Deutsche Mystikerbriefe* (Munich 1931), 397–424; E. Dehnhardt, *Die Metaphorik der Mystiker Meister Eckhart und Tauler in den Schriften des Rulman Merswin* (dissertation, Marburg 1940); *Stammler-Langosch,* III, 355–68, V, 682, with bibliography.

Theologia Deutsch: Editions: *Theologia Deutsch,* ed. H. Mandel (Leipzig 1908); F. Pfeiffer (Gütersloh, 5th ed. 1923); *Der Franckforter,* ed. Willo Uhl (Bonn 1912) from manuscript of 1497; G. Siedel (Gotha 1929), Luther's imprint of 1518. German translations: J. Bernhart (Munich 1946), and others; G. Baring, *Bibliographie der Ausgaben der Theologia Deutsch* (Baden-Baden 1963). Literature: F. G. Lisco, *Die Heilslehre der Theologia Deutsch* (Stuttgart 1857); J. Paquiers, *Un mystique allemand du XIV^e^ siècle* (Paris 1922); K. Müller, "Zum Text der Deutschen Theologie," *ZKG,* 49 (1930), 306–35; E. Schröder, "Die Überlieferung des 'Franckforters,'" *NGG,* new series, II, 2 (1937), 49–65; *RE,* XIX, 626–31, XXIV, 561–63; R. Haubst in *Scholastik,* 33 (1958), 375–98.

45. *Missionary Work of the Mendicants outside Europe*

SOURCES

In addition to the papal *registra* and the *bullaria* of the orders, G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca Bio-Bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Ordine Francescano* (Quaracchi 1906–27) and the related *Documenti* (Quaracchi since 1921); A. van den Wyngaert, *Sinica Franciscana,* I (Quaracchi 1929).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliotheca Missionum, ed. R. Streit and J. Dindinger, IV: *Asiatische Missionsliteratur 1245–1599* (Aachen 1928), XV: *Afrikanische Missionsliteratur 1053–1599* (Freiburg 1951); J. Beckmann, "Neuerscheinungen zur chinesischen Missionsgeschichte 1945–1955," *Monumenta Serica,* 15 (Tokyo 1956), 378–462.

LITERATURE

In addition to the handbooks on mission history by J. Schmidlin, *Catholic Mission History,* K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* II, S. Delacroix, *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques,* I, A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte,* and others, see also: L. Lemmens, *Die Heidenmissionen des Spätmittelalters* (Münster 1919); B. Altaner, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Habelschwerdt 1924); K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China* (New York 1929); G. Soranzo, *Il Papato, l'Europa cristiana e i Tartari* (Milan 1930); O. van der Vat, *Die Anfänge der Franziskanermissionen im nahen Orient und in den mohammedanischen Ländern während des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Werl 1934); N. Simonut, *Il metodo d'evangelizzazione dei Francescani tra Musulmani e Mongoli nei secoli XIII–XIV* (Milan 1947); M. Roncaglia, *I Francescani in Oriente durante le Crociate* (Cairo 1954).

SECTION TWO

The Western Schism and the Councils

46. *The Western Schism to the Council of Pisa*

SOURCES

Mansi, XXVI–XXVII; *RepGerm,* I: *Clemens VII. von Avignon (1378–1394),* ed. E. Göller (Berlin 1916), II: *Urban VI., Bonifaz IX., Innocenz VII. und Gregor XII. (1378–1415),* ed. G. Tellenbach (Berlin 1933–62), III: *Alexander V., Johann XXIIII., Konstanzer Konzil (1409–17),* ed. U. Kühne (Berlin 1935); *Analecta Vaticano-Belgica,* VIII (Brussels and Rome 1924), XII (1930), XIII (1932); *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemiae illustrantia,* V (1903–05); *Deutsche Reichstagsakten,* older series, I–VI (reprinted 1956); Dietrich of Niem, *De schismate libri tres,* ed. G. Erler (Leipzig 1890); F. Ehrle, "Neue Materialien zur Geschichte Peters von Luna (Benedikt XIII.)," *ALKGMA,* 6 (1892), 7 (1900); *Baluze-Mollat,* I–IV; F. Ehrle, *Martin de Alpartils chronica actitatorum temporibus domini Benedicti XIII.* (Paderborn 1906); J. Vincke, *Briefe zum Pisaner Konzil* (Bonn 1940); *idem,* "Acta concilii Pisani," *RQ,* 46 (1941), 81–331; *idem, Schriftstücke zum Pisaner Konzil* (Bonn 1942).

LITERATURE

Fliche-Martin, 14, 1–2 (Paris 1962–64), with copious bibliography; L. Gayet, *Le grand schisme d'occident. Les origines,* 2 vols. (Florence and Berlin 1889); L. Salembier, *Le grand schisme d'occident* (Paris, 5th ed. 1922); N. Valois, *La France et le grand schisme d'occident,* 4 vols. (Paris 1896–1902); M. Seidlmayer, *Die Anfänge des grossen abendländischen Schismas* (Münster 1940); W. Ullmann, *The Origins of the Great Schism* (London 1948); E. F. Jacob, *Essays in the Conciliar Epoch* (Manchester, 3d ed. 1963); O. Přerovský, "L'elezione di Urbano VI e l'insorgere dello scisma d'occidente," *Miscellanea della società Romana di storia patria,* XX (Rome 1960); H. Angermeier, "Das Reich und der Konziliarismus," *HZ,* 192 (1961), 529–83; P. Brezzi, "Lo scisma d'occidente come problema italiano," *ADRomana,* 67 (1944), 391–450; A. Cutolo, *Re Ladislao d'Angiò-Durazzo,* 2 vols. (Milan 1936); M. de Boüard, *La France et l'Italie au temps du grand schisme d'occident* (Paris 1936); E. Perroy, *L'Angleterre et le grand schisme d'occident. Étude sur la politique religieuse de l'Angleterre sous Richard II, 1378–1399* (Paris 1933); W. Ullmann, "The University of Cambridge and the Great Schism," *JThS,* new series, 9 (1958), 53–77; A. M. Rodríguez, "Benedicto XIII y el reino de Aragón," *Hispania,* 19 (1959), 163–91; L. Suárez Fernández, *Castilla, el cisma y la crisis conciliar 1378–1440* (Madrid 1960); A. Boscolo, *La politica italiana di Martino il vecchio re d'Aragona* (Padua 1962); S. Puig y Puig, *Pedro de Luna último papa de Aviñón* (Barcelona 1920); G. Pillement, *Pedro de Luna, le dernier pape d'Avignon* (Paris 1955); A. Glasfurd, *The Antipope (Peter de Luna, 1342–1423). A Study in Obstinacy* (London 1965); G. J. Jordan, *The Inner History of the Great Schism of the West. A Problem in Church Unity* (London 1930); K. A. Fink, "Zur Beurteilung des grossen abendländischen Schismas," *ZKG,* 73 (1962), 335–43; R. G. Trexler, "Rome on the Eve of the Great Schism," *Speculum,* 42 (1967), 489–509; J. Favier, *Les finances pontificales à l'époque du grand schisme d'occident* (Paris 1966).

The Council of Pisa: Hefele-Leclercq, VI; F. Stuhr, *Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Pisaner und Konstanzer Konzils* (Schwerin 1891); L. Schmitz, "Zur Geschichte des Konzils von Pisa," *RQ,* 9 (1895), 351–75; L. Dax, *Die Universitäten und die Konzilien von Pisa und Konstanz* (dissertation, Freiburg 1910); A. Brüggen, *Die Predigten des Pisaner Konzils* (typed dissertation, Freiburg 1963).

The Conciliar Idea: F. Bliemetzrieder, *Das Generalkonzil im grossen abendländischen Schisma* (Paderborn 1904); R. Scholz, "Eine Geschichte und Kritik der Kirchenverfassung vom Jahre 1406," *Papsttum und Kaisertum, Festschrift P. Kehr* (Berlin 1926), 595–621; J. Klotzner, *Kardinal Dominikus Jacobazzi und sein Konzilswerk, AnGr,* 45 (1948); F. Merzbacher, "Wandlungen des Kirchenbegriffs im Spätmittelalter. Grundzüge der Ekklesiologie des ausgehenden 13., des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts," *ZSavRGkan,* 39 (1953), 274–361; B. Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge 1955); L. Buisson, *Potestas und Caritas* (Cologne and Graz 1958); J. M. Moynihan, *Papal Immunity and Liability in the Writings of the Medieval Canonists, AnGr,* 120 (1961); A. Marongiu, "Il principio della democrazia e del consenso (quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbari debet) nel XIV secolo," *StG,* 8 (1962), 553–75; M. J. Wilks, *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1963); H. Jedin, *Bischöfliches Konzil oder Kirchenparlament* (Basel 1963); K. W. Nörr, *Kirche und Konzil bei Nicolaus de Tudeschis, Panormitanus* (Cologne and Graz 1964); U. Horst, "Papst, Bischöfe und Konzil nach Antonin von Florenz," *RThAM,* 32 (1965), 76–116; K. A. Fink, "Die konziliare Idee im späten Mittelalter," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* 9 (1965), 119–34; F. Merzbacher, "Die ekklesiologische Konzeption des Kardinals Francesco Zabarella," *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft,* 12 (1966), 279–87; J. Lecler, "La crise conciliaire du XVe siècle," *RSR,* 55 (1967), 76–87.

47. *The Devotio Moderna*

Literature

J. M. Dols, *Bibliographie der Moderne Devotie* (Nijmegen 1941); W. Nijhoff and M. E. Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliogr. von 1500–1540,* 3 vols. ('s-Gravenhage 1923–54); W. Jappe Alberts, "Zur Historiographie der Devotio moderna und ihre Erforschung," *Westfälische Forschungen,* 11 (1958), 51–67; G. Dumbar, *Analecta seu vetera aliquot* *scripta,* I (Deventer 1719); J. Acquoy, *Het klooster te Windesheim en zijn invloed,* 3 vols. (Utrecht 1875–80); K. Grube (ed.), *Des Augustinerpropstes Johannes Busch Chronicon Windeshemense und Liber de reformatione monasteriorum* (Halle 1886); P. Mestwerdt, *Die Anfänge des Erasmus. Humanismus und Devotio moderna* (Leipzig 1917); A. Hyma, *The Christian Renaissance, A history of the Devotio Moderna* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1924), partially revised in *The Brethren of the Common Life* (*ibid.* 1950) and *Renaissance to Reformation* (*ibid.* 1951); on the preceding *cf.* J. De Jong, "Het karakter en de invloed van de 'moderne devotie,'" *Historisch Tijdschrift,* 4 (1925), 26–58; R. Stadelmann, *Vom Geist des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Halle 1929); P. Debognie in *DSAM,* III, 727–47; R. Post, *De moderne Devotie* (Amsterdam, 2d ed. 1950); *idem, Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland in de middeleeuwen,* 2 vols. (Utrecht and Antwerp 1957); S. Axters, *Geschiedenis van de vroomheid in de Nederlanden,* III: *De moderne Devotie 1380–1550* (Antwerp 1956).

Gerard Groote: Sources: *Gerardi magni epistolae,* ed. W. Mulder (Antwerp 1933); *Tractatus de quatuor generibus meditationum,* ed. A. Hyma, *AGAU,* 49 (1924), 296–326; M. H. Mulders, *Geert Groote en het huvelijk* (ed. of *De Matrimonio*) (Nijmegen 1941); *Incipiunt aliqua verba notabilia Domini Florencii et Magistri Gherardi Magni,* ed. F. van Vree and J. Vregt, *AGAU,* 10 (1882), 427–72; Petrus Horn, *Vita Magistri Gerardi Magni,* ed. W. J. Kühler, *NAKG,* 6 (1909), 332–70; Rudolf Dier van Muiden, *Scriptum de magistro Gherardo Grote, Domino Florencio et multis aliis devotis fratribus,* ed. G. Dumbar, *Analecta,* I (Deventer 1719), 1–87; Thomas a Kempis, *Vita Gerardi Magni, Opera omnia,* ed. J. Pohl, VII (Freiburg 1927), 31–115; *Gerrit Grote, Die Nachfolge Christi,* ed. and trans. by F. Kern (Olten 1947). Literature: L. Smit, "Geert Groote over de Kerk," *StC,* 10 (1934), 257–68, 367–77; K. de Beer, *Studie over de spiritualiteit van Geert Groote* (Brussels and Nijmegen 1938); J. Tiecke, *De Werken van Geert Groote* (Utrecht and Nijmegen 1941); J. van Ginneken, *Geert Groote's Levensbeeld naar de oudste gegevens bewerkt* (Amsterdam 1942); T. P. van Zyl, *Gerard Groote, Ascetic and Reformer* (Washington 1963).

The Brothers of the Common Life: J. Gerretsen, *Florentius Radewijns* (Nijmegen 1891); M. v. Woerkum, "Florentius Radewijns. Schets van zijn leven, geschriften persoonlijkheid en ideeën," *OGE,* 24 (1950), 337–64; C. van der Wansem, *Het ontstaan ende geschiedenis der Broederschap van het Gemene Leven tot 1400* (Louvain 1958).

The Windesheim Congregation: V. Becker, "Eene onbekende kronijk van het klooster te Windesheim," *Bijdragen en Mededeeligen van Historisch Genootschap,* 10 (1887), 376–445; W. J. Kühler, *Joh. Brinckerinck en zijn klooster te Diepenveen* (Rotterdam 1908); L. Schmitz-Kallenberg, "Die Windesheimer Kongregation," *HJ,* 36 (1915), 306–16, 598–608; E. de Schaepdrijver, "De congregatie van Windesheim gedurende de 16. eeuw," *Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis,* 14 (1924), 15 (1924), 16 (1925); P. Hofmeister, "Die Verfassung der Windesheimer Augustinerkongregation," *ZSavRGkan,* 30 (1941), 165–270; K. Löffler, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes Frenswegen* (Soest 1930); J. A. Bemolt van Longhum Slaterus, *Het klooster Frenswegen* (Arnheim 1938); W. J. Alberts and A. L. Hulshoff, *Het Frensweger Handschrift* (Leiden 1958); S. van der Woude, *Joh. Busch Windesheimer kloosterreformator en kroniekschrijver* (Edam 1947); *idem, Acta Capituli Windeshemensis* ('s-Gravenhage 1953); W. Lourdaux and E. Persoons, "De Statuten van de Windesheimse mannenkloosters," *Archief voor de geschiedenis van de Kath. Kerk in Nederland,* 6 (Utrecht 1964), 180–224; *LThK,* X (2d ed. 1965), 1177 f.

The Brothers of the Common Life in Germany: Sources: "Urkunden der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben zu St. Michael in Rostock," *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Mecklenburgische Geschichte und Altertumskunde,* 4 (Schwerin 1839), 211–81; H. A. Erhard, Gedächtnisbuch des Fraterhauses in Münster," *Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte und Altertumskunde,* 6 (1843), 89–126; F. J. Mone, "Jahresgeschichten der Stiftskirche zu Wolf," *ZGObrh,* 18 (1865), 74–83; J. Petry, "Die Hausordnung der Fraterherren ... zu Emmerich," *Programm des Progymnasiums zu Steele* (1899); *idem,* "Die Satzungen des St. Gregoriushauses zu Emmerich," *AHVNrh,* 93 (1912), 103–22; H. Doebner, *Annalen und Akten der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben im Lüchtenhof zu Hildesheim, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens,* IV (Hanover 1903); H. A. Grimm, *Die Annalen des Klosters Wolf, 1478–1503, Trierer Chronik,* 12 (1916), 10–17; K. Löffler, "Das Gedächtnisbuch des Kölner Fraterhauses Weidenbach," *AHVNrh,* 103 (1919), 1–47; *idem, Quellen zur Geschichte des Augustinerchorherrenstiftes Frenswegen* (Soest 1930); F. W. Oediger (ed.), *Schriften des Arnold Heymerik* (Bonn 1939). Literature: L. Schulze, "Heinrich von Ahaus, der Stifter der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben,* 3 (Leipzig 1882), 38–48; O. Gerland, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben in Hessen," *Hessenland,* 18 (1904), 218–21, 232–35, 249–51, 265 ff.; G. Boerner, *Die Annalen und Akten der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben im Lüchtenhofe zu Hildesheim* (Berlin and Fürstenwalde 1905); K. Löffler, "Heinrich von Ahaus und die Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben," *HJ,* 30 (1909), 762–98, and, in connection with it, *cf. Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte und Altertumskunde Westfalens,* 74 (1916), 229–40; *idem,* "Das Fraterhaus Weidenbach in Köln," *AHVNrh,* 102 (1918), 99–128, and *cf. AHVNrh,* 104 (1920), 174–77; O. Meyer, "Die Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben in Württemberg," *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte,* 17 (1913), 97–138, 18 (1914), 142–60; J. H. Richter, *Geschichte des Augustinerklosters Frenswegen in der Grafschaft Bentheim* (Hildesheim 1913); E. Barnikol, *Studien zur Geschichte der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben* (Tübingen 1917); H. Gleumes, "Das Wirken der Fraterherren in Emmerich," *AHVNrh,* 124 (1934), 143–46; H. Draht, *St. Martini Wesel* (Gladbeck 1936); W. Brüggeboes, *Die Fraterherren (Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben) im Lüchtenhofe zu Hildesheim* (dissertation, Münster 1939); H. Nottarp, "Die Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben," *ZSavRGkan,* 32 (1943), 384–418; H. Stiesberg, *Die Wirksamkeit der Fraterherren in Emmerich* (typed, 1950); B. Windeck, *Die Anfänge der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben* (typed dissertation, Bonn 1951); W. M. Landeen, "The Beginnings of the Devotio Moderna in Germany," *Research Studies of the State College of Washington,* 19 (1951), 162–202, 221–53, 21 (1953), 275–309, 22 (1954), 53–75; *idem,* "Gabriel Biel and the Devotio Moderna in Germany," *ibid.,* 27 (1959), 135–213, 28 (1960), 21–45, 61–95; F. J. Heyen, "Die Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben in St. German," *Neues Trierisches Jahrbuch,* 1 (1962), 16–27.

Literature and Spirituality: J. F. Vregt, "Eenige ascetische tractaten, afkomstig van de Deventersche Broederschap van het Gemene Leven," *AGAU,* 10 (1882), 321–498; G. G. Wilbrink, *Das geistliche Lied der Devotio moderna* (Nijmegen 1930); J. J. Mak, "Christus bij de Moderne Devoten," *OGE,* 9 (1935), 106–66; M. Goossens, *De Meditatie in de eerste tijd van de Moderne Devotie* (Haarlem and Antwerp 1954); F. van d. Borne, "Geert Groote en de Moderne Devotie in de geschiedenis van het middeleeuwse ordewezen," *StC,* 16 (1940), 397–414, 17 (1941), 120–33, 197–209, 18 (1942), 19–40, 203–24; H. Watrigant, "La méditation méthodique et l'École des Frères de la vie commune," *RAM,* 3 (1922), 134–55.

Sources of Spirituality; M. Viller, "Le speculum monachorum et la Devotio moderna," *RAM,* 3 (1922), 45–56; C. Smits, "David van Augsburg en de invloed van zijn Profectus op de Moderne Devotie," *Coll. franciscana neerlandica* (1927), 171–203; H. Gleumes, "G. Groot und die Windesheimer als Verehrer des heiligen Bernhard von Clairvaux," *ZAM,* 10 (1935), 90–112; E. Mikkers, "Sint Bernardus en de Moderne Devotie," *Cîteaux en de Nederlanden,* 10 (Westmalle 1953), 149–86; M. A. Lücker, *Meister Eckhard und die Devotio Moderna* (Leiden 1950), and, in this regard, L. Reypens in *OGE,* 25 (1951), 215; D. de Man, "Heinrich Suso en de Moderne Devotie," *NAKG,* 19 (1926), 279–83; P. Debongnie, "Henri Suso et l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ," *RAM,* 21 (1940), 242–68.

Florens Radewijns: "Het libellus 'Omnes, inquit, artes' een rapiarium van Florentius Radewijns," *OGE,* 25 (1951), 113–58, 225–68; *Het libellus "Multum valet,"* ed. J. F. Vregt, *AGAU,* 10 (1882), 383–427.

Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen: De spiritualibus ascensionibus, ed. J. Mathieu (Bruges 1941); J. van Rooij, *Gerard Zerbolt van Zutphen. Leven en Geschriften* (Nijmegen and Utrecht 1936); A. Hyma, "Is Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen the Author of the 'Super modo vivendi'?" *NAKG,* 16 (1921), 107–28; *idem* (ed.), *Super modo vivendi devotorum hominum simul commorantium, AGAU,* 52 (1926), 1–100.

Dirc van Herxen: De libris teutonicalibus, ed. A. Hyma, *NAKG,* 17 (1924), 42–70; P. H. J. Knierim, *Dirc van Herxen (1381–1457) rector van het Zwolse fraterhuis* (Amsterdam 1926).

Hendrik Mande: G. Visser, *Hendrik Mande, Bijdrage tot de kennis de Noord-Nederlandse mystiek* ('s-Gravenhage 1899); A. Combes, "Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson," *Études de théologie et d'histoire de la spiritualité,* 3 vols. (Paris 1945–59).

Gerlach Peters: Soliloquium, ed. J. Strange (Cologne, Bonn, and Brussels 1849); W. Moll, "Gerlach Peters en zijne schriften," *Kerkhistorisch Archief,* 2 (1859), 174–99; E. Assemaine, "Gerlach Peters," *VS,* 5 (1921), 117–23; *idem* (trans. and introduction), *Gerlach Peters, Le soliloque enflammé* (Juvisy 1936); J. J. Mak, *De Dietse vertaling van Gerlach Peters' Soliloquium* (Rotterdam 1936); *M. van Rijn, Wessel Gansfort* (The Hague 1917); *idem, Studien over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Utrecht 1933).

John Mombaer: Exercitia utilissima pro horis solvendis et pro devota communione sacramentali cum considerationibus variis de vita et passione domini et sacramento eucharistiae (Zwolle 1491); *Rosetum exercitiorum spiritualium et sacrarum meditationum* (Basel 1504); H. Watrigant, "La méditation méthodique et Jean Mauburnus," *RAM,* 4 (1923), 13–29; P. Debongnie, *Jean Mombaer de Bruxelles, ses écrits et ses réformes* (Louvain and Toulouse 1927); J. Donndorf, *Das Rosetum des Johannes Mauburnus* (dissertation, Halle 1929).

John Veghe: Lectulus noster floridus. Unser Blumenbettchen, ed. H. Rademacher (Hiltrup 1938); *Wyngarden der sele,* ed. H. Rademacher (Hiltrup 1940); F. Jostes, *Johannes Veghe. Ein deutscher Prediger des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Halle 1883); *idem,* "Drei unbekannte deutsche Schriften von Johannes Veghe," *HJ,* 6 (1885), 345–412; H. Triloff, *Die Traktate und Predigten Veghes* (Halle 1904); A. Bömer, "Johannes Veghe," *Westfälische Lebensbilder,* I (Münster 1930), 166–82; H. Rademacher, *Mystik und Humanismus der Devotio moderna in den Predigten und Traktaten des Johannes Veghe* (Hiltrup 1935); H. Kunisch, "Johannes Veghe und die oberdeutsche Mystik des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum,* 75 (1938), 141–71.

Imitatio Christi: Thomas a Kempis, *Omnia opera,* ed. J. Pohl, I–VII (Freiburg 1902–22); French translation by L. Baudry (Paris 1950) gives the literature and a survey of the history of the question of authorship; L. M. J. Delaissé, *Le manuscrit autographe de Thomas a Kempis et "L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ,"* 2 vols. (Brussels 1956); P. E. Puyol, *Descriptions des manuscrits et des principales éditions du livre De Imitatione Christi* (Paris 1898); *idem, L'auteur du livre De Imitatione Christi,* 2 vols. (Paris 1899 f.); R. Storr, *Concordantia ad IV libros a Thoma Kempensi* (London, 2d ed. 1911).

Question of authorship: C. Wolfsgruber, *Giovanni Gersen, sein Leben und sein Werk de Imitatione Christi* (Augsburg 1880); R. Pitigliani, *L'Abbate Giovanni Gersenio autore dell'Imitazione di Cristo* (Turin 1937); *idem, Le fonti dell'Imitazione di Cristo, SC,* 65 (1937); T. Lupo, "Validità della tesi gerseniana sull'autore della 'Imitazione di Cristo'," *Salesianum,* 12 (Turin 1960), 56–106; P. Bonardi and T. Lupo, *L'Imitazione di Cristo e il suo autore,* 2 vols. (Turin 1964); H. Denifle in *ZKTh,* 6 (1882), 692–718, 7 (1883), 692–743. J. B. Monnoyeur, *Gerson, l'auteur de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ* (Paris 1936). J. Huijben and P. Debongnie, *L'auteur ou les auteurs de l'Imitation* (Louvain 1957); C. C. de Bruin, *De middelnederlandse vertaling van de Imitatio Christi in hs. Leiden . . . 339* (Leiden 1954), synopsis in German in *Altdeutsche und Altniederländische Mystik,* ed. K. Ruh (Darmstadt 1964), 462–96. P. Hagen, *Zwei Urschriften der Imitatio Christi in mittelniederdeutschen Übersetzungen* (Berlin 1930); *idem, De Imitatione Christi libri qui dicitur tractatus secun-*

dus et tertius recognovit et ad auctorem anonymum atque Thomam Kempensem reduxit (The Hague 1935); *idem, Untersuchungen über Buch II und III der Imitatio Christi, Verhandlelingen d. k. Ak. v. Wet. Afd. Letterk.*, 34 (Amsterdam 1935); J. van Ginneken, *Trois textes pré-kempistes du premier livre de l'Imitation, ibid.*, 44 (Amsterdam 1940); *idem, Trois textes pré-kempistes du second livre de l'Imitation, ibid.*, 46 (Amsterdam 1941); *idem, De Navolging van Christus* (Amsterdam, 2d ed. 1947); L. Kern, "Zur Verfasserfrage der Imitatio Christi," *OGE,* 28 (1954), 27–44, 151–71; A. Hyma, "The Original Version of de Imitatione Christi by Gerard Zerbolt of Zutphen," *AGAU,* 69 (1950), 1–41; J. Huby, "Les origines de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ de G. Groote à T. a Kempis," *RSR,* 31 (1943), 102–39, 32 (1944), 211–44; J. Tesser, "De eerste en de laatste faze van het auteursproblem der Navolging in Italië," *OGE,* 23 (1949); M. Lücker in *GuL,* 22 (1949), 228–32; B. Spaapen in *GuL,* 31 (1958), 303–08; *idem* in *OGE,* 23 (1949); L. Fernández, "El autor de 'La Imitación de Christo,'" *Manresa,* 32 (1960), 33–44.

Content: P. E. Puyol, *La doctrine du livre De Imitatione Christi* (Paris, 2d ed. 1898); G. Clamens, *La dévotion à l'humanité du Christ dans la spiritualité de Thomas a Kempis* (Lyons 1931); P. Debongnie, "Les thèmes de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ," *RHE,* 36 (1940), 289–344; E. Iserloh, "Die Kirchenfrömmigkeit in der Imitatio Christi," *Sentire Ecclesiam* (Freiburg 1961), 251–67; *idem,* "Die Nachfolge Christi," *Bücher der Entscheidung,* ed. W. Sandfuchs (Würzburg 1964), 55–66.

Influence: H. Watrigant, *La méditation fondamentale avant saint Ignace* (Enghin 1907); P. Groult, *Les Mystiques des Pays-Bas et la littérature espagnole du seizième siècle* (Louvain 1927); H. Gleumes, "Niederländische und spanische Mystik im 16. Jahrhundert," *ZAM,* 11 (1936), 323–28; J. Hashagen, "Die Devotio moderna in ihrer Einwirkung auf Humanismus, Reformation und Gegenreformation," *ZKG,* 55 (1936), 523–31; A. Suquia Goicoechea, "El Epistolario de Gerardo de Groote y el Libro de Ejercicios de San Ignacio de Loyola," *Manresa,* 21 (1949), 305–24; *idem, La santa Misa en la espiritualidad de San Ignacio de Loyola* (Madrid 1950).

48. *The Nationalist Heresies: Wyclif and Hus*

Wyclif

SOURCES

John Wyclif, The Latin Works, 35 vols. (London 1883–1922, reprinted Frankfurt 1964); Thomas Netter of Walden, *Fasciculi zizaniorum magistri Ioannis Wyclif cum tritico,* ed. W. Waddington Shirley (London 1858); F. Palacký, *Documenta Magistri Ioannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi concilio actam et controversias de religione in Bohemia annis 1403–1418 motas illustrantia* (Prague 1869, reprinted Osnabrück 1966).

LITERATURE

Fliche-Martin, 14, 2, 943–88; *LThK,* X (2d ed. 1965), 1278–81; *Hefele-Leclercq,* VII; H. Grundmann, "Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters," *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* 2, series G, 1 (Göttingen 1963), G 60–G 62; M. McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century 1307–1399,* 510–24, 554; A. Molnár, "Recent Literature on Wyclif's Theology," *Communio viatorum,* 7 (1964), 186–92; B. A. Vermaseren, "Niewe studies over Wyclif en Hus," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis,* 76 (1963), 190–212; H. B. Workmann, *John Wyclif,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1926); J. H. Dahmus, *The Prosecution of John Wyclyf* (New Haven 1952); J. A. Robson, *Wyclif and the Oxford Schools* (Cambridge 1961); L. J. Daly, *The Political Theory of John Wyclif* (Chicago 1962); P. de Vooght, "Wiclif et la 'Scriptura sola,'" *EThL,* 39 (1963), 50–86; G. A. Benrath, *Wyclifs Bibelkommentar* (Berlin 1966); *idem,* "Wyclif und Hus," *ZThK,* 62, 196–216; A. Zumkeller, "Die Augustinereremiten in der Auseinandersetzung mit Wyclif und Hus, ihre Beteiligung an den Konzilien von Konstanz und Basel," *AAug,* 28 (1965), 5–56; G. Wendelborn, *Das Verhältnis von Schrift und Vernunft im Werk John Wiclifs* (typed dissertation, Rostock 1964); F. de Boor, *Die neue Definition der Simonie bei John Wyclif* (typed dissertation, Halle 1964); M. Wilks, "Predestination, Property and Power. Wyclif's Theory of Dominion and Grace," *Studies in Church History,* 2 (1965), 220–36; J. Dahmus, *William Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury 1381–1396* (London 1966); G. A. Benrath, "Stand und Aufgaben der Wyclif-Forschung," *ThLZ,* 92 (1967), 261–64.

Hus

SOURCES

Ioannis Hus atque Hieronymi Pragensis confessorum Christi historia et monumenta, 2 vols. (Nürnberg 1588); *Magistri Ioannis Hus Opera omnia,* ed. W. Flajšhans and M. Kominkowá, 3 vols. (Prague 1903–07, reprinted Osnabrück 1966); *Magistri Ioannis Hus Opera omnia,* 8: *Sermones de tempore qui collecta dicuntur,* ed. A. Schmidtová (Prague 1959), 22: *Polemica,* ed. F. Graus (Prague 1966); *Magistri Ioannis Hus Tractatus de ecclesia,* ed. S. Harrison Thomson (Cambridge, Mass. 1956); F. Palacký, *Documenta Magistri Ioannis Hus vitam, doctrinam, causam . . . illustrantia (supra).* Writings and sermons in Czech are listed under the literature *(infra),* as are also the most important works on Hus in Czech by F. M. Bartoš, V. Novotný, V. Kybal, J. Sedlák, *et. al.*

LITERATURE

Fliche-Martin, 14, 2, 989–1029, with bibliography; *LThK,* V (2d ed. 1960), 543–45, with bibliography; H. Grundmann, "Ketzergeschichte" *(supra),* G 62–G 65; *Hefele-Leclercq,* VII, 110–66; *Hauck,* V, 870–950; P. De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Hus* (Louvain 1960); *idem, Hussiana* (Louvain 1960); *idem,* "Jean Hus au Symposium Hussianum Pragense," *Istina,* 11 (1965 f.), 41–60; D. Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches* (Göttingen 1964); H. Köpstein, "Über die Teilnahme von Deutschen an der hussitischen revolutionären Bewegung—speziell in Böhmen," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft,* 11 (1963), 116–45; J. Kejř, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Hussitentums," *Die Welt zur Zeit des Konstanzer Konzils* (Constance 1965), 47–61; A. Zumkeller, "Die Augustinereremiten in der Auseinandersetzung mit Wyclif und Hus" *(supra), AAug,* 28 (1965), 5–56; F. Seibt, "Hus und die Hussiten in der tschechischen wissenschaftlichen Literatur seit 1945," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung,* 8 (1958), 566–90; *idem, Hussitica. Zur Struktur einer Revolution* (Cologne and Graz 1965), with detailed bibliography; A. Molnár, "Gli studi su Jean Hus nel 550⁰ anniversario della morte," *Nuova Rivista storica,* 49 (1965), 696–99; Jiři Kejř, *Husitský Právník M. Jan z Jesenice* (Prague 1965), with German summary; M. Spinka, *John Hus' Concept of the Church* (Princeton 1966); F. M. Bartoš, *Husitská revoluce. Doba Žižkova 1415–1426,* 2 vols. (Prague 1965 f.), with bibliography; I. Hlavacek, "Bohemicale Literatur in den mittelalterlichen Bibliotheken des Auslandes (nach den mittelalterlichen Bibliotheksverzeichnissen)," *Historica,* 13 (1966), 113–55; M. Kudelásek, "Bibliographie des travaux sélectionnés des historiens tchécoslovaques parus au cours des années 1963–64," *Historica,* 13 (1966), 233–71; J. Macek, "Jean Hus et son époque," *Historica,* 13 (1966), 51–80; *idem,* "Giovanni Hus e la riforma Boema," *BIStIAM,* 78 (1967), 45–73; *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder,* ed. K. Bosl, I (Stuttgart 1957), 494–531; R. Kalivoda, *Husitská Ideologie* (Prague 1961); *idem,* "Seibt's 'Hussitica' und die Hussitische Revolution," *Historica,* 14 (1967), 225–46; F. Šmahel, "Le mouvement des étudiants à Prague dans les années 1408–1412," *Historica,* 14 (1967), 33–75,

with bibliography; H. Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1967); E. Werner, "Der Kirchenbegriff bei Jan Hus, Jakoubek von Mies, Jan Zelivsky und den linken Taboriten," *SAB*, Klasse für Philosophie, Geschichte, Staats-, Rechts- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften (1967), no. 10.

49. *The Council of Constance. Martin V*

Sources

Acta scitu dignissima docteque concinnata Constantiensis concilii celebratissimi (Hagenau 1500); H. von der Hardt, *Magnum œcumenicum Constantiense concilium*, 6 vols. (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1696–1700), index volume (1742); J. Lenfant, *Histoire du concile de Constance*, new ed., 2 vols. (Paris 1727); H. Bourgeois du Chastenet, *Nouvelle histoire du concile de Constance* (Paris 1718); *Mansi*, XXVII–XXVIII; H. Finke, *Acta concilii Constanciensis*, 4 vols. (Münster 1896–1928); Ulrich Richental, *Das Konzil zu Konstanz. Faksimileausgabe und Kommentarband* (Constance 1964); H. Heimpel, "Aus der Kanzlei Kaiser Sigismunds," *AUF*, 12 (1932), 111–80; *idem*, "Regensburger Berichte vom Konstanzer Konzil," *Festschrift G. Hugelmann*, I (Aalen 1959), 213–72; H. Koeppen, *Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren des Deutschen Ordens an der Kurie, 2: Peter von Wormditt (1403–19); Veröffentlichungen der Niedersächsischen Archivverwaltung*, Heft 13 (Göttingen 1960); C. M. D. Crowder, "Constance Acta in English Libraries," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz (infra)*, 477–517; *idem*, "Correspondence between England and the Council of Constance 1414–1418," *Studies in Church History*, I (London 1964), 184–206; H. Finke, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils* (Paderborn 1889); K. A. Fink, "Zu den Quellen für die Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz (infra)*, 471–76; L. R. Loomis, *The Council of Constance* (New York 1961), contains selections from Richental's Chronicle, Fillastre's Diary and Cerretano's Journal.

Literature

Hefele-Leclercq, VII: *Fliche-Martin*, 14, 1; E. F. Jacob, "Reflections upon the Study of the General Councils in the Fifteenth Century," *Studies in Church History*, I (1964), 80–97; A. Franzen and W. Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz. Beiträge zu seiner Geschichte und Theologie* (Freiburg 1964), with detailed bibliography; E. Hänggi, "Zur Geschichte des Konzils von Konstanz," *ZSKG*, 60 (1966), 187–94; "Die Welt zur Zeit des Konstanzer Konzils," *Vorträge und Forschungen*, 9 (Constance 1964); K. A. Fink, "Die weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Konstanzer Konzils," *ZSavRGkan*, 51 (1965), 1–23; P. Glorieux, *Le concile de Constance au jour le jour* (Tournai 1964); J. Gill, *Constance et Bâle-Florence* (Paris 1965); A. Franzen, "Das Konstanzer Konzil: Probleme, Aufgaben und Stand der Konzilsforschung," *Concilium*, I (1965), 555–74 (English translation: "The Council of Constance: Present State of the Problem," *Concilium, 7, Historical Problems of Church Renewal* [Glen Rock, N. J. 1965], 29–68); F. Stuhr, *Die Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Pisaner und Konstanzer Konzils* (dissertation in philosophy, Breslau 1891); H. Finke, *Bilder vom Konstanzer Konzil* (Heidelberg 1903); P. Arendt, *Die Predigten des Konstanzer Konzils. Ein Beitrag zur Predigt- und Kirchengeschichte des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Freiburg 1933); J. B. Schneyer, "Konstanzer Konzilspredigten. Eine Ergänzung zu H. Finkes Sermones- und Handschriftenlisten," *ZGObRh*, 113 (1965), 361–88; O. Engels, "Der Reichsgedanke auf dem Konstanzer Konzil," *HJ*, 86 (1966), 80–106; Graziano di S. Teresa, "Contributi alla Libellistica dello scisma occidentale (1378–1417)," *ECarm*, 15 (1964), 387–424.

Prehistory of Constance: E. Göller, *König Sigismunds Kirchenpolitik vom Tode Bonifaz' IX. bis zur Berufung des Konstanzer Konzils 1404–1413* (Freiburg 1902); F. Schoenstedt, "König Sigismund und die Westmächte," *Die Welt als Geschichte,* 14 (1954), 149–64; A. Franzen, "Die Vorgeschichte des Konstanzer Konzils. Vom Ausbruch des Schismas bis zum Pisanum," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 3–35; J. Lenzenweger, "Von Pisa nach Konstanz," *ibid.,* 36–54.

Participants: J. Riegel, *Die Teilnehmerlisten des Konstanzer Konzils* (dissertation in philosophy, Freiburg 1916); P. Lehmann, "Konstanz und Basel als Büchermärkte während der grossen Kirchenversammlungen," *Erforschung des Mittelalters,* 1 (1941), 253–80; J. Goñi Gaztambide, "Los españoles en el concilio de Constanza. Notas biográficas," *HS,* 15 (1962), 253–386, 18 (1965), 103–58, 265–332; *idem,* "Los obispos de Pamplona del siglo XV y los Navarros en los Concilios de Constanza y Basilea," *Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragón,* 7 (1962), 358–547; B. Fromme, *Die spanische Nation und das Konstanzer Konzil* (Münster 1896); L. Suárez Fernández, *Castilla, el cisma y la crisis conciliar 1378–1440* (Madrid 1960); K. Dieterle, "Die Stellung Neapels und der grossen italienischen Kommunen zum Konstanzer Konzil," *RQ,* 29 (1915), 3–21, 45–72; J. Hollerbach, "Die gregorianische Partei. Sigismund und das Konstanzer Konzil," *RQ,* 23 (1909), 129–65, 24 (1910), 3–39, 121–40; H. Keusen, "Die Stellung der Universität Köln im grossen Schisma und zu den Reformkonzilien des 15. Jahrhunderts," *AHVNrh,* 115 (1929), 225–54; D. Girgensohn, "Die Universität Wien und das Konstanzer Konzil," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 252–81; T. Straub, *Herzog Ludwig der Bärtige von Bayern-Ingolstadt und seine Beziehungen zu Frankreich in der Zeit von 1391–1415, Münchener historische Studien,* Abt. Bayer. Gesch., VII (1965); J. Keppler, *Die Politik des Kardinals-Kollegiums in Konstanz vom Januar bis März 1415* (dissertation in philosophy, Münster 1899); K. Zähringer, *Das Kardinalkollegium auf dem Konstanzer Konzil bis zur Absetzung Papst Johannes' XXIII., Münsterische Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung,* 59 (1935); K. Gatzemeier, *Stellung und Politik der Kardinäle auf dem Konstanzer Konzil nach der Absetzung Johanns XXIII.* (dissertation in philosophy, Münster 1937); J. Rest, *Kardinal Fillastre bis zur Absetzung Johanns XXIII. auf dem Konstanzer Konzil* (dissertation in philosophy, Freiburg 1908); W. Hasenohr, *Patriarch Johannes Maurosii von Antiochien* (dissertation in philosophy, Freiburg 1909). For Cardinal d'Ailly see the bibliography for Chapter 41; also: A. Gómez Moriana, "El pensamiento eclesiológico de Pierre d'Ailly," *Anales de la cátedra Francisco Suárez* (Granada), 3 (1963), 1–43; F. Oakley, *The Political Thought of Pierre d'Ailly. The voluntarist tradition* (New Haven and London 1964); P. Glorieux, "Pierre d'Ailly, Jean XXIII et Thierry de Nieheim," *RThAM,* 31 (1964), 100–21. For Gerson see the bibliography for Chapter 41; also: G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, *Jean Gerson, zijn Kerkpolitiek en ecclesiologie* ('s-Gravenhage 1963); J. B. Morall, *Gerson and the Great Schism* (Manchester 1960); P. Glorieux, *Jean Gerson. Œuvres complètes,* I: *Introduction générale* (1960), thus far 6 vols.

Causa unionis: A. Lenné, *Der erste literarische Kampf auf dem Konstanzer Konzil im November und Dezember 1414* (dissertation in philosophy, Freiburg 1913); J. Katterbach, *Der zweite literarische Kampf auf dem Konstanzer Konzil im Januar und Februar 1415* (dissertation in philosophy, Freiburg 1919); H. G. Peter, *Die Informationen Papst Johanns XXIII. und dessen Flucht von Konstanz bis Schaffhausen* (Freiburg 1926); J. A. Rubio, *La política de Benedicto XIII desde la substracción de Aragón a su obediencia hasta su destitución en el concilio de Constanza* (Zamora 1926); K. A. Fink, "Die Wahl Martins V.," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 138–51; J. Goñi Gaztambide, "Recompensas de Martín V a sus electores españoles," *Hispania sacra,* 11 (1958), 259–97; H. Zimmermann, "Die Absetzung der Päpste auf dem Konstanzer Konzil," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 113–37.

Causa fidei: D. Girgensohn, *Peter von Pulkau und die Wiedereinführung des Laienkelches, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte,* 12 (Göttingen 1964), with detailed bibliography; J. Kejř, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Hussitentums," *Die Welt zur Zeit des Konstanzer Konzils* (Constance 1965), 47–61; F. Seibt, *Hussitica. Zur Struktur einer Revolution* (Cologne and Graz 1965); P. De Vooght, *L'hérésie de Jean Hus* (Louvain 1960); *idem, Hussiana* (Louvain 1960); *idem,* "Jean Huss et ses juges," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 152–73; *Hus in Konstanz, Der Bericht des Peter von Mladoniowitz,* translation into German, with introduction and comment by J. Bujnoch, *Slavische Geschichtsschreiber,* 3 (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1963); F. Machilek, "Hus in Konstanz. Zu einer deutschen Übersetzung der relatio de magistro Iohanne Hus des Peter von Mladoňovic," *ZRGG,* 18 (1966), 163–70; bibliography on Hus and Hussitism in H. Grundmann, "Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters," *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte,* 2, series G, 1 (Göttingen 1963), 62–65; A. Coville, *Jean Petit. La question du tyrannicide au commencement du XV^e siècle* (Paris 1932); F. Schoenstedt, *Der Tyrannenmord im Spätmittelalter. Studien zum Begriff des Tyrannen und zum Problem des Tyrannenmordes im Spätmittelalter, insbesondere in Frankreich, Neue deutsche Forschungen,* 198 (Berlin 1938); H. Koeppen, *Die Berichte der Generalprokuratoren des Deutschen Ordens an der Kurie,* 2: *Peter von Wormditt* (Göttingen 1960); S. Belch, "Magistri Pauli Wladimiri decr. doct. scriptum denunciatorium errorum Satyrae Ioannis Falkenberg OP concilio Constantiensi datum," *Sacrum Poloniae millennium,* 2 (1955), 165–92; *idem,* "Tractatus 'opinio Hostiensis,'" *ibid.,* 3 (1956), 385–431; *idem, Paulus Wladimiri and his Doctrine concerning International Law and Politics,* 2 vols. (London, The Hague, and Paris 1965); R. Bäumer, "Das Verbot der Konzilsappellation Martins V. in Konstanz," Franzen-Müller, *Das Konzil von Konstanz,* 187–213; E. Weise, "Der Heidenkampf des Deutschen Ordens," *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung,* 12 (1963), 420–73, 622–72, 13 (1964), 401–20; K. A. Fink, "Zum Streit zwischen dem Deutschen Orden und Polen auf den Konzilien zu Konstanz und Basel," *Reformata reformanda, Festgabe H. Jedin,* I (Münster 1965), 74–86; A. D. De Sousa Costa, "Canonistarum doctrina de Iudaeis et Saracenis tempore concilii Constantiensis," *Antonianum,* 40 (1965), 3–70; F. Machilek, *Ludolf von Sagan und seine Stellung in der Auseinandersetzung um Konziliarismus und Hussitismus* (dissertation in philosophy, Munich 1967).

Causa reformationis: B. Hübler, *Die Constanzer Reformation und die Concordate von 1418* (Leipzig 1867); J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform* (Berlin 1903); H. Heimpel, *Dietrich von Niem* (Münster 1932); *idem, Dietrich von Niem, Dialog über Union und Reform der Kirche 1410* (Leipzig and Berlin 1933); *idem, Studien zur Kirchen- und Reichsreform des 15. Jahrhunderts, SAH* (1929 f.); F. Merzbacher, "Wandlungen des Kirchenbegriffs im Spätmittelalter," *ZSavRGkan,* 39 (1953), 274–361; L. Buisson, *Potestas und Caritas* (Cologne and Graz 1958); H. Jedin, *Bischöfliches Konzil oder Kirchenparlament. Ein Beitrag zur Ekklesiologie der Konzilien von Konstanz und Basel* (Basel 1963); K. A. Fink, "Die konziliare Idee im späten Mittelalter," *Vorträge und Forschungen,* 9 (1965), 119–34; P. De Vooght, *Les pouvoirs du concile et l'autorité du pape au concile de Constance* (Paris 1965).

Martin V: Mansi, XXVIII; K. A. Fink, *RepGerm,* IV, 1–3 (Berlin 1943–58); *idem,* "Die ältesten Breven und Brevenregister," *QFIAB,* 25 (1933 f.), 292–307; *idem,* "Die politische Korrespondenz Martins V. nach den Brevenregistern," *QFIAB,* 26 (1935 f.), 172–244; *idem, Martin V. und Aragón* (Berlin 1938); *idem,* "Martin V. und Bologna," *QFIAB,* 23 (1931 f.), 182–217; *idem,* "Papsttum und Kirchenreform nach dem Grossen Schisma," *ThQ,* 126 (1946), 110–22; B. Partner, *The Papal State under Martin V* (London 1958); J. Haller, "England und Rom unter Martin V.," *QFIAB,* 8 (1905), 249–304; N. Valois, *Le Pape et le Concile, I* (Paris 1909); R. Valentini, "Lo Stato di Braccio," *ASRomana,* 52 (1931), 223–379.

50. *Eugene IV and The Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence*

SOURCES

Deutsche Reichstagsakten, 9–17 (reprinted Göttingen 1957–63); *RepGerm, Pontifikat Eugens IV.*, I (Berlin 1897); *Mansi,* XXIX–XXXII; *Monumenta conciliorum generalium saeculi decimi quinti,* I–IV (Vienna 1857–1935); *Concilium Basiliense, Studien und Quellen zur Geschichte des Concils von Basel,* I–VIII (Basel 1896–1936). In regard to the transmission of the sources for the Council of Basel: *Deutsche Reichstagsakten,* 10, pp. xlv–cix; *Concilium Florentinum. Documenta et scriptores,* I–VIII (Rome 1940–64), not yet completed.

LITERATURE

Hefele-Leclercq, VII; J. Gill, *Constance et Bâle-Florence* (Paris 1965); *Fliche-Martin,* 14, 1–2; N. Valois, *Le Pape et le Concile,* 2 vols. (Paris 1909); J. Gill, *Eugenius IV Pope of Christian Union* (Westminster, Md. 1961); *idem, The Council of Florence* (Cambridge 1959), with copious bibliography; *idem, Personalities of the Council of Florence* (Oxford 1964); A. N. E. D. Schofield, "The Second English Delegation to the Council of Basel," *JEH,* 17 (1966), 29–64; W. Küchler, "Alfons V. von Aragón und das Basler Konzil," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 23 (1967), 131–46; J. Décarreaux, "L'arrivée des Grecs en Italie pour le concile de l'union des églises d'après les mémoires de Siropoulos 1437–1438," *Revue des études italiennes,* 8 (1961); *idem,* "Les Grecs à Florence pour le concile de l'union des églises d'après les mémoires de Siropoulos," *ibid.*, 9 (1962–63), 33–99, 10 (1964), 219–39; D. Caccamo, "Eugenio IV e la crociata di Varna," *ADRomana,* 79 (1956), 35–87; R. Bäumer, "Eugen IV. und der Plan eines 'Dritten Konzils' zur Beilegung des Basler Schismas," *Reformata reformanda, Festgabe für H. Jedin,* I (1965), 87–128; J. Dephoff, *Zum Urkunden- und Kanzleiwesen des Konzils von Basel* (Hildesheim 1930); U. Frommherz, *Johannes von Segovia als Geschichtsschreiber des Konzils von Basel* (Basel and Stuttgart 1960); M. Lehmann, *Die Teilnehmer des Basler Konzils* (dissertation, Vienna 1945); H. Angermeier, "Das Reich und der Konziliarismus," *HZ,* 192 (1961), 529–83; H. Stutt, "Die nordwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Basler Konzil in den Jahren 1431 bis 1441," *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch,* 5 (1928), 1–97; C. Hanna, *Die südwestdeutschen Diözesen und das Baseler Konzil in den Jahren 1431 bis 1441* (dissertation in philosophy, Erlangen 1929); R. Wittram, *Die französische Politik auf dem Basler Konzil während der Zeit seiner Blüte* (dissertation in philosophy, Tübingen 1927); N. Valois, *Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges sous Charles VII* (Paris 1906), and, in this connection, J. Haller in *HZ,* 103 (1909), 1–51; A. N. E. D. Schofield, "England, the Pope and the Council of Basel," *Church History,* 33 (1964), 248–78; J. H. Burns, *Scottish Churchmen and the Council of Basle* (Glasgow 1962); L. Suárez Fernández, *Castilla, el cisma y la crisis conciliar 1378–1440* (Madrid 1960); V. Beltrán de Heredia, "La embajada de Castilla en el concilio de Basilea y su discusión con los ingleses acerca de la precedencia," *HS,* 10 (1957), 1–27; J. Toussaint, *Philippe le Bon et le concile de Bâle* (Brussels 1942); *idem, Les relations diplomatiques de Philippe le Bon avec le concile de Bâle* (Louvain 1942); J. Goñi Gaztambide, "Los obispos de Pamplona del siglo XV y los Navarros en los concilios de Constanza y Basilea," *Estudios de edad media de la corona de Aragón,* 7 (1962), 358–547; A. Zumkeller, "Die Augustinereremiten in der Auseinandersetzung mit Wyclif und Hus, ihre Beteiligung an den Konzilien von Konstanz und Basel," *AAug,* 28 (1965), 5–56; R. Zwölfer, "Die Reform der Kirchenverfassung auf dem Konzil zu Basel," *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde,* 28 (1929), 141–247, 29 (1930), 1–58; P. Clausen, *Heinrich Toke, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reichs- und Kirchenreform in der Zeit des Baseler Konzils* (dissertation in philosophy, Jena 1939); H. Dannenbauer, "Ein deut-

scher Reformantrag vom Konzil zu Ferrara 1438," *HJ*, 62 (1942), 279–85, extant only as an off-print; P. Becker, "Fragen um den Verfasser einer benediktinischen Reformschrift ans Basler Konzil. Studie über die Wirksamkeit des Abtes Johannes Rode von St. Matthias in Trier," *SM*, 74 (1963), 293–301; H. Hürten, "Die Mainzer Akzeptation von 1439," *AMrhKG*, 11 (1959), 42–75; J. B. Toews, "Pope Eugenius IV and the Concordat of Vienna 1448," *Church History*, 34 (1965), 178–94; H. Koller, *Reformation Kaiser Sigismunds* (Stuttgart 1964); L. Hödl, "Kirchengewalt und Kirchenverfassung nach dem liber de ecclesiastica potestate des Laurentius von Arezzo. Eine Studie zur Ekklesiologie des Basler Konzils," *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Munich 1957), 255–78; F. Boularand, "La primauté du pape au concile de Florence," *BLE*, 61 (1960), 161–203; H. Hürten, " Zur Ekklesiologie der Konzilien von Konstanz und Basel," *ThRv*, 59 (1963), 362–72; K. Binder, *Wesen und Eigenschaften der Kirche bei Kardinal J. de Torquemada* (Innsbruck 1955); H. Jedin, *Bischöfliches Konzil oder Kirchenparlament* (Basel and Stuttgart 1963); B. Duda, *Johannes Stojkovič OP: doctrina de cognoscibilitate ecclesiae, Studia Antoniana*, 9 (1958); N. López, "El cardenal Torquemada y la unidad de la iglesia," *Burgense*, 1 (1960), 45–71; V. Proaño, "Doctrina de Juan de Torquemada sobre el concilio," *ibid.*, 1 (1960), 73–96; C. Lefèbvre, "L'enseignement de Nicolas de Tudeschis et l'autorité pontificale," *EIC*, 14 (1958), 312–39; K. N. Nörr, *Kirche und Konzil bei Nikolaus de Tudeschis, Panormitanus* (Cologne and Graz 1964); E. F. Jacob, "Reflections upon the Study of the General Councils in the Fifteenth Century," *Studies in Church History*, I (1964), 80–97; B. Schultze, "Das letzte ökumenische Einigungskonzil theologisch gesehen," *OrChrP*, 25 (1959), 288–309; H. G. Beck, "Byzanz und der Westen im Zeitalter des Konziliarismus," *Die Welt zur Zeit des Konstanzer Konzils* (Constance and Stuttgart 1965), 134–48; A. Leidl, *Die Einheit der Kirchen auf den spätmittelalterlichen Konzilien von Konstanz bis Florenz* (Paderborn 1966); G. Hödl, "Zur Reichspolitik des Basler Konzils: Bischof Johannes Schele von Lübeck," *MIÖG*, 75 (1967), 46–65.

SECTION THREE

The Byzantine Church: The Age of Palamism

51. *From the Second Council of Lyons to the Council of Ferrara-Florence*

LITERATURE

W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz. Die Trennung beider Mächte und das Problem ihrer Wiedervereinigung bis zum Untergange des byzantinischen Reiches* (Berlin 1903); M. Viller, "La question de l'union des églises entre Grecs et Latins depuis le concile de Lyon jusqu'à celui de Florence," *RHE*, 17 (1921), 260–305, 515–33, 18 (1922), 20–60; M. Jugie, *Le schisme byzantin. Aperçu historique et doctrinal* (Paris 1941); *Runciman*, III; Aziz S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London 1938).

52. *Hesychasm and Palamism*

SOURCES

The chief sources are the synodal decrees *(tomoi)*, which will be cited in the chapter footnotes. For the numerous polemical writings and reports see the references in *Beck*, 712ff. New material since 1959; Gregory Palamas, *Défense des saints hésychastes*, ed. J. Meyendorff, 2 vols. (Louvain 1959), in Greek and French; other new editions of texts are listed in H. G. Beck, "Humanismus und Palamismus," *XII^e^ Congrès Intern. des Études byzantines, Ohrid 1961,* Rapports, III (Belgrade 1961), 63–82.

LITERATURE

M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium,* II (Paris 1933), 48–183; *idem,* "Palamite, Controverse," *DThC,* XI/2, 1777–1818; I. Hausherr, "L'hésychasme," *OrChrP,* 22 (1956), 5–40, 247–85; S. Guichardan, *Le problème de la simplicité divine en Orient et en Occident aux XIV^e^ et XV^e^ siècles* (Lyons 1933); G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone . . . ed altri appunti . . .* (Vatican City 1931); E. von Ivánka, "Hesychasmus und Palamismus," *JÖByzG,* 2 (1952), 23–34. On Palamas in particular: V. Krivošein, *Die asketische und theologische Lehre des heiligen Gregorios Palamas* (Würzburg 1939); J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris 1959), the best monograph. On Barlaam see especially the introduction to G. Schirò, *Barlaam Calabro: Epistole greche* (Palermo 1954); M. Jugie in *DHGE,* VI, 817–34. On Akindynos: M. T. Disdier in *DSAM,* I, 263–68. On Gregoras: R. Guilland, *Essai sur Nicéphore Grégoras* (Paris 1926).

53. *Intellectual Life in the Late Mediaeval Byzantine Church*

LITERATURE

F. Dölger, "Politische und geistige Strömungen im sterbenden Byzanz," *JÖByzG,* 3 (1954), 3–18; H. Hunger, "Von Wissenschaft und Kunst der frühen Palaeologenzeit," *ibid.,* 8 (1959), 123–55; I. Ševčenko, "The Decline of Byzantium seen through the Eyes of its Intellectuals," *DOP,* 15 (1961), 169–86; *idem,* "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *CHR,* 24 (1955), 291–323; E. Bouvy, "Saint Thomas. Ses traducteurs byzantins," *Revue Augustinienne,* 9 (1910), 401–08; M. Rackl, "Die griechische Übersetzung der Summa theologiae des heiligen Thomas von Aquin," *ByZ,* 24 (1923 f.), 48–60; *idem,* "Die griechischen Augustinusübersetzungen," *Miscellanea F. Ehrle,* I (Rome 1924), 1–38; G. Mercati, *Notizie di Procoro e Demetrio Cidone, Manuele Caleca e Teodoro Meliteniota ed altri appunti per la storia della teologia e della letteratura bizantina del secolo XIV* (Vatican City 1931).

54. *Patriarchate-Emperor and Church-Missions-Monasticism*

SECTION FOUR

From the Middle Ages to the Reformation

55. *Renaissance and Humanism*

SOURCES

V. Ilardi, "Fifteenth-century Diplomatic Documents in Western European Archives and Libraries 1450–1494," *Studies in the Renaissance,* 9 (1962), 64–112; *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland,* X–XIV, *1447–1492* (1915–60); *RepGerm,* VI: *Nikolaus V.* (in preparation); Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vite di Uomini illustri del secolo XV,* ed. P. D'Ancona and E. Aeschlimann (Milan 1951); L. Pastor, *Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste,* I: *1376–1464* (Freiburg 1904).

Literature

Fliche-Martin, 15 (1951); *Pastor,* I–IV, English translation: *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages,* II–VIII (St. Louis 1891–1908), and, in this connection, A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini. Politik und Mäzenatentum im Quattrocento," *RömHM,* 8/9 (1964–66), 101–425, with supplements and corrections for *Pastor* and very copious bibliography; *Seppelt-Schwaiger,* IV (1957); *Storia d'Italia,* ed. N. Valeri, II (Turin 1959); N. Valeri, *L'Italia nell'Età dei Principati* (Verona 1949); P. Paschini, *Roma nel Rinascimento* (Bologna 1940), 477–88 (bibliography); H. Marc-Bonnet, *Les papes de la Renaissance 1447–1527* (Paris 1953); D. Hay, *The Italian Renaissance on its Historical Background* (Cambridge 1961); F. Bérence, *Les papes de la Renaissance* (Paris 1966); F. Cognasso, *L'Italia nel Rinascimento. Società e Costume,* II (Turin 1965), 275–372; J. H. Plumb, *The Italian Renaissance. A Concise Survey of its History and Culture* (New York 1965); F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit* (Munich 1953); S. Schüller-Piroli, *Borgia. Die Zerstörung einer Legende, die Geschichte einer Dynastie* (Olten and Freiburg 1963); *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder,* ed. K. Bosl, I (Stuttgart 1967); G. Urban, "Die Kirchenbaukunst des Quattrocento in Rom," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte,* 9/10 (1961 f.), 73–287; D. Redig de Campos, *I palazzi Vaticani* (Bologna 1967); R. U. Montini, *Le Tombe dei Papi* (Rome 1957); G. Ladner, "Die mittelalterliche Reform-Idee und ihr Verhältnis zur Idee der Renaissance," *MIÖG,* 60 (1952), 31–59; B. L. Ullmann, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Rome 1955); P. O. Kristeller, "Studies on Renaissance Humanism during the Last Twenty Years," *Studies in the Renaissance,* 9 (1962), 7–30; *Bibliographie internationale de l'Humanisme et de la Renaissance,* I: *Travaux parus en 1965* (Geneva 1966); *The Renaissance. A Reconsideration of the Theories and Interpretation of the Age,* ed. T. Helton (Madison 1964); E. Raimondi, *Rinascimento inquieto* (Palermo 1965); F. Chabod, *Scritti sul Rinascimento* (Turin 1967); *Begriff und Problem der Renaissance. Wege der Forschung,* ed. A. Buck (Darmstadt 1968); H. Baron, "Die politische Entwicklung der italienischen Renaissance," *HZ,* 174 (1952), 31–56; *idem, Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice at the Beginning of the Quattrocento* (Cambridge, Mass. 1955); *idem, The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance. Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny,* 2 vols. (Princeton 1955); in regard to the preceding see M. Seidlmayer, *Wege und Wandlungen des Humanismus* (Göttingen 1965), 47–74, and Ferguson and Baron in *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 19 (1958), 14–34; P. Herde, "Politik und Rhetorik in Florenz am Vorabend der Renaissance," *AKG,* 47 (1965), 141–220; G. Toffanin, *La religione degli Umanisti* (Bologna 1950); *idem, Storia dell'Umanesimo,* 3 vols. (Bologna 1950); E. Garin, *La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento Italiano* (Florence 1961); *idem, Medioevo e Rinascimento* (Bari, 2d ed. 1961); *idem, Storia della Filosofia Italiana,* 3 vols. (Turin 1966); *idem, Die Kultur der Renaissance, Propyläen-Weltgeschichte,* VI (1964); R. Weiss, *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 2d ed. 1957); *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa,* I, directed by J. Irmscher (Berlin 1962); M. Gritz, *Die Stellungnahme der katholischen Kirchenhistoriker Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert zu Renaissance und Humanismus* (typed dissertation in theology, Tübingen 1955).

R. Weiss, *The Spread of Italian Humanism* (London/New York 1964); R. A. Goldthwaite, *Private Wealth in Renaissance Florence* (Princeton, 1968); L. Martines, *Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence* (Princeton 1968); J. E. Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism: The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom, Petrarch to Valla* (Princeton 1968); W. K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought* (Boston 1948); T. Helton (ed.), *The Renaissance: A Reconsideration of the Theories and Interpretations of the Age* (Madison 1961); W. K. Ferguson, *et al., The Renaissance: Six Essays* (New York 1953); D. Herlihy, *Medieval and Renaissance Pistoia: the Social History of an Italian Town, 1200–1430* (New Haven/London 1967): Charles G. Nauert, Jr., *Agrippa and the Crisis of Renais-*

sance Thought (Urbana, 1965); P. G. Bietenholz, *History and Biography in the Work of Erasmus of Rotterdam* (Geneva 1966); M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Printers and of Foreign Printers in Italy from the Introduction of the Art of Printing into Italy to 1800* (Boston 1968); and *idem, Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300–1800,* 5 vols. (Boston 1968); B. Berenson, *The Italian Painters of the Renaissance* (London 1967); H. Baron, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni* (Chicago 1968); L. Martines, *Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence* (Princeton 1968); H. Baker, *The Race of Time: Three Lectures on Renaissance Historiography* (Toronto 1967); C. H. Clough, *Machiavelli Researches* (Naples 1967); R. Ergang, *The Renaissance* (Princeton 1967).
Christian Humanism: A. Della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di Firenze* (Florence 1902, reprinted Turin 1960); M. Becker, *Florence in Transition* (Baltimore, Maryland, 1967); P. O. Kristeller, *Studies in the Renaissance Thought and Letters* (Rome 1956); A. Soria, *Los Humanistas de la Corte de Alfonso el Magnánimo* (Granada 1956); E. Garin, *Studi sul Platonismo medioevale* (Florence 1958); F. Secret, *Les Kabbalistes chrétiens de la Renaissance* (Paris 1964); P. O. Kristeller, *Eight Philosophers of the Italian Renaissance* (London 1965); E. Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (Bungay, Suffolk 1967). On Valla: *Laurentii Vallae Opera* (Basel 1540, 1543), ed. E. Garin (Turin 1962 ff.); G. Radetti, *L. Valla, Scritti filosofici e religiosi* (Florence 1953); F. Gaeta, *Lorenzo Valla* (Naples 1955); *Convegno di Studi per il V centenario della morte di L. Valla, Archivio storico per le province Parmensi,* IV, 9th series (1957). On Marsilius Ficinus: *Marsilii Ficini Florentini Opera,* 2 vols. (Basel 1561, 1576, reprinted Turin 1959); P. O. Kristeller, *Supplementum Ficinianum,* 2 vols. (Florence 1937); W. Dress, *Die Mystik des Marsilius Ficinus* (Berlin and Leipzig 1929); P. O. Kristeller, *Il Pensiero filosofico di Marsilio Ficino* (Florence 1953); M. Schiavone, *Problemi filosofici in Marsilio Ficino* (Milan 1957). On Pico della Mirandola: *Opera* (Basel 1572), ed. E. Garin, 3 vols. (Florence 1942–52); E. Monnerjahn, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Ein Beitrag zur philosophischen Theologie des italienischen Humanismus* (Wiesbaden 1960); P. Rocca, *Studi in onore di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nel V centenario della nascita, Atti e memorie della Dep. prov. Ferrarese di storia patria,* new series, 26 (Ferrara 1963); E. Garin, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola* (Parma 1963); G. Di Napoli, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola e la Problematica dottrinale del suo tempo* (Rome 1965); *L'Opera e il Pensiero di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nella storia dell'umanesimo.* I: *Relazioni,* II: *Communicazioni* (Florence 1966).
Important Periodicals and Series: MRS; Renaissance News; since 1967 *Renaissance Quarterly,* Renaissance Society of America Publications (New York 1948 ff.); *Rinascimento.* Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento (Rome 1950 ff., 2d series, 1961 ff.); *Studies in the Renaissance.* Publications of the Renaissance Society of America (New York 1954 ff.).

56. *The Popes of the Early Renaissance*

LITERATURE

A. A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini," *RömHM,* 8/9 (1964–66), 101–425, the most important supplement to *Pastor,* II–IV, with very detailed bibliography; *Storia d'Italia,* ed. N. Valeri, II (Turin 1959); *Storia di Milano,* VI–VIII (Milan 1955 f.); F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit* (Munich 1953); H. Pfeffermann, *Die Zusammenarbeit der Renaissancepäpste mit den Türken* (Winterthur 1946); *Handbuch der Geschichte der böhmischen Länder,* ed. K. Bosl, I (Stuttgart 1967); F. G. Heymann, *George of Bohemia. King of Heretics* (Princeton 1965); O. Odložilík, *The Hussite King. Bohemia in European Affairs 1440–1471* (New Brunswick 1965); V. Ilardi "The Italian League, Francesco Sforza, and Charles VII (1454–1461)," *Studies in the Renaissance*. Publications of the Renaissance Society of America, VI (New York 1959), 129–66; E. Dupré-Theseider, *La politica italiana di Alfonso d'Aragona. Lezioni tenuti nell'Università di Bologna durante l'anno accademico 1955–1956* (Bologna 1956); G. F. Ryder, "La politica italiana di Alfonso d'Aragona 1442–1458," *Archivio storico per le province Napoletane,* new series, 38 (1959), 43–106; J. Hofer, *Johannes Kapistran. Ein Leben im Kampf um die Reform der Kirche,* new ed. O. Bonmann, 2 vols. (Rome 1966); C. Santoro, *Gli Sforza* (Milan 1968).

Nicholas V: Sources: Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vite di Uomini illustri del secolo XV* (Milan 1951), 21–47; I. Manetti, *Vita Nicolai V summi pontificis ex manuscripto Florentino, Muratori,* III, 2 (Milan 1734), 908–60; *RepGerm,* VI (in preparation). Literature: *Pastor,* II, with bibliography; *Seppelt-Schwaiger,* IV, 306–26, with bibliography; F. K. Pleyer, *Die Politik Nikolaus' V.* (dissertation in philosophy, Tübingen 1927); G. Soranzo, *La Lega Italica 1454–1455* (Milan 1924); *idem,* "Studi e Discussioni su la Lega Italica del 1454–1455," *Studi storici in onore di G. Volpe* (Florence 1958), 969–95; V. Ferrando, *Vita del Papa Niccolò V-Tommaso Parentucelli* (Sarzana 1929).

Calixtus III: Sources: J. Rius Serra, *Regesto Ibérico de Calixto III,* I (Barcelona 1947); *RepGerm,* VII (in preparation). Literature: *Pastor,* II, with bibliography; *Seppelt-Schwaiger,* IV, 326–31, with bibliography; J. Rius Serra, *Catalanes y Aragoneses en la Corte de Calixto III* (Barcelona 1927); P. Brezzi, "La Politica di Callisto III. Equilibrio italiano e difesa dell'Europa alla metà del secolo XV," *StRom,* 7 (1959), 31–41; S. Schüller-Piroli, *Borgia* (see bibliog. for Chapter 55), 100–39.

Pius II: Sources: *Opera quae extant omnia* (Basel 1551, 1571, reprinted Frankfurt 1967); *Briefwechsel des Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini,* ed. R. Wolkan, *Fontes rerum Austriacarum,* 61, 62, 67, 68 (Vienna 1909–20); *Pii II Pont. Max. olim Aeneae Sylvii Piccolomini Senensis orationes politicae et ecclesiasticae,* ed. G. D. Mansi (Lucca 1755–59); *Aeneae Silvii Piccolomini Senensis opera inedita,* 3 vols., ed. G. Cugnoni, *Atti della Real Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei,* 3d series (1882 f.); *Commentarii rerum memorabilium,* considerably modified, ed. F. Bandini-Piccolomini (Rome 1584), Book 13 by C. Voigt, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini als Papst Pius II. (infra),* 359–77, complete English translation, *The Commentaries of Pius II,* 5 vols. (Northampton 1937–57), by F. A. Gragg, abbreviated edition (New York 1962); on the preceding *cf.* G. C. Zimolo, *Le vite di Pio II (infra),* 73 f.; H. Kramer, "Untersuchungen über die Commentarii Pius' II.," *MIÖG,* 48 (1934), 58–92; R. Avesani, "Per la biblioteca di Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini, vescovi di Pienza," *SteT,* 236 (1964), 1–87 (a critical edition is being prepared by F. Gaeta and G. Bernetti according to Cod. Vat. Regin. lat. 1995); L. Pastor, *Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste* (Rome 1904), 88–331; *Le Vite di Pio II di Giovanni Antonio Campano e Bartolomeo Platina* a cura di G. C. Zimolo, *Muratori,* III, part II (Bologna 1964), with an important introduction. Literature: *Pastor,* III, with bibliography; *Seppelt-Schwaiger,* IV, 331–48, with bibliography; G. Voigt, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini als Papst Pius II. und sein Zeitalter,* 3 vols. (Berlin 1856–63, reprinted Berlin 1967); J. Paparelli, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini* (Bari 1950); G. Bürck, *Selbstdarstellung und Personenbildnis bei Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pius II.)* (Basel and Stuttgart 1956); E. Dupré-Theseider, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini umanista* (Bologna 1957); E. Garin, "Ritratto di Enea Silvio Piccolomini," *La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano* (Florence 1961), 38–59; B. Widmer, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Papst Pius II. Ausgewählte Texte* (Basel 1960), with a biographical introduction, 13–139; *idem, Enea Silvio Piccolomini in der sittlichen und politischen Entscheidung* (Basel 1963); R. J. Mitchell, *The Laurels and the Tiara, Pope Pius II* (London 1962); L. M. Veit, *Pensiero e vita religiosa di Enea Silvio Piccolomini prima della sua consacrazione episcopale, AnGr,* 139 (Rome 1964); G. Toffanin, "Cicerone fra i padri della chiesa e gli umanisti (per il centenario di Pio II)," *AHPont,* 2 (1964), 187–210; G. B. Picotti, *La dieta di Mantova e la politica de' Veneziani. Miscellanea di storia Veneta,* 3d series, 4 (1912); E. Meuthen, *Die letzten Jahre des Nikolaus von Kues*

(Cologne and Opladen 1958); A. Matanič, "L'idea per la crociata anti-turca del papa Pio II," *StudFr,* 61 (1964), 382–94; F. Wasner, "Piccolominibriefe. Ein Beitrag zum italienischen Humanismus," *HJ,* 79 (1960), 199–219; A. Lhotsky, *Aeneas Silvius und Österreich* (Basel and Stuttgart 1965); "Il Convegno Senese per il V centenario della morte di Pio II," *RSTI,* 20 (1966), 204–06; *Atti del Convegno storico Piccolominiano Ancona 9 maggio 1965. Estratto da Atti e Memorie,* series VIII, vol. 4, fasc. 2 (Ancona 1967); L. F. Smith, "Lodrisio Crivelli of Milan and Aeneas Sylvius, 1457–1464," *Studies in the Renaissance,* 9 (1962), 31–63; H. Diener, "Enea Silvio Piccolominis Weg von Basel nach Rom. Aus päpstlichen Registern der Jahre 1442–1447," *Adel und Kirche. Festschrift Tellenbach* (Freiburg 1968).

Paul II: Sources: *Le Vite di Paolo II di Gaspare da Verona e Michele Canensi* a cura di G. Zippel, *Muratori,* III, part XVI (1904); B. Platina, *Liber de Vita Christi ac omnium Pontificum,* ed. G. Gaida, *Muratori,* III, 1, 363–98. Literature: *Pastor,* IV, with bibliography; *Seppelt-Schwaiger,* IV, 348–53, with bibliography; R. Weiss, *Un Umanista Veneziano Papa Paolo II* (Venice 1958); G. Soranzo, "Giovanni Battista Zeno, Nipote di Paolo II, cardinale di S. Maria in Portico (1469–1501)," *RSTI,* 16 (1962), 249–74; *Storia di Milano,* VII (Milan 1966); other special literature in A. A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini," *RömHM,* 8/9 (1964–66), 101–425.

57. *The Popes of the High Renaissance*

Sources

Stefano Infessura, *Diario della Città di Roma,* ed. O. Tommassini (Rome 1890); Sigismondo dei Conti da Foligno, *Le storie de' suoi tempi (1475–1510),* 2 vols. (Rome 1883); Jacopo da Volterra, *Diarium Romanum (1479–1484),* ed. E. Carusi, *Muratori,* XXIII, 3 (1904); Jacopo Ammanati-Piccolomini, *Diario Concistoriale (1472–1479),* ed. E. Carusi, *Muratori,* XXIII, 3 (1904–11); Sebastiano de Branco Tedalini, *Diario (1492–1524),* ed. P. Piccolomini, *Muratori,* XXIII (1906–11); Antonio de Vascho, *Il diario della Città di Roma (1480–1492),* ed. G. Chiesa, *Muratori,* XXIII, 3 (1910 f.); *Iohannis Burckhardi Liber notarum ab anno 1483 usque ad annum 1506,* ed. E. Celani, *Muratori,* XXIII, 1, 2 (1911–42), incomplete; Paris de Grassis, *Il diario di Leone X,* ed. P. Delicati and M. Armellini (Rome 1884); Marino Sanudo, *I diarii,* 58 vols. (Venice 1879–1903); *Les "libri Annatarum" pour les pontificats d'Eugène IV à Alexandre VI.* IV: *Pontificats d'Innocent VIII et d'Alexandre VI 1484–1503.* Textes publiés par E. Brouette, *Analecta Vaticano Belgica,* XXIV (Brussels 1963).

Literature

E. Rodocanacchi, *Histoire de Rome. Une cour princière au Vatican pendant la Renaissance. Sixte IV, Innocent VIII, Alexandre VI Borgia* (Paris 1925); *idem, Le pontificat de Jules II, 1503–1513* (Paris 1928); *idem, Le pontificat de Léon X, 1513–1521* (Paris 1931); *Storia d'Italia,* ed. N. Valeri, II (Turin 1959); *Storia di Milano,* VII–VIII (Milan 1956 f.); F. Babinger, *Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit* (Munich 1953); P. Partner, "The 'Budget' of the Roman Church in the Renaissance Period," *Italian Renaissance Studies* by E. F. Jacob (London 1960), 256–78; E. Gagliardi, *Der Anteil der Schweizer an den italienischen Kriegen 1494–1516* (Zürich 1918); A. Büchi, *Kardinal Matthäus Schiner als Staatsmann und Kirchenfürst,* 2 vols. (Fribourg 1923–37); H. Pfeffermann, *Die Zusammenarbeit der Renaissancepäpste mit den Türken* (Winterthur 1946); J. Fernández Alonso, *Legaciones y nunciaturas en España de 1466 a 1521,* I: *1466–1484* (Rome 1963); E. Breisach, *Caterina Sforza. A Renaissance Virago* (Chicago and London 1967).

Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII: B. Platina, *Liber de Vita Christi ac omnium Pontificum,* ed. G. Gaida, *Muratori,* III, 1 (Bologna 1913–32), gives detailed treatment of Sixtus IV to 1475); E. Carusi, *Dispacci e lettere di Giacomo Gheradi nunzio pontificio 1487–90, SteT,* 21 (Rome 1909); *I diarii di Cicco Simonetta,* ed. A. R. Natale, I: *1473–1478* (Milan 1962); *Pastor,* IV; further literature in the footnotes for this chapter.

Alexander VI: Dizionario biografico degli Italiani, II (1960), 196–205, with copious bibliography; G. Pepe, *La politica dei Borgia* (Naples 1946); E. Olmos y Canalda, *Reivindicación de Alejandro VI* (Valencia, 7th ed. 1954); O. Ferrara, *El papa Borgia* (Madrid, 4th ed. 1956), English translation by F. J. Sheed, *The Borgia Pope, Alexander VI* (New York 1940); G. Schwaiger, "Savonarola und seine Zeit," *MThZ,* 12 (1961), 210–14, with bibliography; S. Schüller-Piroli, *Borgia. Die Zerstörung einer Legende, die Geschichte einer Dynastie* (Olten and Freiburg 1963); M. Batllori, *Alejandro VI y la casa real de Aragón 1492–1498, Real academia de la historia* (Madrid 1958); H. Kühner, "Der Charakter Alexanders VI.," *ThZ,* 14 (1958), 214–21; G. Soranzo, *Studi intorno a Papa Alessandro VI Borgia* (Milan 1950); *idem,* "Risposta al Prof. Giovanni Picotti," *RSTI,* 6 (1952), 96–107; *idem,* "Documenti inediti o poco noti relativi all'assunzione al pontificato di Alessandro VI." *Archivi,* 19 (1952), 157–78; *idem,* "Orsino Orsini, Adriana di Mila sua madre, e Giulia Farnese, sua moglie, nei loro rapporti con papa Alessandro VI," *Archivi,* 26 (1959), 119–50; *idem, Il tempo di Alessandro VI Papa e di Fra Girolamo Savonarola* (Milan 1960); *idem,* "La più grave accusa data al papa Borgia," *Archivi,* 28 (1961), 179–88; G. B. Picotti, "Nuovi studi e documenti intorno a Papa Alessandro VI," *RSTI,* 5 (1951), 169–262; *idem,* "Replica al Prof. Giovanni Soranzo," *RSTI,* 6 (1952), 107–10; *idem,* "Ancora sul Borgia," *RSTI,* 8 (1954), 313–55; *idem,* "Alessandro VI, il Savonarola ed il cardinale Giuliano della Rovere in una pubblicazione recente," *ASRomana,* 83 (1960, published 1963), 51–72; *Pastor,* V–VI.

Pius III: A. A. Strnad, "Francesco Todeschini-Piccolomini. Politik und Mäzenatentum im Quattrocento," *RömHM,* 8/9 (1964–66), 101–425; this detailed study treats the entire second half of the fifteenth century and must be used to supplement *Pastor,* II–IV; it includes a copious bibliography; *Pastor,* VI.

Julius II: De Terrateig, *Politica en Italia del Rey Católico 1507–1516. Correspondencia inédita con el embajador Vich,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1963); M. Brosch, *Papst Julius II. und die Gründung des Kirchenstaates* (Gotha 1878); E. Rodocanacchi, *Le pontificat de Jules II, 1503–1513* (Paris 1928); G. B. Picotti, *La giovinezza di Leone X* (Milan 1928); *idem, La politica italiana sotto il pontificato di Giulio II* (Pisa 1949); A. Luzio, "I Preliminari della Lega di Cambrai concordati a Milan ed a Mantova," *Archivio storico Lombardo,* 38 (1911), 245–310; *idem, Isabella d'Este di fronte a Giulio II negli ultimi tre anni del suo pontificato* (Milan 1912); C. Fusero, *Giulio II* (Milan 1965); G. de Beauville, *Jules II, Sauveur de la Papauté* (Paris 1965); L. Bindi Senesi, *Giulio II. Un Papa con l'archibugio* (Milan 1967); D. S. Chambers, *Cardinal Bainbridge in the Court of Rome 1509 to 1514* (London 1965); R. Cessi, *Dispacci degli ambasciatori veneziani alla corte di Roma presso Giulio II* (Venice 1932) *Storia di Milano,* VIII (Milan 1957); F. Seneca, *Venezia e Papa Giulio II* (Padua 1962); *Pastor,* VI.

Leo X: J. Hergenröther, *Regesta Leonis X,* fasc. 1–8, 1514–1515 (Freiburg 1884–91); P. Bembo, *Libri XVI epistolarum Leonis P. M. nomine scriptarum* (Basel 1539 and later); Paris de Grassis, *Diario di Leone X,* ed. D. Delicati and M. Armellini (Rome 1884); M. Sanudo, *I diarii,* XVI–LVIII (Venice 1886–1903); S. Camerani, *Bibliografia Medicea, Biblioteca di Bibliografia Italiana,* XLV (Florence 1964); F. Nitti, *Leone X e la sua politica* (Florence 1892); G. B. Picotti, *La giovinezza di Leone X* (Milan 1928); E. Rodocanacchi, *Le pontificat de Léon X* (Paris 1951); D. Gnoli, *La Roma di Leone X* (Milan 1938); P. Prodi, "Relazioni diplomatiche fra il Ducato di Milano e Roma sotto il Duca Massimiliano Sforza 1512–1515," *Aevum,* 30 (1956), 437–94; *Storia di Milano,* VIII (Milan 1957); E. Dupré-

Theseider, "I Papi Medicei e la loro politica domestica," *Studi Fiorentini* (Florence 1963), 271–324; *Pastor, VII–VIII.*

58. *The Inner Life of the Church*

LITERATURE

The Urban Parish: Feine RG; F. X. Künstle, *Die deutsche Pfarrei und ihr Recht zu Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart 1905); A. Schultze, *Stadtgemeinde und Kirche im Mittelalter, Festgabe R. Sohm* (Munich and Leipzig 1914); A. Störmann, *Die städtischen Gravamina gegen den Klerus am Ausgange des Mittelalters und in der Reformationszeit* (Münster 1916); L. von Muralt, *Stadtgemeinde und Reformation, Recht und Staat in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* 11 (Tübingen 1918); E. Rütimeyer, *Stadtherr und Stadtbürgerschaft in den rheinischen Bischofsstädten* (Stuttgart 1928); S. Reicke, *Das deutsche Spital und sein Recht im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1932); K. Fröhlich, "Kirche und städtisches Verfassungsleben im Mittelalter," *ZSavRGkan,* 22 (1933), 188–287; S. Schröcker, *Die Kirchenpflegschaft. Die Verwaltung des Niederkirchenwesens durch Laien seit dem ausgehenden Mittelalter* (Paderborn 1934); F. Röhrig, *Die europäische Stadt im Mittelalter* (Göttingen n. d.); E. Hegel, "Städtische Pfarrseelsorge im deutschen Spätmittelalter, *TThZ,* 57 (1948), 207–20. A. H. Thompson, *The English Clergy and Their Organization in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford 1947); K. Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages* (Manchester 1949); W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (London 1955); K. L. Wood-Legh, *Studies in Church Life Under Edward III* (Cambridge, 1934); E. L. Cutts, *Parish Priests and Their People in the Middle Ages* (London 1898); B. L. Manning, *The People's Faith in the Time of Wycliffe* (Cambridge 1919); R. A. Smith, *Canterbury Cathedral Priory* (Cambridge 1943); M. Aston, *Thomas Arundel: A Study of Church Life in the Reign of Richard II* (Oxford 1967); H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church* (Hamden, Conn., 1966); R. Brentano, *Two Churches: England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century* (Princeton 1968); L. Gabel, *Benefit of Clergy in England in the Later Middle Ages* (New York 1967); L. B. Betcherman, "The Making of Bishops in the Lancastrian Period," *Speculum,* XLI (April, 1966), 397–419; W. O. Ault, "Manor Court and Parish Church in Fifteenth-Century England: A Study of Village By-Laws," *Speculum,* XLII (January, 1967), 53–67; W. M. Brady, *The Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland and Ireland AD 1400 to 1875* (Rome 1876–77); N. Harpsfield, *Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica* (Douay 1622).

Parish Books: F. Falk, *Die pfarramtlichen Aufzeichnungen des Fl. Diel zu St. Christoph in Mainz (1491–1518)* (Freiburg 1904); J. Greving, *Joh. Ecks Pfarrbuch für U. L. Frau in Ingolstadt* (Münster 1908); J. B. Götz, *Das Pfarrbuch des Stephan May in Hilpoltstein vom Jahre 1511* (Münster 1926).

Pastoral Privileges of the Mendicant Friars: C. Paulus, *Welt- und Ordensklerus beim Ausgang des 13. Jahrhunderts im Kampf um die Pfarrechte* (Essen 1900); B. Mathis, *Die Privilegien des Franziskanerordens bis zum Konzil von Vienne (1311)* (Paderborn 1928); K. L. Hitzfeld, "Krise in den Bettelorden im Pontifikat Bonifaz' VIII.," *HJ,* 48 (1928), 1–30; K. Schleyer, *Anfänge des Gallikanismus im 13. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1937); Sisino de Romallo, *Il ministero della confessione nei primordi dell'ordine francescano in relazione ai diritti parrocchiali* (Milan 1949); L. Hödl, "Zum Streit um die Bussprivilegien der Mendikantenorden in Wien im 14. und beginnenden 15. Jahrhundert," *ZKTh,* 79 (1957), 170–89.

The Liturgy: A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1902); *idem, Die kirchlichen Benediktionen im Mittelalter,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1909); L. A. Veit, *Volksfrommes Brauchtum und Kirche im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1936); P. Browe, *Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (Munich 1933); *idem, Die häufige Kommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1938); *idem, Die Pflichtkommunion im Mittelalter* (Münster 1940); *Jungmann*

MS, I; *idem*, "Der Stand des liturgischen Lebens am Vorabend der Reformation," *Liturgisches Erbe und pastorale Gegenwart* (Innsbruck 1960), 87–107; A. L. Mayer, "Die Liturgie und der Geist der Gotik," *JL*, 6 (1926), 68–97; A. Kolping, "Eucharistie als bona gratia. Die Messauffassung Alberts des Grossen," *Studia Albertina* (Münster 1952), 249–78.

Preaching: M. Kerker, "Die Predigt in der letzten Zeit des Mittelalters," *ThQ*, 43 (1861), 373–410, 44 (1862), 267–301; R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter* (Detmold 1879); A. Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Ausgang des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1886); N. Paulus, "Zur Geschichte der Predigt des ausgehenden Mittelalters," *Katholik*, 10 (1894), 279–87; F. Landmann, *Das Predigtwesen in Westfalen in der letzten Zeit des Mittelalters* (Münster 1900); J. Rauscher, "Die Prädikaturen in Württemberg vor der Reformation," *Württembergische Jahrbücher für Statistik und Landeskunde*, 2 (1908), 152 ff.; *idem*, "Die ältesten Prädikaturen Württembergs," *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, new series, 25 (1921), 107–11; R. Herrmann, "Die Prediger im ausgehenden Mittelalter," *Beiträge zur Thüringischen Kirchengeschichte*, 1 (1929), 20–68; F. W. Oediger, *Über die Bildung der Geistlichen im Spätmittelalter* (Leiden and Cologne 1953); T. Freudenberger, *Der Würzburger Domprediger Dr. Joh. Rayss* (Münster 1954); C. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge 1926); *idem, Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge 1933); T. M. Charland, *Artes Praedicandi* (Paris 1936); M. A. Devlin, "Bishop Brunton and his Sermons," *Speculum*, XIV (1939), 324–344; D. Robertson, "The Frequency of Preaching in 13th Century England," *Speculum*, XXIV (1949), 376–388.

Catechesis. J. Geffken, *Der Bilderkatechismus des 15. Jahrhunderts und die katechetischen Hauptstücke bis auf Luther* (Leipzig 1855); P. Göbl, *Geschichte der Katechese im Abendland* (Cologne 1880); F. Probst, *Geschichte der katholischen Katechese* (Breslau 1886); F. Falk, "Der Unterricht des Volkes in den katechetischen Hauptstücken am Ende des Mittelalters," *HPBI*, 108 (1891), 553–60, 682–94; P. Bahlmann, *Deutschlands katholische Katechismen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1894); W. Burger, "Römische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Katechese im Mittelalter," *RQ*, 21 (1907), II, 159–97; L. Pfleger, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Predigt und des religiösen Volksunterrichtes im Elsass während des Mittelalters," *HJ*, 38 (1917), 661–717; K. Schrems, *Die religiöse Volks- und Jugendunterweisung in der Diöcese Regensburg vom Anfang des 15. Jahrhunderts bis gegen Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Katechese* (Munich 1929); P. Browe, "Der Beichtunterricht im Mittelalter," *ThGl*, 26 (1934), 427–42; *Jungmann K;* E. Schoelen and W. Haerten, *Pädagogisches Gedankengut des christlichen Mittelalters* (Freiburg 1956); R. Padberg, *Erasmus als Katechet* (Freiburg 1956).

Scripture: translations of the Bible: *LThK*, II (2d ed. 1958), 401–11, with bibliography; W. Walther, *Die deutschen Bibelübersetzungen des Mittelalters*, 3 parts (Braunschweig 1889–92); F. Falk, *Die Bibel am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Cologne 1905); H. Vollmer, *Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte und religiösen Volkskunde des Mittelalters*, 4 vols. (Berlin 1912–29); *idem, Neuere Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bibel im Mittelalter* (Berlin 1938); *idem, Die Bibel im deutschen Kulturleben* (Salzburg and Leipzig 1938); *Bibel und deutsche Kultur*, I–XI (Potsdam 1931–41); W. Hadorn, *Die deutsche Bibel in der Schweiz* (Leipzig 1925); H. Rost, *Die Bibel im Mittelalter* (Augsburg 1939); A. Schramer, *Die ersten deutschen Bibelübersetzungen und Bibeldrucke* (Einsiedeln 1952); W. Ziesemer, *Studien zur mittelalterlichen Bibelübersetzung* (Halle 1928); F. Maurer, *Studien zur mitteldeutschen Bibelübersetzung vor Luther* (Heidelberg 1929); H. Volz, *Bibel und Bibeldruck im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Mainz 1960); S. Berger, *La Bible française au moyen âge* (Paris 1884); D. Lortsch, *Histoire de la Bible en France* (Paris 1915); H. H. Glunz, *History of the Vulgate in England* (Cambridge 1933); B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1952); A. Gasquet, *The Old English Bible and other Essays* (London 1897); M. Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge 1920).

Religious Orders: Heimbucher; S. Hilpisch, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums,* III (Freiburg 1929), 253–365, with bibliography; P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoît,* 7 vols. (Maredsous 1948–56), Vols. III–VII; J. Zeller, "Das Provinzkapitel im Stift Petershausen im Jahre 1417," *SM,* 41 (1921), 1–73; V. Redlich, *Joh. Rode von St. Matthias bei Trier. Ein deutscher Reformabt des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1923). Kastl: B. Wöhrmüller, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kastler Reform," *SM,* 42 (1924), 10–40; J. Hemmerle, *Die Benediktinerklöster in Bayern* (Munich 1951), 60 ff. (bibliography); J. Sudbrack, *Die geistliche Theologie des Joh. von Kastl,* 2 vols. (Münster 1967), with bibliography. Melk: F. X. Thoma, "Petrus von Rosenheim und die Melker Benediktinerreformbewegung," *SM,* 45 (1927), 94–222. Bursfeld: P. Volk, *Die Generalkapitel der Bursfelder Benediktinerkongregation* (Münster 1928); *idem, 500 Jahre Bursfelder Kongregation* (Münster 1950); H. Herbst, "Die Anfänge der Bursfelder Reform," *Zeitschrift für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte,* 36 (1931), 13–30; *idem, Das Benediktinerkloster Klus und die Bursfelder Reform* (Leipzig 1932); A. G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History* (Manchester 1917); A. Gwynn, *The English Austen Friars in the Time of Wycliffe* (Oxford 1940); A. F. C. Bourdillon, *The Order of Minoresses in England* (Manchester 1926); T. Burke (ed.), *Hibernia dominicana, sive historia provinciae Hiberniae ordinis praedicatorum* (Cologne 1762, 1772); C. Cotton, *The Grey Friars of Canterbury* (Manchester 1924); C. L. Kingsford, *The Grey Friars of London* (Manchester 1924); A. R. Martin, *Franciscan Architecture in England* (Manchester 1937).

France: P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme,* II (Melun, 2d ed. 1946). Valladolid: M. del Alamo in *Enciclopedia España,* 66 (Barcelona 1929), 930–87, with bibliography; P. Hofmeister, "Die Verfassung der Benediktinerkongregation von Valladolid," H. Finke, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens,* 5 (1935), 311–36. St. Birgitta: *Revelationes celestes domine Birgitte de Swedia* (Lübeck 1492, Rome 1628); *Revelationes S. Birgittae,* ed. E. and M. Wessén, *Corpus codicum Suecicorum medii aevi,* 10 (Copenhagen 1949), 13 (1952); *Acta et processus canonisationis Beatae Birgittae,* ed. I. Collijn (Uppsala 1924–31); E. Fogelklon, *Die heilige Birgitta* (German trans., Munich 1929); K. Adalsten, *Licht aus dem Norden* (Freiburg 1951). Order of the Saviour (Birgittines): *DHGE,* X, 728–31, with bibliography; B. Berthelson, *Studier i birgittinordens byggnadsskick* (Stockholm 1946); T. Ahldén, *Nonnenspiegel und Mönchsvorschriften der Danziger Birgittinerkonvente* (Göteborg 1952); T. Nyberg, *Birgittinische Klostergründungen des Mittelalters* (Lund 1965).

59. *Theology in the Age of Transition*

Nicholas of Cusa: Works: *Opera omnia,* ed. Faber Stapulensis (Favre d'Étaples) (Paris 1514, reprinted Frankfurt 1962); ed. H. Petri (Basel 1565); ed. Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften (Leipzig and Hamburg 1932 ff.); *Cusanus-Texte,* I (sermons), II (treatises), IV (correspondence), V (documents from Brixen), *SAH* (1929 ff.); texts of his philosophical works, I, ed. A. Petzelt (Stuttgart 1949). German translation sponsored by the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, 15 vols. (Leipzig and Hamburg 1936–64), 3 vols. (Heidelberg 1949–60); philosophical and theological works in Latin and German, ed. L. Gabriel, 3 vols. (Vienna 1964–67). Bibliography: *Mitteilungen und Forschungsbeiträge der Cusanusgesellschaft,* 1 (Mainz 1961), 95–126, 3 (1963), 223–37; J. Koch, *Untersuchungen über Datierung, Form, Sprache und Quellen. Kritisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Predigten* (Heidelberg 1942); *Cusanus-Konkordanz,* ed. E. Zellinger (Munich 1960). Literature: F. A. Scharpff, *Der Kardinal und Bischof Nicolaus von Cusa,* I (Mainz 1843); J. M. Düx, *Der deutsche Cardinal Nicolaus von Cusa,* 2 vols. (Regensburg 1847); E. Vansteenberghe, *Le cardinal Nicolas de Cues* (Paris 1920, reprinted Frankfurt 1963); P. Mennicken, *Nikolaus* *von Kues* (Trier, 2d ed. 1950); J. Koch, *Nikolaus von Cues und seine Umwelt* (Heidelberg 1948); E. Meuthen, *Die letzten Jahre des Nikolaus von Kues* (Cologne and Opladen 1958); *idem, Nikolaus von Kues* (Münster 1964); *idem, Das Trierer Schisma von 1430 auf dem Basler Konzil* (Münster 1964); S. Ehses, "Der Reformentwurf des Kardinals Nicolaus Cusanus," *HJ*, 32 (1911), 281–97; J. Lenz, *Die docta ignorantia des Nikolaus Cusanus* (Würzburg 1923); J. Hommes, *Die philosophische Gotteslehre des Nikolaus Kusanus* (Munich 1926); A. Posch, *Die "Concordantia catholica" des Nikolaus von Cusa* (Paderborn 1930); M. de Gandillac, *La philosophie de Nicolas de Cues* (Paris 1942); R. Haubst, *Das Bild des Einen und Dreieinen Gottes in der Welt nach Nikolaus von Kues* (Trier 1952); *idem, Nikolaus von Kues und Johannes Wenck* (Münster 1955); *idem, Die Christologie des Nikolaus von Kues* (Freiburg 1956); M. Seidlmayer, "'Una religio in rituum varietate' zur Religionsauffassung des Nikolaus von Kues," *AKG*, 36 (1954), 145–207; G. Pöppel, *Die docta ignorantia des Nicolaus Cusanus als Bildungsprinzip* (Freiburg 1956); K. H. Volkmann-Schluck, *Nicolaus Cusanus* (Frankfurt 1957); G. Heinz-Mohr, *Unitas Christiana* (Trier 1958); E. Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues und Raimund Llull* (Berlin 1961); E. Iserloh, *Reform der Kirche bei Nikolaus von Kues* (Wiesbaden 1965); H. Bett, *Nicholas of Cusa* (London 1932); P. E. Sigmund, *Nicholas of Cusa and Medieval Political Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963); J. P. Dolan, *Unity and Reform: Selected Writings of Nicholas of Cusa* (Notre Dame 1962); M. Watanabe, *The Political Ideas of Nicholas of Cusa, with Special Reference to his De Concordantia Catholica* (Geneva 1963). Also, see the following articles: R. Bauer, "Sacrum imperium et imperium germanicum chez Nicholas de Cues," *Archives d'histoire*, 12, 28–54 (1949); F. E. Cranz, "St. Augustine and Nicholas of Cusa in the Tradition of Western Christian Thought," *Speculum*, 28, 297–315 (April, 1953); B. Decker, "Die Toleranzidee bei Nikolaus von Kues und in der Neuzeit," in *Nicolo Cusano, Relazioni presentate al Convegno Interuniversitario di Bressanone* (Florence 1962), pp. 5–24; L. Duhem, "Thierry de Chartres et Nicolas de Cues," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques*, 3, 525–531 (1909); E. F. Jacob, "Nicholas of Cusa," in *Social and Political Ideas of Some Great Thinkers of the Renaissance and Reformation*, ed. F. J. C. Hearnshaw (London 1925), pp. 31–60; R. Klibansky, "Copernic et Nicolas de Cues," in *Leonard de Vinci et l'expérience scientifique au seizième siècle*, pub. by Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (Paris 1953); B. L. Ullmann, "Manuscripts of Nicholas of Cues," *Speculum*, 13, 194–197 (1938).

John von Wesel: Sources: *Disputatio adversus indulgentias* (1475), ed. C. W. F. Walch, *Monimenta medii aevi*, I/1 (Göttingen 1757), 111–56; Relatio A of the process: Orthuinus Gratius, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum* (Cologne 1535), and D. d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum de novis erroribus*, I/2 (Paris 1724), 291 ff. Literature: O. Clemen, "Über Leben und Schriften des Johannes von Wesel," *DZGw*, new series, 2 (Freiburg 1898), 143–73 (with Relatio B of the process); *idem*, "Zu dem Ketzerprozess Johannes' von Wesel," *HV*, 3 (1900), 521–23 (with the 19 recanted propositions; *idem* in RE, 21, 127–31; N. Paulus, "Johannes von Wesel über Bussakrament und Ablass," *ZKTh*, 24 (1900), 644–56; *idem* in *ZKTh*, 27 (1903), 601; *idem, Geschichte des Ablasses*, III (Paderborn 1923), 524–27; *idem*, "Wimpheling als Verfasser eines Berichtes über den Prozess gegen Johannes von Wesel," *ZGObrh*, 81, new series 42 (1929), 296–300, 451 ff.; G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik*, III (Heidelberg 1927); R. Samoray, *Johannes von Wesel* (typed dissertation, Münster 1954); J. F. G. Goeters, "J. Ruchrat von Wesel," *Monatshefte für ev. Kirchengeschichte des Rheinlands*, 16 (1967), 184–91, with bibliography.

John von Goch: Works: *De libertate christiana* (1473; Antwerp 1521); *Epistola apologetica* (1474, Antwerp 1520); *Dialogus de 4 erroribus circa evangelicam legem* (Antwerp 1523); *In divinae gratiae et christianae fidei commendationem ... fragmenta* (Antwerp 1523). Editions: C. W. F. Walch, *Monimenta medii aevi*, I/4 (Göttingen 1760), 73–239 *(Dialogus)*, II/1 (Göttingen 1761), 3–24 *(Epistola apologetica);* F. Pijper in *BNR*, VI (The Hague

1909), *De libertate christiana, Fragmenta, Epistola apologetica;* Luther's Foreword to the *Fragmenta* in *WA,* 10, II, 327–30. Literature: C. Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation,* I (Gotha, 2d ed. 1866), 17–148; C. Clemen, *Johannes Pupper von Goch* (Leipzig 1896); *idem* in *RE,* 6, 740–43, 23, 565; G. Ritter, *Studien zur Spätscholastik,* I–III (Heidelberg 1921–27); *idem,* "Romantische und revolutionäre Elemente in der deutschen Theologie am Vorabend der Reformation," *DVfLG,* 5 (1927), 342–80; R. R. Post, "Joh. Pupper von Goch," *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis,* 47 (1965 f.), 71–97; L. Abramowski, "Die Lehre vom Gesetz und Evangelium bei Joh. Pupper von Goch im Rahmen seines nominalistischen Augustinismus," *ZThK,* 64 (1967), 83–98.

Wessel Gansfort: Works: *Opera* (Groningen 1614). Literature: *RE,* 21, 131–47; E. W. Miller, *Wessel Gansfort, Life and Writings,* 2 vols. (New York and London 1917); M. van Rhijn, *Wessel Gansfort* (The Hague 1917); *idem, Studien over Wessel Gansfort* (Utrecht 1933); H. J. J. Wachters, *Wessel Gansfort* (Nijmegen 1940); R. R. Post, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland in de Middeleeuwen,* I (Utrecht 1957), 397 ff.

Gabriel Biel: Works: *Sermones,* 4 vols. (Tübingen 1499 f., Hagenau 1510 and later); *Passionis dominicae sermo historialis* (Tübingen 1489 and later); *Canonis missae expositio* (Reutlingen 1488, Tübingen 1499 and later), ed. H. A. Oberman and W. J. Courtenay, 4 vols. (Wiesbaden 1963–67); *Epitoma expositionis canonis missae* (Tübingen 1499 and later; Antwerp 1565); from the preceding: *Sacri canonis missae expositio brevis et interlinearis* (after 1499); *Epithoma et collectorium circa IV libros Sententiarum* (Tübingen 1501 and later; reprinted Frankfurt 1965); extract (IV Sent., d. 15, g. 9): *De potestate et utilitate monetarum* (Oppenheim 1516), English translation by R. B. Burke (Philadelphia 1930); *Regula puerorum* (Urach 1483, Leipzig *ca.* 1497); *De communi vita clericorum* (MS, The Hague 75–958), ed. W. M. Landren, *Research Studies, Washington State University,* 28 (1960), 79–95. Literature: G. Plitt, *Gabriel Biel als Prediger* (Erlangen 1879); H. Hermelink, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät in Tübingen vor der Reformation 1477–1534* (Tübingen 1906), 204–07; O. Meyer, "Die Brüder des gemeinsamen Lebens in Württemberg 1477–1517," *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte,* 17 (1913), 109–38; C. Feckes, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Gabriel Biel* (Münster 1925); *idem,* "Der erste Dogmatiker der Universität Tübingen in seiner wissenschaftlichen Bedeutung," *ThQ,* 118 (1927), 50–76; J. Haller, *Die Anfänge der Universität Tübingen 1477–1537* (Stuttgart 1927–29), I, 153–72, II, 54–64; *DHGE,* VIII (1935), 1429–35; P. Anatriello, *La Dottrina di Gabriele Biel sull'Eucaristia* (Milan 1937); A. M. Jodice, "L'efficacia del Sacramento della Penitenza negli Scolastici e in Gabriele Biel," *SC,* 66 (1938), 141–60, 430–42; *idem* in *DTh(P),* 41 (1938), 113–29, 44 (1941), 273–92; E. Bonke, "Doctrina nominalistica de fundamento ordinis moralis apud Gulielmum de Ockham et Gabrielem Biel," *CollFr,* 14 (1944), 57–83; W. M. Landren, "Gabriel Biel and the Brethren of the Common Life," *Church History,* 20 (1951), 23–36; *idem,* "Gabriel Biel and the Devotio Moderna in Germany," *Research Studies, Washington State University,* 27 (1959), 135–76, 214–29, 28 (1960), 21–45, 61–78; L. Grane, "Gabriel Biels Lehre von der Allmacht Gottes," *ZThK,* 53 (1956), 53–75; *idem, Contra Gabrielem* (Copenhagen 1962); H. A. Obermann, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology. Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963), with bibliography; R. Damerau, *Die Abendmahlslehre des Nominalismus insbesondere die des Gabriel Biel* (Giessen 1963).

60. *The Jews in Mediaeval Christendom*

LITERATURE

J. Aronius, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland bis zum Jahre 1273* (Berlin 1902); I. Elbogen, A. Freimann, and H. Tykocinski, *Germania Iudaica. Von den ältesten Zeiten bis 1238* (Breslau 1934, reprinted Tübingen 1963); H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart,* 11 vols. in 13 (Leipzig, 4th ed. n. d. [1894–1908]); S. Dubnow, *Weltgeschichte des jüdischen Volkes,* 10 vols. (Berlin 1928–30); I. Elbogen, *Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* (Berlin 1935); H. Fischer, *Die verfassungsrechtliche Stellung der Juden in den deutschen Städten des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Breslau 1931); E. L. Dietrich, "Das Judentum im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge," *Saeculum,* 3 (1952), 94–131; G. Kisch, *Forschungen zur Rechts- und Sozialgeschichte der Juden in Deutschland während des Mittelalters* (Zürich 1955); *idem, Die Universitäten und die Juden* (Tübingen 1961); E. L. Ehrlich, *Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland* (Düsseldorf, 2d ed. 1958); E. Meyer, *Juden und Judenfeinde in der christlichen Welt* (Cologne 1962); P. Wilpert (ed.), *Judentum im Mittelalter. Beiträge zum Christlich-Jüdischen Gespräch* (Berlin 1966).

The Church and the Jews: M. Stern, *Urkundliche Beiträge über die Stellung der Päpste zu den Juden,* 2 vols. (Kiel 1893–95); *idem, Die päpstlichen Bullen über Blutbeschuldigung* (Munich 1900); L. Erler, "Die Juden des Mittelalters: Die Päpste und die Juden," *AkathKR,* 48 (1882), 369–416, 50 (1883), 3–64, 53 (1885), 3–70; H. Loewe, *Die Juden in der katholischen Legende* (Berlin 1912); P. Browe, "Die Hostienschändung der Juden im Mittelalter," *RQ,* 34 (1926), 167–97; *idem,* "Die religiöse Duldung der Juden im Mittelalter," *AkathKR,* 118 (1938), 3–76; *idem,* "Die Judenbekämpfung im Mittelalter," *ZKTh,* 62 (1938), 197–231, 349–84; *idem, Die Judenmission im Mittelalter und die Päpste* (Rome 1942); S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia 1933); H. Pflaum, *Die religiöse Disputation in der europäischen Dichtung des Mittelalters,* I: *Der allegorische Streit zwischen Synagoge und Kirche* (Geneva and Florence 1935); G. La Piana, "The Church and the Jews," *Historia Iudaica,* 11 (1949), 117–44; E. Peterson, "Perfidia Iudaica," *ELit,* 50 (1936), 296–311; on the preceding see J. Oesterreicher in *Cahiers Sioniens,* I (1947), 85–101, H. Schmeck in *VigChr,* 5 (1951), 129–47, B. Blumenkranz in *ALMA,* 22 (1952), 157–70; E. Iserloh, "Werner von Oberwesel," *TThZ,* 72 (1963), 270–85; W. P. Eckert, "Das Verhältnis von Christen und Juden im Mittelalter und Humanismus," *Monumenta Iudaica. Handbuch,* ed. K. Schilling (Cologne 1963), 131–98; K. Schilling and E. L. Ehrlich, *Judenhass—Schuld der Christen* (Essen 1964); W. Seiferth, *Synagoge und Kirche im Mittelalter* (Munich 1964); K. H. Rengstorf and S. von Kortzfleisch (ed.), *Kirche und Synagoge. Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden,* I (Stuttgart 1968).

Jewish Philosophy and Theology: Bibliography: G. Vajda, *Jüdische Philosophie* (Bern 1950). Texts: *Jüdischer Glaube,* ed. K. Wilhelm (Bremen 1961); A. Franck, *Die Kabbala oder die Religionsphilosophie der Hebräer* (Leipzig 1844); D. Neumark, *Geschichte der jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1907–20); J. Guttmann, *Philosophie des Judentums* (Munich 1933); L. G. Lévy, *Maimonide* (Paris 1911, 2d ed. 1932); *Moses ben Maimon,* ed. W. Bacher *et al.,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1908–14); G. Vajda, *Introduction à la pensée juive du moyen-âge* (Paris 1947); H. Köhler, *Wirkung des Judentums auf das abendländische Geistesleben* (Berlin 1952); A. Altmann, *Jewish Philosophy* (New York 1953); K. Schubert, *Die Religion des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Vienna 1955); *idem,* "Kabbala," *LThK,* V (2d ed. 1960), 1233–36; G. Scholem, *Die jüdische Mystik in ihren Hauptströmungen* (Frankfurt 1957); *idem, Ursprung und Anfänge der Kabbala* (Berlin 1962); C. Roth, *History of the Jews in England,* 3d ed. (Oxford 1964); S. Stern, *Josel of Rosheim, Commander of Jewry in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation* (Philadelphia 1965); A. Altmann (ed.), *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (Cambridge, Mass. 1967); E. A. Ashtor, *A History of the Jews in Muslim Spain,* 2 vols. (Jerusalem 1967); Z. W. Falk,

Jewish Matrimonial Law in the Middle Ages (Oxford/New York 1966); B. Blumenkranz, *Le Juif Mediéval au Miroir de l'Art Chrêtien* (Paris 1966); J. P. Dolan, "A Note on Emperor Frederick II and Jewish Tolerance," in *Jewish Social Studies,* XXII, No. 3, 165–175; J. Starr, "The Mass Conversion of the Jews in Southern Italy (1290–1293)," in *Speculum,* XXI (1946), 203–211; J. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (New York 1959); *idem, Essays on Maimonides* (New York 1941); I. Husik, *A History of Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (Philadelphia 1941).

61. *German Humanism*

LITERATURE

Schottenloher, 37909–70, 63158–210; R. Stupperich, "Vom Humanismus zur Reformation. Literaturbericht," *AKG,* 36 (1954), 338–401; P. Joachimsen, *Geschichtsauffassung und Geschichtsschreibung in Deutschland unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus* (Leipzig and Berlin 1910); *idem,* "Der Humanismus und die Entwicklung des deutschen Geistes," *DVfLG,* 8 (1930), 419–80; *idem,* "Loci communes. Untersuchungen zur Geistesgeschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation," *LuJ,* 8 (1926), 27–97; H. Hermelink, *Die religiösen Reformbestrebungen des deutschen Humanismus* (Tübingen 1907); P. Mestwerdt, *Die Anfänge des Erasmus. Humanismus und Devotio Moderna* (Leipzig 1917); G. Ritter, "Die geschichtliche Bedeutung des deutschen Humanismus," *HZ,* 127 (1923), 393–453; M. P. Gilmore, *The World of Humanism (1453–1517)* (New York 1925); H. Baron, "Die religiösen Reformbestrebungen des deutschen Humanismus," *HZ,* 132 (1925), 413–46; H. von Schubert, "Reformation und Humanismus," *LuJ,* 8 (1926), 1–26; P. Kalkhoff, "Die Stellung der deutschen Humanisten zur Reformation," *ZKG,* 46 (1928), 161–231; H. Rupprich, *Humanismus und Renaissance in den deutschen Städten und an den Universitäten* (Leipzig 1935); *idem, Die Frühzeit des Humanismus und die Renaissance in Deutschland* (Leipzig 1938); R. Newald, "Deutsche Literatur im Zeitalter des Humanismus (Literatur-Übersicht 1939/53)," *DVfLG,* 27 (1953), 309–26; A. Schreiber, *Petrarca und Erasmus. Der Humanismus in Italien und im Norden* (Heidelberg 1947); J. Sellmair, *Humanitas christiana. Geschichte des christlichen Humanismus* (Munich, 2d ed. 1948); H. von Srbik, *Geist und Geschichte vom deutschen Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart,* I (Munich and Salzburg 1950); P. Renucci, *L'aventure de l'humanisme européen* (Paris 1953); A. Renaudet, *Préreforme et Humanisme à Paris (1494–1517)* (Paris 1953); P. Lehmann, "Grundzüge des Humanismus deutscher Lande," *Aevum,* 31 (1957), 253–68; H. Lutz, *Conrad Peutinger* (Augsburg 1958); B. Moeller, "Die deutschen Humanisten und die Anfänge der Reformation," *ZKG,* 70 (1959), 46–61; L. W. Spitz, *The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963).

Conrad Celtis: Works: *Fünf Bücher Epigramme von Konrad Celtis,* ed. K. Hartfelder (Berlin 1881); *Briefwechsel,* ed. H. Rupprich (Munich 1934); *Quatuor libri Amorum, Germania generalis,* ed. F. Pindter (Leipzig 1934); *Libri Odarum, Liber Epodon, Carmen saeculare,* ed. F. Pindter (Leipzig 1937); *Oratio in Gymnasio in Ingolstadio recitata,* ed. J. (H.) Rupprich (Leipzig 1932). Literature: F. von Bezold, *Konrad Celtis der deutsche Erzhumanist* ([1883] Darmstadt 1959); E. Novotny, *Die Weltanschauung des Konrad Celtis* (typed dissertation, Vienna 1938); L. Sponagel, *Konrad Celtis und das deutsche Nationalbewusstsein* (dissertation, Heidelberg 1939); D. Narr, "Conrad Celtis," *Württembergisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* (Stuttgart 1955), 66–78; H. Drewinc, *Vier Gestalten aus der Zeit des Humanismus* (St. Gallen 1946), 60–124; L. W. Spitz, *Conrad Celtis, The German Arch-Humanist* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957); M. Seidlmayer, "Konrad Celtis," *Wege und Wandlungen des Humanismus* (Göttingen 1965), 174–96.

The Alsace Circle: O. Herding, "Probleme des frühen Humanismus in Deutschland," *AKG*, 38 (1956), 344–89; R. Newald, *Elsässische Charakterköpfe aus dem Zeitalter des Humanismus* (Colmar 1944); W. Gilbert, "Sebastian Brant, Conservative Humanist," *ARG*, 46 (1955), 145–67; J. Knepper, *J. Wimpheling* (Freiburg 1902), with list of writings; E. von Borries, *Wimpheling und Murner im Kampf um die ältere Geschichte des Elsasses* (Heidelberg 1926).

The Erfurt Circle: Der Briefwechsel des Mutianus Rufus, ed. C. Krause (Kassel 1885); *Der Briefwechsel des Conradus Mutianus,* ed. K. Gilbert (Halle 1890); L. Geiger, *Humanismus und Renaissance* (Berlin 1882), 132–35; G. Bauch, *Die Universität Erfurt im Zeitalter des Frühhumanismus* (Breslau 1904); P. Kalkhoff, *Humanismus und Reformation in Erfurt* (Halle 1926); M. Burgdorf, *Der Einfluss des Erfurter Humanismus auf Luthers Entwicklung bis 1510* (Leipzig 1928); P. Halbauer, *Mutianus Rufus und seine geistesgeschichtliche Stellung* (Leipzig and Berlin 1929); L. W. Spitz, "The Conflict of Ideals in Mutianus Rufus," *Journal of the Warburg Institute,* 16 (London 1953), 121–43; E. W. Krapp, *Der Erfurter Mutiankreis und seine Auswirkungen* (dissertation, Cologne 1954).

Epistolae obscurorum virorum: Editions: E. Böcking, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1864–70); F. G. Stokes (London 1909, 2d ed. 1925); A. Bömer, 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1924). Literature: *Schottenloher,* 36720–35; W. Brecht, *Die Verfasser der Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (Strasbourg 1904); P. Merker, *Die Verfasser des Eccius dedolatus und anderer Reformationsdialoge* (Halle 1923); A. Bömer, "Verfasser und Drucke der Epistolae obscurorum virorum," *ZblB,* 41 (1924), 1–12; L. Blum, "La part de l'Alsace à l'origine des 'Epistolae obscurorum virorum'," *Arch. de l'Église d'Alsace,* 19 (Rixheim 1949 f.), 99–128.

John Reuchlin: Works: *Codex Reuchlinianus,* 3, with introduction by A. Sperber (Copenhagen 1956); *Augenspiegel,* ed. J. Benzing (Munich 1961); *Johannes Reuchlins Briefwechsel,* ed. L. Geiger (Stuttgart 1875, reprinted Hildesheim 1962). Literature: *Schottenloher,* 17841–89a, 48848–57a, 57727–38; L. Geiger, *Johannes Reuchlin* (Leipzig 1871); J. Wille, "Johannes Reuchlin," *ZGObrh,* 76 (1922), 249–75; T. Schmid, *Reuchlins Anschauung von Wesen und Sinn der Sprache* (dissertation, Vienna 1938); W. Maurer, "Reuchlin und das Judentum," *ThLZ,* 77 (1952), 539–44; *Johannes Reuchlin,* ed. M. Krebs (Pforzheim 1955); J. Benzing, *Bibliographie der Schriften Johannes Reuchlins im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Bad Bocklet 1955); L. W. Spitz, "Reuchlin's Philosophy," *ARG,* 47 (1956), 1–20; W. Maurer, "Melanchthon und Reuchlin," *Philipp Melanchthon,* ed. W. Elliger (Göttingen 1961), 116–20.

Desiderius Erasmus: Works: ed. Beatus Rhenanus, 9 vols. (Basel 1540), J. Clericus, 10 vols. (Leiden 1703–06, reprinted Hildesheim 1961); selected works ed. H. Holborn (Munich 1933, reprinted 1964); *Opuscula,* ed. W. K. Ferguson (The Hague 1933); *Ausgewählte Schriften. Ausgabe in 8 Bänden,* Latin and German, ed. W. Welzig, I (Darmstadt 1967); *Opus Epistularum,* ed. P. S. Allen, 12 vols. (Oxford 1906–58); *De libero arbitrio,* ed. J. von Walter (Leipzig, 2d ed. 1935); *Encomium Moriae,* ed. H. A. Schmid (Basel 1931). Translations: *Erasmus and His Times: A Shortened Version of the Adages of Erasmus,* trans. M. M. Phillips (Cambridge 1967); L. K. Born (ed.), *Education of a Christian Prince* (New York 1965); *Julius Exclusus,* trans. P. Pascal (Bloomington, Ind. 1968); *Enchiridion of Erasmus,* trans. R. Himelick (Bloomington, Ind. 1963); *Epistles of Erasmus,* trans. F. M. Nichols, 3 vols. (New York 1918); *On Copia of Words and Ideas,* trans. D. B. King and H. D. Rix (Milwaukee 1963); *The Colloquies of Erasmus,* trans. C. R. Thompson (Chicago 1965); *Discourse on Free Will,* trans. E. F. Winter (New York 1961); J. P. Dolan (ed. and trans.), *The Essential Erasmus* (New York 1963).

Literature: *Schottenloher,* 5492–845, 46065–187, 54278–477; P. Mestwerdt, *Die Anfänge des Erasmus* (Leipzig 1917); A. Renaudet, *Études érasmiennes (1521–29)* (Paris 1939); *idem, Érasme et l'Italie* (Geneva 1954); R. Newald, *Erasmus* (Freiburg 1947); K. A. Meissinger, *Erasmus* (Berlin, 2d ed. 1948); W. E. Campbell, *Erasmus, Tyndale and More* (London 1949); J. Lortz, "Erasmus—kirchengeschichtlich," *Aus Theologie und Philosophie, Festschrift für F. Tillmann* (Düsseldorf 1950), 271–326; J. Huizinga, *Erasmus;* A. Flitner, *Erasmus im Urteil seiner Nachwelt* (Tübingen 1952); A. Auer, *Die vollkommene Frömmigkeit des Christen nach dem Enchiridion* (Düsseldorf 1954); K. Schätti, *Erasmus und die römische Kurie* (Basel 1954); L. Bouyer, *Autour d'Érasme* (Paris 1955); E. Schneider, *Das Bild der Frau im Werk des Erasmus* (Basel 1955); J. Étienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvanistes* (Louvain and Gembloux 1956); R. Padberg, *Erasmus als Katechet* (Freiburg 1956); C. Augustijn, "Die religiöse Gedankenwelt des Erasmus," *Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter,* 28 (1963), 218–30; G. Gebhardt, *Die Stellung des Erasmus von Rotterdam zur römischen Kirche* (Hamburg 1966); E. W. Kohls, *Die Theologie des Erasmus,* 2 vols. (Basel 1966), with bibliography. M. M. Philipps, *Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance* (New York/London 1949); P. S. Smith, *Erasmus, A Study of His Life, Ideals and Place in History* (New York 1962); *idem, A Key to the Colloquies of Erasmus* (Cambridge/London 1927); P. S. Allen, *Lectures and Wayfaring Sketches* (Oxford/New York 1934); L. Bouyer, *Erasmus and His Times* (Westminster, Md./London 1959); M. P. Gilmore, *The World of Humanism* (New York/London 1952); E. H. Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* (New York 1956); J. Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation* (New York 1957).

LIST OF POPES

Rival claimants are preceded by an asterisk.

Calixtus II	1119–1124
Honorius II	1124–1130
*Celestine II	1124
Innocent II	1130–1143
*Anacletus II	1130–1138
*Victor IV	1138
Celestine II	1143–1144
Lucius II	1144–1145
Eugene III	1145–1153
Anastasius IV	1153–1154
Hadrian IV	1154–1159
Alexander III	1159–1181
*Victor IV	1159–1164
*Paschal III	1164–1168
*Calixtus III	1168–1178
*Innocent III	1179–1180
Lucius III	1181–1185
Urban III	1185–1187
Gregory VIII	1187
Clement III	1187–1191
Celestine III	1191–1198
Innocent III	1198–1216
Honorius III	1216–1227
Gregory IX	1227–1241
Celestine IV	1241
Innocent IV	1243–1254
Alexander IV	1254–1261
Urban IV	1261–1264
Clement IV	1265–1268
Gregory X	1271–1276
Innocent V	1276
Adrian V	1276
John XXI	1276–1277
Nicholas III	1277–1280
Martin IV	1281–1285
Honorius IV	1285–1287
Nicholas IV	1288–1292
Celestine V	1294
Boniface VIII	1294–1303
Benedict XI	1303–1304
Clement V	1305–1314
John XXII	1316–1334
*Nicholas V	1328–1330
Benedict XII	1334–1342
Clement VI	1342–1352
Innocent VI	1352–1362
Urban V	1362–1370
Gregory XI	1370–1378
Urban VI	1378–1389
*Clement VII	1378–1394
Boniface IX	1389–1404
*Benedict XIII	1394–1423
Innocent VII	1404–1406
Gregory XII	1406–1415
*Alexander V	1409–1410
*John XXIII	1410–1415
Martin V	1417–1431
Eugene IV	1431–1447
*Felix V	1439–1449
Nicholas V	1447–1455
Calixtus III	1455–1458
Pius II	1458–1464
Paul II	1464–1471
Sixtus IV	1471–1484
Innocent VIII	1484–1492
Alexander VI	1492–1503
Pius III	1503
Julius II	1503–1513
Leo X	1513–1521

GENERAL INDEX

Figures in italics denote pages where the subject receives more intensive treatment.

Abaga, Khan 206
Abelard, Peter 44 f., *46 f.*, 48–50, 52 f., 58, 67, 79, 89 f., 92, 95, 98, 109, 131, 375
Absalom, Abbot of Saint-Victor 162
Absalom, Archbishop of Lund 153
Academy, Roman 542
accessus 455
Acciaiuoli, Angelus, Cardinal 410
Acebes, Diego de, Bishop of Osma 164, 173
Achard of Saint-Victor 42
Acre 37, 85, 184, 187, 190, 220, 222, 240, 281, 286, 297, 489
— Kingdom of 85, 281
"Ad abolendam" 76, 104, 162 (n.), 211
Adalbero, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 28f., 218
Adalbero, Archbishop of Trier 24, 51
Adalbert, Archbishop of Mainz 4, 24
Adalbert, Bishop of Prague 217
Adam, William 398
Adam, William d' 490
Adam du Petit Pont 45
Adam of Perseigne 15
Adam the Scot of Dryburgh 43
Adele, Countess of Blois 26, 109
Adele of Vohburg 52
Adhémar, Bishop of Le Puy 117
Adolf of Nassau, King of Germany 275
Adolf von Nassau, Archbishop of Mainz 600
Adria, Kingdom of 409 f.
Adrian V, Pope 234, 269
Adrianople 491
Aegidius Romanus, Archbishop of Bourges 278, 356–58
Aeidarus, Angelus 509
Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx 15, 42, 112
Afonso Henriques, Count and King of Portugal 27
Agnetenberg 433, 442, 599
Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons 604
Agricola, Rudolf 616
Ahaus, Henry von 434
Aigrefeuille, William d' 327
Ailly, Peter d', Cardinal 352, 411, 436, 458, 461, 464, 613
Aimeric, Cardinal Deacon of Santa Maria Novella 4–9, 16, 18, 20
Akindynos, Gregory 500–02, 504
Alain de Lille 15, 92 f., 110
Alan Anglicus 225
al-Ashraf Khalil, Sultan 281
Albanenses 208
Albergati, Nicholas, Cardinal 528
Alberic, Abbot of Cîteaux 12
Alberic, Archbishop of Magdeburg 212
Alberic, Cardinal 26
Alberic, Magister 91
Albert I, King of Germany 239, 275, 305
Albert II, King of Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary 483
Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem 182
Albert of Brabant, Bishop of Liège 79 f.
Albert of Buxhövden, Bishop of Riga 217, 219
Albert of Parma, Magister 199
Albert the Bear, Margrave of Brandenburg 218
Albertists 354, 586
Albertus Magnus, Bishop of Regensburg 183, 210, 253, *255*, 353, 389, 511, 600, 609
Albi 98, 100, 162
Albigensians 65, 92, 162, 169; *see also* Cathari
Albornoz, Gil de, Cardinal 326, 328
Alcuin 97
Aldulf, Bishop of Carlisle 26
Aleman, Louis d', Cardinal 485
Alessandria 61, 74, 192
Aleth of Montbard 18
Alexander II, Pope 604
Alexander III, Pope 12 f., 27, *57–66*, 67 f., 73–75, 76 (n.), 79, 81 f., 94, 96, 101, 118, 139 f., 152, 224, 227 f., 232, 265, 613
— and Becket 70 f., 73
— and Frederick I 57–64
— and heresy 102 f., 211
Alexander IV, Pope 182, *200*, 209, 219, 248, 269, 369, 517, 611
Alexander V, Pope of Pisan obedience 422, 448 f., 453
Alexander VI, Pope 524, *550–57*, 558
— children 551–53, 557
— and Papal State 553
— and Savonarola 554
— reform gesture 555
— line of demarcation 555
— death 556

— character 556 f.
Alexander of Hales 183, 254, 257
Alexians 584
Alexius I, Byzantine Emperor *115–17,* 129 (n.), 130 f., 133
Alexius III, Byzantine Emperor 155–57, 166 (n.)
Alexius IV, Byzantine Emperor 155 f.
Alexius V, Byzantine Emperor 156
Alfarabi 251 f.
Alfonso, Duke of Bisceglie 552
Alfonso I, King of Aragón 27
Alfonso III, King of Aragón 239 f.
Alfonso V, King of Aragón and Naples 470, 472, 482, 484 f., 522, 529, 531–34
Alfonso VII, King of Castile 27
Alfonso VIII, King of Castile 146, 392
Alfonso X, King of Castile and Germany 201 f., 204–06, 235
Alfonso IX, King of León 146
Alfonso III, King of Naples 552
Alger of Liège 46, 50
al-Kamil, Sultan 178, 181, 189 f., 221, 282, 391
Allucingoli, Ubaldo, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia *see* Lucius III, Pope
Amadeus VI, Count of Savoy 331
Amadeus VIII, Duke of Savoy *see* Felix V, Antipope
Amadeus of Lausanne 42
Amauri, King of Cyprus and Jerusalem 80, 157
Amaury of Bène 170, 209 f., 252
Amboise, George d', Cardinal 557
Amelii, Peter, jurist 424
Amelio, John de 316
Anacletus II, "Antipope" *7–10,* 16
Anagni 269, 272, 279, 291–93, 295 f., 356, 404–06
— Treaty of (1176) 62 f., 65
Anastasius IV, Pope 27 (n.), 52
Ancona, Marches of 144, 162, 190, 200, 242, 270, 304, 326, 410, 454
Andrew II, King of Hungary 147, 220, 282, 395
Andrew of Escobar 464
Andrew of Hungary, King of Naples 323
Andrew of Longjumeau 394
Andrew of Rinn 606
Androin de la Roche, Cardinal 328
Andronicus II, Byzantine Emperor 488–90, 506 f.
Andronicus III, Byzantine Emperor 501
Angela of Foligno 376 f.
Angelus of Clareno 242, 370
Angers, University of 248
animadversio debita 211 f., 214 f.
Anna Comnena 114 (n.)
Anna Dalassena 113
annates 264, 332, 339, *340,* 463, 465, 472, 478, 482, 525
Anne of Bohemia, Queen of England 447
Anne of Savoy, Byzantine Empress 501 f.
Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury 27 (n.), 44, 46, 49, 112, 345, 508 f., 596
Anselm, Archbishop of Milan 5
Anselm, Bishop of Havelberg 43, 51, 57, 117 (n.), 131
Anselm of Laon *44 f.,* 46–48, 91, 95
Anthimus, Bishop 517
Anthony IV, Patriarch of Constantinople 516
Anthony of Padua 179–81
Antioch 116 f., 157, 229
antipapal polemics 271 f., 312, 344, 358 f., *360–63, 367 f.*
Apokaukos, Alexius 502
Apostolics 243 f.
apparellamentum 100
appeal from Pope to council 467 (n.), 527, 539, 545
appeals to Holy See 34, 68–70, 73–75, 82, 149, 160, 171, 465, 478, 563, 590
Apulia 54, 78, 192, 209, 240, 270, 547
Aragón 146, 163, 166, 189, 208, 211–13, 237, 238–40, 268—70, 272, 274, 284, 300 f., 309, 323, 403, 407, 412, 424, 469, 482 f.
archdeacons 230
archives, Vatican 280, 338, 402, 547, 556
Argyropulos, John 523
Aristenus 129
Aristotelianism 248, 251–53, 255–58, 260, 351, 375, 500, 609
Aristotle 92, 131, 210, 246, 251–53, 255–57, 347, 355, 360, 506, 509, 511, 522 f., 595, 609
Arles, Kingdom of 235
Armenia, Cilician 80, 84 f., 132, 242, 398, 490
Arnald of Villanova 243, 292
Arnaud-Amaury, Abbot Cîteaux, Archbishop of Narbonne 163
Arnold, Abbot of Dickeninge 436
Arnold of Brescia 33, 53 f., *98f.*
Arnold of Cologne 223, 397
Arnoldists 104
Arnolfo di Cambio 279
Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux 36
Arsenites 489
Arsenius, Patriarch of Constantinople 489
Arsuf, battle of 85
artes liberales 40, 90, 96, 248, 614
Arthur, Duke of Brittany 150
Arundel, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury 445
Ascellin of Longjumeau 394
Assises of Romania 156
Athos, Mount 122, 124 (n.), 133, 499–501, 504, 518–20
Aubert, Stephen, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 325; *see also* Innocent VI, Pope
Audientia Litterarum Contradictarum 263, *266,* 337
Audientia Sacri Palatii 262, *265 f.; see also Rota*
auditores 260, 338
Augsburg, Diet of (1266) 201
Augustinianism 257–59, 377, 446, 459, 522 and *passim*
Augustinus Triumphus 356, 358
Aureoli, Peter 345
"Ausculta Fili" 276 f.
Averroes 251–53, 255 f., 609
Averroism, Latin 210, 253, 256 f., 360
Avicebron 252, 609
Avicenna 252 f., 256, 259
Avignon 195, 295, 297, 304, 308, 312, 314–16, 319–23, 325–32, *333 f.,* 338, 341, 347, 351, 360, 364, 370 f., 373, 378, 381, 401, 410–14, 422, 427, 468 f., 476, 492 f., 496

— *palais des papes* 316, 320, 323, 333 f.
— purchase of 323, 333
— Clement VII at 406–10
— Benedict XIII at 410–13
— Synod of (1209) 165
— University of 280, 327
Avignon Papacy *294–344*, 365–67
— Clement V 294–307
— John XXII 308–15
— Benedict XII 315–20
— Clement VI 321–24
— Innocent VI 324–26
— Urban V 327–29
— Gregory XI 330–33
— Curia 333–44
— papal income 339–41
— papal expenses 342 f.
— criticism of 343 f., 374
— abuse of censures by 344
— and reunion of Churches 492–94
Ayubite Empire 155

Bacon, Roger 253, *257 f.*, 391
Baghdad 223, 396
Bagnolenses 208
Bajazet I, Sultan 495
Bajazet II, Sultan 549, 553
Balbi, John, of Genoa 355 f.
Baldwin, Archbishop of Trier 306, 319
Baldwin, Count of Hainaut 83
Baldwin III, King of Jerusalem 37
Baldwin IV, King of Jerusalem 64, 75, 82
Baldwin I, Latin Emperor of Constantinople 120, 156 f.
Baldwin II, Latin Emperor of Constantinople 196, 202, 205, 236 (n.), 237
Balliol College 250
Bamberg, diocesan Synod of (1451) 588, 607
Bandinelli, Roland, Cardinal 52–55, 57, 94, 103; *see also* Alexander III, Pope
Bandinus, Magister 90
baptism 111, 170, 578, 607 f., 613
baptisms, register of 577 f.
Barbo, Louis, Abbot of Santa Giustina 582
Barbo, Peter, Cardinal 540, 543; *see also* Paul II, Pope
Bari 113 f.
— Assembly of (1195) 80
Barlaam of Calabria, Bishop of Gerace 492 f., 499–502, 504, 518
Barletta, Gabriel 577
Bar-Sauma 396
Bartholomew of Dordrecht 428
Bartholomew of Messina 251
Basel, Council of 344, 391, 394, 433, 457, 462, 466, 471 f., *474–87*, 496, 521 f., 531, 533 f., 539 f., 545, 583, 586 f., 595, 612, 614
— opening 474
— dissolution of (1431) 474
— defiance 475
— withdrawal of dissolution 475
— and reunion of Churches 475 f.
— transfer of 476
— and Hussites 476
— and *Compactata* of Prague 476, 538
— and reform 476–79, 486
— and France 482
— and Aragón 482 f., 485
— and Castile 483
— and Burgundy 483
— and England 483
— and Germany 484
— and supremacy in Church 484
— and deposition of Eugene IV 484
— and Felix V 484 f.
— transfer to Lausanne 484
— dissolution of (1449) 485, 531
— evaluation of 486
— effort to reconvoke 545 f.
Basil, Bishop of Reggio 116
Basle, Council of, *see* Basel, Council of
Basssolis, John de 345
Bate, Henry, of Malines 259
Bearers of the Cross, Order of 186
Beatrice of Burgundy, Queen of Germany and Empress 61, 63
Beatus Rhenanus 618
Bec, school of 44 f., 95
Becker, Egeling, of Braunschweig 600 f.
Becket, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury *66–74* 79, 111
Beghards 210, 240, 372, 384, 429
Beguines 109, 210 f., 240, *244–46*, 376, 381, 384 f. 429, 567
Beleth, John 92
Belgrade, relief of 532
Benedict, Cardinal of Santa Susanna 119 f.
Benedict XI, Pope 280, *291 f.*, 293, 296, 341
Benedict XII, Pope *315–20*, 321, 333, 335, 337, 340–43
— career 315 f.
— and Rome 316
— and France 316 f., 320
— and Empire 317–19
— and reform 319 f., 581 f.
— personality of 320
— and reunion of Churches 492 f.
Benedict XIII, Pope at Avignon 335, 402, *410–17*, 419, *420*, 421 f., 424, 448–50, 452, 454 f., 465, 469, 611
— withdrawal of obedience (1398) 413
— siege of 413
— restoration of obedience 414
— and Boniface IX 414
— and Gregory XII 415 f., 421
— withdrawal of obedience (1408) 416 f.
— Council of Perpignan 417, 449
— and Council of Pisa 419 f., 422
— and assembly at Morella 450
— deposition of 454
Benedict, Saint 72
— rule of 13 f., 22
Benedictines 11, 13, 16, 141, 172, 267, *320*, 321, *580–84*, 589
— provinces 582
— congregations 582 f.
benefice 65, 336 f., 343, 463, 472, 477 f., 525, 527, 534, 540, 563

Benevento 5, 53, 61, 77, 533
— battle of 201
— Peace of (1156) 54, 56
— Treaty of (1128) 5
Benizi, Philip 182
Bentivenga of Gubbio 244
Berengar of Perpignan 372
Bergen, Henry von, Bishop of Cambrai 621
Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux *8–10*, 14, 15, 17, *18–22*, 23, 25, 27, 29, 41 f., 45, 47, 48 (n.), 51 f., 54 (n.), 59, 75, 79, 86, 100, 107–12, 137, 375, 438, 440, 604 f.
— and Schism of 1130–38 8–10
— and Roman Curia 20, 33 f.
— and Second Crusade 20 f., 35–38
— literary work of 21
— and Wend Crusade 38 f., 218
Bernard, Cardinal Priest of San Clemente 55
Bernard, Margrave of Baden 408
Bernard of Chartres 48
Bernard of Morlay 41
Bernard of Pavia 225
Bernard of Pisa, Abbot of Sant'Anastasio *see* Eugene III, Pope
Bernard of Ventadour 15
Bernard Primus 170
Bernard Silvestris 48
Bernard Simorre 163
Bernardine of Siena 374, 577, 612
Bernold of Constance 50
Berthold, Count of Katzenelnbogen 155
Berthold of Andechs, Patriarch of Aquileia 223
Berthold of Calabria 182
Berthold of Moosburg 377
Berthold of Regensburg 181, 209
Berthold ten Have 432
Bertrand, Archbishop of Embrun 316
Bertrand of Born 15
Besançon, Diet of (1157) 55, 79
Bessarion, Metropolitan of Nicaea and Cardinal 497, 511, 522
Béziers 164
— Synod of (1246) 216
Bible, printed editions of 580
Biel, Gabriel 435, 577, *599–603*
— theology of 601 f.
— and the Mass 602
Birgitta of Sweden 329, 584 f.
Birgittines 584 f.
bishops, auxiliary 229
Black Death 324, 374, 398, 581, 584, 607 f.
Blanche of Castile, Queen of France 151 (n.)
Blankenheim, Frederick von, Bishop of Utrecht 431
Blommaerdine 384 f.
Bocassini, Nicholas, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 291 f.; *see also* Benedict XI, Pope
Boethius 253, 255, 506
Boethius of Dacia 257
Bogomiles 99, 132 f., 162, 499
Bohemia 209, 215, 443, 445 f., *447 f.*, 457–59, 462, 476, 537 f., 542; *see also* Hus, Hussites, *Compactata*, George of Podiebrad
Bohemond IV, Prince of Antioch 157 f.
Bohemond of Tarentum, Prince of Antioch 116 f.
Bohun, Jocelin de, Bishop of Salisbury 71
Boilas, George 509
Boleslas I, Duke and King of Poland 220
Boleslas III, King of Poland 217
Bologna 322, 326, 328, 373, 410, 449, 469–71, 474 f., 528, 530, 535, 558, 563
— schools of 44, 49 f., 67, 90, 93–95, 102, 138, 140, 224, 247
— University of 96 f., 170, 174, 179 f., 212, 226, *247*, 248–50, 257, 269, 551
Bonagrazia of Bergamo 347, 372 f.
Bonaventure, Cardinal Bishop of Albano 180 f., 183, 206, 210, 241 f., 254, 258–60, 369 f., 438, 440
Bonaventure of Jesi 181
Boniface II, Margrave of Montferrat and King of Thessalonica 155 f.
Boniface VIII, Pope 207, 222, 226, 229, 232, 237, 242 f., 262, 265 f., *269–81*, 291–94, 304, 307, 314, 334, 336, 340 f., 355–57, 370, 479
— and Papal State 270, 305
— and War of Sicilian Vespers 270, 272, 274
— and taxation of clergy 270–72
— and the Colonna 272–74, 285
— and Florence 274
— and canon law 225, 279
— and Albert I 275
— and Jubilee 275 f.
— and Philip IV 270–72, 276–79
— and mendicant orders 279 f., 570
— posthumous fate 280, 291, 296 f., 299, 301
Boniface IX, Pope 410, 412, 414 f., 420, 468 f., 585
Borgia, Alfonso, Cardinal 531, 551; *see also* Calixtus III, Pope
— Caesar, Duke of Valentinois and Romagna 551–53, 556–58
— Geoffrey, Prince of Squillace 551 f.
— Isabella 551
— Jerónima 551
— John, Duke of Gandía and Benevento 551 f., 555
— John, *infans Romanus* 553
— Lucretia, Duchess of Ferrara 551 f., 557
— Peter Louis 551
— Peter Louis, Duke of Benevento 533
— Rodrigo 553
— Rodrigo, Cardinal 533, 548, 550, 552, 554, 557; *see also* Alexander VI, Pope
— family 544 f., 552, 558
Bortz, Prince of the Cumans 395
Bosnia 162
Boso, Cardinal 54
Botone, Bernard de, of Parma 226
Bouvines, battle of (1214) 149, 151
Braccio of Montone 469 f., 472
Bracciolini, Poggio 523
Brancaccio, Cardinal 419, 448
Brando, Bishop of Holar 159 (n.)
Brant, Sebastian 617 f.
Breakspear, Nicholas, Cardinal Bishop of Albano 28, 53; *see also* Hadrian IV, Pope
Brixen 588, 590

brothers, lay 13 f., 17, 109, 430, 434
Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit 384, 427
Brothers of Saint John the Baptist 88
Brothers of the Common Life 427 f., *429–32*, 433, *434–36*, 437 f., 440, 584 f., 597 f., 600
— literary work 430, 437–43
— organization 434–36
— opposition to 436 f., 461
— and education 429–31, 438 f., *see also* Windesheim Congregation
Brothers of the Holy Sepulchre 186 f.
Brothers of the New Spirit 245
Bruni, Leonard 421, 523
Bruno, Archbishop of Trier 610
Bruno, Bishop of Olomouc 204 f.
Bruno, Bishop of Strasbourg 24
Bruno, papal legate 117
Bruno of Cologne 43
Bruno of Querfurt 217
Bryennius, Joseph 510 f., 517 f.
Buisine, Eustace 254
Bulgaria 147, 154, 494
Buonarrotti, Michelangelo 560, 565
Burckard of Strasbourg 548, 556
Buren, Emil van 431
Burgundio of Pisa 49, 131
Burgundy 451 f., 475, 483, 536
Buridan, John 351, 354
Bursfeld, Congregation of 583, 589
Busch, John 426, 432 f., 439, 583, 589
Busche, Hermann von dem 616
Byzantine Church *113–35*, 205 f., 462, *488–520*
— hierarchy 128–30, 514–16
— literature 134 f., 505–13
— missionary activity 516–18
— in Asia Minor 513 f.
— Patriarch of Constantinople 514–16
— relations with Eugene IV and Council of Basel 475 f., 486, 496
— and Council of Ferrara-Florence 479–81, 496–98; *see also* monasticism, Byzantine, mysticism, Byzantine
Byzantine Empire 36–38, 52, 61 f., 64, 99, *113–35*, 203, 284, *488–520*
— and Norman Italy 114 f., 118
— anti-Latin bitterness 119, 135
— relations with Eugene IV and Council of Basel 475 f., 486, 496
— and Council of Ferrara-Florence 479–81, 496–98
— and Ottomans 491, 494
— intellectual life 505–13
— humanism 505–507, 509, 511

Cabala 524, 609 f., 619
Cairo 281, 283, 393
Calabria 54, 209, 238, 240, 270, 584
Calecas, Manuel 504, 508
Calixtus II, Pope 3–6, 8, 12, 13 (n.), 27, 261
Calixtus III, Antipope 61, 63 f.
Calixtus III, Pope 400, *531–33*, 548, 551
— and crusade 531 f.
— nepotism 533
Cambalu *see* Peking
Cambrai, League of (1509) 558
Cambridge, University of 249, 257
Camera Apostolica 82, 261, 263, *246 f.*, 269, 325, 334, 337 f., *339–44*, 407, 463, 471 f.
— account books 339, 341 f.
— income 339–41
— expenditures 342 f.
— in Renaissance 525 f.
camerlengo of College of Cardinals 261, 264
camerlengo of Roman Church 31 f., 81, 262–65, 339, 532, 565
Can Grande della Scala 360
canonization of saints 227
canon law, Byzantine 129 f.
canon law, "new" *49 f.*, 51, 58, 66, 68 f., 91, *93 f.*, 95 f., 106, 136, 139, *224–26*, *229*, 248, 262
— method of instruction 225
canons regular 3, 6, 10, *16*, 17–20, 23, 25 f., 28, 40–42, 46, 52, 58, 77, 112, 140, 172, 175, 184, 186, 217, 474, 582; *see also* Windesheim Congregation
Canterbury 66–68, 70–74, 150 f., 258
— pilgrimage to 74, 111
capella, papal 31 f., 262 f., 332, 335
capellani, papal 263, 266, 335
capitulation, election 526–28, 539, 545
— of 1352 324 f., 336
— of 1431 473 f., 479
— of 1458 533 f.
— of 1464 540 f., 543
— of 1471 543 f., 546 f.
— of 1484 548, 557
— of 1492 550
— of 1503 557
— of 1513 561
Capranica, Dominic, Cardinal 473, 533 f.
Capua, County of 5, 54
Caracciolo, Robert 577
Carcassonne 163–65
Cardinals, College of 3, 6 f., 15 f., 31 f., 57, 65, 79, 81 f., 138, 194, 228, 231, *260–62*, 264, 267, 291, 293, 295, 307 f., 313, 327, 329 f., *335 f.*, 339, 401 f., 404, 410 f., 463
— at Avignon 333–36
— and capitulations 324 f., 336
— opposition to departure from Avignon 328 f.
— and Urban VI 404 f.
— and Benedict XIII 413 f.
— and Gregory XII 416
— and ending of the Schism 417
— and Council of Pisa 417–19
— in conciliar theory 425
— at Council of Constance 452, 455
— reform of 464 f.
— and Eugene IV 473–75
— and Council of Basel 478 f.
— in Renaissance 526 f., 531, 533 f., 539–41, 544, 547 f., 550–52, 555, 557 f., 561–65, 592
Carmelite Order 181 f., 207, 581
Carta Caritatis 12 f., 17, 19
Carthusians 43, 58, 325, 427, 581, 583 f.
Carvajal, John, Cardinal 532
Castel Sant'Angelo 402, 406, 437, 462, 527, 533, 541, 546–48, 553, 561, 564

Castile 146, 173, 208, 301, 323, 400, 403, 412, 414, 424, 475, 483, 555, 584
— decision for Clement VII 403, 407
Catalan Company 490
Catalonia 208, 450
catechesis 87, 110, 174, 183, 576, *578–80*
Cathala, Jordan, of Sévérac, Bishop of Quilon 398
Cathari 99–102, 104, *162–66*, 173 f., 189, *208*, 209 f., 214, 240, 284; *see also* Albigensians
Catherine of Courtenay 270, 490
Catherine of Siena 329, 332
Catherine of Sweden 584
Cattaneis, Vanozza de 551 f.
Causis, Michael de 457
Celestine II, "Antipope" 4
Celestine II, Pope 16, 35 (n.), 227
Celestine III, Pope *79–82*, 137, 139
Celestine IV, Pope 193
Celestine V, Pope 207, 222, 228, 237, 240, 242, *267–69*, 270, 273, 280, 297, 370
Celestine Order 267 f.
celibacy, clerical 65, 140, 161
— disregard of 428, 557, 589
Celtis, Conrad 614 f., 618
centralization of Church government 336–44
Cesarini, Julian, Cardinal 472, 474–76, 478, 486
Chalant, Anthony de, Cardinal 450
chancellor, papal 31 f., 81, 262
Chancery, papal 82, 194, *263 f.*, 266, 271, *337 f.*, 465, 471
chaplains 231, 263, 266, 335
chapters of canons 168, 171, 195, 206, 227, 231, 248
— cathedral 231 f., 276, 417
charistikariate 133 f.
Charles, Count of Valois 238–40, 270, 274, 284, 305, 490
Charles II the Lame, King of Naples 238–40, 268–70, 291, 293 f., 308, 490
Charles III, King of Naples 409
Charles IV, King of Bohemia and Germany and Emperor 319, 322, 326, 328 f., 607 f.
Charles IV, King of France 490
Charles V, King of France 406
Charles VI, King of France 411–14, 450, 459, 494
Charles VII, King of France 482, 535
Charles VIII, King of France 553 f., 558, 560
Charles Martel, King of Hungary 235, 238
Charles I, King of Spain (Charles V, King of Germany and Emperor) 563 f., 623
Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily 85, 124, 127, *199–203*, 205, *234–38*, 283 f., 488
Charles the Great, canonization of 60, 111
Charlier, Aegidius 476
chartophylax 125, 127, 129 f.
Chartres, school of 44, 48, 95, 247
Chezal-Benoît, reform of 583
children, religious instruction of, *see* catechesis
China, evangelization in 396–99
Chioniades, Gregory, Bishop of Tabriz 516 f.
chorepiscopus 229
Christburg, Peace of (1249) 220 f.
Christian of Buch, Archbishop of Mainz 60, 63 f., 75
Christian of Lekno, Bishop of the Prussians 220
Christodulus 113
Chrysoberges, Andrew, Archbishop of Nicosia 509
Chrysoberges, Maximus 509
Chrysoloras, Demetrius 509
Chrysoloras, Manuel 495, 509, 522
Chumnus, Nicephorus 506
Church, constitution of 226–33
— at Avignon 335–44
— papacy 226–28
— councils 228, 423–25, 462, 465, 467, 472, 484, 527 f., 539, 586
— episcopate 228–30
— archdeaconries 230
— rural deaneries 230 f.
— parishes 231
— cathedral chapters 231 f.
— laity 232 f.
— criticism of 240–44
— Curia 262–67, 334–44
— centralization 336–44
— Ockham 365–88
— Wyclif 446
— Hus 448, 458
Church-State relations 355–68
— in Byzantine Empire 515 f.
Cibò, Franceschetto 549
Cibò, John Baptist, Cardinal 548, 550; *see also* Innocent VIII, Pope
cipher, use of 314, 338 f.
Cistercian nuns 109, 176, 244 f., 376
Cistercian Order 6, *12–15*, 18, 22, 26 f., 71, 112, 140, 162 f., 172, 175, 184, 217 f., 271, 279, 315, *319 f.*, 391, 394, 581, 584
— constitution of 13 f., 171
Cîteaux 3 f., 12–15, 17–20, 23, 29, 39–41, 58, 61, 160, 168; *see also* Cistercian Order
cities, growth of 566
Cividale, Council of (1409) 449
Clairvaux 12, 14, 18–22, 61
Clare of Assisi 178
Clare of Montefalcone 244
Clarenbald of Arras 48
Clarendon, royal council at (1164) 69; *see also* Constitutions of Clarendon
Claudius, Bishop of Turin 604
Clement III, Pope *78 f.*, 81, 83, 85, 138, 232
Clement IV, Pope 124, 186, *201 f.*, 258, 284, 375
Clement V, Pope 222 f., 269, 280, 287, *294–307*, 308 f., 334–36, 340–43, 370, 372, 397, 463, 490
— and Rome 295
— character 295 f.
— and process against Boniface VIII 296 f., 299, 301
— and the Templars 297–301, 303 f.
— and Council of Vienne 300–03
— and Italy and Papal State 304 f.
— and the Empire 305–07
— nepotism of 341, 343
Clement VI, Pope 320, *321–24*, 325, 327, 330, 333, 338, 340–43, 360, 608
— career 321
— and Hundred Years' War 321
— and the Empire 321 f.

— and Italy 322 f.
— and Rome 322 f.
— and Rienzo 322 f.
— and Jubilee of 1350 322 f.
— and Naples 323
— display 323 f.
— and reunion of the Churches 493
Clement VII, Pope at Avignon 403, *405–10,* 411, 424 f.
— obedience of 406–08
— at Avignon 406
Clementines 303
clergy, education of 575 f.
clergy, moral defects of 160 f., 389
clerical exemption from taxation 171, 191, *270–72,* 358, 567 f.
"Clericis laicos" 271–73, 276, 356
Clermont, Synod of (1130) 10
Cluny 4–6, 8, 11–16, 19–21, 40 f., 44, 46, 58, 160, 264, 583
Colet, John 621
Collège Montaigu 621
Cologne, Dominican house at 255, 377 f., 381 f.
Cologne, provincial Council of (1452) 589, 607
Cologne, University of 352 (n.), 353 f., 570, 585, 597 f., 600, 616, 619 f.
Colombini, John 584
Colonna 267, 269, *272–74,* 278 f., 291, 293 f., 296, 316, 468, 470 f., 473 f., 528, 531, 545, 548, 553
— crusade against 274, 285
— James, Cardinal 272 f., 278, 291–93
— John, Cardinal 178
— Oddo, Cardinal 448, 455–57; *see also* Martin V, Pope
— Peter, Cardinal 272 f., 278, 291–93
— Prospero, Cardinal 528
— Sciarra 279, 312, 356
— Stephen 272
Columbus, Christopher 555
commenda 319, 463–65, 527, 581–83
communion 111, 171, 441, 443, 456, 572, 578
— under both species 456, 476, 537; *see also* Eucharist, Mass
Compactata of Prague 476, 537 f.; *see also* Hussites
Compilatio tertia 224
Compilatio quinta 224
Compostela, pilgrimage to 28, 60, 86, 111, 584
Comtat Venaissin 323
conciliarism 423–25, 486 f., 492, 494, 496, 527, 534, 539, 545 f., 586
conclave *206 f.,* 228, 234, 268, 293, 420, 526, 559
— of 1304–05 292–94
— of 1314–16 308
— of 1352 324, 346
— of 1362 327
— of 1370 330
— of 1378 401 f., 405
— of 1389 410
— of 1394 410
— of 1409 421 f.
— of 1417 455 f., 468
— of 1431 473 f.
— of 1447 528
— of 1455 531
— of 1458 533
— of 1464 540
— of 1471 543
— of 1484 548 f.
— of 1492 550
— of 1503 557, 558
— of 1513 561
Concordat of Bologna (1516) 563, 583
Concordat of the Princes (1447) 485, 530, 588
Concordat of Vienna (1448) 485, 530, 588
Concordat of Worms (1122) 3–5, 8, 22, 24, 52, 149
Condulmer, Gabriel, Cardinal 473; *see also* Eugene IV, Pope
confession 110 f., 171, 225, 233, 361, 446, 570, 575 f., 578 f., 589
Conrad, Archbishop of Mainz 85
Conrad, Archbishop of Salzburg 9, 60
Conrad, Bishop of Halberstadt 155
Conrad, Bishop of Hildesheim 85
Conrad III, King of Germany 21, 23 f., *35–38,* 51
—, as Antiking 5
Conrad IV, King of Germany and Jerusalem 190, 192, 198 f., 284
Conrad of Gelnhausen 424
Conrad of Marburg 213
Conrad of Megenburg 363
Conrad of Montferrat, King of Jerusalem 85
Conrad of Offida 242
Conrad of Saxony 181
Conrad of Soltau 428
Conrad of Suburra, Cardinal, *see* Anastasius IV, Pope
Conrad of Urach, Cardinal 177
Conrad of Urslingen, Duke of Spoleto 80
Conrad von Wittelsbach, Archbishop of Mainz 60, 148
Conradin of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia and King of Jerusalem 198, 200–02, 204, 237, 284
consistory 32, 261 f., 265, 268, 297 f., 301 f., 317, 322, 331, 334, 336, 339, 421, 464, 527, 540 f., 563, 565
consolamentum 100, 102
Constance, Ecumenical Council of (1414–18) 344, 353, 374, 419 f., 423, 436, 440, 445 f., *448–68,* 469–71, 473, 475–79, 482 f., 485 f., 526, 534, 539 f., 545, 582, 613 f.
— and King Sigismund 449–51
— and John XXIII 450 f.
— program 452
— problem of unity 452–56
— doctrinal questions 456–62
— problem of reform 462–68, 476
— supremacy of the Council 452 (n.), 462, 467
— execution of Hus 458
— execution of Jerome of Prague 459
— decree "Frequens" 466, 528
— evaluation of 466–68
— and reunion of the Churches 495
Constance, Queen of Sicily and Germany and Empress 76–81, 145, 152, 154
Constance, Peace of (1183) 74 (n.), 75
Constance, Treaty of (1153) 52–54, 56
Constance of Sicily, Queen of Aragón 238 f., 270

Constantine IX, Byzantine Emperor 129
Constantine XI, Byzantine Emperor 497
Constantine Chrysomallus 133
Constantine Meliteniotes 126
Constantinople 113–35, 156 f., 202, 229, 237, 475 f., 489 f., 493, 495–98, 500, 512, 522, 529, 531 f., 590
— recovery of (1261) 123, 202, 491
— higher school system 129–31
— Synods of 1341 501 f.
— Synod of 1351 503
— Patriarch of 514–17
Constitutiones Aegidianae 326
Constitutions of Clarendon 68–71, 74
Constitutum Constantini 55, 305, 358, 522, 586
Conti, Gregory, Cardinal *see* Victor IV, "Anti-pope"
Conventual Franciscans 242, 273, 301, 370 f., 374 f., 581
conversi 13 f.
Cordus, Euricius 618
Corinth 123, 518
Corneto 328, 332
Correr, Angelus, Cardinal 415; *see also* Gregory XII, Pope
Corsica 270, 304
Cortenuova, battle of 192
Cossa, Baldassarre, Cardinal 422; *see also* John XXIII, Pope of Pisan obedience
Courtenay, William, Archbishop of Canterbury 444 f.
Courtrai, battle of 278
courts, ecclesiastical, in England 66–69, 73 f.
Cramaud, Simon de, Latin Patriarch of Alexandria 416–19, 421
Crescas, Chasdai ben Abraham 609
Crescentius of Jesi 242
Crete 123, 510, 517
Crispin, Gilbert, Abbot of Westminster 610
Crivelli, Uberto, Archbishop of Milan *see* Urban III, Pope
Crotus Rubeanus 618, 620
Crusade, First 116 f., 281, 604 f.
Crusade of 1101 605
Crusade, Second 15, *20 f.*, 25, 30, *35–38*, 66, 85, 152, 283, 605
Crusade, Third 77 f., *83–85*, 605
— financing of 83 f.
Crusade, Fourth 119, 135, *155 f.*, 167, 282, 514
Crusade, Albigensian *164 f.*, 166, 189, 211, 214, 248, 284 f.
— financing of 164
Crusade, Children's (1212) 158
Crusade, Fifth 169 f., 178, 189, *282*
— preparations 170
Crusade, Sixth *189 f.*, 282
Crusade, Seventh 283
Crusade, Eighth 283
Crusade, Stedinger 284
Crusade, Wend 21, 29, *38 f.*, 217 f., 284
Crusade against Aragón 239
crusade against heretics 65 f., 103 f., 163–65, 211, 240
crusade, criticism of 286
Crusade, double, of 1239–41 282 f.
Crusade of Henry VI 80 f., 85
Crusade of Nicopolis 494
Crusade of Varna 497
crusade organization 285
crusade piety 17, *86–88*, 108, 110, 245, 282, 285
crusades, political 284 f., 310, 328, 331
crusade preaching 84, 86 f., 110, 155, 164, 168, 170, 239, 282, 285, 321, 392, 490
crusade propaganda 286 f.
cubicularii 335, 539
Cuissy 17
Cumans 173, 176, 220, 395
Curia, Roman 3–6, 8, 15, 20, 25, 27–29, *30–34*, 35, 37, 49, 52 f., 55 f., 61, 64, 68 f., 71, 73, 75–82, 115, 138 f., 144, 147–50, 152, 168, 178, 180 f., 194, 200, 202, 212–14, 218 f., 221, 223, 227, 247 f., *262–67*, 269–75, 279 f., 285–87, 295 f., 299–301, 307 f., 312, 316–18, 321–23, 326, 330, *334–44*, 347, 368, 370 f., 373, 401, 414, 420, 445, 448–50, 453, 476, 521, 524
— struggle against Frederick II 189–98
— reform of 160 f., 205
— and the Sicilian problem 199–202
— and Greek Church 127
— under Angevin influence 234–40, 267 f.
— University of the 247, 251, 255
— Chancery 263 f., 337 f.
— Camera 264 f., 339–44
— judicial offices 265 f.
— and John XXII 315
— and Benedict XII 319
— and Clement VI 324
— and return to Rome 328-33
— at Avignon 334–44
— reservations 336 f.
— and banking firms 342 f.
— use of revenue 343
— defense of 356–59
— defection from Urban VI 406
— reform of, at Constance 462–68
— and Martin V 468–73
— and Eugene IV 473 f., 477–81, 486 f.
— and Charles VII 482
— and Aragón 482
— and Germany 484
— and reunion of the Churches 490, 495
— and the Turks 525
— in the Renaissance 524–28, 533 f., 538–40, 542 f., 546–48, 551 f., 554 f., 560 f., 563 f., 572, 591 f., 615, 617
— criticism of *32–34*, 137, 240–44, 286, 312, 316, 318, 336, *343 f.*, 363, 365, 385, 615, 617 f.
cursores curiam sequentes 338
cursores papae 338
custodian of church 568 f.
Cyprus 80, 84 f., 182, 190, 300, 510, 517 f.

Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa and Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem 117
Dalmatia 154, 178
Damascus 37 f., 223, 281, 283, 393
Damasus, Hungarian canonist 226
Damietta 189, 221, 282 f.

Dandolo, Henry, Doge of Venice 156
Dante 179, 292 (n.), 293 (n.), 294, 306
Dataria 525, 547
David, Bishop of Utrecht 599
David of Augsburg 209, 438
David of Dinant 209 f., 252
deans, rural 230 f.
De consideratione 21, 38
decretalists 225 f., 423
decretals, collections of 224 f.
decretists 50, 93, 103, 107, 224, 423
Decretum Gratiani *49 f.*, 68 f., 90, 93 f., 103, 107, 130, 224
Dederoth, John, Abbot of Bursfeld 583
Defensor pacis 359, *360–63*, 364, 391
demarcation, line of 555
Demetrius of Lampe 132
Denmark 153, 219 f.
"Deum time" 277
devolution, right of 65 f., 227
devotio moderna 353, 355, *426–43*, 597–99, 616 f.
— translations 436
— literature 430, 437–43; *see also* Brothers of the Common Life, Windesheim Congregation
didaskaloi 130, 132
Dieburg, Peter 437
Dieter von Isenburg, Archbishop of Mainz 538, 600
Dietrich, Archbishop of Cologne 169
Dietrich of Freiberg 377
Dietrich of Niem 363, 453, 458, 463 f.
Dijon 18 f.
Dionysius the Carthusian 46, 353, 440, 584
Di Vico, John, Prefect 326
Docking, Thomas, of Norfolk 257
Dolcino of Novara 243
Dôle, Synod of (1162) 59
Domenichi, Dominic de', Bishop of Torcello 539, 591
Dominican nuns 176 f., 375, 378, 383
Dominican Order *173–77*, 179–81, 183, 213, 219 f., 222–24, 228, 234, 274, 291 f., 320, 338, 376–78, 382 f., 389, 492, 546, 554, 570, 582, 613
— constitution of 175 f.
— expansion of 176
— and Inquisition 176, 183, 215
— missionary work of 222–24, 391–400
— and universities 248, 255 f., 259
Dominic Guzmán 164, *173–76*, 178 f., 181, 391
Dominici, John, Cardinal 421, 454
dominion, universal, theory of 356 f.
Donation of Constantine see Constitutum Constantini
Dorylaeum 36
double truth 210, 256 f., 564, 598
Dovizi da Bibbiena, Bernard, Cardinal 561
Doxopatres 134
Dringenberg, Louis 616
Dschem, Prince 549
Dubois, Peter 286 f., 359, 490
Duèse, James, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 308; *see also* John XXII, Pope
Dungersheym, Jerome 577
Duns Scotus, John 183, 254 f., 258–60, 345, 391
Durandus of Huesca 166, 170, 173, 208
Durandus of Saint-Pourçain 345

Ebendorfer, Thomas 485
Eberhard I, Archbishop of Salzburg 58 f.
Eberhard, Bishop of Bamberg 61
Eberhard V the Bearded, Count of Württemberg 408, 435, 600, 619
Eberwin, Provost of Steinfeld 100
Ebner, Christine 388
Ebner, Margaret 383, 389
Eck, John 576, 599
Eckhart, Master 315, *377–81*, 382–84, 388, 390, 426 f., 586, 609
— writings 378
— doctrine 378–81
Edessa 20
Edmund of England 199 f.
Edward the Confessor, King of England, canonization of 111
Edward I, King of England 239, 270 f., 274
Edward III, King of England 318
Eger, Henry, of Kalkar 427, 584
Egypt 155, 189, 237, 396
Ekbert 112
Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of France and of England 25, 36 f., 66, 109
elections, ecclesiastical 171, 207, 225, 266, 477 f., 482
— of pastors 568; *see also* papal electoral law
Elias of Cortona 178–80, 242
Elizabeth of Schönau 112
Elten, Gerard von 597
Embrich of Leiningen, Bishop of Würzburg 24
Emeric, King of Hungary 146 f.
Emmenhard, Bishop of Mecklenburg 29
Empire, Holy Roman 4 f., 8 f., *23 f.*, *51–64*, *75–80*, 82, 140, 142 f., 145, *147–49*, 152, 154, *188–98*, 200, 202 f., 211 f., 214, 220, 229, 261, 264, 275, *305–07*, *309–13*, *317–19*, *321 f.*, 406–08, 482, 537, 586, 588
— Interregnum 202, 204; *see also* Germany, Lombardy
"Engelberg Preacher" 384
Engelberti, Ulric, of Strasbourg 255, 377, 575
England *25–27*, *66–74*, 80, *150–52*, 168, 174, 182, 189, 195, 199 f., 208, 248 f., 257 f., 269, *270–72*, 275, 300, 309, 316, 321 f., 335, 340, 343, 346, 406, 409, 412 f., *443–47*, 451, 462, 475, 482 f., 525, 608, 621–23
— episcopal elections in 66–69
— fief of Holy See 151
— Wyclif 443–47
Enguerran de Marigny 297, 299, 301
Enzio, King of Sardinia 192
Eobanus Hessus 618
Epirus 490
— Despotate of 120, 123, 156 f.
episcopate 228–30
Epistola de vita et passione Christi 439 f.
Epistolae obscurorum virorum 619
Eppe, John d', rector of Romagna 236
Erasmus, Desiderius 523, 599, 616, *620–24*
— biblical and patristic editions 622–24

— and England 621–23
Erfurt, University of 352 (n.), 354, 570, 595, 599 f., 616
Erfurt Circle 616, 618, 620
Eric IX, King of Sweden 219
Eskil, Archbishop of Lund 55
Estates General 277, 279, 299, 301
Este, Alfonso d', Duke of Ferrara 552
Esthonia 217, 219 f.
Estouteville, William d', Cardinal 533, 551
Étampes, Synod of (1130) 19
Eteriano, Hugh 117, 131 f., 135
Euboea 490, 542
Eucharist 170 f., 255, 347, *349 f.*, 376, 444, 447, 457, 480f., *570–74*, 589, 592, 599f., 603f., 606, 612
— benediction, exposition, procession 572; *see also* communion, liturgy, transubstantiation
Eudes, Abbot of Ourscamp, Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum 92
Eudes de l'Étoile 98 f.
Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris 137, 162
Eugene III, Pope 13, 15 f., 20 f., 27, 29 f., 33, 35–38, 51–53, 54 (n.), 75, 152
Eugene IV, Pope 374, 399, 437, 467, *473–87*, 515, 528, 540 f., 582, 587
— and Council of Basel 474–76, 479
— and Greeks 475 f.
— reservations 477 f.
— and Council of Ferrara-Florence 479–82
— and reunion of Churches 480 f., 496
— and France 482
— and Aragón 482 f.
— and Castile 483
— and Burgundy 483
— deposition of 483 f.
— and Alfonso V 485, 522, 531
— and Germany 485
— character 487
Eustace, son of King Stephen 51
Eustathius, Metropolitan of Thessalonica 130, 134
Eustratius, Metropolitan of Nicaea 131
Euthymius Zigabenos 132
"Execrabilis" 539
exemption 24, 32, 34, 56, 133, 302, 463, 465 f.
— of Cistercians 13, 15
— of Benedictines 16
— of Premonstratensians 17
— of mendicant orders 279 f., 302, 590
"Exivi de Paradiso" 302, 371
exokatakoiloi 129
expectatives 227, 269, 319, 407, 463, 471, 563
Eyb, Albert von 615
Eymerich, Nicholas 424

Falconieri, Juliana 182
Falkenberg, John 461 f., 467 (n.)
fanaticism, Christian 240–46
— Joachimism 241
— Spirituals 241–43
— Apostolics 243 f.
— Beguines 244–46
Farnese, Alexander, Cardinal 552; *see also* Paul III, Pope
Farnese, Julia 552
Fatimids 116
Felix V, Antipope 483, *484 f.*, 534, 540
Ferdinand I, King of Aragón 450, 454
Ferdinand III, King of Castile 197
Fernández Pecha, Peter 584
Ferrante, King of Naples 533–36, 549 f.
Ferrara 305, 496, 545 f., 565
Ferrara-Florence, Ecumenical Council of *479–82*, 496, 504, 510, 512, 515
— reunion of the Churches 480 f.
— transfer to Rome 480
— attendance 481 f.
Ferrer, Vincent 424, 577
Ficinus, Marsilius 522–24
Fidentius of Padua 204 (n.), 286
Fieschi, Ottobono, Cardinal 200 (n.), 234; *see also* Adrian V, Pope
Fieschi, Sinibaldo, Cardinal 194, 226; *see also* Innocent IV, Pope
Figueras, Treaty of (1293) 240
Finland 217, 219
Fisher, John, Bishop of Rochester 621
Fitzherbert, William 27
Flanders 272
Flandrin, jurist 424
Floreffe 17
Florence 274, 304, 328–32, 342, 409 f., 417, 437, 449 f., 461, 469 f., 474 f., 496, 509, 531
— in Renaissance 522 f., 525, 529, 535 f., 542, 544 f., 549, 554, 559, 561 f., 565; *see also* Ferrara-Florence, Ecumenical Council of
Florens of Wewelinghoven, Bishop of Utrecht 428
Flotte, Peter 272 f., 276–78
Floyran, Esquiu de 298
Foliot, Gilbert, Bishop of London 67 (n.), 71, 73
Folmar, Archbishop of Trier 76–78
Fondi 405 f., 424
Fonseca, Peter de, Cardinal 495
Fontevrault 29, 244
Foulque, Bishop of Toulouse 174
Fournier, James, Cardinal 315; *see also* Benedict XII, Pope
France *24 f.*, 29, 59–61, 150, *152 f.*, 162–65, 173 f., 182, 186 f., 189, 200, 208 f., 211 f., 214–16, 239, 269, *270–72*, 273–75, *276–79*, 284, 291, *296–301*, 303–07, 309, 311, 316, 318 f., 321 f., 328, 333, 335, 340, 343 f., 358 f., 393, 405 f., 409 f., 412 f., 416, 442 f., 449, 451, 469, 475, 482 f., 485, 525, 529, 534–36, 538, 543, 549, 552–54, 558–64, 583, 592, 608, 617
— subordination of Church to crown 153
— veering of papacy to 199 ff.
Francesi, John 272
Francis I, King of France 563 f.
Franciscan Order *177–81*, 182, *222 f.*, 240, 273 f., 312, 318, 320, 346, 360, 366, 376, 392, 422, 492, 558, 570, 581 f., 584, 613
— expansion of 178, 181
— constitution of 178
— and fanaticism 240, 241–43, 244
— missionary work of 221–24, 391–400
— and the universities 248 f., 254 f., 257–59; *see also* Conventuals, Observant movement, Poor Clares, poverty dispute, Spirituals

Francis of Assisi 106, 173, *177–81*, 189, 221, 241, 369 f., 374, 391, 395, 543
— rules of 178, 369, 391
— personality 179 f.
Francis of Paula 584; *see also* Minims
Frangipani 6–8, 137
— Cencio 5
— Leo 4
Frankfurt, Diet of (1147) 21, 38
— Diets of (1338) 318
— Diet of (1339) 318 f.
Fraticelli 244, 326, 372
Frederick, Archbishop of Magdeburg 589
Frederick III, Duke of Swabia 33; *see also* Frederick I, King of Germany and Emperor
Frederick IV, Duke of Swabia 83 f.
Frederick, Elector of Saxony 563
Frederick I, King of Germany and Emperor 29, *51–64*, 66, 68, 70 f., 74 f., 78–80, 96, 99, 118, 163, 211
— and Hadrian IV 53–57
— and Alexander III 57–64
— and Lucius III 75 f.
— and Urban III 77
— and Clement III 78
— imperial coronation of 54 f.
— and Third Crusade 83 f.
— and the Jews 605
— death of 84
Frederick II, King of Germany and Emperor and King of Sicily 80 f., 122 f., 145 f., 148, 150, 154, 168 f., *188–98*, 199, 202, 205, 216, 219 f., 247, 260, 283–85
— separation of Sicily and Empire 145, 149, 188
— King of Germany 149, 169
— crusade vow 149, 188 f.
— imperial coronation of 188
— excommunication of 190
— and Sixth Crusade 189 f., 282
— King of Jerusalem 190
— reconciliation with Gregory IX 191
— and Sicilian Kingdom 191
— and Lombard cities 192
— second excommunication of 192 f.
— prevents meeting of council 193
— and Innocent IV 194–98
— deposition of 197
— death of 198
— legislation against heresy 212–14
— and the Jews 605, 613
Frederick III, King of Germany and Emperor 484, 530, 533, 535, 542 f., 546, 568, 589, 607 f., 615
Frederick II of Aragón, King of Sicily 240, 270, 272, 274, 304, 309
Frederick II of Habsburg 309, 311, 490
Frederick IV of Habsburg, Duke of Tirol 451 f.
Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia 4 f.
"Frequens" 466 f., 472, 474–76, 479, 482, 528
Friars Minor, *see* Franciscan Order
Friedauer, Bartholomew 384
"friends of God" 381–83, 389
Froben, John 622
Fugger, James 576
Fulcher, Patriarch of Jerusalem 37
Fulco, Bishop of Reval 219
Fulco of Marseilles 15
Fulda, Diet of (1170) 61
Fulk of Neuilly 155

Gaetani 280, 291, 294
Gaetani, Benedict, Cardinal 268 f., 273, 292, 296; *see also* Boniface VIII, Pope
— Francis, Cardinal 294
— Stefaneschi, James, Cardinal 294, 336
Gallego, Peter 251
Gallus, Thomas, of Saint-Victor 254
Galvano of Levanti 286
Gandulf 90
Gansfort, Wessel 442, 594, 597, *598 f.*
Garatenses 208
Gascony 270, 294 f., 307, 335
Gaufrid of Auxerre, Abbot of Hautcombe 101 (n.)
Gaufridi, Raymond 370
Gazan, Il-khan 396
Gebhard of Henneberg 24
Geiler von Kaysersberg, John 577, 579, 618
Gelasius I, Pope 58, 355
Gelasius II, Pope 16
Gelmírez, Diego, Archbishop of Compostela 27
Gelnhausen, Diet of (1186) 77
Genoa 192, 194, 235, 274, 281, 323, 325, 409, 414 f., 450, 536, 548
Geoffrey, Count of Anjou 26, 66
Geoffrey de Villehardouin 155
George, King of the Ongüt 397
George, Patriarch of Constantinople 166 (n.)
George Acropolites 126
George Metochites 126
George Pachymeres 125
George of Podiebrad, King of Bohemia 537 f., 542
Geraldus Oddonis 373
Gerard II, Archbishop of Bremen 284
Gerard, Bishop of Angoulême 8
Gerard, Cardinal of Santa Croce 4
Gerard of Borgo San Donnino 209, 241, 369
Gerard of Cremona 251
Gerard of Parma, Cardinal 238
Gerhoh of Reichersberg 33 f., 41–43, 52 f., 58, 60, 89, 106, 112, 132
German Theology 390
Germanus III, Patriarch of Constantinople 126
Germany 174, 185–88, *191 f.*, 195, 197–200, 204, 208, 215 f., 235 f., 270, 272, 274 f., 284, 300, 305 f., *311–13*, 317, 319, 322, 360, 363, 376, 407 f., 415, 426, *434–36*, 449, 472, 475, 483 f., 521, 525, 534, 559 f., 563 f., 576, 578, 580, 582 f., 588 f., 592
— Interregnum 202, 204
— universities in 352–54, 595
— mysticism in 375–90
— cities 566–68
— humanism in 614–24
— and the Jews 605–08, 612 f.; *see also* Empire, Low Countries
Gerona, Council of (1143) 27
Gersen, Abbot 440

Gerson, John 46, 352 f., 387–89, 430, 436, 440, 456 f., 460 f., 464, 467 (n.), 573, 577, 579
Gertrude the Great 376, 427
Gervase, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople 169
ghetto, Jewish 604, 608
Ghibellines 194, 200–03, 235 f., 239, 269, 305, 309, 311–13, 360
Giffoni, Leonard, Cardinal 408
Gilbert Anglicus 225
Gilbert de la Porrée, Bishop of Poitiers 44 f., *47 f.*, 49, 51, 53, 89 (n.), 90, 92 f., 254
Gilbert of Hoyland 42
Gilbert of Sempringham 20
Gilbert *universalis* 45
Giles of Rome 259; *see also* Aegidius Romanus
Giraldus Cambrensis 15
Glabas, Isidore, Metropolitan of Thessalonica 510
glossators 90, 93 f., 224 f.
Godfrey, Bishop of Chartres 10
Godfrey de la Roche-Vanneau, Bishop of Langres 18–20, 26 (n.), 36
Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lotharingia 116
Godfrey of Fontaines 259
Godfrey I of Helfenstein, Bishop of Würzburg 83
Godfrey of Poitiers 254
Godfrey of Saint-Victor 42
Godfrey of Trani 226
Goffredo Castiglioni, Cardinal, *see* Celestine IV, Pope
Golden Bull of Eger (1213) 145, 149
Golden Bull of Rimini (1226) 220
Gossembrot, Sigismund 615
Got, Bérard de, Archbishop of Lyons, Cardinal Bishop of Albano 294
Got, Bertrand de, Archbishop of Bordeaux 294; *see also* Clement V, Pope
Grabow, Matthew 436 f., 461 f.
Grandmont, Order of 160
Gratian, canonist *49 f.*, 93 f., 233; *see also Decretum Gratiani*
Gratian, Cardinal 94
Gratius, Ortwinus, Master 619
Gravina, Concordat of (1192) 79
Gray, Walter, Bishop of Worcester, Archbishop of York 169
Gregoras, Nicephorus 503, 505, 507, 518
Gregory, Cardinal Deacon of Sant'Angelo, *see* Innocent II, Pope
Gregory III, Patriarch of Constantinople 497
Gregory VII, Pope 16, 114 f., 139, 146, 197
Gregory VIII, Pope 77, 83, 94, 138
Gregory IX, Pope 175 f., 179 f., 182, *189–93*, 194, 211, 220, 222 f., 230, 242, 248, 252 f., 260, 265, 279, 282–84, 370, 392
— and Frederick II 189–93
— and Inquisition 211, 213–16
— and canon law 224 f., 262
Gregory X, Pope *124–27*, *203–07*, 225, 227, 234 f., 236 f., 239, 267 f.
— and reunion of the Churches 124–27, 206, 236 f.
Gregory XI, Pope *330–33*, 338, 341–43, 401, 444
— career 330
— character 330
— return to Rome 330, 332 f.
— and Italy 330–32
Gregory XII, Pope *415–17*, *420 f.*, 422, 449 f., 452, 455, 468, 473
— negotiations with Benedict XIII 415 f., 421
— defection of cardinals 416 f.
— and Council of Pisa 420–22
— and Council of Cividale 449
— abdication of 454
Gregory of Montelongo 192
Gregory of Naples 180
Gregory of Rimini 352, 602
Grimoard, William, Abbot of Saint-Victor de Marseille 327; *see also* Urban V, Pope
Groenendael 384 f., 432 f.
Groote, Gerard 384, *426–28*, 429, 431–33, 436, 438 (n.), 440
Grossolano, Peter 117 (n.), 131
Gualo, Cardinal 151 f., 189
guardian of church 106, 233
Guelfs 203, 235 f., 305 f., 309–11, 313 f., 342
Guerric of Igny 15, 42, 112
Guibert de Nogent 41
Guibert of Tournai 254
Guichard, Archbishop of Lyons 101 (n.)
Guido, Cardinal of Santi Cosma e Damiano 27, 29, 54 (n.)
Guido of Crema, Cardinal, *see* Paschal III, Antipope
Guienne 270
Guigues de Châtel 43
Gundisalvi, Dominic 251
Guy of Lusignan, King of Jerusalem and of Cyprus 85
Guy of Montefeltro 236, 239
Guy of Montpellier 162, 172
Guy of Orchelles 91
Guzmán, Dominic, *see* Dominic Guzmán

Haakon IV, King of Norway 153
Hadrian IV, Pope 16, 33, *52–57*, 75
Hagen, John von, Abbot of Bursfeld 583
Harding, Stephen, Abbot of Cîteaux 12, 18
Hariulf of Saint-Riquier 41
Hartwig of Stade, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen 29, 218
Hattin, battle of 83
Hegius, Alexander 616
Heidelberg, University of 352 (n.), 354, 585, 597–99, 616
Heimburg, Gregory von 538, 615
Heimo of Michelsberg 41
Heinbuche, Henry, of Langenstein 352, 424, 577
Hélinand of Froidmont 15
Héloise 47, 109
Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, Cardinal Bishop of Albano 83, 101 (n.), 102 f.
Henry, Archbishop of Mainz 52
Henry, Archbishop of Reims 102
Henry, Bishop of Toul 36
Henry, Bishop of Uppsala 219
Henry, Cardinal of Santi Nereo ed Achilleo 55
Henry, Duke of Bavaria 204

Henry II, King of Castile 403
Henry III, King of Castile 412 f.
Henry I, King of England 8, 25 f., 66–69
Henry II, King of England 26, 51, 56, 58 f., 64, *66–74*, *79*, 83 f.
Henry III, King of England 152, 189, 197, 199 f., 249
Henry VI, King of England 483
Henry IV, King of Germany and Emperor 604, 613
Henry V, King of Germany and Emperor 4 f., 24, 26, 28, 66
Henry VI, King of Germany and Emperor 62 f., *76–81*, 144 f., 149, 190
— and crusade 80 f., 85
— and Celestine III 79–81, 144
— imperial coronation 79
Henry (VII), King of Germany 145, 149, 188, 192, 219
Henry VII, King of Germany and Emperor *305–07*, 309 f., 313
— imperial coronation 306
Henry, Latin Emperor of Constantinople 120–22, 168
Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester 26 f.
Henry of Brussels 257
Henry of Coesfeld 584
Henry of Diesenhofen 319
Henry of Ghent 259
Henry of Gorkum 353 f.
Henry of Habsburg 311
Henry of Halle 376
Henry of Langenstein, *see* Heinbuche, Henry
Henry of Lausanne 98 f., 102
Henry of Nördlingen 376, 381, 383, 389
Henry of Susa, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 226, 261
Henry the Lion, Duke of Bavaria and Saxony 29, 60, 62, 64, 78, 218
Henry the Navigator, Prince 399
Henry the Younger, co-King of England 71 f., 74
Henry von Virneburg, Archbishop of Mainz 317, 378
Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem 75
heresy *98–104*, 105, 140, *162–66*, *208–11*, *443–48*, *456–59*
— suppression of 75 f., 98–100, 102–04, 149, 166, 170, 189, 194 f., *211–16*, 240, 315
— death penalty 103, 212–14; *see also* Inquisition
Hermann Judaeus 610
Hermann of Fritzlar 383
Hermann of Minden 375
Hermann of Salza 189, 191, 220
Hermann the German 251
Hermits of Saint Augustine 182, 207, 581
Herrad of Landsberg 112
Herxen, Dirc van 431, 438
Hesychasm 135, 498–501, 503 f., 511, 518, 520
Hethum II, King of Armenia 242
Hethum, Prince, Prior at Poitiers 286
Hieronymites 584
Hildebert of Lavardin, Archbishop of Tours 8, 34, 105, 110
Hildegard of Bingen 112, 611
Hillin, Archbishop of Trier 60
Holkot, Robert 351, 577
Holy League of 1495 553
Holy League of 1511 558 f.
Holy Spirit, Hospitallers of the 88, 162, 172, 186
Honorius II, Pope *4–7*, 16, 20
Honorius III, Pope *27* (n.), 174, 178, 182, *188 f.*, 211–13, 220, 224, 245, 263, 265, 282, 391 f.
Honorius IV, Pope 238–40
Hoogstraeten, James von 619
Hospital of the Holy Spirit 162, 186, 547
Hospitallers of Our Dear Lady 88
hospitals 86, 88, 106, 109, *183–87*, 245, 250, 592
— confraternities 184, 186 f., 569
— hospital orders 184–87
— municipal 187, 569
Hostiensis, *see* Henry of Susa
Hubert, Bishop of Lucca 9
Hübner, John, Master 445
Hugh I, Abbot of Cluny 5
Hugh, Abbot of Tre Fontane, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 20
Hugh, Bishop of Gabala 35
Hugh, Bishop of Grenoble 43
Hugh III, King of Cyprus 237
Hugh du Puiset, Bishop of Durham 71
Hugh of Digne 181, 242
Hugh of Fosses, Abbot of Prémontré 17
Hugh of Lincoln 606
Hugh of Mâcon, Abbot of Pontigny, Bishop of Auxerre 18, 20
Hugh II of Marcigny, Abbot of Cluny 5
Hugh of Reading, Archbishop of Rouen 41
Hugh of Saint-Cher 183, 254 f.
Hugh of Saint-Victor 20, *42*, 43, *46*, 48–50, 90, 427
Huguccio of Pisa, Bishop of Ferrara 94, 103, 138, 140 f.
Hulagu, Il-khan 223, 396, 516
humanism, Byzantine 505–07, 509, 511
humanism, German 586, 593 f., *614–24*
humanism, Italian 521–28, 530, 533, 539, 541 f., 547, 549, 560, 565, 585, 594, 598, 614
— and Council of Constance 452
humanism, monastic 39–43
Humbert, Cardinal Bishop of Silva Candida 115
Humbert of Romans 174, 176, 204 f., 224, 285
Humiliati 104, 173, 208, 244
Hungary 146 f., 154 f., 173, 197, 209, 223, 274, 395, 406, 449, 531 f., 537
Hunyadi, John 532
Hus, John 445 f., *447 f.*, 456, *457–59*
Hussites 483, 574, 584, 595, 597
— negotiations with 476; *see also* George of Podiebrad
Hussite War 474, 476, 612
Hutten, Ulric von 618, 620
Hyacinth, Cardinal of Santa Maria in Cosmedin 55, 59, 79; *see also* Celestine III, Pope

Iceland 159
Ida 245
idiorrhythmia 519 f.
Iglau, Diet of (1436) 476
Imitation of Christ, The 439, *440–42*, 443

— authorship of 440
India 398, 400
"indifference" in Western Schism 406 f., 417
indulgences 103, 111, 227, 448, 547, 588 f., 592, 595 f.
Ingeborg of Denmark, Queen of France 152
Innocent II, Pope *7–10,* 19 f., 23, 26 (n.), 27–30, 32, 35 (n.), 59, 137, 152
Innocent III, Pope 82, 94, 103 f., 106, 119, 121 f., *136–72,* 173, 175, 186, 188 f., 209, 220, 224, 226, 232, 262, 264, 266, 281, 284 f., 355
— career 137–39
— personality 139 f.
— literary work 138
— election 137, 139
— program 136 f., 140–43
— and reform 140 f., 159–62, 172
— and papal authority 141–44
— and Papal State 144 f., 270
— and Sicilian Kingdom 145 f., 199
— and Otto IV 145, 148 f.
— and Aragón 146
— and León 146
— and Portugal 146
— and Hungary 146 f.
— and Bulgaria 147
— and the Empire 147–49
— and Frederick II 149
— and England 150–52
— and France 152 f.
— and Scandinavia 153
— and Poland 153 f.
— and Dalmatia 154
— and Serbia 154
— and Fourth Crusade 154–57
— and the Latin Empire 157
— and Children's Crusade 158
— and decentralization 160, 171
— and defence of matrimony 161
— and heresy 162–66, 208, 211, 213, 216
— and Albigensian Crusade 164 f.
— and the Waldensians 166
— and Lateran IV 166–72
— and Fifth Crusade 167–70, 282
— and Dominicans 173 f.
— and Franciscans 178
Innocent IV, Pope 122, 141 (n.), 176, 181 f., *194–99,* 200, 202, 221–23, 225, 227, 230, 248 f., 260, 262, 266, 281, 283 f., 314, 369, 394, 606
— and Frederick II 194–98
— and the Inquisition 216
— and University of the Roman Curia 247, 251
Innocent V, Pope 234, 255
Innocent VI, Pope *324–26,* 338, 340–43
— election capitulation 324 f.
— and reform 325
— and Rome 325 f.
— and Italy 325 f.
— and Albornoz 326
— and Rienzo 326
Innocent VII, Pope 415, 468
Innocent VIII, Pope *548–50,* 551, 558, 562
— children 549
— and Italian politics 549
Inquisition 76, 102–04, 170, 176, 208–10, *211–16,* 240, 243, 246, 273, 298, 310, 372, 595, 597, 608, 619
— death penalty 212–14
— torture 216, 298 f.
Investiture Controversy 4, 10, 16, 22, 25, 29, 32, 44, 107
Ireland 56, 73, 151, 340, 482
Irnerius 93, 96
Isaac I, Byzantine Emperor 128
Isaac II, Byzantine Emperor 84, 155 (n.), 156
Isaac of Stella 15, 42
Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev, Cardinal 497
Isidore, Patriarch of Constantinople 502
Italy 163, 173 f., 186–89, 191, 194, 197 f., 200–04, 208, 211, 216, 235, 242, 274, 284, 291, 294 f., 300, *304–07,* 309–13, 316, 322, *325 f.,* 327, *328 f.,* 330 f., 337, 341 f., 360, 363, 370, 374, 376 f., 401, 403, 405 f., 409–12, 415, 422, 449 f., 469 f., 476, 482, 486, 490, 578, 607 f., 612
— in the Renaissance 522, 524, 529–32, 534–38, 540, 542 f., 545–49, 551, 553 f., 558–63, 583, 598, 614–16, 618 f., 621 f.
— *cinque principati* 486, 524, 558; *see also* Lombardy
iudices de clero (palatini) 31
Ivan III, Great Prince of Russia 546
Ivetta 245
Ivo, Archdeacon of Chartres 92
Ivo, Bishop of Chartres 50

Jacopone da Todi 242
Jahballahā III, Catholicos of Baghdad 396
James, Archbishop of Gniezno 28
James, Cardinal Bishop of Preneste 194
James I, King of Aragón 182, 205, 212 f.
James II, King of Sicily, King of Aragón 239 f., 270, 274, 298, 300, 304
James a Voragine 577
James of Albenga 225
James of Douai 257
James of Mies, Master 456
James of Venice 131
James of Viterbo 356 f.
James of Vitry, Bishop of Acre 221, 245
Jasper, rector of Deventer 435
Jerome de Sancta Fide 611
Jerome of Ascoli, *see* Nicholas IV, Pope
Jerome of Prague 459
Jerusalem 35, 37, 73, 83, 85, 88, 116 f., 185, 190, 195, 202, 229, 282 f.
— pilgrimage to 86, 111, 190, 281, 285
— Kingdom of 82, 85, 154 f., 157, 190, 201 f., 222, 237, 281 f.
Jesuates 584
Jesus, Prayer of 498
Jews 65, 172, 252, 391, 589 f., *603–13,* 619
— servitude of 603–06, 608, 613
— ghetto 604, 608
— during crusades 604 f.
— protection of 605–08
— ritual murder 606
— dress 607 f.
— usury 607

— pogroms 606–08
— expulsion of 608
— philosophy and theology 609 f.
— efforts to convert 610–13, 619
Jiménez de Cisneros, García, Abbot of Montserrat 443
Joachim, Abbot of Fiore 89, 170, *209*, 210, 241, 369
Joachimites 241, 268
Joanna I, Queen of Naples 323, 328, 404, 406, 409
Joanna II, Queen of Naples 450, 470, 482
Job, Archbishop of Esztergom 159 (n.).
Job Jasites 125
Joceran, Bishop of Langres 19
Jochai, Simon bar 609
Johannitsa, Tsar of Bulgaria 147
John I, Archbishop of Trier 78
John, Bishop of Faenza 94
John, Bishop of Norwich 150
John II, Byzantine Emperor 133
John III, Byzantine Emperor of Nicaea 122 f., 491
John IV, Byzantine Emperor of Nicaea 489
John V, Byzantine Emperor 493, 501, 503, 516
John VI, Byzantine Emperor 493, 501–04, 508
John VIII, Byzantine Emperor 476, 479–82, 496 f., 509, 512, 515
John, Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum 239
John, Cardinal of San Paolo 81
John, Duke of Anjou 536
John I, King of Aragón 407
John II, King of Aragón 450
John I, King of Castile 403
John II, King of Castile 450, 483
John, King of England 84, 148 f., *150–52*, 189
John V Oxeites, Patriarch of Antioch 117, 133
John VIII Xiphilinus, Patriarch of Constantinople 129 f., 134
John IX Agapetus, Patriarch of Constantinople 134
John X Kamateros, Patriarch of Constantinople 120 f.
John XI Beccus, Patriarch of Constantinople 125–27, 488
John XIV Calecas, Patriarch of Constantinople 501 f.
John XXI, Pope 228, 234, 253
John XXII, Pope 182, 243, 246, 256, 302, *308–15*, 316–20, 334–36, 338, 340–44, 347, 355, 378, 381, 398 f., 540
— career 308
— political orientation 308 f., 314 f.
— and Rome 309
— and France 309
— and Naples 309
— and the Empire 309–13
— and the beatific vision 313, 316, 374
— as preacher 314
— and the poverty dispute 371–74
John XXIII, Pope of Pisan obedience 419 f., 445, 448, *449–54*, 455, 457, 460, 467 f.
— indictment against 453
— deposition of 453 f.
John Andreae 226
John Damascene 49
John de Brienne, King of Jerusalem and Latin Emperor of Constantinople 157, 190
John de Nova Domo 354
John di Luglio 208
John Italus 131
John Mesarites 121
John of Belna 372
John of Capestrano 374, 532, 577, 612
John of Cornwall 89
John of Crema, Cardinal 5
John of Dambach 319
John of Dumpno 251
John of Frankfurt 390 (n.)
John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster 444
John of Herolt 577, 579
John of Jandun 360
John of Kastl 389
John of Luxembourg, King of Bohemia 313
John of Matha 162, 172
John of Mirecourt 351
John of Montecorvino, Archbishop of Peking 181, 223, 397
John of Palomar 474, 476, 485
John of Paris 359
John of Parma 210, 241 f.
John of Piano di Carpine 181, 223, 394
John of Procida 270
John of Ragusa 474, 476, 485
John of Ronco 209
John of Rupella 254
John of Saint-Gilles 254
John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres 21, 33 f., 36, 40, 45, 48, 53, 55, 64, 65 (n.), 108
John of Segovia 485
John of Spain 251
John of Toledo, Cardinal 200 (n.)
John of Tours 45
John of Wales 257
John of Werden 577
John of Winterthur 319
John Teutonicus 225
John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy 459 f.
John the German 176
John von Goch, *see* Pupper von Goch, John
John von Wesel, *see* Rucherath von Oberwesel, John
Jonas, Justus 618
Jonathan, Cardinal Deacon 7
Jordan de Fantasma 92
Jordan of Quedlinburg 577
Jordan of Saxony 174, 176
Josbert the Red de Châtillon, Abbot of La Ferté 18
Joseph I, Patriarch of Constantinople 125, 127, 203
Joseph II, Patriarch of Constantinople 479, 497, 515
Joseph the Philosopher 507
Josias, Archbishop of Tyre 83
Josuah, Jewish physician 610
Jubilee of 1300 275 f.
Jubilee of 1350 322 f.
Jubilee of 1450 530, 588 f.
Jubilee of 1475 547

Jubilee of 1500 552, 555
Julius II, Pope 467 (n.), 524, 552, *557–61*, 562, 564, 608
— and Papal State 558
— and Lateran V 559
— and Maximilian I 559 f.
— patronage of humanists 560

Kabasilas, Neilus, Metropolitan of Thessalonica 508–510
Kabasilas, Nicholas 510 f.
Kalojan, Tsar of Bulgaria 120
Kalteisen, Henry 476
Karakorum 223, 394
Karoch, Samuel, of Lichtenberg 614
Kastl, reform of 583
Kerait, Turcomans of 223, 392
Kessel, John 430
Khanbaliq 397–99; *see also* Peking
Khwarazmian Turks 195, 392
Kietlicz, Henry, Archbishop of Gniezno 153 f.
Kilwardby, Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury 253, 258
king, position in the Church 107
Kingston, Peace of (1217) 152, 189
Knapwell, Richard 258
knighthood, Christian 107 f.
Knights Hospitallers 37, 64, 88, 168, 184 f., 287, 301, 303, 325, 389, 391, 549
Knights of Christ 399 f.
Knights of Christ of Dobrin 220
Knights of the Sword 219 f.
Knights Templars 20, 37, 64, 108, 168, 184, 281, 287, 296, *297–301*, 302, 303 f., 399
Knights, Teutonic 85, 172, 184–86, 217, *220 f.*, 311, 395, 456, 461
Knut, King of Denmark, canonization of 111
Knut VI, King of Denmark 153
Koblenz, Diet of (1338) 318
Kolde, Dietrich 578, 580
Koran 537, 591
Kublai, Great Khan 396 f.
Kuno II, Archbishop of Trier 613
Kutná Hora, decree of 447
Kydones, Demetrius 504, 507–10, 512
— Prochorus 504, 508
Kyparissiotes, John 504, 508

Laborans, Cardinal 94
Ladislas, King of Hungary 147
Ladislas, King of Naples 416, 421, 448–51, 469
La Ferté 12, 18 f.
laicized state 359–63
laity, independence of 355 f., 358 f., 375, 384, 567 f.
laity, position in the Church 232 f.
laity, rights of 106 f., 233
laity, spiritual aspirations of *104–109*, 375 f., 384 f., 388 f., *426–43*, 576
Lambert, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, *see* Honorius II, Pope
Lambert of Auxerre 253
Lambert the Stammerer 245
Lancia, Manfred 270
Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury 44
Lang, Matthew, Bishop of Gurk 560
Langen, Rudolf von 616
Langres 19 f., 26
Langton, Simon, Archbishop-elect of York 169
Langton, Stephen, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury 92, 137, *150 f.*, 168 f., 254
Languedoc 103, 208, 211, 213, 216, 242, 246
Laon, school of 44–46, 48, 95, 247
Las Navas de Tolosa, battle of 392
Lateran basilica 7, 9 f., 64, 261, 306, 312, 329, 473, 480
Lateran Ecumenical Council, First (1123) 3, 10, 27, 140
Lateran Ecumenical Council, Second (1139) *10*, 49, 54 (n.), 137, 140
Lateran Ecumenical Council, Third (1179) *63–66*, 75, 82, 89, 96, 101, 103, 140, 171, 228
Lateran Ecumenical Council, Fourth (1215) 89 f., 138, 142, 149, 151, 158, 164 f., *166–72*, 174 f., 188 f., 197, 206–09, 211–13, 228, 271, 431, 607
— background 167 f.
— program 167 f.
— participants 168
— decisions 168 f.
— crusade proclaimed 169 f., 281 f.
— legislation 169–72
Lateran Ecumenical Council, Fifth (1512–17) 278, 559–62, 564
Latin Empire of Constantinople *120–23*, 127, 147, 169, 194–97, 202, 237, 270, 281, 283, 286, 489–91
Lausanne 484
Lavaur, Synod of (1213) 165
Lawrence Hispanus 225 f.
Lawrence of Portugal 394
lay control of churches 568–70, 573
laymen as protectors of the Church 107 f.
lay teachers 106
Lazarus, Order of 88, 185 f.
legists 358–60
Legnano, battle of (1176) 62
Le Goulet, Peace of (1200) 150
Leipzig, University of 352 (n.), 354
Le Moine, John, Cardinal 278
Leo, King of Armenia 80, 157
Leo IX, Pope 7, 32
Leo X, Pope 375, 525, *561–66*, 608, 623
— career 562
— and Italian politics 562–64
— and France 562 f.
— and Lateran V 564
— Conspiracy of Cardinals 564 f.
— nepotism of 565
— patronage of humanists 565
— frivolity 565 f.
— and the Reuchlin dispute 619 f.
Leo of Montecassino 41
Leo Tuscus 117, 131
León 146
León, University of 247
Leonine City 61, 530
Leopold V, Duke of Austria 80

Leopold VI, Duke of Austria 282
Leopold III of Habsburg, Duke of Austria 408
leprosaria 109, 185 f., 245
Les Dunes 14
Liber Augustalis 191
Liber censuum 81, 144, 188
Liber Extra 170, 172, 213, *225*, 226
Liber Sextus 207, *225*, 262, 279
liberty, evangelical 365 f., 368
library, Vatican 531, 547
Libri de schismate 402 f.
"Licet iuris" 318
Liebhard of Prüfening 91
Liège, Diet of (1131) 9
Liège, schools of 45 f., 95
Liegnitz, battle of 223, 394
Liguria 543, 548
Limousin 321, 323, 325, 330, 335, 401
Linköping, Council of (1153) 53
Lisbon 39, 284
Lithuania 221
liturgy *570–74; see also* baptism, communion, confession, Eucharist, matrimony, preaching
Liutizians 28
Livonia 217, 219–21
Lodi, Peace of (1454) 524, *529*, 530, 533, 535, 542
"Lollard Bible" 445
Lollards 445
Lombard League 61 f., 74 f., 191 f., 213
Lombardy 5, 56, 60 f., 76–78, 96, 100, 145, 162, 166, 173, 189, 191, *192*, 194, 202, 208 f., 211, 213, 235, 243, 274 f., 284, 310, 313, 331, 333, 341, 360, 422, 440, 471; *see also* Italy
Longis, William de, Cardinal 336
Loria, Roger 270
Lothar of Hochstaden, Bishop of Liège 79
Lothar of Supplinburg, Duke of Saxony, King of Germany and Emperor 4 f., 9, 23 f., 28 f., 59
— imperial coronation 9
Louis, Count Palatine 204
Louis I, Duke of Anjou 409
Louis II, Duke of Anjou 410, 415, 449
Louis III, Duke of Anjou 470
Louis I, Duke of Bavaria 189
Louis VII, Duke of Bavaria 458
Louis, Duke of Orléans 410 f., 413 f., 417, 459
Louis VI, King of France 25, 29
Louis VII, King of France 20, 25, *35–37*, 58 f., 61, 64, 66, 70, 83, 102
Louis VIII, King of France 151 f., 189, 211 f.
Louis IX, King of France 85, 124, 151 (n.), 197, 199 f., 213 f., 223, 273, 394
— crusades of 283
Louis XI, King of France 535 f.
Louis IV the Bavarian, King of Germany and Emperor *309–13*, *317–19*, 347, 360, 363 f., 372 f., 381
— and John XXII 309–13
— excommunication of 311
— imperial coronation 312, 364
— and Benedict XII 317–19
— declarations of 1338–39 317–19
— and Clement VI 321 f.
— and the Jews 605 f.
Louis I, King of Hungary 323
Louis, Prince of Taranto 323
Low Countries 384, 426–43, 616, 623
Loyola, Ignatius 383, 443
Lucius II, Pope 27, 35 (n.), 100
Lucius III, Pope 13 (n.), *75–77*, 104, 162 (n.), 163, 211
Luder, Peter 614, 618
Ludolf of Saxony 383 f., 427, 438, 440, 584
Luke of Mont-Cornillon 18
Lull, Raymond 222, 286, 490, 586, 612
— plan of evangelization 222, 303, 393 f.
Lupold of Bebenburg 363
Luther, Martin 390, 564, 579 f., 594, 599, 601–03, 618, 620, 624
Lutterell, John 346 f.
Lyons 194, 196, 204 (n.), 205
Lyons, First Ecumenical Council of (1245) *195–97*, 199 f., 206, 225, 283 f., 394
Lyons, Second Ecumenical Council of (1274) 126 f., 203, *204–07*, 225, 228, 234, 236, 242, 246, 255, 267, 340, 492, 501, 508, 515
— and reunion of the Churches 203, 205
— crusade project 205–07
— decrees 206 f.

Magdeburg 16 f., 23, 28, 52, 218
— provincial Council of (1451) 589, 607
magister palatii papae 331, 335
magister sacri palatii 335, 420
Magna Carta 151, 271
Maillard, Olivier 577
Maimonides, Moses 252, 609
Mainz, Diet of (1188) 83
— Diet of Princes (1439) 483
— provincial Council of (1451) 589, 607
— University of 597
Maironis, Francis de 577
Malabranca, Latino, Cardinal 235, 267
Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh 21, 42
Malatesta 542
— Charles, Lord of Rimini 421, 449, 454
— Robert 545
— Sigismund, Lord of Rimini 536
Malesec, Guy de, Cardinal 418
Malleus Maleficarum 597
Mallorca 222, 301
— Kingdom of 238, 323
Mamelukes 281, 396
Mancasole, Thomas, of Piacenza, Bishop of Samarkand 398
Mande, Hendrik 439
Manderscheid, Ulric von 586
Manfred, King of Sicily 123 f., 198, *199–201*, 238, 251, 284
Mangu, Great Khan 396
Mansurah 189, 282 f.
Mantellates 182
Mantes, assembly of (1203) 152 f.
Mantua, Congress of (1459) 534, *535 f.*, 592
Manuel I, Byzantine Emperor 36 f., 57, 61, 99, 117–19, 132
Manuel II, Byzantine Emperor 494 f., 509, 519

Manzikert, battle of 114
Margaret Maultasch 319
Marignano, battle of 563
Marignolli, John de 398
Mark Eugenicus, Metropolitan of Ephesus 497, 512
Markward of Anweiler, Margrave of Ancona and Duke of Romagna 80 f., 146, 284
Marsh, Adam 251, 257
Marsilius of Inghen 352
Marsilius of Padua *359–63*, 365 f., 373, 391, 446, 595
— and supremacy of the state 360–63
— condemnation of 363
— and conciliarism 423; *see also Defensor Pacis*
Marston, Roger 254
Martí, Raymond 393, 612
Martin, Abbot of Pairis 155
Martin I, King of Aragón and of Sicily (Martin II) 412 f., 415 f., 419
Martin I, King of Sicily 415
Martin, Magister 91, 254
Martin IV, Pope 127, 234, *236–38*, 239, 269, 284, 488, 570
Martin V, Pope 182, 395, 399, 437, 446, 452, 456 f., 461, 464, 467, *468–73*, 474–76, 539, 582
— and Papal State 469–71, 526
— and Braccio 470
— and Naples 470
— and Bologna 470 f.
— and Rome 471
— and Council of Pavia-Siena 472
— and reform 471 f.
— and reunion of the Churches 495 f., 509
Mary, devotion to 111, 314
Mary of Oignies 245
Mass, changes in externals of 570–74; *see also* Eucharist, liturgy
Mass, fruits of 571–73
Mass priest 569, 573
Massa, Anthony da 495
Masses, votive 574
Mathildine Lands 62, 75 f., 78, 80, 144, 274
Matilda, Empress, Countess of Anjou 26, 27 (n.), 66, 70
matrimony 106, 111, 161, 170 f., 225, 233, 315
Matthew of Aquasparta, Cardinal Bishop of Porto 254, 277 (n.), 278
Matthew of Cracow, Bishop of Worms 463
Matthew of Narni 180
Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary 542, 549
Matthias of Neuenburg 319
Maurice de Sully 110
Maximilian I, King of Germany and Emperor 553, 558–60, 562 f., 615 f., 618 f.
Maximus Confessor 499 f.
Mechtilde of Hackeborn 376
Mechtilde of Magdeburg 376
Medici 542, 544 f., 554, 559, 562 f., 565, 608
— Cosimo de' 523
— John de', Cardinal 559, 561; *see also* Leo X, Pope
— Julian de' 544
— Julian de' 565
— Lawrence de' 544 f., 549, 562
— Lawrence de', *il Pensieroso* 562, 565
— Maddalena de' 549
medicine, faculty of 248
Meinhard of Segeberg 219
Melanchthon, Philip 619
Melfi, Constitutions of 191
Melfi, Synod of (1059) 114
Mélisende, Queen of Jerusalem 20, 35, 37
Melk, reform of 583
mendicant orders *173–83*, 205, 207, 217, 240, 243, 245, *279 f.*, 293, 302, 325, 428, 436, 444, 570, 576, 580, 590, 597
— at universities 247–49, 253–60, 269, 369
— crusade preaching 285
— missionary work 221–24, 391–98
— missionary organization 395; *see also* Augustinian Hermits, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Mercedarians, Servites
mercatores curie romane 265, 338
Mercedarian Order 182
Merswin, Rulman 389
Merton College 250
Messalians 499 f.
Metochites, Theodore 505–07
Metrophanes II, Patriarch of Constantinople 497
metropolitans 229 f.
Michael VII, Byzantine Emperor 114 f.
Michael VIII, Byzantine Emperor *123–27*, 203, 205 f., 236–38, 488 f., 492 f., 499
— excommunication of 236 f.
Michael Caerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople 115, 128
Michael Choniates, Archbishop of Athens 123
Michael of Cesena 244, 312 (n.), 347, 363, 371–74
Michael Psellus 130 f.
Michael Sikidites 132
Michael the Scot 251
Migliorati, Cosimo, Cardinal 415; *see also* Innocent VII, Pope
Milan 79, 116, 192, 235, 304, 310 f., 322, 330 f., 333, 409 f., 422, 469 f., 475, 482
— and Frederick I 56, 59, 61, 74 f., 77
— in Renaissance 525, 529, 542, 545, 548–50, 553, 559, 562; *see also* Visconti, Sforza
military orders 86, 88, 108, 182, 184–86, 207, 222, 274, 281, 283, 298, 417, 451; *see also* Knights Hospitallers, Knights of the Sword, Knights Templars, Teutonic Knights
Mindaugas, Prince of Lithuania 221
Minims 555, 584
minnesingers 109, 376, 383
missionary apostolate 176, 178, 181, 183, *216–24*, *391–400*
— as crusade 284 f.
— in Pomerania 217 f.
— among Wends 218
— in Livonia 219
— in Esthonia 219
— in Finland 219
— in Prussia 220 f.
— among Muslims 221–23, 392–94
— in Eastern Europe 395 f.
— among Mongols 223 f., 394–97

— of mendicant orders 221–24, 391–98
— in North Africa 392, 395
— in Near East 392 f.
— in China 396–99
— methods 393 f.
— organization 396–99
— of Order of Christ 399 f.
— Byzantine 516–18
Mistra 512, 518
Molay, James de 298 f., 303 f.
Molesme 12
Mombaer, John, Abbot of Livry 442 f., 599
monasteries, control of by cities 570
monastery, double 17, 244, 585
monasticism, Byzantine 121–24, 133 f., 488 f., 501, 512, *518–20*
Moneta of Cremona 254
Mongols 176, 181, 194–97, 205 f., 217, *223 f.*, 281, 286, 392, *394–97*, 398 f., 491, 516
monopsychism 256 f.
Montebello, Truce of (1176) 62
Montecassino 5 f., 113, 268, 562, 582
Montecristo, battle of 193 f.
Montpellier, schools of 95, 97, 224
Montpellier, Synod of (1162) 102
Montpellier, Synod of (1211) 165
Montpellier, University of 248, 327
More, Thomas 621 f.
Morella, meeting at (1414) 450
Morimond 12, 19
Morocco 221 f., 391 f.
Morosini, Thomas, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople 156, 169
Morra, Albert de, Cardinal, *see* Gregory VIII, Pope
Moses de León 609 f.
Moses of Bergamo 131
Mosse, Andrew Bertram 611
Muhammad II, Sultan 518, 532, 535, 537, 542, 546 f., 549
Mühldorf, battle of 311
Munich Academy 318
Murdach, Henry, Archbishop of York 26 f.
Muret, battle of (1213) 165
Murmellius, John 616
Murner, Thomas 617 f.
Muslims, Christian evangelization of 221–23
Mutianus Rufus 618
mysticism, Byzantine, *see* Hesychasm, Palamism
mysticism, German *375–90*, 441

Naples, Kingdom of 237–39, 268, 270, 272, 274, 304, 306 f., 309, 314, 323, 326 f., 331, 343, 401, 404–06, 409, 415, 450, 470, 472, 482, 485
— in Renaissance 522, 525, 529, 531, 533–36, 542, 545, 548 f., 553, 558, 562 f., 565; *see also* Sicily, Kingdom of
Naples as centre for translation 251
Naples, University of 247, 251, 255
Narbonne, Synod of (1243) 216
nations at Council of Constance 452, 454 f., 461, 464–66
nations at Council of Pisa 418 f.
Navarre 407, 552
Negroponte 542; *see also* Euboea
Neophytus Enkleistus 135
Neoplatonism 134, 251 f., 259, 354, 375–77, 506, 523, 586
nepotism 280, 305, 307, 336, 341, 343, 409, 421, 471, 524, 533, 536, 539, 544, 546–48, 551 f., 557, 565
Nestorians 223, 396 f., 516
Nicaea, Empire of 120–23, 156 f.
Nicephorus III, Byzantine Emperor 115, 128
Nicephorus, monk of Athos 499
Nicephorus Basilakes 132
Nicephorus Blemmydes 126
Nicetas, Metropolitan of Heraclea 135
Nicetas Choniates 132, 156
Nicholas, Bishop of Methone 134
Nicholas, Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum 151, 249
Nicholas II, Pope 114, 228
Nicholas III, Pope 225, 234, *235 f.*, 237, 269, 369 f., 372, 612
Nicholas IV, Pope 179 (n.), 222, *240*, 261, 267, 286, 325, 397, 473
Nicholas V, Antipope 312, 360, 364
Nicholas V, Pope 399, 485, 521–23, *528–31*, 539, 547, 589 f., 607
— and *status quo* in Italy 529 f.
— and Conspiracy of Porcaro 530
— and humanism 530 f.
Nicholas Mesarites 121
Nicholas of Amiens 93
Nicholas of Autrecourt 351
Nicholas of Clémanges 464
Nicholas of Cologne 158
Nicholas of Cusa, Cardinal, Bishop of Brixen 363, 433, 486, 522, 535, 537, 539, 572, 577 f., 583, *585–94*, 607, 609
— career 585 f.
— as legate 588–90, 607
— as bishop 588, 590
— at the Curia 591 f.
— writings 586 f., 590 f.
— and reform 588–90, 592 f.
Nicholas of Damascus 251
Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl 352, 456, 577
Nicholas of Louvain 389
Nicholas of Myra 113
Nicholas of Paris 253
Nicholas of Strasbourg 381
Nicholas of Trani 113
Nicholas of Tudeschi, Archbishop of Palermo 485
Nidaros 53
Nider, John 389 f., 577
Niklot, Prince of the Obodrites 38 (n.)
Nogaret, William of 278 f., 287, 291 f., 296–99, 303, 356
Nolasco, Peter 182
nominalism 344–55, 357, 365, 381, 426, 444, 598–600
Norbert of Xanten, Archbishop of Magdeburg 9, *16–18*, 19, 28, 43
Northampton, royal council at (1164) 69 f.
Norway 153
Notker 97
Nur-ed-Din 37

obedience, withdrawal of 412 f., 416 f., 420
Observant movement 374 f., 581
Ockham, William of 315, 320, *345–51*, 352, 360, *363–68*, 373, 381, 446, 595 f., 600–02
— career 346 f.
— doctrine 348–50, 364–68
— influence 350 f.
— political theory 364–68
— and conciliarism 367, 423
Ockhamism 351 f., 594 f., 598
Octavian of Monticello, Cardinal 56 f.; *see also* Victor IV, "Antipope" (2)
Oderisius, Cardinal, Abbot of Montecassino 6
Odo Rigaldus 181, 254
Odoric of Pordenone 223, 397 f.
officialis 230
Ogdai, Great Khan 223
Ognibene, Bishop of Verona 94
oikonomia 116, 125
Olav II, King of Norway, canonization of 111
Olegar, Archbishop of Tarragona 27
Oliver, *scholasticus* of Cologne 282
Olivi, Peter John 242 f., 246, 254, 259, 301 f., 315, 370 f.
Ongüt 396 f.
Ordericus Vitalis 41
Orléans, school of 44, 95
Orléans, University of 248
Orsini 267, 269, 279, 316, 471, 528, 531, 545, 548 f., 551, 553
— James, Cardinal 331
— John Gaetano, Cardinal, *see* Nicholas III, Pope
— Jordan, Cardinal 419, 460
— Matthew 235
— Matthew Rosso, Cardinal 269, 291, 293 f.
— Napoleone, Cardinal 293 f., 308, 313, 336
— Orsino 552
— Poncello, Cardinal 410
— Rinaldo, Cardinal 405
Ortlieb of Strasbourg 209 f.
Osman 491
Otranto 546
Ottakar II, King of Bohemia 204 f.
Otto, Bishop of Bamberg 28, 217
Otto, Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum 194
Otto IV, King of Germany and Emperor 145, *148 f.*, 150, 169, 205
— imperial coronation 149
— excommunication of 149
Otto of Freising 15, 35 f., 57, 392
Otto of Wittelsbach 57
Otto of Wittelsbach, Count Palatine 148
Ottoman Turks 491, 494 f., 497, 499, 507, 513 f., 525–27, 531–34, 538, 540, 542 f., 546, 548–50, 553, 561, 563, 574, 584, 588
Oxford, school of 97
Oxford, Synod of (1382) 444
Oxford, University of 181, 224, 247, *248 f.*, 250–54, 257 f., 346 f., 422, 443–47, 457, 459
— colleges 250

padroado 399
Padua, University of 248, 257, 546, 585
Pagus, John 253
Palamas, Gregory, Metropolitan of Thessalonica 500–05
Palamism 135, 500–04, 507 f., 511, 518
Palencia, University of 247
Paletsch, Stephen 457
Pamiers 276, 315
Pamiers, colloquy of (1207) 166
Panaretus, Angelus 509
Pandulf, papal agent 151
Pantaléon, James, Patriarch of Jerusalem, *see* Urban IV, Pope
papacy 226–28
papacy, Renaissance 524–66
papacy, vassal states of 27, 54, 78, 81, *145–47*, 149, 151, 154, 192, 284, 482, 533
papal electoral law 464, 478
— of 1059 8, 228
— of 1179 65, 66, 228; *see* also capitulation
papal household at Avignon 335, 338, 342
papal legates, activity of 24, 26–28, 53–55, 64, 71, 73, 83, 102 f., 119–21, 148, 151, 157, 160, 192, 262, 274, 284, 310, 316, 321, 546, 588–90
Papal State 54, 140, *144 f.*, 149, 194, 199, 201, 235 f., 264, 267 f., 270, 274, 291, *304 f.*, 309, 316, 323, 325, *326*, 328, 330–33, 337, 409 f., 421, 451, 453, *469–71*, 473–75, 479, 482, 486
— in Renaissance 521, 524–27, 529 f., 533–36, 539, 541, 543, 545, 548 f., 551–53, 557 f., 560–63, 565, 592, 608; *see also Patrimonium*
Parenti, John 180
Parentucelli, Thomas, Cardinal 528; *see also* Nicholas V, Pope
Paris, Council of (1210) 252
Paris, Council of (1212) 161
Paris, Councils of (1395) 411 f.
Paris, Council of (1398) 413
Paris, Council of (1414) 460
Paris, Peace of (1229) 189, 213 f.
Paris, schools of 44 f., 48, 90–96, 137 f., 140, 153, 224, 247 f.
Paris, University of 96 f., 174, 181, 183, 209 f., 225, 241, *247 f.*, 249 f., 252–60, 269, 278, 315, 321, 360, 369, 376, 393, 422, 426, 451, 457, 570, 598 f., 619, 621
— organization 247–49
— colleges 250
— and Ockhamism 351 f., 354
— and ending of Western Schism 411, 451
parishes 231, 592
— urban 566–70
— lay control of 568–70
— records 578
Paschal II, Pope 8, 13 (n.), 117 f.
Paschal III, Antipope 59–61
Passau Anonymous 210
pastoral activity 110 f., 231, 233, 570, 574 f.
Patari 104
Patras 123, 518
Patrimonium 3, 51, 56 f., 62–64, 75, 77 f., 81, 141 f., 144, 162 f., 190, 193, 195, 261, 264, 304, 326, 412; *see also* Papal State
patronage, right of 106, 231, 233, 276, 568
Paucapalea 93 f., 103
Paul, Bishop of Skalholt 159 (n.)

Paul, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople 493
Paul II, Pope 540–43
— and humanists 541 f.
— and Italian states 542
— and George of Bohemia 542
Paul III, Pope 552, 613
Paul IV, Pope 523, 608
Pavia, Council of (1160) 58
Pavia-Siena, Council of (1423) 466, 471 f., 474, 477
Pazzi Conspiracy 544
Pecham, John, Archbishop of Canterbury 180, 254, 258–60
Peking 223 f., 397
Pelagianism 350, 352, 601 f.
Pelagius, Cardinal Bishop of Albano 121, 157, 189 f., 282
Peloponnesus 517 f.
penance, Sacrament of 170; *see also* confession
Penitentiaria 262 f., *265*, 465
Penitentiarius 265, 325, 539
Penitents of Saint Mary Magdalen 176 f.
Perpignan, Council of (1408) 417, 420, 449
Persia 205, 396, 398, 516
Perugia 292–95, 329, 331, 341, 372, 410, 553, 558
Peter, Bishop of Aberdeen 257
Peter, Cardinal Bishop of Porto 7
Peter, Cardinal of San Crisogono 102
Peter II, King of Aragón 146, 163, 165, 213
Peter III, King of Aragón 237–39, 284
Peter IV, King of Aragón 403, 407 (n.)
Peter Abelard, *see* Abelard, Peter
Peter Cantor 91, 93, 110
Peter Catanii 178, 180
Peter Cella 215
Peter Comestor 65, 90, 110, 580
Peter de Corbeil, Bishop of Cambrai, Archbishop of Sens 137
Peter de Luna, Cardinal 407, 410, 424, 611; *see also* Benedict XIII, Pope at Avignon
Peter de Palude 345
Peter de Trabibus 254
Peter di Corvaro *see* Nicholas V, Antipope
Peter Hispanus 226, 234, 253, 354; *see also* John XXI, Pope
Peter Ismael 137
Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris 46 f., *48 f.*, 50, 89–93, 110, 138, 253, 355
— *The Sentences* 46 f., *48 f.*, 89 f., 93, 138, 254 f., 346 f., 351, 353, 355, 422, 595, 599 f.
Peter Martyr 208 (n.)
Peter of Aragón 329
Peter of Auvergne 257, 259
Peter of Benevento, Cardinal 165
Peter of Benevento, Magister 170, 224
Peter of Blois 65, 110
Peter of Bruys 98, 102
Peter of Capua 91
Peter of Capua, Cardinal 121, 254
Peter of Castelnau 163 f.
Peter of Courtenay 82
Peter of Ireland 251
Peter of Macerata 242, 370
Peter of Montecassino 41
Peter of Murrone *see* Celestine V, Pope
Peter of Pisa, Cardinal Priest 7, 9 f.
Peter of Poitiers 90 f., 253 f., 508
Peter of Rosenheim 485
Peter of Tarentaise, Cardinal 206, 234, 255; *see also* Innocent V, Pope
Peter of Wormdith 461
Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny 5, 8, 11, 15, 19 f., *40 f.*, 603
Petershausen 582 f.
Peter's Pence 53, 57, 151, 264
Peters, Gerlach 439
Petit, John 459 f.
Petrarch 320
Petrucci, Alfonso, Cardinal 564 f.
Peutinger, Conrad 616
Pfefferkorn, John 619
Philagathus of Cerami 134 f.
Philagrius, Joseph 509
Philarghi, Peter, Cardinal, Archbishop of Milan 418, 422; *see also* Alexander V, Pope of Pisan obedience
Philip, chancellor 248, 254
Philip, Count of Flanders 83
Philip II Augustus, King of France, 78 f., 83, 85, 149–51, *152 f.*, 164, 189, 247
Philip III, King of France 204, 238 f., 284
Philip IV the Fair, King of France 239 f., 260, 285–87, 292–96, 305, 312
— and Boniface VIII 271–73, 276–79, 296 f., 299, 301
— and Clement V 296–301, 306
— and the Templars 297–301, 303
Philip VI, King of France 310, 313, 316 f., 321
Philip, Prince of Taranto 490
Philip of Courtenay 127, 236 (n.)
Philip of Harvengt, Abbot of Bonne-Espérance 18, 43, 112
Philip of Heinsberg, Archbishop of Cologne 76 f., 83
Philip of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia and Tuscany, King of Germany 80 f., 145, *148*, 150, 155 f.
Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy 483, 535
Philotheus Coccinus, Patriarch of Constantinople 493, 503 f.
Piccinino, James 533, 535
Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvius, Cardinal 486, 487 (n.), 496, 533, 541, 588, 591, 614; *see also* Pius II, Pope
Piccolomini, Anthony 535 f.
Pico della Mirandola, John 522, 524, 610
Piedmont 209, 235, 322, 405
Pierleoni 6 f., 9
— Hugh, Cardinal Deacon of Sant'Angelo 74
— Peter, Cardinal of San Callisto 4, 7 f.; *see also* Anacletus II, "Antipope"
piety, popular 571 f., *see also* crusade piety
Pileo da Prata, Cardinal 408
pilgrimage 28, 60, 74, 86, 88, 111, 113, 178, 190, 275 f., 281, 285, 441, 572, 584, 589 f.
Pirkheimer, Willibald 615 f.
Pisa 281, 373, 416
Pisa, Council of (1128) 5

Pisa, Council of (1135) 9 f.
Pisa, Council of (1409) 416 f., *418–23*, 448 f., 451–53, 462, 468, 495
— organization 418
— process against rival Popes 419–22
— evaluation 423
Pisa, Council of (1511–12) 558–61, 563
Pius II, Pope 467 (n.), 525, *533–40*, 541, 548, 557, 588, 591 f., 594, 614
— career 534
— and crusade 534, 536 f., 540
— and Naples 534 f.
— and Congress of Mantua 535 f.
— and Muhammad II 537
— and George of Bohemia 537 f., 542
— and reform 538 f., 591 f.
— "Execrabilis" 539
— personality 539 f.
Pius III, Pope 557
Planudes, Maximus 505 f.
Platina, Bartholomew 541
Plato 506, 509, 511 f., 522 f.
Platonic Academy of Florence 522–24
Platonism 523, 586, 593, 618, 622
Plethon, George Gemistus 511 f., 520, 522
pluralism 161, 207, 337 f., 463, 539, 570, 573, 592
Poitiers, interviews between Clement V and Philip IV 295 f., 299, 305
Poland 153 f., 209, 217, 223, 456, 459, 461, 467 (n.), 482, 537
Policraticus 34
Pollaiuolo, Anthony 548
Pomerania 28, 217 f.
Pomponius Laetus 542
Pons de Melgueil, Abbot of Cluny 5 f.
Pontigny 12, 14, 18, 20, 70 f.
Poor Catholics 166
Poor Clares 178
Poor Lombards 101, 170, 208 f.
Poor Men of Lyons 166, 208; *see also* Waldensians
Poor Men of Milan 166
Pope as Senator of Rome 235, 239
Porcaro, Stephen 530
Porré, Martin, Bishop of Arras 460
Portiuncula 178 f.
Portugal 27 f., 39, 146, 170, 301, 399 f., 407, 482, 555
potentia dei absoluta 346–49, 601
Poujet, Bertrand du, Cardinal 310, 313
poverty dispute, Franciscan 180, *241–43*, 302, 313, 347, 363 f., 368, *369–75*
poverty movement 33, 54 (n.), 86, 98 f., 101, 105, 136, 158, 173, 177 f., 183, 241, 243 f.
poverty of Christ and Apostles 371–73
Praepositinus of Cremona, *see* Prévotin of Cremona
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges 482, 536, 558, 563, 583, 618
Prague, University of 447 f., 456
Preachers, Order of, *see* Dominican Order
preaching 110, 138 (n.), 171, 173–76, 179, 181, 376, 384, 447 f., 511, 554, 571, *574–78*, 600, 612 f.
preaching, itinerant 98, 101, 105, 109, 177 f., 181
Premonstratensian Order 6, 13, *16–18*, 43, 109, 140, 175, 184, 217 f., 610
— constitution 17
— in cathedral chapters 17
— nuns 17
Prémontré 3, 17, 19 f., 23, 29, 39 f., 43, 58, 160, 168, 244; *see also* Premonstratensians
Prester John 223, 392
Prévotin of Cremona 91, 254
Prignano, Bartholomew, Archbishop of Bari 401 f.; *see also* Urban VI, Pope
primates 229
printing 579 f.
— of Bible 580
privy purse, papal 341
Procop 476
procurations 463, 465
prostitutes 159, 160 (n.)
Prouille 173 f., 176
Provence 242, 295, 322, 325, 329, 333, 370 f., 413 f., 609
provisions, papal 227 f., 407, 463, 472
Prussia 176, 185 f., 215, 217, *220 f.*
pseudo-Dionysius 255, 388, 437, 524, 586
Ptolemy of Lucca 259
Pupper von Goch, John 594, *597 f.*

Qipčaq 396 f.
Qrna 398

Radewijns, Florens 427–29, 431 f., 434, 438
Radulf, Cistercian monk 605
Rainald of Dassel, Archbishop of Cologne 55, 59–61
Rainald of Urslingen, Duke of Spoleto 190
Ranulf de Broc 72
Raoul Ardent 93
Raoul of Laon 44 f.
Raoul of Vermandois 25
Raoul the Breton 257
rapiaria 430, 437, 440, 443
Ravenna, battle of (1512) 559
Raymond V, Count of Toulouse 102
Raymond VI, Count of Toulouse 162, 164 f., 169
Raymond VII, Count of Toulouse 169, 196, 214, 216
Raymond, Prince of Antioch 37
Raymond Berengar IV, Count of Catalonia, King of Aragón 27
Raymond Berengar, Count of Provence 196
Raymond-Roger, Count of Foix 166
Raymond-Roger, Viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne 164 f.
Raymond Ruben 157
Raymond of Peñaforte, Cardinal 174, 176, 182, 225 f., 393
Raymond of Saint-Gilles, Count of Toulouse and of Tripolis 116
recluses 109, 244 f.
Reconquista 27, 146, 170, 221, 283
reform literature 463 f.
reform of Church 136 f., 140 f., *159–62*, 167, 169, 196, 203, 205, 207, 302 f., 319 f., 325, 444–48,

455, *462–68*, 471 f., *476–79*, 482, 486 f., 521, 538 f., 545 f., 555, 564, 588–90, 592–98, 600, 618
Reginald, Archbishop-elect of Canterbury 150
Reginald of Priverno 256
Reims, cathedral school 91, 95, 247
Reims, Council of (1131) 10
Reims, Council of (1148) 48 (n.), 49
relics, cult of 171 f., 441, 446, 592, 620
Renaissance 521–624
René, Duke of Anjou 482
reservation of benefices 336 f., 339–41, 344, 463, 465, 472, 477, 563
Reuchlin, John 608, 610, *619 f.*
reunion of the Churches, efforts for 114 f., 117–22, *124–27*, 135, 147, 154, 156 f., 166 f., 169, 176, 183, 203, 204 (n.), *205 f.*, 207, 234, 236 f., 325, 328, 396, 462, 475 f., 486, 490, *491–98*, 504, 511, 531 f., 546
— in 1274 124–27, 205 f., 236
— in 1439 480 f., 496–98
— with Oriental Churches 480
"Rex gloriae" 297
Rhense, Declaration of 318 f.
Riario, Jerome, Count of Imola and Forlì 544 f., 548
Riario, Peter, Cardinal 544, 565
Richard, Abbot of Fountains 26
Richard, Earl of Cornwall, King of Germany 199 f., 202, 204, 282 f.
Richard I Lionheart, King of England 78, 80, 84 f., 148, 150, 154
Richard II, King of England 411, 413, 447
Richard Anglicus 225
Richard of Cornwall 257
Richard of Leicester 92
Richard of Middleton 254, 258 f.
Richard of Paris 606
Richard of Saint-Victor 20, 42, 46, 112
Richard of San Germano 169
Richental, Ulric 451
Ricoldo da Monte Croce 393, 508
Rienzo, Cola di 322 f., 326, 493, 530
Rievaulx 14 f., 26
Riga 219 f.
Ripelin, Hugh, of Strasbourg 255
ritual murder, accusation of 606
Robert, Abbot of Molesme and Cîteaux 12
Robert, Count of Artois 238
Robert, King of Naples 304, 306 f., 309 f., 313, 323
Robert de Courçon, Cardinal 92, 137, 151, 161, 165, 247, 249, 252, 254
Robert de Sorbon 250
Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln 249, 251, 253, 257
Robert Guiscard, Duke of Apulia and Calabria 114 f.
Robert of Geneva, Cardinal 405; *see also* Clement VII, Pope at Avignon
Robert of Hereford 26
Robert of Melun, Bishop of Hereford 67, 90
Robert of Merton 67
Rode, John, Abbot of Sankt Matthias 583
Roger I, Count of Sicily 54
Roger II, Count and King of Sicily 3, 5, 9, 35–39, 51, 53, 76
Roger, Hugh, Cardinal 327
Roger, Peter, Cardinal 321; *see also* Clement VI, Pope
Roger, Peter, Cardinal 330; *see also* Gregory XI, Pope
Roger de Pont-l'Évêque, Archbishop of York 67 f., 70 f., 73
Roger of San Severino 237
Rokycana, John, Archbishop-elect of Prague 476
Roland of Cremona 255
Romagna 144, 162, 200, 212, 235 f., 239, 270, 305, 326, 410, 544 f., 552, 558
Roman Commune 35 (n.), 52–54, 64, 75, 78, 81 f., 144, 195
Roman Curia, University of the 251, 255
Romania, *see* Latin Empire of Constantinople
Roman Law 58, 93, 96, 103 f., 163, 211, 232, 358, 604
Romanus, Cardinal 212, 214
Rome 192 f., 195, 200–03, 228, 234 f., 239, 262, 268–70, 272, 276, 279, 291, 294 f., 304, 306 f., 309–12, 315 f., 321–23, 325 f., 333 f., 336, 360, 364, 401–06, 410, 412 f., 415 f., 445, 449 f., 461, 469–71, 473 f., 480, 493 f., 497, 585, 608 and *passim*
— and Rienzo 322 f., 326
— return of papacy from Avignon 328–33
— in Renaissance 522–25, 529–34, 537–43, 545–51, 553, 555, 557–59, 562, 591 f.
Rome, Conference of (1490) 549 f.
Rome, Congress of (1453) 529
Rome, Council of (1302) 276 f., 294
Rome, Council of (1412–13) 445 f., 449
Rome, pilgrimage to 86, 88, 111, 178, 275 f.
Rome, University of 280
Roncaglia, Diet of (1158) 56, 60, 74 (n.), 96
Roscelin of Compiègne 45, 345
Rota 262, 265 f., 338, 539; *see also Audientia Sacri Palatii*
Rovere, Francis della, Cardinal 543, 546 f.; *see also* Sixtus IV, Pope
Rovere, Julian della, Cardinal 544, 548–50, 557 f., 560; *see also* Julius II, Pope
Rucherath von Oberwesel, John 594–97
Rüdiger, Bishop of Speyer 604
Rudolf of Bern 606
Rudolf of Habsburg, King of Germany 204–06, 235, 239 f., 275
Rudolf of Hildesheim 177
Rudolf zu Wied, claimant to see of Trier 76, 78
Rudolph of Frontfroide 163
Rufinus, Bishop of Assisi 64, 94, 103
Rugger 24
Rupert, Abbot of Deutz 41–43, 107, 112, 603, 610 f.
Rupert, Count Palatine and King of Germany 408, 414, 418 f.
Russia 223, 516, 546
Ruysbroeck, John van *384–88*, 427, 432 f., 439
Ruysbroeck, William of 181, 223, 394

Sacconi, Rainer 208, 254
Sachsenhausen, Declaration of 311 f., 360, 372
Saint Anthony, Hospital Order of 186
Saint-Denis 44
Saint-Félix de Caraman, Council of (1167) 101
Saint-Gildas 44
Saint-Martin de Laon 17
Saint Peter's basilica 7, 56, 61, 273, 275, 291, 306, 329, 530, 548, 560
Saint-Ruf d'Avignon 20, 28, 52 f.
Saint-Victor de Marseille 327 f.
Saint-Victor de Paris 17 f., 20, 29, 40, 44–46, 48, 96, 112, 255, 388
saints, cult of 111
Saisset, Bernard, Bishop of Pamiers 276
Saladin 82–85
Saladin Tithe 83
Salamanca, University of 224, 247
Salerno, schools of 95, 97, 247
Salutati, Coluccio 523
"Salvator mundi" 276
Salviati, Francis, Archbishop of Pisa 544
Salzburg, provincial Council of (1451) 588, 607
Samson, Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds 110 (n.)
Sancho VII, King of Navarre 146
Sancho I, King of Portugal 146
Sancia of Aragón 552
Sancia, Queen of Naples 313
San Germano, Treaty of (1225) 188–90
San Germano, Treaty of (1230) 191, 193
Sankt Matthias in Trier 583
Sansoni-Riario, Raffael, Cardinal 544
Santa Giustina, Congregation of 582 f.
Sanzio, Raffael 560, 565
Sarai 396 f.
Sardinia 192, 270, 284, 304, 309
Sareshel, Alfred 251
Sarzana, Congress of (1378) 333
Sauli, Bandinelli, Cardinal 564
Savas, Saint 133
Savelli 553
— Cencio, Cardinal 81, 144, 188; *see also* Honorius III, Pope
— James, Cardinal, *see* Honorius IV, Pope
— Pandulf 239
Savona 415 f., 420 f.
Savonarola, Jerome 524, *554*, 556, 577
Savoy 209, 331, 406, 476, 484
Saxo, Cardinal Deacon of Santo Stefano 4
Scadde, Gerard 431
Schedel, Hermann 615
Schele, John, Bishop of Lübeck 485
Schism, Western 292, 336, 343 f., 374, *401–25*, 444, *448–68*, 473, 484, 495, 526, 531, 549, 581
— sources for 402 f.
— evaluation of testimony 403 f.
— second conclave of 1378 405
— obediences 406 f.
— and religious orders 408
— withdrawals of obedience 412 f., 416 f.
— discussion of a council 414, 423–25
— negotiations between claimants 414–16
— Council of Pisa 418–23
— Council of Constance 448–68
Schism of 1054 113–15
Schism of 1130–38 3, *6–10*, 19, 23, 27, 30, 57, 98
Schism of 1159–78 *57–63*, 65 f., 75, 79, 81 f.
schola notariorum 31
Scholarius, George Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople 498, 510 f.
scholasticism *43–50*, *89–93*, 131 f., 135, *250–60*, *344–55*, 375, 377, 509, 522 f.
scholasticism, attacks on 614, 619
schools, cathedral 43, 65, 95, 106, 249
schools, monastic *40–43*, 95, 250
schools, urban 569 f., 614
schools of languages 393
Schwarz, Peter 612 f.
Scolari, Paul, Cardinal, *see* Clement III, Pope
Scotland 56, 83, 181, 185, 229, 268, 274, 340, 406, 475
Segarelli, Gerard, of Parma 243
Segni, Lothar dei Conti di, Cardinal Deacon of Santi Sergio e Bacco 94, 137–39; *see also* Innocent III, Pope
Seljuk Turks 114, 116, 122, 129, 491, 513
Semipelagianism 601
Sens, Council of (1141) 47
Serbia 147, 154, 499
Serlo of Wilton 15
Servite Order 182
servitia communia 264, *339 f.*, 343 f., 465, 472, 525
Sforza 552 f.
— Ascanius, Cardinal 550 f.
— Catherine 544, 548
— Francis, Duke of Milan 529, 534–36, 542
— Galeazzo Maria, Duke of Milan 542–44
— Louis *il Moro*, Duke of Milan 550
— Maximilian, Duke of Milan 559
Sicard, Bishop of Cremona 94, 103
Sicilian Vespers 237 f., 267, 284, 488
Sicily, Kingdom of 3, 5, 9, 24, 30, 52–55, 59, 61 f., 64, *76–81*, 113, 145 f., 149, 152, 154, 170, 182, 188, 190, *191*, 192, 197–99, 205 f., 235, 238–40, 247, 270, 283 f., 304, 323, 407, 412, 415
— and Byzantine Empire 114 f., 118, 236
— transfer from Hohenstaufen 199–202, 235 f.
— War of Sicilian Vespers 237 f., 270, 272, 274; *see also* Naples, Kingdom of
Siegfried, Archbishop of Cologne 239
Siena, Council of, *see* Pavia-Siena, Council of
Siena, University of 248
Siger of Brabant 210, 253, 257, 260
Sigismund, King of Hungary, Germany, and Bohemia and Emperor 411, 448, 452, 454–56, 458, 461, 465, 468, 475 f., 484
— and prehistory of Council of Constance 449–51
— and Crusade of Nicopolis 494
Sigismund of Habsburg, Count of Tirol 588, 590
Silvester II, Pope 147
Simeon Metaphrastes 134
Simeon of Thessalonica 509, 515
Simeon the New Theologian 499
Simon de Brie, Cardinal 236; *see also* Martin IV, Pope
Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester 165 f., 168 f., 189
Simon of Bisignano 94

Simon of Perugia 418
Simon of Taversham 257
Simon of Tournai 91 f., 254
Simon of Tournai, Franciscan 246
Simon of Trent 606
Simon Stock 181
simony 65, 140, 161, 172, 428, 453 f., 462 f., 465 f., 478, 512, 548, 550 f., 558, 560, 589
Sinaites, Gregory 499
Sisters of the Common Life 427, 429, 431 f., 434, 436, 442, 584
Sistine Chapel 547 f., 560
Sixtus IV, Pope 523, *543–48*, 550 f., 558, 584
— nepotism of 544, 546–48
— and Pazzi Conspiracy 544
— and wars in Italy 545
— effort to reconvoke Council of Basel 545 f.
— and crusade 546 f.
— and College of Cardinals 547
— and Curia 547
— and patronage of humanism 547 f.
Skanderbeg 531
Smyrna 325, 514
Soissons, Council of (1121) 47
Sophia Palaeologa 546
Soterichus Panteugenes 131 f.
Spain *27*, *146*, 207–09, 211, 216, 221, 224, 247, 252, 283 f., 344, 393, 399, 417 f., 443, 448, 454, 482, 525, 549, 553, 555, 558–60, 562, 564, 583 f.
— and Jews 608–12
Spalatin, George 618
Spina, Alfonso de 612
Spiritual Franciscans 180, 210, *241–46*, 268, 273, 280, 292, 312 f., 320, 360, 370–72
Spoleto, Duchy of 144, 200, 326, 557
spolia 339, *340*, 341, 463, 465, 541
Sprenger, James 597
Stagel, Elsbeth 383, 388
Stefaneschi, Cardinal 457
Steinhövel, Henry 615
Stephen, Bishop of Metz 36
Stephen, Bishop of Tournai 94, 103, 110
Stephen, Great Zupan of Serbia 154
Stephen, King of England 26, 51, 68
Stephen I, King of Hungary 146
Stephen Nemanja, Kral of the Serbs 133
Stephen of Cloeys 158
Stephen of Garlande 29
Stephen of Landskron 578
Stephen Urosh II, Kral of the Serbs 490
Sterngassen, Gerard 377
Sterngassen, John 377
Strasbourg, Treaty of (1189) 78
Stuben, Verena von, Abbess of Sonnenburg 590
subdeacons and chaplains, papal 31 f., 539
subsidium caritativum 339, *340 f.*, 463
Suckis, Cornelius de 575
Suerbeer, Albert, Archbishop of Armagh and Riga 219
Suger, Abbot of Saint-Denis 25, 29, 37, 41, 51
Sultaniyah 398 f.
"Super cathedram" 279, 570
"Super Petri solio" 279
supplicia 263, 337 f.
Surgant, John Ulric 577 f.
Suso, Henry 381, *382 f.*, 390, 427, 438, 440
Sverker II, King of Sweden 153
Sverre, King of Norway 153, 159
Sweden 153, 219
synodos endemousa 128 f., 513, 516
Syropoulus, Silvester 481, 510, 515

Tagliacozzo, battle of 202
Talleyrand de Périgord, Cardinal 324, 336
Talmud 608 f., 611, 619
Tanchelin 98
Tancred, canonist 224 f.
Tancred of Lecce, King of Sicily 78–80
Tarascon, Treaty of 269
Tartars 394; *see also* Mongols
Tataria Aquilonaris 395 f.
Tataria Orientis 396
Tauler, John 377, *381 f.*, 384, 389 f., 440
Tebaldeschi, Francis, Cardinal 402
Tegernsee 583
Tempier, Stephen, Bishop of Paris 256
Tenduc 397
Tenorio, Peter, Archbishop of Toledo 408
terminism 354 f.
Terracina 533
Terrena, Guy, of Perpignan 492
Tescelin Sorrel 18
Teutonic Knights *see* Knights, Teutonic
Thaddeus of Naples 286
Thaddeus of Suessa 196 f.
Thedisius, Bishop of Agde 169
Theobald 612
Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury 26, 67
Theobald, Cardinal Priest of Sant'Anastasia, *see* Celestine II, "Antipope"
Theobald, Count of Champagne 19
Theobald II, Count of Champagne 25
Theobald III, Count of Champagne 155
Theobald IV, Count of Champagne and King of Navarre 282 f.
Theobald of Cépoy 490
Theobald of Marly 15
Theoderic, Bishop of the Cumans 395
Theodore, Byzantine Emperor of Nicaea 121 f., 157
Theodore Balsamon, Patriarch of Antioch 129 f.
Theodore of Antioch 251
theology, mystical 112, 136 f., 353, 375–90, 426–43
theology, scholastic *43–49*, 50 f., 58, 66, *89–93*, 95 f., 136, 139, 248, 375, 426
theology in 15th century 585–603
Theophanes, Metropolitan of Nicaea 126
Theophylact Hephaestus, Archbishop of Ochrida 113 (n.), 135
Thessalonica 499
Thierry of Chartres 48
Third Order of Saint Dominic 177
Third Order of Saint Francis 178 f.
Thomas à Kempis 426, 427 (n.), 430, 432 f., 439
— and *The Imitation of Christ* 440
Thomas Aquinas 135, 183, 204 (n.), 205, 226 f., 251–53, *255 f.*, 257, 259, *260*, 278, 314, 345,

353, 355, 436, 508 f., 511 f., 594, 600, 604, 609, 612
— *Summa Theologica* 49, 256, 354, 508, 512
— *Summa contra Gentiles* 255, 393, 508, 512
— works translated into Greek 504, 508, 512
Thomas of Capua, Cardinal 191, 265
Thomas of Sutton 258
Thomas of Valais 257
Thomas of York 257
Thomist school 258 f., 292, 352, 354 f.
Timur, Great Khan 397
Timur-Leng 398 f., 494
Tiron, Order of 29, 583
tithes 268, 309, 316, 321, 325, 340, 343, 463, 465 f., 535, 563
Todeschini-Piccolomini, Francis, Cardinal, *see* Pius III, Pope
Toke, Henry 485
Toledo, school of 247, 251
Toledo as centre of translation 251 f.
Tolfa 525, 540
Tomacelli, Peter, Cardinal 410; *see also* Boniface IX, Pope
Toqtai, Khan 396
Tordesillas, Treaty of (1494) 555
Torquemada, John of 485, 537
Toscanelli, Paul del Pozzo 585
Totting, Henry, of Oyta 352
Toulouse, Council of (1160) 58
Toulouse, Council of (1229) 214
Toulouse, County of 162, 165
Toulouse, University of 248, 252
Tours, Council of (1163) 59, 68, 102, 211
translations from Latin into Greek 506–09
translations of Arabic and Jewish scholarship 251, 609
translations of Greek scholarship 251 f., 523, 530
transubstantiation 90, 170, *349*, 596
Traversari, Ambrose 485, 508
treasure, papal 265, 270, 279, 332, 335, *341 f.*, 532
Trebizond, Empire of 120, 123, 156, 514
Trevisan, Louis, Cardinal, Patriarch of Aquileia 532
Trier, provincial Council of (1227) 611
Trinitarian Order 162, 172, 182, 391
Tripolis 84, 281
Trithemius, John, Abbot of Sponheim 618
Trondheim, *see* Nidaros
troubadours 15, 109, 159
Troyes, Council of (1128) 20
Tunis 283
Turks, *see* Ottoman Turks, Seljuk Turks, Khwarazmian Turks
Tuscany 162, 182, 190, 201–03, 208, 234 f., 242, 274 f., 280, 295, 328 f., 331, 333, 371, 490, 552
tyrannicide 456, *459–61*
Tyre 84, 281

Ubertino da Casale 242, 244, 370 f.
Udo, Magister 90
Ugolino, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia 178 f., 188; *see also* Gregory IX, Pope
Ulric, Bishop of Passau 169
"Unam sanctam" *277 f.*, 357
universities *95–97, 247–50, 252–60*
— organization of 247–50
— and the magisterium 451
Urban II, Pope 16, 30, 35, 43, 54, 113, 125, 154
— and Byzantine Empire 115 f.
Urban III, Pope 76 (n.), 77
Urban IV, Pope 124, *200 f.*, 221, 256, 265, 267, 284
Urban V, Pope *327–29*, 337 f., 340–43, 395, 585
— career 327
— and reform 327
— return to Rome 328
— and Italian politics 328 f.
— return to Avignon 329
— and John V 493 f.
Urban VI, Pope 333, *402–10*, 412, 424 f., 428, 444, 585
— validity of election of 403 f., 406
— character 404
— and the College of Cardinals 404 f.
— obedience 406–08
— and Charles III of Naples 409 f.
Urbino, War of 565
Usun Hasan, Turcoman chief 546
usury 160 f., 172, 207, 607, 612
Uzbek, Khan 396

vacancies of Holy See, prolonged 193 f., 200–03, 234, 236, 240, 261, 267, 270, 292–94, 308
Vadstena 585
Valboa, Gonsalvo de 370
Valencia, Kingdom of 238, 450
Valla, Lawrence 522 f., 622
Valladolid, Congregation of 583 f.
Vallebona, Gonsalvus de 255
Vasilij, Grand Duke of Moscow 516
Vatican 279 f., 401 f., 527, 530 f., 540, 548, 550, 552, 555, 557, 560 f., 564; *see also* archives, library
Veghe, John 442
Velde, Heymeric van de 354, 586
Venice 60, 62 f., 77, 119, 170, 192, 221, 274, 281, 305, 325, 331, 405, 409, 475, 479, 496, 517
— Peace of (1177) 62 f., 65, 74 f., 104
— Council of (1177) 63
— and Byzantine Empire 119, 123 f., 127, 155 f., 237 f.
— in Renaissance 525, 529, 534–37, 542, 545 f., 548 f., 553, 558 f., 561–63, 580
"Vergentis in senium" 104, 163, 211
Verona, Council of (1184) 75 f., 101, 104, 163, 211 f., 214 f.
Verona, League of 60
Vézelay, pilgrimage to 111
via antiqua 353–55, 594; *see also* scholasticism
via cessionis 410–12, 420 f.
via conventionis 411 f.
via facti 409, 411 f.
via moderna 351, 355, 426, 594, 600; *see also* nominalism, scholasticism
vicar (assistant) 231
vicar (substitute) 231 f., 575
vicar general 230

Vicar of Christ 144
vice-chancellor, papal 32, *263 f.*, 337, 539, 548, 550 f.
Victor IV, "Antipope" (1) 9
Victor IV, "Antipope" (2) 57–60
Vienna, Diet of (1237) 192
Vienna, University of 352 (n.), 354
Vienne, Ecumenical Council of (1311–12) 222, 243, 246, 259, 281, 287, 295, 297, 299, *300–03*, 306, 340, 343, 357, 393, 425, 462, 569
— and the Templars 300 f., 303
— and Olivi 301 f.
— and Franciscan poverty 302, 371
— and reform 302 f.
Vincent, Spanish canonist 226
Visconti 235, 310 f., 313, 326, 328–31
— Bernabò 328
— Gian Galeazzo, Duke of Milan 409, 422
— John, Archbishop of Milan 322
— Matthew 360
— Philip Mary, Duke of Milan 529
Visconti, Tedaldo, *see* Gregory X, Pope
visitatio ad limina 161, 230
vita apostolica (evangelica) movement 11, 86 f., 98, 105 f., 173, 183, 240
Vitalis de Furno (du Four) 255, 259
Vizelin, Bishop of Oldenburg 28 f., 218
Vladislav III, Duke of Poland 154
Volz, Paul, Abbot 621
Vornken, Willem 433
Vos van Heusden, John 433, 438 f.
Vulk, King of Dalmatia 154

Wagria 218
Waldemar, Archbishop-elect of Bremen 169
Waldensians 64, 66, *101,* 104, 166, 173, *208 f.,* 210, 240
Waldo, Peter 101
Waleys, Thomas 316
Walter, Archbishop of Ravenna 9
Walter, Bishop of Rochester 71
Walter, Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury 150
Walter Map 15, 65
Walter of Brienne 146
Walter of Bruges 254
Walter of Saint-Victor 89
Walther von der Vogelweide 136 (n.)
Welsham, Roger 257
Wenceslas IV, King of Bohemia and Germany 404, 406, 408 f., 411, 414, 422, 447 f.
Wenck, John 354
Wends 217 f.
Werner of Oberwesel 606
Westminster, royal council at (1163) 68
Wibald of Stavelot 41, 51, 57
Wichmann, Archbishop of Magdeburg 60
Wichmann, Bishop of Zeitz-Naumburg 52
William, Abbot of Saint-Thierry 15, 41 f., 112
William, Archbishop of Tyre 65, 82
William, Cardinal 56, 59
William, Duke of Apulia 5
William I, King of Sicily 53 f., 57, 61
William II, King of Sicily 76, 78, 84
William III, King of Sicily 80
William Arnaud of Montpellier 215
William de la Mare 254, 259
William de Luna 251
William de Montibus 92
William Durandus, Bishop of Mende 236, 347, 425, 462
William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris 248, 253 f.
William of Auxerre 47, 90, 254, 571
William of Champeaux, Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne 19 f., 45, 47, 95
William of Corbeil, Archbishop of Canterbury 26
William of Malavalle 88
William of Malmesbury 41
William of Mandagout, Archbishop of Embrun 225
William of Melitona 254
William of Modena, papal legate 219 f.
William of Moerbeeke 251, 255, 375
William of Nogaret, *see* Norgaret, William of
William of Norwich 606
William of Ockham, *see* Ockham, William of
William of Plaisians 279
William of Saint-Amour 209, 246, 253, 369
William of Shyreswood 253
William of Tripolis 393
William of Ware 254, 259
William I the Conqueror, King of England 25, 67
William the Lion, King of Scotland 83
Williamite Order 182
Wilsnack, pilgrimage to 572, 589 f.
Wimpheling, James 617 f.
Windesheim Chronicle 432, 439
Windesheim Congregation 428, *432–34,* 439, 442, 581, 589
Wladimir, Paul 461
Wodham, Adam 351
woman's role in High Middle Ages 108 f., 375 f.
women, numerical superiority in Late Middle Ages 566 f.
Würzburg, Chapter of (1451) 588 f.
Würzburg, Diet of (1130) 9
Würzburg, Diet of (1165) 60 f., 70
Würzburg, Synod of (1287) 569
Wyclif, John *443–47,* 448 f., 456 f., 459
— realism 444
— writings 444 f.
Wyle, Niklas von 615

Yailaq, Empress of Qipčaq 396
Yolande, Queen of Jerusalem 157, 190
York 67 f., 71

Zabarella, Francis, Cardinal 450, 457 f., 460, 585
Zalva, Martin de, Cardinal, Bishop of Pamplona 402
Zamometič, Andrew, titular Bishop of Granea 545 f.
Zara 155
Zasius, Ulric 618
Zerbolt van Zutphen, Gerard 431, 436, 438
Zonaras 129

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

V

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume V

REFORMATION AND COUNTER REFORMATION

by

ERWIN ISERLOH

JOSEPH GLAZIK

HUBERT JEDIN

Translated by

Anselm Biggs

and

Peter W. Becker

A Crossroad Book
THE SEABURY PRESS · NEW YORK

1980
The Seabury Press
815 Second Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. IV: *Reformation, Katholische Reform und Gegenreformation,* 2d edition
© Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1967

English translation © 1980 by The Seabury Press, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the written permission of The Seabury Press.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Jedin, Hubert, 1900-   ed.
History of the church.
Translation of Handbuch der Kirchengenschichte.
"A Crossroad book."
Vols. 1, 3, and 4 previously issued under title:
Handbook of church history.
Includes bibliographies and indexes.
CONTENTS: [etc.]—v. 5. Iserloh, E., Glazik, J. and
Jedin, H. Reformation and counter reformation.
1. Church history. I. Dolan, John Patrick. II. Title.
BR145.2.J413 1980 270 79-29649
ISBN 0-8164-0449-6 (v. 5)

CONTENTS

Preface xi

Preface to the English Edition xiii

List of Abbreviations xv

PART ONE: THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

SECTION ONE—MARTIN LUTHER AND THE COMING OF THE REFORMATION (1517–25) (Erwin Iserloh) 3

Chapter 1: Causes of the Reformation 3

Chapter 2: Martin Luther: The Early Years 11
  Home and Youth 12
  University and Monastery 13
  Luther's Visit to Rome 18
  Doctor of Holy Scripture 18
  The Lectures on the Psalms (1513–15) 20
  The Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans (1515–16) 24
  The Lectures on the Epistle to the Galatians (1516–17) 29
  The Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews (1517–18) 30
  Luther's Reform Understanding of *Iustitia Dei* 33

Chapter 3: The Indulgence Controversy 42
  History and Use of Indulgences 42
  The Trafficking in Indulgences by Albrecht of Mainz 44
  Luther's Ninety-five Theses 48

Chapter 4: Rome's Proceedings against Luther and the Leipzig Disputation . . 52
  The Leipzig Disputation 63

Chapter 5: Luther's Reform Writings of 1520 64

Chapter 6: The Excommunicated Friar before the Diet of Worms 71

Chapter 7: Luther at the Wartburg and the Reform Movement in Wittenberg . 81
  Monastic Vows and Freedom by the Gospel 85
  Regulation of Community Worship 87
  Luther's Translation of the Bible 94

Chapter 8: The Reformers in Luther's Circle 97

Chapter 9: The Pontificate of Adrian VI 104

SECTION TWO—THE STRUGGLE OVER THE CONCEPT OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM (Erwin Iserloh) 113

Chapter 10: The Knights War 113

Chapter 11: The "Fanatics" Karlstadt and Müntzer 116
Karlstadt 117
Thomas Müntzer 128

Chapter 12: The Peasants' War 138

Chapter 13: Luther's Rejection of Humanism—Erasmus' Later Years 144

Chapter 14: Zwingli and the Beginnings of the Reformation in German Switzerland 156
The Break with the Church 160
The Reformation in the Other Cantons of German Switzerland 170

Chapter 15: Anabaptists and Spiritualists 177
The Swiss Brethren and the South German Anabaptists 178
The Moravian Brethren 182
The Anabaptists in the Netherlands and North Germany 183
Spiritualism 188

Chapter 16: The Catholic Literary Opponents of Luther and the Reformation . 191

SECTION THREE—THE REFORM IN THE GERMAN PRINCIPALITIES (Erwin Iserloh) 208

Chapter 17: The Confessional Leagues. The Imperial Diets of Nürnberg (1524) and Speyer (1526) 208

Chapter 18: Luther's Concept of the Church and Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms 213
Concept of the Church 213
Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms 217
Church Government 220

Chapter 19: The Completion of the Lutheran Community 225
Regulation of Church Property 225
Liturgy 227
Completion of the Ecclesiastical Constitution 230
Schools and Religious Instruction 233

Chapter 20: Clement VII and Charles V 237

Chapter 21: The Speyer Protest and the Marburg Religious Colloquy 241
The Diet of Speyer in 1529 242
Zwingli's Eucharistic Doctrine 245
The Marburg Religious Colloquy 249
Zwingli's Death and Succession 252

Chapter 22: The Imperial Diet of Augsburg 253
Construction of the Creed 255
The Course of the Diet 258
The *Confutatio* 260
The *Apologia* 263

Chapter 23: The Politicizing of the Reform Movement to the Collapse of the Religious Colloquies 265
Right of Resistance 265
The League of Schmalkalden 266
The Nürnberg Armistice 268
Introduction of the Reformation in Württemberg and Other Territories . . 268
The Wittenberg Accord 269
Protestant Refusal to Participate in the Council 270

The Frankfurt Armistice 273
The Religious Colloquies of 1540–41 274

Chapter 24: The Breakdown of Universalism and the Religious Peace of Augsburg 279
The Emperor and the Protestants on the Brink of War 279
Progress of the Reformation 281
The Schmalkaldic War 284
The Violent Diet and the *Interim* 288
The Revolt of the Princes 294
The Religious Peace of Augsburg 295

SECTION FOUR—EUROPE UNDER THE SIGN OF CONFESSIONAL PLURALISM (Erwin Iserloh; chap. 27: Hubert Jedin) 301

Chapter 25: The Reformation in Scandinavia 301
Denmark 302
Norway 304
Iceland 305
Sweden 306
Finland 310

Chapter 26: The Reformation in Eastern Europe 311
The Duchy of Prussia 312
Livonia 315
Poland 317
Hungary 321

Chapter 27: Schism and Reformation in England 327
The Marriage Case of Henry VIII 328
The Act of Supremacy 329
The Suppression of the Monasteries 332
Alliances and Creeds 333
The Upsurge of Protestantism under Edward VI (1547–53) 336
Ecclesia Anglicana under Elizabeth I (1558–1603) 338

Chapter 28: The Struggle over Lutheran Orthodoxy 340
The Antinomian Controversy 341
The Synergist Controversy 344
The Majorist Controversy 347
The Adiaphora Controversy 350
The Osiander Controversy 352
The Second Eucharistic Controversy 356

Chapter 29: Jean Calvin: Personality and Work 361
Youth, Studies, and Early Writings (1509–36) 361
First Activity in Geneva (1536–38) 365
Strasbourg (1538–41) 369
The Organization of Church Authority in Geneva (1541–64) 373
Basic Outline of Calvin's Theology 376
Doctrinal Trials 381
Calvin's Doctrine of the Eucharist and his Efforts for Ecclesiastical and Sacramental Fellowship among the Protestants 383

Chapter 30: The Spread of Calvinism in Western Europe 390
France 391
The Netherlands 398
Germany 402
Scotland and England 410

Chapter 31: The Development of Denominations in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries 419

PART TWO: CATHOLIC REFORM AND COUNTER REFORMATION

The Historical Concepts 431

SECTION ONE—ORIGIN AND BREAKTHROUGH OF THE CATHOLIC REFORM TO 1563 (Hubert Jedin) 433

Chapter 32: Preliminary Steps in Italy and Spain 433
- Reform Efforts in Italy 433
- New Orders 436
- Reform of the Mendicant Orders 437
- Cardinals and Bishops 439
- The Fifth Lateran Council 441
- France and Germany 442
- Spain 442

Chapter 33: Ignatius Loyola and His Order to 1556 446
- The Founder 446
- Spread of the Society 453

Chapter 34: The Beginnings of the Catholic Reform in Rome under Paul III . 456
- Convocations of the Council 462

Chapter 35: The Council of Trent under Paul III and Julius III 466
- The Decree on Justification 469
- Transfer to Bologna 473
- Second Period of Sessions 476

Chapter 36: The Breakthrough of the Catholic Reform (1551–59) 479

Chapter 37: Pius IV and the Conclusion of the Council of Trent 488

SECTION TWO—THE PAPACY AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (1565–1605) (Hubert Jedin) 499

Chapter 38: Personality and Work of the Reform Popes from Pius V to Clement VIII 499
- Pius V 499
- Gregory XIII 503
- Sixtus V 505
- Clement VIII 508

Chapter 39: Self-Assertion of the Church in Western and Eastern Europe . . 511
- Spain and the Netherlands 511
- France 513
- England 517
- Poland, Sweden, and Russia 519

Chapter 40: Crisis and Turning Point in Central Europe 522

SECTION THREE—RELIGIOUS FORCES AND INTELLECTUAL CONTENT OF THE CATHOLIC RENEWAL (Hubert Jedin) 535

Chapter 41: The Revival of Scholasticism, Michael Baius and the Controversy over Grace 535
- Revival of Scholasticism 537
- Jesuit Theology 538
- Michael Baius 541
- Controversy over Grace 542

Chapter 42: The Rise of Positive Theology 546
  Church Fathers and Councils 547
  Church History 550
  Canon Law 552
  Printing Houses and Libraries 553

Chapter 43: Spiritual Life, Popular Devotion and Art 555
  Carmelite Mysticism 557
  Italy and France 558
  Preaching of the Faith 559
  Administration of Sacraments 562
  Popular Devotion 563
  Arts and Literature 565

Chapter 44: The New and the Old Orders 567

SECTION FOUR—THE SPRINGTIME OF THE MISSIONS IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD (Josef Glazik) 575

Chapter 45: The Missions under Spanish Patronage 575
  The Antilles 578
  Mexico 580
  Peru 582
  New Granada 584
  The Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay 585
  The Mission in the Philippines 587

Chapter 46: The Missions under Portuguese Patronage 589
  Africa 592
  Asia 595
  Brazil 606
  Entry of France into the Mission Field 608

Chapter 47: The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith 610

SECTION FIVE—EUROPEAN COUNTER REFORMATION AND CONFESSIONAL ABSOLUTISM (1605–55) (Hubert Jedin) 615

Chapter 48: Paul V, Gregory XV and the Beginnings of the Central European Counter Reformation 615
  Conflict with Venice 616
  Successes and Failures 619
  Start of the Thirty Years' War 620

Chapter 49: Urban VIII, Innocent X and the End of the Counter Reformation 623
  Church Policy during the Thirty Years' War 624
  Counter Reformation in the Empire 626
  The Peace of Westphalia 627
  England's Hegemony among Protestant Powers 629

Chapter 50: Denominationalism and Secularization 632
  Theories of State and Absolutism 637
  Secularization of Thought 639

General Bibliography 646

Bibliography to Individual Chapters 659

Supplement to Bibliography 740

Index 757

PREFACE

This volume was originally intended to treat the Late Middle Ages together with the Reformation and the Catholic Reform. Such an arrangement would have much in its favor, since the historical dependence of the Reformation would have been much clearer. For if the Reformation was the revolutionary answer to the unrealized reform of the Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the late medieval period belongs among the causes of the Reformation. These are discussed briefly in the present volume because it was decided not to deal with the Late Middle Ages and the Age of the Reformation in the same volume. Chapter 13, "Luther's Rejection of Humanism—Erasmus' Later Years," is thus deprived of a direct connection with the chapter "German Humanism," which is now the concluding chapter of volume IV. Nevertheless, the new arrangement, while dictated by technical necessity, is not without an objective basis. For the beginning of the Reformation, the discovery of America, the invention of printing, and other events occurring around A.D. 1500 so clearly inaugurated a new epoch that this has become standard in previous historical works and has, as a matter of fact, determined this one.

The chapters of this volume were produced over a period of about six years. Confident that all contributors could adhere to their agreement and seeking to fulfill its own pledge to the book trade and to the reader, Verlag Herder proceeded quite early with the typesetting and the preparation of page proofs. As a result the bibliography for Part II, in existence for some time, could only be brought into conformity with the most recent publications by means of the supplement given on pages 740–755.

The authors' views on the term "Counter Reformation," used in the title of the volume, is explained on pages 431–432.

Erwin Iserloh

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

The eminent German Jesuit theologian Hugo Rahner recently wrote that through this volume of the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* one can learn that what took place over a thousand years ago—part of which was highly regarded down to the present day—was audaciously cut away by the Church of our day as antiquated historical ballast. A product of the stirring days of the Second Vatican Council, this volume of the history of the Church reflects many of the changes introduced by the Council, but its relationship to that great assembly is more causal than consequential. In a very special way it proves the verity of the old axiom that though history may not confer faith or virtue, it can clear away the misconceptions and misunderstandings that turn men against each other.

No other period in Christian history has witnessed a greater and more violent display of men turning against each other for the sake of a common religion than the events recounted in this volume. At the time the plans for this series on ecclesiastical history were being drawn up by its organizer and editor, Hubert Jedin, he wrote in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* that the history of the Reformation had as yet not been written, nor would it be written until the atmosphere was cleared of the accumulated bias and misconceptions that have continued to cloud both Catholic and Protestant interpretations of the event. Certainly the efforts of those who have produced this volume indicate a step in the right direction. As in the previous volumes, each contributor has been free to present his own scholarly opinions and thus there will be differences in the judgments of persons and events.

In addition to being the result of teamwork, this series has the merit of bringing into proper perspective many aspects of the reform movements that have long been the preserve of the specialist. The attention given the lesser known *personae dramatis,* the collaborators of Luther and his Catholic literary opponents, is an example of this, as is the detailed account of the spread of Lutheranism into Scandinavia and Slavic lands and of Calvinism into eastern Europe.

In a Rankean sense there are no great heroes and villains treated here. A proper balance between the role played by the papacy and the Church at large is consistently maintained. The authors are aware of the fact that historians are often wont to coin phrases—"Reformation" and "Counter Reformation" being examples—without always keeping in mind the disparate realities such terms may have represented in different periods of time. Luther, for example, in his most sensational and stirring attack on the papacy, *An Appeal to the Nobility of the German Nation,* did not use the term "Reformation;" rather he used the expression "improvement" (*Besserung*). The framers of the Augsburg Confession strongly attest to their catholicism. The term "Counter Reformation" in the sense of a common effort was not used until the nineteenth century and then by Leopold von Ranke in his *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation.*

In addition to providing the reader with a wide-ranging account of the reform movements, it is hoped that this volume will act as a moderating influence in the trend among certain church historians who emphasize particularism, if not literally parochialism, as the true approach to understanding the church, seemingly oblivious to the fact that the expression "church" was first used in a universal sense. Thus the book represents, in a real sense, a projection of the Pauline exhortation to the Ephesians:

σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῶ συνδέσμω τῆς εἰρήνης.

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAug	*Analecta Augustiniana,* Rome 1905ff.
ADB	*Allgemeine deutsche Biographie,* 55 vols, Leipzig 1875–1910; Index Vol. 1912 (see NDB)
AElsKG	*Archiv für elsässische Kirchengeschichte,* ed. Gesellschaft für elsässische Kirchengeschichte, 1926ff.
AER	*The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Washington 1889ff.
AFP	*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,* Rome 1931ff.
AFrH	*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* Florence–Quaracchi 1908ff.
AHPont	*Archivum Historiae Pontificiae,* Rome 1963ff.
AHSI	*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu,* Rome 1932ff.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855ff.
AIA	*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Madrid 1914ff.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857.
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Münster and Cologne 1903ff.
Allen	*Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami,* ed. P. S. Allen, 12 vols, Oxford 1906–58.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949ff.
Ann. Eccl.	*Annales Ecclesiastici.*
Anthropos	*Anthropos. Internationale Zeitschrift für Völker-und Sprachenkunde,* Mödling 1906ff.
Antonianum	*Antonianum,* Rome 1926ff.
AÖG	*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte,* Vienna 1865ff.
ARC	*Acta reformationis catholicae ecclesiam concernentia saeculi XVI,* ed. G. Pfeilschifter, 6 vols., Regensburg 1959ff.
ARG	*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Gütersloh 1903ff.
ArSKG	*Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte* I–VI Breslau 1936–41, VIIff. Hildesheim 1949ff.
ASR	*American Sociological Review,* Washington 1936ff.
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Societa Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1878–1934.
AstlIt	*Archivio storico Italiano,* Florence 1842ff.
BGDSL	*Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur,* Halle 1874ff.
BRN	*Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* ed. S. Cramer and F. Pijper, 10 vols., Den Haag 1903–14.
BSLK	*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* ed. Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenausschuss, Göttingen 1956.

BullPatr	*Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae Regum in Ecclesiis Africae, Asia et Oceaniae . . . ,* ed. L. M. Jordão et al., I–III Lisbon 1868–70.
BullRom	*Bullarium, Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Romanorum Pontificum,* ed. G. Tomassetti et al., Turin 1857ff.
BZThS	*Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge,* Düsseldorf 1924–31.
CA	*Confessio Augustana.*
Car	*Caritas,* Freiburg i. Br. 1896ff.
CCath	*Corpus Catholicorum,* founded by J. Gerving, Münster 1919ff.
CH	*Church History,* New York–Chicago 1932ff.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915ff.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850ff. (1871–87 Florence).
Cl	*Luthers Werke in Auswahl,* ed. O. Clemen, E. Vogelsang, H. Rückert and E. Hirsch, 4 vols., Berlin 1966 and 4 suppl., Berlin 1959–66.
Coll	*Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide,* Rome 1893ff.
CollFr	*Collectanea Franciscana,* Rome 1931ff.
CR	*Corpus Reformatorum,* (Braunschweig) Berlin 1834ff.; Leipzig 1906ff.
CT	*Concilium Tridentinum. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatuum nova Collectio,* edidit Societas Goerresiana promovendis inter Catholicos Germaniae Litterarum Studiis, Freiburg i. Br. 1901ff.
Dahlmann-Waitz	F. C. Dahlmann and G. Waitz, *Quellenkunde der Deutschen Geschichte,* 9th ed., ed. H. Haering, Leipzig 1931–32.
DG	*Dogmengeschichte.*
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* Paris 1912ff.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* Paris 1932ff.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* Paris 1930ff.
DVfLG	*Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* Halle 1923ff.
EA	Erlanger Ausgabe der Werke Luthers, 1826ff.
ECarm	*Ephemerides Carmeliticae,* Florence 1947ff.
EE	*Estudios eclesiásticos,* Madrid 1922–36, 1942ff.
EHR	*English Historical Review,* London 1886ff.
EKL	*Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon. Kirchlich-theologisches Handwörterbuch,* Göttingen 1955ff.
Elit	*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Rome 1887ff.
EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* Bruges 1924ff.
Etudes	*Études,* Paris 1856ff. (to 1896: *Études religieuses*)
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich 1934ff.
FStud	*Franziskanische Studien,* (Münster) Werl 1914ff.
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen,* Berlin 1738ff.
GuL	*Geist und Leben. Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (to 1947:ZAM), Würzburg 1947ff.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* (Cologne 1880ff.), 1950ff.
HM	*Historia Mundi,* founded by F. Kern, 10 vols., Bern–Munich 1952ff.

HPBl	*Historisch-politsche Blätter für das katholische Deutschland,* 171 vols., Munich 1838–1923.
HS	*Hispania Sacra,* Madrid 1948ff.
HV	*Historische Vierteljahresschrift,* Leipzig 1898–1937.
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1859ff.
IusPont	*Ius Pontificium seu Ephemerides urbanae ad canonicas disciplinas spectantes,* Rome 1921ff.
Jb	*Jahrbuch.*
Jedin	H. Jedin, *History of the Council of Trent,* 2 vols., London 1957–1961.
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* London 1950ff.
JLH	*Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie,* Kassel 1955ff.
JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41.
JThS	*The Journal of theological Studies,* London 1899ff.
KG	*Kirchengeschichte.*
KLK	*Katholisches Leben und Kämpfen im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung* (Münster 1927ff.)
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen 1955ff.
Kurtscheid F	B. Kurtscheid–F. A. Wilches, *Historia Iuris Canonici,* Tom. I: *Historia Fontium et scientiae Iuris Canonice,* Rome 1943.
Le Plat	J. Le Plat, *Monumentorum ad historiam Concilii Tridentini . . . spectantium amplissima collectio,* 7 vols., Louvain 1781–87.
LexCap	*Lexicon Capuccinum. Promptuarium Historico-Bibliographicum* (1525 to 1950), Rome 1951.
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* Münster 1951ff.
Lortz F	*Festgabe Joseph Lortz,* ed. E. Iserloh–P. Manus, 2 vols., Baden-Baden 1957.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* Freiburg 1957ff.
LuJ	*Lutherjahrbuch.* Jahrbuch der Luthergesellschaft, 1919ff.
Luther	*Luther-Mitteilungen der Luthergesellschaft.*
MAH	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* Paris 1880ff.
Mai S	A. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum,* 10 vols., Rome 1839–44.
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 31 vols., Florence–Venice 1757–98; new edition & editions ed. L. Petit–J. B. Martin in 60 vols., Paris 1899–1927.
MCom	*Miscelánea Comillas,* Comillas/Santander 1943ff.
MHOMC	*Monumenta Historica Ordinis Minorum Capuccinorum,* 8 vols., Assisi–Rome 1937–60.
MHSI	*Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu,* Madrid 1894ff.; Rome 1932ff.
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* Innsbruck–Graz–Cologne 1880ff.
Mirbt	C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus,* 6th ed. prepared by K. Aland, I. Tübingen 1967.
Misc. Hist. Pont.	*Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae.*
MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanii Mercati* 6 vols., Rome 1946.
ML	*Mennonitisches Lexikon,* Frankfurt–Karlsruhe 1913–58ff.
MOP	*Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica,* 14 vols., Rome 1896–1904; Paris 1931ff.

MQR	*The Mennonite Quarterly Review,* Goshen, Ind. 1927ff.
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich, 1950ff.
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichte des Mittelalters,* Hannover 1876ff.
NBD	*Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, Abt. I (1534–59),* ed. Preussischen historischen Institut in Rome, 12 vols., Gotha 1892ff.
NDB	*Neue Deutsche Biographie,* Berlin 1953ff.
NGG	*Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen,* Berlin 1845–1940.
NKZ	*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Leipzig 1890ff.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Tournai–Louvain–Paris 1879ff.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945ff.
NZSTh	*Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie,* Berlin 1959ff.
OC	*Opera Calvini,* 59 vols., *CR* 29–87, Braunschweig–Berlin 1863–1900.
OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Rome 1935ff.
OS	*Joannis Calvini opera selecta,* ed. P. Barth et al., 5 vols., Munich 1952–63.
Pastor	Ludwig von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 16 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1885ff. Eng.: *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages,* 40 vols., St. Louis 1891–1953.
QFIAB	*Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken,* Rome 1897ff.
QQ	*Quellen.*
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920ff.
RE	*Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* founded by J. J. Herzog, ed. A. Hauck, 24 vols., Leipzig 1896–1913.
Reformata	*Reformanda Reformata Reformanda,* Festgabe for Hubert Jedin, ed. E. Iserloh and K. Repgen, 2 vols., Münster 1965.
RET	*Revista Espanola de teologia,* Madrid 1941ff.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921ff.
RF	*Razon y Fe,* Madrid 1901ff.
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* Tübingen 1909–13; 1927–32; 1956ff.
RGStT	*Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte,* founded by J. Greving, Münster 1906ff.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876ff.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire eccl*ésiastique, Louvain 1900ff.
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France,* Paris 1910ff.
RHM	*Revue d'histoire des missions,* Paris 1924ff.
RHPhR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg, 1921ff.
RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1887ff.
RSIt	*Rivista storica Italiana,* Naples 1884ff.
RSPhTh	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris 1907ff.

RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910ff.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947ff.
RTA	*Deutsche Reichstagsakten,* ed. Hist. Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, n.s. 1519–24; I–IV Gotha 1882ff.; 1527–29; VII Stuttgart 1935-Reprints Göttingen 1956ff.
SAB	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen* (until 1944: *Preussischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.* Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Berlin 1882ff.
SAH	*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Heidelberg 1910ff.
SAM	*Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Munich 1871ff.
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der* (since 1947: *Österreichischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,* Vienna 1831ff.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica,* Milan 1873ff.
Scholastik	*Scholastik,* Freiburg i. Br. 1926ff.
Schottenloher	K. Schottenloher, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517–85,* 6 vols., Leipzig 1933–40; Stuttgart 1956ff.; Vol 7: *Das Schrifttum von 1938–60,* Stuttgart 1966.
Scritt. ant.	*Scritture antiche* (Propaganda Archives)
SE	*Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschapen,* Bruges 1948ff.
Sehling	E. Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* I–V Leipzig 1902–13; VI–VIII, XI–XIII Tübingen 1955ff.
ST.A.	*Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* (Studienausgabe), ed. R. Stupperich, 6 vols., Gütersloh 1951 ff.
StC	*Studia Catholica,* Roermond 1924ff.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (Before 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*), Freiburg i. Br. 1871ff.
Stegmüller M	F. Stegmüller, *Geschichte des Molinismus,* Bd I: *Neue Molinaschriften,* Münster 1935.
SteT	*Studi e Testi,* Rome 1900ff.
StL	*Staatslexikon,* ed. H. Sacher, Freiburg i. Br. 1926–32.
StMis	*Studia Missionalia,* Rome 1943ff.
SVRG	*Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte,* Halle 1883ff.; Leipzig 1907ff.; Gütersloh 1951ff.
ThBl	*Theologische Blätter,* Leipzig 1922ff.
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909ff.
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig 1878ff.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819ff.; Stuttgart 1946ff.
ThR NF	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen 1897ff.
ThRv	*Theologische Revue,* Münster 1902ff.
ThStK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* (Hamburg) Gotha 1828ff.
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel 1945ff.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (to 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888ff.
UB	*Urkundenbuch.*
WA	*M. Luther, Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar Edition), 58 vols., Weimar 1883–1948.
WABr	*D. Martin Luthers Werke, Briefwechsel,* 12 vols., Weimar 1930–67.

WADB	*D. Martin Luthers Werke, Die Deutsche Bibel,* Weimar 1906ff.
WATr	*D. Martin Luthers Werke, Tischreden,* 6 vols., Weimar 1912–21.
Walch	*Dr. Martin Luthers sämtliche Schriften,* ed. J. G. Walch, 23 vols., St. Louis, Mo. 1880–1910.
WW	*Werke.*
WZ	*Westfälische Zeitschrift, Zeitschrift für Vaterländische Geschichte,* Münster 1838ff.
Zam	*Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (since 1947: GuL), (Innsbruck, Munich) Würzburg 1926ff.
ZBKG	*Zeitschrift für bayerische Kirchengeschichte,* Gunzenhausen 1926ff.
ZblB	*Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen,* Leipzig 1884 ff.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928ff.
ZE	*Zeitschrift für Ethnologie,* Berlin 1869ff.
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851ff.
ZHTh	*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie,* 45 vols., Leipzig–Gotha 1832–75.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1876ff.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* (Innsbruck) Vienna 1877ff.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 34ff. Münster 1950ff. (*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 18–25 edb. 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 26–27 edb. 1935–37; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* 28–33 edb. 1938–41, 1947–49).
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948ff.
ZSavRGkan	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* Kanonistische Abteilung, Weimar 1911ff.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für Schweizer Kirchengeschichte,* Fribourg, 1907ff.
ZSTh	*Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie,* (Gütersloh) Berlin 1923ff.
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen 1891ff.
ZW	*Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke,* vols. 1–14 = *CR* 88–101, Berlin 1905; Leipzig 1908–35; Zürich 1959ff.

PART ONE

The Protestant Reformation

SECTION ONE

Martin Luther and the Coming of the Reformation (1517–1525)

CHAPTER 1

Causes of the Reformation

When we ask about the causes of the Reformation, we admit that this event of such tremendous importance was not the work of one man, such as Luther, and that it did not first begin with the ninety-five indulgence theses of 31 October 1517. Long before the outbreak of the Reformation things occurred, facts were provided, steps were taken, ideas were spread and emotions were stirred, which facilitated, made possible, provoked, and even made unavoidable the coming of a revolt against the Church—so unavoidable that we can speak of an inner historical necessity. This does not mean that it could not have happened differently. For in regard to historical causes it was in great measure a matter of facts in the realm of the spirit. But these have many facets, can combine in various ways, and can operate in different directions. Thus the same idea, the same word, and the same deed may be links in various series of causes. The *devotio moderna,* with its striving for inwardness and Christocentrism and the resulting criticism of the late medieval system of pilgrimages and relics,[1] is about equally oriented to the Catholic Reform and to the Reformation.

To establish historical necessity does not mean to make a pronouncement on truth or error. A thing can be significant—that is, it can fit into a larger context—without being true. Furthermore, historical blame does not also mean moral blame. Something which was said and done with the best intention and was also good in itself can turn out unfortunately and become "guilty" of an unhappy development. For ideas and facts act independently of the intention of those who express or perform them.

No one desired a reformation that would lead to a division in Western Christendom. The reformers wanted the reform of the one Church common to all. Because this reform in head and members was thwarted, the split occurred. Consequently the Reformation would be the revolutionary rejoinder to the failure of reform in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The causes of this were all the conditions and attitudes in need of reform, in particular everything that stood in the way of the realizing of reform at the proper time. The causes must not be restricted to so-called abuses and bad Popes. For reform never means—and especially not at the end of the fifteenth century—a mere return to an original condition that is now unattainable and the removal of abuses which have crept in, but always an adaptation to new circumstances and an awakening of self to the needs of the hour.

---

[1] *Imitatio Christi* I, 23, 25; III, 58, 9; IV, 1, 38.

Certainly the disgust of the time over the "wretched conditions," to use Zwingli's words, gave great impetus to the Reformation, but its enticing appeal was contributed by the circumstance that to the men of the new age it seemed to lead the way out of outmoded medieval attitudes and conditions, and promised to give man what he had long demanded or unconsciously yearned for in vain. Not by chance was the "freedom of the Christian man" the great shibboleth of the Reformation, laden with portents for the future and frequently misunderstood.

The so-called abuses were certainly no greater at the end of the fifteenth century than in the second half of the fourteenth century. But people put up with them much less easily, for they had become more alert, more aware, more critical, and in the good sense more demanding and hence more sensitive to the contradiction between ideal and reality, teaching and living, claim and achievement.

The fact that this augmented religious need, this greater maturity of the layman, was not sufficiently taken into account, or that an attitude typical of the Middle Ages, and at that time justified by circumstances, was not definitely put aside early, was consequently more disruptive than any failure, however regrettable, on the part of individuals.

Accordingly, a cause of the Reformation in the broader sense is the dissolution of the medieval order and of the fundamental attitudes proper to it or the failure to replace it at the proper time with new organizations in keeping with the times. Here must be mentioned first the disruption of the unity which embraced the totality of political, intellectual, and religious life. The one Church in the one Christendom, expressed in the unity effected through the counterbalancing of *Sacerdotium* and *Imperium,* was the most striking characteristic of the Middle Ages. The papacy itself contributed to severing this unity. For the sake of the independence and autonomy of the Church, it saw itself forced to weaken the power of the *Imperium*. For a while it seemed as though the Pope could also assume political leadership. But the more he exercised his fullness of authority on the secular political sphere, the more decidedly he encountered the justified resistance of a world becoming ever more strongly divided into nations and conscious of its autonomy. Soon, together with its unjustified claims, people were attacking the papacy itself, and its religious guidance was rejected along with its political leadership. It was frankly a warning signal that Boniface VIII, who replaced the traditional two-powers theory—that the secular and the spiritual power are autonomous and both come directly from God—with the monism of the Bull "Unam Sanctam, " became at Anagni in 1303 the captive of the modern national state, represented by Nogaret, and of the laicized democratic forces, symbolized by Sciarra Colonna.

The sequel was the so-called Avignon Exile of the Popes and their far-reaching dependence on France. The papacy seemed no longer to consider the interests of the Universal Church but all the more to be exploiting the nations of Europe in a thoroughly organized fiscal system.

Especially in Germany this charge would henceforth never cease to be heard. In France, Spain, and England the national state, which more and more dominated the territorial Church and made the Church's sources of income useful to itself, was able to a great extent to thwart the exportation of money. The Western Schism obscured the unity of the Church as expressed in the Pope to such a degree that not even saints knew who was the lawful Pope. Conciliarism seemed to be the only escape from the difficulty of the "damnable trinity" of Popes.

After the Council of Constance (1414–18), conciliarism was not overcome from within nor fundamentally but *via facti* and largely by political means. By means of concordats—agreements with states—the Popes sought to protect themselves against democratic currents and in addition to avoid the reform that was in many ways embarrassing for them. Indeed, when schism again loomed at the Council of Basel in 1437, the fate of the Church seemed, according to Haller, to have been handed entirely to the secular powers. The Pope had to pay dearly for recognition by the German princes, the Emperor, and the King of France and allow the state extensive power over the Church. The result was the territorial Church—the dependence of the Church on the secular powers, whether royal, princely, or city, with the possibility granted to these of interfering on a large scale in the life of the Church. Without this sovereignty over Church government it is difficult to conceive of the victory of the Reformation. The papal policy of concordats also brought it about that, in the course of the fifteenth century, the Popes, instead of stressing their proper religious mission in view of the secularization, became more and more princes among princes, with whom alliances could be made and against whom war could also be waged, as against any other prince. This entanglement in politics enabled Leo X to become the savior of the Reformation by neglecting for two years to proceed vigorously against Luther and thus capture the foxes while they were small, as Johannes Cochläus put it.

Also characteristic of the Middle Ages was a clericalism based on the monopoly of education by clerics and on the privileges of the clerical state. To the young and intellectually immature Germanic peoples the Church had to transmit not only the revelation of Jesus Christ but also the cultural treasures of antiquity. This led to a preponderance on the part of clerics, which went beyond their specific duty of religious leadership. The day had to come when medieval man attained his majority and was both able and willing on his own to distinguish between the treasures of faith and of culture held out to him. This required of the Church that at a given time she should relinquish all the fields of activity which she had assumed only in a subsidiary way and the rights not directly connected with her function, which was based on divine institution, and that she should make her religious mission all the clearer.

As consideration of the late Middle Ages has shown, this peaceful change did not take place. The movements in which the striving of the laity for independence was at stake involved revolutionary features. The Church maintained outdated claims, and the world—the individual as well as the state and society—had to extort its autonomy. Thus the process of secularization was carried out against the Church under the standards of subjectivism, nationalism, and laicism.

In the encounter with antiquity and through his own investigation and experience, man discovered realities which had not grown in the soil of Christianity or were self-evident and not in need of confirmation by authorities. The representatives of the new scholarship wanted indeed to be Christians also, but the more the Church seemed to identify herself with the old and the traditional, the more did the new, brought forward with all the fervor of the joy of discovery, have to act on her as critic. The circles of the humanists frequently produced an antischolastic, anticlerical, anti-Roman, and, in the final results, if not an antiecclesiastical, at least a nonecclesiastical atmosphere. If people did not take an aggressive attitude toward the Church, they still held aloof from her dogma, sacramental life, and prayer.

As immediate causes of the Reformation there must be mentioned the abuses among clergy and people, a far-reaching dogmatic uncertainty, and the venality of religious life. When abuses in the Church on the eve of the Reformation are discussed, one thinks especially of "bad Popes," in particular of Alexander VI. But perhaps the decay was even more dangerous in the reign of Leo X. He cannot be charged with the enormous misdeeds by which Alexander VI sullied the throne of Peter; instead he was guilty of shocking negligence, irresponsible frivolity, and prodigal love of pleasure. One does not find in him an awareness of duty and of the responsibility of the supreme shepherd of Christendom and a manner of life in conformity with this responsibility. The deterioration of the Christian is achieved not only in an openly wicked life, but also furtively and hence more dangerously in an inner wasting away, a slow loss of substance, an imperceptible secularization, and a confused lack of responsibility. In 1513 Leo X, scion of the Medici, took possession of his office and of Rome in a great festive display which, in the form of a Corpus Christi procession, was a grand exhibition of the Pope and his court. On a great placard could be read: "Once Venus reigned [i.e., Alexander VI], then Mars [i.e., Julius II], and now Pallas Athene takes the scepter." Humanists and artists thus saluted in the new Pope their patron and Maecenas, but they also proclaimed the frivolous worldliness and thoughtless unconcern which characterized the pontificate of Leo X, the pontificate in which Luther was to sound the prelude to the Reformation.

"Depravity has become so taken for granted that those soiled by it no longer notice the stench of sin." These words were uttered, not by an enemy of the Church, but by no less than the successor of Leo X, Pope Adrian VI, at his first consistorial allocution.

The situation of the clergy, high and low, was no better than that of the papacy. Here too we should not direct our attention exclusively to failures in a restricted moral sphere, such as clerical concubinage. In some areas concubinage was so widespread that parishioners were hardly seriously scandalized in this respect by the lives of their pastors. If only they had really been pastors! Certainly in the late Middle Ages there was holiness in the Church, and much sincere and loyal devotion to duty. But there were also many manifestations of neglect.

Without exaggeration it can be said that the Church appeared altogether as the property of the clergy, property intended to bring economic advantage and profit. In the establishing of positions the needs of divine worship and of the care of souls were often far less decisive than the desire to do a good work in order to gain for oneself and one's family a share in the treasures of grace. Consequently a person would, for example, erect an altar with a benefice for a priest to celebrate Mass. And so there existed revenue which sought a beneficiary. Considering the great number of positions, one could not be very selective in choosing candidates. Bishops and pastors did not regard themselves primarily as persons who held an office for whose exercise the necessary livelihood was provided. They regarded themselves as holders of a benefice in the sense of Germanic feudal law. This benefice was a profitable right to which were attached certain obligations of service. But these could be turned over to a poorly paid substitute, a vicar, a hireling, to whom the sheep did not belong, to paraphrase the Lord's words (John 10:12).

Thus to the detriment of the care of souls, several bishoprics or other pastoral offices could be united in one person. As late as 1556 Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, grandson of Paul III, possessed ten episcopal sees, twenty-six monasteries, and 133 other benefices—canonries, parishes, and chaplaincies. In the Netherlands the "vicars" who served in place of a nonresident benefice holder as canon, curial official, university professor, or administrator of a monastery have been estimated by R. R. Post at 30 to 50 percent. An especially pernicious aspect was that in Germany the episcopal sees and most abbacies were open to members of the nobility only. Thus they became the means of providing for younger children of noble families, who often never gave a thought to leading a clerical life or even engaging in the care of souls. What concerned them was a carefree existence, as enjoyable as possible. If a bishop seriously desired to improve the inner state of his diocese, he was in no position to do so, because he did not control his territory. For his jurisdiction was to a great extent limited, from above by many sorts of exemptions, and from below because most pastors were named by secular patrons, ecclesiastical corporations, and monasteries, and the archdeacons had usurped other episcopal rights.

The lower the religious spirit and zeal for the care of souls sank at the Roman Curia and in the rest of the clergy, the more unpleasant the pursuit of money became, and the preoccupation with financial matters heightened the scandal. At the Curia men sought to fill up the coffers by means of an elaborate system of fees, taxes, more or less voluntary contributions, and finally even indulgence offerings. The prodigal and worldly papal court, the extensive building activity, and the great expenses of war brought about a continuing need for money. It was certainly not accidental that the scandal of Tetzel's dealings in indulgences, which provided the immediate occasion for the outbreak of the Reformation, was connected with this concern for money.

The abuses described resulted in a far-reaching dissatisfaction with the Church, which more and more grew into a resentment and even a hatred of Rome. For a whole century people called for a reform of the Church in head and members but they were disappointed time and again. The *gravamina* of the German nation were expressed for the first time as early as 1455 by Dietrich von Erbach, Archbishop of Mainz. This listing of German grievances against the papacy was thereafter renewed again and again, but the less successful it was, the more it increased the anti-Roman feeling in Germany.

In his *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation* (*To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*) Luther made these complaints his own and thereby became a national hero. Zwingli too knew how to exploit the dissatisfaction. He directed his disciples not to preach chiefly about doctrine but about the wretched conditions and the necessity of restoring righteousness.

The call for reform and the related opposition to the Church thus brought it about that many a person who had absolutely no involvement with their teaching acclaimed the reformers merely because they seemed to be bringing the long-desired reform. There was a great readiness for anything new that announced salvation. The ground was broken and fertile for catchwords that promised what had become urgent. But the explosive had also been accumulated and it was waiting for the word that would ignite it.

Deplorable as the abuses were—here pointed out rather than described in detail—and however much they contributed to the origin and success of the Reformation, they are not the most significant factors in this context. More decisive than the personal failings of Popes, priests, and laity is the question whether the truth given by Christ and the order established by him were attacked, whether the moral decay was an expression of a falling off in matters touching the essence of religion.

We must ask, "Precisely what were the strong and weak points of the Church as it entered the era of the Reformation?"[2] To what extent was the external religious activity, which was so rich and varied, a façade or a reality? In the many-colored picture of popular devotion, veneration of saints, pilgrimages, processions, Mass foundations, and so forth, how much was really genuine and to what extent did superstition, a desire for pious activity, or a mercenary spirit hold sway?

Another question to be asked is: Was this external practice based on a sound theological doctrine, explained by it, and illuminated by it? And special mention must be made here of an extensive dogmatic uncertainty as a manifestation of failure fraught with dire consequences. The areas of truth and error were not delineated with sufficient clarity. Men fancied themselves in accord with the Church, although positions had long been adopted that contradicted her teaching. Luther thought that he was still in the Church when he reviled the Pope as Antichrist, and in 1530 Melanchthon in the Augsburg Confession could still try to have people believe that in that teaching there was no opposition to the "Roman Church" and that persons were of different opinions merely in reference to a few abuses.[3] (Article 21). Uncertainty was particularly great in regard to the concept of the Church. Because of the Western Schism—the last antipope, Felix V, had abdicated only in 1449—it was no longer generally clear that the papacy established by Jesus Christ was essential to the Church. Unable to ascertain who was the legitimate Pope, many people had stopped asking this question and had grown accustomed to getting along without a Pope. Great impetus was given to the Reformation by the fact that many felt Luther was merely bringing about the reform long due and did not notice at all, or only belatedly, that he was questioning essential doctrines of the Church.

---

[2] J. Lortz, *The Reformation, A Problem for Today* (Westminster, Md. 1964), p. 74.

If Luther became a reformer—not the least reason being that he was unable to reconcile his understanding of revelation, gained in severe and perilous religious struggles, with the theology and practice of his day—the cause lay especially in the fact that this theology was the one-sided doctrine of nominalism, while the depth and wealth of an Augustine or an Aquinas, and especially of Scripture, were lacking. Consequently nominalism, going back to William of Ockham and communicated to Luther in the shallow form of Gabriel Biel, who had given it a moralizing tendency, must be named among the decisive causes of the Reformation. Manifestations of failure showed themselves to be especially fateful in the theology and practice of the Mass. If the Mass, which occupied so much of the life of piety in the late Middle Ages, could in so short a time thereafter be abolished as the worst idolatry, must we not suppose that often it was performed only as an external ritual, something not really grasped, not performed from within?

In the lack of inner strength and life, which can be connected very closely with correctness and legalism, is also to be sought the reason why the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17), referred to by Jedin as the last "papal reform effort clothed in the guise of a council" before the Reformation, was of only meager effectiveness. The new spirit was lacking. For of what use can one or another well-meant measure be? Nothing sheds more light on the situation than the fact that in 1514, together with the papal bull on the reform of the Church read at the ninth session of the Council, there was sent to Archbishop Albrecht of Magdeburg and Mainz the Curia's offer, which provided the immediate occasion for the Reformation: for a fee of 10,000 ducats the archbishop would be allowed to hold the two sees simultaneously, and for the financing of the fee, half of the indulgence offerings for Saint Peter's would be made over to him. "Theory and practice were in such glaring contradiction"![4]

---

[3] "Beschluss des 1. Teils," *BSLK,* 83c.

[4] A. Schulte, *Die Fugger in Romo* I (Leipzig 1904), 115.

A lack of seriousness and determination in the leaders, beginning with the Pope himself, condemned the Council to ineffectiveness. And so, after the many useless calls to reform and the many lost opportunities, a revolutionary confrontation, similar to that which actually occurred in the Reformation, was almost inevitable.

CHAPTER 2

Martin Luther: The Early Years

None of the suggested causes of the Reformation really "explains" it. The far-reaching deterioration of religious and moral strength, the want of precision in central questions of faith, and the lack of a sense of pastoral responsibility in the clergy, along with so many lost opportunities for reform and in view of widespread criticism of the Church, make an upheaval quite intelligible. But the fact that it occurred as it did, in what we know as the Reformation, depended to a great extent on Martin Luther himself and hence is steeped in the mystery of the human person. If every *individuum* is something "ineffable," this is especially so of Luther, whom Lortz characterizes as a "sea of energies, of impulses and perceptions and experiences."

If the reformer's image has remained controversial, this is so not only because a judgment on his person and work is bound up with a decision in regard to the Reformation's claim to truth. For one side he is the hero of the faith; for the other the archheretic, the destroyer of the Church's unity. Actually, however, the reason for the difficulty of assessing his person and work and of correctly portraying them is found in Luther himself. We have an abundance of writings from his pen and of his own testimony about himself and his aims. Even though an inner cohesion is not missing from all these statements and all of Luther's questions fit under a rather small number of viewpoints and are answered accordingly, nevertheless he was not a systematizer. He was far too dependent on his experience and will. This makes it even more difficult to grasp the richness and versatility of his being, and he often seems to be vacillating and contradictory. He experienced a profound change in developing from friar to reformer. Because his career was so intimately connected with experience, he was unable to look back without bias on earlier stages of his development. And so he himself had a decisive share in the origin of the "Luther legend," whose gradual deflation has occurred only in recent decades, thanks to the learned and painstaking study by men such as Otto Scheel.[1] Furthermore, everything that Luther wrote and

[1] *Martin Luther. Vom Katholizismus zur Reformation,* 2 vols. (Tübingen 1915–17; 3rd–4th ed., 1921–30).

said is a confession or realization which was paid for in his own experience and suffering and which he had to communicate to others. But again it was uttered in a distressing way, in which he did not shrink from violent language for the sake of clarity, and even the paradox became for him a suitable manner of expression. Luther always asserted things; a cautious consideration for and against seemed to him to be skepticism. No wonder he all too often succumbed to the hazards of his irascible temperament and his polemical ability. All this made it difficult to assess his character and his work, which to a great extent fashioned the German Reformation.

Home and Youth

Martin Luther was born at Eisleben on 10 November 1483. His peasant ancestors came from Mohra, on the western edge of the Thuringian forest. His father, Hans Luder, lacking hereditary title to land, had to earn his living in the copper mining industry. In 1484 he moved to Mansfeld, where by stubborn hard work he slowly rose from simple miner to partner in mining companies and small entrepreneur. The community repeatedly selected him as one of the board of four who had to defend the rights of the citizenry against the town council. Luther's youth in this aspiring lower-middle-class family of numerous children was thus marked by hardship, sobriety, and severity. How much it influenced the sensitive boy is clear from the fact that he often spoke of it in later life:

> At first my parents were poor. My father was a poor miner. My mother carried all the wood home on her back. It was in this way that they raised us. They endured hard work. Now the world no longer does it. [*WA, Tr* 3, 51, no. 2888a] My parents kept me in the strictest order, even to the point of intimidation. [*WA, Tr* 3, 416 no. 3566A]

In the parental home, of course, there prevailed a Catholic piety which, with its colorful customs, was a part of the world of peasants and miners, but which was also laden with superstition and apparitions of witches and devils. The ambitious father wanted a better career for his son and sent him quite early to the Latin school at Mansfeld (1488–97). Here, in addition to reading and writing, he especially learned Latin and ecclesiastical song. Even more severely and perhaps with more justice than Erasmus did, Luther later complained of his teachers' crudeness. He claims "to have been once flogged fifteen times in a morning for no fault" (*WA, Tr* 5, 254, no. 5571). This harsh upbringing at home and at school to a great extent fashioned the uncommonly sensitive youth's image of God. "From childhood I was so trained that I could not but turn pale and become terrified if I merely heard the name of Christ mentioned, for I was taught only to regard him as a stern and angry judge" (*WA* 40, I, 298).

In 1497, at the age of fourteen, Martin and a fellow student went to Magdeburg, to the school of the Brothers of the Common Life. Both there and at Eisenach, to which he transferred after a year (1498), he had to earn his bread, according to the custom of the time, as an itinerant singer, or "Partekenhengst," outside doors (*WA* 30, II, 576). At his "beloved city" of Eisenach he had a number of relatives. Especially in the Schalbe-Cotta family a warm, genuinely Christian environment embraced him.

University and Monastery

In the summer term of 1501 Luther entered the University of Erfurt and began the basic course in the liberal arts. He was enrolled in the Sankt Georgenburse. Manner of life and curriculum were determined for him. The arts faculty belonged entirely to the *via moderna,* the nominalist philosophy deriving from William of Ockham. Luther accordingly said later, "Sum enim Occamicae fractionis" (*WA* 6, 600). Following the course in the trivium—grammar, dialectic, rhetoric—he became a bachelor of arts in the fall of 1502. In this capacity he had to give lectures of his own while continuing his required courses. In addition to the quadrivium he had to attend lectures on cosmology, metaphysics, and ethics. Having become a master of arts on 7 January 1505, he could choose one of the special fields, theology, medicine, or law. His father's ambition destined him for the study of law, which he began on 20 May 1505. But on 20 June, for reasons not clear, he went home for a vacation. On his way back, on 2 July, a powerful electric storm took him by surprise at Stotternheim near Erfurt. Thrown to the ground by lightning striking very close to him, he cried out in great anguish, "Saint Anne, help me and I will become a monk!"

Despite the consternation of his friends and the extreme disapproval of his father, Luther fulfilled this vow, probably wrung from him by terror, and on 17 July entered the monastery of the Hermits of Saint Augustine of the Observance at Erfurt. Of the numerous monasteries in the city, this one may have recommended itself to him, apart from its serious asceticism, because of its Ockhamist bent, which offered Luther an organic continuation of his studies in the arts faculty.[2]

---

[2] L. Meier, "On the Ockhamism of Martin Luther at Erfurt," *AFrH* 43 (1950), 4–15; F. Benary, *Zur Geschichte der Stadt und Universität Erfurt am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Gotha 1919), pp. 70f.

The choral office and the scriptural reading prescribed by the rule made the young Augustinian thoroughly familiar with the Bible. After a year's novitiate he was professed in September 1506, and only a few months later, on 3 April 1507, he was ordained a priest. Anxieties experienced during his first Mass, which almost caused him to flee from the altar, show to what a degree he was impressed by the overwhelming majesty of God and how little he was able to attend to and understand liturgical texts such as "clementissime Pater." This is important for a judgment on Luther's claim that in the monastery he had been taught "to expect forgiveness of sins and salvation through our works" (*WA* 40, III, 719). For the texts[3] that had been spoken at his reception as a novice and that he prayed daily from the missal were, in their constant assertion that man can do nothing of himself and that God supplies the will and the accomplishment, an impressive disavowal of all justification by works. At his reception the superior uttered the following prayers, among others:

> May God, who has begun this good work in you, bring it to completion. . . . O Lord, honor this servant with your blessing, so that by your help he may persevere in your Church and merit eternal life through Christ our Lord . . . that he may be always protected by the holiness which you infuse in him. . . .

But apparently this made no impression on Luther, for he was too much concerned with himself and his experiences.

Marked out to be a teacher of theology, Luther studied at his Order's *studium generale* in Erfurt, which was connected with the university. Here he again came under the influence of Ockhamism, as presented in the commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* by Peter d'Ailly and Gabriel Biel. At the same time he was lecturing in the liberal arts.[4] In the autumn of 1508 he obtained the post of lecturer in moral philosophy at the recently founded University of Wittenberg, and continued his study of theology there. In March 1509 he obtained the baccalaureate and, after that, delivered lectures on the Bible. Before he had reached the position of *sententiarius* he was transferred back to Erfurt, where he lectured on *The Sentences.* In the autumn of 1510 he became *baccalaureus formatus,* as he began the third book—that is, he had completed the requirements for the master's degree.

In his marginal notes on the text of Peter Lombard and those made at the same time on the writings of Saint Augustine we have the first theological observations from Luther's hand. In the notes on Augustine he shows himself to be an Ockhamist on the question of universals and in his concept of God. He interprets Augustine in this sense but at the same time regards himself as confirmed by him in his criticism of philosophy[5] and of philosophers. In their sterile disputations they were, according to Luther, relics of the Stoa (*WA* 9, 24), unwilling to admit the incompatibility of Aristotle with Catholic truth (*WA* 9, 27).

---

[3] O. Scheel, I, 281f.

[4] Luther is mentioned as a lecturer in an indulgence letter of 1508 for the Erfurt community (*RHE* 55 1960, 822).

At the beginning of his comments on *The Sentences* Luther emphasizes that he does not intend to deny all usefulness of philosophy for theology, but that he would rather, with Peter Lombard, rely more on the doctors of the Church, especially Augustine, instead of seeking support in the discussions of the philosophers and the views in which they attack one another (*WA* 9, 29, 1). If we want to speak of divine things, we need only the word of God itself.[6] Otherwise we are groping in the dark, but the oversubtle philosophers will not admit to this. Whereas the master of *The Sentences* stresses with Augustine that our words lag behind our thoughts in regard to God, and our thoughts on the other hand are unable adequately to grasp God's being, the philosophers act as though everything could be comprehended and expressed by them (*WA* 9, 47, 25). To the opinions of the "highly esteemed doctors," who can claim only human traditions, Luther opposes Holy Scripture[7] and thereby first sounds the note of the principle of Scripture.

In these marginal notes Luther was already preoccupied with the questions that would later be so urgent for the reformer—original sin and the justification and sanctification of man by faith and charity. In relatively great detail he concerned himself with the problem of the relationship of the Holy Spirit and charity, discussed in the seventeenth distinction of Book I of *The Sentences.* He distinguished our love, *caritas creata,* from the Holy Spirit, *caritas increata.* The latter is the efficient cause of our love, but not its formal cause, not that whereby we love. This is not the Holy Spirit himself but rather his gift. In the actual order of salvation, however, created love is given and returned with the Holy Spirit.[8]

---

[5] ". . . totam philosophiam stultitiam esse etiam ratione convincit" (*WA* 9, 13); L. Grane, *Contra Gabrielem* (Copenhagen 1962), pp. 10–12. To what extent Luther in this criticism of Aristotle had forerunners in his own order is shown by A. Zumkeller, "Die Augustinertheologen Simon Fidati von Cascia (+1348) und Hugolin von Orvieto (+1373) und M. Luthers Kritik an Aristoteles," *ARG* 54(1963), 15–36.

[6] "Non relictus est hominum eloquiis de Dei rebus alius quam Dei sermo" (*WA* 9, 29).

[7] ". . . ego in ista opinione habeo scripturam . . . ideo dico cum Apostolo . . ." (*WA* 9, 46); ". . . credere oportet et verbis scripturae fidem profiteri et linguam illis aptare et non econtra" (*WA* 9, 84).

[8] "Primo sciendum, quod charitas (quidquid sit de possibili) de facto semper datur cum spiritu sancto et spiritus sanctus cum ea et in ea" (*WA* 9, 42).

Just as "for us Christ is faith, justice, grace, and sanctification,"[9] but at the same time these are created gifts, which become our own, so love is on the one hand the Holy Spirit and on the other hand the act of love which the Holy Spirit produces by means of our will. Hence Luther did not want to assume a specifically created *habitus* of love but only an actual created love, again and again produced in us by the Holy Spirit, who, as the principle of love, plays the role of *habitus.*

Luther did not accept from Peter Lombard the identification of supernatural charity with the person of the Holy Spirit, according to which he himself would be our love immediately. But he defended the master of *The Sentences* against the scholastics. He could not appreciate the reasons for their criticism of Lombard. Their intention was to preserve the distinction between creator and creature and to stress that the sinner needs a new disposition in order to enter upon the new relation and the new dealings with God. For Luther this is a chimera; the scholastics are simply determined by the teaching on *habitus* of that "rancid philosopher" Aristotle.[10] Hence he stood by the doctrine of the Ockhamists, who would have preferred most of all to do without habitual grace in order to eliminate in man every reason which might oblige God to make man happy.[11]

According to Luther, the love effected by the Holy Spirit is not only a good disposition in man; rather it makes "the entire person pleasing"—all its acts and attitudes. "It alone is virtue and makes all else virtue" (*WA* 9, 90); it is "the mistress of virtues and the queen of merits" (*WA* 9, 44, 6). But this love exists only in connection with faith and hope. On the other hand, justifying faith is possible only in connection with love and hope.[12] But one in mortal sin also believes! Is this another faith and not the same, lacking only the form provided by love? Luther assumes two kinds of faith. Infused faith comes and departs with love and hence is identical with *fides formata. Fides informis,* on the contrary, is to be identified with *fides acquisita et naturaliter moralis.*[13] Accordingly, as supernatural virtues, faith, hope, and charity are inseparable. They are infused together. They are based on no habitus except the Holy Spirit himself, who effects them in us and in whom they must be constantly activated by us. Justifying faith, which makes us do what the law commands, is thus always a faith produced in love. All merit is preceded by grace, and in his rewards God crowns his own gifts.[14]

---

[9] 1 Cor. 1:30. Already in the notes on Augustine occurs: "Ipse enim per fidem suae incarnationis est vita nostra, iustitia nostra et resurrectio nostra" (*WA* 9, 17).

[10] "Quia commentum illud de habitibus opinionem habet ex verbis Aristotelis rancidi philosophi. Alias bene posset dici quod spiritus sanctus est charitas concurrens seipso cum voluntate ad productionem actus amandi, nisi si forte determinatio ecclesiae in oppositum" (*WA* 9, 43); ". . . Augustinus hic loquitur de actu charitatis, qui nos deo jungit, habitus autem adhuc est spiritus sanctus" (*WA* 9, 44).

[11] Cf. E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie,* p. 89. When R. Schwarz, *Fides, spes und caritas beim jungen Luther* (Berlin 1962), p. 40, maintains that "none of the Ockhamists consulted by Luther in his commentary on *The Sentences*—Ockham, d'Ailly, Biel—had assailed the scholastic *habitus*-idea as theologically inappropriate," he is mistaken. For Ockham emphasizes that the assuming of a supernatural created form obliges God to give eternal life to the one concerned and favors Pelagianism; *cf.* Iserloh, *op. cit.,* p. 217, footnotes 289 and 290. Biel too feels impelled to stress that ". . . Deus quem cumque beatificat, mere contingenter, libere et misericorditer beatificat ex gratia sua, non ex quacumque forma vel dono collato" (I *Sent.,* d. 17, q. 1, a. 2, concl. 3E). Hence against P. Vignaux, *Luther: Commentateur des Sentences* (Paris 1935), p.93, it must be affirmed that Luther's protest against the *habitus*-idea is an Ockhamist trait. On the other hand, Luther in *Contra Occam* stresses that *acceptatio* without *gratia iustificans* is impossible (*WA* 1, 227, 4).

In regard to the preparation for the grace of justification, Luther, along with Peter Lombard, stresses against the theology of the Biel school that good will is already a gift of grace and that faith precedes it, not indeed in time but causally and by nature.[15] In his doctrine of original sin Luther turns somewhat sharply against Lombard, whose opinion "that original sin is tinder is not to be held" (*WA* 9, 75). Original sin consists in the deprivation of the supernatural justice of man's original state and is totally obliterated in baptism. Concupiscence remains as a punishment; it is the "tinder" which kindles sin and consists in the insubordination of the flesh. Reason, deprived of grace and virtue, can no longer restrain the flesh, whose nature it is to run wild, just as a horse whose reins are broken no longer submits. After baptism the state of concupiscence is weaker (*debilitatur*) but it is not eliminated. As a punishment man encounters the resistance of the flesh; he can control it and fulfill God's commands only with difficulty (*WA* 9, 73). Original sin is, to be sure, transmitted by means of procreation. Its cause, however, is not carnal desire but divine punishment. Against Peter Lombard Luther insists: "Even if the flesh were totally pure and were reproduced without carnal desire, still, by virtue of God's judgment on Adam, the soul would necessarily have to be devoid of the original justice, and hence it would be in original sin" (*WA* 9, 75). In these views Luther was still within the framework of the theology of his day. Of a particular pessimism, based on his own struggles and sad experiences, and of a noteworthy dependence on Augustine there is hardly a trace.

---

[12] "Talis fides non est sine charitate et spe" (*WA*, 9, 72).

[13] ". . . sed sunt duae fides, infusa quae venit et recedit cum charitate" (*WA* 9, 90). "Dico certe et teneo quod tres theologicae sint inseparabiles. Et fides quae remanet cum peccato morali non est ea, quae possit martyrium obire et caetera. Sed est acquisita et naturaliter moralis . . ." (*WA* 9, 90).

[14] "Unde hic non simpliciter fides dicitur, sed (quae) per dilectionem operatur vel qua iustificati sumus . . . Nil deus in nobis praeter sua dona coronat" (*WA* 9, 72).

[15] *WA* 9, 72; cf. L. Grane, *Contra Gabrielem*, pp. 270f.

Luther's Visit to Rome

Conflicts within his Order took Luther to Rome at this time. In 1510 Johann von Staupitz, the German vicar general of the Observant Augustinians, also became provincial of the Saxon province of the Conventual branch of the Order. In keeping with the desire of the Curia, Staupitz sought to unite the two branches, but seven houses of the Observance, including that at Erfurt, resisted, fearing a dilution of the reform through concessions made to the Conventuals. Luther's teacher, Johann Nathin, with Luther as his companion, was sent to the Curia as spokesman of the strict Observance, but very little was accomplished.

What was the significance of this encounter with Renaissance Rome for Luther's development into a reformer? Did he there perhaps receive the decisive impulse for his war against the Curia? Not at all. Luther's experience of Rome was like that of other devout pilgrims of the time. Sacred Rome, with its places of pilgrimage, so monopolized him that unfavorable impressions could scarcely make themselves felt.

> At Rome I was a fanatical saint; I hurried through all the churches and clefts and believed everything that is fabricated there. I suppose I celebrated one or ten Masses at Rome and was then almost sorry that my father and mother were still alive, for I should have been happy to rescue them from purgatory by my Masses and other excellent works and prayers. [1530: *WA* 31, I, 226]

"The main purpose of my journey to Rome," Luther explained later in one of his Table Talks, "was to fulfill my desire of making a complete confession from my youth and to become devout."[16] But he was disappointed in this expectation of being delivered from his inner distresses by a general confession in Rome. He found uneducated and, so he felt, unsympathetic confessors.

Doctor of Holy Scripture

When by the "Compact of Jena" a compromise was found for the conflict in the Augustinian Order which prevented the Observance being outvoted in the chapter, Luther no longer had any reason for opposition to Staupitz, and in the summer of 1511 the latter recalled him to Wittenberg. He now was to prepare to assume the post of professor of

---

[16] *TR* 3, 3582a; *WA* 47, 392; H. Boehmer, *Luthers Romfahrt,* pp. 159f.

Scripture, hitherto filled by Staupitz. In June 1512 Luther was appointed preacher in the Order and on 19 October he became a doctor of theology.

He was now qualified to take over the lectures on the Bible. This post, which he retained until his death, was to determine his lot and to push into the center of world interest the little university town of Wittenberg, lacking in every sort of tradition and "on the edge of civilization" (*WA, Tr* 2, 669, no. 2800b). His lectures, transmitted in autograph or in transcripts by his pupils, were in part discovered only at the turn of this century, but thereafter they were more and more taken into consideration, since they are the most important source for Luther's development into a reformer. They comprise his lectures on the Psalms (1513–15) and on the Epistles to the Romans (1515–16), the Galatians (1516–17), and the Hebrews (1517–18). With his arrangement of the lectures in glosses and *scholia* and his use of the fourfold sense of Scripture, Luther was within the framework of the traditional exegesis. But at the same time he appropriated the new humanistic linguistic studies, for example in his use of the *Psalterium Quincuplex* (1509) of Lefèvre d'Etaples (c. 1450–1536) and the latter's translation and exegesis of the Pauline Epistles (1512). Although these editions may actually have determined the choice of material for the lectures, more decisive is the fact that it was precisely the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles that were best qualified to bring out Luther's strongly experienced theology.

It was in his Order that Luther had been brought early and intensely into contact with Scripture. He bears witness to this in the Table Talks: In the monastery the friars gave him a Bible bound in red leather. He became so familiar with it that he knew what was on every page and could immediately open to any passage.

> If I had been permitted to keep this Bible, I would have become a better expert in Scripture [*localis biblicus*]. Already at that time no other study was as pleasing to me as that of Holy Scripture. I read the Physics of Aristotle with great repugnance, and my heart was on fire when finally I was allowed to return to the Bible. [*WA, Tr* 1, 44, no. 116] When I had entered the monastery, I began to read the Bible, to read it again and again, to the great amazement of Doctor Staupitz. [*WA, Tr* 3, 598, no. 3767]

Thus Luther attained a remarkable grasp of the Bible, which enabled him to quote it at length from memory. But more important than this formal mastery of Scripture was the personal relationship which he developed with it and as a consequence of which he could call it his bride. For him the Bible was not a cultural experience, as it was for some of the humanists, nor a theology in contradistinction to the direct religious encounter with the word of God. To Luther there was no such separation.

> If you intend to become a Christian, take the word of Christ and understand that you will never finish learning it, and you will have to acknowledge with me that you do not yet know the ABC's. If it were worthwhile to boast, then I could also boast. For I have spent days and nights in this study, but I must remain a pupil. Every day I begin, like an elementary school pupil. [*WA* 29, 383]

The scholar J. Lortz comments:

> And yet, from the very beginning, this state of subjection is something totally different from the mere acceptance of a humble Christian. From the start it is an acquisition by the seeker, the wrestler, the fighter, by the giant Luther. This is decisive: he who so totally desired to be captured by the word of God was never a *listener* in the real sense. We will see that this fact overshadowed Luther's road to the end. Luther was subjectively inclined *from his very roots.*[17]

This strong subjectivism allowed Luther to throw an entirely new light on many pages of Scripture, but it also made him blind to other pages, apart from the fact that the reformer Luther would soon shunt off whole books of Scripture—the Epistle of Saint James and the Apocalypse—because they seemed to contradict his understanding of revelation.

The Lectures on the Psalms (1513–15)

The *Dictata super Psalterium,* the written version of the lectures on the Psalms which Luther delivered from August 1513 to October 1515, constitute the earliest comprehensive record of his views. Hence in recent decades they have been repeatedly discussed, but unanimity about their role in Luther's development into a reformer has not yet been achieved.

The young professor, relying on the *Psalterium Quincuplex* of Lefèvre d'Etaples, had a text of the psalter printed expressly for the use of students, with wide margins and considerable space between the lines. The edition was preceded by a preface written by him, and each psalm by an account of its content. Luther's personal copy, with its linear and marginal glosses, is preserved in the "Wolfenbüttel Psalter;" the detailed textual exegesis, the *scholia,* in a Dresden manuscript. Luther began to prepare the lectures for printing in the fall of 1516, but he got no farther than the earliest steps—Psalms 1, 4, and 22 to 24. Nevertheless, we encounter difficulty with the chronology of individual passages, for we do not know whether we are dealing with an expression of Luther's from the time of the lecture series or from the later revision.

---

[17] J. Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland,* I, 162.

Loyal to the exegetical tradition, Luther adhered to the fourfold sense of Scripture. In his view the literal sense was a reference to Christ as already manifested, but this Christ was seen in union with his mystical body. "What can be understood of Christ as the head can also be understood of the Church and of faith in him" (*WA* 4, 215; 3, 458). Hence assertions in regard to Christ can be applied allegorically or mystically to the Church and morally or tropologically to the Christian. Thus there is found in Luther a close connection of Christology, ecclesiology, and soteriology. But though the Church is obviously regarded as the body of Christ, and her function as an instrument of salvation in the administration of the Sacraments is important—above all in her preaching of the word of God—emphasis is placed on the identification of the Christian with Christ, based on the mystery of the mystical body. "Every scriptural passage that speaks of the advent of Christ in the flesh can appropriately, or rather must be understood of his spiritual advent through grace" (*WA* 4, 407; 4, 19). "Hence, as Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit, so too every believer is justified and reborn without any human action by the grace of God alone and the operation of the Holy Spirit" (*WA* 3, 468).

God has revealed himself in Christ, the *opus Dei,* but he is still the hidden one, *Deus absconditus.* Though he cannot in any event be comprehended by us, he has concealed himself in a special manner in the Incarnation (*WA* 4, 7); indeed, in the wretched human figure on the cross he has hidden himself under the very opposite of his true form.[18] In the Crucified the contrast between God and man, heaven and earth, visible and invisible, present and future, spiritual and carnal, judgment and grace, justice and mercy, death and life, was intensified to the point of contradiction, but at the same time all contrasts were reduced in him to a higher unity.[19] By means of the Cross God kills in order to awaken to life, he destroys in order to save, he condemns in order to bless, he judges in order to pardon, in *opus alienum* he effects his *opus proprium* (*WA* 3, 246; 19ff.; 4, 87, 21ff.).

Christ's Cross and death are a judgment on sin; on the Cross Christ assumed our condemnation and rejection. However, God punishes, not to destroy, but to lead to life. God accomplishes marvels in his saints (Ps. 4:4), because he subjects Christ to every temptation of suffering and death and by this very means saves him. He embraces him the most powerfully where he abandons him the most. He leads him to salvation where he condemns him (*WA* 4, 87, 20ff.). Christ, who appears to be the most depraved and accursed, is blessed (*WA* 3, 63, 13ff.). Thus on the Cross is ended the tension between judge and redeemer, between divine anger and grace, and the unity of God's holy wrath and grace-bestowing love becomes visible.

---

[18] "sub contrario" (*WA* 4, 449); "sub contrariis" (*WA* 4, 42).

[19] "Fere omnis contradictio hic conciliatur in Christo" (*WA* 3, 52).

What is now true of Christ by origin (*radicaliter*) and cause (*causaliter*), what happened to him as exemplar, is affirmed in the tropological sense of the Christian, who through his faith is included in salvation history. In fact,

> whoever will rightly understand the Apostle and the other Scriptures must interpret tropologically expressions such as truth, wisdom, virtue, salvation, righteousness. *Virtus* is the power whereby he makes us strong, through redemption we are saved, and through righteousness we are made just. Thus the works of God are the ways of God. In the literal sense everything is Christ; in the moral sense, it is faith in him. [*WA* 3, 458, 8–11]

The *opus Dei* Christ thus becomes the *opus Dei* faith in Christ. Christ is Sacrament, that is, a sign pointing beyond him; "he is our *abstractum,* we are his *concretum*" (*WA* 4, 173, 23), that is, Christ, so to speak, aspires after realization in the believer; "we must all be fashioned according to his example" (*WA* 4, 243, 15).

The applying of the work of salvation occurs in word and in Sacrament: the words of the Gospel are the "vehiculum" (*WA* 4, 229, 38) on which the truth comes to me. This word is not merely a communication but a living word; in it the judgment of God is continued through history, the cross is made contemporary with us. This cross, as the judgment and justice of God, means tropologically *humilitas* or, better, *humiliatio* and *fides.* In humility the just man becomes his own accuser (*WA* 3, 29, 16). Thus the divine summons to judgment becomes effective; we renounce our justice, acknowledge our sins, and admit that God is right, even when he seems to be unjust (*WA* 3, 465, 9).

> There will be no righteousness in us, and none arises, unless first righteousness is totally destroyed and our righteousness disappears. We do not get up unless we first fall. Otherwise, God's justice would become mockery and Christ would have died in vain. [*WA* 3, 31, 9ff.] It is reasonable that we should become unjust and sinners in order that God may be justified in his words . . . and thus the justice of Christ may all the more prevail in us. [*WA* 4, 383, 7ff.]

Thus "all our ardor must be directed to making our sins great and serious" (*WA* 3, 429, 3).

This self-judgment, the "crucifying of the flesh, is an effect of the word of God" (*WA* 4, 461, 37). It is no mere prerequisite of justification, but, as "humilitas fidei" (*WA* 3, 588, 8; 4, 90, 20; 127, 10; 226, 4; 231, 7, *et passim*), it is justification itself. "For not he who considers himself humble . . . but he who thinks himself to be abominable and worthy of damnation is just" (*WA* 3, 465, 6). Tropologically understood, judgment is the *humiliatio,* self-condemnation beneath God's word (*WA* 3, 465; 462), and justice is faith. For according to Romans (1:17), the justice of God is revealed in the Gospel and proceeds from faith to faith (*WA* 3, 466, 26; 463, 1). *Humilitas* and *fides* can be distinguished as concepts, but they are as inseparable as two sides of the same thing. "Self-condemnation is, as it were, the aspect made visible to the outside; faith is the inner side of justice."[20]

Judgment and justification must be understood as one, and judgment must be identified with the Gospel and with grace—for Luther this is the great marvel.

> It is amazing that grace or the law of grace, which is the same thing, can be judgment and justice. . . . No doubt, because he judges and justifies him who believes him. From this point of view, every word of God is judgment. [*WA* 3, 462, 23ff.]

Justification is not completed, however, it is a process. If we come to a standstill we cease to be good. We who are just are still in need of justification (*WA* 4, 364, 14) and never reach an end (*WA* 4, 296, 35). To advance means always to begin anew (*WA* 4, 350, 15; 334, 35). So far we are only redeemed as a result of hope. Justification is not visible; it is imparted only in faith. We who are saved "in spe" are not yet saved "in re" (*WA* 3, 453, 33). In this world we have not the "res" itself, but only evidence or signs of it, for faith is, of course, not the "res" itself, but the conviction of invisible realities (*WA* 3, 279, 30).

---

[20] H. Bornkamm, "Zur Frage der Iustitia beim jungen Luther," *ARG* 52 (1961), 16–29 (especially p. 23); cf. *WA* 4, 383: "Quae [i.e., humilitas] est omnis veritas et omnis iustitia, et brevi verbo ipsa Crux Christi." Here breaks down the sharp distinction between an Augustinian mystical theology of *humilitas* in the first lecture series on the Psalms and in the lectures on Romans and a later and only then really reform theology of Luther of 1518–19, attempted by E. Bizer, *Fides ex auditu* (Neukirchen 1958) and A. Peters, "Luthers Turmerlebnis," *Neue ZSTh* 3 (1961), 203–236. The latter goes so far as to say that, up to the *Operationes in Psalmos* (1518–19), and in the works of edification even up to 1521, it was not easy for Luther "to divest himself of the Semipelagian remnants in the *humilitas* piety" (p. 217). All this so that the reform discovery can be a shattering "of the intellectual structure of Roman Catholic theology" (p. 236). L. Grane, on the other hand, holds it as proved "that Luther's line of thought is misunderstood when *humilitas* is regarded as a human achievement" (*Contra Gabrielem,* p. 295; cf. p. 321, footnote 3).

This antithesis of *res* and *spes* can be understood only against the background of Luther's Christology and doctrine of *absconditas.* In a gloss on Psalm 113 he says that Christ has two natures, one of which is manifest "in res," while the other is given only in faith and will be manifest "in re" only in the future (*WA* 4, 258, 27). The contrast between "in re" and "in spe" is, then, not that between "real" and "unreal" but between "manifest" and "hidden," between "visible" and "invisible." In this life we have Christ, salvation, justification, and so forth, not "in re"—that is, not in the brilliance of the final state—but in the hidden state of the "absconditas sub contraria specie." Hence the hidden reality is accessible to us only "in fide et spe." It must be our concern not to lose what has been given to us only in hope and not permit sin again to obtain power over us (*WA* 3, 364). For even after the forgiveness of guilt there remains much of what sin has done to us—weakness of the memory, blindness of the intellect, concupiscence or disorder in the will. Every sin derives from these three as its source. They are the remains of sin, which was itself remitted in baptism (*WA* 3, 453, 7ff.; 215, 28). Thus even the baptized remain in need of sanctification (*WA* 4, 211, 11).

In the earliest period of his monastic life Luther had learned by experience that "we fall again and again and are always unclean" (*WA* 4, 364, 9f.). In addition, the lectures on the Psalms are full of the recognition that the Christian, like Christ on the Cross, is closest to God in the depths of his abandonment by God (*WA* 3, 63); he is saved when he regards himself as lost, justified when he is dead (Rom. 6:7; *WA* 4, 90). Accordingly it is of no avail to be free from temptation, but rather one must accept it in faith in God, who "alone is just and justifies all in Christ" (*WA* 4, 299, 21; 417, 26).

The Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans (1515–16)

The ideas on judgment and justification expounded in the *Dictata super Psalterium* were further clarified and developed in the lectures delivered from November 1515 to September 1516 on the Epistle to the Romans. If Luther was already inclined to paradox in thought and expression, he was challenged by the language of this Pauline Epistle to thinking in paradoxes to a shocking extent. In the introduction to the *scholia* he thus formulated the fundamental idea of the lectures, the persistence of sin and the external character of justice:

> The sum total of this Epistle is: to destroy, to extirpate, to annihilate all the wisdom and justice of the flesh . . . so far as may be done by the heart and the honest mind, and to plant, raise, and make sin grow. [*WA* 56, 157] For God wants to save us, not through our own, but through an external justice and wisdom, through a justice which does not come from us and grow out of us, but comes to us from elsewhere, which does not spring from our earth but from heaven. Thus one must teach a justice which comes entirely from without and is an exterior justice. Therefore, first our own justice, which abides in us, must be extirpated.
> [*WA* 56, 158]

The question at issue is the acknowledgment that we are sinners, and in this sense we must "become sinners." By this sin, which Luther experienced as persisting and against which the baptized must struggle throughout life, was not meant actual sin but radical sin, which precedes all wicked individual acts—evil concupiscence. Its innermost nature is self-righteousness, self-complaisance, and selfishness. We have grown crooked and bent back upon ourselves (*WA* 56, 258, 304). This reference to self (*WA* 56, 356) threatens to gnaw away and ruin our best dispositions and actions. " 'You shall not covet,' that is, you shall direct nothing to yourself and seek nothing for yourself, but in all things live, act, and think for God alone" (*WA* 56, 356). Everything—knowledge, virtues, property—though it may be good in itself, is perverted because of this false reference. "Hence, if faith does not enlighten man and love does not free him, he cannot will or possess or do anything good; he can do only evil, even when he does good" (*WA* 56, 355). This evil concupiscence is for Luther not only the remains of sin, as it was in the lectures on the Psalms (*WA* 3, 453), and not only the tinder for new sins, but real sin. Luther reproached the scholastic theologians for "imagining that the totality of original sin as well as actual sin is taken away, as if they were certain things which one could remove from sight, as darkness is expelled by light" (*WA* 56, 273).

Guilt may be remitted, but sin as the perverted fundamental disposition of man is eliminated only by grace as a result of a slow process. Luther says that he was not aware of this in the struggles of the years behind him.

> Therefore, I struggled with myself without knowing that forgiveness was indeed real but that there was no taking away of sin, except in hope; that is, that sin must be removed by the gift of grace, which begins to take it away so that henceforth it is no longer reckoned as sin. [*WA* 56, 274]

Whoever admits this sin as his own and "voluntarily acknowledges his damnation" has "satisfied God and is just." "This happens through faith, when man surrenders his intellect to the word of the Cross and renounces himself and abandons all things, dead to himself and to everything" (*WA* 56, 419, 12–16).

This persisting sin does not prevent a real unity of the believer with Christ, nor does it exclude the transfer to him of the justice of God in the sense of an objective justification. "Through his faith, which is Christ's faith, bound up to his death on the Cross and therein accepting the condemnation of his sin in God's sentence, he is transformed in his innermost being and justified before God."[21] Luther's oversubtle formulas and frequent recourse to the words *imputare, reputare,* and *nonimputatio* have led to the erroneous belief that Luther knew no justification of man in the sense of an inner transformation and real remission of sins. External justification does not mean that it remains merely external, but that it comes from without, is bestowed by God, is achieved not through man's strength but only through faith in God's word.[22] In fact Luther stresses that it is above all not a question of the elimination of individual sins but of the elimination of the old man and the creation of a new man. According to human speech, sins would be taken away, while the man remained. But for the Apostle it is quite different:

> It is man who is removed from sin, while sin persists as remains. . . . Grace and spiritual justice elevate man himself, transform him, and alienate him from sins, though they may leave the sin behind. [*WA* 56, 334] Hence Samuel also says, "You will become another man" [1 Sam. 10:6], that is, another human being. He does not say, "Your sins will be changed," but "You will first become another, and only when you have become another will your works be other." [*WA* 56, 335]

Justice does not result from righteous acting, as Aristotle teaches, but precedes it (*WA* 56, 172). As the official acts of the priest presuppose ordination, so the works of faith presuppose justification by faith (*WA* 56, 248). This grace of justification is not a habit or quality which adheres to man as whitewash adheres to the wall (*WA* 56, 354), but it is the state of being touched by the strength of God, by the Holy Spirit, who receives power over us and adjusts our whole existence toward God in faith, hope, and charity. To the extent that we allow ourselves to be actually seized upon by the Holy Spirit, we are just. Man is freed from sin, actual and radical, when "he permits God to act and himself keeps still" (*WA* 56, 277). For the sake of this actualism and to exclude any disposal of grace by man separated from the Holy Spirit—this was Luther's wrong interpretation of scholasticism—he, like Ockham, rejected habitual grace. He saw Christians in danger of wishing to please God independent of Christ, as if they no longer needed Christ after they had received justifying grace (*WA* 56, 288). Life by faith is thus an ever new beginning, an ever new delivering of self to Christ. But it is also a continuous process, "a renewal of the spirit day by day and more and more (2 Cor. 4:16)" (*WA* 56, 443).

---

[21] J. Lortz, "Luthers Römerbriefvorlesung," *TThZ* 71 (1962), 247.

[22] ". . . per solam fidem, qua Dei verbo creditur" (*WA* 56, 172).

Luther regarded the justified man as a sick man in the presence of his physician, who promises health and has already begun to cure him. Christ, the good Samaritan, has "taken the half-dead man into the inn and begun to heal him after he has promised him complete health for eternal life." Meanwhile he denies him anything that could delay recovery.

> Is he thereby completely just? No; he is simultaneously a sinner and just [*simul peccator et iustus*]; a sinner in reality, but just by virtue of the consideration and the sure promise of God that he will redeem him from sin until he completely saves him. Accordingly, he is fully saved in hope [*in spe*], but in reality [*in re*] he is a sinner. Still, he possesses the first gift of justice in order that he may continue to seek, always in the awareness of being unjust. [*WA* 56, 272; cf. 56, 513]

"Iustus ex fide" then means not merely "I am just because of faith," but that justice is the object of faith. It is not visible and empirical ("non in re"). In fact it must remain concealed; like the divine glory in Christ, it must not become visible (*WA* 56, 171). It is established in me and aspires slowly to obtain dominion over me. "For our whole life is a time in which a person wants justice, but it is never completely attained; this occurs only in the life to come" (*WA* 56, 280). In a sense God already has the outcome before his eyes. He beholds man as just and does not impute his sins to him (*WA* 56, 272).

Luther thus distinguishes between justification, which is indivisible, like faith (*WA* 56, 249; 251), and sanctification, which proceeds slowly. In this lecture series, however, he does not yet speak of "double justice" but, following Romans 5:15, of grace and gift. *Gratia* means that whereby God justifies us, or rather that which has been given in Christ as the source, while *donum* signifies that which Christ infuses into us. "That expression, 'through the grace of this one man,' is to be understood of the personal grace of Christ, corresponding to the proper and personal sin of Adam, but the 'gift' is the justice which is given to us"

(*WA* 56, 318). Luther emphasizes that grace and gift are "one and the same" and does not further define the relationship between them. Even the relationship between *gratia operans,* the only efficient "first grace," and *gratia cooperans,* which knows growth and degree (*WA* 56, 379), is not explained. Especially obscure is the subject, which is flesh and spirit, just and sinner, which does the works of the law and of faith, which is passive in regard to the only efficient grace but nevertheless must believe, hope, and love, must even cooperate with grace and grow in it and become holy.

Whereas Paul, besides flesh and spirit, admits also the *nous,* the inner man, which can be carnal and spiritual, Luther knows only *caro* and *spiritus* and is tempted to identify them with man's body and spirit. "The same man is both spirit and flesh" (*WA* 56, 350). Luther compares this unity to that of the two natures in Christ, and in both cases the *communicatio idiomatum* is valid.

> But because one and the same man, as a whole, consists of flesh and spirit, Paul assigns both elements to the whole man, though they are opposed to one another and arise from mutually opposing parts of his being. Thus there results the common possession of properties [*communicatio Idiomatum*]—that one and the same man is spiritual and carnal, just and sinful, good and evil. As one and the same person of Christ is simultaneously dead and alive, simultaneously suffering and happy, simultaneously active and inactive, and so forth, because of the common possession of properties, even though neither of the two natures acquires what is proper to the other, but the most absolute contradiction persists between them [*WA* 56, 343].

According to this comparison the human person ought to be the bearer of *caro* and *spiritus;* though indeed it is inclined to evil, it is not so totally evil "that not even a remnant would remain which is oriented to the good, as becomes clear in our conscience" (*WA* 56, 237).

Thus man must work with the *donum;* or, better, the man seized by the divine Spirit, the *homo spiritualis,* must oppose concupiscence in order that sin, remaining in us, may destroy in us that which formerly prevailed over us (*WA* 56, 314), that man may endure it (*WA* 56, 346; 272) until the spirit removes it. Thus through *concupiscentia* man is a sinner, but because he asks for the justice of God (*WA* 56, 269) he is just. This is not something static, but an enduring process of improvement.

> One who goes to confession must not think that he is there ridding himself of his burden in order to be able to live calmly. He must

> know that, in putting aside the burden, he is entering upon the service of God in war. . . . If anyone, therefore, is not determined to fight thereafter, why does he ask to be absolved and to be enrolled in the levy of Christ? [*WA* 56, 350].

If Luther is in many respects lacking in theological accuracy and care, he is exceedingly serious in regard to man's "being on the way" and to the "typically Pauline problem of being and becoming, of having and aspiring, of indicative and imperative" (O. Kuss). This led easily to the first indulgence thesis, according to which the entire life of a Christian should be a repentance.

The Lectures on the Epistle to the Galatians (1516–17)

After the Epistle to the Romans, Luther expounded the Epistle to the Galatians in the winter of 1516–17 (27 October to 13 March). These lectures have been preserved in only one student manuscript. In 1519 Luther or Melanchthon prepared the series for printing as a "Commentarius" (*WA* 2, 443–618; cf. *WA* 57, II, XVI). The Epistle to the Galatians was to occupy Luther quite often. It was "his letter," to which he had given himself in marriage: "It is my Katharina von Bora" (*WA, Tr* 2, 69, no. 146). In it Luther found confirmation of his concept of justification by faith, of the works of the law and the works of faith, of flesh and spirit, of continuing sin. "The wonderful new definition of righteousness" is as follows:

> Righteousness is faith in Christ. . . . According to a saying of Jerome, the believer does not live by righteousness, but the just man lives by faith; that is, he does not live because he is just, but he is just because he believes. [*WA* 57, II, 69]

By faith we become "one with Christ." Faith is righteousness taken collectively ("universalis iustitia"). Thus every sin can be reduced to unbelief in Christ. To the objection that in that case faith suffices and I no longer need to do good and abandon evil, Luther retorts: In itself faith suffices, but no one has so great a faith that it cannot be increased. Hence works serve to increase faith. Moreover, they are to be done as a free service to the Lord Christ (*WA* 57, II, 70).

In connection with Galatians 2:17 the question is posed how the Apostle could deny that even believers in Christ are found to be sinners (Rom. 6:2, 10ff.). Luther replies:

> All believers are just because of Christ, in whom they believe and to whom they begin to be conformed by the mortifying of the old

> man. Hence, what is not yet mortified is not imputed because of faith and the conformity begun. [*WA* 57, II, 74]

Accordingly justification is really instituted in me but is not yet completed. It is a process of becoming conformed to Christ. Sin persisting to the end is not imputed because God, so to speak, looks to the end, which is already anticipated in faith.

The Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews (1517–18)

The final lectures, those on the Epistle to the Hebrews, have also come down only in transcripts. Luther delivered them from the spring of 1517 to the spring of 1518, and so they fall in the period of the indulgence controversy and the first months of the reform struggle. Little of this is noticeable, however. Criticism of the external image of the Church is no more striking than in the preceding lectures. On the other hand, Luther's philological and humanist interests are much more prominent. Justification has a sharper Christological tone. Union with Christ is given to us in faith. Faith is the cement between the heart and the word of God; by faith they are joined in one spirit (*WA* 57, III, 157) and "man becomes like to the word of God, but the word is the Son of God; and so it finally comes about that everyone who believes in him is a son of God (John 1:12)" (*WA* 57, III, 151).

The idea of the death of Christ as *sacramentum* and *exemplum,* explained (*WA* 9, 18) in the marginal notes on Augustine's *De Trinitate* (IV, 3) and later quite frequently taken up again, among other things, in the lectures on Romans (*WA* 56, 321), was worked out in detail by Luther and brought into close connection with justification. Christ's passion is a divine sign (*sacramentum*) of death and the remission of sins.[23]

> Before Christ can become an example, man must grasp in firm faith that Christ suffered and died for him as a divine sign [*quo ad sacramentum*]. Hence they are badly mistaken who seek at once to obliterate sin by works and exertions of penance and begin, as it were, with the example, when they should begin with the Sacrament. [*WA* 57, III, 114]

Man must die with Christ in faith so that Christ can live and act and even rule in him. "Then, of themselves, works flow out from faith" (*WA* 57, III, 114). In the exegesis of Hebrews 10:19, the death of Christ and his entry into the glory of the Father are the sign and Sacrament[24] of the imitation of Christ. The death of Christ is the divine sign of the mortification of concupiscence,[25] even of its death, and his entry into heaven is the sign (*sacramentum*) "of the new life and the way on which we now seek and love what is heavenly" (*WA* 57, III, 223).

---

[23] "Sacramentum passionis Christi est mors et remissio peccatorum" (*WA* 57, III, 222).

[24] ". . . significat et est sacramentum imitandi Christum" (*WA* 57, III, 222).

However, Christ is not only the model for our passover, not only our leader, but our helper, our ferryman. "For he will be borne on Christ's shoulders who rests on him in faith" (*WA* 57, III, 224). In the death of Christ God allowed the devil to have his way, but thereby death overreached itself against the divinity of Christ. In slaying him the devil was overcome and by death he could create nothing but life. "Thus God advances his work to completion through another's work" (*WA* 57, III, 128).

Just as Christ, by his union with the immortal Godhead, overcame death by dying, so the Christian, by the union contracted in faith with the immortal Christ, overcomes death by dying.[26] Justice is not done to this argument on the basis of the Anselmian doctrine of satisfaction. It must be understood in conformity with the patristic doctrine of redemption against the background of Philippians 2:7ff. Christ divested himself of his divine form, that is, "of justice . . . glory, peace, joy," and assumed what "is ours: sin, folly, perdition, humiliation, the Cross, sorrow, and so forth" (*WA* 57, III, 136), and thereby took away the power from all this from within. Because he thus became conformed to us lost men, we can be brought into likeness to him. He took our injustice upon himself and gave us his justice.

> Justice is grace itself, by which man is justified, that is, faith, hope, love, as expressed in Psalm 31:2: "Rescue me in your justice." . . . This justice is now that written of in Romans 1:17. It comes "from faith," as it is there written: In the Gospel "God's justice is revealed from faith into faith." This is wrongly interpreted as the justice of God, whereby he himself is just. Unless it is thus understood that faith so lifts up man's heart and by itself carries it over to God that "one spirit" (1 Cor. 6:17) is constituted from the heart and God, and the divine justice itself is the justice of the heart . . . just as in Christ the humanity became one and the same person through its union with the divine nature. [*WA* 57, III, 187f.]

According to this exegesis Christ would not communicate his justice to me, but an exchange of subjects would take place. Man would emerge from his own personality and put on the person of Christ, just as in Christ the human nature put on the divine person. Then the properties of Christ could be predicated of man in a *communicatio idiomatum.*

---

[25] According to Hirsch-Rucker, p. 251, "concupiscentiae," but *WA* 57, III, 222, follows the manuscript in reading "conscientiae."

[26] "Sicut enim Christus per unionem immortalis divinitatis moriendo mortem superavit, ita Christianus per unionem immortalis Christi (Quae fit per fidem in illum) etiam moriendo mortem superat, ac sic deus diabolum per ipsummet diabolum destruit et alieno opere suum perficit" (*WA* 57, III, 129).

What is new in the lectures on Hebrews is the discussion of the relations of faith and Sacrament and the presentation of a relatively detailed doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As previously in the lectures on Romans (*WA* 56, 370), in the same words and with a reference to the same passage in Bernard of Clairvaux,[27] Luther maintains: "Faith in the remission of sins does not suffice if you do not believe with absolute certainty that *your* sins are remitted" (*WA* 57, III, 169). This granting of the foregiveness of sins to me personally is effected in the Sacraments. "Hence it is that no one obtains grace because he receives absolution or baptism or communion or anointing but because he believes he obtains grace through absolution, baptism, communion, or anointing" (*WA* 57, III, 169f.).

The statement quoted by Thomas Aquinas[28] from Augustine,[29] that the Sacrament operates by virtue of the word, and not because the word is uttered but because it is believed, is cited by Luther in a somewhat abridged form in which he stresses the necessity of the preparedness of the heart, that is, of faith, for the fruitful reception of the Sacrament. To present no obstacle is not enough.

> Even today a child is not baptized unless someone answer for him, "I believe." [*WA* 57, III, 170] The Sacraments of grace help no one, but rather they harm anyone who does not approach in full faith. No, faith is already a justifying grace. [*WA* 57, III, 191]

Especially urgent for Luther, as for the late medieval theologians, was the question of why there are Sacraments, if faith already justifies. "External word and sign are common to worthy and unworthy; they do not suffice unless we also savor Christ concealed in them" (*WA* 57, III, 200). When Luther stresses that "in the New Testament it is not the Sacrament but faith in the Sacrament that justifies" (*WA* 57, III, 206), he does not intend to deny the *opus operatum* nor to deny that the

---

[27] "Sermo in festo annuntiationis I," *PL* 183, 383. Bizer's remark that "Luther *now* disputes the idea of conscience in Bernard" (*Fides ex auditu,* p. 62) is misleading. As in the lectures on Romans, Luther here points out with Bernard that we do not have the conviction of conscience in regard to the remission of our sins from ourselves, but it is a gift of the Holy Spirit. Bizer's attempt to show in the lectures on Hebrews an advance from Luther's understanding of justice by faith turns out here as elsewhere to be contrived.

[28] *S. Th.* III, q. 60, a. 6.

[29] "In Ev. Ioan. tract.," 80; *PL,* 35, 1840.

Sacrament is effected independently of the worthiness of minister and recipient, but to emphasize that the mere sacramental reception without a spiritual reception, that is, without faith, is of no avail. But on the other hand, the mere spiritual reception, without the sacramental, does avail, according to what Augustine said: "Why do you make ready your stomach and your teeth? Believe! Then you have eaten."[30]

To be mindful of Christ's passion does not mean to take pity on him—even the pagans can do this—but to believe that Christ shed his blood for my sins. "For that means to drink and eat spiritually; by such faith to be plunged into Christ and incorporated into him" (*WA* 57, III, 209). For Luther the Eucharist is a testament—the bequest of the dying Christ. In it the remission of sins is promised to me. The testament became valid by the death of the testator. This death is the sacrifice of the New Covenant, offered once for all time (*WA* 57, III, 172; 217). "What is sacrificed by us daily is not so much a sacrifice as the memorial of that sacrifice, as he said: 'Do this in memory of me'" (*WA* 57, III, 217f.).

If we disregard the development in the lectures on the Psalms, which is difficult to determine because of the later revision, and keep in mind Luther's dependence on his current subject and the central ideas formed under its inspiration,[31] we can say that the exegetical lectures of 1513–18 are based on the same fundamental concept: justification through Jesus Christ, who assumed our weakness and gives us his justice in faith. Faith as communion with Christ, in whom we gradually overcome persisting sin, is a process which will be completed only with death.

Luther's Reform Understanding of *Iustitia Dei*

From 1532 Luther referred frequently in the *Table Talks* and in his lectures to an understanding, even an experience, which had given him an entirely new insight into the Gospel and, after hellish suffering, had opened to him the gate to the joy of paradise and to life and salvation.[32] In substance the understanding of the justice of God was involved. Until then he had been frightened when he read in Psalms 31(30):2 or

---

[30] "In Ev. Ioan. tract.," 25, 12; *PL,* 35, 1602.

[31] J. Lortz, "Luthers Römerbriefvorlesung," *loc. cit.,* pp. 150, 152.

[32] *Tr* III, no. 3232 a–c (Scheel, no. 235); *Enarr. Ps. 51* (1532), *WA* 40, II, 331f. (Scheel, no. 237); 444f. (Scheel, no. 245); *Tr* II, no. 1681 (Scheel, no. 238); *Tr* IV, no. 4007 (Scheel, no. 404); *Tr* V, no. 5247 (Scheel, no. 449); *Enarr. in genes.,* cap. 27, 38(1542), *WA* 43, 537 (Scheel, no. 460); *Tr* V, no. 5518 (Scheel, no. 474); *Tr* V, no. 5553 (Scheel, no. 476); *Enarr. in genes.,* cap. 42, 18–20 (1543), *WA* 44, 485 (Scheel, no. 490); introduction to Volume I of the Latin writings (1545), *WA* 54, 179–187 (Scheel, no. 511).

71(70):2 or Romans 1:17 the words the "justice of God." This expression had struck him like a flash of lightning. Then it had dawned on him, thanks to the illumination of the Holy Spirit, that the meaning was not punitive justice but the justice through which God makes us just in his grace. Thereupon, he says, "all of Holy Scripture and heaven itself was opened up" to him, who had previously hated the Psalms and Scripture because of this anixiety (*WA* 43, 537).

According to Luther's remark in early 1532, one of the *Table Talks* which was written down in almost identical words by Cordatus, Kumer, Schlaginhaufen, and Rorer, this can be described as follows:

> These words, just and justice, had the effect of lightning on my conscience. When I heard them I was horrified. If God is just, he will punish. However, thanks be to God, when I was once meditating in this tower and in my study over the words "the just man lives by faith" [Rom. 1:17] and "the justice of God," I thereupon thought: If we, as just, must live by faith and if the justice of God must bring about salvation in everyone who believes, then it must be not our merit but the mercy of God. In this way my spirit was lifted up. For the justice of God consists in our being justified and redeemed by Christ. And those words then became more pleasing to me. The Holy Spirit revealed Scripture to me in this tower. [*Tr* 3, no. 3232c]

As the place of this experience Luther specified the heated room (*hypocaustum*) in the tower of the Wittenberg monastery, which served as his study. For this reason it is referred to as the "tower experience."

More controversial is the time to which Luther attributed the experience, and on this depends its content. The dispute broke out over Luther's last and most detailed report of his experience in the introduction to Volume I of his Latin works in 1545. In it Luther intends to show the reader that in his earlier writings are found "many important concessions to the Pope," which he, Luther, "now regards and condemns as the greatest blasphemy and abomination" (*WA* 54, 179, 34ff.). It was, he says, quite difficult "to extricate himself from such errors" (*WA* 54, 183, 21ff.). Luther would like, so to speak, to ask his "Protestant" reader's leniency and to give him the theological keys to the correct idea. These keys are justification through faith in Christ and the justice of God as *iustitia passiva.* Both dawned on him only in a long, severe struggle. He shows this in two digressions, which he includes in the report of the external events, with allusion to the past by use of the pluperfect tense (*WA* 54, 183, 21–184, 3, and *WA* 54, 185, 12–186, 20). The second digression is as follows:

Meanwhile during the meeting with Miltiz and the Leipzig Disputation in that year 1519 I had returned to the explanation of the Psalms, confident that I was better prepared after having treated Saint Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews in lectures. I had been seized upon [*captus fueram*] by a certain wonderful desire to understand Paul in Romans. No lack of seriousness had hitherto stood in my way, but only a single statement in the first chapter: "The justice of God is revealed in the Gospel." I had, of course, conceived a hatred of this phrase, "justice of God," because, in conformity with the custom of all theologians, I had been taught to understand it philosophically as formal or active justice, whereby God is just and punishes sinners and the unjust.

Though as a friar I had led a blameless life, I felt myself to be a sinner before God, with a totally restless conscience, and I could not be confident that I had reconciled God by my satisfactions. Hence I did not love, but rather I hated the just God who punishes sinners. Thus I was angry with God, if not in secret blasphemy, at least in strong grumbling, and I said: It is not enough that wretched sinners and those lost forever because of original sin should be oppressed according to the law of the Old Covenant with every sort of calamity. No, God also intends to heap affliction upon affliction by the Gospel, while menacingly holding out to us his justice and his anger through the good tidings. And so I was frantic, upset and raving in conscience, and struggled relentlessly with that passage of Paul, filled with an ardent desire to know what Paul meant.

After days and nights of meditation God finally took pity on me and I noted the inner connection of the two passages: "The justice of God is revealed in the Gospel, as it is written, 'The just man lives by faith.'" Then I began to understand the justice of God as that by which the just man lives, thanks to the gift of God, that is, by faith; that the justice of God, which is revealed by the Gospel, is to be understood in the passive sense; that God in his mercy justifies us by faith, as it is written: "The just man lives by faith." At once I felt myself to be reborn and as though I had entered paradise through the opened gates. Holy Scripture immediately showed me another face. I then went through Scripture, as my memory presented it, and found a corresponding meaning in other passages. For example, the "work of God" is what God works in us; the "strength of God" is that whereby he makes us strong; the "wisdom of God" is that by which he makes us wise. In a similar manner are to be understood the "power of God," "salvation of God," "glory of God."

> Just as great as was my hate with which I had previously encountered the phrase, "justice of God," so great was now my love with which I glorified it as the sweetest word of all. Thus did this Pauline passage really become for me a gate to paradise. Later I read Augustine's *De spiritu et litera,* and there I unexpectedly found that he too understood the justice of God in a similar manner, as that with which God clothes us by justifying us. And though this is said defectively and Augustine does not clearly develop everything concerning imputation, I was pleased that here the justice of God was taught as one whereby we are justified.
>
> Better equipped by such reflections, I began for the second time to expound the Psalms. [*WA* 54, 185f.]

Luther established the point of time of his basic understanding with the remark that he had afterwards read Augustine's *De spiritu et litera.* But he had already quoted abundantly from this work at the beginning of his lecture on Romans (*WA* 56, 157; 172; 173; 191; 200; 202) in order to prove his idea of the *iustitia Dei passiva* in connection with Romans 1:17.[33] Hence we should have to place the reform understanding, so important for Luther, at the period of the first lectures on the Psalms and at the latest before Easter of 1515. On the other hand, Luther himself seems to indicate as the point of time the days before the beginning of the second lectures on the Psalms, the autumn of 1518.[34] For his account is fitted into the second reference to the second lectures on the Psalms. This does not mean that the events related could not have occurred much earlier; in fact the double pluperfect, *redieram* and *captus fueram,* even demands this. Luther aims to show that his lectures on the Pauline Epistles had better equipped him for the lectures on the Psalms, and so, in describing his realization, he goes back beyond the beginning of the lectures on the Psalms. He certainly does not mean that he had lectured on this Epistle for a year without a correct understanding of Romans 1:17. In fact he there interpreted the justice meant in Romans 1:17 as that whereby God makes us just "per solam fidem, qua Dei verbo creditur" (*WA* 56, 172). In a letter of 8 April 1516 to the Augustinian Georg Spenlein, he developed his doctrine of the "justice of God, which is given to us most abundantly and gratuitously in Christ" (*WA, Br* 1, 35, 19), with the indication that he had fallen into error in this regard.[35] Accordingly, a basically new understanding had meanwhile become his. If Luther were specifying the year 1518–19, he must have been mistaken in regard to the time, as some scholars indeed hold.[36] Others assume 1518 as the correct date, but then they have to attribute a different content to the reform experience; H. Grisar, for example, regards it as the discovery of the assurance of salvation.[37] But there is none of this in the text. There is likewise no indication that "Luther discovered the word as the means of grace," which E. Bizer considers the content of the discovery.[38] But a person would be more likely to make a mistake in regard to the date rather than in regard to the substance of so decisive an experience. Nevertheless, as has been said, a glance back from 1545 does not compel us to accept 1518.

---

[33] *Scholion* on Romans 1:17: "On the other hand, by the justice of God one must not understand here that whereby he himself is just in himself but that whereby we are made just by him. This comes through faith in the Gospel. Hence the blessed Augustine says in the eleventh chapter of his book *De spiritu et litera:* 'Justice thus means the justice of God, because by the fact that he imparts it he makes men just'. . ." (*WA* 56, 172). Cf. *WA, Br* 1, 70. Bizer, who would like to assign Luther's new understanding of *Iustitia Dei* to 1518–19 at the earliest, supports himself by the thesis that, in the reading of *De spiritu et litera,* mentioned in retrospect in 1545, not the first but a second reading is involved (p. 10). But why does Luther already cite here in the lectures on Romans what he claimed to have found only in the alleged second reading? And from the letter to Spalatin of 19 October 1516 it is clear that Luther was at that time aware of the importance of Augustine's *De spiritu et litera* for a right understanding of justice (*WA, Br* 1, 10, 9f.). Cf. B. Lohse, "Die Bedeutung Augustins für den jungen Luther," *KuD* 11 (1965), 116–135.

[34] This date is accepted by, among others, H. Grisar (*Luther* I, 307) and P. J. Reiter (*Martin Luthers Umwelt, Charakter und Psychose,* II, 316). A. Gyllemkrok, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung,* pp. 65ff., sees a reform trend in the lectures on Hebrews (1517–18). E. Bizer, *Fides ex auditu,* pp. 7 and 168, places the "experience" in the spring or summer of 1518, and according to K. Aland, *Der Weg zur Reformation,* p. 110, "the breakthrough to liberating clarity had been achieved in February–March 1518."

Are we to think of an experience in the sense of a realization flashing like lightning? The *Table Talks* give this impression, whereas the 1545 retrospect presents the new understanding rather as the result of long, stubborn, and quiet struggling with the meaning of Holy Scripture. Luther, in fact, expressly invites the reader to keep in mind that he, as Augustine says, was one of those who seek to advance themselves by writing and teaching and not one of those who suddenly rise from a nonentity to be everything, and who "at the first glance fathom all the meaning of Holy Scripture" (*WA* 54, 186). Accordingly, he means that he "has begun to understand." In another passage he says of himself: "I did not learn my theology all at once, but I had to dig deeper and deeper" (*Tr* 1, no. 352).

---

[35] "Fuisti tu apud nos in hac opinione, immo errore; fui et ego" (*WA, Br* 1, 35, 22). According to K. Aland, *Der Weg zur Reformation,* p. 13, "it is easy to incur the danger of interpreting the letter falsely and possibly of thinking that Luther is here announcing a new theological discovery, perhaps even that of Romans 1:17. But from the rest of the letter it is clear that in reality what is involved is a theological position other than that described in the *Praefatio* . . ." But the proof of this is not forthcoming.

[36] J. Ficker, *Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief* (Leipzig, 4th ed. 1930), LXXII; F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (H1, 4th ed. 1906), p. 688; O. Scheel, *Martin Luther* II, 664, assumes an error in Luther's memory. K. Holl, *Luther,* p. 195, calls Luther's claim not to have obtained his understanding of *Iustitia Dei* until 1519 "an assertion which contradicts the known facts." A. Peters ("Luthers Turmerlebnis," *Neue ZSTh* 3 [1961], 203–236) distinguishes between the first appearance of the new exegetical insight, which is present in the *Dictata super Psalterium,* and the point "where Luther definitely succeeded in bringing the unfinished exegetical and dogmatic questions to a solution from this new start" (p. 211). This would have happened no earlier than 1518.

[37] *Luther* I, 316ff.; *Martin Luthers Leben und Werk,* pp. 94–99.

[38] *Fides ex auditu,* p. 7.

We certainly must not claim to find in the lectures any direct reference to a "tower experience." But we can inquire when Luther first made fruitful use in his exegesis of the new understanding, so revolutionary, so decisive for his self-knowledge and for his idea of Scripture. The answer must be in the *Dictata super Psalterium,* in the first series of lectures on the Psalms. In them the *scholia* of Psalms 1 and 4 must first be eliminated as the result of a later revision of the series for printing.

In the exegesis of Psalm 30(31):2, where the bitterly hated expression "In iustitia tua libera me" was to be explained for the first time, the new understanding of God's justice is not yet present. There is likewise no trace of the "thunder bolt" (*Tr* 4, no. 4007) by which Luther claimed to have been struck when reading this verse. In the exegesis of Psalm 71(72):2, which Luther tackled twice (*WA* 3, 464, 1–467, 4; 461, 20–463, 37), he clearly defines *iustitia Dei* as *fides Christi,* referring to Romans 1:17 (*WA* 463, 1; 466, 26). To his exegesis of Psalm 71:2 he adds as a general rule of hermeneutics:

> If one wishes to understand wisely the Apostle and the other Scriptures, one must explain tropologically all these concepts: truth, wisdom, virtue, salvation, justice, as that whereby he makes us strong, saved, just, wise, and so forth. Thus the works of God are the ways of God. In the literal sense everything is Christ; in the moral sense, everything is faith in Christ.[39]

Luther commented on Psalm 71 in the autumn of 1514. At that time, then, he would already have made use of his discovery, that *iustitia Dei* is not punitive justice but that of faith given us by God, not *iustitia activa* but *iustitia passiva.*[40]

---

[39] *WA* 3, 458. According to the evidence of the manuscript, this passage is incorrectly arranged. Cf. H. Bornkamm, *Zur Frage der Iustitia,* p. 22, footnote 10.

[40] This idea, used in the retrospect of 1545, is first found in Luther in 1525 in *De servo arbitrio* (*WA* 18, 768f.). According to E. Hirsch, *Luthers Studien* II (Gütersloh 1954), 18, it did not acquire a strict meaning in terminology until 1531 in the commentary on Genesis (*WA* 44, 485–487).

But there is hardly a trace of an immediately previous liberating discovery, of the "entry into paradise" after distressing anxiety. Certainly Luther speaks later of the "wonderful new definition of justice" (*WA* 57, II, 69) and of the fact that the Lord accomplishes marvels in his saints. But what about Luther's contention that until then Romans 1:17 had been understood by all doctors in the sense of punitive justice?[41] H. Denifle refuted this claim by means of an examination of some sixty commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans.[42] Of course the systematic theology—that is, the commentaries on *The Sentences*—and especially the piety of the age should be taken into consideration. For it is possible that a truth may exist in books without making any great impression or emerging into practical realization. In the *Dictata super Psalterium* Luther himself makes a reference to this distinction, remarking that the doctrine of Saint Paul, "the most profound theologian," on justice, which is not ours but God's grace, is "entirely unknown, perhaps not theoretically but definitely in practice," to contemporary theologians (*WA* 3, 21). But this reproach touches Luther too. The collects of the missal time and again put in his mouth expressions such as: "We who place no trust in our own justice" (Mass *Iustus ut palma*), "since we trust in none of our works" (Mass of Sexagesima Sunday), and "we who trust in your power." Obviously he had not pondered the content of these prayers.

Be that as it may, Luther's discovery in regard to *iustitia Dei* is fundamentally Catholic. And he accordingly "was struggling against a Catholicism that was no longer Catholic in the full sense of the word."[43] Luther routed, as religiously inadequate and not in accord with the Gospel, positions which had been handed down to him from late medieval practice and Ockhamist theology. The latter is not quite scholasticism; in fact it is not readily to be identified even with the teaching of William of Ockham himself. The *venerabilis inceptor* did indeed sharply stress human liberty alongside the divine sovereignty, but he no less unequivocally expounded that everything lies in the *acceptatio divina* and neither a naturally nor a supernaturally good work of man can bind God and limit his free choice of graces. Ockham's pupils had no longer been able to maintain this strong tension, exaggerated to paradox, between human freedom and divine caprice. With Gabriel Biel, who directly influenced Luther, they bent Ockham's theses to conform with morality and understood a sentence such as "Facienti quod est in se, deus non denegat gratiam," which is not in the works of the Franciscan, to mean that man by himself can and must dispose himself for grace[44] and that there exists a synchronism, even a causality, between this disposition, effected by man's power, and the infusion of grace, in so far as God, on the basis of his arrangement, necessarily bestows the supernatural *habitus* on whoever loves him above all things *ex puris naturalibus.*[45] But in Catholic doctrine, according to Aquinas[46] as well as Augustine, every disposition—that is, every act directed toward God—which is answered by God with justifying grace, is already a work of prevenient grace, the gift of him who produces the will and the accomplishment (Phil. 2:13).

---

[41] *Enarr. in genes.*, cap. 27, 38: "Sic omnes Doctores hunc locum interpraetati fuerunt, excepto Augustino" (*WA* 43, 537); cf. the introduction of 1545 (*WA* 54, 185).

[42] H. Denifle, *Die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther über Justitia Dei* (*Rom 1, 17*) *und Justificatio* (Mainz 1905).

[43] J. Lortz, *The Reformation: A Problem for Today*, p. 126; id., *Reformation in Deutschland* I, 176.

Luther's *Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam* (*WA* 1, 224–228) of 4 September 1517 was an express and official confrontation with the Ockhamist school of theology. He attributed great importance to it and intended to make it available to far wider circles than would be the case in regard to the indulgence theses of 31 October.[47]

With the individual theses their opponents were named at the same time. They were Scotus, Ockham, Peter d'Ailly, and Gabriel Biel, and the last named was the chief opponent. He was cited most and was also dealt with in passages where the others were specified by name. The matter was taken from Biel's commentary on *The Sentences* and his *Collectorium.*

Luther first objected to any attempt to explain away Augustine's theses on the wickedness of man. Without grace man can will and do only evil (1–4). He has no liberty to turn in both directions (5), but, without grace, necessarily chooses the evil act (6), and to assume that man of his own power can love God above all things is a pretense (18). The *amor amicitiae* is a work of prevenient grace (20). Thus the initiative lies with God, and his choice and predestination constitute the sole disposition for grace (19). It is false to say that man eliminates obstacles when he does what lies in his power (33). Left to himself, he has neither right understanding nor good will (34).

There is no natural morality. Externally good works are sins because of our pride or our bad disposition (37–38). Hence we cannot become just through just works, but we must be just in order to be able to do just works. In connection with this attack on moral philosophy Luther turns in general against Aristotle and the use of logic and metaphysics in theology (43–53).

---

[44] E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie,* pp. 129f.

[45] Gabriel Biel, III *Sent.,* q. un. a. 3, dub. 2 (Q): "Quia secundum legem ordinatam cuilibet facienti quod in se est et per hoc sufficienter disposito ad gratiae susceptionem Deus infundit gradiam . . ." Cf. L. Grane, *Contra Gabrielem,* pp. 242–261.

[46] *S. Th.* I–II, q. 112, a. 2: "Whatever can act as a preparation in man comes from the help of God moving the soul to the good."

[47] *WA, Br* I, 103; 106ff. For what follows cf. L. Grane, *Contra Gabrielem.*

He then emphasizes that grace is not something in man; it determines his entire existence. It is always effective and is not to be separated from love of God, just as love of God is never without grace (54–56) and God cannot accept man without justifying grace (57). As early as the lectures on Romans, Biel's doctrine that man of his own power can love God above all things and fulfill the law in fact (*secundum substantiam facti*), even if not according to the mind of the lawgiver (*ad intentionem praecipientis*), had driven Luther to exclaim, "O fools, O piggish theologians!" (*WA* 56, 274). In the *Disputatio* too this is the chief reproach against scholastic theology. Just as one must not separate love and grace, so also the fulfilling of the law and grace. Grace requires no new work in addition to the observance of the law by natural strength, but it makes possible the spiritual fulfillment of the law (58–60).

For "not to kill" is not a sin because of the mere absence of the grace prescribed by God but because a false disposition—pride, anger, or greed—is at the basis of this external right conduct (61–63). To fulfill the law means to overcome hatred and greed, which inspire the external act, and the will, which rebels against the law (64–73). Only grace, or, better, "the child who is born to us," can do so (74). Only love, which is poured out in our heart by the Holy Spirit, can reconcile the will, which hates the law, with the law (85–90). At the end Luther once more turns on the Ockhamist understanding of the love of God. Grace does not facilitate the act of love, but rather makes it possible at all. We cannot by the same act love God for his own sake and creation for God's sake (94); that is, love of God and love of creature are irreconcilable (95). To love God above all else means to hate self and to know nothing except God (96).

Luther is here opposing a concept which, so to speak, sees man in a neutral zone where he is not challenged by God, does not face him in faith or in defiance, or where neither the anger nor the mercy of God is the power fundamentally determining him. In this disputation it is clear that the scholastic theology attacked by Luther is Ockhamism of the Biel type. With his stressing of prevenient grace, with his requiring of the grace of justification as the basis for *acceptatio divina,* and with his teaching that grace is not added as a condition to an already good natural activity but that it forms man's activity from the very beginning and leads to God, Luther contests what would have been censured by Thomism too and above all by Augustinianism. But at the same time Luther remains dominated by Ockhamism. And therefore he does not succeed, for example, in showing the relationship of the love of neighbor and of God and in seeing creation as an image of the divine nature.

CHAPTER 3

The Indulgence Controversy

History and Use of Indulgences

An indulgence is a remission of the temporal punishment of sins, granted by the Church and effective before God. The practice of indulgences in the Church, going back to the eleventh century, preceded the theological justification. Several factors contributed to the rise of indulgences. Private penance in the early Middle Ages brought about a connection in time between confession and absolution, whereby the subjective performance of penance followed reconciliation and the distinction between guilt and punishment became clearer. And in the atonements and commutations—that is, the adaptations whereby penitential works were adjusted to the circumstances and abilities of the penitent—it became evident that various kinds of penance could be substituted for one another and that the Church could decide such matters. Earlier the Church had already provided assistance outside the Sacrament in the penitential efforts of individuals by means of the intercession of martyrs and the official liturgical prayer. In the early medieval "absolutions" this aid acquired a more official form. These were prayers or benefits of the Church, which were to some extent connected with a summons to a particular work, such as the building of a church or participation in a crusade. Because it had been expressed by the bearer of the power of the keys, such an intercession was regarded as of special efficacy with God.

Whereas the atonement was concerned primarily with the canonical penalty, the absolution referred to the punishment in God's sight. The indulgence united them. But the indulgence differed from the atonement, because in the latter the substituted penitential work had to be equivalent, and also from the absolution, since this was not a judicial act. The indulgence, as a jurisdictional act, concerned the remission of ecclesiastical penance. But it was connected with prayer for the remission of the penalties for sin before God, a prayer which, because of its official character, one could be especially sure would be granted. The transition from a mildly administered atonement to an indulgence is naturally not clear. Still, the mitigation afforded by an indulgence was so well understood that even up to the thirteenth century it was regarded as a kindness toward the imperfect, a kindness that serious Christians were not to claim.

The theological justification of indulgences followed their use. The canonist Huguccio (d. 1210) was the first to describe an indulgence as a jurisdictional act relative to the penalties for sin before God. The question as to the source of the substitute for the remitted penance was answered after Hugh of Saint-Cher in 1230 with the doctrine of the *thesaurus ecclesiae,* of which the Church lawfully disposes. The more its efficacy was derived from the treasury of the Church, the more the indulgence became reserved to the Pope, who alone had power over this treasury, but the penitential work lost its significance in regard to the degree of the remission of punishment. If, besides, the punishments of sin were regarded as merely vindictive penalties, which as such had no meaning for the purification of man, then there was the further danger of disregarding man's susceptibility to the remission of penalties granted him and of neglecting pastoral responsibility for man's inner penitential spirit. Thus it was that the late Middle Ages saw a multiplication of indulgences and ever lighter works of indulgence and an unscrupulous financial exploitation of them.

The indulgence for the dead provided a special opportunity here. As early as the thirteenth century theologians and canonists had taught that indulgences could be applied to the dead,[1] and indulgence preachers had proclaimed such indulgences on their own authority.[2] We do not have genuine papal grants of indulgences for the dead until the middle of the fifteenth century, such as that of Calixtus III in 1457 for a crusade against the Muslims and that of Sixtus IV in 1476 for Saint-Pierre de Saintes.[3] An efficacy *per modum suffragii* was attributed to indulgences for the dead, but this did not keep many theologians and, above all, preachers of indulgences from ascribing to them an infallible effect and from teaching that they could be gained even by one in the state of mortal sin and hence that only the prescribed monetary contribution was necessary.[4] Thus the indulgence agent Raymond Peraudi explained the indulgence bull of Sixtus IV: "The method *per modum suffragii* does not derogate from the method of authority."[5] And in his twelfth "obelisk" against Luther's twenty-fifth thesis Eck asserted that "it [the phrase *per modum suffragii*] does not lessen, as Luther claims, but rather increases" (*WA* 1, 296). Despite the objections of several theologians, such as Cajetan, these views were prevalent around 1500, and indulgence preachers further exaggerated them in the pulpit. As early as

---

[1] E.g., Thomas, IV *Sent.,* d. 45, q. 2, a. 2, so. 2.

[2] N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses,* II, 167ff.

[3] Ibid., III, 380 ff.

[4] E.g., Raymond Peraudi; cf. Paulus, op. cit., III, 386.

[5] *ZKG,* 24 (1903), 225, footnote 1; *WA* 1, 582; cf. Paulus, op. cit., III, 384–386.

1482 there was submitted to the judgment of the Sorbonne a proposition which was identical in content with the notorious lampoon: "As soon as the money jingles in the chest, the soul springs out of Purgatory."[6]

The strong financial exploitation of indulgences by the Curia led to similar practices by the territorial lords. They aspired to a direct share in the financial results; otherwise they forbade the preaching of the indulgence. When in 1508 King Sigismund of Poland opposed the indulgence for Saint Peter's basilica, Julius II granted him two-thirds of the proceeds for the defense of the kingdom.[7] And even Duke Georg of Saxony, later to be so firmly opposed to Luther, was unwilling for financial and political reasons "to grant any favor," that is, he forbade the preaching of the indulgence in his territory. This "indulgence sovereignty" of the territorial lords, which signified a secularization of indulgences, was ridiculed on the eve of the Reformation by Thomas Murner in his *Narrenbeschwörung* (1512):

> Wil der Bapst ein Ablass geben
> So nympt der herr syn teil do neben;
> Wolt man im syn teil nit lon
> So miest der aplass blyben ston.[8]

The Trafficking in Indulgences by Albrecht of Mainz

In 1505 Pope Julius II (1503–13) had begun the rebuilding of Saint Peter's basilica, and in 1507, according to custom, he had announced a plenary indulgence to finance this immense building project. The indulgence had been renewed by Leo X (1513–21). Because of considerable resentment at the financial exploitation by the Curia, as well as the efforts of territorial lords to permit only the preaching of indulgences in which they would have a financial share or which would benefit the churches of their territories, the proclamation of an indulgence did not necessarily assure its being preached. But a special opportunity presented itself in the territories of the Archbishops of Mainz and Magdeburg, the Bishop of Halberstadt, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. In 1513 Albrecht of Brandenburg, a twenty-three-year-old youth, became Archbishop of Magdeburg and administrator of Halberstadt. And in the very next year the chapter of Mainz also postulated the easygoing prince as Archbishop-Elector of Mainz. For Albrecht proposed to pay personally the *servitia* and the pallium tax, which had fallen due now for the third time within one decade. They amounted to 14,000 ducats.[9] In addition there was owed a dispensation fee of 10,000 ducats, since, along with the great Mainz archbishopric, Albrecht wanted to retain his present sees of Magdeburg and Halberstadt—an illegal accumulation of pastoral benefices. The archbishop borrowed 29,000 Rhenish gold florins from the Fugger banking house, and the Curia itself indicated how this burden of debt could be paid. The archbishop was to undertake the preaching of the indulgence for Saint Peter's for eight years and be allowed to retain half the proceeds. Including the tax of 2,143 ducats which the Emperor had reserved for himself, Albrecht had to raise 26,143 ducats. Accordingly the indulgence had to raise 52,286 ducats if it was to achieve its goal.[10] Representatives of the Fuggers accompanied the indulgence preachers in order to take their share on the spot. Thus did the indulgence, which Leo X granted by the Bull "Sacrosanctis Salvatoris et Redemptoris" of 31 March 1513 become an "object of barter in a wholesale commercial transaction," as Lortz stigmatizes the deal. It is useless to inquire whether or not this was a formal case of simony. In shame we can only acknowledge with Meissinger that "the whole thing was a full-fledged scandal."

---

[6] Paulus, op. cit., III, 386.

[7] J. Hashagen, *Staat und Kirche vor der Reformation* (Essen 1931), p. 174.

[8] "If the Pope wants to grant an indulgence, then the prince wants to have his share. If one won't let him have his share, then the indulgence must be given up." T. Murner, *Deutsche Schriften* II, ed. M. Spanier (Berlin, 1926), 249.

As papal agent for this indulgence, Archbishop Albrecht issued for his deputies and the indulgence preachers a comprehensive set of instructions, the *Instructio Summaria.*[11] Despite certain obscurities, the doctrine of indulgences contained in this is correct, but in its recourse to pious formulas and superlatives it resorts in practice to a commercialized extolling of the indulgence in order to realize the highest possible monetary profit. The remission of future sins was not promised, contrary to what Luther claimed in 1541 (*WA* 51, 538). But one could purchase a confession certificate, by virtue of which one could confess to any priest at any desired time in his later life sins reserved to the Pope. The indulgence preacher had to make it clear that a person did not need to confess at the moment of buying such a confession certificate, which procured for him, among other things, then and forever a share in the spiritual goods of the Church Militant.[12] Likewise, one could gain a plenary indulgence for the dead without contrition and confession but merely by the paying of the money.[13] And especially this indulgence was represented as "efficacissime" and "certissime," and sermons of a content such as that referred to in the lampoon mentioned above were thus abetted by it. The faithful were invited to postpone repentence, and the impression was strengthened that what was at stake was money rather than the salvation of souls.

---

[9] A. Schulte, *Die Fugger in Rom 1495–1523* I, 93–141; G. von Polnitz, *Jakob Fugger* (Tübingen 1949), I, 307–311, II, 324–327.

[10] Schulte, op. cit., I, 140.

[11] Text in W. Kohler, *Dokumente,* pp. 104–124.

[12] "Declaramus etiam, quod pro dictis duabus gratiis principalibus consequendis non est opus confiteri seu ecclesias aut altaria visitare, sed dumtaxat confessionale redimere" (W. Kohler, *Dokumente,* p. 116).

On 22 January 1517, Johannes Tetzel (c. 1465–1519), a Leipzig Dominican, was appointed one of the two deputies for the preaching of the indulgence in the province of Magdeburg, and a high compensation was granted him.[14] He quickly took up the task. He is reported to have been active in Halle in March and at Jüterbog on 10 April; according to Luther's statement people flocked to him from Wittenberg also, as though they were "insane" and "possessed."[15] Frederick the Wise had not given leave for the preaching of the indulgence in Electoral Saxony, for he was unwilling to permit his subjects' money to profit Albrecht of Brandenburg, the rival of his dynasty, or to allow the pilgrimage to his Wittenberg Church of All Saints, so richly endowed with relics and indulgences, to suffer any falling off. The store of relics which the elector had assembled there, and the multitude of indulgences which he acquired for those venerating them,[16] show clearly that Frederick the Wise was in no sense an opponent of indulgences.

In regard to his personal life Tetzel provided no reason for any special complaints. He was not one of those indulgence preachers about whom not only Luther (*WA* 1, 588) but also Johann Eck himself, in his opinion on reform for the Pope, said that they paid off their prostitutes with indulgence certificates.[17] But he was one of those who, as Johannes Cochläus, Duke Georg of Saxony, and his court chaplain Hieronymus Emser complained, emphasized the money at the expense of contrition.[18]

As a confessor, Luther had occasion to deal with indulgence preaching and with the expectations and ideas it aroused in the minds of his penitents. He had already directed criticism at indulgences in the lectures on the Psalms and on Romans,[19] and in a sermon usually assigned to 31 October 1516, he came out specifically against the indulgence Tetzel had preached on the Feast of Saint Matthias in 1517. He maintained that as a consequence of indulgences the people learned to flee and abhor the penalties of sin but not sin itself. It would be far better to admonish them to love the punishment and to embrace the Cross (*WA* 1, 141). In a sermon on the occasion of a church dedication, which he delivered in April 1517 or later, he came out against the "big show" of Tetzel's indulgence preaching. In this he emphasized that indulgences merely free from the conditions of private penance and not infrequently stand in the way of inner repentance. The genuine penitent, he said, did not wish to be freed from punishment by indulgences (*WA* 1, 98).

---

[13] ". . . nec opus est, quod contribuentes pro animabus in capsam sint corde contriti et ore confessi" (ibid., p. 116).

[14] H. Volz, *Martin Luthers Thesenanschlag,* p. 13.

[15] *WA, TR* 5, 76, no. 5346; *WA* 51, 539; *WA* 30, II, 282–284; *WA, TR* 5, 535, no. 6201.

[16] Even in 1516 Frederick the Wise requested from Rome an increase of the indulgences for his castle church. The relevant bull was not brought to Germany by von Miltitz until 1518, and it was delivered to the elector in 1519. The collection of relics was constantly added to until 1520. For 1518 Spalatin recorded 17,443 items, and for 1520 there were 18,970. In one visit an indulgence of 1,902,202 years, 270 days, and of 1,915,983 quarantines could be gained for each action; P. Kalkoff, *Ablass und Reliquienverehrung an der Schlosskirche zu Wittenberg* (Gotha 1907), pp. 65f.

[17] *Acta reformationis catholicae* I, 110.

[18] Paulus, op. cit., III, 483.

Luther presented his idea in detail in the treatise *De indulgentiis* (*WA* 1, 65–69). According to this, an indulgence is the remission of the satisfaction imposed in confession by the priest. In itself it does not lessen concupiscence nor does it increase love and grace. In Luther's opinion the faithful should be directed to genuine penance, that is, to inner conversion and the eradicating of radical sin. One cannot buy oneself off from it by an indulgence. Hence an indulgence is to be rejected if it provides the occasion for false security and spiritual laziness and does not promote the allaying of concupiscence and a longing for God. "We have to seek God's healing grace incessantly"—so runs the last sentence of this far too little noticed treatise. Till then Luther had regarded the indulgence doctrine expounded by Tetzel as the latter's private opinion and had ascribed its excesses to his charlatanry. But acquaintance with the *Instructio Summaria* of the Archbishop of Mainz showed him that Tetzel's sermons were based on official instructions. This may have induced him to turn to the prelates responsible—the Bishop of Brandenburg as local Ordinary and the Archbishop of Magdeburg and Mainz as the papal agent for the indulgence.

In a letter of 31 October 1517 to Albrecht of Mainz, Luther complained that the indulgence preachers "by deceiving stories and promises about indulgences lull the people into security and lack of fear" (*WA, Br* 1, 111). The archbishop should withdraw his *Instructio* and give other directions to the preachers; otherwise great shame and dishonor would ensue. From the accompanying theses he would be able to ascertain how unsettled the doctrine on the indulgence really was. The reference here was to the celebrated ninety-five theses. Luther actually sent them to the bishops directly concerned on the eve of All Saints. Only when these prelates did not reply, or replied in an unsatisfactory manner, did he, as he maintained throughout his life, distribute them to learned men in and outside Wittenberg.[20] A posting of the theses at the Wittenberg castle church on 31 October 1517 is incompatible with these statements of Luther. Neither Luther himself nor any other of the numerous contemporary sources refers to such a move. Only after Luther's death did Melanchthon speak of a posting of the theses in his introduction to Volume II (1546) of the reformer's works, which has been proved to be very unreliable on other points also.[21]

---

[19] *WA* 3, 416; 424f.; *WA* 56, 417; 503.

Luther's Ninety-five Theses

Apart from numerous other inconsistencies, the posting of the theses on the eve of the titular feast of the castle church, in view of the great concourse of people attracted by the rich indulgences to be gained there, would have had the character of a public spectacle, despite the fact that the theses were written in Latin. But as he repeatedly insisted, Luther sought a discussion among scholars for a clarification of the doctrine of indulgences, thus far not officially defined.[22] The colleagues to whom Luther forwarded the theses after 31 October—Johann Lang in Erfurt, for example, on 11 November (*WA, Br* 1, 122)—passed them on. Thus in both longhand and print they acquired in a few weeks such a rapid and extensive distribution as no one, not even Luther, could have foreseen (*WA, Br* 1, 120; *WA* 51, 540).

"Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying, 'Do penance . . .' (Mt. 4:17), desired that the whole life of the faithful should be a penance" (Thesis 1). Here is expressed Luther's anxiety lest the faithful be lulled into a false assurance of salvation. Rather they should be "admonished to follow Christ, their Head, through suffering, death, and hell" (Thesis 94; 92–95). Indulgence preachers who by "extravagant and unrestrained" words (Thesis 92) commend indulgences far beyond their value (Thesis 24; 73–80) promote a lazy peace (Thesis 95), at the expense of contrition and penance (Theses 39–41). In this connection Luther later wrote in his *Resolutions:* "See the danger! Indulgences are preached to the people in direct opposition to the truth of the Cross and the fear of God" (*WA* 1, 601). Indulgences are not to be rejected in principle (Thesis 71), but people are not to put their trust in them (Theses 49, 52, 32), and works of charity and prayer especially are superior to them (Theses 41–47). In opposition to the *Instructio* and the indulgence preachers, who give the impression that only by means of indulgences do we obtain remission of the penalties of sin and a share in the goods of Christ and the Church, Luther overemphasizes that every Christian finds full remission of penalty and guilt in true contrition (Thesis 36) and, even without indulgences, has a share in all the treasures of Christ and the Church (Thesis 37). The true treasury of the Church is the Gospel of the glory and grace of God. (Thesis 62). Hence only enemies of Christ can, like the *Instructio,* forbid the preaching of the word of God in the churches during the time of indulgence preaching (Theses 53–55). In Theses 14 to 19 Luther stresses the uncertain character of the statements of theologians in regard to the souls in purgatory. In any case, the indulgence for the dead is granted only in the form of an intercession (Theses 26, 25), and so one must not speak of an infallible effect (Theses 27–29).

---

[20] *WA* 1, 528; *WA, Br* 1, 245; *WA* 51, 540; *WA* 54, 180; cf. B. Iserloh, *Luthers Thesenanschlag,* pp. 13–15.

[21] *CR* 6, 161f.; H. Boehmer, *Luthers Romfahrt* (Leipzig 1914), p. 8.

[22] *WA, Br* 1, 138; 152; *WA* 1, 311; 528. Cf. the heading of the theses: "Quare petit, ut qui non possunt verbis praesentes nobiscum disceptare, agunt id literis absentes" (*WA* 1, 233).

All these topics can be understood as orthodox, as legitimate criticism of abuses in the indulgence system, and as a contribution to the discussion of theological questions not yet defined. Even Luther's idea of the declaratory nature of absolution—that the Pope can remit guilt only by the declaration and the acknowledgment that it is remitted by God (Theses 6, 38)—was in line with contemporary nominalist theology, according to which the sacramental absolution does not cancel "guilt and eternal punishment, but only indicates a cancellation that has already taken place."[23]

Luther also stresses the intention of confessing as a condition of forgiveness by God (Theses 7, 38), and he even allows the Pope a right, efficacious with God, to reserve sins (Thesis 6). But he questions the nature of indulgences, especially according to the prevailing opinion of the time, when he restricts them to the remission of the canonical penalties (Theses 5, 11, 20, 21, 31) and does not concede that ecclesiastical penalties correspond to those imposed by God.[24] In the declaration of these theses, however, he repeatedly affirms that he does not desire to make claims but wishes to dispute and would willingly be corrected.[25]

Although, he says, the views of Thomas and Bonaventure are against him, no canon of law and no passage of Scripture is, and no doctrinal decision by the Church has yet been issued (*WA* 1, 568). Luther is convinced that he is within the limits of theological opinions that are defensible. That he was correct in this view is proved by the fact that his

---

[23] B. Poschmann, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* IV, 3, 102.

[24] "Resolutiones . . . " concl. 36 (*WA* 1, 592).

[25] "Hanc disputo et doceri humiliter peto" (*WA* 1, 534); "Hanc disputo, nondum pertinaciter assero" (*WA* 1, 567).

Resolutions, or explanation of the theses, was submitted to his Ordinary, the Bishop of Brandenburg, whose *placet* it obtained (*WA* 1, 164).

If we are not satisfied merely to establish the facts, if we inquire historically and causally to determine what the theses were aiming at and what development lay imminent in them, then we will attribute to them a greater significance. In so inquiring we have to keep in mind that in the nominalist theology divine and human activity were already separated to a great extent, in the sense that God accepted the action of the Church only as an occasion for his own saving action, without actually entering into it. Luther pushed this separation of the human and the ecclesiastical from the divine so far that he no longer attributed to the ecclesiastical penalty or its remission even an interpretive significance with regard to the penalties for sin imposed by God. In my view this seems to be a root of Luther's proximate rejection of the hierarchical priesthood as a divine institution.

But this theological impact of the theses was not immediately effective. The secret of the inflammatory effect and rapid spread of the indulgence theses lies in their polemical and folksy tone. With them Luther touched long-smoldering questions, grievances, and resentments which had already often become vocal; he made himself the spokesman of many disillusioned hopes and of a widespread discontent. In Theses 80 to 91 he took up, as he himself said, "the quite pointed and critical objections of the laity" (Theses 30, 81), which were not to be "silenced by force" and not to be appeased by cheap excuses. Many contemporaries felt as Prior Johannes Fleck did when, on becoming acquainted with the theses, he said to his confreres, "This is the one who will do it" (*TR* 5, 177, no. 5480). And even such determined later opponents of Luther as Johannas Cochläus, Hieronymus Emser, and Duke Georg of Saxony hailed the theses. The Duke's councillor, Caesar Pflug, told him of a remark by Bishop Adolf VII of Merseburg to the effect that the prelate thought the theses "should be posted in many places" to warn the poor "against Tetzel's humbug."[26]

The rapid circulation of the theses was for Luther himself a proof that he had expressed what many had kept quiet about because of "fear of the Jews" (John 7:13; *WA, Br* 1, 152). But he deplored this turn because the theses had been intended, not for the people but for a few scholars, and because they contained some doubtful propositions (letter to Scheuerl of 5 March 1518). Hence he hastened to put his basic ideas on indulgences in writing for the people in the "Sermon on indulgences and grace" in March 1518 (*WA* 1, 239–246). In 1518 alone thirteen printings of this appeared, an indication of the possibilities afforded to Luther and the Reformation by the printing press. At the same time, in his *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute* Luther provided a detailed case for his indulgence theses, but this did not appear until August 1518 (*WA* 1, 530–628). In it Luther was concerned to protect himself against misunderstandings and distortions and to give his superiors—Leo X, Staupitz, and the Bishop of Brandenburg—a first-hand account of the motives for his action. In the accompanying letter to the Pope Luther alludes to the unprecedented success of his theses. He says that he deplores this because they were unsuited for a circulation of this sort. However, they cannot be withdrawn now ("revocare non possum"; *WA* 1, 529), and so he is issuing this explanation of them. In this way it should become clear that he is honestly concerned for the power of the Church and the respect due to her keys. At the end he wrote: "Therefore, most holy Father, I cast myself at the feet of Your Holiness and commit myself to you with all that I am and have" (*WA* 1, 529). In the *Protestatio* introducing the *Resolutiones* he affirmed: "I first of all declare that I intend to say and to assert nothing except what is contained primarily in Holy Scripture and then in the Church Fathers acknowledged and preserved by the Roman Church and in canon law and the papal decrees . . ." But he declined to be committed to the opinions of the theological schools: "Through this *Protestatio* of mine it is, so I hope, made sufficiently clear that I can err but that no one can make me out to be a heretic . . ." (*WA* 1, 530f.). The letters accompanying the *Resolutiones,* with their quite singular mixture of candid humility, prophetic self-assurance, and bold avowal, are not adequately characterized when they are referred to as "first-rate chess moves."[27] Be that as it may, they prove—especially if the posting of the theses did not take place—that there was a real possibility of binding the Wittenberg friar, zealously striving for the honor of God and the salvation of souls, to the Church and of making him productive in her.

---

[26] F. Gess, *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen,* vol. I (1517 to 1524) (Leipzig 1905), p. 29.

Of course there was also required on the part of the bishops concerned and of the Pope an approximately equal measure of religious strength and of apostolic and pastoral responsibility. That such was unthinkable reveals the radical weakness of the Church of that time. In this failure in the sphere of what is proper to the priesthood rather than in all the abuses lies her part of the guilt for the Reformation.

---

[27] K. A. Meissinger, *Der Katholische Luther,* p. 162.

CHAPTER 4

Rome's Proceedings against Luther and the Leipzig Disputation

The first person affected by Luther's theses was Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz, who requested an opinion from his university at Mainz. The university returned an evasive reply and suggested that the matter be submitted to the Pope, since his authority was at stake. Even before this answer reached him, Albrecht informed his Magdeburg advisers on 13 December 1517 that he had sent the theses to the Pope and suggested that they should institute a *processus inhibitorius* whereby Luther would be summoned and called upon, under threat of punishment, to refrain in future from all attacks on indulgences in preaching, writing, and disputation. But apparently the advisers did not comply. The denunciation of Luther at Rome for spreading new doctrine was the archbishop's only strong weapon. He obviously did not want to be bothered further with the affair, and so his advisers shelved the *processus.*

The efforts of Tetzel and the Dominicans were more effective, but their activity only too easily created the impression that this was a case of a dispute between rival orders. In January 1518, at the chapter of the Saxon Dominican province in Frankfurt on the Oder, Tetzel debated either ninety-five or 106 theses—the sources differ—against Luther, drawn up by Konrad Wimpina, rector of the university. Here he frivolously defended the lampoon: "As soon as the money jingles in the chest, the soul springs out of purgatory." In fact he stressed that the soul would be freed even more quickly, for the money took time to fall.[1] But even he was outdone by his confrere Sylvester Prierias, the Pope's own theologian. According to Prierias, a preacher who taught this was no more blameworthy than a cook who makes food more attractive to a satiated stomach by adding condiments.[2]

Just as grave as this lack of religious seriousness was the thoughtlessness with which opinions of the schools were passed off as dogmas and their opponents were branded as heretics. The opinion so offensive to Luther, that the state of grace was not necessary for gaining indulgences for the dead, was put forth by Tetzel in Thesis 42 as a "Christian dogma."[3] It was for this reason that Cardinal Cajetan, in a treatise on indulgences of 20 November 1519, attacked preachers who pass off private opinions as teachings of the Church.[4] This arbitrary method of making dogmas out of questions still open to debate was a no less dangerous variation of the "theological vagueness" which was one of the most decisive causes of the Reformation.

---

[1] "Quisquis ergo dicit, non citius posse animam evolare, quam in fundo ciste denarius possit tinnire, errat" (N. Paulus, *Johannes Tetzel,* p. 174).

[2] N. Paulus, *Johannes Tetzel,* p. 147.

The Dominican chapter agreed to denounce Luther at Rome of suspicion of heresy. This was done in March 1518, and, considering the great influence of the Preaching Friars at the Curia, it was not without danger for Luther.

Johannes Eck's rather hastily scribbled *Obelisci,* comments on the indulgence theses, were intended for the private use of Gabriel von Eyb, Bishop of Eichstätt. In March 1518 they came into Luther's hands through Wenceslas Link of Nürnberg but obtained about as little publicity as Luther's *Asterisci* did (*WA* 1, 281–314). In addition to his eagerly pursued amusements—the hunt, comedies, banquets—Leo X was fully occupied with plans for filling his always empty coffers, with the family politics of the House of Medici, and with at least one serious enterprise, the defense of Christendom against the Turkish threat; and so he was disinclined to take seriously the "squabble of monks" in Germany.[5] On 3 March 1518, Gabriel della Volta, general-designate of the Augustinians, was directed "to calm down the man" and to put out the rising flame in time. But nothing more than a fraternal admonition by Staupitz seems to have resulted. On the contrary, the Augustinian chapter meeting at Heidelberg in April and May of 1518 turned into a pro-Luther demonstration. Theses composed by Luther on original sin, grace, free will, and the power of the natural man for the good were debated under his direction, with his pupil Leonard Beier as *respondens.* The Heidelberg meeting showed that the German Augustinians were backing Luther. In addition, he was able to gain the support of several of the younger theologians, such as Martin Bucer, a Dominican, and Johannes Brenz, the future reformer of Württemberg.

On 17 May, the day after he returned to Wittenberg, Luther preached on John 16:2: "They are going to put you out of the synagogue." Whoever dies under an unjust excommunication is saved, even though he dies without the Sacraments. Excommunication can deprive one only of external membership in the Church, not of a share in heavenly treasures. At the same time Luther composed the very submissive accompanying letter to his *Resolutiones* for Leo X.

---

[3] "Non esse christianum dogma, quod redempturi pro amicis confessionalia, vel purgandis Iubileum, possint hec facere absque contritione, error" (N. Paulus, *Johannes Tetzel,* p. 175).

[4] *Opuscula* (Lyons 1558), 105a.

[5] ". . . ricae monachales . . ." cf. P. Kalkoff, *Zu Luthers römischem Prozess,* p. 15, footnote 2. According to the Dominican Matthew Bandello (d. 1562 as Bishop of Agen), Leo X is supposed to have said: "Che fra Martino haveva un belissimo ingegno e che coteste erano i invidie fratesche."

The Dominican general chapter at Rome became important for the start of the proceedings against Luther in May 1518, when Tetzel was promoted to doctor of theology by authorization of Leo X. In mid-June, at the Pope's request, Sylvester Prierias drew up an opinion, *In praesumptuosas Martini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate papae dialogus.* This hastily composed polemic rightly began with the authority of Church and Pope as the crucial point of controversy, but exaggerated the extent of the infallible doctrinal authority and made so slight a distinction between binding Church teaching and the practice of indulgences, or rather the views of theologians,[6] and was furthermore so biting in tone, that from the outset it rendered any "dialogue" impossible. The *Dialogus* was printed in June and attached to the notification with which, at the beginning of July, the Auditor of the *Camera Apostolica,* Ghinucci, cited Luther to Rome for hearings.

The summons reached the reformer on 7 August through Cardinal Cajetan, who had been at the Diet of Augsburg since 7 July in an effort to win the German estates for the Turkish war. The next day Luther requested the Elector Frederick the Wise to induce the Emperor to have the Pope allow the proceedings to take place in Germany. If Prierias had allegedly jotted down his *Dialogus* in three days, then Luther claimed to have prepared his *Responsio* (*WA* 1, 647–686) in two days. A work of poor quality, wrote Luther to Spalatin on 31 August 1518, did not deserve a more serious consideration. Thus Luther likewise failed to do justice to the gravity of the situation in style and content. "Both the Pope and a council can err" (*WA* 1, 656). Scripture, as Augustine writes, is without error. To be sure, up to now the Roman Church, Luther gratefully admits, has actually not deviated from the true faith in her decrees and has clung to the authority of the Bible and of the Fathers (*WA* 1, 662). Luther regards himself as bound by her decrees. He will not, however, submit to the opinions of the Thomists but will await the decision of Church or council in the question of indulgences (*WA* 1, 658).

Luther could not count on the good will of Maximilian I. For on 5 August the latter had pointed out to the Pope the danger to the unity of faith caused by Luther's appearance and had promised to back up in the

---

[6] "Qui circa indulgentias dicit, Ecclesiam Romanam non posse facere id, quod de facto facit, haereticus est" (F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner,* p. 11).

Empire the measures to be taken by the Church. Without respecting the period of time specified in the summons, Leo X on 23 August issued a brief for Cajetan at Augsburg: the legate was to summon Luther as a notorious heretic. If he should recant, he was to be graciously received. If he failed to appear voluntarily or refused to recant, Cajetan was to arrest him and send him to Rome. In the event that he was unable to arrest him, the legate received authority to declare Luther and his adherents excommunicated (*WA* 2, 23–25).

At the same time the request was made that Frederick the Wise should surrender the "son of wickedness" to Cajetan or to Rome. The elector exerted himself to have Luther's case dealt with by a court in Germany. From Cajetan he obtained a promise to deal with Luther at Augsburg "paternally" and to release him even if Luther refused to recant. The legate agreed to this concession for political reasons. On 27 August five of the electors—those of Trier and Saxony were not included—had pledged themselves to elect King Charles I of Spain as Maximilian's successor. The Elector Frederick had violently opposed the election of the Habsburg and had thus become a partisan of the Pope, who at any cost wanted to prevent the encirclement of the Papal State by the united Habsburg lands.

On 3 September Leo X announced in consistory his intention of bestowing the Golden Rose on Frederick the Wise. On 10 September the delivery of the distinction to the elector, together with rich indulgences for the Wittenberg castle church, was assigned to a papal notary and secret chamberlain, Karl von Miltitz, a young Saxon noble. But this mission was halted by the arrival of a message from Cajetan reporting Frederick the Wise's opposition to the election of Charles I, as well as his personal intervention in Luther's favor. The Curia agreed to the legate's arrangement about Luther's hearing in Augsburg, but in the brief "Dum nuper" of 11 September placed the responsibility on Cajetan by giving him judicial authority over Luther's case. He was to give the Wittenberg friar a careful interrogation, avoiding any disputation, and, in accord with his findings, acquit or condemn him.

At the end of September Luther received orders from his prince to appear before Cajetan at Augsburg. He arrived there on 7 October 1518. He first waited for the imperial safe-conduct and on 12 October and the two succeeding days went to Cajetan. If any contemporary theologian did, then Cajetan possessed the qualifications for gaining Luther for the Church. He had already written on indulgences in 1517, making it clear that the opinions of canonists and theologians on the subject were widely divergent.[7] At Augsburg in the weeks preceding

---

[7] *Opuscula* (Lyons 1562), 90–97a.

Luther's interrogation he had composed five more *quaestiones* on the subject.[8] He took the trouble to read Luther's writings, and his views on indulgences were moderate. Of course, for Cajetan an indulgence could not be a mere remission of ecclesiastical penalties; it must also free us from the penalties which we have incurred for our sins before the divine justice. Otherwise it would be a dangerous misleading of the faithful. To be concerned about indulgences was not a mark of imperfection. However, it was to be conceded to Luther that an alms is preferable to an indulgence and that anyone who neglects an obligatory alms for the sake of an indulgence commits a sin. Although indulgences for the dead are also based on the Church's power of the keys, they take effect only *per modum suffragii.*

A more detailed study of Luther's writings by Cajetan at Augsburg is attested by several treatises on the Sacrament of penance, excommunication, and purgatory. In a *quaestio* completed on 26 September 1518, Cajetan asks whether, for the fruitful reception of penance, the penitent must have the certainty of faith that he has obtained from God the forgiveness of his sins. After six affirmative arguments, mostly taken *verbatim* from Luther's sermon *De Poenitentia* (*WA* 1, 323f.), Cajetan stresses that the penitent need not necessarily have faith that he has actually been absolved, but he must believe that the grace of absolution is given to us through the Sacrament of penance.[9] Luther's requirement of the certainty of faith by the one receiving the Sacrament that his sins have been pardoned is regarded by Cajetan as unheard of and of great significance; for him it implies "the establishing of a new Church."[10] It is not the necessity of faith for a fruitful reception of the Sacrament that is questioned. Cajetan rejects the faith that is referred back to the recipient; that is, the uncertainty of faith that pardon has been obtained as the constitutive element in justification.

This "reflexive faith" (P. Hacker), together with the doctrine of the *thesaurus ecclesiae,* was the chief topic of the interrogation in Augsburg. According to Luther's description, he was received on 12 October "very graciously by the Lord Cardinal Legate, almost with too much deference" (*WA* 2, 7). Cajetan could not and would not engage in a disputation. He demanded recantation and a promise to keep the peace thereafter. In him Luther saw not the legate of the Church but the Thomist, a "member of the opposition," by whom he refused to let himself be committed to "the hallucinations of scholastic opinions" (*WA* 2, 16). And so a heated dispute arose, nevertheless. The Cardinal demanded the withdrawal of Thesis 58, according to which the treasury of the Church is not identical with the merits of Christ and the saints. Luther refused and insisted upon the thesis: "That the merits of Christ are not the treasury of indulgences, but rather they have amassed it" (*WA* 2, 13), or, as he expressed it in the *Resolutiones:*

---

[8] Ibid., 97a–105a.

[9] "Non est necessarium ipsum poenitentem tunc habere fidem se esse absolutum, quamquam credere oporteat absolutionis beneficium per poenitentiae sacramentum conferri" (*Opuscula,* Lyons 1562, 109b).

[10] "Hoc enim est novam ecclesiam construere" (*Opuscula,* Lyons 1562, 111a). Cf. P. Hacker, *Das Ich im Glauben bei Martin Luther* (Graz 1966).

> . . . since Christ is the ransom and the Redeemer of the world, he is therefore truly the only treasury of the Church. But I deny, until shown otherwise, that he is the treasury of indulgences. [*WA* 1, 608]

It cannot be said that this decisive conversation foundered on hairsplitting distinctions. Luther wanted to make sure that access to the merits of Christ is not restricted to indulgences and even that an indulgence is not the closest and best route to them. But would not and could not the Cardinal concede this? Luther, however, saw a difference between the "treasury of indulgences" and the "treasury of the life-giving grace of God," between what is granted to us on the basis of the "cooperation of the power of the keys and of indulgences" and what we obtain only "through the Holy Spirit and on no account from the Pope" (*WA* 2, 12). Thus the fundamental difference lay in the concept of the Church. For Luther the Pope is "authority," to whom he subjects himself, as he does to political authority, on the basis of Romans 13:1, and not of Matthew 16:18, so long as such submission is pleasing to God (*WA* 2, 19f.). In the same breath Luther emphasized that he "awaited the Pope's judgment" and that "truth has power over the Pope too and he [Luther] no longer awaits any man's judgment where he has clearly recognized the judgment of God" (*WA* 2, 18).

More important for Luther, because it was of immediate significance for salvation, was the question of the certainty of faith in regard to justification proper as the presupposition for it. He claimed to have maintained against Cajetan that it is "an indispensable condition that man believe with firm conviction that he is justified and not to entertain any doubt that he will obtain grace" (*WA* 2, 13). Here, he says, has been found a new kind of theology and an error.

To these fundamental viewpoints in the case were added great differences in character and mentality. Cardinal Cajetan, a precise and objective Italian, was soon angered by the obstinate seriousness and presumptuous and passionate manner of this German friar, who fancied himself to be so important with his "curious speculations" and who felt, for his part, that he was not taken seriously and understood. According to *Table Talk* 3857 (May 1538), Cajetan shouted at Luther, "Do you think that the Pope cares for Germany?" To Karlstadt Luther wrote from Augsburg:

> Cajetan may be a renowned Thomist, but he is a vague, obscure, and unintelligible theologian or Christian and hence as qualified for judging, understanding, and giving sentence in this matter as an ass is for playing the harp. For that reason my affair is in so much greater danger in that it has such judges who are not only enemies and angered, but also unable to recognize and understand it. [*WA, Br* 1, 216]

When they separated on the third day, 14 October, Cajetan directed Luther not to come back until he had changed his mind, but at the same time he tried to influence him through Staupitz and Wenceslas Link. They induced Luther to excuse himself to Cajetan in a letter of 17 October for his haughty, biting, and disrespectful conduct and to promise not to treat further of indulgences, provided the others also observed silence. Luther still felt unable to retract, but he asked for a decision from the Pope on the unsettled questions so that the Church could definitely require retraction or faith. In a second letter, on 18 October, Luther announced his departure and also an appeal to the Pope suggested to him by higher authority. This appeal, "from the Pope poorly informed and from his judges to the Most Holy Father to be better informed," he had already registered before a notary and witnesses on 16 October. The doctrine of indulgences, he said, was in many respects unclear. Hence he considered disputation permissible and useful. He had undertaken one and subjected his controversial opinions to the judgment of the Church and of everyone who understood it better, above all, however, to that of the Most Holy Father and Lord, Pope Leo X. On the other hand, he had not been able to give the recantation which the "very learned and amiable Cajetan" demanded, because the points on which he erred had not been pointed out to him (*WA* 2, 28–33).

This appeal was posted at the Augsburg cathedral on 22 October, after Luther had left the city by night through a small gate in the wall. On 19 November a letter from Cajetan, dated 25 October, reached Frederick the Wise; the cardinal demanded the extradition or the expulsion of Luther. The elector should not, because of a miserable friar, stain the renown of his ancestors with dishonor (*WA, Br* 1, 235). Luther offered to emigrate for the sake of his prince (*WA, Br* 1, 245), who seems for the moment to have agreed to the plan or at least to have given it serious consideration. Spalatin advised against a headlong flight to France. But perhaps he had already thought of hiding Luther somewhere in Saxony.[11]

In the Constitution "Cum Postquam,"[12] of 9 November 1518, Leo X rendered the binding doctrinal definition on indulgences which Luther had requested. It was based on a draft composed by Cajetan and its essence was: To render any evasion impossible it is here declared as the doctrine of the Roman Church that the Pope, by virtue of his power of the keys, can remit punishments of sin through an indulgence, by distributing the treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints. This indulgence is conceded to the living as absolution and to the dead by intercession. Cajetan published this bull at Linz an der Donau on 13 December. It was printed several times but had no lasting effect. Public opinion was already too strong against indulgences as a means of satisfying curial avarice, and Luther, despite all protestations of submission to the Holy See, was prepared to retract only if convicted of error on the basis of Holy Scripture as he understood it.

Meanwhile, he had advanced another step. On 28 November, in the chapel of the Holy Body of Christ at Wittenberg, he registered his appeal to the council, soon and legitimately to be summoned in the Holy Spirit. This, he said, was above the Pope in matters of faith. In the text Luther followed the Sorbonne, which on 28 March 1518, in the controversy over the Gallican liberties, had likewise appealed to the council. The printing of his appeal was commissioned by Luther, but it was not intended for distribution; it was merely to be kept ready in the event of his excommunication. But as Luther several times asserts,[13] the edition was almost disposed of by the enterprising printer before the reformer had his hands on a copy.

An action of such great import, then, is supposed to have happened more or less by chance, contrary to Luther's intention. Must we not, then, accuse him of an irresponsible negligence? Or are we dealing with a diplomatic maneuver whereby Luther intended to present the Saxon court with a *fait accompli* without having acted contrary to its clear instructions? The case of the *Acta Augustana* was probably similar. Here, according to Luther, Spalatin's prohibition did not arrive until after the document, except for the last sheet, had already been distributed (*WA, Br* 1, 263; 281). But Luther might have tempted fate in the sense that he left the decision in the balance in the secret hope that it would be determined in his favor by other factors. Doubtless he was much more anxious and more inwardly troubled than his often bold and decisive actions and noisy language lead one to suppose. We must allow that Luther perhaps often consciously made any retreat impossible and burned his bridges behind him, while in other cases he carried matters too far but then shrank from the ultimate consequences. When these, nevertheless, occurred, due to the inner or the external dynamics of the facts, he accepted them and even greeted them as God's will. Luther knew in what great demand his books and pamphlets were, and he had enough experience with printers to foresee what would happen in the printing of his appeal. Hence what he wrote to Wenceslas Link—that, to his great displeasure, the printer had distributed the appeal, that he had intended to keep the printed copy for himself but God had disposed otherwise[14]—is only superficially credible. Just as he had assured the Pope that the indulgence theses had been widely circulated against his will but that he could now no longer do away with them (*WA* 1, 529), so now he wrote to Spalatin in regard to the publication of his appeal to the council: "What has once happened I cannot undo" (*WA, Br* 1, 281).

---

[11] I. Hoss, *Georg Spalatin,* p. 141.

[12] P. Kalkoff, "Die von Cajetan verfasste Ablassdekretale," *ARG,* 9 (1911f.), 142–171; N. Paulus, "Die Ablassdekretale Leos X. vom Jahre 1518," *ZKTh* 37 (1913), 394–400.

[13] Letter of 18 December 1518 to W. Link (*WA, Br* 1, 270) and of 20 December to Spalatin (*WA, Br* 1, 280f.).

In these weeks Luther again thought of emigrating. He was probably not only concerned not to burden his prince with his affairs but also aimed to obtain liberty of action and to be freed from the network of petty tactical considerations to which his connection with the Saxon court forced him again and again. At this very time (18 December 1518) he thus expressed himself to Wenceslas Link: "I do not know the source of these ideas. In my judgment the case has not yet begun and even less can the lords at Rome yet anticipate its end." And he even entertained misgivings "that the true Antichrist, to whom Paul refers, rules in the Roman Curia. Today I already believe it possible to prove that Rome is worse than the Turk" (*WA, Br* 1, 270).

The Curia confronted a twofold task: to render the heretic Luther harmless and to gain his prince as an ally on the tax for the campaign against the Turks and especially on the question of the imperial succession. It was still uncertain whether both goals could be pursued with all energy simultaneously, that is, whether Frederick the Wise would drop Luther. To clarify the matter—in other words, to investigate the attitude of the elector (*WA, Br* 1, 274)—was the commission entrusted to the papal chamberlain, Karl von Miltitz. In mid-November he was finally started on his way to Cajetan at Augsburg, with the Golden Rose, rich indulgences, and a bull excommunicating Luther. But he did not find the legate, by whose instructions he was supposed to be strictly bound. Hence he deposited the Golden Rose and the papal bulls with the Fuggers and in mid-December joined the electoral councillor Degenhard Pfeffinger, who was returning to the court of Frederick the Wise. En route he could not but ascertain how very much German sentiment favored Luther. But this did not cause the conceited, ambitious, and intellectually mediocre courtier to maintain his reserve. On the contrary, he boasted loudly of his alleged commissions and related Roman gossip, according to which the Pope did not think much of Tetzel or of Prierias.

---

[14] "Edidit impressor noster Appellationem mean ad concilium, multa et magna displicentia mea; sed actum est. Volui impressam apud me servare. Deus autem alia cogitat" (*WA, Br* 1, 270).

On 28 December Miltitz reached Altenburg, the residence of Frederick the Wise. A short time earlier, on 8 December—or, according to the date which Kalkoff prefers,[15] on 18 December—the elector had finally replied to Cajetan, refusing to surrender or to expel his professor. Luther, he said, had not been convicted of heresy; on the contrary, he was open to correction and ready for a disputation. Thus had Frederick the Wise set himself up as Luther's protector, at the same time leaving the proceedings against him open. With this delaying tactic, the arrival of the pompous chamberlain, who, contrary to his instructions, was posing as mediator, was not unwelcome. Frederick brought about a meeting of Luther and Miltitz on 4 and 5 January 1519 which resulted in the following agreement: both parties were henceforth forbidden "to preach about, write about, or discuss the matter," and Miltitz would induce the Pope to appoint a bishop to designate the erroneous articles for Luther's recantation (*WA, Br* 294; 299). Frederick the Wise and Luther did not take the thoughtless officiousness of the "nuncio" very seriously but agreed to the "Miltitziad," because they thereby hoped to achieve their goal of having Luther's case dealt with in Germany, and they at least gained time. In agreement with the elector, Miltitz on 12 June offered the function of arbiter to Richard von Greiffenklau, Archbishop of Trier. In accord with his tactics of putting the blame for the increasing gravity of the situation on the Dominicans, Cajetan and Tetzel, Miltitz reprimanded Tetzel and declared that he would accuse him at Rome of immorality and unlawful personal acquisition of indulgence funds. The indulgence preacher withdrew entirely into the shadows and died on 11 August 1519.

His unprecedented and arbitrary action in bargaining with the friar Martin Luther, who had been declared a heretic by the Pope, ought to have brought down on Miltitz severe criticism from Cajetan and the Curia. But the death of Emperor Maximilian I on 12 January 1519 had created a new situation and was destined to be the prelude to what

---

[15] *ZKG* 27 (1906), 325ff.

Kalkoff calls the "greatest diplomatic campaign" of the age, to which everything else, including Luther's trial, had to give way. As early as 23 January 1519 Cajetan received from Leo X instructions to prevent the election of Charles of Spain by any means. Thus the good will of Frederick the Wise must be gained. Hence the intrigues of Miltitz, with no binding force, did not do the Curia any harm; he was at least catered to and temporarily found a willing ear for his frivolous optimism. Cajetan's own role was more difficult: to have to suppress the condemnatory judgment against Luther that was in his hands and to have to offer the imperial crown to the heretic's protector. The highly embellished reports made by Miltitz provided Leo X with a pretext for pretending in a brief of 29 March 1519 that Luther was prepared to recant and for extending to him a fatherly invitation. Before the Pope, the vicar of Christ, he could make the retraction from which he had been deterred at Augsburg only by Cajetan's severity and partisan favoring of Tetzel (*WA*, *Br* 364f.). If that was the way matters were, then the Pope had no further reason to be annoyed with Frederick the Wise for patronizing the heretic. His wooing of the elector reached its culmination in the message which Miltitz had to deliver eight days before the election.[16] The elector was urgently requested to exert himself for the election of the King of France. If the King's election was impossible, Frederick should himself accept the imperial crown. In return, the Pope would do anything in his power for him and would make one of his friends a cardinal.[17] In Rome at this time Luther was considered the friend of the elector. Thus this could have been a hint that he would be created a cardinal.

Out of concern for the Papal State and the position of the Medici in Italy, then, the Pope behaved as though Luther and his protectors had not been declared heretics. He dropped the proceedings for almost a year and gave the Lutheran movement time to strike deeper roots; he held back the bull of excommunication and instead offered the imperial crown and the red hat.

> If the Roman Court, despite the warnings of Cajetan, forgot, so to speak, the danger which threatened the whole Church from this Martin Luther Eleutherius and put aside the handling of this secular crisis in favor of the momentary exigencies of the papacy's Italian policy, this is perhaps the greatest proof of all that Luther and the opposition were correct when they reproached the Church of Christ for having degenerated into an institution of legal and wordly authority.[18]

[16] On 21 June; P. Kalkoff in *ZKG* 25 (1904), 413, footnote 3.

[17] *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, Jüngere Reihe, I, ed. A. Kluckhohn (Gotha 1893), 824.

The Leipzig Disputation

Though political considerations caused the shelving of the proceedings against Luther, the controversy of intellects that he had stirred up was not to be easily appeased. Some theses which Luther's Wittenberg colleague Andreas von Karlstadt had composed against Eck's *Obelisci* afforded Eck the welcome opportunity in August 1518 to issue an invitation for a debate. In October the professor from Ingolstadt had had a relatively amicable conversation with Luther. They agreed to propose Erfurt and Leipzig to Karlstadt as places for the disputation. Karlstadt left the final choice to Eck, who in December asked the Leipzig theological faculty and Duke Georg of Saxony to permit the disputation there. The faculty and the local Ordinary, Bishop Adolf of Merseburg, were opposed, but Duke Georg eagerly favored it and was able to persuade the faculty to agree. That same month Eck had published twelve theses on penance, indulgences, the treasury of the Church, and purgatory. Ostensibly against Karlstadt, in reality they were against Luther and his view of the authority of the Pope and the Church. Thus, for example, Thesis 12 (later 13) stated: "It is false to assert that before the time of Silvester [314–355] the Roman Church did not yet have supremacy over the other churches."[19] Despite his understanding with Miltitz, Luther published opposing theses (*WA* 2, 160f.), and announced that he would participate in the disputation. With reference to Eck's counter-thesis 13, he claimed that the primacy of the Roman Church was demonstrated by forged papal decretals which were only four hundred years old. To the worried Spalatin he wrote:

> I hide much and hold back, for the sake of the elector and of the university, what, if I were elsewhere, I would spew forth onto the destroyer of Scripture and of the Church, onto Rome, or rather onto Babylon. It is impossible, my dear Spalatin, to deal with the truth of Scripture and the Church without wounding this monster. Do not expect, then, that I will be silent and calm, for otherwise you would have to want me to abandon theology entirely. [*WA, BR* 351]

Some days later, on 5 March, he assured Spalatin that it had never entered his mind to separate from the Apostolic See in Rome. He was agreed to its being called and being the lord of all. A person must also honor and bear with the Turks because of the power bestowed by God (*WA, Br* 1, 356). Hence at that time the papacy was for Luther only a

---

[18] R. Stadelmann, *Das Zeitalter der Reformation, Handbuch der Geschichte,* ed. Brandt–Meyer–Just, II (Constance 1954) 49.

[19] Against Luther's *Resolutiones,* concl. 22 (*WA* 1, 571).

ruling power like any secular authority. But this was not all. On March 13 he whispered to Spalatin[20] that in his study of the decretals for the disputation he had asked himself whether the Pope was not the Antichrist or at least his envoy, since in his decrees he so wretchedly crucified Christ, that is, the truth.

The disputation took place at the Pleissenburg at Leipzig and lasted from 27 June to 16 July 1519. Luther was admitted to it by the Duke of Saxony only at the last moment and through Eck's intervention. First Eck and Karlstadt debated on predestination. Then the controversy between Eck and Luther came to a climax on the problems of divine law, the papal primacy, and the authority of councils. According to Luther, councils could err and had erred; for example, the Council of Constance had been wrong in condemning Hus. Thereby was Scripture set up as the sole source of faith and *sola scriptura* as the formal principle of the Reformation. Luther no longer recognized a supreme ecclesiastical teaching authority which renders a binding interpretation of Scripture. In the disputation Eck's good memory and dialectical skill served him very well. If through his cold precision Eck risked driving his opponent to heretical conclusions and committing him to heresy, still Eck has the merit, granted the absence of dogmatic clarity in his day, of having made it clear that Luther implied, not reform, but an attack on the constitution of the Church.

CHAPTER 5

Luther's Reform Writings of 1520

After the Leipzig Disputation Luther rapidly became the hero and spokesman of the nation. He himself was filled with an apocalyptic spirit and imagined himself called to confront the Antichrist. This outlook gave his words their prophetic solemnity, urgency, and certainty. Knights, townsmen, and peasants, hardly qualified to grasp the reformer's essential religious concern, were carried along by the conviction that Luther would bring about the long-desired reform of Church and Empire. By reform was also understood the realization of one's own social and political aims. From everywhere students flocked to the University of Wittenberg. In 1518, at Luther's urging, the arts faculty had undergone reform in the direction of humanism, and Melanchthon was occupying the chair of Greek. In turn the students were active heralds of Lutheran doctrine to the remotest corner of the Empire.

[20] ". . . in aurem tibi loquor" (*WA, Br* 1, 359).

In addition, printing offered quite new possibilities for propaganda. As early as 1518 the humanist Johannes Froben at Basel had brought out a complete edition of Luther's Latin works in a large number of copies. New, enlarged editions appeared in 1520 at Strasbourg and Basel. At Basel in May 1520 and at Strasbourg in July collections of Luther's German works were made available and sold well. Occasionally Luther employed as many as three printers to make his works available. They were mostly controversial writings, called for by some event of the moment and hastily composed, assailing abuses or parrying an attack. But there were also many works of edification, testimonies to his own religious experiences and at the same time pastoral aids for the many who applied to him. Luther was fully conversant with the language of the people. He was often coarse and full of bitter mockery, never boring and ponderous like the involved disputations of scholastic theology.

The year 1520 brought the first climax in his journalistic activity. Deserving of special mention among his pastoral pieces at the end of 1519 are the sermons on the three Sacraments which alone Luther would henceforth regard as true Sacraments: that on penance (*WA* 2, 713–723), that on baptism (*WA* 2, 727–737), and that on the venerable Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ and on fellowship (*WA* 2, 742–758). Whether Luther still held to the sacramental character of penance in the accepted sense is open to question. From the purely declaratory meaning of absolution, already stressed in the indulgence theses, he deduced that any lay person could grant absolution:

> As a result of number 9 it follows that in the Sacrament of penance and the remission of guilt a pope or bishop does no more than the lowliest priest; in fact, if no priest is at hand every Christian can do as much, even though only a woman or a child. If any Christian says to you, "God forgives you your sins . . ." and you are able to seize upon that word with a firm faith, then God is speaking to you and in the same faith you are indeed absolved. Thus everything rests entirely in the faith in God's word. [*WA* 2, 716]

In regard to baptism and the Eucharist, the "two foremost Sacraments in the Church," Luther stresses the subjective acquiring of the grace offered in them and their fruitful effect. The *opus operatum* must become *opus operantis* in faith; otherwise it only produces harm, just as the Cross of Christ became misfortune for the Jews. Luther rejected Spalatin's suggestion that he should write on the other Sacraments also, because, he said, there is no basis for them in Scripture: "For me there is no other Sacrament. For there only exists a Sacrament where there exists an express divine promise for the exercise of faith" (*WA, Br* 1, 595).

In the spring of 1520, at Spalatin's request, Luther replied to the charge that, by his teaching on justification by faith alone, he prejudiced works or even rendered them contemptible. In the long sermon "On good works," dealing with the relation of faith and works (*WA* 6, 202–276), he supplied the laity with copious advice for a good Christian life and activity. The most eminent of all works is faith (John 6:28). It is, however, not a good work in addition to others, but the source of all good works. These are fruits of faith, which "brings with it charity, peace, joy, and hope." The important thing is not the size of the external work; all that we do can become a good work, if only it has faith as its motivating cause. "For if justice exists in faith, it is clear that faith alone fulfills all commands and makes all their works justified" (*WA* 6, 211). If we possessed the living faith, "we would not need any law, but each of himself would do good works at all times" (*WA* 6, 213). But so long as we do not have this liberty of faith for good works, we need laws and admonitions, and, like children, we must be motivated to good works by ceremonies and promises. Faith, however, does not spring from the works, but is a gift of Christ.

> See! You must then form Christ in you and behold how in him God holds out his mercy to you and offers it without any merits being present in you, and from such a picture of his grace you must obtain faith and confidence in the remission of all your sins. Hence, faith does not begin with works, they do not create it, but it must flow from the blood, wounds, and death of Christ. [*WA* 6, 216]

Faith proves itself in daily life, in obedience to God's command. With that we have our hands full; there is no further need of works which we impose upon ourselves. The works imposed upon me "do not shine and glisten" as do the voluntary works of the "new saints." They are the more sublime and the better the less they "glisten" and "take place so quietly and secretly that no one but God alone is aware of them." In this first and perhaps most important treatise of the decisive year 1520—a treatise that was not heeded in accord with its significance—Luther was moving among the ideas of German mysticism, especially of Tauler. Through all the polemic it remains clear that he did not reject works as such, but only a piety of works that had become mechanical in many respects.

Not his doctrine of justification but his teaching on the Church led ever more clearly to the break. Luther had been struggling for some time with the idea of the Pope as Antichrist.[1] In February 1520 he became acquainted with Ulrich von Hutten's new edition of Lorenzo Valla's work on the alleged Donation of Constantine (1440). On the strength of this he wrote to Spalatin on 24 February: "I am so afraid that I have almost no doubts now that the pope is really the Antichrist whom the world is expecting according to the general opinion" (*WA, Br* 2, 48f.). At the same time there came into Luther's hands the *Epithoma responsionis ad Lutherum* (1519) of Sylvester Prierias, with its strong emphasis on papal primacy and infallibility. In May appeared the Franciscan Augustine Alveldt's *Super apostolica sede,* which was answered by Luther's pupil, Johannes Lonicer. When Alveldt thereupon published in German a revised edition of his work, Luther personally wrote a violent rejoinder: *Von dem Papsttum zu Rome wider den hochberühmten Romanisten zu Leipzig* (1520; *WA* 6, 285–324). In it Luther developed his doctrine of the Church: Christianity, as the congregation of all believers in Christ, is not a "corporal" collection but one "of hearts in one faith." This "spiritual unity" is of itself alone sufficient to constitute Christianity. Baptism and the Gospel are its signs in the world. This Christianity, which alone is the true Church, has no head on earth, "but only Christ in heaven is the head here and alone rules." Bishops are messengers and by divine disposition are all equal. Only by human arrangement is "one above another in the visible Church." Matthew 16:18 must be interpreted by Matthew 18:18. Then it is clear that the keys were given to Saint Peter, not for himself alone, but vicariously for the whole community. Accordingly, the Pope, permitted by God, must be endured in all patience, "as though the Turk were over us."

---

[1] Letter to W. Link of 18 December 1518 (*WA, Br* 1, 270).

Luther felt that he would

> like kings, princes, and the whole nobility to intervene so that the road would be closed to the scoundrels of Rome. How has Roman greed gone so far that it monopolizes all institutions, bishoprics, and feudal holdings of our fathers? Who has ever heard or read of such an unspeakable robbery? [*WA* 6, 322]

If Luther was here touching the national resentment against the Curia, which had been so often expressed in the *gravamina* of the German nation, he unequivocally made himself the spokesman of these desires and complaints in the first of the three great statements of programs in the summer of 1520, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung.* On 7 June 1520 he wrote to Spalatin: "I am planning to issue a pamphlet, addressed to the Emperor Charles and the nobility of all Germany, against the tyranny and unworthiness of the Roman Curia" (*WA, Br* 2, 120). The introductory first part deals with razing the three walls behind which the "Romanists," that is, the Curia, are entrenched in order to avoid any reform. These are: (1) the spiritual power is superior to the secular; (2) only the Pope has the right to interpret Scripture; (3) only he can convoke a legitimate council. In contrast to this, Luther stresses the universal priesthood; he will recognize no other special priesthood.

> For all Christians belong to the true spiritual estate, and among them there is no distinction except that of function. . . . This is so because we have one baptism, one Gospel, one faith . . . which alone make the spiritual and Christian people. . . . For what emerges from baptism may boast that it has already been consecrated as priest, bishop, and pope, although it is not seemly for everyone to exercise such a function . . . . It follows that among lay persons, priests, princes, bishops, and, as they say, clergy and people of the world there is fundamentally no other distinction than that of function (service) or of work, and not that of station. [*WA* 6, 407f.]

If Pope and bishops have failed, then it is the duty of the so-called secular estates to provide a remedy:

> Therefore, when necessity requires and the pope is vexatious to Christendom, the first person who is able should, as a true member of the entire body, do what he can so that a legitimate and free council may take place. None can do this better than the secular sword, especially since they are now also fellow-Christians, fellow-priests, equally spiritual, equally powerful in all things, and must let their office and work, which they hold from God over everyone, operate freely where there is need and use. [*WA* 6, 413] Hence, dear Germans, let us wake up and fear God more than men, so that we may not share in guilt against all the poor souls who are so miserably lost through the infamous and diabolical rule of the Romans. [*WA* 6, 415]

There follows a list of accusations, especially against the "Roman greed and see of robbers." They culminate in the charge that Pope and Curia do not obey their own canon law (*WA* 6, 418). In the third part Luther develops in twenty-eight points a reform program, extending from the abolition of annates, reservations, celibacy, and the numerous feast days to the reform of universities and even the closing of brothels. All—nobles, peasants, and the poor in the cities—could here consider the redress of their grievances. What Luther had struggled with in his personal anxieties of conscience became in this treatise the concern of the nation. Accordingly, readers scrambled to obtain it. The sale—4,000 copies in the first week—was unprecedented.

In the second great statement of program, *De captivitate Babylonica* *ecclesiae praeludium* (October 1520), one of Luther's few writings on systematic theology, he directed himself to theologians. Its occasion was a work by Alveldt, *Tractatus de communione sub utraque specie* (June 1520), but it went far beyond that and was a discussion of the sacramental doctrine of the Catholic Church. Luther admits only three valid Sacraments—baptism, penance, and communion—but they have been "brought by the Roman Court into a wretched prison." The Sacrament of the Eucharist is in a threefold captivity: the refusal of the other species, the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the concept of communion as a sacrifice. Luther does not claim that the second species should be given unconditionally and that the doctrine of transubstantiation is false, but he wants freedom to be preserved. It is Roman tyranny that forbids the chalice to the laity or makes an opinion of Aquinas an article of faith. Luther stresses the true presence of the body of Christ but he wants to leave open the "how." To him the presence of the body of Christ in, with, and under the bread, analogous to the imminence of the divinity in Christ's humanity, is very obvious.

On the other hand, the third prison of the Sacrament is a thoroughly impious abuse and a source of further, more deeply rooted evils. Luther here repeats ideas from the "Sermon on the New Covenant, that is, on the Mass" (1520). He demands a return to the "first and simple institution" of Christ, to his word. According to this, the Sacrament of the altar is a covenant, in which the remission of sins is granted to us. The words of the narrative of the institution are the essence and the power of the Mass and at the same time the totality and epitome of the whole Gospel.

> Behold, O sinful man, fit for damnation, From the genuine and undeserved love whereby I love you. . . . I promise you by these words, before you have merited and desired anything, forgiveness of all your sins and eternal life. And in order that you may entirely be sure of this irrevocable promise of mine I will yield my life and pour out my blood and confirm this promise by death itself and leave them both as a sign and memorial of this promise. As often as you make use of this, you should be mindful of me and esteem, praise, and thank this love and gentleness of mine toward you. [*WA* 6, 515]

Instead of accepting this bequest in faith, men have, according to Luther, made of it a sacrifice, a work, or, in other words, something which they give to God.

> For there should be no one so insane as to say that he does a good work who comes poor and needy and claims from the hand of the rich an alms of the divine promise through the hand of the priest

> offered to all men. Hence, it is certain that the Mass is not a sacrifice. [*WA* 6, 523]

In Christ, the Lord of the Eucharist, Luther sees God simply and not the God-Man, the Mediator. Thus the Eucharist is meant by God for us and not, through Christ the Mediator, for the Father also. Hence Luther likewise sees no inner bond of the community's worship of praise and thanksgiving, the Eucharist, with the Sacrament.

> Therefore, these two are not to be confused—the Mass and prayer, the Sacrament and work, the covenant and the sacrifice. For the one comes to us from God through the priest's ministry and requires faith. The other comes from our faith to God through the priests and asks a favorable hearing. [*WA* 6, 526]

In these years of his attack on the late medieval sacramental practice Luther strongly emphasizes faith, whereby we answer the *verbum sacramenti,* the promise of Christ. In this the real presence, as the seal and pledge of the promise, moves into the background. But Luther holds to the traditional concept of the Sacrament, even when he says:

> And as the word is more important than the sign, so also is there more value to the covenant than to the Sacrament. For a man can have the word or the covenant and make use of it without the sign or the Sacrament. "Believe," says Augustine, "and you have eaten." [*WA* 6, 518]

For by the word is here meant the *verbum sacramenti* and by the Sacrament the *sacramentum tantum.* According to the scholastic teaching on the Sacraments, only the word transforms the sign into a Sacrament and the word is more important than the sign. According to Aquinas, the Sacrament produces its sanctifying effect when the sign touches the body and the word is believed (*Summa Theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 6). Accordingly, scholastic theology is acquainted with a *manducare spiritualiter Christum* in faith, whereas the mere sacramental reception without faith is a sin. Despite his polemic against the concepts *opus operatum* and *opus operantis,* Luther held to what was meant by them. The Sacrament is effected independently of the worthiness of the minister, who is an instrument acting in God's stead, and it produces fruit, though of opposite sorts, in the believer and the unbeliever.[2]

This polemic, with its vehement rejection of the sacrifice of the Mass and its denial of four Sacraments, not only assailed essential doctrines of faith but also amounted to an elimination of the very heart of the

---

[2] ". . . manet tamen semper idem sacramentum et testamentum, quod in credente operatur suum opus, in incredulo operatur alienum opus" (*WA* 6, 526).

Church's worship and the individual's piety. Thus it provoked scandal and contributed fundamentally to a clarification of positions. Many an old friend, such as Staupitz, recoiled in horror. Erasmus felt that before the appearance of this tract the break could have been healed, and Johann Glapion, the confessor of Emperor Charles V, was of the same opinion. The University of Paris issued a public protest against the polemic, and in 1521 King Henry VIII of England composed his *Assertio septem sacramentorum,* which gained for him the papal designation of *Defensor Fidei.* Thomas Murner, a Franciscan opponent of Luther, expected to turn public opinion against Luther merely by translating the *De Captivitate* into German without comment.

The third statement of program, *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* (November 1520), was written at the suggestion of Karl von Miltitz after the publication of "Exsurge Domine," the bull threatening excommunication, to convince the Pope of Luther's orthodoxy and good will. Hence in it polemic yields to a warm, popular exposition of the Christian ideal of life. The Christian is a free man, lord over all things and subject to no one, to the extent that he accepts by faith the Gospel, that is, the promises of Christ. But since "on earth there is only a beginning and a progressing," we have received only the first-fruits of the Spirit and thus, in addition, the commandments and laws of God must be observed. But man cannot become pious and saved through observing them, through works. For works do not make a man pious, but a good and pious man makes works good and pious. However, the commandments lead us to a recognition of sin and to contrition. "And so man is justified and lifted up by faith in the divine words, when he is humbled by fear of God's command and has arrived at self-knowledge" (*WA* 7, 34). The Christian furthermore submits to the law in order to serve his neighbor. Although he is entirely free, he must "willingly again make himself a servant in order to aid his neighbor . . . . Hence from faith flow love and desire for God and from love a free, willing, and joyful life of serving one's neighbor without recompense" (*WA* 7, 35f.). Thus the Christian is "a servant of all things and subject to everyone."

CHAPTER 6

The Excommunicated Friar before the Diet of Worms

With the election on 28 June 1519 of the King of Spain as Emperor Charles V, the Curia's consideration toward Frederick the Wise came to an end. But other political worries, financial distress, and above all his private entertainments deterred Leo X from an energetic pursuit of

Luther's case. It was not until February 1520 that the Roman proceedings entered a new stage. Under the presidency of two cardinals, the theologian Cajetan and the canonist Accolti, three committees in succession examined Luther's teaching. Johannes Eck played a decisive role in the third, which convened at the end of April. In December 1519 the Cardinal of Tortosa, Adrian of Utrecht, had advised that in the condemnation of Luther not a word should be changed from Luther's own formulation, and this suggestion was to a great extent followed. The opinions handed down by the University of Cologne on 30 August 1519, and by that of Louvain on 7 November, were used as supporting material. The last-named listed the objectionable propositions in Luther's own words, and six of these passed *verbatim* into the papal bull. The draft submitted by the third committee was discussed in consistory from 21 May to 1 June 1520, and was finally released as the Bull "Exsurge Domine," dated 15 June 1520.

The bull condemned forty-one propositions extracted from Luther's writings as "heretical, scandalous, false, offensive to pious ears, misleading to simple folk, and contrary to Catholic doctrine," without indicating under which category of this very broad gamut of censures the individual propositions fell. Hence it remained unclear where the area of opinions, dangerous but still open to discussion, ceased and heresy began. The condemnation of the latter was thereby deprived of real effect. Johannes Eck himself had to concede this three years later, when in his reform opinion for the Pope he asked for a new bull in which only the most serious errors would be refuted by full recourse to Holy Scripture. In "Exsurge Domine," he said, much remained obscure; some of the condemned propositions were so vague and insignificant that even scholars could not understand why they had been condemned.[1] This inadequacy of the bull was the more consequential in that it was "the sole authoritative papal intervention in the Lutheran affair right up to the Council of Trent."[2]

Luther was given sixty days to recant—the time to be counted from the publication of the bull in the Saxon bishoprics—and his writings that contained the offensive teachings were to be burned. The Italian humanist Girolamo Aleander[3] and Johannes Eck were deputed to publicize the bull and its threat of excommunication in Germany. On 17 July they were appointed nuncios and Eck was also made a protonotary.

---

[1] "Nam etsi in bulla priori multa fuerint damnata, tamen aliqua videbantur adeo obscura, immo quaedam adeo indifferentia, ut visum fuerit quandoque viris etiam doctissimis partem contrariam veriorem esse quam ea quae damnata fuerint" (*Acta Reformationis catholicae* I, ed. G. Pfeilschifter, Regensburg 1959, 143).

[2] H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent* I (St. Louis 1957), 192.

[3] Born at Motta (Friuli) in 1480, he was, following his studies in the humanities, active as a teacher at the universities of Padua, Venice, Paris, and Orléans. In 1516 he entered the service of the Roman Curia, and in July 1519 he was made prefect of the Vatican

In Germany, especially South Germany,[4] the promulgation of the bull ran into difficulties because the bishops were uninterested and feared that it would cause trouble. In Central Germany Eck encountered dangerous opposition. He had to learn at his own peril how very general the resentment against the Curia was. He was able to have the bull posted in Meissen on 21 September and in Merseburg and Brandenburg a few days later. But at Leipzig the university refused publication and the students rioted, while at Erfurt they stormed the printer's and threw the copies they seized into the river. On 3 October Eck sent the bull to the University of Wittenberg, where the matter was pigeonholed. No one wanted to do anything until the attitude of the elector, who was in the west, on his way to Charles V's coronation at Aachen, became known.

At this time Karl von Miltitz was again busy on Luther's behalf. He apparently begrudged Eck the role of papal nuncio and now intended, following Eck's ill luck with the proclamation of the bull, to come forth on his own again as peacemaker and acquire the credit of having achieved reconciliation. On 12 October 1520, at Lichtenburg an der Elbe, Miltitz induced Luther to send Leo X a letter asserting that he had never intended to attack the person of the Pope but had only meant to defend himself against his opponents. Like Tetzel in 1519, Johannes Eck was now to be made the scapegoat. To avoid the impression that Luther's letter had been instigated only by Eck's publication of the bull, the letter was to be predated 6 September. With it Luther was to convey to the Pope his homage in the form of a treatise. For this purpose *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* was composed, in which Luther aimed to offer "the sum total of a Christian life" (*WA* 7, 11).

Luther's letter to Leo X is a questionable document in so far as Luther, who on other occasions had already termed the Pope the Antichrist, designates him as "Most Holy Father" and "pious Leo" and wants to be regarded as one who has never undertaken anything bad against the person of the Pope and is so well disposed toward him that he desires and wishes the very best for him. But at the same time Luther

---

Library. The important but excessively ambitious humanist was spiritually concerned with the Catholic Reform only in his later years. From the autumn of 1536 he was a member of the great reform commission and a cardinal. He died in Rome on 1 February 1542.

[4] The bull, printed at Eck's expense, was not promulgated at Augsburg until 30 December 1520 (*ZKG* 37 [1918], 159). The Bishop of Freising did not issue the order of promulgation until 10 January 1521 (*Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde,* NF, 9[1918], 198). Cf. Jedin, op. cit., I, 176ff.

engaged in wild ravings against the Roman Curia. It is worse than Sodom, Gomorrah, or Babylon; nothing but corruption has proceeded thence for years:

> The Roman See is through. God's anger has overtaken it without cessation. It is hostile to the general council. It refuses to be taught or to be reformed and yet cannot stop its mad and unchristian conduct. . . . That is why I have always regretted, O pious Leo, that you have become pope at this time, you who would surely be worthy to be pope in a better age. The Roman See is not worthy of you and the likes of you, but the evil spirit ought to be pope. . . . O most unfortunate Leo, who sit in the most perilous see, I truly speak the truth to you, for I desire your good. [*WA* 7, 5f.]

Like Saint Bernard, Luther presumes to teach the Pope. A recantation of his teaching, however, is out of the question: "But that I should disavow my teaching—it won't happen" (*WA* 7, 9).

This distinction between the Pope and the intrigues of the Curia or of Eck was also drawn in the two other writings Luther was composing during the second half of October: a polemic against Eck, *Von den neuen Eckischen Bullen und Lügen* (*WA* 6, 579–594), and the Latin rejoinder to "Exsurge Domine," *Adversus execrabilem Antichristi bullam* (*WA* 6, 597–612). Luther pretended, contrary to his own belief,[5] to doubt the authenticity of the bull. But whoever had composed it, he had no doubt, he said, that it came from Antichrist and hence he meant to treat it as the work of Antichrist:

> I defy you, Leo X, and you too, cardinals, and all other persons who are of importance at the Curia, and say to your face: If this bull really came forth under your name with your knowledge, I admonish you by virtue of the power which I, like all other Christians, have received through baptism: Repent and desist from such satanic blasphemies against God, and do so quickly. Otherwise you must know that I, with all other worshippers of Christ, regard the See of Rome as possessed by Satan and as the throne of Antichrist and will no longer obey or be bound to it, for it is the chief and mortal foe of Christ. If you persevere in this madness, I rather condemn you and hand you over, together with this bull and your decretals, to Satan for the destruction of the flesh that your spirit may be saved with us on the day of the Lord. In the name of him whom you persecute, Jesus Christ our Lord. [*WA* 6, 604]

At the end of the German version, *Wider die Bulle des Endchristes* (*WA* 6, 614–629), on the other hand, Luther completely drops the fiction of spuriousness: "If the pope will not repudiate and condemn the bull and punish Eck and his associates, who observe such a bull, then no one should be in doubt that he is the enemy of God, persecutor of Christ, destroyer of Christianity, and the real Antichrist" (*WA* 6, 629).

---

[5] Cf. letter of 11 October 1520 to Spalatin (*WA, Br* 2, 195).

In the western part of the Empire, Aleander was more successful in promulgating the bull. On 28 September 1520, at Antwerp, he succeeded in inducing Charles V to issue an edict against heresy for his Burgundian hereditary lands. Lutheran writings were solemnly burned at Louvain on 8 October and at Liège on 15 October. The coronation of Charles V on 23 October brought Aleander into the Rhineland, where he found some opposition. On 29 October he visited Cologne. A number of princes and other personages were staying here after the coronation, including Frederick the Wise, who had remained here because of illness instead of going on to the coronation. At first Frederick declined to receive Aleander, but on 4 November the nuncio succeeded in speaking with the elector, demanding that he surrender Luther and burn his writings. Frederick thereupon consulted with Erasmus, who was also at Cologne. Erasmus expressed himself quite superficially but in a way that amused the elector. Luther, he said, had sinned on two points: he had struck the Pope on his crown and the friars in the belly. On 6 November the elector had his reply sent to Aleander. He had never made common cause with Luther's affair and would be greatly displeased if Luther had written anything improper against the Pope. But without doubt Luther would have been accommodating to the Archbishop of Trier as papal deputy if the latter had summoned him under a safe-conduct, and the same disposition was still to be expected of him. When the report of the elector's position reached Wittenberg, in consequence people were even less eager to heed the bull.

On 12 November Luther's books were burned in Cologne at the instigation of Aleander. However, Luther's adherents seem to have slipped so much waste paper and scholastic codices into the executioner's hands that few of Luther's writings were actually committed to the flames. This too indicates how unpopular the proceedings against Luther were. Just the same it became clear that Rome had begun to take the battle against the Lutheran heresy seriously, and not a few on both sides finally understood its importance.

On 2 or 3 December Spalatin visited Luther in Wittenberg and ascertained that he was determined to burn the papal bull together with some books of canon law if, as at Cologne and Liège, there was any move to burn his books at Leipzig also. Spalatin informed Frederick the Wise, but before the latter replied Luther proceeded to act. On 10 December a Latin notice composed by Melanchthon was posted at the parish church in Wittenberg: Whoever was devoted to seeking the truth of the

Gospel should be at the Holy Cross Chapel in front of the Elster Gate at nine o'clock, when the papal decretals and the books of the scholastics would be burned. There was no mention of the bull. The site was the city's knacker's yard, close to the Elbe, the usual place for such undertakings. Several volumes of canon law, a theological *Summa,* and writings of Eck and Emser were burned first. Then Luther approached the pyre and threw a small book into the flames, allegedly saying at the same time: "Quoniam tu turbasti sanctam veritatem Dei, conturbet te hodie Dominus in ignem istum."[6] That the slender volume contained the Bull "Exsurge" was probably not known to all of those present. But even as a burning of the canon law, this spectacle was an impressive challenge to the Curia. It was further underscored by a pamphlet of Luther, *Warum des Papstes und seiner Jünger Bücher verbrannt sind* (*WA* 7, 152–186). The Bull "Decet Romanum Pontificem" of 3 January 1521 now at last carried out the excommunication. On 8 February 1521 Aleander reported to Rome:

> All Germany is in an uproar. For nine-tenths "Luther" is the war-cry; for the rest, if they are indifferent to Luther, it is at least "Death to the Roman Curia," and everyone demands and shouts for a council.[7]

According to the medieval law of Church and state, when Luther was banned by the Church he should have been outlawed: that is, the excommunication should have been carried out by the secular arm. But in fact the Empire negotiated with Luther. This was due only in part to the election capitulation sworn to by Charles V on 3 July 1519, whereby no one might thereafter be outlawed without a previous hearing.[8] In these months Luther had become so truly the voice of the German nation, he had so made himself the advocate of its difficulties and wishes, that no one could have simply ignored him. But for this very reason a further enhancing of his already powerful prestige was to be feared from a public negotiation with the reformer. The papal nuncios sought to avoid this. Moreover, they did not want to let go unchallenged the lay powers' claim to act as judges in a matter of faith already decided by the Pope. In his discourse of 13 February 1521 Aleander stressed that it did not belong to the secular authority "to take cognizance of such matters concerning the faith."[9] Hence the mere fact of Luther's hearing—that the diet should of itself be involved with a question of religion instead of proceeding as a matter of course against the condemned heretic—was a new fact of great import.[10]

---

[6] Thus J. Luther harmonizes the slightly differing reports in "Noch einmal Luthers Worte bei der Verbrennung der Bannbulle," *ARG* 45 (1954), 260–265.

[7] T. Breiger, *Aleander und Luther,* p. 48.

[8] *RA* I, 873; K. Zeumer, *Quellensammlung,* no. 180, p. 311.

[9] *RA* II, 506.

But on 28 November 1520 Charles V had promised Frederick the Wise that he would interrogate Luther. The elector was to bring him along to the Diet of Worms.[11] Because of Aleander's intervention this imperial promise was restricted to mean that the elector could bring Luther into the vicinity of Worms only after a recantation had been made.[12] The reply to this was a protest by Frederick the Wise, who maintained it was only fair to give Luther the possibility of defending himself; a condemnation of a German without trial could not but produce profound scandal. At the urging of the elector the diet on 19 February rejected a law for the suppression of Luther's writings, proposed by Aleander in person on 13 February in a three-hour speech, and requested the Emperor to summon Luther to Worms, out of regard for the excitement among the common people, and there to have him questioned by experts. This decision of the diet proved to be a compromise when it finally directed that there should be no discussion with Luther; he was only to be asked whether he was ready to repudiate his writings against the Church and the Christian faith.[13] In the summons, dated 6 March, that was sent to Wittenberg on 16 March with a safe-conduct, there was no further mention of a recantation. In this the heretic formally condemned by the Pope was addressed as follows:

> Honorable, dear, and pious one: After we and the estates of the Holy Empire, now assembled here, have taken up and reached the decision that because of the doctrines and books which for a time have come from you we wish to obtain information from you, and for this we have given you our and the Empire's assurance and safe-conduct so that you may come to us.[14]

Aleander did not admit defeat. He managed the publication on 26 March of an imperial mandate which had been prepared for some time, in which the confiscation of all of Luther's writings was commanded and the summons of Luther to Worms for a recantation was stated.[15] Perhaps Luther was by this means meant to be deterred from appearing at Worms; in any event, this was how he understood it (*WA, Br* 2, 298). There was anxiety in the entourage of the Elector of Saxony, but Luther himself was in high spirits, filled with the courage of a martyr, defiance, and a proud self-assurance. En route to Worms he is supposed to have written: "Even though there were as many devils at Worms as tiles on the roofs, I still would go there" (*WA, Tr* 5, 65). He had just published the German version of the great Latin treatise on justification against the Bull "Exsurge Domine," *Grund und Ursach aller Artikel D. M. Luthers so durch römische Bulle unrechtlich verdammt sind* (*WA* 7, 308–457). In the introduction he points out that the prophets and champions of truth have always stood alone. "I do not say that I am a prophet, but I say that they have the more reason to fear that I am one, the more they scorn me and esteem themselves" (*WA* 7, 3, 313). Just before his departure for Worms he completed the *Antwort* (*WA* 7, 705–778) to the *Apologia* of the Italian Dominican Ambrose Catharinus as the second part of *De captivitate.* In it he defined precisely his teaching on the Church and the papacy: The Church is not limited as to place nor bound up with persons. She is where the Gospel is proclaimed and where baptism and communion are celebrated according to it. The papal Church is the demoniacal power described in Scripture as Antichrist, which lasts to the end of days and is to be fought, not with weapons, but with the word and the Spirit.

---

[10] K. Repgen, *Die römische Kurie und der Westfälische Friede* I (Tübingen 1962), 35f.

[11] *RA* II, 450, 466ff.

[12] *RA* II, 468ff.

[13] *RA* II, 515f.

[14] *RA* II, 526.

[15] *RA* II, 531f.

Full of such ideas and emotions, Luther, accompanied by Kaspar Sturm as imperial herald, began his journey to Worms on 2 April 1521. From Frankfurt on 14 April he wrote to Spalatin: "We will go to Worms in spite of all the gates of hell and the powers in the air" (*WA, Br* 2, 298). On 16 April, at ten o'clock in the morning, Luther entered Worms through crowded streets, in his little dray, attended by members of the nobility. The next day, at eight in the evening, he faced the Emperor and the diet in the episcopal palace. The conduct of the hearing was entrusted to Johann von der Ecken,[16] *officialis* of Richard von Greiffenklau, Archbishop of Trier, the prelate whom Frederick the Wise had wanted as arbiter in Luther's case in 1519.

Luther was asked whether he acknowledged as his the twenty books exhibited and published under his name and whether he was prepared "to disavow these books or anything in them." In a low voice, "as though he were frightened and shocked" (*RA* II, 863), he acknowledged them as his writings. With regard to recantation he asked for time to reflect, for it would be presumptuous and dangerous were he not to ponder carefully before giving his reply to such a question. This evasive answer need not have been either a tactical move or the result of temporary confusion. Luther, in whose summons there was no mention of a recantation, may have counted on a discussion of faith and may not have been prepared for a simple disavowal without a previous refutation. On the next day, 18 April, he was again asked whether he was prepared to recant. He refused:

---

[16] Born at Trier, he became, after studies at Bologna and Siena, a professor in the law faculty at Trier in 1506. From 1512 he was the archbishop's officialis, but he was not a priest and was scarcely trained in theology. He died at Esslingen on 2 December 1524.

> If I do not become convinced by the testimony of Scripture or clear rational grounds—for I believe neither the pope nor councils alone, since it is obvious that they have erred on several occasions—I remain subjugated by the scriptural passages I have cited and my conscience held captive by the word of God. Therefore, I neither can nor will recant anything. For to act against conscience is difficult, noxious, and dangerous. May God help me. Amen.[17]

Sent back to his lodging, Luther there exclaimed, with outstretched arms and a joyful countenance: "I am through, I am through." The Emperor refused a further hearing but granted a delay of three days during which the estates could try to persuade Luther. Luther appeared before their special committee on 24 April in the lodging of the Archbishop of Trier. These discussions were also fruitless, and von Greiffenklau then made private efforts on Luther's behalf through Johannes Cochläus and the *officialis* Johann von der Ecken. The hopelessness of all these efforts became clear when on the next day Luther again denied the binding force of a conciliar decision. It was not only a question of *gravamina,* not of opposition to an ecclesiastical political view, not even simply of reform, but of fundamentally different concepts of the nature of the Church. On the evening of 25 April Luther received the Emperor's decision: since all admonitions had been without effect, the Emperor, as protector of the Church, would now proceed against him.

The next day the reformer left Worms. Through a hint by his territorial prince he was prepared to be "seized and hidden" (*WA, Br* 2, 305) somewhere along the way. According to a secret instruction he did not travel from Eisenach directly to Gotha but took a detour via Mohra, where he visited his relatives. Then, on 4 May, in the vicinity of Burg Altenstein, he was kidnapped by prearrangement and taken to Wartburg castle.

The Edict of Worms was prepared by Aleander and on 8 May its draft was approved by the imperial ministers. But it was only on 25 May, when most of the estates had already dispersed, that, with some alterations, it was publicly read at the Emperor's residence. The Elector Joachim of Brandenburg accepted it in the name of the estates, and the

---

[17] *RA* II, 581f., 555. The turn of speech, "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise," is an early legendary addition. Cf. K. Muller, "Luthers Schlussworte in Worms 1521," *Philotesia, Festschrift für P. Kleinert* (Berlin 1907), pp. 269–289.

Emperor signed it on 26 May. The edict enumerates Luther's erroneous teachings with reference to *De captivitate Babylonica.* It finds fault especially with his attacking the Council of Constance and his causing disturbance:

> By virtue of our imperial dignity, majesty, and authority, with the unanimous advice and consent of ourselves and of the electors, princes, and estates of the Holy Empire, here assembled, for an everlasting remembrance of this action and for the implementation . . . of the bull which our Holy Father, the Pope, as the proper judge of this matter, has issued, we have recognized and declared that the aforementioned Martin Luther is to be regarded by us and you, each and every one, as a member severed from the Church of God, an obstinate schismatic, and a manifest heretic.[18]

Luther's adherents and well-wishers were also to be be banned. It was forbidden to buy, sell, read, copy, or print his writings, which were to be burned or otherwise destroyed. And to prevent writings hostile to the faith, all books which "touch upon the Christian faith, slightly or to a great degree," must obtain the local Ordinary's authorization for printing.[19]

The edict was valid in law because the estates had allowed the Emperor to proceed against Luther in the event that Luther refused to recant.[20] Nevertheless, the manner of its publication and the fact that it had not been promulgated until after the diet recessed could give rise to doubts as to its authority and provide pretexts to those who lacked the will or the courage to execute it. Immediately after the diet the Emperor journeyed to Spain under the impression that war with France was impending, and he was to remain absent from Germany for nine years. Hence he could not lend personal emphasis to the Edict of Worms, while for his wars in the west, south, and east of the Empire he needed the aid of the pro-Luther estates against which he ought to have taken measures.

---

[18] *RA* II, 654.

[19] Ibid.

[20] N. Paulus in *HJ* 39 (1918f.), 269–277, against P. Kalkoff, *Die Entstehung des Wormser Edikts* (Leipzig 1913).

CHAPTER 7

Luther at the Wartburg and the Reform Movement in Wittenberg

Luther had just been the center of the Diet of Worms, thus actually of German public life; he had spoken before the Emperor and the imperial estates and had been cheered by the people. Now he was suddenly thrust into solitude. Until his tonsure had grown out and a suitable beard adorned "Junker Jörg," he could not show himself to anyone at the Wartburg except the servant who brought his meals. If the sudden loneliness following stormy events would have got on anyone's nerves, and if enormous tension would naturally be followed by profound depression, it can be imagined how much more the solitude of the Wartburg would take its toll of Luther, who was highly emotional, impulsive, and given to depression. And in fact these weeks and months—from 4 May 1521 to 6 March 1522—were for Luther a period of temptations and torment of conscience. He reproached himself for having started the fire and on the other hand for having been too weak before his judges. Prayer left him cold; the devil tormented him all the more with doubts and fears for his salvation. To Spalatin, who was his connection with the outside world, who transmitted his letters and gave his manuscripts to the printers, Luther wrote on 9 September 1521:

> It is time to pray with all strength against the devil; he is bringing so disastrous a tragedy over Germany. And I, who am afraid that the Lord may not grant it, am still snoring and too lazy to pray and to resist, so that I dislike myself beyond measure and am a burden to myself, perhaps because I am alone and you do not help me. [*WA, Br* 2, 388]

Furthermore, there were physical sufferings, including constipation, which were certainly not alleviated by immoderate eating and drinking due to emotional unrest. And his anxiety about the friends at Wittenberg who needed his counsel and comfort did not permit peace of mind.

Luther coped with all these difficulties and temptations by means of literary activities that were unusually energetic and prolific, as well as spontaneous and unrestrained. The Wartburg became his "Patmos" (*WA, Str* 3, no. 3814). He applied himself to the exegesis of Psalm 67 (68), which was followed later by an exposition of Psalms 21 (22) and 36 (37). He also finished his explanation of the "Magnificat" (*WA* 7, 544–601) and began to compose a book of sermons as an aid to parish priests and for family prayer. In *Von der Beichte, ob die der Papst Macht habe, zu gebieten* (*WA* 8, 138–185) he attacked compulsory confession, which he regarded as a torment of conscience.

> I regard private confession, like virginity and chastity, as a very precious and salutary thing. Oh, it should indeed be quite painful to all Christians if there were no private confession, and they should thank God with all their hearts that it is permitted and available. But it is a bad thing that the pope makes it a compulsory institution and puts it within the chains of precept, as he also does with chastity. [*WA* 8, 164]

If a person does not want to confess to a priest, he should open his soul to any man from whom he may expect help.

In *Ein Widerspruch D. Luthers* (*WA* 8, 247–254), Luther continued his controversy with Hieronymus Emser, "the goat of Leipzig." In it he again denied a special priestly state. The *Rationis Latomianae confutatio,* called by Melanchthon *Antilatomus,* was directed against the detailed justification of the Louvain faculty's judgment against Luther by Jacob Latomus. Employing a systematic method not usual with him, Luther here treated a central question of his theology, that of sin persisting: "When all sins have been washed away, there is still a remainder to be washed away" (*WA* 8, 57). He who has been pardoned is nothing but a "shackled robber."

> For the same movement of anger and of lust is in the pious and the godless, the same before grace and after grace, just as the same flesh before grace and after grace. But in grace it can do nothing, whereas without grace it has predominance. [*WA* 8, 91]
>
> [Sins are] entirely remitted but not yet all destroyed. For we believe that the remission of all sins has occurred without any doubt, but every day we have to work and to wait for the blotting out [*abolitio*] of all sins and their complete removal [*evacuatio*]. And those who labor at this do good works. See, this is my faith, for that is the Catholic faith. [*WA* 8, 96]

Luther's distinction between *gratia* and *donum* corresponds to this twofold process of remission and extirpation of sins, of justification and sanctification. "The law reveals two evils, an inner and an outer: the one, which we have laid upon ourselves, sins or the corruption of nature; the other, which God imposes, wrath, death, and damnation" (*WA* 8, 104). To these correspond two goods of the Gospel, *gratia et donum.* Grace obliterates wrath and brings God's favor and peace; the gift brings recovery from corruption. Grace is indivisible, "so that the person is really accepted and in him there is no further place for wrath. . . . Hence it is entirely impious to say that the baptized is still in sins or that not all sins have been entirely remitted"(*WA* 8, 107).

On the other hand, the inner healing and purification of man, which the gift effects and in which man must cooperate, is a slow process.

> All is forgiven by grace, but all is not yet healed by the gift. But the gift is infused, the leaven is mixed with the flour and is operating to purge out the sin which is already forgiven to the person. So long as this process lasts, we speak of sin, and it is sin by nature; but now a sin without wrath, without the law, a dead sin, a harmless sin, if you only remain constant in grace and the gift. In no respect is sin distinguished from sin in its nature, before grace or after grace. But it is distinguished in regard to its treatment. [*WA* 8, 107]

Even though, according to Luther, we "must separate grace and gift from each other" (*WA* 8, 107), yet they are oriented toward each other and the one is given for the sake of the other. Man, even as a person, is "not in God's good pleasure and has no grace except because of the gift which is operating in such a manner as to purge out sin" (*WA* 8, 107). Because sin still has to be purged out, "God does not save imagined but real sinners,"[1] and so man must not boast of his purity but "rather of the grace and gift of God, that he has a gracious God who does not impute these sins and in addition has given his gifts in order thereby to purge them out" (*WA* 8, 108).

If it is borne in mind that Luther is speaking concretely and existentially; that he is employing the concept "sin" analogously, as theology in general does; if, in addition, one does not, like Luther's theological opponents, start with a doctrine of redemption concerned merely with satisfaction and, correspondingly, does not regard the penalties of sin as purely vindictive; then these assertions of Luther are much more reconcilable with Catholic doctrine than is generally held, but in any case they compel the abandonment of the customary scheme of a purely external justification.

The University of Paris, invited to act as arbiter of the Leipzig Disputation, had maintained silence and so could long be counted as a secret partisan of Luther. Not until 15 April 1521 had it condemned as heretical 104 propositions of Luther, one-fourth of them from *De captivitate Babylonica.* Melanchthon came forward with an *Apologia* against the condemnation. Luther translated this and the Paris decree into German and added a foreword and an epilogue in which he specified his attack on the papacy as the decisive point of controversy. For he hurled at the Paris theologians the reproach that in all their articles they had not at all mentioned the most important—indulgences and the papacy.

---

[1] From here light is cast on the much quoted expression, astonishing in its paradoxical boldness, which Luther wrote to Melanchthon on 1 August 1521, during the printing of the *Antilatomus*: "Si gratiae praedicator es, gratiam non fictam, sed veram praedica; si vera gratia est, verum, non fictum peccatum ferto. Deus non facit salvos ficte peccatores. Esto peccator et pecca fortiter, sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo, qui victor est peccati, mortis et mundi . . . Sufficit, quod agnovimus per divitias gloriae Dei agnum, qui tollit peccatum mundi . . . Ora fortiter, etiam fortissimus peccator" (*WA, Br* 2, 372).

> They are thinking of their appeal of 1517 to a council against the pope. The pope hurt them and they decided to take revenge. For that reason I do not want their voice; they do this for no love of truth. I have no desire to associate with these knaves who abandon their master in trouble, but not for God's sake. If I could do so with a clear conscience, I would again exalt the papacy to spite and hurt French perfidy. [*WA* 8, 293]

With this allusion to Gallican resentments Luther had skillfully parried the Sorbonne's thrust, rendering the accompanying filthy expressions quite unnecessary.

Luther was both violently angry and disdainful when he heard that Albrecht of Mainz, against his better judgment and out of mere avarice, had placed the treasury of relics of Halle on exhibition and was inviting all the faithful to visit it and make an offering, promising rich indulgences. He was even more furious, however, when Spalatin, at the instigation of Capito,[2] who despite his reform sentiments had entered the archbishop's service in 1519, prevented the publication of his tract *Wider den Abgott zu Halle.*

> I would rather destroy you and the elector himself and every creature. . . . It is fine of you that you are unwilling to see the divine calm destroyed; but that the everlasting peace of God is destroyed by that impious, temple-desecrating, pernicious action of that man—you will let that pass? By no means, Spalatin! By no means, elector! But for Christ's sheep this detestable wolf must be opposed with all force. [*WA, Br* 2, 402]

The tract did not appear but Luther sent the archbishop an ultimatum on 1 December 1521. In reply the cardinal-elector referred to himself as "stinking filth" and so drew in his horns that the reformer for his part was not certain whether he should praise him as honest or upbraid him for hypocrisy (*WA, Br* 2, 433f.). But to Capito, who wanted to advise him to observe diplomatic caution, Luther wrote pitilessly: "What has a Christian to do with a sycophant?" (*WA, Br* 2, 431). "You wish to have a Luther who will connive at all your doings if his hide is patted only with nice and endearing notes" (*WA, Br* 2, 433).

---

[2] Wolfgang Fabricius Capito, born at Hagenau in 1478, was in the serivce of Albrecht of Mainz from 10 February 1520. In 1523 he acquired the provostship of Sankt Thomas at Strasbourg through the good offices of the nuncio Aleander and then passed definitely to the Reformation. Together with Bucer he tried to mediate between Luther and Zwingli. He died at Strasbourg in 1541.

Monastic Vows and Freedom by the Gospel

Luther's absence from Wittenberg enabled others to come more energetically into the foreground and influence the course of the Reformation. To some extent they had an outlook different from his and had in common with him only an attitude of protest against the abuses in the old Church and the demand for reform. Furthermore, they had not suffered nearly so much under the criticized conditions nor struggled with the truth in painful experience as the Wittenberg friar had done. Thus they were more inclined toward a rapid external upheaval; they saw salvation in a change of form and not chiefly in a transformation of attitude. If Luther's critical writings, such as *An den christlichen Adel* and *De captivitate Babylonica,* were convincing, then a series of practical consequences could not but follow, especially in regard to the celebration of Mass, priestly celibacy, and monastic vows.

The Kemberg Provost Bartholomäus Bernhardi, a pupil of Luther's, had married his cook and hence was under indictment. Melanchthon had written in his defense, stressing that everyone may rid himself of a human regulation that endangers his conscience. Would this also be valid if a religious felt he could no longer fulfill the obligations he had assumed? Luther, unlike Karlstadt and Melanchthon, was not ready so quickly to reply in the affirmative. He distinguished between the priests' obligation of celibacy and monastic vows. With regard to vows he looked for a firm basis for the conscience, a "testimonium divinae voluntatis." Karlstadt's arguments had not convinced him and he was not sure whether by the same token one could also dispense oneself from divine precepts.[3] In his letter to Melanchthon of 9 September 1521 he wrote that he believed he had found the way to a solution in the expression "freedom by the Gospel" (*WA, Br* 2, 384). At the same time he sent to Wittenberg Latin theses for a disputation on the vows. These begin with the text from Romans 14:23, "Omne quod non est ex fide, peccatum est," henceforth to be quoted again and again (*WA* 8, 323).

Gabriel Zwilling, Luther's fellow Augustinian, had fewer scruples. In October he preached violently against the Mass and "monkery." Freedom from the vows was not enough for him. The monk should discard the habit and abandon his state. In November fifteen out of forty Augustinians left the Wittenberg friary. Luther learned of it and feared that not all of them had taken the step with a clear conscience. To help those who had decided to depart he set about composing a treatise on the vows. On 11 November 1521 he wrote to Spalatin: "I have resolved now to take up the question of religious vows also and to free young people from this infernal celibacy" (*WA, Br* 2, 403). In the same month he had completed *De votis monasticis . . . iudicium* (*WA* 8, 573–669). Held back by Spalatin, this work did not appear until February 1522.

---

[3] "Imo ista ratio, quod melius est nubere quam uri, seu, ut peccatum fornicationis vitetur, matrimonium in peccato fidei fractae ineunt, quid est nisi ratio? Scripturam quaerimus et testimonium divinae volumtatis. Quis scit, si cras uratur, qui hodie uritur?" (Letter to Melanchthon of 1 August 1521. *WA, Br* 2, 371).

The dedicatory letter to his father, who had opposed Luther's embracing the monastic life, shows that in this piece he also wanted to settle with his own past. His vows, whereby he had removed himself from the paternal will imposed by God, were worthless, even impious. But now his conscience had become free and that meant freedom in superabundance. "Therefore, I am still a friar and at the same time not a friar; I am a new creature, not the pope's but Christ's (*WA* 8, 575). "And so I hope," he wrote to his father, "that the Lord has deprived you of a son in order to counsel through me many others of his sons" (*WA* 8, 576). On 18 December 1521 he wrote to Wenceslas Link: "I, however, shall continue in this state [*habitu*] and this way of life [*ritu*], unless this world changes" (*WA, Br* 2, 415).

Decisive for an evaluation of vows is freedom according to the Gospel: "For this freedom is of divine law. God has sanctioned it. Neither will he repudiate it nor can he accept anything against it nor permit man to infringe on it by any, even only a slight, statute" (*WA* 8, 613). Hence a vow contrary to freedom is null and void—for example, if it was made on the assumption that the religious life is necessary for justification and salvation, which indeed can be obtained only through faith in Christ (*WA* 8, 605). Furthermore, vows are to be made only with the provision that there is freedom to abandon religious life again. The vow should accordingly be: "I vow chastity as long as it shall be possible for me, but I can marry if I cannot preserve it" (*WA* 8, 633). If till now Luther had parried the argument that one may renounce a vow if one is unable to fulfill it with the remark that a complete observance of the commandments is impossible also, he now stressed that the married state makes possible the fulfilling of the precept of chastity. "But if I can observe the precepts of God and not the vow, then the vow must yield in order that the commandments may remain and that vow and precept may not be violated in unchastity" (*WA* 8, 632).

These ideas could not have been other than alluring to many religious. They made all the more sense to contemporaries because the prevalence of concubinage among the priests of the time made celibacy and the religious state seem to many unworthy of credence. Modern man was less able and ready than man of previous centuries to put up with such tension between ideal and reality. To Luther, however, it was a source of uneasiness that all too many, as a result of his cry of Christian liberty, were abandoning the monastic life. On 28 March 1522 he wrote to Johann Lang, his friend of many years, who had left the Erfurt Augustinian monastery, of which he had been prior:

> I note that many of our friars have departed for the same reason that induced them to enter—for the sake of the belly and of carnal freedom. Through them Satan intends to put out a great stench in opposition to the good odor of our word. But what are we to do? They are sluggards and seek only what is theirs; it is, then, preferable that they sin and perish without the monastic habit than in it. Otherwise, they will perish doubly if they are deprived of this life also. [*WA*, *Br* 2, 488]

Regulation of Community Worship

On 1 August 1521 Luther wrote to Melanchthon that, after his return from the Wartburg, he intended first of all to take up a regulating of the Eucharist in keeping with the institution by Christ. However, his followers in Wittenberg, especially Karlstadt and the Augustinian Gabriel Zwilling, would not wait for this. And so on their own responsibility they began to draw the conclusions from Luther's criticism of the Mass in *De captivitate* and other works. They constructed an "evangelical Mass," abolished private Masses, and took steps against the adoration of the Sacrament. On Michaelmas of 1521 Melanchthon and his students received the Sacrament under both species. Because of Zwilling's sermons the Augustinians ended private Masses on 13 October.[4] These novelties caused a sensation and ran into opposition. The elector was alarmed and appointed an investigating committee. Luther entered the controversy in November with *De abroganda missa privata* (*WA* 8, 411–476), which he then translated as *Vom Missbrauch der Messe* (*WA* 8, 482–536). In it he not only attacks the private Mass, as the title suggests, but the Sacrifice of the Mass in general. In a far more caustic and polemical manner he expounds ideas previously developed on the Mass as a covenant or legacy, as a gift to us, citing as a further argument the "once for all" text of Hebrews against the sacrificial character of the Mass.

> Tell us, you priests of Baal: Where is it written that the Mass is a sacrifice or where has Christ taught that consecrated bread and wine are to be offered? Do you not hear? Christ sacrificed himself once; he does not wish to be sacrificed thereafter by any other person. He wants us to recall his sacrifice. Why, then, are you so

---

[4] "Cessatum est a celebrandis missis in coenobio Augustianorum" (A. Burer to B. Rhenanus on 13 October 1521, in *ARG* 6 1908–1919, 193).

> bold that you make a sacrifice out of a memorial . . . your sacrificing means a shameful repetition of crucifixion. [*WA*, 8, 421, 493] Everyone knows on what the whole kingdom of priests is based and built: on celebrating Mass. In other words, on the grossest idolatry on earth, on shameful falsehood, on the perverted and godless abuse of the Sacrament, and on an unbelief that is more wicked than that of the pagans. [*WA* 8, 443, 520]

Radical though the language of this tract was, powerfully though it called for a correction of the situation,[5] Luther himself still hesitated to introduce a new liturgy. But this does not mean that he rejected the procedure of the Augustinians and the ecclesiastical novelties at Wittenberg as a matter of course. Filled with anxiety and eager to learn about the development at first hand, he secretly left the Wartburg on 2 December 1521 and went to Wittenberg, where he stayed 4–9 December. There on 3 December armed students and townsmen invaded the parish church, drove the priests from the altars, and carried away the missals. The next day a similar scene occurred in the Franciscan friary. The friars were jeered and prevented from offering private Masses. The city council feared there would be an attack on the monastery and had it guarded during the night.

Despite this, Luther wrote to Spalatin: "All that I see and hear gives me special delight. May the Lord strengthen the spirit of those who are motivated by a good intention" (*WA, Br* 2, 410). But the atmosphere of ferment disturbed him and he intended after his return to the Wartburg to raise a warning voice against it.

At the same time, however, he discovered to his great wrath that Spalatin, from a dread of agitation, had held up his tracts against religious vows and the Mass. Hence he wrote to Spalatin from the Wartburg: "Is one, then, only to dispute unceasingly about the word of God but always to refrain from action? . . . If nothing more is to be done than what we have done until now, then nothing else ought to have been taught either" (*WA, Br* 2, 412). But at the same time he sent his friend the proclamation "Eine treue Vermahnung zu allen Christen, sich zu hüten vor Aufruhr und Empörung" (*WA* 8, 676–687). According to this it is not the business of all ("omnes") to remedy abuses by force. Luther proves the power of the unarmed word of God by pointing to his own fate: "Consider my activity. Have I not done more damage to the pope, bishops, priests, and monks, by my mouth alone, without any wielding of the sword, than all emperors, kings, and princes did previously with their might?" (*WA* 8, 683). He then warns against making the Gospel a matter of factions and forbids his adherents to call themselves "Lutherans." "How should it happen to a poor, stinking heap of maggots, such as I am, that the children of Christ should be called by my wretched name?" (*WA* 8, 685).

---

[5] "Cum ergo ex his omnibus probetur, missas non nisi Satanae operatione et communi errore mundi in sacrificia versas esse adversus Evangelium et fidem et caritatem, quae hac machina abolentur, tota fiducia abrogandae sunt universae nobis, qui Christiani esse volumus, nec spectandum, quod pauci pio errore illis utantur sine perditione" (*WA* 8, 457). On 11 November 1521 Luther wrote to Spalatin: "Abrogationem missarum confirmo hoc, quem mitto, libro" (*WA, Br* 2, 403).

The Elector Frederick demanded that the city council punish the authors of the disturbances, but large segments of the townspeople rallied to protesters calling for the free preaching of the Gospel, the abolition of private Masses, the lay chalice, and the closing of public houses—"since they are maintained for excessive drinking"—and of whorehouses.[6] Repeatedly, once more expressly on 19 December, Frederick forbade unauthorized changes. People were to "leave the old customs alone"[7] until greater unanimity should be achieved. Nevertheless, on the fourth Sunday of Advent Karlstadt announced that on New Year's Day he would celebrate Mass with communion under both species, with the words of consecration intelligible and without the other ceremonies and the vestments.[8] Probably to forestall a prohibition by the Elector, he carried out the plan on Christmas. Before a large congregation he celebrated a "German Mass"; that is, he recited the words of institution in German and omitted the rest of the Canon along with the elevation. For the rite he wore secular dress. He pointedly omitted the preparatory confession of sins as unnecessary and administered communion under both species, passing the Host and the chalice into the communicants' hands. On 6 January the chapter of the German Augustinian Congregation declared that the friars were free to abandon the monastery. All who remained were to occupy themselves with preaching or teaching or earn their livelihood by means of a craft.[9] Begging was to be henceforth forbidden. On 11 January Zwilling sounded the call for an attack on images and the elimination of side altars, on the basis that images are forbidden by God's word (Ex. 20:4). On 19 January Karlstadt solemnized his own wedding.

Meanwhile there had appeared in Wittenberg the "Zwickau Prophets," the weavers Nikolaus Storch and Thomas Drechsel, and

---

[6] N. Muller, *Die Wittenberger Bewegung 1521 und 1522* (Leipzig 1911), pp. 161ff.

[7] Ibid., pp. 123ff.

[8] Ibid., pp. 125f.

[9] Ibid., pp. 147ff. "Quantum per nos stat, omnibus fratribus nostris Evangelicam et Christianam permittimus libertatem, Quantonus ii, qui nobiscum vivere, deserto corrupto vitae nostrae fuco, secundum puritatem Evangelicae doctrinae velint, possint" (p. 148).

Mark (Thomas) Stübner, a former pupil of Melanchthon. They prided themselves on being directly guided by the Holy Spirit. For them the "inner word" was decisive, and so they felt less in need of the written word. According to their dreams and visions, the entire order of the world would soon undergo a transformation and through the extermination of priests and the wicked the foundation would be laid for the Kingdom of God. If the possession of the Spirit was decisive, then the Sacraments were unimportant, and the meaning of infant baptism was questionable. For how could one receive the Spirit as a result of another's faith? Melanchthon, in whose house Stübner had taken up residence, was impressed by these doctrines but also disquieted. He wrote to Spalatin on 1 January 1522: "These opinions are surely not to be condemned and will probably cause difficulties for persons much more learned than I am and for the masses. Well, I was expecting that the devil would attack us in a weak spot" (*CR* I, 534).

Melanchthon did not venture to give a judgment and turned to Luther, who advised that the criterion of the spirits should be whether their manifestations were connected with frightening phenomena. For God is a consuming fire, and visions of the saints are fearful. "So apply this test and don't let them tell you about Jesus in his glory before you have seen the Crucified" (*WA, Br* 2, 425). Melanchthon must not let himself be impressed by talk against infant baptism. For no other recourse "is left to any of us except to accept another's faith," the faith whereby Christ believes for us.

> Why, the other's faith is our own faith . . . . To bring a child for baptism signifies nothing else than to present it into Christ's open hands of grace. Since he has proved to us by many examples that he accepts what is offered to him, why do we doubt here? [*WA, Br* 2, 426]

The Zwickau Prophets probably did not intervene directly in the situation at Wittenberg, but they supplied a new stimulus to Karlstadt, Zwilling, and the rigoristic elements among the citizenry. Under Karlstadt's influence the city council on 24 January 1522 issued the "Order of the City of Wittenberg." Among other things, this decreed the removal of images, the celebration of Mass according to Karlstadt's liturgy, and the combining of the spiritual revenues into a common social fund, the "common chest." The sequel was resentment and complaints by the orthodox canons to the elector. On the other hand, the "Order" was not radical enough for the fanaticism of the zealots; above all, it was not carried out quickly and decisively enough. In a document dated 27 January, "On abolishing images and that there should be no beggars among Christians," Karlstadt complained that three days after the enactment of the city order the images still had not been removed.[10] People took the law into their own hands and at the beginning of February there was an iconoclastic attack on the Wittenberg parish church.

These radical reform efforts spread to other localities in the electorate. Frederick the Wise was doubly anxious, for in the meantime a decree had been issued by the Imperial Governing Council (*Reichsregiment*) at Nürnberg on 22 January 1522 against the innovations in Electoral Saxony.[11] In this he and the Bishops of Meissen, Merseburg, and Naumburg were obliged "seriously and *ex officio*" to proceed against priests who in celebrating Mass deviated from the old usages or who married, and against monks who left their monastery. From 6 February the elector several times intimated to the people of Wittenberg—the last time on 17 February—that they were to observe ancient custom. But the collegiate chapter, the university, and the city council were no longer in control of the situation. In this emergency Melanchthon and the council turned to Luther and asked him to come back to Wittenberg.

Luther, probably on the strength of this, announced his coming in a letter to the elector: ". . . I have no more time; if God so wills, I intend to be there soon" (*WA, Br* 2, 449). Luther did not permit the misgivings and remonstrances of his prince to keep him any longer from a public return. He set out on 1 March and, on the way, wrote to Frederick the Wise again, on 5 March:

> In regard to my affair, most gracious Lord, I reply thus: Your gracious Highness [E.K.F.G.] knows or, if you don't, then let it be known to you herewith, that I have the Gospel, not from man, but only from heaven through our Lord Jesus . . . . Such is written to your gracious Highness that Your Highness may know that I am coming to Wittenberg under a far higher protection than that of the elector. And I have no intention of asking protection from your gracious Highness. Indeed, I believe, I wish rather to protect your gracious Highness more than your Highness could protect me. [*WA, Br* 2, 455]

Filled with this prophetic self-confidence, Luther entered Wittenberg on 6 March 1522. At the elector's request and for his protection against the Imperial Governing Council, Luther stated on 7 March and again on 12 March—in a new draft prepared in accord with an instruction of the Elector—that he had returned to Wittenberg without the elector's

---

[10] Printed in E. Sehling, *Die ev. Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts* I, 1 (Leipzig 1902), 697f.

[11] Ed. H. Lietzmann, Kleine Texte, 74 (Bonn 1911), 20.

"knowledge, will, favor, and permission" (*WA, Br* 2, 470). His feelings were expressed in letters of the succeeding days:

> Of necessity I have hurled myself alive into the very center of the raging of pope and emperor, to see if I could drive the wolf from the fold. Unprotected, except by heaven, I linger in the midst of my enemies, who according to human law have every right to kill me. [*WA, Br* 2, 476] I do not know Christ's thoughts; but I do know that in this business I have never been so courageous and of such proud spirit as I am now [*WA, Br* 2, 479].

Publicly his anger was directed, not at the Pope and the Emperor but at the fanatics and hotheads. In this he was following the wish of his prince and the latter's regard for the decree of the Imperial Governing Council, but especially his own dislike of tumult and violent revolution. From the first through the second Sunday in Lent 9–16 March he was daily in the pulpit of the parish church, wearing his habit and a newly trimmed tonsure. In these eight Lenten sermons (*WA* 10, III, 1–64) Luther denounced all who made a new law out of the freedom according to the Gospel and demanded regard for weak consciences. Then the Mass vestments and the elevation were resumed and, except for the abolition of private Masses, everything was as before. The directions in *De captivitate,* repeated by Luther in *Von beider Gestalt des Sakraments zu nehmen* (*WA* 10, II, 11–41), which was completed on 25 March 1522, remained in force. The priest should simply omit in the prayers and the Canon all words referring to sacrifice. Thus he could celebrate Mass according to the Gospel, while the common man would not notice anything to cause scandal. Karlstadt opposed this rescission of the reform and termed Luther and his adherents "neopapists." There ensued a violent scene between him and Luther. A polemic by Karlstadt, containing veiled attacks on Luther, was suppressed by the university (*WA, Br* 2, 509, 511).

Likewise in the 1523 liturgical regulations, the *Formula missae et communionis* (*WA* 12, 205–229), Luther still provided a Latin Mass, purified, however, of all allusions to sacrifice. Equally moderate was his German translation of the rites of baptism (*WA* 12, 42–48), also in 1523.

When the German Mass was already being celebrated in many places, not merely in Thomas Müntzer's Allstedt but also in Strasbourg, Nördlingen, Nürnberg, Basel, Zurich, and elsewhere, the Mass remained in Latin at Wittenberg. The political prudence of Frederick the Wise was surely decisive in this respect. As Spalatin stated, for example, only after Frederick's death was it possible "to drive the whole pope out of All Saints Church at Wittenberg."[12] But it was not only regard for his prince that made Luther hesitate to draw the practical consequences from his principles. There were also reasons within him, and they were of several kinds.

For Luther, forms of worship, prayers, rites, vestments, and vessels were "vain and external things," *adiaphora,* neither prescribed nor forbidden. If the Latin liturgy was not to be regarded as necessary for salvation, then neither was the German liturgy. To issue binding prescriptions on this matter meant to restrict the freedom of Christians and to lay unnecessary burdens on "poor consciences."

> I like it that now Mass is being celebrated by Germans in German. But that Karlstadt wants to make it a necessity, as though it had to be thus, is again too much. The Spirit cannot do otherwise, for always, always there is law, misery of conscience, and the creation of sins. [*WA* 18, 132]

Luther wanted to make it crystal clear that he was concerned for spiritual attitude, not for external conduct or form; for faith, not for works. Of course as a nominalist he underestimated the sign and had too little grasp of the power of images to illuminate or confuse the spirit. He saw only the road from the inside to the outside, whereby the spirit expresses itself in the body, and failed to understand that, on the other hand, the body aids the spirit into crystallization and even into existence.

Second, Luther demanded regard for "weak consciences." If he aimed first to change man's way of thinking and then to provide this with a suitable expression, he had to exercise patience. Of himself Luther relates that he needed three years of struggling to gain "faith"; *a fortiori* he had to allow time to simple folk and could not lead them into confusion and burdened consciences through precipitate changes not adequately prepared by preaching (*WA* 10, II, 25; *WA* 12, 212f.). Of course no compromise was to be made in regard to principles, but remedies could be quietly provided without the necessity of disturbing the common man (*WA* 10, II, 29).

Third, Luther's attachment to tradition and his feeling for form and organization caused him to delay. He was aware that the correct shape of the liturgy cannot be made but must grow. A mere translation of the texts was not enough; melody and text should constitute a unity.

---

[12] *RA* III, 21; F. Gess, *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzogs Georgs von Sachsen* I (Leipzig–Berlin 1905), 250ff; H. Barge, *Aktenstücke zur Wittenberger Bewegung* (Leipzig 1912), pp. 3–6.

> I should like very much to have a German Mass today. I am experimenting with it. But I should also want it to be of a genuinely German character. I do not stop people from translating the text into German and retaining the Latin tone or notes, but the result sounds neither right nor honest. Text and notes, stress, method, and style must proceed from the proper mother tongue and voice; otherwise, it is only imitation after the manner of apes. [*WA* 18, 123]

Finally, as a humanist and a teacher, Luther wanted to see the cultural value of the Latin language preserved. The young in particular should be trained in this language through the Latin liturgy. For them the *Formula missae,* or Latin liturgy, should be continued in use, even after the introduction of the German Mass (1526). In fact, if he had his way, he would celebrate Mass on Sundays in German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew in turn (*WA* 19, 74).

Luther's Translation of the Bible

The most important literary product of the Wartburg period was the translation of the New Testament. After his secret visit to Wittenberg in December 1521, Luther, at the request of his friends, prepared it in about eleven weeks. He was intimately acquainted with the Vulgate, and in addition he had the Greek text edited by Erasmus—the second edition of 1519—with its translation into Latin and its copious exegesis. Considering the brief period of time and Luther's own knowledge of Greek—he had not undertaken serious study of this language until 1518—it can hardly be called a translation from the original.[13] To what extent he relied on the Greek text is difficult to say, but "in any case this much is certain: he sought to grasp the meaning of the basic text."[14] For the translation of the Old Testament, which was protracted to 1534, he called upon the services of linguistic specialists, and that project may fairly be regarded as teamwork.

There were German versions of the Bible before Luther. Between 1461 and 1522 fourteen High German and four Low German printed editions appeared, not counting German psalters, harmonizations of the

---

[13] I. Hoss, *Spalatin,* p. 242.

[14] H. Dibbelt, "Hatte Luthers Verdeutschung des NT den griechischen Text zur Grundlage?" *ARG* 38 (1941), 300–330; H. Bornkamm, "Die Vorlage zu Luthers Übersetzung des NT," *ThLZ* 72 (1947), 23–28; S. Kruger, "Zum Wortschatz des 18. Jahrhunderts: Fremdbegriff und Fremdwort in Luthers Bibelübersetzung," *BGDSL* 77 (1955), 402–464; H. -O. Burger, "Luther als Ereignis der Literaturgeschichte," *Luther Jb.* 24 (1957), 86–101; H. Bluhm, *Martin Luther—Creative Translator* (St. Louis, Mo. 1965).

Gospels, and books of pericopes. The last named in particular were familiar to Luther from the liturgy and his pastoral duties. It is an exaggeration to say that Luther was the first to give the Bible to the Germans, but in his German Bible he created a work which is unrivaled in accuracy of expression, in feeling for the language, and in literary force. Because Luther himself read the Scriptures "as though they had been written yesterday,"[15] because in fact he saw and heard sacred history as alive, message and German language could be blended into such unity that in its German dress the Bible remained a book to be listened to and the sacred text penetrated remarkably into ear and memory. This was, however, not only the fruit of Luther's power of expression, but also of an encounter, filled equally with painful struggle and joy, with God in his word. For Luther this was not only a testimony of the mighty saving action of God, it was itself the divine power. As no one else could, Luther was able to express by means of speech this living and impetuous power of God's word.

Luther translated the Bible when the process of fusing various German dialects into a uniform literary language was under way. On the fringe of the Empire, in the East German area of colonization, where immigration brought numerous dialects together, the prerequisites for the task were particularly favorable. "It is a Protestant legend that the reformer Luther created the new High German literary language,"[16] but he did accelerate the development toward a uniform speech by making use of the idiom of Saxon officialdom.

> I have no certain, special, proper speech in German, but use the common German speech in order that both, speakers of High and Low German, may be able to understand me. I speak the tongue of the Saxon chancery, which all princes and kings in Germany imitate; thus it is the commonest German speech. The Emperor Maximilian and the Elector Frederick have, therefore, pressed the Empire into a definite tongue, thereby absorbing all dialects into one language. [*WA, Tr* 2, no. 2758]

Certainly the translation of the Bible into a language is of great significance for revelation to the extent that this affects a new group of people. But it is likewise an event for that language, since it is challenged to develop potentialities thus far not realized. This became evident to an outstanding degree in Luther's translation. Even his Catholic opponents did not withhold recognition of his achievement. Although Hieronymus Emser (d. 1527), in his tract *Aus was Grund und Ursach*

---

[15] H. Bornkamm, *Luthers geistige Welt* (Gütersloh, 3 d ed. 1959), p. 266.

[16] Sermon of 22 March 1523 (*WA* 12, 444).

Luthers Dolmetschung über das Neue Testament dem gemeinen Mann billig verboten worden sei (1523), verified 1400 "heretical errors and lies" in Luther's New Testament, in his own translation of 1527 he largely adhered to Luther's text. Johannes Dietenberger (d. 1537) also, in his German Bible of 1534—which with fifty-eight editions of the complete Bible alone became the most used German Catholic Bible—made use of Luther's text. According to Johannes Cochläus (d. 1527), Luther's German version stirred the religious feeling of the people and awakened in the ordinary man a truly devouring hunger for the work of God.

But the reformer's impulsive nature, directed by experience, poses the question whether he reproduced the meaning of Holy Scripture in pure form. Because of his painful experience in wrestling with the meaning of *iustitia Dei,* he certainly put some of the emphases too strongly, and he occasionally overstepped the bounds of faithful translation. For example, he translated "justice of God" as "justice valid before God," and to Romans 3:26 and 3:28 he added the controversial "alone," which is quite in accord with the meaning but is not in Paul's text.[17]

More serious is the fact that Luther did not accept the Bible throughout as the word of God but for his part determined what was essential and thereby selected and put aside entire books, such as the Epistle of James and the Apocalypse. For him James was a "straw Epistle" (*WA, DB* 6, 10:7, 385), which he almost wanted to throw in the stove (*WA* 39, II, 199). But Luke 16 was for Luther a "Gospel right for priests and monks" (*WA* 10, III, 273), "one of the quarrelsome Gospels" (*WA* 29, 488), which "Satan cites as proof" (*WA* 12, 646). Christ must "be mastered *in suis verbis*" (*WA* 27, 296); "he must have himself led by the nose *suis verbis*" (*WA* 27, 279, 300); "we must not let ourselves be made fools of by Scripture" (*WA* 27, 303). In themselves these sentences can be understood as hermeneutical references in which Luther is calling attention to uncritical scriptural expressions or demanding that they be interpreted in their context. Thus he stated in the forty-first promotion thesis of 11 September 1535: "Scripture is not to be interpreted against but for Christ; hence either it must be referred to him or it must not be regarded as true Scripture" (*WA* 39, I, 47). But where do we stand if unsuitable doctrines or opponents are thereby driven from the field, as for example according to Thesis 49, "If opponents force Scripture against Christ, we shall force Christ against Scripture" (*WA* 39, I, 47)?

---

[17] H. -O. Burger, *loc. cit.,* p. 86; A. E. Berger, "Luther und die neuhochdeutsche Sprache," *Deutsche Wortgeschichte* 2 (1943), 37–132.

[18] H. Gerdes, "Überraschende Freiheiten in Luthers Bibelübersetzung," *Luther* 27 (1956), 71–80.

[19] Cf. W. von Loewenich, *Luther als Ausleger der Synoptiker* (Munich 1954), pp. 50ff.

With the touchstone of whether the books of Scripture "enhance Christ or not" (*WA, DB* 7, 385), everyone is in the last analysis left to his own personal judgment. When Luther referred both the fanatics and the orthodox who appealed to Scripture against him to its true meaning, then, ultimately, the reformer's personal experience of Christ decided the meaning of Scripture.

CHAPTER 8

The Reformers in Luther's Circle

Luther's protective custody at the Wartburg had shown that even without him the Reformation was alive; in fact, that without him its growth proceeded more impetuously. Even if Luther had been eliminated, it probably would no longer have been possible to wipe out the reform movement by force. It was not only the fanatics, Karlstadt and Müntzer, who in Luther's absence were trying to determine the form of the movement. In addition, in and outside Wittenberg there were a number of men who were working with Luther and in his spirit. On his return from the Wartburg it was clear that, while he no doubt played a decisive role, he was not the only one who would decide the shape of the new doctrine and of the church into which it was developing. Thus it could be seen at the outset that "Lutheranism" would be both more and less than what was embodied in Luther's person: less, because the sea of forces which he contained and the subjective nature of his prophetic function could not be institutionalized; more, because from the beginning his work was also carried by the formative and preserving force of others. Such helpers in Wittenberg, loyal and dedicated, even though to some extent of a different turn of mind, were Nikolaus von Amsdorf, Justus Jonas, Johannes Bugenhagen, Georg Spalatin, and, most important of all, Philip Melanchthon.

Nikolaus von Amsdorf (1483–1565) had been since 1507 a lecturer at the university and since 1508 a canon of the collegiate church of All Saints at Wittenberg. He joined Luther as early as 1517 and was thereafter one of his closest collaborators. He accompanied him to the Leipzig Disputation in 1519 and to the Diet of Worms in 1521 and assisted in the translation of the Bible. As a reformer he was active at Goslar, Einbeck, and Meissen, among other places, and especially at Magdeburg, where in 1524 he became senior minister. On 20 January 1542 Luther "ordained" him Protestant bishop of Naumburg, "without any chrism . . . oil, or incense" (*WA* 53, 231). In 1547 he had to give way to the Catholic Julius Pflug. He lived as a private scholar at Eisenach and took part in the founding of the University of Jena, which became the stronghold of Lutheran orthodoxy in opposition to "Philippist" Wittenberg. Amsdorf was averse to any compromise in the doctrines of justification and the Eucharist. Hence he was an opponent of the Wittenberg Accord of 1536, resisted the *Interim* of 1547, and came out against Melanchthon in the Synergist Controversy. If Melanchthon, and Georg Major (1502–74) after him, stressed the necessity of good works, if not for justification, at least for the preservation of faith and salvation, Amsdorf established against them the paradoxical opinion of the harmfulness of good works for the salvation of souls. He aimed by means of the Jena edition of Luther's works to transmit the latter's doctrine unadulterated to later generations. Hence he helped to canonize the reformer's theology in the sense of Lutheran orthodoxy and to stamp the latter with an inflexible intolerance.

The jurist Justus Jonas (1493–1555) had studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg and had joined the Erfurt humanist circle. An admirer of Erasmus, he discovered Scripture and the Fathers. From 1518 he was professor of canon law at Erfurt and in this capacity he was called to Wittenberg in 1521 and appointed provost of the castle church. He here changed to the theological faculty and gave exegetical lectures. He became one of Luther's chief collaborators and rendered valuable service in the translation of the Bible. He also put into German important writings of Luther and Melanchthon, including *De servo arbitrio, Loci communes,* and *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae.* His knowledge of law stood the Reformation in good stead on the occasion of church visitations, the setting up of the ecclesiastical organizations in Zerbst, Ducal Saxony, and Halle, and in the Wittenberg consistory. He later established the Reformation at Halle, where he became preacher in 1541 and senior minister in 1544. He accompanied Luther on his last journey in 1546, attended him at the hour of death, and delivered his eulogy at Eisleben.

Johannes Bugenhagen (1485–1558) was from Wollin in Pomerania and hence was known as Pomeranus. From 1504 he was headmaster in Treptow. In 1509, with no theological study, he was ordained a priest and in 1517 became lecturer in Scripture and patrology at the monastery school of Belbuck. Here he became acquainted with Luther's writings. At first shocked by the radicalism of *De captivitate Babylonica,* he was won by this very work, and in 1521 undertook the study of theology at Wittenberg. He was soon lecturing there on the Bible but did not obtain the doctorate in theology until 1533; in 1535 he was made a professor. Disregarding the chapter's right of presentation, the city council in 1523 elected him pastor of the parish church, and Luther announced the election from the pulpit. Bugenhagen had married the previous year. In a sense he created the model of the German Lutheran rectory and energetically stressed its blessings in *De coniugio episcoporum et diaconorum* (1525). As a gifted shepherd of souls, pastor rather than professor, he excelled Luther in his closeness to the people. He displayed more practical sense and did not share Luther's indifference to external forms. At Wittenberg he was even more in Luther's shadow than Melanchthon. His significance was more evident as the trail blazer of the Reformation in North Germany, where through numerous organizations of churches he laid the foundation for the local ecclesiastical structure. In addition to the years of cooperation and friendship, Bugenhagen was intimately bound to Luther as his adviser and confessor. He officiated at Luther's marriage in 1525, comforted him in sicknesses, temptations, and fits of depression, and in 1546 delivered his funeral sermon.

Georg Burckhardt (1484–1545) was from Spalt, near Nürnberg, and for that reason was known from 1502 as Spalatin. He studied the liberal arts at Erfurt, and here came under the spell of the humanist circle. In October 1502 he went with his teacher, Nikolaus Marschalk, to the newly founded University of Wittenberg and there became a master of arts in February 1503. He entered upon the study of law as his special field, but in 1504 he transferred to Erfurt, where Mutianus Rufus in Gotha became decisive for his life. Without completing his legal studies, in the fall of 1505 Spalatin accepted the post of instructor of the novices in the Cistercian monastery of Georgenthal, not far from Gotha. His turning to an ecclesiastical career probably derived chiefly from motives of economic security. As early as 1507, without any real theological preparation, he accepted the pastorate of Hohenkirchen and in 1508 had himself ordained a priest. At the end of that year he was called to Torgau to become tutor of the princes at the court of the Elector Frederick the Wise. From 1511 he was the teacher of the elector's nephews at Wittenberg and took over the direction of the library. In addition he worked on a Saxon chronicle and a history of his time.

Spalatin first came into contact with Luther in 1513–14, on the occasion of the Reuchlin controversy. There developed a friendship[1] which found expression in personal communications and in a lively correspondence—more than four hundred of Luther's letters to Spalatin have come down to us—and which reached its climax in 1521 in Luther's reform activity. The sequel to the encounter with Luther was a growing interest in theological problems on the part of the humanist. In September 1516, with his appointment to the Elector's chancery, Spalatin entered the direct service of the court. In particular he had to be concerned with affairs of the university and of the ecclesiastical organization. With Luther, and soon with Melanchthon too, from 1517–18 he promoted the reform of studies in the direction of humanism and of the fostering of the biblical languages.

---

[1] Spalatin's fascination with Luther is apparent from a letter of 2 May 1515, written by Johann Lang to Mutianus: "Eum Luther ipsum ut Apollinem Spalatinus noster veneraturque et consulit" (K. Gillert, *Der Briefwechsel des Conradus Mutianus,* Halle 1890 no. 490; cf. I. Hoss, *Spalatin,* p. 79).

As private secretary, ecclesiastical adviser, and later court preacher, Spalatin acquired a powerful position in the confidence of the elector, which stood Luther in good stead in the critical years 1518–22. Frederick the Wise did not know the reformer personally; at least he had never spoken with him and for tactical reasons avoided his company. Spalatin acted as intermediary. With an eye for the politically acceptable and the possible, he exerted a moderating influence on Luther. Above all, he knew what could be expected of his prince, who was basically cautious and attached to the medieval Church organization, and how to communicate to him Luther's controversial views and actions. If he was unable to persuade the elector to Luther's views on indulgences and relics, Spalatin at least obtained the assurance that the Wittenberg professor could be certain of the elector's protection. This was decisive for the fate of Luther and of the Reformation. The Curia recognized the importance of Spalatin's influence on Luther's prince when in February 1518 it granted him extensive faculties for confession and the right to concede the indulgences attached to visiting the seven churches of Rome to corresponding exercises of devotion in the castle church.[2] In Rome it was as yet impossible to determine to what extent Spalatin supported Luther. Even in 1521 he still solicited benefices and took care to fulfill conscientiously his duties as the elector's priest and confessor. In keeping with his humanist's reserve, he drew the ultimate consequence of separation from the old Church much later than Luther. On the other hand, the reformer, in many respects insolently pugnacious and pressing his own affairs without regard for circumstances, understood how much he needed his diplomatically experienced friend. After receiving the papal summons he wrote to him on 8 August 1518: "I need your aid now most urgently, my Spalatin" (*WA, Br* 1, 188). But this did not prevent Luther in succeeding years from interfering time and again by biting statements and writings with the diplomatic activities of the prudent courtier and endangering their success. Just the same, Spalatin was able constantly to afford Luther effective protection. The elector did not need to acknowledge his Wittenberg professor publicly if he tended to his affairs only in a procrastinating manner.

---

[2] *WA, Br* 1, 161f.; P. Kalkoff, *Zu Luthers römischem Prozess* (Gotha 1912), p. 74; *Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess* (Rome 1905), p. 46; I. Hoss, *Spalatin*, pp. 127f.

Spalatin embodied a union of humanist culture with reform Christianity. Accordingly, he long sought to mediate between Luther and Erasmus. After the death of Frederick the Wise he accepted the pastorate of Altenburg in 1525 and here established his own household. But he continued to render service to the electoral Saxon court in religious negotiations, as at the diets of Speyer (1526) and Augsburg (1530) and in the compromise negotiations at Schweinfurt and Nürnberg in 1532. In 1527 he was named by the Elector Johann to the visitation commission and thereby obtained a prominent share in the organization of the Church government of the principality. The final years of quiet from 1540 were devoted to historical studies and to his congregation at Altenburg, where he died on 16 January 1545.

The most important of the men around Luther was Philip Melanchthon, originally Schwartzert (1497–1560). If his meeting Luther was the turning point in his life, for his part he had a strong influence on Luther and especially on the course of the Reformation, but he was always in the shadow of the greater and more active man. His relationship with Luther moved between intimate friendship and deep respect for a great achievement and groans over the "shameful servitude" (*CR* 6, 880) of Luther's irritable intolerance. He remained with Luther through all vicissitudes; even in serious crises and despite the allurement of honorable offers he could not bring himself to leave Wittenberg and the reformer's direct sphere of action.

Melanchthon was born at Bretten in Baden on 14 February 1497. The early death of his father served to enhance the influence of his great-uncle, Johann Reuchlin, on the course of his education. Directly or by means of his students, Reuchlin equipped the gifted youth with the ancient languages and introduced him into the world of Christian Platonism. After attending the Latin school at Pforzheim (1508–10) and earning his baccalaureate in the liberal arts at the University of Heidelberg (1511), Melanchthon transferred in 1512 to the University of Tübingen, where he became master of arts as early as January 1514. The great-nephew of the famous Hebraist was soon himself a celebrated teacher of classical literature and almost of necessity involved in the Reuchlin controversy. Reuchlin directed him to the field of theology, recommended the works of Jean Gerson and of Wessel Gansfort, and presented him with a New Testament, possibly Erasmus' Greek-Latin edition of 1516.

Quite early Melanchthon admiringly looked up to Erasmus as the master of linguistic elegance and humanist culture. Through Oecolampadius, whose friendship he gained at Tübingen, he probably came into contact with the great humanist. Beyond the distinction of his literary style, he was also won by Erasmus' ethically oriented humanism. For him Erasmus opened up the sources of Christian tradition, the works of the Fathers and their scriptural exegesis.

Despite some minor successes, the young scholar did not really make any great headway at Tübingen. Recommended by Reuchlin and with his encouragement, he accepted the chair of Greek and Hebrew at Wittenberg. In his inaugural lecture on 29 August 1518, "De corrigendis adulescentiae studiis," he advocated a scripturally oriented humanism:

> If we grasp the letter, we shall also comprehend the meaning of things. . . . And if we direct the mind to the sources, we shall begin to understand Christ, his commandments will enlighten us, and we shall be permeated by the blessed nectar of divine wisdom.[3]

Luther was won over to this humanism, which aimed by means of the languages of the Bible to unlock its content. He worked together with Melanchthon on the reform of studies, and the two were soon close friends. The friendship became even deeper when as early as 1518–19 the young humanist embraced Luther's reform ideas and devoted himself to theology. In the theses on the occasion of his obtaining the baccalaureate in theology on 9 September 1519 he proceeded further than Luther himself in his assault on the teaching of the Church.

Melanchthon never became a doctor of theology nor did he ever mount the pulpit. He was satisfied with being able to deliver theological lectures as a bachelor, without achieving full membership in the faculty. With great devotion he dedicated himself to exegetical lectures. We know of thirteen from the years 1518–22 alone, and these include three on Romans.[4] He regarded that epistle, along with the psalter, as the most outstanding book of the Bible, a guide to the understanding of the other books.[5] He gave eloquent expression to his enthusiasm for the new theology under the auspices of Saint Paul in his festive discourse of 25 January 1520, "In divi Pauli Doctrinam." The humanist, made rather for the scholar's study, even ventured into polemics. After the Leipzig Disputation, to which he had accompanied Luther, there ensued a sharp literary duel with Johannes Eck. And rather extensive polemics of 1521 attacked the Dominican Thomas Rodinus and the theologians of the Sorbonne.

---

[3] *CR,* 11, 23; *Studienausgabe* III, 40.

[4] *Studienausgabe* IV, 10f.

[5] *WA* 5, 24f. According to the preface of the Latin edition of Romans (Wittenberg 1520) this Epistle is "rerum theologicarum et summam et methodum continens."

Melanchthon's most valuable service to the young reform movement was a work he wrote during Luther's stay at the Wartburg, the *Loci communes rerum theologicarum seu hypotyposes theologicae* (1521). Employing his *Theologica institutio in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (*CR* 21, 49–60)—produced in connection with his lectures on Romans in 1519—and the *Rerum theologicarum capita seu loci* (*CR* 21, 11–48)—a discussion of the scholastic exegesis of "sentences"—and in conformity with the method developed in these treatises from the application of the rules of classical rhetoric to Scripture, Melanchthon listed the fundamental ideas or great essential subjects according to which the truths of revelation are to be arranged. This work made him the theologian of the Reformation, though the characterization of the *Loci* as the "first Protestant dogmatic theology" is applicable to the 1521 edition only in regard to its systematic presentation. The completeness expected of dogmatic theology is lacking. The doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation is excluded; only soteriology and ethics are treated. Melanchthon's concern is to grasp all of Scripture by means of the leading theological ideas which he acquired in his study of Romans—sin, law, grace, Gospel—to explain them as a unity, and to show their connection in salvation history. "The law shows sin; the Gospel, grace. The law proclaims sickness; the Gospel, the remedy" (*CR* 21, 139). Through the *Loci* Melanchthon aims to assist young students to a right understanding of Scripture and to stimulate them to the study of the Bible. The *Loci* are to be signposts or pole stars for "those wandering lost through the divine books" and to present the basic points of Scripture in outline (*hypotyposis*). The student is to be brought by means of a few ideas into direct contact with that "on which depends the totality of Christian doctrine" (*CR* 21, 82).

Without subjecting his humanism to a fundamental criticism, without even becoming entirely clear on the distinction between humanism and Reformation, as W. Maurer puts it, Melanchthon accepted radical theses of Luther's anthropology, such as man's inability to arrive at a natural knowledge of God and the lack of free will; saw in the law only a death-bringing law in contrast to the Gospel; and regarded only an ethics of faith as possible. But Melanchthon found himself in a serious crisis in 1521–22 because of the Wittenberg disturbances. He saw himself compelled to reexamine his theological ideas and to turn back more strongly to humanism and to the traditions of natural law of the Middle Ages. In the new editions of the *Loci,* from 1522, the door was again opened to a philosophical ethics. Fallen nature can know the *lex naturae,* and free will suffices for its external fulfillment. Thus the unbelieving man of the flesh can produce acts of virtue, which, while they do not lead to the justice of the heart, do make possible a civil justice (*iustitia civilis*). Now, too, the ceremonies of the Church and the enactments by authority are "good creations of God" and their disregard is a sin. If until this point Melanchthon was inclined to adjust everything, spiritual and secular, exclusively according to the Bible, now he begins to speak of a twofold justice, of a "justice of the spirit" and a "civil justice." Reason and tradition supply the norms for this natural ethics. Thus with Melanchthon there ensued a revival of the classical moral philosophy and even a sort of Protestant, humanist neo-Aristotelianism. This union of humanism and Reformation has been evaluated in differing ways up to our own day. The judgments range from Emanuel Hirsch's reproach that Melanchthon "heinously mutilated" Luther's doctrine of justification, to the conviction that he saved it. In between are those who speak of a synthesis[6] or of a juxtaposition and union[7] of humanism and Reformation in Melanchthon, of the hazards and at the same time of the blessings and fruitfulness of this amalgamation. In any case, it is due to him that the Reformation proceeded, not against but with the education of the age, and it was Melanchthon who, in the future, would largely determine the creed, ecclesiology, theology, and pedagogy of Lutheranism.

CHAPTER 9

The Pontificate of Adrian VI

Notwithstanding the Edict of Worms, the Reformation was able to spread without resistance. The German bishops took no steps, and the Pope, in accord with his character, was neither inclined nor fitted to introduce any effective measures of reform beyond the condemnation of Luther's doctrines. The Emperor was to be kept away from Germany for nine years by the wars with France and the necessity of establishing his authority in Spain. Furthermore, in his war on two fronts, against France and the Turks, he was dependent on the help of the very princes against whom he would have had to proceed if he enforced the Edict of Worms. Charles V's relations with Leo X were strained because of the Pope's pro-French policy and his having taken sides in the imperial election. However, it had become evident in the meantime that France was a threat rather than an effective help to the interests of the House of

---

[6] H. Bornkamm, "Melanchthons Menschenbild," in *Philipp Melanchthon. Forschungsbeiträge* (Göttingen 1961), pp. 76–70 (especially p. 90).

[7] W. H. Neuser, *Der Ansatz der Theologie Philipp Melanchthons* (Neukirchen 1957), p. 135.

Medici and the Papal State, whereas Spanish Naples was in a position to afford protection against the Muslim menace to the coasts. Indeed, if the Pope's anxiety in regard to the Turkish danger was serious, his place was at the side of the Emperor and not of the "Most Christian King" who was conspiring with the Turks. Finally, who but the Emperor was to master the Lutheran movement in Germany, so alarmingly described by Aleander? He showed himself to be obliging in this regard, and so Leo X inclined more and more to the imperial side. In May 1521 there emerged an alliance whose goal was to reestablish the rule of the Sforza at Milan and to deprive the French of Genoa. The Emperor promised aid against the enemies of the Catholic faith and was in turn promised imperial coronation in Italy together with help against Venice. Hence Italian politics were decisive, and the Pope was involved both as head of the House of Medici and as Prince of the Papal State.

The alliance was a success. As a result of a rising of the Milanese against the French, papal and imperial troops were able to occupy the city on 19 November 1521, and Francesco II Sforza assumed the government. But soon afterward, on 1 December, the Pope succumbed to malaria. This implied a serious upset in Italian politics and jeopardized the successes thus far gained in France.

But the change of pontificate seemed to assure especially favorable circumstances for cooperation between Emperor and Pope. The conclave, in which thirty-nine cardinals participated—only three of them non-Italians—was difficult. The cardinals, for the most part worldly and at enmity with one another, were a reflection of the Church and of Christendom. But on 9 January 1522 there occurred the completely unexpected election of the absent Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht, Bishop of Tortosa, in Spain. The disappointed Romans were enraged at the choice of the unknown "barbarian."

This Dutchman, the son of a carpenter, was born at Utrecht in 1459. Raised in the spirit of the *devotio moderna,* with a love of virtue and learning, he entered the University of Louvain in 1476. He there became a respected professor and dean of Sankt Peter. His commentary on the fourth book of *The Sentences* and his twelve *Quodlibeta* show him to have been a late scholastic deeply interested in canonical and moral and casuistic questions. In 1507 Emperor Maximilian I appointed him tutor of his grandson, the seven-year-old Archduke Charles. Thus Adrian entered the council of Margaret, Regent of the Netherlands, and in 1515 he was sent to Spain to assure Charles's succession to the throne. Ferdinand the Catholic annulled the will he had made in 1512, which had promised the Spanish crown to Charles's younger brother Ferdinand, raised in Spain and very popular there. After the death of King Ferdinand in 1516, Adrian, together with the great humanist Cardinal

Ximenes, conducted the regency for Charles until the new king was able to assume the government in Spain personally in 1517. Meanwhile Adrian had become Bishop of Tortosa in 1516 and inquisitor for Aragon and Navarre; he later became inquisitor for Castile and León also, and in January 1517 was made a cardinal. King Charles, in whose council Adrian had a seat, was unable to win the Spaniards. They complained of the arrogance of the Burgundians and the greed of the foreigners and they insisted on their liberties. Hence when Charles went to Germany in 1520, he turned over to the Cardinal as his representative a difficult assignment which proved to be too much for him. There was open revolt in Castile, and Adrian contrived to master it only with the aid of two coregents of Spanish blood. The news of the papal election reached him on January 22 at Vitoria, where he was instituting military measures for the defense of Navarre against France.

In a solemn statement on 8 March 1522, Adrian VI accepted the election. In it he emphasized his reliance on Christ, "who would endow him, though unworthy, with the strength necessary to protect the Church against the attacks of the Evil One, and to bring back the erring and deceived to the unity of the Church after the example of the Good Shepherd."[1] For his journey to Rome the Pope chose the sea route, to point up his independence of both France and the Empire. His departure was delayed and it was not until 5 August that he put to sea at Tarragona. He landed at Ostia on 28 August and a day later was in Rome.

In the meantime Belgrade had fallen to Sultan Suleiman, Hungary was defenseless before the threat of a Turkish invasion, and Rhodes, the last Christian outpost in the Mediterranean, was being besieged by superior forces. The Pope would be able to deal with the tasks imposed on him by this situation only if he succeeded in restoring the political and religious unity of Christendom. For this a reform of the Church was necessary and it had to begin with the Curia. Only thus could the Church win back confidence as a prerequisite for carrying out her functions as the regulating authority in the West.

To the Romans Adrian was a barbarian. At the time of the Pope's arrival a pestilence was raging in the Eternal City, and his coronation at Saint Peter's on 31 August was reduced to the simplest form. In his address in the consistory on 1 September Adrian asked the aid of the cardinals in his twofold concern: the uniting of the Christian princes for a war against the Turks and the reform of the Curia.[2] Evil, he said, had become so widespread that, to quote Saint Bernard, those covered with sins no longer noticed the stench of vice. The cardinals should set a good example for the rest of the clergy.

---

[1] Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste* IV, 2, 35; *The History of the Popes* IX, 49.

[2] A. Mercati, *Diarii,* 88, with footnote 47.

If the Pope's stern asceticism and piety—his daily celebration of Mass, for example, was unusual—impressed many people quite unfavorably, for most it was even more distressing that he was so stingy with favors. In the consistory of 26 March 1523 the Cardinal of Santa Croce requested the confirmation of the indults and privileges granted by Leo X. When on this occasion he recalled the unprecedented pleasure of the cardinals at having elevated him to the height of the papacy, Adrian replied that they had called him to suffering and prison. He had found an exhausted and impoverished Church and hence he owed them little. Actually they were his executioners.[3] The dull Dutch scholar apparently had no sympathy for the Italian way of life and the splendor of Renaissance art. When he set about abolishing superfluous offices and showing the door to the beneficiaries of Leo X's prodigal mode of life, the widespread consternation and aversion became bitter hatred. His predecessors had bequeathed to Adrian debts and empty coffers. In addition it was necessary to redeem valuables and works of art, including the Gobelins made after Raphael's designs, which had had to be pawned after the death of Leo X. Drastic economy measures were thus necessary, all the more if the Pope intended to renounce, within the scope of Church reform, the excessive fees which were causing so much bad feeling throughout the world. Adrian's thrift brought upon him the reputation of being a miser. The Romans forgave him this far less than they had pardoned the prodigality of his predecessor.

In addition, Adrian's activities were initially hindered by the plague, which in the fall became worse. On 1 October the Swiss Cardinal Schinner, one of his few reform-minded colleagues, fell victim to it. Against all warnings the Pope stayed in Rome, whereas the cardinals and most officials sought to get as far away as possible. It was only at the end of 1522 that the Curia could again be activated. Collaborators in the carrying out of reform were lacking. The difficulties of the few Dutch and Spaniards, whom the Pope trusted, were increased by the unfamiliar environment, and their ineptitude provoked further opposition. Disillusionment made the Pope even more suspicious of his retinue and even more lonely, and induced him to do much on his own. Added to this, the northerner's ponderous and pedantic methods produced even louder complaints about the slow course of business. Pastor sums it up: "A foreigner, surrounded by foreign confidants, the Dutch pope was unable to find his way about in the new world which confronted him in Rome."

---

[3] Ibid., 95.

The slower the reform of the Curia proceeded, the more difficult became the Pope's position in Germany. He saw himself compelled at the Diet of Nürnberg in 1522–23 to ask the estates to be patient. During the absence of Charles V the religious question was turned over to the Imperial Governing Council, which met at Nürnberg on 1 October 1521. It consisted of twenty-three representatives of the several imperial estates. One elector and two other princes—one secular and one spiritual—were to serve in it, changing every three months. With such organizational weakness consistent action and continuity were possible only with great difficulty. Despite these unpropitious conditions the Imperial Governing Council accomplished much that was useful and it especially sought to adjust the divergent interests to the "common good." The endeavor to coordinate criminal justice provided the basis for the *Carolina* (1532). For defense against the Turks it aimed to provide the Empire with a permanent revenue by means of an imperial toll, a withholding of annates, and a reform of the "common pfennig," an imperial tax established in 1495.

The commotion in Saxony and the fall of Belgrade to the Turks peremptorily showed the urgency of unifying the Empire and of exorcising the religious unrest by means of reform, and Adrian VI meant to extend a helping hand. To the Diet of Nürnberg, which had been summoned for 1 September 1522 but did not actually meet until 17 November, he sent Francesco Chieregati. The legate made known the Pope's agreement that annates and pallium fees should for the future be retained in Germany and spent on the Turkish war; but he also vigorously demanded German assistance for imperiled Hungary.[4] It was only on 10 December that the legate referred to the religious situation in Germany. The erroneous doctrine of Luther was, he said, more threatening than the Turkish danger, and the Pope demanded the implementation of the Edict of Worms.[5] The estates gave an evasive reply and showed little inclination to occupy themselves with this delicate question. Only Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, who did not arrive until 23 December, energetically urged the matter, with the support of the Archduke Ferdinand and the Archbishop of Salzburg. On 3 January 1523 the legate read aloud the documents forwarded to him, a brief and an instruction, in which the Pope, in view of the Turkish peril, deplored the religious danger produced by Luther. Worse even than his errors, said the Pope, was the fact that, despite papal condemnation and imperial edict, he had found patrons and adherents among the princes. It seemed incredible to the Pope that a

---

[4] *RA* III, no. 54.

[5] Ibid., no. 73.

> nation so pious would let itself be led by an insignificant friar [*fraterculum*], who has apostatized from the Catholic faith, away from the path shown by the Saviour and his Apostles . . . almost as though only Luther were wise and possessed the Holy Spirit, whereas the Church . . . had been wandering about in the darkness of folly and on the road to ruin until Luther's new light had enlightened her.[6]

The Pope spoke in a similar vein in the instruction. Here, however, he not only deplored and condemned heresy and the schism in the Church produced by the Lutheran movement, but he also laid bare the deeper causes and with an unprecedented candor admitted the guilt of Curia and Church. At the same time he asked patience, since abuses so deeply rooted could not be eradicated at one stroke.

> You are to say also that we frankly confess that God has allowed this punishment to overtake his Church because of the sins of men, and especially those of priests and prelates. . . . Holy Scripture loudly proclaims that the sins of the people have their source in the sins of the priesthood. . . . We are well aware that even in this Holy See much that is detestable has appeared for some years already—abuses in spiritual things, violation of the commandments—and that everything has been changed for the worst. Hence it is not to be wondered at that the sickness has been transmitted from the head to the members, from the popes to the prelates. All of us, prelates and clergy, have turned aside from the road of righteousness and for a long time now there has been not even one who did good [Psalm 13(14), 3]. Hence we must all give glory to God and humble ourselves before him. Everyone of us must consider why he has fallen and judge himself rather than be condemned by God on the day of his wrath. You must therefore promise in our name that we intend to exert ourselves so that, first of all, the Roman Court, from which perhaps all this evil took its start, may be improved. Then, just as from here the sickness proceeded, so also from here recovery and renewal may begin. We regard ourselves as all the more obliged to carry this out, because the whole world demands such a reform. . . . However, no one should be amazed that we do not liquidate all abuses at one blow. For the disease is deeply entrenched and of many shapes. Therefore, progress must be made step by step, and first of all the most serious and most dangerous evils must be dealt with by proper medicines, lest everything become still more chaotic through a

---

[6] Ibid., no. 75, pp. 401f.

> premature reform. Aristotle rightly says that any sudden change in a community is dangerous.[7]

The Pope's confession of guilt, which must be regarded above all as a religious act and the prerequisite of inner reform in the Curia, and his appeal to the estates had no immediate decisive effect. Hans von der Planitz, a councilor of the Elector of Saxony, knew how to postpone the decision by referring it to a committee and at the same time directing attention to the lot of four Lutheran preachers in Nürnberg, whose arrest Chieregati had demanded. Finally, on 5 February 1523, the estates replied to the nuncio. Proceedings against Luther would evoke the most serious disturbances unless first the Roman Curia, from which, admittedly, the corruption had proceeded, was reformed and the *gravamina* of the German nation were remedied. The Pope, in agreement with the Emperor, should, as quickly as possible and at least within a year, convoke a free Christian council in a German city. Meanwhile the Elector of Saxony should see to it that Luther and his adherents neither wrote nor published anything else. The secular and ecclesiastical estates would during the same time guarantee the suppression of any inflammatory preaching and pledge themselves that nothing but the true, pure, authentic, and holy Gospel should be preached, according to the approved interpretation of the Church and the Fathers.[8]

These vague and procrastinating statements were the outcome of a diet at which the ecclesiastical estates predominated. If the discussion of the religious question was irksome to them anyway, they did not regard themselves as obligated by the Pope's cry for penance to reflection and energetic penitence but instead felt themselves offended and exposed.

The reaction of Luther and Melanchthon was equally irreligious. It was published in 1523 in their pamphlet *Deutung der zwei gräulichen Figuren, Papstesels zu Rom und Mönchskalbs zu Freiberg in Meissen gefunden* (*WA* 11, 369–385). Luther considered it not worth the trouble to acknowledge Adrian's good intentions. To him the Pope was "a *magister noster* from Louvain, a university in which such jackasses are crowned." It is Satan who speaks through the Pope.

In his concern for the Church, in which the Curia left him unaided, the Pope looked about for outside help. In December 1522 he asked his countryman Erasmus, whom he had known from his days at Louvain, to employ his scholarship and his stylistic gifts against the "new heretics." He could not render a greater service, the Pope said, to God, the fatherland, and Christendom. He also invited him to Rome, where he would have an ample supply of books at his disposal and would find an opportunity for contacts with scholars and pious men.[9] The prince of humanists had congratulated Adrian on his elevation and had dedicated to him his edition of Arnobius' commentary on the Psalms.[10] In a second letter he had offered his counsel to the Pope.[11] The latter asked the scholar to come to Rome or to make known his suggestions as soon as possible. The proper measures had to be found "in order to expel the dreadful malady from the midst of our nation, while it is still curable."[12] Erasmus warned against recourse to force and advised the Pope to surround himself with a circle of incorruptible and worthy men, free from personal animosity. But he declined for himself, pleading poor health. He could do more at Basel; if he should go to Rome and thus openly take sides, his writings would lose their influence.[13]

---

[7] Ibid., no. 74, pp. 397f.

[8] Ibid., no. 82.

Unlike Erasmus, Johannes Eck was ready to do what he could for the Pope's reform work. He came to Rome in March 1523 to represent the interests of the Dukes of Bavaria, but he was able to join to this assignment the welfare of the Church and of Christendom. For the enhancing of the Bavarian Dukes' authority over the Church meant a guarantee against the unreliability of the episcopate. In his memoranda Eck called for the restoration of the conciliar system, whose decay was responsible for both the abuses in the Church and the revolt. A general council would not be achieved so quickly. Besides, for Eck the business of Luther was a German affair. He urgently insisted that a mere attack on error would do no good without a serious undertaking of Church renewal. With regard to reform in Rome, Eck called especially for a limitation of indulgences and the abolition of *commendam.*[14]

The Italian political situation had stabilized before the Pope's entry into Rome. A French countermove had been thwarted on 27 April 1522 by German mercenaries under Jörg von Frundsberg, and the French had lost Genoa. Charles V, convinced that God himself had arranged Adrian's election, wrote to the Pope that, united in harmony, they would accomplish great feats. Naturally he expected Adrian to join the league against Francis I. But the Pope, already under suspicion of being a partisan of his former pupil, had to maintain a strict neutrality if his efforts for peace among the princes of Europe for the sake of defense against the Turks were to be crowned with success. This endeavor to maintain his independence vis-à-vis Charles V and especially his tactless and importunate envoy led to a temporary estrangement from the Emperor, without gaining for the Pope the confidence of the French king.

---

[9] Letter of 1 December 1522; P. S. Allen, *Opus epistularum D. Erasmi* V (Oxford 1924), 145–150. On Erasmus and Adrian VI see L. R. Halkin, "Adrien VI et la reforme de l'eglise," *EThL* 33 (1959), 534–542, 539ff.

[10] Cf. the foreword to the edition of Arnobius of 1 August 1522 (Allen, V, 99) and the letter of September 1522 to Adrian (Allen, V, 121f.). At the same time Erasmus wrote to John Fisher in regard to the Pope: "Is qualis olim fuerit novi, qualis futurus sit in magistratu tanto nescio. Illus unum scio, totus est scholasticus, nec admodum aequus bonis litteris" (Allen, V, 123).

[11] Letter of 22 December 1522 (Allen, V, 155f.).

[12] Letter of 23 January 1523 (Allen, V, 196ff.).

[13] Letter of 22 December 1522 (Allen, V, 155f.); of 22 March 1523 (Allen, V, 257–261).

[14] *Acta reformationis catholicae,* ed. G. Pfeilschifter, I (Regensburg 1959), 109–150.

On 21 December 1522, Rhodes fell to the Turks. The Pope's intensified exertions to unite the Christian princes for resistance or at least to arrange a truce were fruitless. All the more he sought by means of tithes and taxes to raise money himself for the Turkish war. In his distress he made concessions to the princes which contradicted his own principles. The disagreement with Charles V and the more flexible attitude of Francis I enabled Cardinal Soderini, a long-time partisan of France, to gain the Pope's confidence and to draw him into the twilight of partiality. A rising against the Emperor was to be contrived in Sicily, and Francis I intended to exploit it for an attack on North Italy. Soderini was arrested and thereafter Cardinal Giuliano de Medici exercised a decisive influence in the Curia. The Pope still tried to bring about peace. On 30 April 1523 he proclaimed a three-year truce for all of Christendom and stipulated the severest ecclesiastical penalties as its sanction. At the end of July he arranged the Peace of Venice with the Emperor.

This and Soderini's trial caused Francis I to show his true colors. In a very insulting letter he threatened the Pope with the fate of Boniface VIII.[15] He also stopped the transfer of money to Rome and readied troops for an invasion of Lombardy. Thus the Pope witnessed the collapse of his peace efforts. On 3 August 1523 he entered into a defensive alliance with the Emperor, with King Henry VIII of England, with Ferdinand of Austria, and with Milan, Florence, Genoa, Siena, and Lucca. In his disillusionment Adrian VI in a sense collapsed. He died on 14 September 1523, after a pontificate of less than thirteen months. This brief time and the unpropitiousness of the circumstances frustrated great hopes and fulfilled the Pope's melancholy inscription on his tomb: "Oh, how much depends upon the time in which the work of even the best man falls!"

---

[15] A. Mercati, op. cit., 107f.

SECTION TWO

The Struggle over the Concept of Christian Freedom

CHAPTER 10

The Knights' War

Luther's message *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation on the Improvement of the Christian Estate* did not die out unheard. While the reformer had at this point taken up the complaints of the humanists and of the Free Knights and made himself the spokesman of national self-assertion against "the shameful and diabolical rule of the Romans" (*WA* VI, 415), conversely many people had become enthusiastic about Luther's religious message because they assured themselves it would mean the fulfillment of their economic, social, and political expectations. The revolt of the Free Knights in 1522–23 and the Peasants' War of 1524–25 indicated the connection of the religious movement with social and political currents.

The profound changes in the economic, social, and political situation at the beginning of the modern age had pushed the estate of the knights into the background. Its position was based on landed property and the feudal rights derived from it. The more a natural economy was replaced by a money economy, a person-oriented feudalism by the territorial and bureaucratic state, and the feudal levy by mercenaries with firearms and cannon, the more the knights, rendered militarily insignificant, were threatened with being crushed by the aspiring cities and princely power. On the other hand, they were no longer ready to support and represent the Empire. They shunned service and refused to pay the "common pfennig." They further undermined the authority of the Empire by violating the territorial peace. By means of private feuds and local conflicts they aimed to enhance their own power and wealth. They were in no way different from the cities and princes in exploiting the weakness of the central power for their own interests. Any of them who was unwilling to maintain himself in a state befitting his rank by more or less disguised brigandage and plundering expeditions had either to enter the service of a territorial prince or to try to raise himself to the position of a territorial prince. This last was possible almost exclusively at the expense of the ecclesiastical principalities. But their elimination meant a great loss for the nobility, which occupied virtually all the episcopal sees and canonicates in Germany. Hence by no means all the knights could be won for a "war on priests." Among those uninterested were extensive groups of Franconian knights who were variously related to ecclesiastical dignitaries.

Ulrich von Hutten (1488–1523) had publicized the "war on priests" since the end of 1520 from Ebernburg an der Nahe, where he had found asylum with Franz von Sickingen (1481–1523). It was not to end without "murderous struggle and the shedding of blood." From this time on Hutten wrote in German; he had his Latin dialogues published as "conversation booklets." His fiery and inspiring polemics gained him great influence over public opinion. But what continued to be literature to him became for Franz von Sickingen and other knights a disastrous and suicidal act.

Franz von Sickingen was born in 1481 at Ebernburg, the scion of a ministerial family of the Palatinate, which in 1488 became a direct imperial vassal. He claimed to have studied under Reuchlin. In 1504 he entered into his paternal inheritance and was successful in strengthening his position. He exploited mines and maintained a small force in his capacity as an official of the Palatinate and in the service of the Archbishop of Mainz. He distinguished himself from the robber knights of his day only through the style and the degree of his enterprises. Exploiting the situation of the Empire, he was able, in attacks on Worms, Metz, Frankfurt, Lorraine, and Hesse, to make himself a considerable political and financial power on the middle Rhine by means of extortion. Under the guise of the knightly ideals of the struggle for justice and the protection of the weak, he had the lower classes turn over to him their alleged and real legal titles and defended them with modern military means such as artillery and mercenaries.

Outlawed for breach of the territorial peace, he entered the service of France. But he was reconciled with Emperor Maximilian, advocated the election of Charles V, and in 1519 took part in the campaign against Ulrich of Württemberg. In this way he became friendly with Hutten and favored his national humanism. Accordingly he supported Reuchlin and forced the Dominicans of the upper Rhine to give way in the controversy with the great humanist. Von Sickingen's castles, as "inns of justice," became places of refuge for reformers such as Bucer, Oecolampadius, Aquila, and Schwebel. He espoused the cause of the Reformation in pamphlets such as *Sendbrieff zu Unterrichtung etlicher Artickel Christliches glaubens* (1522). But the religious question had little effect on him. He had as meager a grasp of the Lutheran doctrine of justification as Hutten had, much as they declared their desire to open a door to the Gospel. Instead they were influenced by the "struggle for German freedom and justice," as they understood it. At an assembly of knights at Landau on 13 August 1522 a "fraternal alliance" of the knights of the middle and upper Rhine, which also had connections with the Franconian nobility, elected von Sickingen their captain. Thereafter disputes were to be settled only by a special knights' court.

Thus assured, von Sickingen began preparations for a great raid against Richard von Greiffenklau, Archbishop of Trier. The challenge was issued on 27 August 1522, and the matter was at first a private affair. The archbishop was said to have designated two citizens of Trier to commit perjury and not to have paid the ransom agreed upon. But the chief reason alleged was that the Elector, as a partisan of Francis I of France, had, on the occasion of the imperial election, "acted against God, the imperial majesty, and the order and justice of the Holy Empire." Finally, the declaration of war spoke of the opening of the struggle as a campaign for the honor of Christ against the enemies and destroyers of the truth of the Gospel.

In the final analysis what was afoot was a grand-scale brigandage under the pretext of an appeal to ideals. The secularization of the archbishopric was supposed to enable von Sickingen to advance to princely status. But he was unable to mobilize groups of his own estate for this, and still less to separate the city of Trier from the archbishop. The promise to the archbishop's subjects to rescue them from the harsh anti-Christian law of priests and to conduct them to evangelical freedom did not prove very effective.

As a warrior, Richard von Greiffenklau was the equal of von Sickingen and knew how to make use of artillery at least as well as his opponent did. Von Sickingen captured Blieskastel and on 3 September 1522 the city of Sankt Wendel. His force is said to have consisted at that time of 600 cavalry and 7,000 infantry.[1] But he did not attempt to exploit his initial successes at once. While he was awaiting reinforcements the archbishop had time to put Trier into a state of defense and to mobilize defensive forces. When von Sickingen appeared before the city on 8 September he was unable to accomplish much and had to withdraw after an eight-day siege. The Archbishop of Trier, to whose aid the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector Palatine came by virtue of the "agreement" of Oberwesel (1519), could now proceed to the offensive. In April 1523 he undertook a punitive expedition against von Sickingen. The latter had to retire to his castle of Landstuhl, where he vainly waited for reinforcements and at length was forced to capitulate on 7 May. The victorious princes found him, mortally wounded, behind the shattered walls of the castle, and a few hours later he died of his injuries. Not real power but a skillful and unscrupulous exploitation of the entangled political situation had conducted von Sickingen to success, but when he ran into determined opposition before Trier, he failed miserably. His cause was thereby stripped of its prestige, and the collapse of the knightly estate became clear.

---

[1] *RA* III (Gotha 1901), no. 148, p. 802; K. H. Rendenbach, *Die Fehde von Sickingens gegen Trier* (Berlin 1933), pp. 59f.

In the summer of 1523 an army of the Swabian League under Baron Georg Truchsess von Waldburg took the field against the Franconian and Swabian knights to put an end to their brigandage and violations of the territorial peace. A cooperative defense by the knights did not materialize. The still bold and defiant resistance of individuals did not suffice when faced with superiority of numbers. In barely six weeks thirty-two castles were burned in the Odenwald and in Franconian Württemberg, and the knightly class was finished as a political force shaping the Empire. The winners were the territorial princes. Some of these saw in the Reformation a promoter of revolution, and this strengthened their will to fight against it.

CHAPTER 11

The "Fanatics" Karlstadt and Müntzer

Men like Melanchthon were so overshadowed by Luther that we are able only with difficulty to evaluate their personal achievement and their significance in the development and form of the Reformation. But there were others, such as Karlstadt and Müntzer, who so quickly ran afoul of Luther, and hence were isolated by him and turned into sectarians, that they were unable to develop and to make their full personal contribution to the reform movement. Neither of them was granted a long and consistent activity nor any possibility of lasting innovation. Only starting points can be examined and these allow no certain judgment. Furthermore, their image was, even in their lifetime, given a prejudiced stamp by the polemics of their opponents, notably Luther. The latter originated the word *Schwärmer,* "fanatics," for Karlstadt and Müntzer as well as for all factions which did not accord with his views, such as those of Zwingli and the Swiss. Only quite recently, and even today inadequately, has the trouble been taken to understand men such as Müntzer and Karlstadt from the basis of their own world of ideas. Thus the numerous works of Karlstadt, which, because they were frequently suppressed, have come down to us only in a few defective first printings, found no revised editions.[1]

Karlstadt

Andreas Rudolf Bodenstein was born around 1480 at Karlstadt am Main and is known by the name of his birthplace. He matriculated at Erfurt in 1499, but he was chiefly influenced not by Erfurt's nominalism but by the Thomism of Cologne, where he studied till the end of 1504. He then went to Wittenberg as a strict Thomist. He became a doctor of theology there in 1510 and was elected archdeacon of the Chapter of All Saints. He held lectures on Aristotle and Saint Thomas. In these he represented a scholastic position opposed to that of Martin Luther, who became doctor of theology in 1512 while Karlstadt was dean and was soon attracting attention by his lectures on the Psalms and Romans. In 1515 Karlstadt traveled to Italy and after a brief stay in Rome gained a doctorate of laws at Siena in 1516. He had thereby acquired the prerequisites for obtaining the provostship at Wittenberg.

From the beginning of 1517 he was preoccupied with Saint Augustine in preparation for a critical discussion of Luther's interpretation of that Father. Under the spell of Augustine's works, especially the anti-Pelagian writings, he became favorably inclined toward Luther. This is evident from Karlstadt's 151 theses on Augustine's theology of 26 April 1517, which were hailed by Luther as witnesses of the new theology (*WA, Br* 1, 94), and from his commentary on Augustine's *De spiritu et litera.* In the dedication to Johann Staupitz of 18 November 1517 Karlstadt relates that he had intended to forge from Augustine's works weapons against Luther, but he had been converted to the new theology.

> The truth thus revealed made me blush and filled me with awe at the same time. For I recognized that I had been made a fool of in a thousand scholastic theses—an ass at the mill, a blind man on the stone—that I had hitherto talked nonsense.[2]

In Karlstadt's commentary the most important question deals with justice and the fulfilling of the law. Of himself man cannot fulfill the law. Justice based on the law—that is, man's claim to fulfill the law by his own strength—is in the strict sense ungodliness, because man attributes to himself what is God's.[3] It is the function of the law to lay bare man's inability and to testify that man cannot become just by the law or his own free will, but "only through the help of the Spirit and through God's gift" (p. 70). The law thus proves our weakness and indicates him, Christ, from whom we must obtain through faith the ability to do what the law commands (p. 71).

---

[1] The list of printed works given by E. Freys and H. Barge (*ZblB,* 21 1904) cites sixty-eight writings in 156 printings. E. Hertzsch, *Karlstadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25* (Halle 1956f.) has edited eight of these.

[2] E. Kahler, *Karlstadt und Augustin* (Halle 1952), p. 5.

More so than Luther, Karlstadt sees justification as sanctification. Grace signifies a change affecting the whole man, qualifying him for good actions but for that very reason requiring of him also a strict moral conduct. If for Luther the tension between law and Gospel persisted and the law retained the function of disclosing and denouncing man's sin, Karlstadt did not rest content with the opposition of spirit and world, which he felt deeply, but taught, in conjunction with Augustine, that grace enables us to love and to fulfill the law.[4] Grace turns the hearer into a doer of the law. In grace, which is identified with love, Christ gives himself to us and through the Holy Spirit effects good works in us. "Christ himself makes us act; he himself makes his work our good works" (p. 18). The justice bestowed on us is only a deposit; we must take further pains with it.[5] In this life it does not acquire full perfection, and hence no man is without sin.[6]

Like law and grace, Scripture and the spirit are oriented to each other. If the law without grace is dead, and in fact brings death, then the letter is dead without the life-giving spirit (p. 34). Christ must enlighten the inner man for a right understanding of the external word. "Thus we direct our ears to the preacher and our eyes to the letters, but our heart only to God, creator of heaven and earth, who from within, as the true word, first breathes life into all works and touches the heart" (p. 27). It is incorrect to see in these Augustinian ideas a "devaluation of the external, the preached word."[7] The nominalist Luther was in more danger of undervaluing the external or of representing it as insignificant than Karlstadt was.

The profound difference between the two men was not apparent at first. Karlstadt's theses of May 1518, a confrontation with Eck's *Obelisci,* maintained the scriptural principle and the fallibility of a general council. They and the Leipzig Disputation, for which the theses were responsible, made the two Wittenberg professors appear in the eyes of the public as fighters for the same cause. Karlstadt was above all concerned about the relationship of divine grace and the human will. How little he undervalued the external word of Holy Scripture is made clear in his *De canonicis scripturis* of August 1520,[8] in which he opposed the rejection of the Epistle of James and insisted that sympathy or antipathy is no criterion for the evaluation of Scripture. He thereby criticized Luther, but not by name. For Karlstadt the authority of the canonical Scripture is absolute, standing above every human authority, papal and episcopal included.

---

[3] "Illa iustitia est proprie impietas, qua sibi tribuit homo, quod dei est" (ibid., p. 70).

[4] Thesis 85 of 26 April 1517: "Gratia facit nos legis dilectores et factores."

[5] "Nam facere iusticiam est incipere facere, est tendere ad iusticiam et operari" (E. Kahler, op. cit, p. 30).

[6] ". . . nullum hominem hic viventem inveniri sine peccato, hoc est, perfectam et ex omni parte absolutam iusticiam facere . . . non erit hic vita sine peccato, non erit hic ex omni parte absoluta iusticia" (ibid., p. 21).

[7] This is E. Kahler's interpretation (op. cit., p. 41). E. Wolf, "Gesetz und Evangelium in Luthers Auseinandersetzung mit den Schwärmern," *EvTh* 5 (1938), 96–109, sees here "the separating of letter and spirit as the principle of scriptural exegesis" (p. 103). Karlstadt "has no confidence in the word of God" (p. 105).

When Johannes Eck added Karlstadt's name in the Bull "Exsurge Domine," threatening excommunication, Karlstadt replied with an "appeal"[9] to the general council. He made crystal clear his break with the Church in his treatise *Von päpstlicher Heiligkeit.*[10]

> If I preach the liberty of Christ to the laity, your excommunication and your malediction must be for me a refreshing dew . . . . All Christians are priests, for they are built on the rock which makes them priests. Christ is that specially chosen rock . . . . Hence it follows that faith in Christ makes all believers priests or pastors and that priests receive nothing new when they are ordained but are only chosen for the office and the ministry.[11]

Karlstadt spent May and June 1521 in Denmark as adviser to King Christian II in the latter's Reformation or, more correctly, in his legislative work against the clergy. But after the Edict of Worms he was no longer welcome at the court of the Dane, who was a brother-in-law of Charles V. When Karlstadt returned to Wittenberg in mid-June, Luther was at the Wartburg. Thus Karlstadt automatically moved more prominently into the foreground. In his treatise on the Eucharist, *Von den Emphahern, Zeichen, und Zusag des heiligen Sakramentes, Fleisch und Blut Christi*[12] he is more moderate than Luther. He does not yet demand the chalice for the laity and quite naturally maintains the real presence. On the other hand, he goes further in the attack on religious vows and celibacy.[13] In dispute at Wittenberg over the conformity of the liturgy with Scripture, he maintains in contrast to Luther that private Masses are permissible in case of need. In any case they are to be preferred to a public Mass without communion under both species. Now Karlstadt held that "one who takes only the bread commits sin"[14] and, unlike Luther, did not allow communion under one species. Luther, however, saw unlawfulness in the Mass celebrated privately (*WA, Br* 2, 395) and wrote to Melanchthon on 1 August 1521: "I will never again celebrate a private Mass" (*WA, Br* 2, 372). It was not Karlstadt but Gabriel Zwilling and the Augustinians who took the initiative in introducing the reformed liturgy. Partly out of regard for Frederick the Wise, Karlstadt was more hesitant. He, much more than Luther, pressed for the practical consequences of the reform doctrines and the abolition of everything that in his view was opposed to the Gospel. To him, a realist, it was not possible, as it was to the nominalist Luther, to leave dialectical propositions unreconciled. He urged solutions, syntheses, and consequences, and on this are founded his rationalism as well as his mystical thinking.

---

[8] Freys-Barge, nos. 34f.

[9] 19 October 1522; Freys-Barge, no. 45.

[10] 17 October 1520; Freys-Barge, no. 44.

[11] H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt* (Leipzig 1905), I, 234.

[12] 24 June 1521; Freys-Barge, nos. 54–58.

[13] "Von Gelübden Unterrichtung" (1521; Freys-Barge, nos. 50–53); "Super coelibatu, monachatu et viduitate axiomata" (1521; Freys-Barge, nos. 59–62).

Karlstadt intended, however, to realize his concept of a congregational Christianity quietly and with the cooperation of the city council. At a disputation on 17 October 1521, in which Karlstadt rejected transubstantiation while demanding the adoration of the sacramental bread, and allowing private Masses in case of necessity, for the sake of communion under both species, Melanchthon impetuously demanded: "Somebody has to make a start; otherwise nothing will happen." Karlstadt retorted: "Indeed, but without any tumult and without providing opponents with an opportunity for slander."[15]

Toward the close of the year he let himself be more and more driven to a change of liturgy by the turbulent pressure of radical elements in the population. Thus, disregarding the elector's regulations, on Christmas 1521 he celebrated the first "German Mass," a Mass with the account of the institution of the Eucharist in German and with communion under both species. He rejected liturgical vestments and let the laity touch with their hands the Eucharistic bread and the chalice to demonstrate that there was no need of a priestly class and that the laity are ministers of the liturgy. On 19 January 1522, in the presence of a group of professors and of Wittenberg councilors, he solemnized his marriage. He had a decisive influence on the Wittenberg city ordinance of 24 January 1522, and vigorously demanded the removal of images by the city council, thinking thus to forestall an iconoclastic outbreak. But in fact through this pamphlet and his sermons he fostered radicalism in Wittenberg. When the electoral councilor Einsiedel called upon him for moderation, he expressly protested against the accusation of insurrection. "I pride myself on hating and shunning insurrection. God grant that my detractors do not in time stir up revolt, which will accomplish no good. I forbid revolt."[16]

---

[14] Thesis 10 of 19 July 1521; cf. E. Hertzsch, *Karlstadts Schriften,* p. 13; H. Barge, I, 290.

[15] H. Barge, I, 323.

Thinking that he had acted in accord with Luther, Karlstadt was deeply hurt by Luther's harsh criticism of him as a fanatic and author of disturbance. The pulpit was denied him (*WA, Br* 2, 478), as was any relationship with the community. A treatise in which he defended those of his reforms that Luther had annulled was censured by the university. This and the measures of restoration taken by Luther, the "neopapist," led to a deeper alienation and hastened Karlstadt's own development, which deviated ever more from the path of the Lutheran Reformation. His unpleasant experiences with his colleagues at the university strengthened his anticultural tendencies, which had been becoming more evident since the beginning of 1523. Condemning the new scriptural scholarship and its dogmatic posturing, he turned more and more to the laity, drawing the ultimate consequences of Luther's teaching on the universal priesthood. He stressed the laity's obligation to read the Bible and their right to interpret it. In *Eine Frage, ob auch jemand möge selig werden ohne die Fürbitte Mariens*[17] he would soon advocate the opinion that many craftsmen were more proficient in theology than priests. Once a prelate of high rank and an intellectually proud professor, thereafter he would live, without academic title or official dress, as "a new layman," like the peasants.

Physically too he took his leave of Wittenberg, taking personal charge in the summer of 1523 of the parish of Orlamünde, the revenues of which he drew as archdeacon of the All Saints collegiate chapter. Here he introduced the changes in the liturgy that had been annulled at Wittenberg, enriched the church singing with German translations of psalms, and preached daily to a great concourse of people.

In contrast to Luther, who attributed no importance to external form and regarded it as *adiaphoron,* Karlstadt felt compelled to press for the changing of what he regarded as wrong practices—expressions, ceremonies, images—because they seduced the people. "Not for my sake but for the sake of the sick and the weak, who are misled by such words and prevented from making progress and coming to God."[18] To wait in this matter, as Luther wanted to do, until the inner judgment was sound would be like letting a child play with a sharp knife until he is intelligent enough to put it aside on his own. "We should take such dangerous things especially from the weak and snatch them out of their hands and pay no attention if they weep, scream, or curse."[19]

---

[16] Letter of 4 February 1522, to Hugo von Einsiedel; cf. N. Müller, p. 181.

[17] 27 July 1523; Freys-Barge, nos. 106–109.

[18] "Dialogus oder ein gesprech-büchlein" (1524); Hertzsch, op. cit., II, 11.

In Karlstadt's numerous treatises from this period the attack on infant baptism and on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist are still in the background. To him it is far more urgent to introduce into his community—through thoughts of mysticism—union with the divine will, the "supreme virtue of composure," inner recollection and sanctification. These are the conditions *sine qua non* for being filled with God, a condition granted to the individual by means of divine illumination in conjunction with the word of Scripture.

> It is, of course, totally impossible that one should become God's friend or son without God's inner and secret revelation. It is equally impossible for one to accept God's external word and consider . . . it a word of the Bridegroom, unless God reveals himself previously or simultaneously in the external hearing with his bright and luminous ray so that one can hear who God is and what he wants.[20]

Karlstadt became the center of a religious movement that was not confined to Orlamünde. This gave the circles at Wittenberg no rest. In March 1524 the university called upon Karlstadt to fulfill his duties as archdeacon and professor and hence to return to Wittenberg. Luther pressed for a prohibition of his writings if he did not submit to the university's censorship. When the petitions and requests of Karlstadt and of the Orlamünde congregation, which claimed the right to choose its priest, were denied, Karlstadt renounced his office as pastor of Orlamünde and resigned the archdeaconry, because he could not reconcile any further celebrating of Mass with his conscience.[21]

In spite of this isolation by the Wittenberg circles, however, Karlstadt did not allow himself to be enticed by Müntzer to join the league for the annihilation of the godless. As early as 1522 he had urged moderation on Müntzer,[22] and now he expressly renounced any connection with him. Such alliances, he said, were contrary to the will of God, in whom alone one must place one's hope.[23] Similar ideas were expressed in the open letter sent by the people of Orlamünde to those of Allstedt.[24] But this decisive withdrawal from Müntzer and the latter's efforts to restore the order of the Gospel by force if necessary did not save Karlstadt from the accusation of sedition. Luther denied to the people of Orlamünde the right of free election of their priest, a right which he himself had proclaimed.[25] He saw them infected by the fanaticism of Allstedt. Hence the *Letter to the Princes of Saxony* of July 1524 (*WA* 15, 210–221), in which Luther asked them to take steps and to forestall insurrection, although directed expressly against Müntzer also included Karlstadt by implication.

---

[19] "Ob man gemach faren und des ergernüssen der schwachen verschonen soll" (1524); Hertzsch, op. cit., I 88.

[20] ". . . wie sich der glaub und unglaub gegen dem licht und finsternis . . . halten" (1524), fol. B4.

[21] *ARG* 11 (1914), 70f.

[22] *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel,* ed. H. Böhmer–P. Kirn (Leipzig 1931), p. 39.

[23] Ibid., p. 69.

On 22 August 1524 Luther preached at Jena against the "Karlstadt fanaticism." Karlstadt was present and in the afternoon, in a conference with Luther, he explicitly protested against being identified with the "Allstedt spirit": "You do me violence and injustice in putting me with that murderous spirit. I solemnly declare before all these brethren that I have nothing to do with the spirit of revolt" (*WA* 15, 236). But he was unable to dissipate Luther's distrust. Even less suited to this purpose was the heated dispute which the people of Orlamünde had with the reformer two days later. Luther convinced the princes of the danger of mob spirit (*WA* 18, 86; 99), and on 18 September 1524, Karlstadt, with his family, was expelled from electoral Saxony.

He sought refuge in South Germany, but more than once had to move again. He went, among other places, to Strasbourg and Basel and finally, toward the end of December 1527, to Rothenburg ob der Tauber. In these troubled weeks and despite severe privations, he published eight works, including five treatises on communion. They had probably been partly written, or at least begun, in Orlamünde, but Karlstadt did not publish them until after his expulsion from Saxony. Hence they could not have been used as the alleged reason for his banishment.

Notwithstanding his numerous works on this subject, Karlstadt provides us with no coherent exposition of his teaching on the Eucharist. The reason for this is probably to be found in his restless ways and the adverse circumstances under which the treatises originated. In them he clearly and definitely denies the real presence, but the point of departure in this is not his understanding of the account of the institution of the Eucharist. His curious explanation of "this is my body" is secondary and does not play in his writings the role that could be expected, according to the literature. If for Luther the Mass is a derogation from the

---

[24] Ibid., p. 88.

[25] "Dass eine christliche Versammlung oder Gemeine Recht und Macht habe, alle Lehre zu erteilen und Lehrer zu berufen, ein- und abzusetzen" (1523) (*WA* 11, 408–416).

Cross of Christ, so for Karlstadt the bodily presence in the Sacrament is also. The Lord's promise to give us his body is a reference to his sufferings and death on the Cross. Here, and not in the Sacrament, occurs the remission of sins. If this were to refer to Christ in his glorified body, the clear relationship with his sacrificial death would disappear. In Karlstadt's view, there are only two modes of Christ's presence—the historical bloody form on the Cross and the glorified form in the splendors of heaven. Christ remains corporally in heaven "until he comes" at the end of time. Karlstadt cannot accept a mysterious descent into the bread: "There are no more than two advents—one in the form of the Cross and Passion here on earth, the other in glory. You must not invent a third, and you cannot add either of the two others to the Host."[26]

Because Karlstadt does not accept a sacramental presence and can understand the real presence of Christ's body only locally, he has to deny the real presence unless he is willing to admit that Christ abandons heaven or is omnipresent in the sense of Luther's doctrine of ubiquity. It now remained to bring this conviction of his—a sort of theological *a priori*—into harmony with the testimony of Scripture. This led to the contrived explanation, greatly ridiculed by Luther, that with the *touto* of the words of institution Christ pointed to the body in which he was present to the disciples.

> I have always reckoned that Christ pointed to his own body and hence said: This is that body of mine, which is given for you. For Christ did not point to the bread, and he did not say: This bread is my body, which is sacrificed for you. But they who say that the bread is the body speak on their own authority . . . . Listen: Jesus took the bread and gave thanks to God and broke it and gave it to his disciples and said that they should eat it in remembrance of him and placed directly in his word the cause and mode of the remembrance of him. That is, for the sake of a remembrance and hence that his disciples should recall that he surrendered his body for them.[27] Christ's body is not in the bread and his blood is not in the chalice. But we must eat the Lord's body in the remembrance or acknowledgment of his body, which he gave into the hands of the unjust for our sake, and drink from the chalice in the recognition of his blood, which Christ shed for us—in other words, we eat and drink in acknowledgment of Christ's death.[28]

Karlstadt's writings produced loud reverberations and were widely accepted. It was learned with alarm at Wittenberg that the banishment of the fanatic from Saxony had in no way silenced him; in fact, in southwestern Germany and in Switzerland he was now even better known and esteemed. "You will not believe," wrote Luther to Wolfgang Stein on 11 October 1524, "how that man Karlstadt is succeeding in Switzerland, Prussia, Bohemia, and everywhere and is seeking a nest" (*WA, Br* 3, 456).

---

[26] E. Hertzsch, op. cit., II, 42.

[27] "Dialogus" (Hertzsch, op. cit., II, 17).

[28] Ibid., II, 49.

Luther took a position against Karstadt in his *Brief an die Christen zu Strassburg wider den Schwärmergeist* of December 1524 (*WA* 15, 391–397). In it he admits how difficult a struggle it was for him to accept belief in the real presence.

> I confess that if Doctor Karlstadt or anyone else had said to me five years ago that there is nothing but bread and wine in the Sacrament, he would have done me a great service. I have truly endured such severe temptations in this question, struggled and wrestled with myself, that I would have been glad to be out of it, for I realized that thereby I could have given the papacy the greatest blow . . . . But I am held captive, I cannot escape. The text is too powerfully present and cannot be driven from the mind by words. [*WA* 15, 394, 12–20]

In *Wider die himmlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sakrament* (*WA* 18, 62–214) he provided a detailed refutation. The first part was in print in December 1524. It attacks the new law of Karlstadt, his iconoclasm, his attitude toward authority, and his disregard of the external word. Luther castigates the spirit which can do nothing but "create more and more law, misery, conscience, and sin" (*WA* 18, 123). Karlstadt "makes for himself his own Moses" and "his own Christ" (*WA* 18, 117), just like the Pope, except that "the pope does so by precept, Doctor Karlstadt by prohibition." The Pope "compels and constrains one to do what is not commanded nor forced by God." Karlstadt "prevents and hinders one from allowing what is not forbidden nor hindered by God" (*WA* 18, 111). "But Christian freedom perishes just as readily when it must give up what is not forbidden as when it is forced to do what it is not obliged to do" (*WA* 18, 111).

Luther furthermore attacks the disparagement of the external word as opposed to the "spirit," of which one becomes aware in an "inner experience" and to which Scripture is only a confirmation. In the *Dialogus* Karlstadt had had the layman say: "For my part I would need no external evidence. I wish to have my evidence from the spirit in my inner self."[29] In the second part of *Wider die himmlischen Propheten,* which appeared at the end of January 1525, Luther discusses the doctrine of the Eucharist in detail. He first of all stresses that, according to God's arrangement, the "external details," the "word of the Gospel given by the tongue" and the "material signs, such as baptism and the Eucharist," precede the imparting of the inner spirit. God "will give to no one either spirit or faith without the external word and sign" (*WA* 18, 136). Karlstadt, the mob agitator, casts it scornfully and mockingly to the winds and "wishes first to enter into the Spirit" (*WA* 18, 136). Luther wishes "to take the words simply as they are . . . and let the bread be the body of Christ" (*WA* 18, 147). Despite all his attempts at interpreting the words of institution, especially in regard to *touto,* Karlstadt is unable to quote a single scriptural text supporting his theory, but all the more he indulges reason, the "arch-whore and bride of the devil" (*WA* 18, 164). When he quotes Scripture, he wishes "not to honor the word of God with faith or to accept it according to the plain manner of speech, but to measure and master it with sophistical reasoning and pointed subtlety" (*WA* 18, 186f.). He shifts the center of gravity from word and Sacrament to the subject—to the remembering and proclaiming of Christ's death on the Cross. He thereby makes "what Christ promised a command and sets up a work in place of faith" (*WA* 18, 196). "But it is still worse and more insane that he attributes to such a memorial the power to justify as faith does," whereas "they who preach and proclaim must first be justified" (*WA* 18, 197f.).

---

[29] Ibid., II, 18.

Luther's words were unusually cutting. Throughout, Karlstadt is called an agitator who "stirs up the crazy mob," a fool or a lying spirit, even a prophet of the devil (*WA* 18, 152; 193; 142).

When the Peasants' War broke out in March 1525, Karlstadt was living at Rothenburg. Now, as before, he did not take part in the social-political disputes, but this did not prevent his being branded even more a fanatic, an iconoclast, an agitator, a murderer of souls, a sinful spirit. This extraordinary acidity in Luther's polemics greatly shocked many contemporaries, including Melanchthon, but especially all who had hitherto regarded Karlstadt as a partisan of the Wittenberg circle. People sided with Karlstadt at Strasbourg and in Switzerland, and he defended himself in three works. In these he sought to shore up his idea of the Eucharist, but otherwise he stressed a practical Christianity which had to produce the fruits of freedom and justice in good works. Caught between the two sides in the Peasants' War—"the ecclesiastical lords hunted me as game, the peasants . . . would have devoured me"[30]—Karlstadt had to leave Rothenburg on 30 or 31 May. He went to his mother in Karlstadt am Main but found no peace there and at last, crushed in spirit, he asked Luther from Frankfurt on 12 June 1525 to obtain from the elector permission for him to return to Saxony. He intended "for the future not to write, preach, or teach any more" (*WA, Br* 3, 529). In his *Entschuldigung des falschen Namens des Aufruhrs* he again protested against the accusation of being an agitator. "In brief, I know that I am innocent of any share in Müntzer's revolt."[31] And in the *Erklärung wie Karlstadt seine Lehre von dem hochwürdigen . . . achtet und geachtet haben will* he maintained that in his writings on the Eucharist he aimed to question rather than to assert and that he was open to further correction.

---

[30] Ibid., II, 117.

Luther was satisfied with this virtual recantation and, happy "to purchase his silence by such a favor and mercy so that he might not cause more distress elsewhere through vengeance or final despair" (*WA, Br* 3, 572), he recommended that the elector allow Karlstadt to take up residence at Kemberg or in a nearby village. Thus Karlstadt managed to support himself as farmer and shopkeeper, wretchedly and under supervision, first at Segrehna, then at Bergwitz, and finally at Kemberg, until in the spring of 1529 he escaped the increasing spiritual constraint by flight to further misery. Via Holstein, East Friesland, Strasbourg, and Basel he went in May 1530 to Zwingli in Zurich. Here he supported himself as a proofreader in a print shop and then as deacon at the hospital. At the end of 1531 he obtained a pastorate at Altstätten in the Rheintal, but after Zwingli's death he had to give it up. He again sought refuge in Zurich until in June 1534 he at last found his final field of activity as preacher and professor in Basel. On 14 April 1534, Bullinger, preacher at the Grossmünster in Zurich, wrote to his friend Myconius at Basel; "You need have no fear that that man is such as Luther has described him. He is very good-natured, modest, humble, and in every respect irreproachable."[32] In contrast to his earlier hostility to scholarship and titles, at Basel Karlstadt again fostered the traditional disputations and obtaining of degrees. In other ways also, happy to have found an asylum after so much persecution and privation, in the service of the Swiss Reformed Church he seems to have given up "trying to impose his own earlier personal convictions."[33] He died of the plague at Basel on 24 December 1541.

Karlstadt was among the first who had to experience how severely Luther and the reformers, who appealed to their own consciences and their own understanding of Scripture, would proceed against those who made the same claim for themselves. With direct reference to Karlstadt and Müntzer, Luther had said that they should be confidently allowed to preach, for there had to be sects and the word of God had to be on the battlefield and fight there.

---

[31] Ibid., II, 112; *WA*, 18, 440.

[32] Hertzsch, I, XVI.

[33] Barge; *RE* X, 80.

> Let the spirits confront and strike one another . . . for we who carry the word of God should not fight with the fist. . . . Our function is to preach and to endure, not to strike with fists and to defend ourselves [*WA* 15, 219].

How little prepared he was to live according to these precepts is clear from his attitude toward Karlstadt. It is true that formally Luther was consistent, since he had the princes use force against him, not because of his preaching but because of his "insurrection." But what does that amount to when one who maintained a different interpretation of the Gospel was branded as a fanatic and an agitator and thereby handed over to the secular authority for punishment?

Thomas Müntzer

Luther's opposition to Thomas Müntzer was even more bitter and more fundamental. Müntzer was from Stolberg in the Harz Mountains, but details of his youth are lacking. If, with H. Boehmer, we assume that ordinarily young men who were not well off matriculated only when they had reached the minimum age of about seventeen, required for the baccalaureate, then Müntzer's birth must be assigned to 1488 or 1489. For a Thomas Müntzer from Quedlinburg was enrolled at Leipzig on 16 October 1506, and we know that Müntzer's family lived in Quedlinburg. As late as 1512 we find him a student at Frankfurt an der Oder. Obviously his studies were unusually prolonged, but the reasons are unknown. In any event, Müntzer acquired an education that was superior to the ordinary student's. He was well read in the Church Fathers, the mystics, Joachim of Fiore, and, above all, Holy Scripture, for the sake of which he studied Greek and Hebrew. In letters he is addressed as master of arts and bachelor of theology. He was a priest of the diocese of Halberstadt[34] and before 1513 an assistant in Aschersleben and Halle; as such he took part in an "alliance" against Archbishop Ernst (1476–1513) of Magdeburg and Halberstadt, a brother of Frederick the Wise. Later (in 1516) he was a prior at the convent in Forse. He was staying at Leipzig in 1519 and perhaps met Luther on the occasion of the disputation. From the end of that year he was confessor at the convent of Beuditz, east of Naumburg. Here he had a slender income but much leisure for study. He occupied himself with Augustine, Tauler, Suso, Eusebius, and other writers and provided himself with the acts of the Councils of Constance and Basel.

---

[34] On 6 May 1514 the council of Altstadt Braunschweig presented "Thomam Munther Halber [stadensis] dyocesis presbiterum" for an altar benefice in Sankt Michaelskirche. Cf. *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel,* appendix no. 1, p. 129.

In May 1520, on Luther's recommendation, Müntzer became vicar of the pastor Johann Sylvius Egranus at Sankt-Marien in Zwickau, and, when the pastor returned, he accepted the small Katharinenkirche in the same town, with a congregation of craftsmen and miners. A zealous and vehement preacher, filled with prophetic self-assurance and a mysticism of the Cross,[35] he came into conflict with the Franciscans. In the autumn he began to be influenced by Nikolaus Storch and the Zwickau prophets. His language became even more radical in his dealings with these spiritualist and Taborite circles, and he did not shrink from personal attacks, above all on the Erasmian Egranus, pastor of the main parish church.[36]

Müntzer disregarded a summons to appear before the bishop's *officialis* at Zeitz. Eventually the elector's local agent and the council intervened and deposed him on 16 April 1521. Müntzer fled the same night. His subsequent wanderings brought him several times to Bohemia. He preached at Prague and tried to gain adherents by means of a proclamation, the Prague Manifesto of 1 November 1521. This document provides our first concrete hold on his views. It is extant in four versions—two in German, one in Czech, one in Latin. The vernacular versions are especially oriented to the needs and desires of the common people.[37] Müntzer emphasizes the necessity of the sevenfold Holy Spirit, especially the Spirit of the fear of the Lord, for the exercise of faith. Without the Spirit we can neither hear nor recognize God. He fits the parts to the whole. Preachers who offer only the "cold" and the "naked" Scripture are thieves and robbers. They "steal the word of God from their neighbor's mouth" (140; 155). The priests give the people only the "dead words of Scripture" and "the sheep do not know that they should hear the living voice of God, that they should all have revelations" (147). For

> the hearts of men are the paper or parchment on which God, with his finger rather than with ink, inscribes his unchangeable will and eternal wisdom. Any man can read this writing, if he has a reason that is in any way developed [140].

---

[35] On 13 July 1520 he wrote to Luther: ". . . omnia propter Christum meum sunt mihi gratissima, graviora certamina mihi restant . . . Crux mea nondum integra . . . Opus meum non ago, sed Domini" (*WA*, *Br* 2, 140f.).

[36] Agricola then (before April 1521) wrote to Müntzer: ". . . Significaverunt nobis certe ii, qui tibi optime volunt, te abuti officio verbi. . . . Te nihil spirare nisi caedes et sanguinem" (*Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel*, no. 21, p. 21).

[37] *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel*, appendix no. 6, A-D, pp. 139–159.

The true preacher should, according to First Corinthians 14, "have revelations, for otherwise he cannot preach the word" (141). God has not ceased to speak. Man must hear the word as now uttered by God and not as a historical report.

If the Church has been made a whore by scholars and priests, now, since God is separating the wheat from the weeds and has appointed Müntzer over the harvest, the "new, apostolic Church" is to begin, first in Bohemia and then everywhere else (150), a church, not of "priests and apes" (*Pfaffen und Affen*), but "of the elect friends of God," who learn to prophesy and thus "truly experience how friendly, in fact cordially, God delights to speak with all his elect" (142). The stressing of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, of the "living Spirit," the tension between the dead letter and the living and timely word of God, the summons to the carrying out of his demanding will, the doctrine of the Church of the elect, which is separated from the godless, and, finally, Müntzer's conviction of being the instrument of God's judgment—such are the special marks of this Prague Manifesto.

Müntzer did not find the anticipated reaction in Bohemia, and the ensuing difficult period up to the spring of 1523 is obscure. Müntzer stayed in his native Central Germany and seems, as can be inferred from a remark by Luther (*WA* 38, 213) and one of Müntzer's letters of 9 March 1523, to have been in the service of a convent at Halle.[38] He interpreted his sufferings and bitter poverty as a sign of election. Thus he wrote to his followers on 19 March 1523:

> In such tribulation the depths of the soul are cleansed. . . . No one can find God's mercy; he must be forsaken, as Isaiah 28:19 and 54:7 clearly says. . . . The Spirit cannot be given to any except the disconsolate [John 16:7]. Therefore, let my sufferings be equal to yours. Let all the weeds spring up as they wish; they must submit to the flail with the pure wheat. Accordingly, the living God is sharpening his scythe within me so that later I can cut the red poppies and the little blue flowers.[39]

The mystical self-annihilation leads to communion with God, which will in turn transform man's cause into God's cause.

At Easter of 1523 Müntzer was tentatively made pastor of the Johanniskirche at Allstedt, a small town of craftsmen and farmers. Here at Allstedt, where he gained the confidence of Johann Zeys, the official agent of the elector, and of the former pastor, he was able for the first time to carry out his ideas. His peaceful outlook and his pressing pastoral concern are evident in his letter to the "brethren at Stolberg," in which he represents suffering and poverty in the Spirit as the prerequisite of the rule of Christ, as well as in his regulation of worship. In the "Deutsch Kirchenamt"—Matins, Lauds, and Vespers—and in the "Deutsch Evangelisch Messe" he created the first completely German liturgy, and in the "Ordnung und Berechnung des Deutschen Amtes zu Allstedt" he provided its theoretical justification. Müntzer intended to foster an intelligible liturgy in keeping with Scripture and thereby to serve the "deliverance of the poor, wretched, blind consciences of men." As the subject of the liturgy, the congregation must actively participate in it. Müntzer equaled Luther in linguistic content and surpassed him in fidelity to liturgical tradition and in a grasp of the religious needs of simple folk. With this emphatically pastoral attitude the "fanatic" Müntzer, like Karlstadt, was much more concerned about formal worship than Luther was. Luther was inspired by him to compose his hymns. Rendered self-sufficient as pastor at Allstedt, Müntzer ceased to court Wittenberg and even sharply criticized Luther and his friends for their hesitation about translating the liturgy into German. "They fear for their own skins and yet want to be preachers of faith and of the Gospel."[40]

---

[38] O. Schiff in *ARG* 23 (1926), 287–293.

[39] *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel,* no. 38, p. 40.

In two doctrinal treatises at the end of 1523, *Von dem getichten Glauben* and *Protestation . . . Von dem rechtem Christenglauben und der Taufe,* Müntzer publicly declared war on Luther. In the *Protestation* he took up the problem of baptism for the first time, warning against overestimating the "external baptism." Nowhere, he said, do we read that Mary or the disciples of Christ were baptized with water. In John 3:5 and throughout the fourth Gospel, water is to be understood as the "movement of the Spirit," which effects the inner, true, and absolutely necessary baptism. The demand for adult baptism is not contained in this train of thought, and Luther and Melanchthon were wrong in making Müntzer the author of Anabaptism. He never practiced rebaptism, which came into use in Zurich only in 1525. Next to Tauler's mysticism of suffering, the spiritualist and chiliastic doctrines of Joachim of Fiore were Müntzer's sources: "The testimony of Abbot Joachim carries great weight with me" (*Von dem getichten Glauben*).

Müntzer was profoundly convinced that faith must prove itself in testimony before the world and that the Christian bears an active responsibility for the world and the fate of his neighbor. For him there was no division into two sides as there was for Luther. The will of God demanded an immediate and absolute realization in all spheres. But Müntzer still thought that the goal could be achieved by peaceful means, especially by the preaching of the word of God. His first conflict with the political authorities did not originate in sociopolitical misunderstandings but because the Count of Mansfeld forbade his subjects to attend Müntzer's "heretical" Mass. From the pulpit Müntzer denounced him as a scoundrel and bloodsucker and in a statement of 22 September 1523,[41] which he signed as "destroyer of unbelievers." he reaffirmed his stand. The count was presuming to forbid the holy Gospel. "You should know that in such mighty and righteous matters I do not fear even the whole world." Even if Müntzer threatened, "do not snap, for otherwise the old garment will tear," he was still in no way presenting the picture of a rebel against the social order but that of a zealous man of God concerned about the irrevocable claims of the Gospel.

---

[40] E. Sehling, *Die evgl. Kirchenordnungen* 1 (Leipzig 1902), 499.

His "Sermon to the Princes," delivered at the Castle of Allstedt on 13 July 1524 in the presence of Frederick the Wise's brother, Duke Johann of Saxony, and the latter's son and heir, Prince Johann Friedrich, shows how unrevolutionary Müntzer was at the outset and how much he still hoped to achieve his goal along with the princes.[42] In it the Kingdom of God is no purely eschatological thing and the princes are not "heathen folk" with merely secular duties; rather, the Kingdom of God is to be realized in this world and time, if necessary by the sword of princes. The proved, unlettered faith of the elect cannot be established alongside the order of the world; it must create a new reality in human society. This is true especially of princes. The sword bestowed by God upon authority has no mere function of warding off or punishing evildoers but a positive, constructive task. The true ruler must take hold of authority by the roots.[43] Like the simple believer, the prince who supports the Gospel must also endure a "great cross and great tribulation." For the cross is the mark of the Christian and the pledge of victory. But if princes refuse to use their sword on behalf of the pious elect against the evil, then "the sword will be taken from them and given to the fervent people for the destruction of the godless."[44]

Even after this sermon, when Müntzer was still uncertain of the princes' reaction to his words, he sought to achieve his aims with them. He invited them to join the divine covenant with the people: "A contractual league, that is, regulated by agreed terms, must be made in such a form that the common man may join himself to the pious rulers for the sake of the Gospel alone."[45] Müntzer decried a social misconception of the sins of the league, as though there were a question of material relief.

---

[41] *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel,* no. 44, pp. 47f.

[42] C. Hinrichs, *Thomas Müntzers Politische Schriften* (Halle 1950), pp. 5–28.

[43] Ibid., p. 24.

[44] Letter of 4 October 1523 to Frederick the Wise, *Briefwechsel,* no. 45, p. 50; cf. "Auslegung," *Politische Schriften,* p. 26.

Meanwhile, at the end of July Luther wrote his *Brief an die Fürsten zu Sachsen von dem aufrührerischen Geist* (*WA* 15, 210–221), in which he branded Müntzer as Satan and asked the princes "to check disorder and forestall revolution." He accused Müntzer of cowardice for having declined a hearing "in the corner," that is, before Luther at Wittenberg. Even after Müntzer had been questioned at Weimar on 1 August after the Allstedt council had abandoned him and his league and his printing press had been forbidden, he still thought at that time of a legal course with the princes, as is evident from his letter of 3 August 1524 to Frederick the Wise. But it soon became clear to him that the territorial authority had rejected him. He was unwilling to accept the fate of sitting down and awaiting their judgment like a dumb animal. And so, on the night of 7–8 August, he secretly left the city and went to Mühlhausen.

But even the *Ausgedrückte Entblössung des falschen Glaubens,* printed at Nürnberg in October, which was a more radical version of the interpretation of the first chapter of Luke submitted to the prince at Weimar on 1 August, shows that for Müntzer not the social question but the religious quest for the true faith was absolutely predominant. Faith implies power to do the impossible. Before it can be achieved, the godless must be hurled from the seat of judgment and man must be made empty by suffering and the cross. Only then can the "power of the Most High" come upon him and the Holy Spirit overshadow him. Holy Scripture confirms faith and from it the road to faith is learned. But faith remains a "matter of letters" and does not become an actual, experienced faith so long as there is no contact with the always and eternally acting spirit. The "godless scriptural scholars" comport themselves "according to Scripture without the spirit of Scripture"; they "make Scripture a shameful cover which impedes the true nature of Christian faith." They would like "to bring the witness of the Spirit of Jesus to the university" and, by means of their monopoly of scriptural exegesis, keep the people dependent "with their stolen Scripture."

Thus for Müntzer the proud who must be toppled from the throne were, before the princes, the scriptural scholars, or rather the "scriptural thieves" with their "monkish idol," Luther. They deceived the people, claiming that the study of Scripture is necessary for salvation and at the same time preaching to the common man that he should permit himself to be oppressed and exploited by tyrants, so that from mere anxiety about his daily bread he has no time for the study of Scripture.

---

[45] Letter of 25 July 1524 to Hans Zeyss; *Briefwechsel,* no. 59, p. 76.

Complaints about material needs are merely incidental. According to Müntzer's mysticism of the cross, man attains to the true faith only through external and inner suffering.

> Man must smash to pieces his stolen, bookish Christian faith by powerful and sublime sorrow and painful grief and by indispensable questioning. Thus man becomes very small and contemptible in his own eyes, and while the godless brag and become arrogant, the elect is swallowed up. Then he can glorify and magnify God and after keen grief he can rejoice with all his heart in God, his saviour. Then what is great must give way to the little and be confounded by it. If only the poor spurned peasants knew this, it would be very profitable to them.[46]

If God despises the "bigwigs," the "big heads with fine titles, such as the Church of godless now has," and takes the humble into his service, still the people are not yet ready. They "must first be quite severely punished." They need the right leader, "a servant of God, filled with his grace, in the spirit of Elias."[47] "Many must be awakened in order that, with a sublime zeal and in fervent seriousness, they may purge Christendom of godless rulers."[48] The new John must "by means of a tried and proved life, make known to others the Cross, understood since his youth, and shout into the wretched, desolate, confused hearts of the God-fearing, who are now beginning to be on the watch for the truth."[49]

At stake is religious renewal, the "movement of the Spirit," that man may resemble Christ "in his sufferings and life through the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit," whom the world mocks but who is given only to the poor in the Spirit.[50] Of course, if the genuine Christian government is to be realized in this world and against the mighty, then a regrouping of political and social conditions cannot be avoided.

Even in Allstedt Müntzer had intended to reply to Luther's *Brief an die Fürsten zu Sachsen von dem aufrührerischen Geist,* for on 3 August he wrote to Frederick the Wise that, because of the scandal given to many pious persons, Luther's slanderous letter should not remain unanswered.[51] But it is not known whether it was at Allstedt that he undertook the *Hochverursachte Schutzrede und Antwort wider das geistlose,*

---

[46] *Politische Schriften,* p. 46.

[47] Ibid., pp. 46f.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid., p. 51.

[50] Ibid., p. 55.

[51] *Briefwechsel,* no. 64, pp. 84f.

sanftlebende Fleisch zu Wittenberg. In any event it was finished only at Mühlhausen—and presumably before 19 September, for in it no mention is made of the revolutionary events there, which ended on 27 September with Müntzer's banishment and flight to Nürnberg.

In this *Schutzrede* Müntzer rejects the charge of having incited "insurrection." He has shown the princes from Scripture that they should use the sword to prevent rebellion, though the princes are not the masters but the servants of the sword. They also are bound by the law. Luther, "father of obsequiousness," "flatterer," "Doctor Liar," attempts "to cover up for them with Christ in concocted validity." For Müntzer law and grace are one: "Christ in the Gospel has made known the Father's righteousness through his kindness." It is not right that Luther should practice the "patience of Christ" toward the great and demand the observance of the law by the little folk. "If the great wish to possess grace, they must also fulfill the law, and the little folk do not need merely to exercise patience but can compel the fulfilling of the law."[52] Thus Müntzer in the most decisive manner rejects the annulling of the law in favor of grace, that is, Luther's doctrine of justification. In fact he insinuates that this doctrine one-sidedly operates in favor of the class interests of the great. Accordingly he attacks Luther's denial of the freedom of the will:

> You claim to confide to God that you are a poor sinner and a poisonous snake, with your rotten humility. You have concocted this, with your fantastic imagination, from your Augustine—indeed a blasphemous thing, to look with scorn on men voluntarily."[53]

In Mühlhausen, Heinrich Pfeiffer had been active since the beginning of 1523, delivering sermons at the Nikolaikirche which were acquiring an increasingly strong political and social character. The townspeople's dissatisfaction with the council had blazed up again at the time of Müntzer's arrival, and Müntzer and Pfeiffer summarized the demands of the citizens in eleven articles drawn from Scripture. On 19 September open insurrection broke out, with the aim of establishing a new order of city regulations in accord with God's word. With the aid of the peasants the council contrived to put down the rising and on 29 September 1524 Pfeiffer and Müntzer were expelled. In October Müntzer was at Nürnberg, where he succeeded in getting his *Ausgedrückte Entblössung* and *Hochverursachte Schutzrede* printed. But both works were confiscated and he was banished. He went south and was in touch with the rebellious peasants in South Germany, with Oecolampadius at Basel, and with Hubmaier. As a result of an appeal by his followers, he returned to Mühlhausen in February 1525 and was made preacher at the Marienkirche. He now more and more assumed the traits of a social revolutionary, not only in regard to active opposition to a godless authority but also in the reorganization of the total order of life in Christendom to bring it into accord with divine justice.

---

[52] C. Hinrichs, *Luther und Müntzer* (Berlin 1952), p. 178.

[53] *Politische Schriften,* p. 95.

In March 1525 Mühlhausen elected a new "perpetual council," which was supposed to introduce a new Christian government based only on the word of God: a Christian democracy under the decisive influence of the preachers. In it Pfeiffer, with his more practical social aims, seems to have had a greater appeal than Müntzer, who remained fundamentally foreign to the people with his preaching of the Kingdom of God. In the meantime the Thuringian peasants had rebelled, less because of Müntzer's agitation than as a result of the example set in South Germany. But Müntzer now urged his followers, as "God's servant against the impious," to join the Peasants' War "with the sword of Gideon." He interpreted the war theologically as a struggle for God's rule against every usurped authority.

> I say this to you: if you are unwilling to suffer for God's sake, you must be the devil's martyrs . . . . The entire German, French, and Italian lands are astir. . . . Therefore, do not let yourselves be frightened. God is with you. . . . You should have no fear of the great multitude; it is not your struggle, but the Lord's. It is not you who fight there.[54]

Müntzer accompanied the hordes of peasants in this "struggle of the Lord," not as a military leader but as a preacher who spurred their will to resist and sought assistance. Thus on 13 May 1525 he wrote to the people of Erfurt:

> Assist us as far as you can, with men and guns, so that we may fulfill what God himself has commanded [Ezekiel 39:4–18; Daniel 7:27; Ezekiel 34:25]. . . . If you now have a desire for the truth, join the dance with us. For we wish to step it lively, so as to repay the blasphemers of God exactly as they have treated poor Christendom.

Müntzer's personal participation in the Peasants' War was limited to three weeks and connected with only one episode—the Thuringian rising which was crushed in a massacre at Frankenhausen on 15 May

---

[54] Letter of 26 or 27 April 1525, to the people of Allstedt; *Briefwechsel,* no. 75, pp. 109ff.

1525. In this he had, however, an important part, in so far as he had swept the masses along in his optimism, counting on divine intervention and frustrating all negotiations. He was arrested in an attic and after cruel torture was executed outside Mühlhausen on 27 May. According to his farewell letter he felt that he had "not been correctly understood" by the people. They had "sought their self-interest more than the vindication of Christianity"[55] and had picked what suited them out of Müntzer's preaching on the realization of the divine will. Thus "a last token was given publicly that the revolutionary in the name and service of God was neither a 'peasant leader' nor a social agitator, that to him the truly important thing was not human rights and social progress but God's law and a Christianity subject to God in faith and life and mighty in spirit, which then, in obedience to God, cannot but give the right shape and order to the things of this world also."[56]

Müntzer's liturgical work survived his fall. His church offices and hymns continued to be sung and were revived in the Erfurt church office of 1525 and 1526. The Müntzer church order at Allstedt was maintained until the visitation of March 1533. According to what Bugenhagen reported in 1543, it was then being used in Wolfenbüttel along with others.[57]

If Christianity exists in tension between the preparatory historical realization of the kingship of God and its final completion in other ages, then Luther with a purely eschatological understanding and Müntzer with a narrow "now-and-here" identification represent the farthest extremes. It is thus not to be wondered at that each felt himself to be closer to "papistry" than to the other.

Posterity regarded Müntzer solely in the light of his connection with the Peasants' War, and overrated his influence on it. This can be traced back, not least of all, to the *Histori Thome Muntzers des anfengers der Döringischen uffrur*[58] of 1526, attributed to Melanchthon, and to Luther himself. Luther defamed Müntzer as a "murderous and bloodthirsty prophet" (*WA* 18, 367) and represented him as the "archdevil," "who rules at Mühlhausen and causes nothing but robbery, murder, and bloodshed" (*WA* 18, 357) or as the murderous spirit who, "using God's name, has spoken through the devil" (*WA* 18, 367). This image was constructed in detail by Melanchthon in his account of the teachings and deeds of the "madman" and was believed by future generations.

---

[55] *Briefwechsel,* no. 94.

[56] W. Elliger, *Thomas Müntzer* (Berlin 1960), pp. 59f.

[57] O. H. Brandt, *Thomas Müntzer,* p. 239; p. 31.

[58] Reprinted in *Thomas Müntzer. Sein Leben und seine Schriften,* ed. O. H. Brandt (Jena 1933), pp. 38–50; cf. H. Boehmer, *Studien zu Thomas Müntzer: Zur Feier des Reformationsfestes der Universität* (Leipzig 1922), pp. 3ff.

Confronted with the essential dissimilarity of men such as Luther on the one side and Karlstadt or Müntzer on the other—a difference not merely in methods but in intellectual and theological content, and also in the harshness with which they fought each other from the start—the question arises: What, then, are the characteristics of the "reform"? What did these men have in common, apart from their attack on the traditional ecclesiastical order?

CHAPTER 12

The Peasants' War

Not only the knights but the people thought that Luther and Zwingli meant the fulfillment of their social and political desires. The reformers had questioned spiritual authority and urged the common man to criticize and to express his opinion. Luther's written program had reached the people in many printings. In addition, short and easily understood pamphlets had made the reformers and especially Luther extraordinarily popular. The Bible had been handed to the peasant, who eagerly read it or had it read to him. Zwingli reported: "The house of every peasant is a school in which the New and the Old Testament, the sovereign art, can be read."[1]

The Bible should even be the guide of daily life. In this way the common man was trained to ponder over much that he had hitherto accepted as a matter of course, to form his own ideas. To use an expression of Eberlin von Günzburg, the peasant had become "smart."[2] He looked to Luther for the long-desired reform in which lay liberation from his political difficulties and the fulfillment of his social desires.

Luther himself, in works such as *An den christlichen Adel,* had encouraged such a "sensual" understanding of the Gospel, even if he had always warned that the Gospel would conquer, not through fist and sword but through its inherent divine strength. But why should the struggle against unbiblical human laws deal only with the hierarchy and the monasteries and not be directed also against the territorial lords, who were, besides, often identical with the bishops and abbots? In *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit, wieweit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei* (1523; *WA* 11, 245–280) Luther had resisted interferences on the part of the secular power in the ecclesiastical sphere, but at the same time he had directed heavy criticism at its worldly rule and had expressed his concern about an imminent judgment.

---

[1] *Werke* III, 361.

[2] P. Bockmann, "Der gemeine Mann in den Flugschriften der Reformation," *DVfLG* 22 (1944), 186–230.

> The secular lords could no longer flay and scrape, impose a toll on some, a tax on others . . . and act as though they were rather brigands and knaves and their secular government was as much neglected as the rule of the spiritual tyrants. [*WA* 11, 265] And you must know that from the very beginning of the world an intelligent prince is an unusual bird, while even more rare is a pious prince. Usually they are the greatest fools or the worst knaves on earth. [*WA* 11, 267f.] People will not, cannot, do not intend to endure your tyranny and wantonness for long. Dear princes and lords, learn to judge yourselves accordingly; God will not endure longer. It is now no longer one world, as formerly, for the people as well as the beasts hunt and pursue you. Therefore, cease from your crimes and violence. [*WA* 11, 270]

In contrast to Luther, Zwingli approved active resistance to an ungodly authority. "If the eye is evil, it must be torn out and thrown away; the hand or foot must be cut off."[3] Accordingly, with the introduction of the Reformation at Zurich he had begun a reorganization of the political situation.

The sixteenth century brought a general amelioration of the peasants' economic status. It is incorrect to speak of a distress of the peasantry, of a special economic oppression. Rather one should speak of a new self-assurance, which was demanding a corresponding status in society and was more than ever resisting the limitation of peasant autonomy and of common holdings in pasture, forests, and water by the developing territorial states. Thus the leaders in the Peasants' War were not the poor of the village, the proletariat, but precisely the prosperous and respected farmers. They demanded their "ancient right" and, in addition, an incorporation on equal terms into civic life, as was their due according to divine justice.

At the same moment many cities were the scene of violent social conflicts, in which the socially inferior strata rose up against the governing bourgeoisie, journeymen and other craftsmen against patricians and masters. Not only peasants but all the poor common folk in city and country fought for their Christian, fraternal liberty and for their social and political status in society. The term "Peasants' War" does not do justice to this frequent cooperation of urban people and peasants.

For some decades before the peasant rising in much of Germany under the influence of the reform movement, local peasant insurrections had occurred again and again. Among these special importance attaches to the "Armer Konrad," which seized Württemberg in 1514, and the "Bundschuh" movement of Southwest Germany. The latter flared up following the example of the nearby Swiss Confederation; it began in the district of Schlettstadt in 1483 and was active in the bishopric of Speyer in 1502, in the Breisgau in 1513, and along the upper Rhine in 1517. Its leader was Joss Fritz, a serf of the Bishop of Speyer. He demanded the abolition of serfdom, with all its payments and tithes, and of the seignorial monopoly of hunting and fishing. In particular there should be an end to clerical domination and to monasteries. Obedience should be rendered only to Emperor and Pope, and to no other lord. The *Reformation des Kaisers Siegmund,* of 1439, which came out in several new editions around the turn of the century, gave the "Bundschuh" its slogan:

---

[3] *Werke* II, 344.

> "Nothing but justice" appeared triumphantly on the standard of the confederates over the image of the crucified Saviour; to one side of him was to be seen a clog, to the other a kneeling peasant, weeping, and raising his hands to the Lord. "To lend a hand to justice" was the goal of the "Bundschuh."[4]

But all its undertakings were frustrated.

The Peasants' War affected extensive areas of Germany and penetrated deep into Thuringia and Saxony. But it was not a uniform and centrally directed undertaking. Rather, it was a group of individual movements, all of which caught fire on the same combustible material, made the same demands, and obtained their dangerous fundamental dynamic from the universal unrest or, better, fever of the age. The insurrection began in May–June 1524 with the rising of the peasants of Stühlingen in the southern part of the Black Forest. Here people did not appeal at first to the law of God and the Bible, but defended their old written law against the territorial authority of Count Sigmund.

In the former mercenary soldier Hans Müller the peasants found a leader who had experience in war and in speaking. His aim was a violent confrontation, and he looked around for allies, whom he expected to find in neighboring Waldshut. The municipality had refused to surrender to the Austrian governor their Zwinglian preacher, Balthasar Hubmaier; had again elected him as their pastor; and had expelled the Catholic priests from the city. Thus townspeople and peasants stood together against authority, and the affair of the peasants was connected with that of the Gospel.

The political situation prevented Archduke Ferdinand from resorting to energetic measures. The Turkish peril tied his hands in the East, while war with Francis I made it necessary to have consideration for

---

[4] G. Franz, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg* (Darmstadt, 4th ed. 1956), p. 65.

Switzerland. Furthermore, Ulrich of Württemberg wanted to profit by Austria's embarrassment to recover his principality by means of French money, Swiss mercenaries, and the aid of the peasants. Hence there could be no thought of a quick, forcible suppression of the revolt. The unrest spread, but nothing decisive occurred during the winter. But the defeat of Francis I at Pavia on 24 February 1525 caused Ulrich's fighting force, consisting overwhelmingly of Swiss, to melt away before Stuttgart, just when victory seemed certain. His failure was also a defeat for the peasants.

Meanwhile the movement had spread to Swabia, Alsace, Franconia, Thuringia, Saxony, Tirol, and Carinthia. The Memmingen furrier Sebastian Lotzer drew up the platform in Swabia, the twelve "Chief Articles of the Whole Peasantry."[5] These demands of the peasants were presented by the Zwinglian preacher Christoph Schappeler as the Gospel. On the basis of numerous biblical passages the following points were demanded: free election of pastors; pure preaching; use of the great tithe as salary for pastors; abolition of the lesser tithe; an end of serfdom, since Christ redeemed all men and so they should be free; annulling of privileges connected with hunting and fishing. Demands made previously on the basis of old German law were now deduced from the Gospel. These articles were everywhere seized upon as a weapon.

At first the disturbances were not of a warlike character. The peasants did indeed band together, not for a war with arms but to back up their demands with demonstrations. Negotiations were arranged. It was precisely the fusing of social and economic demands with religious motives that led in many cases to the use of force, to the sacking of castles and monasteries. Nonpeasant elements also joined in. Since a single, strict leadership was lacking and the maintaining of a rather large number of men presented formidable problems, the revolt progressively deteriorated into general plundering.

The peasants' eyes were fixed on Luther, from whom they expected moral support. He sought at first to mediate. In April he wrote the *Ermahnung zum Frieden auf die zwölf Artikel der Bauernschaft in Schwaben* (*WA* 18, 291–334), in which he admonished the peasants not to misuse God's name: ". . . do not drag in the Christian name, I say, and do not make it a means of concealing your impatient, quarrelsome, unchristian projects" (*WA* 18, 314). The Christian, he said, should suffer injustice and not rise against authority. But he also admonished the lords not to misuse their secular power and to stop "oppressing and taxing" the peasants (*WA* 18, 293). "It is not the peasants who oppose you. God himself opposes you in order to punish your madness" (*WA* 18, 295).

---

[5] A. Goetze, (ed.), *HV* 5 (1902), 9–15; G. Franz, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges* (Munich 1963), pp. 174–179; A. Waas, *Die Bauern im Kampf um Gerechtigkeit* (Munich 1965), pp. 96ff.

But before this work appeared in print in May, Luther, affected by the war, which was being waged with an almost unbelievable harshness, and by what he regarded as Thomas Müntzer's abuse of the Gospel, called upon the princes to intervene pitilessly. In his *Wider die räuberischen und mörderischen Rotten der Bauern* (*WA* 18, 357–361) Luther saw the devil at work in the peasants; their overthrow was a service to God.

> A rebel is outlawed by God and the emperor, so that the first one who can and will slay him does what is right. For in regard to a public rebel every man is two things—supreme judge and executioner. . . . Therefore, whoever can should here slam, choke, stab, secretly or publicly, and bear in mind that there can be nothing more venomous, more pernicious, more diabolical than a rebel. It is just as though one had to kill a mad dog. Do not strike and you harm yourself and a great nation with you (*WA* 18, 358). And so, dear lords, save, rescue, help here. Have pity on the poor people. Stab, strike, slay here, whoever can. If you should perish in this, know that you can never die a more blessed death. For you will die in obedience to the divine word and command [Romans 13] and in the service of love, in order to rescue your neighbor from hell and from the devil's bonds. [*WA* 18, 361]

The princes carried this out, striking, stabbing, and slaying with pitiless cruelty. They would probably not have needed Luther's appeal. After initial successes—the Electors of Mainz and the Palatinate were compelled to accept the twelve articles—the peasant armies were soon overcome by the organized resistance of the princes because they lacked firm leadership and long-range planning. The commander of the Swabian League, Georg Truchsess von Waldburg, defeated the Upper Swabian peasants near Wurzach on 14 April, those of Württemberg near Böblingen on 12 May, and those of Franconia near Königshofen on 2 June and Ingolstadt on 4 June. After overwhelming the Hessian peasants, Philip of Hesse marched to Thuringia and, with Duke Georg of Saxony and the Duke of Braunschweig, annihilated a large army of some eight thousand peasants and townsmen near Frankenhausen. As their chaplain, Thomas Müntzer had fanned their spirit of resistance, leading them into battle with the Pentecost hymn, "Veni, Creator Spiritus." But the battle soon turned into a disorderly rout and a wild killing spree. Müntzer himself was found in an attic and executed. The Alsatian peasants were defeated by Duke Anton of Lorraine near Zabern on 17 May; those of the Palatinate near Pfeddersheim on 24

June. The capture of Salzburg by the Swabian League on 30 July marked the end of the peasants' revolt. All told, some one hundred thousand peasants had perished in battle or been cruelly slain; many were beheaded, run through, burned, or blinded. Settlements agreed upon with the peasants came to an end. All arrangements made with them by lords and princes had to be declared null and void at the demand of the Swabian League or of its general, Georg Truchsess von Waldburg.

The victors were the princes. Even more than the weakened petty nobility, peasants and townsmen were subjected to the power of their prince. Furthermore, the princes confiscated the property of destroyed or abandoned monasteries. To a great extent the Peasants' War meant the end of the Reformation as a popular movement. Luther was often regarded as sharing the responsibility for its attendant ferocity. He accepted these reproaches, even though in quite a different meaning, when in January 1533 he stated in one of his *Table Talks:*

> Preachers are the greatest of all slayers. For they urge the authorities to execute their office strictly and punish the wicked. In the revolt I slew all the peasants; all their blood is on my head. But I pass it on to our Lord God, who commanded me to speak thus. [*WA, Tr* III, no. 2911a.]

People took it amiss that on 13 June 1525, in the middle of these dreadful days, Luther married the former Cistercian nun, Katharina von Bora. Even Melanchthon was exasperated. No wonder Catholic controversialists, such as Johannes Cochläus, exploited it against the reformer. The common people, disillusioned, abandoned Luther in many cases and joined the Anabaptists and the sects or, indifferent, held themselves aloof. The Reformation had ceased to be a popular movement; or at least the Peasants' War greatly damaged Luther's popularity. His "heroic" period was over. The authorities more and more took charge of the Reformation and exploited it to incorporate their subjects into the modern state. Hereafter we can speak of the age of the Princes' Reformation.[6] The Christian congregation, enjoying free elections of pastors, was succeeded by the territorial Church.

---

[6] F. Lau, "Der Bauernkrieg und das angebliche Ende der lutherischen Reformation als spontaner Volksbewegung," *LuJ* 26 (1959), 109–134, regards the assertion that the age of churches directed by the authorities began with the Peasants' War as an "especially rigid" and "perhaps the most dangerous of Luther legends." In refutation he points to the Reformation of the North German cities between 1525 and 1530. But this refers to cities, and specifically to cities of North Germany, where the Peasants' War did not occur. Furthermore, the reform movement there was for the most part still in progress up to 1535, and no one will claim that the change to the Princes' Reformation occurred suddenly.

CHAPTER 13

Luther's Rejection of Humanism—Erasmus' Later Years

The relations between humanism and the Reformation were varied and close. Many of Luther's friends and collaborators—among them Melanchthon, Spalatin, and Justus Jonas—were humanists. Luther himself was in the grip of humanism and favorably disposed toward it, especially as a teacher and lover of the biblical languages. Ulrich Zwingli was a pupil of Erasmus and a humanist, and the other Swiss reformers bore a strong humanist stamp. Humanism had prepared the ground for the Reformation through its criticism of the Church and its urging of reform. Luther found his first response and enthusiastic followers in the sodalities, the humanist circles. Still, humanists such as Johannes Reuchlin rejected the Reformation. Others, including Willibald Pirckheimer, Conrad Peutinger, Ulrich Zasius, Mutianus Rufus, Christoph Scheurl, and Crotus Rubeanus, at first were favorably inclined toward it because they anticipated from it the long-demanded reform. But they backed away when it became clear that the Lutheran movement amounted to a revolutionary innovation which could only shatter the unity of the Church, and when in its sometimes tumultuous course it ran counter to the ideas of this cultural aristocracy.[1] The outstanding men of the older generation, especially, turned completely away from Luther again. If humanism, in its concern with and efforts for the text of the Bible and in its criticism of the Church, formally had much in common with the Reformation, still in its ethical optimism or moralism it was further away from the Reformation's basic principle—*sola fide* or *sola gratia*—than most contemporaries were aware.

This was especially true of Desiderius Erasmus. At the outbreak of the Reformation he had achieved the zenith of his influence, and everyone awaited his decision for or against Luther. But he held back. As late as May 1519 he wrote: "Luther is entirely unknown to me; I have still had no time to read his books."[2] He wanted "to stay away from all controversy, if possible, in order to be the more useful for the revival of scholarship."[3] Even after the publication of the Bull "Exsurge Domine" he saw the war against Luther as a case of "hatred of scholarship." Monks wanted to suppress it "so that they can rule with impunity with their barbarism."[4] As regards Luther, it was only his loudness and pugnacity that Erasmus disliked. "Would that Luther had followed my advice and kept away from these subjects which cause hatred and insurrection!"[5] "His edge is so sharp that, even if all he had written were the purest truth, this business could not have a happy outcome."[6] To the Pope Erasmus wrote in September 1520 that he must not be regarded as a Lutheran just because he had not written against Luther. He declared that he had not the leisure for a thorough perusal of Luther's writings, and this task was beyond his talents and his education. In addition he was unwilling to challenge the position of the universities, which were already preoccupied with this, and, besides, he dreaded calling down the hatred of so many powerful men.[7] At Cologne in October 1520, asked by Frederick the Wise for his opinion of the controversy, he replied, according to Spalatin, with an equal amount of frivolity and *esprit:* Luther has sinned in two respects—he has struck at the Pope on his crown and the monks in their bellies.[8] Taken to task for this by the papal legate Aleander, Erasmus denied having said it.

---

[1] C. Mutianus: "Ego phanaticos lapidatores non amo" (K. Gillert, *Der Briefwechsel des Conradus Mutianus* [Halle 1890], no. 620).

[2] Letter of 18 May 1519 to T. Wolsey (H. M. Allen, *Opus epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* III, no. 967, 78ff.); cf. the letter of 30 May 1519 to Luther (ibid., III, no. 980).

[3] Letter of 30 May 1519 to Luther (Allen, op. cit., III, no. 980, 37f.).

From the desire to remain a spectator and perhaps to act as mediator at the opportune time, he avoided a decision, which he could no longer dodge in Louvain, by "fleeing" to Basel in the fall of 1521. From there he wrote to W. Pirckheimer: "The Lutherans threaten me publicly with invective, and the emperor is almost convinced that I am the source and the head of the whole Lutheran disturbance. And so I am in bad danger from both sides, whereas I have actually deserved well of all."[9]

When at the end of 1522 Ulrich von Hutten tried to induce Erasmus to come out clearly for the Reformation and at the same time sought support from him in his own difficult situation, Erasmus refused to see him for days. To the bitter reproaches of the mortally ill knight in his *Expostulatio cum Erasmo* (1523), that Eramus did not dare to draw the consequences because, in his insatiable ambition, he feared for his reputation among the great lords, Erasmus replied, "I remain on the outside. . . . I am not a party to any side. . . . By taking sides I mean total adherence to all that Luther has written. . . . But I love complete freedom and will not and cannot ever serve one side."[10]

---

[4] Letter of 9 September 1520 to G. Geldenhauer (Allen, op. cit., IV, no. 1141, 25f., 39).

[5] Allen, op. cit., IV, no. 1141, 10.

[6] Letter of July 5, 1521 (Allen, op. cit., IV, no. 1218, 5–7).

[7] Allen, op. cit., IV, no. 1143, 50–58; cf. the letter of 23 September 1521 (Allen, op. cit., IV, no. 1236).

[8] Cf. Allen, op. cit., IV, 370; *WA, TR* I, 55, no. 131.

[9] Letter of 30 March 1522 (Allen, op. cit., V, no. 1268, 76–79).

[10] "Spongia adversus adspergines Hutteni" (1523), *Opp.* X, 1650, BD.

Luther esteemed Erasmus for his services in regard to the biblical languages, without knowledge of which he could not conceive of any genuine theology.[11] He extravagantly glorified the humanist, greeted him as "our adornment and hope," and referred to himself as Erasmus' "little brother in Christ."[12] In *De servo arbitrio* Luther still emphasized the great service that Erasmus had rendered him in the field of linguistics: "I confess that I am much indebted to you and hence I sincerely honor and admire you" (*WA* 18, 786, 38ff.). But even so the reformer sensed early how incompatible he and Erasmus were spiritually, and he suspected in Erasmus the pagan of intellectual snobbery, to whom "human things are of greater importance than divine things."[13] But Luther was aware of what it would mean for his cause if Erasmus came out against him. If he was unable to gain him for his side, he hoped at least for his silence. Accordingly he wrote in April 1524: "If you are unwilling to contribute further, then at least be a mere spectator of our tragedy. But do not make common cause with our adversaries. Above all, do not publish anything against me, just as I will publish nothing against you."[14]

But by then Erasmus was already working on his *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio.* Of course he took his time, but in September 1524 he informed King Henry VIII: "The die is cast: the book on free will has seen the light of day."[15] Clearly Erasmus had been hard pressed and had been reluctant to take a stand publicly. The choice of topic indicates what to the great humanist seemed especially imperiled—the dignity of man, who despite all dependence on grace is God's partner. In his reply Luther himself acknowledged that Erasmus had grasped the decisive point:

> You have really confined yourself to the essential point and—unlike all the others who have assailed me till now—you have not tackled me vainly with the ridiculous questions about papacy, purgatory, and indulgences. You, and you alone, have understood what is really at stake. You have seized the bull by the horns.[16]

Erasmus had been drawn into the dispute over free will some time earlier. In February 1523 he had had to defend himself against the charge of Pelagianism, which had been made by the Lutheran side as a result of his teaching on free will in the explication of Romans (1517).

---

[11] Letter of 29 March 1523 to Eobanus Hessus (*WA, Br* 2, 50).

[12] Letter of 28 March 1519 (*WA, Br* 1, 361, 363).

[13] Letter of 1 March 1517 to John Lang (*WA, Br* 1, 90, 19).

[14] *WA, Br* 3, 271; Allen, op. cit., V, no. 1443, 67–70.

[15] Allen, op. cit., V, no. 1493, 4.

[16] *De servo arbitrio, WA* 18, 786; in what follows cited by page and lines.

In it he marshaled arguments which he pursued in greater detail in *De libero arbitrio,*[17] seeing man between the Scylla and Charybdis of trust in his own works and an unbridled fatalism. He gathered Luther's teaching from the *Assertio* of 1520, the detailed rejoinder to the Bull "Exsurge Domine." In this the reformer had defended the thesis that "after sin free will is a mere word, and, when man acts according to what is inside him, he sins mortally."[18] In the dispute between Luther and Erasmus the point at issue was not moral freedom in general but the role of the human will in effecting salvation. Can man achieve salvation by himself, that is, can he freely accept or reject the grace offered? In Erasmus' view, Holy Scripture, the philosophers, and common sense testify that the will is free. Otherwise why would Scripture need to blame and to admonish or to praise obedience? God's justice and mercy make no sense unless there is some vestige of freedom of choice in man.

With Augustine, Erasmus would prefer not to rate the role of free will too high: "To my taste is the opinion of those who attribute something to free will but most to the grace of God."[19] Man needs prevenient and concurring grace. It is the source and not the mere accompaniment of the work, which it effects with free will. Against Karlstadt and Luther, Erasmus expounded a third view, which, while leaving room for free will, left no doubt that ultimately everything depends on the grace of God:

> Here we have to do with those who are very far removed from Pelagius, who attribute very much to grace and almost nothing to free will, but who nevertheless do not entirely abolish free will. They say that man cannot desire the good without a special grace [*gratia peculiaris*], that he cannot begin nor advance nor finish without the guiding and enduring aid of divine grace. Their view appears sufficiently probable, for it allows man the possibility of exerting himself but does not thereby leave him any possibility for boasting of his efforts. [30, 22–29]

Scriptural passages which speak of an absolute predestination and of a deliberate hardening of men's hearts by God are, according to Erasmus, to be interpreted prudently. In general he would prefer to make as few apodictic claims as possible.

> I take no delight in rigid claims and prefer to take the part of the skeptics where this is allowed by the sacrosanct authority of Scrip-

---

[17] Allen, op. cit., V, no. 1342.

[18] Art. 36 (*WA* 7, 142, 22).

[19] Cited by page and lines according to the edition by Johann von Walther (Leipzig 1910; reprinted 1935).

> ture and the decisions of the Church, to which I gladly submit my judgment in all matters, regardless of whether I understand her regulations or not. [3, 15–20]

But quite apart from man's personal, intellectual, and spiritual make-up, the matter itself calls for a prudent restraint. In any event, the subjective appeal to the "evangelical spirit" (16, 18) affords no certainty. "What am I to do if various interpretations are adduced by several persons and each one swears that he has the Holy Spirit?" (17, 25f.). The self-assurance with which the reformers came forward and shoved aside the biblical exegesis of the Church Fathers was for Erasmus in striking contrast to the disagreements in their own camp. Consequently the meaning of Scripture could not be as clear as had been asserted. It was not in his nature to make over clear-cut claims. He knew too much about the ambiguity of life, he saw too clearly the false in the true and the true in the false, to commit himself unequivocally. He felt disturbed in an age which pressed so relentlessly for decision. What had previously been freely discussed was now not even to be yawned over. Actually out of love of truth he would prefer to remain undecided. "As a matter of fact, there are in Holy Scripture certain inaccessible passages which, in accord with God's will, we should not fathom more deeply and in which, if we nonetheless do seek to penetrate, increasing darkness encompasses us" (5, 17ff.). Many questions, "instead of being postponed till an ecumenical council, as is often demanded today, should be left for the time when mirror and mystery have been eliminated and we behold God face to face."[20] Above all, obscure and uncertain doctrines and even some passages of the Bible do not bear it well when they are held up to unlettered folk. Even supposing that

> it is true in some sense—which Wyclif taught and Luther has confirmed—that everything we do is done not out of free will but of pure necessity, what could be more inappropriate than publicly to advertise this paradox. . . . What weak person would thereafter continue to endure the lasting and laborious struggle against his own flesh? What evil person would thereafter still aspire to improve his life? [9, 20–10, 11]

Erasmus cannot conceive a Christian ethic without the freedom to choose the good and reject the evil, without man's being at least released to this freedom by grace. If the proof of this cannot be unambiguously demonstrated, then a pastoral and theological concern for the uneducated masses compels one to postulate this truth and forbids one to call it in question outside the discussions of scholars.

---

[20] Allen, op. cit., V, no. 1334, 231–234.

Luther did not reply to Erasmus at once. He was preoccupied with his fight "against the heavenly prophets" and with the peasant risings. But despite serious setbacks and so many disappointments he seems to have lost none of his certainty in his counterwork, *De servo arbitrio,* which finally appeared in December 1525. It is, he says, necessary to witness to the truth in God's word, without human and pedagogical considerations, even against the Church and her tradition as well as against the seemingly unquestionable judgment of human reason. Erasmus, he writes, seems to have missed the point that Holy Scripture contains only one doctrine—that God is God, that is, absolute and unlimited, and that man is man, that is, limited and dependent on God.

> He is God, for whose will neither cause nor reason has any importance that can be prescribed for him as rule or measure. He has nothing above or beyond himself, but his will is the rule for everything. If any rule or measure or cause or reason were to have any importance for his will, it could no longer be the will of God. For it is not because he has to will or has had to will thus that what he wills is right; on the contrary, because he himself wills it, therefore what happens must be right. Cause and reason are prescribed for the will of the creature but not for the will of the Creator. [712, 32–38]

Correspondingly, in things subordinated to him man is free and acts according to his own law. Differing from the *Assertio,* in *De servo arbitrio* Luther acknowledges a freedom of choice in the civil sphere.[21]

Whereas Erasmus took pains with nuances, Luther overemphasized to make as clear as possible his undoubtedly serious religious concern. In so doing he did not lack a consciousness of mission and self-assurance. Unfortunately he did not hesitate to revile his adversary and to reproduce the latter's views inaccurately when such a procedure facilitated his own argument. In his view Erasmus was an atheist, a scorner of Scripture and destroyer of Christianity, a hypocrite, blasphemer, and skeptic.[22] "A Christian must love assertions, however, or he is not a Christian" (603, 11).

> I say, this, therefore, in order that from now on you may stop accusing our cause of obstinacy and stubbornness. For you thereby only make known that you cherish in your heart a Lucian or an-

---

[21] ". . . intelligamus hominem in duo regna distribui. Uno quo fertur suo arbitrio et consilio, absque praeceptis et mandatis Dei, puta in rebus inferioribus. Hic regnat et est dominus, ut in manu consilii sui relictus" (*WA,* 18, 672, 8–11).

[22] Cf. Erasmus' grievances in regard to Elector John of Saxony (Allen, op. cit., VI, no. 1670, 28–37) and Luther (ibid., no. 1688, 12–24).

> other pig from the herd of Epicurus, who does not himself believe that there is a God and laughs privately at all who do believe and confess. Let us be "assertors" and find our joy in assertions and, for yourself, stick to your skeptics until Christ summons even you. The Holy Spirit is not a skeptic. In our hearts he has written, not doubtful opinions, but assertions, which are more certain and firmer than life itself and all experience. [605, 26–34]

For Luther Holy Scripture is clear in this matter; at the most it offers philological difficulties. Of course the inner clarity in the heart is the prerequisite for understanding. "Man needs the Spirit of God in order to understand Scripture or even only a part of it" (609, 11). It is by no means irreligious and impertinent, as Erasmus claims, "but, on the contrary, salutary and necessary for a Christian to know whether his will can accomplish anything or nothing for his salvation" (614, 2). "If we do not know this"—and revelation alone assists us in this—"then we know absolutely nothing about Christianity and are worse than all pagans" (614, 6f.). In this matter one should not be afraid of disturbance. "If God and antigod are struggling with each other, must there not be a disturbance throughout the world? To wish to calm this uproar is to wish to annul God's word and to forbid it" (626, 23–26). It is a question of "humiliating our arrogance and recognizing the grace of God" (632, 28).

> But man is unable to humble himself completely until he knows that his salvation is totally beyond his resources, resolves, and exertions, beyond his will and his works, and depends entirely on the free judgment, the resolve, will, and work of another—namely, God. . . . But he who in no way doubts that everything depends upon the will of God, gives up all hope in himself, makes no choice but waits for the operation of God—he is closest to the grace of being saved. [632, 30; 633, 1]

Only those thus humbled and annihilated can be saved—those who believe not only in the unseen but in that which is most deeply concealed, "in contrast to the objective, to perception, and to experience."[23]

> Thus God conceals his external goodness and mercy under eternal anger, his justice under injustice. . . . To be able to believe that he is just who, deliberately and without their being able to change it, makes men deserving of damnation—that is the highest degree of faith. [633, 14–18]

---

[23] "Non autem remotius absconduntur, quam sub contrario obiectu, sensu, experientia" (633, 9).

God, revealing himself, remains the hidden one; he even veils himself in the opposite. Luther wants the doctrine of the servile will understood in the context of this mystery of the *Deus absconditus*—that man is possessed either by evil or by the Spirit of God. Man always acts according to necessity, which is not the same as "forced." For external compulsion is not needed; one's desire or inclination, which cannot be changed by one's own strength, makes one act. If the will is changed by the Holy Spirit,

> it is in no sense free even then. It cannot do otherwise, so long as it is animated by the Spirit of God and grace. [635, 5f.] Thus the human will is placed in the middle, like a beast of burden. If God sits on it, it wills and goes where God wills . . . . If Satan sits on it, it wills and goes where Satan wills. And it is not within its free choice to run to one of the two riders or to seek him; rather, the riders themselves vie to hold on to him and to take possession of him.[24]

When Erasmus cited the tradition of the Church and the testimony of the saints against this unheard-of view, Luther countered with: "The Church is concealed and the saints are unknown. Whom are we to believe?" (652, 23). Only "Holy Scripture decides who is right" (653, 28). It is all the more true that "whoever denies that the Holy Scripture grants a clear insight deprives men of all light, of every possibility of enlightenment" (656, 10f.).

On this basis Luther set to work to refute Erasmus' arguments and to defend his own position. He ended with a eulogy of freely operating grace. The unfreedom of the will is a mark not only of fallen man but in general of man as a creature; even man reborn is unfree. At stake is the "powerless free will inherent in all men, which is nothing but clay, nothing but untilled land, precisely because it cannot will the good" (206, 4–6). But Luther is not depressed by this truth; it is for him the reason for a glad assurance of salvation.

> I do indeed confess concerning myself: if it could possibly happen, I would not desire that free will should be given me or that anything should be entrusted to me whereby I could exert myself for salvation . . . or would be compelled constantly to labor in the dark and to strike at the air. For my conscience will . . . never be certain and secure as to how much it would have to do in order to satisfy God. [783, 17–26]

---

[24] 635, 27–22; cf. A. Adam, "Die Herkunft des Lutherwortes vom menschlichen Willen als Reittier Gottes," *LuJ* 29 (1962), 25–34.

Because salvation is not subject to his will, and is promised as a result not of his work but of God's grace, Luther is sure that no devil can overcome him and snatch him away from God. Even though only a few may be saved, "not even one would be saved by the power of free will, but all would be lost together" (783, 35).

In view of the overwhelming majesty of God, who is pure will in the Ockhamist sense, there is no place for man's free action. If he is not to pine away out of dread, then he needs assurance at any cost. But where does he obtain the assurance of belonging to the few who cannot fail to be saved?

Erasmus was deeply hurt by Luther's violent and personally insulting manner. In his view Luther had "written in such a manner that no further place for friendship remained."[25] In his *Hyperaspistes diatribae* (1526–27) the great humanist again defended his standpoint. He once more showed that Scripture contains obscure passages and should by no means be discussed in all its parts in front of everyone at all times. He firmly protests Luther's insinuations:

> As though I taught that there could be a Christian piety without Christ! . . . Here, Luther, I appeal once more to your conscience. Are you not ashamed to scribble such elegies? You twist my words. . . . In whose books does the name of Christ appear oftener than in mine?[26]

After a struggle Erasmus had come out against the Reformation and had adhered to the teaching of the ancient Church in a question especially close to his humanist heart. His anger and indignation at Luther's reply were strong, but he continued to strive not to appear as belonging to one side. In the *Hyperaspistes,* addressed to Luther, he wrote:

> I have always hated factions. Hitherto I have sought to remain apart; I was unwilling to separate myself from the Catholic Church. . . . I have never abandoned her. . . . I have never wanted to call your church a Church. . . . I know that in the Church which you term "papist" there are many things which offend me, but I see them also in your church. But evils to which one is accustomed are more easily endured. And so I put up with this Church until I shall discover a better one, and she is equally obliged to put up with me until I have become better. It is not a bad policy to keep a middle course between two evils.[27]

[25] Allen, op. cit., VI, no. 1717, 42f.

[26] *Opp.* X, 1266, AB.

[27] *Opp.* X, 1257, C; F.

Even such an admission still demonstrates intellectual restraint, a fear about taking sides and maintaining a stand. Skepticism, even a great amount of dogmatism, also characterized the aging Erasmus. He was concerned, not about theology, but about the piety of the heart and about education. Just as he kept aloof from Luther's religious rigorism, so in the *Ciceronianus* (1528) he divorced himself from a pagan humanism which smacked more of Cicero than of Christianity. The more the religious factions fought among themselves, the more he wanted to bring them back to unity by means of a simple, practical, and scripturally inspired Christianity and by deemphasizing dogma and religious creed. In 1526 he wrote to Bishop Fabri of Vienna that partisans should be excluded from the schools and replaced by men "who do not deal with dogmatic controversies but impart to their students only that which contributes, without controversy, to piety and good morals . . . who, free from the study of details, teach the useful to the children."[28] He confronts the primacy of truth with the primacy of peace. In a letter to Jacob Sadoleto as late as 1530 he maintained that "If people had paid no attention to Luther in the beginning, this conflagration would not have occurred or certainly it would not have spread so."[29] Ultimately guilty, he held, were the friars who first shamelessly preached the indulgence and then attacked Luther when he came forward against it.

It was Erasmus' fate to be born into a time which relentlessly posed the question of truth and pressed for an answer, but to be himself cut out for anything but the role of a martyr.[30] His great friend Thomas More proved that partisanship could be combined with liberal thought, tolerance, and broadmindedness. But nothing better characterizes Erasmus' own failure than his inability to understand the martyrdom of the English chancellor: "If only he had never become involved in that dangerous business and had left the theological matter to theologians."[31]

If the aging Erasmus rejected the Reformation with a growing decisiveness and severity, this was not because of error and heresy but because it was *fatalis tumultus*—it led to unrest, immorality, intolerance, and the ruin of humanistic pursuits. When, under Oecolampodius, the Reformation was forcibly introduced at Basel and the Mass was abolished, Erasmus left for Freiburg im Breisgau in 1529 to find quiet for his literary work. He aimed to restore the unity of the Church (*Liber de sarcienda ecclesiae concordia,* 1533) by a contemplation of the simplicity of the Apostolic Church. A return to Holy Scripture and a confinement to the basic truths of the Apostle's Creed (*Explanatio symboli,* 1533) would put an end to all controversies and enable the Church to rediscover her original spiritual purity (*De puritate ecclesiae christianae,* 1536). These ideas met with the approval of princes—those of the Lower Rhine for example—and found adherents among theologians such as G. Witzel, M. Bucer, and G. Cassander. But Erasmus' unwillingness for a decision and for a confession probably hurt rather than helped the unity of the Church he claimed to serve. "For nothing so fostered the ecclesiastical schism," says H. Jedin, "as the illusion that there was none." The budding starts of reform, present in the work of Erasmus and with roots in the Christian humanism of John Colet (1466–1519) and others, were not equal to the tempest of the Reformation and were rapidly destroyed by it.

---

[28] Allen, op. cit., VI, no. 1690, 33–101.

[29] Ibid., VIII, no. 2315, 256f.

[30] "Non omnes ad martyrium satis habent roboris" (Allen, op. cit., IV, no. 1218, 32). Cf. J. Huizinga: "Erasmus was a man who was too prudent and too moderate to be heroic" (p. 225). Meanwhile, Huizinga and his generation have learned by experience that it is not left to our liking to be heroic or not.

[31] Letter of 24 August 1535 to B. Latomus (Allen, op. cit., XI, no. 3048, 59f.).

It is especially as a teacher and catechist that Erasmus became significant in the inner reform of the Church.[32] As early as 1512, at the request of John Colet, he composed in his *Christiani Hominis Institutum* an elementary instruction, a sort of children's catechism in verse. In at least seventy printings this little work obtained a wide circulation. Once more at the request of an Englishman, the father of Queen Anne Boleyn, there came into print in 1533 a larger catechetical work, the *Explanatio Symboli . . . Decalogi praeceptorum et Dominicae precationis,* which in later editions was called the *Catechismus.* In its literary form the *Explanatio* is a dialogue between catechist and pupil. The first five of the six lessons deal with the Creed; the last with the commandments and the Lord's Prayer.

The Sacraments are explained only briefly, or, as he himself notes, "in passing."[33] In proportion to the size of the work the section on the Sacraments is briefer than in the *Institutum,* although it was the Sacraments that were so hotly disputed because of the Reformation and it was here precisely that the laity would have had need of a clear answer. There is no more unequivocal indication of how foreign to Erasmus were worship and Sacraments and how very much he dodged not merely theological controversy but also the necessary religious avowal.[34] This appears especially in his treatment of the Eucharist. In the *Institutum* he had still spoken of the mystical food which under the image of bread and wine truly offers us the real presence of Christ.[35] In the *Explanatio,* on the other hand, we find:

---

[32] But it seems to me that R. Padberg (*Erasmus als Katechet,* Freiburg 1956) is overestimating him when he terms Erasmus the "renewer of catechetical preaching" (p. 157) and says of the *Explanatio* that it provided "answer and clarity in the fullest sense for this hour of distress and danger" (p. 127).

[33] "Tantum obiter de sacramentis attigisse sat est" (*Opp.* V, 1176 E).

> The Eucharist provides strength for the real combat. By it the power of faith is roused in us and we are filled with abundant grace by recalling the holy death, since in some mysterious way we renew that unique Sacrifice to which we owe our salvation.[36]

Not a word about the real presence. This is astonishing in view of the sharp denial of it by Oecolampadius at Basel, but at the same time understandable if we reflect that Erasmus inclined toward the ideas of this reformer because they "are simpler and more intelligible and raise less complicated questions."[37] He had, it is true, emphatically clung to the teaching of the ancient Church, but preferred that the "how" of the bodily presence should be undiscussed and so far as possible not doctrinally established. As a "return to the proclamation of the Bible and the Fathers,"[38] the fact here under consideration has not been sufficiently characterized. The effort to limit as far as possible the area of obligatory doctrine remained, therefore, a chief characteristic of the theology of Erasmus even at a time when in the Church it was finally realized that, in view of dogmatic vagueness, it was necessary to establish her doctrine and to apply the brake in the face of error.

In the *Institutum* the author had expressly declared his desire to receive the Sacraments of the Church at the hour of death.[39] But the prohibition of celebrating Mass and the risk of dying without the Sacraments did not restrain the priest Erasmus from returning in May 1535 to Protestant Basel when external calm had been restored there. In the treatise *De praeparatione ad mortem* (1534) he appears to have come to grips with the thought of dying in a non-Catholic environment. According to it, a sincere confession at the close of life is certainly beneficial, but if a priest cannot be had, one need not tremble in superstitious dread, for prayer and inner sorrow can also bring salvation.[40] A year later, on 11 July 1536, Erasmus died at Basel without priestly support. He was solemnly buried as a Protestant. To the end of his days he had thus given preference over truth to that peace which proved useful, not least for his own well-being and for *bonae litterae.*

---

[34] Contrary to R. Padberg, who, precisely by means of the *Explanatio,* would like to refute the thesis of the neglect of sacramental theology by Erasmus, maintained by Lortz, Huizinga, and others. Cf. Padberg, op. cit., pp. 46, 56 (footnote 72), 110 (footnote 238).

[35] Mysticus ille cibus (Graeci dixere Synaxin)
Qui panis vinique palam sub imagine Christum
Ipsum praesentem vere exhibet intima nostra
Viscera coelesti saginet et educat esca
Inque Deo reddit vegetos, et reddit adultos.
(*Opp.* V, 1358 E).

[36] *Opp.* V, 1175f.

[37] Allen, op. cit., VIII, no. 2147, 32f.

[38] Padberg, op. cit., p. 107, footnote 221.

[39] *Opp.* V, 1359f.

---

[40] Ibid., 1310f., 1311 BC.

CHAPTER 14

Zwingli and the Beginnings of the Reformation in German Switzerland

The reform movement was not uniform in doctrine and ecclesiastical organization because in southwestern Germany, and above all in Switzerland, the Reformation was from the start essentially independent of Martin Luther and, under the influence of such important and individualistic men as Ulrich (Huldrych) Zwingli (1484–1531), Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531), Joachim Vadian (1483–1551), and Berchtold Haller (1492–1536), acquired a form of its own. And the Reformation was not uniform even in Switzerland. Every canton has its own Reformation history, although this did not prevent Zurich from acquiring a leading position because of its political importance and the surpassing figure of its reformer, Ulrich Zwingli. If the Wittenberg Reformation was under the auspices of the territorial principality, the stage of the Swiss Reformation was the republican urban and rural communities.

The Swiss Confederates, unconcerned for Emperor and Empire, had long been accustomed to regulate their own affairs at diets—*Tagsatzungen*—of their own. Following the Swabian War they had obtained their *de facto* independence of the Empire in the Peace of Basel (1499). Both as mercenaries in the papal service and on their own they had a great share in the struggle between France, Emperor, and Pope for Lombardy. The dream of obtaining for themselves a place among the great powers by acquiring northern Italy after the victory over the French at Novara came to a sudden end with the overwhelming defeat at Marignano in 1515.[1]

---

[1] E. Gagliardi, *Geschichte der Schweiz* I (Zurich, 2nd ed. 1934), 288–312.

The frequent military assistance given to the Pope had brought the Swiss a number of privileges and had led to a state church that was further developed than was elsewhere customary in the cities. The introduction of the Reformation by the authorities was thereby facilitated.

The Reformation first established itself at Zurich, where it was the accomplishment of Ulrich Zwingli. The third son in a family of ten children, he was born at Wildhaus in the county of Toggenburg on New Year's Day 1484. His father was the local cantonal president. Zwingli stressed his rustic origin—"I am a peasant, all peasant"—which stood him in good stead in his graphic, folksy speech. At the age of six he received his first instruction from his uncle, the pastor at Walensee. When he was ten he attended the Latin school at Basel and completed his early schooling with the humanist Wölfflin at Berne in 1497. He did his university studies at Vienna in 1498 and Basel in 1502. Humanism was flourishing in both places, but especially at Basel, with its circle of outspoken scholars.

At the university the *via antiqua* was decisive for Zwingli. Its combining of Thomistic scholasticism and humanism, of rationality and ethics, characterized him throughout life. He claims to have been shown the questionable nature of indulgences by his teacher, Thomas Wyttenbach (*ZW* 2, 145, 27). However, he did not take his formal study of theology very far. Scarcely had he begun it, after obtaining the degree of master of arts in the spring of 1506, when he was elected pastor of Glarus. Having received priestly ordination, he took charge of his parish on 19 September 1506. Zealous, he organized a pilgrimage and built a chapel for it. The care of souls, in which, aided by three or four chaplains, he had to attend to not many more than a thousand people, left him ample time for the study of the ancient authors, the Fathers, and the Vulgate. From 1513 he learned Greek on his own. At the same time he developed a passion for politics. His first literary works were patriotic fables in verse, in which he warned against the French King's recruiting of mercenaries. He often accompanied the Swiss to Lombardy as an army chaplain and was proud that his countrymen were honored by the Pope with the title of "Deliverers of the Church." For his services he received a pension from the Curia.

Zwingli's solemn appeal to the Confederates at Monza for unity and loyalty to the Pope was unable to prevent the catastrophe of Marignano. Because the "Frenchies" now established themselves in Glarus, he had to resign as army chaplain. On 1 November 1516 he obtained leave to go to Einsiedeln for three years and there was active as a priest in the management of the pilgrimage in the customary manner, and in the summer of 1517 he himself made a pilgrimage to the shrines at Aachen. At the same time he studied Erasmus' Greek New Testament and made his own copy of Paul's Epistles. In Zwingli's case there is no question of a struggle for the Gospel, as there was with Luther, or even of a reform understanding that deeply stirred him. If in 1523 he maintained in retrospect: "Before anyone in our area knew anything of Luther's name, I began to preach the Gospel of Christ in 1516 . . ." (*ZW* 2, 144, 32ff.), he was referring to reform preaching and criticism of abuses—something that was not new in Erasmus' circle. Zwingli did not take his obligation of celibacy very seriously. When in 1518 he was about to receive a call to become the priest of the cathedral at Zurich, it was urged against him that in Einsiedeln he had seduced the daughter of an official. In a "letter of confession" (*ZW* 7, 110–113), which in tone did not do justice to the matter and bears very little trace of a theology of the cross, Zwingli stated that she had been the easygoing daughter of a barber and that he had never dishonored a chaste maiden. If he had offended in this regard in Glarus, his sense of shame had caused him to do so in all secrecy. This previous history did not keep seventeen of the twenty-four canons from voting for him.

At his installation he explained to the canons his plan to preach on the text of the Gospel without regard to the order of pericopes. Despite opposition he began on 2 January 1519 with the first chapter of Saint Matthew.[2] In this way he had preached through the entire New Testament by 1525. He did not write out his sermons; at most his thoughts are sketched in one or another later essay.

Zwingli's keeping the indulgence preacher Samson out of Zurich cannot be taken as a reform activity, for the Pope had forbidden this Franciscan to appear again in Switzerland. Likewise, the manner in which in the spring of 1519 he dealt with the veneration of the saints did not go beyond the reform efforts customary among humanists. At that time he wrote, "I have forbidden the worship of the saints; I did not intend to root out entirely the invocation of the saints" (*ZW* 7, 181, 7). He merely attacked the addressing of the "Our Father" to the saints.

A closer acquaintance by Zwingli with Luther's works can be established from 1519. He circulated Luther's writings and saw in them a confirmation of the concept of the Gospel that he had independently gained since 1516. Luther's attitude on the occasion of the Leipzig Disputation deeply impressed him. The treatise *Von der Gewalt des Papstes* (*WA* 2, 183–240), which was printed by Froben at Basel in September, met with his approval. According to this work, Christ rules his kingdom from heaven. The papacy is not of divine law, and councils can err. Scripture alone can be the basis of faith. But when in the middle of 1520 Luther was threatened with excommunication, Zwingli found fault with his inconsiderate and extravagant manner (*ZW* 7, 293, 9). Unwilling to jeopardize his own affairs by a relationship with the Wittenberg professor, the shrewd Swiss peasant kept aloof from him. He stressed that he was not Lutheran and that he had discovered the Gospel on his own.[3] In fact, as late as 1523 he claimed he had read little of Luther's books: "I do not wish to bear Luther's name. I have read very little of his teaching and have often intentionally maintained reserve in regard to his books just in order to satisfy the papists" (*ZW* 2, 147, 28).

---

[2] *Cf. Apologeticus Archeteles* (1522) in *ZW* 1, 284f.

At the end of 1519 Zwingli fell seriously ill of the plague. This experience contributed to his inner maturation but not to his conversion or even to his awakening as a reformer. He himself transferred the beginning of his preaching of the Gospel to 1516[4] and assigned his break with the papacy to the end of 1520. To ascribe the break to a religious shock or to a decisive theological understanding in these months is an invention.[5] Walther Köhler calls the preparatory notes made in the summer of 1520 for a lecture series on the Psalms for the coming winter "the oldest confession of faith of the reformer Ulrich Zwingli."[6] But if he first stresses that "In this lecture series on the psalms, Zwingli, if he ever delivered it, expounded Augustine's theology as a theology from faith alone, as a reform awareness of redemption," he also states that Zwingli did not move to entirely new paths. With selected citations from Augustine he expressed what was then in the air and what he himself had expressed earlier in marginal glosses to Augustine's writings. Forgiveness of sins and justification by faith received central significance, but at the same time the stressing of human cooperation and of the good will made free in grace showed full respect for the humanist legacy.

---

[3] *ZW* 2, 149, 34: "Also wil ich nit, das mich die Bapstler luterisch rennind; denn ich die leer Christi nit vom Luter gelernt hab, sunder uhs dem selbstwort gottes."

[4] At the end of 1521 he wrote: "I began the work on the Gospel five years ago" (*ZW* 7, 485, 3). "I learned the power and the meaning of the Gospel from reading John and the treatises of Augustine as well as from careful study of Paul's Epistles in the Greek text, which I copied with my own hand—this was eleven years ago, whereas you [Luther] came to power only eight years ago" (*ZW* 5, 712).

[5] F. Schmidt-Clausing, *Zwingli,* p. 47, would like to assume the petition of the Our Father, "forgive us our trespasses," as Zwingli's "reform passage." He quotes F. Blanke: "It must no longer be said that Zwingli's development, in contrast to Luther's, was without struggle, without inner shock. Instead, what Luther experienced in Romans 1:17 was brought home to Zwingli in Matthew 6:12. Both knew the sanctification of temptation, both knew the wonder of discovering the Gospel."

[6] W. Kohler, *Huldrych Zwingli* (Stuttgart, 2nd ed. 1952), p. 71; *id.* "Die Randglossen Zwinglis zum Röm in seiner Abscrift der paulinischen Briefe 1516/17, "*Festgabe Joh. Ficker* (1931), pp. 86–106.

The Break with the Church

Zwingli himself saw his break with the papacy in his refusal of the papal pension: "I rejected it in 1520 in a special letter" (*ZW* 2, 314, 13f.). This was entirely in harmony wiith the policy of neutrality which he always clearly professed. An intimate connection of political and reform activity was indeed to become altogether characteristic of his life's work.

At the beginning of his Zurich period he was still devoted to Cardinal Schiner and his anti-French policy, but he even more zealously put forward the idea of peace as held by Erasmus. He encouraged Christoph Froschauer to inaugurate his printery at Zurich with a German translation of the *Querela Pacis.* In May 1521 Zurich alone, of thirteen confederated cantons, rejected an alliance with France, and on 11 January Zurich issued a mandate whereby enlistment was threatened with prison. It is uncertain whether these measures were directly due to Zwingli. In any event he supported independence from foreign powers[7] as well as peace. He sought, with strong words but to no avail, to prevent the city council from allowing the cardinal to raise a levy of fifteen hundred men for the Pope's protection in July 1521. The fact that Schiner tried to lead the troops in the campaign against Milan and France, contrary to the agreement, and that the men, when recalled, had to wait for their wages greatly prejudiced the city against the Pope and contributed to the separation from the Roman Church. Zwingli's renunciation of the papal pension was demanded when he was unwilling to allow his right to take a stand against military support of the Pope to be questioned. The loss of fifty florins, painful in his indigent situation, was somewhat compensated by his admission to the ranks of the canons at the cathedral on 29 April 1521. He continued to perform his priestly duties until October 1522.

An apparently superficial occasion brought about Zwingli's major conflict with the Church. In the Lent of 1522 the printer Froschauer, with a group of citizens, had a dinner of sausages as a demonstration on behalf of the freedom of the Gospel. Zwingli was present but did not eat the sausage. This did not save him from an investigation instituted by the council and the episcopal authorities, for it was evident that offenses against the law of fasting, also seen on previous occasions, were connected with Zwingli's preaching. The matter seemed to proceed without difficulty. A conciliar report of 9 April was accepted, whereby until further notice no one was to eat meat in Lent without a special reason and permission. All malicious conversation regarding the eating of meat and preaching was also forbidden. Zwingli was able to interpret this in his own favor. On 16 April he published as his first reform writing the Lenten sermon that he had preached on 23 March. It was entitled *Von Auswahl und Freiheit der Speisen* (*ZW,* 1, 88–136). In this he defended the freedom of the Christian: "If you like to fast, then fast. If you do not like to eat meat, then do not eat it, but let the Christian enjoy freedom" (*ZW* 1, 106, 15).

---

[7] "Fürsten Fürsten sein lassen und Eidgenossen bleiben" became his motto, according to Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte,* ed. J. J. Hottinger–H. H. Vögeli (Frauenfeld 1838, II, 1840), pp. 41f.

The Bishop of Constance and, even more so, his zealous vicar general, Doctor Johann Fabri of Leutkirch, were further alarmed. In letters to the council of Zurich and to the chapter of the cathedral they warned of the danger to the unity of the Church and of the destruction of her discipline. On 27 May 1522 complaint was made at the *Tagsatzung* at Lucerne that "now priests everywhere in the Confederation are preaching various things whereby indignation, dissension, and error in the Christian faith are springing up among the common people."[8] This probably induced Zwingli to direct to the Confederation in German the petition which on 2 July 1522 he had sent to the bishop in Latin. Ten other priests by their signatures supported the request for the freedom of preaching in accord with Scripture and for the abolition of the obligation of celibacy. All of them were probably already secretly married; in the spring of 1522 Zwingli had entered a secret marriage with Anna Reinhardt, a widow living in his neighborhood. This was not sanctioned until April 1524, shortly before the birth of their first child, by a public procession. Until then ample opportunity was provided for malicious talk.

In the 1522 petition to the Confederation the unhappy consequences of the widespread concubinage were described in detail and the results for the children were amply represented. This argument must have made an impression because of the large number of such illegitimate children. For at that time the Franciscan *Custos,* Sebastian Meyer, was able to maintain in a pamphlet, *Ernstliche Ermahnung Hugos von Landenberg,*[9] that in the bishopric of Constance an annual average of fifteen hundred children of priests were born and the fines imposed in this connection by the bishop brought him six thousand florins per year. Even if the figures are too high, there remains the fact that the wrong was widespread; there was likewise the sad circumstance that the episcopal curia exploited the moral transgressions of the clergy for financial gain.

---

[8] *Eidgenössische Abschiede* IV, 1a, 194.

[9] *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation,* IV, 7, ed. K. Schottenloher (Leipzig 1911), pp. 305f.; O. Vasella, *Reform und Reformation in der Schweiz* (Münster 1958), pp. 28, 61.

The question of Church reform was focused more and more on that of preaching in accord with Scripture and of the principle of Scripture. On the occasion of conflicts between Zwingli and the religious of Zurich, the city council decided that for the future only the Gospel, Saint Paul, and the prophets should be preached. Hence the mandate of the Bishop of Constance of 10 August 1522—which complained that, despite the condemnation of Luther's heresy by Pope and Emperor, opinions were expressed in pulpits to the detriment of the Church and her organization and the secular authority was asked to assist the bishop in averting the danger—lagged behind current developments. On 19 August the clergy of the Zurich chapter recognized the principle of Scripture and decreed that for the future only that should be preached which could be demonstrated by the word of God. Zwingli now published his written defense, *Apologeticus Archeteles,* the "first and last" word (*ZW* 1, 256–327). It signified the break with the bishop. In sixty-nine controverted points the bishop's admonition was opposed with all the resources of scholarly argument, but basically it was the principle of Scripture that was involved.

> Holy Scripture must be the leader and teacher. Whoever uses it rightly must be able to do so with impunity, even if this gives very little comfort to the learned lords. Otherwise it will go badly for us, for a knowledge of Scripture is today no longer the prerogative of priests; it has become common property. [*ZW* 1, 262, 29ff.]

In September 1522 Zwingli issued in print an expanded version of a sermon against the argument that Scripture requires interpretation by means of the teaching authority and tradition. This was entitled *Von Klarheit und Gewissheit des Wortes Gottes* (*ZW* 1 338–384). The word of God does not need human supports; it imposes itself by its own impact. "The word of God cannot err . . . it is clear, does not get lost in darkness, teaches itself, reveals itself" (*ZW* 1, 382, 25ff.). Later, in view of the scriptural exegesis of the Anabaptists and on the occasion of the Marburg discussion with Luther, it would become evident how little Scripture by itself was able to maintain the unity of the Church. But Zwingli himself did not rely on the "pure Gospel." He called upon the arm of authority to impose it and, later, to curb the independence of the Anabaptists.

Until now, as a parish priest, he had to provide Mass and administer the Sacraments. On 10 October 1522, in a pulpit declaration, he resigned his office. The council then instituted a preaching position for him. Thus with no great stir he changed from Catholic priest into reform preacher.

Aided by the city council, Zwingli resolutely carried the Reformation further. He induced the city officials to send invitations to a religious colloquy at Zurich on 29 January 1523. The council, not the bishop, summoned the clergy of the territory. A "notification" was sent to "His Lordship of Constance" and his presence was suggested. A delegation named by the bishop and consisting of four gentlemen, headed by the vicar general, Johann Fabri, appeared. Fabri regarded himself as sent by his Gracious Lord, not to dispute "as a fencer, but to be a spectator or even an arbiter of peace" (*ZW* 1, 484, note 12). The other cantons of the Confederation had refused to participate. The basis of the disputation was Zwingli's sixty-seven theses, for which he later gave more detailed reasons in his extensive work, *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden* (*ZW* 2, 14–457), a "collection of all opinions now in dispute" (*ZW* 2, 2, 2). Differing from Luther in his indulgence theses, Zwingli offered in the epilogue the comprehensive program of his Reformation. He could do so because he knew that, with the council, the ruling circles of the population were behind him. At issue on 29 January was not a disputation and even less a clarification of controversial questions, but the publication of a new order, whose validity was presupposed. In it[10] Christ alone is presented as authoritative for the individual and for all aspects of society. He is "the leader and captain promised and sent by God for all mankind" (6). The Church is "Christ's wife" (8). He who obeys Christ is "drawn to him by his Spirit and transformed into him" (13). What is strictly of a reform nature is expressed in the emphasis on "only the Gospel of Christ" (14), which is self-explanatory. Not by chance does the first article state that "whoever maintains that the Gospel is nothing without the ratification of the Church errs and blasphemes God" and the concluding proposition declare that "here no one should venture to dispute with sophistry and human trifles, but one should come to have Scripture for a judge." According to this principle the papacy, the Mass, the intercession of the saints, regulations concerning food, holy seasons and places, religious orders, celibacy, misuse of excommunication, and other things were repudiated (17–33). Also according to it Zwingli developed his doctrine of the state and justified in practice the ecclesiastical policy of the Zurich council. "The so-called spiritual power in its arrogated pomp is not based on Christ's teaching" (34). "On the other hand, the secular power has its authority and basis in Christ's teachings and practice." Christians must obey it, so long as it commands nothing that is opposed to God (37–38). It alone wields the sword and has the right to kill (40). The other articles deal with correct praying and singing, the forgiveness of sins, penitential works, indulgences, purgatory, the priestly office, and the manner of eradicating abuses. To those who are lacking in judgment one should "offer no physical violence, unless they behave so contumaciously that one could not otherwise deal with them" (65).

---

[10] Text of the sixty-seven articles in *ZW* 1, 458–465.

There took part in the disputation in the Zurich city hall on 29 January 1523 not only the 212 men of the small and the great council but some four hundred other persons, in particular the clergy of the territory of Zurich.[11] When at the beginning Johann Fabri referred to the council contemplated by the Diet of Nürnberg as the competent tribunal for questions of faith, Zwingli successfully exploited Swiss self-assertion against both the Empire and Rome by stressing: "Here in this chamber is, without any doubt, a Christian gathering" (*ZW* 1, 495, 10). Persons cannot wait for a council. It is a utopia. "For Pope, bishops, prelates, and big Johnnies will not put up with a council at which the divine Scripture is declared purely and clearly" (*ZW* 1, 497, 11). In the explanation of article 64 Zwingli entirely rejected a council:

> Hence, devout Christians, not a council is needed but only the pure word of God. In it all things become bright and clear. . . . To cry out for councils is no different from crying out that the word of God should again be fettered and caught in the power of ostentatious bishops. [*ZW* 2, 449, 10ff.]

After a debate on the veneration of the saints the discussion returned to the subject that was decisive for the Zurich Reformation—that of the relations between Scripture and tradition, or the binding force of ecclesiastical laws. In the afternoon the council announced that Master Ulrich Zwingli should continue as before to proclaim the Holy Gospel and the orthodox divine Scripture according to the Spirit of God (*ZW* 1, 547, 12). "All other parish priests, persons entrusted with the care of souls, and preachers should preach nothing which they cannot justify by recourse to the Holy Gospels and the rest of the divine Scripture" (*ZW* 1, 547, 12). Thus was the principle of Scripture officially declared to be the basic law for all pastors, and the conclusions Zwingli deduced from it were fundamentally recognized. Moved and joyful, the reformer exclaimed; "Glory and thanksgiving to God, who wants his holy word to prevail in heaven and on earth" (*ZW* 1, 547, 27).

But people at Zurich still shrank from the practical consequences. In September 1523, probably because of an address by Zwingli, the chapter of the cathedral was reformed. The posts of canon and chaplain were limited to the number necessary for the "word of God and other Christian uses," and the ecclesiastical property was destined "for the common profit"—that is, the hiring of teachers and the care of the poor. For the overdue reform of the school system Zwingli outlined his pedagogical program in the *Lehrbüchlein,*[12] which, dedicated to his fifteen-year-old stepson, Gerald Meyer, is less a catechism than a mirror of the Christian citizen. The youth should be introduced to his duties in regard to God, self, and the community and learn to serve "the glory of God, the fatherland, and the good of all" (*ZW* 2, 547, 25). A patriotic spirit, motivated by Christianity and humanism, is the goal of education.

---

[11] There is no official protocol. We are informed of the process by the copy made by Erhard Hegenwald (*ZW* 1, 479–569) and the reports of the vicar general Faber in Latin to the Archduke Ferdinand and in German to "the lords of government at Innsbruck" (ed. J. G. Mayer, *Kath. Schweizer Blätter* 11 1895, 183–195).

Clear encroachments into the sphere of worship, such as the abolition of images and of the Mass, had not yet been attempted. But as at Wittenberg two years earlier, radical elements now pushed to the fore at Zurich and in the neighboring areas. On 10 August 1523, perhaps on the initiative of Leo Jud, the first child was "baptized in the German language"[13] in the cathedral. At the same time Zwingli undertook work on the liturgical practice. He proceeded vary cautiously in his *Versuch über den Messkanon*[14] of 29 August 1523. Except for the readings the service continued to be in Latin, and rites such as the sign of the cross and the Mass vestments were retained. He changed only the Canon and wanted to eliminate whatever referred to the Mass as a sacrifice. When this was not possible because of regard for the "weak," people should stick with the old and be satisfied with a mental restriction. But this was not enough for the radical forces, headed by Konrad Grebel, and in October Zwingli directed against them his *Verteidigung des Büchleins von Messkanon* (*ZW* 2, 620–625). Similarly, in regard to images the adherents of the Reformation intended to effect both preaching in accord with Scripture and the elimination of idols. And when on 1 September 1523 Leo Jud preached expressly that, according to Holy Scripture, it was "right that idols should be removed from the churches," restraint was no longer possible. Altar images, statues, and crucifixes were wrecked, the lamps for the perpetual light were shattered, and holy water was ridiculed. But the council had to intervene because of the painful impression created and out of regard for the episcopal officials. Even Zwingli came out for punishment of the iconoclasts. Though he was basically in agreement with them—they were for the most part eventually to become Anabaptists—he was more prudent in his method of procedure.

---

[12] It appeared in August 1523 in Latin as *Quo pacto ingenui adolescentes formandi sint* (*ZW* 2, 536–551). The title *Lehrbüchlein* goes back to Jacob Ceporinus' translation of 1524. N. ed., *H. Zwingli: An den jungen Mann. Zwinglis Erziehungsschrift aus dem Jahre 1523,* ed. E. R. Rüsch (Zurich 1957).

[13] F. Schmidt-Clausing, *Zwingli als Liturgiker,* p. 49.

[14] De canone missae epicheresis (*ZW* 2, 556–608).

The council called for a Second Disputation of Zurich[15] to meet 26–28 October 1523 for a clarification of the controverted questions. The bishops were not represented, and the other Swiss cantons, except Sankt Gallen and Schaffhausen, held aloof. On the first day Leo Jud spoke before some nine hundred participants against "images and idols." The next day Zwingli attacked the Mass as a sacrifice:

> It is a blasphemous undertaking, a very work of Antichrist, to make a sacrifice out of the tender body of the Lord and the blood of Christ and to take money for it. Christ our Redeemer gave us this only as a food and a memorial of his sufferings and his covenant. [*ZW* 2, 733, 9ff.]

A participant declared that "the measuring and the butchering" had already given him anxiety of conscience. For the future he would dispense the Sacrament under both species. In opposition to delaying tactics, Konrad Grebel demanded that an unequivocal stand be taken against the Sacrifice of the Mass and purgatory and called for the abolition of hosts, of the mingling of water with the wine, of the placing of the bread in the communicant's mouth, and of the communicating of themselves on the part of priests. There was virtual unanimity in regard to the rejection of the Sacrifice of the Mass, but many felt that the time had not yet come for thoroughgoing changes. The secular authority had the final word. The council issued a mandate[16] at the end of October. According to this, matters were to be left as they were for the moment. Images must not be removed, the Mass must not be abolished. And so seven months were to pass before the disappearance of images and a good eighteen months before an Evangelical Last Supper replaced the Mass. This yielding to the authority of the state procured for Zwingli the opposition of the radical groups and soon led to the founding of Anabaptist congregations. Meanwhile, on behalf of the authorities Zwingli wrote *Eine kurze und christliche Einleitung* (*ZW* 2, 630–663), a primer intended to prepare the clergy and congregations for the changes about to take place. According to this, representations of God are forbidden and the Mass is contrary to Scripture because Christ was sacrificed on the cross, once for all time. The Christian is free with regard to ceremonies but bound by the law emanating from the magistrates. Even when chaplains at the cathedral emphasized in December 1523 that they were tired of being upbraided as butchers of God and refused to celebrate Mass any more, the hesitant regulation remained in force. "Although it is clear from Holy Scripture that the Mass is not a sacrifice, still there are so many weak and ignorant persons that one cannot suddenly abolish the Mass without giving scandal to the weak" (*ZW* 2, 812, 3ff.). However, the attitude of the council was determined not only by regard for the "weak" but even more by the critical political situation. A powerful movement in defense of the ancient faith was stirring in the rest of the Confederation. At the Lucerne *Tagsatzung* of January 1524 a united front against Zurich was formed and a mandate was issued forbidding any change of faith until the decision of a council. Zurich was to be invited to give up its doctrine.[17] The city declined to do so, calling the extravagant outbursts and the abuses of the Mass a result of misunderstanding of preaching in conformity with Scripture, and sought to shield itself by referring to the needed reform of the Church.

---

[15] Acts in *ZW* 2, 671–803.

[16] *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Züricher Reformation 1519–1533*, ed. E. Egli (Zurich 1879), no. 436.

The attitude of the confederated cantons was, to be sure, not so uniform as the mandate of January 1524 made it seem. Bern, Basel, and Schaffhausen did not take a clear stand. Together with Fribourg the five interior cantons especially adopted a position of compromise in regard to the reform movement, which at that time meant that they rejected the principle of Scripture. In April 1524 they joined together for the unconditional defense of the ancient faith and in the Confederate Concordat of Faith of January 1525 they drew up an extensive reform program.[18]

Despite all the official reserve, the Reformation moved forward in Zurich. Like Zwingli in April 1524, the priests married. Processions and pilgrimages were abolished. On 15 June 1524 a conciliar mandate decreed "that images and idols should be removed with all propriety so that a place can be found for the word of God."[19] Images and relics disappeared from the churches without any spectacular iconoclasm. But the council opposed Zwingli's suggestion that now was the time to give up the Mass and celebrate a biblical Lord's Supper. The Latin Mass in the customary vestments continued until 1525, except that all sacrificial prayers were omitted. Zwingli proceeded all the more relentlessly against the Mass in his writings. Between December 1524 and March 1525 he composed his *Commentary on True and False Religion,*[20] the epilogue of a comprehensive exposition of his theology. In the section

---

[17] O. Vasella, op. cit., p. 67.

[18] *Eidgenössische Abschiede* IV, la, 572–578; O. Vasella, *Abt Theodul von Schlegel von Chur und seine Zeit* (Fribourg 1954), pp. 41f.

[19] *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Züricher Reformation,* no. 544.

[20] *Commentarius de vera et false religione,* March 1525 (*ZW* 3, 628–911). German translation in *Zwingli Hauptschriften,* Vols. 9 and 10 (Zurich 1941–1963).

"On the Eucharist" he subjected the Mass and the worship of the Sacrament to the severest criticism.

> Why do we not bid all Mass priests to refrain from so horrible an affront to Christ? For if Christ must again be sacrificed every day, it follows that the sacrifice which he once offered on the cross does not suffice for all eternity. Is there a greater insult than this? All Masses must be immediately discontinued, and the Lord's Supper must be made use of in accord with Christ's institution. (*ZW* 3, 805, 15–20)

On 11 April 1525, Zwingli felt that the time had finally come for the decisive attack. With Leo Jud, Oswald Myconius, and two other priests he complained to the council, demanding the abolition of the Mass as idolatry. By means of his *Aktion oder Brauch des Nachtmahls* (*ZW* 4, 13–24), which he had just finished, he was able to demonstrate how he understood the celebration of the evangelical Lord's Supper. On the next day, Wednesday of Holy Week, the council, by a bare majority, decreed the abolition of the Mass. The last Mass was celebrated before a great crowd of people, "who wanted to have the Holy Sacrament administered to them according to the old custom, as before."[21] Therefore something that was still entirely alive was abolished by official decree. Even Zwingli had to be lectured by the secular authority in regard to his order of the Eucharistic liturgy. He wanted the *Gloria,* the *Credo,* and Psalm 113 to be alternated by the men and the women, but the council forbade it. It likewise did not concede to the Church the right of excommunication, which Zwingli wanted exercised by the congregation as an exclusion from the Eucharist. The Lord's Supper was first celebrated on Holy Thursday 1525 as a "thanksgiving and memorial of Christ's Passion." It is still celebrated in Zwinglian congregations according to the version prepared by Zwingli after Easter 1525, the *Ordnung der christlichen Kirche zu Zürich.* Provision was made for only four feasts: Easter, Pentecost, the Dedication, and Christmas. On Sundays only a service of the word of God, similar to the late medieval preaching service, the *pronaus,* was to take place.

> There was no community singing. Quite otherwise than Luther, the musically gifted Zwingli gave no psalms and hymns to those of his church. The organs remained silent. With the singsong of the Latin choral chant, which no one understood, what pertained to music entirely disappeared.[22]

---

[21] Gerald Edlibach, *Chronik,* ed. Jon. M. Usteri (Zurich 1847), p. 273.

[22] W. Köhler, op. cit., p. 123.

With the elimination of the Mass the Reformation finally achieved its break-through in Zurich. At the same time the creation of other institutions was necessitated by the destruction of the ancient ecclesiastical system. Zwingli had commissioned Leo Jud to prepare German rituals for baptism, marriage, and burial. The city council had issued a "Regulation for the Poor"[23] on 15 January 1525 which to a great extent disposed of ecclesiastical and monastic property. A substitute for the canon law on marriage and for the ecclesiastical matrimonial tribunals was urgently needed. Zwingli also left this important innovation in the hands of the council. On 10 May 1525 it announced the Zurich Order of the Matrimonial Tribunal,[24] which had been worked out by a commission in which Zwingli had played a decisive role. This was the first reform. Judicial power was entrusted to six matrimonial judges, two pastors as people acquainted with Scripture and two members each of the great and the small council. The only court of appeals was the city council. In the following year, 1526, the matrimonial tribunal was expanded into a tribunal of morals, which controlled the lives of the citizens by penal and preventive powers and kept watch over them by means of spies. The authority to punish lay with the council, to which a denunciation had to be made after three warnings. With the introduction in 1529 of the obligation of attending worship and the prohibition of attendance at Catholic Masses outside the territory, the city congregation completely controlled the lives of the citizens. In opposition to Zwingli's spiritualism and to his thesis of the inherent power of the Gospel, but at the same time also in consequence of it, the secular authority had seized control of ecclesiastical government. The church congregation had been absorbed into the civic community.

The founding of a theological school, decided on in 1523, could also move nearer to realization in 1525. To provide payment for the teaching personnel, the canonries at the cathedral were reduced from twenty-four to eighteen. Reuchlin's pupil Jakob Ceporinus was appointed professor of Hebrew in January 1525; after his early death he was succeeded by the former Franciscan, Konrad Pellikan. In place of the morning choral office, Zwingli, in association with Ceporinus, gave daily lectures on the Old Testament from 19 June in the cathedral at 8:00 A.M. "All pastors, preachers, canons, and chaplains and the older students"[25] had to attend. Zwingli himself gave to this hour of philological and theological exegesis of Scripture the name of prophecy. It served for the elementary and more advanced education of preachers and at the same time hastened the appearance of the "Zurich Bible." Until then Luther's translation of the New Testament had been reprinted in an adaptation using the Swiss dialect. Similarly the Pentateuch appeared in 1527 and soon afterwards came the other historical books and the sapiential books of the Old Testament. People qualified to put the prophetic books, still lacking in Luther's translation, into German were sought in Zurich itself. Zwingli and Leo Jud played the chief roles in this, and Jud also translated the so-called apocrypha. And so in March 1529, five years before Luther's Bible was finished, the complete "Zurich Bible" existed in six volumes. In 1531, the year of Zwingli's death, these six were united as one volume, the so-called Froschauer Bible. Holbein had contributed about half of the two hundred illustrations of this typographical masterpiece.

---

[23] Text in W. Oechsli, *Quellenbuch zur Schweizergeschichte,* Neue Folge (Zurich 1893), pp. 536–541.

[24] *Ordnung und ansehen* (= Weisung), *wie hynfür zu Zürich in der statt über eelich sachen gericht sol werden* (*ZW* 4, 182–187).

[25] H. Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte* I, 290.

The Reformation in the Other Cantons of German Switzerland

From Zurich the reform movement was stimulated and fostered in northern and eastern Switzerland. Two laymen, the humanist-educated city physician Joachim Vadian (1483–1551) and the former theological student and later master saddler Johannes Kessler (1502–74), aided in the breakthrough in Sankt Gallen. At first both were under the influence of Erasmus. Vadian was gained for the Reformation by Zwingli. His helper, Kessler, had studied theology at Wittenberg and had then decided to earn his bread as an artisan. They recruited for the Reformation by means of their *Lesinen,* or lay Bible lessons. In 1524 the council put the city church at their disposal and ordered preaching in accord with Scripture. Vadian's election as mayor in 1526 assured the victory of the Reformation. Images, "idols," and altars were removed at night without disturbance and in 1527 an evangelical celebration of the Lord's Supper was introduced.

The Reformation was also established in Toggenburg by 1528. In Appenzell, adjacent to Sankt Gallen, pastors were able to induce their congregations to abolish the Mass as early as 1522. In the next year the community, influenced by the First Zurich Disputation, ordered its priests to preach in conformity with Scripture.

In the lordship of Thurgau the government was in the hands of the nine Catholic localities, which strongly opposed reform influences. In the adjoining northeast tip of the canton of Zurich, at Stammheim and Burg bei Stein, conflict occurred when the congregations, following the directions of the Zurich council, in 1524 ruthlessly removed images and burned them. While low justice here pertained to Zurich, high justice for crimes of witchcraft pertained to the *Landvogt* of Schwyz. He had the pastor of Burg arrested at Frauenfeld. When the peasants of Stammheim and Burg, who came together there, were unable to aid their pastor and their hunger grew together with their anger, they plundered the Ittinger Charterhouse, which was in the neighborhood, and put it to the torch. Under pressure from the nine localities, Zurich was induced to surrender the ringleaders to the *Tagsatzung* in Baden, which had three of them executed in the fall of 1524.

In 1522 Zwingli had installed Valenti Tschudi as pastor in Glarus and had dedicated the "epilogue" of 1523 to his former parish. But Tschudi clung to the unity of the Church and repudiated Zwingli. Hence the adherents of the Reformation did not succeed in achieving a majority in the local congregation until 1528.

In Graubünden (Grisons) the soul of the resistance to the innovations was not the Bishop of Chur, who was disliked on political and personal grounds, but the Abbot of Sankt Luzi at Chur, Theodulus Schlegel (1485–1529). When the cathedral chapter denounced the preacher Johannes Komander (1484–1557) as a heretic, the secular authorities gave him the opportunity to vindicate himself at the Religious Colloquy of Ilanz on 7–9 January 1520.[26] Abbot Schlegel was spokesman on the Catholic side. Komander was not banished and the Reformation was only temporarily halted.

The *Bundestag* soon left it to each area of the canton to choose its own faith. In the Ilanz Articles of June 1526 the episcopal territorial authority was considerably restricted and the regulation of the ecclesiastical situation was turned over to the congregations. Hence confessional allegiance in this canton developed along various lines. In the summer of 1528 the Mass was forbidden at Chur by the council. In 1529 Komander finally succeeded in protestantizing the city, except for the episcopal household. Abbot Schlegel was arrested in the course of a Protestant trial and executed on 23 January 1529, after horrible torture.

In Schaffhausen there was a scholarly circle of humanists around the city physician, Adelphi (John Müling) of Strasbourg, and the Abbot of All Saints, Michael von Eggendorf. These men read and circulated reform literature. But the Reformation found no stronger basis until 1522, when the Franciscan Sebastian Hofmeister, expelled from Lucerne, came to his native city, Schaffhausen, and preached against the papacy and ceremonies. He took part in the disputations at Zurich. His cause experienced a great success when Erasmus Ritter, called in from Rottweil against him by the Catholics, was soon himself converted to the Reformation. The council favored Hofmeister's activity but was unable to decide upon a reform mandate, as had been done at Zurich.

---

[26] O. Vasella, *Abt Theodul von Schlegel,* pp. 53–63.

In 1525 pressure from the Confederation brought about a setback. Hofmeister was banished and the retention of the Mass and of the *Salve Regina* was decreed. The Reformation could not be imposed until 1529.

In Basel humanism and the struggle of the city congregation against the episcopal government had prepared the ground for the Reformation, but on the other side the traditional forces thwarted a quick victory for it. Here the Reformation was under Luther's auspices rather than Zwingli's. The Alsatian Wolfgang Capito (1478–1541), from 1515 preacher at the cathedral, and the Franciscan Konrad Pellikan, *custos* at Basel from 1519, were already spreading Lutheran ideas. Luther's writings were zealously reprinted by the Basel publishers Johannes Froben and Adam Petri. Ostentatious violations of the fasting law and sermons against Church laws led to complaints to the council, which sought to bring calm by a mandate in May 1523. Preachers were urged to adhere to Holy Scripture but not to mention the teachings of Luther and other doctors.

Six months earlier Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531) had come to Basel for the second time. As early as 1520 he had come out for the Wittenberg reformer in the *Iudicium de Luthero.* Then in *Quod non sit onerosa christianis confessio paradoxon* (1521) he defended as an escape from his own scruples the view that one need confess only external sins. Thereafter he could no longer stay at the Birgittine monastery of Altomünster. He went to Basel in November 1522 in order to have his translations of Chrysostom printed. After Easter 1523 he began lectures on Isaiah and in the summer was appointed professor of Scripture. Around him gathered the groups of citizens who were inclined toward the Reformation, especially since, in addition to giving his lectures, he preached zealously in Sankt Martin, of which he was named pastor in February 1525. At first he restricted himself to preaching, but before the end of the year he instituted an evangelical celebration of the Lord's Supper. In the late autumn of 1524 he had had a detailed discussion of the question of the Eucharist with Zwingli. In the *Elleboron* (1525), an attack on J. Latomus' *De confessione secreta,* he developed a spiritualist concept of the Church and the Sacraments. Faith, not the Sacraments, bestows salvation. In the Eucharist the bread remains what it was. He developed this idea of a purely spiritual reception of the body of Christ in faith, for which the Sacrament is the sign, in *De genuina verborum Domini expositione liber* (1525) and in *Antisyngramma* (1526). He thereby set himself in opposition to Pirkheimer, Luther, and Brenz. He had several contacts with the Anabaptists in 1525–27, but came out against them in favor of infant baptism. He took a leading part in the disputations at Baden in 1526 and Bern in 1528. But at first he was unable to establish the Reformation at Basel against the council and the clergy of the city and the influence of Erasmus. In spite of the proclaiming of religious freedom on 29 February—"everyone is to allow the others to continue in his faith without any hatred"[27]—at Easter 1528 there occurred iconoclast outbreaks and protests against the tithe. The guilds opposed the chapter clergy and the council. In a petition to the council on 23 December 1528 they demanded "the abolishing of conflicting preaching and of the Mass."[28] The council tried to mediate and appointed a disputation for May. But the mob, once mobilized, could no longer be restrained. The cathedral was forced on 9 February and, as in other churches, crucifixes, images, and altars were destroyed. The council yielded to the terror. It excluded its Catholic members, had the iconoclasm carried to its completion by urban craftsmen, and in a mandate of 10 February 1529 forbade images and the Mass in the city and its territory.[29] The cathedral chapter fled to Neuenburg and in May established itself at Freiburg im Breisgau. Erasmus, professors of the university, the Carthusian and Dominican communities, and some others also left the city.

Oecolampadius, who was connected with the disturbances and was in fact regarded as their chief instigator, advised the council in the drawing up of the Reformation ordinance[30] of 1 April. In it the council, advised by the clergy in accord with Scripture, dealt with the proclaiming of the word of God, the celebrating of baptism and of the Lord's Supper, the problem of images, and the norms of public morality. In May 1529 Oecolampadius was chosen *antistos* (overseer) of the Church and pastor of the cathedral. He exerted himself at five synods in 1529–31 on behalf of Church doctrine and discipline. He wanted the synods to be controlled by a *presbyterium* of laymen and pastors in a certain independence of the city government, but he had as little success as Zwingli. The city council claimed the right to excommunicate and permitted no central excommunicating authority that would be competent for the entire city but only one for individual parish communities.

Bern was long undecided between the religious factions. The city had to have regard for the conservative rural congregations in its territory. And an outstanding personality was lacking.

Thomas Wyttenbach had done the preliminary work here, but his assistant and successor as canon at the cathedral, Berchtold Haller (1492–1536), is regarded as Bern's reformer. From 1521 Haller was in contact with Zwingli. The Franciscan Doctor Sebastian Meyer and Jörg Brunner, chaplain at the pilgrimage center of Kleinhöchstetten, worked for the Reformation at his side, but with more alacrity. The council sought by means of a mandate of 15 June 1523[31] to deal with the disturbances caused by their preaching against pilgrimages and the Mass. The spread of Lutheran teaching was forbidden, but at the same time the arranging of scripturally oriented preaching was fostered. Bern adhered to the mandate of January 1524, issued by the Lucerne *Tagsatzung* for the unconditional defense of the Catholic faith but rejected the Concordat of Faith of January 1525. In a mandate of 2 April the council expressly decreed the defense of the seven Sacraments, of the veneration of saints, of ceremonies, and of the religious life, out of regard for the frame of mind of the rural folk. Steps were taken against the marriage of priests, but on the other hand the nuns of Königsfelden were allowed to leave their convent. At the beginning of 1526 the situation in Bern was even more unfavorable for the Reformation. On 28 March the great council agreed to participate in the Disputation of Baden, called for 6 May and ordered Berchtold Haller to attend.

---

[27] *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Basler Reformation* III, ed. P. Roth (Basel 1937), p. 60.

[28] Ibid., III, 291.

[29] "Adversarii me fontem omnis huius rei vocant" (E. Staehelin, *Briefe und Akten* II, 282, no. 636).

[30] *Aktensammlung* III, 473.

Johannes Eck had suggested to the Swiss such a disputation against Zwingli after the Regensburg meeting in June and July 1524. At that time the sacrificial character of the Mass was to be the special topic of discussion, and in 1525 the real presence was added as a controverted point. In a letter of 28 October 1525 Eck again offered his services for a disputation and noted that thus far Zwingli, with Luther, had rejected the Mass, but now he was breaking with him and, together with Oecolampadius, was seducing "many thousands into the detestable heresy . . . that they should not believe that in the venerable Sacrament are the true body and blood of Christ."[32] Thus the real presence was brought to the fore and related to the doctrinal opposition between Luther and Zwingli. It was shown that Zwingli surpassed in heresy the Wittenberg teacher who had already been outlawed and excommunicated. Zwingli declined to appear at the Disputation of Baden, which was dominated by the Catholic localities. Berchtold Haller held himself entirely aloof. Oecolampadius was the spokesman; he was pitted against Eck, Fabri, and Murner. The first two of the seven theses posted by Eck on the church doors read as follows: (1) Christ's true body and blood are present in the Sacrament of the altar; (2) they are really offered up in the Mass for the living and the dead.[33]

---

[31] A. Fluri (ed.), "Das erste gedruckte Berner Reformations-Mandat," *Schweizerisches Gutenbergmuseum* 14 (1928), 3–6.

[32] *Eidgenössische Abschiede* IV, 1a, 812; *Briefmappe* (*RST,* 21/2, Münster 1912), 1, 157.

[33] L. von Muralt, *Die Badener Disputation* (Leipzig 1926), pp. 100f.

The religious discussion was protracted from 21 May to 8 June 1526. The Catholic side claimed the victory, but the goal of this last effort to preserve the religious unity of the Swiss was thwarted. Even the reference to the doctrinal opposition between Luther and Zwingli did not convince the representatives of Basel and Bern that Holy Scripture did not suffice as a norm of faith and to move them to suppress the new teachings. The "Verdict of Basel"[34] was signed only by the nine Catholic cantons—Lucerne, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, Glarus, Fribourg, Solothurn, and Appenzell—but not by Basel, Bern, and Schaffhausen. In it Zwingli was declared to have incurred excommunication. Preachers were solemnly bound to the Church's doctrine and worship, and the books of Luther and Zwingli were forbidden. An authority was to be instituted to see to it that persons expelled from one canton were not admitted to another. "The Baden Disputation was the Swiss parallel to the Diet of Worms and the Regensburg Assembly."[35]

On 21 May 1526, the very day on which the Baden Disputation began, the great council of Bern had bound itself under oath to make no change of faith without the consent of the officials. Haller, returning from Baden, was faced with the alternative of offering Mass again or of leaving Bern. He appealed to the council. When the citizenry took to the streets and demonstrated in his favor, he was relieved of his function as canon and hence of his obligation to a sacramental worship and installed as preacher. The elections of Easter 1527 finally brought victory to the new believers. They gained a majority in the great council and were able to prevail also in the small council. The Reformation mandate was renewed. Free preaching was allowed but all high-handed changes were forbidden. This increased the confusion, so it was decided to hold a religious colloquy on 15 November 1527. It was planned to form public opinion and to make an impression on the rural congregations by a pointed display. Eck refused to take part in a "sham disputation" to which the Confederation had not issued the invitation. The Catholic side was not officially represented, and so the disputation of 5–26 January 1528 acquired the character of a display which was to consolidate the decision already basically arrived at. Zwingli set out with about forty Zurich pastors and others from eastern Switzerland under an escort of three hundred armed men. Representatives arrived from the South German cities of Strasbourg, Augsburg, Memmingen, Lindau, Ulm, Constance, and so forth.

The ten theses drawn up by Berchtold Haller and his assistant Franz Kolb were largely a copy of the epilogue of the Ilanz Colloquy of 1526.

---

[34] *Eidgenössische Abschiede* IV, 1a, 935ff.; L. von Muralt, op. cit., pp. 134f.

[35] L. von Muralt, op. cit., p. 151.

The first was as follows: "The Holy Christian Church, whose only head is Christ, was born of the word of God; she continues in it and does not listen to the voice of a stranger" (*ZW* 6, 243, 10ff.). According to the fourth thesis it cannot be proved by Holy Scripture "that the body and blood of Christ are substantially and physically received in the bread of the Eucharist." The Mass is contrary to Scripture, as are also the invocation of saints, purgatory, office of the dead, lamps, candles, images, and celibacy. Not many of the clergy refused to sign at the end; a larger number added that they acquiesced in the decision of the council. A few days after the disputation, on 7 February 1528, the council issued a religious mandate. In it the Mass was abolished and a liturgy was introduced according to the Zurich model. The jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lausanne was repudiated and the direction of the Church was transferred to the council. The accession of Bern gave the reform movement in Switzerland a great boost. In 1536 Bern introduced the Reformation in Vaud, which it had conquered.

The expansion of the evangelical movement increased the tensions in the Confederation. Differing from Luther, Zwingli was willing to defend and propagate the faith by political means and even by arms. "Alive in Zwingli was the complete statesman, who understood the struggle for the faith as a power-struggle and was disposed to carry it out as such."[36]

Zurich pushed forward an expansion of the existing agreements in regard to citizenship. Bern entered into a treaty with Constance, and Sankt Gallen and Mühlhausen in Alsace soon followed. Basel joined in February 1529, and from there the connections continued on to Strasbourg. Such alliances took place in the first place, so Zwingli felt, "for the honor of God and the unlocking of his holy word." They were aimed directly against the Catholic cantons but no less against Austria. The answer to them was the "Christian Union," formed in April 1529. Incidents, such as the attack on the monastery of Sankt Gallen in the spring of 1529, undertaken under the protection of Zurich and the abbey's secularization, or the execution of an evangelical preacher in Schwyz, intensified the mood for war on both sides. Finally a war for the faith was decided on. When Zurich declared war on 8 June it disposed of imposing forces, estimated at more than twelve thousand in April. The addition of the troops of the allies raised this figure to a total of about thirty thousand, to which the Catholic side could oppose only nine thousand. It was desired to spare the reformer and "not allow him to fight . . . But he refused to stay at home. He sat on a charger and had a fine halberd over his shoulder. And so they moved on Kappel."[37] The advance came to a halt there on 10 June. Zurich's allies urged negotiations. Zwingli advised: "Be firm and do not fear war" (*ZW* 10, 147, 2). But Bern in particular refused to take part. The community consciousness of the Confederates asserted itself and on 26 June the First Territorial Peace of Kappel[38] was concluded. The Catholic cantons had to give up their alliance with Ferdinand. Otherwise the terms were not clear and became the source of further conflict. Zwingli had demanded free, that is, Protestant preaching in the Catholic territories. In the peace it was stated "that, since no one is to be forced on account of the word of God, the cantons and their people are likewise not to be coerced." As the people of Zurich had no intention of allowing Catholic preaching and the Mass in their territory, the five cantons saw no reason to permit evangelical preaching. They understood the peace in the sense that each was allowed to persevere in its own faith.

---

[36] W. Köhler, op. cit., p. 173.

[37] *Die Chronik des Bernhard Wyss, 1519–1530,* ed. G. Finsler (Bern 1901), 121, 1ff.

---

[38] Text in Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte* II, 185–191.

CHAPTER 15

Anabaptists and Spiritualists

Even as early as the sixteenth century Anabaptism was often traced back to the Zwickau prophets, Karlstadt and Müntzer, or at least they are supposed to have influenced and substantially promoted it. Today it is known that, apart from an occasional contact with these Central German fanatics, the Anabaptists were an independent movement originating in the immediate circle of Zwingli at Zurich.[1] Attempts have also been made to establish connections with medieval sects, such as the Cathari, the Waldensians, the Bohemian Brethren, and others, but Leonhard von Muralt[2] and Walther Köhler have convincingly shown that Anabaptism was a "separate growth of the Reformation period,"[3] a religious and not a social revolutionary movement.

Anabaptists are distinguished from the fanatics by the conviction that the kingdom of God is to be realized in this world only in a small circle and must not be established by force. They are distinguished from the Spiritualists by the firm determination to form a visible community of the reborn, which is recognized by the covenant sign of baptism, the celebration of the Lord's supper, and a penitential life and which is kept pure by a stern community discipline.

---

[1] Zwingli: "They went out from us but were not ours." (Quoted from W. Köhler, *Die Zürcher Täufer,* p. 63.)

[2] "Zum Problem Reformation und Täufertum," *Zwingliana,* 6(1934–37), 65–85; cf. H. S. Bender, "Die Zwickauer Propheten, Thomas Müntzer und die Täufer," *ThZ* 8(1952), 262–278.

[3] *Die Zürcher Täufer,* p. 48.

The Swiss Brethren and the South German Anabaptists

In 1523 the Zurich city council had introduced the Reformation. Above all, this meant preaching only "in accord with Scripture"; the liturgy should still remain unchanged. When Zwingli agreed to this prohibition of the evangelical Lord's Supper, zealous collaborators broke with him in order to form their own congregation, independent of any hierarchical authority and unencumbered by the mass of customary Christians. The leaders of this movement were Konrad Grebel (c. 1498–1526), son of a councilor, and Felix Mantz (c. 1500–27), whose father was a canon of the Zurich Cathedral. Both had received a humanist education. As Konrad Grebel wrote to Thomas Müntzer in September 1524, the decisive factor for them was the realization that the Church of the New Testament is not a church of everybody, but a community of the few, who have the right faith and lead a proper life. It is based on voluntary membership and stands as an antithesis to the people's church, which has surrendered itself to dependence on authority. "In human respect and all sorts of seductions there is a more serious and more pernicious error than there has ever been since the beginning of the world."[4] From this concept of the congregation arose the criticism of infant baptism. Only he who has experienced a penitential change of mind and believes personally can testify to this experience of salvation in baptism and be incorporated by it into the community. The question of correct baptism, the baptism of adults, thus became the distinguishing factor, and "rebaptizers" became the name given to the brethren by opponents. They themselves repudiated it, for they regarded infant baptism as no baptism at all.[5]

This new congregation wanted to make itself visible. Its members not only kept aloof from the state Church; they also took no part in civic life. Authority was recognized in accord with Romans 13:14. But the disciple of Christ was not to assume any military duty, for such would lead to a conflict of conscience. When in the fall of 1524 Grebel did not have his newly born son baptized, a conflict with the Zurich council resulted. Following a public disputation of 17 January 1525, the council decreed expulsion from the city and canton for everyone who did not have his child baptized within eight days. Grebel and Mantz were forbidden to speak and their close friends, Wilhelm Reublin (Röubli), Ludwig Hätzer, Johannes Brotli, and Andreas Castelberger, were banished. Ready "to obey God rather than man" (Acts 5:29), those condemned met secretly on 21 January 1525, and on this occasion Grebel administered the baptism of faith to a former priest from the Grisons, Jörg of the House of Jacob, called Blaurock ("Blue Coat"). The latter then did the same for the brethren.[6] Thereupon, they retired to the peasant village of Zollikon, celebrated the Lord's Supper as a memorial and love feast, according to the apostolic model, and thus called into being the first Anabaptist congregation.

---

[4] *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel,* ed. H. Böhmer–P. Kirn (Leipzig 1937), p. 93; H. Fast, *Der linke Flügel der Reformation,* p. 13.

[5] E.g., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz* I, 238; *Urkundliche Quellen zur Hess. Ref. Gesch.* IV, 57; *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer* V, 171.

The Zurich council intervened here too. In the formation of a free Church of the Brethren it saw insurrection and it quelled it. This led to the spread of the Anabaptist movement into the rest of Switzerland and to South Germany. On 7 March 1526, when even torture was of no avail, the Zurich council decreed death by drowning for anyone who rebaptized. The Anabaptists displayed a great readiness to suffer. Konrad Grebel, who succumbed to the plague in the summer of 1526, had written in May 1525 to Vadian, the reformer, at Sankt Gallen: "I will bear witness to the truth by the loss of my property, even of my home, and that is all I have. I will bear witness to the truth by imprisonment, by outlawry, by death."[7]

On 5 January 1527 Felix Mantz was put to death by drowning and thus became the first martyr of Anabaptism. On the same day Jörg Blaurock was whipped on the exposed upper part of his body and driven from the city. He preached with great success in Tirol, but on 6 September 1527 he was burned after cruel torture. The indictment against him had mentioned abandonment of the priesthood and denial of infant baptism, of the Mass, of confession, and of prayer to Mary. The Anabaptist movement was almost completely wiped out in the canton of Zurich by ca. 1530.

But meanwhile it had obtained a foothold in South Germany, especially in Alsace, Baden, and Palatinate, Württemberg, and Tirol. Augsburg and Strasbourg became the chief centers. In November 1525 Michael Sattler, from Staufen im Breisgau, former prior of the monastery of Sankt Peter in the Black Forest, had been expelled from Zurich. He had gone to Württemberg, where he displayed a brisk activity. He presided at a meeting of Anabaptists on 24 February 1527, at Schleitheim near Schaffhausen, at which his Anabaptist profession of faith, the seven "Articles of Schleitheim," was adopted. This profession contained only the points of doctrine in which Anabaptism differed from the Reformation—baptism of faith, excommunication, common Lord's Supper, separation from the abominations of the world, pastoral office, nonresistance, and rejection of oaths.[8] Soon after the Schleitheim meeting Sattler was arraigned at Rottenburg am Neckar as a heretic and executed on 21 May 1527.

---

[6] F. Blank, "Ort und Zeit der 1. Widertauf," *ThZ* 8(1952), 74.

[7] *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz* I, 78f.

Wilhelm Reublin (ca. 1480–after 1559), expelled from Zurich in 1525, went to Waldshut, where he converted the pastor, Balthasar Hubmaier (1485–1528), and with him almost the entire city to Anabaptism; it had earlier been won for Zwingli's Reformation. Hubmaier wrote a pamphlet against Zwingli, *Vom christlichen Tauf' der Gläubigen* (*On the Christian Baptism of the Faithful*), which was very highly esteemed in Anabaptist circles. Because of his connection with the rebellious peasants he had to escape to Zurich at the end of 1525. He was imprisoned here but was able to obtain his release by abjuring Anabaptism. Later he again espoused the cause of Anabaptism; at Augsburg he baptized, among others, Hans Denck. In July 1526 he settled at Nikolsburg in Moravia, where various professions of faith were tolerated side by side. For a time Nikolsburg, because of Hubmaier's zeal, became the center of those sympathetic toward Anabaptism—within a year he published eighteen treatises on the true baptism, Church order, excommunication, the Lord's Supper, and so forth. He strongly emphasized congregational discipline. "Where it does not exist, there is surely also no Church, even though baptism with water and the Eucharist itself are preserved," he states in an inscription of his pamphlet *Von der brüderlichen Strafe* (*On Fraternal Punishment*). Contrary to Hans Hut (c. 1490–1527) and the rest of the Anabaptists, Hubmaier did not advocate complete nonresistance. He allowed the authority and the individual Christians to wield the sword and supported the Moravian nobles in their war against the attacking Turks. He justified this idea of his in the work *Vom Schwert* (*The Sword,* 1527). As Anabaptism gained an ever stronger hold in the Austrian lands, Ferdinand I applied energetic measures against it and demanded the surrender of Hubmaier. The latter's trial was less concerned with his reform and rebaptizing activities than with his seductive teaching at Waldshut, whereby he was accused of having caused insurrection and revolt among the common folk. He tried in vain to justify himself in his *Rechenschaft seines*

---

[8] Text in *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges und der Wiedertäufer,* pp. 28–33; H. Fast, op. cit., pp. 62–70; cf. B. Jenny, *Das Schleitheimer Täuferbekenntnis* 1527 (Thayngen, Switzerland 1951).

Glaubens (*Accounting of His Faith*). On 10 March 1528 he was burned at the stake.

Hans Denck (c. 1500–27) worked a short while at Augsburg, following his baptism in May 1526. Here he baptized Hans Hut, a former adherent of Thomas Müntzer. Both introduced strongly spiritualistic and mystical elements into the Anabaptist movement. Difficulties with the leading Lutheran preacher, Urban Rhegius, over his doctrine of justification, predestination, and the ultimate sharing of all in salvation (the *apokatastasis panton* of Origenism), drove Denck from Augsburg. He went to Strasbourg in November 1526, where he met Michael Sattler and Ludwig Hätzer and, through disputations with Capito and Bucer, attracted attention. He had to leave Strasbourg too at Christmas 1526. He went to the Palatinate and worked successfully by word and writing in the Anabaptist congregations of Landau and Worms. Here he collaborated with Ludwig Hätzer and they gained the Lutheran preachers Kautz and Hilarius for their cause. But Kautz caused disturbances by posting theses and distributing pamphlets and was therefore expelled. Hätzer and Denck went to Worms but had to leave there also. In August 1527 Denck was at the "martyrs' synod" at Augsburg where Hans Hut and his theology of the imminent Parousia were at the center of the discussion. In view of the impending end of the world there was a desire to undertake a large-scale missionary activity, and Denck was dispatched to carry it out in the territory of Basel. Meanwhile there was a strong resurgence of persecution against the Anabaptists. Denck arrived at Basel in October 1527 but in mid-November he died of the plague in the house of a friendly humanist. Broken by persecution and setbacks, he seems to have regarded his work as an Anabaptist as ruined and to have turned to an individualistic spiritualism.

By virtue of an imperial decree of 4 January 1528[9] and of the recesses of the Imperial Diets of Speyer (1529) and Augsburg (1530), the Anabaptists fell under the law on heresy. They were persecuted on the charge of heresy and sedition by Catholic and often even more relentlessly by Protestant authorities and were put to death or banished. Nevertheless they could not be entirely suppressed.

The ideas common to Anabaptists can be noted as follows. They desired to reestablish the primitive community of Jerusalem. Only the elect, who were determined to lead a new life in the strictest imitation of the Lord and to testify to their conversion by the baptism of faith could belong to it. The life of the individual and of the congregation must be oriented to Scripture, preferably the New Testament. The

---

[9] Text in *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer* I, 3*f.

Spirit of God, which one knows with certainty, guarantees the correct understanding of its content. The real presence was denied, but great significance for the inner stability of the congregation was attached to the Lord's Supper as a memorial and love feast. As the "congregation of the saints" the community must be kept pure by strict application of excommunication, which is the sign of a legitimate Church. A well-developed awareness of their apostolate led to bustling missionary activity, which was powerfully influenced by the idea of the Second Coming. Only he who belongs to the covenant can expect grace at the time of judgment. While private property was everywhere retained, persons wanted to share goods and chattels with their brothers in voluntary charity. If community of property was required, this referred to common use, not acquisition. The brethren were basically prepared to render obedience to authority, even though real Christians need no authority as such. But, by appealing to the Sermon on the Mount, military service, oaths, and the death penalty were rejected. For the same reason an Anabaptist was not to assume any office of authority. Even when the brethren behaved peaceably and submissively, the authorities saw in them a threat to public order and safety. The Anabaptists met persecution with a great readiness for suffering, this being a mark of their election. Konrad Grebel wrote to Thomas Müntzer:

> Right-believing Christians are sheep in the midst of wolves, sheep for the slaughter. They must be baptized in anguish and distress, in sorrow, persecution, suffering, and death. They must prove themselves by fire and reach the fatherland of eternal rest not by slaying bodily enemies but by killing spiritual foes.[10]

The Moravian Brethren

In addition to the Swiss Brethren, who spread from Zurich throughout southwestern Germany as far as Hesse and Thuringia, the Hutterites (or Hutterian Brethren) are to be mentioned as a second group. The Hutterites of Moravia derived their name from Jakob Hutter (d. 1536). Born at Pustertal, he became leader and organizer of Tirolese Anabaptism after the death of Jörg Blaurock. To escape persecution in Tirol, he and his followers sought refuge in Moravia in 1529. There he came upon Anabaptist congregations which practiced a strict community of goods, following the ideal of the Apostolic congregation at Jerusalem. On this foundation Hutter in 1533–1535 built his consumption and production communes. Ulrich Stadler (d. 1540), director of the Hutterite Brethren at Bucovice in Moravia, wrote in his treatise on community property: "Therefore, where there is property, where persons have it and seek it, . . . there persons are outside of Christ and his congregation and have also no 'Father in heaven.' " On the other hand, it is "true calm to place and surrender oneself thus to the service of the saints with all one's possessions and belongings."[11] One of the Moravian Hutterite Brethren was the Silesian Kaspar Braitmichel (d. 1573), chronicler of the Anabaptist movement. The *Geschichtsbuch* that he began is an important source for the Zurich beginnings for the history and self-evaluation of the Hutterite Brethren.[12]

---

[10] *Thomas Müntzers Briefwechsel,* p. 97; H. Fast, op. cit., p. 20.

The Anabaptists in the Netherlands and North Germany

The third group, the Anabaptists of the Netherlands and North Germany, goes back to Melchior Hofmann. In the Münster Anabaptist area the movement acquired a radical and even fantastic expression, which was especially prejudicial to the reputation of Anabaptists. However, Menno Simons succeeded in bringing Anabaptism in North Germany back to its originally peaceable character.

The furrier Melchior Hofmann (c. 1500–43), born at Schwäbisch Hall, had worked from 1523 as a Lutheran lay preacher in the Baltic provinces, Sweden, and North Germany. There he came into opposition to Luther and the Lutheran Reformation because of his fantastic scriptural exegesis, his ideas about the end of the world, and his spiritualistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Hofmann became acquainted with the Anabaptists at Strasbourg in 1529 and joined them in 1530. Like them, he demanded toleration and freedom of belief, strict sanctification of life, baptism of adults as the seal of the covenant with God, and nonviolence. But he differed from them in extravagant apocalyptic teaching and his Monophysite concept of the Incarnation. According to this, Christ received his flesh, not from, but out of Mary. For Hofmann the Bible was a secret revelation, which only he who was endowed with the Spirit, as with the key of David, knew how to interpret correctly. As a person so endowed, Hofmann believed he recognized the signs of the end of the world and that he was called to collect from Scripture the divine intentions and demands. He regarded himself as one of the two final witnesses announced in Apocalypse 11:3 and on several occasions proclaimed the end of the world. He had to leave Strasbourg repeatedly and worked in East Friesland (Emden) and Holland. Through his impassioned eloquence he succeeded in gaining recognition of Anabaptism in Holland and in winning many adherents for the new "community of the covenant." They were later called "Melchiorites" or "Bontgenooten," (Members of the Covenant). The authorities at Amsterdam took measures against them, however, and Hofmann had to flee. His deputy, Volkertszoon, and eight other followers were beheaded at The Hague on 5 December 1531. After this the community operated as quietly as possible. Hofmann himself had given the directive not to baptize for two years and to limit activity to preaching and admonishing until the Lord set the hour. The Swiss Brethren regarded this as cowardice and disobedience to Christ's missionary command.

---

[11] H. Fast, op. cit., pp. 139f., 146.

[12] Ed. by A. J. F. Zieglschmid, *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1943).

Jan Matthijs of Haarlem, a neophyte of Hofmann's, also rejected his prohibition to baptize and at the end of 1533 sent out twelve "apostles" to preach and baptize. Two of them, Bartel Boeckbinder and Willem Cuper, baptized in Friesland; among their neophytes was Obbe Philips, whom they appointed as elder. He in turn, some two years later (1536), baptized the former Catholic priest Menno Simons (d. 1567), who was to become the head of the group named for him, the Mennonites.

Hofmann, meanwhile, had been led once again to Strasbourg by his awareness of mission—that, as the new Elias, he had to cooperate in the second coming of Christ. An Anabaptist prophet from Friesland had prophesied to him that he would go to Strasbourg and, after an imprisonment of six months, would, at the Lord's return lead a victorious Anabaptist procession through the whole world. Finding himself left in peace for two months, he presented himself to the Strasbourg council to be arrested. The council complied with his wish in May 1533 and discussed his case on the occasion of the General Synod of Strasbourg, in which Martin Bucer participated. The "new Elias" was subsequently kept in prison until his death ten years later, under conditions that were at times downright shameful. Despite his experience, he clung to his apocalyptic hopes. For lack of paper he wrote his visions on linen cloths. Like many others of his numerous writings—more than thirty-five merely in the decade 1523–33—these were lost.

Melchior Hofmann, called by Samuel Cramer the "father of Dutch Anabaptism," belonged to the "peaceful, quiet Anabaptism," which renounced any recourse to force and demanded discipline and sanctification. But through his extravagant apocalyptic teaching and his warning of the imminence of the Last Judgment, and above all through his adherents, the Melchiorites—who emigrated from Holland to Westphalia in large numbers—he shared responsibility for the bloody tragedy of Anabaptism in Münster.

Bernhard Rothmann, a chaplain, born at Stadtlohn (c. 1495), had preached Lutheran doctrine at Münster since 1529. In 1531 he had visited Wittenberg and Strasbourg and in the latter city had met Anabaptists and the spiritualist, Kasper von Schwenckfeld. On his return he had established the Reformation at Münster. His church order and Eucharistic doctrine were influenced by Zwingli. From 1533 he was under the influence of the so-called "Wassenberg Preachers," who rejected the baptism of infants, leading to difficulties with the city council.

But, along with the Melchiorites, who had been pouring in since the summer of 1533, even more radical circles gained a footing in Münster. The Dutchmen Bartel Boeckbinder and Willem Cuper arrived on 5 January 1534 and administered rebaptism to Rothmann and other preachers. Rothmann continued the baptizing. At first the city council resisted and the prince-bishop arranged proceedings against the Anabaptists as rebels and agitators. But they succeeded in getting control of the city government and on 23 February 1534 brought about the election of an Anabaptist council. The internal government was, however, exercised by the Haarlem baker, Jan Matthijs, who wanted to do away with all opponents of Anabaptism. But the Münster cloth merchant Knipperdolling simply had them expelled.

Meanwhile, Bishop Franz von Waldeck had the city blockaded. The Anabaptists mobilized the entire population for defense of the city and to a great extent annulled the right of private property. When Jan Matthijs perished in a sortie, the tailor Jan Beuckelsz of Leiden (Jan van Leiden) came forward as his successor. He dissolved the Anabaptist council and instituted twelve elders as rulers of the tribes of Israel. In reality he did the ruling. After a military success on 31 May he had himself proclaimed king, not only of Münster but of the world. Bernhard Rothmann placed himself at the service of the Kingdom of Münster as court preacher and writer. Of the five works from the years 1533–35, the pamphlet *Von der Rache und Strafe des babylonischen Greuels* (On the Vengeance and Punishment of the Abomination of Babylon) aimed to induce the Anabaptists in the Netherlands to come to Münster and relieve the besieged city:

> Therefore, beloved brothers, prepare yourselves for the struggle, not only with the humble weapons of the Apostles for suffering [2 Cor. 10:4], but also with the glorious armor of David for vengeance, to exterminate with God's strength and help all the power of Babylon and godless existence.[13]

---

[13] H. Fast, op. cit., p. 360.

Communism was not so thoroughly established as among the Moravian Brethren. Production communism among the crafts resulted rather from military necessity, and the family remained together. Still, in June 1534, polygamy in the sense of the simultaneous marriage of one husband with several wives was introduced and all women without husbands were ordered to marry. Those of the banished "godless" who remained behind were obliged to contract a new marriage. The ability and ruthlessness of Jan van Leiden and the stubborness of the Anabaptists succeeded in holding the city for a year and four months, though famine appeared by the end of 1534. Even as treachery was opening up a way into the city for the besiegers, the Anabaptists were defending themselves so effectively with the courage of despair that they came near to inflicting defeat on the bishop's troops. Münster fell on 25 June 1535, and the bloodbath was frightful. Jan van Leiden, his representative Knipperdolling, and the royal councilor Bernhard Krechting were examined under torture for seven months, the king himself being conducted around the country on exhibition, until on 22 January 1536 they were tortured to death at Münster with glowing tongs and their corpses were exhibited in iron cages on the tower of the Lambert church. Thus did the kingdom of Münster, a repulsive "mixture of piety, hedonism, and thirst for blood," as von Ranke styles it, meet a dreadful end. In their striving to establish the Kingdom of God visibly in this world and to subject world and society forcibly to its dominion, the rebaptizers of Münster must be counted as belonging to the fanatics and not to the Anabaptists. For nonviolence and withdrawal into communities of brethren are the distinguishing characteristics of the latter.

But the kingdom of Münster seriously and enduringly injured their reputation. It remained for Menno Simons and the Philips brothers to restore Low German Anabaptism to its original character. The Philips brothers were illegitimate sons of a Catholic priest. In 1533 they were baptized by emissaries of Jan Matthijs at Leeuwarden in Friesland. Obbe (d. 1568), barber and surgeon by profession, and Dirk (1504–68), an ex-Franciscan, opposed the revolutionary Anabaptism of Münster and assumed the leadership of the peaceful wing of the Melchiorites, who were for a time called "Obbenites."

Obbe, appointed an Anabaptist preacher through the imposition of hands, ordained his brother Dirk as elder in the Dutch Anabaptist brotherhood. He did the same at Groningen in 1537 with Menno Simons, whom he had baptized a year earlier. But around 1540 Obbe withdrew from the Anabaptist movement. He accused it of falling into the visible and the external, doubted his own vocation or "mission," and advocated an individualistic spiritualism. His "confession" is an important source for the history of the Melchiorites and of Münster Anabaptism.[14]

In contrast to the spiritualism of his brother and of Sebastian Franck—he had come to a parting of the ways with the latter in the *Verantwortung und Reputation auf zwei Briefe*—[15] Dirk Philips concentrated on the congregation and wanted to set up in it a community of truly converted persons. For the sake of its purity and sanctity he required excommunication and a consequent avoidance of the excommunicated. He labored tirelessly in the Netherlands and North Germany. From 1550 his chief residence was at Danzig. He spread his ideas in numerous works, which he collected and published before his death in the *Enchiridion oder Handbüchlein christlicher Lehre.*[16] He thereby became the theologian and dogmatist of North German and Dutch Anabaptism. Clearer and more systematic than Menno Simons, with whom he collaborated for a long time, he in no sense achieved the latter's depth and breadth of influence because of his sharp, one-sided, and obstinate manner.

Menno Simons (1496–1561) worked for seven years in Friesland and North Holland after his ordination as an elder. He simultaneously displayed a prolific literary activity. His chief work, *Das Fundament der christlichen Lehre* (1539) deals with penance, faith, baptism, the Lord's Supper, the avoidance of the godless, and the mission, life, and teaching of preachers. At Emden in January 1544 Menno had a disputation with Johannes a Lasco who was working there as a reformer. They did not agree in regard to the Incarnation of Christ, infant baptism, and the vocation of preachers. Like Melchior Hofmann, Menno defended the opinion that Christ was born, not of, but in Mary, that he received his flesh, not through Mary, but through the Holy Spirit by virtue of a special creative act of God. After two years' activity at Cologne, his chief residence was in Holstein, and from here he toured the Baltic coast from Lübeck to Livonia.

In various controversies and in regard to rigorists Menno played a reconciling role; he was more and more concerned with peace and unity. Hotly disputed points among the Dutch Anabaptists were excommunication, mixed marriages with those who were not Anabaptists, and the avoidance of an apostate or infidel spouse, which in practice meant divorce. In *Eine wehmütige und christliche Entschuldigung und Verantwortung* (1552) Menno strongly protested against being identified with the Münster insurgents. He and his brethren, he said, were against tumult and did not require community of goods. The charge of polygamy was a wicked calumny. People should not call them rebaptizers or destroyers or souls, for they rejected infant baptism as not a genuine Christian baptism, nor were they blasphemers of the Sacrament, when they did not believe that bread and wine are flesh and blood in substance. Menno repeatedly succeeded in escaping persecution. He died in 1561 at Wüstenfeld near Bad Oldesloe in Holstein. His importance lies in his having gathered together the peaceful Anabaptists of Holland and North Germany and, through his work and his writings, to have gradually brought men to distinguish between those of the Anabaptist persuasion and rebaptizers of the Münster movement. His teaching did not contain much sublime theological speculation. At the center of his doctrine stood rebirth, as the most basic demand of the Christian life. It is the work of God and grows from the seed of the divine word, but it has to show itself in a penitential life, in obedience to God's word and command. Only those truly reborn may belong to the congregation of Christ. Excommunication and the rejection of mixed marriages thus played a big role.

---

[14] *BRN* VII, 121–138; H. Fast, op. cit., pp. 319–340.

[15] *BRN* X, 493–507; H. Fast, op. cit., pp. 171–188.

[16] *BRN* X.

Although Menno Simons was not the founder of the Anabaptist community, which was already ten years old when he joined it, the name Mennonites became popular in the course of the sixteenth century to designate the Anabaptists of the Netherlands and Germany. In Germany it indeed served as a protective designation to distinguish Anabaptists from the "rebaptizers," whom imperial law threatened with death. In the seventeenth century Mennonite became the usual name for all groups of Anabaptists, except the Hutterites. In the independent Netherlands the Mennonites obtained a limited toleration. Since 1811 they have been united there with the "Algemene Doopsgezinde Societeit." Persecutions and the idea of isolation led to migration throughout the world and made the Mennonites pioneers in sparsely populated areas. Through their serious and simple way of life and their community solidarity they acquired great importance for the economic development of their localities. In turn this led to the point that, at least in Germany and the Netherlands, they abandoned the principle of separation more and more in favor of an active participation in social and cultural life.

Spiritualism

A striving toward spiritualization runs through all the reform movements of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In opposition to the venality and materialism of piety, there was a demand for inwardness, for a more inward justice. But spiritualism obtains only where the external is absolutely regarded as unworthy or at least as unimportant. Proceeding from Neoplatonic assumptions, people adopted a dualism and set spirit in opposition to body, letter, and the visible Church with externals such as Sacrament, liturgy, and ecclesiastical discipline. Spiritualist traits are found in Erasmus and Zwingli and to a lesser degree in Luther; but in Luther in some respects these traits are more pronounced than in the fanatics, Karlstadt and Müntzer. Of the Anabaptists, Hans Denck was especially influenced by spiritualism and seems to have embraced it entirely at the end of his life. Under Denck's influence Ludwig Hätzer (c. 1500–1529) also became a spiritualist, as did Christian Entelder and Hans Bunderlin.

The most important representatives of spiritualism in the sixteenth century were Kaspar von Schwenckfeld (1489–1561) and Sebastian Franck (1499–1542). Schwenckfeld, a Silesian noble, was at first an adherent of Luther. As privy councilor for Frederick II of Liegnitz, he gained the latter for the Reformation and contributed powerfully to its spread in Silesia. He called for the life of the primitive Apostolic community. Hence the moral fruits of Christian life were decisive for him. Because of his spiritualist concept of the Lord's Supper and the suspicion of being an Anabaptist, he had to leave Silesia in 1529. He went to Strasbourg until 1533. During his stay there his doctrine acquired its peculiar form in the exchange of views and in disputes with reformers such as Capito and Bucer and with the various groups of Anabaptists, spiritualists, and fanatics. Bucer banished him to Augsburg, and from there he went to Ulm in 1535. Having run afoul of the Swiss also because of his Christology and having been condemned by the Lutheran assembly of theologians at Schmalkalden as a Sacramentarian and Anabaptist, he led a restless life for the next two decades, seeking shelter on the estates of noble families or in the houses of his adherents. Through his numerous writings, of which more than a hundred were printed while others were circulated in manuscript, he created for himself a large circle of readers, the members of which gave mutual edification and strengthened one another in their faith as they individually understood it. They had to separate themselves from the "Church of creatures." The true Church lives in dispersion; only God knows its members.

Human nature itself is a sin, which it is all-important to overcome, just as Christ made his human nature divine. His glorified flesh is the only everlasting food of believers. Matter cannot communicate spirit. Hence there is only the way from within to the external, and God cannot bind himself to external rites, Sacraments, or the written word, but only to man's inwardness.

> I seek that we act precisely and constantly from within, with spirit, faith, and divine love for the improvement of men. They, on the contrary, seek to act from without, with ceremonies and Sacraments.[17]

It is not the Scripture that brings the Spirit, but the man filled with the Spirit who brings it to the Scripture. He "must bring the divine light to Scripture, the Spirit to the letter, the truth to the image, and the master to his work."[18]

Sebastian Franck (1499–1542) of Donauwörth was a priest. From 1526 to 1528 he functioned in evangelical congregations near Nürnberg. Then he relinquished his ecclesiastical position and busied himself as a writer in Nürnberg and Strasbourg. He was expelled from Strasbourg on a complaint by Erasmus, whom he had labeled a heretic. For a time he earned his living as a soap-boiler at Esslingen. From 1533 on he managed a printing press at Ulm, but he had to have most of his voluminous works printed elsewhere. They consisted of chronicles (*Türkenchronik,* 1531; *Chronika, Zeitbuch, und Geschichtsbibel,* 1531; *Germaniae Chronicon,* 1538), a cosmography, *Weltbuch* (1534), biblical exegesis, collections of proverbs, and translations. In 1539 he was expelled from Ulm and in 1540 he was condemned by the assembly of theologians at Schmalkalden because of withdrawal from the Church and contempt for the Bible and the office of preacher. He died at Basel in 1542

In his view "the visible Church of Christ was ruined and destroyed right after the Apostles."[19] Because external doctrine and Sacraments were defiled from that time on, God now allows everything to occur through the Spirit in his invisible Church which is dispersed among the pagans. Besides, God only intended the Sacraments for the Church for the time of her youth, as a doll for a child. Now one must "seek more serious things, such as faith, penance, self-denial."[20] Pagans and Turks also must be considered as brothers, even though they have never heard a letter of the story of Christ. What is important is that through the inner word they have experienced his power. Christ is the invisible word. His story is as meaningless as the external word of Holy Scripture, the "paper pope." The letter conceals the mystery. God must "awaken the dead and death-dealing letter to spirit and life in us."[21]

---

[17] "Unterschied zwischen Kaspar Schwenckfeld und der Predicanten leere" (1556). *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* XV, Doc. 989, p. 24; H. Fast, op. cit., p. 207.

[18] "Von der heiligen Schrift" (1551), *Corpus Schw.* XII, Doc. 780, p. 430.

[19] H. Fast, op. cit., p. 224.

[20] Ibid., p. 227.

[21] Ibid., p. 245.

Franck studied Church history as the history of heretics, in which the latter have to be regarded as the true Christians. "For Christians have been heretics to the whole world everywhere and always."[22] Franck accused the reformers of having given up the principle of the inwardness and freedom of faith, which had been present at the beginning of Protestantism. And, like Schwenckfeld, he fought with all the more vigor for toleration.

Spiritualists and Anabaptists, "the Reformation's left wing," became, because of their basic principles and in consequence of persecution, protagonists of such modern ideas as religious freedom, free Church membership, and separation of Church and state, ideas which of course acquired wider recognition only through the English Free Churchmanship and the French Revolution.[23]

[22] Ibid., p. 235

[23] R. H. Bainton, "Die täuferische Beitrag zur Geschichte," *Das Täufertum,* ed. Hershberger, pp. 299–308.

CHAPTER 16

The Catholic Literary Opponents of Luther and the Reformation

In view of Luther's extensive literary activity and of the many broadsides and pamphlets which he and his friends circulated widely among the people, thanks to the printing press, the question arises: What was done on the part of the ancient Church to counteract this? Did the defense likewise avail itself of the new means of publicity for forming public opinion and exert itself to keep in the Church or to win back for her the masses going over to Luther? And how successful was this? The number of theological writers who undertook the defense of the old Church was amazingly high,[1] especially if it is borne in mind how unpopular and burdensome this assignment was. It is only in recent decades that greater attention has been given to the Catholic controversialists and a beginning has been made of rendering their writings accessible in the *Corpus Catholicorum.* These throw much light on the question of the religious and theological force with which Luther was met. Furthermore, for a better understanding of the reformers, their partners in the discussion must be known. And, lastly, the writings of the pre-

---

[1] N. Paulus increased the number of German controversialists cited by J. Falk to more than 260: *Katholik* 73, 2 (1893), 213–223. F. Lauchert lists the number of "Luther's Italian literary opponents" at sixty-six.

Tridentine controversialists are important as preparations for the Council of Trent and for a correct evaluation of its theological achievement.

In order not to underestimate the works of the early opponents of Luther[2] it is necessary to delineate the difficulties of their task and the unfavorable conditions under which they had to accomplish it. It was necessary to recognize both the extent and the far-reaching importance of error and to fight it by presenting the truth. The first of these aims was not easy because of the extensive theological vagueness. Many regarded Luther as the one who would effect the long overdue reform and felt it was a question merely of the elimination of wrongs, abuses, and grievances that had permeated ecclesiastical life. As late as 1530 Melanchthon sought to have this view accepted at the Diet of Augsburg. In comparison, men who, like Johannes Eck, pinpointed heresy clearly, logically, and inexorably, could not but appear as zealots and disturbers of the peace.

Once heresy had been established, it was necessary to counteract it. Mere refutation was not enough, for the reform movement was not just the sum of individual errors. Like every heresy, it drew its life from the truth, from the partial truth which had hitherto been overlooked or belied in ecclesiastical practice. It had to be shown how the justified concern of the reformers had its place in the doctrine of the Church and that one was prepared to make it respected. All this demanded religious strength and theological vitality on the part of the Catholic writer. He had to sense the basic coherence of the truth and recognize the center which gives life to everything else and to which the peripheral has to be related time and again. Hence it was of decisive importance whether they were able to be detached enough from the opponent in order to achieve an independent presentation of Catholic doctrine. This, invariably, was not the case. For the most part they were mere counterwritings, and frequently these were not only limited in their direction against one specific reform pamphlet, but also they undertook to expound and refute these sentence by sentence. As late as 1524 Hieronymus Emser was disputing Luther and Zwingli in his writings in this medieval and rather cumbersome manner, even though he was convinced that they could "not be cured of their deeply rooted illness by either arguments of reason or skills."[3] Luther had on his side the verve and the appeal of the new and the pathos of the criticism of abuses. He had the advantage of the offensive as Johannes Cochläus once stated, inasmuch as he "struck the first blow and was able to circulate his booklets in great numbers before a reply could be made by the opposition."[4]

---

[2] W. Koehler takes the easy way out when, in *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des christlichen Selbstbewusstseins. Das Zeitalter der Reformation* (Zurich 1951), p. 91, he expresses his judgment: "Facing the richness and the awareness of battle and of victory in the world of ideas in the Protestant line of Christian self-awareness, Catholicism was not only on the defensive but even in intellectual poverty. There was no dearth in number of disputants but the writings now assembled in the Corpus Catholicorum seem alarmingly like the threshing of straw."

It was all the more unfortunate, then, that the Catholic writers often did not get beyond a purely defensive method and permitted their adversary to dictate to them the course of action. Instead of taking up his fundamental points and refuting them from their center, attention was often concentrated on quite superficial details. Successes thus gained proved to be worthless, because the opponent had long since taken up new positions. In *De captivatate Babylonica* (1520) Luther described this situation to the point: "I am always ahead of them, and hence, while they, like illustrious victors, are celebrating triumphs over one of my alleged heresies, I meanwhile usher in a new one" (*WA* 6, 501). In addition, the defenders of the ancient Church were confronting a public opinion which had been heavy with anti-Roman sentiments for decades and was filled with a deep-rooted distrust of the Curia, feelings which Luther, with his great flair for publicity and even demagoguery, was able to utilize skillfully. On the other hand, his opponents operated in a tedious, clumsy, and pedantic fashion and found it doubly difficult to deal with a Reformation that had become a popular movement and was carried along by the appeal of the new.

Beyond the propitiousness of the moment and the greater talent for publicity, in the final analysis it was a question of a different method in theology. With Luther proclamation took the place of the systematic analysis of revelation by philosophical means, which was greatly removed from religious and liturgical life. The "for me," the personal experience of salvation, moved him and urged him to confess his knowledge-become-experience before men. As opposed to this, the prosaic and complicated method of scholasticism could only appear pale or faded. It took time before Catholic writers arrived at a theology which was primarily a proclamation and directly answered the needs of the hour.[5]

Frequently the men who felt called upon to defend the Church and who did not refuse their service were not theologians but humanists—men of letters or schoolmen and practical spiritual directors. Johannes

---

[3] *Canonis missae contra Huldricum Zwinglium defensio* (1524), A, III, c.

[4] *Von der heyligen Mess und Priesterweyhe* (Leipzig 1534), A, II, v.

[5] Cf. E. Feifel, *Grundzüge einer Theologie des Gottesdienstes* (Freiburg 1960), pp. 36ff.

Cochläus, for example, "was by calling a school master and philologist interested in editing ancient works, and a theologian only out of a sense of duty."[6] It was a sacrifice for him to engage in the conflict. He participated in it because, according to his own statement at the time of the Diet of Worms, the Catholic faith was more important to him than *belles lettres.*[7] Similarly, Hieronymus Emser saw himself faced with the task of leading a theological battle without being a theologian.

Scholastic theology had done little by way of preparation. How was the Mass to be defended, when the theology of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had not concerned itself with it practically at all and in regard to the Eucharist had been interested only in transubstantiation or in the cosmological questions connected with it? The unscriptural theology of nominalism, predominantly bogged down in problems of form, on which the criticism of Luther and of the Reformation had caught fire, provided a poor basis for defense. What was the very cause of the Reformation—the dogmatic vagueness and lack of religious depth and force in late scholastic theology—naturally also hamstrung any defense against it.

The principle of Scripture, relentlessly championed by Luther, placed the Catholic controversialists in the presence of a serious problem of methodology. Were they to abandon any appeal to tradition, to the Fathers, councils, and popes and be content with scriptural proof? Were they not to do so at least in practice in order to lend more force to their line of argument vis-a-vis the adherents of the Reformation? In principle they adhered to the view that "not only that which is expressly contained in the divine Scriptures and can be proved from them is to be believed and preserved,"[8] and considered tradition as the "living Gospel."[9] The more the Protestants contended among themselves over such central truths as the Eucharist, the Catholics pointed out that Scripture does not adequately interpret itself but needs a living *magisterium* for that purpose. In practice a few theologians were satisfied with scriptural proofs. Thus, for example, the *Scrutinium*[10] of the Franciscan Kaspar Schatzgeyer is almost a mere enumeration of scriptural passages on faith, grace, good works, the Mass, and so forth. But most Catholic writers, and especially the most outstanding among them, adhered to the traditional method. This did not stem merely from an embrace of dogmatic conviction or even less from inability to adjust to one's opponent and to follow him to the field of battle; it had its basis in the works of the Protestants themselves. Luther's contention that the idea of the Mass as a sacrifice had developed out of the ancient Christian offering of gifts, that before Gregory the Great private Masses were unknown, or that for twelve centuries the Church had known nothing about transubstantiation could not but stimulate his Catholic opponents to seek proof to the contrary in history. Even more than Luther, the other reformers, such as Melanchthon and Zwingli, appealed to the usage of the early Church and quoted the Church Fathers for this purpose. This not only justified the patristic argumentation of the Catholics but practically promoted it. But it also meant that it more and more acquired the character of an historical proof.[11]

---

[6] M. Spahn, *Johannes Cochlaeus* (Berlin 1898), p. 197.

[7] "Colloquium Cochlaei cum Luthero Wormatiae olim habitum" (1521), ed. by J. Greving, *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation* IV (Leipzig 1911), 177–218 (especially p. 199).

[8] J. Eck, *Enchiridion,* p. 33b.

[9] S. Hosius, *Confutatio,* p. 292b.

[10] *Scrutinium divinae Scripturae pro conciliatione dissidentium dogmatum,* ed. U. Schmidt, *CCath* 5 (Münster 1922).

Though at first the more peripheral questions of indulgences, vows, the veneration of saints, and the like formed the object of controversy, soon the basic problems—the doctrine of the Church, of authority, of the papal primacy, of justification, and of the Mass—preempted the stage. In the years 1522–26 there appeared a number of works in defense of the Mass. With its abolition, as idolatry, the reformers interfered the most profoundly and the most noticeably in the religious life of the people. Here the far-reaching effect of their teaching revealed itself most clearly.

The first, most indefatigable, best known, and also most hated adversary of the Reformation was Johannes Eck (1486–1543), diocesan priest and professor at Ingolstadt. At the Leipzig Disputation (1519) he had made plain Luther's abandonment of the idea of the Church. The same end was served by *De primatu Petri adversus Ludderum* (1520), which he submitted in Rome while working there from March until July of 1520 for the condemnation of Luther. Following several works on justification and penance—among others, *De poenitentia et confessione* (1522); *De purgatorio* (1523); *De satisfactione et aliis poenitentiae annexis* (1523)—he produced a "manual" in 1525, *Enchiridion locorum communium adversus Ludderanos,* as a counterpart of Melanchthon's *Loci communes* of 1521. In this he applies the scriptural and patristic proof to the questions in controversy and then seeks to refute the objections of his adversaries. More than ninety editions and translations prove the importance of the *Enchiridion.* When it turned out that, due to a dearth of Catholic sermon manuals, priests were using those of Protestants, Eck wrote five volumes of sermons in German on the liturgical cycles, the feasts of saints, the Sacraments, and the commandments. At the request of his prince, Duke Wilhem II, he published a German Bible in 1537. He himself translated the Old Testament, with great accuracy, into "High German," that is, the South German dialect. For the New Testament he adopted Emser's translation. Eck endeavored to comply with the trend of the age—"to the sources"—by a careful regard for Scripture and the Fathers. But despite an abundance of citations his encounter with them was not creative. He was unable to make them sufficiently fruitful in a religious and theological sense. Keeping in mind the lack of dogmatic clarity in this period, it was to Eck's merit to have shown clearly and even caustically that Luther stood, not for reform, but for revolution and to have spurned any compromise at the expense of truth. At the same time, however, the question arises whether Eck sufficiently felt the responsibility for unity and was correspondingly concerned about his opponent, or whether in his zeal for the disputation he pushed him to heretical conclusions and committed him to error.

---

[11] P. Polman, *L'element historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVIe siecle* (Gembloux 1932), p. 310; cf. p. 320.

A tireless champion of the Catholic Church at the court of Duke Georg of Saxony was the latter's secretary and chaplain, Hieronymus Emser (1478–1527). Following the Leipzig Disputation he had criticized Luther's position regarding the Bohemians. Alluding to Emser's coat of arms, which displayed an ibex, Luther replied in an extremely harsh polemic, *Ad aegocerotem Emserianum* (1519), the prelude to a series of polemical exchanges between the "goat of Leipzig" and the "bull of Wittenberg." Emser's later writings also, which were directed against Karlstadt and Zwingli as well as Luther and were concerned with the defense of images, the Mass, and the priesthood, did not amount to more than a mere "refutation" of his adversary. In 1523 after Emser had attributed 1400 "heretical errors and lies" to Luther's New Testament, he himself, at the instigation of his duke, published his own translation of the New Testament in 1527, which closely followed Luther's text. Emser had been summoned from the carefree life of a humanist to defend the Church. He had not declined the task but had accepted it zealously. Still, he was not enough of a theologian and commanded too little religious respect to do full justice to it.

Emser's successor as Duke Georg's chaplain was Johannes Cochläus (1479–1552). Like many other adversaries of Luther, he had originally held a positive opinion of the reformer. But as of Luther's treatises of 1520, he became his decided opponent. With more than two hundred writings he sought to serve his Church over a thirty-year span in a tireless and selfless literary activity. He was not a theologian and never became one of any significance. He was too much the humanist to become a writer for the people, and his works were burdened with an excess of scholarship. Devoid of a sense of humor and thus all the more fierce in his wrath, he proved to the "many-headed Luther" his real and alleged contradictions. His *Commentaria de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri* (Mainz 1549) had a powerful effect later on. As the first extensive biography of Luther, this work yielded important source material for the history of the Reformation, but it also carried a great deal of mud, which the malicious polemics on both sides had stirred up. The distortions presented in Cochläus' commentary on Luther determined the Catholic image of Luther into the twentieth century.

Johann Fabri (1478–1541) and Friedrich Nausea (c. 1490–1552) were able to work effectively against the Reformation and for the inner reform of the Church not only as authors but directly as successive bishops of Vienna. Fabri, humanist and jurist, came into the open against Luther only in 1521 as vicar general of Constance. In 1522 appeared his *Opus,* composed according to the scholastic method, a "work against some new doctrines of Martin Luther, which in every way contradict Christian teaching." In 1524 a Cologne Dominican published it under the new title, *Malleus in haeresim Lutheranam.* As coadjutor of Wiener Neustadt (from 1524), Fabri composed a number of works in German, the most important being the *Summarium* (1526), which had far more popular appeal. In picturesque language and with abundant references to Scripture he defended the teaching of the Church and pointed out the pernicious results of the Lutheran innovation, which had become especially clear in the Peasants' War. In the *Christliche underrichtung* (1528) he examined the "report of the visitors" (*WA* 26, 195–240) and showed how much Luther had "improved." Had he always taught in that manner, said Fabri, this great misfortune would not have fallen on Germany and the Church. This work shows that the Catholic controversialists still did not draw the full consequences from the break and in a sense were still running after their opponent instead of engaging in positive propaganda for their own cause. This is also the case when Fabri proves how Luther was actually dissenting from Huss and other heretics to whom he appealed,[12] and even contradicted himself.[13] As Bishop of Vienna (from 1530), Fabri published a series of sermons and writings in defense of the Mass and the priesthood, and *Über den Glauben und die guten Werke.* They were worthwhile works but they give little indication of the heated atmosphere of the age.

Fabri's coadjutor and successor, Friedrich Nausea, had been cathedral preacher and writer at Mainz since 1526. His *Centuriae IV homiliarum* appeared in Cologne in 1532. Following his summons to Vienna by Ferdinand I, he opposed the spread of the Reformation in sermons and in his writings. In his works on parish visitations (*Pastoralium inquisitionum elenchi tres,* 1547), and on the education of candidates for the priesthood (*Isagogicon de Clericis ordinandis,* 1548), and in his *Catechismus catholicus* (1543), he left behind him polemics and can be regarded as a representative of the incipient inner reform of the Church.

---

[12] *Wie sich Joh. Huss . . . Lehren und Bücher mit M. Luther vergleichen* (1528).

[13] *Antilogiarum M. Lutheri Babylonia ex eiusdem libris—excerpta* (1530).

Berthold Pürstinger of Chiemsee (1465–1543) had already resigned his episcopal see when in 1528 he wrote his *Tewtsche Theologey,* based on Scripture and closely related to Saint Thomas. It is considered the first work in German on dogmatic theology. His treatises on the Eucharist, the *Tewtsche Rational über das Ambt heiliger Mess* and the *Keligpuechl,* were directly concerned with defense against the Reformation. Whether he wrote the pamphlet *Onus ecclesiae* (1519; printed in 1524 and 1531) is disputed. It came out against the abuses of the age and called for Church reform in head and members.

Cologne and Louvain were the first universities to take a stand against Luther. On 7 November 1519 Louvain issued a *Condemnatio doctrinalis librorum Lutheri.* In 1521 the Louvain professor Jakob Latomus (c. 1475–1544), published *Articolorum doctrinae fratris Martini Lutheri . . . damnatio* against Luther. Luther later paid him the compliment that he was the "most distinguished writer against me."[14] Later works dealt with auricular confession (1525), the papal primacy (1526), and faith, good works, and religious vows (1530).

The Louvain professor and Dominican friar Eustachius van Zichem (d. 1538) brought out in 1521 a "brief refutation of Martin Luther's errors" and in 1523 a defense of the Sacraments and of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.[15] Johannes Driedo (c. 1480–1535), the third among the professors at Louvain, was one of the few contemporary controversialists who knew how to take up new questions and to seek new solutions without rancor and in loyalty to tradition. Hence his writings were still influential at Trent and in the grace controversy. In *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus libri IV* (1533) he discussed the methods and sources of theology; in *De captivitate et redemptione humani generis* (1534), the original state and the redemption of man. Important also for theological anthropology are his *Über die Vereinbarkeit von freiem Willen und Predestination* (1537, *Über Gnade und freien Willen* (1537), and *Über die christliche Freiheit* (1546). These three were published posthumously, the last only in the complete edition prepared by Ruard Tapper (1487–1559) in 1546. Tapper and his colleague at Louvain, Josse Ravesteyn (1506–70), extend into the era of the Council of Trent. In 1544 Louvain University committed its professors to fifty-nine theses. In them it provided, in a carefully thought out-outline of the controverted teachings, a summary of the work thus far accomplished and essentially anticipated the constructing of the Tridentine decrees.[16]

---

[14] *WA, Tr* I, 202; cf. II, 189, IV, 145, V, 75.

[15] *Errorum M. Luther brevis confutatio* and *Sacramentorum brevis elucidatio simulque nonulla perversa M. Luther dogmata excludens.* Reprinted in *Bibliotheca reformatoria neerlandica* III, ed. F. Pijper (The Hague 1905), 227–284, 295–373.

From the University of Louvain came the influential controversialist Albert Pigge (1490–1542). With the doctrine of papal infallibility, expounded in *Hierarchiae ecclesiasticae assertio* (1538), he exerted influence up to modern times. The Council of Trent adopted his views on tradition but not those on justification. His writings *Über den freien Willen des Menschen* (1541) and on original sin in *Controversiarum praecipuarum . . . explicatio* (1541) were even put on the Index at Lisbon in 1624.

In England the first to take up the pen in reply to Luther's *De captivitate Babylonica* was King Henry VIII himself, probably assisted by Thomas More (1478–1535). For, in the face of such heresies, no one could "refrain from opposing them with all one's diligence and resources." In content and method his *Assertio septem sacramentorum* (1521) excelled the other early works of controversy. In 1522 it came out in two German translations, by H. Emser and T. Murner. Luther reacted angrily in his *Antwort deutsch auf König Heinrichs Buch* (1522; *WA* 10, II, 227–262). Ironically the royal "defender of the faith" had his own collaborators Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher (1469–1535) executed for their opposition to his headship of the Church in 1535. As humanists, both of them had profitably used the new interest in the Bible and the Fathers for the defense of the Church.

Zealous literary adversaries of Luther were found in the several Orders, especially in the ranks of the Dominicans and the Franciscans. The Dominicans had managed the trial against Luther and supplied the first writers against him. Silvester Prierias (1456–1523) was concerned, as *Magister sacri palatii* and censor, with Luther's indulgence theses and "quickly strode into the arena" (*WA, Tr* 3, 564, no. 3722) with his *Dialogus* of June 1518. His polemic was frivolous and clumsy. He showed little readiness to take up Luther's concern but clearly grasped and stressed that the Church, in both its ecclesiastical and papal authority, was in question. To Luther's *Responsio* (*WA* I, 647–868) Prierias gave a preliminary answer in his *Replica.*[17] Then, in the *Epitoma responsionis ad Lutherum* (1519; *WA* 6, 328–348), he announced a detailed discussion with Luther on the authority of the pope and the power of indulgences. It appeared at Rome in 1520 under the title *Errata et argumenta Martini Lutheri recitata, detecta, repulsa. . . .* In it he expounded the monarchical constitution of the Church in a quite one-sided fashion. As vicar of Christ, the pope has not only the highest but the only ordinary power. He is *virtualiter* the Catholic Church and the source of all jurisdiction. A council has power only as assigned to it by the pope.[18] This chief polemic of Prierias gained little notice and Luther deigned it as unworthy of an answer.

---

[16] H. De Jongh, *L'ancienne faculte de theologie de Louvain* (Louvain 1911), pp. 81*–89; cf. H. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* I, 326 (*History of the Council of Trent* I, 398f., 406f.).

[17] With a foreword by Luther given in print (*WA* II, 50–56).

Cardinal Thomas de Vio (1469–1534), commonly known as Cajetan, the most important theologian of the day, had already composed a treatise on indulgences (*De indulgentiis* of 8 December 1517) before obtaining a copy of Luther's theses and meeting him in person at Augsburg. In that city he wrote a number of essays on indulgences and penance, which he completed, after his return to Rome, with *De indulgentia plenaria concessa defunctis* of 20 November 1519. In this he strove for an objective solution to the difficulties, which he did not deny, and just as he denounced Luther's errors, so also did he blame the indulgence preachers, who talked too big and gave out their private opinions as the Church's teaching.[19] On the cardinal point of the controversy Cajetan in 1521 wrote *De divina institutione Pontificatus Romani* in reply to Luther's *Resolutio . . . de potestate Papae* of 1519 (*WA* 2, 183–240). He did not, however, mention his adversary by name nor did he lapse into a violently polemical tone so common at the time. His *opuscula* on the Eucharist (*De coena Domini,* 1525; *De sacrificio Missae,* 1531; *De communione,* 1531) stand out among the contemporary writings of others. Not only does he assert the unity of the Mass and the sacrifice of the cross; he is also able to establish it theologically. Christ is present "immolatitio modo," in the manner of sacrifice. The sacrifice is not repeated, but the unique sacrifice, offered once, continues to endure, and in repeated celebrations the everlasting sacrifice is rendered present. Hence, in the Mass Christ is the real priest and intrinsically the Mass is of infinite value. The faith and devotion of the participants are decisive for its fruitfulness. Here was an answer to Luther's objections to the Mass. But it was not heard in Germany and had little effect even on the Council of Trent.

In *De fide et operibus* (1532) Cajetan took up again the chief controversial point discussed with Luther at Augsburg in 1518—the certainty of faith versus reflexive faith. He attacked the confusing of a justifying faith with a subjective *credulitas;* he fought against the idea that it is supposedly not enough to receive the Sacrament with confidence in the merits of Christ, but rather that a person has to be certain of being justified, and that this certainty, only in a sense, establishes justification.[20]

---

[18] "Si vero loquamur de authoritate concilii quae convenit omnibus collective sive collegialiter, eadem est authoritas pontificis et collegii: sed in pontifice est plena et ordinaria, in concilio autem est quantum placet papae, et commissa seu vicaria" (cap. 12, fol. LXXXI b; cf. F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Freiburg 1912), p. 25).

[19] *Opuscula* (Lyons 1562), pp. 103ff.

Exceptionally noisy and pugnacious was Ambrosius Catharinus (c. 1484–1553), who assailed not only Luther but even his own confreres, Cajetan, Soto, and Spina. This "third of the Thomists," as Luther styled him (*WA* 7, 706), composed in 1520, at the command of his superiors, the comprehensive *Apologia pro veritate catholicae et apostolicae fidei* against Luther, and followed it up with the *Excusatio disputationis contra Martinum* even before being in possession of the reformer's vexed reply (*WA* 7, 705–778). The *Apologia* is basically concerned with Luther's *Resolutio Lutheriana . . . de potestate Papae* and, apart from the authority of the Church and the papal primacy, treats in some detail only penance and purgatory. The author's line of argument does not substantially go beyond Prierias; it is merely much more eloquent and clever, without being any less biting and polemical. He tried to establish that Luther was a heretic. After the *Excusatio* Ambrosius Catharinus took no further part in the dispute over faith until 1540, when his *Speculum haereticorum* appeared. In this he tried to unmask the true aims of the reformers, show the evil results of their doctrines, and call for the extirpation of the heresy.

In Germany the Dominican Jakob van Hoogstraeten (1460–1527) came forward against Luther. Ever since the Reuchlin controversy public opinion had been strongly prejudiced against him. When in the dedicatory epistle to his *Zerstörung der Kabala* in April 1519 he suggested that Leo X take energetic action against the disturbers of the Christian faith, without at all mentioning Luther, the latter reacted sharply against the "grand inquisitor" who lusted after the blood of his brothers but was himself the worst heretic (*WA* 2, 386f.). Hoogstraeten did not go in for cheap polemics. He traced Luther's sources and tried to refute him by Augustine in *Cum Divo Augustino colloquia contra enormes et perversos Lutheri errores* (1521–1522). In this he noted the doctrine of original sin and concupiscence as the stumbling block on which Luther had been shattered. Later works of controversy dealt with the veneration of saints, faith and works, and the liberty of the Christian.

As court preacher at Dessau, the Dominican Johannes Mensing (d. c.

---

[20] "Quod dicta credulitas apprehendit remissionem peccatorum" (cap. 3), *Opuscula,* p. 288.

1541)[21] published three treatises on the Mass in 1526, two sermons on the Catholic priesthood in 1527, and in 1529 an essay on the Blessed Sacrament, in particular on the doctrine of concomitance. He also produced an essay on the authority of the Church. He tried to show that the sacrifice of the cross was not confined to the restrictions of history. The very sacrifices of the Old Covenant obtained their efficacy from the cross and in them Christ was already sacrificed. In the New Covenant the sacrifice on the cross remains present before the heavenly Father and hence the priesthood of Christ is eternal. But Mensing does not explicitly draw the obvious conclusion—that the Mass is the representation before the heavenly Father of the ever present sacrifice of the cross. His *Antapologie* (1533–35) is the most important reply to the *Confessio Augustana* and its defense of the teaching of justification.

Johannes Faber (c. 1470–1530), long-time prior at Augsburg, was a close friend of Erasmus and, like him, opposed any strong action against Luther. He expressed this view in the brief *Iudicium in causa Lutheri* (1527) and even more clearly in a "Ratschlag," which appeared anonymously at Cologne at the end of 1520 and was attributed to Erasmus. It was only after the Diet of Worms of 1521 that Faber changed his mind and came out determinedly against the innovation.

More effective as a writer was Johann Fabri (1504–58), also active at Augsburg. But his works, including a *Katechismus* (1551), *Christlich-katholischer Unterricht* (1556), and a much read work on the Mass (1555), belong to the later phase of the controversy in connection with the Council of Trent. The same holds true of the work of Ambrosius Pelagus (1493–1561), except for his treatises of 1528–1529 on the Mass, directed against Oecolampadius.

The Dominican Johannes Dietenberger (c. 1475–1537) was recruited by Johannes Cochläus for the literary war against Luther. As prior at Frankfurt and Koblenz and as professor at Mainz, he composed some twenty polemical works based on the Bible. In 1534 he published a German Bible, which took over extensive parts of Emser's New Testament. For the Old Testament he used the Vulgate as basis. He tried to avoid the linguistic harshness of the pre-Luther translations and had frequent, if critical, recourse to Luther's Bible. His was the most popular Catholic translation of the Bible into German. It saw fifty-eight editions of the complete Bible, and in addition fourteen of the New Testament and twenty of the Psalter alone. In his last work, the German catechism of 1537, polemics disappear and Dietenberger's popular and deeply religious style attained its full expression.

---

[21] N. Paulus, *Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampf gegen Luther* (Freiburg 1903), pp. 16–45; E. Iserloh, *Der Kampf um die Messe* (Münster 1952), pp. 46–52.

The controversialist writings of the Franciscans were in general more appealing to the people than the often overly scholastic counterparts composed by Dominicans. Augustin von Alveldt (c. 1480–after 1532), lecturer in theology at Leipzig, published in 1520 eight other works in addition to his *Super apostolica sede* to which Luther reacted violently with his *Von dem Papsttum zu Rom wider den hochberühmten Romanisten zu Leipzig* (*WA* 6, 285–324).

"Of all Luther's literary opponents, without any question the most quick-witted, the cleverest, and the most popular"[22] was the Strasbourg Franciscan Thomas Murner (1475–1537). He was already one of the favorite and most influential authors when he took up his pen against the religious novelties. Among his four works of 1520 against Luther, most deserving of mention is his *Christliche und brüderliche Ermahnung.* It defends the Mass against the *Sermon von dem Neuen Testament.* Genuinely fraternal in tone, it is both popular and deeply religious. Calumnies such as *Murnarr* and defamations later provoked Murner to give in further to his bent for satire and polemics. His satirical epic, *Vom Lutherischen Narren* (1522), is one of the very few Catholic writings of these years which to some extent equalled Luther in journalistic skill and even in poetic vigor. Expelled from Strasbourg, Murner went in 1525 to Lucerne. He took part in the Baden Disputation of 1526 and wrote against the Swiss reformers, among other works, *Kirchendieb und Ketzerkalender* (1527) and *Die gots heylige mess* (1528).

With his *Scrutinium divinae Scripturae* Kaspar Schatzgeyer (1463–1527), provincial of the South German Franciscan Observants, began a productive career in controversial theology that was to yield twenty-nine works in print and sixteen in manuscript. In a truly ironic spirit he tried to write "pro conciliatione dissidentium dogmatum" and did not become bogged down in mere polemics. Through arguments based on Scripture he approached the reformers on the plane of method. Better than anyone else he was able to present the Catholic teaching, especially on the Church and the Mass, in a way that not only refuted the error of the reformers but at the same time pointed out what was legitimate in their concern in the whole context of truth. Unfortunately, his voice could not make itself heard due to the noisy polemics and his premature death.

His confrere at Marburg, Nikolas (Ferber) Herborn (c. 1480–1535), had vainly fought in several polemics against the Reformation that was being carried out by the ex-Franciscan Francis Lambert of Avignon, acting on the orders of Philip of Hesse. Having fled to Cologne in 1527,

---

[22] W. Kawerau, *Murner und die deutsche Reformation* (Halle 1891), p. 1.

Herborn wrote a manual[23] against contemporary errors, dealing in popular form with almost all the truths of faith and demonstrating them from Scripture. Without attacking specific persons or books, he called attention to the points in controversy, extolled the Church, and depicted the sad consequences of the revolt.

In the effort to prove one's adversary wrong and to triumph over him instead of winning him back lay the danger of controversial theology. This biased polemical attitude was very plainly characterized by the Dutchman, Johann van Kampen, when in 1536 he wrote from Rome that the "four evangelists"—Fabri, Eck, Cochläus, and Nausea—would, he was convinced, "rather that three new Luthers should arise than that the one Luther should be converted."[24] The writer had been summoned to the service of Cardinal Contarini in Rome. Contarini, with Johannes Gropper, Julius Pflug, Michael Helding, Georg Witzel, and others, belonged to a group of theologians who displayed understanding for the religious aims of the Reformation and at first worked for both unity and reform. As so-called theologians of mediation,[25] they were, of course, often exposed to the charge of making compromises at the expense of the truth.

Gasparo Contarini (1483–1542), in his *Confutatio articulorum seu quaestionum Lutheranorum,* a refutation of the main points in the *Confessio Augustana,* complains that the Christians of his day, instead of confessing the faith and, with it, preserving love and humility, were dazzled by disputatiousness and were concerned with nothing but "defending their own viewpoint and refuting that of the opponent."[26] He himself took pains to be open-minded in regard to his opponent's motives and to do justice to him. Even before his elevation to the purple while still a layman in 1535, he defended the divine right of the papacy in *De potestate Pontificis.* In a comprehensive treatise on the Sacraments he refers to the reform position merely in brief remarks. At the Religious Colloquy of Regensburg both sides accepted the doctrine of twofold justice—the one inherent in us and imperfect; the other the justice of Christ imputed to us. The cardinal explained this in more detail in the *Epistola de iustificatione*[27] of 25 May 1541. But this concept was rejected in a consistory at Rome on 27 May 1541 and later at Trent.

As a student of Albert Pigge (Pighius), Johann Gropper (1503–1559) of Cologne had already maintained the doctrine of a twofold justice in 1538 in his *Enchiridion Christianae Institutionis* and he later worked out the subject in full detail in his *Antididagma* (1544). If this "protagonist of the ancient faith,"[28] who preserved Cologne and hence Northwest Germany for the Church, could, like Contarini, be suspected of heresy, and if his *Enchiridion* was consigned to the Index under Clement VIII, then it is easy to see what external and inner danger those persons were courting who did not yet regard the doctrinal split as irreconcilable.

---

[23] *Locorum communium, adversus huius temporis haereses Enchiridion* (1528), ed. P. Schlager, *CCath,* 12 (Münster 1927).

[24] *ZKG* 43 (1924), 217.

[25] On this inadequate term cf. J. Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland* II (Freiburg, 4th ed. 1962), 216–219; W. Lipgens, *Kardinal J. Gropper* (Münster 1951), pp. 111–114.

[26] *CCath* 7 (Münster 1923), 17.

[27] Ibid., pp. 23–34.

Julius Pflug (1499–1564) likewise fell under the reproach of doctrinal unreliability in a letter from Johannes Eck to Contarini.[29] As Bishop of Naumburg–Zeitz, he was already forced by circumstances, instead of attacking the reformers, to devote himself rather to the instruction of his poorly educated faithful and to gaining back Protestants who had for the most part been only superficially won to the new faith. Especially in his *Institutio Christiani Hominis* (1562), a "catechism in the service of unity of faith," Pflug displays himself as a pastor and a herald of the Gospel far more than as an apologist and controversialist.

Also primarily a preaching theologian was Michael Helding (1506–1561), Auxiliary Bishop of Mainz. Concern for catechetical instruction is the dominant motive in his series of sermons on several books of the Bible and in his sermons on the Mass (1548). His catechetical sermons, delivered in the Mainz cathedral from 1542 to 1544, were printed as *Catechismus, das ist Christliche Underweissung,* in 1551 and later, as a manual for parish priests.

Thus, during the years up to 1540, occurred the development of the literature of controversy from polemics to a positive presentation of the faith, from the *enchiridion,* a brief apologetically oriented compendium of dogma, expanding into a proclamation of the faith in great homiletic works, such as those of Eck (1530–39), Nausea (1542), and Hoffmeister (1547), and into catechisms.

The first German catechism before that of Dietenberger was composed in 1535 by Georg Witzel (1501–73). He had studied for a short time at Wittenberg under Luther and Melanchthon, but, nevertheless, in 1520 he was ordained a priest. In 1523 he married without a dispensation and became a Protestant. According to his own account he was led to this by the allurement of the new, the sad condition of the Church, but especially by "the great hope that everything might become much more Christian."[30] It was precisely on this last point that he was disillusioned. Soon "much in the evangelical Church, above all in regard to morals," began to offend him. In addition, an intensive study of the Church Fathers assured him that the Reformation was not in harmony with the apostolic tradition. He resigned as a pastor in 1531 and in his *Apologie* of 1533 publicly abandoned Luther. Therefore he and his family led an insecure life filled with privations, persecuted by Protestants and often treated with distrust by Catholics. But Witzel labored indefatigably for the reform and unity of the Church at religious conferences and at diets, with memoranda for the Emperors Ferdinand I and Maximilian II, the "Via regia," and in almost 150 writings.

---

[28] H. Förster, *Reformbestrebungen Adolfs III. vom Schaumburg in der Kölner Kirchenprovinz* (Münster 1925), p. 11.

[29] Letter of 20 January 1542 (W. Friedensburg, *Briefwechsel,* p. 479).

[30] *Epistolarum . . . libri IV* (Leipzig 1537), IV, S. b 4 v.

His literary work served primarily for preaching, for the liturgy, and for catechetical instruction. Numerous and frequently printed were his lectures and sermons. His works on the history of the Church and of the liturgy sought to point out the usages of the ancient Church (*Typus ecclesiae,* 1540; Parts I–V, 1559) or aimed to defend the Mass (*Von der hl. Eucharisty odder Mess,* 1534 and later) and the liturgy (*Defensio Ecclesiasticae Liturgiae,* 1564, and other works). By means of translations of the missal, ritual, and breviary he tried to arouse an understanding of the liturgy and to make possible an active participation by the laity.[31] He warmly advocated German hymns. He probably worked on the *New Gesangbüchlein* (1537) of Michael Vehe (d. 1539), but he himself also published German hymnals (*Odae Christianae,* 1541). His *Catechismus Ecclesiae* (1535 and later) was the first in the German language and noteworthy as the first to provide a summary of biblical history. It was followed by other catechisms and catechetical works. Witzel's attempts at mediation were Erasmian in spirit.[32] By means of a serious moral reform and with the aid of a few concessions in dogmatically unimportant points, such as the lay chalice and clerical marriage, he hoped to overcome the religious split on the basis of the doctrine of the Fathers. Witzel's efforts were destined to have no penetrating success, and his rich literary legacy to have only a slight effect.

History followed other paths. It agreed that the Bishop of Ermland and papal legate at Trent, Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius (1504–1579), was right when he prevented the invitation of Witzel to Trent because of the latter's readiness to make concessions.[33] Hosius accepted the separation in faith as a melancholy fact and clearly pinpointed the doctrinal differences. By putting decisive emphasis on the divine authority of the Church, indivisible in essence, and on the truth entrusted to her and by pointing at the split within Protestantism he sought to closely tie the wavering to the Church and hoped in time to win back the schismatics. His *Confessio catholicae fidei* (1552–53) brought to a close the Catholic handbook literature. During its author's lifetime it saw thirty editions and translations.

---

[31] *Psaltes Ecclesiasticus* (1550); *Ecclesiastica Liturgia. Wie sich der gemein Christen Lay der Latinischen Missen zur besserung sein selbst gebrauchen künde* (1545); *Verdeutschte Kyrchgesenge* (1546); *Täglichs lob Gottes* (1545).

[32] *Methodus Concordiae ecclesiasticae* (1537); *Dialogorum libri tres. Drey Gesprechbüchlein von der Religion sachen in itzigem ferlichen Zweispalt* (1539 and 1562); O. Clemen, "Reunionsvorschläge Witzels von 1540," *ARG* 10 (1912f.), 101–105.

[33] *Nuntiaturberichte,* section 2, I (Vienna 1897), 269f.

SECTION THREE

The Reform in the German Principalities

CHAPTER 17

The Confessional Leagues. The Imperial Diets of Nürnberg (1524) and Speyer (1526)

The reform movement was able to grow unhindered because the chief representatives of the old order, Emperor and Pope, were consuming their energies in war against each other. The Pope feared Habsburg power in Lombardy and Naples and supported France against the Emperor. The French King conspired with the Turks and urged them, after the fall of Belgrade, to invade Hungary, which, through the marriage of Ferdinand of Austria with Queen Anna, had become the outpost of Habsburg power. Hence Charles V was prevented from energetically tackling the internal problems of Germany. He and his brother Ferdinand, who had remained in the Empire, were not able to take measures against princes whose help they needed in the war against the Turks. Neither the Imperial Governing Council nor the Imperial Diets were able or even willing to implement the Edict of Worms. The Third Diet of Nürnberg, opening in January 1524, continued the policy of procrastination, declaring that the estates should, "as far as possible," act in accordance with the Edict of Worms. At the same time there was a new demand for a free general council on German territory, which should carry out Church reform and clarify the questions in dispute, "so that the good would not be suppressed with the evil and it would finally be discussed how each should behave in the future."[1] It was, however, fully understood that the summoning of the council would take time and that any delay would give further aid to the innovations. This induced especially the staunchly Catholic Bavarian Dukes to demand "a synod of the German nation."[2]

This idea of a national council for settling the religious question and redressing the grievances pointed out in the *gravamina* already had been broached in November 1523 at a conference in Salzburg of the representatives of the bishops of the Salzburg province.[3] The papal legate

---

[1] *RTA* IV, 604

[2] Ibid., 434.

[3] *ARC* I, 186f.

Lorenzo Campeggio saw in a national council the danger of the apostasy of the entire nation and determinedly rejected it. Just the same, the estates clung to their project and decided that, until the convoking of the general council, an assembly of the German nation should be held. It was to meet at Speyer on Martinmas on 11 November.[4] In Rome there was dismay over the attempt to reach a national ecclesiastical solution and a protest was lodged with the Emperor, who on 15 July forbade the Speyer assembly. A national council had about as little place in the universalism of Charles V as it had in the views of the Pope, and through the imperial veto it was temporarily shelved as a means of solving the Church problem.

But at the diet the legate Campeggio had realized that no implementation of the Edict of Worms could be expected from the Empire and that princes as strongly anti-Lutheran as the Bavarian Dukes had demanded a German ecclesiastical assembly in order to make possible a quick and thorough improvement of Church conditions. He endeavored to do justice to this concern by means of provincial councils or of similar particular boards appointed by the Church. He urged the founding of a league of the South German princes and the Rhenish bishops. In March–April 1524 he had requested permission from Clement VII for a special reform conference. And so on 8 May invitations were issued by the legate and the Archduke Ferdinand to the Bavarian Dukes Wilhelm and Ludwig and to twelve bishops of the Austrian and Bavarian territories to meet at Regensburg in order to discuss an anti-Lutheran front. In addition, the reform of the Church and the mutual grievances of the spiritual and the secular princes were to be the themes of the conference.

In the complaints the secular lords demanded that steps be taken not only in the struggle against Lutheranism but also that the reform and inner renewal of the Church should be seriously faced. The bishops, on the other hand, called for the full restoration of their rights of immunity and of jurisdiction. The princes, especially the Bavarian Dukes, sought to exercise, by means of prelates belonging to their territories, criminal justice against heretical or otherwise culpable clerics in the territories of those bishops who failed to take action.[5] The bishops, seeing in this a threat to their jurisdiction, demanded its complete restoration as a sine qua non of effective reform work.

The Regensburg Conference lasted from 27 June to 7 July. The negotiations were dominated by the secular princes, Archduke Ferdinand and the Bavarian Dukes. The bishops and their proxies had no other choice than to accept the decision of the Big Two and to declare their approval.[6] The resulting resentments naturally impaired the effectiveness of the conference results. These were contained in two decrees. In the Regensburg Agreement of 6 July 1524,[7] the implementation of the Edict of Worms was called for. Furthermore, attention was to be devoted to the preaching of the true Gospel by certified preachers and to the reform of the clergy. As to the celebration of Mass, the administration of the Sacraments, and the carrying out of other usages, persons should "adhere to what has laudably come down to us from the holy Fathers and our ancestors."[8] Hence stern measures were to be taken against the reception of the Eucharist without previous confession and against disregard of the laws of abstinence and fasting. Runaway religious and those living in concubinage were to be punished, and the circulation of heretical books was to be stopped by censorship and authorization to print, to be granted expressly. Study at Wittenberg was to be forbidden, and students were to be recalled from there within three months under the threat of confiscation of their benefices. Whoever had studied there should not be admitted to any offices or benefices. Penalties and banishments decreed in one territory should be enforced also in all others. In the event of uprisings the parties would assist one another. These regulations were concerned mainly with measures against Lutheranism, while the Regensburg Reform Order of 7 July 1524, proposed by Campeggio and issued by him, dealt especially with eliminating abuses within the Church and improving the conduct of priests.[9] "If the Regensburg formula had been given effect throughout Germany, as had been planned, the term 'reformation' would no longer have stood for something exclusively Lutheran and a national council would have been superfluous."[10]

---

[4] *RTA* IV, 604.

[5] *ARC* I 159f.

But even the South German bishops represented at the conference were, from indolence and from concern about their jurisdiction, not overly inclined to put the Regensburg Reform Order into effect. It was, therefore, all the more difficult to move to action other bishops who had not been participants in it. Hence Campeggio's effort to make the Reform Order binding on the entire German Church by means of a decree was a failure, for the Rhenish ecclesiastical princes would not comply with an enactment in which they had not participated. Thus any decisive effectiveness was denied the Regensburg Conference, since one can speak of a league only in a very limited sense. Nevertheless, here the first official step toward Church reform was taken, which served also as the preliminary to forming confessional alliances.

---

[6] Ibid., 296.

[7] Ibid., 329–334.

[8] Ibid., 331.

[9] Ibid., 334–344. The German title under which it was published in Austria and Bavaria by the princes is as follows: "Ordnung und Reformation zu abstellung der Missbreuch: und aufrichtung aines erbern wesens: und wandls in der gaistlichkeit" (*ARC* I, 363).

[10] Jedin, I 174 (English trans. I, 218).

In the succeeding year, on 19 July 1525, a union of princes of North Germany was established at Dessau, corresponding to the Regensburg Union. Influenced by the Peasants' War and convinced that its source was the new preaching, the Electors Joachim I of Brandenburg and Albrecht of Mainz and the Dukes Georg of Saxony and Eric I and Heinz II of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel formed an agreement, the League of Dessau, for resisting any peasant risings and for exterminating the Lutheran sect as the "root of this disturbance."

Philip of Hesse (1504–67) had put down the Peasants' War, together with his father-in-law, Georg of Saxony. They had the same aim—to strengthen their territorial authority following the unrest. But their differing attitudes toward the reform movement would not allow them to pursue the aim together. Converted by Melanchthon, Philip of Hesse was in 1524 the first German prince to embrace the Reformation. Luther's own prince, Frederick the Wise, on the other hand, did not receive communion according to the Lutheran rite until he lay on his death bed. At his death on 5 May 1525 he was succeeded by his brother, Johann the Steadfast, who came forward more openly and more energetically for the Reformation. On 6 May 1526 Philip of Hesse formed with him the League of Gotha-Thorgau, which was joined at Magdeburg on 12 June by the Princes Ernst and Franz of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, Philip of Braunschweig-Grubenhagen, Heinz of Mecklenburg, Wolfgang of Anhalt, and Albrecht of Mansfeld, and by the city of Magdeburg. Albrecht of Prussia, who had transformed the territory of the Teutonic Order into a secular principality which he held as a fief of Poland, also allied himself with Johann of Saxony. Thus in Germany, not only did differing religious views confront each other; they now had as their counterparts political power alignments, thereby deepening the split and bringing in their wake the danger of religious wars.

After the Peace of Madrid (14 January 1526), Charles V felt he was free to arrange the religious affairs of Germany according to his own views and to enforce the Edict of Worms. Accordingly, he issued instructions to the Archduke Ferdinand for a diet which was summoned to Speyer for 1 May but did not actually begin its deliberations until 25 June 1526. Charles decreed that in matters of faith nothing should be changed; everything should continue as before "until the council should take up and establish a unanimous, Christian, constant, and needed reformation, regulation, and order." In view of the change that had meanwhile occurred in the political situation—on 22 May 1526 the Pope had formed the League of Cognac with the Emperor's enemies, while the Turks were increasing their pressure on Ferdinand's lands—such an edict could only cripple the not very energetic efforts for reform on the Catholic side.

The evangelical estates, notably the cities, showed a high degree of self-assurance. On the cloaks and in the lodgings of the Saxons and Hessians was to be seen the slogan, "Verbum Dei manet in aeternum." In the courtyards of their inns their preachers recruited publicly for the new faith. According to one report, it was evident to all the people that they no longer belonged to the old faith, "for they no longer went to Mass, they observed no fast days, they made no distinction of foods."[11] Thus the ineffectiveness of the Edict of Worms became clear to everyone. A committee of secular and ecclesiastical princes, including Philip of Hesse, submitted an opinion relevant to the traditional ceremonies and the correcting of abuses. According to this, the seven Sacraments and the Mass should be retained; but fees and Masses offered for money alone were to be abolished. To make it possible for the people to participate in a lively faith and an inner union with the Passion of Christ, the texts of the liturgy should be recited in German and explained. The lay chalice should be tolerated until a general council could give a decision and it would be better to allow priests to marry than to watch how they cohabited with persons of evil reputation to the general scandal and with injury to their souls.

The Archduke Ferdinand rejected the suggestions, appealing to the imperial instructions, according to which no break was to be made with the tradition of the Church until the council. But under the pressure of the political situation and the necessity of obtaining help from the estates against the Turks, he gave his consent to the Recess of the Diet of 27 August, just two days before the defeat of the Hungarians by the Turks at Mohacs. According to this, no innovations were to be undertaken in matters of the Christian faith and religion, in conformity with the imperial instruction. It was felt that the best means of establishing peace and unity was to hold, within a year or eighteen months, a free general council or at least a German national council. *Apropos* of the Edict of Worms, the estates were in agreement that, until the holding of the council, they, with their subjects, "should live, rule, and act in such a way as each expects and trusts to be justifiable before God and the imperial majesty."[12]

---

[11] Cited from J. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* III (Freiburg, 15th ed. 1891), 49; cf. W. Friedensburg, *Der Reichstag zu Speier 1526 im Zusammenhang der politischen und kirchlichen Entwicklung Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter* (Berlin 1887), pp. 299ff.

Such procrastinating decrees could not but have a catastrophic effect on the old faith, the slighter the prospects became for an early convoking of the council. In itself the Recess of the Diet contained no acknowledgment of territorial churches or of a *ius reformandi* and gave no pretext for the suppression of Catholic worship and the confiscation of Church property. But *de facto* it abetted such measures and in the course of time was quoted as their justification.

---

[12] *Neue Sammlung der Reichstagsabschiede: I. Teil derer Reichstagsabschiede von dem Jahr 1495 bis auf das Jahr 1551* (Frankfurt/Main, 1747), pp. 273ff., sections 1–4, 11.

CHAPTER 18

Luther's Concept of the Church and Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms

In the mid-1520s the first German territorial princes and city governments adhered openly to the Reformation. Thereby the question was raised of what position they should occupy in the new ecclesiastical system and whether they should directly participate in constructing it. This construction proceeded slowly. Many of the old institutions had indeed ended, but Luther hesitated to create new ones. He long did without an order of worship and of Church organization, partly because he regarded all externals as indifferent and hence optional—for him rites and institutions were *adiaphora*[1]—partly because he felt that, like himself, everyone had to find justifying faith by a free decision of conscience; and could be led to this only by the preaching of the Gospel. One must not encroach upon this personal decision of faith by means of external reforms, and no one must be induced or compelled to take part in ceremonies whose inner meaning he does not grasp or again he would be legally mistaken.

Concept of the Church

Luther did not offer a new concept of the Church in the sense of determining a system. In the struggle against the Church of his day, which, as a self-sufficient and even a tyrannical institution, in his view took the place of salvation based on faith in Christ's Gospel, and against the

---

[1] "Libertas enim spiritus hic regnat, quae facit omnia indifferentia nulla necessaria, quaecumque corporalia et terrena sunt" (*WA* 7, 720, 11).

Anabaptists, who based the Gospel only on the subjectivity of man, Luther wanted to destroy what seemed to him to contradict the "true Church" and to stress what seemed hitherto dim. For him the Church was a self-evident precondition, without which the Christian would be nothing. Christ "wishes to hear the multitude, not me, not you, not a Pharisee running around by himself."[2]

But for Luther the Church was not the external authority that threatened him with excommunication, not the hierarchical organization and sacral institution, but the community of the true believers in Christ. Luther did not esteem the word "church," because he incorrectly derived it from "Curia."[3] He preferred "common of all Christians," "Christian community or assembly," "nation of believers," "community of the saints," that is, of the *fideles,* who in faith are certain of forgiveness for Christ's sake. But this community in faith is not to be understood in the sense of congregationalism. It is not produced by the voluntary amalgamation of believers, but "convened by the Holy Spirit in one faith."[4] The Gospel transmitted in word and Sacrament constitutes the Church. She is "creatura verbi." Wherever the Gospel is proclaimed in accord with Scripture, the true Church (*ecclesia spiritualis*) lives in the external church (*ecclesia manifesta*), as the soul in the body.[5]

Word and Sacrament are external signs for the existence of the true Church, which herself remains hidden.

> The signs whereby one can note externally where the same Church is in the world are baptism, Sacrament, and the Gospel.[6] A sign is actually necessary, and we have it—baptism, bread, and, the most important of all, the Gospel. These three are Christians' sign of recognition, voucher, and criterion. For, where you see baptism, bread, and Gospel, no matter where, no matter by whom directed, there you must not doubt is the Church.[7]

In this regard the word has precedence over the Sacrament.

> The Gospel is, even before the bread and baptism, the real, surest, and most excellent sign of the Church. For only by the Gospel and

---

[2] *Auslegung deutsch des Vaterunsers* (1519; *WA* 2, 114, 28).

[3] *Grosser Katechismus* II, 48; *Bekenntnisschriften,* p. 656.

[4] *Grosser Katechismus* II, 51; *Bekenntnisschriften,* p. 657.

[5] Because of baptism and the word of God, even the Roman Church was holy for Luther: "Nos et dicimus hodie Ecclesiam Romanam Sanctam . . . manent in Romana urbe, quamquam Sodoma periore, baptismus, vox Evangelii, textus, sacra scriptura, ministeria, nomen Christi, dei . . . Ecclesia ergo Romana est sancta, quia habet nomen sanctum dei, baptismum, verbum" (1531; *WA* 40, I, 68).

[6] *Vom Papsttum zu Rom* (1520; *WA* 6, 301, 3).

[7] *Ad librum . . . Ambrosii Catharini responsio* (1521; *WA* 7, 720, 34).

> through the Gospel is the Church received, formed, nourished, attested, fashioned, fed, clothed, adorned, strengthened, armed, equipped, maintained. In brief, the entire life and being of the Church consists in the word of God.[8] In this must one certainly recognize the Christian community: where the pure Gospel is preached. [*WA* 11, 408] Hence in the Church nothing must be preached except the certain, pure, and agreed word of God. Where this is wanting there is no longer the Church. [*WA* 51, 518]

Luther's concern was not for the written but for the proclaimed word, and in that context about the word in the Church. But no special office is required for the proclamation, "for whatever comes forth from baptism may boast that it is already ordained priest, bishop, and pope" (*WA* 6, 408).

> Gospel and Church know no jurisdictions; these are merely tyrannical human inventions. He who teaches the Gospel is pope and successor of Peter. He who does not teach it is Judas, Christ's betrayer. [*WA* 7, 721, 30]

Every baptized person has the right and duty "of teaching and spreading" the word of God (*WA* 11, 412, 6). Of course, "in order to avoid serious confusion in the people of God" (*WA* 12, 189, 23), not everyone should discharge this duty. Hence the community calls ministers, who act in its name.[9] Then

> ordination is nothing other than . . . taking one out of the crowd—they all have the same power—and commanding him to carry out the same power for the others, just as when ten brothers, sons of the king and his heirs, selected one to administer the inheritance for them. [*WA* 6, 407; 6, 564, 6–17]

The promise in Matthew 16:18 refers "to no person but only to the Church, which is built in the Spirit on the rock, Christ, and not on the pope and not on the Roman Church" (*WA* 7, 709, 26). For the rock foundation of Christianity must be holy and sinless. Since one cannot know this in regard to Peter,

---

[8] " . . . tota vita et substantia Ecclesiae est in verbo dei" (*WA* 7, 721, 12). "Verbum Dei est instrumentum, quo operans efficit istam creaturam ecclesiam" (*WA* 4, 189); " . . . cum Ecclesia verbo Dei nascatur, alatur, servetur et roboretur" (*WA* 12, 191, 16).

[9] Later, for example, in *Von der Winkelmesse* (1533; *WA* 38, 240, 24) and in *Von den Konziliis und Kirchen* (1539; *WA* 50, 647, 8), Luther admits an establishing of the office by Christ. According to *Vom Abendmahl Christi, Bekenntnis* (1528), the priestly function is an "order" or "class" instituted by God, like marriage and the office of secular authority (*WA* 26, 504, 30). We must not harmonize Luther's concepts in his first years as a reformer, in which he identified the universal priesthood with the spiritual function in general and admitted a preaching function only for practical reasons, with his teaching on an office instituted by Christ over and above that of all the baptized. He upheld this last after the Peasants' War in the conflict with the fanatics and in the process of constructing a national Church. Cf. inf., footnote 14.

> Christ alone must necessarily be the rock, since he alone is sinless and will certainly so continue, and with him his holy Church in the Spirit. [*WA* 7, 709, 30] Just as now the rock [Christ] is sinless, invisible, and spiritual and tangible only in faith, so also of necessity is the Church sinless, invisible, and spiritual, and tangible only in faith [*WA* 7, 710, 1].

In regard to its head and its true members the Church is invisible or, as Luther preferred to say, hidden. "The Church is hidden, the saints are unknown" (18, 652, 23). She has no earthly head, and Christ has no vicar, "but only Christ in heaven is her head here and alone rules" (*WA* 6, 297, 39; *WA, Br* 3, 210, 31). Of course, in carrying out the ruling of the Church in word and Sacrament he makes use of human ministers as mere tubes.[10] However, he alone knows his own, knows in whom his means of salvation are really effective and who really belongs to the Church. For us men there is only the standard of fraternal love. We have to consider every baptized person as a member of the Church of Christ who has not excluded himself. Thus there are many baptized unbelievers, who are outwardly "in the Church," but not "of the Church."[11] The Church indeed lives in the flesh, but

> just as the Church is not without food and drink in this life, and yet, according to Paul, the Kingdom of God does not consist in eating and drinking, so also the Church is not without place and body and yet body and place are not the Church nor do they pertain to her. [*WA* 7, 720, 1]
>
> All this is without importance and optional. Every place is suitable for the Christian, and no place is necessary to the Christian. Any person can be his shepherd, and no definite person is necessary to him. For liberty of spirit reigns here, which makes all this of no importance and lets nothing that is corporeal and earthly be indispensable. [*WA* 7, 720, 8]

Therefore, Luther would like "to abolish or change nothing which cannot be abolished or changed with a clear scriptural warrant" (*WA* 26, 167), and no one was more hateful to him than he who forcibly abolished voluntary and harmless ceremonies and made necessity out of freedom (*WA, Br* 4, 411, 15). On the other hand, he was confident that, with the preaching of the word of God, the necessary external form would grow "of itself."

---

[10] *WA* 45, 521, 32.

[11] *WA* 5, 430, 34; 41, 521, 23.

> But where the word of God is pure and certain, then it must be everything: Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Christ, Holy Spirit, baptism, Sacrament, priestly function, preaching office, faith, love, cross, life and blessedness and everything that the Church should have. [*WA* 38, 237]

Luther developed his teaching on the Church in the struggle against the hierarchically established papal Church. In connection with an abbot's right of patronage he defended the fundamental principle: "That a Christian assembly or community has the right and power to review all doctrine and to summon, install, and depose teachers" (1523; *WA* 11, 408–416). But this congregational Christianity soon proved to be impracticable. Luther denied the right of free election of its pastor to Karlstadt's congregation at Orlamünde. The Peasants' War and the disturbances produced in the community by the fanatics, together with the various types of disorder in morality and discipline, showed that nothing could be accomplished without ecclesiastical discipline, Church organization, and especially tribunals above the local level. The practice of the late medieval territorial Church, with extensive control of churches, monasteries, and hospitals by territorial lords or city governments, and the theory of the state of emergency as developed by William of Ockham suggested the entrusting of the external direction of the Church to the authority that had become Lutheran. Luther had impeded this development, however, by his teaching on the hidden Church and the competence assigned by him to the congregation, and especially by his rigorous distinction or even separation of the secular and the spiritual power.

Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms

Luther elaborated his teaching on the two governments in view of the steps taken by Catholic princes against the Reformation (*Von weltlicher Oberkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei,* 1523), in the struggle against the fanatics (*Wider die himmlischen Propheten,* 1525), and on the occasion of the Turkish war (*Vom Kriege wider die Türken,* 1529). This polemical situation resulted in exaggerations and one-sidedness which not even Luther could maintain to the end. This led in turn to contradictions, which make Luther's doctrine of the two kingdoms seem even today to be a "maze." The doctrine must be understood in relation to Luther's teaching on justification or his idea of law and Gospel. Just as the Christian is at the same time sinner and just, just as he is subject to the claim and jurisdiction of the law and at the same time has been acquitted by the Gospel, so too he belongs to the secular and to the spiritual government.

Luther felt obliged to stress the distinction between, or the separation of, the two governments on two counts. On the one side was the theocracy of the old Church, which, in his view, made the Gospel a law, that is, a political juridical order to be enforced by the sword; on the other was the anarchy of the fanatics, who denied the secular government in the name of the spiritual or understood evangelical freedom as freedom from any juridical order. The two governments must not be understood as the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of the Devil. Instead, both come from God's love; they are two different ways in which God rules the world, even though in the secular government he acts only as *deus absconditus*. The secular government wields the sword. It is under the standard of power and the possibility of compulsion and has to maintain external order against the ceaseless anarchical threat from the world, against disruptive tendencies from within and without, the consequences of sin. Sin would have as its result the self-annihilation of creation, if God did not keep destructive forces in check by means of the state and other authorities. For

> the world cannot be ruled according to the Gospel; the word is too little esteemed. [*WA* 17, I, 149] On the other hand, emperors and kings do not have to wage wars, as Christians. Who knows whether they are Christians? Are they not usually the worst enemies of Christendom and of the faith? [*WA* 30, II, 130, 29]

The Christian contends against even the Turks, not with weapons, but with God's word, penance, and prayer. He enters the Turkish war, because "in his body and his property he is subject to the secular authority," which summons him to the struggle against the Turks (*WA* 30, II, 179, 16). If he falls under Turkish rule, then he is subject to it as to his superior, just as to a papal government, "for the Pope . . . is much worse than the Turk" (195, 15). But under no circumstances must the Christian permit himself to be misused for war against the Gospel or for persecution of Christians (197, 9). "The emperor is not the head of Christendom nor the shield of the Gospel and of the faith" (*WA* 30, II, 130, 27). As a secular master, he must wage war for the protection of his subjects.

The secular government is indeed from God, but it has no special relationship to salvation. It is not in the order of redemption but pertains to the order of preservation. The Christian does not actually need it, he is "extricated" by Christ (*WA* 11, 260, 5). "The Christian, to the extent that he is really a Christian, is free from all laws, is subject to no law, within or without" (*WA* 40, I, 235, 8). Even Christ rules him "with the mere word" (*WA* 12, 330, 30). From this it follows that "if all the world were really Christian, no prince, king, lord, sword, or law would be necessary or useful" (*WA* 11, 249f.). But "the world and the multitude is and continues to be non-Christian, even though all are baptized and are called Christians" (*WA* 11, 253). Therefore, to prevent the triumph of evil, law and compulsory order are necessary. The secular government assures the area in which the proclamation of the word and the administration of the Sacraments can take place. These are the tasks of the spiritual government, "by means of which men should become pious and just, so that by the same justice they may attain to eternal life" (*WA* 19, 629). Whether the Church of experience, *ecclesia large dicta* or *manifesta,* pertains to the secular government is not clear in Luther and is still controverted.[12]

Because, though justified, he is still a sinner, the Christian is subject to the secular government, or to the "Kingdom on the left," to which, in addition to *politia, oeconomia* pertains, that is, marriage, parenthood, and vocation. However, he is subject to it voluntarily, and out of love, consents to the arrangements prevailing there, and in them serves his brother. In fact, he can

> even serve God in power and should serve within, where the needs of the neighbor demand. [*WA* 11, 258] For the sword and power belong, as a special divine service, to Christians especially, in preference to all others on earth. [*WA* 11, 258]

In the Christian who takes an interest in the world, Christ's Kingdom is present in the world, even though the world's institutions, such as the state, do not thereby become Christian.

With regard to unjust authority there is, according to Luther, the right of nonviolent active resistance by means of public instruction or rebuke, and then of passive resistance and flight; otherwise, the Christian must endure injustice for God's sake. With regard to his equals and his subjects, in accord with Matthew 5:39 he should not resist evil for himself, and so he does not need the secular power and law; but for others, for example, as prince, father, and soldier, he should "seek revenge, right, protection, and aid" (*WA* 11, 259).

> Here there is no time to listen to the Gospel but rather to the law. [*WA* 40, I, 210] Christian and fraternal ways of acting do not pertain to the secular government . . . a Christian and evangelical

---

[12] For example, between P. Althaus, who seems to uphold the affirmation, and J. Heckel. Cf. the article "Zwei-Reiche-Lehre," *EKL* III, 1927–47, in which both expound their opposing interpretations.

> character belongs only to the governing of consciences. [*WA* 24, 677] Two persons and two sorts of function thus devolve upon one man; he is at the same time a Christian and a prince, judge, lord, servant, maid. These are called vain worldlings, for they belong to the secular government. . . . You are a Christian for yourself, but in regard to your servant you are another. [*WA* 32, 390, 10ff.]

Although one may wield the secular sword, one must not have thoughts of vengeance, "for where the heart is pure, there everything is made right and well" (*WA* 32, 392, 14). Thus was the Sermon on the Mount removed from the sphere of the heart and a dangerous distinction made between "Christian person" and "secular person" or between personal morality and official morality. Only too easily was support provided for a wordly-wise recognition of an emancipated political reality.

Church Government

If Christ alone governs his Church by faith, charity, and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit (*WA, Br* 3, 210, 31) and she is therefore hidden, but if she is, on the other hand, no *civitas Platonica,* but has a visible side, the question arises: in what does this visible side find its order? Luther gave no systematic answer to this question. We have only scattered remarks of the reformer, occasioned by different polemical situations. It is certain that the constitution of the visible Church is not divine but is based on human regulations. But, is the external aspect of the Church to be attributed for this reason to the secular government, as P. Althaus maintains, or is it constructed according to proper ecclesiastical, even if human, law, which is itself based on principles arising from the spiritual government of Christ, as J. Heckel holds? Have the princes, as the secular authority, any competence in constructing the eccelesiastical system or are they only called to a special ministry as outstanding members of the Church?

As early as 1520 Luther had summoned the secular power, along with all the baptized, to the reform of the Church and of Christendom in his "Sermon von den guten Werken" (*WA* 6, 257, 32) and in *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation* (*WA* 6, 406; 409; 411). Because the spiritual authority had refused a thorough-going reform and in particular had opposed the convoking of a council, the secular power should carry out its function. It must protect its subjects from every iniquity, including the corruption of the spiritual power and its interference in the secular sphere. It must punish exploitation, brigandage, and adultery and, in so doing, not stop before Pope and bishops. As Christian authorities, "because now they are also fellow Christians, fellow priests, fellow ecclesiastics, fellow masters in all things" (*WA* 6, 413, 30), they should be concerned with the convoking of a council. In view of the refusal of the spiritual power, no one can do this "as well as the secular sword" (*WA* 6, 413, 29). The more Luther had to do with Protestant authorities, the more he stressed their obligation of crushing resistance to the Gospel and of forbidding the celebration of Mass, just as sacrilege and blasphemy were forbidden. "The secular power does not coerce belief but only defends it externally." It should not overcome heresy: "Bishops should do this, . . . not princes, . . . for heresy is something spiritual [*WA* 11, 268]. If heresy exists, let it be overcome by God's word, as is proper" (*WA* 11, 270). The secular authority must intervene if there is a breakdown of order and in cases of public blasphemy. "Our princes do not coerce to faith and the Gospel, but they prevent external outrages," wrote Luther to Spalatin on 11 November 1525 (*WA, Br* 3, 616, 18). But "assault, theft, murder, and adultery are not so pernicious as this abomination of the papist Mass" (*WA* 15, 777, 8). Hence "authority is bound to prevent such a public blasphemy" (*WA* 18, 36, 19). If this is true of authority in general, then, in addition, the prince, as a "brother in Christ" (*WA, Br* 2, 515, 23) or "as a Christian member" (521, 59), must cooperate in tasks within the Church, for example, in the appointing of a preacher.

Until 1525 Luther rarely called upon his territorial prince, though the latter was very well-disposed toward his affairs. The order of worship was not the prince's business. "What are we to ask of him? He can do no more than in secular matters" (*WA* 12, 649, 18). The renewal of the Church should be accomplished in the power of the word on the basis of the congregation. Luther expected the congregation to create an order at the proper time, that is, the institutions necessary for worship and for community life. Luther also thought of bishops, who governed several communities or were over several pastors (*WA* 6, 440, 29). They too should be appointed by the congregations. However, such an ordination begins only in the regulated public ministry of word and Sacrament. It is merely a ratification by the congregation. Of themselves, all have the same power, but for this very reason no one should on his own "call attention to himself, but rather he should let himself be summoned and brought forward in order that he may preach and teach in the place and at the command of the others."[13] If the papal bishops are not ready for such a call to office, then the leading members of the congregation, should, as Luther wrote to the Bohemians, "lay hands on suitable persons in the presence of the congregation, confirm them, and recommend them to the people and the Church." Thus would they be "bishops, ministers, or shepherds" (*WA* 12, 193, 38).

---

[13] *WA* 11, 412, 31; cf. *WA* 12, 189, 17–27.

The question is whether this call of individuals to the ministry of the word arises only from a practical need when the members of the congregation transfer their rights, so to speak, to an attorney (*WA* 6, 407, 29), as Luther more or less consistently maintained in the 1520s, or whether ordination must follow for the sake of the commission and hence is of divine law, which is the view of the *Confessio Augustana* (XXVIII, 20–22), of the *Apologia* (XIII, 7–13), and probably also of Luther himself later (*WA* 50, 663, 3).[14]

---

[14] Luther's concept of the office is still disputed because he is not consistent in regard to it. J. W. F. Hofling, *Grundsätze ev.-lutherischer Kirchen verfassung* (Erlangen, 3rd ed. 1853), regards Luther's idea as consistent but does not really go into Luther's expressions in his works against the fanatics. According to him, for Luther there was only one function which was given to the whole Church and is entrusted to a special class only for practical reasons. According to A. W. Dieckhoff, *Luthers Lehre von der Kirchlichen Gewalt* (Berlin 1865), two different versions of the doctrine of the spiritual office must be recognized in Luther. In the first period (1520–23) Luther identified the universal priesthood, that is, the same spiritual character of all Christians, with the spiritual office and justified the ministry of the special officials by the "transmission theory" (82–97). Later he stressed the autonomy of an office instituted by God, over and above the universal priesthood (149–159). According to W. Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums* I (Munich, 2nd ed. 1958), in Luther "two apparently completely opposed ideologies confronted each other" (I, 299), when it was a question of understanding the necessity of the office—a "utilitarian" concept, which required the preaching office for the sake of "order," and another, which saw it based on divine institution. But Luther perceived no opposition between the two concepts (301). Elert probably saw "the danger of a relapse . . . imminent" in expressions of the later Luther, in which the distinction between clergy and laity again emerged (303), but still found the harmony of both ideologies in Luther's view of ordination. According to it, the congregation issued the call, but: "In such a call issued by men we may and should behold a divine call, if those calling are so authorized by God" (304). E. Sommerlath, "Amt und allgemeines Priestertum," *Schriften des Konvents Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses* 5 (Berlin 1953), 40ff., also perceives two "ideologies." "A complete adjustment" between them and "a theological clarification were probably never achieved" (41). Hence two lines will probably always have to be seen in Luther (50). W. O. Munter, *Die Gestalt der Kirche "nach göttlichem Recht"* (Munich 1941), and *Begriff und Wirklichkeit des geistlichen Amtes* (Munich 1955), and P. Brunner, "Vom Amt des Bischofs," *Schriften des Konvents Augsburigschen Bekenntnisses,* 9 (Berlin 1955), stress the divine establishment of the preaching office in addition to and even ahead of the universal priesthood. They have in mind especially the Lutheran creeds. But P. Brunner emphasizes that "Luther's views are not in opposition to these" (16, footnote 11). As proof he cites *Von den Konziliis und Kirchen* (1539). Finally, W. Brunotte, *Das geistliche Amt bei Luther* (Berlin 1959), investigates "whether Luther's concept of the spiritual office remained the same in the course of the years . . . , whether it is homogeneous in itself or unadjusted tensions prevail in it" (32). His conclusion is "the unity of Luther's concept" (112). But he admits that from 1520 to 1523 the full power and responsibility of the universal priesthood occupied much space, whereas the coordination of Church and spiritual office was discussed especially in the period from 1530 (112ff.). The claim that there are contradictions in Luther's teaching on the office he regards as "at least very questionable" (116).

Luther gave no further thought to other organs of the community. He agreed to ecclesiastical discipline and more than once inflicted excommunication as a shepherd of souls.[15] But he created no office for this. Organizing was not his forte. He preferred to let things grow. Above all, for him a Church order must never become a "necessary law" (*WA* 18, 72, 6). For Christian congregations can be formed only by the preaching of the Gospel, through faith and charity, not through a reform of rites. It is absolutely unnecessary that the same order be maintained everywhere. No doubt it is good that the liturgy be celebrated uniformly in one lordship or one city with its environs (*WA* 18, 73, 6). But a decreed Church order does not have the binding force of laws which oblige because of the obedience commanded by God toward superiors. For authorization to issue such laws is contained neither in the power of the keys nor in the pastoral office of bishops.[16] Human order in the Church is thus not a juridical order in the strict sense, binding in conscience and to be enforced under compulsion.

But this freedom from law should be a freedom for order and for fraternal service; it "is the servant of love and of neighbor" (*WA* 18, 72, 23). Because of one's brothers, especially the weak, one should hold on to such "worldly and indifferent things" as ceremonies (*WA, Br* 11, 200, 17). Luther repeatedly designates the order of the visible Church as "worldly" (*WA,* 50, 559, 31), even as "lying outside the Church" (*WA, Br* 3, 211, 96). It was natural, therefore, to regard the secular government as competent in this regard. The reformer himself was probably not of this view but of the opinion that the Church had to take herself in hand in the ordering of her worldly affairs.[17] Therefore, he even referred to the territorial lords as "emergency bishops,"[18] who were to render

---

[15] Ruth Götze, *Wie Luther Kirchenzucht übte* (Berlin 1959).

[16] "From this passage [Matt. 16:18; 18:18] they have taken the word 'to bind' and explained it to mean as much as to command or to set up law and prohibition for Christianity. And so they give the pope the power to bind Christians' souls and consciences by laws" (1530; *WA* 30, II, 465, 20; cf., *WA* 6, 536, 20; 45, 460, 27; *WA, Br* 5, 490, 11–492, 27; 493, 38).

[17] J. Heckel, *Kirche und Kirchenrecht nach der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre,* pp. 267–271; F. Lau, *"Äusserliche Ordnung" und "Weltlich Ding" in Luthers Theologie* (Göttingen 1933).

[18] " . . . as our common emergency bishop, because otherwise no bishop will aid us" (*WA, Br* 8, 396, 14); " . . . as real emergency bishops in such a case, for a chapter takes the wrong track" (*WA* 53, 256, 3; 255, 5). As emergency bishop, the prince has an ecclesiastical office and is not exercising his secular power. This results from a letter of Luther's of 19 March 1539: "But now our prince must be an emergency bishop and emergency official, because such goods are acquired, not through civic management but from the ecclesiastical ministry. Hence they cannot be under civil law: they are in the hand and the right of the emergency bishop" (*WA, Br* 8, 15ff.; *WA, Tr* 4, 378, 25): "Nam nostro electori scripsi, adhortabar, ut ipse vigilaret pro ecclesia, that he was an emergency bishop" (1537).

"first aid" in acute distress. But the development went astray in the direction of even greater secular authority of the prince, although nothing further in the way of an emergency was to be noticed.

In the twenty-three Nürnberg visitation articles, which were accepted at Schwabach on 14 June 1528, we find:

> The Church is empowered only to choose ministers and to employ Christian excommunication and to arrange that the needy be provided with alms. . . . All other power belongs either to Christ in heaven or to the secular authority on earth.[19]

Melanchthon decisively fostered the development into the princely Church government. He attributed to the authority the "custodia primae tabulae" and hence the supervision of the worship of God. To it belonged also the prohibition of false doctrine and ungodly worship.[20] According to Melanchthon, knowledge of the true doctrine pertains to the whole Church, priests and laity, and, among the latter, especially to princes. They have to make the Gospel respected in public life and carry out the judgments of synods. Hence the secular power is "minister and executive organ of the Church" (*CR* 3, 472). Its supervision of the ecclesiastical order no longer appears here as an emergency measure. The prince's special position and obligation in the Church result from his character as "foremost member"[21] of the new visible Church. Just as in civil life princes lead the way for their subjects, so also in the service of the Church and of her reform:

> With their authority they are to support the true Church, remove blasphemous teachers, and install pious preachers.
>
> Before all others, the outstanding members of the Church, kings and princes, should aid and care for the Church, in order that errors may be eliminated and consciences may be rightly instructed.

Thus did he write in the treatise *De potestate papae,* which was accepted at Schmalkalden in 1537 as a statement of creed.[22]

As members of the Church, then, the territorial lords took charge of the nomination to office, summoned synods, ordered visitations, and issued Church ordinances. Considering the strong tendency toward the territorial Church—already in existence since the late Middle Ages—it was natural soon to attribute to the secular authority as such what princes or the *pius magistratus* should do as a matter of first aid and out of love, because of their membership in the Church.

---

[19] Sehling, XI, 1, 132.

[20] *CR* 3, 225; 2, 711; "Loci" of 1535, *CR* 21, 553; *Studienausgabe* II, 2, 727.

[21] " . . . praecipua membra in externa societate" (*De iure reformandi,* 1537; *CR* 3, 251, 244).

[22] *Bekenntnisschriften,* p. 488.

CHAPTER 19

The Completion of the Lutheran Community

Luther was disappointed in his hope that the constructing of congregations of real Christians would be effected solely by the preaching of the Gospel. His ideal proved to be impracticable. His expectations were ruined more than ever in the storm of the year 1525. His complaints about the "unspeakable scorn for the word and the dreadful ingratitude of men in regard to the benefit of the Gospel" became ever more serious and bitter. The preaching of justification by faith and of the freedom of the Christian had not produced the anticipated results in the moral life of his followers. On the contrary, according to Luther's own expressions, a moral deterioration and a disregard of the Sacrament and of Sunday worship seem to have crept in. His sermons bitterly complained of these developments.[1] Evangelical freedom was abused, and even preachers and pastors retained "of the Gospel only such a lazy, pernicious, shameful, carnal freedom" (*WA* 30, I, 125, 24).

Not only disillusionments of this sort, but also the spread of the Reformation and the related destruction of the old Church urgently called for new institutions. In the course of time and with the expansion of the area affected by the new doctrine it became obvious that the reconstruction must not be left to free development and that at least the broad mass were in need of the aid of ceremonies and could not manage without ecclesiastical discipline and the preaching of the law. At stake were the regulation of ecclesiastical property, the liturgy, visitations, and Church order.

Regulation of Church Property

The suppression of the monasteries, the secularization of Church property, and the cessation of foundation Masses and other ecclesiastical rites endowed with stipends caused a series of difficulties. The secular lords—high and low—and the cities were very much inclined to appropriate Church property. Whoever had obligations to monasteries and other spiritual institutions was happy to be freed of them so easily. Foundation Masses and stole fees disappeared, but the Church's ministers had to live as before, except that now they also had to support wife and children. Hardly any of those who benefitted by Church property were ready to assume the expenses of the liturgy, the support of the preachers, the care of the poor and the sick. According to Luther it was important to take care that "the goods of such vacant foundations did not disappear into *Rappuse* [that is, did not become spoil for everybody], and that everyone did not struggle for something to snatch" (*WA* 12, 11, 30). Therefore, like Karlstadt's Church order for Wittenberg of 1521, Luther demanded that the property be gathered into a "common chest." According to the "Order of a Common Chest" for Leisnig (1523), for which Luther wrote the preface and which was regarded as a model for other congregations, all Church revenues should go into a common chest, from which should be drawn the expenditures for the clergy, sexton, and plant, for schools and teachers, and for the needy of every sort. Administration should be taken care of by a board of trustees, consisting of two nobles, two councilors, three townsmen and three peasants from the surrounding villages. All the townsmen and peasants should meet three times a year to receive a report and to pass resolutions. Luther had feared that few would follow his suggestion, because "avarice is a disobedient and unbelieving scoundrel" (*WA* 12, 12, 9). As a matter of fact, the order did not attain its goal because the city council was unwilling to turn over to the "chest" the foundations under its control, and the elector shrank from forcible intervention. Thus the "chest" lacked means for the intended purposes.

---

[1] H. Werdermann, *Luthers Wittenberger Gemeinde wiederhergestellt aus seinen Predigten* (Gütersloh 1929).

Luther complained vigorously and repeatedly over the congregations' lack of a spirit of sacrifice.

> Once upon a time we gave much money and property to the papists. But now that we should help the ministers of the Church and the Gospel with a few pennies, we have nothing.[2] Where formerly 300 monks were supported, today not one preacher can find bread. [*WA* 14, 342, 7] It will come to this, that teachers, pastors, and preachers devote themselves to a craft and let the word go. [*WA* 15, 361, 2] Almost all congregations . . . want to call their pastors . . . and give nothing and support no one. Whoever wants to have the power and the right to call should be obliged and bound to support. [*WA, Br* 4, 135, 10]

---

[2] *WA* 29, 94, 11f., 18f. (1529); similarly, *WA* 14, 341, 23.

This situation called for a tribunal superior to the local congregations, and, since the Church had none, for regulation by the territorial prince. Since all the monasteries and foundations, so Luther argued,

> fell into the hands [of the elector] as their supreme head, there also devolved upon him the duty and burden of ordering such things, since otherwise no one takes charge or can or should take charge of them. Because now such goods . . . are instituted for the divine service, it is only right that they should first of all serve for this. [*WA*, *Br* 4, 133f.]

The visitation of 1529 resulted in the elector's ratifying of the common chest for Leisnig (*WA* 12, 7). Later articles of visitation and Church orders adopted this institution, but its character as an autonomous ecclesiastical institution was long in jeopardy, in so far as the city councils sought to take over its administration or even to treat the chest as common property.

Liturgy

The liberty which Luther had allowed to the individual congregations and his dread of binding forms led to a rank growth and an ever greater fragmentation of liturgical forms. As late as 1524 Luther had rejected suggestions for the convoking of a council of his followers for the creation of a uniform liturgy (*WA*, *Br* 3, 373, 16; 384, 108). However, the events of 1525—the impulses of the "mobsters" and the Peasants' War—convinced him of the necessity of establishing uniform ceremonies (*WA*, *Br* 3, 582, 6). Together with councilors and choir directors of the principality, he put together a "Mass for the Laity in the Vernacular" (*WA*, *Br* 3, 591, 8). Thus finally, on 29 October 1525, a completely German Mass could be celebrated for the first time in the Wittenberg parish church. After it had been tested in practice, the "German Mass and Order of Divine Service" appeared in print at the beginning of 1526 and thus could be introduced elsewhere also.

However, according to Luther's preface, the German Mass was not to be the only form of the Evangelical liturgy in Wittenberg, but rather only one of three. Apart from those "who are already Christian" and need no order, because they have "their worship in spirit," Luther envisages the community, that is, "those who are so far becoming Christian or should become stronger," as divided into three groups. The first comprises the young: for them the Latin "Formula Missae" of 1523 should remain binding. The second are "the simple lay folk."

> Among these are many who do not yet believe or are not yet Christian; the greater number among them just stand there and

> gape . . . just as though we were celebrating the liturgy in a public square or field among Turks and pagans. [*WA* 19, 74]

Here it is not at all a question of an ordered "gathering in which one can rule Christians according to the Gospel, but there is an open inducement to the faith and to Christianity" (ibid.).

The third group consists of those "who seriously wish to be Christians and profess the Gospel with hand and mouth." For them a simple order is enough; "there is no need for much and long singing" (*WA* 19, 76). They are a confessional community; they meet in one house expressly for prayer, scriptural reading, reception of the Sacrament, and other Christian work. Whoever "does not behave as a Christian" is punished or excommunicated. Luther did not want to establish any order for this narrow circle, for as yet people for it were lacking. If this *elite* community had only been formed, "the orders and methods would soon have followed."

Accordingly, Luther also saw the possibility of finding a place for the circle of the resolute, the confessional Church, "in the common heap," in the people's Church. But in actuality this "Christian gathering" did not materialize and Luther remained content with the liturgy for the "people" who are not yet seized by the spirit of the Gospel and must still be led to the seriousness of justification by faith.[3] But if there is question "for this reason of enlightening and leading the people" (*WA* 19, 97), then an instruction in worship is inevitable. Accordingly, the Eucharistic Preface became an "exhortation" to the participants in the Sacrament, the "Our Father" became an explication, the "Sanctus," an historical report. No longer was there a realization by the community that it was progressing "to the city of the living God, to the heavenly Jerusalem, to countless hosts of angels" (Heb. 12:22). Rather, the community was instructed in regard to what "happened to Isaiah the Prophet" (*WA* 19, 100, 6).

Actually the German Mass followed the Roman. But the Roman psalmody was replaced by popular hymns. Most important of all, it was reduced from the viewpoint of the doctrine of justification or the rejection of sacrifice. The Roman Mass adopted by Luther was the private form of celebration, itself only a curtailed form. A creative liturgical achievement could hardly be expected in that period, with its deficient grasp of worship as a re-presentation of salvation history, even from Luther himself, if we abstract from his linguistic power of expression.

---

[3] Cf. K. Müller, *Kirche, Gemeinde und Obrigkeit nach Luther* (Tübingen 1910), pp. 39f., with the concluding sentence: ". . . it remains in the community of the great heap." (p. 40).

And so it is not to be wondered at that the German Mass, with its pedagogical tendency, was in some respects only a torso and left "parts of the old liturgy . . . side by side, quite unexpectedly, . . . as unconnected rubble."[4]

Criticism from outside and his own new knowledge induced Luther to revise and make more rigid the baptismal liturgy, already published in 1523. It appeared in the autumn of 1526 under the title of *Das Taufbüchlein verdeutscht, aufs neue zugerichtet* and was widely circulated as a supplement to the small catechism of 1529. Because the pastors proved incapable on their own of preparing a nuptial rite corresponding to the reformed views, Luther composed a *Traubüchlein für die einfältigen Pfarrherren,* which appeared in April 1529 and was also added to the small catechism, which was published in book form soon after. In the remarks with which it was preceded Luther briefly explained his idea of marriage. Already in *De captivitate* (1520) he had refused to regard it as a Sacrament. There he wrote:

> It is contrary to all Scripture to regard matrimony as a Sacrament. . . . We nowhere read that he who takes a wife obtains any grace from God. The sign in matrimony was also not instituted by God. . . . The married state of the ancestors was no less holy than ours; the marriage of unbelievers is no less right than that of believers. [*WA* 6, 550]

Consequently, in the *Traubüchlein* it is concluded that, because "matrimony and the married state are a worldly matter, it in no way pertains to us priests and ministers to order or regulate them" (*WA* 30, III, 74, 3). However, "though it is a worldly state," it is still a "divine work and command" (*WA* 30, III, 74, 16–23), and so it is right to ask the blessing of the priest or bishop. Hence only prayers and blessing belong to the Church. Marriage itself is a civil act. If the Church officiates at marriage, she does so in the name of the secular authority. In conformity with Luther's *Traubüchlein,* the marriage ceremony took place outside the church, the proclamation of the word and blessing at the altar. This separation of the marriage ceremony, which took place at home or outside the church building, from the ecclesiastical celebration—in the pre-Reformation situation this was especially the nuptial Mass—was not unusual at that time. In the pre-Tridentine Church it was legitimate because the bride and bridegroom administered the Sacrament to each other; to Luther, on the other hand, it was legitimate because marriage was not properly a religious act.

---

[4] F. Rendtorff, *Die Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes unter dem Gesichtspunkt der liturgischen Erbfolge* (Giessen 1914), p. 42. Similar criticism in: J. Gottschick, *Luthers Anschauungen vom Gottesdienst* (Freiburg (1887), p. 72; *Leiturgia. Handbuch des ev. Gottesdienstes* I (Kassel 1954), 60. The contrary in: "Luthers Deutsche Messe und die Rechtfertigungslehre," *LuJ* 10 (1928), 170–203; id., "Luthers Reform der Abendmahlsfeier in ihrer konstitutiven Bedeutung," *Schrift und Bekenntnis,* ed. V. Herntrich–T. Knolle (Hamburg 1950), pp. 88–105.

Completion of the Ecclesiastical Constitution

Matters did not end with the mere publishing of liturgical books and catechisms. A tribunal was needed to introduce them as an obligation and thereby, as with other disciplinary measures, to put an end to the anarchy in the ecclesiastical system. In the absence of an ecclesiastical office beyond the local congregation, only the secular power was qualified for this.

The Recess of the Diet of Speyer of 1526 had left the execution of the Edict of Worms to the judgment of the territorial princes. Even though no *ius reformandi* was thereby given them, they claimed it in practice. To the extent that they inclined to the Reformation, they proceeded to enforce the uniform practice of religion in their territories, that is, to liquidate what was left of the Catholic organization and to set up or consolidate the new by the arranging and implementing of visitations.

Meanwhile, Luther had been forced to the recognition that the word alone did not suffice; human authority had to create at least the external preconditions and remove opposition. Like Nikolaus Hausmann, pastor at Zwickau before him, he had written to the Elector Johann on 31 October 1525 that, in view of the wretched condition in the parishes, "a bold order and stately maintenance of churches and lecture chairs" must be undertaken by the elector (*WA, Br* 3, 595). The elector hesitated but said that Luther should "compose an order" which should be established.

Luther thereupon proposed an ecclesiastical visitation. It was started at the beginning of 1526 in a few areas by two officials and the priests Spalatin and Myconius, but soon came to a stop. Luther, however, insisted. The visitation was resumed in the spring of 1527, this time with Melanchthon participating. On 16 June 1527 the elector issued an instruction for it.[5] In this he prescribed the visitation as prince and had it conducted by officials and theologians, who had "power and command" from him (p. 142). The visitation was concerned not only with Church property and the salary of the clergy and with public morality, but first of all with the true doctrine. No pastor should dare to teach, to preach, and to administer the Sacraments except according to God's word, "as this has been accepted by us and ours at the time when God has done and given his grace" (p. 143). The elector intends, indeed, compels no one to the faith, but he will forestall "dangerous sedition" and tolerate no sectarianism or schism in his territory. Anyone who is unwilling to accept such a "Christian instruction" offered by the authority should sell all his property "and move out of our territory" (p. 144). Here there is no question that the elector is acting in spiritual matters differently from the way he acts as territorial prince. In other words, "with this instruction the territorial Church government was present."[6]

---

[5] Sehling, I, 142–148.

Melanchthon took part in the visitation especially as a theologian. Luther played no role, but the reports of the visitation were sent to him for his examination. Adequate instructions for the visitors were lacking, and so the implementation of a uniform Church order was not realized.

For this reason Melanchthon worked out an order of visitation, to which Luther contributed a number of improvements. In September 1527 it was discussed by the visitors—to whose number Spalatin had been added—with recourse to Luther and Bugenhagen. Meanwhile, the visitations and a preliminary work of Melanchthon's that had appeared without his knowledge, the *Articuli de quibus egerunt per visitatores* (1527), had caused a stir, and "visitationis rumores" (*WA, Br* 4, 232, 4) had spread. On the Catholic side it was thought that in the visitation a *rapprochement* with the doctrine and practice of the "old faith" could be established,[7] while in the Protestant camp the Saalfeld pastor, Kaspar Aquila, accused Melanchthon of returning to "papism." In particular, the director of the school at Eisleben, Johannes Agricola, was the spokesman for those who felt that the Wittenberg theologians "were creeping back" (*WA, Br* 4, 265, 6), that is, reverting to the old Church system. In his view an excessive scope was given to the preaching of the law at the expense of the freedom of the Gospel. Penance must begin, not with servile fear, but with faith and love for justice.[8] Melanchthon, on the other hand, had concluded his *Articuli* with the sentence that the people would be lulled into security without the preaching of the law and that they imagined they had justice from faith, although "faith can exist only in those whose hearts have been made contrite by the law" (*CR* 26, 28).

For this reason the elector again issued invitations to conferences on the order of visitation at Torgau on 25 November 1527. Here a compromise was discovered. "In order that adversaries might not be able to say that there had been a disavowal" of the doctrine thus far defended, there was added to the first chapter, "On the Doctrine," the following sentence: Nothing should be taught previous to faith, except that "penance follows from and according to faith."[9] Besides, the necessity of preaching the law was insisted on. It would be a curtailing of the Gospel to speak one-sidedly of the remission of sins but to say nothing or only little of penance. "Without penance, however, there would be no remission of sins" and it could not be understood. The result would be that people would think they had already obtained remission of their sins and hence they would be secure and without fear. This would be a greater error and a greater sin than ever before. For the sake of the "common, uneducated man such articles of faith should be left alone under the name of penance, commandment, prayer, fear, and so forth, for otherwise the common man could be in error in regard to the word 'faith' and raise useless questions."[10] The frequent reference to the "common man" makes clear the danger of pedagogism or moralism in regard to the Gospel in the Lutheran national Church as it was then developing.

---

[6] K. Holl, "Luther und das landesherrliche Kirchenregiment," *Gesammelte Aufsätze* I (Tübingen, 6th ed. 1932), 373.

[7] In his *Christenliche underrichtung . . . über ettliche Puncten der Visitation* (1528) Bishop J. Fabri wrote: "hettestu also gelert szo wolt ich dir mit leib und gutt beygestanden sein" (L. Hebling, *Dr. Johann Fabri* Münster 1941, p. 39).

[8] J. Rogge, *Johann Agricolas Lutherverständnis* (Berlin n.d.), p. 105.

The printing of the "Instruction of the Visitors to the Pastors" was protracted till the end of March 1528. The text is mainly Melanchthon's. Luther wrote the preface, in which he stressed that it was the function of the bishop to be overseer and visitor and that he had "been glad to see it restored again, as something very badly needed" (*WA* 26, 197, 15). Where the bishops had failed, he said, it would have been natural that the reformers should have taken their place. "However," he reported, "because none of ours had been called to this or had any positive command," he had applied to the elector with the request that several qualified men should be called and appointed to this office. Luther made his request to the territorial prince, but not as a secular authority, which had "not been commanded to teach and to rule spiritually" (*WA* 26, 200, 29), but for the sake of the "office of charity, which is common and necessary to all Christians" (*WA* 26, 197, 20). It is the business of the secular authority to break malicious opposition, for it must "see to it that discord, mobs, and sedition not be stirred up among the subjects" (*WA* 26, 200, 30). With this distinction between what the elector was to do as authority and what he was to do "out of Christian charity" as a member of the Church, on the occasion of visitations, Luther was apparently seeking to maintain the autonomy of the Church. Hence the preface has "the meaning of a certain correcting or of a tacit protest"[11] against the elector's instruction of 1527 and the princely ecclesiastical government claimed by it. A protest, to be sure, which was ineffective.

---

[9] Sehling, I, 152.

[10] Ibid.

[11] K. Holl, op. cit., p. 374.

In accord with the instruction of 1527, suitable pastors were named as "superintendents" to carry out the visitation. They were to exercise supervision over their fellow officials in a district, and these fellow officials could have recourse to them in difficult cases. Contrary to Luther's expectation, marriage cases especially soon turned out to be such. Pastors whose conduct, discipline, and teaching gave ground for objections and in regard to whom the admonitions of the superintendents were of no avail were, according to the "Instruction of the Visitors," to be reported to the magistrate for denunciation to the elector.[12] There was no higher ecclesiastical office. If one could apply temporarily to the visitation commissions or to Luther, this was still no solution in the long run. And so there ensued the forming of consistories. In this matter also Electoral Saxony gave the example. The need for matrimonial courts provided the first impulse. In 1538, by order of the Elector Johann Frederick, Justus Jonas elaborated an expert opinion, together with Bugenhagen, Melanchthon, and jurists, in 1538: "Der Theologen Bedenken von wegen der Konsistorien, so aufgerichtet werden sollen." When the discussions on the subject were protracted, the consistory was set up on an experimental basis and undertook operations at the beginning of 1539. A consistorial order was not drawn up until 1542.[13]

If the superintendents can be regarded as holders of an ecclesiastical office, then the consistory took the place of the bishop, though in reality it was an institution of the territorial prince. He summoned it, nominated its members, determined its order of business, and in all things had the final decision. The consistory was composed of electoral advisers who were experts in law and of theologians. The theologians were often only of secondary importance and were only called upon from case to case. In the course of time the consistory became competent for the administering of ecclesiastical discipline and excommunication, for the total administration of the territorial Church, and for decisions in marriage cases and other ecclesiastical disputes, such as patronage and tithes. The princely ecclesiastical government found in this body its corresponding organ and its definitive establishment.

Schools and Religious Instruction

The destruction of the old ecclesiastical system also had involved schools and universities. "The first effects of the Reformation on the educational system were of a destructive character."[14] Church and school were too intimately connected, not merely in theory but also in actuality, for one to be able to destroy the structure of the former without also striking at the latter. Furthermore, teaching and scholarship needed quiet and peace, which were impossible in the heat of polemics and in the convulsions of the Peasants' War. And finally, there were circles like Karlstadt, which justified by the Bible a rejection of education and schools. All this led to a decay of the schools and a strong falling off in the number of students. In 1528 Erasmus complained to Pirckheimer: "Wherever Lutheran teaching prevails, there is the collapse of scholarship."[15] For Luther, as for Melanchthon, teaching was basically secular in character; it was spiritual only in so far as it was in the service of the word. It was the duty and right of the secular power to set up and maintain the school system.

---

[12] Sehling, I, 171.

[13] Ibid., pp. 200–209.

The treatise *An die Ratsherren aller Städte deutschen Lands, dass sie christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen* (1524) had its origin in the fact that "everywhere schools have been allowed to disappear" (*WA* 15, 28). It was a summons to the city government to establish Latin schools and not to excuse themselves with subterfuges such as: "If we are only able to teach the Bible and the word of God in German, this is sufficient for salvation" (*WA* 15, 36). Luther regarded schools as necessary for service to the Gospel as well as to the world. For, even if

> the Gospel came only through the Holy Spirit and so comes daily, it has come however by means of languages and it has grown in the same way and so it must be preserved in the same way. [*WA* 15, 37] And let this be said, that we will not receive the Gospel without languages. . . . They are the chest in which this jewel is carried. . . . Therefore, it is certain that, where languages do not remain, the Gospel must finally perish. [*WA* 15, 38]

Hence schools constituted a vital question for real Christianity. But the secular government also needed "good schools and scholars" and care had to be taken that "cultured and capable persons" should take an interest in the world.

> If right now there was no soul and no need of schools and languages for the sake of Scripture and God, still this reason alone would be sufficient for setting up the very best schools for both boys and girls everywhere—that the world, in order to maintain externally its worldly condition, needs cultured and capable men and women. [WA 15, 44]

---

[14] F. Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts* I, 184.

[15] Letter of 20 March 1528 in Allen, VII, 366, 40, no. 1977.

Here the parents have the most pressing obligations, but this task goes beyond their strength. Nothing is to be expected from the princes. "And so, dear councillors, I want it to continue in your hands alone. You have the capacity for it, better than princes and lords" (*WA* 15, 45).

While Luther specified the several fields of instruction, he did not lay down a curriculum. Rather, this was Melanchthon's job. He had already cooperated in the establishing of the school at Eisleben in 1525. In the last section of the "Instruction of the Visitors" (1528) he submitted his ideas on the carrying out of educational instruction in more detail. In this he had in mind the modest circumstances in Saxony and hence he renounced the teaching of Greek and Hebrew from the outset. In fact, in the interests of concentration, "in order [not] to burden the poor children with so much variety,"[16] no German should be taught either. With Melanchthon and with the contemporary schools there was concern only for the Latin language. The primer was already Latin; German did not appear at all.

The school was to be organized in three stages. In the first the children learned to read and write; in the second, grammar; in the third, also prosody, dialectics, and rhetoric. One day, Saturday or Wednesday, was devoted to "Christian instruction." "To learn nothing but Scripture" was to be tolerated as little as "to learn nothing from Scripture."[17] The Our Father, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and a group of psalms should be learned and explained. From the New Testament, the Gospel according to Matthew should be "grammatically explained." Otherwise, at most the explanation of the Epistles to Timothy, of the First Epistle of John, and of Proverbs was envisaged for the older youths. Pedagogical considerations prevented the treating of other books of the Bible, "for it is not profitable to burden the young with difficult and sublime books," such as Isaiah, the Epistles to the Romans, and the Gospel according to John.[18] Contemporary school regulations, such as those of Wittenberg of 1533, of Braunschweig and Hamburg of 1528, and of Schleswig-Holstein of 1542, show that the basic principles of the "Instruction of the Visitors" were established in Electoral Saxony and became models for other districts. New was the admitting of religious instruction into the school curriculum. But this was so only in the cities and even there not for a long time in all of them. Hence the religious education of youth could not be turned over to the visitors alone. Consequently, on Sunday afternoon, because then "the farmhands and young folk come to church . . . the Ten Commandments, the articles of faith, and the

---

[16] Sehling, I, 172.

[17] Ibid., p. 173.

[18] Ibid., p. 168.

Our Father should be preached and explained in order."[19] In this connection there should "also be sermons intentionally on the Sacraments of baptism and of the altar" (p. 169). "For the sake of the children and of other simple and unlettered folks, [the texts should] be recited word for word" (ibid.).

The visitations had revealed a great ignorance in the congregations and among the preachers. Melanchthon encountered a pastor who did not even know the Ten Commandments. Suitable textbooks were urgently needed. Luther had already emphasized in the German Mass: "Now then, in God's name, what is needed first in the German liturgy is a thick, plain, simple, good catechism" (*WA* 19, 76, 1). Here he meant a catechism in the broad sense, oral instruction in the five chief points—commandments, faith, Lord's prayer, baptism, Lord's Supper. But no less imperative was a book in which this instruction should be set down for pastors and fathers of families, who should "present" the truth to their children and workers. Luther set to work to supply this urgent need.

Others before him had already shown an interest in this task. "Between 1522 and 1529 about thirty such efforts at composing a catechism had been published, some of which were printed in many editions."[20] In addition to Melanchthon and Bugenhagen, Johannes Brenz especially had compiled such a booklet for the religious instruction of the young at Schwäbisch Hall. He titled it *Fragestücken des christlichen Glaubens* (1527f.). Andreas Althammer at Ansbach gave his book of religion the title *Catechism, or Instruction in the Christian Faith* (1528). From 1516 Luther had often delivered catechetical sermons. From this practical activity there came several explanations of the Ten Commandments and the Our Father which had a powerful impact.[21] After the disturbances at Wittenberg the catechetical sermon became a fixed institution in the local parish church. As the substitute for Johannes Bugenhagen, Luther himself in 1528 once again delivered these series of sermons on the five principal points in three cycles during the Ember weeks in May, September, and December. Before the third he had taken part in the visitation, and his experiences in this connection determined him to compose a catechism. The catechetical sermons provided the material. It was to be a book "for the barbarous pagans" (*WA, Br* 5, 5, 22), that is, for the common uneducated people. But it became too bulky, and so Luther seems to have decided, while he was still composing it, to write another quite brief catechism. This small catechism appeared early in 1529, at first, following the late medieval usage, on tablets which could be hung up in church, school, and home, so that the text could more easily be committed to memory. The large catechism was published in April 1529 as *Deutsch Katechismus Martin Luther* (*WA* 30, I, 125–238). Then on 26 May appeared *Der kleine Katechismus für die gemeine Pfarrherr und Prediger* (*WA* 30, I, 264–339). Whereas the large catechism presents the individual items in detail, in the form of a sermon or lecture, the small catechism is drawn up in the form of question and answer. Through it and through his hymns Luther became the great religious moulder of the people. His two catechisms acquired the status of norms quite early. In 1580 they were accepted into the *Book of Concord* and described in the "epitome" of the formula of concord as "the Bible of the laity," "in which everything is included which is dealt with in scattered parts of Scripture and must be known by a Christian as necessary for salvation."[22]

---

[20] J. M. Reu, *D. Martin Luthers Kleiner Katechismus. Die Geschichte seiner Entstehung, seiner Verbreitung und seines Gebrauches* (Munich 1929), p. 14.

[21] "Eine kurze Erklärung der 10 Gebote" (1518; *WA* I, 250–256); "Eine kurze Form der 10 Gebote. Eine kurze Form des Glaubens. Eine kurze Form des Vaterunsers" (1520; *WA* 7, 204–229); "Eine kurze Form, das Paternoster zu verstehen und zu beten" (1519; *WA* 6, 11–19); "Eine kurze und gute Auslegung des Vaterunsers vor sich und hinter sich" (1519; *WA* 6, 21f.); "Auslegung deutsch des Vaterunsers für die einfältigen Laien" (1519; *WA* 2, 80–130).

---

[22] *Bekenntnisschriften,* p. 769.

CHAPTER 20

Clement VII and Charles V

Cardinal Giulio de Medici, a firm partisan of the Emperor and candidate of the imperial faction, emerged from the two-months-long conclave on 19 November 1523 as Clement VII, but as Pope he was soon to pursue entirely different paths. He declined to renew the defensive alliance concluded by Adrian VI with the Emperor and soon established secret contacts with France. His mind was concerned solely with freeing the Papal State from its encirclement by the Habsburg world power which was ruling Naples and Milan. If his own resources did not suffice to expel all "barbarians" from Italy, then at least a political balance should be established by assisting King Francis I of France to gain Milan. In this way Clement VII intended also to profit the interests of his family and to assure the rule of the Medici in Florence. His ideas were first of all political, not, however, in the sense of a universal papacy but as the ruler of an Italian dynasty. But this was too weak an ambition to exert decisive weight in the conflict of the great powers. Furthermore, Clement VII did not possess the character and stability of a great politician. He was, it is true, intellectually alert and conscientious in carrying out his official duties and in regard to his life style he was an improvement over his thoughtless and prodigal cousin, Leo X. "To this were added a dreadful indecision, vacillation and timidity, so that amid endless negotiations and half-measures he let slip his best opportunities and ended by earning for himself from friend and foe alike a reputation for unreliability."[1]

Vis-à-vis this Pope Emperor Charles V was a ruler who was filled with the notion of a universal emperor, on whose awareness it had been impressed in 1523 by his great political mentor and chancellor, Gattinara, in a memorandum: "Your affairs are those of the whole of Christendom and, in a sense, of the whole world."[2]

Initially the Pope exerted himself for peace among the Christian powers, rendered urgent by the Turkish threat. But his intervention failed. After a series of defeats Francis I succeeded on 26 October 1524 in again acquiring Milan. Impressed by this success, the Pope on 12 December allowed himself to be won to an alliance with France and Venice which granted the French troops passage through the Papal State and promised the Pope the possession of Parma and Piacenza and the assurance of Medici rule in Florence. To the Emperor, angered at his treachery, Clement VII wrote on 25 January 1525, that he had had to yield to the French "unwillingly and under compulsion." But with the overwhelming defeat of the French at Pavia on 24 February 1525 and the captivity of Francis I, the Pope's cleverly intended calculations were ruined. He saw himself constrained to seek again the protection of Emperor Charles V, who was able to dictate to France the Peace of Madrid (14 January 1526) and apparently to attain the fulfillment of all his desires. Francis renounced, among other areas, Naples, Milan, and Genoa, and also his rights in Flanders and Artois. He promised to cede Burgundy and its dependencies and, as a token of enduring friendship, to marry Charles' sister, Eleonor. And his two older sons became hostages to guarantee the execution of the treaty.

Francis I had, however, in a notarial protest declared the peace null because it had been extorted by means of imprisonment and he did not intend to abide by it. And so, in the last analysis, the Emperor had succeeded only in bringing his old opponents closer together out of fear of Habsburg predominance in a new alliance. England, previously on his side, concluded a separate peace with France and promoted the League of Cognac, formed on 22 May 1526 by Francis I, Venice, Florence,

---

[1] Jedin, I, 177 (English trans.: *A History of the Council of Trent* I, 221).

[2] K. Brandi, *Berichte und Studien* IX, *Eigenhändige Aufzeichnungen Karls V. aus dem Jahre 1525. Der Kaiser und sein Kanzler,* NGG, phil.-hist. Kl., 1933 (Berlin 1933), pp. 243f.

Francesco Sforza, and the Pope. In his letter of 23 June 1526 to the Emperor, the Pope claimed to have been determined to this step by his solicitude for peace in Christendom, the freedom of Italy, and the security of the Holy See, while Charles V was disturbing the peace and repaying with ingratitude a vast number of acts of kindness. The Emperor, on the other hand, uttered a very strong protest in a state paper of 17 September 1526. He maintained that in Germany he had made himself the protector of the Apostolic See. He still desired peace; if the Pope were to lay down his arms, all others would follow his example, and the strength of Christendom could be directed against heretics and Turks. Otherwise, he was no father but an enemy, no shepherd but a wolf. The memorandum concluded with the threat of a council:

> For, since we see the entire ecclesiastical order and the Christian religion disturbed for the reasons cited and others, and our interests as well as those of Christendom jeopardized, we regard it as appropriate to summon the Holy General Council.[3]

The Emperor urged the cardinals for their part to summon a general council if the Pope refused to do so. Clement VII abhorred and dreaded a council for many different reasons. The conciliarism of the fifteenth century had not been really overcome; it had merely been crippled by means of the papal policy of concordats. At the moment a council could not fail to effect a strengthening of the Emperor's central authority, which the Pope feared as much as did France. Finally, the illegitimate scion of the Medici could expect a reform council to be critical of his person or even to call into question his legitimacy as Pope.

The threat of a council did indeed impress the Pope, but not to the extent of making him give up his alliance with France and England. This would result only from the military occurrences that overtook Rome and the Pope in the next months. The Colonna family, led by Cardinal Pompeo Colonna, made a surprise attack on Rome and plundered the Leonine City. However this was only the prelude to worse. Jörg von Frundsberg had crossed the Alps in the late autumn and reinforced the Spanish troops with his mercenaries. In February 1527 he joined Charles of Bourbon. But there was no money with which to pay the soldiers. Fatigue and hunger led to mutinies, with which Frundsberg was unable to deal. Then he suffered a stroke. The insubordinate troops headed for the Eternal City, where they assured themselves they would acquire rich booty and revenge themselves on the Pope, the Emperor's enemy. In addition, the old and deep-seated anti-Roman sentiment of the Germans and the new talk about the Antichrist in the Roman Babel stirred the desire of punishing rich and wicked Rome. Charles of Bourbon fell at the very start of the attack on the Eternal City on 6 May 1527, with the result that the murder and pillage on the part of the leaderless soldiery became all the more unrestrained.

---

[3] J. Le Plat, *Monumenta ad historiam concilii Tridentini spectantia* II (Louvain 1781), 247–288, 9; K. Brandi, op. cit., I, 216; H. Jedin, "Die Päpste und das Konzil in der Politik Karls V.," P. Rassow (ed.), *Karl V. Der Kaiser und seine Zeit* (Cologne 1960), pp. 104–117 (especially p. 106).

The *Sacco di Roma* became a judgment on Renaissance Rome. The Pope had taken refuge in Castle Sant'Angelo but had to surrender on 5 June and for the next six months he was the prisoner of the imperial troops. By agreeing to the occupation of important cities in the Papal State, paying a considerable indemnity, and promising neutrality, he was able to purchase his freedom on 6 December. Until October 1528 he stayed away from ruined and depopulated Rome. Meanwhile, the Emperor's troops were successful in North Italy and in the Kingdom of Naples. The Pope saw that his interest lay on the Emperor's side. When he was assured absolutely that the Emperor would not insist on a council and that there were other ways of dealing with the Protestants, such as a court of arbitration made up of scholars or a religious colloquy, he was ready for peace, which was signed at Barcelona on 29 June 1529. The Emperor promised the restoration of Medici rule in Florence and the retrocession of cities such as Ravenna, Modena, and Reggio to the Papal State. In return he was again invested with Naples and obtained the disposal of benefices in the kingdom. Pope and Emperor made a defensive alliance against the Turks, then advancing on Vienna, and bound themselves to common action against heretics. Since peace with France was also being negotiated—it became a reality on 3 August 1529, in the Ladies' Peace of Cambrai between Margaret of Parma and Louise of Savoy, mother of Francis I—Charles V was able to undertake the long announced journey to Italy.

He met the Pope at Bologna on 5 November 1529. For four months he lived next door to the Pope, seeking in private conversations to win him over to a council. He was unable to overcome Clement's misgivings and obtained only a conditional assent. The Pope wanted guarantees that peace was assured and schisms—here he had France especially in mind—were out of the question.[4]

On 24 February 1530, his birthday and the anniversary of the Battle of Pavia, Charles V received the imperial crown from the Pope at San Petronio in Bologna. The old unity of Emperor and Pope seemed restored, the precondition for the peace of Christendom reestablished. This coronation, the last that a Pope was to perform, was, however, rather a conclusion than a new start. A real understanding between

---

[4] Jedin, I, 195f. (English trans.: I, 244).

Emperor and Pope, that would have been so necessary for defense against the Turkish peril and for overcoming the religious split in Germany, failed to materialize. His dynastic concerns and dread of the Emperor's predominance in Italy brought Clement VII to a new *rapprochement* with France. In October 1533 he went to Marseilles to marry his great-niece, Catherine de Medici, to Henry of Orleans, the second son of the French King. The conversations with Francis I on this occasion remained secret, and so they could only feed the Emperor's suspicions all the more. In the last years of Clement VII's pontificate occurred also the decisive phase of the divorce of Henry VIII and thus the withdrawal of England from the Church. On 24 March 1534 the Pope issued the judgment which declared the validity of Henry's marriage with Catherine of Aragon. Clement did not live to see the final break—the Act of Supremacy of 3 November 1534. He died on 25 September 1534, called by von Ranke "probably the most calamity-ridden of all the popes who ever occupied the Roman See." It was especially mischievous that he took no decisive step toward renewal of the Church, but rather refused the overdue council and felt that the unity of the Church could be assured by political means, by a subtle diplomacy.

CHAPTER 21

The Speyer Protest
and
The Marburg Religious Colloquy

The Edict of Worms had been suspended *de facto* at the Diet of Speyer in 1526. The Emperor was fully occupied with the war in Italy, while King Ferdinand had to devote himself to the Turkish danger and the struggle for Hungary, that is, for what was left of the kingdom, claimed by him in the name of his brother-in-law, Louis II, who had perished at the battle of Mohacs in 1526. The princes who inclined to the Reformation, Electoral Saxony and Hesse at their head, were able to utilize the opportunity to construct and consolidate the new ecclesiastical organization in their lands. Just the same, there was a growing feeling of insecurity, and the mutual distrust became deeper. Hence people began to look for allies. Especially active was Philip of Hesse, who was little troubled by scruples in political matters. His efforts were directed toward restoring Duke Ulrich of Württemberg to his territory and, by destroying the Swabian League, to gain the South German cities for an evangelical alliance. Both aims were intended to weaken the Habsburgs and to place the adherents of the Reformation in a position to defend themselves against future unfavorable decrees of a diet.

These far-reaching plans of Philip the Magnanimous very nearly led to war because of the "Pack Affair." In February 1528, Otto Pack, a secretary of Duke Georg of Saxony, made known to Philip that King Ferdinand, Duke Georg of Saxony, the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, and other Catholic princes had concluded an offensive alliance with the Bishops of Mainz, Salzburg, Würzburg, and Bamberg in Breslau in order to extirpate heresy and to deprive the princes of Electoral Saxony and Hesse of their authority. Philip thereupon united with the Elector Johann of Saxony for a preventive war and allied with France, Denmark, and Zapolya, Ferdinand's rival in Hungary. First of all, the bishoprics of Würzburg and Bamberg were to be occupied. Luther and the Wittenberg theologians had scruples about an offensive war for the Gospel and stressed the duty of obedience by the estates to the Emperor. Moreover, the Pack documents turned out to be forgeries, and so the military expedition collapsed at its start. Nevertheless, Philip obtained from the Franconian bishops compensation for the costs of mobilization and from the Archbishop of Mainz the renunciation of spiritual jurisdiction in Hesse.

The Diet of Speyer in 1529

The plans in regard to an alliance acquired a fresh stimulus by means of the Diet of Speyer, which began on 15 March 1529. Charles V had become reconciled with the Pope and peace was about to be concluded with France. Hence the Emperor could think about a regulation of the situation in the Empire. At the beginning of the discussions his proposal was not yet ready. The suggestions submitted by Ferdinand were more rigorous and far-reaching.[1] Aid against the Turks preempted the stage. Nevertheless, the religious question was energetically discussed. Under penalty of outlawry it was to be forbidden to deprive anyone of his authority and property "because of his faith" or to force him to embrace another faith. The Recess of the Diet of 1526 was declared null because it had given occasion to misunderstandings and caprice.

The advisory committee made the proposal stricter. Nevertheless, the innovations were permitted to continue; but the Mass had to be tolerated everywhere, and the Sacramentarians and Anabaptists were proscribed.[2] The evangelical estates, however, issued on 19 and 20 April the solemn protest that gave them the name "Protestants."[3] Without regard for this, the Recess of the Diet was signed on 22 April. In it the Emperor was requested to propose to the Pope the convoking of a "free general council in Germany." It should be summoned within one year to meet at Metz, Cologne, Mainz, Strasbourg, or some other German locality and, at the latest, begin its work after another year, "so that the German nation can be united in the holy Christian faith and the impending schism can be discussed."[4] Otherwise, "a general gathering of all the estates of the German nation," a sort of national council then, should take place.[5] The Edict of Worms should remain in force where it was hitherto observed. Where the new doctrine had been introduced and could not be eliminated without tumult henceforth any further innovation should be prevented until the future council could be convened. Above all, teachings and sects which attacked the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood—Zwinglians and Anabaptists—must not be allowed, and the Mass must not be abolished. "Even in places where the other doctrine has taken root and is maintained, it must not be forbidden to hear Mass nor must anyone be hindered from doing so."[6] All "Anabaptists and the rebaptized, men and women of the age of reason, are to be put to death by fire, the sword, or the like . . . without any previous inquiry by the spiritual judges."[7] Finally, it was stated:

---

[1] *RTA* VII, 1129–36.

[2] Testimonial of 15 April (*RTA*, VII, 1140–43).

[3] *RTA* VII, 1262–65, 1274–88.

> We, electors, princes, prelates, counts, and estates, have unanimously agreed and loyally promised one another that no one of a spiritual or a secular estate is to offer violence to another or compel or attack him because of faith or deprive him of rents, taxes, tithes, or goods.[8]

No notice was taken officially of the protest of the evangelical estates. Hence they presented it, in an expanded form, as an appeal to the Emperor on 25 April.[9] Now fourteen cities with Sankt Gallen, including the Free Cities of Strasbourg, Nürnberg, Ulm, and Constance, declared their adherence to the protest of the princes. In addition to the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, Duke Ernst of Lüneburg, Margrave Georg of Brandenburg, and Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt had signed. The dilemma facing the religious question became clear in the protest. People demanded toleration but were not prepared to grant it. They resisted majority decrees in questions of conscience—"in matters relevant to God's honor and the soul's salvation everyone must stand alone before God and give an account"[10]—but appeared to recognize the authority of a general council. They were convinced that they "had the word of God without any doubt, pure, undefiled, clean, and right."[11] Therefore, to grant that the evangelical doctrine would only be tolerated where it had thus far been introduced would amount to "denying . . . our Lord and Saviour Christ and his holy word [not only] tacitly but publicly."[12] On the other hand, only to tolerate the Mass would mean to give the lie to the doctrine of evangelical "preachers which we regard as Christian and reliable." In fact, if "the papal Mass were not against God and his holy word, it must still no longer be retained,"[13] because two kinds of worship in one locality is intolerable and must lead "to disagreeableness, tumult, revolt, and misfortune of every sort" among the common people, particularly when they are serious about God's glory.

---

[4] Ibid., 1299.

[5] Ibid., 1142.

[6] Ibid., 1143.

[7] Ibid., 1299.

[8] Ibid., 1301.

[9] Ibid., 1346–56.

Even if neither the Emperor nor King Ferdinand was in a position to implement the Recess of the Diet, the Protestants felt impelled to be concerned for their own protection and to look around for allies. On the very day of the Recess, Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Nürnberg, Strasbourg, and Ulm entered into a secret defensive alliance against eventual attacks. But the plans of Philip of Hesse went still further, envisaging a widespread war alliance against the Habsburg. It was promoted by Zwingli's efforts to expand the "Christian citizenship" into an anti-Habsburg coalition, but the controversies over the Eucharist presented an obstacle. These were taken very seriously by the Wittenberg theologians, to whom a confession of faith was more important than a league. Luther had made clear the chasm between him and Zwingli in his solemn *Grosses Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl Christi* (*WA* 26, 261–509), and he had rendered an understanding difficult by his violent polemics and even his defamatory tactics. Philip of Hesse endeavored to mediate. At the Diet of Speyer he had successfully prevented the Lutherans from cutting themselves off from the South German cities which inclined to Zwingli's doctrine. Hence the cities had been able to agree to the protest. On 22 April when the league of Protestants came into existence at Speyer and the "Christian Union" between the Catholic cantons of Switzerland and Austria was ratified at Waldshut, the Landgrave wrote to Zwingli that he should attend a meeting with Luther and Melanchthon in order "to reach an agreement [in regard to the Eucharist] on the basis of Holy Scripture." For at the Diet the papists had profited by the lack of union among those "who adhered to the pure word of God" to promote their "villainy" (*ZW* 10, 108f.). The discussion did not take place until October, for while Zwingli enthusiastically accepted the plan (*ZW* 10, 117f.), people at Wittenberg had political and theological hesitations.

---

[10] Ibid., 1277.

[11] Ibid., 1280.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., 1281.

Zwingli's Eucharistic Doctrine

In the epitome of the First Disputation of Zurich (29 January 1523) Zwingli had rejected the Sacrifice of the Mass in a lengthy explanation, in which he referred to the "once for all" of Hebrews 7:27. The Mass implied a "diminution and defamation" of the one perfect Sacrifice of Christ. It was merely a "memorial" of it and an "assurance of the redemption which Christ achieved for us" (*ZW* 2, 119, 26). While Zwingli attacked the refusal of communion under the species of wine, he ascribed no decisive importance to it. Anyone who, from ignorance or compulsion, is content with the species of bread receives Christ. Lastly, one does not need the Sacrament at all, for one finds salvation in faith in Christ, even if both species should be denied.[14] The doctrine of transubstantiation was, for Zwingli, a speculation of theologians. "What theologians have concocted in regard to the transubstantiation of wine and bread does not bother me" (*ZW* 2, 144, 13f.).

He wanted John 6:53–56 understood in faith with reference to John 6:63: "It is the Spirit that gives life; the flesh profits nothing."

> As his flesh or body, which suffered death for us, and his blood, which was shed for us, has redeemed us poor creatures, no more powerful food can come to man's soul than that it surely believe this. For thus his death and the shedding of his blood become the life and joy of the soul [*ZW* 2, 142, 19–23].

If we believe that Christ's body was done to death and his blood was shed for us in order to redeem us and to reconcile us with God, "our soul is given food and drink with the flesh and blood of Christ" (*ZW* 2, 143, 15f.).

Zwingli did not yet question the real presence. But it was only an aid to the faith of the uneducated. In order that "the covenant might be more easily grasped" in its essence, Christ gave his body the appearance of food, and hence they should be "assured in faith by a visible action." But just as immersion in baptism is of no use without faith, so too the body of Christ is of no use if we do not entirely abandon ourselves to him as our salvation.

---

[14] *ZW* 2, 134, 18. Cf. Luther's *De captivitate Babylonica* (*WA* 6, 507, 15).

For Zwingli the words of institution were as yet no problem. Against a "shameless Dominican" he emphasized:

> "This is my body." Is this not a clear, brief, sure, express word of God? How could God have spoken more briefly or really more exactly? [*ZW* 2, 154, 5ff.] For what can be said more clearly than "This is my body"? [*ZW* 2, 154, 21f.]

Two years later, in the *Commentary on the True and False Religion* (1525), the reformer formally retracted his profession of faith in the real presence. If the progress of the Reformation outside Zurich had contributed to this change and if Zwingli had obtained the theological arguments for his new view from outside, nevertheless it was entirely in keeping with his thought. In his humanist-oriented spiritualism he understood *spiritualis* not as "spiritual," as a reality given in the Holy *Pneuma,* but as "intellectual" in contrast to "bodily and material." And so he saw no possibility of a spiritual sacramental presence of the Sacrifice of the Cross—historically unique—in the Mass, but only that of a "memorial," that is, of a making present in thought, in the awareness of the congregation. The intellectual and the material are mutually exclusive. God is a spirit, and he who wants to rise to him must leave behind all that is visible. Ceremonies have their meaning at most as incentives for the unlettered, as pedagogical means on the perimeter of the "true religion." Only spirit can attain to spirit. Worship is accomplished in "spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). It is unworthy of God when we seek to get into contact with him by material means or even to influence him, and, conversely, assume that he wants to communicate himself to us in material signs. Thus our achieving an understanding of the Incarnation, of the Sacrament, and even of the word to which the Spirit of God is bound is greatly obstructed.

Zwingli says that he had made up his mind on the metaphorical nature of the words of institution even before the appearance of Karlstadt, except that he did not know "which word was the metaphor."[15] This did not dawn on him until two "pious and learned men"—Heine Rhode and Georg Saganus—had brought him the letter from the Netherlander, Cornelis Hoen. "In it I found the precious pearl: that the 'is' is to be understood as 'signifies'" (*ZW* 4, 560, 28).

The connection, gained in conjunction with the treatise on the Eucharist by his fellow countryman, Wessel Gansfort (d. 1489), that the copula "is" in the words of institution must be understood as "signifies," had been communicated by the lawyer, Cornelis Hoen of The Hague, in a letter to rector Heine Rhode at Utrecht. Rhode had taken it to

---

[15] *Reply to Johannes Bugenhagen's Letter,* 23 October 1525 (*ZW* 4, 558–576, p. 560, 21).

Luther at Wittenberg in 1521 but had been repulsed. It was accepted by Oecolampadius and Zwingli, whom he and Georg Saganus sought out in 1523–24.[16] In Hoen's letter Zwingli found a clarification of his notion of the Eucharist and in 1525 he published this work, so significant for him, anonymously. Meanwhile Karlstadt had published five treatises on the Eucharist at Basel at the end of October or the beginning of November 1524. Their crude form made them repulsive. When their content was connected with Zwingli, he had to fear for his reputation. Hence he sought to enlighten his friends by writing a detailed letter on the Lord's Supper in November 1524 to the pastor of Reutlingen, Matthäus Alber, who favored Luther.[17] It was at first circulated in manuscript with a request for secrecy and did not appear in print until March 1525, when "more than 500 of the brethren" (*ZW* 4, 558, 23) had become acquainted with it. Thus Zwingli's alienation from Karlstadt had become known in the circle of his adherents months before the position he had taken in it against Luther caused disturbances at Wittenberg. But Luther's judgment on Zwingli was clearly made on the basis of oral information. To him Zwingli, like Karlstadt, was a fanatic and a Sacramentarian. Luther wrote on 17 November 1524: "Zwingli of Zurich, together with Leo Jud, in Switzerland holds the same views as Karlstadt."[18] While Zwingli is not named in *Wider die himmlischen Propheten,* he is certainly meant.

Simultaneously with the printing of the letter to Alber appeared Zwingli's great systematic work, *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* (*ZW* 3, 628–911), which, like Calvin's later *Institutio,* was dedicated to King Francis I. What is by far the longest of the twenty-nine chapters deals with the Eucharist. Here again Zwingli proceeds, not from the words of institution, but from the sixth chapter of Saint John. "Faith is the food that Christ discusses so forcibly in this entire chapter" (*ZW* 3, 776, 30). He satiates the soul with food and drink so that nothing is ever lacking to it. He who believes in Christ remains in God. "Hence it is a spiritual food" [782, 16] of which Christ is speaking. "If he says, 'The flesh profits nothing' [John 6:63], then human audacity should not dispute about an eating of his flesh" (782, 26ff.). To the objection that we are redeemed from death by Christ's flesh Zwingli replies: "Christ's flesh profits everywhere very much, yes, enormously, but . . . as put to death, not as eaten. Put to death, it saves us from death; eaten, it profits absolutely nothing" (*ZW* 3, 782, 30ff.). The flesh that brings salvation is enthroned in heaven at the Father's right hand since the Ascension and cannot at the same time be in the bread.

---

[16] A. Eekhof, *De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen* (Facsimile; The Hague 1917); *ZW* 4, 512–519. English translation in H. A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation* (New York 1966), pp. 268–278.

[17] *Ad Matthaeum Alberun de coena domini epistola* (*ZW* 3, 335–354).

[18] *WA, Br* 3, 373, 11; cf. the letter of 19 July 1525 to Johannes Hess (*WA, Br* 3, 544, 3f.).

As already stated, Zwingli did not understand the reference to the special, sacramental, and nonhistorical manner of Christ's presence and of the eating of his flesh and blood. He was able to grasp "spiritual" only as "intellectual" in his body-spirit pattern. For him it made no sense to say: "We indeed eat the true and physical flesh of Christ but in a spiritual manner."[19] Those who speak in this way do not see

> that "to be in a body" and "to be eaten spiritually" are incompatible concepts. Body and spirit are opposed to each other. . . . Hence "to eat material flesh in a spiritual manner" is nothing other than to assert that body is spirit. [387, 6–13]

Faith "does not move in the realm of the material and physical; it has nothing in common with this" (787, 19f.).

The "insipid," "silly," and "dreadful" opinion of a physical eating, proper only "to cannibals," cannot be supported by the words of institution (789). They too must be understood in the light of "the flesh profits nothing." "This means: 'This is my body' must not or cannot possibly be understood of bodily flesh or of the physically perceptible body" (792, 10f.). But the "symbolic sense" is not to be found in the "this," as Karlstadt thought. He did "not take hold of the matter in the passage where the victory was to be achieved" (817, 2). The "hoc" can refer also to a masculine word, to *panis,* and it does not thereby exclude the Catholic interpretation. At stake is the meaning of "est." "For in more than one passage in Scripture this word stands for *significat*" (795, 11f.). The words of the Last Supper are hence to be understood thus: "This, namely, what I present to you for eating, is the symbol of my body, given for you, and this that I now do you should do for the future in memory of me" (798, 37f.).

Like the Jewish Passover, the Lord's Supper is the great memorial feast of the Redemption.[20] Hence it is

> nothing else than a calling to mind: those who firmly believe that they are reconciled with the Father by Christ's death and blood proclaim in the Supper this life-giving death; that is, they consider themselves fortunate and glorify it. It follows that he who meets for this custom or feast in order to recall the Lord's death, that is, to

---

[19] *ZW* 3, 787, 5f.; here Zwingli has in mind arguments of Cardinal Cajetan. Cf. W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther* I, 161.

[20] "redemptionis commemoratio, festivitas aut celebritas" (803, 26f.).

> proclaim it, testifies by so doing that he wishes to be a member of the one body, that he wishes to be bread. [807, 12–18]

The Eucharist is not a real memorial in the sense that Christ by the action of the Church makes his sacrifice present. It is a recalling of the Sacrifice of the Cross, which continues to belong to the past, and a Sacrament, or "oath of allegiance," a binding testimony to membership in Christ and profession of faith by the community.

Johannes Bugenhagen in August 1525 took a narrow and strict position against Zwingli's Eucharistic doctrine.[21] He was the first member of the Wittenberg circle to express himself. Luther did not make known his reaction until the middle of 1526 in the preface to a translation of the *Syngramma* of Swabian preachers (*WA* 19, 457–461). Luther and Zwingli then exchanged a series of polemics. Luther began with the *Sermon vom Sakrament des Leibes und Blutes Christi wider die Schwarmgeister* (1526). There followed *Dass diese Worte, "das ist mein Leib" noch feststehen* (1527) and *Das grosse Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl* (1528). Zwingli defended himself with *Amica Exegesis* (1527), *Freundliche Verglimpfung über die Predigt Luthers wider die Schwärmer* (1527), *Dass diese Worte, "das ist mein Leib," ewig den alten Sinn haben werden* (1527), and *Über Luthers Buch, "Bekenntnis" genannt* (1528). Their opposition became deeper in the course of this controversy. Mutual insults further envenomed the atmosphere. Thus it was no easy undertaking when Philip of Hesse tried to bring the two reformers to the discussion table; it could only be even more difficult to move them to a common profession, which was regarded by the Wittenberg theologians as the preliminary to forming a league.

The Marburg Religious Colloquy

On 1 July Philip of Hesse sent the official invitation to Luther and Melanchthon, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Andreas Osiander at Nürnberg, and Jakob Sturm to convene at Marburg on 30 September 1529. Sturm was to bring along Bucer and another preacher from Strasbourg, but only as observers. Only the two Swiss and the two from Wittenberg were to engage in the disputation.

Luther and Melanchthon came armed with a confession in seventeen articles, comprising their entire faith. Persons had met at Torgau at the middle of September by command of the Elector of Saxony to draw up this creed. From the use later made of them, they were called the "Articles of Schwabach."

After a friendly greeting on 30 September, on Friday, 1 October,

---

[21] *Contra errorem de sacramento corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi epistola.*

Luther and Oecolampadius and Zwingli and Melanchthon received a mandate for a discussion, each group in private. The next day at six in the morning the decisive discussion began in a private room next to the Landgrave Philip of Hesse's bedroom in the presence of a select group of at most fifty to sixty persons. Luther wanted to start from the beginning and submitted seven points in which the Swiss differed from him: the Trinity, the doctrine of the two natures, original sin, baptism, justification, the doctrine of the function of the word, and purgatory. So long as they were not agreed on these, he said, "they would discuss in vain the true value of the Eucharist."[22] The Swiss objected that they had met because of the Eucharist. Luther gave in and at the outset wrote with chalk the words "This is my body" on the table and covered them with the velvet table cloth. He thereby defined the thesis of the disputation but at the same time he stressed that he "rejected carnal proofs and geometrical arguments entirely" and demanded submission to the word of Scripture. On Saturday and Sunday, 2 and 3 October, the debate went on from morning to evening. Melanchthon intervened only once in the conversation. Oecolampadius submitted arguments from Scripture and the Fathers, whereas Zwingli discussed the dogmatic questions. The presence of the Landgrave served to temper the tone of the dispute. Nevertheless, sharp outbreaks were not lacking.

Luther admitted that in Scripture there were figures of speech and metaphors but said that the presence of such had to be proved for each particular case. In referring to the Spirit that gives life, he said, Christ did not intend to exclude physical eating but only to enlighten the people of Capharnaum "that he was not eaten, like bread and flesh, in a dish, or like roast pork."[23]

Luther referred again and again to Holy Scripture. "Those words, 'this is my body,' hold me captive." "Do away with the text for me and I am satisfied."

> If he would command me to eat dung, I would do it, since I well know: it is good for me. The servant does not meditate on his master's will. One must close one's eyes. . . . Do away with the text for me and I am satisfied.[24]

The humanist Zwingli, on the other hand, stressed that antitheses are for the "flesh and spirit."

---

[22] W. Köhler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* (Leipzig 1929), pp. 54, 8.

[23] Ibid., p. 11.

[24] Ibid., p. 13.

> God is true and the light. He does not lead us into darkness. Hence he does not say "This is my body" essentially, really, corporeally. . . . The soul is spirit, the soul does not eat flesh, spirit eats spirit.[25]

Luther, on the contrary, would even eat "rotten apples" spiritually, if God offered them to him. "For wherever the word of God is, there is spiritual use." But it does not exclude the material. "The mouth receives Christ's body, the soul believes the words while it is eating the body."

At issue was not only the Eucharist but the means of grace in general. According to Zwingli, the material cannot communicate salvation. God operates directly. He must not be removed to external things. This is as true of the Sacrament as of the word, but it does not stop before the humanity of Christ. Oecolampadius urged Luther: "Do not hang so much to Christ's humanity and flesh, but raise your mind to Christ's divinity!" Luther retorted: "I know no God except him who became man, and I do not want any other."[26]

Not a single truth of faith was disputed, but the basic structure was different. Luther perceived this and expressed it to Bucer: "Our mind and your mind do not make sense to each other, but it is obvious that we do not have the same mind."[27]

It was all the more amazing that a far-reaching agreement was arrived at in the end. At the urging of Philip of Hesse, Luther on 4 October assembled fifteen articles for a concord. The "Articles of Schwabach" served as his model. However, he treated the Eucharist last. Zwingli and Oecolampadius obtained several changes in form. Agreement was reached on the first fourteen of these basically Lutheran articles and on five points of the fifteenth. There was unanimity against the Catholic doctrine and practice in the demand for the Eucharist under both species, in the rejection of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in the statements that "the Sacrament of the altar is a Sacrament of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ," that there is question "chiefly" of a spiritual nourishment, and that the Eucharist was instituted in order to move weak consciences to faith.

At the conclusion they say: "Although we are not in agreement this time whether the true body and blood of Christ are physically in the bread and wine, still each should show Christian charity to the other in so far as each conscience can permit, and both parties diligently ask

---

[25] Ibid., p. 15.

[26] Ibid., p. 27.

[27] Ibid., p. 129.

Almighty God to give us the right understanding through his Spirit."[28] Zwingli's signing the essentially Lutheran Articles of Marburg has been presented as a concession from political considerations. Each side probably interpreted the articles in its own sense and was mistaken as to the unanimity. In the expression "Sacrament of the true body and blood" the Lutherans emphasized "true body," whereas Zwingli stressed "Sacrament," understanding Sacrament as a mere sign.[29] Thus the Articles of Marburg would be "an apparent concord in the sense that each of the partners in the colloquy only signed what he had already known until then and erroneously assumed that the other signed the same as he did."[30] And hence disillusion did not fail to appear. Each side quickly charged the other with breach of faith, and the polemics flared up again. On 16 October, scarcely two weeks after the colloquy at Marburg, Electoral Saxony and Brandenburg again tried at Schwabach to gain the South German cities and Hesse for the "Schwabach Articles," and to separate them from the Swiss. They were again unsuccessful.

Zwingli's Death and Succession

Zwingli and Philip of Hesse pursued further their anti-Habsburg league policy in Europe. Strasbourg entered the citizenship on 12 January 1530. The Landgrave allied with Zurich on 30 July. On 18 November there came into being a "Christian understanding" between him, Zurich, Basel, and Strasbourg, "only for defense and safety" in the event of an attack "because of God's word." The Protestant inclinations of Margaret of Navarre, sister of the French King, awakened in Zwingli the hope of winning France, not only for his political plans, but also for his faith. In the early summer of 1531 he composed a second statement of belief, *Fidei expositio,* for Francis I.

The reformer's fate was decided, however, not by his worldwide coalition policy, but by the domestic confrontation in Switzerland. The conflict was due to the "common governments" of Protestant and Catholic cantons, whose officials rotated after agreed terms and while in power tried to impose their creed, while the other party complained of moral constraint. "Zwingli saw a violation of the Peace of Kappel in every proceeding of the five cantons against an evangelical canton, but was unwilling to concede freedom of conscience to the Catholics in his sphere."[31] He urged war, and this time the religious split was to win out over the ties of nationality. True, Zurich was still alone when it demanded war at the *Tagsatzung* on 24 April 1531. When the city continued to demand, it was constrained to be content with a blockade instead of war. On 28 May an embargo on provisions was laid on the five Catholic cantons, which depended on the importing of corn from Alsace and South Germany. They mobilized for defense in order to break the oppressive ring and on 9 October declared war. In Zurich leadership was lacking. Not until the five cantons assumed the offensive on 11 October did mobilization get under way, and then only seven hundred men, instead of twelve thousand, took the field. Finally, two thousand five hundred men of Zurich faced an enemy eight thousand men strong. On 11 October 1531 Zwingli fell as a soldier at Kappel in a war he had passionately wanted. In the Second Peace of Kappel[32] Zurich had to renounce its policy of foreign alliance. Thereby the progress of the Reformation in German Switzerland was slowed down.

---

[28] *BSLK,* p. 62.

[29] His marginal gloss on this sentence reads: "Sacramentum signum est veri corporis, etc. Non est igitur verum corpus." Quoted from S. Hausammann, "Die Marburger Artikel—eine echte Konkordie?" *ZKG* 77 (1966), 288–321, p. 318.

[30] Ibid., p. 291.

On 9 December 1531, the Zurich city council named Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75) as Zwingli's successor. The new *antistes* and all pastors were for the future to confine themselves to the proclaiming of the word of God and not mix in "worldly matters." Bullinger, born on 18 July 1504 at Bremgarten, the son of the local dean and pastor, was twenty-seven when he took up Zwingli's legacy. He succeeded in mastering the crisis relatively quickly and in stabilizing the Church organization in Zurich. In 1532 he created the Zurich Synodal Order. In 1536 he composed the first Swiss Confession for union discussions with the Germans, which collapsed. However, he did achieve agreement with Calvin on the Eucharistic question in the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549. He thereby put Zwinglianism, which he could not bring to worldwide recognition, at least into intimate connection with powerfully rising Calvinism.

---

[31] W. Köhler, *Huldrych Zwingli,* p. 248.

[32] Text in E. Walder, *Religionsvergleiche des 16. Jahrhunderts* I (Bern, 2nd ed. 1960), 5–14.

CHAPTER 22

The Imperial Diet of Augsburg

When, after he had made peace with France and with Pope Clement VII, Italy had become somewhat calm, Emperor Charles V was able to think of devoting himself to German affairs. It was important to restore unity in faith and to assemble the political forces for defense against the Turkish peril in the East. Influenced by the Erasmians, his chancellor Gattinara at their head, the Emperor was optimistic in regard to an agreement with the Protestant estates. He counted especially on the effect of the personal impression of his imperial dignity and power. Accordingly, the proclamation of the Diet for 8 April 1530, which went out even before the imperial coronation at Bologna on 21 January, was drawn up in very conciliatory and friendly language. It did proceed from the Edict of Worms but sought a new start of discussion. The Diet was to take measures for defense against the danger from the Turks. Furthermore, it was to discuss the method of proceeding in regard to "the differences and schism . . . in the holy faith and the Christian religion." For the sake of unity people should refrain from all discord, leave "past errors" to God, and try hard to listen to the opinion of the other side and to understand it. Whatever "on both sides has not been correctly explained and done" should be ignored. It is important for "all to accept and hold one single and true religion." and as "all are and fight under one Christ," so also should "all live in one community of the Church and unity."[1]

Among the Protestant estates Luther's prince, the Elector Johann of Saxony, took the religious question very seriously but was not prepared, without more ado, to go along with Protestants "of another mind," that is, the Zwinglians. On the other hand, he was intent upon reconciliation with the Emperor, from whom he awaited investiture with the electoral dignity. From this point of view he strove to present the religious differences of opinion as unessential and was inclined to regard an understanding in the question of religion as possible through the Emperor.

The Landgrave Philip, on the other hand, was much more political in his thinking. He feared that a successful Diet would mean a weakening of his anti-Habsburg policy. Consequently, he subordinated the Protestant movement and in its interest he worked for an adjustment of the doctrinal differences within Protestantism and for a coalition against the Emperor. He would have preferred most of all to remain away from the Diet, for he feared a condemnation of the Swiss. He therefore denied the competence of Emperor and Diet in the religious question and hoped, by recourse to a council, to gain time for his plans.[2]

Like the Emperor, the Papal Legate Lorenzo Campeggio underestimated the intransigence of the Protestant estates. While holding basically to the Edict of Worms, he held out hopes for the effort to gain the princes by concessions or to intimidate the cities. He alone counted seriously on the use of force, even if as the *ultima ratio.*

---

[1] K. E. Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstages zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530* I (1833; reprinted, Osnabrück 1966), 7f.

[2] Cf. the instruction for the Hessian envoys (W. Gussmann, *Quellen und Forschungen* I, 1, 326ff.).

The Diet met much later than planned. The Wittenberg theologians exploited the time thus allowed them in order to formulate their own religious standpoint, both to be ready for a discussion and to arm themselves against blame. Thus originated the *Confessio Augustana.*

Construction of the Creed

The drawing up of creeds within Protestantism was motivated by confrontations of Lutherans with the fanatics and the Zwinglians and also by the self-assurance vis-à-vis the Imperial Governing Council, which was pressing for an implementation of the Edict of Worms. As early as 1528 Luther had added a "confession" to his great work, *Vom Abendmahl Christi* against Zwingli. It begins:

> Because I see that the longer there are mobs and error, the more there will be no stopping of Satan's raging and raving, so that no more, during my lifetime or after my death, will some have anything to do with me and would like to show up my writings as false in order to confirm their errors, as the Sacramentarian and Anabaptist fanatics are beginning to do, I wish therefore, by this work, to confess my faith, bit by bit, before God and the whole world. [*WA* 26, 499]

In this "confession" Luther further expounded the doctrine of sin, redemption, justification, and Christian perfection (Article 2). In Article 3 he discussed in detail the doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments and sharply rejected the abuses of fanatics and papists.

The seventeen "Articles of Schwabach" go back to this document. They were the first confession to which a group of Lutherans—Electoral Saxony, Brandenburg-Ansbach, and Nürnberg—adhered at Schwabach in Franconia on 16 October 1529 and which they submitted to the envoys of the South German cities. On them the league with the South German "Sacramentarians" was wrecked. The Wittenberg theologians and Electoral Saxony regarded these Schwabach Articles as their confession. Shortly after the opening of the Diet of Augsburg they appeared in print in that city and, together with those of Torgau, served as model in topics and construction for the Augsburg Confession. They were directed, not least of all, against the Zwinglians, who understood them thus. Jakob Sturm (1489–1553) of Strasbourg wrote to Zwingli on 31

May 1539: "I am sending also the articles which Luther earlier tried to force down our throats" (CR 97, 602, 8).

To prepare for the Diet of Augsburg on 14 March 1530, the Elector Johann of Saxony summoned the Wittenberg theologians to Torgau. Here on 27 March they discussed an opinion which has gone into history as the "Articles of Torgau" and which was taken along to Augsburg as working material. In an effort to demonstrate to the Emperor the purity of ecclesiastical usages in Electoral Saxony, doctrines were less discussed in the articles than were the controverted ceremonies. For "now dissension springs especially from several abuses, which were introduced by men into doctrine and laws."[3]

At Augsburg the Lutherans saw themselves facing two fronts and hence in the presence of a twofold task. On the one side they had to repulse the fanatics and Zwingli or keep aloof from them; on the other side they had to convince the Emperor that nothing else was represented by them than the old, pure doctrine of the Catholic Church, as handed down by the Fathers and that they had nothing in common with Anabaptists and Sacramentarians and recognized authority. These two tendencies lay at the basis of the Augsburg Confession. The Catholics had also prepared for the confrontation at the Diet. Probably because of a request by the Bavarian Dukes to the University of Ingolstadt, Johannes Eck had set to work to compile for the Emperor a list of the errors of the Protestants—Lutherans, Zwinglians, and fanatics. Without further elaboration he added up "404 Articles for the Diet of Augsburg."

In these he presented the Bull "Exsurge Domine" (Articles 1–41), the conclusions of the Disputations of Leipzig (Articles 42–54) and Baden (Articles 55–64), and heresies compiled expressly for the Diet. These, Eck said, were only a selection from three thousand heretical statements in his possession. What mattered to Eck was to unmask the Protestants as heretics. The question arises to what extent he was concerned for the clarity that was necessary and, in the final analysis, salutary in view of the far-reaching doctrinal confusion or whether he did not commit the Protestants to error and obstruct the road to an understanding. In any event, the method by which he split up the truth into single sentences and used these without regard for the context and the concerns of the other side, like arguments in a criminal trial, was inadequate for the situation.

On his arrival at Augsburg Melanchthon encountered Eck's 404 Articles and sensed the necessity of formulating as one harmonious confession the doctrinal and ritual material that he had brought along. Hence he drew the doctrinal Articles of Schwabach and the ceremonial Articles of Torgau into an *apologia,* first conceived only in the name of Electoral Saxony. In the version of the end of May the first article began: "In the Electoral Principality of Saxony it is unanimously taught."[4]

---

[3] K. E. Förstemann, op. cit., I, 69; T. Kolde, *Die Augsburger Konfession* (Gotha 1896), p. 128.

The draft was sent to Luther on 11 May for his objections. As an outlaw he could not appear at the Diet and remained behind at the castle of Coburg. On 15 May he declared his agreement with the draft. He said he was unable to improve on anything in it. He wrote to Johann of Saxony that that "would not be fitting, since I cannot step so easily and lightly" (*WA, Br* 5, 319, 7). The question arises whether Luther on this basis of "stepping lightly" was criticizing a falsification or watering down of the reform problem by Melanchthon or whether he only intended, as on numerous other occasions,[5] to call attention to Melanchthon's pleasing and courteous style. In any event, he would have been unable, in view of his prince's hopes for agreement at Augsburg, to allow himself any language that was too sharp. At first he expressed himself in regard to the *Confessio Augustana* in a thoroughly positive sense.[6] His later criticism was, to be sure, not related to the doctrine of justification and other central articles of faith. But Luther gave the lie to Melanchthon's "untrue sentence."[7] At the conclusion of the first part, "Tota dissensio est de paucis quibusdam abusibus," when on 21 July 1530 he wrote to Justus Jonas that the *Confessio Augustana* conceals the articles on purgatory, the veneration of saints, and, above all, the Pope as anti-Christ. At the same time he again spoke of "stepping lightly."[8]

The *Confessio Augustana* includes twenty-eight articles and is divided into two parts. Part I (Articles 1–21) deals with the "Articuli fidei praecipui." Part II treats of abuses that later crept in but had now been abolished or replaced by other institutions, such as communion under both species (22), marriage of priests (23), the Mass (24), confession (25), regulations in regard to foods (26), religious vows (27), and episcopal power (28). Other "abuses," such as indulgences, pilgrimages, and the abuse of excommunication, are only mentioned at the end. For ecclesiastical unity, it is stressed, it suffices to agree on the central points of the teaching of the Gospel, as these are professed in Part I. Variety can prevail in the ecclesiastical usages discussed in Part II. From diplomatic motives and genuine concern for the unity of the Church Melanchthon had enjoined great discretion vis-à-vis the Catholic side. But he set the limits all the more strictly "toward the left," the Swiss and the fanatics.

---

[4] T. Kolde (ed.), *Die älteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession mit Melanchthons Einleitung* (Gütersloh 1906), p. 11.

[5] Cf. *WA* 30, II, 68; *WA, Tr* 3, 460, no. 3619.

[6] 3 July 1530: "placet vehementer" (*WA, Br* 5, 435, 4); 6 July: "publice est praedicatus confessione pulcherrima" (ibid., 442, 14); 9 July: "gloriosa confessione declamatus est" (ibid., 458, 13). If he wrote on 29 June "Pro mea persona plus satis cessum est in ista Apologia" (ibid., 405, 19), this must be understood as the reply to Melanchthon's inquiry as to how far the opponent must still be given in to.

[7] H. Bornkamm, *RGG* I, 735.

[8] "Scilicat Satan adhuc vivit, et bene sensit Apologiam vestram leise treten et dissimulasse articulos de purgatorio, de sanctorum cultu, et maxime de antichristo Papa" (*WA, Br* 5, 496, 1–3).

Consequently the South German cities—Strasbourg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen—saw themselves forced, because of the controverted doctrine of the Eucharist, to submit a confession of their own, the *Tetrapolitana,* on 9 July. Zwingli had not come to Augsburg but had sent there his confessional work, the *Fidei ratio ad Carolum imperatorem.* It was handed to the Emperor on 8 July.

The Course of the Diet

The Emperor did not reach Augsburg until 15 June. Before this Johann of Saxony had exerted himself to arrive at an agreement with the Emperor on the religious question by means of private negotiations without Philip of Hesse. He had sent several embassies to him at Innsbruck and had declared that he would visit him there but was met with a refusal and with disapproval that he had allowed his pastors to preach Lutheranism at Augsburg.

The Emperor's negative attitude moved the Elector to exert himself all the more for a common confession of Protestants.

On the very day of the solemn entry into Augsburg[9] tension occurred because the Emperor wanted the Protestant princes to take part on the next day in the Corpus Christi procession and forbade Lutheran preaching. The princes stayed away from the procession. A compromise was reached in the question of preaching in so far as it was entirely forbidden to disturb the discussions by polemics from the pulpit. On both sides there was a readiness for an understanding. Even before the opening of the Diet on 20 June there were talks between Melanchthon and the Emperor's secretary, Alfonso Valdes.[10] In these Melanchthon defended the view that the Lutheran affair was not so misguided as the Emperor had been made to believe; the split, he said, had to do merely with communion under both species, the marriage of priests, and private Masses (*CR,* II, 122).

---

[9] Cf. the description in Valentin von Tetleben, *Protokoll des Augsburger Reichstages,* edited by H. Grundmann (Göttingen 1958), pp. 59ff.

[10] G. Müller, "Um die Einheit der Kirche. Zu den Verhandlungen über den Laienkelch während des Augsburger Reichstages 1530," *Reformata Reformanda* I, 395ff.

The Papal Legate Campeggio did not avoid the efforts for an arrangement. In his report of 26 June he apparently granted the prospect of union negotiations. On the lay chalice, the marriage of priests, and the changing of the Canon of the Mass he referred to a council as the demand of the Protestants. In return, he said, they were prepared to yield in the question of purgatory, episcopal jurisdiction, and much else.[11]

The readiness for peace found expression in the Protestants' participation in the opening Mass on 20 June. In regard to the order of business they obtained a change in the agenda whereby the discussion of the religious question should precede that of aid against the Turks. But they did not succeed in getting the Catholics to submit their viewpoint in writing since they were unwilling to be pushed into the role of a religious faction and to cooperate in turning the Diet into something of a national council. The Catholics called for a committee of twelve spiritual and secular princes which should receive the Protestants' confession and report to the Emperor. To him, as *advocatus* and supreme protector of the Christian faith, should be left the final decision. From anxiety that the clear Catholic majority would carry its confession in the voting there arose among the Protestants the plan to have the *Confessio* read publicly.

Meanwhile, other Protestant estates had adhered to the *Confessio.* In addition to Johann of Saxony, it was signed by the Margrave Georg of Brandenburg-Ansbach, Dukes Ernst and Francis of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, the Free Cities of Nürnberg and Reutlingen, and finally the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. The last named failed to carry the modification of the article on the Eucharist in the Zwinglian sense, but he did succeed in substituting for the foreword, drawn up by Melanchthon as an appeal to the Emperor's good will, one written by Chancellor Bruck of Electoral Saxony. In this the legal standpoint was more strongly emphasized and the appeal to a council, expressed at Speyer in 1519 in the event of the failure of agreement, was renewed. The German text was read on 25 June by the Saxon chancellor, Christian Beyer.

While the Catholic theologians were working on a refutation of the *Confessio Augustana,* Melanchthon proceeded further along the path of negotiation. On 4 July he implored Campeggio to accord peace to the Protestants.

---

[11] *NBD* 1. Abt., 1. ErgBd, 1530–31, ed. G. Müller (Tübingen 1963), 70.

> He said there was no reason for the use of force. We have no dogma that deviates from the Roman Church. . . . We are ready to obey the Roman Church if, in the mildness she has exercised in regard to all peoples, she overlooks or tolerates trifles that we can no longer change, even if we wished to. . . . Moreover, we most devotedly honor the authority of the Roman Pontiff and the entire Church leadership. [*CR* 2, 170]

In this "infamous letter" has been seen "a denial of the Gospel."[12] Be that as it may, it proves Melanchthon's far-reaching desire for peace. In retrospect it can be said that he made the dogmatic differences unimportant. In any event, the legate Campeggio agreed to the intervention and on 5 July sent for Melanchthon. In a testimonial requested from him, Melanchthon asked only for the lay chalice and the marriage of priests; he was willing to retain public Masses and hoped that, after the restoration of episcopal authority, the remaining questions could be regulated.[13] In a letter of 7 July to Campeggio, or rather to his secretary, Melanchthon was so accommodating that he asked only for toleration of the lay chalice and the marriage of priests until the council should meet and held out the prospect of eliminating the difficulties relevant to the Mass and of restoring episcopal authority. Meanwhile the legate had probably got a glimpse of the first draft of the *Confutatio,* in which the profound doctrinal differences were made clear. He now declined any further private negotiations, for, he said, the questions affect the whole nation and, in fact, all of Christendom.

The *Confutatio*

In view of the tendency of the *Confessio Augustana* to push doctrinal differences into the background, there loomed for the Catholic reply the question whether only the questions posed by the Protestants' confession should be discussed or whether other reform writings should be considered and the controverted points should be mentioned and proved heretical by a substantiated exposition of Catholic doctrine. The legate Campeggio defended this second opinion against the Emperor. Charles V appointed a commission of twenty theologians, including Eck, Cochläus, and Fabri, but it worked too ponderously. Hence the task of composing a Catholic reply was turned over to Eck, who could have recourse to his *Enchiridion,* his "404 Articles," and other works. The quickly finished first version was debated in the commission of theologians, approved by the legate, and submitted to the Emperor on 12 July as *Catholica et quasi extemporalis Responsio.* He rejected it as too long and too polemical. Cochläus and Arnold Haldrein of Cologne sought to comply with his intentions in their *Brevis ad singula puncta Confessionis . . . responsio.* But on 22 July the Emperor commissioned the drawing up of a *Confutatio* which was to be issued in his name. The *Catholica Responsio* was thereupon reduced to one-third its size by Eck, its tone was softened, and its content was restricted to what appeared in the *Confessio Augustana.* After repeated examination, reduction, completion, and correction it was read in German to the imperial estates on 3 August, but was not handed to the Protestants.[14] That this was a testimonial of theologians had become a viewpoint of the Emperor, which was shared by electors, princes, and cities. The label *Responsio Pontificia* is thus misleading. The *Confutatio* sought to argue on the basis of Scripture and provided for justified criticism. In itself it is an important witness of the confessional discussion but not a complete reply to the controverted questions, because the *Confessio Augustana* was not a full statement of the Protestant idea. Its effect was jeopardized from the outset because the willingness for an understanding, especially on the part of the princes, was not so great as it seemed to be in the assertions and the real possibility of peace was less than the Emperor assumed. He held that the *Confutatio* had refuted the *Augustana* and expected submission without further discussion. Thus, when the Protestants declared that they did not feel convinced by the *Confutatio,* the effort to clarify the doctrinal questions by means of an imperial award collapsed. The Emperor could hardly implement his threat at the end of the *Confutatio* to do his duty as *advocatus* and protector of the Church in the event that the Protestants rejected it, for the Turkish peril did not permit the use of force.

---

[12] J. von Walter, "Der Reichstag zu Augsburg," *LuJ* 12 (1930), 68.

[13] *CR* 2, 246ff.; according to G. Müller, "Um die Einheit der Kirche," loc. cit., p. 402, footnote 5, not of 8 August but of 5 July 1530.

The prospect of settling the religious quarrel by a council was now worse than ever. The letter in which Charles V on 14 July, with reference to the talks at Bologna, had asked the Pope for an immediate announcement of a general council was answered by Clement VII on 31 July with a "yes" that was so involved in conditions that it amounted to a "no." The Curia seemed more prepared to make concessions to the Protestants than to convoke the so greatly feared council. In the circumstances the Emperor again approved negotiations for a compromise. These took place from 16 to 21 August in a Committee of Fourteen, to which each of the parties sent two princes, two canonists, and three theologians. The negotiations foundered on the very question of the lay chalice on which till now an arrangement had been regarded as attainable. The Protestants were unwilling to be content with a mere toleration of the lay chalice and of the marriage of priests. Furthermore, the theological arguments had not been decisive for a long time, even if they were still in the foreground. Nontheological factors, especially political interests, became very prominent. Thus the Protestant estates were often less ready for an understanding than were the theologians. They, and in particular the Free Cities, were decidedly opposed to a restoring of episcopal jurisdiction, which for them was intimately bound up with the restoration of Church property. On 29 August 1530 Melanchthon wrote to Luther:

---

[14] Latin and German text in *CR* 27, 81–228; T. Kolde, *Die Augsburger Konfession,* pp. 140–169; Mirbt . . .

> We incur great blame from our people because we give jurisdiction back to the bishops. For the rabble, which is used to freedom and has shaken off the yoke of the bishops, is unwilling to assume that old burden again, the Free Cities in particular hate that authority. They are not concerned about doctrine and religion but only about power and liberty.[15]

Even a committee reduced to six members—one jurist and two theologians from each side—did not achieve the goal. It broke up on 30 August without having come to an agreement in regard to the lay chalice, the Canon of the Mass, the marriage of priests, Church property, and religious vows. And so the negotiations were wrecked on "abuses." More profound differences, especially in the doctrine of the Church, certainly underlay these. "They are termed abuses, which is not the only abuse," wrote Johannes Cochläus in his judgment of the *Confessio Augustana.*[16] But this does not alter the fact that agreement was achieved concerning the doctrinal articles.[17] It is all the more tragic that the *de facto* wrecking of the negotiations determined further developments, rather than this unanimity. For in the confrontations in the succeeding years it was not the agreement arrived at that was the starting point for discussion. Instead, both sides again had recourse to the polemics of 1517–1525.

---

[15] *CR* 2, 328; cf. the letters to Veit Dietrich (*CR* 2, 328) and to Joachim Camerarius (*CR* 2, 329 and 324). Not weakness but anxiety because of a "horribilis confusio dogmatum et infinita Ecclesiarum dissipatio" induced Melanchthon to stand up for the jurisdiction of the bishops. He wrote in October, after the collapse of the negotiations: "Episcopos praestare convenit, ut propagetur ad posteros pura Evangelii doctrina, hoc praecipue postulatur ab isto ordine" (*CR* 2, 433).

[16] *Summarium der kaiserlichen Antwort auff nechstgehalten Reichstag* (Dresden 1531), printed in E. J. Cyprian, *Historia der Augspurgischen Confession* (Gotha 1730), pp. 196–201; quotation on p. 199.

[17] Cf. Johannes Eck's report to Campeggio of 22–23 August 1530, in G. Müller, "Joh. Eck und die Confessio Augustana," *QFIAB* 38 (1958), 239.

On 22 September the draft of the Recess of the Diet, in so far as it touched the religious questions, was submitted to the estates.[18] The Protestants rejected it and sought to present to the Emperor the *Apologia* which Melanchthon had meanwhile composed against the assertion that the *Confessio Augustana* was refuted by Scripture. The Emperor declined to accept it. The Elector of Saxony left Augsburg the next day, and many Protestant estates gradually followed his example. Thus, as at Worms, the Recess of the Diet[19] was issued on 19 November in the absence of most of the Lutheran estates. In order to maintain peace and unity for the good of the Empire the adherents of the *Confessio Augustana* were given time for reflection in regard to the "unsettled articles" until 15 April 1531 (para. 1). Until then they must not introduce other novelties or hinder the practice of the old religion (para. 3). They were to cooperate in prosecuting Sacramentarians and Anabaptists (para. 4). Within six months "a common Christian council" was to be proclaimed "for Christian reformation" and to be held within a year thereafter (para. 5). Monastic and ecclesiastical property that had been taken by force was to be restored. The Emperor, as supreme *advocatus* of Christendom, and the "obedient electors, princes, and estates" had decided on the implementation of the Edict of Worms and desired "to allow no change [before] a decision of the next general council" (para. 10). The old ecclesiastical organization was placed under the protection of the territorial peace (para. 65), and the Imperial Supreme Court, then reorganized at Augsburg, was to proceed against the disobedient (para. 67). Thereby the Protestants incurred the danger of being prosecuted as breakers of the peace. But the very concession of a half-year's moratorium showed how impracticable were the terms of the Recess, severe though they might be.

The *Apologia*

The *Confutatio* had been read to the Protestants on 3 August but not given to them. Hence when, in view of the collapse of the negotiations for a compromise, Melanchthon set about composing a rejoinder, he could rely only on his memory and notes. The Saxon chancellor, Bruck, tried without success to present to the Emperor at Augsburg the resulting *Defense of the Augsburg Confession.* This refusal gave Melanchthon the opportunity to revise his work thoroughly and to expand it. Indirectly, by way of Nürnberg (*CR* 2, 415), he finally came into possession of a copy of the *Confutatio* and could use it for the expanded version of the *Apologia,* which appeared in print in April–May 1531. In the fall of that year Justus Jonas prepared a German translation, or, more exactly, a free rendition in German. The *Apologia* was at first the private work of Melanchthon. It was only by virtue of its being signed at Schmalkalden in 1537 that it became a confession alongside the *Augustana.* It stressed the doctrinal differences more sharply than did the *Augustana.* Article 4 on justification occupies almost one-third of the entire work. This "important monograph of the reform doctrine of justification," as H. Bornkamm calls it, furthered the one-sided forensic understanding of justification as a mere judgment. It is also said that justification signifies rebirth and new life[20] and gives us the Holy Spirit,[21] and that we become God's children and coheirs of Christ.[22] But what was decisive for the further development and the doctrine of justification of Lutheran orthodoxy were not these statements, but others, which speak of a forensic, merely putative declaration of righteousness.[23] The

---

[18] K. E. Förstemann, op. cit., II, 474–481.

[19] E. A. Koch, *Neue und vollständigere Sammlung der Reichstagsabschiede* II (Frankfurt 1797), 306–332.

> expression of Melanchthon in the *Apologia,* that justification also means making righteous, is too singular; it has had only inadequate consequences in the totality of the reform message. We may understand psychologically and in view of the situation of struggle that the Catholic doctrine of works was rejected. But it should not have been rejected without professing the notion of reward, which is biblical, and attributing to this the proper space.[24]

It was more pernicious that Melanchthon, instead of accepting the authors of the *Confutatio* as real partners in dialogue and confronting them with their doctrine of justification, attacked the "scholastici," of whom there were none in 1530, and combated doctrines which were represented by the nominalists of the late Middle Ages but not by the contemporary Catholic theologians.[25]

The *Confutatio* had expressly condemned the teaching that man can merit eternal life by his own powers without grace and emphasized that "every good gift and every perfect gift comes from above" (James 1:17) and that "all our sufficiency [is] from God" (2 Cor. 3:5). But the

---

[20] IV, 64, 65, 116, 125, 132.

[21] IV, 116, 132.

[22] IV, 195.

[23] IV, 307, 72, 252. Cf. F. Loofs *ThStK* 57, I (1884), 613–688, and the later literature cited in *BSLK* 158, footnote 2; H. Fagerberg, *Die Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften von 1529 bis 1537* (Göttingen 1965), pp. 156–161.

[24] H. Asmussen, *Warum noch lutherische Kirche?* (Stuttgart 1949), p. 80.

[25] Cf. IV, 9, 17, 27, 63, 79, 81, 162, 289, and *passim.*

Apologia did not start with this or with the far-reaching agreement in regard to the doctrine of justification that had been established at Augsburg.

CHAPTER 23

The Politicizing of the Reform Movement to the Collapse of the Religious Colloquies

The Diet of Augsburg had exposed the disunity of the Protestants since three different confessions had been laid before the Emperor. In this connection the adherents of the *Confessio Augustana* had striven to hold clearly aloof from the Swiss and the South German cities. But the Recess of the Diet also threatened them with the Supreme Court as breakers of the peace, and so a league for common military resistance suggested itself. In this way the reform movement was further politicized. As early as 23 September, the day after the reading of the draft of the Recess, the Elector Johann of Saxony brought before the representatives of the South German cities at Augsburg his plan for a league "of all Protestant princes and Free Cities."

Right of Resistance

With the coming together for armed defense the question of the right of resistance became acute. Discussions on the subject took place at Torgau in October 1530 between the theologians, led by Luther, and the Elector's legal advisers. Till now Luther had conceded to the princes as individuals only passive disobedience. They might, in fact they had to, deny the Emperor their military service in a religious war against the Lutheran estates.[1] Now the reformer was receptive to the argument of the jurists, who allowed the Imperial Estates a right of armed defense against a violation of the constitution by the Emperor. It was not the business of theologians, he said, to lecture the jurists in regard to their interpretation of the law of the Empire, "for the Gospel does not teach contrary to secular law" (*WA, Br* 5, 662, 7). The Elector Johann was acting as a political person and not as a Christian, he wrote in January 1531 to Nürnberg, where, under the leadership of Lazarus Spengler, people were further questioning a right of resistance to the Emperor. His being a Christian gave the prince no title to armed action but could at most induce him to renounce his right.[2] These reflections did not have as their point of departure the Emperor's position as superior of the princes also. In the course of further developments Luther was to adhere to the jurists, who held the viewpoint that, in accord with the corporate structure of the Empire, the electors were not to be regarded as subjects of the Emperor. They were called to govern the Empire together with the Emperor, just as, in Luther's version of the conciliar idea, the bishops ruled the Church with the Pope and under his guidance as equal members, *iure divino,* of the hierarchy. But if Emperor and princes were on an equal footing in law, then an armed action against them was not an official executive act but war. Since now in the matter of religion the secular authority had no power of command, a war by the Emperor against the Lutheran estates would be an ordinary raid against their possessions. Lastly, so Luther argued in 1539, in this the Pope was the commander-in-chief and the Emperor was his flunkey.

---

[1] *WA* 30, II, 197, 7–10 (military sermon against the Turks, 1529).

> If it is permitted to wage war against the Turk and to defend oneself against him, it is all the more permitted against the Pope, who is worse. Hence, if the Emperor should mix with the warriors of the Pope or of the Turk, he should be prepared for the fate appropriate to such a military service. [*WA, Br* 8, 367, 20–23]

The League of Schmalkalden

Because of his frequent absence from the Empire, Charles V wanted to provide his lieutenant and brother, Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria and King of Bohemia and Hungary, with greater authority and to have him elected as King of the Romans. He won a majority of the princes over to this plan at Augsburg. But Johann of Saxony aligned himself against it with the anti-Habsburg Catholic Dukes of Bavaria. He replied to the Emperor's invitation to the meeting of electors at Cologne on 29 December, by inviting the Protestant estates to a Diet at Schmalkalden on 22 December to discuss the threatened action by the Supreme Court in the matter of the Reformation and the election of a King of the Romans. Representatives of the South German cities appeared at the Diet, headed by Jakob Sturm of Strasbourg, in addition to the signatories of the *Confessio Augustana.*

Apart from Brandenburg-Ansbach and Nürnberg, which had conscientious scruples about the right of armed resistance, the participants agreed on 31 December to provide common assistance if the Supreme Court should proceed against one of them on the basis of the Augsburg Recess. The formal treaty of alliance was dated 27 February 1531.[3] Entering it were the Elector Johann of Saxony, Duke Philip of Braunschweig-Grubenhagen, Duke Ernst of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt-Bernburg, Counts Gebhard and Albrecht of Mansfeld, and eleven cities—Strasbourg, Ulm, Constance, Reutlingen, Memmingen, Lindau, Biberach, Isny, Lübeck, Magdeburg, and Bremen. Still other cities—Braunschweig, Göttingen, Esslingen, Goslar, and Einbeck—joined by the beginning of 1532. Membership had been offered to the Zwinglian cities of Zurich, Bern, and Basel with the stipulation of the recognition of Bucer's *Tetrapolitana,* but Zwingli managed to thwart this. The treaty of alliance itself made no declaration of the condition. With Zwingli's death in the battle of Kappel on 11 October 1531, the South German cities ceased to be concerned for Switzerland. Nothing now prevented their seeking support from the adherents of the League of Schmalkalden. The treaty of alliance was signed for six years and in 1537 was extended for ten years. Lengthy negotiations were needed before the twenty-three members of the league agreed on a constitution. This was decided only on 2 July 1533 at Schmalkalden and was not finally accepted by all members until 23 December 1535. As early as the autumn of 1536 it was replaced by a second constitution of the League. According to the "Constitution for Urgent Safety and Defense,"[4] the League was directed by two League Captains, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, who alternated every six months in the conduct of business. At the Diet the decrees were made by nine spokesmen, of whom two each were named by Electoral Saxony, Hesse, the North German and the South German allied cities, and one by the other princes and counts. The new war councilors, who had the decision in case of war, were determined according to the same ratio. The League army was to be recruited in case of need; however, two months' pay for two thousand horsemen and ten thousand troopers was to be kept in readiness. The Elector of Saxony was to have the supreme command in campaigns in North Germany; the Landgrave of Hesse, in West and South Germany. The League of Schmalkalden became the center of the anti-Habsburg forces. How little it was a question only of the "pure word of God" was made obvious by diplomatic relations with France and England and an understanding with Bavaria not to recognize the election of the Archduke Ferdinand as King of the Romans in October

---

[2] "Quod princeps ut princeps sit politica persona et sic agens non agat ut Christianus, qui nec est princeps nec masculus nec quicquam in mundo personarum. Si igitur principi ut principi liceat resistore Caesari, illorum sit et indicii et conscientiae. Christiano certe nihil licet, ut qui mundo sit mortuus" (*WA, Br* 6, 17, 9–11).

---

[3] Text in E. Fabian, *Die Entstehung des Schmalkaldischen Bundes,* pp. 349–353.

[4] Text, ibid., pp. 358–376.

1531 and to provide assistance if one of them was attacked for this reason.

The Nürnberg Armistice

The Emperor could not even think of proceeding with force and of carrying out the Augsburg decrees. The Turks swarmed into Hungary, and to repulse them the Emperor had once again to purchase the assistance of the Protestants by an armistice. In the Nürnberg Armistice, or religious peace, of 23 July 1532, the members of the League were promised the suspension of all processes by the Supreme Court in religious affairs until the council or, if it did not meet within a year, until the next Diet, and all use of force because of religion and faith was forbidden. The Emperor went in person to Vienna to lead the great army that had been assembled from all his states in the Turkish campaign. But meanwhile the danger had been eliminated. The small West Hungarian fortress of Güns on the frontier of the Burgenland had heroically withstood the onset of the Sultan's troops from 7 to 29 August. This resistance and the reported strength of the imperial army induced Suleiman II to withdraw, with frightful devastation, through Styria, where the German troops were successful in a battle at Graz. The troops of the Empire could not be induced to pursue the Turks more deeply into Hungary and to procure victory for King Ferdinand's cause against the Hungarian claimant, Zapolya. Again the Turkish peril had been exorcised only temporarily; the paralyzing threat to the Empire persisted. The Emperor hurried via Italy to his Spanish kingdoms and was to be away from the Empire for almost ten years.

Introduction of the Reformation in Württemberg and Other Territories

The Protestants had not only held their ground, but they had gained powerfully in self-confidence. Encouraged by the League of Schmalkalden and under cover of the Nürnberg Armistice, which was *de facto* extended also to new members, a group of cities, including Augsburg, Hanover, Frankfurt an der Oder, and Hamburg, and principalities such as Pomerania, Anhalt-Dessau, and Liegnitz and Brieg in Silesia went over to the Reformation.

The fusion of politics and religion became especially clear in connection with the introduction of the new ecclesiastical system in Württemberg. Since the expulsion of Duke Ulrich (1487–1550) by the Swabian League in 1519, the Duchy had been under Austrian administration and at the Diet of Augsburg it had been conferred on the Archduke Ferdinand as an imperial fief. While activating the anti-Habsburg powers France and Bavaria, Philip of Hesse urged the restoration of the Duke, who had found refuge with him. The Landgrave first managed to prevent the renewal of the Swabian League, the prop of the Habsburg policy. In January 1534 he met the French King and obtained a promise of the necessary subsidies in exchange for a mortgage on the County of Mömpelgard near Belfort in Württemberg. Ferdinand was far too preoccupied elsewhere to take serious measures for the possession of Württemberg when the attack from Hesse occurred. The Austrian army was defeated without difficulty at Lauffen on the Neckar on 12–13 May 1534. In the Peace of Kaaden near Eger on 29 June Ferdinand granted Württemberg to Duke Ulrich as an Austrian rear-fief and conceded to him directly the right to introduce the new ecclesiastical system. In return he obtained the recognition of his royal title and the promise of aid against the Turks.

The Reformation, which was introduced immediately, was under the auspices of a liaison of Zwinglianism and Lutheranism. The people of Strasbourg proposed the Zwinglian Ambrosius Blaurer of Constance as reformer; Philip of Hesse, the Lutheran Erhard Schnepf. An effort was made to eliminate the difficulties in the doctrine of the Eucharist by the so-called Stuttgart Accord. The formula of union proposed by the Lutherans at Marburg was taken as its basis. Despite the division of the territory into two areas of the Reformation, the situation remained tense. The pastors were obliged to the *Confessio Augustana.* The Duke ruthlessly confiscated Church property to cover his debts. In 1537 he established the Tübingen *Stift* for the training of spiritual and secular officials. The University of Tübingen did not become Protestant until Johannes Brenz (1499–1570), the reformer of the Free City of Schwäbisch Hall (1522), was summoned there as professor from 1537 to 1538. In 1535 his small catechism was attached to Duke Ulrich's Church order. If the Protestant Church in Württemberg and in South Germany in general obtained a Lutheran stamp, it was due to the influence of Brenz. Under Duke Christoph (1550–68), as provost in Stuttgart, he became the director of the Württemberg Church and composed the *Confessio Virtembergica* and the *Grosse Kirchenordnung* of 1559.

The Wittenberg Accord

The Württemberg Reformation had again displayed the split among the Protestants and at the same time had indicated the way to union. It had been shown that the *Confessio Augustana* and the Stuttgart Accord did not suffice as the basis for unity. The theologians sought to arrive at negotiations for an accord and approached Philip of Hesse as mediator. After a compromise between Bucer and Melanchthon at Kassel in December 1534 and an arrangement between Luther and the city of Augsburg, which in April 1536 was admitted to the League of Schmalkalden, the negotiations for the accord took place at Wittenberg from 22 to 29 May 1536. Meanwhile the Swiss and the city of Constance had declined and did not appear. Bucer acknowledged that the bread is truly the body of Christ and is given by the minister to all recipients, if the words of institution are not adulterated. Because, in his opinion, such adulteration takes place by means of the lack of faith in the recipient, there resulted the old problem of *manducatio impiorum.* Here Bugenhagen suggested that it may be "said that the unworthy, as Paul says, receive the body of the Lord." Luther was satisfied with this. The text drawn up by Melanchthon reads thus:

> Accordingly, they hold and teach that, with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, administered, and received. And although they do not hold transubstantiation, neither do they hold that the body and blood of Christ are enclosed in the bread *localiter* or are otherwise permanently united with it, apart from the use of the Sacrament. However, they admit that, by sacramental unity, the bread is the body of Christ; that is, they hold, the bread is so administered that then the body of Christ is at the same time present and truly administered, and so forth. For, apart from the use, . . . they do not hold that the body of Christ is present.[5]

In addition to the formula *manducatio indignorum* instead of *impiorum,* the expression *unio sacramentalis* involved an intentional ambiguity. Nevertheless, the Wittenberg Accord had importance as a bridge to Lutheranism for the South German cities, making possible their adherence to the League of Schmalkalden.[6] It was later accepted into the *Solida Declaratio* of the Formula of Concord (VII, 12–16) and thereby again recognized as Lutheran.

Protestant Refusal to Participate in the Council

Until this time the Emperor and the Catholic Protestant estates had demanded a council in a united front, and the postponing of the question of faith till its convocation had been again and again a welcome way out of the difficulties. It had not become clear that the ideas on the nature, summoning, and place of the council were very divergent also. But this situation changed decisively when on 2 June 1536, Pope Paul III called for a general council to meet at Mantua in May 1537.

---

[5] E. Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlsstreites im 16. Jahrhundert,* pp. 117ff.; *BSLK,* pp. 977f.

[6] To W. Köhler, *Luther und Zwingli* II, 453, "the whole Accord [was] a pretense," because persons on the two sides had a different understanding of the "unworthy."

The Elector of Saxony objected that nothing was said about the freedom, Christian character, and impartiality of the council and that it was to take place at Mantua. A council, he said, was a court of arbitration; if a person accepted the invitation, he was bound by the award. He demanded a pretext for refusing to participate from his councilors and theologians, he even considered a plan for a Lutheran countercouncil. Luther was to set down on which articles of his current teaching he intended "to stand and to persevere and . . . not yield." The reformer complied and on 28 December 1536 submitted to a conference of theologians his *Articles of Christian Teaching,* known as the *Articles of Schmalkalden.* To Melanchthon their statements in regard to the Pope were too severe. "For the sake of peace and unity" he was prepared to recognize the Pope's superiority over the bishops *iure humano.* Nevertheless he, with the other Wittenberg theologians, signed the articles, which were sent to the Elector on 3 January 1537 and accepted by him. The three parts of unequal length comprise: articles in which there was no need to yield because they were uncontested, such as the doctrine of the Trinity and of the two natures; articles in which there could be no yielding—atonement and justification by Jesus Christ, the Sacrifice of the Mass and the papacy as divine institutions; and articles which could be discussed with scholars and wise men, such as sin, penance, confession, baptism, ordination and marriage of priests, religious vows, and so forth. Luther expressed himself in particular fullness and with alarming severity on the Mass as the "greatest and most horrible abomination" in the papacy, as though in the meantime there had been no clarifying statement uttered or written on the Catholic teaching of the Mass. He concluded:

> This article on the Mass will be in its entirety in the council. For if it were possible that they should yield all the other articles to us, still they could not yield this article. As Campeggio said at Augsburg: he would sooner let himself be torn to pieces than abandon the Mass. Likewise, I will sooner let myself, with God's help, be reduced to ashes than allow a Mass slave with his work, be he good or bad, be equal to or higher than my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Hence we are and we remain eternally separated and opposed. They rightly feel that where the Mass decays, so does the papacy. Before they would let that happen, they would kill all of us, wherever they could. The dragon's tail, the Mass, has brought

> forth on all this much vermin and the filth of various superstitions [*WA* 50, 204, 3–28].

In other respects too Luther, who repeatedly denounced "enthusiasm," the source of all heresy and even of the devilry of the fanatics and of the Pope, did not exactly use a language restrained by God's word. With regard to the imminent council he wrote: There "will we stand not before the Emperor or the secular authority, . . . but before the Pope and the devil himself, who does not intend to listen but to damn abruptly, to murder, and to force to superstition" (*WA* 50, 220, 4–16). At the *Bundestag* at Schmalkalden in February 1537, which was attended by numerous princes, envoys of the cities, and some forty theologians, Luther became ill and could not personally defend his "articles." From dread of a new quarrel over the Eucharist and probably also because of Luther's intransigent language, Melanchthon prevented the articles from being officially submitted to the gathering. The theologians were commissioned to examine the *Confessio Augustana* and to supplement it with articles on the power of the Pope. The formulation was left to Melanchthon. His *Tractatus de potestate papae* received the approval of all and became the official statement of the League by being accepted into the Recess. Luther's "articles," on the other hand, were published as a private work. But they soon enjoyed great esteem and were eventually adopted in the *Book of Concord* of 1580, thus becoming a confessional document of the Lutheran Church.

The gathering at Schmalkalden strictly declined to take part in the council. Acceptance of the invitation would mean to consent to their own condemnation and to accept the Pope as judge in his own case. The bull of invitation to the council was not even taken from the papal legate, Peter van der Vorst. Melanchthon, however, was of the opinion that the invitation should not be bluntly rejected. The Pope, he said, did not indeed have a right to act as judge but he did have the right to summon the council. Melanchthon clearly saw as "the most sad thing of all" the fact "that such discord would continue down to posterity" (*CR* 3, 293). This did not prevent him from composing, by official mandate, the *piece justificative: Weshalb die Fürsten sich dem vom Römischen Papst Paul III. angekündigten Konzil verweigert hoben* (*CR* 3, 313–325).

The Emperor's representative at Schmalkalden was the vice-chancellor, Matthias Held. In accord with his mandate he sought to recruit for the council and rejected the complaints against the Supreme Court but came out more sharply than the Emperor had intended. He faced the harsh reality that the princes insisted on the rejection of the council that had been so vehemently demanded much more than did the theologians. Instead of seeking new paths to an understanding and sounding out the possibilities in the event that no council took place, he pressed for the establishing of a Catholic league. Without this, so he reported to the Emperor in the fall of 1537, everything would collapse, since the heretics were firmly determined to attack the Catholics from the rear, as they did in Württemberg. He found support in King Ferdinand. Consequently, on 10 June 1538 the League of Nürnberg, a defensive alliance between Charles V, Ferdinand, the Dukes of Saxony, Bavaria, and Braunschweig, and the Archbishops of Salzburg and Magdeburg came into existence and lasted for eleven years. With so slight a membership—no elector and scarcely any bishop was involved—and in view of the unclear attitude of Bavaria, the League was in itself not strong. It was soon further weakened by the death of Duke Georg of Saxony in 1539 and the subsequent reformation of his territory.

The Frankfurt Armistice

Even if the League of Nürnberg was not a serious threat to the members of the League of Schmalkalden, the latter felt themselves threatened. This motivated them to bind themselves more closely together. Because of a defeat near Esseg on 9 October 1538 in the Turkish war and the risk of again jeopardizing the ten-years' armistice just concluded at Nice on 18 June 1538 between a league of the Protestants and France, the Emperor could not seriously consider the use of force. In addition, the renewed postponement of the convoking of the council caused him and his contemporaries to doubt the Pope's sincere determination to take hold of the inner problems of the Church. In his effort to restore the unity of faith and of the Empire, Charles V was thus again thrown back upon German resources. He had no choice but to seek peace and aid against the Turks by means of negotiations and to hope to free the way for inner German religious colloquies. At the end of 1538 he appointed as the suitable agent for this the exiled Archbishop of Lund, Johann of Weeze. Prolonged negotiations led on 19 April 1539 to the Frankfurt Armistice. It granted, over and above the Nürnberg peace, an interval of six months to all current adherents of the *Confessio Augustana.* During that time the trials of the Supreme Court were to be suspended and no one was to be attacked because of religion. Peace for fifteen months was offered in the event that the members of the League of Schmalkalden were ready to accept no new members and to renounce any further secularizations. But they could not come to a decision. The Protestants promised to attend the Diet of Princes at Worms to determine the amount of aid needed against the Turks and to implement it. In particular the peace was to facilitate the religious colloquies. These were to take place independently of the council and without the participation of a papal legate in order "to treat of an honorable Christian union." The Elector Joachim II of Brandenburg especially advocated such colloquies. He was in the process of setting up in his own territory a church which occupied a remarkable middle position between the old and the new ecclesiastical system. Since the council was long in coming, he proceeded to introduce the reform as he waited for the council. In August 1539 he ordered debate on a Church order on which Georg Witzel (1501–1573) collaborated and which was decreed in March 1540. It adopted the Lutheran catechism but retained much of the old forms of worship. Luther thought that he could acquiesce in it because the article on justification and orthodox preaching were guaranteed (*WA, Br* 8, 624). Joachim II stressed that he wanted to be neither "Roman" nor "Wittenberger" but "Catholic." A violation of the Frankfurt Armistice occurred with the introduction of the Reformation in the Duchy of Saxony during the summer of 1539, following Duke Georg's death on 14 April. The members of the League of Schmalkalden kept their troops armed that they had recruited before the Frankfurt Armistice until Georg's brother, Duke Heinrich (d. 1541), had taken possession of his inheritance and introduced the Reformation. On Pentecost a Protestant service was held at Leipzig at which Luther himself preached.

The Religious Colloquies of 1540–41

The colloquy arranged for August 1539 at Nürnberg was postponed by imperial order and did not take place. The agreement that no papal legate should take part in the negotiations for a compromise could not but confirm the Curia's distrust of the imperial policy of union. What was here under way was scarcely different from a national council, so dreaded by Rome. The Protestants were hoping in this way to get a recognition of their confession in imperial law—a recognition which would do away with the need to submit the confession to the future council. Intensive papal diplomacy, however, could not deter the Emperor from his union policy. He promised that the Pope should take part in the projected religious colloquy, and people were invited to come to Speyer for it on 6 June. An epidemic forced its transfer to Hagenau. The chiefs of the League of Schmalkalden—the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse—refused to appear, and attendance by other princes and bishops was very meager. Not only King Ferdinand but also the adviser of the Catholics, the nuncio Morone, who was present, complained of the tardiness of the bishops. On 15 June 1540 he wrote to Cardinal Farnese:

> The spirit of the bishops is really, as His Majesty says, womanish in matters in which it ought to be manly, such as resistance to the opponents of our faith, and masculine in matters in which it ought to be feminine, such as drinking and keeping concubines.[7]

An exception was the Bishop of Vienna, Johann Fabri, who, together with Johannes Cochläus, Friedrich Nausea, Julius von Pflug, Johann Gropper, and especially Johannes Eck, acted as the Catholic spokesman. Melanchthon was taken sick en route and hence Wittenberg was represented only by Kaspar Cruciger, Friedrich Myconius, and Justus Menius. Other Protestant theologians present were Martin Bucer, Wolfgang Capito, Andreas Osiander, Johannes Brenz, U. Rieger, and Jean Calvin. King Ferdinand, who was in charge, wanted to take the Augsburg discussions for a compromise as the basis and to allow discussion only of the articles not agreed upon at Augsburg. The Protestants refused and demanded the *Confessio Augustana* as the basis. The fact that they were unwilling to be pinned down by concessions possibly made earlier, and indeed their mere presence, made clear the changed situation since 1530. They now represented a strongly consolidated Church organization, behind which stood the League of Schmalkalden, then the only close-knit political power in the Empire.

At Hagenau no progress was made beyond the discussion of the method of negotiation. Since there was no unity on the *modus conciliandi,* King Ferdinand announced to the members on 16 July that the religious colloquy had to be adjourned to another meeting. This was appointed for Worms on 28 October in the recess that was published on 28 July. But the imperial minister, Granvella, was not able to open the proceedings until 25 November, a month later than had been provided for. The papal legate, Thomas Campeggio, was only an observer and wanted to come forward as messenger of peace and reconciliation. Morone too was present. Once again there were long preliminary discussions on the *modus procedendi,* especially the voting. It had been decided at Hagenau that each side should have eleven speakers or votes respectively. But the Catholics were not sure of the theologians of Cleves, Brandenburg, and the Palatinate and were afraid of being outvoted on important questions and sought to prevent voting according to individuals. The Protestants, on the contrary, insisted on the proceedings decided at Hagenau and would have nothing to do with a written transaction. It was only on 5 January that it was agreed that there should be one speaker on each side.

The colloquy, engaged in by Eck and Melanchthon, began on 14

---

[7] Pastor, pp. 187f.; Lammer, *Mon. Vat.,* pp. 275f.

January with the *Confessio Augustana* as its basis. At the start Eck referred to the not inconsiderable deviations in the text of the *Augustana,* the *Variata,* that had been submitted, from that of 1530; these concerned especially the Eucharist. For three days they discussed original sin, especially to what extent the "penalty" remaining after baptism can itself be called sin. In Granvella's residence on 17 January a compromise formula came into existence, worked out by Mensing, Auxiliary Bishop of Halberstadt, Eck, Melanchthon, and Bucer. It was approved by both sides.[8] At the same time an imperial instruction arrived whereby the colloquy was to be transferred to the Imperial Diet appointed for Regensburg. The Emperor was hoping to promote the faltering discussions by his personal presence. Furthermore, during the not very promising discussions at Worms, Granvella had been concerned for a basis of negotiations in the form of a compromise draft. At his urging Gropper and the imperial councilor, Gerhard Veltwyk, had had secret talks with Capito and Bucer at Worms independently of the main discussion. Bucer was encouraged in this by Philip of Hesse. The Landgrave was eager for an arrangement with the Emperor, since he was in a state of bigamy which was threatening to become an embarrassing matter. The basis of these secret talks were Gropper's *Artikall, vor Christlich und der gesunden katholischen Lehr gemäss erkannt,* as completed and corrected by Bucer.[9] There was quick agreement on original sin and justification. Difficulties arose out of the compromise between the principle of Scripture and the recognition of ecclesiastical tradition, including the Mass and the veneration of saints. Bucer himself, however, took a positive view of the usages of the ancient Church because there had "been one Christendom from the Apostles down to the age of the holy Fathers." Hence he felt he could make concessions in regard to ceremonies and the Mass itself, if only the preaching of the Gospel were allowed. He was able to take much of the formulation that he suggested from the draft for the Leipzig colloquy of 1539, which he had elaborated with Witzel. The compromise draft that thus appeared was accepted on 31 December.[10] It represented the original form of the *Regensburg Book.* Even before the start of the Diet Granvella tried to gain as many of the princes as possible for it. Philip of Hesse was in agreement and Joachim II of Brandenburg enthusiastically sent it on to the Elector of Saxony. But skepticism was expressed by Luther (*WA, Br* 9, 333f.; *CR* 4, 96).

---

[8] *CR* 4, 32f., 89.

[9] Printed in J. Gropper, *Wahrhafftige Antwort* (Cologne 1545), fol. 8a–20a.

[10] Text in M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmütigen von Hessen mit Bucer* III (Leipzig 1891), 39–72.

At Regensburg the Worms compromise draft, after a few modifications approved by Contarini, Morone, and the Catholic cospeakers, Pflug, Gropper, and Eck, was approved as the basis of negotiations,[11] submitted at the opening of the colloquy on 27 April 1541 and accepted also by the Protestant spokesmen, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Pistorius. Important for the conciliatory mood of the Regensburg religious colloquy was the participation of Cardinal Contarini as papal legate. On the basis of his own religious experience and relying on Paul and Augustine, he was "convinced that the religious starting point of Luther's doctrine of salvation, but not its theological formation and the consequences drawn from it, was primitively Catholic."[12] He felt that, with good will on both sides, with charity and humility, the split could be healed. "Now he was to learn that they alone were not enough."[13] There was surprisingly rapid agreement on the first four articles of the *Regensburg Book:* the original state of man, free will, the cause of sin, and original sin. On the second day, 28 April, the participants turned to Article 5, on justification. Melanchthon and Eck rejected the version at hand. After a discussion of several days, however, they again had recourse to it but in a considerably abbreviated form,[14] and on 3 May it was possible to declare that there was agreement on this article. All were filled with joy and hope. Contarini sent the formula of union to Rome,[15] and the Emperor was confident that now "an understanding would be reached also in the other questions."[16] The conflict had blazed forth on justification, which was thus felt to be the "articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae." According to the formula of union, the sinner is "justified by a living and effective faith." This faith is a "movement of the Holy Spirit," whereby the penitent is oriented to God and attains the mercy, forgiveness of sins, and reconciliation promised in Christ. With him is "simultaneously infused charity, which heals the will,"so that he can begin to fulfill the law.

> Hence that is a living faith which obtains mercy in Christ and believes that Christ's righteousness will be imputed to it by grace; at the same time it receives the promise of the Holy Spirit and charity. Thus, justifying faith is faith which operates through charity. [*CR* 4, 199]

---

[11] Text in *CR* 4, 190–238; Le Plat, III, 10–44.

[12] Jedin, I, 305.

[13] Ibid., 306.

[14] Jedin, Bizer, and Stupperich say 2 May; Pastor, p. 245, footnote 2, and Lipgens, p. 127, speak of 3 May.

[15] *ZKG* 5 (1882), 593; F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe des Cardinals G. Contarini* (Braunsberg 1881), p. 177.

[16] *NBD* 1, VII, p. XVI.

The article seeks to take into account the fact that, on the one hand, we are justified for Christ's sake, his righteousness becomes ours, and we are reconciled with God, and, on the other hand, the new righteousness does not yet have full power over us, "the renewal is still imperfect, and a tremendous weakness still clings to the reborn." "Because of the righteousness inherent in us we are called righteous, for we indeed do what is right and, according to John, he is righteous who does righteousness." We will not, however, place our confidence in this activity of ours, but only in the justice of Christ, just as, on the other hand, we do not doubt our weakness. For this reason no one is excluded from the grace of Christ (*CR* 4, 200). There is no question of a "twofold righteousness," but of the one righteousness of Christ the Mediator, which produces full grace, favor, and reconciliation with the Father and renews and sanctifies man but has not yet come here fully into effect.

In the further course of the religious colloquy, however, it was to appear that not justification, but the Church and her office in the interpretation of Scripture and in the administration of the Sacraments constituted the articles that were really at the basis of the split. Contarini managed, in opposition to Eck, to have Articles 6 and 9, on the Church and her full authority in interpreting Scripture, postponed. Otherwise, the discussions would have foundered. There was agreement on Articles 10 to 13, the teaching on the Sacraments in general, orders, baptism, and confirmation. There were crucial difficulties with regard to Article 14, on the Eucharist. The question of transubstantiation was struggled with for almost eight days. No understanding was reached on it nor on Article 15, on penance, but there was agreement on matrimony (Article 16) and the anointing of the sick (Article 17). With Article 19, on the hierarchical order of the Church, and Article 20, on the Mass and the veneration of the saints, it finally became plain to all that the colloquy had broken down. On 31 May the Protestants submitted a summary of their divergent views relevant to the Church, the Eucharist, and penance (*CR* 4, 348–376). The Emperor's policy of union failed utterly when he did not even obtain an understanding that the articles on which there was agreement should be recognized as settled and that patience should be exercised in regard to the others until the council convened.

Meanwhile, it had turned out that the unity over justification was only superficial. On 10 or 11 May Luther had labeled the article a "botched job," "a new piece of cloth patched on to an old coat, so that the rent becomes worse" (*WA, Br* 9, 407, 20f.). On 29 June he termed the compromise a "papist fraud" (*WA, Br* 9, 460, 4). On the Catholic side the union formula was charged with being ambiguous. As early as 25

May Contarini defended himself in the *Epistola de iustificatione* against accusations of this sort.[17] The Curia refused its approval. However, when its rejection reached Regensburg on 8 June, the union was already in ruins and it had become clear for the future how complicated an agreement was. Inner Church reform was thus all the more urgent. To the assembled bishops Contarini directed a pressing admonition to fulfill their pastoral duties, to see especially to preaching and the education of the young, and to avoid all scandal in their own persons and in their retinue. For their part the bishops implored the legate to labor without delay for the convoking of the council; otherwise, all Germany would soon be Lutheran. The council seemed about to become a reality. The Pope had had the Emperor informed that he was determined to lift the suspension of the council and to convoke it at once.[18] Of course, this had come too late to prevent the schism in the Church, as is proved by the repeated rejection of a papal council as a binding tribunal by the Protestants (*CR* 4, 517f.).

In the Recess of the Diet on 29 July 1541, the Nürnberg peace was extended for eighteen months.[19] Within that time a general council or, if necessary, a national council should take place. For the sake of aid against the Turks the Emperor, in a secret declaration, assured the Protestants the possession of the secularized Church property, allowed them to hold the explanation of their theologians in the adjusted articles, and promised them equality in the Supreme Court.

---

[17] *CCath* VII, 23–34.

[18] *CT* IV, 195f.

[19] *CR* IV, 625–630; Contarini's report of 27 July in *HJ* 1 (1880), 498f.; of 26 July in *ZKG* 3 (1879), 183f.

CHAPTER 24

The Breakdown of Universalism and The Religious Peace of Augsburg

The Emperor and the Protestants on the Brink of War

The religious colloquies had failed, and once again the Emperor had had to give in to the Protestants. He familiarized himself even more with the idea of a forcible solution. On the other hand it must be counted as a success when, during the Diet of Regensburg in 1541, he managed to weaken the impact of the League of Schmalkalden by paralyzing the activity of Philip of Hesse. While his lawful wife, the mother of his nine children, was still alive, the Landgrave had married a lady-in-waiting. In a *Beichtrat*[1] Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer had given their approval and they were even present at the wedding in March 1540. The bigamy could not be kept secret and because of it the reformers suffered a painful embarrassment. According to the *Carolina,* the imperial law that he himself had proclaimed, Philip had incurred the death penalty. He tried to evade it by a *rapprochement* with the Emperor. In a treaty of 13 June 1541 he bound himself to prevent an alliance of the League of Schmalkalden with France and England and the admission of the Duke of Cleves to the League and to support the Emperor's claims to Gelderland. The Emperor promised not to attack him on religious grounds unless he had to wage war against all the Protestants. Thus a restoration of religious unity by armed force was envisaged by the Emperor as in the realm of the politically possible, but out of the question for the moment due to external political pressures. Charles V went to Italy and at Lucca on 12 to 18 September 1541 he met Pope Paul III, whom he hoped to gain for a council on German soil, effective aid against the Turks, and support against France. The result was disheartening.

Meanwhile, the peril from the Turks was again great. Zapolya, the King of Hungary, had died in 1540. But, on account of the opposition of the Magyar nobles, King Ferdinand was unable to take up the succession promised him in the Treaty of Grosswardein in 1538. The national Magyar circles invited the Sultan Suleiman II into the country but were not a little astonished when, after occupying Buda on 2 September 1541, he installed a pasha as governor and thus made Hungary a Turkish province. The Emperor's desperate diversionary measure against the Muslim danger through an attack on Algiers in October 1541 failed completely because of stormy weather. At the same time the already critical situation with regard to France became worse, making the ten-years' armistice of 1538 illusory. And so, once again ecclesiastical problems had to yield to political cares. The Diet opened at Speyer by King Ferdinand on 9 February 1542 was overshadowed by the Turkish question. The Protestants made their assistance dependent on their recognition in imperial law by means of the adoption of the Regensburg Declaration in the Recess of the Diet and demanded a visitation of and new personnel on the Supreme Court. This time too the King had recourse to an additional declaration. A visitation of the Supreme Court was indeed introduced but as early as June it was again suspended by the Emperor. Thus the Nürnberg Diets of July–August 1542 and January–April 1543 faced the same problems, to which was added in the second the military confrontation with France and Cleves. If the Emperor could not expect any help here either, at least it was a success that the League of Schmalkalden did not come to the aid of the Duke of Jülich-Cleves-Berg, who was beaten in September 1543. He had to annul the Reformation and turn over Gelderland to the Emperor. This meant a strengthening of the northwestern German sees of Münster, Paderborn, and Osnabrück, which, like Cologne, were then in danger of going over to the Reformation.

---

[1] Cf. *CR* 3, 849–865; *WA, Br* 8, 638–644, no. 3423.

Progress of the Reformation

The Reformation continued to make great advances. After several years' strife the chiefs of the League of Schmalkalden, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, occupied the territory of the Catholic Duke Heinrich of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel in July–August 1542, gave it a provisional government, and had the Reformation introduced by Bugenhagen and Corvinus. The Wittenberg theologians had spoken in favor of these proceedings and against the return of the territory to its legitimate ruler on the ground that one "cannot acquiesce in the restoration of unorthodox doctrine, superstition, and persecution in the country" (*WA, Br* 10, 471, 80f.). When the Duke managed to gain back his territory, but only to be taken captive by Philip of Hesse in 1545, Luther felt that he should be kept in prison: To prevent him from further exercising his "tyranny, blasphemy, and impiety" was to practice mercy to him.[2]

The obliging of a Lutheran prince to hinder idolatry or the abomination of papal "abuses" served territorial interests in a no less questionable manner in the new choice of an occupant of the see of Naumburg. Following the death of the bishop on 6 January 1541 the cathedral chapter, without consulting the Elector of Saxony, had elected the provost of the Zeitz chapter, Julius von Pflug. The Elector, who for some time had been trying to end the political autonomy of the bishopric, in September entrusted the secular administration to an official of the diocese whom he appointed. Since Pflug did not yield and the chapter declined to elect a creature of the Elector, the last named brought about the election of Nikolaus von Amsdorf by the Lutheran estates of the diocese. Contrary to their original conviction, the Wittenberg theologians had assented to these proceedings. Luther wrote to the diocesan estates that a cathedral chapter which did not make a proper election or clung to a persecutor of the Gospel forfeited its rights. "For the command to teach the right doctrine and to celebrate correct worship takes precedence over all other commands" (*WA, Br* 9, 598, 21). "Since the worldly property is furnished for the sake of the spiritual ministry, it must follow the right bishop" (*WA, Br* 9, 598, 60). The control of the worldly property, he said, disappeared with the spiritual power. "Its superstition and its secular power and property" were inseparably united. Luther personally performed the "consecration" of Nikolaus von Amsdorf by the imposition of hands and prayer,[3] "without any chrism . . . and whatever else of the same great sacredness there is" (*WA* 53, 231, 5), and the enthronement. The next day the council and citizenry of Naumburg did homage to the new bishop at the town hall. But Amsdorf was not to find much joy in his office of Lutheran bishop. He was himself in a "miserable situation"—left to the caprices of the Elector's official in secular matters and in full dependence on the electoral government in the spiritual sphere, without obtaining from the government the necessary support. In addition, the legitimacy of his episcopacy was still disputed. Pflug did not renounce his claims and in March 1542 complained to the Diet of Speyer. The Emperor took his part but was unable formally to invest him with the bishopric until 8 August 1545, after much hesitation. The investiture thus represented the Elector's procedure as robbery. War alone brought a decision favorable to Pflug.

---

[2] *An Kurfürsten zu Sachsen und Landgrafen zu Hessen von dem gefangenen Herzog zu Braunschweig* (1545), *WA* 54, 389–411, p. 399, 10.

In the bishopric of Meissen the Elector of Saxony also claimed sovereignty. But when he occupied the district of Wurzen in order to guarantee the payment of the Turkish tax and tried to introduce the Reformation, he came into conflict with his Protestant cousin, Duke Maurice, who likewise intended to assert rights of sovereignty, by arms if necessary. While the intervention of Philip of Hesse led to a compromise, it was unable to prevent the intensifying of the opposition between the two branches of the Wettin Dynasty and with it an increased reserve on the part of Duke Maurice toward the League of Schmalkalden.

In Palatinate-Neuburg the Count Palatine Otto Heinrich confiscated Church property and in 1543 proclaimed a Protestant Church Order. In the Electoral Palatinate the Elector Frederick II (1544–56), who was only superficially religious, inclined to the Reformation. In April 1546 he went over to it publicly and had the Mass abolished. The Catholic majority in the Electoral College was thereby imperiled, for at the same time the Electorate of Cologne was in danger of embracing the Reformation.

---

[3] *Exempel, einen rechten christlichen Bischof zu weihen* (1542), *WA* 53, 231–260.

The Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann von Wied (1515–47), whose grasp of theology was far too inadequate to enable him to evaluate the import of the differences between the Catholic notion of the Church and Protestantism, had in February 1542 invited Bucer to have religious discussions with him and Johann Gropper. The provincial Diet encouraged the archbishop and on 10 March 1542 gave him extensive powers. When, toward the end of the year, Bucer was invited again and preached in the Bonn Minster, there were lively protests at Cologne from the cathedral chapter, the university, the lower clergy, and the city council, and Bucer's departure was demanded. The theological opposition was carried on by the Carmelite Eberhard Billick, the Carthusian Gerhard Kalkbrenner, and especially Johann Gropper. Gropper broke off his connection with Bucer and on 27 January 1543 transmitted to the archbishop a Catholic reform program. Hermann von Wied rejected it and authorized Bucer to draw up an order of Reformation. With the support of other reformers, who, headed by Melanchthon, had meanwhile been enlisted, Bucer put together the "Cologne Reformation." Simultaneously there began the implementation of the Reformation in the archbishopric. By a brief issued in June 1543 the Pope called upon the Elector to return to the Church.

The intervention of Charles V in connection with the War of the Gelderland Succession in August and September 1543 retarded the reform exertions for a while. In a counterreport Gropper attacked the "Cologne Reformation" as not Catholic. Even Luther opposed it and stigmatized its doctrine of the Eucharist as "fanatical." The Archbishop's declaration of January 1544 that he would be satisfied with the preaching of the Gospel, the lay chalice, and baptism and hymns in German did not suffice to overcome the Cologne opposition. The Catholic circles obtained an effective strengthening from the Jesuits, who settled at Cologne in 1544. In the autumn of that year they energetically demanded that the Archbishop annul the innovations and appealed to both Emperor and Pope. A series of polemics, testimonials, and replies testifies to the passionately fought struggle. Hermann von Wied was excommunicated on 16 April 1546 and soon after deposed by the Pope. But it was only in February 1547 that his successor, the former coadjutor Adolf von Schaumburg, could, with imperial support, force him to yield.

The Schmalkaldic War

The successful Gelderland-Cleves campaign of 1543 confirmed Charles V's conviction that power, employed at a given time and properly, is an entirely fit means for mastering "arrogance."[4]

This applied to the Protestants as well as to the French. Hence it was by no means agreeable to him when the Cardinal Legate, Alessandro Farnese, sought at Kreuznach in January 1544 to gain him to peace or at least to an armistice for the sake of the council—in other words to induce him to renounce Milan and Savoy. The Pope favored France and was silent in regard to France's offer of an alliance with the League of Schmalkalden—so ran the bitter words of reproach. At the Diet of Speyer Charles V obtained military help against the Turks and France from the Protestants, who were themselves not united and impressed by the Emperor's success against Cleves. Of course, he had to be quite accommodating in regard to their ecclesiastical demands.[5] He held out to them the prospect of a diet in the coming fall or winter. It was to produce a "Christian reform" because of the religious dispute." Until then no one was allowed to resort to power and force in religious matters. The processes in the Supreme Court and the Recesses of Diets against the Lutherans were to be suspended. Ecclesiastical property was to remain in the hands of those who held it at the moment. For the sake of a momentary success the Emperor here, for the first time, publicly abandoned important positions. As Jedin says, "He offered his hand for a future arbitrary, total regulation of the ecclesiastical situation" by a German diet, a regulation "which, in the situation, could and perhaps had to lead to the complete Protestantization of Germany." The Curia reacted with an admonition of 24 August 1544 to the effect that, by his promise to regulate Church affairs at a diet and by his disposal of Church property, the Emperor had become guilty of a serious invasion of canon law.[6] He should revoke the concessions to the Protestants and, by arranging peace, facilitate the way for the council. In Jedin's words, the brief meant "the taking of a position in principle against the Emperor's religious and conciliar policy." But it was neither officially presented nor published. This did not stop its circulation. Calvin published it and was not sparing in his cutting scorn.[7] Luther lost control of himself in one of his last and most extravagant polemics, *Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet* (1545; *WA* 54, 206–299). The Emperor did not react but created new facts by a rapid and successful campaign against France. In the Peace of Crépy the French King had to promise aid against the Turks and, in addition, he had to oblige himself in a secret treaty of 19 September 1544 to cooperate in the elimination of abuses and the return of apostates and to participate in the council that was to meet at a time specified by the Emperor at Trent, Cambrai, or Metz.[8] He also declared that he agreed the aid promised against the Turks could be used against heretics also in case it should be necessary to proceed forcibly against them.

---

[4] In his *Commentaires* (edited by Kervyn de Lettenhove [Brussels 1862], p. 100; K. Brandi, *Karl V* II, 339), the Emperor wrote: "L'expérience de ce qui se passait ouvrit les yeux de l'empereur et éclaira son entendement de sorte, que non seulement il ne lui parut impossible de dompter par la force un tel orgueil, mais tout au contraire, cela lui sembla très facile en l'entreprenant dans de circonstances et par des moyens convenables."

[5] Jedin, I, 397f.

[6] Text in *CT* IV, 364–373; Jedin, I, 602.

When the Pope finally summoned the Council to meet at Trent on 15 March 1545, in the Bull "Laetare Jerusalem," published on 30 November 1544, the Emperor acquiesced. But he did not desist from his plan of first overcoming the League of Schmalkalden by military might and then of forcing the Protestants to recognize and attend the Council. To this he directed all his strength. Besides, he reckoned on a delay, if not on further obstruction to the opening of the Council. For the present he continued along the route of compromise that had been traveled at Speyer in order to lull his opponents into security. At first this was still the situation at the Diet of Worms, which, because of the Emperor's illness, did not meet on 1 October 1544, but at the end of March 1545 under King Ferdinand. According to the Emperor's wish the aid against the Turks and other political questions were to be urgently dealt with and the religious problems left chiefly to the Council. But the Protestants, who were not ready to recognize the Council, demanded the implementation of the assurances given at Speyer in 1544.

On 17 May, one day after the Emperor, Cardinal Farnese arrived at Worms as papal legate. Discussion of a procedure against the Protestants prepared the way at the end of June for an alliance between Emperor and Pope. The latter promised for the war against the League of Schmalkalden 200,000 ducats, 12,500 auxiliary troops for four months, one-half the revenues of the Spanish Church, and permission to convert up to a half-million ducats into ready cash by alienation of Spanish ecclesiastical property. The opening of the Council was to be delayed. The Emperor continued the Diet in order to gain time and to prevent the Protestants from preparing for war. In the Recess of the Diet on 4 August a religious colloquy was even called for at Regensburg. In order to safeguard his rear for the war against the Protestants, King Ferdinand in October 1545 concluded an eighteen-months' armistice with the Turks, ceded the lost parts of Hungary to them, and bound himself to pay tribute. Delegates arrived at Regensburg for the religious colloquy on 27 January 1546, even though the Council of Trent had already begun its work on 13 December 1545. In order not to give rise to any rivalry the Emperor assigned the colloquy a purely informational task for the sake of the Diet that had also been summoned to Regensburg. Out of an understandable mistrust the Protestant side demanded that all talks be recorded in the minutes. This troublesome procedure did not allow any free exchange of views, and the Emperor rejected it. The Protestants broke off the discussions on justification, which had scarcely begun, on 10 March and ten days later they secretly left the city. The Diet, for which the Emperor arrived on 10 April, could only be opened on 5 June. The leading Protestant princes did not attend in person. Religion, peace, and law were to be the subjects of discussion, but in reality everyone counted on war. The Catholics recognized the Council of Trent, while the Protestants demanded a free, Christian council in Germany. In the background the Emperor was diligently trying to isolate the members of the League of Schmalkalden. Bavaria bound itself to a benevolent neutrality. The marriage of the heir to the Duchy with Ferdinand's oldest daughter, Anna, was to end the old Habsburg-Wittelsbach rivalry. Maurice of Saxony entertained hopes of obtaining the Saxon Electoral dignity and let himself be gained to a treaty on 19 June 1546. In it he was promised the protectorate of the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. For his part, he promised to recognize the Council and send representatives to it. On 7 June the Emperor signed a treaty alliance with the Pope. Charles gave the sign for war when, responding to an inquiry by the Protestants about the aim of his warlike preparations, he said that he had taken action against disobedient princes according to law and by virtue of his authority. On 9 June he had written to his sister Mary:

---

[7] *CR* 35, 253–288.

[8] Text in A. Hasenclever, "Die Geheimartikel zum Frieden von Crépy vom 19. 9. 1544." *ZKG* 45 (1926), 418–426.

> If we did not intervene now, all the estates of the Empire, including the Netherlands, would be in danger of abandoning the faith. After I had considered all this again and again, I decided to start war against Hesse and Saxony as violators of the peace in regard to the Duke of Braunschweig and his territory. And although this pretext will not cover up for long that it is a question of religion, at first anyway it will serve to separate those who have deviated.[9]

---

[9] Brandi, *Karl V* I, 471.

Accordingly, the Emperor wanted to avoid the impression of a religious war and to have the war viewed in the framework of imperial law. The declaration of outlawry against Electoral Saxony and Hesse contributed to this. Charles intended to wage the war in these principalities, but before he obtained control of the troops from the Netherlands and of the papal auxiliary corps his opponents seized the initiative. Thus the territory south of the Danube became the first arena. The field commander of the League of Schmalkalden, Sebastian Schertlin von Burtenbach, moved against the Ehrenberger Klause on the upper Lech with the intention of obstructing the Emperor's principal force from Innsbruck and the approach of the papal troops. But the League's war council called him back to the Danube. There was also no determined attack by the still preponderant League on Regensburg. The "greatest military confrontation which Germany had hitherto experienced" was at first an endless maneuvering in the area around Ingolstadt, a cautious probing of the opponent without risking a decisive blow.[10] This was to the Emperor's advantage. He was able to assemble his forces and strengthen his at first weaker position. But in time the ineffectual moving about exhausted the financial resources on both sides and desire for a fight seized the troops. In the late fall the Italians especially had to endure rain and cold. There was not even any decisive action on the Emperor's part when the intervention of Maurice of Saxony of itself brought a change. Together with King Ferdinand and the latter's Bohemian troops, he invaded Electoral Saxony, forcing the Schmalkaldic chiefs to leave the South German theater of operations. The Emperor rejected a request made by Philip of Hesse on 14 November for a truce and he was soon master of South Germany. Charles demanded contributions but left the Count Palatine his electoral dignity and Ulrich of Württemberg his principality and, above all, did not interfere with the religious situation so long as the important outcome had not been decided. And now it was the Pope himself who jeopardized that. He feared that the Emperor's complete success would mean his strong preponderance and, influenced by antiimperial forces, he recalled his troops at the end of January 1547, thereby greatly embittering Charles V. This was all the more dangerous when hitherto neutral North German Protestantism came to the aid of the Elector of Saxony. Maurice of Saxony fell into serious trouble. Severely tormented by gout and bladder trouble, the Emperor hurried to Saxony and there, relentlessly unsparing of himself, at Mühlberg on the Elbe on 24 April 1547, he won the single battle that he ever took part in. The Elector Johann Friedrich was taken prisoner and condemned to death for *lèse majesté* and heresy. There was no intention of carrying out this judgment; it was intended rather to lend force to the subsequent negotiations. In the Wittenberg Capitulation of 19 May Johann Friedrich had to renounce his principality and the electoral dignity. He firmly refused to recognize the decrees of the Council and remained in prison. The same fate befell Philip of Hesse when on 19 June he asked the Emperor's pardon at Halle.

---

[10] E. Hassinger, *Das Werden des neuzeitlichen Europa 1300–1600* (Braunschweig 1959), p. 236.

Henry VIII of England had died on 28 January 1547, and Francis I of France on 31 March. Martin Luther had preceded them to the grave a year earlier, on 18 February 1546. Charles V seemed left alone as victor on the stage of history. What could now stop him from setting about establishing the new order of Europe in the sense of his own universal imperial idea and of restoring the unity of faith? But this was denied him especially by the one person whose help he had most need of—the Pope. "The dissension that now broke out between the Pope and the Emperor was the salvation of the German Protestants in their extreme distress."[11]

The Violent Diet and the *Interim*

According to the Emperor's plan the Protestants were to be mastered in the field and then brought to participate in the Council at Trent. The first item had succeeded but in the meantime the second had been made impossible by the Council itself with the consent of the Pope. On 11 March it had decreed its tranfer to Bologna. The Protestants were certainly not to be induced to attend a council in a city of the Papal State and to accept the decrees issued there. At the Curia, however, the Catholic Church in Germany had already been written off and the Council's task was seen as predominantly the preservation and reform of the Church in lands that were still Catholic.

After the Emperor's victory at Mühlberg Paul III was all the more fearful of the Spanish-Habsburg pincer movement and of the Emperor's universal power. The bitterness produced by the murder of his son, Pierluigi Farnese, on 10 September 1547, at Piacenza and the occupation of that city by imperial troops quickly envenomed the Pope's relations with Charles V.

The "imperialist" Council Fathers had not gone to Bologna but had stayed on at Trent. The Pope could not be induced to transfer the

---

[11] Jedin, II, 376.

Council back there, but eventually, not wanting to risk a schism, he had to order a cessation of conciliar activity on 3 February 1548.

In view of this development there remained to the Emperor no other possibility than to try to lead the religious affair to a solution within the German framework and without the Pope. This was the central problem of the "Violent Diet" that opened at Augsburg on 1 September 1547. It was the more urgent when the Emperor's other concern, the reorganization of the Empire—a consolidation of the imperial central power—encountered massive resistance. The Emperor envisaged an Imperial League on the model of the Swabian League that, despite everything, had functioned for almost fifty years, from 1487 to 1533, for the management of South Germany and as an instrument of Habsburg policy. Such a league would have offered the possibility of incorporating the Netherlands, Milan, and Savoy and tying the Empire more closely together with the other lands of the Habsburgs. But the days of an imperial reform in the direction of monarchy were past. The princes had become far too powerful through their victories over the knights and the peasants and through the reform movement. As the Elector of Brandenburg had declared, they were not inclined to reduce the Empire "to servitude" to the Emperor by means of a league.

The Emperor was likewise unable completely to regulate ecclesiastical affairs according to his own view, that is, through the return of the Protestants to the ancient Church. He had to content himself with a temporary solution, the *Interim.* At the Emperor's request Julius von Pflug had composed a *Formula sacrorum emendandorum* for the Diet. According to W. Lipgens,[12] it was based on a reform essay of Gropper's. When a committee on religion at the Diet proved to be unsuited for the task, the *Formula* was, at the Emperor's command, debated and revised by Julius von Pflug, Michael Helding, the Spaniards Pedro de Soto and Pedro Malvenda, and others, together with Johannes Agricola, the only Protestant theologian appointed. The outcome of the two-weeks' work of the theologians was a "compromise" confession, to which the Emperor tried to win the Lutheran and the Catholic estates. But Bavaria and the spiritual princes rejected it. In their view the Catholics should simply be ordered to hold to the ancient faith. After much uncertainty the text was published on 15 May 1548 as *Der römisch-kaiserlichen Majestät Erklärung, wie es der Religion halben im Heiligen Reich bis zum Austrag des gemeinen Concilii gehalten werden soll.*[13] It was imposed on the Protestants in the Recess of the Diet on 30 June. On the other hand, the estates that had "hitherto maintained the order and doctrine of the common Christian Church [were] to continue steadfast in them and neither deviate from them nor introduce changes." Hence the concessions made to the Protestants were to have no validity for them until a decision was made by the Council in regard to the marriage of priests and communion under both species. Thus to label the Augsburg *Interim* an "exceptional law for the Protestants" does not quite fit the situation,[14] for nothing was imposed on them which was not also required of the Catholics.

---

[12] W. Lipgens, *Kardinal J. Gropper* (Münster 1951), pp. 169f.

[13] Text in M. K. T. Hergang, *Das Augsburger Interim* (Leipzig 1855), pp. 20–155; *Neue und vollständigere Sammlung der Reichstagsabschiede* II (Frankfurt 1747), 550–574.

In the foreword it was asserted that "His Imperial Majesty [was] industriously working to effect a reformation" (paragraph 11), and the conclusion stressed the necessity "of removing the scandals from the Church which have given great cause for the disorder of this time." Hence no one will refuse his encouragement and aid to the Emperor in his efforts "to bring about the useful reform of the Church" (Article XXVI, para. 25).

In the twenty-six articles the fundamental truths of faith were treated: the original state, fall, and redemption of man (I–III), his justification (IV–VIII), the doctrine of the Church (IX–XIII), that of the Sacraments (XIV–XXI), and in particular detail that of the Mass (XXII–XXV). The last article (XXVI) dealt with ceremonies and customs.

Justification takes place on the basis of the merit of Christ's passion and means the forgiveness of sins and renewal in the Holy Spirit. The love of God, which is poured into our heart, brings it about that man "desires what is good and right and accomplishes in deed what he desires." But carnal lusts still fight against the Spirit even in those who "have obtained such righteousness from grace." On this earth man cannot achieve the perfection of this "infused righteousness." Christ must always come to the aid of the weakness of the righteous with his own perfection. Much as justification is God's work and not man's, still "the merciful God does not deal with a man as with a dead log, but draws him with his will" (Article VI, para. 1). "Prevenient grace . . . moves the heart to God through Jesus Christ, and this movement is faith" in Holy Scripture and the divine promises. Faith leads to trust and hope and "hope in the promised mercy glorifies God and hence is led to love" (VI, para. 3). Love is fruitful in good works (VII). The Church is the "community and assembly of believers in Christ, in which the Holy Spirit . . . thus unites the reborn so that they may be one house and one body from one baptism and one faith" (IX). It is invisible and yet also visible (IX, para. 5). The canon of Scripture is established by it (XI, para. 1). It decides doubtful questions by a legitimate council summoned in the Holy Spirit (XI, para. 6). It exercises teaching and the priesthood in special offices. "Although it has many bishops, who rule by divine right the people whom Christ has gained by his precious blood, it still has one supreme bishop who is set over all others in order to avert schisms and dissension" (XIII, para. 1). The theology and practice of the Sacraments and Mass are treated in detail. Christ's sacrifice on the Cross is "by itself sufficient . . . to redeem the whole human race" (XXII, para. 7). The relevant question in the Mass is that "all men will participate in this mighty sacrifice, which has perfectly, sufficiently, and superabundantly achieved salvation for all men, and take advantage of it" (para. 8). The sacrifices of pagans and Jews had meaning in so far as the one sacrifice of Christ was announced and expected in them (para. 10). In the Mass we celebrate without interruption the memorial of this sacrifice and share in its benefits (para. 19). The sacrifice of the cross and that of the Eucharist are "one in substance but different in the manner of offering" (para. 30). The traditional ceremonies are to be retained (XXVI). But they should be explained to the people and all that could "give cause for superstition" should be eliminated (para. 6). The marriage of priests (para. 20) and the lay chalice (para. 21) should be allowed where they are already the custom until a decision by the Council. In the *Interim* nothing is said about the restitution of the property taken from the Church. As a confessional formula it presents the doctrine of the Church with no watering down, but it exerts itself to take up the concerns of the Protestants in both content and language and to do justice to them.[15] Hence it was all the more to be regretted that it did not obtain the assent of the Catholic estates. For the Protestants could only gain the impression that they were to be enticed back to a completely pre-Reformation Church system by means of concessions that were basically not seriously meant, but that would later be required of them. The intransigent, including the otherwise conciliatory Martin Bucer, had no great difficulty in mobilizing resistance to this last effort to save religious unity and in presenting all cooperation as cowardice and betrayal. If the *Interim* did not affect the Catholic estates, still they were not for that reason to be freed of the claims of reform. For them the Emperor on 9 July 1548, issued a *Formula Reformationis per Caesaream Maiestatem statibus ecclesiasticis . . . proposita et ab eisdem probata et recepta.*[16]

---

[14] E. Bizer, *Reformationsgeschichte Deutschlands bis 1555: Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* III, Lieferung K (Göttingen 1964), 152.

---

[15] J. Lortz, *Die Reformation in Deutschland* II: 273, thinks otherwise: "This *Interim,* while well meant, was an ambiguous compromise and hence weak in itself."

[16] Text in M. K. T. Hergang, *Das Augsburger Interim,* pp. 232–272. According to Lipgens, *Gropper,* p. 171, it can be "shown with great probability that Johannes Gropper was the author of the *Formula Reformationis.*" This is definitely disputed by G. Pfeilschifter, *ARC* II, 121f., footnote 9.

In it the reform of the clergy is presented as urgent. At the beginning we read:

> In order that abuses and scandals . . . may be removed and clergy and people reformed . . . until the general council puts an end to the schism and abuses, it is especially necessary that the spiritual estate be renewed and purified, since through its disorder, confusion, and insecurity the shape of the Church in general has fallen into disorder and is convulsed in various ways.

Accordingly, Article I deals with the formation and trial of candidates for the priesthood and the episcopacy. The pastoral duties of priests and bishops are strongly emphasized. The latter should make it clear by their conduct that they are bishops rather than princes and that their thoughts are directed to heaven rather than to the world (II). The obligation to preach and, as preparation for this, to study Holy Scripture is given special attention. The Sacraments must not become spectacles which are merely watched ("otiosa spectacula"); they should again and again be made clear to the faithful in talks (IX). For example, the texts in the administration of baptism and matrimony may be spoken in the vernacular. All rites and every religious usage must promote genuine piety. The people should be warned about superstitious abuses (XVI). Accumulation of benefices is forbidden (XVIII). Visitations and diocesan and provincial synods are especially mentioned among the methods of reform. "In order that the pious zeal for reformation may not cool through long delays," diocesan synods were to be held by Martinmas and provincial synods by the following Lent. As a matter of fact such reform synods did take place for most German sees[17] and for the provinces of Mainz, Trier, Cologne, and Salzburg.[18] Here an effort was made to apply the imperial reform decree to local circumstances and to make them operative. The decrees enacted in this connection gave the episcopal visitors goals and means in their exertions in regard to doctrine and discipline. Even though a complete success was certainly not achieved, still a new spirit was discernible and a start toward inner reform of the German Church became visible. The ground was thereby made ready to some extent for the reception of the Tridentine decrees.

Both the *Interim* and the *Formula Reformationis* suffered from the fact that they were not issued by the proper ecclesiastical authority and represented a problematic intervention by the Emperor into the inner ecclesiastical sphere. To be sure, the papal bull of indult of 18 August 1548 can be interpreted as a certain sanction of these religious-political measures.[19] In this, after protracted negotiations, the Pope granted the dispensations requested by Charles V for promoting reunion.[20] They had the same orientation as the *Interim* and the *Formula Reformationis.* The rehabilitation of repentant concubinaries, the ordination of preachers who had not so far received that Sacrament, and the employment of apostate religious in the parochial care of souls were made possible by it. The lay chalice was conceded under definite cautions, and an adjustment with the holders of revenues and wealth from former ecclesiastical property was facilitated.

---

[17] G. Schreiber, *Weltkonzil von Trient* II (Freiburg 1951).

[18] L. Lenhardt, "Die Mainzer Synoden von 1548 und 1549," *AMrhKG* 10 (1958), 67–111; H. Foerster, *Reformbestrebungen Adolfs III. von Schaumburg 1547–56 in der Kölner Kirchenprovinz* (Münster 1925); Loserth, "Die Salzburger Prov.-Synode von 1549," *Arch. für östr. Geschichte* 85 (1898), 131–357; B. Caspar, *Das Erzb. Trier im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung* (Münster 1966), pp. 68–84; H. Molitor, *Kirchliche Reformversuche der Kurfürsten und Erzbischöfe von Trier* (Wiesbaden 1967), pp. 96–99.

The *Interim* was difficult to enforce. It was compromised by being the dictate of the victorious power in war and provoked resistance. Also the convictions necessary for realizing its positive potentialities were wanting. There were not enough priests and religious who could have replaced the opposing Protestant preachers. The Jesuits were just beginning to come to Germany. Only in South Germany, in cities such as Augsburg, Ulm, and Constance and in Württemberg did the Emperor have the power to make the *Interim* respected to some extent. In Saxony an attenuated form of it was provided. The Wittenberg theologians, headed by Melanchthon, who was personally ready for an understanding, had laid their hesitations before a Diet at Meissen in July 1548 (*CR* 7, 12–45). In the article on justification, they maintained, "much that was good was said," in particular "that we are freely justified by grace without merit," but also much "pharisaical leaven was intermixed" (16). After further discussions at Pegau and Torgau a new formula was produced at Altzelle. In this were listed the intermediate things (*adiaphora*) on which there could be agreement. This led on 28 December 1548 to the passing of the Leipzig *Interim* (*CR* 7, 258–264). Confirmation and the anointing of the sick were reintroduced, ordination was committed to the bishops, and ceremonies and vestments at Mass and even the feast of Corpus Christi were ordered. The intention was to cling to doctrine and yield in the *adiaphora.* Only an excerpt, the "little Interim" (*CR* 7, 426–428), was published, together with a mandate of the Elector Maurice of 4 July 1549. It obtained no very great importance but evoked among the Wittenberg theologians the momentous quarrel over *adiaphora.* Luther's disciple, Matthias Flacius, came out against it, left Wittenberg, and from Magdeburg, "our Lord God's chancery," together with Nikolaus von

---

[19] Text in Le Plat, IV, 121.

[20] *CT* VI, 767ff.

Amsdorf, led a severe struggle against the *Interim,* which meant for him the *interitus* of the Reformation. In it he heaped mockery and scorn on Johannes Agricola and the dastardly Melanchthon.

Charles V outlawed Magdeburg and commissioned Maurice of Saxony to execute the sentence. This city's effective resistance confirmed the other Protestant cities of North Germany in their rejection of the *Interim.*

The Revolt of the Princes

The Imperial Diet of Augsburg in 1550–51 was influenced by the Council, whose reopening at Trent had been held out by the new Pope Julius III. The Lutheran estates declared their readiness to send delegates but refused to aid in the implementation of the *Interim* and the imperial *Formula Reformationis.* A growing opposition to Charles V was spreading. As early as February 1550 Hans of Küstrin, Albrecht of Prussia, and Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg had concluded an alliance at Königsberg for the maintenance of Protestantism and the support of Magdeburg. Now the Emperor's exertions to secure the imperial succession to his son Philip became known. They led to a Habsburg family pact on 9 March 1551, according to which Ferdinand was to succeed Charles as Emperor, but at the same time Philip, the heir of Spain, was to become King of the Romans and hence Ferdinand's successor in the imperial office. Ferdinand's son Maximilian was to yield to the Spaniard. The sequel to this arrangement was an estrangement of the brothers, Charles and Ferdinand, and an anxiety among the princes, who believed they had reason to fear "the brutal Spanish servitude."

Maurice of Saxony now made himself the champion of the liberty of the princes. He had, in the interval, found it quite distasteful to be branded by opponents of the *Interim* as a traitor to the Lutheran cause. In addition, the Emperor had not fulfilled the new Elector's hopes for an increase of power nor yielded to his repeated pleas for the liberation of his father-in-law, Philip of Hesse. Maurice also feared that the League of Königsberg might pursue the aim of restoring the former Saxon Electorate with French help, and he undertook an artful double game to prevent it. While entering into negotiations with France, he displayed at the same time his loyalty to the Emperor by executing the imperial sentence of outlawry against Magdeburg, which surrendered on 4 November 1551. He united with the Königsberg allies, from whom in January 1551 he had withdrawn the troops assembled at Verden for the relief of Magdeburg, and with Wilhelm of Hesse. On 15 January 1552, at Chateau Chambord, they signed a treaty with King Henry II of France. The latter promised them financial aid for the attack on the

Emperor and in return was assured the imperial vicariate over the cities of Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Thus was the gateway to the Empire opened for the French and a wedge thrust between the Netherlands and Burgundy. At the same time Henry II strengthened the aims of the Turks for an offense and encouraged the Emperor's opponents in Italy to rebel.

Charles V had disregarded several warnings and was unprepared when, at the end of March, Maurice of Saxony advanced against Augsburg and beyond into Tirol, while Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Mulmbach harassed the Franconian bishoprics. Meanwhile, Maurice negotiated unsuccessfully with Ferdinand at Linz from 19 April to 1 May. Before there could be a meeting at Passau for new discussions, the troops of the rebel princes moved via the Ehrenberger Klause against Innsbruck. Charles V saw himself compelled to flee through the Brenner Pass to Villach. At the news of war the Council at Trent had already dispersed on 28 April 1552.

The Emperor was cut to the quick but not broken. The more time he acquired for pushing an energetic countermobilization, the stronger his position became in the negotiations conducted at Passau from May to July 1552. In these King Ferdinand, who was once more in strong difficulties from the Turks, became the spokesman of the neutrals and the mediator between the Emperor and the rebels, who demanded the annulling of the *Interim,* the convoking of a national assembly for an adjustment of the articles of religion, and a lasting religious peace. Church property was to be left in the hands of the current holders. The Emperor scorned any definitive renunciation of a confessional reunion and any binding restrictions on his imperial rights. In the Peace of Passau, which he ratified on 10 August, he again allowed only a truce until the next Diet, at which the religious question and the *gravamina* should be settled.

The Religious Peace of Augsburg

Following the failure of an undertaking against France in the late fall of 1552 and the raising of the siege of Metz in January 1553, Charles V left Germany forever and turned over the Empire to his brother Ferdinand. He saw himself unable to restore religious unity in the Empire and had "scruples" about cooperating in another solution.[21] While he actually summoned the long overdue Diet to Augsburg, he did not intend to appear there in person. The meagerly attended Diet was finally opened on 5 February 1555. At the outset the Emperor lodged a protest against everything whereby "our true, ancient, Christian, and Catholic religion would be in the least injured, insulted, weakened, or encumbered." Since the death of Maurice of Saxony in 1553 the Protestants lacked a leader, but they had asserted their determination to work for an unconditional and perpetual religious peace. Of the Protestant princes only the Duke of Württemberg came to Augsburg in person. The negotiations were conducted by princely councilors, professional jurists, and diplomats. There was a great longing for peace and a general conviction of the need for a compromise. To be sure, the time was not yet ripe for a real religious peace. Even though the Protestants demanded the unlimited exercise of religion for themselves, they were not ready to concede it to Catholics or fanatics in their own territories.[22] On 14 September the Strasbourg delegates, appealing to their consciences, resisted the tolerating of a Catholic minority in their city on the ground that a toleration of Catholicism would be a sin against God.[23]

---

[21] In the letter of 8 June 1554 to Ferdinand, "the actual abdication of Charles as German King" (Brandi, op. cit., II, 398), he wrote: "seulement pour le respect du point de la religion, auquel j'ai mes scruples" (K. Lanz, *Correspondenz* III, 624).

Of the Catholic estates only the Bishop of Augsburg, Cardinal Otto von Waldburg, defended a consistent, though impracticable idea. He explained that it was impossible for him to approve a division of the one Catholic Church and to acknowledge in the Diet competence for such a decision.[24] But at the news of the death of Pope Julius III on 23 March, he left the Diet with the legate, Cardinal Morone, in order to take part in the conclave. The fact that he did not return and had himself represented by his chancellor was probably due to his insight that he stood alone in his unwillingness for concessions.[25] The Roman Church was at first represented by the Nuncio Delfino, then temporarily by Lippomano, and not at all in the decisive business of the final weeks.

Theological arguments played scarcely a role in the discussions at Augsburg. The princes or jurists decided the fate of the confessions. There was no further thought of a compromise in dogma and liturgy. What was sought was a lasting ecclesiastical peace between imperial estates that differed in religion. In addition to the question of the ownership and usufruct of Church property, difficulties arose from the demand that the bishops should abandon jurisdiction over the subjects of Protestant princes. There was a severe struggle for the recognition of the "ecclesiastical reservation," whereby a spiritual prince who passed over to the Reformation should lose his office and his rule. The Protestants were unwilling to approve it. When King Ferdinand insisted, stressing that "he had sworn by his honor not to give it up," they made the counterdemand that the ecclesiastical estates should grant "freedom of religion" to the Lutheran knights, cities, and congregations. Ferdinand agreed. He obtained from the Catholics, not its acceptance in the Recess, but only its admission as a subsidiary *Declaratio Ferdinandea.*[26] The "ecclesiastical reservation," on the other hand, was included with the postscript that the Protestants had not approved it.

---

[22] "There can be no doubt that [the Protestant estates] were demanding a greater freedom than they were prepared to grant" (A. Druffel–K. Brandi, *Reichsgeschichte* IV, 739, footnote 1).

[23] Ibid., p. 719.

[24] J. Grisar, "Die Stellung der Päpste zum Reichstag und Religionsfrieden von Augsburg 1555," *StdZ* 156 (1954f.), 440–462, p. 444; K. Repgen, *Die römische Kurie* I, 1, 74.

[25] K. Repgen, op. cit., I, 1, 74, footnote 80.

The Religious Peace of Augsburg was published with the Recess of the Diet on 25 September 1555. It provided that, following so many fruitless efforts for peace, it had been agreed, in an effort to save the fatherland from dissension and ruin, that none of the imperial estates should be attacked by the Emperor or a prince because of its adherence to the *Confessio Augustana* nor suffer any other disadvantage (para. 3). Conversely, the princes of the *Confessio Augustana* were not to inflict any sort of harm on the secular or spiritual estates that clung to the old religion (para. 4). However, all the others which did not belong to the two confessions were to be excluded from this peace (para. 5). The free choice of confession applied only to the imperial estates, not to their subjects, who, in accord with the fundamental principle, "Ubi unus dominus, ibi una sit religio,"[27] had to accept the confession of the authority. If they could not bring themselves to do so, they should have the right to emigrate after selling their property (para. 11). Because the religious factions could not agree in the case of the conversion of an ecclesiastic to the *Confessio Augustana,* the King, by virtue of the imperial authority, decreed that archbishops, bishops, prelates, or other spiritual estates who abandoned the old religion lost their offices and property, and the chapters could elect a successor who held all the property according to old custom (para. 6). Hence spiritual princes should be able to become Protestants only as private persons, without any right to force their subjects to conform, and with the loss of their authority. In regard to ecclesiastical property, the situation at the time of the Peace of Passau was taken as decisive (para. 7). Until the definitive religious settlement, spiritual jurisdiction should not be exercised over the estates of the *Confessio Augustana* (para. 8). Knights who were immediate imperial vassals were to be included in the peace (para. 13). Where both confessions existed side by side in the Free Cities, matters should remain thus, and each should leave the other in the peaceful possession of its creed, rites, and property (para. 14). The peace should remain valid until the achieving of a peaceful and definitive settlement of religion. If such a union should not come into existence at a general or national council or at a diet, then it should continue in force as "a steadfast, firm, unconditional peace, lasting for ever" (para. 12).

---

[26] Text in E. Walder, *Religionsvergleiche des 16. Jahrhunderts* I (Bern, 2d ed. 1960), 68–71.

[27] This statement, frequently made during the negotiations, later became the celebrated formula, "Cuius regio, eius et religio." It first appears in the *Institutiones iuris canonici* (Frankfurt, 2nd ed. 1612) of the Lutheran Joachim Stephani: "ut et ideo hodie religionem religioni cohaerere dici potest, ut cujus sit regio, hoc est ducatus, principatus, territorium seu jus territorii, ejus etiam sit religio hoc est jus episcopale seu jurisdictio spiritalis" (lib. I, cap. 7, no. 52). Quoted from M. Heckel, "Staat und Kirche nach den Lehren der ev. Juristen," *ZSavRG* 42 (1956), 212, footnote 430.

The Religious Peace, therefore, was understood as only temporary, until the restoration of unity of faith by a council or another authority competent for religion. It was to be permanent only if no better arrangement could be arrived at. In actuality it became something definitive of great historical importance and introduced a period of peace of a duration otherwise unknown in Germany.

The religious cleavage was definitive and the juxtaposition in law of two confessions was created. The principle of equality was established, but only for the Empire as an equilibrium between confessionally complete parts; hence it was an equality based on inequality in the several territories. Thus there could be no question of toleration and freedom of conscience. Quite the contrary: the territorial prince decided the religion of his territory and of his subjects. By recognition of the right of emigration, he merely renounced the implementation of the medieval law on heresy with its consequences for body, honor, and possessions. The arrangement was based on the notion of the modern territorial state, to the consolidation of which confessional unity contributed substantially. The annulling of episcopal jurisdiction in Protestant areas completed the development of the territorial Church and called for the episcopacy of the prince, who, while unable to direct his Church spiritually, had it administered by his jurists. The politicization of religion and the isolation of the confessions intensified their mutual hostility. They knew very little about each other and that only from hearsay in polemical distortions.

The obscurities in the Religious Peace offered much material for conflict. The Protestant estates did not feel bound by the ecclesiastical reservation. They tried in vain to abolish it at later diets. As a matter of fact, the secularization of the sees and chapters in northern and central Germany reached its climax only after 1555: Meissen, Merseburg, and Naumburg in Saxony and Bremen, Lübeck, Schwerin, Camin, Verden, Havelberg, Brandenburg, and Lebus in North Germany. The *Declaratio*

Ferdinandea in regard to the protection of Protestants in the spiritual principalities had, of course, no formal validity in law,[28] but at first it frequently prevented the already insecure Catholic bishops from claiming the right to decide the confessional adherence of their subjects. On the other hand, many Free Cities did not observe the decree for the protection of confessional minorities. The provisional congregations were for the most part again suppressed. Nevertheless, the article on the cities made possible the continued existence of monasteries and chapters in Free Cities with a Lutheran majority. While the peace originally applied only to the adherents of the *Confessio Augustana,* in actuality the Reformed also were soon able to enjoy it, though not without resistance and, until 1648, without any binding force in law. The conversion of the Count Palatine Friedrich III to Calvinism in 1563 contributed decisively to this. Accordingly, the Religious Peace of Augsburg was unable to prevent the split in German Protestantism.

With the abandoning of the exclusive validity of the one, true Catholic faith the concept of the Empire was fundamentally affected. The Empire had been degraded to a mere federation of territorial states. Hence it was more than a coincidence in time that on 12 September 1556 Charles V renounced the imperial throne. The attitude of the Curia, with whose standards the Religious Peace was irreconcilable, can be understood only if one takes into account that under Julius III an interference in the German situation had been avoided because Germany was already regarded as lost[29] and under Paul IV political differences with the House of Habsburg so predominated that "the Religious Peace was not a determining factor."[30] In the entourage of Paul IV there was probably some protest against the Religious Peace, but no more than complaints and accusations in letters to King Ferdinand and others resulted. There was no formal protest and no objection through legal process against the Religious Peace of Augsburg,[31] and, we may say, this was advantageous for the consolidating of the Catholic position in Germany. The Catholic estates, Ferdinand I at their head, were convinced that at the moment no better solution was possible if one did not want to suffer further losses or put up with further military confrontations. In concepts of his own day, for which that age was not yet ripe, Pius XII grasped the historical reality 400 years later, when he declared concerning the Religious Peace of Augsburg: "The common good of the Empire as well as of the Church, for which it was a question of being or not being within the German frontiers, justified the signing of the Religious Peace by the Catholic princes."[32]

---

[28] It was neither published nor communicated to the *Reichskammergericht,* and hence for this court it never had validity.

[29] Morone wrote as legate from Augsburg to Rome on 26 March 1555: "To me it seems that the least evil one can do here is to do nothing and to permit matters to collapse of themselves rather than to destroy them by political decrees." Cf. H. Lutz, "Karl V. und die Kurie 1552/56," RSTI 13 (1959), 22–49, pp. 40f.; K. Repgen, *Die römische Kurie* I, 1, 77, footnote 92.

[30] H. Lutz, *Christianitas afflicta,* p. 472.

[31] This is demonstrated against J. Grisar ("Die Stellung der Päpste," *StdZ* 1956 1954f., 461) by H. Lutz (*Christianitas afflicta,* pp. 471–474) and K. Repgen (*Die römische Kurie* I, 1, 82–86).

---

[32] *AAS* 47 (1955), 597.

SECTION FOUR

Europe under the Sign of Confessional Pluralism

CHAPTER 25

The Reformation in Scandinavia

Even to a greater degree than in Central Europe, in the Scandinavian countries the introduction of the Reformation and the constructing of the new ecclesiastical organization were effected under the pressure of political forces. The Scandinavian Kingdoms of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, together with outlying Iceland and Finland, had been united since 1397 in the Union of Kalmar. This was more a personal union under the Danish King than an organic political unity. National rivalries constantly led to strife. If the King of Denmark sought to exploit the religious innovations as a means of breaking the power of the nobility, especially of the bishops, for Sweden the Reformation was the means of shaking off Danish rule. Norway and Iceland, on the other hand, defended their autonomy against Denmark by the Catholic faith. Ruthlessly and with no effort to gloss matters over, people turned to the confiscation of the well-administered and productive property of churches and monasteries.

Christianity was not yet so deeply rooted in Scandinavia as in southern and central Europe and so people did not know there any "waning of the Middle Ages" with a differentiated and demanding religiosity on the one side and the appearance of decay connected with overripeness on the other. Life went on, as a matter of course and unhindered, in the forms of Catholic piety. The reform exertions of the fifteenth century had had an impact in the North and at times a more lasting effect than in Central Europe. A reformed Catholicism had been active at the beginning of the sixteenth century in the context of humanist zeal for the Bible and the Fathers. It is not always easily distinguished from the Protestant movement.

Alongside the mendicant orders, that of Saint Birgitta displayed a rich life in both the male and female branches. But what has been said of Sweden was true of the Scandinavian countries in general: "Perhaps no country of West European Christendom less needed ecclesiastical Reformation at the beginning of modern times."[1]

---

[1] H. Holmquist, *Die schwedische Reformation 1523–31* (Leipzig 1925), p. 5.

At the end of the Middle Ages the Scandinavian lands were divided among three ecclesiastical provinces. The Danish, under the Archbishop of Lund, comprised the sees of Aarhus, Börglum, Odense, Ribe, Roskilde, and Viborg. Sweden and Finland constituted the province of Uppsala with the suffragan sees of Linköping, Skara, Strängnäs, Västeras, Växjö, and Abo. To the Norwegian province of Trondheim (Nidaros) belonged the bishoprics of Bergen, Hamar, Oslo, and Stavanger, with Holar and Skalholt on Iceland.

Denmark

In Denmark King Christian II (1513–23), gifted but unbalanced and ruled by his passions, wanted to break the power of nobles and prelates and make the crown hereditary. He managed to gain the middle class and peasantry by progressive measures such as the improving of popular education and of the administration of justice and the promoting of industry and commerce. In 1520 he was able to impose his rule briefly on Sweden by crushing the attempts at independence made by Sten Sture, the administrator of that Kingdom. In the "Stockholm Blood Bath" he tried to get rid of his opponents among the Swedish nobility but thereby incurred such hatred that it was easy for the youthful Gustavus Vasa to win over the people, including leaders among the nobles and churchmen, and to be himself elected administrator in 1521. In the autumn of that year the Danish government had to withdraw and Christian's authority was confined to Denmark, Norway, and Iceland.

In October 1520 Christian had asked Luther's prince, the Elector Frederick the Wise, to send him a preacher of the pure word of God. Thus in June 1521 Karlstadt came to Denmark. But he was unable to realize his radical ideas, for the King, from political motives, including consideration for his brother-in-law, Charles V, was unwilling to go as far as to break with the old Church. Christian II first completed his territorial Church government. He curtailed the rights of bishops and forbade appeal to Rome. He permitted priests to marry. But at the beginning of 1523 he was to fail because of the opposition of the nobles, including a group of bishops. They renounced their fealty to him and raised Duke Frederick of Holstein to the Danish throne. They obliged Frederick to proceed against Luther's disciples and all others who preached against "God, the faith of Holy Church, the Holy Father at Rome, or the Roman Church." But Frederick I (1523–1533) came out more openly in favor of Lutheranism as he saw his position consolidated. In June 1526 he gave his daughter in marriage to Albrecht of Prussia, who had been the first spiritual prince to become a Protestant and had transformed the territory of the Teutonic Order into a secular duchy.

Frederick favored Hans Tausen (1494–1561), the "Danish Luther," a former Hospitaler, who had been gained to the new doctrine as a student at Wittenberg in 1523, and in 1526 made him his court chaplain, even though a charge of heresy had been made against him.

Especially harmful was the Curia's practice of disposing capriciously of the benefices of the Scandinavian Church. For example, it did not confirm the canonically elected and properly qualified Master Aage Jepsen Sparre as Archbishop of Lund, but on 6 February 1520 bestowed the rich see on the curial Cardinal Paul Aemilius Cesi. Thereupon Christian II placed, in succession, three of his confidants in the archbishopric. In 1526 Frederick named Aage Sparre as Archbishop, but papal confirmation was refused. Hence Sparre was unable to receive episcopal consecration and governed as archbishop-elect. Under the influence of this struggle in 1526 the King obtained from the *Herredag* at Odense a law to the effect that henceforth no cleric might ask confirmation or provision from the Pope. The hitherto customary fees were to be used for the defense of the country. In 1532 five of the eight Danish bishops, of themselves Catholic-minded, were not consecrated.

At the *Herredag* at Odense in 1527 the bishops demanded that steps be taken against "the new government and the new teaching," but the King got his way and obtained protection in law for the Lutherans. They won most cities. Only the episcopal cities and the rural folk, with the majority of the nobility, remained Catholic. The Carmelite Paul Helgesen (c. 1485–1534) stood up fearlessly for the old faith. He was stamped with the biblical humanism of Erasmus and hoped for a renewal of the Church from a study of Holy Scripture and patristic theology. The bishops called in from Germany Nikolaus von Herborn (c. 1480–1535), provincial of the Franciscans and preacher at the Cologne cathedral. He composed the declaration of the bishops against the forty-three articles of the *Confessio Hafniensis,* which twenty-one Lutheran preachers, under the leadership of Hans Tausen, had submitted to the *Herredag* at Copenhagen in July 1530, and a *Confutatio Lutheranismi Danici.* King Frederick continued consistently his policy of favoring Lutheranism. After his death in 1533 the bishops wanted to thwart the election of his Lutheran-minded oldest son Christian in favor of the latter's younger brother, still a minor. The younger prince had been raised in reform Catholic circles and gave hopes of a Catholic restoration. At the *Herredag* at Copenhagen it was possible to postpone the election. But a civil war, supported by Lübeck and aiming at the reinstatement of the exiled Christian II, forced the election of Christian III (1534–59). This meant the victory of the Lutheran Reformation in Denmark, together with Norway and Iceland. The bishops were imprisoned and excluded from the secular government and their property was confiscated for the crown. On 30 October 1536 they were deposed by the *Rigsdaag* and replaced by "superintendents," who were really royal officials. Johannes Bugenhagen was called to Copenhagen to construct the new Church organization. He crowned the King, drew up the *Ordinantia Ecclesiastica* on the model of the Saxon Church Order, and ordained seven superintendents. These later assumed the episcopal title, without bothering about apostolic succession. The *Ordinantia Ecclesiastica* was accepted by the *Rigsraad* in 1539 as a provisional solution until the settlement of the religious question by a general council. But, as a matter of fact, it continued in force until 1683 and created a Lutheran national Church under the King's direction. When in 1538 Christian III joined the League of Schmalkalden, the *Confessio Augustana* became the creed of the Danish Church. In 1550 appeared "Christian's Bible," a translation of the entire Scripture into Danish. Resistance to the Reformation was crushed by prison and banishment. King Christian IV (1588–1648) forbade Catholic priests to set foot in Denmark under threat of death. Exile and loss of property remained for centuries the punishment for conversion to Catholicism. Religious liberty was not granted until 1844.

Norway

Christian III introduced the Reformation in Norway at the same time as he did in Denmark. Here Olav Engelbriktsson, Archbishop of Trondheim from 1523 to 1537, had tried to save a remnant of Norwegian autonomy vis-à-vis Denmark along with the ancient faith. But he had been unable to unite the forces of the country against Christian and in 1537 he fled to the Netherlands. Without popular support, the Reformation was imposed in Norway on the Danish model. The bishops were deposed, and ecclesiastical and monastic property was confiscated for the Danish crown.

Assemblies of nobles at Bergen and Oslo, powerfully reinforced by Danish vassals, approved the Danish *Ordinantia Ecclesiastica* in 1539. But out of regard for the people, who were unprepared for Lutheran doctrine, the implementation was carried out with prudence. The Catholic faith continued for decades among the rural folk. Catholic customs, such as pilgrimages and the veneration of the Mother of God and of Saint Olav, persisted far beyond the sixteenth century. An obstacle to bringing the people into a close attachment to Lutheranism was the fact that, in addition to the Danish Bible, the liturgy, hymns, and Luther's *Small Catechism* were available only in Danish, and the Norwegian language survived only as the popular dialect. However, the Lutheran Church Order of 1607 brought the Reformation to a definite conclusion.

Iceland

In Iceland too a living Catholic Church succumbed to the Danish King's desire for power. Lutheranism came there, as it came to Denmark and Sweden, through merchants and young clerics educated in Germany. At first Bishops Ogmundur Palsson of Skalholt (1521–1540) and Jon Arason of Holar (1520–1550) contrived to keep these influences out. On the accession of Christian III Iceland obtained a new governor in Klaus of Merwitz, who demanded that the bishops accept the Danish Church Order. They refused, with their clergy, and in two doctrinal letters warned the people against Luther and his errors. Meanwhile, Gissur Einarsson (1515–1548), who had returned as a Lutheran from his academic career in Germany, had dispelled the hesitations of Bishop Ogmundur and secured the blind old man's confidence. When the bishop resigned in 1540 he recommended that young Einarsson, who in the previous years had made himself indispensable, should be his successor. He was elected and at Copenhagen was confirmed by the King as superintendent. In Iceland he managed at first to keep the conservative circles in the dark as to his intentions. When the old bishop recognized his mistake, he became active, despite his feebleness, in defense of the ancient faith and found support among priests and the people. The Danes resorted to force and in 1541 dragged the old man aboard ship, on which he died shortly after putting out to sea. The Bishop of Holar in northern Iceland, Jon Arason, ecclesiastical prince, poet, statesman, and warrior all in one, was determined to defend the Catholic faith along with Iceland's freedom. He had become a bishop, even though he had four sons, of whom two were priests, and two daughters. Denounced as a rebel and heretic by the Danish King, in the summer of 1550 he proceeded, as a true descendant of Vikings, against the south of the island, captured the Protestant Bishop of Skalholt, and expelled the Danish governor and his adherents. Iceland seemed to be under his control, but on his return to the north he fell by treachery into the hands of his enemies. He was condemned to death and, since he scorned to purchase his life on terms not to be expected of a bishop, he was executed along with his two priest-sons. Now Christian III had an easy time in introducing the Reformation. This meant at the same time the despoiling of the island and the end of its freedom. No wonder that it took so long for Lutheranism to gain access to the hearts of the people. It was only in 1584 that there appeared a complete Bible in Icelandic;

this was followed by a hymnal in 1589 and a book of family devotions in 1594.

Sweden

In Sweden Gustavus Trolle, Archbishop of Uppsala, had joined the Danes against the Swedish nationalist movement. He was deposed in 1517. In 1520 Christian II of Denmark in his campaign for the subjugation of Sweden posed as the defender of the Church's freedom and protector of the Archbishop. He had the leaders of the Swedish opposition put to death in the "Stockholm Blood Bath" of November 1520. The union of the two Kingdoms was thereby gravely weakened and Archbishop Trolle was compromised. The struggle for freedom was thus directed against him and the Church that he embodied. In 1521 Gustavus Erikson Vasa (1496–1560) was elected administrator of the Kingdom at Vadstena and before long he controlled the whole country except for a few strongholds. The Danish government had to yield. With the dethronement of Christian II in Denmark Sweden was to achieve its definite independence. At Pentecost 1523 Gustavus Vasa was elected King at Strängnäs. The local archdeacon, Lars Andersson (1470–1552), became his secretary and chancellor. He guided the royal policy in the direction of the Reformation and managed to make Gustavus Vasa understand the advantages offered by a Lutheran ecclesiastical organization for the royal power and the public treasury. Religion was not a particularly profound concern of the King. What mattered to him was to secure his power by means of a state Church and to take care of the financial needs of his political organization by means of ecclesiastical property without imposing further burdens on the people and the nobility.

In Sweden the Lutheran movement had also become known through merchants who were Germans or had German connections and through theologians who had studied in the land of the Reformation. The most important among them and the real reformer of Sweden, Olav Pedersson (1493–1552), came directly from Luther's school. He had studied at Rostock and Leipzig and, from the late summer of 1516, at Wittenberg. He returned to Sweden in the fall of 1518, full of enthusiasm for Scripture as the supreme authority. He entered the service of the Bishop of Strängnäs and became deacon (1520), master of the cathedral school, and cathedral preacher. When his sermons were challenged, the King created for him in 1524 the position of city secretary and preacher at the main church in Stockholm. He labored zealously there for the Reformation until 1531. He inaugurated his series of numerous, predominantly pastoral writings with *A Useful Instruction*

(1526).[2] This first reform treatise in Sweden is a medley of separate sections with translations of passages from Luther, Bucer, and others. Olav composed hymns, translated the New Testament (1526), and in the *Swedish Chronicle* created the first great work of national history.

Hans Brask, Bishop of Linköping, was the steadfast and methodical champion of the Catholic faith. In 1521 Gustavus Vasa had solemnly promised him that he would protect all the rights and possessions of the Church. He distributed religious writings by means of his own printing press. He pressed for a translation of the New Testament and in pastoral essays came out very sharply against Lutheranism. It is not surprising that in the course of years he came into ever stronger opposition to the King. This was all the more portentous when, in 1523–24, almost all the other sees had become vacant and were now occupied by royal candidates. These were Catholic in sentiment but they had been neither confirmed by the Pope nor consecrated. In November 1523 Gustavus Vasa had applied for the papal confirmation with a demand for a dispensation from the customary fees, threatening that otherwise he would confirm, without the Pope, those elected "a solo et summo pontifice Christo" and have them consecrated. The Curia refused. The Pope confirmed only Peder Mansson (d. 1534), superior of the monastery of Saint Birgitta at Rome, as Bishop of Västeras and had him consecrated.[3] Bishop Brask saw the danger of schism and advocated the King's speedy coronation as well as the confirmation and consecration of the bishops. Gustavus Vasa was not to be hurried; in fact, he was more interested in delay. He aimed to eliminate "episcopal rule" in the country, but the royal coronation involved an oath to respect the privileges of the Church and the position of the bishops, and he wanted to evade this. Furthermore, he had less difficulty with administrators who had been merely elected and not consecrated. He feared that after consecration the bishops intended to recognize no further duties to him, "but only to the Pope at Rome."[4]

The decision as to the fate of the Swedish Church was made at the Diet of Västeras in 1527. By recourse to craft Gustavus Vasa contrived to parry the religious question—he said he did not want to introduce any new religion but only to have the pure word of God and the Gospel preached—and to push the Kingdom's difficulties into the foreground. He was chiefly concerned to strip the Church of power and to divert her wealth to the advantage of the unitary state that he was seeking to establish. The passionate appeal of Bishop Hans Brask on behalf of the freedom of the Church and the authority of the Pope produced only a passing impression. In the decree of the Diet the estates completely surrendered the Church to domination by the state. It decided which revenues should continue to accrue to the bishops for their spiritual ministry. The monasteries came under the King's supervision or were turned over to the nobles for spoliation. The external organization of the Church remained, but the King could appoint and depose priests. They had to preach the pure word of God.

---

[2] On the writings of Olav Pedersson cf. S. Ingebrand, *Olavus Petris reformatoriska Askadning* (Lund 1964), pp. 19–48 (German summary, pp. 348–351).

[3] T. van Haag, "Die apostolische Sukzession in Schweden," *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift* 44 (Uppsala 1945), 5ff.

[4] S. Kjöllerström, "Gustav Vasa und die Bischofsweihe (1523–31)," *Festschrift für Joh. Heckel,* ed. S. Grundmann (Cologne–Graz 1959), pp. 164–183.

Gustavus Vasa had achieved his goal at Västeras. Now his coronation and the consecration of the bishops could bring him only advantages and consolidate his position vis-à-vis the outside and the opposition in the country. He made known to the bishops-elect that the people no longer wanted to be without "consecrated bishops." They had to receive consecration or give up their positions. But they should be bishops "in accord with the word of the Lord, not of the Pope." Consequently they had to take an oath to preach the Gospel, to be content with the revenues necessary for their function, and to be loyal to the King. The Pope was not mentioned. The consecration was performed by the Bishop of Västeras, Peder Mansson, who had himself been consecrated in Rome. The candidates stressed their loyalty to Rome, certifying in writing that, when the opportunity presented itself, they would obtain papal confirmation.[5] A week later, on 12 January 1528 Gustavus Vasa had himself anointed and crowned King by the bishops in the Uppsala cathedral according to the old Catholic rite. But in the coronation oath there was no mention of the protection of Holy Church and of the privileges of bishops. The reformer, Olav Pedersson, preached the sermon.

In February 1529 the synod of Örebro denied to the Pope authority higher than that of bishops but was otherwise reform Catholic rather than Protestant. The break with the papacy became complete when in 1531 the brother of the reformer Olav, Lars Pedersson, who had just finished his studies at Wittenberg, was made Archbishop of Uppsala with no concurrence by Rome. In the same year appeared Olav's *Ordo Missae Sueticae,* a translation and revision of the old order of the Mass in the spirit of the reform. Among other things, the Nürnberg Mass served as its model. As chancellor of King Gustavus Vasa, Olav Pedersson exercised the greatest influence in these years 1531–33. Later he and Lars Andersson fell into royal disfavor. Gustavus Vasa sought the advice of two Germans, the theologian Georg Norman and the jurist Georg von Pyhy, to strengthen his influence over the Church. He placed it under the supervision of a superintendent and to this office he appointed Norman, his sons' tutor, in 1539. Olav Pedersson and Lars Andersson were not submissive to this political caprice; they were condemned to death but then pardoned on payment of a heavy fine. From 1543 Olav Pedersson again worked as chief pastor in Stockholm, where he died in 1552.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 180.

Gustavus Vasa's attitude on the religious question was subject to change according to the political situation in the succeeding years. On the whole the construction of the Lutheran Church proceeded quietly but methodically. The external institutions were preserved more than they were elsewhere. Of course, much time was needed to gain the people, especially the rural folk.

Of the sons of Gustavus Vasa, Erik XIV (1560–88) first succeeded to the throne. Highly gifted but extravagant and with no sense for the possible, he provoked the nobility by his attempt to continue or further perfect the absolutist regime of his father and angered the Lutheran clergy by the favor he showed to Calvinism. And yet he urgently needed support by all the forces of the Kingdom because of the seven-years' war with Denmark over Livonia. He was toppled by a rising of the nobles in 1568 and in 1577 poisoned in prison.

His brother and successor, John III (1568–92), gave the Swedish state Church its present form in the Church Order of 1571. It had been composed by Lars Pedersson in 1561 but suppressed by Erik XIV. The revised edition of 1571 was more intimately related to old Swedish tradition, introduced a richer liturgy, and gave the episcopal office more importance and prestige.[6] The episcopal constitution of the Church was completely restored.

John III was himself interested in theology. His marriage with the sister of King Sigismund II of Poland, Catherine, who remained true to her Catholic faith, his own humanist education, and an encounter with the Anglican Church and its liturgy caused him to think of mediating between the Catholic and the Protestant Churches. He was fascinated by the idea of a Church unity based on the common tradition of the patristic age. Union seemed to him to be possible if the marriage of priests, the lay chalice, and the vernacular liturgy were conceded. His "catholicizing" efforts found their expression in the new Church Order of 1575 and in the *Liturgy of the Swedish Church* of 1576, the so-called *Red Book.* Regardless of the opposition, the King held discussions with the learned Jesuit Anton Possevino (d. 1611) on reconciliation with Rome.

---

[6] E. Färnström, *Laurentius Petris handskrivna Kyrkoordning av ar 1561* (Stockholm 1956).

The forces that offered resistance to reconciliation were organized by the third son of Gustavus Vasa, Duke Charles of Södermanland. On the death of John III, Charles felt that the time was especially favorable for energetic measures against a return to Catholicism. John's son Sigismund (1592–99), who had been King of Poland since 1587, and had labored zealously there for the Catholic faith, intended to do likewise as King of Sweden. Duke Charles made use of the time before the King's assumption of the throne to confront him with a *fait accompli.* The national Synod of Uppsala in March 1593 rejected the liturgy of John III as superstitious and formally ascribed to the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530. The coronation of the new King was made contingent upon his agreeing to these decrees. Sigismund agreed. Later he was not even able to secure the free exercise of religion for his Catholic entourage. Disillusioned, he returned to Poland and committed the government to his uncle, Duke Charles. Only when the latter by his autocratic conduct had run afoul of the higher nobility in the *Riksrad* did King Sigismund try to seize power again by armed force. But Charles retained the ascendancy, took bloody vengeance on his opponents after the Diet of 1560, and in 1604 mounted the Swedish throne as Charles IX (1604–11).

In 1595 the Diet of Söderköping had decreed the expulsion of all Catholics from the country and the suppression of the last monastery, Saint Birgitta's foundation at Vadstena.

Finland

The fate of the Church in Finland was totally determined by the country's dependence on Sweden. The decrees of the Diet of Västeras in 1527 and of the Synod of Örebro in 1529 were authoritative here also. But Canon Peter Sarkilathi (d. 1529) of Abo (Turku), who had studied in Germany, had already spread Lutheran teachings. Marten Skytte, who, as a seventy-year-old man, had been made Bishop of Abo by Gustavus Vasa in 1528, was himself a Catholic, but he fostered the Reformation by sending gifted young men to study in Germany. The most important of these, Mikael Agricola (1508–57), returned to Finland with a letter of recommendation from Luther after a period of study at Wittenberg (1536–39). He became the director of the cathedral school, then coadjutor and in 1554 successor of Bishop Skytte. Agricola not only became the reformer of Finland; at the same time he laid the foundations of the Finnish written language and literature. In 1543 he published a speller, attached to a brief catechism, and the next year, a large prayerbook. His chief work was the translation of the New

Testament in 1548. In addition, he produced parts of the Old Testament (1551–52) and a liturgy modeled on the "Swedish Mass."

In the same year as Agricola (1544), Paul Juusten, who had also studied at Wittenberg (1543–46), became bishop of the newly erected see of Viborg (Viipuri). Learned and gifted in a practical and pastoral sense, he ranks as the "Melanchthon of Finland." He died in 1576 as Bishop of Abo. The efforts of John III for recatholicization found a receptive soil in Finland, but here too they were cancelled by the Uppsala Synod of 1593. Significant for the attaching of the people to the Reformation were the Finnish hymnal of 1605, an improved edition of that of 1580, a catechism in questions and answers (1618), and a two-volume book of sermons (1621).

CHAPTER 26

The Reformation in Eastern Europe

At the beginning of modern times the countries of Eastern Europe were characterized by a plurality of nationalities, social orders, and constitutional forms. The sequel was that the Reformation made its appearance relatively early and easily but, except in Prussia and Livonia, was nowhere established fully nor exclusively in its Lutheran form. The plurality of forces produced an altogether milder religious climate and a juxtaposition of several confessions in one territory. Often the authority did not impose a uniform confession, and the consequence was not only the toleration of Protestantism but its fragmentation. In addition to Lutherans and Calvinists, the Antitrinitarians—Unitarians and Socinians—and the Anabaptists and Bohemian Brethren, expelled from the lands of their origin, had a chance to develop.

Religion and nationality were closely connected. The Germans were Lutherans and remained such until the time of the Counter Reformation. Religion and nationality supported each other in an alien environment. Poles and Magyars, in so far as they did not remain Catholics, turned chiefly to Calvinism.

For the smaller nations and national groups the reform movement meant a cultural event to a far greater degree than elsewhere. The exertions in regard to Scripture and to a vernacular liturgy and preaching led to translations of the Bible and the publishing of hymnals, catechisms, collections of sermons, and a devotional literature. In this way dialects often became literary languages, and literary monuments arose which supplied both expression and support to the national consciousness.

The German population in the cities and the nobility and great proprietors in the country played an important role in the introduction of the Reformation. Because of their endeavors to secure and expand their jurisdiction vis-à-vis the King and the episcopal tribunals they were all open to a confession not held by the monarchy or the authority. As a result, frequently only a small upper stratum was affected by the reform movement, and a later recatholicization made easy progress.

The Duchy of Prussia

By the Second Peace of Torun in 1466 the western part of the lands of the Teutonic Order—Pomerellen and Kulmerland—together with the bishopric of Ermland was incorporated into Poland. East Prussia with Königsberg was left to the grand master of the Teutonic Knights, who, however, had to take an oath of personal fealty to the Polish King. When Albrecht of Brandenburg-Ansbach (1490–1568) was elected grand master of the order in 1511, he, like his predecessor, tried to evade the taking of the oath and to recover the West Prussian territories of the order. The sequel was war with Poland in January 1520. In the truce of Torun the solution of the controverted question was referred to a commission of arbitration. In the matter of the reform of the order and of the administration of its territory, Albrecht's adviser, Dietrich von Schönberg, as early as 1521 wanted to submit the order's rules to Luther for revision. But this was not done until June 1523, after Albrecht had meanwhile been gained for the reform movement by Osiander's preaching at Nürnberg in 1522 (*WA, Br* 3, 86f.). On 28 March 1523 Luther had already published *An die Herren Deutschen Ordens, dass sie falsche Keuschheit meiden.*[1] In the autumn of the same year Albrecht summoned two Lutheran preachers, Doctor Johannes Briesmann[2] and Johannes Amandus, to Königsberg and at the end of November he met Luther at Wittenberg. Luther advised him to abandon the rules of the order, to marry, and to transform the order's territory into a secular principality (*WA, Br* 3, 315, 22–25). In December Luther replied to Albrecht's questions: whether Christ had founded his Church on Peter and on the Popes as Peter's successors, whether the Pope had the power, with or without a council, to issue a law over and above the commandments of God, a law whose observance would be important for salvation, and whether Pope and councils could change God's commandments (*WA, Br* 3, 207–219). Through Briesmann, who had already anonymously published theses on justification in September–October 1523,[3] the Bishop of Samland, Georg von Polentz (1478–1550), was won for the reform movement. He delivered a Lutheran sermon in the cathedral at Königsberg on Christmas 1523.[4] Polentz appealed to his episcopal office and intended, as "shepherd and watchman instituted by God" to lead his congregation to the "true and pure word of God" and to confidence in Jesus Christ. He wanted henceforth to use the German tongue in baptism. In an effort to obstruct the progress of the Reformation in his diocese, the new bishop of the neighboring see of Ermland, Mauritius Ferber, issued an edict against the Lutheran heresy on 20 January 1524. Polentz thereupon decreed the introduction of the vernacular in the administration of baptism in a reform mandate for his diocese, issued on 28 January, and recommended the reading of the following works of Luther: the translation of the New Testament, *Von der Freiheit des Christenmenschen, Von guten Werken,* the *Kirchenpostille,* the exegesis of the "Magnificat," and of the psalms. Instructive of his understanding of Reformation is the fact that he does not mention Luther's polemics.[5]

---

[1] *WA* 12, 232–244; cf. *WA, Br* 3, 195.

[2] Cf. R. Stupperich, "Johann Briesmanns reformatorische Anfänge," *Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte* 34 (1937), 3–21.

Luther's German brochure on baptism was printed at Königsberg in 1524 as an aid for pastors and in Lent an explication of the "Our Father" was introduced.[6] In the "Salve Regina" "advocate" and "King Jesus" replaced "Mary."[7] At the same time appeared *Ein Sermon von dreyerley heylsamer Beycht* by Briesmann,[8] in which he maintained that auricular confession to a priest was not commanded by God; also an Easter sermon by Bishop Polentz,[9] containing an exhortation to communion under both species. In the two principal churches of Königsberg the images of the saints were removed during Lent, and on Easter Monday and Tuesday Johannes Amandus urged the people in sermons to plunder and destroy the Franciscan monastery. The resistance of citizens with Catholic sympathies to the innovations was officially and forcibly suppressed by Polentz, who at this time was still in charge of government business for Albrecht.[10] In order to push the further spread of the Reformation, Polentz sent Lutheran preachers into the cities and village parishes of the territory confided to him and then carried out their installation by recourse to his office as regent even when the people of a city were unanimously opposed to the measure.[11]

---

[3] *Flosculi de homine interiore et exteriore, fide et operibus,* ed. by P. Tschackert (Gotha 1887). Canon Tidemann Giese, of the neighboring see of Ermland, composed a reply, the *Antilogikon,* "drawn up in a noble spirit" (P. Tschackert, *Urkundenbuch* I, 69), but it was not printed until 1525. Cf. U. Horst, "Reformation und Rechtfertigungslehre in der Sicht Tidemann Gieses," *Zeitschrift fur die Geschichts-und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 89 (1960), 38–62.

[4] Cf. P. Tschackert, *Urkundenbuch* (hereinafter *UB*) I, 70–74; 41, no. 154.

[5] *WA* 15, 148, 27–35. Luther, who in 1524 published both episcopal edicts with notes, missed in them only Melanchthon's *Loci.*

[6] Tschackert, *UB* II, no. 184.

[7] Ibid., no. 189; here is found also the prayer, "Christe qui lux es," in German.

[8] Ibid., no. 188; cf. ibid., I, 77f. Cf. also Briesmann's *Etliche Trostsprüche für die Furchtsamen und Herzfeigen,* which appeared at Königsberg in October 1524; it is printed in R. Stupperich, *Reformatorische Verkündigung und Lebensordnung* (Bremen 1963), pp. 121–148.

[9] *UB* II, no. 202; cf. ibid., 79–81.

Meanwhile, Paul Speratus (1484–1551) was summoned to Königsberg as court-preacher; he arrived around the end of July 1524. There soon arose a dispute between Amandus and Speratus over the value of the episcopal office. Whereas Amandus could see no difference between the episcopal and the preaching offices, Speratus insisted: "We are preachers, not bishops. . . . One only is our Bishop in Christ," namely Polentz. "The power to impart the episcopal function belongs to the Church, not to the people and the local authority."[12] Amandus was banished from Königsberg in the autumn of 1524. Around the end of the year poor laws were decreed in the cities of Königsberg-Kneiphof and Königsberg-Altstadt.[13] At the same time Erhard von Queis, postulated as Bishop of Pomesania by the cathedral chapter of Marienwerder but never confirmed by the Pope, published a reform program entitled *Themata episcopi Riesenburgensis.*[14] In twenty-two points Queis demanded, among other things, the abolition of pilgrimages (point 4), processions (5), Masses for the dead (6 and 8), sacramentals (7), religious orders (9), daily Mass (19), and the reduction of the seven Sacraments to two, the Lord's Supper and baptism (1). Accordingly, "bishops should be and remain not chrism-bishops and not ordination-bishops; but they should preach and teach and explain God's pure word and govern the Church" (10).

Meanwhile, Albrecht had decided to follow Luther's advice and transform the territory of the Teutonic Order into a secular duchy. On 9 April 1525, one day before the armistice agreed to in 1521 expired, he signed the Peace of Cracow, which provided for the suppression of the Teutonic Order in Prussia and the enfeoffment of Albrecht with the order's Prussian lands as an hereditary secular duchy. On 10 April Albrecht solemnly took the oath of fealty to the Polish King. In August Bishop Polentz relinquished all secular authority in his bishopric to Albrecht, because "it would not be proper for him, as a prelate and bishop, who is obliged to preach and proclaim the word of God, to rule lands and people, to garrison castles, countryside, and cities, but rather to cling to the true and pure word and to carry it out."[15] "But Polentz remained officially what he was—Bishop of Samland—with all the ecclesiastical rights that he had exercised up to now; he retained the right of ordaining the clergy,[16] the right of visitation of all churches in his territory, and jurisdiction over matrimonial cases, just as he had done as Bishop."[17] Erhard of Queis surrendered his secular authority to Albrecht in October 1527. In the summer of 1525 Polentz, Briesmann, and most religious and priests in Prussia married. In the fall, while Duke Albrecht was absent, there were disturbances among the peasants. After they had been forcibly suppressed, Albrecht, who had earlier admitted Briesmann and Johannes Poliander, newly arrived from Wittenberg, into his cabinet as ducal councilors, summoned a Diet for December 1525. At this a territorial ordinance[18] and a Church Order issued by Polentz and Queis were adopted.[19] The annual visitation provided in the latter was first carried out in the spring of 1526.[20] Thereby the Reformation was firmly consolidated in the Duchy of Prussia.

---

[10] Cf. the penal mandate of 15 August 1524 (*UB* II, no. 249).

[11] Cf. *UB* II, no. 224.

[12] Ibid., no. 247. Cf. also Luther's dedicatory preface to the exegesis of Deuteronomy (1525): "Georgio a Polentis vere Episcopo Sambiensis Ecclesiae" (*WA* 14, 497).

[13] *Ordnung eines gemeinen kastens der aldenstadt Königsberg,* Sehling, IV, 143f.; cf. *UB* II, nos. 290f.

[14] Sehling, IV, 29f.

Livonia

The Baltic territories of Kurland, Livonia, and Estonia were under their own master of the Teutonic Order, who was then Wolter von Plettenberg (1499–1535). But he shared the government with the bishops and allowed the cities extensive autonomy. Early on the Reformation got a foothold at Riga, Reval, and Dorpat. Andreas Kopken (b. c. 1468) preached at Riga in the spirit of the Reformation from the late summer of 1521. Having previously been an assistant to Johannes Bugenhagen at Treptow in Pomerania, he went to him a second time in 1519, was gained for the Reformation, and in 1521 returned to Riga. In 1522, without regard for the cathedral chapter's right of provision, the city council appointed him and Master Sylvester Tegetmeyer of Rostock as preachers in the city churches.

---

[15] *UB* II, no. 356.

[16] Cf. the formula of ordination of 1543 (Sehling, IV, 61).

[17] *UB* I, 113. Later the episcopal constitution of the Church was "abolished only because an independent bishop was inconvenient to the government and cost too much money" (ibid.).

[18] Cf. *UB* II, no. 417; text in Sehling, IV, 38–41.

[19] Sehling, IV, 30–38.

[20] Cf. the visitation instruction of 31 March 1526 issued by the territorial prince and the bishop (Sehling, IV, 41f.).

There is evidence for Lutheran preaching also at Reval, Narva, and Dorpat by 1524 at the latest. In the winter of 1524–25 there were riots directed against the churches and monasteries. The city authorities used these as an opportunity for reorganizing the Church and disposing of much Church property, and not merely, as has been alleged, for the care of the poor and the preachers.

In the summer of 1524 Riga renounced its oath of homage to the archbishop, Johannes Blankenfeld, who energetically championed the old faith, and offered to the master of the Teutonic Order, Wolter von Plettenberg, the suzerainty of the city, to be exercised alone instead of with the archbishop. Otherwise, the city would look for another lord. This was an allusion to Albrecht of Prussia, whose secularizing notions were well known. Thus the master was in a difficult position. On the one hand, he did not want to infringe on the archbishop's rights; on the other, he had to allow Albrecht no pretext for interfering. But when the archbishop, in an effort to maintain himself, allied with the Grand Prince of Moscow, Wolter von Plettenberg had a reason for arresting him for treason and assuming the undivided suzerainty. He definitely rejected the demand to secularize Livonia as Prussia had been secularized, but in September 1525 he was willing to concede to the city of Riga the right of free Lutheran preaching in order to evade the danger of Albrecht of Prussia's intervention. He proved that this was only a concession due to political considerations by his energetic efforts on behalf of the Catholic faith within the order and in its territory. The same end was fostered by the speedy restoration of the archbishop, who subjected himself to him but soon died (1527).

In 1527 the city of Riga summoned the Königsberg reformer, Johannes Briesmann, to become cathedral preacher and also gave him a post corresponding to that of superintendent. He stayed until 1531, elaborating a Lutheran Church Order with Andreas Kopken in 1529. This *Kurtz Ordnung des Kirchendienst,*[21] printed in 1530, contained a liturgy in High German and a hymnal in Low German and was made obligatory by Riga, Reval, and Dorpat in 1533. The efforts of Albrecht of Prussia to make Livonia a secular duchy by means of his brother Wilhelm, who became coadjutor in 1530 and Archbishop of Riga in 1539, and to eliminate the Teutonic Order foundered on the resistance of the order and of its victorious master, Wilhelm of Fürstenberg. But when in 1558 the order, without allies, faced an invasion by the Russians and succumbed to their superiority, Livonia broke up. The last master of the order, Gotthard Kettler, received Kurland and Semgallen from Poland as a secular vassal duchy and led it to the Reformation. Ösel fell to Denmark, Estonia to Sweden, while the rest of the order's territory, with the archbishopric of Riga, came under Polish rule in 1561. But King Sigismund II Augustus granted the German cities extensive autonomy and assured them the free exercise of religion according to the *Confessio Augustana.*

---

[21] Sehling, V, 11–17.

Poland

Pre-Reformation currents, the ideas of conciliarism, the impact of Hussitism, and the spirit of humanism also prepared the soil for the Reformation in Poland.

The influence of the royal court, above all that of the Renaissance Queen, Bona Sforza, was harmful to the Catholic Church, especially in the matter of nominations to bishoprics. For example, it was possible for Jan Latalski, called "Bacchus" by the people because of his addiction to strong drink, to purchase the see of Poznan in 1523 for twelve thousand florins. In this country of a predominantly agricultural economy and an aristocratic society the nobility played a great role. Its struggle against episcopal jurisdiction and for extensive autonomy favored the spread of Protestantism.

The reform movement was introduced and propagated by students who had studied abroad, by merchants' sons who were sent to Nürnberg, Augsburg, or Leipzig for training, and by Luther's writings. The humanist Andrzej Modrezewski (1503–72), who had himself studied at Wittenberg in 1531–32 and from 1547 was secretary of the royal chancery, reported: "Luther's books were brought to us from Germany and were sold openly at the University of Cracow. They were hailed and approved by many . . . and even our theologians took no offense."[22] As early as 1520 King Sigismund I (1506–48) saw himself compelled to issue an edict, which was made more strict in 1523, against the introduction of Luther's writings. In 1534 and 1540 attendance at heretical universities was forbidden, but the effect of this decree was not too great.

Luther's treatise on the Ten Commandments had already been printed at Danzig in 1520. Jakob Hegge, Doctor Alexander Svenichen, and Matthias Binewald preached there in the spirit of the Reformation. As almost everywhere else, enthusiasm for the new teaching was connected with social demands, such as that for a reduction of taxes and for a public statement of the household accounts. In 1524 an attack on monasteries and rioting occurred. The old city council had to yield. In January 1525 five preachers of the new doctrine were appointed and in the *Articles of the Community* of 23 January poor laws that had been demanded were provided.[23] In May 1525 Luther sent Michael Meurer of Heinichen to Danzig. Meanwhile, the overthrown mayor, Eberhard Ferber, appealed for help to King Sigismund I. After the Diet, which had been summoned to Piotrkov, and the provincial Diet, convoked at Marienburg for Polish Prussia, had promised the King support, he restored the old order at Danzig, thus stopping for the moment the progress of the Reformation.

---

[22] R. Stupperich, "Der Protestantismus auf seinen Wegen nach Osteuropa," *Kirche im Osten* 1 (1958), 28.

Under Sigismund I there were as yet no reform congregations established, but the Reformation gained many adherents among the nobility. The humanist Christoph Hegendörfer was active at the Poznan Academy from 1529 until his banishment in October 1535. In 1530 Andrzej Gorka, castellan of Poznan, had Lutheran services celebrated in his castle.

Before the middle of the sixteenth century Cracow and Königsberg were the most important centers for the spread of the Reformation. At Cracow from 1542 a group of scholars, nobles, and priests met regularly under the direction of the Franciscan Francesco Lismanini, confessor of the Queen and later a Calvinist, to acquaint themselves with the reform movement outside Poland. A Polish translation of Luther's small catechism was printed at Königsberg as early as 1530. The Church Order of the Duchy of Prussia of 1544 appeared not only in German and Latin but also in Polish.[24] Andrzej Samuel and Jan Seklucian (1500–70) fled from Poznan to East Prussia in 1543. Seklucian composed revisions of the catechism in Polish in 1545 and 1547 and published a Polish hymnal at Königsberg in 1547. In 1552 he also published a New Testament at Königsberg,[25] and in 1556 a Polish prayerbook,[26] a free rendering of that of Melanchthon and Spangenberg. Also active at Königsberg[27] were, among others, Stanislaus Murzynowski (1528–1553) and Jan

---

[23] Text in Sehling, IV, 175f.

[24] Text, ibid., 61–72.

[25] In 1561 there appeared at Cracow a Catholic translation of the entire Bible into Polish. The Calvinist "Brest Bible" dates from 1563.

[26] Nicholaus Rej (1505–69) composed the most popular Protestant prayerbook in Polish in 1558; cf. K. Gorski, "Biblia i sprawy biblijne w Postylii Reja," *Reformacja w Polsce* 12 (1956), 62–125; K. Krejci, *Geschichte der polnischen Literatur,* pp. 52–58.

[27] Cf, B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen* (Münster 1960), p. 46; K. Volker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin–Leipzig 1930), pp. 179f.

Maletius (d. 1567)—the latter published a catechism[28] in 1546—and the Lithuanians[29] Abraham Culvensis,[30] Stanislaus Rapagelan,[31] and Martin Mosvidius.[32] The University of Königsberg, founded in 1544, contributed significantly to the spread of the Reformation.

Protestantism reached its greatest development in Poland under King Sigismund II Augustus (1548–1572). In 1562–63 some six hundred out of thirty-six hundred parishes were in Protestant hands. In 1569 the Senate counted fifty-eight Protestant members as opposed to fifty-five Catholics, but the latter figure does not include the fifteen bishops. From 1552 to 1565 only Protestants were elected as marshals of the Diet.

The Protestants had great hopes in the King, who corresponded with Melanchthon and Calvin. Calvin dedicated his commentary on Hebrews to him in 1549.[33] Prince Mikolaj Radziwill of Lithuania, a zealous champion of Protestantism, was on friendly terms with the King and as grand chancellor occupied an influential position. But on 12 December 1550 Sigismund II publicly professed the Catholic faith, while at the same time continuing to tolerate the advance of Protestantism.

At Pinczow the local lord, Mikolaj Olesnicki, expelled the Minims, destroyed the images and relics in the parish church, and had Lutheran services celebrated. Similar occurrences took place at Niedzwiedz, Dubiecko, and elsewhere. Sigismund approved the acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* by the *Landtag* Diet of Polish Prussia in 1559. He likewise assured Livonia, when it came under Polish rule in 1561, the recognition of the *Confessio Augustana.* The Warsaw Confederation of 28 January 1573 guaranteed freedom of religion to every noble.[34]

Despite these successes the impact of Protestantism was weakened by its fragmentation among Lutherans, Calvinists, Bohemian Brethren, and Antitrinitarians. Lutheranism was represented chiefly by the German middle class. About half the congregations in Greater Poland joined in a synodal union. Erazm Gliczner worked as superintendent from 1565. The main body of the Bohemian "Fraternal Unity" consisted of brethren who emigrated to Poznan after the Schmalkaldic War.[35] They found a great response both among the nobility—Jakub Ostroróg, Andrzej and Raphael of Lissa—and among the common people. Their centers were Poznan, Kozminek, and Lissa.

---

[28] *UB* II, no. 1872.

[29] Cf. S. Kot, "La Reforme dans le Grand-Duche de Lethanie," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slave* 12 (Brussels 1953), 201–261.

[30] T. Wotschke, "Abraham Culvensis," *Altpreussische Monatsschrift* 42 (1905), 153–252.

[31] First professor of theology at the University of Königsberg (WS1544–45; lectures on the psalms; disputation theses, *WA* 39, II, 258–283), he died in May 1545. He was the author of the first hymn in Lithuanian (*UB* I, 289, footnote 1).

[32] Holder of a scholarship at the university and author of the first catechism in Lithuanian (*UB* II, no. 2064).

[33] Cf, *CR* 91, 281–286 (no. 1195).

[34] Text in G. Rhode, *Die Reformation in Osteuropa,* p. 489, footnote 21.

Calvinism made great strides after 1550. Its main centers were Lesser Poland (Cracow) and Lithuania; its adherents came chiefly from the Polish population and the nobility. Jan Laski (1499–1560), a highly educated aristocrat, was its most important figure. After his travels had led him throughout the West, he returned to his Polish homeland in 1556 to act as reformer in Calvin's spirit. Prince Mikolaj Radziwill used his own great influence for Calvinism. Wherever he could, he established a Calvinist worship. He brought about a translation of the entire Bible and founded a press specifically for the printing of this "Brest Bible" (1563). Even the center of the Protestantizing Cracow circle of humanists, Francesco Lismanini, devoted himself to the Calvinist confession after a visit to Geneva at the beginning of the 1550s. With Jan Laski he worked to unite all the Protestants in Poland and to create a strict ecclesiastical system on the Geneva model. But they were unable to overcome the fragmentation and, after Laski's death, Lismanini himself went over to the sect of the Antitrinitarians.[36]

In 1565, under the leadership of the Cracow pastor, Gregor Pauli (Pawel), the Antitrinitarians separated from the Calvinist Church as the "Ecclesia minor." They had taken over the rejection of the dogma of the Trinity from Italian refugees for their faith, such as Giorgio Biandrata and Valentino Gentile. Faustus Sozzini (c. 1537–1604) became their leading theologian. They were later called Socinians after him, though he himself did not join their community. After 1600 Rakow became their intellectual and organizational center, and in that city in 1605 appeared the *Rakow Catechism,* based on preliminary studies by Sozzini.

At Kozminek in 1555 a union of the Calvinists of Lesser Poland and the Bohemian Brethren of Greater Poland was formed. The *Consensus* of Sandomir in 1570 led to a fraternal union which included the Lutherans.[37] But it broke up again in 1645. In addition to the fragmentation and the lack of educational institutions, the weakness of Polish Protestantism lay especially in its failure to win the broad masses of the people. It remained the affair of a thin upper stratum and of the nobility.

---

[35] Whereas the old Utraquists again sought the communion of the Roman Catholic Church, the new Utraquists and the Bohemian Brethren followed the Reformation. In 1538 Luther published the 1535 confession of the Brethren (cf. *WA* 50, 374–380). Of importance for the new Czech literary tongue was the Kralitz Bible (1579–93), Cf. B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation,* pp. 46–48; E. Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz,* pp. 129–140.

[36] Cf. Stasiewski, *op. cit.,* pp. 52–59; *RGG* VI, 207–210; *LThK* IX (2d ed.), 928–931; P. Wrzecionko, "Die Theologie des Rakower Katechismus." *Kirche im Osten* 6 (1963), 73–116; id. "Humanismus und Aufklärung im Denken der polnischen Brüder," ibid., 9 (1966), 83–100.

[37] Test in Sehling, IV, 257–259.

> The broad masses of the rural population were virtually untouched by the religious forces of the Reformation. They took part in the worship as modified in accord with the orders of the manorial lord . . . , but nevertheless had no inner sympathy for it.[38]

Hungary

At the close of the Middle Ages Hungary was engaged in a close cultural interchange with its western neighbors.[39] And so Luther's writings were circulated in Hungary too, especially among the German population. At the royal court in Buda the Reformation found a promoter in the Margrave Georg of Brandenburg-Ansbach-Kulmbach (1484–1543). He had lived there with his royal uncle since 1506 and in 1516 became tutor of the still underage King Louis II (1516–1526) and a member of the government. He represented German interests[40] in opposition to the Magyar faction under John Zapolya.

The young Queen, Mary of Habsburg, sister of Charles V, read Luther's writings enthusiastically[41] and maintained close contact with the humanists, Simon Grynaeus (1493–1541), then rector of the University of Buda and later (1529) successor of Erasmus at Basel, and Vitus of Windsheim. Conrad Cordatus (1476–1546) labored for the Reformation as court preacher in 1521–22; he later planned the first collection of Luther's *Table Talk.*[42] Johannes Henckel, his successor, served the same cause.[43] And Paul Speratus, who had to give up his post of cathedral preacher at Würzburg in 1520 after his marriage, also received a call to Buda.

As early as 1521 the Archbishop of Esztergom was moved to have the bull excommunicating Luther read in the churches of the kingdom. The

---

[38] K. Volker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens,* p. 159.

[39] The sermons of the Hungarian Franciscan Ladislas Pelbartus of Temesvar (d. 1504) were printed in Nürnberg, Lyons, Hagenau, Basel, and Strasbourg. Of these, the series "De Sanctis" alone went through ten editions at Hagenau in 1499–1516. The well-known collection of sermons, *Biga salutis,* was published by a Hungarian Franciscan, Oswald of Lasko (d. 1531), and printed at Hagenau.

[40] Cf. L. Neustadt, *Markgraf Georg als Erzieher am ungarischen Hofe* (Breslau 1883).

[41] In 1526 Luther dedicated to her the exegesis of the four psalms of consolation; cf. *WA* 19, 542–615; *WA, Br* 4, 126.

[42] Cf. *WA, Tr* 2, XXIFF.; *WA, Br* 4, 139, footnote 1.

[43] Cf. A. Hudak, "Der Hofprediger Johannes Henckel und seine Beziehungen zu Erasmus von Rotterdam," *Kirche im Osten,* 2 (1959), 106–113.

Diet of Buda in 1523 decided to apply the paragraph on heretics to the Lutherans also. An edict of 1525 threatened them with burning at the stake. The higher nobility urged the removal of the Lutheran court preacher. Conrad Cordatus was imprisoned, but in 1524 he was able to escape to Wittenberg, to which Grynaeus had earlier betaken himself.

Decisive importance attaches to the battle of Mohács, where on 29 August 1526, in addition to King Louis II, two archbishops and five bishops fell in the struggle against the Turks. Following the Turkish victory Hungary was divided into three parts: the "Kingdom of Hungary," comprising the northern and western parts, came under Habsburg rule; the Turkish province, which included the Pusta, the low plain in the area of the Danube and the Theiss; and the "Principality of Transylvania," where Zapolya (1526–40) maintained himself as vassal of the Sultan and which, after his death, fell, despite the Peace of Grosswardein (1538), not to King Ferdinand but to Zapolya II.

The ecclesiastical property in the widowed bishoprics was seized by the higher nobility, while Ferdinand let part of it be expropriated by his generals, most of whom were inclined to Lutheranism, in payment of his war debts. The rivalry between Ferdinand and John Zapolya prevented any proceedings against the nobles and the Lutherans, since neither wanted to lose adherents, and Ferdinand in particular was dependent on the German faction, which was for the most part friendly to Luther.

The sequel was that in the following years both Ferdinand and Zapolya each named a bishop for the same see, so that some of them, for example Csanad, Weissenburg, Eger, and Grosswardein, at times had two claimants. There was no nomination by the Curia until 1539.

The school of Bartfeld acquired a special importance for the further spread of the Reformation in the German part of the population. Leonhard Stöckel (1510–60) took charge of this in 1539. He had studied at Kaschau, Breslau, and from 1530 Wittenberg and in 1536–37 he directed the school at Eisleben. The majority of the future statesmen of Hungary went through the humanist-oriented school of Bartfeld,[44] from which proceeded nearby schools and printeries. The five royal Free Cities of Bartfeld, Eperies, Kaschau, Klein-Zeben, and Leutschau joined the Reformation in 1549 by adopting the *Confessio Pentapolitana* composed by Stöckel. This confession, stamped with a humanist spirit and recognized even by Ferdinand because of its dogmatic moderation, became the basis of the confession of the seven hill towns of Lower

---

[44] Cf. the *Leges scolae Barthphensis* (1540), composed by Stöckel. Other important works by Stöckel are: *Catechesis pro iuventute Barthphensi* (1556), *Apologia ecclesiae Barthphensis* (1558); *Historia von Susanna in Historien Tragoedien Weise gestellet* . . . (1559), a commentary on Melanchthon's Loci (1561), and volumes of sermons.

Hungary as well as of the fraternity of the twenty-four towns in the Zips.

Johannes Honter (1498–1549), who had studied at Vienna, is regarded as the reformer of the Germans in Transylvania. When after 1529 the Transylvanian cities passed to Zapolya, Honter, as a partisan of Ferdinand, had to flee from his native Kronstadt. Following a stay at Cracow and Basel, he was called back home in 1533 and there he conducted a private school and established the first printery in the country. The prefaces to two works of Augustine[45] that he printed in 1539 were early testimonies to his reform outlook. After his friend Johannes Fuchs had assumed the government of Kronstadt in 1541 and even the clergy had been gained for the Reformation, Valentin Wagner was sent to Wittenberg to establish closer relations with Melanchthon. The liturgy was reformed at Kronstadt in the autumn of 1542. The approval by the city of the Reformation brochure[46] that Honter published in 1543 meant the introduction of the Reformation. To defend it, Honter wrote an Apologia for the Diet at Weissenburg.[47] He was intrigued by the idea of a Reformation within the Catholic Church. This found expression in the fact that as late as 1543 he recognized the Archbishop of Esztergom and the Bishop of Weissenburg. The word of God, he held, had to be the supreme guideline of every reform. Hence the Mass as a sacrifice should be abolished and the Eucharist under both species introduced. On this point Honter appealed to discussions at Regensburg in 1541 for a compromise. Rebaptism was rejected on the basis of the *Decretum Gratiani.* In the doctrine of justification Honter, following Melanchthon and Major, stressed the necessity of good works against the perils of a justification by faith alone.

The example of Kronstadt was soon followed by Hermannstadt, where the city pastor, Matthias Ramser, himself introduced the Reformation, and by Mediasch, Schässburg, and Bistriz.

> In this context there everywhere appeared the effort to remain externally still in the unity of the old Church. At first the Reformation affected merely the form of the liturgy, not the Church organization.[48]

---

[45] Printed in O. Netoliczka, *Johannes Honterus' ausgewählte Schriften,* pp. 3–10; cf. Melanchthon's preface to the edition of the Reformation brochure, published by him in 1543, in *CR,* 5, 172–174.

[46] Netoliczka, op. cit., pp. 11–28.

[47] Ibid., pp. 29–46.

[48] K. Reinerth, *Die Reformation der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Kirche* (Gütersloh 1956), p. 43.

The *Reformatio ecclesiarum Saxonicarum in Transsylvania,*[49] a Church Order based on Honter's Reformation brochure and valid for the entire Saxon area of settlement, appeared in 1547; it was commissioned by the *Universitas Saxorum,* the political organ of the Saxon element in the population. Its aim was to maintain order against fanatics. The power of the keys and excommunication were again more closely linked with the spiritual function. James 2:17 was cited as the chief proof in the doctrine of justification. Even a censorship of books was provided. The Eucharistic teaching was oriented to Wittenberg. This Church Order was made a law in 1550, a year after Honter's death. During the vacancy of the see of Weissenburg Paul Wiener was elected bishop in 1553. His successor, Matthias Hebler (1556–71), had to defend the Lutheran character of the Church against Calvinists and Antitrinitarians. In 1557 the Diet of Torda conceded to the three confessions equality with the Catholic confession, which was itself forbidden by law in 1566.

The Magyars were won to the Reformation, partly by Germans, for example in Transylvania by Kaspar Heltai and Ferenc Dávid, who had conformed to the Magyar culture, or by a few itinerant preachers, most of whom had studied at Wittenberg. Melanchthon's pupil, Johannes Sylvester (c. 1504–1552), directed the school or Ujsziget near Sarvar at the end of the 1530s. After a printery had been opened there in 1537–38, Sylvester published a grammar of the Magyar language and in 1541 the first complete Magyar translation of the New Testament. Mátyás Devai Bíró (c. 1500–45) preached at Buda and Kaschau and on the estates of the noble families of Nadasdy, Perenyi, and Dragffy. After his studies at Vienna, Cracow, and Wittenberg—in the last of which he took his degree in 1544—Stephan Szegedi Kis (1502–72) was schoolmaster at Csanad, Gyula, Cegled Mako, and from 1548 at Temesvar.[50] After the death of Zapolya in 1540 this area was administered by Peter Petrovics, who was entrusted by the widow Queen with the guardianship of the Prince. Petrovics was a zealous promoter of the Reformation and hence the congregations of this territory could be organized as a unit in 1549–1550 and Mátyás Gönzi elected Bishop. When in 1551 Petrovics had to surrender the frontier castle of Temesvar to the Catholic-minded Losonczy, Szegedi moved into the Turkish-occupied area and became head of the school at Tolna and pastor at Lasko and Kalmancsa and, eventually, after being imprisoned by the Turks, pastor and general superintendent at Rackeve. Testimony of his theological formation and of his Calvinistic theology is provided by his works, printed in Switzerland after his death.[51]

---

[49] O. Netoliczka, op. cit., pp. 56–125.

[50] Cf. M. Skaricza, *Vita Stephani Szegedini* (introduction to Szegedi's *Theologiae sincerae loci communes*) (Basel 1585).

Mikael Sztarai (c. 1500–75) was also active for the Reformation in the Turkish-occupied territory as preacher, teacher, and author of hymns and plays. By 1551 he had founded 120 congregations. Imre Ozorai composed the first printed treatise in the Magyar tongue, a work on Christ and Antichrist (Cracow 1535). Stephan Galszecsi and Stephan Bencedi Szekely each had hymnals printed in 1536 and 1538 respectively. Two important centers of the Reformation arose through the favor of the noble family of Torok in Papa and Debrecen.

By 1560 the greatest part of the nobility and, since the manorial lord could appoint Lutheran pastors by virtue of the right of patronage, of the rural folk had been gained for the Reformation.

In the Slovene and Croatian border areas the noble families of Zrinyi, Erdeody, and especially Ungnad supported the Reformation. Johann Ungnad, Baron of Sonneck (1493–1564), the leading official in Styria, after embracing Protestantism went to Württemberg and on his estate at Urach arranged the printing of Bibles, catechisms, primers, and prayerbooks in Slovene and Croatian.[52]

The leaders in cultivating the Slovene language for the sake of the Reformation were: Primoz Trubar (1508–86), who published, among other things, a catechism and a speller in 1550 and between 1555 and 1577 the entire New Testament and writings of Melanchthon and Luther; Sebastian Krelj (1538–67), with his children's Bible of 1566 and prayerbook of 1567; Jurij Dalmatin (1547–89), who translated the Old Testament; and Adam Bohoric (c. 1520–c. 1600), who published the psalter, hymns, some school texts, and in 1584 a Slovene grammar.

Stephan Consul was occupied with translating into Croatian. It was due principally to Georg Zrinyi, who set up a printery at Nedelisce, that the Kajkavisch dialect of the northern Croats became a literary tongue. On the Catholic side there appeared at Graz in 1574 the Slovene catechism of Leonhard Pacherneker. But real literary activity only began early in the seventeenth century with the publishing of a catechism, the Gospels, a prayerbook, and a hymnal by Bishop Thomas Hren (1560–1630).

While the German portion of the population remained Lutheran, the Magyar element, especially in the 1550s and 1560s, adhered to Calvinism. The leading Calvinist theologians were Kalmancsehi, Szegedi Kis, Peter Melius, Gregor Szegedi, and Kaspar Karolyi.

---

[51] Cf. *Assertio vera de Trinitate* (1573); *Theologiae sincerae loci communes* (manual of the theology controversy, 1581); *Speculum romanorum pontificum* (history of the Popes, 1584); *Tabulae analiticae* (sermon book, 1592).

[52] E. Benz, "Hans von Ungnad und die Reformation unter den Südslawen," *Wittenberg und Byzanz* (Marburg 1949), pp. 141–246.

At the end of 1559 appeared the first written Hungarian confession, the *Eucharistic Confession of Neumarkt,* in which the Magyar part of Hungary agreed on the Calvinist view of the Last Supper. Antitrinitarianism became a great danger for Calvinism. It was chiefly represented by Stancaro (1501–74), Biandrata (1514–ca. 1590), physician of King Johann Sigismund, and Ferenc Dávid (ca. 1510–79), Calvinist bishop of Transylvania. A synod met in 1567 at Debrecen, the intellectual center of the Calvinists, for defense against the Antitrinitarian currents. It accepted, in addition to two confessions drawn up by Melius (ca. 1536–72), Bullinger's *Confessio Helvetica Posterior* and a Church Order.

On behalf of the Catholics Georg Utjesenovich, called Martinuzzi (d. 1551),[53] especially tried to stop the advance of the Reformation. He was the most intimate adviser of Zapolya, after whose death in 1540 he was entrusted with the regency of Transylvania. After his assassination by some of Ferdinand's people, altars were eliminated in Grosswardein and several Catholic priests were banished. Matthias Zabardy, from 1553 Bishop of Wardein, managed to push back Calvinism temporarily. After his death in 1557, however, monasteries were destroyed in Grosswardein and the Franciscans were expelled. Earlier, in 1556, P. Bornemisza, who had become Bishop of Weissenburg in 1554,[54] had had to flee. The estates of Transylvania prevented the filling of the see, which thus remained vacant until 1716. There were no bishops in the Turkish-occupied areas. In 1543 the Metropolitan of Esztergom transferred his residence to Tyrnau. From 1554 the Archbishop was Nikolaus Olahus (1493–1568), friend of Erasmus and former secretary of Queen Mary of Hungary. He worked for the restoration of Church property, called the Jesuits to Tyrnau in 1561, and in 1566 opened there the first seminary in the country. When he insisted on the observance of celibacy, many married priests went over to Lutheranism.

Whereas Maximilian II (1564–76) sympathized with the Reformation and in 1564 forbade the publication of the Tridentine decrees, Stephen Bathory, Prince of Transylvania from 1571, promoted the Catholic faith and fought the radical wing of the Antitrinitarians, led by Ferenc Dávid. He confided the direction of the Klausenburg Academy to the Jesuits in 1579, but they were expelled in 1595.

---

[53] Cf. K. Juhasz, "Kardinal Georg Utjesenovich (d. 1551) und das Bistum Tschanad," *HJ* (1961), pp. 252–264.

[54] *Hierarchia catholica* III (Münster 1923), 101.

It was especially through the work of the Jesuits and of Archbishop Peter Pazmany (1570–1637) of Esztergom, himself from a noble Calvinist family, that Hungary eventually became once again a predominantly Catholic land.

CHAPTER 27

Schism and Reformation in England

As in the Scandinavian countries, so in England the Reformation was introduced and carried out "from above"—under the decisive influence of the government. It began as schism under Henry VIII. Under Edward VI Protestantism forced its way into worship and doctrine. And, following the collapse of the Catholic restoration under Mary I, the Anglican Church acquired its definitive form in the reign of Elizabeth I.

Under Henry VII (1485–1509) the Church in England had notably recovered from the devastating effects of the Wars of the Roses. Without possessing a formal right of nomination, the King saw to it that his candidates, usually jurists who had proved themselves in the royal service, obtained the bishoprics in both ecclesiastical provinces: Canterbury, with twenty suffragans, and York, with three. William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury (1503–33), well known as the patron of Erasmus, was far surpassed in political influence in the reign of Henry VIII (1509–47) by the ambitious and unscrupulous Thomas Wolsey, Archbishop of York (1514–30) and Cardinal since 1515. As Lord Chancellor, Wolsey was director of domestic and foreign policy, and as Papal Legate from 1518 he also ruled the English Church in virtual independence. By suppressing the smaller monasteries he procured the means for richly endowing his Oxford foundation, Cardinal College, now called Christ Church College. He adopted strict measures to prevent the entry of Lutheranism. The morals of the parish clergy seem, so far as we can learn from pre-Reformation visitations, such as that of 1515–19 in the diocese of Lincoln, to have provided fewer occasions for censure than was the average on the continent. But the humanist permeation of Oxford under John Colet and of lay circles especially under Thomas More did not take the place of the missing theological education. Only one out of 349 books printed in England between 1468 and 1530 had a strictly theological content. Fifty-eight were liturgical, 106 were devotional manuals. English translations of the Bible had been forbidden since the suppression of Wyclifism, but Lollardy had by no means ceased as an undercurrent. Popular devotion was zealous but not really healthy—Parker terms it "fervent rather than solid piety." A certain anticlericalism found an outlet in the House of Commons, but because of the protection set up by *Praemunire* against the fee system of the Curia there could scarcely be any question of anti-Romanism. During the Western Schism England had adhered to the Roman obedience; during the conflict between Eugene IV and the Council of Basel, it had upheld the Pope. But the serious danger which the Church in England concealed within itself became visible in the second half of the reign of Henry VIII.

The Marriage Case of Henry VIII

Henry VIII's education, unusual for a prince in that period and including theology, had enabled him to come forward in the *Assertio septem sacramentorum* (1521) in refutation of Luther's *De captivitate Babylonica.* In return Leo X had honored him with the title of "Defender of the Faith." It was the unrestrained sensuality of the crafty and brutal monarch that occasioned his break with the papacy. Appealing to Leviticus 18:16 and 20:21, he claimed that his marriage with Catherine of Aragon was invalid because she had previously been married to his older brother Arthur, who had died at the age of fourteen. He said that the dispensation granted by Julius II on 26 December 1503 violated the divine law; that a brief of dispensation of the same date, which was drawn up more clearly in several points, had been falsified;[1] and, finally, that before contracting marriage with Catherine he had declared that the marriage was against his will. Despite this, he had consummated the marriage and had had seven children by Catherine, but only Mary, the future queen, survived. Conscientious scruples in regard to the validity of his marriage did not actually occur to the King until Anne Boleyn, a maid-of-honor with whom he was in love, declined to belong to him except as his wife.[2] Catherine denied the consummation of her first marriage with Arthur and the nullity of her second marriage with Henry. At first probably in ignorance of the King's ultimate intentions, Wolsey was prepared to seek from the Pope a declaration of nullity of Henry's marriage by a court of special competence for this case. Edward Fox and Stephen Gardiner, sent by him as emissaries to Orvieto, where

---

[1] Ehses makes it credible that it was intended for the Court of Aragon, to satisfy its demands in regard to Catherine's interests, and was first produced by her nephew, Charles V, in 1528.

[2] The existence of conscientious scruples of this sort in Henry is denied by many authors but is not excluded by Thieme (see footnote 4) and others. One motive was certainly the desire for a male heir to the throne.

Clement VII was staying since the *Sacco di Roma,* succeeded in having Wolsey and the highly esteemed jurist Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, who had already lived in England as legate in 1518–19, authorized on 8 June 1528 to conduct the canonical trial in England. The Pope promised to confirm their judgment and granted in advance a dispensation for a new marriage in the event that the declaration of nullity should materialize.

But the process, conducted in London, did not result in the judgment desired by the King. At its very opening on 18 June 1529, Catherine appealed to the Pope. The Bishops of Rochester and Saint Asaph upheld the validity of the marriage, but Campeggio observed in regard to the prejudiced conduct of the case: "In another's house one cannot do all that one would like."[3] Hence the Pope, who had meanwhile been set free again by the conclusion of the Peace of Barcelona and who had come under pressure from Catherine's nephew, Charles V, transferred the case to Rome on 19 July 1529. Wolsey had promised too much and had played a double game. He fell from power and died on 29 November 1530, en route to London to be tried for high treason.

In order to influence the Roman proceedings according to his wishes, Henry VIII, upon the advice of Thomas Cranmer, the next Archbishop of Canterbury, gathered legal opinions from universities and individual professors of law, for which he paid handsomely. Favoring the nullity of the King's marriage with Catherine, in addition to the English universities Oxford and Cambridge, were also those of Paris, over the protest of forty-three doctors, Orléans, Angers, Bourges, Toulouse, Bologna, Siena, Padua, Pavia, and others. The opposite opinion was held by those of Louvain, Naples, Salamanca, Alcalá, Granada, and others. At Salamanca Francis de Vitoria in his *Relectio de matrimonio* dealt with the "Causa Regis Angliae." At Wittenberg, where the King urged his case through his emissary Robert Barnes, Luther also spoke out for the validity of the marriage.[4]

The Act of Supremacy

While Clement VII was postponing his decision, Henry VIII was arranging another sort of solution—one without the Pope. On 11 February 1531 the Convocation of the Clergy, under strong royal pressure, voted to hand over 100,000 pounds to the king as "Protector and Supreme Head of the English Church and Clergy," but with the addition, at the suggestion of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, of "in quantum per Christi legem licet." All the bishops and likewise Thomas More, who was then still Lord Chancellor, assented to the ambiguous formula. It was the first step toward apostasy. Parliament forbade any appeal to Rome. On 23 May 1533 the complaisant Archbishop of Canterbury declared Henry's marriage with Catherine null; this was a belated and shabby justification of Henry's marriage to Anne Boleyn, which had already taken place secretly in January.

---

[3] Ehses, *Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII.,* p. 119.

[4] H. Thieme, *Die Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. und die europäischen Universitäten* (Karlsruhe 1957).

It was only now that Clement VII intervened. In the consistory of 11 July 1533, he announced that the King would incur excommunication if he did not dismiss Anne by the end of September and take back Catherine as his lawful wife. The decision issued in the canonical trial on 23 May 1534 confirmed the validity of Henry's marriage with Catherine.[5] It upheld the sanctity and indissolubility of marriage. But it can hardly be questioned that the Pope's original effort to be accommodating, determined by political considerations, aroused in Henry hopes impossible to realize, and that the long delay of the final decision made it easier for the King to prepare for the schism.

Already in June 1533 an antipapal pamphlet, *The Glasse of the Truthe,* composed by order of the King, had conditioned public opinion for the coming measures. In the *Articles,* circulated at the end of the year, "the Bishop of Rome, whom some call pope," was branded as "usurper of God's law and infringer of general councils," and, in addition, an enemy of England. In the spring of 1534 Parliament passed five laws which made ready the break with Rome. These laws gave to the King the nomination of bishops; forbade the obtaining of dispensations at Rome and the paying of fees there and subjected all exempt monasteries to the King; made the clergy subject to the civil laws; required the acceptance under oath of the royal succession of the children born of the marriage of Henry with Anne Boleyn (first Succession Act); and, in the Heresy Act, declared that no statement against the primacy of the Bishop of Rome was to be regarded as heresy.

In sermons and pamphlets the content of these laws was made clear to the people and thereby the way was prepared for the final event—the Act of Supremacy of 3 November 1534.[6] By it the title of "the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England" was conferred on the King, and his power was also extended to maintaining the purity of doctrine. A second Act of Succession required of all officials and ecclesiastics an oath to uphold the succession of Anne's children, while the Treason Act branded as high treason the refusal or questioning of the new royal title.

---

[5] Text in Ehses, op. cit., pp. 215f.

[6] Text in Ceble, *Statutes,* p. 436; also Gee-Hardy, *Documents,* pp. 243ff.

The break with the papacy had thereby been definitively accomplished. For even if the definition of the primacy by the Council of Florence was not universally regarded then as binding, it was still beyond any doubt that the Pope was, by divine law, the visible head of the Church and that a secular ruler, even if he claimed imperial rights, as Henry VIII then did, could not be the "head" of the Church in his country, bearer of the power of teacher and shepherd.

The first victims of the Act of Supremacy were the three Carthusian priors, John Houghton, Augustine Webster, and Robert Lawrence. Together with the learned Richard Reynolds, they were hanged at Tyburn on 4 May 1535, in their religious habits, and hence without having been previously degraded. On 22 June 1535 followed the glory of the English episcopate, Bishop John Fisher of Rochester. Before being beheaded he addressed the spectators: "Christian people, I die for the faith of the holy Catholic Church of Christ." Almost identical was the profession of the former Lord Chancellor, Thomas More, before his execution on 6 July 1535. In the legal proceedings he had characterized the Act of Supremacy as "directly repugnant to the laws of God and his holy Church."[7] The nonjurors, however, constituted a decreasing minority. Except for Fisher, all functioning bishops took the oath, surrendered their papal bulls of nomination, and asked and obtained the *licentia regia ad exercendam iurisdictionem episcopalem.* Earlier the overwhelming majority of the diocesan and regular clergy had signed the declaration: "The Bishop of Rome has by divine law in this Kingdom of England no greater jurisdiction than any other foreign bishop." The question arises: How was it possible that the clergy of an entire country submitted almost unanimously to the King's will and denied the doctrine of the papal primacy?

In replying to this depressing question it must be remembered that the episcopate, standing in complete dependence on the crown, led the way and the rest of the clergy followed. Neither group possessed the theological insight that the papal primacy, far from being a theory of curial canonists, was firmly rooted in the Church's awareness of the faith. What were seriously discussed, even by Church-minded theologians and canonists, were merely its extent and its relations to the Church and the episcopate. Significantly, the *Defensor Pacis,* the most radical denial of the divine right of the primacy to date, was now printed in English at the expense of the King, with the omission, to be sure, of the passages on the so-called sovereignty of the people. In direct dependence on Marsilius' doctrine, Edward Fox published a pamphlet on the two powers. Though he had long shown Lutheran sympathies, he was soon after named Bishop of Hereford. A book by Bishop Gardiner of Winchester in defense of the royal supremacy, composed immediately after the beheading of the martyrs Fisher and More, bore the significant title of *De vera obedientia.* On the other hand, a book *On the Defense of the Unity of the Church,* printed at Rome in 1538, exercised no influence in England, but gained for its author, Reginald Pole, a relative of the King and a resident in Italy, Henry's hatred. Pole's mother, Margaret, was imprisoned and executed in 1541.

---

[7] Hughes, *The Reformation in England* I, 281; More's moving letters to his daughter Margaret Roper, in *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More,* ed. E. Frances Rogers (Princeton 1947), pp. 501–565.

The Suppression of the Monasteries

Resistance on the part of the people did not show itself until the king, following the advice of the Lord Chancellor Cromwell, had a general visitation of the monasteries made in 1535–36 by a commission named by him and consisting of two priests, Layton and London, and two laymen, Legh and Rice. Its chief aim was to get control of the extensive monastic property in order to assure the King of defense against any eventual attacks, to fill his privy purse, and to gain support among the nobility. At the same time the religious life was to be defamed by disclosing moral failings. Relying on the reports of the visitors, which were full of accusations against the conduct of the religious, the King, with the consent of the accommodating Parliament, decreed on 4 April 1536 the suppression of 291 lesser monasteries—191 of men and 100 of women—which had an annual income of less than 200 pounds, and confiscated their real estate and moveable property. The material support of the members left much to be desired, but the numerous complaints do not admit of generalization.[8] However, since the confiscation, and to some extent the squandering, of the monastic properties was a severe financial blow not only to their peasants and servants but also to the inhabitants of the adjoining areas, and the procedure of the visitors stirred up popular indignation, risings occurred, first in Lincolnshire and then in North England. In the latter area Robert Aske, leader of the "Pilgrimage of Grace," declared that the suppression of the monasteries meant the ruin of religion in England and that the royal supremacy was contrary to the law of God. With 9000 men he marched on York and brought expelled monks and nuns back to their monasteries. Since he was willing to negotiate and gave credence to a promise of amnesty, the King gained time for a countermove. The rising was suppressed in blood and Aske was executed.

---

[8] Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* III, 402ff.; cf. also G. Baskerville, *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries* (London 1950).

The first tide of suppression had involved only the lesser monasteries. Between 1537 and 1540 the larger monasteries of the monastic order were also dissolved, mostly by means of "voluntary" surrender to the King, frequently accompanied by and based on the members' acknowledgment of guilt. The houses of the mendicant orders were suppressed at the same time. "Thus, without noise or outcry, almost without a whimper, a familiar class of men disappeared from English life."[9] The account reported at the end of the reign of Henry VIII by the royal treasurer in regard to the sale of monastic property or the revenue realized from it amounted to the then immense sum of 1.3 million pounds.[10]

Alliances and Creeds

Apart from the doctrine of the papal primacy, the Schism of 1534 had not yet attacked the substance of the Catholic faith. This occurred only when the King, basing himself on the authority attributed to him in matters of faith, in agreement with the docile episcopate, accommodated the faith of his subjects to his foreign policy and the question of a council. Between 1534 and 1547 he prescribed no fewer than four norms of faith—the Ten Articles of 1536, the Bishops' Book of 1537, the Six Articles of 1539, and the King's Book of 1543. In them the Protestant ideas which had meanwhile spread in England came to the surface more or less, in adjustment to the political situation of the moment.

Despite the existing book banning, reform writings had come to England as early as the 1520s from the Netherlands and Germany through active commercial relations. Groups had probably been formed for this purpose, but no real congregations. William Tyndale, who in 1524 had left the circle of theologians sympathetic with Luther at Cambridge, had his English translation of the New Testament printed on the continent in 1526. From here it returned secretly to the island along with other works from his pen, anticlerical rather than strictly Lutheran pamphlets. In *The Obedience of a Christian Man* he championed unconditional subordination to the King, who "may at his lust do right or wrong." During his stay at Wittenberg Robert Barnes accepted the

---

[9] Knowles, op. cit., III, 365.

[10] Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* II, 438f.

Lutheran doctrine of justification. Recalled by Cromwell, he acted as agent in the King's matrimonial case and in arranging his marriage with Anne of Cleves, but then he lost the royal favor and was burned as a heretic in 1540.[11] A circle of theologians favorable to innovation, which had been formed at Cardinal College, Oxford, was broken up by Wolsey in 1528. Its most important member, John Frith, fled to Marburg and published at Antwerp, under the title of *De Antichristo,* an English revision of Luther's reply to Ambrosius Catharinus. On 24 May 1530 a list of 251 erroneous propositions which were said to be in the writings of English authors was submitted to the King,[12] who warned against propagating them. When Frith, relying on the imminent break with Rome, returned to England in 1533, he was executed for his teaching on purgatory and the Eucharist. The literary war against Lutheranism proceeded along a parallel line. Fisher's *Confutatio* (1523) belongs with the best examples of pre-Tridentine Catholic controversial writings. Later, Bishop Gardiner of Winchester, who had taken the oath of supremacy, was the chief of the middle party, which did not want to surrender any other doctrine of the Catholic faith. But, despite the position of political trust which he enjoyed with the King, he could not prevail over the Protestant-minded primate, Cranmer, whose suppleness was able to adapt itself to the changes in the royal ecclesiastical policy, which in turn followed the law of *raison d'etat.*

The text of the bull of the major excommunication against Henry VIII was ready on 30 August 1535. But the new Pope, Paul III, hesitated to publish it, because he wanted to assure himself of the cooperation of the great powers in putting the ecclesiastical censures into effect, and for this a projected general council seemed to be the most appropriate means. To prevent its realization became the unchanging goal of Henry's policy. For this reason he joined in discussions with German Protestants. An agreement was arrived at, in the event that the Council, contrary to expectations, should actually meet, for a common protest, but an alliance with the League of Schmalkalden did not materialize, since the discussions of theologians on fundamental questions, held at Wittenberg at the beginning of 1536, did not result in union. The Wittenberg theologians refused to recognize divorce, while Henry would not accept the *Confessio Augustana.*[13]

These fruitless discussions, the convoking of the Council to Mantua, and the disturbances provoked by the suppression of the monasteries constitute the background of the Ten Articles of Faith, prescribed by the King on 12 July 1536.[14] Though ambiguous in many places, they betray the effort to meet the Wittenberg theologians halfway. The principle of Scripture as the sole rule of faith was admitted, justification was described according to Melanchthon's *Loci,* only three Sacraments—baptism, Eucharist, and penance—were expressly named, the veneration of saints and images, though not forbidden, was viewed as the cause of many abuses, and prayer for the dead was permitted, though it was denied that purgatory has a scriptural basis.

---

[11] On Barnes' vacillations in regard to the versions of his "supplication" of 1531 and 1534, see Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants,* pp. 58–77; on Frith, ibid., pp. 78–136.

[12] Text in Hughes, op. cit., II, 331–346.

[13] F. Prüser, *England und die Schmalkaldener 1535/40* (Leipzig 1929).

The *Institution of a Christian Man,* published in 1537 and referred to as the *Bishops' Book* because it was signed by twenty bishops, was a compromise between the Protestant-minded and the conservative wings of the episcopate. After the manner of a large catechism it treated the traditional points of doctrine, the Creed, the Sacraments, the Commandments, the Our Father, and also the Hail Mary. It mentioned the four Sacraments that had been omitted in the Ten Articles, but did not refer to the Mass as a sacrifice. Gardiner, who had not contributed to it, referred to it as a storehouse where everyone deposited what suited him. At the same time the King saw to it that the general Council that had been summoned by the Pope was attacked in several pamphlets.[15]

A new approach to the German Protestants seemed to be under way at the beginning of 1539 when Charles V and Francis I allied against Henry VIII. The English King sent an envoy, Christopher Mount, to Electoral Saxony and arranged to marry Anne of Cleves. Lutheran theologians appeared in London. They became witnesses, however, not of a doctrinal *rapprochement* but of a Catholic reaction. The Six Articles, submitted in the House of Lords by the bishops and assented to by the King on 28 June 1539 commanded under severe penalties the doctrine of transsubstantiation, communion under one species, clerical celibacy, monastic vows, the lawfulness of private Masses, and the necessity of auricular confession.[16] This surprising turn was occasioned by a renewal of ties between France and England. Henry no longer needed the Protestant allies against a threatening coalition of the great powers and wished to be regarded as a "Catholic prince." The Lord Chancellor Cromwell fell out of favor and was beheaded, Barnes was burned, and two Protestant-minded bishops, Latimer and Shaxton, resigned. Cranmer, however, maintained his position. A Catholic restoration according to the teaching of the Six Articles did not occur.

---

[14] Reproduction of the text and evaluation in Hughes, op. cit., I, 349ff., II, 29f.; ibid., II, 30–46, with a detailed discussion of the *Bishops' Book,* whose actual title is: *The Institution of a Christian Man, containing the Exposition or Interpretation of the Common Creed, of the Seven Sacraments, of the Ten Commandments, and of the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria, Justification and Purgatory.*

[15] For the state papers of 1537, see *CT* XII, 767–774; on two other treatises against the Council, see P. A. Sawada, "Two Anonymous Tudor Treatises on the General Council," *JEH* 12 (1961), 197–214. On Henry VIII's entire policy in regard to the Council, see Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* I, 244ff. (*History of the Council of Trent* I, 303ff.); also P. A. Sawada, "Das Imperium Heinrichs VIII. und die erste Phase seiner Konzilspolitik: *Reformata reformanda* I, 476–507.

[16] Gee-Hardy, *Documents,* pp. 303–319.

The equilibrium between old and new doctrine continued to be the norm governing religious policy even in the last years of the reign, when Henry was allied with the Emperor against France. The *King's Book* of 1543,[17] regarded as a catechism for the laity, showed in its teaching on justification a relationship to the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, but stressed the necessity of good works, and warned "not in this lifetime to presume upon the said benefits of Christ, or take occasion of carnal liberty or security." The freedom of the will was maintained, absolute predestination was denied. The ecclesiology continued to be Anglican. The papal primacy was branded as a human invention. The guardian of the orthodox faith was the King, who was bound "to conserve and maintain the true doctrine of Christ," which is found in Scripture, the three ancient creeds, the first four councils, and the exegesis of the Fathers. In his preface the King spoke of the period preceding the Schism as "the time of darkness and ignorance."

Nevertheless, the change in the substance of faith as a matter of fact already went deeper than the two last-mentioned norms of faith indicate. Hitherto Tyndale's translation of the Bible had been strictly forbidden. But in the revision by John Rogers, who hid behind the pseudonym of Thomas Matthew, the prohibition was removed on Cranmer's urging in 1537 and, as "Matthew's Bible," it was ordered purchased by every parish church the following year. A homiliary composed by Cranmer provided a suitable explanation. Gardiner, conservative in ecclesiastical matters and a long-time political adviser of the King, lost the royal favor shortly before Henry's death on 28 January 1547 and was excluded from the council of guardians of the nine-year-old King Edward VI.

The Upsurge of Protestantism under Edward VI (1547–53)

Protestant ideology invaded the life of the Church of England on a broad front during the regency, which was dominated by the King's uncle, the Duke of Somerset. The practical sense of the English was taken into account in that the new doctrines were not so much prescribed as formulations of faith but rather were introduced under the guise of a new liturgy, which, however, retained some traditional forms, such as vestments and candles. Just as on the continent, so too in England the abolition of the Mass struck at the center of the Catholic concept of the Church. The process moved forward step by step. At the end of 1547 communion under both species was allowed and Mass endowments were confiscated by the crown. The Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist and of the Mass was attacked in pamphlets and sermons. An English Communion rite, composed by Cranmer and prescribed on 8 March 1548 was modeled on the "Cologne Reformation," composed chiefly by Bucer, whose Strasbourg colleague Fagus and Vermigli, a refugee from Italy, came to England. A year later (1549) appeared the *Book of Common Prayer.*[18] This not only altered forms, such as the introduction of English as the liturgical language, it also changed the doctrinal content of the liturgy in specific points. Only two Sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, were instituted by Christ. In the rite of the Lord's Supper the sacrificial character was suppressed and any clear acknowledgment of the real presence was lacking. The place of daily Mass was taken by a liturgy of the word, in the constructing of which Cranmer used the Holy Cross breviary of Cardinal Quinonez; the entire psalter was prayed or sung within a month. The ordination rite introduced in 1550 was based on the texts of Bucer's *De ordinatione legitima ministrorum ecclesiae revocanda* (1549). Contrary to Bucer, the ordinations of bishops, priests, and deacons were distinct, but the consecrating prayers accompanying the imposition of hands were changed. At the same time the prohibition of marriage for priests was abolished. A royal decree of 24 November 1550 commanded the removal of consecrated altars; their place was taken by wooden tables. For refusal to execute the decree the Bishop of Chichester was imprisoned and deposed. In the revised form of the Prayer Book, which went into effect on All Saints' Day of 1552, the rite, maintained till now, of the anointing of the sick, the anointings at baptism, and prayers for the dead at their burial disappeared. Participation in the new liturgy was obligatory. Whoever took part in another rite was punished with six months in prison for the first offense, a year for the second, and life imprisonment for the third. Only at the end of the reign of Edward VI was the new statement of faith, summarized in the Forty-two Articles drawn up by Cranmer, prescribed.

---

[17] *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, set forth by the King's Majesty of England* (London 1543); cf. Hughes, op. cit., II, 46–60.

Neither the fall of Somerset in 1549 nor the opposition of individual bishops, particularly to the new rite of ordination, nor the passive attitude of a great part of the parochial clergy was able to stop this evolution. When the Prayer Book was introduced in Devonshire, the people in many parishes opposed it and ridiculed the new liturgy as a "Christmas game," but without success. The confiscation of Church treasures, such as chalices and monstrances, which had begun under Henry VIII but was only now completed, was endured, even though with bitterness. People lamented the disappearance of works of charity, which had earlier been provided by ecclesiastical foundations, and the loss of many parish schools. Nevertheless, the essence of the faith, as hitherto maintained, faded irresistibly with the liturgical forms that had protected it. The loss was so serious that the restoration under Mary I and Cardinal Pole was unable to make it good again.[19] It came too abruptly, was too brief, and was imposed by the government. The clergy, high and low, who had submitted to the Church laws of Henry VIII and Edward VI, headed by Gardiner, as Lord Chancellor, were in no position to gain confidence and above all were not zealous executors of the new laws. The strictness with which Queen Mary proceeded against Cranmer, executed on 21 March 1556, and other opponents of her regime gained it no sympathy. The *Book of Martyrs* by John Fox, published soon after Mary's death—in Latin in 1559 and in English in 1563—glorified them. Emigrants returning from Frankfurt, Strasbourg, and Zurich became the instruments for expanding the Anglican Church under Elizabeth I.

---

[18] *The booke of the common prayer and administration of the Sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche after the use of the Churche of England* (London 1549); cf. F. Procter–W. H. Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London 1951); n.ed. E. S. Gibson (London 1960); further bibliography in *LThK,* 2nd ed., II, 604; also, E. R. Rathcliff, "The Liturgical Work of Archbishop Cranmer," *JEH* 7 (1956), 189–203.

Ecclesia Anglicana under Elizabeth I (1558–1603)

Elizabeth I (1558–1603), the well-educated and clever daughter of Anne Boleyn, first made sure of her throne by an extremely cautious foreign policy. From the start there was no doubt about the direction of her Church policy at home. A new Act of Supremacy and Uniformity in 1559 again put into effect ten Church laws of Henry VIII and Edward VI that had been annulled under Mary and, in addition, the Prayer Book of 1552.[20] The bishops, appointed under Mary and opposed to these measures, were deposed and replaced by new prelates, who were ready to take the Oath of Supremacy. At their head was Matthew Parker, new Archbishop of Canterbury. The penalties decreed for refusing the oath were, however, mitigated—loss of office and, in the event of a relapse into the crime of defending the papal primacy, death. Attendance at the liturgy on Sundays and feasts was prescribed under a fine of twelve pence for each absence. The few monasteries that had been restored under Mary were suppressed. The dividing line was thus clearly drawn against the defenders of the old faith. But a relentless persecution of them did not begin until Pius V had pronounced the major excommunication and deposition of the Queen. On the other hand, the still numerous members of clergy and laity who rejected the new order or were indifferent to it were consciously spared. The Thirty-nine Articles, drawn up by the Convocation of 1563, were a revision of Cranmer's Forty-two Articles of 1552.[21] They breathed a Calvinist rather than a Lutheran spirit. The *Apologia ecclesiae Anglicanae* by the Bishop of Salisbury, John Jewel, which appeared in Latin in 1562 and in English in 1564, justified the new faith and the new order. The *Book of Homilies* (1562) was prescribed for the use of parish priests. Episcopal visitations, which took place from 1568, saw the removal of everything that still recalled the Catholic past. The clergy were strictly supervised by making use of Church wardens and school teachers. The episcopal structure, the cathedral chapters, and the office of archdeacon continued under the shelter of the royal supremacy. When the Calvinist Cartwright at Cambridge advocated the introduction of the Geneva Presbyterian system, John Whitgift sharply opposed him. In 1583 Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury. Toward the close of the Elizabethan Age Richard Hooker in his *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1593) summarized the doctrine and constitution of the now firmly established Anglican Church.[22] The formation of a new type among the Reformation Churches was thereby achieved.[23] An official translation of the Bible, however, was published only under James I.[24]

---

[19] "England, surely, was no longer a Catholic country by 1553," says Hughes, op. cit., II, 302. Numerous examples of the dispersal of Church treasures, based on the inventories of 1552, in H. B. Walters, *London Churches at the Reformation* (London 1939). On the Catholic restoration under Queen Mary I, see below, Chaper 36.

[20] Cf. J. E. Neale, "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity," *EHR* 65 (1950), 303–332.

---

[21] Comparison of the two in Hughes, op. cit., 111, 152ff.

[22] P. Munz, *The Place of Hooker in the History of Thought* (London 1952).

[23] A graphic description, provided with abundant details, of the ecclesiastical conditions is given by A. L. Rowse, *The England of Elizabeth. The Structure of Society* (London 1950), pp. 386–437. Despite his favorable judgment of Elizabethan Church policy, which is represented as tolerant and liberal, he comes to the conclusion (p. 420) that: "The old observances lingered on in country places, in some areas long and tenaciously." In the chapter on the minorities, Catholics and Puritans (pp. 438–488), he explains the harshness of the persecution of Catholics from the time of Pius V by stating that, during the difficulties with Spain, they constituted a "fifth column." Important for the intellectual life is P. H. Kocher, *Science and Religion in Elizabethan England* (San Marino, Cal. 1953).

[24] D. Daiches, *The King James Version of the English Bible. An account of the development and sources of the English Bible of 1611, with special reference to the Hebrew Tradition* (Chicago 1941).

CHAPTER 28

The Struggle over Lutheran Orthodoxy

When, following Luther's passionate protest within the One Church, there gradually developed a particular ecclesiastical system outside and in opposition to the ancient Church, there arose the question of what was distinctive, of what was "reformed." There loomed the task of providing a special, positive profession of the right doctrine for the new reformed congregations. It no longer sufficed to apply corrections and protests to the tradition; now one had to admit into the profession the presuppositions that had, of course, hitherto been accepted as the basis. On the other hand, it appeared that the original outline, alluring in its one-sided emphasis on the reform preoccupation, had to be safeguarded against misunderstandings and extended and corrected.

Luther's struggle against the Pope for the freedom of the Gospel was often understood as a license for revolt, the plundering of monasteries, and laxity of morals. "Now no fear of God is any longer a means of discipline, because the Pope's authority has become obsolete. And everyone does what he wants to" (*WA, Br* 4, 133, 11f.) and that "on the pretext of the Gospel" (*WA* 32, 219, 28). Melanchthon admitted: "The papists charge us with much, not without reason" (*CR* 4, 960). He clearly recognized the moral deterioration, and in 1527 he declared those responsible who, "out of a colossal hatred of the Pope, curse everything, good as well as bad, in the same way" (*CR* 4, 959). In his *Instruction for the Visitors* he intended to bring up "the matter without bitterness."

> I had many reasons for such a restraint. I did not want to nourish the fury of Aureus and like-minded companions, who think that to teach the Gospel means only to upbraid, with the utmost polemics and bitterness, those who think otherwise than ourselves, as though they were carters. I well know how much hatred this discretion of mine earns for me with certain people. But it is far more important to me to look at what pleases God than at how I can appease those greedy accusers, by whom I am now treated as a heretic and a fanatic. [*CR* 1, 898f.]

Melanchthon was afterwards often charged with pusillanimity and cowardice. "But I do not regret this moderation of mine, even if our courtesy is sometimes interpreted as pusillanimity and cowardice," he wrote to Cruciger in October 1536 (*CR* 3, 179). Melanchthon did not understand reformation as a merely negative criticism. His anxiety was for the unity of the Church. In 1527 he wrote to Casper Aquila:

> I ask you, through Christ, to teach moderately, to have care for the harmony of the Church, to overcome opponents by forbearance, and not so to fight against slanderers that you yourself be guilty of slander. . . . Thanks to divine grace, much is now taught better in the Church than formerly. But once some taught some things better than unlearned Lutherans now do. Your task is to heal souls, both those of the opponents and those of your own people, and not to nourish faction hatred. {*CR* 1, 960]

But Melanchthon did not merely rebuke the excessive zeal of some complainants. He also had the courage and the sense of responsibility to apply essential corrections to his own theology. In 1530 he would no longer recommend to his pupils his *Loci* of 1521, which Luther had then declared to be worthy of canonization. He said he had decided to change much in them that was too crude. Instead, he referred to his exegesis of the Epistle to the Colossians of 1527 (*CR* 2, 457). Likewise, in 1532 he published his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in order to suppress the transcript of his lectures of 1521.[1] The various versions of his *Loci* were the expression of this change in his theology. The several "Philippist" controversies are to be viewed against this background.

The Antinomian Controversy

As early as 1524 Lutheran preachers had defended at Tetschen the thesis that "The Law was given to the Jews, not to the heathens. And so the Law or the Ten Commandments do not apply to us" (*WA* 15, 227, 5f.). Vis-à-vis such preachers, who "speak presumptuously about Christian freedom" (*St.A.* I, 235, 12), Melanchthon stressed that:

> All who teach in the churches may cautiously communicate the doctrine on the Law. If the doctrine of faith without Law is handed on, countless scandals will result. The people become assured and imagine that they have the righteousness of faith, because they do not know that faith can be only in those who have contrite hearts by means of the Law. (*CR* 26, 28) Now it is customary to speak about faith, and yet what faith is cannot be understood unless penance is first preached. They are clearly pouring new wine into old skins who proclaim faith without penance, without the doctrine of the fear of God and of the Law, and accustom the people

---

[1] Studienausgabe (*St.A.*) V, 26, 5–8.

> to a certain carnal security. This security is worse than all the errors previously under the Pope. [*CR* 26, 9]

This notion that preaching about the Law must first produce penance and contrition before faith scandalized Johannes Agricola of Eisleben (1499–1566). He drew up a condemnation (*CR* 1, 915) of Melanchthons's articles of visitation (*CR* 26, 7–28). Melanchthon reported thus:

> He finds fault that I do not teach that penance finds its beginning with love for righteousness, that I am far too much attached to the preaching of the Law, that I have sometimes perverted Scripture in the usual way, that in some passages I have violated Christian freedom. He makes me a double papist. [*CR* 1, 920]

Agricola saw in the Law merely an expression of God's anger. It was abolished for Christians by the revelation of God's grace in the Gospel. Christ, he held, preached the Ten Commandments only to the Jews. "But since we are freed from the Law, the decalog is not to be preached" (*CR* 1, 916). Moses "does not concern the heathens."[2] Thus, penance must begin, not with the preaching of the Law, but with love for righteousness. Agricola felt that with this notion of his he had to defend Luther against Melanchthon, who "was creeping back" (cf. *WA, Br* 4, 265).

At the end of November 1527 the electoral court convened a theological meeting to Torgau. Through Luther's mediation there was effected a temporary agreement between Melanchthon and Agricola.[3]

Agricola came out against Luther himself in the second Antinomian Controversy. At Christmas of 1536 the Elector had held out to him the prospect of a position at the University of Wittenberg, and Agricola immediately moved there. With his family he was taken into Luther's house and was frequently asked to represent him. But soon the old controversy, which had seemed to be forgotten, was to blaze forth again. In a collection of sermons, published in June, Agricola defended the thesis of a "twofold revelation: a first one of grace, a second of wrath" (*CR* 3, 386).

God as Judge, if he has any place as such in Agricola's thought, is first made known through the Gospel. Here God's anger is revealed, not indeed for all who are guilty before God, but only toward all those who, out of false security, deride and ridicule the first revelation of grace.[4] At the same time Agricola circulated a collection of theses in which he sought to play off the young Luther against the later Luther. He "denied that the decalog is to be taught in the Church and made a collection of authentic and unauthentic passages relating to the the decalog from Luther's and my writings," wrote Melanchthon to Brenz at the middle of July 1537 (*CR* 3, 391; cf. *CR* 3, 386).

---

[2] Agricola, *130 gemeine Fragstücke* (Wittenberg 1528), in F. Cohrs, *Die evangelischen Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion* II (Berlin 1900), 293, 17f.

[3] Cf. the formula of compromise which Melanchthon inserted in the instruction for the visitors (*St.A.* I, 222, 14–27; *WA*, 26, 202f.).

While Luther had not taken the quarrel of 1527 too seriously, now he was dismayed by Agricola's stand: "This should not be begun in our lifetime by our people!" (*WA, Tr* 3, 405, 6). In a sermon of 30 September 1537 (*WA* 45, 145–156) he stated his own idea of Law and Gospel in opposition to Agricola. The latter endeavored to pacify his teacher [5] and was still concerned for a compromise. But an open quarrel broke out when, at the end of October, he sent his summaries of the Gospels to the printer.[6] Luther learned of the work and brought about the suppression of the pages already printed (*CR* 3, 454).

Together with his opposing theses (*WA* 39, I, 342–354) he published Agricola's above-mentioned collection of Antinomian theses and had the first Antinomian disputation take place on 18 December 1537 (*WA* 39, I, 360–417). As dean of the theological faculty, Luther, on 8 January 1538, withdrew Agricola's *venia legendi* (*WA, Br* 8, 186).

The mediation of Agricola's wife brought about another reconciliation between him and Luther. In order to make it public, persons arranged a second public disputation on 12 January (*WA* 39, I, 418–485). But the real points of controversy were not settled there, and so the conflict broke out again in a third Antinomian disputation on 6 September.[7] Luther now demanded of Agricola a definite recantation, and the court threatened to cut off his salary. Agricola thereupon composed a "form of revocation," which he submitted to Melanchthon as arbiter and which the latter revised. At the same time Agricola turned to Luther himself: "the doctor should himself present him with a form" (*WA* 50, 465). Luther agreed and wrote the treatise *Wider die Antinomer* (*WA* 50, 468–477) in the form of an open letter to the Eisleben preacher, Caspar Güttel. From Agricola Luther demanded in January 1539 theses for another disputation, which he appointed for 1 February.[8] In this way there arose further dissension. Agricola complained of Luther to the Elector (cf. *WA* 51, 425–444) and during the very discussions he fled to Berlin, where he accepted a post as court preacher to the Elector Joachim II.

---

[4] J. Rogge, *Johann Agricolas Lutherverständnis* (Berlin 1960), pp. 140f.; cf. *WA* 22, 86, 32ff.

[5] Cf. "Johann Agricolas Verzeichnis, was er bisher gelehrt habe," *ZKG* 4 (1881), 304f.

[6] K. E. Förstemann, *Neues Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenreformation* I (Hamburg 1842), 296ff.; cf. *WA* 51, 431, 33–432, 24; J. Rogge, of. cit., pp. 156–164.

[7] *WA* 39, I, 486–584; cf. J. Rogge, op. cit., p.187.

Luther explained the question of the meaning of the Law in his *Von den Konziliis und Kirchen* of 1539 (*WA* 50, 599, 5ff.) and in a series of theses of September 1540 (*WA* 39, I, 358).

At stake in the Antinomian Controversy was the correct understanding of Luther. Agricola thought that Luther in his writings taught two different ways of justification: "the one way is through Law and Gospel; the other, only through the Gospel, without the Law." Hence he desired a decision as to which way is correct, "so that the Church which will come after us will not be in perplexity when she sees that both are said and taught."[9] He tried to solve the problem by extracting expressions of the young Luther for a uniform system. Luther was distressed by the controversy which flared up over his legacy in his own lifetime. His struggle was so harsh and pitiless because he dreaded laxity and caprice as the consequences of Agricola's doctrine: "Then sweet grace becomes useless, for there will follow a great and unending wantonness and villainy, which it will be impossible to control."[10]

The Synergist Controversy

Agricola had played off the earlier Luther against the later. In the doctrine of the sole operation of grace in the awakening of justifying grace and of the will's lack of freedom in regard to salvation Melanchthon was accused of deviating from Luther. Melanchthon wrote to Veit Dietrich on 22 June 1537:

> You know that I speak a bit less crudely in regard to predestination, the consent of the will, the necessity of our obedience, and mortal sin. In all these matters I know that Luther thinks essentially as I do, but the imprudent are all too fond of certain of his over-subtle expressions, though they do not see in what context they belong. [*CR* 3, 383]

Luther, like Melanchthon, had represented a strict determinism in 1520–21:

---

[8] Text in *ZKG* 4 (1881), 313ff.; *WA, Br* 12, 277ff.

[9] *WA, Br* 8, 279,5f., 14f.; J. Rogge, op. cit., pp. 165f., dates the letter December 1537.

[10] *WA, Tr* 4, 452, 14f.; cf. 468, 16; 513f.

> Everthing happens of absolute necessity. This is what the poet meant when he said: "Everything exists according to a definite law."[11] God even performs bad works in the godless. [*WA* 7, 144, 34]

Concerning faith, Luther had said that it was the "work of God in us without us" (*WA* 6, 530). But in practice Luther had always appealed to man's personal activity, and consequently he had probably taught that God is all-effective while not consistently teaching that he is uniquely effective.

From 1527 Melanchthon tried to free himself from determinism, from Stoic notions, as he later expressed it.[12] In accord with the Fathers, he emphasized the free will of man as the "ability to turn to grace" (*St.A.* II, 245, 30f.). If God, according to 1 Timothy 2:4, wills that all men be saved, then the reason why some are saved and others are lost must lie with man. Whereas Luther tried to weaken this passage by translating it as "who wishes that all men become better or healthy,"[13] Melanchthon was unable to escape the force of the passage. "Since we must proceed from the [revealed] word and since the promise is universal, we conclude that a cause of the election lies in us: an instrumental cause to lay hold of the promise."[14] If Melanchthon also represents the human will which assents to the promise as a real factor (cf. *CR* 21, 658), there is question here not of an autonomous human will, but of a will which, supported by the Holy Spirit, accompanies prevenient grace (*CR* 12, 481; *St.A.,* II, 243, 20–244, 11; *CR* 9, 970). Accordingly, three causes cooperate in conversion: God's word, the Holy Spirit, and the human will, which assents to the word and does not resist it (*CR* 21, 658; *St.A.* II, 243, 14–17).

Borrowing from the *Interim* of Augsburg (VI, para. 1), the *Interim* of Leipzig stated:

> Although God does not justify man through the merit of the special works which man does . . . , nevertheless the merciful God does not operate with man as with a log but he draws him so that his will also cooperates, if he is of an age to understand. [CR 7, 51]

---

[11] *Assertio* 1520 in *WA* 7, 146, 7ff.; cf. *Loci* 1521 in *St.A.* II, 10, 11ff.

[12] Cf. *CR* 21, 652; *CR* 9, 766; "In Luther's lifetime and afterwards I rejected these Stoic and Manichaean follies. Luther and others have taught that all works, good and bad, must operate in this manner in all, good and bad. Now it is clear that this saying is contrary to God's word and is harmful to all discipline and blasphemous" (1559).

[13] Cf. E. Hirsch, *Hilfsbuch zum Studium der Dogmatik* (Berlin 1964), p. 157.

[14] "Disputatio de sententia: Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri," 1537, in *CR* 12, 481.

In 1549 the Hamburg senior minister, Johannes Äpinus (1499–1553), who at this very time caused a controversy over Christ's descent into hell,[15] took offense at this teaching. He stated that "Man is as little able to come to the Gospel and to Christ's Kingdom through his free will as is a log through its inability to move or a hog through its lack of reason." Matthias Flacius (1520–75) and Nikolaus Gallus (1516–70) had seen in the formulation of the Leipzig *Interim* the "burying of a papist *meritum de congruo.*"[16] Melanchthon's pupils, Georg Major (1502–74), Victorin Strigel (1524–69), and later Johannes Pfeffinger (1493–1573), expressly taught the necessity of the cooperation of free will in justification. Pfeffinger was a professor at Leipzig from 1544. In two disputations in 1555 he defended, in dependence on Melanchthon, the thesis that, in conversion, the consent of our will is required. In this connection he spoke of a certain *synergia* of the will. Although, according to him as well as to Melanchthon, the will is here dependent on the help of the Holy Spirit, Nikolaus von Amsdorf accused Pfeffinger of teaching, together with his "gang," that man can fit himself for grace and prepare for it by the natural powers of his free will.[17] For his part Amsdorf maintained that "man's will is, before God, nothing but clay, stone, or wood."[18] Flacius and Gallus wrote in a similar vein.[19]

In the *Weimar Confutation Book,* which, inspired by Flacius, appeared in 1559, Pfeffinger's so-called Synergism was condemned in Article 6. Victorin Strigel, professor at Jena and until now a friend of Flacius and opponent of the Philippists, opposed the introducing of the *Confutation Book* and hence was imprisoned for several months. After his liberation there took place at Weimar a public disputation between him and Flacius from 2 to 8 August 1560 on the freedom of the will. Here the question found its theological precision. After this disputation Flacius in 1566 defended the notion that original sin is man's *forma substantialis.* The Religious Colloquy of Altenburg, held from 21 October 1568 to March 1569 at the instigation of the Elector August and Duke Johann Wilhelm of Saxony, was fruitless. What made the acceptance of the Catholic idea impossible also prevented an agreement among the Lutherans. The "and" in "grace and free will" was understood as an additive and not as something conclusive, while the divine activity in grace and the releasing of man's will for freedom were envisaged as two self-sufficient causes, moving concurrently on the same plane.

---

[15] Cf. E Vogelsang in *ARG,* 38 (1941), 107–119.

[16] O. Ritschl, *DG* II, 375f.

[17] Ibid., 432.

[18] Ibid., 433.

[19] Cf. the enumeration of the individual polemics, ibid., 424, footnote 4.

The Majorist Controversy

A similarly embittered struggle blazed up over the relationship between justification and good works. From the Wittenberg professor Georg Major (1502–74), who stirred up the quarrel after Luther's death, it is referred to as the Majorist Controversy. It too was based on a problem left unsettled by Luther, that of the inner relation of justification and sanctification, of grace and gift, and the significance or necessity of love in regard to salvation. Luther had laid emphasis on faith and felt that from it good works proceeded naturally. He loved to stress that the good tree produces good fruit. But he shrank from continuing, in accord with Matthew 7:19, that "Every tree that does not bear fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire."[20] The more narrowly Luther's pupils presented justification in their public utterances and the more the concept of inner renewal for good works was pushed into the background or even denied, the more difficult it became to establish the necessity of good works, which were to follow justification.

Melanchthon came more and more to stress the biblical imperative, but without adequately showing its basis in the indicative, in the new being of the one justified.[21] He was moved by pastoral and pedagogical viewpoints: "In all men there is such a natural weakness that, when we hear the doctrine of the account that will freely follow, we become more careless about good deeds, and our carnal security is consolidated."[22] Hence, Melanchthon, following the Gospels and Paul, speaks of God's command and of the necessity of good works:

> Nevertheless, the righteousness of works must necessarily follow. For it is God's command that we render this obedience, because Christ clearly enjoins, "Do penance". . . I do not see why I should shrink from the word "command," since Christ also says [John 15:2], "This is my command," and Paul [Romans 8:12], "We are debtors." Besides, the necessity is so great that Paul clearly says of adulterers, lechers, murderers, and others [Galatians 5:21], "They

---

[20] Cf. P. Manns, "Fides absoluta—Fides incarnata. Zur Rechtfertigungslehre Luthers im Grossen Galater-Kommentar," *Reformata Reformanda. Festgabe für Hubert Jedin* I (Münster 1965), 265–312, p. 306 especially.

[21] In a testimonial on the Majorist Controversy in 1555 Melanchthon wrote retrospectively: "And this disputation was caused by many previous wicked speeches of the past twenty years. Some will not tolerate this statement, "good works are necessary," or hence "one must do good works." They are unwilling to accept the two words *necessitas* and *debitum*. . . . However, *necessarium* and *debitum* do not mean, first of all, *extortum coactione,* but the eternal, immutable order of divine wisdom, and the Lord Christ and Paul themselves use these words, *necessarium* and *debitum*" (*CR* 8, 411; cf. *CR,* 8, 842).

[22] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* of 1544 (1540), *CR* 15, 634; something similar earlier in the exposition of 1532 (*St.A.* V, 199, 1ff.).

> who do such things will not attain the Kingdom of God." [*Loci,* 1535: *CR* 21, 432]

Nikolaus von Amsdorf reported to Luther in a letter of 14 September 1536 from Magdeburg:

> It is said here that the contrary is taught at Wittenberg. That man [Melanchthon] is urging powerfully and to excess in the school that works are necessary for eternal life. [*WA, Br* 7, 540, 5ff.]

Already on 20 August and 8 September 1536, Konrad Cordatus, then pastor at Niemegk, had turned on Caspar Cruciger (1504–48), who had been professor at Wittenberg since 1528, and attacked him because, he alleged, in his lectures he was presenting a "sophistical and papist" faith and deviating from Luther, "the only man through whom we believe in Christ" (*CR* 3, 159, note; cf. 193). The quarrel concerned whether repentance is a *causa sine qua non* of justification and whether the new obedience is necessary for salvation.[23] Melanchthon backed Cruciger. "You rightly say," he wrote to Cordatus, "that Cruciger's affair touches me. . . . I am glad to take the whole business upon myself" (*CR* 3, 345).

When Justus Jonas, rector of the University of Wittenberg, dismissed his complaint (*CR* 3, 348f.), Cordatus on 17 April 1537 turned to the Electoral Chancellor, Brück, and complained that there was at "Wittenberg opposition to the dear doctrine of that pious man Luther." Philip, he said, had written to him yesterday: "On my own I have bettered much in my books, and I rejoice that I have done so" (*CR* 3, 353; cf. *CR* 3, 344).

For his part Luther urged Cordatus to be calm (*WA, Br* 8, 79) and utilized the promotion disputation of 1 June 1537 to clarify the question (cf. *WA* 39, I, 202–257; cf, *CR* 3, 385). He concurred with Melanchthon in the matter to the extent of quoting Augustine: "He who created you without your cooperation will not save you without your cooperation" (*WA* 39, I, 209, 20f.; cf. 121, 29f.). But he expressed himself against "necessary for salvation," because, he said, it implied something merited (*WA* 39, I, 256, 23ff.).

Thus did this point of controversy come to rest for the time being. But Flacius and Gallus again took umbrage at the formulation of the Leipzig *Interim* of 1548 to the effect "that these virtues, faith, charity, hope, and others must be in us and are necessary for salvation" (*CR* 7,

---

[23] *CR* 3, 159–161; *WA, Br* 7, 541–545; 579–581 (*CR* 3, 179); *WA, Br* 7, 600f.; *CR* 3, 182, 185; *WA, Br* 7, 615f. (*CR* 3, 206); *CR* 3, 206f.; *CR* 3, 365f. (*WA, Br* 7, 81–84), 372, 383, 385. On the term "causa sine qua non" cf. *WA, Br* 7, 542; *CR* 3, 180, 593ff., 602, 634, *CR* 13, 674.

63), since it was designed "for the benefit of the papists." Open controversy ensued when Melanchthon's pupil and friend, Georg Major, wrote against Amsdorf in 1552:

> I admit that I have hitherto taught and still teach and will hereafter teach, throughout my life, that good works are necessary for salvation. I say publicly, clearly, and unambiguously that no one becomes holy through evil works and also that no one becomes holy without good works, and I say further that if anyone teaches otherwise, even an angel from heaven, let him be anathema.[24]

Nikolaus von Amsdorf thereupon declared Major to be a "Pelagian, Mameluke, apostate Christian, and twice papist."[25] Against the written attacks of Amsdorf, Flacius, and Gallus, Major defended himself in the sense that he in no way intended to belittle justification by grace alone through Christ and that salvation is not merited by good works. But, he asserted, these are necessary so that salvation can be maintained and not lost again.[26] Melanchthon had taught something similar in his *apologia* in accord with 2 Peter 1:10:

> Do good works so that you may continue with the Gospel, with your heavenly call, so that you may not again fall away, become cold, and lose spirit and gifts which come to you from grace through Christ and not because of the subsequent works. [*BSLK* 316, 18ff.]

Agricola, with whom Amsdorf was closely allied, had rejected 2 Peter 1:10 in the Antinomian theses: "Peter did not know Christian liberty" (*WA* 50, 345, 9f.). In 1559 Amsdorf published a work of his own under the title: *That the Proposition* ["Good works are prejudicial to salvation"] *is a Correct, True, Christian Proposition, Taught and Preached by the Saints, Paul, and Luther.* In the wider Majorist Controversy between the "Gnesiolutherans" (cf. *CR* 3, 453), Amsdorf, Flacius, and Gallus, and the "Philippists," namely Melanchthon's adherents, Major and Justus Menius (1499–1558), the last named tried to be conciliatory and, to avoid the misunderstanding of being thought of as papists, they declared themselves ready to drop the addition: necessary "for salvation or for eternal life."[27] However, no real compromise ensued. Flacius and his friends were not satisfied with a mere dropping of the proposition; they wanted it to be condemned as false (*CR* 9, 474f.). Melanchthon, for his part, declared:

---

[24] Major, *Antwort auff des Ehrenwirdigen Herren Niclas von Ambsdorff schrifft* (Wittenberg 1552), Bl. C^{vf}. Cited from O. Ritschl, *DG* II, 377.

[25] O. Ritschl, *DG* II, 377.

[26] Major, "Sermon on the Conversion of Saint Paul," according to O. Ritschl, *DG* II, 378.

[27] *CR* 8, 336, 411, 842; 9, 39, 142, 370, 469, 470, 473, 496–499; cf. Major, *Bekenntnis von dem Artikel der Justification* (Wittenberg 1558), Bl. 3B; the revocation formula (1556) of Menius, printed in O. Ritschl, *DG* II, 380, footnote 4.

> In sum, to conclude briefly and finally, we say clearly that we cannot abandon this proposition: new obedience is necessary in all the converted. If anyone will not endure this, we regard him as an Antinomian and an enemy of God. [*CR* 9, 552]

In order to justify his position Melanchthon appealed, in addition to Romans 8:12 and 10:10, 1 Corinthians 6:9, 2 Corinthians 7:10, 1 Timothy 1:18, and other places, also to Philippians 2:12: "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling" (*CR* 9, 475). As opposed to this the Gnesiolutherans wanted to maintain the full assurance of salvation and security of conscience. If works were somehow necessary, then salvation depended on man, who could not even be sure of himself. From this viewpoint follows the oversubtle claim of Nikolaus von Amsdorf that good works are prejudicial to salvation, for they seduce man into placing his confidence of salvation in something in himself rather than exclusively in the grace of God. In this way the Gnesiolutherans—in their theology become ideology, their bias, and their "endless revolving around the I, its temptations, and its consolations"—were absolutely not qualified to advance in love beyond themselves to God and neighbor. "If the chief interest of the new man in ethics, as Flacius describes it, proceeds to the point of acquiring feelings of comfort, then there is not much time left for the business whose center is the neighbor."[28]

The Adiaphora Controversy

If behind the outward form of Melanchthons's doctrine of justification, which involved the Antinomian, Synergist, and Majorist Controversies, there lay the problem of protecting men from a false security and from carelessness, Melanchthon's attitude in the Adiaphora Controversy must be understood from the viewpoint of his concern for the right order and the unity of the Church. In a testimonial on the *Interim* he wrote on 1 April 1548:

> I sincerely wanted to advise peace and unity, and many years ago I proposed several serious articles on unity in my teaching, as many wise persons know, and I have never taken pleasure in quarreling

---

[28] L. Haikola, *Gesetz und Evangelium bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus* (Lund 1952), p. 336; cf. O. Modalsli, *Das Gericht nach den Werken* (Göttingen 1963), p. 192; R. Bring, *Das Verhältnis von Glauben und Werken in der lutherischen Theologie* (Munich 1955), p. 100.

> about unnecessary and unimportant matters. I am now so old that I well know that great division and destruction follow useless squabbling. Also, God has forbidden it and punishes it, as Solomon says: "He is an abomination before God who causes disunity among brothers."

Melanchthon and the other theologians who had assembled at Torgau to discuss the *Interim* stated in their testimonial of 13 April 1549 that it was "criminal obstinacy and confusion" to brand as papist whatever one does not wish to retain.[29] Many would quarrel "more about their own freedom than about high and necessary articles of Christian doctrine and aboug right and false appeal and good discipline" (*CR* 7, 365, cf. 624). Answering the charge of idolatry in the Mass they insisted: And even this form which we retain in the Mass was observed one thousand years ago, as Dionysius clearly testifies" (*CR* 7, 366).

Apart from political grounds,[30] a developed confessionalism was also important to Flacius, who rejected any community with the opposing side and for whom there were no *adiaphora,* because Church customs under the papacy were the "seat of godlessness and superstition."[31]

Osiander was of the same opinion when he wrote:

> To accept and agree to the *Interim* is nothing other than to come to terms, in externals, with Antichrist and hence to help to cover up, palliate, excuse, strengthen, and maintain all his sins, abuses, errors, seductions, superstitions, and blasphemies and abominations, whereby consciences are defiled and God's anger, which has already condemned the Antichrist and damned him to the eternal fire of hell, is incurred.[32]

---

[29] "And is not the papacy concerned that persons approve of ceremonies which existed in the early Church in the time of the Apostles, such as Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, the Sunday, and so forth, many of which we have retained until the present? And if we were unwilling to retain them, we said that these were papal, that such barbarity was a criminal obstinacy and a disorder, which operated among the people to impede discipline and doctrine" (*CR* 7, 364).

[30] "The fact that Melanchthon now entered his [Maurice of Saxony's] service and even became at once one of his most esteemed theological advisers could not but have alienated many who could not forgive Maurice for his attitude in the last years" (O. Ritschl, *DG* II, 335).

[31] R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der DG* IV, 2, 485; cf. Melanchthon (1558): "But because Illyricus and his adherents so aggravate this, one should undertake nothing to please the papists, whether it is a middle thing in itself, it is also harshly intensified. For if the bishops thus willed to accept Christian doctrine and wanted equality in some intermediate ceremonies, this does not mean that such equality should be condemned" (*CR* 9, 476).

[32] Work on the *Interim,* extract in W. Möller, *A. Osiander* (Elberfeld 1870), pp. 323f.

The Osiander Controversy

Philippists and Gnesiolutherans stood together in a common front in the controversy with Andreas Osiander (1498–1552) concerning justification. In cooperation with Lazarus Spengler, Osiander had won Nürnberg for the Reformation. He had been lector at the Augustinian monastery there in 1520 and in 1522 had become preacher at Sankt Lorenz. He had compiled a list of twenty-three questions and doctrinal articles for the Nürnberg ecclesiastical visitation.[33] On behalf of the city he had taken part in the Marburg Religious Colloquy of 1529 and in 1530 he had composed a work on justification for the Diet of Augsburg.[34] Together with Johannes Brenz he had drawn up the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Church Order of 1533.[35] In this connection there had been difficulties with the people of Nürnberg, because in their model Osiander and Brenz had expunged public guilt (general confession) and the general absolution following the admonition to the Lord's Supper in order to restore private confession to prominence.[36] Osiander was opposed in principle to general absolution. For it is to be understood either conditionally ("if you do penance"), and then it is neither a Sacrament nor absolution, or unconditionally, and then it is the most ridiculous sacrilege thus to cast pearls before swine. Osiander argued further:

> If this is really absolution, no excommunication can maintain a place in the Church, for every excommunicated person can immediately have absolution, since no one can forbid him to listen to preaching. One key cannot be opposed to the other, so that it can thereby be hindered from carrying out its function according to Christ's institution.[37]

Summoned to Palatinate-Neuburg by the Count Palatine Otto Heinrich, Osiander in 1543 had drawn up the Church order for the Palatinate. In November 1548 he had abandoned Nürnberg as a protest against the *Interim* and in 1549 he had accepted a professorship at the

---

[33] Sehling, 11, 128–134.

[34] W. Gussmann, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Augsburgischen Glaubensbekenntnisses* I, 1 (Leipzig–Berlin 1911), 297–312.

[35] Sehling, 11, 140–205.

[36] Cf. W. Möller, op. cit., pp. 177ff. G. T. Strobel, "Beytrag zur ältesten Beichtegeschichte Nürnbergs vom Jahre 1531," *Neue Beyträge zur Litteratur besonders des 16. Jahrhunderts* II (Nürnberg 1791), 175–390.

[37] W. Möller, op. cit., p. 179; cf. the testimonials of the Wittenberg theologians who were seeking a compromise: in *WA, Br* 6, no. 2008; 2010 (*CR* 2, no. 1108); 2052 (*CR* 2, no. 1133); 2053; 2054; *CR* 3, no. 1477; *WA, Br* 7, no. 3104; 3108 (*CR* 3, no. 1489).

University of Königsberg that had been offered him by Albrecht of Brandenburg-Ansbach.

He began his teaching activity on 5 April 1549, with a disputation on the Law and the Gospel (cf. *CR* 7, 402) and then lectured on the first chapters of Genesis. There soon ensued controversies over penance, the meaning of Christ's Incarnation, and the attitude to the *Interim,* which Osiander had sharply criticized.[38] His authoritarian appearance contributed to the intensification of the friction. A public quarrel broke out over Osiander's "Disputation on Justification by Faith" of 24 October 1550. As he had already done in regard to the doctrine of justification in the *Interim,*[39] he now publicly attacked that of Melanchthon as one-sided: "They are teaching something colder than ice who teach that we are to be regarded as justified only for the forgiveness of sins and not also because of the righteousness of Christ, who dwells in us through faith."[40] Osiander wanted to bring into prominence that man is really justified and to stress against a one-sided emphasis on Christ's vicarious atonement his life-renewing activity in man. Christ alone is righteous, but not so much because he fulfilled the Law as because

> he was born from all eternity, a righteous Son, from the righteous Father [John 17:25]. Hence it is this righteousness of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit whereby he who is himself righteous justifies the godless, that is, the righteousness of God, which is precisely the righteousness of faith.[41]

In the works *Whether the Son of God would have Become Flesh Even If Sin Had Not Come into the World. And on the Image of God: What It Is* (1550) and *On the Sole Mediator Jesus Christ and Justification by Faith* (1551) Osiander expounded his idea in more detail.

He explained the creation of Adam as the image of God thus:

> Hence there dwelt in Adam through grace the Word, the Son of God, and consequently also the Father and the Holy Spirit. Thus, as our Lord Jesus Christ was by nature God and man, Adam was man by nature but by grace he was a sharer in the divine nature and participated in it.[42]

---

[38] Cf. Osiander's work *Von dem neugeborenen Abgott und Antichrist zu Babel* (1550).

[39] "Then the *Interim* does not teach an agreed word about the correct and true righteousness, which is the proper and essential righteousness of God and his son Jesus Christ and is brought, given, and imputed to us through the faith whereby Christ dwells in us" (W. Möller, op. cit., p. 327).

[40] Thesis 73, cited from R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der DG* IV, 2, 497; cf. W. Möller, op. cit., pp. 385f.; H. E. Weber, I, 1, 258; cf. *CR,* 9, 469.

[41] Cited from W. Möller, op. cit., p. 383.

[42] Ibid., p. 392.

Christ's righteousness consisted in his divine nature. The original righteousness of the justified consists in his participation in the divine nature. Proceeding from this notion Osiander explained 1 John 4:2, the coming of Christ in the flesh, simply as the indwelling of the Word in us.[43] It is said of the justified that both natures are in them, just as in Christ.[44] Accordingly, justification is the reproducing of the Incarnation of the essentially divine righteousness in the individual man: "The ontological 'indwelling' of the essential 'righteousness' of Christ in the believer is what is primary, and only on the basis of this does God declare him to be righteous."[45] In his emphasis on the essential righteousness of God in us, in contradistinction to righteousness *extra nos,* Osiander appealed to Luther. Melanchthon, whose doctrine of justification Osiander attacked, tried at first to mediate (cf. *CR* 7, 775), but finally was induced in 1552 to publish a *Reply to the Book of Master Andreas Osiander on the Justification of Man.*[46]

In this he first alluded to the distinction between grace and gift and then insisted:

> And so we clearly profess and have always taught, as all the churches can testify, that it is true that a change must occur in us and that certainly God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, effect consolation and life in us in conversion and hence are in us and dwell in us to the extent that the Gospel is accepted with faith, whereby the Eternal Word, the Son of God, operates and gathers to himself one Church. [*CR* 7, 894f.; *St.A.* VI, 455, 24–30]

He said there was no quarrel over this presence of God in us (*CR* 7, 895; *St.A.* VI, 456, 10–13). However, it is not the basis of our confidence. Faith is based on the God-Man Jesus Christ, on his merits and his intercession (*CR* 7, 898). Even after rebirth man is still in need of the forgiveness of sins. He obtains it through the Mediator, Jesus Christ, who is to be distinguished from the Father and the Holy Spirit. If Osiander had censured the superficiality of Melanchthon's doctrine of justification and felt that "this teaching makes people secure" (*CR* 7, 898), Melanchthon referred to the salvific function of Christ's humanity and to his historical work of redemption, which came off badly in Osiander's mystical doctrine of justification.

---

[43] Testimonials on the *Interim;* cf. W. Möller, op. cit., p. 329. "Disputatio de iustificatione," Thesis 67; cf. H. E. Weber, I, 1, 279.

[44] H. E. Weber, I, 1, 279f.

[45] E. Kinder, "Die evangelische Lehre von der Rechtfertigung," *Quellen zur Konfessionskunde,* Reihe B, Heft 1 (Lüneburg 1957), 7.

[46] *CR* 7, 892–902; *St.A.* VI, 453–461; cf. *CR* 8, 608–612, to which Osiander replied with the *Widerlegung: Der ungegründeten, undienstlichen Antwort Philippi Melanchthonis* (1552).

In the declaration of theologians that he drew up at the Naumburg assembly of 23 May 1554, he thus accused Osiander:

> He nowhere makes a distinction between the Son and the Holy Spirit; he likewise makes no distinction between the presence of the divine nature in Christ and in other saints. . . . Likewise [he maintains] that only the divinity is righteousness; Christ's obedience is not righteousness.[47]

Friedrich Staphylus (1512–71) had again become a Catholic at Breslau in 1552. In 1546 he had been summoned to Königsberg on Melanchthon's recommendation (*CR* 6, 145) and in 1552 he had composed a work against Osiander at Danzig.[48] He now passed a similar judgment, maintaining that Osiander underestimated the importance of Christ's humanity, saw the basis of justification in charity, righteousness, and wisdom rather than in faith, and made it one with the essence of God.[49]

Flacius, Menius, Amsdorf, and Mörlin (1514–71) at Königsberg also wrote against Osiander. And Franciscus Stancarus, opposing him, went the other extreme, teaching that Christ justifies man only by virtue of his human nature.[50] The *Formula of Concord* rejected both the doctrine of Osiander and that of Stancarus.[51]

---

[47] *CR* 8, 286; cf. *CR* 8, 541: "What confusion there is, if only this is said: men are justified by the indwelling of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and if Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not distinct, and the obedience and intercession of the Mediator are not distinct from his activity, and the atonement is not distinct from the subsequent sanctification, and the old saying, that the Holy Spirit is never given without the Son, is not explained." Cf. *CR* 8, 426f., 555–563, 623; cf. *CR* 12, 5–12; *CR* 8, 589.

[48] *Synodus Sanctorum Patrum Antiquorum contra nova dogmata Andreae Osiandri* (Nürnberg 1553).

[49] Cf. *Lutheranae trimembris Theologiae Epitome* (1558) (p. III, *catalogus sectarum inter Confessionistas* III): "Osiander's followers have this in common with those of Schwenkfeld: that love, righteousness, and wisdom (but not love), by which man is made righteous and wise by God, are themselves the essence of God. Peculiar to Osiander's adherents is the doctrine that Christ justifies man only according to his divine nature, and likewise that man, since he is the image of God, becomes entirely the same image of God that Christ, Son of God and of Mary, is."

[50] Cf. *Apologia contra Osiandrum* (1552). *De trinitate et mediatore domino nostro Iesu Christo* (1562). Melanchthon (*CR* 23, 87–102; *St.A.* VI, 260–277) and Calvin (*OC*, 9, 333–358) composed refutations.

[51] Cf. *BSLK* 913, 10ff., 935, 15ff.

The Second Eucharistic Controversy

While the Lutherans were fighting among themselves over the *Interim,* Calvin and Bullinger reached agreement on the Eucharist at Zurich in the *Consensus Tigurinus,* as will be related in Chapter 29. Calvin had made concessions for the sake of unity. Bread and wine are still only signs of the spiritual community (actual communion) with Christ's flesh and blood. In this way was jeopardized the common understanding with Lutheranism, which had been declared at least in form by the signing of the *Confessio Augustana Variata* in 1541. Furthermore, it had not been made clear whether the *Variata* was a binding Lutheran confession. The Zurich agreement was first sent to the other Swiss churches for their acceptance, and hence its publication in print was delayed until 1551. German Lutheranism then saw itself faced with a growing influence of Calvin's theology and an encroachment by Calvinism on German soil. Thus the quarrel now erupting over the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist acquired a special violence and a more strongly confessional tone, which injected controversy into the congregations to a far greater extent than earlier. The division did not run clearly between the Calvinists and the Lutherans. Instead, many in the ranks of the latter, especially the educated, showed themselves to be accessible to the Calvinist teaching on the Eucharist. They opposed the then incipient Lutheran orthodoxy and the dogma of ubiquity which it represented. For this reason, following Melanchthon's death in 1560, they were labeled Cryptocalvinists and attacked.

The Hamburg pastor Joachim Westphal (1510–74) began the struggle in 1552 with a work entitled *Farrago.*[52] It was especially a summons to the Lutherans in view of the menacing danger. He followed this up the next year with his *Recta fides de coena Domini.* The extent of the chasm separating the Protestant confessions became clear when in 1553 Jan Laski (1499–1560), in flight from England with his Calvinist congregation, sought refuge in Germany. They met rejection and even hatred from the North German Lutherans. Westphal called them martyrs of the devil, and Bugenhagen had them told that he would sooner support papists than them.[53] They were finally received at Danzig and Emden. Laski composed a catechism at Emden in 1554. Thereupon strife broke out at Bremen (cf. *CR* 8, 336) between Melanchthon's pupil Albert Rizaeus Hardenberg (1510–47), whom Laski had gained for the Reformation in 1542 and who had been cathedral preacher at Bremen since 1547, and Johannes Timann, called Amsterodamus (d.

---

[52] *Farrago confuseanarum et inter se dissidentium opiniorum de coena Domini* (Magdeburg 1552).

[53] E. Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlstreits im 16. Jahrhundert,* p. 275.

1557). Timann's polemic[54] was answered by Laski.[55] Westphal denied to the Calvinists the right to appeal to Augustine.[56] Calvin himself did not intervene in the quarrel until January 1555, with a *Defense of the Doctrine of the Sacraments.*[57]

Westphal refuted this in his *Legitimate Defense against the False Accusation of a Certain Sacramentarian* (1555). To Calvin's annoyance (*OC* 16, 53f.) it was printed at Frankfurt-am-Main. Laski had gone there with his fugitive Calvinist congregation. Referring to the Religious Peace of Augsburg, the Lutheran clergy demanded agreement with the *Confessio Augustana,* which Laski tried hard to demonstrate.[58] Calvin dedicated his *Second Defense of the Devout and Right Faith,*[59] of the beginning of 1556, to the pastors of Saxony and Lower Germany, stressing that he was not fighting against them, but was only defending himself against Westphal's attacks. He represented Westphal as a disturber of the peace and an outsider. To favor Westphal's activities or in any way to agree with him was

> to regard as of no importance [the agreement of faith], which was clearly the work of God, and to create a schism among those who followed the same Lord of hosts. This is a heartless and godless severing of the members of Christ. [*OC* 9, 50]

This summons to unity was answered by a series of very sharp rejoinders. In 1556 Erhard Schnepf (1495–1558) published at Jena a *Profession on the Eucharist.* Westphal replied with a *Letter Containing a Brief Retort to Jean Calvin's Squabbling* [printed in *OC* 9, XVIII–XXI] *and to Jan Laski's Work in Which he Recasts the Augsburg Confession into Zwinglianism.* He also composed a *Confession of Faith in Which the Ministers of the Saxon Church . . . Expound the Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Supper . . .* (*OC* 9, XXI–XXIII). Calvin replied in 1557 with a *Last Admonition to Joachim Westphal* (*OC* 9, 137–252). A year previously there had also occurred a dispute over the doctrine of the Eucharist (cf. *CR* 8, 662) between the Lutheran Georg Buchholzer (1503–66) at Berlin and Crato of Crafftheim (1519–85) at Breslau.

---

[54] *Farrago sententiarum consentientium* (Frankfurt 1555).

[55] *Forma ac ratio tota ecclesiastici ministerii* (Frankfurt 1555).

[56] *Collectanea sententiarum D. Aurelii Augustini de Coena Domini* (Regensburg 1555).

[57] *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis* (*OC* 9, 4–36; cf. *OC* 15, 272–296, 304–307; *OS* II, 263–287).

[58] *Purgation oder nothwendige christliche Verantwortung der frembden Kirchen-Diener zu Franckfurt am Mayn* (1556).

[59] *Secunda defensio piae et orthodoxae de sacramentis fidei contra Joachimi Westphali calumnias* (1556) (*OC* 9, 41–120).

At Heidelberg Tilemann Hesshusen (1527–88),[60] professor and Bishop of the Palatinate, defended the Lutheran position against his deacon, Wilhelm Klebitz, whom he finally excommunicated. In this dispute the new Elector Frederick III (1559–76) turned to Melanchthon for an opinion. Melanchthon agreed that the Elector should impose silence on both factions and felt that, after the removal of those who were contentious, a common formula could be found for the others (*St.A.* VI, 484, 15–20). Melanchthon was probably thinking of an all-German synod. This manner of evading a decision was condemned by the senior minister at Regensburg, Nikolaus Gallus.[61] He had earlier severely criticized Melanchthon's view that Christ is present merely at the moment of reception. Now he published Melanchthon's testimonial with sharp marginal glosses. In these he accused Melanchthon of falsifying the written confessions in order to create a doctrine acceptable to all. Gallus abetted Calvinism and even agreed with Calvin in the question of the Eucharist. According to him, it was not the Gnesiolutherans who were the sources of discord; they were only defending themselves and the pure doctrine and guarding Luther's legacy. Hesshusen himself reacted to Melanchthon's testimonial with a very sharp *Responsio* (1560). He had had to leave Heidelberg, but he continued the struggle against the Calvinist doctrine of the Eucharist at Bremen and Magdeburg. He accused Hardenberg of having turned the Bremen cathedral into a den of cut-throats. Calvin replied to his work *On the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper against the Sacramentarians* (Jena 1560) with his own *Clear Explanation of the Sound Doctrine . . .* (1561; *OC* 9, 457–524).

The key figure in this dispute, conducted with great bitterness by both sides, was Melanchthon.[62] Lutherans and Calvinists appealed to him. Westphal sought to prove that Melanchthon did not agree with Calvin.[63] Calvin, on the other hand, claimed him for himself but accused him of favoring, by this silence, "unlearned, restless characters," who had again started the dispute over the Sacrament. "For," he wrote on 23 August 1554, "however insolent their stupidity may be, no one doubts that if you decided to admit publicly your opinion, it would be easy for you to calm their rage, at least to some extent."[64]

Here, as in the other controverted questions, Melanchthon was not the one to assume leadership. In the effort to avoid a dispute he had only made it worse through his reserve.

---

[60] *Iudicium de controversia de coena Domini* (1560) (*St.A.* VI, 482–486).

[61] R. Stupperich, *Der unbekannte Melanchthon* (Stuttgart 1961), pp. 123–126.

[62] Calvin himself felt, differing from Bullinger, that Westphal had been treated more roughly than was intended (*OC* 15, 359), but he remarks in the letter to the Saxon pastors that there was nothing left to him "but to drop a violent thunderbolt on a thick head" (*OC* 9, 47).

[63] *Clarissimi viri Ph. Melanchthonis sententia de coena domini* (1557).

[64] *OC* 15, 216; cf. *OC* 9, 52, 107; 16, 430.

The Eucharistic doctrine which he represented was from the outset more different from Luther's than both of them realized. From the start Melanchthon stressed the sacramental action: it, the eating and drinking, was the sign to a greater degree than were the elements.[65] Instead of the presence of Christ's body "in" the bread, he spoke of its presence "with" the bread in the course of his controversy with the Swiss. This allowed him to cling to the real presence without attaching it to the bread and giving occasion to spatial notions. In the *Confessio Augustana Variata* he had contributed the diluting formula: "that with bread and wine Christ's body and blood are truly administered to those who eat of the Lord's Supper."[66] In this Melanchthon had far greater possibilities of a connection with Bucer, Bullinger, and Calvin than with Luther. He did not expressly deny the reception of the body of Christ by the unworthy, but probably out of regard for Luther he did not mention the subject. At first he also passed over in silence the doctrine of ubiquity, but from about 1531 he attacked it as a false understanding of the *communicatio idiomatum.* "We must take care not to stress the divinity of Christ's humanity so much that we destroy his true corporeality" (*CR* 7, 780). The ancient Church rejected "this thesis that Christ is everywhere in his body" (*CR* 7, 780), and we must not introduce any new dogma (*CR* 2, 824).

> This talk [that Christ's body is in all places, in stone and wood] is new in Christianity; from the beginning to this day it has been rejected even by papists. For, while this thesis is true, that Christ is everywhere on the basis of the *communicatio idiomatum,* as he says "I in them" and "I am in their midst," it has a meaning different from this thesis, that his body is everywhere. [*CR* 9, 470]

The confession drawn up by Johannes Brenz at the Stuttgart Synod of 1559, in which it is said that all men, and hence unbelievers and the unworthy, received with their mouths the true body of Christ and that the humanity of Christ impregnates all things in a heavenly way, inaccessible to reason, was stigmatized by Melanchthon as "Hechingen Latin."[67] For him Christ, by his ascension, has occupied a place he did not previously have (*CR* 7, 884f.). But this did not mean, as Zwingli thought (*CR* 1,1100), that Christ could be only in heaven in his body;

---

[65] Already in the *Loci* of 1521 it is said: "Signum gratiae certum est participatio mensae domini, hoc est, manducare corpus Christi et bibere sanguinem" (*CR* 21, 221); cf. H. Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini* (Munich 1937), p. 65.

[66] *BSLK* 63, footnote 2; *St.A.* VI, 19, 31–33.

[67] *CR* 9, 1034, 1046.

rather it meant that Christ is present where he wished to be. Melanchthon emphasized the mystery. Instead of a presence in many places, he preferred to think that the many places are present as one point to the person of Christ and, by means of the person, to the body of Christ also (*CR* 2, 222). In relation to his notion of the "intended presence" of Christ[68] Melanchthon also rejected a presence apart from the action instituted by Christ ("extra usum institutum") and an adoration of the elements (artolatry): "What is left after the celebration is not a Sacrament" (*CR* 7, 872; 8, 598). Melanchthon did not undertake a careful exegesis of the scriptural passages that speak of the Eucharist. He referred less to the narrative of the institution than, again and again, to 1 Corinthians 10:16, in which he saw the best formula of union. He understood it to mean: the bread is the distributing of the body of Christ. Paul, he held, did not say "the bread is God," but "it is that by which arises communion with the body of Christ."[69] Melanchthon was profoundly distressed by the many theological quarrels which were destroying the unity of the Church and especially by the fact that they flared up over the Eucharist. He sought to restore unity in the Eucharistic controversy by reference to the ancient and devout Church (cf. *CR* 2, 824; 7, 543), but he would have much preferred not to dispute at all "over the manner of the presence" (*CR* 3, 511).

But Luther had already denied the doctrine of transsubstantiation as an inadmissible speculation and wanted to leave the "how" of the presence uninvestigated. However, the very necessity of a confrontation with adherents of the Reformation had caused him to seize upon the *theologoumenon* of the ubiquity of Christ's humanity, which brought with it far greater difficulties. Despite all his protestations of being satisfied with the fact of the presence as the pledge of the divine promise, Melanchthon could not do otherwise.

The quarrels continued after his death. His son-in-law, the Elector's physician Kaspar Peucer (1525–1602), the councillor Georg Cracow (1525–75), the theologian Christoph Pezel (1539–1604), and others even more sharply disavowed Luther's doctrine of ubiquity and developed Melanchthon's views still further in the direction of Calvinism. These were frequently not theologians but humanistically trained physicians, jurists, and men of letters, "who concealed their free thinking in regard to religion and life under the guise of Philippism and spread it under such protection."[70] If the educated then subscribed to a Cryptocalvinism, this was because the particular formulas offered were open to a humanistic spiritual understanding. Paul Eber (1511–64) and Paul Crell (1531–79), on the other hand, stressed the real presence more strongly and tried to mediate between the Gnesiolutherans and the Philippists. Their Cryptocalvinism was made clear to all the world with the appearance of the *Exegesis perspicua et ferme integra de Sacra Coena* (1574), composed by Joachim Curaeus (1532–73) but published anonymously.[71] In it ubiquity was rejected as a monophysitic heresy and Luther's sacramental realism was criticized. Toleration was again demanded for the Swiss on the basis of the *Consensus Tigurinus,* until an international synod should have formulated a common Protestant doctrine. The strictly Lutheran Elector August I (1553–86) felt that he had been imposed upon by his theologians. Peucer, Cracow, the court preacher Schütz, and the senior minister Stössel were imprisoned. Others, like Pezel, were banished and thereafter urged Hesse, Nassau, Bremen, and Anhalt to mediate between Wittenberg and Geneva. Strict Lutheranism was restored in Electoral Saxony by the ecclesiastical power of the prince. The route back to the Lutheran position was found in the Torgau Eucharistic Confession of 1574 and at the same time the way was prepared for the doctrinal consensus of the adherents of the *Confessio Augustana* in the *Formula of Concord* of 1577. Article 7 of the *Concord* states: "Nevertheless they hold and teach that, with the bread and wine, the body and the blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, given, and received." Just the same, Crypotocalvinism revived in Electoral Saxony under the weak Elector Christian I (1586–91) and his domineering chancellor, Nikolaus Krell, until the latter was imprisoned in 1591 and, following a ten-year trial, was beheaded in the Dresden marketplace on 9 October 1601.

---

[68] *CR* 23, 751; 4, 264; 7, 877, 887.

[69] *CR* 8, 538, 660; *St.A.* VI, 484 (*CR* 9, 962); cf. H. Gollwitzer, op. cit., p. 83.

[70] J. Moltmann, *Christoph Pezel (1539–1604) und der Calvinismus in Bremen* (Bremen 1958), p. 11.

---

[71] Edited by W. Schaffler (Marburg 1853).

CHAPTER 29

Jean Calvin
Personality and Work

Youth, Studies, and Early Writings (1509–36)

The Reformed Church of Western Europe bears the stamp of the personality and work of Jean Calvin. Born on 10 July 1509, at Noyon in Picardie, he was the son of Gerard Cauvin, manager of the properties of the local cathedral chapter. As such, Calvin's father had probably had many a glimpse into all the human frailties which only too often accompanied the linking together of money or economic interests and religion. Because of a suit against the cathedral chapter he was excommunicated in 1528 and died under the censure in 1531. We must expect that these circumstances may have prejudiced Calvin against the traditional ecclesiastical life. It is significant that the other Geneva reformer, Guillaume Farel, was also the son of the manager of a cathedral chapter's property. If from his father Calvin had inherited a legalistic mind and a sober critical sense, through his Flemish mother he was connected with the intensity of late medieval piety. However, he lost his mother while still a boy.

A benefice at Noyon opened up for young Calvin the way into the clerical state, but first of all it provided him especially with the means to commence his studies. He obtained his earliest education with the sons of a friendly noble family, and with them he went to Paris in 1523, at the age of fourteen. He arrived there in August, the very month in which the Augustinian Jean Vallière was burned outside the gates of the city because of his Lutheran agitation—the first Frenchman to die in this cause. Calvin was admitted to the College de la Marche and in 1524 into the College Montaigu, which was steeped in tradition. Erasmus had already complained of the strictness and scholastic narrowness of the Montaigu. There nominalism was the prevailing approach, and Natalis Beda (d. 1537) played a major role. He was the soul of the opposition to the Lutheran currents in Paris, but he also saw a danger to the Church in humanist reformers such as Lefèvre d'Etaples and Erasmus. In 1528 Calvin obtained the licentiate in the liberal arts. But he did not continue his studies in theology. Apart from the fact that, during his arts courses, he became acquainted with the Fathers and with theological problems—his teacher in this faculty was the Scotsman John Mair (Major)—he never studied theology as such and earned no degree in it. His impressive later knowledge of it was due to private study.[1]

At the wish of his father, then on the outs with the Noyon canons, he studied law at Orléans under Peter de l'Estoile and later (1529) at Bourges under Andreas Alciati, and in 1532 obtained the licentiate.

---

[1] F. W. Dankbaar, *Calvin* (Neukirchen 1959), pp. 5, 26. According to K. Reuter, *Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins* (Neukirchen 1963), however, Calvin is supposed to have been introduced by John Major in 1524–28 to a "new concept of anti-Pelagian and Scotist theology and to a revived Augustinianism" (pp. 21, 36). From John Major he is supposed to have taken, independently of Luther, the doctrine of Gregory of Rimini on God, providence, and sin (pp. 168, 202; cf. pp. 148, 158). The first edition of the *Institutio* gives no indication of this. At the Montaigu Calvin was from fourteen to eighteen years old.

During his studies at Orléans and Bourges he was in contact with the Swabian Melchior Volmar, a reform-minded humanist (born at Rottweil in 1496, died at Tübingen in 1556). Volmar introduced him to Greek.[2] After his father's death in 1531, Calvin went to Paris, where he concentrated especially on the humanities. The fruit of this interest was a commentary on Seneca's *De clementia* (1532), which shows a familiarity with the classical authors and the Church Fathers. It also has a strong political and ethical tone and exhibits its author as a humanist reformer of a juristic stamp. Calvin was still under the spell of biblical reform humanism, whose chief at Paris was Lefèvre d'Etaples (ca. 1450–1536). But the young reformer was too much a man of clarity, of precise commitment, and of ecclesiastical order to be satisfied with the humanist "Nicodemitism." It cannot be exactly determined when he turned to Protestantism. According to the second *apologia* against Westphal, he had already read Luther's writings before 1529 and had "begun to emerge from the darkness of the papacy,"[3] but in the foreword to his commentary on the psalms of 1557 he speaks of a "subita conversio" to the Reformation. It states:

> . . . and although I had so obstinately submitted myself to the papal superstition that it was very difficult to be extricated from so deep a morass, still God, by a sudden conversion to docility (*subita conversione ad docilitatem*), subdued my heart and made it submissive, even though in view of my age, it was only too obdurate in such matters.[4]

If we follow this late testimony of Calvin and accept a sudden change, it must have occurred at the end of 1533. But in that case it is still doubtful whether Calvin, who always defended himself most fiercely against the charge of having split the Church, at that time regarded his conversion as a break with Rome or instead as a summons to "reestablish prostrate religion"[5] or to the "honorable function of preacher and minister of the Gospel."[6] In any event, his conversion, unlike Luther's, did not spring from an anxious wrestling for his own salvation and was not to the same degree experienced by him as a fundamentally new understanding of the Gospel. For Calvin the reform of the Church was much more prominent. He was concerned for *vera religio* against the idolatry of the contemporary Church and, as a layman, he intended to aid *pietas* against the *impii.* The decisive turning points of his life were determined by experiencing that God had laid his hand upon him and destined him for the service of the Church. He was unable to withhold himself. He stated that, "For a person must be cruel and without piety, to be able to behold with dry eyes the Church in our time. But whoever could heal her and fails to do so—such a person is the embodiment of inhumanity."[7]

---

[2] Dedication of the exegesis of Second Corinthians, 1546 (*OC*, 12, 364f.).

[3] *OC* 9, 51.

[4] Ibid., 31, 21; cf. P. Sprenger, *Das Rätsel um die Bekehrung Calvins* (Neukirchen 1960), pp. 9ff.

[5] Letter to Sadoleto (*OC* 5, 410).

[6] Preface to the commentary on the Psalms (*OC*, 30, 21).

Thereafter, Calvin led a wandering life. Among other places, he stayed at Angoulême with Canon Louis du Tillet, and perhaps it was here that he began the preliminary work on his chief literary production, *Institutio Christianae Religionis.* Via Poitiers he went to Orléans, where he composed his first theological work, *Psychopannychia.*[8] In it he took issue with the humanist and fanciful doctrine of the sleep of the souls of the dead until the resurrection of the body. He made abundant use of Scripture—more than two hundred quotations on fifty-one pages—and proved a good knowledge of the Church Fathers. In May 1534 Calvin's benefices in Noyon were distributed to others, and this is generally seen as his final separation from the old Church. At the end of that year or early in 1535 he went via Strasbourg to Basel. Here he met not only the Basel reformers Simon Grynaeus (1493–1541) and Oswald Myconius (1488–1552), but also Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75) of Zurich, who was continuing Zwingli's life work, and Martin Bucer (1491–1551) and Wolfgang Capito (c. 1480–1541) of Strasbourg.

In the summer of 1535 he finished the *Institutio,* which was printed in 1536. This first edition contained a brief compendium of the teachings of the Gospel and at the same time an *apologia* for the French Protestants with a dedicatory note to King Francis I. The King had taken measures against the Protestants when lampoons attacking the Mass had been posted in several parts of Paris and even in the royal Chateau Amboise on the Loire. In a letter to the German Protestant princes he had represented his action as directed against Anabaptists and anarchists. Against this, Calvin intended to plead "the common cause of all the pious, the very cause of Christ himself." For, according to him, the godless have achieved their purpose in that the truth of Christ, if it is not dying scattered and banished, at least remains buried and neglected, and the *paupercula ecclesia* is either carried off by horrible murders or is driven into exile, or, discouraged by threats and terrors, no longer dares to open its mouth.[9] This "poor little" persecuted Church is the one

---

[7] *Institutio* of 1536, chap. 5, *OS* I, 215f.

[8] *Psychopannychia,* 1542, ed. W. Zimmerli (Leipzig 1932).

[9] Dedication to Francis I (*OC* 1, 11); Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 36.

Church of Jesus Christ, which cannot be "seen with bodily eyes" and cannot be "circumscribed by borders." For Calvin, who sharply defended himself against the reproach of schism and sectarianism, the dispute arose because his opponents "claimed, first, that the Church was constantly present and was visible in her external form, and, second, that they fixed the form of the Church in the Roman See and the hierarchy of their bishops."[10] "The Church can also exist without a visible form," or at least her essence does not depend on it. Her marks are "the pure preaching of the word and the legitimate dispensing of the Sacraments."[11] The *gloria Dei,* Calvin's main concern, is often stressed in this letter. The Church founded on the word of God finds its *raison d'etre* in his glory. It is a question of "how God's glory is to be inviolate on earth, how God's truth is to maintain its dignity, how Christ's kingdom is to be well established and supported among us."[12]

The *Institutio* of 1536 shows how in Basel Calvin's theological thought acquired its definitive form. Probably decisive were his status as a fugitive, life in the reform congregation of this city, and the profound study here possible to him. His studies comprised especially the Bible and Luther's writings, chiefly his catechisms, the *Freiheit eines Christenmenschen,* and *De captivitate Babylonica.* The locally prevailing theology—Zwingli's—seems to have been less influential on him. Whereas the 1536 edition of the *Institutio* offered only a brief summary of Christian doctrine in six chapters, Calvin constantly enlarged the work, and the edition of 1559–60 finally became a comprehensive treatise on dogma in four books and eighty chapters.

First Activity in Geneva (1536–38)

After a short stay at Ferrara and at his old home, Calvin, prevented by the war from going to Strasbourg, went to Geneva in July–August of 1536. The Reformation had been established here a short time before, and, as frequently in Switzerland, its introduction took the form of the city's struggle for freedom, even of a patriotic rising against foreign rule. In October 1533 the citizens had expelled Bishop Pierre de la Baume (d. 1544), who was merely the puppet of the Duke of Savoy. Thereafter the bishop and the cathedral canons had resided at Annecy.

Guillaume Farel had appeared in Geneva as a preacher as early as

---

[10] *OC* 1, 20; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 44.

[11] *OC* 1, 21; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 44.

[12] *OC* 1, 11; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 36.

1532.[13] The opposition of the canons, however, had forced him to leave the city, but at the end of 1533 he was back. The reform currents found powerful support in Geneva's ally, Bern. Following a disputation between Catholic and reformed theologians, lasting from 30 May to 24 June 1535, the struggle was decided in favor of the latter, and in May 1536 the city council and the people solemnly resolved "to live according to the Gospel." When Calvin arrived there in the summer of that year, everything was, as he expressed it, topsy-turvy.[14] Farel needed his help, especially his talent for organization, and hence urged him to stay. Calvin wrote later: "It was as though God had stretched out his hand from above and laid it on me in order to stop me."[15] He first ministered not as preacher or pastor but under the title of a "lecturer on Holy Scripture."[16] He interpreted the Epistle to the Romans and preached only occasionally. It was only at the end of 1536 that he was appointed preacher and pastor of the Church of Geneva.[17] Early in October, at a disputation in Lausanne between Catholics and reformed theologians, he had displayed the force of his religious conviction and his wide knowledge of the Bible and of theology. In the same year he drafted the rules of organization for the congregation. Much as Geneva needed it, it met with little approval among the citizens, for large segments of the populace had gone over to the Reformation, not for the sake of the Gospel, but to shake off the rule of the bishop and of the Duke of Savoy. Not a few mistook evangelical freedom for political independence or even for license.

The *Articles concernant l'organisation de l'Eglise,*[18] submitted to the city council "by Master Guillaume Farel and other preachers" on 16 January 1537 were largely Calvin's work. As was stressed from the outset, governing laws for the congregation and ecclesiastical discipline were necessary for the dignified celebration of the Lord's Supper. "It is certain that a congregation cannot be regarded as well ordered and managed, if the Lord's holy Supper is not often celebrated and received in it."[19]

---

[13] Guillaume Farel was born at Gap in Dauphine in 1489. Through his studies in Paris (1509) he came into contact with Lefèvre d'Etaples. He worked for the Reformation from 1521. Flight brought him to Basel and Strasbourg. He had much success for the Reformation at Montgeliard (1524), Aigle, Bern, and especially Neuchâtel (1529). Again and again he returned to Neuchâtel from Geneva. He died on 13 September 1565. Cf. *Guillaume Farel (1489–1565). Biographie nouvelle* (Neuchâtel-Paris 1930).

[14] *OC* 9, 892; *OS* II, 401.

[15] Cf. the preface to the explanation of the Psalms (1577), *OC* 31, 26; J. Cadier, *Calvin* (Zollikon 1959), p. 78.

[16] *OC* 21, 30; 21, 126.

[17] Ibid., 5, 386.

[18] *OS* I, 369–379.

[19] Ibid., I, 369.

Exclusion from the Sacrament— excommunication—is needed in order to keep out the unworthy and preserve the Church spotless. "Those who will not submit voluntarily and in all obedience to the holy word of God after friendly exhortation" should be punished and taught by means of such Church discipline.[20] Because of the profit to believers, who thereby "really share in the body and blood of Christ, in his death, his life, his spirit, and all his gifts,"[21] communion should be celebrated every Sunday as a praiseworthy demonstration of the divine wonders and gifts of grace and as an encouragement to a Christian life in peace and in the unity of the body of Christ. For "Jesus did not institute this Sacrament so that we might celebrate it two or three times a year as a memorial meal, but that we might strengthen and exercise our faith and love through a frequent celebration."[22] However, because of the ignorance of the people, Calvin would agree to a monthly celebration. The city council would not accept even that and decreed that the celebration of Communion be held only four times a year. This became the rule, contrary to the reformer's intention.

In all sections of the city expressly appointed men of strong and incorruptible character were to keep a watchful eye on the behavior of their fellow citizens. If they ascertained improper conduct or vice in anyone, they were to discuss this with a pastor so that he might admonish the guilty and urge them fraternally to mend their ways.[23] Here were the origins of the later *presbyterium.* In the second section of the "articles" directions are given for the congregational psalmody. The third deals with the instruction of children. With the aid of a catechism they should be made capable of confessing the faith.

As soon as the articles had been adopted by the council, Calvin brought out a catechism in French,[24] but not yet in the form of question and answer, which he would do later. In brief chapters it deals with the commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Sacraments, and spiritual and secular authority. To this catechism is added a Creed, "which all the citizens and inhabitants of Geneva and all subjects of the region were to bind themselves on oath to observe and uphold."[25] Comprising twenty-three articles, it begins: "We confess that, as the rule of our faith and of our religion, we will follow only the Holy Scripture, without the addition of any human ideas whatsoever." Whoever refused to accept this Creed was to lose his citizenship and "go elsewhere to live." The ecclesiastical officials were to see to it that everyone lived according to the Creed, and the council was to punish those who refused. The council had prevented the forming of a court independent of the civil authorities, with the result that the Church government was to a great extent dependent on the secular power. This should be kept in mind in speaking of a theocracy at Geneva. At most, at that time, a theocracy existed only in so far as public affairs were to be regulated according to the word of God and the authorities had to supervise religion.

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., I, 370.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid. I, 373.

[24] *Instruction et Confession de Foi dont on use en l'Eglise de Genève* (*OS* I, 378–417).

[25] *OS* I, 418.

Even in this mitigated form the implementation of the articles encountered opposition. The rigorous measures resorted to against those of evil life, such as the pillory, met with scant approval. After all, not for this had the yoke of the bishop and of the Duke of Savoy been thrown off. Nevertheless, on 13 March 1537 the "small council" decided that the Church organization was to be obeyed in full. On 29 July the council secretary Michael Roset mounted the pulpit and read aloud the Creed and the city ordinance. The "presidents of the tenths," or heads of the city districts, were to bring the inhabitants of their territories to the cathedral of Saint-Pierre, where all would bind themselves under oath to the Creed. But many stayed away or refused, and on 12 November the order was renewed. Whoever did not take the oath was to incur the loss of all rights in Geneva. But this was easier said than done. Opposition to the council grew, and the animosity against the French pastors increased more and more.

Calvin did not budge. At the beginning of January the reformers told the council that they would exclude from communion everyone who had not taken the oath to the Creed. But the council, viewing developments with some alarm, decreed that admittance to the Lord's Supper was to be denied to no one.[26] When, in February 1538, men hostile to Calvin and Farel were elected to the council and the opposition obtained a majority, the council forbade the reformers to mix in political affairs and instituted an inquiry into remarks made by Calvin in sermons.[27] The reformers, on the other hand, tried to preserve the independence of religion when Bern urged that the customs it had retained—the baptismal font, unleavened bread, and holy days apart from Sunday, such as Christmas, New Year's, and the Ascension—should be reintroduced at Geneva. On 11 March 1538 the Council of Two Hundred voted its acceptance of ceremonial agreement with Bern and ordered the pastors to comply. They declined to do so.[28] Calvin and

---

[26] OC 21, 219f.

[27] Ibid., 21, 222.

[28] Ibid., 21, 224f.

Farel refused to administer communion on Easter 1538, on the ground that, with so much unrest, mockery, and mob activity, it would be a sacrilege. Despite a prohibition, they mounted the pulpit. On Easter Tuesday, 23 April the council decreed the banishment of Calvin and Farel, who had to leave the city within three days.[29] At the news Calvin said: "If we had served men, this would be a poor recompense. But we serve a great Lord, who will not withhold his reward from us."[30] His bitterness over the wrong did not keep him from admitting that he himself had made a few wrong turns. He wrote to Farel in September 1538:

> Even though we intend to confess before God and his people that, because of our lack of experience, our carelessness, our neglect, and our mistakes, at least partly it has come about that the Church entrusted to us has collapsed so wretchedly, nevertheless it is our duty to assert our purity and innocence against those by whose deceit and malice, dishonesty and shamelessness such a debacle occurred.[31]

Strasbourg (1538–41)

On 25 April 1538 Calvin left Geneva and went to Basel, intending to live there as a private scholar and to revise his *Institutio.* At the time he seems to have entertained doubts as to his pastoral calling. But Bucer, Capito, and Sturm asked him to come to Strasbourg. When Calvin hesitated to undertake again a pastoral office, Bucer threatened him with the anger of God, with reference to the Prophet Jonah. And Calvin wrote in the preface to his commentary on the psalms:

> Martin Bucer called me forcibly to my new post with an adjuration similar to that once employed by Farel at Geneva. The example of Jonah, with which he reproached me, overcame me and I again took up the office of teacher.[32]

Calvin went to Strasbourg in September 1538. He assumed the function of preacher in the French refugee community and at the same time was made lecturer in Scripture at the secondary school conducted by the humanist Johannes Sturm. Here he composed the second, much enlarged and revised, edition of the *Institutio,* which appeared in Latin in 1539 and in French in 1541. But the Strasbourg period was more decisive for his development by providing him with an apprenticeship in practical theology. His fate at Geneva had indeed shown how difficult it was to develop a newly born community and how very much he had lacked patience and experience. Now he learned from cooperating with Bucer and Capito how to build up a community and its order of worship and thus found his complete formation as a reformer.

---

[29] Ibid., 21, 226.

[30] Ibid., 21, 226f.

[31] Ibid., 10, II, 246; cf. *OC,* 10, II, 253.

[32] Ibid., 31, 28.

A "German Mass," composed by the pastor Theobald Schwarz, had been celebrated in Strasbourg as early as 1524. Bucer had further elaborated it. Calvin was able to utilize these works in a liturgy for his French congregation at Strasbourg; in 1540 issuing a formulary for the liturgy of the word, communion, and baptism. Already in 1539 he had compiled in French a psaltery, containing eighteen psalms, the Apostles' Creed, the canticle of Simeon, and the Ten Commandments in hymn form. He had himself put five psalms in poetic form; the others were done by the French court poet, Clement Marot. For these texts the reformer adopted Strasbourg melodies. Bucer had also done the spade work in Church discipline. In Strasbourg Calvin did not have to fear difficulties similar to those in Geneva because his little refugee congregation was under the scrutiny of the city council to a lesser degree. In Idelette de Bure, widow of an Anabaptist, he found a wife who became also a helper in his life's work.

By participating in religious discussions at Frankfurt (1539), Hagenau (1540), Worms (1540–41), and Regensburg (1541), Calvin became acquainted with religious conditions in Germany and came into contact with leaders of German Protestantism, especially Melanchthon. Luther and Calvin never met; they knew each other only through their respective Latin writings. Their differences in personality added to their differing theological interpretations, notably in regard to communion. Luther's sentimental ways and fits of anger could not but be repugnant to Calvin's clear rationalism. On 25 November 1544 the latter wrote to Heinrich Bullinger of Zurich:

> I hear that Luther recently made a fearful verbal attack, not only on you, but on all of us. . . . I do not know whether Luther was provoked by any of your writings; but even if a nature such as his, which is not only irritable but downright soured, goes into a rage for a trivial reason, he certainly could have no adequate grounds for such a storm and uproar. I now hardly dare to ask you to keep silent; for it would not be right to let the innocent be treated so shamefully and to deny them the opportunity to justify themselves; it would also be hard to say whether it would be good to keep silent. But this is my desire: that you keep in mind how great a man Luther is, with what extraordinary spiritual gifts he is

> endowed, how bravely and unshakeably, how skillfully, how learnedly and effectively he has always hitherto labored for the destruction of the rule of Antichrist and for the spread of the doctrine of salvation. I have already often said: if he were to call me the devil, I would still do him the honor of regarding him as a most outstanding servant of God, who, it is true, suffers from great defects, just as he is rich in brilliant virtues. If only he had exerted himself to control better his impetuous nature, which explodes everywhere! If only he had constantly turned his innate passion against the enemies of truth instead of letting it flare up against the Lord's servants![33]

Calvin participated in the Regensburg Colloquy of 1541 as delegate of Strasbourg. He had several reservations in regard to Bucer's conciliating method and the unclear formulae of the *Regensburg Book.* Still, he accepted the concept of twofold justice and defended it against Farel.[34] But he would not be satisfied "with half a Christ" for the sake of union. He expressed himself very critically in regard to the negotiations on the doctrine of the Eucharist: "Philip Melanchthon and Bucer drew up ambiguous and fine sounding theses on transubstantiation in an attempt to satisfy their opponents without really yielding anything. The plan does not please me."[35] Calvin firmly opposed the treatment of the Mass and departed before the colloquy foundered on this subject. Soon after, on 13 September 1541, Calvin returned to Geneva.

There was a prelude to his return. In Geneva the situation had become ever more confused, and pastors and mayors were in no position to reestablish orderly life. The partisans of Calvin and Farel, called "Guillermins," raised their heads again, but a not inconsiderable segment of the population pressed for a return to the old Church. In this situation Cardinal Jacob Sadoleto, Bishop of Carpentras, at the suggestion of an episcopal conference at Lyons, published an open letter to the city of Geneva, inviting it to come back to the bosom of the Church, which "for now fifteen centuries has found unanimous acceptance and approval."[36] The learned, Erasmian-minded cardinal wrote "as a friend and brother" and showed his anxiety over the dissension that was destroying the city. The reformers in their midst, he stated, had led the Genevans astray and sown discord out of mere striving for personal power and honor. After treating of justification by faith alone, of the Sacraments, and of the invocation of the saints, he concluded:

---

[33] Ibid., 11, 774; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 285.

[34] Ibid., 11, 215; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 190f.

[35] *OC* 11, 217.

[36] *OS* I, 441–489.

> Return to the unity which is guaranteed only in the venerable, ancient, Catholic Church. For she is guided always and everywhere by the Spirit of Christ. Only thus can we appear with confidence before the judgment seat of God. But he who separates himself from this Church has no champion at the Last Judgment, and the outer darkness awaits him. Therefore, attach yourselves again to the Catholic Church and its spiritual leaders, for Scripture says, "Do what they say." We have only your salvation in view.[37]

This letter made an impression, and the Geneva pastors were at a loss what to do. A request for a rejoinder was sent to Calvin at Strasbourg. The *Reply to Sadoleto* was composed in six days and is signed: Strasbourg, 1 September 1539.[38] It deals mainly with the Church, justification, and the Sacraments. The Church is based, not on the approval of the centuries, but on the word of God. She proves that she is the true Church by her doctrine, organization, Sacraments, and correct worship. In a sort of psalm of vengeance Calvin solemnly calls God to witness that he did not split the Church nor withdraw from her.

> In what people are careful to blame on me as apostasy from the Church, I am aware of nothing evil in myself. Or is one to be regarded as a deserter who again holds aloft the leader's standard where he sees soldiers collapsed and, pale with anxiety, leaving their ranks, and calls them back to their positions? . . . In order to gather them out of this chaos I have not put them under a strange banner but under your only banner, which we must follow if we wish to belong to your people.[39]

The letter again won Geneva for the Reformation. The people became all the more aware of the inability of their pastors, and the desire to have Calvin back grew. Furthermore, in February 1539 mayors had come into office who were sympathetic to radical reforms. Calvin was called back, but he declined. In October 1540 an official petition from the "small council" reached him. It was seconded by friends such as Farel. But for Calvin the will of man was not the determining factor. He consulted his conscience and tried to determine the will of God. On 24 October he wrote to Farel:

> I present my heart to the Lord as a sacrifice. I want the brethren at Strasbourg to consider only what is best for God's glory and the

---

[37] Ibid., I, 455.

[38] *OC* 5, 356–416; *OS* I, 457–489.

[39] *OS* I, 482. German translation by G. Gloede, *Musste Reformation sein? Calvins Antwort an Kardinal Sadolet* (Göttingen n.d.).

> welfare of his Church. You do not need to be concerned for me. Even though I am not very ingenious, I would probably have excuses which would make it seem to men as though the matter had gone astray without me. But I know that I must deal with God, who brings such falsehood to light. Therefore, I have bound my mind and handed it over into obedience to God. And because I do not know how I must decide, I submit myself to the guidance of those through whom, I hope, God will speak to me.[40]

Participation in the religious colloquies granted time for delay, and in a letter of 1 March 1541, he sighed to the impatiently importunate Farel:

> The lightning flashes with which you so surprisingly thunder against me—why I do not know—have utterly confused and frightened me. For you know that I have dreaded a call back, but I have not shirked it. Why must you inveigh so violently against me that you almost call an end to our friendship?[41]

When Calvin finally left Strasbourg on 4 September 1541 he was probably thinking only of a temporary stay in Geneva, for he did not take his family.

The Organization of Church Authority in Geneva (1541–64)

Calvin went to Geneva in the spirit of his motto, *prompte et sincere.* On 13 September 1541 he entered the council hall and was treated with the greatest politeness and was told he would be well provided for materially. He avoided acting harshly and in any way taking his opponents to task. All the same, serious struggles over the independence of the spiritual power from the city government were still in store for him. He immediately set about organizing the congregation, and already on 20 November 1541, *Les ordonnances ecclésiastiques,*[42] modeled on those of Strasbourg, were accepted by the councillors. There soon followed a liturgy (*Forme des prières et chants ecclésiastiques,* 1542) and the catechism (1542–45). From Bucer at Strasbourg Calvin adopted the system of four ecclesiastical offices—pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons.

Pastors were to preach the word of God and administer the Sacraments. Those of the three city churches and of the surrounding villages constituted the *Vénérable compagnie des pasteurs.* Every week it was to meet for the study of Scripture and consultation on pastoral matters. In differences of opinion as to correct doctrine it was to decide according to God's word what was to be believed. Every three months the mutual, fraternal "censorship," a criticism of conduct was to take place. The *compagnie* was to nominate new pastors, but the sole power of selection rested with the council. It presented them to the congregation, which could only assent to the choice of the council after the event. Calvin wanted to retain the imposition of hands in ordination as an apostolic custom, but he was only too ready to accommodate himself to the city council on the grounds that, out of consideration for the current superstition, it was perhaps better to give up the imposition of hands—as though an abuse could be a sufficient reason for abolishing an apostolic custom. Hence there was preserved the remark that pastors should be inducted into office without any superstitious ceremonies, with only instruction on the office and prayer.

---

[40] *OC* 11, 100; *ep.* 248.

[41] *OC* 11, 169f.; *ep.* 286.

[42] *OS* II, 325ff.; W. Niesel, *Bekenntnisschriften* (Zollikon-Zurich), pp. 42–64.

Doctors, as teachers of theology, were to deliver lectures on the Old and New Testaments. They also had to supervise candidates for the office of pastor. In the secondary school they were to teach the biblical languages and impart a general education. The council named them after consulting the pastors.

The elders, or presbyters, had to supervise the behavior of the members of the congregation. Together with the five to ten pastors they formed the Church council or consistory. In Geneva the "elder" was no purely ecclesiastical official but rather an agent of the city council. The twelve elders were selected by the "small council," in agreement with the pastors, from among the membership of the council and confirmed by the "great council." A mayor was chairman of the consistory. Calvin was unable to achieve the full independence of the Church. As preaching and the administration of the Sacraments were the duty of the pastor, so the direction of the Church pertained to the consistory. The elders had to supervise the conduct of the congregation by means of, among other things, regular visits to homes. Whoever was guilty of gossiping, drunkenness, usury, immorality, brawling, card playing, and so forth, was brought before the consistory each Thursday by a city official. In criminal cases the city council had competence. Stubborn contemners of the Church order had to be excommunicated after three warnings and denounced to the council. Thus ecclesiastical justice was largely subject to the civil law. Calvin had to fight a prolonged battle in order to reserve at least the admission to communion to the spiritual tribunal. If we speak of theocracy or bibliocracy maintained by the reformer at Geneva, we must not forget to what an extent the secular officials interfered in ecclesiastical life and that Calvin was unable for the most part to carry out what he held to be right. In the definitive version of *Les ordonnances ecclésiastiques* of 1561 he was, it is true, able to gain more prominence for his idea of the congregation.

Deacons were stewards of ecclesiastical institutions or took direct charge of the poor and the sick.

Following the organization of the Church, Calvin compiled a catechism in November 1541. This "Geneva Catechism" of 1542 differed in form and arrangement from that of 1537. It was no longer a treatise but consisted of questions and answers. It also abandoned the arrangement of Luther's small catechism. Whereas the latter treated the law before the Creed, the order in the Geneva catechism of 1542 was: faith, law, prayer, Sacraments. In this is expressed a new concept of the law and the Gospel. The law is not only a "disciplinarian," its meaning lies not merely in convicting man of sin; but as the regulation of the covenant it gives the baptized the rule of Christian life. "The law shows us the goal for which we must strive in order that each, in proportion to the grace which God has given him, may ceaselessly exert himself to reach it and may advance day by day" (Question 229).

The community organization at Geneva could be realized only after drawn out struggles. When a start was made of imposing a strict Christian manner of life, many again regarded this as an unpleasant limitation of personal freedom. It was easy to mobilize the local patriotism of the established Geneva families against the overmighty influence of the outsider Calvin and against the French refugees who suported him. These opponents of Calvin called themselves patriots, but his friends called them "libertines," because they stood for a more liberal concept of morals and for the right to a gayer life. The center of the opposition was the family of the mayor, Amié Perrin, who had at first been one of the enthusiastic adherents of Farel and Calvin. But when his father-in-law, Francois Favre, had been denied communion because of immoral conduct; his brother-in-law had been jailed for eight days because of unseemly behavior at a wedding; and his wife had been rebuked for dancing at a wedding, Perrin joined the strong opposition to the pastorate. The question arose as to the limits of the consistory's power. For years Calvin had to put up with various restrictions and affronts. But in the elections of January 1555 the "libertines" suffered a decisive defeat. The new mayors and a majority of the council were on Calvin's side. When his opponents allowed themselves to engage in demonstrations and even in an armed uprising, their fate was finally sealed. The rioters were either executed or banished.

Calvin was now able to give the congregational idea greater importance. The ecclesiastical council obtained more freedom from the secular government. According to the definitive Church organization of

1561 a mayor, when acting as president of the Church council, was to dispense with his staff of office in order to make clear the difference between secular authority and spiritual leadership. Furthermore, the new citizens—the French refugees—were also to be eligible for office and the members of the congregation might express their reservations in regard to candidates.

When, after 1555, Calvin was certain of the support of council and citizenry, he turned to the realization of his old plan, the founding of a university. At Strasbourg in 1556 he sought the advice of the great teacher, Johannes Sturm. The academy finally opened in 1559 with two departments. In addition to elementary instruction, Latin, Greek, and philosophy were taught in the "Schola privata," a continuation of the earlier Latin school. On this was based the "Schola publica," in which lectures were given in Greek, Hebrew, the branches of the liberal arts—that is, philosophy and literature—and in theology, especially exegesis and dogma. Calvin found a rector for the academy in Theodore Beza (1519–1605). Beza and Peter Viret (1511–71) had come from Lausanne, where they had been relieved of office because of difficulties with the officials of Bern. The new university exercised a very strong attraction on students far beyond the boundaries of Switzerland and contributed decisively to the transplanting or the consolidating of the Reformed Church in other European countries—including Kaspar Olevianus (1536–87), the Trier reformer and later professor at Heidelberg; Philip Marnix de Sainte-Aldegonde (1540–98), organizer of the reform in Holland; and John Knox (c. 1515–72), the reformer of Scotland; all of whom studied there.

Until December 1559 Calvin was not even a citizen of Geneva, and hence could act in political commissions at the most as an adviser. But then the council spontaneously offered him citizenship as a "recognition of the many valuable services that Calvin [had] rendered since the Christian Reformation of the republic." By an extensive correspondence Calvin exercised influence beyond the walls of Geneva on the organization of the churches of France, Belgium, the Palatinate, Poland, Hungary, and many other countries. He forced an enormous amount of work on his weak and almost always ailing body until his death on 27 May 1564.

Basic Outline of Calvin's Theology

As a second generation reformer and because of his own intellectual make-up and his education, Calvin was much more a systematizer than Luther was. He avoided narrow positions and sought to bring together his ideas and his knowledge. In the *Institutio* he has left us a compact treatment of dogma, but we must not forget that in it he intended only "to introduce the theology candidate to the reading of the divine word" and to equip him "to establish what he should principally seek in Scripture and to what goal he should relate its content."[43] Calvin wished above all to be an exegete, and hence his numerous exegetical works must be related to the exposition of his theology.

What the theologian was able by himself to say about God and man was "vain folly." He must let himself be instructed by God himself in Scripture. "No one acquires even the slightest understanding of the correct and salutary doctrine unless he first becomes a student of Scripture" (*Institutio* I, 6, 2). Scripture "bears its proof within itself"; by virtue of the illumination of the Holy Spirit it is recognized by us as the word of God (I, 7, 5). The Holy Spirit alone is the proper interpreter of Scripture. He "who spoke by the mouth of the prophets must penetrate our heart" (I, 7, 4) and open it up to the word which lies hidden in the words of Scripture. The determining idea in Calvinist theology is the glory of the sovereign God—*soli Deo gloria.* The glory of God is the meaning of creation and of the redemption of the elect as well as of the punishment of the damned. Calvin's strongly developed doctrine of the Trinity has a soteriological character. He staunchly defended the truth of the Trinity against the heresy of Servetus and others because he wanted to assure the true divinity of Jesus Christ. "No one will really accept Christ as his God in his heart if he does not comprehend the various divine persons in the unity of nature."[44] Calvin strongly emphasized divine providence against the fatalism of the Renaissance and against deistic currents (I, 16–18). The course of things is determined, not by any fate, but by God, Lord of the world. God maintains the creature in existence, gives it its sphere of activity, and guides everything to its goal. "It follows that providence consists in his *works,* and so it is unwise for persons to chatter about a mere *foreknowledge*" (I, 16, 4).

God's special concern is for man, his noblest creature. But in the human realm the greatest importance belongs to the Church. "Because God has chosen the Church as his dwelling, he undoubtedly displays with special testimonies his fatherly concern in supervising her." (I, 17, 6). God's providence does not take away man's responsibility. On the other hand, the active government of the world by God will not allow us to speak, in regard to evil, of his merely permitting it. "As though God were sitting in peaceful contemplation and waiting for things to happen by chance!" (I, 18, 1). Here we confront the mystery which we must not seek to unravel and which is especially impenetrable in the Cross. "And indeed if Christ had not been crucified by the will of God—from where would our redemption come?" (I, 18, 3). God does not force man to evil. "He guides all of man's acts in so marvelous and incomprehensible a way that man's will is left unhampered" (*OC* 36, 222). Here "our wisdom {can} consist in nothing else than in this—that we accept, humbly but eagerly, everything without exception that is proclaimed to us in Scripture" (I, 18, 4).

---

[43] Preface, *OS* II, 6.

[44] *OC* 9, 331; cf. W. Niesel, *Die Theologie Calvins* (Munich, 2nd ed. 1957), p. 56.

Even more impenetrable to Calvin is the mystery of predestination, "the eternal choice whereby God has destined one for salvation, another for damnation" (III, 21, 1). Prying curiosity has as little place here as does a fearful concealing of God's word. Calvin warns against an overly speculative treatment of this question. He himself had, of course, succumbed to this danger in the course of his controversy with his opponents. To keep silent about the mystery of predestination was "to lessen God's glory."[45] For only when "God's eternal election has been made known" to us do we become aware that our salvation issues from the spring of the unmerited mercy of God. Calvin's definition is as follows:

> By predestination we understand God's eternal order by virtue of which he decrees in himself what, according to his will, is to happen to every individual human being. For men are not all created with the same destiny. To some eternal life is assigned; to others, eternal damnation. Accordingly then, as the individual is created for the one or the other goal, he is, we say, predestined to life or to death. {III, 21, 5}[46]

To look for a reason over and above the divine good pleasure, such as the foreknowledge of man's merits, would be to make God's will dependent on external causes.

> This decree is, we assert, based in regard to the elect on God's unmerited mercy, without any regard for human worthiness. But in regard to those whom he delivers over to damnation—he locks up the entrance to life according to his own just and irrevocable but incomprehensible judgment. {III, 21, 7} Hence we can cite only one reason why he allots mercy to his own—because it so pleases him. But by the same token we have for his rejection of others no reason other than his will. {III, 22, 11}

The basis of our predestination to salvation and at the same time of our assurance of salvation is Jesus Christ. In him God has sealed the covenant of life with us.

---

[45] III, 21, 1; cf. Commentary on John 6:40 (*OC* 47, 147) and catechism of 1537 (*OS* I, 391).

[46] III, 21, 5; *OC* 51, 259; 26, 520; 47, 297; 51, 149; 55, 353.

> Therefore, it is said of those whom God has accepted as his children, not that they have been chosen in themselves, but in his Christ [Eph. 1:4]. For only in him could he love them. . . . But if we have been chosen in him, we will not find the assurance of our election in ourselves nor even in God the Father, if we imagine him by himself alone, without the Son. Accordingly, Christ is the mirror in which we are to behold our election and in which we can do so without any deception. [III, 24, 5]

The sign of our election is acceptance of the preaching about Christ and fellowship with him in faith and in communion. Even works, as "fruits of the calling," can have a certain significance for this recognition of our salvation, but only by inference. "Hence, if the conscience is established, supported, and strengthened, the consideration of works also serves to strengthen it, because they are evidence that God dwells and rules in us" (III, 14, 18). The teaching that the number and success of our works are proof of our election occurs only later in Calvinism—*syllogismus practicus*—and does not correspond to Calvin's own tendency. The stronger he stresses that grace is irresistible in the elect and that they are unable to lose salvation, the darker becomes the mystery of reprobation. How is it that Christ is not active in all? Should he be so powerless that he is unable to win to himself all who resist him?[47] Here Calvin sees himself, like Paul, before the unfathomable secret of the will of God. "The Apostle confesses that God's judgments are so deep that every human intellect is swallowed up by them when it seeks to penetrate them" (III, 23, 5).

In his doctrine of justification and sanctification Calvin starts with Jesus Christ. He asks: "In what way do we now participate in the grace of Christ? . . . How do the treasures which the Father has confided to his only-begotten Son reach us?" (III, 1, 1). The answer—that we attain to them by faith—does not satisfy Calvin. It is necessary "to seek more deeply" and to confess that "the Holy Spirit is the bond whereby Christ effectively joins us to himself" (III, 1, 1). In him Christ takes hold of us and he effects in us the "yes" of faith, which is the orientation to Christ brought about by the Holy Spirit.

> Through fellowship with him we receive principally a twofold grace. On the one hand, by his innocence we are reconciled to God, so that he is now no longer our judge . . . and on the other hand, we are sanctified by his Spirit. [III, 11, 1]

We distinguish justification and sanctification.

---

[47] Cf. W. Niesel, *Die Theologie Calvins,* p. 169.

> But Christ bears both of them inseparably in himself. Do you, then, wish to attain to justice in Christ? Then you must first possess Christ. But you can in no way possess him without simultaneously sharing in his sanctification. For he cannot be torn to pieces. [III, 16, 1; 11, 6]

Although sanctification is the result of justification, in the *Institutio* Calvin treats it first in order from the start to dispose of the misconception that faith, through which alone we are justified by grace, is sterile and without works. By sharing in Christ's death and resurrection we die and rise "to a new life which corresponds to the justice of God" (III, 3, 9). This rebirth has as its goal the restoration of our being the image of God, which by Adam's sin "was as good as effaced." However, renewal does not occur "in a moment," and we are not at once in full possession of freedom; but we must "spend our entire life in penance" (III, 3, 9). Hence, sanctification is a slow process; the believer remains a sinner, but sin must not prevail in him (III, 3, 13). Accordingly, if sanctification can be partially realized and if it can be increased, justification on the contrary must come to us as a whole. "A fragment of justification would not soothe the conscience until it had been determined that we are pleasing to God, because without reservation we are justified in his sight" (III, 11, 11). But, on the other hand, justice does not become essentially imminent in us, but is imputed to us. Justification meant for Calvin "the acceptance whereby God receives us in grace and has us pass for justified . . . it is based on the remission of sins and the imputing of the justice of Christ" (III, 11, 2). Calvin sharply attacks Osiander's "monstrous doctrine" of an essential justice and an essential indwelling of Christ in us. Against such an "uncouth mixture" Calvin emphasizes the "spiritual relationship" with Christ (III, 11, 10). Through the power of the Holy Spirit we grow together with Christ, our head (III, 11, 5). Thus our justification is outside us, that is, in Christ, and at the same time it is our own,

> because we have put on Christ and have been incorporated into his body; in short, because he has condescended to make us one with himself, and hence we glory that we have the fellowship of justice with him. [III, 11, 10]

Because of this union with Christ, not only are we ourselves justified, but our works too are regarded by God as justified, "because all the infirmities in them are buried by the purity of Christ and hence are not imputed" (III, 17, 10).

Doctrinal Trials

"Christ's spiritual kingdom and the civil order" were, for Calvin, "two entirely different things" (IV, 20, 1). But this does not imply that Church and state stand side by side and unrelated. In Christ both have the same Lord, and for his earthly life the Christian needs the state. For Calvin the state was reckoned among the "external means" whereby "God summons us to fellowship with Christ and preserves us in it" (IV, 1, 1). The secular authority has to protect the preaching of the Gospel and to take care "that idolatry, blasphemy against God's name, calumny against his truth, and other scandals relating to religion may not flaunt themselves publicly" (IV, 20, 3). The rulers are also bound by the word of God, since there is no sphere which stands outside God's claims. It is not the task of the authorities to do the actual preaching of the Gospel. It is an evil if the civil authority seizes the Church government and makes itself judge in matters of doctrine and of spiritual authority. Accordingly, throughout his life Calvin worked to place ecclesiastical discipline in the hands of spiritual officials and to guarantee the independence of the consistory vis-à-vis the power of the state. But he did not hesitate to urge the city council to proceed against his theological opponents.

Sebastian Castellio (1515–63), to whom the Geneva school system was greatly indebted, was disqualified from the office of pastor because of his biblical criticism and his concept of Christ's descent into hell and had to give up his position as rector of the Latin school. He went to Lausanne in 1544 and to Basel in 1545. At Basel he became professor of Greek, translated the Bible, and appealed for freedom of conscience.[48]

The former Carmelite friar, Jérôme Bolsec (d. 1584), practiced as a physician after embracing the Reformation. But he retained his interest in theological questions and took part in the weekly meeting of the *Compagnie des pasteurs.* He opposed Calvin's doctrine of predestination and charged that he was not a true interpreter of the Bible. Following the meeting of the *Compagnie* in which he had engaged in a violent dispute with Calvin, Bolsec was arrested. For Calvin, as for Aquinas, idolatry was treason and heresy was punishable. Whoever corrupted the soul was more guilty than one who injured the body, and, like the second, the first crime could be punished by the secular court. It was of no avail to Bolsec that he based his claim on Melanchthon and that the congregations of Bern and Zurich, when asked for an opinion, called for moderation in so difficult a question. On 23 December 1551 Bolsec was banished from Geneva by a judgment of the court. He later returned to Catholicism and avenged himself on Calvin by a very polemical biography of the reformer. It appeared at Lyons in 1577 under the title: *History of the Life, Dying, Morals, Deeds, Teachings, Steadfastness, and Death of John Calvin, former Pastor of Geneva.*

---

[48] *De haereticis, an sint persequendi* (1554, Latin and French); new edition by Sape van der Woude (Geneva 1954).

The trial for heresy of the physician Michael Servetus caused a great sensation and severe criticism of Calvin even to our own day. He was burned on 27 October 1553, in compliance with the sentence of the Geneva city council. Born at Villanueva in Aragon on 29 September 1511, he was the son of a Spanish father and a French mother. He studied law, theology, and medicine and discovered, among other things, the pulmonary circulation of the blood. As early as 1531 he attacked the doctrine of the Trinity in a brief work, *De erroribus trinitatis.* For him it was a question, not of three Persons in God, but of three forces or manners of operation. Around 1546 he carried on a correspondence with Calvin which really made clear the gulf between them. In 1553 he published at Lyons a collection of various treatises. The title *Christianismi Restitutio* already discloses his polemic against Calvin or the latter's *Christianae Religionis Institutio.* The attention of the Lyons Inquisition was directed to Servetus by Guillaume de Trie, a French refugee living in Geneva. Calvin himself contributed original letters whereby Servetus could be unmasked as author of the *Restitutio.* But he escaped from prison and, *in absentia,* was condemned to death by burning. Fleeing, he came to Geneva, where he was accused before the city council by Calvin's secretary, Nicolas de Fontaine, and then arrested.

The trial began on 15 August and was dragged out for weeks. In many respects it took the form of theological discussions between Calvin and Servetus. The Swiss cities whose opinion was sought—Bern, Basel, Zurich, Schaffhausen—all declared Servetus guilty. On 26 October 1553 the council decided that Servetus should be burned alive and his books consigned also to the flames. Calvin had demanded the death penalty. But he and other pastors sought to have the sentence mitigated by asking for decapitation instead of the pyre. His intervention, however, was fruitless. The sentence was in keeping with the convictions and practice of the time. So discreet a person as Melanchthon wrote later to Calvin:

> I have read your essay in which you refuted the horrible blasphemies of Servetus and I thank the Son of God, who was judge in your struggle. The Church too is now and hereafter in your debt. I

> am in complete agreement and at the same time I acknowledge that your authority has acted rightly in condemning the blasphemer to death, after a legitimate trial.[49]

The mention of the practice of the time certainly does not imply any justification, least of all for the reformer who claimed for himself the right, by virtue of his understanding of Scripture, to disregard the traditional teaching. For Calvin appeal to his conscience meant at the same time the guarantee of a prophetic commission and the demand that all agree with him. On 6 October 1552 he had written to the Geneva council:

> As for me, my lords, in my own conscience I am sure that what I have taught and written did not arise in my head, but I have it from God and I must hold it fast, if I do not wish to become a traitor to the truth.[50]

Calvin's Doctrine of the Eucharist and his Efforts for Ecclesiastical and Sacramental Fellowship among the Protestants

In his proceedings against "heretics"—Castellio, Bolsec, Servetus—Calvin is clearly a man of intolerance, determined to preserve the unity of the Church at any cost and to assure it with all the means provided by Church discipline, including recourse to the power of the state. Not entirely without cause has he been frequently presented by polemicists as a ruthless fanatic. Calvin's thinking was more decidedly ecclesiological than was Luther's. His basic question is not, "How do I find a merciful God?" but "How does one arrive at the power of God over mankind?"[51] God's universal rule becomes concrete in the visibly constituted Church. Calvin treats this in detail in the fourth book of his *Institutio,* according to which the Church is one of the "external means whereby God invites us to fellowship with Christ." In Chapter I, "On the true Church with which we must maintain unity, because she is the mother of all the devout," he discusses in nineteen out of twenty-nine sections the unity which the Christian must maintain with the Church. Powerfully as Calvin stresses the congregational idea, still, for him, the Church does not grow out of an amalgamation of believers, but she is an institution planted from above. He often quotes Cyprian's saying that no one can have God for his father who does not have the Church for his mother (IV, 1, 1; 1, 4). His concept of the Church is organic, conceived according to the Pauline image of the body of Christ. Corresponding to this, the Church is visible and necessarily one. Already in the first edition of the *Institutio* (1536) he had written:

---

[49] Letter of 4 October 1554 (*CR* 8, 362).

[50] *OC* 14, 382; Schwarz, *Briefe* II, 608.

[51] ". . . quomodo regnum Christo sartum tectumque inter nos maneat" (*ep.* to Francis I [1536]: *OS* I, 23).

> We believe the holy Catholic Church . . . : that there is one Church and one fellowship and one people of God, whose ruler and supreme head is Christ our Lord, like the head of a body. . . . This fellowship is Catholic, or universal, since there cannot be two or three, but instead the elect of God are all united and held together in Christ, so that, as they depend on one head, they grow into one body and mutually support one another as members of one body.[52]

According to Calvin the Holy Scripture speaks of the Church in a twofold manner. First, she is the community of all the elect since the very beginning of the world. I must believe this "Church, visible only to God's eyes." In the second meaning the Church comprises the flock scattered throughout the world, consisting of those who confess Christ, who "are equipped by baptism for faith in him, and by partaking of the Eucharist testify to their unity in the true doctrine and charity" (IV, 1, 7). There is no genuine faith in the Church without esteem for this visible Church and without readiness for fellowship with her (IV, 1, 7). She becomes visible "where God's word is truly preached and heard and the Sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution" (IV, 1, 9).

For Calvin Reformation means restoration of the original Church, shattered by the papacy, and of her real unity. Calvin admits *vestiga* or *reliquiae* of the true Church even in the papal Church, especially in baptism (IV, 2, 11), but this Church lacks "the true and legitimate organization which is found on the one hand in the fellowship of the Sacraments as signs of confession, but on the other hand especially in the fellowship of doctrine" (IV, 2, 12). In regard to the true Church, which can be concretely experienced, Calvin again distinguishes between the universal Church spread throughout the world (*ecclesia universalis*) and the local churches (*singulae ecclesiae*). He is chiefly concerned with the Universal Church. Absolute unity in regard to doctrine and Sacraments must be preserved in her. But, apart from specified central points of doctrine, "differences of opinion" among the individual churches can prevail without any injury to unity in faith. Correspondingly, we see the reformer prepared for compromise in his exertions for unity to an extent that we should not expect in view of his practice in Geneva.

---

[52] *OS* I, 86; cf. *Inst.* IV, 1, 7.

This especially appears in the controversy among the reformers over the Sacrament of unity and peace, the Eucharist. Theologically, Calvin had derived his views from Luther, but before 1536 he had already become acquainted also with Zwingli's *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione.*[53] On 22 September 1537 he took part on behalf of Geneva in a synod at Bern. It had been called at the urging of Martin Bucer to settle the controversy between Zwinglians and Lutherans in regard to the Eucharist. The Swiss charged that Bucer, by consenting to the Wittenberg agreement of May 1536 with its vague notion of the "unio sacramentalis" of the bread and the body of Christ,[54] had sacrificed the Bern Disputation of 1528 and was seeking the union of Lutherans and Swiss at the cost of truth. At the Bern synod of 1537 Bucer intended to clear himself of this suspicion and put an end to distrust. When the violent discussions between him and the Bern preacher and teacher Kaspar Megander (1495–1545) led to no result, Calvin, Farel, and Viret were asked to draw up a *Confessio fidei de Eucharistia.* It was composed by Calvin and signed by the Strasbourg theologians as a sign of their consensus with the Swiss.

According to this confession,[55] Christ offers us in the signs of bread and wine a real participation in his flesh and blood. But this does not mean local presence, which we are deprived of through Christ's ascension. His spirit, however, is in no way limited in its activity. It is the bond of sharing and nourishes us with the substance of Christ's body and blood. Thus Calvin occupies a position between Luther and Zwingli. Against Luther he rejects local and historical and bodily presence. Against Zwingli he so emphasizes the reality of the fellowship in Christ's body and blood that he does not even shy away from the word "substance." In May 1539 Calvin wrote to an opponent of the efforts for unity:

> By no means do I concede that in Zwingli's doctrine there is nothing questionable. For it is easy to see that he, too much preoccupied with eradicating superstition about the bodily presence of Christ, at the same time discards the true force of union [with Christ] or at least obscures it. But especially this point must be brought into the light more.[56]

---

[53] A. Lang, "Die Quellen der Institutio von 1536," *EvTh* 3 (1936), 100–112 (especially p. 107).

[54] E. Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlstreites* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1962), p. 118.

[55] *OS* I, 435f.

[56] *OC* 10, II, 356; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 117f.

Calvin made a special gesture of good will by signing the *Confessio Augustana* at the Regensburg Religious Colloquy of 1541. This was not the *Confessio* of 1530, but the *Confessio Augustana Variata,* a version drawn up by Melanchthon in 1540 with a view to an understanding with the Swiss. At first the *Variata* encountered no opposition from Lutherans and was actually tacitly tolerated by Luther himself. The difference had to do especially with the doctrine of the Eucharist. Whereas the version of 1530 met the Catholics half-way and seemed to teach even transubstantiation, the *Variata* showed consideration to the Swiss. Article 10 reads: "Concerning the Lord's Supper they teach that, with bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are really given to those who partake."[57] Instead of "under the appearances of bread and wine" it has now "with bread and wine;" instead of "is present," "are given to those who partake." This admitted an interpretation in Calvin's sense. And in later controversies he could refer to his having signed the *Confessio Augustana* without having disavowed his view.

If in the *Variata* Calvin had assented to a confession that had been composed without him, in the agreement with the people of Zurich, the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549, he was one of the authors, or even the real driving force. As a result of Luther's *Kurzes Bekenntnis vom heiligen Sakrament* (1544), the dispute with the Swiss over the Sacraments had flared up again. In his "boundless, lightning-hurling anger," as Calvin described it,[58] Luther had also attacked Zwingli, now fourteen years in his grave. The next year Heinrich Bullinger defended his predecessor Zwingli and the Zurich Eucharistic doctrine in the rejoinder, *Wahrhafte Bekenntnis der Diener der Kirche zu Zürich . . . insbesondere über das Nachtmahl.* Earlier, on 25 November 1544, Calvin had asked Bullinger not to let himself be provoked by Luther's harshness and to keep silent. On this occasion he had expressed the desire to treat orally some time with Bullinger their differences in regard to the Eucharist. He wrote to Bullinger:

> If we were able to discuss the matter some time for only half a day, we would, I hope, easily agree, and not only in regard to the matter itself but even in regard to its formulation. Meanwhile, this small disagreement should not prevent our maintaining a brotherly friendship in the Lord.[59]

Though harmony was not destined to be achieved so quickly, still Calvin succeeded, in his serious efforts for unity over a period of three years, in gaining Bullinger's confidence. In 1547 Bullinger submitted his *De sacramentis* to Calvin for an opinion. In a letter of 25 February 1547,[60] Calvin discussed the work critically and again expressed his desire for a personal conversation. He received no answer at first and then, at the end of 1547, a very unfriendly one. On 1 March 1548 Calvin stressed that, if he taught a more intimate union with Christ in the Sacrament than did Bullinger, still they did not cease to have the same Christ and to be one in him. "Perhaps it will some day be granted to us to come together in complete harmony."[61] A visit by Calvin and Farel to Zurich in May 1548 did not accomplish much. In a letter of 26 June 1548, containing "all the thoughts of his heart,"[62] Calvin once again explained his opinion in detail.[63] In July he sent his *Propositiones de sacramentis* to Bullinger,[64] who answered them in November with his *Annotationes.* Further comments passed back and forth, but an agreement was not yet forthcoming. Then in April 1549 Bullinger surprised Calvin with the report that now very little stood in the way of a general Swiss confession. Calvin journeyed happily to Zurich, although Bullinger stated rather reservedly that the matter could be arranged by writing. From all this it becomes clear "that it was not Bullinger and the people of Zurich who pressed for the agreement, but Calvin, who for this purpose traveled several times to Zurich."[65] The accord, in twenty-six articles, was drawn up at the end of May 1549. It was, however, not printed until 1551,[66] because the consent of the other Swiss congregations was awaited.

---

[57] *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Göttingen, 5th ed. 1963), pp. 65, 45.

[58] A letter of 28 June 1545 to Melanchthon; *OC* 12, 98; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 308.

[59] *OC* 11, 775; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 286.

The twenty-six articles deal almost exclusively with the doctrine of the Sacraments in general and with the Eucharist. The Sacraments are to be understood only in relation to Christ, Priest and King (1–4). This Christ communicates himself to us, makes us one with himself, through his Spirit. The Gospel and the Sacraments testify this (5–6). Through the Sacrament God makes present and seals his grace. This happens also through the word. But it is a great thing that living images are represented to our eyes and thus our senses are more strongly impressed (7). A distinction must be made between sign and thing signified, and still sign and reality must not be separated. All who, in faith, take hold of the promises held out in the sign receive Christ spiritually with all his spiritual graces. If union with him already exists, then it is continued and renewed (9). Hence more attention should be paid to the promise than to the sign. For it is not water, bread, and wine that are able to make us sharers in spiritual gifts, but only faith in Christ's promise (10). Of themselves the Sacraments effect nothing. God alone acts through his Spirit.[67] If, in so doing, he makes use of the Sacraments, this does not mean that he, as it were, infuses his power into them and they operate independently of him (12–15). Hence not all who receive the Sacraments share in their grace, but only the elect. Accordingly, it cannot be said that all those receive grace who do not present the obstacle of mortal sin. God does indeed offer grace to all, but only believers are capable of laying hold of it. The Sacraments give nothing which faith would not already have received, but they strengthen and increase faith (19).

---

[60] *OC* 11, 481; Schwarz, *Briefe* I, 370.

[61] *OC* 12, 666; Schwarz, *Briefe* II, 412f.

[62] *OC* 12, 731; Schwarz, *Briefe* II, 424.

[63] *OC* 12, 727f.; Schwarz, *Briefe* II, 421ff.

[64] *OC* 12, 726ff.

[65] H. Grass, *Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin* (Gütersloh, 2nd ed. 1954), p. 210.

[66] *OS* II, 247–253.

Articles 21 to 26 deal specially with the Eucharist. Any notion of bodily presence must be eliminated. Christ as man is to be sought only in heaven and indeed only in spirit and in the knowledge of faith (*mente et fidei intelligentia;* 21). To enclose him within the elements of this world is a wicked and infamous superstition. The words of institution, "this is my body," are to be understood figuratively. The thing signified is transferred to the sign. Bread and wine are termed that for which they are signs (22).

This formulation was subsequently too weak for Calvin. He was especially concerned that there was no mention of the eating of the flesh. And so he asked Bullinger to agree to the insertion of the following Article 23, "De manducatione carnis Christi."[68] The eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood, represented in the sign, mean that Christ nourishes our souls in faith in the power of his Spirit, but any "intermingling or interpenetration of substance" must be excluded. Article 24 even more strongly attacks "transubstantiation and other absurdities." In it are to be rejected, along with this papal invention, all "crass fancies and idle sophistries" which "either detract from his heavenly glory or are not in full harmony with the truth of his human nature." It is indeed regarded as no less absurd to localize Christ in the bread or to confine him to bread than to change the bread into his body. According to Article 25, Christ's body is in heaven as in a place and as such it is to be sought only there. In this way the distance in space is to be expressed and emphasized.

> For even though, philosophically speaking, there is no place beyond the heavens, yet Christ's body is finite in accord with the

---

[67] "Deus enim solus est, qui spiritu suo agit," Article 12.

[68] *OC* 13, 305; Schwarz, *Briefe,* II, 477.

> nature of a human body and is inclosed by heaven as by a place; hence it is necessary that he be separated from us by so great a spatial interval as is heaven from the earth.

If our imagination, then, must not confine Christ in bread and wine, it is also "even less permitted to adore him in the bread" (26). Bread and wine are signs of union with Christ. As signs they are not the thing itself nor do they contain this within themselves nor unite it with themselves. "Hence they make of it an idol who direct their senses to the sign in order to adore Christ in it" (26).

For the sake of unity Calvin had made several concessions in the *Consensus Tigurinus,* among other things in regard to the efficacy of the Sacraments.[69] Nevertheless, the *Consensus* can be regarded as his view. He himself so declared when he was reproached because of it.[70] The development of the Calvinist doctrine of the Eucharist from the first edition of the *Institutio* in 1536 to the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549 or the *Institutio* of 1559 is characterized by a steadily decreasing mention of an inner connection between the signs of bread and wine and union with Christ's body and blood. If in 1536 and 1543 it is still said that bread and wine are sanctified, in the *Consensus Tigurinus* and in the 1559 *Institutio* they are only signs of partaking of the body and blood, which takes place, by the power of the Holy Spirit, on the occasion of celebrating communion.[71] With Calvin there can be no question of the real presence, but of real communion with the body and blood of Christ. The believer to whom bread and wine are given at communion really shares in the fellowship of Christ's body and blood. But they are not tied to bread and wine—to say nothing of being inclosed in them. This is impossible because of Christ's true humanity, which, locally circumscribed, is enthroned in heaven and will not come to us until the *parousia.* The divine Word "is united with the nature of man in one person but is not confined in it," so that it still has reality outside it (II, 13, 4; *Extra calvinisticum*). On the other hand, the true humanity of Christ forbids our attributing to it properties such as ubiquity, which belong to the divinity alone. Calvin regards this as assumed in both the Lutheran and the scholastic doctrine of the real presence. The Holy Spirit effects communion with the life-giving flesh of Christ.

[69] Cf. the letter of October 1549 to Bucer; *OC* 13, 439; Schwarz, *Briefe* II, 497.

[70] *OC* 13, 534f.; Schwarz, *Briefe* II, 514f.

[71] 1536: "sacramentum est panis in Christi corpore sanctificatus et vinum in eius sanguine sanctificatum" (*OS* I, 136). 1543: "signa sunt panis et vinum, quae in Christi corpore et sanguine sanctificantur, ut invisibilem eorum communionem re praesentent" (*OS* V, 342, note c; *OC* 1, 991, note 2, 1). 1559: "signa sunt panis et vinum, quae invisibile alimentum, quod percepimus ex carne et sanguine Christi, nobis repraesentant" (IV, 17, 1; *OS* V, 342).

> The Lord grants us through his Spirit the favor of becoming one with him in body, mind, and soul. The bond of this union is, accordingly, the Spirit of Christ. [IV, 17, 12; 17, 33]

He makes it possible

> that Christ's flesh can, despite so great a separation in space, reach us in order to become our food. . . . What is separated in space, is united by the Holy Spirit in truth. [IV, 17, 10]

If the local presence of Christ in heaven prevents his descending to us and being present on the altar, still Calvin does not find the reverse difficult, that is, that Christ, through the Holy Spirit, "leads us up to him" (IV, 17, 31), and, accordingly, he understands the summons to prayer, *Sursum corda,* quite literally. Calvin's idea becomes fully clear in its practical consequences. Since the body and blood of Christ are in no way united to the bread and wine, the veneration of the Sacrament is forbidden. We must direct our mind, not to the sign, but to the signified, to Christ in heaven. Calvin also rejects the *manducatio impiorum.* The Sacrament is offered to all, but unbelievers receive only the sign, while the union with the life-giving flesh of Christ, affected by the Holy Spirit, does not take place. For "they who are devoid of the Spirit of Christ cannot eat the flesh of Christ" (IV, 17, 33).

The *Consensus Tigurinus* saved the unity of the Swiss and Reformed Protestantism while making definitive the break with Lutheranism. This became evident in the disputes of Calvin and the Calvinists with Joachim Westphal (1510–74) and Tilmann Hesshus (1527–88) in the so-called Second Eucharistic Controversy.

CHAPTER 30

The Spread of Calvinism in Western Europe

In contradistinction to Luther, who was concerned about the "merciful God" and personal justification, Calvin's question was: "How does one arrive at God's dominion over mankind?"[1] If he saw the Reformation as the establishing of the Kingdom of God, then he could not limit himself to Geneva. The community there was in his view only the cornerstone of a worldwide Church. In his extensive correspondence Calvin maintained contact with the decisive personalities of Europe. He intervened wherever he saw a door opened for his movement and acted with a sound political sense and great tenacity. Like Calvin, Calvinism showed itself to be active, militant, and at times ruthless. The reformer demanded that his adherents translate their faith into action and realize it, not only in private, but also in public life. They were to carry their confession into the world and set up Reformed congregations wherever they went. He not infrequently gave them detailed instructions as to where and how this should be done and managed to inspire them with a readiness to be a witness to their doctrine—a witness that did not shrink from even death. To this goal of realizing the Kingdom of God on earth they had to subordinate even political exertions. It goes without saying that Calvin claimed the authority of the state for his aims, and, wherever it was denied him, he turned on the opposing forces. For a prince who attacked the Church that had been reformed in accord with God's word—in other words, the only valid form of Christianity, prescribed by God—was failing in his duty and thereby ceased to be a prince. Orderly "resistance" to him was permitted. The estates, the lesser authorities, and the princes were the ones especially charged with leading such resistance. Differing from the Lutheran, a Calvinist who was not in agreement with the religious policy of his ruling authority had in his very religion a legal basis for resistance, if necessary by armed force. The religious wars in the West, which aroused Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Englishmen, and Scotsmen against their monarchs, were thus partly inspired by Calvin's spirit.

---

[1] " . . . quomodo Dei gloriae sua constet in terris incolumitas, quomodo suam dignitatem Dei veritas retineat, quomodo regnum Christo sanctum tectumque inter nos maneat"; preface to the *Institutio* on 1536, letter to Francis I (*OC* 1, 11; *OS* I, 23).

France

Calvin's relations with France, his native land, were especially close. Many French refugees found a home at Geneva and from there preachers were sent to French cities in order to foster the establishing of congregations.

King Henry II (1547–59) continued the anti-Protestant religious policy of his father, Francis I. In this he was assisted by the mutually rival forces which tried to exert influence on the weak monarch: the chief minister, the Connétable Montmorency; the Guise brothers, Duke Francis and Cardinal Charles of Lorraine; and the Queen, Catherine de Médicis. Catherine only became important when, after thirteen years of marriage, she presented the King with sons. In October 1547 Henry obtained from the *parlement* the establishing of a special court for heresy cases, the *Chambre ardente.* There were then throughout the country groups of adherents of the Reformation, who were referred to as Lutherans, though they were really oriented to Strasbourg and at first sought their preachers there. They recruited from all strata of the population, including the higher nobility, but practiced their faith secretly, had their children baptized in the old Church, and often even participated in the Mass in order to escape persecution.

Calvin was to mould congregations out of these groups of people who regarded themselves as converts to the Gospel, congregations which were prepared, for their part, to convert their environment. He sharply attacked "Nicodemism." Anyone who could not hold himself aloof from the "defilements of the papacy" should emigrate. If he cannot belong to the number of the elect to whom God grants the strength and the honor of martyrdom, then he should at least withdraw to where he can find God's word, a genuine Church, and the pure Sacraments. One must have the courage "to separate from idolatry and all superstition, which are contrary to serving and confessing God."[2] The administration of baptism and the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Calvin advises, should wait until a stable community has been founded on the basis of the assembly for prayer and preaching. For baptism

> at least a small flock, which represents the Church, must be collected, and the one baptizing must be acknowledged as pastor. . . . Hence it is necessary that the child be baptized in a community which has permanently separated from the defilements of the papacy.[3]

For the distribution of communion one must

> be unanimously chosen and elected as pastor. And for this it is necessary that there be an organized ecclesiastical community.[4]

Despite persecution congregations were formed in many places from 1555 based on the Geneva model. At first the gatherings took place in secret, but in 1558 Calvinists dared to sing psalms publicly in Paris. From 1555 to 1562 the Geneva *Compagnie* sent eighty-eight pastors to France. They often exchanged places in order to evade persecution. At an assembly in Poitiers in 1558 it was decided to hold a synod at Paris the next year in order to define the confession of faith and the Church Order. Representatives from fifty congregations met in this first Calvinist National Synod on 25 May 1559. Calvin sent envoys, to whom he gave a confession of faith. The synod added several articles to it. The definitive version, the *Confessio Gallicana,* had, like the appended

---

[2] Letter of 12 October 1553 (*OC* 14, 638).

[3] Letter of 11 October 1554 (*OC* 15, 265).

[4] Letter of 19 June 1554 (*OC* 15, 174).

Church Order, the *Disciplina,* forty articles.[5] The first treated of the authority of Scripture. It alone is authoritative and the

> most sure rule of our faith, not so much through the general agreement and conformity of the churches as through the testimony and the inner persuasion of the Holy Spirit, who lets us distinguish it from the other ecclesiastical books.

The real, though spiritual, community with the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is clearly stressed. But it is shared only by believers and a real presence in the bread and wine is not accepted.

> As already stated, we believe that God actually gives us in both the Eucharist and baptism what he represents in them. Therefore we connect with the signs the true possession and enjoyment of that which is there offered us. And consequently all who bring to Christ's holy table a pure faith, as to a vessel, really receive what the signs there attest: namely, the body and blood of Jesus Christ serve the soul as food and drink no less than bread and wine serve the body [1 Cor. 11:24f.; John 6:56] [37].

The secular authority has to punish by the sword crimes against the first panel of the Ten Commandments, and hence heresy and the like (39). One must be subject, "with a good and free will," even to an unbelieving authority, "provided that God's dominion remains intact (Acts 4:17ff.)" (40). A right of resistance is here formulated only cautiously and *ad casum,* if indeed it is actually formulated at all.

Calvinism found adherents, or at least sympathizers, even in circles in the higher nobility and in the royal house itself. Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre, her husband, Anthony of Bourbon, his brother, Prince Louis de Condé, the Coligny brothers—Admiral Gaspard, infantry general Francois d'Andelot, and Cardinal Odet de Coligny—and other influential persons were among Calvin's adherents. The more they became aware of their strength and political motives, such as the safeguarding of the rights of the nobility against the absolute crown, and these actually became predominant, the more the religious movement developed into a faction.

Henry II died in 1559 of an injury received in a tournament, just as he was beginning to act still more energetically in the struggle to maintain religious unity in his country. In the reign of his sickly fifteen-year-old son, Francis II (1559–60), the Guise brothers took control.

---

[5] Text in *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche,* ed. W. Niesel (Zurich, 3rd ed. n. d.), pp. 66–79.

The *coup de main,* attempted at Chateau Amboise with the aim of removing the King from the influence of these advisers, failed and cost many Protestants their lives. From that time they were known as Huguenots (*hugenauds*), a word probably derived from *Eidgenossen* or *aiguenots,* the term for the adherents of the Reformation in Geneva, who were rebels against Savoy.[6]

The Queen-Mother, Catherine de Médicis, now took the business of state into her own hands. She pushed aside the Guise brothers and summoned their protégé, Michel de L'Hôpital (1503–73), to the chancellorship. As an Erasmian, he was opposed to force in religious matters, just as Catherine, for political reasons, was intent upon *détente.* She assumed the regency for Charles IX (1560–74), brother of the deceased Francis II. She intended to effect a compromise by means of a religious colloquy, which she arranged at Poissy. In his opening speech on 31 July 1561, the chancellor, L'Hôpital, termed the gathering a national council. Such a synod could, better than a general council, provide a remedy, he said, in France's difficulties by reform of morals and doctrine. But the bishops repudiated a national council; they would have nothing to do with any discussion of doctrine but only with the problem of abuses. Nevertheless, the assembly turned into a religious colloquy, in which Theodore Beza from Geneva confronted the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Jesuit general, Lainez. The question of the Eucharist showed how profound the division was.

The number of Calvinists grew. Coligny offered the Queen the assistance of more than two thousand congregations. In January 1562 the Edict of Saint-Germain-en-Laye allowed the Huguenots to hold synods and to celebrate their liturgy outside of cities and private devotions inside them. A triumvirate, consisting of the Duke of Guise, the Connétable Montmorency, and the Marshal Saint-André, was formed to save the Catholic faith; it actively opposed the government's policy of toleration. On the other hand, the concessions did not satisfy the Huguenots. Coligny tried to induce the Queen to an anti-Spanish policy; the Catholic party sought in turn to involve Spain and the Pope. The *parlement* of Paris refused to register the Edict of Saint-Germain.

The overture to the eight Wars of Religion, which were to devastate France until 1598, was sounded by the Massacre at Vassy on 1 March 1562. Francis of Guise caused the breaking up of a service of worship, which was taking place in the city, contrary to the edict. In the skirmish seventy-four participants were killed and around a hundred wounded. The Huguenots, led by the Prince de Condé and Coligny, flew to arms.

---

[6] H. Naef, " 'Huguenot.' Le procès d'un mot," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 12 (1950).

Massacres, profanation of churches, and acts of retaliation convulsed the country. Catherine de Médicis turned for help to the Duke of Savoy, the Pope, and King Philip II, while the Huguenots asked aid from Queen Elizabeth of England. Her assistance arrived too late. Condé was defeated and taken prisoner by the Duke of Guise, who, however, was ambushed and killed by a Huguenot noble in February 1563. The Edict of Amboise in 1563 put an end to the first war. It conceded the free exercise of religion to the nobility; in addition, Calvinist worship was to be permitted in one city of each *baillage,* except Paris. Since neither side was satisfied, the implementation of the edict led to new difficulties. Condé brought on the second war (1567–68), allegedly to free the King from his mother's control. The plan to surprise the court at Meaux miscarried. Catherine de Médicis saw the collapse of her policy of reconciliation. Condé was killed in the third war (1568–1570) and Coligny became the sole leader of the Huguenots. Fearful of the power of the Guises and of Spain, Catherine again showed herself accommodating to the Huguenots and granted them liberty of conscience in the Peace of Saint-Germain (8 August 1570). Calvinist worship could be held where it had taken place before the war and, in addition, in the castles of the nobility and the suburbs of two cities in a province. And four fortified towns were granted to the Huguenots for two years.

The engagement of the King's sister, Margaret of Valois, to Henry of Navarre, the future Henry IV, who had fought on the Huguenot side, appeared to strengthen the compromise. In 1571 the Huguenots were able to hold a national synod at La Rochelle, where the confession and Church Order of 1559 were revised to strengthen the position of the pastors.

Coligny gained ascendancy over Charles IX and persuaded him to go to war against Spain in support of the Protestants of Belgium. A defeat of the French troops gave heart to Coligny's opponents. Catherine de Médicis sought to exploit the situation to reestablish her influence and exclude Coligny. Four days after the marriage of her daughter Margaret with Henry of Navarre, at which the Huguenot nobility was strongly represented, she arranged an attempt to assassinate the admiral, who, however, was only wounded. An investigation ordered by the King in search of the guilty threatened to expose Catherine. She convinced her son of the necessity of getting rid of Coligny and the other Huguenot leaders. From three to four thousand men in Paris alone are said to have fallen victim in the subsequent massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day, 23–24 August 1572, that was thereupon perpetrated by agents of the Guises. The carnage was continued for weeks in the provinces, with the cooperation of the mob. Not religion but an alleged conspiracy against the King and his court was the pretext for the slaughter. This was the explanation sent to the Curia.[7] The Huguenots were now without leaders but they did not give up and successfully defended themselves in La Rochelle. Under Henry III (1574–89) they again obtained religious liberty throughout the kingdom, apart from Paris, in the Peace of Beaulieu (6 May 1576). The Catholic League was established to oppose them with the aim of maintaining the interests and liberties of the estates against royal absolutism as well as of defending the Catholic faith.

With the death of the Duke of Alençon, the youngest brother of the childless Henry III, in 1584, Henry of Navarre, leader of the Huguenots, became heir presumptive. In view of the danger thereby presented of a Protestant succession to the throne, Henry of Guise assumed the direction of the League. An alliance was concluded with Philip II of Spain and, by means of a popular tumult, the King was compelled in the Edict of Nemours in 1585 to repudiate all concessions to the Protestants and to forbid their liturgy under penalty of death. Pope Sixtus V declared that Henry of Navarre, as a relapsed heretic, was excommunicated and had forfeited all claim to the throne. The Eighth War of Religion was initiated by the League in the autumn of 1585 and before long it became an open opposition to Henry III. A popular rising in May 1588 compelled him to leave Paris, which favored the League. King Henry III tried to ward off the threatening might of the Guises by having Duke Henry assassinated on 23 December 1588 and the Duke's brother, Cardinal Louis, on the following day. The League's opposition was thereby strengthened and on 7 January 1589 the Sorbonne declared that the King's subjects were released from their oaths of loyalty. Henry III sought to ally with Henry of Bourbon-Navarre but this only intensified the hatred against him and led to the assassination of the "tyrant" by a fanatical adherent of the League, the Dominican Jacques Clement, on 1 August 1589.

The mortally wounded King had designated Henry of Navarre as his successor. The latter, as Henry IV (1589–1610), proclaimed on 4 August that he would not injure the Catholic religion and that he wished to submit to the decision of a free general or national council. This did not satisfy the League. But its policy threatened to lead to the decisive influence of Spain in France, something that was contrary to French tradition as well as to the Pope's ideas. The danger made Catholic circles ready for negotiations with Henry IV. On 17 May 1593 the King declared to the Archbishop of Bourges his willingness to become a Catholic and on 25 July he repudiated Calvinism at Saint-Denis at the tombs of the Kings of France. After being anointed at Chartres he was able to enter Paris in March 1594. The struggle with Spain had now lost its character as a religious war, especially after the King had been absolved by Pope Clement VIII in the fall of 1595. The remaining Catholic opposition in the country gradually disappeared. Peace with Spain was finally granted to the exhausted land in May 1598 through the Pope's mediation.

---

[7] On Gregory XIII's attitude see p. 514.

A few weeks earlier, on 13 April 1598, Henry IV in the Edict of Nantes had given his former coreligionists a position in the state, which, while not complying with all their demands, certainly far exceeded what people were then inclined to concede to a minority in the way of religious and political rights.[8] At the time the number of Huguenots was about 1.2 million, so that they constituted a good twelfth of the population.

The Catholic religion was recognized as the prevailing faith in the state. Catholic worship had to be reinstituted where it had been suppressed, and buildings and property that had been withdrawn from it had to be given back. The adherents of what was called the "religion prétendu réformée" obtained liberty of conscience in the entire country and freedom of worship in places where they had actually exercised it in 1596–97 and, in addition, in the country seats of the nobility and in one place in each *baillage,* with the exception of Paris. They were permitted to hold consistories and synods, to lay out cemeteries, to institute schools and printeries in the places where they had the right of free worship. In regard to admittance to the universities, schools, and hospitals, Calvinists were not to be discriminated against. For their part they were to respect Catholic holy days and, like Catholics, they were subject to the prohibition of marrying close blood relatives. Even more far-reaching were the concessions in civil law and in politics. The Huguenots were competent in law without restriction and had access to all offices. Mixed tribunals, made up of Catholics and Calvinists on an equal footing, were to be established to decide their dispute. As guarantee they received more than a hundred fortified towns for eight years. Their commandants were to be Calvinists and the garrisons were to be supported by the state. Such a concession of a private army within the state could have been made by the government only under compulsion. It was to be expected that it would be annulled as soon as the crown felt itself strong enough to take this step.

When the Pope expressed his consternation the King maintained the political necessity of the edict for the restoration of the Kingdom. The

---

[8] Text in E. Walder, *Religionsvergleiche des 16. Jahrhunderts* II, 13–11; E. Mengin, *Das Edikt von Nantes,* pp. 21–56.

parlements, the supreme courts, procrastinated about registering the edict and thereby giving it force. The *parlements* of Aix and Reims did not agree to do so until the fall of 1605.

The Netherlands

Due to its clear dogmatic line, its strict organization, and its political theory, Calvinism made rapid progress in the Netherlands, answering as it did to the efforts for independence in the area. It soon counted adherents in all classes and even the nobles professed it in great numbers. Thus Calvinism became the confession of the national revolution.

The political situation proved to be especially favorable to its spread. Emperor Charles V, it is true, was concerned for a good administration in Flanders and Holland and thus had the Netherlands governed by regents beloved by the *bourgeoisie,* first by his aunt, Margaret of Austria, and later by his sister Mary. However, this was no substitute for the lack of religious liberty.

> Influenced by the current theory that the peace and strength of a nation were based on unanimity of religion among all its members and fearful that the Protestant-inclined Netherlands could expose his flank to France and the Lutheran imperial estates, Charles proceeded along with the Church against heresy.[9]

A decree of 25 September 1550 stated that: "No one was to print, transcribe, reproduce, keep, conceal, sell, buy, or give any book or writing of Martin Luther, Johannes Oecolampadius, Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer, Jean Calvin, or any other heretic condemned by Holy Church."[10] Further the Emperor forbade private and public gatherings, "in which adherents of the above-mentioned heretics" spoke. Anyone under even a general suspicion of heresy must not be lodged and aided by the citizenry.

> If anyone should be found guilty of transgressing the aforementioned points, he is to be punished as a disturber of our state and of the general peace as follows: men are to be killed by the sword and women are to be buried alive, if they do not persist in their errors; if they do persist in them they are to be put to death by fire. In both cases their property is to be subject to confiscation by the crown.[11]

---

[9] W. Durant, *The Age of the Reformation.*

[10] L. Motley, *Der Abfall der Niederlande und die Entstehung des Holländischen Freistaats* I (Dresden 1857), 245ff.

[11] Ibid.

This edict was intended, among other things, to destroy the Calvinists in the Netherlands, but as a matter of fact the activity of the Calvinist preachers and congregations was intensified. Even the officials in the Netherlands only supported the execution of the edict very reluctantly. They were by no means willing to have anything to do with the Inquisition, which they regarded as a Roman affair and hence a means of suppression by Spaniards. Thus, in a pernicious way, the religious was fused with the political and national. In addition there existed a special sympathy for Calvin, who always displayed a great understanding for the religious situation in the Netherlands. He came from neighboring Picardie, and his mother was from Cambrai. He thus called himself a Belgian.[12] He had come into contact with Anabaptists at Strasbourg and had married one of them, the widow Idelette de Bure. Soon afterwards (from Geneva) he had made contact with Belgian reformers.

The most important representatives of the new teachings in the Netherlands were the teacher Johannes Sturm (1507–89); the historian Johannes Sleidan (1506–56); the noble Jacques de Bourgogne; the ex-Dominican Pierre Brully (d. 1545); and Guy de Bray (1522–67). Sturm and Sleidan, both of whom came from Schleiden in the Eifel, were at first connected with the Brethren of the Common Life. The Protestant congregation at Strasbourg exercised a great influence on the development of Calvinism in the Netherlands, especially in the French-speaking parts. Sturm owed his renown to the renewal of the *Gymnasium* there. Sleidan became the political agent and later the historian of the League of Schmalkalden. Pierre Brully, formerly a Dominican at Metz, was Calvin's successor as preacher for the French refugee congregation at Strasbourg. In 1544 he was sent by Bucer to the Calvinists at Tournai and Valenciennes, who had requested a preacher. After a few months he was arrested and, following an ecclesiastical trial, handed over to the secular powers and condemned to death at the stake (19 February 1545). He was not the only victim of the more severe Church policy adopted by Charles V after his victory over the Duke of Cleves in 1543 and the Peace of Crépy in 1544. Five other executions occurred at Tournai, six at Ghent, three at Brussels, and two at Bruges. In the same year the first Flemish translations of Calvin's writings were published and his name appeared on the Liège *Index*.

Calvinism gained strength in the Netherlands in spite of severe persecution by the Inquisition, and many Netherlanders went to Geneva to learn there the pure doctrine. The new teaching spread more and more in the Flemish area through the activity of French congregations. Some Calvinists were rash and fanatical. Bertrand Le Blas, for example, had to pay with his life at Tournai for a dramatic spectacle directed against "idolâtrie papistique." He dared to wrest the Host from the hands of the priest who was celebrating the High Mass in the Tournai cathedral on Christmas of 1554. As the punishment for so unprecedented an act he was condemned, after a four-days' trial, by the city court in the presence of imperial councillors. Both his hands were struck off and he was burned.

---

[12] L. E. Halkin, *La Réforme en Belgique sous Charles-Quint,* p. 96.

Georges Kathelyne gave a similar example of religious provocation at Ghent. Having gone over to the Flemish Calvinist Church, he once heard a sermon by a Dominican in the Ghent church of Saint-Michel. He suddenly interrupted the preacher with the words, "O faux prophète."[13] The people covered Kathelyne's escape but a few days later he was arrested. After long discussions between the prisoner and the Dominicans on the real presence, the veneration of saints, purgatory, and the authority of the Pope, on all points of which he professed the Calvinist belief, he was finally condemned to death and in 1555 executed outside Saint-Michel.

The most important Calvinist in the Netherlands and the best preacher was Guy de Bray. Born at Bergen in Hainault, he is regarded as the "Reformer of the Netherlands." Following his conversion to Calvinism, he spent some time in England and at Lille and Frankfurt. He studied at Geneva and Lausanne and preached at Doornik, Sedan, and Antwerp. Finally he was preacher at Valenciennes; with the capture of this city he was executed on 31 May 1567. He was the author of the *Confessio Belgica* of 1561;[14] in composing it he adhered strictly to the Huguenot confession, "but in an entirely independent spirit."[15] "The special character of the Netherlands confession" lies, "on the one hand, in the detailed recourse to the doctrinal forms of the ancient Church in an effort to renew orthodoxy, and, on the other hand, in the telling use of scriptural passages in the text itself."[16] Especially informative is the definition of the true and the false Church in Article 29. Against the "false Church" de Bray launched the charge that it attributed greater validity to its institutions than to the word of God. "It is based on men rather than on Jesus Christ and persecutes those who live a holy life according to God's word and who reproach its vices, such as avarice and idolatry."[17] The organization of the Netherlands Church is explained in Articles 30 to 32. Elders and deacons constituted, with the pastors, the council of the congregation, by which the "ministers of the word of

---

[13] Ibid., p. 107.

[14] P. Jacobs, *Reformierte Bekenntnischriften und Kirchenordnungen,* p. 154.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Cf. ibid., p. 168.

God" were to be chosen. Calvin exercised a direct influence on the numerous writings of de Bray, the "minister of the word of God in the Netherlands."[18]

When Guy de Bray was at the height of his activity, Philip II (1556–98) assumed the government of the Netherlands. Despite his stern exertions against the Reformation, he was unable to stop the expansion and consolidation of Calvinism. His champions were the University of Louvain and the Prince-Bishop of Liège, Eberhard of Mark. Philip was soon confronted by a powerful opposition, headed by the Prince of Nassau-Orange, governor of the provinces of Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht, by Count Egmont, governor of Flanders, and by Admiral Hoorne. Egmont, protagonist of the independence of the Netherlands but himself not a Calvinist, and Hoorne were executed in 1586. The considerable increase in the number of dioceses, made by Paul IV in 1559, gave offense; it was intended to make possible an energetic attack on heresy. Philip II's conflict with the Calvinists split the Netherlands in two. His half-sister, Margaret of Parma, was governor-general from 1559. During her regency there was formed at Brussels in 1565 a league of the lesser nobility for the struggle against the Inquisition. These nobles were termed *Gueux,* beggars, by their opponents. The revolt by the Gueux and the constant progress of Calvinism induced Philip to send the Spanish Duke of Alba to Brussels with full powers. Immediately after his arrival, Alba established the "Council of Troubles," which passed many death sentences. Many Calvinists sought religious freedom in London, Wesel, Emden, Geneva, Strasbourg, and Frankfurt. These congregations of emigrants, "the Church under the cross," provided themselves with a definite order at the Assembly of Wesel (1568) and the Synod of Emden (1571). At Emden an effort was made to realize a "Church reformed in accord with the word of God," which should be united with the state but not dependent on it. The synod worked out a plan for the government of all the churches in the Netherlands and thus united them into a national Church. The *Confessio Belgica* was adopted, and the Geneva Catechism was made obligatory for the French-speaking districts, the Heidelberg Catechism for the Flemish-speaking.

Alba's measures brought about a struggle for freedom; the Prince of Nassau-Orange emerged as its leader. He had converted to Calvinism in 1573, but at first he had very little interest in religion. During his contest with Spain Calvinism consolidated itself especially in the provinces of Holland and Zeeland. In 1575 the University of Leiden was founded and soon became the scholarly center of Calvinism. In the

---

[18] W. F. Dankbaar, *Hoogepunten uit het Nederlandsche Calvinisme in de zestiende eeuw,* pp. 5–40.

"Pacification of Ghent" in November 1576 all the provinces united for the expulsion of the Spanish. The more the political struggle contributed to the spread of Calvinism, the more the Catholic provinces—Walloon Flanders, Artois, and Hainault—feared for their existence. They joined for the defense of the Catholic faith in the Union of Arras on 6 January 1579 and recognized Philip II as their lord. Spain honored this by withdrawing its troops from the provinces of the Union.

The Calvinists' reply to the Union of Arras was the federation of the provinces of Holland, Zeeland, and Utrecht and of the "Ommelanden" around Groningen, together with John of Nassau, governor of Gelderland, in the Union of Utrecht. Of itself it was supposed to have no confessional features, and it expressly guaranteed religious liberty. But in reality the Catholic liturgy was regarded as criminal in the Union's sphere of influence.

Calvinism had conquered the northern Netherlands, but the southern provinces, thanks not least of all to the skill of Alessandro Farnese (1578–92), remained in the Catholic Church. By agreement with Spain the establishing of a Dutch Republic was effected in 1609. Once external peace had been achieved for the Calvinist Church of the Netherlands, serious inner theological conflicts erupted over predestination. "Supralapsarianism" defended a predestination independent of the commission of sin, whereas "Infralapsarianism" saw it as sin's consequence.

The national Synod of Dordrecht (1617–18), attended by representatives of almost all the Calvinist churches of Europe, meant the definitive consolidation of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. At it were laid down the basic theological doctrines of Calvinism, especially an unconditional predestination. The lively intellectual development of the succeeding decades can be ascribed only partially to Calvinism, for the "orthodox" Calvinists were less tolerant than the Catholics before them.[19]

Germany

Calvinist communities appeared on the lower Rhine when, around the turn of the years 1544–45, Walloons and Flemings moved there for economic reasons and as a consequence of Charles V's more rigorous religious policy in the Netherlands. They met with a good reception especially at Wesel, which from 1540 was regarded "abroad as a city of the *Confessio Augustana*.[20] Not the least compelling reason for their acceptance was the fact that people felt they would promote the local textile industry. Because of language difficulties they were allowed their own service of the word of God, but for the sake of unity in the practice of religion the city council required them to participate in the Lord's Supper in the city churches. However, the Calvinist-trained foreigners took offense at the choir dress in use there and at other Catholic ceremonies. They applied to Strasbourg, which sent the French noble, Valerand Poullain, to assume charge of their spiritual needs.

---

[19] J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism,* p. 267.

[20] A. Wolters, *Reformationsgeschichte der Stadt Wesel,* p. 80.

On the accession of Mary the Catholic to the English throne in 1553 many Protestants who had emigrated there left the country again and sought a new shelter, among other places, at Emden, Frankfurt-am-Main, and on the lower Rhine. A rather large group came again to Wesel. The denial of their own celebration of the Last Supper and the demand to accept the *Confessio Augustana* led, in the case of this relatively closed group, to a much greater resistance than was earlier true of the Walloons. They wanted to maintain their confessional standing in congregations of their own. The question was discussed in 1556 with Calvin and Jan Laski at Frankfurt, where similar problems had arisen. Calvin had already written: "It would greatly sadden us if the French Church which could be established at Wesel would be destroyed because we could not adapt ourselves to special ceremonies."[21] He now advised that ceremonies should be overlooked for the sake of the unity of the Church. But the quarrel extended to the doctrine of the Eucharist. When the foreigners were not prepared to sign a confession of the real presence in the sense of *manducatio oralis,* they were expelled in 1557. The victorious Lutheran faction, inspired by Tilemann Hesshusen, in its zeal for the pure doctrine, went to such extremes that it antagonized the city council; the result was a reaction at Wesel. This encouraged the willingness to receive the stream of refugees from the Netherlands, pouring into German territory from 1567, when the Duke of Alba became Spanish governor at Brussels. These emigrants were decided Calvinists. Wherever they arrived, among other places at Emmerich, Rees, Cleves, Gennep, Goch, Duisburg, and Wesel, they established congregations or got the upper hand in existing communities by virtue of their activity and their quite strong confessional stamp. At that time Wesel became a Calvinist city. The number of Calvinists on the lower Rhine had increased to such a degree by 1568 that it was possible to consider giving them an organization. Thus on 3 November numerous pastors and elders and some nobles gathered in synod, the "Wesel Assembly."[22] In accord with Paul's instruction that in the Church everything should be arranged and proceed with propriety recommendations were elaborated for uniting the refugees into congregations and classes. The synodal organization in use in France and the Netherlands was applied to the new situation. Three years later the guidelines of the Wesel Assembly were declared binding at the general Synod of Emden (4–14 October 1571) and further details relevant to discipline were enacted. This synod was the affair of the scattered Dutch congregations. The local church council played no role, either in its preparation or in its implementation. People at Emden were at that time not yet Calvinist but belonged to an intermediate, Melanchthonian tendency. It was only under Menso Alting (1541–1612) that Emden became the "Geneva of the North."

---

[21] Letter of 13 March 1554 (*OC* 15, 80); cf. *OC* 16, 286ff. (1556), 19 619ff. (1563).

[22] Minutes in A. Wolters, op. cit., pp. 335–358.

Nevertheless, beyond the Netherlands and the lower Rhine "the congregations of the continent" were united through the Emden Synod "into a Church with a common confession and common order."[23] The laity were much used in the service of the Church. Together with the preachers (*ministri*), the elders and deacons constituted the consistory, which was to meet weekly (Article 6). "In places where the service of the word could not be carried out" lecturers, elders, and deacons were to be instituted so that congregations could be assembled (41). Hence, in times of persecution, the congregations could, if necessary, get along without preachers. Several congregations formed a "class," which was to hold its own assembly every three or six months (7). Thus the individual congregation found support in the larger unity. The "Wesel Class," in which the congregations of the lower Rhine were amalgamated, met pretty regularly between 1573 and 1609. It not only held together the "Dutch churches under the Cross" on the lower Rhine, but gradually brought the native Protestants into its group or, where there were no refugee congregations, worked for the founding of Calvinist congregations of natives. The Calvinism of the lower Rhine felt itself bound to the Church of the Netherlands and long remained closely united with it. It was not until 1610 that the congregations of Cleves, Mark, Jülich-Berg, and Ravensberg established in Duisburg their own general synodal union. By the Treaty of Xanten in 1614 Cleves, Mark, and Ravensberg fell to Brandenburg. Shortly before this the Elector Johannes Sigismund of Brandenburg had gone over to Calvinism. In 1655 the founding of a Calvinist university for Brandenburg-Cleves finally took place in Duisburg, the chief center of the Calvinist confession.

On the lower Rhine and in East Friesland Calvinism had arisen from below by the founding of congregations and had built itself into a synodal union on the French and Netherlands model. The situation was different where it was introduced from above, by the decision of a prince or of a city government. In these cases the authority sought to retain control of Church administration and hence the congregational organization, created by Calvin, was subject to some restriction. The first German prince to accept the Calvinist creed and introduce it in his territory was Friedrich III of the Palatinate (1559–76). His most important assistants in introducing Calvinism were Melanchthon's Silesian pupil, Zacharias Ursinus (1534–83), and Kaspar Olevianus of Trier (1536–87). Olevianus had made contact with Calvinist congregations as a law student at Paris, Orléans, and Bourges. He took it upon himself to gain his homeland for the Reformation and from 1558 studied theology at Geneva and Zurich. He was sent by Calvin to Trier around 1559. Here he obtained the position of teacher of Latin from the council but was soon active as a preacher of the Reformation. His reform endeavors foundered on the opposition of the elector and of the majority of the city council, and he took refuge at the court of the Elector Palatine at Heidelberg.

---

[23] W. Niesel, *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen,* p. 277; ibid., pp. 279–290, the synodal acts.

The Elector Friedrich III had, shortly before, succeeded the childless Otto Heinrich (1556–59). His wife, Mary of Hohenzollern, daughter of Margrave Kasimir of Brandenburg-Kulmbach, had gained him for Lutheranism. In his religious and ethical seriousness he inclined to rigorism and was intolerant of Catholics, Jews, and, later, of Lutherans. He regarded his purpose in life as the struggle "with Christ" against "the devil and his apostle, the Pope."[24] Concerned for the unity of Protestantism, he was personally involved in the Eucharistic quarrel between the pugnacious Lutheran, Tilemann Hesshusen, called to Heidelberg by Otto Heinrich, and university circles, represented chiefly by the deacon Klebitz, who had received his degree there. The Elector was indignant at the strife of theologians, especially at Hesshusen's fanaticism and, for his own part, intended to arrive at a solution through prayer and the study of Holy Scripture. He declared the Eucharistic formula of the *Confessio Augustana Variata* to be obligatory. According to this version, "the body and the blood of Christ are really administered," not in or under, but "with the bread and wine."[25] In this way one could profess Calvin's view and at the same time be included in the protection afforded by the Religious Peace of 1555 as an adherent of the *Confessio Augustana.* Hesshusen was allowed no peace and was finally dismissed as superintendent. His place was taken by a church council of three theologians and three laymen. A testimonial from Melanchthon of 1

---

[24] A. Kluckholn (ed.), *Briefe Friedrichs des Frommen* I, 517.

[25] *BSLK* 65, 45.

November 1559, and a disputation at Heidelberg on 3–6 June 1560, urged by Friedrich's Gnesiolutheran son-in-law, Duke Johann Friedrich II of Saxony, made the Elector Palatine incline more than ever to the Calvinist viewpoint. On 12 August 1560 he issued an edict whereby ministers who were unwilling to accept Melanchthon's Eucharistic formula had to leave the principality. At the same time Calvinists driven from their homelands, such as Kaspar Olevianus from Trier, Zacharias Ursinus from Breslau, and Wenceslaus Zuleger from Bohemia, acquired great influence at the Electoral court. Despite his youth—he was only twenty-nine—Zuleger was appointed president of the church council. Olevianus became professor and pastor; Ursinus, professor and director of the *Collegium Sapientiae,* the theological school which was separated from the university. When his efforts to assure the unity of Protestantism by again acquiring signatures for the *Confessio Augustana Variata* failed at the Naumburg Diet of Princes in 1561, Friedrich III went over definitively to Calvinism. But he hesitated to adopt the Geneva Catechism, which would have signified an open break with the *Confessio Augustana,* so he commissioned the drawing up of a special catechism. The resulting Heidelberg Catechism of 1563 was essentially the work of Ursinus; that Olevianus made a considerable contribution or revised the German text is improbable.[26] In 129 questions the catechism provides a systematic and carefully composed theology. Following the Introduction—"What is your single consolation in life and in death? That one is the property of Christ his Saviour"—come three parts: I. "On Man's Misery" (sin, which is recognized by virtue of Christ's twofold commandment of love of God and neighbor); II. "On Man's Redemption" (questions 12 to 85: the Creed, baptism, the Lord's Supper); III. "'On Gratitude" (questions 86 to 129: works, the decalog, the Lord's Prayer). The Calvinist doctrine of predestination and any polemic against the Lutheran teaching on the Eucharist are abandoned. All the more sharply is the Catholic Mass repudiated, from the third edition, in Question 80: "And thus the Mass is basically nothing less than a denial of the unique sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ and a damnable superstition." Hence the clarification of the doctrine of the Mass that had meanwhile been made by the Council of Trent was completely ignored. The fourth and definitive edition of the catechism was published, along with the Church Order, in November 1563 for the dominions of Friedrich III of the Palatinate. Beyond this area it won, among other places, Nassau-Orange, the lower Rhineland, the County of Mark, and especially the Netherlands. It was translated into Dutch as early as 1563 and at the Dordrecht Synod of 1618–19 it was declared to be the symbolic book whereby the way into the entire Calvinist world was opened up.

---

[26] Cf. W. Hollweg, "Bearbeitete Caspar Olevianus den deutschen Text zum Heidelberger Katechismus?" *Neue Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Heidelberger Katechismus* (Neukirchen 1961), pp. 124–152.

The Church Order dealt with preaching and the administration of the Sacraments. Exclusion from the Sacraments was provided for. But, so that no abuse could creep into the matter of excommunication, as happened under the papacy, it was to lie, not in the power of the ministers, but in that of the entire Christian congregation.[27]

Swiss influence became especially apparent in the cessation of all ceremonies. Eventually the Church Order regulated the eleemosynary system, dress, marriage cases, the care of the sick and of prisoners, and burial. Ecclesiastical life was to be supported from without by a strict police organization. The Church council acquired a new order in 1564. It had to exercise authority over the territorial Church as one of the prince's administrative offices. Also, ecclesiastical districts were subject to it, each headed by its superintendent. Olevianus instituted Church discipline on the Geneva model, whereby it was entrusted rather to the congregation or to a court selected by it. He was able to see his plans realized at least partially when in 1570 the Elector issued a disciplinary order for the Church council. According to this the council had the means of calling to account every deviation in doctrine or too outspoken notion. Two pastors, inclined toward anti-Trinitarianism, were enabled to experience what this meant. One of them, Adam Neuser, contrived to flee to Constantinople, where he became a Muslim; the other, Johannes Sylvanus, superintendent of Ladenburg, was, despite recantation, executed in the public square in the presence of his wife and children.

The appearance of the Heidelberg Catechism brought Friedrich III into new difficulties with imperial law. The Lutheran Dukes Christoph of Württemberg and Wolfgang of Zweibrücken, King Maximilian II, and the Emperor Ferdinand I accused him of sectarianism. In a letter of 13 July 1563 the Emperor stated that the Calvinist Lord's Supper was not in accord with the *Confessio Augustana* and hence the Electoral Palatinate was excluded from the Religious Peace of 1555.[28] Then and in 1566 at the Diet of Augsburg, when the accusations were repeated, it was argued by the champions of the Palatinate that they were in agreement with the *Confessio Augustana* as properly understood and in accord with the teaching of great foreign Protestant churches. In addition, the Elector in 1563 requested a testimonial from Bullinger; and in 1565 he again asked him for literary assistance in view of the coming Diet. These difficulties led to the printing and approving of a profession of faith which Bullinger, for personal reasons, had put in writing in 1562 in the expectation of his death. It was printed in 1566 as the *Confessio Helvetica Posterior* and sent to Heidelberg.

---

[27] W. Niesel, op. cit., pp. 194, 34–45.

[28] A. Kluckhohn, op. cit., I, 420f.

This temporarily threatening situation did not keep Friedrich III from again proceeding forcibly against Lutheranism and especially from suppressing Catholic worship and faith. Almost forty monasteries and chapters had thus far maintained themselves in the Palatinate. The route of a peaceful Reformation, which the Elector had probably first wanted to travel, proved to be all the less successful as Catholicism began to display signs of a regeneration. It was extirpated by brute force. Friedrich III did not even shrink from suppressing monasteries in areas of condominion where he shared rule with Catholic princes, showing a disregard of their rights and from staging iconoclastic outbreaks in churches. He who had appealed to his own conscience at the Diet of 1566 was not prepared to concede this right to Lutherans and Catholics. For, so he argued, it is one thing to force a person to the good, to God's word and truth, and quite another thing to force him to idolatry and lies.

After his death Lutheranism was restored for five years by his son and successor, Ludwig VI (1578–83), who had recourse to the same state-police methods. Olevianus, who had warned from the pulpit that the wolves, the Lutherans, were on the point of tearing to pieces the sheep, the Calvinists, was the first to have to leave the country. He went to Berleburg to become tutor of the princes and then in 1584 to Herborn as pastor and professor of theology.

There, in Nassau, Count John VI (1559–1606), a brother of William of Orange, favored Calvinism; he was confirmed in this by his close connections with the Netherlands. In 1568 he summoned Gerhard Eobanus Geldenhauer from Hesse and in 1572 appointed him superintendent. When the Calvinist theologians were expelled from the Palatinate and the Cryptocalvinists from Wittenberg, they obtained a public reception in Nassau in 1577. On 8–9 July 1578 the Synod of Dillenburg adopted the Nassau Confession,[29] which was composed chiefly by Christoph Pezel. A *presbyterium* was instituted in the same year. The General Assembly of 1581 adopted the Palatinate Church Order and the Heidelberg Confession. The Johannea University, established at Herborn in 1584 on the model of the Geneva Academy, acquired a great reputation through its important teachers, Kaspar Olevianus, Johann Piscator, Georg Pasor, Johann Alsted, Johann Althusius, and others, and became, after Geneva and Leiden, a center of Calvinist theology. At the general synod in Herborn in 1586 a superterritorial synodal Church of the counties of the Wetterau was founded at the suggestion of Johann VI and his theologians. In 1648 it had to give way again to the territorial Church system. The Herborn Order,[30] an effort to unite the Geneva presbyterial-synodal system with the territorial institution of superintendents, continued to operate until the Rhenish-Westphalian Church Order of 1835.

---

[29] Text in E. F. K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche,* pp. 720–739.

In Bremen Philippism had gained influence through Hardenberg. In an effort to mediate between the Zwinglians, represented by Molanus, and the Lutherans, by Jodocus Glanaeus, the city council in 1570 summoned the Melanchthonian Marcus Mening. In 1572, when he was superintendent, an "Agreement on the Chief Points of Christian Doctrine" was accepted. The influence of Calvinism also grew at Bremen from the downfall of Philippism in Electoral Saxony. Christoph Pezel was active in the Hansa city from 1580. A confession that he composed, the Consensus Bremensis,[31] was signed on 2 May 1595, by all members of the Church officialdom and in 1644 it was declared by the council to be the valid creed. In comparison with the Nassau Confession, it was enlarged by, among other points, a section on predestination and it represented a strict Calvinism.

Simon VI (1554–1613) assumed control of the government of the County of Lippe in 1579. He had studied at Strasbourg in 1567–69, together with his teacher, the Philippist Thodenus, who had been banished from Wittenberg. Simon maintained good relations with the Calvinists of the Netherlands. He gradually filled the parishes of his county with Calvinist clerics. While the Lutheran Church Order of 1571 was not formally annulled, the three superintendents introduced a Calvinist Lord's Supper on the basis of the consistorial ordinance of 1600. Luther's small catechism was replaced by one composed by Anger (1547–1607). The Heidelberg Catechism was introduced in 1618. Apart from Lemgo, which successfully resisted and in 1617 obtained extensive autonomy, the County of Lippe became a Calvinist principality. Then in 1684 Count Simon Henry introduced a new Calvinist Church Order in place of that of 1571.

Prince Joachim Ernst of Anhalt (1546–86) brought all parts of the principality under his rule from 1570. While inclined to Lutheranism, he could not be induced to sign the *Formula of Concord.* Wolfgang Amling (1542–1606), called by him to Zerbst in 1578 to become superintendent, opposed to the *Formula of Concord* a *Confessio Anhaltina* and an *Apologia Anhaltina.* Without having been authorized, he had preachers ordained in accord with these writings of a private character. Some clerics who had been driven from Saxony under the suspicion of Cryptocalvinism were welcomed in Anhalt. Because of his mediating attitude Prince Joachim Ernst was accused of being a Calvinist. In 1585 he had his theologians draw up a "Brief and True Profession of the Lord's Holy Supper," which all clergymen of his territory had to sign. His successor, Johann Georg I, through his marriage was in close connection with the Electoral Palatinate; his brother, Christian, was married to a daughter of the Calvinist Count of Bentheim. In 1596 they both decreed that the tablets and wooden crucifixes on and over altars, the candles, and the vestments were abolished. Altars were to resemble tables, and the clergy were to break bread behind the table and facing the congregation.[32] In all this it was maintained that these changes meant no modification of doctrine. But as early as 1599 Johann Georg commissioned his superintendent Amling to draw up a liturgy. The outline,[33] sketched by Amling and some theologians, did not meet with the Prince's approval, for, as he said, it did not resemble enough the Palatinate liturgy. With the coming of age of Johann Georg's brothers the principality was divided in 1603 into Dessau, Bernburg, Zerbst, and Köthen. The confessional basis of the corresponding territorial Churches consisted of the *Confessio Augustana Variata,* the Palatinate liturgy, and the Heidelberg Catechism.

---

[30] Text in W. Niesel, op. cit., pp. 290–298.

[31] Text in E. F. K. Müller, op. cit., pp. 739–799.

Thus around 1600 the formation of the Calvinist territorial Church in Germany was completed. A leading role in this had been played by pupils of Melanchthon, some of whom had had to give way to Lutheran orthodoxy at Wittenberg. They proclaimed their passage to Calvinism as a "second Reformation."[34] In their eyes, Lutheranism, with its "papist" relics, was a preliminary step; Melanchthon, with his theology of mediation, was the transition; Calvinism, on the other hand, with its liturgy, its ecclesiastical discipline, and its idea of Christian authority, was the consistent completion of the Reformation. In contradistinction to the "Reformation of doctrine" that was carried out by Luther, in Calvinism was seen the "Reformation of life."

Scotland and England

In 1549 the Scottish National Synod stressed two reasons for the deterioration of the Church in Scotland:[35] the immorality and the defective formation of the clergy. The Church required, among other things, that priests should be capable of explaining Scripture and that pastors and bishops should preach at least four times a year. It also forbade the spending of ecclesiastical revenues on illegitimate children. An improvement in the manner of life of the clergy was everywhere called for, so that "those who show others the way might not themselves be at fault."[36] From a report made by Cardinal Sermoneta to Pope Paul IV in 1556,[37] it appears that none of these demands of the synod were carried out. This climate created a good soil for the reception of the new teaching, and even the political situation was favorable. James V of Scotland died in 1542, when his successor, Mary, Queen of Scots, was only a week old. The struggle over the regency between the Archbishop of Saint Andrews, Cardinal David Beaton (1539–46), and the Earl of Arran, heir presumptive to the throne, ended in the victory of the latter. The outcome was an encouragement of Protestantism. For, like many other nobles, the Earl favored the Reformation in the expectation of thereby acquiring a part of the property of the Church.

---

[32] Sehling, II, 533–580.

[33] Ibid., 536f., 581.

[34] J. Noltmann, *Christoph Pezel (1539–1604) und der Calvinismus in Bremen,* pp. 76–81; H. E. Weber, *Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus* I, 2 (Darmstadt, 2d ed. 1966), 326f.

[35] *A Source Book of Scottish History* II, 147–148.

Under these conditions George Wishart (c. 1513–46) found it easy to gain adherents for Protestantism.[38] Wishart, called "the martyr of the Scottish Reformation," spent a short time in Switzerland and Germany, where he got to know Calvinism and Lutheranism in their pure forms. From 1544 he was closely associated with John Knox. He died at the stake, as a heretic, in Edinburgh on 1 March 1546.[39] In return, Cardinal David Beaton was assassinated by a group led by John Knox.[40]

From then on, Knox (c. 1505–72) was the chief figure in the Scottish Reformation. He carried on the work of his friend and teacher much more decisively and even more fanatically and thus became the "Reformer of Scotland." When, following a two-years' absence abroad—from 1547 to 1549 he was in detention on a French galley—he returned to Scotland, the Scottish court was under the domination of Mary Stuart's mother, Mary of Guise, Francophile and Catholic. Knox was able to stir up the Protestants, who had been forced into the background, to new activity. At the Scottish provincial synod in 1552 it was decided to publish a catechism in the Scottish tongue as an aid for the clergy in explaining the Bible. This "Hamilton's Catechism"[41] accepted a Protestant ideology, especially in the teaching on predestination:

---

[36] W. C. Dickinson, *A New History of Scotland* I, 313.

[37] *A Source Book of Scottish History* II, 150f.

[38] J. Knox, *History of the Reformation in Scotland* I, 60ff.

[39] Cf. *A Source Book of Scottish History* II, 136f.

[40] Ibid., 138–142.

[41] Ibid., 148–150.

> In short, we must entrust ourselves entirely to God. Our salvation, our trust, our confidence rest on his help, his support, goodness, and merciful providence in all our needs, dangers, every misfortune, every weakness. In everything [we must] give up our own will and in obedience entrust everything to God's gracious will.[42]

The Covenant of 1557 constitutes a climax in the development of the Scottish Reformation. In this the Scottish nobility swore to defend the "congregation of Christ" and to annihilate the "congregation of Satan."[43] From now on the Catholics were confronted by a compact array of influential men. Meanwhile, Knox had spent a year (1554–55) at Geneva, where he became a definite follower of Calvin. His chief aim hereafter was to combat Catholics and Catholicism with all his energy. He preached, with Calvinist severity, resistance to "unrighteous authority," as well as the destruction of images, churches, and monasteries. He knew how to captivate the masses. As an example may be cited his libel, *Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women,* composed in 1558. The persecution of Protestants in England by Queen Mary I was attributed to this work, which thus understandably aroused resentment in the persecuted against Knox. When Calvin chided the English Protestants because of this "unfraternal attitude" of theirs toward Knox, they retorted:

> We can assure you that this outrageous libel has added much fuel to the flames of persecution in England. For not one of our brethren suffered death before its publication, but as soon as it was put on sale, many distinguished men were sent to the stake.[44]

This example makes clear how the more radical bent of John Knox, stamped by Calvinism, differed from the more moderate English Protestants and what course Scotland would hereafter follow. The marriage of Queen Mary Stuart with the future Francis II of France in 1558 was unfortunate for the Catholics of Scotland, for the Protestants would have much preferred an alliance with Protestant England. Because of the marriage distrust and discontent between Catholics and Protestants grew to such an extent that finally civil war broke out in 1559. The immediate reason was the support given to the Ancient Church by Mary of Guise. The Protestants managed to maintain themselves with the help of English troops. Though outlawed by the regent, Knox from now on displayed an extremely active agitation against Catholic "idolatry."

In 1560, after the death of Mary of Guise, an assembly of spiritual and secular lords met in Edinburgh, at the urging of John Knox. Three important decisions were taken, almost unanimously, by this meeting of the estates: the authority and jurisdiction of the Pope were abolished, the Mass and all else that was opposed to the Protestant confession were forbidden, and the *Confessio Scotica* was declared in force. This *Scottish Confession* was composed by a committee of six on the initiative of Parliament. The leading spirit was here again John Knox.

---

[42] Ibid., 150.

[43] Ibid., 162.

[44] A. Zimmermann, "Zur Reformation in Schottland," *RQ* 25 (1911), 39.

> The *Confession* makes us aware of his spirit in each section: namely, in the unflinching justification of every single statement of belief on the sole authority of Holy Scripture. It thereby ranks on a level of equality with the other Church confessions of the Age of the Reformation, especially those of the churches influenced by Calvin.[45]

The assembly which enacted the *Confessio Scotica* is called the "Reformation Parliament." It was attended by a large number of members of the lesser nobility, all of whom were enthusiastic Protestants. Their vehemence went so far that anyone taking part in the celebration of the Catholic liturgy was threatened with the death penalty. Mary Stuart, who, following the death of her husband, assumed the government of Scotland in 1561, never signed this *Confession of Faith and of Doctrine.* Under her, a convinced Catholic, the religious question remained unsolved. Vis-à-vis the Calvinists she adopted a very liberal position, but she was nevertheless regarded by them as a danger for their faith. On the first Sunday after her return to Scotland the Queen had Mass celebrated for herself and her court. The upshot was a rising of the Calvinists against her. She had to promise by proclamation to maintain the status quo, that is, to accept Protestantism as the state religion, as it had been since 1560. The Queen's privy councilors even promised to support the Calvinist Church; this meant that one-third of the Church property was confiscated. The Calvinists obtained one part of this; the remainder went to the Queen. The fact that the Calvinists' share became in the course of time ever less and the Queen's all the greater gave occasion to Knox's remark: Two parts of all Church property belong to the devil; the third part is divided between God and the devil.[46] In view of the activity of Knox's adherents, Mary could not dare to uphold those of her own faith, especially since Knox more and more emphasized that the Calvinists must not be forced to concur with the "idolatrous Queen."

Mary's second marriage, to Henry Darnley, in 1565 did nothing to improve her position. On the contrary: when this incompetent man was murdered on 10 February 1567, the Queen was accused of complicity, since three months later she married the Protestant Earl of Bothwell who had taken part in the crime. Knox ranted against the Queen and demanded her execution. In July 1567 there was nothing left for her except to abdicate in favor of her infant son, James VI, who was later to become James I of England. He was educated as a Calvinist.

---

[45] P. Jacobs, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen,* p. 128.

[46] W. C. Dickinson, op. cit., I, 335.

More so than elsewhere, in Scotland the Reformation was a lay movement,[47] lacking so theologically distinctive a leader as Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, or Cranmer. John Knox is in a different category from the reformers just mentioned; he was a fanatical Church Leader rather than a theologian. But he did not succeed in fully realizing the plans and hopes which he had set forth in his *First Book of Discipline* in 1560.[48] For the Scottish Lords regarded the Church Order advocated by him, the proposal of an earthly republic which was to prepare for heaven, from quite another viewpoint than his own and "refused to consider an independent system of canon law, in which the Church ruled the state, took over the schools, and provided for the sick and weak."[49] Knox envisaged an intimate cooperation between Church and state. In his *Book of Discipline* he protested, in agreement with Calvin, against Church festivals; they were human institutions and hence to be abolished. Here he meant not only the feasts of Apostles, martyrs, and other saints, but also Christmas, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, "and other feasts of our Lady. . . . "[50] A further section had to do with church buildings. Worship was permitted only in parish churches or schools, not in monasteries and abbeys. The place of worship had to be properly equipped. Knox devoted himself in great detail to the "admission of ministers."[51] Every congregation had the right to elect its own clergy. The prerequisite was a definite educational level; ordination and imposition of hands were repudiated. Readers and exhorters were assigned to churches which had no permanent minister. The requirement for this appointment was a religious life and intellectual ability. After their trial period, readers and exhorters could advance to the regular clerical state. A comprehensive support of the families of ministers in which there was a definite need was demanded; attention to the education of the children and the maintenance of the widows was especially stressed. Knox required that the poor in general be supported, but only those who could not really help themselves, not those "who followed the profession of begging."[52] These demands and proposals point to the modern welfare state.

---

[47] A. Zimmermann, loc. cit., 38.

[48] *A Source Book of Scottish History* II, 171–180.

[49] A. Zimmermann, loc. cit., 113.

[50] *A Source Book of Scottish History* II, 171.

[51] Ibid., 172f.

Knox's remarks on the use of superintendents give an insight into the organization of the Church.[53] The entire country was to be divided into ten or twelve provinces, and each province was to receive a superintendent. Their duties were to establish congregations and institute clergymen. They were responsible for the order and morals of the congregations and their ministers. The prerequisite of this function was a two-years' ministry in a parish. The Church was also responsible for the education of the people. Every congregation in the city had to appoint a schoolmaster who was able to teach grammar and Latin. In the country instruction in the catechism, in accord with the *Book of Common Order,* had to be provided for children and adolescents. "Colleges" were to be founded in the larger cities, in particular in the superintendent's seat, and in these the arts and languages were to be taught. In addition, three universities—St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen—were demanded for all of Scotland. It was made possible for pupils and university students to obtain scholarships; the deciding factors here were the intellectual ability of the candidate and the financial situation of his parents. Clergymen, the poor, the schools, and the teachers had to be provided for out of ecclesiastical revenues and property.

The "Kirk Session"—a tribunal of laymen and ministers—was to be of great importance for the ecclesiastical organization of the Church.[54] At its annual session took place the election of deacons and elders. It was the duty of the elders to assist and supervise the pastor. Unworthy pastors were to be deposed by the elders with the approval of the Church and the superintendent; here the presbyterial system was already making its appearance. Knox also clearly expressed his ideas on public and family piety.[55]

As far as possible, baptism was to be administered only on Sunday, following the sermon; the Lord's Supper was to be celebrated four times a year—on the first Sunday of March, June, September, and December. The requirement for reception was to be a knowledge of the "Our Father," of the Creed, and of the ten commandments. Every church had to possess an English Bible. The faithful were to be obliged to listen to the Bible and its explanation. Every head of a family had to instruct the members of his household in Christian doctrine. All the faithful were to learn psalms and practice so as to be able "to sing along mightily" at worship. According to this *First Book of Discipline,* people and rulers are subjects of the same God. Church and state are the two pillars for God's Kingdom on earth. But the repudiation of this book in Scotland shows that there people were still far from the "perfect city of Geneva."

---

[52] Ibid., 174.

[53] Ibid., 174–176.

[54] Ibid., 179.

[55] Ibid., 179f.

If, with the deposition of Mary Stuart in 1567, Protestantism flourished again and the *Confession of Faith* and the *Book of Discipline* were recognized, no practical consequences really resulted from this approval. Knox remarked in this regard: "Greed does not allow this depraved generation to accept the aims of pious ministers."[56] The Catholic bishops and priests were at first left undisturbed in their positions, but they no longer had any influence on the faithful. There thus existed, side by side, two Churches; the one was reduced to silence, but wealthy, while the other was active, but poor. Meanwhile, the Calvinist Church was completing its institutions at synods. When positions became vacant, they were given to Calvinist preachers. The bishops were treated in the same way. From 1572, on the basis of the Concordat of Leith, they were no longer nominated by the crown but were examined and accepted by Calvinist preachers, and they were subject only to the General Assembly, the general synod of the Scottish Church.

Andrew Melville found this "tolerant" attitude of the Scottish Calvinists when in 1574 he returned from Geneva to become Knox's successor. He thus felt called upon for a *Second Book of Discipline.*[57] Like the *First Book,* he claimed to be merely going back to the word of God. Like Knox, he wanted all the possessions of the Church to be turned over to Calvinist ministers, schools, the poor, and other ecclesiastical institutions. But the demand for the equality of ministers was a departure from the *First Book.* The episcopal organization was superseded by the presbyterian. Church discipline was to be guaranteed not only by clerics but by tribunals of laymen and ministers. These were called the "Kirk Session," "Presbyter Synod," and "General Assembly," and had authority to give decisions in regard to laymen and clerics in ecclesiastical matters. At the beginning of the book it is explained that the Church has a "power of its own," which is given directly by God. It has no head on earth, its only head being Christ. If the secular power offends in matters of conscience and religion, it is subject to Church law. It is the Church's duty to prescribe to the secular power how it is to bring its activities into harmony with the word of God. Here was the initial step toward a Church that could determine the policy of the state. What meaning could a secular Parliament still have, if the Church claimed to be in direct "counsel with God"?

---

[56] W. C. Dickinson, op. cit., I, 349.

[57] *A Source Book of Scottish History* III, 22–31.

King James VI (1567–1625) was intelligent enough to recognize the danger in this development. It was to be feared that the General Assembly would soon control every aspect of royal authority. Melville, in fact, maintained that the authority of the Church stood, not merely alongside, but above that of the state. In 1584 he made it known to the King's secret council that it was a usurpation to control the ambassadors and envoys of a King who was far above him, the earthly King. This led to the declaration by James VI that Scottish Presbyterianism was as compatible with the monarchy as were God and the devil, and that he was guided by the axiom: "No bishop, no king." Thus one can understand the King's proceedings against Melville and the Scottish Church. James wanted an episcopal system; he wanted bishops who would be named by the crown. In this he saw the sole possibility of being master in his country. Melville, on the contrary, worked for a presbyterial system, independent of the state and actually over it.

With the arrival of Erné Stuart, Lord d'Aubigny, came new difficulties. He was suspected of being a papist agent. In an effort to end this suspicion James VI, Lord d'Aubigny, who had meanwhile become Earl of Lennox, and the entire royal family signed the "King's Confession" in 1581. It was also called the "Negative Confession," because in it every religion and doctrine that was not in harmony with the *Confessio Scotica* of 1566 was rejected. Two months later all Scotland had to subscribe to this document.

> This so-called "Confessio Negativa" of 1581 was brought about by the agitation of the Counter-Reformation, which made itself felt in Scotland. Hence in a quite special way it bears an expressly anti-Roman character in that it mentions and rejects individually the errors and superstitious usages of the Church of Rome. Its author was the chaplain of the royal household, John Craig, who was entrusted with the work by the King himself.[58]

In August 1582 the King, by whose orders the "Confessio Negativa" had been drafted, was imprisoned because he was still regarded as a danger to true religion. After James' escape Melville was charged with treason against the country, but he fled to England. The King, embittered by his imprisonment, now turned against everything that Melville had demanded for the Church. The so-called "Black Acts"[59] were enacted in May 1584 as measures of retaliation. They stated that Parliament and Council were above all spiritual and temporal estates and sanctioned them as such. Supervision of the lower clergy and of ecclesiastical government in general was to continue with the bishops and "commissioners," who were now responsible to the King and not, as formerly, to the General Assembly. Meetings of the clergy were forbidden except with the King's express consent. It was declared that this decree was directed especially against Presbyterianism. The King now claimed jurisdiction over clergy and laity. All decrees of the Church that lacked his ratification were invalid for the future. This was unacceptable to the Calvinists. In order to achieve a compromise it was recommended by representatives of the Church in 1586 that the King should suggest the names of bishops to the General Assembly; but this never became effective in practice, for the "Magna Charta of the Church of Scotland" meant the repudiation of the "Black Acts" by the King. In it he confirmed all privileges of the Calvinist Church and again promised it the right to convoke general assemblies, synods, and presbyterial meetings. He even declared that the "Black Acts" were not to oppose the "privilege which God has given to spiritual officials in the Church."[60] Despite these concessions the equality of all clergymen was for the King the cause of all evil, or "mother of confusion"; hence his change was a purely external one. His diplomatic skill soon enabled him to give the episcopal form the predominance again over the presbyterian form.

---

[58] P. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 128.

[59] *A Source Book of Scottish History* III, 39–43.

In sum, it can be said of the development in Scotland: In organization and doctrine the Scottish Church was Calvinist. It was not yet Presbyterian under Knox, who never called for the equality of all clerics. It was only his successor, Melville, who pushed the development further in this direction and realized a full Presbyterianism. In James VI it discovered a great opponent. An so in the period that followed there was a continual struggle between King and Presbyterianism for the leadership of the Church.

In England Calvinists were long unable to establish themselves. For the most part they were refugees from France or Englishmen who had become acquainted with Knox's ideas in Scotland. Having become used to the simplicity of the Calvinist worship, they regarded as too much to approve the "Romish" rite of the Anglican Church. And the royal control of the Church was for them a relic of "papist domination." Thus the Calvinists were in conflict with the Anglican Church. They had no possibility of developing an ecclesiastical system of their own, however, for the Act of Uniformity, issued under Queen Elizabeth I in 1559, prescribed a uniform Anglican liturgy.

---

[60] Cf. Dickinson, op. cit., I, 362–370.

The Calvinists did not stop demanding a "pure" Church, "in accord with Scripture," thereby acquiring the name "Puritans" around 1566. The middle class especially favored them. At first they represented a group with a particular intellectual outlook within the Anglican Church; a really passionate attachment to the letter of Scripture was proper to them. When the state Church would not go along with their demand, they separated from it and instituted their own congregations in 1567. They gave themselves a democratic Church organization and thus became Presbyterians. Following this their opposition to the Anglican High Church became notorious and severe persecutions ensued. Many "Dissenters" went to prison, but they could not be exterminated. Many left England. In 1620 one group, the "Pilgrim Fathers," sailed for North America on the *Mayflower* and established a new home for themselves in Massachusetts. Their idea of the autonomous congregation under Christ as its unique head contributed substantially to the American notion of democracy as the political form of government most in accord with God's will.

Puritans were also persecuted in England under Charles I (1625–49). In particular Archbishop Laud of Canterbury (d. 1645) tried to restore unity of worship and proceeded sternly against Puritanism and Presbyterianism in Scotland. This led to civil war. The King's defeat in 1645–46 and execution in 1649 meant the temporary end of the Anglican Episcopal Church and the victory of Presbyterianism.

CHAPTER 31

The Development of Denominations in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

When the division of the Western Church had long been a sad reality and there was already a multiplicity of religious communities which differed substantially in doctrine, worship, and law, people were still in no sense aware of the full import of these facts. Only relatively late were there denominations in the sense of ecclesiastical communities, whose members knew they were united in professing clearly defined truths of faith and by means of a common worship and common norms of moral conduct and that they were separated from other groups. Denominational formation took place in a slow process of more than a century and in a manner quite different according to countries and even localities. In Catholic territories it was ordinarily much more protracted than in Protestant lands. Acceptance of the Reformation by a state or a city did not mean, of course, that the masses also took this step from their own convictions. If the reformers did not intend to found a new Church, *a fortiori* their adherents were not thinking of any schism in faith and Church. People wanted "preaching according to Scripture," they professed the "pure doctrine," and, in short, intended to take reform seriously. When Christendom was actually split into denominations, each of them thought of itself as universal, as the true Church, and accordingly considered all others as heretical. People clung to the traditional notion of the unity of the Church and of its teaching, which could be formulated in obligatory dogmas. To deviate from them was to become guilty of wicked heresy.

The situation was complicated but also mitigated by the fact that not only Catholics and Protestants were in opposition. For Protestants soon split into various groups, bitterly hostile to one another, and again had to defend themselves, together with the Catholics, against Anabaptists, fanatics, and Spiritualists. Then all groups, more or less, found it necessary to be more firmly united. This process of clarifying and acquiring awareness from within and of stabilization and differentiation from without, which we call denominational formation, was not only and not even most powerfully urged and supported by religious forces but also by cultural and social and especially by political strength. Undoubtedly, Lutheran preaching was only in its beginnings from 1520 in broad areas of Germany and Switzerland. But the destruction and rebuilding of the ecclesiastical organization that it had called for could as yet be regarded only as the long overdue and longed-for reform of the Church. The formation of an autonomous Lutheran Church came about not only by means of the "German Mass" of 1526 and the Catechism of 1529 but also through the visitations arranged by the political authority and the Church Order decreed by it.

At Augsburg the Protestants were invited by the Emperor to present their viewpoint. The result was the *Confessio Augustana* and its *Apologia.* But these were intended as a confession of the "Catholic Church"[1] and endeavored to show that what was sought was not a new Church but only the abolition of abuses. Discussions and agreements were made, not by ecclesiastical communities among themselves, but by political powers—by the Emperor and the estates in the Empire, by the cantons in Switzerland. Of course, they regarded themselves as bound by a confession; accordingly, the then already customary notion of "religious factions" correctly describes the situation.[2] The unity of religion with a particular political sphere was still taken for granted by all concerned. According to Luther, no contrary preaching should be tolerated in a principality or city, for the sake of peace. Hence he was unwilling that Lutheran preachers should sneak into Catholic communities and preach there uninvited.[3]

---

[1] Apol. VII, *BSLK* p. 235, 27 and frequently.

[2] F. Dickmann, "Das Problem der Gleichberechtigung der Konfessionen," *HZ* 201 (1965), 265–305 (especially p. 267).

When religious unity could no longer be preserved for the Empire, it was assured for the individual territories by awarding to the princes the right to decide the confession of their subjects. The princes made a powerful contribution to the formation of denominations after the 1555 Religious Peace of Augsburg by striving to create in their territories a distinct and uniform religious situation. They tried to eliminate other creeds and to consolidate their own by various means. Where authority made no use of its right to determine the religion of its subjects the process of denominational formation was longest drawn up. This was the case, for example, on the lower Rhine, where the Dukes of Jülich-Cleves-Berg favored reform in the spirit of Erasmus, without adopting Protestantism and without fighting it energetically. They were happy with reform but hostile to novelty. For decades they allowed free rein to the religious currents and thereby fostered Protestantism without intending to do so.

Consequently, the relationship of the political authority to the Church in its territory was in no sense everywhere the same. "Cuius regio eius et religio" was, of course, universally in force as a principle, but it was not everywhere made use of in the same way. Partly the political power of the princes did not suffice to impose their religion. Resistance came, not from the masses of the people, but from the leading circles of the cities and from the rural nobility, which asserted its independence from state authority by means of a religion different from that of the prince. This was seen above all in Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland. The rural estate and the cities often favored another creed out of opposition to the prince's religious policy. In the Swiss Confederation and in some Imperial Free Cities political necessity produced a juxtaposition of confessions. In Austria and France the *raison d'état* at times required a giving in. In 1598 the French crown conceded extensive privileges to the Protestants of the country by the Edict of Nantes, but it modified them and finally withdrew them when it felt strong enough.[4]

---

[3] "Denn es ist nicht gut, das man ynn einer pfarr odder kirchspiel widderwertige predigt yns volck lesst gehen, denn es entspringen daraus rotten, unfried, hass und neid auch ynn andern, welltlichen sachen" (*WA* 31, I, 209, 28). Cf. H. Bornkamm, "Die religiöse und politische Problematik im Verhältnis der Konfessionen im Reich," *ARG* 56 (1965), 209–218 (especially p. 213).

[4] H. Lutz, "Die Konfessionsproblematik ausserhalb des Reiches und in der Politik des Papsttums," *ARG* 56 (1965), 218–227 (especially p. 220). See *supra,* p. 397.

Economic viewpoints could also motivate the tolerating and even the granting of privileges to denominational minorities.[5] Difficulties easily occurred in areas of condominium, when lords belonging to different religions held the territorial sovereignty. Thus the Elector Palatine Frederick III introduced Calvinism in districts in which he shared rule with the Prince Bishops of Worms and Speyer, without concerning himself for his partners' rights of sovereignty.[6] The Catholic congregation of Kröw on the Moselle could put to flight the Lutheran pastor sent to it by the government of Zweibrücken because it had the support of the Archbishop-Elector of Trier, who shared authority there with the Dukes of Palatinate-Zweibrücken and the Margrave of Baden.[7]

The manner and degree in which the secular power influenced the religious situation differed according to denomination. Lutheranism allowed the greatest amount of influence to the the state. Calvinism sought to gain the authority of the state for itself but at the same time to preserve its independence in the sphere of dogma, worship, and ecclesiastical discipline. The Catholic Church also claimed the secular arm for the organizing of Church life and in return had to permit some interference in the spiritual sphere. In principle she made decisions independently in matters of doctrine, worship, and canon law, and she did so from central headquarters without regard for political boundaries. This was felt as irksome by some governments and led to conflicts between the spiritual and the secular power. A Protestant authority issued ecclesiastical decisions without anyone seriously lecturing it; a Catholic authority, on the other hand, had to reckon with the objections of the competent bishop, of the legate, or of a religious superior with international connections, and to take these into consideration.[8]

How did the population react? How did it accept the control of its religious confession by its lord? It is difficult to find a universally valid answer. The response would differ according to particular areas and decades. At the beginning of the seventeenth century people were no longer as ready as they had been at the middle of the sixteenth century to change their religion along with their prince. This was the result of a better religious formation and of the increased denominational awareness. Examples are not wanting of resistance by the population to the introduction of a novel ecclesiastical organization and to changes in worship. The rural folk especially clung to traditional customs. Monasteries and collegiate chapters often resisted the introduction of the

---

[5] E. Hassinger, "Wirtschaftliche Motive und Argumente für religiöse Duldsamkeit im 16. und 18. Jahrhundert," *ARG* 49 (1958), 226–245.

[6] L. Stamer, *Kirchengeschichte der Pfalz* III, 1 (Speyer 1955), 52.

[7] V. Conzemius, *Jakob III. von Eltz* (Wiesbaden 1956), pp. 53–65.

[8] E. W. Zeeden, *Die Entstehung der Konfessionen* (Munich 1965), p. 96.

Reformation by the authority and yielded only to force. On the whole, however, change of religion as decided by the political power was effected rather smoothly.

The most flagrant example is the Palatinate, where within a span of thirty years the people changed their creed four times along with the prince. Under the Elector Otto Heinrich (1556–59) a visitation instituted by the prince introduced Lutheranism. The Elector Friedrich III (1559–76) made his territory Calvinist in 1563. His son, Ludwig VI (1576–83), forcibly suppressed Calvinism in favor of Lutheranism, while the Count Palatine Johann Kasimir, who headed the regency for his underage nephew, Friedrich IV, from 1583–92, again imposed the Heidelberg Catechism. When Lutheranism became the territorial creed in 1576, the Calvinist congregations in great numbers asked to be permitted to retain their pastors and their customary ecclesiastical life. Because this was refused, several hundred families, mostly of pastors and teachers, emigrated. Since they had no Lutheran successors, it was not easy to establish Lutheranism solidly. Nevertheless, seven years later, when Johann Kasimir restored Calvinism, the same congregations defended their Lutheran faith and asked for its preservation, as they had previously requested the preservation of Calvinism.

> Hence, in this case a period of seven years sufficed, not only to turn a people from the faith they had formerly practiced, but to accustom them so strongly to a newly introduced form that they desired to retain it and opposed a return to the previous form. The expulsion of pastors and teachers seems to have been decisive in both cases.[9]

The masses were mostly uneducated and often unaware of the change of faith. This was possible especially in the sphere of Lutheranism, where the retention of ceremonies was allowed so generously that it almost amounted to a deception of the congregations. The elevation of the Host, for example, was retained at Wittenberg until 1542. The fact that great portions of the Canon, which was in any event prayed silently, had been dropped did not necessarily attract the notice of those in attendance. In northern and eastern Germany the retaining of the Catholic organization and usages went especially far. This involved the liturgical vestments, feasts of Our Lady and the saints, candles on the altar, private confession with absolution. In some places the Latin choir office, the "Angelus" and the weather bell, processions, elevation of Host and chalice, bells, incense, Mass servers, and much else continued in use.

A visiting Catholic bishop from Poland, who attended the worship in the Berlin collegiate church, said that he found no difference between it and the Catholic liturgy.[10] How, then, should the common folk have noticed the distinction? The ease with which entire populations of subjects were led to the Reformation or back to Catholicism is all the more understandable.

---

[9] Ibid., p. 70.

In addition to legitimate Catholic traditions that had been accepted in the Church Orders, some practices were maintained which were irreconcilable with a Protestant ideology but which the people, especially the rural folk, were unwilling to give up. Even at the close of the sixteenth century visitations found cause to take measures against pilgrimages and the blessing of water, salt, herbs, candles, and so forth.[11] A Lutheran "First Mass" was celebrated according to a missal of 1514 at Frankfurt an der Oder in Electoral Brandenburg in 1591.[12] Denominational uncertainty, frequent change, and the circumstance that pastors suitable for the religion decreed from above were not available fostered indifference and increased the number of those who no longer went at all to church and the Sacraments. Complaints were heard.

> The people are now becoming more Epicurean, and one religion is as important to them as another, a blaspheming papist, Jew, or Turk as an honest Christian. To them everything is something in between. They are good fellows and boon companions with everyone.[13]

The Lutheran superintendent of Ulm stated bitterly that gradually there had arisen a new, third crowd, which went to no church, neither the Lutheran nor the papist, nor to the Sacraments.[14]

Crass ignorance in matters of faith, neglect of religion, and immorality characterized the situation in the second half of the sixteenth century cutting across all denominations. Massive superstition, curiosity for marvels, astrology, and the witchcraft delusion also flourished where people boasted of the pure Gospel. They especially spread in the now Protestant northeast of Europe, where Christianity had up to then scarcely established itself against paganism and the gloomy forces of blood and earth.

---

[10] N. Müller, "Zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes der Domkirche zu Berlin 1540–98," *Jahrbuch fur Brandenb. Kirchengeschichte* 2–3 (1905f.), 342; J. Mörsdorf, "Das erste Domkapitel und die erste Domkirche zu Berlin," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch* 8 (1954), 88–109 (especially p. 101).

[11] For example, Instr. Magdeburg 1583; Schling, II, 424.

[12] H. Grimm, "Die liturgischen Drucke der Diözese Sebus," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch,* 9–10 (1956), 45–51 (especially p. 51).

[13] According to E. W. Zeeden, op. cit., p. 71.

[14] J. Endriss, *Die Ulmer Kirchenvisitationen der Jahre 1557–1615* (Ulm 1937), p. 34.

And so, together with the clarifying and deepening of the awareness of the particular denomination, it was important for Christianity in general to send new roots into the masses as doctrine and life. In this what routes were traveled? What help was at hand?

First of all, by means of formulated "confessions," catechisms, and textbooks an effort was made to end the uncertainty about what the doctrine was and the arbitrary way it was proclaimed. Assent to the true teaching became the distinctive mark of belonging to a denomination.

In the *Confessio Augustana* Lutheranism had started the practice of defining a particular standpoint by means of a denominational book. But it had turned out to be inadequate in the doctrinal strife within Lutheranism, and meanwhile a differentiation in regard to Calvinism had become necessary. On the initiative of several princes, in particular of the Elector August of Saxony, several discussions occurred with the aim of ending the doctrinal quarrels and of restoring unanimity in the confession. Jakob Andreä (1528–90), chancellor of the University of Tübingen, especially worked for doctrinal unity. After years of struggle, the result was the *Formula Concordiae* of 1577. On 25 June 1580, fifty years after the presentation of the *Confessio Augustana,* the *Book of Concord*—the collection of Lutheran confessional documents ending with the *Formula of Concord*—was published at Dresden. The Concord was signed by fifty-one princes, thirty-five cities, and more than eight thousand theologians.

From the outset Calvinsim had followed the path of clear creedal formulae and of systematic exposition of doctrine. Jean Calvin had set the example with the Geneva Catechism of 1542–45 and the *Institutio Religionis Christianae* (1536; 4th edition 1559). There followed official formulae of faith on a national basis: the *Confessio Gallicana* (1559), *Scotica* (1560), *Belgica* (1561), *Helvetica posterior* (1566), and the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563. In accord with the Calvinist ideas of the Church, these confessions also contained instructions in regard to congregational organization and discipline.

In the Catholic Church an end was put to what Jedin calls the "doctrinal confusion" by the decrees of the Council of Trent. The *Catechismus Romanus* of 1566, based on them, provided clergy and people with a compendium of Christian doctrine. The *Professio fidei Tridentina* had to be sworn to by all bishops and, on the urging of Peter Canisius, also by professors of theology. King Ferdinand I ordered the composing of a compendium of Catholic doctrine. He fostered the work of Canisius on the catechism, prescribed it for his territories, and issued detailed instructions on the manner of using it.[15] The formulae of faith and the catechisms put an end to the dogmatic uncertainty but at the same time necessarily restricted the area of free discussion and produced a polemical discrimination vis-à-vis other ideas.

Second, in addition to the clear formulation of doctrine, a Church Order was of great importance for the introduction and consolidation of a denomination. This regulated worship, law, education, salaries of pastors and teachers, administration, and the care of the poor for the Church in a territory, a city, a lordship, and, in certain circumstances, in a mere district. In the period 1550–1600 the number of such Church Orders increased to the hundreds.[16]

The fact that Duke Wilhelm V (1539–92) of Cleves-Jülich-Berg could not make up his mind to enact a new Church Order and that the discussions on the subject were prolonged from 1545 to 1567 shows the denominational uncertainty that characterized the lower Rhine area.

To enforce the Church Orders and to see to it that the territorial religion was also practiced by the subjects was the business of the periodic visitations. The records of visitations gave a picture of the religious situation and were the reason and the motive for further political and pastoral measures. On the Catholic side, visitations, following diocesan or provincial synods, were the means of assembling forces that had become uncertain and disoriented and of implementing the Tridentine reform.

Third, if the defective formation of clergy and people was the chief reason for the uncertainty and confusion in matters of faith, the establishing of educational institutions and the care for the formation and social security of pastors was the best means of creating a clear denominational situation. In the struggle against Cryptocalvinism the consistories took pastors and students to task and examined them in regard to their orthodoxy. In this way a group of students were expelled from Wittenberg in 1594. At the instigation of the Margrave of Ansbach the theologians and jurists of the University of Tübingen were arrested and banished because of too mild a punishment of the court preacher, who had been convicted of Calvinism. They had proposed life-imprisonment, with separation from wife and child. Lutheran officials also set up an index of forbidden books in defense of the unity and purity of the denominational Church and had the book trade supervised by inspectors.[17] The concern for a better formation of the clergy had

[15] Text of the order of 14 August 1554, in O. Braunsberger (ed.), *Beati P. Canisii epistulae et acta* I (Freiburg 1896), 752–754; J. Broderick, *Peter Canisius* I (Vienna 1950), 325–328.

[16] Cf. Sehling, I-XIIIff.

[17] E. W. Zeeden, op. cit., pp. 115f.

tangible success from 1600, but of course the situation still differed from one locality to another. These efforts to educate the clergy and for the development of schools were to be observed in all denominations toward the close of the sixteenth century. On the Catholic side the profession of teacher and tutor in secondary schools, universities, and seminaries was the chief activity of the Jesuits. Apart from transmitting the treasures of education, their instruction aimed at winning the youth for the Church and strengthening them in the Catholic creed and life. In this the religious drama played an important role at Jesuit and Benedictine schools. "All of pedagogy was geared to the practice of Christianity in the sense of denominations."[18]

Fourth, the appearance of Calvinism at the end of the 1550s eventually contributed powerfully to the formation of denominations and the defining of fronts. Its very consciousness of election, its organizational strength, and its aggressiveness had as their consequence a well developed denominational awareness. On the lower Rhine it helped to make clear that the age of Erasmian efforts at mediation was over and an unambiguous confession was the order of the day.

The effort to distinguish itself denominationally from Calvinism led in Lutheranism to an emphatic love of ceremonies and to the restoration of Catholic institutions, such as Mass vestments and the elevation of Host and chalice.[19] If denominational differentiation here produced a certain degree of enrichment, the contrary was normal. As soon as definite usages and ceremonies became characteristic of one denomination, they were thereby forbidden to the others, even if, in themselves, they were *adiaphora* and had nothing or only remotely to do with differences of doctrine. In fact, the less people were aware of the really distinctive differences, the more "ceremonies" became marks of the differences among denominations. If the sign of the cross or the "Angelus" was "Catholic," then it was for that reason no longer to be practiced by Lutherans. A visitation at Coburg in 1554–55 forbade the bell for the "Salve," even though this had been recommended by many Lutheran Church Orders, "for the sake of foreign and neighboring peoples, so that we will not be regarded as papists."[20] While at the middle of the sixteenth century it still seemed possible by the concession of the lay chalice to preserve for the Catholic Church large groups in Bavaria, Austria, and the lower Rhineland, who desired Communion under both species, the form of administering Communion soon became so much a question of denominational distinction that the granting of the chalice merely caused confusion. Thus, Communion under both species, introduced in Bavaria in 1565 by virtue of an indult of Pius IV, was again abolished as early as 1571. Similarly, the reform demand for the vernacular in the liturgy brought it about that in the minds of Catholics the Latin language acquired the special character of orthodoxy and the initial steps taken in the Middle Ages toward a more careful regard for the vernacular were not followed up. In view of the Protestant denial of an official priesthood, this was pushed so powerfully to the foreground by the post-Tridentine Church that the priesthood of all Christians, based on baptism and confirmation, was almost forgotten. In view of Luther's doctrine of the hidden Church, the Church as a visible community and institute of salvation was so greatly stressed that her inner mystery as the mystical Body of Christ was hardly seen any more, and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (d. 1621) could say of the Church that she is as visible and tangible as the Republic of Venice.[21] On the one hand, the Church, as the bride of Christ, as the mother of the faithful, as the protector of the truth and minister of the life of grace, became herself the object of devotion; on the other hand she risked succumbing to the appeal of a superficial triumphalism. Compared with the Protestant communities as churches of the word, the Catholic Church became a narrow Church of the Sacrament.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 125.

[19] The general superintendent of Electoral Brandenburg, Andreas Musculus (d. 1581), a stern champion of Lutheranism against Calvinism, had himself portrayed with breviary and rosary (*Wichmann-Jahrbuch,* 9–10 [1956], 51; cf. footnote 12) and urged pastors not to abolish the elevation (Schling, III, 236). The Elector Johann Georg ordered all pastors of the Neumark to reintroduce the elevation "zu mehrerer bekreftigung unseres glaubens von der wahren kegenwertigkeit des leibes und blutes Christi" (Sehling, III, 27).

[20] Sehling, I, 544.

Thus the form and rise of the denominations were greatly influenced by the "anti" to the other. People were in danger of overlooking the common inheritance because of the emphasis on differences and even of becoming impoverished and narrow. Denominational complacency contained an obstinate and militant trait. Processions obtained the character of demonstrations, and accordingly the opposition took a very dim view of them and resisted them. Controversy and polemics took up much room in theology; exasperation, vast prejudices, and various tricks were the result in wide circles of people who had no insight into the real doctrinal differences. A popular song of the Lutheran Cyriacus Spangenberg (1528–1604) began: "Keep us, Lord, in your word and arrange the murder of Pope and Turk." The poet and theologian Paul Gerhardt (1606–76), by whose hymns all denominations today feel themselves enriched, in his strict Lutheran orthodoxy said in the pulpit:

---

[21] *De controversiis christianae fidei* III, 2, *Opera omnia* (Naples 1858), II, 75b.; cf. ibid., III, 12.

"I cannot regard the Calvinists, *quatenus tales,* as Christians."[22] All this constituted the negative side, weighing heavily on the future of the formation of denominations, a process that, as such, was necessary for clarifying and solidifying, after the Reformation had finally led to a split instead of to the reform of the one Church.

---

[22] E. W. Zeeden, op. cit., p. 140.

PART TWO

Catholic Reform and Counter Reformation

The Historical Concepts

Both concepts, "Catholic Reform" and "Counter Reformation," presuppose the term "Reformation" as an historical definition of the Protestant separation from the body of Catholic believers. By "Counter Reformation" the Göttingen lawyer Pütter (1776) understood the forcible restoration to the Catholic faith of territories that had become Protestant. Ranke, after first speaking of Counter Reformations (in the plural), soon acknowledged the unity of the movement and, as its root, the "restoration, the new planting, so to speak, of Catholicism." Moritz Ritter's *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation* (1889ff.) popularized the term outside Germany also (*contre-réforme,* Counter Reformation, *contrariforma, contrarreforma*), but it encountered an almost unanimous rejection in Catholic historiography, because the expression seemed to interpret the recovery of the Catholic Church merely as a counteraction to the schism and seemed to imply the use of force in religious matters. Hence, L. Pastor, J. Schmidlin, and others preferred the designation "Catholic Restoration," which, however, did not adequately express either continuity with the Middle Ages or the new elements accruing from the Tridentine reform.

Meanwhile, following von Ranke, W. Maurenbrecher had coined (1880) the term "Catholic Reformation" to describe the self-renewal of the Church, especially in Spain and Italy, which was the continuation of late medieval reform efforts. He had been preceded by the Catholic writers Joseph Kerker ("Catholic Reform" 1859) and Constantin Höfler ("Roman Reformation," 1878). We prefer the designation "Catholic Reform," because it avoids the term "Reformation" in the sense of "Protestant Reformation"—an expression that is subject to certain misgivings but is in general use—while on the other hand it indicates the continuity of the efforts for the reinvigoration of the Church from the fifteenth to the sixteenth centuries, without excluding, as does the term "Restoration," the new elements and the influence of the schism on the progress of the movement. However, it requires the additional concept "Counter Reformation," for the Church, inwardly renewed and strengthened, did actually proceed after the Council of

Trent to a counterattack and recovered lost territory, in association, to be sure, with confessional absolutism, the importance of which Eder has made clear. Hence both concepts are justified, as signifying not separate but intimately correlated movements. Also, Catholic authors, such as Paschini and Villoslada, hold that the term "Counter Reformation" is permissible for the entire movement of renewal and counteraction. Only when the terms "Catholic Reform" and "Counter Reformation" are used in conjunction can they be considered epoch-making in Church History. How far the extension of the term "Counter Reformation" to the succeeding centuries, including the very transition to the present age, as has become usual since the Second Vatican Council, is justified will be shown at the end of Section Five.

SECTION ONE

Origin and Breakthrough of the Catholic Reform to 1563

CHAPTER 32

Preliminary Steps in Italy and Spain

The Catholic Reform drew its strength from the late medieval endeavors for religious renewal, which were able to maintain themselves in Italy and Spain without being interrupted by schism. Its further development became possible only when, under Paul III, the reform movement gained a footing in Rome, when it began to eliminate obstacles inherent in the practices of the Curia, and when it finally affected the whole Church through the Council of Trent. Its growth and its breakthrough to Rome, which became apparent in the papal elections of 1555, occurred under the pressure and influence of the defections in northern Europe, which showed that an interior renewal of the Church was absolutely necessary. In substance Catholic Reform meant an orientation toward the apostolate and active *Caritas,* an orientation which came about through Christian self-realization. Not only did the religious points of departure vary, but the emphasis which the individual proponents of this reform assigned to these three elements also differed. In several instances, laymen and secular powers participated in the beginnings, but it was of decisive importance that the episcopate and the papacy initiated the necessary steps for the reform of the diocesan and the regular clergy.

Reform Efforts in Italy

The amply developed system of religious confraternities in Italy produced, apart from numerous "Compagnie," which were run like ordinary clubs, a tendency in the fifteenth century toward a more profound inwardness and an uncommon devotion to charitable goals. The regulations of the Brotherhood of Saint Dominic of Bologna, set up before 1443, offered a complete introduction to the spiritual life. The Brotherhood of Saint Jerome, founded at Florence in 1442 with the cooperation of Saint Antoninus, devoted itself to the relief of the deserving poor, as did the Brotherhood of Saint Nicholas, which was established in Bologna in 1495, also under the direction of the Dominicans. Bergamo had a "Schola disciplinatorum divini amoris." In 1494 Saint Bernardino of Feltre founded at Vicenza an "Oratory of Saint Jerome," twelve of whose members visited the sick and twelve took care of the poor every week. In 1506 it took charge of the hospital of the Misericordia. A Brotherhood of Saint Jerome, with a similar purpose, was established at Orvieto in 1510 by the Canon Thomas di Silvestro. All these brotherhoods consisted of lay persons, some under the direction of the mendicant Orders, some subject to the local bishop.

In the "Fraternitas divini amoris sub divi Hieronymi protectione," established at Genoa in 1497, the layman Ettore Vernazza (ca. 1470–1524), influenced by Saint Catherine of Genoa, effected a combination of self-sanctification and apostolate. According to its statutes, it admitted no more than thirty-six laymen and four priests. Its aim was "to implant in hearts the love of God, that is, Caritas." "Whoever wishes to join it must be humble of heart and center all his thought and hope on God." Striving for perfection, common religious exercises, and serving the sick were closely bound together.[1] The brotherhood maintained a hospital, started by Vernazza, for the incurable sick, the prototype of similar institutions established from the turn of the century at Savona, Bologna, Rome, and Naples.

Vernazza was certainly responsible for the Brotherhood of the Divine Love in Naples (1518), where he gained for the management of the hospital the widow Maria Laurenza Longo. On the other hand, it is uncertain who founded the Venetian brotherhood associated with a hospital for the incurable. Little is also known of the Milan "Oratory of Divine Wisdom." All of these were surpassed in importance by the Roman brotherhood, usually called the "Oratory of Divine Love." Founded before 1515 under the patronage of Saint Jerome, it bound its sixty members, lay and clerical, to daily attendance at Mass, at least monthly confession and communion, assiduous prayer, visiting the sick, and service in the hospital of the incurable, entrusted to them by Leo X in 1515. Once a week they gathered for Mass and community prayers in the parish church of Santa Dorothea in Trastevere, whose pastor, Julian Dati, was a member. The statutes and activity of the brotherhood were to be kept secret. A list of members compiled in 1524 includes, among fifty-six members, fourteen "laymen," so expressly termed, and also six bishops and several high curial officials.[2] Among them are the founders of the Theatine Order, but not, as was formerly assumed, Sadoleto, Aleander, Giberti, and Contarini. After 1527 the Oratory ceased to exist. Though short-lived and inconspicuous, it was a deeply earnest cell of Christian renewal in Medicean Rome.

---

[1] Statutes in Tacchi Venturi, I/2, 25–38.

[2] Cistellini, *Figure,* pp. 282f.

In 1521 a member, the curialist Bartolomeo Stella, left Rome and founded a hospital for the incurable in Brescia and in 1525 an Oratory, which obtained the approval of Clement VII and was patterned after the one in Rome. The members designated themselves as an "amicitia," as did also a circle at Cremona, in which Zaccaria, who later founded the Barnabites, used to give talks. Stella was in close contact with the Augustinian canoness and mystic of Brescia, Laura Mignani (d. 1525), the Dominican nun Stefana Quinzani (d. 1530), and Saint Angela Merici; later he joined the circle of Cardinal Pole. Probably associated with him and a group of pious folk at Salò on Lake Garda was the diocesan priest Francesco Cabrini (d. 1570), who started at Santa Maria della Pace a society of diocesan priests. In 1619 it was incorporated into the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri.

Independent of and uninfluenced by these brotherhoods, the young Venetian patrician, Paolo Giustiniani (1476–1528), gathered around himself in Venice a circle of like-minded men who had become acquainted at the University of Padua. In a house of his on the island of Murano they studied together the Bible and the Fathers of the Church, not out of a purely humanistic interest but as a means to Christian perfection. The only priest was the humanist Egnazio. The others were laymen: Vincenzo Quirini (1479–1514), for a time Venetian ambassador at the courts of Philip the Fair of Burgundy and the Emperor Maximilian I; Gasparo Contarini; and Nicolò Tiepolo. Contarini was Venetian ambassador at the Diet of Worms in 1521; Tiepolo, at that of Augsburg in 1530. After a visit to the Holy Land, Giustiniani determined to renounce the world completely and entered the hermitage of Camaldoli near Arezzo. He was soon followed by Quirini and Sebastian Giorgi but not by Contarini, who, after a hard inner struggle, deliberately sought a Christian way in the world. The experience of justification, which he describes in a letter of 24 April 1511 to Giustiniani, resembles Luther's tower experience and explains his later appreciation of Luther's religious concern. As Camaldolese, Giustiniani and Quirini rescued their monastery from the maladministration of the general, Delfino, Savonarola's former adversary, and presented to Leo X a memorandum, intended for the Fifth Lateran Council, on the reform of the Church, which anticipated some basic ideas of the Tridentine reform and contained suggestions for union with the Eastern Churches and the missions in the New World.[3] It had no sequel. Quirini died in Rome, nominated a cardinal; Giustiniani founded after 1520 the Congregation of Hermits of Monte Corona.[4]

---

[3] Text in Mittarelli-Costadoni, *Annales Camaldulenses* IX (Venice 1773), 612–719; cf. J. Schnitzer, *Peter Delfin* (Munich 1926), pp. 227–249; for the section on the missions see *NZM* 2 (1946), 81–84.

The importance of these reform circles becomes clear when one considers their cross-connections, in both personnel and ideas, with the founding of new religious institutes and with the Tridentine reform.

New Orders

The founding of the Theatine Order was the work of two members of the Roman Oratory. Both Saint Cajetan of Thiene (c. 1480–1547) and Gian Pietro Carafa (d. 1559 as Paul IV) sought the spiritual renewal of the clergy. Cajetan, born at Vicenza, had attained the rank of protonotary in the Curia when in 1516 he was ordained a priest. The Neapolitan Carafa, patronized by his uncle, Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, had been Archbishop of Chieti (*Theate*) in the Abruzzi since 1505 and had been entrusted with several diplomatic missions. In the spirit of the Oratory Cajetan, during a passing stay in his native district, established hospitals in Vicenza, Venice, and Verona on the model of that in Rome. Back in Rome, together with the priests Boniface di Colle and Paolo di Siglieri, he founded in 1524 a society of clerics on the basis of the so-called Augustinian Rule. Carafa joined them. The society was to have neither real estate nor fixed income but neither was it to live by begging, as the mendicant Orders did. Its support was to be left to divine providence. It was approved by Clement VII on 24 June 1524, with Carafa as its first superior. Pride of place was assigned to the careful fulfillment of all priestly duties: the praying of the Office, the worthy celebration of Mass, preaching, and every sort of pastoral activity. After they had been dispersed from Rome in 1527, Venice and Naples were, for some time, their only centers. Their recovery began with Carafa's election as Pope. He called upon them for the reform of the breviary and promoted one of them, Bernardino Scotti, to the College of Cardinals. At the end of the sixteenth century and during the seventeenth the Order was a nursery of good bishops but it flourished little outside Italy.[5]

A native of Cremona, Saint Antonio Maria Zaccaria (1502–37) was ordained a priest in 1528 after the completion of his medical studies at Padua and, with the jurist Ferrari and the mathematician Morigia, established at Milan in 1533 a society of priests, the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul, who were to imitate the Apostle of the Gentiles. They were known as Barnabites after the monastery of San Barnabà had been given to them. For them the apostolate held the first importance. They especially stressed missions among the people, in which they were assisted by a community of women, the Angelicals, established in 1530 by Luisa Torelli, and the deepening of devotion to the Eucharist through the introduction of the Forty Hours' Prayer. Their rule was approved by Gregory XIII in 1579 after it had been examined by Saint Charles Borromeo, who made use of it in the reform of his diocese.

---

[4] Confirmation by Pope Clement VII in *Bull Rom* VI, 117ff.

[5] St. Cajetan in Munich 1675; houses earlier in Prague and Salzburg.

Works of charity held the first place among the Somaschi. Their founder, Saint Jerome Aemiliani, shortened to Miani (1481–1537), captured while defending the fortress of Castelnuovo, had undertaken the education of orphans in Venice after his liberation, and in Verona, Brescia, and Bergamo had established orphanages, partly with the active assistance of the members of the Oratory. Later in Somasca, between Milan and Bergamo, he founded a large institution for the education of orphans, but also for the care of the poor and sick. The society, approved in 1540, was responsible for its support. After a temporary union with the Theatines (1547–55) it was confirmed as an Order by Pius IV in 1568.

Closely associated with the pious circles of Brescia was Saint Angela Merici (1474–1540), from Desenzano on Lake Garda, when in 1535 she founded there, with twenty-eight companions, the "Company of the Servants of Saint Ursula," a society for the education of neglected girls. Though at first it did not practice the common life, its statutes obtained episcopal approval in 1536 and papal confirmation in 1544. The common life and simple vows were introduced by Saint Charles Borromeo in 1572 on the authority of Gregory XIII. The Ursulines became an Order with strict inclosure and solemn vows after their establishment in France (1612), where they were especially strong until the French Revolution. Individual convents were at times combined into a union, but they were never centrally administered.

Reform of the Mendicant Orders

Parallel to the rise of these new institutes ran efforts for the renewal of the mendicant Orders. From the end of the fifteenth century their generals were frequently drawn from the Observant branches, which had gained the right to exist in the canonical form of congregations alongside the provinces in all the mendicant Orders, though in the course of time they had lost something of their original austerity. Their aims were essentially the same: suppression of all private ownership, restoration of the common life, more careful training of novices, and improvement of theological studies. These were called for in visitations and in the decrees of general chapters, but as a rule were achieved only slowly and imperfectly. For those in dread of reform it was easy to obtain, by approaching the Sacred Penitentiary, authorization to live outside the monasteries (*licentia standi extra*) and thereby to escape the claustral discipline. Conditions could not improve until this source of much evil was eliminated by a reform of the Curia.

In the Order of Preachers success attended the reform work of the generals, Thomas de Vio of Gaetà (1506–18), together with his general procurator, Nikolaus von Schönberg, and García de Loaysa (1518–24). All three were later made cardinals.[6] In Aegidius of Viterbo (1506–18) the Hermits of Saint Augustine acquired a general of outstanding spirituality and a zealot for reform, whose instructions constituted the basis for the renewal of the Order during Seripando's term as general.[7] Between 1523 and 1562 the reform of the Carmelites was in the hands of the Cypriot Nicholas Audet, who continued the work of the most zealous promoter of the observance in the fifteenth century, John Soreth. However, during the first years of his office he was hampered by a schism that occurred in France. Among the Franciscans the General Chapter of 1517 had consummated the separation of the two branches, Conventuals and Observants, without providing a solution to the centuries-long dispute over the Order's ideal. Although the Observants obtained a scholarly general in Francesco Lichetto (1518–20) and earnest reforming superiors in Francisco Quiñones (1523–27) and Vincenzo Lunelli (1535–41), the Capuchin Order was founded as a third branch of the Franciscan religious family.

Matteo da Bascio and Ludovico da Fossombrone, ascetics belonging to the Observance but dissatisfied with it, obtained from Clement VII in 1528, through the intercession of Catherine, Duchess of Camerino, authorization to follow the Franciscan Rule in its original austerity and to wear a habit of coarse material with an angular capuche. At first limited to the Marches of Ancona and Umbria, the movement established for itself at the Chapter of Albacina (1529) a preliminary constitution envisaging the eremitical ideal and lay activities, such as manual labor and the care of the sick.[8] Despite powerful opposition the number of members grew—there were thirty-five houses in 1535. It was the Vicar General Bernardino d'Asti who, through the constitutions which he drew up in 1536, prescribing the care of souls and preaching, gave to the originally ascetic movement the character of an Order dedicated to pastoral work and thereby became its real founder. Matteo and Ludovico departed. The approval of the vicar general continued to be reserved to the general of the Conventuals by virtue of the confirmation given by Paul III in 1536. Vittoria Colonna had exerted her influence to obtain it. When the most renowned preacher of the new Order, Bernardino Ochino of Siena,[9] accused in Rome of teaching Lutheran ideas, fled to Geneva in 1542, the Capuchins were for a time forbidden to preach. The restriction of the Order to Italy lasted until 1574.

---

[6] Acts of the General Chapters at Rome (1508), Genoa (1513), Naples (1515), Rome 1518), Valladolid (1523), and Rome (1525) in *MOP,* IX (Rome 1917), 81–216; R. Creytens, "Les vicaires généraux de la Congrégation dominicaine de Lombardie 1459–1531," *AFP,* 32 (1962), 285–326.

[7] The acts of the General Chapters of Naples (1507), Viterbo (1511), and Rimini (1515) have not been preserved; cf. *AAug* IX (Rome 1918f.), 171–182.

[8] *MHOMC,* V, 158–171; the statutes of 1536 were printed under the title *Costituzioni de li frati Minori detti Capuccini* (Naples 1537).

Cardinals and Bishops

Although the College of Cardinals had received a thoroughly secular tone as a result of the creations of Sixtus IV, there sat in the Senate of the Church a few outstanding individuals, even under Julius II and the two Medici Popes. Oliviero Carafa (d. 1511) had a share in the reform gesture of Alexander VI. Included in the great creation of 1517 were the generals of the Dominicans and the Augustinian Hermits, Thomas de Vio and Aegidius of Viterbo, who had been prominent at the Fifth Lateran Council. The former was an unsurpassed commentator on Saint Thomas and an original exegete; the other, a Platonist and humanist, who in a "keynote" sermon at the opening session of the Council had formulated the guiding principle of the Catholic Reform: "Men must be transformed by the holy, not the holy by men." Adrian VI found an expert adviser for his reform undertakings in Lorenzo Campeggio (d. 1539),[10] who did not enter the clerical state until after more than ten years of married life.

Not only in the College of Cardinals but also in the Italian episcopate there were at hand individuals favorable to a Catholic Reform, though not very many. The overwhelming majority was not concerned for reform in the first third of the sixteenth century. All the great sees belonged to absentee cardinals or, through resignation, to their relatives or intimates, so that they have been labeled by Tacchi Venturi "fiefs of the great noble families." The proper care of souls was therefore greatly neglected. Bishops of a really spiritual life and of genuinely pastoral activity were rare. The pastoral tradition of the fifteenth century, maintained by Saint Lorenzo Giustiniani (d. 1455), Saint Antonio of Florence (d. 1459), John di Tossignano, Bishop of Ferrara (d. 1446), and Antonio Bertini, Bishop of Foligno (d. 1486), would have to be regarded as interrupted, had not Pietro Barozzi, Bishop of Padua (1487–1507), provided the living model of the ideal bishop, which the layman, Gasparo Contarini, wrote about in 1516 for his friend, Pietro Lippomani, just promoted to the see of Bergamo:[11] The self-sanctification and the spiritually oriented conduct of the bishop form the basis for his function as teacher and shepherd, which Barozzi exercised not only as a preacher and a pastor concerned with individuals, but also through the reform statutes of a diocesan synod (1488). He was under the influence of the Christian humanists, Guarino and Francesco Barbaro.

---

[9] R. H. Bainton, *B. Ochino* (Frankfurt am Main 1940); B. Nicolini, "B. Ochino Capuccino," *Atti dell'Academia Pontaniana*, NS 6 (1956f.), 1–19; id., "G. Muzio e B. Ochino," *Biblion* 1 (1947), 9–45. On Ochino's connections with Bologna and Lucca see B. Nicolini, *Aspetti di vita religiosa e letteraria del Cinquecento* (Bologna 1963).

[10] Campeggio's memorandum of 23 March 1522 for Adrian VI in *CT* XII, 5–17.

Although the opening up of the archival sources is as yet only in its beginnings, it may be held that good bishops were not entirely lacking. Claude de Seyssel, once a French court bishop, who had exchanged the see of Marseilles for that of Turin (1517–20), measured up to the episcopal ideal which he sketched in his treatise *On the Threefold State of Pilgrimage* (1518).[12] Gian Pietro Carafa, as Archbishop of Chieti in the Abruzzi, exerted himself for the reform of his diocese before participating in the founding of the Theatine Order. The Cistercian Jerome Trevisani of Cremona (1507–23) and John Peter Grassi of Viterbo (1533–38) were regarded as zealous bishops. Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, engrossed in politics and for a time regent of the Duchy of Mantua, had his see of Mantua visited from 1535 by his excellent vicar general, Francesco Marno. Andrea de Novellis, Bishop of Alba, issued for his diocese such splendid statutes that his successor in the Tridentine period, the humanist Jerome Vida, needed only to re-enact them.

The model of the future Tridentine reform on the diocesan level was Giovanni Matteo Giberti, Bishop of Verona (1524–43).[13] From 1527, when he left Rome for his diocese, following the fiasco of his pro-French diplomacy, he systematically improved the care of souls despite numerous obstacles. He began by assuring a higher quality among the clergy through an association of priests and the providing of lectures for their further education, the development of an existing boarding school into a seminary, the drawing up of registers of households in the parishes, the organization of preaching and of the instruction of adults and children, and the establishing of a charitable society (*Societas Caritatis*) in which the bishop and the pastor cooperated with the laity. The entire work of reform was in 1542 condensed in printed constitutions. Soon after, Giberti's secretary, Zini, sketched the bishop's life under the title *Example of a Good Shepherd.* A new episcopal ideal was forming and was being described in writing. Absenteeism, hitherto so lightly regarded, was more and more understood to be incompatible with it.

---

[11] G. Contarini, *Opera omnia* (Venice 1589), pp. 401–431.

[12] P. Broutin–H. Jedin, *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale du XVIe siècle* (Louvain 1953), pp. 26–37.

[13] The constitutions for the diocese of Verona (1542) with other documents on the diocesan reform as well as the *Vita* of Giberti, by Fr. Zini, with the significant title "Boni Pastoris Exemplum," are contained in *I. M. Giberti, Opera,* ed. P. and H. Ballerini (Ostiglia 1740); there is given Giberti's motto, *Commisso gregi prodesse non praeesse.* On Giberti's influence at the Council of Trent and on Charles Borromeo, see chaps. 37–38.

A stimulus toward religious renewal made itself felt in the domain of the Eucharist itself from the close of the fifteenth century. In almost all the larger cities of Italy arose confraternities devoted to promoting the cult of the Eucharist. Out of their own means the members saw to the worthy reservation of the sacred species and the maintenance of the perpetual light. They provided an escort when the Sacrament was carried to the sick. The founding of an archconfraternity of the Eucharist at Santa Maria sopra Minerva in Rome by Paul III gave these confraternities a center.[14]

The Fifth Lateran Council

On the eve of the schism the single attempt at a general reform of the Church, the Fifth Lateran Council, had, it is true, produced salutary results in the mendicant Orders, which were forced to defend themselves against the attacks of the bishops by means of self-reform, but otherwise its success was meager. No abuse was really eradicated, no reform decree was consistently carried out. The reform constitutions of 1513–14 abolished abuses in the curial system of taxation and provisions, but did not eliminate their cause, the venality of offices and pluralism. The decree on preaching, favorable to the exempt Orders, was an adjustment of jurisdiction rather than a genuine reform. As formerly, preaching was essentially restricted to the great cycles of Advent and Lent, and the sermons were given almost exclusively by mendicant friars. The introduction of the censorship of printed matter would perhaps have prevented much future mischief if it had been really enforced.

Lacking consistency, the feeble gesture of reform grew even weaker. In order to cut the ground from under the legitimate complaint that at Rome ordinations were conferred on clerics of foreign dioceses without the necessary examination of the candidates, without the consent of the proper Ordinarios, and, secretly or publicly, in a manner smacking of simony, Gian Pietro Carafa was in 1524 appointed examiner of candidates for ordination and given extensive authority.[15] But a definite improvement did not occur until the appointment of Filippo Archinto as Vicar of Rome (1542) and the examination of candidates by the Jesuits. The colleges established by Cardinals Capranica (1475) and Nardini (1484) for future priests touched only a slight fraction of the candidates and can be regarded only in a very restricted sense as forerunners of the Tridentine seminaries. The reform decrees of Clement VII for the Jubilee of 1525 likewise brought very little change in the situation. Only the catastrophe of the *Sacco di Roma,* which was almost universally considered to be a judgment on Renaissance Rome, produced in the papacy a change of heart or at least an awareness that things could no longer go on as they had.

---

[14] Bull "Dominus Noster" of 30 November 1539, in *Bull Rom* VI, 275ff., according to Tacchi Venturi (I/1, 223) an "epoch-making document."

France and Germany

North of the Alps, in France and Germany, were there no efforts for a Catholic Reform? There too, on the eve of the schism, were bishops who were concerned for improving the quality of the clergy and for the care of souls. Parochial pastoral activity was in general superior to that in Italy, and the duty of residence was less neglected. But neither the plan of the Fleming Standonck for the reform of the French diocesan clergy (1493) nor the initial efforts for a synodal self-reform, notably in the province of Salzburg—the Provincial Council of 1512 and the Mühldorf Reform Council of 1522—nor the encouragement proceeding from the northern version of the current Christian humanism were of immediate advantage to the Catholic Reform. They were all overwhelmed by the schism before sustaining support came from the Church's center, from the papacy. A decisive impulse for reform flourished only in the Iberian Peninsula. It differed from all the other movements thus far mentioned.

Spain

Whereas in Italy the sources of the Catholic Reform were found in small communities of clerics and lay persons, from which proceeded several new religious institutes and eventually some strong personalities, in Spain even before the turn of the century the episcopate and the monastic and mendicant Orders became, with the active encouragement of the Catholic Kings, the representatives of religious and ecclesiastical renewal. While in the rest of Europe the crusading idea had long since lost its force, in the Iberian Peninsula the *Reconquista*—the total expulsion of the Muslims—remained a political and religious goal. It was achieved when in 1492, under Ferdinand and Isabella, the united kingdoms of Castile and Aragón succeeded in taking Granada, the last Islamic stronghold. The missionary task thereby imposed did not find the Spanish Church unprepared.

---

[15] The letter of appointment of 2 May 1524 (Pelliccia, *Preparazione,* pp. 462f.) gives an idea of the meager demands made of the candidates for ordination, when it confers on Carafa the authority (not the obligation): promotos in regulis, more et norma celebrationis et recitationis missarum, horarum canonicarum et aliorum divinorum officiorum ac ministerio sacramentorum docendi et imbuendi."

Earlier, at the national Council of Seville (1478), an agreement had been reached between the Catholic Kings and the bishops, under the presidency of the "Great Cardinal," Pedro González de Mendoza, that crown and episcopate should promote the reform of the Spanish Church together and ward off any possible interference from outside.[16] Bishops and other benefice-holders were to be bound to residence for at least six months of the year, papal provisions and the privileges of exempt Orders were to be curtailed, and abbeys were not to be given to diocesan clerics. The close cooperation between the spiritual and the secular powers promoted the reform in that the pious and energetic Queen Isabella, influenced by her director, the Hieronymite Hernando Talavera, named efficient prelates, zealous for reform, to several Castilian sees. Among them was the Bishop of Burgos, Paschal de Ampudias, who continued the reform work of the *conversos*, Paolo and Alfonso of Burgos. Talavera himself, as first Archbishop of reconquered Granada (1493–1507), untiringly shared in the administration of the Sacraments and preaching—on all Sundays and holy days—and instituted farsighted organizational measures. These included the building of about one hundred churches, the employment of Arabic-speaking missionaries, the founding of a seminary for future priests, of houses for *conversos* and orphans, and the preparing of a "Breve Doctrina" for popular instruction. He was thus a direct forerunner and model of a bishop of the Catholic Reform. His apostolic activity was continued a generation later (from 1529) by Blessed Juan de Avila and then by Archbishop Pedro Guerrero.

Even more far-reaching was the activity of Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, Archbishop of Toledo (1495–1517). Originally a jurist and vicar general of Cardinal Mendoza in Sigüenza, in 1484 he had joined the Observant Franciscans and as provincial worked for the reform. Finally he was promoted to the primatial dignity by his spiritual daughter, Queen Isabella. He enforced the reform of the diocesan and regular clergy with a firm and at times hard hand and in the University of Alcalá, which he founded, created a center for humanism and positive theology; its supreme achievement was the Complutensian Polyglot (1514–17). At his suggestion the *Imitation of Christ* was translated into Spanish; the *Exercitatorium Spirituale* of his nephew García was also influenced by the *Devotio moderna.* As Abbot of Montserrat (1493–1510), García brought the famed monastery into the reform Congregation of Valladolid and established there a printing press.[17]

---

[16] The acts of the synod (*Boletino de la Real Academia de Historia,* 22 [1893], 215–250) give an accurate picture of the cooperation of throne and episcopate: the Catholic Kings propose sixteen reform decrees; the prelates reply and make counter-suggestions; agreement is reached on eight reform proposals.

The typically Spanish cooperation of crown and episcopate was confirmed again when on 17 December 1511 Ferdinand the Catholic summoned several prelates to Burgos for consultation in preparation for the Fifth Lateran Council. In the advice which they gave to the King, as well as in his instructions for the delegates to the Council, ideas emanating from the days of the reform councils were evident.[18] Bishop Ampudias of Burgos was opposed to any modifying of the decrees of the Council of Constance in regard to papal elections and the general reform of the Church by Pope and cardinals, and maintained that the theory that the Pope cannot commit simony, whereby the practice of the *Dataria* was justified, should be condemned as heretical. The Grand Inquisitor, Archbishop Deza of Seville, traced the disorder in the Church to frivolously granted papal dispensations from the common law. Both were agreed that papal reservations were to be curbed, taxes reduced, and the hamstringing of ecclesiastical jurisdiction through appeals to Rome ended. Almost all the abuses which were later discussed at the Council of Trent were enumerated, but the positive program of reform was not so fully developed. Deza advocated the introduction of the concursus for nomination to parishes, following the model of the diocese of Palencia, thanks to which that see had more properly educated clerics (*clérigos letrados*) than all the other bishoprics of Castile combined. In his instruction for the delegates to the Council the King called for the formal abrogation of the decrees of Constance in regard to conciliar supremacy but for the ratification of the decree "Frequens" and other reform measures of the Councils of Constance and Basel. Concern for Church reform was expressed along with national reform; it was agreed that the current reform of the Spanish Church could not achieve its goal without a general Church reform.

In the Spanish branches of the mendicant Orders the Observants experienced progress unequaled elsewhere. The Franciscan Recollects, who saw Pedro de Villa Creces as their spiritual father, were greatly aided by Ximenes, who was one of them. The reformed provinces of the Augustinian Hermits were as distinguished for fidelity to the rule as were the Observants, but frequently caused difficulties for the central authority in the Order on account of their highhandedness. The Spanish Dominican provinces were united with the Observants at the Chapter of Burgos (1506) under the guidance of Father Diego Magdaleno, after an earlier effort by Deza (1500) had miscarried. The ascetical and reform ideas of Savonarola entered Spain through Dominico de Mendoza and greatly stimulated the spiritual life, but also gave rise to strife in regard to the visionary María de Piedrahita and the ultra-reformer Juan Hurtado de Mendoza. The assignment of the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria to Salamanca made this university the starting point of the renewal of scholastic theology. Vitoria made the *Summa theologiae* of Saint Thomas the basis of his enthusiastically attended lectures and treated also the pressing questions of colonial ethics and international law, reform and council, according to Thomas's concepts. Without making concessions to the conciliar theory, he called for assurances against papal disregard of the decrees of ecumenical councils.[19] From his school proceeded the great Spanish theologians of the Council of Trent—Dominico Soto and Andrés de Vega—and outstanding bishops of the reform era.

---

[17] A. Albareda, "La imprente de Montserrat," *Analecta Montserratensia* 2 (1918), 11–166.

[18] The views of the bishops together with the instruction for the conciliar delegates in J. M. Doussinague, *Fernando el Católico y el cisma de Pisa* (Madrid 1946), pp. 521–543.

Spanish Church reform suffered a setback during the first years of the reign of Emperor Charles V because of the political disturbances then current—the Comunero Revolt. Charles encountered violent criticism from Paolo de León (*Guía del cielo,* composed before 1527) and Juan Maldonado (*Pastor Bonus,* written in 1529). At the same time Spain was invaded by the ideas of Erasmus, for which the University of Alcalá had become the port of entry ever since the Conference of Valladolid took place. Their chief proponents were the brothers Juan and Alfonso Valdéz, both in the service of Charles V.[20] Juan's *Dialogue on Christian Doctrine* (1529) was an Erasmian catechism with a spiritualistic bent, which was later emphasized in his brother Alfonso's writings. Erasmus's thought permeated even the hierarchy. Cardinal López de Mendoza,

---

[19] The Relectio VII of 1534 bears the striking title: "Utrum concilium generale possit facere decreta et leges condere, quas nec Summus Pontifex possit immutare vel per dispensationem vel prorsus per abrogationem?"

[20] Domingo de Sta. Teresa, *Juan Valdés. Su pensamiento religioso y las corrientes espirituales en su tiempo* (Rome 1957); J. Méseguer, "Nuevos datos sobre los hermanos Valdés: Alfonso, Juan, Diego y Margarita," *Hispania* 17 (1957), 369–394; J. I. Tellechea, "Juan de Valde y Bartolome de Carranza. Sus normas para leer la Sagrada Escritura," *RET* 22 (1962), 373–400.

Bishop of Burgos (1529–37), protected Erasmus from Stunica. Though the anti-Erasmian reaction begun as early as 1530 with the trial of the Greek specialist Juan Vergara, Erasmian ideas continued to affect both preaching and popular instruction until they were definitively suppressed by the Inquisition in the middle of the 1550s. This Spanish "Evangelism" was a branch of a European movement, which as such was not assimilated by the Catholic Reform, but was definitively expelled from it. Spain's contribution to Catholic Reform lay in its episcopate, desirous of and experienced with reform, and in the theology of the Salmanticenses. These had a vital share in determining the image of the Council of Trent because behind them stood the Spanish world power. Finally, Spain also gave birth to the most effective reform Order, the Society of Jesus.

CHAPTER 33

Ignatius Loyola and His Order to 1556

The Society of Jesus became the most effective agent of the Catholic recovery. In the person and the work of its founder the fundamental principles of the Catholic Reform clearly emerge, obtain a new character, valid for centuries, and become of the greatest historical significance.

The Founder

Iñigo López de Loyola, born in 1491 in the ancestral castle (province of Guipúzcoa) of one of the ten great families of the Basque country, received the tonsure and a family benefice when still a boy, but was trained as a knight at court and, probably from 1507, was in the service of the Grand Chancellor of Castile, Juan Velásquez, at Arévalo, where he not only learned courtly manners but was also deeply impressed with the moral worth of loyalty to the ancestral dynasty. Heeding his impulses for adventure, he became an officer in the service of the Duke of Nájera and was seriously wounded at the siege of Pamplona by the French on 20 May 1521. While the healing of his shattered leg long confined him to his sick bed, he read the Franciscan Ambrose Montesa's Spanish translation of the *Life of Christ* by Ludolf of Saxony and a Spanish translation of the *Lives of the Saints* (*Flos Sanctorum*) of Jacobus a Voragine. When he found that this literature produced in him an inner peace, whereas the courtly romances were disquieting, he longed "to do great things in God's service" instead of seeking the warlike deeds of heroism that were denied him, and above all "to accomplish great external works of the sort mentioned [works of penance], because the saints had accomplished such for the honor of God."[1] After a general confession in the monastery of Montserrat upon his recovery, he hung up his dagger and sword before the miraculous image of the Mother of God, put aside his clothes, assumed the dress of a pilgrim, and kept a night vigil at the altar. Then he went to nearby Manresa, where, preoccupied with reading the *Imitation of Christ,* between March 1522 and February 1523 he experienced a mystical transformation and put into writing the first part of his *Exercises.* The visions which he had in the beginning revealed themselves as having been inspired by the devil. After a period of despair, during which he sought forcibly to acquire peace of soul by extravagant penitential practices and long hours of prayer, he received in new visions, principally in one at the chapel of Saint Paul on the Cardoner River, such an illumination in regard to the reality and the relationship of the mysteries of faith that later, whenever he was approached for decisions by his companions, he would refer to the insights acquired at that time. To dedicate himself entirely to the service of God and the salvation of souls was henceforth his life's goal: "In the mystical transformation of Manresa," says H. Rahner, "from Iñigo, the pilgrim and penitent, emerged Ignatius the churchman." But which road he would have to take toward this goal was still not clear to him. He remained a seeker for more than a decade.

A pilgrimage took him in 1523 *via* Rome to Jerusalem, but his plan of settling permanently in Palestine was vetoed by the Custos. On his return home he applied himself at Barcelona to a study of the rudiments of Latin and at Alcalá (1526–27) began the Arts course. Since, assisted by like-minded people, he began to engage in the spiritual direction of ladies, he came under suspicion as an *alumbrado,* was questioned three times by the Inquisition and the episcopal court respectively, and was imprisoned for forty-two days. After a similar experience while continuing his studies at Salamanca, he departed for Paris in 1528,[2] and there he lived in the College of Saint Barbara. He earned his livelihood by begging on journeys as far away as Flanders and England. Once again he fell under suspicion for having conducted spiritual exercises for his fellow-students. He took the degree of master of arts and at Montmartre on 15 August 1534, with six companions—Lainez, Salmerón, Bobadilla, Francis Xavier, Rodrigues, and Faber—vowed poverty, chastity, and a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, as well as work for the care of souls. At the renewal of vows in 1536 Lejay, Broët, and Condure joined the group. In order to carry out the planned pilgrimage to Jerusalem the companions met in Venice on 8 January 1537. Prevented from sailing, they engaged in pastoral work and in hospital service there and in the vicinity, and on 24 June 1537, Ignatius received the priesthood.

---

[1] The chief source is the autobiography, based on the oral account given by the saint and written down by González, superior of the Roman house of the professed, in 1553 and 1555; it ceased after 1538. The original text, in Spanish, from Chapter 79 in Italian, with a Latin translation by Coudray in *MHSI, Fontes Narr.* I, 353–507; it is supplemented by a letter of Lainez of 16 June 1547 (ibid., pp. 70–145), notes of Polanco and Nadal, and especially the diary of González for 1555 (ibid., pp. 527–752). Criticism of the sources: J. Šusta, "Ignatius' von Loyola Selbstbiographie," *MIÖG* 26 (1905), 45–106. The *Spiritual Diary* (*MHSI, Const.* I, 86–158) is extraordinarily jejune, especially in the later parts; extract: A. Feder, *Aus dem Geistlichen Tagebuch des Ignatius von Loyola* (Regensburg 1922); *Ignatius von Loyola, Das geistliche Tagebuch,* ed. A. Haas–P. Knauer (Freiburg 1961); P. de Leturia, "La Conversión de S. Ignacio," *AHSI* 5 (1936), 1–35.

After a year they decided to offer their services to the Pope. With Lainez and Faber, Ignatius proceeded to Rome in November 1538, encouraged shortly before arrival by Christ's promise, made during prayer in a chapel at La Storta: "I will be gracious to you."[3] In Rome "the windows were shut tight" at first and Ignatius was even charged again with heresy. The case ended in his acquittal. Because of the good impression made by the apostolic activity of the small community, the atmosphere became favorable, and Ignatius then definitely decided in the spring of 1539 to found an Order.

A petition, presented to the Pope on 3 September 1539 through the good offices of Cardinal Contarini, contained the *Formula Instituti,* that is, the fundamental idea of the foundation. What was new in it was that, in addition to the vows of poverty and chastity, a vow of obedience to the Pope was to be taken. Once the hesitations of especially Cardinal Guidiccioni, who was very close to Pope Paul III, and of the conservative Cardinal Ghinucci had been overcome, the Society of Jesus was confirmed on 27 September 1540 by the Bull "Regimini Militantis Ecclesiae."[4] Its aim was "to fight for God under the standard of the Cross and to serve only the Lord and the Roman Pontiff, his Vicar on earth," by preaching, teaching, and works of *Caritas.* The members took the three customary vows and also a fourth—to obey without hesitation ("sine ulla tergiversatione aut excusatione") every command given by the Pope for the salvation of souls and the spread of the faith. Their number was limited to sixty. Ignatius was elected superior (*Praepositus*) on 8 April 1541 and a solemn profession followed at San Paolo on 22 April.

---

[2] R. G. Villoslada, *La Universidad de Paris durante los estudios de Francisco de Vitoria* (Rome 1938); G Schurhammer, *Franz Xaver* I (Freiburg 1955), 71–261.

[3] T. Baumann, "Die Berichte über die Vision des hl. Ignatius bei La Storta," *AHSI* 27 (1958), 181–208. Sources for the charges of 1538 in *MHSI, Fontes Narr.* I, 500ff.

[4] Text in Mirbt, no. 430, with the documents; *MHSI, Const.* I, 1–32. The term "Compagnia," earlier usually interpreted as "troop," and hence of a military connotation, is traced by T. Baumann to the Italian use of "compagno" to mean "comrade," in "Compagnie de Jésus. Origine et sens primitif de ce nom," *RAM* 37 (1961), 47–60.

The founder lived thereafter in Rome, from 1544 in the house of the professed near the little church of Santa Maria della Strada, preoccupied with composing the constitutions and consolidating the Society. The *Formula Instituti* of 1539 was the basis of the constitutions,[5] in the formulation of which Ignatius consulted not only Lainez but also his most intimate coworker, Nadal, and his secretary, Polanco. The first edition of 1541 was completely revised after Ignatius had made a thorough study of the monastic and mendicant rules and had sought the views of his first companions on specific points, and in 1550 it was prescribed for a trial period. Repeatedly altered in the succeeding years, the constitutions were essentially in final form at Ignatius's death and were put in force by the General Congregation of 1558. They devote special attention to the reception and the studies of the members. Simple vows are made only after a two-years' novitiate. The study of philosophy and theology, lasting at least seven years, is interrupted by practical activity as teacher and tutor; during this period the "scholastic" is a member of the Society but he can be dismissed at any time. After being ordained, he completes a third year of novitiate (tertianship). Then, depending on aptitude, he is admitted to perpetual simple profession of the three vows as a "spiritual coadjutor" or, after additional years of trial, to the solemn profession of the four vows—the fourth being that of obedience to the Pope—as a "professed" in the strict sense. The "professed" constitute the real heart of the Order; they alone occupy the higher offices.

The constitution of the Order is strongly monarchical. The general (*Praepositus generalis*) is elected for life by the General Congregation and has virtually unlimited authority. He names all superiors, and they are required to make regular reports to him. In the government of the Order he is aided by the assistants, to whom several provinces are assigned at a time. The General Congregation meeting after the general's death is composed of the vicar general elected for the interregnum, the assistants, the provincials, and two elected delegates of each province. It exercises the supreme legislative authority. The strong centralization promotes the Society's goal of acting in military uniformity and strict obedience for the cause of Christ and the Church. In Ignatius's eyes obedience is the concrete realization of the surrender to the will of God and self-renunciation.[6] In his last will he lays down the rule: "In all that is not sinful I must follow the superior's will and not my own," for "God speaks through every superior." When he continues: "I must regard myself as a corpse which has neither will nor feeling," he is speaking of ascetical and perfect obedience, not of blind and abject obedience.

---

[5] For the origin of the constitutions see the introduction to Volume I of the edition in the *MHSI:* edition of 1541, ibid.

It is disputed whether the "Rules for cultivating the mind of the Church" are anti-Reformation or anti-Erasmus.[7] The strong rejection of Erasmus by Ignatius finds, in any case, its deepest motive in the Erasmian criticism of the Church and her display of piety. Luther appears only once in Ignatius's letters; it is regarded as certain that he had read none of Luther's books,[8] and not even an inclination to engage in controversial theology is evident. When his biographer, Ribadeneira, draws out certain parallels in the lives of Luther and Ignatius, it cannot be inferred from them that the founder of the Society of Jesus considered himself to be an "Anti-Luther" and established his Order as a battle corps for the war against Protestantism. Defense against Protestantism soon became more and more the center of attention, because the crisis in the Church required the effort on this front. But Ignatius's primary goal continued always to be inner renewal, promoted by the *Exercises,* and a worldwide apostolate.

The forgoing of a special religious habit and of choir service, customary until then in all Orders, and above all the election of the general for life encountered strong criticism from Pope Paul IV, who, since his conflict with Ignatius at Venice, had been hostile to him and characterized him as a "tyrant." He forced the Order to make appropriate changes in the constitutions, but after his death they were annulled by Pope Pius IV. The position of Protector of the Society, which Cardinal Rodolfo Pio of Carpi had exercised from about 1544 to 1564, was not filled after his death;[9] here too the Order went its own way. The establishment of a female branch of the Jesuits, imposed on the founder by a decree of Pope Paul III which had been obtained by Ignatius's former benefactress, Isabel Roser of Barcelona, was, with papal permission, cancelled after one year (1 October 1546). Ignatius wrote to the deeply disappointed lady: "I have come to the conclusion, in harmony with my conscience, that it is not compatible with the commitments of our Society to undertake expressly the direction of women bound by the vow of obedience."[10] After an irritating struggle and a lawsuit brought by Isabel's nephew in regard to monetary gifts which Ignatius had received from her, she acquiesced and returned to Barcelona. The saint's decision was doubtless influenced by the many difficulties which at that very time the mendicant Orders were experiencing from the spiritual direction of the convents of nuns affiliated with them. Nevertheless, on 3 January 1555 he admitted the Infanta Joanna, daughter of Charles V, to the profession of the so-called "scholastic vows" under a pseudonym and thereby received her temporarily into the Order.[11]

---

[6] P. Blet, "Les fondements de l'obéissance Ignatienne," *AHSI* 25 (1956), 514–538; B. Schneider, "Zum historischen Verständnis des Papstgehorsams-Gelübdes," *AHSI* 25 (1956), 488–513; K. D. Schmidt, *Die Gehorsamsidee des Ignatius von Loyola,* (Göttingen 1935).

[7] J. Salaverri, "Motivación histórica y significación teológica del ignaciano sentir con la Iglesia," *EE* 31 (1937), 139–171; P. de Leturia, "Sentido verdadero en la Iglesia militante," *Gr* 23 (1942), 137–168; R. G. Villoslada, "S. Ignacio de Loyola y Erasmo de Rotterdam," *EE* 16 (1942), 235–264, 399–426; 17 (1943), 75–103.

[8] H. Wolter, "Gestalt und Werk der Reformatoren im Urteil des hl. Ignatius von Loyola," Lortz F, I (Baden-Baden 1958), 43–67.

[9] J. Wicki, "R. P. da Carpi, erster und einziger Kardinalprotektor der Gesellschaft Jesu," *Misc. Hist. Pont.* 21 (Rome 1959), 243–267.

When Ignatius died on 31 July 1556 the Order was in a serious external crisis, brought about by the hostility of Paul IV toward Spain and Spaniards, which led to the Carafa War against Spain. Just as soon as he had received news of the election of the Carafa Pope, Ignatius, according to his own admission, trembled in his whole body. On the outbreak of the war the Roman house of the professed was searched for weapons; none were found. There was further suspicion when the Spanish fathers suggested that the General Congregation be held outside Rome. The Vicar General Lainez won his point that it should take place in Rome (August–September 1558). It was due to his good sense and prudent tactics that the Order came safely through the difficult period of the Carafa pontificate.

In his lifetime Ignatius had refused to sit for his portrait. The source of the later portraits, for example that by Coello, is the death mask taken by an unknown person. Just the same, we are relatively well informed in regard to his external appearance. He was short (5′2″) and of a delicate rather than a strong constitution. His head, with its high forehead and aquiline nose, was dominated by piercing eyes; the serene facial expression was that of a man united to God. The Fleming Coster described his external appearance on 29 May 1553:

> The old man went through the garden, supported by a cane. His face radiated piety; he is gentle, amiable, and charming and converses with the learned and the unlearned, with the great and the lowly.

---

[10] H. Rahner, *Ignatius von Loyola, Briefwechsel mit Frauen*, p. 332.

[11] Informative is the memorandum of 26 October 1554, in H. Rahner, op. cit., pp. 62ff.

Ignatius combined cold reason with mystical devotion to Christ, the military rigor of his idea of obedience with great liberty in the shaping of the interior life, imperturbable foresight in regard to the worldwide tasks of the Society with a tender sympathy for the individual person, the courtesy of a man of the world with the practical good sense of the Basque peasant. Constantly maintaining an aristocratic reserve, he was never on familiar terms with even his closest associates. He made a point of considering his decisions long and carefully, of listening to others' advice, of seeking divine guidance in prayer, and then, when the decision had been reached, of enforcing it without respect for people and even with severity. In his *Exercitia Spiritualia* he shows himself to be one of the great teachers of the spiritual life, thoroughly familiar with human nature, and a master in the handling of men.[12]

The title of his work is not original; the adherents of the *Devotio moderna* referred to their spiritual maxims as *exercitia,* and in 1500 Abbot Cisneros of Montserrat had published an *Exercitatorium spirituale.* But in content and construction the *Exercises* are undeniably Ignatius's work, the fruit of his own searching for God. After being examined by the Cardinal of Burgos, the vicar general of Rome, Archinto, and the Master of the Sacred Palace, Egidio Foscarari, they received papal approval on 31 July 1548. "It has long been established by history that the spirit and thought of Ignatius Loyola acquired their clearest expression in the book of *The Spiritual Exercises* and that his Order emanated from the deliberations of this book and continues to come forth from it." "With the help of the two most important meditations of this book—'On the Kingdom of Christ' and 'On the Two Standards'—we can summarize in a single sentence the basic organization of the perfect life: Man has been created to wage war in the Church Militant against Satan in loyal service to the majesty of the Triune God through assimilation to the crucified Man Jesus and thus to arrive at the glory of the Father." What was peculiar to this ideal of perfection and made it appropriate to its age was its intimate relationship to the visible Church: "From the union of love that bursts everything open with his being tightly compressed into the body of the Church is released that vast power which we can establish as historically certain in his work."[13] Though eminently personal traits are not wanting, such as the explanation of the Kingdom of Christ in terms of a worldly kingdom in whose service Ignatius had grown up, the book of *Exercises* is full of the basic thought of traditional theology. When on the fourth day of the second week of the *Exercises* he poses the question under which of the two standards (*banderas*), Christ's or the devil's, one desires henceforth to fight, he is taking his stand on the Augustinian theology of the two Cities. The older characteristics of the Christian ideal of perfection, which he had seen at first only in the opaque light of medieval legends, especially those of Onufrius, Francis, and Dominic, he later grasped more exactly through study of the great religious rules and fused them into his new ideal, which was different from them but was filled nevertheless with the spirit of the tradition. The blending of ascetical tradition and personal experience made the *Exercises,* in the words of H. Böhmer, a "book of destiny for mankind." "The work of Ignatius is unequalled in its ability to transform, in the spirit of its author, the men who came upon it."[14]

---

[12] Critical edition in *MHSI* (*supra*); besides the literature there cited, P. de Leturia, "La devotio moderna en el Montserrat de S. Ignacio," *RF* 111 (1936), 371–386; M. Batllori, "Montserrat i la Campanyia de Jesus," *Miscellania Anselm Albareda* I (Montserrat 1962), 89–100.

[13] H. Rahner, op. cit., pp. 11f.

Spread of the Society

The two great books, *Constitutions* and *Exercises,* radiate the strength of Ignatius's personality and constitute the basis of the astonishing expansion of the Order in the very first decades after its establishment. Until about 1550 the individual effort of the members in the care of souls and in teaching was in the foreground, but thereafter the Order was consolidated by the erection of an increasing number of foundations—houses of the professed, colleges, residences—and the development of the organization. The limitation of the number of members to sixty was abandoned as early as 1544. Already in 1539 Father Araoz had gone to Spain. In 1540 the Order was established in Paris. In the same year Father Faber set out for Germany in the company of the imperial diplomat Ortiz, who had earlier made a retreat under Ignatius, and, soon after, Peter Canisius was won for the Society. Fathers Lejay and Bobadilla went in 1542 to Regensburg to strengthen Catholicism there. At the request of King John III of Portugal, Francis Xavier and three companions sailed to the East Indes in April 1541. Lainez and Salmerón took part, as papal theologians, in the first period of the Council of Trent. At the beginning of 1548 Jesuits were entrusted at Rome with the examining of candidates for the priesthood. The requests by bishops and other highly placed people to the general to put Fathers at their disposal became so numerous that all of them could by no means be satisfied. But there was also opposition.

In the Spanish realm, from which the majority of the first members came, neither Charles V nor his successor Philip II was well disposed toward the Society,[15] and the Dominican Melchior Cano, highly esteemed as a theologian and at court, was its bitter enemy. It found strong support, though, in Francis Borgia, Duke of Gandía and Viceroy of Catalonia, who received seven Jesuits at Gandía in 1545 and in 1546 entered the Society. The excessive asceticism of Borgia and other Spanish members, however, endangered the uniform development of the Spanish branch for a time. Founded in 1547, the province was already divided seven years later into three provinces—Castile, Aragón, Andalusia—which, out of regard for Spanish national pride, were grouped under Borgia as deputy. In Granada Archbishop Guerrero, a good friend of the Society, made possible the founding of a college, and about the same time colleges were established in Zaragoza, Seville, and Medina del Campo. In Portugal the Society experienced a downright spectacular growth because of Rodrigues, who was highly esteemed by King John III. The first foundation arose at Lisbon in 1541; in 1542 a college was established at Coimbra; in 1546 Rodrigues became first provincial of Portugal. The number of members grew so fast that their thorough inner formation could not keep pace. Since Rodrigues did not correct abuses, he was deposed in 1552. The new provincial, Miron, dismissed 130 members, retaining only 105.

---

[14] K. Holl, "Die geistlichen Übungen des Ignatius von Loyola," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* III (Tübingen 1928), 285–301; the quotation, p. 285.

In Italy the founding of colleges at Messina (1548) and Palermo (1549) was followed by the establishment of the Roman College (1551), which developed as the Order's principal educational institute. In 1556 colleges had already been founded or were coming into existence in twenty Italian cities, including Naples, Florence, Bologna, Modena, Ferrara, Venice, and Genoa. On the other hand, in France the Order encountered the opposition of the *Parlement* of Paris and the Sorbonne. Father Doménech was expelled from Paris in 1542 and went to Louvain. Although a French province had been established in 1552, it was not until 1556 that, thanks to the assistance of the Bishop of Clermont, the first college could be opened at Billom. After the successful appearance of Lainez at the Religious Colloquy of Poissy (1561), the *Parlement* of Paris gave its consent for further foundations, whereupon there followed at close intervals those in Tournon, Rodez, and Paris. The establishment of colleges in the Low Countries was at first delayed by the refusal of the States General to grant the Order legal recognition as a corporation; not until 1562 were colleges founded at Brussels and Tournai.

Nadal's saying, "Vae nobis, si non iuvemus Germaniam," expresses the importance attributed by Ignatius to the crisis in Germany. The

---

[15] M. Batllori, "Carlos V y la Compañía de Jesús," *Cuarto centenario del emperador Carlos V. Estudios carolinos* (Barcelona 1959), pp. 131–148.

Order's chief promoters were Cardinal Otto of Augsburg, the Dukes of Bavaria, and King Ferdinand I. But the soul of the movement was Peter Canisius, who from 1549 was active at the University of Ingolstadt as professor and spiritual director. He began the erection of colleges at Vienna (1552) and Ingolstadt (1556) and in 1556 became provincial of the Upper German Province, from which a Lower German Province branched off. The colleges at Munich (1559), Trier (1560), and Dillingen (1563)—the last named grew to be a university—developed into strongholds of the gravely threatened Catholicism of Germany.

The ever increasing number of colleges founded from the mid-1550s was the sequel to an expansion of the Order's activity which was to be of the greatest importance. While not ceasing to be pastorally oriented, it became increasingly a teaching Order, because the formation of a new generation was recognized as the most urgent task. The colleges, which were originally intended for the training of the Order's recruits at existing universities and hence were permitted to possess fixed revenues and real estate, proceeded to accept externs who did not plan to join the Order. The college of Messina became the model of this new type. Thus, in the constitutions of 1550 there appeared colleges offering public instruction in addition to those, chiefly at universities, intended for the Jesuit recruits. In the definitive edition of the constitutions the emphasis had already shifted: the colleges were "rather for externs" and served also for the education of recruits.[16]

Although Ignatius himself had recognized the necessity of this change, Lainez may be regarded as the chief promoter of the new role of the colleges. Probably the Order's keenest theological mind, during his generalship (1558–65) he fostered the move toward a teaching Order and obtained from Pius IV the right to confer academic degrees. In 1563 there originated at the Roman College the first Marian Congregation, which aimed to further religiously and ascetically the pick of the best. Though Lainez was essentially of an imperious nature and hence had been sternly handled by Ignatius, as general he ruled with great mildness. The Order grew at an ever faster tempo. At the founder's death (1556) it had had about 1000 members in twelve provinces; when Lainez died on 19 January 1565, it counted 3500 members in eighteen provinces. Jesuits were active in all parts of the Portuguese colonial empire, but not yet in the Spanish. After 1549 there was a province in India, with its headquarters at Goa; after 1553 a Brazilian province; in 1555 Nuñez Barreto became the first Jesuit to set foot in China; after 1562 there was a foundation in Macao.

---

[16] L. Lukács, "De origine collegiorum externorum deque controversiis circa eorum paupertatem obortis," *AHSI* 29 (1960), 189–245; 30 (1961), 1–89.

CHAPTER 34

The Beginnings of the Catholic Reform in Rome under Paul III

The self-reform of the members, as realized in the Italian reform groups and the new Orders proceeding from them, in the Spain of the Catholic Kings, and above all in the Society of Jesus, could not extend throughout the Body of the Church until it had first gained the Church's Head. Its advance on Rome made strides in the pontificate of Paul III, not only because of its inherent strength but because of the pressure of the seemingly irresistible progress of the schism, which at that very moment was consolidating itself in Germany as a distinct Church and was beginning to spread throughout Europe. While Paul III (1534–49) cannot be regarded as the first Pope of the Catholic Reform, he was its forerunner.

From a conclave lasting only two days (11–13 October) came forth as Pope the oldest and most intellectual of the cardinals, the Dean of the College, Alessandro Farnese. A product of the Renaissance and formed by it, he not only owed the red hat, conferred by Alexander VI in 1493, to the depravity of that era, but in his own personal life he had paid tribute to it. His children, Pierluigi and Costanda, born out of wedlock before his promotion to higher Orders, and his grandsons, Alessandro the Younger and Ottavio, seriously compromised his pontificate. The exaltation of his family and its admission among the dynasties of Italy through the bestowal of the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza on Pierluigi and even further designs on Milan had a disastrous influence on both the political and the ecclesiastical decisions of the Pope. His policy of neutrality between the two great powers, the Habsburgs and France, at times served his dynastic interests no less than those of the Church. Nevertheless, his pontificate marks a new start. Paul III had understood that the policy of Clement VII, opportunistic and almost exclusively diplomatic, could only founder, because it failed to recognize the predominant forces of that era and that the papacy had to extend its hand to the agencies of renewal, if it wanted to halt the progress of the schism. A Catholic Reform had to confront the Protestant Reformation. In the consciousness of the age, reform and council were inseparably linked; they became the essential components of Paul's program of government.

The establishment of the Roman Inquisition served the purpose of defense rather than of reconstruction. The points of entry of the new doctrine into Italy were Milan and Venice, which were closely bound to southern Germany and Switzerland through commercial relations; but communities of dissidents were found also in Central Italy (Modena and Lucca) and at Naples. Devotional writings, such as the little book *On the Favor of Christ,* disseminated a piety which only trained theologians could recognize as no longer Catholic. Lay persons interested in religion crowded into lectures on the Pauline Epistles and argued about problems of justification, grace and freedom, and predestination. Italy's greatest woman poet, Vittoria Colonna, and the greatest artist of the age, Michelangelo Buonarroti, were affected by the movement of "Evangelism," which contained many positive merits as well as serious dangers. From the end of the 1530s it increasingly happened that preachers, especially mendicant friars, occasioned strife and scandal, but because of the conflicts of jurisdiction between religious superiors, bishops, and local inquisitors they were called to account either tardily or not at all.[1]

Hence, through a brief of 14 January 1542, the Pope annulled for Italy every exemption in matters within the competence of the Inquisition and by the Bull "Licet ab initio" of 21 July 1542 he entrusted responsibility for maintaining the purity of the faith and investigating and punishing all doctrinal errors on both sides of the Alps to a commission of six cardinals—Carafa, Toledo, Parisio, Guidiccioni, Laurerio, and Badia—whose powers included the infliction of the death penalty on "obstinate heretics"; judgment on those willing to recant was reserved to the Pope.[2] In keeping with the Pope's attitude, the procedure of the new institution was relatively mild during his pontificate. It became stricter as the influence of Carafa, the spiritual father of the new foundation, grew; at his suggestion the Dominican Michele Ghislieri was appointed general delegate (1551). As early as 1543 the Roman Inquisition forbade any introduction of Protestant books into Italy; the enforcement of the prohibition naturally depended on the secular arm. Aleander, nuncio at Venice, was unable to prevent the smuggling of forbidden books. The nuncios to the imperial court, to King Ferdinand I, and to France were also instructed to keep an eye on the press. Morone and Tommaso Campeggio submitted lists of controversial German theologians,[3] but they received inadequate support from Rome. The significance of the press for the spread of Protestantism and for the Catholic Reform was not sufficiently appreciated until later.

More important than these defensive measures was the strengthening of the reform element at the Curia through the nomination of strongly Church-minded cardinals and the fostering of reform in the Orders. Even in the High Renaissance the Senate of the Church had not been entirely lacking in men zealous for reform. Oliviero Carafa, Francesco Piccolomini, Egidio of Viterbo, and Cajetan had maintained the great tradition of the fifteenth century, but they could not prevail against the powerful *nepoti,* the worldly minded scions of Italian princely families, and the crown cardinals of the great powers. And yet only a purified College of Cardinals could elect a reform Pope. Paul III began by creating two youthful *nepoti,* Alessandro Farnese and Guido Ascanio Sforza, but the next creation (21 May 1535) included, in addition to the martyr-bishop John Fisher, the future leader of the reform party at the Curia, Gasparo Contarini (1483–1542). Deeply imbued with the spirit of Giustiniani's circle, as Venetian ambassador at the imperial court (1521–25) Contarini had witnessed the beginnings of the schism and, though a layman, had exerted himself as a theologian. He became the soul of the Catholic Reform in Rome and of contact with the Lutherans.[4] In the following years the purple was bestowed upon Carafa, cofounder of the Theatines; the humanist Sadoleto;[5] Aleander,[6] well informed on the events in Germany; and the Englishman Pole, highly esteemed for his deep piety. Later followed Marcellus Cervini, destined to mount the throne of Peter as the first reform Pope; Morone, long active in Germany; the Dominican Badia and the Benedictine Cortese,[7] both distinguished for piety and scholarship. If one takes into account that even among the new cardinals selected from curial posts and among the crown cardinals, especially the Spanish, there were men who were convinced of the need of Church reform, such as the canonists Guidiccioni,[8] Ghinucci, and Sfondrato, and the Spaniard Juan Alvarez de Toledo, then it does not seem to be an exaggeration to speak of a renewal of the College of Cardinals.

---

[1] Fundamental are: B. Fontana, "Documenti Vaticani contro l'eresia lutherana in Italia," *ASR* 15 (1892), 71ff.; H. Jedin, "Ein Streit um den Augustinismus vor dem Tridentinum," *RQ* 35 (1927), 351–368; P. Paschini, *Venezia e l'Inquisizione Romana da Giulio III a Pio IV* (Padua 1959), pp. 3–29.

[2] *Bull Rom* VI, 344f.

[3] *NBD* I/2, 68; I/6, 293ff.

---

[4] F. Dittrich, *G. Contarini* (Braunsberg 1885); *id., Regesten und Briefe des Card. G. Contarini* (Braunsberg 1881); "G. Contarinis gegenreformatorische Schriften," ed. F. Hünermann, *CCath,* 7 (1923); H. Jedin, *Contarini und Camaldoli* (Rome 1953); further literature: *DHGE* XIII, 771–784; *LThK* 2nd ed., III, 49f.; also A. Casadei, "Lettere del Cardinale G. Contarini durante la sua legazione de Bologna 1542," *AstIt* (1960), pp. 77–130, 220–285; H. Mackensen, "Contarini's Theological Role at Ratisbon in 1541," *ARG* 51 (1960), 36–57; A. Stella, "La lettera del Card. C. sulla predestinazione," *RSTI* 15 (1961), 411–441.

[5] S. Ritter, *Un Umanista teologo: J. Sadoleto* (Rome 1912).

[6] G. Müller, "Die drei Nuntiaturen Aleanders in Deutschland," *QFIAB,* 39 (1959), 222–276; cf. ibid., pp. 328–342.

[7] *Opera,* 2 vols. (Padua 1774).

[8] H. Jedin, "Concilio e riforma nel pensiero del Card. B. Guidiccioni," *RSTI* 2 (1948), 33–60.

Of course, the reform cardinals did not constitute a homogeneously oriented group; they were agreed on the goal but not on the choice of means. Contarini and Carafa were convinced that profound and radical interventions in the organization of the curial offices, the Orders, and the diocesan clergy were necessary; the conservatives, mainly consisting of curial canonists, felt that reform of the Church could be effected not through new laws but through a return to the "old law," that is, the observance of the canonical rules. Opposed to any change in the status quo was the organized curial bureaucracy, whose revenues were threatened by reforms.[9] Through certain administrative chiefs, for example, the Grand Penitentiary Pucci, this group was assured of firm support. That Paul III allowed full scope to all three tendencies was in keeping with his breadth of mind, but also indicated the limitations of his desire for reform.

The renewal of the College of Cardinals was not without effect on the reform of the mendicant Orders, in whose charge lay, at least in Italy, theology, preaching, and urban pastoral work. As their protectors, the reform cardinals were able to promote the reform element in this important field. Far-reaching plans for the unification of the various kinds of Orders, such as had been suggested from the time of the reform councils and most recently by Cardinal Guidiccioni, were put aside—Benedictines and Cistercians as the only monastic Orders, Dominicans and Franciscans as the only mendicant Orders, and, in addition, one military Order, and also Carafa's proposal to suppress the Conventual branches of the mendicant Orders.

Following the retirement of the excellent generals Cajetan and Loaysa, the Dominican Order suffered at first from frequent change in administration and the weakness of the generals Butigella and Du Feynier, and its protectors, Pucci and Salviati, were indifferent to reform. The general Romeo (1536–52), from the convent of San Marco in Florence, and his successor, Usodimare (1553–58), were the first to take it in hand, supported by the protector, Juan Alvarez de Toledo,[10] himself a Dominican. In the Franciscan religious family, whose two branches had been separate since 1517, the Conventuals at first continued to suffer from the decay of discipline, though they still produced capable theologians, such as Giovanni Antonio Delfino. In Lunello (1535–41) and Calvi (1541–47) the Observants acquired distinguished minister generals, who were seconded by the protectors, Cardinals

---

[9] W. v. Hofmann, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der kurialen Behörden vom Schisma bis zur Reformation,* 2 vols. (Rome 1914), especially I, 243–329.

[10] Acts of the General Chapters at Rome (1539, 1546, 1553) and Salamanca (1551) in B. M. Reichert, *Acta cap. gen. OP* IV, 266–361; Walz, pp. 257ff.

Quiñones and Carpi. The Augustinian Hermits, especially imperiled by Luther's apostasy, elected Seripando as general at the General Chapter of Naples (1539), on the personal initiative of the Pope, and commissioned him to restore morals and orthodoxy.[11] When he resigned in 1551 after an excellent administration, he saw to it that the reform would be continued under his successor by having Cervini named protector. As regards the Carmelites, Audet, general from 1523 to 1562, balanced the accounts for Maffei, who became protector in 1550: out of thirty provinces, six in northern Europe were destroyed, while the others had either been already reformed or had at least been persuaded to reform.[12] Among the Servites improvement was brought about in the generalships of Laurerio (1535–42), who became a cardinal, and Bonuccio (1542–53), prominent at Trent.[13]

Without prejudice to the diversity of constitutions, these reformers pursued essentially the same goals: restoration of the common life, abolition of private ownership, and greater attention to the admission and training of recruits. They used the same means: extended journeys of visitation for the enforcement of the decrees of general chapters and designation of energetic provincials. The authority of the generals was strengthened, and in the mendicant Orders there was a definite tendency toward centralization, as realized in the Society of Jesus. As the progress of the reform became more evident, the special position of the Observant branches seemed less justified; among the Augustinian Hermits and the Carmelites the virtually autonomous Observant congregations were, after a tiresome struggle, again subjected to the general's authority. The Pope encouraged this development in the interest of reform, but could not bring himself to eliminate the influence that was especially harmful to religious discipline—that of dispensations and privileges all too easily issued by the Curia, and chiefly by the Sacred Penitentiary, and, particularly, the flagrantly abused permission to live outside the community and to receive benefices, whereby those dreading reform escaped being reformed. Like the reform endeavors of individual bishops, the pre-Tridentine reform of religious institutes encountered an obstacle that was to be removed only by reform of the Curia.

"Purga Romam, purgatur mundus"—this challenge directed to Adrian VI was still valid. Beginnings of a reform of the curial offices had been made since the days of the reform councils by Pius II, Sixtus IV, Alexander VI, and at the Fifth Lateran Council, but none were carried through. On the contrary, the number of salable official posts had been constantly increased for financial reasons. They were made lucrative by raising and multiplying the fees, many of which were not fixed but were determined by the *Datarius* in an arrangement with the parties. Every reform curtailed the income of the officials and the Pope.

---

[11] *Analecta Augustiniana* IX (1921), 277: "ut ordo vester quandoque restauretur ac suae integritati pristinoque suae sanctimoniae candori restituatur"; acts of the General Chapters at Naples (1539), Rome (1543), Recanati (1547); ibid., pp. 271–381, X, 117–166.

[12] A. Staring, *Der Karmelitengeneral Nikolaus Audet und die katholische Reform des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Rome 1959), pp. 427–431.

[13] P. Soulier, *Constitutiones antiquae et recentiores Serv. S. Mariae* (Brussels 1905) (General Chapter at Butri [1548]). For the sequel cf. chap. 36 and 38.

At first Paul III did not go beyond the reform gestures that had by now become almost routine. Soon after his election he set up a commission of cardinals for a "reform of morals," and on 23 August 1535, the commission, activated and expanded, was operating in the traditional manner. It was only the impending Council that moved the Pope to summon to Rome in the fall of 1536 eight independent and uncommitted men, from whose deliberations emanated a reform statement, the "Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia." On 9 March 1537 this was submitted to the Pope and commented on by Contarini.[14] With admirable candor it designated as the root of all evils the exaggerated growth of the papal theory and avarice; it called for a ruthless correction of the curial procedures in regard to dispensations, a restriction of exemptions, a greater care in the conferring of ordinations, a new and sincerely Christian countenence for the city of Rome.

The memorandum did not remain secret. It was printed, first in Italy and then in Germany, and misused as an alleged confirmation of the charges raised earlier by the opponents of the papacy.[15] The conservative Guidiccioni saw in it an unjust attack on the centuries-old curial procedure, which he said was to be spared, but even he did not actually deny the necessity of reform.[16] Symptomatic of the fate of the bold attack was the struggle fought in 1537–38 in regard to the *Dataria*. Contarini and Carafa did not prevail against the canonists Ghinucci and Simonetta; the "compositions" of the *Dataria,* openly branded as simony in the memorandum, found defenders among theologians, and the Pope shrank from putting up with the threatened loss of a considerable part of his income. At the end of 1537 an observer reported: "The reform of the *Datarius* has gone up in smoke." In the succeeding years, a similar fate befell efforts to reform the Chancery, the *Camera,* the

---

[14] *CT* XII, 131–145, with the signatures of Contarini, Carafa, Sadoleto, Pole, Ridolfi, Aleander, Giberti, Cortese, and Badia; excerpt in Mirbt, no. 427.

[15] E.g., by Luther (*WA* I, 288ff.) and J. Sturm; against the latter J. Cochläus wrote his "Aequitatis discussio super Consilio delectorum cardinalium" (1538), ed. H. Walter, *CCath* 17 (1931).

[16] *CT* XII, 226–256. An attempt at a chronological arrangement of the partly undated documents is made by H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent* I (St. Louis 1957), 429, footnote 2.

Penitentiary, and the Rota, chiefly because the corporations of functionaries utilized the opportunity to defend their alleged "legitimate rights." Some individual abuses were removed, but complete success was not achieved because the Pope was only lukewarm in his support for the authors of the memorandum.

Of all the abuses in the pre-Tridentine Church the worst was the neglect of the duty of residence on the part of those responsible for the proper care of souls—bishops and parish priests. Absenteeism sprang from the view that the right to a benefice and its revenues was distinct from the personal fulfillment of the official duties connected with it. Cardinals possessed bishoprics which they had never seen; dozens of bishops lived permanently in Rome and Venice who scarcely ever visited their dioceses and had them administered by vicars. Neglect of residence by parish priests is less easy to ascertain by statistics.[17] In this matter also Paul III initiated some improvement. On 13 December 1540 he called upon eighty bishops present in Rome to go to their dioceses. They defended themselves by pointing to the manifold hindrances to episcopal activity from above, from below, from outside.[18] they cited the numerous exemptions of individual persons, Orders, and corporations, their own scant influence on the nominations to benefices, the abetting of reform-shy elements by appeals to the Roman tribunals, and the many interferences on the part of the secular power with the exercise of jurisdiction and the administration of ecclesiastical property. The demands of the bishops were at least partially met in a reform bull, drafted early in 1542 but not enforced.

Convocations of the Council

Undeniably, the greatest service of Paul III to the Catholic Reform was convoking the Council of Trent. Long convinced that the delaying tactics of his predecessor were ill-advised, he fixed his eyes from the start on the organizing of a general council. He was aware, and became increasingly more conscious, of the risk connected with it for the papacy since the emergence of conciliarism and in the face of the widespread anti-Romanism. The difficulties had increased with the long delays in the calling of a council. Papal promises of a council were regarded by Protestants as altogether insincere and were not taken at face value even by many Catholics. A council that was supposed to be attended by representatives from all parts of Christendom required the concurrence of the Christian princes and kingdoms, for whom it was at the same time a political event of the first importance. In regard to the rival great powers, the Habsburg Emperors and France, the Pope was determined to remain neutral, but how was this compatible with the fight against the apostasy? The Pope's policy in regard to a council can be understood only against the backdrop of all these circumstances, and its sincerity was often called into question.[19]

---

[17] Outstanding in its methodical approach is J. Absil, "L'absentéisme du clergé paroissial au diocèse de Liège au XV^{e} et dans la première moitié du XVI^{e} siècle," *RHE* 57 (1962), 5–44 (neglect of the duty of residence not synonymous with pastoral neglect). Cf. also F. W. Oediger, "Niederrheinische Pfarrkirchen um 1500," *AHVNrh* 135 (1939), 132f. (of 143 pastors of the archdeaconry of Xanten, around 1500, some 60 paid the tax on absentees). According to P. Hughes, *The Reformation in England* I (London 1952), 103, in the 1088 parishes of the see of Lincoln visited in 1518–19 there were 247 absentee pastors; in 1530 the ratio was 585 to 43.

[18] *CT* IV, 481–485.

In the spring of 1535 the Pope announced the imminent summoning of the Council through his nuncios in Germany (Vergerio), France (Carpi), and Spain (G. Guidiccioni) and proposed as the meeting place Mantua, his first choice, and then Turin, Piacenza, and Bologna. France declined, fearing from the council a weakening of the Protestant opposition to the Emperor and a corresponding increase in the power of its chief foe. It relented when the Pope in a personal meeting with Emperor Charles V had obtained his consent to Mantua without yielding his own fundamental neutrality in the impending war with France. The Bull "Ad Dominici Gregis Curam," of 2 June 1536, summoned the council to Mantua and listed as its tasks the condemnation of heresies, the reform of the Church, and the restoration of peace among Christian princes for defense against the Turkish threat.

Three causes conspired to frustrate this first summons. On 24 February 1537, the League of Schmalkalden firmly declined the invitation delivered by the Nuncio Peter van der Vorst; Francis I announced that Mantua, situated within the Emperor's sphere of influence, was unacceptable; and the Duke of Mantua demanded that the Pope maintain a force of from five thousand to six thousand to protect the council. After the announced opening date, 23 May 1537, had passed, Paul III saw himself compelled to substitute Vicenza for Mantua. The three legates, Cardinals Campeggio, Simonetta, and Aleander, went there, but the bishops did not appear, and so the opening had to be postponed a second time. On 21 May 1539 it was prorogued to an unspecified date.

Although the war between Charles V and Francis I had in the meantime been ended by the armistice of Nice, the plan for a council was for a time laid aside, since the negotiations initiated by the Emperor for reunion with the German Protestants seemed to indicate that another solution of the religious crisis was within the realm of possibility. Its dramatic climax, the Religious Colloquy of Regensburg in 1541, proved the impossibility of bridging the gap. The division in the Church was already a fact which could not be disposed of even by the exceptional willingness of the Papal Legate Contarini to come to an understanding. The failure of Regensburg, coinciding with alarming reports of the invasion of Italy by Protestantism, determined the Pope in the summer of 1541 to take up again the plan for a council.

---

[19] P. Leturia, "Paolo III e il Concilio di Trento nelle memorie di Carlo V," *CivCatt* 97/II (1946), 12–23. The question of the imperial conciliar policy was again opened up by G. Müller, "Zar Vorgeschichte des Tridentinums. Karl V. und das Konzil während des Pontifikates Clemens' VII.," *ZKG* 74 (1963), 83–108.

During a meeting with the Pope at Lucca (September 1541) the Emperor proposed Trent as the place of the council, for, situated in imperial territory, it satisfied the demand for a council "on German soil." The Pope at first insisted on Mantua (besides Ferrara and Cambrai) but finally approved the agreement of the Nuncio Morone with the Imperial Estates in regard to Trent and by the Bull "Initio Nostri Huius Pontificatus" of 22 May 1542 summoned the council to meet there on 1 November 1542. This second summons was also fruitless, for in the summer the war between Charles V and Francis I broke out again. The Pope was again neutral, but France declined to send delegates, and the Emperor regarded the convocation of the council as an insincere gesture. His minister, Granvella, sent as his deputy to Trent early in January 1543, ascertained that, except for the Legates Parisio, Morone, and Pole, almost no bishops were present; in May, despite numerous summonses from the Pope, there were only ten. A meeting at Busseto near Parma (June 1543) produced no agreement. The Pope refused to give up his neutrality; the Emperor declined to transfer Milan to the Farnese as urged on him especially by the *nepote,* Alessandro Farnese. Since the unsettled situation in Trent could not continue without of loss of prestige, the Pope on 29 September 1543 ordered the suspension of the council.

The tension between him and the Emperor increased when the latter, in order to obtain the assistance of the estates against France at the Diet of Speyer (1544), made considerable concessions to the Protestants and proposed for the next diet a reform of the Church without the Pope's participation. In a brief of reprimand (24 August 1544) the Pope lodged a solemn protest and renewed his offer of a council. This again became a possibility unexpectedly fast by the conclusion of the Peace of Crépy (18 September 1544). Not only did it eliminate the principal obstacle which had obstructed the success of this first convocation of the Council to Trent, but it also contained a secret clause whereby Francis I dropped his opposition to Trent and declared his willingness to participate in a council to be held there or in Cambrai or Metz. Thus the Emperor had seized the initiative in the matter of settling the question of the council. He carefully explored his great plan of forcibly crushing the religious and political opposition of the League of Schmalkalden and of then inducing the Protestants to accept the hitherto rejected invitation to the council, where the existing doctrinal differences were to be authoritatively decided and a general reform of the Church resolved. Without entering upon further negotiations with the powers, the Pope, in the Bull "Laetare Jerusalem" (30 November 1544), thereupon annulled the suspension of the Council and appointed Laetare Sunday, 15 March 1545, as the opening date. On 22 February Cardinals Del Monte, Cervini, and Pole were named as legates.

When, on 13 March, they arrived at Trent and were welcomed by the local bishop, Cardinal Christoforo Madruzzo, not a single other bishop was there except the papal deputy Sanfelice. Because the viceroy of Naples had designated four bishops of the kingdom to represent the entire Neapolitan episcopate and had directed the others to grant them full powers of attorney, the Pope on 17 April 1545 forbade the naming of proxies without sufficient reason. While the bishops who had meanwhile arrived in Trent were impatiently awaiting the signal for the opening, an understanding between Pope and Emperor was reached in regard to concerted action together with the Council against the German Protestants. It had been prepared through dispatch of Alessandro Farnese to Charles V at Worms. The Pope bound himself to furnish an auxiliary corps and to contribute a subsidy; the Emperor, to promote attendance at the council after victory had been achieved. The beginning of the war had to be deferred to the following year, for the Emperor was not yet prepared for the attack, and a new colloquy with Protestants, organized at Regensburg, stirred new misgivings at Trent. Unhappy over the delays, the legates discussed a transfer of the Council to Rome or Ferrara, without realizing that the change of place imperiled the great plan as a whole. The Emperor firmly rejected the suggestion of a transfer when the papal private secretary, Dandino, broached it to him at the beginning of October. Giovio wrote from Rome to Trent: "The key [to the opening] of the council has fallen into a deep well, and the blind Archbishop of Armagh is not likely to find it."[20] The Pope, however, disregarded all misgivings and appointed the third Sunday of Advent, 13 December, for the opening in Trent. In addition to the three legates and Madruzzo, four archbishops, twenty-one bishops, and five generals of Orders took part in the first session.

---

[20] *CT* X, 216.

CHAPTER 35

The Council of Trent under Paul III and Julius III

"Now the gate is open," the Augustinian general Seripando wrote happily in his diary.[1] But the deliberations got under way slowly, the delay arising from three causes. The number of participants was meager. There was as yet no order of business nor clearly drawn up program. And, whereas the Emperor, seeing the Council in the framework of his great plan and looking forward to the eventual participation of the German Protestants, favored postponing questions of doctrine until Church reform had been achieved, the Pope insisted that priority belonged to matters of faith.

Due to the constantly repeated admonitions addressed by the Pope to the bishops of Upper Italy and to those staying in Rome and Venice, the number of the voting members rose by 17 June to sixty-six; it dropped to about fifty in the autumn, and at the beginning of 1547 again reached almost seventy.[2] In addition to the Italians, who constituted approximately three-fourths, only the Spaniards were present in any number. They were represented by outstanding bishops—those of Astorga, Calahorra, and Badajoz—and, led by Cardinal Pacheco of Jaén, formed with the bishops of Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia, a compact group in political questions. France was represented by three bishops; Germany, following the departure of Helding, Auxiliary Bishop of Mainz, in January 1546, only by the proxies of the Archbishops of Mainz and Trier.

Agreement as to the right to vote in the general congregations was reached at the end of December: Entitled to vote were all bishops, including auxiliaries, the generals of the mendicant Orders, and two abbots from each of the monastic congregations. All plural voting was excluded. The indult granted to the German bishops and abbots on 5 December 1545, whereby they could be represented by voting proxies, was modified by the legates to mean only a consultative vote. The conciliar officials—the auditor Pighino, the promotor Severoli, the abbreviator Boncompagni—were named by the Pope. As secretary of the Council, in place of Ludovico Beccadelli, who withdrew, Angelus Massarelli, was selected on 1 April 1546, who till then had been secretary of the Legate Cervini. In its second session (7 January 1546) the Council prescribed its regimen; the order of seating was based on the dates of appointment as bishop. The decision of 22 January, which called for the considering of dogma and reform at the same time,[3] encountered the Pope's opposition and was not published in the third session (4 February), but it was actually observed throughout the duration of the Council. The right of proposition, that is, of deciding the program and the daily order of business, was claimed and exercised by the legates as deputies of the Pope. However, on 20 May 1546, the president, Del Monte, expressly stated that freedom of speech was not thereby curtailed.[4]

---

[1] *CT* II, 409.

[2] The list of all participants in the first period (*CT* V, 1037–1041) comprises twelve archbishops, seventy-four bishops, three abbots, six generals of Orders, and two proxies; with the three legates and Cardinals Madruzzo and Pacheco, the number is about 100.

In order to acquaint the Fathers with the theological problems proposed for discussion, the plenary sessions of the Fathers entitled to a vote (general congregations) were, from 20 February 1546, preceded by particular congregations, in which the theologians delegated by the Pope (the Jesuits Lainez and Salmerón) and the theological advisers of the participants, mostly mendicant friars, discussed questions formulated by the legates or propositions from the writings of the Reformers and their confessional books. These were followed by full debate in the general congregations, in which each qualified member cast his vote. The proposed rough drafts of decrees were drawn up either by selected committees or by the legates, with the assistance of expert prelates and theologians. They were debated in the general congregations, often in several readings, and correspondingly revised until acceptance in the solemn session was secured. In regard to the deliberations on reform, on 23 March 1546 the Pope agreed in principle to the treatment of abuses connected with the curial offices,[5] but reserved to himself the carrying out, on his own authority, of the reform of these offices, an attempt that had broken down before the beginning of the Council. Dread of conciliarism induced the legates not to admit into the decrees the designation of the Council as "universalem Ecclesiam repraesentans," which was again and again called for by the Spaniards and some Italians.

Although the Emperor repeatedly (2 May and 16 June) besought the legates through his second ambassador, Francisco de Toledo—the first, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, was usually absent—to postpone dogmatic decisions for the present, namely, until the end of the war, the Council, during the period from February to June 1546, issued dogmatic as well as reform decrees, in conformity with the decision of 22 January. Fundamental for all later doctrinal definitions was the decree of the fourth session (8 April) on the sources of revelation.[6] The Canon of Holy Scripture includes also the deuterocanonical books; the books of both Testaments, having for their author the one God, and the apostolic traditions concerning faith and morals, insofar as they have been preserved through the uninterrupted succession in the Catholic Church, are accepted with the same, and not merely "similar," respect. The opinion advocated by the Bishop of Chioggia and the Servite general Bonuccio, that revelation is in its entirety contained in Holy Scripture and that "tradition" is only the interpretation of it as given authoritatively by the official teaching office, led to a slight change in the original draft of the decree (substitution of "et . . . et" for "partim . . . partim"), but there is hardly any doubt that the overwhelming majority of the Fathers understood the apostolic traditions as a stream of revelation complementing Scripture.[7] The adoption of the decree on the Vulgate was preceded by a spirited debate on the lawfulness and appropriateness of translating the Bible into the vernacular. Cardinal Madruzzo of Trent advocated it, Pacheco opposed it. The "vetus et vulgata editio" of the Bible was declared "authentic," that is, free from doctrinal error, and suitable for scholarly and practical use. The correction of the Vulgate text, acknowledged as necessary, was carefully considered; study of the original languages of the Bible and versions in the vernacular were not forbidden. Just the same, the decree occasioned hesitations in Rome, but without resulting in an alteration of its text.

---

[3] *CT* IV, 569–572.

[4] *CT* V, 152.

[5] *CT* X, 427.

During the discussions of Original Sin, following the fourth session, Seripando and other theologians of the Augustinian school advocated the view that the removal of guilt by baptism does not prevent the survival of a concupiscence that is in some degree sinful, and Pacheco sought to obtain the definition of the Immaculate Conception. Neither view prevailed. Canon 5 specified the remission of sin in every respect ("totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet"); concupiscence, it states, is at times labeled sin in Saint Paul because it issues from it and lures to it. The Council declared that it did not intend to include the Mother of God in the decree on Original Sin; the constitutions of Sixtus IV concerning the dispute between Dominicans and Franciscans over the Immaculate Conception were to remain in force.

---

[6] *CT* V, 91f.; the draft of 22 March *CT* V, 31f. Bibliography in Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent* II (St. Louis 1961), 52f. For the treatise, not given there, of the Carmelite general Audet on the Canon, see *E Carm* 4 (1950), 337–355.

[7] Opposed to the interpretation of the decree as expounded by J. R. Geiselmann (*Una Sancta* 11 [1956], 131–150, and by M. Schmaus, *Die mündliche Überlieferung* [Munich 1957], pp. 123–206) are F. Lennerz, *Gr* 40 (1959), 38–53, 624–635; J. Beumer, *Scholastik* 34 (1959), 249–258; G. Rambaldi, *Antonianum* 35 (1960), 88–94; cf. also H. Holstein, "La Tradition d'après le Concile de Trente," *RSR* 47 (1959), 367–390; Y. Congar, *La tradition et les traditions* (Paris 1960); R. Geiselmann, *Schrift und Tradition* (Freiburg 1962).

A reform decree dealing with the establishing of prebends of lectorships in cathedral and collegiate churches sought in this traditional manner to improve the defective instruction of the clergy. During the debate over the reorganization of preaching Bishop Martelli of Fiesole attacked the exemption of the mendicants and demanded that, even for preaching in their own churches, they should have to seek the permission of the local bishop. The mendicants resisted successfully, but the right and the duty were enjoined on bishops of taking steps, regardless of exemption, against preachers who disseminated error or caused other kinds of scandal. The bishop was personally obliged to the preaching of the faith; parish priests, to vernacular sermons on all Sundays and holy days. An attempt by the Emperor's supporters to deal also in this connection with the duty of residence on the part of bishops and parish priests was rejected by the majority.

The Decree on Justification

With the simultaneous publication of the two reform decrees and the decree on Original Sin in the fifth session (17 June),[8] the Council was confronted with its most difficult assignment: the definition of the doctrine of justification. The opinions propounded by the thirty-four conciliar theologians (22–28 June) on six proposed questions—nature of justification, faith and works, grace and freedom—reflected the views of the three great theological schools represented at the Council—Dominican, Franciscan, and Augustinian. The proposal on which the general debate (30 June–23 July) was based distinguished three stages (*status*) of justification: the conversion of the sinner; the increase of justification; its recovery following the loss of grace. The first draft, submitted on 28 July and formerly attributed incorrectly to the Franciscan Andrés de Vega,[9] was so severely criticized that it had to be withdrawn. The simultaneous outbreak of the Schmalkaldic War and the advance of the Protestant army against the Ehrenberger Klause having occasioned a panic in Trent, the legates considered the transfer of the Council to Bologna, which, situated within the Papal State, conformed to the Pope's original plan as to the place of the Council. Though they had received full authority from the Pope in this regard, they lost precious time by making an inquiry at Rome and missed a favorable opportunity, since the military situation soon stabilized itself. It was not until 23 September that they perforce again took up the thread of the discussions. At Cervini's suggestion, they submitted a new draft composed by Seripando,[10] which complemented the "canones" by a positively stated "doctrina." "Even if all the universities of the world and the Lutherans were here," wrote Bishop Lipomani of Verona, impressed by the general debate on this second draft (27 September–12 October), "the subject could not have been better discussed."[11]

---

[8] Decrees of Session V in *CT* V, 238–243; bibliography on the decree on Original Sin in Jedin, op. cit., II, 132f; on the decree on preaching, Jedin op. cit., II, 105f.; also E. Feyaerts, "De evolutie van het predikatie-recht der Religieuzen," *StC,* 25 (1950), 117–190, 225–240.

[9] *CT* V, 384–391. A Mobilia, *Cornelio Musso e la prima forma del decreto sulla giustificazione* (Naples 1960), argues for the authorship of Cornelio Musso, Bishop of Bitonto.

The Emperor's faction, now firmly held together, sought to delay the conclusion. In order to meet them halfway and to gain time in which to arrange the contemplated suspension of the Council, the legates called for particular congregations (15–26 October) on two problems which had come to the foreground in the course of the debate: the question, open since the Regensburg Religious Colloquy of 1541, of twofold justification (justification by the justice of Christ and that by grace immanent in man); and the possibility of attaining certainty on the state of grace (Luther's certainty of faith and the Scotist view on the efficacy of the Sacraments). Both questions were argued in the general congregations from 9 November to 1 December together with the "November draft" of the decree,[12] with the result that the doctrine of a twofold justification was rejected but not formally condemned. As for the certainty of grace, the Council confined itself to striking out against Luther's certainty of faith. Here, as in other matters, the Council adhered to the principle of not deciding differences of opinion within Catholic theology. Throughout December the form of the decree was polished by a committee (*Praelati theologi*); the definitive wording (the fifth) was approved on 11 January 1547, and two days later unanimously accepted in the sixth session.[13] In sixteen dogmatic chapters and thirty-three canons, it defined the responsibility of grace for justification in all its stages, its nature as sanctification and renewal of the inner man, the necessity of a preparation, and the importance of faith in the process of justification; the increase of justification, its restoration, and the possibility of merit; and eternal life as grace and reward.

---

[10] *CT* V, 420–427; Seripando's preliminary drafts, *CT* V, 821–833; bibliography in Jedin op. cit., II, 168ff., 239; also J. I. Tellechea, "El Articulus de iustificatione de fray Bartolome de Carranza," *RET* 15 (1955), 563–635. Of the older works listed by me, op. cit., the most important are those by H. Rückert and E. Stakemeier.

[11] *CT* X, 675.

[12] *CT* V, 510–518.

[13] *CT* V, 791–799; perhaps too far-going in its harmony is the interpretation in H. Küng, *Rechtfertigung. Die Lehre Karl Barths und eine katholische Besinnung* (Einsiedeln 1957), pp. 105–276.

The length of the debate on justification was due not only to the subject but also to political considerations. In late autumn the Bishop of Fano, intimate with the Emperor's party, had brought forward a plan for a temporary suspension of the Council in order to do away with the discrepancy between the Emperor's delaying tactics and the legates' efforts for acceleration. In an agreement on 16 November between Cardinal Farnese and the first imperial ambassador, Mendoza, it was proposed to suspend the Council for six months and to complete the debate on justification, but not to publish the decree. But when the Emperor refused to ratify this agreement of Trent, the legates proceeded to promulgate the decree.

Whereas the acceptance of the decree on justification was unanimous, the reception of that on the duty of residence of bishops and parish priests, promulgated in the same sixth session of 13 January 1547, was greatly divided. During a first, brief debate on 9 and 10 June the Spaniards had demanded not only punishment for neglect of residence but the elimination of its causes: dispensation from the duty, only too easily obtained from the Curia; impeding of episcopal control through privileges of exemption granted by the Pope and on the part of the secular powers; and the frequent exclusion of the bishops in the successive steps of judicial appeals. At the prompting of the legates, bishops had submitted lists of these "impedimenta residentiae."[14] But the draft proposed by Del Monte on 29 December removed the whole set of hindrances. Pacheco expressed his opinion thus: "No reform is better than this sort!" The amended draft of 11 January 1547, the work of a committee of canonists (*Praelati canonistae*), went farther than the "little solution" of the presidential draft by annulling dispensations from residence obtained for an unspecified period and obliging those in possession of limited dispensations to make them known to the bishops, who were then to see to the appointment of qualified vicars. Bishops obtained also the right, by apostolic authority, to visit and correct exempt cathedral canons, but only in person. These concessions, however, did not satisfy the episcopal opposition; on the other hand, they seemed to be too extensive to high curial officials, such as T. Campeggio, Cicada, Pighino, and Archinto. Members of both factions qualified their *placet* in the session with so many stipulations that the approval of the decree appeared doubtful. The legates were obliged to broach once more the problem of residence.

---

[14] *CT* XII, 578–597 (six memoranda in full and two summaries).

A reform proposal of 3 February 1547,[15] prepared by the commission of canonists, already contained the basic features of a new law dealing with ordination and appointments to office. It gave to the bishop concerned the responsibility for ordination, including control of dimissorial letters issued by the Curia, and recognized the principle that office and benefice were inseparable by forbidding pluralism and requiring definite personal qualifications in those designated to become bishops and parish priests. Del Monte designated as the goal of the whole reform the restoration of pastoral care ("animabus providere"). In an effort to meet the demands of the opposition halfway, the Pope had at the beginning of the year transmitted to the legates the sketch of a reform bull in which the position of the bishops was strengthened, for example, by a limitation of exemptions and by the so-called alternation in the conferring of benefices. By a consistorial decree of 18 February he forbade the cardinals to hold more than one see.[16] Hence in the general congregation of 25 February 1547, after careful examination of the votes cast in the session, the acceptance of the decree on residence could be proclaimed. Bishops of every rank, including cardinals, who failed to fulfill the duty of residence for six successive months were deprived of one-fourth of their revenues; if the absence continued for a year, they lost another fourth. The climate of the reform discussions had so greatly improved that the new reform proposal, which had meanwhile been extended to include statements opposing the union of benefices and dealing with the bishops' right of visitation, was accepted in the seventh session on 3 March 1547 by a large majority.[17]

The preparation of the thirty canons on the Sacraments in general, baptism, and confirmation, promulgated in the same session, had begun on 17 January when a collection of thirty-five erroneous propositions, extracted from the writings of the reformers, was submitted for evaluation by the theologians of the Council. The current rivalries among the schools in regard to the causality of the Sacraments and a certain insecurity as to the nature of the sacramental character did not prevent complete unanimity with reference to the nature and sevenfold number of the Sacraments. In the general debate (8–21 February) the Council decided to limit its definition strictly to the condemnation of the concepts of the reformers and not, as proposed by Bishop Archinto of Saluzzo, to draw up a doctrinal decree of a positive nature, modeled on the *Decretum pro Armenis* of 1439, nor to condemn the reformers by name along with their writings, as demanded by two Spanish bishops. The last-mentioned decision was in accord with the policy suggested by Cardinal Farnese at the beginning of the Council: that doctrines and not persons be condemned. On 25 February he again impressed this policy on the Council and added as a reason that otherwise the reformers ought to be summoned to the Council and heard by it.[18] The canons accepted in the seventh session defined the sevenfold number of the Sacraments and their institution by Christ. The Council described their nature as efficacious signs by having recourse to the scholastic terms added only during the concluding debate on 1 March: *gratiam non ponentibus obicem conferre* or *ex opere operato conferre.* The importance of faith was only negatively stated: The Sacraments were instituted not only for the strengthening of faith and operate not only through faith in the word of promise. Rebaptism was condemned and the bishop was designated as the ordinary minister of confirmation.

---

[15] *CT* V, 871f.

[16] The reform bull of 31 December 1546, in *CT* IV 504–512; the consistorial decree of 18 February 1547, in *CT* V, 981f.

[17] *CT* V, 984ff.

Transfer to Bologna

During February the theologians had discussed the doctrine of the Eucharist. It had just been referred to the full Council when several cases of typhus fever, presumably brought to Trent from the German theater of operations in the war, provided the grounds for the decision reached on 11 March in the eighth session, by a vote of thirty-nine to fourteen (with five doubtful), to transfer the Council to Bologna. The epidemic was not invented, as opponents of the transfer claimed; the expert opinion drawn up by the Council physician, Fracastoro, is medically incontrovertible.[19] However, it is equally certain that the legates and the Italian majority had long aimed at the transfer and felt that they were thereby complying with the Pope's desire, but a direct charge to the legates is not demonstrable. The imperial minority regarded the decree of transfer as not binding and remained at Trent. The long-existing tension led to a rupture just at the moment when the Council seemed to have assumed the function of restoring Church unity.

For, since the turn of the year 1546–47, a victory of the Emperor over the Schmalkaldic League was in prospect. The army of the League had had to evacuate South Germany, and several Free Cities, the Duke of

---

[18] *CT* X, 291, 826f.

[19] *CT* V, 1014f. On the author, see F. Pellegrini, *G. Fracastoro* (Verona 1948); H. Jedin, "Laientheologie im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung: Der Konzilsarzt Fracastoro," *TThZ* 64 (1955), 11–24.

Württemberg, and the Count Palatine had submitted to the Emperor. However, instead of now negotiating, as Paul III desired, with the still unconquered leaders of the League, the Elector Johann Friedrich of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, and their secret patron, France, Charles V aimed at total victory, which he obtained at Mühlberg on 24 April. In a brief of 22 January the Pope had ended his alliance with the Emperor and had recalled his troops. His aim in the war was the subjugation of the Protestants, not the revival of the imperial power in Germany and the consolidation of Charles V's universal monarchy. Considering the Spanish supremacy in Italy, it was not without reason that he feared becoming dependent upon Charles V. Incensed by this change in papal politics, the Emperor showered the Nuncio Verallo with reproaches.[20] The transfer of the Council to Bologna frustrated his great plan completely and wrecked the understanding laboriously established two years earlier between the two leaders on whom the plan depended. Charles demanded that the Pope annul the transfer of the Council, but the Pope refused on the ground that it was the business of the Council alone. However, the gathering in Bologna stipulated as a condition to any discussion of a return to Trent that first the minority that had remained there must submit to the decree of transfer and move to the new place of meeting. Finally, the personal relations of Paul III with the Emperor were irreparably contaminated when, on 10 September 1547, Pierluigi Farnese was murdered at Piacenza at the instigation of the imperial governor of Milan, Ferrante Gonzaga, and the city was occupied by imperial troops. Nevertheless both parties made serious efforts to avoid a complete break. The Pope allowed the Council at Bologna to discuss but not to publish any decree; the Emperor established a provisional ecclesiastical settlement for the Empire without the direct participation of the Pope but with his tacit toleration.

In the ninth session (21 April 1547) the Council had constituted itself officially at Bologna and during May the debate begun at Trent on the Eucharist had been resumed. But the eight canons on the Real Presence,[21] already completed, were not published in the tenth session (2 June) for the reason just mentioned. The same fate befell the canons discussed in June on the Sacrament of penance[22] and those on the anointing of the sick, holy orders, and matrimony, which engaged the general congregations and the then very prominent theological commission (*Praelati theologi*) during July, August, and September.[23] The Council theologians, whose number rose at times to eighty and never fell below fifty, were preoccupied with the doctrine of purgatory and indulgences in June and July, with the Sacrifice of the Mass in August. The reform commission appointed on 6 June drew up as a program for the discussion of reform the abuses in the administration of the Sacraments, and, after preparatory work in the commission of canonists, these abuses were debated in the plenary sessions during the autumn and winter (26 September 1547 to 30 January 1548).[24] On 28 November a new commission was formed to codify abuses in the celebration of Mass, in indulgences, and in religious Orders.[25] On 10 December two more commissions were appointed—one to compile a list of abuses on the part of the secular powers, the second to deal with other abuses not yet discussed.[26] But their assignments were not completed.

---

[20] Verallo's report of 7 February 1547, in *NBD* I, 9, 462–469.

[21] *CT* VI, 166f.

[22] *CT* VI, 196, 218f.

Though in its sessions at Bologna the Council did not issue a single reform decree, this period was important for almost all the subsequent decrees in that their topics were now for the first time thoroughly discussed. The view previously put forward at Trent, that the improvement of pastoral activity was the Council's central concern, was brought into clearer focus; once again the need to strengthen the position of the bishops was affirmed, and consideration was given to the arrangement of provincial and diocesan synods, the preparation of a catechism, and the liturgy.

After the Emperor's final move, through the dispatch of Cardinal Madruzzo to Rome to induce the Pope to restore the Council to Trent, had failed, he lodged a formal protest against the transfer in Bologna on 15 January 1548 and in Rome on 23 January. Imperial circles were already weighing the continuation of the Council by means of the minority that had remained in Trent.[27] To avoid the threatened schism, the Pope on 1 February decreed the suspension of discussions at Bologna and requested the Council to defend the legality of the transfer before a tribunal set up at Rome; the minority in Trent also received the invitation to send a deputation to Rome.[28] It declined. The deputies from Bologna were heard by the tribunal in the summer of 1548, but no verdict was reached.

---

[23] V. Heynck, "Contritio Vera. Zur Kontroverse über den Begriff der contritio vera auf der Bologneser Tagung des Trienter Konzils," *FStud* 33 (1951), 137–179; P. Fransen, "Ehescheidung im Falle von Ehebruch. Der fundamental theologisch-dogmatische Ertrag der Bologneser Verhandlungen von 1547," *Scholastik* 27 (1952), 526–556; *id.*, "Réflexions sur l'Anathème au Concile de Trente (Bologne 10–24 septembre 1547)," *ETbL* 29 (1953), 657–672.

[24] T. Freudenberger, "Der Kampf um die radikale Abschaffung der Stolgebühren während der Bologneser Periode des Trienter Konzils," *MTbZ* 1 (1950), 40–53.

[25] *CT* VI, 611.

[26] *CT* VI, 630.

[27] H. Jedin, "Der kaiserliche Protest gegen die Translation des Konzils von Trient nach Bologna," *HJ* 71 (1952), 184–196; F. de P. Sola, "Manuscritos Tridentinos en el Archivo de Protocolos de Barcelona," *Estudios historicos y documentos de los Archivos de Protocolos* 3 (Barcelona 1955).

Meanwhile, the Emperor had undertaken to settle the religious affairs of Germany, regardless of the Council, by means of the *Interim* of Augsburg and the "reform" simultaneously published for the Catholic estates. These were not authorized by the Pope, but their realization was indirectly furthered by him when he sent two reform nuncios to the Empire, Pighino and Lippomani, with extensive faculties for the reconciliation of Protestants. The *Interim* foundered on Protestant resistance. The Augsburg "reform" led to a series of provincial and diocesan synods but could effect no thorough Church renewal because the forces of regeneration were still too weak. The death of Paul III on 10 November 1549, however, opened up the prospect of reactivating the Council of Trent and hence of resuming the original "Great Plan."

Second Period of Sessions

Though the new Pope, Julius III, had, as Council president, brought about the transfer to Bologna, he conceded to the Emperor the return of the Council to Trent on the assumption that the Protestant estates, in conformity with the Recess of the Diet of 30 June 1548, would submit to it. The assumption proved to be wrong, for their submission, given under pressure of military defeat, was bound up with two conditions: that the Council should not be under the Pope's direction and that it should reopen for discussion the doctrinal decrees promulgated during the first period of sessions, taking as a starting point the Protestant principle of Scripture. The Emperor and even the Pope, who was at first inadequately informed of this state of affairs, acted as though an unconditional surrender were at hand. The Bull "Cum ad Tollenda" of 14 November 1550, reconvoking the Council to Trent, maintained the view held by the Curia that the transfer had been legitimate by speaking of "resuming" (*reductio*), but at the same time it met the Emperor halfway by designating the new meeting at Trent as a "continuation" of the earlier. France, having recognized the transfer, declined to participate.

The Legate Marcellus Crescenzio, in association with co-presidents Pighino and Lippomani, who were previously active in Germany as reform nuncios, opened the meeting on the appointed day, 1 May 1551, but discussions did not get under way until September. The character of the gathering differed from the earlier one, for the imperial minority, which had held out in Trent after the transfer, had been increased during the fall and winter by thirteen bishops from Germany and Switzerland, including the three Ecclesiastical Electors,[29] and the previous predominance of the Italians had been broken. Among the Council theologians there were now present, in addition to the great Spaniards (D. Soto, M. Cano, and A. de Castro), representatives of the University of Louvain (R. Tapper, Hessels, and Ravesteyn) and the German theologians Johann Gropper, Eberhard Billick, and Ambrosius Pelargus. And, above all, there appeared for the first and only time ambassadors of the Protestant imperial estates: Brandenburg, Württemberg, Strasbourg, and Electoral Saxony, among them the historian Johannes Sleidanus.

---

[28] *CT* VI, 739ff.

The ten articles on the Eucharist which were submitted on 2 September were related to the articles of Trent of 3 February 1547, rather than to the canons formulated in Bologna, but, thanks to the preliminary work accomplished in Bologna and to the complete agreement on this article of faith, the debate was relatively brief (particular congregations of 8 to 16 September and general congregations of 21 September to 10 October). The decree on the Eucharist was soon ready for promulgation; it was accepted on 11 October 1551, in the thirteenth session.[30] It defined the Real Presence and the notion of transubstantiation as suitable (*aptissime*) for designating the substantial change and condemned the teaching that Christ is present only at the moment of reception. A decision in regard to communion under both species was deferred.

Likewise, the twelve articles on the Sacrament of penance and the four on the anointing of the sick were not identical with the Bologna canons. Debate occurred in particular congregations from 20 to 30 October, in general congregations from 6 to 15 November. Contrary to Luther's teaching that penance consists in a recalling of baptism and is essentially a penitential attitude, the Council defined penance as a Sacrament, consisting of three elements: contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Confession of all serious sins committed after baptism is required by divine law, and priestly absolution is a judicial act. The anointing of the sick is no mere ceremony adapted for the relief of those who are ill, but a Sacrament instituted by Christ and promulgated by the Apostle James. As in the case of the Eucharist, the Canons relative to penance were complemented by a "doctrina," but only at the last moment.

---

[29] More precise information on the German participants in Schreiber, II, 1–265, 295ff.; H. Ries, "Vorboten und Gefolge des Kurfürsten Johann V. von Trier auf seinem Zug zum Konzil von Trient im Sommer 1551," *TThZ* 60 (1951), 281–289. A list of the documents and books taken to the Council by Archbishop Heusenstamm of Mainz, published by A. Bruck in *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 301–310; H. Jedin, "Das konziliare Reformprogramm Friedrich Nauseas," *HJ* 77 (1958), 229–253.

[30] *CT* VII, 111–229.

Less satisfactory was the progress of the discussions on reform. The reform decree of Session XIII regulated the successive appeals in criminal trials; that of Session XIV amended the law on ordination and appointment (Chapters 12 and 13 governed the *patronatus*). Spaniards and Germans agreed that reform was not being adequately pursued. When the Bishop of Verdun complained that the conferring of monasteries *in commendam* was not being entirely abolished, Crescenzio rebuked him so sharply that the Archbishop of Cologne blurted out, "Is this still a free Council?"[31] In December and January, during the debates on the Mass and holy orders, the negotiations with the ambassadors of the Protestant imperial estates, which were conducted by means of the imperial representatives, Count Montfort and Francisco de Toledo, made no progress. The envoys of Württemberg and Electoral Saxony were received in the general congregation of 24 January 1552, and on the next day, in the fifteenth session, obtained the amended safe-conduct that they had demanded. But a theological discussion failed to materialize, for the Protestants insisted on their earlier stipulations relative to recognizing the Council. "For both sides," said Bizer,[32] "it is clearly a question of principle, in which to yield would have meant to surrender."

At the same moment there arrived alarming reports concerning the military activity of the Elector Maurice of Saxony, who was allied to France. The German archbishops took their departure, the Legate Crescenzio fell gravely ill, and the suspension of the Council seemed inevitable. But the Emperor, approached for instructions by his envoys at the Council, strenuously resisted any admission that his great plan had definitely collapsed and commanded that the suspension be opposed.[33] When the rebel princes took the initiative in April and compelled the Emperor to flee from Innsbruck, no alternative remained. On 28 April 1552, in the sixteenth session, the Council decided to adjourn indefinitely. After the dissolution a Spaniard wrote, with resignation: The suspension has revealed the futility of the Council; neither have the heresies that arose in Germany and elsewhere been liquidated, nor has the Church been reformed, nor has peace been restored among Christian princes.[34] Disappointment obstructed the view of what had really been achieved, but it was incontestable that the Council presented itself as a torso: Its doctrinal decrees embraced only a part of the disputed teachings, the reform decrees eliminated some but in no sense the most crying abuses, and they had no binding force, because they had not yet been confirmed by the Pope.

---

[31] *CT* XI, 710, 713.

[32] Bizer, *Confessio Virttembergica,* p. 40.

[33] Instruction for the treasurer Vargas and the Emperor's reply of 17 February in *CT* XI, 994–1003.

---

[34] H. Jedin, "Ein spanischer Epilog zur zweiten Tagungsperiode des Konzils von Trient," *Gr* 31 (1950), 100–113.

CHAPTER 36

The Breakthrough of the Catholic Reform (*1551–59*)

The decade 1549–59 witnessed the breakthrough of the Catholic Reform in Rome. In 1555 two of its leaders mounted the Throne of Peter in rapid succession.

Julius III, as nephew of Cardinal Antonio Del Monte, who was much esteemed under Leo X and Clement VII, had risen high in the curial career and was an outstanding canonist. After a long conclave (29 November 1549 to 7 February 1550) he was elected as a result of an understanding between Cardinals Guise and Alessandro Farnese, after the zealous reformer Pole, one of the Emperor's candidates, had failed by one vote to obtain the required two-thirds majority. Though not inclined toward the Emperor, he necessarily promoted the imperial policy in restoring the Council to Trent. Furthermore, he was impelled to the Emperor's side by the war against Ottavio Farnese, who refused to surrender the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza to the Church and was supported by France. When both undertakings had miscarried, Julius declared his official neutrality in the struggle for Siena, which broke out in the summer of 1552 on the expulsion of its Spanish garrison. But the two peace envoys, sent in the spring of 1553—Dandino to the Emperor, Capodiferro to Henry II—accomplished nothing. The Sienese, supported by France, lost their freedom to Cosimo I of Florence, and Spanish predominance in Italy was finally consolidated. The Pope came to terms with it, on the advice of Dandino, favorable to France, and of Ricci, inclined to the imperial side. Ricci had undertaken the virtually impossible task of rescuing the finances from the chaos produced by the *nepoti* policy of Paul III. The costly Parma War and the preparations for the defense of the Papal State, rendered necessary by the Siena War, deepened the financial distress. Just the same, the Pope laid out a sumptuous villa before the Porta del Popolo and eagerly superintended its construction.

The most important event of his pontificate, the Catholic Restoration in England, fell into Julius III's lap without his participation. On 19 July 1553, Mary, daughter of Catherine of Aragon, was proclaimed Queen of England. Resolved from the start to lead the nation back to the Roman obedience, she proceeded cautiously in the question of religion, advised by her cousin, Charles V, and mindful of the strong opposition she had to overcome even after her accession. The religious laws of Edward VI were repealed, Catholic worship was restored, and on 1 April 1554 Bishop Gardiner, whom she had appointed Lord Chancellor, consecrated six bishops to replace those deposed. The Queen herself applied to the Pope for their confirmation.

But Cardinal Pole, named as Papal Legate, was not permitted to set foot in England until the end of November 1554, after the marriage arranged by the Emperor of Charles V's son Philip to Mary had taken place. On 30 November 1554, the legate solemnly pronounced the absolution from schism in the presence of the Queen and Parliament. Demands for the return of alienated Church property were dispensed with and the current holders were confirmed in possession on 24 December. The Provincial Council of Canterbury, presided over by Pole (4 November 1555 to 10 February 1556), was to institute the rebuilding of the Church in England and was in accord with the spirit of the Catholic Reform in its concern for obliging bishops to reside in their dioceses and to preach, the organizing of groups of preachers to take the place of the mendicants, and the decree on the founding of seminaries for boys, which became the direct model of the Tridentine decree on seminaries.

The task of reconstruction was hampered by the fact that half the bishops in office had been compromised by the schism, that there were not enough priests on hand, and above all that after twenty years of schism a great part of the faithful were estranged from the papacy and Catholic worship. The acts of the visitations of the dioceses of Lincoln and Canterbury make clear how thoroughly the Catholic tradition had been liquidated—as late as 1557 sixty churches in the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury had no crucifix at the high altar.[1] The judicial proceedings against schismatics and Protestants, normally instituted by the secular judge, frequently aroused popular resentment, because a number of the ecclesiastical judges themselves had cooperated with the earlier system. Among the 273 persons put to death were, it seems very likely, many Anabaptists, who had been persecuted by the Anglican Church as well as by the Catholic Church. The flight of Protestant-minded preachers to the continent, from fear of the Queen, prepared the collapse of the restoration.

---

[1] W. Sharp–L. E. Whatmore, *Archdeacon Harpsfield's Visitations 1557* (London 1950f.).

The most pressing, but so far deferred, task of the papacy continued to be the reform of the Roman Curia. In the autumn of 1550 Julius III had summoned to Rome three resolute members of the reform party, Cervini, Pole, and Morone, and through them, and a little later through still other cardinals, he expanded the reform commission which had been formed soon after his election. But, like Paul III, he had not carried out his original purpose of anticipating the impending reconstitution of the Council by a papal reform of the Curia. On the suspension of the Council there emerged the plan of entrusting the reform to an international gathering of bishops who were to meet in Rome. But because of the opposition raised by the Emperor's faction it was dropped.[2] Still, during the winter of 1552–53, Cervini and Maffei pushed so zealously the reform of the conclave, the consistory, the *Signatura,* and the Sacred Penitentiary, taking into consideration old and new opinions, that Andreas Masius, agent of the Duke of Cleves, expected the "reformation of the Roman Court in a few days."[3] The Tridentine reform decrees, completed by a "reform of the princes" and modified in several points, were to be put in force by a great reform bull.

The driving force sprang out of events in Spain and Portugal, where many bishops, supported by the secular powers, were beginning to carry out certain reform decrees of the Council, notably Chapter 4 of Session VI concerning the visitation of exempt capitulars, though these still lacked papal confirmation and hence were without the force of law. The Pope reacted with great firmness. On 15 January 1554 he referred the King of Portugal to the forthcoming reform bull; in Spain he intervened in favor of the exempt cathedral canons of León, Astorga, Segovia, and Calahorra and categorically demanded that the bishops withdraw the orders issued against them.[4] He thereby rejected the view that conciliar decrees possessed validity as "directives of the Holy Spirit for the good of souls" without papal confirmation and at the same time squarely faced the Erastian tendency to play them off against the papacy. In the introduction to the projected reform bull (spring of 1554) was expressed the intention of conferring the force of law through it on the conciliar decrees together with the newly drafted reform chapters. The bull was submitted to the cardinals for their consideration at the beginning of December 1554,[5] but before it could be given a final polishing Julius III died on 23 March 1555.

---

[2] For the view of the Spanish diplomat Francis Vargas against this plan, see *CT* XIII/1, 178–182.

[3] M. Lossen, *Briefe von Andreas Masius* (Leipzig 1886), p. 119.

[4] In addition to the evidence in *HJ* 54 (1934), 411ff., cf. C. Gutiérez, "Una edición española en 1553 de los decretos conciliares tridentinos," *EE* 28 (1954), 73–105.

Seripando's judgment, that Julius neither promised nor achieved Church reform ("nec dixit nec fecit"), sprang from the disappointment of a reform zealot, but it is too severe.[6] Numerous notes in the acts of reform, in the Pope's own hand, testify to his personal interest. Among the twenty cardinals he created were such splendid men as Puteo, Dandino, Bertano, and the Pope's nephew, Nobili, but there was also the totally unworthy adopted son of his brother Baldovino, Innocenzo Del Monte. Julius had encouraged reform bishops by grants of full apostolic authority. At the beginning of 1554 he issued a list of only fourteen bishops who, needed for service in the Curia, were permitted to remain in Rome; the others were to go to their dioceses. But to reform circles these measures seemed inadequate; they expected more.

On the death of Julius III the reform party proved to be strong enough to take advantage of the approximately equal balance between the two political factions in the College of Cardinals and thus to secure the tiara for one of their own. Neither the imperialists nor the French could expect to rally the two-thirds majority for one of their candidates. Furthermore, the leading candidate of the French, Ippolito d'Este, who was wholly a Renaissance figure, damaged rather than promoted his own candidacy through his intrigues. Hence the imperialist faction, led by Sforza, contrived to carry the election, after a four days' conclave (6–10 April 1555), of the most ardent of all the reform cardinals, Cervini, who was all along acceptable to the French.

Marcellus Cervini, born at Montepulciano near Siena in 1501, was a Christian humanist and patristic scholar, and as tutor of Paul III's nephews had been raised to the purple as early as 1539. Though not in continuous residence, he had conscientiously cared for his sees (first Nicastro, then Reggio-Emilia, and finally Gubbio). As legate at the Council he had retained the Pope's confidence, even after he had fallen out with Alessandro Farnese over the latter's unscrupulous family politics. In his decision not to change his name and to be known as Marcellus II is discerned his wish to remain as Pope what he had been before. In a suggestion for his administration, which he had solicited, appeared the deeply moving sentence: "For twenty years people have talked about reform and openly admitted that it is necessary, but nothing has resulted."[7] Marcellus II was resolved to take vigorous action; hence he is the first Pope of the Catholic Reform. His directives to the *Signatura* and the Penitentiary to render no decisions until the reform bull should appear demonstrate his firm will to act. But he died on 30 April, "shown rather than given" to the Church. However, the breakthrough had been achieved.

---

[5] For the final redaction of the Bull "Varietas Temporum," with the views of the cardinals, see *CT* XIII/1, 291–312.

[6] *CT* II, 449; cf. H. Jedin, *Seripando* II (Würzburg 1937), 34f.

In the next conclave (14–23 May 1555) the same constellation within the College of Cardinals produced a similar result. The election of Puteo, pushed by the imperialists, misfired and in his place was chosen a declared enemy of the Spaniards, the dean of the College, Gian Pietro Carafa, a man of irreproachable life but dreaded for his severity. Paul IV, born in 1476, belonged to one of the great baronial houses of the Kingdom of Naples. Through the efforts of his uncle, Oliviero Carafa, of decisive influence in the reform deliberations under Alexander VI, he had obtained as early as 1505 the archiepiscopal see of Chieti and had discharged the duties of nuncio in England and Spain. Then, having renounced his benefices, he had founded the Theatine Order with Cajetan of Thiene. A judgment drawn up in Venice in 1532 on defense against Protestantism in Italy and certain proposals of the "Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia," notably with regard to the establishment of the Roman Inquisition, presented his radical views, wholly different from the thought of the humanistic reform movement.

Despite his advanced age the tall, ascetic, but passionate Neapolitan was in full possession of his physical and mental powers. Profoundly conscious of the majesty of his office and an adherent of the papal theory in its most extreme form, an autocrat by character and conviction, he abandoned the political neutrality maintained by his predecessors and sought, without regard to the changed situation, to rule Christendom after the manner of a Pope of the High Middle Ages. The unilateral nature of his reform measures, curiously incompatible with his blind nepotism, lessened their efficacy and provoked a reaction harmful to the progress of the Catholic Reform.

By family tradition and his own observations a violent opponent of Spanish rule in Naples and of Spanish ascendancy in Italy, he permitted himself to be led into an alliance with France and a war against Spain by Carlo Carafa, his energetic and ambitious, but morally worthless nephew. The war laid bare the military and political impotence of the Papal State, led to defeat near Paliano, and ended with the Peace of Cave on 12 September 1557. When England entered the war against

---

[7] *CT* XIII/1, 315. G. M. Monti, *Studi sulla Riforma Cattolica,* pp. 38ff., attributes the memorandum to an unknown Theatine.

France on the side of the Emperor, Paul deprived Pole of his position as legate for England and replaced him with the Franciscan Petow, who, however, declined the post.

The death on 17 November 1558 of Pole and of Mary the Catholic and the accession of Elizabeth I brought a sudden end to the Catholic Restoration in England. Though long since determined to renew the schism, the new Queen deferred the break with Rome until her throne was firm. In February 1559 she recalled her ambassador from Rome, on 23 March the bill concerning the royal supremacy—with "head" replaced by "governor of the Church of England"—was accepted against the opposition of the bishops, especially of Archbishop Heath of York, and in the summer of 1559 the Anglican liturgy was reintroduced. All the bishops, except the Bishop of Llandaff, refused to recognize the new establishment and were deposed. But still Paul IV pronounced no ecclesiastical censure on Elizabeth.

The situation of the Church in Poland was likewise threatened. The Nuncio Luigi Lippomani found the existence of Catholicism in great danger, for a part of the higher nobility, headed by Prince Radziwill, were Protestant-minded, the greater number of the bishops, apart from such praiseworthy exceptions as the Primate Dzierskowski of Gniezno, were compliant or even, like Bishop Uchanski of Chelmno, suspected of leaning toward Protestantism, and King Sigismund Augustus was powerless. The royal demands for the marriage of priests, the lay chalice, Mass in the vernacular, and a national council were flatly rejected by the Pope. A provincial council held in Lowicz banished, at least for the moment, the danger of a national council. At the Diet of Petrikow (1558) Lippomani's successor, Mentuato, in whose retinue was Peter Canisius, managed to prevent the issuing of resolutions directed against the Catholic religion but not to stop the continuation of Protestant propaganda. The Pope had to be content with appealing to the King's conscience through a letter of admonition.

In Germany the Protestant estates of the Augsburg Confession gained recognition by imperial law through the Religious Peace of Augsburg of 25 September 1555. To replace the Nuncio Delfino, who had been recalled to Rome, the Pope had sent Lippomani to Augsburg with instructions to do all in his power to prevent the ratification of the Peace of Passau. Since the Emperor was known to be opposed to the Passau concessions, the nuncio sought to induce him to restrict the power transferred to his brother Ferdinand. These measures were inadequate. That the Pope misjudged the situation of the Church in Germany in general as well as the significance of the Religious Peace is made clear by his charge to the Nuncio Delfino, returning to Germany, to induce King

Ferdinand I and the Duke of Bavaria to withdraw their consent. The expected papal protest was not lodged.[8] The Pope's exasperation with the Habsburg brothers was so intense already in 1556 that their deposition was discussed in all seriousness. When, following his brother's abdication, Ferdinand I had himself crowned at Frankfurt and assumed the title of "Roman Emperor elect," without having obtained the Pope's consent or even having admitted the Nuncio Antonio Agustín, Bishop of Alife, to the election proceedings, the Pope denied him recognition, alleging as his reason, derived from medieval canon law, that both the resignation of Charles V and the election of Ferdinand I were subject to papal scrutiny, and that the election was invalid because of the participation of three Protestant Electors.[9] Before Ferdinand I was able to refer the quarrel to the Diet of Augsburg and thereby introduce into a totally changed world the medieval struggle between *Sacerdotium* and *Regnum,* the Pope died.

As in politics, so also in the ecclesiastical sphere Paul IV followed paths different from those of his predecessors. For him the resumption of the Council of Trent was out of the question. Instead of taking up the almost completed reform bull of Julius III, he appointed a commission of some sixty cardinals, bishops, and curial officials in the spring of 1556 and considered settling, by a doctrinal decree on the question of simony, the theological considerations which under Paul III had served as a pretext for impeding the reform of the *Dataria,* the chief item in the reform of the Curia;[10] a later expansion of the commission into a papal council, on the model of the Fifth Lateran Council, was contemplated. At the same time three newly created cardinals, Scotti, Rebiba and Reumano—all in the Pope's confidence—were entrusted with the reform of the *Dataria,* and a new *Datarius* was named who seemed to give promise of finally realizing the reform of this office. But the outbreak of the Carafa War interrupted the execution of these projects, and after the Peace of Cave they were not taken up again.

The Theatines Scotti and Isacchino and the papal librarian Sirleto busied themselves at the Pope's orders with the reform of the breviary and the missal, an old concern of Paul IV and the Theatines. The reformed breviary compiled by Cardinal Quiñones, known as the "Holy Cross Breviary" from his titular church of Santa Croce and consisting almost exclusively of Scriptural texts, was forbidden.[11] In time the Pope proceeded ever more exclusively to extirpate with Draconian severity the grievances against which he had earlier inveighed in vain, above all to check the advance of Protestantism through stern measures of repression.

---

[8] J. Grisar, "Die Stellung der Päpste zum Reichstag und Religionsfrieden von Augsburg 1555," *StdZ,* 156 (1955), 440–462, regards a condemnation of the Religious Peace, pronounced in the Consistory of 22 August 1556 as equivalent to a protest.

[9] Cf. J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, "La renuncia de Carlos V y la elección de Fernando de Austria," *Scriptorium Victoriense,* 7 (1960), 7–78, 207–283.

[10] Acts in *CT,* XIII/1, 327–364; also *RQ* 43 (1935), 128–156.

The presenting of monasteries to secular clerics *in commendam* was forbidden. Severe penalties were visited on "apostates," religious who had abandoned the common life without authorization or with a surreptitiously obtained indult. Any who were apprehended in Rome were taken into custody. Public immorality and acts of violence, once an everyday occurrence, were suppressed by excessively severe decrees of the governor of the city. Renaissance Rome changed its image. In an effort to impose a halt to the spread of Protestantism, at least where the Church's arm reached, Paul created and sharpened two weapons: the Index of Forbidden Books and the Inquisition.

The preventive censorship prescribed by the Fifth Lateran Council had proved to be ineffective. State as well as ecclesiastical authorities began, in view of the annually swelling flood of publications of the religious innovators, to forbid books that had already appeared, individually or by drawing up lists. Between 1544 and 1556 the Sorbonne published four such catalogs; the most painstaking was that of the theological faculty of Louvain, issued at the Emperor's command in 1546. The Louvain catalog contained a list of forbidden versions of the Bible in Latin, Greek, German, and French, an alphabetically arranged index of Latin books, and finally lists of German and French books. Because of its rich contents it was adopted and expanded by the Spanish Inquisition in 1551. For Venice the Nuncio Giovanni della Casa had drawn up a similar catalog in 1549. On 21 December 1558, Paul IV withdrew all previously granted licenses for the reading of forbidden books, commanded that they be surrendered, and the next year published the first Papal Index of Forbidden Books. In arrangement and content it was modeled on the Louvain catalog, but in severity it far surpassed it. In addition to the writings of the reformers, all the works of Erasmus, whatever their content, were forbidden, all works on occult sciences (palmistry, geomancy, etc.), all publications issued in the preceding forty years without the name of the author or publisher, and finally, regardless of content, all products of sixty-one printers specified by name, fourteen of whom were from Basel alone.[12] The great majority of editions of the Bible and of the Fathers fell under the prohibition, and many scholars saw themselves deprived of their scientific tools. From Germany Peter Canisius wrote: "Even the best Catholics disapprove of such rigor."[13]

---

[11] J. A. Jungmann, "Warum ist das Reformbrevier des Kardinals Quiñonez gescheitert?" *ZKTh* 78 (1956), 98–107.

[12] Text in H. Reusch, *Die Indices Librorum prohibitorum des 16. Jh.* (reprint, Nieuwkoop 1961), pp. 176–208, preceded by the most important earlier lists; M. Scaduto, "Lainez e l'Indice del 1559," *AHSI* 24 (1955), 3–32.

Almost passionately the Pope addressed himself to the improvement of the Roman Inquisition.[14] It acquired precedence over all other offices and its general delegate Ghislieri had the same powers as the cardinals of the Inquisition. Its jurisdiction was extended to embrace moral lapses of the greatest variety. The doctrinal tribunal became a bureau of morals. Death sentences were passed more frequently than before, and no one was safe. Cardinal Morone, highly meritorious because of Church reform and the Council, was cast into the Castel Sant'Angelo on suspicion of heresy. As time went on, the Pope's interest was more exclusively focused on the Inquisition, whose sessions he never missed.

The Pope was rudely aroused from the most serious self-deception when, early in 1559, the Theatine Isacchino apprised him of the scandalous doings of his nephews, the Cardinal Carlo Carafa and his brother, who, following the downfall of the Colonna, had been made Duke of Paliano. Paul IV banished them from Rome, but the moral damage could not be repaired. He had refused to pay any heed to the wishes of the great powers in his creations of cardinals. But the more he had enriched the college with such distinguished men as Ghislieri, the Theatines Rebiba and Reumano, and his great-nephew Alfonso Carafa, so much the more flagrant appeared the crimes of his nephews.

The Pope was lacking in moderation. He took such pains with the nomination of bishops that in October 1558 no fewer than fifty-eight sees were vacant. The undeniable tightening of all ecclesiastical standards, noticeable, for example, in the dispensation procedures of the *Signatura,*[15] was a great forward step on the road of Catholic Reform, but the narrow-mindedness and harshness of his measures and his prolonged blindness in regard to his nephews made his pontificate a great disappointment. After his death (18 August 1559) the repressed hatred for the Pope and his family exploded in the destruction of the headquarters of the Inquisition and the abuse of his statue on the Capitol.

[13] *P. Canisii Epp. et Acta,* ed. O. Braunsberger, II, 377; an instruction for the drawing up of the Index, issued in February 1559, edited by A. Mercati in *Miscellanea Hist. Pont.* 19 (Rome 1945), 95–102.

[14] The Jesuit Bobadilla had recommended this reorganization; cf. P. Leturia, "Los recuerdos presentados por el Jesuita Bobadilla al recién elegido Paulo IV," *Miscellanea A. De Meyer* II (Louvain 1946), 855–869.

[15] Examples in *RQ* 42 (1934), 311–332. According to a statement of the Venetian Ambassador Soranzo, the revenues of the *Dataria* dropped as a consequence from between 30,000 and 40,000 ducats per month to 6,000: E. Alberi, *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti* II, 4, 87.

The success of the reform movement in the papal elections of 1555 did not yet mean definitive victory over the crisis. The apostasy was making apparently irresistible progress. England was about to be lost to the papacy once more. The Religious Peace of Augsburg had been concluded in the Empire. In France and Poland the position of the Church was shaky. She still held her own, unchallenged, only in the two southern peninsulas, thanks to the support furnished by the secular arm. But the very relations of the papacy with Spain, which became the leading European power in the Peace of Câteau-Cambrésis in 1559 between Spain, England, and France and regarded itself as the protector of the Church, were almost ruptured. Only one relatively small remnant of the Western Christian Family of Nations felt itself bound with its head. The Catholic Reform had now reached this head; the resumption and conclusion of the Council of Trent enabled it to embrace the members.

CHAPTER 37

Pius IV and the Conclusion of the Council of Trent

The first two periods of the Council of Trent were occasioned by the German religious split and were oriented to it. Their dogmatic decrees were the reply of the Church's teaching authority to the doctrinal concepts of Luther and Zwingli and the ecclesiastical communities based on them. Their reform decrees were an as yet inadequate endeavor to meet the Protestant Reformation with a Catholic Reform. Politically, both sittings constituted a part of the great plan, projected by Emperor Charles V and approved and supported by Paul III and Julius III, of rendering the German Protestants impotent. The third and final period of the Council was motivated by ecclesiastical events in France, where Calvinism seemed about to gain for itself the most heavily populated country of the West, the one that had been the intellectual leader into the late Middle Ages. Had this goal been achieved, the Catholic Church would have been definitely confined to the two southern peninsulas of Europe.

After a dramatically developing conclave of over three months (5 September to 26 December 1559), in which the three about evenly matched factions of Spanish, French, and Carafa cardinals confronted one another, the Milanese Gianangelo Medici, candidate of Duke Cosimo of Florence, was elected. Pius IV, who had been employed mostly in the administration of the Papal State and made a cardinal by Paul III in 1549, was not an outstanding politician, and in his entire previous career he had not belonged to the reform party. His closest adviser was Cardinal Morone, just liberated from Sant'Angelo, and in matters of high politics he usually followed the counsels of the crafty Duke Cosimo, who had come to terms with the Spanish power in Italy. Affairs of government were conducted by the Pope himself and not by his still youthful nephew, Carlo Borromeo, whom he elevated to the cardinalate on 31 January 1560. It was not until after the death of his brother Federigo on 19 November 1562, which profoundly affected him, that Carlo became the chief promoter of reform at the papal court. The Pope's "new course" implied a break with the Carafa regime and a return to the Church policies of Paul III and Julius III. Yielding to the bitterness against the Carafas, he had proceedings instituted against Cardinal Carlo Carafa and his brother, the Duke of Paliano, and had them put to death on 5 March 1561. Numerous repressive measures of Paul IV were annulled and the paths laid out by his predecessors were again followed. Not a reform assembly at Rome but the continuation of the still suspended Council of Trent lay in the administrative program of the new Pope.

His very first contacts with the great powers made it clear that two basically different views confronted each other. Philip II of Spain, undeniably the mightiest monarch in Europe since the Peace of Câteau-Cambrésis, regarded the envisaged Council as the continuation of the two earlier sittings, whose decrees, even though they had not yet been ratified by the Pope, might not be changed. The Emperor and France, on the other hand, wanted a new council: Ferdinand I, out of regard for the German Protestants, who feared a continuation of Trent would endanger the permanence of the Religious Peace of Augsburg; France, in the hope of finding in a new council, in default of other means, a settlement with the rising Huguenot faction. The Bull of Convocation, "Ad ecclesiae regimen," of 29 November 1560,[1] favored the first view by referring to the lifting of the suspension, without excluding the second in using the expression "announcement" (*indictio*). None of the parties was satisfied and all hesitated in accepting the bull.

The Protestant estates, meeting at Naumburg, gave the Nuncio Commendone another flat refusal. Ferdinand I replied ambiguously to the Nuncio Delfino, who had been sent to him and to South Germany, and in this he was supported by France, where, since the death of Francis II and the downfall of the Guises, the Queen Mother, Catherine de Médicis, was acting as regent for her second son, Charles IX. This niece of Clement VII, to maintain herself in power, was playing off the two religious factions and their political exponents against each other and, advised by the Chancellor Michel de L'Hôpital, was seeking an accommodation. While as yet no definitive acceptance had been given by the powers, the Pope in February and March 1561 named five legates for the Council: the highly cultured and politically experienced Ercole Gonzaga, who in the last conclave had come close to gaining the tiara; the canonist Puteo; the one-time general of the Augustinians, Seripando, now Archbishop of Salerno; Stanislaus Hosius, expert in controversial theology, Bishop of Warmia, and nuncio to the Emperor; and the curial canonist Ludovico Simonetta, who possessed the Pope's full confidence. Later the papal nephew Sittich von Hohenems was substituted for the ailing Puteo.

---

[1] *CT* VIII, 104–107.

Though Gonzaga and Seripando were in Trent from 16 April 1561, it was not certain that the Council would actually meet until the autumn. To be sure, Philip II, once he had obtained the Pope's assurance in a secret brief of 17 July that the Council was to be regarded as the continuation of the earlier sittings, had commanded the Spanish bishops to prepare for the journey. And Ferdinand I had finally promised to appoint envoys. But events in France decided the issue. The assembly of the clergy at Poissy in August–September 1561—really a national council—and the religious discussion there with the Calvinists under the leadership of Theodore Beza made clear the danger of the country gradually drifting toward Calvinism. The Pope did not allow himself to be deceived by the palliating reports of the Cardinal Legate Hippolytus d'Este and exerted himself to have the Italian bishops go to the Council. The first Spaniards also made their appearance at the end of the year. It was possible to have the opening on 18 January 1562, in the presence of 109 cardinals and bishops, four abbots, and four generals of Orders. Compared with this numerous gathering, said Seripando, the opening session of 1545 was like that of a diocesan synod.

The legates endeavored to put aside the continuing controversy concerning the relationship to the earlier sittings by submitting on 11 March twelve reform articles which were inspired by a memorandum of some of the Italian bishops.[2] Article 1 took up the still unsettled problem of the duty of residence; in the meantime a vigorous literary controversy concerning its basis had blazed forth.[3] In the course of the debate, which began on 7 April a minority, consisting of Spaniards and reform-zealous Italians, declared that the obligation of residence on the part of the bishops is of divine law and hence not an object of the Pope's dispensing power. The other side vigorously attacked this *ius divinum* argument as prejudicial to the papal primacy. When the legates brought this main point to a vote in the general congregation of 20 April, sixty-seven Fathers expressed themselves in favor of the *ius divinum,* thirty-five against it, and thirty-four left the decision to the Pope.[4] Alarmed by the reports of the Legate Simonetta, the Pope on 11 May forbade the continuation of the debate on residence, rebuked Gonzaga and Seripando for opening the question, and considered recalling them.

---

[2] *CT* VIII, 378f. The ninety-three Italian reform articles in *CT* XIII/1, 607–612. L. Castano, "Pio IV e la Curia Romana di fronte al dibattito tridentino sulla residenza," *Miscell. Hist. Pont.* 7 (1943), n. 12.

[3] The Dominicans B. Carranza and D. Soto, following Cajetan, and the future Jesuit Francis Torres spoke in favor of the *ius divinum;* opposed were A. Catharinus and T. Campeggio. A collection of all relevant treatises appeared at Venice in two volumes in 1562; cf. *CT,* XIII/1, 655.

The "residence crisis," basically a crisis of confidence among the legates and in their relations with the Pope, produced a rather long standstill in the conciliar discussions. In the nineteenth session on 14 May the Council received the "orators" of the King of Spain, the Republic of Venice, and Duke Cosimo; in the twentieth session on 4 June, the ambassadors of France and of the Catholic Swiss cantons. Those of the Emperor had been in Trent since spring. On 6 July these last presented to the legates the Emperor's carefully prepared reform project, which, among other things, asked for the grant of the chalice to the laity and the marriage of priests.[5] The conciliar discussions again got under way only after Gonzaga had held out the prospect of a resumption of the debate on residence in connection with the consideration of holy orders. The Pope dropped his plan of recalling the two senior legates but never again gave them his full confidence. The conciliar crisis had not really been overcome, but only postponed.

The decision for the continuation, which the Spanish Ambassador Pescara had again demanded, was actually made through the decree of the twenty-first session, 16 July 1562, on Communion under both species;[6] it reflected the Eucharistic decree of 1551. The petition for the grant of the lay chalice, now supported by Duke Albrecht of Bavaria,[7] was referred to the Pope after a long debate and over the strong opposition of the Imperial Ambassador, Bishop Draskovich of Pécs.

In the succeeding debate on the sacrificial character of the Mass, its relationship to the Sacrifice of the Cross was worked out. The chief point of controversy was whether the Last Supper was a propitiatory sacrifice. The "August draft,"[8] submitted on 6 August, suppressed the passage on the subject in the schema of 1552. But as the opponents of this doctrine—including Seripando, the Archbishops of Granada and Braga, and the Bishop of Modena—continued to constitute a minority in the debate, it was restored in the "September draft" and passed into the definitive wording of the decree on the Mass, which was approved in the twenty-second session on 17 September 1562.[9] The Sacrifice of the Mass is the reenacting and recalling of the Sacrifice of the Cross and the applying of its fruits, a propitiatory offering for the living and the dead, offered by the same Christ who offered the Sacrifice of the Cross (*una eademque hostia, idem nunc offerens*) but by means of priests and performed in a different manner. The Canon of the Mass is free of error. It is allowed to celebrate Mass in honor of the saints, though of course the Sacrifice is offered to God alone. Private Masses are lawful, and the use of the vernacular in the Mass is not practicable (*non expedire*). A corresponding reform decree abolished some of the many abuses listed by a conciliar commission.[10] The second reform decree of Session XXII was directed against abuses in the diocesan sphere but it did not seriously take into account the reform memoranda which the Spanish and Portuguese bishops had been submitting since spring nor the Emperor's reform project.[11] The ambassadors accredited to the Council by the secular powers, except those sent by Venice and Florence, entered a protest with the legates on 16 September against the prevailing manner of handling the question of reform.

---

[4] S. Ehses, "Eine bewegte Abstimmung auf dem Konzil von Trient," *Miscellanea Franz Ehrle* III (Rome 1924), 224–234.

[5] *CT,* XIII/1, 661–685.

[6] *CT,* VIII, 698ff.

[7] A. Knöpfler, *Die Kelchbewegung in Bayern unter Herzog Albrecht V* (Munich 1891), pp. 106ff.

[8] The August draft in *CT* VIII, 751–755; the September draft, *CT* VIII, 909–912.

The lingering crisis of the Council became acute when on 13 November Charles de Guise, the "Cardinal of Lorraine," arrived in Trent with thirteen French bishops. After a briefing on the position of the conciliar business he espoused the side of the opposition and became its leader. The discussions initiated on the Sacrament of holy orders in the general congregation of 13 October and the new decree on residence,[12] submitted on 6 November, converged on the problem of primacy-episcopacy. The institution of the episcopal office *de iure divino,* contained in the schema of 21 January 1552, had been suppressed in the proposal given to the theologians on 18 September,[13] and the new decree on residence traced the obligation to divine *and* human law. The French and Spanish opposition, supported by a part of the Italians, urged "episcopalism"[14] to solve the problem, while the *zelanti,* encouraged by Rome and supported in the body of legates by Simonetta, aimed at a strictly curialist decision. Though Gonzaga and Seripando exerted themselves from December 1562 to February 1563 to discover compromise formulas,[15] the opposing camps became so adamant that the Council was disabled, the Catholic powers began to intervene, and the collapse of the Council seemed a distinct possibility. To keep the Council busy, the legates inaugurated particular congregations on the Sacrament of matrimony on 9 February 1563. Cardinal Guise, extremely bitter over the obstinacy of the *zelanti,* obtained from the Emperor, during a visit to Innsbruck, a serious letter of admonition to the Pope not to resist reform by the Council and to impose restraint on the *zelanti.* The conflict, hitherto constantly avoided, over the relation of the Pope to the Council, seemed at hand.

---

[9] *CT* VIII, 959–968.

[10] *CT* VIII, 916–921, extraordinarily informative for the pre-Tridentine Mass procedure.

[11] In addition to the Italian reform articles (cited in footnote 2) and the Emperor's reform project (footnote 5) there were on hand a reform memorandum of the Spanish bishops, presented at the beginning of April 1562 (*CT* XIII/1, 624–531); a memorandum composed at the same time by the Portuguese Ambassador Mascarenhas (ibid., pp. 632f.); a petition of Portuguese bishops of 6 August (ibid., pp. 725ff.); a request of the Archbishops of Granada and Braga in regard to the conferring of benefices of 17 August (ibid., pp. 727–730).

[12] *CT* IX, 135ff.

The great crisis in the Council was not overcome until, following the deaths of Cardinals Gonzaga (2 March) and Seripando (7 March), a new president was acquired in Morone, who enjoyed the Pope's full confidence. Hurrying to Innsbruck, he first pacified the Emperor. In Trent he pushed aside the collateral government of Simonetta and the *zelanti,* ignored a *Practica* for the settlement of the crisis which the former nuncio to France, Bishop Gualterio of Viterbo, had devised along with the French ambassador to the Council, Ferrier, and finally, in a way not fully clarified, won Cardinal Guise to a compromise which was accepted in a conference of Council notables on 6 July. Previously, in an autograph of 1 April, the Pope had convinced the King of Spain of his determination to continue the Council and lead it to a conclusion and of the sincerity of his reform intentions.

Now, after an interruption of almost ten months, it was possible to hold on 14 July 1563 the twenty-third session,[16] which became the turning point of the Council. The compromise proposed by Cardinal Morone and accepted by the opposition amounted to this, that the Council limited itself to rejecting, in canons 6 to 8 on holy orders, the Protestant teaching on the episcopal office while avoiding a definition of the papal primacy. In the remaining canons and in the appended doctrinal chapters were defined the institution of the priesthood of the New Law by Christ and the distinction of major and minor orders. The new decree on residence increased the penalties for neglect of the obligation and left the *ius divinum* unmentioned. No less important was the final chapter (chap. 18) of the reform decree: the bishops were obliged to establish seminaries for the training of future priests.[17]

---

[13] *CT* IX, 6.

[14] The term "episcopalism" is used here in a broad sense to denote the strengthening of the authority of bishops; hence it does not imply a denial of the papal primacy.

[15] A classification of the compromise formulas then discussed, in *CT* IX, 226–241.

[16] *CT* IX, 620–630. For its antecedents: G. B. da Farnese, *Il sacramento dell'Ordine nel periodo precedente la Sessione XXIII di Trento* (Rome 1946); F. García Guerrero, *El Decreto sobre residencia de los obispos en la tercera asamblea del Concilio Tridentino* (Cádiz 1943).

On 30 July 1563 Morone handed to the orators of the powers for their comments a reform proposal in forty-two articles, prepared chiefly by the Uditore Paleotti. It took into account numerous postulates from the reform memoranda under consideration by the Council, including the French petition of 3 January 1563, but so constructed that none of the current claims of the Curia were abandoned in principle. In the general congregations from 11 September to 2 October twenty-one articles,[18] taken from this schema but slightly revised, were debated. Previously, during July and August, in the debate on matrimony, the declaration of the nullity of clandestine marriages and the question, relevant to the practice of the Greeks, of divorce by reason of adultery had evoked spirited arguments.[19] The fourteenth session on 11 November 1563, embraced three decrees, the significance of which cannot be too highly esteemed. A dogmatic decree affirmed the sacramental nature of matrimony, its indissolubility, and the Church's right to establish matrimonial impediments. The reform decree "Tametsi" made the validity of future marriages dependent upon the observance of the *forma tridentina,* the exchange of the marriage promises before the authorized parish priest and two or three witnesses; it also ordered priests to keep registers of baptisms and marriages.[20] The general reform decree, in twenty-one chapters, contained norms for the method of nominating bishops, including the conducting of processes for obtaining information,[21] for the holding of triennial provincial councils and annual diocesan synods and for episcopal visitations, and finally for cathedral canons and appointments to parishes. Throughout, where pastoral considerations required, the rights of bishops were extended at the expense of exempt Orders and corporations by grant of apostolic authority.

---

[17] J. A. O'Donohoe, *Tridentine Seminary Legislation. Its Sources and Its Formation* (Louvain 1957). H. Jedin, "Domschule und Kolleg. Zum Ursprung der Idee des Trienter Priesterseminars," *TThZ* 67 (1958), 210–223.

[18] *CT* IX, 748–759.

[19] The eleven canons on matrimony of 20 July in *CT* IX, 639f; the twelve revised canons of 5 September, ibid., pp. 760ff.

[20] H. Jedin, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Anfänge der Kirchenmatrikeln," *ZSavRGkan* 32 (1943), 419–494; H. Börsting, *Geschichte der Matrikeln von der Frühkirche bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg 1959) 94–104; M. Simon "Zur Entstehung der Kirchenbücher," *ZBKG* 28 (1959) 129–142 (on the Nürnberg plan for a church book in the 14th cent.)

[21] H. Jedin, "Die Reform des bischöflichen Informativprozesses auf dem Konzil von Trient," *AkathKR* 116 (1936), 389–413.

Even after Cardinal Guise, most of the Spaniards, and the imperialists had been won to Morone's policy of reconciliation, an increasingly dwindling minority of Spaniards, notably the Bishop of Segovia,[22] held firm in their opposition and were supported by Count Luna, who had been introduced on 21 May 1563 as ambassador of Philip II. Luna was against the legates' exclusive right of proposition[23] and Morone's exertions for a quick conclusion of the Council; the reform project introduced by the president, he said, neither satisfied the Spanish postulates of reform nor took sufficient consideration of the German situation. Cardinal Morone overcame these and other obstacles adduced by the powers against a speedy closing of the Council when he threatened the consideration of a proposed "reform of the princes," that is, the complaints of the bishops against the interference of the secular powers in the ecclesiastical domain.[24] During November the rest of the great reform schema was discussed.

The final session was set for the middle of December, but at the news that the Pope was ill it was advanced to 3 December and continued on 4 December (the twenty-fifth session).[25] It included decrees on controverted doctrines not so far considered: purgatory, the veneration of saints and their relics, images,[26] and indulgences, all of which could be debated only briefly on 2 and 4 December. The reform of the Orders, sketched under Julius III, preserved the character of a skeleton law which did not annul their existing constitutions but merely modified them in specific points. It contained norms for the acceptance of new members and on the novitiate, poverty, and the inclosure of nuns.[27] Despite the bristling opposition of Alessandro Farnese and other cardinals,[28] the cardinals too were included in this session's second reform decree, which in chapter 1 sketched the duties of bishops. In addition, it contained directions for the conducting of the visitation (chap. 6) and the administration of the Church's hospitals,[29] a reorganization of the *ius patronatus* (chap. 9) and of the proceedings against concubinaries (chap. 14). The revision of the Index of Paul IV, for which a conciliar commission had been appointed early in 1562, the reform of the missal and the breviary, also dealt with, and the drawing up of a catechism for parish priests could not be brought to completion. The Council decided to turn over to the Pope the preliminary work "so that it can be finished and put into effect by his authority."

---

[22] H. Jedin, "Die Autobiographie des Don Martin Perez de Ayala," *Spanische Forschungen* I/11 (1955), 122–164.

[23] The brief of 8 May 1563 (*CT,* IX, 956, n. 8), in which the Pope had declared his willingness to drop the legates' exclusive right of proposition, was not executed because of Morone's energetic remonstrances (Šusta, IV, 71f.); in Session XXIV the legates explained that the formula "proponentibus legatis" of the decrees did not limit the freedom of speech permitted up till then at ecumenical councils.

[24] L. Prosdocimi, "Il progetto di Riforma dei principi al Concilio di Trento," *Aevum* 13 (1939), 3–64.

[25] *CT* IX, 1077–1110.

[26] H. Jedin, "Entstehung und Tragweite des Trienter Dekrets über die Bilderverehrung," *ThQ* 116 (1935), 143–188, 404–429.

[27] H. Jedin, "Zur Vorgeschichte der Regularenreform Trid. Sessio XV," *RQ* 44 (1936), 231–381.

After all the decrees of the two earlier periods under Paul III and Julius III had been once more read aloud, all the bishops present confirmed their acceptance over their own signatures. The decrees were signed by six cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, 169 bishops, seven abbots, and several generals of Orders. At the close of the session Cardinal Guise proposed acclamations in honor of the three Popes of the Council, Emperors Charles V and Ferdinand I, and all who had contributed to the success of the work. All present cried out, "We are resolved always to profess the faith of the Sacred Ecumenical Council of Trent, always to observe its decrees!"

The importance of the Council of Trent in ecclesiastical and secular history is based on two achievements. First, it precisely defined the Catholic deposit of faith against the reform doctrines, though not in every controverted point, for the definition of the papal primacy and of the concept of the Church, the most violently challenged teachings, was prevented by episcopalism and Gallicanism. The Council did not aspire to settle theological differences of opinion within the Church. Second, to confront the Protestant Reformation the Council set up a Catholic Reform. Not a *reformatio in capite et membris* in the late medieval sense, it admittedly disregarded many postulates of the reform movement—it bypassed the reform of the Curia—but it did eliminate the most crying abuses on the diocesan and parochial levels and in the Orders, effectively strengthened the authority of the bishops, and gave priority to the demands of pastoral care.

However, the Council's reform achievement could become operative only if the papacy took charge of the execution of the decrees. In accord with the resolution contained in the last session, Morone sought papal confirmation of the conciliar decrees. This was given orally on 26 January 1564, and, after strong curial resistance had been overcome, in writing on 30 June by the Bull "Benedictus Deus," antedated 26 January. To prevent the exploitation of the Council against the Pope, Pius IV reserved to himself the interpretation of the decrees and on 2 August 1564 instituted a congregation of cardinals for their authentic interpretation and enforcement. They were made of obligation outside Rome from 1 May 1564.[30] By the end of March they were available in print in the official version edited by Paul Manutius, but the plan of also publishing the conciliar acts was dropped. Peter Canisius delivered texts of the decrees with accompanying papal briefs to the German bishops. In Italy the enforcement began when on 1 March 1564 the Pope urged the bishops present in Rome to take up residence in their dioceses. At the same time the first diocesan synods and episcopal visitations were held, as prescribed by the Council, and the mendicant Orders brought their constitutions into conformity with the regulations of Session XXIV. In the Bull "Dominici gregis," of 24 March 1564, the Index of forbidden books, prepared at the Council, was published.[31] The Pope complied with the petition for the lay chalice by allowing it, with certain reservations, to the bishops of the six provinces of Germany, the provinces of Esztergom and Prague, and several exempt dioceses on 16 April 1564.[32] A brief summary of the dogmatic results of the Council, the "Professio Fidei Tridentinae," was prescribed on 13 November 1564, to be taken by bishops, religious superiors, and doctors. Thereby the Council made a distinct impression in the domain of belief.

---

[28] J. Birkner, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Kardinalskollegiums unter Pius IV," *HJ* 52 (1932), 350ff.

[29] H. Jedin, "Zwei Konzilsdekrete über die Hospitäler," *Atti del primo congresso italiano di Storia Ospitaliera* (Reggio-Emilia 1957), pp. 376–385.

Paul III had begun but not pushed the reform of the Curia as a result of the Council, but with the breakthrough of 1555 a longer reprieve was clearly impossible. Since Pius IV insisted that the reform of the administration was not within the competence of the Council, he had to take up the task himself. In 1561 and 1562 appeared in rapid sequence decrees on the reform of the Rota, the Sacred Penitentiary, the Chancery, and the *Camera,* and thus on 29 June 1562, the Pope could assert: "We have announced and accomplished a strict reform of Our court."[33] A bull of 9 October 1562 was directed against abuses that had occurred in the last conclave.[34] The chief representative of the new spirit was the Cardinal-Nephew Borromeo, concerning whom Soranzo, the Venetian ambassador, reported: "He in his own person does more good at the Roman Court than all the decrees of the Council together." In actuality, the renewal of the papacy formed the basis for the enforcement of the Tridentine decrees, which in turn led to the successful self-assertion of the Church in the Counter Reformation. The forces of renewal now began to operate, but the crisis had by no means been surmounted.

---

[30] On the beginnings of the Congregation of the Council cf. P. Prodi, *Paleotti,* pp. 193ff. (the older literature is there given) and S. Tromp, "De primis secretaris S. Congr. Concilii," *Gr* 40 (1959), 523–527.

[31] New material concerning the procedure in A. Rotondo, "Nuovi documenti per la storia dell' Indice dei libri prohibiti 1572–1638," *Rinascimento* II/3 (1963), 145–211.

[32] G. Constant, *Concession à l'Allemagne de la Communion sous les deux espèces,* 2 vols. (Paris 1923).

[33] Sickel, *Röm. Berichte* II, 118.

---

[34] *Bull Rom* VII, 230ff.; cf. *RQ* 42 (1934), 306–311.

SECTION TWO

The Papacy and the Implementation of the Council of Trent (1565–1605)

CHAPTER 38

Personality and Work of the Reform Popes from Pius V to Clement VIII

A glance at the contemporary religious map of Europe makes clear the gravity of the crisis in which the Church found herself at the conclusion of the Council of Trent. Only the inhabitants of the Italian and Iberian peninsulas had remained positively Catholic. In Western Europe the Calvinist offensive threatened to sever France from Rome, as it had already succeeded in doing with Scotland. In Rome there was still reluctance to admit that England, by renewing the schism, had definitely entered the ranks of the Protestant powers. The Scandinavian North was gone; in Poland kingship and Catholicism were wavering. In the Empire the Religious Peace of Augsburg had not stopped the progress of Protestantism: in North Germany the last footholds of the ancient Church were lost, in the South and West she was asserting herself with difficulty in the ecclesiastical states and under the protection of the houses of Wittelsbach and Habsburg, but Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary remained exposed, and the Swiss Confederation continued to be split on the question of religion.

That the Church overcame the crisis and at the end of the century stood forth renewed and strengthened is due to the carrying out of the Council of Trent by the papacy. Because of the efforts of three outstanding Popes its decrees did not remain a dead letter but permeated the life of the Church. The methods employed by them were as different as their personalities, but the goal was identical: the regeneration of the Church in the spirit of the Catholic Reform.

Pius V

In the conclave following the death of Pius IV (20 December 1565 to 7 January 1566), which was, according to Pastor, "freer from external influences than any other in the memory of man," Cardinal Borromeo prevented the election of Ricci, skillful in business and favored by Duke Cosimo, and of Alessandro Farnese, and, after the rejection of the candidates whom he promoted (Morone and Sirleto), succeeded, in an understanding with Farnese, in having the Dominican Michael Ghislieri elected, who was, in the judgment of the Spanish Ambassador Requesens, "the pope demanded by the times."[1] A remarkable opinion, if it is borne in mind that the new Pope Pius V owed his rise to that enemy of Spain, Paul IV. But it was an accurate appraisal, for he differed from his patron by thinking and acting in all spheres from the religious viewpoint and shunning both the blind nepotism and the pomp of the Carafa. His court was as austere and frugal as was the Pope himself. In the severity of his measures against blasphemy, immorality, and the profanation of holy days and in his zeal for the Inquisition he did not yield place to the Carafa Pope. It was said of him that he sought to turn Rome into a monastery. The sentences of the Inquisition were made known and carried out in public *autos-da-fe.*[2] Among the "obstinate" and the relapsed who were condemned to death were Clement VII's former private secretary, Pietro Carnesecchi, and the humanist Aonio Paleario, both of whom had been acquitted under Pius IV. The number of Inquisition processes soared; in Venice alone eighty-two were carried out under Pius V. The Bull "In Coena Domini," to be read aloud on Holy Thursday, in which the ecclesiastical censures reserved to the Pope were listed, was given a new and stricter form in 1568.[3]

These repressive measures, in comparison with the work of positive reconstruction, are of meager importance in the total picture. The catechism for parish priests, begun by the Council of Trent, was brought to completion chiefly by the Dominicans Egidio Foscarari, Leonardo Marini, and Francisco Foreiro, put into classical Latin by the humanist Giulio Poggiani, and, following another revision by Cardinal Sirleto, appeared in print in September 1566.[4] The reformed Roman breviary (1568) and the Roman missal (1570), on which had cooperated, besides Marini and Sirleto, the Theatine Scotti and Paul IV's great-nephew, Antonio Carafa, were prescribed for use in all dioceses and Orders which had not had breviaries and missals of their own for the preceding 200 years.[5]

---

[1] *A mi juicio es el Cardenal que en los tiempos de agora convendria que fuese papa* (J. J. I. Döllinger, *Beiträge* I, 579). The comprehensive report (ibid., pp. 571–588) provides an excellent characterization of the whole College of Cardinals.

[2] Relevant extracts from the diary of the master of ceremonies Firmanus in Pastor, XVII, 400–404.

[3] K. Pfaff, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Abendmahlsbulle vom. 16.–18. Jh.," *RQ* 38 (1930), 23–76.

[4] P. Paschini, *Il Catechismo romano del Concilio di Trento* (Rome 1923; reprinted in P. Paschini, *Cinquecento romano e riforma cattolica* [Rome 1958], pp. 33–89).

But far more decisive than these supplements to the Council was the Pope's will of steel to enforce the Trent reform decrees and to tolerate no return to the former lax procedure in regard to dispensations, which would have detracted from their validity. A reform of the Sacred Penitentiary, restricting its competence to the internal forum, definitely sealed off this source of limitless abuses.[6] Observing the Tridentine regulation, the Pope visited the Roman patriarchal basilicas in person; he entrusted the visitation of the parishes to a commission to which Borromeo's vicar, Ormaneto, belonged. The "Confraternity of Christian Doctrine," transplanted from Milan to Rome, received such a powerful impetus from Philip Neri and his companion Pietra that people designated "the Roman Reform as the daughter of the Milanese."[7] In an effort to push the Tridentine Reform energetically, at least in Italy, in 1571 the Pope appointed apostolic visitors for the bishoprics of the Papal State and the Neopolitan Kingdom,[8] while Marini was given a corresponding assignment for twenty-four dioceses of Central and North Italy, and, later, Ragazzoni and Castelli for the Adriatic sees. Convinced that the Tridentine reform decrees were the instrument of Church renewal throughout the world, he took pains to have them published also in mission lands, as far as Mexico, Goa, and the Congo.[9] Numerous provincial and diocesan synods applied the decrees on the diocesan level, many seminaries were founded, and the rules of Trent's decree on regulars were made even stricter in regard to the inclosure of nuns.[10]

---

[5] H. Jedin, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuchs," *Liturgisches Leben* 6 (1939), 30–66; also, the supplement of B. Opfermann in *E Lit* 72 (1958), 214f.; H. Jedin, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform der liturgischen Bücher," *E Lit* 59 (1945), 5–38; E. Focke–H. Heinrichs, "Das Kalendarium des Missale Pianum," *ThQ* 120 (1939), 383–400, 461–469; A. P. Frutaz, "Contributo alla storia del Messale promulgato de San Pio V nel 1570," *Problemi religiosi,* pp. 187–214.

[6] E. Göller, *Die päpstliche Poenitentiarie* II/2, 98ff.; *Bull Rom* VII, 750ff.

[7] A. Monticone, "L'applicazione de Concilio di Trento a Roma," *RSTI* 7 (1953), 225–250, 8 (1954), 23–48; G. Franza, *Il Catechismo a Roma dal Concilio di Trento a Pio VI nello zelo dell'Archiconfraternita della Dottrina Christiana* (Alba 1958).

[8] With the statements of Pastor (XVII, 218ff., and XIX, 76ff.) compare P. Villani, *La Visita Apostolica di Tommaso Orfini nel Regno di Napoli 1566–1568* (Rome 1957); later: A. Bason, "La diocesi di Aquileja secondo la Visita Apostolica dell'anno 1584," *Studi Aquileji offerti a G. Bus* (Aquileia 1953), pp. 433–451; G. Vitezic, *La Prima Visita Apostolica post-tridentina in Dalmazia (1579)* (Rome 1957); on the visitations of the Jesuit Possevino in the lands of the Gonzaga, cf. M. Scaduto, *Arch. stor. lombardo* VIII/10 (1960), 336–410.

[9] C. Bayle, "El Concilio de Trento en las Indias espanolas," *RF* 131 (1945), 257–284.

The pattern of a vigorous and effective application permeating all aspects of Church life was furnished by Charles Borromeo through his activity at Milan (1565–84). By his personal efforts, his visitations, and his legislation at eleven diocesan and six provincial synods (1565, 1569, 1575, 1579, 1582), he became, in Pastor's words, "the paragon of a Tridentine bishop." The regulations he issued for the daily routine and manner of life of his household[11] were evidence of the new spirit: a *praefectus spiritualis* took charge of the spiritual life of the group. A seminary was established in Milan for the training of priests with several minor seminaries attached, among them one for late vocations. He intensified and improved the care of souls by dividing the extensive diocese into twelve districts, each under a trusted deputy. The Jesuits and the Theatines obtained colleges; the schools of Christian Doctrine, organized by the priest Castellino da Castello, counted more than twenty thousand pupils in 1595. Borromeo visited in person even the most remote Alpine valleys of his diocese and still found time to travel from place to place in his suffragan sees, such as Bergamo, in his capacity as apostolic visitor. When in 1582 the *Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis*—a condensation of the entire work of reform—appeared, one hundred copies were ordered in Lyons, eleven in Toledo. The eagerness of the tireless archbishop, expending himself in the apostolate to christianize all facets of life in his diocese, led to serious conflicts with the Spanish viceroys Requesens and Ayamonte, so that for a while it appeared doubtful that the Pope, now Gregory XIII, would support him vis-à-vis the Spanish state Church. His presence in Rome, where the measures of the "zealot" of Milan had many opponents, restored the situation. The acts of the fourth provincial council were ratified and a papal brief vindicated the archbishop before the Milanese who chafed under his strictness.

Borromeo was not the unique embodiment of the Tridentine episcopal ideal. A decade after his death Cardinal Valier of Verona cautioned Borromeo's successor Federigo against copying the example of his great model in all things.[12] Cardinal Paleotti pursued different paths in his see of Bologna; and eventually Francis De Sales, whose activity in Geneva belongs to the following century (1599–1622), set up a new episcopal ideal of humanistic breadth. But it is doubtful that the mountain of abuses could have been leveled without Borromeo's "steely consistency," capable of being intensified into hardness.

---

[10] The list of synods (Pastor, XVII, 215f.), as Pastor himself remarks, needs to be revised, for the zenith of synodal activity occurs in the pontificates of Gregory XIII and Sixtus V. For the Bull "Circa Pastoralis Officii" on inclosure, see *Bull Rom* VII, 447–450.

[11] *Acta Eccl. Mediol.* II (Milan 1599), 811–825.

[12] A. Valerius, "De cauta imitatione sanctorum episcoporum," Mai S, VIII, 89–117; P. Prodi, "Lineamenti dell'organizzazione diocesana in Bologna durante l'episcopato del Card. Paleotti," *Problemi religiosi,* pp. 323–394.

Pius V blazed a new trail in the nomination of bishops by instituting a commission of his own for examining candidates. Among the twenty-one cardinals he created were such distinguished men as Antonio Carafa, Santorio, the Dominican general Giustiniani, the Franciscan Felice Peretti, the Theatine Burali. But what was decisive was that Pius V excluded the slightest vacillation in affirming the Tridentine Reform. The Pope's death on 1 May 1572 was suffused with the glory of the victory over the Turks at Lepanto on 7 October 1571, achieved by the fleet of the Holy League with Spain and Venice which he had laboriously brought into being in 1570. He was beatified in 1672 and canonized in 1712.

Gregory XIII

His successor, the canonist Ugo Buoncompagni, originally a curial official, did not possess the ascetical severity and unflinching consistency of his predecessor, but his long pontificate (1572–85) was no less significant for the carrying out of the Council of Trent, in which he had taken part, and the consolidating of the Catholic Reform. Gregory XIII owed his unusually speedy election on 13 May 1572 to the intervention of Philip II. But his frank recognition of Spanish hegemony did not prevent him from defending, with moderation, ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Milan and Naples and even in Spain against the Spanish state Church.[13] In 1576 he concluded, with a mild verdict, the trial of Archbishop Carranza of Toledo, indicted by the Spanish Inquisition, whom Pius V already had summoned to Rome.[13a] Jealously concerned for his independence, he allowed only a restricted influence on his decisions to even his most intimate adviser, his private secretary, Toloemo Galli, the "Cardinal of Como." In the application of the Tridentine norms he was more open than his predecessor to considerations of ecclesiastical politics. In order to bind the dynastic interests of the House of Wittelsbach to the security of Catholic property rights in Northwest Germany he allowed the worldly Ernst of Bavaria to accumulate eventually five bishoprics, in flagrant violation of the Tridentine prohibition of pluralities.

---

[13] P. Prodi, "San Carlo Borromeo e le trattative tra Gregorio XIII e Filippo II sulla giurisdizione ecclesiastica," *RSTI* 11 (1957), 195–240, with information on the earlier literature.

[13a] A comprehensive collection of sources is Fray Bartolomé Carranza, *Documentos Historicos,* ed. I. I. Tellechea Idigoras, 3 vols. (Madrid 1962–1966); in addition there are numerous detailed studies by the author, of which, "Melchior Cano y Bartolomé Carranza, dos Dominicos frente a frente" *HS* 15 (1962) 5–93, touches upon a particularly critical point.

Gregory's chief merit was to have transformed the nunciatures into instruments of Church reform. They had in the past never been exclusively diplomatic agencies, but now their ecclesiastical duties moved so far into the foreground that a generation later it could be claimed: "On them depends to a great extent the restoration of religion, worship, and ecclesiastical government."[14] To the existing permanent nunciatures at the Catholic courts—the Emperor, Spain, France, Portugal, Poland, Venice, Florence, Savoy—were added nunciatures, expressly for reform, in Upper Germany (Ninguarda and Porzia), Switzerland (Bonhomini), and Lower Germany (K. Gropper), which carried out duties like those of the apostolic visitors in Italy and were the origin of the permanent nunciatures in Lucerne (1579), Graz (1580), and Cologne (1584). The view, widespread under Paul III and his successors, that Germany was lost to the Church, was now abandoned. The "German Congregation," formed by Pius V and comprising experts on German affairs, such as Cardinals Otto of Augsburg, Madruzzo, Morone, Delfino, and Commendone, acquired a clear picture of conditions and from 1573 coordinated relevant measures.

Since the enforcing of the Tridentine decree on seminaries encountered serious difficulties in the imperiled lands, Gregory XIII encouraged the expanding of existing Roman colleges to care for the training of clerics and founded new ones. The Jesuits' Roman College was accommodated in an imposing new structure and richly endowed; it still bears his name. The Collegium Germanicum was united with the Hungarian College and through generous donations enabled to support 100 students, from whom were to emerge capable leaders for the German Church, still suffering from a serious lack of priests. Like the German College, the English College, founded in 1579, was entrusted to the Jesuits. The Greek Collegio Sant'Atanasio, a Maronite, and an Armenian college were intended to provide a center in Rome for the Eastern Churches in communion with the Holy See. By virtue of these educational foundations Gregory XIII inaugurated a development of incalculable significance: Rome, long a center of ecclesiastical administration, became likewise a center of theological scholarship and of the training of clerics for the Universal Church.

Finally, identified with the name of Gregory XIII is the reform of the Julian Calendar, projected long before under Sixtus IV, Leo X, and Clement VII. Now, after the views of numerous scholars had been obtained, agreement was reached by a commission under Sirleto's presidency on the basis of the proposals of the brothers Giglio, and on 24 February 1582 the work was concluded in the papal Villa Mondragone near Frascati.[15] The synchronization of the astronomical with the calendar year was assured by dropping ten days (5–14 October 1582) and introducing a new rule for leap years. The introduction of the Gregorian Calendar indicated the extent of papal authority. The Catholic states accepted it. The Protestant states did not follow suit for more than a century, despite the support of the astronomers Brahe and Kepler; the Greek Orthodox world waited until the twentieth century.

---

[14] Cf. Pastor, XIX, 59–65.

Sixtus V

Like that of 1565–66, the conclave after the death of Gregory XIII (4 April 1585) was virtually free from the influence of the great powers. Cardinal Medici, supported by the French against Farnese, succeeded in having the Friar Minor Felice Peretti of Montalto elected on 24 April 1585, and thereby brought a towering personality to the highest office in the Church. Sixtus V (1585–90) combined in himself the strictly ecclesiastical outlook of Pius V, who had raised him to the purple in 1570, with the statesmanlike gifts of a Paul III, which the papacy needed even more than in Paul's day if it was to maintain its independence. His inflexible sovereign will impressed its features on the Roman Curia and on the City of the Popes for centuries. Persuaded that the papacy's worldwide activity presupposed order in the Papal State, he ruthlessly suppressed the brigand disorder that had flourished in the time of Gregory XIII and so successfully restored the papal finances that he left in Castel Sant'Angelo a treasure of some four million gold *scudi.* His most important contribution to the Catholic Reform was the reorganization of the Roman Curia.

Yielding to the firm wishes of the Popes, the Council of Trent had waived the *reformatio capitis.* But the existing organs of government—the plenary meeting of the cardinals (Consistory) and the central administrative offices handed down from the Middle Ages (Chancery and *Camera*)—though meanwhile purged of the grossest abuses, were no longer adequate for the mounting tasks of the reform Popes. Ever since the Catholic Reform had gained a foothold in Rome, the Popes had proceeded to depute the weightiest tasks to commissions of cardinals, several of which—the Roman Inquisition (1542), the Congregation of the Council (1564), the Congregation of the Index (1571), the Congregation of Bishops (1572)—had, because they were permanent, already acquired administrative authority, whereas others were dissolved on the completion of their assignments. By a bull issued on 22 January 1588, Sixtus V created fifteen permanent congregations of cardinals with carefully circumscribed competence and administrative character. Six directed the government of the Papal State. The others tended to the business of the Universal Church—Inquisition, Index, the Council, Bishops, Regulars, the Consistory, the *Signatura Gratiae,* Rites, and Vatican Printing Press.[16] From 1588 on the participation of the cardinals in the government of the Church was discharged in the congregations. The Consistory declined in importance, as did the Chancery, which functioned henceforth only as a dispatching office. The claim to corule, pressed by a numerically small oligarchy of cardinals in the late Middle Ages and even under the Renaissance Popes, was definitively destroyed. At the same time the number of cardinals, limited to twenty-four by the Council of Constance, was fixed at seventy—six cardinal bishops, fifty cardinal priests, fourteen cardinal deacons—and a new list of titular churches and deaconries was drawn up.[17] The Pope filled the vacancies by creating thirty-three new cardinals.

---

[15] *Bull Rom* VIII. 386ff.: Pastor. XIX. 283–296.

The closer union of the members with the head was promoted by the new arrangement of the visit to Rome on the part of bishops (*visitatio liminum*), dated 20 December 1585.[18] The bishops of Italy, the adjacent islands, Dalmatia, and Greece were obliged to make their report in Rome every three years; for most of the other countries of Europe, in particular the Empire, France, and Spain, the interval was set at four years, for those farther away at five, and for those overseas at ten years. On the occasion of the visit a report on the state of ecclesiastical life (*Relatio status dioecesis*) was to be submitted in a definitely prescribed form. The "status reports," presented in increasing numbers from the turn of the century, provide, though frequently in colors too rosy, many particulars for diocesan statistics that would not otherwise be available. At that time they frequently constituted the point of departure for papal reform instructions. In this way the steps taken by the Pope became a "turning point and permanent factor of the Catholic Reformation" (Schmidlin).

Obsessed with a passion for building, Sixtus V undertook to make Rome, by means of imposing buildings and of a carefully supervised city planning, the most beautiful city in Europe and at the same time the center of the world. The cupola of Saint Peter's was completed by Giaconio della Porta; together with the obelisk set up in the Piazza San Pietro and the palace designed by Domenico Fontana, it is still for every Roman pilgrim the distinctive landmark of the Eternal City. The tortuous complex of buildings at the Lateran Basilica, though sacred because of a millennium of history, had to make way for a new construction. The principal church of the Jesuits, the Gesu, begun in 1568 and erected according to the plans of Vignola and Giaconio della Porta, was consecrated on 25 November 1584, the first great monument of Roman Baroque architecture. The Chiesa Nuova of the Oratorians was under construction. The medieval city, hitherto confined to the bend of the Tiber, reached out again to the hills which had been built up in Roman imperial days but now lay desolate. On the Quirinal Gregory XIII had begun to construct in a more healthy location a new residence, which was finished by Paul V a generation later, and he had a new street built to connect the Lateran with Santa Maria Maggiore. Sixtus V laid out a connecting street from the Pincio to Santa Maria Maggiore, where he erected a grandiose burial chapel for himself and his patron, Pius V. Other newly laid out streets facilitated the pilgrimage to the seven principal churches, a custom revived by Philip Neri. The crowning of the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius with the statues of the Apostles Peter and Paul symbolized the Pope's aims for the construction of a new Baroque Rome, which quickly made the plans sketched by Bufalini (1551) and Du Perac (1577) obsolete. Rome had become a "new city," whose progress in the epoch of the Catholic Reform left far behind all other cities of Europe.[19]

---

[16] *Bull Rom* VIII, 985ff.; Pastor, XXI, 247ff.

[17] *Bull Rom* VIII, 808ff. (3 December 1586). Jerome Manfredus, *De perfecto cardinali S.R.E.* (Rome 1584) sketched a likeness of a cardinal and dedicated it to Gregory XIII.

[18] J. Schmidlin, *Die kirchlichen Zustände in Deutschland vor dem Dreissigjährigen Kriege nach den bischöflichen Diözesanberichten an den Heiligen Stuhl,* 3 parts (Freiburg 1908–10), on the Bull "Romanus Pontifex," I, XVIIIff.; further literature in Fink, *Vat. Archiv.* 120.

The limits to the creative aims of this great Pope, to whom are due also the new construction of the Vatican Library and the establishment of the Vatican Press, became apparent in his solution of a scholarly task which the Council of Trent had planned but had not achieved—the revision of the Vulgate Bible. For decades the learned Sirleto had been doing preliminary work for the revision of both the Greek and the Latin texts of the Bible. The commission set up by Sixtus V for the revision of the Vulgate, to which, among others, Cardinal Carafa belonged, took great pains but proceeded too slowly to suit the impatient Pope. He had them turn over the data to him and through arbitrary manipulations so altered the sacred text that the edition, which appeared in print on 2 May 1590, had to be recalled after the Pope's death on 27 August 1590, though it had already been sent to twenty-five princes and the accompanying bull of introduction had been published.[20] A new commission, set up by Gregory XIV and headed by Cardinal Colonna, eliminated the crudest blunders. At Robert Bellarmine's suggestion the edition thus rectified was published by Clement VIII in 1592 as the *Sixto-Clementina.*

---

[19] Delumeau, *Vie économique et sociale de Rome* I, 358. The description of the building activity of Sixtus V in Pastor, XXII, 202–312, is to be compared with the section "Rome at the close of the Renaissance" in Pastor, XIII, 356–427. For the publisher Franzini's guides to Rome, appearing from 1588 in numerous editions and embellished with woodcuts, cf. L. Schudt, *Le guide di Roma* (Vienna–Augsburg 1930), pp. 31ff.

The Tridentine generation died out with three popes who followed one another in rapid succession; all of them had personally taken part in the Council. Urban VII (15–27 September 1590), Gregory XIV (5 December 1590–16 October 1591), and Innocent IX (29 October–30 December 1591) had cooperated actively, as bishops or nuncios, in the carrying out of the Council decrees: Gian Baptist Castagna as Archbishop of Rossano and nuncio at Madrid under Pius V, Miceolò Sfondrato as Bishop of Cremona, Gian Antonio Facchinetti as Bishop of Nicastro and nuncio at Venice. The pious but ailing Gregory XIV continued the Council's reform work by regulating the procedure for determining the qualifications of candidates for the episcopacy, but, influenced by his inexperienced nephew, Paul Emilio Sfondrato, he squandered a considerable part of the treasure amassed by Sixtus V through hopeless subsidies to the French Catholic League.

Clement VIII

Like the three preceding ones, the conclave of 10–30 January 1592 was strongly influenced by Spain. Though unable to carry the election of its preferred candidate, the intellectually outstanding but harsh Santorio,[21] it did achieve that of Ippolito Aldobrandini, who was equally acceptable though far weaker. Clement VIII (1592–1605) disappointed Spanish hopes, however, when, after much hesitation, he granted absolution to Henry IV of France despite the powerful opposition of Philip II. Thereby the papacy recovered its political freedom of movement, was enabled to act as mediator in the arranging of the Franco-Spanish Peace of Vervins (1598), and, on the extinction of the direct line of the House of Este, recovered the papal fief of Ferrara and incorporated it into the Papal State.[22]

---

[20] The thesis that the bull was really published was defended by P. M. Baumgarten, *Neue Kunde von alten Bibeln,* 2 vols. (Krumbach 1922–1927) against C. A. Kneller and again in the essay "Die Bibelbulle Sixtus' V," *ZKTh* 52 (1928), 202–224; 59 (1934), 81–101, 268–290, and may be regarded as proved. The earlier literature (Le Bachelet, Amann, Höpfl) is in Seppelt, IV, 521, and also in P. Paschini, *G. Sirleto ed il Decreto tridentino sull'edizione critica della Bibbia* (Lecco 1923).

[21] The informative *Autobiografia di Mons. G. A. Santori,* ed. G. Cugnoni (Rome 1890).

In his person Clement VIII embodied the episcopal ideal of the Catholic Reform. He led the austere life of a devoted priest and zealous bishop, made a monthly pilgrimage on foot to the seven principal churches, heard confessions in Saint Peter's for hours at a time during the Jubilee Year, made the visitation of the patriarchal basilicas and of several monasteries and hospitals. He chose Baronius as his confessor and honored Philip Neri as a father. Nevertheless, in his pontificate the movement of renewal began to lose verve and the universal character which it had received from Pius V and his two immediate successors. A new revision of the Index of Forbidden Books (1596) omitted Bellarmine's works but it struck heavily at Jewish literature. In 1593 the Republic of Venice surrendered the apostate Dominican Giordano Bruno to the Roman Inquisition, which sent him to the stake on 17 February 1600, following his relapse into his views, which were contrary to Catholic doctrine and which he had repeatedly recanted, as late as 5 April 1597[23] The quarrel which had erupted between Dominicans and Jesuits on the question of grace Clement left undecided, and he was unable to make up his mind in regard to promulgating the new collection of decretals, which was completed and was supposed to bear his name. Though as a former nuncio in Poland he was in no sense politically inexperienced, the conscientious but indecisive Pope abandoned the conduct of affairs almost entirely to his nephews, Cincius and Peter Aldobrandini, and threw the papal finances into disorder by excessive gifts to his family.

Despite these weaknesses of the Aldobrandini Pope the Jubilee Year of 1600 turned out to be a triumph for the regenerated papacy. The previous Jubilee of 1575 had drawn hundreds of thousands of pilgrims to Rome, especially from all over Italy, and renowned preachers, such as the Jesuit Francisco de Toledo, the Capuchin Lupus, and the Friar Minor Panigarola, had given the pilgrimage the character of a popular mission. When, on 31 December 1599, Clement VIII opened the Holy Door, 80,000 persons were present. The total number of pilgrims was estimated at 1.2 million. In order to accomodate at least a portion of the teeming masses, the Hospice of Santa Trinita dei Pellegrini, founded by Philip Neri, was enlarged. In order to gain the indulgence fifteen churches had to be visited by the foreign pilgrims, thirty by the Romans. The Pope made sixty visits, frequently washed the feet of poor pilgrims, and invited them to his table. He received processions of pilgrims in the Cortile del Belvedere. All classes of society were represented: the Dukes of Bavaria and Lorraine, the viceroy of Naples, Cardinals Andreas of Austria and Dietrichstein. How a German prelate found the new Rome a few years later (1612–13) is clearly described in the *Raiss uf Rom* by Bishop Aschhausen of Bamberg.[24]

---

[22] B. Barbiche, "La politique de Clément VIII a l'égard de Ferrare en Novembre et Décembre 1597 et l'excommunication de César d'Este," *MAH* 74 (1962), 289–328.

[23] The extract taken before the summer of 1597 from the acts of the trial in A. Mercati, *Il Sommario del processo di G. Bruno* (Citta del Vaticano 1942); ibid., pp. 46–53, a well-balanced judgment of Bruno's personality.

A generation had sufficed to change the face of the Church. Following the close of the Council of Trent the Popes had carried its decrees like a banner and had gathered and encouraged the religious forces at hand. The papacy's authority was restored, if not throughout the medieval *Respublica Christiana,* at least within the peoples that had remained Roman Catholic. The restoration of papal power by means of the Council of Trent was not, as claimed by Vergerio, Sarpi, and other anticurial writers,[25] a sly trick of power-hungry curialists, but the natural result of the Catholic Reform, sought sincerely though not always with strict consistency and complete success.[26] The new centralization, replacing the fiscally oriented late medieval centralization, was based on religious and spiritual foundations. The papacy had given the norms of Trent validity. One Bible, the Vulgate; one liturgy, the Roman; one Law Code guaranteed unity and effected a far greater uniformity of Church life than the pre-Tridentine Church had known. But the Tridentine Reform was no mere restoration of the Middle Ages. In almost all its manifestations it displayed anti-Reformation characteristics. From the affirmation of its own special nature it drew the strength for self-renewal and self-assertion.

---

[24] Pastor, XIX, 197–214, XXIV, 269–280; Ch. Hautle, *Des Bamberger Fürstbischofs J. G. von Aschhausen Gesandtschaftsreise 1612–13* (Tübingen 1881).

[25] P. P. Vergerio maintained this view in the fictitious "Consilium quorundam episcoporum Bononiae congregatorum" (1553) and in the "Actiones duae secretarii pontificii (1556)," in F. Hubert, *Vergerios publizistische Tätigkeit* (Göttingen 1893), pp. 284f., 299f. P. Sarpi developed it in his *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* I/1; cf. Jedin, II, 3ff.

[26] Bellarmine's sharp criticism of the imperfect enforcement of the Council of Trent is found in the memoranda in Le Bachelet, *Auctarium Bellarminianum* (Paris 1913), pp. 513–518 and 518ff. (1600–1601) and 533ff. (1612).

CHAPTER 39

Self-Assertion of the Church in Western and Eastern Europe

From the close of the Council of Trent the Catholic Reform had been canalized and coordinated—it was virtually identical with the enforcement of the Tridentine decrees under papal leadership. Proceeding from the medieval view that the secular arm must cooperate, the Popes exerted themselves, though not always to the same degree, to secure the acceptance of the Council by the state, successfully in Spain, the Spanish Netherlands, and Poland, unsuccessfully in France. The two "religious wars" of the period, in which political as well as religious power struggles were decided—the Huguenot Wars and the Revolt of the Netherlands—ended at the turn of the century. The French monarchy and the southern Netherlands were saved for the Church; the northern Netherlands were lost. The Anglican state Church was consolidated in England, Calvinism in Scotland; only in Ireland did the majority of the people remain Catholic. The return of the Swedish King John III and his son Sigismund to the Church cost the latter his throne. In Poland, recently recovered, Catholic Reform made progress and raised hopes of a union with the Russian Orthodox Church.

Spain and the Netherlands

Under Philip II (1556–98), sincerely religious and conscientious but indecisive and aloof, Spain was the Church's strongest support and the leading European power. It was only after detailed consideration that he decided to accept the Council's decrees, with the restrictive clause "without prejudice to the rights of the crown." These included the *placet* for papal dispensations, the *recursus ab abusu*—the right to appeal to the secular power against abuses of the spiritual power—the autonomy of the Spanish Inquisition, and the *patronato* in the colonies. It would, however, be unfair to condemn the "ecclesiastical establishment" of Philip II for its numerous interventions in the sphere of Church jurisdiction and to disregard entirely the King's zeal in effecting the Catholic Reform when this work encountered resistance, chiefly from exempt canons and Orders, and sought support in Rome. The papal nuncios, who included Castagna (later Pope Urban VII), Ormaneto, and Speciano—the last two were colleagues of Borromeo[1]—were in a difficult position whenever they had to champion papal complaints about state interference with the Church.

---

[1] N. Mosconi, *La Nunziatura di Spagna di Cesare Speciano 1586–1588* (Brescia, 2nd ed. 1961), pp. 25ff.

Even though the Tridentine reform decrees by no means complied with all the desires of the Spanish episcopate, the bishops, at the royal command, set a good example to all other countries by promulgating them in provincial and diocesan synods. Provincial councils were held at Toledo, Salamanca, Granada, Zaragoza, and Valencia as early as 1565–66. For that of Toledo Juan de Avila composed a bulky memorandum in which the modifications desirable for Spain were proposed. Naturally, the enforcement of the decrees was a slower process. For example, the diocese of Pamplona did not obtain a "ley fundamental" until the diocesan synod of 1590,[2] and in Coria, where a reform synod of 1537 continued to have validity, the enactments of the synod of 1606 constituted "la major fuente de restauracion tridentina hasta dos siglos mas tarde." Several Tridentine seminaries, the founding of which started early in Spain,[3] could not be maintained because those liable for contributions opposed giving them. Thus the seminary of Coria, founded in 1579, obtained a sound financial basis only through a grant by Bishop Galaza in 1603. The unreformed Orders had to put up with serious interference based on Pius V's briefs of 2 December 1566 and 16 April 1567. The Conventual Franciscans were forced to adopt the Observance. The Mercedarians, Trinitarians, and Carmelites accepted the papal decrees. The Premonstratensians successfully resisted a forced union with the Hieronymites.[4] The monasteries of the Benedictine Congregation of Tarragona were subjected to apostolic visitations but resisted the reform bull of 1592.[5] The close union of Church and state acquired an impressive expression in the Hieronymite monastery of the Escorial, built by Philip II in 1563–84, in which the King's cell overlooked the high altar.

Long before the ecclesiastical organization of the mother country had been carried further,[6] three new ecclesiastical provinces had been established in the Spanish Netherlands on 12 May 1559, at the request of Philip II: Cambrai, with Tournai, Arras, Saint-Omer, and Namur as suffragans; Mechlin, with Antwerp, 'sHertogenbosch, Ghent, Bruges,

---

[2] J. Goni Gaztambide, *Los Navarros en el Concilio de Trento y la Reforma tridentina en la diocesis de Pamplona* (Pamplona 1947), pp. 181–301; F. S. Pedro Garcia, "La Reforma del Concilio de Trento en la diocesis de Coria," *HS* 10 (1957), 273–299.

[3] D. Mansilla, "El seminario conciliar de S. Jeronimo de Burgos," *HS* 7 (1954), 3–44, 359–398; for Coria, *HS* 10 (1957), 286f.

[4] J. Goni Gaztembide, "La Reforma de los Premonstratenses espanoles del Siglo XVI," *HS* 13 (1900), 5–96.

[5] R. Auge, "La bulla de Clemente VIII per la Reforma de la Congregacion claustral tarraconense," *Catalonia Monastica* 2 (1929), 259–283.

[6] D. Mansilla, "La reorganizacion eclesiastica espanola del Siglo XVI," *Antologica annua* 4 (1956), 97–238.

Ypres, and Roermond; Utrecht, with Haarlem, Middelburg, Leeuwarden, Deventer, and Groningen. The imperial bishopric of Liège remained in the province of Cologne. Of the eighteen sees fourteen were new. The task of filling them was somewhat drawn out or, as in the North, became impossible, for the revolt of the Netherlands impeded the reconstruction.

The national opposition to Spanish rule was bound up with religious opposition, chiefly Calvinist. While Margaret of Parma was governor, the "Geusen" (so called from *gueux,* the beggars) had demanded the mitigation of Charles V's edicts on religion (the "placards"), the abolition of the Inquisition, and the convocation of the States General. A barbaric iconoclasm in 1566 destroyed irreplaceable works of Christian art. The "Council of Troubles," set up by the Duke of Alba, could not suppress the revolt, but the statesmanship of the governor Alessandro Farnese, Margaret's son, succeeded in having the almost wholly Catholic southern provinces break away from the Pacification of Ghent (1576). The mostly Protestant northern provinces, allied in the Union of Utrecht (1579), proclaimed their independence in 1581 and, at first under William of Orange (assassinated in 1584) and then under his son Maurice (1585–1625), carried on the war against Spain until the truce of 1609. In the States General all Catholic worship had been forbidden since 1574. The care of the still numerous Catholics was provided in an insufficient manner under the direction of a vicar apostolic in Utrecht.

The Council of Trent had been accepted by the governor, Margaret of Parma, on 11 July 1565, with the same reservations as in Spain, but the political confusion, together with the not infrequent resistance of the clergy, delayed enforcement. Definite progress came only in the governorship of the Archdukes Albrecht and Isabella.[8]

France

In France, too, the Church was engaged in a struggle for existence which was not conducive to the progress of the Catholic Reform. Like

---

[7] M. Dierickx, *De oprichting der nieuwe bisdommen in de Nederlande onder Filips II 1559–1570* (Antwerp 1950); for the relevant *acta* see the summary of the literature.

[8] In addition to Willcox (see the summary of the literature): G. Rolin, "L'esprit du Concile de Trente dans le statut organique de l'Archevêché de Malines en 1561," *Miscellanea De Meyer,* II, 881–894; E. Voosen, "Exécution du Concile de Trente dans la diocèse de Namur," *Revue diocésaine de Namur* 9 (1954), 321–349; E. Brouette, "La vie religieuse dans le Comté de Namur au siècle de la réforme," *Revue du Nord* 35 (1953), 233–251; H. J. Elias, *Kerk en Staat in de zudelijke Nederlanden onder de Regeering der Aartsherzogen Albrecht en Isabella 1598–1621* (Antwerp 1931). For Liège: H. Dessart, "La visite du diocèse de Liège par le nonce A. Albergati 1613–1614," *Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'hist.* 114 (1949), 1–135. E. Donkel, "Luxemburger Gutachten zu den Trienter Reformdekreten," *Rhein. Vierteljahrsbll.* 19 (1954), 119–134.

the revolt of the Netherlands, the Huguenot Wars (1562–98) were never purely a religious conflict, even while Catherine de Médicis was regent for Charles IX (1560–74), and under Henry III (1574–89) they became more and more a power struggle between the Houses of Bourbon and Guise, with Spain intervening on the side of the Catholics, England and the States General of the Netherlands on the side of the Calvinists. Correspondingly, the papal policy was straightforward when the preservation of Catholicism and the suppression of Calvinism was or seemed to be in question, but cautious vis-à-vis the political power groups, especially the League of Henry of Guise, Charles of Bourbon, and Philip II, established in 1576 and revived in 1584.

The Edict of Amboise (1563), which ended the First Huguenot War, granted Calvinists the right of worship in one town of each *baillage*. When, not satisfied with this success and supported by English money and German troops, they again took up arms, Pius V sent subsidies and a military force, only to be disillusioned when the Huguenots, several times defeated, were accorded freedom of religion in the Peace of Saint-Germain (1570). In an effort to shield her son, Charles IX, from the influence of the Huguenot leader, Admiral De Coligny, Catherine de Médicis sought to remove the latter by assassination. When this proved unsuccessful, she tried to conceal the crime by a still greater one, the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day, 24 August 1572. Misled by euphemistic and misleading reports, Gregory XIII saw in this damnable act, proceeding from an unscrupulous greed for power, the thwarting of a treasonable attempt against the King and a victory over Calvinism. He prescribed a Te Deum and personally attended a thanksgiving service in the French national church of San Luigi. He played no part in the preparation and execution of the crime, which claimed between five thousand and ten thousand victims.[9]

The opposition of the Huguenots became even more bitter. In the Fifth Religious War they obtained from the weak Henry III in the Peace of Beaulieu (1576) almost complete religious freedom, but in the following year it was again restricted by the Edict of Poitiers. The danger that the French crown would devolve on a Calvinist became acute when, on the death of the younger brother of the childless Henry III, the Bourbon Henry of Navarre was recognized as his successor by the King and also by many Catholics. Though Sixtus V did not actually join the Catholic League formed against Henry of Navarre, he forever excluded him from the succession in 1585 as a relapsed heretic. The League gained military ascendancy and in 1588 forced Henry III to issue the Edict of Rouen, which envisaged the suppression of Calvinism. To rid himself of pressure from the League, the King a half year later procured the murder of its leaders, Henry and Louis of Guise, at Blois and allied himself with Henry of Navarre, only to be himself stabbed to death by the Dominican Jacques Clément on 1 August 1589. Charles of Bourbon, raised up as rival King by the League, died on 9 May 1590. Henry of Navarre, who as Henry IV had very quickly promised to protect the rights of the Catholic Church and who also had a strong Catholic following, found a steadily increasing recognition, particularly after he had returned to the Church on 25 July 1593. Gregory XIV and at first Clement VIII supported the League in its opposition. But when it was quite certain that Henry IV maintained the upper hand and, when, though remaining indifferent to religion ("Paris is worth a Mass"), he approached the Pope, Clement VIII condescended to absolve him under specific conditions. By the Edict of Nantes (30 April 1598) Henry IV granted to the Calvinists unrestricted freedom of conscience, access to political office, the right to worship publicly in all places where this was allowed in 1596–97 and in two places in every *bailliage,* and finally possession of 200 strongholds for eight years. These were quite extraordinary rights, but the crown and the vast majority of the people remained Catholic and once again France was a Catholic power. In politics Sixtus V had felt that in regard to Spain he was impotent, "like a fly facing an elephant." But now the papacy had again achieved a limited political independence.

---

[9] The older literature in regard to Saint Bartholomew's Day (till 1923) in Pastor, XIX, 482–518; H. Hauser, loc. cit. nos. 2099–2173; S. L. England, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew* (London 1938); P. Erlanger, *Le massacre de la Saint-Barthélemy* (Paris 1960).

The reception of the Council of Trent in France ran into strong opposition from the partly Huguenot, partly Gallican-minded, jurists of the highest tribunals, the *parlements*, in which every law valid in France had to be registered. The Calvinists Du Moulin and Gentillet denied the binding force of both the dogmatic and the reform decrees; the Gallicans Ranchin and Thou rejected only the reform measures.[10] A petition of the clergy, seconded by the Nuncio Salviati, to the Estates of Blois (1577–78), to the effect that the King might promulgate and carry out the decrees (*publier et inviolablement garder*) without prejudice to the Gallican Liberties, was unavailing, as was its renewal by the assembly of the clergy of Mélun in 1579. When the League adopted the reception of the Council in its program and the Papal Legate Morosini, at the command of Sixtus V, demanded its unconditional publication, Henry III gave in only when his cause was already lost and the assassination of

---

[10] A survey of the anti-Tridentine journalism so far as the historical material is concerned in V. Martin, *Le Gallicanisme et la réforme catholique* XXIIIff. (Paris 1919), and H. Jedin, *Überblick,* pp. 66–79.

Cardinal Louis of Guise excluded any agreement with the Pope. To what extent the publication of the Council by order of the state was a sign of the King's religious conviction is evident from the advice given to Henry IV by Cardinal Gondi, Archbishop of Paris: "Publish the Council of Trent!"[11] Although the clergy again presented a petition, the King, influenced by the Gallicans Harlay and Thou, did not in 1600 live up to the promise he had given through his proxies before his absolution. Gallican anti-Trent journalism—Ranchin, Thou, Ribier, Richer—was strong enough to bring about the definite denial of acceptance by the state at the Estates General of 1614.

Meanwhile, the bishops, left to themselves, had begun to carry out the Council. Shortly after his return from Trent Cardinal Charles Guise had taken the lead with the Provincial Council of Reims (1564). The assembly of the clergy at Mélun set up guidelines, on the basis of which eight provincial councils were held between 1580 and 1590. That of Aix (1585), guided by Archbishop Canigiani, was to the greatest extent under Milanese influence. Bishop La Rochefoucauld of Clermont (1585–1610), following Borromeo's example, exerted himself for the improvement of his clergy.[12] The reform will of bishops and clergy finally proved sufficiently strong to proceed without regard to the state. At the assembly of the clergy in Paris on 7 July 1615, three cardinals, forty-seven archbishops and bishops, and thirty deputies of the rest of the clergy swore to accept (*recevoir*) and to carry out (*observer*) the Council of Trent. This decision produced a powerful reform wave and formed the prelude to the steep ascent of the French Church in the next generation. Until this moment there had been, despite isolated and usually short-lived foundations, "a search for a solution of the seminary problem."[13] It was not only the known opposition to financing it that had delayed the realization of the Tridentine decree on seminaries, but also the rivalry of the universities and the Jesuit colleges and the absence of a clearly formulated ideal. In the course of the seventeenth century France finally became the leader in this field through its development of various types of priestly formation—Bourdoise, the Sulpicians, the Eudists.[14]

---

[11] V. Martin, op. cit., p. 279.

[12] Rochefoucauld composed a guide for the priestly seeking of perfection, *De la perfection de l'état ecclésiastique* (Lyon 1597, 1628); cf. Broutin, I, 44ff.; P. Gouyon, *L'introduction de la réforme disciplinaire du Concile de Trente dans la diocèse de Bordeaux* (Paris 1945).

[13] Broutin, II, 181.

[14] A. Degert, "Les premiers seminaires français," *RHEF* 2 (1911), 24–38, 129–144; G. Bonnenfant, *Les seminaires Normands du XVI au XVIII siècles* (Paris 1915); P. de Lattre, "Les Jésuits et les seminaires," *RAM* 20 (1953), 161–176.

England

By means of the Act of Uniformity of 1559—slightly mitigated by substituting "Supreme Governor" for "Supreme Head"—Elizabeth I of England had effectively renewed the Anglican Schism; the reintroduction of the *Book of Common Prayer* and the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1563 had restored the creed and liturgy of Edward VI in the English state Church. Of the sixteen bishops who had functioned under Mary the Catholic, fifteen were deposed for rejecting the Oath of Supremacy and for the most part replaced by clerics who had taken refuge on the continent during the Catholic Restoration. The overwhelming majority of the parish clergy took the oath,[15] and the laity were encouraged by the threat of considerable fines to frequent the Anglican worship. Just the same, the Queen, who was well versed in all diplomatic tricks and was supported at Rome by Spanish efforts of pacification, knew how to ward off the menacing blow until such time as her throne was secured against every assault from within.

It was not until 25 February 1570 that Pius V pronounced the major excommunication against Elizabeth I and her deposition.[16] The bull of excommunication aggravated the situation of the English Catholics all the more in that Mary Stuart, a prisoner in England since 1568, was regarded as the Catholics' claimant to the throne, and hence, on the outbreak of war with Spain, they came under suspicion of high treason. From 1581 death was the penalty for celebrating Mass, administering the Sacraments, and sheltering priests. One hundred and twenty-four priests and sixty-one lay persons were executed, including the Jesuit Campion. Another Jesuit, Gerard, was released after a long imprisonment.[17] A college was established at Douai (1568) by William Allen (cardinal in 1587, died 1594) to train priests for the extremely dangerous ministry to the English Catholics, who continued to exist despite all measures of suppression. The Jesuit Persons founded similar institutes at Valladolid and at Eu and Saint-Omer, and there were English colleges in Rome and Reims.[18] The efforts to maintain the care of souls in England were compromised by the opposition between the "Spanish" wing, whose chief was the Jesuit Persons, and the "Scottish" under Lewis. After the diocesan priests working in England had acquired a superior without episcopal consecration in the person of the Archpriest George Blackwell, who maintained good relations with the Jesuits, an anti-Jesuit minority, the "Appellants," opposed him and maintained that it was lawful to take the oath of loyalty to the Queen.

---

[15] A list of sixty-one "recusants" of 1561 in P. Hughes, *The Reformation in England* III, 422–427.

[16] *Bull Rom* VII, 810ff.; Mirbt, n. 491.

[17] E. Waugh, *E. Campion* (London 1935); *The Autobiography of an Elizabethan* [John Gerard], ed. P. Charaman (London 1952); C. Devlin, *The Life of Robert Southwell, Poet and Martyr* (London 1956).

[18] P. Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent* I (London 1914); M. Hayle, *William Allen* (London 1914).

The Anglican Church was consolidated under the Archbishops of Canterbury, Parker (1559–76) and Whitgift (1583–1604). The Elizabethan establishment, attacked by the Presbyterian Cartwright, was justified and defended in the eight books of Richard Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.*[18a]

The ruin of the Catholic Church in Scotland was sealed in the enactments of the Parliament of Edinburgh in 1560. The religious discussions of Aberdeen and Edinburgh and Ninian Winzet's literary defense (1562) could do nothing to alter the *fait accompli.* Queen Mary Stuart, a Catholic but morally vulnerable and finally completely isolated, was powerless against it. Archbishop Beaton of Glasgow resided in France from 1560 and the other bishops were deprived of their jurisdiction. After 1565 the Queen named the outstanding John Sinclair as Bishop of Brechin and in the following year sent an envoy to express her obedience to Pius V. But the Nuncio Laureo, dispatched by the Pope, was not allowed on Scottish soil. Following the Queen's forced but not undeserved abdication in 1567, the suppression of Catholics gained in intensity. Four priests were condemned to death for having celebrated Mass, and on 5 April 1571 the last Archbishop of Saint Andrew's, John Hamilton, was hanged for high treason. The care of the few remaining Catholics was exercised mostly by priests who had fled from England. Gregory XIII's plan to arrange that Mary's son, James VI, who had been baptized a Catholic, should be brought up as one proved to be impossible. When James took over the reins of government, he tried without success to substitute an episcopal system for the presbyterian constitution of the Scottish Church, which he detested. His cleverly feigned inclination toward Catholicism and his wife's conversion did not keep him from further increasing the penal laws against Catholics after his accession to the English throne as James I (1603–25).[19]

Only the Irish successfully resisted the introduction of the Anglican Church in the Emerald Isle. Their attachment to the ancestral faith, kept alive by native priests and by missionaries sent from Rome, was identified with the struggle against England. A landing expedition of Earl Fitzmaurice, with the support of Gregory XIII, miscarried in 1579.

[18a] See H. Marot, "Aux origines de la théologie Anglicane," *Irenikon* 33 (1960), 321–343.

[19] On James' attempts at contact with Gregory XIII and Clement VIII see Pastor, XXIV, 49–80.

Clement VIII congratulated the Catholic leader O'Neill after the victory at Blackwater (1598). Though the Catholic nobility was almost wholly exterminated and replaced by English landowners, the impoverished and repressed people held fast to the Church.

Poland, Sweden, and Russia

King Sigismund II Augustus of Poland (1548–72), whose wavering attitude had made possible the progress of Lutheranism and later of Calvinism and the anti-Trinitarians, accepted the Tridentine decrees at the urging of the Nuncio Commendone in 1564, but the "Warsaw Confederation" of the mainly Protestant nobility interceded in favor of the equality of the dissidents with the Catholics (1573). The Catholic renewal got under way with King Stephen Bathory (1575–86). Deeply Catholic, yet tolerant, and inspired by bold projects, he had the cooperation of the Nuncios Caligari and Bolognetti. The Provincial Council of Piotrkow (1577) repudiated the Warsaw Confederation and accepted the Council of Trent. Hosius, his successor Martin Cromer, Archbishop Uchanski of Gniezno, and Bishop Konarski of Poznan championed its enforcement. Bishop Karnkowski of Wloctawek founded the first Tridentine seminary. The Jesuit College at Vilna became an academy. The Jesuit Skarga made many conversions, including Prince George Radziwill, who became Bishop of Vilna and a cardinal. Jesuit colleges in Riga and Dorpat worked to recover Livonia for the Church.

The prospect of the restoration of Catholicism in Sweden seemed to be favorable when King John III (1586–92) became a Catholic in 1578, influenced by his Polish wife Catherine and also hoping to win the Polish throne. The liturgy which he introduced, the Red Book of 1576, was modeled on the Roman missal but was rejected by the Protestant clergy. The Jesuit Antonio Possevino, sent to Sweden as nuncio, realized that the recovery of the country would be impossible if the concessions demanded—marriage of priests, the chalice for the laity, Mass in the vernacular—were granted by Rome, which they were not. John's son Sigismund, raised a Catholic, had to confirm on oath before his coronation (1594) the exceptional laws demanded by the assembly of the clergy at Upsala in 1593 against Catholics, including the prohibition of public worship and exclusion from offices of state. After his departure for Poland the last traces of Catholic ritual disappeared, such as the elevation after the consecration. The nuns of the Birgittine convent of Vadstena were expelled. When Sigismund had tried without success to put down the revolt led by his uncle Charles, he was deposed (1599) and the profession of the Catholic faith was severely penalized. The great hopes connected with the conversion of the House of Vasa crumbled.[20]

The same fate befell an approach directed toward Russia. Hard pressed by the victorious Polish King, Czar Ivan the Terrible in 1581 sent an embassy to Rome to ask mediation for peace and promised to participate in the war against the Turks. Possevino did indeed negotiate a truce between Poland and Russia but in talks with Ivan he discovered no leaning toward union. The Pope, declared the Czar, was "not a shepherd but a wolf." During his stay in Moscow Possevino was kept from any other contacts by a "guard of honor." A second embassy from the Czar, in the company of which Possevino returned to Rome, confined itself to an exchange of courtesies. Disappointed by this failure, Sixtus V now supported Bathory's far-reaching plans: the conquest of Russia, which, after Ivan's death (1584), was weakened by internal dissensions, and then a concentrated assault on the Turkish Empire. They became pointless when Bathory died at the age of only fifty-four and Sigismund Vasa established himself as King against the Curia's candidate, Archduke Maximilian of Austria.

During the long reign of Sigismund III (1587–1632) Polish Catholicism grew progressively stronger.[21] About half the lost churches became Catholic again. A new elite of clergy and laity was formed in the Jesuit colleges of Poznan, Braunsberg, Vilna, Polock, and Lublin, and at the same time popular missions extended the field. The Jesuit Wujek produced a Polish translation of the Bible and a *Catholic Prayer Book* which was used for three centuries, and his confrere Skarga (d. 1612) was active as a preacher and author.[22] His book *On the Government and Unity of the Church of God under one Shepherd and the Greek Schism* contrasted the prosperity of the Church in Poland with the decline of the Orthodox Church, which was predominant in Lithuania and the Ukraine. Its intellectual center was the Academy of Ostrog, founded by Prince Constantine Ostrogski; from it came the "Ostrog Bible" in Ukrainian, of a decidedly Protestant tendency. Two synods, which the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias II held in connection with his journey to Moscow for the consecration of the patriarch (1589), were unable to settle the disputes among the Orthodox bishops. This situation is the key to the origin and fortune of the Union of Brest (1596).

---

[20] Especially in the *Relatio* of Malaspina, composed in 1594–98; see Pastor, XXIV, 544ff.

[21] In the final report of Cardinal Caetani, who had lived in Poland as legate in 1596–1597, it is said: "Religio Catholica in Polonia . . . fructificat et crescit et novis quotidie haereticorum conversionibus et animarum lucris augetur" (Pastor, XXIV, 117, footnote 1).

[22] A. Berga, *Un prédicateur de la Cour de Pologne sous Sigismond III* (Paris 1916); Sommervogel, VII, 1263–1287; T. Glemma, *Piotr Kostka 1532–1595* (Thorn 1959).

As early as 1590 the four Orthodox bishops of Tuck, Chelmno, Lwow, and Przemysl had declared their readiness, under specific conditions, to break with the Metropolitan of Kiev and attach themselves to Rome. But the declaration had no sequel. A new statement of Bishops Terlecki of Tuck and Pociej of Vladimir, in Torczyn at the end of 1594, which had been preceded by conversations with Maciejowski, Latin Bishop of Tuck, was followed by discussions with the representative of the nuncio in Cracow. Even before a settlement had been reached, Prince Ostrogski's violent opposition decided the King to send Terlecki and Pociej to Rome, where on 23 December 1595 they returned to the Union of Florence. The Bull of Union allowed the Ruthenians to retain their rite; bishops were to be named by the metropolitan, who was himself to be elected by the bishops. The Synod of Brest (6–10 October 1596) accepted the union; a countersynod, held at the same time and comprising, among others, the Bishop of Przemysl and lay deputies, excommunicated the Uniates. In addition to Ostrogski, the union was resisted by a group of theologians, notably the future Ecumenical Patriarch Kyrill Lukaris, who was under Calvinist influence, and the lay brotherhoods, which had been ignored during discussions of the Synod. Their participation in the revolt (Rokosz) of 1606–08 led to their being suppressed by the state, but they were revived after the Patriarch Theophanos of Jerusalem, supported by the Cossacks, had erected a new schismatic hierarchy in 1620. Saint Josaphat Kuncewicz, Catholic Bishop of Potock, fell victim to their hatred in 1623.[23]

Recognized as such by the King alone, but not, like the Latin bishops, admitted into the Senate, the Uniates held their own under the guidance of the zealous Metropolitans Pociej and Rudzki. But they were unable to prevent persons from going over to the Latin Rite, favored by the Polish side, though this had been forbidden by the Congregation of Propaganda since 1624. The reform of the Basilians, pursued by Rudzki, went much too far in assimilating this Order to those of the Latin Rite. The Religious Colloquy of Torun, organized by King Vladislav IV in 1645 and aiming at a new union which should include the Orthodox, only deepened the estrangment. Alongside the constantly expanding Church of the Latin Rite, the Uniate Church declined more and more in importance. Its status found no improvement until the accession of the Orthodox bishops of Galicia to the union in 1681.

Shortly after the conclusion of the Union of Brest there again appeared hopes of gaining a foothold in Russia. Misled by reports of the

---

[23] E. Unger-Dreiling, *Josafat* (Vienna 1960).

Nuncio Rangoni, Paul V supported the "False Demetrius," who claimed to be a son of Ivan the Terrible and had become a Catholic. His murder on 27 May 1606, terminated the adventure. Antipathy for the Roman Church was stronger than before and became even worse when the accession of Michael Romanov to the throne in 1613 brought an end to Russia's internal troubles.

CHAPTER 40

Crisis and Turning Point in Central Europe

As the Council of Trent was finishing its work, the Catholic Church in Germany seemed to be on the point of total dissolution. The Religious Peace of Augsburg had not halted the Protestant movement. The majority of the secular princes and the great Free Cities had joined it; a large part of the nobility and of the cities in the Catholic territories had done the same. Episcopate and clergy had by no means overcome their defeatism; slight was their concern for self-reform, and their will for self-defense was weak. The more precise doctrinal clarification effected at Trent was the first step toward recovery and the prerequisite for taking the second step, which was much more difficult, namely, the implementation of the Council's reform measures, enacted virtually without the cooperation of the German episcopate and hence not adapted to the German situation.

The determining of confessional allegiance was settled by the Religious Peace of Augsburg; it was definitively and by law taken away from Emperor and Empire and transferred to the states; thus making acceptance of the Council of Trent by the Empire an impossibility. Commendone, sent as legate to the Augsburg Diet of 1566, had to content himself with an oral declaration, given in the name of the Catholic estates, that the Council's decrees would be carried out as far as possible. Nothing of the sort could be expected from the Protestant-minded, "enigmatic emperor," Maximilian II (1564–76). However, at the Regensburg Diet of 1576, to which Cardinal Morone had been sent as legate, it was possible to prevent ratification of the *Declaratio Ferdinandea,* which would have undermined both the principle contained, but not expressly formulated, in the Religious Peace—"Cuius regio, eius et religio"—and the Ecclesiastical Reservation. The significance of these for the preservation of Catholicism revealed itself even more clearly. To avoid the appearance of violating the Religious Peace, the Catholic estates maintained a cool reserve in regard to the Council.

Furthermore, even public opinion was unfavorable to Trent. Against the massive onslaught of the Lutheran Martin Chemnitz in his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*[1] only a feeble response was attempted.[2] The nobly born cathedral canons, eager before all else to maintain their privileges, and the great majority of the parochial clergy, among whom marriage or concubinage was widespread, offered passive resistance. A new kind of leadership, which would in itself embody the Tridentine ideal of the shepherd of souls, had to develop and implant the ideal in others. Hence, apart from a few starts, the Tidentine Reform made general progress only from the turn of the century. This process took place amid the formation of denominations and the struggle for self-assertion.

The delimitation of the "confessions" was much slower and required much more time than was formerly thought. Only by having people make the Tridentine Profession of Faith, "will it be possible to ascertain who is of the Catholic Religion and who is opposed to it,"[3] declared the Würzburg Cathedral Chapter in a resolution to this effect of 3 March 1570. The determining factor, in accord with the Religious Peace, was the right of the territorial state to determine religious adherence, but in practice there were barriers of different kinds, such as consideration for neighboring princes of another creed and the opposition of the estates.

Nevertheless, the territorial state first fixed the clearly changing ecclesiastical map of the Empire. Where there existed an impossibility or an unwillingness to adopt a definite viewpoint, odd mixtures resulted, as on the Lower Rhine. At the court of Duke Wilhelm V of Jülich-Cleve-Berg (1539–92) Catholics and Lutherans were referred to as "the two Catholic factions," and under the influence of the irenical Witzel and Cassander an ecclesiastical order inspired by the spirit of Christian antiquity was sought. In Minden the Protestant canons regularly took part in the Mass and processions of the Catholic canons.[4] Into the seventeenth century it is at times impossible exactly to determine from reports of visitations to which denomination the pastors belonged. Because the indult granting the chalice to the laity obliterated the frontier between denominations, it fell into disuse in Bavaria, on the Lower Rhine, and elsewhere. The attitude of the laity toward the officially imposed religion differed from place to place. Religious ignorance encouraged adaptation all the more when the Protestant authorities and pastors respected Catholic traditions, as was the general rule in the North and East. But on both sides there were convinced and loyal believers, who remained steadfast in the midst of an alien religious environment or emigrated elsewhere. Repeated shifts of religious allegiance on the part of the government, as in the Margraviate of Baden-Baden and in the Upper Palatinate, led not infrequently, of course, to insecurity of faith and to indifference.

---

[1] First complete edition, Frankfurt 1574; the last, personally supervised by Chemnitz himself in 1578, was reedited by E. Preuss (Berlin 1861).

[2] W. Lindanus, *Stromata* (Cologne 1575); Kaspar Frank, *Rettung und Erklärung des tridentinischen Concils* (Cologne 1582); Andrada's *Defensio Tridentinae fidei* was reprinted in Cologne (1580) and Ingolstadt (1580 and 1592).

[3] Schreiber, II, 85.

[4] H. Nottarp, *Zur Communicatio in Sacris cum Haereticis* (Halle 1933), p. 16.

The Tridentine Reform took hold first of all in the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg, where, since the beginning of the religious cleavage, the reform efforts of the bishops had never been entirely broken off. At the provincial council of 1569, which was under the influence of Ninguarda, the Tridentine reform decrees were applied to German conditions in sixty-four constitutions. A second provincial council (1573) ordered the decrees to be printed, but they were not promulgated until after the diocesan synod of Salzburg (1576), under pressure from the Nuncio Portia. All clerics were obliged to make the Tridentine Profession of Faith and to observe celibacy; in addition, the Cardinal Legate Morone issued a reform mandate in the same year.[5] These measures and the diocesan synods had only meager success. Ninguarda, the soul of all efforts for the implementation of the Council, returned to Italy in 1583 without seeing the realization of the principal items of reform—the general visitation of all dioceses and the founding of seminaries. Even willing bishops, such as Urban von Trennbach of Passau (1561–98), were unable to succeed against their cathedral canons and the passive resistance of their clergy. Dietrich von Raitenau, Archbishop of Salzburg (1587–1612), proceeded vigorously against the Protestants of his see, but his own unclerical conduct prejudiced the internal reform. The friction between the bishops and the Dukes of Bavaria, Albrecht V (1550–79) and Wilhelm V (1579–97), which had already hurt the pre-Tridentine reform efforts, was lessened by a concordat in 1583. The "definitive victory of the Tridentine renewal" (Oswald) was not achieved until after the turn of the century, when shepherds of souls in the spirit of the new episcopal ideal assumed leadership—Hausen in Regensburg (1600–13), Gebeck in Freising (1618–51), Lodron in Salzburg (1619–53). Passau, from 1598 to 1664 dominated by Habsburg archdukes, obtained capable administrators. In the Austrian part of this extensive bishopric the dynasty decided the issue anyway.

---

[5] *QFIAB* 4 (1900), 123–137; K. Schellhas, *Der Dominikaner Felician Ninguarda und die Gegenreformation in Süddeutschland und Österreich 1560–1583,* 2 vols. (Rome 1930–39); J. Oswald, "Die Tridentinische Reform in Altbayern," Schreiber, II, 1–37.

The strength of Protestantism in Upper Austria was gradually broken after the suppression of a peasant uprising by the "General Reformation" (1597–1602) decreed by Emperor Rudolf II; from 1600 Jesuits were active in Linz. In the Lower Austrian part of the diocese of Passau and in the dioceses of Vienna and Wiener Neustadt Maximilian II had allowed to the nobles, in the "Religious Concession" (1568), the free exercise of religion in their castles and domains. During a demonstration before the Castle of Vienna in 1579 the cry was heard, "We are asking for the Gospel." Only the firm stand of Rudolf II and of his brother Ernst, supported by the energetic action of the *officialis* of Passau, Melchoir Klesl (1580–1600), secured the continuance of Catholicism. At the Diet of 1572 the Archduke Charles had granted religious freedom to the Protestant nobles of Inner Austria—Styria, Carinthia, Carniola—but in 1580 he had refused it to the cities. His son, Ferdinand, later Emperor, expelled the Protestant preachers—twenty-seven in Klagenfurt alone. These stern measures would have had scarcely any success if they had not been supplemented by internal ecclesiastical renewal, especially on the part of Bishops Brenner of Seckau (1585–1615) and Stobaeus of Lavant (1584–1618). In Tirol Bishop Spaur of Brixen (1600–13) became the "great reformer of the see" (Wodka) through his visitations, a diocesan synod, and the founding of a seminary.[6]

In Franconia leadership was assumed by the city of Würzburg under Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn (1574–1617), equally outstanding as bishop and statesman.[7] A Jesuit college, with a seminary attached, had already been founded by his predecessor, Bishop Wirsberg (1558–73). Without binding himself strictly to the letter of the Tridentine decrees and always maintaining a certain independence even toward Rome, von Mespelbrunn combined the internal renewal of the diocese, through visitations and by establishing the university, with the reconversion of the, since 1585, mostly Protestant subjects of his see. His activity is the classical example of combining the Catholic Reform with Counter Reformation. If his procedure against Abbot Dernbach of Fulda, who was overzealous, on bad terms with the estates of his principality, and threatened by his Protestant neighbors, must be judged unfortunate, the neighboring see of Bamberg, where little in the way of reform had occurred under the unclerical Bishop Würtzburg, found in him a strong support. In 1586 Bishop Mengersdorf opened there a seminary and in 1594 his successor, Thüngen, organized a visitation and issued a decree on religion. But it was only after a severe setback under the concubinary Gebsattel that the Tridentine principles were realized through Aschhausen (1609–22), an alumnus of the Collegium Germanicum.[8] Eichstätt, weakened through the loss of 209 parishes in the Protestant parts of the diocese, was in a relatively satisfactory state: the seminary founded by Bishop Martin von Schaumberg in 1564–65 was the first on German soil. In 1614 it was given to the Jesuits.[9]

---

[6] E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* II (Innsbruck 1949), 301–326; J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1959), pp. 195–240, with indication of the literature, pp. 433–436; T. Wiedemann, *Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation im Lande unter der Enns,* 5 vols. (Prague 1876–87); K. Eder, *Glaubensspaltung und Landstände in Österreich ob der Enns 1525*–1602, 2 vols., (Linz 1936); J. Loserth, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich* (Stuttgart 1898): V. Bibl, *Erzherzog Ernst und die Gegenreformation in Niederösterreich* (Vienna 1901); J. Stadlhuber, "Die Tridentinische Priesterbildung unter dem Brixener Fürstbischof J. Ch. v. Spaur," *ZKTh* 81 (1959), 351–368; J. Rainer, "Quellen zur Gesch. der Grazer Nuntiatur," *Rom. hist. Mitteilungen* 2 (1959) 72–81.

[7] G. Frh. v. Pölnitz, *Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn* (Munich 1934); A. Biglmair, "Das Konzil von Trient und das Bistum Würzburg," Schreiber, II, 39–91 (with copious bibliography).

Events in Augsburg and Constance show how dubious was the purely formal introduction of the Tridentine decrees. The diocesan synod of Dillingen (1567), at which the reform decrees of Trent were, almost in their entirety, declared in force, "was denied any lasting success," (Zoepfl), largely because its organizer, Cardinal Otto Truchsess von Waldburg, more zealot than zealous, soon went to Rome (1573).[10] The Jesuit College he had founded at Dillingen (1563) and the university, soon after given to the Jesuits, exerted influence beyond the boundaries of the bishopric of Augsburg, but Bishop Heinrich von Knoeringen (1598–1646) was the first to refashion his see in the Tridentine pattern through the synod of 1610 and the founding of a seminary at Dillingen. In Constance Cardinal Mark Sittich von Hohenems had adopted the Tridentine decrees at a diocesan synod in 1567. The visitation then prescribed was, however, only carried out at irregular intervals, partly through the deans, and, like the later visitations, for example, that of the vicar general Pistorius in 1591, produced no significant result, while the constantly discussed project for a seminary was unrealized. A new era dawned with Bishop Jakob von Fugger (1604–26) in the diocesan synod of 1609. The statutes of the synod were printed and later repeatedly renewed and reprinted, and a visitation was made by the bishop.[11]

---

[8] W. Hotzelt, *Veit II von Würtzburg, Fürstbischof von Bamberg 1561–1577* (Freiburg 1919); J. Kist, "Bamberg und das Tridentinum," Schreiber, II, 119–134; L. Bauer, "Die Kurie und J. Ph. v. Gebsattel, Bischof von Bamberg," *QFIAB* 40 (1960), 89–115.

[9] F. X. Buchner, "Das Bistum Eichstätt und das Konzil von Trient," Schreiber, II, 93–117.

[10] F. Siebert, *Zwischen Kaiser und Papst. Kardinal Truchsess von Waldburg und die Anfänge der Gegenreformation in Deutschland* (Berlin 1943); G. Frh. v. Pölnitz, "Petrus Canisius und das Bistum Augsburg," *Festgabe Spindler* (Munich 1955), pp. 352–394; O. Bucher, "Marquard von Berg, Bischof von Augsburg 1575–1591," *ZBLG* 20 (1957), 1–52; J. Spindler, *Heinrich V. von Knoeringen, Fürstbischof von Augsburg 1598–1646* (Dillingen 1911); F. Zoepfl, "Die Durchführung des Tridentinums im Bistum Augsburg," Schreiber, II, 135–169.

Of the Rhenish archbishoprics only Trier under Jakob von Eltz (1567–81), energetic both as a bishop and as a territorial prince, was exposed relatively early to the reform, which was actually carried out by Archbishop Johann von Schönenberg (1581–99).[12] Daniel Brendel, Archbishop of Mainz (1555–82), also showed his good will toward achieving the Tridentine Reform. He required the cathedral canons to make the Tridentine Profession of Faith and, through the agency of Nikolaus Elgard, alumnus of the Germanicum, reconverted Eichsfeld, which belonged to the see. Jesuit colleges were established in Mainz in 1568 and Heiligenstadt in 1581. But Brendel refused to summon a provincial council for the promulgation of the Tridentine decrees. His successor, Dalberg, would not publish the Bull "In Coena Domini" and only because of Rome's unrelenting pressure agreed to organize a general visitation and to compile a ritual in the spirit of the Tridentine decrees (1598). Under Schweikard von Cronberg, another alumnus of the Germanicum, the Rhenish part of the see was brought back to Catholicism; his "Order of Reformation" (1615) could be regarded as a substitute for a Tridentine diocesan synod. The realization of the Tridentine Reform, "for which efforts had been made in Mainz for a century without real success" (Brück), fell to the lot of the great Johann Philip von Schönborn after the Thirty Years' War.[13]

That the most serious danger to the stability of the prince-bishoprics was internal is indicated by events in Strasbourg and Cologne. In Johann von Manderscheid (1569–92) the see of Strasbourg had had a zealous reform prelate.[14] Nevertheless, after his death a Protestant-minded minority in the cathedral chapter elected Johann Georg von Brandenburg. The Catholics chose the Cardinal Charles II of Guise, who established himself with French aid and obtained imperial investiture with the see after he had accepted as his coadjutor the Archduke Leopold. In Cologne under the successors of Adolf von Schaumburg, who was well disposed toward reform, Protestant infiltration made great progress, and the cathedral chapter entered into negotiations with the rebel Dutch for the secularization of the see. Archbishop Friedrich von Wied, a nephew of the apostate Hermann von Wied, openly refused to make the Tridentine Profession of Faith. The visitation of the Rhenish part of the see (1569–70), ordered by Salentin von Isenburg, was rather an inventory than the beginning of a vigorous reform. Catholic-minded but without higher orders, Salentin resigned in order to perpetuate his family. Gebhard Truchsess von Waldburg, confirmed as his successor only after the conquest of serious scruples, broke with the Church in his "Christian Declaration" of 1583, married the canoness Agnes von Mansfeld, and sought to secularize the see. With Cologne the remnants of Catholicism in North Germany, in fact the very continuance of the Catholic Empire, were in danger; the loss of Cologne would have meant the loss of the remaining archiepiscopal sees of North Germany and would have assured the Protestants a majority in the Electoral College. Deposed on 1 April 1583, Gebhard was expelled by Bavarian troops with Spanish assistance in the "War of Cologne." He was succeeded by the worldly Ernst of Bavaria (1583–1612), under whom the nuncios at Cologne, Bonhomini, and Frangipani, "laid the foundations for all later reform activity" (Franzen), though they were unable to achieve the promulgation of Trent at the diocesan synod of 1589. Only the decree on matrimony, "Tametsi," was published by Frangipani in 1590. Ferdinand of Bavaria (1612–50), accepted as coadjutor in 1595, can be regarded as the first Tridentine reform bishop in the Rhenish metropolis. He personally visited the see, at least in part, held five diocesan synods, obliged the pastors to make the Tridentine Profession of Faith, and out of his own resources founded a modest seminary (1615), which lasted only thirty years.[15] In this work of reconstruction, which proceeded in the face of uninterrupted disputes with the cathedral chapter and the archdeacons, he was aided from 1601 by an "Ecclesiastical Council" and later by his capable vicars general, Gelenius, Binius, and Stravius. The last named was, after Ferdinand's death, the soul of the diocesan synod of 1662, at which Trent was formally promulgated.

---

[11] K. Schellhas, *Gegenreformation im Bistum Konstanz im Pontifikat Gregors* XIII (Karlsruhe 1925); K. Holl, *Fürstbischof Jakob Fugger von Konstanz (1604–1626) und die Katholische Reform in der Diözese im ersten Viertel des 17. Jh.* (Freiburg 1898); H. Tüchle, "Das Bistum Konstanz und das Konzil von Trient," Schreiber, II, 171–191.

[12] V. Conzemius, *Jakob III. von Eltz, Erzbischof von Trier 1567–1581* (Wiesbaden 1956); L. Just, "Ein Bericht des Kölner Nuntius O. M. Frangipani über die Durchführung der Tridentinischen Reformen in Trier 1595," Lortz F, I, 343–367.

[13] A. L. Veit, *Kirche und Kirchenreform in der Erzdiözese Mainz 1517–1618* (Freiburg 1920); A. P. Brück, "Das Erzstift Mainz und das Tridentinum," Schreiber, II, 193–243. A. Dolle, "Erzbischof D. Brendel von Mainz und die Gegenreformation auf dem Eichsfelde," *Universitas. Festschrift für A. Stohr* II (Mainz 1960), 110–125; L. Drehmann, *Der Weihbischof Nikolaus Elgard, eine Gestalt der Gegenreformation* (Leipzig 1958).

[14] K. Hahn, *Die katholische Kirche in Strassburg unter dem Bischof Erasmus von Limberg 1541–1568* (Frankfurt a. M. 1940); id. *Die kirchlichen Reformbestrebungen des Strassburger Bischofs J. von Manderscheid* (Strasbourg 1913); also L. Pfleger, *AElsKG* 9 (1934), 97ff.

---

[15] M. Lossen, *Der Kölnische Krieg,* 2 vols. (Gotha 1882); P. Weiler, *Die kirchliche Reform im Erzbistum Köln 1583–1615* (Münster 1931); A. Franzen, *Der Wiederaufbau des Kirchlichen Lebens im Erzbistum Köln unter Ferdinand von Bayern 1612–1650* (Münster 1941); *id.* "Innerdiözesane Hemmungen und Hindernisse der kirchlichen Reform im 16. und 17. Jh.," *Festgabe Wilhelm Neuss* (Cologne 1947), pp. 163–201; *idem, Die Kölner Archidiakonate in vor- und nachtridentinischer Zeit* (Münster 1953); id., *Die Durchführung des Konzils von Trient in der Diözese Köln,* Schreiber, II, 267–294; A. Brecher, *Die kirchlichen Reform in Stadt und Reich Aachen von der Mitte des 16. bis Anfang des 18. Jh.* (Münster 1957); A. J. Herkenrath, *Die Reformbehörde des Kölner Kirchenrates 1601–1615* (Düsseldorf 1960).

In Münster, where Bishop Hoya (1566–74) and the zealous dean of the chapter, Raestel, had prepared the ground, Ferdinand of Bavaria created "an environment in which Trent could enjoy free operation" (Schroer). He accomplished this through the visitation of 1611–16 and the five great reform decrees connected with it. Only after the Thirty Years' War was the reform completed here by Bishop Galen.[16] The fate of Hildesheim would have been virtually sealed by the Lutheran-minded Friedrich von Holstein, but Bishop Oberg (1557–73) and his successors, the Bavarian princes Ernst and Ferdinand, at least saved the bishopric. On the other hand, Osnabrück, where in 1570 Bishop Hoya had promulgated Trent, fell for a half-century (1575–1623) into Protestant hands. The Catholic restoration under Cardinal Eitel Friedrich von Hohenzollern and Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg was not lasting. The Peace of Westphalia called for the odd arrangement of alternating Catholic and Protestant bishops, and the see itself, with seventeen Protestant parishes out of forty-five, continued to be divided as to denomination.[17]

Definitely lost in North Germany through the chapter election of Protestant administrators were the archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Bremen and the prince-bishoprics of Minden, Halberstadt, Verden, and Lübeck. Magdeburg was incorporated into Brandenburg after the confirmation, surreptitiously obtained, of the Hohenzollerns Friedrich and Sigismund, sons of Joachim II. Georg von Braunschweig was the last Archbishop of Bremen to be confirmed by a Pope (1561); Heinrich von Sachsen-Lauenburg, elected by the chapter, secularized the see. Halberstadt was annexed by Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel to that duchy, while Minden, where the cathedral canons long maintained Catholic worship in an entirely Protestant environment, was added to Braunschweig by Hermann von Schaumburg in 1582. The cathedral chapter of Lübeck, designated as Catholic by the papal agent Trivius under Gregory XIII, was unable to withstand Bishop Holle, who, though confirmed by Pius IV, had gone over to Protestantism. He also secularized the see of Verden. The Saxon bishoprics of Naumburg, Merseburg, and Meissen were regarded as lost under Gregory XIII. They were confiscated by their Protestant territorial lords, as were the mediatized sees of Brandenburg, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania.[18]

---

[16] L. Keller, *Die Gegenreformation in Westfalen und am Niederrhein,* 3 vols. (Leipzig 1881–95); A. Schröer, "Das Tridentinum und Münster," Schreiber, II, 295–370; W. Stüwer, "Das Bistum Paderborn in der Reformbewegung des 16. und 17. Jh.," Schreiber, II, 387–450; H. Kramer, "Abt Leonhard Ruben," *Westfal. Zeitschr.,* 103–104 (1954), 271–333.

[17] H. Hoberg, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Osnabrücker Synodaldekrete des 17. Jh.," Schreiber, II, 371–386.

Not until the struggle over the Religious Peace of Augsburg and the carrying out of the Tridentine Reform in the last third of the sixteenth century was it decided that the South and West of Germany would remain mostly Catholic. To be sure, one can speak of a "carrying out of the Tridentine Reform" only within limits; it was indeed attempted, but until the turn of the century it was realized only to a very slight degree. None of the three distinguishing marks by which the reform is usually measured is ascertainable in all places—reform synods on the basis of Trent, episcopal visitations according to its norms, and the founding of Tridentine seminaries. Only in the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg were provincial councils held; they were convoked in no other province. It is doubtful whether under existing conditions they would have had the expected success, for even the comparatively few diocesan synods, for example, at Augsburg and Constance, were ineffectual. Trent had ordered the personal visitation of the diocese by the bishop; where visitations were made in Germany they were usually conducted by deputies, with the participation, as a rule, of civil officials in the secular territories, and in some instances by papal reform legates. In many cases they effected no thorough-going improvement of conditions, because, due to the existing shortage of priests, it was impossible to remove unorthodox or concubinary pastors. The establishment of seminaries was frustrated in most dioceses by the refusal of the cathedral canons to contribute to their founding and support. While their importance in educating a Catholic elite is undisputed, scholarship endowments and the Jesuit colleges springing up in all metropolitan sees and Catholic territories provided no real substitute for the training of a uniformly prepared diocesan clergy.

Not until toward the end of the century did a new class of ecclesiastical leadership appear. The cathedral chapters, which decided the choice of the bishops and which regarded themselves as coowners and corulers of the sees, were, partly through papal provision, interspersed with elements zealous for reform, especially from the Collegium Germanicum. While the bourgeois were not excluded, preference was shown to students of noble birth, out of regard for the current capitular statutes, with the result that, of the 800 students who had entered the college by 1600, six became bishops and eight auxiliary bishops. In

---

[18] Synopsis in K. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte* II/2, 277.

Breslau, because of the personal policies of the Bishops Gerstmann and Jerin, of the twenty-one canons who met for an episcopal election in 1599 twelve were alumni of the Germanicum. Mainz, the highest ranking bishopric in the Empire, had from 1604 to 1647 three archbishops who had come from the Germanicum.

The Tridentine ideal of the bishop as shepherd of souls was found in only a few individuals, and in none of these to a very high degree. The prince-bishop had to prove himself as a prince. Only with the prestige stemming from his status of territorial lord could he maintain the Catholic character at least of his own see. The struggle forced upon the Church for her very existence led to a flagrant violation of the Tridentine prohibition of pluralism. In order to preserve Cologne for the Church, and the even more seriously exposed North German sees of Paderborn and Hildesheim, as well as Liège, threatened by its Dutch neighbors, these bishoprics were given to Bavarian princes; thereby ecclesiastical interests were joined to dynastic, so that for almost two hundred years there existed on the Lower Rhine a sort of Bavarian secundogeniture.[19] The same motive led, somewhat later than at Cologne, to the episcopal pluralism of the Habsburg Archdukes Leopold and Leopold Wilhelm in the sees of Passau, Strasbourg, Breslau, and Olmütz. In these cases of pluralism, tolerated rather than encouraged by the Popes, was revealed the importance of the Wittelsbach and Habsburg dynasties in maintaining Catholicism and the Tridentine Reform. Wherever re-Catholicization of territories almost or completely lost was undertaken, such as in the Margraviate Baden-Baden, it was done upon the initiative of the territorial lord, that is, the estate. It was Philipp II, a Wittelsbach, educated at Ingolstadt, who after 1577, aided by Ingolstadt's secular councilors, suppressed non-Catholic doctrines and rejuvenated the spiritual estate.[19a]

Inner renewal in the spirit of Trent came to the German Church not from its own strength but through the use of existing political means and through help from abroad. Not bishops but secular princes, the Bavarian Wittelsbachs, led the way with the strict implementation of the right to determine religious allegiance as guaranteed to the territorial prince by the Religious Peace. In all Germany there was no succession of princes so resolutely Catholic as Albrecht V, Wilhelm V, and Maximilian I of Bavaria. The Habsburgs followed them only a generation later, after overcoming strong opposition from their estates.

---

[19] G. v. Lojewski, *Bayerns Weg nach Köln. Geschichte der bayr. Bistumspolitik in der 2. Hälfte des 16. Jh.* (Bonn 1962).

[19a] *Der Geistliche Rat zu Baden-Baden und seine Protokolle 1577/84,* ed. H. Steigelmann (Stuttgart 1962).

It is difficult to imagine how the Tridentine Reform could have made progress if the Popes had not kept the episcopate under unrelenting pressure through nuncios. Its more rapid progress in the South than in the West is explained by the fact that in the South there were fewer "episcopalian" hindrances to be dealt with than in the Rhenish archbishoprics. The lack of suitable personnel for education and the care of souls was somewhat remedied by the introduction of the Orders, especially of those originating in the course of Catholic Reform—the Society of Jesus and the Capuchins.

The network of Jesuit colleges, in which the future Catholic elite was formed, became ever more widespread between 1564 and 1618, particularly in the Habsburg territories (for example, Hall, Krems, Graz, Klagenfurt, Laibach), but also in the West and North, where they proved to be the strongest centers of the renewal—Koblenz, Cologne, Münster, Paderborn, Heiligenstadt. Naturally, the occasional endowment of the colleges with the buildings and property of sparsely occupied or defunct monasteries of other Orders caused resentment in these.

No oil was poured on troubled waters by the court confessors, such as Blyssem and Viller in Graz and Mengin in Munich, whose presence was at first resented by their superiors, but who were in a position to contribute to the direction of the ecclesiastical policies of the courts. However, their influence has often been overestimated. Far more effective and influential were others: Peter Canisius, as organizer of his Order in Germany, as agent of the Popes in matters of ecclesiastical policies, as teacher, preacher, and writer; with him in Cologne were Kessel and Rethius, both murdered in 1574 by a mentally deranged confrere; in South Germany Paul Hoffaeus (d. 1608), successor of Canisius as South German provincial and later a dreaded visitor; in Austria Georg Scherer (d. 1605), an important preacher. The undeniable success of the Jesuits explains the hate they inspired in Protestants. The Count Palatine Ludwig called them "spiritual locusts" and "scorpions in Christendom";[20] the libel of the apostate Hasenmüller, *Historia Jesuitici Ordinis* (1593), found wide circulation.

Shortly before the turn of the century the Capuchins entered the lists on the side of the Jesuits as popular preachers, confessors, and missionaries in Tirol (Innsbruck, 1593), Salzburg (1596), and Bavaria (Munich, 1600). In South Germany there arose six Capuchin provinces in addition to the two Rhenish provinces, which were founded from Flanders. Significantly, the three outstanding Capuchins who were active in Central Europe in the first decades of the seventeenth century were Italians—Laurentius of Brindisi (d. 1619), Hyacinth of Casale (d. 1627), and Valerian Magni (d. 1661).

---

[20] A. Kluckhohn, *Briefe Friedrichs d. Frommen* II (Braunschweig 1872), 811.

As in the Empire, in Switzerland also Tridentine Reform and self-assertion in the face of Protestantism went hand in hand; and the forces and counterforces in action were similar. The implementing of the Council began in the Catholic central parts of Switzerland and was supported by the lay authorities when the bishops of Constance, whose responsibility it was, failed to act. In the name of the seven Catholic cantons their former envoy to the Council, Melchior Lussy, on 3 March 1564, accepted all the Tridentine decrees. Harsh measures were taken against concubinary clerics, but all efforts to found a local seminary failed. Here too help from abroad was decisive; specifically, the activity of the nuncios to Lucerne—Bonhomini, Santonio, Paravicini, and finally Borromeo, who visited Switzerland in 1570 and founded the Helvetian College in Milan. In Lucerne there was a Jesuit College from 1574. In its mayor, Ludwig Pfyffer, this Catholic center possessed an energetic leader. The Capuchins were almost more active than the Jesuits. Between 1581 and 1589 they established themselves in Altdorf, Stans, Lucerne, and Schwyz, and in 1595 in Zug. After 1589 the Swiss monasteries constituted a separate province.

The Abbots of Einsiedeln and Sankt Gallen, Joachim Eichhorn and Othmar Kunz, were able to boast at the diocesan synod of Constance in 1560 that they had "fully observed and carried out" the Council.[21] Internally regenerated, the two great abbeys fortified a consciousness of the faith in all of Catholic Switzerland. When the pilgrimage to Einsiedeln was resumed, Stoyb, diocesan priest of Schwyz, wrote: "The Almighty has reserved to Himself seven thousand and more who have not apostatized from the faith." In the diocese of Basel Bishop Blarer (1575–1608) began the Tridentine renewal at the diocesan synod of 1581. The Treaty of Baden (1583) with the city of Basel assured financial compensation for the valuable episcopal property that had been lost there, and gave a free hand for the maintenance of Catholicism in Blarer's territorial domain. In the Valais, which had not joined the Catholic cantons, Bishop Riedenstein of Sion (1565–1604) was too weak to prevent the further progress of Protestantism and to carry out the Tridentine Reform in earnest. In the see of Chur the reform of the clergy was begun with the liturgy of 1590 and the diocesan statutes of 1605. However, when Bishop Flügi (1601–27) took vigorous action, the Nuncio d'Aquino wrote in 1613: "the bishop moves in constant danger to his life from the Protestant confederates; in his see city there is not a Catholic apart from the episcopal curia."[22] The see of Lausanne had shrunk substantially to the Canton of Fribourg. Here the Jesuit College, founded in 1580, and Peter Canisius supported the reform.

---

[21] R. Tschudi, *Das Kloster Einsiedeln unter den Äbten Ludwig II Blarer und Joachim Eichhorn 1526–1569* (Einsiedeln 1946), p. 195; Stoyb's remark, ibid., p. 155.

The self-assertion of the Church in Central Europe and the progress of the Tridentine Reform, together with the ending of the Huguenot Wars, the continuing union of the southern Netherlands with Spain, and the consolidation of Catholicism in Poland, made it possible after the turn of the century to regard the crisis of the religious cleavage, if not as overcome, at least as definitely checked. Contributing not a little to this outcome was the weakening of the Protestant front resulting from the conflict between Calvinists and Lutherans. The deepest cause, however, lay in the reinvigoration of the spiritual and intellectual substance of ecclesiastical life, which was manifested in the flowering of theology, of religious life, and of piety.

---

[22] J. G. Mayer, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Gegenreformation in der Schweiz,* II, 310f.

SECTION THREE

Religious Forces and Intellectual Content of the Catholic Renewal

CHAPTER 41

The Revival of Scholasticism, Michael Baius and the Controversy over Grace

Just as in the Middle Ages the flowering of scholasticism was intimately connected with the rise of the universities, so now its revival was associated with the formation of new centers in the development of the European universities. Now, as before, the University of Paris maintained its great authority in doctrinal decisions; this was impaired only by the university's Gallicanism and its opposition to the aspiring Society of Jesus. Alongside Paris new centers of theological activity sprang up from the second third of the sixteenth century. In Louvain, which through Latomus, Driedo, and Tapper had very early joined Cologne in opposing Luther and had strengthened its reputation through the presence of its professors at Trent in 1551–52, Augustinianism received a new stimulus at the hands of Baius, Hessels, and the older Jansenius. The revival of scholasticism, which stamped its character on the era, did not, however, proceed from these universities situated on the very battlefield of religious innovation, but from Spain, whose universities at the time of the Council of Trent and until the turn of the century exercised a leadership similar to that of the Spain of Philip II in high politics.

At Salamanca the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria, as holder of the first theological chair at the university, the *Catedra de prima,* founded a theological school which spread not only in Spain and Portugal but even to Rome and Germany. Of the seven chairs of theology, six were reserved for speculative theology, and for these the Dominicans of the Colegio San Esteban competed with members of the other mendicant Orders. In addition, there were four chairs of Greek and two of Hebrew. Even more keenly was positive theology pursued at Alcalá, in keeping with the aim of Ximenes, the founder; here the Colegio San Ildefonso held a predominant place, similar to that of San Gregorio at Valladolid. At Coimbra theology and canon law were taught in the convent of San Agustín. The Spanish Benedictines founded their own university at Zaragoza, or, more properly, Irache.

In the last third of the century Rome overtook the Spanish universities through the brilliance at the Jesuits' Roman College of stars of the first magnitude, all of them Spaniards, except Bellarmine: Francisco de Toledo, Maldonado, Suarez, Vazquez, Ruiz. They made Rome what it had never been in the Middle Ages or in the Renaissance—a stronghold of theological study. Theologians of the rising Society of Jesus carried the revitalized scholasticism to the German universities of Ingolstadt and Dillingen, the "citadels of the Catholic counter-offensive in the Empire" (Willaerts). Among their professors were many Spaniards and Dutch, at their head Gregorius of Valencia, whose work was continued by the Germans Gretser and Tanner.

How did the spirit and method of this reinvigorated scholasticism differ from the content and teaching method of the late medieval theological schools?

Whatever the answer to the question of Luther's nominalism, the fact is that this school of thought had scarcely any champions left at the Council of Trent. There the Franciscans had numerically the strongest representation, but the Dominicans were best able to undertake the defense of the Church against Protestantism. Neither of these schools was entirely able to free itself from the influence of Humanism, which was strongest in the Augustinian School led by Seripando. Above all, the fact that the Protestants asserted the sufficiency of Scripture and invoked the authority of the Fathers on behalf of the new doctrines forced upon Catholics an intensive preoccupation with the Bible and the witness of Tradition, which were not only given more weight than formerly and consulted at first hand in systematic theology but also led to the establishment of an autonomous domain of positive theology. Both revived scholasticism and controversial theology were committed to positive theology. Four new approaches resulted from this return to the positive data of revelation contained in Scripture and Tradition.

First, the new scholasticism proceeding from Salamanca sought, like the medieval, to reconcile *fides* and *ratio* but dispensed with the ballast, amassed in the late Middle Ages, of oversubtle questions amounting to dialectical acrobatics and took as its standard the classical period of scholasticism and especially Thomas Aquinas. Thus the reproof of the humanists—*Perdunt nugis tempora*—was no longer applicable and once more theology became simpler, clearer, and more relevant to life. Second, attacked by humanist and reformer alike, it reexamined the method of theological proof. Third, as controversial theology, it grappled with the theological problems raised by the religious cleavage, but also sought answers to the ethical and juridical questions which became acute with the colonizing activity of the Iberian peoples in the New World. Fourth, in the pastoral spirit of the Council of Trent, it was much concerned with popular religious instruction and preaching. All five Doctors of the Church who lived at this period were eminently practical theologians: Canisius and Bellarmine as compilers of catechisms, John of the Cross as a mystic, Francis de Sales as a teacher of the spiritual life, Lorenzo of Brindisi as a preacher.

Revival of Scholasticism

The "Golden Age of Scholasticism" was inaugurated by the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (d. 1546). He was introduced to the study of Saint Thomas by another Dominican, Petrus Crockaert, at the University of Paris, but he was also familiar with the investigation of the sources that was going on at Louvain. After his change in 1526 to Salamanca as holder of the first theological chair he based his teaching very largely on the *Summa* of Aquinas. His dynamic lectures, above all on questions of moral theology, and his celebrated conferences (*Relectiones*) had an extraordinary effect on his large audiences, sometimes numbering as many as one thousand people, even though not one of his books was printed in his own lifetime. The *Summa sacramentorum*, compiled by one of his pupils and first printed in 1560, went through more than thirty-three editions and became "the manual of pastoral theology most used by the Spanish clergy in the sixteenth century" (Stegmüller). Thomistic in his basic approach, Vitoria was not narrow-minded. His moderate views on the relationship between Pope and Council determined the attitude of many Spanish bishops at the Council of Trent. His analysis of the ethical and juridical problems of the Spanish Colonial Empire entitles him to be considered the founder of modern international law. Hugo Grotius is heavily indebted to him.

Among the sixty-six doctors of Salamanca who attended the Council of Trent were many bishops and theologians who had sat at Vitoria's feet. His pupil and successor in the chair, the Dominican Melchior Cano (d. 1560), became, through his *De locis theologicis* (1563), the founder of theological methodology.[1] Following the Humanist Rudolf Agricola instead of the Topics of Aristotle in the definition of *loci* (sources), Cano distinguished ten such *loci* (or *domicilia*, as he also called them) from which theological arguments are drawn: Holy Scripture, Apostolic

---

[1] Last edition in *Opera* I–II (Rome 1890). A. Lang, *Die Loci theologici des M. Cano und die Methode des dogmatischen Beweises* (Munich 1925) demonstrated the dependence on Agricola, contrary to A. Gardeil, "La notion du Lieu théologique," *RSPhTh* 2 (1908), 51–73, 246–276, 484–505; J. Beumer, "Positive und spekulative Theologie," *Scholastik* 29 (1954), 53–72; E. Marcotte, *La nature de la théologie de M. Cano* (Ottawa 1949), along with G. Thils in *EThL* 26 (1950), 409ff.; F. Pelster, "Eine Kontroverse über die Methode der Moraltheologie aus dem Ende des 16. Jh.," *Scholastik,* 17 (1942), 385–411.

Tradition, the *magisterium* of the Universal Church, the councils, the *magisterium* of the Roman Church, the Fathers, the scholastics and canonists, natural reason, the philosophers, and history. This work made Cano the "father of theological methodology" (Lang). His reputation was tarnished by his passionate attacks on his fellow Dominican Carranza[2] and on the Jesuits.

Though the groundwork for this revival had been laid at the very beginning of the sixteenth century by the great commentators Cajetan and Koellin, Thomism received a powerful stimulus and a wide dissemination from the Salamanca School. In 1567 Pius V proclaimed Aquinas a Doctor of the Church. His *Summa theologiae* gradually supplanted the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard as a textbook. But in the last third of the century a differentiation was beginning to show. The Spanish Dominicans Bartolomeo of Medina (d. 1580) and Dominico Báñez (d. 1604) were developing the "classical Thomistic School" (Grabmann), that is, strict Thomism; while the Jesuit School, increasingly prominent, went its own way in both method and doctrine.

Jesuit Theology

The Jesuit theologians at the Council of Trent, Lainez and Salmeron, had still adhered to a certain eclecticism. The general congregation of 1593 prescribed Thomas as the guide of the Society's theologians, allowing them to depart from him only in exceptional cases and for good reasons (*gravate admodum et rarissime*). The voluntarist and activist tendency of the Society, however, soon made itself felt in theology, both in Spain (Molina) and in Rome and Germany.

Gregorius of Valencia (d. 1603), who had been educated at Salamanca, combined a sound grasp of scholasticism with a humanist attitude and remarkable talent for exposition. As professor at Ingolstadt (1575–97), he contributed to a large degree through the training of numerous pupils—hence his title of *Doctor Doctorum*—to restoring the good name of scholasticism in Germany, where it had been most exposed to contempt by the criticism of humanists and reformers.[3] His pupil and successor, Jakob Gretser (d. 1625), wrote all his numerous theological, philological, and historical works in the form of controversial theology,[4] as did Adam Tanner (d. 1632), who taught in Munich, Ingolstadt, Prague, and Vienna.[5] Tanner encouraged von Spee in his opposition to witchcraft trials.

---

[2] For the literature, see *LThK* 2nd ed. II, 957; J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, *B. Carranza Arzobispo* (San Sebastian 1958); *Fray B. Carranza. Documentos historicos,* ed. J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, so far 2 vols. (Madrid 1962).

[3] His chief work, *Commentarii theologici,* 4 vols. (Ingolstadt 1591–97), had twelve editions in twenty years; see Sommervogel, VIII, 388–400, IX, 897, W. Hentrich, *G. von Valencia und der Molinismus* I (Innsbruck 1928); cf. *Scholastik* 4 (1929), 91–106; id. *G. von Valencia und die Erneuerung der deutschen Scholastik,* (Regensburg 1930); J. Esposa, *Arch. teol. Granadino* 8 (1945), 99–123; H. Wolter, "Die Kirche im Religionsgespräch zwischen Gregor v. V. und Lucas Osiander," *Sentire ecclesiam,* ed. J. Danielou and H. Vorgrimler (Freiburg 1961), pp. 350–370.

Clearly decisive for the further growth of the new scholasticism were its spread to Rome and its development by the great Jesuit theologians, Francisco de Toledo, Bellarmine, Suarez, and Vazquez. Important also as an exegete, Francisco de Toledo (d. 1596),[6] a pupil of Soto, taught from 1559 at the Society's Roman College; in 1593 he became the first Jesuit cardinal. The most profound and most prolific of these men, both in philosophy and in theology, was the *Doctor Eximius,* Francisco Suarez (d. 1617).[7] Also trained at Salamanca, he taught at times at Rome (1580–85), only to return to Spain and to Alcala, Salamanca, and finally Coimbra (1598–1616) where he reached the climax of his creative work. Here he produced his works on grace and law—"summing up the achievements of sixteenth-century Spanish theology in natural law, international law, and political philosophy" (Stegmüller)—as well as a large-scale defense of religious Orders and of the Society of Jesus. On several occasions he intervened in the dispute concerning grace to contribute his expert opinion, and Protestant universities also paid attention to his philosophy. Like Suarez, Gabriel Vazquez (d. 1604) was active only briefly (1586–91) at Rome and then returned to Spain.[8] His relationship to Suarez has been compared to that of Scotus to Thomas. An extremely keen-sighted theologian, dreaded as a fiery debater, Vazquez, who had studied under Báñez at Alcalá, became famed among his contemporaries as a "second Augustine" because of his knowledge of the Fathers of the Church; he entered the dispute over grace as a strict Molinist.

---

[4] Important for history is *De Cruce Christi,* 3 vols. (Ingolstadt 1598); his 234 printed works, including Latin plays, in Sommervogel, III, 1743–1809.

[5] W. Lurz, *A. Tanner und die Gnadenstreitigkeiten* (Breslau 1932); his chief work is *Universa theologia scholastica,* 4 vols. (Ingolstadt 1626f.); Sommervogel, VII, 1834–1855.

[6] His chief work, the commentary on the *Summa,* last edited by J. Paiva, 4 vols. (Rome 1869–70); Sommervogel, VIII, 64–82.

[7] His works are in 23 vols. (Lyons–Mainz 1630); latest complete edition in 28 vols. (Paris 1856–61); Sommervogel, VII, 1661–87; P. Mugica, *Bibliografia Suarenciana* (Granada 1948); R. De Scoraille, *Fr. Suarez,* 2 vols. (Paris 1912–13); F. Stegmüller, *Zur Gnadenlehre des jungen Suarez* (Freiburg 1933); G. Ambrosetti, *Il diritto naturale della Riforma cattolica. Una giustificazione storica del sistema di Suarez* (Milan 1951); J. Giers, *Die Gerechtigkeitslehre des jungen Suarez* (Freiburg 1958). Survey of the most recent literature in *AHSI* 30 (1961), 471f.

[8] Commentary on Saint Thomas (1608–15); Sommervogel, VIII, 513–519.

The brightest star of the Jesuit School and the systematizer of controversial theology was Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621). A nephew of Pope Marcellus II, he had already occupied himself with the Protestant concepts as a teacher at Louvain (1570–76), where he distinguished himself as a preacher. Appointed professor of controversial theology at the Roman College (1576–88) and in 1592 its rector, then consultor of the Holy Office and theological adviser to Clement VIII, he won such esteem that the Pope in 1599 made him a cardinal. Because of differences with the Pope over the controversy on grace, he was removed from Rome by his appointment as Archbishop of Capua in 1602, but returned after the death of his former patron and under Paul V took part in all the great disputes in which the papacy was involved: the quarrels with Venice and James I of England and the Galileo Case. His *De potestate Pontificis in rebus temporalibus*, composed at this time (1610), which enlarged on the teaching he had already championed in the *Controversies* in regard to the merely indirect power of the Pope in the temporal sphere, met with violent opposition from the advocates of the *potestas directa*, as well as from the Protestants. At the peak of his scholarly activity and finally as a cardinal, Bellarmine remained as devoted to pastoral activity as he had always been: his small catechism (1597), with its 400 editions, almost equalled that of Canisius; the larger catechism (1598) was intended for catechists. In the last years of his life Bellarmine, who was the friend of Baronius and Francis de Sales, composed ascetical works, for example, *De arte bene moriendi* (1620). His cause was introduced in 1627 but was suspended by Benedict XIV. He was beatified in 1923 and canonized in 1930; the next year he was declared a Doctor of the Church.

Bellarmine's chief work, the *Disputationes de controversiis fidei* based on his Roman lectures and usually called *The Controversies*, is a synthesis of the Catholic controversial theology of the sixteenth century. Though by no means original, it is inspired by a consistent fundamental concept and enriched by an astonishing command of literature. It far surpasses the earlier controversial manuals of Johannes Eck, Albert Pigge, Stanislaus Hosius, and Ruard Tapper[9] through its assimilation of all the material amassed in countless monographs, and it had a natural advantage over them in being able to build on all the decrees of the Council of Trent. Whereas the Council, because of the opposition of Gallicans and "episcopalists," had avoided a declaration on the concept of the Church,

---

[9] S. Hosius, *Confessio catholicae fidei christiana* (1551); L. Bernacki, *La doctrine de l'église chez le card. Hosius* (Paris 1936); J. Lortz, *Kard. St. Hosius* (Braunsberg 1931). R. Tapper, *Explicatio articulorum ven. facultatis . . . Lovaniensis circa dogmata ecclesiastica ab annis XXXIV controversa* (1555); *Opera* (Cologne 1582).

Bellarmine, after a discussion of the sources of revelation—Scripture and Tradition—placed the doctrine of the Church at the beginning (Book I) and only then passed on to the Sacraments (II) and to the doctrine of grace and justification (III). His predessor in this arrangement of controversial theology was the Englishman Thomas Stapleton (d. 1598), who had rightly attributed the limited success of the contemporary controversial theologians to the fact that they had not started with the teaching office of the Church.[10]

Michael Baius

At the Council of Trent the moderate Augustinian School led by Seripando had been unable to carry the day.[11] Even before the Council was finished Augustinianism in its strictest form found scholarly and stubborn representatives in the Louvain professors Michael Baius (d. 1589) and Johannes Hessels (d. 1566). When one of their pupils, the Franciscan Sablons at Nivelles, defined the freedom of the will as freedom from external compulsion and expressly declared that Calvin's teaching on the subject was correct,[12] twenty of his propositions were censured by the University of Louvain at the beginning of 1560; both professors concurred with the judgment on eighteen of them. In the summer of the same year the Sorbonne likewise censured eighteen theses of the Franciscan. The Nuncio Commendone demanded the intervention of the Pope, who imposed silence on both parties. Baius and Hessels traveled to Trent in 1563; but the Council, then at its worst crisis, did not take up the matter. Baius himself explained his teaching on man's original state, justification, freedom of the will, merit, and also on Sacrifice and Sacraments in a collection of treatises (1563–64). Numerous propositions extracted from this work were, at the request of Philip II, censured on 31 March 1565 by the University of Alcalá, and on 8 August 1565 by the University of Salamanca.[13] The University of Louvain then asked Rome for a judgment on 26 November 1566. After the expanded new edition of the offending book had been censured once more by the University of Alcalá, Pius V in the Bull "Ex omnibus afflictionibus" of 1 October 1567, condemned seventy-nine of the 120 propositions rejected by the Spanish censors in the sense intended by the author, although some of them could have been interpreted in an acceptable sense.[14] Baius submitted to the bull, which had not been made public, later (1569) formally repudiated the errors attributed to him, and in 1575, under oath, professed the faith of the Council of Trent.

---

[10] *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (composed 1579), *Opera* I (Paris 1620), 1–503. N. Sander, *De visibili monarchia ecclesiae* (Louvain 1571), was composed as a defense of the Primacy, with exclusive concern for the English situation. On all these, see G. Thils, *Les notes de l'Eglise dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la Réforme* (Gembloux 1937). J. B. Bicunas, *Doctrina ecclesiologica S. Roberti Card. Bellarmini cum illa Jo. Card. Turrecremata comparata* (Rome 1963); M. R. O'Cormell, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter-Reformation* (New Haven 1964).

[11] H. Jedin, *G. Seripando,* I, 354–426, II, 239–268; id., "Agostino Moreschini und seine Apologie Augustins," *Augustinus-Festschrift* (Cologne 1931), pp. 137–153.

[12] M. Roca, "Documentos ineditos en torno a Miguel Bayo," *Anthologia annua* 1 (1953), 311: "Calvinus bene scripsit de libero arbitrio, nec erat reprehendendus, nisi in aliis errasset;" the concurrence of the two professors, ibid., p. 318.

Nevertheless, the dispute grew in intensity. A case brought before the Holy Office ended in 1580 with a new condemnation by Gregory XIII. Baius accepted this too in the presence of Francisco de Toledo, who had been dispatched to Louvain, and the Louvain Faculty committed itself to an anti-Baian formulary. As the unquestionably sincere submission of Baius to the several papal judgments shows, his basic attitude was Catholic, but the difficulty of reconciling the decisions of the *magisterium* with the conclusions to which his studies had led him created a genuine conflict of conscience. Convinced that it must vindicate the Augustinian teaching on grace, the Louvain Faculty, with the cooperation of Baius, in 1587 censured thirty-four theses of Leonard Lessius (d. 1623), a Jesuit teaching at the Louvain College, on the inspiration of Holy Scripture, grace, and predestination; by order of Sixtus V the Nuncio Frangipani had again to enjoin silence on both parties. The Louvain disputes were, however, soon eclipsed by the great Molinist conflict over grace described below, though they did break out again with full force in the Jansenist Quarrel of the seventeenth century.

Controversy over Grace

In 1588 there appeared in Lisbon, with the approval of the censor of the Inquisition, the Dominican Ferreira, the Jesuit Luis de Molina's book, *Liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione concordia,* which undertook to explain the compatibility of the universal efficacy of grace with the free will of man by virtue of God's foreknowledge, and which was expressly directed against the Thomistic teaching presented in the commentary on Saint

---

[13] M. Roca, op. cit., pp. 322ff., 329ff.

[14] D. 1001–1080. By changing the punctuation (Comma Pianum), the Baianists gave to the formula the meaning: "Although some of them might be maintained in the sense intended by the author."

Thomas published just previously (1584) by the Dominican Báñez. Molina's *Concordia* was, for this reason, suppressed for three months by the Portuguese Inquisition, but after its release it was at once reprinted by leading publishers in Lyons, Antwerp, and Venice. When Báñez tried to bring it before the Spanish Index, Molina replied with the charge that his opponent's teaching on physical predestination and on efficacious grace agreed with Luther and Calvin and contradicted Trent. On the other hand, the Dominican Nuño, at a disputation arranged by the Jesuits at Valladolid on 5 March 1594, termed some of their theses erroneous and heretical; the Jesuits either defended these or denied that Molina held them.

In order to put an end to the scandalous quarrel, behind which the rivalry of the two great Orders was now apparent, Clement VIII in an instruction of 28 June 1594 to the nuncio at Madrid, Gaetani, withdrew the case to Rome; the nuncio forbade any further dispute over efficacious grace. Both parties objected to the imposition of silence. Báñez, in a memoir to the Pope, maintained that he was only expressing the teaching of Augustine and Aquinas; Bellarmine, in an opposing opinion, denied this claim and the assertion that the Jesuits were "innovators." Thereupon, the order of silence was canceled for both parties by the Roman Inquisition on 26 February 1598.

In the same spring of 1598 the case, which had meanwhile been brought to Rome, took a turn which seemed to bring victory within the grasp of the Dominicans. The theological commission appointed by the Pope had been directed to examine, not the disputed point as such, namely, the teaching of both parties, but only Molina's teaching. It decided on 13 March 1598 that the book and the doctrine were to be forbidden and renewed this decision after weighing the exhaustive expositions of both schools, in which the most eminent theologians on both sides took part, the opinions of the Universities of Salamanca, Alcalá, and Sigüenza, and the views of five Spanish bishops and four Spanish theologians. A report drawn up by the secretary of the commission, the Augustinian Coronel, which was presented to the Pope on 12 March 1599, proposed that sixty theses of Molina be condemned. Thus far Molina himself had not been directly heard, although he had requested a hearing in a petition to the Pope. In order to permit the Jesuits to have a better opportunity to speak, Clement VIII, at the intercession of Philip III of Spain and other highly placed patrons of the Society, had the two generals, Beccaria and Acquaviva, each assisted by eminent theologians—among others, the Dominican Diego Alvarez and the Jesuit Michael Vazquez—define orally and in writing their viewpoint in the controversy. The Dominicans resisted any side-tracking of the real issue, which in their opinion concerned only the teaching of

Molina. The Jesuits insisted on discussion of the entire problem, including Báñez's teaching on the *praemotio physica;* in any case, they said, Molina's teaching was not that of the Society. They won their point, despite the protests of the Dominicans.

The success was only a brief one. When the Theological Commission, enlarged by three members, resumed its activity at the Pope's command, it again decided against Molina, by a majority of nine to two, and rejected twenty propositions contained in his works. On 5 December 1601 it submitted all its documents to the Pope, who exclaimed when he saw the mass of paper: "A year may have been sufficient for you to write all this, but a year is not sufficient for me to read it."[15] In Spain the rumor was already spreading that Molina, who had died in 1600, had been condemned and his effigy burned, when the Jesuits, by means of a memoir handed to the Pope on 12 February 1602, succeeded in obtaining another postponement. Clement VIII decided to hear both parties himself and to pass sentence personally. All the same, the prospects of the Jesuits were as bad as ever, because the Pope was angry with them. The Jesuit College of Alcalá had held a disputation on the subject of whether it was a truth of faith that the reigning Pope was the lawful successor of Peter! Once again the two generals and their theologians, in the presence of the Pope, of Cardinals Arigoni and Borghese, and of the Theological Commission, further strengthened by four members, debated only Molina's teaching, comparing it with Augustine and Cassian and also with Trent. Although the disputations—a total of sixty-eight—and the succeeding deliberations of the cardinals and consultors were continued for almost three years (1602–5), the Pope felt unable to reach a decision. Bellarmine had clearly been right in warning him not to try to settle so weighty a question himself but to refer it to a council or to trained theologians. Clement VIII was inclined to favor the Dominicans; his confessor, Cardinal Baronius, admitted to being an opponent of Molina but a friend of the Jesuits. At the Pope's death nothing had been settled.

Paul V had both sides present their views to him concisely and in writing. But nevertheless, on 2 September 1605, he again convened the commission which had been investigating Molina and had shortly before been sharply attacked by the Jesuit Bastida. On 14 September 1605 the disputations were resumed over the documentary evidence which it had not been possible to consider at the beginning of the year because of the illness of Clement VIII. Their course convinced Pope Paul V that in this manner no progress was possible. He ordered that only the fundamental question should be considered: how the efficacy of grace on the free will is to be understood. Thus the doctrine of Molina, which had been generally fixed as the point at issue under Clement VIII, was put aside and the Pope now yielded to the original demand of the Jesuits. These endeavored to refute the Thomistic doctrine of the *praemotio physica* and to prove that it was akin to the Calvinist theory of grace.

---

[15] Pastor, XXIV, 336.

After the conclusion of the disputations the consultors were directed to answer four questions: 1. Which propositions on grace should be defined; 2. Which should be condemned; 3. Where lay the difference between the Catholic and the heretical views; 4. Whether a bull should be issued on the subject. The opinion of the consultors, rendered at the end of November 1606, was that forty-two propositions of Molina were to be censured; only one consultor, the Carmelite Bovio, counseled against any decision because the question was not ready for a final judgment. This was also the view of Francis de Sales and Cardinal Duperron, whose advice the Pope sought. Of the nine cardinals whom he questioned on 28 August, four advocated further discussion; two recommended a judgment, but without indicating in what sense; the Dominican Cardinal Bernerio called for the condemnation of Molina's forty-two propositions; Cardinals Bellarmine and Duperron asked for the contrary. In these circumstances the Pope refrained from a decision, saying that the teaching of the Dominicans was quite different from that of Calvin, the teaching of the Jesuits, different from Pelagianism; so that no definition was necessary. The *Congregatio de Auxiliis* was dissolved and silence concerning the discussions was enjoined on all participants. The Inquisition, on 11 December 1611, decreed that, for the future, writings published on the subject of grace would require its previous approbation.

Molina barely had escaped condemnation, but the Society of Jesus, accused with him, had held its own. No definition concluded the greatest dogmatic controversy which had ever broken out within Catholic Theology, over what is, in the final analysis, an almost insoluble problem, and which had kept in suspense not only the Catholic but also the Protestant world. The issue remained officially undecided and probably had to, because the mystery of the collaboration between divine grace and man's free will defies ultimate clarification by human reason. The antagonism between the two schools, Thomists and Molinists, has begun to diminish only quite recently.

CHAPTER 42

The Rise of Positive Theology

Humanism's slogan, "To the sources," had riveted attention on the Bible and the Fathers. Now the confrontation with the Protestant doctrinal system on the basis of Scripture and Tradition, defined at Trent as the sources of revelation, together with the defense of the Church institutions that were under attack, led to the construction of historical theology.[1] While at first Spaniards and Italians played the leading role in the Catholic Reform, toward the close of the period under discussion the French joined them with distinguished achievements.

The Tridentine decree on the Vulgate did not prevent work on the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible. By order of Philip II Arias Montanus (d. 1598) supervised the "Royal Polyglot"[2] based on the Complutensian text. The Parisian philologist Robert Estienne revised four of Erasmus' editions of the Greek New Testament, the last of which (1551) introduced the verse arrangement. The *textus receptus* of the Leiden book dealer Elzevir (1633) enjoyed the greatest esteem. The edition of the Septuagint, prepared under the direction of Cardinal Antonio Carafa, appeared in Rome in 1587. The most popular text of the Vulgate until the release of the Sixto-Clementina was the often reprinted Louvain edition of the Dominican Johann Henten (1547), which was later improved by Luke of Bruges (d. 1619).

Despite Trent's contrary attitude, the Bible was translated into the vernacular, especially in countries threatened by Protestantism. The German translations of Dietenberger and Eck were unsatisfactory; the one begun in 1614 by Caspar Ulenberg,[3] but not completed until after his death by Heinrich Francken-Sierstorff (1630), continued in use into the eighteenth century as the "Mainz Catholic Bible," so called because of revisions by theologians of Mainz. The French Bible going back to Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples was placed on the Index in 1546, but after being revised by Louvain theologians it was reprinted at least two hundred times.

Biblical exegesis was not outdistanced by textual criticism. Whereas the exegetical works of the Jesuit Francisco de Toledo, important also as philosopher and preacher, are only a part of his total achievement, Juan de Maldonado (d. 1583)[4] became the most celebrated exegete of the period with his commentary on the Gospels (posthumously published in 1596) and those on the Old Testament. Both men came from the Salamanca school. But in the extent of exegetical accomplishment both were surpassed by Cornelius a Lapide (van Steen, d. 1637),[5] who commented on almost all the books of the Bible during his long teaching career at Louvain. Sixtus of Siena (d. 1569) established the "introduction" to Scripture on a scientific basis. After his conversion from Judaism he had been condemned to death for alleged heresy, pardoned through Ghislieri's intervention, and admitted to the Dominican Order. His *Bibliotheca Sancta*[6] contained not only the most complete introduction to Scripture up to that time but also a critical history of biblical interpretation.

---

[1] This expression already occurs in A. Possevino, *Bibliotheca selecta* (Rome 1593), p. 151.

[2] Eight volumes (Antwerp 1569–72). B. Rekers, *Benito Arias Montano 1527–98* (Gronigen 1961).

Church Fathers and Councils

The Fathers of the Church, the knowledge of whom had been so greatly promoted by Erasmus' complete editions, became the arsenal of controversial theology. It was necessary to produce witnesses for the antiquity of the Mass and the Real Presence, for the official priesthood and the papal primacy, for ceremonies and the veneration of saints. John Fisher and Hieronyumus Emser had already had recourse to them. For purposes of controversial theology Cochläus published writings of Cyprian, Optatus of Milevis, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom. Guglielmo Sirleto submitted evidence to the Council of Trent from the Vatican manuscripts, especially those of the Greek Fathers.[7] Although he published little, he was a pioneer of Greek patrology. Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom were first termed Doctors of the Church in the breviary of Pius V. The early complete editions had provided their works only in Latin translation; after the turn of the century editions in both Greek and Latin appeared in rapid

---

[3] J. Solzbacher, *Kaspar Ulenberg* (Münster 1948), pp. 61–66 [*KLK* 8].

[4] Sommervogel, V, 403–412.

[5] Sommervogel, IV, 1511–26; last edition in 22 vols. (Paris 1859ff.) G. Boss, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre in den Bibelkommentaren des Kornelius a Lapide* (Münster 1962) [*KLK* 20].

[6] Two volumes (Venice 1566); best edition by T. Milante (Naples 1742); J. W. Montgomery, "Sixtus of Siena and Roman Catholic Scholarship in the Reformation Period" in *ARG* 54 (1964), 214–234.

[7] Extracts for 1545–47 in *CT* X, 929–955; cf. S. Merkle, "Ein patristischer Gewährsmann des Tridentinums," *Festgabe A. Ehrhard* (Bonn 1922), pp. 342–358.

succession.[8] The most prominent scholar active in this work was the French Jesuit Fronton du Duc (d. 1624). The Basel complete editions of Augustine (by Amerbach in 1506, by Erasmus in 1528f.) were replaced by the Louvain editions (1577); the Basel editions of Erasmus' texts of Jerome (1516–20) and Ambrose (1527), by the Roman editions (Jerome in 1565–72 and Ambrose in 1579–87). About the same time the Sorbonne professor Marguerin de la Bigne (d. 1589), in his *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum,* published writings of more than 200 ancient and medieval authors in order to provide material for refuting the Magdeburg Centuriators.[9] The authenticity of the *Apostolic Canons* and of the pseudo-Isidorean decretals was defended by the Spaniard Franciscus Torres (d. 1584) against the Centuriators but disproved by the *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus Vapulantes* (1628) of the Calvinist Blondel. The *Apostolic Constitutions,* first published in 1563, also by Torres, and to an even greater degree the researches of the Augustinian Hermit Onofrio Panvinio (d. 1564) on the Roman stational churches, titular churches, and deaconries, the origin of the College of Cardinals, and the iconography of the Popes "lighted the fire of the science of Christian antiquity" (De Rossi), which culminated in the rediscovery of the catacombs.

Individual catacombs had indeed been accessible during the Middle Ages and had been visited by pilgrims, for example, San Sebastiano, San Pancrazio, San Callisto. But the way was really paved for their exploration by the devotion to the Church of the Martyrs enkindled by Philip Neri. Accidentally, in the summer of 1578, the hitherto entirely unknown Catacomb of the Giordani on the Via Salaria was discovered; it was at first believed to be the Catacomb of Santa Priscilla. Its paintings and inscriptions were catalogued by Alphonse Chacon, Philip de Vighe, and John Makarios. The systematic exploration of the old and the recently discovered catacombs began in 1593 with Antonio Bosio (d. 1629), of whose grand-scale *Roma sotteranea* only a part was published, posthumously, in 1632.[10] The reawakened interest in Christian antiquity was further stimulated by fortunate discoveries, such as that of the well-preserved remains of Saint Cecilia by Cardinal Sfondrato in 1599.

The conflict over the Council had brought forth the first complete editions of the ancient councils by Merlin (1524) and Crabbe (1538). They were thereafter continually enlarged. Crabbe's second edition (1551) comprised three volumes; the next, by the Carthusian Surius (1567), four; and Bini, a canon of Cologne, enlarged it in 1606 to five volumes. But all these were far surpassed by the Roman edition in four volumes (1608–12), ordered by Sixtus V but not completed until the pontificate of Paul V. It not only gave better texts; it was the first to give the Greek.[11] Later in the seventeenth century the French took the lead in this field. Bartolomé Carranza composed a much used and often printed compendium of the history of the councils.[12]

---

[8] Athanasius, Heidelberg 1601; Basil, Paris 1618 (preceded by a Greek edition [Basel 1532]); Gregory Nazianzen, Paris 1609–11; Gregory of Nyssa, Paris 1615; Epiphanius of Salamis, Paris 1622 (by Petavius); Chrysostom, Paris 1609–33 (by Fronton du Duc).

[9] Nine volumes (Paris 1575–89).

[10] A. Ferrua, "Le tre Rome sotterranee," *CivCatt* II (1938), 399–412; C. Marcora, "Il Card. Federigo Borromeo e l'archeologia cristians" in *Mélanges E. Tisserant* V (Citta del Vaticano 1964), 115–54.

To facilitate a general survey of Christian literature, which in the course of the sixteenth century had increased enormously, most of all through the abundant publication of sources, the Augustinian Hermit Angelus Rocca (d. 1620) composed an *Epitome,* at first for his own convenience but published in 1594 with a dedication to Clement VIII.[13] It contained, though not yet in chronological order, a summary of editions of the Bible and exegetes, the works of the great Latin and Greek Fathers, of the great scholastics, and of selected modern writers. Of a similar origin but far more satisfactorily arranged in chronological order was Bellarmine's brochure of 1613 on ecclesiastical authors.[14] Much more detailed than both was Possevino's alphabetically arranged *Apparatus sacer,* with an attached guide to ecclesiastical libraries.[15] The old catalogues of authors by Jerome, Gennadius, Sigebert of Gembloux, and others had been reedited in 1580 by the Frisian Suffridus Petri (d. 1597). The Belgian historian Miraeus (Le Mire, d. 1640), to whom we owe several works on Church statistics, continued the last medieval catalogue of authors, that of Johannes Trithemius, by means of two appendices, one of which appeared in his lifetime (1639), the second and more copious after his death (1649).[16]

---

[11] S. Kuttner, *L'édition Romaine des Conciles généraux et les actes du premier Concile de Lyon* (Rome 1940) [*Misc. Hist. Pont.* III, 5]; C. Leonardi, "Per la storia dell'edizione romana dei Concili ecumenici 1608/12" in *Mélanges E. Tisserant* VI (Citta del Vaticano 1964), 583–637; V. Peri, "Due protagonisti dell'editio romana dei Concili ecumenici: P. Morin ed A. d'Aquino," ibid., VII, 131–232; on the importance of the edition for the enumeration see id., *Aevum* 37 (1963), 430–501.

[12] *Summa conciliorum et pontificum* (Venice 1546), often reprinted. On the compiler, see chapter 41, note 2.

[13] *Bibliothecae theologicae et scripturalis epitome sive index* (Rome 1594).

[14] *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Rome 1613). The first draft, composed in Louvain in 1569–76, in Le Bachelet, *Auctarium Bellarminianum,* pp. 339–357.

[15] Three volumes (Venice 1606).

[16] *Notitia episcopatuum orbis christiani* (Antwerp 1613). *Politia ecclesiastica* (Cologne 1609) on the mission territories; *Geographia ecclesiastica* (Lyons 1620).

Church History

Even more important than these advances in Christian literary history were those in Church history, which, literally refounded at this time, at once displayed a monumental achievement. The *Catalogus testium veritatis* (1556) and to a much greater extent the Church history by Matthias Flacius Illyricus and his associates, known as the *Centuries,*[17] which set for itself the goal of establishing the "integram ecclesiae Christi ideam" but in reality was an historial defense of orthodox Lutheranism drawn up with great scholarship, had evoked rebuttals by Conrad Braun, Peter Canisius, and Gilbert Génébrard,[18] whose scholarly equipment, however, was inadequate for this task. A satisfactory reply had to wait for the *Annales ecclesiastici* of the Oratorian Caesar Baronius (1538–1607). The *Annales* grew out of the lectures which Baronius, at the request of Philip Neri, had delivered since 1558 at the Roman Oratory. After he had repeated the course seven times and, constantly revising it, had assembled a vast amount of material, "Especially against the innovators of today in defense of the antiquity of the sacred traditions and of the authority of the Roman Church,"[19] Neri induced him "to make for that immensely broad sea" and undertake the composition of a Church history based on the sources, which, in spite of its annalistic arrangement and its fundamentally apologetic tendency, is outstanding as a sincere searching for truth.[20] Tirelessly the always unassuming but strong-principled scholar, who was raised to the purple in 1596, continued his work through twelve volumes to 1198. The rejoinder of the Calvinist Isaac Casaubonus (1614) did not prevent the *Annales* and their later continuations, especially by Raynald and Laderchi, from remaining to the present as a standard work in Church history.[21]

---

[17] *Ecclesiastica historia . . . secundum singulas centurias* (1559–74); principal collaborators were J. Wigand and M. Judex. W. Preger, *M. Flacius Illyricus und Seine Zeit,* 2 vols. (Erlangen 1859–61); L. Haikola, *Gesetz und Evangelium bei M. Fl. Ill.* (Lund 1952); P. Polman in *RHE* 27 (1931), 27–73.

[18] C. Braun, *Liber adversus Centurias Magdeburgenses* (Dillingen 1565); P. Canisius, *De verbi Dei corruptelis* (Dillingen 1571); *idem, De Maria Virgine incomparabili Dei genitrice* (Ingolstadt 1577); G. Génébrard, *Chronographiae libri IV contra Centuriatores Magdeburgenses* (Paris 1580).

[19] Dedicatory letter to Sixtus V: "praesertim contra novatores nostri temporis, pro sacrarum traditionum antiquitate ac S. Romanae Ecclesiae potestate."

[20] Ibid.: "cum nihil periculosius sit in historia, quam cuivis scribenti de quacumque re fidem habere."

[21] This judgment does not hold for Baronius's first continuator, the Dominican Abraham Bzovius, whose extremely biased treatment of Ludwig the Bavarian led to a conflict with Bavaria. A. Kraus, "Die Annales ecclesiastici des A. Bzovius und Maximilian I. von Bavern," *Reformata reformanda* II, 253–303.

As the Magdeburg *Centuries* unintentionally contributed to the development of general Church history, so did the history of the Council of Trent by the Servite Paolo Sarpi stimulate research into this fundamental event of the entire era.[22] Sarpi's seemingly sober and objective presentation was in reality only an attack on the post-Tridentine papacy, and he not infrequently bridged gaps in his sources by conjectures. The writers whom Urban VIII summoned to refute it were to some extent unqualified or they were drowned in their material, for example, the Jesuit Terenzio Alciati (d. 1651). The latter's confrere, Sforza Pallavicino (d. 1667), succeeded in producing a history of the Council that would be the standard Catholic work into the nineteenth century. He availed himself of the rich source materials amassed by his predecessor and considerably augmented by himself. By his own avowal, he intended it as an historical defense, and that is what it was.[23]

The Protestant rejection of the cult of the saints was met by the hagiographers Lippomani and Surius with their collections of lives of saints. The *Vitae sanctorum priscorum Patrum* of Luigi Lippomani (d. 1559 as Bishop of Bergamo) contained, among other items, the first translation of the lives of Byzantine saints by Simon Metaphrastes and John Moschus;[24] the Frenchman Hervet and Sirleto collaborated with him. The Carthusian Laurentius Surius (d. 1578), meritorious as editor of the councils and also for a contemporary history and his translations of the works of Suso, Tauler, and Ruysbroeck, received from Lippomani a third of his material, chiefly Metaphrastes, but often had recourse to the original sources, including those in manuscript. The reproach hurled at him, that he arbitrarily altered various *vitae,* or rather the critical texts, can be verified in only a few cases, but he frequently changed expressions and suppressed passages that might have offended Catholic readers.[25] These defects were to some extent rectified in the third edition (1618). Surius' work was the chief forerunner of the *Acta*

---

[22] H. Jedin, "Survey," pp. 83–93, is corrected by G. Cozzi, "Fra P. Sarpi, l'Anglicanesimo e la Historia del Concilio Tridentino." *RSIT* 68 (1956), 559–619, thus: The publication of the work took place with Sarpi's knowledge and consent, and it was marked by a Calvinist bias. The manuscript was supplied only by fascicles (*a puntate*) in the course of printing. In regard to M. A. de Dominis, apostate Archbishop of Spalato, until recently termed a go-between, and his theory of the Church, cf. D. Cantimori, "Su M. A. de Dominis," *ARG* 49 (1958), 245–258; id. "L'utopia ecclesiologica di M. A. de Dominis," *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento* (Padua 1960), pp. 103–122.

[23] H. Jedin, *Der Quellenapparat der Konzilsgeschichte Pallavicinos* (Rome 1940).

[24] Vols. I–V (Venice 1551–56); VI–VIII (Rome 1558–60); an abridged edition in 2 vols. (Louvain 1564).

[25] *De probatis sanctorum historiis,* 6 vols. (Cologne 1570–75); second edition, *ibid.,* 1576–81. P. Holt, "Die Sammlung von Heiligenleben des Laurentius Surius," *NA* 44 (1922), 341–364.

Sanctorum, which, first projected by the Jesuit Heribert Rosweyde in 1607, appeared in its initial volumes in 1643. The *Martyrologium Romanum,* compiled by Cardinal Sirleto with the assistance of Baronius at the order of Gregory XIII, was prescribed for liturgical use in 1584.[26]

The apologetic tone of not only hagiography but of other aspects of historical theology gradually lessened and the historico-critical method asserted itself. The Jesuit Dionysius Petavius (1593–1652)[27] directed his energies in his writings, saturated with historical material, on the special priesthood (1639) and on the hierarchy (1643) against Grotius and Salmasius and also against the Jansenists. His main work, *Dogmata theologica,* is regarded as the foundation of the history of dogma. His *Doctrina temporum,* the first scientific chronology, inaugurated a long series of French contributions to the establishment of auxiliary sciences of history and the historical method, culminating in the works of Mabillon and Montfaucon.

Canon Law

A trend toward the positive historical method is seen, finally, in canon law. Of the Spanish triple constellation, Martin de Azpilcueta (d. 1586) and his pupil Diego de Covarruvias (d. 1577 as Bishop of Segovia) were systematizers.[28] The first named, the "Doctor Navarrus," after a long teaching career in Salamanca and Coimbra, moved to Rome and from the time of Pius V was looked upon as an oracle even in difficult questions of moral theology. On the other hand, Antonio Agustin (d. 1586 as Archbishop of Tarragona), who had been educated at Alcalá and Salamanca, applied the historico-critical method during his stay in Italy first to Roman and then to canon law under the influence of the jurist Andrea Alciati. His textual criticism of the Decree of Gratian, based on preliminary studies of the ancient collections of decretals, indicated numerous errors in the new edition of 1582, ordered by Gregory XIII. Agostino Barbosa (d. 1649) was the outstanding Italian canonist by virtue of his extensive acquaintance with the law and the canonical literature. The growing influence of canon law in the domain of moral casuistry is clearly discernible in the Jesuit Paul Laymann (d. 1635). The founders of modern Gallicanism, Pierre Pithou (d. 1596) and Edmund Richer (d. 1631), belong to this period but can only be understood against the background of the ecclesiastico-political and ecclesiological development of seventeenth-century France.

---

[26] H. Lämmer, *De Martyrologio Romano* (Regensburg 1878).

[27] *Dogmata theologica,* 4 vols. (Paris 1644–50); *Doctrina temporum,* 2 vols. (Paris 1627).

[28] F. Merzbacher, "Azpilcueta und Covarruvias. Zur Gewaltendoktrin der spanischen Kanonistik im Goldenen Zeitalter," *ZSavRGkan* 46 (1960), 317–344; on pp. 318ff., complete list of the literature on both these canonists; id. "Kard. Juan de Lugo als Rechtsdenker," *Spanische Forschungen,* 19 (1962), 269–280; *Martin de Azpilcueta,* Commentario resolutorio de cambios, ed. A. Ullastres–J. M. Perez Prendes–L. Perena (Madrid 1965) [-Corpus Hispanorum de Pace IV].

The progress of historical theology did not yet include, on the Catholic side, the introduction of Church history into the theological curriculum. Whereas at most Protestant universities universal history—still treated from the viewpoint of salvation history—and Church history became fields of study, the perceptible trend at some Catholic universities toward academic instruction in history disappeared. Such a trend could have led to instruction in Church history, under the influence of the Jesuit *Ratio Studiorum,* which dominated all studies.[29] The plan of the Jesuit general Acquaviva to establish a sort of academy of Church history was unrealized.[30]

Printing Houses and Libraries

Connected with the rise of positive theology was the growth of efficient printing presses and of well-equipped ecclesiastical libraries. Of the printing centers, Basel, where Erasmus' editions of the New Testament and of many Church Fathers had appeared, had become Protestant, while Paris and Lyons were severely handicapped by the Huguenot Wars. Now, alongside Venice, reformed Rome became the place where excellent works were published. In 1561 Pius IV summoned the Venetian printer and philologist Paul Manutius to Rome[31] for the express purpose of using his talents as a qualified printer and publisher. In 1587 Sixtus V founded the Vatican Printing Press, which brought out, among other works, Baronius' *Annales* and the Roman conciliar collection. And the Propaganda Fidei Printing Press, set up in 1626, had Arabic and Armenian fonts as well as Latin and Greek.[32] The prosperity of the Plantin family of Antwerp sprang from the printing of the Tridentine breviary.[33] The Quentel heirs—Gerwin Calenius is counted as one of them—Johann Birckmann, and Maternus Cholinus, printed many

---

[29] E. C. Scherer, *Geschichte und Krichengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten* (Freiburg 1927), pp. 52–131.

[30] P. Leturia, "L'Insegnamento della storia ecclesiastica nella Roma dell'Umanesimo e del Barocco," *CivCatt* IV (1945), 393–402.

[31] F. Barberi, *P. Manuzio e la stamperia del Popolo romano* (Rome 1942); A. M. Giorgetti Vichi, *Annali della stamperia del Popolo romano 1570–98* (Rome 1959).

[32] Pastor XXII, 199ff., XXIX, 216.

[33] R. M. Kingdom, "The Plantin Breviaries." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de Renaissance* 22 (1960), 133–150.

Catholic works at Cologne,[34] while in South Germany the houses of Weissenhorn and Eder made Ingolstadt the leading publishing center. Four hundred and sixty-five printings from the Dillingen firm of Sebald Mayer are known for the years 1550–76; after 1620 the Jesuit college at Dillingen had its own press.[35] A survey of new publications was rendered easier after 1564 by the Frankfurt book catalogues, which on the eve of the Thirty Years' War recorded more than fifteen hundred titles a year. Occasionally they were accompanied by indexes of Catholic books, compiled at the instigation of the Jesuits, as counterparts of the Index of Forbidden Books.[36]

The *Ratio Studiorum* ordered for each college the preparation of a library budget, because the Fathers would otherwise be "unarmed soldiers." Peter Canisius could sooner imagine a college without a church than one without a library.[37] The importance of libraries was also clearly grasped at Rome. Under Cervini, the first cardinal librarian, and his successors, Sirleto, Antonio Carafa, and Baronius, the Vatican Library grew enormously.[38] For it Sixtus V raised the building still in use, which, it is true, bisected Bramante's Belvedere Cortile but architecturally inaugurated the series of Italian library complexes. Its manuscript and book collections were enriched by the gift of the Heidelberg Palatina, made to the Pope by the Elector Maximilian of Bavaria. The Biblioteca Angelica, so called from its founder, Angelus Rocca, was a public library. Cardinal Francesco Barberini's collection of books and manuscripts became, under the direction of Luke Holstenius (after 1636), the richest of all Roman libraries next to the Vatican. In Milan Cardinal Federigo Borromeo founded the Ambrosian Library in 1602. By 1669

---

[34] H. Schrörs, "Der Kölner Buchdrucker Maternus Cholinus," *AHVNrh* 85 (1908), 147–165. On the printer Franz Behem, who was related to Cochläus and who between 1540 and 1580 printed works of Cochläus, Witzel, Braun, Hosius, and others at Mainz cf. S. Widmann, *Eine Mainzer Presse der Reformationzeit im Dienste der kath. Literatur* (Paderborn 1889).

[35] D. Bucher, *Bibliographie der deutschen Drucke des XVI. Jahrdunderts,* I: *Dillingen* (Bad Bocklet–Vienna 1960), lists 796 printed works of the Dillingen firm.

[36] Cf. also W. Brückner, "Die Gegenreformation im politischen Kampf um die Frankfurter Buchmessen," *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* 48 (1962), 67–86.

[37] O. Braunsberger, "Ein Freund der Bibliotheken und ihrer Handschriften," *Miscellanea F. Ehrle* V (Rome 1924), 455–472.

[38] P. Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul III a Paul V* (Paris 1890); Pastor, XXII, 291ff., XXVII, 243ff.; P. Petitmengin, "Recherches sur l'organisation de la Bibliothèque Vaticane à l'époque des Ranaldi 1547–628.

Italy had eighty libraries, the Netherlands fifty, France twenty-seven, Germany twenty-three, and England eleven.[39]

---

[39] J. W. Montgomery, *A Seventeenth-Century View of European Libraries* (Berkeley–Los Angeles 1962). A survey for Spain is provided by A. Schott, *Hispaniae bibliothecae seu de academiis ac bibliothecis,* 3 vols. (Frankfurt 1608).

CHAPTER 43

Spiritual Life, Popular Devotion and Art

Ascetical and mystical literature leads to the sources of the Church's renewal. The connection of this literature, in regard to both its content and the persons involved, with the reinvigorated theology makes apparent its relevance to life. Luis de León stated as its aim "to explain the sound doctrine which rouses souls and conducts them to the way of virtue." It proceeded from Spain and in Spain culminated in the Carmelite mystics. Until about the mid-century people were content with guides to the interior life and prayer and to a virtuous life. Erasmus' polemic against extraversion of piety and certain abuses in worship and popular devotion was insignificant in the light of positive suggestions; in 1546 his *Modus orandi* was translated into Spanish, and Luis of Granada followed the rules of life of the *Enchiridion.*[1] The Dominican John of the Cross, not to be confused with the Carmelite, in his *Dialogo* (1555) defended vocal prayer and ritual. The influence of Savonarola, predominant in the Spanish Dominican reform, is evident in the *Guia del cielo* (1527) of the Dominican Pablo de León and in the most popular ascetical works of the Catholic Reform, the *Libro de la oracion y meditacion* and the *Guia de precadores* of Luis of Granada (d. 1588). The latter's real model was his director, Juan de Avila (d. 1569), the "Apostle of Andalusia."[2] In the last years of his life, when physically broken as a consequence of overexertion in preaching and pastoral activity, Juan had his *Audifilia* printed (1557)—a guide to the spiritual life intended for Doña Sancha Carillo—and thereafter devoted himself to the direction of souls. His spiritual letters are the fruit of this preoccupation.[3] The Portuguese Dominican Bartholomaeus a Martyribus (d. 1590 as Archbishop of Braga), in his *Stimulus pastorum* (1567), composed at Borromeo's request, sketched the episcopal ideal of the Tridentine Reform, that of the Good Shepherd, drawn to a great extent, like his *Compendium doctrinae spiritualis* (1582), from Scripture and the Fathers.[4]

---

[1] V. Beltran de Heredia, *Las corrientes de espiritualidad entre los Dominicos de Castilla* (Salamanca 1941), rejected the overemphasis of Erasmian influence on Spanish piety in the French original of Battaillon (1937); the Spanish edition of Battaillon took these objections into account to some extent.

[2] *Obras,* ed. J. Cuervo, 14 vols. (Madrid 1906–8); M. Llaaneza, *Bibliografia del Ven. P. L. de Granada,* 4 vols. (Salamanca 1926–28); M. Battaillon, *Erasmo y Espana* II, 191ff. (with the literature); Fidele de Ros, "Los misticos del Norte y Fray L. de Gr.," *AIA,* 7 (1941), 5–30, 145–165; R. L. Oechslin, *L. de Granada ou La recontre avec Dieu* (Paris 1954); J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, "Aprobacion de la Guia de Pecadores de Fray L. de Granada en el Concilio de Trento," *HS* 12 (1959), 225ff.; A.Huerga, "El proceso inquisitorial de la Monja de Lisbon y Fray L. de Granada," *HS* 12 (1959), 333–356; id., "Fray L. de Granada y S. Carlos Borromeo. Una amistad al servicio de la restauracion catolica," *HS* 11 (1958), 299–347.

In Francisco de Osuna (d. 1540 or 1541) the Franciscan school had produced an outstanding master of the spiritual life, whose *Abecedario espiritual* (6 parts, 1527–54) led Teresa of Avila to interior prayer. Peter of Alcántara (d. 1562, canonized in 1669), highly esteemed as a spiritual director but, as founder of the Franciscan Recollects, excessively strict with himself and others, wrote a *Treatise on Prayer and Contemplation*—its relationship to Luis of Granada's work of the same title is disputed—which developed still further the doctrine of interior prayer. With Perez de Valdivia (d. 1589), he completed the tendency toward mysticism, which realized in Juan de los Angeles (d. 1610) its most subtle psychological depths under the influence of Tauler and Ruysbroeck.[5]

Alonso de Orozco (d. 1591), the most prolific ascetical writer of the Spanish Augustinian Hermits, also betrays a mystical trend in his many treatises.[6] But the Augustinians' "most read, most often translated, and most often commented" author was Luis de León (d. 1591), who received from Domingo Soto the position of professor of Scripture at Salamanca. His exposition of the fourteen biblical names of Christ (*De*

---

[3] *Obras Completas* (Madrid 1588); critical edition by L. Sala Balust, 3 vols. (Madrid 1952ff.); the spiritual letters, edited by V. Garcia de Diego, also in *Clasicos Castellanos* XI (Madrid 1912); good character sketch by J. M. de Buck in *NRTh* 55 (1928), 30–49; on the Inquisition proceedings in which Juan de Avila was involved in 1532f., see C. M. Abad in *MCom* 6 (1946), 95–167; A. Berengueras de Nilar in *Verdad y vida* 17 (1959), 75–96; for his reform memorandum see chapter 35.

[4] *Opera Omnia,* ed. M. d'Inguimbert, 2 vols. (Rome 1734f.); H. Jedin–P. Broutin, *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale du 16e siècle* (Paris 1953), pp. 84–103.

[5] Fidele de Ros, *Un maitre de S. Therese: Le Père François d'Osuna* (Paris 1937); S. Piat, *Le maitre de la mystique S. Pierre d'Alcantara* (Paris 1960); Vicente de Peralta, "El doctor Perez de Valdivia," *Estudios Franciscanos* 27 (1931), 177–225; for Valdivia's stay in Barcelona, see J. M. Madurell y Marimon in *Anal. S. Tarracon.* 30 (1957), 343–371. *Juan de los Angeles, Obras Misticas* ed. J. Sala, 2 vols. (Madrid 1912–17); further literature in *LThK* 2nd ed., V, 998.

[6] T. Camara, *Vida y escritos del B. Alonso de Orozco* (Valladolid 1882); later bibliography in D. Guttierrez, *S. Augustinus vitae spirit.* Magister II, 173ff.

los nombres de Cristo, 1583) and his *La perfecta casada* (1583), intended for his cousin, Maria Varela, showed him to be a poet of real inspiration (K. Vossler) and a master of language, who fused theological depth with practical sense.[7] Not his least merit is to have made possible the printing of the works of Teresa of Avila by his judgment "de muy sana y catolica doctrina."

Carmelite Mysticism

After the mid-century the cultivation of contemplative prayer brought forth the flower of mysticism in Carmel. Teresa of Avila, actually de Ahumada y Cépeda (1515–82, canonized in 1622), surpassed the late medieval German mystics in blending the most refined psychological observation and mystical experience with a truly Spanish practicality and tireless activity for the reform of her Order. The story of her interior life to the beginning of her reform activity (1562) is contained in her autobiography, recorded at the command of the Toledo Inquisitor and completed in 1565. The exquisitely refreshing *Libro de las fundaciones* narrates the establishing of eighteen reformed houses between 1567 and 1582, accomplished after overcoming strong opposition. Intended for her nuns was the *Camino de perfección,* composed about 1565 at the request of her confessor, the Dominican Báñes. The most complete of her mystical writings is *El castillo interior* (1577), in which she describes her progress to mystical union with God in seven stages. A knowledge of her truly great personality is provided by her less mystical writings (*Exclamaciones, Avisos,* and others) and above all by her 440 letters, while the constitutions approved by the chapter of 1581 show her activity in the Order. She profited by her careful reading of spiritual works—Augustine's *Confessions,* the German mystics, Osuna—to describe correctly her own mystical experiences concerning whose divine origin she was long troubled, and to express them without affectation in classical Spanish. Patiently and with fortitude she finally vanquished all her opponents, including the papal Nuncio Sega, who regarded her as an adventuress.

Associated with Teresa from 1568 was John of the Cross (1542–91, canonized in 1726, declared a Doctor of the Church in 1926), who had made his theological studies at Salamanca. As spiritual director of the convent of the Incarnation (1572–77), of which Teresa was superior, he seconded her endeavors, only to be thrown into prison himself by the opponents of reform. When the autonomy of the reformed branch of the Order had been achieved, he occupied posts in the Order at Baeza and Segovia and died in Ubeda, misunderstood and shamefully treated but purified by suffering. In his chief works, *Subida del Monto Carmelo* (1579) and *Noche oscura del alma* (1579), he describes the active and passive purification of the soul and outlines a system of mystical theology: The night of the senses and the night of the spirit must be overcome in order to mount "far above all limitations of knowledge" to union with God in the essence of the soul. The *Cantico espiritual* and the *Llama de amor viva,* composed during his imprisonment in Toledo, are genuinely poetic, expressing a never surpassed exclamation of the soul, cleansed by suffering and united with God.

---

[7] *Obras Completas,* ed. F. Garcia (Madrid 1944); K. Vossler, *Luis de Leon* (Munich 1946); S. Munoz Iglesias, *Fray L. de Toledo teologo* (Madrid 1950); R. J. Welsh, *Introduction to the Spiritual Doctrine of Fray L. de Leon* (Washington 1951).

Italy and France

Italy too produced mystics, such as Catherine Ricci (d. 1592), influenced by Savonarola, and the ecstatic Maria Magdalena dei Pazzi (d. 1607, canonized in 1669).[8] The most influential ascetical work, after and alongside the *Exercises* of Saint Ignatius, was, however, the *Combattimento spirituale* (single and unrevised edition: Venice 1589) of the Theatine Lorenzo Scupoli (d. 1610). The Jesuit school of spirituality, after some hesitation while Borgia was general, adhered to the sober and psychologically sound asceticism of the founder. Some authors, A. Cordeses, P. Sánchez, B. Rossignoli, followed the traditional plan of the three stages in the ascent to God. Based entirely on the manner of life in the Order, and hence unsystematic, was the teaching of Alonso Rodríguez (d. 1616) on prayer and the virtues in his *Ejercicio de perfección y virtudes cristianas* (3 vols., 1609–16). Alvarez de Paz (d. 1620) developed a theory of meditation culled from Scripture. Luis de la Puente (d. 1624),[9] a pupil of Francisco Suárez and Balthasar Alvarez, in his *Meditaciones de los misterios de nuestra Santa fé* (1605) and even more in his commentary on the Canticle of Canticles (1622) and the *Sentimientos* (published posthumously in 1670), makes it clear that he "was blessed with the gift of mystical prayer" (Guibert).

From the turn of the century the French school became increasingly prominent. Even before then the reform-minded Benedictine Abbot Louis de Blois (Blosius, d. 1566), shunning certain harsh aspects of Spanish asceticism, had designated the cultivation of interior prayer, humility, and charity as the pillars of the virtuous life.[10] Francis de Sales (1567–1622, canonized in 1665, proclaimed a Doctor of the Church in 1877), very successful as a missionary and as Bishop of Geneva, promoted a realistic asceticism in his *Introduction à la vie dévote* (1608, usually known as *Philothea*) and his *Traité de l'amour de Dieu* (1616, also called *Theotimus*). His correspondence with Jane Frances de Chantal (d. 1641, canonized in 1767) is a monument of understanding and firm spiritual direction. His *Humanisme dévote* is much indebted to the mystic Barbe Acarie (d. 1618), who, married and the mother of six, established the Discalced Carmelites in France and, after her husband's death, joined them. It owes even more to the Oratorian Pierre de Bérulle (1575–1629, a cardinal in 1627), founder of the French Oratory (1611) and influential in Church politics, who is to be considered the real founder of the French school of spirituality. Educated in the Jesuit College de Clermont, in his youth Bérulle was influenced by the German and then by the Spanish mystics. Beginning in 1601 with his *Discours de l'état et de la grandeur de Jésus* there was formed in him a strictly Christocentric piety, which he spread as director of souls and which was still further developed by Charles de Condren (d. 1641), his pupil and successor in the government of the Oratory. The Oratory became the nursery for the leaders of the French spirituality of the *Grand Siècle*—Olier, Eudes, and others.

---

[8] Ermanno del SS. Sacramento, "Y manoscritti originali di S. Maria Maddalena de' Pazzi," *ECarm* 7 (1956), 323–400; *Tutte le opere di S. Maria Maddalena* I (Florence 1960); M. Petrocchi, *L'estasi nelle mistiche italiane della riforma cattolica* (Naples 1958), pp. 76f.; other literature in *LThK* 2nd ed., VII; biographies by F. van der Kley (Chicago 1957) and Alberto de la Virgen del Carmen (Madrid 1957).

[9] *Obras espirituales,* 5 vols. (Madrid 1690); C. M. Abad, "Doctrina mistica de V.P.L. de la P.," *EE* 3 (1924), 113–137, 4 (1925) 43–58, 251–273. On the whole subject see Guibert, *Spiritualite,* pp. 198ff., 237–270.

Preaching of the Faith

The stream of spiritual literature was indeed broad, but not broad enough to touch the uneducated classes. This duty was fulfilled by means of preaching and popular catechetical instruction, which the Council of Trent made obligatory for parish priests on all Sundays and holy days. In the Latin countries, as earlier, the Advent and Lent series, given mostly by preachers of the mendicant Orders, continued in practice. But the mission and apologetic sermons favored by the Jesuits and Capuchins were a new development. The present state of research does not provide a comprehensive or even adequate picture. In Italy, where between 1530 and 1550 entire books of the Bible, above all the Pauline Epistles, had been expounded in public lectures, Scriptural preaching, as carried out, for example, by Seripando and as Bishop Florimonte of

---

[10] *Opera* (Louvain 1568); reprinted in Cologne (1572) and Paris (1622); literature in *DSAM* I (1937), 1730–1738.

Sessa had sought to promote it in his collection of patristic homilies, later yielded again to topical preaching, causing the Conventual Cornelius Musso (d.1574) to indulge in bombast.[11] The three most renowned preachers around 1580 were thus characterized: Toledo (the Jesuit Francisco de Toledo) instructs, Panigarola (a Franciscan who died in 1594 as Bishop of Asti) is applauded, Lupus (a Spanish Capuchin who died in 1593) thrills hearts.[12] Lorenzo of Brindisi (1559–1619, canonized in 1881, declared a Doctor of the Church in 1959)[13] kept close to Scripture even in his topical sermons. In Germany the defense of the faith was served by the sermons of Eck, Hoffmeister, and Wild based on the Scriptural passage of the liturgy and even more by the topical sermons of Tintzmann, a pastor of Neisse.[14] The Lenten and Eucharistic sermons of Simon Vigor (d. 1575 as Archbishop of Narbonne) were published in several editions. French pulpit eloquence did not reach its climax, however, until the seventeenth century, with Vincent de Paul and Lejeune.

The clergy had at hand far more and far better tools for catechetical instruction than had been the case before Trent. In addition to the *Roman Catechism,* Peter Canisius' *Summa doctrinae christianae* (1554) for catechists and Bellarmine's *Dichiarazione* (1598) and the corresponding popular catechisms—Canisius' *Parvus catechismus* (1558) and *Catechismus minimus* (1556) and Bellarmine's *Dottrina cristiana breve* (1597)—

---

[11] H. Jedin, *Seripando* II, 63–84; for Florimonte's patristic homilies, ibid., II, 294; for Musso as a preacher see *RQ* 41 (1933), 252ff.

[12] Hurter, III, 249; P. M. Sevesi, "S. Carlo Borromeo e il P. F. Panigarola," *AFrH* 40 (1947), 143–207; G. Pozzi, "Intorno alla Predicazione del Panigarola," *Problemi religiosi . . .* (Padua 1960), pp. 315–323.

[13] The *Opera Omnia* (15 vols., Padua 1928–56) contain mostly sermons, including three for Lent. Literature in *Lex Cap,* pp. 925–930. For the Capuchin method of preaching see Arsenio d'Ascoli, *La predicazione dei Capuccini nel Cinquecento in Italia* (Loreto 1956), Bonaventura von Mehr, *Das Predigtwesen in der kölnisch-rheinischen Kapuzinerprovinz im 17. und 18. Jh.* (Rome 1945); Melchoir a Pobladura, *Hist. ord. Cappuccinorum* I, 247–264.

[14] Sermon books most used in Germany were those of: John Eck (5 vols.; Vols. I–III treat the scriptural readings of Sundays and feasts; Vols. IV–V deal with the Sacraments and the Decalog; editions *CC,* 16, n. 68); Johannes Hoffmeister, *O.E.S.A.* (for the twelve editions of his homilies on the Gospels for 1547, see N. Paulus, *J. Hoffmeister, O.E.S.A.,* pp. 388f.); Johann Wild, O.F.M. (4 vols. 1552–55); H. Pöhlein, *Wolfgang Seidel 1492–1562, Benediktiner aus Tegernsee, Prediger zu München* (Munich 1951); H. Jedin, "Das Breslauer Kanonikus und Pfarrer von Neisse N. Tintzmann (d. 1616) als Prediger," *ArSKG* 5 (1940), 142–151 (six complete annual courses of pastoral sermons, 1589–96, in which, among other items, the sermons of the Auxilliary Bishop Feucht of Bamberg and Stapleton's *Promptuarium* are used).

found a wide circulation.[15] Within eight years 42,000 copies of the Auger Catechism (1563) were sold in France. The *Doctrina cristiana* (1607) of the Jesuit Astete was much used in Spain. If the early catechisms, for example those of Dietenberger and Witzel, were strongly influenced by Luther and Erasmus, the later ones testified to more independence but were frequently lacking in clarity.[16] The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, introduced in Milan by Borromeo, spread in and beyond Italy. The catechist César de Bus founded at Aix the Congregation of Priests of Christian Doctrine, which was confirmed by Clement VIII in 1598.[17] The Piarists of Joseph Calasanctius acquired an importance in elementary education analogous to that of the Jesuit colleges in higher education.

Like the acceptance and implementation of the Tridentine reform decrees, the introduction of the reformed breviary and missal of Pius V made very slow progress outside Italy.[18] Diocesan feasts were included in appended "propers."[19] Though not prescribed, the *Rituale Romanum* (1614) acquired great prestige for the administration of the Sacraments.[20] It utilized Cardinal Santori's ritual, printed in 1584 but not official, and also no fewer than fourteen other diocesan rituals, supplanted the older pastoral manuals in common use, such as the

---

[15] P. Canisius, *Catechismus lat. et germ.*, ed. F. Streicher, 2 vols. (Munich 1932–36); editions of Bellarmine's *Catechism* in Sommervogel, I, 1127–1178.

[16] C. Moufang, *Katholische Katechismen des 16. Jh. in deutscher Sprache* (Mainz 1881); R. Padberg, *Erasmus als Katechet* (Freiburg 1956); id., "Zum katechetischen Anliegen G. Witzels," *ThGl*, 43 (1953), 192–200; L. Pralle, "Die volksliturgischen Bestrebungen des G. Witzel," *Jahrbuch f. d. Bistum Mainz* 3 (1948), 224–242; E. Feifel, *Grundzüge einer Theologie des Gottesdienstes, Motive und Konzeption der Glaubensverkündigung Michael Heldings* (Freiburg 1960); F. Brand, *Die Katechismen des E. Augerius* (Fribourg 1917).

[17] A. Tamborini, *La compagnia e le scuole della dottrina cristiana* (Milan 1939); F. Pascucci, *L'Insegnamento religioso in Roma dal Concilio di Trento ad oggi* (Rome 1938); G. Franza, *Il Catechismo a Roma dal Concilio di Trento a Pio VI nello zelo dell'Arciconfraternita della dottrina cristiana* (Alba 1958). V. Sempels, "Het catechismusonderricht te Brussel gedurende de Contra-Reformatie," *Miscellanea De Meyer* II, 928–940; A. Berz, *Geschichte des Katechismus im Bistum Basel* (Fribourg 1959). L. Volpicella, *Il pensiero pedagogico della controriforma* (Florence 1960), gives text with introduction.

[18] The acceptance of Pius V's reformed breviary and missal needs to be further investigated; the most important tool is W. H. J. Weale-H. Bohatta, *Catalogus missalium ritus latini* (London 1928).

[19] E.g., the Breslau Diocesan Synod of 1592 prescribed the *Breviarium Romanum,* but it was not definitively adopted in the cathedral until 1653, and the *proprium* was approved in 1662; see *ArSKG* 5 (1940), 198f.

[20] B. Löwenberg, *Das Rituale des Kard. J. A. Sanctorius. Ein Beitrag zur Enstehungsgeschichte des Rituale Romanum* (Munich 1937); id. "Die Erstausgabe des Rituale Romanum von 1614," *ZKTh* 66 (1942), 141–147.

Sacerdotale Romanum (1523) of Alberto Castellani, and promoted the standardization of the rites, but of course repressed the vernacular tongues. Although people took pains to defend and explain "ceremonies" in areas exposed to Protestantism and the good screen between clergy and people gradually disappeared from the churches, popular participation in the liturgy was neither sought nor achieved. German Church hymns, held back rather than stimulated by the Protestant example, recovered ground only after much hesitation (Ulenberg's *Psalms* of 1582; the Mainz *Cantuale* of 1603; the Constance *Gesangbuch* of 1613; and F. Spee, *Trutznachtigal* of 1649).

Administration of Sacraments

The rite of administering the Sacraments and the frequency of reception still differed greatly from region to region. At the beginning of the sixteenth century annual Easter Communion was the almost invariable rule. Reception three or four times a year, prescribed in the Third Orders and the confraternities, was interpreted as a sign of religious zeal in the laity. But from the middle of the sixteenth century reception became much more frequent, especially under the influence of the new Orders—Theatines, Barnabites, Jesuits, and Capuchins—and in consequence of the general rise of devotion to the Eucharist. In many Italian confraternities monthly Communion was prescribed, while the Jesuits recommended weekly Communion for those seeking Christian perfection. However, the students of the Eichstätt seminary were encouraged to receive only five times a year—on Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Assumption, and All Saints. The Easter Time in which Communion was of obligation and which was restricted by Eugene IV in 1446 to Holy Week and the Octave of Easter and in some places still further reduced, was again extended in certain dioceses, such as Salzburg in 1616.

As a rule Communion was preceded by confession. The confessional, hitherto usually open and moveable and in most churches close to the altar or the choir inclosure, was gradually replaced from the turn of the century under the influence of the *Rituale Romanum* by one that was stationary and provided with a wooden screen. In the Baroque period (beginning about 1550) the confessional in three sections, often artistically decorated, became a fixture of church equipment. The anointing of the sick was seldom requested in Germany, according to the records of visitations. The Constance synod of 1609 complained that in a large part of the diocese it had become obsolete. Confirmation slowly became more common in connection with visitations. When in 1586 it was first administered in Paderborn after a lapse of forty years, only 200 Catholics appeared. In the bishopric of Augsburg, where according to

Ninguarda's reports (1579) it had fallen into disuse many years before, 30,000 Catholics were confirmed in two months according to the *realatio* of 1597. The rite of contracting marriage exhibited, as previously, very great differences, but, due to the decree "Tametsi," there was a tendency to specify the reception of the Sacrament in the exchange of consent before the parish priest or in the blessing given by him.

Popular Devotion

Popular devotions, processions, and pilgrimages, frequently arranged by the again flourishing confraternities, became genuine expressions of popular piety. What was new in this post-Tridentine piety was its emphasis on specifically Catholic doctrines and forms of worship; it became anti-Protestant and hence a confessional piety. The Eucharistic confraternities, going back to the fifteenth century and having as their model the *Confraternità del SS. Sacramento* at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, which had been confirmed by Paul III in 1539, promoted devotion to the Eucharist in addition to communion, in particular the maintenance of the perpetual light and the providing of an escort for the taking of communion to the sick.[21] The Forty Hours' Prayer during Holy Week, originally lasting from Holy Thursday to Holy Saturday, was introduced in Milan by Borromeo in 1577 and by the Nuncio Frangipani in Cologne in 1591. In Rome it was extended as the Perpetual Prayer in 1592.[22] The Corpus Christi procession, recommended by Trent, was celebrated with great solemnity in several Catholic districts of Germany (Munich Processionals, 1582–1611).[23] In Spain the *Fiesta del Corpus* became during the second half of the sixteenth century the "highest of all Church feasts" and was enhanced by special performances, the *autos sacramentales.* Gradually the altar tabernacle replaced the receptacle situated to one side.

Devotion to Mary was intensified. The Marian Congregation, established by the Fleming Johannes Leunis in 1563 for the students of the Roman Jesuit College, made it the starting point of self-education and the fostering of an apostolic attitude. Introduced into almost all Jesuit colleges, by 1576 it numbered already 30,000 members. It was confirmed by Gregory XIII in 1584.[24] The Marian place of pilgrimage, Loreto, was visited by many Romans, and the Litany of Loreto, traceable there back to 1531, was approved in 1589 by Sixtus V. The rosary acquired its present form and was promoted by rosary confraternities. And in thanksgiving for the victory at Lepanto Pius V instituted the feast of the rosary. In Germany the pilgrimages to miraculous Marian shrines, which had slackened during the religious cleavage, were revived at Altötting and Einsiedeln; many new ones arose, for example Kevelaer and Werl, and were encouraged by Catholic territorial princes in order to prevent "leakage" into foreign states. Reports of favorable answers to prayers were recorded in miracle books.

---

[21] P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Comp. di Gesu in Italia* 2nd ed., I, 217–290.

[22] J. A. Jungmann, "Die Andacht der 40 Stunden und das Hl. Grab," *LF* 2 (1952), 184–198.

[23] A. Mitterweiser, *Geschichte der Fronleichnamsprozession in Bayern* (Munich 1930); G. Matern, *Zur Vorgeschichte und Geschichte der Fronleichnamsfeier* (Münster 1962).

At the end of the sixteenth century the gild, predominant in the Middle Ages and based on considerations of rank and status, was outstripped by the confraternity of prayer, which stood above class lines.[25] The book of family devotions, the private prayerbook, and the devotional picture became popular.[26] The example given by the courts of the Catholic Habsburg and Wittelsbach dynasties was imitated in popular devotion.[27] Spanish and Italian forms of piety and the saints popular in those countries were especially made known by religious Orders—Ignatius and Francis Xavier by the Jesuits, Anthony of Padua by the Franciscans, devotion to Saint Joseph by Teresa of Avila. Religious folklore increased in the course of the seventeenth century, and so did superstition. If it is certain that post-Tridentine piety preserved or resumed many pre-Reformation characteristics, it cannot be denied that it stressed new, anti-Reformation ideas and aimed to revive a Catholic consciousness of the faith and arouse enthusiasm for it. But in our period it must not be termed "Baroque piety" without qualification.

---

[24] P. Löffler, *Die Marianischen Kongregationen* (Freiburg 1924); J. Stierli, *Die Marianischen Kongregationen,* 2 vols. (Lucerne 1947); J. Wicki, *Le P. Leunis* (Rome 1951); the devotional book used in the Marian Congregations, F. d. Coster, *Vitae christianae institutiones* (Cologne 1576), went through sixteen editions to 1616. H. Rahner, *Die geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung der Marianischen Kongregationen* (Augsburg 1954).

[25] E.g., the St.-Anna-Bruderschaft, originating in Koblenz around 1500, at first comprised only jurists of the electoral court; in 1589 it was reestablished as a religious confraternity. A. Schmidt in *Veröffentlichungen des köln. Geschichtsvereins* 25 (1960), 285–342.

[26] G. Achtern-H. Knaus, *Deutsche und niederländische Gebetbuch-handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Darmstadt* (Darmstadt 1959); A. Schrott, "Das Gebetbuch in der Zeit der Katholischen Restauration," *ZKTh* 61 (1937), 1–28, 211–257; A. Spamer, *Das Kleine Andachtsbild vom 16. bis 20. Jh.* (Munich 1930).

[27] A. Coreth, *Pictas Austriaca. Ursprung und Entwicklung barocker Frömmigkeit in Österreich* (Munich 1959).

Arts and Literature

The same precaution against glib terminology is necessary in regard to the relationship of "mannerism" and of the Baroque to religious and ecclesiastical development during the seventeenth century.[28] The following facts are to be borne in mind. The Tridentine decree on images had as its aim to defend the lawfulness of sacred images and their veneration against the Calvinist iconoclasm in France and to eliminate abuses, but not to determine the canons of artistic production. In his *De imaginibus* (in Italian, 1582; in Latin, 1594) Cardinal Paleotti required in religious art a strict imitation of the *realta naturale e storica,* rejected the representation of pagan divinities and myths and the merging of this world and the next, and insisted that the principles of the Tridentine decree on images should be supplemented by detailed orders for their execution and strictly carried out. But he found no approval in Rome.[29] The first large church buildings of the Jesuits, the *Gesù* in Rome and St. Michael in Munich, in which the style of the Renaissance is little changed, coincide in time with the climax of the Catholic Reform; along the Rhine and in the Low Countries the Jesuits at first built in the Gothic style.[30] The history of the construction of the new Saint Peter's reflects the gradual turning away from Renaissance concepts and the return to the traditional plan, but at the same time it represented the breakthrough of the Baroque style by the architects Maderna and Bernini. The beginning of Baroque art in Rome corresponds to the papal assumption of leadership in the implementation of the Council of Trent and of Church renewal. On the other hand, Roman Baroque arrived at a new climax under Urban VIII (1623–44) and his successors, when the Catholic Reform was already declining in internal strength and the Counter Reformation came to a halt. The zenith of German Baroque proceeded side by side with the reestablishment of the Church and the carrying out of the Tridentine Reform after the Thirty Years' War. The effect of Trent on iconography is unequivocal. Painting and sculpture favored the controverted subjects defined at Trent. They aspired to strengthen Catholic awareness of the faith and to stir up devotion.

---

[28] Against W. Weisbach, *Der Barock als Kunst der Gegenreformation* (Berlin 1921), N. Pevsner, "Gegenreformation und Manierismus," *Report, für Kunstwiss.* 46 (1925), 243–262, sought to prove that "Manierismus" corresponds to "Counter Reformation," i.e., to the Church renewal lasting till about 1600; later observations of both authors, ibid., 49 (1928), 16–28, 225–246. H. Lützeler, "Der Wandel der Barockauffassung," *DVfLG* 11 (1933), 618–636; W. Hager, "Zur Raumstruktur des Manierismus," *Festschrift M. Wackernagel* (Cologne 1958), pp. 112–140; W. Friedländer, *Mannerism and Antimannerism in Italian Painting* (New York 1958); R. Stamm, *Die Kunstformen des Barockzeitalters* (Bern 1956); A. L. Mayer, "Liturgie und Barock," *JLW* 15 (1941), 67–154.

[29] Paleotti's memorandum of 1596 in P. Prodi, "Ricerche sulla teoria delle arti figurativa nella riforma cattolica," *Archivio per la storia della pieta* 4 (1962); on the whole subject see H. Jedin, "Das Tridentinum und die bildenden Künste," *ZKG* 74 (1963).

[30] J. Braun, *Die belgischen Jesuitenkirchen* (Freiburg 1907); id., *Die Kirchenbauten der deutschen Jesuiten,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1918); *id., Spaniens alte Jesuitenkirchen* (Freiburg 1913); P. Pecchiai, *Il Gesu di Roma* (Rome 1952); P. Perri, *Giovanni Pristano e i primordi della architettura gesuitica* (Rome 1955); P. Moisy, *Les églises des Jésuits de l'ancienne assistance de France* 2 vols. (Rome 1958).

The legend started by Agazzari (1609) that the Council of Trent's contemplated prohibition of polyphonic music was dropped because of Palestrina's "Missa Papae Marcelli" is historically true to the extent that this Mass, presumably produced during the Council (1562), and the conciliar prayers composed by the Dutchman Otto Kerle realized the demands of the reformers—textual integrity and moral purity.[31] As Palestrina (d. 1594) in his choral compositions combined classical proportions and deep feeling, so too did the extremely productive Orlando di Lasso (d. 1594), court composer for the Duke of Bavaria at Munich. The compositions of the Spaniard Thomas de Vitoria (d. 1613) were also in the spirit of Palestrina. The Medicean edition of the *Graduale Romanum,* so called because it was produced in the Medici Press, was published in 1614–15 at the command of Paul V. It altered the Gregorian melodies in accord with humanist principles.

If the Spanish national literature of the *Siglo de Oro* is unthinkable apart from Spain's leading role in the ecclesiastical sphere, the relationships are more complicated in Italy and France and even more so in Germany, where antibourgeois, courtly, and absolutist tendencies are bound up with the anti-Reformation trends. Certainly from the religious background came the Jesuit theater, which culminated in the dramas of Jakob Bidermann (d. 1639), the "Cenodoxus" and the martyr plays "Adrianus" and "Philemon Martyr."[32] According to Kindermann, "it is one of the chief glories of the European stage in the seventeenth century."

---

[31] The older view, defended by F. Y. Haberl and K. Weinmann, "Zur Geschichte von Palestrinas Missa Papae Marcelli," *Jb. der Musikbibliothek Peters* 22 (1916), 23–42, that there is no direct connection with the Council of Trent, has been corrected by O. Ursprung and K. Jeppesen (in the works listed *supra* under "Literature").

[32] *Ludi theatrales sacri* (Munich 1666); "Philemon Martyr," Latin and German, ed. M. Wehrli (Cologne 1961). A. Dürrwächter, *Jacob Gretser und seine Dramen* (Freiburg 1912); K. W. Drozd, *Schul-und Ordenstheater am Kollegium SJ Klagenfurt 1604–1773* (Klagenfurt 1965); C. Zander, *Jesuitentheater u. Schuldrama als Spiegel trierischer Geschicte:* Kurtrier Jb. 5 (1965), 64–88; J. Seidenfaden, *Das Jesuitentheater in Konstanz* (Stuttgart 1963).

CHAPTER 44

The New and the Old Orders

The fundamental motives of the Catholic Reform—first, self-sanctification, then the apostolate and works of charity—which had been basic to the new pre-Tridentine foundations, continued to operate in the religious life of the post-Tridentine period. The most powerful impulses came from Spain and Italy and, with the turn of the century, from France.

The idea of the apostolate is found in probably its purest form in the Oratory of Philip Neri (1515–95, canonized in 1622).[1] After being ordained in 1551, this affable and humorous "Apostle of Rome," beloved by high and low, began to gather young men, chiefly students, at San Girolamo della Carita for spiritual conferences, often with musical interludes. The society of diocesan priests, founded in 1564 and soon joined by the future Cardinals Baronius and Tarugi, was formally established in 1575. Its constitution was confirmed by Paul V in 1612. Its headquarters were at Santa Maria in Vallicella; other houses arose in Naples, Palermo, Lucca, and elsewhere in Italy. In 1611 Pierre de Bérulle transplanted the Oratory to France, where it received a fresh impetus.

The Oblates of Saint Ambrose were a society of diocesan priests, founded at Milan by Borromeo in 1578. Their single vow obliged the members to be at the disposal of the Archbishop of Milan in the care of souls and instruction.[2] The Regular Clerics of the Mother of God, living according to the Augustinian Rule, were founded at Lucca in 1574 by Gionvanni Leonardi (d. 1609, canonized in 1938) and later moved to Rome.[3] Among them the education of poor children gradually assumed primary importance, and it became the real aim of the Piarists, called in Italy the *Scolopi,* an abbreviation of *scuole pie.*[4] The Aragonese Joseph Calasanctius (1556–1648, canonized in 1767), who, on settling in Rome in 1592, had first been active in the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, opened there in 1597 the first free elementary school and gathered his coworkers into a community with simple vows (1617). The constitutions were confirmed in 1622. The Order had already spread from Italy to the Habsburg lands and Poland when the founder was brought before the Inquisition and deposed from the generalship (1643); his foundation was reduced to a mere society without vows. Alexander VII restored it as an Order. Its field of activity continued to be elementary education.

---

[1] The older literature in Heimbucher, II, 562ff.; *Il primo processo per S. Filippo Neri nel Cod. Vat. lat. 3798,* ed. G. Incisa della Rocchetta–N. Vian–C. Gasbarri, 3 vols. (Citta del Vaticano 1957–60), containing the acts of the process of beatification (1595–1601). Older biographies: A. Capecelatro, *Vita di S. F. N.* 2 vols. (Rome, 3rd ed., 1889–92); L. Ponnelle–L. Bordet, *S. F. N. e la Societa romana del suo tempo* (Florence 1932; Paris, 2nd ed. 1958); A. Dupront, "Autour de S. P. N.," *MAH* 49 (1932), 219–259; id. "D'un Humanisme chrétien en Italie à la fin du XVIe siècle," *RH* 175 (1935), 296–307; C. Gasbarri, *Il riformatore di Roma* (Rome 1937); P. Hofmeister, "Die Verfassung des Oratoriums Ph. Neris," *Festschrift J. Heckel* (Cologne and Graz 1959); G. de Libero, *Vita di S. Filippo Neri, Apostolo di Roma* (Grottaferrata 1960); M. Jouhandeau, *P. Neri* (Paris 1957).

[2] Heimbucher, II, 560f.

[3] Heimbucher, II, 113f.; F. Ferraironi, *S. G. Leonardi e Propaganda Fide* (Rome 1938).

The Society of Jesus was, and became even more so, the most influential Order in education. Following its tempestuous growth at the beginning, it experienced under the generals Borgia (1565–73) and Mercurian (1573–80) a period of internal consolidation, which was completed by the intellectually distinguished Claudius Acquaviva (1581–1615). The order of the day and manner of life of the members was fixed, a *directorium* for the conducting of the Exercises was drawn up, and, after long preparation, the *Ratio Studiorum* was put in force (1599). Their ultimate goal in education was "to stimulate the knowledge and love of our Creator and Redeemer." Following the "Paris Method," a mastery of written and spoken Latin (to a lesser extent, of Greek) was systematically aimed at; on it was built the philosophical and finally the theological training. The pupils' ambition was incited by competition, and plays and dramatic presentations open to the public forged a bond between students and parents, while youthful saints—Stanislaus Kostka (d. 1568), Aloysius Gonzaga (d. 1591), and John Berchmans (d. 1621)—were held up as models. Following the uniform instructional plan of the *Ratio Studiorum,* the 372 colleges which the Society maintained in 1616 were training an ecclesiastical and secular elite which shaped Church and world more effectively than any other factor. In the Parisian province alone some thirteen thousand students were enrolled in eighteen colleges in 1643.

The Society found and maintained its definitive frame and reached the height of its influence during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Popes Pius V and Sixtus V, both from mendicant Orders, sought without success to remodel it along mendicant lines by introducing the choral office and having solemn profession precede ordination and even to change its name. Gregory XIII, favorably disposed, curtailed the hitherto predominant Spanish influence on the government of the Society by procuring in 1573 the election of the Belgian Mercurian in place of Polanco, who had long been the Society's secretary. Efforts of Spanish Jesuits with the support of Philip II to obtain a general deputy for the Spanish Empire or to transfer the general to Spain were unavailing. Acquaviva publicly disavowed the intervention in politics of such prominent members as Auger in France and Skarga in Poland. In conflicts with his critics, for example the German Assistant Hoffaeus, he demonstrated both firmness and moderation. The number of members, about 3500 in 1563, rose to more than 13,000. Under Acquivava's mild and sensible successor, Mutius Vitelleschi (1615–45), the Order obtained in 1622 the canonization of its founder and greatest missionary, Francis Xavier, and in 1640 celebrated the first century of its existence with great pageantry. The magnificent *Imago primi saeculi Societatis Iesu* documented its achievement.

---

[4] *Epistolario di S. Giuseppe Calasanzio,* ed. L. Picanyol, 8 vols. (Rome 1950–55); G. Santha, *S. Jose de Calasanz* (Madrid 1956); C. Vila Pala, *Fuentes inmediatas de la pedagogia calasancia* (Madrid 1960). L. Picanyol, *Brevis conspectus historico-statisticus ordinis scholarum piarum* (Rome 1932); other literature in M. Escobar, *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose* I, 855–870.

Though the Jesuits, in the spirit of their founder, rendered great service as preachers and confessors in the pastoral care of all classes through their conducting of the Exercises and of popular missions, as exemplified in Saint John Francis Regis (d. 1640) in Languedoc, still, in works for the masses they were at least equalled by the Capuchins from the close of the sixteenth century. Once Gregory XIII had removed the restriction of this new branch of the Franciscans to Italy in 1574, it spread extraordinarily fast in France, Spain, the Low Countries, and the German-speaking world. When in 1621 Paul V freed it from dependence on the general of the Conventuals, it already numbered 15,000 members. The greater the number of preachers trained in higher institutions—Saint Bonaventure became the Order's Doctor in 1578—the more attention they devoted to itinerant preaching and popular missions, in addition to the customary sermons of the Advent and Lent cycles, and they became the favorite guides and confessors of the people. Matthias of Salo (d. 1611),[5] prominent as organizer and preacher, promoted the Forty Hours' Prayer. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, prior at Feldkirch, was slain at Seewis in 1622 by Calvinist peasants before beginning his mission preaching; he was canonized in 1746.[6] Lorenzo of Brindisi, general from 1602–5, did much to establish the Order in the Habsburg and Wittelsbach territories while he was general deputy.[7] Even though his share in the founding of the League was of benefit to the Catholic cause, the "Gray Eminence," Joseph of Paris (d. 1638), an austere religious and devoted director of souls, still allowed himself to be used by Richelieu as an instrument of his power politics.

---

[5] His not entirely reliable *Historia cappuccina,* edited by Melchior a Pobladura, 2 vols. (Rome 1946–50); other literature in *Lex Cap* pp. 1078ff.

[6] Festschrift on the occasion of the bicentennial of his canonization (Lucerne 1946); *Lex Cap,* pp. 585ff.

Jesuits and Capuchins, their apostolic zeal and their new pastoral methods, are as integral to the picture of the sixteenth-century Catholic renewal as were the then new mendicant Orders to that of the thirteenth century. And once again the mendicants showed their vitality. They now adapted their constitutions to the Tridentine decree on Regulars. The effort for a strict observance of the rule led in some Orders to the founding of houses of Recollects within the provinces, in others to the formation of new branches with a "stricter" and a "most strict" observance. Among the Franciscans, the Alcantarines, so called from their founder, Peter of Alcántara, but also known as Discalced, and widespread in the Spanish empire, surpassed, because of their penitential strictness and their extreme poverty, the "Riformati," who had originated at Fonte Colombo near Rieti and were very popular in Italy and South Germany; they also surpassed the French Recollects, who first united at Nevers after the Huguenot Wars. The Alcantarines described themselves as "of the strictest observance," the others, as "of the more strict observance," but all of them remained within the Order of the Observance. This was also true of the Spanish Discalced Augustinians, who from 1601 constituted a separate province of the Augustinian Hermits. In 1621 this was divided into four provinces and even obtained its own vicar general. More loose still was the dependence on the general of the Order among the Italian Discalced, who spread from Sicily as far as Austria and Bavaria, and also the French Congregation, which held its first general chapter at Avignon in 1617. Several reform congregations of the Dominicans were changed into provinces, but new Observant congregations, such as that of Saint Louis in France (1629), also arose.

On the other hand, the Carmelite general Rossi did not succeed in leading back the reformed houses of friars and nuns that had been established in Spain by Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross "to a less austere observance and to obedience to the superiors of the Order," in accord with the decree of the general chapter of Piacenza in 1575. In 1580, with the permission of Gregory XIII, secured by Philip II, the reformed set up a province of their own with statutes which stressed strict observance of the rule and the cultivation of interior prayer. When in 1593 they obtained the right to elect their own general, they became an independent Order. These Discalced Carmelites had a house in Rome from 1597 and spread to Poland (Cracow, 1605), France (Paris, 1611), Germany (Cologne, 1613, and Vienna, 1622), and Ireland (Dublin, 1625). In 1631 Urban VIII approved their revised constitutions, which brought them close to the penitential monastic Orders of Carthusians and Camaldolese through the extremely strict manner of life they prescribed—prohibition of meat, fasting from 14 September to Easter, two hours of meditation a day, and perpetual silence in the convents of hermits. The *Collegium Complutense Philosophicum* (Alcalá, 1624) and the *Cursus Theologicus* of the Order's theologians at Salamanca (1631) gave them a great reputation for scholarship. Thomas of Jesus (d. 1627) was instrumental in the founding of the Congregation of Propaganda by means of his *De procuranda salute omnium gentium* (1613), a work on mission theology.[8]

---

[7] Cf. chapter 70, footnote 12; also, Lazaro de Aspurz, "Personalidad y mision de S. Lorenzo de Brindisi," *Estudios Franciscanos,* 61 (1960), 175–201.

A glance at statistics, naturally not complete, indicates the continuing importance of the two great mendicant Orders in the life of the Church. In 1573 the Dominicans had 920 houses in twenty-nine provinces, five congregations, and four vicariates; the number of members was considerably more than 7,000.[9] In the Franciscan family there were in 1682 some 15,000 Conventuals in thirty-one provinces and 952 houses; around 1585 the Observants counted 2,113 houses in eighty-eight provinces. Since the number of members was given as 30,000 at the time of the separation from the Conventuals in 1517 and as 60,000 in 1680, it was at least 40,000 in the Tridentine period.[10]

Whereas the enforcing of the regular observance in the centralized mendicant Orders frequently produced centrifugal tendencies, the concern of the Benedictine reforms continued to be to protect the individual monastery from isolation and decay by organization in a larger union. The Council of Trent in its reform of Regulars had prescribed the federation of exempt monasteries either in provincial chapters or in congregations. Italy and Spain already had the great congregations of Montecassino and Valladolid. The Congregation of Flanders, founded in 1564, and the "Great Gallican" Congregation in France, from which that of Saint-Denis split in 1617, satisfied the letter of the Tridentine requirement but did little for reform because many monasteries were still, as earlier, the property of commendatory abbots and had only a few monks. The Abbey of Liessies, reformed by Blosius, influenced nearby monasteries by its example but established no congregation. A new flowering of Benedictine monasticism was first effected by the Congregation of Saint-Vanne, to which abbeys of Lorraine and Burgundy belonged from 1604 to 1670; also important were the Belgian Congregation, formed by Abbot Fanson of Saint-Hubert in 1629 after violent struggles with the episcopate, and especially the Maurist Congregation, confirmed in 1621. The Maurists, finally comprising 178 monasteries, gave themselves, on the model of the Montecassino Congregation, a strict organization under a triennial general, residing at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, with a general chapter, a strictly regulated visitation, and a common novitiate in each of the six provinces. In it there came to maturity in the succeeding epoch the great works on the history of the Benedictine Order and patristic editions that are not outdated even today. The Maurists also perfected the historico-critical method in these provinces.

---

[8] Reprinted at Rome in 1940; on the sources, see P. Charles, *Scientia missionum ancilla* (Nijmegen 1953), pp. 46–53. On the activity of Calced Carmelites in Germany, see G. Mesters, *Die rheinische Karmeliterprovinz während der Gegenreformation* (Speyer 1958).

[9] Walz, pp. 421f. Cf. also S. Forte, "I Domenicani nel carteggio del Card. Scipione Borghese, Protettore dell'Ordine 1606–1613," *AFP* 30 (1960), 351–416.

[10] Holzapfel, pp. 415ff., 596f.

Despite great losses, the Union of Bursfeld in northern and western Germany had weathered the storms of the Reformation.[11] In South Germany, following the failure of several moves for apostolic visitations, the Swabian Congregation was formed in 1603 under the leadership of Abbot Georg Wegelin of Weingarten;[12] the Swiss Congregation had originated in 1602. Somewhat later was the Austrian Congregation, which was confirmed in 1625; but it was set up for defense of its privileges rather than for reform. The project of amalgamating all the German Congregations into a single one foundered on the opposition of the bishops. A resolution to that effect, passed by a meeting of abbots at Regensburg in 1631, was annulled by Urban VIII. But success crowned the effort of the German Benedictines to create a center of scholarship in the university of Salzburg, founded in 1617 by Archbishop Mark Sittich and incorporated into the Order.

Among the Cistercians too the pre-Tridentine trend toward merging reformed monasteries into congregations continued. New congregations arose in Portugal (1567), Poland (1580), Upper Germany (1595), Aragon (1616), Rome (1623), and Calabria (1633). A reform of the entire Order, suggested by Louis XIII and entrusted to Cardinal Rochefoucauld by Gregory XV, came to nothing. The Cistercians of the Strict Observance were separated as the Trappist Order in the following period.

---

[11] For the 1597 reform plan of the Cologne Nuncio Garzadoro, see P. Volk, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Bursfelder Kongregation* (Bonn 1951), pp. 150ff.

[12] R. Reinhardt, *Restauration, Visitation, Inspiration. Die Reformbestrebungen in der Benediktinerabtei Weingarten 1567–1627* (Stuttgart 1960).

The strengthening of the episcopal control of the hospital institutions by Trent could not impede their progressive secularization.[13] However, the physical and the spiritual needs of the sick, especially during epidemics,[14] were attended to, sometimes with heroic risks, and two new Orders dedicated themselves exclusively to this work. John of God (1495–1550, canonized in 1690),[15] having been converted as a result of a sermon delivered by Juan de Avila, in 1540 founded at Granada a hospital, which, provided with new accommodations with the help of Archbishop Guerrero, also received the insane. The community, consisting of helpers whom John of God had attracted, received the Augustinian rule from Pius V in 1572; Sixtus V approved its constitutions in 1586. Under Urban VIII the Brothers Hospitallers had seventy-nine hospitals in the Spanish Empire under a general resident at Granada. The houses founded in Italy (from 1571), France (from 1602), and Austria (from 1605) had after 1592 their own general, who lived in Rome. Shortly before, in 1584, Camillus of Lellis (1550–1614, canonized in 1746)[16] had founded in Rome the Clerics Regular for the Aid of the Sick, especially the dying. Also called "Camillians," they distinguished themselves during plagues in Rome and Naples and from the time of Gregory XV bound themselves to this ministry by a fourth vow. At the founder's death the Order had sixteen houses in Italy.

Although Trent's strict regulations on inclosure at first constituted an impediment, communities of religious women began to engage in the Church's works of social charity. In addition to the Ursulines,[16a] the Visitandines and the English Ladies devoted themselves to the education of young girls. The Visitandines, founded at the suggestion of Saint Francis de Sales by the widow Jane Frances Fremiot de Chantal (1572–

---

[13] Synopsis of the ecclesiastical legislation in: E. Nasalli Rocca, *Il diritto ospedaliero nei suoi lineamenti storichi* (Milan 1956), pp. 131ff.; Benedetto da Alatri, *Le ospedali di Roma e le bolle pontificie* (Viterbo 1950); M. Vanti, *Bernardino Cirillo, Commendatore e Maestro generale dell'ordine di S. Spirito 1556–1575* (Rome 1936).

[14] E.g., Donato da S. Giovanni in Persiceto, "I cappuccini e la peste a Bologna nel 1630," *Atti del primo Congresso italiano di Storia Ospedaliera* (Reggio-Emilia 1957), pp. 228–246.

[15] Heimbucher, I, 600f.; biographies by L. Ruland (Frankfurt a. M. 1949) and J. Cruset (Barcelona 1958); *Per il IV Centenario della morte di S. Giovanni da Dio* (Rome 1950); C. Salvadori, *Incontri con S. Giovanni da Dio* (Rome 1959); A. Chagny, *L'Ordre hospitalier de St. Jean de Dieu en France* I (Lyons 1951).

[16] Heimbucher, II, 114ff.; biographies by M. Fischer (Freiburg 1935), R. Svoboda (Linz, 5th ed. 1946), and M. Vanti (Milan, 2nd ed. 1958).

[16a] See M. de Chantal Gueudré, *Les monastères des Ursulines sous l'Ancien Régime 1612–1788* (Paris 1960).

1641, canonized in 1767),[17] were at first occupied in the service of the poor and the sick. But after they had become an Order with the Augustinian rule in 1618, they took up the training and instruction of young girls in boarding schools, out of regard for the Tridentine prescription of inclosure. At the death of de Chantal the Order had eighty-six independent convents, all in French-speaking countries. At about the same time an English woman, Mary Ward (d. 1645),[18] had founded at Saint-Omer in 1609 a community, the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which was supposed to conform to the rule of the Jesuits but forego the Tridentine inclosure. The request for papal confirmation was denied for this reason, the community was dissolved in 1631, and Mary Ward herself was for a time imprisoned on flimsy charges. Thanks to the protection of Maximilian I of Bavaria, the Institute, whose members were popularly known as the English Ladies, was established at Munich in 1626–27 for teaching in girls' schools and became the source of many new foundations in South Germany. Only Vincent de Paul succeeded in founding a female Order for the care of the sick. The Daughters of Charity, directed from 1634 by Louise de Marillac (d. 1660, canonized in 1934), took the place of the associations of women organized by Vincent for the care of the poor and the sick and in 1656 were approved as an Order by Innocent X.[19] Together with the Borromeans of Nancy (1652), they blazed the trail for the grand-scale development of the modern congregations of women, without which the Church's social work in the nineteenth century could not be imagined.

---

[17] Sources in *Ste. J. F. de Chantal, sa vie et ses oeuvres,* 8 vols. (Paris 1874–79); biography by H. Waach (Eichstätt 1957); M. Müller, *Die Freundschaft des hl. Franz von Sales mit der hl. J. F. von Ch.* (Regensburg 1924); D. Mezard, *Doctrine spirituelle de Ste. J. F. de Ch.* (Paris 1928).

[18] M. Oliver, *M. Ward* (London 1959); J. Grisar, *Die ersten Anklagen in Rom gegen das Institut M. Wards* (Rome 1959); id., "Vani tentativi di M. Ward di fondare scuole femminili a Napoli 1623–28," *Studi in onore di R. Filangieri* II (Naples 1959), 525–549.

[19] Bibliography by L. Gebsattel in *Car* 61 (1960), 158ff., 200f.; J. Guy, *L. de Marillac* (Paris 1960).

SECTION FOUR

The Springtime of the Missions in the Early Modern Period

CHAPTER 45

The Missions under Spanish Patronage

The discovery of the Canary Islands (1312–41) may be considered the prelude to the great discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.[1] What followed set the example for all missionary activity in the so-called Age of Discovery. As early as 1351 Pope Clement VI appointed the Carmelite Bernard as Bishop of the "Happy Islands,"[2] and in 1368 Urban V directed the Bishops of Barcelona and Tortosa to send missionaries there. But these early endeavors were unsuccessful. Thirteen missionaries are said to have been slain by the inhabitants in 1391. Only the conquest of the islands by the Spaniards created more favorable conditions. In 1404 the bishopric of the Canary Islands was established as the new diocese of Rubicon,[3] and in 1424 Fuertaventura became the second see.[4] Besides Dominicans and Augustinians, it was especially Franciscans—Saint Diego of Alcalá (d. 1463) and Alfonso of Bolano—who labored for the conversion of the presumably Berber islanders. Their work was seriously hampered by the encroachments of the Spanish conquerors and merchants, and Pope Eugene IV had to protect the neophytes from exploitation and enslavement and defend their human rights.[5] But, contrary to what has been frequently claimed, the native population was not exterminated. In fact, within scarcely a century it had become a civilized European nation.[6] By 1476 the majority of the islanders were Catholics, and in 1483 Las Palmas became the episcopal see for the entire archipelago.

---

[1] R. Henning, *Terrae incognitae* III (Leiden 1938), 136–143, following Petrarch, *De vita solitaria* II, Chapter 3.

[2] K. Eubel, "Der erste Bischof der canarischen Inseln," *RQ* 6 (1892), 237–240; Lütolf, "Zur Entdeckung und Christianisierung der westafrikanischen Inseln," *ThQ* 59 (1877), 319–332.

[3] Streit, XV, 354f.; on the whole question cf. *Historia de la Religion en Canarias* (Santa Cruz de Tenerife 1957); J. Zunzunegui, "Los origenes de las misiones en las Islas Canarias," *RET* 1 (Madrid 1940), 361–408; I. Ormaecheverria, "En torno a las misiones del archipielago Canario," *Missionalia Hispanica* 14 (Madrid 1957), 539–560.

[4] Streit, XV, 390f.

[5] Ibid., pp. 400, 409; cf. J. Wölfel, "Bericht über eine Studienreise in die Archive Roms und Spaniens zur Aufhellung der Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Kanarischen Inseln," *Anthropos* 25 (1930), 711–724.

The marriage of Isabella of Castile to Ferdinand of Aragon paved the way for Spanish national unity, and the victory at Granada in 1492 completed the *reconquista.* In the same year Spain entered into competition with Portugal in the field of exploration. The Genoese Christopher Columbus (1451–1506), in the service of Spain, discovered America, which he thought to be a part of Asia and hence called the "West Indies." To counter Portuguese claims, the Spanish royal pair secured from Pope Alexander VI the recognition of their right to the newly discovered regions and the drawing of a line of demarcation 100 leagues west of the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands: All lands discovered on the far side of the line were to belong to Spain, all lying on the other side of the line were to belong to Portugal.[7] In 1494 this imaginary line was advanced some 270 leagues farther to the west, at the request of Portugal, in the Treaty of Tordesillas—perhaps proof that Portuguese sailors had already acquired knowledge of the new world before Columbus. In any case, on the basis of this revision, Portugal could legally claim possession of Brazil, occupied by Cabral in 1500. Following the first circumnavigation of the globe and the discovery of the Philippines by Ferdinand Magellan (1480–1521) there broke out a protracted struggle for a corresponding line of demarcation in the Pacific. This quarrel was to be of great importance in the missionary history of the Far East. It concerned not only the Philippines but eventually Japan and China. And the fact that the Spanish missionaries had to go to Asia via America (Mexico) is noteworthy.

Passions have been frequently aroused by Pope Alexander VI's award, referred to as the "partition of the world" and the "Donatio Alexandrina." Its importance is discussed even today.[8] It seems clear that it granted a national monopoly of the missionary work in specified regions, for, in return for the "donation," the Spanish King assumed the obligation of promoting the spread of Christianity in the new lands; thereby laying the basis for the royal *patronato*. Responsibility for missionary work implied corresponding rights in the ecclesiastical sphere and these were given to the Spanish crown in 1508 by Julius II's Bull "Universalis Ecclesiae."[9] To the duty of supporting the clergy, churches, and dioceses was added the right to found dioceses and to name all benefice-holders, even bishops.

---

[6] Cf. E. Fischer, *ZE* 62 (Braunschweig 1931), 258–281; J. Wölfel, ibid., pp. 282–302.

[7] Cf. the two Bulls "Inter Caetera" of 3 and 4 May 1493 and the Bull "Eximiae Devotionis" of 4 May 1493; also P. Leturia, "Las grandes bulas misionales de Alejandro VI (1493)," *Bibliotheca Hispania Missionum* 1 (Barcelona 1930), 209–251; M. Gimenez Fernandez, "Las bulas alejandrinas de 1493," *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 1 (Sevilla 1944), 171–429; A. Garcia Gallo, *Las Bulas de Alejandro VI y el Ordenamiento Juridico de la Expansion Portuguesa y Castellana en Africa e Indias* (Madrid 1958).

[8] E. Staedler, "Die 'donatio Alexandrina' und die 'divisio mundi' von 1493," *AkathKR* 117 (1937), 363–402; id., "Die westindischen Lehnedikte Alexanders VI (1493)," ibid., 118 (1938), 377–417; J. Leclercq, "Autour de la 'donation' d'Alexandre VI (1493)," *Etudes* 237 (1938), 5–16, 195–208.

From its mission mandate Spain deduced the right of conquest and annexation. The *conquista* became a war against paganism, as the *reconquista* had been a war against Islam—it was waged for the faith. "The sword in one hand, they held out the Gospel with the other."[10] The force taking possession of an area sometimes issued a *requerimiento*[11] whereby, under threat of the most severe penalties, the inhabitants were called upon to accept Chrisitanity and to recognize the dominion of the Spanish King. Whoever refused lost his freedom or was killed. The conquerors took the land as a royal fief (*encomienda*)[12] and had the right to force the Indians to work it. The missionaries who accompanied the troops, being men of that era, usually approved this procedure. They were not prepared for their missionary work and had absolutely no knowledge of peoples of a strange culture. They felt that exotic peoples could become genuine Christians only if their views, customs, and worship were first destroyed ("method of *tabula rasa*"). To this end, recourse to force was at times necessary, but from this it is not to be inferred that the Spanish missionaries knew only compulsory methods. Such a conclusion is contradicted by the fact that, clearly due to the work of the missionaries, in most Latin American countries the Indian population has maintained itself to this day and the native languages survive to some extent.

The overall view of the age contained a theological bias which did not keep pace with the problems raised by the widening of the world horizon. Thus, the unsolved question concerning the salvation of pagans and the nature and extent of the faith necessary for salvation led to the too speedy conferring of baptism,[13] producing many new Christians but only a superficial christianization. How little people were aware of the new situation is revealed by the fact that at Trent the Fathers hardly mentioned the overseas lands, let alone seriously discussed them. Hence Church life in the missions retained its pre-Tridentine stamp long after 1561. The home situation was transferred just as it was to areas of very different culture where closed and exclusively Latin-European dominions were established under the rule of the "Catholic" King of Spain.[14]

---

[9] Streit, II, 54.

[10] Quoted in Schmidlin, M, 290, footnote 3, from Baluffi, *L'America sotto l'aspetto religioso* I (1845), 159.

[11] B. Biermann, "Das requerimiento in der spanischen Conquista," *NZM* 6 (1950), 94–114.

[12] S. A. Zavala, *La encomienda indiana* (Madrid 1935).

[13] F. Rousseau, *L'idée missionaire aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles* (Paris 1930); V. Carro, *La teologia y los teologos-juristas españoles ante la conquista de America* (Seville 2nd ed. 1951).

Spanish discoverers made rapid strides in the sixteenth century. In 1513 Vasco Nũnez de Balboa, having crossed the isthmus of Panama, reached the Pacific, which he called the "South Sea." By 1519 the northern coast of the Gulf of Mexico was traversed; by 1526 the southern outlines of South America had been determined. Discovery was followed by conquest, and in a little more than a half-century America from Chile to Oregon was claimed to be under Spanish rule. This achievement is explained not only by might and technical superiority: It finds its causes also in the discords and the internal deterioration of the ancient American empires. Spain's ability to retain these vast regions for centuries is due to the strictly organized administration which was set up immediately after the conquest and before the *conquistadores,* often acting on their own, succumbed to the temptation to establish independent empires. Thus arose clearly distinct administrative areas: the Antilles, Mexico (New Spain), Peru, and New Granada, with corresponding ecclesiastical divisions. Hence it is proper to present the missionary history of Spanish America with regard to this geographical arrangement.

The Antilles

It can be regarded as almost certain that Columbus was not accompanied by any priest on his first voyage.[15] On the second voyage a motley group of twelve or thirteen diocesan and regular priests went to the new world under the direction of Fray Bernard Boyl, but the expedition was fruitless and by the end of 1494 Boyl had returned to Spain. Missionary work in America really began with the departure of a group of Franciscans in 1500. Already in their first letter they were able to report 3000 baptisms.[16] The erection of an archdiocese and two suffragan sees for the Antilles, decreed in 1504 by Julius II, foundered on King Ferdinand's objection that his rights had been disregarded. Only when these had been assured (1508) could the sees of Santo Domingo and Concepción de la Vega on Hispañiola (Haiti) and San Juan on Puerto Rico be established in 1511. The first diocese on the American continent, Santa María Antigua del Darién (Panama), followed in 1513.

---

[14] In *Il Concilio di Trento* I (Rome 1942), 35–43, P. Leturia investigates why the American bishops did not attend the Council.

[15] B. Biermann, "Die ersten Missionen Amerikas," *Festschrift 50 Jahre katholischer Missionswissenschaft* (Münster 1961), pp. 115–120; D. Olmedo, "La primera evangelizacion en America 1494–1504," *Abside* (Mexico 1953), pp. 35–67.

[16] Streit, II, 37.

In the meantime Dominicans also had come to America in 1509–10, inaugurating a new epoch in the scarcely opened missionary history of America—the age of the struggle for the freedom and for the procedure of evangelization.Decrees in favor of the Indians had indeed already been issued,[17] but they were ignored by the Spaniards. Even Columbus carried Indians to Spain as slaves. Forced labor, sicknesses connected with exposure to the diseases of the Europeans, and acts of violence decimated the population. Frightful epidemics of suicide completed the work of depopulation. As early as 1501 the import of Negro slaves from Africa was allowed in order to counteract the depopulation. Scarcely more than twenty years of colonization sufficed to reduce the population of the Antilles from millions to 14,000 and finally to a few hundred.[18] From 1517 Negroes were systematically settled on Haiti, and very soon they constituted two-thirds of the island's population.

The abuses induced the Dominicans to intervene. Antonio de Montesino was the first to make a violent protest. To his aid came Bartolomé de Las Casas (1474–1566), who was a diocesan priest at that time but became a Dominican in 1522. Las Casas crossed the ocean seven times to implore the king to protect the Indians deprived of their rights. He obtained the righting of the worst abuses and exercised a decisive influence on Spanish legislation in favor of the Indians. He forced the theologians and lawyers of his time to face squarely the still unsettled questions as to the human rights of the Indians, the lawfulness of war against infidels, and Spain's claim to have a legitimate title to the occupation of America. Nevertheless, history's judgment on Las Casas has not yet been rendered. Some regard him as an unflinching champion of freedom and justice, or even as a divinely sent leader, while others consider him a dangerous fanatic, a mad genius, or even a wanton and conscious falsifier of history and a libeler. Certainly Las Casas was guilty of unjustified generalizations and exaggerations; he was concerned to denounce wrongs. As accuser, he had to produce proof of guilt, and nothing else interested him. Thus, in a sense, he is the source of the *leyenda negra,* which discredited the whole colonizing and christianizing activity of the Spaniards abroad and contributed to the judgment, hardened by tradition, on the Spanish methods. In this he was, in the final analysis, neither more nor less than one of the authentic representatives of the Christian conscience of Spain in the New World.

---

[17] In 1497, 1501, 1503, 1509. Cf. Streit, II, 33f. 38, 42, 56.

[18] Las Casas speaks of 3 million on Haiti, others of 1 million.

Mexico

By arbitrarily changing his mandate to explore, Hernando Cortés (1485–1546) quickly put an end to the Aztec empire in Central America (1519–1521). Montezuma II (1502–20) was killed, the capital, Tenochtitlán, was razed, and in its stead Mexico City was founded. The complete pacification of the country, however, was not achieved until about 1550.

Cortés was typical of the *conquistadores.* Violent and excessively cruel, at the same time he was zealous for the spread of the Christian faith. Everywhere he set up crosses, forbade human sacrifice, and destroyed idols. The reports he constantly sent to Charles V testify to his zeal.[19] He always had priests in his army to preach the faith. The Mercedarian Bartolomé de Olmedo especially distinguished himself on Cortés' first expedition, but the real missionary work was begun by Franciscans. The first three came from the southern Netherlands; the best known of these, Peter of Ghent, labored in Mexico for fifty years. In 1524 they were followed by twelve Spanish Franciscans, the "Twelve Apostles of Mexico." Among them was Toribio de Benavente, called by the Mexicans "Motolinía," the poor man, because he selflessly gave away all that he had. The Franciscans were joined by Dominicans in 1526 and Augustinians in 1533. The Spanish religious houses were emptied in behalf of the new overseas provinces of the Orders. In 1559 in Mexico alone the Franciscans numbered 380 members in eighty houses, the Dominicans 210 and the Augustinians 212 in forty houses each.

From Mexico proper the missionaries spread over the areas to the north and the south of New Spain subject to the Viceroy of Mexico. In 1525 one of the three Flemish Franciscans went to Guatemala, and missionary work began in Honduras in 1527, Yucatán in 1534, and New Mexico in 1540. The success of conversion corresponded to the supply of missionaries. The sources speak of millions of neophytes and extol their faith. Many a conversion may have been merely external. The mass baptisms—as many as 14,000 a day!—betray a hurried and superficial procedure and the numerical data in regard to destruction of temples and idols refer to the use of force. Still, the Indians' conversion must have been genuine and sincere on the whole. The rapid establishment of the hierarchy testifies to the development of Christian life. The see of Tlaxcala was founded in 1525, Tegucigalpa in 1527, Mexico City in 1530, Honduras in 1531, Anteguera in 1535, Michoacán in 1536, Chiapas in 1538, Guadalajara in 1548, Yucatán in 1561. In 1546 Mexico City became the metropolitan see of New Spain, with all the other dioceses as its suffragans. The Franciscan Juan de Zumárraga was Mexico City's first and most important bishop (1530–48).[20]

---

[19] Streit, II, 187ff., 194; cf. p. 466.

Recent historical investigation of the methods of evangelization indicate that the Spanish missionaries have been seriously maligned. They not only adapted themselves to the native languages and customs but through their scholarship made noteworthy contributions to the philology, ethnology, and historiography of America. The extant catechisms, prayer books, and devotional treatises, together with their grammars, provide irreplaceable sources for modern research. Let it suffice to mention only Bernardin of Sahagún, whose works are being reprinted today.[21]

It is, then, understandable if the Franciscans quickly exerted themselves for the education of the Indians. In 1523 Peter of Ghent set up a school in which, together with religion, reading, writing, and arithmetic were taught and trades and skills were imparted. In 1536 Bishop Zumarraga even started a college of higher studies, presumably for the training of a native clergy,[22] but this goal was not achieved. However, the college sent forth a supply of splendidly educated people from whom Sahagún selected his assistants in his scholarly undertakings. The Jesuits, who did not arrive until 1572, created nothing new in this regard. They devoted themselves at first chiefly to the care of souls and instruction of the Spanish city dwellers. From 1584 they too turned to missionary work, and in 1609 forty-four of them were tending four missions of their own. The Carmelites and the Mercedarians followed the Jesuits. All together, there were about 400 religious houses in New Spain at the turn of the century. Mexico had become a Catholic country, and the stage of direct missionary work was over.

The essence of missionary work was regarded as the conferring of baptism. Of the other Sacraments only confession and matrimony were stressed. For decades serious hesitations existed in regard to allowing the Indians to receive communion[23] and even more so in regard to ordaining them. In 1555 the First Council of Mexico forbade the conferring of major orders on Indians, *mestizos,* and mulattoes.[24] This prohibition remained in force throughout the sixteenth century and was influential still later. Perhaps here lies one reason for the prevailing shortage of priests throughout Latin America[25] Into the nineteenth century the Church maintained the appearance of a foreign institution.

---

[20] J. Garcia Icazbalceta, *Don Fray J. de Zumarraga, primer obispo y arzobispo de Mexico* (Mexico City 1881); F. de J. Chauvet (Mexico City 1948).

[21] *Colloquios y doctrina cristiana, Quellenwerke zur alten Geschichte Amerikas, aufgezeichnet in den Sprachen der Eingeborenen,* 3 (Stuttgart 1949).

[22] R. Ricard, *5e Semaine de Missiologie de Louvain 1927* (Louvain 1927), pp. 83–89.

[23] J. de Lugo (d. 1660) treats the question in his *Disputationes scholasticae et morales* IV (Paris 1869), but answers it in favor of the Indians.

[24] See J. Specker, "Der einheimische Klerus in Spanisch-America im 16. Jh., "*Der einheimische Klerus in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Festschrift für L. Kilger) (Schöneck-Beckenried 1950), pp. 73–97; for Mexico, pp. 75–83.

Peru

Between 1532 and 1536, starting with a force of only 180, Francisco Pizarro (1475–1540) undertook to conquer the Inca empire, extending from southern Colombia to northern Chile and northwest Argentina, which had already been weakened by the rivalry between the cities of Cuzco and Quito. The Inca Acahualpa received the Spaniards in a friendly manner but was made prisoner and, despite the surrender of his treasury gold and the reception of baptism, was executed. The collapse of the Inca empire was thereby sealed, though the conquest of the vast territory was not completed until 1572. Power-struggles among the *conquistadores,* strong protests against the laws aimed at protecting the Indians (*nuevas leyes*), and the elimination of the "Pizarro Dynasty" by the royal government long disturbed the peace of the largest viceroyalty in Latin America. Lima, the "City of Kings," founded by Pizarro in 1535 and made a diocese in 1541 and an archdiocese in 1546, was so much the political and ecclesiastical center that the history of all of South America, except Brazil, can be read in its story.

Missionary work in Peru was begun by the Dominicans,[26] whose first representative, Vincent Valverde, came in 1531. In 1539 Paul III erected the Peruvian Dominican province and in 1544 it had about fifty-five members. It provided in Jerome de Loaysa the first Bishop of Cuzco and the first Archbishop of Lima (1541–81). The Franciscans came next and spread across the land. Their most prominent missionary was Saint Francis Solano (1549–1610),[27] the "miracle-worker of the New World." They were joined by Augustinians and Mercedarians and in 1568 by the first Jesuits. In 1570 there were forty-four Jesuits in Peru, in 1575 sixty, in 1581 the number had risen to 110, in 1592 to 242, and in 1607 to 376. The early Jesuits worked almost exclusively in the larger cities; thus, in 1575 of the total of sixty there were forty-three in Lima and fourteen in Cuzco.

The religious Orders determined the history of the missions and of the Church in the viceroyalty. In their presence the diocesan clergy, predominantly Spaniards and Creoles, could maintain themselves only with difficulty. However, along with the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinians, they also provided prelates for the numerous sees which were suffragans of Lima—Panama (1513), León in Nicaragua (1534), Cuzco (1536), Quito (1545), Popayán in Colombia (1546), Paraquay (1547), Charcas in Bolivia (1551), Santiago de Chile (1561), Imperial in Chile (1563), Santiago de Estero (1570), Arequipa (1577), Trujillo (1577), and Buenos Aires (1582).

---

[25] Cf. J. Hoffner, *Christentum und Menschenwürde,* p. 296.

[26] B. Biermann, "Die Anfänge der Dominikanertätigkeit in Neuspanien und Peru,"*AFP,* 13 (1943), 5–58.

[27] Streit, II, 1437; also, O. Maas (Leutesdorf 1938) for the literature; F. Royer (Paterson, N.J. 1955).

The internal development of the Church kept pace with its expansion. The Archbishops of Lima, especially Saint Toribio Alfonso de Mogrovejo (1581–1606),[28] the Apostle of the Indians, exerted themselves to lay a firm foundation at the numerous provincial councils, held in 1552, 1567,[29] 1583, 1591, and 1601. Though the conciliar acts betray the prevailing defects in methods of evangelization, they also certify a clear insight into the necessity of thorough reforms. Thus the Council of 1567 warned against hasty baptism and insisted on the obligation of systematic instruction of catechumens and neophytes. The establishing of the so-called *doctrinas,* meaning both "instruction" and "community," was intended to meet this need. Not only the parish priests (*doctrineros*) but also the *encomenderos* were responsible for this work twice a week.

The same council made obligatory the study of the native languages and strictly forbade the hearing of confessions through an interpreter. The Church festivals were celebrated in great splendor, if not with pomp, but it was soon discovered that pagan customs often were concealed by ecclesiastical ceremonies. Hence the method of eradication (*tabula rasa*) was advocated, the too ready admission of Indians to the reception of communion was disapproved, and their very ability to become priests was flatly denied. It was not until the Tridentine decrees on the qualifications for the priesthood had become known overseas that a more conciliatory view became evident in theory.[30] In practice, however, the admission of Indians, *mestizos,* and mulattoes to the priesthood was closed into the seventeenth century, even though in 1576 Gregory XIII had allowed ordination to persons of illegitimate birth in order to obtain priests conversant with the vernaculars.[31] This measure led to so many abuses that caution in regard to it can be detected already at the Provincial Council of 1583.

---

[28] C. Garcia Irigoyen, *S. Toribio,* 4 vols. (Lima 1906f.); V. Rodriguez Valencia, *S. Toribio de Mogrovejo,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1956f.);A. Oyarzun, *La organizacion eclesiastica en el Peru y en Chile durante el pontificado de Sto. Toribio de M.* (Rome 1935); P. de Leturia, *I grandi missionari* II (Rome 1940), 69–117.

[29] F. Mateos, *Los dos Concilios Limenses de Jeronimo de Loaysa* (Madrid 1947).

[30] A. Pott, "Das Weihehindernis für Indianer im 3. Konzil von Lima," *NZM* 12 (1956), 108–118.

The implementation of the conciliar decrees was seriously impeded by the vast extent of the province of Lima. Other obstructions were the inadequate means of communication, the difficult geographical and climatic conditions in the widely varying altitudes, and the sparse and widely scattered Indian settlements. Saint Toribio needed six years for his first missionary journey, four for his second. In order to overcome the difficulties he would have needed a numerous clergy of more than average moral and intellectual stature. Thus the danger always remained that the newly won Christians would reassert their pagan customs.

From Peru proper Christianity spread through all the neighboring areas. In Chile,[32] in spite of the strong and centuries-long resistance of the Araucanians to the Spanish colonists, cities, churches, and monasteries could be erected and many conversions could be realized. Here too the first sees arose very soon—Santiago in 1561 and Imperial in 1563. In the La Plata districts christianization made evident progress when in 1547 the connection with Peru was established by means of El Gran Chaco. At the close of the sixteenth century Paraguay and Uruguay were also included in the missionary zone and the whole region was divided into dioceses.

New Granada

Colombia, conquered for Spain by Quesada in 1536 and united with Venezuela in 1549 to form the Audiencia of New Granada, was evangelized chiefly by Dominicans. Contrary to what had occurred in Mexico and Peru, here the Dominicans did not establish any monasteries at first, but merely isolated missions and schools. It was not until 1551 that the individual enterprises were gathered into a congregation, which in 1569 included eighteen priories, forty *doctrinas,* and 100 Indian villages. The Dominican province of New Granada was canonically erected in 1577. The outstanding missionary was Saint Louis Beltrán (1526–81),[33] who in a few years brought tens of thousands of Indians to the Christian faith, though he constantly encountered obstacles in the excesses of the Spaniards. The Franciscans too had to defend their neophytes against the *conquistadores,* and this they did so ardently that they were charged with having destroyed the *conquista.* Around the mid-century the Augustinians also joined the ranks of the missionaries. Due to the efforts of all of these Orders, the population became Christian within a few decades. Santa Fe de Bogotá became an episcopal see in 1562 and in 1564 it obtained metropolitan status, with Popayán and Santa María as suffragans.

---

[31] L. Lopetegui, "El Papa Gregorio XIII y la ordinacion de mestizos hispano-incaicos," *Miscellanea Hist. Pont.* 7 (Rome 1943), 180ff.

[32] Gazulla, *Los primeros Mercidarios en Chile* (Santiago 1918); R. Ghigliazza, *Historia de la provincia dominicana de Chile* (Concepcion 1898); F. Enrich, *Historia de la Compania de Jesus en Chile,* 2 vols. (Barcelona 1891); Maturana, *Historia de los Agustinos en Chile,* 2 vols. (Santiago 1904).

[33] B. Wilberforce, *Vie de St. Louis Bertrand* (Paris 1904).

Venezuela, also belonging to the viceroyalty of New Granada, had been evangelized at the beginning of the sixteenth century from the Antilles. But success on the continent was more and more frustrated by the outrages of the licentious Spanish soldiers, for whose misdeeds the missionaries had to pay with their lives in various places. And the attempt of Bartolomé de Las Casas to make a settlement in this region (Cumaná in 1521) foundered as a result of atrocities committed by a punitive expedition against the Indians. When in 1528 Venezuela was assigned by Charles V to the Augsburg business house of Welser as holder of the monopoly for the importation of Negro slaves, matters hardly changed. Of course, the German mercenaries brought missionaries into the country, but they must have behaved in a worse manner than the Spaniards. In 1546 the grant to the Welser was withdrawn and in 1549 the Spanish viceroyalty of New Granada was erected.

The first great theorist of the missions in modern times, the Jesuit José de Acosta (1540–1600),[34] in his *De procuranda Indorum salute* (Salamanca 1588), gives a detailed report on the success of the South American missions and on the shortcomings of the methods employed. Here the lack of qualifications in the clergy is presented as the reason for the symptoms of decay. However, de Acosta expresses himself as opposed to admitting Indians and colonists' sons to the priesthood.[35]

The Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay

An especially characteristic undertaking of the Latin American missionary endeavor is provided by the so-called Reductions, villages where

---

[34] L. Lopetegui, *El P. Jose de Acosta y las Misiones especialmente americanas del siglo XVI* (Madrid 1942); id., "Notas sobre la actividad teologica del P. Jose de Acosta," *Gr* 21 (1940), 527–563; id., "I: Como debe intenderse la labor misional de P. Jose de Acosta," "II: Bibliografia misional del P. Jose de Acosta," *StMis* 1 (Rome 1943), 115–136; L. Kilger, "Die Peru-Relation des J. de Acosta 1576 und seine Missionstheorie," *NZM* 1 (1945), 24–38.

[35] A. Pott, "Der Acosta-Text vom Weihehindernis für Indianer," *NZM* 15 (1959), 167–180.

Christian Indians, segregated from the Spanish immigrants, lived under the more or less patriarchal authority of the missionaries. Best known are the Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay, but they were neither peculiar to this country nor to the Society of Jesus. In fact, such Christian villages were begun in the very first years of South American mission history. As early as 1503 an instruction laid down regulations for Indian settlements of this sort, and Las Casas experimented with this method of colonization and evangelization. In a sense, the *doctrinas* (like the *aldeas* in Portuguese missionary territory) were forerunners or variations of the reductions. But the system existed on the largest scale and in its most typical fashion in the Jesuit missions of Paraguay.

Invited into the country in 1585 by the Dominican Bishop Vittoria of Tucumán to evangelize the Indians who had retreated before the Spaniards into the inaccessible forests of the Pampas and the Gran Chaco, the first Jesuits conformed to the then prevailing methods of the itinerant mission. But the conversions thus made were not lasting, and the Jesuits were considering abandoning the work as a failure when their general Claudius Acquaviva, on the basis of a report of a visitation made by Father Stephen Paez, ordered the erection of permanent settlements in which the Indians should live shielded as far as possible from outside influences. The mere spreading of the word, he said, was not enough; the seeds must also be tended. This project of isolation and concentration met with the approval of the Spanish crown, despite the colonists' opposition. The still unoccupied Paraná territory was turned over to the Jesuits with the full authority to gather all Christian Indians, independently of any other supervision and far from contact with the outside world. The execution of the mandate began in 1610. In four decades of assiduous work the missionaries pushed forward to the Brazilian province of Tape and united the Indians of the Guaraní and Chaco peoples into a Christian Indian state. There was no lack of resistance on the part of Church and state. Finally, the Indians had to be equipped with firearms in order to repulse raids made by *mestizo* kidnappers from Brazil. In the wars with the so-called *Paulistas* or "Mamelukes," thousands of neophytes were carried off and several reductions destroyed, but some thirty reductions, with about 150,000 Christian Indians, were victorious in 1641.

Through the centuries the "Paraguay Jesuit State" has had friends and foes and has evoked a vast quantity of literature. Against the censures, justified and unjustified, there rises the objection that the reductions were a relative necessity and a legal self-defense against the danger, threatening from all sides, of exploitation and extermination. The pure motives of most of the missionaries are beyond question. Problems of evangelization and of colonization, as they presented themselves, were brilliantly solved. In spite of a few drastic educational methods, such as beatings and imprisonment, there is no question of terror or violence but at most of too strict a tutelage. The later catastrophe in no way implies a merely apparent success. On the contrary, the reversion to savagery rather shows how necessary was the authoritarian and strictly organized direction of the unstable and helpless Indians. Whether the Jesuits regarded the reductions as a stage of transition to adulthood cannot be determined, but it seems to be refuted by the painful fact that no native priest came out of the Jesuit reductions.

The Mission in the Philippines

With the Portuguese Ferdinand Magellan, who in Spanish service discovered the Philippines in 1521, there also landed Spanish Augustinian Hermits, who together with the crew proclaimed the Gospel to the natives. On Easter Magellan had Mass celebrated and a cross set up, to which the island Kings had to do reverence and homage. A village which refused was reduced to ashes. This act of violence caused a rising in which Magellan was murdered, and the crew and missionaries only escaped with difficulty.

For the moment Spain could not take possession of the newly discovered islands because the Pacific line of demarcation, drawn in 1529, assigned them to Portugal. But Portugal displayed no interest in the archipelago; in any event, Spain was able to undertake various attempts from her settlements in America at bringing the Philippines under her occupation. It was only in 1564 that the Augustinian Andrea de Urdaneta succeeded in doing so.[36] He was a former fleet admiral, who regarded the treachery of the natives against Magellan as cause for declaring war in the event that they should oppose an effort at conversion. In 1569 Spain formally took possession of the islands, regarding them as an extension of her American holdings and as outposts of the continent of Asia. The road from Madrid to Asia went via Mexico and the Philippines. Attention was directed almost exclusively at China, and this is the reason why missionary work on the islands was taken up only reluctantly. Manila was founded in 1571; in 1583 the Audiencia Manila was made subject to the viceroy of New Spain (Mexico).

Here too there began a downright migration of Spanish friars. Twenty-four Augustinian Hermits landed on Luzón in 1575 and were followed by the first Franciscans in 1577. Manila was made a see in 1579, and the first bishop, the Dominican Dominic de Salazar,wanted his confreres to play a role in the evangelization. His exertions in this regard make clear the dangers a journey overseas involved at the time. Of the twenty friars whom the bishop brought along, eighteen died en route, while only fifteen of thirty-two Dominicans who sailed from Spain in 1586 reached Manila. Still, the influx of new missionaries did not cease. Into the beginning of the seventeenth century 450 religious are said to have embarked for the Philippines; these included Jesuits (1581) and Augustinian Recollects (1606). The Franciscan province of Saint Gregory arose in 1586,[37] the Dominican province of the Holy Rosary in 1592, the Jesuit province in 1606.

---

[36] Streit, IV, 1134, 1138.

From the islanders, who practiced a primitive animism, the evangelists encountered almost no resistance. Only in the Islamic principalities on Jolo and Mindanao in the south of the archipelago was a barrier raised against their endeavors. On the other islands they could find gratification in abundant success. The number of Christians was 400,000 as early as 1585, and it increased to almost 700,000 in 1595 and to more than 2 million in 1620. In scarcely more than a half-century the mass of the inhabitants had become Christian. The Philippines obtained its own hierarchy in 1595, the sees of Cebu, Nueva Segovia, and Nueva Caceres being suffragans of Manila.[38]

From the viewpoint of method, the Philippine missions occupy an exceptional position within the history of the Spanish missions and *patronato,* the reason being the special status of the Philippines in the Spanish Colonial Empire. The islands could be reached only by way of Mexico. This so impeded commerce with the mother country that, in comparison with missionary work, it withdrew completely into the background. The missionaries seem to have recognized this exceptional situation, and they profited by it to avoid and prevent the mistakes that had been made in America. What had been impossible to a Las Casas could be realized here. There was no slavery and no forced labor. The missionaries had themselves named as protectors of the "Indians" and were able to shield them from all excesses of the whites. The consideration and gentleness shown to the natives did not fail to produce an effect. The Filipinos remained loyal to Spain and to their missionaries, with whom they maintained the colonial empire during 150 years against all attacks by Moros, Chinese, and Dutch.

The success of the undertaking meant a new Catholic nation, the only one in the Far East. To be sure, the population completely lost its own character and became Spanish, but it took part in the intellectual and spiritual life of Catholic Spain. The educational system flourished, with schools and colleges everywhere. In 1611 the Dominicans established the Colegio Santo Tomás,[39] which became a university in 1645.[40] A direct result of this intensive educational activity was that soon there were native priests, who in the course of time took charge of almost half the parishes.[41] It was only the decline of the Spanish world power that was to make the first change in this favorable picture.

---

[37] Streit, IV, 1240f.

[38] Streit, IV, 1315, 1318f.

[39] *Algunos documentos relativos a la Universidad de Manila* (Madrid 1892), pp. 5–20.

[40] Bull "In Supereminenti" of Innocent X (20 November 1645) in Streit, V, 863.

[41] A. Huonder, *Der einheimische Klerus in den Heidenländern* (Freiburg 1909), pp. 47–56.

CHAPTER 46

The Missions under Portuguese Patronage

The transfer to the Portuguese kings of the rights of the *Militia Christi*[1] and Alexander VI's award to Portugal of all territories to the east of the line of demarcation constituted the basis of Portuguese *padronado.* In the lands recently discovered and still to be discovered the Portuguese Crown had not only the duty of spreading the Christian faith but the right to nominate suitable incumbents to sees, churches, and benefices.[2] "By this fact the Church in the Portuguese colonies was for all time delivered over to the state" and "thus the dignity of grand master of the *Militia Christi* became the source of state absolutism in Portuguese missionary areas."[3]

When Columbus discovered the "West Indies" for Spain in 1492, Portuguese caravels in search of the Indies had already occupied the key positions of the African coast and under Bartolomeo Diaz in 1486–87 they had sailed around the "Cape of Storms," which John II (1481–95), overjoyed to be so near his goal, renamed the "Cape of Good Hope." In 1498 Vasco da Gama pushed up the East African coast and from there, aided by Arab pilots, reached India. In 1500 Pedro Alvares Cabral discovered Brazil; from there he sailed around the southern tip of Africa to India and brought the first cargo of Indian spices to Lisbon. The Arab spice monopoly had been broken; it was ruined by the capture of Ormuz, Aden, and Diu. The approaches to the "Spice Islands" proper, or Moluccas, were in Portuguese possession by 1511. The taking of Malacca was celebrated in Lisbon as a victory for Christianity over Islam. And not entirely without justification: in the same year the Kings of Sumatra and Java, of Siam and Pegu (Burma) entered into friendly relations with Portugal, and in 1512 the Negus of Ethiopia sent an embassy to arrange peace and friendship with King Manuel I (1495–1521) of Portugal.

---

[1] Cf. Chapter 9.

[2] Leo X's Bull "Dum fidei constantiam" (7 July 1514) in *Bull Patr* I, 98f.

[3] A. Jann, *Die katholischen Missionen in Indien, China und Japan* (Paderborn 1915), pp. 65f.

King Manuel at once took up the question of Portuguese missions. He had informed Alexander VI of his decision to send diocesan and regular priests as missionaries to the lands discovered since 1499 and had obtained by the Bull "Cum sicut maiestas" of 26 March 1500 the right to subject the region from the Cape of Good Hope to India inclusively to an apostolic delegate, who, like the grand prior of the *Militia Christi,* was to be given quasi-episcopal jurisdiction. Julius II encouraged these missionary endeavors by granting Portugal spiritual advantages[4] and all of Manuel's missionaries a plenary indulgence.[5] In the interests of a more efficient direction of the regions, which could be hardly supervised from Portugal, the urgency of erecting an overseas bishopric more and more imposed itself. For this purpose Manuel suggested to the Pope the capital of Madeira, Funchal. Leo X thereupon suppressed the jurisdiction of the *Militia Christi* and by the Bull "Pro excellenti praeeminentia" (12 June 1514) erected the diocese of Funchal, to comprise all conquered islands and lands from the southern border of Mauretania to the Indies in the East and Brazil in the West.[6] Simultaneously King Manuel had all lands conquered and to be conquered adjudged as his inalienable possession.[7]

It was not until 1534, at a time when Spain already had seven missionary jurisdictions in her overseas territories, that, in the interests of a further division of the vast diocese, Funchal was raised to metropolitan rank and given as suffragans Santiago de Cabo Verde, São Tomé, São Salvador de Angra (Azores), and Goa.[8] But even this new arrangement was inadequate, for Goa embraced the entire area from the Cape of Good Hope as far as the Japanese islands, limited of course to the boundaries of the Portuguese colonial holdings, a restriction that was later to become extraordinarily significant. Just the same, the elevation of Goa to diocesan status made possible a development in keeping with local circumstances.

The question why Portugal, in contrast with Spain, was so slow to divide her mission territory into dioceses must not be answered by suggesting that the Portuguese Kings were excessively parsimonious. It is only fair to consider the reasons which can be deduced from the inner structure of the Portuguese colonial possessions and which created an entirely different situation from that encountered by Spain in her territories. Most important of all is the fact that Portugal, except in Africa, faced countries and empires moulded by highly developed cultures and vigorous religious systems. Hence it was not possible for Portugal to create a colonial empire with areas linked together; she could only establish trading posts. This meant that the missions, which thrived only in the area under the influence of Portuguese power, acquired the character of ecclesiastical colonies. They did not gain populations but merely religious minorities. Christianity continued to be something imported from Europe, and native Christians were suspected of having given up their nationality when they accepted the faith. Hence they ceased to have any influence in favor of Christianity on their pagan countrymen.

---

[4] Constitution "Orthodoxae fidei" (12 July 1505) in *Bull Patr* I, 62–69.

[5] "Romanus Pontifex" (12 July 1506) in *Bull Patr* I, 76.

[6] *Bull Patr* I, 100f.

[7] "Praecelsae devotionis" (3 November 1514) in *Bull Patr* I, 106f.

[8] By the Bull "Aequum reputamus" of Paul III (3 November 1534), confirmed as authentic by "Romani Pontificis" (8 July 1539), in *Bull Patr* I, 148–152, 170–173.

And just as Portugal did not succeed in displacing the native rulers, so too Christianity was unable to absorb native religions and cultures. To make matters worse, the selfishness of the Portuguese merchants and settlers made the preaching of the missionaries untrustworthy and at times even impossible. The government itself frequently preferred its commercial interests to the spreading of the faith. This was invariably true of Africa, regarded merely as an intermediate stop en route to India. An so Portugal made absolutely no effort to penetrate beyond a more or less extensive coastal strip into the interior of the continent. And even here she possessed mere bases serving and protecting trade. The names given to the various coastal strips—Pepper Coast, Ivory Coast, Gold Coast, Slave Coast—indicate what Portugal expected from Africa. Most lucrative was the commerce in "black ivory," or slaves, who were annually exported by the tens of thousands to the West Indies. That even priests, biased in favor of the opinions of the day, took part in this commerce is the clearest proof of how little they were aware of their missionary responsibility toward unfamiliar peoples.

When Portugal, toward the close of the sixteenth century and in the course of the seventeenth, ceased to be a world power and was losing one colonial area after another to the Dutch and the English, she was no longer able to fulfill the duties of her patronage completely. The personal union with Spain (1580–1640), resulting from the extinction of the Dynasty of Aviz, eventually affected missionary work. Prolonged vacancies in the overseas dioceses resulted and hence led to the decay of what had been so laboriously built up in the missionary lands.

Africa

West Africa to the mouth of the Congo, included under the name "Guinea" in contemporary reports, was entrusted by Pius II in 1462 to the Franciscans under the leadership of Afonso of Bolano.[9] Dominicans were also active in West Africa from 1486, especially on the Bight of Benin and from 1489 among the Wolof in Senegambia. But there were no enduring successes to be recorded except in the neighborhood of the Portuguese strongholds. The Cape Verde Islands and São Tomé became the points of departure for repeated missionary endeavors, and hence in 1534 were made episcopal sees.

In the *Congo,* reached by Diogo Cão in 1482, the victory of the Infante Afonso over the pagan opposition led by his brother inaugurated a period which held out hope of the Christianization of the entire Congo. King Afonso himself preached to his subjects and, when his requests for missionaries went unanswered, sent his own son with several companions to Lisbon to be educated there as priests. It seems that Afonso's letters were falsified by interpreters or were suppressed by the local Portuguese authorities. Finally, "since he could no longer trust any Portuguese,"[10] Afonso had a Congolese student write to entreat Manuel I "by the Saviour's Passion" to help him; in the letter he likens the whites in Africa, including the priests, to the Jews who crucified Christ.[11] Finally, he had the consolation of receiving back his son Henry as titular Bishop of Utica (1521). Afonso expected great things of him for the Christianization of his Empire. He would have liked to see his capital, São Salvador, raised to the status of a diocese, but in 1534, São Tomé obtained the honor and a European bishop. Afonso, greatly disappointed, thought of refusing his consent to the appointment,[12] but his son, Dom Henry, was in chronic ill health after his return from Europe and his anxious father did not let him out of his sight. Consequently, Bishop Henry did not comply with a summons to go to Rome and to the Council of Trent.[13] It may be that by that time he was no longer alive. There is no news of him after 1534, and a letter written by his father in 1539 speaks of him as dead. King Afonso himself died in 1541, having suffered the cruel experience that a priest sought to murder him during the Easter Mass.

King Afonso of the Congo is one of the most tragic figures in the history of Europe's encounter with lands beyond the seas. He asked for bread and received stones. Manuel I of Portugal thus instructed his envoys to him: "Although our efforts are directed first of all to the greater glory of God and the satisfaction of the King, still you must explain to the King of the Congo, as if you were speaking in my name, what he has to do in order to fill our ships with slaves, copper, and ivory."[14] Three centuries later David Livingstone found on the left bank of the Congo River, 160 kilometers from its mouth, an inscription hewn into a rock in which the King professes his Christian faith and announces that there are twelve churches in his empire and that to a distance of 200 leagues from the coast thousands of his subjects can read.[15]

---

[9] Streit, XV, 550.
[10] Ibid., p. 757.
[11] Ibid., p. 811.
[12] "Facta fide de expeditione Episcopatus non posse concedi" (Streit, XV, 993).
[13] Ibid., p. 972.

Under Afonso's grandson Diogo the first Jesuits came to the Congo in 1548. They found a greatly decayed Christianity. Their remonstrances, which did not spare even the King, so enraged him that he ordered all whites to quit his Empire. It was no longer possible for the missionaries to exert a beneficent influence, and after scarcely seven years the Jesuit mission was closed. All attempts to begin again were failures. A group of Spanish Carmelites perished by shipwreck, another fell into the hands of English pirates. A third group, which finally arrived in the Congo in 1584, could only confirm the fact that the few priests in the country "sought slaves rather than souls."[16] Hence they left in 1587 to seek new instructions and their superior did not let them go back. At last Philip II, who had worn the Portuguese crown since 1580 and was much preoccupied with details of the missions in the Portuguese demarcation zone, succeeded in detaching the Congo from the diocese of São Tomé. In 1596 Clement VIII made São Salvador an episcopal see, suffragan of Lisbon.[17] But this measure did not help the Congo mission. One of the first bishops was murdered shortly after he had taken possession of his see, causing his successors to reside at Loanda and shun the Congo.

Angola, explored by the Portuguese as early as 1520, did not establish contacts with Portugal until 1558. Included was the establishing of a mission which Francis Borgia undertook for the Society of Jesus. In a letter announcing the departure of the first missionaries it is expressly noted that the Gospel had not hitherto been preached in Angola.[18] And even then it was not going to be done for some time, as the Jesuits were thrown into prison. One of them contrived to go to Portugal in 1575, shortly before the new missionary expedition arrived. Again matters went awry. The Angolese bitterly resisted the occupation of their country and it was not till 1581 that the Portuguese won a victory and the missionaries their first converts. In the annual report for 1590–91 they counted 25,000 Christians.[19] At the same time the Portuguese governor was announcing that from 1575 to 1591 the number of slaves exported from Angola was 52,053.[20] No wonder that thereafter there was no end to reports of revolt and war. Not until the Bishops of São Salvador took up residence at Loanda in 1626 could the mission be stabilized.

---

[14] Cf. J. Cuvelier, *L'Ancien Royaume de Congo* (Brussels 1946), p. 131.

[15] G. Renault, *Die Karavellen Christi* (Wiesbaden n. d.), pp. 96f.

[16] Streit, XV, 2016.

[17] Bull "Super specula" (20 May 1596).

[18] *MHSI* 5 (1925), 519–525.

East Africa. Authenticated information on missionary activity on the east coast of Africa does not antedate 1559. The priests in the fortified port cities labored exclusively among the Portuguese soldiers and traders. Even Saint Francis Xavier, passing through Mozambique, had to be content with preaching to Portuguese Christians.

In 1559 a report reached the Jesuits in Goa that a son of the King of Inhambane (Zambesi) had had himself baptized and in his father's name was asking for missionaries. The Jesuits accepted the mission, since Inhambane had not yet been touched by Islam. Furthermore, from there they hoped to find access to the Gold Emperor of Monomotapa. The mission was entrusted to Father Gonçalo da Silveira.[21] In Inhambane he achieved initial success, baptizing the King and 400 of his people. And in 1561 he was able to baptize the Emperor of Monomotapa, thereby arousing a strong movement toward Christianity. This alerted the Muslims, who feared for their trade and influence. They accused the missionary of espionage and magic and were so successful that the Emperor had Father Gonçalo strangled. In Inhambane, too, things became so difficult that the missionary who had remained there decided to return to India. The East Africa mission had collapsed, and the Portuguese traders in Mozambique, with an eye to their trade, opposed its continuance. In 1571 the Portuguese government organized a punitive expedition to avenge the death of Father Gonçalo, but it ended miserably. At length Dominicans resumed their missionary work in 1577 and Jesuits in 1607. Around 1624 the two Orders maintained some twenty stations and forty-five missionaries. In 1612 the area was detached from Goa as the vicariate of Mozambique and organized as an autonomous jurisdiction.[22]

---

[19] Streit, XV, 2095.

[20] Ibid., p. 2097.

[21] H. Chadwick, *Life of the Ven. Fr. Gonçalo da Silveira, Proto-Martyr of South Africa* (London 1910); B. Leite, *D. Gonçalo da Silveira* (Lisbon 1946).

[22] Constitution "In supereminenti" (21 January 1612) in Streit, XVI, 2405.

Asia

India. The early missionary age in India was inaugurated by diocesan priests and the older Orders, chiefly Franciscans and Dominicans. Coming with the explorers and conquerors, they built monasteries and churches or destroyed temples and replaced them with churches. But their activity among the natives was limited by their ignorance of the languages and their faulty methods. Baptism was the goal of their preaching; once it was achieved, the missionaries moved on, without taking sufficient care for the absorption of Christian doctrine. There was no dearth of successes so far as numbers go, though the figures for the early period must be regarded with caution. Many conversions to Christianity were obtained by the sword, others were purchased by worldly benefits. Thus the 10,000 to 20,000 Paravas of the Fishery Coast became Christians because they expected Portuguese protection from the Muslims. Successes could be obtained even among the schismatic "Saint Thomas Christians" of South India. However, missionary efforts were seriously hindered by the wicked lives of the Portuguese and by the Hindu caste system. Christians came almost exclusively from the lowest strata of the population.

In the matter of jurisdiction, from 1506 to 1534 India was subject to an apostolic delegate[23] and his vicar general, though in 1514 Goa had been incorporated into the diocese of Funchal. In 1534 Goa became a suffragan see of Funchal. Its first bishop, the Franciscan John d'Albuquerque (1537–53),[24] exerted himself tirelessly for a better organization of his extensive territory. Under him the College of the Holy Faith was founded at Goa in 1541 for the training of a native clergy; a second, for the Saint Thomas Christians, was established at Cranganur.[25]

The second period of India's missionary history began with the entrance of the Jesuits into evangelization. Ignatius Loyola, approached by John III for some members of the Society, which had just obtained papal confirmation, selected Francis Xavier (1506–52) for India. Paul III named him legate in 1541 and provided him with the fullest authority. Francis Xavier bacame the Apostle of India and of the entire Far East and is the greatest missionary of modern times.

Francis waived his legatine authority and placed himself at the disposal of the Bishop of Goa. At the beginning of his career he differed from the other missionaries only in his extraordinary zeal. His method, like theirs, was determined by tradition. His first care was for the Portuguese colonists, whose moral and religious life had hopelessly deteriorated. Only then did he turn to the conversion of the pagans. He visited the existing congregations on the Paravas and Malabar coasts, worked to organize them, preached, and baptized. In 1545 he undertook a missionary exploration of the Portuguese colonial area. His journey carried him beyond Cochin and Malacca to the Moluccas (Amboina, Ternate) and then back to Malacca, where his attention was directed to Japan. In Japan (1549–51) he conceived the plan of extending his activity to China; but entry was denied him. Alone and forsaken, he died on the night of 2–3 December 1552 on the rocky island of Sanch'uan near Canton.

---

[23] See p. 590. The apostolic delegates for India and East Africa were Duarte Nuñez, O. P. (1514–17), Andrea Torquemada, O. F. M. (1520–22), Martinho (1522–30?), and Fernando Vaqueiro, O. F. M. (1531–32).

[24] Paul III's Bull "Regimini universalis" (April 11, 1537) in *Bull Patr* I, 278–181.

[25] Cf. A. Huonder, *Der einheimische Klerus in den Heidenländern* (Freiburg 1909), pp. 56ff., 65.

Francis Xavier's merit does not lie in his having shown the methods of the modern mission in the Far East. Far more important for the missions among the highly cultured peoples of Asia was the realization that, if the missionaries wanted to gain foreign and unfamiliar peoples for Christianity, they must adapt themselves to them. Questions about the successes of the saint, who was canonized by Gregory XV in 1622, about his miracles and the gift of tongues attributed to him, should therefore pale before the appraisal of his understanding of method. The number of those he baptized, including many children of Christian parents, may have amounted to 30,000 people. Reports of miracles appeared only after his death, and in his letters he complained of the difficulties in communication because of language. What made him a great missionary was the saint's power to attract. His example and his letters inspired many to missionary work in the succeeding period.

In 1557–58 Goa became the metropolitan see of all of East Asia, with the dioceses of Cochin and Malacca as its suffragans.[26] Later the sees of Angamale (1600)[27] and Mailapur (1606)[28] were added in India. This early granting of autonomy to the Church in India was of great importance for missionary procedure. At numerous provincial councils in Goa (1567, 1575, 1585, 1592, 1606) steps were taken against the use of force and against state interference and a more convincing method of conversion was recommended.

An especially difficult problem presented itself in regard to the schismatic Saint Thomas Christians of the Malabar Coast.[29] Jurisdiction over them was disputed among the Nestorian Patriarch of Mosul, the

---

[26] Streit, IV, 825ff., 839ff.; *Bull Patr* I, 191–198.

[27] Clement VIII's Constitution "In supremo militantis" (4 August 1600) in Streit, V, 6; *Bull Patr* I, 260f.

[28] Paul V's Cedula Consistorialis of 9 January 1606 in Streit, V, 83, *Bull Patr* II, 4ff.

[29] Jann, op. cit., pp. 142–173.

Chaldean Patriarch of Amida, and the Archbishop of Goa. Matters were aggravated by the fact that both patriarchs sought to install in the sees of the Saint Thomas Christians men of their respective obediences, while the Portuguese Franciscans, active in Malabar for a half-century, wanted a Latin bishop at Angamale. The attendant scandalous political intrigues made the situation confused.

At the Provincial Council of Diamper in 1599 all disputed points were to be definitively settled and the reunion of the Saint Thomas Christians formally ratified.[30] The Syro-Chaldean Rite was to be maintained; the liturgical books were purged of heretical elements; and a catechism in the Malayalam language was intended to increase and deepen the Saint Thomas Christians' knowledge of the faith. The Syriac archbishopric of Angamale was divested of its metropolitan rank and made a suffragan of Goa.[31] The Jesuit Francisco Roz was named as bishop. He was fluent in Syriac and Malayalam and had worked for years among the Saint Thomas Christians. But Angamale's reduction in rank was not accepted quietly. Actual riots put the union in serious danger. Rome relented and in 1608 Angamale recovered its former status.[32] In 1609 the see was moved to the Portuguese citadel of Cranganur for reasons of safety.[33]

Elsewhere in India Christianity spread very slowly. For a time it seemed that the Emperor Akbar (1556–1605) would embrace the faith, but this hope was unfulfilled.[34] An even more promising endeavor was undertaken by the Italian Jesuit, Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656).[35] He realized that the transfer of Western usages and institutions deprived Christianity of any prospect of lasting success. Hence he decided to adapt himself to the Hindus' manner of life and viewpoints. He studied Tamil, Telugu, and Sanskrit and dressed and lived as a penitential monk. His neophytes were allowed to retain Hindu customs in so far as these were not pagan in character. This method proved to be very effective with the Brahmins, who had hitherto rejected Christianity. In 1609 he had to build a church for them. De Nobili did not escape opposition, but his method was finally approved by Gregory XV.[36] At de Nobili's death the Madura mission counted 40,000 faithful.

---

[30] Acts of the Diocesan Synod of Diamper in *Bull Patr,* Appendix I, pp. 148–357; cf. J. Thaliath, *The Synod of Diamper* (Rome 1958).

[31] Streit, V, 6; *Bull Patr* I, 260f.

[32] Streit, V, 106; *Bull Patr* II, 8f.

[33] Streit, V, 127; *Bull Patr* II, 10f.

[34] A good complete presentation (with bibliography) in A. Camps, *Jerome Xavier, S. J., and the Muslims of the Mogul Empire* (Schöneck–Beckenried 1957).

[35] Streit, V, 91 (works and literature).

[36] "Romanae Sedis Antistes" (31 January 1623) in Streit, V, 254, *Bull Patr* II, 32ff.

Franciscan missionaries reached Ceylon as early as 1517. However, they did not take up the work in large numbers until 1540, when they had much success in the kingdoms of Cotta and Kandy. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Jesuits also settled on the island.

Malay Archipelago. The goal of the Portuguese seafarers' commercial policy was the "Spice Islands," the source of the cloves so much desired by Europe. In 1511 they were discovered in the Moluccas. In accordance with the attitude of the age, the merchants felt obliged to spread the faith in the islands they had discovered. They sought to win the chiefs, and, if successful, left there the religious who had made the voyage with them. It was in this way that the first Christian communities arose on Amboina, Ternate, and other islands. However, since most of the inhabitants were Muslims, the Christians and their missionaries were persecuted, as on Ternate in 1534. As early as 1521 the Portuguese had erected a fortress on Ternate for the protection of their commerce. The island had to be reconquered and "reconverted" after 1534. Francis Xavier visited the Moluccas in 1546–47.[37] He was followed by other Jesuits, who were tending forty-seven congregations in 1556 and in 1569 close to 80,000 Christians. Eventually the Dutch gained possession of the islands and the missions fell into ruin. In 1644 the number of Christians had dropped to 3,000.

The first missionary efforts on Celebes (1525) were fruitless. But in 1548 the Franciscans arrived and their preaching of hell-fire converted whole princedoms in South Celebes; elsewhere too the concept of hell is said to have impressed the Muslims far more than tidings of paradise. Christianity was unable to penetrate North Celebes until Jesuits arrived there in 1563. They are supposed to have baptized a quarter of the population. But communities of any size were not established on Celebes until 1641, when the Bishop of Malacca, expelled by the Dutch, set up his see in Makassar.

The other large Sunda Islands, despite their proximity to India, were scarcely affected by evangelization. The lack of missionaries, the resistance of the Muslim sultans, and the inaccessibility of the interior of the islands may have been the reasons. Only in East Java did Jesuits have some success among the as yet non-Islamic population.

The small Sunda Islands, discovered by Spaniards in 1522 during the first circumnavigation of the globe, were, however, successfully evangelized by the Dominicans. Their chief center was the island of

---

[37] C. Wessel, *De geschiedenis der R. K. Missie in Amboina vanaf har stichting door de H. Franciscus Xaverius tot har vernietiging door de O. I. Compagnie, 1546–1605* (Nijmegen 1926).

Solor,[38] from which Christianity spread to the other islands, and before long more than fifty thousand believers were counted. But Muslim opposition and Portuguese blunders almost wiped out the successes. In spite of the Dutch conquest of the islands, the Dominicans continued their work and were even able to induce a new flowering of Christianity. The Solor missions managed to survive into the eighteenth century.

Japan was accidentally discovered by the Portuguese in 1542–43, when a vessel, driven off course by a typhoon, landed there instead of in Siam. In 1548–49 the Portuguese undertook the first expedition to establish commercial relations with Japan. Francis Xavier, having met three Japanese in Malacca, had become interested in the island empire of the Far East and went there with them in 1549. He landed on Kagoshima, where he established the first Christian community. His aim was to win the Emperor to the faith and through him and the Buddhist monasteries to convert the people. But he soon had to acknowledge that the Mikado was only the nominal ruler of the country. In fact, Japan was in a state of anarchy; the island empire had dissolved into some fifty petty states and the territorial princes, or Daimyos, did as they pleased. To gain access to them, Francis decided henceforth to proceed as papal legate in great splendor and he directed that future missionaries should seek to win the people by their public appearance, among other things by observing the Japanese rules of etiquette. The encounter with the high culture of the Japanese induced the saint to abandon the traditional Europeanizing method and to urge a far-reaching accommodation. In his religious discussions with Buddhist monks he unhesitatingly accepted their religious concepts,[39] for example the term *Dainichi* for God. But when he discovered that *Dainichi* denoted, not a personal being, but the original substance of all things, he resumed the Latin *Deus.* (In a revision of his catechism in 1556 some fifty Buddhist terms had to be replaced by Portuguese-Latin terms.)

Francis Xavier returned to Goa in 1551, entrusting to his companion, Father Cosmas de Torres, three Christian communities with approximately 1000 neophytes, all of them from the lower classes. The first Daimyo was not baptized until 1563, but so many others soon followed that their conversion became the special mark of the early Japanese mission.[40] Their example attracted many Samurai and Bonzes and finally the people. In certain parts of Japan regular mass conversions occurred. In 1570 the young Christendom counted from 20,000 to 30,000 faithful, among whom worked thirty Jesuit priests and brothers, aided by lay Japanese. Since in Japan the mission could not, as was the case elsewhere, claim the assistance of the Portuguese state, these successes cannot be overestimated. In most cases the conversions were genuine, without any selfish motives.

---

[38] B. Biermann, "Die alte Dominikanermission auf den Solorinseln," *ZMR* 14 (1924), 12–48, 269–273; *id.*, "Frei Luis de Andrada und die Solormission." *ZMR*, 43 (1959), 176–187, 261–274.

[39] G. Schurhammer, *Das kirchliche Sprachproblem in der japan. Jesuitenmission des 16. und 17. Jh.* (Tokyo 1928).

[40] M. Steicher, *Les daimyos chrétiens ou un siècle d'histoire religieuse et politique du Japon 1549–1650* (Hongkong 1904).

Of course, the missionaires had to support themselves. This unfortunately induced them to participate in the Portuguese silk trade and to lease houses which they had received as gifts. This would have been permitted if disagreements in regard to procedures had not arisen among the missionaries. De Torres' successor, Francisco Cabral, was opposed to any accommodation and insisted on the Europeanizing missionary method traditional among the Portuguese. This produced tension within the Christian communities, especially among Christians of the higher classes. Still, the number of Christians grew and reached 150,000 while Cabral was in charge (c. 1580). In 1576 Japan was detached from the diocese of Malacca and placed under the new see of Macao.[41]

The internal crisis was exorcised by the arrival as visitor of Father Alessandro Valignano (1539–1606).[42] This farsighted and intelligent man quickly carried out a reform of the mission in accord with Xavier's principles of accommodation, prescribed a thorough study of the language by the missionaries, and, with the construction of two seminaries, laid the foundation for a native diocesan and regular clergy. On his departure he took along a Japanese embassy to the Pope and the King of Spain. The embassy not only caused a sensation in Europe (1582–90) but aroused a keen interest in the Japanese mission.[43]

Meanwhile a reaction had taken place in Japan's internal politics. Following the restricting of the arbitrariness of the Daimyos by the Commander-in-Chief Nobunaga between 1564 and 1568, Hideyoshi acquired as regent of the Mikado an almost unlimited authority in the early 1580s. Originally friendly to the Christians, he became suspicious because of the indiscretions of the mission superior Coelho and was turned into a foe of Christianity. In 1587 he issued an order for the expulsion of all missionaries. Though the order was not carried out, the work had to be done much more circumspectly. Still, between 1587 and 1597 the Jesuits gained 65,000 additional converts. In 1588 Japan became a separate diocese, with Funai as the episcopal residence.[44]

---

[41] "Super specula" of Gregory XIII (23 January 1576) in Streit, IV, 1525.

[42] J. F. Schütte, *Valignanos Missionsgrundsätze für Japan,* I, 1–2 (Rome 1951–58).

[43] L. Frois, *La première ambassade du Japon en Europe 1582–1592.* Première partie: "Le voyage en Europe (1582–1586), ed. J. A. A. Pinto et al. (Tokyo 1942).

[44] Sixtus V's Cedula Consistorialis of 19 February 1588 in Streit, IV, 1701.

In the missionary sphere too an entirely new situation had arisen in Japan. After the union of the Portuguese and Spanish crowns in 1580 Spanish missionaires from the Philippines sought to enter the Portuguese missionary area, though in 1585 Gregory XIII had granted the Society of Jesus the exclusive right to evangelize the Far East.[45] In 1593 Franciscans under the leadership of Pedro Bautista began missionary work in Japan. Having gained the good will of Hideyoshi, they displayed great zeal and, though adhering to the traditional Spanish method, had considerable success. But the national antipathies of Portuguese and Spanish were more fundamental than the differences in method and the rivalry of the Orders. Hideyoshi skillfully exploited these by subtle trickery and finally discovered a pretext for striking at Christianity. This was provided by the celebrated and still sharply debated remark of the pilot of the *San Felipe,*[46] that the Spaniards sent merchants and missionaries in order to conquer foreign lands with their assistance. The sequel was the first mass martyrdom of Nagasaki, where the six Spanish Franciscans, three Japanese Jesuits, and seventeen other Japanese Christians suffered death on 5 February 1597.[47] Despite this, the Franciscans resumed the work in Japan in 1598 and, following the annulment of the Jesuits' privilege,[48] Spanish Dominicans and Augustinians also arrived. The number of Christians continued to grow in spite of the persecution and in 1614 amounted to about three hundred thousand. The first Japanese priests were ordained in 1601. At the close of the early Japanese missionary age there were fifty of them—nine diocesan priests, thirty-two Jesuits, three Dominicans, and one each of the Franciscan and Augustinian Orders. Twenty-one of them died as martyrs.[49]

On Hideyoshi's death in 1598, wars raged again between rival army commanders. The victor, Tokugawa Ieyasu, established a military dynasty that lasted until 1868. The seizure of political power by an absolute dictator was something so unprecedented that the Daimyos appeared to be completely paralyzed. That the Christians among them might, perhaps with outside aid, unite against the central government was sufficient cause for Ieyasu to declare war on Christianity. The commercial intrigues of the European powers, aggravated by the denominational opposition of Portuguese and Spaniards on the one hand and Dutch and English on the other, made him see in the religion of the West a national danger for Japan. The Christian Daimyos failed in the trial of strength forced upon them. The first Christian generation had completely disappeared and the second was not inspired with the early ardor. From 1603 one family after another apostatized. In 1613 Ieyasu issued an edict against Christians, which was followed in 1614 by a decree of banishment.[50] Only eighteen Jesuits, seven Dominicans, six Franciscans, five diocesan priests, and one Augustinian remained. Every year many Christians died as martyrs. In the second mass martyrdom 100 died together, including eighteen missionaries from the four Orders. The persecution grew in intensity. After 1623 every Japanese had to declare publicly his religious adherence every year. From 1627 the so-called *efumi,* or "image-trampling," prevailed, for the persecutors desired to make apostates rather than martyrs. By 1630 the number of those who had died for their faith amounted to 4,045.[51] The persecution found its final climax in the Shimabara Revolt of 1637–38, in which 30,000 Christians were put to death. Japan shut itself off more and more from the outside world; trade relations with Spain and Manila were broken off in 1624, with Portugal in 1639. The Dutch alone, under conditions not entirely honorable, were able to conduct a modest trade on the island of Deshima until 1854. To achieve this, they had cooperated in putting down the Shimabara Revolt. Christianity had thereafter to lead a catacomb existence in Japan but did maintain itself into the nineteenth century.

---

[45] Brief "Ex pastorali officio" of 28 January 1585 in Streit, IV, 1647.

[46] Cf. also the articles of J. Laures in *NZM* 7 (1951), 184–203; J. F. Schütte in *ZMR* 36 (1952), 99–116; and L. Alvarez-Talandriz in *Missionalia Hispanica* 10 (Madrid 1953), 175–195; and also F. J. Schütte in *ZMR,* 38 (1954), 328–331.

[47] L. Frois, *Relacion del Martirio 1597* (Rome 1935); G. Huber, *Kreuze über Nagasaki* (Werl 1954).

[48] "Onerosa pastoralis officii" of Clement VIII (12 December 1600) in Streit, V, 987.

[49] A. Brou, "Le clergé japonais au XVIIe siècle." *RHM* 9 (1932), 475–505.

China. Francis Xavier's death at the very gates of China was the reason prompting the Jesuits to seek admission to the sealed off Middle Empire, which had been known to the Portuguese since 1514–15. But the Portuguese did not succeed in establishing relations with China until 1554. They acquired the Gozan peninsula and there founded the city of Macao, which was to be the focal point of European interests in the Far East for 300 years. The city soon became also the base and refuge of missionaries, but all efforts from 1555 on to set foot in China failed. Macao became an episcopal see in 1576,[52] and, to satisfy the Spaniards, Manila had to be given the same honor in 1581. Thus in the Far East there were two centers from which efforts were made to obtain access to China. Many difficulties of the China mission derived from the fact that missionaries of different nationalitites took up their activities in the Middle Empire from different starting points. Here too the personal union of the two Iberian empires made itself felt. The Spanish Jesuit Alonso Sanchez even defended the right to procure entry by armed force and offered plans relevant to a military conquest of China.[53]

---

[50] H. Cieslik, "Das Christenverbot in Japan unter dem Tokugawa Regime," *NZM* 6 (1950), 175–192, 256–272; 7 (1951), 24–36.

[51] J. Laures, "Die Zahl der Christen und Martyrer im alten Japan," *Monumenta Nipponica* 7 (1951), 84–101.

[52] "Super specula" of Gregory XIII (23 January 1576) in *Bull Patr* I, 243–245.

Finally in 1583 two Jesuits, Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci (1552–1610),[54] succeeded in obtaining authorization to reside in China. They settled at Chao-ch'ing near Canton and began their work dressed as Buddhist monks. They eagerly learned Chinese and studied the writings of Confucius and other Chinese sages. Compared with the statistics then in use, their success was slight. By 1586 they had gathered no more than forty converts. An effort to extend their sphere of activity brought forth a prohibition of remaining longer in Chao-ch'ing, but they were permitted to settle in another place in the same province. There they changed their dress, for they had discovered that the Buddhist monks were not highly regarded. From then on they appeared in the robes of scholars and were able to use their knowledge of the profane sciences for the spread of the faith. Ricci's two philosophical works, *On Friendship* and *The Art of Recollection* were from this period (1595). From his discussions with Chinese scholars came his *The True Doctrine of God,* a brochure later admitted among the Chinese classics.

The missionaries had quickly learned that everything depended on gaining the good will of the Emperor. Ricci sought in every way to be admitted to the Court at Peking. His efforts led to the founding of settlements at Nan-ch'ing and Nanking, where Ricci himself took up residence in 1598. Here he produced the famous "Map of Ten Thousand Empires," a map of the world on which Ricci, to avoid hurting the feelings of the Chinese, made China literally the "Middle Empire" in the very center of the map.[55] It was here that Ricci gained his most important convert, the scholar Hsu Kuang-ch'i, who, as Paul Hsu, was to play a notable role in China's mission history.

In 1601 Ricci was able to settle in Peking. The Emperor himself presented the Jesuits with a house and allowed them to erect a church.

---

[53] Cf. Streit, IV, 329, nn. 31, 32, 34.

[54] In addition to the old biographies by D'Orleans (1693), Sainte Foi (1859), and Werfer (1870), see particularly Ricci-Ricardi, *Il d. Matteo Ricci* (Florence 1910); J. Brucker, "Le P. M. Ricci," *Etudes,* 124 (Paris 1910), 5–7, 185–208, 751–779; P. Tacchi Venturi, *L'apostolato del P. M. Ricci in Cina secondo i suoi scritti inediti* (Rome, 2nd ed. 1910); H. Bernard, *Le P. M. Ricci et la société de son temps (1552–1610)*, 2 vols. (Tientsin 1937; P. D'Elia, "Il P. M. Ricci, S. J., fondatore delle moderne missioni della Cina," *I grandi missionari* I (Rome 1939), 127–176.

[55] J. Brucker, "Note sur une carte supposee du P. Ricci," *Atti e Memorie di Geografi-Orientalisti* (Macerata 1911), pp. 85ff.; P. E'Elia, *Il mappamondo del P. M. Ricci, commentato, tradotto e annotato* (Citta del Vaticano 1938).

Ricci developed an extensive teaching and gained influential members of the imperial court and the learned world for the faith. There are said to have been more than 200 Christians in Peking in 1605. In 1608 a settlement was made in Shanghai also. The total number of Christians was given in the same year as 2500, many of them of rank and position. When Ricci died in 1610 at the age of fifty-eight, exhausted by his tireless activity, he left his confreres, in his own words, "before a gate that can be opened to the advantage of all but not without toil and danger."

Soon after Ricci's death his liberal accommodation[56]—that the Chinese Christians might continue after baptism to honor their ancestors and Confucius—caused scandal and later gave rise to the so-called Dispute over Rites and Accommodation. About one thing there is no room for doubt: Ricci was a man of apostolic outlook and a capable missionary, who destroyed prejudices against the Christian religion and won important scholars for the faith. It may be that he was misled in regard to the meaning and importance of the Chinese rites, which he interpreted as purely civil. Several things were later attributed to him which can definitely not be ascribed to him, for example, preserving secrecy about or even falsifying Christian doctrines in essential points. If this had been the case, his converts would not have endured so heroically the persecutions that soon overtook them. In spite of all difficulties, Christianity in China rose from 5,000 in 1615 to 38,200 in 1636.

Johann Adam Schall von Bell (c. 1591–1666) of Cologne was Ricci's real and effective successor for the period from 1630 to 1666.[57] He skillfully brought the mission through the troubles of his day. Spanish-Portuguese power was more and more violently shaken in the Far East during this period. The destruction of the Spanish Armada had only now begun to make itself felt. The Dutch had established themselves in the Indian Ocean since 1601, and in 1639 the remainder of the trade with Japan passed into their hands. In 1640 the national revolution of the Braganza destroyed the loose union of Portugal with Spain. The Manchus invaded China and toppled the Ming Dynasty in 1644.

The political confusion was aggravated by the tension among the Christians, which had been produced by missionaries from the Spanish

---

[56] A. Brou, "Les tâtonnements du P. M. Ricci," *RHM* 15 (1938), 228–244; J. Bettray, *Die Akkommodationsmethode des P. M. Ricci in China* (Rome 1955).

[57] A. Väth, *Joh. Adam Schall von Bell SJ, Missionar in China, kaiserlicher Astronom und Ratgeber am Hofe von Peking, 1592–1666* (Cologne 1933).

Philippines.[58] In 1631 the Dominican Angelus Cocchi landed at Fukien; in 1633 the Dominican Juan Baptist de Morales and the Franciscan Antonio de Santa María Caballero followed, eventually bringing many of their confreres. So far as the Church was concerned, they could count on approval of their undertaking. (As a matter of fact, Urban VIII in 1633, at the urging of the Congregation of Propaganda, permitted all Orders to do missionary work in East Asia. In order to assure a unified effort, they were supposed to base their preaching on the Tridentine Catechism and Cardinal Bellarmine's *Doctrine christiana.*[59])

The appearance of the Spanish missionaries, who showed very little consideration for the missionaries already active in the country, caused much perplexity among the faithful. They went about in their habits, preached publicly, cross in hand, and made clear to the faithful their opposition to the worship of ancestors and of Confucius. The conflict in method was to grow into the disastrous Disputes over Rites, which will be considered in detail later. By way of anticipation it may be said that the solution of the conflict is not to be sought in the success or failure of the various methods, for the Dominicans and Franciscans had successes to record similar to those of the Jesuits. Around the middle of the seventeenth century the China mission experienced a new flowering in spite of all the internal and external confusion. In 1651 the Congregation of Propaganda was already considering a plan to erect a patriarchate in Peking and to subject to it two or three archbishoprics and twelve bishoprics.[60] But matters were to take an entirely different course.

Indochina. From 1511 Malacca served as the point of departure for mission work in Indochina. It was an almost fruitless effort because of the deplorable example of the Portuguese, although Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, and Augustinians had monasteries and churches in the city and in 1557–58 Malacca had been made a diocese.

Toward the close of the sixteenth century missionaries were admitted to Burma, the ancient Pegu, as chaplains for the Portuguese mercenaries and Goan prisoners of war, who, having married Burmese wives, established Catholic village communities.

Siam witnessed various missionary endeavors of Dominicans and Franciscans, but not a few of them paid for their boldness with their lives. They did not have any success until a commercial treaty with Portugal had been concluded at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

---

[58] B. Biermann, *Die Anfänge der neueren Dominikanermission in China* (Münster 1927); O. Maas, *Die Wiedereröffnung der Franziskanermission in China in der Neuzeit* (Münster 1926).

[59] Streit, V, 1489; *Collectanea S. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide* I (Rome 1907), 72.

[60] F. Schwager, *ZMR* 2 (1912), 207f., according to the Propaganda materials.

A Portuguese Dominican labored in Cambodia from the middle of the sixteenth century. At the time of the personal union of Portugal and Spain, Spanish Franciscans from the Philippines established themselves in this part of the Portuguese sphere of demarcation.

The Church's most promising mission field lay to the east, in the empires of Annam, Cochin-China, and Tongking. But here too the work of the Portuguese Franciscans was made more difficult by their Spanish confreres from Manila. The Jesuits were the first to succeed in establishing stable communities (from 1615). The most successful was the French Jesuit, Alexandre de Rhodes (1591–1660), who worked here from 1624. In Tongking in four years he gained almost 7,000 converts, among them 200 priests and the King's sister. In spite of a royal prohibition (1630), the number of Christians continued to mount, thanks to native lay catechists. In 1639 there were 82,000 Tonkinese Christians.

Having been expelled from Tongking in 1640, de Rhodes returned to Cambodia, where by himself he cared for 30,000 faithful. In order to obtain help with the work, he established a catechists' school. From among the pupils he formed a religious community of catechists, who lived celibate lives and bound themselves by oath to a lifetime of service in the congregations. In 1645 de Rhodes was expelled from here also. He returned to Europe to seek assistants for the missions and to submit plans to Rome for the formation of a native clergy and hierarchy.

Brazil

From the time of its discovery by Europeans in 1500 Brazil saw numerous but isolated missionary endeavors, made by Portuguese, Spanish, and Italian Franciscans of the various branches of the Order.[61] As a consequence of the cruelty of Portuguese soldiers, traders, and colonists, these undertakings had little permanent success. Enduring missionary activity had to await the arrival of the Jesuits, who came in 1549 with the governor, Tomé de Souza. Their leader, Father Manuel da Nóbrega (1519–70),[62] urged above all else the erection of a Brazilian bishopric, which was established as early as 1551 in the capital at that time, São Salvador (Bahia).[63] But the first bishop, Pedro Fernandes Sardinha, could not cope with the situation. The insubordination of his own priests threatened to cancel out their labors as missionaries. In 1556 the bishop fell into the hands of pagan Indians, who ate him.[64]

---

[61] A. Jaboatam, *Novo Orbe Serafico Brasilico ou Chronica dos Frades Minores da Provincia do Brasil* (Lisbon 1761; Rio de Janeiro, 2nd ed. 1858f., in two parts); V. Willeke, "Die franziskanische Missionspraxis unter den Indianern Brasiliens (1585–1619)," *ZMR* 42 (1958), 133–139; D. Romag, *Historia dos Franciscanos no Brasil, 1500–1659* (Curitiba 1940); B. Roewer, *A Ordem Franciscana no Brasil* (Petropolis, 2nd ed. 1947); id., *Paginas de Historia Franciscana no Brasil* (Petropolis, 2nd ed. 1958); O. van der Vat, *Principios da Igreja no Brasil* (Petropolis 1952).

[62] A. Peixoto, *Cartas Jesuiticas* I: *Manuel da Nobrega, Cartas do Brasil, 1549–1560* (Rio de Janeiro 1931), which contains the dialogue "Conversao do gentio."

In 1506 there arose in Bahia the Colegio de Jesus, which was destined to become the famous center for the training of the Brazilian clergy and a model for all similar institutions in the larger cities of Brazil. Its importance becomes clear from the curious fact that in the Portuguese colonial sphere of influence in America there was not a single university or printing press.

The Jesuits' educational activity was entirely geared to the service of the missions among the Indian population. The missionaries, who within a few years pushed forward to the extreme south of the country and began their Guarani mission, to become so famous, along the Portuguese-Spanish border, sought to acquire the local languages, instructed the children in reading and writing, and translated prayers and catechisms. In regard to missionary methods it is significant that the Jesuits were very cautious about conferring baptism. They required a long period of preparation and carefully selected the neophytes from the number of catechumens. They were even slower in allowing the new Christians to receive communion. The first ones were not admitted to Easter Communion until 1573 and they had to prepare for it by fasting and mortification. This procedure explains why the Jesuits did not accept a single Indian into the Society or let any be ordained.

The work of the missionaries was obstructed by the colonists, above all by the mulattoes known as "Mamelukes." Before long the Jesuits in Brazil were filling a role analogous to that of Las Casas in Spanish America. To protect the Indians, they gathered them into communities called *aldeas* or *doutrinas* or into reductions. In 1609 they succeeded in doing away with Indian slavery, but the Portuguese colonists were able to render the law inoperative by introducing forced labor.

The Jesuits of Brazil were constituted a separate province of the Society in 1553. Though forty Jesuits were sunk by Huguenot pirates while at sea,[65] and twelve more were captured and killed a year later, the Brazilian province counted 142 members in 1584 and about 180 in 1622. But not all of them were Portuguese; they came from various European countries. Portugal, which then had about 1,500,000 inhabitants, could never have carried out its tasks in its gigantic colonial empire without outside help. The burden of the mother country was heavy enough besides. For example, in 1572 Pope Pius V decreed that two-thirds of all Church revenue in Portugal must be applied to the missions of Brazil and Japan.[66] In 1627 North Brazil became the autonomous Jesuit province of Maranhão. Missionary work had been very quickly carried ever deeper into the interior. The stimulus to this came from José de Anchieta (1534–97),[67] a native of the Canary Islands, who earned for himself the title of Apostle of Brazil by his tireless zeal. By 1584 the number of Indian Christians is said to have mounted to 100,000.

---

[63] Julius III's Bull of 25 February 1551 in *Bull Patr* I, 177f.

[64] Pastor, XIII, 293.

[65] M. G. de Costa, *Inacio de Azevedo* (Braga 1946); A. Rumeau de Armas, "La expedicion misionera al Brasil martirizada en aquas do Canarias (1570)," *Missionalia Hispanica* 4 (Madrid 1947), 329–381.

Toward the end of the sixteenth century other Orders also entered the field. Carmelites came in 1580[68] Benedictines in 1581,[69] and a bit later Augustinians and Oratorians. When the competing French broke into Latin America at the beginning of the seventeenth century and founded a colony of their own at Maranhão in North Brazil, they obtained Capuchin missionaries for their district.[70] France was preparing to enter the contest with the Iberian colonial powers.

Entry of France into the Mission Field

North America. Francis I of France (1515–47) was not inclined to stand aloof from the partition of the world. He assisted Giovanni de Verrazzano, a Venetian in French service, who sighted the Hudson in 1523, and Jacques Cartier, who in 1534 took possession of Canada for France. Francis also, either from conviction or from political considerations, looked upon discovery and conquest as a means for the conversion of the "savages." But possession of Canada remained unexploited. French failure in Brazil—in 1557 they were driven from the Bay of Rio de Janeiro which they had occupied two years before—made them recognize *de facto* the division of the world by Alexander VI. Later Henry IV (1589–1610) managed to secure in the Treaty of Vervins of 1598 the right to annex territory north of an east-west line which intersected the Canary Islands.

---

[66] Streit, II, 1301.

[67] A. Peixoto, *Cartas Jesuiticas* III; *Cartas, informacoes, fragmentos historicos e sermoes do P. Joseph de Anchieta, S. J., 1554–1594 (Rio de Janeiro 1933); S. Leite, A primeira biografia inedita de Jose de Anchieta, apostolo do Brasil* (1934); S. Lopez Herera, *El P. J. de Anchieta* (Madrid 1954); works in Streit, II, 1239, pp. 339–342.

[68] P. A. Prat, *Notas historicas sobre as Missioes carmelitas no extremo norte de Brasil. Seculos XVII–XVIII* (Recife 1948).

[69] D. J. Luna, *Os mongos beneditinos no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro 1947); G. Muller, *Os Beneditinos no Brasil* (Bahia 1947).

[70] C. D'Aberville, *L'arrivée de Pères Capucins en l'Inde Nouvelle, appelée Maragnon . . .* (Paris 1612); cf. Streit, II, 2370; *Suite de l'histoire des choses plus mémorables advenues en Maragnon . . .* (Paris 1615); cf. Streit, II, 2378.

Following the isolated efforts of two Jesuits in Acadia (1611–13), four Franciscan Recollects settled in 1615 at Quebec, founded in 1608 by Samuel de Champlain.[71] In 1625 the first Jesuits arrived in Canada under Father Charles Lalemant to evangelize the Hurons and other Indian tribes. But England seized the colony in 1628 and the missionaries had to leave. Not before 1632 could a third group of Jesuits undertake a new effort under Father Paul Le Jeune.[72] Jean de Brébeuf followed with a mission among the Hurons in 1633.[73] It seemed that the spell was broken, and as early as 1637 there were twenty-nine Jesuits in Canada. The first female religious came in 1639, among them the Ursuline Marie de l'Incarnation.[74]

But terrible reverses soon occurred. The wars between the Iroquois and the Hurons exacted bloody sacrifices from the Jesuits. Jean de Brébeuf, Gabriel Lalemant, Isaac Jogues, and five others suffered martyrdom between 1642 and 1649; they were beatified in 1925 and canonized in 1930.[75] The Huron mission was wiped out and the surviving missionaries returned to Quebec.

The Near East. France was chiefly interested in gaining influence in the Near East, and to this end Louis XIII (1610–43) and his minister, Cardinal Richelieu (1585–1642), made special use of the Capuchins. Their most eager assistant was Father Joseph of Paris,[76] born François

---

[71] O. Jouve, *Les Franciscains et le Canada* I: *L'établissement de la foi, 1615–1629* (Paris 1915).

[72] J. Bouchard, *Le R. P. Paul Le Jeune S. J. et la fondation des missions des Jésuites en Nouvelle France, 1632–1642* (Rome 1958).

[73] R. Latpurelle, *Etude sur les écrits de S. Jean de Brébeuf,* 2 vols. (Montreal 1952f.); F. X. Talbot, *Saint Among the Hurons* (New York 1949).

[74] *Ecrits spirituels et correspondance de Marie de l'Incarnation,* ed. by A. Jamet, 3 vols. (Paris 1928–35); 4 vols. (Quebec 1929–39); H. Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France* IV (Paris 1926), 1–76; P. Renaudin, *Une mystique française au XVIIe siècle: Marie de l'Incarnation, ursuline de Tours et de Quebec* (Paris 1935); G. Goyau, "La première francaise missionnaire: La vocation canadienne de Mère Marie de l'Incarnation," *Et* (1936), 145–168; id., *L'Eglise en marche* V (Paris 1936), 95–125; *Le témoignage de Marie de l'Incarnation, O. S. U.* (Paris 1943); Marie-Emmanuel, *Marie de l'Incarnation, d'après ses lettres* (Ottawa 1946); *Les Ursulines de Quebec,* 4 vols. (Quebec 1863–66).

[75] G. Goyau—G. Rigault, *Martyrs de la Nouvelle France, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Extraits des relations et lettres des missionnaires Jésuites* (Paris 1928); H. Fouqueray, *Martyrs du Canada* (Paris 1930); J. A. O'Brien, *The American Martyrs* (New York 1953).

[76] G. Fagniez, *Le P. Joseph et Richelieu,* 2 vols. (Paris 1894); L. Dedouvres, *Politique et apôtre, Le P. Joseph de Paris,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); G. Goyau, *L'Eglise en marche* V (Paris 1936), 63–94; G. de Vaumas, "L'activité missionnaire du Père Joseph de Paris," *RHM* 15 (1938), 336–359; G. de Vaumas, *Lettres et documents du P. Joseph de Paris concernant les missions étrangères, 1619–1638* (*Lyon 1942*).

Le Clerc du Tremblay, Baron de Maffliers (1577–1638), in whom was a strange blend of crusading ardor and diplomatic finesse. Within a short time he managed to have 100 of his confreres sent to the Near East under a French protectorate.

Hence France's entry into the mission field took place despite the Portuguese and Spanish rights of patronage. And from the beginning it was clear how deeply national interests were involved. Thus was the ground prepared for the French protectorate of the missions that was destined to play a fateful role in their future history.

CHAPTER 47

The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith

Into the seventeenth century the history of the missions was determined almost exclusively by the partition of the world into Portuguese and Spanish spheres of influence and the related rights of patronage. But it became increasingly more apparent that the two powers were far more concerned for their rights than for their duties. The view was even expounded that the Pope in granting the right of patronage had renounced his own rights over the missions. His instructions and decisions were subjected to a royal *placet,* without which they were not valid. In mission affairs the Kings were no longer regarded as merely the Pope's vicars but as the direct representatives of God.[1]

This development and the resulting abuses in mission lands called for the taking of decisive action by Rome, especially since the reform Popes had just taken the first steps to recover leadership in missionary work. Thus in 1568 Pius V established a Congregation of Cardinals for the Conversion of Infidels, and its activity is discernible in many mission briefs of the Pope. But presumably this was intended only as a temporary institution, for the systematic revamping of the Curia by Sixtus V involved no special department for the missions. It was not until Clement VIII that a specific Congregation of the Missions was constituted, which met several times at the turn of the century and had Cardinal Sanseverino as its *spiritus rector.*[2]

---

[1] Cf. J. Solorzano Pereira, *De Indiarum iure* (Madrid 1629); also A. de Egana, "La funcion misionera del poder civil segun Juan de Solorzano Pereira (1575–1655)," *StMis* 6 (1950–51), 69–113.

[2] P. Tacchi Venturi, *Diario concistoriale di Antonio Santori, Cardinale di Santa Severina* (Rome 1904); J. Schmidlin, "Eine Vorläuferin der Propaganda unter Klemens VIII.," *ZMR* 11 (1921), 232–234.

The view that a congregation of this sort must form part of the permanent set up of the Curia made steady progress and found literary expression in the *De procuranda salute omnium genitum* of the theorist of the missions, the Carmelite Thomas of Jesus (1564–1627).[3] In Book III the institution of a Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was urged. Gregory XV took up the suggestion and before the end of the first year of his pontificate established the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* on Epiphany 1622. Thirteen cardinals,[4] two prelates, and a secretary were assigned to it. It held its first meeting on 14 January, and on 22 June the Pope signed the bull of institution, "Inscrutabili divinae providentiae arcano,"[5] which claimed for the Pope in the fullest degree the duty and right to spread the faith as the chief task of the papal role of shepherd of souls. In this way the new congregation was to prepare for the change "from the colonial mission to the purely Church mission" (Kilger). Hence the entire mission system was to be subordinated to the Roman central authority; all missionaries were to depend on it in the most direct manner possible and be sent out by it, missionary methods were to be regulated, and mission fields to be assigned by it.

To carry out this task it was important first of all to clarify the status of the missions. For this purpose the earth was divided into twelve provinces, which were allotted to the respective nuncios in Europe and to the patriarchal vicars in the Near East. The nuncios were to compile information from their districts and then to report to Propaganda. In actual fact, the first reports came in from the missionary Orders.[6] Relying on them, the first secretary of the congregation, Francesco Ingoli (1622–49), composed three important memoranda in which he exposed the shortcomings and hindrances in missionary work and indicated remedies that would eliminate them.[7] Almost everywhere missionary activity was the victim both of jurisdictional quarrels between the local bishops and the religious and of the opposition between the older Orders and the Jesuits. Similarly, nationalist rivalries among missionaries and a mania to feather their own nest during residence overseas contributed to making their work ineffectual. Hence Ingoli felt that a clear distinction of missionary areas according to membership in the Orders and nationality was the first achievement to be sought. In addition, the sees were to be increased in number and assigned as far as possible to members of the diocesan clergy. An on the spot supervision of missionary work should be realized by the dispatching of papal legates or nuncios. In order to stop the mercantile activities of the missionaries, all departing missionaries had to be checked in regard to their pure intentions, and to guarantee this Ingoli wanted branches of Propaganda to be set up in Seville and Lisbon. He regarded as particularly urgent the formation of a native clergy, which should share in the work and in the direction of the missions on an equality with the foreign missionaries. Through the realization of these proposals Ingoli hoped to free the missions from the colonial powers and from direction by European religious superiors and, as a result, to have them become autonomous.

---

[3] Antwerp 1613; Rome 1940.

[4] Among them was Cardinal Eitel Friedrich von Zollern, Bishop of Osnabrück (1623–25).

[5] *Coll* I, n. 3.

[6] Propaganda archives: *Scritture antiche* 189, fol. 13f., 20–23 (Jesuits); 33–38 (Dominicans); 206–211 (Observant Franciscans); 220f. (Augustinian Hermits). In addition, a letter of the Bishop of Malacca (ibid., fol. 228), the report of the *collettore* in Portugal, Anthony Albergati (1623: Congr. Part. I, fol. 315–318), and the report of the Franciscan Gregory Bolivar on Spanish American (*Scritt. ant.* 189, fol. 62–74).

[7] 1625: *Scritt. ant.* 189, fol. 279–281; 1628: ibid., 189, fol. 153–155; 1644: ibid., 192, fol. 1–5.

A cursory glance at the *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* is sufficient to show that these guidelines had existence not only on paper. The first care was for the training of missionaries, and as early as 15 April 1622 a special committee for the Roman seminaries and national colleges was set up. The various generals of Orders were admonished to establish schools for teaching languages to future missionaries (no. 7), and Propaganda itself erected seven schools of apologetics for the education of missionaries destined for work among heretics.[8] In 1627 Urban VIII, in the Constitution "Immortalis,"[9] set up a special College of Propaganda, which was soon accepting candidates from the missions. On missionary bishops was imposed the obligation of admitting qualified youths to the priesthood.[10] As arguments Propaganda adduced the practice of the Apostles and of the early Church, the greater confidence which a native priest would enjoy among his fellow countrymen, and his familiarity with their language, customs, and inclinations. Before long Propaganda was in a position to carry out its principles. A young Christian Brahman, Matteo de Castro Mahalo, had come to Rome in 1625 because in India he had not been permitted to enter the priesthood. He took degrees in philosophy and theology, became a priest, and in 1631 returned home as protonotary apostolic and Propaganda missionary to realize the aims of Propaganda in the

---

[8] *Jus Pont.* II/1, no. 2.

[9] Of 1 August 1627 in *Jus Pont.* I, no. 87. Cf. N. Kowalsky, *Pontificio Collegio Urbano de Propaganda Fide* (Rome 1956).

[10] Thus, according to *Coll* I, no. 1002, p. 543, as early as 1626 for Japan and, according to *Coll* I, no. 62, in 1630 for India.

Mughal Empire and educate a native clergy. In spite of the hostility of the Portuguese and of the missionaries of the patronage, he contrived to gather a few priests from among the Brahmins into a sort of Oratory.[11]

Many things which are today taken for granted in missionary efforts were first proposed at that time, even though they could not be immediately realized. Such are: the duty of submitting an annual report (no. 22); the prohibition of giving up the mission without authorization (no. 41); the determining of the conditions in which missionaries may act as physicians (no. 42); the distinction between religious superiors and mission superiors (no. 46); the granting of special faculties to missionaries (nos. 88f.); and regulations on Church music (no. 107). All this vindicates von Ranke's judgment that Propaganda "sought to fulfill its function on a grand scale . . . , perhaps most successfully at its beginning."[12]

Not unexpectedly, this activity of the Propaganda Congregation encountered lively opposition from the powers enjoying patronage. Portugal especially, which had suffered painful losses of power in its East Indian possessions because of the union with Spain, defended its patronage in order thereby to retain influence overseas at least in the spiritual domain. But in the final analysis, the Congregation of Propaganda was concerned less with power than with an entirely new concept of the missions. The patronage powers had after all proved that it was their aim to assimilate the newly gained Christians to themselves in every respect, that in fact they were transplanting European Christianity overseas. But the Propaganda represented more than ever before the contrary idea. By means of a clergy recruited from the mission countries an indigenous Christianity was to be developed and a Church in complete harmony with it was to be founded. The renunciation of Europeanism was clearly expressed some decades after the erection of the new Congregation.[13]

The Spanish patronage power also resisted the claims made by Propaganda in regard to the papacy's exclusive right over the missions. Although Juan de Solorzano Pereira's *De Indiarum iure* had been put on the Index in 1642, in the Spanish colonial territories it continued to be an authoritative statement of prescriptive law for the local administrations; the condemnation was not published overseas.[14] The Catholic powers stubbornly refused to accept Propaganda's claim to the exclusive right to issue orders in regard to the missions.

---

[11] T. Ghesquière, *Mathieu de Castro, premier Vicaire Apostolique aux Indes* (Lophem-Bruges 1937); also, J. Schmidlin in *ZMR* 27 (1937), 243–250; F. Combaluzier in *RHE* 39 (1943), 132–151.

[12] *Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten* II (Leipzig 1874; Munich 1938), 299.

[13] Cf. the instruction for the vicars apostolic in 1659 in *Coll* I, no. 135.

The Congregation had openly made this claim to the superiors of Orders.[15] These, however, knew how to escape direct control by Propaganda by again procuring privileges which enabled them, as before, to decide on the sending or recalling of their members. It was clear that the new Congregation could not assert itself vis-à-vis the competence of the other congregations and the administrative routine. The Orders had recourse, according to circumstances, to the department from which they expected a favorable decision in strife produced by rivalry or even in strictly missionary questions. Even the Pope failed to place himself squarely on the side of the supreme mission authority and, after all missions had been subjected to Propaganda in principle, allowed himself to be persuaded to renew the privileges of the Orders.

Hence it should cause no surprise that Propaganda sought to deal in another way with the difficulties arising from the patronage powers and the Orders by establishing missions outside the patronage lands and entrusting them to religious communities which had hitherto done little or hardly any missionary work, such as the Carmelites and the Capuchins. Since France had long sought, for reasons easy to understand, to open up overseas colonial areas of its own and to maintain missions in them, Propaganda obtained the opportunity it wanted. To be sure, the national opposition of the new European great powers to the older Iberian world powers contained new explosives. When Portugal withdrew from the personal union with Spain in the Braganza Revolt of 1640 and the Pope, under pressure from His Catholic Majesty, had to deny recognition to the new King, there arose in the Portuguese colonial empire a situation urgently calling for a solution. For soon almost all the dioceses in the Portuguese patronage area were vacant. In 1649 Brazil and Africa were without bishops, as were the East Indian sees of Cochin, Mailapur, Macao, and Funai. The course adopted by Rome in an effort to liquidate this state of affairs introduced a new period in the history of Catholic missions.

---

[14] Cf. P. de Leturia, "Antonio Lelio de Fermo y la condanacion del 'De Indiarum iure' de Solorzano Pereira," *HS* 1 (1948), 351–385; 2 (1949), 47–87; *id.*, "El regio vicariato de Indias y los comienzos de la Congregacion de Propaganda," *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft* 1. Reihe: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens* II (Münster 1930), 133–177.

[15] 5 December 1640 (*Coll* I, no. 101).

SECTION FIVE

European Counter Reformation and Confessional Absolutism (1605–55)

CHAPTER 48

Paul V, Gregory XV and the Beginnings of the Central European Counter Reformation

Sustained by the religious and intellectual forces of the Tridentine Reform, the papacy under Paul V and Gregory XV attained a position which can be compared only with that of the High Middle Ages. Its neutrality between the rival Catholic great powers, Spain and France, did not as yet work against Catholic interests, because France's relations with the rising Protestant powers of the North, the rebel Netherlands, England, and Sweden, had not yet been solidified into alliances for war. Hence the active Catholic faction in the Empire, the League, and Emperor Ferdinand II succeeded in defeating the disunited Protestants and in pushing the restoration of lost lands to the Catholic Church. But since Urban VIII was unwilling and perhaps not in a position to thwart Cardinal Richelieu's policy of alliance with Protestants, the defeat of the Catholics in the Empire sealed the end of the Counter Reformation and of the papacy's position of political leadership. From the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 its influence subsided irresistibly and the spirit of the Catholic Reform weakened. Religious and intellectual leadership within the Church passed from Italy and Spain to France, but also the secularization of European thought announced itself.

Sixty cardinals took part in the conclave of 14 March to 11 April 1605, following the death of Clement VIII. Cardinal Aldobrandini, leader of the strongest faction, was allied with the French; Cardinal Montalto, with the Spaniards. Cardinals Medici and Baronius, favored by France, met the resolute opposition of the Spaniards—Baronius because of his criticism of the *Monarchia Sircula.* Just the same, Baronius lacked only eight votes on 30 March. Since, however, not he but Zacchia was Aldobrandini's real candidate, the French Cardinal Joyeuse succeeded in carrying the election of Medici. As ambassador of Cosimo I in Rome, Leo XI had become the favorite disciple of Saint Philip Neri and was highly esteemed for his piety and integrity. But on 27 April

1605 he died as a result of a chill which he had caught when taking possession of the Lateran.

In the next conclave (8–16 May 1605) the fronts changed to the disadvantage of Aldobrandini. The election of Bellarmine foundered on Spain's veto. After vehement confrontations Aldobrandini and Montalto agreed on the fifty-two-year-old Camillus Borghese, hardly noticed until now. Paul V came from a family of lawyers that had moved to Rome from Siena and had himself risen from auditor of the *Camera* to the cardinalate in 1596. At first lacking in political experience, he conscientiously familiarized himself with matters of state, and little influence was exercised by the Cardinal Nephew, Scipione Borghese. His political advisers were first Cardinal Arigoni, later Millini, formerly nuncio in Spain, and Maffeo Barberini, formerly nuncio in France. He continued until 1613 the division of the Secretariate of State into two departments, introduced by Clement VIII, with one chief secretary for each (*Secretarius domesticus in capite, Secretario intimo*), although in 1609–11 Margotti, promoted to the purple, had conducted the business by himself. After 1613 Feliciani was the sole chief secretary.

Paul V's policy was based on the principle of neutrality vis-à-vis the tension between Spain and France. Ubaldini, nuncio to Henry IV, and Coton, the King's Jesuit confessor, urged a Habsburg-Bourbon marriage alliance, but the project was frustrated by Henry's refusal to give up his support of the rebel Netherlands and his urging of the claims of Brandenburg and Palatinate-Neuburg to the Jülich-Cleves inheritance. In an effort to prevent the threatened war from breaking out, Cardinals Millini and Barberini were dispatched as peace envoys to Spain and France, but before they were able to carry out their commission Henry IV was assassinated on 14 May 1610 by a fanatic, Ravaillac, who had not been instigated by the Jesuits, as was once claimed. The impending European war was averted, but the pernicious rivalry of the two great powers continued even though the dynastic alliance desired by the Curia was effected by the marriage in 1616 of the Bourbon Louis XIII to Anne of Austria, daughter of the Habsburg Philip III.

Conflict with Venice

The conflict of Paul V with the Republic of Venice very nearly led to a European war, which would necessarily have acquired the character of a religious war. Even before the Pope's accession the Venetian *Signoria* had forbidden the erecting of churches, monasteries, and hospitals and the acquiring of real estate by the Church without the permission of the state and, without regard to the *privilegium fori,* had brought two unworthy clerics to trial and had imprisoned them. In briefs of 10 December 1605 and 26 March 1606, Paul V condemned these procedures and, on the republic's declining to cancel its measures, sent an ultimatum threatening excommunication and interdict on 17 April 1606. On the advice of its official theologian, the shrewd and fluent Servite Paul Sarpi (1552–1623), the *Signoria,* protesting its divine right, forbade the publication of the papal censures under pain of death. After the expiration of the four weeks' respite allowed, the censures became effective but were ignored by the republic as invalid. A majority of the clergy obeyed the state and disregarded the interdict. All diocesan and regular priests who observed it, headed by the Jesuits, were banished. In his *Treatise on the Interdict*[1] and numerous other polemics Sarpi denied its validity on the ground that the Pope was abusing his authority and whoever obeyed him was guilty of sin. The conflict over Church policy was escalated to a conflict of principle over the relations of the spiritual to the secular power. As early as 1607 the Jesuit Gretser counted twenty-eight polemical writings favoring Venice and thirty-eight upholding the Pope, among these last being works by Bellarmine, Baronius, and Suarez. The apostasy of Venice from the Church and even a European war were distinct possibilities, especially when England, through its ambassador, Wotton, held out to the *Signoria* the prospect of support by the Protestant powers.

It was only after Cardinal Joyeuse, acting on instructions from Henry IV, had ascertained in the spring of 1607 how far the *Signoria* was prepared to yield that the Pope also gave in. The two imprisoned ecclesiastics were surrendered to Joyeuse. The *Signoria* promised not to repeal the laws in dispute, but not to enforce them, and the Kings of France and Spain vouched for this. Also, except for the Jesuits, priests who had been expelled for observing the interdict were allowed to return to Venice. On 21 April 1607 Joyeuse absolved the *Signoria* from the ecclesiastical censures it had incurred; thus the *Signoria* tacitly acknowledged their existence. The Pope's defeat was only thinly veiled: he lifted the interdict without requiring the *Signoria* to make adequate satisfaction or to abandon the principle at stake. The demanded surrender of Sarpi and of his partisans, Micanzio and Marsiglio, was refused and for almost fifty years the Jesuits were excluded from Venetian territory. Responsibility for a murderous attempt on Sarpi was blamed on the Curia because the culprits had taken refuge in the Papal State. Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent,* printed in London in 1619, was inspired by hatred of the papacy and greatly damaged its prestige. However, his effort to propagate Calvinism in Venice misfired, as did his plans to overthrow the papacy with the aid of a coalition of Protestant powers.[2]

---

[1] *Istoria dell'Interdetto e altri scritti editi e inediti,* ed. M. D. Busnelli–G. Gambarin, II, 1–41.

Loyal to his principle of neutrality, Paul V refused financial support to the Catholic Grisons (the easternmost canton of Switzerland) against the Protestants because he was unwilling to lay himself open to the reproach of furthering the involved strategic interests of Spain in a territorial connection between Milan and Tirol. To preserve peace, Paul's successor even agreed to have papal troops occupy the strongholds of the Valtellina.

Paul V's death was followed by a brief conclave on 8 and 9 February 1621. The choice fell on Allessandro Ludovisi, beloved for his kindness, esteemed for his knowledge of law, but in poor health. In memory of Gregory XIII, his fellow Bolognese, he styled himself Gregory XV. His right arm was the Cardinal Nephew, Ludovico Ludovisi, very much like him in character and a gifted statesman, whose many-faceted intellectual interests are demonstrated by the construction of Sant'Ignazio, the layout of the Villa Ludovisi on the Pincio, and his collections of antiques. "Let the fear and love of God be your political wisdom," was the Pope's admonition to his nephew.[3] According to Pastor, "Probably never has a short pontificate left such deep traces in history."

In the bull on the papal election, 15 November 1621,[4] the so-called election by adoration—or unanimous quasi-inspiration—which had taken place in several recent elections, was not excluded, but the secret written vote was prescribed as the rule. Subsequent "accession" was for the future to be allowed only in writing and only once after each of the two daily scrutinies. The greatness of the Ludovisi pontificate was revealed most clearly in the establishment of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on 22 June 1622 as already noted. Financially well endowed and furnished with exceptional authority, it was conceived as the organ for the coordination of the missions in America, Asia, and Africa and as the counterpoise of the patronage exercised by the Spanish and Portuguese crowns. But since relations with the Eastern Churches and the spread of the Catholic faith in the parts of North Europe that had become entirely or mostly Protestant were assigned to it, it developed into the headquarters of the Counter Reformation.[5] Its presupposition was the continuance of the Catholic Reform, in which were concentrated the forces for the self-assertion of the Church in the struggle against Protestantism, and no less the political and military successes of the Catholic powers at the beginning of the Thirty Years' War.

---

[2] Sarpi's innermost conviction remains a puzzle. I still adhere to the view of Gallican influence on his history of the Council, even though, according to Ulianich, his concept of the Church was far more radical than the Gallican.

[3] "La vostra dottrina politica, i precetti di ragione di stato e gl'intimi consiglieri siano il timore e l'amore di Dio." H. Laemmer, *Zur Kirchengeschichte des XVI. und XVII. Jh.* (Freiburg 1863), p. 23.

[4] *Bull Rom,* XII, 619–627; further details are provided by a second bull of 12 March 1622 (ibid., p. 662ff.).

Successes and Failures

The implementation of the reform decrees of the Council of Trent was the chief concern of both Paul V and Gregory XV. The duty of residence was again enjoined on the bishops, and titular rather than residential bishops began to be appointed nuncios. The exertions of the Nuncios Barberini and Ubaldini to achieve the acceptance of Trent by France finally collapsed at the Estates General of 1614–15 because of the resistance of the Third Estate and of the *Parlement* of Paris, but on 7 July 1615 the clergy voted the publication of the reform decrees in provincial councils. In the Spanish Netherlands the decrees of the Provincial Council of Mechlin (1607) and of the diocesan synods following were declared binding by the government. In 1621 the Cologne Nuncio Albergati wrote that "the salvation of Germany depends" on the publication and observance of Trent.[6] In the conviction that the Catholic renewal was based not merely on the enforcement of laws but equally on the strength of ideals, the great sixteenth-century champions of renewal were raised to the honors of the altar. Charles Borromeo was canonized in 1610. Paul V had beatified Ignatius Loyola in 1609, Teresa of Avila in 1614, Philip Neri in 1615, and Francis Xavier in 1619; on 12 March 1622 the four of them were canonized in a single ceremony which in brilliance surpassed all previous celebrations.

But setbacks were not lacking. When on 5 November 1605 it was discovered that a group of English Catholics planned to blow up Parliament in order to kill King James I, suspicion of complicity fell on the Jesuit Garnet, who had acquired knowledge of the "Gunpowder Plot" under the seal of confession but had sought to stop the crime. Garnet's trial, legally open to attack, was exploited to charge the Pope and the Jesuits with high treason and immoral principles; Garnet was executed.[6a]

---

[5] The nuncios acted as connecting links: Brussels kept an eye on England, Holland, Denmark, and Norway; Cologne, on North Germany; the nuncio in Poland, on Sweden and Russia (Pastor, XXVII, 135f.).

[6] "Ex illo sc. Concilio Tridentino pendet salus Germaniae" (Pastor, XXVII, 318).

[6a] In addition to Pastor, XII, 405–428, see H. R. Williamson, *The Gunpowder Plot* (London, 1951).

New laws aggravated the situation of the English Catholics. An oath was required of them to the effect that James I was the lawful King of England and that the Pope had no power to depose him. The Archpriest Blackwell and many of the laity took the oath, though it had been condemned by Paul V, but sixteen priests and two lay persons who refused it were executed. The attitude to the oath of loyalty split the English Catholics into two factions.

In the Habsburg hereditary states the dissension between the incompetent Emperor Rudolf II and his brothers resulted in far-reaching concessions to the Protestants, which raised apprehension of serious losses to the Church. The Calvinist estates of Hungary obtained religious liberty in the Peace of Vienna (1606), as did the adherents of the Bohemian Confession in the "Letter of Majesty" of 9 July 1609. King Matthias extended the rights of the Hungarian Calvinists and in 1609 granted religious liberty to the Protestant estates of Upper Austria, a move synonymous with the suppression of Catholicism in their lands.

Despite these reverses the Catholics' self-assurance was so strengthened that they ceased to be satisfied with merely preserving what they held and considered the pushing back of Protestantism and the reconquest of lost areas. A plan to seize Geneva, the "Babylon of heresies," and to restore it to the Church again surfaced. The concessions to the Huguenots in the Edict of Nantes seemed to the Curia to be excessive. The Nuncio Barberini was to explain to Henry IV that reasons of state called for a confessionally unified state; at least the Protestants should be excluded from the highest functions of government, as Simonetta, nuncio in Poland, was successfully urging. Thus the Counter Reformation sought the aid of Poland, where the political disunion of the Catholics had been surmounted through the establishing of the League, while in Emperor Ferdinand II the House of Habsburg acquired a leader for whom the defense and propagation of the Catholic religion was a matter of conscience.[7]

Start of the Thirty Years' War

The execution by Duke Maximilian I of Bavaria of the ban against the Free City of Donauwörth, which had violated the Religious Peace, and the unlawful imposition of Catholicism on the city led to the bolting of the Diet of Regensburg by the Protestant estates and to the forming of a league, the Union (16 May 1608), led by the Calvinist Elector Palatine.

---

[7] Ferdinand had declared that "he would sooner lose his kingdoms and lands than knowingly let pass an opportunity to promote the true faith." *ARG* 49 (1958), 259.

The reply to this was the concluding a year later of a Catholic defensive alliance, the League, at the prompting of Maximilian I. At first it comprised, besides Bavaria, only the most seriously menaced spiritual princes—Würzburg, Constance, Augsburg, and Regensburg—and after 30 August 1609, the three spiritual electors, but not the Habsburgs, who were quarreling among themselves. The Pope hesitated to enter into a formal treaty with the League and made his financial support contingent upon proof that there existed a general Protestant union directed against the Catholics; legalist that he was, he did not wish to be suspected of violating the Religious Peace.[8] It was not until 1610 that he promised subsidies, while at the same time he urged the inclusion of the Emperor in the League. For its part, the Union acquired powerful support through alliances with England (1612) and Holland (1613).

While Emperor Matthias, under the influence of his advisor Klesl, Bishop of Vienna and in 1616 a Cardinal, was inclined to yield to Protestant demands in the Empire, such as permitting the Protestant administrator of Magdeburg to sit in the Diet, his successor, Ferdinand II, elected King of Bohemia in 1617 and King of Hungary in 1618, was opposed to any compromise. The revolt of the Protestant nobles in Bohemia and the election as anti-King of the Count Palatine Friedrich V set off the long-threatening religious war. Both Ferdinand II and the reinvigorated League obtained considerable subsidies from the Pope from 1620 onward. The "Winter King," left in the lurch by his allies, was defeated in the Battle of the White Mountain on 8 November 1620. To enable Ferdinand II and the League to make the most of their victory, Gregory XV in just two and one-half years contributed subsidies in the amount of about 1,239,000 florins in sound money and of about 700,000 florins in bad money, depreciated through inflation.[9] The transfer of the dignity of Elector Palatine to Bavaria was energetically pushed by the Pope, by, among other measures, the dispatch of the Capuchin Hyacinth of Casale. These military and political successes formed the basis for the Counter Reformation now getting under way, first of all only in the Habsburg states.

At the instigation of the energetic and circumspect nuncio, Carlo

---

[8] "Dixit nuntius quod S. Stas cupiat religionem Augustanae Confessionis et talia compactata illaesa." *Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 30jährigen Krieges* IX (Leipzig 1903), 312.

[9] Cf. Albrecht, "Zur Finanzierung des Dreissigjährigen Krieges. Die Subsidien der Kurie für Kaiser und Liga 1618–35," *ZBLG* 19 (1956), 534–567. Paul V had contributed around 650,000 florins in the last two and one-half years of his pontificate and in addition imposed a tithe on the German clergy.

Carafa,[10] Protestant ministers and teachers were expelled from Bohemia. At the start only those who had taken part in the revolt were affected, but later all were included on the basis of the King's right of reformation. Mixed commissions under military protection restored the churches and introduced Catholic pastors. Resistance, especially from the urban middle class and from the peasants, who were unwilling to forego the lay chalice, was quashed by military force. In order to avoid oppressive billeting, expected to force conversions, many Protestants emigrated. Recourse to these measures of force was not mitigated until 1626 and then without abandoning the fundamental requirement of return to the Catholic Church.

The soul of the rebuilding of Catholicism was Cardinal Harrach, Archbishop of Prague (1624–67), advised by the Capuchin Valerian Magni. At his urging, the role of the state's means of pressure gradually yielded to pastoral action. The chief source of difficulty was the lack of diocesan priests, and thus the lion's share of the immensely heavy burden fell to the Orders, most of all to the Jesuits and the Capuchins, but also to the older institutes. The University of Prague was entrusted to the Jesuits. Corresponding to Harrach in Prague was Cardinal Dietrichstein in his bishopric of Olmütz. In Silesia, where the "Letter of Majesty" continued in force, the Counter Reformation was carried out only in the principalities directly under the King and in the territory of the see of Breslau, which was held by Habsburg archdukes from 1608 to 1665. In Upper Austria on 12 October 1624 the Protestants were given until Easter of 1626 to return to the Church. In Lower Austria, where Ferdinand II had assured religious liberty to the nobles adhering to the Augsburg Confession, the authorities were content with expelling the Calvinist preachers. In Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola the Protestant nobles too were banished (1628). The restoration of Catholicism in Hungary was almost entirely the work of Cardinal Pázmány, Archbishop of Esztergom (1616–37).[11]

As early as 1621, opinions concerning the anti-Reformation measures to be adopted[12] recognized both the urgency and the questionable character of the Church's use of secular means of compulsion. Success, it was felt, depended on the intensification of the care of souls. The political postulate of denominational unity continued to be admitted. The extending of the Counter Reformation to the Empire belongs in the pontificate of Urban VIII.

---

[10] Carafa's final report of 1628, edited by J. G. Müller in *Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen* 23 (1860), 103–450, is based on several preliminary studies; cf. J. Pieper, *HJ 2* (1881), 388–415; Pastor, XXVII, 229f.; H. Jedin, *RQ* 39 (1931), 411ff. His *Commentaria de Germania sacra instaurata* (Antwerp 1630; Cologne 1639; etc.) is the most important contemporary exposition of the Counter Reformation in the Habsburg hereditary states and in the Empire.

[11] His *Opera Omnia,* Series lat., 6 vols. (Budapest 1894–1904); Series Mugarica, 7 vols. (Budapest 1910–11); latest bibliography: L. Polgar, *Bibliographica Soc. Jesu* (Rome 1957)n. 1150–1416. Pázmány is viewed highly as a Hungarian stylist.

[12] Larmormaini's opinion, composed after 1 October 1621, in J. Kollmann, *Acta S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia* I, 17–36; H. Jedin, "Eine Denkschrift über die Gegenreformation in Schlesien aus dem Jahre 1625," *ArSKG* 3 (1938), 152–171 (composed by Christoph Weller, S.J.). The memorandum *De missionibus Germanicis* (composed around 1600) also points in this direction; it will be found in Döllinger-Reusch, *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten* II (Nördlingen 1889), 390–393.

CHAPTER 49

Urban VIII, Innocent X and the End of the Counter Reformation

In the conclave of 19 July to 6 August 1623, the small Ludovisi faction was so reinforced by the adherents of Aldobrandini, the German Cardinals Zollern and Klesl, and the Princes Farnese and Medici that it was almost equal to the followers of Borghese and was able to prevent the election of Millini, which Borghese was urging. The illness of a number of the cardinals hastened an agreement by the two party leaders on the person of the Florentine Maffeo Barberini, who, to the delight of the Romans, called himself Urban VIII. Only fifty-five years of age, he had acquired valuable political experience that qualified him to participate personally in the conduct of affairs.[1] He did so, at least in the first third of his pontificate, proving his skill in dealing with diplomats and his keen self-assurance. He had a dislike of Spain and a partiality for France that went back to the period of his nunciature in the latter kingdom (1604–07). More given to nepotism than any other Pope of the century, he bestowed the purple on his brother Antonio and his nephews Francesco and Antonio the Younger and enriched his family so prodigally that on his death bed he felt remorse of conscience. His extravagance toward the Barberini family presented a painful contrast to his niggardly contributions for the support of the Catholic side in the Thirty Years' War. At the urging of his nephews he had the papal fief of Castro occupied on the ground that its holder, Duke Odoardo Farnese of Parma, was not satisfying his creditors in Rome. But since the duke found support in France and formed a league with Venice, Tuscany, and Modena against the Pope, the "Castro War" ended with the Pope's defeat. The Papal State, enlarged by the territory of Urbino following the renunciation of claims by the last duke, della Rovere, suffered severely from the devastation of large areas and disordered finances.

---

[1] "All business," said the Venetian Ambassador P. Contarini in 1627, "passes through the hands of His Holiness, and without his knowledge and instructions no political or other important decision is rendered" (N. Barozzi–G. Berchet, *Le relazioni della Corte di Roma lette al Senato degli ambasciatori veneti nel sec. XVII* I, 212).

A connoisseur of both ancient and modern literature, owner of a large library, and himself an accomplished stylist, the Pope personally took part in the reform of the breviary of 1631, rewriting a number of the hymns. The reform commission, headed by Cardinal Gaetani and including the Franciscan Luke Wadding, the Jesuit Terenzio Alciati, the Dominican Niccolò Riccardi, and the Barnabite Bartolomeo Gavanti, contented itself with trifling changes in the lives of saints and the homilies. The corrections in the missal (1634) and pontifical (1644) were of no importance. Liturgical centralization found its culmination in the constitution of 5 July 1643, in which beatification and canonization were reserved to the Pope and every liturgical cult of a saint was forbidden which had not been in effect for at least a century with proper ecclesiastical approval. In 1630 Urban VIII granted cardinals the title of "Eminence." In an effort to deal with the pressure from the Catholic powers to consider their candidates, he preferred Italians even more than his predeccessors had in the creation of new cardinals. In nine promotions he bestowed the purple on seventy-eight men.

Church Policy during the Thirty Years' War

Von Ranke's view, that Urban VIII, from antipathy to Spain and preference for France, favored Cardinal Richelieu's anti-Habsburg policy and thus indirectly saved German Protestantism, simplifies the situation too much. Following the principle, correct in itself, that the papacy must stand above the rivalry of the great powers and intervene for the preservation of peace, he was unable and perhaps not really willing to thwart Richelieu's superior and crafty diplomacy, which, without regard for the interests of the Church, aimed at the destruction of the power of the Habsburg lands and at French hegemony in Europe. He failed to grasp that the defeat of the Emperor and of the League involved the ruin of the Counter Reformation which his predecesors had promoted. The question whether in this he let himself be influenced by the view that recourse to political and military means for religious ends was obsolete and restriction to the religious strength of the Church was necessary cannot be solved in the present state of research. The Pope's policy of neutrality must be evaluated from this standpoint.

He took no effective measures to prevent the expulsion of the papal troops from the fortresses of the Valtellina by Swiss in French pay. After the unsuccessful peace delegation of the Cardinal Nephew Francesco Barberini (1625), the affair was finally settled by the Treaty of Monzon in 1626. On the other hand, he refused to enter the anti-Spanish League promoted by France in the War of the Mantuan Succession (1628), although he regarded the claims of the Duke of Nevers as strongest and was opposed to a further extension of Spanish preponderance in Italy. He participated as mediator in the concluding of the Peace of Regensburg in 1630. When in 1631 France allied with Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden in the Treaty of Bärwalde, Urban trusted in Sweden's promise to maintain Catholic worship in the conquered territories and expected that the Franco-Bavarian alliance arranged with the cooperation of Bagno, nuncio at Paris, would deter Richelieu from joining the German Protestants. Both hopes were disappointed. When after Gustavus Adolphus' victory at Breitenfeld it was made clear that he had been deceived by Richelieu, the Pope made nothing stronger than paper protests and refused the Habsburg side the adequate financial help which could have brought relief to the seriously threatened Catholics.[2] Only when the victories of the Swedish King aroused fears of an invasion of Italy did he propose an Italian defensive league, which, however, found no favor. The tale that on the news of the death of Gustavus Adolphus he celebrated a Requiem Mass was long ago disproved.[3]

It was the interlacing of political and religious interests that made Urban's position so difficult. In Spain there was talk of convoking a general council, while Richelieu threatened schism. But when France's open entry into the war in 1635 compelled Ferdinand II to make concessions to the Protestants in the Peace of Prague, the Emperor was severely blamed, whereas Richelieu received merely an admonition to peace. The peace congress convoked to Cologne was sabotaged by Richelieu, but the Pope drew no conclusion from this attitude. It is hard to avoid the impression that Urban VIII's policy of neutrality actually amounted to a patronage of France. Its inescapable sequel was the cessation of the Counter Reformation in the Empire and heavy damage to Catholic interests.

---

[2] According to D. Albrecht, "Zur Finanzierung des Dreissigjährigen Krieges," *ZBLG* 19 (1956), 548–562, virtually only what was left of the amount earlier promised was paid out until 1631 and from then until 1635 about 550,000 thalers. In regard to the scene with Cardinal Borgia on 8 March 1632, described by Pastor (XXVIII, 286ff.), it is to be borne in mind that Cardinal Ludovisi, highly esteemed by Pastor, was on Borgia's side and the far more moderate Cardinal Pázmány had no support from Urban VIII.

[3] S. Ehses, "Papst Urban VIII. und Gustav Adolf," *HJ* 16 (1895), 336–341; J. S. Schnitzer, "Urbans VIII. Verhalten bei der Nachricht vom Tode des Schwedenkönigs," *Festschrift Camposanto* (Freiburg 1897), pp. 280–283.

Counter Reformation in the Empire

From the beginning of the seventeenth century the Catholics had held the initiative in the Empire. Following the conversion of Wolfgang Wilhelm of Palatinate-Neuburg in 1613, his territories had become again at least partly Catholic, Bamberg was assured by Aschhausen, and at the same time Bishop Jakob Fugger was effective in Constance. In North Germany also progress was to be noted. The Calvinist council was expelled by Spanish troops from the Free City of Aachen (1614). The Tridentine reform was carried out in the see of Münster by Ferdinand of Bavaria, Elector of Cologne, who was also able to profit by the measures of his predecessor Fürstenberg in the bishopric of Paderborn. But here and throughout the North there was no real change in the situation until the victories of Tilly and Wallenstein. The return of the prince-bishoprics and abbeys that had become Protestant since 1552 was begun. Montorio, nuncio at Cologne, sent missionaries to Bremen, Magdeburg, and Halberstadt. The convert Johann von Leckow and, later, Jesuit missionaries were active in the Margraviate of Brandenburg.

The legal basis for a large-scale operation was to be furnished by the Imperial Edict of Restitution of 6 March 1629. It was prepared by the *Pacis Compositio* of the same year, whose authors, the Jesuits Forer and Laymann, upheld the view that the Religious Peace of Augsburg did not formally annul the Edict of Worms and established merely a temporary emergency law which did not entitle the Protestants to further "reformations" beyond the position of 1552.[4] The Edict of Restitution decreed: 1) the return of the two archbishoprics, twelve bishoprics, and numerous monasteries, direct imperial fiefs, that had been alienated since the Treaty of Passau; 2) the return of mediatized sees and monasteries and their property, alienated in the same period; 3) by means of the abrogation of the *Declaratio Ferdinandea,* the equalizing of the Catholic estates with the Protestant in the "right of reformation." Defensible in law, the edict was a serious political mistake, for it united German Protestantism by threatening its very existence.[5]

---

[4] M. Heckel, "Autonomia und Pacis compositio. Der Augsburger Religionsfriede in der Deutung der Gegenreformation." *ZSavRGkan,* 45 (1959), 141–248.

[5] Text in M. C. Lundorp, *Acta Publica* II (Frankfurt a. M. 1668), 1048.

Imperial delegates were appointed to carry it out. In Lower Saxony the energetic Bishop of Osnabrück, Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg,[6] obtained the sees of Verden and Minden; Bremen, Magdeburg, and Halberstadt were entrusted to the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm. By the end of 1631 two archbishoprics, five bishoprics, two prince-abbeys, and 150 churches and monasteries were again in Catholic hands. But before the execution of the edict was completed and the interior permeation of the newly won lands had passed beyond the initial stage, the preconditions for distribution of power for the counteroffensive were offset. Wallenstein was toppled, and the victories of Gustavus Adolphus and his advance into South Germany involved the loss of all gains in the North and of most of the South, especially in Württemberg. In the Peace of Prague with Saxony (1635) the Emperor was forced to renounce the Edict of Restitution and concede for forty years to those adherents of the Augsburg Confession who assented to the peace the ecclesiastical lands they had occupied from the Treaty of Passau until 12 November 1627.

The Peace of Westphalia

The Pope's endeavor to mediate between the chief opponents—the two Habsburg powers and France—through the Cardinal Legate Ginetti at the Peace Congress of Cologne came to nothing. Matters did not progress beyond formalities (1636–40). Meanwhile, year after year, the military situation of the Catholic party in the Empire deteriorated. Ferdinand III and his advisors understood that peace was impossible without great concessions in the ecclesiastical sphere. Fabio Chigi, nuncio at Cologne, was sent to the Peace Congress at Münster with instructions to intervene only between Catholic states. Whereas Count Trautmannsdorf, the Emperor's plenipotentiary, and the Elector Maximilian of Bavaria regarded broad concessions to the Protestants as unavoidable, a closed group whose public spokesman was the Jesuit Wangnereck, under the leadership of Cardinal Wartenberg and Bishop Knöringen of Augsburg, came forward against the surrender of ecclesiastical rights and claims as a matter of principle. But their efforts were in vain.

The peace signed on 24 October 1648,[7] contained three provisions which solidified the religious cleavage in the Empire, defined the property of the denominations, and brought the Counter Reformation to an end: 1) The Religious Peace of Augsburg was extended to include the Calvinists; 2) Except in the Austrian hereditary states, the standard year for deciding the practice of religion and the ownership of Church property was computed as 1 January 1624; 3) The "right of reformation" of the estates and the Ecclesiastical Reservation, which had hitherto been assailed by the Protestants, were both recognized. Against these stipulations, so injurious to the Church, but not against the peace as such, Chigi on 14 October 1648 lodged a protest long before prepared, and about twenty Catholic imperial estates associated themselves with it. It was confirmed, though to no purpose, by a papal brief of 26 November 1648. In the Peace of Westphalia a new age proclaimed itself; the system of European states freed itself from papal controls. Urban VIII's successor, by whom the protest was made, could do nothing to arrest this development.

---

[6] G. Schwaiger, *Kardinal Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg als Bischof von Regensburg* (Munich 1954).

[7] The *Instrumentum Pacis Osnabrugense* and *Monasteriense* are most readily found in K. Zeumer, *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der deutschen Reichsverfassung in Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Leipzig 1904), pp. 332–379; the acknowledgment of the protest by Innocent X in *Bull Rom* XV, 603ff.

In the conclave of 9 August to 14 September 1644, Sacchetti, at first the most promising candidate of the nephews of Urban VIII and of the French, incurred the veto of Spain. Thereupon both factions united to elect Gianbattista Pamfili, though he was not acceptable to the French and the Spanish minister-in-charge Olivarez had earlier opposed the elevation of the former nuncio in Spain to the cardinalate. More to the point than any other characterization of Innocent X is the portrait by Diego Velazquez from 1650: a majestic appearance, intelligent, reserved, even distrustful, hence slow, sometimes vacillating in reaching decisions, intent on right and order. His pontificate, termed by Pastor "neither brilliant nor fortunate," was overshadowed by his tyrannical and venal sister-in-law, Olimpia Maidalchini, to whom he allowed far too much influence in secular matters and in personal politics. However, her son, the Cardinal Nephew Camillo Pamfili did not become secretary of state. This post went to Cardinal Panciroli, who was succeeded in 1651 by the former nuncio at Cologne, Chigi. When the Barberini were to be called to account for squandering Church money, Cardinal Antonio fled to France and placed himself under French protection. Overawed by the French prime minister's threats, the Pope submitted to a pardon for him.

The continuing war between France and Spain forced Innocent X "to tread a silk thread," to quote Pastor. Though inclined toward Spain, he could not disregard France, rising to the position of leading power in Europe, and its prime minister during the minority of Louis XIV, the Italian Jules Mazarin (d. 1661). Portugal had broken away from the Spanish crown in 1640 and elected a native King, John IV of the House of Braganza. Like Urban VIII, Innocent X refused to recognize him and to fill vacant sees with bishops nominated by him. During the Masaniello Revolt of 1647 he declined to uphold Spanish rule in the Kingdom of Naples but, contrary to Mazarin's wishes, did not exploit the confusion to extend the Papal State on the plea of the papal right of suzerainty. In the north the Papal State was rounded off by the confiscation of the Farnese fief on the Lake of Bolsena. The still strained relations with Venice improved when the Pope restored the inscription removed by Urban VIII from the Sala Regis. This was a representation of the Peace of Venice of 1177, which mentioned that Pope Alexander III had recovered his position through the aid of Venice. But when the *Signoria* continued to infringe ecclesiastical immunity, Innocent X gave it only meager support in its war with Turkey over the island of Candia (Crete).

England's Hegemony among Protestant Powers

In England the marriage of Charles I to Henrietta Maria, daughter of Louis XIII of France, did not bring the expected alleviation of persecution to the Catholics. The promises made when the dispensation was obtained were not honored when Parliament raised opposition. To replace the archpriest hitherto functioning there, a vicar of episcopal rank was named in 1623. But strife with the Jesuits induced the second holder of the office to leave England, and thus the approximately one hundred fifty thousand Catholics were without a head. Catholic worship continued to be proscribed, while absence from the Anglican service was punishable by a fine. Under the influence of the King, who inclined personally to the Catholic Church, and of the Queen the persecuting laws were more mildly enforced and even the possibility of reunion was discussed,[8] but Charles' absolute rule and, in the ecclesiastical sphere, the greater emphasis on the episcopalian constitution, which his father had gradually reintroduced in Scotland, and the communion rite, closer to the Catholic tradition, which he himself had prescribed there in 1637, encountered powerful opposition in Parliament and among the Presbyterians and Independents respectively. Although on the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 he was supported by the Catholic nobility and eventually by the Irish, he was defeated and executed (1649). The fanatically anti-Catholic Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, abolished the fine for non-attendance at Anglican worship (1650), but the religious toleration granted by him was of slight benefit to Catholics as "idolators." Anyone who rejected the oath of abjuration, demanded of laity and clergy from 1655—repudiation of the papal primacy, of transubstantiation, and of the veneration of saints and images—lost two-thirds of his property and almost all his civil rights, and priests had to leave the country under pain of death.

---

[8] H. R. T. Brandreth, "Grégoire Panzani et l'idéal de la rèunion sous le règne de Charles I. d'Angleterre," *Irenikon* 21 (1948), 32–47, 179–192; M. Nedoncelle, *Trois aspects du problème anglo-catholique au 17e siècle* (P 1951); the reunion writing of the convert C. Davenport of 1634 is discussed in R. Rouse–S. C. Neill, *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung* I (Göttingen 1957), 191ff.

The English revolution annihilated also the hope of an alleviation of the lot of the harshly suppressed Irish Catholics. Their at first victorious rising against English rule had been supported by Urban VIII through money and the sending of nuncios. The Treaty of Kilkenny (1645), in which the royal agent Glamorgan had guaranteed them religious liberty, was not ratified by Charles I and it was not until shortly before his fall that he granted it to them in return for an assurance of armed assistance in the struggle with Parliament.[8a] The concession came too late. With cruel severity Cromwell subjected the country to his control and by means of an act of settlement expropriated a great part of the property of Catholic landowners. A decree of 6 January 1653 prescribed that all Catholic priests had to leave the country under penalty of high treason. The Catholics were decimated, partly through deportation to the West Indies, partly through emigration and famine.

Cromwell made England the greatest Protestant power in Europe. The Netherlands obtained the definitive recognition of their sovereignty in the peace with Spain. Sweden, though unable long to maintain the position of a great power gained by Gustavus Adolphus, still dominated the Baltic Sea through its bridgeheads on imperial soil and forced Poland to make peace. The Protestant powers, in which the Catholic faith was virtually exterminated,[9] were in the ascendancy. Spain, the former Catholic power, was defeated by the France of Richelieu who was unwilling to accept Philip II's role of protector of Catholic interests. The Counter Reformation had come to a stop in Central Europe, but the Tridentine reform had not. Like his predecessors, Innocent X worked for it and, soon after the conclusion of peace, set in motion in the Empire a wave of Church renewal.[10]

[8a] According to H. F. Kearney, "Ecclesiastical Politics and the Counter-Reformation in Ireland 1618–1648," *JEH* 11 (1960), 202–212, the Irish episcopate was divided between a moderate faction, in favor of a reconciliation with England, and a radical one, favoring Spain; the Curia after 1640 supported the former.

[9] *Romeinische Bronnen voor den kerkelijken Toestand der Nederlanden onder de Apostolische Vicarissen* I, ed. J. D. M. Cornelissen ('s Gravenhage 1932), sources from 1592 to 1651; J. Metzler, *Die Apostolischen Vikariate des Nordens* (Paderborn 1919); I. Hansteen-Knudsen, *De Relationibus inter Sanctam Sedem et Norvegiam* (Rome 1946); on the Jesuits' fruitless missionary efforts in Denmark and Sweden, see Duhr, II, 2, 75ff.

In condemning five propositions from the *Augustinus* of Cornelius Jansenius (d. 1638 as Bishop of Ypres) on 31 May 1653, Innocent X delivered the most momentous official doctrinal decision of the century. It can be appreciated only in connection with the quarrel over the Augustinian doctrine of grace, which had broken out again under Urban VIII. This controversy continued the quarrel over Baius and Molinism but, in contrast to them, it affected almost all facets of Church life far into the eighteenth century.

Under Innocent X occurred a change still operative in regard to the highest political office in the Holy See: the respective Cardinal Nephew was supplanted as chief minister by the secretary of state. In the pontificate of his predecessor the Cardinal Nephew Francesco Barberini, who at first had been overshadowed by the secretaries of state Magalotti and Azzolini, had contrived to secure a predominant influence at the side of and in fact ahead of the secretary of state, Ceva, whom the Pope regarded as a counterpoise, and finally (1643) obtained this post for his creature, Spada. But this enhancement of the political importance of the cardinal nephew was no more than an episode. Camillo Pamfili and Astalli, nephews of Innocent X, never played a leading role. This went instead to the secretaries of state, Panciroli and after 1651, Chigi, with whom begins the series of cardinal secretaries of state. "For the first time in the history of the secretariate of state the nuncios and legates sent their correspondence directly to the secretary of state; for the first time the secretary of state alone signed letters and instructions" (Hammermayer). And Chigi became the first secretary of state to ascend the Throne of Peter.

The paralysis of the Catholic counteroffensive did not involve that of artistic powers. On 18 November 1626, Urban VIII had consecrated the new Saint Peter's, for which his architect, Bernini, executed the bronze baldachin over the *confessio* and the tomb of the Barberini Pope.[11] Numerous churches of martyrs, such as Santa Bibiana and Santi Cosma e Damiano, were restored by him, his nephews, and other cardinals. The rebuilding of the Seven Hills, started by Sixtus V, was continued with the laying out of new streets and the erection of a splendid family palace, and the appearance of the city was enhanced by the installation of numerous fountains. The guides to Rome by Mancini and Celio, Baglione and Totti were no longer pilgrims' guides to the sanctuaries and relics but experts on the artistic monuments of pagan and Christian Rome from antiquity to the present. Under the prosaic and thrifty Innocent X Bernini was for a time out of favor. The belfrey of Saint Peter's that he had erected was again torn down but the interior decorations were completed and thus the estimated seven hundred thousand pilgrims of the Jubilee Year 1650 viewed the church in essentially its present form. The same holds for the Lateran Basilica, restored by Borromini, and the Baroque churches of Sant' Ignazio and Sant' Andrea della Valle, finished after a long period of construction. The jewel of all the Roman squares, the Piazza Navona, where arose the Pamfili family palace, received its final form with Bernini's Fontana dei Fiumi. Baroque Rome was now completed. In the march of the Catholic Reform its universities and colleges had made it a center of ecclesiastical scholarship. Now it became the goal of cultural journeys.

---

[10] Encyclical of 4 April 1652, mentioned in *Deutsche Geschichtsblätter* 16 (1915), 10.

[11] Pastor, XXIX, 455–544; XXX, 381–411; L. Schudt, *Le guide di Roma* (Vienna 1930), pp. 40ff.; O. Pollak, *Die Kunsttätigkeit unter Urban VIII (Augsburg 1928); R.* Wittkower, *Bernini, the Sculptor of the Roman Baroque* (London 1955).

CHAPTER 50

Denominationalism and Secularization

The strict doctrinal and territorial separation between Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists, "confessionalization," and the resulting doctrinal quarrels are the outstanding characteristics of the century between the Council of Trent and the Peace of Westphalia. But the very violence of the opposing polemics and the blood-letting of the wars of religion gave rise to a new longing for religious peace and Church unity. While it is true that the ever more numerous conversions around the turn of the century and a series of religious colloquies led to renewed strife, nevertheless the hazards of irenicism were embraced, though only by individualists. When it became clear that religious unity within the state could no longer be enforced, the idea of toleration made progress, but, except in the France of Henry IV, it was unable to carry the day.

Strictly speaking, conversions to the Catholic Church presupposed the strict differentiation of the Catholic doctrine from the Protestant by the Council of Trent. This concept does not cover the return of entire territories on the basis of edicts issued by territorial lords, though, for example among the figures reported by the Jesuits,[1] a large number of genuine conversions based on conviction is found. The series of German converts of princely rank began in 1590 with the Margrave Jakob of Baden-Hachberg, later followed by the Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm, Count Johann Ludwig of Nassau-Siegen, Margrave Christian Wilhelm of Brandenburg, Landgrave Friedrich of Hesse, and, in the years immediately after the Peace of Westphalia, Duke Ulrich of Württemberg, Duke Johann Friedrich of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, and Landgrave Ernst of Hesse-Rheinfels. It is obvious that in some of these conversions political and opportunistic motives played a part. For the conversion of scholars the disunity of the Protestants and the diversity of their doctrinal concepts were frequently given as motives, while the uniformity of the Catholic doctrinal system and the beauty of its worship exercised a powerful attraction. Outstanding among the large number of scholarly converts were: Friedrich Staphylus (d. 1563), former professor at Königsberg; the Hessian Johannes Pistorius (d. 1608), whose pamphlet *Anatomia Lutheri* (1595–98) enraged Protestants; the Marburg Jesuit Helferich Hunnius (d. 1636); the philologist Lukas Holstenius (d. 1661) of Hamburg, whose change of mind went back to the period of his Leiden activity and who, only after his conversion in Paris, was employed by Cardinal Francesco Barberini as librarian.

---

[1] Duhr, II,2, 66ff. J. Schacher, "Luzerner Akten zur Geschichte kath. Konvertiten 1580–1780," *ZSKG* 57 (1963), 1–36, 165–220, 303–41.

The religious conversations of the age varied from place to place. The colloquy arranged by Emperor Ferdinand I at Worms from 11–20 September 1557 was a straggler of the talks called for by Charles V to overcome a dilemma. Ferdinand's colloquy was sterile, for the Jena theologians, Flacius at their head, could not agree with the majority of the Protestant speakers led by Melanchthon, and these last refused to condemn doctrinal opinions not in accord with the original *Confessio Augustana.*[2] The Religious Colloquy of Baden (1589) had been summoned by the Margrave Jakob of Baden-Hachberg, the future convert. Its chief topic was the doctrine of justification. The Protestant spokesmen were Jakob Andreä and Jakob Heerbrand; the Catholic, the convert Pistorius and the Jesuit Busaeus. Pistorius was excluded from the Colloquy of Emmendigen, arranged the next year to discuss the doctrine of the Church.[3] The prospect of conversion was also the basis of the Regensburg Religious Colloquy of 1601, jointly convoked, after careful preparation, by Maximilian I of Bavaria and the strongly Lutheran Philip Ludwig of Palatinate-Neuburg. The topic was the relationship of Scripture and Tradition. In addition to Philip Ludwig, theologians from Württemberg, Electoral Saxony, and Brandenburg upheld the

---

[2] *P. Canisii Epp. et Acta* II, 125–180; ibid., p. 791, the list of the Catholic participants. Bishop Pflug of Naumburg presided. Further literature in Janssen, IV, 21–31.

[3] *Acta des Colloquii zu Baden* (1950); cf. A. Kleinschmidt, *Jakob III., Markgraf zu Baden-Hachberg, der erste regierende Konvertit in Deutschland* (Frankfurt a. M. 1875).

Protestant side; the Jesuits Gretser and Tanner, the Catholic view. No less than fifty-five controversial works came out of this discussion.[4] King Ladislaus of Poland summoned the Religious Colloquy of Torun in 1645 in the hope of ending the altercations going on within his country. In the number of participants—twenty-six Catholics, twenty-eight Lutherans, twenty-four Calvinists—it surpassed all earlier discussions, but it foundered at the outset on the question of the order of business.[5] Effective incentives for mutually drawing closer did not emanate from any one of these meetings, but came from elsewhere.

The humanist irenicists around the middle of the sixteenth century always started from the Erasmian distinction between the fundamental articles of faith, concerning which there was or at least could be agreement, and theological doctrinal opinions, which were to be left to free discussion; in them the traditional consciousness of the one Christianity lived on. However, there were not unimportant variations. Georg Witzel aspired to restore Christian unity by reform of the present Church and return to the ancient Church. His work on unity, *Via regia,* appeared posthumously in 1564.[6] Georg Cassander (d. 1566) became the most influential representative of this "Old Catholic" orientation. In his *De officio pii et publicae tranquillitatis vere amantis Viri,* composed on the occasion of the Religious Colloquy of Poissy (1561), he declared that all who accept the Apostles' Creed belong to the Church of Christ. The *Consultatio de articulis inter Catholicos et Protestantes controversis* (1564), ordered by Emperor Ferdinand I, specified as the sole practicable road to reunion a return to the faith and the institutions of the ancient Church, which for him was identified with the Age of Constantine and of the great Fathers of the Church.[7] But neither Witzel nor Cassander were regarded by Peter Canisius as real Catholics (*vere et integre catholici*), because they did not observe the decrees of the Council of Trent and the norms of a sound theology, and occasionally even deviated from the Catholic faith.[8] The influence of Erasmus continued predominant in the Pole Andreas Frycz Modrzewski (d. 1572), who as secretary of King

---

[4] W. Herbst, *Das Regensburger Religionsgespräch von 1601* (Gütersloh 1928).

[5] K. E. Jordt Jorgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den polnischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1645* (Copenhagen 1942); H. Schüssler, *Georg Calixt. Theologie und Kirchenpolitik* (Wiesbaden 1961), pp. 122–133.

[6] W. Trusen, *Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche. Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels* (Münster 1956), pp. 77ff.

[7] M. E. Nolte, *Georgius Cassander en zijn oecumenisch streven* (Nijmegen 1951).

[8] *P. Canisii Epp. et Acta* VII, 553 (8 August 1580). According to Reusch, *Der Index* I, 361, Cassander's edition of ancient Church hymns was put on the Index of Trent, but not his work on union.

Sigismund Augustus influenced the latter's religious policy,[9] and in Michel de L'Hôpital (d. 1573), Catherine de Médicis's chancellor, who bridged humanist irenicism and the idea of state toleration and the group of *politiques* seeking an understanding with the Huguenots.[10] Cassander's ideas were taken up a half-century later by two Protestant irenicists, Grotius and Calixt.

The Dutchman Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), while he was imprisoned for having attacked the dominant strictly Calvinist line and for high treason (1619–21), developed the theological principles of his later efforts to bring closer especially the Protestant denominations, the Anglicans, and the Orthodox. Though as a boy he had sought to induce his Catholic mother to apostatize, because she "was too intelligent to remain a papist," toward the close of his life he drew nearer the Catholic Church by championing the apostolic succession, the hierarchy, and the Catholic concept of the Sacraments. He declared that the solution of the religious split, which with Erasmus he regarded as unnecessary and pernicious, was possible on the basis of the *Confessio Augustana* and, in the midst of the Thirty Years' War, outlined the ideal of a reconciled *Magna Universitas Christianorum,* headed by the supreme priest, the Pope.[11]

Whereas, on the side of the Reformed—partly from ecclesiastico-political motives, since Calvinism was not yet recognized in imperial law—exertions for the union of Protestants were never broken off, for example, the efforts of Philippe de Mornay Duplessis, Franz Junius, and John Dury, on the Lutheran side the "Old Catholic" tendencies present in Melanchthon were suppressed by orthodoxy and only reappeared with the Helmstedt theologian Georg Calixt (d. 1656). The principle of tradition, which at first (1629) he had sought to exploit against the Catholic Church, became the basis of his irenicism, which consciously made use of Cassander. Apostolicity and the universal consensus of the ancient Church on the fundamental articles of Christian faith constituted for him the only possible basis for reunion.[12] His viewpoint was violently attacked from the strict Lutheran side in the *Anatomia Calixtina* (1644), but some of his ideas recurred in the Mainz Plan of Union of 1660, which was probably connected with the efforts of Johann Philip von Schönborn, Elector of Mainz, to achieve a *rapprochement* of the denominations. This sought a reunion of the Lutherans, not of the Calvinists, with the Catholic Church on the basis of the *Confessio Augustana,* the marriage of priests, the lay chalice, and certain dogmatic and disciplinary concessions. As "reformed Catholics" they were to return to the obedience of the Pope.[13] The Elector remained aloof, and in Rome the project was presumably never given serious consideration.

---

[9] *De republica emendanda* (Basel 1559); cf. G. Schramm, "Modrevius-Forschungen," *Jahrbücher fur Geschichte Osteuropas,* NF 6 (1958), 352–373 (report on the literature).

[10] A. Buisson, *Michel de L'Hôpital* (Paris 1950), with excellent bibliography.

[11] *Via ad pacem ecclesiasticam* (Paris–Amsterdam 1642); to the works of J. Schlüter, R. Voeltzelt, and P. Polman (listed in *LThK* 2nd ed., IV, 1244) add J. Spörl, "Hugo Grotius und der Humanismus des 17. Jh.," *HJ* 55 (1935), 350–357; J. Cornelissen, "H. de Groot op den Index," *Miscell. historica in honorem L. van der Essen* II (Brussels 1947), 757–768; K. Repgen, "Grotius papizans," *Reformata reformanda* II, 370–400.

[12] E. L. T. Henke, *Georg Calixt und seine Zeit,* 2 vols. (Halle 1853f.); H. Schüssler, *Georg Calixt. Theologie und Kirchenpolitik* (Wiesbaden 1961).

Antipapal rather than irenic in tone was the project of union of the apostate Marcantonio de Dominis:[14] United in faith in Christ and in apostolicity, an Episcopal Church was to include the Protestants, without prejudice to certain doctrines proper to them; the Pope was the external symbol of unity but he must first restore their original rights to the members of the Church.

Different in principle from the efforts of the irenicists, though resembling them in their results, were the discussions on the lawfulness of toleration by the state. While the postulate that only one religion or denomination should prevail within a state remained essentially undisputed, it could not be maintained in practice. During the Huguenot Wars the *politiques*—the sons of the Connétable Montmorency, Cardinal Bellay, Maurillac, and others—advocated cooperation with and toleration of the Calvinists. According to Bodin (d. 1596), the monarch is obliged to preserve the religious unity of his country if it exists, but it must not be restored by force. Later Bodin inclined to the view that it is best to allow to each his own personal religion.[15] After Henry IV had granted religious liberty to the Huguenots in the Edict of Nantes, the English and the Dutch Catholics asked in vain for the same concession.[16] In Germany the Jena theologian Johann Gerhard (d. 1637) characterized unity of faith within a state as a desirable but scarcely realizable ideal. In the denominationally mixed state the prince might tolerate individuals of other faiths but not public worship for fear of serious disorders; excepted from toleration were Anabaptists and Unitarians.[17] And the Jesuit Martin Becanus (d. 1624), contradicting Bellarmine, knew a series of cases in which a Catholic prince may tolerate heretics in his territory: if they are in the majority or are more powerful than the Catholics or are supported by outside powers, and also if the use of force would impede their conversion.[18]

---

[13] A. P. Brück, "Der Mainzer Unionsplan aus dem Jahre 1660," *Ehrengabe A. Schuchert* (Mainz 1960), pp. 148–162.

[14] D. Cantimori, "L'utopia ecclesiologica di M. A. de Dominis," *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento* (Padua 1960), pp. 103–122; on p. 111 the passage: "Neque componi potest dissensio neque partes ad concordiam possunt redire nisi restitutio fiat in integrum."

[15] J. Lecler, *Histoire de la tolérance au siècle de la réforme* I, 91ff., 153ff. E. Benz, "Der Toleranzgedanke in der Religionswissenschaft. Über den Heptaplomeres des J. Bodin," *DVfLG* 12 (1934), 540–571.

[16] R. Persons, *Treatises tending to Mitigations towards Catholic Subjects in England* (1607); cf. J. Lecler, op. cit., II, 383f.; H. Witte, *Die Ansichten Jacobs I. v. England über Kirche und Staat mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der religiösen Toleranz* (Berlin 1940).

Theories of State and Absolutism

In these theological exchanges over the permissibility of toleration by the state is reflected the power shift in the relations of state and Church since the religious cleavage. Earlier, during the Great Schism and the struggle against conciliarism, the papacy had had to court the secular powers. Now it was the princes first of all, and individuals only in the second place, who determined adherence to religion and creed. The Council of Trent took place in agreement with the princes, and only with their cooperation could it be enforced and implemented. To an even higher degree the Counter Reformation was their work. The power shift proceeded hand in hand with a change in the structure of the state, from a feudal to a modern bureaucratic state, with the development of princely absolutism and modern theories of government in which the way was prepared for its secularization.

Machiavelli's idea of the autonomous power state, subject to its proper law, the reason of state, slowly gained ground. In his *apologia* against Henry VIII Cardinal Pole had clearly recognized the threatening danger. Later writers, such as Giovanni Botero, for a time in Borromeo's service, believed it possible to transform Machiavelli's idea into a Christian one and thereby to neutralize it.[19] Bodin did not question the religious obligations of the prince, but subordinated the form and laws of the state to the concept of the sovereignty and the natural conditions of nations and individuals, in the final analysis to the welfare of the state.[20] Friends and enemies of Machiavelli derived arguments from Tacitus. Justus Lipsius, who revived him (though in 1591 he returned to the University of Louvain and to the Catholic Church) openly championed Machiavelli and his *Politica* (1589) was translated into five languages.[21] The Duke of Rohan, a coworker of Richelieu, made the statement that princes command peoples and interest commands princes.

---

[17] J. Lecler, op. cit., I, 289ff.; J. Wallmann, *Die Theologiebegriff bei Johann Gerhard und Georg Calixt* (Tübingen 1961).

[18] J. Lecler, op. cit., I, 292ff. On the penetration of Machiavellian ideas into England see G. Mosse, *The Holy Pretence* (Oxford 1957).

[19] *Della ragion di stato* (1589), n.ed. L. Firpo (Turin 1948).

[20] J. Bodin, *Six livres de la république* (1576); A. Schmitz, *Staat und Kirche bei J. Bodin* (Leipzig 1939); J. H. Franklin *J. Bodin and the XVIth Century Revolution in the Methodology of Law and History* (New York–London 1963).

The roots of princely absolutism reach back into the late Middle Ages, but its refinements, differing widely according to countries and people, were incontestably furthered, in both the Protestant and the Catholic area, by the religious split and its consequences. Considerable power accrued to the Protestant territorial princes through the formation of the territorial Church and the secularization of Church property. The Catholic princes not only made use of their right to determine the religion of their subjects; while protecting the Church and promoting reform and even reconquering lost territory for her, they extended their own authority in the ecclesiastical sphere, frequently with the consent or at least the toleration of the papacy. Roles were reversed: the state no longer afforded help to an imperiled Church, but the Church, even unconsciously and often unwillingly, aided a state that was becoming absolute.

The intrusion of the modern state into the ecclesiastical field is essentially different from the ascendancy of the lay power in the early medieval Western Christian family of nations. Now for the first time there arose a genuine Church establishment. The papacy defended the freedom and independence of the Church particularly against the claims of the dominant Catholic powers, Spain and France, but in most cases without any outstanding success. Papal decrees were subject to the royal *placet;* clerical privileges, such as the *privilegium fori* and the right of asylum, were curtailed; Church property was taxed, with or without papal authorization and in France by means of clerical contributions voted by the national assembly; the Inquisition and ecclesiastical censure of books were impeded or, as in Spain, nationalized. Even after the adjustment of the conflict with Rome, Venice tolerated the propaganda proceeding from the Dutch and English embassies, refused to readmit the Jesuits, and acted as protector of monasteries whose reform was demanded by the Curia. The Church was forced into a defensive position.

The doctrine of the right of resistance and of tyrannicide is to be explained by the increasing pressure of princely absolutism. In the last third of the sixteenth century assassinations of princes increased in number, and Bodin declared tyrannicide lawful. Nevertheless it created a sensation when the Spanish Jesuit Juan Mariana in his *De rege et regis*

---

[21] G. Oestreich, "J. Lipsius als Theoretiker des modernen Machtstaates," *HZ* 181 (1956), 31–78; id., "J. Lipsius in sua re," *Festgabe Fritz Neubert* (Berlin 1956), pp. 291–311. Other literature in *LThK* 2nd ed., VI, 1072.

institutione (1599), dedicated to King Philip III, expounded the theory that a usurper may be killed by anyone, but a legitimate prince only if, in the general opinion (*si vox populi adsit*), he is destroying the state, despising religion and laws, and there is no other way of inducing him to cease from tyranny. These rules, unobjectionable in regard to content, were intended as a warning to princes who ruled in an absolutist manner, but since they were related to a thinly veiled approval of the assassination of Henry III of France the Sorbonne, on the basis of the decree of Constance against John Petit, condemned Mariana's book, and the Society's general, Acquaviva, disavowed it and forbade further debate.

Secularization of Thought

Even more portentous than absolutism and Church establishment, or than the rising secularization of the concept of the state, were the beginnings of the secularization of European thought in both the arts and the sciences. It must not only be assessed negatively as a natural process of maturation. It must also be regarded as a reaction to the extreme claims of theologians and their quarrels, to the recourse to ecclesiastical and political means of power in the religious sphere, and to the luxuriant growth of superstition. Skepticism and incredulity became a problem. A growing number of religious individualists, abandoning the central doctrines of the Christian faith, were rejected by the Catholic Church as well as by the Protestant denominations. And religious splintering proceeded noticeably. Unrelated to theology, there arose the "natural system of intellectual knowledge" (W. Dilthey). The natural sciences, with no regard for authority, based themselves on empirical observation and mathematical computation, but in the "Galileo Case" they encountered the Church's opposition.

In the "century that wanted to believe" superstition proliferated. Astrology was held in reverence, illness in man and beast was traced to magic, devils and witches were portrayed in the theater. The most frightful aberration of superstition, the witch trials, claimed thousands of innocent victims in both Catholic and Protestant Germany. In Gerolshofen, belonging to the see of Würzburg, ninety-nine witches were put to death in the year 1616; in Ellwangen, 167 in 1612; in Trier and its vicinity the witchcraft delusion required 306 victims in less than seven years from 1587 to 1593; in the Canton of Bern more than 300 within the decade 1591–1600. Only with great exertion did Johannes Kepler save his mother from the pyre. Duke Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1589–1613) enjoyed the dubious fame of a zealous burner of witches.[22] Denunciations and the ruthless resort to torture to extort confessions released the basest instincts; not infrequently piety led to the suspicion of witchcraft. Although according to Janssen, "not a single example is known of Jesuits' having brought the ill-starred persons to the attention of the authorities or of ever having advocated their being burned," they were frequently accused of having instigated the trials. And in fact a majority of Jesuits, like the rest of their contemporaries, were under the spell of the witchcraft delusion, which they connected with diabolical possession; for example, Georg Scherer, Delrio, and Stengel. On the other hand, the moral theologians Tanner and Laymann warned against the illegal and inhuman conduct of the trials, and Friedrich von Spee (1591–1635), who, as confessor of many of the accused, knew at first hand their deep distress and despair, summoned the courage to brand the absurdity and the injustice of the trials as crying out to heaven, comparing them to the methods of Nero's persecution of Christians.[23] Within his own Order he met stiff resistance and was urged to leave it. Von Spee's Christian conscience was roused to indignation against the witch trials but he could not end them. It was inevitable that the reaction against the excesses perpetrated would one day bring into question the belief in a spiritual world.

The resort to ecclesiastical and political means of compulsion for the preservation of orthodoxy had already led, with Sebastian Castellio (d. 1563) and Jacobus Acontius (d. 1566–67), to the repudiation of any external force in the religious sphere. Religious individualists and groups, repelled and suppressed by the prevailing denominations, demanded freedom of conscience and of teaching; for example, the Arminians in Holland. Some even attacked the central dogma of the Trinity, especially Italians who had broken with the Christian faith and had fled from the Inquisition, usually into Switzerland. They had taken refuge, some in western, some in eastern Europe. Celio Secundo Curione lived in Basel until his death in 1569; Bernardino Ochino died in Moravia in 1565; Lelio Sozzini, who had attacked the dogma of the Trinity in his commentary on the prologue of the Fourth Gospel,[24] closed his turbulent wandering life at Zurich in 1562. Whereas the earlier anti-Trinitarians, such as Adam Pastoris, had drawn their objections from the Bible, the later ones were more rationalistic in their approach; for example, the Padua jurist Matteo Gribaldi, Giovanni Gentile (beheaded at Bern in 1566), and the physician Giorgio Blandrata, who drew from his Unitarianism the conclusion that, differing from Christianity, Judaism and Islam had preserved the true doctrine of the "One and Supreme." Poland became a refuge of anti-Trinitarians; as early as 1556 Papal Nuncio Lippomanni dealt with them in a report but without distinguishing between the different tendencies—Tritheists and Unitarians.

---

[22] Still of value are J. Hansen, *Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexenprozess im MA und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgungen* (Leipzig-Munich 1900); N. Paulus, *Hexenwahn und Hexenprozess vornehmlich im 16. Jh.* (Freiburg 1910); Janssen, VIII (Freiburg, 15th ed. 1924), 531–751; F. Merzbacher, *Die Hexenprozesse in Franken* (Munich 1957); W. Kramer, *Kurtrierische Hexenprozesse im 16. und 17. Jh.* (Munich 1959); H. Klein, "Die älteren Hexenprozesse im Lande Salzburg," *Mitt. der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde,* 97 (1957), 17–50; popular and taking into account also France and England is K. Baschwitz, *Hexen und Hexenprozesse* (Munich 1963); other literature in *LThK* 2nd ed., V, 316–319.

[23] *Cautio criminalis* (Rinteln 1631) anonymous; German translation by J. F. Ritter (Weimar 1939); H. Zwetsloot, *Friedrich Spee und die Hexenprozesse. Die Stellung und Bedeutung der Cautio criminalis in der Geschichte der Hexenverfolgungen* (Trier 1954); E. Rosenfeld, *F. Spee von Langenfeld* (Berlin 1958); K. Honselmann, "F. von Spee und die Drucklegung seiner Mahnschrift gegen die Hexenprozesse," *Westfäl. Zeitschrift* 113 (1963), 427–54.

Unitarianism established itself between 1560 and 1568—Peter Gonesius constitutes a transitional stage. The "Polish Brethren" were partly inclined to Anabaptism, and hence the leader of the anti-Trinitarians, Fausto Sozzini (d. 1604), Lelio's nephew, prevailed only slowly. His catechism appeared in Polish in 1605. The sect's intellectual center was Rakow near Sandomir, where the general synod met annually and a secondary school flourished. But it was suppressed in 1638 and in 1658 the adherents of the sect were expelled from the country. Part of them took refuge in Holland; the historian of the Unitarians, Stanislaus Lubiniecki, found it in Hamburg.

In France François de Rabelais (d. 1553) had already posed the problem of unbelief. The skeptical outlook of Montaigne (d. 1592) was directed especially at the existing authorities and was compensated by a fideism, to which his friend, Pierre Charron (d. 1603), also subscribed in his *Trois Vérité* (1593), a defense of Christianity. Jean Pierre Camus, friend of Saint Francis de Sales, saw in Montaigne an ally against the rigid dogmatism of the Calvinists and defended him. The Jesuit Garasse recognized the mortal danger of skepticism and warned against it.[25] For René Descartes (d. 1650) methodical doubt was the beginning of philosophizing. His awareness of the sovereignty of constructive thought places him at the head of modern philosophy, emancipated from theology.

---

[24] Text in D. Cantimori–E. Feist, *Per la storia degli Eretici italiani del secolo XVI in Europa* (Rome 1937), pp. 61–78; A. Stella, "Ricerche sul Socianesimo," *Bolletino dell'Instituto di storia della societa e dello Stato veneziano* 3 (1961), 77–120. Written from a Marxist viewpoint and inadequate in content is A. Pirnat, *Die Ideologie der Siebenbürger Antitrinitarier in den 1570er Jahren* (Budapest 1961); cf. *RHE* 57 (1962), 602ff.; J. Tazbir, *Stanislaw Lubiniecki, przywodca arianskie j emigrac ji* (Warsaw 1961). For the Unitarian movement as a whole see E. M. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism,* 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1945–52).

[25] R. H. Popkin, "Scepticism and the Counter-Reformation in France," *ARG* 51 (1960), 58–87; J. Lecler, "Un adversaire des libertins au début du XVIIe siècle, le P. François Garasse," *Etudes 209 (1931), 553–572.*

Though dependent on modern scholasticism in his doctrine of rights, and in particular on Francisco de Vitoria and Suarez, Hugo Grotius had preceded Descartes in understanding law as "an effective function of life, based on natural law and reason" (E. Wolf). The ethical foundation of law lies in man's social nature. Hence law is spiritually autonomous; its connection with theological and philosophical assumptions is not entirely broken but it is loosened. To this extent Grotius is the founder of modern natural and international law.

The rising independence of the arts, including history, was in itself a natural maturing of the European mind. It did not necessarily have to lead to conflict with the faith and with theology, no more than the constructing of a natural science on empirical observation and mathematical computation had to. The reason why the systems of natural philosophy, suspected of Pantheism, of the ex-Dominican Tommaso Campanella (d. 1639) and Giordano Bruno were, together with their creators, condemned by the Church lay in the nature of things and in the attitude of their representatives.

Far more momentous was Galileo's encounter with the Inquisition. Nicholas Copernicus (d. 1543) had dedicated to Paul III his *De revolutionibus orbium coelestinum,* which had endeavored to prove by mathematical arguments the motion of the earth around the sun. Since that time the "Copernican World System" had, like its preliminary steps in the Parisian natural philosophy of the fourteenth century, encountered no hostility from the Church. After 1594 the University of Salamanca made the text of Copernicus the basis of instruction. Luther, Melanchthon, Osiander, and the University of Tübingen attacked the Copernican system as contradicting Scripture. Nevertheless, it was further developed around the turn of the century. Johannes Kepler, court astronomer of Rudolf II, discovered the laws of planetary motion. Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), active in Florence from 1610, found confirmation of the Copernican system by observing the heavenly bodies, such as the moons of Jupiter. With the help of a telescope he constructed and defended it against objections drawn from Scripture (Josh. 10:12f., Ps. 103:5).[26] Following denunciation by the Dominican court preacher Lorini, Galileo was summoned before the Roman Inquisition. Until then he had enjoyed the greatest esteem in Rome's ecclesiastical circles and in 1611 had been admitted to the Papal Academy. But by his vehement efforts to demonstrate the compatibility of his system with a correct interpretation of Scripture, he so provoked the consultors of the Inquisition that on 24 February 1616 it declared his propositions on the standing of the sun and the movement of the earth as heretical or erroneous and forbade him to defend them in the future. He was not obliged to abjure them or to cease his investigations, and Pope Paul V granted him an audience and assured him of his protection. Just the same, on 5 March 1616 the work of Copernicus and all books that defended his system were placed on the Index. After the accession of Urban VIII Galileo, relying on the Pope's benevolence, dedicated to him his reply to a criticism by the Jesuit Grassi and, following a visit to Rome, was extolled "as the man whose fame shines forth in the sky and permeates the world." But when, confident of the Pope's favor, he published, with the *Imprimatur* of Riccardi, Master of the Sacred Palace, his *Dialogues on the two most important World Systems* in 1632, the Inquisition again summoned him on 23 September 1632, for having violated the earlier prohibition of 1616. Though during the second trial he declared that interiorly he did not adhere to the Copernican system, he was condemned on 22 June 1633 to abjuration and to life-imprisonment. He recanted and the imprisonment was commuted to a mild detention on his estate of Alcetri near Florence. The sequel to the Galileo trial was that his mathematico-physical concept of the world was not accepted by the Church and his chief work, *Discorsi e dimostrazioni matematiche intorno a due nuove scienze* (1638), the "first text in physics" (Von Laue), had to be printed in Leiden. Galileo's personal fate was determined by his taking into his own hands the resolving of the apparent contradiction between his conclusions from his study of natural science and scriptural revelation, instead of leaving it to theologians.

---

[26] Galileo to the Benedictine Castelli on 21 December 1613; *Opere,* ed. A. Favaro, V, 279–288.

A new epoch in Church history begins in the mid-seventeenth century. The Peace of Westphalia definitely settled denominational rights in the Empire and put a stop to the Counter Reformation as an ecclesiastico-political activity. It brought to a close the age of the Wars of Religion and at the same time shifted political powers. The Peace of the Pyrenees (1659) decided the struggle for European hegemony in favor of France, and a decade later the recognition of the English Navigation Acts by the States General of the Netherlands put the seal on England's maritime supremacy. Innocent X's protest against the religious articles of the Peace of Westphalia fell on deaf ears, and the papacy could not assert, even vis-à-vis the remaining Catholic powers, its authority as guarantor of supranational order. The already long-faded idea of *Christianitas* completely lost its significance in practical politics. However, the Church had been interiorly renewed since the Council of Trent and had overcome the crisis of the religious schism. She was asserting herself and was even able to recover lost ground, but to restore the unity of the Church had proven clearly impossible. Confessionalization divided the Christian peoples of the West into three sharply defined and quarrelling bodies—Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists—and lessened the convincing force of Christian thought. Forced into a defensive position, the Church was unable to master the religious and intellectual forces pressing to the surface, some of them released by the split, others having their roots deep in the late Middle Ages. She lost command, and a new crisis, the supreme crisis of the European mind, announced itself.

Parallel to, and often intertwined with, this changing relationship to the "world" were structural changes within the Church. Defense against Protestantism and inner renewal of the Church from the time of the Council of Trent were possible only because the papacy sharply tightened the reins of the central authority and, in a new centralization, very different from the medieval, strengthened the threatened members who were themselves too weak, by means of nuncios, controlled the bishops through the *visitatio liminum,* and in the congregations that were becoming stabilized and being organized as offices created an effective instrument, which, unlike the chancery and *camera* of the late Middle Ages, did not pursue a mainly financial end. The "Episcopalist" currents, which, becoming ever stronger in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, resisted this tendency, left themselves open to suspicion because in part they attenuated or denied the Pope's primacy of jurisdiction, in part they relied on the protection of the national estate, as in France and Spain, or on secular means of power, as in the Holy Roman Empire. From the time of Bellarmine ecclesiology put the doctrine of the papal primacy in the center and caused the function of the college of bishops to withdraw into the background. After Trent no general council was summoned for more than three centuries.

The Tridentine doctrinal system and reform work, to which the Church owed her renewal and self-assertion, impressed their stamp on the Church's life and well-nigh became its unique form. The post-Tridentine Church was anti-Protestant and became anti-reform. Theological schools which had been unattacked in the Middle Ages, such as Augustinianism, were hard put to maintain themselves. Gratian and the older canon law lost their importance. And the historical picture of the Church which could have been obtained from the flourishing study of patrology and Church history became ineffectual. Just as liturgy in its post-Tridentine form hardened into rubricism, so canon law became formalistic and remained so for three whole centuries. Is one justified, then, in extending the "Tridentine epoch" of Church history or the

"Counter Reformation" into the nineteenth century or even to the present?

It is not to be denied that certain characteristics of the post-Tridentine Church—her anti-Protestant orientation in doctrine and piety, her centralization and formalism—remained active after the time limit here treated, the middle of the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, it is misleading and ruinous to any effort to obtain an insight into the real historical process if the centuries that have elapsed since Trent are studied from the one viewpoint of the present, of ecumenism and the openness to the world as displayed by the Second Vatican Council, while the influence of the Enlightenment and of the great upheavals since the French Revolution—to cite only these examples—are treated as of little significance. It is no less one-sided, as our presentation has shown, to regard the schism in the Church as a tragedy only, while overlooking the deepening and activating of the religious life which it had as a consequence, the wealth of values which came to light in the Catholic Reform, in new and old Orders, in asceticism and mysticism, in piety and art, in missionary expansion on three continents. In the hard crust that was forming there lay hidden a precious kernel, a specific, not to be mistaken kernel, encountered only in this epoch. To throw it away as worthless, not to recall that every period of Church history stands directly before God, is unhistorical and presumptuous: unhistorical, because one cannot see the limits and possibilities of the pilgrim Church; presumptuous, because it means forgetting that even we are not in possession of the perfect. Instead we are awaiting it—and only then will we dispose of the standards for judging fairly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION AND COUNTER REFORMATION

1. General Aids, Dictionaries and Reference-works

A. v. Brandt, *Werkzeug des Historikers* (Stuttgart^{2} 1958; with bibliography); G. Wolf, *Einführung in das Studium der neueren Geschichte* (Berlin 1910); H. O. Meisner, *Aktenkunde. Ein Handbuch für Archivbenutzer mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Brandenburg-Preussens* (Leipzig^{2} 1952; with bibliography); A. Brennecke–W. Leesch, *Archivkunde* (Leipzig 1953); K. Haebler, *Handbuch der Inkunabelkunde* (Leipzig 1925); M. Geisberg, *Der deutsche Einblattholzschnitt in der l. Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1923–30); Ch. Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis,* 10 vols. (Niors 1883–88); M. Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Hand-Wörterbuch,* 3 vols. (Leipzig 1872–78); id., *Mittelhochdeutsches Taschen-WB* (Leipzig^{24} 1944); A. Goetze, *Frühneuhochdeutsches Glossar* (Berlin^{5} 1956); H. Rössler–G. Franz, *Biographisches Wörterbuch zur Deutschen Geschichte* (Munich 1952); id., *Sachwörterbuch zur Deutschen Geschichte* (Munich 1958); E. Haberkern–J. F. Wallach, *Hilfswörterbuch für Historiker* (Bern-Munich 1964); H. Rudolph, *Vollständig geographisch-topographisch statistisches Ortslexikon von Deutschland,* 2 vols. (1859–68; including Austria); J. Penzler, Ritter's *Geographisch-Statistisches Lexikon,* 9th reprint, 2 vols. (1905–6); J. G. Th. Graesse, *Orbis Latinus oder Verzeichnis der wichtigsten lat. Orts-und Ländernamen,* revised ed. by F. Benedict (Berlin 1922); W. Maurer, *Namenliste zur deutschen Geschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts,* Part I: A-E (Leipzig 1941); A. Cappelli, *Lexicon abbreviaturarum. Dizionario di abbreviature latine ed italiane* (Milan^{6} 1961); id., *Cronologia, Cronografia e Calendario perpetuo. Dal principio dell'Era Christiana ai giorni nostri* (Milan 1930); *Dictionary of National Biography* (London 1885f.); G. Strauss, *Sixteenth Century Germany: Its Geography and Topography* (Madison, Wis. 1959); C. T. Martin, *The Record Interpreter: A collection of Abbreviations* (London 1949); M. S. Giuseppi, *A Guide to the Manuscripts Preserved in the Public Record Office* (London 1923–24), 2 vols. (supercedes F. S. Thomas, *Handbook to the Public Records* (London 1853); S. Scargil-Bird, *Guide to the Principal Classes of Documents in the Public Record Office* (London 1891, 1896, 1908); a new guide to the Public Record Office is in preparation; R. Hale, *Guide to Photocopied Historical Material in the United States* (Ithaca 1961); P. Haner (ed.), *A Guide to the Archives and Manuscripts in the United States* (New Haven 1961); D. H. Thomas–M. L. Case (eds.), *Guide to the Diplomatic Archives of Western Europe* (Philadelphia 1959); G. F. Howe et al., *The American Historical Association's Guide to Historical Literature* (New York 1961).

2. Sources and Bibliography

P. Herre, *Quellenkunde zur Weltgeschichte* (Leipzig 1910); Dahlmann-Waitz, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte,* ed. H. Haering, 2 vols. (Leipzig^{9} 1930–31; new edition in

preparation); A. W. Pollard–G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title-Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640* (The Bibliographical Society 1926); F. Schnabel, *Deutschlands Quellen und Darstellungen in der Neuzeit* I: *Das Zeitalter der Reformation 1500–1550* (Leipzig 1931); G. Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte,* 3 vols. (Gotha 1915, 1916 and 1922, two parts 1923); suppls. in *Mitteilungen aus der historischen Literatur* 45 (1916), 46 (1918), 51 (1923), 52 (1926), 55 (1927), 56 (1928), 57 (1929); L. Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1826–38; reprint Milan 1948); W. A. Coppinger, *Supplement zu Hains Repertorium Bibliographicum* Part I, II: 1, 2 (Milan 1950); G. W. Panzer, *Annalen der älteren deutschen Literatur,* 2 vols. (Nürnberg 1788–1805; reprint Hildesheim 1961); J. Weller, *Repertorium typographicum. Die Deutsche Literatur im ersten Viertel des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Nördlingen 1864; reprint Hildesheim 1961); *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke,* published by the Kommission für den Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke (I–VII A-Ei) (1925–38); Th. Bestermann, *Early Printed Books to the End of the Sixteenth Century* (Geneva 1961); G. Franz, *Bücherkunde zur deutschen Geschichte* (Munich 1951); id., *Bücherkunde zur Weltgeschichte* (Munich 1956); W. Trillmich, *Kleine Bücherkunde zur Geschichtswissenschaft* (Hamburg 1949); G. Franz, *Historische Kartographie, Forschung und Bibliographie* (Bremen 1955); M. Arnim, *Internationale Personalbibliographie,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1952–63); G. M. Dutcher, *Guide to Historical Literature* (New York 1949; mainly Anglo-Saxon literature); H. Planitz-T. Buyken, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (Frankfurt a. M. 1952) with index volume (to 1500; considers also legal ecclesiastical conditions); I. Dagens, *Bibliographie Chronologique de la Litterature de Spiritualité et de ses sources* (1501–1610) (Paris 1952); K. Schottenloher, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517–85,* 6 vols. (Leipzig^2 1956–58); VII, writings from 1938 to 1960 (Stuttgart 1966); *Bibliographie de la Réforme, 1450–1648:* I. Allemagne, Pais-Bas (Leiden 1958); II. Belgique, Suède, Norvège, Danemark, Irlande, Etats-Unis d'Amérique (ibid. 1960); III. Italie, Espagne, Portugal (ibid. 1961); IV. France, Angleterre, Suisse (ibid. 1963); H. J. Hillebrand, *Bibliographie des Täufertums 1520–1630* (Gütersloh 1962); A. Goetze, *Die hochdeutschen Drucker der Reformationszeit* (Strassburg 1905); A. Kuczyński, *Verzeichnis einer Sammlung von nahezu 3000 Flugschriften Luthers und seiner Zeitgenossen* (Nieuwkoop 1955); *Antiqua literarum monumenta autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrium virorum ab A. 1517 usque ad A. 1546* (Brunswig 1690); *Bibliotheca Missionum* of Robert Streit, continued by Johannes Dindinger: I. Grundlegender und allgemeiner Teil (Münster 1916); II. Amerikanische Missionsliteratur 1493–1699 (Aachen 1924); IV. Asiatische Missionsliteratur 1245–1599 (Aachen 1928); V. Asiatische Missionsliteratur 1600–99 (Aachen 1929); XV. Afrikanische Missionsliteratur 1053–1599 (Freiburg 1951); XXI. Missionsliteratur von Australien und Ozeanien 1525–1950 (Freiburg 1955); Continued by Johannes Rommerskirchen and Josef Metzler: XXII. Grundlegender und allgemeiner Teil 1910–35 und Nachtrag zu Band I (Freiburg 1963); XXIII. Grundlegender und allgemeiner Teil 1936–60 (Freiburg 1964); S. Delacroix, *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques,* 4 vols. (Paris 1956); L. Vriens–A. Disch (eds.), *A Critical Bibliography of Missiology* (Nymegen 1960).

3. SOURCES

GERMANY: J. Ch. Lüning, *Teutsches Reichs-Archiv* 22 (Leipzig 1719); *Neue und vollständige Sammlung der Reichs-Abschiede, welche von den Zeiten Kayser Conrads des II bis jetzo auf den Teutschen Reichs-Tagen abgefasst worden sammt den wichtigsten Reichs-Schlüssen,* 2 vols. (Frankfurt a. M. 1747); K. Lanz, *Staatspapiere zur Geschichte des Kaisers Karl V. aus dem*

Königlichen Archiv und der Bibliothèque de Bourgogne zu Brüssel (Stuttgart 1845); id., *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V.*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1846); J. Fiedler, *Die Relationen der Botschafter Venedigs über Deutschland und Österreich im 17. Jahrhundert* (Vienna 1866) (=Fontes rerum Austriacarum); J. J. I. Döllinger, *Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Culturgeschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte* I: *Dokumente zur Geschichte Kaiser Karls V., Philipps II. und ihrer Zeit. Aus spanischen Archiven* (Regensburg 1862), III (Vienna 1882); *Politische Korrespondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation*, 5 vols. (Strassburg–Heidelberg 1882–1933); A. V. Druffel, *Beiträge zur Reichgeschichte*, 3 vols. (Munich 1873–82), Vol. 4 ed. K. Brandi (Munich 1896); *Deutsche Reichstagsakten, Jüngere Reihe*, ed. the Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Adademie der Wissenschaften: I. A. Kluckhohn, Kaiserwahl 1519 (Gotha 1893); II. A. Wrede, Reichstag zu Worms 1520–21 (Gotha 1896); III. id., Nürnberger Reichstag 1522 u. 1523 (Gotha 1901); IV. id., Nürnberger Reichstag 1524 (Stuttgart 1905); VII. J. Kühn, 1. u. 2. anberaumter Reichstag zu Regensburg 1526–27; *Schwäbische Bundestage 1527–28. Reichstag zu Speier 1529* (Stuttgart 1935); *Acta Pacis Westfalicae*, ed. M. Braubach–K. Repgen (Münster 1962f.); *Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges*, ed. the Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 11 vols.: 1596–1613 (Leipzig 1870–1908); n. ed. 1618–51, Part II: 1-3: 1623–27 (Leipzig 1907f.); 4:1628–29 (Munich 1948).

FRANCE: *Collection des documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de France*, to date 290 vols. (Paris 1836f.); *Correspondance de Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, ed. A. L. Herminjard, 9 vols. (Geneva–Paris 1866–7; reprinted Nieuwkoop 1966).

THE NETHERLANDS: L. P. Gachard, *Collection des voyages des souverains des Pays-Bas* (Brussels 1874); *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, ed. S. Cranier–F. Pijper, 10 vols. ('s-Gravenhage 1903–4); *Documenta Reformatoria*, ed. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink et al., 2 vols. (Kampen 1960–62); G. Brom-A. H. L. Hensen, *Romeinsche Bronnen voor den Kerkelijk-staatkundig toestand der Nederlanden in de 16de eeuw* (Rijks geschiedkundige Publikatien . . . Groote serie 52) ('s-Gravenhage 1922); J. D. M. Cornelissen, *Kerkelijken Toestand der Nederlanden onder de apostolische Vicarissen 1592–1727*, Part 1, 1592–1651 ('s-Gravenhage 1932); *Bibliotheca catholica Neerlandica impressa 1500–1727* (The Hague 1954).

ENGLAND: *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs*, ed. J. M. Rigg, 2 vols. (London 1961–62).

SPAIN: *Colleción de documentos inéditos del Archivo general de la Corona de Aragón*, 41 vols. (Barcelona 1847–1910).

REPORTS OF PAPAL NUNCIOS

GERMANY: *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, Section I: 1533–59, 14 vols., ed. the Preussische Historische Institut in Rome (Gotha 1892–1912); more recently XIII: 1552–53, ed. H. Lutz (Tübingen 1959), XVI: 1550–54, ed. H. Goetz (Tübingen 1965); Erg. I: 1530–31, ed. G. Müller (Tübingen 1963); Section II: 1560–72, 7 vols. (1897–1953); Section III: 1572–85, 4 vols. (1894–1909); Section IV: 17th Century, 3 vols. (1895–1913); *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken 1585–1604*, Section 2 with 6 vols., ed. the Görres-Gesellschaft (Paderborn 1895–1919); Editions of the Görres-Gesellschaft in addition to the Series "Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland" are: 1539–40; 1573–76 (*Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte* I (1892), V (1898); Details of the nuncio reports from Germany: H. Lutz, "Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. Vergangenheit und Zukunft einer 'klassischen," Editionsreihe: *QFIAB* 45 (1965) 321–324.

BOHEMIA: *Epistulae et Acta nuntiorum apostolicorum apud imperatorem 1592–1628 curis Instituti historici Bohemoslovenici* (Rome–Prague 1932–46), III, IV, 1–312.

SWITZERLAND: *Nuntiaturberichte aus der Schweiz,* Part I, 1579–81, 3 vols. (Solothurn 1906–29).

FRANCE: *Acta Nuntiaturae Gallicae,* ed. the Gregoriana and the Ecole Française in Rome, 1535–46 and 1583–86, 3 vols. (Rome–Paris 1961–63), particulars in ZKG 75 (1964) 347–354.

BELGIUM: *Analecta Vaticano Belgica.* 2d series, ed. the Belgian Historical Institute in Rome, 1–10: 1596–1642 (=Nuntiatur in Flanders) (Brussels-Paris 1924–55; Section B, 1: 1634–39 (=Nuntiatur in Cologne) (Brussels-Rome 1956); 3: 1606–74 (Brussels-Rome 1958).

ITALY: *Nunziature di Napoli,* ed. the Instituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, I: 1570–77, revised by P. Vallani (Rome 1962); Nunziature di Venezia, I: 1533–35 revised by F. Gaeta, (Rome 1958); 2: 1536–42 (Rome 1960); *Nunziature di Savoia,* I: 1560–73, revised by F. Fonzi (Rome 1960).

SPAIN: *Legaciones y nunciaturas en España* I: 1466–86, ed. the Instituto español de historia eclesiastica, revised by A. J. Fernandez (Monumenta Hispaniae vaticana, 2 Secc.: Nunciatura I) (Rome 1963).

POLAND: *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana IV–VI,* Series Nuntiaturae Poloniae, I: 1578–81 (1915), II: 1581–82 (1923–33), III: 1583 (1938).

REFORMATION: V. E. Löscher, *Vollständige Reformations-Akta und Dokumente 1517–19* (Leipzig 1720–29); J. E. Kapp, *Kleine Nachlese einiger zur Reformationsgeschichte nützlicher Urkunden* (Leipzig 1727–33); Ch. G. Neudecker, *Urkunden der Reformationszeit* (Kassel 1836); *Neues Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenreformation* I (Hamburg 1842); H. Laemmer, *Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI illustrantia* (Freiburg 1861); O. Schade, *Satiren und Pasquille aus der Reformationszeit* 1–3 (Hanover ^{2}1863); P. Balan, *Monumenta reformationis lutheranae* (Regensburg 1881–84); *Flugschriften aus der Reformationszeit,* 19 vols. (Halle 1877–1928); *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation,* ed. O. Clemen, 4 vols. (Halle 1906–11); *Flugschriften aus der Reformationszeit in Facsimiledrucken,* ed. O. Clemen (Leipzig 1921); *Acta reformationis catholicae ecclesiam Germaniae concernentia saeculi XVI.* The negotiations of the German episcopate on reform from 1520–70, I: 1520–32, II: 1532–42, ed. G. Pfeilschifter (Regensburg 1959–60); *Schriften zur Kirchen- und Rechtsgeschichte,* ed. E. Fabian, to date 31 vols. (Tübingen 1956f.); B. J. Kidd (ed.), *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford 1911).

4. OLD DOCUMENTS WITH LISTED SOURCES

S. Franck, *Chronica, Zeitbuch und Geschichtsbibell von anbegyn biss in diss gegenwertig iar verlangt* (Ulm 1536); J. Cochlaeus, *Commentaria de actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri* (Mainz 1549); J. Sleidanus, *De Statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo quinto Caesare Commentariorum libri* XXVI (Strassburg 1555); O. Reginaldus (Reynald) and J. Laderchi, *Caesaris Baronii Annales Ecclesiastici* 31–37: 1513–71 (Paris 1878–83); L. v. Seckendorf, *Commentarius historicus apologeticus de Lutheranismo sive de Reformatione religionis ductu D. Martini Lutheri . . .* (Frankfurt–Leipzig 1688); Ch. A. Salig, *Vollständige Historie der Augspurgischen Confession und derselben Apologie,* 3 vols. (Halle 1730–35); P. Sarpi, *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* (London 1619). Critical edition by S. Sambaria, 3 vols. (Bari

1935); P. Sforza Pallavicino, *Istoria del Concilio di Trento,* 2 vols. (Rome 1656–57); best edition by F. A. Zaccaria, 5 vols. (Faenza 1792–96); *Texte zur Kirchen-und Theologiegeschichte,* ed. G. Ruhbach, II: The beginning of the reformation historical writings (Melanchthon, Sleidanus, Flacius, and the Magdeburg Centuries) (Gütersloh 1966); J. Sandar, *De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani* (Cologne 1585); T. Stapleton, *Vita Thomae Morae in Tres Tomae* (Cologne 1612); S. Cattely, ed. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe,* 8 vols. (Oxford 1837–41).

5. THEOLOGY

H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae* II–III (Innsbruck 1906–7); Ch. Du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus,* 3 vols. (Paris 1724–36); Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. *Etudes et documents pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines chrétiennes dupuis la fin de l'âge apostolique jusqu'à la clôture du concile de Trente:* Université Catholique et Collèges O. P. et S. J. de Louvain, Paris, 28 vols. (Louvain 1922ff.); *Corpus Reformatorum* (the works of Melancthon, Calvin, and Zwingli; to date 101 vols.) (Halle 1834ff.; Braunschweig 1853ff.; Berlin 1905; Leipzig 1908ff.; Zurich 1959ff.); *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* ("Weimarer Ausgabe"), 58 vols. (Weimar 1883ff.); id., *Die Deutsche Bibel,* 12 vols. (Weimar 1906–61); id., *Tischreden,* 6 vols. (Weimar 1912–21); id., *Briefwechsel,* 12 vols. (Weimar 1930–67); *Luthers Werke in Auswahl,* ed. O. Clemen–E. Vogelsang–H. Rückert–E. Hirsch, 4 vols. (Berlin 1966) and 4 suppls. (Berlin 1959ff.); *Klassiker des Protestantismus,* ed. Ch. M. Schröder, I: *Wegbereiter der Reformation,* ed. G. A. Benrath (Bremen 1967), II: *Der Glaube der Reformatoren,* ed. F. Lau (Bremen 1964), III: *Reformatorische Verkündigung und Lebensordnung,* ed. R. Stupperich (Bremen 1963), IV: *Der Linke Flügel der Reformation,* ed. H. Fast (Bremen 1962); *Corpus Catholicorum, Werke Katholischer Schriftsteller im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung,* ed. J. Greving et al., to date 29 vols. (Münster 1919ff.).

6. COUNCILS, DOCTRINAL AND CANONICAL DECISIONS, CANON LAW

H. Quentin, *J. D. Mansi et les Grandes Collections Conciliaires* (Paris 1900); J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio,* 31 vols., to 1440 (Florence, then Venice 1759–98); n. ed. with additions 1902 by J. B. Martin–L. Petit, 60 vols. (Paris 1899–1927); J. Hardouin, *Acta Conciliorum et Epistolae Decretales ac Constitutiones Summorum Pontificum,* 12 vols. (Paris 1714–15); *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta,* ed. Centro di Documentazione Bologna (Freiburg i. Br. 1962); J. Le Plat, *Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini Potissimum Illustrandam Spectantium Amplissima Collectio,* 7 vols. (Louvain 1781–87); *Concilium Tridentinum, Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatuum Nova Collectio,* ed. the Görres-Gesellschaft, to date 13 vols. (Freiburg 1901ff.); J. Doellinger, *Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Concils von Trent,* Abt. I–II (Nördlingen 1876); J. Sirmond, *Concilia Antiqua Galliae,* 3 vols. (Paris 1926) with suppl. by P. Delande (Paris 1966); J. Sáenz de Aguirre, *Collectio Maxima Conciliorum Omnium Hispania et Novi Orbis,* 4 vols. (Rome 1693); 2nd ed. by J. Catalanus, 6 vols. (Rome 1753–55); D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae,* 4 vols. (London 1737); J. Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae,* 11 vols. (Cologne 1759–90); H. Denzinger–A. Schönmetzer. *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum* (Barcelona–Freiburg 1965); *Corpus Confessionum, Die Bekenntnisschriften der Christenheit, Sammlung Grundlegender Urkunden aus Allen Kirchen der Gegenwart,* ed. C. Fabricius (Berlin 1931ff.); *Quellen zur Konfessionskunde:*

Reihe A. Römisch-katholische Quellen, I, ed. D. Schmidt–W. Sucker (Lüneburg 1954–57). *Reihe B. Protestantische Quellen,* ed. K. Kinder et al., Heft I–VII (Lüneburg 1957–61); *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche,* ed. the Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenausschuss (Göttingen ^{5}1963); *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Reformierten Kirche,* ed. E. F. K. Müller (Leipzig 1903); *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der Nach Gottes Wort Reformierten Kirche,* ed. W. Niesel (Zurich 1948); *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen in Deutscher Übersetzung,* ed. P. Jacobs (Neukirchen 1949); W. Gussmann, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1911, Kassel 1930); *Corpus Juris Canonici,* the best edition of *Editio Romana Iussu Gregorii XIII* (Rome 1582); E. Friedberg, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1879–91); *Codis Juris Canonici Fontes,* ed. Petrus Card. Gasparri, since VII by Justinianus Card. Serédi, I–VIII and IX: Tabellae (Rome 1923–39); A. U. Richter, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts (1846); E. Sehling, Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts.* I–V (Leipzig 1902–13); VIff. (Tübingen 1955ff.); *Bullarium Romanum, Editio Taurinensis* by A. Tomassetti, 24 vols. (Turin 1857–72); C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Römischen Katholizismus* (Tübingen 1934); 6th ed., ed. K. Aland, I (Tübingen 1967); A. Mercati, *Raccolta dei Concordati su Materie Ecclesiastiche tra la S. Sede e le Autorità Civili* (1908–54), 2 vols. (Rome 1954).

7. CHURCH HIERARCHY

A. Ciaconius, *Vitae et Res Gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium* III (Rome 1677); P. B. Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Regensburg 1873; suppl. 1879–86 Graz 1957); C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris Aevi* II: 1431–1503, III: 1503–92, IV: 1592–1667 (Münster 1914–35).

8. HAGIOGRAPHY

Acta Sanctorum, ed. J. Bolland and his followers (Antwerp–Brussels–Tongerloo–Paris 1643ff., Venice 1734ff., Paris 1863ff.); H. Quentin–H. Delehaye (eds.), *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*=Acta SS Nov. II, 2 (Brussels 1931); H. Delehaye et al. (eds.), *Martyrologium Romanum, Propylaeum ad Acta SS Decembris* (Brussels 1940).

9. ORDERS

H. Urs v. Balthasar (ed.), *Die Grossen Ordensregeln* (Einsiedeln ^{2}1961); L. Holstenius–M. Brockie (eds.), *Codex Regularum Monasticarum et Canonicarum,* 6 vols. (Augsburg 1759); A. M. Zimmermann, *Kalendarium Benedictinum,* 4 vols. (Vienna 1933–38); J. M. Canivez (ed.), *Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis 1116–1786,* 9 vols. (Louvain 1933); N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense,* 3 vols. (Straubing 1949ff.); J. Le Paige, *Bibliotheca Ordinis Praemonstratensis* (Paris 1633); *Bullarium Franciscanum* I–IV (Rome 1759–68), V–VII (Rome 1898–1904), VIII (Quaracchi 1929), IX–X (ibid. 1939–49). Suppl. I (Rome 1780); suppl. II (Quaracchi 1908); *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum,* I–V (Rome 1882–86), VIff. (Quaracchi 1887ff.); L. Wadding, *Annales Ordinis Minorum,* 30 vols. (Quaracchi 1931ff.); id., *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (Rome^3 1906); suppl., 4 vols. (Rome 1906–36); *Bullarium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum,* 8 vols. (Rome 1729–49); *Epitome Bull. OP* (Rome 1898); *Monumenta OP Historica,* 14 vols. (Rome 1896–1904); cont'd (Paris 1931ff.); J. F. Ossinger, *Bibliotheca Augustiniana historica* (Ingolstadt–Augsburg 1768); J. Lanteri, *Eremi Sacrae Augustinianae,* 2 pts. (Rome 1874–75); id., *Postrema Saecula Sex Religonis Augustinanae* I–II (Tolentino

1858–59), III (Rome 1860); N. Crusenius, *Pars Tertia Monastici Augustiniani* I (Valladolid 1890); *Acta Ordinis Eremitarum Sancti Augustini* (Rome 1956ff.); Daniel a V. Maria, *Speculum Carm.*, 2 vols. (Antwerp 1680); E. Monsignani, *Bullarium Carm.*, 4 vols. (Rome 1715–68); B. Zimmermann, *Monumenta Hist. Carm.* I (Sérius 1905–07); G. Wessels, *Acta Capit. General.*, 2 vols. (Rome 1914–34); C. de Villiers, *Bibliotheca Carm.*, 2 vols. (Rome 1927); *Annales Ordinis Servorum Mariae*, 3 vols. (Lucca 1719); *Monumenta Ordinis Servorum Mariae* (Brussels–Rome 1917ff.; to date 20 vols.); *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ordinis Minorum S. Francisci Capuccinorum* (Venice 1747); Appendix 1747–1852 (Rome 1852); *Bullarium OFM Cap.* I–VII (Rome 1740–52), VIII–X (Innsbruck 1883–84); *Monumenta Historica OFM Cap.*, 8 vols. (Assisi–Rome 1937); *Monumenta ad Constitutiones OFM Cap.* (Rome 1916); *Constitutiones OFM Cap.* (Rome 1926); *Ordinationes Capitulorum Gen. OFM Cap.* (Rome 1928); *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*, to date 70 vols. (Madrid 1894ff., Rome 1932ff.); C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 9 vols. (Brussels–Paris 1890–1900); X-suppl. by E. M. Rivière (Toulouse 1911).

10. MISSIONS

Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae Regum in Ecclesiis Africae, Asiae et Oceaniae . . . , ed. L. M. Jardão et al. 1–3 (Lisbon 1868–79) (=Bull. Patr.); *Collección de Documentos Inéditos Relativos al Descubrimiento, Conquista y Colonización de las Posesiones Españolas en América y Oceania*, 42 vols. (Madrid 1864–84); 2nd Series, 13 vols. (Madrid 1885ff.); P. Hernáez, ed., *Colección de Bulas, Breves, y Otros Documentos Relativos a la Iglesia de America y Filipinas* (Brussels 1879); *Cuerpo de Documentos del Siglo XVI Sobre los Derechos de España en las Indias y las Filipinas*, ed. L. Hanke-Millares Carlo (Mexico 1943); R. Ricard, *Études et Documents pour l'Histoire de l'Espagne et du Portugal* (Louvain *1931); Bullarium Pontificii de Propaganda Fide Pars Prima*, ed. R. de Martinis, I (Rome 1888). *Collectanea S. C. de Propaganda Fide* I (Rome 1907).

II. NARRATIVE ACCOUNTS

1. GENERAL

Historia Mundi, ed. F. Valjavek, 10 vols. (Bern 1952–61), VIII: *Übergang zur Moderne* (1957); *Handbuch der Weltgeschichte*, ed. A. Randa, 2 vols. (Olten–Freiburg 1954–55); *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte*, ed. G. Mann–A. Heuss, 12 vols. (Berlin 1961ff.), VIII: *Von der Reformation zur Revolution* (1964); *Histoire Générale des Religions*, ed. R. Goree–R. Mortier, 5 vols. (Paris 1948–51), IV: *Christianisme Medieval–Réforme Protestante;* J. Pirenne, *Les Grands Courants de l'Histoire Universelle*, 6 vols. (Neuchatel 1939), revised (1944–58); *The New Cambridge Modern History*, ed. G. R. Elton, I–II: *The Reformation (1493–1559)* (Cambridge 1957–58); A. Ballesteros y Beretta, *Historia de España*, 9 vols. (Barcelona 1920–36), I–III in 2, revised (Barcelona 1943–48), IV on Hapsburg Spain (Barcelona 1926–27); J. Janssen, *History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8 vols. (London 1896–1925); O. Brandt–A. O. Meyer, *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte* II (Potsdam 1935–41), newly edited by L. Just, II (Constance 1953), incomplete; B. Gebhardt–H. Grundmann, *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte* II: *Von der Reformation bis zum Ende des Absolutismus* (Stuttgart 1955); H. Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany* I: *The Reformation* (New York 1959).

2. Handbooks of Church History

K. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte* II, 1–2 (Tübingen ^{3}1923); K. Bihlmeyer-H. Tüchle, *Church History* III (Westminster, Md., 1966); G. Krüger, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende* III: H. Hermelink–W. Maurer, *Reformation und Gegenreformation* (Tübingen 1931); K. Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte,* (Tübingen 1960); A. Fliche–V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église* 17: L. Christiani, *L'Église à l'Époque du Concile de Trente* (Paris 1948); 18: *Après le Concile de Trente. La Restauration Catholique (1563–1648)* (Paris 1960); R. G. Villoslada–B. Llorca, *Historia de la Iglesia Católica* III: *La Iglesia en la Época del Renacimiento y de la Reforma Católica* (Madrid 1961); K. D. Schmidt-E. Wolf, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* III, K: F. Lau-E. Bizer, *Reformationsgeschichte Deutschlands bis 1555* (Göttingen 1964); L. J. Rogier et al., *The Christian Centuries* III: H. Tüchle, *Reformation und Gegenreformation* (Einsiedeln 1965).

3. Accounts from the Middle Ages to the Reformation

J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform. 4 Kapitel zur Geschichte des Ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Berlin 1903); R. Stadelmann, *Vom Geist des Ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Halle–Saale 1929); W. E. Peukert, *Die Grosse Wende. Das Apokalyptische Saeculum und Luther* (Hamburg 1948; new impression, Darmstadt 1966); J. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (New York 1937); *The Cambridge Medieval History.* vol. VIII, *The Close of the Middle Ages,* ed. by C. W. Previté-Orton–Z. N. Brooke (Cambridge 1936); W. K. Ferguson, *Europe in Transition 1300–1520* (Boston 1962); S. H. Thompson, *Europe in Renaissance and Reformation* (New York 1963); G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages,* 2 vols. (Manchester 1966); W. Andreas, *Deutschland vor der Reformation. Eine Zeitwende* (Stuttgart–Berlin^{6} 1959); L. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements* (Chicago 1971); A. G. Dickens, *The Age of Humanism and Reformation* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1972).

4. Accounts of the Reformation and of the Counter Reformation

L. von Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Berlin 1839–47). Akadamie-Ausgabe, ed. P. Joachimsen, 6 vols. (Munich 1925–26); I. Doellinger, *Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkung im Umfange des Lutherischen Bekenntnisses,* 3 vols. (Regensburg 1848); W. Maurenbrecher, *Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation* I (Nördlingen 1880); G. Egelhaff, *Deutsche Geschichte im 16. Jahrhundert bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1889–92); Friedrich von Bezold, *Geschichte der Deutschen Reformation* (Berlin 1890); M. Ritter, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1889–1907); P. Imbert de la Tour, *Les Origines de la Réforme,* 3 vols. (Paris 1905–14), vol. I was reprinted in 1944; J. Menyz, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, Gegenreformation, und des 30jährigen Krieges* (Tübingen 1913); E. Fueter, *Geschichte des Europäischen Staatensystems von 1492–1559* (Munich–Berlin 1919); G. Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit* (Paderborn 1937); L. E. Binns, *The Reformation in England* (Hamden ^{2}1966); J. Lortz, *The Reformation in Germany,* 2 vols. (New York 1968); T. W. Windsay, *A History of the Reformation,* 2 vols. (Edinburgh 1948); T. Janelle, *The Catholic Reformation* (Milwaukee, Wis., 1949); K. Eder, *Die Geschichte der Kirche im Zeitalter des Konfessionellen Absolutismus (1555 bis 1648)* (Freiburg–Vienna 1949); G. Ritter, *Die Neugesaltung Europas im 16. Jahrhundert. Die Kirchliche und Staatliche Wandlung im Zeitalter der Reformation und der Glaubenskämpfe*

(Berlin 1950); A. Hymna, *From Renaissance to Reformation* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1951); P. Joachimsen, *Die Reformation als Epoche der Deutschen Geschichte,* ed. Otto Schottenloher (Munich 1951); R. H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Boston 1952); F. H. K. Green, *Renaissance and Reformation* (London 1952); M. Benediscioli, *La Riforma Protestante* (Rome 1952); id., *La Riforma Cattolica* (Rome 1958); H. J. Grimm, *The Reformation Era (1500–1650)* (New York 1973; extensive literature); E. H. Harbison, *The Age of Reformation* (New York 1955); H. Rössler, *Europa im Zeitalter von Renaissance, Reformation, und Gegenreformation (1450–1650)* (Munich 1956); K. Brandi, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation* (Munich^3 1960); E. G. Léonard, *Histoire Générale du Protestantisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1961), vol. I in English translation, *The Reformation* (London 1965); H. E. van Gelder, *The Two Reformations in the 16th Century* (The Hague 1961); W. Durant, *The Reformation* (New York 1957); R. Rousse–S. C. Neill, *History of the Ecumenical Movement* (London 1954); G. R. Elton, *Reformation Europe 1517–59* (London 1963); H. Lutz, *Christianitas Afflicta. Europa, das Reich und die Päpstliche Politik im Niedergang der Hegemonie Kaiser Karls V* (Göttingen 1964); E. Hassinger, *Das Werden des Neuzeitlichen Europa, 1300–1600* (Braunschweig 1964); A. G. Dickens, *Reformation and Society in Sixteenth Century Europe* (London 1966); O. Chadwick, *The Reformation* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965); H. Koenigsberger–G. Mosse, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (New York 1968); G. Swanson, *Religion and Regime: A Sociological Account of the Reformation* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1967); J. P. Dolan, *History of the Reformation. A Conciliatory Assessment of Opposite Views* (New York 1965); F. Braudel, *The Meditterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II,* 2 vols. (New York 1972).

5. PAPAL AND CONCILIAR HISTORY

L. von Ranke, *History of the Popes,* 3 vols. (London 1873); L. von Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages,* 40 vols. (London 1891), esp. vols. VIII to XXX; F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste* IV–V, revised by G. Schwaiger (Munich 1957–59); C. J. Hefele–H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* VIII: *1472–1536* (Paris 1917–21); IX: *Concile de Trente* (Paris 1930–31); X: *Les Décrets du Concile de Trente* (Paris 1938); H. Jedin, *Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church,* (St. Louis 1960); id., *A History of the Council of Trent* I: *Council and Reform from the Council of Basle to the Lateran Council;* II: *The First Sessions at Trent 1545–47* (Freiburg 1951); id., *Das Konzil von Trient. Ein Überblick über die Erforschung seiner Geschichte* (Rome 1948); K. Repgen, *Die Römische Kurie und der Westfälische Friede. Idee und Wirklichkeit des Papsttums im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* I: *Papst, Kaiser, und Reich 1521–1644,* 2 parts (Tübingen 1962, 1965).

6. LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht,* 7 vols. (Regensburg 1845–72); VIII by F. Vering (ibid. 1889); F. v. Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des Canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart 1877–80; new impression, Graz 1956); P. Hinschius, *System des katholischen Kirchenrechts* I–VI (Berlin 1869–97; new impression, Graz 1959); R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1892–1923); J. B. Sägmüller, *Lehrbuch des kath. Kirchenrechts,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1914); J. Freisen, *Verfassungsgeschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands in der Neuzeit* (Leipzig–Berlin 1917); G. Holstein, *Die Grundlagen des evangelischen Kirchenrechts* (Tübingen 1928); E. Sehling, *Geschichte der protestantischen Kirchenverfassung* (Leipzig–Berlin 1930); B. Kurtscheid, *Historia iuris canonici,* 2 vols. (Rome 1941–43); F. Hartung, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart 1959); H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte. Die katholische Kirche*

(Cologne–Graz 1964; Lit.); E. Wolf, *Ordnung der Kirche. Lehr- und Handbuch des Kirchenrechts auf ökumenischer Grundlage* (Frankfurt 1961); H. Dombois, *Das Recht der Gnade. Ökumenisches Kirchenrecht* I (Witten 1961); W. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* III: *Das katholische Kirchenrecht der Neuzeit* (Vienna 1959).

7. RELIGIOUS ORDERS

P. Hélyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires,* 8 vols. (Paris 1714–19); M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der kath. Kirche,* 3 vols. (Paderborn 1933–34); G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion,* 4 vols. (Cambridge 1923–50) (from the eleventh cent. on); M. Escobar, *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose,* 2 vols. (Turin 1951–53); D. Pflanzer (ed.), *Orden der Kirche,* to date 4 vols. (Fribourg 1955ff.); J. Hasenberg–A. Wienand, *Das Wirken der Orden und Klöster in Deutschland* (Cologne 1957); Ph. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benôit,* 6 vols. (Maredeous I–II; III–VI 1948–49); dt.: *Geschichte des Benediktinerordens,* 5 vols. (Einsiedeln 1947ff.); St. Hilpisch, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums* (Freiburg 1929); id., *Geschichte der Benediktinerinnen* (St. Ottilien 1951); E. Martène, *Histoire de la Congrégation de St-Maure,* 9 vols. (Ligugé–Paris 1928–43); B. Grassl, *Die Prämonstratenserorden* (Tongerloo 1934); L. Lekai–A. Schneider, *Geschichte und Wirken der weissen Mönche* (Cologne 1958); A. M. Rossi, *Manuale di Storia dell'Ordine dei Servi di Maria* (Rome 1956); H. Holzapfel, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens* (Freiburg 1909); Th. Ferrée, *Histoire de l'ordre de S. François* (Reims 1921); Lázaro de Aspurz, *Manual de historia franciscana* (Madrid 1954); A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux do l'ordre des frères prêcheurs* (Paris 1903ff.); A. Walz, *Compendium historiae ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome^{2} 1948); D. A. Perini, *Bibliographia Augustiniana,* 4 vols. (Florence 1929–35); P. Cuthbert–J. Wildlöcher, *Die Kapuziner* (Munich 1931); Bernardinus a Colpetrazzo, *Historia ordinis fratrum minorum Capuccinorum 1525–93,* 3 vols. (Rome 1939–41); Melchior a Pobladura, *Historia generalis ordinis fratrum minorum Capuccinorum,* 2 vols. (Rome 1947–48); Th. Graf, *Zur Entstehung des Kapuzinerordens* (Olten 1940); id., *Die Kapuziner* (Fribourg 1957); B. Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge,* 4 vols. (Freiburg 1907–28); T. Sévérin, *L'épopée des Jesuits* (Liege ^{2}1946); P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* (Rome 1950); R. G. Villoslada, *Manual de Historia de la Compagnia de Jesús* (Madrid 1954); H. Becher, *Die Jesuiten* (Munich 1961); O. Kapsner, *Catholic Religious Orders* (Collegeville, Minn., 1948); P. Kunkel, *The Theatines in the History of the Catholic Reform Before the Establishment of Lutheranism* (Wash., D. C. 1941); C. Hess, *The Capuchins* (New York 1929); Sr. M. Monica, *Angela Merici and Her Teaching Idea,* (London 1927); M. Jounandeau, *St. Philip Neri* (New York 1961); J. de Guibert, *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice* (Chicago 1964); R. Huber, *A Documented History of the Franciscan Order, 1182–1517* (Wash., D. C. 1941); L. Lekai, *The Cistercians* (Kent State, Ohio 1977); W. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominicans* I (New York 1966).

8. HISTORY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITIES, SCHOOLS, CULTURE

E. Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts an den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1919–21); J. van den Driesch–J. Esterhues, *Geschichte der Erziehung und Bildung,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1956–57); A. C. Crombie, *Augustine to Galileo. The History of Science 400–1560* (London 1957); St. de Irsay, *Histoire des universités françaises et étrangères des origines à nos jours,* 2 vols. (Paris 1933–35); P. Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres, Époque moderne,* 7 vols. (Paris 1890–1909); Th. Muther, *Aus dem Universitäts-und*

Gelehrtenleben im Zeitalter der Reformation (Erlangen 1866); G. Kaufmann, *Zwei katholische und zwei protestantische Universitäten vom 16–18. Jahrhundert* (Ingolstadt–Wittenberg–Helmstedt–Freiburg i. Br.) (Munich 1920); H. Rückert, *Die Stellung der Reformation zur mittelalterlichen Universität* (Die Universität, Stuttgart 1933); L. Petry, "Die Reformation als Epoche der deutschen Universitätsgeschichte. Eine Zwischenbilanz" *Festgabe J. Lortz,* ed., E. Iserloh–P. Manns (Wiesbaden 1958), II: *Glaube und Geschichte,* 317–353; E. Bonjour, *Die Universität Basel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart 1460–1960* (Basel 1960); M. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition,* 1558–1642 (Oxford 1959); H. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (New York 1959); H. Barycz, *Historja Uniwersytetu Jagiellonskiego w epoce Humanizmu* (Cracow, 1935); N. Wood, *The Reformation and English Education* (London 1931). For art history of the period: *The Pelican History of Art:* A. Blunt, *France, 1500–1700* (London 1953); H. K. Gerson–E. H. Kuile, *Belgium, 1600–1800* (London 1960); E. Hempel, *Central Europe, 1600–1800* (London 1965); G. Kubler–M. Soria, *Spain and Portugal, 1500–1800* (London 1959); J. Rosenberg, *Dutch Art and Architecture, 1600–1800* (London 1966); J. H. Summerson, *Britain, 1530–1830* (London 1953); R. Wittkower, *Italy; 1600–1750* (London 1958). On Music: *The New Oxford History of Music: Ars Nova and the Renaissance, 1300–1540,* III; *The Age of Humanism, 1540–1630,* IV (Oxford 1954–1968). H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,* (n.ed. in 3 vols. by F. Powicke–A. Emben) (Oxford 1958).

9. THE HISTORY OF DOGMA AND THEOLOGY

L. Maimbourg, *Histoire du Lutheranisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1680); G. J. Planck, *Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfang der Reformation bis zur Einführung der Concordienformel,* 6 vols. (Leipzig 1791–1800); id., *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie von der Konkordienformel an bis in die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen 1831); J. A. Möhler, *Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnisschriften* (Mainz 1832), critical edition by J. R. Geiselmann, 2 vols. (Cologne 1958–61); H. Laemmer, *Die vortridentinische-katholische Theologie des Reformations-Zeitalters* (Berlin 1858; new impression, Frankfurt a. M. 1966); K. Werner, *Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Literatur der christlichen Theologie,* 5 vols. (Schaffhausen 1861–67); id., *Geschichte der kath. Theologie seit dem Trienter Concil bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich–Leipzig 1889; new impression, Hildesheim 1965); J. A. Dorner, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie, besonders in Deutschland* (Munich 1867; new impression, Hildesheim 1965); O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus,* 4 vols. (Göttingen 1908–27); A. v. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* 3 vols. ([1885–89] Tübingen 1931–32); F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* ([1889] Tübingen 1959); R. Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines,* 2 vols. (Philadelphia 1905); P. Wernle, *Der evangelische Glaube nach den Hauptschriften der Reformatoren,* 3 vols. (Luther, Zwingli, Calvin) (Tübingen 1918–19); E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches,* 2 vols. (New York 1949); W. Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums* I: *Theologie und Weltanschauung des Luthertums hauptsächlich im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert,* II: *Soziallehren und Sozialwirkungen des Luthertums* (München [1931], 1952–53). English trans. of Vol. 1: *The Structure of Lutheranism: The Theology and Philosophy of Life of Lutheranism,* (St. Louis 1962); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg 1933); H. E. Weber, *Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus,* 2 vols. in 3 parts (Gütersloh 1937–40–51; new impression, Darmstadt 1966); C. Giacon, *La seconda scolastica,* 3 vols. (Milan 1946–50); W. Koehler, *Dogmengeschichte. Von den Anfängen bis zur Reformation* (Zurich 1951); id., *Dogmengeschichte. Das Zeital-*

ter der Reformation (Zurich 1951); E. Hirsch, *Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie im Zusammenhang mit den allg. Bewegungen des europ. Denkens,* 5 vols. (Gütersloh 1964); M. Werner, *Der protestantische Weg des Glaubens,* 2 vols. (Bern 1955–62); M. Schmaus–J. R. Geiselmann–A. Grillmeier, *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg 1951ff.); P. Jacobs, *Theologie reformierter Bekenntnisschriften in Grundzügen* (Neukirchen 1959); H. A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963); F. Stegmüller, *Geschichte des Molinismus* I (Munich 1935).

10. HAGIOGRAPHY AND ICONOGRAPHY

R. Aigrain, *L'Hagiographie. Ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire* (Paris 1953); P. Peeters, *L'oeuvre des Bollandistes* (Brüssel 1961); F. Doye, *Heilige und Selige der römisch-katholischen Kirche. Deren Erkennungszeichen, Patronate und lebensgeschichtliche Bemerkungen,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1929); J. Baudot et Chaussin, *Vies des Saints et des Bienheureux selon l'ordre du calendrier avec l'historique des fêtes,* 13 vols. (Paris 1935–59); J. Torsy, *Lexikon der deutschen Heiligen* (Köln 1959); P. Manns (ed.), *Die Heiligen in ihrer Zeit* (Mainz 1967); *Bibliotheca Sanctorum,* ed. Istituto Giovanni XXIII, to date 8 vols. (A-Mar) (Rome 1961–67); K. Künstle, *Iconographie der christlichen Kunst,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1926–28); J. Braun, *Tracht und Attribute der Heiligen in der deutschen Kunst* (Stuttgart 1943); L. Réau, *Iconographie de l'art chrétien,* 3 vols. (Paris 1955–58).

11. LITURGY

Liturgisch Woordenboek, ed. L. Brinkhoff et al., 2 vols. (Roermond 1962ff.); L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgie,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br.^{2} 1941); J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite, History of the Liturgy,* Vol. I trans. F. A. Brunner (New York 1951); M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica,* 4 vols. (Milan: I, 1950; II, 1955; III, 1964; IV, 1955); A. G. Martimort, *Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft* I (Freiburg 1963); Th. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte. Bericht u. Besinnung* (Bonn 1965); *Leiturgia, Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes,* ed. K. F. Müller–W. Blankenburg, 4 vols. (Kassel 1954–61); P. Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands,* 2 vols. (Göttingen 1937–39); Ph. Wackernagel. *Das dt. Kirchenlied von der ältesten Zeit bis zu Anfang des 17. Jahrhunderts,* 5 vols. (Leipzig 1864–77); W. Bäumker, *Das katholische deutsche Kirchenlied in seinen Singweisen von den frühesten Zeiten bis gegen Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts,* 4 vols. (Freiburg 1883–1911).

12. MISSIONS

J. Schmidlin, *Katholische Missionsgeschichte* (Steyl o. J. [1925]); *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques* I–II, ed. S. Delacroix (Paris 1956–57); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* III (New York–London 1939); A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte. Die Ausbreitung des katholischen Glaubens* (Regensburg 1960); A. Jann, *Die Katholischen Missionen in Indien, China und Japan. Ihre Organisation und das portugisische Patronat vom 15. bis 18. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn 1915); R. Aubenas–R. Ricard, *L'Église et la renaissance:* Fliche-Jarry XV (Paris 1951).

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One

The Protestant Reformation

SECTION ONE

Martin Luther and the Coming of the Reformation (1517–25)

1. *Causes of the Reformation*

Literature

G. v. Below, *Die Ursachen der Reformation* (Munich 1917); J. Haller, *Die Ursachen der Reformation* (Tübingen 1917); J. Hashagen, *Staat und Kirche vor der Reformation* (Essen 1931); W. Andreas, *Deutschland vor der Reformation* (Stuttgart 1932, 1948); J. Lortz, *Die Reformation als religiöses Anliegen heute* (Trier 1948); id., *Wie kam es zur Reformation?* (Einsiedeln 1955); id., *Zur Problematik der kirchlichen Missstände im Spätmittelalter* (Trier 1950: SD from *TThZ* 58, 1949); H. Rückert, "Die geistesgeschichtliche Einordnung der Reformation" *ZThK* 52 (1955) 43–64; R. Post, *Kerkelijke verhoudingen voor de Reformatie* (Utrecht 1955); L. Spitz, *The Reformation: Material or Spiritual* (Boston 1962) selections of recent interpretations; H. J. Grimm, "Social Forces in the German Reformation" *CH* XXXI (1962) 3–13; H. A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation* (New York 1966).

2. *Martin Luther: The Early Years*

Sources

The first edition of Luther's collected works appeared during his own lifetime at the insistence of the Saxon Elector Johann Friedrich and his friends. This Wittenberg edition appeared in German in fifteen volumes between 1539 and 1559 and a Latin edition in seven volumes appeared between 1545 and 1557. The Jena edition, more complete and reliable, appeared between 1555 and 1558, eight volumes in German and four in

Latin. J. Aurifaber edited a "Comprehensive Eisleben" addition to the Jena volumes in 1564–1565. Meanwhile, the ten-volume Altenburg edition with a better chronological order and an index appeared. This was enlarged in 1702 by J. G. Zeidler in his Halle Supplement. The Altenburg, Eisleben, and Halle volumes formed the basis for the twenty-two-volume Leipzig edition which appeared between 1728 and 1734. Johann Georg Walch published the twenty-four-volume Halle edition between 1740 and 1753 which included introductory material as well as other reformatory writings including those of the opponents of Luther. The Latin works were translated into German. In 1826 Johann Georg Plochmann and Johann Konrad Irmischer began the Erlangen edition. The German section contains some sixty-seven volumes of which volumes 1–20 and 24–26 were revised by E. L. Enders (1862–85). The Latin section remained incomplete with thirty-eight volumes. To this was added the correspondence in nineteen volumes (Frankfurt, 1884–1932) edited by E. L. Enders, G. Kawerau, and P. Fleming. Due to the great advances made in Luther studies, the Erlangen edition was outdated before its completion. Hence J. F. K. Knaake during the jubilee year of 1883 began the new critical Weimar edition (*Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Ausgabe*). After completing the first two volumes himself he was forced to call upon the assistance of collaborators among philologists and theologians. The project consists of the chief writings, sermons, lectures, and disputations arranged in chronological order with critical footnotes. By 1921 the *Table Talk* was finished in six volumes; the Works fill an entire sixty-nine volumes; the Letters comprise eleven volumes and the German Bible ranges over twelve volumes. The first part of volume 58, released in 1948, is an index of previous volumes. The first, Lectures on the Psalms (1513–15) *WA* 3 and 4, was revised and other volumes have been photographically reproduced; vol. 32 in 1963; 33 in 1961; vol. 40, 1st and 2nd sections, in 1962. The new editions do not contain the emendations, supplements, citations, and indices, rather they are found in additional revisions published separately. The Berlin student edition "Luthers Werke in Auswahl" (four vols. Berlin ^{6}1966) and a compendium 1950–55 by O. Clemen, E. Vogelsang, and E. Hirsch is based upon the Weimar edition.

ENGLISH EDITIONS: The "Philadelphia Edition" *Works of Martin Luther,* ed. by H. E. Jacobs, 6 vols. (Philadelphia 1915–43). *Luther's Correspondence* (selections), ed. by P. Smith, 2 vols. (Philadelphia 1913–18). An American edition of *Luther's Works in English* (LW) St. Louis, 1955ff. by J. Pelikan is in the process of completion. As planned it will include fifty-five volumes. The first thirty volumes are to contain Luther's expositions of various Biblical works, the remaining volumes will contain his Reformation writings and other occasional pieces. The final volume will be an index, quotes, proper names, topics, and a glossary of technical terms. Volume 26 (1963) contains Luther's lectures on Galatians (1535) chaps. 1–4. The Library of Christian Classics also contains a number of Luther's works in translation, including his Lecture on Romans, Scholea vol. XV (Philadelphia 1961) and vol. XVI (Philadelphia 1962). Early Theological Works containing Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews 1517–18, disputation against "Scholastic Theology" 1517, Heidelberg Disputation, 1518, and Answer to Latomus (poor translation) appeared in *Works of Martin Luther* (WML, Philadelphia 1965).

GUIDE TO LUTHER'S WORKS AND EDITIONS: G. Kawerau, *Luthers Schriften* (SVRG 147) (Leipzig ^{2}1929); K. Aland, *Hilfsbuch zum Lutherstudium* (Berlin ^{2}1958); H. Volz, *RGG* IV (^{3}1960) 520–523 (lit.); G. S. Robert, "A Checklist of Luther's Writings in English" *Concordia Theological Monthly* XXXVI (1965) 772–792; K. Hagen and J. Bigane, *Annotated Bibliography of Luther Studies, 1967–1976* (Sixteenth Century Bibliography, No. 9) (St. Louis 1977).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LITERATURE

1. BIOGRAPHIES AND GENERAL WORKS: J. Köstlin–G. Kawerau, *Martin Luther. Sein Leben und seine Schriften,* 2 vols. (Berlin ^{5}1903); H. Denifle, *Luther und Luthertum,* 2 vols. and 2 suppl. (Mainz 1904–9); Grisar, 3 vols. (Freiburg 1924–25) English trans. 6 vols. (London 1913–17); id., *Martin Luthers Leben und sein Werk* (Freiburg 1927); K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze KG* I: *Luther* (Tübingen 1948); G. Ritter, *Luther* (New York 1963); R. Thiel, *Luther* (1933–35, Berlin–Stuttgart 1952); J. Lortz, *Reformation* (Westminister, Md. 1964); P. J. St. Reiter, *Martin Luther's Umwelt, Charakter und Psychose,* 2 vols. (Copenhagen 1937–41); R. H. Bainton, *Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther* (New York 1950); H. Bornkamm, *Luther's World of Thought* (London 1958); id., *Das Jh. der Reformation* (Göttingen 1961); H. Fausel, *Martin Luther. Sein Werden im Spiegel eigener Zeugnisse* (Stuttgart 1955); F. Lau, *Luther* (Philadelphia 1963); J. Mackinnon, *Martin Luther and the Reformation,* 4 vols. (London 1925–30); H. Boehmer, *Road to Reformation* (St. Louis 1946); R. H. Fife, *The Revolt of Martin Luther* (New York 1957); G. Rupp, *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms* (New York 1964); E. S. Schweibert, *Luther and His Times* (St. Louis 1950); V. H. H. Green, *Luther and the Reformation* (London 1964).

2. LUTHER'S THEOLOGY: Th. Harnack, *Luthers Theologie mit besonderer Beziehung auf seine Versöhnunge- und Erlösungslehre,* 2 vols. (1862–86, new printing, Munich 1927); J. Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und ihrem inneren Zusammenhang,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1901); R. Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte* IV, 1 (Leipzig 1933, new printing, Basel 1953); E. Seeburg, *Luthers Theol.* I: *Die Gottesanschauung* (Göttingen 1929), II: *Christus* (Stuttgart 1937); id., *Luthers Theologie in ihren Grundzügen* (Stuttgart 1950); W. v. Loewenich, *Luthers Theologia crucis* (Munich 1954); Ph. S. Watson, *Um Gottes Gottheit. Einf. in Luthers Theologie* (Berlin 1952); R. Hermann, *Gesammelte Studien zur Theologie Luthers* (Göttingen 1960); R. Prenter, *Spiritus Creator, Studien zu Luthers Theologie* (Munich 1954); E. Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1964) 221–306; W. Ebert, *The Structure of Lutheranism* (St. Louis 1962); J. Pelikan, *Obedient Rebels* (New York 1964); J. Dillenberger, *God, Hidden and Revealed* (Philadelphia 1953); J. M. Headley, *Luther's View of Church History* (New Haven 1963); P. Althaus, *Die Theologie M. Luthers* (Gütersloh 1963); id., *Die Ethik M. Luthers* (Gütersloh 1965); L. Pinomaa, *Sieg des Glaubens, Grundlinien der Theologie Luthers* (Göttingen 1964); I. Asheim (ed.), *Kirche, Mystik, Heiligung und das Natürliche bei Luther* (Göttingen 1967).

3. LUTHER STUDIES: H. Boehmer, *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung* (Leipzig 1906, 1918); E. Wolf, "Über neuere Lutherliteratur u. den Gang der Lutherforschung" *Christentum und Wissenschaft* 10 (1934) 6–21, 203–219, 259–273, 437–457; H. Hermelink, "Die neuere Lutherforschung" *ThR NF* 7 (1935) 63–85, 131–165; V. Vajta, *Lutherforschung heute* (Berlin 1958) contains summaries of research in various countries, presented at first International Congress for Luther Research at Arhus, Denmark, 1956; D. Löfgren, "Verschiedene Tendenzen in der neueren Lutherforschung" *KuD* 5 (1959) 146–164; G. Müller, "Neuere Lit. zur Theologie des jungen Luther" *KuD* 11 (1965) 325–357; W. Pauck, "The Historiography of the German Reformation in the Past Twenty Years" *CH* IX (1940) 305–340; J. Dillenberger, "Major Volumes and Selected Periodical Literature in Luther Studies, 1956–1959" *CH* XXX (1961) 61–87; H. Grimm, "Luther Research Since 1920" *Journal of Modern History* XXXII (1960) 105–118; id., *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (New York 1946).

4. HISTORY OF THE UNDERSTANDING OF LUTHER: H. Stephan, *Luther in den*

Wandlungen seiner Kirche (1907, Berlin 1951); O. Wolff, *Die Haupttypen der neueren Lutherdeutung* (Stuttgart 1938); A. Herte, *Das kath. Lutherbild im Bann der Lutherkommentare des Cochläus,* 3 vols. (Münster 1943); E. W. Zeeden, *Martin Luther and the Reformation in the Estimation of the German Lutherans* (London 1954) id., "Die Deutung Luthers und der Reformation" *ThQ* 140 (1960) 129–162; H. Bornkamm, *Luther im Spiegel dt. Geistesgeschichte* (Heidelberg 1952); English trans. *Luther's World of Thought* (St. Louis 1958); W. Seibel, *Martin Luther. Wandlungen des Lutherbildes* (Kevelaer 1962); *Wandlungen des Lutherbildes, Stud. u. Ber. d. kath. Akad. in Bayern,* ed. K. Foster, H. 36 (Würzburg 1966). E. Carlson, *The Reinterpretation of Luther* (Philadelphia 1948).

5. The Young Luther: O. Scheel, *Martin Luther. Vom Katholizismus zur Reformation,* 2 vols. (Tübingen 1921–30); id., *Dokumente zu Luthers Entwicklung* (Tübingen 1929); H. v. Schubert, *Luthers Frühentwicklung bis 1517* (Leipzig 1916); E. Wolf, *Staupitz und Luther* (Leipzig 1927); id., "Johann v. Staupitz und die theol. Anfänge Luthers" *LuJ* II (1929) 43–86; H. Boehmer, *Road to Reformation* (Philadelphia 1946); K. A. Meissinger, *Der kath. Luther* (Munich 1952); M. Werner, "Psychologisches zum Klostererlebnis Martin Luthers" *Schweizer Zschr. für Psychologie* 7 (1948) 1–18; F. Lau, "Luthers Eintritt ins Erfurter Augustinerkloster" *Luther* 27 (1956) 49–70; E. Iserloh, "Luther-Kritik oder Luther-Polemik?" *Festgabe J. Lortz* I (Baden-Baden 1958) 15–42; E. H. Erikson, *Young Man Luther* (New York 1962); H. Strohl, *Luther jusqu'en 1520* (Paris ^{2}1962); S. Rupp, *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms* (New York ^{2}1962); J. von Rohr, "The Sources of Luther's Self-despair in the Monastery" *Journal of Bible and Religion* XIX (1951) 6–11; R. Bainton, "Luther's Struggle for Faith" *CH* XVIII, 193–206.

6. Luther and the Theology of the Late Middle Ages: F. Benary, *Zur Geschichte der Stadt und Universität Erfurt* ("via antiqua" and "via moderna" at the German universities of the Middle Ages with special attention to the University of Erfurt) (Gotha 1919); H. Rommel, *Über Luthers Randbemerkungen* (Diss., Kiel 1931); A. Hamel, *Der junge Luther und Augustin,* 2 vols. (1934–35); P. Vignaux, *Luther: Commentateur des Sentences* (Paris 1935); id., "Sur Luther et Ockham" *FStud* 32 (1950) 21—30; E. Vogelsang, "Luther und die Mystik" *LuJ* 19 (1937) 32–54; W. Kohlschmidt, *Luther und die Mystik* (Diss., Hamburg 1936); W. Link, *Das Ringen Luthers um die Freiheit der Theologie von der Philosophie* (Munich 1955); R. Weijenborg, "La Charité dans la première théologie de Luther" *RHE* 45 (1950) 617–669; A. Gyllenkrok, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung in der frühen ev. Theologie Luthers* (Uppsala 1952); W. Jetter, *Die Taufe beim jungen Luther* (Tübingen 1954); B. Hägglund, *Theologie und Philosophie bei Luther und in der occamistischen Tradition* (Lund 1955); E. Iserloh, *Gnade und Eucharistie in der philos. Theologie des W. v. Ockham* (Wiesbaden 1956); H. Beintker, "Neues Material über die Beziehungen Luthers zum ma. Augustinismus" *ZKG* 68 (1957) 144–148; E. Bizer, *Fides ex auditu* (Neukirchen 1958); L. Grane, *Contra Gabrielem* (Byldendal 1962); R. Schwarz, *Fides, spes und caritas beim jungen Luther* (Berlin 1962); K. Bauer, *Die Wittenberger Universitätstheologie und die Anfänge der Reformation* (Tubingen 1928); A. Zumkeller, "Die Augustinertheologen Simon Fidati von Cascia u. Hugolin von Orvieto u. M. Luthers Kritik an Aristoteles" *ARG* 54 (1963) 15–36.

7. Luther's Journey to Rome: H. Boehmer, *Luthers Romfahrt* (Leipzig 1913); R. Weijenborg, "Neuentdeckte Dokumente im Zshg. mit Luthers Romreise" *Antonianum* 32 (1957) 147–202.

8. Lecture on Psalms: Text: *WA* 3; 4; Selection *Cl* V, 38–221; *LW* vols. 12, 13, and 14. Literature: A. W. Hunzinger, *Luthers Neuplatonismus in der Psalmen-Vorlesung von 1513–16* (Leipzig 1906); K. A. Meissinger, *Luthers Exegese der Frühzeit* (Leipzig

1911); H. Thomas, *Zur Würdigung der Psalmen-Vorlesung Luthers von 1513–15* (Weimar 1920); H. Boehmer, *Luthers 1. Vorlesung* (Leipzig 1924); J. Ficker, "Luthers 1. Vorlesung -welche?" *ThStk* 100 (1927–28) 348–353; E. Vogelsang, *Die Anfänge von Luthers Christologie nach der 1. Psalmen-Vorlesung* (Berlin–Leipzig 1929); H. Lang, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers 1. Psalmen-Vorlesung" *NKZ* 40 (1929) 549–564; F. Huck, "Die Entwicklung der Christologie Luthers von der Psalmen- zur Römervorlesung" *ThStK* 102 (1930) 61–142; A. Hamel, *Der junge Luther und Augustin,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh 1934–35); W. Wagner, "Die Kirche als Corpus Christi mysticum beim jungen Luther" *ZKTh* 61 (1937) 29–98; F. Hahn, "Faber Stapulensis und Luther" *ZKG* 57 (1938) 356–432; id., "Die Hl. Schrift als Problem der Auslegung bei Luther" *EvTh* 10 (1950) 407–424; G. Ebeling, *Ev. Evangelienauslegung. Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik* (Munich 1942); id., "Die Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik" *ZThK* 48 (1951) 172–230; id., "Luthers Psalterdruck vom Jahre 1513" *ZThK* 50 (1953) 43–99; id., "Luthers Auslegung des 14.(15.) Ps in der 1. Psalmen-Vorlesung im Vergleich mit der exegetischen Tradition" *ZThK* 50 (1953) 280–339; H. Volz, "Luthers Arbeit am lateinischen Psalter" *ARG* 48 (1957) 11–56; U. Saarnivaara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel* (St. Louis 1951); J. Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor* (St. Louis 1959); A. Brandenburg, *Gericht und Evangelium* (Paderborn 1960); Also, E. Iserloh, "Existentiale Interpretation" in "Luthers 1. Psalmen-Vorlesung?" *ThRv* 59 (1963) 73–84; R. Prenter, *Der barmherzige Richter. Iustitia dei passiva in Luthers Dictata super Psalterium 1513–15* (Copenhagen 1961); S. Raeder, *Das Hebräische bei Luther bis zum Ende der 1. Ps-Vorlesung* (Tübingen 1961); G. Müller, "Ekklesiologie u. Kirchenkritik beim jungen Luther" *NZSTh* 7 (1965) 100–128.

9. Lecture on the Epistle to the Romans: Text: *WA* 56; Selection *Cl.* V, 222–304; German Translation by: E. Ellwein (Munich 1957); Italian-German Edition: 2 vols. (Darmstadt 1960); English: W. Pauck, *Christian Classics* XV. Literature: K. Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief" *Gesammelte Aufsätze* I, 111–154; F. W. Schmidt, "Der Gottesgedanke in Luthers Römerbrief-Vorlesung" *ThStK* 93 (1920–21) 117–248; H. Lang, "Die Bedeutung Christi für die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Römerbrief-Vorlesung" *NKZ* 39 (1928) 509–547; R. Hermann, *Luthers These "Gerechte und Sünder zugleich"* (1930, new printing Gütersloh 1960); A. K. Wood, "The Theology of Luther's Lecture on Romans" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 3 (1950) 1–18, 113–126; J. Hilburg, *Luthers Frömmigkeit in seiner Vorlesung über den Römerbrief* (Diss., Marburg 1951); P. Althaus, *Paulus und Luther* (Gütersloh 1958); H. Beintker, "Glaube und Handeln nach Luthers Verständnis des Römerbriefs" *LuJ* 28 (1961) 52–85; J. Lortz, "Luthers Römerbrief-Vorlesung" *TThZ* 71 (1962) 129–153, 216–247; M. Lienhard, "Christologie et humilité dans la Theologia du commentaire de l'Épître aux Romains du Luther" *RHPhR* 42 (1962) 304–315; W. Grundmann, *Der Römerbrief . . . und seine Auslegung durch M. Luther* (Weimar 1964); H. Hübner, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung in Luthers Römerbrief-Vorlesung* (Witten 1965).

10. Lecture on the Epistle to the Galatians: Text: *WA* 57, II; Selection *Cl* V, 327–343. Literature: H. v. Schubert–K. A. Meissinger, *Zu Luthers Vorlesungstätigkeit* (Heidelberg 1920); J. Ficker, "Zu Luthers Vorlesung über den Galaterbrief 1516–17" *ThStK* 88–89 (1926) 1–17; L. Grane, "Lov og nåde in Luthers Galaterbrevsforelaesning 1516–17," *Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift* 50 (1954) 107–122; H. Volz, "Eine neue studentische Nachschrift von Luthers 1. Galaterbrief-Vorlesung" *ZKG* 66 (1954–55) 72–96.

11. Lecture on the Epistle to the Hebrews: Text: *WA* 57, III; Selection *Cl* V, 344–374; E. Hirsch–H. Rückert, *Luthers Vorlesung über den Hebräerbrief* (Berlin–Leipzig

1929); J. Ficker, *Luthers Vorlesung über den Hebräerbrief* (Leipzig 1929); trans. E. Vogelsang (Berlin–Leipzig 1930); trans. G. Helbig (Leipzig 1930); *Library of Christian Classics,* vol. 16, contains Disputation against Scholastic Theology, etc. Literature: E. Vogelsang, *Die Bedeutung der neuveröffentlichten Hebräerbrief- Vorlesung Luthers von 1517–18* (Tübingen 1930); E. Ellwein, "Die Entfaltung der Theologia crucis in Luthers Hebräerbrief-Vorlesung" *Theologische Aufsätze, K. Barth zum 50. Geburtstag* (Munich 1936) 382–404.

12. REFORMATION EXPERIENCE: IUSTITIA DEI: E. Stracke, *Luthers grosses Selbstzeugnis 1545* (Leipzig 1926); H. Bornkamm, "Luthers Bericht über seine Entdeckung der iustitia dei" *ARG* 37 (1940) 117–128; id., "Iustitia Dei in der Scholastik und bei Luther" *ARG* 39 (1942) 1–46; id., "Zur Frage der Iustitia beim jungen Luther" *ARG* 52 (1961) 16–29, 53 (1962) 1–59; E. Bizer, *Fides ex auditu* (Newkirchen 1966); G. Pfeiffer, "Das Ringen des jungen Luthers um die Gerechtigkeit Gottes" *LuJ* 26 (1959) 25–55; A. Peters, "Luthers Turmerlebnis" *Neue ZSTh* 3 (1961) 203–236; E. Hirsch, *Initium theologiae Lutheri: Lutherstudien* II (Gütersloh 1954) 9–34; E. G. Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (London 1953); F. E. Cranz, *An Essay on the Development of Luther's Thought on Justice, Law and Society* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959); K. Aland, *Der Weg zur Reformation* (Munich 1965); O. Pesch, "Zur Frage nach Luthers reformatorischer Wende" *Catholica* 20 (1966) 216–243, 264–280.

3. *The Indulgence Controversy*

LITERATURE

LThK ^{2}I (1957) 46–54; N. Paulus, *Geschichte des Ablasses im Mittelalter vom Ursprung bis zur Mitte des 14. Jh.,* 3 vols. (Paderborn 1922–23); B. Porschmann, *Der Ablass im Lichte der Bussgeschichte* (Bonn 1948); id., *Penance and the Annointing of the Sick* (London–New York 1964).

THE INDULGENCE CONTROVERSY: N. Paulus, *Johannes Tetzel, der Ablassprediger* (Mainz 1899); W. Köhler, *Dokumente zum Ablassstreit von 1517* (Tübingen 1934); E. Göller, *Der Ausbruch der Reformation und die spätmittelalterliche Ablasspraxis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1917); A. Schulte, *Die Fugger in Rom 1495–1523,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1904); G. v. Pölnitz, *Jakob Fugger,* 2 vols. (Tübingen 1949–51); H. Volz, *Martin Luthers Thesenanschlag und dessen Vorgeschichte* (Vienna 1959) (lit.); E. Iserloh, *Luthers Thesenanschlag. Tatsache oder Legende?* (Wiesbaden 1962); English: *The Theses Were Not Posted* (Boston 1968; id., *Luther zwischen Reform und Reformation* (Münster 1966); K. Aland, *Martin Luthers 95 Thesen* (Hamburg 1965); English: *Martin Luther's Theses* (St. Louis 1967); K. Honselmann, *Urfassung und Drucke der Ablassthesen M. Luthers und ihre Veröffentlichung* (Paderborn 1966); F. Lau, "Die gegenwärtige Diskussion um Luthers Thesenanschlag," *LuJ* 34 (1967) 11–59; H. Bornkamm, *Thesen und Thesenanschlag Luthers* (Berlin 1967).

4. *Rome's Proceedings against Luther and the Leipzig Disputation*

LITERATURE

THE PROCESS: K. Müller, "Luthers römischer Prozess" *ZKG* 24 (1903) 46–85; P. Kalkoff, *Forschungen zu Luthers römischem Prozess* (Rome 1905); id., "Zu Luthers römischem Prozess" *ZKG* 25 (1904), 31 (1910), 32 (1911), 33 (1912); id., *Zu Luthers* *römischem Prozess. Der Prozess des Jahres 1518* (Gotha 1912); id., *Luther und die Entscheidungsjahre der Reformation* (Munich–Leipzig 1917); suppl. *ZKG* 44 (1925) 213–225; Kalkoff's researches are summarized in E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Time* (St. Louis 1950) 481f.; N. Paulus, *Johannes Tetzel, der Ablassprediger* (Mainz 1899); J. Atkinson, *The Trial of Luther* (New York, 1971).

ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF LUTHER TO FREDERICK THE WISE: P. Kalkoff; *ARG* 14 (1917) 249–262; *ZKG* 43 (1924) 179–208; *HZ* 132 (1925) 29–42; P. Kirn, *Friedrich der Weise und die Kirche* (Leipzig 1926); A. Koch, "Die Kontroversen über die Stellung Friedrichs des Weisen zur Reformation" *ARG* 23 (1926) 213–260; I. Höss, *Georg Spalatin* (Weimar 1956); F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Freiburg i. Br. 1912); J. F. Groner, *Kardinal Cajetan* (Fribourg 1951); H. A. Creutzberg, *Karl v. Miltitz* (Freiburg i. Br. 1907); P. Kalkoff, *Die Miltitziade* (Leipzig 1911); K. Brandi, *Die Wahl Karls V* (Göttingen 1925).

THE LEIPZIG DEBATE: *WA* 2, 250–383; O. Seitz, *Der authentische Text der Leipziger Disputation* (Berlin 1903); H. Emser, "De Disputatione Lipsicensi" *CCath* 4 (1921); J. Lortz, "Die Leipziger Disputation 1519" *BZThS* 3 (1926) 12–37; F. Schulze, *Aus Leipzigs Kulturgeschichte* (Leipzig 1956) 41–70; H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein v. Karlstadt*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1905); S. Harrison Thomson, "Luther and Bohemia" *ARG* 44 (1953) 160–181; E. Kähler, "Beobachtungen zum Problem von Schrift und Tradition in der Leipziger Disputation von 1519" *Hören und Handeln, Festschrift f. E. Wolf* (Munich 1962) 214–229.

5. *Luther's Reform Writings of 1520*

LITERATURE

H. Dannenbauer, *Luther als religiöser Volksschriftsteller 1517–1520* (Tübingen 1930); O. Clemen, *Die Lutherische Reformation und der Buchdruck* (Leipzig 1939); H. v. Campenhausen, "Reformatorisches Selbstbewusstsein und reformatorisches Geschichtsbewusstsein bei Luther, 1517–1522" *ARG* 37 (1940) 128–150; H. Volz, "Die ersten Sammelausgaben von Lutherschriften und ihre Drucker (1518–1520)" *Gutenberg-Jb.* (1960) 185–202; W. Köhler, "Zu Luthers Schrift an den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation" *ZSavRGkan* 14 (1925) 1–38; W. Maurer, *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* (Göttingen 1949); H. Asmussen, "Glaube und Sakrament. Zwei Abschnitte aus *'De captivitate'*" *Begegnung der Christen* (Stuttgart 1959) 161–178.

6. *The Excommunicated Friar before the Diet of Worms*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

A) THE BULL OF EXCOMMUNICATION: Cf. Chap. 4; "Exsurge Domine": *BullRom* V 748–757; D. 741–781; "Decet Romanum Pontificem": *BullRom* V 761–764; Schottenloher I 12043–56; V 47670a–71; H. Roos, "Die Quellen der Bulle Exsurge Domine" *Festschrift Schmaus* (Munich 1957) 909–926; A. Schulte, "Die römischen Verhandlungen über Luther 1520" *QFIAB* 6 (1904) 32–52, 174ff.; J. Greving, "Zur Verkündigung der Bulle Exsurge Domine durch Dr. J. Eck 1520" *RGStT* 21–22 (Münster 1912) 196–221; G. Müller, "Die drei Nuntiaturen Aleanders in Deutschland" *AFIAB* 39 (1959) 222–276.

THE BURNING OF THE BULL OF EXCOMMUNICATION: Schottenloher I 14107–15, VII 55923–27; J. Luther–M. Perlbach, *SAB* V (1907) 95–102; O. Clemen, *ThStK* 81 (1908) 460–469; H. Boehmer, *LuJ* 2–3 (1920–21) 3–53; J. Luther, *ARG* 45 (1954) 260–265.

B) THE DIET OF WORMS: *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Karl V* (=RA), II (Gotha 1896); Th. Brieger, *Aleander und Luther 1521. Die vervollständigten Aleander-Depeschen I. Abt* (Gotha 1884); P. Kalkoff (trans.), *Die Depeschen des Nuntius Aleander vom Wormser Reichstag* (Halle ²1897) id., *Briefe, Depeschen und Berichte über Luther vom Wormser Reichstage* (Halle 1898); J. Cochlaeus, "Colloquium cum Luthero Wormatinae olim habitum" *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation* IV (Leipzig 1910) 177–218; Schottenloher I 14281–346, III 27923–50; H. v. Schubert, "Die Vorgeschichte der Berufung Luthers auf den Reichstag zu Worms 1521" *SAH* (1912); H. Grisar, *Luther zu Worms* (Freiburg 1921); Paul Kalkoff, *Der Wormser Reichstag von 1521* (Munich 1922); E., Kessel, "Luther vor dem Reichstag in Worms 1521" *Festgabe für Paul Kirn,* ed. E. Kaufmann (Berlin 1961) 172–190.

7. *Luther at the Wartburg and the Reform Movement in Wittenberg*

LITERATURE

G. Kawerau, *Luthers Rückkehr von der Wartburg nach Wittenberg* (Halle 1902); H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1905); id., "Luther und Karlstadt in Wittenberg" *HZ* 99 (1907) 256–324; id., *Frühprotestantisches Gemeindechristentum in Wittenberg und Orlamünde* (Leipzig 1909); id., *Aktenstücke zur Wittenberg Bewegung Anfang 1522* (Leipzig 1912); K. Müller, *Luther und Karlstadt* (Tübingen 1907); N. Müller, *Die Wittenberger Bewegung 1521 und 1522* (Leipzig ²1911); W. Köhler, *GGA* 174 (1912) 505–550; Th. Knolle, *Luther und die Bilderstürmer* (Wittenberg 1922); H. v. Campenhausen, "Die Bilderfrage in der Reformation" *ZKG* 68 (1957) 96–128; I. Höss, *Georg Spalatin* (Weimar 1956); P. Graff, *Gesch der Auflösung der alten Gottesdienstformen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands* I (Göttingen ³1937); L. Fendt, *Der lutherische Gottesdienst im 16. Jh.* (Munich 1923); V. Vajta, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther* (Göttingen ²1952); B. Lohse, *Mönchtum und Reformation* (Göttingen 1963); H. B. Meyer, *Luther und die Messe* (Paderborn 1965).

8. *The Reformers in Luther's Circle*

LITERATURE

R. Stupperich (ed.), *Reformatorische Verkündigung und Lebensordnung* (Bremen 1963).

NIKOLAUS VON AMSDORF: *Ausgewählte Schriften,* ed. O. Lerche (Gütersloh 1938); E. O. Reichert, *Amsdorf und das Interim. Erstausg. seiner Schriften zum Interim mit Kommentar und hist. Einl.* (Diss. Halle–Wittenberg 1955); O. H. Nebe, *Reine Lehre. Zur Theologie des Niklas von Amsdorff* (Göttingen 1935); H. Stille, *Nikolaus von Amsdorf, sein Leben bis zu seiner Einweisung als Bischof von Naumburg* (1483–1542) (Diss. Leipzig 1937); O. Lerche, *Amsdorf und Melanchthon* (Berlin 1937); P. Brunner, *Nikolaus von Amsdorf als Bischof von Naumburg* (Gütersloh 1961).

JUSTUS JONAS: Th. Pressel, *Justus Jonas. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld 1862); *Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas,* ed. G. Kawerau, 2 vols. (Halle 1884–85); Supp. by

W. Delius: *ARG* 31 (1934) 133–136, 42 (1951) 136–145; M. Schellbach, *Justus Jonas* (Essen 1941); W. Delius, *Lehre und Leben. Justus Jonas* (Berlin 1952); id., *Reformationsgeschichte der Stadt Halle* (Berlin 1953); H. Abe, *Der Erfurter Humanismus und seine Zeit* (Diss. Jena 1953); F. W. Krapp, *Der Erfurter Mutiankreis und seine Auswirkungen* (Diss. Cologne 1954). M. Lehmann, *Justus Jonas, Loyal Reformer* (Minneapolis, Minn. 1963).

JOHANNES BUGENHAGEN: G. Geisenhof, *Bibliotheca Bugenhagiana I, Bibliographie . . . des Johannes Bugenhagen* (Leipzig 1908); *Briefwechsel,* ed. O. Vogt (Stettin 1888); G. Buchwald (ed.), *Predigten Bugenhagens* (Halle 1885); id., *Johannes Bugenhagens Katechismuspredigten* (Leipzig 1909); id., *Ungedruckte Predigten Bugenhagens* (Leipzig 1910); id., "Bugenhagens Katechismuspredigten vom Jahre 1534" *ARG* 17 (1920) 92–104; K. A. T. Vogt, *Johannes Bugenhagen Pomeranus* (Elberfeld 1867); H. Hering, *Dr. Pomeranus Johannes Bugenhagen* (Halle 1888); E. Wolf, *Johannes Bugenhagen. Gemeinde und Amt. Peregrinatio* (Munich, 1962) 257–278; W. Rautenberg (ed.), *Johannes Bugenhagen, Beiträge zu seinem 400. Todestag* (Berlin 1958) (lit.); R. Stupperich, "Dr. Pomeranus. Zum 400. Todestag des Reformators Johannes Bugenhagen" *Luther* 29 (1958) 49–60; additional articles on Johannes Bugenhagen: *NDB* III, 9f.

GEORG SPALATIN: I. Höss, *Georg Spalatin* (Weimar 1956); id., "Georg Spalatins Traktat 'De sacramento venerabile eucharistiae et de confessione' vom Jahre 1525" *ARG* 49 (1958) 79–88; id., "Georg Spalatins Verhältnis zu Luther und die Reformation" *Luther* 31 (1960) 67–80; H. Volz, "Bibliogr. der im 16. Jh. erschienenen Schriften Georg Spalatins" *Zschr. für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliogr.* 5 (1958) 83–119; W. Ulsamer, "Spalatins Beziehungen zu seiner fränkischen Heimat" *Jb. für fränkische Landesforschung* 19 (1959) 425–479.

PHILIP MELANCHTHON: Works: *CR* 1–28 (Halle-Braunschweig 1834–60); *Epistolae iudicia, consilia etc.,* ed. E. Bindseil (Halle 1874); *Supplementa Melanchthoniana,* 6 vols. (Leipzig 1910–26); Selected Works (text for study), ed. R. Stupperich (Gütersloh 1951f.); P. Fraenkel, "Fünfzehn Jahre Melanchthonforschung (lit)" *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 22 (1960) 582–624, 23 (1961) 563–602, 24 (1962) 443–478; C. L. Hill (ed.), *The Loci Communes of Philip Melanchthon* (Boston 1944); id., *Selected Writings* (Minneapolis, Minn. 1962); C. Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld 1861); A. Herrlinger, *Die Theologie Melanchthons* (Gotha 1879); K. Hartfelder, *Philipp Melanchthon als Praeceptor Germaniae* (Berlin 1889); G. Ellinger, *Philipp Melanchthon* (Berlin 1902); O. Ritschl, "Die Entwicklung der Rechtfertigungslehre Melanchthons bis zum Jahre 1527" *ThStK* 85 (1912) 518–540; P. Joachimsen, "Loci Communes" *LuJ* 8 (1926) 27–97; H. Engelland, *Melanchthon, Glauben und Handeln* (Munich 1931); F. Hübner, *Natürliche Theologie und theokratische Schwärmerei bei Melanchthon* (Gütersloh 1936); Cl. Bauer, "Die Naturrechtsvorstellungen des jüngeren Melanchthon" *Festschrift G. Ritter* (Tübingen 1950) 244–255; id., "Melanchthons Naturrechtslehre" *ARG* 42 (1951) 64–98; id., "Melanchthons Wirtschaftsethik" *ARG* 49 (1958) 115–160; P. Schwarzenau, *Der Wandel im theologischen Ansatz bei Melanchthon von 1525–35* (Gütersloh 1956); W. H. Neuser, *Der Ansatz der Theolgie Philipp Melanchthons* (Neukirchen 1957); W. Maurer, "Melanchthons Anteil am Streit zwischen Luther und Erasmus" *ARG* 49 (1958) 89–115, and in *Melanchthon-Studien* (Gütersloh 1964) 137–162; id., "Die Loci Communes als wiss. Programmschrift" *LuJ* 27 (1960) 1–50; A. Sperl, *Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus und Reformation* (Munich 1959); G. Urban (ed.), *Philipp Melanchthon. Gedenkschrift zum 400. Todestag* (Bretten ^{2}1960); H. Bornkamm, *Philipp Melanchthon* (Göttingen ^{3}1960); P. Meinhold, *Philip Melanchthon. Der Lehrer der Kirche* (Berlin 1960); W. Elliger (ed.),

Philipp Melanchthon. Forschungsbeiträge (Göttingen 1961); V. Vajta (ed.), *Luther und Melanchthon* (Göttingen 1961); R. Stupperich, *Melanchthon* (Berlin 1960); id., *Der unbekannte Melanchthon* (Stuttgart 1961); R. Schäfer, *Christologie und Sittlichkeit in Melanchthons frühen Loci* (Tübingen 1961); P. Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum. The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Geneva 1961); H. Lieberg, *Amt und Ordination bei Luther und Melanchthon* (Göttingen 1962); E. Bizer, *Theologie der Verheissung, Studien der theol. Entwicklung des jungen Melanchthon (1519–24)* (Neukirchen 1964); F. Hildebrandt, *Melanchthon: Alien or Ally?* (New York 1946); C. L. Manschreck, *Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer* (New York 1958); M. Greschat, *Melanchthon neben Luther* (Witten 1965); H.-G. G. Geyer, *Von der Geburt des wahren Menschen* (Neukirchen 1965).

9. *The Pontificate of Adrian VI*

SOURCES

L.-P. Gachard, *Correspondance de Charles-Quint et d'Adrien VI* (Brussels 1859); H. J. Reusens, *Syntagma doctrinae theologicae Adriani Sexti* (Louvain 1862); A. Mercati, *Dall'Archivio Vaticano* II: *Diarii di concistori del pontificato di Adriano VI* (*SteT* 157) (Rome 1951).

LITERATURE

C. v. Höfler, *Papst Adrian VI.* (Vienna 1880); M. v. Domarus, "Die Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstes Hadrian" *HJ* 16 (1895) 70–91; P. Kalkoff, "Kleine Beiträge zur Gesch. Adrians VI." *HJ* 39 (1918–19) 31–72; L. v. Pastor, *Gesch. der Päpste* IV, 2, pp. 3–157; E. Hocks, *Der letzte dt. Papst* (Freiburg 1939); E. Göller, "Hadrian VI. und der Ämterkauf an der päpstl. Kurie" *Abhh. aus dem Gebiete der mittleren und neueren Gesch. Festgabe H. Finke* (Münster 1925) 375–407; H. W. Bachmann, *Kuriale Reformbestrebungen unter Adrian VI.* (Diss. Erlangen 1948); E. van Eyl, "Keizer Karel V en de pauskeuze van Adriaan VI" *SE* 1 (1948) 277–298; P. Brachim, "Adrian VI et la devotio moderna" *Etudes Germaniques* 14 (1959) 97–105; *ETbL* 35 (1959) 313–629 (with bibliography); J. Posner, *Der dt. Papst Adrian VI.* (Recklinghausen 1962); P. Berglar, *Verhängnis und Verheissung* (Bonn o. J.).

SECTION TWO

The Struggle over the Concept of Christian Freedom

10. *The Knights' War*

LITERATURE

KNIGHTHOOD: Schottenloher 41521a–41534; K. Schottenloher, *Flugschriften zur Ritterschaftsbewegung des Jahres 1523* (Münster 1929); R. Fellner, *Die fränkische Ritterschaft von 1495–1524* (Berlin 1905); G. Lotz, "Der fränkische Adel und dessen Einfluss auf

die Verbreitung der Reformation" *Zschr. für die gesamte luth. Theologie und Kirche* 29 (1868) 465–486; G. Knetsch, *Die landständische Verfassung und reichsritterschaftliche Bewegung im Kurstaate Trier, vornehmlich im 16. Jh.* (Berlin 1909); O. Brunner, *Adeliges Landleben und europäischer Geist* (Salzburg 1949)

SICKINGEN AND THE TRIER AFFAIR: Schottenloher 20010–20067; 49329–49339a; 58243–58254; H. Ullmann, *F. v. S.* (Leipzig 1872); id., *ADB* 34, 151–158; E. Göller, "Sickingen u. seine Beziehungen zur Reformation: Bl. für Pfalz." *KG* 2 (1926) 36–46; K. H. Rendenbach, *Die Fehde F. v. Sickingens gegen Trier* (Berlin 1933); G. Franz, "F. v. S." *Saarpfälz. Lebensbilder* 1 (1938) 61–74; E. Kilb, *F. v. S.* (Metz 1943); W. R. Hitchcock, *The Background of the Knight's Revolt 1522–1523* (Berkeley 1958).

ULRICH V. HUTTEN: Schottenloher 9157–9301; 47021–47043; 65068–65071; 55286–55308; *Werke,* ed. E. Böcking, 5 vols. and 2 suppl. vols. (Leipzig 1859–70); *Deutsche Schriften,* ed. S. Szamatolski (Strassburg 1891); F. Walser, *Die politische Entwicklung Huttens* (Munich–Berlin 1928); P. Held, *Hutten, seine geistige Auseinandersetzung mit Katholizismus, Humanismus und Reformation* (Leipzig 1928); H. Holborn, *Ulrich v. Hutten and the German Reformation* (New Haven 1937); H. Fechter, *Ulrich v. Hutten* (Pähl 1954); K. Kleinschmidt, *Ulrich von Hutten* (Berlin 1955).

E. Bock, *Der Schwäb. Bund u. seine Verfassungen 1488–1534* (Breslau 1927); G. Truchsess v. Waldburg: Schottenloher 21459–21463; 60985–60988; F. Siebert, *Zwischen Kaiser und Papst* (Berlin 1950).

11. *The "Fanatics" Karlstadt and Müntzer*

LITERATURE

KARLSTADT: **Works:** E. Freys and H. Barge, "Verz. der gedr. Schriften des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt" *ZblB* 21 (1904; reprinted Nieuwkoop 1965); *Von Abtuhung der Bilder,* ed. H. Lietzmann, *Kleine Texte 74* (Berlin 1911); E. Kähler, *Karlstadt und Augustin, Der Kommentar des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt zu Augustins Schrift De spiritu et litera. Einführung und Text* (Halle 1952); *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25,* ed. E. Hertzsch, 2 vols. (Halle 1956–57); "Karlstadts Sabbat-Traktat von 1524," ed. R. Stupperich: *Neue Zschr. für systematische Theologie* 1 (1959) 349–375. **Literature:** similar to Chap. 35: H. Barge, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1905); E. Hase, "Karlstadt in Orlamünde" *Mitt. der geschichts- und altertumsforschenden Ges. des Osterlandes* 4 (1858) 42–125; W. Friedensburg, "Der Verzicht Karlstadts auf das Wittenberger Archidiakonat" *ARG* 11 (1914) 69–72; M. Wähler, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Orlamünde* (Erfurt 1918); E. Hertzsch, *Karlstadt und seine Bedeutung für das Luthertum* (Gotha 1932); id., *Luther und Karlstadt: Luther in Thüringen,* compiled by R. Jauernig (Berlin 1952) 87–107; E. Kähler, "Karlstadts Protest gegen die theologische Wissenschaft" *450 Jahre Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* I (Halle 1952) 299–312; G. Fuchs, "Karlstadts radikal-reformatorisches Wirken und seine Stellung zwischen Müntzer und Luther" *Wiss. Zschr. der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* 3 (1953–54) 523–551; *NDB* II 356f.; *RGG* III 1154f.; G. Rupp, "Andrew Karlstadt and Reformation Puritanism" *JthS NS* 10 (1959) 308–326; J. Seuppel, *Schwenckfelk, Knight of Faith* (Pennsburg, Pa. 1961).

MÜNTZER: **Works:** G. Franz, "Bibliographie der Schriften Th. Müntzers" *Zschr. des Vereins für Thüring. Gesch. u. Altertumskunde NF* 34 (Jena 1940) 161–173; H. J. Hillerbrand, *Bibliographie des Täufertums* (Gütersloh 1962) 21011–21050; *Thomas Müntzers*

Briefwechsel, ed. H. Böhmer–P. Kirn (Leipzig 1931); *Thomas Müntzer, sein Leben und seine Schriften,* ed. O. H. Brandt (Jena 1933); O. J. Mehl, *Thomas Müntzers deutsche Messen und Kirchenämter* (Grimmen 1937); Sehling I; *Thomas Müntzers politische Schriften,* ed. C. Hinrichs (Halle 1950); *Die Fürstenpredigt,* ed. by and with introduction by S. Streller (Leipzig 1958). **Literature:** O. J. Mehl, "Thomas Müntzer als Liturgiker" *ThLZ* 76 (1951) 75–78; C. Hinrichs, *Luther und Müntzer* (Berlin 1952); H. S. Bender, "Thomas Müntzer und die Täufer" *ThZ* 8 (1952) 262–278; A. Meusel, *Thomas Müntzer und seine Zeit* (Berlin 1952); M. Schmidt, "Das Selbstbewusstsein Thomas Müntzers" *Theologia viatorum* 6 (Berlin 1954–58) 25–41; M. M. Smirin, *Die Volksreformation des Thomas Müntzer und der grosse Bauernkrieg* (Berlin ^{2}1956); M. Steinmetz, "Zur Entstehung der Müntzerlegende" *Beiträge zum neuen Geschichtsbild. Zum 60. Geburtstag von A. Meusel* (Berlin 1956) 35–70; id., *Das Müntzerbild in der Geschichtsschreibung von Luther und Melanchthon bis zum Ausbruch der französischen Revolution* (Jena 1956); cf. R. Schmid, "Thomas Müntzer im Geschichtsbild des Dialektischen Materialismus" *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt* 65 (1965) 258–262; G. Franz, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg* (Darmstadt ^{4}1956) 248–270; H. Goebke, "Neue Forschungen über Thomas Müntzer" *Harz-Zschr* 9 (Bad Hatzburg 1957) 1–30; G. Baring, "Hans Denck und Thomas Müntzer" *ARG* 50 (1959) 145–181; W. Elliger, *Thomas Müntzer* (Berlin 1960); id. *LuJ* 34 (1967) 90-116; *RGG*^{3} IV 1183f.; E. Iserloh, "Zur Gestalt und Biographie Thomas Müntzers" *TThZ* 71 (1962) 248–253.

12. *The Peasants' War*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dahlmann-Waitz 9891–9902; 9976–9981; 10065–10080; Schottenloher 34765–35241; 51510–51531; 62311–62366; *Bibl. de la Réforme* I, Reg. p. 77.

SOURCES

L. Baumann, *QQ zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges in Oberschwaben* (Tübingen 1876); id., *Akten zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges aus Oberschwaben* (Freiburg 1877); H. Wopfner, *QQ zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges in Dtl.* I (Innsbruck 1908); H. Brandt, *Der grosse Bauernkrieg* (Jena 1925); *Akten zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges in Mittel-Dtl.,* ed. O. Merx–G. Franz–W. P. Fuchs, 3 vols. (Leipzig–Berlin 1923–1941); G. Franz, *QQ zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges* (Munich 1963).

LITERATURE

G. Franz, *Der dt. Bauernkrieg* (Darmstadt ^{4}1956); R. M. Radbruch–G. Radbruch, *Der dt. Bauernkrieg zwischen MA u. Neuzeit* (Göttingen 1962); H. v. Schubert, *Revolution u. Reformation im 16. Jh.* (Tübingen 1927); H. Hantsch, *Der dt. Bauernkrieg* (Würzburg 1925); W. Stolze, *Bauernkrieg und Reformation* (Leipzig 1926); A. Rosenkranz, *Der Bundschuh,* 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1927); E. Bohnenblust, *Luthers Verhalten im Bauernkrieg* (Bern 1929); A. Waas, *Die grosse Wende im dt. Bauernkrieg* (Munich–Berlin 1939); id., *Die Bauern im Kampf um Gerechtigkeit 1300–1525* (Munich 1964); I. Schmidt, *Das göttl. Recht* (Diss. Jena 1939); M. M. Smirin, *Die Volksreformation des Th. Müntzer u. der grosse Bauernkrieg* (Berlin 1956); H. Kamnitzer, *Zur Vorgesch. des dt. Bauernkrieges* (Berlin 1953); W. Andreas, *Der Bundschuh* (Karlsruhe 1953); P. Althaus, *Luthers Haltung im Bauernkrieg* (Tübingen 1952); H. Michaelis, *Die Verwendung und Bedeutung der Bibel in den Hauptschriften der Bauern von 1525–26* (theol. diss.

Greifswald 1954); F. Lau, "Der Bauernkrieg und das angebliche Ende der lutherischen Reformation als spontaner Volksbewegung" *LuJ* 26 (1959) 109–134; M. Greschat, "Luthers Haltung im Bauernkrieg" *ARG* 56 (1965) 31–47; J. S. Schapiro, *Social Reforms and the Reformation* (New York 1909); H. Kirschner, *Luther and the Peasant's War* (Philadelphia, 1972); A. Holmio, *The Lutheran Reformation and the Jews* (Hancock, Mich., 1949).

13. *Luther's Rejection of Humanism—Erasmus' Later Years*

LITERATURE

F. Kattenbusch, *Luthers Lehre vom unfreien Willen und von der Prädestination nach ihren Entstehungsgründen untersucht* (Diss. Göttingen 1875); K. Zickendrath, *Der Streit zwischen Erasmus und Luther über die Willensfreiheit* (Leipzig 1909); H. Jedin, *Des Johannes Cochläus Streitschrift De libero arbitrio hominis* (1525) (Breslau 1927); E. Schott, "Luthers Lehre vom servum arbitrium in ihrer theologischen Bedeutung" *ZSTh* 7 (1929) 399–430; W. Maurer, "Humanismus und Reformation" *ThR NF* 3 (1931) 49–74, 104–145; R. Hermann, "Zu Luthers Lehre vom unfreien Willen" *Greifswalder Studien zur Lutherforschung und neuzeitlichen Geistesgeschichte* 4 (1931) 17–38; A. Renaudet, *Etudes érasmiennes (1521–1529)* (Paris 1939); E. Schweingruber, *Luthers Erlebnis des unfreien Willens* (Zürich 1947); L. Schauenburg, *Luthers Lehre vom verborgenen, alleinwirksamen Gott und von der Unfreiheit des Willens* (Diss. Göttingen 1949); E. Erikstein, *Luthers Prädestinationslehre geschichtlich dargestellt bis einschliesslich "De servo arbitrio"* (Diss. Göttingen 1957); M. Werner, *Erasmus und Luther: Glaube und Aberglaube* (Bern–Stuttgart 1957) 50–65; H. Bandt, *Luthers Lehre vom verborgenen Gott* (Berlin 1958); H. Bornkamm, "Erasmus und Luther" *LuJ 25 (1958) 3*–22; W. Maurer, "Melanchthons Anteil am Streit zwischen Luther und Erasmus" *ARG* 49 (1958) 89–115; id., *Melanchthonstudien* (Gütersloh 1964) 137–162; C. Reidijk, "Das Lebensende des Erasmus" *Basler Zschr. für Gesch. u. Altertumskunde* 57 (1958) 23–66; K. H. Oelrich, *Der späte Erasmus und die Reformation* (Münster 1961); O. J. Mehl, "Erasmus contra Luther" *LuJ* 29 (1962) 52–64; J. Boisset, *Erasme et Luther* (Paris 1962); E. F. Winter, (ed.), *Erasmus-Luther-Discourse on Free Will* (New York 1961); E. W. Kohls, *Die Theologie des Erasmus* (Basel 1966); J. P. Dolan, *The Essential Erasmus* (New York 1964); H. Holeczek, *Humanistische Bibelphilologie als Reformproblem bei Erasmus von Rotterdam, Thomas More und William Tyndale* (Leiden, 1975); J. Rouschausse, *Erasmus and Fisher: Their Correspondence, 1511–1524* (Paris 1968); The first volume of the new edition of the complete works of Erasmus appeared in 1969, the five-hundredth anniversary of his birth: *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami recognita et adnotatione critica instructa notisque illustrata* (Amsterdam 1969ff.).

14. *Zwingli and the Beginnings of the Reformation in German Switzerland*

SOURCES

Die Eidgenössischen Abschiede aus dem Zeitraume von 1521–28 (The Confederate Secession of 1521–1528), *Der Amtlichen Abschiedesammlung* IV, la, revised by J. Strickler (Bruges 1873); W. Oechsli, *Quellenbuch zur Schweizergeschichte,* n.s., (Zurich 1893); id., *Quellenbuch zur Schweizergeschichte, Kleine Ausgabe* (Zurich 1918); *Actensammlung zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte in den Jahren 1521–1532,* revised and edited by J. Strickler, 5 vols. (Zurich 1878–83); *Actensammlung zur Gesch. der Zürcher Reformation in* *den Jahren 1519–1533,* ed. E. Egli (Zurich 1879); *Actensammlung zur Gesch. der Berner Reformation 1521–1532,* ed. R. Steck–G. Tobler (Bern 1923); *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Basler Reformation in den Jahren 1519–1534,* ed. E. Dürr–P. Roth, 6 vols. (Basel 1921–1950); *Heinrich Bullingers Reformationsgeschichte,* ed. J. J. Hottinger–H. H. Vögeli, 3 vols. (Frauenfeld 1838–1840); *Die Chronik des Bernhard Wyss 1519–1530,* ed. G. Finsler (Basel 1901); *Johannes Stumpfs Schweizer- und Reformationschronik,* 2 parts, ed. E. Gagliardi–H. Müller–F. Büsser (Basel 1952–55); *Gerold Edlibachs Chronik,* ed. J. M. Usteri (Zurich 1847); *Valentin Tschudi's Chronik der Reformationsjahre 1521–33,* ed. Joh. Strickler (Bern 1889); B. Sprüngli, *Beschreibung der Kappelerkriege,* ed. W. Weiss (Zurich 1932); *Reformation und kath. Reform 1500 bis 1572, Quellenhefte zur Schweizergeschichte* 5, revised A. Bucher–W. Schmid (Aarau 1958).

ZWINGLI, Works: First complete edition, ed. M. Schuler–J. Schultheiss, 8 vols. (Zurich 1828–42); *Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke: Corpus Reformatorum* 88–92; 93–98, 100–101 (Berlin 1905, Leipzig 1908, 1935, Zurich 1959ff.) (=ZW 1–14), cf. *Zwingliana* 12 (1964) 1–9; Ulrich Zwingli, *Eine Auswahl aus seinen Schriften,* trans. and ed. G. Finsler–W. Köhler–A. Rüegg (Zurich 1918); Zwingli, *Hauptschriften,* revised by F. Blanke–O. Farner–O. Frei–R. Pfister, 11 vols. (Zurich 1940–63); *Huldrych Zwingli. Auswahl seiner Schriften,* ed. E. Künzli (Zurich 1962); *Aus Zwinglis Predigten,* 2 vols., ed. O. Farner (Zurich 1957).

LITERATURE

J. Dierauer, *Gesch. der Schweizer Eidgenossenschaft 1516–1648* (Gotha 1907); E. Gagliardi, *Gesch. der Schweiz,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1934–37); H. Nabholz et al., *Gesch. der Schweiz* (Zurich 1932–38); Th. Schwegler, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in der Schweiz* (Stans^2 1945); E. Egli, *Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte* I (1519–25) (Zurich 1910); B. Fleischlin, *Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte,* 2 vols. (Stans 1907–09); W. Hadorn, *Die Reformation in der deutschen Schweiz* (Frauenfeld–Leipzig 1928); R. Pfister, *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz* I (Zurich 1964); G. Gerig, *Reisläufer und Pensionenherren in Zürich 1519–32* (Zurich 1947); O. Vasella, *Reform und Reformation in der Schweiz* (Münster 1958); W. Oechsli, *History of Switzerland* (Cambridge 1922).

ZWINGLI: **Bibliography and research reports:** G. Finsler, *Zwingli-Bibliographie* (1897, new printing Nieukoop 1962); G. Locher,: "The Change in the Understanding of Zwingli in Recent Research" *CH* 34, 3–24 (1965); L. v. Muralt, "Probleme der Zwingli-Forschung" *Schweizerische Beiträge zur Allgemeinen Gesch.* 4 (Aarau 1946) 247–267; R. Pfister, "Die Zwingli-Forschung seit 1945" *ARG* 48 (1957) 230–240; id., "Neue Beiträge" *Zwingliana* 9 (1952) 445–452; J. v. Pollet: *RevSR* 28 (1954) 155–174, 37 (1963) 34–59, 38 (1964) 294–298; P Hauri, *Die Reformation in der Schweiz im Lichte der neueren Geschichtsschreibung* (Zurich 1945); G. W. Locher, "Wandlungen des Zwingli-Bildes" *Vox Theologica* 32 (Assen 1962) 169–182; F. Büsser, *Das katholische Zwingli-Bild von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Diss. Zurich 1964). **Biographies:** R. Staehelin, *Huldreich Zwingli. Sein Leben und sein Wirken,* 2 vols. (Basel 1895–97); W. Köhler, *Huldrych Zwingli* (1943, Stuttgart 1952); O. Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli,* 4 vols. (Zurich 1943–60); id., *Zwingli the Reformer* (New York 1952); J. Courvoisier, *Zwingli* (Geneva 1953); J. v. Pollet, *Huldrych Zwingli et la Réforme en Suisse* (Paris 1963); id., *LThK* X 1433–41; F. Schmidt-Clausing, *Zwingli* (Berlin 1965); F. Blanke, *Aus der Welt der Reformation* (Zurich 1960); Th. Pestalozzi, *Die Gegner am Grossmünsterstift* (Zurich 1918); J. Figi, *Die innere Reorganisation des Grossmünsterstiftes in Zurich 1519–31* (Phil. Diss. Zurich 1951); O. Vasella, "Die Wahl Zwinglis als Leutpriester von Glarus" *ZSKG* 51 (1957) 27–35; id., *Österreich und die Bündnispolitik der kath. Orte* (Fribourg 1951); J. Rogge, *Zwingli und Erasmus* (Stuttgart 1962); J. Rilliet, *Zwingli, Third Man of the Reformation* (Philadelphia 1964); M. Haas, *Zwingli und der l. Kappeler Krieg* (Diss. Zurich 1962); cf. *Zwingliana* 12 (1964) H. 1, 93–136; 2, 35–68; L. v. Muralt, "Zwingli als Sozialpolitiker" *Zwingliana* 5 (1929–33); W. Köhler, *Zürcher Ehegericht und Genfer Konsistorium,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1932–40); K. Kildenmann, *Die Organisation des Zürcherischen Ehegerichtes zur Zeit Zwinglis* (Zurich 1946); R. Ley, *Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli* (Zurich 1948); A. Farner, *Die Lehre von Kirche und Staat bei Zwingli* (Tübingen 1930); Erik Wolf, "Die Sozialtheologie Zwinglis" *Festschr. Guido Kisch* (Stuttgart 1955) 167–188; S. Rother, *Die religiösen und geistigen Grundlagen der Politik Zwinglis* (Erlangen 1956); J. F. G. Goeters, *L. Hätzer* (Gütersloh 1957); S. M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli* (New York 1901). J. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto 1968). **Theology:** F. Blanke, "Zwinglis 'Fidei ratio' (1530). Entstehung und Bedeutung" *ARG* 57 (1966) 96–101; J. Courvoisier, *Zwingli: A Reformed Theologian* (Richmond 1963); E. Künzli, "Zwingli als Ausleger des AT" *ZW* 14, 871–899; id., *Zwingliana* 9 (1952) 185–207, 253–307; 10 (1957) 488–491; G. Krause, "Zwinglis Auslegung der Propheten" *Zwingliana* 11 (1960) 257–265; L. v. Muralt, *Zwinglis dogmatisches Sondergut* (Zurich 1932); A. Rich, *Die Anfänge der Theologie H. Zwinglis* (Zurich 1949); R. Pfister, *Das Problem der Erbsünde bei Zwingli* (Leipzig 1939); id., *Die Seligkeit erwählter Heiden bei Zwingli* (Zurich 1952); H. Schmid, *Zwinglis Lehre von der göttlichen und menschlichen Gerechtigkeit* (Zurich 1959); G. W. Locher, *Die Theologie H. Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie,* 1st part: *Die Gotteslehre* (Zurich 1952); id., "Das Geschichtsbild Zwinglis" *ThZ* 9 (1953) 275–302; id., "Die Prädestinationslehre H. Zwinglis" ibid. 12 (1956) 526–548; W. Tappolet, *Das Marienlob der Reformatoren* (Tübingen 1962); G. W. Locher, "Inhalt und Absicht von Zwinglis Marienlehre" *Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz* 107 (1951) 34–37; K. Federer, "Zwingli und die Marienverehrung" *ZSKG* 45 (1951) 13–26. **Eucharistic Doctrine:** F. Blanke, "Zwinglis Sakramentsanschauung" *ThBl* 10 (1931) 283–290; C. C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (Evanston, I11., 1949); W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther. Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1914, Gütersloh 1953); H. Gollwitzer, "Zur Auslegung von John 6 bei Luther und Zwingli" *In Memoriam E. Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart 1951) 143–168; H. Rückert, "Das Eindringen der Tropuslehre in die Schweizer Auffassung vom Abendmahl" *ARG* 37 (1940) 199–221; J. Courvoisier, "Vom Abendmahl bei Zwingli" *Zwingliana* 11 (1962) 415–426; J. Schweizer, *Zur Ordnung des Gottesdienstes in den nach Gottes Wort reformierten Gemeinden der deutschsprachigen Schweiz* (Zurich 1944); id., *Reformierte Abendmahlsgestaltung in der Schau Zwinglis* (o. J.); F. Schmidt-Clausing, *Zwingli als Liturgiker* (Berlin 1952); id., "Johann Ulrich Surgant, ein Wegweiser des jungen Zwingli" *Zwingliana* 11 (1961) 287–320; id., "Zwingli und die Kindertaufe" *Berliner Kirchenbriefe* 6 (1962) 4–8; G. W. Locher, *Im Geist und in der Wahrheit. Die reformatorische Wende im Gottesdienst zu Zurich* (Neukirchen 1957); M. Lenz, "Zwingli und Landgraf Philipp" *ZKG* 3 (1879); R. Hauswirth, "Landgraf Philipp v. H. und Zwingli" *Zwingliana* 11 (1962) 499–552. C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (Evanston, I11., 1949).

LEO JUD: Leo Jud, *Katechismen,* compiled by O. Farner (Zurich 1955); id., *Vom Leiden, Sterben und Auferstehen des Herrn,* revised by O. Farner (Zurich 1955); Schottenloher 9528–34f., 36656, 55341–48; L. Weiss, *Leo Jud, Ulrich Zwinglis Kampfgenosse* (Zurich 1942); O. Farner, "Leo Jud, Zwinglis treuester Helfer" *Zwingliana* 10 (1955) 201ff.

CONSTANCE: A. Willburger, *Die Konstanzer Bischöfe Hugo v. Landenberg, Balthasar Merklin, Johann v. Lupfen (1496–1537) und die Glaubensspaltung* (Münster 1917); C. Gröber, "Die Reformation in Konstanz von ihrem Anfang bis zum Tode Hugos von

Hohenlandenberg (1517-32)" *FreibDiözArch* 46 (1919) 120–322; Th. Gottlob, *Die Offiziale des Bistums Konstanz im MA* (Limburg 1951); O. Vasella, *Das Visitationsprotokoll über den Schweizer Klerus des Bistums Konstanz von 1586* (Bern 1963); L. Helbling, *Dr. Johann Fabri und die schweizerische Reformation* (Einsiedeln 1933).

ST. GALLEN: Th. Müller, *Die St. Gallische Glaubensbewegung* (1520–30) (St. Gallen 1913); P. Staerkle, *Beiträge zur spätmittelalterlichen Bildungsgeschichte St. Gallens* (St. Gallen 1939); G. Thürer, *St. Gallen Geschichte,* 1st vol. (St. Gallen 1953), cf. *HJ* 76 (1956) 518; K. Spillmann, *Zwingli und die Zürcherische Politik gegenüber der Abtei St. Gallen* (St. Gallen 1965).

VADIAN: Schottenloher 21628–56, 58615–40; J. Ninck, *Arzt und Reformator Vadian* (St. Gallen 1936); W. Näf, *Vadian und seine Stadt St. Gallen,* 2 vols. (St. Gallen 1944–57) (lit.); *Vadianstudien. Untersuchungen und Texte,* ed. W. Näf, 1–7 (St. Gallen 1945–62); C. Bonorand, "Stand und Probleme der Vadianforschung" *Zwingliana* 11 (1959 bis 1963) 586–606; id., "J. Vadian und die Täufer," *Schweizer Beiträge zur allg. Gesch.* 2 (1953) 43–72.

TOGGENBURG: O. Frei, *Die Reformation im Toggenburg* (Zurich 1920).

GRAUBÜNDEN: E. Camenisch, *Bündnerische Reformationsgeschichte* (Chur 1920); id., *Gesch. und Reformation und Gegenreformation in den italienischen Südtalern Graubündens* (Chur 1950); O. Vasella, "Bauernkrieg und Reformation in Graubünden 1525 bis 1526" *ZSKG* 20 (1940) 1–65; id., *Abt Theodul Schlegel von Chur und seine Zeit* (Freiburg, Switz. 1954) (lit.).

APPENZELLERLAND: J. Willi, *Die Reformation im Lande Appenzell* (Bern 1924).

SCHAFFHAUSEN: J. Wipf, *Reformationsgeschichte der Stadt und Landschaft Schaffhausen* (Zurich 1929).

BASEL: Schottenloher 23706–58, 59189–59219; Wackernagel, *Gesch. der Stadt Basel,* 3rd vol.: *Humanismus und Reformation* (Basel 1924); E. Staehelin, *Das Buch der Basler Reformation* (Basel 1929); K. Gauss, "Basels erstes Reformationsmandat" *Basler Jahrbuch* 50 (1930) 185–224; P. Roth, *Die Reformation in Basel,* 1st part: *Die Vorbereitungsjahre* (1525-28): Neujahrsblatt 114 (Basel 1936); id., *Durchbruch und Festsetzung der Reformation in Basel* (Basel 1942); P. Burckhardt, *Gesch. der Stadt Basel von der Zeit der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Basel ^{2}1957); W. Brändly, "Oswald Myconius in Basel" *Zwingliana* 11 (1959–63) 183–192.

OECOLAMPADIUS: E. Staehelin, "Oekolampad-Bibliographie" *Basler Zeitschrift für Gesch. und Altertumskunde* 17 (1918) 1–119; id., *Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads* I: 1499–1526 (Leipzig 1927), II: 1527–1593 (Leipzig 1934) (lit.); id., *Das theologische Lebenswerk Joh. Oekolampads* (Leipzig 1939); H. W. Frei, "Johannes Oekolampads Versuch, Kirchenzucht durch den Bann zu üben" *Zwingliana* 7 (1939–43) 494–503; A. Moser, "Die Anfänge der Freundschaft zwischen Zwingli und Oekolampad" *Zwingliana* 10 (1958) 614–620.

BERN: *Gedenkschrift zur Vierjahrhundertfeier der bernischen Kirchenreformation,* 2 vols. (Bern 1928); W. Koehler, *Zwingli und Bern* (Tübingen 1928); O. E. Strasser, *Capitos Beziehungen zu Bern* (Leipzig 1928); H. Specker, *Die Reformationswirren im Berner Oberland 1528* (Freiburg, Switz. 1951); R. Feller, *Gesch. Berns,* 2nd vol.: *Von der Reformation bis zum Bauernkrieg 1516–1653* (Bern 1953); K. Guggisberg, *Bernische Kirchengeschichte* (Bern 1958).

THE DISPUTATION AT BADEN: Schottenloher 41283c-97; A. Baur, "Zur Vorgeschichte der Disputation von Baden" *ZKG* 21 (1901) 91–111; L. v. Muralt, *Die Badener Disputation* (Leipzig 1926); A. Weiss, "Das Kloster Engelberg unter Abt A. Bürki" *ZSKG Beiheft* 16 (1956); Th. Platter, *Lebensbeschreibung,* ed. A. Hartmann (Basel 1944).

THE DISPUTATION AT BERN: Text: E. F. K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Reformierten Kirche* (Leipzig 1903); Schottenloher 41299–311; F. Schlachter, *Das Evangelische der Reformation am Berner Religionsgespräch 1528* (Bern 1909); K. Lindt, "Der theologische Gehalt der Berner Disputation" *Gedenkschrift zur Vierjahrhundertfeier* I: 301–344; L. v. Muralt, "Zwinglis Mitwirkung an der Berner Disputation" *ZW* 6: 1202–225.

15. *Anabaptists and Spiritualists*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: **Bibliography:** H. J. Hillerbrand, *A Bibliography of Anabaptism* (Elkart 1962); Schottenloher 44213a–44512, 52181–52191, 64167–64431. **Sources:** Hillerbrand 2683–3542; *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer* (in late vols, *Täufer*): Vol. 1, *Württemberg,* ed. G. Bossert (Leipzig 1930): Vol. 2, *Bayern I,* ed. K. Schornbaum (Leipzig 1934): Vol. 3, *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter,* ed. L. Müller (Leipzig 1938); Vol. 4, *Baden und Pfalz,* ed. M. Krebs (Gütersloh 1951); Vol. 5, *Bayern II,* ed. K. Schornbaum (Gütersloh 1951); Vol. 7–8, *Elsass 1–2,* ed. M. Krebs–H. G. Rott (Gütersloh 1959–60); *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz:* I., *Zürich,* ed. L. von Muralt and W. Schmid (Zurich 1952); *Urkundliche Quellen zur Hessischen Reformationsgeschichte:* IV., *Wiedertäuferakten* 1527–1626, ed. G. Franz (Marburg 1951); *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges und der Wiedertäufer,* ed. H. Böhmer (Berlin 1933); *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers,* ed. G. H. Williams (Philadelphia 1957); *Der linke Flügel der Reformation. Glaubenszeugnisse der Täufer,* ed. H. Fast (Bremen 1962) (=H. Fast); *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica,* ed. S. Cramer–F. Pijper (Gravenhage 1903–14) (=BRN); *Documenta Reformatoria* 1, ed. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink et al. (Kampen 1960). **Literature:** *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* (Goshen, Ind., 1927f.) (=*MQR*); *Mennonitisches Lexikon* (Frankfurt–Karlsruhe 1913–58 (=*ML*); *The Mennonite Encyclopedia,* 4 vols. (Scottdale, Pa. 1955–59); W. Wiswedel, *Bilder und Führergestalten aus dem Täufertum* III (Kassel 1952); S. Hirzel, *Heimliche Kirche. Ketzerchronik aus den Tagen der Reformation* (Hamburg 1953); F. H. Littel, *The Anabaptist View of the Church* (Boston 1958); H. A. E. van Gelder, *The Two Reformations* (The Hague 1961); G. H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia 1962); J. C. Wenger, *Die dritte Reformation* (Kassel 1963); G. F. Hershberger, *Das Täufertum* (Stuttgart 1963); K. Holl, "Luther und die Schwärmer" *Gesammelte Aufsätze* I (Tübingen 1923) 420–467; H. S. Bender, "Die Zwickauer Propheten, Thomas Müntzer und die Täufer" *ThZ* 8 (1952) 262–278; R. Stupperich, "Melanchthon und die Täufer" *KuD* 3 (1957) 150–170; H. J. Hillerbrand, "Anabaptism and the Reformation: Another Look" *CH* 29 (1960) 404–423; U. Bergfried, *Verantwortung als theologisches Problem im Täufertum des 16. Jh.* (Wuppertal 1938); F. Heyer, *Der Kirchenbegriff der Schwärmer* (Leipzig 1939); W. Wiswedel, "The Inner and the Outer Word" *MQR* 26 (1952) 171–191; F. H. Littell, *Von der Freiheit der Kirche* (Bad Nauheim 1957); G. Rupp, "Word and Spirit in the Reformation" *ARG* (1958) 13–26. C. Clasen, *Anabaptism: A Social History* (Ithaca, N.Y. 1972).

1. THE SWISS BRETHREN AND THE LOWER GERMAN ANABAPTISTS: *Ausbund, das ist: Etliche schöne christliche Lieder, Wie sie in dem Gefängnis zu Passau . . . von den*

Schweizer-Brüdern . . . gedichtet worden (Lancaster County, Pa. 1935). Literature: E. Bernhofer, *Täuferische Denkweisen und Lebensformen im Spiegel mittel-und oberdeutscher Täuferverhöre* (Diss. Freiburg 1967); G. Zschäbitz, *Zur mitteldeutschen Täuferbewegung nach dem grossen Bauernkrieg* (Berlin 1958); H. W. Schraepler, *Die rechtliche Behandlung der Täufer in der deutschen Schweiz, Südwestdeutschland und Hessen 1525–1618* (Tübingen 1957); H. J. Hillerbrand, *Die Politische Ethik des oberdeutschen Täufertums* (Leiden–Cologne 1962); Ch. H. Hege, *Die Täufer in der Kurpfalz* (Frankfurt 1908); E. F. P. Güss, *Die kurpfälzische Regierung und das Täufertum* (Stuttgart 1960).

THE SWISS BRETHREN: W. Köhler, "Die Zürcher Täufer" *Gedenkschrift zum 400jährigen Jubiläum der Mennoniten oder Täufgesinnten 1525–1925,* ed. C. Neff (Ludwigshafen 1925) 48–64; F. Blanke, "Beobachtungen zum ältesten Täuferbekenntnis" *ARG* 37 (1940) 240–249; O. Vasella, "Zur Geschichte der Täuferbewegung in der Schweiz" *ZSKG* 48 (1954) 179–186; P. Peachy, *Die soziale Herkunft der Schweizer Täufer in der Reformationszeit* (Karlsruhe 1954); F. Blanke, *Brüder in Christo: Die Geschichte der ältesten Täufergemeinde* (Zurich 1955); J. Yoder, *Täufertum und Reformation:* I, *Die Gespräche zwischen Täufern und Reformierten in der Schweiz 1523–1548* (Karlsruhe 1962).

CONRAD GREBEL: Hillerbrand 1484–1508; H. Fast 9–27; H. S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel (c. 1498–1526): The Founder of the Swiss Brethren* (Goshen 1950).

FELIX MANTZ: Hillerbrand 1840–1847; H. Fast 27–35; E. Krajewski, *Leben und Sterben des Zürcher Täuferführers Felix Mantz* (Kassel 1958); id., "The Theology of Felix Mantz," *MQR* 36 (1962) 76–87.

JÖRG BLAUROCK: Hillerbrand 1190–1199; J. A. Moore, *Der starke Jörg* (Kassel 1955); *NDB* II: 292.

MICHAEL SATTLER: Hillerbrand 2276–2285; Schottenloher 57954–57969; H. Fast 58–77; *ML* 4 (1959) 29–38.

WILHELM REUBLIN: Hillerbrand 2216–2221; H. Fast, "Neues zum Leben Wilhelm Reublins" *ThZ* 11 (1955) 420–426; *ML* 3 (1958) 477–481.

BALTHASAR HUBMAIER: Hillerbrand 1602–1640a; Schottenloher 9057–9075, 46993–46998, 55259–55266a; *Hubmaiers Schriften,* ed. G. Westin–T. Bergsten (Gütersloh 1962); H. Fast 35–58; C. Sachsse, *D. Balthasar Hubmaier als Theologe* (Berlin 1914); W. Wiswedel, *Balthasar Hubmaier* (Kassel 1939); *ML* 2, 353–363; T. Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier* (Kassel 1961).

HANS DENCK: Hillerbrand 1350–1402; *Schriften* I (with bibliog.), ed. G. Baring (Gütersloh 1955); II (with bibliog.) and III, ed. W. Fellmann (Gütersloh 1956–60); O. E. Vittali, *Die Theologie des Wiedertäufers Hans Denck* (Offenburg 1932); J. J. Kiwiet, "The Life of Hans Denck" *MQR* 31 (1957) 227–259; id., "The Theology of Hans Denck" *MQR* 32 (1958) 3–27; G. Baring, "Hans Denck und Thomas Müntzer in Nürnberg 1524" *ARG* 50 (1959) 145–181; W. Fellmann, "Der theologische Gehalt der Schriften Dencks" *Leibhaftigkeit des Wortes. Festgabe für Adolf Köberle* (Hamburg 1958) 157–165; id., "Irenik und Polemik bei Hans Denck" *LuJ* 29 (1962) 110–116.

LUDWIG HÄTZER: Hillerbrand 1528–1549a; J. F. G. Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer* (Gütersloh 1957).

HANS HUT: Hillerbrand 1648–1659; H. Fast 79–99; W. Neuser, *Hans Hut* (Berlin 1913); H. Klassen, "The Life and Teaching of Hans Hut" *MQR* 33 (1959) 171–205; id., "Hans Hut und Thomas Müntzer" *MQR* 267–304.

2. THE HUTTERIAN BRETHREN: Hillerbrand 221–336; *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder,* ed. A. J. F. Zieglschmid (Ithaca, N.Y. 1943); *Das Kleingeschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Brüder,* ed. A. J. P. Zieglschmid (Philadelphia 1947); F. Hubry, "Die Wiedertäufer in Mähren" *ARG* 30–32 (1935) 1–36, 1–40, 61–102, 170–211; R. Friedmann, "The Christian Communism of the Hutterite Brethren" *ARG* 46 (1955) 196–209; G. Mecenseffy, "Die Herkunft des oberösterreichischen Täufertums" *ARG* 47 (1956) 252–259; G. J. Neumann, "Nach und von Mähren" *ARG* 48 (1957) 75–90; P. Hofer, *The Hutterian Brethren and their Beliefs* (Starbuck Man 1955); V. J. Peters, *A History of the Hutterian Brethren, 1528–1558* (Diss. Göttingen 1960); R. Friedmann, *Hutterite Studies* (Goshen, Ind. 1961).

JAKOB HUTTER: H. F. Fischer, *Jakob Hutter* (Diss. Vienna 1949–Newton 1956); R. Friedmann, "Jakob Hutter's Last Epistle to the Church in Moravia 1535" *MQR* 34 (1960) 37–47. Z. Zeman, *The Anabaptists and the Czech Brethren in Moravia* (The Hague 1969).

3. THE ANABAPTISTS IN THE LOW COUNTRIES AND IN NORTH GERMANY: Hillerbrand 877–1094; Schottenloher 44213a–44513, 52181–52188, 64314–64324; W. J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der nederlandsche Doopsgezinden* I–III (Haarlem 1961); N. van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnheim 1952); A. F. Mellink, *De Wederdopers in de Noordelijke Neerlanden 1531–1544* (Groningen–Djakarta 1954); A. L. E. Verheyden, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in de zuidelijke Nederlanden in de XVI^{e} eeuw* (Brussel 1959); J. F. G. Goeters, "Die Rolle des Täufertums in der Reformationsgeschichte des Niederrheins" *Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter* 24 (1959) 217–236; H. Stiasny, *Die strafrechtliche Verfolgung der Täufer in der freien Reichsstadt Köln 1529–1618* (Münster 1962).

MELCHIOR HOFMANN: Hillerbrand 1570–1593; H. Fast 196–318; W. I. Leendertz, *Melchior Hofmann* (Haarlem 1883); F. O. zur Linden, *Melchior Hofmann* (Haarlem 1885); P. Kawerau, *Melchior Hof(f)man als religiöser Denker* (Haarlem 1954); E. W. Kohls, "Ein Sendbrief Melchior Hofmanns aus den Jahre 1534" *ThZ* 17 (1961) 356–365.

THE MÜNSTER ANABAPTISTS: Hillerbrand 513–767; Bahlmann: *Zschr. für vaterländische Gesch. u. Altertumskunde* 51 (1893) 119–174; off print with additions (Münster 1894); K. Löffler, "Zur Bibliographie der münsterischen Wiedertäufer" *ZblB* 24 (1907) 116–118; H. Detmer, "Ungedruckte Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in Münster" *Zschr. für vaterländische Gesch. u. Altertumskunde* 51 (1893) 90–118; C. A. Cornelius, *Berichte der Augenzeugen über das Münsterische Wiedertäuferreich* (Münster 1853); *Hermanni a Kerssenbroch Anabaptistici furoris . . . narratio,* ed. H. Detmer, 2 vols. (Münster 1899–1900); *Die Wiedertäufer zu Münster 1534–35. Berichte, Aussagen und Aktenstücke von Augenzeugen und Zeitgenossen,* ed. K. Löffler (Jena 1923). **Literature:** C. A. Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1855–60); L. Keller, *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer und ihres Reichs zu Münster* (Münster 1880); F. Blanke, "Das Reich der Wiedertäufer zu Münster 1534–35" *ARG* 37 (1940) 13–37; H. Rothert, *Das Tausendjährige Reich der Wiedertäufer zu Münster 1534–35* (Münster 1947); R. Stupperich, *Das Münsterische Täufertum* (Münster 1958); H. Neumann, *Masse und Führer in der Wiedertäuferherrschaft in Münster* (Diss. Freiburg 1959); K. H. Kirchhoff, "Die Wiedertäufer in Coesfeld" *WZ* 106 (1956) 113–174.

BERNHARD ROTHMANN: Hillerbrand 2254–2270; R. Stupperich, *Die Schriften der münsterischen Täufer und ihrer Gegner* 1: *Die Schriften Bernhard Rothmanns* (Münster

1968); H. Fast 340–360; F. J. Wray, "The 'Vermanung' of 1542 and Rothmann's 'Bekenntnisse' " *ARG* 47 (1956) 243–251.

OBBE PHILIPS: *BRN* 7; H. Fast 318–340; B. Stroman, *Obbe Philipsz, oudste der Doopers* (Hilversum 1935); J. A. Brandsma, "Is Obbe Filips wer Roomsk wurden?" *It Breaken. Tydskrift fan der Fryske Akademy* 22 (1960) 119–121.

DIRK PHILIPS: *BRN* 10; *Enchiridion oder Handbüchlein von der christlichen Lehre und Religion* (Scottdale, Pa. 1920); C. J. Dyck, "The Christology of Dirk Philips" *MQR* 31 (1957) 147–155, 277–295; W. Keeney, *Dirk Philips* (Diss. Hartford Theol. Seminary 1957); id., *MQR* 32 (1958) 171–191, 298–306; J. ten Doornkaat Koolman, "Een onbekende brief van Dirk Philips (1550)" *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiednis* 43 (1959) 15–21; id., *Dirk Philips* (Haarlem 1964).

MENNO SIMONS: Hillerbrand 1893–2002e; Schottenloher 15370–15580a, 48248–48254, 57026–57046; C. Krahn, "Menno Simons Research (1910–1960)" *CH* 30 (1961) 473–480; *Opera omnia theologica* (Amsterdam 1681); *The Complete Works,* 2 vols. (Elkhart 1876–81); *The Complete Writings,* trans. L. Verduin, ed. C. Wenger, with a biography by H. S. Bender (Scottdale, Pa. 1956); H. Fast 147–169. **Literature:** C. H. Smith, *The Story of the Mennonites,* 3rd rev. ed. C. Krahn (Newton 1957); F. H. Littell, *A Tribute to Menno Simons* (Scottdale, Pa. 1961); H. W. Meihuizen, *Menno Simons* (Haarlem 1961); J. A. Brandsma, *Menno Simons* (Kassel 1962) (from the Dutch); I. B. Horst, *A Bibliography of Menno Simons* (Wieuwboop 1962).

4. SPIRITUALISM:

KASPAR SCHWENCKFELD: Schottenloher 19575–19720, 49233–49247, 58077–58140. Works: *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum,* 19 vols. (Leipzig 1907ff.); H. Fast 204–217. **Literature:** G. Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte* II/2 (Gotha 1922) 171–183; S. G. Schultz, *Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig* (Norristown, Pa. 1946); H. Urner, "Die Taufe bei Caspar Schwenckfeld" *ThLZ* 73 (1948) 329–342; H. J. Schoeps, *Vom Himmlischen Fleisch Christi* (Tübingen 1951); K. Ecke, *Kaspar Schwenckfeld* (Gütersloh 1952); P. G. Eberlein, "Schwenckfelds Urteil über die Augsburger Konfession" *Jahrbuch für die Schlesische Kirche und Kirchengesch. NF* 34 (1955) 581–586; G. Maron, *Individualismus und Gemeinschaft bei Caspar von Schwenckfeldt* (Stuttgart 1961); J. H. Seyppel, *Schwenckfeld, Knight of Faith* (Pennsburg, Pa. 1961); R. Pietz, *Der Mensch ohne Christus. Eine Untersuchung zur Anthropologie Schwenckfelds* (Diss. Tübingen 1956); W. Knörrlich, *Kaspar von Schwenckfeld und die Reformation in Schlesien* (Diss. Bonn 1957); T. Bergsten, "Pilgram Marbeck und seine Auseinandersetzung mit Caspar Schwenckfeld" *Kyrkohistorik Arsskrift* 57 (1957) 39–100, 58 (1958) 53–87; P. L. Maier, *Caspar Schwenckfeld on the Person and Work of Christ* (Assen 1959); R Pietz, *Die Gestalt der zukünftigen Kirche. Schwenckfelds Gespräch mit Luther 1525* (Stuttgart 1959); W. Knoke, "Schwenckfelds Sakramentsverständnis" *ZRGG* 11 (1959) 314–327.

SEBASTIAN FRANCK: Hillerbrand 1453a–1457; Schottenloher 6472–6536, 46321–46334, 54608–54623; H. Fast 217–248; B. Becker, "Nederlandsche vertalingen van Sebastiaan Francks geschriften" *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 21 (1928) 149–160; A. Hegler, *Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck* (Freiburg 1892); W. E. Peuckert, *Sebastian Franck* (München 1943); E. Teufel, *"Landräumig." Sebastian Franck* (Neustadt a.d. Aisch 1954); K. Räber, *Studien zur Geschichtsbibel Sebastian Francks* (Basel 1952); J. Lindeboom, *Een Franc-tireur der Reformatie, Sebastian Franck* (Arnheim 1952); S. L. Verheus, *Kroniek en Kerugma. Een theolog. studie over de Geschichtsbibel van Sebastiaan Franck* (Arnheim 1958).

16. *The Catholic Literary Opponents of Luther and the Reformation*

TEXTS

Corpus Catholicorum (=*CCath.*) *Werke kath. Schriftsteller im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung,* to date 29 vols. (Münster 1919–67). For the origins of this series see H. Jedin, *Jos. Greving (1868–1919)* (Münster 1954).

LITERATURE

K. Werner, *Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Literatur der christlichen Theologie* IV (Schaffhausen 1865); H. Laemmer, *Die vortridentinischkatholische Theologie des Reformationszeitalters* (Berlin 1858); F. Falk, "Das Corpus Catholicorum" *Der Katholik* 71/1 (1891) 440–463; N. Paulus, "Kath. Schriftsteller aus der Reformationszeit" *Katholik* 72/1 (1892) 544–564; 73/2 (1893) 213–223; id., *Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampf gegen Luther (1518–63)* (Freiburg 1903); F. Lauchert, *Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Freiburg 1912); G. Wolf, "Die kath. Gegner der Reformation vor dem Tridentinum und Jesuitenorden" *Quellenkunde der dt. Reformationsgeschichte* II ²(Gotha 1922) 206–262; P. Polman, *Die polemische Methode der ersten Gegner der Reformation* (Münster 1931); id., *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle* (Gembloux 1932); H. Jedin, "Die geschichtl. Bedeutung der kath. Kontroversliteratur im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung" *HJ* 53 (1933) 70–97; id., *The Council of Trent* (St. Louis 1957) 355–409; J. Lortz, *The Reformation in Germany* (New York 1968) 175–223; E. Iserloh, *Der Kampf um die Messe in den ersten Jahren der Auseinandersetzung mit Luther* (Münster 1952); *Acta Reformationis catholicae eccelsiam Germaniae concernantia,* ed. G. Pfeilschifter, I: 1520–1532 (Regensburg 1959), II: 1532–42 (1960); J. P. Dolan, "The Catholic Literary Opponents of Luther" *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* II (1974) 447–466;

JOHANNES ECK: List of Writings: J. Metzler, *CCath* 16 (1930) LXXI–CXXXI. New editions: *CCath* 1 (1919), 2 (1921), 6 (1923), 13 (1928), 14 (1929); W. Friedensburg, "Dr. Johannes Ecks Denkschriften zur dt. Kirchenreformation 1523" *Beitr. zur bayer, Kirchengesch.* 2 (Erlangen 1895–96) 159–196, 222–253; id., Letters, *ZKG* 19 (1899) 211–264, 473–485; J. Greving, *Eck als junger Gelehrter* (Münster 1906); id., *Ecks Pfarrbuch für U. L. F. in Ingolstadt* (Münster 1914); H. Schauerte, *Die Busslehre des Johannes Eck* (Münster 1919); W. Gussmann, *Des Johannes Eck 404 Artikel zum Reichstag von Augsburg 1530* (Kassel 1930); H. Rupprich, *Der Eckius Dedolatus und sein Verf.* (Vienna 1931); G. v. Pölnitz, "Die Beziehungen des Johannes Eck zum Augsburger Kapital" *HJ* 60 (1940) 685–705; Th. Wiedemann, *Dr. Johannes Eck* (Regensburg 1865); H. G. Assel, *Das kanon. Zinsverbot und der 'Geist' des Frühkapitalismus in der Wirtschaftsethik bei Eck und Luther* (unpublished Diss., Erlangen 1948); E. Iserloh, *Die Eucharistie in der Darstellung des Johannes Eck* (Münster 1950); F. Zeopfl, *Johannes Eck: Lebensbilder aus dem Bayer. Schwaben* (Münich 1958) 186–216; Gerh. Müller, "Johannes Eck und die Confessio Augustana. Zwei unbekannte Aktenstücke vom Augsburger Reichstag 1530" *QFIAB* 38 (1958) 205–242.

HIERONYMUS EMSER: Works: L. Enders, *Luther und Emser. Ihre Streitschriften aus dem Jahre 1521,* 2 vols. (Halle 1890–91); *De disputatione Lipsicensi (1519), A venatione Luteriana assertio (1519),* ed. X. Thurnhofer; *CCath* 4 (Münster 1921). Letters: *RGStT* 3 u. 40; 5 *Messopferschriften 1524–25,* ed. Th. Freudenberger; *CCath* 28 (Münster 1959). Literature: P. Mosen, *Hieronymus Emser* (Halle 1890); G. Kawerau. *Hieronymus Emser* (Halle 1898); F. Gess, *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1905–17); F. Jenssen, *Emsers N. T. in niederdt. Übertragung* (Schwerin

1933); G. Reichel, *Herzog Georg der Bärtige und Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Diss. Leipzig 1947); O. Vossler, "Herzog Georg der Bärtige und seine Ablehnung Luthers" *HZ* 184 (1957) 272–291.

JOHANNES COCHLAEUS: List of Writings: M. Spahn, *Johannes Cochlaeus* (Berlin 1898) 341–373 New editions: *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation* IV (Leipzig 1910) 177–218; *CCath* III, XV, XVII, XVIII; *CT* XII, 166–208. Letters: *ZKG* 18 (1898); *RGStT* 3 (1907) 14–18, 44–51, 53ff., 57, 59–65; 7 (1909) 32ff., 45ff., 51ff., 58–62; 21–22 (1912) 248–252; *RQ* 35 (1927) 447–451 with additional letters; ArSKG 5 (1940) 216–220. Literature: M. Spahn, *Johannes Cochlaeus* (Berlin 1898); H. Jedin, *Des Johannes Cochlaeus Streitschrift de libero arbitrio hominis (1525)* (Breslau 1927); id., *Schlesische Lebensbilder* IV (Breslau 1931) 18–28; A. Herte, *Die Lutherkommentare des Johannes Cochlaeus* (Münster 1935); id., *Das kath. Lutherbild im Bann der Lutherkommentare des Cochlaeus,* 3 vols. (Münster 1943); K. Kastner, "Cochlaeus und das Priestertum" *ArSKG* 10 (1952) 84–105.

JOHANNES FABRI: Works: *Opuscula* (Leipzig 1537); *Opera* (Cologne 1537–41); *Malleus in haeresim Lutheranam,* ed. A. Naegele; *CCath* 23–26 (Münster 1941–52); *CT* IV: 10–23. Literature: A. Horawitz, "J. Heigerlein (gen. Fabri) bis zum Regensburger Convent" *SAW* 107 (1884) 83–220; K. Czerwenka, *Johannes Fabri als Generalvikar von Konstanz* (Diss. Vienna 1903); L. Helbling, *Johannes Fabri* (Münster 1941, with further lit. and ref. to sep. works).

FRIEDRICH NAUSEA: Letters, ed. W. Friedensburg: *ZKG* 20 (1900) 500–545; 21 (1901) 537–594; *Acta Reformationis Catholicae* II (Regensburg 1960) 547–555; "Reformgutachten" *CT* XII: 364–426, 428–431. Literature: J. Metzner, *Friedrich Nausea* (Regensburg 1884); J. G. Mayer, "Bischof Nausea auf dem Konzil von Trient" *HJ* 8 (1887) 1–27; H. Gollob, *Friedrich Nausea* (Vienna 1952); H. Jedin, "Das konziliare Reformprogramm Friedrich Nauseas" *HJ* 77 (1958) 229–253; J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1959) 201–205.

BERTHOLD VON CHIEMSEE: *Tewtsche Theologey,* ed. W. Reithmeier (Munich 1852); F. X. Remberger, "Die Lehre von der Kirche in der 'Tewtschen Theologey'" *MThZ* 9 (1958) 97–109.

LOUVAIN UNIVERSITY: H. De Jongh, *L'ancienne faculté de théologie de Louvain* (Louvain 1911); E. de Moreau, "Luther et l'université de Louvain" *NRTh* 54 (1927) 402–435; R. Guelluy, "L'évolution des méthodes théologiques à Louvain d'Erasmus à Jansenius" *RHE* 37 (1941) 52–71; J. Étienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien et théologiens louvanistes* (Louvain 1956); K. Blockx, *De Veroordeeling van Maarten Luther door de Theol. faculteit de Leuven in 1519* (Brussels 1958).

JAMES LATOMUS: *Opera Omnia* (Louvain 1550); "De Primatu Romani Pontificis (1525)" *Bibliotheca reformatoria neerlandica* III, ed. F. Pijper (The Hague 1905) 111–195; J. Étienne, *Spiritualisme érasmien* 163–186 (works and lit.).

ALBERT PIGGE: H. Jedin, *Studien über die Schriftstellertätigkeit Albert Pigges* (Münster 1931); L. Pfeifer, *Ursprung der kath. Kirche und Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach Albert Pigge* (Würzburg 1938); J. Feiner, *Die Erbsündenlehre Albert Pigges* (Zurich 1940); M. E. Kronenberg, "Albert Pigge zijn geschriften en zijn bibliotheek" *Het Boek* 28 (1944) 107–158, 226; R. Bäumer, *Die Unfehlbarkeitslehre Albert Pigges* (Diss. Bonn 1956); id., "Die Auseinandersetzung über die römische Petrustradition in den ersten Jahrzehnten der Reformationszeit" *RQ* 57 (1962) 20–57.

HENRY VIII: *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII,* ed. J. S. Brewer, 21 vols.

(London 1861–1910); C. S. Meyer, "Henry VIII burns Luther's Books, 12 May 1521" *JEH* 9 (1958) 173–187; P. Hughes, *The Reformation in England,* 3 vols. (London 1951–54); E. Koermberg, *Henry VIII and Luther* (Stanford 1961); H. E. Jacobs, *The Lutheran Movement in England* (Philadelphia 1894); L. B. Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics* (Princeton 1953); E. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII* (London 1913); H. Thieme, *Die Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. und die europäischen Universitäten* (Karlsruhe 1957).

JOHN FISHER: *Opera,* ed. G. Fleischmann (Würzburg 1597); *English Works,* ed. J. B. Mayor (London 1876). Suppl. (London 1921); *Sacerdotii defensio: CCath* 9 (Münster 1925); T. E. Bridgett, *Life of blessed John Fisher* (London 1888, 1922); J. Grisar, "Der hl. Martyrer John Fisher" *StdZ* 129 (1935) 217–230; F. P. Bellabriga, *De doctrine beati Joannis Fisher in operibus adversus Lutherum* (Rome 1934); V. McNabb, *St John Fisher* (London 1935); O. Hendriks, *John Fisher. Bissehop en martelaar* (Nijmegen 1947).

THOMAS MORE: *Opera Omnia latina* (Frankfurt–Leipzig 1689; n. ed., Frankfurt 1963); *English Works,* ed. W. Rastell (London 1557), re-edited by W. E. Campbell, 2 vols. (London 1931). Literature: *Moreana 1478–1945,* ed. F.–M. P. Sullivan (Kansas City–Los Angeles 1946); T. E. Bridgett, *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas Morus* (London 1892); E. M. G. Routh, *Sir Thomas Morus and his Friends* (London 1934); *AAS* 27 (1935) 159–162, 201–208; R. W. Chambers, *Thomas Morus* (London 1935), German (Munich 1946, lit.); W. E. Champbell, *Erasmus, Tyndale and More* (London 1949); P. Huber, *Traditionsfestigkeit und Traditionskritik bei Thomas Morus* (Basel 1953); E. Flesseman van Leer, "The Controversy about Scripture and Tradition between Thomas Morus and W. Tyndale" *Ned. Archief voor Kerkgesch. NS* 43 (The Hague 1959) 143–164; id., "The Controversy about Ecclesiology between Thomas Morus and W. Tyndale" ibid. 44 (1960) 65–86; H. de Vocht, *Acta Thomae More* (Louvain 1947); G. J. Donnelly, *A Translation of Sir Thomas More's Responsio ad Lutherum* (Washington 1962); E. F. Rogers, ed., *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (Princeton 1947); id., *Selected Letters* (New Haven 1961); E. E. Reynolds, *St. Thomas More* (London 1953); T. Stapelton, *Thomas Mori. in Tres Thomae* (Cologne 1612); L. Bradner–C. A. Lynch, *The Latin Epigrams of Thomas More* (Chicago 1953); R. W. Gibson, *St Thomas More: A Preliminary Bibliography* (New Haven 1961); G. Marchadour, *L'Univers de Thomas More* (Paris 1963); R. Ames, *Citizen Thomas More and his Utopia* (Princeton 1949); E. L. Surtz, *The Praise of Pleasure* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957); id., *The Praise of Wisdom* (Chicago 1957); J. H. Hexter, *More's Utopia* (New York 1965); J. P. Dolan and W. Greene, *The Essential Thomas More* (New York 1967); J. M. Headley, "Thomas Murner, Thomas More, and the First Expression of More's Ecclesiology" *Studies in the Renaissance* XIV 73–92; A. Prévost, *Saint Thomas More, contribution a l'histoire de la pensée religieuse* (Diss. Lille 1945).

SILVESTER PRIERIAS: F. Lauchert, *Die it. literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Freiburg 1912) 7–30.

THOMAS DE VIO CAJETANUS: *Opera Omnis,* 5 vols. (Lyon 1639); *Opuscula Omnia* (Lyon 1558); *De divina institutione Pontificatus Romani,* ed. F. Lauchert: *CCath* 10 (Münster 1925); J. F. Groner, *Kard. Cajetanus* (Freiburg 1951) (lit.).

AMBROSIUS CATHARINUS: *Apologia,* ed. J. Schweizer: *CCath* 27 (Münster 1956); J. Schweizer, *Ambrosius Catharinus* (Münster 1910); F. Lauchert, *Die it. literarischen Gegner Luthers* (Freiburg 1912) 30–133; *ECatt* IX 1686f. (lit.).

JAKOB VAN HOOGSTRAETEN: *Bibliotheca reformatoria neerlandica* III, ed. F. Pijper (The Hague 1905); *De veneratione sanctorum* (1524), *De Purgatorio* (1525), *Disputationes contra Lutheranos* (1526); N. Paulus, *Die dt. Dominikaner im Kampf gegen Luther* (Freiburg 1903) 87–107.

Johannes Mensing: N. Paulus, *Die dt. Dominikaner* 16–45; A. Warko, *Johannes Mensings Lehre von der Ehrsünde und Rechtfertigung* (Diss. Breslau 1963); E. Iserloh, *Der Kampf um die Messe* (Münster 1952) 46–52.

Johannes Faber, OP: N. Paulus, *Die dt. Dominikaner* 292–313; Th. a Dillis, "Johannes Faber" *Lebensbilder aus dem bayerischen Schwaben* 5 (1956) 93–111.

Johannes Fabri, OP: N. Paulus, *Die dt. Dominikaner* 232–266; P. Siemer, *Gesch. des Dominikanerklosters St. Magdalena in Augsburg* (Vechta 1936) 107–114.

Ambrosius Pelargus, OP: N. Paulus, *Die deutschen Dominikaner,* 190–212; A. Keil, "Ambrosius Pelargus" *AMrhKG* 8 (1956) 181–223; W. Mann, "Eine humanistische Schrift über die Messe," *AMrhKG* 13 (1961) 197–233; P. Mohr, *Der Opfercharakter der Messe in der Apologia und im Hyperaspismus des Ambrosius Pelargus* (Speyer 1965).

Johannes Dietenberger: Ch. Moufang, *Kath. Katechismus des 16. Jh.* (Mainz 1881) 1–105; N. Paulus, *Die dt. Dominkaner* 186–189; H. Wedewer, *Johannes Dietenberger* (Freiburg 1888).

Augustin von Alveldt: *CCath* 11 (Münster 1926); *Wyder den wittenbergischen Abgot (1524) u. Erklärung des Salve Regina (1527);* L. Lemmens, *P. Augustin von Alveldt* (Freiburg 1899); id., *FStud* 5 (1918) 131–134; G. Hesse, "Augustin von Alveldt, Verteidiger des Apostolischen Stuhles" ibid. 17 (1930) 160–178.

Kaspar Schatzgeyer: *Omnia Opera* (Ingolstadt 1543); *Scrutinium,* ed. U. Schmidt: *CCath* 5 (Münster 1922); N. Paulus, *Kaspar Schatzgeyer* (Freiburg 1889); O. Müller, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre nominalistischer Reformationsgegner* (Breslau 1940); V. Heynck: *FStud* 28 (1941) 129–151, 29 (1942) 25–44; H. Klomps, *Kirche, Freiheit und Gesetz bei . . . Kaspar Schatzgeyer* (Münster 1959); E. Komposch, *Die Messe als Opfer der Kirche. Die Lehre Kaspar Schatzgeyers über das eucharistische Opfer* (Diss. Munich 1962).

Nikolaus Herborn: *Enchiridion,* ed. P. Schlager: *CCath* 12 (Münster 1927), *Confutatio Lutheranismi danici (1530),* ed. L. Schmidt (Quaracchi 1902); E. Kurten, *Franz Lambert von Avignon und Nikolaus Herborn* (Münster 1950).

Gasparo Contarini: *Opera* (Paris 1571; Venice 1578, 1589); *Gasparo Contarinis Gegenreformatorische Schriften,* ed. F. Hünermann: *CCath* 7 (Münster 1923); "Reformgutachten" *CT* XII 131–145, 153f., 208–215; F. Dittrich, *Gasparo Contarini* (Braunsberg 1885); id., *Regesten und Briefe* (Braunsberg 1881); H. Rückert, *Die theol. Entwicklung Gasparo Contarinis* (Berlin 1926); H. Jedin, *Kard. Contarini als Kontroverstheologe* (Münster 1949); id., *Contarini und Camaldoli* (Rome 1953); id., "Ein 'Turmerlebnis' des jungen Contarni" *HJ* 70 (1951) 115–130; id., *Gasparo Contarini e il contributo veneziano alla Riforma Cattolica: La Civilta Veneziana del Rinascimento* (Florence 1958) 105–124; R. M. Douglas, *Jacopo Sodaleto* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959).

Johannes Gropper: W. van Gulik, *Johannes Gropper* (Freiburg 1906); W. Lipgens, *Kard. Johannes Gropper* (Münster 1951, lit.); H. Lutz, "Reformatio Germaniae. Drei Denkschriften Johannes Groppers" *QFIAB* 37 (1957) 222–310; R. Stupperich, "Briefe und Merkblätter Johannes Groppers aus den Jahren 1542–1549" *WZ* 109 (1959) 97–107; H. Jedin, "Das Autograph Johannes Groppers zum Kölner Provinzialkonzil von 1536" *Spiegel der Gesch. Festgabe für M. Braubach* (Münster 1964) 281–292.

Julius Pflug: A. Jansen, "Julius Pflug" *Neue Mitteilungen aus dem Gebiet hist. antiquarischer Forschung* X/1 (Halle 1863) 1–110; X/2 (1864) 1–212; W. Offele, *Ein Katechismus im Dienst der Glaubenseinheit* (Essen 1965) (lit.).

MICHAEL HELDING: N. Paulus, "Michael Helding" *Katholik* 74, II (1894) 410–430, 481–502; E. Feifel, *Grundzüge einer Theologie des Gottesdienstes, Motive und Konzeption der Glaubensverkündigung Michael Heldings* (Freiburg 1960) (lit.); id., *Der Mainzer Weibischof Michael Helding zwischen Reformation und kath. Reform* (Wiesbaden 1962).

GEORG WITZEL: G. Richter, *Die Schriften Georg Witzels bibliographisch bearb.* (Fulda 1913; new edition, Niewkoop 1963); *Apologia* (1533); A. Räss, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* I (Freiburg 1872) 156–184); H. Volz (ed.), "Drei Schriften gegen Luthers Schmalkaldische Artikel von Cochläus, Witzel und Hoffmeister" *CCath* 18 (Münster 1932); L. Pralle, "Die volksliturgischen Bestrebungen des Georg Witzel" *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 3 (1948) 224–242; R. Padberg, "Zum katechetischen Anliegen Georg Witzels" *ThGl* 43 (1953) 192–200; id., "Georg Witzel der Ältere, ein Pastoraltheologe des 16. Jh.s." *ThQ* 135 (1955) 385–409; J. P. Dolan, *The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel and Cassander in the Church of Ordinances . . . of the United Duchies of Cleve* (Münster 1957); id., "Witzel et Erasme a propos des sacrements" *RHE* LIV 1 (1959); id., "Georg Witzel: Liturgiker und Kirchenreformer" *Una Sancta* XI, IV, 196–204; id., *N. Cath. Enc.* XIV: 984–985; W. Trusen, *Um die Reform und Einheit der Kirche. Zum Leben und Werk Georg Witzels* (Münster 1957).

STANISLAUS HOSIUS: *Opera,* 2 vols. (Cologne 1584); *Die dt. Predigten und Katechesen,* ed. F. Hipler–V. Zakrzewski (Krakau 1879–88); E. M. Wermter (ed.), *Kard. Stanislaus Hosius und Herzog Albrecht von Preussen. Ihr Briefwechsel über das Konzil von Trient* (Münster 1957) (lit.); *Bibliographia Hosiana,* ed. J. Smoczynsky (Peplin 1937); H. Eichhorn, *Der ermländische Bischof und Kard. Stanislaus Hosius,* 2 vols. (Mainz 1854); J. Lortz, *Kard. Stanislaus Hosius* (Braunsberg 1931); L. Bernacki, *La doctrine de l'église chez le Card. Hosius* (Paris–Posen 1935); F. J. Zdrodowski, *The Concept of Heresy according to Card. Hosius* (Washington 1947).

REGINALD POLE: *Epistolae,* 5 vols. (Brescia 1744–57); M. Haile, *Life of Reginald Pole* (New York 1910); W. Schenk, *Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England* (London 1950).

JACOPO SADOLETO: *Omnia Opera,* 4 vols. (Verona 1737; Rome 1760–64); *Epistulae* (Cologne 1590; Rome 1767); F. C. Church, *The Italian Reformers, 1534–1564* (New York 1932); A. Cistellini, *Figure della Riforma pretridentina* (Brescia 1948); S. Ritter, *Un Umanista teologo Jacope Sadoleto* (Rome 1912); G. Schultess-Reckberg, *Der Kardinal Jacope Sadoleto* (Zurich 1909); R. M. Douglas, *Jacope Sadoleto: Humanist and Reformer* (Cambridge 1959); F. Benoit, *La Légation du cardinal Sadolet auprès de François I en 1542* (Paris 1928); P. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy* (Oxford 1967).

SECTION THREE

The Reform in the German Principalities

17. *The Confessional Leagues. The Imperial Diets of Nürnberg (1524) and Speyer (1526)*

LITERATURE

Deutsche Reichstagsakten. Jüngere Reihe. IV, compiled by A. Wrede (Stuttgart 1905)= *RTA; Acta Reformationis Catholicae,* ed. G. Pfeilschifter, I (Regensburg 1959)=*ARC;* W.

Friedensburg, "Der Regensburger Convent von 1524," *Hist. Aufsätze dem Andenken v. G. Waitz* (Hannover 1886) 502–539; id., *Zur Vorgeschichte des Gotha-Torgauischen Bündnisses der Evangelischen* (Marburg 1884); id., *Der Reichstag zu Speier im Zusammenhang mit der politischen und kirchlichen Entwicklung Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter* (Berlin 1887); id., "Die Reformation und der Speierer Reichstag von 1526" *LuJ* 8 (1926) 120–195; J. K. Seidemann, "Das Dessauer Bündniss vom 26. Juni 1525" *ZHTh* 17 (1847) 638–655; E. Cardinal, *Cardinal L. Campeggio, Legate of the Courts of Henry VIII and Charles V* (Boston 1935); Schottenloher 41253–57 (Regensburg Konvent); 27957a–60a (Nürnberg 1524); 27960b–74 (Speyer 1926).

18. *Luther's Concept of the Church and Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms*

SOURCES

CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH: "Von dem Papsttum zu Rom wider den hochberühmten Romanisten zu Leipzig" (1520; *WA* 6: 285–324); "Ad librum . . . Ambrosii Catharini . . . responsio" (1521; *WA* 7: 705–778); "Dass eine christliche Versammlung oder Gemeine Recht und Macht habe, alle Lehren zu urteilen und Lehrer zu berufen, ein- und abzusetzen" (1523; *WA* 11: 408–416); "De instituendis ministris ecclesiae ad senatum Pragensem Bohemiae" (1523; *WA* 12: 169–196).

DOCTRINE OF THE TWO KINGDOMS: "Von weltlicher Oberkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei" (1523; *WA* 11: 245–281); "Wider die himmlischen Propheten . . . " (1525; *WA* 18: 62–125); "Ob Kriegsleute auch in seligem Stande sein Können" (1526; *WA* 19: 623–662); "Vom Krieg wider die Türken" (1529; *WA* 30/II: 107–148); "Eine Heerpredigt wider den Türken" (1529; *WA* 30/II: 160–197).

LITERATURE

CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH: J. Köstlin, *Luthers Lehre von der Kirche* (Stuttgart 1853); P. Drews, *Entsprach das Staatskirchentum dem Ideale Luthers?* (Tübingen 1908); K. Müller, *Kirche, Gemeinde und Obrigkeit nach Luther* (Tübingen 1910); M. Rade, "Der Sprung in Luthers Kirchenbegriff" *ZThK* 24 (1914) 241–260; K. Holl, "Die Entstehung von Luthers Kirchenbegriff" *Ges. Aufsätze* I (Tübingen 1932) 288–325; id., "Luther und das landesherrliche Kirchenregiment" loc. cit. 326–380; F. Kattenbusch, "Die Doppelschichtigkeit in Luthers Kirchenbegriff" *ThStK* 100 (1927–28); E. Kohlmeyer, "Die Bedeutung die Kirche für Luther" *ZKG* 47 (1928) 466–511; E. Rietschel, *Das Problem der unsichtbar-sichtbaren Kirche bei Luther* (Leipzig 1932); H. J. Iwand, "Zur Entstehung von Luthers Kirchenbegriff" *Festschr. für G. Dehn* (Neukirchen 1957) 145–166; K. G. Steck, "Ecclesia-creatura verbi" J. Beckmann et. al., *Von Einheit u. Wesen der Kirche* (Göttingen 1960) 40–56; E. Kinder, *Der evangelische Glaube und die Kirche* (Berlin 1960) 57–144 (lit.).

DOCTRINE OF THE TWO KINGDOMS: R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht* I (Leipzig 1892); Harold Diem, *Luthers Lehre von den beiden Reichen* (Munich 1938); G. Törnwall, *Geistliches und weltliches Regiment bei Luther* (Munich 1947); E. Kinder, *Luther und die Politische Frage* (Neukirchen 1950); F. Lau, *Luthers Lehre von den beiden Reichen* (Berlin 1953); J. Heckel, *Lex charitatis. Eine juristische Untersuchung über das Recht in der Theologie M. Luthers* (Munich 1953); id., *Im Irrgarten der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre* (Munich 1957); id., "Kirche und Kirchenrecht nach der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre" *ZSavRGkan* 48 (1962) 222–284; Gunnar Hillerdal, *Gehorsam gegen Gott und Menschen. Luthers Lehre von der Obrigkeit und die* *moderne evangelische Staatsethik* (Göttingen 1955); P. Althaus, "Luther Lehre von den beiden Reichen im Feuer der Kritik" *LuJ* 24 (1957) 40–68 (lit.); id., *Die Ethik Martin Luthers* (Gütersloh 1965) 49–87; Sigfrid Grundmann, "Kirche und Staat nach der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre Luthers: Im Dienste des Rechts" *Festschr. Franz Arnold* (Vienna 1963) 38–54; E. Wolf, "Königsherrschaft Christi und lutherische Zwei-Reiche-Lehre" *Peregrinatio* II (Munich 1965) 207–229; *EKL* III, 1927–47 (opposing interpretations of Luther's doctrine by P. Althaus and Joh. Hechel). **Melanchthon:** R. Nürnberger, *Kirche und weltliche Obrigkeit bei Melanchthon* (Diss. Würzburg 1937); A. Reuter, "Luther und Melanchthons Stellung zur jurisdictio episcoporum" *NKZ* 36 (1925) 549–575; A. Sperl, *Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus und Reformation* (Munich 1959); F. Lau, "Melanchthon und die Ordnung der Kirche" *Philipp Melanchthon. Forschungsbeiträge,* ed. W. Elliger (Göttingen 1961) 98–115.

19. *The Completion of the Lutheran Community*

SOURCES

E. Sehling (ed.), *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jh.* (Tübingen 1955–56), 1–5 (1902–13), 6–8, 11–13 (1955–66).

CHURCH PROPERTIES: "Ordnung eines gemeinen Kastens" (Leipzig 1523; *WA* 12: 11–30).

DIVINE SERVICES: "Deutsche Messe und Ordnung des Gottesdiensts" (1526; *WA* 19: 72–113); "Das Taufbüchlein verdeutscht, aufs neue zugerichtet" (1526; *WA* 19: 537–541); "Das Taubüchlein für die einfältigen Pfarrherrn" (1529; *WA* 30/III: 74–80).

VISITATION: "Unterricht der Visitatoren an die Pfarrherren im Kurfürstentum Sachsen" (1528) *CR* 26: 51–96; *WA* 26: 195–240; *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* I (1959) 215–271; Sehling, I: 149–174.

SCHOOLS: "An die Ratsherren aller Städte deutschen Landes, dass sie christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen" (1524; *WA* 15: 27–53); "Eine Predigt, dass man Kinder zur Schulen halten solle" (1530; *WA* 30/II: 517–588); R. Vormbaum, *Die evangelishcen Schulordnungen des 16. Jh.* (Gütersloh 1860); S. Hendrix, "Luther and the Climate for Theological Education" *Lutheran Quarterly* 26 (1974) 3–11.

CATECHISM: *WA* 30/I: Sermons on the Catechism 1528 and the Text of Luther's Catechism with introduction, bibliography, and philological notations, by O. Albrecht, O. Brenner, G. Buchwald and J. Luther (1910); *BSLK* 501–733; F. Cohrs, *Die Evangelischen Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion,* 5 vols. (Berlin 1900–7).

LITERATURE

CHURCH PROPERTIES: A. Schultze, *Stadtgemeinde und Reformation* (Tübingen 1918); F. H. Löscher, *Schule, Kirche und Obrigkeit im Reformations-Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1925); H. Werdermann, *Luthers Wittenberger Gemeinde wiederhergestellt aus seinen Predigten* (Gütersloh 1929); H. Lehnert, *Kirchengut und Reformation* (Erlangen 1935).

DIVINE SERVICES: H. Jacoby, *Die Liturgik der Reformatoren,* 2 vols. (Gotha 1871–76); P. Drews, "Studien zur Gesch. des Gottesdienstes IV–V" *Beiträge zu Luthers liturgischen Reformen* (Tübingen 1910); J. Smend, *Die Deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers deutscher Messe* (Göttingen 1896); H. Waldenmaier, *Die Entstehung der evangelischen Gottes-*

dienstordnungen Süddeutschlands im Zeitalter der Reformation (Leipzig 1916); L. Fendt, *Der lutherische Gottesdienst des 16. Jh.* (Munich 1923); A. Allwohn, *Gottesdienst und Rechtfertigungsglaube* (Göttingen 1926); E. Reim, "The Liturgical Crisis in Wittenberg 1524" *Concordia Theological Monthly* 20 (1949) 284–292; W. Jensen, "Von der ev. Mess" *Festgabe für K. Schornbaum* (Neustadt a. d. Aisch 1950) 61–100; V. Vajta, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther* (Göttingen 1959); A. Boes, "Die Reformatorischen Gottesdienste in der Wittenberger Pfarrkirche von 1523 an" *JLH* 4 (1958–59) 1–40; H. B. Meyer, *Luther und die Messe* (Paderborn 1965).

VISITATION: C. H. Burkhardt, *Geschichte der sächsischen Kirchen- und Schulvisitationen 1524–1545* (Leipzig 1879); E. Sehling, *Geschichte der protestantischen Kirchenverfassung* (Leipzig 1914); K. Eger, "Grundsätze evangelischer Kirchenverfassung bei Luther" *ThStK* 106 (1934–35) 77–123; M. Schmidt, "Die Reformation Luthers und die Ordnung der Kirche" *Im Lichte der Reformation* II (Göttingen 1959) 5–31.

SCHOOLS: F. Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts an den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten* I (Leipzig 1919); G. Mertz, *Das Schulwesen der deutschen Reformation im 16. Jh.* (Heidelberg 1902); F. H. Löscher, *Schule, Kirche und Obrigkeit im Reformations-Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1925); O. Scheel, "Luther und die Schule seiner Zeit" *LuJ* 7 (1925) 141–175; F. Falk, "Luthers Schrift an die Ratsherrn . . . und ihre gesch. Wirkung auf die deutsche Schule" *LuJ* 19 (1937) 55–114; Th. v. Sicard, *Luther und die Schule* (Gütersloh 1947); G. Mertz, "Luther über die Schule" *Schule und Leben* I (1950) 289–296; E. Lichtenstein, "Luther und die Schule" *Der ev. Erzieher* 7 (1955) 2–13; E. Reimers, *Recht und Grenzen einer Berufung auf Luther in den neueren Bemühungen um eine evangelische Erziehung* (Weinheim 1958); I. Asheim, *Glaube und Erziehung bei Luther* (Heidelberg 1961) (Bibliography).

CATECHISM: O. Albrecht, *Luthers Katechismen* (Leipzig 1915); D. J. M. Reu, *D. Martin Luthers Kleiner Katechismus* (Munich 1929); J. Meyer, *Historischer Kommentar zu Luthers Kleinem Katechismus* (Göttingen 1929); K. Aland, *Der Text des Kleinen Katechismus in der Gegenwart* (Gütersloh 1954); Appraised by G. Dehn: *ThLZ* 79 (1954) 719–724; G. Hoffmann, "Der kleine Katechismus als Abriss der Theologie M. Luthers," *Luther* 30 (1959) 49–63; E. V. Wills, "Joh. Brenz's Catechismus of 1528 and 1535" *Lutheran Church Quarterly* 19 (1946) 271–280.

20. *Clement VII and Charles V*

LITERATURE

Pastor, X (London 1938) Chaps. 1–8; T. Pandolfi, "Giovan Matteo Giberti e l'ultima difesa della libertá d'Italia negli anni 1521–1525" *AS Romana* 34 (1911) 131–237; E. Rodonachi, *Les pontificats d'Adrien VI et de Clément VII* (Paris 1933); K. Brandi, *The Emperor Charles V* (New York 1939); P. Rassow, *Die Kaiser-Idee Karls V.* (Berlin 1932); id., *Die politische Welt Karls V.* (Munich 1947); M. Salomies, *Die Pläne Karls V. für eine Reichsreform* (Helsinki 1953); J. Calmette, *Charles V* (Paris 1945); R. Tyler, *The Emperor Charles the Fifth* (London 1956); *Karl V: Der Kaiser und seine Zeit,* ed. P. Rassow–F. Schalk (Cologne 1960); I. Ludolphy, *Die Voraussetzungen der Religionspolitik Karls V.* (Stuttgart 1965).

21. *The Speyer Protest and the Marburg Religious Colloquy*

THE PACK AFFAIR: Schottenloher 40566a–91; J. Kühn, "Über die Verantwortlichkeit an der Entstehung des politischen Protestantismus" *Festschr. W. Goetz* (Leipzig 1927); id., "Landgraf Philipp von Hessen, der politische Sinn der Packschen Händel" *Festschr. E. Brandenburg* (Leipzig 1928); K. Dülfer, *Die Packschen Händel,* 2 vols. (Marburg 1958).

DIET OF SPEYER: *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Karl V.,* VII, revised by J. Kühn (Stuttgart 1935); *Die Appellation und Protestation der ev. Stände auf dem Reichstag zu Speier,* ed. J. Ney (1906; Neudruck Darmstadt 1967); J. Kühn, *Die Gesch. des Speyrer Reichstages 1529* (Leipzig 1929); J. Boehmer, "Protestari und protestatio, protestierende Obrigkeiten und protestantische Christen" *ARG* (1934) 1–22.

RIGHT OF RESISTANCE: See Chap. 23.

THE MARBURG COLLOQUY: See Chapter 14; H. Heppe, *Die fünfzehn Marburger Artikel vom 3. Oktober 1529* (Kassel ^{2}1854) (facsimile); M. Lenz, "Zwingli und Landgraf Philipp" *ZKG* 3 (1879) 28–62, 220–274, 429–463; id., (ed.), *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmütigen von Hessen mit Bucer,* 3 vols. (Leipzig 1880, 1887, 1891); R. Hauswirth, "Landgraf Philipp von Hessen und Zwingli" *Zwingliana* 11 (1959–63) 499–552; H. v. Schubert, *Bekenntnisbildung und Religionspolitik 1529–30* (Gotha 1910); id., *Anfänge ev. Bekenntnisbildung bis 1529–30* (Leipzig 1928); W. Köhler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* (Leipzig 1929); id., *Zwingli und Luther* II (Gütersloh 1953); E. Bizer, *Studien zur Gesch. des Abendmahlsstreits im 16. Jh.* (Gütersloh 1940); H. Köditz, "Die gesellschaftlichen Ursachen des Scheiterns des Marburger Religionsgesprächs 1529" *Zschr. f. Geschichtswiss.* 2 (1954) 37–70; J. Staedtke, "Eine neue Version des sog. Utinger-Berichtes vom Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529" *Zwingliana* 10 (1954–58) 210–216; F. Büsser (ed.), *Beschreibung des Abendmahlstreites von Johannes Stumpf* (Zurich 1960); H. W. Neuser, "Eine unbekannte Unionsformel Melanchthons vom Marburger Religionsgespräch" *ThZ* 21 (1965) 181–199; Chr. Gestrich, *Zwingli als Theologe, Glaube und Geist beim Zürcher Reformator* (Diss. Zurich 1966); S. Hausammann, "Die Marburger Artikel–eine echte Konkordia?" *ZKG* 77 (1966) 288–321.

HEINRICH BULLINGER: **Works:** *Reformationsgeschichte,* ed. J. J. Hottinger–H. H. Vögeli, 3 vols. (Frauenfeld 1838–40); *Diarium,* ed. E. Egli (Basel 1904); *The Decades of Heinrich Bullinger,* ed. T. Harding, 4 vols. (Cambridge 1849–52); *Das höchste Gut,* ed. J. Staedtke (Zurich 1955); *Das 2. helvetische Bekenntnis,* ed. R. Zimmermann–W. Hildebrandt (Zurich 1936); G. W. Bromily (ed.), *Zwingli and Bullinger* (Philadelphia 1953) (Contains Bullinger's *Of the Holy Catholic Church*). **Literature:** Schottenloher 2049–2122, 45237–46, 52997–53032; C. Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld 1858); A. Bouvier, *Heinrich Bullinger réformateur et conseiller oecuménique* (Neuchâtel 1940); F. Blanke, *Der junge Bullinger* (Zurich 1942); W. Hollweg, *Heinrich Bullingers Hausbuch* (Neukirchen 1956); P. Walser, *Bullingers Lehre von der Prädestination* (Zurich 1957); H. Fast, *Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer* (Weierhof 1959); J. Staedtke, *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger* (Zurich 1962) (Bibliography to 1528 and literature); *Glauben und Bekennen, 400 Jahre Confessio Helvetica Posterior* (Zurich 1966).

22. *The Imperial Diet of Augsburg*

SOURCES

Schottenloher 28011–67, 34504–687a, 36895; 62221–50; G. Brück, *Geschichte der Handlungen in der Sache des heiligen Glaubens auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530,* ed. K. E. Förstemann (Halle 1831); K. E. Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstages zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530,* 2 vols. (Halle 1833–35; new imprint Osnabrück 1966); *Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI illustrantia,* ed. H. Laemmer (Freiburg 1861); F. W. Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Akten zu der Geschichte des Religionsgespräches zu Marburg 1529 und des Reichstages zu Augsburg 1530* (Gotha 1876); *Die Ratschläge der evangelischen Reichsstände zum Reichstag von Augsburg,* ed. W. Gussmann: *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Augsburgischen Glaubensbekenntnisses* I, 1 and 2 (Leipzig–Berlin 1911);*J. Ecks 404 Artikel zum Reichstag von Augsburg 1530,* id.: ibid. II (Kassel 1930); V. Tetleben, *Protokoll des Augsburger Reichstages 1530,* ed. H. Grundmann (Göttingen 1958); St. Ehses, "Kardinal Lorenzo Campeggio auf dem Reichstag von Augsburg 1530" *RQ* 17–21 (1903–07); J. Walter, *Die Depeschen des venez, Gesandten N. Tiepolo* (Berlin 1928); *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, Erste Abt. 1533–59,* I. ErgBd 1530–31, ed. G. Müller (Tübingen 1963); "Briefwechsel," *CR* 2; *WA, Br* 5.

CONFESSIO AUGUSTANA: *BSLK* 31–137; M. Reu, *The Augsburg Confession* (Chicago 1930).

CONFUTATIO: *Die Konfutation des Augsburgischen Bedenntnisses. Ihre erste Gestalt und ihre Geschichte,* ed. J. Ficker (Leipzig 1891); *CR* 27, 1–243; Th. Kolde, *Die Augsburgische Konfession* (Gotha 1896, 1911) 140–169.

CONFESSIO TETRAPOLITANA: E. F. K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* (Leipzig 1903) 55–78; Zwingli, *Fidei ratio (1530):* ibid. 79–94.

APOLOGIA: *CR* 27, 244–378; *BSLK, 139*–404.

LITERATURE

L. Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V.* (Freiburg 1879); J. Walter, *Die Depeschen des venez. Gesandten N. Tiepolo* (Berlin 1928); id., "Der Reichstag zu Augsburg 1530" *LuJ* 12 (1930) 1–90; R. Hermann, "Zur theol. Würdigung der Augustana," ibid. 162–214; H. Schubert, "Luther auf der Koburg" ibid. 109–161; id., *Der Reichstag zu Augsburg im Zusammenhang der Reformationsgeschichte* (Leipzig 1930); W. A. Nagel, *Luthers Anteil an der Confessio Augustant* (Gütersloh 1930); W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther* II (Gütersloh 1953); F. W. Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen um die Einheit der Kirche im Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Stuttgart 1957); G. Müller, "Johann Eck und die CA" *QFIAB* 38 (1958) 205–242; H. Grundmann, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen auf dem Augsburger Reichstag 1530* (Gütersloh 1959); W. Maurer, "Studien über Melanchthons Anteil an der Entstehung der Confessio Augustana" *ARG* 51 (1960) 158–207; id., "Melanchthon als Verfasser der Augustana," *Luth. Rundschau* 10 (1960–61) 164–179; E. Honée, "Die Vergleichsverhandlungen zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten im August 1530" *QFIAB* 42–43 (1963) 412–434; G. Müller, "Um die Einheit der Kirche. Zu den Verhandlungen über den Laienkelch während des Augsburger Reichstages 1530" *Reformata Reformanda, Festgabe H. Jedin,* ed. E. Iserloh–K. Repgen, I (Münster 1965) 393–427; K. Honselmann, "Otto Beckmanns

Vermittlungsversuch beim Reichstag zu Augsburg 1530" ibid. 428–444; K. Thieme, *Die Augsburgische Konfession und Luthers Katechismen auf theologische Gegenwartswerte untersucht* (Giessen 1930); E. Schlink, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (Munich 1948); H. Asmussen, *Warum noch lutherische Kirche* (Stuttgart 1949); F. Brunstäd, *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (Gütersloh 1951); M. Lackmann, *Katholische Einheit und Augsburger Konfession* (Cologne 1959); H. Fagerberg, *Die Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften von 1528–1537* (Göttingen 1965); H. Bornkamm, *Das Augsburgische Bekenntnis* (Hamburg 1965); L. Fendt, *Der Wille der Reformation im Augsburgischen Bekenntnis,* 2 revised by B. Klaus (Tübingen 1966); B. Moeller, "Augustana-Studien" *ARG* 57 (1966) 76–95; F. Blanke, "Zwinglis 'Fidei ratio' (1530), Entstehung und Bedeutung" ibid. 96–101.

23. *The Politicizing of the Reform Movement to the Collapse of the Religious Colloquies*

LITERATURE

1. THE RIGHT OF RESISTANCE: L. Cardauns, *Die Lehre vom Widerstandsrecht des Volkes gegen die rechtmässige Obrigkeit im Luthertum und im Calvinismus des 16. Jh.* (Diss. Bonn 1903); K. Müller, "Luthers Äusserungen über das Recht des bewaffneten Widerstandes gegen den Kaiser" *SAM* 1915, VIII (Munich 1915); H. Lüttge, "Melanchthons Anschauung v. Recht des Widerstandes gegen die Staatsgewalt" *ZKG* 47 (1928) 512–542; J. Heckel, *Lex charitatis* (Munich 1953) 184–191; id., "Widerstand gegen die Obrigkeit?" *Zeitenwende* 25 (1954) 156–168; E. Wolf, "Widerstandsrecht" *RGG* VI 1681–92.

2. THE LEAGUE OF SCHMALKALD: Schottenloher 41646–71; 52101f; 64018–26; O. Winckelmann, *Der Schmalkaldische Bund und der Nürnberger Religionsfrieden* (Strassburg 1892); E. Fabian, *Die Entstehung des Schmalkaldischen Bundes und seiner Verfassung* (Tübingen 1962 lit.); id., *Die Schmalkaldischen Bundesabschiede 1530–32* (Tübingen 1958); Chr. Glitsch, *Die Bündnispolitik der oberdt. Städte des Schmalkaldischen Bundes unter Einfluss von Strassburg und Ulm 1529–32* (Diss. Tübingen 1960); St. Fischer-Galati, "Ottoman Imperialism and the Religion Peace of Nürnberg" *ARG* 47 (1956) 160–179; R. Schelp. *Die Reformationsprozesse der Stadt Strassburg am Reichskammergericht z. Z. des Schmalkaldischen Bundes* (Kaiserslautern 1965).

3. THE REFORMATION IN WÜRTTEMBERG: Schottenloher 34046d–62; 61983–62018; J. Wille, *Philipp der Grossmütige von Hessen und die Restitution Ulrichs v. Wirtemberg 1526–35* (Tübingen 1882); J. Rauscher, *Württembergische Reformationsgeschichte (1500–1559)* (Stuttgart 1934); H. Hermelink, *Gesch. der ev. Kirche in Württemberg von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart u. Tübingen 1949); W. Köhler, *Zwingli u. Luther* II (Gütersloh 1953).-J. Brenz: W. Köhler, *Bibliographia Brentiana* (Berlin 1904); J. Brenz, *Anecdota Brentiana,* ed. Th. Pressel (Tübingen 1868); "Brentiana," ed. W. Köhler: *ARG* 9–26 (1911–29); *Confessio Virtembergica,* ed. E. Bizer (Stuttgart 1952); *Predigten des Joh. Brenz,* ed. E. Bizer (Stuttgart 1955); A. Hegler, *Joh. Brenz und die Reform in Württemberg* (Freiburg 1899); M. Brecht, *Die frühe Theologie des Johannes Brenz* (Tübingen 1966) (lit.: auch Schottenloher 52867–81).

4. THE WITTENBERG CONCORD: E. Bizer, *Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlsstreites im 16. Jh.* (1940, Darmstadt 1962); W. Köhler, *Zwingli u. Luther* II (Gütersloh 1953).

5. THE SCHMALKALDIC ARTICLES: (*Sch. A.*): *BSLK*, 405–468, 1226–1228 (lit.); H. Volz, "Luthers Sch. A. u. Melanchthons Tractatus de potestate papae" *ThStK* 103 (1931) 1–70; E. Bizer, "Die Wittenberger Theologen u. das Konzil" *ARG* 47 (1956) 77–101; id., "Zum geschichtlichen Verständnis von Luthers Sch. A." *ZKG* 67 (1955–56) 61–92; id., "Noch einmal: Die Sch. A." *ZKG* 68 (1957) 287–294; *Urkunden u. Aktenstücke zur Gesch. von M. Luthers Sch. A. (1536–74)*, ed. H. Volz (Berlin 1957); H. Volz, "Luthers Sch. A." *ZKG* 68 (1957) 259–286; id., "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Luthers Sch. A." *ZKG* 74 (1963) 316–320; A. Ebneter, "Luther und das Konzil" *ZKTh* 84 (1962) 1–48; Chr. Tecklenburg Johns, *Luthers Konzilsidee* (Berlin 1966).

6. THE TREATY OF FRANKFURT: Text: P. Fuchtel, "Der Frankfurter Anstand" *ARG* 28 (1931) 145–206; Le Plat II 625–630; E. Ziehen, "Frankfurter Anstand und deutsch-evangelischer Reichsbund von Schmalkalden 1539" *ZKG* 59 (1940) 324–351; G. Müller, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Frankfurter Anstandes 1539" *QFIAB* 39 (1959) 328–341.

REFORMATION IN SAXONY: O. A. Hecker, *Religion und Politik in den letzten Lebensjahren Herzog Georgs des Bärtigen von Sachsen* (Leipzig 1912); E. Brandenburg, *Herzog Heinrich d. Fr. von Sachsen und die Religionsparteien im Reich* (Dresden 1896); S. Issleib, "Herzog Heinrich als ev. Fürst" *Beitr. zur sächs. KG* 19 (1905) 143–215; H. Bornkamm, *Das Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Göttingen 1961) 142–162; H. Helbig, *Die Reformation der Universität Leipzig im 16. Jh.* (Gütersloh 1953).

BRANDENBURG: P. Steinmüller, *Einführung der Reformation in der Kurmark Brandenburg durch Joachim II.* (Halle 1903); N. Müller, "Zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes der Domkirche zu Berlin 1540–1598" *Jb. für brandenburgische KG* 2–3 (1906) 337–550; L. Zscharnack, *Das Werk M. Luthers in der Mark Brandenburg* (Berlin 1917); W. Wendland, "Einführung in die Quellen und Literatur zur märkischen Reformations-Gesch." *Jb. f. brandenburgische KG* 34 (1939) 131–163; 35 (1940) 217–227; id., "Die märkische Reformation" ibid. 34 (1939) 33–51; W. Dürks. "Der Beginn der märkischen Reformation i. J. 1539" ibid. 52–87; O. Gross, "Vom Widerstand der Kath. Kirche gegen die Kirchenordnung Joachims II." *Wichmann-Jb.* (1953) 36–52; W. Delius, "Die Reformation des Kurfürsten Joachim II." *Theol. Viatorum* 5 (1954) 174–193; B. Klaus, "Die kurbrandenburgische Kirchenordnung" *JLH* 4 (1958–59) 82–85; E. W. Zeeden, *Katholische Überlieferungen in den luth. Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jh.* (Münster 1959).

7. THE RELIGIOUS COLLOQUIES: Schottenloher 41279f; K. Brandi, *Kaiser Karl V.* II (Münich 1941) 296–306; L. Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V.* (Freiburg 1879); L. Cardauns, *Zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Unions- und Reformbestrebungen 1538–42* (Rome 1910); R. Stupperich, *Der Humanismus und die Wiedervereinigung der Konfessionen* (Leipzig 1936); W. Lipgens, *Kardinal J. Gropper 1503–1559* (Münster 1951); H. Jedin, *Kirche des Glaubens-Kirche der Geschichte* I (Freiburg 1966) 361–366.

HAGENAU: Schottenloher 41323a–28; Text of the Abschiedes in L. v. Ranke, *Dt. Gesch. im Zeitalter der Reformation* VI (Munich 1926) 136–145; R. Moses, *Die Religionsverhandlungen in Hagenau und Worms* (Jena 1889); F. Dittrich, *Nuntiaturberichte G. Morones vom dt. Königshofe 1539–40* (Paderborn 1892) 130–179; *NBD* I 420–464; A. Ph. Brück, "Die Instruktion Kardinal Albrechts von Brandenburg für das Hagenauer Religionsgespräch" *AmrhKG* 4 (1952) 275–280.

WORMS: Schottenloher 41404–16; W. Lipgens, "Theologischer Standort fürstlicher Räte im 16. Jh." *ARG* 43 (1952) 28–51; H. Jedin, *Tommaso Campeggio (1483–1564)* (Münster 1958).

REGENSBURG: Schottenloher 28073–82, 41253–57, 41376–89; P. Vetter, *Die Religionsverhandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Regensburg 1541* (Jena 1889); V. Schultze, "Aktenstücke zur dt. Ref.-Gesch. (Dispatches from Regensburg)" *ZKG* 3 (1879) 150–183, 609–653; L. Pastor, "Die Correspondenz des Card. Contarini . . . 1541" *HJ* 1 (1880) 321–392, 473–500.

SUPPLEMENTS: *NBD* 17 (Berlin 1912); H. Eells, "The Origin of the Regensburg Book" *Princeton Theol. Review* 26 (1928) 355–372; R. Stupperich, "Der Ursprung des Regensburger Buches" *ARG* 36 (1939) 88–116; J. Schattenmann, "Regensburger Religionsgespräche 1541 u. 1546" *Zeitwende* 19 (1947–48) 44–52; H. Mackensen, "Contarini's Role at Ratisbon in 1541" *ARG* 51 (1960) 36–57.

24. *The Breakdown of Universalism and the Religious Peace of Augsburg*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: K. Lanz, *Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V.* III 1550–1556 (Leipzig 1846); A. v. Druffel, Beiträge zur Reichsgeschichte, [Vol. 1] 1546–51 (Munich 1873), [Vol. 2] 1552 (Munich 1880), [Vol. 3] 1546–52 (Munich 1882), [Vol. 4] 1553–1555, completed and revised by K. Brandi (Munich 1896) [=*Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des* 16. Jahrhunderts Vol. 1–4]; *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland,* first section 1533–1559, Vol. 7–13, 16 (Vienna, Leipzig, Tübingen 1898–1965); K. Brandi, *Kaiser Karl V.* 2 vols. (Munich 1941, 1959); F. Hartung, *Karl V. und die Reichsstände* 1546–55 (Halle 1910); J. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation,* 2 vols. (New York 1963); K. Repgen, *Die Römische Kurie und der Westfälische Friede* I: *Papst, Kaiser und Reich 1521*–1644, 2 parts (Tübingen 1962, 1965); H. Lutz, *Christianitas afflicta, Europa, das Reich und die päpstliche Politik im Niedergang der Hegemonie Kaiser Karls V. 1552–1556* (Göttingen 1964; lit.).

THE EMPEROR AND THE PROTESTANTS IN THE EARLY STAGES OF THE WAR: A. Hasenclever, *Die Politik der Schmalkaldener vor Ausbruch des Schmalkaldischen Krieges* (Berlin 1901); id., *Die Politik Kaiser Karls V. und Ladgraf Philipps von Hessen vor Ausbruch des Schmalkaldischen Krieges* (Marburg 1903); P. Heidrich, *Karl V. und die deutschen Protestanten am Vorabend des Schmalkaldischen Krieges,* 2 vols. (Frankfurt 1911–1912).

THE BIGAMY OF PHILIPP OF HESSE: Schottenloher 30354–30369; W. W. Rockwell, *Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen* (Marburg 1904); W. Köhler, "Die Doppelehe Landgraf Philipps von Hessen" *HZ* 94 (1905) 385–411; Th. Brieger, "Luther und die Nebenehe des Landgrafen Philipp" *ZKG* 29 (1908) 174–196; N. Paulus, "Die hessische Doppelehe im Urteil der protestantischen Zeitgenossen" *HPBl* 147 (1911) 503–517, 561—573; H. Eells, *The Attitude of Martin Bucer toward the Bigamy of Philipp of Hesse* (New Haven 1924); W. Maurer, "Luther und die Doppelehe Philipps von Hessen" *Luther* 24 (1953) 97–120.

THE WAR OF SUCCESSION IN GELDER: Schottenloher 30740a–g, 37186–37201; F. Petri, "Landschaftliche und überlandschaftliche Kräfte im habsburgisch-klevischen Ringen um Geldern und im Frieden von Venlo 1537–1543" *Festschr. F. Steinbach* (Bonn 1960) 92–113.

PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION: "The Attack on Braunschweig (Brunswick)" Schottenloher 29766–29836; F. Bruns, *Die Vertreibung Herzog Heinrichs von Braunschweig* *durch den Schmalkaldischen Bund* (Diss. Marburg 1889); E. Brandenburg, *Die Gefangennahme Herzog Heinrichs von Braunschweig durch den Schmalkaldischen Bund (1545)* (Leipzig 1894); H. Reller, *Vorreformatorische und reformatorische Kirchenverfassung im Fürstentum Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel* (Göttingen 1959).

THE DIOCESE OF NAUMBURG: P. Brunner, *Nikolaus von Amsdorf als Bischof von Naumburg* (Gütersloh 1960) (lit.); Julius Pflug: Schottenloher 17222–17232, 31567–31572; F. I. Schwarzius, *Acta Julii Pflugii episcopi Numburgensis in caussa religionis* (Eisenberg 1774); A. Jansen, "Julius Pflug" *Neue Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiet historisch-antiquarischer Forschungen* 10 (1864) I: 1–110, II: 1–212; W. van Gulik, "Zeitzer Beiträge zur Geschichte der katholischen Gegenreformation im 16. Jh., I Julius Pflug und Eberhard Billick, II Julius Pflug und Daniel Mauch" *RQ* 18 (1904) 57–83; E. Hoffmann, *Naumburg im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Leipzig 1900).

COLOGNE: Schottenloher 30837–30880, 51297–51301, 61327–61339; C. Varrentrapp, *Hermann von Wied und sein Reformationsversuch in Köln* (Leipzig 1878); id., "Zur Charakteristik Hermanns von Wied, Bucers und Groppers" *ZKG* 20 (1900) 37–58; W. Lipgens, "Neue Beiträge zum Reformationsversuch Hermanns von Wied aus dem Jahr 1545" *AHVNrh* 149–150 (1950—51) 46–73; J. Niessen, "Der Reformationsversuch des Kölner Kurfürsten Hermann von Wied (1536–1547)" *Rhein. Vierteljahresbl.* 15–16 (1950–51) 298–312; H. Jedin, "Fragen um Hermann von Wied" *HJ* 74 (1955) 687–699; Th. Schlüter, *Die Publizistik um den Reformationsversuch des Kölner Erzbischofs Hermann von Wied aus dem Jahre 1542–1547* (Diss. Bonn 1957); E. Mühlhaupt, "Die Kölner Reformation" *Monatshefte für ev. KG des Rheinlandes* 11 (Düsseldorf 1962) 73–93; M. Köhn, *Martin Bucers Entwurf einer Reformation des Erzstiftes Köln* (Witten 1966).

THE SCHMALKALDIC WAR (=SCH. K.): Schottenloher 41672–41797, 52103, 64027–64029; G. Wolf, *Quellenkunde der dt. Reformationsgeschichte* I (Gotha 1915) 466–476; F. Hortleder, *Der Römischen Keyser- und Königlichen Majesteten, auch des Heiligen Römischen Reichs geistlicher und weitlicher Stände Handlungen und Ausschreiben von den Ursachen des Teutschen Kriegs* (Frankfurt 1617–18, Gotha 1645); A. Stein, *Kaiser und Kurfürst. Historische Erzählung aus dem Sch. K.* (Halle a. S. 1885); A. Schütz, *Der Donaufeldzug Karls V.* (Tübingen 1930); A. Ph. Brück, "Stadt und Erzstift Mainz im Sch. K." *Hessisches Jb. für Landesgeschichte* 4 (1954) 155–185; E. Hühns, "Nationale Propaganda im Sch. K." *Zschr. für Geschichtswissenschaft* 6 (1958) 1027–1248.

THE COLLOQUY OF REGENSBURG: Schottenloher 41390–41398; H. Jedin, II: 165–168, 478 (lit.); H. v. Caemmerer, *Das Regensburger Religionsgespräch im Jahre 1546* (Diss. Berlin 1901); F. Roth, "Der officielle Bericht der von den Evangelischen zum Regensburger Gespräch Verordneten an ihre Fürsten und Obern" *ARG* 5 (1907–8) 1–30, 375–397; V. Schultze, "Das Tagebuch des Grafen Wolrad II zu Waldeck zum Regensburger Religionsgespräch 1546" *ARG* 7 (1909–10) 135–184, 294–347; H. Nebelsieck, "Elf Briefe und Aktenstücke über das Religionsgespräch in Regensburg von 1546" *ARG* 32 (1935) 127–136, 253–283.

THE INTERIM: Schottenloher 38259a–38330a; K. Th. Hergang, *Das Augsburger Interim* (Leipzig 1855); N. Müller, "Zur Geschichte des Interims" (Leipzig 1855); N. Müller, "Zur Geschichte des Interims" *Jb. für brandenburgische KG* 5 (1908) 51–171; "Verteidigung des Augsburger Interims von dem Bischof Julius Pflug, aus einer Handschrift," ed. Ch. G. Müller: *Archiv für alte und neue KG* 4 (1818) 104–148; M. Weigel, "Ein Gutachten des Johann Agricola von Eisleben über das Interim" *ZBKG* 16 (1941)

32–46; W. v. Loewenich, *Das Interim von 1548;* id., *Von Augustin zu Luther* (Witten 1959) 391–406.

REVOLT OF THE PRINCES: K. E. Born, "Moritz v. Sachsen und die Fürstenverschwörung gegen Karl V." *HZ* 191 (1960) 18–67 (lit.).

THE RELIGIOUS PEACE OF AUGSBURG: Schottenloher 34481–34503, 62198–62220; Text: K. Brandi, *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede vom 25. September 1555* (Göttingen 1927); E. Walder, *Religionsvergleiche des 16. Jh. I* (Bern 1960) 41–68; Ch. Lehenmann, *De pace religionis acta publica* (Frankfurt 1707); A. Druffel–K. Brandi, *Beiträge zur Reichsgeschichte 1553–1555; Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 16. Jh.* IV (Munich 1896); K. Brandi, "Passauer Vertrag und Augsburger Religionsfriede" *HZ* 95 (1905) 206–264; G. Wolf, *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede* (Stuttgart 1890); W. Kühns, *Gesch. des Passauischen Vertrages 1552* (Diss. Göttingen 1906); G. Bonwetsch, *Gesch. des Passauischen Vertrages von 1552* (Göttingen 1907); N. Paulus, "Religionsfreiheit und Augsburger Religionsfriede" *HPBl* 149 (1912) 356–367, 401–416; F. Siebert, *Zwischen Kaiser und Papst. Kardinal Truchsess von Waldburg und die Anfänge der Gegenreformation in Deutschland* (Berlin 1943); M. Simon, *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede* (Augsburg 1955); G. Pfeiffer, "Der Augsburger Religionsfriede und die Reichsstädte" *Zschr. des hist. Vereins für Schwaben* 61 (1955) 213–321; H. Tüchle, "Der Augsburger Religionsfriede. Neue Ordnung oder Kampfpause?" ibid. 323–340; H. Lutz, "Aus vatikanischen Quellen zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden 1555" ibid. 389–401; J. Grisar, "Die Sendung des Kardinals Morone als Legat zum Reichstag von Augsburg 1555" ibid. 341–387; id., "Die Stellung der Päpste zum Reichstag und Religionsfrieden von Augsburg" *StdZ* 156 (1954–55) 440–462; L. W. Spitz, "Particularism and the Peace of Augsburg 1555" *CH* 25 (1956) 110–126; M. Heckel, "Staat und Kirche nach den Lehren der ev. Juristen in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jh." *ZSavRGkan* section 42 (1956) 117–247; id., "Autonomia und Pacis Compositio. Der Augsburger Religionsfriede in der Deutung der Gegenreformation" ibid. 45 (1959) 141–248; id., "Parität" ibid. 49 (1963) 261–420; W. P. Fuchs, "Der Augsburger Religionsfriede von 1555. Ein Literaturbericht" *Jb. der Hessischen Kirchengeschichtlichen Vereinigung* 8 (1957) 226–235; L. Petry, "Der Augsburger Religionsfriede von 1555 und die Landesgeschichte" *Blätter für Deutsche Landesgeschichte* 93 (1957) 150–175; H. Bornkamm, *Der Augsburger Religionsfriede:* id., *Das Jahrhundert der Reformation* (Göttingen ^{2}1966) 242–253.

SECTION FOUR

Europe under the Sign of Confessional Pluralism

25. *The Reformation in Scandinavia*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographie de la Réforme (1450–1648). Ouvrages parus de 1940 à 1955, fasc. 2 (Leiden 1960); H. Kellenbenz, "Forschungsbericht über skandinavische Geschichte I" *HZ* 190 (1960) 618–655.

LITERATURE

I. G. Lindhardt, *Den nordiske Kirkes Historie* (Copenhagen 1945); M. Gerhardt–W. Hubatsch, *Deutschland und Skandinavien im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Bonn 1950); G. Johannesson, "Die Kirchenreformation in den nordischen Ländern" *XI^{e} Congrès International des Sciences Historiques. Rapports IV* (Göteborg–Stockholm–Uppsala 1960) 48–83; G. Schwaiger, *Die Reformation in den nordischen Ländern* (Münich 1962).

DENMARK: *Acta Pontificum Danica* V–VI, ed. A. Krarup–J. Lindbeck (Copenhagen 1913–1915); J. Danstrup, *A History of Denmark* (Copenhagen 1948); N. K. Andersen, *Confessio Hafniensis (1530)* (Copenhagen 1954); E. H. Dungley, *The Reformation in Denmark* (London 1948); Hal Koch–B. Kornerup, *Den Danske Kirkes Historie* IV (Copenhagen 1959); *Ekklesia,* ed. F. Siegmund-Schultze, II:7 (Leipzig 1937); L. Schmitt, *Der Karmeliter Paulus Heliä* (Freiburg 1893); id., *Joh. Tausen* (Cologne 1894); id., *Die Verteidigung der katholischen Kirche in Dänemark gegen die Religionserneuerung* (Paderborn 1899); id. (ed.), *Nic. Stagefyr seu Herborn, Confutatio Lutheranismi Danici (1530)* (Quaracchi 1902); J. O. Andersen, *Der Reformkatholizismus und die dänische Reformation* (Gütersloh 1934); id., *Paulus Helie I* (Copenhagen 1936); M. Christensen, *Hans Tausen* (Copenhagen 1942); C. T. Engelstoft, *Liturgiens Historie i Danmark* (Copenhagen 1840); J. Schnell, *Die dänische Kirchenordnung von 1542 und der Einfluss von Wittenberg* (Breslau 1927); E. Feddersen, "Philippismus und Luthertum in Dänemark und Schleswig-Holstein" *Festschr. H. von Schubert ARG ErgBd* 5 (Leipzig 1929) 92–114; id., "Die lateinische Kirchenordnung König Christians III. von 1537" *Schriften des Vereins für Schleswig-Holsteinische Kirchengesch.* I:18 (1934) 1–93; O. Kaehler, "Zur Gesch. der dänischen Kirchenordnung von 1537" *Festschr. K. Haff* (Innsbruck 1950) 111–119.

NORWAY: *Diplomatarium Norvegicum,* to date 21 vols. (Oslo 1847ff.); A. Chr. Baug, *Den norske kirkes historie ireformationsaarhundredet* (Oslo 1895); *Ekklesia,* ed. F. Siegmund-Schultze, II:6 (Gotha 1936); J. Welle, *Norges kirkehistorie* (Oslo 1948); O. Garstein, "The Reformation in Norway" *The Month* N.S. 21 (London 1959) 95–103; T. B. Wilson, *History of Church and State in Norway from the 10th to 16th Century* (Philadelphia 1903); K. Larsen, *A History of Norway* (Princeton 1948).

ICELAND: *Diplomatarium Islandicum,* 12 vols. (Copenhagen 1857–1902; Reykjavik 1900–1932); F. Johanneus, *Historia ecclesiastica Islandiae,* 4 vols. (Copenhagen 1772–1778); J. Helgason, *Islands Kirke fra Reformation en til vore Dage* (Copenhagen 1922); *Ekklesia,* ed. F. Siegmund-Schultze, II:7 (Leipzig 1937); T. J. Oleson, "Bishop Jon Arason (1484–1550)" *Speculum* 28 (Cambridge, Mass. 1953) 245–278; cf. ibid. 29 (1954) 535f.

SWEDEN: J Weidling, *Schwedische Gesch. im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Gotha 1882); J. Andersson, *Schwedische Geschichte* (Munich 1950); B. Gustafsson, *Svenk kyrkogeografi* (Malmö 1957); id., *Svenk kyrkohistoria* (Stockholm 1963); J. F. Martin, *Gustave Vasa et al Réforme en Suède* (Paris 1906); Hj. Holmquist, *Die Schwedische Reformation 1523–1531* (Leipzig 1925); S. Kjöllerström, "Kirche und Staat in Schweden nach der Reformation" *ZSavRGkan* 41 (1955) 271–289; id., *Guds och Severiges lag under Reformationstiden* (Lund 1957); id., "Gustav Vasa und die Bischofsweihe (1523–1531)" *Festschr. für Joh. Heckel* (Cologne–Graz 1959) 164–183; H. Yrwing, *Gustav Vasa, kröningsfrågan och Västerås riksdag 1527* (Lund 1956); I. Salvenius, *Gustav Vasa* (Stockholm 1950); E. Färnström, *Laurentius Petris Handskrivna Kyrkoordning av år 1561* (Stockholm 1956); Olavus Petri, *Samlade skrifter,* 4 vols., ed. B. Hesselmann, (Stockholm 1914–17); R. Holm, *Olavus Petri* (Uppsala 1917); C. Bergendoff, *Olavus Petri and the Ecclesiastical*

Transformation in Sweden (1521–1552) (New York 1928); R. Murray, *Olavus Petri* (Stockholm 1952); S. Ingebrand, *Olavus Petris reformatoriska åskådning* (Uppsala 1964); E. E. Yelvertow, *The Manual of Olavus Petri* (London 1951); G. Carlsson, "Preussischer Einfluss auf die Reformation Schwedens" *Festschr. O. Scheel* (Schleswig 1952) 36–48; M. Roberts, *The Early Vasas: A History of Sweden 1523–1611* (Cambridge 1968); J. Kolberg, "Aus dem Leben der letzten katholischen Bischöfe Schwedens" *Vorlesungsverzeichnis der Akademie Braunsberg* (1914); *Briefe von Johannes und Olaus Magnus,* ed. G. Buschbell (Stockholm 1932); Th. v. Haag, "Die apostolische Sukzession in Schweden" *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift* 44 (Uppsala 1945) 1–168; J. G. Hoffmann, *La réforme en Suède 1523–1527 et la succession apostolique* (Neuchatel 1945); E. Benz, *Bischofsamt und apostol. Sukzession im dt. Protestantismus* (Stuttgart 1953); Y. Stenström, *Om biskops tjänst och ämbete* (Stockholm 1959); A. A. Stomberg, *A History of Sweden* (New York 1931); H. W. Waddamg, *The Swedish Church* (London 1946).

FINLAND: W. Sommer, *Gesch. Finnlands* (Munich 1938); I. Salomies, *Suomen kirkon historia,* 3 vols. to date (Helsinki 1944–1962); G. Sentzke, *Die Kirche Finnlands* (Göttingen 1963); *Ekklesia,* ed. F. Siegmund-Schultze, II:8 (Leipzig 1938); J. Gummerus, *Michael Agricola, der Reformator Finnlands* (Helsinki 1944); T. Harjunpaa, "Liturgical Developments in Sweden and Finland in the Era of Lutheran Orthodoxy" *CH* XXXVII (1968) 14–36.

26. *The Reformation in Eastern Europe*

LITERATURE

E. Sehling, *Die ev. Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jh.* IV, V (Leipzig 1911–13) (Lit.); E. Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz* (Marburg 1949); R. Stupperich, "Der Protestantismus auf seinen Wegen nach Osteuropa" *Kirche im Osten* 1 (1958) 24–40; G. Rhode, "Die Reformation in Osteuropa" *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 7 (1958) 481–500; "Gestalten und Wege der Kirche im Osten" *Festgabe für A. Rhode,* ed. H. Kreska (Ulm 1958); R. Stupperich, "Geschichtl. Wandlungen und Lebensbedingungen des slawishcen Protestantismus" *Kirche im Osten* 2 (1959) 80–96; J. Matl, "Reformation und Gegenreformation als Kulturfaktoren bei den Slawen" *Festschr. Karl Eder* (Innsbruck 1959) 101–117; R. Stupperich, "Melanchthons Verhältnis zu Polen und Ungarn: Der Remter" *Zscht. für Kultur und Politik im Osteuropa* 6 (1960) 236–243; *La Renaissance et la Réformation en Pologne et en Hongrie,* ed. G. Székely–E. Fûgedi (Budapest 1963); E. W. Zeeden, *Die Entstehung der Konfessionen* (Munich–Vienna 1965) 153–178; *The New Cambridge Modern History* II (London–Cambridge 1962) 186–204; *Baltische Kirkengeschichte,* ed. R. Wittram (Munich 1956).

PRUSSIA: P. Tschackert, *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgesch. des Herzogtums Preussen,* 3 vols. (Leipzig 1890); H. Laag, "Die Einführung der Reformation im Ordensland Preussen" *NKZ* 36 (1925) 845–873; K. Forstreuter, *Vom Ordensstaat zum Fürstentum* (Kitzingen 1951); E. M. Wermter, "Herzog Albrecht von Preussen und die ermländischen Bischöfe" *Zschr. für die Gesch. und Altertumskunde Ermlands* 86 (1957) 198–311; id., "Reformversuche im Ermland vor dem Konzil von Trient" ibid. 87 (1958) 428–437; M. Lackner, "Neuere Lit. zur preussischen Reformationsgesch." *Kirche im Osten* 3 (1960) 195–200; P. Tschackert, *Georg von Polentz* (Leipzig 1888); id., *Paul Speratus von Rötlen* (Halle 1891); R. Stupperich, "Johann Briesmanns reformatorische Anfänge" *Jb. Für brandenburgische Kirchengesch.* 34 (1937) 3–21; E. Roth (ed.), *Vertrau Gott allein. Gebete*

Herzog Albrechts von Preussen (Würzburg 1956); W. Hubatsch, *Albrecht von Brandenburg-Ansbach* (Heidelberg 1960); J. B. Blessing, *Johannes Dantiscus* (Phil. Diss. Hamburg 1959); R. Stupperich (ed.), *Die Reformation im Ordensland Preussen 1523–24. Predigten, Traktate und Kirchenordnungen* (Ulm 1966).

LIVONIA–ESTONIA–CURLAND: L. Arbusow, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Liv-, Est-, und Kurland* (Leipzig 1921); O. Pohrt, *Reformationsgesch. Livlands* (Leipzig 1928); St. Arnell, *Die Auflösung des livländischen Ordensstaates* (Lund 1937); K. D. Staemmler, *Preussen und Livland im ihrem Verhältnis zur Krone Polens 1561–1586* (Diss. Göttingen 1949); R. Wittram, "Die Reformation in Livland" *Baltische Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen 1956) 35–56; R. Ruhtenberg, "Die Beziehungen Luthers und der anderen Wittenberger Reformatoren zu Livland" ibid., 56–76; E. Treulich, "Die Reformation der kurländischen Kirche unter Gotthard Kettler" ibid., 77–86.

POLAND: Ch. Z. Salig, *Vollständige Historie der Augsburgischen Confession* II (Halle 1733) 515–803 (Poland through 1557); K. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin–Leipzig 1930); G. Smend, *Die Synoden der Kirche Augsburgischer Konfession in Grosspolen* (Posen-Poznan 1930); K. E. Jordt Jorgensen, *Ökumenische Bestrebungen unter den polnischen Protestanten bis zum Jahre 1645* (Copenhagen 1942); A. Rhode, *Gesch. der ev. Kirche im Posener Lande* (Würzburg 1956); A. Schwarzenberg, "Besonderheiten der Reformation im Polen" *Kirche im Osten* 1 (1958) 52–64; E. W. Zeeden, "Calvins Einwirken auf die Reformation in Polen-Litauen" *Syntagma Friburgense. Histor. Studien H. Aubin dargebracht* (Lindau–Konstanz 1956) 323–359; K. Krejci, *Gesch. der polnischen Literatur* (Halle 1958); G. Schramm, "Antitrinitarier in Polen 1556–1658, ein Literaturbericht" *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Rennaissance* 21 (1959) 473–511; O. Bartel, "Luther und Melanchthon in Polen" *Luther und Melanchthon* ed. V. Vajta (Göttingen 1961) 165–177; id., "Melanchthon und Polen" *Philipp Melanchthon* (Berlin 1963) 227–236; B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen* (Münster 1960); cf. J. Lecler, *Toleration in the Reformation* I (New York 1960) 385–422; H. Holzapfel, *Tausend Jahre Kirche Polens* (Würzburg 1966); A. F. Modrevius, *Opera omnia,* ed. C. Kumaniecki, I–V (Warsaw 1953–60), compare to: J. Lecler; Jan Laski, *Werke,* ed. A. Kuyper, 2 vols. (Amsterdam 1866); O. Bartel, *Jan Laski* I (Warsaw 1955); U. Falkenroth, *Gestalt und Wesen der Kirche bei Johannes von Laski* (Diss. Göttingen 1958); G. Schramm, *Der polnische Adel und die Reformation 1548–1607* (Wiesbaden 1965); O. Halecki, *A History of Poland* (Baltimore 1924); *The Cambridge History of Poland* I, ed. W. F. Reddaway et al. (New York 1950); S. Kot, *Socialism in Poland* (Boston 1957); O. Bartel, *Jan Laski* I (1499–1556) (Warsaw 1955).

BOHEMIA: Schottenloher 62501a–07; P. Rican, *Das Reich Gottes in den böhmischen Ländern* (Stuttgart 1957) (lit.); id., *Die Böhmischen Brüder* (Berlin 1961) (lit); id., "Melanchthon und die böhmischen Länder" *Philipp Melanchthon* (Berlin 1963) 237–260.

HUNGARY: G. D. Teutsch, *Urkundenbuch der ev. Landeskirche Augsburgischen Bekenntnisses in Siebenbürgen,* 2 vols. (Hermannstadt 1862–83); id., *Die Reformation im (siebenbürgischen) Sachsenland* (Hermannstadt 1929); F. Teutsch, *Gesch. der ev. Kirche in Siebenbürgen,* 2 vols. (Hermannstadt 1921–23); A. Schullerus, *Die Augustana in Siebenbürgen* (Hermannstadt 1923); V. Bruckner, "Die oberungarischen Glaubensbekenntnisse und die CA" *Gedenkbuch anlässl. der 400jähr. Jahreswende der CA* (Leipzig 1930) 1–67; B. v. Pukanzsky, *Gesch. des deutschen Schrifttums in Ungarn* (Münster 1931); M. Ödön, *Die Entstehung der ungarischen protestantischen Kirchenverfassung im Reformations-Jh.* (Papa 1942); E. Roth, *Die Reformation in Siebenbürgen,* 2 vols. (Cologne-Graz 1962–64); id., *Die Geschichte des Gottesdienstes der Siebenbürger Sachsen*

(Göttingen 1954); K. Reinerth, *Die Reformation der siebenbürgisch-sächsischen Kirche* (Gütersloh 1956); id., "Studien und Kritiken zu E. Roth, Die Geschichte des Gottesdienstes" *Jb. für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 4 (1958–59) 73–82; M. Bucsay, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Ungarn* (Stuttgart 1959) (Lit.); J. Solyom, "Melanchthonforschung in Ungarn" *Luther und Melanchthon,* ed. V. Vajta (Göttingen 1961) 178–188; E. Kovacs, "Melanchthon und Ungarn" *Philipp Melanchthon* (Berlin 1963) 261–269; K. Juhasz, "Kardinal Georg Utjesenovich (+1551) und das Bistum Tschanad" *HJ* 80 (1961) 252–264 (lit.); F. Kidric, *Die protestantische Kirchenordnung der Slovenen im 16. Jh.* (Heidelberg 1919); G. Stöckl, *Die deutsch-slavische Südostgrenze des Reiches im 16. Jh., ein Beitrag zu ihrer Geschichte, dargestellt an Hand des südslavischen Reformationsschrifttums* (Breslau 1940); id., "Der Beginn des Reformationsschrifttums in slowenischer Sprache" *Südostforschungen* 15 (1956) 268–277; F. Valjavec *Gesch. der deutschen Kulturbeziehungen zu Südosteuropa* II (Munich 1955); A. Slodnjak, *Gesch. der slovenischen Lit.* (Berlin 1958); Johannes Honter, *Ausgewählte Schriften,* ed. O. Netoliczka (Vienna 1898); K. K. Klein, *Der Humanist und Reformator Johannes Honter* (Hermannstadt–Munich 1935); Solyom, "Disticha Novi Testamenti. Ein didaktischer Buchdruck des siebenbürgischen Reformators Johannes Honter" *Geschichtswirklichkeit und Glaubensbewährung. Festschr. für R. Müller* (Stuttgart 1967) 192–203; G. Gündisch, "Franz Salicäus, Ein Beitrag zur Reformationsgesch. Siebenbürgens" ibid., 204–219; L. Binder, "Die frühesten Synoden der ev. Kirche in Siebenbürgen" ibid., 220–244; J. Balazs, *Johannes Sylvester* (1958) (lit.); W. Toth, "Stephen Kis of Szeged" *ARG* 44 (1955) 86–103; N. Rupel, *Primus Truber* (Munich 1965); W. Toth, "Highlights of the Hungarian Reformation" *CH* IX (1940) 141–156; L. Revesz, *History of the Hungarian Reformed Church* (Washington 1956).

27. *Schism and Reformation in England*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

C. Read, *Bibliography of British History. Tudor Period* (Oxford 1933).

SOURCES

J. S. Brewer–J. Gairdner, *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII,* 21 vols. (London 1862–1910); J. M. Rigg, *Calendar of St. Paul relative to English Affairs, principally in the Vatican Archives and Library,* 2 vols. (London 1916–26), to 1578; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic and Foreign, for the Reigns of Edward, Mary and Elizabeth,* see C. Read, nos. 65, 66, 425; N. Pocock, *Records of the Reformation,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1870); J. Keble, *Statutes* (London 1684); H. Gee–W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London 1896); G. R. Elton, *The Tudor Constitution, Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge 1960); *Tudor Royal Proclamations* I, ed. P. G. Hughes–I. F. Larkin (New Haven 1964); *The Work of Thomas Cranmer,* ed. J. I. Packer–C. E. Duffield (Appleford 1964); St. Ehses, *Römische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England* (Paderborn 1893).

LITERATURE

GENERAL: J. D. Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors* (Oxford 1952) (Oxford History of England VII); J. A. Williamson, *The Tudor Age* (London ^{3}1964); G. R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge 1953); C. H. -K. George, *The Protestant Mind of the English*

Reformation 1570–1640 (Princeton 1961); Opposing the idealization of the character of Henry VIII, especially by A. F. Pollard, *Henry VIII* (London 1951), see G. R. Elton, *Henry VIII. An Essay in Revision* (London 1962); H. Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (London 1962); G. Mattingly, *Catharine of Aragon* (London 1942); N. Sanders, *De origine ac progressu schismatis Anglicani* (Köln 1585), the oldest complete description of the English schism; One of the newest accounts: G. Constant, *La réforme en Angleterre,* 2 vols. (Paris 1930–39), to Edward VI; Ph. Hughes, *The Reformation in England,* 3 vols. (London 1950–54), to Elizabeth I; An excellent short account is P. M. Parker, *The English Reformation to 1558* (London 1963), with good literature survey; F. A. Gasquet, *Heinrich VIII. und die englischen Klöster,* 2 vols. (Mainz 1890–91); the work is brought up to date by D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England III: The Tudor Age* (Cambridge 1959) and W. C. Richardson, *History of the Court of Augmentation 1536–54* (Baton Rouge, La. 1961); Concerning the penetration of Protestantism: E. G. Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition* (Cambridge 1947); H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge 1958); C. Hopf, *M. Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford 1946); W. A. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants 1520–35* (New Haven 1964); C. W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London 1958); H. C. White, *The Tudor Books of Private Devotion* (Madison 1951); J. K. McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford 1965); N. S. Tjernagel, *Henry VIII and the Lutherans* (Saint Louis 1965); J. E. Oxley, *The Reformation in Essex* (Manchester 1965); A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (London 1964); T. Mac Caffery, *The Shaping of the Elizabethian Regime* (Princeton, 1968); P. Seaver, *The Puritan Lectureships, The Politics of Religious Dissent 1560–1662* (Stanford 1970); M. Breslow, *A Mirror of England: English Puritan Views of Foreign Nations, 1618–1640* (Cambridge 1970); M. O'Connell, *Thomas Stapelton and the Counter Reformation* (New Haven 1964).

Church Government: E. W. Kemp, *Counsel and Consent. Aspects of Church Government* (London 1961); E. T. Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England* (Oxford 1950); Very detailed for the time of Elizabeth: W. P. M. Kennedy, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration,* 3 vols. (London 1924); F. Higham, *Catholic and Reformed. A Study of the Anglican Church* (London 1962).

Biographies: A. F. Pollard, *Thomas Wolsey* (London 1953); Ch. Ferguson, *Naked to Mine Enemies. The Life of Card. Wolsey* (London 1958); See *$LThK^2$* III 85 for works concerning Cranmer by A. F. Pollard (^{2}1926), A. C. Deane (1927), G. W. Bromily (1956) and T. Maynard (1956) to the comprehensive biography by J. Ridley, *Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford 1962). For literature concerning J. Fisher and Thomas More which increased greatly after canonization (1935), see *$LThK^2$* IV:159 and VII:628; G. J. Donelly, *A Translation of St. Thomas More's Responsio ad Lutherum* (Washington 1962); G. Marc'Hadour, *St. Thomas More. Lettre à Dorp. La supplication des âmes* (Namur 1962); *Opera omnia* (Frankfurt a. M. 1689), reprinted unaltered in Frankfurt 1963; E. Flessmann–E. van Leer, "The Controversy about Scripture and Tradition between Th. More and W. Tyndale" *NAKG* 43 (1959–60) 143–164; From the extensive literature concerning the *Utopia:* E. Surtz, *The Praise of Pleasure. Philosophie, Education and Communism in More's Utopia* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957); H. Süssmuth, *Studien z. Utopia des Th. M.* (Münster 1967). *Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (New Haven, Ct. 1961ff.).

28. *The Struggle over Lutheran Orthodoxy*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: Ch. A. Salig, *Vollständige Historie der Augsburgischen Confession* I–III (Halle 1730–1733–1735); G. J. Planck, *Gesch. der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unsers protestantischen Lehrbegriffs vom Anfang der Reformation bis zu der Einführung der Concordienformel* I–VI (Leipzig 1791–1800); H. Heppe, *Gesch. des deutschen Protestantismus* I–IV (Marburg 1852–59); H. R. Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienformel,* 4 vols. (Erlangen 1858–65); F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte* (Halle 1906); P. Tschackert, *Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirchenlehre* (Göttingen 1910); O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* (= DG) I–IV (Leipzig 1908–12, Göttingen 1926–27); R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* IV, 2 vols. (Leipzig ^{3}1920; new imp., ^{3}1959) (Eng. *The History of Doctrines, #76, #77*; Grand Rapids, Mich. 1964); H. E. Weber, *Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus* Tl. I 1.2 (Gütersloh 1937–40; new impression, Darmstadt 1966); P. Meinhold, *Philipp Melanchthon* (Berlin 1960); R. Stupperich, *Der unbekannte Melanchthon* (Stuttgart 1961); F. W. Katzenbach, *Die Reformation in Deutschland und Europa* (Gütersloh 1965); W. Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit,* 2 vols. (Erlangen 1859–61; reprint Hildesheim–Nieuwkoop 1964); H. Aland, "Die theologische Fakultät Wittenberg während des 16. Jh." *Kirchengeschichtliche Entwürfe* (Gütersloh 1960) 283–394; L. Theobald, "Einiges über die Lebensschicksale des Gallus während seiner Regensburger Superintendentenzeit" *ZBKG* 19 (1950) 67–77, 20 (1951) 100; H. W. Gensichen, *Damnamus. Die Verwerfung von Irrlehre bei Luther und im Luthertum des 16. Jh.* (Berlin 1955); M. Mirkovic, *Matjia Vlac'c Ilirik* (Zagreb 1960); J. Massner, *Kirchliche Überlieferung und Autorität im Flaciuskreis* (Berlin–Hamburg 1964); P. Fraenkel, *Testimonium Patrium: The Function of Patristic Argument in the Theol. of Melanchthon* (Geneva 1961); C. L. Manschreck, *Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer* (New York 1958).

THE ANTINOMIAN CONTROVERSY: G. Kawerau, "Der Ausbruch des antinomistischen Streites" *ThStK* 53 (1880) 24–48; id., "Briefe und Urkunden zur Gesch. des antinomistischen Streites" *ZKG* 4 (1880–81) 299–324, 437–465; id., "Beiträge zur Gesch. des antinomistischen Streites" *Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte, Köstlin gewidmet* (Gotha 1896) 60–80; id., *RE* ^{3}I (1896) 585–592; J. Werner, "Der erste antinomistische Streit" *NKZ* 15 (1904) 801–824, 860–873; G. Hammann, *Nomismus und Antinomismus innerhalb der Wittenberger Theologie von 1524–30* (Diss. Bonn 1952); R. Hermann, *Zum Streit um die Überwindung des Gesetzes* (Weimar 1958); G. Rosenberger, *Gesetz und Evangelium in Luthers Antinomerdisputationen* (Diss. Mainz 1958); J. Rogge, *Johann Agricolas Lutherverständnis* (focuses on Antinomianism) (Berlin 1960).

THE SYNERGISTIC AND MAJORISTIC CONTROVERSY: C. Schlüsselburg, *Catalogus Haereticorum* V (*De Synergistis,* Frankfurt 1611), VII (*De Maioristis,* Frankfurt 1599); Ch. E. Luthardt, *Die Lehre vom freien Willen und seinem Verhältnis zur Gnade in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt* (Leipzig 1863); G. L. Schmidt, *Justus Menius,* 2 vols. (Gotha 1867); Kawerau, *RE* ^{3}XIX:229–235 (Synergy); K. D. Schmidt, "Der Göttinger Bekehrungsstreit 1566–70" *Zschr. der Ges. für niedersächsische KG* 34–35 (1929) 66–121; H. Kropatscheck, *Das Problem theologischer Anthropologie auf dem Weimarer Gespräch von 1560 zwischen Matthias Flacius Illyricus und Viktorin Strigel* (Diss. Gottingen 1943); L. Haikola, *Gesetz und Evangelium bei Matthias Flacius Illyricus* (Lund 1952); R. Bring, *Das Verhältnis von Glauben und Werken in der lutherischen Theologie* (Munich 1955); G. Moldaenke, *Schriftverständnis und Schriftdeutung im Zeitalter der Reformation* Tl. I: *Matthias Flacius Illyricus* (Stuttgart 1936).

THE ADIAPHORAN CONTROVERSY: C. Schlüsselburg, 13 (1599); H. Ch. Hase, *Die Gestalt der Kirche Luthers. Der casus confessionis im Kampf des Matthias Flacius gegen das Interim von 1548* (Göttingen 1940); C. L. Manschreck, "The Role of Melanchthon in the Adiaphora Controversy" *ARG* 48 (1957) 165–182; H. Scheible, "Melanchthons Brief an Carlowitz" *ARG* 57 (1966) 102–130.

THE OSSIANDRIAN CONTROVERSY: W. Möller, *Andreas Osiander* (Elberfeld 1870); A. Ritschl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Andreas Osiander" *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* I (Bonn ³1889) 235–255; E. Hirsch, *Die Theologie des Andreas Osiander* (Göttingen 1919); M. J. Arntzen, *Mystieke rechtvaardigingsleer. Een bijtrage ter beorderling van de theologie van Andreas Osiander* (Kampen 1956).

THE EUCHARISTIC CONTROVERSY: A. Ebrard, *Das Dogma vom Abendmahl und seine Gesch.*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt a. M. 1845); A. W. Dieckhoff, *Die evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter geschichtlich dargestellt* I (Göttingen 1854); G. L. Plitt, "Melanchthons Wandelung in der Abendmahlslehre" *Zschr. f. Protestantismus und Kirche* NF 56 (1868) 65–101; G. Mönckeberg, *Joachim Westphal und Joh. Calvin* (Hamburg 1865); C. H. W. Sillem, *Briefsammlung des J. Westphal 1530–75*, 2 vols. (Hamburg 1903); R. Calinich, *Kampf und Untergang des Melanchthonismus in Kursachsen* (Leipzig 1866); J. F. A. Gillet, *Crato v. Crafftheim und seine Freunde*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt 1860–61); H. Gollwitzer, *Coena Domini. Die altlutherische Abendmahlslehre in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Calvinismus dargestellt an der lutherischen Frühorthodoxie* (Munich 1937); E. Bizer, *Studien zur Gesch. des Abendmahlstreites im 16. Jh.* (1940; new impression, Darmstadt 1962); H. Grass, *Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin* (Gütersloh ²1954).

29. *John Calvin: Personality and Work*

WORKS

Omnia Opera (=OC), 59 vols. *CR* 29–87 (Braunschweig-Berlin 1863–1900); *Supplementa Calviniana, Sermons inédits* I: *Predigten über 2 Sam.* ed. H. Rückert (Neukirchen 1961); V: *Sermons sur le Livre de Michée*, ed. J. D. Benoît (Neukirchen 1964); *Opera Selecta* (=OS), 5 vols. ed. P. Barth, W. Niesel, D. Scheuner (Munich 1952–62); *Johannes Calvins Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift*, New Series, ed. O. Weber, 20 vols. (Neukirchen 1937f.); *Johann Calvin, Diener am Wort. Predigtauswahl*, ed. E. Mülhaupt (Göttingen 1934); *Der Psalter auf der Kanzel Calvins*, ed. E. Mülhaupt (Neukirchen 1959); *Institution de la religion chrétienne* (1541), ed. J. Pannier, 4 vols. (Paris 1936); A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue francaise*, 9 vols (Geneva 1866–1897); *Johannes Calvins Lebenswerk in seinen Briefen*, trans. R. Schwarz, 3 vols. (Neukirchen 1961–62); *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kircher*, ed. W. Niesel (Zollikon–Zurich 1938); *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen in dt. Übersetzung*, ed. P. Jacobs (Neukirchen 1949); *Commentaries and Letters*, ed. J. Harovtiwian (Philadelphia 1958); *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols., ed. J. T. McNiel (Philadelphia 1961); *Theological Treatises*, ed. J. A. S. Reid (Philadelphia 1954); *A Collation of the Latin Texts of the First Edition of Calvin's Institutes*, ed. W. G. Hards (Baltimore 1958).

LITERATURE

Bibliographia Calviniana: Opera 59, 457–586, new printing (Nieuwkoop 1960); W. Niesel, *Calvin-Bibliographie 1901–1959* (Munich 1961); J. T. McNiel, "Thirty Years of

Calvin Study" *CH* XVII (1948) 207–240; XVIII (1949) 241; E. A. Dowey, "Continental Reformation Reference Works of General Interest. Studies in Calvin and Calvinism since 1955" *CH* XXIX (1960) 187–204.

BIOGRAPHIES: F. W. Kampschulte, *Johannes Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1869–99); A. Lang, *Johannes Calvin* (Leipzig 1909); E. Doumerque, *Jean Calvin, Les hommes et les choses de son temp.*, 7 vols. (Lausanne–Paris 1899–1927); A. de Quervain, *Calvin. Sein Lehren und Kämpfen* (Berlin 1926); P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme IV: Calvin et l'institution chrêtienne* (Paris 1935); G. Gloede, *Calvin, Weg und Werk* (Leipzig 1953); W. F. Dankbaar, *Calvin. sein Weg und sein Werk* (Neukirchen 1959); J. Cadier, *Calvin. Der Mann, den Gott bezwungen hat* (Zollikon 1959); E. Pfisterer, *Calvins Wirken in Genf* (Neukirchen 1957); F. Büsser, *Calvins Urteil über sich selbst* (Zurich 1950); J. Moltmann, ed., *Calvin-Studien 1959* (Neukirchen 1960); J. Rogge, ed., *Johannes Calvin (1509–1564)* (Berlin 1963); J. Bohatec, *Budé und Calvin* (Graz 1950); E. W. Zeeden, "Das Bild Martin Luthers in den Briefen Calvins" *ARG* 49 (1958); A. Ganoczy, *Le jeune Calvin* (Wiesbaden 1966).

THEOLOGY: SOURCES: F. Wendel, *Calvin—The Origins and Development of his Religious Thought* (London 1963); B. B. Warfield, *Calvin and Augustine* (Philadelphia 1956); L. Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin* (Assen 1957–58); K. Reuter, *Das Grundverständnis der Theologie Calvins* (Neukirchen 1963); W. Neisel, *Theology of Calvin* (Philadelphia 1956); R. C. Hunt, *Calvin* (London 1933).

GENERAL WORKS: P. Wernle, *Der evangelische Glaube* III: *Calvin* (Tübingen 1919); O. Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* III (Göttingen 1926); H. Bauke, *Die Probleme der Theologie Calvins* (Leipzig 1922); H. Weber, *Die Theologie Clavins* (Berlin 1930); E. Mülhaupt, *Die Predigt Calvins* (Berlin 1931); W. Niesel, *Die Theologie Calvins* (Munich ^{2}1957); H. Wendorf, *Calvins Bedeutung für die prot. Welt* (Leipzig 1940); H. Olsson, *Calvin och reformationens theologi* I (Lund 1943).

SPECIAL STUDIES: G. Gloede, *Theologia naturalis bei Calvin* (Stuttgart 1935); T. H. L. Parker, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Edinburgh 1952); E. A. Dowey, *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (New York 1952); H. H. Wolf, *Die Einheit des Bundes. Das Verhältnis von AT und NT bei Calvin* (Neukirchen 1958); H. Jackson Forstmann, *Word and Spirit. Calvin's Doctrine of Biblical Authority* (Stanford, Calif. 1962); H. Noltensmeier, *Reformatorische Einheit. Das Schriftverständnis bei Luther und Calvin* (Graz–Cologne 1953); P. Brunner, *Vom Glauben bei Calvin* (Tübingen 1952); M. Neeser, *Le Dieu de Calvin* (Neuchâtel 1956); J. F. Jansen, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word of Christ* (London 1956); W. Kolfhaus, *Christusgemeinschaft bei Johannes Calvin* (Neukirchen 1939); id., *Vom christlichen Leben nach Johannes Calvin* (Neukirchen 1937); S. van der Linde, *De leer van de Heilige Geest* (Wageningen 1943); W. Krusche, *Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes bei Calvin* (Göttingen 1957); J. Beckmann, *Vom Sakrament bei Calvin* (Tübingen 1926); W. F. Dankbaar, *De Sacramentsleer van Calvijn* (Amsterdam 1941); id., *De tegen woordigheid van Christus in het Avondmaal* (Nijkerk 1950); R. S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament* (Edinburgh 1953); L. G. M. Alting v. Geusa, *Die Lehre von der Kindertaufe bei Calvin* (Mainz 1963); G. P. Hartvelt, *Verum Corpus* (Delft 1960); W. Niesel, *Calvins Lehre vom Abendmahl* (Munich 1935); W. Boelens, *Die Arnoldshainer Thesen* (Assen 1964); J. Rogge, *Virtus und res. Um die Abendmahlswirklichkeit bei Calvin* (Stuttgart 1965); A. Ganoczy, *Calvin Théologien de l'église et du ministère* (Paris 1964); L. Schummer, *Le ministère pastorale dans l'Institution chrêtienne de Calvin* (Wiesbaden 1965); K. Fröhlich, *Gottes Reich, Welt und Kirche bei Calvin* (Stuttgart 1965); W. Nijenhuis, *Calvinus Oecumenicus* ('s Gravenhage 1959); Th.

F. Torrance, *Calvin and the Doctrine of Man* (London 1949); H. Quistorp, *Die letzten Dinge im Zeugnis Calvins* (Gütersloh 1941); W. A. Hauck, *Sünde und Erbsünde nach Calvin* (Heidelberg 1938); id., *Calvin und die Rechtfertigung* (Gütersloh 1938); id., *Christusglaube und Gottes Offenbarung nach Calvin* (Gütersloh 1939); id., *Vorsehung und Freiheit nach Calvin* (Gütersloh 1947); id., *Die Erwählten, Prädestination und Heilsgewissheit bei Calvin* (Gütersloh 1950); A. Göhler, *Calvins Lehre von der Heiligung* (Munich 1934); P. Jacobs, *Prädestination und Verantwortlichkeit bei Calvin* (Neukirchen 1937); E. Buess, "Prädestination und Kirche in Calvins Institutio" *ThZ* 12 (1956) 347–361; H. Otten, *Calvins Theologische Anschauung von der Prädestination* (Munich 1938); G. Räcke, *Gesetz und Evangelium bei Calvin* (Diss. Mainz 1953); J. Bohatec, *Calvin und das Recht* (Feudingen 1934); id., *Calvins Lehre von Staat und Kirche* (Breslau 1937, reprinted Aalen 1961); M. E. Chenevière, *La Pensée politique de Calvin* (Paris 1937); J. T. McNiell, *John Calvin on God and Political Duty* (New York 1950); W. A. Mueller, *Church and State in Luther and Calvin* (Nashville, Tenn. 1954); Q. Breen, *John Calvin, A Study in French Humanism* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1931); R. M. Kingdom, *Geneva and the Coming of the Religious Wars in France 1555–1563* (Geneva 1956); J. T. McNeill, *Calvin and the Reformation* (New York 1962); A. M. Schmidt, *John Calvin and the Calvinistic Tradition* (London 1961); S. G. Craig, (ed.), *Calvin and Augustine* (Philadelphia 1956); W. E. Stuermenn, *A Critical Guide to Calvin's Concept of Faith* (Tulsa 1952); R. W. Battenhause, "The Doctrine of Man in Calvin and in Renaissance Platonism" *Journal of the History of Ideas* IX (1948) 447–471; J. T. McNeill, "The Democratic Element in Calvin's Thought" *CH* XVIII (1949) 153–168; G. L. Mosse, *Calvinism: Authoritarian or Democratic* (New York 1957); J. Baur, *Gott, Recht und weltliches Regiment im Werke Calvins* (Bonn 1965).

HERESY TRIALS: F. Buisson, *S. Castellio, sa vie et son oeuvre,* 2 vols. (Paris 1892); E. Giran, *S. Castellio et la Réforme Calvinienne* (Paris 1914); H. Fazy, *Procès de Bolsec* (Geneva 1866); E. Choisy, *Calvin et Servet* (Neuilly 1926); B. Becker (ed.), *Autour de M. Servet et de S. Castellio* (Haarlem 1953); J. F. Fulton, *M. Servet. Humanist and Martyr* (New York 1953); P. Cavard, *Le procès de M. Servet à Vienne* (Vienna 1953); R. H. Bainton, *Hunted Heretic* (Boston 1953); id., *Concerning Heretics* (New York 1935).

30. *The Spread of Calvinism in Western Europe*

SOURCES

E. F. K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* (Leipzig 1903); W. Niesel, *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche* (Zurich ^{3}1938); P. Jacobs, *Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen* (Neukirchen 1949); D. C. Fabricius, *Die Kirche von England, ihr Gebetbuch, Bekenntnis und kanonisches Recht* (= *Corpus Confessionum* 17. Abt.) (Berlin-Leipzig 1937); id., *Presbyterianismus* (= *Corpus Confessionum* 18. Abt.) (Berlin 1940).

LITERATURE

E. Knodt, *Die Bedeutung Calvins und des Calvinismus für die protestantische Welt* (1910); H. Wendorf, *Calvins Bedeutung für die protestantische Welt* (Leipzig 1940); A. A. van Schelven, *Het calvinisme gedurende zijn blocitijd in de 16^{e} en de 17^{e} eeuw. Zijn uitbreiding en cultuur-historische beteeknis* I: *Genève, Frankrijk;* II: *Schotland, Engeland, Noord-Amerika* (Amsterdam 1943–51); H. Rössler, *Der Calvinismus* (Bremen 1951); J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism* (New York 1954); B. S. Warburton, *Calvinism* (Grand Rapids 1955); E. G. Leónard, *Histoire générale du protestantisme* II: *L'établissement* (1564–1700) (Paris 1961); E. A. Dowey, "Continental Reformation: Works of General Interest. Studies in Calvin and Calvinism since 1955" *CH* XXIX: 187–204.

France

SOURCES: H. Hauser, *Les sources de l'histoire de France. Le XVI^e siècle* (1494–1610), 4 vols. (Paris 1906–16); *Lettres de Catherine de Médicis,* 10 vols. (Paris 1880 through 1909); Ivan Lontchinsky, *Documents inédits sur la Réforme et la Ligue* (Paris 1857).

LITERATURE: G. v. Polenz, *Gesch. des französischen Calvinismus,* 5 vols. (Gotha 1857–69); Ch. Roulet, *Histoire de l'Église de France,* 3 vols. (Paris 1946–49); J. Viénet, *Histoire de la Réforme française des origines à l'Édit de Nantes,* 2 vols. (Paris 1926–34); P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les origines de la Réforme* IV: *Calvin et l'Institution chrétienne* (Paris 1935); J. Chambon, *Der französische Protestantismus* (Munich 1948); R. Nürnberger, *Die Politisierung des französischen Protestantismus* (Tübingen 1948); S. Mours, "Liste des églises réformées" *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français* 103 (1957) 37–59, 113–130, 200–216; *Checklist of French Political Pamphlets 1560–1644 in the Newberry Library,* compiled by D. V. Welsh (Chicago 1950); E. Armstrong, *The French Wars of Religion* (Oxford 1904); id., *Geneva and the Consolidation of the French Protestant Movement* (Madison, Wisconsin 1967); R. M. Kingdom, *Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France* (Geneva 1956); J. W. Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France* (Chicago 1909); O. Zeff, *The Huguenots* (New York 1942); J. H. Mitchell, *The Court of the Connetable* (New Haven, Conn. 1947); S. L. England, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew* (London 1938). **Wars of Religion:** L. Romier, *Les origines politiques des guerres de rêligion,* 2 vols. (Paris 1913–14); id., *Le royaume de Catherine de Médicis: La France à la veille des guerres de religion,* 2 vols. (Paris 1922); id., *La conjuration d'Amboise* (Paris 1923); id., *Catholiques et Huguenots à la cour de Charles IX* (Paris 1924); G. de Lagarde, *Recherches sur l'esprit politique de la Réforme* (Paris 1926); L. R. Lefèvre, *Les Français, pendant les guerres de Religion* (Paris 1949); A. de Lévis-Mirepoiz, *Les guerres de Religion 1559–1610* (Paris 1950); Ph. Erlanger, *Le massacre de la Saint-Barthélemy* (Paris 1960); *The Letters and Documents of . . . Baron di Biron (1524–1592),* 2 vols., ed. J. W. Thompson (Berkeley 1936). **Edict of Nantes:** Text: E. Walder, *Religionsvergleiche des 16. Jh.* II (Bern 1961) 13–71; id., E. Mengin (ed.), *Das Edikt von Nantes* (Flensburg 1963); E. Benoist, *Histoire de l'édit de Nantes,* 5 vols. (Delft 1693–95); J. Pannier, *L'église réformée de Paris sous Henri IV* (Paris 1911); J. Faurey, *Henri IV et l'édit de Nantes* (Bordeaux 1903); id., *L'édit de Nantes et la question de la tolérance* (Paris 1929); J. de Missècle, *L'édit de Nantes et sa révocation* (Colmar 1930); A. Bailly, *La réforme en France jusqu'à l'Édit de Nantes* (Paris 1960); A. Buisson, *Michel de l'Hôpital* (Paris 1950); Jean Héritier, *Catherine de Médicis* (Paris 1941, Lit.); E. Neale, *The Age of Catherine de Medici* (London 1943); H. O. Evenett, *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent* (Cambridge 1930); E. Marcks, *Gaspard de Coligny, sein Leben und das Frankreich seiner Zeit* (Leipzig 1918); Ph. Erlanger, *Henri III* (Paris 1948); P. de Vaissière, *Henri IV* (Paris 1928); Ph. Erlanger, *L'étrange mort de Henri IV* (Paris 1957); M. Reinhard, *Henri IV ou la France sauvée* (Paris 1958).

The Netherlands

SOURCES: S. Cramer–F. Pijper, *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* I–X (The Hague 1903–14); *Racueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas,* 6 vols. (1506–1555) (Brussels 1893–

1922); W. Perquin, *Bibliotheca catholica neerlandica impressa 1500–1727* (The Hague 1955); *Recueil des ordonnances de la principauté de Liège I* (*1507–80*) (Brussels 1869); P. Frederico, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae* IV–V (Gent 1900–06); G. Brom–A. H. L. Hensen, *Romeinsche bronnen voor den kerkelijk-staatkundigen toestand der Nederlanden in de 16*^{de} *eeuw* (The Hague 1922); J. Lefèvre, *Correspondance de Philippe II sur les affaires des Pays-Bas* (Brussels 1940); M. Dietrick, *Documents, inédits sur l'érection des nouveaux diocèses au Pays-Bas 1521–70,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1960–62).

LITERATURE: **History:** J. W. Motley, *Der Abfall der Niederlande und die Entstehung des Holländischen Freistaats,* 3 vols. (Dresden 1857–60); A. Heune, *Histoire du règne de Charles-Quint en Belgique* (Brussels 1858–60); P. Frederico, *De Nederlanden onder Keizer Karl V.* (Gent 1885); E. Gossart, *L'établissement du régime espagnol dans les Pays-Bas et l'insurrection* (Brussels 1905); G. de Boom, *Charles-Quint, prince des Pays-Bas* (Brussels 1941); M. Dierickx, *De oprichting der nieuwe bisdommen in de Nederlanden onder Filips II 1559–70* (Antwerp–Utrecht 1950); id., *RHE* 59 (1964) 489–499. **Inquisition:** P. Claessens, *L'Inquisition et le régime pénal pour la répression de l'hérésie dans les Pays-Bas du passé* (Turnhout 1886); J. Scheerder, *De Inquisitie in de Nederlanden in de 16*^{de} *eeuw* (Antwerp 1944). **Calvinism:** H. Q. Janssen, *De Kerkhervorming in Vlaanderen* (Arnhem 1868); F. L. Rutgers, *Calvijns involved op de Reformatie in de Nederlanden* (Leiden 1899); H. J. Elias, *Kerk en Staat in de zuidelikjke Nederlanden 1598–1621* (Antwerp 1931); L. J. Rogier, *Geschiendenis van het Katholicisme in Noord-Nederland in de 16*^{e} *en de 17*^{e} *eeuw,* 3 vols. (Amsterdam 1945–47); W. F. Dankbaar, *Hoogtepunten uit het Nederlandsche Calvinisme in de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem 1946); J. Lindeboom, *De confessioneele ontwikkeling de Reformatie in de Nederlanden* (The Hague 1946); J. Roelink, *Het calvinisme, Algemene Geschiedenis de Nederlanden* IV (Utrecht 1952); E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'église en Belgique* V (Brussels 1952); L. E. Halkin, *La Réforme en Belgique sous Charles-Quint* (Brussels 1957, Lit.).

GERMANY

LOWER RHINE: *Die Akten der Synoden und Quartierskonsistorien in Jülich, Kleve und Berg, 1570–1610* (Neuwied 1909); E. Simons (ed.), *Urkundenbuch zur rheinischen KG* I: *Synodalbuch;* A. Wolters, *Reformationsgesch. der Stadt Wesel bis zur Befestigung ihres reformierten Bekenntnisses* (Bonn 1868); J. Hillmann, *Die ev. Gemeinde Wesel und ihre Willibrordkirche* (Düsseldorf 1896); W. Hollweg, "Calvins Beziehungen zu den Rheinlanden" *Calvinstudien,* ed. der reformierten Gemeinde Elberfeld (Leipzig 1909) 126–186; H. Kessel, "Reformation und Gegenreformation im Herzogtum Cleve (1517–1609)" *Düsseldorfer Jb.* 30 (1918–19) 1–160; H. Forsthoff, *Rheinische KG* I: *Die Reformation am Niederrhein* (Essen 1929); D. Coenen, *Die katholische Kirche am Niederrhein von der Reformation bis zum Beginn des 18. Jh.* (Münster 1967); G. Hövelmann u.a., *Niederrheinische KG* (Kevelaer 1965).

PALATINATE: A. Kluckhohn, "Wie ist Kurfürst Friedrich III. von der Pfalz Calvinist geworden?" *Münchener Historisches Jb.* (1866) 432–520; id., *Friedrich der Fromme, Curfürst von der Pfalz, der Schützer der reformierten Kirche 1559–76* (Nördlingen 1876); id., (ed.) *Die Briefe Friedrichs des Frommen,* 2 vols. (Braunschweig 1866–70); R. Lossen, *Die Glaubensspaltung in Kurpfalz* (Heidelberg 1930); E. Mayer, *Pfälzische KG* (Kaiserslautern 1939); L. Stamer, *KG der Pfalz III* 1 (Speyer 1955); H. Müller, "Der Calvinismus am Rhein" *Monatshefte für KG des Rheinlands* (1954) 34–41; E. W. Zeeden, *Kleine Reformationsgesch. von Baden-Durlach und Kurpfalz* (Karlsruhe 1956) (lit.); K.

Sudhoff, *C. Olevianus und Z. Ursinus* (Elberfeld 1857); Ruth Wesel-Roth, Thomas Erastus. *Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der reformierten Kirche und zur Lehre von der Staatssouveränität* (Lahr 1954); W. Hollweg, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Gesch. und Lehre des Heidelberger Katechismus* (Neukirchen 1961); id., *Der Augsburger Reichstag von 1566 und seine Bedeutung für die Entstehung der Reformierten Kirche und ihres Bekenntnisses* (Neukirchen 1964); J. Staedtke (ed.), *Glauben und Erkennen. 400 Jahre Confessio Helvetica Posterior* (Zurich 1966).

NASSAU: B. Weber, *Cartons aus dem deutschen Kirchenleben* (Mainz 1858) 575–660: Die Reformation in Nassau; H. F. Röttsches, *Luthertum und Calvinismus in Nassau-Dillenburg* (Berne 1954) (lit.); L. Hatzfeld, "Die Reformation in der Grafschaft Nassau-Dillenburg" *AMrhKG* 7 (1955) 77–111; K. Wolf, "Zur Einführung des reformierten Bekenntnisses in Nassau-Dillenburg" *Nassauische Annalen* 66 (1955) 160–193.

BREMEN: O. Veeck, *Gesch. der reformierten Kirche Bremens* (Berlin 1917); J. Moltmann, *Christoph Pezel (1539–1604) und der Calvinismus in Bremen* (Bremen 1958).

LIPPE: W. Butterweck, *Die Gesch. der Lippischen Landeskirchen* (Schötmar 1926); H. Kiewning, *Lippische Gesch.* (Detmold 1942).

ANHALT: R. Specht, *Bibliogr. zur Gesch. von Anhalt* (Magdeburg 1930); supplement 1930–35 (Dessau 1935); H. Wäschke, *Gesch. Anhalts im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Cöthen 1913); H. Duncker, *Anhalts Bekenntnisstand während der Vereinigung der Fürstentümer unter Joachim Ernst und Johann Georg (1570–1606)* (Dessau 1892); C. A. Valentiner, *Das Bekenntnis der Anhaltischen Landeskirche* (Bernburg 1895); G. Schubring, "Die Einführung der reformierten Confession in Anhalt" *Zschr. für die gesamte luth. Theol. u. Kirche* 9 (1848) 291–340; H. Becker, "Der wesentliche Anteil Anhalts an der Festlegung der Bezeichnung 'reformiert' als Kirchenname in Dtl." *ThStK* 74 (1901) 242–269; A. Boes, "Die ev. Landeskirche Anhalts, ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung in Bekenntnis und Verfassung" *Amsblatt der ev. Landeskirche Anhalts* (Dessau 1956) 41–45.

SCOTLAND

SOURCES: *Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, from the year 1560,* ed. Th. Thomson, 3 vols. (Edinburg 1839–45); D. Calderwood, *The History of the Kirk of Scotland,* ed. Th. Thomson–D. Laing, 8 vols. (1842–49); R. Keith, *History of Affairs of Church and State in Scotland,* ed. J. Parker Lawson, 3 vols. (1844–50); *Statuta Ecclesiae Scoticanae* (*Concilia Scoticae*), ed. Joseph Robertson, 2 vols. (1866); *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots during her Reign in Scotland, 1561–67,* ed. John Hungerford Pollen (1901); John Knox, *History of the Reformation in Scotland,* ed. W. C. Dickinson, taken from the works of Knox, I–II (1949); *A Source Book of Scottish History* II (1424–1567), III (1567–1707), ed. W. C. Dickinson–G. Donaldson (Edinburgh 1958).

LITERATURE: A. Lang, *History of Scotland,* 4 vols. (Edinburgh 1903–07); F. H. Brown, *History of Scotland to the Present Time,* 3 vols., II: *From the Accession of Mary Stuart to the Revolution* (Cambridge 1911); G. Donaldsen, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge 1960, Lit.); W. C. Dickinson–G. S. Tryde, *A New History of Scotland,* 2 vols., I: *Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603* (1961), II: *Scotland from 1603 to the Present Day* (1962) (lit.). **Church History:** A. Bellesheim, *Gesch. der katholischen Kirche in Schottland,* 2 vols. (Mainz 1883); A. R. MacEwen, *A History of the Church in Scotland,* 2 vols. (London

1913–18); D. Nobbs, *England and Scotland 1560–1707* (London 1952); J. H. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (New York 1960). **Reformation in Scotland:** F. Mitchell, *The Scottish Reformation. Its Epochs, Episodes, Leaders and Distinctive Characteristic,* ed. D. H. Fleming (Blackwood–Edinburgh 1900); D. H. Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland, Causes, Characteristics, Consequences.* (London 1910); A. Zimmermann, "Zur Reformation in Schottland" *RQ* 25 (1911) 27–41, 110–123; G. Donaldson, *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge 1960); J. Girdwood Maggregor, *The Scottish Presbyterian Polity* (Edinburgh 1926); G. D. Henderson, *Religious Life in Seventeenth Century Scotland* (Cambridge 1937); id., *The Claims of the Church of Scotland* (London 1951). **John Knox:** A. Lang, *John Knox and the Reformation* (London 1905); Lord E. Percy, *John Knox* (London 1937); *Works,* ed. D. Laing, 6 vols. (Edinburgh 1895); P. H. Brown, *John Knox* (New York 1905); H. Watt, *John Knox in Controversy* (New York 1950). **Scotch-English Royal Houses:** D. H. Fleming, *Mary Queen of Scots: From her Birth to her flight into England* (London 1898); H. Witte, *Die Ansichten Jakobs I. von England über Kirche und Staat* (Berlin 1940); S. A. Tannebaum, *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots. A Concise Bibliography,* 3 vols. (New York 1944–46); A. Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London 1969).

ENGLAND

E. C. E. Boume, *The Anglicanism of William Laud* (London 1947); W. Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York 1956); J. Marlowe, *The Puritan Tradition in English Life* (London 1957); M. P. Ashley, *Oliver Cromwell and the Puritan Revolution* (London 1958); P. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkley 1967); see chaps. 27 and 39; A. Fraser, *Cromwell the Lord Protector* (New York 1974).

31. *The Formation of Denominations in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*

SOURCES

E. Sehling (ed.), *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jh.* 1–5 (Leipzig 1902–14), 6–8, 11–13 (Tübingen 1955–6); L. Richter (ed.), *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jh.* (Weimar 1846); W. Niesel (ed.), *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche* (Zurich ^{3}1938); *Die evangelisch-lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (Göttingen 1952).

VISITATIONS: cf. Chap. 19; M. Gmelin, "Die Visitationsprotokolle der Diözese Konstanz 1571–86" *ZGObrh* 25 (1873) 129–204; J. Jungnitz, *Visitationsberichte der Diözese Breslau,* 4 vols. (Breslau 1902–08); W. E. Schwartz, *Die Akten der Visitation des Bistums Münster aus der Zeit Johannes von Hoya 1571–73* (Münster 1913); A. Franzen, *Die Visitationsprotokolle der ersten nachtridentinischen Visitation im Erzstift Köln unter Salentin von Isenburg 1569* (Münster 1960).

LITERATURE

A. Franzen, *Die Kelchbewegung am Niederrhein im 16. Jh.* (Münster 1955); id., "Die Herausbildung des Konfessionsbewusstseins am Niederrhein im 16. Jh." *AHVNrh* 158 (1956–57) 164–209; id., "Das Schicksal des Erasmianismus am Niederrhein im 16. Jh." *HJ* 83 (1964) 84–112; H. Lutz, "Bayern und der Laienkelch" *QFIAB* 34 (1954) 203–235; H. W. Gensichen, *Damnamus: Die Verwerfung von Irrlehre bei Luther und im Luther-*

tum des 16. Jh. (Berlin 1955); H. Nottarp, *Zur Communicatio in sacris cum haereticis* (Halle 1933); E. W. Zeeden, "Grundlagen und Wege der Konfessionsbildung in Deutschland im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe" *HZ* 185 (1958) 249–299; id., *Katholische Überlieferungen in den lutherischen Kirchenordnungen* (Münster 1959); id., *Die Entstehung der Konfessionen* (Munich 1965); J. B. Götz, *Die religiösen Wirren in der Oberpfalz 1576–1620* (Münster 1937); D. Coenen, *Die Katholische Kirche am Niederrhein von der Reformation bis zum Beginn des 18. Jh.* (Münster 1967); A. Zieger, *Das religiöse und kirchliche Leben im Spiegel der Kirchenordnungen von Preussen und Kurland* (Diss. Tübingen 1963); F. Dickmann, "Das Problem der Gleichberechtigung der Konfessionen im Reich im 16. und 17. Jh." *HZ* 201 (1965) 265–305; H. Bornkamm, "Die religiöse und politische Problematik der Konfessionen im Reich" *ARG* 56 (1965) 209–218; H. Lutz, "Die Konfessionsproblematik ausserhalb des Reiches und in der Politik des Papsttums" ibid. 218–227; E. W. Zeeden and H. Molitor, *Die Visitation im Dienst der kirchlichen Reform* (Münster 1967).

Part Two
Catholic Reform and Counter Reformation

The Historical Concepts

LITERATURE

A. Elkan, "Entstehung und Entwicklung des Begriffes Gegenreformation" *HZ* 112 (1914) 473–493; H. Jedin, *Katholische Reformation oder Gegenreformation?* (Lucerne 1946), in addition K. D. Schmidt, *Katholische Reform oder Gegenreformation* (Limburg 1957); E. W. Zeeden, "Probleme und Aufgaben der Reformationsgeschichtsschreibung" *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 6 (1955) 201–217; G. Villoslada, "La contrarreform, su nombre y su concepto histórico" *Saggi storici intorno al Papato* (Rome 1959) 189–242; B. Croce, *Der Begriff des Barocks und der Gegenreformation* (Zurich 1926).

GENERAL ACCOUNTS

W. Maurenbrecher, *Geschichte der katholischen Reformation* I (Nördlingen 1880); G. Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit* (Paderborn 1937); K. Eder, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des konfessionellen Absolutismus* (Freiburg 1949); P. Janelle, *The Catholic Reformation* (Milwaukee, Wisc. 1949); M. Bendiscioli, *La riforma cattolica* (Rome 1958); K. Eder, "Die katholische Erneuerung" *HM* VII (Bern 1957) 114–160; G. H. Tavard, "The Catholic Reform in the XVI Century" *CH* 26 (1957) 275–288; B. J. Kidd, *The Counter Reformation* (London 1933); H. Daniel-Rops, *The Catholic Reformation* (New York 1960); E. M. Burns, *The Counter Reformation* (Princeton 1964).

SECTION ONE

Origin and Breakthrough of the Catholic Reform to 1563

32. *Preliminary Steps in Italy and Spain*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

A general work on the sources is lacking; likewise complete descriptions of each of the two countries; for France and Germay see Chapters 39 and 40.

ITALY: P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* I:2–3 (Rome 1950); M. Petrocchi, *La contrariforma in Italia* (Rome 1947); P. Paschini, *Tre ricerche sulla storia della Chiesa nel Cinquecento* (Rome 1945) 3–88 (Oratories of Divine Love); id., *Eresia e*

riforma cattolica al confine orientale d'Italia (Rome 1951); G. Alberigo, *Contributi alla storia delle Confraternite dei disciplinati e della spiritualità laicale nei secoli XV e XVI* (Perugia 1961); A. Cistellini, *Figure della riforma pretridentina* (Brescia 1948) (B. Stella and the Oratory in Brescia); F. S. da Brusciano, "Maria Lorenza Longo e l'opera del Divino Amore a Napoli" *CollFr* 23 (1953) 166–226; On the Venetian reform group: J. Leclercq, *Le bienheureux P. Giustiniani* (Rome 1951); The ascetic main work G.s: *Secretum meum mihi* (Frascati 1941); H. Jedin, "Contarini und Camaldoli" *Arch. Ital. per la Storia della pietà* 2 (1959) 51–117; id., "Quirini und Bembo" *MisMercati* IV (1946) 407–424; id., "G. Contarini e il contributo veneziano alla Riforma cattolica" *La Civiltà veneziana del Rinascimento* (Florence 1958) 105–125; F. Gaeta, *Il vescovo Barozzi e il trattato de factionibus extinguendis* (Venice–Rome 1958).

ROME AND DIOCESES: G. Pelliccia, *La preparazione ed amissione dei chierici ai santi ordini nella Roma del secolo XVI* (Rome 1946); R. Putelli, *Prime visite pastorali alla città e diocesi [de Mantove]* (Mantua 1934); A. Grazioli, *G. M. Giberti* (Verona 1955).

THEATINES: P. Paschini, *S. Gaetano Thiene, G. P. Carafa e el origini dei Chierici Regolari Teatini* (Rome 1926); P. Chiminelli, *S. Gaetano Thiene, cuore della riforma cattolica* (Vicenza 1948); F. Andreu, *Le lettere di S. Gaetano da Thiene* (Città del Vaticano 1954); R. de Maio, "Un tentativo rifomatore nel Cinquencento. Girolamo Ferro" *Regnum Dei. Collectanea Theatina* 16 (1960) 1–58.

BARNABITES: O. Premoli, *Le lettere e lo spirito religioso di Antonio Maria Zaccaria* (Rome 1909); id., *Storia dei Barnabiti nel Cinquecento* (Rome 1913); G. Chastel, *S. A. M. Zaccaria* (Paris 1930), Italian edition by S. de Ruggiero (Brescia 1933); G. M. Cagni–F. M. Ghilardotti, "I sermoni di S. A. M. Zaccaria" *Arch. Ital. per la Storia della pietà* 2 (1959) 231–284; G. Boffitto, *Scrittori barnabiti* IV (Florence 1937).

SOMASCHI: G. Landini, *S. Girolamo Miani* (Rome 1947); G. Vaira, *G. Miano educatore* (Rome 1960); M. Tentorio, *Ven. P. Francesco Spaur da Trento preposito generale dei padri somaschi* (Rome 1961); P. Bianchini, "Origine e sviluppo della Compagnia dei servi dei poveri" *Rivista dell' Ordine dei PP. Somaschi* 31 (1956) 100–111, 184–192, 229–237; 32 (1957) 11–28, 103–116.

URSULINES: C. Lubieńska, *S. Aniela Merici i jej Dziejo* I (Cracow 1935 with bibl.); P. Guerrini, *S. A. Merici e la Compagnia di S. Orsola* (Brescia 1936); S. M. Monica, *Angela Merici and her Teaching Idea* (S. Martin, Ohio ^{2}1945).

MENDICANTS: H. Jedin, "Zur Vorgeschichte der Regularenreform Trid. Sess. XXV" *RQ* 44 (1936) 231–281; id., *G. Seripando* I (Würzburg 1937) 147–289; A. Ghinato, "I Francescani e il Monte di pietà di Terni" *AFrH* 52 (1959) 204–289; id., "Il b. Michele d'Acqui e il suo apostolato in Verona" *Venezie francescane* 4 (1957) 145–192; L. Saggi, *La Contregazione Mantovana dei Carmelitani sino alla morte del B. Battista Spagnoli 1512* (Rome 1954); A. Staring, *Der Karmelitengeneral Nikolaus Audet und die katholische Reform des 16. Jh.* (Rome 1959); P. Cuthbert-J. Widlöcher, *Die Kapuziner* (Munich 1931); *Monumenta Hist. Ord. Min. Capuccinorum* (since 1937); Melchior a Pobladura, *Historia generalis O. Min. Cap.* I (Rome 1947); Th. Graf, *Die Kapuziner* (Fribourg 1957); G. Abate, "Fra Matteo da Bascio el gli inizi dell'Ordine Cappuccino" *CollFr* 30 (1960) 31–77.

SPAIN: F. Fernández, *F. Hernando de Talavera, confesor de los Reyes y primer arzobispo de Granada* (Madrid 1942); Tarsicio de Azcona, "El tipo ideal de obispo en la Iglesia española antes la rebelión luterana" *HS* 11 (1958) 21–44; id., *La elección y reforma del Episcopado español en tiempo de los Reyes Católicos* (Madrid 1960); L. F. de Retana, *Cisneros*

y su siglo, 2 vols. (Madrid 1929); J. M. Doussinague, *Fernando el Católico y el cisma de Pisa* (Madrid 1946); V. Beltrán de Heredia, *Historia de la Reforma de la Provincia de España 1450–1550* (Rome 1936); id., *Las corrientes de espiritualidad entre los Dominicos de Castilla durante la primera mitad del siglo XVI* (Salamanca 1941); *Introducción a los origines de la Observancia en España: Las Reformas de los siglos XIV el XV* (Madrid 1958); M. Battaillon, *Erasmo y España,* 2 vols. (Mexico 1950); C. Sánchez Aliseda, "Precedentes Toledanos de la Reforma tridentina" *Revista española de Derecho Canónico* 2 (1948); J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, *El Obispo ideal en el siglo de la Reforma* (Rome 1963), with special reference to Spanish authors.

33. *Ignatius Loyola and His Order to 1556*

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

A. Carayon, *Bibliographie historique de la Compagnia de Jésus* (Paris 1864); Heimbucher II:130–138; A. de Backer–Ch. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus,* 11 vols. (Paris 1890–1932); Since 1932 a continuous bibliography in *AHSI.* On the origin (1894) and history of the chief source material, *MHSI* cf. P. de Leturia: *AHSI* 13 (1944) 1–61 and *HJ* 72 (1953) 585–604. It was located originally in Madrid, since 1929 in Rome. The first section of the *Monumenta Iganatiana* contains 4 series: I: *Epp. et instructiones,* 12 vols. (1903–11), 6813 letters of the last decade, for the most part not by Ignatius himself, but rather formulated by his assistants. II: *Exercitia spiritualia* (1919), J. Iparraguirre, *Directoria Exercitiorum Spiritualium 1540–1899* (Rome 1955). III: *Constitutiones,* 3 vols. (1934–38) and *Regulae Societatis Jesu* (1948). IV: *Fontes narrativi di S. Ignatio,* 3 vols (1943–60), containing the so-called "Memories of Life," other contemporary testimonies, and the canonization process. Manuscript: *Obras completas de S. Ignacio de L.,* ed. J. Iparraguirre (Madrid 1952); On Ignatius and the establishment of the order the so-called *Chronicon S. J.* written by the secretary of the saint, by J. A. Polanco, *Vita S. Ignatii Loyolae et rerum Soc. Jesu historia,* 6 vols. (1894–97), in addition, *Complementa,* 2 vols. (1916–17) are important. For the history of the establishment of the order the following are useful in addition to the letters in the *MHSI:* The letters of the first members in the *MHSI: Lainii Monumenta,* 8 vols. (1912–17). *Fabri Mon.* (1914). *Epp. Salmeronis,* 2 vols. (1906–07). *Bobadillae Mon.* (1913). *Epp. Hieronymi Nadal,* 4 vols. (1889–1905). The *Epp. mixtae 1537–56,* 5 vols. (1898–1901) are useful also for general Church history.

LITERATURE

IGNATIUS: J. Juambelz, *Bibliografía sobre la vida, obras y escritos de S. I. de L.* (Madrid 1956); J. Iparraguirre, *Orientaciones bibliográficas sobre S. I. de L.* (Rome 1957); F. G. Gilmont–P. Daman, *Bibliographie Ignatienne 1894–1957* (Paris–Louvain 1958). The official life of Ignatius is presented in the *Vita of P. Ribadeneira* (+1611), first appearing in Naples, 1572. Cf. R. G. Villoslada, "La figura histórica de S. I. de L. a través de cuatro siglos" *RF* 153 (1956) 40–70; H. Böhmer, *Ignatius von Loyola,* ed. H. Leube (Leipzig 1941); P. Dudon, *S. Ignace de L.* (Paris 1934); P. de Leturia, *El gentilombre I. López de Loyola* (Barcelona 1949); The numerous preliminary works of the former editor of the *MHSI* for an until now missing biography of large scope are collected in the *Estudios ignacianos,* ed. J. Iparraguirre, 2 vols. (Rome 1957); The 400th anniversary of the death of Loyola produced many biographies of varying worth: G. Papàsogli (Rome 1955), J. Brodrick, A. Guillermon, F. Wulf, R. G. Villoslada (all 1956, Villoslada in second edition 1961); *Commentarii Ignatiani* (Rome 1956), the Jubilee volume of the *AHSI*, with collection of the literature of the Jubilee, 617–629. Because of its insight one biography stands out: H. Rahner, *I. v. L. Briefwechsel mit Frauen* (Freiburg 1956); J. Lewis, *Le gouvernement spirituel selon S. Ignace de Loyola* (Bruges–Paris 1961).

SPIRITUAL EXERCISES: H. Böhmer, *Loyola und die deutsche Mystik* (Leipzig 1921); L. Zarncke, *Die Exercitia Spir. des hl. I. v. L. in ihren geistesgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen* (Leipzig 1931); A. M. Albareda, "Intorno alla scuola di orazione metodica stabilita a Monserrato dall'abbate Garsias Jimenez de Cisneros" *AHSI* 25 (1956) 254–316. For the originality: A. Codina, *Los orígenes de los Ejercicios espirituales de S. I. de L.* (Barcelona 1926); P. de Leturia, "Génesis de los Ejercicios de S. Ignacio y su influjo en la fundación de la Compañiá de Jésus" *AHSI* 10 (1941) 16–59; H. Rahner, "I. v. L. und die aszetische Tradition der Kirchenväter" *ZAM* 17 (1942) 61–77; id., *I. v. L. und das geschichtliche Werden seiner Frömmigkeit* (Salzburg 1949), fundamental; id., "Zur Christologie der Exerzitien" *GuL* 35 (1962) 14–38, 115–140; id., *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, chap. III (New York 1964); J. Iparraguirre, *Espíritu de S. I. de L.* (Bilbao 1958); F. Charmot, *L'union au Christ dans l'actions selon S. Ignace* (Paris 1959); J. de Guibert, *La spiritualité de la Comp. de Jésus* (Rome 1953); Issac Jogues Iroquois, *Fr. Mission in Canada;* J. de Guibert, *The Jesuits, Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice* (Chicago 1965): This is the chief work on the subject.

FIRST MEMBERS: F. Cerecéda, *Diego Laínez en la Europa religiosa de su tiempo,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1945); J. Danemarie, *Le bienheureux P. Favre* (Paris 1960); G. Guitton, *Le bienheureux P. Favre* (Lyon–Paris 1960); M. Nicoláu, *J. Nadal* (Madrid 1949); G. Schurhammer, *Franz Xaver* I (Freiburg 1955); O. Karrer, *Der hl. Franz von Borja* (Freiburg 1921); C. de Dalmases–J. F. Gilmont, "Las obras de S. Francisco de Borja" *AHSI* 30 (1961) 125–179; C. Englander, *Ignatius von Loyola und Johannes von Polanco* (Regensburg 1956); J. F. Gilmont, *Les écrits spirituels des premiers Jésuites. Inventaire commenté* (Rome 1961).

HISTORY OF THE ORDER: The order had from the beginning a carefully kept archive (see G. Schurhammer, "Der Ursprung des römischen Archivs der Gesellschaft Jesu" *AHSI* 12 [1943] 89–118) and carefully recorded its history. Older complete descriptions: N. Orlandini, F. Sacchini et. al., *Historia S. J.*, 6 parts (Rome 1614–1859); D. Bartoli, *Dell'istoria della Comp. di Gesù,* 6 vols. (Rome 1650–60); J. Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Comp. de Jésus,* 6 vols. (Paris ^{3}1851), strongly apologetic; E. Rosa, *I gesuiti dalle origini ai nostri giorni* (Rome ^{3}1957); Th. J. Campbell, *The Jesuits* (London 1935); R. G. Villoslada, *Manual de historia de la Compañía de Jésus* (Madrid 1941); H. Becher, *Die Jesuiten* (Munich 1951), best account in German; More detailed, extending only to 1579: J. Brodrick, *The Origins of the Jesuits* (London 1940); id., *The Progress of the J.* (London 1946). Good tabulated synopsis [F. X. Wernz–J. B. Boetstouwers], *Synopsis Historiae Societatis Jesu* (Louvain 1950). Rich in material but of variable worth are the histories of the provinces written at the mandate of the order: B. Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge,* 4 vols (Freiburg–Regensburg 1907–28), extends to the suppression of the order, and is indispensable for the general Church history of Germany from the 16th to the 18th centuries; A. Astraín, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España,* 7 vols. (Madrid 1902–25); P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesú in Italia,* 2 vols. (Rome 1930–51), extending only to 1556; H. Fouqueray, *Histoire de la Comp. de Jésus en France,* 5 vols. (Paris 1910–25), to 1645, completed by P. de Lattre, *Les établissements des Jésuites en France,* 4 vols. (Paris 1941–56); A Poncelet, *Histoire de la Comp. des Jésus dans les anciens Pays-Bas* (Brussels 1927–28); F. Rodrigues, *História de la Companhia de Jesus na Assistên-*

cia de Portugal I (Porto 1931); A. Kröss, *Geschichte der Böhmischen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1910–38). For the histories of the overseas provinces see chaps. 45 and 46.

REFERENCE BOOKS AND WORKS ON THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDER: B. Duhr, *Jesuitenfabeln* (Freiburg 1904); L. Koch, *Jesuitenlexikon* (Paderborn 1934); P. Lippert, *Zur Psychologie des Jesuitenordens* (Freiburg 1956); G. Gundlach, *Zur Soziologie der kath. Ideenwelt und des Jesuitenordens* (Freiburg 1928); H. Stoeckius, *Forschungen zur Lebensordnung der Gesellschaft Jesu im 16. Jh.,* 2 parts (Munich 1910–11); M. Mir, *Historia interna documentada de la Comp. de J.,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1913); P. M. Baumgarten, *Ordenszucht und Ordensstrafrecht* [*der Jesuiten*] (Krumbach 1932); P. v. Hoensbroech, *Der Jesuitenorden,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1926–28), pamphlet.

ASSESSMENTS OF THE ORDER WRITTEN BY NON-JESUITS: Pilatus [=V. Naumann], *Der Jesuitismus* (Regensburg 1905); R. Fülöp-Müller, *Macht und Geheimnis der Jesuiten* (Lucerne 1929); H. Böhmer, *The Jesuits* (Philadelphia 1928).

34. *The Beginnings of the Catholic Reform in Rome under Paul III*

SOURCES

BullRom VI:173–401; Raynold, *Ann. Eccl.* XXI:1; NBD, *I. Abt.* 1–11 (Gotha 1892, Berlin 1910); The preliminary Acts of the Council of Trent: *CT* IV (1904); G. Ribier, *Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat sous François I, Henry II et François II,* 2 vols. (Paris 1666); *Acta nuntiaturae Gallicae,* I: *Correspondance des Nonces en France Carpi et Ferrero 1535–40,* ed. J. Lestocquoy (Rome–Paris 1961); id., *G. Alberigo: Critica storica* (1962) 66f.; P. G. Baroni, *La nunziatura in Francia di Rodolfo Pio 1535–37* (Bologna 1962); *Correspondance du Card. de Tournon,* ed. M. Francois (Paris 1946); *Nunziature di Venezia,* ed. F. Gaeta, 2 vols. (Rome 1958–60), cf. also id., *Annuario dell'Instituto storico ital. per l'età moderna e contemporanea* 9–10 (1957–58) 5–281.

LITERATURE

Pastor V; C. Capasso, *Paolo III,* 2 vols. (Messina 1924); L. Dorez, *La cour du Pape Paul III,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); L. Cardauns, *Von Nizza bis Crépy* (Rome 1923); W. Friedensburg, *Kaiser Karl V. und Papst Paul III.* (Leipzig 1932); K. Brandi, *Kaiser Karl V.,* 2 vols. (Munich 1937–41) Eng. Vol. I (New York 1939); P. Rassow–F. Schalk, *Karl V.: Der Kaiser und seine Zeit* (Cologne 1960) 104–117, the conciliar politics of the Emperor; H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent* I (St. Louis 1957) 245–444, also treats the works of St. Ehses and others used by Pastor; id., "Eine bisher unbekannte Denkschrift Tommaso Campeggios über die Reform der Römischen Kurie" *Lortz F I* (Baden-Baden 1958) 405–417; K. Schnith, "Karl V. in europäischer Sicht. Hinweise auf neuere Arbeiten" *HJ* 80 (1961) 270–285; W. Gramberg, "Die Hamburger Bronzebüste Pauls III" *Festschrift E. Meyer* (Hamburg 1959) 160–172.

ITALIAN EVANGELISM: *Opuscoli e lettere di riformatori italiani del Cinquecento,* ed. G. Paladino, 2 vols. (Bari 1913); E. M. Jung, "On the Nature of Evangelism in Sixteenth-Century Italy" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14 (1953) 511–527; Bibliography on Vittoria Colonna in the jubilee volume: *V. Colonna, Marchesa di Pescara* (Rome 1947) 126–134; The ambivalent character of Evangelism was often misunderstood due to the numerous defections and the Inquisition, e.g., H. W. Beyer, *Die Religion Michelangelos* (Bonn 1926); P. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy* (Oxford 1967).

INQUISITION: G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition in Italien um die Mitte des 16. Jh.* (Paderborn 1912); P. Paschini, "Episodi della Inquisizione a Roma nei suoi primi decenni" *Studi romani* 5 (1957) 281–301.

35. *The Council of Trent under Paul III and Julius III*

SOURCES

H. Jedin, *Das Konzil von Trient. Ein Überblick über die Erforschung seiner Geschichte* (Rome 1948). The official edition of the *Canones et Decreta* (Rome 1564 by Paulus Manutius) was reprinted innumerable times; expanded to include the most important declarations of the council congregation, ed. E. L. Richter (Leipzig 1853). Phototypic reproduction of an autograph of Massarelli with an introduction about the oldest prints: St. Kuttner, *Decreta septem priorum sessionum Concilii Tridentini sub Paulo III Pont. Max.* (Washington 1945). Because the acts were inaccessible since the end of the 16th century, both of the descriptions of the history of the council, which appeared in the 17th century, were treated into the 19th century almost like source works: the sharply antipapal *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* by P. Sarpi (London 1619), critical edition by Gambarin, 3 vols. (Bari 1935), and the refutation by P. Sforza Pallavicino, *Istoria del Concilio di Trento* (Rome 1655), best edition by F. A. Zaccaria, 5 vols. (Faenza 1792–96); cf. H. Jedin, *Der Quellenapparat der Konzilsgeschichte Pallavicinos* (Rome 1940). On the reliability of Sarpi see Jedin II 518–21ff. A synopsis of those sources made available up to that time is supplied by J. Le Plat, *Monumentorum ad historiam concilii Tridentini potissimum illustrandam spectantium amplissima collectio,* 7 vols. (Louvain 1781–87); the first, defective edition of the acts A. Theiner, *Acta genuina ss. oecumenici Concilii Tridentini,* 2 vols. (Agram 1874). A critical edition of all comprehensible sources was begun in 1891 after the opening of the Vatican Archives by the Görres-Gesellschaft: *Concilium Tridentinum. Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatuum nova collectio* (Freiburg 1901–61), till now 13 vols. in 4 sections: Diaries, S. Merkle I–III:1; Acts, IV–V (1545–47); VIII–IX (1561–63), ed. St. Ehses; VI:1 (Bologna) and VII:1 (1551–52), ed. Th. Freudenberger; Letters, X–XI, ed. G. Buschbell; Treatises, XIII, ed. V. Schweitzer; XIII:1, ed. V. Schweitzer–H. Jedin. The history of the origin of the collection by Jedin, U. Sufera 195–213.

GENERAL LITERATURE

P. Richard, *Histoire de Concile de Trente,* 2 vols. (Paris 1930–31), suppl. A. Michel, *Les decrets du Concile de Trente* (*Paris 1938*); L. Cristiani, *L'Église à l'époque du Concile de Trente* (Paris 1948). In addition *RSTI* 2 (1948) 274–284; G. Schreiber, *Das Weltkonzil von Trient,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1951), there I:11–31 a survey of the literature appearing at the jubilee in 1945.

ON THE PARTICIPANTS: G. Alberigo, "Cataloghi dei partecipanti al Concilio di Trento editi durante il medesimo" *RSTI* 10 (1956) 345–373; 11 (1957) 49–94; H. Jedin, "Die deutschen Teilnehmer am Konzil von Trient" *ThQ* 122 (1941) 238–261; 123 (1942) 21–39; C. Gutiérrez, *Españoles en Trento* (Valladolid 1951); A. Wazl, *I domenicani al Concilio di Trento* (Rome 1961). Further statements about the participants of the orders: Jedin, II:457; J. de Castro, *Portugal no Concilio de Trento,* 6 vols. (Lisbon 1944–46); I. Rogger, *Le nazioni al Concilio di Trento 1545–52* (Rome 1952). On the attitude of the Protestants, comprehensive but not exhaustive, R. Stupperich, "Die Reformation und das Tridentinum" *ARG* 47 (1956) 20–63. A stronger consideration of the sociological

factors is demanded by A. Dupront, "Du Concile de Trente. Reflexions autour d'un IV^{e} Centenaire" *RH* 206 (1951) 202f.

FIRST SESSION: "Acts": *CT* IV–V, in addition the later discovered votes on justification by J. Olazarán, *Documentos inéditos Tridentinos sobre la justificación* (Madrid 1957); The diaries of Severoli, Massarelli and the pro-imperial Pratanus: *CT* I–II; The correspondence: *CT* X with suppl. *CT* XI:3–129. Complete description with literature to 1956: Jedin II; newer special literature in the notes. Copious bibliography on the Italian bishops by G. Alberigo, *I vescovi italiani al Concilio di Trento 1545–47* (Florence 1959). H. O. Evennett, *Three Benedictine Abbots at the Council of Trent: Studia monastica* 1 (Montserrat 1959) 343–377.

BOLOGNA: "Acts": *CT* VI:1; the votes follow in VI:2; L. Carcereri, *Storia esterna di Concilio di Bologna* (Montevarchi 1902); id., *Il Concilio di Trento dalla traslazione a Bologna alla sospensione* (Bologna 1910); H. Jedin, "Il significato del periodo Bolognese per le decisioni dogmatiche e l'opera di riforma del Concilio di Trento" *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento* (Padua 1960) 1–10.

SECOND SESSION: "Acts": *CT* VII:1, in addition J. Birkner, "Die Akten des Trienter Konzils für die zweite Tagungsperiode unter Papst Julius III" *QFIAB* 29 (1939) 297–311. The letters of the treasurer Vargas, recorded in the correspondence *CT* XI, the authenticity of which has long been doubted, may now, after recent archival discoveries in England, be considered to be authentic. H. Jedin, "Das Konzilstagebuch des Bischofs Julius Pflug von Naumburg 1551–52" *RQ* 50 (1955) 22–43; E. Bizer, *Confessio Virttembergica* (Stuttgart 1952), with important introduction; C. M. Abád, "Dos Memoriales inéditos para el Concilio de Trento del B. Juan de Avila" *MCom* III (1945), in addition *ZAM* 11 (1936) 124–139; H. Jedin, "Die Deutschen am Trienter Konzil 1551–52" *HZ* 188 (1959) 1–16; J. Birkner, "Kardinal Marcellus Crescentius" *RQ* 43 (1935) 267–285; G. Alberigo, "Un informatore senese al Conc. di Trento 1551–52" *RSTI* 12 (1958) 173–201.

36. *The Breakthrough of the Catholic Reform (1551–59)*

SOURCES

BullRom VI:401–566; Raynald, *Ann. eccl.* XXI:2; The Reform Decrees of Julius III and Paul IV:*CT* XIII:1; *NBD,* I. Sect. 12 (1901), ed. G. Kupke; Sect. 13 (1959), ed. H. Lutz; R. Ancel, *Nontiatures de France* I (Paris 1909–11), includes the years 1554–57. For the Catholic Restoration in England: *Calendar of Letters, Dispatches and State Papers Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain. Philip and Mary 1554–58,* ed. R. Tyler (London 1954); The Acts of the Provincial Synod of Canterbury: Mansi XXXV: 475–504; W. Sharp–L. E. Whatmore, *Archdeacon Harpsfield's Visitations 1557* (London 1950–51); J. Tellechea Idigoras, "Pole y Paulo IV" *AHPpont* 4 (1966) 105–154.

LITERATURE

Pastor, VI; Seppelt, ^{2}IV:58–90; H. Lutz, *Christianitas afflicta* (Göttingen 1963).

FOR MARCELLUS II: In addition to the still reliable biography by P. Polidori (Rome 1744): A. Mercati, *Prescrizioni pel culto divino nella diocesi di Reggio-Emilia del vescovo card. M. Cervini* (Reggio–Emilia 1933).

For Paul IV: G. M. Monti, *Ricerche su Papa Paolo IV Carafa* (Benevent 1925); id., *Studi sulla Riforma cattolica e sul papato nei secoli XVI e XVII* (Trani 1941); I. Torriani, *Una tragedia nel Cinquecento romano: Paolo IV e i suoi nepoti* (Rome 1951).

English Restoration: Ph. Hughes, *Reformation in England* II (London 1954) 184–330; W. Schenk, *Reginald Pole* (London); G. Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon* (Boston 1941).

Other Subjects: H. Jedin, "Kirchenreform und Konzilsgedanke 1550–1559" *HJ* 54 (1934) 401–431; id., "Analekten zur Reformtätigkeit der Reformpäpste Julius' III und Pauls IV" *RQ* 42 (1934) 305–332; 43 (1935) 87–156; id., "Kard. Giovanni Ricci" *Misellanea P. Paschini* II (Rome 1949) 269–358; L. Serrano, "Anotación al tema: El papa Paolo IV y España" *Hispania* 3 (1943) 293–325.

Literature on Poland: B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen* [=KLK 18] (Münster 1960) 72–78; M. Francois, *Le Card. Francois Tournon* (Paris 1951) [=Bibliothèques des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Vol. 173].

37. *Pius IV and the Conclusion of the Council of Trent*

Sources

Negotiations: *CT* VIII–IX (St. Ehses); Diaries: *CT* II–III:1 (S. Merkle); Correspondence of the Legates: J. Susta, *Die Römische Curia und das Concil von Trient unter Pius IV.,* 4 vols. (Vienna 1904–14); Most important earlier work: Th. Sickel, *Römische Berichte,* 5 parts (Vienna 1895–1901); Reports of Imperial Ambassadors: Th. Sickel, *Zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient* (Vienna 1872); G. Drei, "La Corrispondenza del Card. Ercole Gonzaga, presidente del Concilio di Trento" *Archivio storico per le provincie Parmensi* 17 (1917) 185–242, 18 (1918) 30–143; H. Jedin, *Krisis und Wendepunkt des Trienter Konzils 1562–63. Die neuentdeckten Geheimberichte des Bischofs Gualterio von Viterbo an den hl. Karl Borromäus* (Würzburg 1941); Survey of important sources for history of last session: H. Jedin, *G. Seripando* II: 121; "Reports of the Nuncios Hosius, Delfino and Commendone to the Imperial Court" *NBD,* II. Abt., 1–3 (Vienna-Graz 1897–1953). E. M. Wermter, *Kard. St. Hosius, Bischof von Ermland, und Herzog Albrecht von Preussen. Ihr Briefwechsel über das Konzil von Trient 1560–62* (Münster 1957) [=RST 82].

Literature

Pastor VII; St. Ehses, "Die letzte Berufung des Trienter Konzils durch Pius IV" *Festschrift G. von Hertling* (Kempen 1913) 139–162; H. Jedin, *G. Seripando* II (Würzburg 1937) 194–238; H. O. Evennett, *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent* (Cambridge 1930); B. Chudoba, "Les relaciones de las dos cortes Habsburgesas en la tercera asemblea del Concilio Tridentino" *Boletín de la R. Academia de la Historia* 103 (1933) 297–368; H. Jedin, "La politica conciliare di Cosimo I" *RSIt* 62 (1950) 345–374, 477–496; G. Constant, *La légation du Cardinal Morone près l'Empereur et le Concile de Trente* (Paris 1922); L. Castano, *Mons. Nicolò Sfrondrato, Vescovo di Cremona al Concilio di Trento* (Turin 1939); P. Prodi, *Il Cardinale Gabriele Paleotti* I (Florence 1959).

SECTION TWO

The Papacy and the Implementation of the Council of Trent (1565–1605)

38. *Personality and Work of the Reform Popes from Pius V to Clement VIII*

SOURCES

BullRom VI–IX; L. Serrano, *Correspondencia diplomática entre España y la S. Sede durande el Pontificato de Pio V,* 4 vols. (Madrid 1914); G. Catalano, *Controversie giurisdizionali tra Chiesa e Stato nell'età di Gregorio XIII e Filippo II* (Palermo 1955); for the reports of the Nuncios cf. chap. 39 and 40; A. Sala, *Documenti circa la vita di San Carlo,* 4 vols. (Milan 1857–62); *Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis,* ed. A. Ratti, 3 vols. (Milan 1890–96); A. G. Roncalli, *Gli atti della Visita Apostolica di S. Carlo Borromeo a Bergamo,* 5 vols. (Florence 1936–58), also there is the short account of this visitation in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 452–457; P. Guerrini, *Atti della visita pastorale del vescovo Domenico Bollani alla diocesi di Brescia,* 3 vols. (Brescia 1915–40); *Nunziature di Savoia* I, ed. F. Fonzi (Rome 1960); *Nunziature di Napoli* I, ed. P. Villani (Rome 1962); Also, H. Jedin, "Osservazioni della Nunziature d'Italia" *RSIt* 75 (1963) 327–343.

LITERATURE

Basic: Pastor VIII (Pius V), IX (Gregory XIII), X (Sixtus V), XI (Clement VIII); P. Herre, *Papsttum und Papstwahl im Zeitalter Philipps II.* (Leipzig 1907); L. Browne Olf, *The Sword of Saint Michael. The Life of Pius V* (Milwaukee, Wisc. 1943); G. Grente, *Le pape des grands combats* (Paris ^{2}1956); G. Carocci, *Lo Stato della Chiesa nella seconda metà del sec. XVI* (Milan 1961); L. Castano, *Gregorio XIV* (Turin 1957).

NUNCIATURES: L. Just, "Die Erforschung der päpstlichen Nuntiaturen" *QFIAB* 24 (1933) 244–277; H. Kramer, "Die Erforschung und Herausgabe der Nuntiaturberichte" *Mitt. des Österr. Staatsarchivs* 1 (1948) 492–514; L. H. Halkin, "Les Archives des Nonciatures" *Bull. de l'Institut Belge de Rome* 33 (1961) 649–700.

CATALOGUE OF NUNCIATURES: H. Biaudet, *Les nonciatures permanentes jusqu'en 1648* (Helsingfors 1910).

ROMAN COLLEGES: P. Paschini, "Le origini del Seminario romano" *Cinquecento romano e riforma cattolica* (Rome 1958) 3–32; R. G. Villoslada, *Storia del Collegio Romano dal duo inizio 1551 alla soppressione della Compagnia di Gesù 1773* (Rome 1954); F. A. Gasquet, *A History of the Ven. English College at Rome* (London 1920); Steinhuber, see chap. 40.

THE CITY OF ROME: P. Pechiai, *Roma nel Cinquecento* (Bologna 1949); J. Delumeau, *Vie économique et sociale de Rome dans la seconde moitié du XVI^{e} siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959); H. Siebenhüner, "Umrisse zur Gesch. der Ausstattung von St. Peter in Rom von Paul III. bis Paul V." *Festschrift H. Sedlmayr* (Munich 1962) 229–320; M. Romani, *Pellegrini e viaggiatori nell' economia di Roma dal XIV al XVII secolo* (Milan 1948), there are 323–355 accounts of pilgrims cared for in *S. Trinità dei Pellegrini;* P. M. Baugarten, *Von den Kardinälen des XVI Jh.* (Krumbach 1926).

CATHOLIC REFORM IN ITALY: G. Alberigo, "Studi e problemi relativi all' applicazione del concilio di Trento in Italia" *RSIt* 70 (1958) 239–298, numerous unpublished dissertations are summarized; *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nell Cinquecento. Atti del Convegno di Storia della Chiesa in Italia 1958* (Padua 1960). A satisfactory biography of Borromeo does not exist, primarily because his extensive correspondence in the Library Ambrosiana has not been researched. Bibliography: LThK² II: 612; R. Mols, "S. Borromée pionnier de la moderne pastorale" *NRTh* 89 (1957) 600–622, 715–747; M. Grosso–M. F. Mellano, *La Controriforma nella arci diocesi di Torino 1558 bis 1610,* 3 vols. (Vatican City 1957); M. F. Mellano, *La controriforma nella diocesi di Mondovi 1560–1602* (Turin 1955); F. Molinari, *Il card. Teatino B. P. Burali e la riforma tridentina a Piacenze 1568–76* (Rome 1957); R. de Maio, *Le origini del Seminario di Napoli* (Naples 1957); id., *Alfonso Carafa, Card. di Napoli* [SteT 210] (Vatican City 1961); P. Villani, "Una visita apostolica nel Regno di Napoli 1566–68" *Studi in onore di R. Filangieri* II (Naples 1959) 433–466; "Bibliography of the Italian diocesan synods" *Silvino da Nedro, Sinodi diocesani italiani 1534–1878* (Vatican City 1960) [=SteT 207].

39. *Self-Assertion of the Church in Western and Eastern Europe*

SPAIN AND THE NETHERLANDS

SOURCES: Provincial Synod of Toledo: Mansi 34, 537–570; R. Sánchez Lamadrid, "Un manoscrito inédito del B. Juan de Avila" *Arch. Theol. Granadino* 4 (1941) 137–241, completed by C. M. Abad, "Ultimos inéditos extensos del B. J. de Avila" *MCom* 13 (1950) 13–60. The Provincial Synods of Salamanca, Granada and Saragossa: Aguirre V², 445–463; E. Rodríguez Amaya, *Revista de estudios extremeños* 6 (1951) 235–295. The Statutes of the Provincial Synod of Valencia: Aguirre V, 445–463. **Visitations:** I. I. Tellechea Idiogoras, "El formulario de visita pastoral de B. de Carranza, arzobispo de Toledo" *Anthologica annua* 4 (1956) 385–437; D. Mansilla, "Reacción del Cabildo de Burgos ante las visitas y otros actos de iurisdicción intentados por sus obispos" *HS* 10 (1957) 135–159. **The Religious Policies of Philip II:** Serrano, Catalano and Villani see Chap. 38; For Philip II (early periods): J. de Olarra–M. L. de Larramendi, *Correspondencia entre la nunciatura en España y la S. Sede* I (Rome 1960). **Netherlands:** *Correspondance de Philippe II sur les affaires des Pays-Bas,* ed. L. Gachard, 5 vols. (Brussels 1848–79); *Correspondance de Philippe II sur les affaires des Pays-Bas,* ed. J. Lefèvre (Brussels 1941–53); *Nonciatures de Flandres,* ed. The Belgian Historical Institute in Rome, especially L. van der Essen-A. Louant, *Correspondance d' O. M. Frangipani 1595–1606,* 3 vols. (Rome 1924, 1932, 1942); J. Cleyntjens, *Corpus iconoclasticum,* 4 vols. (Tilburg 1928–34); *Documents relatifs à la jurisdiction des nonces et internonces des Pays-Bas pendant le régime espagnol 1596–1706,* ed. J. Lefèvre (Burssels–Rome 1942); M. Dierickx, *Documents inédits sur l'érection des nouveaux diocèses aux Pays-Bas 1521–70,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1960–62).

LITERATURE: L. Pfandl, *Philipp II* (Munich 1938); R. Konetzke: *HZ* 164 (1941) 316–331; J. M. March, *Niñez y juventud de Felipe II,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1941–42); R. Altamira, *Felipe II, hombre de estado* (Mexico City 1950); G. Mattingly, *The Armada* (Boston 1959); F. Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le Monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II* (Paris 1949); R. T. Davies, *The Golden Century of Spain 1501–1621* (New York 1961); A. Robb, *William of Orange* I (London 1962); C. V. Wedgewood, *William the Silent* (New Haven 1944); C. J. Cadoux, *Philip of Spain and the Netherlands;* L. van der Essen, *Alexandre Farnèse,* 5 vols. (Brussels 1933–37); B. de Meester, *Le Saint Siège et les troubles des Pays-Bas 1566–79* (Louvain 1934); F. Willcox, *L'introduction des décrets du Concile de Trente dans les Pays-Bas et dans la Principauté de Liège* (Louvain 1929); E. Donckel, "Luxemburger Gutachten zu den Trienter Reformdekreten" *Rhein. Vierteljahrsbll* 19 (1957) 119–134; L. J. Rogier, *Geschiedenis van het Katholizime in Noord-Nederland in de*

16^e en 17^e Eeuw, 3 vols. (The Hague 1945–47); A. Pasture, *La restauration religieuse aux Pays-Bas catholiques 1596 bis 1633* (Louvain 1925); J. Scheerder, *Die Inquisitie in de Nederlanden in de XVI^e Eeuw* (Antwerp 1944); E. de Moreau, *Histoire de l'Église en Belgique* V (Brussels 1952); C. Petrie, *Philip II of Spain* (New York 1963); I. I. Woltjer, *Friesland in de hervormingstijd* (Leiden 1962).

FRANCE

SOURCES: H. Hauser, *Les sources de l'hist. de France, XVI^e siècle* III, IV (Paris 1912–15); *Lettres de Cathérine de Médicis,* ed. H. de la Ferrière-Baguenalt de la Puchesse, 10 vols. (Paris 1880–1909); *Recueil des lettres missives de Henri IV,* ed. Berger de Xivrey et. al., 9 vols. (Paris 1843–76); H. C. Davila, *Historia delle guerre civili di Francia 1559–98* (Venice 1630).——Provincial Councils: Reims 1564: Mansi 33, 1289–1390; Rouen 1581: Mansi 34, 617–682; Reims 1583: Mansi 34, 683–938; Aix 1585: Mansi 34, 937–1014; Toulouse 1590: Mansi 34, 1269–1322; Narbonne 1609: Mansi 34, 1477–1536.——*Girolamo Ragazzoni, évêque de Bergame, nonce en France. Correspondance de sa nonciature 1583–86,* ed. P. Blet (Rome–Paris 1962).

LITERATURE: L. Romier, *Les origines politiques des guerres de Religion,* 2 vols. (Paris 1913–14); id., *Le Royaume de Cathérine de Médicis,* 2 vols. (Paris 1922); id., *Catholiques et Huguenots à la Cour de Charles IX* (Paris 1924); N. Reolker, *Queen of Navare: Jeanne d'Albert, 1528–1572* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968); J. E. Neale, *The Age of Catherine de Medici* (London 1943); A. Bailly, *La réforme en France jusqu' à l'Édit de Nantes* (Paris 1960); R. Nürnberger, *Die Politisierung des französischen Protestantimus* (Tübingen 1948); A. Buisson, *Michel de l'Hôpital* (Paris 1950); Ch. Hirschauer, *La politique de Pie V en France 1566–72* (Paris 1922); V. Martin, *Le Gallicanisme et la réforme catholique* (Paris 1919), chief work, see criticism by Ch. Hirschauer: *RHEF* 9 (1923) 545f.; A. Degert, *Histoire des séminaires français jusqu' à la révolution,* 2 vols. (Paris 1912); L. Serbat, *Les assemblées du Clergé de France 1561–1615* (Paris 1906); V. Carrière, "Le épreuves de l'église de France au XVI^e siècle" *Introduction aux études d'histoire eccl. locale* III (Paris 1936) 247–509; J. Lestocquoy, "Les évêques français au milieu du XVI^e siècle" *RHEF* 45 (1959) 25–40; J. Cloulas, "Les aliénations du temporel eccl. sous Charles IX et Henri III" *RHEF* 44 (1958) 5–56; id., "Un aspect original des relations fiscales entre la royauté et le clergé" *RHEF* 55 (1960) 876–901; J. Imbert, "Les prescriptions hospitalières du Concile de Trente et leur diffusion en France" *RHEF* 42 (1956) 5–28; R. M. Kingdon, *Geneva and the Coming of the Religious Wars in France* (Geneva 1956); J. R. Mayor, *Representative Institutions in Renaissance France* (Madison 1960); W. C. Grant, *Constitutional Thought in 16th Cent. France* (New York 1947); F. C. Palm, *Calvinism and the Religious Wars* (New York 1932); O. Zoff, *The Huguenots* (New York 1942); S. L. England, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew* (London 1938); D. Jensen, *Bernardine de Mendoza and the French Catholic League* (Cambridge 1964); R. B. Merriman, *Six Contemporaneous Revolutions* (Oxford 1938); W. F. Church, *Constitutional Thought in 16th Cent. France* (Cambridge 1941); *Bibliography of Cardinal d'Ossat, active in the reconciliation of Henry IV with Rome,* P. Laccade (Tarbes 1937).

ENGLAND

SOURCES: In addition to the older series of State Papers: J. M. Rigg, *Calender of State Papers Relating to English Affairs,* 2 vols. (London 1961–62) (to 1578); J. H. Pollen, *Sources for the History of Roman Catholics in England, Ireland and Scotland* (London 1921);

id., *Unpublished Documents Relating to the English Martyrs* I (London 1908); E. H. Burton–J. H. Pollen, *Lives of the English Martyrs under Elizabeth I 1583–88* (London 1914); L. Hicks, *Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Persons* I (London 1942).——The Act of Uniformity, 1559: H. Gee–W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London 1921) 442–458; On the development of the Anglican Church: J. E. Neale: *EHR* (1950) 304ff.; For sources concerning the Establishment of the Anglican Church: Parker Society Publications; For the Inner Consolidation of Anglicanism: *The Works of R. Hooker,* ed. R. W. Church–F. Paget, 3 vols. (Oxford 1888); An Irish source concerning the Flanders Nunciature: *Collectanea Hibernica I,* ed. C. Giblen (Dublin-London 1958).

LITERATURE: J. B. Black, *The Reign of Elizabeth* (Oxford 1959); H. Wilson, *King James VI and I* (London 1956); Ph. Hughes, *The Reformation in England* III (London 1954); A. O. Meyer, *England und die katholische Kirche unter Königin Elizabeth* (Rome 1911) (this is the primary work); J. H. Pollen, *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London 1920); A. H. Atteridge, *The Elizabethan Persecution* (London 1928); H. S. Lucas, "Survival of the Catholic Faith in the XVIth Century" *CHR* 29 (1943) 25–52; Ph. Caraman, *The Other Face. Catholic Life under Elizabeth I* (London 1960); M. D. R. Leys, *Catholics in England 1559–1829. A Social History* (London 1961); P. McGrath, *Papists and Puritans Under Elizabeth I* (London 1968).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

SOURCES: A. Theiner, *Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae* II (Rome 1861); III (Rome 1863); id., *Schweden und seine Stellung zum Heiligen Stuhl unter Johann III., Sigismund III; und Karl IX.,* 2 vols. (Augsburg 1838–39); The Reports of the Nuncios Caligari (1578–81) and Bolognetti (1581–85): *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana* IV–VII (Cracaw 1915–50); J. Sawicki, *Concilia Poloniae,* 9 vols. (Cracaw–Warsaw–Breslau 1945–57). Cf. ZSavRGkan 46 (1960) 395–429; M. Olsoufieff, *Le lettere di Ivan il Terribile con i Commentari della Moscovia di A. Possevino* (Florence 1958); *Litterae nuntiorum apostolicorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes,* ed. A. G. Welykyj, I–IV (Rome 1959–60); *Res Polonicae Elizabetha I Angliae regnante conscriptae ex archivis Londoniarum,* ed. C. H. Talbot (Rome 1961); *Res Polonicae Jacobo I Angliae regnante conscriptae ex archivis Londoniarum,* ed. C. H. Talbot (Rome 1962).

LITERATURE: B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen, Neue Forschungsergebnisse* (Münster 1960) (lit.); "The Lists of the Bishops Collected by Z. Szostkiewicz" *Sacrum Poloniae Millenium* I (Rome 1954) 391–608; O. Halecki, "From Florence to Brest" ibid. V (1958) 13–444; St. Polein, *Une tentative d'Union au XVI^e^ siècle. La Mission religieuse du P. A. Possevino en Moscovie 1581–82* (Rome 1957); A. Wolter, "A. Possevino, Theologie und Politik im Spannungsfeld zwischen Rom und Moskau" *Scholastik* 31 (1956) 321–350; J. Lecler, *Histoire de la tolérance au siècle de la réforme* I (Aubier 1955) 363–398 (Concerning tolerance in Poland); E. Winter, *Russland und das Papsttum* I (Berlin 1960); H. Holmquist–H. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia* III:2 (Stockholm 1933); H. Biaudet, *Le St. Siège et la Suède durant la seconde moitié du XVI^e siècle* (Paris 1907), with 2 vols. of documents (Paris 1906 and Geneva 1913). O. Garstein, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in Scandinavia* (Copenhagen, 1963); F. Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, N. J. 1962); G. Schramm, *Der polnische Adel und die Reformation 1548–1607* (Weisbaden 1965); I. Revesz, *History of the Hungarian Reformed Church* (Washington, D. C. 1956).

40. *Crisis and Turning Point in Central Europe*

SOURCES

For the background history of the Tridentine reform in Germany the following is basic: *Acta reformationis catholicae ecclesiam Germaniae concernentia saec. XVI (1520–1570)*, ed. G. Pfeilschifter, earlier 2 vols. (Regensburg 1959–60) [=ARC]. *NBD,* section II, 1560–72, ed. the Historical Commission of the Vienna Academy, 7 vols. (Vienna 1897–1953); section III, 1572–85, ed. the Prussian Historical Institute Rome, l: *Der Kampf um Köln,* ed. J. Hansen (Berlin 1892), 2: *Der Reichstag zu Regensburg 1576 . . . ,* ed. J. Hansen (Berlin 1894), 3–5: *Die süddeutsche Nuntiatur des Grafen Portia,* ed. K. Schellhas (Berlin 1899, 1903–09); this portion was completed by W. E. Schwarz, *Die Nuntiaturkorrespondenz Kaspar Groppers 1573–76* (Paderborn 1896). W. E. Schwarz, *Zehn Gutachten über die Lage der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland 1573–76* (Paderborn 1891). The third division closed the undertaking of the Görres-Gesellschaft: *Die Nuntiatur am Kaiserhofe 1584–92* I, ed. R. Reichenberger (Paderborn 1905), II:3, ed. J. Schweizer (Paderborn 1912–19). *Die Kölner Nuntiatur 1584–90* I, ed. St. Ehses and A. Meister (Paderborn 1895), II, ed. St. Ehses (Paderborn 1899). From the fourth section which includes the nuncios' reports of the 17th century, belongs here: *Die Prager Nuntiatur des D. St. Ferreri und die Wiener Nuntiatur des G. Serra 1603–06,* ed. A. O. Meyer (Berlin 1913). From the Czechoslovakian Historical Institute Rome the following is used: *Epistulae et Acta A. Gaetani 1607–08,* ed. M. Linhartova (Prague 1932–37). *P. Canisii epp. et acta IV–VIII,* ed. O. Braunsberger (Freiburg 1905–23).

SYNODS: F. Dalham, *Concilia Salisburgensia* (Augsburg 1788) 348–583 (Salzburg Provincial Synods of 1569 and 1573). Diocesan Synods: Hartzheim, C VII: 498–517 (Lüttich 1585), 873–908 (Breslau 1580), 1057–1077 (Regensburg 1588; VIII), 320–363 (Olmütz 1591), 367–402 (Breslau 1592), 517–536 (Cologne 1598), 822–947 (Constance 1609).

VISITATIONAL REPORTS: M. Gmelin, "Die Visitationsprotokolle der Diözese Konstanz 1571–86" *ZGObrh* 25 (1873) 129–204; J. Jungnitz, *Visitationsberichte der Diözese Breslau,* 4 vols. (Breslau 1902–08); W. E. Schwarz, *Die Akten der Visitation des Bistums Münster aus der Zeit Johanns von Hoya 1571–73* (Münster 1913); A. Franzen, *Die Visitationsprotokolle der ersten nachtridentinischen Visitation im Erzstift Köln unter Salentin von Isenburg 1569* (Münster 1960); J. B. Kaiser, *Der Archidiakonat Longuyon am Anfang des 17. Jh.,* 2 vols. (Colmar 1928–29).

GENERAL LITERATURE

E. W. Zeeden, "Zeitalter der europäischen Glaubenkämpfe, Gegenreformation, Katholische Reform" *Saeculum* 7 (1956) 321–368; Literature of recent research; id., "Das Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe" *Gebhardt-Grundmann* II (1955) 105–202; K. Repgen, "Kaiser und Reich als Idee und Wirklichkeit für das Papsttum im Zeitalter der Reform" *Jb. der Görres-Gesellschaft* 1958 (Cologne 1959) 5–15; J. Hashagen, "Das Zeitalter der Gegenreformation und der Religionskrieg" L. Just, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* II (Constance 1956) (with good bibliography); J. Greven, *Die Kölner Kartause und die Anfänge der Kath. Reform in Deutschland* (Münster 1935); Schreiber II (1951); id., "Tridentinische Reformdekrete in deutschen Bistumern" *ZSavRGkan* 38 (1952) 395–442; J. Schmidlin, *Die kirchlichen Zustände in Deutschland vor dem 30 jährigen Kriege,* 3 parts (Freiburg 1908–10); A. Steinhuber, *Geschichte des Collegium Germanicum-Hungaricum in Rom* I (Freiburg 1906); B. Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge* I (Freiburg 1907) (rich in material); B. Schneider, "Die

Jesuiten als Gehilfen der päpstlichen Nuntien und Legaten in Deutschland zur Zeit der Gegenreformation" *Miscellanea Hist. Pont.* XXI (Rome 1959) 269–303; Bibliography on Peter Canisius: *LThK*² II, 917.

CONFESSIONALISM: E. W. Zeeden, "Grundlagen und Wege der Konfessionsbildung in Deutschland im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe" *HZ* 185 (1958) 249–299; id., *Katholische Überlieferungen in den lutherischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jh.* (Münster 1959); A. Franzen, *Die Kelchbewegung am Niederrhein im 16. Jh.* (Münster 1955); H. Lutz, "Bayern und der Laienkelch" *QFIAB* 34 (1954) 203–235; J. P. Dolan, *The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel and Cassander in the Church Ordinances and Reform Proposals of the United Duchies of Cleve during the Middle Decades of the 16th Century* (Münster 1957); H. Nottarp. *Zur Communicatio in sacris cum haereticis* (Halle 1933).

CONFESSIONAL CHANGES IN THE UPPER PALATINATE: J. B. Götz, *Die erste Einführung des Kalvinismus in der Oberpfalz 1559–76* (Münster 1933); id., *Die religiösen Wirren in der Oberpfalz 1576–1620* (Münster 1937).

SWITZERLAND: K. Fry, *G. A. Volpe. Seine erste Nuntiatur in der Schweiz 1560–64* I (Fribourg 1931), II (Florence 1936), III (Stans 1946), also: *ZSKG* 39 (1945) 1–32, 81–110; F. Steffens–A. Reinhardt, *Die Nuntiatur von G. F. Bonhomini 1579–81,* 3 vols. (Solothurn–Fribourg 1906–29); E. Giddey, "Le nonce Paravicini 1587–91" *Revue Suisse d'hist.* 5 (1955) 369–375; J. G. Mayer, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Gegenreformation in der Schweiz,* 2 vols. (Stans 1902); R. Fischer, *Die Gründung der Schweizer Kapuzinerprovinz 1581–89* (Fribourg 1955), also: *ZSKG* 54 (1960) 257–281; R. Tschudi, *Das Kloster Einsiedeln unter den Äbten Ludwig II Blarer und Joachim Eichhorn 1526–69* (Einsiedeln 1946); W. Brotschi, *Der Kampf J. Chr. Blarers von Wartensee um die religiöse Einheit im Bistum Basel 1575–1608* (Fribourg 1956); A. Chèvre, "La restauration religieuse tridentine dans le diocèse de Bâle" *ZSKG* 42 (1948) 11–22, 107–123; see also 44 (1950), 17–36; 47 (1953), 25–46, 123–148; id., *L'officialité du diocèse de Bâle à Altkirch 1565–1630* (Fribourg 1946); H. Rennefahrt, "Die Verstärkung der Staatsgewalt im Bistum Basel unter Bischof Jacob Christoph 1575–1608" *In memoriam W. Näf* (Bern 1961) 267–310; J. Müller, "Der Kampf um die tridentinische Reform in Disentis" *ZSKG* 42 (1948) 23–65; 43 (1949) 175–202, 259–313; H. Metzger, *Vorstudien zu einer Geschichte der tridentinischen Seelsorgereform im Eidgenössischen Gebiet des Bistums Konstanz* (Basel 1951); H. Andres, *D. Jodocus Knab, Probst von Luzern und Bischof von Lausanne 1593–1658* (Stans 1961).

SECTION THREE

Religious Forces and Intellectual Content of the Catholic Renewal

41. *The Revival of Scholasticism, Michael Baius and the Dispute over Grace*

GENERAL LITERATURE

Grabmann G 158–172; C. Giacon, *La seconda scolastica,* 3 vols. (Milan 1946–50); H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae* III (Innsbruck ³1907), still indispensable [=Hurter].

UNIVERSITIES: Willaert 183–219; C. Duplessis d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum* II (Paris 1728); P. Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres* I–IV (Paris 1900–6); J. Urriza, *La preclara facultad de artes y filosofia de la univ. de Alcalá de Henares en el siglo de oro 1509–1621* (Madrid 1942); V. Beltrán de Heredia, "La teología en la univ. de Alcalá" *RET* 5 (1945) 145–178; About Sigüenza: id., *RET* 2 (1942) 409–469; Gonzalo de Arriaga, *Historia del Colegio de S. Gregorio de Valladolid,* ed. M. Hoyos, 2 vols. (Valladolid 1928–40); F. Stegmüller, "Zur Literaturgeschichte der Philosophie und Theologie an den Universitäten Evora und Coimbra im 16. Jh." *Spanische Forschungen* 3 (1931) 385–438, expanded Portugese edition: Coimbra 1959; J. Grisar, "Die Universität Löwen zur Zeit der Gesandtschaft des P. Franciscus Toltus (1580) nach bisher unbenützten Quellen des Vatikanischen Archivs" *Miscellanea De Meyer* II 941–968; K. Eschweiler, "Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten" *Spanische Forschungen* 1 (1928) 251–325.

VITORIA AND THE SCHOOL OF SALAMANCA: F. Ehrle, *Los Manoscritos Vaticanos de los téologos Salmantinos del siglo XVI* (Madrid 1930); V. Beltrán de Heredia, *Los manoscritos del M. F. de Vitoria* (Madrid 1928); Modern editions of Vitoria's work: *Relecciones teológicas del M. F. de Vitoria,* ed. L. G. Getino (Madrid 1936); *Comentarios a la secunda secundae de Sto. Tomás* (Salamanca 1952); L. G. Getino, *El M. F. de Vitoria* (Madrid 1930) (chief work); F. Stegüller, *F. de Vitoria y la doctrina de la gracia en la escuela Salmantina* (Barcelona 1934); J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, "F. de Vitoria y la reforma católica" *Revista española de derecho canónico* 12 (1957) 65–110; R. G. Villoslada, "Pedro Crockaert OP, maestro de F. Vitoria" *EE* 14 (1935) 174–201.

VITORIA AND INTERNATIONAL LAW: J. Brown Scott, *The Spanish Origin of International Law* (London 1934); J. A. Fernandes-Santamaria, *The State, War and Peace. Spanish Political Thought in the Renaissance, 1516–1559* (Cambridge 1977); E. Reibstein, *Die Anfänge des neueren Natur- und Völkerrechtes* (Berne 1949) on Vasquez; K. Deuringer, *Probleme der Caritas in der Schule von Salamanca* (Freiburg 1959); A. Truyol Serra, *Die Grundsätze des Staats- und Völkerrechtes bei F. de Vitoria* (Heidelberg 1947); id., "Die Grundlagen der völkerrechtlichen Ordnung nach den spanischen Völkerrechtsklassikern" *Heidelberger Jb.* (1958); F. Elias de Tejada, "El concepto del derecho natural en los comentaristas Hispanos de Graciano" *Studia Gratiana* II (Bologna 1954) 230–261; V. Carro, *Domingo Soto* (Salamanca 1931); C. Pozo, *La teoría del progreso dogmático en los téologos de la escuela de Salamanca* (Madrid 1959); J. Btitau Prats, *El pensamiento politico de D. de Soto y su concepción del poder* (Salamanca 1960); A. Dempf, *Christliche Staatsphilosophie in Spanien* (Salzburg 1937).

POLEMICAL THEOLOGY AND BELLARMINE: (Survey) P. Polman, *L'élément historique dans la Controverse religieuse du XVI*^{e} *siècle* (Gembloux 1932). Bellarmine: last edition of his works in 12 volumes (Paris 1870–76); *Opera oratoria posthuma,* 9 vols. (Rome 1942–44); Sommervogel I:1151–1254. Sources for the history of his life: X. M. Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin avant son cardinalat* (Paris 1911), there 435–466 the controversial autobiography; id., *Auctarium Bellarminianum* (Paris 1913), also suppl. *AHSI* 4 (1935) 132–139; *Scritti politici,* ed. C. Giacon (Bologan 1950); J. Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine, Saint and Scholar* (London 1961); J. de la Servière, *La théologie de Bellarmin* (Paris 1928). Methodologically correct: G. Buschbell, *Selbstbezeugungen des Kardinals Bellarmin* (Krumbach 1924), and S. Merkle, *ZKG* 45 (1926) 26–73; F. X. Arnold, *Die Staatslehre des Kardinals Bellarmin* (Munich 1934); Further Bibliography: *LThK*^{2} II:160f.; Special Bibliography for Toledo, Suárez, Vázguez in the notes.

BAJUS: *Opera* (Cologne [actually, Amsterdam] 1696), 2nd part contains Documents and is Jansenist inspired; Opposed viewpoint; J.-B. Duchesne, *Histoire du Bainanisme*

(Douai 1731) (anti-Jansenist); M. Roca, "Documentos inéditos en torno a Miguel Bayo" *Anthologica annua* 1 (1953) 303–476; F. -X. Jansen, *Baius et le Baianisme* (Louvain 1927); *DThC* II:38–111, the best treatment is by Le Bachelet; *LThK*² I:1196–1199; Ch. van Sull, *Lessius* (Louvain 1960); J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, "Españoles en Lovaina 1551–58. Primeras noticias sobre el Bayanismo" *RET* 23 (1963) 21–44.

CONTROVERSY CONCERNING GRACE: Critical text of the Concord, ed. J. Rabeneck (Madrid 1953); Older Treatment of the Controversy by the two parties: J. A. Serry OP (under the pseudonym Le Blanc), *Historiae Congregationum de auxiliis divinae gratiae* (Mainz 1699, Antwerp 1709); L. de Meyere SJ (under the pseudonym Eleutherius), *Historiae controversiae de divinae gratiae auxiliis* (Venice 1742); G. Schneemann SJ, *Controversiarum de divinae gratiae liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus* (Freiburg 1881); F. Stegmüller, *Geschichte des Molinismus* I (Münster 1935) (chief work); Pastor, XI:513–576, XII:163–183; On Molina: J. Rabeneck, "De vita et scriptis L. Molinae" *AHSI* 19 (1950) 75f.; G. Smith, *Freedom in Molina* (Diss. Toronto 1936); W. Weber, *Wirtschaftsethik am Vorabend des Liberalismus. Höhepunkt und Abschluss der scholastischen Wirtschaftsbetrachtung durch L. Molina* (Münster 1959); *StL*⁶ V:805–809 (Stegmüller).

42. *The Rise of Positive Theology*

GENERAL LITERATURE

Still reliable is H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae* III (Innsbruck ³1907); J. Turmel, *Histoire de la théologie positive du Concile de Trente au Concile de Vaticane* (Paris 1906); P. Polman, *L'Elément historique dans la Controverse religieuse du XVI*ᵉ *Siècle* (Gembloux 1932); R. Snoeks, *L'argument de tradition dans la controverse eucharistique entre catholiques et réformées français au XVII*ᵉ *siècle* (Gembloux 1951); V. Baroni, *La contreréforme devant la Bible* (Lausanne 1943).

ON THE VULGATE DECREE AND REVISIONS: H. Höpfl, *Compendium introductionis in Sacros utriusque Testamenti libros I* (Rome ³1931) 346–367.

PATROLOGY, CHRISTIAN LITERARY HISTORY, CHURCH HISTORY, AND HAGIOGRAPHY: J. H. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica* (Hamburg 1718) with Suffridus Petri's and Miraeus' extension of the Catalogue of Trithemius; H. Quentin, *J. D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires* (Paris 1900); C. Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici,* 12 vols. (Rome 1588–1605) (to 1198).

ON BARONIUS: G. Calenzio, *La vita e gli scritti del Card. C. Baronio* (Rome 1907) (unsatisfactory in spite of using Baronius' own notes); A. Walz, "La storiografia del Baronio e la storiografia de oggi" *Angelicum* 17 (1940) 88–110; A. Roncalli, *Il Card. C. Baronio* (Rome 1961) with bibliography by G. De Luca 47; *Bibliotheca hagiographica Latina* I (Breslau 1898–99), editions of Lippomanis and Surius; P. Peeters, *L'oeuvree des Bollandistes* (Brussels 1961); A. Fabrega Grau, "El P. Pedro Gil SJ (+1622) y su colección de Vidas de Santos" *Analects Sacra Tarracon* 31 (1958) 5–25; For the editor of the *Acta Sanctorum veteris et maioris Scotiae seu Hiberniae* (Louvain 1650) see F. J. Colgan OFM, *Essays in Commemoration of the Third Century of his death,* ed. T. O'Donell (Dublin 1959) 7–40.

CANONISTS: A good survey of canonists in this period in F. Kurtscheid, 278–301; J. F. V. Schulte, *Gesch. der Quellen von der Lit. des Canon. Rechts* III (Stuttgart 1880) though incomplete, is still indispensable; For Azpilcuenta, Antonio Agustin et. al. see footnotes in Pastor, IX 203f. the entire subject is in need of more serious research.

43. *Spiritual Life, Popular Devotion and Art*

LITERATURE

ASCETICISM AND MYSTICISM: M. -J. Dagens, *Bibliographie chronologique de la littérature de spiritualité et de ses sources 1501–1610* (Paris 1952).

PORTUGAL: Survey in I. S. Da Silva Dias, *Correntes de sentimento religioso em Portugal,* 2 vols. (Coimbra 1960)

SPAIN: *DSAM* IV (1961) 1127–1178; C. M. Abád, "Ascetas y misticos españoles del siglo de oro" *MCom* 10 (1948) 27–127; E. Allison Peers, *Studies of the Spanish Mystics* (London 1951); P. S. Rodrigues, *Introduccion a la historia de la literature mistica en Espana,* 4 vols. (Madrid 1927); J. Chuzeville, *Les Mystiques espagnols* (Paris 1952); P. Groult, *Les mystiques des Pays-Bas et la littérature espagnole du XVI^e siècle* (Löwen 1927); J. Sanctis Adventosa, *La escuela mística Alemana y sus relaciones con místicos del siglo de oro* (Madrid 1946); D. Gutiérrez, "Ascéticos y místicos agostinos de España, Portugal y Hispano-América" *S. Augustinus spiritualis vitae Magister* II (Rome 1959) 147–238 (lit.); J. Monasterio, *Místicos agustinos españoles,* 2 vols. (El Escorial 1929); *Espirituales españoles,* (Numerous texts), P. Sáinz Rodríguez and L. Sala Balust, eds., 8 vols. (Barcelona 1959f.).

CARMELITE MYSTICISM: *Teresa de Avila, Obras,* ed., Silverius a S. Teresa, 9 vols. (Burgos 1915–24). Popular edition in one volume (Madrid 1948); Comprehensive Biography: Silverio de S. Teresa, *Historia del Carmelo descalzo en España, Portugal y América* I–IV (Burgos 1935–36); E. A. Peers, *A Handbook to the Life and Times of St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross* (London 1954); id., *Complete Works of St. Theresa of Jesus,* 3 vols. (London 1946); id., *The Letters of St. Teresa of Jesus* (Westminster 1950); M. Auclair, *St. Teresa of Avila* (London 1953); H. Flasche, "Syntaktische Untersuchungen zu Santa Teresa de Jesús" *Spanische Forschungen* 15 (1960) 151–174; E. Hamilton, *Saint Teresa* (New York 1959); A. Vermeulen, *Ste. Thérèse en France au XVII^e siècle* (Louvain 1958); *S. Juan de la Cruz, Obras,* ed., J. Vicente de la Eucaristía (Madrid 1957); A. Winklhofer, *Die Gnadenlehre in der Mystik des Hl. Joh. vom Kreuz* (Freiburg 1936); H. Sanson, *St. Jean de la Croix entre Bossuet et Fénelon* (Paris 1953); E. Schering, *Mystik und Tat. Th. von Jesus, Joh. vom Kreuz und die Selbstbehauptung der Mystik* (Munich–Basel 1959); E. A. Peers, *St. John of the Cross* (London 1946); id., *The Complete Works of St. John of the Cross* (Westminster 1949).

ITALY: G. Getto, "La letteratura ascetica e mistica in Italia nell'eta del Concilio Tridentino" *Contributi alla Storia del Concilio di Trento e della Controriforma* (Florence 1948) 51–77; cf. P. de Leturia, *CivCatt* II (1949) 82–98; A. Saba, *Federico Borromeo e i mistici del suo tempo* (Florence 1933); M. Andrews, *Men and women of the Italian Reformation* (New York 1914); F. C. Church, *The Italian Reformers* (New York 1932); P. Misciatelli, *The Mystics of Italy* (New York 1949); M. Jouhandeau, *St. Philip Neri* (New York 1960); L. Ponelle and L. Bordet, *St. Philip Neri and the Roman Society of His Times* (London 1932).

FRANCE: H. Brémond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion,* 11 vols. (Paris 1916–33); the primary work for our period is in I–III; English trans., *A Literary History of Religious Thought in France,* 3 vols. (New York 1929–1930); L. Cognet, *De la dévotion moderne à la Spiritualité française* (Paris 1958); id., *La Spiritualité française au XVII^e siècle* (Paris 1949). Franz von Sales, *Oeuvres,* 26 vols. (Annecy 1892–1932); Biography by F. Trochu, 2 vols. (Lyon–Paris 1946), H. Waach

(Eichstatt 1955); A. Liuima, *Aux sources du Traité de l'Amour de Dieu de F. d. S.,* 2 vols. (Rome 1959–60); M. de la Bedoyère, *F. de Sales* (London 1960). Pierre Bérulle, *Correspondance,* ed. J. Dagens, 3 vols. (Paris 1937–39); L. Molien, *Le card. de Bérulle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1947); J. Dagens, *Bérulle et les origines de la restauration catholique 1575–1611* (Bruges 1952); J. Orcibal, "Les oeuvres de pitié du Card. Bérulle" *RHE* 57 (1962) 813–862.

PREACHING, SACRAMENTS, AND POPULAR PIETY: Bonaventura von Mehr, "De historica praedicationis, praesertim in ordine Min. Cap. scientifica pervestigatione" *CollFr* 11 (1941) 373–422; 12 (1942) 5–40; A. Valerius, *De rhetorica ecclesiastica* (Venice 1574); F. Borromaeus, *De sacris nostrorum temporum praedicatoribus* (Milan 1632); J. M. Connots, "Homiletic Theory in the Late 16th Century" *AER* 138 (1958) 316–332; B. Fischer, "Predigtgrundsätze des hl. Karl Borromäus" *TThZ* 61 (1952) 213–221; Bonaventura von Mehr, *Das Predigtwesen in der kölnischen und rheinischen Kapuzinerprovinz im 17. und 18. Jh.* (Rome 1945); A. L. Veit–L. Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Freiburg 1958); G. Schreiber, "Der Barock und das Tridentinum" Schreiber, I:381–425; St. Beissel, *Geschichte der Verehrung Mariens im 16. und 17. Jh.* (Freiburg 1910); H. Aurenhammer, *Die Mariengnadenbilder Wiens und Niederösterreichs in der Barockzeit* (Vienna 1956); C. Flachaire, *La dévotion à la Vierga dans la littérature catholique au commencement du XVII*^{e} (Paris 1950); M. Petrocchi, "La devozione alla Vergine negli scritti di pietà del Cinquecento italiano" *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia* (Padua 1960) 281–287.

ART: Ch. de Job, *L'influence du Concile de Trente sur la littérature et les Beaux-Arts chez les peuples catholiques* (Paris 1884); G. Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit* (Paderborn 1937); F. Würtenberger, *Der Manierismus* (Vienna 1962); C. J. Friedrich, *The Age of the Baroque* (New York 1965); *Trattati d'arte del Cinquecento fra manierismo e controriforma,* ed. P. Barocchi, 2 vols. (Bari 1960–61); B. Croce, *Der Begriff des Barock. Die Gegenreformation* (Zurich 1925); O. Benesch, *The Art of the Renaissance in Northern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass. 1947); E. Kirschbaum, "L'influsso del Concilio di Trento nell'arte" *Gr* 26 (1945) 100–116; E. Mâle, *L'art religieuse après le Concile de Trente* (Paris 1951); B. Knipping, *De iconographie van de Contra-Reformatie in de Nederlanden,* 2 vols. (Hilversum 1939–40); E. M. Vetter, "Der Verlorene Sohn und die Sünder im Jahrhundert des Konzils von Trient" *Ges. Aufsätze zur Kulturgesch. Spaniens* 15 (1960) 175–218; P. Prodi, "Ricerche sulla teoria delle arti figurativa nelle riforma cattolica" *Archivio per la storia della pietà* 4 (1962) 121–212; A. Hauser, *The Social History of Art,* 2 vols. (New York 1950); F. B. Artz, *From the Renaissance to Romanticism* (Chicago 1962).

MUSIC: K. Weinmann, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Kirchenmusik* (Regensburg 1919); K. G. Fellerer, *Palestrina* (Regensburg 1930); id., "Das Kölner Provinzialkonzil von 1536 und die Kirchenmusik" *Festschrift G. Kallen* (Bonn 1957) 327–336; O. Ursprung, "Palestrina und die tridentinische Reform de Kirchenmusik" *Monatschefte für kath. Kirchenmusik* 10 (1928) 210–219; K. Jeppesen, "Marzellusprobleme" *Acta musicologica* 16–17 (1946) 11–38; H. W. Frey, *Die Diarien der Sixtinischen Kapelle in Rom 1560–61* (Düsseldorf 1959) 11–38; W. Boetticher, *Orlando di Lasso und seine Zeit* (Kassel 1958); R. Molitor, *Die nachtridentinische Choralreform zu Rom,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1901–2); M. F. Bukofzer, *Music in the Baroque Era* (London 1957).

LITERATURE: P. Hankamer, *Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock* (Stuttgart 1935); H. Kindermann, *Theatergeschichte Europas* III (Salzburg 1959) 440–484, 679f.; G. Müller, *Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge,* 2 vols. (Augsburg 1930); K. Adel, *Das Jesuitendrama in Österreich* (Vienna 1957); C. M. Haas, *Das Theater der Jesuiten in Ingolstadt* (Emsdetten 1958).

44. *The New and the Old Orders*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE TO 1933

Heimbucher; additional, M. Escobar, *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose,* 2 vols. (Turin 1951–53); L. Willaert, *La restauration catholique,* (Paris 1960) 95–167.

JESUITS: *Ratio studiorum SJ,* ed. G. M. Pachtler (Berlin 1887, contains the constitutions of 1586, 1599, and 1832). Bibliography: Sommervogel I:487ff.; H. Becher: *Die Jesuiten* (Munich 1961) 108–146; J. Sicard, "La reforma de Clemente VIII y la Comp. de Jesús" *Revista española del derecho can.* 3 (1954) 681–724; B. Schneider, *Paul Hoffaeus* (Rome 1956); id., "Der Konflikt zwischen Acquaviva und P. Hoffaeus" *AHSI* 26 (1957) 3–56; J. Iparraguirre, *Boletín de spiritualité ignatienne 1556–1615* (Rome 1961).

CAPUCHINS: Bernardinus a Colpetrazzo, *Historia ord. fr. min. Capuccinorum 1525–93,* 3 vols. (Rome 1939–41) (with attention to contemporary accounts); Melchior a Pobladura, *Hist. gen. I und II* (Rome 1947–48); Godefroy de Paris, *Les frères mineurs Capucins en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1937–48); P. Hildebrand, *De Kapucijnen in de Nederlanden en het Prinsbisdom Luik,* 9 vols. (Antwerp 1945–55); A. Jacobs, *Die rheinischen Kapuziner 1611–1725* (Münster 1933); R. Linden, *Die Regelobservanz in der rheinischen Kapuzinerprovinz 1611–68* (Münster 1936); C. von Oberlinsch, "Die Kapuziner in Österreich" *CollFr* 20 (1950) 219–334; Additional literature: *LThK*^{2} V:1332–1339; F. X. Martin, *Friar Nugent. A Study of F. L. Nugent 1567–1635, Agent of the Counter-Reformation* (Rome 1962).

OTHER MENDICANT ORDERS: "Anpassung der Konstitutionen an das Tridentinum bei den Dominikanern" *MOP* X:51ff. (general chapter at Bologna 1564); For the Augustinian Hermits: *Analecta Aug.* IX:423–440 (general chapter from 1564); For the Carmelites: *Acta cap. gen.,* ed. G. Wessels I:462ff.; The Constitutions of the Servites from 1569; *Mon. ord. Serv.* VI:109–158; Additional: Heimbucher and in the histories of the order by Mortier, Walz and Holzapfel.

DISCALCED CARMELITES: B. M. a. S. Cruce [Zimmermann], *Regesta* J. B. Rubei (Rome 1936); Silverio a. S. Teresa, *Historia del Carmel descalzo en España, Portugal y América* IV–IX (Burgos 1935–40) (Chief work, extends to 1650); Higinio a. S. Teresa, *Apuntos para la historia de la Ven. orden tercera del Carmel en España y Portugal* (Victoria 1954).

AUGUSTINIAN: *Bullarium ord. recollectorum S. Augustini,* ed. J. Fernández de S. Corde Jesu, 2 vols. (Rome 1954–61) (extends from 1570 to 1683).

MONASTIC ORDERS: E. Martène, *Histoire de la Congrégation de St. Maure,* 9 vols. (Ligugé–Paris 1928–43), postum; U. Berlière, *Nouveau Supplément á l'hist. litt. de la Congr. de St. Maur,* 3 vols. (Maredsous 1931); Y. Chauny, *Matricula monachorum professorum Congr. S. Mauri* (Paris 1959). List of the numerous letters of the Maurians in *Revue Mabillon* 23–29 (1933–39), 33 (1943); *Die Generalkapitelsrezesse der Bursfelder Kongregation,* ed. P. Volk 11 (Siegburg 1957) (covers the years 1531–1653); Canivez, VII (1939); R. Molitor, *Aus der Rechtsgeschichte benediktinischer Verbände* I (Münster 1928) 319–384 (Post Tridentine Congregations), II (Münster 1932) 37–327 (German attempts at unification), 328–347 (France); Ph. Schmitz-R. Tschudy, *Geschichte des Benediktinerordens* IV (Einsiedeln *1960*); St. Hilpisch, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums* (Freiburg 1929) 323–350; R. Hesbert, "La Congrégation de St. Maure" *Revue Mabillon* 51 (1961); Additional literature: *LThK*^{2} VII 192; E. Martin, *Los Bernardinos españoles* (Palencia 1951).

SECTION FOUR

The Springtime of the Missions in the Early Modern Period

45. *The Missions under Spanish Patronage*

SOURCES

Colección de documentos inéditos relativos al descubrimiento, conquista y colonización de las posesiones españolas en América y Oceania, 42 vols. (Madrid 1864–84), Segunda Serie, 13 vols. (Madrid 1885ff.); (P. Hernáez), *Colección de bulas, breves y otros documentos relativos ala Iglesia de América y Filipinas,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1879); *Cuerpo de documentos del siglo XVI sobre los derechos de España en las Indias y las Filipinas,* ed. L. Hanke–Millares Carlo (Mexico City 1943); B. de Las Casas, *Historia general de las Indias,* ed. Millares Carlo, 3 vols. (Mexico City 1951); B. de Las Casas, *Apologética Historia de las Indias,* ed. Serrano y Sanz (Madrid 1909); *The Spanish Tradition in America,* ed. C. Gibson, (Columbia, S.C. 1968); Also the publications of the various orders in their periodicals and collections, e.g. the Franciscans in the Archivo Ibero-Americano and the Americas in the Documentary Series of the Academy of American Franciscan History (Washington, D.C. from 1951), The Archivium Fratrum Praedicatorum (Rome), the Archivium Historicum S. I. and the Monumenta Historica S. I. (Rome).

LITERATURE

Streit II (Aachen 1924); C. Bayle, *España en Indias. Nuevos ataques y nuevas defensas* (Vitoria 1934, Madrid 1944); G. García, *Caracter de la conquista española según los testes de los historiadores primitivos* (Mexico City 1901); L. Hanke, *The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America* (Philadelphia 1949); id., *Colonisation et conscience chrétienne au XVI^e s.* (Paris 1957); J. Höffner, *Christentum und Menschenwürde. Das Anliegen der spanischen Kolonialethik im Goldenen Zeitalter* (Trier 1947); P. de Leturia, "Der Heilige Stuhl und das spanische Patronat in Amerika" *HJ* 46 (1926) 1–71; J. Specker, *Die Missionsmethode in Spanisch Amerika im 16. Jh.* (Beckenried 1953); R. Greenleaf (ed.) *The Roman Catholic Church in Colonial Latin America* (New York 1971); A. Ybot León, *La Iglesia y los eclesiásticos españoles en la empresa de Indias* (Barcelona 1954); P. Borges, *Métodos misionales en la cristianización de América s. XVI* (Madrid 1960); A. de Egaña, *La teoría del Regio Vicariato Español en Indias* (Rome 1958); M. Mónica, *La gran controversia del siglo XVI acerca del Dominio Español en América* (Madrid 1952); P. de Leturia, *Relaciones entre la Santa Sede e Hispanoamérica 1493–1835,* 3 vols. (Rome–Caracas 1959).

BARTHLOMÉ DE LAS CASAS: *B. de Las Casas 1474–1566. Bibliografía crítica y cuerpo de materiales, para el studio de su vida . . . ,* ed. L. Hanke–M. Giménez Fernández (Santiago de Chile 1954); L. Hanke, *B. de Las Casas. An Interpretation of his Life and Writings* (The Hague 1951); id., *Bartolome de las Casas: Bookman, Scholar, Propagandist* (Philadelphia 1952); C. H. Haring, *The Spanish Empire in America* (New York 1963) (reprint). B. Biermann, "Lascasiana" *AFP* 27 (1957) 337–358; A. Fabié, *Vida y escritos de D. Fr. B. de Las Casas,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1879). Also the Monographs by A. Freitag (Steyl 1915), M.

Brion (Paris 1927), C. Bayle (Sevilla 1945), M. González Calzada (Mexico City 1948), M. Giménez Fernandez (Sevilla 1953), M. Martínez (Madrid 1955); G. Sanderlin, (ed.) *Bartolomé de Las Casas: A Selection of His Writings* (New York 1971); A. Losada, *Juan Gines de Sepulveda, Democrates segundo o De las justas causas de la guerra contra los indios* (Madrid 1951).

MEXICO

SOURCES: J. García Icazbalceta, *Colección de documentos para la historia de Méjico* (Mexico City 1856–66); *Nueva Collección* (Mexico City 1886–92), there: Jerónimo Mendieta, *Historia Eclesiástica Indiana* (1956), Toribio de Benaventa o Motolinía, *Historia de los Indios de la Nueva España* (1541, Washington, D.C. 1951); F. Zubillaga, *Monumenta Mexicana,* 2 vols. (Rome 1956–59).

LITERATURE: J. García Icazbalceta, *Bibliografía Mexicana del s. XVI* (Mexico City 1886); M. Cuevas, *Historia de la Iglesia en México,* 5 vols. (El Paso 1921–28); R. Ricard, *La "conquête spirituelle" de Mexique* (Paris 1933) Eng. trans. *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico* (Berkeley 1966); C. Ceccherelli, *El bautismo y los Franciscanos en México* (Madrid 1955); F. J. Alegre, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en Nueva España,* 4 vols. (Rome 1956–60); F. Chevalier, *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico* (Berkeley 1963); C. Gibson, *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico 1519–1810* (Stanford, Calif. 1964); F. Cervantes de Salazar, *Life in the Imperial Royal City of Mexico in New Spain and the Royal and Pontifical University* (Austin, Tex. 1953); F. Morales, *Ethnic and Social Background of the Franciscans Friars in Seventeenth-Century Mexico* (Washington, D.C. 1973); J. Jacobsen, *Educational Foundations of the Jesuits in Sixteenth Century New Spain (Berkeley 1938).*

PERU

SOURCES: E. Lissón, *La Iglesia de España en el Perú* (Seville 1943–45); R. Vargas Ugarte, *Concilios Limenses 1551–1772,* 3 vols. (Lima 1951–54); A. de Egaña, *Monumenta Peruana,* 2 vols. (Rome 1954–58).

LITERATURE: F. de Armas Medina, *Cristianización del Perú;* 1532–1600 (Seville 1953); R. Levillier, *Organización de la Iglesia y Órdenes religiosas en el Virreinato del Perú en el siglo XVI,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1919); A. Robledo, *La orden Franciscana en la América meridional* (Rome 1948); A. Tibesar, *Franciscan Beginnings in Colonial Peru* (Washington, D.C. 1953); R. Vargas Ugarte, *Los Jesuítas del Perú* (Lima 1941).

THE JESUIT REDUCTIONS IN PARAGUAY

SOURCES: A. Ruiz de Montoya, *Conquista espiritual . . . en Paraguay* (Madrid 1639); id., *Memorial* (Madrid 1643); N. del Techo, *Historia Provinciae Paraquariae* (Liege 1673).

LITERATURE: P. Pastells–F. Mateos *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la Provincia del Paraguay,* 8 vols. (Madrid 1912–49); F.-X. Charlevoix, *Histoire du Paraguay,* 6 vols. (Paris 1747); P. Hernández, *El Organización social de las doctrinas Guaranies,* 2 vols. (Barcelona 1913); M. Fassbinder, *Der "Jesuitenstaat" in Paraguay* (Leipzig 1926); C. Lugon, *La république communiste chrétienne des Guaranis, 1610–1768* (Paris 1949) (with literature); E. Gothein, *Der christlich-soziale Staat der Jesuiten in Paraguay* (Berlin 1883); J. Pfotenhauer, *Die Missionen der Jesuiten in Paraguay,* 3 vols. (Gütersloh 1891–93). R.

Graham, *A Vanished Arcadia: Some Account of the Jesuits in Paraguay* (London 1924); M. Morner, *The Political and Economic Activities of the Jesuits in the Rio de la Plata Region: The Hapsburg Era* (Stockholm 1953); G. O'Neill, *Golden Years on the Paraguay: History of the Jesuit Missions* (London 1934).

MISSIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

SOURCES: *The Philippine Islands (1493–1898),* ed. Blair-Robertson, 53 vols. (Cleveland 1903–08); P. Torres y Lanzas, *Catálogo de los documentos relatios a las Islas Filipinas* I–V (Barcelona 1925–29).—For the Mission History of the Orders see Juan de Medina OESA (1630), Diego Aduarte OP (1698), F. Colin SJ (1663), Juan Franc. de S. Antonio OFM (1738–44).

LITERATURE: *Streit* IV–V (1928–29): W. E. Retana, *Catálogo abreviado de La Biblioteca Filipina* (Madrid 1898); Marín y Morales, *Ensayo de una síntesis de los trabajos realizados por las corporacionas religiosas de Filipinas,* 2 vols. (Manilla 1901); F. J. Montalbán, *El patronato español y la conquista de Filipinas* (Burgos 1930); H. Bernard-Maître, *Les Iles Philippines du Grand Archipel de la Chine* (Tientsin 1936); L. de la Costa, *The Jesuits in Philippines, 1581–1768* (Manila 1961).

46. *The Missions under Portuguese Patronage*

SOURCES

Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae Regum in Ecclesiis Africae, Asiae et Oceaniae . . . , ed. L. M. Jordão et al., I–III (Lisbon 1868–1879) (-BullPatr.); R. Ricard, *Études et document pour l'histoire de l'Espagne et du Portugal* (Löwen o. J. [1930]).

LITERATURE

A. Jann, *Die katholischen Missionenen in Indien, China und Japan* (Paderborn 1915); J. Godinho, *The Padroado Portugal in the Orient, 1454–1860* (Bombay 1924); B. J. Wenzel, *Portugal und der Heilige Stuhl* (Lisbon 1957); M. de Oliveira, *História ecclesiástica de Portugal* (Lisbon 1960).

1. AFRICA

SOURCES: Paiva Manso, *História do Congo* [-L. M. Jordâo] (Lisbon 1877); A. Brasio, *Monumenta Missionária Africana, Africa Ocidental* (*1471–1531*), 7 vols. (Lisbon 1952–56).

LITERATURE: E. Weber, *Die portugiesische Reichsmission im Königreich Kongo von ihren Anfängen 1491 bis zum Eintritt der Jesuiten in die Kongomission 1548* (Aachen–Immensee 1924); J. Cuvelier–J. Boon, *Het Oud-Koninkrijk Kongo* (Brügge 1941; French trans. Brussels 1946); J. Cuvelier–L. Jadin, *L'ancien Congo d'après les archives romaines, 1518–1640* (Brussels 1954); L. Kilger, *Die erste Mission unter den Bantustämmen Ostafrikas* (Münster 1917); id., "Die ersten zwei Jahrhunderte ostafrikanischer Mission" *ZMR* 7 (1917) 97–108; P. Schebesta, "Zum ersten Missionsanfang am Sambesi" *ZMR* 14 (1914) 88–99; C. P. Groves, *The Planting of Christianity in Africa,* 4 vols. (London 1948–58).

2. ASIA

A) INDIA

SOURCES: *Documentacão para a História das Missões de padroado Português do Oriente. India,* ed. A. da Silva Rego, 12 vols. (Lisbon 1947–58); B. de Tobar, *Compendio Bulario Indico* I (Sevilla 1954); D. Gonçalez, *História do Malavar,* ed. J. Wicki (Münster 1955); S. Gonçalvez, *Primeira parte da História dos Religiosos da Companhia de Jesus . . . nos reynos e provincias das India Oriental,* ed. J. Wicki (Coimbra 1957–60); G. Schurhammer, *Die zeitgenössischen Quellen zur Geschichte Portugiesisch-Asiens und seiner Nachbarländer . . . zur Zeit des hl. Franz Xaver, 1538–1552* (Leipzig 1932, Rome ^{2}1962); G. Schurhammer–E. A. Voretzsch, *Ceylon zur Zeit des Königs Bhuvaneka und Franz Xavers, 1539–1552. Quellen zur Geschichte der Potugiesen sowie der Franziskaner- und Jesuitenmission auf Ceylon,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1928); *Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii aliaque eius scripta,* ed. G. Schurhammer–J. Wicki, 2 vols. (Rome 1944–45); *Die Briefe des Francisco de Xavier, 1542–1552,* ed. E. Gräfin Vitzthum (Munich ^{3}1950); A. Valignano, *Historia del principio y progreso de la Compañís de Jesús en las Indias Orientales, 1542–1564,* ed. J. Wicki (Rome 1944); B. Biermann, "Documenta quaedam initia missionum Ordinis Praedicatorum in India Orientali illustrantia" *AFP* (1940) 132–157.

LITERATURE: G. Correira, *História da Colonizacão Portuguesa na India,* 5 vols. (Lisbon 1948–54); F. Rodriquez, *História da Companhia de Jesus na Assistencia de Portugal,* 4 vols. (Porto 1931–50); M. Müllbauer, *Geschichte der katholischen Missionen in Ostindien von der Zeit Vasco da Gamas bis zur Mitte des 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1852); A. Jann, *Die katholischen Missionen in Indien, China und Japan. Ihre Organisation und das portugiesische Patronat vom 15. bis 18. Jh.* (Paderborn 1915); G. Schurhammer, *Franz Xaver, sein Leben und seine Zeit* I (1506–1541) (Freiburg 1955); id., *The Malabar Church and Rome During the Early Portuguese Period and Before* (Trichinopoly 1934); E. Tisserant-E. R. Hambye, *Eastern Christianity in India. A History of the Syro-Malabar Church from the Earliest to the Present Day* (London 1957); E. Maclagen, *The Jesuits and the Great Mogul* (London 1932).

B) MALAY ARCHIPELAGO

SOURCES: *Documentacão para a História das Missões do padroado Português do Oriente. Insulindia,* ed. A. B. de Sá, 5 vols. (Lisbon 1954–58).

LITERATURE: B. Visser, *Onder portugeesch-spaansche vlag. De Katholieke Missie van Indonesie 1511–1601* (Amsterdam 1925); A. Mulders, *De Missie in Tropisch Nederland* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1940); *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography,* ed. Soedja Tmoko (Ithaca, N.Y. 1965); *Historians of South East Asia,* ed. D. G. E. Hall (London 1962) esp. chap. 13–15.

C) JAPAN

SOURCES: J. Laures, *Kirishitan Bunko. A Manual of Books and Documents on the Early Missions in Japan* (Tokyo 1957); L. Frois, *História do Japão 1549–1578* (Leipzig 1926); *Segunda parte da História de Japan 1578–1582* (Tokyo 1938); *Terza parte da Historia de Japan,* ed. A. Pinto u. a. (Tokyo 1942); *La première ambassade du Japon en Occident (1582–1592),* ed. A. Pinto et al. (Tokyo 1942).

LITERATURE: *Streit* IV–V; H. Haas, *Geschichte des Christentums in Japan* (Tokyo 1902–

04); J. Laures, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Japan* (Kaldenkirchen 1956); C. R. Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan 1549–1650* (Berkeley 1951); O. Cary, *A History of Christianity in Japan,* 2 vols. (Chicago 1909); J. Jennes, *History of the Catholic Church in Japan, 1529–1873* (Tokyo 1959).

D) China

Sources: *Avvisi della Cina . . .* (Milan 1586–1588); *Lettere annue 1601–1611. Fonti Ricciane,* ed. P. D'Elia, 3 vols. (Rome 1942–49); *Cartas de China. Documentos inéditos sobre Misiones Franciscanas de los siglos XVII y XVIII,* ed. O. Maas, 2 vols. (Sevilla 1917); D. Advarte, *Historia de la Provincia del S. Rosario de Filipinas, Japón y China* (Saragossa 1693).

Bibliography: H. Cordier, *Bibliotheca Sinica,* 4 vols. (Paris 1904–08), suppl. I (Paris 1922); *Streit* IV, V and VII; J. Beckmann, "Neuerscheinungen zur chines. Missionsgeschichte, 1945–1955" *Monumenta Serica* 15 (Tokyo 1956) 378–462.

Literature: K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China* (London 1929); H. Bernard-Maître: *DHGE* XII 693–741; P. M. D'Elia, "Sunto storico dell'attività della Chiesa Cattolica in Cina dalle origini ai nostri giorni (635–1294–1948)" *StMis* 6 (Rome 1951) 3–68; C. Cary-Elwes, *China and the Cross* (New York 1956).

E) Indo-China

Sources: Ch. Borri, *Relatione della nuova missione de' Padri di Comp. di Gesù nel Regno di Cochinchina* (Rome 1631); A. de Rhodes, *Relazione de' felici successi della santa fede predicata da' padri della Comp. di Gesù nel regno di Tunchino* (Rome 1650).

Literature: *Streit* IV–V; P. Pachtler, *Das Christentum in Tonking und Cochinchina* (Paderborn 1861); F. Schwager, "Aus der Vorgeschichte der hinterindischen Mission" *ZMR* 3 (1913) 146–156; B. Biermann, "Die Missionen der portugiesischen Dominikaner in Hinterindien" *ZMR* 21 (1931) 305–327; id., "Die Missionsversuche der Dominikaner in Kambodscha" *ZMR* 23 (1933) 108–132.

3. Portuguese-America: Brazil

Sources and Literature: *Streit* II:331–361, 739–753; S. Leite, *Monumenta Brasiliae,* 4 vols. (Rome 1956–60); id., *História da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil* I–II (Lisbon–Rio de Janeiro 1938); A. Lourenco Farinha, *A expansão de fé na Africa e no Brasil* I (Lisbon 1942) 419–542; R. Ricard, "Les Jésuites au Brésil pendant la seconde moitié du XVI^{e} siècle, 1549–1597" *RHM* 1 (1937) 321–366, 435–470; D. Romag, *Compêndio de História da Igreja* (Petrópolis 1952).

4. The Entrance of France into the Mission Field

Sources: Ch. le'Clercq, *Premier établissement de la foi dans la Nouvelle France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1691); S. le Tac, *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle France, ou Canada,* ed. Réveillaud (Paris 1888); R. G. Thwaites (editor), *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610 to 1791,* 73 vols. (Cleveland 1897–1910; selections [New York 1925]); F.-X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France,* 3 vols. (Paris 1794); *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du christianisme en Orient,* ed. Rabbath, 2 vols. (Beyrouth 1907–10).

LITERATURE: C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVII^{e} siècle,* 3 vols. (Paris 1895–96); G. Goyau, *Une épopée mystique. Les origines religieuses du Canada* (Paris 1934); L. Pouliot, *Études sur les Relations des Jésuites de la Nouvelle France* (Brugge 1940); C. de Bonnault, *Histoire du Canada francais, 1534–1763* (Paris 1950); L. Groulx, *Histoire du Canada francais depuis sa découverte* (Montréal 1950); G. de Vaumas, *L'éveil missionnaire de la France au XVII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1959); *Delacroix* II:70–88, 281–320; H. de Barenton, *La France catholique en Orient* (Paris 1902); Rocco da Cesinale, *Storia delle Missioni dei Cappuccini,* 3 vols. (Rome 1873); Clemente da Terzorio, *Missioni dei Minori Cappuccini* IV–V (Rome 1918–19); F. X. Talbot, *Saint among the Hurons* (New York 1949); J. B. Tyrell (ed.), *Documents Relating to the Early History of Hudson Bay* (Toronto 1931).

47. *The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith*

SOURCES

Bullarium Pontificum S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 5 vols. (Rome 1839–41); R. de Martinis, *Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide Pars prima . . . ,* 7 vols. (Rome 1888–97), Pars secunda (Rome 1909); *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* (Rome 1893 [arranged by subject], ^{2}1907 [2 vols. arranged chronologically]) [=Coll].

LITERATURE

O. Mejer, *Die Propaganda, ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht,* 2 vols. (Leipzig–Göttingen 1852–3); *ZMR* 12 (1922) Heft 1 for the 300th anniversary of the Propaganda with contributions from: J. Schmidlin, "Die Gründung der Propaganda Kongregation (1622)" 1–14, 115; L. Kilger, "Die ersten fünzig Jahre Propaganda—eine Wendezeit der Missionsgeschichte" 15–30; K. Pieper, "Ein Blick in die missionsmethodischen Erlasse der Propaganda" 31–51. Very good material in H. Chappoulie, *Aux origines d'une Eglise. Rome et les missions d'Indochine au XVII^{e} siècle* I (Paris 1943). Cf. also B. Arens, *Handbuch der katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1925) 7–17.

SECTION FIVE

European Counter Reformation and Confessional Absolutism (1605–55)

48. *Paul V, Gregory XV and the Beginnings of the Central European Counter Reformation*

SOURCES

BullRom XI–XII; A. O. Meyer, *Die Prager Nuntiatur des G. St. Ferreri; Die Wiener Nuntiatur des G. Serra 1603–06* (Berlin 1913); L. Linhartova, *Epp. et Acta A. Gaetani 1607–8,* 3 vols. (Prague 1932–37–40); A. Cauchie-R. Maere, *Recueil des instructions* *générales aux nonces de Flandre 1596–1635* (Brussels 1904); A. Louant, *Correspondance d'Ottavio Mirto Frangipani* III (Brussels 1942); L. van Meerbeeck, *Correspondance des nonces Gésualdo, Morra, Sanseverino avec la Secrétairerie d'Etat Pontificale 1615–21* (Brussels 1937); B. de Meester, *Correspondance du nonce G. F. Guido di Bagno 1621–27* (Brussels 1937); J. Kollmann, *Acta S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide res gestas Bohemicas illustrantia* I (Prague 1923); *Acta S. C. de Propaganda fide Germaniam spectantia. Die Protokolle der Propagandakongregation zu deutschen Angelegenheiten 1622–49,* ed. H. Tüchle (Paderborn 1962); I. de Olarra Garmendia–M. L. de Larramendi, "Correspondencia entre la nunciatura de España y la Santa Sede durante el reinado de Felipe III" *Anthologica annua* 9 (1961) 495–816 continued to 13 (1965) 395–697.

LITERATURE

Pastor, XII (Paul V.), XIII:1, 27–224 (Gregory XV.); Seppelt, V:243–275.

THE HISTORY OF THE STATE SECRETARIATS: A. Kraus, "Secretarius und Sekretariat" *RQ* 55 (1960) 43–84; id., "Das Päpstliche Staatssekretariat i. J. 1623" *RQ* 52 (1957) 93–122; J. Semmler, "Beiträge zum Aufbau des Päpstlicher Staatssekretariates unter Paul V." *RQ* 54 (1959) 40–80; L. Hammermayer, "Grundlinien der Entwicklung des Päpstlichen Staatssekretariates von Paul V. bis Innocenz X." *RQ* 55 (1960) 157–202; D. Albrecht, *Die deutsche Politik Papst Gregors XV. Die Einwirkung der päpstlichen Diplomatie auf die Häuser Habsburg und Wittelsbach 1621–23* (Munich 1956); id., *Die auswärtige Politik Maximilans I. von Bayern 1618–35* (Göttingen 1962).

CONFLICT WITH VENICE AND SARPI: F. Gaeta, *Origine e sviluppo delta rappresentanza stabile Pontificia in Venezia* (Rome 1958); A. Stella, "La proprietà ecclesiastica nella Repubblica di Venezia dal sec. XV al XVII" *Nuova Riv. storica* 42 (1958) 4–30; P. Pirri, *L'interdetto di Venezia del 1606 e i Gesuiti* (Rome 1959) (many documents); J. M. Pou y Marti, "La intervención espãnola en el conflicto entre Paulo V y Venecia 1605–07" *Misc. P. Paschini* II (Rome 1949) 359–381; M. R. Pazos, "Del conflicto entre Paulo V y Venecia. El embajador de la Serenisima en Espãna y el entredicto" *AIA* 4 (1944) 32–61; A. M. dal Pino, "Fra Fulgenzio da Passirano negli anni di studio e di insegnamento" *Studi storici dell'Ord. dei Servi* 8 (1957–58) 134–151; *Opere di P. Sarpi,* 8 vols. (Helmstat, in reality Verona 1761–68); *Istoria dell'Interdetto e altri scritti editi e inediti,* ed. M. D. Busnelli and G. Gambarin, 3 vols. (Bari 1940); F. L. Polidori, *Lettere di Fra P. Sarpi,* 2 vols. (Florence 1863) (it is surpassed by more recently published collections of letters, especially Busnelli); In opposition to P. Savio, "Per l'epistolario di P. Sarpi" *Aevum* 10 (1936) 1–104; 11 (1937) 3–74, 275–322; 13 (1939) 558–623; 14 (1940) 3–84; 16 (1942) 3–43, 105–138; R. Taucci, *Intorno alle lettere di P. Sarpi ad Antonio Foscarini* (Florence 1939); B. Ulianich, *Paolo Sarpi, Lettere ai Gallicani* (Wiesbaden 1961) (lit.); id., "Considerazioni e documenti per una Ecclesiologia di P. Sarpi" *Lortz F* II (1958) 363–444; V. Buffon, *Chiesa di Cristo e Chiesa Romana nelle opere e nelle Lettere di Fra Paolo Sarpi* (Löwen 1941); C. M. Francescon, *Chiesa e Stato nei consulti di Fra P. Sarpi* (Vicenza 1942); G. Getto, *Paolo Sarpi* (Pisa 1941).

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE THIRTY YEARS WAR AND FERDINAND II: *Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 30jährigen Krieges,* 11 vols. (Leipzig 1870–1908); Continued by W. Goetz, *Die Politik Maximilians I. und seiner Verbündeten,* 2 vols. (Munich 1908–1918); Gebhardt-Grundmann II:130f., additional lit.; V.-L. Tapié, *La Politique de la France et le début de la Guerre de Trente ans 1616–21* (Paris 1934); C. V. Wedgewood, *The Thirty Years War* (London 1938); H. Sturmberger, *Aufstand in Böhmen, Der Beginn des 30jährigen Krieges* (Munich 1959); For the characteristics of Ferdinand II—besides F.

Ch. Khevenhiller, *Annales Ferdinandei,* 12 vols. (1716–26) and F. Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II.,* 11 vols. (Schaffhausen 1850f.)—B. Dudik, "Korrespondenz Kaiser Ferdinands II. und seiner Familie mit M. Becanus und W. Lamormaini" *AÖG* 54 (1876) 219–350; G. Franz, "Glaube und Recht im politischen Denken Kaiser Ferdinands II" *ARG* 49 (1958) 258–269 (biased); For his confessor Lamormaini: R. Stiegele: *HJ*28 (1907) 551–569, 849–870; Duhr II:2: 691–713; A. Posch: *MIÖG* 63 (1955) 375–390; F. X. v. Altötting, "Laurentius von Brindisi in der Politik Bayrens 1606–12" *CollFr* 29 (1959) 237–272; Arturo da Camignano, "La part de S. Laurent de Brindes dans le ban de Donauwörth 1607" *RHE* 58 (1963) 460–486; D. Albrecht, *Die auswärtige Politik Maximilians von Bayern 1618*–35 (Göttingen 1962) (basic).

49. *Urban VIII, Innocent X and the End of the Counter Reformation*

SOURCES

BullRom XIII–XV; *Le relazioni della Corte di Roma lette al Senato degli ambasciatori veneti nel sec. XVII,* ed. N. Barozzi–G. Berchet, 2 vols. (Venice 1877–79); A. Leman, *Recueil des instructions générales aux nonces ordinaires de France 1620–34* (Paris 1919); Q. Aldea, "España, el Papado y el Imperio durante la guerra de los treinta años, I: Instrucciones a los Embajadores de España en Roma 1631—43" *MCom* 27 (1957) 291–437; A. Malvezzi, "Papa Urbano VIII e la questione della Valtellina. Nuovi documenti" *Nuovo Archivio lombardo* VIII:7 (1957) 5–113; H. Kiewning, *Die Nuntiatur des Palotto 1628–*30, 2 vols. (Berlin 1895–97); V. Kybal–G. Incisa Della Rocchetta, *La Nunziatura di F. Chigi 1640*–51, 2 vols. (Rome 1943–46); W. Friedensburg, "Regesten zur deutschen Geschichte aus der Zeit des Pontifikates Innocenz' X." *QFIAB* 4 (1902) 236–285; 5 (1903) 60–124, 207–222; 6 (1904) 146–173; 7 (1905) 121–138; *Acta Pacis Westfalicae,* ed. M. Braubach–K. Repgen, Series IV, Abt. D., Vol. 1 (Münster 1964).

LITERATURE

Pastor XIII (Urban VIII), XIV:13–299 (Innocent X); Seppelt V:275–321. Pastor's criticism of Ranke and Gregorovius is not without justification, yet he stands too strongly under the influence of Leman in spite of the harsh judgement of Richelieu; See also the unfavorable judgement of J. Grisar, "Päpstliche Finanzen, Nepotismus und Kirchenrecht unter Urban VIII" *Misc. Hist. Pont.* 14 (1943) 205–366; K. Repgen, "Finanzen, Kirchenrecht und Politik unter Urban VIII" *RQ* 56 (1961) 62–74; A. Kraus, "Amt und Stellung des Kardinalnepoten zur Zeit Urbans VIII" *RQ* 53 (1958) 238–243; id., *Die Päpstliche Staatssekretarie unter Urban VIII* (Freiburg 1964); A. Malvezzi, "Papa Urbano VIII e la questione della Valtellina" *Archivio storico lombardo* 84 (1957) 5–113; P. Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie* I (Rome 1959); id., "La congrégration des affaires de France de 1640" *Mélanges E. Tisserant* IV:59–105.

EDICT OF RESTITUTION: EARLY HISTORY: Pastor XIII:1, 354f.; K. Repgen, "L. Holstenius als politischer Gutachter in Rom" *QFIAB* 39 (1959) 342–352; H. Günter, *Das Restitutionsedikt von 1629 und die katholische Resauration in Alt-Württemberg* (Stuttgart 1901); For a list of restored church properties: Th. Tupetz, *Der Streit um die geistlichen Güter und das Restitutionsedikt von 1629* (Vienna 1883) 523–566; Comprehensive survey and lit. in K. Repgen, *Die Römische Kurie und der Westfälische Friede* I:157–189 (vide infra).

THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA: M. Braubach, *Der Westfälische Friede* (Münster 1948); F. Dickmann, *Der Westfälische Frieden* (Münster 1959) (basic); L. Steinberger, *Die Jesuiten*

und die Friedensfrage 1635–50 (Freiburg 1906) (Wangnereck and his opponent 63f., 78f.); D. Bötticher, "Propaganda und öffentliche Meinung im protestantischen Deutschland 1628–36" *ARG* 44 (1953) 181–203; G. Schmid, "Konfessionspolitik und Staatsräson bei den Verhandlungen des Westfälischen Friedenskongresses über die Gravamina ecclesiastica" *ARG* 44 (1953) 203–222; K. Repgen, "Die Hauptinstruktion Ginettis für den Kölner Kongress 1636" *QFIAB* 34 (1954) 250–287; id., "Fabio Chigis Instruktion für den Westfälischen Friedenskongress" *RQ* 48 (1953) 79–166; id., *Die Römische Kurie und der Westfälische Friede* I (Tübingen 1962); H. Bücker, "Der Nuntius Fabio Chigi in Münster 1644–49" *WZ* 108 (1958) 1–90; S. Cultrera, *Per la pace di Westfalia. Missione alle corti di Francia e di Spagna del P. Innocenzo Marcinò da Caltagirone 1647–48* (Milan 1955); P. Frischauer, *The Imperial Crown* (London 1939); M. Roberts, *The Political Objectives of Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, 1630–32* (London 1957); J. J. Poelhekke, *De Vrede van Munster* (The Hague 1948); E. A. Beller, *Propaganda in Germany during the Thirty Years War* (Princeton 1940).

RICHELIEU AND MAZARIN: G. Hannoteaux, *Histoire du card. Richelieu,* 6 vols. (Paris 1893–1947); C. J. Burckhardt, *Richelieu. Der Aufstieg zur Macht* (Münich 1947); E. Hassinger, "Das politische Testament Richelieus" *HZ* 173 (1952) 485–503; C. V. Wedgewood, *Richelieu and the French Monarchy* (London 1949); L. Dedouvres, *Le P. Joseph de Paris Capucin. L'Éminence grise,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); U. Silvagni, *Il Card. Mazzarino* (Turin 1928); V. Tornetta, "La politica del Mazzarino verso il papato" *AstIt* 99 (1941) 86–116; 100 (1942) 95–134; R. Derricau-M. Laurain, *La mort du Card. Mazarin* (Paris 1960).

MISCELLANEOUS: G. Marañón-L. Pfandl, *Olivares. Der Niedergang Spaniens als Weltmacht* (Munich o. J. 1939); G. Albion, *Charles I and the Court of Rome* (London 1935); W. Brulez, "La crise dans les relations entre le Saint-Siège et les Pays-Bas au XVII^{e} siècle" *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 28 (1953) 63–104; M. J. Havran, *The Catholics in Caroline England* (Stanford 1962); W. M. Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Cambridge, Mass. 1962); W. S. Knight, *The Life and Works of Hugo Grotius* (London 1925); J. Laures, *The Political Economy of Juan de Mariana* (New York 1928); C. V. Wedgewood, *A Coffin for King Charles* (New York 1964).

50. *Denominationalism and Secularization*

LITERATURE

IRENICISM AND TOLERANCE: F. W. Kantzenbach, *Das Ringen um die Einheit der Kirche im Jahrhundert der Reformation. Vertreter, Quellen und Motive des "ökumenischen" Gedankens von Erasmus von Rotterdam bis Georg Calixt* (Stuttgart 1957); R. Rouse–St. Ch. Neill, *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung* I (Göttingen 1957); N. Paulus, *Protestantismus und Toleranz im 16. Jh.* (Freiburg 1911); J. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation,* 2 vols. (New York 1960); L. Cristiani, "Tolérance et intolérance religieuses au XVI^{e} siècle" *Journal of World-History* 5 (1959) 857–878; E. Hassinger, "Wirtschaftliche Motive und Argumente für religiöse Duldsamkeit im 16. und 17. Jh." *ARG* 49 (1958) 226–245; H. Conrad, "Religionsbann, Toleranz und Parität am Ende des alten Reiches" *RQ* 56 (1961) 167–199; K. Goldammer, "Friedensidee and Toleranzgedanke bei Paracelsus und den Spiritualisten" *ARG* 46 (1955) 20–46, 47 (1956) 180–211; K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England,* 4 vols. (London 1932–40); A. Räss, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* I–VI (Freiburg 1866–68) (until 1653); H. Bainton, *The*

Travail of Religious Liberty (Philadelphia 1951); H. Bainton–B. Becker, et al., *Castellioniana, Quatre études sur Sebastien Castellion et l'idee de la tolerance* (Haarlem 1954).

POLITICAL THEORY AND ABSOLUTISM: P. Meinecke, *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte* I (Munich 1960); H. Lutz, *Ragione di stato und christliche Staatsethik im 16. Jh.* (Münster 1961); M. Beloff, *The Age of Absolutism* (New York 1962) (a schematic treatment of the period); P. Mesnard, *L'essor de la philosophie politique an XVI*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1951); R. v. Albertini, *Das politische Denken in Frankreich zur Zeit Richelieus* (Marburg 1951); L. Firpo, *Il pensiero politico del Rinascimento e della Controriforma* (Milan 1948); T. Bozza, *Scrittori politici italiani dal 1550 al 1650* (Rome 1949) (Bibliography); M. d'Addio, *Il pensiero politico di G. Scioppio e il Machiavellismo del Seicento* (Milan 1958); J. Spörl, *Widerstandsrecht und Grenzen der Staatsgewalt* (Berlin 1955); C. J. Friedrich, *The Age of the Baroque* (New York 1952); J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the 16th Century* (New York 1928); B. Hamilton, *Political Thought in 16th Century Spain* (New York 1963); R. H. Murray, *The Political Consequences of the Reformation* (London 1926); B. Reynolds, *Proponents of Limited Monarchy in 16th Century France* (New York 1931); H. Butterfield, *The Statecraft of Machiavelli* (London 1940); R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York 1926). D. Ogg, *Europe in the Seventeenth Century* (New York 1962).

LITERATURE ON ABSOLUTISM: W. Hubatsch, "Das Zeitalter des Absolutismus in heutiger Sicht" *AKG* 33 (1953) 342–371, suppl. M. Schlenke: *AKG* 39 (1957) 112–129; L. Just, "Stufen und Formen des Absolutismus" *HJ* 80 (1961) 143–159; St. Skalweit, "Das Zeitalter des Absolutismus als Forschungsproblem" *DVfLG* 35 (1961) 298–315.

THE SECULARIZATION OF THOUGHT: W. Dilthey, *Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation* (Leipzig–Berlin 1914); G. Saitta, *Il pensiero italiano nell'Umanesimo e nel Rinascimento* III (Bologna 1951); H. E. Weber, *Reformation, Orthodoxie und Rationalismus,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh 1940).

PHILOSOPHY: *Ueberweg* III (Darmstadt 1957); F. Copelston, *History of Philosophy* III–IV (London 1958–68). For the Italian emigrants the following works are basic: D. Cantimori, *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento* (Florence 1939); D. Cantimori-E. Feist, *Per la storia degli Eretici italiani del secolo XVI in Europa* (Rome 1937) (Texts). Since the appearance of these works there have been numerous monographs about individual personalities, e.g.: G. Spini, *A. Bruccioli* (Florence 1940); Giacomo Aconcio, *Stratagematum Satana* ll. VIII, ed. G. Radetti (Florence 1946); Ch. Donald O'Malley, *Jacopo Aconcio* (Rome 1955); L. Firpo, *Gli scritti di F. Pucci* (Turin 1957); A. Bertini, "Giovanni Bernardino Bonifacio, Marchese d'Oria" *Archivio Storico napoletano* 76 (1958) 191–265; St. Dunin Borkowski, "Die Gruppierung der Antitrinitarier des 16. Jh." *Scholastik* 7 (1932) 481–523; E. M. Wilbur, *A History of Unitarism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1945); B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen* (Münster 1960) 52f.; G. Schramm, "Neue Ergebnisse der Antitrinitarierforschung" *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas NF* 8 (1960) 428f.; L. Febvre, *Le problème de l'incroyance au XVI*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1942), also the remarks of P. Jourda: *RHEF* 29 (1943) 262–275; id., *Au coeur religieux du XVI*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1957); A. Klempt, *Die Säkularisierung der universalhistorischen Auffassung* (Göttingen 1960).

GALILEI: A. Favaro (ed.), *Le Opere di G. Galilei,* 20 vols. (Florence 1890–1909); L. Olschki, *Galilei und seine Zeit* (Florence 1927); A. Koyre, *Etudes Galiléennes,* 3 vols.

(Paris 1939); *Nel terzo centenario della morte di G. Galilei.* Saggie conferenze (Milan 1942); F. Dessauer, *Der Fall Galilei und wir* (Frankfurt a. M. 1949).

FOR THE TRIAL PROCEDURE: Pastor, XII:203–214; XIII:1, 616–630; F. A. Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (London 1964); G. De Santillana, *The Crime of Galileo* (Chicago 1959).

SUPPLEMENT TO BIBLIOGRAPHY

Part One

Handbuch der Europäischen Geschichte III: *Die Entstehung des neuzeitlichen Europa,* ed. J. Engel (Stuttgart 1971); St. Skalweit, *Reich und Reformation* (Berlin 1967). H. J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *Brennpunkte der Reformation. Zeitgenössische Texte und Bilder* (Göttingen 1967); J. Delumeau, *Naissance et Affirmation de la Réforme* (Paris 1968); J. Lortz–E. Iserloh, *Kleine Reformationsgeschichte* (Freiburg ^{2}1971); R. Stupperich, *Die Reformation in Deutschland* (Munich 1972); R. Kottje–B. Moeller (eds.), *Ökumenische Kirchengeschichte* II (Mainz 1973); K. Kupisch, *Kirchengeschichte* III: *Politik und Konfession. Die Reformation in Deutschland* (Stuttgart 1974); A. Laube, M. Steinmetz, G. Vogler, *Illustrierte Geschichte der deutschen frühbürgerlichen Revolution* (Berlin/DDR 1974).

CHAPTER 1: H. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation* (New York 1960); A. Schroer, *Die Kirche in Westfalen vor der Reformation* (Munster 1967); R. Bäumer, *Nachwirkungen des konziliaren Gedankens in der Theologie und Kanonistik des frühen 16. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1971).

CHAPTER 2: 1. R. Friedenthal, *Luther* (Munich 1967); G. Zschäbitz, *Martin Luther. Grösse und Grenze* I (*1483–1526*) (Berlin 1967); R. García-Villoslada, *Martin Lutero,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1973); G. Ebeling, *Luther* (Tübingen 1974).—2. P. Hacker, *Das Ich im Glauben bei M. Luther* (Graz 1966); F. Gogarten, *Luthers Theologie* (Tübingen 1967); W. Joest, *Ontologie der Person bei Luther* (Göttingen 1967); O. H. Pesch, *Die Theologie der Rechtfertigung bei M. Luther und Thomas v. A.* (Mainz 1967); J. Wicks, *Man Yearning for Grace. Luther's Early Spiritual Teaching* (Wiesbaden 1969); R. Damerau, *Die Demut in der Theologie Luthers* (Giessen 1970); G. Ebeling, *Lutherstudien* I (Tübingen 1971); K. H. Zur Mühlen, *Nos Extra Nos. Luthers Theologie zwischen Mystik und Scholastik* (Tübingen 1972); E. Iserloh, *Luther und die Reformation. Beiträge zu einem ökumenischen Lutherverständnis* (Aschaffenburg 1974).—3. P. Manns, *Lutherforschung heute* (Wiesbaden 1967); H. G. Koch, *Luthers Reformation in kommunistischer Sicht* (Stuttgart 1967); R. Wohlfeil (ed.), *Reformation oder frühbürgerliche Revolution?* (Munich 1972); A. Friesen, *Reformation and Utopia. The Marxist Interpretation of the Reformation and Its Antecedents* (Wiesbaden 1974); M. Bogdahn, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre Luthers im Urteil der neueren katholischen Theologie. Möglichkeiten und Tendenzen der katholischen Lutherdeutung in evangelischer Sicht* (Göttingen 1971).—4. R. Stauffer, *Die Entdeckung Luthers im Katholizismus* (Zurich 1968); W. Beyna, *Das moderne katholische Lutherbild* (Essen 1969); G. Ph. Wolf, *Das neuere französische Lutherbild* (Wiesbaden 1974); K. Aland, *Martin Luther in der modernen Literatur* (Witten 1973); H. Jedin-R. Bäumer, *Die Erforschung der kirchlichen Reformationsgeschichte* (Darmstadt 1975).–-5. A. Zumkeller, "Martin Luther und sein Orden" *AA* 25 (1962) 254–290; A. Kunzelmann, *Geschichte der deutschen Augustiner-Eremiten.* Teil V: *Die Sächsich-Thüringische Provinz*

und die Sächsiche Reformkongregation bis zum Untergang der beiden (Würzburg 1974).—6. E. Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erfordiensis* (Leipzig 1964); E. Iserloh, "Sacramentum et Exemplum. Ein augustinisches Thema lutherischer Theologie" *Reformata* I (Münster 1965) 247–264; G. Baring, "Luther und die "Theologia Deutsch" in der neuesten Forschung" *ThZ* XXIII (1967) 48–62; St. E. Ozment, "Homo Viator: Luther and Late Medieval Theology" *Harv. ThR* 62 (1969) 275–287; H. Hilgenfeld, *Mittelalterlich-traditionelle Elemente in Luthers Abendmahlschriften* (Zurich 1971); K. H. Zur Mühlen, "Zur Rezeption der Augustinischen Sakramentsformel 'Accedit Verbum ad Elementum. et Fit Sacramentum' in der Theologie Luthers" *ZThK* 70 (1973) 50–76.—7. H. Vossberg, *Im Heiligen Rom. Luthers Reiseeindrücke 1510–1511* (Berlin 1966).—8. J. Vercruysse, *Fidelis Populus* (Wiesbaden 1968); S. H. Hendrix, *Ecclesia in Via. Ecclesiological Development in the Medieval Psalms Exegesis and the Dicta Super Psalterium (1513–1515) of Martin Luther* (Leiden 1974).—9. D. Demmer, *Lutherus Interpres. Der theologische Neuansatz in seiner Römerbriefexegese unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Augustins* (Witten 1968); E. Plutta-Messerschmidt, *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus. Eine Studie zu Luthers Auslegung von Römer* 3–5 (Tübingen 1973).—11. H. Feld, *Martin Luther und Wendelin Steinbachs Vorlesungen über den Hebräerbrief* (Wiesbaden 1971).—12. B. Lohse (ed.), *Der Durchbruch der reformatorischen Erkenntnis bei Luther* (Darmstadt 1968); O. Modalski, "Luthers Turmerlebnis 1515" *StTh* XXII (1968) 51–91; R. Schäfer, "Zur Datierung von Luthers reformatorischer Erkenntnis" *ZThK* 66 (1969) 151–170; O. Bayer, "Die Reformatorische Wende in Luthers Theologie" *ZThK* 66 (1969) 115–150; id., *Promissio. Geschichte der reformatorischen Wende in Luthers Theologie* (Göttingen 1971); A. Franzen (ed.), *Um Reform und Reformation. Zur Frage nach dem Wesen des "Reformatorischen" bei Martin Luther* (Münster 1972).

CHAPTER 3: K. V. Selge, *Normen der Christenheit im Streit um Ablass und Kirchenautorität* (Diss. theol. habil. Heidelberg 1968); R. Bäumer, *Die Diskussion um Luthers Thesenanschlag:* A. Franzen (ed.), *Um Reform und Reformation* (Münster 1968) 53–95.

CHAPTER 4: G. Hennig, *Cajetan und Luther* (Stuttgart 1966); G. Müller, "Die römische Kurie und die Anfänge der Reformation" *ZRGG* XIX (1967) 1–32; U. Mauser, *Der Junge Luther und die Häresie* (Gütersloh 1968); W. Borth, *Die Luthersache (Causa Lutheri) 1517–24* (Lübeck 1970); R. Bäumer, *Martin Luther und der Papst* (Münster 1971); id. (ed.), *Lutherprozess und Lutherbann. Vorgeschichte, Ergebnis, Nachwirkung* (Münster 1972); E. Iserloh, *Aufhebung des Lutherbannes?;* R. Bäumer (ed.), *Lutherprozess und Lutherbann* (Münster 1972) 69–80; D. Oliver, *Der Fall Luthers. Geschichte einer Verurteilung 1517–1521* (Stuttgart 1972); W. Delius, "Der Augustinerorden im Prozess Luthers" *ARG* 63 (1972) 22–42. M. O'Connell, "Cardinal Cajetan: Intellectual and Activist" *The New Scholasticism* L, no. 3 (1976) 310–322.

CHAPTER 5: F. Mann, *Das Abendmahl beim Jungen Luther* (Munich 1971).

CHAPTER 6: E. W. Kohls, *Luthers Entscheidung in Worms* (Stuttgart 1970); F. Reuter (ed.), *Der Wormser Reichstag von 1521. Reichspolitik und Luthersache* (Worms 1971); H. Steitz, *Martin Luther auf dem Reichstag zu Worms 1521* (Frankfurt a. M. 1971); E. W. Kohls, "Die Deutungen des Verhaltens in Worms innerhalb der neueren Historiographie" *ARG* 63 (1972) 43–71; F. T. Bos, *Luther in het orded van de Sorbonne* (Amsterdam 1974).

CHAPTER 7: C. F. Wiesløff, *Abendmahl und Messe. Die Kritik Luthers am Messopfer* (Berlin 1969); F. Pratzner, *Messe und Kreuzesopfer. Die Krise der sakramentalen Idee bei*

Luther und in der mittetalterlichen Scholastik (Vienna 1970); J. Rogge, *Gratia und Donum in Luthers Schrift gegen Latomus. Theolog. Versuche* II (Berlin 1970); E. Iserloh, "Gratia und Donum, Rechtfertigung und Heiligung nach Luthers 'Wider den Löwener Theologen Latomus' (1521)" *Luther und die Reformation* (Aschaffenburg 1974) 88–105.

Chapter 8: W. Hammer, *Die Melanchthonforschung im Wandel der Jahrhunderte,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh 1966–68); W. Maurer, *Der Junge Melanchthon,* 2 vols. (Göttingen 1967–69); H. H. Holfelder, *Tentatio et Consulato. Studien zu Bugenhagens "Interpretatio in Librum Psalmorum"* (Berlin 1974).

Chapter 9: R. E. McNally, "Pope Adrian VI (1522–23) and Church Reform" *AH Pont* 7 (1969) 253–285; K. H. Ducke, *Das Verständnis von Amt und Theologie im Briefwechsel zwischen Hadrian VI und Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Leipzig 1973).

Chapter 11: R. J. Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. The Development of His Thought 1517–1525* (Leiden 1974); F. Kriechbaum, *Grundzüge der Theologie Karlstadts* (Hamburg 1967); G. Franz (ed.), *Thomas Müntzer. Schriften und Briefe* (Gütersloh 1968); G. Wehr (ed.), *Thomas Müntzer, Schriften und Briefe* (Frankfurt 1973) (lit.); M. Steinmetz, *Das Müntzerbild von M. Luther bis Friedrich Engels* (Berlin 1971); Th. Nipperdey, "Theologie und Revolution bei Th. Müntzer" *ARG* 54 (1963) 145–181; P. Wappler, *Müntzer in Zwickau und die Zwickauer Propheten* (Zwickau 1908, Neudruck Gütersloh 1966); M. Bensing, *Thomas Müntzer und der Thüringer Aufstand 1525* (East Berlin 1966); H. J. Goertz, *Innere und äussere Ordnung in der Theologie Th. Müntzers* (Leiden 1967); E. W. Gritsch, *Reformer without a Church. The Life and Thought of Thomas Muentzer (1448–1525)* (Philadelphia 1967); G. Goldbach, *Hans Denck und Thomas Müntzer* (Diss. Theol. Hamburg 1969); E. Iserloh, "Revolution bei Thomas Müntzer. Durchsetzung des Reiches Gottes oder Soziale Aktion" *H. J.* 92 (1972) 282–299; G. Wehr, *Thomas Müntzer in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbeck 1972); K. Ebert, *Theologie und Politisches Handeln. Thomas Müntzer als Modell* (Stuttgart 1973); H. J. Goertz, "Der Mystiker mit dem Hammer. Die Theologische Begründung der Revolution bei Thomas Müntzer" *KuD* 20 (1974) 23–53; W. Elliger, *Thomas Müntzer. Leben und Werk* (Göttingen 1975).

Chapter 12: A. Waas, *Die Bauern im Kampf um Gerechtigkeit 1300–1525* (Munich 1964); H. Angermeier, "Die Vorstellung des Gemeinen Mannes von Staat und Reich im Deutschen Bauernkrieg" *VSWG* 53 (1966) 329–343; A. Franke (ed.), *Das Buch der hundert Kapitel und der vierzig Statuten des sog. oberrheinischen Revolutionärs. Historische Analysen von G. Zschäbitz* (Berlin 1967); H. Buszello, *Bauernkrieg von 1525 als politische Bewegung* (Berlin 1969); K. Kaczerowsky (ed.), *Flugschriften des Bauernkrieges* (Reinbeck 1970); D. W. Sabean, *Landbesitz und Gesellschaft am Vorabend des Bauernkrieges* (Stuttgart 1972); H. Vahle, "Der dt. Bauernkrieg als politische Bewegung im Urteil der Geschichtsschreibung" *GWU 23* (1972) 257–277; R. Endres, "Der Bauernkrieg in Franken" *BDLG* 109 (1973) 31–68; P. Blickle, *Landschaften im Alten Reich* (Munich 1973); id., *Die Revolution von 1525* (Munich 1975); M. Brecht, "Der theologische Hintergrund der zwölf Artikel der Bauernschaft in Schwaben von 1525" *ZKG* 85 (1974) 174–208; R. Wohlfeil (ed.), *Der Bauernkrieg 1524–1526. Bauernkrieg und Reformation* (Munich 1975); W. Lenk (ed.), *Dokumente aus dem dt. Bauernkrieg* (Leipzig 1974) (lit.); G. Seebass, "Bauernkrieg und Täufertum in Franken" *ZKG* 85 (1974) 284–300; W. Becker, *Reformation und Revolution* (Münster 1974); M. Bemsing–S. Hoyer, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg 1524–1526* (Berlin ^{3}1975); G. Heitz, A. Laube, M. Steinmetz, G. Vogler (eds.), *Der Bauer im Klassenkampf* (Berlin 1975); M. Kabusch–E. Müller, *Der deutsche*

Bauernkrieg in Dokumenten (Weimar 1975); *Flugschriften der Bauernkriegszeit,* ed. Christel Laufer et al. (Berlin 1975).

CHAPTER 13: Lewis W. Spitz, *The Renaissance and Reformation Movements* (Chicago 1971); W. P. Eckert, *Erasmus von Rotterdam: Werk und Wirkung* II: *Humanismus und Reformation* (Cologne 1967); H. J. McSorley, *Luthers Lehre vom unfreien Willen* (Munich 1967); R. D. Jones, *Erasmus and Luther* (Oxford 1968); *Colloquia Erasmiana Turonensia* I–II, *Douzième Stage International d'Etudes Humanistes* (Tours 1969); G. Faludy, *Erasmus of Rotterdam* (London 1970); R. H. Bainton, *Erasmus. Reformer zwischen den Fronten* (Göttingen 1972); A. G. Dickens, *The Age of Humanism and Reformation. Europe in the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Centuries* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1972); M. Hoffman, *Erkenntis und Verwirklichung der wahren Theologie nach Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Tübingen 1972); A. Rabil, Jr., *Erasmus and the New Testament. The Mind of a Christian Humanist* (San Antonio, Tex., 1972); H. Holeczek, "Die Haltung des Erasmus zu Luther nach dem Scheitern seiner Vermittlungspolitik 1520–21" *ARG* 64 (1973) 85–112; G. B. Winkler, *Erasmus von Rotterdam und die Einleitungsschriften zum NT* (Münster 1974); W. Hentze, *Kirche und Kirchliche Einheit bei Desiderius Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Paderborn 1974); M. Brod, *Johannes Reuchlin und sein Kampf* (Stuttgart 1965); L. Borinski, *Englischer Humanismus und deutsche Reformation* (Göttingen 1969); *Willibald Pirckheimer 1470–1970, Dokumente, Studien, Perspektiven,* ed. W. Pirckheimer-Kuratorium (Nuremberg 1970); W. P. Eckert–Eh. von Imhoff, *W. Pirckheimer, Dürers Freund, im Spiegel seines Lebens, seiner Werke und seiner Umwelt* (Cologne 1971).

CHAPTER 14: F. Büsser, *Das katholische Zwinglibild* (Zürich 1968); U. Gräbler, "Die Zwingli-Forschung seit 1960" *ThLZ* 96 (1971) 481–490; R. Pfister, *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz* II: *Von der Reformation bis zum Zweiten Villmerger Krieg* (Zürich 1974); J. Courvoisier, *Zwingli als reformierter Theologe* (Neukirchen 1966); R. C. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto 1967); R. Hauswirth, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen und Zwingli* (Tübingen 1968); M. Haas, *Huldrych Zwingli und seine Zeit. Leben und Werk des Zürcher Reformators* (Zürich 1969); G. W. Locher, *Huldrych Zwingli in neuer Sicht* (Zurich 1969); K. Maeder, *Die Via Media in der Schweizerischen Reformation* (Zurich 1970); W. Jacob, *Politische Führungsschicht und Reformation. Untersuchungen zur Reformation in Zürich 1519–1528* (Zurich 1970); O. Scheib, "Die Theologischen Diskussionen Huldrych Zwinglis, in: *Von Konstanz nach Trient,* ed. R. Bäumer (Munich 1972) 395–417.

CHAPTER 15: *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer:* Vol. 11 *Österreich I,* ed. G. Mecenseffy (Gütersloh 1964); Vol. 12 *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter,* ed. R. Friedmann (Gütersloh 1967); Vol. 13 *Österreich II,* ed. G. Mecenseffy; R. Friedmann (ed.), *Die Schriften der Huterischen Täufergemeinschaften* (Graz 1965); H. G. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia 1962); R. Friemann, "Das Täuferische Glaubensgut" *ARG* 55 (1964) 145–161; C. P. Clasen, *Die Wiedertäufer im Herzogtum Württemberg* (Stuttgart 1965); id., *Anabaptism. A Social History 1525–1618* (London 1972); F. H. Littel, *Das Selbstverständnis der Täufer* (Kassel 1966); W. Schäufele, *Das missionarische Bewusstsein und Wirken der Täufer* (Neukirchen 1966); J. H. Yoder, *Täufertum und Reformation im Gespräch* (Zurich 1968); C. Krahn, *Dutch Anabaptism (1450–1600)* (The Hague 1968); H. D. Schmid, "Das Hutsche Täufertum" *HJ* 99 (1971) 327–344; H. D. Plümper, *Die Gütergemeinschaft bei den Taufen des 16 Jahrhunderts* (Göppingen 1972); E. Geldbach, "Toward a More Ample Biography of the Hessian Anabaptist Leader Melchior Rinck" *MQR* 48 (1974) 371–184; G. H. Williams, "German Mysticism in the Polarization of Ethical Behavior in Luther and the Anabaptists" *MQR* 48 (1974) 275–

304; R. von Dülmen (ed.), *Das Täuferreich zu Münster 1534–1535* (Munich 1974) (lit.); R. Stupperich (ed.), *Die Schriften Bernhard Rothmanns* (Münster 1970); J. W. Porter, *Bernhard Rothmann (1495–1535)* (Diss. Wisconsin 1964); G. Brendler, *Das Täuferreich zu Münster 1534–35* (East Berlin 1966); O. Rammstedt, *Sekte und Soziale Bewegung* (Cologne 1966); K. H. Kirchhoff, *Die Täufer in Münster 1534–35* (Münster 1973); G. List, *Chiliastische Utopie und radikale Reformation* (Munich 1973); C. Bornhäuser, *Leben und Lehre Menno Simons': Ein Kampf um das Fundament des Glaubens* (ca. 1469–1561) (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973); M. Barbers, *Toleranz bei Sebastian Franck* (Bonn 1964); H. Weigelt, *Sebastian Frank und die lutherische Reformation* (Gütersloh 1972); E. W. Gerdes, "Pietistisches bei Kaspar von Schwenckfeld" *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae* (Louvain 1967) 105–137.

CHAPTER 16: J. Lortz, "Wert und Grenzen der Katholischen Kontroverstheologie" A. Franzen (ed.), *Um Reform und Reformation* (Münster 1968) 9–32; F.-J. Kötter, *Die Eucharistielehre in den katholischen Katechismen des 16 Jahrundert* (Münster 1969); P. Fraenkel, "John Eck's Enchiridion of 1525 and Luther's Earliest Arguments Against Papal Primacy" *StTh* 21 (1967) 110–163; id., "Johann Eck und Sir Thomas More 1525 bis 1526," in: *Von Konstanz nach Trient,* ed. R. Bäumer (Munich 1972) 519–545; K. Rischer, *Johann Eck auf dem Reichstag zu Augsburg 1530* (Münster 1968); H. A. Oberman, "Wittenbergs Zweifrontenkrieg gegen Prierias und Eck" *ZKG* 80 (1969) 331–358; G. Epiney-Burgard, *Jean Eck et le Commentaire de la Théologie Mystique du Pseudo-Denys.* Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance 34 (1972) 7–29; E. Iserloh, "Die Verteidigung der Bilder durch Johannes Eck zu Beginn des Reformatorischen Bildersturms: Aus Reformation und Gegenreformation" *Würzburger Diözesan-Geschichtsblätter* 35–36 (1974) 75–85; J. Beumer, "Friedrich Nausea und seine Wirksameit zu Frankfurt, auf den Colloquien zu Hagenau und Worms und auf dem Trienter Konzil" *ZKTh* 94 (1972) 29–45; R. Bäumer, "Das Kirchenverständnis Albert Pigges" *Volk Gottes* (Freiburg 1967) 306–322; J. Rouchausse, *La Vie et l'Oeuvre de John Fisher, Évêque de Rochester, 1496–1535* (Nieuwkoop–Angers 1972); E. Surtz SJ, *The Works and Days of John Fisher. An Introduction to the Position of St. John Fisher (1496–1535), Bishop of Rochester, in the English Renaissance and the Reformation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); J. Rouchausse (ed.), *Erasmus and Fisher. Their Correspondence, 1511–1524* (Paris 1968); A. Bodem, *Das Wesen der Kirche nach Kardinal Cajetan. Ein Beitrag zur Ekklesiologie im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Trier 1971); M. W. Anderson, "Thomas Cajetan's Scientia Christi" *ThZ* 26 (1970) 99–108; J. P. Massaut, *Josse Clichtove: l'Humanisme et la Réforme du Clergé (1472–1520)*, 2 vols. (Paris 1969); G. Chaintraine SJ, "Josse Clichtove: Témoin de l'Humanisme Parisien. Scolastique et Célibat au XVI^{e} Siècle" *RHE* 66 (1971) 507–528; R. Braunisch, *Die Theologie der Rechtfertigung im "Enchiridion" (1538) des Johannes Gropper* (Münster 1974); O. Müller, *Bischof. J. Pflug von Naumburg-Zeitz in seinem Bemühen um die Einheit der Kirche. Beiträge zu Gesch. des Erzb. Magdeburg* (Leipzig 1968) 155–178; Julius Pflug, *Correspondence,* ed. J. V. Pollet, 2 vols. to date (Leiden 1969–73); J. V. Pollet, "Gropper und J. Pflug nach ihrer Korrespondenz" *Paderbornensis Ecclesia* (Paderborn 1972) 223–244; W. Kaliner, *J. Pflugs Verhältnis zur "Christlichen Lehre" des Johann von Maltitz* (Leipzig 1972).

THOMAS MURNER, *Werke* (German), ed. F. Schultz, 9 vols. (Strassburg–Berlin 1918–1928); "Des alten christl. Bären Testament," ed. M. Scherer: *Anzeiger für Schweizer. Gesch.* 50 (Bern 1919) 6–38; "Des Jungen Bären Zahnweh," ed. J. Lefftz: *AElsKG* 1 (1926) 141–167; "Purgatio Vulgaris," ed. J. Lefftz: *AElsKG* 3 (1928) 97–114; *Die gottesheilige Messe,* ed. W. Pfeiffer-Belli (Halle 1928); *M. im Schweizer Glaubenskampf,* ed. W. Pfeiffer-Belli (Münster 1939); "De Immaculata Virginis Conceptione. Eine unvollendete Jugendschr.," ed. F. Landmann: *AElsKG* 15 (1941–42) 73–128.—Lit.: Th. von Liebenau, *Der Franziskaner Dr. Th. M.* (Freiburg 1913); J. Lefftz, *Die Volkstüml. Stilelemente in M.s Satiren* (Strassburg 1915); E. Fuchs, "M.s Belesenheit, Bildungsgang u. Wissen" *FStud* 9 (1922) 70–79; P. Scherer, *M.s Verhältnis zum Humanismus* (Basel 1929); F. Landmann, "M. als Prediger" *AElsKG* 10 (1935) 295–368; M. Sondheim, *M. als Astrolog* (Strassburg 1938); R. Newald, "Wandlungen des M.bildes: Beitr. z. Geistes- u. Kulturgesch. der Oberrheinlande," ed. H. Gumbel (Fr 1938) 40–78; id., *Elsässische Charakterköpfe aus dem Zeitalter des Humanismus* (Colmar 1944) III:185; A. Erler, *M. als Jurist* (Freiburg 1956). P. L. Nyhus, "Caspar Schatzgeyer and Conrad Pellican: The Triumph of Dissension in the Early Sixteenth Century" *ARG* 61 (1970) 179–204; J. Beumer, "Erasmus von Rotterdam und G. Witzel" *Cath* 22 (1968) 41–67; G. Scholtz, *Die Aufzeichnungen des Hildesheimer Dechanten Johan Oldecop (1493–1574). Reformation und katholische Kirche im Spiegel von Chroniken des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Münster 1972).

CHAPTER 17: E. Fabian (ed.), *Quellen zur Gesch. der Reformationshindernisse und der Konstanzer Reformationsprozesse 1529–1548* (Tübingen 1967); O. Scheib, *Die Reformationsdiskussionen in der Hansestadt Hamburg 1522–28* (Münster 1975).

CHAPTER 18: H. Kunst (ed.), *Martin Luther und die Kirche* (Stuttgart 1971); H. W. Krumwiede, *Zur Entstehung des landesherrlichen Kirchenregiments in Kursachsen und Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel* (Göttingen 1967); H. H. Schrey (ed.), *Reich Gottes und Welt. Die Lehre Luthers von den zwei Reichen* (Darmstadt 1969); U. Duchrow, *Christenheit und Weltverantwortung. Traditionsgeschichte und syst. Struktur der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre* (Stuttgart 1970); A. Hakamies, *Eigengesetzlichkeit der natürlichen Ordnungen als Grundproblem der neueren Lutherdeutung. Studien zur Geschichte der Problematik der Zwei-Reiche-Lehre Luthers* (Witten 1971); G. Ruhbach (ed.), *Die Vorstellung von zwei Reichen und Regimentern bis Luther* (Gütersloh 1972); G. Wolf, *Luther und die Obrigkeit* (Darmstadt 1972); R. Ohlig, *Die Zwei-Reiche-Lehre Luthers in der Auslegung der deutschen lutherischen Theologie der Gegenwart seit 1945* (Diss. Theol. Münster 1974); J. Haun (ed.), *Zur Zwei-Reiche-Lehre Luthers* (Munich 1973) (lit.); K. Trüdinger, *Luthers Briefe und Gutachten an weltliche Obrigkeiten zur Durchführung der Reformation* (Münster 1975); J. Aarts, *Die Lehre Martin Luthers über das Amt in der Kirche. Eine genetisch-systematische Untersuchung seiner Schriften von 1512 bis 1525* (Hämeenliena–Helsinki 1972); P. Manns, "Amt und Eucharistie in der Theologie Martin Luthers," in: *Amt und Eucharistie,* with additions by P. Bläser et al. (Paderborn 1973) 68–173; W. Stein, *Das Kirchliche Amt bei Luther* (Wiesbaden 1974).

CHAPTER 19: P. Johannsen, "Gedruckte deutsche und undeutsche Messen für Riga" *Zschr. f. Ostforschung* 8 (1959) 523–532; E. W. Kohls (ed.), *Evangelische Katechism in der Reformationszeit vor und neben Martin Luthers Kleinem Katechismus* (Gütersloh 1971).

CHAPTER 20: G. Müller, *Die römische Kurie und die Reformation 1523–34. Kirche und Politik während des Pontifikats Clemens VII.* (Gütersloh 1969).

CHAPTER 21: G. Mog (ed.), *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch* (Gütersloh 1970); S. Hausmann, *Römerbriefauslegung zwischen Humanismus und Reformation* (Zurich 1970); Heinrich Bullinger, *Werke. Zweite Abteilung. Briefwechsel. Bd 1 Brr. der Jahre 1524 bis 1531,* updated by Ulrich Gabler and Endre Zsindely (Zurich 1973); J. Staedtke, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der gedruckten Werke von Heinrich Bullinger* (Zurich 1972); Ph. Melanchthon, *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae,* ed. H. G. Pöhlmann (Gütersloh 1967).

CHAPTER 22: W. Günther, *Martin Luther und die Reichsverfassung* (Diss. Phil. Freiburg 1972); W. Maurer, "Zur Entstehung und Textgeschichte der Schwabacher Artikel" *The-*

ologie in Geschichte und Kunst. Walter Elliger zum 65 Geburtstag (Witten 1968) 134–151; K. Rischar, *Johann Eck auf dem Reichstag zu Augsburg* (Münster 1968), W. Maurer, "Erwägungen und Verhandlungen über die Geistliche Jurisdiktion der Bischöfe vor und während des Augsburger Reichstags von 1530" *ZSavRGkan* 55 (1969) 348–394; L. Grane, *Die Confessio Augustana* (Wiesbaden 1970); G. Müller, 'Kardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, die Römische Kurie und der Augsburger Reichstag von 1530" *NAKG* 52 (1972) 133–152; E. Honée, "Die Theologische Diskussion über den Laienkelch auf dem Augsburger Reichstag 1530. Versuch einer historischen Rekonstruktion" *NAKG* 52 (1972) 1–96; H. Immenkötter, *Um die Einheit im Glauben* (Münster 1974); M. Bucer, *Opera Omnia.* Ser. I: *Deutsche Schriften.* Vol. 3: *Confessio Tetrapolitana und die Schriften des Jahres 1531,* ed. R. Stupperich (Gütersloh 1969); A. Engelbrecht, *"Abconterfeytung Martin Butzers"* (1546), ed. W. Bellardi (Münster 1974): *CCath* 31; E. W. Kohls, "Martin Bucers Katechismus vom Jahre 1534 und seine Stellung innerhalb der Katechismusgeschichte" *ZBKG* 39 (1970) 83–94; W. P. Steffens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (Cambridge 1970).

CHAPTER 23: H. Scheible (ed.), *Das Widerstandsrecht als Problem der deutschen Protestanten 1523–46* (Gütersloh 1969) (lit.); W. von Loewenich, *Duplex Iustitia. Luthers Stellung zu einer Unionsformel des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden 1972); P. Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg* (Oxford 1972).

CHAPTER 24: Hermann von Wied, *Einfältiges Bedenken. Reformationsentwurf für das Erzstift Köln von 1543,* ed. H. Gerhards–W. Borth (Düsseldorf 1972); A. Franzen, *Bischof und Reformation. Erzb. Hermann von Wied in Cologne* (Münster 1972); id., "Zur Vorgeschichte des Reformationsversuchs des Kölner Erzbischofs Hermann von Wied" *HJ* 88 (1968) 300–324; id., "Hermann von Wied, Kurfürst und Erzbischof von Köln" *Der Reichstag zu Worms von 1521* (Worms 1971) 297–315; H. Buck–E. Fabian, *Konstanzer Reformationsgeschichte in ihren Grundzügen* (Tübingen 1965); H. C. Rublack, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Konstanz von den Anfängen bis zum Abschluss 1531* (Gütersloh 1971); B. Caspar, *Das Erzbistum Trier im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung* (Münster 1966); M. M. Chrisman, *Strasbourg and the Reform* (New York 1967); H. Stratenworth, *Die Reformation in der Stadt Osnabrück* (Wiesbaden 1971); J. Vögeli (ed.), *Schriften zur Reformation in Konstanz, 1519–38* (Tübingen 1973); Interim: *Acta Reformationis Catholicae* IV (Regensburg 1974) 255–348; J. Mehlhausen (ed.), *Das Augsburger Interim von 1548. Nach den Reichstagsakten Deutsch und Lateinisch herausgegeben* (Neukirchen 1970); H. Jedin, *Interim statt Konzil: Gesch. d. Konzils v. Trient* III (Freiburg 1970) 197–215; H. Rabe, *Reichsbund und Interim. Die Verfassung und Religionspolitik Karls V. und der Reichstag von Augsburg 1547–1548* (Cologne 1971); M. Stupperich, "Das Augsburger Interim als apokalyptisches Geschehnis nach den Königsberger Schriften Andreas Osianders" *ARG* 64 (1973) 225–245; W. Bellardi, "Bucers 'Summarischer Vergriff' und das Interim in Strassburg" *ZKG* 85 (1974) 64–76.

CHAPTER 26: *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Kirchengeschichte Ostmitteleuropas,* ed. Ostkirchenausschuss Hannover (Ulm 1959); B. Geissler–G. Stöckl, in: *Oriente Crux. Versuch einer Geschichte der reformatorischen Kirchen im Raum zwischen der Ostsee und dem Schwarzen Meer* (Stuttgart 1963); K. Juhasz, *Das Tschanad-Temesvarer Bistum im Spätmittelalter* 1307—1572 (Munich-Paderborn 1964); P. Kawerau, "Die Reformation in Ost- und Südosteuropa" *Reformation und Gegenwart,* ed. H. Grass (Marburg 1968); C. Bonorand, "Joachim Vadians Beziehung zu Ungarn" *Zwingli* 13 (1969) 97–131; D. Caccamo, *Eretici Italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania (1558–1611)* (Florence 1970); U. Arnold, "Luther und Danzig" (lit.) *Zschr. f. Ostforschung* 21 (1972) 94–121.

CHAPTER 27: Ph. Hughes, *Theology of the English Reformers* (London 1965); W. P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (London 1968); J. Ridley, *John Knox* (London 1968).

CHAPTER 28: E. O. Reichert, "In Tanta Ecclesiarum Mestitia" *ZKG* 78 (1967) 253–270; *Andreas Osiander d. Ä. Gesamtausgabe Bd. 1. Schriften und Briefe 1522 bis März 1525,* in Zusammenarbeit mit Gottfried Seebass, ed. Gerhard Müller (Gütersloh 1975); J. Seebass, *Bibliographia Osiandrica* (Nieuwkoop 1971); G. Seebass, *Das Reformatorische Werke des A. Osiander* (Nuremberg 1967).

CHAPTER 29: R. Stauffer, *Calvins Menschlichkeit* (Zurich 1964); J. I. Packer, *Calvin the Theologian: Courtenay Studies in Reformation Theology* I (Abingdon 1966) 149–175; Fr. Wendel, *Calvin. Ursprung und Entwicklung seiner Theologie* (Neukirchen 1968); A. Ganoczy, *Ecclesia Ministrans. Dienende Kirche und kirchlicher Dienst bei Calvin* (Freiburg 1968); D. Schellong, *Das Evangelische Gesetz in der Auslegung Calvins* (Munich 1968); J. Staestke, *Johannes Calvin* (Göttingen 1969); D. Schellong, *Calvins Auslegung der synoptischen Evangelien* (Munich 1969); J. Cadier, "La Conversion de Calvin" *Bull-SocHistPrFr* 116 (1970) 142–151; T. W. Casteel, "Calvin and Trent" *HTR* 63 (1970) 91–117; W. Neuser, *Calvin* (Berlin 1971); U. Schmidt (ed.), *Johannes Calvin und die Kirche. Ein Lesebuch* (Stuttgart 1972); T. Stadtland, *Rechfertigung und Heiligung bei Calvin* (Neukirchen 1972); H. Schützeichel, *Die Christologie Calvins* (Munich 1972); id., *Die Glaubenstheologie Calvins* (Munich 1972); W. Bahkle, *Calvijn en de Doperse Radikalen* (Amsterdam 1973); J. Bratt (ed.), *The Heritage of John Calvin. Heritage Hall Lectures 1960–70* (Grand Rapids, Mich. 1973); U. Plath, *Calvin und Basel in den Jahren 1552 bis 1556* (Zurich 1974).

CHAPTER 30: K. J. Seidel, *Frankreich und die deutschen Protestanten* (Münster 1970); J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, "De Bartholomeusnacht" *NAKG* 54 (1973) 77–105; J. Railt, *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza. Development of the Reformed Doctrine* (Chambersburg, Pa. 1972); O. de Jong, "Die Emder Generalsynode vor dem Hintergrund der Westeuropäischen Reformationsgeschichte" *Jb. d. Gesellsch. für Niedersächsische KG* 68 (1970) 9–24; W. Reinhard, *Die Reform in der Diözese Carpentras unter den Bischöfen J. Sadoleto, P. Sadoleto, J. Sacrati, und F. Sadoleto 1517–1596* (Münster 1966); C. A. Tucker, *De Classis Dordrecht van 1573–1609* (Leiden 1965); O. Press, *Calvinismus und Territorial-Staat. Regierung und Zentralbehörden der Kurpfalz 1559–1619* (Stuttgart 1970); M. Schaab, "Die Wiederherstellung des Katholizismus in der Kurpfalz in XVII und XVIII Jh" *ZGObrh* 114 (1966) 147–205; W. Hollweg, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Heidelberger Katechismus* II (Neukirchen 1968); G. Güldner, *Das Toleranz-Problem in den Niederlanden im Ausgang des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Lübeck 1968); H. J. Hillerbrand, "The Spread of the Protestant Reformation of the 16th Century" *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 47 (1968) 265–286; H. Schilling, *Niederländische Exulanten im 16. Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh 1972); U. Beyer, *Abendmahl und Messe. Sinn und Recht der 80. Frage des Heidelberger Katechismus* (Neukirchen 1965); *Mélanges d'Histoire du XVI^{e} Siècle: Offers à Henri Meylan* (Geneva 1970); D. Nugent, *Ecumenism in the Age of the Reformation: The Colloquy of Poissy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974); E. Droz, *Chemins de l'Hérésie: Textes et Documents.* 2 vols. (Geneva 1970–71); N. M. Sutherland, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the European Conflict, 1559–1572* (New York, 1973); P. Bietenholz, *Basle and France in the 16th Century: The Basle Humanists and Printers* (Toronto 1971); H. Salmon, *The French Wars of Religion* (Boston 1967).

CHAPTER 31: E. Hassinger, *Religiöse Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert* (Basel 1966); F. Schrader, *Die Visitationen der kath. Klöster im Erzbistum Magdeburg durch die evgl. Landesherren 1561–1651* (Münster 1969); id., *Reformation und katholische Klöster* (Leipzig 1973); E. W. Zeeden (ed.), *Gegenreformation* (Darmstadt 1973); H. J. Köhler, *Obrigkeitliche Konfessionsänderung in Kondominaten* (Münster 1975).

Part Two

Basic Ideas and General Descriptions

The two components of the ecclesiastical renewal of the Tridentine Era, "Catholic Reform" and "Counter Reformation," have found in historiography, if not in general, a more univocal significance in so far as, since the Second Vatican Council, one speaks of the end of the Counter Reformation. From the copious body of literature accepting this assumption we list the following selections: F. Molinari, "La Riforma Cattolica" *Scuola Cattolica* 97 (1969) 163ff. (lit.); I. C. Olin, *The Catholic Reformation* (New York 1969); R. Garcia Villada–B. Llorca, *Historia de la Iglesia Católica* III: *Edad Nueva. La Iglesia en la Época del Rinacimiento y de la Reforma Católica* (Madrid 1967); *Sacramentum Mundi* II 1078ff.; M. Marocchi provides evidence for the continuance of reform efforts within the Church in *La Riforma Cattolica, Documenti e Testimonianze,* 2 vols. (Brescia 1970). That Luther and Ignatius of Loyola and the Tridentine Reform really belong to the world of the Middle Ages is the theme of F. Rapp, *L'Église et la Vie Religieuse en Occident à la Fin du Moyen Âge* (Paris 1971). Although the author is close to our position, he nevertheless maintains the traditional distinction: H. D. Evennett, *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation,* edited by I. Bossy (Cambridge, 1968), lecture on the subject in: I. W. O'Malley, "Recent Studies in Church History 1300–1600" *CHR* 55 (1969) 394–437; the widest survey of bibliography is in *AHPont;* M. B. O'Connell, *The Counter Reformation: 1559–1610* (New York 1974).

SECTION ONE

Origin and Breakthrough of the Catholic Reform to 1563

EARLY PHASES IN ITALY AND SPAIN: Italian reform bishops of the 15th cent.: L. Pesce, *Ludovico Barbo, Vescovo di Treviso 1437–1443,* 2 vols. (Padua 1969); St. Orlandi, *S. Antonino. Studi Bio-bibliografici,* 2 vols. (Florence 1960); id., "Gli Ultimi Otto Anni di Episcopato di S. Antonino secondo il Registro di Entrata e Uscita e Molti Altri Documenti Inediti" *Memorie Domenicane* NS 36 (1960) 169–248; G. Dufner, "Antonio

Bettini, Jesuat und Bischof von Foligno" *RSTI* 18 (1964) 399–428 (B., +1487, personally pious and an active publicist, he was of little importance in Foligno); A. Prosperi, *Tra Evangelismo e Controriforma: G. M. Giberti, 1495–1543* (Rome 1969), presently the most comprehensive biography of the famous bishop; V. Meneghini, "Due Compagnie sul Modello di Quelle del Divino Amore Fondate da Francescani a Feltre e Verona 1499–1503" *AFH* 62 (1969) 518–564; N. H. Minnich, "Concepts of Reform Proposed to the Fifth Lateran Council" *AHPont* 7 (1969) 163–251.—Important for Savonarola's influence: R. Creytens, "Les Actes Capitulaires de la Congregation Toscano-Romaine OP (1496–1530)" *AFP* 40 (1970) 125–230.

CHURCH REFORM IN SPAIN AT THE TURN OF THE FIFTEENTH TO SIXTEENTH CENTURIES: I. Garcia Oro, *La Reforma de los Religiosos Españoles en Tiempo de los Reyes Católicos* (Valladolid 1969); id., *Cisneros y la Reforma del Clero Español en Tiempo de los Reyes Católicos* (Madrid 1971); Tarsicio de Ascona, "Reforma de la Provincia Francescana de la Corona de Aragón en Tiempo de los Reyes Católicos" *EstFranc* 7 (1970) 245–344.—J. P. Massaut, *Josse Clichtove. L'Humanisme et la Réforme du Clergé,* 2 vols. (Paris 1968). On the Bishop of Albi's not too successful efforts to reform the French Carmelites: L. van Wijnen, *La Congrégation d'Albi (1499–1602)* (Rome 1971).

NEW ORDERS: G. Llompart, *Caetano de Thiene. Estudios Sobre un Reformator Religioso* (Wiesbaden 1969); C. Linari, "Il Beato Giovanni Marinoni" *Regnum Dei* (1962) 7–46, biography of the Theatine of Venice; Ph. Caraman, *Sant'Angela Merici. Vita della Fondatrice della Compagnie di Sant'Orsola e della Orsoline* (Bresica 1965); L. Moletta, *La Compagnie di S. Angela Merici a Chiari e le Sue Opere* (Bresica 1966); T. Ledóchowska, *Angèle Merici et la Compagnie de Sainte-Ursule à la Lumière des Documents,* 2 vols. (Rome 1967).

IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA AND THE FOUNDING OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS: Bibliography *AHSJ* 35 (1966) 420ff. and the following volumes, finally 43 (1974) 399ff.; I. Iparaguirre, "Desmitificación de S. Ignacio" *AHSJ* 41 (1972) 357–87; A. Jiménez Oñate, *El Origen de la Compañia de Jesús* (Rome 1966).—On the constitutions of the orders: G. Philippart, "Visiteurs, Commissaires, et Inspecteurs dans la Compagnie de Jesus de 1540 à 1615" *AHSJ* 37 (1968).—Important on pedagogical methods: G. Codina, *Aux Sources de la Pédagogie des Jesuites. Le "Modus Parisiensis"* (Rome 1968); the sources in the early period from 1500 to 1556 in the *Monumenta Paedagogica Soc. Jesu* I, edited by L. Lukács (Rome 1965); M. Foss, *The Founding of the Jesuits* (London 1969), in *AHSJ* 43 (1974) 176ff., not adequately evaluated; E. M. Buxbaum, *Petrus Canisius und die kircheiche Erneuerung des Herzogtums Bayern 1459–1556* (Rome 1973).

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT: The edition of the Acts has been continued by Th. Freudenberger VII:2 (1975); Vol. III of Jedin's *Council of Trent,* treating the Bologna period and the second period at Trent, appeared in 1970; Vol. IV, on the conclusion, 1562–63, appeared in 1975; H. Rabe, *Reichsbund und Interim. Die Verfassungs- und Religionspolitik Karls V. und der Reichstag von Augsburg 1547–48* (Cologne 1971).—On the position of the Protestants at Trent, 1551–52, see M. Brecht, "Abgrenzung oder Verständigung. Was wollten die Protestanten in Trient" *Blätter f. Württembergische Kirchengeschichte* 70 (1970) 148–175; F. Schrader, "Die Beschickung des Konzils von Trient durch die Diözesen Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Merseburg, Naumburg und Meissen. Ein Briefwechsel aus den Jahren 1551–52" *AHC* 2 (1970) 303–352.—The debate on the Constitution on Divine Revelation at Vatican II produced a copious body of literature on the subject of the relationship between scripture and tradition, especially by Ortigues,

Congar, Bévenot, and others, cited by J. Ratzinger in: *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* II (Freiburg 1967) 498ff.; M. Midali, "Rivelazione, Chiesa, Scrittura, e Tradizione alle IV Sessione del Concilio di Trento" *Salesianum* 34, 607–650; 35 (1973) 3–51, 179–246.—Other difficult issues, especially in the postconciliar discussions on the sense and importance of the Tridentine decrees were those on original sin (Sess. V); Z. Alszeghy–M. Flick, "Il Decreto Tridentino sul Peccato Originale" *Gregorianum* 52 (1971) 595–635; B. A. Vanneste, *Het Dogma van de Erfzonde* (Utrecht 1969).—On the Eucharist (Sess. XIII), J. Wohlmuth, *Realpräsenz und Transsubstantiation im Konzil von Trient,* 2 vols. (Bern–Frankfurt 1975); G. Fahrnberger, *Amt und Eucharistie auf dem Konzil von Trient,* in: P. Bläser, *Amt und Eucharistie* (Paderborn 1973) 174–207.—On the sacrament of penance (Sess. XIV): H. Jedin, "La Nécessité de la Confession Privée selon le Concile de Trente" *La Maison Dieu* 104 (1970) 88–115; K. J. Becker, "Die Notwendigkeit des vollständigen Bekenntnisses in der Beichte nach dem Konzil von Trient" *Theologie und Philosophie* 47 (1972) 161–228, on canon 3 and 10; Fr. Rodriquez: *Burgense* 13 (1972) 69–84; 14 (1973) 107–136; reaching further back, L. Braekmans, *Confession et Communion au Moyen Âge et au Concile de Trente* (Gembloux 1971).—On the decree on orders (Sess. XXIII): G. Fahrnberger, *Bischofsamt und Priestertum in den Diskussionen des Konzils von Trient* (Vienna 1970); P. F. Franzen, *Das Konzil von Trient und das Priestertum: Priester-Beruf im Widerstreit,* ed. A. Descamos (Innsbruck 1971) 101–137; more on this by I. A. De Aldama, B. Jacqueline, J. Saraiva Martins in: *Teologia del Sacerdocio* V (Burgos 1973); J. Galot, "Le Caratère Sacerdotal selon le Concile de Trente" *NRTh* 93 (1971) 123–946.—The sacrament of marriage and the Tametsi: H. Jedin, *Die Unauflöslichkeit der Ehe nach dem Konzil von Trient:* K. Reinhard–H. Jedin, *Ehe–Sakrament in der Kirche des Herrn* (Berlin 1971) 61–109, 123–135; G. Di Mattia, "La Dotrina sulla Formazione Canonica del Matrimonio e la Proposta per un Suo Esame" *Apollinaris* 44 (1971) 471–522.—Material especially on the origin and implementation of the reform decrees of Trent in: *Il Concilio di Trento. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Trento 2-6 Settembre 1963,* 2 vols. (Rome 1965); H. Jedin, *Kirche des Glaubens—Kirche der Geschichte* II (Freiburg 1966) (this contains the largest collection of essays by the author on the history of the Council of Trent).

SECTION TWO

The Papacy and the Implementation of the Council of Trent (1565–1605)

THE PAPACY, ROME, AND ITALY: H. Jedin, "Nuntiaturberichte und Durchführung des Konzils von Trient" *QF* 63 (1973) 180–213; in the same volume are contributions by H. Lutz, G. Lutz, G. Müller, and H. Goetz on the criticisms and evaluations of the reports of the papal nuncios; of special interest here is K. Repgen, "Die Finanzen des Nuntius Fabio Chigi. Ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte der römischen Führungsgruppe im 17. Jh." *Geschichte—Wirtschaft—Gesellschaft. Festschrift Clemens Bauer* (Berlin 1974) 220–280; J. Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio Germanica und die Kath. Reform in Deutschland nach dem Tridentium* (Münster 1972) (=RST 105); H. Jedin, *Papst Pius V., die Heilige*

Liga und der Kreuzzugsgedanke: Il Mediterraneo nella Seconda Metà del '500 alla Luce di Lepanto (Florence (1974) 193–213; A. Walz, "S. Tommaso d'Aquino Dichiarto Dottore della Chiesa nel 1567" *Angelicum* 44 (1967) 145–173; P. Hurtubise, "Comment Rome apprit la Nouvelle du Massacre de la Sainte Barthélemy" *AHPont* 10 (1972) 187–210; J. Mieck, "Die Bartholomäusnacht als Forschungsproblem" *HZ* 216 (1973) 73–110; N. Sutherland, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the European Conflict 1559–1572* (New York 1973); H. D. R. Veroliet, "Robert Granjou à Rome 1578–1589. Note Préliminaire à une Histoire de la Typographie Romaine à la fin du XVI^e^ Siècle" *Bull. de l'Institut Belge de Rome* 38 (1967) 177–231; H. Jedin, *Die Autobiographie des Kardinals G. A. Santorio* (Wiesbaden 1969) (=Akademie der Wiss. und der Literatur Mainz, Abh. d. Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Klasse; Jg. 1969, 2); V. Peri, "La Congregazione dei Greci e i Suoi Primi Documenti" *Studia Gratiana* 13:129–256; V. Peri, *Chiesa Romana a "Rito" Greco. G. A. Santoro e la Congregazione dei Greci 1566–1596* (Brescia 1975); J. Krajčar, "The Greek College under the Jesuits for the First Time 1591–1604" *OrChrP* 31 (1965) 85–118; A. Gasparini, *Cesare d'Este e Clemente VIII* (Modena 1960); P. Bartl, "Marciare Verso Constantinopoli. Zur Türkenpolitik Klemens' VIII" *Saeculum* 20 (1969) 44–56.

CHARLES BORROMEO: P. Prodi, "Charles Borromée, Archévêque de Milan et la Papaute" *RHE* 62 (1967) 379–411; G. Alberigo, "Carlo Borromeo come Modello di Vescovo nella Chiesa Posttridentina" *RSIt* 79 (1967) 1031–1052; R. Robres Lluch, "La Congregación del Concilio y S. Carlos Borromeo en la Problemática y Curso de la Contrarreforma 1593–1600" *Anth. An.* 14 (1966) 101–171; a brief compilation with a digest of the canonization decrees and the extensive investigations of E. Cattaneo, C. Marcora, and A. Rimoldi: H. Jedin, *Carlo Borromeo ed il Card. Agostino Valier 1566–84* (Verona 1972), contains the correspondence.

ITALY: Examples of apostolic and episcopal visitations in Marocchi, *La Riforma Cattolica* II:13–44; also S. Tramontin, "La Visita Apostolica del 1581 a Venezia" *St. Ven.* 9 (1967) 453–533; for the Kingdom of Naples: *Nunziature di Napoli* II (1577–1587), ed. P. Villani–D. Veneruso (Rome 1969), and III (1587–1591), ed. B. Bettoni (Rome 1970); D. Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge 1972).

SPAIN: B. Llorca, "Acceptación en España de los Decretos del Concilio de Trento" *EE* 39 (1964) 341–360, 459–482; J. L. Santos Diez, *Politica Conciliar Postridentina en España. El Concilio Provincial de Toledo 1565* (Rome 1969); A. Marin Ocete, "El Concilio Provincial de Granada en 1565" *ArchTeolGran* 25 (1962) 23–178; J. Villegas, *Die Durchführung der Beschlüsse des Konzils von Trient in der Kirchenprovinz Peru 1564–1600; Die Bischöfe und die Reform der Kirche* (Cologne 1971); Introduction at the parish level: J. I. Tellechea Idigoras, *La Reforma Tridentina en San Sebastián. El Libro de Mandatos de Visita de la Parroquia de San Vicente 1540–1670* (San Sebastián 1970).

FRANCE: In addition to the *Acta Nuntiaturae Gallicae,* Vol. VII which contains the correspondence of the Nuncio G. B. Castelli, 1581–83, edited by R. Toupin in 1967, the most important accounts are: *Lettres de Henri IV concernant les Relations du St. Siège et de la France 1595–1609,* ed. B. Barbiche (Città del Vaticano 1968) (=*Studi e Testi* 250); R. Mousnier, *The Assassination of Henry IV. The Tyrannicide Problem and the Consolidation of the French Absolute Monarchy in the Early XVII Century* (London 1973).

ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND: From the ever-growing body of literature on the establishment of the Anglican Church and the fate of the Catholic minority we can offer only a small selection here: W. P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation. The Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion* (Cambridge 1968), on the approval of the 39 Articles; for southern England, R. B. Manning, *Religion and Society in Elizabethan Sussex. A Study of the Enforcement of the Religious Settlement 1558–1603* (Leicester 1969), with many notes on the Catholic recusants; H. Davies, *Worship and Theology in England I: From Cranmer to Hooker 1534–1603* (Princeton 1970).—For the beginning based on the study of the letters of Bentham, see: R. O'Day, "Thomas Bentham" *Journal of Eccl. History* 23 (1972) 137–159; P. MacGrath, *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I* (London 1967).—C. Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London 1969), tones down the severity of the execution of the anti-Puritan act and shows that two-thirds of the property of the recusants was not actually confiscated by the Act of 1587, as it was turned over to relatives. *The Welsh Elizabethan Martyrs: The Trial Documents of Saint Richard Gwynn and of the Venerable William Davies,* ed. A. Thomas (Cardiff 1971), Document; *Letters of William Allen and Richard Barret 1572–1598,* ed. P. Renold (London 1967), 120 letters of the first two presidents of the Douay College; *The Seminary Priests. A Dictionary of the Secular Clergy of England and Wales 1558–1850,* Vol. I: *Elizabethan,* ed. G. Anstruthe (Ware–Durham 1969); L. Rostenberg, *The Minority Press and the English Crown. A Study in Repression 1558 to 1625* (Nieukwoop 1971); K. L. Lindley, "The Lay Catholics of England in the Reign of Charles I" *Journal of Eccl. History* 22 (1971) 199–221; R. J. Bradley, *Blacklo and the Counter Reformation. An Inquiry into the Strange Death of Catholic England: Essays in Honour of Garrett-Mattingly,* ed. C. H. Carter (London 1966) 366–370, reaches beyond Jedin's periodization; M. O'Connell, *Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation* (New Haven 1964).

SCOTLAND: The biographies of P. Janton, *John Knox. L'Homme et l'Oeuvre* (Paris 1967) and J. Ridley, *John Knox* (Oxford–New York 1968); L. Hammermeyer, "Herrschaftlich-staatliche Gewalt, Gesellschaft und Katholizisimus in Irland vom 16. bis 18. Jh. Aspekte des Postreformatorischen Katholizisimus auf den Britischen Inseln während der Penal Times" *Festgabe Karl Bosl* (Munich 1969) 191–218.

EASTERN EUROPE: Rich material on the post-Tridentine synods in Poland in Sawickis *Concilia Poloniae.* An example of a Tridentine visitation in the archdiocese of Cracow in 1599, although there was actually such a visitation in 1565–70: *Materly do Dziejow Kosciola w Polsce* II, ed. Cz. Skowron (Lublin 1965); *Erectici Italiani in Moravia, Polonia, Transilvania 1558–1611,* ed. D. Caccamo (Florence–Chicago 1970); L. Szilas, *Der Jesuit Alfons Carillo in Siebenbürgen 1591–99* (Rome 1966); *Documenta Unionis Berestensis Eiusque Auctorum 1590–1600,* ed. A. G. Welykyj (Rome 1970).

CENTRAL EUROPE, THE EMPIRE, AND THE HABSBURG HEREDITARY LANDS: A great deal of information in the continuing editions of the reports of the Cologne Nunciature by B. Roberg (II:2 and II:3: O. M. Frangipani 1590–1593, Munich 1969–71), K. Wittstadt (IV:1: A. Amalteo 1606–7) and W. Reinhard (V:1: A. Albergati 1610–14, Munich 1972); an excellent summary of this research by W. Reinhard in: *RQ* 66 (1971) 8–65 and by K. Wittstadt in: *Festgabe Franzen* 695–711. The reports of the nuncios at Graz, G. Malaspina and A. Possevino, 1580–82, were edited by J. Rainer (Vienna 1972); he had previously prepared the reports of G. Delfino and G. F. Commendone, from the imperial court, 1571–72 (NB II:8, Graz–Cologne 1967). On the significance of the Peace of Augsburg: M. Heckel, "Autonomie und Pacis Composito. Der Augsburger Religionsfriede in der Deutung der Gegenreformation" *ZSavRGMan* 45 (1959) 141–248; H. Raab, "Die oberdeutschen Hochstifte zwischen Habsburg und Wittelsbach in der frühen Neuzeit" *Blätter f. Deutsche Landesgesch.* 109 (1973) 69–101.

EXAMPLES OF THE WORKS IN VARIOUS TERRITORIAL HISTORIES ON CHURCH RENEWAL: *Julius Echter und seine Zeit,* ed. F. Merzbacher (Würzburg 1974); O. Schaffrath, *Fürstabt Balthasar von Dernbach und seine Zeit. Studien zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Fulda* (Fulda 1967); H. G. Molitor, *Kirchliche Reformversuche der Kurfürsten und Erzbischöfe von Trier im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation 1567–1648* (Wiesbaden 1968); E. Camenzin, *Weihbischof Balthasar Würer von Konstanz 1574–1598 und die kirchl. Reformbewegung in den Fünf Orten* (Fribourg 1968); J. Bücking, *Frühabsolutismus und Kirchenreform in Tirol 1565–1665* (Wiesbaden 1972); J. Köhler, *Das Ringen um die Tridentinische Erneuerung im Bistum Breslau vom Abschluss des Trienter Konzils bis zur Schlacht am Weissen Berg* (Cologne–Vienna 1973); *Die Protokolle des Geistlichen Rates in Münster 1601–1612,* ed. H. Immenkötter (Münster 1972).—A hitherto neglected area is covered by U. Eisenhardt, *Die Kaiserliche Aufsicht über Buchdruck, Buchhandel und Presse im Hl. Römischen Reich deutscher Nation 1496–1806* (Karlsruhe 1970); H. Raab, "Apostolische Bücherkommission in Frankfurt a. M." *HJ* 87 (1967) 326–354, where the Index of recommended Catholic books that first appeared in 1614 is mentioned; R. Becker, "Die Berichte des kaiserlichen und apostolischen Bücherkommissars Joh. Ludwig von Hagen an die röm. Kurie 1623–1649" *QF* 51 (1971) 422.

SECTION THREE

Religious Forces and Intellectual Content of the Catholic Renewal

Literature on the rise of Spanish theology by C. Pozo in: *Arch. Teol. Granatino 29* (1966) 87–124; E. Llamas Martinez, "Orientaciones Sobre la Historia de la Teologia Española en la Primera Mitad del Siglo XVI" *Repertorio de Historia de la Ciencias Eclesiásticas en España* I (Salamanca 1967) 95–174; V. Beltran de Heredia, *Domingo Bañez y la Controversia Sobre la Gracia. Textos y Documentos* (Madrid 1968); B. Hamilton, *Political Thought in Sixteenth Century Spain. A Study of the Political Ideas of Vitorio, De Soto, Suárez, and Molina* (Oxford 1963); M. A. Huesbe Llanos, *Henning Arnisaeus 1575–1636. Untersuchungen zum Einfluss der Schule von Salamanca auf das Lutherische Staatsdenken* (Mainz 1965); G. Galeota, *Bellarmino Contro Baio a Lovanio. Studio e Testo di un Inedito Bellarminiano* (Rome 1966), also G. Colombo in: *La Scuola Cattolica* 95 (1967) 307–338; J. Stöhr, *Die theologische Wissenschaftslehre des Juan de Perlin (1569–1638)* (Münster 1967). A survey of the development of the training of the clergy in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in: M. Arneth, *Das Ringen um Geist und Form der Priesterbilding im Säkularklerus des 17. Jhs.* (Würzburg 1970).

SPIRITUALITY: A survey in L. Cognet, *La Spiritualité Moderne* (Aubier 1966) 15–230; F. Chiwaro, *Bernardino Rossignoli SJ (1547–1613). Orientamenti della Spiritualità Post-Tridentina* (Rome 1967). For a biography of St. Theresa of Avila based upon wider sources and more chronologically precise: Efren de la Madre de Dios—O. Stegink, *Tiempo y Vida de Santa Teresa* (Madrid 1968); On the struggle over the reform of the Carmelite Order: O. Steggink, *La Reforma del Carmelo Español. La Visita Canonica del*

General Rubeo y su Encuentro con S. Teresa 1566–67 (Rome 1965); H. J. Prien, *Francisco de Ossuna. Mystik und Rechtfertigung* (Hamburg 1967); A. Barrado Manzano, *San Pedro de Alcántara* (Madrid 1965); A. Cistellini, "S. Filippo Neri e la sua Patriá" *RSTI* 23 (1969) 54–119, on the influence of San Marco and Savonarola: R. Razzi, *Vita di S. Caterina di Ricci* (Florence 1965); *Donna Battista Vernazza da Genova, Commento al Paternoster,* ed. G. J. Scatena (Rome 1968), contains a detailed introduction and bibliography; P. Lopez, *Riforma Cattolica e Vita Religiosa e Culturale a Napoli dalla Fine del Cinquecento ai Primi del Settecento* (Napoli 1964); id., "Le Confraternità Laicali in Italia e la Riforma Cattolica" *Rivista di Studi Salernitani* 4 (1969) 153–238; H. Reifenberg, *Sakramente, Sakramentalien und Ritualien im Bistum Mainz seit dem Spätmittelalter* I (Münster 1971), to 1671; K. Pörnbacher, *Jeremias Drexel. Leben und Werk eines Barockpredigers* (Munich 1965); L. Intorp, *Westfälische Barockpredigten in volkstümlicher Sicht* (Münster 1964); B. Hubensteiner, *Vom Geist des Barock. Kultur und Frömmigkeit im alten Bayern* (Munich 1967); Friedrich Spee, *Guldenes Tugendbuch,* ed. Th. G. M. van Oorschot (Munich 1968).

THE HISTORY OF THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS: From the *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* IV on the end of the generalship of Laynez has appeared a comprehensive review of works on the Jesuit theater by M. Scaduto in: *AHSJ* 36 (1967) 194–215; an account of the same in German-speaking lands by R. G. Dimler, "A Geographic and Genetic Survey of Jesuit Drama in German-Speaking Territories 1555–1609" *AHSJ* 43 (1974) 133–146; A. Rodríguez Gutiérrez de Ceballos, *Bartolomé de Bustamente y los Orígenes de la Arquitectura Jesuítica en España* (Rome 1967). For especially wide-ranging and extraordinary literature one might consult the bibliographies in *AHSJ.*—The reform of the Capuchins is placed within the overall reform movement in: Optat de Veghel, "La Réforme de Frères Mineurs Capucins dans l'Ordre Franciscain et dans l'Église" *CollFr* 35 (1965) 5–108; Carmelo de la Cruz, "Derecho Reformatorio de Trento en los Primeros Pasos de su Aplicación a la Reforma Teresiana" *MonteCarm* (Burgos 1965) 49–97; H. Schwendenwein, *Franz von Sales und die Entwicklung neuer Formen des Ordenslebens* (Eichstätt–Vienna 1966); J. Grisar, *Mary Wards Institut vor römischen Kongregationen (1616–1630)* (Rome 1966) (=Misc. Hist. Pont XXVII).

SECTION FIVE

European Counter Reformation and Confessional Absolutism (1605–55)

PONTIFICATE OF PAUL V: J. Semmler, *Das päpstliche Staatssekretariat in den Pontifiken Pauls V. und Gregors XV. (1605–1623)* (Rome 1969); on the Gunpowder Plot see Ph. G. Caraman, *Henry Garnet and the Gun-Powder-Plot* (London 1964); on the conflict with Venice, W. J. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defence of Republican Liberty. Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter-Reformation* (Berkeley–Los Angeles 1968); P. Sarpi, *Opere,* ed. G. and L. Cozzi (Mailand 1969). On the editor of Sarpis' *Istoria*: A. Russo, *Marcantonio De Dominis, Arcivescovo di Spalato e Apostata 1560–1624* (Naples 1965); W. Reinhard, "Ein Römisches Gutachten vom Juli 1612 zur Strategie der Gegenreformation im Rheinland" *RQ* 64 (1969) 168–190; F. Neuer-Landfried, *Die Katholische Liga. Gründung, Neugründung und Organisation eines Sonderbundes 1608–1620* (Kellmunz 1968); E. A. Seils, *Die Staatslehre des Jesuiten Adam Contzen, Beichtvater Kurfürst Maximilians I. von Bayern* (Lübeck–Hamburg 1968).

PONTIFICATE OF CLEMENT VIII: A. Gasparini, *Cesare d'Este Clemente VIII* (Modena 1960); B. Barbiche, (ed.), *Correspondence du Nonce en France Innocenzo del Bufalo, Évêque de Camirno, 1601–04;* id., "L'Influence Française à la Cour Pontificale sous le Regime Henri IV" *MAH* 77 (1965), 277–299; J. de Lamar, *Diplomacy and Dogmatism: Bernardino de Mendoza and the French Catholic League* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

PONTIFICATE OF URBAN VIII: A. Springhetti, "Urbanus VIII. P. M. Poeta Latinus et Hymnorum Breviarii Emendator" *AHPont* 6 (1968) 163–190. On the significance of the "Politics of Neutrality" of Urban VIII: G. Lutz, *Kard. G. Fr. da Bagno. Politik und Religion im Zeitalter Richelieus und Urbans VIII.* (Tübingen 1971); A. Kraus, "Der Kardinalnepot Francesco Barberini und das Staatssekretariat Urbans VIII." *RQ* 64 (1969) 191–208; French nuncio reports: *Ranuccio Scotti 1639–41,* ed. P. Blet (Rome 1965). On the case of Galileo: *G. G. Celebrazioni* (Rome 1965); *Galilée. Aspects de sa vie et de son oeuvre* (Paris 1968); G. Galli, "Il Card. Maculano al Processo di Galileo" *Memorie Domenicane* NS 41 (1965) 24–42, 65–101; W. Brandmüller, "Der Fall Galilei—im Konflikt Naturwissenschaft und Kirche?" *StdZ* 162 (1968) 333–342, 399–411; E. Gentili, "Bibliografia Gallileana fra i due Centenari 1942–1964" *SC* 17 (1964) 267–309; P. Blat, (ed.), *Correspondence du Nonce en France Ranuccio Scotti, 1639–41* (Rome 1965); L. von Meerbeeck, (ed.), *Correspondence du Nonce Fabio de Lagonissa, 1627–34* (Brussels 1964); questioning Pastor's interpretation of Urbino's politics of neutrality based on his correspondence is Q. Aldea, "Instrucciones de los Ambajadores en Roma, 1631–43" *Misc. Comillas* 29 (Comillas 1958).

CONVERSIONS: G. Christ, "Fürst, Dynastie, Territorium und Konfession. Beobachtungen zu Fürstenkonversionen des ausgehenden 17. und beginnenden 18. Jh." *Saeculum* 24 (1973) 367–387; H. Tüchle, "Zum Kirchenwesen fürstlicher Konvertiten des 17. und 18. Jh." *Festschrift Ferdinand Maas* (Vienna 1973) 231–247.

WITCHCRAFT IN ITALY: C. Ginzburg, *I Benendanti. Ricerche sulla Stegoneria e sui Culti Agrari Cinquecento e Seicento* (Turin 1966); see also the literature on the subject in: *RSCI* 25 (1971) 231–237. Against the traditional concept "secularization" see: H. Blumenberg, *Säkularisierung und Selbstbehauptung* (Frankfurt 1974).

TOLERANCE AND SECULARIZATION OF THE STATE AND OF THOUGHT: F. Dickmann, "Das Problem der Gleichberechtigung der Konfessionen im Reich im 16. und 17. Jh." *HZ* 201 (1965) 265–305; H. Bornkamm, "Die religiöse und politische Problematik im Verhältnis der Konfessionen im Reich" *ARG* 56 (1965) 209–218; H. Lutz, "Die Konfessionsproblematik ausserhalb des Reiches und in der Politik des Papsttums" ibid. 218–227; E. Hassinger, *Religiöse Toleranz im 16. Jh. Motive, Argumente, Formen der Verwirklichung* (Brussels 1966); F. Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli: A Changing Interpretation 1500–1700* (London 1964); G. Lewy, *Constitutionalism and Statecraft during the Golden Age of Spain. A Study on the Political Philosophy of Juan de Mariana SJ* (Geneva 1961).

INDEX

Aachen 626
Aarhus, bishopric of 302
Abyssinia 589
Abo, bishopric of 302
Absconditas, Luther's doctrine 24
Absolution 42, 352, 423
Absolution, princely 637ff
Acarie, Barbe 559
Accolti 72
Acontius, Jacobus 640
Acosta, José de 585
Acquaviva, Claudius 543, 553, 568f, 586, 639
Acta Sanctorum 551
Ad Dominici gregis curam, bull of (1536) 463
Ad ecclesiae regimen, bull of (1560) 489
Adelphi (Johannes Müling) 171
Aden 589
Adiaphora 293, 351, 424, 427
Adiaphoristic Dispute 350f
Adolf VII, bishop of Merseburg 50, 63
Adrian VI, pope 7, 104–14
—acknowledges responsibility of church and curia 109f
—and Germany 107f
—briefs and instructions on Luther's reformation 108f
—church reform 107
—curia reform 107f
Adrian of Utrecht, cardinal of Tortosa 72
Adult baptism 178
Afonso, king of the Congo 592
Africa 589ff, 614
—missionary work in 591ff
Agazzari 566
Agenda 168, 475
—of the Palatinate 410
Aegidius of Viterbo 438, 439, 458
Agricola, Johannes 231, 289, 294, 342, 344, 349
—Mikael, bishop of Abo 310
—Rudolf 537
Agustín, Antonio, bishop of Alife 485, 552
Ailly, Pierre de 14, 16, 40
Aix 398
Akbar, Great Mogul 597
Accommodation controversy 604
Alba, Duke of 401f, 403, 513
Albarcina, Capucine chapter of (1529) 438f
Alber, Matthäus 247f
Albergati 619
Albrecht, Archduke 513
Albrecht V, Duke of Bavaria 491, 524, 531
Albrecht of Brandenburg-Ansbach 312ff, 353
Albrecht, Duke of Brandenburg-Prussia 211
Albrecht II, Elector of Mainz 10, 44f, 47, 50, 52, 84, 211
Albrecht, Count of Mansfeld 211, 267
Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Kulmbach 295
Albret, Jeanne d' 393
Albuquerque, Joao de 595
Alcalá, university of 329, 444, 535, 541, 543, 571
Alcantarius 570
Alciati, Andrea 362, 552
—Terenzio 551, 624
Aldeas 586, 607
Aldobrandini, Cinzio, cardinal 509
Aldobrandini, Ippolito, see Clement VIII
Aldobrandini, Pietro, cardinal 509, 615
Aleander, Girolamo 72, 75f, 76f, 79, 105, 145, 434, 457, 458, 463
Alençon, Duke of 396
Alexander VI, pope 6f, 439, 456, 461, 483, 576f, 590, 608
Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi), pope 568, 627f, 631
Alfons of Bolano 575, 592
Algemene Doopsgezinde Societeit (Dutch Mennonites) 188
Algiers, attack of Charles V on (1541) 280
Allen, William, cardinal 517
Alliances, confessional 211
Alms 56
Alonso de Orozco 556
Alphons of Burgos 443
Alsted, Johann 123f, 130, 133f, 408
Altar, Sacrament of, see Eucharist
Altar tabernacle 563
Altdorf 533

Altenburg, religious discussion of (1568–69) 346
Althammer, Andreas 236
Althaus, P. 220
Althusius, Johann 408
Alting, Menso 404
Altötting 564
Altzelle 293
Alvarez, Balthasar 558
—Diego 543
Alvarez de Paz, Jacob 558f
Alvarez de Toledo, Juan 458
Alveldt, Augustine 67, 69, 203
Amandus, Johannes 312f
Amboina 596
—mission work in 598f
Amboise, palace of 364
—edict of (1563) 395, 514
Ambrosian Library 554
Amerbach 548
Amida 597
Aemiliani, Hieronymus 437
Amling, Wolfgang 409
Ampudias, Pascual de, bishop of Burgos 443
Amsdorf, Nikolaus of 97, 281f, 294, 346f, 348, 349f, 355
Amsterdam 184
Amsterodamus, see Timann
Anabaptism 131, 166, 178–89, 191, 214, 242f, 256, 263, 311, 324, 420, 637
—concept of mission 181f
—condemnation 473
—in Austria 179f
—in England 480
—in Netherlands and Northern Germany 182–88
—in Southern Germany 179
—in Switzerland 178f
—see also Mennonites, Münster, Müntzer
Anchieta, José de, apostle of Brazil 608
Andalusia 454
Andelot, François d' 393
Andersson, Lars 306, 308
Andreä, Jacob 425, 633
Andrea de Novellis, bishop of Alba 440
Andreas of Austria, cardinal 510
Angamale, bishopric of 597
Anger 409
Angers, university of 329
Anglican Church 327, 511, 518, 629
—*Apologia ecclesiae Anglicanae* (1562–64) 339
—under Elizabeth I 338f
Anglican College in Rome 504
Angola, mission work in 593f
Anhalt, Reformation 409
—church order 410
Anhalt-Dessau, Reformation 268
Ann, Queen of Hungary 208
—daughter of Emperor Ferdinand I 286
Anne of Cleves 334, 335
Ann of Austria 616
Annam, mission work in 606
Annates 106f
Annecy 365
Ansbach 236
Antequera, bishopric of 581
Anthropology, theological 198
Antichrist 9, 60, 64f, 67, 73f, 78, 110, 166, 240, 257, 325, 334, 351f, 371
Antilatomus 82f
Antilles, mission work in 578
Antinomial controversy 341ff
Antiromanism 463
Antitrinitarians, antitrinitarianism 311, 326f, 641
Anthony of Padua 564
Anton, duke of Lorraine 142
Antoninus of Florence 433, 439
Antwerp 542, 553
—bishopric of 512
Äpinus, Johannes 346
Apocalypse 96
Apologia Anhaltina 409
Apologia of the Augsburg Confession 263, 420
Apostolate 433
Apostolic Canons 548
Apostolic Constitutions 548f
Appellants 518
Appeals 462
Appenzell, Reformation 170, 175
Aquila, Caspar 231, 341
Aquino, d', Nuncio 533
Aragón 443, 454
Araoz, P. 453
Arason, Jon, bishop of Holar 305f
Araucans 584
Archinto, Filippo 442, 452, 471, 472
Arequipa, bishopric of 583
Arévalo 446
Arigoni, cardinal 544, 616
Aristotle, in Luther 15ff, 19, 41
Aristotelianism, new Protestant-humanistic 104
Armenian College in Rome 504
Arminians 640
Arran, count of 411
Arras, bishopric of 512
—union (1579) 402
Art decree of Tridentine Council 565
Arthur, brother of Henry VIII 328f
Artois 238, 402
Artolatry 360
Arts 642
Arts and literature, post-Tridentine development 565f
Aschhausen, bishop of Bamberg 510, 526, 626
Asia, mission work in 595–606
Aske, Robert 332f
Astalli 631
Astete 561
Astorga 466, 481
Astrology 424, 639
Atahualpa 582

Audet, Nicholas 438, 460
Auger, Edmond 561, 569
Augsburg 175, 179f, 266, 270, 293, 294, 317, 421, 526, 530, 621
—Diet (1518) 55, 200
—Diet (1530) 181, 192, 254–65, 352, 435
  —apologia by Melanchthon 263ff
  —confutation of Charles V 260ff
  —creation of the Confession 255ff
  —development 259–260
—Diet (1547) (Violent Diet) 288f
—Diet (1550–51) 294
—Diet (1555) 295ff
—Diet (1566) 407, 522
—Reformation 268
—synod of martyrs (1527) 181
Augsburg Confession, *Confessio Augustana* 9, 204, 222, 255f, 260f, 265, 269f, 272, 275f, 297f, 334, 357, 386, 402, 407, 410, 420, 425, 633ff
—in Denmark (1538) 304
—in Livonia 317
—in Poland 319
—in Sweden 310
Augsburg *interim* see *Interim*
Augsburg "Reform" 476
Augsburg, religious peace of (1555) 295ff, 421, 484, 488, 489, 499, 522f, 620, 626f, 626
August I, Elector of Saxony 346, 361f, 425
Augustinians 469
—chapter in Heidelberg (1518) 53
—mission in Brazil 608
——in Japan 601
——in Mexico 580
——in New Granada 584
——in Peru 582
Augustinian Discalceati (Discalced) 570
Augustinian Eremites (Hermits) 445, 459, 570
—mission in the Philippines 587
Augustinian Recollects
—mission in the Philippines 588
Augustinian schools, 535, 541
Augustinianism 535, 541, 644
Augustine 10, 32, 36, 38, 40, 54, 70, 117f, 159
—Luther's view of 14ff
Austria 428, 499, 622
—development of denominations 421
Authority, spiritual 138
Authority, spiritual and temporal
—division according to Luther 217
Authors, ecclesiastical 549
Autos Sacramentales 563
Avignon 570
—Exile 5
Ayamonte 502
Azpilcueta, Martín de 552
Aztecs, empire of 580
Azzolini, Decio 631

Badajoz 466
Baden (Switzerland)
—Disputation (1526) 172ff, 203, 256
——Real Presence of Christ 174
——Verdict of Baden 175
—religious colloquy (1589) 633
—Treaty (1583) 533f
Baden-Baden, Margraviate 524, 531f
Badia, cardinal 457f
Baglione 632
Bagno, nuncio 625
Baía, see São Salvador
Baius, Michael 535, 541f, 631
Balboa, Vasco Nuñez de 578
Bamberg 242, 626
—priest seminary 526
Báñez, Dominicus 538, 539, 543, 557
Ban (excommunication) 233, 258f, 352
Baptism, sacrament 250, 271, 278, 292, 314, 335, 337, 415, 472
—liturgy, Lutheran 229f
—Luther's views 65, 69
——external sign of the Church 214
—Müntzer's view 131
Baptist movement, see Anabaptists
Baptists, community of 183
Barbaro, Francesco 440
Barberini, family 623, 665f
—Antonio the Elder, cardinal 623
—Antonio the Younger, cardinal 623, 628
—Francesco, cardinal 554, 623, 624, 631, 633
—Maffeo, see Urban VIII
Barbosa, Agostino 552
Barcelona, peace (1529), 240
Barnabites 435, 436, 562
Barnes, Robert 329, 334, 336
Baroque, art 565f
—piety 564
Baronius, Caesar, cardinal 509, 540, 544, 550f, 554, 555, 567, 615, 617
Barozzi, Pietro, bishop of Padua 440
Barreto, Nuñez 455
Bärwalde, treaty of (1631) 625
Bartfeld, school 322
Bartholomaeus a Martyribus 556
Bartholomew, massacre of St. (1572) 395, 514
Bartolomé de Olmedo 580
Basel 167, 175, 176, 252, 267, 382, 553
—bishopric 533
—diocesan synod (1581) 533
—peace (1499) 156
—Reformation 172ff
——Reformation regulation (1528) 174
Basilians 521
Bastida 544
Bathory, Stephan, prince of Siebenbürgen 326, 519f
Baume, Pierre de la, bishop of Geneva 365
Bautista, Pedro 601
Bavaria 268, 269, 273, 286, 428, 532, 621
—concordat (1583) 524
Beaton, David, cardinal 411
—James, archbishop of Glasgow 518

Beaulieu, peace (1576) 396, 514
Becanus, Martin 637
Beccadelli, Ludovico 466
Beccaria 544
Beda, Natalis 362
Beier, Leonhard 53
Belgium 376
Belgrade 108, 208
Bellarmine, Robert, cardinal 428, 508, 536f, 539f, 543, 545, 549, 560, 605, 616f, 637, 643
Bellay, cardinal 636
Beltrán, Louis 584
Bemburg 410
Bencedi Szekely, Stephan 325
Benedictus deus, bull (1564), affirming Tridentine Council 497
Benedict XIV, pope 540
Benedictines 427, 459
—Austrian congregation 572
—congregation of Montecassino 572
—mission in Brazil 608
—post-Tridentine development 571
—Spanish 535
—Swabian congregation 572
—Swiss congregation 572
Benefices, accumulation of 7f, 292, 441, 472
Berchmans, John 568
Bergamo 434, 437
—bishopric 502
Bergen, bishopric 302
—assembly of nobles (1539) 304
Berlin 357
Bern 167, 175f, 177, 267, 366, 368, 382, 639
—Disputation (1528) 172, 385
—Disputation (1535) 366
—Reformation 174
—religious colloquy (1527) 175
—religious mandate (1528) 176
—synod (1537) 385
Bernardin de Sahagún 581
Bernerio, cardinal 545
Bernard of Clairvaux 32, 105
Bernard, bishop of Canary Islands 575
Bernhardi, Bartolomäus 85
Bernardino of Asti 438
Bernardino of Feltre 434
Bernini 565, 631
Bertano, cardinal 482
Bertini, Antonio, bishop of Foligno 440
Bérulle, Pierre de 559, 567
Beuckelsz, Jan 185
Béza, Theodore 376, 394, 490
Biandrata, Giorgio 320, 326
Bible 138f, 510, 536, 546f
—Christian's 304
—editions 202
—explanation 546
—translations 311, 468, 546
— —Eck's 196
— —German 94
— —Luther's 94ff
— —Polish 520
— —see also Vulgata
Biberach 267
Bibliotheca Angelica 554
Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum 548
Bidermann, Jakob 566
Biel, Gabriel 10, 14, 16f, 39
Bigne, Marguerin de la 547
Billick, Eberhard 283, 477
Binewald, Matthias 317
Bini(us), Severin 529, 548
Birckmann, Johann 553
Birgitta 301
—Order 301
Bíró, Mátyás Devai
Bishop's Book of Henry VIII 335
Bistriz 323
Bishoprics, secularization 298
Bizer, E. 31, 36, 37, 478
Black Acts 417f
Blackwell, George, archpriest 518, 620
Blackwater, victory by O'Neill (1598) 519
Blandrata, Giorgio 641
Blankenfeld, Johannes, archbishop of Riga 316
Blarer, Jakob Christoph, bishop of Basel 533
Blaurer, Ambrosius 269
Blois, assembly of Estates General (1577/78) 515
Blondel 548
Blosius, see Louis de Blois
Bloodbath of Stockholm (1520) 302, 306
Bluecoat, see Jörg of the House of Jacob
Blyssem 532
Bobadilla, Nicholas 448, 453
Boeckbinder, Bartel 184f
Bodenstein, Andreas Rudolf, see Karlstadt
Bodin, Jean 636, 637, 638
Bohemia 499, 621
—development of denominations 421
Bohemian Brothers 311
—in Poland 319
Böhmer, H. 128, 453
Bohoric, Adam 325
Boleyn, Anne 154, 328, 330, 338
Bologna 240, 254, 454, 463, 469, 502
—transfer of Council of Trent (1547) 288, 473
—university 329
Blognetti, papal nuncio 519
Bolsec, Jérôme 381f, 383
Bonaventure 49, 569
Boncompagni, Ugo, see Gregory XIII
Bonhomini, Giovanni Francesco 504, 528, 533
Boniface of Colle 436
Boniface VIII, pope 5
Bonuccio 460, 468
Book of Common Order 415
Book of Common Prayer (1549) 337, 517
Book of Discipline by John Knox 414ff
— — by Melville 416
Book of Homilies (1562) 339

Book of Martyrs 338
Bora, Katharina von 143
Borghese, Camillo, see Paul V
—Gasparo 623
—Scipione 616
Borgia, Francis 454, 558, 568, 593
Börglum, bishopric 302
Bornemisza, P., bishop of Weissenburg 326
Bornkamm, H. 264
Borromeans 574
Borromeo, Charles 437, 489, 498, 499, 502f, 511, 533, 556, 561, 563, 619, 637
—activity in Milan 502
Borromeo, Federigo, cardinal, archbishop of Milan 489, 502, 554
Bosio, Antonio 548
Botero, Giovanni 637
Bothwell, count 414
Bourbon, House of 514, 616
—Antoine de 393
—Charles de 515f
Bourdoise 516
Bourges, university 329
Bovio, 545
Boyl, Bernal 578
Braga 492
Braganza, House of 628
—revolt (1640) 614
Brahe, Tycho 505
Braitmichel, Kaspar 183
Brandenburg 298, 477, 529, 616, 626
—electoral 621
—established church 274
—Protestant church regulation (1539–40) 274
Brandenburg, Johann Georg von, bishop of Strasbourg 528
Brandenburg-Ansbach 255, 266
Brandenburg-Nürnberg church regulation (1533) 352
Brazil 576, 589, 614
—mission to 606ff
Brask, Hans, bishop of Linköping 307
Braun, Conrad 550
Braunsberg, Jesuit college 520
Braunschweig 267, 273, 286
—school regulation (2528) 235
Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, Reformation 281
Bray, Guido de 399, 400f
Brébeuf, Jean de 609
Breitenfeld, victory of Gustavus Adolfus (1631) 625
Bremen 267, 298, 356, 358, 529, 626, 627
—Calvinism 409
—Philippism 409
Brendel, Daniel, archbishop of Mainz 527
Brenner, bishop of Seckau 525
Brenz, Johannes 53, 172, 236, 269f, 275, 343, 352, 359
Brescia 435, 437
—Oratory 435
Breslau 357
—bishopric 531, 622
Brest, synod (1596) 521
Brest Bible (1563) 320
Brethren of the Common Life 399
Breviarium Pianum 547
—*Romanum* (1568) 500
Breviary, reform of 485, 495, 501, 561, 624
Brieg in Silesia, Reformation 269
Briesmann, Johannes 312f, 316
Broët 448
Brötli, Johannes 178
Brück, Electoral Saxon chancellor 259, 263f, 350
—A.Ph. 528
Brotherly love 216
Brothers Hospitallers 573
Bruges 399
—bishopric 512
Brully, Pierre 399f
Brunner, Jörg 174
—P. 222
Bruno, Giordano 509, 642
Brunotte, W. 222
Brussels 399, 401, 403, 454
Bucer, Martin 53, 84, 154, 181, 184, 189, 249f, 267, 270, 275f, 277, 280, 283f, 291, 307, 337, 359, 364, 370ff, 373, 385, 398, 399
Buchholzer, Georg 357
Bucovice 183
Buda 320, 321, 324
—Diet (1523) 322
Buenos Aires, bishopric 583
Bufalini 507
Bugenhagen, Johann 98, 137, 231, 233, 236, 249, 270, 281, 304, 315, 356
Bullinger, Heinrich 127, 253, 326, 356, 359, 364, 370, 386ff, 407
Bünderlin, Hans 189
Buonarotti, Michelangelo 457
Burali 503
Burckhardt, Georg, see Spalatin
Bure, Idelette de 370, 399
Burg bei Stein, Reformation 170
Burgos, chapter (1506) 445
Burgundy 238, 295
Burma (Pegu) 590, 605
Bursfeld Union O.S.B. 572
Bus, César de 561
Busaeus 633
Butigella 459

Caballero, Antonio de S. Maria 605
Cabral, Francisco 576, 589, 600
Cabrini, Francesco 435
Caetani, cardinal 624
Cajetan, Thomas (de Vio), cardinal 43, 53, 54ff 60ff, 72, 200f, 438f, 458f, 538
Cajetan (Gaetano) of Thiene 436, 483
Calahorra 466, 481
Calender reform of Gregory XIII 504f
Calenius, Gerwin 553

Caligari, papal nuncio 519
Calixtus III, pope 43
Calixt, George 635
Calvi 459
Calvin, Jean 253, 275, 284, 319f, 325, 356ff, 386, 387ff, 391, 399, 403, 405, 412, 425, 543
—and France 391ff
—and the Netherlands 398
—church service regulation for Strasbourg 369f
—concept of the church 364
—establishment of church rule in Geneva (1541–1564) 373ff
—eucharistic doctrine and attempts to establish church and eucharistic agreements among Protestants 383ff, 387ff
—in Geneva (1536–38) 365ff, 371f
—in Strasbourg (1538–41) 369ff
—*Institutio* 365, 369, 377, 380, 383f
—outlines of his theology 376ff
—personality and work 361–405
—relationship to Luther 370
—second eucharistic dispute 356ff
—teaching procedures 379ff
—youth, studies, first writings (1509–36) 361ff
Calvinism, Calvinists 253, 299, 311, 356, 425, 488, 499, 511, 628, 632, 635, 644
—and development of denominations 427
—and Lutheranism 425
—and power of the state 422
—completion of the Reformation 410f
—spread in western Europe 390–419
——in France 391ff, 514
——in Germany 402ff
——in Poland 320
——in Sweden 309
——in the Netherlands 398ff
Camaldoli 435
Camaldolese 571
Cambodia, mission to 606
Cambrai 464, 465
—archbishopric 512
—treaty (1529) 240
Cambridge 333
—university 329
Camillus de Lellis 573
Camillians 573
Camin 298
Campanella, Tommaso 642
Campeggio, Lorenzo, cardinal 209, 210f, 254, 259f, 271, 329, 439, 463
—Tommaso, legate 275, 457, 471
Campion, Edmund 517
Camus, J. P. 641
Canada 608
—mission to 609
Canary Islands, mission to 575
Candia 629
Canigiani, archbishop of Aix 516
Canisio, Egidio 458
Canisius, Peter 425, 453, 455, 484, 487, 497, 532, 534, 537, 550, 554f, 560, 635
Cano, Melchior 454, 477, 537f
Canon law 552, 644
Canterbury, archbishopric 327, 480
—provincial synod (1555–56) 480
Cão, Diogo 592
Cape Verde Islands, bishopric 592
Capito, Wolfgang Fabricius 84, 172, 181, 189, 275f, 364, 370
Capodiferro, legate 479
Capranica, cardinal 442
Capuchins 438, 532f, 562, 570, 614, 622
—mission in Brazil 608
——in Near East 609f
Carafa, family 489
—Alfonso 487
—Antonio, cardinal 500, 503, 507, 546, 554
—Carlo 483, 487, 489, 622
—Gian Pietro, see Paul IV
—Oliviero, cardinal 436, 439, 458, 483
Cardinal College, Oxford 327, 334
Cardinals, college of 439, 506
—at beginning of reform 458ff
—congregations of 506f
——for proselytizing infidels 610
Carillo, Sancha 556
Carinthia 525, 622
Caritas, 433
—Luther's view 15f
Carmelites 438, 460, 512, 614
—mission in Brazil 608
——in Mexico 581
—mysticism 557f
Carnesecchi, Pietro 500
Carolina 106, 280
Carpi, Rodolfo Pio, cardinal 450, 460, 463
Carranza, Bartolomé 503, 538, 549
Cartagena, bishopric 585
Carthusians 571
Cartier, Jacques 608
Cartwright 339, 518
Casa, Giovanni della 486
Casaubonus, Isaac 550
Casimir, margrave of Brandenburg-Kulmbach 405
Cassander, Georg 154, 523, 634, 635
Castagna, Gian Battista, see Urban VII
Castelberger, Andreas 178
Castellani, Alberto 479
Castelli 501
Castellio, Sebastian 381, 383, 640
Castello, Castellino da 502
Castelnuovo 437
Castile 444, 454
Castro, Alfonso de 477
Castro war 624
Castro Mahalo, Matteo de 612
Catacombs 548
Câteau-Cambrésis, peace (1559) 488, 489
Catechetics 206, 559ff
—reformatory 234ff

Catechisms 202, 205, 311, 420, 425f, 475, 496, 537
—Bellarmine's Large (1598) 540
— —Small (1597) 540
—Calvin's 367
—Catholic 561
—Laski's (1554) 356
—Luther's 236f
—Malabaric 596
—reformatory 236f
—Roman (1566) 425, 500, 560
Catharine of Aragon, queen of England 241, 328ff, 480
Catharine of Genoa 434
Catharine de Médicis, see Medici
Catharine, queen of Sweden 519
Catharinus, Ambrosius 78, 201, 334
Cathedral chapters 494
Catherine, duchess of Camerino 438
Catholics 420, 632, 643
Catholic Bible of Mainz 546
Catholic places (Switzerland) 533
Catholic Prayer Book, Polish 520
Catholic reform 615, 631f
—and council 456
—beginnings in Rome under Paul III 456–65
—continuity under Paul V and Gregory XV 619
— —under Marcellus II 483
— —under Paul IV 483ff
—definition 431f
—implementation of Tridentine decrees under Pius V, Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, and Clement VIII (1565–1605) 499–534
—in Germany 524–32
—origin and realization (to 1563) 433–98
—preliminary stages in Italy and Spain 433–46
—principle 439
—realization (1551–59) 479–88
Cauvin, Gérard, Calvin's father 362
Cave, peace (1557) 483, 485
Cebu, bishopric 588
Cegled Mako 324
Celebes, mission to 598
Celibacy 85ff, 119, 335
—obligation and monastic vows 85ff
Celio 632
Censorship 210
—see also Index
Centuries 550f
Ceporinus, Jakob 169
Ceremonies 246, 258f, 276, 290, 293, 423, 427, 547, 562
—Lutheran 227
Cervini, Marcello, see Marcellus II
Cesi, Paolo Emilio, archbishop of Lund 303
Ceva 631
Ceylon, mission to 598
Chacon, Alphons 548
Chamber, papal 462, 498, 644
—reform 497
Chambord, treaty (1552) 294
Chambre ardente 391
Champlain, Samuel 609
Chancellery, papal 462, 505, 506, 644
—reform 497
Chantal, Jane Frances Frémiot de 559, 574
Chao-ch'ing 603
Chapters 298, 627
—secularization 298
Charcas, bishopric 583
Charles, archduke 525
Charles of Bourbon 239
Charles of Lorraine, cardinal 391
Charles I, king of England 629
Charles IX, king of France 393, 395, 489, 513, 514
Charles IX, king of Sweden 310
Charles V (I of Spain), emperor of Germany 55, 62, 71, 75, 76f, 80, 104f, 106, 111, 114, 208f, 211, 238f, 242, 244, 253, 258, 260ff, 266f, 271, 273, 279f, 284, 293, 294ff, 299, 302, 321, 329, 335, 398ff, 402, 445, 451, 453, 463f, 474, 480, 485, 488, 496, 513, 580, 585, 633
—alliance policy 273, 278, 289
—and Clement VII 237–41
—and Council of Trent 286
—and Paul III 285ff
—and Schmalkalden 287
—campaign against France 284
—coronation (1530) 240
—council plans 239ff
—fight against Reformation in the Netherlands 398ff
—journey to Italy (1529) 241
—leaves Germany (1553) 295
—resigns imperial crown (1556) 299
—Schmalkaldic War 283
Charron, Pierre 641
Chastity 86
Chelm 521
Chemnitz, Martin 523
Chiapas, bishopric 580
Chichester, bishopric 337
Chieregati, Francesco, legate 108f
Chieti, bishopric 483
Chigi, Fabio, see Alexander VII
Chile, mission to 584
China 576, 596
—mission to 602ff
Chioggia 468
Cholinus, Maternus 553
Christ Church College, Oxford 327
Christian, prince of Anhalt 410
Christian II, king of Denmark 119, 302f, 305
Christian III, king of Denmark 303
Christian IV, king of Denmark 304
Christian I, elector of Saxony 361
Christian Wilhelm, margrave of Brandenburg 633
Christian research of antiquity 548

Christian understanding (1530) 252
Christian Union of Catholic towns in Switzerland and Austria 244
Christian militia 590
Christians, persecutions of
—in Canada 609
—in Japan 601f
Christ's human nature 246, 353
Christoph, duke of Württemberg 269, 296, 407
Chronology 552
Chur
—bishopric 533
—Reformation 171
Church 278, 290, 371f
—abuses on eve of Reformation 6f
—and spiritual office in Luther's view 220ff
—and state, see State
—authority and power 201, 202, 203f
—definition (ecclesiology) 9f, 195, 337, 541
——according to de Bray 400
——according to Calvin 383f
——according to Luther 69f, 78, 195, 213–17
——after Council of Trent 496
—hierarchical order 278
—literary opponents of Luther 191–207
—reform 208ff
——see also Catholic reform
—survival in western and eastern Europe 511–22
—under influence of formation of denominations 427
Church, Catholic 425
—after peace of Westphalia 643
—and power of state 421f
—centralism 644
—episcopalism 644f
—formalism 644
—in England 630
—in Ireland 630
—post-Tridentine 644
Church constitution, Protestant 217
—Lutheran, expansion 230ff
Church councils, see Consistories
Church discipline 217, 233
—Calvin's 366f
—Luther's view 223
Church fathers 536, 546
—editions 547ff
Church history 550ff
—as academic discipline 552
Church hymn, German 131, 206, 428, 562
Church law 644
Church ordinance for Denmark 304
—for Norway 304
Church, people's, Lutheran 228, 231
Church property 262, 263, 279, 284, 291, 296, 301, 462, 638ff
—regulation 225–27
—secularization 225f
Church reform 162, 208, 465
—and Adrian VI 106f, 109, 111
Church regimen 217
—by state 219–25, 229ff
—according to Calvin 373ff
Church regulations, Protestant 420, 426
—Lutheran 223, 229ff
—see also individual countries
Church schism 456, 464
Church visitation, see Visitation
Cicada 471f
Cisneros, abbot of Montserrat 452
Cistercians 459, 572
—formation of congregations 572
—post-Tridentine development 572
Civil servants, state of 637
Clandestine marriage 494
Clement VI, pope 575
Clement VII (Giulio Medici), pope 209, 237, 261, 329, 435, 436, 438, 442, 456, 479ff, 500, 504, 540
—and Charles V 237–41
—and France 237ff
Clement VIII (Ippolito Aldobrandini), pope 205, 397, 509ff, 515, 519, 543, 549, 561, 593, 610, 615, 623
—and dispute over grace 543f
Clément, Jacques 396, 515
Clericalism 6
Clergy 6f
—education 426
—monopoly of instruction 6
—native in mission areas 612ff
—privileges of position 6
Cleves 281, 284f, 399, 403, 404
Coburg 427
Cocchi, Angelo 605
Cochin, bishopric 596, 614
Cochinchina, mission to 606
Cochläus, Johannes 6, 46, 50, 79, 96, 193f, 197, 202, 204, 261, 262, 275, 547
Condure 448
Coelho 600
Coello 451
Cognac, league of (1526) 212, 238
Coimbra 454, 535
Colet, John 154, 327
Coligny, Gaspard, admiral 393f, 514
—Odet de, cardinal 393
Colleges, English 517
Collegium Germanicum in Rome 504, 530
Cologne 531, 535, 554, 571
—bishopric 528, 531
—diocesan synod (1589) 528
—diocesan synod (1662) 529
—electors, assembly of (1530) 266
—Jesuit college 532
—peace congress (1636–40) 627
—priest seminary 528
—reform synods 292
—reformation attempts 283f

—university 198
—war (1583) 528
"Cologne Reformation" 283
Colombia 584
Colonna, family 239
—Marc Antonio, cardinal 508
—Pompeo, cardinal 239
—Sciarra 5
—Vittoria 439, 457
Columbus, Christopher 576, 579, 589
Commandments and vows 86f
Commendone, Giovanni Francesco, cardinal 489, 504, 522, 541
Common penny 113
Communero rebellion 445
Communion of both kinds 89, 120, 257, 259, 290, 337, 428, 477, 491
—actual 356, 389
—of one kind 335
—see also Lay chalice
Community box 90, 226f
Commutatio idiomatum 28f, 32, 359
Commutations 42
Compagnia delle dimesse di S. Orsola, see Ursulines
Compagnie des pasteurs 373, 381
Complutensian Polyglot 444, 546
Concepción de la Vega, bishopric 579
Conciliarism 5, 239, 317, 462, 467
Conclave, reform 481
Concomitance 202
Concord, Book of (1580) 237, 425
Concord, formula of (1577) 355, 361
Concordat of Leith 416
Concordats 5
Concubinage 7, 86, 161, 496, 523
Concupiscence
—Luther's views 25f, 201
—at the Council of Trent 468f
Condren, Charles de 559
Confessio Anhaltina 409
Confessio Augustana, see Augsburg Confession
Confessio Augustana Variata 356, 359, 386, 405, 410
Confessio Belgica 400, 401, 426
Confessio Gallicana 392, 425f
Confessio Hafniensis 303
Confessio Helvetica Posterior (1566) 326, 408, 425
Confessio Negativa 417
Confessio Pentapolitana 322
Confessio Scotica 413, 417, 425
Confessio Virtembergica 269
Confession 257, 271, 278, 335, 562
Confessional 562f
Confessing Church 228
Confessions 420, 425f
—reformed 425f
Confirmation 278, 293, 472, 562
Confraternities 433, 562, 563
—of Christian Doctrine 561
—of Christian Instruction 501, 561
—of Divine Love, Naples 434
—of the Eucharist 441
Confutatio Lutheranismi Danici 303
Confutation of Charles V 260–63
Congo 501, 592
—mission to 592
Congregation
—Calvin's concept 383
—Luther's concept 215–221
—Lutheran, expansion 225–37
Congregations, papal 644
—of bishops 505
Congegation of Propaganda 553, 571, 605, 610–14
—difficulties as supreme missionizing office
——with Orders 614
——with patronage powers 613f
——within the Curia 614
—establishment of Propaganda college in Rome 612
—founding (1622) 618
—planning center of Counter-Reformation 619
—renunciation of limiting missionary work to Europe 613
Conquistadores, Spanish 577ff
Conscience, freedom of conscience 298, 350
Consensus Bremensis 409
Consensus Tigurinus (1549) 253, 356, 361, 386, 389ff
Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia (1537) 461, 483
Consistories 233f, 374f, 427
Consistory, regulations (1542) 233
Consistory, plenary session of cardinals 481, 505f
Constance 175, 176, 243, 258, 267, 270, 293, 526, 530, 621, 626
—diocesan synod (1560) 533
—diocesan synod (1567) 526
—diocesan synod (1609) 527, 562
Constitution of congregation, Calvinistic 366f, 425
Consul, Stephan 325
Consultatio de articulis inter Catholicos et Protestantes controversis (1564) 634
Contarini, Gasparo, cardinal 203, 205, 277ff, 434, 440, 448, 458, 459, 461, 464
Controversies, doctrines of 199, 495
Controversies, sermons 560
—writings 634
Controversy, theologians, Catholic 191–207, 539
—John Fisher 334
Controversy, theology 535, 547
Conventuals 438, 459f, 569, 571
Conversions 632f
Copenhagen
—assembly of lords (1530).303f
—assembly of lords (1533) 304

Copernican system 642f
Copernicus, Nicholas 642
Cordatus, Conrad 34, 321, 348
Cordeses, A. 558
Coria
—reform synod (1537) 512
—synod (1606) 512
Cornelius a Lapide (van Steen) 547
Coronel 543
Corpus Catholicorum 191
Corpus Christi 293
—procession 563
Cortés, Hernán 580
Cortese, Gregorio 458
Corvinus, Anton 281
Cosimo, duke of Florence 489, 500
Cosimo I, grand duke of Tuscany 615
Coster 451
Coton, Pierre 616
Council 200, 259, 285, 291
—agreement of Paul III 279
—attempts of Charles V 261
—authority 244
—call by Paul III to Mantua (1537) 271
—calls for 462ff
—demands of Catholic and Protestant estates 270
—plans of Diet of Speyer (1529) 243
—Protestant appeals to 259
—rejection of Protestant participation 271ff
Councils, ecumenical
—editions 549
—of Basel (1431–45) 5, 444
—of Constance (1414–18) 5, 444
—Fifth Lateran (1512–17) 10, 439, 441f, 461
—of Trent (1545–63) 286f, 295, 425, 637
——agenda 467
——beginnings 286, 466ff
——confirmation 497
——congregation 506
——controversial doctrines 495
——convocation of 464f
——crisis 491ff
——decree of justification 469ff
——episcopate 492ff, 497
——eucharist, doctrine of 474, 477
——first session (1545–48) 466–76
——historical significance 496f
——implementation (1565–1605) 499–534
——marriage reform decree 494
——move to Bologna 288, 473ff
——orders, reform 495
——ordination, sacrament 493
——participants 466
——reform 492ff
——reform negotiations 478
——residence crisis 491f
——residence decree 493
——sacrament of penance 474, 477
——sacrificial nature of mass, decree 492
——second session (1551–52) 476–479
——suspension 464, 476
——third session (1562–63) 490–98
——voting rights 466f
Counter-Reformation 621f, 624, 637, 643f
—beginnings in central Europe 615–23
—definition 431f
—European and denominational absolutism 615–45
—in Bohemia 622f
—in Hungary 622
—in the German Empire 626f
—see also Catholic reform
Court practice 462
Covarruvias, Didacus de 552
Covenant (1557) 412
Crabbe 549
Cracow 318, 320, 571
—peace (1525) 314
Cracow, Georg 361
Crafftheim, Crato von 357
Craig, John 417
Cramer, Samuel 184
Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury 329ff, 334, 336, 337, 338, 339
Credulitas 201
Crell, Paul 361
Cremona 435
Crépy, peace of (1544) 285, 399, 464
Crescenzio, Marcello 476, 478
Croatia, Reformation 325f
Crockaert, Petrus 537
Cromer, Martin 519
Cromwell, Oliver 332, 334, 336, 629
Cromberg, Schweikard von 527
Cross, breviary of the Holy 485
—sacrifice 492
Crotus, Rubeanus 144
Cruciger, Caspar 275, 340, 348f
Crusade, indulgence 42
Crusade idea 443
Cryptocalvinism 356, 360, 426
Csanad 322, 324
Cuius regio eius et religio 421, 522
Cult 246
—see also Ceremonies
Culvensis, Abraham 319
Cum ad tollenda, bull (1550) 476
Cumaná 585
Cum occasione, bull (1563) 631
Cum postquam, constitution 59
Cum sicut maiestas, bull (1500) 590
Cuper, Willem 184, 185
Curaeus, Joachim 361
Curia, Roman 193, 644
—and peace of Augsburg 299f
—and Reformation in Sweden 307f
—in Luther's reform writings 67f
—reform
——attempts by Julius III 481f
——beginnings under Paul III 461
——under Adrian VI 106ff

——under Paul IV 485
——under Pius IV 497
——reorganization under Sixtus V
—see also *Dataria,* Congregations, Penitentiary
Curione, Celio Secundo 641
Customs 210, 290, 291, 424, 428
Cuzco, bishopric 582f

Daimyos 599f, 601f
Dainichi 599
Dalberg, archbishop of Mainz 527
Dalmatin, Jurij 325
Dandino, cardinal 465, 479, 482
Danzig 318, 356
—attack on monasteries (1524) 318
Darnley, Henry 413
Dataria, papal 461f, 485f
Dati, Julian 434
Dávid, Ferenc 324, 326
Deacons (Calvinist church service regulation) 375
Dead, mass for 314
Debrecen 325
—synod (1567) 326
De captivitate Babylonica ecclesiae praeludium, by Luther 68ff, 83, 87, 92, 98, 193
Decet Romanum Pontificem, bull (1520) 76f
Declaratio Ferdinandea 297, 298, 626
Decretum Gratiani, see Gratian
Decretum pro Armenis (1439) 473
Defensor Pacis 331
Decalogue 341ff
Delfino, Giovanni Antonio 459
—Pietro 435
—Zaccaria, cardinal 296, 484f, 489, 504
Del Monte, Antonio 479
—Giovanni Maria, see Julius III
—Innocenzo 482
Delrío, Martin Anton 640
Denck, Hans 181f, 189
Denifle, H. 39
Denmark 301, 305, 309, 317
—Reformation 302ff
Denominations, creation of 644
Denominations, development of Protestant 255–58
—in 16th and 17th centuries 419–29
—see also Augsburg Confession, *Professio fidei Tridentina*
Denominationalism 632–37
Dernbach, abbot of Fulda 526
De Rossi 548
Descartes, René 641
Dessau 410
—alliance (1525) 211
Determinism 345
Devai Biro, Matthias 324
Deventer, bishopric 513
Devil 639
Devonshire 338
Devotio moderna 3, 444, 452
Devotion, popular 9, 534
—post-Tridentine 563f
Devotional literature 311
Deza, archbishop of Seville 444
Diamper, provincial synod (1599) 597
Diaz, Bartolomeo 589
Didacus of Alcala 575
Dieckhoff, A. W. 221
Dietenberger, Johannes 96, 202, 205, 546, 561
Dietrich, Veit 344
Dietrich von Erbach, archbishop 8
Dietrich von Schönberg 312
Dietrichstein, cardinal 510, 622
Dillenburg, synod (1578) 408
Dillingen 526, 536
—diocesan synod (1567) 526
—Jesuit college 455, 526
—priest seminary 526
—university 455, 526
Dilthey, Wilhelm 639
Diogo, king of the Congo 593
Diocesan synods 292, 426, 475f, 494, 497f, 501f, 530
Discalceates 570
Disputatio contra scholasticam theologiam (1517) 40
Disputations, see Baden, Bern, Emden, Heidelberg, Lausanne, Leipzig, Valladolid, Weimar, Zürich
—in the Antinominalist controversy (1537 and 1538) 343
Dissenters 419
Discipline, Calvinistic 425
Diu 589
Divine service order 206
—Luther's 221, 223
—of the Lutheran congregation 226–30
Divine services of congregation
—Müntzer's concept 131
—regulation by Luther 92f
——by Wittenberg 87
—Reformation 119ff
Divorce 494
Doctrinas 586
Doctrine 291
—mark of denomination 425
Dogmas, history of 552
Doménech 454
Dominici gregis, bull (1564) 497
Dominican brotherhood, Bologna 433
Dominicans 438, 445, 469, 535, 570f
—chapter (January 1518) 52f
——(May 1518) 54
—dispute over grace 542ff
—mission in America 579
——in China 605
——in East Africa 594
——in India 595ff
——in Indochina 605
——in Japan 601
——in Mexico 580

——in New Granada 584f
——in Peru 582
——in the Philippines 587
——in West Africa 592
—reform 556
—theologians opposing Luther 199ff
Dominis, Marcantonio de 636
Donatio Alexandrina 576
Donation of Constantine 67
Donauwörth 620
Doornik, see Tournai
Dordrecht
—national synod (1617–18) 402
—synod (1618–19) 407
Dorpat 316f
—Jesuit college 519
Douai 517
Doutrinas 607
Dragffy, family 324
Draskovich, bishop of Fünfkirchen 491
Drechsel, Thomas 89f
Driedo, Johannes 198, 535
Dualism 189
Dubiecko 319
Dublin 571
Duc, Fronton du 548
Du Feynier 459
Duisburg 403, 404
—university 404
Dum nuper, papal brief 55
Du Moulin, Calvinist 515
Du Perac 507
Duperron, cardinal 545
Dury, John 635
Dutch rebellion 511, 513
Dzierzkowski, primate of Gnesen 484

East Africa 594
Eastern Europe, Reformation 311–27
East Friesland 404
East Prussia 312
Eber, Paul 361
Eberhard von der Mark, prince bishop of Liège 401
Eberlin von Günzburg 138
Ecclesia Anglicana, see Anglican Church
Echter von Mespelbrunn, Julius, prince bishop of Würzburg 525
Eck, Johannes 43, 46, 53, 63f, 72f, 74, 76, 79, 102, 111f, 118, 174f, 192, 196, 204f, 256f, 260, 274f, 277f, 540, 546, 560
—*Enchiridion* 195
Eder 554
Eder, K. 432
Edict of Nantes (1598) 397f, 421, 515, 620, 636
Edinburgh 518
—meeting of Scottish Estates (1560) 412
Education 426
—and Reformation 233ff
—religious 537
Edward VI, king of England 327, 336ff, 480
Egmont, count 401
Egnazio, humanist 435
Egranus, Johann Sylvius 129
Ehrenberger Klause (pass) 287, 295, 469
Eichhorn, Joachim, abbot of Einsiedeln 533
Eichsfeld 527
Eichstätt 526
—priest seminary 526
Einarsson, Gissur 305
Einbeck 267
Einsiedel, electoral councillor 121
Einsiedeln 533, 564
Eisleben 235
—school 322
Ecclesiology, see Church
Elders, Presbyters (Calvinist church regulation) 373f
Electors 266
Ebert, W. 222
Elgard, Nicolaus 527
Elizabeth I, queen of England 327, 338f, 395, 418, 484, 517ff
—excommunication (1570) 517
Ellwangen 639
Eltz, Jakob von, archbishop of Trier 527
Elzevir 546
Emden 356, 401, 403, 404
—disputation (1544) 187
—synod (1571) 401, 404
Emigration, right to 297
Emmendingen
—religious colloquy (1590) 633
Emmerich 403
Empires, spiritual and secular 4f
Emser, Hieronymus 46, 50, 76, 82, 95, 192, 194, 199, 202, 547
Engelbriktsson, Olav, archbishop of Nidaros (Trondheim) 304
England 238, 267, 280, 488, 499, 511, 514, 609, 615, 621, 643
—Anglicanism 629
—Calvinism 418f
—Catholic restoration under Julius III 480
——end under Paul IV 484
—Catholicism 629
——under James I 619
—Confiscation of church treasures 338
—Convocation of the clergy (1563) 339
—Dissolution of monasteries 332f
—Established church 327
—New liturgy 337ff
—Pastoral care 517
—Predominance of Protestantism 629ff
—Popular devotion 328
—Protestant articles of faith 333
—Protestant wave under Edward VI 336ff
—Puritanism and high church 419
—Reformation 327–39
—Rite of ordination 338
—Schism (1534) 330ff

— —Renewal 484, 499, 517
—Separation from church 241
—Test Oath (after 1655) 630
—under Elizabeth I 517ff
English Free Churchmanship 191
English Ladies 573
Entfelder, Christian 189
Eperies 322
Episcopalism, episcopal system
—in England 417f, 629
Episcopate (bishops) 265, 291f
—appointment 503
—at Council of Trent, 493f, 541
— —strengthening 496
—authority 260
—baptismal authority 473
—interference with work 471
—Italian, beginning of reform 439f
—jurisdiction 209f, 259, 262, 296, 298
— obligation of residence 471f, 491f, 619
— office 314
— —according to Luther 233
— office regulation 472
— ordination according to Luther 221f
—power 257
—reform 433
—revelation of faith 469
—right of ordination 472
—visitation right 472
Epistle of James 96, 119
Erasmus, Desiderius 12, 71, 75, 94, 98, 101f, 111, 144–56, 160, 170, 173, 189f, 202, 234, 321, 326, 327, 362, 421, 446, 450, 486, 546f, 556, 561, 634
—and Luther 144f
—and Reformation 144ff, 152f
—*Christiani Hominis Institutum* (1512) 154
—*Ciceronianus* (1528) 153
—*De libero arbitrio* 146f
—*De praeparatione ad mortem* (1534) 156
—*De puritate ecclesiae christianae* (1536) 154
—*Explanatio Symboli* (Catechism; 1533) 154
—*Hyperaspistes diatribae* (1526–27) 152
—*Institutum* 154f
—*Liber de sarcienda ecclesiae concordia* (1533) 154
Erdeödy, family 325
Erich I, duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel 211
Erik XIV, king of Sweden 309
Erlau 323
Ermland, bishopric 312
Ernst, duke of Bavaria 504, 528
Ernst, duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg 211, 243, 259, 267
Ernst, landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels 633
Ernst, archbishop of Magdeburg-Halberstadt
Escorial, Hieronymite monastery 512
Esseg, defeat of Charles V against Turks (1538) 273
Esslingen 267
Established church, Lutheran 5, 143, 213, 217, 224, 233, 299
Estates
—protest at Diet of Speyer (1529) 242f
—Protestant 263
—right to Reformation 628
Este, family 509
—Ippolito d' 482, 490
Estienne, Robert 546
Estoile, Pierre de l' 362
Estonia 315, 317
Eu 517
Eucharist, doctrine 194f, 201, 202, 244, 248, 250, 258, 272, 276, 278, 314, 323, 335, 337, 356ff, 371, 386, 387, 388, 394, 403, 406, 415
—at Council of Trent 474, 477
—Calvin's 366, 385f, 393f
— —attempts to create Protestant agreement 383ff
—Dispute
— —between Lutherans and Calvinists 356ff, 386, 390
— —concensus of Zürich 356f
— —Marburg Disputation (1529) 249ff
—in both kinds 250, 323
—Karlstadt's 122ff
—Liturgy 630
—Luther's 65, 124ff
—reception 210
—Reformed 405ff
—Report on institution of, Zwingli's interpretation 247ff
—Veneration 562
—Zwingli's 245–49
—see also Holy Communion, Lay Chalice, Lord's Supper, Mass, Real Presence, Transsubstantiation
Eudes 559
Eudists 516
Eugene IV, pope 562, 575
Eugene VI, pope 328
Europe marked by denominational pluralism 301–429
Evangelical liberty 85f
Evangelical Mass 87
Evangelism, in Italy 457
—in Spain 446
Eternal prayer 563
Exegesis, see Bible explanation
Exemptions 8, 462, 469
—papal privileges 471
Exercises, Exercitia spiritualia by Ignatius of Loyola 452, 569
Ex omnibus afflictionibus, bull (1567) 542
Exsurge Domine, bull (1520) 71, 72ff, 119, 144, 147, 256
Extreme unction, see Sick
Eyb, Gabriel von, bishop of Eichstätt 53

Faber, Johannes (Augustanus) 202

—Peter (Pierre Lefeure) 448f, 453
Fabri, Johann, vicar general of Constance, bishop of Vienna (1530) 153, 161, 163f, 174, 197f, 260, 275
—Johannes, polemicist 202, 204
Facchinetti, Gian Antonio, see Innocent IX
Faith 201, 341f, 344, 470
—and sacrament according to Luther 32f
—and works 65, 347, 469
— —see also Justification, Works
—certainty of 56f, 470
—community of, according to Luther 214
—formulas 425f
— —see also Confessions
—justification 65f
—justifying 201, 345
— —Luther's view 16
—revelation of 194, 205f, 425, 469, 559f
— —according to Luther 215
Fanson, abbot 572
Farel, Guillaume 362, 365, 369f, 371f, 375, 385, 387
Farnese, Alessandro the Elder, see Paul III
—Alessandro the Younger, cardinal 8, 275, 284, 285, 456, 458, 464, 465, 471, 473, 479, 482, 495, 500f, 505
—Alessandro, governor of the Netherlands 402, 513
—Costanza 456
—Odoardo, duke of Parma 624
—Ottavio 456, 479f
—Pierluigi 288, 456, 474
Favre, François 375
Felix V, anti-pope 10
Ferber, Eberhard 318
—Mauritius, bishop of Ermland 313
Ferdinand I, emperor 107, 112, 177, 180, 197, 206, 208, 209, 211, 212, 242, 244, 266f, 268, 273, 274, 280, 286, 287, 294f, 295f, 299, 322f, 326, 407, 425, 455, 457, 485, 489, 496, 525, 633, 634
Ferdinand II, emperor 615, 620ff, 625
Ferdinand III, emperor 627
Ferdinand II the Catholic of Aragon 105, 443, 444, 576
Ferdinand of Bavaria, elector of Cologne 528, 626
Ferrara 454, 464, 465, 509
Ferrari, jurist 436
Ferreira 542
Ferrier, conciliar legate 493
Feudal state 637
Fideism 641
Fidelis von Sigmaringen 569
Filles de la Charité, see Vincentians
Finland 301
—Reformation 310f
— —liturgy 311
Fisher, John, bishop of Rochester 199, 330, 331f, 334, 458, 547
Fiscalism 8
Fitzmaurice, count 518
Flacius (Illyricus), Matthias 293, 346f, 348f, 351, 355, 550, 633
Flanders 238
Fleck, Johannes 50
Flemish 403
Florence 237f, 240, 454, 492
Florimonte, bishop of Sessa 559
Flügi, Johann V, bishop of Chur 533
Fontaine, Nicolas de 382
Fontana, Domenico 507
Fonte Colombo 570
Foreiro, Francisco 500
Forer, Lorenz 626
Formula Concordiae (1577) 405
Formula Instituti, see Society of Jesus
Formula Missae 228
Formula missae et communionis 92
Formula reformationis 293
Foscarari, Egidio 452, 501
Foundation masses 9, 225
Fox, John 329, 338
Foxe, Edward, bishop of Hereford 332
Fracastoro, conciliar physician 473
France 237ff, 251, 267, 269, 273, 281, 285, 294f, 336, 376, 456, 457, 463f, 466, 474, 476, 479, 483, 488ff, 499, 511, 567, 614, 615, 623f, 628, 630, 633, 638f, 643f
—and Spain 628, 631
—beginnings of reform 442
—Calvinism 391ff, 490
— —church regulation (1559) 392
— —formation of communities 391ff
—Catholic reform 513ff
—decrees of Council of Trent 516f
— —rejection of Council of Trent by Estates General (1614–15) 619
—development of denominations 422
—education of priests 516
—entrance into Thirty Years War (1635) 625
—missionary work 608ff
— —in Near East 609
— —in North America 608
—provincial synods 516
—reforms of Council of Trent through episcopate 516
Francis I, king of France 112, 115, 141, 237f, 247, 252, 288, 335, 364, 391, 393, 412, 463f, 608
—aid to Turks 285f
Francis II, king of France 489
Francis, duke of Lorraine 391
Francis de Sales 502, 537, 540, 545, 559, 573, 641
Francis Regis 569
Franciscans 438, 469, 536, 570f, 581
—conventuals 512
—mission to the Antilles 578
— —to Brazil 606
— —to Celebes 598
— —to Ceylon 598

——to China 605
——to India 595ff
——to Indochina 605
——to Japan 601
——to Malabar 597
——to Mexico 580
——to New Granada 585
——to Peru 582
——to Philippines 588
——to West Africa 592
—Recollects 445
—theologians opposing Luther 199ff, 203ff
Francisco de Osuna 556
Francisco de Toledo 467, 478, 509, 536, 539, 542, 546, 560
Franck, Sebastian 187, 189, 190f
Francken-Sierstorff, Heinrich 546
Franconia 526
Frangipani, Ottavio, nuncio in Cologne 528, 542, 563
Frankenhausen (1525) 136, 141
Frankfurt/Main 338, 357, 401, 403
—religious colloquy (1539) 370
Frankfurt/Oder 424
—Reformation 268
Frankfurt Armistice 273f
Franz, duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg 211, 259
Franzen, August 528
Fraternitas divini amoris sub divi Hieronymi protectione, Genoa 434
Frederick I, king of Denmark 302
Frederick the Wise, see Friedrich III, Elector of Saxony
Freedom of belief 191
Freedom of Christian Man 4, 113–207, 161, 201, 225, 457
—see also Will, freedom of, Predestination
Freiburg i. Breisgau 173
Freiburg (Switzerland) 167, 175
Freising 524
French Revolution 191
Friedrich, landgrave of Hesse 633
Friedrich von Holstein 529
Friedrich II of Liegnitz 189
Friedrich II, Elector Palatine 282
Friedrich III, Elector Palatine 299, 358, 405f, 407, 408, 422, 423
—fight against Catholicism and Lutheranism 408
Friedrich IV, Elector Palatine 423
Friedrich V, Count Palatine 621
Friedrich III the Wise, Elector of Saxony 46, 54f, 58, 61f, 71, 75f, 77, 78, 91f, 95, 99f, 120, 128, 133f, 145, 211, 302
Frith, John 334
Fritz, Joss 140
Froben, Johannes 65, 172
Froschauer, Christopf 160
Froschauer Bible 170
Frundsberg, Jörg von 239
Fuchs, Johannes 323
Fuertaventura, bishopric 575
Fugger, banking house 45
—Jakob von, bishop of Constance 527, 626
Fukien 605
Funai, bishopric 600, 614
Funchal, bishopric 590, 595
Fürstenberg, Dietrich (Theodor), bishop of Paderborn 626

Gaetani, nuncio 543
Galaza, bishop of Coria 512
Galen, Christoph Bernhard von, bishop of Münster 529
Galicia, union of orthodox bishops with Rome (1681) 521
Galileo, Galilei 540, 639, 642
Galli, Tolomeo 503
Gallicans, Gallicanism 535, 540, 553
Gallican liberties 59
Gallus, Nikolaus 346f, 348f, 358
Gama, Vasco da 589
Gansfort, Wessel 246
Garasse, François 642
Gardiner, Stephen, bishop of Winchester 328, 332, 334, 335f, 338, 480
Garnet, Henry 619
Gattinara, Mercurio Arborio di, chancellor 238, 254
Gavanti,. Bartolomeo 624
Gebeck, bishop of Freising 524
Gebhard, count of Mansfeld 267
Gebsattel, bishop of Bamberg 526
Geldenhauer, Gerhard Eobanus 408
Geldern 281f
—war of succession 283
Gelenius, vicar general in Cologne 529
Génébrard, Gilbert 550
General Assembly 416f, 418
General council, see Councils
Geneva 372, 391, 400, 503
—Calvin's church regulation 366ff
—Calvin's confession of faith 367f
—Calvin's founding of university 376
—Calvin's Reformation 365ff
—church regulation (1541) 373f
—church regulation (1561) 376
—Company 392
—divine service order (1542) 373
—libertines 375
—theocracy 368
—university 408
Geneva Catechism 375, 401, 425
Gennep 403
Gentile, Giovanni 641
Gentillet, Calvinist 515
Gentine, Valentino 320
Genoa 238, 454
Georg, margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach 243, 259, 321
Georg von Braunschweig, archbishop of

Bremen 529
Georg, duke of Saxony 44, 46, 50, 63, 142, 196f, 211, 242, 273f
Georg, Truchsess von Waldburg 116, 142f
Gerard, John 517
Gerhard, Johann 636
Gerhardt, Paul 428
German Mass 89, 92, 94, 120, 131, 227f, 236, 370, 420
Germany 333, 420, 506
—beginnings of reform 442
—Calvinism 402ff
—delimitation of denominations 523f
—reception of Tridentinism 523, 524f
—see also Reformation
Gerolshofen 639
Gerstmann, Martin, bishop of Breslau 531
Ghent 399
—bishopric 512
—pacification of (1576) 402, 513
Ghinucci, Girolamo, cardinal 54, 448, 458, 461
Ghislieri, Michele, see Pius V
Giberti, Giovanni Matteo, bishop of Verona 434, 440
Gift 354
—see also Justification
Giglio, brothers 505
Gilds 564
Ginetti, cardinal 627
Giorgi, Sebastian 435
Giovio 465
Giustiniani, Lorenzo 439, 458
—Paolo 435f
—Vincenzo 503
Glamorgan 630
Glanaeus, Jodocus 409
Glapion, Johann 71
Glarus 157, 175
—Reformation 171
Gliczner, Erazm 319
—Luther's view 41
Gnesiolutherans 349, 352, 358, 361
Goa 455, 501, 590, 597
—bishopric 595f
Goch, 403
Gondi, cardinal 516
Gonesius, Petrus 641
Gonzaga, Ercole, cardinal 440, 490, 491, 493
—Ferrante 474
—Luigi 568
Gönzi, Matthäus, bishop 224
Gorka, Andrej 318
Goslar 267
Gospel 214, 342f
—see also Faith, revelation of, Word
Gotha-Torgau, alliance (1526) 211
Göttingen 267
Government, secular, Luther's 217ff
Grabmann, M. 538
Grace, doctrine of grace 151, 342, 344ff, 353, 387f, 457, 542, 631
—and freedom 469
—as viewed by Calvin 379
——Erasmus 146ff
——Karlstadt 118f
——Luther 40, 345
—certainty 470f
—disputation 509, 539, 542ff
—means toward 251
—see also Justification, Council of Trent
Graduale Romanum 566
Gran 326, 498
—archbishopric 323f
Granada 454, 492
—conquest (1492) 443
—provincial synod (1565–66) 512
—university 329
—victory (1492) 576
Granvella, Nicolas 275f, 464
Grassi, G. P., bishop of Viterbo 440
Gratian 644
—decree 323, 552
Gratia and *Donum* according to Luther 82f
Graubünden, Reformation 171f
Gravamina of the German Nation 8, 67, 110
Graz 268, 532
—Jesuit college 532
Grebel, Konrad 165, 166, 178f, 183
Gregory XIII (Ugo Boncompagni), pope 437, 466, 502, 503ff, 507, 514, 518, 529, 542, 552f, 564, 569ff, 583, 601
—founding of colleges in Rome 504
Gregory XIV (Niccolò Sfondrato), pope 508, 515
Gregory XV (Alessandro Ludovisi), pope 573, 596, 597, 611, 618, 621
Gregorius of Valencia 536, 538
Greiffenklau, Richard von, archbishop of Trier 61, 78, 115f
Gretser, Jakob 536, 539, 617, 634
Gribaldi, Matteo 641
Greek college San Atanasio in Rome 504
Grisar, Heinrich 37
Groningen, bishopric 513
Gropper, Johann 203f, 275ff, 283f, 289, 477
—Kaspar 504
Grosswardein 322, 326
—peace (1538) 322
Grotius, Hugo 537, 552, 635
Grynaeus, Simon 321, 364
Guadalajara, bishopric 580
Gualterio, bishop of Viterbo 493
Guarino 440
Guatemala 580
Guerrero, Pedro 443, 454
Gueux 401, 513
Guibert 558
Guidiccioni, Bartolomeo, cardinal 448, 457, 458, 461, 463
Guise, House of 489, 514
—Charles, cardinal of Lorraine 479, 487, 488,

493ff, 496, 516
—Charles II, cardinal 528
—Francis, duke of 391, 393, 395
—Henry I de 396, 515
—Louis I de, cardinal 396
—Louis II de, cardinal 515, 516
—Mary de 411f
Güns, victory over Turks (1532) 268
Gustavus Adolfus 625f, 627, 630
Gustavus Erikson Vasa, king of Sweden 302, 306ff
Güttel, Caspar 343
Gyula 324

Haarlem, bishopric 513
Habitus, Luther's view 16f
Habsburg 241, 244, 286, 288, 299, 456, 463, 499, 531f, 564, 616, 620, 624
Hacker, P. 56
Hagenau, religious colloquy (1540) 274, 370
Hagiography 551
Haiti 578f
Halberstadt, bishopric 286, 529, 626f
Haldrein, Arnold 261
Hall, Jesuit college 532
Haller, Berchtold 156, 174f, 175
—Johannes 5
Hamar, bishopric 302
Hamburg, Reformation 268
—school regulation (1528) 235
Hamilton, John, archbishop of St. Andrews 518
Hamilton's Catechism 411
Hammermayer 631
Hanover, Reformation 268
Hans von Küstrin 196
Hardenberg, Albert Rizaeus 356, 358, 409
Harlay, François de 516
Harrach, archbishop of Prague 622
Hasenmüller 532
Hätzer, Ludwig 178, 181f, 189
Hausen, bishop of Regensburg 524
Hausmann, Nikolaus 230
Havelberg 298
Heath, archbishop of York 484
Hebler, Matthias, bishop of Weissenburg 324
Heckel, Joh. 220
Heerbrand, Jakob 633
Hegendörfer, Christoph 318
Hegge, Jakob 317
Heidelberg 358
—Disputation (1560) 405
Heidelberg Catechism (1563) 401, 406ff, 408f, 423, 425
Heiligenstadt, Jesuit college 527, 532
Held, Matthias, vice chancellor 272
Helding, Michael 204, 205, 289, 466
Helgesen, Paul 303
Heltai, Kaspar 324
Helvetian college in Milan 533
Helvetic Confession (1536) 253
Henckel, Johannes 321
Hennegau 402
Henriette Maria, daughter of Louis XIII 629
Henrique, titular bishop of Utica 592
Henten, Johann 546
Herborn, general synod (1586) 409
—academy 408
Herborn (Ferber), Nikolaus 203
Herborn regulation 409
Heresy Act of Henry VIII 330
Hermannstadt 323
Hertogenbosch, bishopric 512
Hervet, Gentian 551
Hessels, Johannes 477, 535, 541f
Hesse 244, 287
Hesshus(en), Tilemann 358, 390, 403, 405f
Heinrich II, duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel 211, 281
Heinrich von Mecklenburg 211
Heinrich, duke of Saxony 274
Heinrich of Sachsen-Lauenburg 529
Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel 529, 639
Henry VII, king of England 327
Henry VIII, king of England 71, 112, 146, 199, 241, 288, 327, 338, 637
—Act of Supremacy 329ff
—alliance policy and creeds 333ff
—*Bishop's Book* (1537) 335
—dissolution of monasteries 332f
—divorce 328ff
—fight against the council 334f
—*King's Book* (1543) 336
—relations to German Protestantism 334f
—Six Articles (1539) 335
—Ten Articles of Faith (1536) 334f
Henry II, king of France 295, 391, 393, 479
Henry III, king of France 396f, 514f, 639
Henry IV, king of France 395ff, 508, 515, 608, 616, 632, 636
Henry of Navarre 515f
Henry of Orléans 241
Hideyoshi 600
Hierarchy 265
Hieronymites, Florence 434, 512
—Orvieto 434
Hilarius, Lutheran preacher 181
Hildesheim, bishopric 529, 531
Hirsch, Emanuel 104
Historical-critical method 552f, 572
Historical sciences 642
Hoen, Cornelis 247
Hoffaeus, Paul 532, 569
Hoffmeister, Johann 205, 560
Höfler, Constantin 431
Höfling, J. W. F. 222
Hofmann, Melchior 183f
Hofmeister, Sebastian 172
Hohenems, Mark Sittich von, cardinal 490, 526, 572
Hohenzollern, Eitel Friedrich von, bishop of

Osnabrück 529
Holar, bishopric 302
Holbein 170
Holland 401, 438, 640
Holle, bishop of Lübeck 529
Holstein 187
Holstenius, Lucas 554, 633
Holy Scripture 202f, 205, 536, 546
—as viewed by Erasmus 147ff
—as viewed by Luther 150f
—as viewed by Müntzer 133f
—canonicity 119
—translation by Luther 93ff
Honduras 580
—bishopric 580
Honter, Johannes 323f
Hoogstraeten, Jakob van 201f
Hooker, Richard 339, 518
Hoorne, admiral 401
Hospitals 573
Houghton, John 331
Hoya, Johann von, bishop of Münster 529
Hozjusz (Hosius), Stanislaw, cardinal 206, 490, 519, 540
Hren, Thomaz, bishop 325
Hsü Kuang-ch'i (Paul Hsü) 603
Hubmaier, Balthasar 136, 140, 180f
Huguenots 394ff, 489, 620, 635, 636
Huguenot Wars (1562–98) 394ff, 511, 514f, 534, 553
Hugo of St. Cher 43
Huguccio 43
Humanism 317, 444, 536f, 546
—and Reformation 144ff
— —according to Melanchthon 103
—Christian 442
—in England 327
Hungary 212, 280, 376, 499, 620
—Counter-Reformation 622
—development of denominations 422
—Reformation 321ff
Hunnius, Helferich 633
Hurons 609
Hus, Jan 64, 197
Husitism 317
Hut, Hans 181f
Hutten, Ulrich von 67, 114f, 145
Hutter, Jakob 182
Hutterites, see Moravian Brethren
Hyacinth of Casale 533, 621

Iceland 301, 303
—Reformation 305f
Iconoclasm 89ff, 120, 125, 165f, 167, 173, 314
Iconography 566
Idalcan 613
Ieyasu, Tokugawa 601
Ignatius of Loyola 446ff, 564, 595, 619
Ilanz, Ilanz Article (1526) 171
—religious colloquy (1526) 175
Images, veneration of 335
Immaculate conception of Mary 468f
Immortalis (1627) 612
Imperiale (Chile), bishopric 583f
Imperial cities 262, 298, 299
Imperial estates 267, 297
Imperial executive council 106
—religious trials 274
Imperial idea 299
Imperial knights 298
—feud (1522–23) 113ff
Imperial rein and papacy 104f, 208, 285ff
—under Charles V and Clement VII 237–41
Imputation of Christ's justice 380
In Coena Domini, bull (1568) 500
Independents 629
Index of forbidden books
—of Liège 399
—Protestant 426
—Roman 486, 496, 497, 509, 554, 638, 643
Index congregation 506
Indians, christianization 577ff, 580, 582ff, 586, 607, 609
Indian state, Christian 586
India 590
—mission to 595ff
—provincial synod 597
Indochina, mission to 605
Indulgence, indulgence doctrine 59, 84, 111, 157, 195, 199, 258, 475
—controversy 42–51
—deals with Albrecht of Mainz 44ff
—for St. Peter's Church 44
—for the dead 43
—history 42ff
—in practice 42ff
—monies 8
—preachers 49f
—privilege of sovereigns 44
—trade 8
Indult, bull (1548) 293
Infallibility, papal 199
Infant baptism 90, 122, 178
Infralapsiarianism 402
Ingoli, Francesco 611
Ingolstadt 287, 455, 536, 554
—university 455
Inhambane (Zambezi) 594
Initio nostri huius pontificatus, bull (1542) 464
Incas, empire of, conquest and mission to 582
Innocent IX (Gian Antonio Facchinetti), pope, 508
Innocent X (Gianbattista Pamfili), pope 574, 628ff, 631f, 643
Innsbruck 258, 287, 295, 478, 532
Inquisition, Roman 382, 446, 456, 483, 486f, 500, 506, 638, 640
—Galilei's case 642f
—in the Netherlands 399ff
—Spanish 447, 486, 511
Inscrutabili divinae providentiae arcano, bull (1622) 611

Inspiration 542
Institutio Religionis Christianae by Calvin (1559) 389, 425
Instruction religious
—Lutheran 233ff
—public 559ff
Interim, Augsburg (1548) 289ff, 292ff, 345, 476
—Leipzig (1548) 293, 345, 348, 352, 356
—Torgau negotiations 351
Irache 535
Irenics, irenicism 633ff
—see also Cassander, Erasmus, Grotius, Witzel
Ireland 511
—preservation of Catholicism 518
—persecution of Catholics 630
Iroquois 609
Isabella, archduchess 513
Isabella of Castile 443, 576
Isachino 485, 487
Isenburg, Salentin von, archbishop of Cologne 528
Isny 267
Italy 433, 568, 615
—beginnings of reform 433ff
Ivan the Terrible 520

Jacobus a Voragine 455
Jakob, margrave of Baden-Hachberg 633
James I, king of England (VI of Scotland) 339, 414, 417, 518, 540, 619
James V, king of Scotland 411
Jansenists 542, 552
Jansenius, Cornelius 535, 631
Janssen, Johannes 640
Japan 576, 596
—mission to 599ff
Java 590
—mission to 598
Jedin, Hubert 10, 284, 425
Jena 357
—compact 18
Jeremias II, ecumenical patriarch 520
Jerin, Andreas von, bishop of Breslau 531
Jesuits, see Society of Jesus
Jesuit colleges 455, 504, 530, 532, 561, 563, 568
Jesuit reductions, see Reductions
Jesuit theater 566
—see also *Autos sacramentales,* spiritual drama
Jesuit theology 538ff
Jewel, John, bishop of Salisbury 339
Joachim I, elector of Brandenburg 79, 108, 211, 242
Joachim II, elector of Brandenburg 274, 276f, 344
Joachim of Fiore 131
Joachim Ernst, prince of Anhalt 409
Johanna, Infintin 451
Jogues, Isaac 609
Johann of Nassau 402, 408
Johann, elector of Saxony 101, 132, 150, 211, 230, 242f, 254, 255ff, 259, 265, 267, 274, 281
Johann, archbishop of Weeze 273
Johann Albrecht von Mecklenburg 294
Johann Friedrich, duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg 633
Johann Friedrich, elector of Saxony 132, 233, 288, 474
Johann Friedrich II, duke of Saxony 406
Johann Georg I, prince of Anhalt 410
Johann Kasimir, count Palatine 423
Johann Ludwig, count of Nassau-Siegen 633
Johann Sigismund, king 326
Johann Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg 404
Johann Wilhelm, duke of Saxony 346
Johannes a Lasco 187
Johannes Makarios 548
John of the Cross 537, 556, 557, 570
John of God 573
John of Tossignano, bishop of Ferrara 440
John II, king of Portugal 589
John III, king of Portugal 454, 595
John IV, king of Portugal 628
John III, king of Sweden 309ff, 511, 519
Jolo 588
Jonas, Justus 98f, 144, 233, 257, 264, 348
Jörg vom Hause Jakob 179
Jörg von Frundsberg 111
Joseph of Calasanza 561, 568f
Joseph of Paris 570, 609
Joyeuse, cardinal 615, 617f
Juan de Avila 443, 512, 555, 573f
Juan de los Angeles 556
Jubilee (1600) 509
Jud, Leo 165, 166, 169f, 247
Julian calender, reform by Gregory XIII 504f
Jülich-Kleve-Berg 281, 404, 421, 616
Julius II (Giuliano della Rovere), pope 7, 43, 328, 439, 577, 578, 590f
Julius III (Giovanni Maria del Monte), pope 294, 296, 299, 465, 466, 471, 472, 476, 479ff, 485, 489, 495
Junius, Franziskus 635
Jurisdiction, spiritual 298
—according to Luther 215
—see also Episcopate, Papacy
Jus reformandi 213, 230
Justification, justification doctrine 195, 201, 202, 217, 225, 250, 257, 265, 271, 274, 276ff, 285, 290f, 293, 323, 333, 335f, 344, 347f, 350, 353, 371, 457, 469ff, 633
—and good works 347ff
—and sanctification 82
——Luther's view 27
—at the Council of Trent 469ff
—Calvin's 379f
—Karlstadt's 118
—Luther's 15, 17f, 26, 34f, 83
—Melanchthon's 341ff
—Müntzer's 135

—Osiander's 352ff
Justice 342
—double 204, 371, 470
—God's, Luther's concept 34f
—Christ's, see Justification
Justus ex fide 27
Juusten, Paulus, bishop of Viborg (Viipuri) 311

Kaaden near Eger, peace (1534) 269
Kalkbrenner, Gerhard 283
Kalkoff, P. 61, 62
Kalmancsa 324
Kalmancsehi 326
Kalmar, union (1397) 301
Kampen, Johann van 204
Kappel, first peace (1529) 177, 252
—second peace (1531) 253
—skirmish (1531) 267
Karlstadt, Andreas von 58, 63f, 85, 87, 89f, 93, 97, 116–28, 189, 196, 217, 226, 234, 247ff, 302
—doctrine of Holy Communion 119
Karnkowski, bishop of Wloclawek 519
Karolyi, Kaspar 326
Kaschau 322, 324
Kassel, compromise (1534) 270
Kathelyne, Georges 400
Kautz, Lutheran preacher 181f
Kepler, Johannes 505, 639, 642
Kerker, Joseph 431
Kerle, Jacobus de 566
Kessel 532
Kessler, Johannes 170
Kettler, Gotthard, master of Teutonic Order 317
Kevelaer 564
Kilger, L. 611
Kilkenny, treaty (1645) 630
Kindermann 566
King's Book of Henry VIII 336
King's Confession 417
Kircher, Athanasius 644
Kirk Session 415, 416
Kis, Stephan Szegedi 324, 326
Klagenfurt 525
—Jesuit college 532
Klaus von Merwitz, governor of Iceland 305
Klausenburg, academy 326
Klebitz, Wilhelm 358, 406
Kleinhöchstetten 174
Klein-Zeben 322
Klesl, Melchior, cardinal 525, 621, 623
Knights, see Imperial Knights
Knipperdolling 185, 186
Knoeringen, Heinrich von, bishop of Augsburg 526, 627
Knopken, Andreas 315f
Knox, John 376, 411ff, 418
Koblenz, Jesuit college 532
Köhler, Walther 159
Kolb, Franz 175
Koellin 538
Komander, Johannes 171f
Konarski, bishop of Poznan 519
Königsberg 294, 312ff, 318, 355
—alliance (1550) 294
—university 319
Kostka, Stanislaus 568
Köthen 410
Kozminek 320
—union (1555) 320
Krain 525, 622
Kranganore 596, 597
Krechting, Bernhard 186
Krelj, Sebastian 325
Krell, Nikolaus 361
Krems, Jesuit college 532
Kreuznach, meeting of Charles V with A. Farnese (1544) 284
Kronstadt 323
Kröw 422
Kulm, province 312
Kumer 34
Kuncewicz, Josaphat, uniate bishop of Poland 521
Kunz, Othmar, abbot of St. Gallen 533
Kurland 315, 317
Kuss, Otto 29

Laderchi 550
Ladislaus IV, king of Poland 521, 634
Laetare Jerusalem, bull (1544) 285, 465
Laibach, Jesuit college 532
Lainez, Diego 394, 448f, 451, 453, 454f, 538
Laicism 6
Lalemant, Charles 609
—Gabriel 609
Lambert, Franz 203
Landau 180
—assembly of knights (1522) 115
Lang, A. 538
—Johann 48, 87
Language, common 428, 491
La Plata countries, christianization 584
La Rochefoucauld, bishop of Clermont 516
La Rochelle 395
—national synod of Calvinists (1571) 395
Las Casas, Bartolomé de 579, 585, 586, 607
Laski, Jan 320f, 356f, 403
Lasko 324
Las Palmas, bishopric 576
Lasso, Orlando di 566
Latalski, Jan 317
Latin schools 234
Latimer 336
Latomus, Jakob 82, 172, 198, 535
Laud, archbishop of Canterbury 419
Laue, Max von 643
Lauffen on the Neckar, victory over Austrians (1534) 269
Laurentius of Brindisi 533, 537, 569
Laureo, papal nuncio 518

Laurerio, cardinal 457, 460
Lauretan litany 564
Lausanne 376
—bishopric 534
—disputation (1536) 366
Law 342ff
Law, international 642
Lawrence, Robert 331
Lay chalice 89, 119, 205, 212, 260, 262f, 291, 293, 428, 491, 523, 622
—see also Communion of both kinds
Laymann, Paul 552, 626, 640
Laymen 457
— coming of age 4, 6
—Karlstadt's view 121
—participation in liturgy 206
Layton 332
Le Blas, Bertrand 399
League
—Catholic in France (1576, 1584) 396f, 514f
— of Cognac (1526) 212, 238
— of German Catholic princes 569, 615, 621f, 625
Lebus 298
Leckow, Johann von 626
Le Clerc du Tremblay, see Joseph of Paris
Leeuwarden, bishopric 513
Lefèvre d'Etaples (Faber Stapulensis) 19, 20, 362f, 546
Legh 332
Leiden, Jan van 185
Leiden, university 401, 408
Leipzig 317
—disputation 35, 63–64, 119, 196, 256
—interim, see Interim
Leisnig 227f
Lejay, 448, 453
Lejeune, Jean 560
Le Jeune, Paul 643
Lemberg 521
Lemgo 409
Leo X, pope 5f, 44, 51, 53, 54f, 59, 62, 71, 74, 104, 105f, 201, 238, 328, 434f, 479ff, 504, 590
Leo XI (Alessandro Ottaviano De Medici), pope 505, 615
León 481
León, Luis de 556
—Pablo de 445, 556
Leonardi, Giovanni 567
Leopold V, archduke of Austria 527, 531
Leopold Wilhelm, archduke 531, 627
Lepanto, victory over Turks (1571) 503, 564
Lessius, Leonard 542
Letter of Majesty (1609) 620, 622
Lettner 562
Leunis, Johannes 563
Leutschau 322
Lewis 517
Leyenda negra 579
L'Hôpital, Michel de, chancellor of Catherine de Médicis 394, 490, 635
Libraries 553f
Licet ab initio, bull (1542) 457
Lichetto, Francesco 438
Liège, bishopric 531
Liegnitz, Reformation 268
Lima 582f
—archbishopric 582
Lincoln, bishopric 327, 480
— county 332
Lindau 175, 258, 267
Link, Wenceslaus 52, 58, 60, 86
Linköping, bishopric 302
Linz 295, 525
Lipgens, W. 289
Lippe, county 409
—church regulation 409f
Lippomani, Luigi 296, 470, 476, 484, 551, 641
Lipsius, Justus 637
Lismanini, Franceso 318ff
Lissa 320
Lissa, Andreas von der 319
—Raphael von der 320
Lisbon, Jesuit college 454
Lissies, abbey 571
Lithuania 320, 520
Literature, ascetic 556ff
—mystical 556ff
Literature, history of, Christian 547ff
Liturgy 206, 644
—Roman 510
Livingstone, David 593
Livonia 309, 311, 319
—church regulation (1529–30) 316
—Reformation 315f
Loanda 594
Loaysa, García de 438, 459
—Jerónimo de 582
Loci theologici 537f
Lodron, bishop of Salzburg 524
Lollards 327
London 401
London, priest 332
Longo, Maria Laurenza 434
Lonicer, Johannes 67
Lord's Supper 491
—see also Eucharist, Mass
Lorenzo of Brindisi 560
Loreto 564
Lorini 642
Lortz, Joseph 11, 20, 45
Losonczy 324
Lotzer, Sebastian 141
Louis, prince de Condé 393, 395
Louis XIII, king of France 609, 616
Louis XIV, king of France 628
Louis II, king of Hungary 241, 322
Louis of Blois 559, 571
Louise of Savoy 240
Louvain, university 198, 329, 401, 486, 535, 541

Love 347
Lowicz, provincial synod 484
Loyola, Iñigo López de, see Ignatius
Lübeck 267, 298
—bishopric 529
Lubiniecki, Stanislaus 641
Lublin, Jesuit college 520
Lucca 457, 567
—meeting of Paul III with Charles V (1541) 280, 464
Luck 521
Luder, Hans 12f
Ludolf of Saxony 446
Ludovico da Fossombrone 438
Ludovisi, Allessandro, see Gregory XV
—Ludovico, cardinal 618, 623
Ludwig, duke of Bavaria 209f
Ludwig VI, Elector Palatine 407, 423
Ludwig, Count Palatine 532f
Luis of Granada 555f
Lukaris, Cyrill, ecumenical patriarch 521
Lukas of Bruges 546
Luna, count 495f
Lund, archbishopric 302
Lunelli, Vincenzo 438, 459
Lupus 509, 560
Lussy, Melchior 533
Luther, Martin 7, 9f, 14–41, 110, 128f, 137, 138f, 156, 172, 174, 183, 188, 191, 193ff, 197, 199f, 213ff, 233, 244, 249f, 255, 262, 265, 270, 271f, 274, 276f, 280, 282ff, 285, 306, 310, 312, 317, 321, 325, 329, 340ff, 344f, 348, 354, 359f, 370, 386, 390, 398, 421, 435, 450, 488, 535, 543, 561, 642
—life
——and the Leipzig debate 63f
——appeal to the council (1518) 59
——at Diet of Augsburg (1518) 55ff
——at the fortress of Coburg 257
——at Wittenberg (1522) 91
——at Worms 71–80
——doctor of Holy Scripture 18f
——experience in the tower 33
——excommunication 76f
——home and youth 12f
——journey to Rome 18
——lecture on Paul's epistle to the Galatians 29f
——lecture on Paul's epistle to the Romans (1515–16) 24ff
——lecture on the epistle to the Hebrews 30ff
——lecture on the psalms (1513–15) 20ff
——marriage to Katharina von Bora 143
——meeting with Karl von Miltitz (1519) 61
——posting of theses 48
——Roman trial 52ff
——stay at Wartburg and reformatory movement at Wittenberg 81–97
——university studies and entry into monastery 13ff
—personality 11
——language 65
——popular religious instructor 237
—teaching
——*absconditas,* doctrine of 24
——antinomism controversy 342ff
——and Agricola 342f
——and Augustinism 41
——and beginning of Reformation (1517–25) 3–112
——and council 64, 270f
——and Karlstadt 116ff
——and Müntzer 129ff
——and Ockhamism 14ff, 39ff
——and Peasants' War 138f, 140ff
——and scholastics 16, 27
——and Thomism 41
——and Zwingli (eucharist controversy) 244, 247f, 248
——bible translation 94ff
——catechisms 236f
——catechism sermons 236f
——Christology 21ff
——church concept 213–17
——congregation, expansion of 225–37
——denomination, development of 255
——ecclesiology 21, 66ff, 78
——faith and works 66
——freedom of will 148ff
——grace, doctrine of 27, 82f
——indulgences 46ff, 199
——justice and justification 22f, 24ff
——justification by faith 29ff
——*Justitia Dei* 33ff
——Reformation 11
——rejection of humanism 144ff
——right doctrine, struggle for 340–61
——Roman primacy 63
——sacrament dispute with Swiss 386
——sacraments, doctrine of 65f, 69f
——soteriology 21
——synergist controversy 344
——two kingdoms, doctrine of 217–20
—writings
——*Adversus execrabilem Antichristi Bullam* (1520) 74f
——*Against the rebellious and murderous Peasants* 142
——*Assertio* (1520) 147
——*De abroganda missa privata (Of the Abuse of the Mass)* 87
——*De captivitate Babylonica* 78, 80, 85
——*De servo arbitrio* 146, 149
——*Letter to the Princes of Saxony on the Mutinous Spirit* 123, 133f
——*Of Eck's New Bulls and Lies* (1520) 74f
——*Of Secular Authority* 138
——*Of the Freedom of a Christian* (1520) 71, 73
——*Of the Papacy in Rome . . .* 67ff
——*Open Letter to Pope Leo X* 73
——reformatory writings of 1520 64–70

——*To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* 85, 113, 138
——*Why the Books of the Pope and his Followers were Burned* (1520) 75f
Lutherans, Lutheranism 97, 255, 269, 311, 426, 534, 550, 632, 635, 644
—and Calvinism 409, 426
—and development of denominations 423
—and power of the state 422
—in Electoral Palatinate 407
—in France 391
—in Poland 319
—see also dispute over Eucharist
Luther's bible 202
Luther's opponents 191ff
Lucerne 175, 533
—city council session (1522) 161
—city council session (1524) 167
—Jesuit college 533
Luzon 587
Lyon 502, 543, 553

Mabillon 552
Macao 455, 602, 614
—bishopric 600, 602
Machiavelli 637
Maciejowski, bishop of Luck 521
Maderna 565
Madrid, peace (1526) 211, 238
Madruzzo, Cristoforo, cardinal 465, 468, 475, 504
Maffei, Bernardino, cardinal 460, 481
Magalotti 631
Magdaleno, Diego 445
Magdeburg 211, 267, 273, 286, 293, 358, 626f
—archbishopric 529
—centurions 548, 550f
—surrender (1551) 294
Magellan, Ferdinand 576, 587f
Magic 639
Magisterium 194
Magna Carta of Church of Scotland 418
Magni, Valerian 533, 622
Magyars 311
—Reformation 324
Maidalchini, Olimpia 628
Mailapur 614
—bishopric 596
Mainz 242
—bishopric 531
—Jesuit college 527
—plan of union (1660) 635
—reform synods 292
Mair (Major), John 362
Major, Georg 98, 323, 346, 347, 349f
Majorist controversy 347ff
Malabar 596f
Malacca 589, 596, 605
—bishopric 596, 605
Malayan archipelago, mission to 598f
Maldonado, Juan de 445, 536, 547
Maletius, Jan 319
Malvenda, Pedro 289
Man, original state of 277, 290
Mancini 632
Manderscheid, Johann von, bishop of Strasbourg 527
Manducatio impiorum 270
Manducatio indignorum 270
Manila 588
—archbishopric 588
—bishopric 587, 602
Manresa 447
Mansfeld, Agnes von 528
Mansson (Magni), Peder, bishop of Västeras 307f
Mantua 271, 334, 463f
Mantuan war of succession (1628) 625
Mantz, Felix 178f
Manuel I, king of Portugal 590f, 593
Manutius, Paulus 497, 553
Maranhão 608
Marburg articles 251f
—religious colloquy (1529) 162, 249–52, 352
Marcellus II (Marcello Cervini), pope 458, 460, 465, 467, 470, 481, 482f, 540, 554
Margaret of Austria 398
Margaret of Navarre 252
Margaret of Parma 240, 401, 513
Margaret of Valois 395
Margotti, cardinal 616
Maria of Habsburg, queen of Hungary 321, 326
Maria of Hohenzollern, 405
Maria de Piedrahita 445
Mariana, Juan 638
Marian congregation 455, 564
Marie de l'Incarnation 609
Marienburg, provincial diet (1526) 318
Marignano, battle (1515) 156f
Marini, Leonardo 500f
Mark 404
Mark, county 407
Marnix, Philip 376
Maronite college in Rome 504
Marot, Clemens 370
Marriage 278, 292, 474f
—and chastity 86
—courts 233f
—Luther's view 230
—sacrament of 493, 494, 563
—see also Clandestine marriage, *Tametsi*
Marschalk, Nikolaus 99
Marsiglio 617
Marsilius of Padua 332
Martelli, bishop of Fiesole 469
Martinuzzi, see Utjesenovich 326
Martyrologium Romanum 552
Marvels, craving for 424
Mary, regent of the Netherlands 398
Mary Stuart, queen of Scotland 411, 412, 517, 518

Mary Tudor, queen of England 327, 328, 338, 403, 412, 480, 484, 517
Masaniello rebellion (1647) 629
Masius, Andreas 481
Mass, sacrifice of the mass 10, 123, 194ff, 200ff, 205ff, 210, 212, 242ff, 246, 251, 257, 259f, 262, 271f, 276, 278, 290f, 293, 314, 323, 337f, 371, 406, 475, 547, 562
—Luther's views 69ff, 87f, 221
—sacrificial character 491
—Zwingli's view 246
—see also German Mass, Private Mass
Massachusetts 419
Massarelli, Angelo 466
Matteo da Bascio 438
Matthew, Thomas, see John Rogers 336
Matthias, emperor 620, 621
Matthias of Salo 569
Matthijs, Jan 184f
Maurenbrecher, W. 431
Maurer, W. 103
Maurice of Orange 513
Maurice, elector of Saxony 282, 286, 287, 293ff, 478
Maurillac 636
Mauriner 571f
Maximilian, elector (duke) of Bavaria 531, 554, 574, 620, 627, 633
Maximilian I, emperor 54, 61, 95, 105, 114, 435
Maximilian II, emperor 206, 294, 326, 407, 520, 522, 525
Mayer, Sebald 554
Mazarin, Jules 628
Meaux 395
Mechelen, archbishopric 512
—provincial council (1607) 619
Mecklenburg 530
Mediasch 323
Medici, family 237, 239
—Alessandro Ottaviano de, see Leo XI
—Catherine de 241, 391, 394ff, 489, 514f, 635
—Gian Angelo de, see Pius IV
—Giuliano, cardinal 113
—Giulio de, see Clement VII
Medina, Bartolomeo de 538
Medina del Campo, Jesuit college 454
Megander, Kaspar 385
Meissen, bishopric 298, 530
—provincial diet (1548) 293f
—Reformation 282
Meissinger, K. A. 45
Melanchthon (Schwartzert), Philip 9, 29, 48, 64, 75, 82f, 83f, 87, 90f, 99f, 101ff, 110, 116, 120, 126, 131, 137, 143f, 192, 195f, 224, 230f, 233f, 235f, 244, 256f, 258ff, 263ff, 270ff, 275ff, 280, 283, 293f, 319, 323ff, 335, 340ff, 345f, 347ff, 350, 353f, 356, 358, 370f, 381f, 405, 633, 635, 642
—apologia for the Augsburg Confession 263ff
—church visitation 231ff
—eucharist controversy 359ff
—justification, doctrine 341ff
—majorist controversy 347ff
—Osiander controversy 352ff
—theology 341ff
—visitors, instructions for 340, 342
Melchiorites 184f, 187
Melius, Peter 326
Melun, assembly of clergy (1579) 515
Melville, Andrew 416, 417, 418
Memmingen 175, 258, 267
Mendicant Orders 301, 441, 444, 457, 469, 497
—exemption 469
—post-Tridentine development 570f
—reform 437ff, 459f
—see also Dominicans, Franciscans
Mendoza, Diego Hurtado de 467, 471
—Dominicus de 445
—Juan Hurtado de 445
—López de, cardinal, bishop of Burgos 446
—Pedro González de, cardinal 443
Mengersdorf, bishop of Bamberg 526
Mengin 532
Mening, Marcus 409
Menius, Justus 275, 349, 355
Mennonites 184, 188
Mensing, Johannes 201, 276
Mentuato 484
Mercedarians 512
—mission in Mexico 581
— —in Peru 582
Mercurian, Eberhard 569
Merici, Angela 435, 437
Merlin 548
Merseburg, bishopric 298, 530
Messina, Jesuit college 455
Mestizos 583
Method doctrine, theological 537
Metz 295, 465
—siege (1553) 295
Meurer, Michael 318
Mexico (New Spain) 501, 578
—bishopric 580f
—conquest and mission to 580
—council (1555) 581f
—Twelve Apostles 580
Meyer, Gerald 165
—Sebastian 161, 174
Micanzio 617
Michael von Eggendorf, abbot 171
Michoacán, bishopric 580
Middle Ages 3ff
Middleburg, bishopric 513
Mignani, Laura 435
Milan 237f, 284, 289, 436, 456f, 464, 502f, 554
—major and minor seminaries 502
Millini, cardinal 616, 623
Miltitz, Karl von 46, 55, 61f, 63, 71, 73

—meeting with 35
Mindanao 588
Minden 523
—bishopric 529, 627
Miracles, books of 564
Miraeus (Le Mire) 549
Miron 454
Missals, reform 485, 496, 501, 561, 624
Missale Romanum (1570) 500
Mission
—at beginning of modern time 575–614
——in Portuguese sphere 589–610
——in Spanish sphere 575–89
—native clergy 612f
—to the people 569
—training of missionaries 612f
Mission districts 612
Mission congregations 610
Mission method 578f, 581, 607
—adaptation in China 603ff
——in India 597
——in Japan 599f
—in Peru 583
Mission patronage 575ff, 610
—opposition of patronage states to Propaganda congregation 613f
—Portuguese 589f
—Spanish 575ff
Mission sermons 559
Modena 240, 457, 492, 624
—Jesuit college 454
Modrezewski, Andrzej Frycz 317, 634
Mogrovejo, Toribio Alfonso de 583
Mohács, Turkish victory over Hungary (1526) 212, 241, 322
Molanus 409
Molina, Luis de 538, 542ff
Molinism 542ff
Molinist controversy 631
Moluccas 589, 596
—mission to 598f
Mömpelgard 269
Monasteries 299
—dissolution 225f
—in England 339
Monastic vows 119, 257, 262, 271, 335
—and evangelical freedom 85ff
Monastic prebens 478
Monastic property 263, 301, 626
Monomotapa 594
Montaigne 641
Montalto, cardinal 615
Montanus, Arias 546
Monte Corona 436
Montesa, Ambrosio 446
Montesino, Antonio de 579
Montezuma II 580
Montfaucon 552
Montfort, count 478
Montmorency, duke of, constable of France 391, 394, 636
Montorio, nuncio 626
Montserrat 447
Moors 443
Morality, private 220
Moravian Brethren (Hutterites) 182, 188
More, Thomas 153, 199f, 327, 330ff
Morigia 436
Mörlin 355
Mornay Duplessis, Philip de 635
Morone, Giovanni, cardinal 274, 277, 296, 457, 464, 481, 487, 489, 493ff, 496, 500, 504, 522f
Morosini, papal legate 515
Mossul 596
Mosvidius, Martin 319
Motolinía, see Toribio
Mount, Christopher 335
Mozambique 594
Mühlberg on the Elbe, victory of Charles V over Schmalkaldic League (1547) 287f
Mühldorf, reform convention (1522) 442
Mulattos 583
Mülhausen 176
Müling, Johannes, see Adelphi
Müller, Hans, peasant leader 140
Munich 532f
—Jesuit college 455
Münster in Westphalia 183
—Anabaptists 184ff
——"Empire of Münster" 186
—bishopric 281, 529, 626
—Jesuit college 532
—peace congress (1645–48) 627f
Münter, W. O. 222
Müntzer, Thomas 92, 97, 116, 122, 128–38, 142f, 178, 183, 189
—*Ausgedrückte Entblössung des falschen Glaubens* . . . 133, 135
—Church office 137
—Church regulation 131, 137
—German church office 130, 137
—German Evangelical Mass 131
—*Hochverursachte Schutzrede* . . . 134
—mysticism of the cross 134
—protestation 131
—social revolution (Peasants' War) 136f
Murner, Thomas 44, 71, 174, 199, 203
Murzynowski, Stanislaus 318
Musso, Cornelio 560
Mutianus Rufus 99f, 144
Myconius, Friedrich 230, 275
—Oswald 128, 168, 364
Mysticism 556ff

Nadal, Jerónimo 449, 454
Nadasdy, family 324
Nájera 446
Namur, bishopric 512
Nan-ch'ing 603
Nancy 574
Nanking 603

Nantes, edict (1585), see Edict
Naples 237f, 240, 434, 436, 457, 466, 483, 501, 503, 567, 629
—General chapter of Augustinians (1539) 460
—Jesuit college 454
—university 329
Nardini, cardinal 442
Narva 316
Nassau 408
—Calvinism 408f
— —church regulation 408
Nassau Confession 408
Nassau-Oranien 406
Nathin, Johann 18
Nationalism 6
National council 243, 273
—attempt to have German (1523ff) 208ff
Natural law 642
Natural sciences 639f, 642
Naumburg, bishopric 281, 298, 530
Naumburg, bishopric 281, 298, 530
—convention (1554) 355
—Reformation 281f
Nausea, Friedrich 197, 204, 205, 275
Navigation Acts 643
Nedelisce 325
Nemours, edict (1585) 396
Nepotism 500, 623
—of Paul IV 487f
Neri, Philip 435, 501, 507, 509, 548, 550, 567, 615, 619
Netherlands 287, 289, 295, 333, 407, 511, 512, 534, 615, 619, 621
—Calvinism 398ff
—established church, Reformed 401
—peace with Spain 630
Neuenburg 173
Neuser, Adam 407
New Granada 578
—mission to 584f
New Mexico 580
New Spain, see Mexico
Nevers 570
Nicaragua (Leon), bishopric 583
Nice, armistice between Charles V and Francis I (1538) 273, 463
Niedzwiedz 319
Nikolaus von Herborn 303
Nikolsburg (Moravia) 180
Ninguarda, Felician 504, 524f, 563
Nobili, cardinal 482
—Roberto de 597
Nóbrega, Manuel da 606
Nobunaga 600
Nogaret 5
Nominalism 10, 194, 264, 536
Norman, Georg 308
Norway 301, 303
—Reformation 303f
Novara, battle (1513) 156
Novitiate 495
Nueva Cáceres, bishopric 588
Nueva Segovia, bishopric 588
Nunciatures, papal, under Gregory XIII 504f
Nuño 543
Nürnberg 243f, 255, 259, 265f, 317
—church visitation 352
—diet (1522–23) 106
—diet (1524) 208f
—diet (1542) 281
—diet (1543) 281
Nürnberg Anstand (armistice) (1532) 268f
Nürnberg, league of (1538) 273
—Mass 308
—peace 273
—visitation articles (1528) 224

Obedience 348
Obbenites 186
Oberg, bishop of Münster 529
Oblates of St. Ambrose 567
Obligatory communion 562
Observants 437, 445, 459, 570f
Observance 444, 512
Ochino, Bernardino 439, 641
Ockham, William of 10, 16, 39f
—Luther's views 12, 14ff, 27
Odense, bishopric 302
—assembly of nobles (1526) 303
—assembly of nobles (1527) 303
Oecolampadius, Johannes 101, 136, 153f, 156, 171ff, 174, 202, 247, 249f, 398
Ofen, occupation by Suleiman (1541) 280
Office, spiritual 195, 250, 278, 291
—according to Luther 215f, 220ff
—regulations of 478
Official morality 220
Olahus, Nikolaus, archbishop of Tyrnau 326
Olesnicki, Mikolaj 319
Olevianus, Kaspar 376, 405f, 407f, 408
Olier 559
Olivarez, Spanish official 628
Olmütz, bishopric 531, 622
O'Neill, Hugh 519
Opus operatum—opus operantis 65, 70f
Orange, see William of Orange
Oratorians 567
—mission in Brazil 608
Oratory of Divine Love, Rome 434f
Oratory of Divine Wisdom, Milan 434
Oratory of St. Jerome, Vicenza 434
Orders, life in Orders 314, 532, 534, 612, 621
—new foundings 436f
—post-Tridentine development 567–74
—reform 458, 495
— —pre-Tridentine 459ff
Ordination 293, 374
—licenses 472
—right to 478
— —at Council of Trent 493
—sacrament 271, 294, 474f, 478, 491f
Örebro, provincial synod (1529) 308, 310

Orlamände 121ff, 217
Orléans, university 329
Ormaneto, vicar 501, 511
Ormuz 589
Ortiz 453
Orvieto 328
Ösel 316
Osiander, Andreas 249, 275, 312, 351, 352ff, 380, 642
—doctrine of justification 352ff
—controversy 352ff
Oslo, bishopric 302
—assembly of nobles (1539) 304
Osnabrück, bishopric 523
Ostrog, academy 520
—Bible 520
Ostrogski, Constantine, prince 52f
Ostroróg, Jakub 320
Oswald, J. 524
Otto Heinrich, Elector Palatinate 282, 352, 405, 423
Otto von Waldburg, bishop of Augsburg, cardinal 296, 455, 504
Oxford, university 329
Ozorai, Imre 325

Pacheco of Jaén, cardinal 466, 468, 471
Pacherneker, Leonhard 325
Pacis compositio (1629) 626
Pack, Otto 242
—affair 242
Paderborn, bishopric 281, 531, 626
—Jesuit college 532
Padua, university 329, 435
Páez, Esteban 586
Palatinate 376
—development of denominations 423
Palatinate, church regulation (1543) 352
Palatinate, Electoral, Reformation 282
—Calvinism 405ff
—church regulation, Calvinistic (1563) 406
Palatinate/Neuburg 616
—Reformation 282
Paleario, Aonio 500
Palencia, diocese 444
Paleotti Gabriele, cardinal 494, 502, 565
Palermo, Jesuit college 454, 567
Palestrina 566
Paliano, defeat of Paul IV (1557) 483
Pallavicino, Pietro Sforza 551f
Pallium fees 108
Palsson, Ögmundur, bishop of Skalholt 305
Pamfili, family 632
—Camillo 628, 631
—Gianbattista, see Innocent X
Pamplona 446
—bishopric 512
—diocesan synod (1590) 512
Panama, bishopric 583, 585
Panciroli, cardina 628, 631
Panigarola, Francesco, bishop of Asti 509, 560
Panvinio, Onofrio 548
Papa 325
Papacy, pope 4f, 9f, 204, 266, 271
—and council 493f
—and princely absolutism 637
—and reform 433
—concordat policy 5
—defenders of liberty and independence of the church 638
—implementation of Tridentine decrees 499–534
—Luther's views 63, 66ff, 78, 215, 257
—position under Paul V and Gregory XV 615
—primacy 195, 199, 201, 330ff, 336, 496, 547, 644f
— —and episcopate 492f
—rejuvenation since Council of Trent 498, 510
Papal state 237, 240, 483, 509, 624, 629
—regulation by Sixtus V 506
Paraguay
—bishopric 583
—christianization 584
—Jesuit reductions 585f
Paraver 595f
Paravicini 533
Paris 364, 396, 397, 553, 571
—assembly of clergy (1615) 516
—assembly of Estates General (1614–15) 619
—Jesuit college 454
—reformed national synod (1559) 392
—university 329, 535
Parishes, appointments to 495
—concursus for nominations 444
Parisio, Pietro Paolo 457, 464
Parker, Matthew, first anglican archbishop of Canterbury 328, 338, 518
Parma 237, 456, 479
Paschini, P. 431
Pasor, Georg 408
Passau 295, 524
—bishopric 531
—treaty (1552) 295f, 627
Pastor, Ludwig von 431, 499, 502, 618, 628
Pastoral care 7f, 472, 475, 496, 537
Pastors (Calvinist church regulation) 373
Pastoris, Adam 641
Patristics 547
Patronage, right 8, 217, 233, 478, 495
—Portuguese in colonies 589–610
—Spanish in colonies 511, 575–89
Paul III (Alessandro Farnese), pope, 8, 271, 279, 284f, 288, 334, 433, 439, 448, 451, 456, 458f, 461f, 474, 479ff, 485, 489, 495, 497, 504, 563, 582, 595
—and Charles V 464, 474
—and Henry VIII 334
—council convocations 462f
—reforms of curia 460f
—trailblazer of Catholic reform 456ff
Paul IV (Gian Pietro Carafa), pope, 299, 401,

411, 436, 440, 442, 450f, 459, 461, 483ff, 496, 500
Paul V (Camillo Borghese), pope 507, 522, 540, 544, 549, 566, 567, 569, 615ff, 619, 643
—conflict with Venice 616ff
—grace controversy 544
Paul of Burgos 443
Paul of Siglieri 436
Pauli (Pawel), Gregor 320
Paulins 319
Pavia, defeat of the French (1525) 238
—university 329
Pazmany, Peter, archbishop of Gran 327, 622
Pazzi, Maria Magdalena de 558
Peasants' War 126, 136, 138–43, 211, 217, 227, 234
Pedro de Villa Creces 445
Pegau 293
Pegu, see Burma
Peking 603
Pelargus, Ambrosius 202, 477
Pellikan, Konrad 169, 172
Penance 195, 200, 201, 232, 271, 335, 341f, 353
—Luther's view 69
—practice 42f
—sacrament 56
——Luther's view 65ff
——at Council of Trent 474, 477
Penitentiary 462, 481, 483
—reform 497, 501
Peraudi, Raimund 43
Perenyi, family 324
Peretti of Montalto, Felice, see Sixtus V
Pérez de Valdivia 556
Perrin, Aimé 375
Persons, Robert 517
Peru 578
—council (1567) 583
—mission to 582ff
—provincial council (1583) 584
Pescara 491
Petavius, Dionysius 552
Peter of Alcántara 556, 570
Peter of Ghent 580, 581
Petow 484
Petri, Adam 172
—Laurentius, archbishop of Uppsala 308f
—(Pederson), Olavus 306ff
—Suffridus 549
Petrikau
—provincial synod (1577) 519
—diet (1526) 318
—diet (1558) 484
Petrovics, Peter 324
Peter Lombard, discussed by Luther 14ff
Peucer, Kaspar 361
Peutinger, Conrad 144
Pezell, Christoph 361f, 408
Pfeddersheim (1525) 142
Pfeffinger, Degenhard 61
—Johannes 346f
Pfeiffer, Heinrich 135f
Pflug, Cäsar 50
—Julius von 97, 204, 205, 275, 277, 281f, 289
Pfyffer, Ludwig 533
Philip, duke of Braunschweig-Grubenhagen 211, 267
Philip II, king of Spain 294, 395f, 401f, 453, 489, 503, 508, 511, 535, 541, 546, 569, 570, 593
Philip III, king of Spain 543, 616, 639
Philip II of Wittelsbach 531
Philip the Magnanimous, landgrave of Hesse 142, 203, 211f, 241ff, 251, 254, 259f, 267, 269f, 274f, 280f, 281f, 288, 294, 474
—and Marburg colloquy (1529) 249f
Philip the Fair of Burgundy 435
Philip Ludwig of Palatinate-Neuburg
Philippines 576
—christianization 587ff
—conquest by Spain 587
Philippinos 588
Philippists 349, 352, 361
Philips, Dirk 186f
—Obbe 184, 186f
Philosophy 642
Piacenza 238, 288, 456, 463, 474, 479
Piarists 561, 568
Piccolomini, Francesco 458
Pietra 501
Piety, see Baroque piety
Pigge, Albert (Pighius) 199, 540
Pighino, reform nuncio 466, 471, 476f
Pilgrimages 9, 258, 314, 424, 563f
—to seven principal churches in Rome 507
Pinczow 319
Pirckheimer, Willibald 144, 145, 172, 234
Piscator, Johann 408
Pistorius, Johannes 277, 526, 633
—Johannes the Younger 634
Pithou, Pierre 553
Pius II, pope 461, 592f
Pius IV (Gianangelo Medici), pope 428, 437, 450, 455, 488ff, 497, 499f, 530, 553
—conclusion of Council of Trent 489–98
Pius V (Michele Ghislieri), pope 339, 457, 487, 500, 503f, 507, 509, 514, 517f, 538, 542, 546, 552, 564, 568, 573, 608, 610
Pius XII, pope 300
Pizarro, Francisco 582
Planitz, Hans von der 110
Plantin 553
Plettenberg, Wolter von, master of Teutonic Knights 316f
Pociej, bishop of Vladimir 521
Poggiano, Giulio 500
Poissy
—assembly of clergy (1561) 490
—national council (1561) 394f
—religious colloquy (1561) 454, 490, 634

Poitiers, assembly of Calvinists (1558) 392
Polanco 449, 569
Poland 311f, 317, 376, 484, 488, 499f, 511, 534, 630
—Catholic reform 511, 519
—development of denominations 421
—Reformation 317ff, 519
—religious freedom of nobility 319
—union of orthodox churches with Rome 521
Pole, Reginald, cardinal 332, 338, 435, 458, 464f, 480f, 484
—Margaret 332
Polentz, Georg, bishop of Samland 313ff
Poliander, Johannes 315
Politicians 635, 636f
Polish brothers 641
Polock, Jesuit college 520
Polyglots 546
Pomerellen 312
Pomerania 530
—Reformation 268
Pontifical reform (1644) 624
Poor Laws 169, 314
Poor Konrad (1514) 140
Popayán, bishopric 583, 585
Porta, Giacomo della 507
Portia, papal nuncio 524
Portugal 481, 535, 613, 629
—age of discovery 575f
—conquest and christianization of discovered lands 589ff
Porzia 504
Possevino, Antonio 310, 519f, 549
Post, R. R. 8
Potestas directa 540
Poullain, Valérand 403
Poverty 495
Power, spiritual and secular 617
—see also Office
Power, state 637
Poznan 318, 320
—Jesuit college 520
Prague 497
—manifesto (1521) 129f
—peace (1635) 625
— —with Saxony (1635) 627
—university 622
Prayer, confraternity of 564
Prayerbook 318, 564
Prayer, forty-hour 437, 563, 569
Prayer for the Dead 335
Prayer picture 564
Prayers 563f
Preaching of the law 232
Prebends, system of 112, 486
Predestination, and doctrine 336, 402, 406, 457, 542
—according to Calvin 378f
Premonstratensians 512f
Presbyterianism 629
—in England 419
—in Scotland 417f
Presbyterian synod 416
Presbyterian system 415
Press 457
Prierias, Sylvester 52, 54, 61, 67, 199f
Priests, priestly office 202, 215, 291f
—free selection of 122f
—general 119, 121, 222, 428
—in Luther's reform writings 68f
—marriage 205, 212, 257, 259f, 262f, 271, 290f, 337, 491, 523
—ordination, see Ordination, sacrament of
—professional 428, 547
—seminaries 442, 493, 501
— —Tridentine in Germany 530f
—see also Office
Primacy, see Papacy
Princes 289
—reform 481, 495
—Reformation 143
—revolution 294ff
Printing shops 553f
Printing permits 210
Private confession 352, 423
Private feud 113
Private mass 87ff, 120, 259, 335, 492
Pro excellenti praeeminentia, bull (1514) 590
Professio fidei Tridentina (1564) 425, 497
Propaganda fide, see Congregation of Propaganda
Protestants, Protestantism 242ff, 256, 286, 420, 539, 635
—and council 288
—development of denomination 255ff
—disunity 265, 269f
—during beginnings of Counter-Reformation 620
—German 626
—see also Calvinism, Lutheranism, Zwinglians, etc.
Providence, divine, according to Calvin 378
Provincial synods 292, 426, 475f, 494, 502f, 530
Processions 9, 314, 428, 563
Prussia, duchy 311
—church regulation (1525) 315, 318
—constitution (1525) 316
—diet (1525) 316
—Reformation 312ff
Przemysl 521
Psalterium Qincuplex 19f
Public peace 263
Pucci, grand penitentiary 459
Puente, Luis de la 558
Puerto Rico 579
Purgatory 201, 250, 257, 259, 335, 475, 495
Puritans 419
Pürstinger, Berthold von Chiemsee 198
Puteo, cardinal 482f, 490
Pütter, J. St. 431

Pyhy, Georg von 309
Pyrenees, peace (1659) 643

Québec 609
Queis, Ehrhard von, bishop of Marienwerder 315f
Quesada 584
Quiñónez, Francisco, cardinal 337, 438, 460, 485
Quinzani, Stefana 435
Quirini, Vincenzo 435f
Quito, bishopric 583

Rabelais, François de 641
Rackeve 324
Radziwill, George, cardinal 519
—Mikolaj, prince 320, 484
Ragazzoni, 501
Rahner, Hugo 447
Raienau, Dietrich von, archbishop of Salzburg 524
Rakau Catechism (1605) 320
Rakow 320, 641
Ramser, Matthias 323
Ranchin, Gallican 515, 516
Rangoni, nuncio 522
Ranke, Leopold von 186, 241, 431f, 446, 624
Rapagelan, Stanislaus 319
Raesfeld, cathedral dean in Münster 529
Ratio studiorum 553, 554, 568
Ravaillac 616
Ravenna 240
Ravensberg 404
Ravesteyn, Josse 198, 477
Raynald 550
Real Presence 119, 123f, 169, 246, 337, 356, 359f, 389, 393, 403, 474, 477, 547
—view of Erasmus 155f
—see also Holy Communion, Eucharist, Transsubstantiation
Rebiba, cardinal 485, 487
Recollects 570
Reconquista 443, 576
Redemptions 42f
Reductions 585
—in Brazil 607
Rees 403
Reform, clerical 3, 8ff, 192, 208ff, 279, 292
—of church and nation 64
—see also Catholic Reform
Reformatio in capite et membris 8ff, 496
Reformatio Sigismundi 140
Reformation 3–429
—and humanism 144ff
—and Peasants' War 143
—as church reform 420f
—as church schism 429
—as seen by Calvin and Calvinism 384, 391f
—beginning (1517–25) 3–112
—causes 3–11
——historical 3ff
——immediate 6
—education 233ff
—German Reformation of princes 208–300
—in Eastern Europe 311–27
—in England 327–39
—in hand of authorities 143
—in Switzerland 156–77, 365f
—in the northern countries 301–11
—in Württemberg and other territories 268f
—privileges of the Estates 628
—politicization of reformatory movement 265–74
—progress 281–83
—religious instruction 233ff
—theology of controversy 191–207
—see also individual countries
Reformers around Luther 97–104, 138f
Reformed 299, 534, 635
—see also Calvin, Calvinism, Geneva
Reform cardinals and bishops 439ff, 458f
—Catholicism in Scandinavian countries 301
—constitutions (1513–14) 441
—councils 239f, 444, 459
—nunciatures 504
—popes, from Pius V to Clement VIII 499–510
—synods 530
Regensburg 287, 524, 620
—assembly of abbots (1631) 572
—Book 276f, 371
—convention (1524) 174, 209f
—diet (1541) 277ff, 280
—diet (1545) 286
—diet (1576) 522
—peace (1630) 625
—reform regulations (1524) 210
—religious colloquy (1541) 204, 277ff, 370f, 386, 464, 470
—religious colloquy (1545) 286, 465
—religious colloquy (1601) 633
—union (1524) 210
Reggio 240
Regimini militantes ecclesiae, bull (1540) 448
Register of baptisms and marriages 494
Regular clerics, Tridentine decree 570f
Regular Clerics of the Mother of God 567
Reims 398, 517
—provincial synod (1564) 516
Reinhardt, Anna 161
Relatio status dioecesis 506
Relicts, veneration 495
Religiosity, on eve of Reformation 9
Religious peace 295
—colloquies (1540–41) 273, 274–79, 633f
—see also Frankfurt/Main, Hagenau, Ilanz, Leipzig, Marburg, Poissy, Regensburg, Torun, Worms
—concession of Maximilian II (1568) 525
—instruction 235
—parties 421
—wars 265, 511f, 632, 643

— —see Schmalkaldic War
Repentance 341f, 348
Reprobation 379
Requeséns, Spanish ambassador 500, 502
Reservatum ecclesiasticum 665
Residence obligation 461, 469, 471f, 494, 628
—at Council of Trent 491f
—see also episcopate
Resistance, active and passive 219
—right 265f, 393, 638
Restitution, edict (1629) 626f
Rethius 532
Reublin (Röubli), Wilhelm 178, 180f
Reuchlin, Johannes 101, 114f, 144
Reumani, cardinal 485, 487
Reunion negotiations between Charles V and Protestants 464
Reunion, Christian 634f
Reutlingen 259, 267
Reval 316f
Revelation, revelation sources 536, 546
—Tridentine decree (1546) 468
Revolution 3, 10, 116f, 122, 128, 132ff, 138, 144, 150, 186, 196, 294, 340
Reynolds, Richard 331
Rhine, lower 406, 426ff, 523
—development of denominations 421f
Rhode, Heine 246
Rhodes 112
Rhodes, Alexandre de 606f
Ribadeneira 450
Ribe, bishopric 302
Ribier, Gallican 516
Riccardi, Niccolò 624, 643
Ricci, cardinal 479, 500
—Catherine 558
—Matteo 603f
Rice 332
Richelieu, cardinal 609, 615, 624, 630, 638
Richer, Edmund 516, 553
Riedenstein, bishop of Sitten 533
Rieger, U. 275
Riformati 570
Riga 316f
—Jesuit college 519
Rites 292
—of baptism 92, 228
—dispute 604, 605
Ritter, Erasmus 171
—Moritz 431
Rituale Romanum 561f
Rocca, Angelo 549, 554
Rochester 329
Rodez, Jesuit college 454
Rodinus, Thomas 103
Rodríguez, Alonso 448, 454f, 558
Rogers, John 336
Rohan, duke of 638
Rome 434, 465, 506, 517, 535, 553
—beginnings of Catholic reform 433, 455ff
—construction during Baroque 506f, 631f
—Jesuit college 454
Romanov, Michael 522
Romeo 459
Roman catechism, see Catechisms
Rorer 34
Roermond, bishopric 513
Rosary confraternities 564
Roser, Isabel 451
Roset, Michael 368
Roskilde, bishopric 302
Rossi, Carmelite general 570
Rossignoli, B. 558
Rosweyde, Heribert 552
—reform 497
Rota Romana 462
Rothmann, Bernhard 185
Rouen, edict (1588) 515
Rovere, Francesco della, see Sixtus IV
—Giuliano della, see Julius II
—Giulio 624
Royal Polyglot 546
Roz, Francisco, bishop of Angamale 597
Rubicon, bishopric 575
Rudolf II, emperor 525, 620, 642
Ruggieri, Michele 603
Ruiz 536
Rural population and development of denominations 422
Russia, attempts to approach by Rome 520
Ruthenians, union with Rome 521
Rutskij, uniate metropolitan 521
Ruysbroek 556

Sablons 541f
Sacco di Roma (1527) 240, 442
Sacerdotale Romanum 562
Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, see Congregation of Propaganda
Sacramental words 388
Sacramentals 314
Sacramentarians 242, 255, 263
Sacraments, and sacramental doctrine 204, 210, 212, 246, 278, 290f, 292, 314, 335, 337, 372, 387ff, 470, 472
—dispensation 219, 561f
— —abuses 475
—efficacious signs 473
—external sign of the church (Luther) 214
—fraternities 563
—institution 473
—receptacle 563
—seven 472f
Sacrosanctis salvatoris et redemptoris, bull 45
Sadoleto, Jacopo, cardinal 153, 372, 434, 458
Saganus, Georg 247
Salamanca 535f
—provincial synod (1565–66) 512
—school 537
—university 329, 445f, 542f, 642
Salazar, Domingo de 587

Salesians 573
Salmasius 552
Salmerón, Alfonso 448, 453, 538
Salò 435
Salviati, nuncio 459, 515
Salzburg 242, 273, 530, 532
—assembly of bishops (1576) 524
—provincial synod (1512) 442
—provincial synod (1569) 542
—provincial synod (1573) 542
—reform synods 292
—Tridentine reform 524
—university 572
Samson, indulgence preacher 158
Samuel, Andrzej 318
Sánchez, Alonso 603
—P. 558
Sanctification 16, 347
—according to Calvin 379f
Sandomir, agreement (1570) 319
Sanfelice 465
San Juan 579
Sanseverino, cardinal 610
Santa Fe de Bogotá, archbishopric 585
Santa María Antigua del Darién, bishopric 579
Santa Maria della Pace, union of secular priests 435
Santa Marta, bishopric 585
Santiago de Cabo Verde, bishopric 590
Santiago de Chile, bishopric 583f
Santo Domingo, bishopric 578
Santonio 533
Santori, cardinal 561
Santorio 503, 508
San Salvador 592
—bishopric 593f
São Salvador (Bahía), bishopric 607
São Salvador de Angra, bishopric 590
São Tomé, bishopric 590, 592
Saragossa 536
—Jesuit college 454
—provincial synod (1565–66) 512
Sardinha, Pedro Fernandes 607
Sardinia 466
Särkilathi, Petrus 310
Sarpi, Paolo 510, 551, 617f
Sattler, Michael 180, 181
Savona 434
Savonarola 435, 445, 556, 558
Savoy 284, 289
Saxony, duchy 273, 293, 298
—Reformation (1539) 274
Saxony, Electoral 244, 255, 287f, 477
Scandinavian countries, Christianity 301ff
Scarga 519, 520
Schaffhausen 166f, 175, 382
—Reformation 171
Schall von Bell, Johann Adam 604
Schappeler, Christoph 141
Schässburg 323
Schatzgeyer, Kaspar 194, 203
Schaumburg, Adolf von, archbishop of Cologne 283, 528
—Hermann von 529
—Martin von, bishop of Eichstätt 526
Scheel, Otto 11
Scheiner, Christoph 644
Scherer, Georg 532, 640
Schertlin von Burtenbach, Sebastian 287
Scheuri, Christoph 50, 144
Schiner, cardinal 106, 160
Schism, western 5, 10f
—English, see England
Schlaginhaufen 34
Schlegel, Theodul, abbot 171f
Schleitheim, meeting of Anabaptists (1527) 179
—Articles 180
Schleswig-Holstein school regulation (1542) 235
Schmalkalden 264
—convention of theologians (1540) 189f
—diet (1537) 272
Schmalkaldic, League 266ff, 270, 273ff, 280ff, 282, 287, 334, 463, 465, 473
—Articles 271f
—first constitution (1533) 267
—second constitution (1536) 267
—treaty of union (1530–31) 267
—war 284–288, 469
Schmidlin, J. 431, 506
Schnepf, Erhard 269, 357
Schola Disciplinatorum divini amoris 434
Scholastics 39, 194, 538
—Luther and scholastics 16, 27
—renewal 535ff
—see also Salamanca
Schönberg, Nikolaus von 438
Schönborn, Johann Philip von, elector 527, 636
Schönenberg, Johann von, archbishop of Trier 527
Schools, decline during Reformation 233
Schools for boys 480
Schott, Kaspar 644
Schröer, A. 529
Schütz, court preacher 361
Schwabach 224, 251
—Articles 249ff, 255, 257
—Confession (1529) 255
Schwäbisch Hall 236, 269
Schwärmer (fanatics) 217f, 222, 255f, 258, 420
—Karlstadt and Müntzer 116–37
Schwarz, Theobald 370
Schwenckfeld, Kaspar von 185, 189f
Schwerin 298
Schwyz 175, 176, 533
Scotland 499, 511
—Calvinism 410ff
—catechism 411
—church discipline and regulation 414ff
—national synod (1549) 410

—provincial synod (1552) 411
—ruin of Catholic Church 518
Scotti, Bernardino, cardinal 436, 485f, 500
Scotus 40
Scripture
—principle of 276, 335
— —at Council of Trent 468, 476
— —Luther's 194
— —Zwingli's 162
Seclusion, monastic 495, 501
Secularization 5, 298, 638, 639–45
—of thought 639ff
Sega, nuncio 557
Segovia 481
Seklucian, Jan 318
Semgallen 317
Seminaries, see Priest seminaries
Separation of church and state 191
Septuaginta 546
Seripando, conciliar legate, archbishop of Salerno 438, 460, 466, 470, 482, 490f, 492ff, 536, 541, 559
Sermon 276, 537, 559f, 560
—collections 311
—public 469
—reform 441
—Tridentine reform 469
Sermoneta, cardinal 411
Servet(us), Michael 377, 382f
Servites 460
Severoli 466
Seville
—Jesuit college 454
—national council (1478) 443
Seyssel, Calude de, bishop of Turin 446
Sfondrato, Celestino, cardinal 548
—Francesco, cardinal 458
—Niccolò, see Gregory XIV
—Paolo Emilio 508
Sforza, family 105
—Bona 317
—Francesco II 105, 239
—Guido Ascanio 458, 482
Shanghai 604
Shaxton 336
Shimabara rebellion (1637–38) 602
Siam 590, 605
Sicily 466
Sick, extreme unction 278, 293, 337, 562
—at Council of Trent 474, 477f
—care of 573
Sickingen, Franz von 114ff
Siebenbürgen 322, 324
—Reformation 326
Siena
—war (1552) 479
—university 329
Sigismund I, king of Poland 44, 318
Sigismund II Augustus, king of Poland 309, 317, 319f, 484, 519, 635
Sigismund III Vasa, king of Sweden 310, 519f
Sigmund, count 140
Signature, papal 481, 483
—practice of dispensation under Paul IV 487
Sigüenza, university 543
Silesia 622
—Reformation 189
Silveira, Gonçalo da 594
Simon VI, count of Lippe 409
Simonetta, Giacomo, cardinal 461
—Ludovico, council legate 463, 490f, 493
Simons, Menno 183f, 186, 186f
Simony 44f, 441f, 461, 485
Sin 271, 277
—according to Luther 82f
Sinclair, John, bishop of Brechin 518
Sirleto, Guglielmo, cardinal 485, 500, 505, 507, 547, 552, 554
Sixto-Clementina (1592) 508, 546
Sixtus IV (Francesco della Rovere), pope 43f, 439, 461, 469, 504
Sixtus V (Felice Peretti of Montalto), pope 396, 503, 505ff, 514, 515, 520, 542, 549, 554, 564, 568, 573, 610, 631
—building activity 506f
—reform of Curia 506f
Sixtus of Siena 547
Skalholt, bishopric 301
Skarga, Peter 569
Skytte, Marten, bishop of Abo 310f
Slave trade 585, 591, 594
Sleidanus, Johannes 399f, 477
Slovenia, Reformation 325f
Society of Jesus (Jesuits) 283, 293, 442, 446, 446ff, 456, 502, 525, 532f, 535, 539, 562, 565, 568f, 611, 622, 626, 629, 638
—and dispute over grace 542ff
—and education 427
—and witch trials 639
—constitutions 449f
—expansion 453ff
— —in Brazil 455
— —in China 455
— —in Germany 455
— —in France 454
— —in India 455
— —in Italy 454
— —in Portugal 454f
— —in Spain 454
— —in the Netherlands 454
—expulsion from Venice (1606) 617f
—*Formula Instituti* 448f
—founding of Order 447f
—mission to Angola 593
— —Brazil 606f
— —Canada 609
— —Celebes 598
— —Ceylon 598
— —China 602ff
— —Congo 593
— —East Africa 594
— —East Java 598

——India 595f
——Indochina 605
——Japan 599ff
——Mexico 581
——Moluccas 598
——Paraguay 585ff
——Peru 582
——Philippines 588
—work in Hungary 327
—see also *Ratio studiorum*
Socinians 311, 320
Soderini, cardinal 112f
Söderköping, diet (1595) 310
Solano, Francisco 582
Sola scriptura, principle of Reformation 64
Solor 599
Solórzano 613
Solothurn 175
Somasca 437
Somaschi 437
Somerset, duke of 336, 337
Sommerlath, E. 222
Songbooks 311
Soranzo 498
Sorbonne 59, 396, 454, 486, 639
—appeal of council (1518) 59
Soreth, John 438
Soto, Domingo de 201, 445, 477, 539, 556
—Pedro de 289
South America 575–608
Souza, Tomé de 606
Sovereigns 298
—"emergency bishops" (Luther) 223f
—and Luther's Reformation 229f
Sozzini, Fausto 320, 641
—Lelio 641
Spada 631
Spalatin (Burckhardt), Georg 36, 46, 54, 58ff, 64, 66ff, 75, 78, 81, 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, 99ff, 144f, 221, 230f
Spangenberg, Cyriakus 318
Spain 433, 481, 483, 488, 503, 506, 511, 514, 534, 535, 567, 615, 625, 628, 631, 638, 644
—age of discovery 576f
—beginnings of reform 442ff
—Catholic reform 511
—church and state under Philip II 512
——iconoclasm (1566) 513
——new church provinces 512
——religious edicts of Charles V 513
—mission to newly discovered lands 577
—provincial synods 512
—rivalry with France 615f
—Tridentine seminaries 512
Sparre, Aage Jepsen, Master, archbishop of Lund 303
Spaur, bishop of Brixen 525
Speciano 511
Spee, Friedrich von 539, 562, 640f
Spengler, Lazarus 265, 352
Spenlein, Georg 37
Speratus, Paul 314, 321
Speyer 209, 422
—diet (1526) 211f, 241
——recess 212, 230, 242
—diet (1529) 242
——recess 181, 243f
—diet (1542) 280, 282
—diet (1544) 284, 464
—national council (1524) 208
Spina 201
Spiritual drama 427
Spiritual estates 297
Spiritual life 556ff
Spiritual regimen 218ff
Spiritual reservation 297, 298, 522
Spiritualism, spiritualists 188–91, 420
—Obbe Philips 186
Spirituality, Spanish 556ff
St. André, marshall 394
St. Asaph 329
St. Denis 571
St. Gallen 166, 176, 243, 533
—Reformation 170
St. Germain-des-Prés 572
St. Germain-en-Laye, edict (1562) 394
—peace (1570) 395f, 514
St. Nicholas fraternity 433
St. Omer 517, 574
—bishopric 512
St. Vanne, congregation OSB 572
State and church 637ff
—according to Calvin 381
State church 639
State secretariat, papal 631
State, theory of 637ff
Stadler, Ulrich 182
Stammheim 171
Stancarno (Stancarnus), Francesco 326, 355
Standonck 442
Stans 533
Staphylus, Friedrich 355, 633
Stapleton, Thomas 541
Status reports 506
Staupitz, Johann von 18f, 51, 53, 58, 71, 117
Stavanger, bishopric 302
Stegmüller, F. 537, 539
Stein, Wolfgang 125
Stella, Bartolomeo 435
Stengel, Georg 640
Sten Sture the Younger 302
Stobaeus, bishop of Lavant 525
Stöckel, Leonhard 322
Storch, Nikolaus 89f, 129
Stössel 361
Stoyb, diocesan priest 533
Strängnäs, bishopric 302
Strasbourg 175f, 179f, 243f, 252, 258, 266, 338, 370, 391, 399ff, 403, 477
—bishopric 527, 531
—synod (1533) 184
Stravius, vicar general in Cologne 529

Strigel, Victorin 346f
Stuart, Erné, Lord D'Aubigny 417
Stübner, Markus (Thomas) 89f
Stunica 446
Sturm, Jakob 249, 266
—Johannes 369, 376, 399
—Kaspar 78
Stuttgart 269
—Accord 269
—synod (1559) 359
Styria 325, 525, 622
Suárez, Francisco 536, 539, 558, 617, 642
Subjectivism 6
Succession Act of Henry VIII 330
Suleiman II, sultan 105, 268, 280
Sulpicians 516
Sumatra 590
Sunda Islands, Large, mission to 598
—Small, mission to 598
Superintendents 233f
Superstition 9, 424, 639f
Supralapsiarianism 402
Supremacy Act (1534) 241, 329
—(1559) 338
Supreme Court 263, 265, 266, 272, 279, 280, 284
Surius, Laurentius 549, 551
Svenichen, Alexander 318
Swabian League 241, 268, 289
Sweden 301f, 305, 317, 615, 630
—attempt to re-Catholicize 519f
—church regulation (1571) 309
—new church regulation (1575) 309
—Reformation 306ff
Swedish Mass 308
Switzerland 420, 499
—Christian union (1529) with Austria 177
—established church 156
—Reformation 156, 170–77, 253
— —Zwingli and beginnings of Swiss Reformation 156–70
—reformers 249
—religious war (1529) 176
—Tridentine reforms 533f
Syllogismus practicus 379
Sylvanus, Johannes 407
Sylvester, Johannes 324
Synergism, synergist controversy 98, 344ff
Synodal system 112
Synods, see Diocesan synods, Provincial synods
Szegedi, Gregor 326
Sztarai, Michael 325

Tacchi Venturi 439
Talavera, Hernando, archbishop of Granada 443
Tametsi, marriage decree (1563) 494, 528, 563
Tanner, Adam 536, 539, 634, 640
Tapper, Ruard 198, 477, 540
Tarragona, Benedictine congregation 512
Tarugi, cardinal 567
Tauler 131, 556
Tausen, Hans 344
Teaching benefices 469
Tegetmeyer, Sylvester 316
Temesvar 324
Tenochtitlán 580
Teresa of Avila 556, 557f, 564, 570, 619
Terlecki, bishop of Luck 521
Ternate 596
—mission to 598f
Territorial princes 638
Territorial states 299
Territories and development of denominations 421f
Tetrapolitana 258, 267
Tetschen 341
Tetzel, Johannes 8, 46f, 50, 52f, 54, 61f, 73
Teutonic Order, state of 312, 314
Textus receptus 546
Thamer, Theobald 633
Theatines 436f, 483, 502, 562
Theocracy 218, 368, 374
Theology 194f, 218, 291, 534
—mystical 558
—of controversy and polemics 428
—positive 536
— —rise 546–55
Theophanos, patriarch of Jerusalem 521
Thesaurus ecclesiae 43, 56
Third Order 562
Thirty Years War, beginning 620ff
—church policies 624f
Thodenus 409
Thomas a Jesu 570f, 611
Thomas Aquinas 10, 32, 40, 49, 69f, 445, 536f
Thomas de Vio, see Cajetan
Thomas of Silvestro 434
Thomas Christians 595f, 597f
—union with Rome 597
Thomism 538, 542ff
Thou, Jacques Auguste de 516
Thüngen, bishop of Bamberg 526
Thurgau, Reformation 170
Tiepolo, Nicolò 435
Tillet, Louis du 364
Tilly 626
Timann (Amsterodamus), Johannes 357
Tintzmann 560
Tithing 233
Tlaxcala, bishopric 580
Toggenburg, Reformation 170
Toledo 502
—provincial synod (1565–66) 512
Toledo, cardinal 457
Tolerance 298, 632, 635
—by state 636, 637
Tolna 324
Tonkin, mission to 606
Torczyn 521
Torda, provincial diet (1557) 324

Tordesillas, treaty (1494) 576
Torelli, Luisa 437
Torgau 249, 265
—Articles 255f, 257
—convention (1527) 342
—Eucharistic Confession (1574) 361
—expert opinion of (1549) 351
—visitation regulation (1527) 231f
Toribio de Benavente 580
Török, family 325
Torres, Cosme de 599
—Franciscus 548
Totti 632
Toul 295
Toulouse, university 329
Tournai 399
—bishopric 399
—Jesuit college 454
Tournon, Jesuit college 454
Tradition 194, 276, 536, 546
Transubstantiation, and doctrine 69, 120, 194f, 245, 278, 335, 360, 371, 385, 386, 388, 477
—see also Eucharist, doctrine of
Trapper 535
Trappists 572
Traubüchlein, Luther's 229
Trautmannsdorf, count 627
Treason Act of Henry VIII 331
Trembach, Urban von, bishop of Passau 524
Trent 288, 294, 295, 464
—Council of, see Councils
Treptow (Pomerania) 315
Trevisani, Jerome, bishop of Cremona 440
Trials 478
Tridentine reform, see Catholic reform
Trie, Guillaume de 382
Trier 405, 527, 639
—Jesuit college 454
Trinitarians 512
Trinity, trinity doctrine 250, 271, 640
—Calvin's 377
—Servet's 382
Tritheists 641
Trithemius, Johannes 549
Trivius 529
Trolle, Gustav, archbishop of Uppsala 306
Trondheim (Nidaros), archbishopric 302
Trubar, Primoz 325
Trujillo, bishopric 583
Tschudi, Valenti 171
Tübingen
—monastery 269
—university 269f, 426, 642
Tucumán (Santiago de Estero), bishopric 583
Turin 463
Turks, threat from Turks 212, 239ff, 241, 254, 261, 268, 280, 285, 295, 322
Turkish wars 106, 108, 112, 218f, 268, 273
Tuscany 624
Twelve Chief Articles of the Peasantry 141
Two natures, doctrine 250, 271
Two powers theory 5
Tyburne 331
Tyndale, William 333, 336
Tyrants, assassination of 638f
Tyrnau 326f
Tyrol 295, 525, 532
—anabaptists 182

Ubaldini, papal nuncio 616, 619
Ubiquity, doctrine 124, 356, 359f, 389
Ubi unus dominus, ibi una sit religio 297
Uchanski, archbishop of Gnesen 484, 519
Ujsziget near Savar, academy 324
Ukraine 520
Ulenberg, Caspar 546, 562, 633
Ulm 175, 243, 244, 267, 293, 424
Ulrich, duke of Württemberg 114, 141, 241, 268, 287, 633
Unam sanctam, bull 5
Ungnad, family 325
Ungnad Freiherr zu Sonneck, Johann 325
Uniformity Acts (1554) 418
—(1559) 338, 517
Union of Arras (1579) 402
—of Brest (1596) 521
—Protestant 621
Unio sacramentalis 270, 385
Unitarians, unitarianism 311, 637, 641
Unity, religious 258
Universalis Ecclesiae, bull (1508) 577
University
—effects of Reformation 233ff
—see also individual cities
Unterwalden 175
Upper Palatinate 524
Uppsala, archbishopric 302
—national synod (1593) 310f, 519
Urban V, pope 575
Urban VII (Gian Battista Castagna), pope 508, 511
Urban VIII (Matteo Barberini), pope 551, 565, 571, 572f, 605, 612, 615f, 619f, 623ff, 628ff, 643
—neutrality policy 624f
Urbanus Rhegius 180
Urbino 624
Urdaneta, Andrea de 587
Uri 175
Ursinus, Zacharias 405ff
Ursulines 437, 573
Uruguay, christianization 584
Usodimare 459
Utjesenovich (Martinuzzi), George 326
Utrecht 402, 513
—union (1579) 402, 513

Vadian Joachim 156, 170, 179
Vadstena, convent of St. Bridget 310, 519
Valdez, Alfonso 258, 445
—Juan 445
Valencia, provincial synod (1565–66) 512

Valencia, Gregory of 538
Valenciennes 399
Valier of Verona, cardinal 502
Valignano, Alessandro 600
Valladoilid 444, 517, 535
—Benedictine congregation 571
—Disputation: Grace controversy (1594) 543
Vallière, Jean 362
Valverde, Vicente 582
Varela, María 557
Västeras, bishopric 302
—diet (1527) 307, 310
Vatican library 554
—printing house 553
Växjö, bishopric 302
Vázquez, Gabriel 536, 539f
—Michael 543
Vega, Andrés de 445, 469
Vehe, Michael 206
Velázquez, Diego 628
—Juan 446
Veltlin 625
Veltwyk, Gerhard 276
Veneration of saints 9, 195, 201, 257, 276, 278, 335,371, 495, 547, 551, 624
Venezuela 584f
—christianization 585
Venice 238f, 435, 436, 437, 456, 492, 500, 503, 509, 540, 550, 553, 624, 629
—conflict with Paul V 616ff
—Jesuit college 454
—peace (1177) 629
—Turkish war 629
Verallo, nuncio 474
Verden 294, 298
—bishopric 529, 627
Verdun 295
Vergara, Juan 446
Vergerio, Pietro Paolo the Younger 463, 510
Vernazza, Ettore 434
Verona 436, 437
Verrazzano, Giovanni de 608
Vervins, Spanish-French peace (1598) 508, 609
Viborg, bishopric 302
Vice curates 8
Vicenza 436, 463
Victoria, Fr. de, bishop of Tucumán 586
Vienna 571
—bishopric 525
—Jesuit college 455
—peace (1606) 620
Vignaux, P. 17
Vignola 507
Villach 295
Viller 532
Villoslada, G. 432
Vilna, Jesuit college 519, 520
Vinghe, Philip de 548
Vincentians 574
Vincent de Paul 560, 574
Violent Diet (1547), see Augsburg
Viret, Peter 376, 385
Visitatio liminum 506, 644
Visitations, canonic (episcopal) 292, 494, 497, 530
—commissions 233
—Melanchthon's regulation 231f
—Protestant 231f, 236, 421, 424, 426
Visitors, instructions for 233, 235f
Vita communis 460
Vitelleschi, Mutius 569
Vitoria, Francisco de 329, 445, 535, 537, 642
—Thomas de 566
Vitus von Windsheim 321
Volkertszoon 184
Volmar, Melchior 363
Volta, Gabriel della 53
Vondel, Jost van den 633
Volusius, Adam Gottfried 633
Vorst, Peter van der, papal nuncio 272, 273
Vossler, K. 557
Vows 195
Vulgate 468, 510
—revision 507

Waadt, Reformation 175
Wadding, Luke 624
Wagner, Valentin 323
Waldberg, Gebhard Truchsess von, archbishop of Cologne 528
—Otto Truchsess von, cardinal 526
Waldeck, Franz von, bishop of Münster 185
Wallenstein 626, 627
Wallis 534
Walloons 402
Wallon-Flanders 402
Wangnereck 627
War against priests 114ff
Ward, Mary 574f
Warham, William, archbishop of Canterbury 327
Warsaw confederation (1573) 319, 519
Wartenberg, Franz Wilhelm von, bishop of Osnabrück 529, 627
Wassenberg preachers 185
Webster, Augustin 331
Wegelin, Georg 572
Weimar, disputation (1560) 346
Weimar Confutation Book (1559) 346
Weissenburg, bishopric 322f, 326
Weissenhorn 554
Welser, merchants 585
Werl 564
Wesel 401, 402f
—classes 404
—convention (1568) 401, 403
West Africa, mission to 592f
Westphalia, peace (1648) 529, 615, 627ff, 643
Westphal, Joachim 356ff, 390
Wetterau 409
Whitgift, John, Anglican archbishop of

Canterbury 339, 518
Wied, Friedrich von, archbishop of Cologne 528
—Hermann von, archbishop of Cologne 283f, 528
Wiener, Paul, bishop of Weissenburg 323
Wiener Neustadt, bishopric 525
Wild 560
Wilhelm, archbishop of Riga 316
Wilhelm IV, duke of Bavaria 196, 209f
Wilhelm V, duke of Bavaria 524, 531
Wilhelm von Fürstenberg, Master of Teutonic Order 316
Wilhelm of Hesse 294
Wilhelm V, duke of Jülich-Cleve-Berg 426, 523
William of Ockham 217
William of Orange 401, 408, 513
Wiiliamists in Geneva 371
Will, freedom of 277, 336, 346f 541
—according to Erasmus 146ff
—according to Luther 149ff
—lack of 344
—see also Predestination, Synergism
Willaert 536
Wimpina, Konrad 52
Winzet, Ninian 518
Wirsberg, bishop of Würzburg 525
Wishart, George 411
Witch trials, witch persecution 425, 639f
Wittelsbach, House of 286, 499, 503, 531, 564
Wittenberg 120, 210, 227, 245, 255f, 282, 293f, 324, 329, 423, 426
—accord (1536) 98, 269f, 385
—accord negotiations (1536) 270
—capitulation 288
—church regulation (1521) 226
—city ordinance (1522) 120
—faculty of arts 64
—people and Karlstadt 122
—reformatory movement 81ff
—school regulation (1533) 235
—see also Lutherans
Witzel, Georg 154, 204, 205ff, 273, 276, 523, 561, 634f
Wolf, E. 642
Wolfenbüttel Psalter 20
Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt-Bernburg 211, 243, 259, 267
Wolfgang, duke of Zweibrücken 407
Wolfgang Wilhelm, count Palatinate 626, 633
Wölfflin 157
Wolsey, Thomas, archbishop of York 327f, 334
Women, religious associations, post-Tridentine development 573
Word (gospel) 246, 387
—external sign of the church (Luther) 214f
—liturgy of the 337
—proclamation of 219
Works, good 98, 347ff, 349
—according to Calvin 379
—see also Faith and works
Work piety 9, 66
Worms 181, 422, 465
—assembly of princes (1539) 273
—colloquy (1557) 633
—diet (1521) 77ff, 202, 435
—diet (1545) 285
—edict (1521) 79, 105, 108, 208ff, 211ff, 230, 241, 243, 254f, 263, 626
—religious colloquy (1540–41) 275, 370
Wotton, English ambassador to Venice 617
Wujek 520
Württemberg 293, 477, 627
—church regulation of Duke Ulrich 269
—Reformation 268
Würtzburg, bishop of Bamberg 526
Würzburg 242, 525, 621
—university 525
Wyclif, John 148
Wyclifism 327
Wyttenbach, Thomas 157, 173

Xanten, treaty (1614) 405
Xavier, Francis, apostle to India 448, 453, 564, 569, 594, 595f, 598, 599, 602, 619
Ximénes de Cisneros, archbishop of Toledo 106, 443, 445, 535

York 332
—archbishopric 327
Yucatán 580
—bishopric 580
Ypres, bishopric 513

Zabardy, Matthias, bishop of Wardein 326
Zabern (1525) 142
Zaccaria, Anton Maria 435, 437
Zapolya, John, king of Hungary 242, 268, 280, 322f, 324f
—John II 322
Zasius, Ulrich 144
Zeeland 401
Zelanti, at Council of Trent 493f
Zerbst 409
Zeys, Joh. 130
Zichem, Eustachius van 199
Zini, secretary 441
Zips 323
Zollern, cardinal 623
Zollikon 179
Zoepfl, Friedrich 526
Zrinyi, family 325
—Georg 325
Zug 175, 533
Zuleger, Wenceslaus 406
Zumárraga, Juan de 581
Zürich 176, 178, 252, 267, 338, 382
—abolition of images, relics, etc. 167
—Bible 170
—church order 169
—defense treaties 176

—diet (1531) 253
—Eucharist, doctrine of 386ff
—first debate (1523) 163, 245
—iconoclasm 165f
—marriage court regulation 169
—morals court 169
—poor law 169
—Reformation 157
—second debate (1523) 166
—synod regulation (1523) 253
—Zwinglian reform 159ff
Zweibrücken 422
Zwickau prophets 89f, 129
Zwilling, Gabriel 85, 87, 89f, 120
Zwingli, Ulrich 4, 9, 84, 116, 127, 138f, 144, 156, 157–70 174, 175f, 178, 185, 189, 192, 195, 196, 244, 249ff, 255f, 259f, 267, 359, 364f, 386, 398, 488
—and council 164
—and Luther 158
—break with church 160–70
—break with papacy 159ff
—death and succession 252f
—divine service regulation 165
—education reform 165
—Eucharistic doctrine 166ff, 245–49
—iconoclasm 165f
—life 157f
—Marburg colloquy 249–52
—reform sermons 158, 163
—Scripture, principle 162ff
—social revolution 139
—spiritualism 246f
—state theory 163
—word, liturgy of the 168
—writings
——prophecy 169
——*Regulation of the Christian Church in Zürich* 168
Zwinglians, Zwinglianism 243, 253, 255f, 269
—Eucharist, doctrine 386ff
Zwingli's Christian right to defense 244

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

VI

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume VI

THE CHURCH IN THE AGE OF ABSOLUTISM AND ENLIGHTENMENT

by

Wolfgang Müller

Quintín Aldea

Johannes Beckmann

Louis Cognet

Patrick J. Corish

Oskar Köhler

Heribert Raab

Burkhart Schneider

Bernhard Stasiewski

Translated by

Gunther J. Holst

Crossroad · New York

1981
The Crossroad Publishing Company
18 East 41st Street, New York, NY 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. V: *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Absolutismus und der Aufklärung*
© Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1970

English translation © 1981 by The Crossroad Publishing Company

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored
in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Kirche im Zeitalter des Absolutismus und der Aufklärung.
English.
The Church in the age of absolutism and enlightenment.
(History of the Church; v. 6)
Translation of: Die Kirche im Zeitalter des
Absolutismus und der Aufklärung.
Includes bibliographies and index.
1. Church history—17th century. 2. Church history—
18th century. I. Müller, Wolfgang, 1905–
II. Series: Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. English; v. 6.
BR145.2.J413 1980, vol. 6 [BR440] 270s 81-5056
ISBN 0-8245-0010-5 [270.7] AACR2 Previously: 0-8164-0445-3

CONTENTS

Preface ix
Preface to the English Edition xi
Introduction xiii
List of Abbreviations xxi

PART ONE: THE LEADERSHIP POSITION OF FRANCE

SECTION ONE: ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE IN FRANCE (Louis Cognet) 3

Chapter 1: Christian Renewal after 1615 3
  French Catholicism under Louis XIII 3
  Richelieu and the *Milieu Dévot* 11
  The Reform of the Clergy 16

Chapter 2: Origin and Development of Jansenism to 1653 24
  Augustinianism in Louvain and Jansen 24
  Augustinianism in France: Saint-Cyran and Port-Royal 28
  The Beginnings of the Jansenist Conflict; The Bull *In eminenti* 31
  The Five Theses and the Bull *Cum occasione* 37

Chapter 3: The Jansenist Conflict to 1713 41
  The *quaestio juris* and the *quaestio facti;* The *Provinciales* 41
  The Formulary 45
  The Clementine Peace 49
  The Way to the Bull *Unigenitus* 53

Chapter 4: Gallicanism and Protestantism 57
  Gallicanism at the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century 57
  Richelieu and the Holy See 61
  The Gallicanism of Louis XIV 65
  Protestantism in Seventeenth-Century France 70

Chapter 5: Spirituality in Seventeenth-Century France 75
  Major Trends in Seventeenth-Century Spirituality 75
  The Great Christian Works 80
  Christian Life 84
  From Cartesianism to Quietism 88

Chapter 6: Christian Thought in Seventeenth-Century France 93
  Systematic and Scholastic Theology 93
  The Development of Historical Theology 97
  Cartesianism and Religious Thought 101

SECTION TWO: THE PAPACY IN THE PERIOD OF FRENCH HEGEMONY (Burkhart Schneider) 107

Introduction 107

Chapter 7: The Popes from Alexander VII to Clement X 109
  Alexander VII (1655–67) 109
  Clement IX (1667–69) 114
  Clement X (1670–76) 115

Chapter 8: Innocent XI 118

Chapter 9: The Popes from Alexander VIII to Clement XI 126
  Alexander VIII (1689–91) 126
  Innocent XII (1691–1700) 127
  Clement XI (1700–1721) 129

SECTION THREE: THE END OF THE DENOMINATIONAL ERA IN EUROPE—PROGRESS AND STAGNATION OF THE WORLD MISSION (ch. 10: Heribert Raab; 11: Quintín Aldea; 12: Patrick J. Corish; 13 and 14: Bernhard Stasiewski; 15–17: Johannes Beckmann) 135

Chapter 10: Reconstruction and Constitution of the Church of the Empire . . 135

Chapter 11: Spain and Portugal to 1815 161
  The General Intellectual Situation 161
  The Geographic, Sociographic, and Economic Situation 162
  The Development of Ecclesiastical Institutions 163
  Church and State 168

Chapter 12: The Condition of the Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries 172
  The Early Stuarts 172
  Commonwealth and Restoration 174
  The Penal Code of the Eighteenth Century 177
  Catholic Emancipation 181

Chapter 13: The Russian Orthodox Church 183
  Moscow the Third Rome 183
  The First Moscow Patriarchate 185
  The Dissolution of the Patriarchate and the Establishment of the Holy Synod 193
  The Russian Established Church under the Holy Synod 198
  Protestants and Catholics in Russia 203

Chapter 14: The Autonomous and the Uniate Churches in the East 207
  The Autonomous Eastern Churches 208
  The Orthodox Churches 209
  The Oriental National Churches of the Nestorians and Monophysites . . . 217
  The Uniate Churches 223

Chapter 15: The Propagation of the Faith in America 232
  The Waning of the Missionary Spirit and the Decline of the Missions . . . 232
  The Revival of the Missionary Spirit and the Expansion of the Missions . . 247
    The Franciscans 247
    The Jesuits 252
    Other Orders 259
  The Enlightenment and Its Consequences 264

Chapter 16: The Propagation of the Faith in Africa 270

Chapter 17: The Propagation of the Faith in Asia 279
The Propaganda and the Portuguese *Padroado* 280
Development and Decline of the Missions in the Asian Countries 290
India 290
Indochina 301
China 303
Japan 317
The Philippines and the South Seas 321

PART TWO: THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

SECTION ONE: CONCEPTS (Oskar Köhler) 329

Chapter 18: Foundations and Forms of the Established Church in the Bourbon States of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries 329

Chapter 19: The Enlightenment 342
Concept 342
The Enlightenment within the Political and Social Conditions of Individual Countries 347
Creation and Natural Law—The History of Salvation and the World of History 372

SECTION TWO: CHURCH LIFE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT (ch. 20–22: Louis Cognet; 23, 24, 26 and 27: Heribert Raab; 25: Bernhard Stasiewski; 28 and 29: Wolfgang Müller) . . 381

Chapter 20: Jansenism in Eighteenth-Century France 381
The Bull *Unigenitus* 381
The Appellation 392
The Defeat of Jansenism 404
Jansenism and the Religious Mentality of the Eighteenth Century 413

Chapter 21: Spirituality and Its Development in Eighteenth-Century France . 428
Christian Life 428
The Continuance of Mysticism 430
Popular Devotions 433

Chapter 22: Anglican Spirituality in the Eighteenth Century 435
John Wesley (1703–91) and Methodism 439

Chapter 23: Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire from the Middle of the Seventeenth Century to the End of the Eighteenth Century 443
Practical Episcopalism from the End of the Seventeenth Century to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century 443
The Canonical and Theological Foundation of Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire 449
Febronius and Febronianism 453
The Coblenz *Gravamina* of 1769 458
The Nunciature Dispute and the Congress of Ems 465

Chapter 24: The Established Church and the Enlightenment in the Temporal Territories of the Empire—Theresianism and Josephinism 469
Theresianism and Josephinism 472
The Established Church in Electoral Bavaria 482

Chapter 25: State and Church in Poland-Lithuania to the End of the Republic of the Aristocracy 489

Chapter 26: The Decline of the Church of the Empire in the Great Secularization 491

Chapter 27: Attempts at Church Reunion 509

Chapter 28: Ecclesiastical Learning in the Eighteenth Century—Theology of Enlightenment and Pietism 524
Catholic Theology 524
Scholarship in Italy 532
Jansenism in Italy; The Synod of Pistoia, 1786 534
Protestant Theology 535
Catholic Universities 538
Academies 543
Education 545

Chapter 29: Liturgy and Popular Piety—New Religious Orders 547
The Liturgy 547
New Religious Orders 554

SECTION THREE: THE PAPACY UNDER THE INCREASING PRESSURE OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH (Burkhart Schneider) 558

Chapter 30: The Popes from Innocent XIII to Clement XII 560
Innocent XIII (1721–24) 560
Benedict XIII (1724–30) 560
Clement XII (1730–40) 563

Chapter 31: Benedict XIV 566

Chapter 32: Clement XIII and Clement XIV 573
Clement XIII (1758–69) 573
Clement XIV (1769–74) 577

BIBLIOGRAPHY 583

General Bibliography 584

Bibliography to Individual Chapters 591

INDEX 645

PREFACE

As the list of contributors to this volume demonstrates, it was necessary to take into account the increasing complexity of the life of the Church in the period treated by calling upon more experts from other countries. The number of contributors could not but make it more difficult to maintain the uniformity within the total concept of this work. Therefore the editor and the coordinators have decided to preface this volume with an introduction to facilitate its synthesis.

At this time we announce with great sadness the death of Louis Cognet on 29 July 1970. The stamp of his greatness appears in this volume. Although it was only two years ago that he was invited to collaborate with us, he has produced an account of the life of the Church in France during and following the *Grand Siècle* to the great revolution which far surpasses any such account of similar size available in Germany till now. Drawing on his most profound expertise, he has done this with admirable precision. He was able to read the proofs of the chapters he authored, but prevented from seeing this volume appear in print.

Hubert Jedin

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

Few periods in the history of the Church offer such a striking variety of currents and counter currents, of triumphs and failures, as in what is known as the Age of the Baroque. Not only had a reformed, triumphant, and centralized Curia to maintain its counter offensive against a Protestantism increasingly vitalized and supported by the new maritime powers, it was now also faced with growing resistance from within on the part of an episcopate and princes who saw its once needed direction as being tantamount to interference. This was especially true in France where the decrees of Trent were only belatedly accepted. It can be said that all the movements that plagued the Church from the Reformation to the Revolution—Gallicanism, Jansenism, episcopalism, and absolutism—originated in Europe's most Catholic nation.

While Jansenism and Gallicanism held center stage, it was the nascent Enlightenment, spreading from Protestant Europe, that posed the real challenge to the post-Reformation Church. Many of its earlier disciples were from among the educated clergy and many of its basic principles—the idea of progress, religious freedom, recognition of the basic rights of man—form the very foundation of modern society. It was the alleged divorce of the use of reason from a humble dependence on God that turned the Church against it. It was perhaps Protestantism's adaptation to the new movement that made it, rather than Catholicism, the more dynamic of the Christian bodies in eighteenth-century Europe. Evangelism and Pietism would wait another two centuries to touch the Church of Rome seriously.

While the Church declined in religious leadership, it also continued to lose what was left of its prestige in political Europe. The failure of Louis XIV to restore the Catholic Stuarts to the English throne was as indicative of this as was the dissolution of the Jesuits in 1773 by Clement XIV. We might add to this list the disintegration of the Baroque. Perhaps nothing more strikingly demonstrates the secularized temper of the time and the profound cultural change than the fact that there is hardly a major painter, sculptor, or architect after 1700 who was primarily a religious artist.

John P. Dolan

INTRODUCTION

The century and a half of church history after the Peace of Westphalia, treated in this volume, is a particular epoch in the formation of the "modern world," but regarding the Church this period is difficult to characterize in a general way if the requisite criteria are gleaned from its own historical existence.

Concerning the relationship between the Church and the temporal world it must be stated that in the area of political forces the Church lost its participation and its leadership in the intellectual development of Europe. This loss, while especially marked in the case of the Catholic Church because of its significance within the context of Western history and its intrinsic predisposition for a universal world order, was also sustained by the Protestant and the Eastern Churches. Not only was Christianity split into denominations, it also began to lose more and more of its congruence with the society in which it lived. To be sure, "published" history commonly overlooked the fact that in this period of roughly 150 years and far beyond broad segments of the general population remained anonymous and continued to live within the Christian tradition until even the last retreats of traditional Christianity were confronted with the "modern world." This volume occasionally makes reference to the endurance of this order of life, grown throughout the centuries, which has been obscured to the view of history by the spectacular events of the "great" and mighty aspects of history, which were, however, shaped by a mere small segment of actors. To sharpen that view is one of the tasks of church history which must make use of the recently developed sociohistorical methods for that purpose.

The complexity of the period from 1648–1789, customarily designated as "the Age of Absolutism and Enlightenment," is equally significant in its bearing on church history. The assertion that the Church lost its role of intellectual leadership is indeed justified. Yet one must hasten to add that in the construction and interior design of churches and monastic establishments the period of the Baroque has given the general public a number of magnificent representations of a spirit which melded mathematical rationality and an awareness of the Christian faith. If one considers Voltaire as a representative of the spirit of his time, one must also be aware—regardless of cultural differences—that Johann Sebastian Bach and George Frederick Handel, both masters in the field of church music, represented high points in the history of music, and that such architects and artists as B. Neumann and Tiepolo were his contemporaries. Our general view of the history encompassing that century and a half is excessively determined by phenomena which "even then" presaged the arrival of modern society, whereas elements which tended to retain and preserve any religious creations in art and music have been undervalued. The degree of this distortion is heightened by the fact that the history of the Church of this period (even in church historiography itself) is treated too much within the framework of political history, while the history of Christian spirituality, both in Catholicism and Protestantism, has been neglected. This volume therefore pays particular attention to the latter element.

A final task for the determination of church history within the universal history of this period was the need to modify the prevailing opinion formed by nineteenth-century church historians concerning the age of Enlightenment. Its growing anti-Church and even anti-Christian tendencies are unequivocal. But the so-called Second Enlightenment in our present age has permitted us to see the strong effect exerted by the unbroken existence of Christian tradition upon the intellectual movements of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, regardless of all their polemical rhetoric (Chap. 19). To be sure, the "crisis of European intellectuality" was underway, but the old categories of order and the spirituality of the masses stayed alive.

The shift in the relationship between church history and general history is hardly more apparent than in the fact that the Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia were of necessity natural topics for discussion in Volume V, *Reformation and Counter Reformation,* while the present volume can only highlight the international relations and changes in the European balance of power. The last religious war lost its denominational character in 1635 when France under Cardinal Richelieu intervened formally against the Catholic powers. In the period after 1648 the fight of France for European hegemony relegated the denominational issue to a role of mere political propaganda. A case in point was the war between France and Holland (1672–78) in which Pope Clement X let himself be deceived regarding the intentions of Louis XIV (Chap. 7); in the Peace of Nijmegen (1678/79), in which France consolidated its hegemony at the expense of Spain and the Empire, the legate of Innocent XI merely played a minor role. Even before that, in the negotiations for the Peace of the Pyrenees between France and Spain (1659) the Holy See was completely excluded. On the other hand, an alliance of a different kind united the Emperor and the Protestant powers of Holland and England against France, which had invaded the Palatinate in 1688. Louis XIV, all the while, was giving the appearance of furthering the aims of the Catholic Church by supporting James II of the Stuarts and then, after James's flight, making the subsequent unsuccessful Irish rebellion (1690) an object of his political calculations (Chap. 12). The Pope was not officially represented at the Peace of Rijswijk (1697). "The Rijswijk Clause," stipulating that Catholic towns, whenever they came under Protestant dominion, would have to be tolerated, continued to be a recurring problem given the subsequent shifts in the balance of power. This was the case in the Peace of Utrecht (1713) and Rastatt (1714), in the Spanish War of Succession and again during Prussia's expansion in the Silesian wars and the Polish partitions (Chap. 24).

The fact that its residual political power over the Papal States would merely serve to embarrass the Holy See is demonstrated in exemplary fashion by the Spanish War of Succession. After Innocent XII had pleaded the cause of the Bourbon candidate and Clement XI had tried in vain to stay out of the conflict, war broke out between the troops of Emperor Joseph II and those of the Pope (1708). In retrospect this is reduced to a mere momentary specter which had nothing at all to do with the dualism of the highest representatives of Catholic Christianity (Chap. 9). What was left were the disputes with the radical regalism of the Spanish Bourbons (Chap. 11). Reduced to a state of helpless neutrality, Benedict XIV had to watch the farce performed by the history of the Western Empire some fifty years before its end in the Austrian War of Succession (1740–48) between Maria Theresa and the Wittelsbachs, who by the grace of France were able to furnish an Emperor in the person of Charles VII (1742). Benedict XIV was just as impotent when Frederick II reached out for Silesia (Chap. 31). And once again the conflict was ended by an alliance between the house of Habsburg and the Protestant powers of England and Holland against France.

The fact that the rights of the Papal States were ignored in war as well as in the bargaining surrounding the conclusion of peace was the lesser of the evils in comparison to their domestic shortcomings. These could simply not be overcome, because in an era of the modern state their political structure had become anachronistic. Yet the greatest damage to the Church itself was done by the rivaling influence of the Catholic powers of France, Spain and the Habsburgs on the papal elections from one pontificate to the other. Since the time of Constantine the Great these elections, to be sure, had been more or less exposed to the varying conditions of temporal history, not least among them the rivalries of Italian families. But diplomatic moves in an age of totally secularized abolutism—regardless of the political divine right ideology of the respective rulers—largely determining the election of the highest dignitary of Catholic Christianity was a perversion of the relationship between political and eccesiastical power in the former *corpus christianum.* While there were no unworthy persons on the throne of Saint Peter in this period and, indeed, Innocent XI (1676–89) and Benedict XIV (1740–58), one as pontiff, the other as scholar, were far above average, there is reason to doubt whether the political circumstances allowed the optimal candidate to prevail in each case (Chaps. 7–9, 30–32). Closing this volume with the suppression of the Society of Jesus (1773) during the pontificate of Clement XIV, brought about by the pressure of the Catholic powers, emphasizes a characteristic feature of this period.

But even though the papacy—in accordance with the facts—does recede into the background in the organization and structure of this book, we must emphasize one achievement which was significant for all of Europe and yet often too little recognized: the diplomatic initiative and financial support of the Popes in resisting and repulsing the Turks. In 1664 when Vienna was threatened by them, Alexander VII was politically in a very weak position opposite Louis XIV. Yet he asked for the King's help and, indeed, French troops had a part in the victory on the Raab River. But this victory could not be exploited because Leopold I justifiably distrusted the subsequent attitude of Louis XIV. Clement X deserves considerable credit for the victory of John Sobieski (1673), at a time when Louis XIV was conducting his Dutch war of conquest (Chap. 7). Above all others it was his successor Innocent XI who deserves a place of honor in the history of Europe. In the face of international adversities he worked undeterred towards the alliance which brought about the successful turn of events for central eastern Europe in the Turkish War 1683–99 (Chap. 8). The fact that this decisive victory initiated the rise of the Austro-Hungarian power was the motive for Louis XIV's inconstant policy towards the Turks and his formation of a front on the Rhine which paralyzed Emperor Leopold I. Following the example of France, from where the Crusades had once emanated, Spain, the land of *reconquista,* also betrayed Prince Eugene's victory at Peterwardein (1716) when it led its fleet, financed in large part by the Pope to be used against the Turks, in an attack against the imperial possessions in Italy (Chap. 9). A final chapter in the common history of Europe which was coauthored by the papacy was ended in the last third of the eighteenth century when Turkey was on the brink of collapse: In 1763 Austria entered into a defensive alliance with Turkey against the combination formed by Prussia and Russia upon the death of Augustus III, King of Poland.

The period discussed in this volume no longer had a Catholic Europe in the sense of a universal historical subject. For this reason the present volume could discuss connections common to all of Europe only from the viewpoint of a history of the papacy, while the major accents had to be put on the presentations of the individual countries. This necessitated dividing the volume among a number of authors. A guiding topic had to be the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century established Church (Chaps. 11, 18, 24). Overlaps with the history of the papacy were unavoidable, as was a separate discussion of Gallicanism (Chap. 4), because the latter could not be separated from its close connection with the Jansenism of this period if we were to demonstrate the complexity of the prevailing situation in which Jansenists were as anti-Gallican as the papacy, which in turn condemned the theology of Jansenism. At the same time the Gallican court was playing off its anti-Jansenism politically against the papacy and its policy, leading to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) against the Calvinists. Ecclesiopolitical embarrassments were thus added to the temporal political plights of the Popes. The concept of the "established Church" must be differentiated according to the various countries as well as the progressive theories and radicalism of the canon law of the established Churches. Connected with the established Churches is their religious evaluation, for which there is no common denominator even though the factor of political secularization is undeniable. A historical judgment must take into account the prevailing contradiction between the concept of a modern state and a Church historically endowed with political freedoms as well as the tensions between an extreme episcopalism and an extreme papalism.

The episcopalism of the Church of the Empire, like Gallicanism, had its roots in the late Middle Ages. The history of the Church of the Empire within the span of this volume (Chaps. 10, 23, 26) therefore provides an especially informative view of the historical situation in which the Church had to exist for these 150 years because it was a case of a "carry-over" from the period of Otto the Great into totally different conditions. No matter how scant the political reality one may be willing to grant the imperial patriotism of the ecclesiastic princes, especially since the Emperor had made Austria conspicuous, the memory of the Empire, which can still be experienced in the residences and monasteries, is a magnificent phenomenon—sentimentality aside—if history is not merely taken to represent the history of power. But the conflicts are obvious: In spite of all the attempts at reform there were the prevailing contradictions between the strange dual structure of the ecclesiastical principality and the Tridentine program; the tensions with the papal nuncios which intensified the more the threats to the ecclesiastical states receded after the Peace of Westphalia and church reform proceeded, raising the self-assurance of the ecclesiastic princes of the Empire whose episcopalism till the middle of the eighteenth century was rooted in the religiopolitical fundament of their existence, in the loyalty to the Empire. The radically Gallican theories of Enlightenment of those regarding the canon law of the established Church did not come into the episcopalism of the Empire until the turn to Febronianism. If we add the modernization of the ecclesiastical territories in the sense of enlightened absolutism, it becomes obvious that the history of these strange institutions was approaching its end long before the general secularization in 1803, which had actually been underway since 1648.

If in view of these ecclesiastical phenomena, "overtaken" by world history and yet respectable in their persistence, we search for elements pointing to the future we encounter the history of spirituality and foremost the history of religiosity in seventeenth-century France (Chaps. 1–3,5), which was deliberately chosen to start the present volume. Corresponding to the intellectual connections, this presentation reaches back to draw a line from Pierre de Bérulle (d. 1629), the founder of the French Oratory and friend of Saint Francis de Sales (d. 1622)—both of them religious inspirers of Saint Vincent de Paul (d. 1660)—through the Basque Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, abbot of Saint-Cyran (often called by that name; d. 1643), to the leader of Jansenism in its classical time, Antoine Arnauld (d. 1694), the brother of Mother Angélique, Abbess of the Cistercian convent Port-Royal in Paris. Originally the French Augustinianism of Bérulle had nothing to do with the problem of grace which was at the center of the Augustinianism of Cornelius Jansen (d. 1638) in Louvain. The basic common bond of all these religious movements and also the root of Blaise Pascal's (d. 1662) involvement on the side of Port-Royal was their protest against a purely political ecclesiasticism of the ruling segment and the search for a new Christocentric piety. Precisely this protest provoked not only the reaction of the political power structure—although one should not argue that Church and state acted in concert in the brutal destruction of the convent of Port-Royal, given the complex motivation for it—but also led to a politicization of Jansenism, noticeable especially in its expansion abroad in Italy (Chap. 28) and the Empire (Chaps. 23–24). It may well be called a tragedy of church history that the religious energies, engendered with such great promise in seventeenth-century France were consumed in the eighteenth century by the Jansenist controversy—a battle fought on the wrong fronts. A universal history of piety, yet to be written, which would make up for the lead of French research on this subject, will have to point out very heterogeneous currents, decisively influenced by the Baroque and Enlightenment (Chap. 29).

The history of Anglican spirituality and its remarkable connections with the French continent (Chap. 22) and German pietism (Chap. 28), which in many respects had parallels to Jansenism, shows that there was in the seventeenth and eighteenth century a sort of common search for a Christian answer to the modern world, regardless of all the denominational and especially ecclesiological differences. The different development in the Russian Orthodox Church (Chap. 13) is exemplified by the fate of Patriarch Nikon (1652–66). His church reforms after the Greek model provoked resistance within the clergy and, on the other hand, his attempts to make the Russian Church independent of the state made the tsar remove him from his office. The joint resistance of the Old Believers and the patriarchal Church against Peter the Great (1682–1725) and his policy of Europeanizing Russia failed. The persecution of the Old Believers had serious consequences especially for the monastic system in Russia. The year 1700 marked the end of the independent patriarchate.

With some few exceptions the systematic theology of the period was merely heir to previous achievements (Chaps. 6, 28). It established no contact with the intellectual movements of its time, either Christian spirituality or the Enlightenment. This was essentially the case in all the denominations. A few notable exceptions were the attempt by the Oratorian Malebranche (d. 1715) to combine Descartes with Augustinianism and the search by Protestant physicotheologists to achieve a concordance with the natural sciences. The theology of Wolff was an unproductive adaptation and the extreme rationalism in the theology of the late eighteenth century the initial step towards surrender. Except for the contemporary accentuation of moral and pastoral theology the main concentration was on historical theology, for Catholicism primarily in France (Chap. 6) and Italy (Chap. 28), for Protestantism in Germany (Chap. 28) where the church history by L. Mosheim also started the exclusion of this discipline from the field of theology. The assertion that this period marked the beginning of a golden age of historical theology is worth considering in connection with a well-known statement by Hegel even if one does not share the dogmatic objections over which that field of research had to prevail.

The fate of the Catholic Church in territories under non-Catholic rule, in England and Ireland (Chap. 12), in Russia (Chaps. 14 and 25), and in Prussia after its annexations corresponded as much as the eviction of Protestants from Salzburg (1731–32) to the conditions of a time which was still struggling to reach a state of practical toleration. The efforts towards an ecclesiastic reunification in France (Chap. 4) and in the Empire (Chap. 27) took place partly under the sign of toleration (like the latter they were threatened by the danger of indifferentism) and partly under the sign of politics. But at the same time they were a first sign of religious reason which was ultimately promoted by the Enlightenment.

The history of the missions was deliberately placed in the middle of the volume (Chaps. 15, 16, 17) since it provides an essential indication of the historical situation of the Church, within and without, during the different periods. The fact that the royal missionary patronages became increasingly problematic was an outgrowth of absolutism. In spite of its regression in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, ultimately caused by the history of the European states, the mission work received a new impetus thanks to the initiative of the religious orders, the Propaganda and the seminars of the Paris Foreign Mission Society (founded in 1660). The farsightedness of the Propaganda was manifested by its emphasis on the education of a native clergy and its efforts to depoliticize the missions. The jailing of Propaganda missionaries by the *Padroado* inquisition in Goa corresponds to the overall image of this period of established Churches. The lack of coordination with the Church, as in the relationship of the secular and regular clergy or in the undelineated juxtaposition of the Propaganda and the *Padroado* missionaries, was distressing. The differentiation of the rites issue, attempted in this volume, may contribute towards a reevaluation of judgments too hastily made.

In an attempt to characterize this century and a half of the Church in spite of the many different and contradictory elements one can perhaps call it a period of transition, from a Church which—despite the schism in the sixteenth century—existed in a society seeing itself as a *corpus christianum,* to one which was forced to reduce itself more and more unto itself. The difficulty of this process was manifest in all the vital areas of the Church, in its adherence to outmoded positions as well as its helplessness against the forces of a new age. The French Revolution which initiated the nineteenth century aggravated these problems. Contrary to the original design they will be discussed in Volume VII.

The contributions in this volume have deliberately refrained from any references to the present Church. But the scientist who makes use of them and the readers of whom we hope to have many will discover without any effort that the Church's past even if one would like to cast it off will inevitably affect the present and the future. The contributors and editors of this volume also hope to provide a contribution to overcoming the present crisis of the Church.

Hubert Jedin
Oskar Köhler
Wolfgang Müller

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAM	*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Klasse, Munich 1835ff.
AAS	*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Rome 1909ff.
AAug	*Analecta Augustiniana,* Rome 1905ff.
AcLinceiMem.	*Atti di Accademia nazionale dei Lincei,* Rome.
AcModena	*Atti e memorie della Accademia di scienze, lettere e arti,* Modena.
AcTorino	*Atti di Accademia di scienze di Torino,* Turin 1865ff.
AE	*Analecta ecclesiastica, presbyterorum s. Ludovici de Urbe curis edita,* Rome 1893–1911.
AElsKG	*Archiv für elsässische Kirchengeschichte,* Gesellschaft für elsässische Kirchengeschichte, ed. J. Brauner, Rixheim im Oberelsaß 1926ff.; 1946ff., ed. A.M. Burg, Strasbourg
AFrH	*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* Florence 1908ff.
AHPont	*Archivum Historiae Pontificiae,* Rome 1963ff.
AHSI	*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu,* Rome 1932ff.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855ff.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857ff.
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Münster and Cologne 1903ff.
ALW	*Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* (previously: *JLW*), Regensburg 1950ff.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949ff.
AnGr	*Analecta Gregoriana cura Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae edita,* Rome 1930ff.
Annales E.S.C.	*Annales: Économies, sociétés, civilisations,* Paris 1946ff.
Anthropos	*Anthropos. Internationale Zeitschrift für Völker- und Sprachenkunde,* Mödling 1906ff.
Antonianum	*Antonianum,* Rome 1926ff.
AÖG	*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte,* Vienna 1865ff.
Aportes	*Aportes. Revista de estudios latinoamericanos,* Paris 1966f.
APraem	*Analecta Praemonstratensia,* Tongerloo 1925ff.
ArSKG	*Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte,* ed. K. Engelbert, I–VI, Breslau 1936–41; VIIff., Hildesheim 1496ff.
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Scoietà Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1878–1934 (1935: *ADRomana*).
Astraín	A. Astraín, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España* I–VII, Madrid 1902–25.

Augustiniana	*Augustiniana. Tijdschrift vor de studie van Sint Augustinus en de Augustijnenorde,* Louvain 1951ff.
BAE	*Biblioteca de Autores Españoles,* Madrid 1846ff.
BÉCh	*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes,* Paris 1839ff.
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* Toulouse 1899ff.
BullRom	*Bullarium, Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Romanorum Pontificum,* ed. G. Tomassetti et al., Turin 1857ff.
Catholicisme	*Catholicisme. Hier—Aujourd'hui—Demain,* ed. G. Jacquemet, Paris 1948ff.
CH	*Church History,* New York and Chicago 1932ff.
Ciaconius	A. Ciaconius, *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S.R.E. Cardinalium,* 2 vols., Rome 1601f., completed by F. Cabrera Morales; 1630 ibid., continued to Clement VIII by A. Victorelli; 1677 ibid., 4 vols., continued to Clement IX by A. Oldoini; 1751 ibid., 6 vols., continued to Clement XII by Guarnacci; Vol. 7 ibid., 1787.
Cîteaux	*Cîteaux. Commentarii cisterciences,* Westmalle (Belg.) 1950ff.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850ff. (1871–87 Florence).
CollFr	*Collectanea Franciscana,* Rome 1931ff.
D	H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* Freiburg i. Br. 1967.
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* ed. Baudrillart, et al. Paris 1912ff.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* ed. M. Viller, Paris 1932ff.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* ed. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, continued by É. Amann, Paris 1930ff.
DZKR	*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht,* Tübingen 1861–1917.
ED	*Euntes docete (Commentaria urbana),* Rome 1948ff.
ÉO	*Échos d'Orient,* Paris 1897ff.
Études	*Études,* Paris 1856ff. (until 1896: *Études religieuses*)
FDG	*Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte,* 26 vols., Göttingen 1860–86.
Feine *RG*	H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte* I: *Die katholische Kirche,* Cologne and Graz 1964.
FreibDiözArch	*Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv,* Freiburg i. Br. 1865ff.
Gebhardt-Grundmann	B. Gebhardt, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* 8th printing, ed. H. Grundmann, Stuttgart, I, 1954; II, 1955; III, 1960.
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen,* Berlin 1738ff.
Gr	*Gregorianum,* Rome 1920ff.
Grabmann	G. M. Grabmann, *Die Gerschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit,* Freiburg i. Br. 1933.
GWU	*Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht.* Zeitschrift des Verbandes der Geschichtslehrer Deutschlands, Stuttgart 1950ff.

Heimbucher	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 3 vols., Paderborn 1907–8; 1932–34 ibid., 2 vols.
HH.ST.A. Wien	*Haus-, Hof-und Staatsarchiv Wien* (Vienna).
Hinschius	P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland,* 6 vols., Berlin 1869–97.
Hisp. Am. Hist. Rev.	*Hispanic American Historical Review,* Durham 1918ff.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* (Cologne 1880ff.), Munich 1950ff.
Hochland	*Hochland,* Munich 1903ff.
HPBl	*Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland,* ed. F. Binder and G. Jochner, 171 vols., Munich 1838–1923.
Hurter	H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae,* 6 vols., Innsbruck 1903–13; I, 1926, ed. F. Pangerl.
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1859ff.
IKZ	*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Berne 1911ff.
IPO	*Instrumentum Pacis Osnabrugense et Monasteriense.*
Irénikon	*Irénikon,* Amay-Chevetogne 1926ff.
JGO	*Jahrbücher für die Geschichte Osteuropas,* Munich 1953ff.
JKölGV	*Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins,* Cologne 1912–41, 1950ff.
JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41 (now: *ALW*).
Jugie	M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium* I–V Paris 1926–35.
KRA	*Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen,* founded by U. Stutz, Stuttgart 1902ff. (so far 118 vols.).
Kyrios	*Kyrios. Vierteljahresschrift für Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte Osteuropas,* Berlin 1960ff.
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* Münster 1951ff.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* Freiburg 1957ff.
Maaβ	F. Maaβ, *Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich* I–IV, Wien 1951ff. (*Fontes rerum Austriacarum* II/71–74).
MAH	*Mélanges d'archelologie et d'histoire,* Paris 1880ff.
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 31 vols., Florence and Venice 1757–98; reprint and continuation, ed. L. Petit and J. B. Martin, 60 vols.; Paris 1899–1927.
MCom	*Miscelánea Comillesa,* Comillas/Santander 1943ff.
MF	*Miscellanea francescana,* Rome 1886ff.
MH	*Missionalia Hispanica*
Mid-America	*Mid-America. An Historical Review,* Chicago 1918ff.
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* (Innsbruck) Graz-Cologne 1880ff.
MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati,* 6 vols., Rome 1946.
Monumenta Nipponica	*Monumenta Nipponica. Studies on Japanese culture past and present,* Tokyo 1938ff.
MÖSTA	*Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs,* Vienna 1948ff.
MthSt(H)	*Münchener theologische Studien,* ed F. X. Seppelt, J. Pascher, and K. Mörsdorf, Historical Section, Munich 1950ff.
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1950ff.

NDB	*Neue Deutsche Biographie,* Berlin 1953ff.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945ff.
Orbis	*Orbis. Bulletin international de documentation linguistique,* Louvain 1952ff.
OrChr	*Oriens Christianus,* (Leipzig) Wiesbaden 1901ff.
OrChrA	*Orientalia Christiana* (Analecta), Rome (1923–34: *Orientalia Christiana;* 1935ff.; *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*).
OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Rome 1935ff.
OstKSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien,* Würzburg 1951ff.
Pastor	L. v. Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 16 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1885ff.
QFIAB	*Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken,* Rome 1897ff.
Quétif	J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum,* 2 vols., Paris 1719–21; 3 suppl. vols., 1721–23; continued by R. Coulon, Paris 1909ff.
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920ff.
RET	*Revista Española de teología,* Madrid 1941ff.
Rev. Arch. Bibl. y Museos	*Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos,* Madrid 1871ff.
RevÉAug	*Revue des Études Augustiniennes* (cont. of: *L'Année Théologique Augustinienne*), Paris 1955ff.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921ff.
RF	*Razón y Fe,* Madrid 1901ff.
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* Tübingen 1909–13; 1927–32; 1956ff.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876ff.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900ff.
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France,* Paris 1910ff.
RHM	*Revue d'histoire des missions,* Paris 1924ff.
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Paris 1880ff.
RömHM	*Römische Historische Mitteilungen,* Graz and Cologne 1958ff.
RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1887ff.
RQH	*Revue des questions historiques,* Paris 1866f.
RSIt	*Rivista storica Italiana,* Naples 1884ff.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910ff.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947ff.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1950ff.
SAW	*Sitzungsberichte der* (from 225, 1, 1947: *Österreichischen*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,* Vienna 1831ff.
Schnabel *G*	F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert* I, Freiburg i. Br. 1948; II, 1949; III, 1954; IV, 1955.
SEER	*The Slavonic and East European Review,* London1922.
Seppelt-Schwaiger	F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts* I, II, IV, V, Leipzig 1931–41; I, Munich 1954; II, ibid. 1955; III, ibid. 1956; IV, ibid. 1957; V, ibid. 1959.
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden bzw.*

	zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige, Munich 1880ff. (1911ff., n.s.).
SPM	*Sacrum Poloniae Millennium,* Rome 1954ff.
Stamer	L. Stamer, *Kirchengeschichte der Pfalz* I, Speyer 1936; II, 1949; III, 1 1955.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (prior to 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*), Freiburg i. Br. 1871ff.
StG	*Studia Gratiana,* ed. J. Forchielli and A. M. Stickler, I–III, Bologna 1953ff.
StL	*Staatslexikon,* ed. H. Sacher, Freiburg i. Br. 1926–32 (*StL*: ibid. 1957ff.).
StMis	*Studia Missionalia,* Rome 1943ff.
Streit	*Bibliotheca Missionum,* founded by R. Streit, continued by J. Dindinger, (Münster, Aachen) Freiburg i. Br. 1916ff. (to 1968: 26 vols.).
StudFr	*Studi francescani,* Arezzo-Florence 1903ff.
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909ff.
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig 1878ff.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819ff.; Stuttgart 1946ff.
ThSt	*Theological Studies,* Baltimore 1940ff.
Tr	*Traditio,* New York 1943ff.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (to 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888ff.
Veit-Lenhart	L. A. Veit and L. Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock,* Freiburg i. Br. 1956.
Werner	K. Werner, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie. Seit dem Trienter Konzil bis zur Gegenwart,* Munich and Leipzig 1889 (= *Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland.* (Modern Times, Vol. 6).
WZ	*Westfälische Zeitschrift. Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte,* Münster 1838ff.
Zagaglia	*Zagaglia. Rassegna di scienze, lettere ed arti,* Lecce 1959ff.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928ff.
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851ff.
ZHTh	*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie,* 45 vols., Leipzig-Gotha 1832–75.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1876ff.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 34 ff., Münster 1950ff. (*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 1–17, ibid. 1911–27; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 18–25, ibid. 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 26–27, ibid. 1935–37; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 28–33, ibid. 1938–41, 1947–49).
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948ff.
ZSavRGgerm	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* Germanistische Abteilung, Weimar 1863ff.
ZSavRGkan	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte,* Kanonistische Abteilung, Weimar 1911ff.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für Schweizer Kirchengeschichte,* Fribourg 1907ff.
ZSTh	*Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie,* (Gütersloh) Berlin 1923ff.

PART ONE

The Leadership Position of France

SECTION ONE

Ecclesiastical Life in France

CHAPTER 1

Christian Renewal after 1615

French Catholicism under Louis XIII

When Henry IV was assassinated on May 14, 1610, France had again become a great Catholic nation which was not only tied closely to the Roman Catholic religion, but had even begun to put religious sentiment above national considerations. Proof of this can be perceived in the unpopularity of the war against Spain prepared by Henry IV at the time of his assassination. However obscure the background of the regicide may be, religion was a definite motivating factor in Ravaillac's crime. Spain—hitherto an obstacle in the path of French expansionism—was at this time already on the decline. Under these conditions, waging war to confirm the hegemony of France would have been politically justified. Public opinion in France was nonetheless opposed to it since the most pressing obligation of the Catholic states was considered to be an alliance against the Protestant Reformation.

Although Protestantism still occupied a powerful position, it was evident that in France the Reformation had to end in failure. The conversion of Henry IV had no doubt been a mere gesture of political opportunism by a rule indifferent to the faith. But it became obvious that no Huguenot ruler could be forced upon the kingdom. Calvinism had reached its pinnacle about the year 1571. Although its outward manifestations seemed unimpaired, it was in a process of irreversible retrogression. It became a minority party and was conscious of that fact. After the religious wars the real basis for the appeal of Protestantism was the intensive religious life of many of its members, which hardly found a counterpart in the politicized Catholicism of the Holy League. Towards the end of the reign of Henry IV, however, the Reformation had lost this advantage. Endeavors by the great Catholic spiritual leaders—Francis de Sales, Benedict of Canfield, Father Coton, Bérulle, and many others—had brought about a Catholic climate whose piety and inward orientation was equal to that of the Reformed Churches. At this time, this *milieu dévot* or *parti dévot*, as it was also called, was still a compact group firmly united by common ideals revolving around the triumph of Catholicism and the defeat of Protestantism. On the other hand, the Protestants found themselves more and more hampered by becoming socially disadvantaged. Following the King's example, other conversions had taken place among the aristocracy and the upper bourgeosie—with equal lack of sincerity. Now it was obvious that being Catholic would henceforth be an indispensable prerequisite for achieving high positions. For a long time Sully was to be the last Protestant minister of France and the death of Henry IV forced him to resign, albeit not until he had calmly amassed a fortune. For quite some time France, along with the rest of Europe, was far from reaching the maturity needed for a tolerant attitude.[1] The attitude of public opinion toward the Edict of Nantes was symptomatic in this regard. No one perceived in it a laudable attempt at achieving religious peace. The Catholics considered it a concession required by necessity, a despicable and offensive infringement on the immutable rights of the true religion, while the Protestants saw it as something fundamentally too unjust and precarious to be permanent. Although the two blocs had for the time being abandoned the violence of the religious wars, beneath the surface the antagonism remained unchanged. Given another opportunity, it could break out into open warfare once again.

Materially speaking, the situation of the Church steadily improved under the reign of Henry IV. Of course not all the devastation caused by the religious wars could be repaired. Even today more than a few abbeys and parish churches are still in ruins. The possessions of the Church however had regenerated very quickly and—since their parts by definition cannot be lost—increased steadily. In a memorandum written around 1625 Richelieu estimated that one-third of the national property was in the hands of the clergy.[2] This financial aspect was preeminent in the eyes of many Catholics. This was true especially for members of high society who felt and advocated quite openly that the possessions of the Church should be used to make up for the insufficiencies of family fortune. As late as 1647, President Molé—against the express advice of Vincent de Paul—had his patently incompetent son invested as bishop of Bayeux in order to "shield him from any and all want," and he added that his son could always compensate for his incompetence by calling upon capable advisers. The same view was held by the lower class, for whom the priesthood represented the only possibility for social advancement: the father of Vincent de Paul had sold a pair of oxen to finance his son's education, and the son himself was already received by the Queen. As a matter of fact, the sees continued to be the appanage of the aristocracy. Although Richelieu appointed a few bishops from among members of the upper bourgeoisie, he no doubt did so hoping they would submit to him more readily than the members of the high aristocracy. The distribution of the social origin of the bishops was not broadened appreciably until Louis XIV and even then the richest dioceses were reserved for the very prominent families. But the selection of the bishops was always made within the circle of the royal court. A cleric unknown at the court had no chance to rise to the bishopric. Many great families moreover acted as if an episcopate once possessed were a kind of inheritance which was to be retained at any price by means of a royal warrant authorizing it to be handed on from uncle to nephew. The bishopric of Reims was thus perpetuated as a regular de Guise dynasty and in the period from 1568 to 1662 four members of the Gondi family held the office of bishop of Paris. Philippe de Gondi, General of the Galleys, friend of Vincent de Paul and later on an Oratorian, developed a personal interest in this matter in order to secure for his son Paul, who later became Cardinal de Retz and who called himself "possibly the least ecclesiastical soul in the universe,"[3] the succession to the bishopric of his uncle. The nominations of bishops were made by the King and were generally decided by the *Conseil de Conscience,* but even Vincent de Paul, a member of this council from 1643 to 1652, could not prevent some scandalous appointments, such as that of Beaumanoir de Lavardin, bishop of Mans (1684), who was held to be a complete unbeliever and probably justifiably so. There were indeed very distinct differences in the quality of individual appointees. The first few bishops dedicated to reforms and a sense of duty are found under Louis XIII—yet they were exceptions. Many prelates continued their propensities and interests in contradiction with their priestly role. Numerous bishops remained in the service of the court or pursued literature, warfare or diplomacy and never actually set foot in their respective dioceses.

---

[1] J. Leclerc, *Toleration and the Reformation,* 2 vols. (New York 1960): contains important general views of the beginnings of the seventeenth century.

[2] G. d'Avenel, *Richelieu et la monarchie absolue* (Paris 1884–90), III, 277.

The condition of the parish clergy as well had hardly improved since the religious wars. The root cause for this stagnation lay in the almost total lack of education of the clergymen. In France, the pertinent regulations established by the Council of Trent remained largely unimplemented and the few timid attempts at establishing seminaries undertaken after 1610 extended to only a small number of persons. For the purpose of ordination, most bishops were satisfied with mere rudimentary knowledge and only a few demanded even as much as a few days of spiritual retreat. Since the bishops rarely resided in their dioceses, the candidates for priesthood had themselves—if possible with the written consent of the appropriate bishop—ordained by another bishop. This situation was even further aggravated by the innumerable bishops *in partibus* who were roaming the realm ordaining any and everyone. The deplorable consequences of such practices are not surprising. In 1643 an archdeacon of Bourges ascertained that many priests did not know Latin, several could hardly read and some were incapable of administering the Holy Sacraments validly and did not even know the words of absolution. Concubinage and drunkenness among the clergy were widespread and in some dioceses were looked upon as common practice. Besides their clerical duties many priests held common jobs and frequented taverns. In certain areas they frequently practiced exorcism.[4] Most of them never preached a sermon, no longer taught catechism and abandoned their churches to a state of scandalous neglect and squalor. As late as 1660, the archdeacon of Evreux, Henri-Marie Boudon, was horrified at the condition of the tabernacles and ciboria he saw. But these shortcomings were rarely ever remedied. Intervention was very difficult because bishops could make appointments in only a few parishes of their diocese since most of them were controlled by abbeys or by lay patronage. Another impediment was the canonical regulation requiring three corresponding verdicts against an accused priest before he could be prosecuted, a situation that could be indefinitely extended. Clerics who were forced to leave their locality because of extremely serious scandals usually sought to hide out in Paris, which was teeming with priests who managed to evade the police and some of whom made their livelihood in transactions which were in flagrant contradiction to their vocation.

---

[3] M. Allem, ed., *J. F. de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, Mémories.* La Pléiade (Paris 1956), 3.

Conditions among the members of religious orders were hardly better, although here sporadic attempts at reform had been introduced since the end of the sixteenth century and especially under Henry IV. By and by, the members of religious orders had no doubt relinquished their military habits of the time of the Holy League, but their morals had hardly improved. In fact, all orders were in need of reform, with the exception of the Carthusians, who at this time were relatively numerous and had their establishments in close proximity to the towns. They had retained their traditional obligations; their austerity impressed the masses and even led to conversions. And yet the image of the other orders should not be painted entirely black. To be sure, even now there were frequent and blatant scandals. In 1609 the parliament of Toulouse had to have the Augustinian superior Burdeu executed since he had been convicted as an accessory in the killing of the husband of his mistress, Violante du Chastel.[5] At the same time, a sister of the famous Belle

---

[4] Especially characteristic cases were investigated by J. Bernou, *La chasse aux sorciers dans le Labourd* (Agen 1897).

[5] See A. Praviel, *Violante et ses amants* (Paris 1934).

Gabrielle, mistress of Henry IV, was the abbess of the Cistercian nuns of Maubuisson. She was Angélique d'Estrées, who had twelve children by twelve different fathers. But public opinion proved less and less prepared to accept these unbelievable conditions. The court, influenced by the *parti dévot*, began to deal with these matters and civil authorities intervened in order to eliminate the most flagrant abuses. But this happened only in exceptional cases. On the whole the monasteries deteriorated into physical and moral mediocrity; they hardly even kept up the appearance of monastic seclusion, which was to them merely a distant memory, for now outsiders came and went freely and casually. In 1614 at the occasion of the investiture of Charles Faure, who later reformed the Genovevians, the canons of Saint Vincent-de-Senlis received all the participants, even the women, in the refectory, where there was dancing. The young abbess of Port-Royal, Angélique Arnauld, intent on reform, had triggered quite a scandal on 25 September 1609 on the occasion of the famous "day of the grating" when she refused even her own family admission to the convent.[6] Often the vow of poverty existed in theory only; monks and nuns usually established their own financial resources aiming thereby to alleviate the deficiencies of a life which all too often was characterized by a distressing degree of penury.

This decadence which had become more and more noticeable since the end of the Middle Ages had its foremost cause—common to both men and women—in the quality of the vocation or rather in the lack of a true vocation. The number of those entering of their own accord was very small. The family commonly made the decision to enter their children in a monastery—and usually for financial considerations. Excess children who for lack of necessary family means could not be put into suitable positions, the later-born left without an inheritance, those unable to bear arms, girls who could not be given a dowry, all of them were simply pushed off on the Church. Girls especially were sent into convents at an irresponsibly young age. In 1599, the God-fearing Attorney General Simon Marion, grandfather of the famous Mother Angélique Arnauld, without hesitation had two of his granddaughters take the veil at seven and five years of age respectively. To make his decision more palatable to them he promised to make them abbesses. He kept his promise in as much as Angélique became abbess of Port-Royal at the age of eleven.

Another practice, but one that affected monasteries only, contributed to the mediocrity of the monastic environment. This was the fairly common custom of the commendam, which originated in France in the thirteenth century and was generally applied after the Concordat of

---

[6] See L. Cognet, *La réforme de Port-Royal* (Paris 1950), 114–21.

1516. The procedure consisted of separating the clerical functions of an ecclesiastical office from the secular income connected with it. The office was granted to a titular who was barred by canon law from executing its office and who was therefore dependent upon another person who had the necessary authority. The holder of the benefice, however, kept the greater part of the income and only gave the substitute and his subordinates a barely sufficient part, the *portio congrua*. In time, the beneficiary became accustomed to curtailing it even more so that the designation ultimately came to mean a "restricted and insufficient part." This practice had rendered the enormous properties of the Church back into the hands of the monarchy. The Kings used them unscrupulously for the purpose of rewarding loyal servants and supporting artists and literati: Sully, although a Protestant, was titular of four abbeys. When Louis XIII began his reign, some of the abuses of the commendam had disappeared; the system was no longer applied to bishoprics, but only to monasteries. And yet virtually all monasteries and priories were benefices and many of their titulars were mere tonsured people less than twenty years of age. Richelieu himself continued to reward the musicians of his orchestra with abbeys and priories. Indeed, up until the Revolution most bishops supplemented the income of their bishoprics by the proceeds from one or more abbeys. Bossuet added the abbey of Saint-Lucien-lès-Beauvais to his bishopric of Meaux, and Fénelon was accused of zealotry upon his appointment to the see of Cambrai when he relinquished his abbey of Saint Valéry at Caux. Even among the most conscientious clerics there were few who did not hold benefices. Duvergier de Hauranne remarked that the modest abbey of Saint-Cyran in Poitou which he had received in 1620 was his "disgrace";[7] yet he kept it till he died. Some, like the famous Philippe de Gamaches, professor at the Sorbonne, and even J.-J. Olier, the founder of the Society of the Priests of Saint Sulpice, practiced the accumulation of benefices forbidden by canon law. In most cases the titulars kept at least two-thirds of their incomes for themselves and many attempted to increase their portion by reducing the number of monks. They were therefore not at all inclined towards initiating any sort of reform or even to tolerating one that would have resulted in lowering their income. It was a rare titular, such as Barcos, the nephew of Saint-Cyran, who withdrew to his abbey in order to reform it. Even rarer were those who, like the famous Rancé, became titular abbot of their own abbey.

Overall the situation was further impaired by unpleasant differences of opinion between the secular clergy and the orders. The latter enjoyed the privilege of exemption and therefore could almost completely evade the jurisdiction of the bishops. This had a twofold disadvantage. For one, it caused reform bishops who were becoming more numerous in the course of the century to encounter insurmountable obstacles, which frustrated their attempts at abolishing certain scandalous conditions and enabled the large abbeys, including those of nuns, brazenly to defy those bishops. As late as 1690, for example, Bossuet was embroiled in a long and dramatic conflict with the abbess of Jouarre, Henriette de Lorraine.[8] In addition, some ardent and influential congregations used their status of exemption to establish a sort of parallel clergy. They did this by attracting to their chapels a great number of visitors who—frequently members of aristocratic families—deserted their own parish churches. This held true especially for the Jesuits and Capuchins. The diocesan and provincial synods attempted to alleviate this problem by obliging the faithful to attend Mass at their parish churches on a certain number of Sundays: the Council of Bordeaux, for instance, prescribed one Sunday in three (1582).[9] But these measures had virtually no success and worse, they often led to violent incidents such as the one in the spring of 1620, when the pugnacious bishop of Poitiers, La Rocheposay, collided with the Jesuits of that town. So it is not surprising that even the best representatives of the episcopate were somewhat reluctant to oppose the orders whose good qualities they otherwise valued. One of the most prominent champions of this cause was Jean-Pierre Camus (1584–1652), bishop of Belley, who was a friend of Francis de Sales and an extremely prolific spiritual writer.[10] Again and again he polemicized against the demands of the orders and was not afraid to compose works of unusual vehemence such as his polemic *Rabat-joie du triomphe monastique* (1634). At first he was encouraged by Francis de Sales, who wrote to him on 24 August 1614: "It redounds to the honor of God that our episcopal order be recognized as such and that this moss that constitutes exemption be torn from the tree of the Church on which it has inflicted such damage, as we have seen." Later, in 1632, Saint-Cyran also joined the fray. Under the pseudonym Petrus Aurelius he emphatically defended the rights of the hierarchy in a number of pamphlets which received official character, so to speak, by being approved by the *Assemblées du Clergé*. To be sure, the situation subsequently calmed down a bit, but difficulties of this sort nonetheless surfaced throughout the *ancien régime*.

---

[7] See L. Cognet, "La jeunesse d'Antoine Singlin," *Chroniques de Port-Royal* (1953), 10.

Negative aspects notwithstanding, French Catholicism had embarked on its renewal (see Chap. 5) with the beginning of the reign of

---

[8] See Y. Chaussy, *Jouarre et Bossuet: L'abbaye royale de Jouarre* (Paris 1961), 247–94.

[9] Text in: J. Godefroy, *Le Mercure Jésuite* (Geneva 1630–31), I, 25.

[10] See F. Boulas, *Un ami de saint François de Sales, Camus évêque de Belley* (Lyon 1878); R. Heurtevent, "Camus," *DSAM* 2, 62–73.

Louis XIII. The *milieu dévot* which had originated with the Holy League was an extremely eager and active Catholic group. Its central figure was a mystic from the highest level of society, Mme Acarie.[11] In her circle one could at times encounter a bishop in the person of Francis de Sales, more frequently such secular priests as Bérulle[12] and Gallement, or professors at the Sorbonne such as Duval,[13] Jesuits like P. Coton, father confessor to the King, Capuchin monks such as Benedict of Canfield,[14] Carthusians such as Dom Beaucousin, and ladies of high society including Mme de Sainte-Beuve or Mme de Maignelay, sister of Gondi. At first this group was primarily concerned with monastic reforms which had actually had definite results in only two convents, the Benedictine convent of Montmartre (1598) and that of the Cistercians of Port-Royal (1608). The movement subsequently encompassed other convents as well. Another effort concerned the introduction of orders from other countries, where they had already been reformed. Considerable success was achieved with the Carmelites who had been reformed in Spain by Saint Teresa: as early as 1610 the French branch of the order, founded in September 1604, had established eighteen houses and by 1630 as many as forty-six, whose members were predominantly from the aristocracy. The prioress of Paris, Madeleine de Saint-Joseph, née Fontaines-Marans, exerted an unusually strong spiritual influence upon the whole Parisian society. In 1610, through the combined efforts of Mme Acarie and Mme de Sainte-Beuve, the Ursuline order founded in 1596 in the *Comtat-Venaissin*, which had been dedicated to improving the often neglected education of young girls, was established in Paris. It developed rapidly and by the turn of the century had approximately 300 houses.[15] The male congregations fared less well with the exception of the two large orders, the Jesuits (1552) and the Capuchins (1573), introduced into France in the sixteenth century; they flourished and were able to maintain their influence in spite of all the attacks upon them. But in 1601 the *Frères de la Charité* of John of God were hard put to establish a hospital in Paris. Although the barefoot Carmelites managed to extend their order from Spain to France in 1611, they were opposed in this by the *milieu dévot*, who were afraid of their competition in directing the affairs of the Carmelites. Nevertheless Mme Acarie and her friends had an efficacious hand in a number of foundations. One of the most significant was the Order of the Visitation of Holy Mary in 1610 by Francis de Sales and Jane Frances de Chantal.[16] It was initially conceived as a partially active congregation without complete claustration, but in 1618, impelled by Marquemont, archbishop of Lyon, it had to change into a contemplative order with ceremonious public vows. But this did not impede its expansion in any way: at the death of its founder (1641) the Visitation of Holy Mary had more than 80 houses. Soon the sisters of the Visitation, as had many other claustrated convents (e.g., Port-Royal), took over educational tasks. School congregations were also founded, such as the *Filles de Notre-Dame* by Jeanne de Lestonnac[17] in Bordeaux (1606), the *Soeurs de Notre-Dame de Lorraine* of Saint Peter Fourier (1618), the *Filles de la Croix,*[18] established in Paris in 1641 by Mme de Villeneuve, and many others. Later we shall talk about the congregations devoted to the nursing of the sick.

---

[11] See Bruno de Jésus-Marie, *La Belle Acarie* (Paris 1942).

[12] See J. Dagens, *Bérulle et les origines de la restauration catholique* (Bruges and Paris 1952).

[13] See L. Cognet, "Duval," *DHGE* 14, 1213–16.

[14] See Optat de Veghel, *Benoît de Canfield, sa vie, sa doctrine et son influence* (Rome 1949).

[15] See Louise de Jésus, *La Vénérable Madeleine de Saint-Joseph* (Clamart 1935); Marie de Chantal Gueudré, *Histoire de l'ordre des Ursulines en France*, 3 vols. (Paris 1957–63).

After 1610 the *milieu dévot*, despite its vitality, began to dissolve. It was gradually weakened by internal dissention and the fact that Mme Acarie, having become a Carmelite in 1614, could no longer serve as its focal point. She was, moreover, personally embroiled in the controversies concerning the leadership of the Carmelites, which Bérulle, in opposition to Duval and Mme Acarie, wanted to transfer to the French Oratory.[19] This conflict, which had initially been confined pretty much to the level of the parties involved, became public after 1618 and was intensified by the appearance of two new opponents of Bérulle: the Carmelites, who wanted to take over the direction of the whole order, and the Jesuits, who in their various apostolates feared the competition of the Oratory founded by Bérulle in 1611. All these hostilities contributed toward putting Bérulle into a difficult situation; his approach was suspect, the *milieu dévot* was undermined and its slow deterioration became inevitable.

Richelieu and the *Milieu Dévot*

At the beginning of the regency of Marie de Médicis the *milieu dévot* was highly respected. It could easily impress the not so intelligent queen, who valued the piety, probity and unselfishness of its representatives. Bérulle, who by way of his mother belonged to the Séguier family, at the time one of the most important families of France by virtue of its position and wealth, was of course an important figure in this group. The queen's favorite, Concini, maréchal d'Ancre, willingly left all religious affairs to the *parti dévot.* He did not consider himself to have sufficient authority nor was he particularly interested in them. Because of these circumstances, Bérulle contributed considerably to advancing the career of a young cleric who had become bishop of Luçon in 1606; Armand du Plessis du Richelieu, ten years his junior and from a less distinguished family, but in whom he had discovered brilliant abilities. Ambitious and clear-sighted, Richelieu did not hesitate to seek contact with the queen mother and the *parti dévot* although later he was to turn against it. He began by flattering Bérulle and in 1612 he was one of the first to introduce the Oratory in his diocese. His widely noticed speech to the Estates-General in 1615 contained skillful encomia for Marie de Médicis, which gained him entrée to the affairs of state. In November 1616 he became minister of foreign affairs to Concini, whose assassination almost caused him to fall out of favor. That Richelieu was able to rehabilitate himself in 1619 was primarily due to the support of a member of the *parti dévot,* Sébastian Bouthilliers. Not until 1624 was he actually appointed to a first-rate position, but by that time his political ideas had fully matured and increasingly he conflicted with Bérulle and the latter's friends. In 1619, after Richelieu's brother Henry died a tragic death in a duel, Bérulle, moreover, made the somewhat naive mistake of taking Richelieu's protestations that he wanted to withdraw from politics seriously. Aggravating the relationship further was the fact that in 1621 Bérulle had a hand in Richelieu's being denied the cardinalship, which he subsequently did not receive until September 1622.

---

[16] See E. J. Lajeunie, *Saint François de Sales,* 2 vols. (Paris 1966); H. Bremond, *Sainte Chantal* (Paris 1912).

[17] L. Entraygues, *La Bienheureuse Jeanne de Lestonnac* (Périgueux 1940).

[18] See A. de Salinis, *Mme de Villeneuve* (Paris 1918).

[19] See Mme Acarie, *Mémoire sur la fondation, le gouvernement et l'observance des Carmélites déchaussées,* 2 vols. (Rheims 1894).

Bérulle and Richelieu indeed developed their respective political positions in totally opposite directions. Bérulle (see Chap. 5) above all else wanted the triumph of Catholicism over the Protestant heresy. Richelieu's unshakable goal was to provide the French monarchy with a firm national foundation and to insure France's hegemony in Europe—even at the price of Catholic interests. In this regard Richelieu was an heir to Philip the Fair and the French canonists. Bérulle and the *parti dévot* subordinated politics to the concerns of religion while Richelieu's position was the exact opposite. A clash between these contradictory tendencies could not be avoided for long. Gradually the supremacy of the state became Richelieu's basic argument.[20] The *parti dévot* on the other hand, reinforced by Port-Royal, demanded priority for the rights of religion over the claims of individual conscience. Richelieu's views, taking up, as they did, political ideas dating back to the Middle Ages, were without doubt reactionary, whereas those of the *parti dévot* showed the way into the eighteenth century and into the mentality of the modern era.

---

[20] See E. Thuau, *Raison d'état et pensée politique à l'époque de Richelieu* (Paris 1966).

Before Richelieu had firmly secured his position, the contradiction between the two positions became manifest as a result of several incidents. In the conflict between the new Emperor, Ferdinand, and the Protestant Elector Palatine Friedrich V, which broke out toward the end of 1619, President Jeannin, through mediation by Bérulle and Minister Luynes, succeeded in gaining the support of the Royal Council for the Catholic faction. But the victory of the Catholics at the end of 1620 had radicalized the claims of Austria and Spain, putting France into a difficult situation. As a consequence, Richelieu was moved to criticize the policies of Luynes and of the *parti dévot* by means of several anonymous pamphlets. The controversy became even more evident on the occasion of the marriage of Henriette de France, sister of Louis XIII, to Charles I of England. Bérulle favored this marriage because through it he hoped to save what was left of Catholicism in England. Richelieu wanted it as well, but hoped to secure through it the alliance with England against Spain. But both were soon disappointed. Bérulle—even at the price of war—wanted to realize those clauses in the marriage contract which would have favored the Catholics. But Richelieu, who had scant concern for the English Catholics and was governed by ruthless realism, dropped the contractual clauses without regrets and turned towards Protestant Germany. In 1626 Richelieu disapproved of Bérulle's action at the Treaty of Madrid, in which the Valtellina problem was solved in a manner far too favorable to Spain. But Bérulle, who in 1627 had also become a cardinal, continued to exert a powerful influence on the queen mother, who had remained well-disposed towards the *parti dévot*. After the conquest of La Rochelle the latter was planning an alliance with Spain and Austria which was finally to destroy Protestantism. But in 1629 Bérulle irrevocably fell out of favor when Richelieu succeeded against Bérulle's recommendation in inducing the Royal Council to come to the aid of Charles de Nevers, Duke of Mantua, who was under siege by the Spanish at Casal. On 15 September 1629 Bérulle refused his consent to the Treaty of Susa, which in the end sanctioned an alliance against England. Just as Richelieu was about to rid himself of his adversary by dispatching him to Rome as French ambassador, Bérulle suddenly died on 2 October 1629. On the following 21 November Richelieu was appointed first minister of the state.

The death of Bérulle was a heavy blow to the *parti dévot*. Although the minister of justice, Michel de Marillac, was now the most significant person in the party, he lacked the stature that would have enabled him to take the place of the dead cardinal. A final crisis which momentarily threatened Richelieu's power ended in the *Journée des Dupes* (Day of Dupes, 12 November 1630) and the queen mother being exiled. After this, Richelieu was in a position methodically to eliminate his opponents. Marillac was arrested and died in prison on 7 August 1632; he never received a proper trial, which would have proved his innocence. His brother Louis, marshal of France, was accused of misappropriation of public funds and was beheaded on 10 May 1632.[21] But Richelieu found himself confronted by yet another opponent who was all the less vulnerable in as much as he rarely involved himself in affairs of state. He was Jean Duvergier de Hauranne (1581–1643), of Basque origin, abbot of Saint-Cyran since 1620 (see Chap. 5). He had been a brilliant university student, friend and fellow student of Cornelius Jansen from Flanders. After finishing his studies, Saint-Cyran had embarked on a career as secular cleric which had led to ties of friendship with Richelieu. In 1618, on the occasion of his ordination, Saint-Cyran had undergone a moral crisis, from which he emerged a changed person, converted to an inner life. A chance meeting around 1620 soon led to a close friendship and occasional collaboration with Bérulle. Gradually Saint-Cyran identified himself with Bérulle's point of view and began to express his position against the latter's opponents, not only the Jesuits and Carmelites, but even Richelieu himself. After the death of Bérulle the Oratory, for fear of the cardinal-minister, hardly dared eulogize their founder. Yet Saint-Cyran on 5 October circulated an impressive letter to Fr. Bourgoing, the subsequent second successor to Bérulle in the generalship of the congregation, which contained unreserved praise of the deceased. In other respects, too, Saint-Cyran's keen intelligence was widely known: Guez de Balzac called him "the oracle of the monastery of Notre-Dame," after his place of residence. Without wanting to, Saint-Cyran quickly occupied an exposed position with the *parti dévot* and became an opponent of Richelieu. During the brief period in which the party held decisive power, immediately prior to the *Journée des Dupes*, the queen mother had even designated him bishop of Bayonne. Initially, Richelieu did not dare proceed against his former friend, because he either lacked sufficient grounds or was still hoping to win him back over to his side.

Saint-Cyran, knowing himself to be in a dangerous situation, behaved most cautiously while the cardinal's anti-Spanish policies intensified and in May 1635 culminated in a declaration of war. Yet the public was aware that Saint-Cyran condemned the hostility towards a great

---

[21] See G. Pagès, "Autour du Grand Orage, Richelieu et Marillac, deux politiques," *RH* 179 (1937); P. de Vaissière, *Un grand proces sous Richelieu, l'affaire du Maréchal de Marillac* (Paris 1924).

Catholic nation as well as Richelieu's alliance with the Protestants of Germany. In the course of the summer of 1635 Jansen, whose connection with Saint-Cyran was well-known, published his *Mars gallicus, seu de justitia armorum et foederum regis Galliae*, a blunt and cutting pamphlet against Richelieu's foreign policy. Saint-Cyran did not approve of this far too partisan comment. But Richelieu was offended; he reacted sharply and marked Saint-Cyran the victim of his revenge. At the same time, he was afraid that his opponent might openly resist him in a delicate matter of extreme importance to him. It involved the marriage of Gaston d'Orléans, brother of the King, who on 3 January 1632 had married Marguerite of Lorraine without the crown's consent.[22] This union interfered with Richelieu's policies because he was speculating on the properties of Marguerite's brother, the duke of Lorraine. By an edict of parliament (1634), the minister had the marriage dissolved on the strange pretext that Gaston had been the victim of an abduction. To buttress his case and to soothe the King's conscience Richelieu obtained—though not without difficulty—expert opinions from the Assembly of the Clergy, from fourteen Parisian congregations, and from sixty doctoral academicians, all of whom attested to the marriage being invalid. But the Holy See continued to consider it valid. This was also Saint-Cyran's opinion and in spite of using the utmost discretion he could not conceal it, particularly because he was a friend of Condren, general of the Oratory and Gaston's confessor. Richelieu, aware of this, was at once resentful and uneasy; he feared that Saint-Cyran might publicly express himself in this matter after Condren and even Vincent de Paul had already been neutralized. Richelieu, with newspaper writers in his paid employ, knew very well of the power of the press and of public opinion, which could have been reversed by an active intervention on the part of Saint-Cyran. At this time, moreover, the minister was making public his plan to establish a French patriarchate relatively independent of the Holy See. It was obvious from the beginning that Saint-Cyran would oppose with all his force this schismatical design in which Richelieu, as he was well aware, had most of the nation against him. So Saint-Cyran unintentionally became the cardinal's foremost antagonist. Once more Richelieu attempted to win him over by arranging to have the bishopric of Bayonne offered to him in the spring of 1637. The abbot refused because he did not want to relinquish his independence, but knowing full well that this refusal would expose him to greater danger. At this point Richelieu actually thought of using force. But the intellectual authority of the abbot, his reputation for piety and integrity, and the seclusion in which he dwelt made him a difficult target. It took the incidents at Port-Royal, with which we shall soon deal, to provide the cardinal with the seemingly religious pretext he was seeking. In any event, Richelieu could now assume that the arrest of Saint-Cyran would seal the disintegration of the already weakened *parti dévot.* He could not foresee that Port-Royal would endure as the strongest bastion of resistance against absolutism.

---

[22] See A. Degert, "Le mariage de Gaston d'Orléans," *RH* 143 (1901), 161ff.

The Reform of the Clergy

During the few years under the regency of Marie de Médicis in which the *parti dévot* enjoyed a full measure of power, its foremost aim was the reform of the secular clergy and that of the orders. This endeavor was supported and continued by Richelieu. After 1610 the efforts in behalf of monastic reform were not only sustained by the *milieu dévot*, but were indeed frequently pursued by civil authorities as well. It must be pointed out that the idea of monastic reform had a twofold significance. In some cases an outstanding religious personality at the head of a community was able to restore strict observance and to turn it into a center of spirituality simply by persuasive power and by setting an example. In other cases, the authorities intervened from the outside and when necessary applied force in order to do away with the most flagrant excesses and to bring about at least a minimum of observance of the rules. The religious significance of the reform is of course basically different in the two cases.

An amusing example of the second kind is represented by the Cistercian abbey of Maubuisson, headed, as we mentioned before, by the amorous Angélique d'Estrées. Age apparently had done nothing to moderate her since her well-known liaison with a nobleman continued to feed the chronicles already rich in scandals.[23] Finally, in 1617, the court ordered the abbot of Cîteaux, Dom Boucherat, to restore order to Maubuisson. Dom Boucherat made a canonical visitation. Consequently, on 5 February 1618, he had Mme d'Estrées arrested by royal police and interned with the *Filles répenties.* Then he sent for Mother Angélique Arnauld, abbess of Port-Royal, and three of her nuns to administer and reform the house. By 10 September 1619 the situation had improved, but now Mme d'Estrées, having escaped from the *Filles répenties*, stormed the abbey in company with a number of nobles devoted to her. Mother Angélique and the nuns loyal to her had to flee to Pontoise. It took a second expedition by the police to evict Mme d'Estrées, who had by the way managed to abscond, and to reinstall Mother Angélique. Subsequently and indeed on several occasions, the latter was in danger of being murdered. Not until the spring of 1623 was Mme d'Estrées finally replaced by another abbess so that Mother Angélique could return to Port-Royal. To be sure, this was an especially romantic episode, but by no means the only one in this period.

---

[23] See L. Cognet, *La Mère Angélique et saint François de Sales* (Paris 1951).

A decisive position in the movement for monastic reform was occupied by Cardinal François de la Rochefoucauld (1558–1645).[24] He had been court prelate and, at the time of the League, a combative bishop of Clermont. In his youth he had met Saint Charles Borromeo in Italy; now he was consumed with the idea of emulating Borromeo's reformatory zeal. La Rochefoucauld had close ties to the *parti dévot* and it was probably Henri de Gondi, bishop of Paris, who had recommended him to Louis XIII in about 1620 to work on monastic reform. A brief by Gregory XV, dated 8 April 1622, assigned him to the task; this was confirmed by royal letters patent on the following 13 July, setting him to work with the utmost vigor. La Rochefoucauld, who by the way was unscrupulous in his accumulation of church benefices, had among his acquisitions of abbeys that of Sainte-Geneviève in Paris, a monastery of the Canons Regular, which made him primarily interested in the reform of this particular branch. For this purpose he collaborated with Father Charles Faure (1594–1644), a pious monk from Senlis,[25] in establishing the *Congrégation de France*, which was to integrate all the abbeys of the Canons Regular. In accomplishing his goals the cardinal was not without ruthlessness, as in the case of the venerable Alain de Solminihac,[26] bishop of Cahors, who from his abbey at Chancelade had established his own branch of the Canons Regular. La Rochefoucauld was not as successful with other chapters, especially those of Clairvaux and Cîteaux. Dom Denis Largentier, abbot of Clairvaux, joined by several abbeys, had introduced reforms in 1615. Dom Nicolas Boucherat, abbot of Cîteaux, supported the reformed chapters and permitted them to elect their own vicar general. But in May 1622 at a conference chaired by La Rochefoucauld, he acceded to the latter's suggestions by allowing the reformed chapters to form their own congregation. But the following May the chapters general rescinded this decision.[27] When Dom Largentier and Dom Boucherat died shortly after one another (1624, 1625), their places were taken by abbots antagonistic to reform. Thereupon Dom Étienne Maugier, abbot of La Charmoye, took over the leadership of the reform movement. With the support of La Rochefoucauld he initiated a movement claiming independence for the reformed chapters. The ensuing dissension split the order until the end of the century. Even the constitution *In suprema* by Alexander VII, prescribing slightly more moderate statutes, could not restore harmony, but on the contrary evoked spirited resistance. Among the disputants was Armand-Jean Le Bouthillier de Rancé (1626–1700). After a checkered career as a wordly abbot he converted and in 1664 became titular abbot of his commendam La Trappe in Normandy,[28] where he embarked upon a reform of his abbey. While far exceeding the Cistercian ideal in its scope and severity, his reforms nonetheless caused an immense awareness because Rancé was known widely. But within the order it was greatly resisted by, among others, Dom Eustache de Beaufort, who had initiated the reform of his abbey of Sept-Fons in Bourbonnais in 1663.[29] The Cistercian nuns also joined the reform movement, which had been initiated in Port-Royal in 1608; by the end of the century several congregations of reformed Bernardine nuns had been founded. Among the most interesting was the one founded in 1618 at Tart in the diocese of Langres; it was suggested by Mother Jeanne de Courcelle de Pourlan and supported by Bishop Sébastien Zamet[30] and the nuns of Port-Royal. Another congregation founded by Mother de Ballon with support by Saint Francis de Sales was established in 1621 in Rumilly.

---

[24] See G. de la Rochefoucauld, *Le Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld* (Paris 1921).

[25] See L. Cognet, "Faure," *DHGE* 16, 714–19.

[26] See E. Sol, *Le Vénérable Alain de Solminihac* (Cahors 1928).

[27] See J. Canivez, "Cîteaux," *DHGE* 12 (1952), 950–97.

The Benedictines as well benefited from several attempts at reform emanating from Lorraine where the congregations of Saint-Vanne and Saint-Hydulphe had been formed in 1604. The reform of Saint-Vanne was transferred to France in 1613, mediated by Dom Bénard, prior of the Collège de Cluny in Paris. Several cloisters joined in, but since Lorraine at this time was part of the Empire, they had to form an autonomous congregation in 1618, the *Congrégation de Saint-Maur*; this was encouraged by Louis XIII and canonically sanctioned in 1921. In 1624 Dom Grégoire Tarrisse,[31] a superior administrator, became president of the congregation and gave it a strong centralized organization. Gradually most of the important Benedictine abbeys joined the congregation with the exception of Cluny and its chapters. In 1631 the renowned abbey of Saint-Germain des Prés in Paris emerged as the center of the Maurists.[32] In Cluny, Abbot Jacques de Veny d'Arbouze unsuccessfully attempted a reform in 1622. Richelieu, who had become commendam abbot of Cluny in 1629 and wanted to unite all French Benedictines in one body,[33] attempted to fuse the Cluniacs with the Maurists into the congregation of Saint-Benoît. But Rome never agreed and when the cardinal died, the plan was abandoned. A subsequent attempt by Mazarin to combine the reformed houses of Cluny with the congregation of Saint-Vanne failed as well. Indeed, the Cluny group remained rather undistinguished, whereas the Maurists flourished. Simultaneously, instances of reforms in the Benedictine convents also increased. Highly esteemed were the reforms introduced in 1619 by Marquerite de Veny d'Arbouze in her abbey of Val-de-Grâce and continued when the abbey was transferred to Paris in 1631. She was aided by the affection of Anne of Austria and her statutes were adopted by numerous houses. Some of these reforms adapted the Benedictine traditions to contemporary forms of piety, as was the case with the Benedictine nuns of Calvary. This chapter had been founded in 1617 in Poitiers by Antoinette d'Orléans[34] with support by the famous Capuchine Father Joseph du Tremblay, who later received the sobriquet "the gray eminence." The change was even more marked in the case of the Benedictine nuns of the Holy Sacrament founded in 1653 by Mother Mechtilde in Paris.[35] The atonement of injuries done to the Holy Sacrament by the Huguenots was then a central devotional act within the *milieu dévot;* after 1647 it was also practiced by the Cistercian nuns of Port-Royal.

---

[28] See H. Bremond, *L'abbé Tempête, Armand de Rancé et la réforme de la Trappe* (Paris 1926).

[29] See B. Martelet, "Dom Eustache de Beaufort et la réforme de Sept-Fons," *Cîteaux* 14 (1963), 4, 281–92.

[30] See L. Prunel, *Sébastien Zamet, sa vie, ses œuvres* (Paris 1912).

[31] See F. Rousseau, *Un promoteur de l'érudition bénédictine, Dom Grégoire Tarrisse* (Lille 1924).

[32] Collected contributions for the Centennial of the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in *RHEF* 43 (1957).

During the first half of the seventeenth century almost all the old established orders in fact had to submit to reform for internal reasons. For the Dominicans, Sebastian Michaelis had managed in 1608 to establish a reformed congregation for the Toulouse region; in 1613 it expanded to Paris, where it assumed the name *Congrégation de Saint-Louis*. Seven years later Father Antoine Le Quieu founded a new, even stricter reform chapter also consecrated to the Holy Sacrament.[36] The reform of the Premonstratensians started in 1617 in Lorraine and spread to France in 1623. First indications of a Carmelite reform of Touraine appeared in 1604.[37] Reform of the clergy of the orders on the whole resulted from individual and private efforts, rather than from initiatives by the state. The commission under the chairmanship of La

---

[33] Cf. P. Denis, *Le Cardinal de Richelieu et la Réforme des monastères bénédictins* (Paris 1913).

[34] See P. Petit, *Vie de la Mère Antoinette d'Orléans* (Paris 1880).

[35] M. Hervin and M. Dourlens, *Vie de Mechtilde du Saint-Sacrement* (Paris 1883).

[36] See R. L. Oechslin, *Une aventure spirituelle: Vie du Père Antoine Le Quieu* (Paris 1967).

[37] See S. M. Bouchereaux, *La réforme des Carmes en France et Jean de Saint-Samson* (Paris 1950).

Rochefoucauld, in spite of his personal effort, achieved but very limited success. Later on Richelieu had the abbeys of Cluny, Cîteaux and Prémontré conveyed to himself in order to be in a position to intercede effectively. Yet he used them primarily for the income he derived from them. In reality, the leadership was making too much profit from the existing abuses to want to remedy them. But for all the difficulties they faced, the efforts by the reformers were not in vain. Many cloisters not only turned into places of sincere spiritual life, but also had a profound effect on the laity. Groups of friends gathered around the convents of Port-Royal, Val-de-Grâce, the Carmelites and the Visitation; at La Trappe, Rancé received the most important personages of his time. Even in houses at the periphery of reforms the most scandalous excesses were stopped; transgressions were no longer overt. Eventually the religious orders regained their dignity.

Reform of the secular clergy posed a completely different problem. From the outset, the whole *milieu dévot* agreed that it would be useless to undertake a reform of the present clergy, that it was necessary to start all over again by bringing up a new clergy. But from this point on, the proposed solutions diverged. One feasible idea was the creation of an organism whose sole function was to be the education of a clergy worthy of its duties. This had actually been prescribed by the Council of Trent when it ordered the establishment of seminaries. Yet in spite of efforts in this direction by many clerics including La Rochefoucauld, the council's decrees never became state law;[38] implementation was left instead to private initiative. So the bishops were quite late when they began to establish seminaries, which, moreover, were frequently forced to operate under very difficult conditions. Without a doubt the pioneer in this field was Adrien Bourdoise (1584–1665),[39] an impressive figure who lived outside the customary frame, passionately involved in the idea of clerical reform, a man of uncompromising severity and insufferable character whose vagaries even Vincent de Paul and Bérulle were not spared. In 1612 he formed a society for aspiring priests in Paris where he gave an education almost exclusively aimed at practical application and that was very limited intellectually.[40] Following a verbal approval in 1631, Bourdoise's seminary experiment finally received its official approval in 1643. His example was emulated: between 1622 and 1680 there appeared in twenty French towns seminary societies of this type, several of which were but short-lived. Initially Bourdoise's enterprise required true courage, for at that time even La Rochefoucauld did not dare open a seminary either in Clermont or in Senlis, the diocese he was given later on. Bourdoise's influence was to prove vital in connection with other foundings, such as the Oratory and Saint-Sulpice.

---

[38] See V. Martin, *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique, essai sur l'introduction en France des décrets du Concile de Trente* (Paris 1919).

[39] See J. F. Darche, *Le saint abbé Bourdoise*, 2 vols. (Paris 1884); J. Harang, *Bourdoise* (Paris 1949).

[40] See P. Schoenher, *Histoire du Séminaire de Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet*, 2 vols. (Paris 1909–11).

In fact, there appeared to be another solution to the reform of the parish priests: the creation of a secular clergy to be both example and complement to the existing clergy. It was this solution Bérulle approved on 10 November 1611 when he founded the Oratory of Jesus, an unpretentious congregation of secular clerics without special vows. His model was the foundation of Saint Philip Neri in Rome. Neri had designed the Oratories in the various towns as autonomous houses without an organic connection. In contrast, Bérulle had planned his French Oratory from the beginning to be a single congregation structured under the authority of a superior general whose members could change houses if required by circumstances.[41] In this respect, Bérulle's design was better adapted to the requirements of France, which had the kind of political unity totally lacking in Italy. The members of the Oratory immediately took over the various forms of parish apostleship, to which they soon added educational duties. The Oratory developed swiftly. By the time of its first plenary session in August 1631 it already had seventy-one houses. This quantitative as well as qualitative achievement proved that the Oratory fulfilled the needs of a large segment of the religious public. In spite of its liberal attitude, expansion and centralization actually gave the Oratory the posture of a large national congregation, comparable in France to the Society of Jesus. Since the latter was actively dedicated to the same areas of endeavor, conflicts between the two were unavoidable; in 1620 an open quarrel ensued. In December 1623, after an exchange of highly aggressive memoranda, Bérulla and the Jesuits brought the matter before the papal nuncio, Corsini. Yet the hostility between the two congregations did not abate and later on led a significant group of Oratory members to join the Jansenists.

The role and influence of the Oratory and the priestly spirituality promoted by Bérulle and his successors,[42] contributed significantly to raising the level of the secular clergy. Meanwhile the Oratory and its followers were occupied also with the first of the above-mentioned solutions, to create institutions which were to insure the proper education of the clergy. While Bérulle was alive, the Oratory already took over seminaries, many of which were attached to secondary schools such as the seminary of Saint-Magloire, founded for the Paris diocese. But these institutions met with limited success in counteracting the problems within the secular clergy. Bérulle's successor at the head of the Oratory, Charles de Condren (1588–1641), an indecisive person who shunned responsibility, did not make an effort to continue the task of establishing seminaries within the Oratory although he recognized the need for them and recommended them to his students. One of them, Jean-Jacques Olier (1608–57), realized a work of fundamental significance.[43] Having become pastor of Saint-Sulpice in 1642, he established a seminary in his parsonage which soon brought forth the *Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice,* an association of secular priests. Following the model of the Oratory, it was dedicated to teaching at diocesan seminaries and directing them.[44] In Olier's lifetime four more such associations were established. Following his death numerous additional houses were either established or received into the association both in France and Canada. Before long the Sulpician seminaries were considered exemplary and their education became the prototype of clerical training. Educated in accordance with the spiritual principles of Bérulle regarding the eminence of the priesthood and its place in the hierarchy, a certain type of priest emerged from these seminaries. Pious, well educated and charitable, leading a dignified and retired life, they all came from a certain social stratum, which was to endure through the upheavals of the Revolution to the threshold of our century. However, the education and training was limited by the quality of the candidates. This improved, although a decision for the priesthood was not always in response to a true calling. The aristocracy continued to provide the recruits for the episcopate, but usually had its candidates, too, go through the seminaries. Talleyrand's *Mémoires* indicate that these clerical youths on the eve of revolution were prepared to upset the strict order of the seminaries. Among the lower levels of society, the priesthood remained as always the simplest means for social mobility. Parents would simply enter their most gifted children into the priesthood—whether the children wanted it or not. So it is easy to understand that the pseudophilosophy of the eighteenth century met with a great deal of concurrence among the rural clergy, for whom Rousseau's *Vicaire Savoyard* was by no means a mere mythical figure.

---

[41] See A. George, *L'Oratoire* (Paris 1928).

[42] See M. Dupuy, *Bérulle et le sacerdoce* (Paris 1969).

The reform movement also brought about other foundations which were concerned with clerical education. One of the most significant emanated from Vincent de Paul (1581–1660) (see Chap. 5). As a farmer's son from the area of Landes, Vincent's youth had been wanting in material things. Although his reputed stay in Tunisia must be considered a legend,[45] he nevertheless had to undergo a number of adventures before he settled in Paris at the end of 1608. After 1610 his life led him on the path to an even more demanding holiness under the influence of Bérulle. Yet he took many more years to discover his true destination. In 1618 he started to devote himself to the rural missions, but not until 1625, supported by one of the most powerful families of the *milieu dévot*, the Gondi, did he establish the *Congrégation des Prêtres de la Mission*, housed initially in the Collège des Bons Enfants and then in 1632 in Saint-Lazare, the former home for lepers and future center of the congregation. The new congregation, which initially occupied itself with the rural apostolate and later on with several foreign missions, developed so rapidly that by 1641 Vincent de Paul was able to use his priests in establishing some diocesan seminaries. At the time of his death there was a total of about a dozen houses. At the request of the archbishop, Vincent de Paul five or six times a year offered a week's contemplation at Saint-Lazare for candidates for ordainment. These retreats were highly frequented and very successful; in 1652 even Bossuet prepared for his ordination there and later returned four times to preach. In July 1633—also at Saint-Lazare—the renowned Tuesday conferences were initiated (*Conférences du Mardi*), at which gathered the foremost representatives of the Parisian clergy to instruct one another and to discuss the problems of the apostolate. The following years, the Vincentians established similar organizations in the large provincial towns. All of these institutions were objects of Vincent de Paul's constant occupation; at certain points he spent considerable time looking for the right solution to problems. This was true especially for the seminaries where the candidates for the priesthood unfortunately spent no more than a few months. This was too short a time to enable them to receive a solid education. Even at that, the results were positive as Vincent himself stated at the end of his life.

---

[43] See P. Pourrat, *J. J. Olier* (Paris 1932).

[44] See P. Boisard, *La Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice, trois siècles d'histoire* (n.p., 1959); not available commercially.

Vincent de Paul quickly freed himself from Bérulle's initial influence; this even led to some differences of opinion between the two. In addition to them, the Oratory brought forth another great founder in the area of rural mission and seminary work: Saint John Eudes (1611–80),[46] a member of the Oratory from 1623 to 1643. The sole reason for his leaving the Oratory in 1643 was the fact that he was opposed by the superior general, François Bourgoing, when he established a seminary in Caen. He founded the *Congrégation de Jésus et Marie,* which assumed the direction of numerous seminaries and remained dominated by a spirituality inspired by Bérulle. At the same time there were other experiments and foundings. One of them in the south of France was the *Congrégation des Pères de la Mission* by Christophe d'Authier de Sisgaud, which to some degree was at variance with Vincent de Paul's congregation; but all of these groups were limited in their range and duration. And yet these efforts did lead to a genuine, gradually expanding reform of the prevailing mentality. After 1650 most of the dioceses established seminaries; the conditions for ordination began more and more to conform with canonical norms with the result of raising standards among the parish clergy rapidly without, however, going beyond the above-mentioned limitations (see Chap. 5).

---

[45] See A. Dodin, *Saint Vincent de Paul et la charité* (Paris 1960); L. Cognet, *Saint Vincent de Paul* (Paris 1959); P. Debongnie, "Saint Vincent de Paul était-il à Tunis en 1606–1607?" *RHE* 58 (1963), 862–64.

[46] See D. Boulay, *Vie du Vénérable Jean Eudes*, 4 vols. (Paris 1905–08); Berthelot du Chesnay, *Les missions de saint Jean Eudes* (Paris 1967).

CHAPTER 2

Origin and Development of Jansenism to 1653

Augustinianism in Louvain and Jansen

The congregations *De Auxiliis* had not resulted in a condemnation of Molina's *Concordia.* While Paul V did not want to diminish the esteem enjoyed by the Jesuits, who had rendered to him inestimable political services, he was nonetheless determined to maintain the fundamental position of the Augustinian-Thomist system of grace. This is why he allowed the Dominican Diego Álvarez (d. 1635) to publish his monumental treatise *De auxiliis divinae gratiae* (1611) as a work of quasi-official character. In order to prevent works on the same topic by the Jesuits Lessius and Suárez to be published, he had the Holy Office issue a decision (not a decree!), which was communicated to those involved and forbade them to publish anything involving the subject of grace. In spite of this, the faculty of Louvain reaffirmed its censures of the Jesuits Lessius and Hamelius. In December 1614 the Jesuit General Claudius Acquaviva, fearing that the old quarrels would be revived, directed Thomism to be taught at the colleges of the society. Yet neither Paul V nor Acquaviva succeeded. Numerous works proclaiming to be commentaries on the *Summa* of Saint Thomas circumvented the prohibition of 1611; the Jesuits on the whole continued to defend Molina. Under those circumstances, Urban VIII—elevated to the papacy in 1623—reiterated the prohibition in December of the same year and acknowledged it by formal decree on 22 May 1625. But even he could not settle the quarrels about the concept of grace.

The Louvain group then remained identified with Augustinianism; Baius, whose condemnation was considered unfair, enjoyed continued sympathy especially among such famous professors as the Franciscan Florent Conry (Conrius) (1590–1629) and Jacques Jansson (1547–1629). It was in this atmosphere that Cornelius Jansen (Jansenius) (1585–1638) developed.[1] From 1602 to 1604 and from 1607 to 1609 he was a student in Louvain, the latter two years under the tutelage of Jansson. From 1609 to 1616 he resided for the main in France, where he met and for some time shared a domicile with Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, who later was to become abbot of Saint-Cyran (see Chap. 1). After his return to Flanders he dedicated himself to a peaceful and honorable university career. From 1617 until 1624 he was president of the Sainte-Pulchérie Seminary and was then appointed representative of the university at the court of Spain, where he successfully defended the monopoly of the faculty against the Jesuits, who were applying for the privilege to award degrees. In March 1630 he was rewarded with the regius chair of Sacred Scripture and wrote commentaries on numerous books of the Bible, which avoided the touchy issue of grace. In the meantime his ideas about this problem had taken on very definite form. In the course of his studies, he had read excerpts from Augustine, but without paying any special attention to him. Only after his return to Louvain—under the influence of Jansson—did he undertake a systematic study of Augustine's works, excerpting the essential theses and compiling them into a system of thought. In 1621 he allied himself with Conrius, who influenced him in like manner.[2] At this point Jansen began to secure various political connections—in France with the help of Saint-Cyran—who were to aid him in his intention to bring about a triumph of Augustinianism over Molinism. Since 1621 he had also been planning to write a comprehensive synthesis of the Augustinian doctrine of grace. To this end, he spent the years 1623–26 in a final systematic study of the works of Augustine. Obligations at the university and his trip to Spain delayed the start of the manuscript until 1627. After this it advanced with remarkable speed; his letters to Saint-Cyran offer insight into the various stages of progress. On 27 March 1630 he was able to send him the table of contents for the first volume. In spite of interruptions by his professorial duties and the anti-Protestant polemics in 1630–31, he started on the third volume in February 1635, hoping to finish it within a year. But in August 1635 he was appointed rector of the university; on 28 October 1636, he became bishop of Ypres and was occupied intensively with his episcopal duties. Under these circumstances he was unable to complete his great treatise. When he was about to finish it, he started worrying about its publication. With a caution understandable in a time that was aggravated by polemics, he had gone about his work with the utmost discretion. Rather than submit his writings, he decided to install a printing shop in his palace together with all the necessary materials. In April 1638 the work was finished, crowned by a dedication to Pope Urban III.[3] But he was not to see its publication. He died from the plague in God's peace on 6 May 1638, having placed his manuscript into the hands of his pupils Henri Calenus and Liber Froidmont.[4]

---

[1] See J. Orcibal, "Jansénius," *Catholicisme* 23 (Paris 1963), 332–43; A. Vandenpeereboom, "C. Jansénius évêque d'Ypres," *Ypriana* VI (Bruges 1882).

[2] See L. Ceyssens, "Florence Conry, Hugh de Burgo, Luke Wadding and Jansenism," *Festschr. Father Luke Wadding* (Dublin 1957), 295–304.

In spite of Jansen's precautions, the Jesuits of Flanders had some knowledge of his undertaking. Since the Jesuits looked upon a resumption of the polemics on this topic as a potential disaster, they had mobilized support for themselves especially in France and Spain and had also kept the Jesuits of Rome informed. Soon they knew that Jansen had left behind a completed work and so did their utmost to prevent its publication. Through an internuncio in Brussels, Richard Stravius, they reminded Calenus and Froidmont of the prohibition of 1611 and the decree of 1625, which forbade publications on the subject of grace. But since these decisions were never officially communicated to the University of Louvain the latter considered them of no consequence.[5] When Jesuits appealed to the Council of Brabant and the Privy Council, Calenus and Froidmont countered by pointing to the enormous sums of money already invested by the printer, Zegers, and they finally prevailed. The treatise was made public in September 1640. This huge folio of more than thirteen hundred pages in small print of two columns per page was entitled simply *Cornelii Jansenii Episcopi Yprensis Augustinus.* It was no doubt with regard to the prohibitions by the Holy See that Jansen's representatives omitted his dedication to Urban III.

This extensive book, the work of a lifetime, was indeed in itself a remarkable synthesis of the Augustinian concepts on grace and predestination. But in it Jansen proceeded from the most extreme positions advocated by Saint Augustine in his fight against the Pelagians without taking into consideration the long history of their development. What evolved was a rigid system often sharply formulated. The first volume treats the positions of the Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians. In a "Liber proemialis" introducing the second volume, Jansen investigates the correlations between philosophy and theology; he opposes the methods of Scholasticism as being too rationalistic and claims Augustine's authority in regard to the issue of grace. He then talks about the state of fallen nature from a perspective characterized by Augustinian pessimism with special emphasis on the basic depravity which emanated from sin and about the power of concupiscence, which grants man no more than the freedom of evil. In the process he also addresses the classical problem of the state of pure nature, which he solves in a negative fashion. He concludes that by creation man was elevated to a supernatural calling. The third volume, by far the most significant, examines the healing of human nature and its restitution to true freedom by virtue of the redeeming grace in Christ. Jansen stresses emphatically that grace becomes unfailingly effective without however destroying Man's freedom and that this grace is accorded to him by God totally unowed by virtue of a decree of predestination. He passes over the classical explanation of the Thomists, which goes back to the *praemotio physica;* but he rejects the notion of freedom—also Thomist—which consists of the ability to posit opposite actions. In his view, freedom is identical with the unfathomable spontaneity of nature, which he calls will. Thus he disregards the Scholastic distinction between will as instinct and will as free choice. His will seeks fulfillment and pleasure spontaneously. But a fallen nature can find its fulfillment only in the creature, in egotistical self-love and therefore turns away from God perforce. It takes the intercession of grace in order to heal it, to breathe into it an inspiration of divine love which resurrects the will in this love and inclines it to a spiritual and holy pleasure through which he puts his whole happiness in God and in the fulfillment of His demand. This is his theory of victorious pleasure through which the will unfailingly enters into harmony with God. In all this, Jansen supposedly reflected the thoughts of Saint Augustine, but actually it is evident that he was influenced by the Baianistic atmosphere of his training. The work as such obviously avoids any and all polemics, but an appendix entitled *Parallèle* vigorously attacks the Molinists and compares their teachings with those of the Pelagians.[6] Jansen strove strictly to maintain the language of Augustinianism and, like Baius, rejected the concepts of the Thomists, which otherwise would have given strong impulses to his undertaking.

---

[3] See L. Ceyssens, "De dedicatiebrief van C. Jansenius aan Paus Urbanus VIII," *AGAU* 66 (1947), 203–22; 67 (1948), 13–14.

[4] See C. Callewaert and Q. Nols, *Jansénius évêque d'Ypres, ses derniers moments* (Louvain 1893); L. Ceyssens, "Libert Froidmont," *BullSocAHLiège* 43 (1963), 1–46; ibid., "Hendrik Calenus pastoor van Asse," *Ascania, driemaandelijks tijdschrift voor Asse* 4 (1961), 15–50; idem, "Henri Calenus évêque manqué," *Bulletin de la Commission royale d'Histoire* 127 (1961), 33–128.

[5] See L. Ceyssens, "La publication de l'Augustinus d'après la correspondance de Henri Calenus," *Antonianum* 35 (1960), 417–48.

---

[6] See A. de Meyer, "De Werkwijze van Jansenius en zijn Augustinus," *Mededelingen der Kon. Vl. Academie van Belgie* (1946), VIII, I.

Augustinianism in France: Saint-Cyran and Port-Royal

While it was torn by the religious wars, France paid scant attention to the controversy concerning divine grace. With peace restored, the universities, above all the Sorbonne, regained their former luster; the most famous professors lectured with great clarity concerning grace, openly adhered to Thomism and revered Augustine as their teacher; Molinism was either completely or almost unknown to them. From the beginning of his career, Bérulle appeared dominated by Augustinianism, but not exclusively because in 1612 he accepted Guillaume Gibieuf into the Oratory, who at that time was a confirmed Molinist and only under Bérulle's influence turned to Augustinianism. Duvergier de Hauranne, formerly a Jesuit pupil, too, did not at first oppose the new ideas. During the busy years he spent with Jansen at his estate Camp-de-Prats near Bayonne (1611–16) he did not seem to have been occupied with the issue of grace in any intensive way. But just about the time when Jansen in Louvain discovered Augustinianism, a similar range of perception opened up to the future abbot of Saint-Cyran under the influence of Bérulle. Yet the strictly intellectual mode of Augustinianism, which Jansson had disclosed to his pupil Jansen, was not identical to the Augustinianism provided to Saint-Cyran by Bérulle. The latter was not very much interested in abstracting a coherent theory of grace and predestination from the works of the bishop of Hippo. Involved in the practice of Christian spirituality, he sought to derive from Augustine a method that would make the souls realize their total dependence on God and their personal wretchedness. Saint-Cyran moved along the same lines. Yet, disregarding the difference in their individual outlook, Jansen and Saint-Cyran united in a common defense of Augustinianism. In the autumn of 1621 Saint-Cyran spent some time with Jansen in Louvain. At this meeting they decided to enlist political support in order to effect a breakthrough of Augustinianism against the Jesuits. After their meeting they started cultivating the proper connections. With this in mind, Jansen helped introduce Bérulle's Oratory into Flanders during the following years. But these political initiatives were unsuccesful: given Richelieu's attitude, the two friends realized that they could not hope for anything from him. On 10 May 1623, they met again in Péronne and decided upon a "change of plans," namely to start waging the battle in the universities and on the intellectual level. After 1621 they had made use of a secret code, a common practice at a time when the postal service was still very uncertain. This enabled them to carry on a regular and sufficiently secure correspondence until 1635, when it was interrupted by the war. Until this time, Saint-Cyran was thus in a position to follow the progress of this great treatise, to give data and advice to his friend and even to send him a first draft of the "Liber proemialis." Unfortunately he was unable to lend him his support in editing the third volume, the most important of all, whose content he did not learn until after it was published. Only Jansen's letters were preserved, but they show clearly that he and Saint-Cyran developed in two different intellectual worlds and that Augustinianism never meant the same to the two of them.

As mentioned already, Jansen's pamphlet against Richelieu, *Mars Gallicus*, was a sore point with the cardinal, yet Richelieu did not draw upon this pamphlet for his main argument against Saint-Cyran, who was at the pinnacle of his fame by 1634. Generally considered the indisputable head of the *parti dévot*, he maintained excellent connections through his friendship with the elite of French Catholicism. But by then another event involving him was unsettling his life. Since 1620 he had been a close friend of Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, a diplomat, active at the court. The eldest child of a family whose nobility derived from being in the King's service, he was a brother of the famous Mother Angélique, abbess and reformer of the Cistercian abbey of Port-Royal, which had formerly been located in the Chevreuse Valley and in 1625 transferred to Paris. Saint-Cyran had only had occasional slight connections with Mother Angélique and her sister Mother Agnès. Meanwhile Mother Angélique had left Port-Royal for a few years. Together with the bishop of Langres, Sébastien Zamet, she had founded a new order, the *Institut du Saint-Sacrement*.[7] But Zamet, a strange and uneven personality, soon incurred the enmity especially of the archbishop of Sens, Octave de Bellegarde. The latter, intending to damage the *Institut*, provided himself with a devotional text by Mother Agnès entitled *Chapelet secret du Saint-Sacrement*.[8] He represented it as the spiritual charter of the new foundation and managed to have it critically examined by eight professors of the Sorbonne on 18 June 1633. Upon Zamet's request, Saint-Cyran agreed to defend the text, in which he recognized Bérulle's influence. He won out totally and incurred Mother Angélique's deep gratitude. This established a closer relationship between them in the course of which Mother Angélique came to admire Saint-Cyran not only as a pure intellectual, but also as a great spiritual leader.

Yet in this area Saint-Cyran had some very personal convictions inspired in part by Francis de Sales and Bérulle. He rejected the idea that Christian life could alternate constantly between a state of grace and a state of sin. So he endeavored to lead his charges to a truly new life by a method designed to trigger a psychological shock. It consisted of going through the intermediate stage of penitence, yet during this period the penitent would deny himself Communion and delay receiving absolution. Only after this delay, generally lasting a few weeks, did he receive absolution and Communion. Following this he had to live in as much seclusion as possible in order to preserve the grace he had received. This method had been worked out prior to 1627, but until that time Saint-Cyran had had little opportunity to apply it. But he made the mistake of telling the nuns of Port-Royal and Saint-Sacrement about it. They were filled with enthusiasm for it, indeed all of them wanted to set out on this journey to self-renewal. But they also talked about it outside their monastic environs without considering that they were exposing Saint-Cyran to accusations of indulging in dangerous innovations and were providing Richelieu with weapons against him. Plagued by severe scruples, Mother Angélique remained without Holy Communion from Easter to Ascension Day 1635. That she did so in spite of reprimands by Saint-Cyran did not lessen his responsibility for it in the eyes of the public. But soon this affair concerning the recluses of Port-Royal took on a completely different significance. Mother Angélique had a nephew, Antoine Lemaistre, a brilliant young lawyer in whom high hopes were placed for a future in the Paris court of law. In 1634, following a sentimental disappointment, he wanted to commit suicide, but was stopped by Saint-Cyran. The sudden death of one of his aunts on 24 August 1637 brought about an enthusiastic wish for conversion. After a long probationary period, Saint-Cyran, on about 15 December 1637, permitted him to write an open letter to Chancellor Séguier in which he announced his decision henceforth to live in seclusion and penitence, but without wanting to become a priest or joining an order. It was common knowledge that Saint-Cyran was his spiritual guide and so he was accused of wanting to establish a new order, especially since other pupils of his began to join Lemaistre in his seclusion. Richelieu took this to be a budding resistance and decided to intervene severely. But before he did, he tried once again—and failed—to buy the benevolence of his erstwhile friend by offering him a bishopric in February 1637. In March 1638 Claude Séguenot, a member of the Oratory, published a translation of Saint Augustine's *De Sancta Virginitate* together with a commentary in which he violently attacked the religious orders and espoused a rigid uncompromising Augustinianism. Journalists in the pay of Richelieu designated Saint-Cyran as the actual author of the book, since his connection with the Oratory was well known. The arrest of Séguenot on 7 May was followed on 14 May by the incarceration of Saint-Cyran at the palace of Vincennes.

---

[7] See L. Prunel, *S. Zamet, sa vie et ses œuvres, les origines du jansénisme* (Paris 1912).

[8] See L. Cognet, "Le Chapelet secret du Saint Sacrement," *Chroniques de Port Royal* (1951), 3–14.

Public opinion initially considered Saint-Cyran guilty of aggravated heresy and Richelieu intended to compromise him by putting him on trial. But when his papers were scrutinized and his friends and pupils interrogated, the accused turned out to be completely innocent. For a while, Richelieu hoped to use the issue of attritionism against him since Saint-Cyran had always defended the need in the Sacrament of Penance for a *contritio* based on the love of God. Richelieu held this concept to be in contradiction to the decisions of the Council of Trent. But on 14 May 1640 Saint-Cyran, for whom this problem was actually of little practical importance, announced that he was prepared to draft a letter relatively favorable to attritionism. By doing so, he deprived Richelieu of his main charge. Nevertheless Saint-Cyran remained in custody without a trial. His only hope was that the unhealthy conditions of his jail at Vincennes would soon destroy his fragile health. By now the Catholic circles among the public knew what was going on and public opinion turned against the cardinal. Saint-Cyran, on the other hand, having acquired an aura of martyrdom was able to initiate from his jail a voluminous correspondence which influenced an ever more significant group of pupils. Seriously ill and threatened by blindness he was repeatedly near death. Yet he was destined to outlive Richelieu, who passed away on 4 November 1642. Saint-Cyran was able to leave his jail on 6 February 1643. But he remained in ill health and died of apoplexy on 11 October, without having resumed his activities. Yet he left a number of pupils who continued his work.

The Beginnings of the Jansenist Conflict

The Bull *In eminenti*

It was foreseeable that the publication of Jansen's *Augustinus* would ultimately result in a renewed controversy regarding the question of grace. So no one, least of all the Louvain group, was caught unprepared; in fact, everyone had carefully prepared his position ahead of time. The Jesuits started the campaign by disregarding the prohibitions (1611 and 1625) of publications on the topic of grace, in which they had originally concurred without reservations. On 22 March 1641 lectures were read at the Jesuit college of Louvain in which Jansen was accused of renewing the errors of Calvin and Baius, of reducing human freedom to nothing and of limiting salvation to the chosen few.[9] These theses met with spirited rejoinders and innumerable polemics. Henceforth the faculties were split into Jansenists and anti-Jansenists.

France, too, was a ready battlefield for renewed strife. Saint-Cyran had hoped that of his pupils his nephew Martin Barcos

---

[9] See L. Ceyssens, "Le jansénisme, considérations historiques préliminaires à sa notion: Nuove ricerche storiche sul giansenismo," *AnGr* 21 (1954), 3–32.

(1600–1678), who had studied with Jansen in Louvain, would continue his work. But Barcos quickly proved to be very unsettled in his judgment.[10] Saint-Cyran's spiritual heir turned out to be the youngest brother of Mother Angélique, Antoine Arnauld (1612–94), whom posterity accorded the sobriquet Le Grand Arnauld. Initially a student of law, he turned to theology in 1632. For a long time Saint-Cyran was disappointed by the young man's exclusively intellectual and all too worldly ambitions although he demonstrated remarkable abilities all along. At that time the short works by Augustine against the Pelagians were hardly available, but through Jansen's good offices Saint-Cyran had gotten about twenty copies of the Louvain edition of 1555.[11] He gave one of them to young Arnauld and was amazed at the quickness and depth with which the latter grasped the main points of the treatise. For the baccalaureate in theology on 14 November 1635, Saint-Cyran had him defend some clearly Augustinian theses whose content was close to that of *Augustinus.* The defense proved quite successful; it demonstrated that Augustinianism continued to have enthusiastic adherents at the Sorbonne and provoked no polemics of any kind. In December 1638 Arnauld received the subdeaconate; shortly thereafter he converted to an intensive and challenging life of the spirit under the exclusive guidance of Saint-Cyran. The latter had him continue his studies at the Sorbonne, where he was awarded his doctorate on 18 December 1641. By that time Saint-Cyran had already called on him to defend his ideas in several publications.

Since Augustinians as well as Molinists had correspondents in Louvain, several copies of *Augustinus* were sent to France when it appeared in September 1640. The following November and December six Parisian professors gave their approval for a reprint which appeared in 1641 in Paris, followed by another one in Rouen in 1643. It was in the nature of things that violent polemics ensued between the detractors and defenders of Jansen. Among the latter there were groups whose defense of Augustinianism had by then become a tradition: Oratorians, Dominicans, Carmelites and numerous professors at the Sorbonne. But several professors joined the fray on the side of the anti-Jansenists, among whom the Jesuits played an especially significant role. Foremost among Jansen's opponents was Richelieu, who had never forgiven him for his *Mars Gallicus*. Richelieu was inclined toward Molinism; in his *Instruction du Chrétien* of 1619 he had supported attritionism, whereas *Augustinus* represented a lively defense of contritionism. Yet he did want to spare the Jesuits, several of whom were rendering him great political service at the time. Although he showed his sympathies openly, he was very late in giving the signal for the start of the battle. No doubt he was aware of the power of the Augustinian party.

---

[10] See J. Orcibal, "Martin de Barcos abbé de Saint-Cyran et sa correspondance," *RHE* 52 (1957), 877–99.

[11] *D. Aurelii Augustini opera contra Pelagianos*, 2 vols. (Louvian 1555).

By the end of 1640 Saint-Cyran, too, had in his jail a copy of *Augustinus*. But weakened by illness and in danger of going blind, he was unable to analyze the large folio systematically. Apparently he read only the table of contents and a few chapters. No doubt he derived his knowledge of the work primarily from analyses given him by Arnauld or Barcos. He had had no connection with Jansen since 1635, so he was not familiar with the final projections of the work, especially of the third volume, in which he was astonished to find an attack on attritionism. He had been unable to keep his original agreement with Jansen, namely to go over the work before it was published. Now he found it dry, harsh, incongruous with its subject matter and out of touch with the spiritual aspects of the problem. Nevertheless he acknowledged it as a well-founded presentation of the fundamentals of Augustinianism. A short time later, for the benefit of informing Arnauld d'Andilly, he expressed his own ideas about it in a small treatise *De la grâce de Jésus-Christ*.[12] The continuous development of the relationship of grace and incarnation shows him to be thematically closer to Bérulle than to Jansen. At any rate, he desired no hasty polemics and impressed this upon his pupils. He confined himself to promoting other Augustinian writings which complemented the works of Jansen. The Paris edition of *Augustinus* contained an appendix with a treatise by Conrius in which he maintained that children who die without the benefit of baptism were condemned to hell. Shortly thereafter appeared the *Pélerin de Jéricho* by the same author, a somber depiction of the humiliation of man after his Fall. At the same time a small treatise by Jansen, *Oratorio de interioris hominis reformatione* (1627) was printed and translated into French by Arnauld d'Andilly in 1642. This prompted the Jesuits to have the anti-Jansenist theses, presented at the University of Louvain in March 1641, reprinted. Shortly before his death Richelieu initiated the altercation by ordering Isaac Habert, canon and professor at the Sorbonne, to attack Jansen in his sermons. Habert complied in sermons at Notre-Dame on 30 November, 21 December and another the following Septuagesima Sunday. This last attack was especially vehement. Thereupon the prisoner of Vincennes decided to let Jansen's defenders break their silence and charged Arnauld with a reply to Habert. Arnauld, under the direction of Saint-Cyran, then composed his extensive *Apologie pour M. Jansénius,* but the intervention by President Molés and the archbishop of

---

[12] Text: J. Orcibal, *Spiritualité,* 233–40.

Paris, François de Gondi, who preferred continued silence, delayed its publication until September 1644. They could not prevent the appearance meanwhile of numerous polemics. The Feuillant Pierre de Saint-Joseph attacked Jansen in his *Défense de Saint Augustin.* The Oratorian Collin du Juanet replied with *Saint Augustin enseignant par lui-même*, an interesting collection of texts indirectly justifying the *Augustinus*. At the same time Jacques Sirmond, a learned Jesuit well known as a specialist in Christian antiquity, attempted to prove that Augustine had been accused of the heresy of so-called predestinarianism. This caused a vehement controversy.

The Flemish Jesuits and the internuncio, Stravius, had reported to Rome concerning the events surrounding *Augustinus* even before its publication. But it is improbable that this affair had a strong effect on Urban VIII. He was an old man consumed by illness and scruples who occupied himself mainly with poetry and politics, concentrating his efforts on the glory of his family, the Barberini, and leaving the government to his nephew, Cardinal Francesco Barberini. The latter—since he had been unable to prevent the publication of *Augustinus*—at the very least wanted to silence those involved in the controversy. On 1 August 1641 he published through the Holy Office a decree which condemned *Augustinus* as well as the theses of the Jesuits and numerous other publications of both parties. But the council of Brabant raised several legal obstacles allowing the University of Louvain to suppress the decree, which was thus left without any practical significance. Then the Jesuits started a comprehensive campaign aimed at having the teaching of *Augustinus* explicitly condemned. Several lists of anathematizeable theses were sent to Cardinal Barberini, but the Holy Office refused to condemn them before studying the work itself. However, Barberini superseded this decision and condemned the work on the grounds that it reiterated sentences condemned by Pius V and Gregory XIII. A corresponding bull dated 6 March was proposed. It was probably authored by Francesco Albizzi, an assessor in the Holy Office who took an especially active part in this affair. But additional negotiations ensued in which the nuncio of Cologne, Fabio Chigi, took a significant part because he expected to gain from them a reputation as a peacemaker. These negotiations delayed the publication in Rome of the bull *In eminenti*[13] until 19 June 1643. The circumstances associated with its publication were very debatable. The Belgian Jesuits had received copies of the bull from their Roman brothers and published it on their own responsibility even before the nuncios had been appraised of it.

---

[13] Text: *BullRom* 15, 92; Text and French trans.: *Recueil historique des bulles*, 36–45; see L. Ceyssens, "Les origines romaines de la bulle *In eminenti*," *Jansenistica* 3, 7–110.

Antonio Bichi, internuncio in Brussels, who had succeeded Stravius in that office in July 1642 and his uncle, Fabio Chigi, nuncio in Cologne, were officially informed of the bull shortly thereafter and published it, but they amended their own text and dated it 1643. Other editions were circulated, again offering different variations. Under these conditions the Dutch public for a while even doubted the authenticity of the bull. When it was finally recognized, the text contained so many doctrinal and juridical difficulties that in Flanders it was not effectively published until 1651.[14]

In Louvain the dean of theology, Schickelius, who had been won over to anti-Jansenism, tried to have the bull accepted before its publication. But he failed because most of his colleagues considered its motives erroneous, especially the assertion that *Augustinus* had stirred up trouble in the Church.[15] In order to change the Pope's decision, the Jansenists, in the name of the University of Louvain and the Brabant states, sent two representatives, Johannes Sinnich and Cornelius de Paepe, to Rome, where they arrived on 24 October 1643.[16] But this delegation proved useless since the Holy Office, in which Albizzi ruled supreme, let it be known at once that the bull would not be revised under any circumstances. De Paepe died in Rome. Sinnich received an audience with Urban VIII in the course of which the venerable Pope acknowledged that it was his intention not to have Jansen named in the bull. This indirectly implicated Albizzi as being responsible for the actual authorship of the bull. Taken aback by this development, Albizzi had the bull confirmed by a decree of the Holy Office on 16 June 1644.[17] Urban VIII died on 29 July 1644 and was succeeded by Innocent X (Pamfili). In several briefs[18] he demanded execution of the bull, but in reality he would have preferred to have things drag on. Sinnich returned to Louvain empty-handed in September 1645. The situation in the Netherlands gradually calmed down. It was in France that this matter was to take a decisive turn.

For some obscure reasons, the nuncio of Paris, Cardinal Hieronymus Grimaldi, did not receive his copy of the bull *In eminenti* which had been dispatched on 10 June 1643; the official documents regarding this problem did not reach him until September. In the meantime, the Jesuits of Rouen had had the text of the bull printed, which had already been disseminated by their fellow Jesuits in Flanders. But the numerous absurdities in it at first caused even Grimaldi to consider this publication a forgery. Arnauld, advised by Saint-Cyran, now gathered all possible arguments against the authenticity of the bull. These appeared in his *Premières* and *Secondes observations sur la bulle* in August 1643 and made a strong impression on public opinion. In the fall, after the authenticity of the bull had been acknowledged conclusively, the delegates from Louvain arrived in Paris on their way to Rome and coordinated their moves with the French Jansenists. With the help of efficacious parliamentary support Jansen's followers succeeded in preventing the adoption in France both of the bull and the decree of 16 June 1644. This was at the beginning of the regency of Anne of Austria and the unsettled state of the country marked by Mazarin's rise to power provided the Jansenists with opportunities for wide-ranging action. In September 1644 Arnauld circulated his *Première apologie pour M. Jansenius;* he followed it with a second in reply to renewed attacks by Habert. At the same time Arnauld replied to a Jesuit polemic against Saint-Cyran in his *Apologie pour M. de Saint-Cyran*, the first two parts of which had been composed by Lemaistre in 1639. It touches upon several problems of the doctrine of grace. But the basic problems of doctrine in *Augustinus* were hardly referred to at that time.

---

[14] Idem, "L'impasse de la bulle *In eminenti* en les années 1646–1649." *A Praem* 31 (1955), 227–52; 32 (1956), 5–59.

[15] Idem, "L'enquête officielle faite en 1644 sur le scandale causé par l'Augustinus," *AFrH* 43 (1950), 68–160.

[16] See Sinnich's report to the Louvain faculty in L. Ceyssens, "Verslag over de eerste Jansenistiche deputatie van Leuven te Rome, *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 22 (1942), 31–111.

[17] Text, *Recueil historique des bulles*, 49.

[18] See the brief to Governor Castelrodrigo, ibid., 55–58.

This unstable period was above all affected by conflicts kindled by Arnauld's *De la Fréquente communion*. This voluminous quarto had originally been nothing more than a very brief refutation of an essay published in 1641 by the Jesuit Sesmaisons, who presented ideas regarding penance and the Eucharist which were diametrically opposed to those of Saint-Cyran. With the aid of Saint-Cyran, Arnauld's work had grown into a comprehensive defense of Saint-Cyran's theses concerning the practice of "renewals," which later were represented as a return to the discipline of the early Church. This in turn had to please the representatives of the *milieu dévot* and of the Counter-Reformation. In August 1643 the work appeared with an approbation by fifteen bishops and twenty-one professors. It triggered a spirited exchange of charge and countercharge; Father Nouet attacked it vehemently in sermons at the Jesuit professed house in Paris. Arnauld countered in 1644 by publishing a copious collection of texts translated by Lemaistre, *La tradition de l'Église sur le sujet de la pénitence et de la communion*. But governmental circles where Mazarin's anti-Jansenism was gaining ground were not well-disposed towards Arnauld. Mazarin considered himself to be in a position to initiate rapport with the Holy Sea by ordering Arnauld and Barcos personally to defend the work in Rome. Arnauld and Barcos preferred to withdraw from Mazarin's immediate sphere of influence, but the Gallican circles protested against the decision, which in the last instance remained inconsequential. Those bishops who had given their approval felt involved by the controversy and brought the matter before the Holy See through a letter of 5 April 1644. A professor of the Sorbonne who had been one of those who had given their approval also was dispatched to Rome. By the time he returned in 1646,[19] the Holy Office had examined the book thoroughly and declined to censure it. In 1647 it merely condemned—without reference to the work—one sentence from the preface written by Barcos. It speaks of Peter and Paul as two heads of the Church, but who are one.[20] Parallel to this quarrel, which actually was a mere diversion, the first attacks against the laxism of the Jesuit theory of morality in the *Théologie morale des jésuites* (coauthored by Arnauld and Hallier, a professor at the Sorbonne, whose arguments were later to be reiterated by the *Provinciales*) began.

The Five Theses and the Bull *Cum occasione*

By 1645 it became obvious that Mazarin was exercising complete control over the queen regent and was continuing Richelieu's policies, including the latter's anti-Jansenist orientation. At court several of the friends of Port-Royal grasped the situation and changed their position. Those who remained loyal to Port-Royal were considered part of the opposition and were excluded. Arnauld d'Andilly himself ended his secular career and in 1646 withdrew from court. Vincent de Paul, a member of the *Conseil de Conscience* since 1643 and formerly a friend of Saint-Cyran, to whom he was indebted for many services, no longer dared oppose his fellow councilors; in 1648 he came out against Jansenism. Several others thought it wise to do the same. Finally Port-Royal remained the last bastion of resistance, which first Mazarin and then Louis XIV sought to reduce. For several years there were mere superficial quarrels in which the Jansenists were prominently represented by Arnauld, Barcos, and the Oratorian P. Desmares, and the anti-Jansenists by Habert and the Jesuits Deschamps and Pinthereau. The latter managed to procure some of the papers confiscated in Saint-Cyran's apartments and from 1646 to 1655 he published skillfully chosen excerpts from them, supplemented by an exceedingly dishonest commentary. In this manner he provided posterity with a wealth of valuable documents. By 1649 the stage was set for a massive attack on

---

[19] The report written by Bourgeois was published in 1695 through the efforts of Quesnel, see A. Arnauld, *Œuvres* 18, 665–734.

[20] Text of the decree: *Recueil historique des bulles*, 59–63.

Jansen. At a meeting of the Sorbonne on 1 July 1649 the syndic Nicolas Cornet, without reference to a particular work, submitted the following seven propositions to be examined:

1. Some of God's commandments cannot be followed by the righteous with the help of those powers available to them in the present state even if they want to follow them. Neither do they have the grace which would make it possible for them to be followed.
2. In the state of fallen nature inner grace never meets resistance.
3. In the state of fallen nature merit or demerit does not require man's freedom from inner compulsion; freedom from outer constraint is sufficient.
4. The Semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of antecedent inner grace for the individual acts, also for the beginning of faith. Their error was to maintain that human will could resist or obey this grace.
5. It is Semi-Pelagian to assert that Christ has died or shed his blood for all men.
6. The acts of disbelievers are sins.
7. The Church earlier believed that the Sacrament of Penance was not sufficient for secret sins.

Immediately a stormy and chaotic discussion ensued, in the course of which several professors asserted that the present intention was to condemn the teachings of Augustine under the name of Jansen. In spite of the opposition of seventy of the participants a commission was charged with the examination requested by Cornet. A short time later Arnauld made public his *Considérations sur l'enterprise faite par Maître Nicolas Cornet,* in which he declared the formulation of the propositions to be deliberately ambiguous. In as much as a superficial reading could make them appear to have a heretical meaning, they could—from the Augustinian viewpoint—be taken in a completely orthodox sense. In the end, an appeal based on misuse of authority filed by sixty-one professors gave President Molé an opportunity to impose on both parties a four-month armistice which was honored only in the breach. The situation at the Sorbonne was further complicated by the fact that professors belonging to a religious order were each given a vote, whereas the old rules limited this right to only two representatives of each order so that block voting in accordance with instructions by the order could be avoided. Under these conditions it was impossible to compose and publish a censure of the propositions. Recourse to the Holy See, suggested earlier by the Roman Jesuits, now appeared unavoidable. This coincided with Rome's desire not to have such an important issue left up to the Sorbonne.

Towards the end of 1650, Isaac Habert, by now bishop of Vabres, wrote to Innocent X, submitting to him the first five propositions and vaguely ascribing them to Jansen.[21] For this letter the anti-Jansenists collected the signatures of bishops and when it was sent to Rome early in 1651 there were seventy-eight, another fifteen signatures were added later. At that time the French episcopate totaled about one hundred and thirty bishops. Arnauld countered the letter by arguments similar to those used in his reply to Nicolas Cornet. The episcopate also had supporters of Jansen, among them Henri Arnauld, bishop of Angers and brother of the Great Arnauld. At the meeting of clergy from February to March 1651 several bishops protested to the nuncio against Habert's action. A little later eleven participants wrote a letter to Innocent X, an action which later gained the support of two more bishops. Saint-Amour, a professor at the Sorbonne who happened to be in Rome, was willing to represent their cause and presented the letter on 10 July 1651. In the following months other Jansenist delegates came to Rome. The anti-Jansenists, too, initially represented there by the Franciscan Mulard, sent three more emissaries in April 1652. All signs pointed to a long wait for a decision. Meanwhile the conflict again turned to less important matters. One of them involved the appearance of a *Catéchisme de la grâce* by the Jansenist Feydear; another was provoked by the teachings of Alphonse Le Moyne, an anti-Jansenist professor at the Sorbonne whom Arnauld opposed by his *Apologie pour les saints Pères*, one of his best works. Other incidents concerned the convent of Port-Royal, whose father confessor, Antoine Singlin, was prohibited from preaching in 1649. In a pamphlet by the Jesuit Brisacier, *Le jansénisme confondu* (1651) the convent also was accused of surreptitious Calvinism.

From the start, the Jansenist delegation in Rome made the mistake of demanding convocations with public discussions similar to the congregations *De Auxiliis*, while Innocent X wanted to be the sole judge in this issue. The precise details of these tiresome negotiations can be perused in Saint-Amour's *Journal*.[22] In April 1651 a commission of cardinals was formed; in September 1652 another commission, consisting of theologians, dealt with the matter. There was only one Jesuit member and it was distinguished by the remarkable manner in which the Franciscan Luke Wadding[23] defended Jansen. The two delegations were empowered to send briefs to the commission, but were not allowed official meetings with each other. They were received in audience very rarely and even then only separately. Several extremely interesting polemical writings originated at that time, especially the *Écrit à trois colonnes*[24] which was handed to the commission by Jansen's supporters on the occasion of their last audience on 19 May 1653. It is extremely significant if one is to understand Jansenist thought. For each of the five propositions it distinguishes between orthodox and heretical meaning and also lists the opposing Molinist position. In reality political factors had a decisive part in the negotiations. On the one hand, Rome did not want to change its mind and retract the bull *In eminenti*. On the other hand, the Holy See—very sensitive on the issue of Gallicanism—had been well disposed to the appeal by the anti-Jansenist bishops and was prepared to allow them to emerge victorious especially since they represented a large majority of the episcopate. After all, Mazarin, with whom good contacts were desired, had come out openly against Jansenism and in 1651 had even sent to Rome a letter signed by the young King Louis XIV. Given these conditions, another condemnation of Jansen was unavoidable and indeed it seems as though the responsible circles in Rome never thought of an alternative. Here and there certain representatives wanted orthodox Augustinianism to be excepted explicitly from the condemnation, but this was not done. The bull *Cum occasione*, dated 31 May 1653 and published on 3 June, condemned without reservations the five propositions which it ascribed to Jansen, the first four as heretical, the fifth one as erroneous.[25] This bull was a complete victory for the anti-Jansenists. In Flanders it was accepted without difficulties. The Jansenists, hit hard by the recent censures of the archbishop of Mechelen and the bishop of Ghent and much weakened by the deaths in quick succession of Calenus and Froidmont (February, October 1653, respectively), resisted but feebly. Indeed Louvain was no longer the home of the Jansenist party: it was now Paris.[26]

---

[21] Habert's letter can be found in *Recueil historique,* 74–77.

[22] Saint-Amour kept a diary of his negotiations; it was edited by Arnauld and published in 1662.

[23] See L. Ceyssens, "Florence Conry," cf n. 2.

---

[24] The "Écrit à trois colonnes" is in the appendix of the *Journal de M. de Saint-Amour* (n. p. 1662).

[25] Text: *BullRom* 15, 720: Text and French trans.: *Recueil historique des bulles*, 79–86; see D 2001–07.

[26] L. Ceyssens, "La publication aux Pays-Bas de la seconde bulle contre Jansénius," *Augustiniana* 7 (1957), 196–240, 389–426, 576–93.

CHAPTER 3

The Jansenist Conflict to 1713

The *quaestio juris* and the *quaestio facti*
The *Provinciales*

The bull *Cum occasione* no doubt represented a victory for the anti-Jansenists, since Mazarin exerted his own efforts at having the bull accepted throughout France. An order to this effect was addressed to parliament and the clergy by means of a royal declaration dated 4 July 1653. Mazarin had the bull acknowledged in the name of the whole clergy by the twenty-eight bishops present in Paris at that time and shortly thereafter the Sorbonne was also forced to accept it. But a few bishops published it with certain reservations by means of which they sought to save orthodox Augustinianism. Port-Royal found itself in an especially difficult situation. The *Fronde* had become weaker and weaker. In the most recent disturbances the people of Port-Royal, while proving their absolute loyalty to the crown, had clearly shown their antipathy towards Mazarin, the real victor. In addition, there is no doubt that several pamphlets by the coadjutor of Paris, the future Cardinal Retz, had been edited by the men of Port-Royal. It is therefore understandable that the Jansenists at first took refuge in silence. But the clumsy triumph of their adversaries enabled them to come out into the open again. First they responded to a tasteless cartoon in an almanac which appeared in 1654. In it Jansen and his pupils are depicted throwing themselves into the arms of Calvin. Sacy replied to it with a long satirical poem *Enluminures du fameux almanach des jésuites*. In February 1654 the Jesuit Father François Annat, the King's father confessor, published a polemic with the title *Chicanes des Jansénistes* asserting that the Pope in his last bull had intended not even to spare the teachings of Saint Augustine. He also maintained that the five propositions had been taken literally from the *Augustinus*. In March Arnauld responded with three essays which represented a manifesto of the new Jansenist point of view. First he cleared up the question of the so-called *quaestio facti;* he proved that only the first proposition is contained in the *Augustinus* but in a context proving it to be orthodox. He goes on to prove that the rest of the propositions might have summarized other passages of the work, but that these, too, are de facto orthodox and reflect only Augustinian thinking. Finally, he cites propositions from the *Augustinus* which pronounce the opposite of those that were condemned. Arnauld concludes that while the propositions with a heretical meaning were justifiably condemned by Innocent X, they were in their heterodox meaning not ascribable to Jansen.

But Arnauld could not actually reach public opinion. In a conference of thirty-eight bishops of 9 March 1654, Mazarin prevailed with a text which acknowledged the condemnation of the propositions as reflecting Jansen's ideas. In a rejoinder of 29 September Innocent X issued a brief with the same objective.[1] On 15 January 1655 Mazarin forced a conference of 15 bishops to have all the clergy and female branches of orders sign a formulary condemning Jansen. But in order not to aggravate the situation, this measure was not immediately implemented. Once again the actual doctrinal issue was not resolved. The Jesuit Étienne Deschamps revived it in his voluminous treatise *De l'hérésie jansénienne* (1654). By means of a formulary, later taken up by Bossuet, he tried to prove that the five propositions were the core of *Augustinus,* but he had absolutely no success. The pamphlets then turned to the realm of politics. In his *Relation juridique* (1654) the publicist Filleau de la Chaise spread the falsehood that a meeting had taken place in 1620 at the Carthusian monastery of Bourgfontaine in the course of which Jansen, Saint-Cyran, and others had articulated a plan to introduce deism and to destroy belief in the Eucharist. At the same time the royal almoner Marandé made an effort in his *Inconvénients d'état* to represent the Jansenists as dangerous opponents of the authority of the state.

Another incident soon heated up the conflict again. On 1 February 1655 the vicar of Saint-Sulpice, Picoté, refused absolution to the duke of Liancourt because of the duke's well-known relations with Port-Royal.[2] Picoté was supported in his stand by the famous Jean-Jacques Olier, pastor of Saint-Sulpice, who was extremely hostile towards Jansenism. This incident attracted much attention and even the intercession by Vincent de Paul came to nought. Three weeks later Arnauld made the issue public through his *Lettre à une personne de condition*, which his adversaries countered with about ten pamphlets. It took Arnauld four months, until 10 July 1655, to reply to them in his *Seconde lettre à un duc et pair*, which is actually an extensive work summarizing the position of French Jansenism with a remarkable degree of clarity. He accepts without reservation the condemnation of the heresy contained in the five propositions, but he considers it preferable not to comment as to whether or not they should be attributed to Jansen. He adds that he had not discovered them in a close reading of *Augustinus*. Then he vigorously attacks the Molinist concept of *gratia sufficiens* citing Peter and his denial of the Lord as an example of a righteous person who sinned because he was lacking in grace. Arnauld's opponents immediately sought to have him condemned because of the last two propositions concerning the *Augustinus* and Peter. Arnauld wanted to anticipate them by bringing the issue before the Holy See by a letter of 27 August. Nonetheless it was placed on the agenda of a meeting of the Sorbonne on 4 November. It took place in spite of protests by Arnauld, who asked in vain for a hearing and just as unsuccessfully multiplied his written justifications to the assembly. An initial censure was pronounced on 14 January 1655 under circumstances so contrary to the rules that sixty professors withdrew from the Sorbonne. Nevertheless Arnauld was expelled from the Sorbonne on 15 February. In his defense he was supported by a young theologian from Chartres, Pierre Nicole (1625–95), who from then on played a significant role in the quarrel over Jansenism. Unfortunately Arnauld and Nicole only spoke the language of theologians. Whereas their extraordinary level of erudition in this field assured them of a hearing among their kind, their works hardly met with a response from the general public. At this time, however, as Mazarin's position was gradually weakening, the actual problem was on the level of public opinion. Then, even before the final condemnation of Arnauld, Port-Royal found a man who was uniquely suited to help them out: Blaise Pascal (1623–62).

---

[1] Letter and brief: *Recueil historique des bulles,* 120–131.

[2] See the duke's authentic report: "Une relation authentique du duc de Liancourt," *Documents d'Histoire* 3 (March 1912), 90–96.

Up to this time the recluses of Port-Royal[3] had considered Blaise Pascal (Chap. 6) a young man of the world, occupied with the sciences, a recent convert who was friendly towards the convent in which his younger sister Jacqueline had lived as a nun since January 1652. When Arnauld, Nicole, and he were in Port-Royal des Champs in January 1656, a casual invitation by Arnauld prompted him to lend his literary ability to a polemic which was intended for society at large and not for specialists. On 23 January 1656 the *Provinciales* came into being. This first letter to a friend in the country was an enormous success and initiated a new episode in the conflict. The collaborators quickly found that they were on the right path and so another seventeen *Provinciales* were issued in the course of a little more than a year, the last one dated 24 March 1657. This campaign, being rather dangerous, forced Arnauld, Nicole, and Pascal to go into hiding in order to evade a *lettre de cachet* which would have sent them to the Bastille. The printing, too, was done in hiding and successfully evaded every police investigation. In spite of the dangerous conditions the *Provinciales*, starting with the fifth letter, were printed in 6,000 copies, at that time an unusually large circulation.[4] Attesting to the lasting nature of their success is the fact that three editions in one volume appeared between 1657 and 1659. For a long time the public was left to guess about the author; not until 1659 did the fact of Pascal's authorship gradually become known.

---

[3] See L. Cognet, "Le jugement de Port-Royal sur Pascal," *Blaise Pascal, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1956), 11–30.

[4] See L. Parcé, "La réimpression des premieres Provinciales," *Pascal, textes du tricentenaire* (Paris 1963), 142–59.

Pascal collaborated closely with Arnauld and Nicole; he lent the magic of his incomparable style to the documentation and arguments of the two specialists. He also made use of numerous polemic writings which had appeared earlier and whose contents were now made known to the broad public. Yet he did not meet with complete agreement at Port-Royal; Mother Angélique and Singlin considered this campaign to be irreconcilable with Christian love. With the fifth *Provinciale*—after Arnauld was defeated at the Sorbonne—Pascal counterattacked. Taking up an old polemic, he assailed the laxist morality of the Jesuit casuists. With this topic he found himself on favorable terrain. Rigorism in morality was indeed not only inherited by Port-Royal, but widespread as well among the best representatives of the clergy and among the faithful. By identifying the Jesuits with laxism, Pascal discredited the Society of Jesus to such an extent that they could never quite overcome it. The conflict thus introduced was to continue far beyond the *Provinciales*. The secular clergy took up the fight again by means of the *Écrits des Curés de Paris*, in which Pascal also collaborated. This led to a number of decrees by the Holy Office under Alexander VII (1665, 1666) and Innocent XI (1679),[5] which condemned 110 laxist propositions; 50 of them were indirectly from the *Provinciales*. Unfortunately Pascal had no congenial adversary in the opposite camp. Aside from several replies by individual anti-Jansenists, the Jesuits after the sixth letter published collaborative retorts whose main authors were probably Fathers Annat and Nouet, the latter an excellent writer in the field of spirituality, but merely an average polemicist. These retorts, discussing a boundless wealth of details from the casuist texts quoted by Pascal, were indeed mediocre. But they benefitted Pascal since they gave the impression to the public that the Jesuits were actually identifying themselves with these controversial casuistic positions. The tone of the *Provinciales* became increasingly sharper and more vehement; the last two addressed directly to Father Annat are especially caustic. But this did not prevent a Parisian Jesuit, Georges Pirot, from publishing a clumsy *Apologie des casuistes* in December 1657, which by provoking spirited disapproval further weakened the Jesuit position.

The *Provinciales* indeed had great influence on the public; this is reflected in the letters of Mme de Sévigné and the physician Guy Patin. Public opinion was also agitated by the famous miracle of the holy thorn which occurred on 24 March at Port-Royal, where Pascal's niece, Marguerite Périer, was healed from a lachrymal fistula by means of a thorn from the Holy Crown. In spite of objections by the Jesuits this was generally seen as a sign in favor of Port-Royal. But none of this changed the attitude of the prominent circles. Mazarin, as well as Chancellor Séguier, irritated more than ever by the *Provinciales*, made increasing attempts to eliminate Jansenism. Innocent X, of a rather more indifferent nature, never wanted to get seriously involved in this fight. When he died on 7 January 1655 he was succeeded by the former nuncio of Cologne, Fabio Chigi, a decided anti-Jansenist who acceeded to the papal throne as Alexander VII. As of the end of 1655, a new bull concerning Jansen was being prepared, but initially kept secret in order to be issued at some advantageous point in time. In the summer of 1654 the French assembly of the clergy pressured by Mazarin again ordered signing of the formulary against Jansen and by an official letter to Alexander VII, dated 2 September, requested a definitive decision in the *quaestio facti*.[6] The Holy See considered this a favorable moment: on 16 October 1656 the bull *Ad sacram*[7] was officially signed. A nuncio extraordinary, Piccolomini, took it to Paris the following January, but various negotiations delayed its official delivery to the King until 2 March 1657. Mazarin, on 17 March, forced the Assembly of the Clergy to accept. Parliament put off its acceptance for a while longer and it took a formal court day on 29 November to break its resistance (Chap. 7).

---

[5] Text of Alexander VII's decrees: *BullRom* 17, 387–389, 427–428; D 2021–65; Innocent XI's *BullRom* 19, 145–149, D 2101–67.

The Formulary

The bull *Ad sacram* caused a violent outbreak of emotion in France. For the Jansenists it represented another defeat and forced them into formulating a new position. Arnauld and Nicole dealt with this problem in various writings published between April and August 1657. In the *quaestio juris*, that is concerning the heresy contained in the five propositions, Arnauld came out in full agreement with the papal condemnation. But in the *quaestio facti*, that is concerning the actual presence of the five propositions in the *Augustinus*, he presented the view that the Pope was simply in error. He maintained that this was entirely possible since the Church was not infallible in nonrevealed facts. On this point he thus refused his inner concurrence and obliged himself to a mere "reverential silence." But this attitude on the part of Arnauld and Nicole did not meet with complete agreement by Port-Royal. Several thought that in the last analysis the condemnation of the five propositions redounded upon Augustinianism as such and that it should therefore be opposed without reservation, even at the price of a schism. The major proponents of this extremist group were the bishop of Alet, Nicolas Pavillon, who was widely revered because of the holiness of his life, and the abbot of Haute-Fontaine, Guillaume Le Roy. Yet others held Arnauld's tactical comments to be absurd. Proceeding from the concept of an unalterably evil world in which it is impossible to defend the truth, they thought it better to submit to the papal condemnations and to leave to God's care the victory of His cause. Barcos, the nephew of Saint-Cyran, was a central figure of this group. But by virtue of his theological authority, Arnauld's ideas were clearly given preeminence.

---

[6] Letter: *Recueil historique des bulles,* 136–43.

[7] Text of the bull: *BullRom* 16, 247, see D 2010–12; text and French trans.: *Recueil historique des bulles,* 144–149.

For Mazarin, anti-Jansenism had actually been above all an argument intended to secure papal neutrality in the conflict with Spain. Having reached this goal he was no longer intent upon a crisis. But after his death (9 March 1661) Louis XIV personally took charge of the battle. Pursued by the specter of the *Fronde* he was determined to do away with all the sources of opposition which endangered national unity. His determination had a bearing upon both Jansenism and Protestantism. Yet on this point the King, who was not very intelligent and indeed very ignorant in religious matters, was totally in the hands of his Jesuit confessors. On 20 February 1661 the bishops of the Assembly of the Clergy had again taken up the issue of the formulary and had asked Alexander VII for his approbation.[8] On 23 April a decree by the Council of State relentlessly demanded the signing of the formulary and in doing so forced the Jansenists to take a stand. Arnauld declared himself ready to sign the formulary, but only if his distinction between the *quaestio juris* and the *quaestio facti* were appended to it. The two vicars general who were administering the Paris diocese in the absence of their archbishop, the famous Cardinal Retz, who had fled, accepted Arnauld's condition. On 8 June 1661 a pastoral letter probably edited by Pascal himself prescribed the signing with the added distinction, which satisfied the group around Arnauld. But faced with opposition by official circles they had to retract the pastoral letter on 31 October and instead to demand the signing without any reservation. Thus Port-Royal was driven to refusal.

At this point the convent and its friends had already suffered severe agitation against them. By 23 April the postulants and pupils had been removed. The spiritual leaders and confessors as well as the most prominent recluses were to be exiled by *lettres de cachet* or imprisoned, but they managed to flee, pursued by the authorities. Later, in May

---

[8] Text: ibid, 151–65.

1666, the police with the aid of an informant succeeded in arresting the nephew of Mother Angélique, Isaac Lemaistre de Sacy, who was subsequently jailed in the Bastille till October 1668. The nuns were prohibited from flight by their monastic confinement and were therefore in the midst of the situation. Naturally none of them had ever read the *Augustinus* and only three or four of them, such as Angélique de Saint-Jean Arnauld d'Andilly, the niece of Mother Angélique, had even had any theological education. But their reverence for Saint-Cyran absolutely convinced them of Jansen's orthodoxy. So a majority of them rejected any signing of the formulary, even a conditional one, and on this point stood in opposition to Arnauld. Mother Angélique died in August 1661; in the course of the summer passionate internal disagreements erupted at Port-Royal. The resistance was led by Angélique de Saint-Jean and Jacqueline Pascal. But when the pastoral letter by the vicars general was retracted Arnauld and the nuns again agreed in their unqualified refusal to sign. A short time later the archbishop of Paris, Retz, resigned; his successor, Pierre de Marca, died four months later without having occupied the bishopric. Thereupon Louis XIV appointed his former teacher Hardouin de Péréfixe. But in July 1662 some difficulties arose between France and the Holy See. As a result Péréfixe had to wait one and a half years for his bull of investiture and the events centered upon Port-Royal were left in abeyance. There were some who understood that compromise was preferable to the continued conflict. Among them was the bishop of Comminges, Gilbert de Choiseul, who attempted to reconcile the parties in 1663, but the respective views concerning the *quaestio facti* proved irreconcilable.

In April 1664 Péréfixe finally became archbishop of Paris. At once irascible and good natured, an average theologian, he was convinced that he could easily overcome the Jansenist resistance. On 8 June 1664 he issued a pastoral letter which acknowledged the distinction between de jure and de facto by demanding the divine faith for the *quaestio juris* and a simple "human faith" for the *quaestio facti*. But this could only half satisfy the theologians of Port-Royal, who were unwilling to go beyond the "reverential silence" in the *quaestio facti*. Nicole was entrusted with the reply and in his *Lettres sur l'hérésie imaginaire* and other pamphlets he sharply rejected the archbishop's view. Péréfixe, beside himself, took his revenge on the nuns. On 21 and 26 August, after two dramatic visits at the convent of Paris, he had twelve of them deported to other convents. Among them were Angélique de Saint-Jean and the aged Mother Agnès. In Paris and at the convent of des Champs the nuns were refused the sacraments and were placed under police supervision. The incredible moral torture brought about by such coercion on the part of the archbishop and his people finally made twelve of the nuns sign the formulary, but some of them renounced it later. Reports about these events written by the nuns immediately afterwards and smuggled outside were published. They created a great stir, for the archbishop had frequently been compromised by his intemperate disposition. Furthermore the *Apologie pour les religieuses de Port-Royal*, composed at the beginning of 1665 by Arnauld and Nicole, brought all the events before the public. Through one of the nuns who had signed, the "traitoress" Flavie Passart, Péréfixe had found out about the internal tensions at Port-Royal and wanted to make use of them with the help of the publicist Desmaret de Saint-Sorlin. But Nicole succeeded in neutralizing the latter by ridiculing his exaggerated mysticism in the *Visionnaires*. The small number of signatures he had gotten from the nuns was a serious defeat for the archbishop. In an attempt to stabilize the situation, those nuns who refused to sign were gathered at Port-Royal des Champs and guarded by a police unit, while those who had signed stayed in Paris with a special abbess, Dorothée Perdreau. But neither of these measures solved the problem.

In the meantime Alexander VII had responded to the wishes of the French clergy by issuing in February 1665 the bull *Regiminis apostolici*, which also ordered the signing of a formulary.[9] But the bull only made matters worse because four bishops published it together with a clear distinction between the *quaestio juris* and the *quaestio facti* and in doing so openly took the side of Port-Royal. Among them were Henri Arnauld and Nicolas Pavillon. The Courts of France and Rome were equally annoyed. Father Annat considered the possibility of asking the Pope to remove the four bishops, but this idea had to be given up in order not to provoke the opposition of the entire episcopate, who would not have tolerated such a measure. In January 1667 the Holy See appointed a commission to initiate a trial against the dissidents. This prompted an immediate declaration of solidarity by nineteen bishops; twenty more entered a protest against the papal action. But Clement IX, a peaceful man, who had succeeded Alexander VII as Pope, desired reconciliation (see Chap. 7). Louis XIV, having also recognized that war with Holland was unavoidable, wanted to settle the religious quarrels and reunite the kingdom. In 1668 Nuncio Bargellini was charged with the task of seeking ways to reach an agreement. The Jesuits were excluded from the negotiations in which Gondrin, archbishop of Sens, Ligny, bishop of Meaux, and Vialart, bishop of Châlons, played a decisive role. In the summer of 1668 there was reason for hope. It was agreed that the four bishops in question were to write to the Pope pledging to publish the bull *Regiminis apostolici* again and to have it signed in their dioceses. The Pope on his part was to tolerate tacitly that the signing would be performed through protocols which—theoretically secret, but in reality generally known—would make the distinction between de facto and de jure. The group of people around Arnauld and Nicole who tended more towards the status of a moderate third party was completely satisfied with this agreement, but not so the extremists of the two opposing parties. A council decree of 23 October 1668 and a brief by Clement IX of 14 January 1669 gave the Clementine Peace official sanction. But the nuns of Port-Royal, still tortured by the same doubts as before, could not decide in favor. Urged by Sacy, they finally signed on 15 February 1669 and were ceremoniously admitted to receive the sacraments.

---

[9] Text of the bull: *BullRom* 17, 336, see D 2020; text and French trans.: *Recueil historique des bulles,* 223–30.

The Clementine Peace

For almost thirty years the Clementine Peace, imperfect though it was, brought to an end the doctrinal controversies and accorded Port-Royal its last quiet decade. During this period the old convent had loyal and highly placed friends; it was cared for and protected by the former heroine of the *Fronde*, the duchess de Longueville, cousin to the King. But all this could not but displease Louis XIV, who continued to see in this circle a source of opposition against his absolutism. Yet he was intent on letting nothing happen that could reignite the conflicts.

The people of Port-Royal were now in a position to turn their intellectual endeavors to peaceful areas, in which they had excelled earlier, among them the subject of spirituality. A decision was made to research the documents left by the great deceased, to emend them and make them available to the public. At the beginning of 1670, Pascal's *Pensées* appeared, followed in 1671 by two volumes of the *Considérations sur les dimanches et les fêtes,* excerpts from the notes of Saint-Cyran, whose *Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles* was reissued in Louvain in 1679. Also published were original works such as the *Traités de Piété* by the physician of Port-Royal, M. Hamon (1617) and the *Essais de Morale* by Nicole (1671). Translations were also published, among them Teresa of Ávila (1670), John of Ávila (1673) and many others. Port-Royal strove to make biblical texts accessible to the faithful. During the last crisis in 1667 the group had published a translation from the Greek of the New Testament. Called the *Nouveau Testament de Mons*[10] after its place of origin, it owes its existence primarily to Arnauld, Nicole and Sacy.

---

[10] See E. Hublard, *Le Nouveau Testament de Mons, histoire d'un livre* (Mons 1914); E. Jacques, "Les sympathies jansénistes à Mons à la fin du XVII^{e} siècle, *Annales du Cercle archéologique de Mons* 66 (1965–67) 249–309.

Although it was a precise and elegant translation, it provoked a violent polemic and was put on the Index in 1668. Sacy—while jailed at the Bastille—had started work on a translation of the Vulgate which he began publishing together with commentaries from the church Fathers. After his death in 1684 his pupils concluded the work. The liturgical translations of Port-Royal—*Heures de Port-Royal* and *Office de Saint-Sacrement* (1659) had several revised reprints. Finally the group also turned to polemicizing against the Calvinists, Arnauld and Nicole collaborating with Bossuet. It is possible that Arnauld even had a significant hand in the *Expositions de la doctrine de l'Église catholique* published by Bossuet in 1671. Nicole—although collaborating with Arnauld—was the main author of *Perpétuité de la foi de l'Église catholique touchant l'Eucharistie*, an imposing work whose first volume appeared in 1669.

In reality both sides knew that the peace thus maintained was very fragile and several incidents clearly demonstrated the true sentiments of the court. In 1675 Henri Arnauld was accused of not permitting the unqualified signing of the formulary in his diocese of Angers. For this Louis XIV reprimanded him through the Edict of Camp de Ninove (30 May 1676). The King was very annoyed in the beginning of 1677 when a memorandum authored by Nicole and signed by two bishops submitted several laxist propositions to the new Pope Innocent XI. But most of all it was the unpleasant regalia quarrel between Louis XIV and the Holy See going on since 1675, in which Arnauld unequivocally sided with the Holy See against the King.[11] When the Treaty of Nijmegen had ended the war and the duchess of Longueville died on 15 April 1679 Louis XIV decided to liquidate Port-Royal without, however, causing the doctrinal quarrels to be rekindled. On 16 May the confessors, pupils, and novices were removed from the convent, an action which condemned it to die out. Arnauld, fearing for his freedom, left the country in June 1679. Although Innocent XI had a retirement home and probably also a cardinalate offered to him, he rejected this solution because it would make it impossible for him to return to France. After a long period of indecision he took up residence in Brussels, where he died on 8 August 1694, having continued polemics against the Jesuits and later on against Malebranche and his ideas of grace. Nicole, who had gone into exile with Arnauld, received the support of the new archbishop of Paris, Harlay de Champvallon, which enabled him to return to France in 1683. But he no longer participated in the conflicts with the Jesuits and because of this the party looked upon him to some extent as a turncoat.

---

[11] See A. Latreille, "Innocent XI pape janséniste, directeur de conscience de Louis XIV," *Cahiers d'histoire* [publications of the universities of Grenoble, Lyon, and Clermont-Ferrand], 1 (1956), 9–39.

In 1685 Arnauld received two Oratorians in Brussels who had been forced to leave France because of their Augustinian convictions. The younger of the two, Jacques-Joseph Du Guet (1649–1733), was soon forced by ill health to return home, where he began a career as a religious writer. The other, Pasquier Quesnel (1634–1719) (See Chap. 5), remained till the end a loyal companion to Arnauld. Before his arrival, Quesnel had distinguished himself by scholarly works, among them an excellent edition of the writings of Leo the Great. His personal views were determined by an Augustinianism strongly influenced by Bérulle. He was also strongly affected by the thoughts of Saint Thomas Aquinas, whose work he knew extremely well. Given these conditions, the rigid, archaizing Augustinianism of Jansen did not appeal very much to him and so it was understandable that he had earlier signed the formulary four times. Quesnel, moreover, tended towards Gallicanism and was influenced by ideas advocated by Edmond Richer at the beginning of the seventeenth century. He shared Richer's belief that within the Church the blessing of truth is not entrusted to the Pope and the bishops alone, but to the totality of the faithful who share the responsibility for it and therefore have the same right as the hierarchy to judge the doctrine. A dogmatic truth then could only become binding if the host of the faithful accepted it. Intellectually Quesnel clearly influenced Arnauld in a Thomist direction. This is apparent most of all in the last great works of the aged theologian. Quesnel was also much more the politician than Arnauld. A determined opponent of Jesuits and Molinists, he perceived that the presence of Jansenism among the leading ranks of those advocating parliamentarianism, which was traditionally opposed to royal absolutism, created a set of favorable circumstances to be used to good advantage. For this purpose Jansenism had to be changed into a firmly structured party and this was Quesnel's achievement. Clear-sighted and persistent, endowed with leadership qualities, he soon established an expansive network of Jansenist agencies all across Europe and so perfected the work started by some of his predecessors, mainly by Du Vaucel and Pontchâteau.[12] But even though Quesnel wanted the Augustinian party to be victorious, he was not willing to side with Jansenism, which he did not esteem very highly. Through his *Tradition de l'Église romaine sur la prédestination des saints et*

---

[12] See B. Neveu, "Un janséniste à Rome: les deux missions de M. de Pontchâteau (1677–1680)," *Annuaire de la section des Sciences religieuses de l'École pratique des Hautes-Études* 74 (1966–67), 197–202.

sur la grâce efficace, which connected incarnation and grace completely from the perspective of Bérulle and thereby at great remove from Jansen, he tried to remain aloof from the latter (1687–90).

But there still were supporters of Jansen who considered him the authentic interpreter of Saint Augustine. This view was shared by Barcos (whose manuscripts Quesnel at one time even ordered destroyed), by a significant group of theologians in Louvain who put up a desperate fight, and by a French Benedictine, Dom Gabriel Gerberon (1628–1711), whose intransigent Jansenism forced him into Dutch exile. From there he liberally criticized Arnauld and Quesnel, who on their part held him to be a dangerous muddlehead. To counter Quesnel's ideas, Gerberon had an earlier essay by Barcos, in which the latter had advocated an aggressive but awkward Augustinianism, *Exposition de la foi catholique touchant la grâce et la prédestination*, published in 1690. This untimely publication led to excited protests in Paris even by moderate Jansenists. But at the same time it offered the intransigents a point of reference. The new archbishop of Paris, Noailles, outwardly manifested Augustinianism. He felt obliged to condemn the *Exposition*, and did so in an order of 20 August 1696, whose doctrinal part, composed by Bossuet, emphatically laid a foundation for Augustinianism. Of course he distrusted everyone. Quesnel thereupon advised silence, but Gerberon and the intransigents in Paris circulated several pamphlets against the archbishop, among them the especially malicious *Histoire abrégée du jansénisme* (1697).

In 1695 when he was still bishop of Châlons, Noailles had given his approbation to Quesnel's *Le Nouveau Testament en français avec des réflexions morales sur chaque verset*, a revised edition of a much shorter work of the year 1671. On the spiritual level much of the commentary was excellent, but Quesnel's Augustinianism was often expressed in very categorical formulas and his sympathies for Richer's system were clearly discernible. Noailles was quite dismayed when a brochure entitled *Problème ecclésiastique* appeared towards the end of 1698 which posed the question of whether the Noailles who had approbated Quesnel or the Noailles who had condemned Barcos was to be believed. He found himself in a position of having contradicted himself. For a long time this piece was attributed to the Jesuits; the real author was not identified until modern times: he was Dom Hilarion Monnier, a Benedictine from Saint-Vanne who was an extreme Jansenist, but had had nothing to do with its publication.[13] The pamphlet was condemned by parliament on 10 January 1699—a reply was imperative. Noailles turned to Bossuet, who composed an *Avertissement* to appear at the beginning of a new, revised edition of the *Réflexions morales.* But meanwhile the prelates got into a squabble over the issue of quietism. Bossuet's text was not published until 1710, but Noailles made use of it in the four *Lettres d'un théologien* (1700). Although he was not immediately involved in this matter, Quesnel again played the part of a mediator. At this point the whole affair came to a halt and no one could foresee that it was destined to become the starting point for eighteenth-century Jansenism.

---

[13] See A. Vacant, "Renseignements inédits sur l'auteur du Problème ecclésiastique, "*Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* 61 (1890), 411–25; 62 (1891), 34–50, 131–50.

The Way to the Bull *Unigenitus*

Another incident soon renewed the conflict. At the beginning of 1701 the priest of Notre-Dame du Port at Clermont, Fréhel, submitted to the Sorbonne a question of conscience. It was soon common knowledge that it concerned Pascal's nephew, Louis Périer. The question: can a penitent be granted absolution when he asserts that he cannot go beyond the reverential silence in the *quaestio facti?* A well-known Jansenist, Nicolas Petitpied, drafted a positive answer which—after various negotiations—was approved by forty professors on 20 July 1701, but rejected by Bossuet. It was not published right away and indeed it should never have been published. But in July 1702 the *Cas de Conscience* and the answer were printed and promptly generated a flood of pamphlets. The Holy Office condemned the *Cas* on 12 February 1703. Noailles, who had initially been on the positive side, joined in the condemnation on 22 February. But this did not end the polemic, for not until 4 September 1704 did the Sorbonne issue the condemnation. Petitpied refused to recant and withdrew to Holland.

By that time Fénelon (see Chap. 5) had decided to enter the fray. Sympathetic to the Jesuits, who for the most part had defended him loyally on the issue of *L'Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure*, he had opposed Jansenism for the past ten years.[14] So when Gerberon offered to defend his ideas concerning Pure Love, he did not have to change his convictions at all.[15] On 15 February 1704 he made public a pastoral instruction[16] in which he developed ideas which placed him in the center of the conflict without being able to satisfy anybody at all. As he saw it, the condemnation of Jansen could have a bearing only on the *sensus obvius* of his book, but not on the personal intentions of its author. But concerning this *sensus obvius*, the Church could make a decision and indeed an infallible one. In fact he asserted that the Church could be infallible in such dogmatic facts as were not revealed; that included Jansen's *quaestio facti* as well. This theory encountered opposition by almost all the specialists in France and by many theologians in Rome. But Fénelon defended and further defined his ideas in three more pastoral instructions in March and April 1705. At the same time he made use of his good relations with Pope Clement XI in order to achieve an unequivocal opinion from the Holy See in favor of his thesis of infallibility in nonrevealed facts. But the Holy See was not so inclined and would have preferred for Fénelon to support the thesis of the personal infallibility of the Pope defended by a majority of the Roman theologians. This led to a misunderstanding and cooled the relations between the prelate and Rome,[17] whereupon Fénelon—sorely disappointed—no longer demanded the formulary to be signed in his diocese.

---

[14] See H. Hillenaar, *Fénelon et les jésuites* (The Hague 1967).

[15] See J. Orcibal, "La spiritualité de Dom Gabriel Gerberon, champion de Jansénius et de Fénelon," *RHEF* 43 (1957), 151–222.

[16] Fenelon, *Œuvres* 3, 573–636.

In the meantime the pamphleteering of Quesnel and Gerberon had made the authorities of the Netherlands uneasy. On 30 May 1703 the two were arrested in Brussels and incarcerated at the jail of the court at Mechelin. Gerberon was extradited to the French police and never regained his freedom, but Quesnel managed to flee in a most unusual manner on 13 September. He took up residence in Amsterdam and resumed his activities. But the documents confiscated in his apartment demonstrated the power and efficacy of the Jansenist network spread over all of Europe. They led directly to the arrest of a number of party agents, among others Quesnel's correspondent in Paris, Germain Vuillarts.[18] The documents also showed the strange way in which the Jansenists adhered to the respectful silence; it did not keep them from publishing innumerable works. Louis XIV—badly informed until that time—had thought Jansenism almost extinguished; Quesnel's documents made him comprehend how much alive and how dangerous it was and also that his efforts had failed. Mme de Maintenon, who gave herself the appearance of being extremely orthodox so that the issue of quietism would be forgotten, urged him to request another bull from Rome condemning the respectful silence. But Clement XI, who understood that this measure would not be any more efficacious than the past ones, was not very enthusiastic and delayed his decision. Only when the French court kept urging him, did he issue the bull *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*.[19] While it condemned the respectful silence, it did so in such terms as to imply that the silence concerned the *quaestio juris*, but not the *quaestio facti*. Fénelon was disappointed that it did not contain a statement about infallibility regarding the facts. In some points, moreover, the documents contradicted Gallican principles; as a result, parliament—to Rome's chagrin—only accepted it with serious reservations. Of the numerous polemics inspired by the bull, the *Denuntiatio Bullae Clementinae* by a theologian from Louvain, De Witte, is especially important. It contained an appeal to the general council, an idea which would show an effect in the future.

---

[17] See J. Orcibal, "Fénelon et la Cour romaine," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome* 57 (1940), 235–348.

[18] See L. Ceyssens, "Les papiers de Quesnel saisis à Bruxelles et transportés à Paris en 1703 et 1704," *RHE* 44 (1949), 508–51; ibid., "Suites romaines de la confiscation des papiers de Quesnel," *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 29 (1955), 5–27.

[19] Text of the bull: *BullRom* 21, 235, see D 2390.

Aside from this revival of the conflict the bull *Vineam Domini* had few actual results if one excepts the last nuns of Port-Royal. Death had gradually decimated their ranks and only about twenty aged nuns occupied the imposing building of Port-Royal des Champs. They were forced to sign the bull, but they added a reservation saying that they were not willing to deviate from the arrangement made for them in the Clementine Peace. Not even threats could make them submit. Finally, at the urging of Mme de Maintenon, Louis XIV in October 1709 had their community dispersed and the nuns deported by the police to several different convents. This act of force was roundly condemned by public opinion, even by people who did not consider themselves Jansenists. To prevent the deserted convent from becoming a place of pilgrimage, Louis XIV had it demolished in 1711 and had the remains of the graves thrown into a mass grave in the cemetery of Saint-Lambert. In spite of this, there were pilgrimages and the stones of the ruins became relics. The abbot Le Sesne d'Etemare and the Jansenists published the *Gémissements sur la destruction de Port-Royal*, which was well received.

The bull *Vineam Domini* was indeed a disappointment for Louis XIV. The difficulties regarding its acceptance by parliament and also by the Assembly of the Clergy showed him that Jansenism could count on substantial support, even extending into the episcopate, for whom the King had always selected candidates who were above the slightest suspicion. Among these friends of Jansenism, Noailles, who owed his see in Paris to Mme de Maintenon's favor, soon played a prominent role. Quesnel from his shelter in Amsterdam quickly reorganized his network. His arrest had made him the undisputed leader of the party, especially since the disappearance of Gerberon had destroyed integral Jansenism once and for all. Quesnel used his voluminous correspondence to extend his influence far afield. But he was ominously destined to draw future attacks by the anti-Jansenists. After some cooling, Fénelon had reestablished his close relations with Rome. He immediately resumed his polemics against Jansenism. Deviating not a whit from any of his ideas, he warned the Holy See untiringly of the seriousness of the situation. Future events proved him correct. In 1710 he attacked Quesnel. The latter, no mean polemicist himself, vigorously rejected the prelate's ideas in some blunt pamphlets. One of Quesnel's advocates turned out to be Noailles, whom Fénelon resented ever since he had opposed him on the issue of quietism. So Fénelon decided to direct his attack to Quesnel's *Réflexions morales*. This work had already been denounced in Rome by the Capuchin Timothée de la Fleche in 1703 and condemned on 13 July 1708 by the brief *Universi Dominici gregis*. But the brief contained clauses contradictory to Gallican principles and had not been accepted in France. Fénelon, unwilling to be personally involved, used two of his friends, the bishops of Luçon and La Rochelle, as straw men. Those two issued a pastoral letter whose details were furnished by Fénelon. In it they condemned the *Réflexions morales*, accusing them of reiterating the errors of Baius and Jansen. Noailles, having approved the work, thus considered himself indirectly addressed and correctly so. Both bishops had nephews at the seminary of Saint-Sulpice, the diocesan seminary of Paris. Noailles promptly dismissed them without giving a reason. On 28 April 1711 he replied to his adversaries in a sharply worded pastoral instruction. The King thereupon reprimanded Noailles and through Mme de Maintenon demanded that he retract his approbation of Quesnel's book. Noailles of course refused to do so.

Noailles's refusal resulted in a complicated web of intrigue. Gradually Mme de Maintenon turned against the former protégé. At the very least she wanted to scare him into acquiescence. She apparently succeeded in making the new confessor to the King, the Jesuit Le Tellier, go along with her, whereas his predecessor, La Chaize, had consistently thwarted her plans. With her approval, Tellier collected a file of letters by bishops demanding the condemnation of the *Réflexions morales* and then sent a sample letter ultimately intended for the King to several different dioceses. But a letter by Abbot Bochart de Saron to his uncle, the bishop of Clermont, uncovering the scheme was intercepted in the mail and made public by the Jansenists. Noailles was extremely angry and hardened his position. When the King pressed him again to disassociate himself from Quesnel he refused and it became more and more obvious that part of the episcopate was supporting him. Louis XIV, grasping that he was threatened by a schism in the hierarchy, found himself in a quandary. The only way out seemed to be to involve Rome. So on 16 November 1711 he requested a papal bull against Quesnel, assuring the Holy Office that he would be able to force it upon the episcopate and parliament if he were made privy to its contents beforehand. At this point Noailles declared himself willing to submit to the Pope's decision. But when the King's request was transmitted by the

French ambassador it encountered less enthusiasm than had been assumed. The Pope was extremely well informed and—unlike the King—had few illusions about the effect such a measure would have in France. He was also anxious to avoid the appearance of following orders by Louis XIV. The commissioners charged with examining the problem quickly recognized moreover that the subtle, unctuous text of the *Réflexions morales* offered less of a basis for attack then the *Augustinus*. But after long hesitation Clement XI gave in: on 8 September 1713, he signed the bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius* condemning 101 propositions from the *Réflexions morales* (see Chap. 9).

CHAPTER 4

Gallicanism and Protestantism

Gallicanism at the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century

In the beginning of the seventeenth century the theses offered by the majority of French theologians and canonists concerning the function and power of the Pope were clearly aimed at decreasing his importance. These "Maxims of the Parisian School," supported by the writings of such medieval luminaries as Jean Gerson, Pierre d'Ailly, Jacques Almain, and John Mair, endorsed the relatively independent authority of the bishops in their respective dioceses, but they refused to consider the Pope a universal bishop. They demanded superiority of the general council over the Pope and maintained that the council could convene even without the Pope. They concluded that the Pope was in no way omnipotent and that natural law, canon law, and even the civil law of Christian nations placed limits upon his authority. Yet the French theologians unanimously acknowledged the true primacy of the Pope, his universal authority, and his position as the center of the unity of Christians.

Of course, none of these ideas was intended to sacrifice a single one of the privileges traditionally called "Liberties of the Gallican Church." On this point their views were clearly political and identical with that of Parliament which saw itself as official guardian of these liberties, which had been codified in 1594 by Pierre Pithou, a lawyer of parliament. While this codification remained authoritative for the whole *ancien régime,* four more treatises on this topic by parliamentary jurists had appeared between 1594 and 1604, with more to come. These works clearly demonstrate to what extent French parliamentary jurists viewed themselves as heirs to the great medieval jurists whose traditions they were continuing. The eighty-three liberties listed by Pithou were unequivocally aimed at restricting the authority of the Holy See in France, limiting its interference to a minimum and at the same time expanding the King's powers relative to religious matters. Although he had no spiritual authority, the King was responsible for the well-being of the French Church, possessing the requisite authority by virtue of divine right. Yet the crown was free of any and all vassalage or state of dependence vis-à-vis the Pope. Parliamentary jurists and theologians alike appeared sensitive to a high degree on all issues concerning the person of the King, who was regarded as sacrosanct. The theological faculties repeatedly censured writings which sought to justify not only the Pope's authority to depose a ruler guilty of heresy but even theories advocating tyrannicide. This latter issue was especially sensitive because the assassinations by Jacques Clément, Jean Chatel, and Ravaillac were not yet forgotten. So it was not surprising that essays by the Jesuits Mariana (1611) and Santarelli (1625), one an apologia for regicide, the other a demand for papal authority to depose kings, provoked great excitement and censure. All of this contributed towards maintaining a state of latent tension which was skillfully manipulated until the time of the Revolution by kings and ministers intent on expanding the power of the monarchy.

The manifestations of Gallicanism, however, continued to be relatively moderate; its advocates kept a low profile by avoiding extremism. This was shown in the events surrounding the writings of Edmond Richer (1560–1631).[1] Richer, a priest from Langres who was a creative personality with an excellent education, became syndic of the theological faculty of Paris in 1608. In 1606 he had published the writings of Gerson with additional annotations and treatises designed to emphasize the latter's Gallican tendencies. In 1610 Bellarmine published his *Tractatus de potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaeum*, which emphatically reclaimed the rights of the Holy See. Richer replied in 1611 with a small brochure of only thirty pages, *De ecclesiastica et civili potestate libellus*, which summarized in the name of the tradition of the Parisian School his own very extreme ideas. According to him temporal and spiritual authority—each in its respective realm—are sovereign and independent. But he goes beyond that in asserting that the Church possesses spiritual authority only and must be subordinate to the King in all temporal matters and requirements. He agrees with Gerson that the Pope is merely the prime minister of the Church, whereas the Church's head is Jesus Christ. But while Gerson meant to say that the Pope is Christ's deputy receiving from him the authority for the commonweal of the Church, Richer interpreted this concept in a way that conceded nothing more than an executive authority to the Pope. The actual legislative authority, the leadership, is constituted in the general council, which alone is infallible because infallibility is a property only of the whole Church, whose representatives comprise the general council. The Pope is responsible only for the *status*, that is for the implementation of the canons issued by the council, but he can not impose anything binding upon the Church without its consent. Richer, however, avoided the multitudinism advocated by Marco-Antonio de Dominis, the apostate archbishop of Spalato, who defected to the English schism. In Richer's view Christ has entrusted jurisdiction of the Church to the totality of the priestly order within which the bishops represent the Apostles and the pastors the seventy-two disciples. The Church, then, is led by an aristocracy, the bishops, who by divine right are above the priests and whose authority is binding even on the Pope. The episcopate does not constitute an order of its own since the body of the priesthood is already realized in the priests; instead it constitutes simply an office which, derived from divine right, gives them an immediate jurisdiction independent of the Holy See. In its roots Richer's theory is thus a form of episcopalism which strongly projects the rights of the clergy and the faithful even if they are subordinate to those of the bishops. By stressing the fact that the *Depositum fidei* is indivisibly entrusted to the complete Church, Richer concludes that a dogmatic statement can become obligatory only if agreed to by the total Church and that neither the Pope nor the bishops can force the acceptance of such a statement upon the Church without its agreement. To all practical extent, this makes the faithful into judges of the dogma. One of his pupils, Simon Vigor (1556–1624), a member of the grand council, paralleled Richer in several of his works, which extended the Gallicanism of his teacher to an extreme point: he denied the Pope any and all primacy and declared invalid all definitions and institutions issued or established after the fifth century.

---

[1] See E. Puyol, *Edmond Richer, étude historique et critique sur la renovation du gallicanisme au commencement du XVII^{e} siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1876).

The publication of Richer's *Libellus* created considerable excitement at the universities and in political circles. Rome immediately pronounced condemnations, but they were neither unexpected nor did they have any practical significance, because one of the infamous Gallican Liberties stipulated that the decrees of the Holy Office would not be accepted in France. But the condemnation of the work by a provincial council (March 1612) chaired by the famous Cardinal du Perron in the archbishopric of Sens, to which Paris was subordinated at that time, was quite serious. The theological faculty joined in the condemnation and—for the first time since its existence—dismissed its syndic. Richer took a stand and emphatically defended his ideas in several publications, in turn provoking numerous replies, before he finally admitted defeat. On 30 July 1622 he was prudent enough to sign a declaration submitting to the Holy See and maintaining that it had been his intention merely to "summarize the old teachings of the Parisian School." In actuality he persisted in his viewpoints; even another recantation forced on him by Richelieu on 7 December 1629 did not change that. Richer continued to attract followers. While, in 1630, France was not yet ready for his ideas, these were to reemerge in the Jansenism of the eighteenth century and take on great significance.

Richer's most determined opponent in this fight was another professor at the Sorbonne, André Duval (1564–1638).[2] His views demonstrate clearly how far those Frenchmen who—in relative terms—were most dedicated to the idea of ultramontanism were willing to go. Duval, a professor at the Sorbonne since 1597, had opposed Richer ever since the latter had published Gerson's works in 1606. A friend of the Jesuits and of Nuncio Barberini, later Pope Urban VIII, Duval in effect defended views which openly favored the rights of the Holy See, but he avoided any one-sidedness. In 1612 he replied to Richer in an elenchus sharply rejecting his adversary's *Libellus*. In addition to several other pamphlets he wrote two rather more significant works relating to this quarrel: *De suprema romani pontificis in Ecclesiam potestate* (1614) and *Tractatus de summi pontificis auctoritate* (1622), the latter opposing Simon Vigor. The ideas developed in these works are remarkably balanced, moderate and conciliatory. He determines very precisely those points actually stipulated by Christian faith and respects freedom of opinion vis-à-vis others. Regarding the superiority of the general council over the authority of the Pope he remarks that the theological faculty of Paris alone supports this view, but he presents these opposing views objectively and refrains from rendering a qualifying judgment on either position. He openly defends the personal infallibility of the Pope without, however, raising the accusation of heresy against those who deny it. With this presupposition he advocates the view that a doctrinal decision by the Pope can actually be binding on the faithful only after the universal Church has accepted it at least tacitly. This does not go as far as the theories of Bellarmine, from whom Duval candidly disassociates himself. While obliging the ruler to respect those privileges which are the Pope's, he upholds the King's independence in the temporal and political realm; Duval later concurred in the condemnation of Santarelli's book. It is obvious, then, how moderate Duval's so-called ultramontanism was in comparison to Rome's demands.

---

[2] See A. Dodin, "Duval," *DSAM* 3 (1957) 1857–62; L. Cognet, "Duval," *DHGE* 14 (1960), 1213–16.

Richelieu and the Holy See

In 1612 Duval said of Richer and his views that the hot-tempered syndic unwittingly paved the way for the schism. As a matter of fact, from this point on some French Catholics considered a more or less total divorce from the Holy See. In the Estates General of 1614 the Third Estate proposed a basic law which was to stipulate France as being immediately dependent only on God, but du Perron wisely thwarted this undertaking. The attitude of numerous clerics during Marie de Médicis' regency provided Rome with a feeling of relief. After the Regent transferred the conduct of foreign affairs to Richelieu in 1617, the latter began concealing his true sentiments, allowing the nuncio to think that he was squarely on the side of the Holy See and Spain. Not until 1621 when he urged the King to resist Spain did he give even a hint of his true position. Spain, as a great Catholic nation, traditionally could count on the support of the Holy See. In his conflict with Spain, which even within France was opposed by the *parti dévot,* Richelieu thus had to ensure himself of Rome's neutrality by any available means. Blackmailing Rome with the issue of Gallicanism was the most effective method towards achieving this aim and the cardinal-minister made use of it unscrupulously. In the messages of gratitude written after his elevation to the cardinalate (September 1622) he praised the kindness of the King, but never once mentioned the Pope. At that time Richer's ideas found a responsive chord at the Sorbonne and Richelieu had defended the theological faculty against the ultramontanist tendencies of Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld. At the same time he engaged in several demonstrative diplomatic and military initiatives which could not but have disquieted the Holy See: an alliance with the Protestant united provinces, negotiations with the German Protestants, attacks on the papal fortifications in the Veltlin and ratification of a treaty very favorable to the Huguenots (5 February 1626). This makes it clear why he did not intervene in 1625 and 1626 when the Assembly of the Clergy, the Sorbonne, and Parliament, on the issue of Santarelli's book, sharply condemned ultramontanism. He managed to make a decided enemy of Urban VIII and turned the sentiments of the French *parti dévot* against himself. After June 1626, when he needed the Pope's support in the Mantua problem, he tried to reverse his policies. He kept the Sorbonne from publishing its censure of Santarelli and increased his political concessions. In France he resumed the fight against the members of the Reformed Churches.

But this was a mere episode, and Urban VIII saw through it although he, too, made a conciliatory move. At the end of 1628 Richelieu entered the war against Austria and again signed treaties with the Protestants of Germany and England. The Pope now stiffened his attitude against the minister by systematically denying him all favors he requested. In spite of Richelieu's urging he refused to elevate Father Joseph to the cardinalate (1632) and made Mazarin wait for it a long time (1641). In 1634 he prevented Richelieu's having himself named bishop of Speyer, which would have given the cardinal access to the German College of Electors. He also refused him several briefs in matters of the episcopate and the religious orders, and, most importantly, he never agreed to nullify the marriage of Gaston d'Orléans, which was essential to Richelieu's politics. After the latter declared war on Spain (26 May 1635) the situation was further aggravated. In order to defy Urban VIII, Richelieu appointed Marshal d'Estrées, who was known for his temper and crudity, ambassador to Rome. The marshal occasioned so many incidents that in 1639 his equerry, Rouvray, was murdered. Almost simultaneously the Pope, in a countermove, appointed Scotti, hardly an ideal choice, as the new nuncio to Paris. It is accurate to say that the Pope at this particular time enjoyed considerable sympathy among the French episcopate, which was up in arms about the heavy taxation imposed on the Church's possessions by Richelieu. Public opinion for the better part did not approve of this opposition to the Holy See.

This tense situation explains why Urban VIII used all means to prevent Richelieu from assuming any sort of legal or canonical authority over the Church of France. The minister, eager in every way to consolidate his power, had long wanted such authority. In 1627, during a short span in which his relations with Rome were somewhat less aggravated, he let it be known discreetly that he would be glad to accept the title of permanent papal legate to France; ultimately he unequivocably demanded the title. Although Richelieu argued the precedent of Cardinal d'Amboise, Urban VIII, convinced of the cardinal's schismatic intentions, did not relent. It was only with great reluctance that he offered him the title for the limited period of a few months after the birth of the Dauphin, but Richelieu declined.

In 1635 Richelieu began to develop a new plan. The obligation on the part of the French clergy to obtain bulls for the canonical investiture of various church benefices from the Holy See, sanctioned in the Concordat of 1516, was obviously very unpopular and led to a number of protests. What Richelieu had in mind was branding the Concordat as illegal and contradictory to the old church discipline, and returning the privilege of electing bishops to the chapters. Subsequently he planned to call a national council into session where the King was to forego his regalia, which was very oppressive to the dioceses. In return he was to be given the right to hand out benefices directly and without participation by the Holy See. The final stage provided for Richelieu to be appointed patriarch of Gallia or of the Occident, with privileges similar to those of an Eastern patriarch. This would make the French Church almost independent of Rome in all but matters of faith, and the Pope would actually retain no more than an honorary primacy. Richelieu appears to have soon made a few politicians he trusted privy to his plan. Among them Chancellor Séguier, who suggested the royal councilor Pierre de Marca, in his role as a jurist, and several newspaper writers capable of propagating the idea among the public. Richelieu was well aware of the great difficulties he faced in trying to realize his plan. He also knew how difficult it would be to win the French public over to his scheme. He hoped to win public opinion over to his side by personally initiating a mass conversion of Protestants, who would look favorably upon such an undertaking by a French patriarch. This explains his mild treatment of the defeated Calvinists whom he allowed the free exercise of their cult. Polemicists in the minister's pay were ordered to extend concessions to members of the Reformed Churches as far as possible. As a result several pastors were won over. Richelieu even thought of calling a spectacular conference of Protestants with him as their protagonist.

In order to create a basis for his plan, Richelieu again facilitated publications with Gallican tendencies. This was the case with an anonymous pamphlet, *Le Nonce du Pape français* (1637), probably written by one of the cardinal's confidants, which asked the King to end the oppression of France by papal power and to create instead an ecclesiastic authority independent of the Holy See. Public reaction was more negative than positive. Two years later, in 1639, the brothers Dupuy, two well-known scholars, published two works by order of the minister: the *Traité des droits et libertés de l'Église gallicane*, a voluminous folio, followed by *Preuves des libertés de l'Église gallicane*.[3] These works, based on ample documentation, virtually did away with everything, including the special privileges of the Pope and immunity of the clergy. The public was greatly perturbed. On the initiative of Cardinal La Rochefoucauld, who defended Rome, and Nuncio Bolognetti, eighteen bishops present in Paris severely censured the work. The cardinal-minister permitted the censure, but did not in any way suppress the books of the brothers Dupuy.

---

[3] See P. Demante, "Histoire de la publication des livres de P. Du Puy sur les libertés de l'Église gallicane," *BÉCh*, ser. 1, 5 (Paris 1843).

At that point the project of the Gallican patriarchate was beginning to be talked about, although in cryptic fashion. By January 1646 the public had become so sensitized to the subject that the tiny pamphlet *Optatus gallus de cavendo schismate*, announcing the impending schism, created an enormous emotional response. The author, whom Richelieu could not identify, was Charles Hersent, a former Oratorian. Initially the minister was very annoyed with the pamphlet. But then it probably occurred to him that the *Optatus gallus* incident, given the proper exaggerative embellishment, would alarm Rome sufficiently to form the basis for extensive extortion. So he ordered several of his favorites to reply to the *Optatus gallus*. One of the replies, whose author, the Jesuit Rabardeau, made it appear to be coming officially from Richelieu himself, represented the establishment of the patriarchate as being totally legitimate and in no way schismatic. In fact, several Jesuits openly supported Richelieu's plan. The most significant of the replies was one by Marcas, *De concordia sacerdotii et imperii* (1641), who sought to prove that the Gallican Liberties did not run counter to the rights of the Holy See.[4] Rome appeared to take the apparent schismatic intentions of Richelieu very seriously, especially when he confirmed them by various measures designed to prevent all contact between the nuncio and the episcopate. But Urban VIII was clever enough to exercise extreme restraint. In time Richelieu had to admit to himself that his plan of a patriarchate was not meeting with a favorable response from the public, especially when the war against Spain as well as his domestic policies were becoming more and more unpopular. When Richelieu died on 4 December 1642 the issue was unresolved. Urban VIII manifested his sentiments for the dead prelate by forbidding the solemn mass for the dead, customarily celebrated in Rome at the death of a cardinal.

Mazarin, although a cardinal, was hardly an ecclesiastic personality in the customary sense; he was unable to continue Richelieu's undertakings. And yet he inherited his policies, especially in regard to Spain, and thereby incurred Rome's enmity. Innocent X scorned Mazarin as much as his predecessor Urban VIII had hated Richelieu. But now the Jansenist conflict began to interfere with Gallicanism and to slightly modify the respective positions.[5] The attitude of the French government became unequivocally anti-Jansenist, a position it would maintain for some time to come. It was its anti-Jansenism that forced the French court constantly to appeal to the dogmatic authority of the Holy See. This met with some benevolence on the part of the papal court. Originally Rome had been favorably disposed towards the French *milieu dévot*, the traditional defender of papal rights, and had emphasized this attitude by refusing to condemn Arnauld's *Fréquente Communion* as requested by Mazarin. But when the *milieu dévot* turned into the Jansenist party, Rome was forced to intercede against it. While this created an area of rapprochement with the French court, Rome's reticence nonetheless remained obvious. Mazarin experienced this in the upheavals during the *Fronde* when he found himself in opposition to the famous Cardinal Retz, coadjutor of Paris, who had automatically succeeded his uncle François Gondi as archbishop after the latter's death on 3 March 1654. Upon his flight Retz sought refuge in Rome in September 1654. Innocent X welcomed him benignly; he treated him according to his station as archbishop and cardinal and denied Mazarin the right to appoint a commission of bishops for the purpose of initiating a trial against Retz. Mazarin was forced to dispatch Lionne as ambassador to Rome to negotiate this matter. After the death of Innocent X, Lionne could not prevent the election of Fabio Chigi, the former nuncio of Paris, who was not well disposed towards France. Lionne thus encountered great difficulty when he worked out an agreement regarding the temporary administration of the Parisian diocese. This dilemma was not resolved until the dismissal of Cardinal Retz in 1661. The Holy See also stubbornly refused Mazarin and young Louis XIV the extension of the Concordat of 1516 to the newly conquered areas, especially the diocese of Arras.

---

[4] F. Gaquère, *P. de Marca (1594–1662). Sa vie, ses œuvres, son gallicanisme* (Paris 1932).

[5] See L. Cognet, "Le jansénisme drame gallican," *L'Année canonique* 10 (1965), 75–83.

The Gallicanism of Louis XIV

During the last years of his life Mazarin had been determined to maintain the status quo. But under young Louis XIV this position underwent a fundamental change. Imbued with absolutist ideas, the King strove for religious as well as political unity in his realm. Moreover, he was surrounded by advisers with decidedly Gallican tendencies, among them his confessors Father Annat and Father de la Chaize,[6] who—although they were Jesuits—were shaped by the Gallican tradition. A revival of Gallican ideas can be perceived from the very beginning of the grand monarch's absolute rule. On 12 December 1661 the Flemish Jesuit Coret presented theses at Clermont College in which he defended the infallibility of the Pope in the *quaestio juris* as well as in the *quaestio facti.* In so doing he provoked a lively controversy. Louis XIV rebuked Coret and ordered him to be silent because he did not want to provide the Jansenists with additional arguments by a discussion on the Pope's infallibility. The violent confrontation between the Corsican guards and the French soldiers which took place on 20 August 1662, not far from the Palazzo Farnese, seat of the French ambassador, apparently had no doctrinal significance, but Louis XIV used the occasion to threaten an invasion of the Papal States and to humiliate the Pope, who was ultimately forced to capitulate at the Peace of Pisa (12 February 1664). In January 1663 Gabriel Drouet de Villeneuve had meanwhile presented some theses to the Sorbonne which openly advocated papal authority, calling the Gallican Liberties simple privileges granted by the Holy See. A parliamentary decree censured three of these theses on 22 January. The Sorbonne was very indignant over this incursion into its decision-making area. Bossuet, at that time just embarking on his Parisian career, endangered his advancement by joining the opponents. On 1 March the Sorbonne capitulated. But a month later, on 4 April, another incident occurred regarding the theses of Laurent Desplantes, a Cistercian monk, who granted to the Pope total jurisdictional authority in the entire Church *in foro externo* as well as *in foro interno*. The court and parliament vehemently demonstrated their opposition and took repressive steps. On 11 May, upon the intervention of the King's minister Michel Tellier,[7] the Sorbonne signed six clauses in favor of the independence of the King and of the Gallican Liberties, rejecting both the Pope's superiority over the council and his infallibility. A year later, in April 1664, the faculty censured a work by the Carmelite friar Bonaventura Hérédie,[8] published under the pseudonym Vernant, which defended extreme Montanist theses. In February 1665 a work published under the name of Guimenius was censured as well. Authored by the Jesuit Mateo Moya, it defended the casuists and acknowledged papal infallibility.[9] This time Rome reacted: the bull *Cum ad aures* by Alexander VII (25 June 1665)[10] condemned and annulled the faculty's censure. On 29 July Attorney General Talon delivered a vehement indictment of the document in parliament, but in the end the matter was permitted to rest: on the eve of the war with England, Louis XIV did not want the additional burden of clashing with the Holy See. At the same time the Jansenist conflict reached a critical juncture and the French court had to call for the assistance of the authority of Rome several times. This explains the relative quiet lasting until the Clementine Peace (1668) and beyond.

---

[6] See G. Guitton, *Le P. de la Chaize confesseur de Louis XIV,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959).

---

[7] See L. André, *Michel Le Tellier et Louvois* (Paris 1942), 448; J. Sahuc, *Un ami de Port-Royal, messire Pierre Jean François de Percin de Montgaillard* (Paris 1909), 37–43.

[8] *La défense de l'autorité de Notre Saint Père le Pape et de Messeigneurs les cardinaux, les archevêques et évêques et de l'emploi des religieux mendicants contre less erreurs de ce temps* (Metz 1658).

[9] *Amadaei Guimenii Lomarensis opusculum singularia universae fere theologiae moralis complectens* (Lyon 1664).

[10] Text of the bull: J. Boileau, *Recueil,* 92–96.

Yet Louis XIV continued his efforts towards religious unity in his realm and to insist upon extending the Concordat of 1516 to all the areas subject to him, to bishoprics as well as abbeys. This presupposed a broadening of the right of regalia, the spiritual regalia which enabled the King to fill the benefices of a bishop while the bishopric was vacant, and the secular regalia enabling the King to gain possession of the income of vacant bishoprics. An edict of 10 February 1673 made this extension official and a declaration of 2 April 1675 recognized the measure. It applied to approximately sixty dioceses, for the most part in the southern provinces, which had been exempt from the regalia. Almost all bishops submitted, although in some cases with covert resistance. Only two resisted openly: Nicolas Pavillon, bishop of Alet, and François Étienne Caulet, bishop of Pamiers. Both of them had already demonstrated their independence on the issue of the formulary. Thus Jansenism unequivocally manifested its opposition to Gallicanism. In their instructions Pavillon and Caulet expressly rejected the sovereign rights and submitted the matter to the Assembly of the Clergy of 1675. They simultaneously excommunicated the prebendaries named on the title of the regalia.[11] To be sure, Pavillon and Caulet presided over tiny, out-of-the way dioceses, but were venerated as examples of the episcopate because of their virtue. Louis XIV hesitated to engage in open conflict with them because he knew that part of the public would not concur in it. Not until the middle of 1677 did he decide to intervene by having the council of state annul the instructions of the two rebellious bishops, who promptly turned to the Holy See for support. Innocent XI, elected in 1676, had immediately proved his zeal for ecclesiastic reform by abolishing nepotism and by defending his rights against the princes. It could be assumed that he favored the opponents of the regalia, but he had not as yet spoken out on this point. On 30 July 1677 Pavillon sent a letter to Innocent XI by way of one of the recluses of Port-Royal, Pontchâteau.[12] The latter was supported by the Roman Jansenists and could easily have convinced the Pope to side with the anti-regalists.[13] Unfortunately Pavillon died shortly thereafter (18 December 1677) and the regalia were immediately extended to his diocese. The burden of the fight was now on Caulet, who had been condemned by his metropolitan, the archbishop of Toulouse, and had turned to the Pope on 26 October 1677. In a highly laudatory brief of 2 March 1678, Innocent XI sided with the prelate against the King. Certain of Rome's support, Caulet now opposed the King in ever more vehement fashion. In 1679 this resulted in the confiscation of his benefices. There followed two additional briefs, of 20 December 1679 and 17 July 1680, which praised the bishop even more than the first one had. But Caulet died on 7 August 1680 without having received the last brief. Meanwhile the foreign minister, Arnauld de Pomponne, a nephew of the Great Arnauld, who had exercised a moderating influence on the King, had fallen out of favor[14] and the King stiffened his attitude. But several incidents in connection with church appointments in which Innocent XI annulled decisions of Louis XIV made it clear that the Pope, too, was not willing to give in (see Chap. 8).

---

[11] L. Bertrand, *Bibliothèque sulpicienne ou histoire littéraire de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice*, 3 vols. (Paris 1900), III, 42–57.

[12] See B. Neveu, *Sébastien Joseph du Cambout de Pontchâteau (1634–1690) et ses missions à Rome* (Paris 1969).

[13] See A. Latreille, "Innocent XI, pape janséniste, directeur de conscience de Louis XIV," *Cahiers d'Histoire publiés par les universités de Grenoble, Lyon et Clermont-Ferrand* 1 (1956), 9–39.

But the matter of Pamiers was by no means ended by Caulet's death: the chapter elected a new chapter vicar who continued the resistance and was supported in it by Rome. Next, Louis XIV tried to intimidate Innocent XI by furnishing proof that he had public opinion and the clergy well in hand. He ordered publication of the treatise *De l'autorité légitime des rois en matière de régale* (1682) by the reporter on petitions in the council of state, Le Vayer de Boutigny, who vigorously defended the regalia. At the same time the plenary Assembly of the Clergy of 1680 and another assembly at the beginning of 1681 assured the King of their loyalty. But Louis XIV was resolved to escalate his intimidation. On 31 October 1681 he convoked a special plenary assembly, attempting to lend to it the significance of a genuine national council. The deputies were carefully selected and demonstrated total deference to the royal power. Bossuet played a significant part in this assembly, but in reality he was a mere instrument in the hands of the archbishop of Paris, François Harlay de Champvallon, a figure of dubious morality who nonetheless had the King's ear. On 3 February 1682 the assembly officially accepted the extension of the right of regalia; on 19 March it published the four articles of the famous Declaration of the French Clergy (*Declaratio cleri gallicani*). This document asserted the independence of civil authority in secular matters and the council's superiority over the Pope. His authority was thereby limited to the Church canons; his decisions, even in matters of faith, were to be subject to concurrence by the total Church. On 23 March a royal decree ordered the *Declaratio* to be included in the curriculum of all universities and seminaries. But this incurred strong opposition from the clergy and the public. Innocent

---

[14] C. Gérin, "La disgrâce de M. de Pomponne," *RQH* 23 (1878), 170.

XI openly showed his bitterness, but the Roman commission charged with examining the four articles could not agree upon the qualification to be imposed upon it. Innocent XI therefore chose not to take any official measures. He merely refused to issue the bulls for canonical investiture to those new bishops who had participated in the assembly of 1682. As a consequence France had thirty-five vacant bishoprics in January 1688.

Around this time the conflict between France and Rome reached another climax. To restore orderly conditions to the city of Rome, Innocent XI had revoked the quartering privileges of houses located in close proximity to the embassies in 1677 (see Chap. 8). But Louis XIV had refused to yield to this measure. So the bull *Cum alias* of 12 May 1687 excommunicated those who acted contrary to the decree. On 16 November 1687 the new French ambassador, Marquis de Lavardin, entered Rome at the head of 100 armed men. In spite of having been excommunicated, he had the sacraments administered to himself in full view of the public at the church of San Luigi dei Francesi. As a result the church was interdicted. At the beginning of January 1688 Innocent XI secretly informed Louis XIV that he and his ministers had been excommunicated.[15] The King immediately took several countermeasures. On 22 February 1688 General Harlay, speaking before parliament, appealed the decision to a general council; the following day the Solicitor General Talon delivered a violent indictment against Innocent XI in which he renewed the prior appeal and stated that the newly appointed bishops would simply forego the papal bulls of investiture. A decree to this effect was approved by parliament and posted in Rome on 8 February by Lavardin. At the same time Louis XIV openly prepared the occupation of the papal possessions of Avignon and Comtat-Venaissin. Innocent XI expressed his indignation, but did not pronounce an official condemnation of the action because he felt that even in Rome a number of cardinals would not support his unyielding stance. Next, Louis XIV, wanting to bring about the election of an elector-bishop in Cologne who was well inclined towards France, attempted to establish improved rapport with the Holy See by using the services of a secret agent. But Innocent XI rejected these overtures. On 16 September Louis XIV occupied Avignon and Comtat-Venaissin. On 27 September he formally renewed his appeal to the general council and had it recognized by several clerical bodies, among them the various theological faculties. Finally, he not only had the papal nuncio, Ranuzzi, unlawfully jailed, but he also forbade the bishops and Jesuits any and all correspondence with Rome. The actions of Louis XIV against Rome were actually supported by many Jesuits, among them Father de la Chaize, the King's confessor. Since 1675 the *Conseil de conscience* which had to decide religious matters had consisted merely of La Chaize and Harlay who, by the way, were agreed in only one thing, namely to calm down the King regarding his differences of opinion with the Holy See. The general public liked Innocent XI and was not well inclined towards the King's intransigent position, but through forged documents, skillfully propagated by the King's minister, Colbert de Croissy, in the summer of 1688, public opinion was modified somewhat on this point. But the majority of the Jansenist party remained loyal to the Pope. This in turn gave the necessary argument to La Chaize that prompted him to accuse Innocent XI himself of Jansenism.[16] The situation was now in danger of entering a period of stagnation, when suddenly it was fundamentally altered by an unforeseen event: the conquest of England in November–December 1688 by William of Orange. Faced with this new danger, Louis XIV attempted rapprochement with Rome and recalled Lavardin. But Innocent XI, without even referring to his previous statements, remained silent, made no official decisions, and continued to keep the King's excommunication secret. The Pope died on 12 August 1689 without having issued a single act against the regalia, against the Declaration of the French Clergy 1682 or the appeal to the general council of 1688, and, lastly, without having had an idea that his patience had paved the way for Jansenism in the eighteenth century.

---

[15] See M. Dubruel, "L'excommunication de Louis XIV," *Études* 137 (1913), 608–35.

During the pontificate of the very conciliatory Innocent XII (1692) the aim was mutual pacification. An agreement was achieved in September 1693. The conflict regarding the regalia, which was destined never to be resolved, was simply ignored. A letter from Louis XIV to the Pope said that all possible steps had been taken to prevent the execution of the edict of 1682 concerning the Four Articles. In the future, relations between Rome and France achieved a relatively peaceful "modus vivendi" lasting for the remainder of the *ancien régime*. Yet the ideas involved in the dispute went their own way (on the subject of the State Church see Chaps. 17 and 23).

Protestantism in Seventeenth-Century France

After the death of Henry IV, Catholics as well as Protestants considered the regime established by the Edict of Nantes a mere armistice in a continuing state of opposition. Hardly anyone perceived in it the basis for mutual toleration. At this time the Huguenot party knew themselves to be a minority, but they did not give up. The regency of Marie de Médicis was not well disposed towards them, indeed it brought men of the Catholic Counter Reformation to power. The renewal of Catholic spirituality deprived the Huguenots of the esteem they enjoyed because of the deep personal piety of many of them. From this point on, conversions from Protestantism to Catholicism increased while those in the other direction decreased. The Huguenots were therefore firmly resolved to make full use of the guaranties given them by the Edict of Nantes and indeed even to broaden them. Accordingly the assembly of La Rochelle in May 1621 established a military structure for the whole of France in which the country was divided into eight districts. While the plan did not come to full fruition, it nonetheless formed the basis for the Protestant rebellions of 1622 and 1626. But the Huguenots encountered resistance on the part of Richelieu, who had his own ideas in this matter. He was not about to tolerate the creation of a state within the state by the Reformed religion nor that it maintain connections with foreign powers. So he decided to subjugate La Rochelle, the bastion of the Calvinists, which was considered to be impervious to attack. The city surrendered after a terrible siege of eleven months. Although Bérulle and the *parti dévot* tried to talk Richelieu into exterminating all vestiges of heresy, the cardinal refused to follow up his victory. The Peace of Alais (28 June 1629) granted to the Calvinists the free exercise of their religion and equality in the service of the King, but it deprived them of their military guarantees. In this way Richelieu was not only hoping to keep his connections with Germany's Protestants intact, but perhaps—as has been mentioned—even to become the promoter of a general return to the faith by the Protestants. This would have put him in a very strong position with the Holy See. Mazarin, on the other hand, preferred to let the matter rest, especially since the Protestants had been clever enough to render proof of their very deep loyalty during the upheavals of the *Fronde*.

---

[16] See J. Bruckner, "Le P. de la Chaize dans les conflits de Louis XIV avec Innocent XI," *Études* 160 (1919), 304–23.

Intolerance was the rule on both sides. There was not a single Assembly of the Clergy that did not remind the King to work towards the destruction of heresy; in every one of these assemblies complaints were voiced about the "unholy freedom of conscience" granted to the Reformed Church. The Protestant congregations, numerically inferior in most areas, had to suffer manifold insults from the Catholics almost everywhere, but wherever they themselves were in the majority they in turn harassed the minority loyal to Rome. Protestants and Catholics lived in a sort of mutual fear of each other which frequently led to indelible hatred. It was only within the educated and moneyed classes that friendly relationships could at times exist.

The beginning of the absolute reign of Louis XIV brought about certain changes. In the very limited intellectual horizon of the King, whose ignorance in religious matters was well known at court, the political unity of the kingdom had to be followed by religious unity as well. The cohesion and power of the Protestant community appeared dangerous to him, especially since this active, diligent, and enterprising minority[17] possessed a significant part of the national wealth. He therefore more or less confessed to a desire to weaken it if not to disband it altogether. Initially he thought that he would reach his goals by means of an intellectual controversy and by withdrawing royal favor from them. After 1660 the learned disputes on Christian dogma gained added intensity. Bossuet stood out through his keen perspicacity and his irenic spirit. It was probably in collaboration with Arnauld that he created a masterful work, *Exposition de la foi catholique* (1671), in which Roman dogma was rid of its incidental elements and the difficult issues were presented with remarkable skill. As mentioned above, the people of Port-Royal played a significant role; the very aspect of their inward Christianity, oriented along biblical and liturgical lines, brought them closer to the Protestants. These disputes also led to positive results, the most manifest being the public abjuration by Turenne (23 October 1668), which was the culmination of a long intellectual development. There was in fact no dearth of Reformed who desired reunification and a return to the oneness of the Church. And so there were several common attempts along those lines. From 1660 to 1662 Marshall Fabert negotiated with the pastor of Sedan, Le Blanc de Beaulieu. Around 1665 Bossuet received instructions from a kind of semiofficial conference formed around the royal minister Le Tellier and the royal confessor Father Annat, with the participation of Turenne, to negotiate with the well-known Pastor Ferry. After the Peace of Aachen (2 May 1668) Turenne, who by now had converted, conceived a comprehensive plan which envisioned winning over at least fifty absolutely reliable pastors and convening a conference with them. The positive outcome of such a conference could not but have an impact on the very spirit of the Reformed. He also planned the revocation of the Edict of Nantes for some point in the future when the conversion of the majority of Protestants would have made the edict academic. Nuncio Bargellini was toying with similar ideas. Turenne appears actually to have been successful with some of the pastors, but he encountered the firm resistance of the intransigent faction of Calvinists who did their utmost to nip the plan in the bud. The war against

---

[17] About the relationship between Protestantism and the development of modern economy cf. the classic analysis by Max Weber, "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialethik* 20/21 (1904–05).

Holland and the death of Turenne put a final stop to it. So the "cabal of the mediators between the religions"—as it was called then—proved unavailing.

There were moral and religious, but also material and financial reasons for that failure. Indeed it took money to aid the newly converted and especially the pastors, who were frequently abandoned to misery by their return to the Roman Church. Earlier, the only money available had been in the form of private donations, above all from the famous *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*, known to be extremely hostile to the Calvinists. Aside from these, very limited contributions had been solicited from the Assemblies of the Clergy. Turenne had finally managed to interest Louis XIV in this problem. At this point the former first secretary of Superintendent Fouquet, Paul Pellison-Fontanier, set to work. He succeeded in persuading the King to create a cash fund, soon known as the "conversion fund" (November 1677), to which was allotted a part of the income from regalia benefices. Famous Protestants such as Jurieu, Bayle and Spanheim raised accusations of corruption, but Innocent XI, Bossuet, Fénelon, Arnauld, and Bourdaloue approved of Pellison's methods. The view prevailed, at any rate, that the application of money could make the use of force unnecessary and that at least the children of converts would become good Catholics. Pellison was also interested in the distribution of Bibles and liturgical texts to the newly converted. His achievements were significant, but more so among the common folk than among the wealthy families.

Meanwhile the Catholic public in France was strongly affected by events in England and the resumption of the persecutions of "Papists." The execution of five Jesuits in London on 30 June 1679 triggered violent emotions, and now the attitude began to prevail that the civil authorities in France were much too tolerant of the heretics. It appeared to Louis XIV that the occasion was ripe for violent measures. Actually such measures had been used since the beginning of his reign: while the Peace of Saint-Germain had been favorable to the Reformed, a new declaration of 1669 applied a much more restrictive and oppressive interpretation to the Edict of Nantes. From 1660 to 1679 there were a mere twelve official acts against the Huguenots; in the six years from 1679 to 1685 there were eighty-five. Not only were all churches, opened after 1598, destroyed, but also those which were in any way found to be in violation of existing laws. In addition, harsh restrictions were imposed on the ministry of pastors. Gradually the Protestants were excluded from the majority of public offices and a large number of professions. But the most effective method was one conceived by the provincial governor of Montauban, Foucault: soldiers were forcibly quartered with the Reformed; their actions were equivalent to those in occupied territories. This was the origin of the infamous *dragonnades* which aroused indignation throughout Europe. Actual responsibility for them must be borne by Minister Louvois and the provincial governor of the Poitou, Marillac. Of course this method effected many conversions and even now some families started emigrating abroad. In 1683 riots took place in Vivarais and in the Dauphiné, but they were bloodily put down.

Neither Father de la Chaize, the King's confessor, nor Mme de Maintenon, however, appear to bear the responsibility—generally ascribed to them—for the way these methods developed.[18] It is certain that the King's motives were religious in only a few of the cases; for the most part they were political in nature. The events in Holland caused him to impute republican sympathies to the Reformed. He was also convinced that his fame would rest on the completion of the work he had initiated: the restoration of the religious unity of the kingdom. Lastly, he hoped that this would make him appear to be the great defender of Catholicism in the eyes of Innocent XI and thus put the latter in a difficult situation regarding Gallicanism. These motives led him to use violent measures which actually did not correspond to his character. When it was noticed in the summer of 1685 that the number of new converts, having reached several hundred thousand, represented a financial problem because they enjoyed freedom from taxation, Louis XIV thought the time had come for a final decision. On 14 October, against the advice of some of those around him, he published the Edict of Fontainebleu. It revoked the Edict of Nantes and prohibited the public exercise of the Reformed religion. With few exceptions, the most famous being that of Vauban, French and even foreign public opinion accepted this act enthusiastically. Innocent XI, who gauged the motives of Louis XIV correctly, was among the most reticent. He waited for a full year before he had a Te Deum celebrated in gratitude. But the revocation also had more serious consequences, both religious and political. The ensuing emigration by the Protestants unbalanced the economy of the realm. The abominable persecution following on the heels of the revocation is a blemish on French Catholicism. The forced conversions prepared the soil for the spread of religious relativism and indifferentism in the eighteenth century (Chap. 18).

The King, moreover, was forced to acknowledge that the revocation was for the most part a failure, for in spite of everything a strong Protestant resistance was kept alive, especially in areas with a traditionally Calvinist majority. Bloody proof of this was furnished by the Camisard rebellion of 1702 in the Cévennes. Painful and dangerous, the condition of the Protestants remained a constant source of unrest for the remainder of the *ancien régime*. It was beyond doubt one of the causes of the Revolution.

---

[18] See C. Pascal, *La révocation de l'Édit de Nantes et Mme de Maintenon* (Paris 1885).

CHAPTER 5

Spirituality in Seventeenth-Century France

Major Trends in Seventeenth-Century Spirituality

The French *milieu dévot*, which made its appearance after the religious wars and brought about a true renewal of Catholicism, exhibited very clear directions within its spirituality.[1] Despite the chaotic conditions, French spiritual literature was abundant during the whole of the sixteenth and the first third of the seventeenth century, but it consisted almost totally of translations.[2] The foremost were the great authors of Rhenish-Flemish mysticism, Tauler, Suso, Harphius, Ruysbroeck, Louis de Blois and the *Perle Evangélique*; Spaniards such as Louis of Granada and above all John of Ávila; later on Saint Teresa[3] and John of the Cross also played a significant role; the Italians are represented by the *Combat spirituel* of Saint Catherine of Genoa. These mystics, who combined Platonic theories with the mysticism of Nordic spirituality, were strongly influenced by the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius, excellently translated by the Feuillant friar Dom Goulu into French. The foundations were laid for a spiritual forum characterized by a mysticism whose ultimate fulfillment of the inner life was an immediate union with the divine essence, surpassing all created means and even the humanity of Christ. The growing influence of this "abstract school" was favored by the impassioned predilection of this period for mysticism. The period is rich with mystics who enjoyed great esteem. While some of them, such as Mme Acarie[4] and later the blessed Carmelite Marie de l'Incarnation (1566–1618) belonged to the noblest Parisian society, there were others like Marie Teysonnier (Marie de Valence) (1570–1648) and Marie des Vallées (1590–1656), the Saint of Coutances, who came from the poorer classes.[5] Their mystical experiences were interpreted by those around them in a very abstract sense.

---

[1] See Louis Cognet, *Les origines de la spiritualité française aux XVII^e siècle* (Paris 1949).

[2] Bibliographical selection: J. Dagens, *Bibliographie chronologique de la littérature de piété et de ses sources, 1501–1610* (Paris 1952).

[3] See P. Sérouet, *De la vie dévote à la vie mystique* (Paris 1958); A. Vermeylen, *Sainte Thérèse en France au XVII^e siècle* (Louvain 1958).

[4] See Bruno de Jésus-Marie, *La Belle Acarie* (Paris 1942).

To complete the picture, it should be mentioned that parallel to the mystical trend there was also a propensity for the diabolic. It originated in the Middle Ages and persisted throughout the seventeenth century, at times leading to tragic incidents.[6] The cases of demoniacal possession produced lively curiosity; immense numbers of people hurried to witness these events. In most cases the person accused of being possessed ended up at the stake after a questionable trial. Incidents of this kind can be found throughout the century. Among the best-known cases we might mention those of Elizabeth of Ranfaing at Nancy[7] and of the Ursuline nuns of Loudun (1632–40), whose principals were Prioress Jeanne des Anges and the Jesuit Jean-Joseph Surin (1600–1665), an admirable spiritual author, who had, however, been mentally ill for many years.[8] Public exorcisms degenerated into horrific mass hysteria. But Richelieu, who was personally interested, encouraged them because he hoped they would provide him with decisive arguments against the Protestants. Only towards the end of the century did persecutions of witches and devil trials abate.

The themes of the abstract school were summarized in the work of a Capuchin friar of English origin, Benedict of Canfield (1562–1610). In 1609, almost at the end of his long career as master of novices and guardian, Canfield published his *Règle de perfection*. But the first version was so abstract and contained so many Platonic audacities that his superiors forced him to publish an amended edition in 1610.[9] Of merely mediocre stylistic quality, the work nevertheless went through twenty-five printings in the seventeenth century and had a profound influence. Under the guidance of Dom Beaucousin, prior of the Paris Carthusians, young Bérulle composed a *Bref discours de l'abnégation intérieure* (1597) which was actually no more than a very abstract adaptation of a small Italian work, but it enjoyed lasting success. On the other hand, the monumental *Palais d'amour divin* (1602) by the Capuchin friar Laurent de Paris (1563–1631)[10] as well as the *Sentiers de l'amour divin* (1623) by yet another Capuchin, Constantin de Barbanson (1582–1631),[11] manifesting similar tendencies, were soon forgotten. Although Platonic mysticism slowly became unfashionable after 1630, it did have advocates even into the time of Fénelon. Between the years 1654 and 1659 the work of a blind Carmelite, John of Saint-Samson (1571–1636), a great mystic, appeared posthumously. His writings took up the most extreme themes of Ruysbroeck and Henry of Herp. Also inspired by this kind of mysticism, although on a lesser plane, were François Malaval of Marseilles (1627–1719),[12] also blind, in his *Pratique facile pour élever l'âme à la contemplation* (1664), and the Premonstratensian Epiphanius Louys, abbot of Étival (d. 1682), in his *Conférences mystiques* (1676).

---

[5] See E. Dermenghem, *La vie admirable et les révélations de Marie des Vallées* (Paris 1926).

[6] Valuable bibliographical data in the special issue of *Études carmélitaines*, "Satan" (Paris 1948).

[7] See E. Delcambre and J. Lhermitte, *Un cas énigmatique de possession en Lorraine au XVII^e siècle: Elisabeth de Ranfaing* (Nancy 1956).

[8] Notable edition of letters: J. J. Surin, *Correspondance*, ed. by M. de Certeau (Paris 1966); cf. L. Cognet, "A propos des lettres du P. Surin," *RSR* 56, 2 (1968), 269–82.

[9] See J. Orcibal, "La 'Règle de Perfection' de Benoît de Canfield a-t-elle été interpolée?" *Divinitas* 11 (1967), 845–74.

[10] See C. Dubois-Quinard, *Laurent de Paris, une doctrine du pur amour en France au début du XVII^e siècle* (Rome 1959).

In the reign of Henry IV other spiritual tendencies began to appear which were no less fruitful. In his *Introduction à la vie dévote* (1609) Francis de Sales strove to make Christian perfection attainable for simple Christians all over the world. To this end his *Traité de l'amour de Dieu* (1616) develops an extraordinarily well-balanced concept of Christian mysticism centered around charitable love and a very optimistic view of the possibilities of man, a concept placing him in close proximity to humanism. By leading the soul to a devotion to God in "holy indifference" he points the way for most of the representatives of the classical period of spirituality to follow, each in his own way. Numerous printings of his *Introduction*—almost one a year in the course of the century—were spreading the Salesian view of piety. But although the influence of Francis de Sales was almost worldwide, he yet had no actual disciple or successor, since this designation could not be granted unequivocally even to his friend, the very prolific Jean-Pierre Camus (1584–1652), who authored more than two hundred works and became the founder of the religious novel.[13]

The founder of a true school of spirituality is encountered in the person of Pierre de Bérulle (1575–1629), appointed cardinal in 1627, whose political activities we have already discussed (Chap. 1). Proceeding from the abstract school he brought about a truly Copernican change in the field of spirituality by recognizing the preeminent significance for the inner life of the secret of Jesus' incarnation and by subsequently concentrating his piety on the person of the Incarnate Word. His ideas were first put down in a number of small devotionals which remained unpublished for a long time. It was only when forced to defend his position that he gave definitive shape to his ideas in the twelve volumes of *Discours de l'état et des grandeurs de Jésus* (1623),[14] which he composed with the help of his friend Saint-Cyran. His influence was maintained through the Oratory and the Carmelites and even though—as we shall demonstrate later—his was not the only impulse for the Christological piety of the seventeenth century, it has remained the most significant one. Some of Bérulle's pupils remained loyal to their master's ideas, such as Saint-Cyran and above all the Oratorian François Bourgoing (1585–1662).[15] The many reprints of the latter's *Vérités et excellences de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* (1636) made Bérulle's system accessible to a wide public in the form of devotionals. Guilleaume Gibieuf (1580–1650)[16] who had published Bérulle's collected works in 1644 was the first to come out with a treatise of Platonic orientation, *De libertate Dei et creaturae*. But in his *La vie et grandeurs de la très sainte Vierge Marie* (1637) he initiated the Mariological orientation of Bérullism. Other successors gave their own imprint to Bérulle's ideas. Foremost among those was Charles de Condren (1588–1641), Bérulle's successor in the Oratory, an intellectually curious spirit, but hostile to the written word, whose influence was felt above all by way of the spoken word. In Condren's ideas the themes of vanity of the human creature and of sacrifice through destruction gain extraordinary significance and lend strangely pessimistic and negating characteristics to him.[17] Similar perspectives formulated with rare literary talent determine the work of one of Condren's pupils, Jean-Jacques Olier (1608–57), founder of Saint-Sulpice, whose *Journée chrétienne* (1657) enjoyed rare success. Saint John Eudes (1601–80), also an Oratorian until he founded his own *Congrégation de Jésus et Marie* (1643), was at first under the profound influence of Bérulle and later under the more mystically oriented influence of Marie des Vallées. In its simplicity, his first great work, *La Vie et la royaume de Jésus dans les âmes chrétiennes* (1637), is essentially obligated to Bérulle. He was among the initiators of the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Mary and the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which he later developed in a Christocentric atmosphere.[18] Thus, among the authors of the classical period, the efforts of Bérulle's successors gradually led to a theological wealth of piety under the imprint of the devotion to Christ, a piety resting soundly on biblical and patristic foundations.

---

[11] See Théotime de Bois-le-Duc, "Le P. Constantin de Barbanson et le préquiétisme," *CollFr* 10 (1940), 338–82.

[12] See. J. Bremond, "Le quiétisme de Malaval," *RAM* 31 (1955), 399–418.

[13] See L. Lafuma, *Les histoires dévotes de Jean-Pierre Camus* (Paris 1940); J. Dagens, "Camus, écrivain dévot," *Studi francesi* (1958).

---

[14] See L. Cognet, "Bérulle et la théologie de l'Incarnation," *XVII^e siècle* 29 (1955), 330–52.

[15] See M. Leherpeur, "Le P. François Bourgoing," *L'Oratoire de France* 28 (1937), 286–99; 31 (1938), 241–56; 34 (1939), 125–38.

[16] See R. Notonier, "Le P. Guillaume Gibieuf," *Oratoriana* (1960–61); L. Cognet, "Gibieuf," *DSAM* 6 (1965), 356–63.

[17] See B. Kiesler, *Die Struktur des Theozentrismus bei Pierre de Bérulle und Charles de Condren* (Berlin 1934).

[18] See L. Cognet, "Le Cœur de Jésus et la Trinité d'après saint Jean Eudes," *Le Cœur du Seigneur* (Paris 1955), 180–91.

A special position in this development is occupied by the French Jesuits. But their spirituality was in no way uniform. Especially at the beginning of the century, many of their members arrived at the *humanisme dévot* through their predilection for aesthetic literature. They weakened, at times to a dangerous extent, the traditional demands of Christianity. This holds true for Louis Richeome (1544–1625) as well as Étienne Binet (1569–1639), who otherwise manifested some very beautiful, profoundly religious perceptions. But in Pierre Coton (1564–1626), the compliant confessor of Henry IV, we encounter a rival of Francis de Sales. His *Intérieure occupation d'une âme dévote* (1608) also attempts to make piety accessible to the members of the court, but with less psychological penetration. In the person of Louis Lallemant (1588–1635) we meet a true mystic who in his capacity as instructor of the tertiaries put his stamp on a whole generation of Jesuits.[19] He wrote nothing himself, but with the help of lecture notes from his pupils, Father Champion later compiled a *Doctrine spirituelle* (1694) which appears to reflect his teachings faithfully. Lallemant skillfully combined the most essential themes of Ignatian mysticism with those stemming from Rhenish-Flemish mysticism. The significance he gives to the unity of man with Christ puts him close to Bérulle, whom he admired without, however, being influenced by him. The same Christocentrism is found in one of Lallemant's contemporaries, who, in contrast to the latter, was an extremely prolific author: Jean-Baptiste de Saint-Jure (1588–1657). It is apparent primarily in his first work, which is also his best, *De la connaissance et de l'amour du fils de Dieu Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* (1634), in which he demonstrates his profound knowledge of the literature of mysticism. Lallemant, too, had numerous successors who were true to his inspiration. Among them are Surin, in his unsettled way, and the very sympathetic group of Breton Jesuits consisting of Jean Rigoleuc (1595–1638), Vincent Huby (1608–93), and Julien Maunoir (1606–83), who excelled in the area of popular missions. The work of François Guilloré (1615–84), especially his interesting *Secrets de la vie spirituelle qui en découvrent les illusions* (1673), accentuates the mystical aspect. Unfortunately, its value is impaired by its ponderous style.[20]

---

[19] See J. Jiménex, "Précisions biographiques sur le P. L. Lallemant," *AHSI* 33 (1964), 269–331; idem, "En torno a la formación de la Doctrine spirituelle del P. Lallemant," *AHSI* 32 (1963), 225–92.

[20] See A. Klaas, "La doctrine spirituelle du P. François Guilloré," *RAM* 24 (1948), 143–55 (Source for numerous other articles).

The Great Christian Works

Although the French *milieu catholique* was characterized by a spirituality rooted in mysticism, it nonetheless grew into a center of practical activities and efficacious undertakings. We have already mentioned its popular mission work and the reform of the secular clergy and that of the religious orders, but it also initiated numerous other works. Vincent de Paul (see Chap. 1) became a symbol of Christian charity. There was hardly a single sort of distress that escaped his attention. Starting in 1618, he turned his attention to the miserable condition of the galley slaves, touching the imagination of the people to such an extent that legend had him take the place of a manacled galley slave. As we know, abject poverty and begging were two of the great festering sores of the seventeenth century and Vincent de Paul quickly became involved in these problems. In 1624 he found a helper of extraordinary ability in the person of Louise de Marillac (1591–1660). Born out of wedlock to Louis de Marillac, she married Antoine le Gras in 1613 and was widowed in 1625. In September 1621 Vincent de Paul had established a *Confrérie de la Charité* in Mâcon to help the poor. With the participation of the aristocracy, similar institutions were founded in other towns. But it was difficult to create close ties between the individual fraternities. In 1628 this task was entrusted to Louise de Marillac. A year later she was asked to organize the charitable fraternities in Paris and in 1634 she was given the very important charge of helping the sick of the Hôtel-Dieu. The most noble ladies of Paris participated in this work, especially the duchess of Aiguillon, a niece of Richelieu. But of equal importance was the formation of a group of helpers of the poor for such tasks as were closed to the ladies of the aristocracy by the conventions of the times. This came about, to a very modest extent, as early as 1630, but did not take on final form until the courageous Louise de Marillac became its focal point in November 1633. This was the beginning of the *Filles de la Charité*, whose formation was promoted vigorously by Vincent de Paul. Soon after, they were practicing the apostolate of charitable love.

In the wake of Vincent de Paul's foundings, other similar ones occurred which were, however, of lesser and generally mere local significance.[21] In 1638 through the *Dames de Charité* Vincent de Paul was able—initially on a very modest basis—to establish a charity for foundlings. Although it continued to grow, it never reached the level required to solve this painful problem; in the seventeenth century there were three to four hundred foundlings in and around Paris every year who were sold at eight *sols* to one *livre pièce* to beggars and carnival people.

---

[21] See M. d'Escola, *Misère et charité au Grand Siècle* (Paris 1942).

Yet another broad field of endeavor for Vincent de Paul's charitable love was to ameliorate the sufferings of war. In the almost total absence of logistics for supplying the troops, they existed at the expense of the populace. In the process, the mercenaries committed wholesale murder, arson, pillage, and plunder, and left in their wake fields which were devastated for a long time to come. In 1639 Vincent de Paul became involved in the sad fate of Lorraine, the Picardie, and the Champagne, which were destroyed by the Thirty Years' War. Even though he had gone over to the anti-Jansenist side—albeit more from opportunism than conviction—he yet dared turn to Charles Maignart de Bernières (1616–62), a friend of Port-Royal.[22] In order to arouse the public to this problem, twenty-nine *Relations* were distributed from 1650 to 1655 describing the plight of the respective provinces. In this way, abundant alms were collected and distributed on the spot to refugees.

In all his charitable works Vincent de Paul frequently received support from a secret association of piety and brotherly love, the *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*. It had been founded in 1630 by Henry de Lévis, Duke of Ventadour, with the concurrence of Louis XIV, but without official approbation.[23] It developed very rapidly and soon counted some of the most illustrious names of France among its members. Among those who were especially active in its overall administration were Gaston de Renty and above all Jean de Bernières-Louvigny (1602–59). The latter was an interesting personality, a mystic and author of religious texts, of which *Le Chrétien intérieur* (1660/77) enjoyed great success.[24] Beyond that, Bernières founded a house for spiritual exercises, called *Hermitage,* which radiated its effect through all of Normandy. We should also mention René Le Voyer d'Argenson, a productive religious author,[25] and the Marquis de Salignac, an uncle of Fénelon. The *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement* placed a high value upon maintaining its lay character and its independence; it accepted no members of religious orders and very few priests, one of whom was Bossuet. Spread across France and having at its disposal a far-flung network of connections by virtue of the high social standing of its members, it played an important role on the religious as well as the political level. The *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement* frequently had large financial resources; it was in a position to support numerous charitable works and often put funds at Vincent de Paul's disposal. The national and foreign missions, especially those of Canada, owe much to the *Compagnie*. A number of its members made great sacrifices for the poor, the sick, the prisoners, and the galley slaves without regard for their own well-being. At times the activities of the *Compagnie* were viewed with some reticence if not hostility. Its fight against the practice of dueling—although supported in governmental circles—met with vehement criticism from among the aristocracy. Mazarin disliked the *Compagnie*'s political perspectives, which were exclusively Catholic-oriented; some of its members, moreover, had repeatedly demanded his dismissal from the Queen. Its virtually omnipresent system of police surveillance, used to prevent the laws of the Church from being violated, was ill-received, as was its intercession to have the most important posts filled with good Christians and to exclude men who were suspected of free thought. And finally the *Compagnie* showed itself to be utterly merciless in the fight against the Protestants. It did not hesitate to use any means at its disposal to close the churches and schools of the Reformed faith. It even went so far as to have Calvinist tradesmen barred from working. But more than anything else it attacked the Jansenists, who in turn swore bitter revenge. In 1660 a well-known Jansenist, Charles du Four, abbot of Annay, published two pamphlets about the *Hermitage* of Caen, which was known to be an affiliate of the *Compagnie*, and mentioned the latter by name. When Mazarin made skillful use of the situation, the *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement* understood the implications: in the summer of 1660 it announced its disbandment and destroyed the larger part of its archives. On 13 December a decree prohibited all associations which had not been authorized by royal letters patent. Only a few groups in the provinces continued their activities until 1664, but more or less secretly. As late as 1664, Molière attacked the *Compagnie* in his *Tartuffe*.[26] Other secret associations were formed later which appear basically to have been a continuation of the *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*.

---

[22] See A. Féron, *La vie et les œuvres de C. Maignart de Bernières, 1616–1662* (Rouen 1930).

[23] See A. Rébelliau, "Un épisode de l'histoire religieuse au XVII^e siècle, la Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement," *Revue de Deux-mondes* 16 (1903), 49–82; F. Bégouen, *Une société secrète émule de la Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement, l'Aa de Toulouse aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles* (Paris 1913).

[24] See M. Souriau, *Deux mystiques normands, G. de Renty et J. de Bernières* (Paris 1913); R. Heurtevent, *L'œuvre spirituelle de Jean de Bernières* (Paris 1938).

[25] See M. de Certeau, "Politique et mystique, René d'Argenson, 1596–1651," *RAM* 153 (1963), 1–37.

Among the apostles who were supported by the *Compagnie* was the venerable nun Marie of the Incarnation (1599–1672)—not to be mistaken for the Carmelite by the same name. Born Marie Guyard, she married Claude Martin in 1617 and was widowed two years later. Leading an intensely mystical life, she joined the Ursulines in 1630, became a friend and confidante of Bernières and in 1639 went to Canada, where she completely immersed herself in her apostolic work.

---

[26] See M. Émard, *Tartuffe, sa vie, son milieu et la comédie de Molière* (Paris 1932).

In this period she arrived at the most exalted stages of mystical union. Her spiritual experiences are preserved in two admirable autobiographical reports. Her voluminous correspondence with numerous people in France is an extraordinarily rich source and a valuable contribution to the history of Canada. Bossuet considered Marie of the Incarnation the "Teresa of France"; in her capacity as a religious writer she is without a doubt comparable to the great Carmelite. Moreover she bears witness to the rich development of French mysticism in the middle of the seventeenth century.

The *milieu catholique*, being dedicated above all to the task of education, continued the initiatives of the early sixteenth century. The Society of Jesus, with its long tradition in this form of the apostolate, remained the leader in this field. Their colleges enjoyed continued esteem; they were frequented by the aristocracy and granted royal favor. Mazarin had his nephew educated the Clermont College, which assumed the name Louis le Grand in 1682 when it had an enrollment of two thousand pupils, four hundred of them in residence.[27] The college Henry IV in La Flèche and that at Rennes were even more prominent.[28] Since the society concentrated heavily on the teaching of Latin literature, it trained many excellent humanists[29] and some eminent specialists, the most famous being Dominique Bouhours (1628–1702). But then the Jesuits encountered serious competition in the form of the Oratory.[30] Initially Bérulle had not intended the establishment of a college, but in 1616 he changed his mind and founded one in Dieppe, which was soon followed by others. The Académie royale, founded in 1639 in Juilly, was among the most famous of them.[31] The Oratorian colleges usually had fewer students than the Jesuit ones, although in 1642 Dieppe reached an enrollment of twelve hundred. But an experiment in a dual emphasis on Greek and Latin was not entirely successful. Mathematics and physics, on the other hand, were given a prominent position in the curriculum. On the whole the pedagogical methods of the Oratorians were both more liberal and more modern. Their colleges, too, were well attended by the most prominent society. In the framework of education we should also mention the "schools" of Port-Royal, not for the size of their enrollment but for their historical significance. In the brief span of their existence from 1646 to 1660 they only educated one hundred pupils,[32] the most famous of whom was Racine.[33] Of all the Port-Royal "recluses" it was Claude Lancelot[34] who was most consistently involved with them. He created a number of "methods" for these schools, among them the famous *Jardins des Racines grecqes* (1657), which advanced the state of pedagogy considerably. We have already mentioned the activities of the Ursulines and the Sisters of the Visitation in the field of girls' education. Their education never received the same high level of attention as that of boys. Even the intellectual level of the flexible and admittedly intelligent program designed by Fénelon in his famous *Traité de l'éducation des filles* (1687) remained quite modest. Thus the school for girls from needy aristocratic families founded by Mme de Maintenon in the former abbey of Saint-Cyr in 1686,[35] to which she devoted constant personal care, was far from turning out learned women. In spite of these lacunae, the education of the higher classes had reached an excellent level by the end of the seventeenth century.

---

[27] See G. Dupont-Ferrier, *Du Collège de Clermont à Louis-le-Grand,* 3 vols. (Paris 1921).

[28] See G. de La Rochemonteix, *Le Collège Henri IV de La Flèche*, 4 vols. (Le Mans 1889).

[29] See F. de Dainville, *Naissance de l'humanisme moderne* (Paris 1940).

[30] See P. Lallemand, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'éducation dans l'ancien Oratoire de France* (Paris 1887).

[31] See C. Hamel, *Histoire de l'abbaye et du collège de Juilly* (Paris 1868).

This did not hold true for the lower classes. To be sure, parish schools and charitable schools had been established almost everywhere, but these had encountered great difficulties both in general and in the training of teachers; for these reasons their achievements were not more than mediocre. This explains the fundamental importance of a small number of teachers sponsored in 1684 by the former prebendary of Reims, John Baptist de la Salle (1651–1719), who were given a definitive organization in Vaugirard (1694): the Brothers of the Christian Schools (*Frères des Écoles chrétiennes*). This new foundation initially encountered great difficulties but finally blossomed until it corresponded perfectly to its task of providing an elementary education in its various forms. In the course of the seventeenth century it led to similar efficacious, albeit more limited experiments of this sort. But in the countryside the problem stayed largely unsolved, as demonstrated by the continuing high number of illiterates.

Christian Life

The efforts by involved Catholics showed rapid achievements in the realm of religious practices, piety, and Christian life. Along with the increasing renewal of the clergy the parishes were once again turning into genuinely spiritual places. Sermons were given regularly; the clergy had recourse to solid materials in sermon books readily at their disposal. Sermons by such famous practitioners as the Oratorian Le Jeune, Sénault, and later Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massilon, Mascaron, Fléchier, and many others were not only published as religious reading, but were to serve as examples to the clergy and to inspire them. The great number of such works appearing throughout the century cannot even be estimated.[36] Catechism classes were revived; many dioceses published catechisms, some of which enjoyed great success,[37] as for instance the *Catéchisme des trois Henris* (entitled after the first names of the editing bishops) used in the dioceses of Angers, Luçon and La Rochelle. This revival made possible a steady increase in devotional literature. As a matter of fact, the production in this area is overwhelming; it includes works designed for a relatively well-educated audience as well as for the more simple readers. Jesuits, the Oratory, and Port-Royal were competing to outdo each other in productivity; to the present day it has not been possible to compile an exhaustive bibliography. In the process there came about a variety of literary genres, of which three were favored: works of meditation, moral treatises concerning the duties of daily life, and the hagiographies. While the saints occupied the first place among the latter, they satisfied a mere part of the demand. The seventeenth century loved religious biographies, and whenever a personality revered in some fashion died, a historian surfaced, so that there was never a dearth of such books.

---

[32] See L. Cognet, "Les Petites-Écoles de Port-Royal," *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises* 3–5 (1953), 20–29.

[33] See J. Orcibal, "L'enfance de Racine," *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 51 (1951), 2–16.

[34] See L. Cognet, *Claude Lancelot Solitaire de Port-Royal* (Paris 1950).

[35] See T. Lavallée, *Mme de Maintenon et al Maison royale de Saint-Cyr* (Paris 1862).

The seventeenth century was above all a privileged period for devotions. While they were not any more popular than in the Middle Ages, they now found followers among the educated and were propagated by the great representatives of spirituality and by famous theologians. In first place was the worship of Mary, a symbol of which may have been the gesture by Louis XIII on 15 August 1638 to dedicate his kingdom to the Most Blessed Virgin, an act that horrified the Protestant ambassadors.[38] Although thologians repeatedly protested abuses in the worship of Mary, especially towards the end of the century,[39] they received no support among the general populace. We have already mentioned the devout worship of the Sacrament of the Altar, with its intention of expiating the insults by the Calvinists. The group around Bérulle now developed a loving worship of Jesus' infancy. This was inspired primarily by a young Carmelite from Beaune, Marguerite Parigot, whose convent name was Marguerite of the Blessed Sacrament (1619–48). In 1636 she founded a devout association called the *Famille du saint Enfant-Jésus.*[40] The Oratory and the Carmelites took over the propagation of the worship of the Infancy of Jesus, aided energetically by Mme Guyon later on.[41] While devotion to the Sacred Heart has earlier origins, it nonetheless created special forms of expression in the seventeenth century. They were initiated by Saint John Eudes, who was the first to establish that liturgical cult around 1670. But the decisive role in this was played by a member of the Sisters of the Visitation, Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque (1647–90).[42] Completely self-taught and of modest education, she was but a mediocre author whose writings moreover were destroyed upon her death by her mother superior. Yet she conveyed very touching private revelations which were in part made known to the public before her death by the *Retraite spirituelle* (1684), the posthumous work of her spiritual guide, the Jesuit Claude de la Colombière (1641–82). But this new type of piety encountered strong resistance and did not spread until the following century.

---

[36] See E. Griselle, *Bourdaloue, Histoire critique de sa prédication* (Lille 1901); J. Lebarq, *Histoire critique de la prédication de Bossuet* (Paris 1888).

[37] See J. C. Dhôtel, *Les origines du catéchisme modern d'aprés les premiers manuels imprimés en France* (Paris 1967).

[38] See C. Flachaire, *La dévotion à la Vierge dans la littérature catholique au commencement du XVII^e siècle* (Paris 1957).

[39] See P. Hoffer, *La dévotion à Marie au déclin du XVII^e siècle* (Paris 1938).

The liturgical efforts of the seventeenth century must be viewed from a threefold perspective. First, new liturgical texts were created. At this time the bishops had extensive authority in this matter. To be sure, a detailed history in this regard has not yet been written, but it is certain that numerous dioceses had their own breviaries or missals. In 1680 Harlay de Champvallon had texts stricken from the Parisian breviary concerning episodes of legendary origin; also an attempt was made to reintroduce a uniform character to the divine service. This effort was made in many other dioceses as well. There was also an attempt to provide the liturgical books with thorough and accurate theological commentaries, modeled after the famous *Instructions du Rituel d'Alet* (1667), requested by Pavillon from the group of Port-Royal and edited by Barcos, the nephew of Saint-Cyran. In spite of their Jansenist origin they were approved by thirty bishops; although they did provoke a polemic they were even adopted by dioceses which were headed by anti-Jansenist prelates. Finally, a third problem had to be solved: the liturgical text had to be made accessible to those of the faithful who did not understand Latin. This presented an obstacle of a very special kind.

---

[40] See E. Deberre, *Histoire de la vénérable Marguerite du Saint-Sacrement* (Paris 1907).

[41] See I. Noye, "Enfance de Jésus," *DSAM* 4 (1959), 652–82.

[42] See A. Hamon, *Histoire de la dévotion au Sacré-Cœur,* 5 vols. (Paris 1923–40); P. Blanchard, *Sainte Marguerite-Marie, expérience et doctrine* (Paris 1961).

Many Catholics feared that the translation of liturgical texts into French might favor the Calvinist spirit, since this was precisely one of the main demands of the Reformed Church. On the other hand, there was also the convinction that the use of Latin provided a necessary element of mystery to the ceremonies which would be lost by translating, especially the Canon of the Mass. Yet in the period 1587 to 1660 at least five separate translations of the Ordinary were printed. Port-Royal had played a significant role in these efforts with its *Office de l'Église et de la Vierge en latin et en français* (1650), generally referred to as *Heures de Port-Royal*, which enjoyed great success with its many printings. It was followed by the *Office du Saint-Sacrement* (1659) and the *Piété des chrétiens envers les morts* (1665). But a violent controversy was triggered by the translation of the complete missal in 1660 by Jacques de Voisin (d. 1685), an erudite and by no means Jansenist theologian who was victimized in part by political considerations. Voisin's work was censured immediately after it appeared by the Assembly of the Clergy and by the Sorbonne. It was also condemned in a brief by Alexander VII dated 12 January 1661. But this brief, which never came up for passage in parliament, had limited success, since it did not keep Voisin from publishing in 1662 a translation of the Office of Holy Week. Among the defenders of Voisin was Arnauld. But the most important work of this kind was that of one of the confessors at Port-Royal, Nicolas Le Tourneux (1640–86). At his death he left behind a manuscript in the process of being published, *Année chrétienne*. Completed by his friend Ernest Ruth d'Ans,[43] it constitutes a remarkable spiritual explication of the liturgical texts. In addition he wrote a translation of the Roman breviary, also published after his death. The Jansenist origin of these works led to several incidents and in 1695 *Année chrétienne* was placed on the Index. But Le Tourneux's work was taken up again in the eighteenth century and led to a renewal of liturgical devotion in France.

Translation of the books of the Bible posed similar problems. Reading the Holy Scriptures in French was one of the chief demands of the Reformed Church and this created among the Catholics a certain emotional prejudice towards any such translations. Consequently the number of French translations available to the Catholics for most of the seventeenth century was very small.[44] Foremost among them were those by Deville (1613), Frizon (1621), Pierre de Besse (1631), and Corbin (1643), all of which followed the old Louvain translation very closely. But they were hardly known to the public.

---

[43] See X. Janne d'Othée, *Ernest Ruth d'Ans, secrétaire du grand Arnauld* (Verviers 1949).

[44] See D. Lortsch, *Histoire de la bible en France* (Paris 1910); J. Baroni, *La Contre-Réforme devant la bible* (Lausanne 1943).

Only the New Testament which appeared frequently in separate printings, improved through a few supplementary translations, achieved a broader distribution. The situation changed somewhat after 1660 when several translations such as the New Testament by the Oratorian Amelote (1667) and of the Bible by Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin (1669) reached the general public. The Jansenists played a significant role in this field of endeavor with the so-called Mons New Testament (1667) and, above all, with the Bible annotated by Sacy whose thirty-two volumes appeared from 1672 to 1696. Predictably, the translations of Port-Royal caused several polemics in which Arnauld took an effective part. But these attacks did not make them any less appreciated. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, translations of the Bible and liturgy were frequently needed for use by new converts from Protestantism.

A significant part of Christian life was the development of religious art. Characterized by a profound inwardness in the very sobriety of its form it slipped into a decorative phase after 1668.[45] This development is especially noticeable in religious painting where the initial tendency is incorporated: in the work of Simon Vouet (1590–1649), Georges de la Tour (1593–1657), Eustache Le Sueur (1617–55), and Philippe de Champaigne (1602–74). The later phase is represented by Pierre Mignard (1610–95) and Charles Le Brun (1619–90). In the field of architecture the difference in inspiration is to a certain extent obscured by the continuity in planning. At first a strong Roman influence can be perceived: even Bernini was asked for designs. A great religious zeal produced a boom that resulted in more than thirty churches being built in the first half of the century. Several among them excel by virtue of their truly authentic religious character, such as Port-Royal of Paris, Val-de-Grâce, and the chapel of the Sorbonne. After 1660 church architecture became an instrument to the glory of the King, as represented by the Hôtel des Invalides and also by the chapel of Versailles, both of which attest in their own way to the change in the artistic climate.

From Cartesianism to Quietism

The far-reaching religious transformation in France after 1660 came from a profound change of mentality in which Cartesian rationalism was able to gain ground. There was a simultaneous development towards psychological and moral analysis and introspection. The tendency in regard to the inner life was towards seeking one's own identity within a clear consciousness, within clearly formulated thoughts; all obscure elements and those that could not be articulated were viewed with distrust. Mystical experience gradually disappeared from the perspective of consciousness; its dynamic and fundamental role in Christian life was being forgotten. In its place a spiritual psychologism and moralism were introduced into devotional literature. Yet this current did produce some valuable works which were based on a dogmatic fundament indebted to Bérulle's Christocentricity.

---

[45] See C. Mauricheau-Beaupré, *L'art au XVII^e^ siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris 1947).

One of the most prominent representatives of this movement was the Jansenist Pierre Nicole (1625–95), the longtime collaborator of Arnauld. In 1672 he began publishing his famous *Essais de morale,* a sequence of small treatises and commentaries on the Bible which enjoyed great popularity until the Revolution. Two other Jansenists were competing with him. One was the Oratorian Pasquier Quesnel (1624–1719), whose religious and political role has already been discussed. He was also a remarkable religious author. It should be remembered that his *Réflexions morales* (1693), long before they became the immediate cause of the bull *Unigenitus*, served as the basis for meditation to many of the faithful, even among non-Jansenists. His many other devotional writings, especially his frequently reprinted *Prières chrétiennes* (1687), demonstrate a remarkable talent for dealing exhaustively with topics of Bérulle's theology. Quesnel's literary abilities almost equaled those of Jacques-Joseph Du Guet (1649–1733), a former Oratorian as well, who was deeply engaged in the disputes over Jansenism.[46] Du Guet was an admirable author who deserves to be counted among the greatest. Unfortunately the very enormity of the body of his works, which exceeds one hundred printed volumes, as well as the all too undifferentiated uniformity of his very perfection detract from his work. But it should yet be possible to reawaken an interest in some of his most successful works, such as the *Traité de la prière publique* and the ten volumes of his *Lettres de morale et de piété* (1707–53). He advanced the art of psychological analysis farther than did Quesnel and showed rare powers of differentiation. Quesnel and Du Guet followed in Nicole's footsteps and ensured the continuity into the eighteenth century. But they should not obscure the other authors of like tendencies. A special place is occupied by the doctor of Port-Royal, Jean Hamon (1618–87), who left behind a voluminous body of writings, part of which was not published until much later.[47] His poetic and colorful style, above all in his *Lettres et opuscules* (1734) and his treatise *De la solitude* (1734), distinguish them from the somewhat drab language of the rest of the works from Port-Royal. Finally, we should call attention to the third superior general of Saint-Sulpice, Louis Tronson (1622–1700), whose famous *Examens particuliers* (1690) made an imprint on the development of conscience and on introspection for innumerable generations of priests. They have been read in most of the religious orders up until our day.

---

[46] P. Chételat, *Étude sur Du Guet* (Paris 1877).

[47] See L. Cognet, "Hamon," *DSAM* 7 (1968), 64–71.

The development of psychologism in spirituality gradually led to a distrust of mysticism and created a climate favorable to the outbreak of a crisis. This process crystallized around a woman, Jeanne-Marie Bouvier de la Motte (1648–1717), married to Jacques Guyon du Chesnoy[48] and widowed since 1676. She was a devout person given to a somewhat exaggerated mysticism who used her considerable fortune and the freedom of her widowed state in order to dedicate herself to a spiritual apostolate which led her, together with her spiritual guide, the Barnabite François La Combe (1643–1715), to Savoy, Turin, and Grenoble.[49] Having returned to Paris in 1686, she was embroiled in a financial controversy in 1688 caused by the greed of Harlay de Champvallon and leading to the incarceration of Father La Combe. Mme Guyon was released upon the intervention of Mme de Maintenon. The latter introduced her into the royal residence of Saint-Cyr, where in October 1688 she met Fénelon. After a little hesitation he recognized her spiritual gifts and entered into a close relationship with her. By this time Mme Guyon had already written a lot, but published very little. Only her *Moyen court et très facile pour l'oraison* (1685) had been fairly successful. The rest of her writings were published very much later, between 1712 and 1720, by the pietistic pastor Pierre Poiret, one of her ardent admirers. Not very original, but also not without talent and skill, Mme Guyon's writings present the classical teachings of the great tradition of Christian mysticism. But at times her expression lacks precision, which explains why her books occasionally caused some disquiet.[50]

Fénelon, too, had been introduced at Saint-Cyr by Mme de Maintenon. Under his and Mme Guyon's leadership the spirituality there was influenced in a clearly mystical direction. But the trial in Rome against Molinos (1687; Chap. 8) had aroused public opinion even in France and resulted in an attitude hostile to mysticism. Given the maliciousness of the court, where Mme de Maintenon was hated, this was enough to accuse her of spreading quietism at Saint-Cyr. Mme de Maintenon tried to counteract the accusation by removing Fénelon and Mme Guyon from Saint-Cyr in the spring of 1693. She also prevailed in having Mme Guyon's writings examined by Bossuet, who was by no means a specialist in matters of mysticism. In fact these were almost totally foreign to him. This did not prevent him from rendering an unequivocally negative judgment in March 1694. Above all he reproached Mme Guyon for her views on the passive state, which in his opinion was incompatible both with the practice of the prayer of supplication and the exercise of Christian virtues. Thereupon Mme Guyon demanded a more precise examination. This led to the discussions of Issy from July 1694 to 10 March 1695 in which Bossuet, Noailles, and Tronson conferred, with none of them actually being competent in this matter. Fénelon, having been appointed archbishop of Cambrai in February 1695, succeeded in having a protocol composed which contained thirty-four paragraphs relating to the inner life. This brought the conferences to a hardly satisfactory conclusion.

---

[48] See ibid., "Guyon," *DSAM* 6 (1967), 1306–38.

[49] See G. Boffito, *Scrittori Barnabiti* II (Florence 1933–34), 305–11.

[50] See L. Cognet, "La spiritualité de Mme Guyon," *XVII^{e} siècle* 12–14 (1952), 269–75.

Next Bossuet wrote a long pastoral instruction on this topic largely designed to prove Mme Guyon wrong for which he hoped to obtain Fénelon's concurrence and, with it, the latter's disassociation from Mme Guyon. But Fénelon rejected any sort of condemnation of her. He had received significant ideas from her and maintained an unswerving devotion towards her, proof of an admirable degree of loyalty. In July 1696 Fénelon received Bossuet's manuscript and returned it to him with a categorical rejection. Yet he perceived that the time had come for him to clarify his own position. In the summer of 1696 he used a stay in Cambrai to compose his *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure*, a compact systematization of his mystical spirituality centered around his ideas of pure love and completely unselfish Christian charity. Bossuet, having been appraised of the existence of the work, tried to prevent its publication. But Fénelon's friends thereupon hurried the printing along so that the *Maximes* were published at the beginning of February 1697, more than a month before Bossuet's *Instruction sur les états d'oraison*, a work very much lacking in matters of spirituality which nonetheless attacked Mme Guyon violently. Next, Bossuet started agitating public opinion and prejudicing the King against Fénelon, whom he openly accused of quietism. But Fénelon succeeded in securing the King's permission to put the matter before the Holy See.

In France, Fénelon and Bossuet exchanged numerous polemics and the conflict was joined by many other experts. On 15 September 1697 Fénelon defined his ideas extremely well in a remarkable pastoral instruction which received the support of numerous theologians. By April 1698 Bossuet realized that he would not win this fight on the level of doctrine. Urged on by part of those around him and blinded by vengefulness, he then engaged in a contemptible campaign of defamation. In

June 1698 he published his *Relation sur le quiétisme* which completely avoided the basic problems and was nothing but a long persiflage. Moreover, he included many slanderous innuendos regarding the relationship between Fénelon and Mme Guyon, making use, with incredible indiscretion, of even the most confidential communications. This tactic turned out to be very effective and Fénelon's beautiful *Réponse à la relation* (August 1698) was unable to save the situation.

Innocent XII, who scorned Bossuet because of the latter's Gallicanism, did not conceal his sympathy for Fénelon because of the latter's recognition of papal prerogatives. Convinced of the archbishop's profound orthodoxy and of his loyalty to the authentic mystical tradition, he tried his best, including the use of procrastination, to avoid having to condemn Fénelon.[51] But Bossuet's propagation in Rome of the *Relation sur le quiétisme* was most injurious to Fénelon's reputation. Yet Innocent XII would probably not have given in had it not been for the personal persistent interference on the part of Louis XIV, who was completely on the side of Bossuet. The disfavor aimed at Fénelon, his family, and friends clearly showed the King's attitude; barely disguised threats reached all the way to the Vatican. It was well known that, given the Pope's advanced age, a conclave was not far off and that the cardinals feared a negative attitude on the part of France. So they pressured Innocent XII in order to obtain a condemnation in principle and the Pope regretfully gave in. But Cardinal Albano, secretary of briefs and the future Clement XI, succeeded in defying Bossuet even by means of this condemnation. The brief *Cum alias*,[52] dated 12 March 1699, was simply a brief, whereas Bossuet had expected a formal bull. Furthermore, it contained the proviso "motu proprio," which usually caused the French parliament to reject it. Twenty-three sentences from the *Maximes* were condemned as a whole, but without any individual qualifications. The term "heretical" did not occur in the brief. Fénelon accepted the condemnation without reservation in a pastoral letter of 9 April, and on this occasion Innocent XII sent him a letter of unusual praise. A little later, in October, in order to demonstrate his sympathy he announced his intention to elevate Fénelon to a cardinalship, an honor which he persistently refused Bossuet. But Fénelon's friends kept him from it because they feared the wrath of Louis XIV. For the rest of his life Fénelon was banished from the court to his diocese of Cambrai; yet he continued to maintain his deep affection for Mme Guyon, who had been incarcerated in December 1695 under most obscure circumstances. It was only in March 1703 that she was freed and exiled to

---

[51] See J. Orcibal, *Le procès des Maximes des Saints devant le Saint-Office* (Rome 1968).
[52] Text: *BullRom* 20, 870b.

Blois. From here she was able secretly to correspond with Fénelon, who in turn sent his nephews and selected pupils to her. Mme Guyon subsequently had a strong influence on the milieu of Protestant Pietism, especially in England.[53] But the foresight of Innocent XII was proved correct: the condemnation of Fénelon damaged Christian mysticism on the whole and caused it to enter a period of regression for more than a century.

---

[53] A. de la Gorce, "Mme Guyon à Blois," *Études* 310 (1961), 182–96.

CHAPTER 6

Christian Thought in Seventeenth-Century France

Systematic and Scholastic Theology

Catholic renewal, initiated at the beginning of the seventeenth century, was manifested less in the realm of thought than in the area of Christian life and spirituality. The men of the Counter Reformation did not occupy themselves with a renewal of theological methods. Patristics and history became objects of detailed studies only inasmuch as they were forced upon them by the exigency of polemics with the Reformed Churches. But it was not their intention to continue the efforts of the great Christian humanists of the Renaissance in these areas. The famous theological faculties and above all the Sorbonne remained bastions of traditional speculative theology. Here the situation of the prominent Parisian professors was characteristic. Their teachings were almost exclusively Thomistic, their lectures nothing but commentaries on the *Summa theologica*. This does not mean, however, that they were actually based upon a genuine Thomism. Rather they were frequently influenced by the deteriorating Scholasticism of the waning Middle Ages.

We see this reflected in the case of the well-known Philippe de Gamaches (1568–1625), professor at the Sorbonne, whose honor it was to count Bérulle and Condren among his pupils and who doubtlessly strongly influenced Bérulle. Although he, together with Duval, was among the first to occupy one of the chairs for positive theology established by Henry IV in 1598, his method remained absolutely Scholastic. His numerous quotes from the Fathers were intended as proof or illustration, but not as a return to the thought of Christian antiquity. Vestiges of nominalism as well as a strong Augustinian influence are occasionally discernible in his work. His competitor Nicolas Isambert

(1565–1642), who published a voluminous commentary on the *Summa* in 1639, represented a much more consistent Thomism, although he did not universally accept the concept of absolute predestination independent of previous merit. Aside from the Sorbonne professors many Jesuits could be mentioned who under the cover of Saint Thomas Aquinas introduced ideas of the new theology of Molina and Lessius.

Within the same framework were others representing even more independent thoughts. This holds true for André Duval, whose role in the Gallican conflict we have mentioned before. His commentary on the *prima pars* of the *Summa* is still unpublished in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; that on the *secunda pars* was published by him in 1636. Duval, a follower of the abstract school, approved of Canfield's theses. He had read Ruysbroeck and Henry of Herp and was preoccupied with Platonic ideas. All these influences are reflected in his commentary on Saint Thomas Aquinas as well. He is therefore an informative witness for the Platonic tendencies in spirituality and theology especially up to 1630; its presence up to Bérulle has already been mentioned. It was in the latter's circle that a strange theological study appeared which did not claim the auspices of Saint Thomas Aquinas and furthermore made no bones about its Platonic origin: *De libertate Dei et creaturae* by the Oratorian Guilleaume Gibieuf, whose Marian spirituality has been mentioned earlier.[1] Gibieuf's complex system posits the highest idea of freedom in God and its perfect realization in Jesus Christ, the God-Man. Therefore, man's freedom increases the more it approximates that of Christ and becomes incapable of sin. Gibieuf rejects both the Thomist idea of *praedeterminatio physica* as well as the Molinist idea of the *scientia media*. His thoughts are clearly inspired by Ruysbroeck and Henry of Herp. This work provoked a violent controversy in which the Jesuit Theophile Raynaud pointed out the Rhenish-Flemish origins of his opponent. Gibieuf's presentation breaks with Scholastic tradition by virtue of its continuous structure, but his primarily deductive method is absolutely ahistoric. His work was unique in its way, since Platonism in theology as well as in spirituality was retreating after 1630. The only treatise which could be connected with Gibieuf's work is *De Sancto Sacerdotio* (1631) by the Oratorian Paul Métézeau (1583–1632), who develops a hierarchic, Platonic, and dionysian theology of the priesthood.[2]

After this period the teaching at the theological faculties more and more lost contact with reality, towards an abstract speculation out of step with the spiritual tendencies of the time. The rejection of Cartesianism by official circles—a topic to be dealt with later—may serve as an example. A characteristic work in this regard is the *Opera theologica* of Martin Grandin (1604–91), who was famous for his piety and erudition. Published posthumously in 1710 by his former pupil and compilator Charles du Plessis d'Argentré, it is a more or less mediocre commentary on a few articles of the *Summa*, devoid of any originality. Henceforth the teaching duties at the Sorbonne, instead of being a source of true intellectual education, appeared to even the best of minds as no more than a condition for achieving university degrees. It is a significant fact that even Bossuet did not keep his notes of the lectures he attended at the Collège de Navarre. Some minds were aware of this stagnation and, in an attempt to renew the theology from within, strove for a synthesis with spirituality, yet still by traditional methods. One of them was Louis Bail (1610–69), who wanted to create a comprehensive work on spiritual theology on a Scholastic basis, his *Théologie affective ou saint Thomas en méditations,* which appeared in four parts from 1638 to 1650. This work is not without merit, but has a certain ponderousness about it. Besides, it is not entirely free of commonplaces. In this field Bail is far behind the Dominican Guillaume de Contenson (1641–74), the author of the *Theologia mentis et cordis* (1668–87). Left incomplete, it was concluded by his fellow Dominican Massoulié. The *speculationes,* a presentation of the dogma with a heavy Scholastic imprint, are followed by the *reflexiones,* subtly differentiated spiritual discussions which—while at times going rather far afield—do contain some very beautiful pages. Unfortunately these spiritual reflections are not always connected in a natural fashion with the theological part. Consequently the work does not show the necessary unity; its speculative tendency is weakened by its methodology.[3]

---

[1] See G. Marafini, *Agli albori del Giansenismo, Guglielmo Gibieuf e il suo pensiero intorno alla libertà* (Rome 1947); J. Orcibal, "Néoplatonisme et jansénisme, du *De libertate* du P. Gibieuf à l'*Augustinus*: 'Nuove ricerche storiche sul giansenismo,'" *AnGr* 71 (Rome 1954), 33–57.

[2] I. Noye, *Sacerdoce et sainteté d'après le P. Métézeau: La Tradition sacerdotale* (Le Puy 1962), 169–89.

Moral theology was no doubt in a more critical situation. Theologians frequently developed problems of moral theology following the respective *quaestiones* of Saint Thomas's *Summa,* but in a purely speculative and theoretical fashion. No one intended to create the basis for an individual theological moral philosophy. At the same time an ever more distinct predilection for casuistry was developing. To a certain extent this development was even demanded by the need to reform the clergy as well as by the necessity to educate sufficiently well-instructed confessors. Instruction in the *casus conscientiae* was included in all the curricula of clerical education. In this area the Jesuits, the great guides of souls, are undeniable masters. Yet the Society of Jesus scarcely produced any famous casuists in France; the most prominent authors in this field were foreigners. In passing, one could mention Étienne Bauny (1564–1649) who taught at Clermont College from 1618 to 1625. He is primarily known as the author of a French handbook for priests who could not read Latin sufficiently well, the *Somme des péchés qui se commettent en tous états* (Paris 1634). This casuistry is nothing more than a collection of guidelines for the treatment of specific cases, but the fundamental problems of morality are not at all mentioned. Probabilism, without any theoretical justification, is applied as the basic principle. The method of casuistry soon crossed over into the field of controversialism and in so doing became one of the most controversial topics of seventeenth-century religious thought, mainly for political reasons. The major cause lay in the old enmity between the university and the Jesuits. A regulation, issued in 1618 and jealously upheld, obliged the candidates for a baccalaureate degree to study for three years with the professors of the theological faculty and not to have any other teachers of theology. This excluded the Jesuit pupils from the baccalaureate. The Jesuits were most reluctant to submit to this humiliating regulation; towards the end of 1642 they attacked it, causing another round of polemics. In order to discredit the Jesuits, partisans of the university published a pamphlet in August 1643 entitled *Théologie morale des jésuites extraite fidèlement de leurs livres*, a collection of clearly laxist solutions from the pens of Jesuit casuists. This pamphlet was written by Doctor François Hallier and the young Antoine Arnauld, who was then at the beginning of his career. Although the controversy was belayed quickly, the public remained sensitive to this issue. Thus the ground remained fertile for the great talent of Pascal, who resumed the battle in 1656 with his fifth *Provinciale*. At this point the issue of laxist casuistry interfered with the Jansenist conflict and furnished a veritable arsenal of arguments against the Jesuits which were used again and again. But it should be noted that no one actually unfolded the problem by starting with its root causes. Neither Pascal nor Nicole in his annotations, added to his Latin translation of the *Provinciales* (1658), nor the Jesuit Georges Pirot (1599–1669) in his *Apologie pour les casuistes* (1657) posed the question of the actual value of probabilism in its fundamental principles. Henceforth Jesuits and laxism, and Jansenism and rigorism were firmly identified with each other in the eyes of the general public. Not even the example of a rigorist Jesuit such as Bordaloue could change that. The moralism of the spiritual authors of the waning seventeenth century is of a purely psychological and empirical nature. Not until the *Traité de morale* (1683) of Malebranche do we encounter an essay on Christian moral philosophy, but it was conceived in an atmosphere dominated entirely by Descartes.

---

[3] See A. Bozaudun, *Une gloire dominicaine, histoire du T.R.P. de Contenson* (Montauban 1863).

The Development of Historical Theology

Various causes contributed to the fact that Scholasticism gradually became archaic and unfashionable. The anti-Protestant controversies played a significant role in this development. We should recall that the Reformed, especially the Calvinists, refused to recognize medieval theology, viewing it as the application of totally heathen logic to the realities of the revelation. So their own weapons had to be used against them: the Scriptures and the Fathers. From 1575 on, the *Bibliotheca patrum* of Marguerin de la Bigne (1546–90) offered a valuable source to the controversialists. In 1644 it was reprinted in seventeen folios. After 1600, scientific editions of authors from Christian antiquity multiplied, and numerous formerly unpublished works were made accessible. Work in this field encompassed the entire century and reached a high level of scientific precision, especially in the great editions of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur. Initially this abundant material was used primarily for polemics; the *Discours de controverse* by Bérulle (1609) is a good example of that sort of use. But soon the scientific investigation of that period became an independent science, disregarding polemical prejudice and seeking fulfillment in the interest in Christian antiquity, an interest which spread from the Italian Counter Reformation to the French *milieu dévot.*

Some famous specialists excelled in this field, the Jesuit Jacques Sirmond (1559–1651) for instance, who during his long life was able to engage in extensive editorial activities, above all the *Concilia antiqua Galliae* (1629). There was also his fellow Jesuit Théophile Raynaud (1582–1663), whose polemics against Gibieuf have already been mentioned. He gave us an excellent edition of Anselm of Canterbury (1630). Among the Dominicans we should mention François Combéfis (1605–79), a specialist in Greek patristics who published a remarkable edition of the writings of Maximus Confessor (1675). It was also his somewhat dangerous merit to prove that the acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council concerning the condemnation of Pope Honorius were in no way a falsification. The Oratorians made their contribution in the person of Jean Morin (1591–1659), whom we shall meet again in his capacity as exegete, but who was also an admirable expert in oriental liturgical texts. The two volumes of *Supplementum operum sancti Augustini* (1654), edited by his fellow Oratorian Jérôme Vignier (1606–61), also known as an exegete, are unfortunately full of errors into which he was led by his anti-Jansenist zeal.[4]

Among the French scholarly groups the reformed Benedictines of Saint-Maur (Maurists) whose center was the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés occupied a special place. The initial impulse came from their first superior, Dom Grégoire Tarrisse,[5] but the actual organizer of their scholarly work was Dom Luc d'Achéry (1609–85), the founder of the marvelous library of Saint-Germain who placed at the disposal of his fellow monks tools which were unique at that time.[6] His work was continued by the famous Dom Jean Mabillon (1632–1707) a milestone of whose prodigious production was his edition of the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux (1667).[7] Aside from him there were others, no less famous, such as Dom Bernard de Montfaucon (1655–1742), Dom Thomas Blampin (1640–1710), who directed the edition of the works of Saint Augustine, and many more. The work of the Maurists continued until the Revolution and comprised the majority of the patristic literature. Even today their folios represent a prime example of scholarship. Their untiring efforts extended into all other areas of the holy sciences. Yet prior to them, other learned circles had exercised a similar influence, such as the one formed around the brothers Dupuy, where Bossuet developed his critical thinking and scholarship.[8] The role of this circle in the issue of Gallicanism has already been mentioned.

Another product of these editorial activities were the comprehensive syntheses of patristic theology. Several names already mentioned in connection with their editorial work excelled in this field as well. These endeavors were dominated, however, by the mighty figure of the Jesuit Denis Petau (1583–1652), whose *Dogmata theologica* (1644–50) represented a theretofore unsurpassed monument of patristic work of extraordinary informational and analytical exactness.[9] In the person of Louis Thomassin (1619–95) he had a competitor from the ranks of the Oratorians, but Thomassin's comprehensive *Dogmata theologica* (1680–84), written in a more personal vein, was inferior to Petau's in its lack of objectivity. He also authored a number of historical and dogmatic treatises in French.[10] Petau's work quite unintentionally sealed the disrepute into which Scholasticism had fallen even before the century had reached its midpoint. Jansen had already criticized its methods in his *Augustinus* and Saint-Cyran faulted Saint Thomas for having lived in a century in which philosophy and human judgment were overvalued.

---

[4] See E. Havet, "Les decouvertes de Jérôme Vignier," *BÉCh* 46 (Paris 1885); L. Saltet, "Un mystificateur janséniste," *BLE* 43 (1942), 75 ff.

[5] See F. Rousseau, *Dom Grégoire Tarrisse, premier supérieur général de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Paris 1924).

[6] See M. Laurain, "Les travaux d'érudition des Mauristes, origine et évolution," *RHEF* 43 (1957), 231–72.

[7] See H. Leclercq, *Mabillon*, 2 vols. (Paris 1953–57).

[8] See I. Uri, *Un cercle savant au XVII^e^ siècle* (Paris 1886).

[9] See J. C. Vital-Chatellain, *Le P. Denis Petau d'Orléans, jésuite, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris 1884).

An analogous development can be traced in the field of exegesis. The tradition of spiritual, moral, and even allegorical exegesis no doubt continued to be widespread. They were used primarily by the people of Port-Royal, and especially in Sacy's Bible and in the *Explications sur le Nouveau Testament* (1683) by his secretary Nicolas Fontaine (1625–1709); both of them joined the patristic tradition and particularly that of Augustine. Bossuet too can be added on the basis of his *Apocalypse avec une explication* (1689). A parallel, albeit less significant tradition, was that of scientific exegesis. It originated in the humanistic endeavors of the Renaissance and was represented by the Jesuit Johannes Maldonatus in Paris. In 1645 this form of exegesis had led to the publication of the beautiful polyglot Bible by the lawyer Guillaume Le Jay. Also in this line was the work of the Oratorian Jean Morin, a convert to Judaism and a great scholar of rabbinical literature who demonstrated its importance for the interpretation of Holy Scripture. But he also expressed the daring idea that the Masoretic interpreters had falsified the Hebrew text. He offered this theory in his *Exercitationes ecclesiasticae* (1631) about the Samaritan Pentateuch and in his *Exercitationes biblicae* (1633), which provoked spirited polemics. But the actual founder of biblical criticism was another Oratorian, Richard Simon (1638–1712), an unsavory character but intellectually a genius of comprehensive education. Initially he tried to achieve a clear and satisfactory definition of the infallibility of the Bible and thus to demonstrate that the normal methods of historical criticism could be applied to the Holy Scriptures.[11] In 1678 he attempted to present his ideas in his *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*. But Bossuet, warned through an indiscretion, managed to get a table of contents of the book and promptly intervened. He had the work confiscated and all copies destroyed. The Oratorians thought their congregation endangered by Simon and expelled him on 21 May 1678. He then became parish priest at Bolleville in the diocese of Rouen. His ideas were indeed too far ahead of his time, and all the world opposed him; Bossuet, the Great Arnauld, and Protestants such as Vossius and

---

[10] See P. Clair, *Louis Thomassin, étude biographique et bibliographique* (Paris 1964).

[11] See J. Steinmann, *Richard Simon et les origines de l'exégèse biblique* (Paris 1960); P. Auvray, "Richard Simon d'après des documents inédits," *Oratoriana* 1 (1960), 46–68; idem, "Richard Simon après 1678," 6 (1962), 55–69; idem, "Richard Simon, Bossuet et l'abbé Bibnon," 14 (1968), 89–103; idem, "Richard Simon et Jean Leclercq," 15 (1969), 26–42.

Jurieu. Yet he persisted in his views. The *Histoire critique du texte du Vieux Testament* was reprinted in Holland in 1680 and 1685. In 1689 Simon published a *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament*, followed by several similar works and finally by a translation of the New Testament in 1702 which led to another incident with Bossuet. The latter continued the fight, but died without having completed his *Défense de la tradition des Saints Pères*, in which he wanted to refute the exegetical methods of Richard Simon and to justify the traditional principles. Simon was in fact not emulated because his ideas were considered too daring in those days. A contemporary of that pioneer of genius was another Oratorian, Bernard Lamy (1640–1715), a well-educated and skilled exegete and friend of Malebranche.[12]

The development of scholarship was attended by that of historiography, which now ceased being a literary composition in favor of becoming a genuine science. This movement had already been indicated since the beginning of the century by the historian Eudes de Mézeray, brother of Saint John Eudes, but its actual development did not start until 1630. In the field of church history Baronius had some competitors in France since all the great specialists in historical theology were interested in it as well. Jean Morin, Petau, and Thomassin created significant works in this field, but the true French Baronius was an Oratorian, Charles Lecointe (1611–81), whose *Annales ecclesiastici Francorum* appeared in eight folios from 1665 to 83. Lecointe wisely avoided including the first two centuries so he would not have to dispute the legends which traced back the origins of many French dioceses to the apostles. But in this connection the Bollandists served as an example in France inasmuch as numerous specialists now tried to examine the historical truth of the lives of local saints. In this regard a professor of the Sorbonne, Jean de Launoy (1603–78), developed a deterrent reputation which gained him the sobriquet "Nest robber of the Saints." He had the courage to attack the legends of Provence about Saint Lazarus and Saint Magdalen (1641), those of the city of Paris concerning Saint Dionysius (1641) and the ones of the Carmelites about Simon Stock and the scapular. As a consequence he found himself exposed to intense polemics. Others nonetheless followed in his footsteps, mainly the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, who excelled in this sort of research, contributing an extraordinary number of works. By virtue of the quality as well as quantity of his work Mabillon occupied the most prominent position among them. He authored the *Acta sanctorum ordinis sancti Benedicti* (1668–1701; in collaboration with Dom Thierry Ruinart) and the *Annales ordinis sancti Benedicti* (1703–13). In his famous work *De re diplomatica* (1681) he determined the basic rules applying to works in the field of historiography. Many of the successors and pupils of Mabillon gained prominence in the difficult area of local and regional history. Later on, Dom Denys de Sainte-Marthe (1650–1725) took over the task of reediting and completing the *Gallia christiana*. These works gained a considerable reputation throughout Europe for their comprehensiveness and quality. Louis XIV expressly requested to have Mabillon introduced to him. Port-Royal, too, contributed one of its finest representatives in this field in the person of one of its last pupils, Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont (1637–98).[13] While he was not blessed with a long career, his enormous energy enabled him to complete a monumental number of works. In addition to the six volumes of the *Histoire des empereurs* (1690–1738), there are the sixteen volumes of his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (1693–1712). All of his work is characterized by a profound scholarship and an unusual scientific rigor. In addition, Tillemont, whose kindness was inexhaustible, furnished the documentation for numerous other works. Sacy, who had agreed before his death to write a history of Saint Louis for the Dauphin (the son of Louis XIV), had received some admirable treatises from Tillemont which manifest an unusually profound knowledge of the Middle Ages. These manuscripts remained unpublished until the nineteenth century.[14] Tillemont, who was very sympathetic to the Maurists, left to them his complete documentation on Augustine, from which the Benedictines compiled a history of the life of Saint Augustine and added it to volume twelve of his works (1700). Additionally, he collaborated on the patristic biographies of the Jansenist Godefroy Hermant (1617–90), who wrote the lives of Saints Athanasius (1671), Basilius, Gregory of Nazianzus (1674), and Ambrose (1678). Lastly, a valuable work by another Oratorian, Jacques Lelong (1665–1721), should be mentioned: the *Bibliothèque historique de la France* (1719), which represents an indispensable source even today.

---

[12] F. Girbal, *Bernard Lamy, étude biographique et bibliographique* (Paris 1964); B. Lamy, *Entretiens sur les Sciences*, ed. by F. Girbal and P. Clair (Paris 1966).

Cartesianism and Religious Thought

One of the main reasons for the decline of Scholasticism in the seventeenth century was the success of Cartesian philosophy. In order to comprehend its full significance, the presence of a latitudinarian, skeptical, and even at times atheistic current in France has to be taken into consideration. Its origins go back to the sixteenth century and possibly even farther;[15] it invokes Jean Bodin,[16] Montaigne,[17] and Pierre Charron.[18] For the first thirty years of the seventeenth century this intellectual current attracted a large part of high society. The circle of Gaston d'Orléans and of the famous lady of the demimonde, Ninon de Lenclos,[19] was characterized by latitudinarianism. In these circles were poets such as Théophile de Viau,[20] Saint-Amant, Tristan, and even Cyrano de Bergerac. They were joined by philosophers as well, one of them being François de la Mothe le Vayer (1588–1672), the teacher of Monsieur, brother of Louis XIV. In his treatise *De la vertu des païens* (1640), de la Mothe le Vayer represents the view that Christianity is superfluous if not pernicious, since pagans can possess the same virtues as Christians. Another prominent member of this group is Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655), canon of Digne and professor of mathematics at the Royal Bourbon College, a splendid scholar who advocated Epicureanism.[21] Around them gathered the *libertins érudits,* the learned latitudinarians who were also encountered in scholarly circles and even in the famous cabinet of the brothers Dupuy. Latitudinarianism persisted throughout the century. Temporarily forced into retreat and anonymity when Louis XIV was under the influence of Mme de Maintenon, it made itself felt more strongly than ever after 1717.

---

[13] See B. Neveu, *Un historien à l'école de Port-Royal, Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont* (The Hague 1966).

[14] *Vie de saint Louis roi de France, par Lenain de Tillemont*, ed. by J. de Gaulle, 6 vols. (Paris 1847–51).

René Descartes (see Chap. 18) was himself in no way a latitudinarian. His Christian education was profound, his faith serious, and his astonishing ties with Thomism are of greater significance for deciphering his personal thought than generally assumed.[22] It is understandable that he was encouraged by Bérulle at the beginning of his career. When he structured his essay on the rational mastery of all reality by following a method of systematic doubt, Descartes had no anti-Christian intentions. He limited himself to pursuing the old dream of a comprehensive explanation of material as well as intellectual reality by means of a single principle. But the *Discours de la Méthode* (1637) represents in every respect a turning point in Western thought. His search for evidence, aimed for by the application of sharp and clear logic, created a new way of thinking. This gradually crossed over into the religious realm and left behind the cumbersome synthetic dialectics of Scholasticism, but by its systematic application of doubt it also furnished arguments for the skepticism of the latitudinarians. The success of Cartesianism was extraordinary. To be sure, its success was most prevalent in the social salons, but even the best of minds were affected by it. It is very interesting to see for instance how widespread Cartesianism was even in Port-Royal circles.[23] Arnauld and Nicole adhered to it without, however, renouncing Augustinianism and Thomism. In dealing with this problem they made an extremely valuable contribution with their famous *Logique de Port-Royal* (1662), which probably owed a great deal to Pascal.[24] In Port-Royal as well as in secular circles Cartesianism was of great interest for the sciences, especially mathematics and physics. This interest spread to the intellectuals among the clergy. It is very illuminating that a pious and modest confessor of Port-Royal such as Antoine de Rebours from Auvergne (1595–1661) had in his library a unique collection of scientific works.[25] Philosophic-scientific circles were formed in Paris. One of the most famous was the one around Marin Mersenne (1588–1648), the founder of a successful academy frequented by some of the greatest scholars of their time, among them Roberval. One of its first members was the father of Pascal, Étienne Pascal.[26]

---

[15] See F. Lachèvre, *Le libertinage au XVII^e siècle* (Paris 1920).

[16] See R. Chauviré, *J. Bodin auteur de la République* (Paris 1928).

[17] See P. Villey, *Montaigne et la postérité* (Paris 1925).

[18] See J. Sabrié, *De l'humanisme au rationalisme, Pierre Charron* (Paris 1913).

[19] See E. Magne, *Ninon de Lenclos* (Paris 1925).

[20] See A. Adam, *Théophile de Viau et la libre-pensée française en 1620* (Paris 1935).

[21] See B. Rochot, *Les travaux de Gassendi sur Epicure et l'atomisme, 1619–1658* (Paris 1944); R. Pintard, *La Mothe le Vayer, Gassendi, Guy Patin, études de bibliographie et de critique* (Paris 1943).

[22] See H. Gouhier, *Les premières pensées de Descartes, contribution à l'histoire de l'anti-Renaissance* (Paris 1958); C. Serrurier, *Descartes, l'homme et le penseur* (Paris and Amsterdam 1951).

Pascal (Chap. 3) also owed much to Cartesianism, although he turned against it after his conversion. Pascal's is an interesting case inasmuch as he is at the origin of a new Christian philosophy. But we should not forget that he did not at all aspire to be a philosopher and that his interests were not in this area. He wanted to be an apologist and defend the Christian religion against the latitudinarians, whom he had gotten to know better than anybody else during his secular period.[27] In this regard he joined a long tradition,[28] as had the Jesuit François Garasse[29] and the Capuchin Yves de Paris.[30] But these pre-Pascal polemics missed their target because they were too ponderous and inept. On the day after the miracle of the Holy Thorn (24 March 1656) Pascal had jotted down some notes concerning the value of miracles. But not until 1657 did he resolve to oppose the latitudinarians and to collect notes with a view towards an apologia. His project had caused some disquiet at Port-Royal since he was considered a mere amateur in the field of theology. Moreover, Port-Royal, while skilled in controversies with the Protestants, had no experience in polemics against the latitudinarians. So Pascal was asked to give a lecture which was to detail his plan. For this conference Pascal took an initial inventory of his notes. Fortunately this compilation is preserved and provides insight into Pascal's way of thinking at the time of this presentation, probably around June 1658. Pascal's sickness and subsequent early death kept him from completing his work, which, by the way, was not given very great importance by Port-Royal. In honor of his memory, Pascal's sister Gilberte and his friend, the duke of Roannez, insisted on compiling the *Pensées* from the surviving papers. These appeared in 1670, but only in a partial edition whose text was much changed. Not until 1844 was the precise and complete wording of Pascal's manuscripts made accessible to the readers. But the edition of Port-Royal had sufficed to call the public's attention to Pascal's method, his rich view of man and the world, and the profundity of his analysis of the *conditio humana* and *christiana.* But it was merely a limited success: in his manner of humiliating man's intellect vis-à-vis a God unfathomable to the intellect but able to be experienced by the heart, Pascal opposed the rationalism of Descartes, which nonetheless won out. Few people in the eighteenth century understood the *Pensées.* We know that Voltaire used them as the butt of his ridicule.

---

[23] See G. Lewis, *Augustinisme et cartésianisme à Port-Royal: Descartes et le cartésianisme hollandais* (Paris and Amsterdam 1950), 131–82.

[24] See P. Clair and F. Girbal, eds., *La logique ou l'art de penser* (Paris 1965).

[25] See L. Cognet, *Antoine de Rebours, confesseur de Port-Royal, ami de la famille Pascal: Clermont, ville de Pascal* (Clermont 1962), 219–29.

[26] See R. Lenoble, *Mersenne ou la naissance du mécanisme* (Paris 1943).

[27] See J. Mesnard, "Introduction à l'étude de Pascal mondain," *Annales Universitatis Saraviensis* 3 (1954), 76–94.

[28] See Julien-Eymard d'Angers, *Pascal et ses précurseurs* (Paris 1954).

[29] See J. Lecler, "Un adversaire des libertins au début de XVII^{e} siècle, le P. Garasse," *Études* 209 (1931), 570–72.

Only those who attempted a synthesis between Cartesianism and Christianity managed to reach public opinion. They deserve praise because this undertaking was not without danger. In fact the official circles soon initiated a reaction against the further spread of Descartes's ideas. This resulted in a fight replete with complex and unpleasant episodes, reaching a climax on 1 September 1671 when, after the Mass of the Holy Ghost, the resolutions against Descartes's philosophy were read at the Sorbonne. The dean, Morel, explained that this condemnation concerned especially those who denied the *materia prima* and the *formae substantiales*. The public derided the Sorbonne's insistence upon this sort of archaic Scholasticism and Boileau mocked it in his *Arrêt burlesque.* But the majority of the congregations thought it wiser to prohibit any and all teaching smacking of Cartesianism in their schools. This prohibition was enforced even with measures insulting to some professors. Lamy, whose exegeses have been mentioned before, was summoned to the philosophical faculty of Angers in 1673 and charged with teaching the traditional philosophy of Aristotle and Saint Thomas Aquinas. In his lectures he expressed some clearly pro-Cartesian theses and was promptly exiled to Grenoble on the heels of some dubious incident. Yet he held on to his Cartesian views.

---

[30] See Julien-Eymard d'Angers (C. Chesneau), *Le P. Yves de Paris et son temps, 1590–1670*, 2 vols. (Paris 1946).

Understanding these conditions makes it easier to appreciate what the courage of Nicolas Malebranche (1638–1715), also an Oratorian, meant in such an atmosphere. To fully comprehend him we need an appreciation of what he really was: an admirable religious author who expressed himself through his metaphysics.[31] He was also an apologist, but one who proceeded from his heart, who wanted to lend to religion a metaphysical and logical coherence able to convince both the intellect and the heart in this century of Enlightenment. His daring identification of *ratio* with the word of God combined Descartes's method with the original Augustinian principles, and that is the meaning of the synthesis for which he strove. A Cartesian by deep conviction, he proceeded to contemplate the religious universe of Augustinianism. In his *Recherche de la vérité* (1674) Malebranche presented his basic ideas precisely at the time of the incidents at Angers. His opponents immediately gave voice. From this point on, the mild-mannered and peaceable Malebranche showed himself to be the kind of powerful polemicist he was to remain till the end of his life. In subsequent editions of his work he countered every attack. His other works raised the expression of his thought to ever higher levels, probably reaching a climax in the *Méditations chrétiennes et métaphysiques* (1683). In contrast to the apologias of Pascal, those of Malebranche merged beautifully with the spirit of the century. This accounts for their great success, as demonstrated by the many reprints of his works. But his apologias also embroiled him in lively polemics with the representatives of the old school. Furthermore, his *Traité de la nature et de la grâce* (1680) involved him in a lengthy controversy with the Great Arnauld in which both gave as well as they took. The system by means of which Malebranche wanted to synthesize the mechanism of Descartes with the Augustinian concepts of the *praedestinatio* and the *gratia efficax* was daring and new. But it did contain numerous weak points, which was why Malebranche encountered such a dangerous adversary in the person of the Great Arnauld and why this dispute ended in a draw. Malebranche was quite conscious of that. Long after Arnauld's death in 1712 he was still planning a summary of all his responses to Arnauld. Bossuet was quite hostile to Malebranche's views. In 1684 he charged the young Fénelon, with whom he was on friendly terms at the time, to compose a *Réfutation du système du P. Malebranche*. Fénelon obeyed, but in reading the manuscript Bossuet recognized that these all too youthful comments merely scratched the surface of a difficult problem. Fénelon's work was not published. In spite of the resistance from various parties, the reputation of Malebranche grew more and more. In all of Europe those who knew the problems involved—foremost among them Leibniz—considered it an honor to have maintained connections with Malebranche[32] (see Chap. 18).

---

[31] See A. Robinet, *Système et existence dans l'œuvre de Malebranche* (Paris 1965).

For posterity the fame of Malebranche has overshadowed less prominent Cartesians who were making similar efforts at that time. Yet several of them are of interest even today. We have already named Lamy, but we should also mention the Oratorian Nicolas Poisson (1637–1710), the author of the rare book *Commentaires ou remarques sur la méthode de M. Descartes* (Vendôme 1671), which played an important role in the history of Cartesianism. Clerselier suggested that he also write a biography of the great philosopher. We should not forget the very interesting Géraud de Cordemoy (1626–84),[33] who enjoyed the esteem of both Malebranche and Leibniz. But these are only the privileged representatives of a movement the detailed history of which has not yet been written. It was a movement which—no doubt unintentionally—paved the way for the rationalism of the eighteenth century.

---

[32] See A. Robinet, *Malebranche et Leibniz, relations personnelles* (Paris 1955).

[33] See G. de Cordemoy, *Œuvres philosophiques, avec une étude bio-bibliographique*, ed. by P. Clair and F. Girbal (Paris 1968).

SECTION TWO

The Papacy in the Period of French Hegemony

Introduction

The Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Wars of Religion in Europe (with the exception of England) and determined the configuration of the confessional map of Europe up to the first half of the present century, also meant a turning point in the position of the papacy. It had to resign itself to the factual situation. The protest of Innocent X charging the accords with contravening or injuring the rights of the Church have frequently encumbered the Church by the implication that the Pope, by his protest, wanted to undermine the making of peace in favor of continuing the war. Yet it amounted to nothing more than a formal legal reservation which, furthermore, was published with considerable delay in the brief *Zelus Domus Dei*, antedated by almost two years, so that the protest really had no practical effect.

The outcome of the Thirty Years' War meant a strengthening of the power of the state in ecclesiastical matters as well and led to the gradually expanding principle of the established Church, which, although developing differently in the various countries, had in common the diminution of the influence of Rome. In the following period the papacy increasingly lost esteem and the power to influence events. This can be demonstrated by the diminishing participation of the Holy See in the peace negotiations of the time. Whereas it took an active part in the Peace Conference of Münster in the person of its legate Chigi, the representative of the Pope was seldom listened to by the end of the century. In the eighteenth century decisions between the powers were generally made without the Pope and at times even against him.

As far as the Catholic powers were concerned, the papacy became in this period an object of their politics rather than those politics being determined to any degree by the Pope. In any given case he was caught within the existing and continuing field of tension based upon the constant opposition between France and the Habsburgs on the one hand, and between France and England on the other. The only area in which the Pope retained a certain initiative of his own was leadership in repelling the continuing Turkish threat.

For the most part the papal elections turned into political power plays between groups of cardinals in sympathy either with France or the Emperor. It was only in rare cases that the "Third Party" of independents—after the conclave of 1655 they were called the *squadrone volante* because of their political neutrality and their mobility resulting from it—could make a decision. As the result of political pressure on the papal elections it was not altogether rare that a compromise had to be sought and that sometimes there were elections which would have been unthinkable without the massive intervention of the various powers. In general it held true that no candidate could be elected against the express will of the French King. Yet this did not always mean invoking the *ius exclusival,* since the two-thirds' majority required by the rules of papal elections did create the possibility of a blocking minority. The fact that papal elections of this period generally took a very long time was due—aside from the slowness of communication and the difficulties encountered in traveling—precisely to those political interventions.

The appointments of cardinals as well were jealously watched by the various governments so that none of the individual powers would in any way be favored. There still remained the unwritten "right" of Catholic sovereigns to suggest to the Pope a number of candidates for the cardinalate in order to have, by virtue of these "Cardinals of the Crown," a special representation of their own interests within the College of Cardinals primarily for the event of a papal election. The nepotism of the previous period was not entirely overcome, even if some Popes kept themselves either partially or totally aloof from this traditional form of governing and family welfare.

The position of the papacy in the field of dogma and church discipline was aggravated and even endangered by tensions that appeared at mid-century which, spreading rapidly, were destined to lead to internal divisions. The ideas of Gallicanism and the Jansenist movement continued to be in opposition to each other into the next century. Thus it could happen that a comment by the Holy See against one was almost interpreted as partisanship in favor of the other party. No doubt the Church lost a good deal of initiative and strength by these continuing dogmatic disputes which no longer were of concern merely to theological experts, but encroached on the life of the Church itself (Chaps. 2–4).

The intellectual movement known as the Enlightenment also had its beginnings around this time. Rome was late in recognizing its importance and even then underestimated it because the Holy See's attention was riveted too much upon the negative effects and especially upon the attack on the belief in revealed religion. This necessarily widened the gulf between the leadership of the Church, arrested in traditional ways of thinking, and the new intellectual current emanating from England and France and influencing the whole Western world, a movement that soon went beyond the narrow circle of scholars to lead to a generally accepted new attitude towards life and the intellect even within the bourgeoisie. Its basic concerns, such as the demand for critical examination instead of a mere faith in authority, or its idea of tolerance and a practical humanity were viewed with distrust and rejection even when they were pronounced with the best of intentions by the foremost moderate representatives of the Enlightenment, such as Leibniz. The fact that the Church offered nothing but a rigid rejection of this challenge directed energetically against the traditional forms of church life contributed to both Church and papacy being viewed more and more as outmoded. More so than in other countries, where certain concerns of the new intellectual current were gradually accepted by ecclesiastical circles, resulting in something like a Catholic Enlightenment being formed, the above reaction could not but have its effect in Italy and primarily in the Papal States. It was here that the influence of Rome was most immediate and developments which were possible elsewhere could only take place with great difficulty or not at all (Chap. 18).

The simple faithful remained relatively untouched by the Enlightenment; they preserved their faith. A clear indicator of this was the noticeably high participation of the faithful in the popular missions which experienced a new flowering in this period especially in Italy. Above all it was the two Segneri, Paolo (1624–94) and his nephew Paolo the Younger (1673–1713), who developed their own exemplary missionary style with impressive elements of a baroque, sometimes perhaps exaggerated piety (with penitential processions, public flagellation, and dramatic religious plays). Aside from the religious benefits of this novel pastoral method, contemporaries especially recognized its social success, consisting of settling family and blood feuds as well as economic injustices. Of similar importance was the Capuchin Francesco Maria Casini (1648–1719), who preached at the papal court for fourteen years. In his sermons before the Pope he criticized the failings of the clergy and the administration of the Papal States with surprising frankness.

CHAPTER 7

The Popes from Alexander VII to Clement X

Alexander VII (1655–67)

After the death of Innocent X, Cardinal Mazarin, who conducted French policies, wanted to push through the election of Giulio Sacchetti. The latter had been considered as far back as 1644 but had been excluded by Spain and since then been called Cardinal Trentatre because of the insufficient thirty-three votes he consistently received over a period of time. But Sacchetti personally intervened with Mazarin in favor of the candidacy of Fabio Chigi, which he had earlier opposed. Because of his actions at the Peace Conference of Münster (Westphalia) he was initially not agreeable to France.[1] But with Mazarin's concurrence Chigi was elected on 7 April 1655 after a conclave of eighty days. He chose his name in memory of his countryman Alexander III.

The newly elected Pope was born into a Siena family who had been generous patrons of the arts two generations earlier in Rome (Farnesina, chapels in Santa Maria della Pace and Santa Maria del Popolo). After twelve years as nuncio on the Rhine his predecessor appointed him Secretary of State in 1651 and cardinal in the following year. But towards the end of the pontificate of Innocent X he lost influence because of Olympia Maidalchini's intrigues against him. Alexander VII, impressed by his personal experience of the extant abuses, was initially resolved to end the practice of nepotism completely. But later on he gave in to the entreaties of diplomats and even some well-known cardinals who urged him to call his relatives to the papal court and entrust them with governmental positions. The safeguards designed to prevent abuses subsequently proved insufficient.

From the very beginning of Alexander's pontificate, his relationship with France, the supreme Catholic power, was tense. Added to the fact that Chigi was not Mazarin's actual choice, his papal government was also encumbered by problems he inherited from his predecessor. Among them was that of Cardinal de Retz (Jean-François Paul de Gondi), who had been arrested in France as an enemy of Mazarin. In August 1654 he was able to escape and make his way to Rome via Spain by the end of the year. In spite of all the efforts by the Pope to arrive at a satisfactory solution of this case, the presence of de Retz in Rome could not fail to have a deleterious effect on the relationship with France. In addition, the negotiations concerning the appointments of bishops in the newly acquired areas of France, which were not covered by the Concordat of 1516, had stagnated under Innocent X. Lastly, Mazarin did not like the Pope's efforts to promote peace between France and Spain.

---

[1] P. Richard's criticism is very sharp and probably not without exaggeration: "Il est indéniable que Chigi a travaillé au congrès contre la France, et mis tout en œuvre pour faire échouer ses vues et ses prétentions. C'était peu répondre à un programme de médiation, et justifier par avance l'animosité dont le poursuivirent plus tard les hommes d'État français, Mazarin en tête. . . ." But even he admits: "Ce qui justifie l'attitude du nonce médiateur, c'est que les Français abandonnaient l'Église pour les protestants, ce que lui, agent de la papauté, ne pouvait, ne devait pas admettre." (*DHGE* 2, 235 f.).

Therefore Rome was excluded as the site of a peace conference. In March 1656 the French ambassador at the Holy See was recalled. The negotiations, which resulted in the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659) and the uniting of the dynasties of France and Spain through the marriage of Louis XIV to the infanta Maria Teresa, the daughter of King Philip IV, took place to the deliberate exclusion of the Pope. In the peace treaty the two powers even obliged themselves to support the claims of the Este family to the coastal town of Comacchio and those of the Farnese family to Castro which ran counter to the interests of the Holy See.

After the death of Mazarin (9 March 1661), tension between France and Rome increased. The twenty-two-year-old Louis XIV, convinced of his dignity and power and raised in the spirit of Gallican ideas, sought to prevail in his ecclesiastic policies. Sending the duke of Créqui as ambassador to Rome in June 1662, although welcomed by Alexander VII as a sign of support of the papal defensive policy against the Turks (see below), was designed at the same time to demonstrate the hegemony of France. Then problems of ceremony led to displeasure. The new ambassador, moreover, claimed immunity for the buildings bordering on the Palazzo Farnese. The demand of this extended "quartering privilege" was initially rejected. After several fights between the ambassador's retinue and the papal soldiers from Corsica billeted near the Ponte Sisto, the Corsicans got carried away and fired upon the Farnese Palace on 20 August 1662, putting Créqui himself in danger of his life, and then molested the duchess and her companions, who were returning to the palace just then. In spite of immediate measures by the papal administration and an offer by the Pope to make amends, Créqui retired to Florence. The incident offered to French policy makers a good opportunity to exact some special concessions in matters of ecclesiastical policy and so they escalated their demands. Avignon was occupied and military actions against the Papal States were prepared. It was under this kind of pressure that the Treaty of Pisa was concluded on 12 February 1664. Alexander VII was compelled to accept the humiliating conditions which included, among others, the erection of a memorial pyramid bearing a confession of guilt which was not removed until more than four years later (31 May 1668). On the issue of bishops' appointments the Pope had to comply fully with the wishes of the French King. Only then did Louis XIV return Avignon (May 1665); in order to give another signal for the decrease of tension he recalled the duke of Créqui in May 1665 and put in his place the duke de Chaulnes.

The Pope's attitude towards France was also conditioned by the Turkish threat. The island of Crete, belonging to Venice, was especially vulnerable. A diversionary attack against the Dardanelles in June 1657, conducted with papal support, failed and resulted in the loss of several islands in the Ionian Sea. In 1660 after the Battle of Clausenburg the Turks conquered Grosswardein. When Emperor Leopold I appealed to him for aid, the Pope attempted to establish a defensive league. But the success of his efforts depended entirely on France. The negotiations conducted by the duke de Créqui were interrupted by the incident involving the Corsican soldiers. It was feared that the Turks would attack Vienna as early as 1664. Surprisingly, Louis XIV sent a contingent of seven thousand men in the summer of 1664 with whose help the Turks were decisively defeated near the Cistercian convent of Sankt Gotthard on the Gyor River (1 August 1664). Yet the victory was not exploited. The Emperor was eager to conclude the Peace of Eisenburg because he could neither be sure of continued aid from the Empire nor of support from France. The next military objective of the Turks was again Candia. In the last months of his life Alexander VII again sent an urgent appeal to Louis XIV and the other Catholic princes asking for military aid for the Signoria of Venice. The Pope on his own part authorized a great sum of financial aid and had the papal galleys prepared. The total expenditures in connection with the papal fleet in defense against the Turks during the pontificate of Alexander VII are estimated at more than one and a half million scudi.

In his appointments to cardinalates, Alexander VII kept to the traditional practice of giving primary consideration to Italians. Out of a total of thirty-eight appointments with six promotions, foreigners were appointed only twice—two Spaniards and Germans each and one Frenchman. The conspicuous favoring of Sienese was taken note of even then; the great number of reservations *in petto,* a total of seventeen, is surprising. The reason for that was the lack of adequate remuneration for the appointees. But the appointments were nonetheless pronounced in order to complete the traditional membership of seventy in the College of Cardinals and thereby to forestall the demands by Catholic powers for crown cardinals. The most prominent among the appointees were the Jesuit Pallavicino, a friend of the Pope's and well known through his history of the Council of Trent; the bishop of Regensburg, Franz Wilhelm zu Wartenberg, who had worked with Chigi at the Peace Conference of Münster; and Gregorio Barbarigo, bishop of Bergamo and later of Padua, who came close to being elected Pope in subsequent conclaves.

The condemnation of laxist propositions by the Holy Office in 1665 and 1666 (D 2021–65) are thematically related to the continuing Jansenist disputes. The decrees were triggered by censures on the part of the universities of Louvain and Paris, some of whose wording was included verbatim in the Roman condemnations. Even though probabilism was not rejected as a system, this first detailed condemnation of "laxist" propositions represented a considerable success for the opponents of the Jesuit order, which was accused of lax morality.

A great stir was caused when Queen Christina of Sweden, daughter and successor of Gustavus Adolphus, renounced her throne and converted to Catholicism. The assertion that her conversion was without actual religious conviction and merely an escape from her dynastic responsibility is undoubtedly without fact. We need not dwell on the questions whether or to what extent her decisive motives were a compelling insight in matters of faith, or a certain aversion for the rigidity of the kind of orthodox Protestantism in Scandinavia at that time and the desire for greater intellectual freedom.[2] After renouncing the throne on 6 June 1654, Christina secretly pronounced the Catholic confession of faith on Christmas Day that year in Brussels. On 2 November 1655 she reiterated it publicly in Innsbruck. Shortly before Christmas she entered Rome with great ceremony. It was characteristic of the situation that the Pope exhorted the cardinals to make sure that the royal convert could not take offense at their behavior. He told them how his own work in Germany had taught him how scrupulously the northerners watched the Romans. Impulsive spending, political gaffes—especially her attempts to attain the crown of Naples—lack of sensitivity, and her scornful criticism of the customs of Roman piety led to friction. Yet Alexander VII was never lacking in benevolence and helpfulness towards the former queen. The tension decreased after Cardinal Azzolini gained influence about 1660 and managed to eliminate the undependable elements from Christina's retinue. Aside from two stays in France and two trips to Sweden in connection with her appanage, the former queen remained in Rome. Her apartments—initially in Mazarin's palace on the Quirinal and later in the Palazzo Riario on the right bank of the Tiber—became a center of the cultural life of Rome.

Rome's culture was considerably enhanced by the extension of the University of Rome. New chairs were established, among them that of church history, together with an appropriate library called the Biblioteca Alessandrina after its founder. But most prominent were the construction projects in the Vatican initiated by the Pope and executed by Bernini. The *Cathedra Petri,*[3] a simple oaken armchair decorated with small antique tablets of ivory and used in the Middle Ages in the liturgy on Saint Peter's Day (22 February) was to be the focal point in the apse of Saint Peter's, which was empty at that time. Bernini's design of four bronze statues of the great church Fathers carrying the *Cathedra* enclosed in bronze was approved by the Pope, who personally supervised all the work. Construction of Saint Peter's Square was started at the same time, again planned and executed by Bernini. According to the original design as shown on a medallion coined on 28 August 1657 on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone, the space between the two half-arches of the colonnades was to be closed by a continuation separated only by two relatively narrow entrances. By the end of Alexander VII's pontificate only part of the construction work was finished. The Pope also had Bernini build new stairs to the Scala Regia and to the Sistine Chapel; this Scala Regia was finished in 1666. Four years later the equestrian statue of Constantine the Great, created by Bernini and completed during Alexander's VII lifetime, was placed in the vestibule.

---

[2] See S. Stolpe, *Königin Christine von Schweden* (Frankfurt 1962); *Queen Christina of Sweden: Documents and Studies*, ed. by M. von Platen (Stockholm 1966); C. Weibull, *Christina of Sweden* (Göteborg 1966); G. Masson, *Queen Christina* (London 1968).

[3] See D. Balboni, *La Cattedra di San Pietro* (Vatican City 1967); for an initial tentative report of the results of the examination which was made by a commission appointed by Paul VI in 1968/69, see *L'Osservatore Romano* no. 275 of 28 November 1968, p. 3.

Clement IX (1667–69)

On 20 June 1667 Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi was elected Pope after a remarkably brief conclave of only eighteen days. As nuncio at Madrid he had obtained Spain's goodwill, but—unknown to Spain—he was also in the favor of Louis XIV. Also active in his behalf were the cardinals of the *squadrone volante*, who were primarily credited with the outcome of the election. The new Pope had been secretary of state under his predecessor and was famous for his humanistic education and poetic talent. A number of his dramas, based in part on Spanish models, were successfully performed at the time. His choice of the name Clement was prompted by the meaning of the word rather than its connection with an earlier bearer of the name, as was often the case. One of the few medallions of his brief pontificate is inscribed "Aliis non sibi clemens." A short pontificate was expected from the start because of his frail health.

The pontificate of Clement IX was troubled by two major problem areas. One was the continuing tensions in France caused by the Jansenist movement and the Pope's efforts to allay them. This was to be achieved by the so-called Clementine Peace (Chap. 3), but in the last analysis the Pope's efforts remained unsuccessful. The other was the danger posed by the Turks. The island of Crete was again their prime objective. They had already conquered the larger part of the island and were preparing to attack the capital of Candia (Megalo Castro), still in the hands of the Venetians. Just like his predecessor, Clement IX attempted to bring about joint aid by the Western powers. He tried to bring an end to the war between Louis XIV and Spain (War of Devolution) which broke out in May 1667 when France invaded the Spanish Netherlands. But the Pope's suggestions and the entreaties of various nuncios extraordinary sent to all the capitals were hardly successful. But the political constellation resulting from the alliance between Holland, England, and Sweden made the French King condescend to a negotiated peace. He kept his conquests in the Netherlands, but had to return the occupied Franche-Comté. The fact of the papal mediation was emphasized in the peace treaty of Aachen (2 May 1668). Finally, the removal of the humiliating pyramid erected in Rome in 1664 was intended to seal the reconciliation between France and the Holy See. The peace treaty also increased hopes of joint aid for the island of Crete. But the assurances given by the Western powers were only partly kept and were insufficient to boot. Even the French expeditionary corps, numerically small in the summer of 1668 but significantly increased the following year, was unable to change the outcome. Naval superiority was not exploited and so the fortress of Candia was forced to surrender on 6 September 1669.

Clement X (1670–76)

A few days before he died on 9 December 1669, Clement IX had appointed seven cardinals, bringing the complement of the college back up to the traditional seventy. The subsequent conclave, lasting more than four months, proved difficult. Among the sources informing us in detail of the events and negotiations, the voluminous correspondence between Queen Christina and Cardinal Azzolini is especially interesting. The French rejected two possible candidates (D'Elce and Odescalchi), while the Spanish opposed two others (Vidoni and Brancaccio), virtually eliminating any chance of those four being elected. Vidoni was the candidate promoted by Queen Christina and Azzoli. The long duration of the conclave provoked great displeasure and gave rise to many satires. The representatives of the Catholic powers probably exerted greater influence on this papal election than on any previous one. Upon mediation by Venice, Spain and France finally agreed that one of the cardinals appointed by Pope Clement IX before his death should be elected. The choice was the oldest of that group, the eighty-year-old Cardinal Altieri. The election took place on 29 April 1670. Resisting for some time, Altieri finally gave in to the urgings of the cardinals and accepted the election as Pope Clement X. The advanced age of the newly elected Pope resulted in the cardinal-nephew Paluzzi-Altieri gaining in importance while the secretary of state lost influence. While Clement X personally urged thriftiness, he could not prevent his nephew from enriching himself by means of his position.

The pontificate of Clement X was largely determined by the increasing danger posed by Turkey. In 1672 the objective was Poland, which was weakened by internal disorder. The Pope sought to have the Emperor and the Catholic princes of Germany coalesce into a defensive alliance and even appealed—probably following a suggestion by Queen Christina—to the King of Sweden, Charles IX, who refused, however, to enter into any direct negotiations with the Pope. Conversely, Russia now sought Western support against the Turks and after thirteen years of war concluded an alliance with Poland. With financial support from the Pope and a personal contribution from Cardinal Odescalchi, John Sobieski had formed his own army in 1673. He advanced against the Turks and defeated them decisively at the Dniester (11 November). On the eve of the battle the Polish King, Michael Wiśniowiecki, had succumbed to an illness. In lengthy negotiations concerning the succession to the throne, the Pope and his nuncio, Buonvisi, insisted on a Catholic candidate. But the candidacy of the papal nephew, Gaspare Altieri, suggested by Rome in the course of the negotiations, was rejected as totally impossible by the nuncio. But more dangerous by far were the applicants from the house of Brandenburg. Finally, on 20 May 1674, John Sobieski was elected king. The following summer he again succeeded against the Turks in the defense of the city of Lemberg.

While the Pope made every effort to form a defensive alliance against the Turks, Louis XIV prepared for a war of conquest against Holland, which had permitted itself to become politically isolated. This war was propagated by France as a holy war for the restoration of the Catholic religion. Initially the Pope in fact believed this professed goal. Briefs of praise and Te Deums in Rome upon the victories of the French army demonstrate how effective that propaganda was. The military aid given to the Dutch by Emperor Leopold I was disapproved of as a weakening of the unified front against the Turks. The intervention of Spain was also condemned by the Pope. After about the summer of 1674 Clement X perceived that he had been deceived regarding the actual aims of the war against Holland. In addition, Louis XIV tried to frustrate the Pope's peace negotiations at every turn. Nevertheless three nuncios extraordinary were sent to the western capitals of Paris, Vienna, and Madrid in October 1675 in order to prepare for peace negotiations. At the same time a papal representative was designated for the actual peace conference, although no place or time had been considered yet. The instruction composed for this purpose is important since it clarifies the developments since the time of the Peace of Westphalia.[4] At that time Chigi had strictly to hew to the traditional rule of dealing only with the Catholic powers and not having anything to do with the apostates. But now the papal representative was permitted to establish communication with the Protestants as well. He was instructed not to offend them by pedantic considerations and to make concessions for the sake of peace in Europe. Yet for the time being these preparations did not lead to anything.

More than his predecessors the aged Pope was hard pressed by the Catholic powers to accede to appointments to the cardinalate. In addition to fifteen Italians, Clement X appointed a mere five cardinals of other nationalities: two French, one German, Spanish, and English. France especially exerted constant pressure. Louis XIV above all wanted to have the bishop of Laon, César D'Estrées, promoted to cardinal. So the King sent him to Rome as an ambassador extraordinary to enable him personally to pursue his appointment. D'Estrées was indeed appointed *in petto* on 24 August 1671, but he was not satisfied with that. Even before the appointment was published the brother of the new cardinal arrived in Rome as the new ambassador of France. By order of Louis XIV, César also remained at the Curia. Now both brothers pursued the appointment of additional favorites of the French King to cardinalates. On 21 May 1675 their strenuous efforts led to a serious incident. In a papal audience the duke D'Estrées addressed himself to the subject of appointments still outstanding. In the process he vehemently reproached Cardinal Altieri, the papal nepotist. When the Pope wanted to signal the end of the audience by means of his bell, the ambassador obstructed him by grabbing his hand. When Clement X made another attempt to end the audience, D'Estrées would not leave. After a third signal of the bell the Pope tried to get up and was pushed back into his chair by D'Estrées. A few days later the Pope appointed six new cardinals, his last ones, among whom there was not a single Frenchman.

---

[4] The most important part of the instruction in *QFIAB* 15 (1913), 366 f., n. 3.

CHAPTER 8

Innocent XI

After having met with the determined resistance of France at the previous conclave, Cardinal Odescalchi's election came as a complete surprise. At the beginning of the present conclave his candidacy had been openly promoted by the nephew of the late pope, Cardinal Altieri, with whom Louis XIV and his ambassador to Rome were totally at variance. Furthermore, Altieri acted in concert with the Spanish cardinals, also opponents of France. When D'Estrées threatened to invoke the *ius exclusivae* if the election were to take place before the arrival of the French cardinals, the number of votes for Odescalchi decreased markedly. But in the meantime the French ambassador had asked Louis XIV to approve the election of the candidate originally rejected by him. Cardinals Chigi and Rospigliosi, both in the King's favor, supported this action by emphatically recommending Odescalchi to Louis XIV. The King concurred and he was elected unanimously on 21 September 1676, after having received a mere eight votes on the previous day.

The new Pope chose his name in memory of the one who had appointed him cardinal in 1645 when he was a mere thirty-four years of age. He came from a wealthy mercantile family in Como and made a name for himself in the administration of the Papal States under Urban VIII and Innocent X. His charity, extreme conscientiousness, and austere piety were widely acknowledged. Before he accepted the election he insisted that all cardinals sign the fourteen articles of reform suggested by him during the conclave.[1] Always intent upon safeguarding and defending the rights of the Church, he was not very open to the advice of others and at times persisted all too rigidly in his own views. Moreover, he had never spent any time abroad, so that his knowledge of the political situation was insufficient. While he was an excellent administrator with a special skill in financial matters, he was lacking in knowledge of human nature and even in theological education.

Innocent XI refrained from any kind of nepotism. Frugal by nature, he put the financial affairs of the Papal States in order. But in his strict, sometimes overly pedantic instructions concerning any sort of luxury and the reform of public order he several times went so far as to prohibit all carnivals, consequently becoming the butt of ridicule by the Romans.

The pontificate of Innocent XI bears the stamp of two problem areas.

---

[1] The text of the articles of reform is published in Bojani I, 31–37.

In addition to his efforts in the defense against the Turks (see below), the tense relationship between the Holy See and France was a major problem. It emanated from the unrestricted right of regalia claimed by the French King. Ever since the Middle Ages the King had had the right to make appointments to ecclesiastical livings in certain vacant dioceses (spiritual regalia) and to receive the revenues of bishoprics (temporal regalia). Since Louis XIII, care had been taken not to use these revenues for improper purposes. The second council of Louvain (1274) had forbidden further extension of this right. In so doing it appeared to recognize implicitly or at least to condone it. After several earlier attempts to extend the right of regalia to other dioceses, Louis XIV—considering it a true right of the crown—decreed in 1673 and 1675 that it was to apply to all areas subject to the French crown. Clement X, informed of the decree by his nuncio, did not make any response. Almost all the French bishops, in part influenced by the papal silence which could be construed as acquiescence, submitted to the royal decree. Only Bishop Pavillon of Alet and Bishop Caulet of Pamiers resisted. Not getting any support from their metropolitan, they appealed to the Pope. The fact that Innocent XI accepted the bishops' appeal was in accord with his conviction not to permit any encroachment upon the rights of the Church. But under the circumstances it was a somewhat dangerous assertion of principle in a matter of secondary importance. As a consequence the Pope was viewed as a friend of the Jansenist party. This was incorrect yet understandable in view of the personality of the two appellants, who were well known from the Jansenist conflict. The situation vis-à-vis France, already tense, was unnecessarily aggravated by this incident. In two briefs of March 1678 and January 1679 the Pope admonished the King not to follow the bad advice which was misleading him into an extension of the right of regalia and with it into a violation of the rights of the Church, but instead to keep in mind the salvation of his soul. A third brief, sent in March 1680, was more to the point. It warned the King of the wrath of Heaven which could manifest itself in making him die without a successor. But Louis XIV, having been struck by the idea of a national council, decided upon a noncommittal answer. At the Curia, the King's confessor, de la Chaize, and his fellow Jesuit Maimbourg were wrongly given the major portion of the blame for the King's inflexibility. In the meantime, the French Assembly of the Clergy of 1680 had taken the King's part. Louis XIV, wanting to gain time, suggested negotiations. After a lengthy delay, Cardinal d'Estrées, who was to conduct them, arrived in Rome in the spring of 1681. But Innocent XI had already given a sharp allocution against France in a consistory on 13 January 1681. At that time the so-called "Small Assembly" of the French clergy under the direction of the archbishop of

Paris, Harlay, and the archbishop of Reims, Le Tellier, supported the King's position concerning the right of regalia and suggested convening a national council or an extraordinary Assembly of the Clergy. Aside from their original function as a "tax parliament" which decided the contributions of the French Church to the King (*don gratuit*), these periodic assemblies since their inception had also dealt with other ecclesiastical matters.[2] In general they involved efforts genuinely serving the reform and the promotion of church life even though the self-consciousness of the Gallican Church appears always to have been involved, intent on safeguarding its special privileges and position. Depending on the importance of these assemblies, the King and his government increasingly tried to influence their composition, either by means of recommendations or by exerting pressure upon the elective body of the individual church provinces. Such measures were also employed in the preparation of the assembly of October 1681. Again under the direction of Harlay and Le Tellier, it turned into an obedient tool of the government. The assembly agreed with the King that regalia was an exclusive right of the crown. In a general way the assembly noted that the ruler was independent of the authority of the Church in all purely temporal matters. The codification of additional articles designated as "Gallican Liberties" required lengthy discussion. In the end they were formulated by Bossuet, who was trying to avoid a more radical version. The King then decreed that they be included as binding doctrine.

The news of the assembly's conclusions arrived in Rome during the negotiations between the Pope and Cardinal d'Estrées, which were immediately interrupted. In his brief of 11 April 1682, Innocent XI sharply rebuked the assembly while sparing the King as much as possible. The Pope's chagrin was primarily directed at de la Chaize, the King's confessor, but the latter's influence was overestimated and his personal attitude misunderstood.[3] Indeed, Louis XIV suspended the assembly on 9 May and dismissed it at the end of June in order to bring about a resumption of the interrupted negotiations in Rome. Since the threat of Turkey had become more and more acute, Innocent XI was prepared for a moratorium. As an outward sign of détente he was to send a nuncio extraordinary to France upon the birth of the first son of the Dauphin. Although it was not the birth of a crown prince, the nuncio was to present the diapers blessed by the Pope as a special sign of goodwill.

---

[2] See P. Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie: Étude sur les Assemblées Générales du Clergé de 1615 à 1666* (Rome 1959).

[3] See G. Guitton, *Le Père de la Chaize, Confesseur de Louis XIV* (Paris 1959); P. Blet, "Jésuites Gallicans au XVII^{e} siècle," *AHSI* 29 (1960), 55–84.

But the most important reason for the nuncio's mission was to get the support of Louis XIV for the war against the Turks and to pave the way for a reconciliation between France and the Emperor. The gravest impediment was the issue of the vacant sees. Innocent XI steadfastly refused to confer canonical investiture upon the new bishops nominated by the King if they had participated in the Assembly of the Clergy of 1681/82 and had not disavowed the four Gallican articles.

Louis XIV was convinced that his measures against the Huguenots, resulting in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, would meet with the Pope's approval and he therefore expected Rome's cooperation on the issue of the regalia. But Innocent XI maintained his reserve for two reasons: the actions against the Huguenots were prompted by Gallicanism, and the Pope expressly disapproved of the violent methods applied against them.

During this conflict between the Pope and France another one arose in Rome. It had to do with the quartering privilege claimed by the ambassadors to the Holy See. Their demands for concomitant immunity from police supervision and for extensive freedom from customs duty, which led to trade and business transactions on a large scale, stretched the quartering franchise to troublesome proportions. From the very beginning of his pontificate Innocent XI was determined to put an end to those abuses. Spain declared its willingness to forego the quartering privilege if the other powers would follow suit. But no agreement could be reached. So the Pope let it be known that he would receive no new ambassador unless he would surrender the franchise in advance. Venice was first to give in. After a lengthy period of resistance Spain followed suit in 1682. After the death of the French ambassador d'Estrées (30 January 1687), the Pope informed France that the new ambassador would only be received if he acceded to the conditions laid down by him. Subsequent proposals for settling the issue were rejected by Innocent XI. In November the new ambassador de Lavardin entered Rome at the head of a large retinue. Since he was considered subject to the sanctions of the bull *In Coena Domini*, he was not granted the papal audience he had requested. At the same time the French King was informed by the nuncio that the censure of the bull applied to him as well. The conflict broke into the open on 24 December 1687 when de Lavardin attended midnight Mass at the French national church of San Luigi dei Francesi. He was ushered to the seat of honor according to his rank of ambassador and given the sacraments. The Pope thereupon put the church under the interdict.

The tension was increased by the issue of the appointment of a coadjutor of Cologne. After the sudden death of the elector of Cologne, Maximilian von Wittelsbach, the election of a successor had to be endorsed. Both candidates, Cardinal Wilhelm von Fürstenberg, Bishop of Strasbourg, nominee of Louis XIV, and the seventeen-year-old Clement of Bavaria, the Emperor's nominee, needed the Pope's dispensation. The election was inconclusive. In spite of threats from Louis XIV, the Pope appointed the Bavarian. This led to the outbreak of the war between France and the Emperor in September 1688. Attempts at mediation on the part of James II of England failed. In April 1689 de Lavardin was recalled from Rome without having been received in audience by the Pope. The following May Nuncio Ranuzzi left Paris, having been under police supervision since October 1688.

The conflict with France had a bearing on simultaneous efforts by the Pope to establish a defense against the Turks. These constitute the foremost achievements of his pontificate, as is rightfully pointed out on his tomb in Saint Peter's.

At about the beginning of Innocent XI's pontificate, Kara Mustafa had become grand vizier and had taken over the direction of the Turkish government. This increased the danger of a renewed offensive. In order to counter this danger and to make sure of an effective defense the Pope engaged in mediation to end the war between France and the Emperor. For this purpose he sent a legate to the peace negotiations at Protestant Nijmegen. This was the first time since the schism that a papal representative set foot on Dutch soil. But his authority displeased France since it was the custom that only the Emperor was mentioned by name while the other rulers were mentioned collectively. Because of these problems of protocol the legate, Bevilacqua, could not sign the peace treaties and the papal mediation was not mentioned at all. The peace terms were especially unfavorable for Catholics living in Protestant areas. By doing nothing to advance the cause of the Catholic religion Louis XIV disappointed the Pope's expectations.

The advent of peace did not further the Pope's main goal of bringing about a defensive and offensive alliance against the Turks. In the east his efforts were thwarted by the distrust prevailing between Russia and Poland. This was aggravated by the initial Francophile policy of King Sobieski, who—disregarding the Pope's admonitions—supported the Hungarians revolting against Emperor Leopold I by letting them recruit troops in Poland. In return Louis XIV stated his readiness to try to have his ambassador in Constantinople ensure that Poland would not be attacked by Turkey. If such an attack were to take place, he promised to come to Poland's aid. At the Imperial Diet of 1680 renewed attempts to form a league with the Emperor failed; in the following year the French influence once again managed to prevent a resolution by the Polish Diet in favor of an alliance against the Turks. Yet Innocent XI did not tire in pursuing his plans of a great offensive. He envisioned French naval operations in support of a land-based attack by the Emperor and Poland. This was basically the same plan suggested fifteen years before to Louis XIV by the young Leibniz.[4] Actually Louis XIV informed the Holy See that he would help Poland and Venice if they were attacked, but that the Emperor would not be able to count on his aid. This assurance of benevolent neutrality in the eventuality of an attack upon the Emperor coupled with Thököly's revolt in Hungary confirmed Kara Mustafa in his intentions against Austria. But now this direct threat had the effect of reversing Polish policy, leading to a defensive alliance with the Emperor (April 1683). The Pope expended approximately one and a half million guilders in subsidies, about two-thirds of which went to the Emperor. By 14 July Vienna, defended by Rüdiger von Starhemberg, was completely surrounded. The Emperor and his court had shortly before fled to the west. The siege was prolonged by the unswerving courage of the numerically weak garrison of Vienna and by tactical mistakes on the part of the Turks. At the very last moment a relief force consisting of Austrian, Polish, and Bavarian troops under the nominal command of Sobieski approached and on 12 September 1683 forced the Turks to retreat. Vienna owed its liberation above all to the efforts of Innocent XI.

In spite of the allied victories at Ofen and the conquest of Gran in October of the same year, the alliance was endangered by a renewed rapprochement between Sobieski and the Hungarian rebels and by Louis XIV's attempts at joining Poland to France in a closer relationship. But the Pope managed to maintain the alliance. In 1684 it was joined by Venice after diplomatic relations, terminated five years prior because of the quartering franchise, were reestablished between the Serenissima and the Holy See. The powers of the "Holy League" pledged to use their troops only against the Turks, to update war plans annually, and not to negotiate without the agreement of the other allies. Again the expansionist policies of France impaired the effectiveness of the league. In May 1684 Genoa, refusing to bow to the wishes of France, was destroyed by a French fleet and Luxemburg was conquered by French troops. Therefore the military operations of the league could not begin until late in 1684 and, with the unsuccessful siege of Ofen, showed scant success. Primarily owing to the Pope's urgent appeals, a peace treaty and subsequent alliance against the Turks were concluded between Poland and Russia. The successes of the following years were primarily due to the Austrian and imperial troops, whereas Sobieski was inactive. But the Emperor's offensive against the Turks was stopped in

---

[4] A. Foucher de Careil, ed., "Projet d'expédition d'Égypte présenté à Louis XIV," *Œuvres de Leibniz* V (Paris 1864).

1688 by the beginning of the third French war of conquest. In addition to the significant financial aid—the Emperor alone had been paid approximately five million guilders by the apostolic treasury—it was the untiring efforts of the Pope which had brought about the alliance against the Turks and at least to some extent had kept it together.

Innocent XI was extremely strict in his direction of the Church. He tried to restore church discipline especially among the clergy and the orders, but in the process he sometimes dissipated his energy in details. His conscientiousness, almost bordering on scrupulousness, was also manifest in the promotion of cardinals. During his pontificate he decided on only two appointments. The first one, numbering sixteen, was comprised of Italians only (1681), which led to a protest by France. The second promotion again consisted of sixteen Italians, but also of an additional eleven foreigners. Among the latter there were four Germans, but among them the bishop of Strasbourg, Egon von Fürstenberg, who was on the side of Louis XIV.

Innocent XI's position within the Church was marked by his firm opposition against any form of Gallicanism. Opponents of Gallicanism met with ready understanding on the part of the Pope and with support that was not always wise from a tactical viewpoint. This explains why many of the Pope's decisions and actions were viewed as partisanship in favor of the Jansenist movement, since it was precisely the Jansenists who took an especially strong stand against the Gallicanism of the King. In addition, the manifest religious severity of Jansenism and its stress on church discipline corresponded with the Pope's personal views. The moral system of probabilism offered by the Jesuits, who were certainly the most confirmed enemies of Jansenism, nonetheless represented a dangerous move towards laxism. Even at the beginning of his pontificate a small group of French bishops, among them Pavillon of Alet, urged the Pope to condemn certain moral propositions. Their agents in Rome, starting with Possion and continuing with the abbot of Pontchâteau and Louis de Vaucel, were able to wield considerable influence. At the same time, the University of Louvain attempted to effect a similar condemnation. This took place in 1679 by means of a decree of the Holy Office (D 2101–67). Within the Jesuit order, Tyrsus González de Santalla tried to push back probabilism; in 1680 he received papal approbation for his system of probabiliorism (D 2176–77). The fact that he was elected general of the order in 1689 was a result of the benevolence of Innocent XI, who clearly let it be known to the General Congregation of the order on the occasion of an audience whom he wished to have at the head of the Society of Jesus.

Ever since the middle of the century a quietistic current had spread primarily in Italy. Beginning with an intensification of the religious life of the individual and stressing the practice of contemplative prayer, the movement led to the sole emphasis on the efficacy of grace to the total exclusion of personal deeds, amounting finally to a complete passivity of the individual. The Spanish priest Miguel Molinos became the focal point of a large circle in Rome where he was joined by important laymen as well as by many clerics, among them Cardinal Odescalchi. More than his book *Guía espiritual*, which first appeared in Rome in 1675 and could be interpreted in a harmless fashion, it was his guidance of souls through an active correspondence by which he made his influence felt. When the Roman Inquisition dealt with him, it tracked down approximately twelve thousand such letters, from which it compiled the quietistic doctrines. Jesuits were the first to offer reservations against Molinos and his doctrine. In 1680 Paolo Segneri published a treatise concerning contemplative prayer which was forbidden by the Inquisition. In the meantime more reservations against Molinos's doctrine arose. In 1682 the Holy Office had Cardinal Hieronymus Casanate compose an instruction for confessors (D 2181–92) whose actual publication can not be ascertained. In 1685 Molinos was arrested by the Inquisition and his writings were confiscated. Innocent XI had earlier had high esteem for Molinos. As late as 1686 he had elevated Pier Matteo Petrucci, who had held similar views, to the cardinalate. So he waited for some time before granting his permission for a formal trial, which was concluded in 1687. Of an original 263 propositions 68 were condemned (D 2201–68). Thirteen of these were taken from the defense which Molinos submitted to the Inquisition. (D 2241–53). Molinos was condemned to life in prison and died in 1696. After an investigation against Cardinal Petrucci the latter had to recant in front of the Pope. But Innocent XI advocated mild treatment. As a consequence Petrucci retained all his rights as a cardinal and as bishop of Jesi.

When Queen Christina of Sweden died on 19 April 1689, the Pope ordered a formal funeral in Saint Peter's, which was attended by all cardinals. Shortly thereafter his condition deteriorated. For years he had suffered from painful illnesses to which he succumbed in the Quirinal on 12 August.

Soon after his death the Romans began to venerate Innocent XI as a saint, but not until 1956 was he canonized by Pius XII.[5] The procedure, initiated by Clement XI, was delayed primarily by the opposition of the French government, which was apparently unable to forget the Pope's struggle with Louis XIV which had endured through almost his whole pontificate.

---

[5] A balanced overview of the entire pontificate is provided in the address by Pius XII at the beatification (*AAS* 48 [1950], 762–78), written by Father Robert Leiber, S.J., who also revised the major portion about Innocent XI by Pastor.

CHAPTER 9

The Popes from Alexander VIII to Clement XI

Alexander VIII (1689–91)

The conclave took place during a war which enveloped the larger part of Europe. The Emperor and the King of France were represented by ambassadors extraordinary attempting to exert their influence upon the papal election. But before the monarchs' wishes were made known, the majority of the cardinals had already decided upon Pietro Ottoboni from Venice. France concurred in his candidacy after Ottoboni's nephew had given assurances that canonical investiture would be conferred on the French bishops who had participated in the Assembly of 1681/82 and that Lavardin would be received as ambassador. The new Pope chose his name in memory of Alexander VII, to whom he felt especially obliged. Although he was eighty years of age, he performed his work with unusual energy. His personal life-style was diametrically opposed to that of his predecessor, which ensured him of the immediate goodwill of the Romans. It was disastrous, however, that he permitted the practice of nepotism to be revived. His barely twenty-year-old grandnephew Pietro, in addition to being appointed cardinal and reigning nephew, was invested with large benefices. Other family members as well were beneficiaries of the Pope's largesse, who is credited with the pronouncement: "Let us make haste as much as possible, for the clock has struck the twenty-third hour."

Alexander VIII also differed from his predecessor Innocent XI in his attitude towards the great powers. Relations with the German Empire cooled off noticeably. Financial aid granted Leopold I for the Turkish Wars was decreased considerably, not in the least because Venice, worried about its own interests in the Levant, looked with a jaundiced eye upon Austria's great military successes. On the other hand, the Pope sought improved relations with France, which had a growing number of uninvested bishops. The consistory of February 1690 was designed as a sign of rapprochement. Disregarding serious reasons to the contrary as well as protests by the Emperor, the Pope fulfilled a longstanding wish of Louis XIV by appointing to the cardinalate the bishop of Beauvais, Toussaint de Forbin-Janson, who had participated in the assembly of 1682. When the third consistory of Alexander VIII passed in November 1690 without the Pope appointing any of the Emperor's nominees, Vienna threatened to break off diplomatic relations. The ambassador was indeed recalled, but additional resolves were not translated into action because of the Pope's serious illness.

But attempts by the King of France to represent his war as a war in defense of Catholicism and to have it approved as such by the Pope were unsuccessful. Since Louis XIV, largely under the influence of the newly appointed Cardinal Forbin-Janson, who was leading the negotiations in Rome, proved to be unyielding on the issue of the Gallican articles, Alexander VIII, already on his deathbed, decided to publish the decree prepared under Innocent XI which nullified the four Gallican Liberties. (D 2281–85).

By condemning propositions which manifested a tendency towards laxism, Innocent XI gave support—albeit unintentionally—to the opponents of the Jesuit order and to the friends of the Jansenist party. Under Alexander VIII contrary propositions, excerpted primarily from writings published in Belgium, were condemned. These propositions, originally ninety-six in number, had been submitted to Rome in 1682; the examination was finished in 1686, but no actual decree was issued. In the end, thirty-one propositions were condemned in 1690 (D 2301–32).

Alexander VIII fell ill in January 1691. On 30 January, in the presence of ten cardinals he ordered the publication of the above-mentioned decree against the Gallican articles and dictated a personal letter to Louis XIV. On 1 February he died at the age of eighty-one.

Innocent XII (1691–1700)

The conclave beginning on 12 February 1691 lasted exactly five months. The front-runner was Gregorio Barbarigo. But Vienna considered him too submissive to France because of his connections with Venice. As a consequence the imperial government sought to prevent his election, yet without making use of a formal *exclusivae*. Since the French group also failed to support Barbarigo's election—which was promoted by the *Zelanti*, the apolitical party of the College of Cardinals—although Barbarigo was personally agreeable to Louis XIV, his candidacy failed. After many futile attempts at a compromise, agreement finally centered on Antonio Pignatelli, who received the votes of various blocks and finally those of the French as well. The seventy-five-year-old aristocratic cardinal from the south of Italy had been nuncio in Poland and Vienna; he had been raised to the cardinalate rather late, in 1681, by Innocent XI. His choice of name was intended to be an expression of gratitude for his predecessor. In his mode of governing, his care for the poor, and the simplicity of his personal life-style, he indeed resembled Innocent XI. The most important reform document of his papacy was the bull against nepotism (22 June 1692). After some initial resistance by a good many cardinals, this bull, which for all practical purposes put an end to the practice of nepotism in papal history, was signed by all cardinals.[1] Innocent XII also restricted the sale of ecclesiastical offices at the Curia. To make up for the resulting financial loss he applied thrift to the running of the papal court, and, most importantly, he enlarged the harbors of Civitavecchia and Netuno in order to promote trade. Yet many of his reform measures were impeded by his excessive attention to details.

A compromise was reached with Louis XIV after the latter was forced to be more conciliatory by the formation of the Grand Alliance. As an initial step, the new bishops, appointed by the King since 1682, who had not participated in the Assembly of the Clergy of that year, were granted papal approbation. In return, Louis XIV promised to revoke the decree prescribing the four articles of 1682 as doctrine. The participants of the assembly signed a declaration of obedience. Although clad in provisos, it nonetheless amounted to a recognizable repudiation of their original resolutions. In return the King kept his promise and revoked the decree concerning the Declaration of the French Clergy. Thereupon the bishops in question were granted canonical institution. By the end of 1693 the French hierarchy was restored. Yet the King's right of regalia remained intact in spite of the Pope's protestations. But this act of rapprochement between Rome and France was viewed with distrust by the Emperor. Initially the Pope, following Innocent XI's policy in this regard, gave liberal support to the Emperor in the defense against the Turks. But gradually relations between them became more and more strained, due in part to the unwise behavior of the imperial ambassadors in Rome, Liechtenstein and Martinitz. This tension was skillfully exploited by the French ambassador, Cardinal Forbin-Janson.

The death of Sobieski in 1696 reignited the struggle for the Polish succession. Ostensibly maintaining neutrality, the Holy See nonetheless made efforts to have a Catholic King elected. The candidacy of the French Prince Conti, understandably rejected by Austria, Russia, and Prussia, was successfully contested by Friedrich August, elector of Saxony, who had declared his willingness to convert to Catholicism in the event of his election. Innocent XII was initially somewhat reticent about the new Polish King. Only when the latter had consolidated his rule did the Pope have his letter of recognition and congratulation transmitted.

Innocent XII, having increased his efforts since 1696 towards bringing about an end to the European war of Louis XIV against the Grand

---

[1] Text of the bull in *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) 20, 441–46.

Coalition, welcomed the Peace of Rijswijk (1697) although the Holy See had not been officially represented at the congress. He especially liked the so-called Rijswijk Clause, a stipulation keeping the Catholic religion intact in all places made subject to Protestant rule by the terms of the peace. Originally suggested by the Count Palatine Johann Wilhelm von Neuburg, the clause was included in the negotiations and put through at the last minute by the representatives of Louis XIV, to whom it had been expressly recommended by the Pope.

At the end of his pontificate the Pope had to deal with the issue of the Spanish succession. The heir designated by the childless Spanish King, Charles II, died suddenly on 6 February 1699. He had been the Bavarian electoral prince Joseph Ferdinand, grandson of Charles II's sister, who was the wife of Emperor Leopold I. The Spanish King wanted a successor from the Austrian dynasty, but the Council of State under the direction of Cardinal Portocarrero preferred the French dynasty. Innocent XII, whose advice the Spanish King had requested, approved the decision of a commission of cardinals in favor of the French solution. The demise of the Pope (27 September 1700) preceded that of Charles II by a mere few weeks.

Clement XI (1700–1721)

The death of Charles II led to protracted political manipulations and finally to the election of Cardinal Gian Francesco Albani, nominated by the *Zelanti*. Albani accepted the unanimous election only after several days of consideration and after soliciting formal opinions by several theologians. He chose the name Clement XI after the saint of the day (23 November). Appointed by Alexander VIII, he had become probably the most powerful of the cardinals during the pontificates of Alexander and the latter's successor. He had received his ordination late (in September 1700) and was consecrated a week after his election to the papacy. Since he was only fifty-one years old, he could count on a long pontificate.

From the very beginning the new pontificate was affected by the danger of renewed warfare in Europe. While King Philip V of the French dynasty was recognized by most of the European powers and the Pope as well, Leopold I formally protested the testament of Charles II of Spain. By recognizing the royal title, arbitrarily assumed by the elector of Brandenburg, the Emperor was able to ensure himself of Prussia's support. He also obtained the support of the two naval powers England and Holland, who felt themselves endangered by France's expansionist policies. Clement XI was immediately involved in the conflict by his very proximity to the Kingdom of

Naples, which he considered a papal lien. His claim was disputed by both the opposing sides. At first he tried to avoid a decision in order to gain time. But the Emperor considered the Pope to be a partisan of France primarily because of his quick recognition of Philip V as King of Spain and because of his protest in April 1701 against the assumption of the royal title by the elector of Brandenburg. The Pope's attempt to keep Italy out of the war and to form a defensive league of the Italian states for the purpose of protecting his own neutrality failed. After Mantua surrendered to the French troops without a battle (5 April 1701), Italy became a theater of war with parts of the Papal States under occupation. At the end of 1701 the Emperor requested free passage to Naples for his troops, which was denied. Both belligerents violated the neutrality of the Papal States in northern Italy. France's skillful propaganda, representing the Emperor's alliance with the Protestant powers as a danger to the Church and to France and simultaneously picturing Spain as the sole protector of Catholicism, achieved some success with the Pope, especially since his efforts to achieve peace were brusquely rejected by the Court of Vienna. When Joseph I succeeded his father Leopold I on 5 May 1705, tensions between the Pope and the Emperor worsened. During the following year the military situation clearly changed in favor of the Emperor. In September, after Prince Eugene's victory at Turin the French troops had to vacate all of northern Italy. In spite of protests by the Pope the imperial army occupied some of the legations. In May 1707 the Pope was forced to grant free passage to Naples for the imperial troops. Within a few weeks almost all of the kingdom was in their hands. Contrary to papal claims, Parma and Piacenza were taxed as imperial liens. A bull of 27 July 1707 pronouncing excommunication against those abuses achieved nothing. Since Clement XI still adhered to Philip V as the rightful King of Spain, the Austrian pretender, Charles III, ordered a freeze on all revenues of the Church in Lombardy and Naples (April 1708), which caused many members of the Curia to lose a considerable part of their income. Next, the imperial troops invaded the Papal States without a declaration of war and occupied the Comacchio, important for its production of salt (situated between Ravenna and Ferrara on the coast). In autumn 1708, hoping for help from Louis XIV, the Pope decided to oppose the Emperor by force of arms. But left to his own devices, Clement XI was unable to stop the attacking imperial army. On 15 January 1709 he had to accept the Emperor's harsh conditions: disarmament of the papal troops, recognition of Charles III as King of Spain, recognition of the Emperor's precedence over the King of France, a peaceful solution of the territorial issues concerning Parma, Piacenza, and Comacchio. In return he received a promise that the prohibition against the transfer of money would be revoked and compensation would be paid for the damages caused by the occupation of the Papal States.

Although Philip V had encroached on church rights several times, the actual break occurred upon papal recognition of his rival Charles. The defeat of Louis XIV at Malplaquet and Spain's breaking off of diplomatic relations with Rome resulted in a definitive recognition of Charles III on 10 October 1709. Clement XI refused canonical investiture to the bishops appointed by Philip V after the latter had closed the nunciature in Madrid. In the end the Pope suggested mediation by Louis XIV. Yet the development towards an established Church in Spain continued. Conversely, Charles III, residing in Barcelona, demanded a nuncio proper, who arrived in 1711. The negotiations concerning the return of Comacchio and the encroachment on church rights in Naples conducted in Rome since 1710 were protracted. They were concluded after a year with an agreement stipulating the return of that coastal town. The unexpected death of the Emperor on 17 April 1711 of smallpox and that of the French Dauphin, who had succumbed to the same disease three days earlier, caused a complete turnabout in the issue of the Spanish succession. The dead Emperor left only daughters, so that his brother Charles was the logical choice to succeed him in Austria. In the face of French machinations, the Pope held fast to Charles's candidacy. But his nephew Albani, whom he dispatched to the imperial election in Frankfurt as his personal envoy, was kept from exerting any and all influence and was treated curtly on every occasion. England was immutably opposed to a union of Spain and the Empire under one monarch: Philip V was to remain King of Spain while Austria was to be compensated by the Spanish possessions in Italy and the Habsburg Netherlands.

At the peace congress starting in Utrecht in January 1712, the papal representative Passionei—since he was devoid of any diplomatic rank he could only act as a common agent of the Pope—had a twofold charge: to prevent the revocation of the Rijswijk Clause and see to it that the feudal rights of the Pope over Parma, Piacenza, and Sicily (the latter was to be given to the duke of Savoy) were upheld. But he could, in fact, achieve very little. The territorial alterations turned out to be damaging to the Church. France recognized the Protestant succession in England and withdrew its support of the pretender James III of the house of Stuart, hitherto staunchly supported by the Pope; Sicily was promised to the duke of Savoy without consultation with the Pope. Personal efforts by the Pope to influence Louis XIV notwithstanding, the Rijswijk Clause—while not formally revoked—was in effect weakened. However, in the parallel peace treaty concluded in Rastatt between the Emperor and the King of France (March 1714) the clause was included. But since the estates of the realm had not participated in the negotiations, a new congress had to be convoked. This took place in Baden, Switzerland, where the Protestant estates again worked towards a revocation of that clause. Passionei, back in his role as papal agent, was again charged with upholding the rights of the Church, with the Rijswijk Clause still being promoted by the Pope. The imperial peace concluded in September 1714 indeed corresponded to that of Rastatt, so that the efforts of the Holy See can be considered partially successful.

Passionei had to protest against those stipulations that were unfavorable to the Catholic Church: the recognition in toto of the Peace of Westphalia, the recognition of the Protestant electoral status of Hanover and of the Prussian royal title, and the ceding of Catholic territories to Protestant princes. In the consistory of 21 January 1715, in which he talked about the three peace treaties, Clement XI had his protest publicly reiterated.

While the Northern War, which lasted beyond the War of the Spanish Succession, did not directly affect the papacy and the Church, the end of the European war renewed the Turkish threat. Initial preparations by the Holy See centered around Venice. Following the example of Pius V, Pope Clement XI tried to bring about a defensive alliance against the Turkish naval threat. Yet the Emperor, distrustful of the French, was unwilling to engage in a military operation on such a large scale. As a consequence the Turkish fleet achieved a series of great successes in the summer of 1715. Venice lost the entire Peloponnesos; an attack upon Italy itself was greatly feared. Urged by the Pope, Philip V of Spain had Clement XI transmit formal guarantees to the Emperor at the end of 1715 that the imperial possessions in Italy would not be endangered for the duration of the Turkish war. This declaration was influenced more than anything by the abbot Giulio Alberoni, a native of Piacenza and envoy of the duke of Parma in Madrid who had promoted the second marriage of Philip V with Elizabeth Farnese. With great financial aid and upon constant urging by the Pope, the Emperor concluded an alliance with Venice in April 1716. The offensive in Hungary was initiated in the summer of that year. The subsequent victory by Prince Eugene at Peterwardein and the successful defense of Corfu against the Turks were a welcome prelude to the operations.

In order to interest Spain in taking an active part in the war against Turkey and on the condition of completely restoring the nunciature in Madrid, the ambitious Alberoni, who had created for himself a superlative position of power, was appointed cardinal.[2] The Spanish fleet, largely equipped by means of financial aid from the Pope, was now expected to intervene in the naval war against the Turks so that the continental military operations of the Emperor, which had led to the conquest of Belgrade in August, could be supported. Instead Spain had conceived a plan to attack the Italian possessions of the Empire in order to establish a secundogeniture. Four days after Alberoni found out about his elevation to the cardinalate the Spanish fleet sailed from its harbor and—in violation of the peace—took Sardinia from the Emperor. The Pope, who had given a moral guarantee for the security of the imperial possessions in Italy was assigned part of the blame for this outrageous betrayal and even accused of complicity in it. When the Pope took certain measures against Spain they were called insufficient by Vienna; the Emperor insisted on a complete break with Spain. The situation was further aggravated by the fact that the nuncio at Madrid, Aldrovandi, obviously permitted himself to be influenced by the Spanish government. By invading papal territories and making unacceptable demands Madrid increased the tensions to the point of a complete break of diplomatic relations with Rome. In 1718, while the Spanish fleet was busy conquering Sicily, the Emperor, France, England, and Holland formed a quadruple alliance for the purpose of reordering Italy. When Spain rejected the suggestions of the alliance, the Spanish fleet was destroyed by the English fleet. Intent on taking care of his own interests, King Philip disavowed Alberoni, blaming him for his own political failures. The Emperor acquired Sicily; Sardinia went to Savoy. Don Carlos, son of Philip V and Elizabeth Farnese, was to assume the succession in Parma and Piacenza. The traditional feudal rights of the Holy See in these territories were disregarded. The trial against Alberoni, initiated by Clement XI and promoted strongly by Philip V for political reasons, was concluded under Clement's successor, Innocent XIII, on the whole in favor of the cardinal, who had even participated in the conclave of 1721. His office and rank were completely restored to him.

---

[2] The more recent research has for the most part exonerated Alberoni; cf. A. Arata, *Il processo del card. Alberoni* (Piacenza 1923); P. Castagnoli, *Il card. G. Alberoni* (Piacenza

In addition to the difficulties caused by the wars, the long pontificate of Clement XI was also troubled by a series of natural catastrophes such as floodings of the Tiber river, epidemics, and earthquakes. These and other problems prevented him from taking far-reaching measures. The penal institution for juveniles, San Michele in Rome, established in 1703, was a pioneering effort in the modern penal system.

Clement XI has been criticized for his timid and indecisive character

---

and Rome 1929); R. Quazza, *Dizionario Biografico Italiano* I, 662–68; G. F. Rossi, *La bibliografia Alberoniana di Mons. Antonio Arata* (Piacenza 1964).

and his inability to lend needed emphasis to important decisions.[3] But the lack of success of his pontificate in the area of politics and the Church was surely caused above all by the unfavorable state of affairs confronting the Pope. He never quite recovered from a serious illness in the beginning of 1710. In the winter of 1720 his health further deteriorated. He personally dictated to his nephew the inscription for the simple grave already prepared for him. During the following months his condition was precarious. He died on 19 March 1721 after a pontificate lasting over twenty years.

---

[3] Pastor XV, 385.

SECTION THREE

The End of the Denominational Era in Europe—Progress and Stagnation of the World Mission

CHAPTER 10

Reconstruction and Constitution of the Church of the Empire

The Peace of Westphalia had ended the Thirty Years' War, but it had not been able to bring peace to the Empire. Throughout a series of wars lasting into the first third of the eighteenth century and barely interrupted by a few years of peace, the ecclesiastical states within the "constituted anarchy" of the Empire were helpless pawns of the great powers. Again and again afflicted by military campaigns and the aftermath of war, repeatedly threatened by secularization and manipulation at European peace conferences, their reconstruction was also seriously impeded by their own constitution as electoral states, by joint dominion with the cathedral chapters, a lack of continuity, and the dual function of ecclesiastical princes.

In the period of 1500 to 1720, the archbishopric of Trier, for example, had to suffer a total of one hundred years of war, pestilence, and occupation.[1] The small bishopric of Worms, almost completely surrounded by the Protestant Palatinate, its cathedral used as a garrison church by the Swedes, is another case in point. Only after the Catholic house of Neuburg succeeded the house of Pfalz-Simmern in the Palatinate could Prince-Bishop Franz Ludwig von Pfalz-Neuburg begin to overcome the terrible destruction of the Orléans War and to restore church life under the protection of the controversial Rijswijk Clause. The Turkish threat,[2] reflected even in motifs and figures of popular piety, was not banished until the Treaty of Passarowitz (1718). Only the peace treaties of Utrecht, Rastatt, Baden (1713/14), and Aachen (1748) were preludes to lengthier periods of peace. Lamentations were heard across the land uniformly decrying, in the typical hyperbole of the baroque, the pervasive wretchedness, the misery of the war in the west, the threat of the Turks in the east, joined by woeful tales of pestilence, famine, and the decay of morals.[3] Even if one were inclined to take the tendentiousness and exaggeration of the contemporary accounts into consideration and not view conditions as being totally hopeless, the political and economic reconstruction, beset by constant reverses, was yet an impressive achievement. The same holds true for the renewal and deepening of religion and church life, which were palpably expressed in the sacred art under the rule of the various dynasties, those of Wittelsbach, Habsburg, Pfalz-Neuburg, and Schönborn.

---

[1] G. Reitz, *Die Größe des geistlichen und ritterschaftlichen Grundbesitzes in ehemaligen Kur-Trier* (Koblenz 1919), 43.

[2] H. Watzl, ed., *Flucht und Zuflucht. Das Tagebuch des Priesters Balthasar Kleinschroth aus dem Türkenjahr 1683* (Graz and Cologne 1956); L. A. Veit and L. Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1956), 64ff.

The ecclesiastical territories of the Empire, militarily and politically impotent and reduced to relying on the law, had been afflicted most grievously during the Thirty Years' War. Hardly a prince-bishop was able to do what the zealous Archbishop Paris Lodron of Salzburg (1619–53) had accomplished: preserved his land from war and its aftermath, founded the university, the Collegium Marianum (1645), the Rupertinum (1653), and finished construction of the cathedral.[4] Neutrality had neither spared the prince-bishopric of Liège under Ferdinand of Bavaria[5] nor the bishopric of Basel, although the migration after the war into more depopulated areas of the Empire,[6] as for instance from Liège to Seligenstadt, might have created the opposite impression. Even in those areas of the Catholic Church of the Empire which had never directly suffered pillage and destruction, the war had increased prewar indebtedness, severed traditional ties, created misery for many refugees, and affected living conditions. By 1659 the bishopric of Brixen was so deeply in debt that the annates and taxes to Tyrol could not be paid and the major portion of its revenues had to be applied to the amortization of interest. A report by Prince-Bishop Karl Emanuel shows that in 1653 economic conditions in the prince-bishopric of Trent were hardly better.[7]

---

[3] Regarding the misery of war from 1703 to 1713 the Luxemburg Carmelite Father Pacificus a Cruce remarks: "Now all is subjected to war and in a bad state; the Netherlands have been further lowered by war; Alsace has become a place of misery; the Rhine a river of pain; Italy is a battleground. . . . War and misery are everywhere! . . ." quoted from E. Donckel, "P. Pacificus a Cruce, Ordinis Fratrum B.M.V. de Monte Carmelo. Sein Leben—Sein Predigtwerk," *Festschrift für Alois Thomas* (Trier 1967), 106, n. 43.—A little later a contemporary of his complains about the conditions in the bishopric of Speyer: "There was no trace left of the *disciplina ecclesiastica*, no sinful excess so great that it was not also seen among the clergy. The teachings of Christ have proved to be unknown in many places." Cited from O. B. Roegele, "Damian Hugo von Schönborn und die Anfänge des Bruchsaler Priesterseminars," *FreibDiözArch* 71 (1951), 10.

[4] F. Martin, *Salzburgs Fürsten in der Barockzeit (1557–1812)* (Salzburg 1966), 85–105.

[5] P. Harsin, "Les origines diplomatiques de la neutralité liégeoise," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 5 (1926), 423–52.

[6] Regarding loss of population and war damages, see G. Franz, *Der Dreißigjährige Krieg und das deutsche Volk* (Stuttgart 1961); J. Schmidlin, *Kirchliche Zustände und Schicksale des deutschen Katholizismus während des Dreißigjährigen Krieges nach den bischöflichen Romberichten* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1940); A. Rothbauer, "Der Dreißigjährige Krieg im Spiegel der ältesten Langenloiser Matrik,*Jahrbuch für Landeskunde von Niederösterreich* n.s. 35 (1964), 357–63; H. Steinberg, *Der Dreißigjährige Krieg und der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Europa 1600–60* (Göttingen 1967), is not very convincing in his attempt to correct the "traditional" image of the terrible catastrophe of the Thirty Years' War and to deemphasize its destructive effects on culture and morals.

Compared to the bishoprics on the periphery of the Church of the Empire west and south of the Danube, political, economic, religious, and moral conditions around the middle of the seventeenth century were even worse in the so-called "priests' alley" on the Rhine and Main, as well as in those bishoprics of northern Germany which had remained Catholic. In most of the ecclesiastical territories whole regions had to be almost completely recolonized, numerous deserted villages and decayed towns rebuilt, exorbitant debts repaid, monetary confusion and infringements by secular masters on the assets and prerogatives of churches and clerics had to be checked. "Reports received by us of visitations undertaken at war's end show a disconsolate picture of the destruction of churches, of the inferior condition of the sparse number of clerics, of the dissolution and ruin of all church life, of the moral degeneration and the wild superstition of the populace."[8]

In 1647 upon the accession of Johann Philipp von Schönborn in Mainz, the so-called primary see with its second residence of Aschaffenburg had vacancies in 77 of 105 parishes. The archbishopric on the left bank of the Rhine including Mainz, which was left half-destroyed after the Swedish occupation, remained in French hands until 1650. In the archbishopric of Bamberg "the population was decimated by atrocities, famine, and pestilence. The survivors were quite impoverished as a consequence of repeated tributes."[9] In the prince-bishopric of Münster, religious and moral conditions were more precarious than the economic ones. Church discipline had deteriorated, strange cults had been introduced, and when Bishop Christoph Bernhard von Galen entered office, a large part of the clergy lived in concubinage.[10] The report to Rome by Bishop Johann Franz Vogt von Altensumerau and Praßberg of Constance, the largest diocese of the Catholic Church of the Empire, counted only six hundred occupied parishes among more than a thousand. In 1654 the bishopric of Regensburg had more than three hundred vacant parishes. Conditions were not much better in most of the remaining prince-bishoprics. In addition to the well-known aftermath of the war, the political, economic, and religious reconstruction was often impeded by foreign occupation troops, raids, and considerable reparations.[11]

---

[7] I. P. Dengel, "Berichte von Bischöfen über den Stand ihrer Diözesen (Relationes status ecclesiarum). Als Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte Österreichs im 16. und 17. Jh.," *Forschungen und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte Tyrols und Vorarlbergs* 6 (1907), 323–26, 337–40.

[8] F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte des Bistums Breslau* (Breslau 1929), 71.

[9] J. Kist, *Fürst und Erzbistum Bamberg* (Bamberg 1962), 103.

[10] W. Kohl, *Christoph Bernhard von Galen: Politische Geschichte des Fürstbistums Münster 1650–78* (Münster 1964), 26–32.

Wherever reliable sources are available, they demonstrate that the indebtedness of many prince-bishoprics dating back to the late Middle Ages could not be reduced substantially even in the most affluent archdioceses. Among the reasons were the financial burdens of war, monetary deterioration, wrong financial policies, excessive expenditures for households, construction projects, and maintaining the relatives of the reigning princes.[12] During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the following prince-bishoprics were considered either quite poor or highly indebted: Chur, Constance, Regensburg, Paderborn, Hildesheim, in part also Worms, Speyer, Trier, and Freising. The cumulation of bishoprics has to be seen from economic viewpoints as well. Those bishoprics which were economically healthy and therefore relatively rich were desirable political objects for princes and knights of the Empire. In the period mentioned, these included the archbishopric of Mainz with annual revenues of approximately 1.5 to 1.7 million imperial talers (around 1790), the archbishopric of Cologne, the bishoprics of Münster, Strasbourg, Würzburg, Augsburg, and also Bamberg after it was reconstructed by Bishop Philipp Valentin Voit von Rieneck. The revenues of Bishop Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg (1740) from the prince-bishopric of Strasbourg, the abbeys of Saint Arnulf in Metz, Saint Michel and other benefices are estimated at 600,000 to 700,000 *livres* annually, those of Elector-Archbishop Max Franz of Cologne at more than one million imperial talers.

Yet the justifiable criticism of the financial policies[13] of many an ecclesiastical prince should not obscure their merits in the promotion of the arts, especially architecture—as by the Schönborns[14]—painting, the music of the baroque and Rococo, but also of science, and their charitable efforts, all of which can more than hold their own in comparison with the more powerful secular territories. The absence of standing armies, the primary instrument of power in modern absolutist states, and the close connection between the military and the exchequer tended to hold back the ecclesiastical territories in their public organization and as a political factor. At the same time it provided them with the possibility to solve by means of older forms of governing the basic question of the affairs of any state, to bring about in a faster and simpler way and in correspondence with the natural order a relationship between the individual and society, between man and the state, not least under the aspect of future salvation in the hereafter. The lack of political format, destined to become a fateful issue in the areas governed by crosier and miter, could not but provoke criticism on the part of the Enlightenment; yet it was nonetheless a positive force since it promised relatively more freedom and a certain worldly happiness according to the proverb "Under the crosier one can rest assured." On the eve of secularization, Friedrich Carl von Moser wrote: "The often scorned *Pfaffengasse* [priests' alley] constitutes a Pyrenees of sorts of inestimable value to the German people and worthy of their eternal gratitude. Thanks to it the power of monarchs was prevented from enchaining all and everything, as it did in France and Spain, leaving these Alps intact." He continues by saying that only the ecclesiastical princes "deserve the name of public administrators in the true sense of the word because bad and damaging actions are not let pass, as in the case of secular sovereigns, since the eyes of the chapter are on and around them."[15]

---

[11] The prince-abbeys of Murbach and Luders, for example, had to pay an immense sum in reparations. This had a negative effect until the eighteenth century; A. Gatrio, *Die Abtei Murbach im Elsaß* II (Strasbourg 1895), 553.

[12] The Mainz elector-archbishop Friedrich Karl von Ostein reported to Maria Theresa on 20 March 1763 that the Seven Years' War had "left behind nothing but beggars. Chapters and convents are totally prostrate regarding their revenues. Indeed, there is no hamlet in my entire archbishopric so small that it does not have debts as much and often manifold as is its worth." According to a calculation by the Mainz electorate of 16 October 1763, losses and damages by the French, imperial, Prussian, and allied troops, including the expenditures for the Mainz contingent of the Imperial Army, amounted to 20, 156, 447 guilders and 21 crowns. (*Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv Wien* MOG, 25 A, [n.d.], 20).

[13] The policies of expenditures, revenues, and debts of the ecclesiastical princes have not yet been examined closely. Only two pertinent investigations regarding the eighteenth

The ecclesiastical princes could not expect significant help from Rome or from the nunciatures in Cologne, Vienna, and Lucerne for the task of

---

century can be mentioned: H. Maas, *Verwaltungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Bistums Speyer während der Regierung des Fürstbischofs Franz Christoph von Hutten (1743–1770)* (diss., Göttingen 1931); O. Schneider, "Die Finanzpolitik des Kurfürsten Clemens Wenzeslaus von Trier," *Finanzwissenschaftliche Forschungsarbeiten* n.s. 19 (Berlin 1958).

[14] M. V. Freeden, *Würzburgs Residenz und Fürstenhof zur Schönbornzeit* (Würzburg 1949); idem, *Kunst und Künstler am Hofe des Kurfürsten Lothar Franz von Schönborn* (Würzburg 1949); J. F. Albert, *Vom Mäzenatentum der Schönborn* (Würzburg 1949); M. Braubach, "Politik und Kultur an den geistlichen Fürstenhöfen Westfalens gegen Ende des alten Reiches," *WZ* 105 (1955), 65–82; also in: *Bonner historische Forschungen* 33 (1969), 546–62; "Kurfürst Clemens August, Landesherr und Mäzen des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Katalog der Ausstellung in Schloß Augustusburg zu Brühl 1961* (Cologne 1961).

[15] F. C. v. Moser, *Über die Regierung der geistlichen Staaten in Deutschland* (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1787), 163.

religious reconstruction. There is scant reference to actions by the nunciatures on behalf of reforms, unlike the case in the waning sixteenth century and the first two decades of the seventeenth century.[16] As a matter of fact, some bishops pushed through reforms against the resistance of certain nuncios. In the case of Cologne, hardly more than the central part (the bishoprics of Cologne and Liège) were left of the vast jurisdictional area which the nuncio of Cologne, Sanfelice, casting his eyes towards Metz, Toul, and Verdun, warned against giving up. Even in 1670 the *Uditore Fini* claimed all of it in his instruction: ". . . si estende questa Nunziatura per tutto quel tratto di paese, che bagna il Rheno, cominciando da Basilea fino alle sue bocche dell'Oceano Britannico."[17] But even in the part that was left, opposition against the jurisdiction and the existence of the nunciature assumed dangerous proportions.[18]

The latent existential crisis or the threatening "total ruin" of some prince-bishoprics could not be averted by either the nunciatures or by the steadily weakening papacy. They could be averted only by the Emperor and the Empire and by the policies of the Wittelsbachs and the Habsburgs, of the Pfalz-Neuburgs, and the great chapter families such as the Eltz and Schönborns, the von der Leyens, Dalbergs, Stadions, Metternichs, Walderdorffs, and their relatives among the knights of the Empire. After a fashion, these efforts were fairly successful in the first century after the Peace of Westphalia, but less so after the middle of the eighteenth century. Much to their credit was the securing of ecclesiastical properties and the re-Catholization in the Upper Palatinate, Silesia, Jülich and Berg, in the diaspora areas of the Catholic Church of the Empire. But the political results of the conversion of princes have usually been overestimated.[19]

---

[16] A. Franzen, "Die Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Sanfelice vom Jahre 1659," *RQ* 50 (1955), 69–88 idem, "Französische Politik und Kurkölns Beziehungen zu Frankreich unter Erzbischof Max Heinrich (1650–1688), *RQ* 52 (1957), 169–210; H. Raab, "Die Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Fabrizio Paolucci," *RQ* 55 (1960), 129–50; idem, "Die Relation des Kölner Nuntius Gaetano de' Cavalieri von 1732," *RQ* 58 (1963), 71–88; idem, "Die Instruktion für den Kölner Nuntius Jacopo Oddi," *RQ* 62 (1967), 36–69; A. Levinson, "Nuntiaturberichte vom Kaiserhofe Leopolds I. (1657–1669)," *AÖG* 103 (1913), 547–831; R. Scotti, *Helvetia sacra. Relatione de Vescovati, Abbatie, et altre dignità subordinate alla Nuntiatura helvetica* (Macerata 1642); K. Haid, "Aus der Aktenmappe des Monsignore Francesco Boccapaduglio, Nuntius in der Schweiz," *ZSKG* 38 (1944), 121–53.

[17] L. Just, "Die Kölner Nuntiatur nach einer Information des Uditore Fini von 1670," *AHVNrh* 155/56 (1954), 314.

[18] See Chap. 23: "Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire."

[19] Concerning Johann Ludwig von Nassau-Hadamar, who converted to Catholicism in Vienna in 1628 and as a widower and father of a large number of children, some of

The renewal of church life, initiated in force after 1648, received a late start in comparison with the Romance countries. It can only be fully understood if its special constitutional aspects and the difficulties arising from them are taken into account.[20]

According to the constitution of the Empire, the bishops were not only dignitaries of the hierarchy and successors of the apostles, but as holders of ecclesiastical territories granted as fiefs of the Empire they were also pillars of the Empire, full members with a vote in the imperial diet, princes with the sovereignty granted them by the Peace of Westphalia, albeit a sovereignty which few of them were able to claim for lack of concrete power. This duality of ecclesiastical and secular functions of the prince-bishops and prince-abbots had a positive potential for Church reform. But it also represented a temptation which in a courtly world of absolutism frequently surpassed their strength and permitted the worldly prince in them to win out over the bishop. Forgoing the pomp and circumstance, as was often demanded by contemporary critics, or the demand for a more profound scientific education on the part of prince-bishops[21] only scratched the surface of the problem.

A Church of the Empire in the sense of an association comprising all bishoprics under an ecclesiastical head empowered to lead and direct

---

whom were already placed in German chapters, applied in 1650 for the prince-bishopric of Münster, see K. Wolf, "Johann Ludwig, Graf von Nassau-Hadamar," *Nassauische Lebensbilder* II (Wiesbaden 1943), 109–23; W. Kohl, "Nassauische Absichten auf das Bistum Münster," *Westfalen* 36 (1958), 92–102; concerning Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels, who promoted re-Catholicization in St. Goar, Bad Schwalbach, Rotenburg/Fulda, see H. Raab, *Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels (1623–93)* (St. Goar 1964). The conversion of Duke Alexander Heinrich von Holstein (1649), Duke Friedrich von Hanover (1651), Count Palatine Christian August von Sulzbach, Elector Friedrich August I of Saxony, the dukes of Württemberg, etc. had little or no consequence from the standpoint of denominational politics.

[20] It is self-evident that space does not permit us to write the history of the counter-reformational and reformational efforts of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century in the Church of the Empire, although in spite of a number of monographs this field has remained largely unexplored.

[21] In his "Speculum pro Episcopo et simul Principi saeculari" Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels expressed the view that a bishop should be allowed the exercise of ecclesiastical and temporal power only "propter duritiem cordis, that is, according to the present state of the world." No bishop was to be implicated, like Christoph Bernhard von Galen of Münster and the Popes Julius II and Innocent X "in war and matters of war." Thorough knowledge of theology, academic titles, and experience in the ministry should be demanded of every candidate for the office of bishop. Membership in a certain estate should not exclude him from being eligible for election.—According to the prince-abbot Bernhard Frank von Disentis eighty years later, "an uneducated bishop is a speechless herald" (L. Schmid, *Bernhard Frank von Frankenberg, Fürstabt von Disentis 1742–63* [Chur 1958], 53.).

never existed. As far as its unity was concerned, the Church of the Empire could not be compared with the *Ecclesia Gallicana*. But after the canonical and historical foundation of episcopalism, initially in imitation of Gallicanism, had made some progress, it proudly put its own freedoms—Prince-Abbot Martin Gerbert even spoke of a "national freedom of the German Church"—on a higher footing than those of the Gallican Church, which were considered basically to give expression only to the dominance of the King over the Church. In its legal aspects the Church was initially and exclusively based on the Concordat of Vienna (1448),[22] including, most importantly, its stipulations regarding the filling of bishoprics in the Empire, the granting of benefices, and the financial tribute to the Roman Curia. In the late seventeenth century, following the ambiguous Cologne election of 1688 and the efforts of G. W. Leibniz, there was an attempt to revive the Concordat of Worms and to deduce from it the right of the Emperor to decide conflicting elections.[23] The episcopal church law of the Empire stressed the rediscovered *Concordata Principum* of 1447 and specifically the Mainz Acceptation of 1439 in order to use them in an attempt to modify the Concordat of Vienna.[24] The reform councils of Constance and Basel viewed as foundations of the Church of the Empire the pertinent stipulations of the Peace of Augsburg, the Peace of Westphalia, the Emperor's election capitulation, and the Rijswijk Clause, in addition to the more significant peace treaties of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In neither of these centuries did the Church of the Empire effect a new concordat satisfying the demands of the time.

The church province of Mainz and the idea of a *Primas Germaniae* was brought up as an age-old unifying tie between the bishoprics of the Empire. When Magdeburg joined the Reformation, the archbishops of Salzburg not only claimed the title of *Primas Germaniae,* but were able to maintain their claim with the support of the Emperor and even have it recognized by the Imperial Chancellery in 1750. Yet it had never really amounted to more than an honorary title when the elector-archbishops of Mainz raised their claim to it. This held true even though Mainz, with some justification, was considered the *Metropolis Germaniae* until the fall of the Empire, "increasingly in the sense that involved legal and constitutional aspects of the Empire, decreasingly in the sense of ecclesiastical primacy, and hardly at all in the sense of territorial power."[25]

---

[22] H. Raab, *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae in der kanonistischen Diskussion des 17. bis 19. Jh. Ein Beitrag der episkopalistischen Theorie in Deutschland* (Wiesbaden 1956).

[23] P. Kopfermann, *Das Wiener Konkordat im deutschen Staatsrecht* (Berlin 1908).

[24] See Chap. 23: "Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire from the Middle of the Seventeenth to the End of the Eighteenth Century."

[25] J. Bärmann, *Moguntiae Metropolis Germaniae* (Mainz 1965), 23.

It was in his capacity as elector-archchancellor of the Empire that the archbishop of Mainz occupied the most respected position among the ecclesiastical princes.[26] The prince-bishops of Eichstätt assumed the title of a *Sanctae Moguntinae Sedis Cancellarius* whose task it was to watch over the inviolateness of the Empire and the rights of its Catholic Church. But in spite of the occasional use of the title of primate and some attempts to make themselves the spokesmen representing the interests of the Church of the Empire, their ecclesiastical authority was no greater than that of the other three archbishops.

The extent and borders of the Church of the Empire have never been precisely defined; nor do they correspond to Wessenberg's later definition of the "German Church" under a German primate.[27] They are best determined according to the area affected by the Concordat of Vienna (1448) combined with the basic law of the Empire calling for the free election of bishops. Fluidity and obscurity of its borders, overlapping authority, strange legal conditions, as in the case of the prince-abbeys of Sankt Gallen and Murbach-Luders, the Salzburg bishoprics proper, the abbeys *nullius dioecesis*[28] and the quasi-bishoprics, the alternation of Osnabrück and the denominationally mixed cathedral chapters and benefices all lent a special character to the Church of the Empire and made many a reform difficult. Not counting the elevation of Fulda and Corvey to bishoprics in the second half of the eighteenth century, the number of bishoprics remained constant during the 150 years following the Peace of Westphalia. Neither strength nor will were sufficient to establish Counter Reformation bishoprics, although Joseph II was not the first to perceive the necessity for reordering the organization of the bishoprics, which was almost a thousand years old at that time. Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels (1623–93) demanded that the Empire be restructured into 150 archdioceses and dioceses with each of them having no more than 200 parishes and annual revenues of 4000 talers. Even individual corrections in the administrative structure could not be effected without considerable difficulty. Thus the centuries-old issue between Salzburg and Passau[29] concerning exemption was not decided until 1728, in favor of Passau.

For all practical purposes, the Catholic Church of the Empire ended at the borders of the Emperor's patrimonial dominions, yet it also overlapped the borders of Switzerland and France. In spite of some corresponding details, its situation in the Bavarian sphere of influence cannot simply be compared with that of the Rhenish ecclesiastical electorates. In the Austrian hereditary lands the Church was to a large extent an established Church; despite their extensive property holdings, the bishops were merely members of the provincial diets. With the exception of aristocratic clerics of the Empire who played a significant role in Vienna or Prague (as did the vice-chancellor of the Empire, Walderdorff, and Archbishops Manderscheid and Salm-Salm), and the bishops of Brixen, Trent, Seckau, and Lavant, the clergy of the hereditary lands, unless they simultaneously occupied a seat in the cathedral chapters of Passau, Salzburg, Regensburg or in imperial chapters, simply could not have very strong feelings regarding their ties to the diocesan structure of Germany. Since the turn of the eighteenth century, moreover, the Habsburg emperors started to carve an Austrian monarchy from the Empire and increasingly to consider themselves heads of an established Church.

---

[26] H. Mathy, "Über das Mainzer Erzkanzleramt in der Neuzeit Stand und Aufgaben der Forschung," *Geschichtliche Landeskunde* II (1965), 109–49.

[27] I. H. von Wessenberg, *Betrachtungen über die Verhältnisse der katholischen Kirche im Umfange des deutschen Bundes* (1818).

[28] Hofmeister, "Gefreite Abteien und Prälaturen," *ZSavRGkan* 50 (1964), 176ff.

[29] E. M. Eder, *Beiträge zum Passauer Exemtionsstreit*, (diss., Vienna 1962).

And yet if one looks for a head of the Church of the Empire, able to exert influence upon it, it would most likely be the Emperor, the *Advocatus ecclesiae.*[30] The seat of German Kings and Emperors in the choir stall of many a cathedral, to be sure, had become a sort of venerable legacy. The office of an archchancellor of the empress, occupied by the prince-abbot of Fulda, or that of the archmarshall, claimed by the prince-abbot of Kempten was endowed with a very modest influence. But these various offices and the artistic aspects of "Imperial Halls," the historiography and architecture of the *Germania sacra* demonstrate its "amphibious constitution."[31] In spite of the denominational split, the Empire remained Catholic, albeit semiecclesiastic in its claims and its mission. It was not only political self-preservation that prompted a bond with the Empire, generally stronger than in most of the secular territories. Only within the framework of the Empire were these many Caesaropapal states of varying size able to develop a political and cultural life or eventually realize their lack of political power relative to the rise of the modern absolutist states.[32]

[30] L. Glier, *Die Advocatia ecclesiae Romanae imperatoris in der Zeit von 1519 bis 1648* (diss., Erlangen 1897); R. Müller, *Die rechtlichen Wandlungen der Advocatia Ecclesiae des römischen Kaisers deutscher Nation* (diss., Erlangen 1895).

[31] This apt expression was first found in N. Lieb, "Die Stiftsanlagen des Barocks in Altbayern und Schwaben," *SM* 29 (1968), 120: "From the standpoint of creativity in architecture, the synthesis of a monastery and an immediate ecclesiastical state can be compared to the combination of bishop's church and royal church in the Gothic cathedral."—G. Iller, *Die Malereien des Kaisersaales zu Fulda* (1939).

[32] Joseph von Eichendorff, "Über die Folgen der Aufhebung de Landeshoheit der Bischöfe und Klöster in Deutschland," *Sämtliche Werke,* ed. by W. Kosch and A. Sauer, X

The basic laws of the Empire, especially the stipulations of the Peace of Westphalia and the electoral capitulation obliged the Emperor to secure the status quo of the Church of the Empire,[33] to maintain the *Concordata Nationis Germanicae*, and to stop the complaints against the Roman Curia.[34] Since the thirteenth century the German Kings and Emperors had exercised the privilege of "First Entreaties" (*Jus primariarum precum*)[35] even without a papal indulgence and under Joseph I held fast to it in the face of a violent dispute with Rome. They granted so-called panis letters "which ordered a religious chapter or congregation that upheld or was still upholding the custom of a common table to provide for a certain person's livelihood for life either in agricultural products or money."[36]

Although basically respecting the electoral freedom of the cathedral chapters, the Emperor was nonetheless able to influence the filling of bishoprics and through this the policies of ecclesiastical territories by dispatching electoral ambassadors, or by means of recommendations, tokens of favor to Austrian canons or those loyal to the Empire, that is by political and financial means. The presence of imperial election commissioners at the decisive preliminary negotiations, although not at the election itself, was considered legally necessary.[37] But even the right of decision in ambiguous episcopal elections and the *ius exclusivae,* for whose justification the proponents of an established Church in favor of increased advocacy invoked the Concordat of Worms and imperial cus-

---

(Regensburg 1911), 169: "[The ecclesiastic territories] as the only remains of a monstrous ancient temple maintained, in the midst of the flood of changes, a steadfast, almost mystic connection with and reference to their great past, the memory of which other states could not destroy fast enough."

[33] Ferdinand III, for example, admonished the Swiss Confederation in 1656 to leave the seminary of Sankt Gallen unmolested on the grounds of "the regalia, privileges, and jurisdiction it held in fief from the Holy Roman Empire." Emperor and Empire regarded Sankt Gallen as belonging to the Empire, that is, as not affected by the Peace of Westphalia. This was evident in their conduct during the Toggenburg War.

[34] W. Wagner, *Das Staatsrecht des Heiligen Römischen Reiches deutscher Nation. Eine Darstellung der Reichsverfassung gegen Ende des 18. Jh. nach einer Handschrift der Wiener Staatsbibliothek* (Karlsruhe 1968), 58–62.

[35] H. E. Feine, "Papst, Erste Bitten und Regierungsantritt des Kaisers seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters," *ZSavRGkan* 20 (1931), 1–101; F. J. Heyen, "Die kaiserlichen Ersten Bitten für das Erzbistum Trier von Ferdinand I. bis Franz II. (1531–1792)," *Festschrift für Alois Thomas* (Trier 1967), 175–88.

[36] W. Wagner, *Staatsrecht*, 64.

[37] About the claim to send imperial curate delegates to the election of bishops, cf. W. Hermkes, *Das Reichsvikariat in Deutschland. Reichsvikare nach dem Tode des Kaisers von der Goldenen Bulle bis zum Ende des Reiches* (Karlsruhe 1968), as well as Chap. 24: "The Established Church."

tom, did not prevail against the resistance of the cathedral chapters and the prebendal aristocracy.

In Trent, where the Compacts of 18 September 1363 and the Note of Speyer of 1571 granted extensive concessions to the Habsburgs, and in Brixen, Passau, Eichstätt and Salzburg, whose "Eternal Statute" (1606) prohibited the election of Bavarian princes and Austrian archdukes and practically excluded all but Tyrolians and Lower Austrians, as a rule candidates from Austrian nobility and those in the service of the Emperor ascended to the see. A position unique in the Church of the Empire and indeed within the Church as a whole was occupied by Salzburg. It had the privilege of appointing, confirming, and consecrating the bishops of its own four small bishoprics of Gurk, Seckau, Chiemsee, and Lavant. Only in the case of Gurk had there been an arrangement made between King Ferdinand I and Archbishop Matthäus Lang (25 October 1535) to the effect that of three successive bishops the first two would always be appointed by the ruler.

The ecclesiastical territories on the Main and middle Rhine were for the most part ruled by prince-bishops who were patriotic and loyal to the Emperor. These cathedral chapters of knights of the Empire repeatedly and successfully demonstrated their independence to candidates nominated by the respective rulers. The knights of the Empire prevailed over proof of ancestry and immediate exclusiveness as well as over the great Catholic dynasties such as the Wittelsbachs, Habsburgs, Pfalz-Neuburgs, and Wettins. But they also prevailed over the mediate nobility who dominated the northwest German cathedral chapters but were in a much more difficult situation in trying to ward off the candidates of their princes. Their resistance was aggravated by the system of coadjutorships, which was expanded in the course of the Counter Reformation and dynastic policies to the extent of a "quasi-hereditability" in a number of states. Thus the prince-bishopric of Freising was referred to as "our parish" by the court of Munich. As a consequence of the Wittelsbach coadjutorships only two elections took place in more than two hundred years in the archbishopric of Cologne (1688 and 1763), although the election of coadjutors was never acknowledged as an actual election or postulation by the Curia, at least in theory. Yet in spite of considerable disadvantages, the coadjutorships at least had the advantage of avoiding interregna and provisional governments by cathedral chapters in the case of vacant sees and the attendant negative consequences.

The ecclesiastical territories were electoral states without any continuity in their foreign and domestic policies or in their attempts at clerical reform. To be sure, they were spared disputes and partitions of inheritance, but were not immune to dynastic rivalries, the ambitions of prebendal families, their nepotism and conflicts of interest. Interregnum and provisional governments during vacancies—not unfairly characterized as "cathedral chapter harvest"—were frequently marked by an express animosity towards the person, the family, and government of the deceased prince-bishop, as well as against his advisers, who at times were not spared personal persecution.[38] This, as well as the considerable cost of an episcopal election and the sums to be raised for annates, services, and pallium contributions, made all reforms exceedingly difficult. Many prince-bishops started their reign without financial means and consequently with little authority. In addition they were tied to the electoral capitulations acknowledged by the Peace of Westphalia,[39] which secured for the cathedral chapters joint government in the bishopric and participation in the clerical administration of it, altogether guaranteeing the estates to be constitutionally embodied in the ecclesiastical territories.[40]

Some wishes for church reforms were reflected in the electoral capitulations, among them the demand to forgo accumulations of bishoprics, a stricter observance of the residence obligation, the settlement of clerical jurisdiction, and the care of elderly and indigent clergy. Those elected were frequently obliged not to take on a coadjutor, not to seek a cardinalate or to do so only if the electoral privilege of the cathedral chapter was assured, not to admit religious orders, which could mean a diminution of episcopal jurisdiction, to root out heresy and to promote the Catholic mission. In the prince-bishoprics of Würzburg, Speyer, and Eichstätt, lengthy lawsuits ensued because of the electoral capitulations. In 1690 Prince-Bishop Johann Gottfried II von Guttenberg of Würzburg managed to be absolved from the electoral capitulation by the Pope. The prince-bishops of Eichstätt, Bamberg, and Constance tried to achieve a similar solution. In 1692 a particular congregation examined all the German electoral capitulations.

---

[38] G. Christ, "Der Wiener Hof und die Wahl Conrad Wilhelms v. Werdenau zum Fürstbischof von Würzburg 1683," *Würzburger Diözesangeschichts-Bll.* 26 (1964), 298.

[39] J. F. Abert, "Die Wahlkapitulationen der Würzburger Fürstbischöfe bis zum Ende des 17. Jh.," *Archiv des Hist. Vereins für Unterfranken u. Aschaffenburg* 46 (1969), 104ff.; J. Kremer, "Studien zur Gesch. der Trierer Wahlkapitulationen (1286–1786)," *Westdt. Zschr. ErgH* 16; G. Weigel, *Die Wahlkapitulationen der Bamberger Bischöfe 1328–1693* (Bamberg 1909); L. Bruggaier, *Die Wahlkapitulationen der Bischöfe und Reichsfürsten von Eichstätt Eine historisch-kanonistische Studie* (Freiburg i.Brsg. 1915); N. Fuchs, "Die Wahlkapitulationen der Fürstbischöfe von Regensburg 1437–1801," *Verhandlungen des Hist. Vereins für Oberpfalz und Regensburg* 101 (1960–61), 5ff.

[40] R. v. Oer, *Landständische Verfassungen in den geistlichen Fürstentümern Nordwestdeutschlands: Ständische Vertretungen in Europa in 17. und 18. Jh.,* ed. by D. Gerhard (Göttingen 1969), 94–119.

Following its suggestions, Innocent XII issued the constitution *Ecclesiae catholicae* (22 September 1695). By threatening dire penalties, it prohibited any and all agreements prior to the election and made all obligations to be contracted after the election subject to concurrence by the Holy See in order to be valid. Emperor Leopold I expressed similar sentiments concerning the invalidity of the electoral capitulations. This *Constitutio Innocentiana* was a decisive blow to the electoral capitulations of several archbishoprics, such as Würzburg, Bamberg, Cologne, and Salzburg, but in those chapters which refused to obey the papal bull and the Emperor's resolution it could not abolish them. In those places a tolerable modus vivendi was obtained which was only occasionally disturbed since the capitulars made the bishops keep to their stipulations and forgo recourse to Rome. Moreover, no prince-bishop who had to consider the consequences for his family could afford deliberately to seek a conflict over the electoral capitulation.

Social differences, reduced during the late Middle Ages, again played a more prominent role in the Church of the seventeenth century. In an unprecedented campaign of securing established positions and in the process of Catholic renewal the hierarchy and leadership of the Church of the Empire consisted exclusively of the few Catholic princely families and the prebendal nobility. Until the death of the Archdukes Leopold Wilhelm (1662) and Karl Joseph (1664), and of the Cologne elector Ferdinand (13 September 1650), who had singlehandedly accumulated five archbishoprics, one prince-abbey and one prince-priory, had never been consecrated, and yet had done well in reforms, half of the Church of the Empire seems to have been dominated by the Habsburgs and Wittelsbachs. Finally, when the archdynasty of Austria for lack of male descendants could no longer furnish candidates for the bishoprics,[41] the nobility of the hereditary lands and later on the related houses of Pfalz-Neuburg, Wettin, and Lorraine took their place.

To be sure, accumulations of bishoprics as practiced under Leopold Wilhelm of Austria and Ferdinand of Bavaria were rarely equaled after the middle of the seventeenth century. Yet for another century the northwest German *Germania Sacra* from Liège to Hildesheim remained almost exclusively an ecclesiastical secundogeniture of the Wittelsbachs until the death of Elector-Archbishop Clemens August of Cologne (1761). The prince-bishoprics of Freising and Regensburg were occupied almost throughout by Wittelsbachs until the passing away of Cardinal Johann Theodor of Bavaria (1763). The Thuns alone furnished four prince-bishops of Passau, the rich archdiocese of Strasbourg was in the hands of the Fürstenbergs from 1663 to 1704; until its decline it was a prebend of the princely family Rohan. The prince-bishopric of Basel came under the rule of a group of "ten families whose seats were on the left and right banks of the Rhine."[42] For three generations the history of the ecclesiastical territories on the Rhine and Main was determined by the rule of the Schönborns and their related families.[43]

---

[41] A. Schulte (*Der Adel und die deutsche Kirche im Mittelalter* [Stuttgart 1922]) repeatedly pointed out that quite a few noble families jeopardized the continuation of their line when their sons entered the ecclesiastical estate.—H. L. Krick, *212 Stammtafeln adeliger Familien, denen geistliche Würdenträger des Bistums Passau entsprossen sind* (Schweiklberg 1924) shows 134 of 212 families as having died out; of these, however, ca. 60 through circumstances other than the entrance of male descendants into the ecclesiastical estate. Beside the Habsburgs, the Wittelsbach, Pfalz-Neuburg, and Slavata families were diminished through ecclesiastical professions.

Dynastic policies within the Church of the Empire undoubtedly contributed to a concentration of power, securing of ecclesiastical properties, and slowing the process of secularization. But as a means of securing a livelihood for younger sons of princes not always suited for the clerical estate they also carried with them grave dangers for the Church. Even taking into account the beneficial influence of the suffragan bishops, the accumulation of bishoprics nonetheless militated against church reform emanating from the hierarchy. Towards the end of the seventeenth century the Church of the Empire had a number of weak and theologically uneducated bishops who were more interested in politics, war, art or entertainment than in their clerical tasks. Yet the number of unconsecrated bishops did decrease. In fact, there were more excellent and truly religious bishops who came close to the ideal than is immediately apparent. Among the exemplary bishops who earned great merit in the implementation of church reforms were the following: Johann Hugo von Orsbeck, archbishop of Trier; Johann Ernst von Thun (1709), archbishop of Salzburg; Sebastian Count von Pöking (1673–88), bishop of Passau; the reformatory Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg, bishop of Regensburg and Osnabrück (d. 1661), "one of the greatest church politicians of his century";[44] and J. F. Eckher von Kapfing (d. 1724), bishop of Freising, who was "the type of baroque prince of the Church whose intellect and soul were dedicated to the *Tridentinum*."[45]

---

[42] H. Rössler, *Deutscher Adel 1555–1740* (Darmstadt 1965), 196.

[43] Ibid. On p. 194 Rössler quotes from a report by the imperial legate to the Rhenish electoral courts, Trauttmannsdorff, of 1786, according to which the Schönborn and Stadion families were still considered as being in the top group of the nobility of electoral Mainz.

[44] G. Schwaiger, *Kardinal Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg als Bischof von Regensburg (1649–61)* (Munich 1954), 302.

[45] B. Hubensteiner, *Die geistliche Stadt Welt und Leben des Johann Franz Eckher von Kapfing und Liechteneck, Fürstbischofs von Freising* (Munich 1954), 193.

The capitulars looked on themselves as "hereditary lords" of the archbishoprics, as "condomini et conregnantes" or as "patriae et statuum protectores" (from the 1729 electoral capitulation of the electorate of Trier). These "princes of the Papal States" (Sartorius) have often enough been harshly judged. They were taken to task for their inept mediocrity, their lack of zeal and theological education, their chasing after prebends, belligerence, and their chronic gambling and drinking (deplored by the papal nuncios almost in terms of a German national vice). They were blamed for a good part of the abuses in the Church and for the fact that they delayed or hesitated in implementing reform. It is indeed not easy to do them justice, especially if we take into account that while the chapters were similar on the whole they nonetheless differed considerably in detail regarding size, revenues, and structure. The prebendal nobility was rooted deeply in the courtly world of the baroque. There were lethargic, incompetent prebendaries, talented politicians, sophisticated cavaliers in the cathedral and collegiate chapters, but there were also unobtrusive supplicants and humble pious priests. Greed for fame and money were widespread, but so were preparedness for penitence and expiation. The prebendal nobility were not exclusively engaged in taking care of their families. While they were open to criticism concerning the "aristocratic Church of the Empire," their achievements for Church and Empire, for the arts and sciences deserve recognition. The Schönborns and Eltzes, the Stadions and Dalbergs, the von der Leyens, Breidbach-Bürresheims, Walderdorffs, Fürstenbergs, Thuns, and Firmians, to mention a few, have left their mark on inner and outer aspects of the Church. Their clerical and political decisions, their courts and church architecture, their collections and foundations represent prominent high points in the course of German history.

Efforts to strengthen the principle of exclusiveness had to do with the desire for political, economic and religious security. In the course of the seventeenth century the requirements regarding proof of ancestry were generally augmented. In 1606 the cathedral chapter of Bamberg increased its demands to include eight ancestors. The statutes of the cathedral chapter of Mainz dated 19 December 1654 required of prebendal applicants the witness of eight matriculated knights of the Empire to the effect that the former's ancestors corresponded with the traditions of the Mainz Church. Towards the end of the seventeenth century the closely connected chapters of Mainz, Bamberg, and Würzburg demanded proof of sixteen immediate ancestors of the Empire. The cathedral chapters of Eichstätt, Constance, Passau, and Regensburg were satisfied with proof of four ancestors. The farther the chapters were situated to the east and south of the Empire, the less stringent were the requirements and the less frequent the rejection of spurious ancestors. The mediate nobility of these areas did not try to compete in its requirements with those of the knights of the Empire. By increasing their demands regarding proof of ancestry in Bamberg, Würzburg, Mainz, and later on in Trier, Worms, and Speyer, the knights achieved exclusive status for their class and to a large extent also for their territories, unaffected by the resistance of the mediate nobility of the Lower Rhine and Westphalia, who were supported by Prussia and Hanover. The bishops of these dioceses—disregarding the special circumstances in Trier—were almost exclusively from families of knights of the Empire from Franconian, electoral Rhenish, and Swabian areas.

In 1526 the bishopric of Chur had gained territorial exclusiveness by means of the Articles of Ilanz, which, in fact, made the cathedral chapter and the archdiocese into an institution of triple ties. A strong Italian, Tridentine character was preserved in the cathedral chapter of Trent. Eight of twenty-four capitular prebends had been open to the French high aristocracy since 1687; in 1713 the requirements for proof of ancestry were made much less stringent. In the cathedral chapter of Liège the number of prebendal German nobles decreased steadily. In the eighteenth century the cathedral chapters of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Münster attempted to come to an agreement regarding estates and territories of the Empire. It was their intention to no longer admit either Rhenish, Swabian, or Franconian knights of the Empire—with the exception of the cantons of Hegau, Allgäu and Bodensee—or Bohemians and Moravians. In the cathedral chapter of Cologne, where proof of sixteen ancestors had had to be demonstrated since the end of the fifteenth century, the dominance of the nobility was breached by eight pastoral prebends accessible to members of the bourgeoisie. These prebends required both ordination and the doctorate; the equality of rank between the doctoral degree and noble origin thus continued. In the cathedral chapters of Liège, Brixen, and Chur the bourgeois element was not only represented, but actually gained influence in the course of the eighteenth century. Even if one readily admits to cases of reactions against the candidacy of prebendal nobles or princes of the Empire in Stablo-Malmedy or Liège, reactions based on territorial issues or the question of mediate or immediate imperial status, the assumption of a contrast between an aristocratic Church and a rising bourgeoisie can no longer be taken for granted. This is the conclusion to be drawn if one examines the composition of the upper German chapters, the list of their abbots—with Sankt Gallen a case in point[46]—as well as the origin of the various prelates[47] and the suffragan bishops. Entering a monastery in the period of the baroque was more a matter of "social rise than a policy for securing a livelihood,"[48] for the monasteries of that period made tremendous contributions towards reforms and cultural changes, not least in the area of equalizing the differences between social classes.

The Council of Trent had aimed at strengthening the position of the bishops within the diocese, doing away with the separation of the pontificate and the secular-political office characteristic of the development of the Church of the Empire prior to the Reformation. It had also raised a demand for the abolition of the suffragan bishop, this *larva ecclesiae Dei*. To be sure, the bishops had increasingly returned to the center of diocesan life, especially since the middle of the seventeenth century, and there was hardly a diocese within the confines of the Church which could not point to at least one and in most cases several exemplary bishops in the period between the Peace of Westphalia and the Catholic Enlightenment. Yet there was no dearth of complaints concerning the position of the suffragan bishops, that German "bizarrerie, que l'Évêque in partibus n'est que pour les fonctions Épiscopales de l'ordre, et qu'il n'a que voir au gouvernement spirituel, celui qui en est chargé n'étant que Prêtre,"[49] more so if conditions in the Church of the Empire were measured against the Tridentine or early Christian ideal. "A bishop can do everything according to his plans," was the complaint of the learned and profoundly religious suffragan bishop Niels Stensen, who withdrew to his jurisdiction of the "Nordic Missions" as a protest against the controversial election of the Cologne elector Max Heinrich to the prince-bishopric of Münster. He continued: "But I am only permitted pontifical acts; therefore all those other functions, such as visitations, synods, schools, and other things necessary to prepare a candidate for ordination, are out of my hands."[50]

---

[46] As early as 1430–36 Sankt Gallen abolished the exclusion of nonnobles. Three of its eight abbots between 1630 and 1803 came from the lowest social stratum (two were sons of poor peasants, one the son of a shoemaker); the majority of the others came from the bourgeoisie. Of more than 350 conventuals between 1648 and 1803 only seven were real nobles. The last noble conventual took his vows in 1723 (cf. J. Salzgeber, *Die Klöster Einsiedeln und St. Gallen im Barockzeitalter* [Munich 1966]).

[47] E. Krausen, "Die Zusammensetzung bayerischer Prämonstratenserkonvente," *HJ* 86 (1966), 166ff.; idem, "Die Herkunft der bayerischen Prälaten des 17. und 18. Jh." *ZBLG* 27 (1964), 259–85.

[48] J. Salzgeber, op. cit., 90.

[49] Antoine Arnauld to Landgrave Ernst von Hessen Rheinfels, 30 September 1683. *Lettres de Messire Antoine Arnauld, Docteur de la Maison et Société de Sorbonne* II (Paris and Lausanne 1775), 353.

Compared to the aristocratic ecclesiastical princes, not all of whom had been consecrated or were able to fulfill their residence obligation, the suffragan bishops were very much in the background even in the historical representations of the Church, since their work appears to have been limited primarily to pontifical acts and their lives were evidently lacking in prominent events and were too dull and colorless to merit the interest of historians. This one-sided picture of an aristocratic Church of the Empire in modern times must be rectified by an improved assessment of the role and origin of the suffragan bishops. From the Peace of Westphalia to secularization, the Mainz suffragan bishops *in partibus Rheni* were almost exclusively of bourgeois origin, most of them from rather modest circumstances. From 1600 to 1800 there was not a single aristocrat among the ten suffragans of Speyer; the seven suffragans of Basel during the same period were either bourgeois or patricians. Although the prince-bishops and the cathedral chapter of Strasbourg were exclusively members of the high nobility, the vast majority of the suffragans were from the bourgeoisie. This was also the case in Augsburg during the seventeenth century, while during the eighteenth century it was the knights of the Empire who predominated, so that in the course of two centuries the two were approximately of equal representation. In the same two centuries the tendency in favor of the aristocracy manifest in Augsburg was even more prominent in Constance in the form of a transition from graduated theologians to the barons of the baroque.

The suffragans more or less took care of the ministry in their bishoprics and undertook a great part of the reforms. Their work, insufficiently known even today, characterized an inner aspect of the Church of the Empire, which at times has been seen too much as an "aristocratic Church," as ecclesiastical principalities, as a merger of secular and clerical rule, and as the exclusive domain of Catholic princes and aristocratic families.

In the duchy of Berg and later as suffragans in Mainz and Cologne the brothers Peter and Adrian van Walenbusch dedicated all their energies to church reform and the reunification in the faith. As suffragans of Mainz, their friend, the convert Adolf Gottfried Volusius, as well as Mathias Starck and Christian Nebel continued their efforts towards intensifying the life of the Church. In northern Germany it was the extraordinarily capable Osnabrück suffragan Kaspar Münster (d. 5 February 1654), "filled with a burning zeal for reform,"[51] who worked for the implementation of the Edict of Restitution and the propagation of the faith. The larger part of his inheritance went to the Cologne Archbrothership of the Sufferings of our Lord,[52] that is for the benefit of the ministry to converts. The learned Niels Stensen was hard at work in the prince-bishopric of Münster and in the "Nordic Missions." But the attempt, welcomed by the Jansenist Antoine Arnauld as an "action agréable à Dieu," to attract Stensen as suffragan in the service of the pious Johann Hugo von Orsbeck of Trier came to naught.[53] In the diocese of Regensburg, reforms and the reconstruction of the Church were given strong impulses by Bishop Wartenberg's excellent collaborator, the titular bishop of Almira, Sebastian Denich. During the reign of the Wittelsbach prince-bishops Joseph Clemens, Clemens August, and Johann Theodor, who rarely resided there, these tasks were undertaken by the saintly suffragan bishop Gottfried Johann Freiherr Langwerth von Simmern, a convert and a distant relative of Freiherr vom Stein.[54] During his long tenure, the titular bishop of Edremit, Kaspar Zeiler (1645–81), applied his energy to the restoration of church life in the bishopric of Augsburg. The learned Thomas Henrici, titular bishop of Chrysopolis (1648 to 1660) and public advocate of the reunification of the Churches, worked in the bishopric of Basel. The Suffragan Bishops Peter Verhorst and Matthias von Eyss led the defense against Jansenism in the archdiocese of Trier. Cologne developed an active church life under the Francken-Siersdorf suffragans. Representative of many other suffragans of the seventeenth century for their achievements and reforms were the following: Johannes Brunetti and Elias Daniel von Sommerfeld in Breslau, Paul Aldringen (1592–1644), who came from a poor Luxemburg family and in his role as suffragan under Archduke Leopold Wilhelm was the actual bishop and reformer of the Strasbourg diocese,[55] his successors Gabriel Haug and the Titular Bishop of Adrianople, Johann Peter Quentel (d. 1710), from the well-known Cologne family of printers, who last worked in Münster. Others who deserve mention by virtue of their political or diplomatic missions, or the promotion of science and art during the eighteenth century are the suffragan bishops Nalbach of Trier, Jacquet of Liège, Toussaint Duvernin of Strasbourg,[56] and Ungelter of Augsburg.[57] For personal achievements in the areas of historical research, canon law, reforms of church life, and a Catholic Enlightenment they were surpassed by the great bourgeois suffragans at the end of the eighteenth century, such as Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim from an old patrician family of Trier; the Mainz suffragans Ludwig Philipp Behlen, the son of a simple Eichsfeld family; and Valentin Heimes, who came from a family of vintners in the Rheingau. In company with the Worms suffragan Stephen Alexander Würdtwein, who prepared a tremendous amount of source material for the history of the Church of the Empire; Suffragan Bishop Seelmann in Speyer, his successor; the prominent canonist Philipp Anton Schmidt,[58] brother of the "historiographer of the Germans"; and, lastly, Dalberg's suffragan Kolborn,[59] they left the imprint of their names upon the final attempts at a reform of the Church in an episcopal sense and upon the theological and canonical discussions of the waning eighteenth century. And finally, after similar demands had been raised here and there in the chapters of Germany, Valentin Heimes attempted at the Congress of Ems to limit the privileges of the nobility within the Church of the Empire in favor of improving the quality of the ministry.

---

[50] Quotation from M. Berbaum, *Niels Stensen. Von der Anatomie zur Theologie (1638–1688)* (Münster, n.d.), 100.

---

[51] G. Denzler, *Die Propagandakongregation in Rom und die Kirche in Deutschland im ersten Jahrzehnt nach dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Paderborn 1969), 179.

[52] About this archbrotherhood, see L. Just, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kölner Nuntiatur," *QFIAB* 36 (1956), 248–320.

[53] Stensen died 12 May 1686. For almost four months before his death he had waited in vain for a decision from Rome concerning "sia in ordine alla licenza di ritornar in Italia, sia per veder cosa si possa far a Treveri, secondo le instanze dell' Eminentissimo Signor Elettore, sia di veder come posso trattenermi ne' vicariati" (G. Scherz and J. Raeder, eds., *Nicolai Stenonis epistolae et epistolae ad eum datae* II [Hafniae-Friburgi 1952], 894 f.; H. Raab, "Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels und der Jansenismus," *AMrhKG* 19 [1967], 48–56).

[54] H. F. Langwerth v. Simmern, *Aus Krieg und Frieden. Kulturhistorische Bilder aus einem Familienarchiv* (Wiesbaden 1906), 83–254.

The economic condition of the parish clergy and its education immediately after the Thirty Years' War was poor throughout. Even in the following decades, ravaged by war and epidemics, it was rarely better.

---

[55] Aldringen's younger brother Johann Markus became canon in Salzburg and Olmütz and was bishop of Seckau from 1633 to 1664. One should really pay attention in research to "bourgeois" bishops' families. A good example is the family of the innkeeper of "The Lion," Hans Jakob Haus from Stein am Rhein near Säckingen. His two sons, Johann Christoph (1652–1725) and Johann Baptist (1672–1745) became suffragan bishops of Basel, as did their great-nephew Johann Baptist Gobel, who later became constitutional bishop of Paris.

[56] J. Gass, *Straßburger Theologen im Aufklärungszeitalter (1766–90)* (Strasbourg 1917), 183–85.

[57] F. Zoepfl, "Weihbischof Ungelter und Christoph Schmidt," *Christoph Schmid und seine Zeitgenossen*, ed. by H. Pörnbacher (Weißenhorn 1968), 43–49.

[58] W. Kratz, "Exjesuiten als Bischöfe 1773–1822," *AHSI* 6 (1937), 200.

[59] H. Raab, "Aus dem Briefwechsel des Aschaffenburger Weihbischofs J.H.K. v. Kolborn mit dem Generalvikar von Konstanz Ignaz von Wessenberg," *Aschaffenburger Jb.* 2 (1955), 98–135.

Abject poverty, hunger, and totally inadequate housing were frequent occurrences. The comment by the deacon of Bingen, Dr. Vogt, regarding the conditions at Niederheimbach pertained to the average income of many priests: "The revenues of the parish priest are such that they do not permit a priestly existence unless he were to sustain himself by means of only bread, milk, and smoked meat, without wine except in autumn, when he may drink cider until the wine is finished and sold."[60]

Greed, gambling, drunkenness, and violation of the law of celibacy in many a place were probably consequences of dire distress. The circumstances explain why many a priest assumed the glebe lands for his own use, disregarding encumbrances and the unavoidable consequences. Patronage rights and incorporation on one hand, surplice fees and oblations on the other, but also economic and spiritual anguish, the difficulties in ministering and trying to lead a pious life can no more than imply the problems of the parish clergy in the second half of the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century until the reform efforts of the Enlightenment and the parish regulation of Joseph II.

The words of Leonhard Mayr, longtime priest of the court church in Neuburg, expressed in one of his last sermons before his death (1665), apply to many other priests of his time: "Since 1617 I have remained with you through all sorts of adversity, untoward conditions, dearth, through hunger and grief, raging pestilence, in danger of life and limb, never have I forsaken you, but have instead persevered. *Mementote!* Preserve my memory! During that time 2,857 have died; to each of them, except for pestilence, have I given the funeral rites. I have baptized 2,500 children and have had many books put in print."[61]

The parish clergy was often hopelessly overburdened. Given the severe lack of priests during the seventeenth century, the restoration of church life would have been impossible without aid not only by the orders, especially the Capuchins,Carmelites, and the Jesuits, but also by the chapter clergy. The number of monastic parishes in Bavaria and Austria was considerable. The prebendary chapter of Sankt Florian near Linz administered thirty-three parishes; Klosterneuburg near Vienna twenty-three, and in the Cologne deaconry of Zülpich thirty parishes were in the care of religious orders. But these "expositures" led to many an incompatibility for the *expositi*, their monastic establishments, and the secular clergy. On the whole, the end of the eighteenth century not only saw an increase in the number of priests but also a more profound intellectual and religious life within the clergy.

---

[60] A. L. Veit, *Kirchliche Reformbestrebungen im ehemaligen Erzstift Mainz unter Erzbischof Johann Philipp von Schönborn 1647–73* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1910), 64.

[61] Veit-Lenhart, 217.

In the opinion of contemporary sources of the seventeenth century, seminaries appeared to be the best means to restore and improve church discipline. Given the great need for priests, it was tempting to favor exemplary conduct over theological education, thus enabling a less than ideal alternative to have its effect on the rivalries of the ministering regular clergy. The first seminary in Germany was established in 1564 by Bishop Martin von Schaumburg in Eichstätt over the opposition of his cathedral chapter. But the Swedes destroyed it in 1634 and it could not be reopened until 1710. The seminary of Breslau, founded by the cathedral chapter in 1565 almost against the wishes of its bishop, began to flourish again after the Thirty Years' War under the reign of Archduke Leopold I Wilhelm of Austria (1656–56). The diocese of Ermland had a seminary since 1567; it closed its doors between 1625 and 1637 as a result of the Swedish incursion and was given a new building in 1651. Other seminaries were opened in Würzburg (1570), Salzburg (1577/79), Basel (1606), and Dillingen (1614, for the Augsburg diocese). With the exception of Salzburg these seminaries were unable to develop steadily either because of the vagaries of war or because of financial problems. As was the case in Basel under Prince-Bishop Johann Konrad von Reinach in 1716,[62] they had to be reformed or reestablished in the second half of the seventeenth or during the eighteenth century.

In 1639 the seminary in Münster, established in 1613 and named after Suffragan Bishop Johannes Kridt (d. 9 July 1577), failed. A new seminary was founded in 1776 under Franz von Fürstenberg in the abandoned Benedictine monastery of Überwasser. On 1 December 1615, Archbishop Ferdinand opened a seminary in Cologne with a mere twelve boarding students, but it ceased to exist on 1 May of 1645 as a result of the war. Reopened in 1658/60 with a discouragingly small number of students, it had to be dissolved fifteen years later because of the catastrophic economic condition and the effects of the Dutch War. During its tenure it had produced no more than two novice priests per year.[63] It was not until 1738, after difficult negotiations, that the Seminarium Clementinum was founded. The situation was somewhat better in the archbishopric of Mainz, where Johann Philipp von Schönborn, the "German Solomon," having seen the Institute for a Universal Clergy of Bartholomäus Holzhauser in Gastein, put him in charge of the Mainz seminary in 1660. Holzhauser himself took over the difficult parish of Bingen; for over a century Sankt Emmeran of Mainz, the parishes of Frankfurt, Heppenheim an der Bergstrasse, and Duderstadt were domains of the Bartholomites. Under their guidance the seminary of Würzburg educated 187 seminarians in the years from 1655 to 1679.[64]

---

[62] A letter from the prince-bishop of Basel elucidates the situation: "Il a passé un siècle qu'un de mes prédécesseurs put élever un bâtiment dans ma ville de Porrentrui qui devait servir de Séminaire pour le Clergé de son diocèse, mais côme les guerres ensuites en ont affligé la plus grande partie, ce dessein est demeuré sand exécution. . . . La première raison qui m'y a porté a esté la disposition de l'Église . . . et la seconde estait le déréglement, l'ignorance et le libertinage qui commençoit à se glisser dans mon Clergé, le tout fautte d'occasion à instruire les Ecclésiastiques dans leurs ministères et à donner de vives corrections à ceux qui s'écartaient à leur devoir." (Quotation from A. Schaer, *Le clergé paroissial catholique en haute Alsace sous l'Ancien régime 1648–1789* [Paris 1966], 119).

The seminary in Osnabrück, founded by the reform bishop Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg, closed soon after the latter's death (1 September 1661) during the reign of the Protestant pseudobishop Ernst August. The one in Wartenberg's second diocese of Regensburg which he entrusted to the Bartholomites in 1650 and which was reestablished in 1665 under the direction of the Jesuits, continued in spite of considerable difficulties, but did not begin to flourish until the reign of Prince-Bishop Anton Ignaz von Fugger (1769–87).[65]

The college of clerics at the Porta Beatissimae Virginis Mariae developed into a Seminary for a Universal Clergy for the Prince-Abbey of Sankt Gallen because the college was unable to implement its own theological curriculum (1642) as a result of the war.[66]

After the deluge of the Thirty Years' War and given the total impoverishment of the ecclesiastical territories and their deep indebtedness even from the period before the war—in Constance under Prince-Bishop Jakob Fugger (1604–26) it amounted to 200,000 florins—there could be no thought of establishing new seminaries. It was not "a lack of goodwill on the part of the bishops and not a matter of resistance against the idea of seminaries as such, but primarily the question of finances which created the greatest difficulty."[67]

---

[63] E. Reckers, *Gesch. des Kölner Priesterseminars* (Cologne 1929), 93.

[64] M. Arneth, *Bartholomäus Holzhauser und sein Weltpriesterinstitut* (Würzburg 1959); A. Werfer and H. Wildanger, *Der ehrwürdige Bartholomäus Holzhauser und sein Weltpriesterinstitut* (Munich 1941); K. Böck, "Bartholomäus Holzhauser," *Lebensbilder aus dem bayerischen Schwaben* 5 (1956), 221–38; K. Braun, *Gesch. der Heranbildung des Klerus in der Diözese Würzburg seit ihrer Gründung bis zur Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (Mainz 1897); A. P. Brück, "Das Mainzer Priesterseminar der Bartholomisten," *AMrhKG.* 15 (1963), 33–94.

[65] G. Schwaiger, *Kardinal Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg als Bischof von Regensburg (1649–61)* (Munich 1954), 151–71; E. Meißner, *Fürstbischof Anton Ignaz Fugger (1711–87)* (Tübingen 1969), 243f.

[66] J. Duft, *Die Glaubenssorge der Fürstäbte von St. Gallen im 17. und 18. Jh. Ein Beitrag zur Seelsorgsgeschichte der katholischen Restauration als Vorgeschichte des Bistums Sankt Gallen* (Lucerne 1944), 103ff.

The papal seminaries in Fulda and Dillingen, to be sure, provided some relief and the relatively well educated monastic clergy successfully took part in the ministry. Yet the fact that many bishops had to have their theologians trained in the orders or in foreign and often backward universities was rather disadvantageous for the Church of the Empire. There was a noticeable discrepancy between the meager and sometimes very poor conditions in the training of priests and the background of monumental architecture in the ecclesiastical states; in the mediate chapters, there was a vivid contrast between many a poor village church and splendid monastic libraries.[68] The difficulties encountered by the large diocese of Chur in the education of its priests are well known. Supported by only a small prince-bishopric and scant revenues, its attempts to obtain a seminary were fruitless throughout the seventeenth century. Until the time of Napoleon it had to depend on the Jesuit college in Feldkirch, which was abolished in 1773, and on vacancies in Rome, Milan, Vienna, and Dillingen. Not until the end of the seventeenth and the first decades of the eighteenth century, when the worst aftermath of the war had been overcome by the *Germania Sacra*, were existing seminaries restored and new ones opened. This development was accompanied by a new striving for reforms especially during the reign of the Schönborns, to whom four seminaries owed either their existence or their support. Wilhelm Egon von Fürstenberg founded a seminary for the diocese of Strasbourg (1683) which enjoyed an excellent reputation up to the end of the eighteenth century. He also relocated the Catholic university of Molsheim to the episcopal seat. After all its attempts since the Salzburg Synod of 1569 had failed, the bishopric of Freising finally obtained a seminary in 1691, thanks to an unequivocal demand by Pope Innocent XI.[69]

---

[67] E. Reckers, *Kölner Priesterseminar*, 25.

[68] Some light is shed on the morals of the students of theology, for example at the University of Dillingen. Immediately before Sailer's appointment there prevailed, "especially among the students of theology, the most immoderate drunkenness, even in the dormitory, and the zeal for study had slackened." (Quotation from H. Schiel, *Johann Michael Sailer, Leben und Briefe* I [Regensburg 1948], 84).—The impressions gathered by the regent of the Würzburg seminary for priests, the future suffragan bishop Fahrmann, on a trip for "seminary, literary, architectural purposes" in 1787 are most informative. The Strasbourg Seminary made the best impression on him: "Discipline here is by far not as strict as in Besançon, yet it works fairly well. The students are cheerful and filled with respect and love toward their superiors." (Quotation from J. Gass, *Straßburger Theologen im Aufklärungszeitalter* [Strasbourg 1917], 3).

[69] B. Hubensteiner, *Die geistliche Stadt Welt und Leben des Johann Franz Eckher von Kapfing und Liechteneck, Fürstbischofs von Freising* (Munich 1954), 157.

Seminaries were founded in Königgrätz (1706) and Leitmeritz (1736). But in Speyer and Trier the training of clerics was insufficient until the turn of the eighteenth century. The boarding seminary of the Speyer cathedral chapter had perished in the tumult of the Thirty Years' War. During the warring seventeenth century there had not been enough money, and so it was not until 1723 that Prince-Bishop Damian Hugo von Schönborn was able to establish a pastoral seminary.[70] Trier did indeed have the Bantus Seminary founded in 1586/92 and, after 1667, there was the aristocratic, lavishly endowed Lambertus Seminary established by an endowment of Ferdinand von Buchholtz,[71] but it hardly produced any ministering clergymen. The strange founding of a seminary in Koblenz during the reign of Elector Franz Ludwig von Pfalz-Neuburg, who forwent consecration for dynastic and political reasons, illuminates the difficulty of the conditions at that time. In Koblenz twelve younger but not yet sufficiently educated priests were supposed to live together with eight older ones and thus further their education in theology and canon law.[72] Not until the reign of the last Trier elector-archbishop, Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen, was a satisfactory solution found in the form of the *Seminarium Clementinum*. Under the influence of reform-Catholic efforts and a moderate administrative enlightenment, a considerable improvement took place in the condition of the ministering clergy. This included the establishment of houses for retired priests and a better education of recruits for the priesthood. The Bamberg seminary was reformed under Prince-Bishop Friedrich Karl von Schönborn (1729–46); his brother Damian Hugo opened the seminary of Constance (1734–35),[73] and the third great Schönborn of that generation, the elector of Trier and prince-provost of Ellwangen Franz Georg, founded the seminary on the Schönenberg. In Paderborn the Harsewinkel *Seminarium clericorum* came into being in 1776. In the waning years of the prince-bishopric of Chur, where the education of priests was endangered by the abolition of the Society of Jesus and the loss of student vacancies in Rome, Milan, Vienna, and Dillingen, Gottfried Purtscher opened a small seminary in Meran on 9 September 1800, but this was closed again by the provisions of the Peace of Preßburg after the attack on Tirol by Bavaria.

---

[70] O. B. Roegele, "Damian Hugo von Schoenborn und die Anfänge des Bruchsaler Priesterseminars," *FreibDiözArch* 71 (1951), 5–51.

[71] P. A. Reuß, *Gesch. des bischöflichen Priesterseminars zu Trier* (Trier 1890).

[72] P. Reitz, "Das zweite Koblenzer Priesterseminar von 1728," *Pastor bono* 40 (1929), 54–58.

[73] F. Hundsnurscher, *Die finanziellen Grundlagen für die Ausbildung des Weltklerus im Fürstbistum Konstanz vom Tridentinischen Konzil bis zur Säkularisation mit einem Ausblick auf die übrigen nachtridentinischen Bistümer Deutschlands*, (diss., Freiburg i. Brsg. 1968).

CHAPTER 11

Spain and Portugal to 1815

The General Intellectual Situation

The structure of the Spanish and Portuguese Church from 1650 to 1815 was determined by the rules and mentality of the *ancien régime.* It was a socially privileged Church with significant agricultural and urban assets, with an unchallenged authority over the faithful. Based on a religious foundation, it also exerted its influence on the bureaucracy of the state. The period falls into two divisions: the century from 1650 to 1750 bears a counterreformational character, while the period from 1750 to 1815 should be considered part of the Enlightenment. However, this concept demands refinement. Was the Spanish Enlightenment Catholic or antireligious? Was it an importation or did it stem from inner dynamics, although characterized by foreign elements? What relationship was there between the Spanish Enlightenment, the Encyclopedists, and the French Revolution? Was it congruent in time with the rest of Europe? These questions contain a number of stimulating problems which cannot be comprehensively or even adequately solved here, but must be mentioned briefly in order to provide a perspective towards a better understanding of this period. The three basic components of the "enlightened Spaniard" as he was represented by a good many clerics of that time were: a Catholic education, European culture and a social and economic reformative zeal.

In its origins, the Spanish Enlightenment was not antireligious. While anticlerics and disbelievers could have joined it, all the typical exponents of the Spanish Enlightenment were Catholic. The clergy especially, being most prominent in the life of the nation, were considered the great representatives of this form of the Enlightenment. The fact that the most pressing problem was socioeconomic reform, with the state as its most important instrument, was not accompanied by scorn for the supernatural order and even less by opposition to it. And if the authority of the state did usurp the rights of the Church in a pernicious and extremely destructive manner, it was an error on the part of the authority and not of the Enlightenment. Similar to the Renaissance, Enlightenment existed only in its various shadings according to the perception of those who adapted to it.

The representatives of the four generations of the Spanish Enlightenment, referred to by Vicens Vives[1] and adopted here according to their respective generations are Feijóo (1676–1764), Flórez (1702–1783), Campomanes (1723–1802), and Jovellanos (1744–1811). The first two were prominent personalities from religious orders. Jovellanos was tonsured and, although not ordained, remained loyal to the principles of his ecclesiastical office. Campomanes, one of the great regalists of his century, was educated by his uncle, the capitular of Oviedo, and by the Dominicans of Santillana; he steadfastly avowed his Catholicism.

---

[1] J. Vincens Vives, *Approximación a la Historia de España* (Barcelona 1960), 175.

The Geographic, Sociographic, and Economic Situation

At this time Spain had eight Church provinces and 56 bishoprics. Only one change was brought about in the seventeenth century: the loss of the bishopric of Elna when Roussillon became French (1659). Four new dioceses were founded in the eighteenth century: Santander (1754), Tudela (1783), Ibiza, and Minorca (1795), so that the number of bishoprics was 59 by the end of the century.

At the end of the sixteenth century the population of the Iberian Peninsula totaled 9,485,000; of those 1,250,000 were in Portugal. About three-fourths, that is 6,910,000, were in Castile. According to Felipe Ruiz there were 33,087 secular clerics, 26,297 monks, and 20,369 nuns. These amounted to 11.33 per thousand of the population. These figures contradict the exaggeration in that part of the secondary literature where the number of clerics is given at 200,000. By the end of the seventeenth century the total population of Spain decreased considerably due to wars and epidemics, but by 1797 it again increased to a total of 10,541,221. According to Canga Argüelles this figure included 57,488 secular clerics, 49,365 monks, and 24,007 nuns. The number of clerics also contained those who had received minor orders. The 73,372 monks and nuns were distributed among forty-three orders. The male orders owned 2,104 houses and the female orders 976.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the Spanish Church had 59 bishoprics and, beyond that, 648 dignities, 1,768 prebends, 216 pensions and 200 half-pensions in the cathedrals and collegiate churches. There were 64 collegiate and 16,481 parish churches.[2] The wealth of the Church at that time has been exaggerated just as much as the number of clerics. Yet it must be noted that the economic condition of the Church was good. As in society at large, there existed a significant inequality between the higher and the lower clergy. The most important source of revenue was the *diezmo*, the tenth part of the agrarian gross income. But it fluctuated according to the harvest. In 1592 the annual income of the Church amounted to 10,400,000 ducats; by 1638 it had decreased to 7,000,000. In addition there were the simple benefices and the religious foundations. But these revenues were decreased by a number of contributions to the state or the Roman or national church administration, such as annates, bishops' subsidies, pensions, welfare funds, monthly assessments, etc. There were also the church seigniories, which were dependent on bishoprics, monasteries, or other church bodies. Most of this economic system disappeared in the nineteenth century, together with the *ancien régime*.

---

[2] *Censo de población de las provincias y partidos de la Corona de Castilla en el siglo XVI* (Madrid 1829); J. Nadal, *Historia de la población española (siglos XVI a XX)* (Barcelona 1966); Felipe Ruiz, "La población española en los tiempos modernos," *Cuadernos de Historia. Anexos de la revista Hispania* 1 (1967), 189–202; Miguel Artola, *La España del Antiguo Régimen* (Salamanca 1967); José de Canga Argüelles, *Diccionario de Hacienda* (Madrid 1833).

Portugal had three church provinces and sixteen dioceses during the eighteenth century.

The Development of Ecclesiastical Institutions

In the present state of research it is not easy to render a complete picture of the hierarchy, but some general characteristics can be pointed out.

In spite of political decadence, church discipline did not deteriorate. The lateral transfer of prelates was more frequent in the earlier years. From the point of view of the pastoral administration it was possible that this practice was commendable. The question then is whether the motive should be sought in rank or remuneration.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century there was an increase in the appointments of bishops from the ranks of religious orders. We do not know the reasons for this phenomenon. Rome did not have full confidence in the Spanish episcopate; several expressions of distrust were voiced regarding its loyalty to the disciplinary norms of the Curia. The episcopate was assumed to be subservient to the court. It was suspected of standing up more for the fulfillment of its own material interests than for the defense of church jurisdiction and the decisions of the Roman Curia. The latter therefore called the attention of the nuncios to this situation and to the existing tension between the lower clergy, organised in a large association called the *Congregación del clero de Castilla y de León*, and the residing bishops. The nuncios were recommended, whenever justified, to support the demands of the cathedral chapters against the bishops, thereby making them ever more dependent on the will and the protection of the nuncios. Was there a reason for the state secretariat to interpret the situation in this manner? No doubt there was a danger that being dependent on the King for promotion to a better paid or more prestigious position could change into a golden cage. On the other hand, there was criticism in Spain of the Curia and the nepotism of Popes and members of the Curia. The sources do not reveal that the submissiveness of the episcopate to the King or his dynastic concerns was a fundamental disadvantage for the Church. Devotion to the King had its limits; in every case we know of the bishop either accepted the royal decrees in accordance with his conscience or he freely argued his pastoral duties when these did not permit him to obey such decrees. Conversely, opposition of Spanish bishops to the Curia was frequently aimed at the latter's centralism and fiscalism or the anti-Spanish policies of Popes. In the seventeenth century Spain had neither a political and theological episcopacy, as did France, nor did the episcopate form a united front with a more or less uniform mentality for or against Rome or Madrid.[3]

In the middle of the eighteenth century the historian and enlightened reformist Gregorio Mayáns y Siscar (1699–1781) deplored the lack of interest of some bishops in culture and enlightenment and their preoccupation with Scholasticism. Yet the research by J. Sarrailh proves that most of the bishops made great efforts in the area of charity and material improvement within their dioceses. Since they were generally of modest origins, they stayed in contact with their faithful. J. Sarrailh presents a list of such "charitable" bishops whose energy was applied to ameliorating misery and to promoting the well-being of their sees. He also points out the "economically active" bishops who promoted public buildings and established schools and houses for the poor.

Within the episcopate a group of Jansenist bishops[4] attained prominence. Though small, it was extremely active and influential: Asensio Salas and José Climent, both of them bishops of Barcelona, Felipe Bertrán of Salamanca, Antonio Tavira, also of Salamanca and later of Osma, as well as others. As bishop of Salamanca, Tavira—in the company of the bishop and the archdeacon of Cuenca and two capitulars of the chapter of San Isidoro—regularly attended the meetings of the duchess of Montijo, who had translated the Jansenist work *Instrucciones cristianas sobre el sacramento del matrimonio*, whose foreword was written by Bishop Climent.

At the end of the eighteenth century (19 November 1799) the Austrian ambassador to Madrid, Kageneck, had some disparaging things to say about the bishops of that time. According to him they had no influence on the government, in spite of their wealth, nor did they form a social body within the monarchy. Yet all the while they represented a high level of authority for the pious faithful in the provinces. He continues by saying that it was the custom of the Spanish cabinet of the time not to select highly intelligent people for high offices and none at all who could pose a serious threat to the regime. Kageneck did not reproach the high clergy so much in regard to morality, but referred to the majority of the prelates as insignificant, of low estate, occasionally given to intrigues once they attained positions of leadership, and of being covetous of honor and money. He describes the Spanish episcopate at the end of the *ancien régime* thusly: "The majority of prelates who play a very small part at the court and rarely appear in the capital are very pious but also very hard-hearted."[5] No doubt this is a generalization and exaggeration; at any rate this judgment can not be applied to the whole century. The fact that the bishops were not as submissive as could be assumed was evidenced on the occasion of the regalia decree of Urquijo (5 September 1799). Of sixty-one bishops only ten agreed to it, among them the leaders of the Jansenists, Antonio Tavira, bishop of Salamanca, and Francisco Mateo Aguiriano, bishop of Calahorra (see below). Regardless of all the weakness of the system, this century had great bishops, such as Belluga, Valero, and Lorenzana.

---

[3] Q. Aldea, *Iglesia y Estado en siglo XVII* (Comillas [Santander] 1961), 105–08.

[4] A. Mestre, *Ilustración y Reforma de la Iglesia* (Valencia 1968), 219–29.

As in other countries and times, the lower clergy, too, was deeply in need of reform and adaptation. To be sure, the demands of the Council of Trent for reforms were theoretically still in force. But a broad spectrum of the clergy—with the exception of some select groups—lagged far behind the priestly ideal. Ignorance, stinginess, and a wordly spirit were the deficiencies castigated by Cardinal Belluga, bishop of Cartagena, in his lengthy pastoral letter of 1705. In order to remove these ills, Innocent XIII, with the help of Belluga, issued the bull *Apostolici ministerii* (13 May 1723) containing twenty-six points for the reform of the clergy. This bull replaced the provincial councils, advocated by the archbishop of Toledo, Francisco Valero, and the national council, demanded by some politicians. From 1650 to 1815, as a consequence, no provincial councils were convened, the only exception being the province of Tarragona, where seventeen meetings were called, the majority of them to deal with economic matters.[6]

Preaching had declined from the classical ideal of the "Golden Era" of Spain, which boasted of so many exemplary teachers. Even Belluga deplored the foolishness of the sermons "full of exquisite voices, exuberant phrases, and hairsplitting concepts." Father Francisco Isla fought against this by means of his burlesque *Fray Gerundio de Campazas*, in which he ridiculed the severe shortcomings of contemporary sermons.

---

[5] R. Olaechea, *Las relaciones hispano-romanas en la segunda mitad del XVIII* II (Saragossa 1965), 586.

[6] Rafael Serra Ruiz, *El pensamiento social-politico del Cardenal Belluga* (Murcia 1963), 242–47.

This in turn brought down upon the Jesuits the wrath of other orders who felt they were the accused. But there was a sizeable school of parish missionaries who regularly traversed the peninsula. Dominicans, Franciscans and Capuchins competed in this apostolic task, but the Jesuits were the leaders. One of the most prominent parish missionaries of this period was Father Jerónimo López (1589–1658), who untiringly wandered through Catalonia, Aragon, Valencia, the Balearic Islands, Navarre, and many villages of the two Castiles. He was the author of the well-known *Acto de contrición*, a pious book of devotions with which he went through the streets delivering sermons. His pastoral successor was Father Tirso Gonzáles (1624–1705), who later became general of the Society of Jesus. Accompanied by many helpers he made 120 trips in northern Spain alone in a period of four years (1671–75), many of which lasted more than twenty days. Other great parish missionaries were the Jesuit Pedro de Calatayud (1689–1773) and the blessed Diego de Cádiz, a Capuchin. These missions were extremely fruitful; above all they revived the practice of the sacrament among the masses.

A typical form of piety in this period was the Sacred Heart devotion. It was propagated by Fathers Cardaveraz (d. 1720), Bernardo de Hoyos (d. 1735), Juan de Loyola (d. 1762), and Pedro de Calatayud. In his apostolic travels Calatayud founded congregations whose members were pledged to dedicate themselves to the Sacred Heart devotion, to confess monthly, and to receive Communion. Along with the parish missions, though without the fanfare, went retreats which gradually changed the lives of certain groups of priests and laymen.

In Portugal there were two great figures who deserve special mention, Antonio Vieira (1608–97), called "the Portuguese Demosthenes," and Manuel Bernardes, more esteemed as an author than as an orator.

The persecution of the Jesuits started in Portugal, a country most favored by the society. Under the weak King José I, his minister, the Marquis de Pombal, reigned supreme. Pombal ordered the confiscation of all Jesuit property in 1759 and a few months later their expulsion. Seventeen hundred Jesuits (aside from the nine hundred missionaries) were expelled in a most brutal fashion, deported to the Papal States, or incarcerated in dirty jail cells in their own homeland. Some twenty Jesuit schools were taken over by laymen.

The Jesuits in Spain had great influence and practically a monopoly in the educational system, having a total of 130 colleges. This was one of the causes leading to a tragedy in Spain similar to the one in Portugal. Other reasons for the expulsion were: prejudices on the part of those who had earlier felt themselves disadvantaged by the Jesuits, their assumed wealth, the close connection of the Society of Jesus with the Pope, the suspected opposition to the authority of the King (the Jesuits were said to have been responsible for the rebellion of Esquilache), theological differences of opinion, especially on the issue of probabilism, which many orders and bishops, such as Lorenzana and Armañá, condemned as laxism but without actually knowing it. In addition there was their political and social influence, and finally, the example of Portugal and France. The trial did not take place in the *Consejo* of Castile, as had been the custom, because there the majority favored the Jesuits. For this reason the famous *Consejo extraordinario* was convened, excluding all having any connection with the Jesuits. During the night of 2 and 3 April 1767, all Spanish Jesuits, approximately twenty-seven hundred, with twice that number overseas, were driven from their homeland without having been given a hearing or having been properly convicted. Fear of repression by the King suppressed all protest. The reasons for this decision remained a secret of Charles III. Through his ambassador in Rome, Moñino, he obtained from Clement XIV the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* (21 July, 1773). When in 1769 the King questioned fifty-six bishops, forty-two of them agreed with the measures against the society, six abstained, and eight opposed them.[7]

The decree *Pro Seminariis* of the Council of Trent, stipulating the establishment of a seminary in every diocese, was at first followed conscientiously. But the difficulties encountered militated against further implementation. Among those were the large number of colleges, which absorbed the elite of the youth, and the high cost of constructing the necessary buildings. But more important than the construction costs were the direction of seminaries, the selection of applicants and the curricula, which were generally antiquated. By the end of the sixteenth century twenty seminaries were founded; in the seventeenth century eight, and in the eighteenth century seventeen, for a total of forty-five by 1816. Of the thirteen seminaries existing in Portugal by that year, five were established in the eighteenth century.

As everywhere in Europe, Scholasticism and above all theological studies at the universities slowly regressed. There was a lack of originality and realism. One was satisfied with composing the no doubt necessary *cursus* or compendium of theological or philosophical knowledge for the use in schools. But in the background of Scholasticism were the new philosophy, the Enlightenment, and the positive sciences. There were significant personalities nonetheless, such as Cardinal Alvaro Cienfuegos (d. 1737), Pedro Manso (1736), Luis de Losada, Francisco Armañá and others. The moral theologian Miguel de Molinos

---

[7] V. Rodríguez Casado, "Iglesia y Estado en el reinado de Carlos III," *Estudios Americanos* 1 (1948–49), 5–57; F. Tort, *Francisco Armanyá* (Villanueva and Geltrú 1967), 113–48.

(1628–96) gave rise to a great controversy when sixty-eight propositions of his *Spiritual Guide* (Rome 1675) were condemned as quietistic by Innocent XI.

Historical studies flourished considerably through men such as José Sáenz de Aguirre, Enrique Flórez (author of the *España sagrada*), Andrés Burriel, and Jaime Villanueva. There was a group of literary figures of great quality, such as Benito Feijóo, Francisco Isla, and the group of exiled Italian Jesuits.[8] Among the religious authors who should be mentioned were the venerable Mother Agreda (d. 1665), who was often consulted by Philip IV, and Manuel de Reguera y Álvarez de Paz, and the Portuguese Luis Brandão and Alonso de Andrade.

The authority of the Inquisition decreased considerably, as can be seen by the number of autos-da-fé held at the time: there were 782 under Philip V, 34 under Ferdinand VI and only a dozen under Charles III and Charles IV. The last condemnation by the Inquisition was pronounced in Seville on 7 November 1781.

The royal confessors, who did not limit themselves to the sacraments but freely interfered in the problems of state, enjoyed great esteem. In the council of state they had a voice and a vote just like any other member of the council.

Under the Habsburgs those positions were occupied by the Dominicans. Among the confessors of Philip IV were Antonio de Sotomayor, archbishop of Damascus and inquisitor general, and Juan de Santo Tomás, a famous Portuguese theologian. Under Charles II the position again was entrusted to the Dominicans, but Queen Mariana, following the custom of the imperial court, brought along Father Eberhard Nidhard. The Spanish Bourbons followed French custom: Philip V had as his confessor the Jesuit Daubenton. The last and probably best known of the Jesuit confessors was Francisco de Rávago, professor of theology at the Roman college and provincial of Castile.

In the course of the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the seventeenth century twenty Spanish saints were canonized, whereas the period we are discussing here lists only two: José Oriol (1650–1702) and José Pignatelli (1737–1811).

Church and State

Relations between Spain and the Holy See rested on the principle of the two authorities: the papal and the royal authority, each supreme in its realm. But the person of the Pope had an additional position: not only was he the successor of Saint Peter, but the prince of the Papal States as well. In cases of doubt the Spanish politicians followed the delimitation formulated by Gabriel Pereira: if there is doubt whether a civil law violates the ecclesiastical weal, the decision of the Pope has to be adhered to. Whenever there is doubt whether it violates the political weal, the decision of the civil authorities prevails. These principles were applied in the theory of the indirect authority of the Pope in Spain under the Habsburgs, and the concepts of the great Spanish writers Vitoria, Molina, Suárez and others were followed. Just shortly before the Bourbons took over the reign, Bossuet formulated his views of the divine origin of the monarchs' absolute power on which the Bourbons based their interference in church affairs, especially in the second half of the eighteenth century (see Chaps. 4 and 7).[9]

---

[8] M. Batllori, *La cultura hispano-italiana de los jesuitas expulsos* (Madrid 1966).

The legal claims of royal intervention were based—over and above his general position as a Christian prince—on the obligation to ensure observation of the decrees of the Council of Trent and, above all, on the royal patronage of Spain, from which the missions patronage over the West Indies is derived as well. The institution of the patronage in Spain was traced to the sixth canon of the twelfth Council of Toledo (681) and formulated by Philip II (1565) in the first law, section six of the first volume of the *Nueva recopilación* as follows: "Legally and on the basis of old custom, just claims as well as apostolic concessions we are patrons of all cathedral churches of these kingdoms and are entitled to appoint the archbishops and bishops, the prelates and abbots of these kingdoms even if they fall vacant in Rome." The following were the decisive steps in the development of the patronage system: The granting of universal and eternal patronage over the Kingdom of Granada, the Canary Islands and Puerto Real (from this was derived in part the royal patronage over the West Indies), which was granted by the bull *Orthodoxae Fidei* (13 December 1486) by Sixtus IV; the granting of presentation in the cathedrals and consistorial benefices for the rest of Spain by a bull of Hadrian VI (6 September 1523); the granting of the royal universal patronage over the entire national territory by virtue of the concordat of 11 January 1753. Benedict XIV reserved for himself no more than the granting of fifty-two benefices. This constituted the climax of the presentation privilege in Spain.[10]

Since the reign of Philip II, Spain and Portugal had been united under the Spanish crown. In 1640 the Portuguese rose up against Philip IV and crowned Juan IV (1640–70) King. This posed great problems for the Holy See, not just because of the diplomatic recognition of the new King, but also regarding the filling of vacant bishoprics in Portugal, which was the King's prerogative. The conflict lasted until the consolidation of Portuguese independence. In 1670 relations between Portugal and Rome were resumed and the bishoprics filled.

---

[9] Q. Aldea, *Iglesia y Estado en el siglo XVII,* 57–63.

[10] Ibid., 63–111.

A special role was played by the *Gravamina Ecclesiae Hispanae.* In 1632 the parliamentary estates of Castile and León submitted to the King a petition listing the encumbrances of the Spanish Church by the Roman Curia and the nunciature in Madrid. The number of complaints, especially against the dataries, increased until the end of the eighteenth century. Several Spanish cardinals, such as Zapata and Gil de Albornoz, criticized the granting of marriage dispensations, the filling and authentication of church benefices, and the distribution of pensions from them. The complicated fees in the case of marriage dispensations, their high rates (two tables from the end of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have been preserved), and their arbitrary application led to Cardinal Zapata comparing the datary with a house of commerce. Complaints against the Apostolic Chamber in connection with the *spolia* and the revenues of vacant bishoprics did not cease until the publication of the Concordat of 1753, whose ARTICLE 20 granted these revenues to the church where they originated. The Madrid nunciature was accused of economic and jurisdictional abuses, the latter as well bearing close connection with economic factors. It was accused of charging inordinately high fees, accepting original law suits, making illegal demands for gold and silver money, issuing marriage dispensations contravening the decrees of the Council of Trent and so forth. In 1634 when repeated protests on the part of the ambassadors in Rome, especially by the ambassadors extraordinary Pimentel and Chumacero, were rejected, Madrid used the pretext of the death of Nuncio Campeggi to discontinue the activities of the Madrid nunciature for the period of one year. The so-called agreement of Nuncio Facchinetti of 1640 brought about a new table of rates, but until the Concordat of 1753 and essentially until 26 March 1771, when the Spanish *Rota* was established according to the model of the Roman *Signatura iustitiae*, the problem remained unsolved.[11]

"Regalism," that is the abuse of privileges or rights of the King in church matters, is an ambiguous concept. Regarding Spanish regalism one has to differentiate between the reign of the Habsburgs and that of the Bourbons. One must also take into consideration the dialectics of a modern state with its steadily growing administrative autonomy and the intimate ties between Church and state of earlier epochs. The inordinate extent of ecclesiastical immunity of persons as well as properties had created a state within the state and triggered considerable tensions. This explains the origin of recourse to the King, the reticence of papal bulls and the laws of amortization. Yet these events are also a page in the process of secularization of modern society, manifesting itself in the usurpation of spiritual tasks and hostility towards ecclesiastical institutions.[12]

---

[11] Ibid., 115–85.

After 1700, when the first Bourbon, Philip V, had ascended the throne of Spain, monarchical absolutism following the French example was intensified by attempts to limit the independence of the Church. Regalism, more radical than ever before, was turned against the papal reservations which had developed into a sort of "regalism of the pope." One of the bishops fighting against Roman centralism was Francisco de Solis, bishop of Ávila and later of Córdoba, who in 1709 composed the famous *Dictamen sobre los abusos de la Corte Romana por lo tocante a las regalías de su M.C. y jurisdicción que reside en los obispos*. He went so far as to maintain that: "On the basis of these privileges His Majesty is permitted and even obligated to protect His kingdoms and churches from the slavery of the Roman Curia and to liberate them from it . . ." He was referring to the illegal limitation of the authority of bishops, without however going into the opposite extreme.

Philip V reacted violently against the recognition of Archduke Charles as King of Spain, a step forced upon Clement XI during the War of Sucession (1700 until 1715). He founded the *Junta Magna*, which on 25 February 1709 ordered the nuncio expelled and the nunciature closed, the *spolia* and revenues of vacant bishoprics sequestered and all relations of Spanish ecclesiastics with Rome prohibited. These were restored after the Peace of Utrecht (1713) and a provisional concordat concluded in 1717. The concordat was broken a year later when the nuncio was expelled again; only in July 1720 was he permitted to return to Madrid.

When Charles III ascended to the throne (1759) the front of the advocates of regalism hardened. The political and ecclesiastical complications brought about by the letter of exhortation of Parma, the expulsion of the Society of Jesus, the Fourth Mexican Provincial Council (1771) and the State Junta (1784), with its famous *Instrucción reservada,* were manifestations of an extreme regalism. Charles IV followed along this path until the publication of the decree of 5 September 1799. It provided that the Spanish bishops in case of a *sedes vacans* of the Holy See "would in accordance with the old church discipline make use of all their faculties for marriage dispensations and other powers," without regard to the papal reservations.[13] This betrayed the extreme philosophy of the royal minister Urquijo, whom a good many people called a schismatic. But actually this event proved the words of the Austrian ambassador Kageneck right, who said that "schisms are not possible in Spain."[14]

---

[12] Alberto de la Hera, *El Regalismo Borbónico* (Madrid 1963).

After the eradication of the *ancien régime* by the French Revolution the vestiges of Bourbon regalism gradually died out in Spain. The rebellion of Porto in 1820 signaled the beginning of new ideas in Portugal and the start of an epoch of liberalism in both countries.

---

[13] J. A. Llorente, *Coleción Diplomática* (Madrid 1809), 65–66. This book contains some of the letters of reply concerning the above-mentioned decree; Luis Sierra, *La reacción del episcopado español ante los decretos de matrimonios del ministro Urquijo de 1799 a 1813* (Bilbao 1964).

[14] R. Olaechea, *Las relaciones hispano-romanas en la segunda mitad del XVIII* II, 585.

CHAPTER 12

The Condition of the Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

The Early Stuarts

The history of English Catholicism in the first half of the seventeenth century has already been treated briefly. What remains to be added is that English Catholicism at this time had already assumed the social structure which it was to retain until the great Irish immigration during the Industrial Revolution. The faith survived in isolated groups on the estates of individual rural aristocrats who supported the clergy and consequently demanded a certain amount of control over them. The same structure also dominated among the few Catholics of the Scottish Lowlands. On the Gaelic islands and in the Scottish Highlands, Catholicism maintained itself in stronger groups. They were efficaciously supported by Franciscan missionaries.[1] In Wales Catholicism was almost completely abolished after 1650 when Puritan preachers introduced the nonconformist tradition.

Ireland, on the other hand, had remained predominantly Catholic. Subject to the English crown but with its own parliament, the island had not developed into a homogeneous nation. At the beginning of the seventeenth century three groups can be clearly distinguished: The old Irish of Gaelic origin; the old English from before the Reformation, and the new English who had come to Ireland since the Reformation. The latter group was Protestant, the former two were Catholic. The Tudors had subordinated their desire for religious conformity to political conquest. The old English, strongly represented in the Tudor parliaments, had seen to it that the penal laws in Ireland were never as strict as in England. In addition, the local administration was in the hands of the old English, so that the laws were not as harshly applied as the government might have wished. After about 1570 the Irish—by nature a conservative people who for religious reasons were little susceptible to Protestantism—had at their disposal a growing number of priests who had been educated on the continent according to Tridentine ideals. A considerable number of Irish seminaries had been established on the continent as early as around 1600. To be sure, the seminary priests did not gain immediate access to the old Irish, but these had suffered so deeply during the Tudor conquest that their Catholic faith had become part of their resistance against the new rulers. The old English, on the other hand, continued to keep their wealth and possessions.[2]

---

[1] C. Giblin, *Irish Franciscan Mission to Scotland 1619–1646* (Dublin 1964).

In the early seventeenth century the Irish Catholics fought in vain for a political agreement which was to recognize both their loyalty and their Catholicism. Just as in England, James I continued the Elizabethan penal legislation. He also promoted her policies of colonialization. Extensive settlements, especially in Ulster, brought a strong Protestant element into the country for whose economic acumen the conservative Irish Catholics were no match. The King's policies, moreover, excluded the Catholics from public service. The parliament of 1613 clearly manifested that the Catholic influence on legislation had sharply decreased.[3] Political pressure upon them was maintained; around 1640 the old English Catholics had every reason to fear that in the eyes of the administration they were merely "semisubjects"—as James I had called them—who, like the old Irish, were robbed of their political rights because of their religion and whose right of property was being questioned.

Yet in actual practice there was sufficient tolerance at this time to enable the Catholic Church to carry out a comprehensive reorganisation of its mission. From the colleges on the continent Ireland received enough priests who were trained to teach a people whose religious formation had been neglected for a long time. The Catholic episcopate, too, had been renewed. Even during the reign of Elizabeth nominations to the Irish bishoprics had not ceased, although there had at times been lengthy vacancies. From the ranks of the first generation of seminary priests emerged a superior group of bishops who had been appointed around 1620. They were confronted by serious problems, especially on the part of the monastic clergy, who continued to claim the right of extensive missionary authority as it had been granted to them by the Holy See at the time of Elizabeth. But in collaboration with the newly founded Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith the bishops succeeded in establishing a parish system. The monastic clergy calmed down since it now became possible for them to found their own houses. By 1636 the situation had been stabilized by a series of decrees for the Irish mission issued by the Propaganda.[4]

---

[2] A. Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland 1625–42* (London 1966); P. J. Corish, *The Origins of Catholic Nationalism* (Dublin 1968).

[3] T. W. Moody, "The Irish Parliaments under Elizabeth and James I," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 45 (1938–40), 42–81.

In 1641 the old Irish took up arms in order to reconquer their rights and property. After brief hesitation the old English joined them. United in the Confederation of Kilkenny, they undertook anew an effort to regain their position as "the King's Catholic subjects." Their negotiations with the King were difficult and were further aggravated by the arrival of the papal nuncio, Rinuccini, in 1645, who demanded the restoration of Catholicism on the basis of strict counterreformational principles which did not take into account the complexity of the Irish situation. Several attempts to prevail with his views, even in the face of ecclesiastical censure, finally split the confederation and forced him to leave the country.[5] Thus weakened and divided, Ireland easily fell prey to Oliver Cromwell.

Commonwealth and Restoration

Under Cromwell's rule the two islands had a single administration in the years around 1650. This meant that the more repressive English laws were automatically extended to Ireland as well. Cromwell's concept of "freedom of conscience" condemned the Anglicanism of the High Church of Charles I and Catholicism in like measure. Paradoxically, this meant that the English Catholics were not subject to the bloody persecutions which they had feared because their sympathy had been with the royalists during the civil war. They escaped persecution because they constituted a minority and also because for a time they could successfully claim the principle of freedom of conscience.

The Irish Catholics, on the other hand, suffered a bitter fate. In addition to their being Catholics they were viewed as inferior and uneducated, criminal and politically dangerous. Cromwell had conquered the country in a brutal war of extermination. As a general rule, clergymen captured in the war were executed without a trial. Then followed a large-scale process of confiscation. The propertied Catholics were banished to the province of Connaught. A sharp distinction must be made between the continuity of Catholicism in Ireland and England.

---

[4] See B. Jennings, ed., "Acta Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide 1622–1650," *Archivum Hibernicum* 22 (1959), 28–139.

[5] Rinuccini followed a much stricter direction in Ireland than the papal ambassador Fabio Chigi (the future Pope Alexander VII) took at the peace conference in Münster.

When the war was over, a priest—according to an Elizabethan decree of 1585—was guilty of treason by his mere presence in Ireland. As a result many clergymen voluntarily went into exile. Those who stayed were persecuted relentlessly, but after 1654 the government preferred to jail the prisoners or to banish instead of executing them. Only a relatively small number of priests were able to follow their vocation—receiving help in numerous ways and assuming various disguises. Mass was usually celebrated in the open, on the "Mass rock." No doubt this was the most severe test ever faced by the Irish Catholics. Fortunately, it lasted but a short time.

The reorganization of the previous generation had been totally destroyed. Again priests exercised their office by virtue of missionary authority if indeed they had such authority at all. But around 1657 the Propaganda in Rome set up new plans for the Irish mission. By the end of 1659, two bishops had returned to Ireland. On 29 May 1660, Charles II reoccupied the throne of his father.

Following the Restoration, England, Scotland, and Ireland again had separate parliaments, which were now much more powerful than under the early Stuarts. The King, striving to safeguard his personal authority, endeavored to secure the support of his royal cousin, Louis XIV of France. The struggle between King and parliament in England was aggravated by distrust on the part of parliament of the King's benevolence towards the Catholics (Charles himself converted to Catholicism on his deathbed and his brother James, duke of York, the heir apparent, converted shortly after 1668).

In 1670 Charles signed the treaty of Dover with Louis XIV, which parliament countered a year later with an act banishing the Catholic clergy. Charles in turn issued the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, which extended toleration to the dissenters, including Catholics. But parliament proved to be the stronger. The Test Acts of 1673 and 1678 affirmed the exclusion of Catholics from public life. Although the balance of power between King and parliament was sufficient to guarantee the Catholics enough toleration, some of the Catholic gentry and consequently their tenants and vassals left the faith. Church authority was maintained in a much reduced fashion by a canon chapter established in

1623 by Apostolic Vicar William Bishop. It represented a conservative body with Gallican tendencies in which vacancies were filled by election.

In Ireland, Charles had to accept the fact that power was held by those who had profited by the great land confiscations and now increasingly looked on themselves as the "Protestant Interest." In trying to prove their loyalty, Catholic laymen gave considerable support to a movement known as the "Remonstrance," which wanted to obtain from the Irish Church a declaration of Gallican principles. The resistance of the clergy against this demand, which to some extent can be seen as a justification of Rinuccini's ultramontanistic attitude of twenty years before, came to a head in 1666 during a synod in Dublin. But at this point it had become clear that a large majority of the dispossessed Catholics would not get their property back.

Again the Church had to rebuild its ministry. There were only two bishops remaining in the country and those who lived in exile were politically compromised by the events of the religious conflicts so that they were not permitted to return. There was indeed a real shortage of priests. For almost a decade no new bishops were appointed, but priests were ordained in considerable numbers—often with insufficient or no preparation for their vocation. Both decisions appear to have been made by Rome; no doubt they were the wrong ones.[6]

It was not until 1669 that the first bishops were appointed; by 1671 most of the sees were again occupied. The new bishops were worthy men, some of them even superior. Helped by a greater degree of toleration in the years around 1670, they started the restoration of the parish system by a series of synods and visitations. But toleration was merely relative; congregations continued to be reduced to making use of the "mass rock," although there were some modest chapels or "mass houses" the Catholics were able to establish. But in 1673 a royal proclamation ordered all members of religious orders and clerics with jurisdictional authority to be banished. While this proclamation was not implemented strictly, it did affect an episcopate already in distress. Some of the clerics, ordained in the last decade, now proved themselves unequal to their task. The reconstruction of the parish system led to renewed divergence between the secular and monastic clergy, aggravated by the fact that all the clergy were dependent on gifts by the people, since the Catholic laymen as well as the clergy had lost all their wealth and property.

The Catholics of both islands were exposed to bloody persecutions when Titus Oates instigated a conspiracy in 1678 in order to exclude the duke of York from the royal succession.[7] Oates was an unprincipled adventurer and totally untrustworthy, but because of the political hysteria of the time he was able to have an impact. On 11 October 1678 the archbishop of Dublin was arrested; he died in jail in November 1680. The trials in England began on 15 November 1678. More than twenty-five Catholics were executed and the number of those who were jailed ran into the hundreds. The last and best-known victim was the blessed Oliver Plunkett, archbishop of Armagh, who was executed at Tyburn on 1 July 1681. He was the last victim of the conspiracy as well as the last priest to be executed under the penal laws applying at that time.

---

[6] B. Millett, *Survival and Reorganization 1650–1695* (Dublin 1968), 12–22.

The hysteria collapsed as quickly as it had arisen. In February 1685 James II followed his brother to the throne. He was an incompetent politican and ignored the fact that at most 10 percent of his English subjects were ready to accept a Catholic monarchy. The birth of a Catholic heir cost him the throne, which went to his Protestant daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange. James fled to France and later returned to Ireland to lead the resistance there.

The great Catholic majority in Ireland had enough freedom to exercise their religion. The bishops received a maintenance from the government and the congregations were established publicly. When James arrived in Ireland, he convened a parliament which promised freedom of religion and the return of confiscated property to the Catholics. But the further course of events was determined by William's victory over the Irish-Jacobite forces, which enabled the "Protestant Interest" to regain its political power.[8]

The Penal Code of the Eighteenth Century

After William's victory the laws excluding Catholics from public life in England were again noticeably tightened up. On the other hand, several laws concerning property proved to be ineffective and the Catholic landed gentry continued to be accepted on the social level. Yet in the following century there were more and more cases of apostasy among them. During the reign of James II there had been about 300,000 professed Catholics, by 1780 this figure had decreased to 70,000.

An act of parliament of 1700 replaced the death penalty decreed in 1585 with life imprisonment. William tended toward a concept of limited toleration practiced in Holland. Although the English Protestants could not quite accept this, there was, in practice, an increasing extent of toleration; only a few priests were actually jailed. Those who were under the protection of the Catholic gentry were almost completely safe, although the price of this safety may at times have been a humiliating state of dependence. Other clerics, especially in London, had to execute their office in greater secrecy. Bishop Giffard, the vicar apostolic of the London district, was jailed several times.

---

[7] See mainly J. Lane, *Titus Oates* (London 1949).

[8] J. G. Simms, *Jacobite Ireland 1685–91* (London 1969).

The jurisdiction of the bishops had been reestablished in England during the reign of James II. In 1685 John Leyburn was appointed vicar apostolic and in 1688 the country was divided into four districts, each headed by a vicar apostolic. All four vicars were jailed during the revolution, but released afterwards. Their authority over the clergy had to be exercised very carefully, especially over those who were chaplains with the gentry and even more so with the monastic clergy who were against the restoration of the bishops' authority. In 1753 Benedict XIV made a final decision in favor of the bishops.

The only truly predominant figure among the English bishops of the eighteenth century was Richard Challoner (1691–1781), who was head of the London district for more than forty years. Reticent, strict, and very English, he had a great formative influence on Catholicism not only in England but to some extent also in Ireland. He made his influence felt through numerous written works which he composed over and above a life filled with the work of ministry. His *Garden of the Soul* (1740) *Think well on't* (1728), and *Meditations* (1753) became almost synonymous for his kind of spirituality. Challoner was also influential through his translation of the *Imitatio Christi*, the *Confessiones* of Augustine and the *Introduction à la vie dévote* of Francis de Sales. His revision of the bible translation of Douai-Reims continued to be the Holy Scripture most used in England until recently.

The Scottish Catholics were subjected to penal legislation very similar to that of England,[9] but for them it was frequently even more oppressive, since Jacobite sympathies were more widespread in Scotland. In 1653 a priest had been installed for the purpose of directing the Scottish mission and in 1694 Bishop Thomas Nicholson was appointed vicar apostolic. In 1731 two more vicariates were established, one for the Highlands and one for the Lowlands. From the remote hamlet where each bishop had his residence he directed the education of candidates for the priesthood in order to do his part for the next generation which emerged from the Scottish colleges on the continent. The Catholics of the Highlands suffered profoundly under the repression after 1745, which led to a lasting wave of emigration, particularly to the country which was given the name "New Scotland" (Nova Scotia).

---

[9] The Act of Union (1707) united England and Scotland into the Kingdom of Great Britain with a single parliament in London.

The minority in Ireland, constituting the "Protestant Interest," was faced by some very complex problems. Theoretically it was obliged to work towards the extermination of Catholicism. But for all practical purposes a mass conversion was unthinkable, since this would have meant an immediate threat to the property which the "Protestant Interest" had gained by confiscation. The religious articles of the Treaty of Limerick (1691) had promised the Catholics even better conditions than had prevailed under Charles II. William wanted to respect these agreements, but after the Treaty of Rijswijk (1697) he was more inclined to give in to the Protestant parliament in Dublin.

An act of 1697 ordered all members of religious orders and clerics with jurisdictional authority banished. Those who returned were put under sentence of death. About five hundred monastic clerics were deported and only three bishops managed to stay. The secular clergy had always enjoyed a certain immunity, an outcome of the resistance on the part of the old English in the Elizabethan parliaments. The aim was to put the clergy under surveillance by means of the Registration Act of 1703 and if possible to oppress them. The act provided for the official registration of one priest for each parish; he had to perform his duties under strict control. There were no provisions at all to fill vacancies. In 1704 a total of 1089 priests registered in accordance with the Registration Act, they included three bishops and a number of priests who can be identified as monastic clerics.

The system of controls and possible extermination collapsed with the Act of Renunciation of 1709, which demanded of each priest an oath renouncing the cause of the Stuarts. Only thirty priests swore the oath. Although new laws were passed for another generation, the government had finally given up its goal of religious conformity and instead pledged itself to a policy of social and political humiliation. The Acts of Banishment and Registration were not consistently implemented. No more priests were condemned to death. To be sure, parliament passed laws, but their implementation was in the hands of an executive answerable directly to the crown. The administrative apparatus was weak, especially in remote areas, and even in Dublin it had to proceed with caution to keep the Catholic masses from rioting.

In spite of the Act of Banishment new bishops were appointed in 1707 and almost all the sees were occupied by 1720. Priests were ordained, some on the continent, others within the country, but the latter all too often were given insufficient preparation. The monastic clergy had a large number of recruits and after 1720 were able to resume a certain measure of communal life. But many of its representatives were not personally engaged and were often in unpleasant competition with the parish priests for the alms of the faithful. In spite of great difficulties the bishops wanted to reinstall a parish clergy. But because their mere presence was legally prohibited, they had to act with caution, especially in times of political tension, as for instance in 1715 or 1745. Poverty was a constant problem and sometimes it was very difficult for them to live in their dioceses for any length of time.

By 1730 a more stable parish system emerged. The conflicts between the secular and monastic clergy were lessened by a number of decisions from Rome, which were reaffirmed by Benedict XIV in 1751.[10] They placed limitations upon the monastic clergy which transcended even the rules prescribed by general canon law. On the other hand, they also limited, perhaps too rigorously, the number of priests to be ordained by any one bishop. Yet the papal decisions were motivated by well-founded grievances, based above all on numerous cases of premature ordination. Within a short time there were complaints concerning the shortage of priests to minister to the growing populace, but this situation was never very serious. The continental colleges took care of the recruits needed for the priesthood until they were closed by the French Revolution and Maynooth assumed their role in 1795.

By the middle of the century the "mass rock" was replaced everywhere by the "mass house." Only in Ulster did this process take longer, because the large-scale settlements at the beginning of the seventeenth century had created a Protestant majority there. For the most part, the parish priests had their own houses and the monastic clergy, too, were able to maintain a communal life. Each of the two groups developed its own missionary field. The offerings of the faithful guaranteed both of them a suitable subsistence. In the eighteenth century Ireland finally found peace and gradual economic improvement. Problems reemerged when England—unlike Ireland—was industrialized. Most of the Catholics remained impoverished. This was the case in all the social classes, even though a small number of the gentry had at least kept some of their estates and a middle class was able to establish a certain affluence from skills and commerce. But it required the first Relief Act of 1782 for new churches to be built. In 1800 a report of the bishops to the government made note that the average annual income of a bishop amounted to 300 pounds sterling and that of a priest to 65 pounds sterling. This constituted a modest but sufficient subsistence.

The long fight for the Mass had inculcated the latter firmly into the center of religious life in Ireland. Veneration of the Most Blessed Virgin and above all the Rosary had also become deeply rooted. Catholic teachers, although outlawed, continued to teach religious instruction in cooperation with the clergy. By the late seventeenth century religious tracts in English were widely distributed; during the eighteenth century a sizeable system of publication and distribution was developed. The inventories of book dealers in the second half of the century show that the works of Richard Challoner were the most popular. Almost nothing was printed in the Irish language, but a good many devotionals were distributed by means of copies, a procedure based on a long tradition. These writings, too, were for the most part translations, occasionally from English, but most of them were translations of European works of counterreformational spirituality.

---

[10] See H. Fenning, "John Kent's Report on the Irish Mission 1742," *Archivum Hibernicum* 28 (1966), 59–102.

The traditional devotions also survived. The great pilgrimages expecially were kept alive, although the bishops frequently forbade them because of the danger of superstition connected with them. The government also prohibited them because it feared all gatherings of Catholic groups. Modern Irish-Catholic spirituality as it crystallized in the eighteenth century was a mixture of old and new characterized—at least in the English-speaking middle class—by a strict and fearful ethos. This is customarily ascribed to the Jansenist influence, but historically this connection cannot be demonstrated[11] and many other causes can be assumed for it. One of the predominant traits of Irish Catholicism is its traditional severity; even today the popular pilgrimage to Lough Derg is considered a genuine penance. To some extent this attitude is derived from the strict attitude of Challoner, but perhaps more so from the experience of persecution which has been deeply imprinted on Irish Catholic consciousness.

Catholic Emancipation

The Relief Acts canceling the penal laws were prompted primarily by the situation in Ireland, where the consequences of the acts were extremely important. Under the reign of George II (1727–60) suggestions were submitted on numerous occasions which aimed at the approval of a "suitable number" of priests and even some bishops, provided that they would accept a certain measure of government supervision. But these suggestions were unacceptable to parliament. The succession to the throne by George III (1760), the death of the eldest son of James II (1766), and the American Declaration of Rights (1774) created a changed political climate which made it possible to alleviate the condition of the Catholics.

---

[11] See R. Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal* (Cambridge 1932), 210ff.; C. Giblin, "Catalogue of Material of Irish Interest in the collection *Nunziatura di Fiandra* (Vatican Archives)," *Collectanea Hibernica* 5 (1962), 73ff.

Derived from English tradition, the Declaration of Rights had been partisan to the politically oppressed. A more urgent problem was England's need to increase its army; to this end the Catholics of Ireland and the Scottish Highlands constituted a promising pool of recruits. To call them to arms without granting them a certain measure of political recognition was impossible. So in 1774 an oath of allegiance, couched primarily in political terms, was accepted by parliament and—after some initial hesitation—by the Catholics as well. In 1782 some concrete concessions were made. These were easier to put through in England, but an attempt to expand them to Scotland had to be given up in the face of the Protestant rebellion.

In 1782 the Gallican laity of England founded the Cisalpine Club, which suggested an oath of allegiance for England very similar to the one decreed by James I in 1607. This oath rejected papal power of removal as being "heretical" and in so doing resurrected an issue which had been largely laid to rest. More importantly, the oath withdrew from the Pope all spiritual authority which was not in accordance with the laws and constitutions of the Kingdom. The vicars apostolic resisted, whereupon parliament decided to replace that suggestion with the Irish oath of 1774.

By 1791 full religious emancipation had been achieved in England; in 1793 it was extended to Scotland. The Irish Catholics, too, obtained similar relief, wrested in a long fight from a resisting parliament by a middle class which was developing the beginnings of a Catholic democracy.

Many political deficiencies continued to exist. Their elimination was difficult as long as Ireland, with its sizeable Catholic majority, retained its own parliament. William Pitt, the English prime minister, therefore suggested a common parliament for the two islands with some governmental control of appointments in the Catholic hierarchy. After the sudden loss of all their continental seminaries the Irish bishops had accepted a subsidy from the government when Maynooth was founded in 1795; four years later, in 1799, they accepted in principle a government veto power over appointments of bishops.

The union of the parliaments took place in 1801, but George III refused to support Catholic emancipation, and for a number of years the issue of the veto dominated public and parliamentary discussion. In 1805 the Holy See approved a limited veto privilege and thereby created acceptable conditions for the leaders of the Catholic laity in England. But in Ireland the budding Catholic democracy rejected this concession; in February 1809 the Irish bishops declared the veto to be unacceptable. An opinion from Rome of 1813 and another from Pope Pius VII two years later favored the veto, yet neither of the two opinions appeared to be acceptable to Ireland. In 1813 the Irish Catholic democracy had found a talented leader in Daniel O'Connell. Political emancipation was finally granted in 1829 without creating any obligations for the Church vis-à-vis the government. In consideration of the annual subsidy the curators of Maynooth were the only ones answerable to parliament until the Irish Church Act of 1869.

CHAPTER 13

The Russian Orthodox Church

The rise of the duchy, or rather grand duchy, of Moscow to the tsardom and the close connection of the Orthodox Church of Russia with the rulers in Moscow led to the relocation of the metropolitan see of Kiev and all of Russia to the north. The dependence of the Russian branch Church upon the patriarchate of Constantinople was weakening as was attested to in a letter dated 1393 from Patriarch Antonios to Grand Duke Vasili I (1389–1425). As a result of the election at the Moscow synod (1448) of Bishop Ioanna of Riazan as metropolitan (1448–61), desired by Grand Duke Vasili II (1425–62) and certified in the synod of 1459, the Church for all practical purposes obtained its ecclesiastical independence, even though it was not released from the jurisdictional ties with Constantinople until its elevation to a patriarchate.

Moscow the Third Rome[1]

After the fall of the imperial city on the Bosporus in 1453, the metropolitans, in concert with the rulers of Moscow, expanded their independence and gradually took over the central position, which had been occupied by Byzantium, the New, the Second Rome, for almost a millennium. The formulation of a "Third Rome" represented an easily remembered symbol for the symbiosis between the Moscow tsars and the metropolitans. In 1472 Ivan III (1462–1505) married as his second wife Sophia (Zoë), niece of the last of the Palaeologoi emperors, Constantinos XI (1448–53). He included the Byzantine double eagle in his coat of arms,[2] assumed the Greek imperial title of autocrat and the Byzantine court ceremonial. In 1492 Metropolitan Zosima (1490–95) designated: "Ivan Vasilevich, chosen by God, loyal to faith, as tsar and autocrat of all of Russia, a new Emperor Constantine for the new Constantinople-Moscow."[3] The writings of Filofei of the monastery of Saint Eleazar near Pskov at the beginning of the sixteenth century reveal the essential ideas of the Third Rome. His letter to Grand Duke Vasili III (1505–33)[4] reads: "For the Church of the Old Rome has fallen by the unbelief of Appollinarian heresy. The doors of the Second Rome, Constantine's city, were shattered by the axes of Hagar's offspring. This is now the Church of the Third, the New Rome, of your sublime realm the Holy Catholic (*sobornyi*) Apostolic Church, which at the ends of the earth shines brighter than the sun in the Orthodox Christian faith on all the earth. Know, Your Majesty, pious tsar, that all the realms of the Orthodox Christian faith together have been transferred into your singular realm. You alone are on all the earth tsar of the Christians."[5]

---

[1] V. Malinin, *Starec Eleazarova monastyrja Filofej i ego poslanija* (Kiev 1901). N. F. Kapterev, *Charakter otnošenij Rossii k pravoslavnomu vostoky v XVI i XVII stoletijach* (Sergiev Posad 1914 = The Hague and Paris 1968), 26–102; N. Zernov, *Moscow the Third Rome* (London 1937); H. Rahner, *Vom ersten bis zum dritten Rom* (Innsbruck 1950); I. Smolitsch, *Mönchtum*, 129–34; H. Schaeder, *Moskau das Dritte Rom* (Darmstadt 1957); W. Lettenbauer, *Moskau das dritte Rom* (Munich 1961); H.-D. Döpmann, *Der Einflußder Kirche auf die moskowitische Staatsidee* (Berlin 1967), 152–60; K. Onasch, op. cit., 30–34; M. Hellmann, "Moskau und Byzanz," *JGO n.s.* 17 (1969), 338–44. H. v. Rimscha, *Geschichte Rußlands* (Darmstadt 1970), 152–59.

These utterances should not be overestimated, especially since the panegyrics on the Third Rome were accompanied by admonitions to the orthodox tsar to protect Russia's orthodoxy and the continuance of the Church. But they should not be underestimated either, as though only refugees from Serbia and Byzantium in the Russian grand duchy, the only country not ruled by the infidel, viewed it as "the refuge of orthodoxy, the hope for the liberation of the homeland."[6] Intellectual-historical, political and religious motives, ideas of Rome, New Rome, and Jerusalem, Byzantine heritage, a messianic sense of mission and eschatology mingled with each other and formed a concept which was to prove historically powerful. The theory of Moscow as the Third Rome lent to the Orthodox faithful and to the tsar a strong sense of mission, which continued its effect in the Russian ideology of state and empire and was evidenced even in the first decades of the twentieth century in the newly established Moscow patriarchate.[7]

---

[2] M. Hellmann disagrees, op. cit., 330–38.

[3] A. M. Ammann, op. cit., 164.

[4] V. Malinin, op. cit., appendix, 49–66a; H. Schaeder, op. cit., 206–9. Also cf. N. Andrejev, "Filofey and his epistle to Ivan Vasilyevich," *SEER* 38 (1959), 1–31.

[5] H. Schaeder, op. cit., 206–7.—A letter to Michail G. Misjur' Munechin, an official of the grand duke (cf. V. Malinin, op. cit., appendix, 37–47), states, following a similar praise of the tsar: "All Christian realms have vanished and together have merged into the One Realm of our sovereign, according to the prophetic books: That is the Russian Empire. . . . For two Romes have fallen, but the third lives, and there will not be a fourth (H. Schaeder, op. cit., 204).

[6] M. Hellmann, op. cit., 342.

The First Moscow Patriarchate

The ecclesiastical independence existing since the middle of the fifteenth century was under the direction of the metropolitans of Moscow, who—given the symbiosis of Church and state in the grand duchy of Moscow and the growing power of the Moscow tsardom—grew ever more dependent on the state. A new ritual was published by Metropolitan Makari (1542–63) and Tsar Ivan IV (1533–84). The Synod of the Hundred Chapters (1551)[8] solved the conflict between the "Altruistic" and the "Propertied" by compromise. The former were composed of followers of starets Nil Sorski (d. 1508), who advocated a complete separation of Church and state. The latter, called "Josephites" after their founder Iosif of Volokalamsk (d. 1515), were in favor of close collaboration of Church and state and wanted to put at the state's disposal an elite troop to permeate society in the form of a tightly organized monasticism. The rule of terror by Ivan IV (starting in 1560) which gave him the sobriquet "the Terrible," rigorously interfered in the affairs of the Church. Makari's successors tried in vain to put a stop to his ruthless frenzy. Metropolitan Afanasi (1564–66) resigned; Metropolitan German (1566) was driven out; Metropolitan Philip (1566–68) was banished to a monastery and strangled in 1569.[9] Their successors Cyril III (1570–77), Antoni (1577–80), and Dionisi (1581–86) were helpless in the face of Ivan's fury; he traced his autocracy back to God and used church property for purposes of the state. The Church's dependence on the state persisted under Ivan's mentally retarded son Fedor I (1584–98) and the latter's brother-in-law, Boris Godunov, who reigned in his place and followed him as tsar (1598–1605). When Metropolitan Dionisi attempted to limit Godunov's influence, he was removed from office and replaced by Archbishop Job of Rostov (metropolitan: 1586–89, patriarch: 1589–1605). The "dismissals and appointments of hierarchs by the ruler" can be called with some justification "Russian

---

[7] Cf. H. Rahner, op. cit., 18; H. Koch, *Schriften* (incl. biblio.), 195–225.

[8] A. Herman, op. cit., 51–64.

[9] The martyr Metropolitan Filipp was canonized in 1636 as fighter for the truth; in 1652 his remains were brought to Moscow.

Gallicanism."[10] These actions did not prevent the patriarchs of the East who suffered under the supreme rule of the sultan to request and receive gifts from the Moscow tsar. Negotiations and visits made the tsar's authority within the total Orthodoxy grow. In 1585, for instance, Silvester, patriarch of Alexandria, communicated to the tsar "not to let the Holy Places be lacking in his protection."[11] At the same time he prophesied for him the inheritance of Emperor Constantine. These and other utterances prompted the government to aspire to have the autocephalic Russian Church elevated to a patriarchate in order to strengthen its position in the sense of the Orthodox symphony of state and Church. When Patriarch Joachim V of Antioch visited Moscow as a petitioner in 1586, he received—along with generous gifts of money for the other patriarchs as well—the charge to enlist their sympathies for a Moscow patriarchate. When the Serbs had obtained the restoration of their patriarchate of Peć at the insistence of Grand Vizir Mohammed Sokolović, the ecumenically minded patriarch was faced by the decision to recognize yet another autonomous patriarchate.

When Patriarch Jeremias II of Constantinople arrived in Moscow in 1588, he was forced to agree to the establishment of an independent patriarchate of Moscow and of the entire Russian tsardom (*patriarchestvo moskovskoe i vsego rossiiskago czarstviia*). The synod meeting in January 1589[12] nominated three candidates for the new office, of whom the tsar selected Metropolitan Job of Moscow, who was anointed and enthroned by Jeremias II on 26 January 1589 as the first Russian patriarch. At another synod the eparchies of Novgorod, Kazan, Sarai (Kruticy), and Rostov were elevated to metropolitanates. The ecclesiastical arrangement also included six archbishoprics and eight bishoprics whose borders were determined.

Tsar Fedor I and Boris Godunov forced Jeremias II to recognize the patriarchate by a synodal resolution of the other patriarchs. The synod in May 1590 in Constantinople[13]—in the absence of the patriarch of Alexandria, Silvester, who had died and whose successor had not yet been elected—approved the actions of Jeremias II and assigned to the Moscow patriarchate the fifth place in the ranks of the patriarchates (Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Moscow). The tsar was not satisfied with this order; he claimed the third place. He further insisted that Meletios Pigas, the new patriarch of Alexandria, who had not entered his office until June 1590 and had protested the resolution, agree to this. Fedor I sent messengers to the four patriarchs with letters and gifts of money to persuade them to agree. In 1593 a synod in Constantinople finally announced the approval of all the patriarchs,[14] without, however, changing the ranking.

---

[10] K. Onasch, op. cit., 57; K. Onasch, op. cit., 29: Note 11 refers to the parallel he drew to Gallicanism as "Russian Gallicanism within Byzantine Orthodoxy." His examples represent a fertile hypothesis.

[11] A. I. Muravev, *Snošenija Rossiis Vostokom do dělam cerkovynym* I (St. Petersburg 1858), 151.

[12] A. Herman, op. cit., 57–58.

[13] W. Regel, op. cit., 85–91.

The establishment of the Moscow patriarchate in 1589 and its recognition by the whole of Orthodoxy did away with the special position usurped by the Russian Church since the middle of the fifteenth century and concluded its Slavonicization. The diarchy of ecclesiastical and secular rule, considered agreeable, was now represented by a tsar and patriarch who were dependent upon each other. According to the theory of the Third Rome, they stood side by side to act in concert for the salvation of the faithful entrusted to them. In point of fact, the patriarchs remained just as dependent on the tsars as had been the case with the Russian grand dukes and the Moscow metropolitans. Only under special circumstances did some of the eleven patriarchs (1589–1700) succeed in asserting themselves in the face of the tsarist autocracy and to strengthen the authority of the Church by dint of their powerful personalities.

Patriarch Job (1589–1605) was completely overshadowed by Fedor I and Boris Godunov. Following the extinction of the Riurik dynasty, there occurred the "Time of Troubles," during which the false Dmitri pretended to be a son of Ivan IV. With Polish help he conquered Moscow in 1605, deposed Job and elected Ignati, until then archbishop of Riazan, in his stead. (1605/06). After the assassination of Dmitri under the rule of Tsar Vasili IV Shuski (1606–10), Ignati had to make way for the metropolitan of Kazan, Germogen, who became patriarch from 1606 to 1612. When the Poles again advanced to Moscow in 1610, they threw Germogen into jail and reinstated Ignati as patriarch. Germogen on his part stirred up nationwide resistance against the Poles until the exterior threats and upheavals of Russia could be overcome by the election of Tsar Michail Romanov (1613–45).

The tsar's father, Fedor Romanov, who had assumed the name Filaret after he entered the monastery and who, as metropolitan of Rostov had been imprisoned by the Poles until 1618, had been designated for the office of patriarch. When he regained his freedom, he took over the highest church office in Russia (1619–33) whose affairs had been conducted by an administrator for seven years (1612–19). Until his death a constellation unique in Russian church history prevailed: father and son—both had the title of "Sublime Ruler" (*velikii gosudar*)—reigned together as patriarch and tsar. The Orthodox symphony of spiritual and secular power became a reality in this rule of two tsars (*dvoeczarstvie*) in which the two forces strengthened each other and gave a strange imprint to the idea of the Third Rome. The Moscow patriarchate was stabilized by the establishment of the archbishopric of Tobolsk in Siberia (1620), the reordering of the patriarchal administration within the structure of the state (1625), and the rejection of all Western infiltrations by the Roman Catholic Church, the Uniates, and the Protestants.

---

[14] A. Herman, op. cit., 40–41.

The next patriarchs Ioasaf (1634–40) and Iosif (1642–52) benefited from the heritage of their predecessor Filaret, even though the reign of Tsar Alexei (1645–76), who codified extant law in 1649, brought about a noticeable tendency towards subordination of the Church under the authority of the state. The establishment of a central government office for church affairs and the prohibition of acquisition of property by the Church initiated the deterioration of church privileges. Patriarch Nikon (1652–66)[15] attempted once again to achieve a status of priority of the Church over the state. In an appendix to the *Epanagoge*, a Byzantine book of laws written between 879 and 886 in which Patriarch Photios opposed the hegemony of the Emperor in the Eastern Church, Nikon developed an ideal of church autonomy: "To the tsar are entrusted the affairs of the body, to the clergy those of the souls . . . therefore the priesthood is far higher than the tsardom."[16] His recourse to Greek models is demonstrated as well by his re-edition of the collection of canon law of the *Nomokanon* (*kormčaia kniga*)[17] and in the improvement of liturgical texts in adherence to the Greek originals by correcting the deviations which had become custom in Russia. With this work he continued the views of Grecophile Russian hierarchs who expected to raise the cultural level of the clergy and ministry by contacts with the Eastern patriarchs. Nikon, who had met the patriarch of Jerusalem, Paisios, in Moscow received texts, among others "a ritual for the execution of the liturgy in the East by a bishop."[18] They were transmitted to him by the former ecumenical patriarch Athanasios III Patellaros, who had been in Moscow in 1653–54. In 1653 the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople, Paisios I, sent him a large volume containing the precise rules of the Greek Orthodox liturgy and descriptions of the holy implements and vestments.

---

[15] N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarch Nikon i caŕ Michajlovič*, 2 vols. (Sergiev Posad 1909–12); M. V. Zyzykin, *Patriarch Nikon,* 3 vols. (Warsaw 1931–38).

[16] A. V. Karešev, *Očerki poistorii russkoj cerkvi* II (Paris 1959), 195.

[17] A. Herman, op. cit., 23–33; H. Neubauer, op. cit., 134–35.

[18] I. Smolitsch, *Mönchtum*, 366.

With the help of these and other documents Nikon initiated his reforms. In an admonition to the Moscow clergy in 1653 he ordered the seventeen genuflections at certain prayers reduced to four and decreed the use of three instead of two fingers for making the sign of the cross.[19] Even these first few reforms on the Greek model created confusion in Moscow. The Moscow protopopes Avvakum (1621–82)[20] and Ivan Neronov protested against the innovations and appealed to the tsar as the protector of Orthodoxy. At the Moscow synod of 1653 Nikon had Neronov condemned, demoted, and banished to a remote monastery; Avvakum was sent to Siberia. At the Moscow synods of 1654, 1655, and 1656[21] the patriarch pushed through the adaptation of the liturgy to the Byzantine liturgy. He was supported by Serbian Patriarch Gabriel, Patriarch Makarios of Antioch and the representative of the ecumenical patriarch, Paisios I. Tsar Alexei acknowledged the reform resolutions, made them law, and recognized the penalties against protesting clerics, simultaneously trying to have them ameliorated. The close ties between the Moscow and Constantinople patriarchs opened political perspectives. Because the Treaty of Pereiaslaw of 1654 united the larger part of the Ukraine with Russia—since then Nikon had called himself patriarch of Greater Russia, Russia Proper, and Byelorussia—the avenue to Constantinople appeared open. At the occasion of his stay in Moscow the former ecumenical patriarch, Athanasios III Patellaros, had implied that the orthodox subjects of the sultan could place themselves under the protection of the tsar and encouraged him to "conquer Constantinople and to install his patriarch there as ecumenical patriarch."[22] There were distinct possibilities of the Third Rome uniting with the Second.

Nikon, allowed since 1654 to bear the title of *velikii gosudar*, like his predecessor Filaret, was administrator of the realm during the Russo-Polish War of 1654/55. His exaggerated self-assurance, the overemphasis of his position, above all the growing movement of the Old Believers, who considered the reforms[23] as interference with the blessed

---

[19] J. Chrysostomus, *Die "Pomorskie Otvety" als Denkmal der Anschauungen der russischen Altgläubigen gegen Ende des l. Viertels des XVIII. Jh.* (Rome 1957), 174–92; H. Koch, *Schriften*, 94–103.

[20] P. Pascal, *Avvakum et les débuts du Raskol* (Paris 1963), incl. biblio.

[21] A. Herman, op. cit., 60–61.

[22] A. M. Ammann, op. cit., 270.

[23] P. Hauptmann, *Altrussischer Glaube. Der Kampf des Protopopen Avvakum gegen die Kirchenreform des 17. Jh.* (Göttingen 1963).—Ibid., 86: Enumeration of the main components of Nikon's cultural reform: Text revision of agenda, the cross made with three fingers instead of two, three instead of two hallelujahs, orthography and pronunciation of *Jesus* ("Jisus" instead of "Isus"), reduction of liturgical bows to the ground, changes in the creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, five prosphorae instead of seven, reversal of direction of procession.

Russian tradition and consequently took up a fight against the state and the Church causing a schism (*raskol*)[24] within the Russian Orthodox Church unsolved to the present day, all these contributed to a break between him and the tsar in 1658. Nikon threatened his resignation, whereupon Alexei took away his title of *velikii gosudar* and convoked a bishops' synod in 1660 which was to issue a declaration that the patriarch had resigned his office voluntarily. When this attempt failed, Greek theologians were called in and expert opinions were requested from the four former patriarchs. At the great Moscow synod of 1666/67,[25] in which the patriarchs Paisios of Alexandria and Makarios of Antioch as well as numerous monks and Greek princes of the Church participated, Nikon was dismissed for refusing the opinion of the united Orthodox patriarchs, for restructuring valid canon law, and resigning unjustifiably. He had to retreat to a monastery as a simple monk and spend the last fifteen years of his life there (d. 1682). Nikon's attempt to upgrade the office of the patriarch had failed; the tsar had had his way. At the end of January 1667 the synod submitted a list of three possible candidates for a successor, of whom Alexei chose Ioasaf, the aged abbot of the Monastery of the Trinity near Moscow, to be the next patriarch. The fall of Nikon affirmed the priority of the secular ruler in church matters.

The last four patriarchs who were more or less appointed directly by the government could not stop this development. Ioasaf II (1667–72) followed the tsar's wishes in every way. To be sure, at the end of the great synod he advocated the rights of the Church and obtained an amelioration of the limitations put upon the ecclesiastical court jurisdiction in 1649, but had to recognize that the reform of the liturgy implemented by Nikon had actually been advised by the tsar. According to the records of Paisios Ligarides, a member of the Jerusalem patriarchate,[26] the position of the tsar within the Church was solved by a compromise according to which "neither of the two powers were to interfere in the affairs of the other. In secular matters the tsar was to prevail, the patriarch was to have priority in spiritual ones."[27] The resolutions of the synod honored the tsar as a new Constantine, Zealot of the faith, Defender of the true faith, Judge and Avenger for the Old

---

[24] V. V. Andreev, *Raskol i ego značenie v narodnoj russkoj istorii* (St. Petersburg 1870=Osnabrück 1965); J. Chrysostomus, op. cit., 1–34; V. Pleyer, *Das russische Altgläubigentum* (Munich 1960); P. Hauptmann, op. cit.

[25] A. Herman, op. cit., 63–64; cf. H. Neubauer, op. cit., 142–98, about the deposition of Nikon and its consequences.

[26] N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarch Nikon* II, 227–50.

[27] H. Neubauer, op. cit., 176.

Believers and the disobedient.[28] The Old Believers rejected their being condemned as a partisan and uncanonical act. The brotherhood of the Solovecki monastery on the Caspian Sea reasoned for their views in several petitions: it was convinced that the end of the world was immediately impending, since tsar and hierarchs had fallen from the old faith and had betrayed the charge of the Third Rome, while the members of the synod had interpreted the idea of the Third Rome according to their own opinions. The brotherhood did not accept the Archimandrite Iosif appointed by Patriarch Ioasaf II and elected its own superiors. The monks defended themselves passionately and resisted the troops called out against them from 1670 to 1676, when their monastery was finally stormed.[29]

After only seven months in office Patriarch Pitirim (1672–73) was followed by Ioakim (1674–90). Next to promoting strict monastic and Church discipline and rejecting all Western influences, he considered the implementation of the decisions of the 1666/67 synod one of his main tasks. This was shown at the bishops synod of 1675[30] and even more so at the synod of 1682,[31] which continued the development of liturgical reform and declared anew that the punishment of the Old Believers was a duty of the state. One of the first victims was the Protopope Avvakum, who ended at the stake in 1682. A religious conference at the beginning of the reign of Tsarina Sophia (1682–89), who took over the regency for her minor brothers Ivan V and Peter I after the death of Tsar Fedor II (1676–82), ended with draconic measures and the execution of the main speakers for the Old Believers. A ukase of 7 April 1685 ordered their prosecution and conviction as rebels and enemies of the state. In the following years thousands of them were executed; many evaded their persecutors by self-immolation. They rejected the actions of the state and the Church as being dictated by the Anti-Christ, idealized the past of the Russian Church, and as itinerant priests proselytized for their views. Two groups were now formed, those with priests (*popovcy*) and those without (*bezpopovcy*). The suppression of the *raskol* had serious consequences for Russian monkdom. Many monasteries which had hitherto been centers of religious life and literary production, now ceased to fulfill that function. Most of the monks, because they had joined the Old Believers and rejected the reforms decreed by the patriarchal Church and later on also by the government, were suspected to be enemies of the state.

---

[28] Ibid., 177–78.

[29] I. Smolitsch, *Mönchtum*, 374–81.

[30] A. Herman, op. cit., 64.

[31] Ibid., 64–65.

The synod of 1682 was also occupied with the moral and educational reform of the secular and monastic clergy. New bishoprics were established and the organization of the metropolitanates was tightened. In 1685 the metropolitanate of Kiev was incorporated in the patriarchate; in 1686 Patriarch Dionysios of Constantinople released it from his jurisdiction. This incorporation aggravated the tensions within the Russian Church because the academy founded by the Ukrainian metropolitan Peter Mogila (1633–47) in Kiev was prepared to engage in a discourse with Catholicism and the Counter Reformation. It also required a knowledge of Latin in addition to Greek and gained influence beyond its borders of the Ukraine in the second half of the seventeenth century. One of its pupils, Simeon of Polock (1629–80), who had been tutor of the princes in Moscow and had opened a Latin school, and his friend, the monastic priest Silvester Medvedev, spread the many-faceted intellectualism cultivated in Kiev to Moscow.[32] The fight between the conservative forces and those of the "Latinists" who were supported by the government came to a head during negotiations concerning the establishment of a university in Moscow.[33] Although a Slavic-Greek-Latin academy was founded in Moscow in 1687, Patriarch Ioakim prevailed at the Moscow Synod of 1689/90: the followers of the Ukrainian movement were demoted; Medvedev was convicted, laicized, and executed.[34]

The relative uniformity of Russian church life at the beginning of the patriarchate gave way to noticeable differentiations at the end of the seventeenth century.[35] Although publications on canon law, liturgy, and hagiography predominated, the revision of the liturgical books represented a new scientific contribution. The interior disputes with Ukrainian and Greek theologians led to a loosening of traditional ties. Baroque culture flowing from the Ukraine to Russia enriched church literature, architecture, painting, and music. The icon painter Simeon Ushakov (1626–86) made use of typically baroque emblematics, the icons show traces of individual portraiture. In architecture the traditional elements combined with Greek ideas and influences of the baroque. Polyphony was added to the customary homophonous singing. The Russian Church, then, received many impulses during the time of the first patriarchate, but these were rejected by the influential conservative circles that determined matters.

One of them was Patriarch Adrian (1690–1700). He tried once again to protect the privileges of the Church, but did not have the strength to prevail against Tsar Peter I,[36] who, together with his debilitated half-brother Ivan V (1689–96) and after the latter's death, ruled and restructured the realm as autocrat (1696–1725). Just as his predecessor Ioakim, Adrian was so steeped in tradition that the tsar's predilection for foreigners and his European trip (1697–98) were totally inconceivable to him. When Peter I returned from abroad in 1698 and ruthlessly proceeded against the revolt of the Streltsi, Adrian, paralyzed since 1696, asked him in vain to apply mercy; henceforth tsar and patriarch communicated only in writing. The patriarchal Church and the Old Believers were united in rejecting the new customs introduced by the tsar, as for instance the wearing of European clothes and shaving of beards. Peter I did not refrain from parodying and scorning church ceremonies. His church policies[37] were an integrated part of his desire, shaped by rationalism and the philosophy of early Enlightenment, to reform the realm. His reforms were aimed at the commonweal (*vsenarodnaia polza*)—albeit interpreted by him in an arbitrary fashion—and for this he made use of the Church as well. While he took into account the ties of his people with the Orthodox faith, he nonetheless considered the Church no more than an institution for moral education, which he wanted to implement by legal norms instead of religious commandments. During his travels through Catholic and Protestant countries he had become familiar with the dependence of the Churches upon secular authority. He was determined to subordinate the Church to the state in Russia as well.

---

[32] A. M. Ammann, op. cit., 346–55.

[33] H. Neubauer, op. cit., 204–21.

[34] A. Herman, op. cit., 65.

[35] *Jugie* I, 558–78; K. Onasch, op. cit., 77–87.

The Dissolution of the Patriarchate and the Establishment of the Holy Synod

The death of Patriarch Adrian on 16 October 1700 meant the end of the autonomous patriarchal administration. Peter I arbitrarily interfered in church affairs. He did not allow the election of a new patriarch. Two months later he simply appointed Stefan Javorski (1658–1722),[38] metropolitan of Riazan, to the position of administrator and regent of the patriarchate. He was given the supervision of ecclesiastical matters, the right of nomination to fill vacant bishoprics—they amounted to a total of twenty-three—and the surveillance of opponents of the Church, especially the Old Believers, whereas the overseeing of church properties was handed to the Office of Monasteries (1701–20); church judicature was considerably curtailed. The tsar thought that Stefan Javorski, a former professor of the Kiev academy who had occupied himself with polemical theology and had lectured at the Moscow Academy in 1697/98, would be open to his plans.

---

[36] R. Wittram, *Peter I. Czar und Kaiser. Zur Gesch. Peters des Großen in seiner Zeit,* 2 vols. (Göttingen, 1964).

[37] H. Koch, *Die russische Orthodoxie im Petrinischen Zeitalter* (Breslau 1929); R. Stupperich, *Staatsgedanke und Religionspolitik Peters des Großen* (Königsberg/Pr.-Berlin 1936); R. Wittram, "Peters des Großen Verhältnis zur Religion und den Kirchen," *HZ* 173 (1952), 261–96; I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 57–75.

[38] J. Šerech, "Stefan Yavorsky and the Conflict of Ideologies in the Age of Peter the Great," *SEER* 30 (1951–52), 40–62.

Initially they collaborated in the mission to the pagans and Mohammedans[39] and in the struggle against the Old Believers. In 1703 Stefan Javorski had dealt with them in an essay, "The Signs of the Appearance of the Antichrist and the End of the World."[40] But he was soon chagrined by several significant measures of the tsar's. The latter confiscated monastic revenues to finance his army; he practiced tolerance towards the Protestants, granting them freedom of conscience and autonomous rights when he annexed the Baltic provinces; he appointed Pastor Barthold Vagetius superintendent of the Lutheran congregations in Russia, and, finally, he subordinated the Office of Monasteries to the "Reigning Senate" created in 1711, which became the supreme supervisory office, usurping all administrative and judicial functions. In 1712 Javorski used a sermon to take a stand against the church policies of Peter I and his marriage to Katharina (Catherine) Skravronka, later Tsarina Catherine I: "You stormy sea of man's transgressions of the law, why do you break and devastate the shores? The shores are God's law; since its creation it has consisted in not coveting the wife of one's neighbor and in not leaving one's own . . ."[41] In 1689 the tsar had separated from Evdoxia Lopuxina, mother of Tsarevich Alexei, and decreed that she enter a convent. In the same sermon, Stefan Javorski also expressed his sympathies for the heir to the throne who did not agree with his father's methods of governing. As a consequence Javorski was prohibited from giving sermons for the period of three years. His polemics against the Protestant circles of Moscow and the army surgeon Dimitri Tverentinov, who represented Calvinistic views, led to a summons before the Senate. When the physician Foma Ivanov, a follower of the surgeon, hacked apart some icons, the patriarchal regent had a bishops' synod in 1714 sentence him to death at the stake. The tsar, outraged by this action, forced Stefan Javorski into humiliating apologies. Henceforth the latter did not dare express his opinions freely. But he put them down in his "Rock of Faith, Dedicated to the

---

[39] J. Glazik, *Die russisch-orthodoxe Heidenmission seit Peter dem Großen* (Münster 1954); idem, *Die Islammission der russisch-orthodoxen Kirche* (Münster 1959).

[40] I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 80.

[41] Ibid., 87.

Sons of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church for their Strengthening and Spiritual Edification, but as Support and Betterment for Those who Perceive it as a Stumbling Block."[42] In this manuscript dedicated to Tsarevich Alexei he maintained that the Church was superposed over the state: "Tsars are the guardians of the laws of God and of the Church, but they are not legislators; it is not theirs to determine what should be part of the faith."[43]

When the conflict between the tsar and his son caused a trial in 1718 against Alexei and his followers, the investigation extended to ecclesiastic dignitaries, who were made answerable for the widespread opposition and an alleged conspiracy. Stefan Javorski advocated a pardon, but was unable to avert the death penalty. The opposition between the patriarchal regent and Peter I, whose founding of Saint Petersburg (1703) had created a symbol for the Russia changed by him, had become unbridgeable. Church life was paralyzed more and more each year by the incursions of the autocrat. In 1714 he prohibited the building of new churches for ten years in favor of the construction of Saint Petersburg, elevated in 1712 to be the capital. In 1716 the Senate ordered the bishops to bind themselves by oath to deal mildly with the opponents of the Church, to employ clerics and sacristans only when needed, and not to interfere in secular affairs. In 1717 the tsar demanded of all confessors that they tell him personally all news of attempts directed against the state. In 1718 he ordered Feofan Prokopovich (1681–1736)[44] to draft a "Description and Evaluation of an Ecclesiastical College," intending to direct the central authority of the Church according to his ideas and to incorporate it in the total administration of the state.

Feofan Prokopovich was one of the most important Russian theologians of the first half of the eighteenth century. Although he referred to certain basic ideas of Protestantism and tenets of the Enlightenment, he tried to combine the Byzantine heritage and Moscow tradition with the demands of his time. After his studies at the Kiev Academy he had temporarily become a Basilian monk and successfully passed a course in Catholic Scholastic philosophy at the Greek College of Saint Athanasius (1698–1701). On his way back through Switzerland and Germany he had met Calvinist and Lutheran theologians. In 1704 he became an Orthodox monastic priest and soon rose to the position of professor

---

[42] K. Onasch, op. cit., 100.

[43] R. Stupperich, *Staatsgedanke*, 51–52.

[44] R. Stupperich, "Feofan Prokopovič in der neueren Lit." *Festschrift für Margarete Woltner zum 70. Geburtstag*, P. Brang et al., eds. (Heidelberg 1967), 284–93; H.-J. Härtel, *Byzantinisches Erbe und Orthodoxie bei Feofan Prokopovič* (Würzburg 1970, incl. biblio.).

(1706) and then rector (1711) in the academy. In 1716 the tsar, who had known him personally since 1706, called him to Saint Petersburg as his adviser and in spite of reservations on the part of the patriarchal regent succeeded in having him appointed bishop of Pskov in 1718.

After his sermon concerning the power and honor of the tsar on 6 April 1718, the basic ideas of which he deepened in 1722 in his essay "The Right of the Monarchic Will," the collaboration between him and the tsar became closer. Its product was the *Spiritual Regulations* (*duxovnyi reglament*), which made the Russian Church a part of the order of the state and placed at its head the Holy Synod as a state institution.[45] The text drafted by Feofan Prokopovich in 1720 was corrected by Peter I and submitted to the Senate for its information and for all bishops to sign. It regulated church supervision, church education, the order of Mass, appointment to church offices, the ecclesiastical court and the administration of church property. The tsar's manifesto of 25 January 1721[46] made the council form of government of the Church stipulated in the regulations its basic law and decreed that the Ecclesiastical College could not do anything without his approval. In the first meeting of 14 February 1721 Feofan Prokopovich gave the opening speech based on John 15:16, stressing the decisive role of the monarchic will. At this meeting the designation "Ecclesiastical College" was changed into "Most Holy Governing Synod." It was composed of eleven members who received princely salaries. Saint Petersburg was designated as the seat of this office. Peter I appointed Archbishop Stefan Javorski first president and Bishop Feofan Prokopovich second president. When Javorski, who could not stop this development and whose protests were disregarded, died in 1722, the tsar did not appoint another president but transferred the authority to Prokopovich as vice-president. In April 1722 the Holy Synod issued supplements to the regulations concerning the monastic system. Men could not be vested as monks anymore until the age of thirty; women were prohibited from being vested until the age of fifty to sixty.

On 11 May 1722, Peter I—to whom the Senate had given the title of Emperor (*imperator*) and the sobriquet "the Great" (*Velikii*) in 1721—installed within the Holy Synod the office of a chief procurator corresponding to the procurator general in the Senate. Subordinate to the will of the tsar, who simultaneously made him head of the chancery of the synod, he was to have full supervision of the synod "as Our eyes and administrator of the business of the state."[47] J. V. Boltin, colonel of the dragoons, was the first chief procurator (1722–25). His successors were elevated to the rank of ministers in the nineteenth century and became key figures of the Russian established Church. Under the direction of its vice-president, the Holy Synod attempted to return the Old Believers to the Church by means of words of exhortation; it took steps to reform the monastic system and to make it useful to the state, to improve the education of the people, and to raise the level of knowledge of the clergy. Feofan Prokopovich composed a "First Instruction for Boys,"[48] a catechism for children which had to be read to all the congregations four times a year. He also expanded the Alexander Nevski Monastery in Saint Petersburg into a model seminary.

---

[45] I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 99–132.

[46] Mansi XXXVII, 1–99; A. Herman, op. cit., 80–83; I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 103–05.

[47] R. Stupperich, *Staatsgedanke*, 86.

It was not easy for the members of the Holy Synod to explain to the Orthodox clergy within and without Russia its role as a bishops' synod, able to invoke Orthodox traditions, and its functions as an organ of the state. The Holy Synod had the legislative, executive, and judicial power within the church government which had earlier rested with the Moscow patriarchate. It tried to calm the bishops with the following message: "The synod has the honor, authority, and power of the patriarchs, if not more so, because it is a council (*sobor*)."[49] The petitions of the liturgy henceforth mentioned the Holy Synod instead of the patriarchs. The commemoration of the other patriarchs was to cease, lest it create the impression that the Holy Synod was below them. When Stefan Javorski raised an objection, he was outvoted. The tsar took it upon himself to inform Patriarch Jeremias III of Constantinople of the new church order in Russia and asked him in turn to communicate it to the other three patriarchs of the East. But in his devoutly phrased letter of 30 September 1721 he did not mention the content of the regulations, which he designated merely as "Instruction." He also kept silent concerning the incorporation of the Holy Synod into the collegiate system of state administration and the subordination of the Church to the supervision of the state. Furthermore, he changed the text of the manifesto of 25 January 1721 in several places.[50] In 1723 the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch recognized the "Most Holy Governing Synod" as "Holy Brother in Christ,"[51] only Patriarch Chrysanthos Notara of Jerusalem refused his approval. Aside from the one-sided information they had received, the decisive factor in obtaining their recognition was the patriarchs' dependence on Russian subsidies because they were under Turkish domination.

---

[48] Ibid., 92–93. Cf. the list of works by Feofan Prokopovič, H. J. Härtel, loc. cit., 13–14.

[49] I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 124.

[50] Ibid., 107–8; R. Wittram, *Peter I. Czar und Kaiser* II, 192–93.

[51] Kartašev II, 363–67.

The uncanonical installment of the Holy Synod meant the complete dissolution of the Moscow patriarchate. The Russian Orthodox Church became the Orthodox Church in Russia. To be sure, it continued to be connected with the other Eastern Churches in its teachings, the celebration of its liturgy and sacraments, but received a new structure in its relation between Church and state by virtue of the abolition of the earlier dual rule of tsar and patriarch and its subordination to the state. The decrees of the Holy Synod were published in the name of the tsar, by order of His Imperial Majesty. The harmonious collaboration between state and Church aligned for centuries according to the symphonious Byzantine model was part of history. Dostoevski's acerbic judgment that "the Church has been in a state of paralysis since Peter the Great,"[52] is exaggerated. But in the history of the Russian Church the establishment of the Holy Synod meant the beginning of the dictatorship of the established Church (*gosudarstvennaia czerkovnost*).

The Russian Established Church under the Holy Synod

The Holy Synod was the instrument by which the state subjugated the Church in the eighteenth century. Its members, reduced to four in 1730 and fluctuating between three and eight in the following decades, possessed the legislative, administrative and judicial power. The administrative offices of the Holy Synod prepared all decisions for the conferences usually taking place twice a year. The directives of the ruler were decisive in everything; the chief procurators appointed by them merely received orders.

Under Catherine I (1725–27) the Holy Synod was placed under the "Supreme Secret Council" established in 1726. Archbishop Feodosi Janovski of Novgorod, having shortly before criticized the tsarina's church policies, was demoted and banished to a monastery on the Caspian Sea as an ordinary monk. Feofan Prokopovich, promoted to archbishop of Novgorod in 1725, had to fight for his leadership position in the Holy Synod during the reign of Peter II (1727–30), the son of Tsarevitch Alexei, because the great families protecting the young tsar again declared Moscow the capital of Russia and permitted discussion of a possible restoration of the patriarchate stimulated by some princes of the Church. In 1728 Archbishop Lopatinski of Tver published the "Rock of Faith" written by Stefan Javorski, in which the basic attitude of Feofan

---

[52] F. M. Dostojevskij, *Dnevnik pisatelja. Sobranie sočinenij* V (St. Petersburg 1885), 356.

Prokopovich was suspected as Lutheranism. The first edition was quickly out of print; the second was sent to all bishops and abbots in 1729.

After the death of Peter II, under the reign of Anna Ivanovna (1730–40), a niece of Peter the Great, Archbishop Prokopovich again obtained dictatorial powers. He removed from the Holy Synod three members who had been supporters of the nun Evdoxia Lopuxina, the first wife of Peter I, for the succession to the throne. He also proceeded against all people who had favored the dissemination of the "Rock of Faith." The Metropolitans Georgi Dashkov and Ignati Smola were stripped of their ecclesiastical office and dispatched to separate monasteries as ordinary monks; Archbishop Lopatinski was divested of his bishopric after a three-year pretrial arrest (1738) and taken to the fortress of Vyborg. Feofan Prokopovich cast suspicion on his adversaries as enemies of the state; he packed the Holy Synod, by now subordinated to the cabinet of ministers, with men whom he trusted and intensified the dependence of the Church upon the state. He punished bishops and abbots if they resisted government regulations, such as total obedience to monastic legislation. When he died in 1736, the arbitrary rule of the tsarina and her favorite, Duke Ernst Johann von Biron, interfered even more in church matters. In 1737 all church officers between the ages of fifteen and forty with the exception of priests and deacons were drafted into the army. Conscription even reached into the monasteries. These and other measures, making it problematical to enter a monastery, reduced the number of monks and nuns from approximately twenty-five thousand to hardly fourteen thousand.[53] In 1738 the Holy Synod had to hand the College of Economics over to the jurisdiction of the Senate, with the result that all church property revenues flowed into the state exchequer. The tsarina ostensibly represented herself as a benefactress of the total Orthodox Church. In 1732 she established a budget for gifts of charity, granting the patriarch of Constantinople an annual 1000 and the other patriarchs 100 rubles each. Other beneficiaries were the Balkan Slavs, the Athos Monasteries, and the Georgians.

After the short interregnum of the minor Prince Ivan VI and the regent Anna Leopoldovna (1740–41) the oppressed situation of the Church improved temporarily at the beginning of the reign of Tsarina Elizabeth (1741–61), a daughter of Peter the Great. She granted freedom to several bishops and returned the administration of the properties of the Church and monasteries to the Holy Synod. Basically she continued the church policies of her father. The chief procurator, Prince Shakovskoi (1742–53), and his successors made sure that the interests of the state were safeguarded; they prepared for the secularization of all church property. The mission among the Mohammedans of the Volga region, suppressed under Anna Ivanovna, was now promoted by the state. For the period 1743 to 1747 the "Office for the Newly Baptized" registered 217,258 baptisms, from 1748 to 1760 another 192,606,[54] which could only be brought about by forcible measures. Thus mosques in places cohabited by Christians and Mohammedans were destroyed. In the province of Kazan 418 of 536 Islamic places of worship were leveled, in the province of Tobolsk 98 of 133, in Astrakhan 29 of 40.[55] In Siberia conversion to Christianity was promoted with the promise of economic favors. The increase in the number of souls by almost a half million may have strengthened the self-assurance of some bishops, to be sure, but the necessary expansion of the church organization—in 1753 there were thirty bishoprics with about 18,000 parishes—was limited to mere outward appearances. The edition of the Holy Scripture, a revision of the 1581 edition in Church Slavonic of the Ostrog Bible after the Greek original text, which was published by the Holy Synod in 1751, and the exhortations of some princes of the Church against the incursions of ideas of the Enlightenment were unable to stop the process of the Church being pushed more and more from public life. Moscow University and its branches, founded in 1755 (see Chap. 18), did not include a theological faculty.

---

[53] I. Smolitsch, *Mönchtum,* 389: there were 7,829 monks and 6,543 nuns around 1740.—The number of monastics receded even more in the second half of the eighteenth century; cf. I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte,* 713: in 1764 to 7,659 monks and 4,733 nuns, in 1796 to 4,160 monks and 1,671 nuns.

Over the following decades the Church lost the last vestiges of its autonomy. The infantile Peter III and his ambitious wife Catherine II (née princess of Anhalt-Zerbst), who pushed him aside and usurped the throne, continued the subjugation of the Church under the yoke of the state. Peter III, the son of Tsarina Anna and Duke Karl-Friedrich of Holstein-Gottorp, reigned for only half a year (1761–62). He did not have the slighest understanding of the special character of the Orthodox Church. The president of the Holy Synod, Archbishop Dimitri Seshchenov of Novgorod, was expected to remove all icons except those of the Redeemer and the Blessed Virgin, to abolish the monasteries, and make the clergy adopt the dress of Protestant ministers. Complete control by the state over all church property was introduced by the reinstatement of the governmental College of Economics and the inventorying of all monastic estates.

---

[54] J. Glazik, *Heidenmission*, 79.

[55] J. Glazik, *Islammission*, 87.

To be sure, Catherine II (1762–96) designated herself "Orthodox Empress," but was guided mainly by the spirit of the French Encyclopedists, with whom she corresponded. She deliberately and stubbornly completed the church policies of Peter I.[56] Even prior to her coming to power she had jotted down the following maxim: "Respecter la religion, mais ne la faire entrer pour rien dans les affaires d'État."[57] Once empress she called herself "chef de l'église grecque" or "chef de son église."[58] At times she referred to the bishops as "people being part of the administration of the state, subject to the will of the monarch as well as to the Gospel."[59] Chief procurators, such as J. J. Melessino (1763–68), who suggested the abolition of fasting, abbreviation of the Mass, and facilitation of divorces, and P. P. Shehebyshchev (1768–74), an avowed atheist, gradually made the Holy Synod comply with the wishes and demands of the tsarina.

At the very beginning of her reign Catherine II appointed a commission to deliberate the problem of the Church properties. The result was the secularization law of 26 February 1764, which ordered all properties to be transferred to the Office of Economics. Four hundred eighteen monasteries were dissolved; the budget for all bishoprics, churches, and monasteries, whose number was further decreased in the following years, provided for three different income scales. At first the process of secularization included only the monastic institutions of Greater Russia; after the special status of the Ukraine was phased out in 1786 and 1788, it was extended to the southwestern territories as well. Aside from a very few other clerics only one prince of the Church, Metropolitan Arseni Masejevich of Rostov (1742–63), who had earlier proved his courage by a paper opposing the wrongs done to Stefan Javorski, dared protest publicly against the nationalization of church property. When he prophesied the destruction of Church and piety in two petitions to the Holy Synod, whose members he characterized as "mute dogs" who "look on without barking,"[60] he was tried by a synodal court in 1763, stripped of his consecration as bishop and priest, and banished to a remote monastery. Shortly thereafter he also lost his monastic status and was condemned to life in prison at the fortress of Reval, where he died in 1772.

The established Orthodox Church bowed to the will of the Tsarina in all matters. This was manifest in the preparation of a new legal code and the expansion of the system of higher education. The religious academy in Moscow, being refused any connection with the university, and the seminaries were so meagerly supported that the Church was reduced more and more to the liturgical realm. All the while Catherine II represented herself as guardian of the Orthodox faith. In the peace treaty with Turkey in 1774 she obtained protectionary rights over the Orthodox faithful in the principalities of Moldavia and Walachia. The "Greek Project,"[61] a plan to restore the Byzantine Empire under a Russian secundogeniture, pursued visions of even greater scope, which could not, however, be realized.

---

[56] I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 247–72, 346–56.

[57] Ibid., 251.

[58] Ibid., 252.

[59] A. M. Ammann, op. cit., 405.

[60] I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 264.

In the second half of the eighteenth century the Church—in a condition of total dependence on the state since Peter I—was endangered from within by the advances of rationalism, the Enlightenment and Freemasonry. Some princes of the Church sought to avert the infiltration by means of compromise, such as the Moscow metropolitan Platon Levshin (1773–1812). He went back to the works of Feofan Prokopovich, whose views were prevailing at the Moscow Academy, and himself published sermons and catechetical works. The number of bishops and monks who deliberately concentrated on the religious core of their tasks was small. One of them was Bishop Tixon of Voronezh (1763–67), who withdrew to the monastery of Zadonsk and, as a hermit and religious writer, radiated great influence.[62] Another was Metropolitan Gavril Petrov of Saint Petersburg (1770–1801), who oversaw the printing of the Church Slavonic translation of the *Philokalia* (*dobrotoliubie*). The translator Paisi Velichkovski (1722–94)[63] renewed the "altruistic" current of monasticism, represented by Nil Sorski around 1500, and revived the institution of monastic elders (*staretsy*), which led the Russian monasteries out of the crisis of the closing eighteenth century. Such personalities of high profile were exceptions in the Orthodox Church of Russia at the time of Catherine II. The condition of the Church was characterized by the process of secularization, through which it had lost the major part of its self-support for its charitable and social tasks. The schism of the Old Believers continued. The government tried to move those who followed official church dogma to recognize the established Church and was prepared to tolerate separate customs for its concession. But it also took harsh measures when it deported twenty thousand Old Believers who had settled on the Dnepr island of Vjatka to Siberia. The "priestless" Old Believers split up in numerous groups. New sects were formed, such as the Chilysty, Skoptsy, Milk-Drinkers (*molokany*) and Dukobors, who separated from the established Church and—although they were small in numbers—were troublesome to the Holy Synod.

---

[61] E. Hösch, "Das sogenannte 'griechische Projekt' Katharinas II.," *JGO* n.s. 12 (1964), 168–206.

[62] I. Kologriwow, *Das andere Rußland* (Munich 1958), 288–326.

[63] Ibid., 326–39.

Paul I (1796–1801) considered the Church an ally in his fight against the consequences of the French Revolution. He called the welfare of its servants "one of the main duties of the imperial rule"[64] and made the expansion of church schools possible so that four Church academies and forty-six seminaries were in existence at the end of the eighteenth century, but he considered the clerics civil servants, as had his mother Catherine II. He was the first to award medals to the bishops, thereby tying the already pliant ecclesiastic princes even more firmly to the state. Even as heir apparent he had a religiously embellished concept of an autocrat feared and honored by his subjects "because he is the image of the Most High."[65] In the law of succession drafted in 1797 he had himself designated "Head of the Church."[66] He chaired the Holy Synod and claimed supreme supervision of the established Church; he appointed and transfered bishops according to whim. The designation of the tsar as "Head of the Church" was the culmination of the development of centuries and sealed the state's domination of the Orthodox Church of Russia.

Protestants and Catholics in Russia

The population of Russia at the time of Peter the Great is estimated at approximately 14 million,[67] most of whom were of the Orthodox faith. The attitude of the patriarchal Church towards the Lutheran congregations which had formed in the course of the seventeenth century was negative. When the number of Protestant immigrants grew considerably at the beginning of the eighteenth century, especially after the Edict of Solicitation and Toleration by Peter I (16 April 1702) and the annexation of the Baltic provinces, the state issued special regulations for them.[68] In 1721 the Holy Synod was given control over all congregations. In addition to ministering to the Orthodox it became responsible for the administrative and judicial problems of the Lutherans, Calvinists, Catholics, and Jews as well. The individual Protestant congregations were dependent upon themselves and had no higher administrative office. Only the church organizations in Livonia, Estonia, and Finland had their own central administration which represented their interests to the state. The congregations had to announce the election of their clergy and the prepositors to the Holy Synod for confirmation. The prepositors had to affirm their loyalty to the tsar by oath. In turn they took the oath from all pastors and submitted pertinent documentation with their signatures. The Holy Synod had to give its approval for the opening of new churches and the establishment of church schools. The College of the Judiciary, founded in 1718, and its department for Livonian and Estonian affairs extended its authority to include supervisory power over the Protestant Church. In spite of ostensible recognition the Protestants had to obey the repeated prohibition against proselytizing (1702, 1723, and 1735).[69] Special advantages were promised to those who converted to the Orthodox faith. In her manifesto of 22 July 1763, Catherine II solicited new settlers from Germany and western Europe for the Volga regions. She promised them free exercise of their religion, but prohibited clerics of non-Orthodox Christian faiths from attempting to convert Russian subjects to their faith.

---

[64] I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 274.

[65] Ibid., 142.

[66] Ibid., 142–44.

[67] Ibid., 9. By 1762 the population increased to 19 million and reached ca. 41 million in 1812.

[68] J. C. Grot, op. cit. I–III; R. Stupperich, ed., *Kirchenordnungen der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Rußland* (Ulm 1959); G. Langer, "Zuständigkeitsabgrenzungen für die christlichen Kirchen Rußlands in der Gesetzgebung des 17. bis zum Anfang des 19. Jh." *ZSavRGkan* 46 (1960), 452–470; E. Amburger, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Rußland* (Stuttgart 1961, incl. biblio.); I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte*, 129–32.

While the Protestants in Russia—in spite of subordination to the Holy Synod and subsequent limitations—were tolerated by the government and in part furthered, the situation of the Catholics of the Latin and Uniate Rite was oppressive.[70] Following the split between the Western and Eastern half of Christianity in the Middle Ages, an anti-Catholic prejudice had developed in Russia; it became even more pronounced after the Unions of Florence and Brest, which rejected the papacy and condemned Roman efforts at union as interference in the rights of the Orthodox Church. The repeated conquests of Moscow at the beginning of the seventeenth century were connected with the Catholic Counter Reformation and strengthened the distrust of everything Catholic. The Jesuits who had come to Moscow in the retinue of foreign legations in 1684 were expelled in 1689.[71] Although they returned after a few years as legation priests of Emperor Leopold I, their ministry was severely limited to Catholic immigrants; they were again expelled in 1719.[72] Their place was taken by Capuchins and Reformists, who were given scant possibilities to function and were, moreover, suspected of espionage.

---

[69] G. Langer, op. cit., 460, 462, 466.

[70] J. C. Grot I–II; A. Theiner, *Die Neuesten Zustände der Katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Rußland seit Katharina II. bis auf unsere Tage* (Augsburg 1841); D. Tolstoy, *Le catholicisme romain en Russie*, 2 vols. (Paris 1863–64); R. Ryšavy, "Die Reformatenmission in Rußland," *AFrH* 27 (1934), 179–224; A. V. Florovský, *Čeští Jesuité na Rusi* (Prague 1941); A. M. Ammann, op. cit., 373–75, 409–10, 441–47, 457–63; J. Reinhold, *Die St. Petersburger Missionspräfektur der Reformaten im 18. Jh.* (Florence 1963); B. Stasiewski, "Die kirchliche Organisation der deutschen katholischen Siedler in Rußland," *Festschr. für Margarete Woltner zum 70. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1967), 270–83.

Peter I, who—after his visit to the Sorbonne in 1717—had ordered an opinion from Feofan Prokopovich and Stefan Javorski regarding prospects of a union between the Russian and Catholic Churches, kept up a good personal relationship with several Catholics in his service, among them Vice-Admiral Matvei Zmaevich and the architect Carlo Bartolomeo Rastelli. But he showed a clear dislike for the Uniate Catholics whom he encountered during his campaigns in White Russia and Lithuania. He was angered by the fact that of the four Orthodox bishops in the southeast of Poland-Lithuania three (of Przemyśl, Lemberg, and Tuck) had joined the Union of Brest (1691 and 1702). In 1706 he had the Uniate, formerly Orthodox Bishop Dionysius Zabrokricki of Łuck forcibly taken to Russia, where he died in jail in 1715. Shortly before this incident, in 1705, there had been a verbal dispute between Peter I and some Basilian monks which ended with five monks being beaten to death.

When the Catholics, along with all other non-Orthodox Christians, were placed under the authority of the Holy Synod in 1721, there were mainly German, French, Italian, and Polish immigrants involved. The suppression of the Orthodox in Poland-Lithuania in the first half of the eighteenth century increased anti-Catholic sentiment in Russia. In 1746 and 1760 Tsarina Elizabeth allowed the Austrian auxiliary troops freedom of their religion only because she had to. In 1747 the Capuchins on mission work in Astrakhan were expelled. As a result of the settlement manifesto of 1763 about six thousand German Catholics came to the Volga region of Saratov. They were permitted to build churches, but monasteries and conversion among members of other Christian faiths were forbidden to them.[73] Disputes among Catholics in Saint Petersburg who were of different nationalities and subsequent appeals to the government led to the establishment of the Livonian department of the College of the Judiciary as their office of appeal. It drafted a set of regulations for the Catholic congregations which was published in 1769. It put the Catholics under state supervision and granted the laity a decisive influence in the election of the clerics.

---

[71] A. V. Florovský, op. cit., 149–67.

[72] Ibid., 320–27.

[73] R. Ryšavy, op. cit., 185.

After the Counter Reformation had prevailed in Poland-Lithuania and Catholicism as the national religion had relegated the other Christian faiths to a minor role,[74] Catherine II contrived to have her favorite, August Poniatowski, placed on the Polish throne (1764–95). Through her ambassador Nikolai Vasilevich Count Repnin she repeatedly interfered in the ecclesiastic affairs of her neighbor to prevent reforms initiated by prominent clerics. In 1767 she had the Bishops Kajetan Sołtyk of Crakow and Józef Andrzej Załuski of Kiev arrested and deported to Russia because they resisted her demands. The Polish partitions (1772, 1793, and 1795) caused large segments of the Catholic population to come under Russian rule. The tsarina found a willing helper in the person of the former Calvinist Stanisław Siestrencewicz-Bohusz (1731–1826),[75] who through her protection rose from suffragan bishop in Vilna to metropolitan of Mogilev, an archbishopric created by her. The new archbishopric to which all Catholic parishes were attached had to follow the *Regulations* of 1769. Only the Jesuits were able to preserve a certain amount of independence after their order was officially dissolved by Clement XIV (1773), because they willingly placed themselves at the disposal of the new rule in the capacity of teachers. The protest by Nuncios Giovanni Andrea Archetti and Lorenzo Litta notwithstanding, all Catholic church property in the areas occupied by Russia were secularized.

Catherine II proceeded ruthlessly against the Uniate Catholics.[76] With the exception of the archbishopric of Polock all Uniate bishoprics were dissolved. Moral force and police measures recombined the Uniates with the Orthodox. Those who dared protest were convicted as rebels. When the Uniate metropolitan of Kiev, Feodosi Rostovski, traveled to Saint Petersburg in order to protest, he was not allowed to return. The bishops of Chelm and Vladimir and the coadjutor of Łuck tried in vain to obtain help from the Curia. The Basilian order was secularized, its monasteries and property confiscated. The church policies of Catherine II cost the Uniate Church 8 million faithful, 9,316 parishes, and 145 Basilian monasteries from 1773 to 1796. In the region of Polock, too, government pressure became unmistakable. In a pastoral letter of 3 November 1795, Archbishop Heraklius Lisowsky had to announce that no one was allowed to put obstacles in the path of those who wished to convert to the Orthodox faith.

---

[74] B. Stasiewski, *Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen* (North Rhine-Westphalia 1960); idem, "Tausend Jahre polnischer Kirchengeschichte," *Kirche im Osten* 10 (1967), 48–67, especially 55.

[75] A. A. Brumanis, *Aux origines de la hiérarchie latine en Russie Mgr Stanislas Siestrzencewicz-Bohusz* (Louvain 1968).

[76] J. Madey, *Kirche zwischen Ost und West* (Munich 1969), 100–10.

Under Paul I there was at first some amelioration. The former Warsaw nuncio, Lorenzo Litta, participating as papal legate in the crowning of the tsar in 1797, submitted a memorandum concerning the desperate situation of the Uniate Catholics and the wishes of the Pope for improving the relationship between the two rites in Russia. The tsar did not accede to any negotiations, but he did revoke the dependence of the Catholics on the Department of Livonian and Estonian Affairs, decreed at the beginning of his reign, and instead subordinated them to a special department of the College of the Judiciary. Of his own accord he ordered six suffragan bishoprics to be incorporated in the archbishopric of Mogilev, recognized the Uniate archbishopric of Polock, and reestablished the dissolved Uniate bishoprics of Łuck and Brest in order to calm the unrest that had broken out in Wolhynia and White Russia. In November 1798 he issued a *reglament* for the Catholic Church of the Latin and Uniate Rites. After expelling Lorenzo Litta he appointed Archbishop Stanisław Siestrencewicz-Bohusz as head of the Catholic Church in Russia. A ministerial instruction explained the decree by saying that the complete "outward aspect" of the Church was claimed by the state and only the "religious aspect" was part of the Pope's supremacy.[77]

Parallel to the development in western, central, and southern Europe, where the system of established Churches had to a large extent prevailed, the absolute claim of the state's leadership over the Church had become a reality in eastern Europe as well. Neither the Orthodox Church nor other Christian faiths could avoid this development.

---

[77] A. M. Ammann, loc. cit., 461.

CHAPTER 14

The Autonomous and the Uniate Churches in the East

After the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 the Ottoman Empire reached the zenith of its power under Selim I (1512–20) with its expansion to Syria and Egypt and under Suleiman I (1522–66) with advances into southeastern Europe, the Mediterranean, and Asia, which made its sphere extend from Algeria and Tunisia to the Persian Gulf. In the seventeenth century a gradual decline set in brought about by interior crises as well as pressure from the Republic of Venice, the Habsburgs, Poland-Lithuania and the rise of Russia. The Sultans succeeded in spreading the Islamic faith to the Bulkans and in consolidating it in their empire, which spanned three continents.[1] The Koran was considered binding not only as a religious code but it also shaped the empire's political and cultural life. The "infidels" who did not embrace the faith of Mohammed were *reaya* ("grazing herd") and had to pay a head and property tax to the sultan. They had limited rights and were merely tolerated. The Moslems as representatives of the ruling religion designated the heretical religious communities as *millet.* This concept goes back to the Koran designating the Jews (Abraham's *millet*). In Turkish the word underwent a secular change coming to mean "nation." Thus the Orthodox Christians were combined in the *rum millet,* the Monophysite Christians in the *ermeti milleti,* which also included the Armenians, Copts, and Jacobites. A religious head (*millet bashi*) was responsible for the independent administration of these various bodies; he was directly under the sultan. The ecumenical patriarch, whose title the Greeks freely translated as "Ethnarch," was the most prominent. He could stabilize his ecclesiastical power by adaptation to the sultanate. The interests of the small groups of Catholics of the different Uniate rites and the even smaller ones of the Latin Rite, especially in the Holy Land, were represented by the Pope, French diplomats, and after the seventeenth century also by the German Emperor. Some Orthodox Churches were financially and politically supported by the Russian government. These factors contributed to the fact that the Ottoman Empire, imbued with the Islamic faith, guaranteed certain rights to individual Christian communities. But to a large extent the Eastern Churches, whether separated from or connected with Rome, were exposed to the caprice of the sultans and their officials. Consequently there were a great many defections from Christianity to Islam.

The Autonomous Eastern Churches

The constituents of the autonomous Eastern Churches were the four Eastern patriarchates of Christian antiquity,[2] the patriarchates in Bulgaria and Serbia, established in the Middle Ages, the Moscow patriarchate (founded in 1589),[3] the Orthodox Churches on Cyprus and Mount Sinai, the Eastern national Churches of the Orthodox Georgians, the Nestorians, and the Monophysites; among the latter we have to differentiate between the Churches of the Jacobites, the Christians of St. Thomas, the Copts, Ethiopians and Armenians.

---

[1] G. Vismara, *Bisanzio e l'Islam, per la storia dei trattati tra cristianità orientale e le potenze musulmane* (Milan 1950); T. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination* (Brussels 1952); B. Homsy, *Les capitulations et la protection des chrêtiens au Proche-Orient aux XVI^e, et XVII^e, et XVIII^e siècles* (Harissa 1956); A. Bombaci, "Das osmanische Reich," *Historia Mundi* VII (Berne 1957), 439–85; A. Fattal, *Le statut légal des nonmusulmans en pays d'Islam* (Beirut 1958); W. E. D. Allen, *Problems of Turkish Power in the XVIth Century* (London 1963); A. J. Arberry, loc. cit. II, 1–362; *Atlas zur Kirchengesch.* (Freiburg 1970), maps 72 and 96A.

[2] W. de Vries, *Die Patriarchate des Ostens, bestimmende Faktoren bei ihrer Entstehung: I patriarcati orientali nel primo millenio* (Rome 1968), 13–36.

The Orthodox Churches

Of the four Eastern patriarchates the youngest, Constantinople, achieved a leading position around the middle of the fifth century, a position it was able to maintain into the modern period. The appointment of Patriarch Gennadios Scholarios by Sultan Mehmed II in 1454 changed the harmonious balance, which had existed for a millennium between the Emperors and the patriarchal Church in Byzantium, into a state of dependence dictated by the state. Each newly elected patriarch had to request recognition by the sultan, for which he had to pay considerable sums of money. From the end of the fifteenth century on he also had to pay annual taxes, a large part of which he could only cover by selling ecclesiastical offices. In each case the official written recognition returned to the patriarch stipulated his authority. As the responsible head of the Orthodox population the patriarch was granted judicial and police powers on the basis of the *millet* system. By virtue of his political function as ethnarch he was considered governor of the sultan with the rank of a pasha. The disadvantages of such close ties to the Porte were evident in the fact that the patriarch's position was very insecure. Of the 162 "Archbishops of Constantinople, the New Rome, and Ecumenical Patriarchs" (their official title since 588) reigning at the time of the Ottomans, only 22 died in office.[4] Many of them—especially in the seventeenth century—were dismissed by the sultan and reinstalled,[5] some were executed at his order. As a result their average time in office between 1453 and 1821, the beginning of the Greek war of liberation, was only two and a half years. In the period from 1625 to 1700 the patriarchate was filled fifty times; in the eighteenth century there were 48 patriarchs in the course of seventy-three years.

After the Hagia Sophia was changed into a mosque, the patriarchs designated the monastery of Pammakaristos as their patriarchal church and relocated their see to the buildings of the monastery (1456–1586). Because the environs were inhabited almost exclusively by Turks they

---

[3] See Chap. 13.

[4] F. W. Fernau, op. cit., 73.

[5] Patriarch Cyril Lucaris even seven times: 1612, 1621–23, 1623–30, 1630–33, 1633–34, 1634–35, 1637–38. After his last dismissal he was strangled by Turkish soldiers on his way to the fortress of Rumelī Hisārī.

found a temporary abode in the palace of the prince of Walachia. Around 1600 they located their see in the *Phanar,* the Greek part of the city, where they raised the Church of Saint George to the status of patriarchal church. The *Phanar* was comparable to the Vatican. The great synods were convened in the *Phanar;* all matters were decided in the presence of as many archbishops and bishops as possible and the synods were frequently attended by the other Orthodox patriarchs or their representatives. The laymen involved in the administration of the Church rose to become the influential segment of the so-called *Phanariots,* who strengthened the Ottoman government in Moldavia and Walachia and strove for the Hellenization of the Orthodox Church on the Balkan peninsula.

The move to independence on the part of the Russian Patriarchal Church under Patriarch Jeremias II (1589), the Union of Brest (1595/96), the actions of the Curia to win over the Orthodox faithful, evidenced by the founding in Rome of colleges for the Eastern Churches, the appearance of Jesuits and Capuchins in Constantinople and other places forced the Orthodox Churches to counter Roman propaganda for the union and her mission policies. In the period of renewal within the Catholic Church and the time of the Counter Reformation, the Protestants had sought contacts with the Orthodox Church.[6] The scholarly Ecumenical Patriarch Cyril Lucaris (1624–38, with four brief interruptions),[7] who had been present at the Synod of Brest (1596) as representative of the patriarch of Alexandria and who had also been patriarch of Alexandria (1602–20), took from the works of Calvin arguments for use in his fight against Rome. He hoped that the creation of a united front of Orthodox and Calvinists would bring about a union in the true faith. His relationship with Cornelius Haga, the Dutch ambassador to Constantinople (1621–39), and with Antoine Léger, predicant at the Dutch embassy (1628–36), deepened his knowledge of Protestant confessional writings. He wanted to reform the Orthodox Church and to this end composed a *Confessio fidei,* which was published in Geneva first in Latin (1629) and then in a Greek translation (1633); in addition, one English and four French translations appeared simultaneously.[8] In this creed Cyril Lucaris relinquished important dogmas of the Eastern Church; he embraced the doctrine of the *sola scriptura,* denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, expressed regret at the veneration of icons, and called the invocation of the saints idolatry. The opposition against Cyril Lucaris was led by Metropolitan Contares of Berhoia, who took the former's place several times as Patriarch Cyril II (1633, 1635–36, 1638–39).[9] Contares was supported by the Vatican, as well as by French and imperial diplomats. The accusation that Cyril Lucaris had initiated treasonous connections with the tsar led to his fall; he was condemned to death. Three months later, on 24 September 1638,[10] his *Confessio fidei* was rejected by a large synod in Constantinople in which patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Jerusalem, twenty-one metropolitans and twenty-four other clerics took part. In 1640 Metropolitan Petrus Mogilas of Kiev drafted a *Confessio orthodoxa* which argued against the Calvinist views of Cyril Lucaris and represented the Orthodox point of view. Translated by the Greek theologian Meletios Sygiros from Latin into Greek, it was accepted by all the Eastern patriarchs at the Synod of Jassy in 1642 and the Synod of Constantinople in 1643.[11] The initial attempts by Cyril Lucaris to renew the Orthodox Church, to cleanse it of alleged falsifications by "papist innovations," and to bring about an approach to Protestantism had failed. The reorganization of the patriarchate of Constantinople, the establishment of a printing shop, and the translation of the New Testament into the Greek vernacular were stopped in their initial stages; only the planned educational reform of the priests was developed further at a later time. He failed in his attempt to involve the *Phanar* in the complicated maneuverings of European diplomacy along with the Sublime Porte, the Vatican, and the Catholic and Protestant powers in order to influence the presence and future development of Christianity. The ecumenical patriarchate remained in a state of dependence on the sultanate. Cyril II Contares was dismissed in 1639, arrested, deported to North Africa, and strangled in 1640.

---

[6] E. Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz. Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Reformation mit der östlich-orthodoxen Kirche* (Marburg 1949).

[7] R. Belmont, "Le patriache Cyrille Lukaris et l'union des églises," *Irénikon* 15 (1938), 342–63, 535–53; G. A. Hadjiantoniou, *Protestant Patriarch. The Life of Cyril Lucaris (1572–1638), Patriarch of Constantinople* (London 1961); G. Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik 1620–1638* (Wiesbaden 1968; biblio.)

[8] G. Hering, op. cit., 188; also cf. Jugie I, 505–7.

Under supervision by the government, the subsequent patriarchs made efforts to preserve their jurisdictional sphere and to consolidate it in present-day Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Greece. By 1700 they were at the head of sixty-three metropolitans, eighteen exempt archbishops, and seventy bishops. Whereas the Slavic languages dominated the Balkans in the sixteenth century, the new upper class promoted Greek. Initially the Greek-speaking families furnished the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries, but after the seventeeth century the bishops were almost exclusively Greek. The *Phanar,* meanwhile, aimed at eliminating the autonomy of the Balkan Orthodox Churches. In 1766 the Serbian patriarchate of Ipek was abolished; in 1767 the autocephaly of the Bulgarian archbishopric of Achrida was dissolved by Sultan Mustafa III and incorporated in the ecumenical patriarchate and Hellenized by it. The Turkish designation of its dominion in Europe as Rumeli, Land of the Rum (Greeks), appeared justified. Patriarch Samuel Khanzeris (1763–68, 1773–74), a Phanariotic parvenue whose brother, the governor of Walachia, was recalled and executed by the Sultan for extortion, attempted to lessen the influence of the Sublime Porte on the election or appointment of the patriarchs by forming a college of councilors. But he could not keep the rival Greek families from increasing the dependence of the patriarchate upon the sultan by calling upon him as a referee in their fight for political and ecclesiastical positions.

---

[9] G. Hering, op. cit., 427.

[10] Mansi XXXIV, 1719–21.

[11] Ibid., XXXIV, 1629–38; Jugie I, 508–9; G. Hering, op. cit., n. 103.

The dependence of the ecumenical patriarchs on the government of the Ottoman Empire merely guaranteed outward security. The life of the Church was unable to develop. The threat of the death penalty for conversion to Christianity, the ban against building new churches, the apostasy of Orthodox faithful to Islam were dangerous implications. In the face of these, the patriarchs made efforts to improve the education of the priests; Cyril Lucaris (1627), Samuel Khanzeris (1767), Gregorios V (1798), and others set up printing shops. But the Orthodox heritage of the forefathers was primarily preserved by the monasteries. The monks and recluses on Mount Athos,[12] whose privileges were not touched by the Turks and were, in fact, expanded with the help of the Russian Tsars and Emperors, formed a religious center which was supported by the whole Orthodox Church. Their abbots did not shy away from traveling to the West asking for money, as did Abakum Andriani, abbot of Iberon, at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[13] The Athonias School near the monastery of Vatopädi had been planned as an academy; its director, Eugenios Bulgaris (1753–57), made a name for himself as editor of Greek authors and as a controvertist, but because of the resistance of numerous monks against all higher education the school did not flourish.

The patriarchs of the four Eastern sees had the title "Father and Shepherd, Pope and Patriarch of the Great City of Alexandria of Lybia, Pentapolis, Ethiopia, Father of Fathers, Shepherd of Shepherds, Bishop of Bishops, Thirteenth Apostle and Judge of the World." But even at the end of the sixth century the glory of the Alexandrian Church of Christian antiquity faded when most of the faithful joined a form of

---

[12] *Le millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963, études et mélanges,* 2 vols. (Chevetogne 1964); P. Huber, *Athos. Leben, Glaube, Kunst* (Zurich 1969).

[13] H. de Greeve, "Neue Quellen zur ersten Reise des Athosabtes Abakum Andriani in Westeuropa," *OstKSt* 16 (1967), 325–33.

Monophysitism under its own Coptic patriarch. Copts and Melchites (from the Syrian *malko*), as the Orthodox followers of the Byzantine Emperor were called, were equally oppressed by the Arabs. The dependence on Byzantium of the Melchite Orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, whose following was further decreased by anti-Christian government measures, brought with it the displacement of the stately old Alexandrian liturgy by the Byzantine liturgy. From 1209 to 1316 the patriarchs resided in Constantinople; they were represented in Alexandria by a deputy. After the fall of the imperial city many Greeks fled to Alexandria. Following the conquest of Egypt by Sultan Selim I, Patriarch Joachim Pany (1487–1567) established good relations with the Turkish rulers, but under his successors the patriarchate deteriorated into total dependence on the Sublime Porte and the ecumenical patriarch. Initially the patriarchs took up residence in Constantinople while an archimandrite ministered to the faithful, who were reduced to a mere five thousand in the eighteenth century. Several patriarchs of Alexandria played a fairly important role in the *Phanar.* Among them were Meletios I Pegas (1590–1601), who administered the ecumenical patriarchate in 1597/98; the already mentioned Cyril Lucaris (1602–20); Gerasimos Startaliotes (1620–1639), who founded the first Greek schools in Cairo and Alexandria and maintained connections with the Moscow patriarchate and the Anglican Church; Paisios (1657–77) who took part in the Moscow Synod of 1666 against Nikon; and, lastly, Samuel Kapasulis (1710–23).

At the time of the Arab rule and the Ottoman Empire, the patriarchs of Antioch also depended strongly on the patriarch of Constantinople. At the end of the thirteenth century they relocated their residence to Damascus, the capital of the Arab caliphate. After the conquest of Syria by Sultan Selim I in 1516 they had to submit to the Turks, whose taxation added greatly to the debt of the patriarchate. Patriarchs Joachim V (1584–87) and Makarios III (1647–72) made trips to Russia for the purpose of soliciting gifts of money. In the course of the seventeenth century, Jesuits and Franciscans achieved some success in their efforts regarding union. In 1683 Archbishop Euthymios of Sydan and Tyre embraced Catholicism. He initiated the establishment of an independent Uniate Melchite patriarchate (1724), which was joined by many Orthodox faithful. In 1718 Archbishop Euthymios was excommunicated by Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias III and then arrested by the Sultan, but Louis XIV brought about his release. From 1724 to 1851 the *Phanar* made sure that only Greeks would hold the office of patriarch. Among the Arabic-speaking people they competed for influence with the Monophysites and the Uniate Catholics.

The island of Cyprus, originally under the patriarchate of Antioch,[14] preserved its autocephaly, recognized by the Council of Ephesus, for over a thousand years throughout all political and ecclesiastic disorders into the sixteenth century. When the Turks occupied the island in 1571, they introduced the *millet* system and appointed the archbishop as ethnarch of all the Greeks living there. They suffered greatly under the oppressive new rule, especially in the seventeenth century. The Synod of Leukosia (1668) under Archbishop Nikephoros condemned the Calvinist views of Patriarch Cyril Lucaris. Being isolated, the archbishops again reestablished a connection with the patriarchs of Antioch, from whom they received the Holy Myron in 1860.

After 1543 the patriarchate of Jerusalem, too, was occupied exclusively by Greeks. After Selim I incorporated Palestine into the Ottoman Empire, they were politically and ecclesiastically under the influence of Constantinople. Since they were leading the "Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre," the sultan granted them full jurisdiction over the holy places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem; this was contested by several other Christian communities. Patriarch Germanos Peloponnesios (1534–79) and many of his successors made frequent trips to the centers of Orthodox Christendom collecting funds for the places of pilgrimage. In addition, the ecumenical patriarchs and the ecclesiastical princes of Moldavia and Walachia also extended their efforts towards the preservation of those places. Some patriarchs made serious efforts to gain possession of the holy places. Among them were Patriarchs Theophanes III (1608–44), Paisios (1645–60), Nektarios (1660–69), and Dositheos II (1669–1707),[15] who enjoyed great esteem among the whole Orthodox Church. He established a Greek press with which to counter the propaganda of the Roman and Uniate Catholics. At a synod in Bethlehem-Jerusalem in 1672[16] he had the rejection of the *Confessio fidei* by Cyril Lucaris reasserted; the rejection was seconded by a synod in Constantinople the same year.[17] The struggle over the holy places was continued by Patriarchs Chrysanthos (1707–31) and Parthenios (1737–66). They succeeded in regaining possession of the places of pilgrimage, administered since 1689 by the Franciscans. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the patriarchate comprised six metropolitans, seven archbishops, and one bishop. Most of them lived in Jerusalem, four in their small eparchies, and one in the monastery on

---

[14] Hippolytos, "Die Autokephale Apostolische Orthodoxe Kirche Cyperns," *Ekklesia* X 117–29.

[15] A. Palmieri, *Dositeo, Patriarca greco di Gerusalemme* (Florence 1909).

[16] Mansi XXXIV, 1651–1776; Jugie I, 509–10.

[17] Mansi XXXIV, 1777–90.

Mount Sinai. The patriarchal school established in 1736 intensified its activities under Patriarch Anthimos (1788–1808).

Closely connected to the patriarchate of Jerusalem was the small Orthodox church on Mount Sinai. It was led by an archbishop who at the same time was abbot of the Monastery of Saint Catherine.[18] Its monks received letters of safe passage from Sultan Selim I and his successors. The monastic buildings adjacent to the church and protected by a wall against attacks by the Bedouins contained a famous library with valuable Greek, Georgian, and Slavic manuscripts, as well as a pinacotheca with old icons. Its abbot-archbishop cultivated good relations with the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem and with the Orthodox Greeks on the island of Crete. The monks of Mount Sinai built a school in Herakleion on Crete among whose graduates were Alexandrian Patriarch Meletios Pegas and the painter Domenicos Theotokopoulos (1548–1614), known as El Greco. Because the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch contested each other's jurisdiction over the archbishopric of Sinai, the Synod of Constantinople declared the church autocephalic in 1575; this ruling was recognized by all Eastern patriarchs in 1782. Each abbot of Sinai was consecrated as bishop by the patriarch of Jerusalem.

While the Church on Mount Sinai in the south of the Ottoman Empire gained its independence, the Bulgarian and Serbian Churches on the Balkan Peninsula lost theirs. Since the early Middle Ages the Byzantine Church had achieved great successes in its mission there. During the periods of 927 to 1018 and 1235 to 1393 the Orthodox Bulgarians had their own patriarchate with the residence in Achrida and Trnovo respectively. After the conquest of Bulgaria by the Turks in 1393 they were placed under the archbishopric of Achrida, which became ever more dependent on the ecumenical patriarchate in the centuries which followed.[19] Bulgarian rebellions (1595 and 1688) against the Turkish rule heightened the tensions between the monasteries adhering to the national traditions and the upper clergy installed by the *Phanar.* By order of Sultan Mustafa III the archbishopric was incorporated into the patriarchate of Constantinople in 1767; the books in Church Slavonic were removed and replaced by Greek ones. The Bulgarian language was suppressed by the Greek hegemony; the church administration was completely in the hands of Greeks. The same sort of development took place in the principalities of Moldavia and Walachia, where the Rumanian liturgical language began spreading after 1648, but the Greek influence nonetheless remained decisive after the eighteenth century.

---

[18] H. L. Rabino, *Le monastère de Saint-Catherine du Mont Sinai* (Cairo 1938).

[19] I. Snĕgarov, *Istorija na ochridskata archiepiskopija-patriarsija ot padeneto i pod turcitĕ do nejnoto unišoženie 1394–1767* (Sofia 1931); A. P. Péchayre, "L archevêché d'Ochrida de 1394 à 1767," *ÉO* 35 (1936), 183–204, 280–323; S. Zankow, "Die Bulgarische Orthodoxe Kirche in Gesch. und Gegenwart," *IKZ* 48 (1958), 189–208.

The Serbian Church also lost its independence. In 1219 it had been granted its own archbishopric and in 1351 its own patriarchate in Peć (Ipek); in 1459 it was placed under the jurisdiction of the archbishopric of Achrida. In 1557 Grand Vizier Mehmed Sokolović, a Serb converted to Islam, reinstated the patriarchate and appointed his brother, the monk Makarios, patriarch of Ipek. For the next two centuries Serbs and Greeks fought for this office, which the sultan gave to those who offered the most for it.[20] From 1690 to 1765 a total of fourteen patriarchs succeeded one another, continually increasing the debt of the patriarchate from one decade to the next. The emigration in 1690 of thirty thousand Serbian families led by their patriarch Arsenije III into areas taken from the Turks by the Habsburgs and the emigration of a similar number under their patriarch Arsenije IV caused the *Phanar* to intensify its efforts to place only dependable Greeks in the patriarchates and the bishoprics. In 1766 Patriarch Samuel Khanzeris of Constantinople finally induced Sultan Mustafa III to abolish the Serbian patriarchate. It was combined with the metropolitanate of Prizren and incorporated in the ecumenical patriarchate. Several Serbian hierarchs turned to Tsarina Catherine II for help, but were unable to obtain relief. All bishoprics were subsequently filled by Greeks. The only exception was the metropolitan of Cetinje in Montenegro, whose princes had wrung some degree of independence from the Ottoman rule and established close connections with Russia. He managed to avoid the incorporation, and as a result the Orthodox Church of Montenegro became autocephalic.

The abolition of the national Serbian and Bulgarian Churches in 1766 and 1767 placed all Christian subjects of the sultanate in Europe under one uniform ecclesiastical administration. The ecumenical patriarch promoted the use of Greek for the Mass in every part of the patriarchate; he had Greek schools established and consolidated his position throughout the Ottoman Empire.

Only one numerically strong autocephalic Orthodox Church remained, the Greater Church of Georgia,[21] which had separated from the patriarchate in the early Middle Ages and formed a catholicate at the end of the seventh century. The Byzantine rule in the eleventh century produced an accommodation with the Church of the Byzantine Empire for which the adoption of the Byzantine liturgy in the Georgian language was symbolic. After the collapse of political independence in the late Middle Ages, Turks and Persians fought for Georgia, the larger part of which came under Persian supremacy. But the majority of the population remained Orthodox and resisted the Islamization by their rulers, although defections to Turkish tribes near Batum and on the coast of the Black Sea did occur and a so-called third faith, a mixture of Christian, Islamic, and heathen ideas, started spreading. The catholicos was dependent on the benevolence of the Persian governor. When Catholicos Jesse became susceptible to overtures by the Capuchin and Theatine friars regarding union, he was dismissed by a synod in 1755. King Erekle II of East Georgia (1744–98) sought closer connections with Orthodox Russia in order to decrease his dependence on Persia. His treaty with Catherine II (1783) initiated the eventual annexation by Russia. In 1801 Tsar Alexander I declared western Georgia and in 1803 all of Georgia to be Russian provinces. Catholicos Antonios II had to abdicate and go to Russia. The catholicate was dissolved and the Georgian Church was entrusted to a Russian exarch (1817) who had his residence in Tiflis. The construction of Russian monasteries in Georgia was intended to add to the number of the Russian Orthodox faithful.

---

[20] N. Djordjević, *Die Selbständigkeit der Serbischen Kirche* (diss., Berne 1922); A. Hudal, *Die serbisch-orthodoxe Nationalkirche* (Graz and Leipzig 1922), 21–38; L. Hadrovics, *Le peuple serbe et son église sous la domination turque* (Paris 1947); C. Jelavich, "Some aspects of Serbian Religious Development in the eighteenth Century," *CH* 23 (1954), 144–52; V. Pospischil, *Der Patriarch in der Serbisch-Orthodoxen Kirche* (Vienna 1966), 32–45.

[21] M. Tamarati, *L'Église Géorgienne* (Rome 1910); M. Tarchnišvili, "Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der kirchlichen Autokephalie Georgiens," *Kyrios* 5 (1940–41), 177–93; C. Toumanoff, "Introduction to Christian Caucasian History," *Tr* 15 (1959), 1–104.

The Oriental National Churches of the Nestorians and Monophysites

The Nestorian Church,[22] whose missionary work had spread its faith to Persia, Turkestan, Tibet, Mongolia, China, and to the Malabar Coast in India during the Middle Ages, was confined by the Mongols, especially Timur Lane (1360–1405), to the mountain regions of Northern Kurdistan and Persian Azerbaijan on Lake Urmia.[23] The Nestorian catholicos, i.e., patriarch, who had resided in Baghdad from 750 to 1258 moved his see to the monastery of Rabban Hurmuz near Mosul. Since the middle of the fifteenth century it had become customary to have nephew follow uncle in the catholicate. But after the death of Patriarch Simon VII bar Mamma, part of the clergy and laity refused to recognize his nephew Simon VIII Denha (1551–59) and instead elected John Sulaga, abbot of the monastery of Rabban Hurmuz. But the latter could not be consecrated for lack of an authorized Nestorian metropolitan. So John reestablished ties to the Curia, which had been fashioned by the Nestorians in the high and late Middle Ages. He went to Rome, embraced the primacy and the Catholic creed, was consecrated bishop in 1553 and proclaimed patriarch of the Chaldeans by Pope Julius III. When he returned home, he was arrested by the Turks, rulers of the land of the Euphrates and Tigris since 1534. He died a prisoner in 1555. In 1672 Simon XIII Denha separated from that Uniate patriarchate with its seat in Diarbekr west of the upper Tigris and founded his own, the so-called Mountain Nestorian patriarchate, with the residence in Kotschannes in Kurdistan. The old Nestorian patriarchate also remained; its faithful—in contrast to the Uniate Chaldeans—were called Assyrians. Defections by Uniate patriarchs to Nestorianism and back increased the confusion among the Nestorians (comprised of about forty thousand families).

---

[22] *Atlas zur Kirchengesch.* (Freiburg 1970), map 27.

[23] A. R. Vine, *The Nestorian Churches* (London 1937); B. Spuler, "Die nestorianische Kirche," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (Leiden and Cologne 1961), 120–69; P. Kawerau, "Die nestorianischen Patriarchate in der neueren Zeit," *ZKG* 67 (1955/56), 119–31; A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 237–302.

Among the Monophysite communities there were the Churches of the Jacobites of western Syria, the Christians of Saint Thomas, the Copts, Ethiopians and Armenians.

The Jacobite Syrian Church,[24] having flourished in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, was divided in the late Middle Ages and split into four rival centers which suffered under the oppression of the Mongol Timur Lane. In 1495 Ignatius XII Noah (1483–1509) was able to reunite the patriarchate. But his successors, who had resided in Amida since 1555 and in Aleppo since the seventeenth century, had a mere twenty bishoprics under their jurisdiction; the number of faithful was estimated at fifty thousand families in 1583. The majority of them inhabited Tur-Abdin in the Izla Mountains, where their survivors are living even now. The existence of the Church was further weakened by successful efforts at union during the second half of the seventeenth century. Yet the Church experienced some growth when it was joined by Uniate Nestorians in South India during the patriarchate of Ignatius XXIII (1662–86). But the lack of seminaries for priests and monks prevented development of the Jacobite Syrian Church in the eighteenth century.

The Nestorian faithful in South India were called *Surjani* (Syrians) because of the language of their cult. They called themselves Christians of Saint Thomas after the Apostle Thomas.[25] Their bishops were ap-

---

[24] P. Kawerau, *Die jakobitische Kirche im Zeitalter der syrischen Renaissance* (Berlin 1955); B. Spuler, "Die westsyrische (monophysitische/jakobitische) Kirche," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (1961), 170–216; A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 167–235.

[25] E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India. A History of the Syro-Malabar Church from the Earliest Time to the Present Day* (London, New York and Toronto 1957); B. Spuler,

pointed by the Nestorian catholicos. The union effected under Portuguese rule in the sixteenth century and the decisions of the Synod of Diamper (Urdiamperur) near Cochin in 1599 met with considerable resistance. Archdeacon Thomas Palakomot, having protested unsuccessfully in Rome (1637) against the destruction of most of the Nestorian liturgical books and also against the Latinization of his Church, established contacts with the Nestorian, Jacobite, and Coptic patriarchs, asking them to furnish a bishop. In 1653 twelve priests declared him their Metropolitan Mar Thomas I by the laying on of hands. He is assumed to have been legally consecrated ex post facto by the Jacobite Bishop Mar Gregorios of Jerusalem. In an open letter he asserted the correctness of the Syrian faith and rite as opposed to the Catholic Church. The majority of the approximately two hundred thousand Christians of Saint Thomas joined him; only a small percentage remained obedient to the Portuguese Roman Catholic Archbishop Franciscus Garcia (1641–59).[26] Mar Thomas I started the line of metropolitans of the Christians of Saint Thomas who subordinated themselves to the western Syrian patriarchate. Mar Thomas II (1670–86) and Mar Thomas IV (1688–93) were able to offset Nestorian attempts at reconversion and solidify the Monophysite Church organization with support by the western Syrian patriarchs. Their struggle for autonomy progressed during the eighteenth century, but so did efforts at union by the Jesuits and Carmelites. By 1770 their Church comprised about fifty thousand faithful in thirty-two parishes under Metropolitan Mar Thomas VI, who assumed the name Mar Dionysios I (1765–1808) after his consecration in 1772.[27] That same year a congregation in the north of the Christian area which did not recognize the dependence on the western Syrian patriarchate defected and declared itself the autonomous Church of Annur. The fact that a considerable segment of the original Nestorian Christians of Saint Thomas changed to Monophysitism proves that the latter had more charisma than the Nestorian Church of the seventeenth century. Metropolitan Mar Dionysios I, who came from an aristocratic Catholic family but had been educated by his Monophysite uncle Mar Thomas V, repeatedly negotiated union

---

"Die Thomas-Christen in Süd-Indien," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (1961), 226–39; P. J. Podipara, *Die Thomas-Christen* (Würzburg 1966); N. J. Thomas, *Die Syrisch-Orthodoxe Kirche der Südindischen Thomas-Christen* (Würzburg 1967); A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 357–88.

[26] K. Werth, *Das Schisma der Thomaschristen unter Erzbischof Franciscus Garzia* (Limburg a.d. Lahn 1937).

[27] J. Kollaparambil, "Mar Dionysius the Great of Malabar, for the One True Fold," *OrChrP* 30 (1964), 148–92.

with the vicar apostolic of Malabar. In 1799 he reembraced Catholicism, but reverted to Monophysitism after another six months.

The Coptic Church of Egypt, consisting of six million Christians in the early Middle Ages, called *kibt* (Copts) by their Arabian conquerors, lost in importance in the further course of the Middle Ages because of internal conflicts and anti-Christian measures by their Islamic rulers, especially the Mamelukes. By about 1400 they were a mere tenth in an Arab population embracing Islam. Under Turkish rule from 1517 to 1798,[28] which installed Mameluke governors in Cairo, the patriarchs residing in Cairo were unable to stop the deterioration of theological education and the decline in the number of their faithful. These were estimated at a mere one hundred fifty thousand around 1700. Most of their once flourishing monasteries had been either dissolved or had disintegrated. The Turkish government prevented contacts with other Monophysite Churches, such as the Egyptian Church, all of which were prosecuted as being dangerous to the state. In the second half of the eighteenth century the Coptic Church was indebted to the politically influential and wealthy Gauhari family for generous gifts. Ibrahim Gauhari had old Coptic manuscripts copied and given to several churches restored by him. Under Marcus VIII (1796–1809) the Coptic patriarchate showed the first signs of a renewal which was to continue throughout the nineteenth century. He relocated his residence to the property deeded to the Church by Ibrahim Gauhari in Ezbikije, a suburb of Cairo, where he rebuilt the old monastery church of Saint Mark, which had been burned in street fighting with the French in 1798.

The established Monophysite Church of Ethiopia[29] was dependent on the Coptic patriarch, who delegated to it a metropolitan as its *abuna* (our father). One of his tasks was to anoint the king (*negus*). The most prominent position next to him was occupied by the abbot of the monastery of Dabra Libanos; in his capacity as court confessor he was given the title of *etschege* (the one standing next to the assistant of the throne) in the fifteenth century. He was the one who supervised all monastic property. The Church's ties to its mother Church were not very close because of the spreading of the Islamic faith in Egypt and Nubia. Black tribes advancing from the periphery into the interior of the country increased its isolation. When new attacks by Islamic princes took place at the beginning of the sixteenth century and the Ottomans of Massaua in Eritrea threatened to shake the state structure of Ethiopia in 1527, Negus Lebna Denghel (1508–40) sought help from the Pope and the King of Portugal, who in turn was seeking bases in order to secure naval passage around Africa to his possessions in India. With the help of the Portuguese the negus and his successors managed to vanquish the fanatical Islamic invader Ahmad ibn Ibrahim al Ghazi, who had destroyed many churches and monasteries. The Jesuits who had come into the country with the Portuguese were later expelled by Negus Claudius (1540–59). Half a century later Negus Atnas Sagas (Za Denghel) was converted to Catholicism by the Jesuit priest Pedro Páez (1569–1622) just before he died. Páez also persuaded the former's successor, Malak Sagad III (Susenyos) (1607–32), to conclude a union. The abuna's protests against the union and against the patriarch of Ethiopia, Alonso Mendes, who had been designated by King Philip IV of Spain and recognized by Pope Urban VIII, and the rebellions against the Latinization of the Ethiopian Church by the Portuguese forced the negus to abdicate. His successor, Fasiladas (Basilides) (1632–67), canceled the union and imposed the death penalty on Catholic clerics who entered the country. The stirrings of union in the Ethiopian Church were reflected in various writings of the period in the colloquial language of Amharic. After its ties with the Coptic Church were restored (1632), translations of theological and legal works from the Arabic (of which there had been earlier evidence) increased, but ended in the eighteenth century as a result of civil wars and wars with the Hamitic nomads. In the seventeenth century the issue, discussed as early as the Middle Ages in rival monastic schools, of whether Jesus Christ received his divine nature at birth or later at the baptism on the Jordan (*unctio,* anointment) created the two parties of the Uniates and Unctionists. Around 1740 a third group maintained that Jesus was "anointed," "anointment" and "the anointed" in one. These and other Christological disputes extended into the nineteenth century. In the process there was no lack of mutual accusations of the Arian, the Nestorian, and the Cryptocatholic heresies. There were turbulent disputations and temporary predominance of one or the other current of thought, leading to victory by the abuna, a provincial prince, or the negus, often after bloody battles. But the basic Monophysite concept proved stronger in the end than all the quarrels concerning the interpretation of the one nature of Christ, and the unity of the Ethiopian Church remained intact.

---

[28] R. Strothmann, *Die Koptische Kirche in der Neuzeit* (Tübingen 1932); M. Cramer, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten einst und heute* (Wiesbaden 1959); S. Chauleur, *Histoire des Coptes d'Égypte* (Paris 1960); B. Spuler, "Die koptische Kirche," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (1961), 269–308; A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 99–101; A. J. Arberry, op. cit. II, 423–53.

[29] H. M. Hyatt, *The Church of Abyssinia* (London 1928); B. Spuler, "Die äthiopische Kirche," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (1961), 309–24; E. Hammerschmidt, *Äthiopien. Christliches Reich zwischen gestern und morgen* (Wiesbaden 1967); A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 146–66; op. cit., 454–81.

In the Middle Ages the Monophysite Armenian Church,[30] also called Gregorian (after its founder Gregory the Enlightener), had broken up into several jurisdictions. This had been caused by the migrations and subsequent divisions of the Armenian people. In addition to the catholicate of Wagharchapat, or Aghtamar in its original homeland, a patriarchate with residence in Sis in the kingdom of Lesser Armenia had come into existence during the second half of the thirteenth century. It ministered to the Armenians in Cilicia, northern Syria and on the island of Cyprus. Since 1311 there had also been a patriarchate of Jerusalem. In 1441 several bishops, having quarreled with the patriarch of Sis, who had been raised from the office of catholicos, founded a new catholicate at the monastery of Etchmiadzin at Mount Ararat. In 1463 Sultan Mehmed II had the patriarchate of Constantinople established for the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Without clarifying the canonical aspects, the catholicos of Etchmiadzin came to be the most influential ecclesiastical shepherd of the Armenians for the next few centuries. In the middle of the seventeenth century he was recognized by the sultanate as the supreme Armenian ecclesiastic, although the patriarch of Constantinople retained his special civil position. Caught between the expansionary struggles of the Ottoman and Persian rulers, the Armenians repeatedly suffered persecutions which caused part of them to emigrate to the Holy Land, Poland-Lithuania, and India. The Persians forced those Armenians living on the western periphery of their realm to leave their settlements, assigning them new ones in Iran. Shah Abbas I (1587–1628) carried the catholicos off to his capital of Isfahan. The new Catholicos Moses III (1629–32), elected during his predecessor's imprisonment, had come from a reformed monastic order and renewed church life. Some of his predecessors as well as successors, such as Stephan V (1545–64) and Nahapet (1691–1705), were prepared for union with Rome. While pertinent negotiations were successful in the patriarchate of Sis, they were suppressed in the patriarchate of Constantinople by Patriarch John Golod (1715–41). In the second half of the eighteenth century the supreme shepherds of Etchmiadzin established ties with the Russian Empire, which was expanding into the Caucasus. In 1797 northern Armenia and in 1828/29 the largest part of Greater Armenia were annexed by Russia. After 1800 the catholicate was under Russian influence.

---

[30] F. Tournebize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie* (Paris 1910); M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia* (London 1955); B. Spuler, "Die armenische Kirche," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (1961), 240–68; J. Mécérian, *Histoire et institutions de l'Église arménienne* (Beirut 1965); A. K. Sanjian, *The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion* (London 1965).

During the first few decades of the nineteenth century all autonomous Orthodox, Nestorian, and Monophysite Churches suffered greatly under the strong pressure of their Turkish, Persian, and Russian rulers. This restricted their development and limited their work to the liturgical realm. The number of their faithful decreased, but in spite of all the oppressions those who remained loyal to their faith preserved the heritage of their fathers, the properties of their faith, and their liturgies, the essentials of which had their origin as far back as Christian antiquity. Their perseverance in the midst of trials and tribulation gives witness to their Christian history.

The Uniate Churches

The union of Rome with the Greeks, signed at the Council of Florence in 1439 and in 1442–45 joined by the Armenians, Copts, Syrian Jacobites, and groups of Nestorians and Maronites living on Cyprus, was but of short duration. The further the Ottomans advanced west and south, the more quickly the ties between the Apostolic See and the Uniate Churches in the Near East, the islands of the eastern Mediterranean and the Balkan peninsula were cut. The Popes had no means by which to counter these reverses. Their expectation that military victory over the Turks fighting under the banner of their prophet might pave the way for reunification of the separated halves of Eastern and Western Christendom proved illusory. They tried in the sixteenth and seventeenth century to bring about coalitions against the Turks, and at times were successful, as evidenced by the defense of Vienna in 1689. But their becoming part of the development of the Western world was manifested in the modern-day unions organized by them. To be sure, these unions bore a different stamp from the *communio* of all partial Churches in existence during the first millenium. In the West a uniformly and well-organized Church had been developed under the direction of Popes who had scant understanding of the autonomous administration of the Eastern Churches which had developed since Christian antiquity. In addition, many members of religious orders urged Latin spirituality upon the Uniate Churches and, further, the Greek (1576) and Maronite Colleges (1584) founded in Rome for the education of Uniate clerics were based (among other things) upon Scholastic theology. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith gave orders initially to win individual believers over to the Catholic Church but at first to have them remain in their mother Church. The intention was to gain influence slowly and—given a vacancy—to get a patriarch or catholicos appointed who would embrace Catholicism. One such instance was the elevation of Michael Garweh to the patriarchate of Antioch after the death of George III in 1783.[31]

For several reasons the unions—with the exception of the one concluded with the Maronites in 1515—lasted but a short time or proved to be durable only after several tries. The Popes paid close attention to keeping the privileges granted the Uniate Churches and safeguarding their Armenian, Byzantine, Chaldaic, Coptic, Maronite, and Syrian rites. But several Western rulers formulated plans to effect a union while pursuing their own motives, as for instance the Kings of France in the Near East, the German Emperors in Siebenbürgen (Hungary), and the Kings of Poland-Lithuania with their magnates in the Ukraine.

The unions were generally considered an intermediate step between Latin Christendom and an Eastern Christendom which was to be eschewed. In the course of the centuries the influences of Latin liturgy and Roman canon law became more and more noticeable in the life of the Uniate Churches. The blend of Eastern features and Latin traditions, sharply criticized as "Uniatism" by Eastern theologians, militated against the development of many unions in eastern and southern Europe, in the Near East, in northeastern Africa, and the Indies.

The union with the Ruthenians and Ukrainians in Poland-Lithuania, concluded in Rome (1595) and accepted at the synod in Brest (1596), was slow to permeate all segments of the population.[32] It lacked the support of the authoritative circle of the magnates, who were either Orthodox or Roman Catholic. Polish theologians considered union as a transitional phenomenon and therefore extended their efforts towards a reduction in the separate customs granted to the Uniate rites and towards a gradual Latinization of their cult. In 1620 when the Orthodox Church reestablished its metropolitanate of Kiev, which flourished quickly under the leadership of Archbishop Petrus Mogilas (1633–45), several Uniate bishops returned to it. The piecemeal defections from the union could not be stopped until the reign of King Jan III Sobieski (1674–96), when the Uniate Basilians formed a new congregation and several Orthodox eparchs switched to the union. The Synod of Samosc (1720),[33] convened by Archbishop Leo II Kiszka (1714–28), was presided over by the papal nuncio Girolamo Grimaldi. Its significance for the Uniate Ukrainians has been compared to that of the Council of Trent for the Latin Church. It wanted to eliminate abuses, elevate education and discipline among the clergy and populace and harmonize the Orthodox tradition with the demands of the time. Its decisions—in contrast to those of the Synod of Brest—demonstrated a certain amount of adaptation to the Latin Rite and the customs of the Roman Church. This synod gave to the Byzantine-Ukrainian Rite its special form, which has remained the most widespread non-Latin Rite of the Catholic Church to the present day. After just a few decades of undisturbed development, witnessed by the church architecture of Lemberg, Polock, and other towns, the Polish partitions and the westward expansion of Russia initiated strong political pressure against the Uniate rites within the Russian sphere of influence, forcing them to return to the Orthodox Church.[34] Only in Galicia, which had come under Austria, could they continue to develop their Churches.

---

[31] W. de Vries, *Rom,* 245 and 356.

[32] A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Wien 1950), 199–215, 299–336, 415–447; A. G. Welykyj, ed., *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia (1075–1953)*, 2 vols. (Rome 1953–54); G. Lužnickij, *Ukrainska cerkva miž schodom i zachodom* (Philadelphia 1954); W. de Vries, *Rom.* 102–7; J. Krajcar, "The Ruthenian Patriarchate. Some remarks on the project for its establishment in the 17th century," *OrChrP* 30 (1964), 65–84.

[33] J. Bilanych, *Synodus Zamostiana an. 1720* (Rome 1960); J. Madey, op. cit., 78–84.

In 1646, in accordance with the example of the Union of Brest, the Union of Užhorod[35] was concluded with the Ruthenians who had settled in Podcarpathia (Carpathian Ukrainians) who belonged to the Orthodox bishopric of Mukačevo, established in the second half of the sixteenth century. From 1633 to 1711 that area was the domain of the Princes Rakoczy, who enlisted sympathies for the spread of Calvinism. This prompted the bishops of Mukačevo to seek ties with the Catholic Church. Bishop Basilios Tarasovič (1633–51) negotiated union with the Latin bishop of Erlau, George Lippay (1637–42), who rose to become bishop of Gran and primate of Hungary (1642–66), as well as with Emperor Ferdinand III and the apostolic nuncio Gasparo Mattei. In 1642 he embraced the Catholic faith in Vienna, but was prevented by Prince George I Rakoczy (1630–48) from returning to his see. Although he reverted to the Orthodox Church, he did recommend shortly before his death (1651) the election of a successor who would be sympathetic to the union. In 1646, meanwhile, the union had been announced by the bishop of Erlau, George Jakušič. It was embraced by 63 of 650 priests and spread further by Bishop Petrus Partheneus Petrovič (1651–66). Upon his death a serious crisis set in when— in addition to the successor elected by the Uniate Church—the Emperor and Princess Sophie Rakoczy each appointed another successor. This confusion was not ended until the appointment of the vicar apostolic of Mukačevo, John Joseph Camillis (1689–1706), a Greek born in Chios and educated at the Greek college in Rome. He convened several synods, published a catechism and consolidated the union, which had 420 member parishes by 1693. During the first several decades of the eighteenth century the Latin bishops of Erlau managed to have the Uniate bishops of Mukačevo made subordinate to them. The Uniate clergy protested in vain against the restrictions placed upon their bishops. Not until 1771 did Pope Clement XIV alleviate the tense situation by issuing his bull *Eximia regalium* and granting personal jurisdictional rights to their bishops. The Uniate bishopric was comprised of 839 churches and 675 parishes; in 1776 it became a suffragan bishopric of the archbishopric of Gran.

---

[34] See Chap. 13.

[35] M. Lacko, *Unio Užhorodensis Ruthenorum Carpaticorum cum Ecclesia Catholica* (Rome 1955); idem, "Die Užhoroder Union," *OstKSt* 8 (1959), 3–30; idem, "Die Union von Užhorod 1646," W. de Vries, *Rom*, 114–131.

Similar to Podcarpathia, Calvinist rulers also had great influence in Siebenbürgen. When the region came under imperial supremacy and was placed under the Hungarian crown, the danger of domination by both Magyars and Calvinists was a growing threat. The Orthodox Bishop Theophilos Szeremy of Alba Julia detailed a plan for union on the occasion of a Rumanian synod in 1697. The members of the synod were favorably inclined, but demanded complete safeguards of their Orthodox rites and customs as well as equality with the Catholic clergy. The union was accepted under Bishop Atanas Anghel (1697–1713) at the Synods of Alba in 1698 and 1700[36] after the Emperor granted to the Uniate Church the same rights as were enjoyed by the Catholics. In 1701 the imperial court named Atanas bishop of the Rumanian nation in Siebenbürgen. Cardinal Leopold Karl Kollonics, archbishop of Gran, conditionally reconsecrated him, an action which was sharply protested by the Orthodox theologians and bishops. Yet the Uniate Bishop Atanas was joined by almost all the Orthodox Rumanians, about half a million. In 1721 Pope Innocent XIII established the bishopric of Fagaras for the Uniates, which was joined with the archbishopric of Gran by Emperor Charles VI. In spite of the difficulties created by the Calvinists and the emissaries of the Orthodox patriarch of Ipek the Uniate bishops were able to consolidate the union. In the town of Blaj the Uniate Bishop Peter Paul Aron (1752–64) founded a college led by Basilian monks and a press which published liturgical books and brochures for religious instruction. The union was further promulgated by his successors, such as Athanasios Rednik (1764–72) and Gregor Major (1773–82), with support by Empress Maria Theresa and many clerics who had studied in Rome.

The families who had emigrated from Bosnia to Croatia in 1573 were served by the Orthodox bishop who resided at the monastery of Saint Michael in Marca. In 1611 Bishop Simeon Vratanja embraced Catholicism before Cardinal Robert Bellarmin, but was able to persuade only a part of the monks of the Marca monastery and of the Orthodox Serbians to join the Union.[37] Subsequent tensions with the Latin archbishop of Zagreb (who considered the Uniate bishop a subordinate auxiliary bishop), efforts by the patriarch of Ipek to rejoin the Uniates with the Orthodox Church, the existence of a Uniate vicariate for Syrmia (1688–1706), whose ordinary resided at the Monastery of Hopovo, and the sacking and destruction of the monastery of Marca by members of the Orthodox Rite (1739) prompted Bishop Gabriel Palkovič (1751–59), who saw his bishopric endangered from within and without, to relocate it to Pribic. In 1777 Pope Pius VI issued the bull *Charitas illa,* creating the diocese of Kreutz for the Uniate Church of Byzantine Rite as part of the archbishopric of Gran.

---

[36] G. Patacsi, "Die unionfeindlichen Bewegungen der orthodoxen Rumänen Siebenbürgens in den Jahren 1726–29," *OrChrP* 26 (1960), 349–400; W. de Vries, *Rom,* 132–80, 394–423.

The majority of Greeks who had fled from Albania to southern Italy and Sicily, the so-called Italo-Albanians (Italo-Greeks) succumbed to a process of Latinization. After they had achieved the opening of seminaries for the education of their own priests at Piana in Sicily (1716), at Ullano in Calabria (1732), and at Palermo (1736), Pope Benedict XIV acknowledged in his constitution *Etsi pastoralis* (1742) the validity of the Greco-Albanian customs, but he stressed the *praestantia* of the Latin Rite. The Italo-Greeks were given an auxiliary bishop in Calabria (1735) and in Sicily (1784). Of the numerous Greek monasteries in Italy only Grottaferrata near Rome and Piana in Sicily preserved the Byzantine Rite although there, too, mixed forms of the liturgy were practiced along with the Latin liturgy.

In addition to the unions of different national groups of Orthodox Christians in eastern Europe, southern Europe, and Italy mentioned so far, there were the Monophysites who had emigrated from Greater Armenia to Poland-Lithuania and had an Armenian bishopric in Lemberg. Bishop Nikolaus Torosowič (1627–81) joined Rome in 1630. While he did become archbishop of the Uniate Armenians for Poland and Walachia with his residence in Lemberg (in 1635),[38] it was his coadjutor and successor Vatan Hunanian (1686–1715) who definitively broke with the catholicate of Etchmiadzin and stabilized the union. The

---

[37] J. Šimrak, *De relationibus Slavorum meridionalium cum Sancta Romana Sede Apostolica saeculis XVII–XVIII* I (Zagreb 1926); G. Hoffman, "Urkunden zur Union des Bischofs Vratanja," *OrChrA* 8 (1927), 290–98; M. Lacko, "Die Union in Kroatien 1611," W. de Vries, *Rom,* 108–11.

[38] G. Petrowicz, *L'Unione degli armeni di Polonia con la Santa Sede 1626–86* (Rome 1950).

Polish partitions caused the archbishopric to be split into a Russian and an Austrian part.

Efforts by zealous religious prompted some individual Armenian bishops in Constantinople, Etchmiadzin, and Sis to agree to the union. But the Dominicans in Transcaucasia, the Mechitarists[39] called into existence in 1701 by Mechithar of Sebaste (1676–1749), and the missionary order of the Armenian Antonites founded in Lebanon during the eighteenth century, had only limited success. In Syria the Catholics attempted to fill the vacant patriarchal see of Sis with one of their own in 1737. The Monophysite Armenians elected Michael, the Catholics elected Archbishop Abraham Ardzivian of Aleppo as successor.[40] The latter received recognition of his office and the pallium as Catholicos Abraham Peter I (1740–69) by Pope Benedict XIV in 1742. But his intention to relocate his residence to Constantinople was thwarted by the protest of the Monophysite Armenians. So he resided at the monastery of Krim in Lebanon and his successors in nearby Bzommar. They were responsible for the Uniate Armenians in Cilicia, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. The members of the Uniate rites in the north and west of Asia Minor, in Constantinople, and the European part of Turkey were given their own vicar-bishop, who was subordinate to the Latin vicar apostolic of Constantinople.

While efforts towards union were initially unsuccessful among the Orthodox Georgians, they showed promise among the Orthodox Melchites, but could not come to fruition because of the rivalry among Uniate dignitaries during the eighteenth century. Although Capuchins, Carmelites, and Jesuits in Syria enlisted some bishops and patriarchs for the union, a widespread movement did not occur until the appointment of Archbishop Euthymios of Sidon and Tyre (1683–1723), administrator of all Catholic Melchites in the patriarchate of Antioch since 1701, and the engagement of the missionary congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, founded by him in accordance with the rules followed by the Basilian order. After the death of the Melchite Patriarch Athanasios (1724), who embraced Catholicism on his deathbed, the Catholic minority elected as his successor Seraphim Tanas, a nephew of Euthymios, who assumed the name of Cyril VI (1724–59). At the same time the opponents of the union elected a nephew of Athanasios as Patriarch Jeremias III. The latter had Cyril and his followers excommunicated at a synod in Alexandria in 1728. Having been forced to leave Damascus, Cyril VI took up residence in Sidon. He initiated the line of Uniate Melchite patriarchs of Antioch whose jurisdiction was broadened in 1772 to include all Catholics of the Byzantine Rite within the confines of the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria.

---

[39] P. Krüger, "Die armenischen Mechitharisten und ihre Bedeutung," *OstKSt* 16 (1967), 3–14.

[40] M. Terzian, *Le Patriarcat de Cilicie et les Arméniens catholiques 1740–1812* (Beirut 1955).

After Capuchins and Jesuits had enlisted some individual Jacobites for the Church, Bishop Andreas Akidjian of Aleppo was elevated to the vacant Monophysite patriarchate (1662–77).[41] As a result of mediation by the French consul he was recognized as patriarch of the Syrian nation by the sultan. His successor Ignatius Petrus IV (1677–1702) was repeatedly persecuted for his adherence to the union, alleged to be an agent of France, and finally driven out. Many Uniate western Syrians left Monophysitism, part of them going over to the Maronites. Their number diminished in the course of the eighteenth century so that by 1768 no more than 150 Uniate families were counted in Aleppo and 50 in Damascus. Not until 1783 were they given a new patriarch in the person of Ignatius Michael Garweh (1783–1800). His election in Mardin in 1781 by four of the six Jacobite bishops was recognized neither by his opponents nor by the Turks. He was forced to make way for the Jacobite Patriarch Matthias and withdrew to the monastery of Scharfeh in Lebanon. In 1783 the Pope recognized him as the Syrian patriarch of Antioch whose line can be traced up to the present.

Since the Nestorians of eastern Syria had been split into several jurisdictional areas, the Chaldeans who had joined the union also formed several centers. The patriarchate of the Chaldeans in Diarbekr, created in the middle of the sixteenth century under John Sulaqa, came to an end by the return to Nestorianism of Simon XIII (1662–1700). Archbishop Joseph of Amida (Diarbekr), who had become Catholic in 1672, was elevated to the patriarchate as Joseph I (1681–96).[42] He ministered to about one thousand faithful. His successor Joseph II (1696–1713) called himself patriarch of Babylon and the nation of the Chaldeans. The Dominicans succeeded in recruiting for the union the nephew of the Nestorian patriarch, Elias XII Denha (d. 1778), who resided in the monastery of Rabban Hurmuz near Mosul. He was elected patriarch and then appointed metropolitan of Mosul and administrator of the patriarchate of Babylon. The rivalry between the two Chaldean patriarchates of Diarbekr and Mosul, which latter was comprised of a mere few thousand faithful, ended in 1834 with the enthronement of John Hormez as patriarch of Babylon.

---

[41] W. de Fries, "Dreihundert Jahre syrisch-katholische Kirche," *OstKSt* 5 (1956), 137–57.

[42] A. Lampart, *Ein Märtyrer der Union mit Rom. Joseph I. 1681–96. Patriarch der Chaldäer* (Einsiedeln 1966).

The Maronite Church of Lebanon[43] had been firmly tied to Rome since the Fifth Lateran Council. The embassy of the Jesuit Giambattista Eliano (1578 and 1580) introduced an increased Latinization of the Antioch Rite which was protested in vain by several monks and bishops. In 1584 Pope Gregory XIII created the Maronite college in Rome which produced a number of important priests and scholars, the members of the Assemani family (as-Simani) being especially prominent among the latter. In 1606 the Gregorian calendar was introduced among the Maronites. Patriarch Stephanus Ad-Duwaihi (1670–1704), who had been educated in Rome, had valuable help from the order of Saint Anthony of Saint Isaias in developing his Church. The disputes created by the elections of dual patriarchs and the rejection of increasing Latinization were to be resolved in 1736 at the Synod of Kesrowan. In the presence of the papal legate Joseph Simon Assemani,[44] the decisions of the Council of Trent and the *Catechismus Romanus,* which appeared in Arabic in 1786, were accepted. Latin vestments were prescribed for celebrating the Eucharist. In 1741 Pope Benedict XIV accepted the decisions of the synod. The following year he divided the patriarchate into eight dioceses, giving them the titles of old Syrian metropolitanates. Five Maronite monks were in sharp disagreement with the negotiations of the synod and the papal utterances. Not until the second half of the eighteenth century under Patriarch Joseph Estephan (1766–92) could unity be reestablished in the Maronite Church. The seminary founded by Estephan in Ain-Warka (1789) continued the activities of the Armenian college in Rome after it was dissolved in the tumult of the French Revolution. The Synod of Bkerke in 1790 contributed significantly to consolidating the Maronite Church.

Among the Monophysite Copts the contacts with Patriarch John XVI (1676–1718), initiated by Jesuits and reformed Franciscans, were unsuccessful.[45] The assistant to the patriarch of Cairo, the Coptic Bishop

---

[43] J. B. Chabot, *Les listes patriarcales de l'Église Maronite* (Paris 1938); B. Spuler, "Die Maroniten," *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Abt. 1, VIII/2 (1961), 217–25; P. Dib, *L'Église Maronite,* 2 vols. (Beirut 1962); A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 389–423.

[44] P. Mahfoud, *Joseph Simon Assimani et la célébration du concil libanais maronite de 1736* (Rome 1965).

[45] J. P. Trossen, *Les relations du patriarche copte Jean XVI avec Rome 1676–1718* (Luxemburg 1948); A. Colombo, *Le origini della gerarchia della chiesa copta cattolica nel secolo XVIII* (Rome 1953); G. Giambernardini, *I primi copti cattolici* (Cairo 1958); G. D'Albano, *Historia della missione francescana in alto-Egitto-Fungi-Etiopia 1686–1720* (Cairo 1961).

Athanasios of Jerusalem, who had embraced Catholicism in 1739, was given the leadership of the approximately two thousand Uniate Copts by Pope Benedict XIV in 1741. But since he was unwilling to terminate his connection with the Coptic Church, the Propaganda named Justus Maraghi vicar general (1744–49). He was followed in that office by prefects of the reformed Franciscans. In 1761 the former Coptic Archbishop Antonius Fulaifil became the first vicar apostolic in Cairo. He was unable to achieve much progress because the bishops and priests who were prepared to join the union insisted on conditional reconsecration.

After the initial successes in Ethiopia achieved by Portuguese missionaries in the seventeenth century collapsed, the union was unable to establish firm roots.[46] Capuchins and Franciscans who dared enter the country of the negus were either driven out or died a martyr's death. Efforts by the Franciscan Theodor Krump, in his capacity as royal physician (1701–02), to enlist the negus and etschege for the union came to nought. Father Liberat Weiss and his friends were condemned and stoned to death in 1716. Bohemian Franciscans were expelled from the country in 1752 after a brief sojourn. The native Bishop Tobias George Ghebragzer, consecrated in Rome in 1788, fled to Cairo in 1797.

The successful union concluded in the sixteenth century with the Christians of Saint Thomas in India was weakened by the creation of the Jacobite Church under Mar Thomas I in the middle of the seventeenth century. Those Thomas Christians who had remained Catholic were under a vicar apostolic directly subordinate to the Propaganda; at the same time they were under the Portuguese *padroado*, which in turn was under the influence of the Jesuits. The vicar apostolic, Mar Alexander Parampil (1663–94), was successfully supported by Carmelites who became his successors. The partition into two jurisdictional areas brought with it all sorts of difficulties which were overcome only when the Jesuit order was dissolved in 1773 and the Carmelite order started furnishing the majority of apostolic administrators.

In spite of the tensions from without and within to which the unions, concluded from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, were exposed, the Apostolic See was able to unite both large and small religious communities with Rome. Reverses were inevitable and many unions were limited to small numbers of faithful. Yet the eastern border of the Catholic Church, rigid since the Middle Ages, became fluid. Several ethnic groups of eastern and southern Slavs, of Maronites, Thomas Christians, and others were joined to the Roman center of the Church.

---

[46] T. Somigli, *Etiopia francescana nei documenti dei secoli XVII e XVIII,* 2 vols. (Quaracchi 1928–48); G. Manfredi, "I minori osservanti riformati nella prefettura dell'Alto Egitto-Etiopia 1697–1792," *Studia orientalia christiana* 3 (Cairo 1958), 83–182.

CHAPTER 15

The Propagation of the Faith in America

The Waning of the Missionary Spirit and the Decline of the Missions

The manifest diminution of the missionary spirit in the seventeenth and eighteenth century contrasted with manifold, often heroic incidents of missionary activity. This fact alone shows clearly that the history of the propagation of faith in America did not follow a simple and transparent line of development, but was instead of a rather complex nature. The gradual flagging of the missionary spirit with its logical consequences goes back to events of the sixteenth century, which must be described briefly if one is to understand and judge fairly the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

A decisive factor was the long struggle between Pius V (d. 1572) and Philip II (d. 1598) for the growing and potentially immense Church in the New World. Philip II demanded the establishment of an "Indian Patriarchate" which was to exist and be considered as a more or less autonomous Church parallel to the Roman Church. The patriarch was to be appointed by the King and reside in Madrid. This demand was emphatically rejected by Pius V, as was the moderated form of a "royal vicariate" for the overseas territories, which was also opposed in 1634 and 1643 by the newly founded Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.[1] Pius V, on his part, sought ways in which to realize the papal claims and the papal influence in Spanish America. Upon the suggestion and with the collaboration of the Jesuit general Francis Borgia, he formed a congregation of cardinals in 1568 for the ecclesiastic and religious affairs in the overseas territories which—while its structure and goals already corresponded to those of the Congregation of Propaganda to be organized in 1622—could neither be an effective instrument nor a permanent one.[2] Subsequently Pius V strove in vain to foil the machinations of the Spanish crown, first by dispatching a nuncio and then, with the help of papal visitors composed in the main of Spanish or Hispanophile Jesuits, by at least providing himself with precise knowledge concerning the situation in the American lands.[3]

---

[1] P. de Leturia, S.J., "El Regio Vicariato de Indias y los comienzos de la Congregación de Propaganda," *Relaciones* I, 101–52.

[2] L. Lopetegui, S.J., "San Francisco de Borja y el plan misional de San Pio V. Primeros pasos de una Congregación de Propaganda Fide," *AHSI* 11 (1942), 1–26.

[3] P. Borges, "La Nunciatura Indiana. Un intento de intervención directa en Indias bajo

After the Pope had exhausted all means of subordinating the American Church to papal supremacy, he tried to make the powerful personalities of the New World responsive to the interests of the Church by means of personal letters and briefs.[4] But Pius V could hardly foresee that as of the end of 1568 all his efforts would be in vain. That year an event took place which—as we know today—assumed an essential, indeed decisive significance for the development of the Church in America: the Great Junta of Madrid in 1568.[5]

The *Junta Magna*, which in addition to selected members of the Council of Castile included all the members of the Council of the Indies and other prominent personalities, was to reach two goals which Philip II had in mind: (1) to expand the right of patronage to such an extent that any influence of Rome would be excluded for all times (Up to that point the patronage had been restricted more or less to the outer organization of the Church, the establishment and borders of the dioceses, the appointment of the bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. From now on the system was to be extended to include not only every representative of the clergy, secular and regular, but also the internal affairs of the Church.); (2) to supplant the Indian Church coming into existence by achieving a breakthrough for a Church which would bear the Spanish imprint.

The implementation of the decisions of the *Junta Magna* was entrusted to the newly appointed viceroy of Peru, Francisco de Toledo,[6]

Felipe II., 1566–88," *MH* 19 (1962), 169–227; idem, "La Santa Sede y América en el siglo XVI," *Estudios Americanos* 21 (Seville 1961), 141–68 (mentions for the period of 1513–70 fourteen letters from America expressing an urgent desire for a vicar apostolic); A. de Egaña, S.J., *La teoría del Regio Vicariato español de Indias* (Rome 1958); J. Wicki, "Nuovi documenti attorno ai piani missionari di Pio V nel 1568," *AHSI* 57 (1968), 408–17 (publishes the list of the appointed groups of visitors).

[4] M. Monica, *La gran controversia del siglo XVI acerca del dominio Español sobre America* (Madrid 1952), 249 f., for example the brief of Pius V to Francisco de Toledo; see also Card. Grente, *Le pape des grande combats. Saint Pie V*. (Paris 1956), 189ff., 199ff.

[5] M. Monica, op. cit., 197–240; P. de Letuira, S.J., "Misiones hispanoamericanas según la Junta de 1568," *Relaciones* I, 205–31. For an evaluation of the Junta and its impact the following aspects appear important as well. Las Casas, the courageous pioneer in a fight for freedom of the Indians, had died in 1566. The proponents of his ideas in Spain, especially the professors in Salamanca, had no political influence. Philip II, moreover, thwarted them by appointing his confessor, Father Diego de Chaves, to the position of theologian. R. Richard summarized briefly in 1966: "C'est surtout à partir de Philippe II et davantage à partir de l'installation des Bourbons sur le Trône d'Espagne en 1700, que les progrès de l'esprit régaliste ont fait du patronage un instrument d'asservissements pour l'Église des Indes" ("La 'Conquête spirituelle du Mexique revue après trente ans," *La Découverte de l'Amérique. Esquisse d'une synthèse* [Paris 1968], 231).

[6] R. Levillier, *Don Francisco de Toledo, Virrey del Perú, Supremo organizador del Perú, su vida, su obra (1515–82)*, 4 vols. (Madrid 1929–40).

who not only participated in several of the junta's meetings, but was also furnished a set of secret instructions. It was quite certainly a skillful move by Philip II that he selected a personal friend of the Jesuit general Francis Borgia to execute his plans while simultaneously acceding to the latter's repeated requests to permit the first large-scale expedition of twenty-four Jesuits to South America, a prelude to the missionary activities in Spanish America by that order.[7] It can be assumed that Philip II gave his viceroy some valuable instructions regarding missionary work, but most probably of such nature that he, i.e., the government, became the actual guarantor of the conversion of the Indians; the previous secular and regular missionaries turned into mere executive organs.[8]

As was the case for all Spanish laws overseas, it took some considerable time of compromises and transitional solutions until the patronage right was implemented down to its very last ramifications. In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century the King and the Council of the Indies received crucial help from theologians as well as jurists. As early as 1600 the Franciscan Miguel Agia, missionary in Guatemala, published his fundamental work on the necessity and importance of the secular arm for missionary work.[9] This work was concretely applied in three expert opinions on the forced labor of the Indians (1604).[10] Among the Augustinians it was the bishop of Santiago de Chile, Gaspar de Villaroel, who traced the line from the right of patronage to regalism in his comprehensive *Govierno Eclesiástico Pacífico*, which first appeared in 1656 and was reprinted in 1738. Actually his work was intended to reduce the tensions between Church and state in America.[11] An extreme partisan of regalism towards the end of the eighteenth century was the Carmelite José Antonio de San Alberto, bishop of Tucumán

---

[7] Preceded a few years earlier by the more modest mission in Florida, see F. Zubillaga, *La Florida. La misión jesuítica (1566–72)* (Rome 1941). The first Jesuit expeditions to Mexico took place in 1572.

[8] Even the Jesuits who maintained ties of friendship with the viceroy were made to feel this. In 1577, filling a need for the ministry, they built a branch in the mission town of Potosí with the viceroy's permission. By the latter's order they had to relinquish it (A. de Egaña, *Monumenta Peruana* II, 476–84, 542–54, 558–69; R. Vargas Ugarte, op. cit. I, 141).

[9] Streit I, 116.

[10] Ibid., 125. See the review of the critical edition (Seville 1947), *Hisp. Am. Hist. Rev.* (1947), 300–304.

[11] Streit, 233f., 421; A. J. González Zumariaga, *Problemas del patronato indiano a través del "Govierno Eclesiástico Pacífico" de Fr. Gaspar de Villaroel* (Vitoria 1961); J. López Ortiz, *El regalismo indiano en el Govierno eclesiástico pacífico dι Don Fr. Gaspar de Villaroel. Real Academia de Jurisprudencia y Legislación* (Madrid 1947). (G. de Villaroel was born in 1587 in Quito and died in 1665 as bishop of Buenos Aires.)

(Córdoba) and later archbishop of La Plata. With his legalistically oriented pastoral letter of 1786 he published a *Catecismo real*, as the work was called.[12] The scholarly Jesuit Pedro Murillo Velarde compiled the regalist canon law in the more than one thousand pages of his two-volume work *Cursus Juris Canonici Hispani et Indici* in 1743.[13] His fellow Jesuit Diego de Avedaño had taken a more reticent stance in his *Encyclopädie für die Missionspastoral und für das Missions- und Kolonialrecht Thesaurus Indicus* (Antwerp 1668).[14]

But in the final analysis neither theologians nor canonists exerted the decisive influence regarding the extension of the right of patronage; the most prominent part was played by the counsels for the crown. Among them were Pedro Fresso in Lima,[15] A. J. Álvarez de Abreu,[16] A. J. Ribadeneyra y Barrientos in Mexico,[17] and, most prominently, Juan de Solórzano Pereira (1575–1655). He was professor in Salamanca, official of the Curia in Lima, and after his return to Spain a member of the Council of the Indies. The first volume of his *De Indiarum Jure* appeared in 1629, the second in 1639.[18] They are a consistent continuation and development of the basic ideas of Ginés de Sepúlveda, the great adversary of Bartolomé de Las Casas. For more than two centuries this work determined the relations between the state and the Church in accordance with Spanish state law. To be sure, it was condemned and put on the Index by Rome in 1642.[19] But since the Council of the Indies did not recognize Rome's decision, it had no validity in Spain and America.[20]

---

[12] The actual title was "Instrucción donde per lecciones, preguntas y respuestas se enseñan a los niños y niñas las obligaciones mas principales que un vasallo debe a su rey y señor." R. Esquerra, "La crítica sobre América en el siglo XVIII," *Revista de Indias* 22 (1962), 246ff.

[13] Streit I, 439.

[14] Ibid., 268f., with voluminous supplements from 1675 (ibid., 283) and 1686 (ibid., 307f.). See P. de Leturia, "Misioneros extranjeros en Indias según Diego de Avendaño," *Relaciones* I, 453–67 and A. de Egaña, "El P. Diego de Avendaño y la tesis teocrática 'Papa, dominus orbis'," *AHS* XVIII (1949), 195–225.

[15] *De regio patronatu indiano 1671, 1679*; Streit I, 287f. The work was placed on the Index in 1688.

[16] *Victima real legal* (Madrid 1726); Streit I, 379.

[17] *Manuel Compendio de el regio Patronato Indiano* (Madrid 1755); Streit I, 470.

[18] Streit I, 191, 262. The Spanish edition appeared in 1648 under the title *Política Indiana* (ibid., 217f.); its fourth edition appeared in 1776 and a third edition in Latin came out in 1777 (ibid., 529f.). See F. J. de Ayala, "Ideas Canónicas de Juan de Solárzano. El Tratado *De Indiarum Jure* y su inclusión en el Indice," *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 4 (Seville 1947), 579–614; A. de Egaña, "La función misionera del poder civil según Juan de Solárzano Pereira (1575–1654)," *StMis* 6 (Rome 1951), 69–113; idem., *La teoría del Regio Vicariato Español* (Rome 1958), 106–73.

[19] P. de Leturia, "Antonio Lelio de Fermo y la condenación del *De Indiarum Jure* de Solórzano Pereira," *Relaciones* I, 335–408.

Theory and practice gradually led to extensive legislation which more and more constricted the activities of the Church. The final codification (1791) in the *Recopilación de Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*[21] represented the finishing touch, predetermined as early as 1771 by the fourth provincial council of Mexico in accordance with the precise instructions of the Council of the Indies.[22]

Regalism or state absolutism proved to be one of the most serious obstacles to the missionary development of the American Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Except for the papal bulls of investiture and some few privileges, all the influence of Rome was practically eliminated. This had a paralyzing and demoralizing effect on the total missionary effort.[23] Just how negative its effect on individual missions was can be gleaned from unpublished documents—unpublished because mention of such matters was not allowed in print—concerning the life of the Apostle of California, Junípero Serra.[24] For this reason his biography, written by his long-time companion and successor Francesco Palou (1787), speaks only of the positive aspects concerning the cooperation of Church and state and of the necessity for military protection of the missions in Mexico as well as California.[25]

---

[20] In fact there would hardly have been a person in Spanish America who knew of the condemnation by Rome. The work was used as a basic handbook by the temporal and ecclesiastic authorities.

[21] Especially in bk. I, Chap. 8, "Del Patronazgo Real de Las Indias." See F. J. de Ayala, "Iglesia y Estado en las Leyes de Indias," *Estudios Americanos* 1 (1948/49), 417–60; R. Gomez Hoyo, *La Iglesia de América en las Leyes de Indias* (Madrid 1961).

[22] M. Giménez Fernández, "Estudios para la Historia del Regalismo Español, I: El Concilio IV Provincial Mejicano," *Anales de la Universidad Hispalense* I and II (Seville 1939).

[23] G. Desdevises du Dezert, "L Église espagnole des Indes à la fin du XVIII^{e} Siécle," *Revue Hispanique* 39 (1917), 112–293. Basing his claims on numerous documents from the Indias-Archives, the author proves that all provincial synods were predetermined down to the smallest details by royal instructions (see 115–20), further, how complicated the appointment of parish priests by the local authorities was (172ff.), that the visitors of the orders were appointed by the Council of the Indies in Spain (221), and so forth. See also Alluto de la Hera, *El Regalismo Borbónico en su proyección indiana* (Madrid 1963).

[24] M. Geiger, *The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra OFM*, 2 vols. (Washington 1959). Volume II, 329ff. gives an example of the bureaucracy making the mission work more difficult. It took four years for the authorization by Rome for conducting confirmations to make its way through the various authorities in Spain and Mexico and another three years for the subordinate authorities to recognize the signatures and seals. The authorization granted in 1774 and limited to ten years could, in the end, be used by Serra for all of three years.

Not only was the application of the principle of regalism most injurious to the interests of the Church, but the brutal prevention of establishing an Indian Church turned an already bad situation into a catastrophe, because it was an Indian Church and not one after the Spanish model that was envisioned by the missionaries, especially the Franciscans, soon after the beginning of evangelization,[26] even if neither the goal nor the means were as yet fully recognized.[27]

That the *Junta Magna* of 1568 prevented the Indian Church from coming into being can be shown by several negative features which were clearly recognizable as the result of its decisions. Principal among them is the suppression of all publications relative to the propagation of the faith which stressed the great abilities and good qualities of the Indians. Of the Franciscan writings we mention *Motolinia* (Toribio de Benavente), *Historia de los Indios de la Nueva España*, a basic source, first published 1858 by its discoverer, the Mexican historian J. García Icazbalceta,[28] the *Historia Eclesiástica Indiana* by Gerónimo de Mendieta (also discovered by Icazbalceta; published in 1870),[29] and last but not least the life's work of the scholar Bernardino de Sahagún. Only one of his many works was published during his lifetime, the *Psalmodia christiana* (Mexico 1583). The manuscripts of his other works, his comprehensive *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España* included, were confiscated and sent to Spain for examination only to disappear in government archives, where they were newly discovered in the nineteenth century.[30]

Whereas Bartolomé de Las Casas was able to have a number of his writings printed in 1552, among them the virulent *Brevísima Relación de la destrucción de las Indias*, his other works, especially the lengthy *Historia General de las Indias*, were not published until the ninteenth and twentieth century.[31] His fellow religious, Diego Durán, did not fare any better with his *Historia de la Indias de la Nueva España,* which was completed in 1581.[32] Conditions in other countries, especially Peru and Colombia, were no different from those in Mexico.

---

[25] See especially the English translations with the valuable notes by M. Geiger, *Palou's Life of Fray Junipero Serra* (Washington 1955).—Without this nationalistic direction Palou would hardly have received the required state and Church imprimatur.

[26] R. Ricard, "La Conquête spirituelle." The impressive lists (pp. 345–52) of the works written in Indian languages alone clearly show this direction; P. Borges, *Métodos*.

[27] J. L. Phelan, *The Millenial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World. A Study of the Writings of Gerónimo de Mendieta (1525–1604)* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1956), which stresses the eschatological utopian characteristics in the work of the Mexican Franciscans.

[28] Streit III, 581.

[29] Ibid. III, 605–7.

[30] Ibid. II, 216–22.

The lifework of the Franciscan Pedro Aguado, the first chronicler of Colombia, which did not become well known until the twentieth century, was illuminated by the Colombian historian Juan Friede by means of a comparison of handwritings. In the process he sifted out the principles of government censorship (those of the Church had to be obtained beforehand in each case).[33] They were: (1) everything that diminished the good reputation of the *conquista* or the *conquistadores* had to be suppressed; (2) in treating the missions, all mention of conflicts, especially those with government offices, had to be left out; (3) the Indians had to be represented as a low human race without culture.[34] Authors, including chroniclers of the religious orders, who wanted to obtain the requisite imprimature had to follow these unwritten yet painstakingly enforced rules.

The discrimination against the Indians, carried out according to J. Friede by government censorship, shows clearly that it was aimed against an essential element in the creation of an Indian Church: the education of indigenous clergy.[35] Indeed the Council of Mexico had already prohibited the ordination of Indians in 1555, but in a more general context (in connection with the Muslims [*moros*], mestizos, and mulattos),[36] but at the Third Council of Lima in 1567/68 the prohibition already referred exclusively to the newly converted Indians.[37]

Judging from the text of the council, precluding priesthood for the Indians appeared to have been a temporary measure (*hoc tempore*). In point of fact it was to last until the eighteenth century. The Franciscans found this out in their college of Tlaltelolco (Mexico), which had been established by Bishop Zumárraga in 1536 primarily for the education of a native clergy. The various parties, those among the laity, the secular and the regular clergy—even among the Franciscans—who were hostile to the Indians continued to hold the upper hand and after the 1560s the formerly flourishing school was merely vegetating.[38] The same experience was had by the Jesuits working in the country since 1572. Under the spiritual leadership of Juan de Tobar, who was born in Mexico, they tried to get permission from the Jesuit general to establish a college for the education of Indian priests. After fifteen years of trying, their plan was categorically rejected.[39] The final decision by General Claudius Acquaviva had been indicated earlier by the guidelines of the junta of 1568.[40]

---

[31] Ibid. II, 27–32.

[32] Ibid. II, 226.

[33] "La Censura Española del Siglo XVI y los libros de Historia de América," *Revista de Historia de América* 47 (Mexico City 1959), 45–94.

[34] Aguado described the prominent tribe of the Muiscas Indians and according to the table of contents planned twenty chapters for that part (op. cit., 88–90), all of which were eliminated by censorship for the reasons stated.

[35] J. Specker, "Der einheimische Klerus in Spanisch-Amerika im 16. Jh. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Konzilien und Synoden," in J. Beckmann, *Der Einheimische Klerus in Gesch. und Gegenwart* (*Festschr. L. Kilger*) (Beckenried 1950), 73–97; A. Pott, "Das Weihehindernis für Indianer im 3. Konzil von Lima," *NZM* 12 (1956), 108–18.

[36] J. Specker, op. cit., 78f.

[37] "Sentit sancta Synodus, et ita servandum statuit, hos noviter ad fidem conversos, hoc tempore non debere ordine initiari. . . ." R. Vargas Ugarte, *Concilios Limenses* (*1551–1772*) I (Lima 1951), 192.

In this connection the efforts of the Propaganda, i.e., of its first secretary Francesco Ingoli, are deeply moving. In letters and petitions to popes, cardinals, and generals of the orders he gave the most cogent arguments for the ordination of Indian priests in America, but the power of the Council of the Indies could not be broken even by the Popes.[41]

---

[38] R. Ricard, *La Conquête spirituelle*, 260–84.

[39] In addition to various references in the *Monumenta Mexicana* (I–IV) and in F. J. Alegre, op. cit., see also the summary study by J. Lafaye, "Une lettre inédite de XVI^{e} siècle, relative aux collèges indiens de la Compagnie de Jésus en Nouvelle-Espagne," *Annales de la Faculté des lettres et Sciences humaines d'Aix*, t. 38 (2d fasc.) (Gap 1964), 9–21, (19–21 contains the letter from Father Pedro Díaz to the general of the Society of Jesus, dated 21 June 1592).

[40] Father Juan de Tobar already demonstrated clear insight when he wrote: "se perdieron las mejores ocasiones que jamás tendremos moralmente hablando" (E. J. Alegre, op. cit. I, 546).—The education of a native clergy in Paraguay was therefore principally out of the question.

[41] J. Metzler, "Francesco Ingoli und die Indianerweihen," *NZM* 25 (1969), 262–72. Ingoli's perspicacity is shown by his summary of 1638 to the general of the Augustinian order: "If the Spanish regulars do not consecrate any Indians, the Church in both Indies will always be a small child and will never grow inwardly strong." (op. cit.). R. Ricard, who adduces these facts in a lecture of 1966 in the process of clarifying some details of his classical work of 1933 (*La "Conquête spirituelle du Mexique" revue après trente ans: La Découverte de l'Amérique. Esquisse d'une synthèse* [Paris 1968], 236), attempts to muster some understanding for his attitude against a native clergy. As its motive he cites the total strangeness of the Indian races and cultures to the Spaniards and also a certain fear of a "Luther" who might emerge from an "Indian Church." There was the distinct possibility that such reasons carried a certain weight in small circles, but decisive for the crown were political and economic reasons. As Ricard, too, sees clearly (p. 235f.), a native Church was rejected because ecclesiastical independence brought with it in the danger of political independence and because the Spanish conqueror caste and its successors scorned all physical labor to such an extent that they thought they could not exist without slaves or the slave labor of the Indians. These connec-

In his ideas of regalism Philip II was by no means guided by anti-Church sentiments. He was deeply convinced of the divine mission which he thought to have been given especially for the formation of the American Church. The bishops nominated by him were all well educated, pious and apostolic men, as were the visitors of the orders. The building of churches and monasteries, of hospitals and schools was supported. Beyond that he tried to promote everywhere the veneration and reverence for the Holy See and the Popes. Thus we witness the paradox that reverence for the Pope was nowhere greater than in the American territories, where practically all papal influence was eliminated.[42] It was well known that his opponent, Pius V, had the implementation of the Council of Trent close to his heart. So in order to keep him from making demands regarding the American Church, Philip II in a letter of 12 July 1564 had ordered the implementation of the Tridentine rules. Consequently, Archbishop Alonso de Montúfar as early as 1565 convened the Second Council of Mexico, which was to promulgate, adapt, and reacknowledge the Council of Trent. The Third Council of Lima in 1567/68 served the same purpose for South America.[43]

While the Council of Trent was a blessing for the European Church, it was a double-edged sword for the budding Indian Church. Quite aside from the fact that—as a result of the actions of Charles V and Philip II—America, in spite of the efforts by individual bishops, was not represented in Trent and its problems were nowhere discussed,[44] the centralist tendencies beginning at this point could not but have an impeding and in the long run seriously damaging effect.[45] The greatest damage was probably in discontinuing the already initiated organic growth of an Indian Church; the original main ideas concerning missionary work were discarded with noticeable haste. The first generation of missionaries had in mind the example of the original Church; the dogma of

---

tions were clearly seen by Las Casas and Mendieta. On this topic, see R. Konetzke, "Einige Grundzüge der geschichtlichen Besonderheit Lateinamerikas in der westlichen Hemisphäre," *HZ* 204 (Munich 1957), especially p. 29ff. regarding unwillingness to work.

[42] Thus A. Ybot Leon in the chapter about the patriarchate in India, which according to the intentions of the Spanish rulers was to weaken the papacy outwardly as well, used illustrations of the twelve Popes from Leo X to Pius VI (op. cit. II, 1–23).

[43] J. Specker, *Die Missionsmethode*, 36f. The widespread acceptance of the Tridentine regulations led to the great councils of Lima (1583) and Mexico City (1585).

[44] P. de Leturia, "Perchè la nascente chiesa ispano-americana non fu rappresentata a Trento?" *Relaciones* I, 495–509; F. Mateos, "Ecos de América en Trento," *Revista de Indias* VI (1945), 559–605.

[45] Regarding the impact of the Tridentine regulations in America see R. Lebroc, "Proyección tridentina en América," *MH* 26 (1969), 129–207.

the Church as the mystical body of Christ was impressed very quickly on their Christians.[46] The message was deeply rooted in the Holy Scripture and the doctrines of the Fathers.[47] That the dogma was adapted especially to the intellectual capacity of the Indians, is supported by the expression Theologia Indiana.[48] In the sixteenth century this referred to the instructional books and tracts in the native languages. After the sixteenth century this intellectual attitude receded more and more, making way for a purely European-Spanish direction, for instance by translating European catechisms (like the one by Bellarmine) and relegating the Holy Scripture and the Fathers to a position of lesser importance.[49]

In the exterior realm it was primarily the execution of the Tridentine rules concerning the ministry of regulars and their relationship to the bishops which had appalling consequences, especially since both sides, bishops as well as the orders, were somehow right. On the side of the bishops were the regulations of the Council of Trent, at whose inception, however, no one had thought of missionary conditions. On the side of the mendicant orders were experience in missionary practice and the immense distances of the sees.[50] It was self-evident that the increase in the number of secular clerics would place the regular Spanish ministry in their hands. But the conditions were different in the often remote and extensive *doctrinas* (missionary stations) of the Indians. Their creation and expansion throughout was the work of the mendicant orders, who were executing their priestly functions on the basis of a papal bull of Hadrian VI (1522) known by its abbreviation *Omnimoda.*[51] These privileges were reaffirmed again and again by successive Popes, such as Pius V in 1567.

---

[46] In addition to the *Doctrina* of Pedro de Córdoba we should mention especially the works of the first bishop of Mexico, Juan de Zumárraga. See J. Beckmann, "Die Erziehung der Christen zum kirchlichen Denken in der jungen Kirche Mexikos," *Novella Ecclesiae Germina* (Nijmegen 1963), 45–60; P. Borges, *Métodos*, 31–44.

[47] J. Specker, "Die Einschätzung der Heiligen Schrift in den spanisch-amerikanischen Missionen," in Beckmann, *Die Heilige Schrift in den Katholischen Missionen* (Beckenried 1966), 37–71. On the church Fathers see for instance A. Etchegaray, "Saint Augustin et le contenu de la catechèse prétridentine en Amérique latine," *RevÉAug* 11 (Paris 1965), 277–90.

[48] The name given a few small volumes in an Indian language of Guatemala by Dom. de Vico, a companion of B. de Las Casas. Streit II, 325: the Franciscan Franc. Maldonado also named his religious treatise in three languages of Guatemala (thirteen volumes by the time of his death) "teología indiana muy útil a los ministros evangélicos de aquellas provincias, y muy provechosa a los neófitos" (Beristain de Souza, *Bibliotheca Americana Septentrionalis* III: *Mexiko* [1947], 178). One of the finest examples of subtle and tactful adaptation are the translations into the Aztec language of the sermons by the first Franciscans in Mexico preserved by Sahagún (W. Lehmann and K. Kutscher, *Sterbende Götter und christliche Heilsbotschaft. Wechselreden indianischer Vornehmer und spanischer Glaubensboten in Mexiko 1524* [Stuttgart 1949]).

[49] The history of the Inquisition, too, has to be viewed in this context. Initially individual inquisitors were appointed as organs of the Spanish Inquisition for certain countries and periods. But toward the end of the sixteenth century independent, full-fledged tribunals were established in Lima (1569), Mexico (1571), and Cartagena (1610). They watched over the faith and morality not only of the Spaniards but also the Indians, who were made subject to the Inquisition in Mexico as early as 1573. See the various sources and histories by J. Toribio Medina. Brazil did not have its own Inquisition; instead the Portuguese crown appointed inquisitors for individual cases. Regarding Mexico see Lopetegui-Zubillaga, *Historia*, 438–47.

When efforts by the bishops resulted in an increase in the number of secular clerics in the second half of the sixteenth century, and the positions in the cathedral chapters and parishes heretofore administered by missionaries were occupied by them, the secular clergy pushed more and more into the well-established *doctrinas* of the Indians. The transfer of the *doctrinas* had already begun in the sixteenth century. In spite of resistance by some orders the change initially took place without resulting in great damage, especially since knowledge of the native language and suitability for serving in the *doctrinas* were required of the secular clerics as well. Only after the great councils of Lima and Mexico was the extent of the transfer of *doctrinas* to the secular clergy increased and the earlier missionaries with all their experience and linguistic ability were shunted into the large religious houses in the cities. The great disadvantages of this practice began to have a real effect in the seventeenth century. The most fatal actions in this connections were probably those of Bishop Juan de Palafox y Mendoza (1600–59), bishop of Puebla and visitor general of Mexico since 1639 (in 1642 he was viceroy of Mexico until the arrival of the newly appointed viceroy; he rejected the archbishopric of Mexico and returned to Spain in 1646, where he died as bishop of Osma). Barely having arrived in Mexico, he already submitted to the King an indictment against the Franciscans charging them with usurpation of jurisdiction. The same year he issued his first pastoral letter to the clergy of Puebla, in which he stressed the right of ministry on the part of the secular clergy for the total ministry. In 1642 the Dominican Luis de Orduna sent a defense to the King. But because of the bishop's authority all the *doctrinas* of the Franciscans were soon transferred to secular clerics. Other bishops in Mexico and South America followed this example. By these actions Palafox had inflicted upon the American Church what was perhaps the worst possible irreparable damage.[52] This becomes clear if one takes into account the fact that the mendicant orders, especially the Franciscans, maintained in their *doctrinas*, frequently serving more than twenty thousand Indians, relatively small religious houses with only three to five priests. Only one of these, the *doctrinero*, was paid from government funds, while the others, as auxiliary staff, depended upon the Indians for their livelihood. While the secular priests did use the religious houses as their parish houses, they had no auxiliary staff available to them.[53]

---

[50] J. Specker, *Die Missionsmethode*, 25–29; P. Borges, *Métodos passim.*

[51] P. Torres, *La Bula "Omnimoda" de Adriano VI (9. 5. 1522)* (Madrid 1946).

[52] F. Sánchez-Castañer, *Don Juan de Palafox, Virrey de Nueva España* (Sarragosa 1964),

The conflicts between the bishops and the Jesuits, resounding worldwide, were concerned with jurisdictional issues, but were primarily centered around the issue of the tithe which the bishop demanded form the missions' property.[54]

In view of the Tridentine reforms and state absolutism, Palafox acted correctly. Privately he had great respect for the Indians and their abilities;[55] he provided a thorough education for the clergy by establishing the first Tridentine seminary in the New World, combining with it the first public library in Mexico.[56] But Palafox overestimated his secular clergy, to whom he respectfully referred in his first pastoral letter as "Venerable Congregación de San Pedro";[57] they could not take the place of the missionaries of the mendicant orders in the *doctrinas,* especially in the barely accessible ones. Many a parish was soon dissolved as such or rarely visited by a priest, and the unadorned but attractive religious and parish houses fell into ruin.[58]

67–72 (Las doctrinas o Parroquias rurales); idem, comprehensive introduction to the new edition of the works of *Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, Tratados Mejicanos*, 2 vols. (Madrid 1968); L. Lopetegui and F. Zubillaga, *Historia*, 729–32.

[53] Individual statistics of the year 1565 already show this phenomenon (instead of two to three Franciscans, more than three Augustinians, five to six Dominicans, and so forth they merely indicate "1 clérigo") (P. Borges, *Métodos*, 532–34).

[54] The most detailed presentation of the Jesuit point of view is found in Astrain V, 356–411; C. E. P. Simmens ("Palafox and his Critics. Reappraising a Controversy," *Hisp. Am. Hist. Rev.* [1966], 394–408) tries to defend the measures taken by the bishop of Puebla against the members of orders, especially the Jesuits. He believes that the expulsion of the Jesuits would have been avoided if the bishop had been able to prevail with his reform ideas. Concerning the large land holdings of the orders, especially the Jesuits, see F. Chevalier, *La formation des grandes domaines au Mexique* (Paris 1952).

[55] He wrote the *Virtudes del Indio* (1650), a small treatise which went through several editions; Streit II, 515.

[56] This is the Seminario Palafoxiano and the Bibliotheca Palafoxiana in Puebla (J. Specker, "Die 'Bibliotheca Palafoxiana' in Puebla," *ED* 21 [Rome 1968] [Festschrift Rommerskirchen], 487–509).

[57] Streit II, 472.—For the genesis and significance of this appellation see R. Ricard, "El habito de San Pedro," *Bulletin Hispanique* 59 (1957), 304–8.

[58] Various illustrations in G. Kubler, *Mexican Architecture of the Sixteenth Century*, 2 vols. (New Haven 1948).

The problem can be illustrated by the following figures: in the sixteenth century 63.16 percent of the appointed bishops were from religious orders, in the seventeenth century it was still 50.81 percent, but in the eighteenth century it was only 24.25 percent.[59] The development reached a climax of sorts under Bishop Palafox even though it did not actually prevail in the more remote areas. Yet as late as 1722 the nuncio in Madrid received an instruction from Rome for the archbishop of Mexico concerning the transfer of Indian parishes to secular clerics.[60]

The above figures are not intended to represent a value judgment. Among both types of clerics there were superior missionaries. Among the bishops of the secular clergy we should mention the contemporary of Bishop Palafox, Alonso de la Peña Montenegro (1596–1687, bishop of Quito).[61] He, too, looked after his rights vis-à-vis the regulars, the Franciscans and the Jesuits,[62] but without onesidedness and imprudence. His *Itinerario para parochos de Indios* (Madrid 1668)[63] had an enduring influence throughout the Spanish colonial period. Its tenor is a sense of missionary responsibility and great respect for the Indians, although a strong canonistic-casuistic direction and a narrow application of the Tridentine regulations for the Indian mission are also noticeable.

In the initial stages of missionary work by the secular clergy the lack of linguistic knowledge had an important negative effect. But this was improved by the establishment of teaching chairs for the study of native languages at the large universities of Mexico and Lima and later on in Guatemala and other places; missionaries of the secular clergy produced some outstanding linguistic experts.[64] It was precisely their knowledge of languages and their solidarity with the people which enabled them to participate in extraordinary measure in missionary work and to serve the bishops as visitors or interpreters.[65] Some also fought paganism in their role as writers. In connection with Peru we should mention the works of the mestizo priest Dr. Francisco de Ávila, as well as those of Hernando de Avendaño, Pablo José de Arriaga,[66] and Juan Pérez Bocanegro.[67]

The displacement of the regular clergy gave rise to many a quarrel, especially on the issue of language. The Hispanicizing decrees of the Council of the Indies, applied to the Indian settlements as well, were for the most part without effect because no financial means were allocated for their execution, but especially because the priests in the Indian parishes, both the regular and the secular priests, but above all the mestizos, resisted the decrees most strenuously. Most deleterious was the decision by the archbishop of Mexico, Antonio de Lorenzana (d. 1804 as cardinal-archbishop of Toledo), in a pastoral letter to require the acquisition of Spanish for the benefit of the Indians and the elevation of religious life in Mexico.[68]

---

[59] A. Ybot León, *La Iglesia* II, 168.

[60] A. de Egaña, *La teoría del Regio Vicariato Español* (Rome 1958), 302 f.

[61] M. Bandin Hermo, *El Obispo de Quito Don Alonso de la Peña Montenegro* (Madrid 1951).

[62] Ibid., 189–96: relationship to the Franciscans; 197–222: relationship to the Jesuits.

[63] Streit I, 271 f. The work had five editions, the last one as late as 1771.

[64] C. Bayle, *El Clero Secular y la Evangelización de América* (Madrid 1950), 197–220.

[65] Ibid., 223–291, and the introduction to the "Crónicas peruanas de interés indígena," *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* 209 (Madrid 1968); L. Millones, "Introducción al estudio de las idolatrías. Análises del proceso de aculturación religiosa en la área andina," *Aportes* (Paris 1967), 47–82.

[66] The Spanish works of these three authors in a new edition are contained in Vol. 209 of the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*. For Francisco de Ávila, see H. Trimborn and Klelm

The character of Portuguese Brazil was completely different from that of the Spanish territories.[69] The Spanish had occupied and settled whole countries, whereas the Portuguese for a long time limited themselves to individual coastal areas. They did not advance into the interior of the country until the seventeenth century and then only did so gradually. The establishment of bishoprics reflects both the colonial and the ecclesiastical expansion. After 1551 Bahia was the only bishopric for over a century. In 1676 it was joined by Rio de Janeiro, Olinda-Recife, and Maranhão; in 1745 by São Paulo and Marianna (Minas Gerais); in 1781 by Goiaz and Cuiabá. Missionary work, too, had initially limited itself to the coastal areas, where Franciscans and Dominicans, Jesuits and Capuchins, but also Benedictines and Carmelites were active in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. In order to

---

Antje, *Francisco de Ávila* (Berlin 1967); concerning Arriaga and the entire problem, see J. Specker, "Das Weiterleben des Heidentums in den peruanischen Missionen des 17. Jh.," *Jb für Gesch. von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* 3 (Cologne 1966), 118–40; C. Bayle, "Los Clérigos y la extirpación de la idolatría en los neófitos americanos," *MH* 1 (1944), 53–94.—The battle against the enduring paganism was of course also waged by the missionaries of the orders. For the sixteenth century, see P. Borges, *Métodos*, 247–306; L. Clark Keating, *The Extirpation of Idolatry in Peru* (Lexington 1968).

[67] *Ritual, formular e institución de cura para administrar a los naturales de este reino* (Lima 1631). Bishop Peña Montenegro also deals with this question comprehensively in his *Itinerario para parochos de Indios* 6k. II, tract IV (1754), 219–35. In all these works of the Peruvian secular clerics we should not ignore the antipathy, often strong, against the regular clergy. In addition to the documentation for the continuing existence of paganism, which reasonable Indian missionaries never denied, they should also document the deficient missionary work of the regular clergy.

[68] R. Konetzke, "Die Bedeutung der Sprachenfrage in der Kolonisation Amerikas," *Jb. für Gesch. von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* 1 (Cologne 1964), 72–116; R. Ricard, "Le problème de l'enseignement du castillan aux Indiens d'Amérique durant la période coloniale," *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* 39 (1961), 281–96.

[69] R. Richard, "La Dualité de la civilisation hispanique et l'histoire réligieuse du Portugal," *RH* 216 (1956), 1–17; idem, "Comparison of Evangelization in Portuguese and Spanish America," *The Americas* 14 (Washington 1957/58), 444–53.

ameliorate the conflicts between the individual orders there was a rough jurisdictional division of certain areas between the Jesuits, Franciscans, Capuchins, and Carmelites. In the larger monasteries and colleges of the coastal areas the orders also educated native priests, sons of Portuguese settlers, mestizos, and some few Negroes (but no Indians), all of whom demonstrated a higher degree of adaptability and linguistic ability than the European missionaries.[70]

Aside from the effects of patronage, injurious in Brazil as well,[71] missionary work there was hampered in the seventeenth century by the Dutch occupation in the north and the French occupation in the south. But the greatest disaster was slavery. The Dutch occupation (with its center in Pernambuco) united all forces in the country, governmental and ecclesiastical, Portuguese and native, in a common defense. Yet the prevailing attitude towards slavery became a significantly divisive element in missionary work. The Franciscans sought to protect the Indian villages (*Aldeias*) which they served against the Portuguese slaveholders, whereas the Jesuits under the leadership of the most eloquent Antonio Vieira (d. 1697) pursued their fight against slavery in Brazil as well as in Portugal primarily in the public forum. Neither order achieved any lasting success. In 1640 the Jesuits were even driven out of São Paulo. They were not allowed to return until 1653, and then only after they promised not to oppose the slave expeditions of the Paulists or *Bandeirantes* inasmuch as the latter were concentrating on the Indians in the reductions of Guairá, which belonged to the Jesuit province of Paraguay. A royal edict of 1758 tried to put a definitive end to Indian slavery although the enslavement of Negroes continued until the end of the nineteenth century.

---

[70] An example of the increasing number of native-born priests is given by the statistics in S. Leite, *Suma Histórica de Companhia de Jesus no Brasil (1549–1760)* (Lisbon 1965), 257. This shows the Brazilian province in 1757 to have had 210 native-born among a total of 474 members, whereas the vice-province of Maranhão had only 13 Brazilians among 155 members. For the history of the Jesuits in Brazil, see S. Leite, *Historia da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil,* 10 vols. (Lisbon 1938–50); for the Franciscans, see V. Willeke, O.F.M., "Franziskanermission in Brasilien 1500–1966, *NZM* 1967 ff; for the Capuchins, see Metodio da Nembro, O.F.M. Cap., *Storia dell'attivitá missionaria dei Missioni Cappuccini nel Brasile (1538?–1889)* (Rome 1958); for an overview see A. L. Farinha, *A expansão de fé na Africa e no Brasil* (Lisbon 1942), 419–542. A comprehensive history of the mission in Brazil is lacking.

[71] B. Biermann, O.P., "Die Sklaverei in Maranhão—Brasilien im 17. Jh. Ein unveröffentlichtes Dokument aus der Tätigkeit des P. Ant. Vieira," *NZM* 13 (1957), 103–18, 217–25; G. Freyre, *Casa-Grande e senzala*, 2 vols. (Rio de Janeiro 1954), Eng.: *The Masters and the Slaves* (New York 1946), French: *Maîtres et Esclaves* (Paris 1952). Regarding the unceasing efforts of the missionaries for the human rights of the Indians, see M. Kiemen, O.F.M., *The Indian Policy of Portugal in the Amazonas Region 1619–1693* (Washington 1954).

Under these conditions it is not surprising that the first synod in Brazil was not convened until 1707. On this occasion Archbishop Sebastian da Vida published the first constitutions of the archdiocese of Bahia after he had become personally familiar with the church situation in the country through laborious visitations.[72] The second synod of Brazil did not take place until 1888. The great significance of the *Constitutiones* of 1707 lies in the fact that for the first time the total religious life of Brazil, down to the last details, was dealt with and regulated in 1,318 paragraphs, giving thought to the Indians and Negroes in the appropriate places with the intention of securing their religious life.[73] The constitutions were printed in Lisbon (1719) and Coimbra (1720), but in 1750 Marquis de Pombal began his activities, which were to be equally disastrous for Brazil.

The Revival of the Missionary Spirit and the Expansion of the Missions

The extant religious missions in America again and again produced prominent men in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, so that the orders cannot be said to have been decaying.[74] The original missionary spirit was revived by new foundations and orientations.

The Franciscans

The rejection of an Indian Church by Philip II and the Council of the Indies damaged the Franciscan mission more than others, as did the gradual transfer of the already established *doctrinas* to the secular clergy. To be sure, the Franciscans retained a number of *doctrinas,* even in Mexico, after the actions of such prelates as Bishop Palafox.[75] Propagation of the faith among the remaining pagan Indians was both started and continued, albeit with great sacrifices. But it took Antonio Llinás to bring about a true reorientation.[76] Born in Mallorca in 1635, he joined

[72] O. Schulte O.F.M., *De primis Archidiocesis Bahiae constitutionibus anno 1707 promulgatis* (Rome 1962).

[73] Ibid., 140–66.

[74] The best overview of all the orders is probably A. Ybot León, *Iglesia* II, for the Franciscans: 243–510; Dominicans: 511–631; Mercedarians: 632–88; Augustinian Hermits: 689–794; Augustinian Recollects: 795–840; Jesuits: 841–994; Capuchins: 995–1028, with an abundant bibliography for each section.

[75] According to a report in 1691 by the archbishop of Mexico 147 parishes and *doctrinas* were served by regular clerics and only 79 by secular clerics (L. Lemmens, op. cit., 226).

[76] E. R. Paxos, *De Patre Antonio Llinás Collegiorum Missionarum in Hispania et America Fundatore 1635–93* (Vich 1936); he is treated in detail by the chronicler F. de Espinosa, O.F.M., *Crónica de los Colegios de Propaganda Fide de la Nueva España*, ed. by Lino G. Cañedo (Washington 1964), books II–III, 233–443. A good summary is found in D.

the Franciscan order of strict observance and went to Mexico in 1664. After he worked as a lecturer in philosophy and theology for ten years, he became guardian in Valladolid in 1674. He did his duty and pursued music as a hobby. But the stricter observance of the rules of the order and devotion to apostolic work (popular missions) led to his being elected in 1679 as representative to the upcoming chapter general. At the beginning of 1680 he arrived in Spain and used his time until the chapter of Toledo to prepare his lifework, the foundation of mission colleges. For soon after he began his apostolic work, Llinás recognized that the required apostolic manpower could no longer be obtained from the large monasteries in the cities of Mexico, most of which had been in existence for more than one hundred years. In 1682 the general of his order agreed to the statutes of these mission colleges and designated the monastery of the Holy Cross in Querétaro, Mexico, for the planned new foundation; he allowed Llinas to recruit twenty-four missionaries in the Spanish provinces. Innocent XI approved the statutes through a brief of 8 May 1682, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith did so by decree of 15 June 1682. The Holy Office also assigned the necessary faculties for the apostolic work.[77]

The constitutions of the mission colleges, probably authored by the general of the order, José Ximénez Samaniego,[78] but derived from Llinas's experiences, were based on the perception that true apostolic work is only possible in conjunction with the strictest observance.[79] The monastery of the Holy Cross in Querétaro, the cradle of the mission colleges, was already a monastery of recollection (*recolección*) and strict observance.[80] As were later mission colleges, it was released from the provincial structure and placed directly under the commissioners of the order in Mexico. The college was to be an institution for training in the missionary parish work and in the languages of the natives. It was planned to enable the missionaries to retreat there for longer or shorter periods of time for the purpose of contemplation. The rule for the new Indian missions was that the missionaries would only work there until the Indians were truly converted and could be left to the care of the

---

Saiz Diez O.F.M., "Los Colegios de Propaganda Fide en Hispanoamérica," *MH* 25 (1968), 257–318; 26 (1969), 5–113.

[77] The three documents were ratified by the Council of the Indies and approved in 1683 (see R. Pazos, op. cit., 72).

[78] V. Añibarro, O.F.M., "El P. José Ximénez Samaniego Ministro General O.F.M. y Obispo de Placencia," *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 3 (Madrid 1943), especially 292–309.

[79] F. de Espinosa, *Crónica* in the introduction by P. L. G. Cañedo, XXVff.

[80] M. B. McCloskey, *The Formative Years of the Missionary College of Santa Cruz of Queretaro 1683–1733* (Washington 1955).

secular clerics.[81] Because of the disputes between the native Spanish regulars and the Creoles, the mission colleges sought to refill their ranks with new recruits from Spain, although in principle Creoles and members of other provinces in the country were not excluded.[82] This attitude with its attendant consequences prompted the founder of the college of Querétaro to return to Spain at the end of 1684 in order to save the endangered foundation.[83] The superiors both of the order and the Church renewed their approbation. But Llinás did not go back to Mexico because he was entrusted with a new challenge in Spain which he had not foreseen, but nonetheless accepted with pleasure: the founding of similar mission colleges in Spain, which were to secure a rising generation, grown up and already schooled in the missionary spirit of the overseas colleges. The colleges in Spain were also to take over the task of popular mission there.[84] Their title, *Colegios de Propaganda Fide*, is surprising and can be traced to the recognition of the foundation in Querétaro by the Propaganda. They were accorded great esteem but no more. The mission colleges were also subject to the Spanish right of patronage. When Llinás was negotiating in Rome in 1685/86, the Spanish ambassador received a letter from the Council of the Indies requesting him to make sure that no patronage rights were violated. It stipulated that Llinás was not to confer about the conversion of the Indians because the King himself, contrary to opinions in Rome, had manifested the greatest concern for the missionary work. All documents written in Rome prior to and at this time were to be submitted again to the Council of the Indies for their appraisal.[85]

---

[81] By means of this regulation the general attempted to prevent conflicts with the secular clergy. Thus the college of San Fernando in Mexico handed the flourishing mission in the Sierra Gorda over to the secular clergy (see M. Geiger, *Palou's Life of Fray Junípero Serra* (Washington 1955), 35 f.). The basis was the mutual esteem as expressed in the fraternal accord between the secular clergy of Queretaro and the College of the Holy Cross (see F. de Espinosa, *Crónica,* 217–21 [Hermanidad ejemplar que hizo la muy ilustre y venerable congregacion de Nra. Sra. de Guadelupe con el colegio, a chapter which is exemplary for the new spirit of the colleges]).

[82] For Querétaro, Father Lino Gómez Cañedo lists the following figures for the period of 1683–1750: 142 priests and 14 lay brothers who were from Spain, 58 priests and 36 brothers from among the Creoles who were accepted into the novitiate, and 11 priests and 4 brothers who transferred into the mission college from other provinces (F. de Espinosa, *Crónica*, XXVIII).

[83] R. Pazos, op. cit., 104ff.

[84] The care applied to the selection process for the mission college is shown by the regulations left for his successors by Father M. Mingo de la Concepción, who represented the mission college of Tarija (Bolivia) in Spain (P. Borges, "Trámites para la organización de las Expediciones misioneras a América [1780]," *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 26 [Madrid 1966], 405–72).

[85] R. Pazos, op. cit., 112f.

The most important mission colleges were founded in Mexico. The monastery of the Holy Cross continued to be the parent monastery, as it were. The missionaries initially worked in the pagan enclaves of the country, among the Otomis near Querétaro, the Tlaxcaltecs near Puebla, the Coles and Lacadones in the Verapaz, and among the Licques Indians of Honduras. To these were soon added the Talamanca mission in the southeast of Costa Rica and missionary work in what is now Texas. The mission in the Verapaz and among other Indian tribes of Guatemala prompted the establishment of the second mission college of the "Crucified Christ" in the city of Guatemala. Another foundation, "Our Dear Lady of Guadelupe" in Zacatecas, received royal acknowledgment in 1704. Emanating from Zacatecas, the southern stretch of land in the Gulf of Mexico known as Nuevo Santander was successfully missionized.[86] In 1733 the college of San Fernando was founded in the capital; it was confirmed by the King in 1733. Since the Discalced also opened a similar mission college (1733), designed to take over the mission in the barely accessible mountains of Zimapán, Mexico now had five colleges for the propagation of the faith.

Mexico also became the point of departure for the establishment of other colleges in South America. In Ocopa in the south of the archbishopric of Lima the Colegio di Santa Rosa was founded (1724). From 1779 to 1783 it was charged with the mission on the island of Chiloé and later on some additional ones, among them those of the expelled Jesuits.[87] In Colombia the colleges of Popayán (founded 1747 in Quito and relocated 1749 in Popayán) and Cali (1756) were set up. In Tarija (Bolivia) the local college took over the mission among the Chiriguanos in the Chaco, stagnant for over two hundred years. Their apostle was the venerable Franciscus del Pilar, who, living among them as helper and servant of all from 1765 until his death in 1803, gradually overcame their resistance. By 1810 the mission comprised twenty-two stations with 16,425 Christians.[88] In 1756 the college of Chillán (Chile) was founded; after 1767 it was in a position to take over the majority of the missions of the expelled Jesuits.[89] The last college to be founded in the eighteenth century was San Carlos on the Paraná (1784); it was designed especially for the conversion of the Indians in the southern Chaco and in Paraguay.[90] The historian of the Franciscan order justifiably speaks of "that glorious new epoch of the eighteenth century which begins with the entrance of the apostolic colleges into the vineyard of the Lord."[91] The new missionary spirituality is especially well reflected in the life of two men.

---

[86] F. de Lejarza, O.F.M., *Conquista espiritual del Nuevo Santander* (Madrid 1947). Here, too, the missionaries established twenty-three Indian villages (see pp. 187–295). Following the expulsion of the Jesuits the missionaries of Zacatecas were able to take over the Jesuit missions among the Tarahumara Indians as well (J. A. Alcocer, O.F.M., *Bosquejo de la historia del Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe y sus misiones. Año de 1788* [Mexico City 1958]; A. M. Carreño, "The Missionary Influence of the College of Zacatecas," *The Americas* 7 (Washington 1950/51), 297–320).

[87] O. Maas, O.F.M., *Las Órdenes religiosas* (contains a number of informative documents especially about the activities of this college).

[88] L. Lemmens, op. cit., 319–23. Another Bolivian college was established at the end of the eighteenth century in Tarate.

One of the founders of the Mexican colleges was Antonio Margil (1657–1726). He spent forty-three years in Central America and not only founded the colleges of Guatemala and Zacatecas, but to a large extent put his stamp on the spirit of the colleges. He worked as a missionary in all the areas of Central America, to Talamancas in Costa Rica, and on the other side up to Texas, where he spent the period from 1716 to 1722. After his sermons got him a firm foothold somewhere, he hurried on, leaving his successors to consolidate his achievements.[92] The apostle of California, Junípero Serra (1713–84), belonged to the mission college of San Fernando in Mexico. In 1750 he left the professorship of his native university (Palma de Mallorca) and at first worked among the Indians of the Sierra Gorda and after 1767 as superior of the Franciscan mission in California, initially in Baja California, where the Franciscans of the colleges took over the missions of the expelled Jesuits. Finally, he pioneered the mission in present-day California, where even now a number of Franciscan names are a reminder of the modest beginnings of Indian missions. In a constant fight with regalism, dominant even in California, Serra succeeded in establishing a chain of missionary stations all the way to San Francisco. The state of California has placed a statue of its actual colonizer in the capital in Washington.[93]

---

[89] L. Lemmens, op. cit., 312–16. In 1777 this college initiated the founding of a college for Indian priests the first three of whom were ordained in 1794 (ibid., 313). It was closed in 1811 when the new national government proved to be even more opposed to the Indians than the former Spanish rule.

[90] Ibid., 332. In his history Lemmens makes additional references to smaller colleges as well.

[91] Ibid., 239. F. de Espinosa, *Crónica de los Colegios*, 783–88 (contains a good summary of the first sixty years of the colleges in Mexico and their actual missionary work).

[92] The first account of his life is by his contemporary F. de Espinosa, *El pelegrino Septentrional Atlante . . .* (Valencia 1742); Streit III, 130; critical biography by Rios and Leutenegger, *Life of Fray A. Margil OFM* (Washington 1959).

[93] First biography by his countryman and successor F. Palóu, *Relación Histórica* (Mexico City 1787) (English translation with critical commentary by M. Geiger [Washington 1955]); *The Writings of J. S.*, trans. and ed. by A. Tibesar, 3 vols. (Washington 1955–56); standard biography by M. Geiger, O.F.M., *The Life and Time of Fr. J. S.*, 2 vols. (Washington 1959).

By the middle of the eighteenth century and the expulsion of the Spanish by the Americans the mission colleges had—with few exceptions—taken the place of the earlier missionaries of the Franciscan provinces in the newly opened missions in the north, and in the states of New Mexico, Texas, Arizona, and California (later annexed by the United States). The spirit of these colleges could only be broken by force,[94] in Mexico by their abolition in 1827, somewhat later in other countries. Just a few of them continued on into modern days, incorporated in the reorganized Franciscan provinces.

The Jesuits

A new impetus to the missionary spirit was expected from the Society of Jesus, which arrived in America relatively late. But government and Church alike wanted the Jesuits above all to serve the Spaniards, or rather the Creoles, especially in the field of education, where they indeed earned their greatest merits, indirectly of benefit to the Indian mission as well. Subaltern officials and the secular clergy were educated in their schools.[95] The dispatch of the Jesuits to America met with great opposition in Spain and indeed even within their own order.[96] Thus the Jesuits only gradually grew into their role as Indian missionaries. Even in the vice-kingdom of Peru, where they had arrived in 1568 and where the propagation of the faith had developed most intensively, it was not until 1576 that the provincial chapter of Cuzco took over the large missionary center of Juli on Lake Titicaca, sending the first missionaries there in the same year.[97] Yet at the colleges of Lima and Cuzco the Jesuits had already worked successfully among the Indians in those areas. The refusal to take over their own *doctrinas* or Indian parishes was probably based on the fear that this would tie them too closely to the civil and ecclesiastic authorities.[98]

---

[94] An abundance of details in the two volumes of O. Maas, op. cit.—Approximately eighty years after the establishment of the college of Querétaro the Capuchin Father Franc. de Ajofrín praised its apostolic spirit (B. de Carrocera, "Noticias Misionales de Méjico en los años 1763–1767." *MH* 11 [1954], 221ff.). The same spirit was still widespread in Spain as noted by a report of the Comisario Collector for the year 1811 (F. de Lejarza, "Las Levas misioneras en el siglo XIX," *MH* 13 [1956], 179–90).

[95] The Jesuits substantially elevated the education and social status of the secular clergy so that together they represented the third party (in addition to the bishops and the mendicant orders) (See R. C. Padden, "The Ordenanza del Patronasgo 1574. An Interpretative Essay," *The Americas* 12 [Washington 1955/56], 333–54, esp. 353f.).

[96] Astraín II, 284ff.; F. Mateos, "Antecedentes de la entrada de los jesuitos españoles en las Misiones de América (1538–63)," *MH* 1 (1944), 109–66.

[97] A. Echánovo, "Origen y evolución de la idea jesuítica de 'Reducciones' en las Misiones del Virreinato del Perú," *MH* 12 (1955), 95–144; *MH* 13 (1956), 497–540; A. de Egaña, *Monumenta Peruana* II (Rome 1958), see Index p. 875. But even later on complaints reached Rome which prompted General Claudio Acquaviva to issue his encyclical to the missions (dated 15 June 1584), which Egaña calls the "Carta Magna Misional" of the order (ibid. III, Doc. 100).

In the following period Juli not only became a model of Jesuit missionary work on Lake Titicaca, but a universal center of Peru. The missions of the Maynas (on the upper Amazon in eastern Ecuador), among the Moxos (in present-day Bolivia), and especially in Paraguay had their roots there. The Chiquitos mission in Bolivia, too, was indirectly connected with Juli.[99]

This expansion of the Jesuit colleges and missions in South America resulted in the formation of more and more provinces.[100] What gave these areas, especially the missions among the Indians during the seventeenth and eighteenth century, their very own character was the steady increase of non-Spanish missionaries. Jesuits from countries under Spanish dominion, such as Italians, Flemish, and Walloons were the first to be admitted.[101] Then, towards the end of the seventeenth century, subjects of the Habsburg lands received permission to travel abroad (1678),[102] and finally others as well, such as Germans and Swiss. The major portion of the non-Spanish missionaries went to the reductions in Paraguay. According to A. Huonder, the province of Paraguay, separated from Peru in 1606, included about one hundred twenty-five German-speaking missionaries, most of them in the reductions.[103] The reason for this was not only the fact that the foreign Jesuits in faraway Paraguay were at greater remove from supervision of Spanish officials, but also that their labor and skills were highly esteemed. They excelled as prominent architects and musicians, as for instance the Austrian Anton Sepp von Reinegg or the Swiss Martin Schmid;[104] as ethnologists like

---

[98] In 1576 the eminent mission theoretician José de Acosta was the provincial of the Peruvian province. The decision for the taking over of the *doctrinas* can probably be attributed to him (L. Kilger, "Die Peru-Relation des José de Acosta 1576 und seine Missionstheorie," *NZM* 1 [1945], 24–38).

[99] In July, for instance, there was a rule that after twenty days of work in the *doctrinas* the missionaries had to return to the religious house for eight days of spiritual renewal and communal life (A. Echánovo, "Origen y evolución . . . ," *MH* 12 [1955], 117f.).

[100] Details in Streit II and III and in the supplementary volumes XXIV–XXVI; E. Cardozo, *Historiografía Paraguaya* (Mexico City 1959).

[101] P. Delattre and E. Lamalle, "Jésuites wallons, flamands, français, missionaires du Paraguay 1608–1767, "*AHSI* 16 (Rome 1947), 98–176.

[102] F. A. Plattner, "Die Groß-Expedition von Jesuiten deutscher Zunge," *NZM* 1 (1945), 169–83. These were the expeditions of 1680.

[103] *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionare des 17. und 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1899), 139–51; A. Blankenburg, "German Missionary Writers in Paraguay," *Mid-America* 29 (Chicago 1947), 34–68, 122–31.

[104] F. A. Plattner, *Ein Reisläufer Gottes. Das abenteuerliche Leben eines Schweizer Jesuiten P. Martin Schmid aus Baar* (1694—1772) (Lucerne 1944); idem, *Genie im Urwald. Das*

Martin Dobritzhoffer, whose work on the Abipones is highly respected even today, or the Silesian Florian Paucke, whose observations were published only recently.[105] Very much in demand were the German and Flemish brothers who were highly skilled in the trades but were also working as artists and apothecaries. All of this was of great use to the reductions, but caused growing antipathy among the Spanish population in the surrounding countryside.[106] Immense herds of mules and cows provoked the envy of the urban Spaniards.[107] The major export articles were Paraguay tea, the production rights of which was granted to the Indians by a royal cedula on 1645,[108] and woven goods.[109] The tragic outcome of the courageous fight against the slave hunters of São Paulo, leading, in the end, to Portugal's claiming a number of reductions in the present Brazilian state of Paraná contributed significantly to the decline of the large-scale "Indian State" of the Jesuits. The order by the Jesuit general to obey in every way the regulations of the Portuguese and finally the cession to Portugal of seven reductions, together with all their territory (stipulated by the Treaty of Madrid in 1750), had a disastrous effect. The missionaries were forced to abandon their Indians when the latter, deprived of help from the fathers and the other reductions, were defeated in battle by a Portuguese-Spanish alliance. This completely undermined the Indians' confidence in their missionaries. The Jesuits, frequently with great ceremony, had assumed the legal protection over the Indians because they knew all too well that their Christians were sold without mercy on the slave markets of Brazil, especially since they were more valuable to the sellers than other Indians by virtue of their skills in agriculture and the crafts. In 1768 when the Jesuits, together

---

Werk des Auslandschweizers M. Schmid (Zurich 1959); idem, *Deutsche Meister des Barock in Südamerika im 17. und 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1960).

[105] Zwettler Codex 420 of P. Florian Paucke. *Jesuiten-Mission in Paraguay* I (Vienna 1959); II (ibid. 1966); H. Hoffmann, "Der Indianermissionar Florian Paucke SJ aus Winzig in Schlesien," *Beiträge z. schles. Kirchengeschichte. Gedenkschrift für Kurt Engelbert* (Cologne and Vienna 1969), 376–81.

[106] See especially M. Mörner, *The Political and Economic Activities of the Jesuits in the La Plata Region* (Stockholm 1953); pp. 6–21 have a thorough introduction to the published and unpublished sources especially of the reductions; pp. 229–41 contain an excellent bibliography.

[107] Even in 1680 there were thirty-five hundred mules sold from Cordoba to Peru (M. Mörner, op. cit., 167). In addition to the mules the college of Buenos Aires, where the superiors of Paraguay province resided, regularly exported approx. twenty thousand other animals (ibid.).

[108] M. Mörner, op. cit., 100. See 150f. regarding the planting of yerba, as the tea was called commercially, its expansion and the resulting decrease of its price on the world market.

[109] M. Mörner, op. cit., 163.

with about one hundred thousand Indians, were driven out of their remaining thirty reductions, there was no resistance on the part of the Indians.[110]

Closely connected with these events was probably the downfall of the social utopias which had initially been nurtured by older Jesuits and then taken root among the Indians, leading to some syncretistic movements among them.[111] In the end, this undermined the vitality of the Indians of Paraguay and the surrounding reductions. Adding the totally paternalistic attitude of the missionaries, which had after all prevailed for 150 years,[112] one can understand in historical terms the extent of the tragedy inherent in the downfall of such an idealistic undertaking. But one must also know that the missionaries of other orders, especially the Franciscans, were no more successful. By 1802 the thirty former Jesuit reductions contained a mere 30,116 inhabitants. A large number had retreated into the forests.

The arrival of the Jesuits in the vast areas of New Granada (Colombia) and Venezuela occurred relatively late and they had few missions there. But early on they built a large college in the port city of Cartagena, the point of entry for vast areas of South America and at the same time the largest place of reshipment in the slave trade. At least two names should be mentioned among the missionaries of this college as an example of the apostolate among the black slaves. Alonso de Sandoval (1571–1652) was not only the actual organizer of this ministry, but also the first and only theoretician of the Negro mission in America. In 1627 a Spanish-language version of his work appeared in Seville.[113] The thirty-two chapters of the first part of his *De Instauranda Aethiopum salute* dealt with Africa and its cultures, primarily those between the islands of Cape Verde and Angola, from where most of the slaves were coming. The second part describes the miserable conditions of the Negro slaves; the third part treats the qualities and methods required for this special kind of ministry;[114] the fourth part gives the reasons which call for Jesuits above all to dedicate themselves to this task.[115] Sandoval's pupil and successor, the Catalan Pedro Claver (1581–1659), sought to ameliorate the social conditions of his charges as much as possible. He secured the privilege for Negroes of attending Mass in the college church of the Jesuits. He defended them before the courts and the Inquisition. By taking on the role of "slave of the slaves" day after day he was protesting the practice of slavery.[116]

---

[110] R. Lacombe, "Problème et mystère des Jésuites du Paraguay," *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 17 (Montreal 1965), 89–109, 283–95. The most informative treatment of the war and its background is provided in G. Kratz, S.J., *El Tratado Hispano-Portugues de Límites de 1750 y sus consecuencias. Estudio sobre la abolición de la Compañía de Jesús* (Rome 1954).

[111] M. Humbert, "Indiens et Jésuites au Paraguay. Rencontre de deux messianismes," *Archives de Sociologie des Religions* 27 (Paris 1969), 119–33.

[112] idem, *La vie quotidienne du Paraguay sous les Jésuites* (Paris 1967).

[113] Streit I, 188. The Spanish title is *Naturaleza, Policia sagrada i profana, Costumbres, Ritos, Disciplina—Catechismo Evangélico de todos Etíopes*. The work was probably supposed to have had the Latin title *De instauranda Aethiopum salute*. This is indicated in the preface. A second printing (Madrid 1647) comprised only the first three books (Streit I, 217). A reprint of the Seville edition appeared in 1956 in Bogotá under the title *De instauranda Aethiopum salute. El mundo de la esclavitud negra en América*.

The Jesuits did not come to the vice-kingdom of Mexico until 1572. Here, too, their principal service was initially to the white population. By and by colleges were built in Mexico, Puebla, Oaxaca, and Valladolid, the great novitiate of Tapozotlán, the seminary of San Ildofonso in Mexico, and the residences in Guadalajara, Pátzcuaro and Vera Cruz. For some time there was no actual Indian mission, a fact which was deplored in contemporary documents by those Jesuits who were eager to missionize. An order by the Jesuit General Acquaviva was required to initiate Indian missionary work of more sizeable proportions;[117] this started in 1584 in the northwestern part of the country. The work not only comprised the Tarahumara Indians,[118] but also the tribes of Sonora and the Pimeria Alta and spread from there across the area of present-day Arizona to Southern California. The most prominent figure among these Jesuit missionaries was a native of Trent, Eusebio Francisco Kino (1645–1711),[119] trained in that southern German province not only to become one of the greatest missionaries, but also a superior explorer and cartographer. The world owes him the first precise knowledge of California.[120] But Father Kino was foremost a missionary and organizer of the far-flung northeastern missions, architect and builder of mission stations and churches. He was so modest about his mission theory that it was not discovered until very recently; it has yet to be evaluated.[121] His greatest worry was the dearth of suitable missionaries; his requests for additional missionaries, especially from German-speaking countries, were fulfilled. H. E. Bolton remarked that more and more "black robes" with non-Spanish names emerge from the annual reports of Pimeria Alta, Sonora, and California during the eighteenth century.[122] Yet the shortage persisted. In his annual report to the general of 1 December 1751 the Swiss provincial Johann Anton Balthasar mentioned that of the 624 members of the Mexican province there were only 111 missionaries available for the territories of the northwest and California.[123]

---

[114] See also the hardly known instructions of the archbishop of Seville, Pedro de Castro y Quiñones, of 1614 for the conversion and ministry of the Negro slaves (Ed. 1956, 463–75).

[115] In spite of the zeal for the religious care of Negro slaves there is not a single chapter challenging the principle of Negro slavery either because the author as a product of his time did not consider it a problem or because censorship did not allow it. Unfortunately, a critical appraisal of Sandoval's work is still lacking, as is a general treatment of the religiomissionary problems of the Negro slaves in the Americas.

[116] For the numerous biographies, see Streit II, III, XXIV, XXVI. The last critical biography was written by A. Valtierra, S.J., *El santo que libertó una raza* (Bogotá 1959), Eng.: *Peter Claver Saint of the Slaves* (London 1960).

[117] F. Zubillaga, op. cit. III (1585–90) (Rome 1968). Even in 1589 reports indicate that of a total of 180 Jesuits no more than 12 or 13 were in the Indian mission (p. 384).

[118] P. Master Dunne, S.J., *Early Jesuit Mission in Tarahumara* (Berkely 1948).

[119] The best biography is by the American scholar of the "border mission," H. E. Bolton, *Rim of Christendom. A Biography of Eusebio Francisco Kino, Pacific Coast Pioneer* (New York 1936, 1960). The most important source for his lifework is the *Favores Celestiales*, written in 1699–1710 in the nature of a biography, ed. with critical commentary by H. E. Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir* (Rome 1954) (letters by Kino to the generals of the Society of Jesus); idem, *Kino writes to the Duchess* (Rome 1965), Span. (Madrid 1964) (letters to the great patroness, the duchess of Aveiro); idem., *Kino's Plan to the*

Contrary to Hispanic America, the Jesuit mission in Brazil (after 1503) and Maranhão (after 1627) was more limited in its development, though not for lack of manpower. The Portuguese homeland allowed neither the establishment of a university nor of a press. Industries whose development the Jesuits had aided were restricted or prohibited altogether lest the colonies become too strong. The predominant Jesuit of the seventeenth century was Antonio Vieira (1608–97), whom we have mentioned before.[124] His parents had brought him

---

Development of Pimeria Alta, Arizona and Upper California (Tucson, Arizona 1961) (the great justification to the viceroy of Mexico [1703]).

[120] E. J. Burrus, *La obra cartográfica de la provincia mexicana de la Compañía de Jesús (1567–1967)*, 2 vols. (Madrid 1967), especially I, 15–26 (lists thirty-one maps of areas explored and mapped by Kino; ten of them are published in Vol. 2).

[121] E. F. Kino, S.J., *Vida del P. Francesco J. Saeta SJ Sangre Misionera en Sonora*, ed. by E. J. Burrus (Mexico 1961). The eighth book of this bibliography is entitled: "Dictámenes de Misionero Apostólico del Venerable Padre Francisco Javier Saeta, sacados de sus cartas y de su religiosa conversación," 159–83.

[122] *Rim of Christendom*, 594.—For the first two areas he names: Benz, Fraidenegg, Gerstner, Gratzhoffer (= Kratzhoffer), Hoffenrichter, Hlava, Keller, Klever, Kolub, Kürtzel, Middendorff, Miner, Mentwich, Och, Pauer, Rhuen, Sedelmayr, Segesser, Slerag, Steb, Stiger, Wazer and Weiß; for California: Baegert, Bischoff, Consag, Ducrue, Gasteiger, Gordon, Helen, Link, Neymayr, Retz, Tempis, Teursch and Wagner. Concerning the missions in California see P. M. Dunne, *Black Robes in Lower California* (Berkeley 1968).

[123] Ms. in the archive Al Gesù "Fondo Jesuitico," 630 C.

[124] R. Ricard, *Antonio Vieira et les missions du Brésil septentrional au XVII^e^ siècle* (Louvain 1927) (also in *Études et documents* [Louvain 1930], 189–203); C. R. Boxer, *A Great Luso-Brazilian figure: Padre Ant. Vieira* (Paris 1960); M. Haubert, *L'Église et la défense des "sauvages": Le Père Ant. Vieira au Brésil* (Brussels 1964). These new works list the collections of sources, his writings, and fifteen volumes of his sermons.

to Brazil as a little boy; in 1623 he joined the Society of Jesus. Having worked as Portuguese legate in various countries, he returned to Brazil as a missionary in 1652. Because of his fair and humane partisanship for the Indians he and the other Jesuits of the college of Belem were deported to Portugal by the colonists. Some individual doctrines in his prophetic, utopian works, primarily in his *Esperanças de Portugal, Quinto Imperio do Mundo* and the *Historio de futuro,* resulted in his being jailed by the Inquisition after a trial lasting four years. A change of government brought about his release in 1669.[125] Vieira viewed the widely expanded system of patronage as the instrument willed by God for the final realm of the Messiah, the fifth realm of the eschatology coinciding with the universal rule of Portugal.[126] While he was in Rome to justify himself from 1669 to 1675, he was removed from the jurisdiction of the Portuguese Inquisition, but he rejected all ecclesiastical offices offered to him. After twenty years of banishment he returned to the Maranhão mission, where he died at the age of eighty-nine at the college of Bahia. The strength of the Society of Jesus in Brazil now seemed to be spent. The discovery of the gold mines of Minas Gerais and the coffee plantations of São Paulo no longer offered the same possibilities for missionizing as before. In 1759 the Jesuits were expelled by Pombal.

After an auspicious start, the wars between the Iroquois and Hurons and the killing of the Jesuits working among them (1642–49) brought an end to the mission in the French colonies. Only after 1665, when Carignan secured Canada for the French, was missionary work able to be resumed in earnest. The Jesuits joined in it until the Peace of Paris in 1763, which relinquished Canada to England. During these 100 years they furnished 320 missionaries, most of them for the five Indian villages built after the fashion of Paraguay.[127] As a result of an agreement between the Jesuits and the French Capuchins (1632), the latter worked in Nova Scotia while the Sulpicians, the Paris Missionaries, and the

---

[125] The trial is treated in the 2-volume work of Hernani Cidade, *Ant. Vieira, Defesa Perante o Tribunal do Santo Oficio* (Bahia 1957).

[126] R. Ricard, "'Prophecy and Messianism in the Works of Antonio Vieira," *The Americas* 17 (April 1961), 357–68.

[127] For sources and literature see Streit II and III. F. B. Steck, O.F.M., *Marquette Legends* (New York 1960) (Attempts to prove that Marquette was not the discoverer of the Mississippi, but two of his younger fellow religious who used the great reputation of the older man to issue the reports under his name); also C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVIII^e siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1906); S. Delacroix, op. cit. II, 281–99.—C. C. O'Neill, *Church and State in French Louisiana* (New Haven 1966).

Recollect Franciscans supported the work of the Jesuits in Canada proper.

During the Indian Wars a number of Catholic Indians had been pushed south and southeast. This occasioned the great explorations of the Jesuits, foremost the ones by Jacques Marquette (1637–75), who reached the Mississippi in 1673 and worked among the Illinois and Miami Indians. Other Frenchmen, such as de la Salle, among whose companions was the Franciscan Louis Hennepin (d. 1701), succeeded in exploring the entire stream to its estuary. The Jesuits restricted their mission work to the Indian tribes in the northern areas with whom they were familiar, while others, especially those of the Foreign Missions of Paris, were active farther in the south. None of these groups was truly successful. In spite of all efforts Louisiana was not given its own church organization; it was under the jurisdiction of Quebec until the eighteenth century.

Other Orders

The Dominicans were the first missionaries of Peru; from there they spread all over South America. The two saints of this order in Peru can be considered as programmatic symbols: Rosa of Lima (1586–1617), a Creole, member of the Third Order and example of a contemplative, mystical life,[128] and Martín de Porras (or Porres, 1569–1639), a mulatto from Lima trained in the art of healing, a Dominican brother who gave himself in charitable love to all, regardless of class or race.[129]

The Dominicans also maintained the Indian missions established in the sixteenth century and further expanded them during the next two centuries. They achieved special merit in the promotion of higher education. In addition to the state universities in Lima and Mexico City founded in the sixteenth century, they operated the University of Santo Domingo from 1538 into the eighteenth century. In 1620 they initiated a *studium generale* in Guatemala which was expanded into a full-fledged university as the Real y Pontificia Universidad de San Carlos, recognized in 1676. Following this, two more universities were founded: the Universities of Santiago de Chile (1685) and Quito (1688). The seventeenth century also marked the beginning of a most quarrelsome competition with the Jesuits, who were able to base their claim on papal briefs similar to those of the Dominicans. As a result, places such as

---

[128] The first biography appeared in 1654 (Streit II, 536), a second one in 1659 (ibid., 550); further biographies appeared almost annually in all sorts of languages.

[129] Sanctification in 1962. More recent biographies by Vargas Ugarte (Buenos Aires 1949), John Jordan (Dublin 1957), and E. Romero (Lima 1959).

Bogotá, Quito, and Santiago de Chile soon had a Dominican and a Jesuit university. The Dominican monastery of San Juan de Letrán in Cuba was expanded into a university in the eighteenth century, as was their Colegio Seminario of Caracas.[130] In some fashion all these institutions were in the service of the Indian mission because the secular as well as the regular clergy received their education and their training in the native languages there.

The humanistic aspect of missionary work in the sixteenth century was primarily represented by the Augustinian Hermits. Alonso de la Vera Cruz was the first professor of theology in the New World (University of Mexico); even his first lectures in 1553/54 dealt with the Indian problem in the spirit of Las Casas and with the weapons of a theologian schooled in Salamanca.[131] The fact that succeeding generations of Augustinian Hermits of the seventeenth century were filled by his spirit is demonstrated by the chronicles of Fray Antonio de la Calancha[132] and Francisco Romero. The latter, a Creole Augustinian from Peru and itinerant missionary of South America, wrote the very moving *Llanto Sagrado de la América Meridional,* printed in Milan in 1693. It was a fearless indictment of the Spanish policy of exploitation of the Indians and was immediately confiscated by the Inquisition.[133] In spite of their efforts Romero and the missionaries recruited by him did not succeed in converting the Tames Indians in the province of Popayán in present-day Colombia.[134] At the beginning of the seventeenth century the wilderness of Raquira became the site of the first hermitage, Our Lady de la Candelaria, founded by the reform movement of the Barefoot Augustinians (Recollects). It became the focus of renewed missionary zeal and religious renewal for Colombia, Venezuela, Central America, and later on for Peru and Mexico. But the Philippines ultimately were to become the most fertile missionary field for them.[135]

---

[130] R. Konetzke, "Spanische Universitätsgründungen in Amerika und ihre Motive," *Jb. für Gesch. von Staat, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Lateinamerikas* 5 (Cologne 1968), 111–59.

[131] E. J. Burrus, "Las Casas and Veracruz: their Defense of the American Indians Compared," *NZM* 22 (1966), 201–12; idem, *The Writings of Alonso de la Vera Cruz* II: *The Defense of the Indians: Their Rights. Latin Text and English Translation* (Rome and St. Louis 1968).

[132] *Cronica Moralizada del Orden de San Augustín en el Perú* I (Barcelona 1639), II (Lima 1653).

[133] For the long title of the Milan edition see Streit II, 655.

[134] J. Metzler, "Das Missionsunternehmen des Francisco Romero O.E.S.A. Ende des 17. Jh.," *NZM* 21 (1965), 1–17.

[135] In addition to A. Ybot León, op. cit. II, 795ff., see especially J. A. Salazar, *Los Estudios eclesiásticos superiores en el Nuevo Reino de Granada 1563–1810* (Madrid 1946), 123ff. and the *Bullarium Ordinis Recollectorum S. Augustini* I (Rome 1954), II (1961).

The last Spanish missionaries in the Americas of the seventeenth century, the Capuchins, initially went to what is now Venezuela. The Council of the Indies had been unwilling to admit yet another order to America. But the lay brother Francisco de Pamplona, formerly General Don Tiburcio de Redín (with excellent connections to Philip IV), prevailed in having missionary work initiated first in Darien and then in Venezuela proper (1650).[136] The first Capuchins did not establish large monasteries nor did they accept novices from the ranks of the Creoles. Thus they maintained closer ties with their Spanish homeland provinces than the other orders.[137] They also sought to implement a new method of missionary style. From the north they advanced to the yet unconverted Indians, establishing small houses and gradually moving farther and farther south and southeast. Thanks to their unobtrusive method they were able to survive the tumult of the times.[138]

It is a striking fact that the participation of the nuns in the task of conversion in America has either been omitted or at best just cursorily described.[139] Remarks by early writers permit us to conclude that the problem of women's education was indeed tackled, since Bishop Juan de Zumárraga, to whom Queen Isabella had sent help in the persons of tertiaries (*Beatas*) in 1531 and 1535. Towards the end of the seventeenth century there were twenty-two convents in the city of Mexico alone and ten in Puebla.[140] All of these convents counted among their pupils Spanish, Creole, and Indian girls.[141] Such convents were also founded exclusively for Indian girls, daughters of caciques, among them the convent of Corpus Christi in Mexico (1724).[142] Emanating from here, the Indian convents of Cosamalsapán (1737) and Oaxaca (1782) were established with the particular aim of avoiding tensions among the races. Indian women had never been denied admittance to the orders.[143] The provincial synod of Charcas (Sucre, Bolivia) of 1629 indeed stressed that all sisters would enjoy equal rights in the convents. It emphasized that half-castes were to be accepted among the officiating nuns, "cum apud Deum fides non genus in pretio sit."[144] In the more distant provinces missionaries probably followed the example of the *Beatas* of the sixteenth century, founding *Beaterios* with the daughers of Indians. Two such convents are mentioned by the Capuchin friar Francisco de Ajofrín in his memoirs concerning his mendicant travels in Mexico.[145] The chronicler of the Dominican province of Guatemala reports that Benito de Villacañas founded such *Beaterios* in Guatemala and San Juan Sueatepequez and wrote the life of Christ and of Saint Catherine of Siena in the language of the sisters, that is, in Cacchiquel.[146] Only a thorough study will be able to show the extent of the contribution to the cultural life of the individual countries made by the convents. At this time it is enough to mention the poetess, dramatist, and essayist Sister Juana Inéz de la Cruz (1648–95), a Creole and Carmelite nun, still recognized throughout the tumultuous history of her native land as "the most important author ever born in Mexico."[147]

---

[136] The first biography was written by the Capuchin chronicler Mateo de Anguiano, *Vida y virtudes del Capuchino Español, el Venerable Servo de Dios Fray Francisco de Pamplona* (Madrid 1686); a modern critical one by L. de Aspurz (Madrid 1951); see also B. de Carocera, "F. Francisco de Pamplona, organisador de Misiones y conductor de Misioneros," *MH* 9 (1952), 5–51.

[137] For the American Capuchin mission see Froilán de Rionegro, *Relaciones de las Misiones de los PP. Capuchinos en las Provincias españoles hoy República de Venezuela* (*1650–1817*), 2 vols. (Seville 1918). Additional sources and literature in A. Ybot-León. op. cit., 1021ff.

[138] Information about the ethnological and linguistic works of the Capuchin friars provided in their journal *Venezuela Misionero* I (Caracas 1938)ff.

[139] I am not aware of any comprehensive work on this topic although reference is made to it in individual sources and in monographs about several convents.

[140] F. Chevalier, *La formation des grands domaines au Mexique* (Paris 1952), 330f.

[141] Ibid., 331. About the convents of Mexico City see the monograph by J. Muriel, *Conventos de monjas en la Nueva España* (Mexico City 1946). At the beginning of the seventeenth century Lima had six convents. B. Cobo, S.J., *Fundación de Lima*, ed. by F. Mateos (Madrid 1956), 428–33; of special interest is the chapter on the Carmelite nuns, "Del colegio de Nuestra Señora del Carmen," 434–36; it also maintained a girls' school and a girls' orphanage. For the educational work of a Dominican convent in Oaxaca, see J. Muriel, "Notas para la Historia de la educación de la mujer durante el Virreynato," *Estudios de Historia Novohispaña* II (1968), 25–33.

---

[142] J. Muriel, *Las indias caciques de Corpus Christi* (Mexico City 1963); in addition to a thorough introduction this work contains eight biographies of Indian sisters.

[143] F. de Lejarza, O.F.M., "Expansión de la Clarisas en América y Extremo Oriente," *Archivo Ibero-Americano* 14 (1954), 446f., 450f. Another convent was dedicated in the province of Michoacán (Valladolid) in 1743. The dedicatory sermon was given by the secular priest Juan Wallo Anguita. It was published under the title: *Oración panegírico de la dedicación del convento de indias capuchinas de Valladolid de Michoacán* (Mexico City 1743). Beristain de Sousa, *Bibliografía Hisp. Am. Sept.* I (Mexico City 1947), 144.

[144] *MH* 21 (1964), 120.—That Negresses were accepted is shown by a remark of the Franciscan chronicler Diego de Córdova Salinas, *Crónica Franciscana de las Provincias del Perú*, ed. by L. G. Cañedo (Washington 1957), 950. He speaks of a Negress who entered the Clarisse convent of Cuzco together with her daughter when they were freed from slavery.—Poor Indian women who did not have the required dowry often came as servants to their Creole mistresses, whom they continued to serve in the convent and in whose cells they usually lived. (See the reference in J. de Palafox y Mendoza, *Virtudes del Indio* [Madrid 1893], 58).

[145] B. de Carrocera, O.F.M.Cap., "Noticias Misionales de Méjico en los años 1763 à 1767," *MH* 11 (1954), 218 (Xalapa), 227 in Salvatierra. About the *Beaterios* of the Indian sisters in the sixteenth century, see esp. G. de Mendieta O.F.M., *Historia Eclesiástica Indiana* (Mexico City 1870), 420–24.

[146] F. Ximénez O.P., *Historia de la Provincia de San Vicente de Chiapa y Guatemala* II (Guatemala 1930), 49. The Calle de las Beatas Indias in Guatemala is mentioned on p. 282.

The alleviation of misery and disease was the goal not only of all the religious orders but also of the native societies, such as the numerous brotherhoods, founded for Spaniards, Indians, and Negroes. Social aid in all of Brazil was taken over primarily by the brotherhood of the *Misericordia,* whose model dates back to 1498 in Lisbon. The Hospitalers of Saint John of God, active in Mexico since 1603, especially excelled in the nursing of the sick. From Mexico they spread out to the Central and South American countries, establishing their hospitals and gaining the recognition of all levels of the populace in the service of lepers and those sick with the plague. In Mexico alone sixteen of their number died during the plague of 1736.[148] Long before this, in 1594, Clement VIII had granted the privileges of hospitalers to a society in Mexico founded by Bernardino Álvarez. They were named Hippolites, after the first hospital they built in Mexico dedicated to Saint Hippolyte. After the first vow dedicating themselves to the care of all the sick, they also took the vow of obedience and after 1700 also that of celibacy.[149]

The order of the Bethlemites, originated in Guatemala, maintained its own character. It went back to Pedro de San José Betancur (1616–67), who initially undertook the education of children, but then included the care of convalescents, especially of strangers and transients. After Betancur's early death his helpers continued his work. They founded an order of lay brothers which was recognized by the Pope in 1672 and spread surprisingly fast to Mexico and South America. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the order deteriorated and was dissolved in 1820. At this time it still operated ten hospitals in the Mexican and twenty-two in the Peruvian provinces.[150] A similar foundation for women, started by Maria Anna del Galdo in Guatemala (1688), did not grow very much and was also discontinued in 1820.[151]

Every one of these hospitaler orders had physicians trained in the native country. The fact that racial discrimination had no place in the treatment of the sick constitutes a great part of its missionary importance.

---

[147] Most recent collected works in Mexico City 1969.—In a monograph R. Ricard shows the poetess combined Spanish-Creole and native Indian elements into a natural unity: "Sur 'El Divino' Narciso de Sor Joana Iñés de la Cruz," *Mélanges de la Casa de Velasquez* 5 (Paris 1969), 309–29.

[148] L. Lopetegui and F. Zubillaga, *Historia*, 736–38.

[149] Ibid., 736; Heimbucher I, 607f.

[150] J. Specker, "Der Spiritualorden der Bethlehemiten in Lateinamerika (1667–1820)," *Das Laien-Apostolat in den Missionen* (*Festschr. Joh. Beckmann*) (Schöneck/Beckenried 1960), 181–99.

[151] Heimbucher I, 609.

The Enlightenment and Its Consequences

A fair evaluation of the Enlightenment in Latin America is a difficult undertaking even now. The intellectual history of Spain and Portugal of the eighteenth century as a period of obscurantism and Scholastic rigidity has received scant attention up to the most recent past. This holds true even more so in regard to America, little of whose intellectual life in the colonial period is known in Europe. As a consequence, historical research has shown little interest in the cultural phenomena in which the missionaries had a significant part.[152] The first generation of missionaries in Mexico, such as the Bishops Juan de Zumárraga and Vasco de Quiroga, were guided by contemporary humanists: Zumárraga by Erasmus,[153] Quiroga by Thomas More.[154] This intellectual attitude continued to be the determinant, especially for the missionary work. Two institutions were always connected with European intellectual life: the libraries, especially those of the monasteries, and the universities.

Although there are only a few monographs and precious few particulars or even inventories of books from the earliest times, references in letters, chronicles, and books relating to libraries[155] manifest two facts: 1. their collections were comprehensive; theological works most surely predominated, but there was no dearth of works from classical and modern literature; 2. new European publications, even from distant or

---

[152] "The history of rationalism and Enlightenment in Brazil has remained almost totally uninvestigated; their impact on the religious life of Brazil cannot yet be estimated" (R. Konetzke, "Forschungsproblem zur Gesch. der Religionen und ihrer Bedeutung in den Kolonisationen Amerikas," *Saeculum* 10 [1959], 95).—This remark to some degree is true also for Spanish America, for which there is no comprehensive work either. The thorough treatise by J. Sarrailh, *L'Espagne éclairée de la seconde moitié du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1954) is limited to Spain, but does permit some conclusions regarding the New World.

[153] M. Bataillon, *Erasmo y España*, 2 vols. (Mexico City and Buenos Aires 1950), esp. the last chapter of Vol. 2 concerning the influence of Erasmus in Mexico; this chapter is missing in the French edition.

[154] S. Zavala, *La "Utopia" de Tomás More en la Nueva España* (Mexico City 1937); newly edited with supplementary studies in *Recuerdo de Vasco de Quiroga* (Mexico City 1965).

[155] F. Fernández de Castillo, *Libros y Libreros del siglo XVI* (Mexico City 1914) (mostly booklists compiled by officials of the Inquisition on the arrival of ships in Veracruz). The Argentinian Jesuit and historian G. Furlong refers to such a work ironically: "A los pobres de espíritu que creen y propagan que el Nuevo Mundo no llegaban sino novenas y trisagios, les recomendamos nuestra monografía sobre las *Bibliotecas Argentinas durante la Dominación Hispánica* (Buenos Aires 1944)" (*Nacimiento y desarrollo de la Filosofía en el Río de la Plata 1536–1810* [Buenos Aires 1952], 52).

Protestant cities, reached the Spanish American countries relatively quickly.[156]

The universities were decisive elements of intellectual life. Towards the end of the colonial period there were twenty-three universities in Spanish America. Seven of them were comprehensive state universities, probably with a faculty of theology, but—just as in Spain—operated by secular and regular priests. In addition to the state universities there were sixteen other ones, recognized by the state, with only faculties of philosophy and theology. Fourteen of these were led by the various orders, two of them by bishops. The preponderance of higher education was undeniably in the hands of the state universities, in which laymen had the major influence.[157]

Libraries and universities prepared the way for the advance of new ideas and the advance of the Enlightenment with its positive and negative elements. The Jesuit college of Saint Paul in Lima contained the collected works of Isaac Newton, as well as histories and publications of the Académie des sciences and the Prussian Academy in Berlin. The major works of one of the most important forerunners of positive Enlightenment, the Benedictine Benito Gerónimo Feijóo y Montenegro (d. 1764), the *Teatro crítico universal* in eight volumes and the *Cartas Eruditas* in six volumes were to be found not only in the college libraries but also in the private libraries of the professors.[158] Even works by the English deists were widely represented in the libraries. But the French deists Bayle, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopedists were not available in the overseas territories until the Spanish minister Count de Aranda ordered their importation.[159] The Latin works of the German philosopher Christian Wolff could be found in several libraries of Latin America.[160] (see Chap. 18)

---

[156] See for example J. Beckmann, "Alte Basler Drucke im Dienste der Christianisierung Mexikos," *ZSKG* 59 (1965), 107–12. In arguing that the activities of the Inquisition militated against the exchange of ideas with the European centers of culture, the great difference between theory and practice is often overlooked. There were, to be sure, very strict regulations for the export and import of suspect or even heretical books. But the findings of M. Defourneaux (*L'inquisition espagnole et les livres français au XVIII^e siècle* [Paris 1963]) regarding the eighteenth century are valid for the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries as well: for periods of years and, indeed, decades the book dealers of Seville were not at all checked by the officials of the Inquisition. The lists published by F. Fernández de Castillo (op. cit.) are representative for the import; again and again there is a notation that so and so many crates of books were destined for members of the orders who were exempt from the controls of the Inquisition. The remainder, rather superficially catalogued, was probably only for sale by the bookdealers.

[157] Of 150,000 academic degrees awarded between 1550 and 1821 the number awarded by the University of Mexico alone amounted to 39,367 (J. T. Lanning, "The Church and the Enlightenment in the Universities," *The Americas* 15 [1958/59], 334).

[158] L. Martín, *The Intellectual Conquest of Peru, The Jesuit College of San Pablo* (New York 1968), 93–96. The works of Feiyóo in Spanish and Latin were present in all libraries "from Mexico City to Tucumán" (G. Furlong, op. cit., 64).

These books were eagerly studied everywhere and used in lectures at the universities and colleges. Wherever the well-educated Creoles, even missionaries at remote stations, manifested familiarity with the intellectual currents of Europe, they owed it to the education they had received at the universities or at their monasteries.[161] The two examples of the Jesuit universities of Quito and Córdoba demonstrate the reception of modern European intellectualism. The Swiss Jesuit Jean Magnin in Quito was probably the first to deal systematically with René Descartes after 1746.[162] The English Jesuit Falkner, a pupil of Newton, introduced experiments in the natural sciences in Córdoba and closely followed Christian Wolff in his philosophy lectures.[163] His fellow Jesuit Domingo Muriel before him had incorporated modern philosophy in his lectures. In 1749 one of his students wrote about him: "In order to further the understanding of the old scholastic philosophy he added a precise knowledge of the modern."[164] Richard Konetzke justifiably countered the wrong impressions by saying "that rationalism and the Enlightenment were propagated early and quickly in Spanish America, where contemporary European currents were almost immediately experienced . . . it was precisely the priests, monks, and prebendaries who were the forerunners of the Enlightenment in Spanish America . . ., modern ideas were promulgated especially by the Jesuits . . ."[165] Thus the ideas of the Enlightenment were able to be promulgated on all the cultural levels of the individual American countries through the universities, colleges, and seminaries. Initially they had a positive effect. The level of studies was raised everywhere and expanded; a fresh wind blew through the institutions of learning, which had become somewhat rigid.[166] Research centers in the natural sciences were established, as were associations of scholars. There was a first wave of periodicals, but it died out after a few years even in the large countries such as Mexico and Peru. In all these movements the clergy furnished the initial contributors; the episcopate promoted participation or at least did not oppose it. The Inquisition generously granted permission for the reading of proscribed books or overlooked violations of the Index.[167] Overall, the Enlightenment in Latin America was able to develop more freely than was initially the case in Europe.

---

[159] G. Furlong, op. cit., 47.

[160] G. Furlong, op. cit., index, 751.

[161] Although the individual orders had the upper levels of philosophy and theology taught by their own members, the latter nonetheless had to earn their required degrees for teaching at the universities.

[162] He had translated a work about Descartes from French into Latin, a manuscript of 262 pages, which is kept at the National Library of Quito. J. Beckmann, "La première Traversée de la Colombie par un missionaire suisse (1725). Le Père Jean Magnin SJ," *Annales Fribourgeoises* 46 (1964), 33–65.—G. Furlong, *Filosofía,* gives the subtitle "Cartesianismo" to the second part, which treats mainly the philosophy after the expulsion of the Jesuits to the end of the eighteenth century (223–483).

[163] G. Furlong, op. cit., 177f.

[164] "Añadiendo a la comprensión de la antigua filosofía escolástica, el conocimiento puntal de la moderna" (G. Furlong, op. cit., 178).

[165] Research topic 95. The reaction of the individual orders to the Enlightenment was not alike. The Franciscans everywhere had explicit orders to follow "modern" currents and in a good many places, esp. in Guatemala, were members of the leading circles. The Dominicans did not have a uniform direction. Depending on conditions and pressure they either defended the old Scholastic methods or took over the new ones (J. T. Lanning, op. cit., 343ff.).

Initially the intellectual elements of the Enlightenment had less of a negative impact than the abuses of regalism (Chap. 11), whose anti-Roman tendencies were strengthened by the skillful promotion of Gallican and Febronian ideas.[168] Most fatal—especially overseas—was the implicit acceptance of decisions by the state in religious matters, which became more and more a matter of course. Two events had far-reaching consequences. The expulsion of the Jesuits, initiated in 1759/60 by the Marquis de Pombal both in Portugal and the colonies, was followed by the Spanish colonies in 1767. It was executed smoothly but mercilessly, ending in 1768 in the deportation of the missionaries from the reductions of Paraguay. In regard to Brazil and the Spanish colonies various reasons were advanced to justify the expulsion of the Jesuits. The main one was that the Jesuits because of their inner structure could not be made an integral part of the regalist framework of enlightened absolutism.[169] Just how seriously the regalist attitude, especially of some bishops, obstructed a realistic view of the issue is demonstrated by the pastoral letter of the bishop of Puebla, Fabián y Fuero, dated 28 October 1767, which referred to the expulsion of the Jesuits as part of the "rightful use of privileges which God accorded to the King along with the crown."[170] The other equally portentous event was the provincial synods of 1771, invoked by the Spanish King. A detailed list of points to be negotiated, the *tomo regio,* had been given beforehand to the members of the synods by the Council of the Indies. Archbishop Francesco Antonio de Loranzana presided over the synod of Mexico; those of Lima and La Plata took place in 1772. Loranzana submitted decrees drafted by him and the bishop of Puebla, Fabián y Fuero, and then simply called for a vote, precluding any discussion. In order to prove their loyalty to the representative of the viceroy they added two provisions which threatened the penalty of excommunication for any form of resistance to a royal decree or any insult to the King.[171] When the bishop of Durango, José Vicente Díaz Bravo, called this procedure tyrannical, he was put on trial, deprived of his bishopric, and sent to Madrid to defend himself. He died on the journey to Spain.[172] Loranzana and his colleague from Puebla, on the other hand, were promoted, the former to the office of archbishop of Toledo (1789) and to the cardinalate, the latter was elevated to the bishopric of Valencia.[173] These regalist synods were never recognized by Rome and even Loranzana did not dare submit the *acta* to Rome.

---

[166] In the somewhat modest San Carlos University of Guatemala the number of baccalaureate examinations in philosophy was 108 during the first quarter of the eighteenth century; it was 538 in the last quarter; the corresponding figures for philosophy were 22 and 79 resp. The licentiates and doctorates in theology at the University of Mexico increased from 107 to 184 (J. T. Lanning, op. cit., 339).

[167] K. Schmitt, "The Clergy and the Enlightenment in Latin America," *The Americas* 15 (1958/59), 381–91.

[168] It is typical that the works of the French Oratorian Fleury, of Bernhard Zeger van Espen, professor at Louvain, and of the suffragan bishop of Trier, Hontheim (=Febronius) were prohibited by the Roman Index but not by the Spanish one (N. M. Farris, op. cit., 102).

[169] M. Mörner, *The Expulsion of the Jesuits from Latin America* (New York 1965), a collection of opinions by prominent historians of all persuasions; idem, "The Expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain and Spanish America 1767 in the Light of 18th Century Regalism," *The Americas* 23 (1966/67), 156–64. A more recent French Americanist, P. Chaunu, expresses the opinion of historians which prevails today: "Il est incontestable que l'acte de l'expulsion des Jésuites de 1767 a porté un coup extrêmement dur à

The negative elements of the Enlightenment as an intellectual movement were noticeably slow to develop in America. They were, moreover, of a different nature from those in Europe (Chap. 18). Eighteenth-century America appeared not at all to be a carbon copy of European mentality. Even in the transition to the nineteenth century, America represented the most diverse views encompassing the entire

---

l'œuvre de l'Espagne dans le nouveau monde. Sur ce point, adversaires et amis sont définitivement d'accord: puisque, dans leur œuvre civilisatrice, dans l'aide qu'ils apportèrent à la colonisation, les milliers des Jésuites expulsés n'ont pu être remplacés" (*RH* 214 [1955], 159). The same is stated for the Portuguese territories by C. R. Boxer: "Whatever the failings of the Jesuits, the fact remains that they were the best educators, teachers, and missionaries in the Portuguese colonial world. Their sudden and drastic removal left gaps which were not filled for centuries, if indeed they have all been filled at the present day" (*Four Centuries of Portuguese Expansion, 1415–1825. A Succinct Survey* [Johannesburg 1963], 84).

[170] N. M. Farriss, op. cit., 52.

[171] Ibid., 32–38.

[172] Ibid., 26f.

[173] Ibid., 35.

spectrum from strict spirituality to rationalistic thought. G. Furlong has called this period in Argentina that of "Eclecticismo."[174] An actually anticlerical, radically nationalistic current appeared later when the university chairs were occupied by Creoles who had received their education in Coimbra (dominated by Pombal),[175] or at French universities, and to a lesser extent in Spain. Yet at the turn of the nineteenth century political freedom was the one element which unified all the different currents.

The paradoxical aspect of the Spanish movement of liberty and independence lies in the fact that it was triggered primarily by the enlightened absolutism of the mother country and especially by the often farsighted and just rules for reform. Although many a utopian concept may have been connected with them,[176] the improvement of conditions, especially for the Indians, and the elimination of the vestiges of slavery and forced labor were based precisely on these rules.[177] The abovementioned role of the Creoles in the context of the Enlightenment is very ambivalent, for the ideals of freedom valid for all mankind contradicted their traditional economic and political world. While they did claim these freedoms for themselves, they denied them to the Indians. From this Creole element emerged the Spanish-speaking clergy who were in the front lines in the wars of independence.[178]

The victims of these conflicts were the Indians. The Spanish had oppressed and exploited them, but for all that they had at least created a paternalistic relationship which was sought to be further improved by the enlightened monarchs and their ministers. Although the Indians for the most part had fought on the side of the Creoles against the Spaniards, they were soon ignored by the victors and indeed considered as nonexistent.[179] Their particular problems have remained unsolved even today, as have those of the mestizos, Negroes, and mulattos. From this point of view, Richard Konetzke has characterized the movement for independence as a "reaction against historical progress. In this regard the era of the waning Spanish colonial rule was at any rate more modern than the subsequent epoch of independent states during the nineteenth century."[180]

---

[174] G. Furlong, op. cit., 487–717.

[175] A typical example is the life of José Joaquino de Cunha de Azeredo Coutinho (1742–1821), born in Rio de Janeiro, who studied theology in Coimbra, became bishop of Pernambuco in 1794, and founded the seminary of Olinda in the spirit of Coimbra. He was later promoted to bishop of Braganza and Miranda (E. Bradford Burns, "The Role of Azeredo Coutinho in the Enlightenment of Brasil," *Hisp. Am. Hist. Rev.* [May 1964], 145–60).

[176] The count of Aranda seriously planned the partition of Spanish America into three kingdoms for the three sons of Charles III, who was then to assume the title of Emperor (J. Sairrailh, *L'Espagne éclairée* [Paris 1954], 58).

[177] Count Aranda wrote: "I do not understand why there should be a distinction, not only between the Creoles and natives of Spain, but also regarding the Indians; only the suitability of the individual should be taken into account." R. Konetzke adds the remark: "These Spanish statesmen of the second half of the eighteenth century can not be accused of European arrogance towards the overseas possessions nor of racial prejudice towards the native populations" (Staat und Gesellschaft in Hispano-Amerika am Vorabend der Unabhängigkeit," *Saeculum* 12 [1961], 165).

[178] In the appendix for Mexico N. M. Farris lists all those priests named in the sources who were called "subversive," "insurgent," "conspirator," "collaborator," etc. The list contains the names of approximately 250 secular and 160 regular clerics from the various orders (op. cit., 254–65).

---

[179] This gradual state of "no longer existing" is reflected in the decrease of language studies in new states and especially the abolition of chairs for native languages at the state universities.

[180] "Staat und Gesellschaft," op. cit., 164.

CHAPTER 16

The Propagation of the Faith in Africa

Whereas the Church in America comprised large but defined areas and paganism was pushed to the peripheries or hard-to-approach regions, only a few coastal areas of Africa, aside from the Congo and Angola, could be missionized, most of them only temporarily.

The north of Africa can not be included in the actual missionary area, at least not in the narrow sense because there the Islamic and Christian faith had been opposing each other in implacable enmity ever since the Middle Ages. And yet the land belt from Morocco to Tunisia developed a Christian idealism and heroism often superior to that in the actual missionary countries. Free exercise of religion and with it missionary activity were ensured by treaties.[1] Franciscans, Mercedarians, and Trinitarians had been working there since the Middle Ages. The treaties and their own religious rules prescribed their primary task to be the ministry to Christian merchants and the ransom of Christian slaves. As the great distress in connection with the Berbers surfaced, Vincent de Paul's first letters of 1643 demonstrate that the ministry to Christian slaves and the actual missionary task, initially consisting of returning the renegades to the fold, had become his main concern. He therefore purchased—through the great missionary benefactress, the duchess d'Aiguillon—the French consulate in Algiers. After 1646 he had its affairs conducted by his fellow religious, the Lazarists. Under their protection others were able to pursue their ministry.[2] The mission of the Lazarists was able to be maintained with growing skill until Tunisia and Algeria were conquered by France.

---

[1] For a survey of these treaties see T. Grentrup, *Jus Missionarium* (Steyl 1925), 361–69; Streit XV, 74–79.

Catholic missionary work among actual followers of Islam was not permitted. Yet again and again there were conversions by Muslims to Christianity, most of which could be kept secret. But individual cases, often those occurring abroad in Italy and Spain, were divulged and frequently resulted in persecution of the Christians and the death of missionaries in the respective North African countries.[3] The Franciscans were especially well prepared for this apostolic task because of their excellent knowledge of Arabic.[4]

Aside from the often orphaned dioceses of Spanish and Portuguese enclaves in western North Africa,[5] the missions had been under the authority of the Propaganda since the middle of the seventeenth century. This was not so for West and East Africa. All of West Africa was under the two bishoprics of the Cape Verde Islands and São Tomé, established in 1534; East Africa was under the bishopric of Goa, established separately from Funchal at that time. As early as the sixteenth century Portuguese missionaries (Jesuits, Augustinians, and Dominicans) had started missionizing in the various West African countries. Along the coast of Guinea, in the arch stretching from present-day Portuguese Guinea to Nigeria, and especially in their initial area, Sierra Leone, and the final extension, the old Kingdom of Benin, they had achieved some successes, albeit of varying duration. But towards the end of the century and increasingly during the seventeenth century the weakening of the military impetus of the Portuguese also impaired the missionary thrust. The English and Dutch now obtained secure footholds in these territories. The Dutch effort was crowned by the occupation of Luanda in Angola (1640) and São Tomé (1641). Although the Dutch were driven out again (1645), a coastal area of about four hundred kilometers contained more than thirty fortresses manned by different nations, Portuguese, Spanish, French, Dutch, Danish, Swedish and Prussian, who, succeeding each other, sought to acquire the profitable slave trade.

---

[2] Among the most prominent representatives was Jean Le Vacher, who started working in Tunisia and Algeria. In 1650 he was appointed vicar apostolic and in 1677 French consul. He was shot by Muslims in 1683; Streit, XVI, 728–33.

[3] One of the most significant conversions was that of the young Moroccan Sidi Muhammad ben Muhammad el Hadji ed Dilai (1654), who went on to become a Jesuit priest. He received the call for the mission in India, but died before his departure in Lisbon (J. Henninger, *NZM* 10 [1954], 207; Streit XVI, 653 f.).

[4] A. Kleinhans, *Historia Studii Linguae Arabicae et Colegii Missionum OFM in Conventu ad S. Petrum in Monte Aureo Romae erecti* (Karachi 1930).

[5] A. Lopez, O.F.M., *Obispos en el África Septentrional desde el siglo XIII* (Tangier 1941).

In these territories the Propaganda succeeded in breaking through the rigid barriers of the Portuguese system of the *Padroado.* After repeated reconnaissance, Capuchin monks from Brittany were sent to the west coast in 1634, especially to Benin. But all their attempts failed. In 1651 when the provincial of Brittany reported about it, he noted only that nine Breton Capuchins had already died on the coast of Guinea. They were followed by the Spanish Capuchins, who—with great sacrifice and scant success—again and again pursued missionary work in Sierra Leone and Benin until about 1700.[6] In present-day Dahomey, at the time the Kingdom of Arda, a group of Spanish Capuchins started missionizing in 1660, but in spite of repeated efforts they failed.[7] In the eighteenth century French Dominicans tried to renew the mission in Guinea. Gottfried Loyer was appointed apostolic prefect by the Propaganda, but the difficulties encountered were so great that they retreated to France.[8]

The main concentration of Portuguese missionary work in the sixteenth century took place in the large reaches of the Congo and in Angola. But there, too, Christianity regressed after some initial successes because of a shortage of missionaries. The Congo Kings attempted to establish direct contact with Rome by means of their own embassies in order to extend their political independence to the religious realm as well and to obtain non-Portuguese missionaries through the Pope and the Propaganda. Thanks to the untiring efforts by the Capuchin friar Francisco de Pamplona, the former Spanish General Tiburcio de Redín,[9] resistance by the Spanish and Portuguese was gradually overcome. In

---

[6] L. Kilger, O.S.B., "Die Missionen in Oberguinea und Ostafrika nach den ersten Propaganda-Materialien 1622–1670," *ZMR* 20 (1930), 297–311; idem, "Die Missionsversuche in Benin," *ZMR* 22 (1932) 305–19. At about the same time, various attempts to found missions in Oeri or Overo (present-day Owerri in Nigeria) were made.

[7] H. Labouret and P. Rivet, *Le Royaume d'Arda et son Evangélisation au XVIII*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1929; facsimile of the Arda-Catechism of 1658); B. de Carrocera, O.F.M. Cap., "Misión Capuchina al Reino de Arda," *MH* 6 (Madrid 1949), 523–46.

[8] G. Loyer, O.P., *Relation du Voyage du Royaume d'Issing* . . . (Paris 1714); J. Schmidlin, "Die Afrikamission nach Fortiguerra (1707)," *ZMR* 16 (1926), 125.

[9] L. de Aspurz, *Redín, soldado y misionero 1597–1651* (Madrid 1951); idem, "Un momento de contacto entre el Consejo de Indias y la Congregación de Propaganda Fide (1644–51)," *MH* 8 (1951), 505–24; B. de Carrocera, "Fray Francisco de Pamplona, organizador de Misiones y conductor de Misioneros," *MH* 9 (1952), 5–51; F. Bontinck, "Répercussion du conflit entre le Saint Siège et le 'Padroado' sur l'évangélisation de l'Ancien Royaume du Congo," *AHPont* 4 (1966), 197–218.

1645 the first group of missionaries, seven Spanish and five Italian Capuchin friars, were sent to the court of King Garcia II of the Congo.[10] Subsequent expeditions came to the Congo aboard Spanish ships. But after the defeat of the Dutch by the Portuguese in 1648 the Portuguese influence was strengthened. The Spanish missionaries had to leave the country and the Italians were forced to travel on Portuguese passports via Lisbon, which was always connected with lengthy negotiations.

A first significant success by Capuchin missionaries was the return to the faith of Queen Anna Nzinga of Matamba. Although baptized in Luanda in 1622, she had defected. After she was reaccepted in the Church in 1656, she zealously tried to propagate Christianity at her court and in her realm. With the help of the Capuchins she built churches and towns and sought to Christianize the life of her subjects by means of education and upbringing.[11] Her sister, who succeeded her in 1663, continued to support and consolidate the work of the missionaries. After paganism won out briefly, the Capuchins again managed after 1684 to strengthen Christianity in Matamba. But towards the end of the century domestic wars and unsafe routes forced the Capuchins to shift their attention more and more to the Kingdom of Congo and to Angola, with their center in Luanda.

From the start the Propaganda had elevated the Capuchin mission to the level of an apostolic prefecture, although to some extent subordinated to the bishops of Congo and Angola. The latter had been residing in Luanda beginning in the seventeenth century. Unfortunately this jurisdictional structure again and again gave rise to disputes and quarrels within as a consequence of claims of patronage and opposition to the secular clergy.[12]

Just how serious the Italian Capuchins were about their missionary work in the Congo and Angola is shown by their linguistic works, such as grammars, dictionaries, and catechisms,[13] their many different questions to the Propaganda, and, above all, their handbook on missionary behavior and work in the eighteenth century.[14] Using new sources, L. Kilger, an expert in African missionary history, demonstrated a mere few decades ago how groundless the oft-repeated accusations of precipitous baptism were.[15]

---

[10] Jean-François de Rome, O.F.M.Cap., *La fondation de la mission des Capucins au Royaume du Congo (1648)*, ed. by F. Bontinck (Louvain 1964).

[11] F. M. Gioia, *La maravigliosa conversione alla Santa Fe della regina Singa e del suo regno di Matamba* (Naples 1669).

[12] L. Jadin, "Le clergé séculier et les Capucins du Congo et d'Angola aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles," *Bulletin de l'Institut hist. Belge de Rome* 36 (Rome and Brussels 1964), 185–483. Only in 1726 was a balanced jurisdictional agreement between Portugal and the Propaganda worked out which was valid until the missions treaty of 1940; the text is in A. Brasio, *Spiritana Monumenta Historica. Series Africana* I/1 (Pittsburgh and Louvain 1966), 16–20.

[13] B. de Carrocera, "Los Capuchinos españoles en el Congo y el primer Diccionario congolés," *MH* 2 (Madrid 1949), 209–30.

We should add the fact that for 150 years the missionary work of the Capuchins had to proceed under continually unfavorable conditions. The tropical climate often killed the missionaries within a very short time after their arrival; at times they suffered a violent death, as did their fellow brother Georg von Geel (d. 1652).[16] The Spanish chronicler Father Mateo de Anguiano presents an impressive list of 230 names for the period of 1645 to 1705.[17] By the end of the Capuchin mission in the Congo approximately 400 members of the order lost their lives in the service of this fruitless mission.[18] Toward the end of the eighteenth century, French secular priests attempted to missionize a part of the Congo, an area generally lacking in priests.[19] For them the Propaganda established the apostolic prefecture of Loango, where nine priests and six lay assistants were active from 1766 to 1776.[20]

---

[14] *Pratique missionnaire de PP. Capucins italien* (Louvain 1931). A compilation of rules in missionary methodology from 1747 by the missions' prefect Fr. Giacinto da Bologna. This work with its trenchant observations and critical appraisal of customs and usages was not the only one of its kind, as demonstrated by the as yet unpublished "Avvertimenti salutevoli alli apostolici Missionari nè Regni del Congo, Angola e circunvicini" by P. Giovanni di Roma of 1681 (see *NZM* 24 [1968], 210).

[15] L. Kilger, "Die Taufpraxis in der alten Kapuzinermission im Kongo und in Angola," *NZM* 5 (1949), 30–40, 203–16 (Schriftenreihe *NZM* 7) (Schöneck/Beckenried 1949). But all the efforts by the missionaries, whose number was always small, could not prevent the formation towards the end of the seventeenth century of the syncretistic sect of the Antonites. Essentially a precursor of the movements of religious fanatics in modern day Africa, it was named after a Christian Negress who asserted that she was possessed by Saint Anthony (L. Jadin, "Le Congo et la secte des Antoniens 1694–1718," *Bulletin de l'Institut hist. Belge de Rome* 33 [Brussels and Rome 1961], 411–615.

[16] P. Hildebrand, *Le Martyr Georges de Geel et les débuts de la Mission du Congo* (*1645–52*) (Antwerp 1940).

[17] *Misiones Capuchinas en África* I (Madrid 1950), 468–79.

[18] L. Jadin, *L'Afrique et Rome,* 53. For the slow extinction of the old Congo-Angola Mission, see L. Jadin, *Les Missionnaires du Congo à la fin du XVIII^e siècle* (Lisbon 1961); for the period of 1746 to 1761, see J. Cuvelier, "Le Vén. André de Burgio," *CollFr* 22 (1952), 85–115. They show a high rate of decline in the number of missionaries.

[19] In 1669 the Jesuits had already relinquished their college in San Salvador, the capital of the Congo kingdom; the Capuchins started their work in neighboring Matamba and were subsequently unable to furnish more than a few missionaries for the Congo.

[20] J. Cuvelier, *Documents sur une Mission Française au Kakongo 1766–76* (Brussels 1953), 14 f. For earlier missionary attempts of the Flemish Franciscans, see L. Jadin, "Rivalités luso-néerlandaises au Sohio, Congo 1600–75, *"Bulletin de l'Institut hist. Belge de Rome* 37 (Brussels and Rome 1966), 137–360.

The greatest impediment not only to the Capuchin mission but to all the missions in West Africa was the slave trade, gaining ground from the seventeenth century on, in which nearly all the countries of Europe were participating.[21] A fatal flaw was the fact that missionaries, too, were caught up in the ideas of their time: they treated the slaves benignly, but did not question slavery as a social institution. Jesuits as well as Capuchins were slaveholders, the so called *esclaves de l'église.* Secular priests, in the absence of pay from Portugal, frequently ensured their livelihood by participating in the slave trade. Others participated without any qualms at all, including some from São Tomé.[22] Farsighted methods in missionary work, as on the issue of the native clergy, did not make up for this tacit approval of slavery.[23]

In South Africa neither the care of souls nor mission work was possible. Only after the conquest of the cape by the English did the situation appear to improve. But the Treaty of Amiens in 1802 ceded the Cape of Good Hope back to the Dutch, who were now more open to the question of ministry for their Catholic soldiers and inhabitants. In 1804 Jan Lansink became apostolic prefect; he started his work with two secular priests. But in 1806 when the English permanently reconquered the cape, the Dutch priests were expelled.[24]

---

[21] The great worldwide significance of the African slave trade is highlighted in C. R. Boxer, *Salvador de Sá and the Struggle for Brazil and Angola 1602–86* (London 1952). For the slave trade as an impediment to the mission see C. P. Groves, op. cit. I, 160–64; R. M. Wiltgen, S.V.D., *Gold Coast Mission History 1471–1880* (Techny 1956), 93–105.

[22] Around 1760 the Jesuit college in Luanda, for instance, had more than one thousand slaves on its various properties (*DHGE* 15, 426); J. Cuvelier and L. Jadin, *L'ancien Congo d'après les archives romaines, 1518–1640* (Brussels 1954) (in various documents, esp. 85–92, there is a summary of the slave trade and the participation of the missionaries). Among the Capuchin missionaries the Spanish seem to have been opposed the most to the slave trade. According to the information provided by the chronicler of the order, Mateo de Anguiano, this is shown not only by their petitions to the King of Portugal and the Pope, but even more so by the fact that they were expelled from the Congo and the West-African territories precisely "for damaging Portuguese trade" (= slave trade) (*Misiones Capuchinas en Africa* II [1957], 199f.; pp. 131–46 contain a detailed description of the slave trade). Of course there were individual missionaries and bishops who spoke for the slaves and attacked especially the slave expeditions which violated contemporary law. But only the newly baptized Queen Nzinga addressed the Propaganda by letter in 1660 asking for a decree which would forbid the sale of baptized Negroes as slaves (Mateo de Anguiano, op. cit. II, XIII).

[23] L. Kilger, "Der erste einheimische Ordenspriester in der alten Kongo-Mission," *NZM* 14 (1958), 50–52; B. de Carrocera, "Los capuchinos españoles en el Congo y sus trabajos en pro la formación del clero indígena," *España Misionera* 2 (Madrid 1945), 183–206.—The extent to which Portuguese circles as well were convinced of the necessity for a native clergy is shown by the Portuguese polyhistor Manuel Severino de Feria (d. 1655), who emphasized in a memorandum of 1622 that a true success in the christianization of Guinea could only be achieved by educating a black clergy (J. Faro, "Manuel Severino de Feria e a evangelização da Guiné," *Boletim Cultural de Guinea Portuguesa* 14 [Bissau 1959], 459–97).

In the eastern half of Africa three missionary areas can be clearly marked: in the southeast there was Mozambique and the bordering land of the Monomotapa (Rhodesia), Mombasa with its immense Jesus Fortress securing the Portuguese maritime route to India, and in the northeast there was Ethiopia.

Following the failure of the Jesuit mission in the sixteenth century, the Dominicans had resumed missionary work in southeast Africa in 1577. In 1607 they were again followed by the Jesuits. The lack of clearly defined borders between the missions of the two orders led to many a dispute. After the Dominicans succeeded in converting the Monomotapa and his sons in 1629, all the missionary work in the realm of the "Golden Emperor" gradually passed to them. The Jesuits engaged in the conversion of the ethnic tribes on the Lower Zambezi. In 1612 Mozambique and its surrounding lands was elevated to the status of a free prelature, which it retained into the twentieth century. A report to the Propaganda in the 1730s indicated eleven mission stations staffed by eleven secular priests, one Augustinian, twenty-five Dominicans and eighteen Jesuits.[25] The Dominicans, mostly Goanese, were foremost in striving to educate many good native clerics. Two of their African members were known as lecturers of theology in Goa, Father Manuel around 1670 and Father Constantino de Rosario around 1712.[26]

As a result of wars and political power struggles the realm of the Monomotapa and with it the Dominican mission collapsed. The order subsequently restricted itself to Mozambique. The Jesuit mission on the Zambezi was able to develop until its expulsion by Pombal in 1759. At that time the Jesuits were replaced by Franciscan and Dominican missionaries. Aside from some secular priests only Dominicans appear to have been active in Mozambique as of the end of the eighteenth century,[27] until the abolition of all religious orders in the Portuguese territories in 1835 paralyzed the missions for a number of decades.[28]

---

[24] J. Rommerskirchen, *Die Afrikamission um das Jahr 1805: 50 Jahre katholische Missionswissenschaft* (Münster 1961), 157 f.

[25] L. Kilger, "Die Mission in Oberguinea und in Ostafrika nach den ersten Propaganda-Materialien (1622–70)," *ZMR* 20 (1930), 307.

[26] L. Jadin, *L'Afrique et Rome* (Louvain 1965), 62.

[27] J. Rommerskirchen, *Die Afrikamission um das Jahr 1805,* 154.

[28] For a complete overview of the mission in Southeast Africa, see esp. Harald v. Sicard, *Karangafolkets äldsta Missions-Historia* (Stockholm 1943); also P. Schebesta, *Portugals Conquistamission in Südostafrika. Missionsgeschichte Sambesiens und des Monomotapareiches (1560–1920)* (St. Augustin 1966), 54–292; F. Hoppe, *Portugiesisch-Ostafrika in der Zeit des Marquês de Pombal (1750–77)* (Berlin 1965).

The decisive achievement of the Portuguese in the eastern half of Africa was the rolling back and weakening of Islam beyond Mombasa. The two decades of Portuguese dominance on the east coast of Africa is described by L. Kilger as follows: "The Portuguese policy concerning Islam managed successfully to hold down the Mohammedans in the south and kept them from obtaining a sizeable and dominating position in the north."[29] In 1592 Mombasa with its fortress became the seat of the Portuguese governor; at this time the Portuguese Hermits of Saint Augustine began their missionary work. In 1630 Jussuf ben Hassani, a Christian prince educated by the Augustinians in Goa, became ruler of Mombasa. In his initial zeal he violently turned upon his former brothers in faith. But he soon recognized that this was not the way to make his government popular. So he promptly reembraced Islam, took the Portuguese fortress in a surprise attack, and created a horrible bloodbath among the Christians, both Portuguese and natives. But in 1631 Mombasa was reoccupied by the Portuguese and the missionary work of the Augustinians could be resumed with growing success. Portuguese rule and the mission lasted until 1729, at which point both had become severely weakened and had to make way for the stronger Islam. From their sizeable seminary in Mombasa the Augustinians were able to expand their work southward to the islands of Pemba and Zanzibar. They achieved few conversions among the Muslims, but they were more successful among the Negro population.[30]

From its stronghold in Goa, Portugal had decisively resisted the advance of Islam in remote Ethiopia and through the heroic fight of its *Fidalgos* (1541 and after) saved it for Christianity. The rest of the troop settled there under the ministry of the Jesuits, who were unceasingly working for the union of the Ethiopian Church with Rome (which came to pass in 1622). The same year, the Jesuit Pêro Pais, one of the great missionaries and promoters of the union, died.[31] In 1625 the new patriarch appointed by Rome arrived in the Ethiopian highland. But the union was of short duration. In 1632 a change in government and the Latinizing tendencies of the Jesuits brought the Monophysite form of Christianity back to power. The patriarch and the rest of the Jesuits were expelled from the country; those arriving later were murdered in 1638. After this failure the newly founded Propaganda took over the mission in Ethiopia. Unfortunately the congregation was prone to make mistakes from the beginning. It permitted itself to be convinced by the fraudulent Zaga Christos that the cancellation of the union in his homeland was based solely on dislike for the Jesuits; he did not rest until the mission work was transferred to the Franciscans. They took over the new task joyfully and enthusiastically, but were soon disappointed in their expectations.[32]

---

[29] "Christliche Islam-Mission und Islam-Politik in Ostafrika," *ZMR* 7 (1917), 16–36. This appraisal is supported by the German colonial historian J. Strandes, *Die Portugiesen-Zeit in Deutsch- und Englisch-Ostafrika* (Berlin 1899), 314. According to him the Portuguese deserve thanks for having prevented the Turkish-Muslim rule from gaining a foothold in East Africa and India (L. Kilger, op. cit., 36). The excellent treatise by Justus Strandes is supplemented by new sources in C. R. Boxer and C. de Azevedo, *A Fortaleza de Jesus e os Portugueses em Mombaça* (Lisbon 1960).

[30] The most important source for the Augustinian mission is the "Manual Eremitico da Congregação da India Oriental . . . pelo Fr. Manuel da Ave Maria" of 1817, published by A. da Silva Rego in "Documentoção para a Historia das Missões do Padroado Português do Oriente," *India* 11 (Lisbon 1955), 95–833; Manuel da Purificação, "Memorias da Congregação Agostiniana na India Oriental," *India* 12 (Lisbon 1958), 3–98; A. Hartmann, "The Augustinians in the Land of the Swahili," *AAug* 25 (Rome 1962), 326–39.

French Capuchins also attempted to advance to Ethiopia from Egypt, as did Jesuits from Goa via Mombasa and smaller places along the Red Sea. But even the smallest of successes had to be paid for with great danger and suffering: in 1638 the two Capuchin friars Agathangelus de Vendôme and Cassian Vaz were murdered, as were the Franciscans Francisco de Mistrella and Ludovico de Laurenzana (1668), and Liberatus Weiss and his companions of the same order (1716).[33]

In 1788 the Propaganda tried a new tactic in having the Ethiopian priest Tobias George Ghebragzer consecrated bishop and sending him and others of his countrymen back to Ethiopia. But after a short sojourn he was subjected to severe sufferings, for never before had an Ethiopian been bishop of his country. The patriarch of Alexandria excommunicated him. For several years he had to flee for his life. He died in Cairo in 1801.[34]

Cairo should have become the center and gateway of the Ethiopian mission, but circumstances turned it more and more into a point of departure for the Coptic mission in Lower Egypt, which is to be treated in another connection. Striking out from Egypt, Franciscans tried to establish a mission in Central Sudan (Boznu) at the beginning of the eighteenth century. It failed because of the great difficulties in getting there.[35]

---

[31] This Spanish Jesuit Pedro Páez wrote the *Historia Ethiopiae,* which was edited by Beccari in Vols. II and III of his collection of sources (1905–06). A critical Portuguese edition was done by Lopez Teixeira, *Pêtro Pais, Historia da Etiopia* I–III (Oorto 1945–46).

[32] T. Somigli de Detole, *Etiopia Francescana* (1928–48); J. Dindinger, "Bemerkungen zu den ersten Missionsversuchen der Franziskaner in Äthiopien," *Antonianum* 20 (Rome 1945), 97–126.

[33] See the bio-bibliographical data on the individual missionaries in Streit XVI, 219–21, 627; XVII, 137–38.

[34] N. Kowalsky, "Tobias Georg Ghebragzer. Ein "schwarzer" Bischof im 18. Jh.," *NZM* 15 (1959), 198–204.

Many efforts were made by the Propaganda to missionize the large island of Madagascar. Following unsuccessful attempts by Portuguese Dominicans in the sixteenth century and by Jesuits at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Italian Jesuit Cristoforo Borri submitted to the Propaganda a memorandum concerning the establishment of a mission on the island, one that allowed it to serve as a center for expanded mission in the newly discovered lands of the South Seas. The Propaganda actually did establish an apostolic prefecture for the Discalced Carmelites in 1640. But because the French had gained a foothold on the island at the same time, the sending of Italian Carmelites had to be canceled and the offer by Saint Vincent de Paul to transfer this new mission to the Lazarists had to be accepted.[36] The first two Lazarists arrived on Madagascar in 1648. The murderous coastal climate claimed many victims, whom the homeland again and again sought to replace until in 1674 the French mission station was removed and with it the backbone of the missionary effort.[37]

In the seventeenth and eighteenth century the French had also occupied and settled the islands of Mauritius and Réunion. When the Lazarists were charged with an apostolate, they hoped to renew from there the old mission on Madagascar. They made some attempts to this end, but none of them succeeded.[38]

---

[35] J. Schmidlin, "Die ersten Madagaskarmissionen im Lichte der Propagandamaterialien," *ZMR* 12 (1922), 193–205.

[37] Streit XVI, 421 ff., 547 ff., about the first linguistic works and the first catechism of the Vincentians.

[38] J. Rommerskirchen, *Die Afrikamission um das Jahr 1815: 50 Jahre katholische Missionswissenschaft* (Münster 1961), 154–57; F. Combaluzier, "François-Marie Halnat (1760 bis 1808)," *NZM* 10 (1954), 208–23, 264–78; 11 (1955), 42–55.

CHAPTER 17

The Propagation of the Faith in Asia

While the activities of the Church were able to develop within a relatively uniform framework in America, the Asian continent was full of contrasts. There were the Islamic realms of the west with that of the Moguls extending deeply into the Hindu territories, the Hindu and

Buddhist states, and, finally, China, which had put a Confucian stamp on its peripheral tributaries. Following the Portuguese, who had obtained strategic footholds in Asia since the end of the fifteenth century, the Spanish—after several attempts—managed to get to the area of the Spice Islands and, in 1565, to the Philippines. Their conquest of Portugal gave them nominal rule over the Portuguese overseas territories from 1580 to 1640 as well. Following the overthrow by the new ruling house of the Braganza in 1640, Rome, under pressure from Spain, was unable to appoint Portuguese bishops. Not until 1670 did a papal nuncio resume residence in Lisbon. The improvement in the relations between Rome and Portugal was also repeated in the vast colonial territories. In 1600, East Indies companies were founded both in England and Holland. The Dutch, anti-Catholic and uninterested in missionary work, displaced the Portuguese from their dominant position in the commerce with Japan and conquered the fortress of Malacca in 1641. This gave them a key position regarding Indonesia and the vast coastal areas of Indochina, which they ultimately lost to the Danes and the English. The French East Indies company, founded in 1664, first settled in Surat and then in Pondicherry (1674).

These often bloody conflicts between the European powers, who were frequently allied with indigenous forces, more and more impeded the missionary work. Additional obstacles were raised within the ecclesiastical ranks, especially by the collision between the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, established in 1622 and called the Propaganda for short, and the Portuguese system of the *Padroado.* The latter was of such importance for the entire missionary history of the seventeenth and eighteenth century that it merits description before we treat the missions in the individual countries.

The Propaganda and the Portuguese *Padroado*

The Popes and the Propaganda reluctantly accepted the established church system in America because those territories were actually ruled by Spain and Portugal and had become true colonies, whereas the commercial colonization was satisfied with individual bases.

The Propaganda held the view that these bases and the hinterland dominated by Portugal should be subject to the *Padroado,* but not those countries independent of Portugal. But the latter insisted on a universal system of the *Padroado.* It took a long time and many reversals for both the Propaganda and Portugal slowly to recast these sharp differences into a bearable modus vivendi. Until this happened, the mission in the Portuguese areas and those under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda suffered greatly.[1] The extent to which collaboration between the missionaries of the Propaganda and the *Padroado* was impaired was demonstrated by the modest activities of the Franciscans, most of them Italian, in the northern Chinese province of Hopei during the eighteenth century. Neither the orders from Rome nor those from the bishops, in fact not even bloody persecution were able to enforce harmony in the preaching of the faith.[2]

The first and most enduring success of the Propaganda was brought about by the dispatch of the first vicars apostolic to East Asia.[3] The idea for this undertaking came from a missionary of the *Padroado,* the Jesuit Alexandre de Rhodes (1591–1660) of Avignon.[4] As a result of the persecutions in Japan he and his companions from the Japanese provinces had established a flourishing community of Christians in Tongking. Its backbone was the *domus dei,* with carefully trained catechists. Adapting to local conditions, these religious communes put their very own stamp on the entire mission of the East Indies for centuries.[5] To be sure, de Rhodes had written a catechism for the purpose of training his catechists,[6] but priests and bishops who could ordain them were sorely lacking. In 1649 he arrived in Rome and was instructed to look for suitable candidates himself. After unsuccessful efforts in Italy he went to Paris in 1653, where he met the future vicars apostolic in a community of young priests (*Les Bons Amis*) led by his fellow Jesuits. But in 1654, probably at the instigation of Portugal, he had to take on another task; he died in 1660 as superior of the mission in Ispahan. While de Rhodes was awakening a missionary spirit in France, Rome hesitated. Not until July 1658 were two members of the *Bons Amis* consecrated bishops and vicars apostolic: François Pallu (1626–84) and Pierre Lambert de la Motte (1624–79). A third, Ignatius Cotolendi, died en route in 1662. The bishops and their companions from the newly founded missionary seminary of Paris had to take the difficult overland route through Syria, Persia and northern India.[7] In 1662 and 1664, respectively, they arrived in Ajuthia, the capital of Siam, but a war forced them to stay there. So they established the center of their East Asian mission in Ajuthia, combining it with a central seminary for the training of a native clergy.[8]

---

[1] A. Jann, op. cit.; B. J. Wenzel, *Portugal und der Heilige Stuhl* (Lisbon 1958); A. da Silva Rêgo, *O Padroado Português do Oriente. Esboco Historico* (Lisbon 1940) (French; Lisbon 1957); J. Wicki, "Il patronato portoghese d'Oriente," *CivCatt* III (1955), 527–29.

[2] G. Mensaert, O.F.M., "Les Franciscains au service de la Propagande dans la Province de Pékin 1705–1784," *AFrH* 51 (1958), 161–200, 273–311.

[3] H. Chappoulie, op. cit.; A. Launay, *Histoire générale,* I (Paris 1912); idem, *Mémorial;* G. Goyau, *Les prêtres des Missions étrangères* (Paris 1925); L. Baudiment, *François Pallu, principal fondateur de la Société des Missions Étrangères (1626–84)* (Paris 1934).

[4] H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 3–41, 102–13; A. Launay, *Histoire de la Mission du Tonkin* (Paris 1927).

[5] N. Kowalsky, "Die Anfänge der 'Domus Dei' in Tongking und Cochinchina," in: J. Specker and W. Bühlmann, *Das Laienapostolat in den Missionen (Festschr. Beckmann)* (Beckenried 1961), 155–60.

[6] *Catechismus pro ius qui volunt suscipere Baptismum* (Rome [press of the Propaganda] 1651), new ed. with Vietnamese text, introduction and commentary by A. Marillier, CC. Larre and Pham Dink (Saigon 1961); a French translation by H. Chappoulie, op. cit. II, 147–261.

The arrival of the first vicars apostolic in Siam definitely represented not only the most significant measure by the Propaganda in the entire course of missionary history, but the most important one for the young Church of the Far East overall.[9] Most important was the advance of Rome into the hitherto Portuguese jurisdictional sphere. The achievement was of course not reached by the mere dispatch of vicars apostolic. Initially the vicars did not even have the necessary papal jurisdiction for Siam. This was finally granted to Louis Laneau (1637–96) in 1673. But foreign jurisdiction in Portuguese territory was so unusual that the missionaries hardly paid attention to it except for the difficulties created by the Inquisition emanating from Goa and by the bishops appointed after 1670. This prompted Pallu to go to Rome, where he convinced the Propaganda to take firm steps. These included corresponding briefs by Clement IX (1669). But the latter's successor, Clement X, had his mind changed by the Portuguese ambassador, until the vicars apostolic remonstrated anew. In 1673 briefs were issued to the inquisition and to the cathedral chapter of Goa, withdrawing from them all jurisdiction outside the Portuguese territories.[10] In 1677 the Propaganda ordered all Jesuit missionaries to swear an oath of obedience to the vicars apostolic. In 1678 the oath was extended to include all missionaries in the Far East. In 1680 this was reaffirmed by another decree. Portugal consequently demanded from all missionaries departing from Lisbon an oath of loyalty to the *Padroado* which encompassed the political interests of Portugal as well.[11] Thus one oath was pitted against another.

---

[7] See the detailed travelogue by Pallu from his diaries and letters in L. Baudiment, op. cit., 99–161.

[8] P. Destombes, M.E.P., *Collège Général de la Societé des Missions Étrangères* (Paris 1934).

[9] The new element regarding the vicars apostolic appointed in 1659 was that they were given full jurisdiction for large territories and were, at the same time, titular bishops. Prior to this their only function had been to represent a bishop who was in some way prevented from exercising his office. The change was intended for a brief transitional period but instead it endured for more than 300 years (N. Kowalsky, "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der apostolischen Vikare," *NZM* 13 [1957], 217–86).

[10] H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 233ff.

While this affair was settled relatively soon in East India—probably because of the bloody persecutions and the vastness of the countries—the China mission erupted in a storm of protest. Pallu came to China as vicar apostolic of Fukien and administrator of China in January 1684 and immediately published the decree of 1680. At the same time he transmitted an order by the Jesuit General to the missionaries of the *Padroado.* As a result all but one Spanish missionary took the oath. But Spanish Franciscans, Dominicans and Augustinians had heretofore obeyed only their superiors in Manila, and therefore resisted the oath.[12] The Jesuits, sent to Siam and China under Louis XIV, were prohibited by the state from taking the oath. Closure of the seminary of the Parisian Missionaries and the recall of the vicars apostolic were imminent. But compromises and jurisdictional reordering indirectly invalidated the Roman oath. Yet Lisbon insisted on an oath to the *Padroado.* As a result the situation was severely aggravated throughout the eighteenth century. Given this attitude by Portugal, which stiffened even more after its newly won independence (1640), the missionaries were forced to seek new routes by which to get to the Far East. Jesuits had earlier contemplated a land route to China via Russia and had sought to acquire precise knowledge of it by means of expeditions.[13] Unfortunately all their efforts were in vain. The Propaganda recommended the land route via Persia and Mesopotamia and strongly requested avoidance of all Portuguese territories.[14] For his first trip Pallu had already reconsidered the land route through Russia. For his last trip he actually attempted to get permission for it from the Russian Tsar through the good offices of the French King.[15] Towards the end of the seventeenth century the

---

[11] Delacroix, op. cit. II, 190f.

[12] A. van de Wyngaert, "Mgr. Fr. Pallu et Mgr. Bernardino della Chiesa, Le Serment de fidélité aux Vicaires Apostoliques, 1680–88," *AFrH* 31 (1938), 17–47; O. Maas, "Zum Konflikt der spanischen Missionare mit den französischen Bischöfen in der Chinamission des 17. Jh.," *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft* III (Münster 1930), 185–95.

[13] B. Zimmel, "Bemühungen um den Landweg nach China. Die Expedition P. Aimé Cherauds S.J. nach Chorassan 1659," *NZM* 25 (1968), 102–8 (with references to earlier efforts).

[14] Instruction of 1659 (H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 394). A possibility to get to East Asia through America, considered earlier, had to be abandoned as utopian (J. Schmidlin, "Projekt eines nordamerikanischen Missionsweges nach China in der Frühzeit der Propaganda," *ZMR* 15 [1925], 147–49).

[15] L. Baudiment, *Pallu,* 88, 360f.—It is surprising that missionaries even before were not so much blaming Russia but Lisbon for failing to gain an overland route to China. The French sinologist P. Pelliot states emphatically that all efforts for an overland route foundered on the resistance of Portugal, which was intent on securing Macao as a

Portuguese rule to effect entry exclusively through Macao became meaningless because the English and French were only too glad to transport the missionaries on their vessels.

More difficult than opening up land routes was the problem concerning new missionaries. The cardinals of the Propaganda were perhaps privately convinced that those missionaries operating under the *Padroado,* at least those outside the Portuguese territories, would agree to go under the jurisdiction of the French bishops. But the large religious orders, foremost among them the Jesuits, who were doing the major portion of the missionary work in the provinces of the vicars apostolic, had no intention of exchanging the *Padroado,* which had proved its excellence for over 150 years, for an unproven new institution.

As early as 1658 the vicars apostolic—in addition to Pallu and Lambert de la Motte, there was the first vicar apostolic of Quebec, de Laval—had sent a petition to the Propaganda which mentioned for the first time the establishment of a seminary. They maintained that the education of a native clergy in Canada, China, and Tongking required helpers who had to be prepared in their own seminaries. The secretary of the Propaganda noted on the margin; "Will be heeded!" But the plan was actually realized by the procurators of the missionary bishops. In 1663 they founded the seminary in the Rue du Bac, where it continues today. In the same year it received royal sanction as the Séminaire pour la conversion des Infidèles dans les pays étrangers. Recognition by Rome followed in 1664.[16]

The second religious community to place its members at the disposal of the Propaganda was the Capuchin order. Their first vicar apostolic was the famous "grey eminence" of Cardinal Richelieu, Father Joseph Leclerc du Tremblay or Father Joseph of Paris. Missionaries for Canada, Brazil, and the French bases in India (Surat, Madras) also came from the French provinces.[17] Members of the

---

gateway for the Catholic missionaries (*T'oung Pao* 26 [Leiden 1929], 192f.). In 1707, in fact, Peter the Great had let Clement XI know that he would permit the Catholic missionaries to use the route through Russia (*AFrH* 27 [1934], 181).

[16] J. Guennou, M.E.P., *Les Missions Étrangères* (Paris 1963), 67 (the author also treats the pertinent French background, esp. the Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement); idem, "Le troisième centenaire du Séminaire des Missions Étrangères de Paris," *NZM* 19 (1963), 290–99.

[17] G. ce Vaumas, *L'éveil missionaire de la France* (Lyon 1942); idem, *Lettres et Documents du Père Joseph de Paris concernant les Missions Étrangères (1619–38)* (Lyon 1942); idem, "L'activité missionnaire du P. Joseph de Paris," *RHM* 15 (Paris 1938), 336–59; O. M. Jouve, "Le Père Joseph Leclerc du Tremblay, Capucin, et les Missions de la Nouvelle France (1632–33)," *RHM* 16 (Paris 1939), 206–32; G. Goyau, "Le Père Joseph et les Missions Capucines," *L'Église en Marche* V (Paris 1936), 63–93.

Italian province of the Carmelite order also entered the service of the Propaganda. The initial impetus owed a lot to certain of its members. They had had a mission in Persia since the beginning of the seventeenth century and had spread from there to various countries of Indochina and finally also to India. Leandro de la Anunciación—a native Spaniard to be sure—succeeded in founding a first branch in Goa, followed by a second one in 1630 which was actually a missionary seminary. Its graduates soon became missionaries for those parts of India occupied by the English.[18] The Italian province of the Franciscans also gave missionaries to the Propaganda who were primarily active in China. In 1687 the first Italian arrival, Bernardino della Chiesa, was consecrated bishop by Pallu. In the following period the Italian Franciscans were especially active in the northern provinces of China.

The Propaganda itself, especially its first secretary Francesco Ingoli, preferred secular priests, especially for the office of vicar apostolic. The congregation founded in 1646 in Naples as the *Congregazione delle Apostoliche Missioni* developed well, but domestic and foreign political events thwarted all missionary work.[19] In 1639 when the Augustinian Recollects (or Barefoot Augustinians), a reformed branch of Augustinian Hermits with origins in Spain, placed their experience in the Philippines at the disposal of the Propaganda for service in China, the latter did not accept the offer;[20] only members of the Italian province could now and then work in China.[21] On the other hand the Italian association of the Congregation of Secular Clergy of the Battistini, recognized in 1753 by Benedict XIV, was readily used for the China mission. Among the ranks of the religious orders the Propaganda also employed the Italian Barnabites for the mission in Burma.[22]

The conflict caused by the complexity of the organizational structure of the missions was demonstrated by a papal visitation in Cochinchina conducted by the French Mgr. E. F. des Achards de la Beaume (d. 1741), who heightened the confusion rather than eliminating it.[23] To some extent these difficulties were the fault of the Propaganda itself. All the missionaries of the *Padroado* were obedient to the superiors of their respective orders, yet the Propaganda immediately wanted to remove them from their traditional structure and subordinate them directly to the Propaganda.[24] Furthermore, the Propaganda was largely lacking in understanding of the ideals and way of life of the regular clergy.[25] In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century there was a growing necessity to separate the missionary dioceses by religious orders and congregations and to appoint separate vicars apostolic for the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Parisian missionaries.

---

[18] Florencio del Niño Jesús, *La Orden de Santa Teresa, la fundación de la Propaganda Fide y la Misiones Carmelitas* (Madrid 1923), 91ff.

[19] J. Metzler, "Das erste Weltpriesterinstitut im Dienste der Propaganda," *NZM* 17 (1961), 161–74.

[20] This is shown esp. in *Bullarium Ordinis Recollectorum S. Augustini* II (1623–83) (Rome 1961).

[21] J. Beckmann, "Zur Missionstätigkeit der italienischen Unbeschuhten Augustiner im Fernen Osten," *NZM* 22 (1961), 62–65.

[22] L. Gallo, *Storia del Cristianesimo nell'Impero Barmano,* 3 vols. (Milan 1862).

[23] Streit VI (Aachen 1931), 454.

A decisive element for judging the work of the Propaganda in the Far East was the new spirit manifest in the principal documents and in the work of its missionaries. Ever new formulations emphasize the purely religious character of the mission, placing the spreading of the Gospel at the center of all endeavors.[26] This basic character of the mission was most emphatically demonstrated in the instruction of 1659 to the newly appointed vicars apostolic.[27] In part one, regarding the selection of their missionaries, the departing bishops are exhorted above all to pay attention to the spiritual and religious qualities and the character of the candidates over and above their physical condition. Part two deals with the travel route. The third and most thorough part contains the basic missionary program: "Do not demand of those peoples that they change their ceremonies, customs, and habits if these do not quite obviously contradict religion and decency, for what could be sillier than to want to import France, Spain, Italy, or any other country into China? Not these but the faith is what you shall bring to them, which neither rejects nor fights against any peoples' customs and traditions, but rather seeks to keep them inviolate."[28] Commercial and political activities were forbidden to the missions; the training of an indigenous clergy was demanded. The confrontation of this instruction with the practice in the missions in Siam resulted in the *Instructiones ad munera apostolica rite obeunda*[29] in ten chapters and several practical appendices.

---

[24] As a result the home provinces and monasteries showed little interest in the fate of their brothers in the Propaganda. When the Capuchins, for instance, complained to the Propaganda that they could not live in accordance with the rules of their order, the congregation asked the mission prefect, Father Joseph de Paris, to remove them "de peur qu'ils se fissent turcs" (G. de Vaumas, *L'éveil Missionnaire de la France* [Lyons 1942], 121).

[25] This is manifest from many letters from missionaries kept in the archive of the Propaganda which have not yet been closely examined.

[26] K. Pieper, "Ein Blick in die missionsmethodischen Erlasse der Propaganda," *ZMR* 12 (1922), 31–51; J. Beckmann, "Der religiöse Charakter von Mission und Missionar nach den Bestimmungen der Propaganda-Kongregation," *Kath. Missionsjahrbuch der Schweiz* (1946), 13–23.

[27] A critical edition *Instructio Vicariorum Apostolicorum ad Regna Sinarum Tunchini et Cocincinae proficentium 1659* by H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 392–402; see also the commentary in L. Baudiment, *Pallu* 61ff.

[28] H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 400.

The goals and means of the mission were attuned to each other. The very important eleven articles concerning the catechumate were the first systematic and probably deliberate renewal of an institution going back to Christian antiquity. It represented the first fundamental break with the medieval missionary method. The guiding thought of conversion was no longer embodied in the principle of working down from the top, that is, the conversion of the masses by their political leaders as the Jesuits in East Asia aspired, but rather in the reverse procedure of working up to the top, that is through the conversion of the masses and the establishment of Christian communities.[30] Very important was the third chapter *De recto mediorum humanorum usu,*[31] a declaration of war against the missionaries of the *Padroado* and—probably not intended for them at the time—against the Jesuits as well, who provided, after all, the greater number and the most prominent of the missionaries of the *Padroado.*[32] The fight was concentrated against the close connection between the mission and the politics of Portugal, the world power, and the involvement of missionaries in commerce. The number of Jesuit missionaries alone departing via Lisbon and supported by Portugal made any blunt solution of the problem impossible.[33] The Propaganda, moreover, did not take into account the immense sacrifices that Portugal, small as it was, had made for the total missionary effort from Goa to

---

[29] This work was first printed in 1669 by the press of the Propaganda (Streit I, 275). The instructions were reedited again and again; since 1840 they have been entitled *Monita ad Missionarios.* The following is based on the Hong Kong edition of 1893.

[30] The chapter "De regimine cuiuscumque particularis Ecclesiae, maxime ubi Sacerdos deficit," op. cit., 130–35, probably contributed in a decisive way to the fact that the congregations founded by the Paris Missionaries were able to save themselves even in the bloodiest persecutions.

[31] Op. cit., 21–35.

[32] A thorough investigation of the *Monita ad Missionarios* is still lacking.—Pallu and his companions assuredly were not basically opposed to the Jesuits. They had gone through the ascetic school of P. Bagot in Paris; the Jesuit de Rhodes had selected them; two of Pallu's brothers were Jesuits and the Jesuit General Paul Oliva even saved the new undertaking from being abolished by Louis XIV. Initially Pallu considered harmonious collaboration with the Jesuits completely natural. For individual references see esp. H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I (index).

[33] J. Wicki, S.J., *Liste der Jesuiten-Indienfahrer 1541–1758: Aufsätze zur portugiesischen Kulturgeschichte* VII (Münster 1967), 252–450. In 1541–1658 the number of Jesuits departing from Lisbon was 1,047. In the period 1658–1758 it was 1,073.

Japan even though after 1600 it was no longer capable of protecting its bases or its missionaries.[34] The dogged obstinacy of Portugal's claim for power vis-à-vis the mission was experienced not only by individual members of the Parisian Missionaries who were caught and were languishing in the jails of the Inquisition in Goa, but also by the papal legate Maillard de Tournon (d. 1710), who was deported by the Chinese to Macao after an unsuccessful missionary effort and held in jail by the Portuguese until his death.[35]

Even Pallu was not free from the same political ambitions of which he accused the missionaries of the *Padroado.* He advised the French East Asia Company and, more than that, tried to influence the royal minister Colbert towards bringing the power of France to bear in India and East India.[36] In this way he helped initiate the policy which in 1685/86 led to an exchange of ambassadors between France and Siam and, a 100 years later—with the help of the vicar apostolic of Cochinchina, Mgr. Pierre Pigneaux de Béhaine (d. 1799)—resulted in France obtaining a firm foothold in East India.[37] The first problem to arise was the participation by the missionaries in commerce, involving primarily the Jesuit mission in Japan, in part because of the extremely high costs of operation and in part because of insufficient subsidies from Portugal and other sources in Europe. The visitant of the Far East, A. Valignano, in opposition to the general of the order, Claudio Acquaviva (d. 1615), took the stand that the mission could only be maintained through participation in the commerce between Macao and Japan.[38] After the collapse of the Japanese mission the missionaries who had been expelled or newly designated for Japan were sent to East India, where participation in the trade was probably upheld as a sort of traditional privilege. At any rate, the report of the vicars apostolic in Ajuthia was followed by the pointed brief of Clement IX *Sollicitudo Pastoralis officii* (17 June 1669), which reiterated all prior regulations and prohibitions of trade by the missionaries.[39] The *Instructiones* of the Paris Missionaries, who fought against commerce, were published in the same year.[40] The fact that the Jesuits—in spite of all the prohibitions and claims by their superiors—did not stop their involvement in commerce is shown by an inquiry of 23 June 1797 by Ángel de la Fuente, administrator of the assets of the suppressed Society of Jesus in the Philippines. He wanted to know what was to happen to the 254,320 pesos, invested by the Jesuits in the trade between China and Mexico. In 1775 this sum had been 306,341; by 1793 it had grown to 393,454 pesos.[41]

---

[34] B. Biermann, O.P., "Das Spanisch-portugiesische Patronat als Laienhilfe für die Missionen," *Das Laienapostolat in den Missionen* (*Festschr. Beckmann*) (Beckenried 1961), 161–79.

[35] The main task of Cardinal de Tournon was not to end the rites quarrel but to establish a direct relationship between Rome and Peking (on the basis of a nunciature). This would have ended the Portuguese influence in Peking (F.-A. Pouleau, "Maillard de Tournon," *AHSI* 31 [1962], 264–323).

[36] H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 278–82.

[37] G. Taboulet, *La geste française en Indochine* I (Paris 1955) (161–239 about Mgr. Pigneaux de Béhaine).

[38] A. Valignano, *Sumario de las Cosas de Japón* (1583), ed. by J. R. Álvarez-Taladriz (Tokyo 1954), 334–39 and the editor's introduction, 41–50.—According to the unpublished dissertation by L. Bourdon, "La Compagnie de Jésus et le Japon" (Paris), Pierre Chaunu quoted the expenditures of the Japan mission for 1579 at 6,000 cruzados; by 1582 they increased to 12,000. From 1581 to 1582 the mission needed 8,650 cruzados for subsistence for the personnel, for buildings, presents, etc. and 2,100 for necessary purchases in India and Europe. Of this, the Portuguese exchequer paid 4,000. In addition there were the gifts by certain benefactors (such as Pius V) and the revenues from the port of Nagasaki, granted to the Jesuits, and their possessions in Macao and Bazain. The silk trade brought in 4,000 cruzados and the remainder was taken in by private trade of individual missionaries (P. Chaunu, "Une grande puissance économique et

The reorientation of the mission relinquishing the principle of "working down from the top" required a different missionary method.[42] This involved the formation of individual parishes with catechists, priests, sisters, and a native episcopate. These aspects will be treated in detail as we deal with the respective countries. In general it can be said that the method of proceeding from the princely courts, advocated especially by the Jesuits of the *Padroado,* in the final analysis was ineffectual. The Propaganda, for its part, had to postpone its lofty program of a native Church led by indigenous bishops because the foundation of individual parishes initially claimed all the available energy.

The position of the Propaganda, or rather of its missionaries, on the

---

financière: les débuts de la Compagnie de Jésus au Japon [1547–83]," *Annales—Economies. Sociétés. Civilisations* V [Paris 1950], 198–212).

[39] The connections are shown by the fact that the regulation was emphasized to apply also to the Society of Jesus and even if the trade was the only means to maintain the mission (T. Grentrup, "Das kirchliche Handelsverbot für Missionare," *ZMR* 15 [1925], 257–68).

[40] "De illicita et indigna Viro Apostolico negotiatione" (*Monita,* op. cit., 23–25). At the same time the generals of the Society of Jesus had renewed the prohibition of trade (J. Humbert, "Some Answers of the Generals of the Society of Jesus to the Province of Goa," *AHSI* 36 [1967], 72–103).

[41] P. S. Lietz, *Calendar of Philippine Documents in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library* (Chicago 1956), Doc. 256, p. 129.—The author explains that the Jesuits (in the Philippines) invested their assets one third each in trade with Mexico, with China and Indonesia, and as a reserve, idem, Doc., 257, p. 130.

[42] The chapter by H. Bernard-Maître, "La Rencontre du Padroado et du Patronat: l'affrontment des méthodes," Delacroix, op. cit. II, 323–36, and its thesis of the tabula rasa on the part of the Spanish and a progressive method of accommodation among the *Padroado* missionaries (i.e., Jesuits) is historically untenable.

issue of Chinese and Malabar Rites is also connected to the new methodological direction.[43] The third chapter of the *Monita ad Missionarios*[44] clearly shows the position of the Paris Missionaries, although at the time of its writing this issue was not at all contemplated, since it was hardly known to exist beyond a small circle.

Development and Decline of the Missions in the Asian Countries

The development of the Propaganda missions in Asia brought about an expansion of their territories into those of the *Padroado.* Initially both sides employed every means at their disposal to hold fast to their respective right to propagate the faith. Not until the eighteenth century did this attitude give way to an implicitly recognized, sometimes geographically separated coexistence, the form of which differed from one country to the other.

INDIA

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century India was the heart of the Portuguese rule and with it of the mission. The city of Goa was still wealthy and powerful, the seat of the viceroy and of the great convents and monasteries of the various religious orders. From here spread the impulse for the missions and ministry in all the countries from East Africa to Japan. The archbishop of Goa was the highest ecclesiastical authority in all these territories. Thus the fact that the bishoprics were vacant for decades in the hard years of political and jurisdictional crises had a fatal effect. Portugal had achieved its political independence in 1640. Yet for the next thirty years Spain was still powerful enough to prevent any direct connection between Portugal and Rome. Only after 1670 was it possible to appoint new bishops for India.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century the Jesuit college was the backbone of the mission in all the *Padroado* countries. The Jesuit press operating since 1556 was the only one to continue printing the necessary books in the various languages.[45] After 1572 the strongest mendicant order in Goa were the Augustinian Hermits, who trained their own missionaries for work in the Muslim areas from Africa through Indochina all the way to Bengal. It was from them that the viceroys preferred to select their ambassadors to the courts of the Mongolian rulers.[46]

---

[43] Sources and literature esp. in Streit V, VI, VII (with supplements in Vols. XII–XIV). More recent literature in *DHGE* XII, 741 and *LThK* VIII, 1324.—In the dispute over the rites and in other decisions it has to be noted that the Propaganda Congregation had no theologians of its own; instead all decisions were made by the Holy Office (J. Metzler, "Controversia tra Propaganda e S. Officio circa una commissione teologica [1622–1658]," *Annales Pont. Univ. Urbaniana* [Rome 1968–69], 47–62).

[44] De recto mediorum humanorum usu (op. cit., 21–35).

[45] "Impresa em Goa." *Boletim do Instituto Vasco da Gama* (Bastora and Goa 1956). Memorial vol. for the four hundredth anniversary.

The five councils of Goa (1567, 1575, 1585, 1592, 1606) were concerned most with adapting the Tridentine reforms to the native conditions.[47] Yet in Goa especially the actual conditions were behind the stated ideals, most of all in the social sector. Slavery, as at the time of Francis Xavier,[48] was still a wide-spread practice in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. It was calculated that an average Portuguese civil servant needed fifteen to twenty male and female slaves. Even the one convent in India, the Augustinian convent of Saint Monica (founded in 1606), was granted 120 female servants and slaves by no less than royal order. Black male and female slaves were highly regarded because of their capacity for work.[49] We know—not only from numerous prohibitions by various offices in the homeland, but also from actual reports—that the male orders were keeping slaves.[50] The slaves, as well as Indians and Brahmins, were refused Communion, though not as a matter of principle, but yet in practice. The Italian Theatine Father Antonio Ardizone Spinola was the first to give a sermon against this discriminatory practice. It was entitled: "Sigh of the Christian Brahmins and Canarins and many other castes and peoples because they never in all their life . . . are allowed to commune."[51]

Equally fatal was the effect of the Inquisition, active in Goa from

---

[46] A. da Silva Rêgo, "Documentação," *India* XI, IX–XIII stresses the importance of the Augustinians for the missions of the East and publishes the *Manual Eremitico da Congregação da India,* which was finished by Manuel da Ave-Maria in 1815, pp. 95–833.

[47] J. Wicki, S.J., "Die ältere katholische Mission in der Begegnung mit Indien," *Saeculum* VI (1955), 345–67, (335–60: the Goan councils and India); idem, "Die unmittelbaren Auswirkungen des Konzils von Trient auf Indien (ca. 1565–85)," *AHPont* I (1963), 241–63.

[48] G. Schurhammer, *Franz Xaver, sein Leben und seine Zeit* II/1 (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1964, Index).

[49] L. Kilger, "Das erste Frauenkloster in Portugiesich-Indien. St. Monika 1606–1834," *NZM* 7 (1951), 119–23, esp. 121ff.

[50] When a Portuguese religious or nobleman traveled, he had himself carried by blacks in a sedan (A. Zerlik, *P. Xav. Ernbert Fridelli S.J., China-missionar und Kartograph* [Linz 1962], 13).—The fact that Propaganda missionaries held identical views is attested to by a letter from Pallu to Paris (20 Dec. 1683) in which he ennumerates the persons for whom he had to care, "sans compter un grand nombre d'esclaves" (*Lettres de Mgr. Pallu,* ed. by A. Launay, I [Angoulême 1914], 378).

[51] R. Cantel, "Le Père Ardizone Spinola et son 'Cordal Triplicado de Amor a Jesus Sacramentado'," *Mélanges Marcel Bataillon-Bulletin Hispanique* 54 (Bordeaux 1962), 347–57. Subsequent sermons on the same topic in 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648.

1560 to 1812, which decreed penalties ranging from flogging to public burning at the stake. As in America the Inquisition was above all the highest office for the safeguarding of patronage rights. Several missionaries of the Propaganda became rather familiar with the inside of the Goan jails of the Inquisition.[52] Of great help to the Christian congregations was the *Pai dos Christãos.* The office of this "Father of the Christians" was usually entrusted to such missionaries who were able to work in the field of social welfare and against the exploitation of the new Christians, especially in the vicinity of Goa and other bases.[53]

The area around Goa was apportioned to the three major orders who were initially working in India: the province of Bardez went to the Franciscans, a number of islands off the coast of Goa to the Dominicans, and the peninsula of Salsette to the Jesuits. From the seventeenth century on the Goan clergy gained more and more importance. It is among the merits of the *Padroado* that it stressed from the very beginning the education of a native clergy.[54] To be sure, the Portuguese in India had their own racial prejudices;[55] in the early period only members of the Brahmin caste were ordained in the priesthood. Up until the eighteenth century Indians were accepted into religious orders only in individual cases.[56] Yet a great number of secular priests were educated at the Jesuit College of Saint Paul in Goa, in the Franciscan seminaries in Reis Magos (Bardez) and Kranganore, in the Thomas Academy of the Dominicans in Goa, and later at the archdiocesan seminary of Goa and at the Great Seminary of Rachol.[57] Not only were these clerics suitably trained to take over the parishes founded by the individual orders, but they also performed capably as missionaries in the countries of the *Padroado.*[58] It was Goan priests who saved the Christian congregations in the areas which were lost by Portugal in the course of the centuries. Thus one of them wrote: "Although these priests had to do without the help of the Jesuits since 1760, forego the help of all the other orders since 1834, and since the middle of the nineteenth century were deserted by a government formerly sympathetic to the mission, the Goan clergy, especially since the eighteenth century, has worked with great dedication towards maintaining the congregations founded and built up by the missionaries of the *Padroado.*"[59] Contrary to the widely held opinion that the *Padroado,* or rather the state exchequer, paid the expenditures of the congregations, it is a fact that these were also born by the faithful themselves. A certain basic asset were the lands of the suppressed Hindu temples.[60] Numerous brotherhoods in almost all the congregations paid for other expenditures, such as the celebration of religious high holidays.[61] These brotherhoods, invariably led by laymen, were an important element of Christian life.

---

[52] A. Baião, *A Inquisição de Goa,* 2 vols. (Coimbra 1930–49).—See also the discourse in A. D'Costa, S.J., *The Christianisation of Goa Islands* (Bombay 1965), 193–200, who proves that the Inquisition did not extort forced conversion from the missionaries.

[53] J. Wicki, S.J., *O Livro do "Pai dos Cristãos"* (Lisbon 1969).

[54] C. Merces de Melo, *The Recruitment and Formation of the Native Clergy in India* (Lisbon 1955) 65–205; J. Wicki, S.J., "Der einheimische Klerus in Indien (16. Jh.)," in J. Beckmann, *Der einheimische Klerus in Gesch. und Gegenwart* (*Festschr. Kilger*) (Schöneck/Beckenried 1950), 17–72.

[55] C. R. Boxer, *Race Relations in the Portuguese Empire 1415–1825* (Oxford 1963), 57–85.

[56] A. Meersman, "The Question of Admitting Indians to the Franciscan Order," *NZM* 13 (1957), 29–34; J. Wicki, S.J., "Pedro Luis, Brahmane und erster indischer Jesuit," *NZM* 5 (1950), 115–26.

[57] The annual report of 1646 by the provincial mentions that the colleges of Goa, Rachol, and Bassein also taught the Brahmans Latin, philosophy, morals, and speculative theology, paid for by the Society of Jesus, until they were ordained (M. de Melo, *The Recruitment,* 183f.).

In Ceylon it was the establishment of the Oratory of the Holy Cross in Goa[62] which gave the clergy a special apostolic impulse and saved the Ceylonese Church. Its moving spirit was Joseph Vaz (1651–1711), "the Apostle of Ceylon."[63] He came to Ceylon in 1687 disguised as a beggar. After 1696 he was supported by other priests of the Oratory of Goa, which alone had carried the burden of that hard-pressed Church for 150 years.[64] In its main features the organization of this mission can be traced back to Father J. Vaz.[65] In very perilous times the Kingdom of Kandy, which was independent of Holland, offered refuge. Here too originated the major portion of the Catholic Singhalese literature.

---

[58] In faraway Ethiopia the Goan B. da Silva worked from 1598 to 1613 (Streit XV, 621, 637f.; XVI, 2); and in Madagascar three Goan Oratorians tried to found a mission in 1726 (*AHSI* 41 [1962], 244).

[59] F. Coutinho, *Le régime paroissial* 24/25. See also p. 282.

[60] A. D'Costa, S. J., "Demolition of the Temples in the Islands of Goa and the Disposal of the Temple Lands," *NZM* 18 (1962), 161–76.

[61] F. Coutinho, op. cit. 130–38.

[62] M. da Costa Nuñes, *Documentação para a historia da congregação do Oratorio de Santa Cruz del Clero natural de Goa* I (1681–1727) (Lisbon 1966).

[63] S. G. Perera, *Life of the Venerable Father Joseph Vaz, Apostle of Ceylon* (Galle 1953).

[64] When the Dutch had conquered the Portuguese territories of Ceylon (1638–58) they prohibited all Catholic cults and ordered forced Calvinization (19 Sept. 1658) (R. Boudens, O.M.I., "Negombo. Un centre de résistance catholique à Ceylon sous l'occupation hollandaise [1658–1796]," *NZM* 11 [1955], 81–91; idem, *The Catholic Church in Ceylon under Dutch Rule* [Rome 1957]).

[65] Ibid., 89–115; see 173–88 for the method of the Oratorians.

Father Vaz himself acquired an excellent knowledge of the language, but he persuaded his younger fellow Oratorian Jacome Gonçalvez (d. 1742) to dedicate himself to the apostolate of the book.[66] That the missionary spirit of the Oratorians stayed alive was witnessed by the Capuchin Marco della Tomba, who was traveling through. In 1783 he reported of fourteen Oratorians who attended to 90,000 Catholics in 400 parishes of varying size.[67] In 1796 the Dutch were driven out by the English, but the Catholics did not get full religious freedom until 1806. Later on the Oratorians had to be replaced by European missionaries of the Propaganda.[68]

The intervention of the Propaganda in India came to pass through an individual case. In 1625 the young Brahmin Matthaeus de Castro arrived in Rome and was ordained for the priesthood five years later.[69] In 1633 he was sent back to India as a *missionarius apostolicus.* But his faculties were recognized neither by the secular nor by the ecclesiastical authorities. So he traveled to Rome a second time and was appointed vicar apostolic of Bijapur[70] and consecrated bishop in 1637. Before entering into his office he was to accompany the newly appointed Bishop Francesco Antonio de S. Felice Frasella to Japan.[71] But since the latter was not longer able to travel there, de Castro began his work as vicar apostolic. But his unwise actions and efforts to have the Dominican, Augustinian, Franciscan, and Jesuit congregations taken over by the Brahmin priests ordained by him caused Lisbon to institute harsh measures which de Castro was able to evade only by flight to Rome (1644). After an interlude as vicar apostolic in Ethiopia he returned to India in 1653. But in the meantime the sultan there had established good relations with the Portugese so that the Portuguese Jesuits were able to resume their work and de Castro found his see occupied. At this time he wrote the pamphlet *The Brahmin Mirror,* attacking the Portuguese and the Jesuits. In 1658 he again traveled to Rome but received no cooperation this time. He died in 1677 at the College of the Propaganda. His successor, Custodio de Pinho (d. 1697), a Brahmin as well, did live in peace with the representatives of the *Padroado,* but he was unable to repair the damage his predecessor had done.[72] It was to no avail that Rome appointed him apostolic visitant for Malabar, where the Italian Carmelites had taken the place of the Jesuits in 1656.[73]

---

[66] R. Boudens, *Catholic Church* (Index); Streit VI, 217–19 (list of his works in Singhalese, Tamil, and Portuguese); E. Peiris, O.M.I., *Singhalese Christian Literature of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries* (Colombo, n. d.).

[67] R. Boudens, *Catholic Church,* 169f.

[68] Because of resistance by the Dutch and the native population the Oratorians could not consider the training of a native clergy until the second half of the eighteenth century; even then they were unsuccessful (see R. Boudens, *Catholic Church,* 186–88).

[69] T. Ghesquière, *Mathieu de Castro, Premier Vicaire Apostolique aux Indes* (Louvain 1937); J. Metzler, "Der Brahmanenspiegel des Matthäus de Castro," *NZM* 23 (1967), 252–65.

[70] Bijapur was a Muslim sultanate east of Goa, inaccessible to the archbishop of Goa.

[71] A. Meersman, "A Few Notes Concerning Archbishop Franc. Ant. Frascella O.F.M. Conv. in Goa 1640–1653," *MF* 59 (1959), 346–51.

In 1669 the vicariate of Bijapur was enlarged by the Muslim state Golconda in the east and in 1697 by the complete realm of the grand mogul; as a result the mission see comprised ninety percent of the Indian subcontinent. But the establishment of a native hierarchy, envisioned by the secretary F. Ingoli at the time of de Castro's appointment, was stopped abruptly in 1696 by the appointment of the papal nephew Petrus Palma-Pignatelli as vicar apostolic by Innocent XIII. This action delayed the envisioned development by centuries. Palma-Pignatelli had worked as a missionary in Malabar; in 1701 (five years after his appointment), he died at Surat.[74] His successors continued to be selected from the Carmelite order.

Goa had not reacted strenuously against the appointment of Indian vicars apostolic except in de Castro's case. But then ensued the real conflict between the *Padroado* and the Propaganda in which the latter did not realize that Portugal's influence in Asia was still quite strong. The Portuguese bishops claimed territories of the Propaganda and in 1709 the viceroy of Goa expelled the Carmelites, active in Goa since 1620.[75]

In 1661 when the marriage contract between Charles II of England and Catherine of Braganza ceded (yet) unimportant Bombay to England, the Portuguese Franciscans were able to continue their missionary work in full freedom. But in 1730 they were finally expelled and replaced by Italian Carmelites.[76] From 1789 to 1791 Goa again exercised jurisdiction over Bombay with the result that the Carmelites now had to leave. This was followed by the disastrous compromise of the double jurisdiction by which the parishes were divided among the *Padroado* and the Propaganda missionaries. This also happened in several parts of British India[77] and was especially disadvantageous for the so-called Christians of Saint Thomas of the Malabar Coast. In these congregations of the Eastern Rite, which had been afflicted by earlier schisms and were unwilling to acquiesce to Latinization, Propaganda and *Padroado* bishops had worked side by side since 1704.[78] According to a report by the Carmelite missionary Paulinus a S. Bartholomeo, who worked on the Malabar Coast,[79] there were at that time eighty-four Uniate and thirty-two non-Uniate congregations. The former were split up among the bishops of Kranganore (twenty congregations) and the vicars apostolic in Verapoly (sixty-four congregations).[80]

---

[72] G. Radaelli, "Mons. Custodio de Pinho e la sua opera Missionaria," *Pensiero Missionario* (1942), 23–37; idem, "Le Missioni Cattoliche di Mogul, Golcanda e Idalcan alla metà del secolo XVII," *Pensiero Missionario* (1941), 214–26.

[73] Idem, "Un Visitatore Apostolico indigeno nel Malabar," *Pensiero Missionario* (1942), 122–35.—Mgr. de Pinho had been consecrated bishop by the vicar apostolic of the Comorin Coast, the Brahman Thomas de Castro, who was a cousin of M. de Castro.

[74] Ambrosius a S. Theresia, *Hierarchia Carmelitana* III, 101–8.

[75] The Carmelites had been well prepared at the mission college in Rome (see L. Kilger, "Eine alte Hochschule missionarischer Fachbildung," *ZMR* 5 [1915], 207–24).

[76] A. Meersman, *The Franciscans in Bombay* (Bangalore 1957), 81–102; J. H. Gense, *The Church at the Gateway of India 1720–1960* (Bombay 1960), 32–69.

In the Jesuit literature the Malabar mission not only comprised the actual Malabar Coast, but the total area of the earlier Malabar province established in 1610. Part of it was Madura, probably the most flourishing mission of the entire seventeenth and eighteenth century.[81] Located outside the Portuguese territory, it was affected by the wars of native princes, Muslims, and Hindus, and additionally by the terror of native despots. The Portuguese Jesuit João de Britto (1647–93) died a martyr there and was canonized in 1947.[82] The missionaries of this mission founded by Father Nobili were foremost in creating values which are still alive today by making use of Indian doctrines of wisdom and the native languages for the propagation of the faith.

The so-called Malabar Rites in India had a considerable bearing on the missionary method of Roberto Nobili and his successors. But protest against certain customs arose from the ranks of his own brethren, the Portuguese Jesuits. In 1623 Gregory XV had approved Nobili's practices. But these concessions were seriously questioned by the missionaries of the Propaganda, especially by the Capuchin Father M. de Tours. Since Mgr. Maillard de Tournon had been appointed apostolic legate for East Asia and China in 1701, he was charged with clarifying the issue of Indian customs on the spot. In July 1704 Tournon issued a decree in Pondicherry which prohibited the Malabar Rites. This was protested above all by the archbishop of Goa, so that the legate's decree was not given papal recognition until 1734 and then again in 1739. The final condemnation of these and the Chinese Rites came from Benedict XIV in his bull *Omnium sollicitudo* of 1744. Modernization and secularization prompted the Propaganda to issue a decree in 1940 concerning the toleration of these rites.[83]

---

[77] Concerning the legal position of the Catholics in English territories, see M. Arputhasamy, *L'Église catholique dans l'Inde. Étude Historico-juridique* (diss., Fribourg 1948).

[78] K. Werth, *Das Schisma der Thomas-Christen unter Erzbischof Franciscus Garzia* (Limburg 1937); E. Tisserant and E. R. Hambye, *Eastern Christianity in India* (London 1957), esp. 69–97; Placid J. Podipara, *Die Thomas-Christen* (Würzburg 1966).

[79] Concerning his works: Ambrosius a S. Theresia, *Bio-Bibliographia Missionaria omnis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum* (Rome 1940; Index); L. Wetzel, *Der österreichische Karmelit Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo, Persönlichkeit und Werk* (Vienna 1936); Streit VI, 187–91.

[80] See E. Tisserant and E. R. Hambye, op. cit., 97; P. Placid, an Indian Carmelite writes: "In perusing the documents and works of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century one is quite surprised to see how the Thomas Christians became victims of the conflicts between Franciscans and Jesuits, between Jesuits and Carmelites, between the dioceses of Cochin and Angamale (Cranganore), and between the jurisdiction of the *Padroado* and the Propaganda" (op. cit., 137).

[81] D. Ferroli, *The Jesuits in Malabar* II (Bangalore 1951).

[82] The first and fundamental biography was written by his brother Pereyra de Britto (Coimbra 1722).

Among the great successors of Nobili were the Italian G. C. Beschi (1680–1747)[84] and the German E. Hanxleden (1681–1732).[85] G. Constancio Beschi worked for about twenty years in the area of Travancore, dominated by the Danes, where a German Lutheran mission had also established itself under Ziegenbalg. Circumstances and the order of his superior Dom Madeira made him the first controvertist theologian in the Tamil language.[86] In his annual report on the Madura mission to which Tanjore belonged as well, Beschi wrote that every priest attended to from five to twenty thousand Christians.[87] The missionaries always held fast to Nobili's guidelines: among the Brahmins and the higher castes the missionaries worked as *Sannyasei;* the pariahs had their own padres. The dispute over the Malabar Rites, rekindled around 1700 in distant Madras—in Travancore itself the tolerated rites were fought by the Lutherans as idolatry—actually had little influence on the missions because the last condemnation by Benedict XIV of 1744 was hardly known prior to the expulsion of the Jesuits by Pombal.

Portuguese Franciscans who had been active in some areas since the sixteenth century were also working in the Tamil-speaking part of the Jesuit province of Malabar. After the expulsion of the Jesuits they were able to take over their stations.[88] In contrast to other countries, the collaboration between the mendicant orders, Jesuits, and the secular priests of the *Padroado*—except for some minor disputes—was rather more harmonious in India.

---

[83] *AAS* 32 (1940), 379.

[84] For a list of his works, see esp. Streit VI, 30–41; M. Ledrus, *Beschi* (Louvain 1931); D. Ferroli, op. cit., 298–314.

[85] D. Ferroli, op. cit., 315–32; A. Huonder, *Deutsche Jesuiten-Missionare* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1899), 175. For the complete Christian literature in Tamil see Devanesan Rayarigam, *Christliche Literatur in der Tamilsprache* (Gütersloh 1961) (reviewed by A. Lehmann in *ThLZ* [1962], 306f.).

[86] The Danes were more tolerant than the Calvinist Dutch so that Catholic missionary work could be continued in their territories (A. Meersman, "The Catholic Church in Tranquebar and Tangore During the Formative Years of the Lutheran Mission," *Indian Church History Review* 1 [1967], 93–112 [about Beschi see 110–12]).

[87] A. Meersman, op. cit., 111.

The missions in the vast realm of the grand mogul were also part of the Malabar province of the Jesuits. Those missions had had a promising start under the rulers Akbar and Jahangir, but in the seventeenth and eighteenth century they had to be confined to ministering to the already converted Christians and those who migrated there. Among the most important Jesuit missionaries the following deserve special mention: the Germans Heinrich Roth (1620–88), author of the first Sanskrit grammar,[89] and Andreas Strobl (1703–70), who worked at the Muslim courts of northern India as a distinguished natural scientist, and the Tyrolian Joseph Tieffenthaler (1710–85), probably the most important geographer of India.[90]

The Portuguese Franciscans who organized two large expeditions to northern India had no lasting successes.[91] The Carmelites of the Italian province who started missionary work in Persia in 1607 and from there advanced to the northern Indian province of Sind were forced to confine themselves to the ministry of Portuguese and other Christians in the large port of Tatta, where they had arrived in 1672.[92] The same was true for the Augustinian Hermits who also gained a foothold in Tatta in 1624 in order to hold on to the important Portuguese bases for the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Goa and for the *Padroado.*[93]

Even in Tibet the interests of the *Padroado* and the Propaganda collided. The Portuguese missionary Antonio d'Andrade managed to settle in Tsaparang in 1624, but six years later wars within the country forced the missionaries to leave Tibet.[94] In 1704 the Propaganda transferred the mission to the Capuchin friars of Piceno. They arrived in Lhasa in 1707, but were forced to return to Bengal in 1712.[95] In the meantime Ippolito Desideri had been selected for the Tibet mission by the Jesuit provincial of Goa. He arrived in Lhasa in 1716, where he encountered the new Capuchin mission, but he did not believe that he was entitled to transfer his charge to them. In 1718 Rome consequently was required to entrust the Tibet mission to the Capuchins for a second time. Father Desideri thereupon left Lhasa and returned to Rome in order to render his report (d. 1733).[96]

---

[88] A. Meersman, *The Franciscans in Tamilnad* (Schöneck/Beckenried 1962).

[89] A. Camps, "Fr. Heinrich Roth SJ (1620–68) and the History of his Sanscrit Manuscripts," *ZMR* 53 (1969), 185–95.

[90] Concerning the cultural and scientific achievements of the India Missionaries see A. Ballini, "Il contributo delle Missioni alle conoscenza delle lingue e della cultura dell'India," *Le Missioni Cattoliche e la Cultura dell'Oriente* (Rome 1943), 233–60; L. Ambruzzi, S.J., "Il contributo dei Missionari cattolici alla conoscenza delle religioni, dei costumi e della geografia dell'India," *Le Missioni Cattoliche e la Cultura dell'Oriente* (Rome 1943), 261–92.

[91] A. Camps, "Franciscan Missions to the Mogul Court," *NZM* 15 (1959), 259–70.

[92] E. Berden, "The Carmel in Sind" *NZM* 11 (1955), 169–78, 241–50.

[93] J. Beckmann, "Die Augustiner-Eremiten in Sind," *NZM* 13 (1957), 191.

[94] G. Toscano, *La Prima Missione Cattolica nel Tibet* (Hong Kong 1951). The reports by Father d'Andrades are backed by Tibetan historical sources; A. H. Francke, "Die Jesuitenmission in Tsaparang im Lichte der tibetanischen Urkunden," *ZMR* 15 (1925), 269–76.

The beginnings of the Capuchin mission in Lhasa were modest, but thanks to their linguistic and religious knowledge the missionaries—especially under their prefect Francisco Orazio Oliverio della Penna di Billi (d. 1745)—were able to establish a peaceful relationship with the Mongols.[97] Yet in 1742 the Capuchins had to retreat before the persecution instigated by the leaders of the Lama. They withdrew to Nepal until 1771, when they were driven out from there as well. They continued their hard work in Hindustan.[98]

The East Coast of India around the vast Gulf of Bengal was part of the diocese of São Tomé, Mylapore. This was the area in which the conflicts between the European powers were to be decided in favor of England.

These territories remained free from ecclesiastical conflicts: the Capuchins, missionaries of the Propaganda, received jurisdiction only for the French settlements, initially in Madras and later in Pondicherry; missionary work among the natives remained the prerogative of the *Padroado* missionaries. Bengal was a traditional missionary field of the Augustinian Hermits and the Portuguese Jesuits. In the neighboring provinces, especially in distant Carnate, the French Jesuits operated their own mission. They had their own superior and enjoyed a certain amount of independence. During the eighteenth century their mission was conducted by an average of 20 Jesuits, whose activities were not affected by Pombal's anti-Jesuit policy. In 1776, after the abolition of the Society of Jesus, their mission was entrusted to the Paris Missionaries.[99] The English victory and the effects of the Revolution on Pondicherry, which had stayed French, impeded the mission. One of their most significant representatives was Jean Antoine Dubois (1766–1848), whose somewhat pessimistic work about Indian customs and traditions determined the European attitude towards India during the nineteenth century.[100]

---

[95] L. Petech, *I Missionari Italiani nei Tibet et nel Nepal. I Cappuccini Marchigiani* I–IV (Rome 1953).

[96] L. Petech, op. cit.; *Ippolito Desideri S J,* V, VI (Rome 1954–55); G. Castellani, "Un trattato di Missionologia del sec. XVIII," *CivCatt,* 1933, III, 127–40; *DHGE* XIV, 1503–5.

[97] A. Jann, "Zur Kulturarbeit der katholischen Kirche in Innerasien. Die missionarische und literarische Tätigkeit des Apostolischen Präfekten von Tibet, P. Franz. Horatius Oliverius della Penna di Billi 1712–45," *Studien aus dem Gebiet von Kirche und Kultur (Festschr. Gustav Schnaürer)* (Paderborn 1930), 128–207; Streit VI, 96–100.

[98] Abundant source material for this period in A. Jann, *Monumenta Anastasiana* I (Lucerne 1939), 970–1152.—Perhaps the largest obstacle was the abject poverty of the missionaries. For this reason the missionaries in Mexico were permitted to conduct a collection for the mission from 1763 to 1767 (see F. de Aljofrén, *Diario del Viaje . . . a la América Septentrional en el siglo XVIII,* 2 vols. [Madrid 1958–59]).

Burma, respectively the Kingdoms of Ava and Pegu were also part of the diocese of Meliapur. Portuguese Franciscans had worked there and especially in Pegu since the sixteenth century.[101] In 1721 when the missionaries of the Propaganda (Barnabites) arrived there, they met with heavy resistance, which they tried to avoid by confining their work to the Kingdom of Ava. Pegu always remained the preferred domain of the Franciscans. In 1766 Giovanni M. Percoto was named vicar apostolic of Ava and bishop of Maxula. The West owes him the first Buddhist manuscripts in Pali (on palm leaves). In various manuscripts and works not published until the nineteenth century he proved himself to be an expert on Burmese Buddhism.[102]

Far distant from India, yet part of Portuguese India, there was a number of Christian centers in Indonesia. After the conquest of Malacca (1640) by the Dutch, Macassar (on the island of Celebes) briefly became the center of the *Padroado* mission in Indonesia. But in the treaty of Batavia of 1660 the Dutch managed to force the ruler, Sultan Hassan Udin, to deport all Portuguese and their followers, i.e., Catholics.[103] But with heavy sacrifices the Dominicans were able to save their Solor mission into the nineteenth century.[104] Always weak, they nonetheless managed to uphold the remainders of Catholic congregations in neighboring Flores as well.[105] Again and again the Franciscans, too, sent individual missionaries to Indonesia; some of them using disguises were able to get to Malacca to minister to the native Christians.[106] North of Sumatra a new field of mission even offered itself to them. There the much feared Atjehr (or Achin) were reconciled with the Portuguese so that the Portuguese Franciscans could work there again from 1688 to 1775.[107]

---

[99] A. Launay, *Histoire des Missions de l'Inde* I (Paris 1898); J. Lafrenz, *Précis de l'Histoire de la Mission de Pondichéry* (Pondicherry 1953). From 1736 to 1741 the Capuchin Norbert de Bar-le-Duc (1697–1769) worked in Pondicherry. His works on the conflict over the Malabar Rites poisoned the atmosphere in the mission; he also made it impossible for the first European sisters, the French Ursulines, to work in India. They had settled in Pondicherry in 1738 (J. Lafrenz, op. cit., 4f.).

[100] The English East India Company published the manuscript in London in 1817 (Streit VIII, 27f.).

[101] A. Meersman, "The Franciscans in the Burmese Kingdoms of Ava and Pegu 1557–1818," *AFrH* 31 (1938), 356–86.

[102] P. Anatriello, "I Cattolici ed il Buddismo Birmano," *NZM* 22 (1966), 260–69.

[103] B. Biermann, O.P., "Frei Luis de Andrade und die Solormission," *ZMR* 43 (1959), 176–87, 261–75 (on Makassar 274f.). For the sojourn of the Franciscans in Makassar, see A. Meersman, O.F.M., *The Franciscans in the Indonesian Archipelago* (Louvain and Paris 1967), 115–22.

INDOCHINA

In 1664, two years after their arrival in Ajuthia, the capital of Siam, the missionaries of the Paris Seminary established a seminary for the education of a native clergy which was to become the central seminary for all of East India and southern China. It was destroyed during the invasion by the Burmese in 1769, but found a new home near Pondicherry where it fell victim to the French Revolution a few decades later. In 1808 it was opened again in English-owned Pulo-Penang.[108] Beyond this the new missionaries also developed a direct apostolic activity in Siam. For 100 years the Dominicans had had a monastery and church in the Portuguese quarter for the ministry to the Portuguese. The Jesuits, driven from Japan by persecutions, found a new sphere of activity in the Japanese quarter and the Paris Missionaries found theirs in the Chinese quarter. The first vicar apostolic, Louis Laneau (1674–96), transferred his residence to Bangkok and through Goa and Rome he prevailed in having all regular clerics subordinated to his jurisdiction. But in spite of his excellent knowledge of the language[109] he and his missionaries did not succeed in gaining ground among the Buddhist population of the Thai, good relations between France and Siam notwithstanding. The opening of a mission in Burma failed as well and in 1693 the first two missionaries of the Seminary of Paris were murdered. Yet by the formation of a native clergy Laneau had created a tranquil and secure center.

---

[104] B. Biermann, "Die alten Dominikanermissionen auf den Solorinseln," *ZMR* 14 (1924), 12–48, 269–73.

[105] Idem, "Lieder der Florinesen," *NZM* 10 (1954), 141–45.

[106] A. Meersman, op. cit., 184ff.

[107] Ibid., 123–44.

[108] A. Launay, *Histoire de la Mission de Siam 1662–1811* (Paris 1920); idem, *Documents Historiques*, 2 vols. (Paris 1920); H. Chappouli, op. cit. I, 131ff.; T. Destombes, *Le Collège Général de la Societé* des Missions *Étrangères de Paris* (Hong Kong 1934); G. Cassac, "Les Missions d'Indochine après l'arrivée des Vicaires Apostoliques (1658–1799)," *Delacroix II, 213*–26; H. Bernard-Maître, *Pour la compréhension de l'Indochine et de l'Occident* (Paris, n. d.).

[109] A. Launay, *Memorial,* 356–59. Laneau was the first to translate the Gospels into the Thai language.

Lambert de la Motte, the first vicar apostolic to Cochinchina,[110] whose mission also included neighboring Cambodia, briefly worked there on two separate occasions. In 1671/72 he got as far as the port of Faifo, where he conducted a synod with three of his missionaries and several catechists. In spite of its modest character this synod was to form the legal basis for the mission of the Propaganda. In 1675/76 he worked as a ship's chaplain on a French ship. Francis Pérez (1687–1728) later worked there as vicar apostolic. In spite of violent persecutions, especially in 1698 and 1700, he succeeded—probably because he was a native and quite independent—in unifying the missionaries under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda. Later on there ensued some serious dissension, primarily between the Spanish Franciscans from the Philippines and the French missionaries. Two Roman visitations in 1740 and 1744 failed. In 1750 all missionaries and their Christians were afflicted by a general persecution[111] from which the congregations had great difficulty recovering. For the most part they were attended by Chinese and native priests.

In 1666 by order of Mgr. Pallu the first missionary of the Paris Seminary, François Deydier (1637–93), pushed up into the vast areas of the north, to Tongking,[112] supported after 1670 by his colleague Jacques de Bourges (1630–1714). When Pallu suggested dividing the area into two vicariates apostolic, the latter became vicar apostolic of West Tongking in 1679; in the same year he consecrated his colleague François Deydier bishop of East Tongking. At this time the two vicariates already contained three hundred thousand Christians. Although the Tongkinese Church had been founded by Alfonso de Rhodes and the Jesuits driven out of Japan (missionaries of the Portuguese *Padroado*), Tongking became the area where the Paris Missionaries could execute the principles and the program of the Propaganda. Moreover, Tongking represented the first sizeable sphere of activity for the native clergy, part of whom had been trained locally (mostly on fishing boats because of the persecutions), the rest in Siam. The future vicar apostolic, Louis Néez (1680–1764), who during fifty-two years of active missionary work got to know most of them personally, wrote biographical sketches of fifty-three of them, stressing their personal merits during the times of persecution.[113] In 1694 Mgr. de Bourges nominated one of them to be his successor as bishop and vicar apostolic. Along with the education of a native clergy, the organization of catechists and of the first congregation of native sisters, the Lovers of the Cross, who worked for the education of women and girls, proceeded apace. Around 1765 West Tongking alone included twenty branches with twenty to thirty sisters each.[114] But during the seventeenth and eighteenth century periods of toleration and tranquility were rare[115] and bloody persecutions frequent. Nonetheless, there were disagreements between the missionaries of different nationalities and religious orders, although the common goal prevented serious conflicts. An initial fundamental solution appeared to have been found in the transfer of the vicariate of East Tongking to the Spanish Dominicans of the Philippines (1679), who had been working in the country since 1675. But in addition to the Dominicans there were also some Italian Discalced Augustinians working there who disputed parts of the Dominican territory. But in 1757 these Augustinians were recalled by the Propaganda and their station handed over to the Spanish. In different places of West and East Tongking there were Jesuit missionaries of the *Padroado* who went over the heads of the vicars apostolic of both regions. This attitude hardened when after decades of a *sedes vacans* a bishop was finally residing again in Macao in 1692 who as the next *Padroado* bishop also claimed jurisdiction in Tongking. The strong ties of the missionaries to their congregations, strengthened in times of persecution, made any delineation of territories impossible. As a result there were constant conflicts via Rome or Lisbon until the abolition of the Society of Jesus.

---

[110] A. Launay, *Histoire de la Mission de Cochinchine* (1658–1823), 3 vols. (Paris 1923–25).

[111] The two bishops and seven of the Paris Missionaries, two Italian Dominicans and a priest from Nepal, nine Spanish Franciscans from the Philippines and eight Jesuits of the *Padroado,* five Portuguese and three Germans were caught. Only Johannes Koffler, S.J., was able to remain (as a physician at the royal court of Hué).

[112] A. Launay, *Histoire de la Mission du Tonkin. Documents Historiques* I (Paris 1927).

CHINA

Thanks to the influential position of the Cologne Jesuit J. A. Schall von Bell (1592–1666) under both the Ming and Manchu dynasties (the latter since 1644) the tumultuous domestic politics at first had no damaging effects for Christianity in China. But the persecutions of 1664 came upon the young Church like a whirlwind. Father Schall, already beyond the age of seventy, was removed from his governmental positions and condemned to death. His penalty was later reduced to imprisonment.[116] All churches were destroyed and twenty-five missionaries of the Jesuit and mendicant orders taken off to be imprisoned in Canton.

---

[113] *Documents sur le Clergé tonkinois au XVIII^e siècle,* ed . by A. Launay (Paris 1925).

[114] N. Kowalsky, *Stand der katholischen Missionen 1765* (1957), 26.

[115] About the scientific works, see Streit VI, XI and G. Dindinger, "Il contributo dei Missionari cattolici alla conoscenza del Siam e dell' Indochina," *Le Missioni cattoliche e la cultura dell'Oriente* (Rome 1943), 293–338.

The Belgian Jesuit Ferdinand Verbiest (1623–88)[117] and two of his brethren were not banished to Canton. Thanks to his knowledge of astronomy, which he had displayed as a coworker of Father Schall, he became the savior of the mission. Called upon again to work in the mathematical institute of the court, he became its director in 1670. One of his first acts was to obtain the release of Father Schall so that the latter could die in freedom in 1666. After the Manchu ruler Kangshi ascended to the throne in 1667,[118] Verbiest gained his confidence and became his teacher of mathematics and astronomy. In 1671 the missionaries imprisoned in Canton were able to return to Peking.[119] Verbiest became interpreter for the court's relations with foreign ambassadors, a position held by Catholic missionaries into the nineteenth century. Appointed vice-provincial in 1677, he employed all the means at his disposal to increase the number of missionaries. This included letters to the Jesuit general and the Pope, but, most importantly, an appeal of 15 August 1678 to his brethren in Europe.[120] This appeal, supported by Philipp Couplet (1624–92), was most successful in France. Not only did many Jesuits there enlist for duty in China, but Louis XIV also assumed the cost of travel and subsistence for the missionaries. On 7 February 1688, ten days after the death of Verbiest, the first five French Jesuits arrived in Peking.[121]

The French Jesuits gave a great impetus to the Chinese mission. The Manchu ruler maintained good relations with them, above all with Father J. Bouvet (1656–1730), who became his ambassador to Louis

---

[116] A. Vath, S.J., *Joh. A. Schall v. Bell* (Cologne 1933), 295 ff.; about the Jesuit missionaries in China, L. Pfister, S.J., op. cit.

[117] H. Josson and L. Willaert, *Correspondance de Ferdinand Verbiest de la Comp. de Jésus (1623–88)* (Brussels 1938).

[118] L. Wei Tsing-sing, "Louis XIV et K'and-Hi. L'épopée des missionnaires français du Grand Siècle en Chine," *NZM* 19 (1963), 93–109, 182–204.

[119] Verbiest's letter to Innocent XI (1678) praises the missionary importance of astronomy (*Correspondance,* op. cit., 227–28).—H. Bernard-Maître, S.J., *La science européene au tribunal astronomique de Pékin* (Paris 1952).

[120] *Correspondance,* 230–53. On the success of this appeal by Ferd. von Fürstenberg, bishop of Münster and Paderborn (1682), see O. Maas, "Die Stiftung Ferd. von Fürstenbergs zum Besten der ostasiatischen Missionen," *ThGl* 25 (1933), 701–10.

[121] P. Bornet, "La Mission Française à Pékin (1688–1775). Notes sur son origine et son personnel," *Bull. Cath. de Pékin* 25 (1938) 555–63, 609–16; C. de Rochemonteix, *Jos. Amoit et les derniers survivants de la Mission Française à Pékin* (Paris 1915).

XIV and his biographer.[122] He gave a piece of property near his palace to the French for a church and missionary station where a sizeable library was installed.[123] The French Jesuits became the most eager promoters of Chinese culture in Europe, especially by means of the seventeen-volume *Lettres Édifiantes et Curieuses,* published from 1702 to 1726,[124] and the voluminous folios about China by J. B. du Halde.[125] These works played an important role in the criticism of followers of the Enlightenment concerning the Christian belief in revealed religion and religious history.[126]

The French Jesuits were not about to submit to the laws of the *Padroado.* Louis XIV demanded categorically that his missionaries were not to be placed under the authority of foreign, non-French superiors, which was in contradiction to the basic rules of the order. This brought about tedious negotiations between the general of the order, Tirso González, and Louis XIV, respectively his father confessor de la Chaise. The French Jesuits were given their own superior, but legally they remained part of the vice-province of China.[127] Even on the issue of the rites they were not uniformly among the Ricci front.

While the persecutions in China were followed by a quiet reconstruction of the missions, King Pedro II of Portugal attempted to call everything into question again. He prevailed with Pope Alexander VIII (1689–91) in the establishment of two new bishoprics of the *Padroado,* Nanking and Peking, which were approved by the Pope in 1690 as though no vicariates apostolic existed there. Portugal sought to weaken the objections of the Propaganda by suggesting the two vicars apostolic for these bishoprics. But the Propaganda could not be satisfied with this. The next Pope, Innocent XII (1691–1700), tried to make up for the overly compliant action of his predecessor. By a brief of 15 October 1696 he confined the Portuguese bishoprics of Macao, Nanking, and Peking to two provinces each; vicariates apostolic were to be established in the rest of the provinces. In the course of time some vicariates were converted into administrative regions. For almost 100 years the three *Padroado* bishoprics existed side by side with the three vicariates apostolic of Fukien, Szechwan, and Shansi.[128]

---

[122] J. C. Gatty, *Voiage du Siam du P. Bouvet* (Leiden 1963), esp. the introduction and bibliography of his works; L. Wei Tsing-sing, op. cit., 185–87. Bouvet published the *Histoire de l'Empereur de la Chine 1699* in Paris.

[123] See esp. the introduction by H. Verhaeren, C.M., *Catalogue of the Pei-tang Library* (Peking 1949), I–XXVII. A photomechanical reprint appeared in Paris in 1969.

[124] A. Rétif, "Brève histoire des Lettres édifiantes et curieuses," *NZM* 7 (1951), 37–50.

[125] *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique et physique de l'Empire de la Chine* (Paris 1735).—See also A. Brou, S.J., "Les Jésuites sinologues de Pékin et leurs éditeurs à Paris," *RHM* 11 (1934), 551–66.

[126] B. Guy, *The French Image of China before and after Voltaire* (Geneva 1963). See chapter 19 of this volume.

[127] G. Guitton, S.J., *Le Père de la Chaise, confesseur de Louis XIV,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959).

The lines of the bishoprics and vicariates had been precisely adapted to the geography of the Chinese provinces, but were disregarded in personnel matters. Thus the Spanish Franciscans of the Philippines were working in the areas of the *Padroado* as well as those of the vicars apostolic. By and by the mission fields were divided by orders. Well into the nineteenth century Peking had four stations and churches, two of the Jesuits of the *Padroado,* one of the French Jesuits, and one of the Propaganda missionaries. From the end of the seventeenth century on the jurisdiction of the whole China mission was as follows: The missionaries of the *Padroado,* mostly Jesuits, attended to a broad strip stretching from Macao beyond Peking via Nanking.[129] The Dominicans of the Rosary Province of the Philippines worked in the coastal provinces, first in collaboration with the Paris Missionaries and later by themselves. From the beginning of the eighteenth century they were also in charge of the vicariate of Fukien, to which the provinces of Kiangsi and Chekiang were joined in 1718.[130] The Paris Missionaries concentrated more and more on the vast provinces of western China, consisting of the provinces of Kweichow, Kwangsi, and Yünnan.[131] A prepared missionary field in the northwest, long since abandoned by the Jesuits, was encountered by the Italian Franciscans. This was the vicariate of Shansi, together with Shensi and Kansu, joined in 1792 by the double province of Hukuang (Hunan and Hupei).[132]

The missionaries' differences of nationality and order did not prevent the uniformity of their efforts. An exception were the missionaries in Peking who were in the service of the Chinese Emperor. Both *Padroado* and Propaganda missionaries worked as painters and musicians, physicians and engineers, but especially as astronomers and mathematicians.

---

[128] P. d'Elia, "L'Istituzione della Gerarchia Episcopale e dell'Internunziatura in Cina," *StMis* II (1946), 1–31; J. Beckmann, "Die hierarchische Neuordnung in China," *NZM* 3 (1947), 9–24.

[129] The best information about this is still contained in L. Pfister, also the surveys by J. Dehergne mentioned in n. 158.

[130] J. M. González, O.P., *Historia de la Misiones Dominicanas de China,* 5 vols. (Madrid 1964–67).

[131] A. Launay, *Histoire des Missions de Chine. Mission du Se Tchoan,* 2 vols. (Paris 1920); idem, *Mission du Kouy-Tchéou,* 3 vols. (Vannes and Paris 1907); idem, *Mission du Kouangsi* (Paris 1903); idem, *Missions du Kouang-Tong* (Paris 1907).

[132] *Sinica Franciscana,* ed. by A. von den Wyngaert, G. Mensaert, F. Margiotti and S. Rossa, vols. II–VII (Karachi and Rome 1933–65).

Even during the cruelest persecutions of the eighteenth century they were protected, but their spiritual activities were more and more confined to the ministry of Christians in the capital, while the mission stations in the countryside were left to other missionaries and native priests who waited in vain for the help of their Peking brethren, who in reality no longer had any influence. Even Emperor K'anghsi, who as late as 1692 had issued a decree of toleration for Christianity, in 1717 reacted favorably to a memorandum from his ministries which was radically hostile to Christians. This was the prelude to the local persecutions in the provinces, which became ever more widespread and cruel under the Emperors Yung Cheng (1722–35) and Ch'ien Lung (1735–96). Just how serious the situation in the middle of the eighteenth century was, even in Peking, is shown by a letter of 1753 from the Jesuit Antonio Gaubil (1689–1759) to the general of the order: "The Emperor is still tolerating a certain amount of religious freedom in Peking, but all Chinese and Tartars (i.e., Manchus) know full well that he hates the Christian name and know his resolve not to tolerate missionaries in the provinces and not to permit any Mandarin to become a Christian. . . . The Emperor thinks that he has done enough for us by elevating four of us to the rank of Mandarin. . . ."[133]

But not all the Peking missionaries showed such discernment. During the hard periods of persecution in the provinces most of them were living as on an island, aggravating their lives by quarrels connected with national rights and canon law. The most disastrous of them was the so-called Peking Schism.[134] After the death of Bishop Polykarp de Souza (d. 1757), until then the only bishop able to reside in Peking, disagreements ensued among the Peking missionaries concerning the administration of the bishopric by the neighboring Bishop Gottfried von Laimbeckhoven (1787) of Nanking. The quarrel was aggravated by the appointment and consecration of the Italian Augustinian Salusti in 1780. His successor Alexander de Gouvea, who arrived in Peking in 1785, was able to eliminate the schisms and realize the last eighteenth century revival of Catholicism in Peking.[135]

[133] In C. de Rochemonteix, *Jos. Amiot* (Paris 1915), 35.

[134] R. Primon, O.S.M., "L'atteggiamento della Congregazione di Propaganda Fide nello scisma di Pechino," *Missionswissenschaftliche Studien* (*Festgabe Dindinger*) (Aachen 1951), 315–31; G. Mensaert, O.F.M., "Nouveaux documents sur le soi-disant Schisme de Pékin," (*Festgabe Dindinger*), 332–46.

[135] J. Beckmann, "Bischof Alexander de Gouvea von Peking (1771–1808) im Lichte seiner Bibliothek" (*Festschr. Rommerskirchen*) in *ED* 21 (1968), 457–79. In a report to the Propaganda the new bishop writes in 1785: "Pekini omnia erant calumniae, rixae, murmurationes et charitatis fraternae violationes," and then he complains that the missionary activities of his priests had been reduced to zero. "Non loquor de omnibus, sed de maxima parte" (C. de Rochemonteix, *Jos. Amiot* [Paris 1915], 542–47).

While the situation of the Peking Church was in many ways serious, the provincial congregations were ailing badly yet always fighting heroically. The persecutions began in the province of Fukien in 1723. The harsh decree of the local viceroy against the Christians was immediately approved by the Emperor and consequently applied in the other provinces as well. In short order about thirty banished missionaries arrived in Canton. When several of them managed to return to their missions in secret, all banished missionaries were later transported to Macao. The individual congregations were affected even more severely by the laws of persecution.[136] Most of them were left for decades without a resident priest. Among the missionaries who returned from Canton the blessed Pedro Martyr Sanz and four of his brethren who accompanied him were condemned to death.[137] In 1784/85 all of China was involved in the persecution of Christians. On 27 August 1784 four new Franciscan missionaries designated for the Shansi/Shensi mission were arrested. Because a dangerous Muslim revolt had broken out in the western border region, the prisoners were immediately suspected of collusion with the enemy (popular view considered Islam and Christianity one and the same religion). To be sure, the trial in Peking clearly established their innocence, but the case had grave consequences. The Peking authorities were surprised that in spite of all imperial prohibitions there were still so many Christians in the country. Forty priests were finally caught and transported to Peking; seven Europeans among them died of the extreme exertion. The rest of the Europeans were deported to Macao, while the native priests and Christians were condemned to banishment beyond the Great Wall.[138] The matter of Christianity and the missionaries henceforth became the responsibility of the subordinate authorities, who were outdoing themselves in tracking down Christians.[139] And yet new missionaries were able again and again to reach their stations by covert routes. Naturally the persecutions resulted in considerable attrition in the Christian communities. The China mission was burdened by the problem of apostates for a number of decades. But many missionaries and Christians of this era manifested great heroism.[140] The causes of the persecution are manifold. The one of 1784/85 shows clearly that Christians and Muslims were considered as potential allies of foreign or domestic opponents of the regime. The fact that K'anghsi admonished his successor Yung Cheng to tolerate the missionaries in his service in Peking, but never in the provinces, demonstrated the limits of even that Emperor's attitude. A special problem was posed by the Mandarins. Many of them intensely disliked having foreigners on equal footing with them or, worse yet, having them as their superiors. In addition, most missionaries misunderstood Buddhism and Taoism. Their attacks on Buddhist and Taoist superstitions frequently affected the Confucian circles of the Mandarins as well because syncretism had taken place among them long ago.[141] The missionaries in Peking and to a larger extent their defenders in Europe pointed to the papal condemnation of the Chinese Rites as the main cause. A connection cannot be denied. Yet the issue of the rites and their significance requires a more subtle treatment.

---

[136] According to a "Catalogus omnium missionariorum qui Sinarum imperium ad haec usque tempora ad praedicandum Jesu Xi Evangelium ingressi sunt" written shortly before the persecution (*Revue de l'Extrême-Orient* 2 [Paris 1883], 58–71), there were eighty-eight churches and mission stations in the provinces. In addition there were sixty missionaries in the four churches and residences of Peking.

[137] J. M. González, O.P., *Misiones Dominicanes en China* (*1700–1750*) (Madrid 1952).

[138] B. Willeke, O.F.M., *Imperial Government and Catholic Mission in China During the Years 1784–85* (New York 1948).

[139] After the persecution the procurator of the Propaganda, J. B. Marchini, reported on 10 December 1785 that the following missionaries were still at their posts: Bishop Gottfried von Laimbeckhoven (Nanking) with one European and one Chinese priest; the vicar apostolic of Szechwan, Mgr. Pottier, with three European and six Chinese priests; in Fukien four Spanish Dominicans and three Chinese priests; in Shantung one Spanish Franciscan; in Kwangsi and Kwantung one native priest each; in Shansi three native priests; in the Peking outer missions seven Chinese priests. In addition there was

The issue of the rites refers to the often violent quarrels regarding the sanction of Chinese ceremonies and observances for use by the Christians. Closely connected with this were the proclamation and obligation of the positive commandments of the Church.[142] Four stages in this issue can be identified in China.

Thanks to the authority of the mission's founder, Matteo Ricci (d.

Bishop A. de Gouvea in Peking with sixteen European missionaries (Propaganda Archives, Rome, *Scritture riferite nei Congressi* 38, fol. 255/56).

[140] We need only mention the Austrian Jesuit Gottfried von Laimbeckhoven, who was appointed bishop of Nanking in 1752, but could not enter his bishopric until 1768 because of the fear of his Christians. Until his death in 1787 he had no fixed residence, being forced to wander constantly. After the abolition of his order Portugal did not pay him a salary for a period of years. He nonetheless felt bound to his oath as a *Padroado* bishop, which, in turn, brought him into conflict with the Roman authorities (J. Krahl, S.J., *China Missions in Crisis. Bishop Laimbeckhoven and His Times 1738–87* [Rome 1964]).

[141] The Dominican Domingo Fern. Navarrete wrote about this phenomenon after his sojourn in China (1658–69) and added that he had heard of a Christian in Peking who also wanted to merge Christianity with these three religions (J. S. Cummins, *The Travels and Controversies of Friar Domingo de Navarrete (1618–86)* II [London 1962], 249 [see also I, LXIX]).

[142] Concerning these peripheral questions, see X. Bürkler, *Die Sonn- und Festtagsfeier in der katholischen China-Mission* (Rome and Immensee 1942); idem, Die Fasten- und Abstinenzpraxis in der chinesischen Mission," *NZM* 1 (1945), 258–71.

1610), the Jesuits initially proceeded in concert.[143] The problems within the ranks did not surface until after his death. His successor, N. Langobardi (d. 1654), took the stance that the heretofore tolerated rites and terminology were not permitted. He probably knew that Ricci's predecessor, Michele Ruggieri (d. 1607) did not have in mind an adaptation to the Confucian ideas of the well educated, but rather to the religious forces residing within the people in the form of Buddhism and Taoism.[144] The firm rejection of accommodation by the missionaries of Japan probably affirmed him in his own position.[145] Just how serious a question this was within the orders is shown by the fact that by 1665 seventy-four conferences on the issue had taken place. While Ricci and his followers, as it appears, referred to the original Confucianism, his opponents were convinced that they should consider the doctrines of the commentaries published at that time. The arrival of the Spanish mendicant orders from the Philippines in the midst of the negotiations broadened the conflict. To come to their own conclusions, the latter proceeded from the conditions as they actually were. But since they could not arrive at an understanding with the Jesuits, who were positively inclined towards the rites, they sent the Dominican J. B. de Morales to Rome, which decided the disputed issues in their favor in 1645. Shortly thereafter when the Jesuit Martin Martini of Triest (d. 1661) presented the purely private character of the rites to the Roman authorities, they were permitted by Alexander VII in 1656. For the time being there were two views which were diametrically opposed to each other. The conferences by the missionaries interned in Canton (1664–70), the efforts by the Spanish Dominican D. E. Navarrete (d. 1688),[146] and even the letter to Philipp V (1647) and Pope Innocent X (1649) by the otherwise respected and influential bishop of Puebla in Mexico, Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, were unable to change the matter in favor of the mendicant orders.[147] In addition to the objective differences there were also the political ones between Portugal and Spain. The arrival of the Paris Missionaries (1684) changed the situation. The Portuguese and Spanish combined to oppose the vicars apostolic. Pallu's successor, Charles Maigrot (1652–1730), decided against the rites in his letter of 1693. He was not only vicar apostolic of Fukien, but had also been appointed apostolic administrator for all of China by Pallu prior to the latter's death. After years of negotiations which escalated the disputes, which up to then had been pursued objectively, Clement XI condemned the Chinese rites (1704). Within China Maigrot's pastoral letter had split the missionary community into two camps: The Propaganda missionaries joined by the Spanish missionaries from the Philippines and, on the opposite side, the *Padroado* missionaries, most of them Jesuits. But in 1687 the French Jesuits, the "mathématiciens du Roi" (Louis XIV), had also come to China. They were not inclined to accede to the claims of the *Padroado.* They produced the men who, later on, were called the figurists or symbolists and who embarked on a third path. They searched the Chinese classics, especially the Tao Te Ching, for prophetic images and sayings which anticipated certain teachings of Christianity. They also thought that they were best able to render the Christian name of God by the ambiguous "Tao." Yet neither the superiors in China nor in Europe agreed with their ideas.[148]

---

[143] Among the more recent historians of the Society of Jesus H. Bernard-Maître esp. tried to prove that Matteo Ricci considered permission, while not certain, yet at least probable. Except for a brief reference in his *Storia* there is nothing at all regarding the problem of the rites. The most recent presentation of the Jesuit point of view is G. H. Dunne, *Generation of Giants* (Notre Dame 1962) (opposing viewpoints: B. Biermann, O.P., in *ZMR* 46 [1962], 296–302; B. H. Willeke, O.F.M., in *NZM* 22 [2966], 144–46).

[144] J. Shih, S.J., *Le Père Ruggieri et le problème de l'évangélisation en Chine* (Rome 1964).

[145] G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Das kirchliche Sprachproblem in der japanischen Jesuitenmission des 16. und 17. Jh.* (Tokyo 1928).

[146] J. S. Cummins, *The Travels and Controversies of Friar Domingo de Navarrete 1618–88,* 2 vols. (London 1962).

[147] Idem, "Palafox, China and the Chinese Rites Controversy," *Revista de Historia de América* 51 (Mexico City 1961), 395–427.

The issue of the rites was one reason, though not the most important one, for dispatching the first papal legate to China, Maillard de Tournon. On 31 December 1705 he had an audience with Emperor K'anghsi—an extraordinary achievement considering Chinese circumstances—but he could not bring about the establishment of direct relations between Rome and Peking which would shunt aside the *Padroado.*[149] When the legate's health became precarious, Chinese custom forced him to leave the capital in August 1706. He was therefore unable to execute the second part of his task, the visitation of the Chinese mission. On top of it all, his departure from Peking was followed by a sharp reversal of the Emperor's formerly favorable attitude. In 1707 de Tournon published the decision of Clement XI of 1704 against the rites in a pastoral letter. Twenty-two Jesuit missionaries and the Spanish Augustinian de Benavente[150] appealed to Rome, but they made the mistake of submitting this church matter to Emperor K'anghsi as well, who decided in their favor.[151] Upon the publication of his pastoral letter the legate was banished to Canton, where he founded the procuration of the Propaganda for the Chinese and East Indian missions which for about 150 years formed the backbone of the Propaganda mission in East Asia.[152] By his efforts he achieved the subordination in principle of all missionaries under the jurisdiction of the *Padroado* bishops, respectively vicars apostolic.[153] After an appeal by the proponents of the rites the Pope upon further examination issued the brief of 1715, reiterating the decree of 1704. Another legate, A. Mezzabarba (1719–21), was as unsuccessful as his predecessor. Besides, he had created new problems by his *Permissiones* of 1721. His orders caused Rome to reexamine the whole issue. By his bull *Ex quo singulari* (1742) Benedict XIV definitively rejected the rites.[154] Because of the persecutions by the Chinese authorities the papal bull did not meet with any substantial resistance. But towards the end of the century the issue of the rites briefly flared up again between the two vicars apostolic of the seminary of the Paris Mission, Pigneaux de Béhaine of Cochinchina and de Saint-Martin of Szechwan in western China. This time the issue was focused on certain rites of Chinese funerals, held to be permissible by the former and forbidden by the latter.[155] Because both the times and the meaning of the rites had changed, they were permitted with certain conditions and stipulations in 1939.[156]

---

[148] J. Beckmann, "Die katholischen Missionare und der Taoismus vom 16. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart," *NZM* 26 (1970), 1–17.

[149] F.-A. Rouleau, S.J., "Maillard de Tournon. Papal Legate at the Court of Peking," *AHSI* 31 (1962), 264–323.

[150] An Augustinian in Colombia wrote a Latin work against this appeal; it appeared in Bogota in 1712 (see *NZM* 15 [1959], 180).

A historian will find it difficult to render a balanced judgment on the issue of the rites in China. Both sides had in common their goodwill and the goal of building a Chinese Church. Any judgment is made more difficult by the fact that the persecutions prevented the two theories from being evaluated in actual missionary practice.[157]

---

[151] The vicars apostolic Maigrot and Mezzafalce were expelled; the Lazarist Appiani, who was accompanying the legate, was arrested and imprisoned for twenty years.

[152] S. De Munter, O.F.M., *De S. Congr. de Prop. Fide Procurae Cantonensis Primordiis* (Rome 1957).

[153] Later on the legate was himself imprisoned until his death by the Portuguese in Macao. The Pope approved of his behavior and elevated him to the cardinalate in 1707.

[154] The disputes in Europe were aggravated in 1700 by the actually justified intervention of the Sorbonne; Charles Maigrot was a doctor of theology of the University of Paris (J. Davy, "La condamnation en Sorbonne des Nouveaux Mémoires sur la Chine du P. Le Compte," *RSR* 54 [Paris 1950], 366–97).

[155] The correspondence of the two bishops in A. Launay, *Histoire des Missions de Chine, Mission du Se-tchoan* II (Paris 1920), Appendix, 21–82.

[156] *AAS* 32 (1940), 24 ff.

[157] The difficulty of an appraisal of the rites problem even for an objective historian is shown in the contribution of H. Bernard-Maître, "La correspondance Becker-Brucker sur la question des rites chinois (1885–1907)," *RSR* 54 (Paris 1966), 417–25. J. Brucker, S.J., had written the article about the rites in *DThC* on which Pastor and most

Persecutions and even the conflict of the rites led to a substantial reorientation of the missionary method in China. As of the end of the seventeenth century the main stress of missionary work was undeniably placed on the individual congregations in the provinces.[158] Knowledge of the languages, something all the orders tried to achieve, was a condition for fruitful missionary work. The first Chinese grammar was published by the Spanish Dominican Francisco Varo (1627–87) in 1703.[159] It was surpassed by the Jesuit de Prémare's *Notitia Linguae Sinicae,* completed in 1728 in Canton.[160] The first comprehensive Chinese-Latin lexicon was written by the Italian Franciscan Basilio Brollo de Gemona (1648–1719), who had been vicar apostolic of Shensi since 1700.[161] The missionaries were also pioneers in the research of Chinese dialects.[162]

Aside from the rites issue, all the missionaries were in agreement regarding their outward adaptation to the Chinese way of life and thought. All of them were satisfied with Chinese food; they clothed themselves and lived in the Chinese manner.[163] The most profound understanding was manifest in their deep respect for the social structure, the community spirit, and the spirit of the greater family. An example of true Sinicism of the Catholic form of prayer were the forms of the chanted public prayers alive all over China. As far as we know, the form of private prayer in the European manner did not develop in China.[164]

---

of the other historians based their work. Father Émile Becker was superior of the China mission in the province of Hopei; in reference to the rites problem he wrote: "Quand on veut justifier la Compagnie dans la question des rites chinois, il ne faut pas chercher à rejeter sur les autres tous les torts" (op. cit., 419).

[158] The individual investigations by J. Dehergne, S.J., of the status of the missions around 1700 provide an extremely valuable overview (see *AHSI* 22 [1953], 314–38; 24 [1955], 251–94; 28 [1959], 289–330; 30 [1961], 307–66; 36 [1967], 32–71, 221–46; idem, "La mission de Pékin à la veille de la condemnation des rites," *NZM* 9 [1953], 91–108).

[159] J. M. González, O.P., "Semblanzas Misioneras: P. Francisco Varo OP," *MH* 12 (Madrid 1954), 145–91.

[160] De Prémare sent the manuscript to his "friend" Fourmont in Paris, who had just written his own grammar, that is he had translated the one by P. Varo from the Spanish; so the manuscript disappeared. It was published in Malacca in 1831 by Protestant missionaries (1666–1736) (Streit V, 958).

[161] Streit V, 874 f.; *Sinica Franciscana* VI, 789–802.

[162] Yang Fu-mien, S.J., "The Catholic Missionary Contribution to the Study of Chinese Dialects," *Orbis* 9 (Louvain 1960), 158–85.

[163] The first doubts concerning the suitability of a Chinese diet for Europeans appeared in the nineteenth century; they were increasingly affirmed.

[164] For the text of the prayers, see Paul Brunner, S.J., *L'Euchologe de la Mission de Chine* (Münster 1964). The rich Mass proclamation of the Alsatian Jesuit R. Hinderer (1669–1744) was sung by the Christians (P. Brunner, S.J., "La Messe Chinoise du Père Hinderer," *NZM* 15 [1959], 271–84).

With the exception of Macao there was no possibility of establishing true convents in China. So the Dominican missionaries went back to the form of the *Beata* popular in Spain. The Chinese virgins, while taking their vows, continued to live with their families, where they taught the women and children and during the times of persecution became the true pillars of the faith within the greater families.[165] The Paris Missionaries introduced this institution in their missions in Szechwan. In 1744 the vicar apostolic de Martillac published the first rules of conduct for them in a pastoral letter. Later on these rules were adapted to changing conditions, especially by the blessed Jean-Martin Moyë (1730–93), who implemented this institution outside the family as well. The synod of Szechwan of 1803 extended it to include all of China. One of the most beautiful documents of a natural and generous adaptation are the so-called *Ordonnances de la Sainte Église,* which originated during the persecutions after 1644 and served as guidelines for parishes deprived of their priests.[166] The *Ordonnances* also instructed the catechists and Christians how to propagate the faith without polemics running counter to accepted Chinese views.[167]

One of the consequences of the persecutions from 1664 to 1670 was that probably all the missionaries accepted the need for a native clergy. After the return to their stations they were able to see what the first Chinese priest, the Dominican Lo Wen-tsao (1617–91),[168] had done to save the congregations. But differences of opinion arose in regard to their education. By his brief *Romanae Sedis Antistes* of 27 June 1615 Paul V had allowed the use of Chinese as a liturgical language. During the persecutions Ludovico Buglio had started the necessary translation, but his Jesuit superiors in Macao had not released the brief for purposes of practical missionary work.[169] So the missionaries of the order and later on the missionaries of the Paris Seminary sought to apply papal permission. Yet as time went on they encountered less and less understanding for their wishes in Rome. Initially their efforts led to a compromise. As early as 1659 the vicars apostolic received permission to ordain Chinese natives, as long as they could read Latin, even if they did not understand it. In accordance with that, the first Chinese bishop, the abovementioned Lo Wen-tsao, ordained the first Chinese priests in China on 1 August 1688.[170]

---

[165] B. Biermann, O.P., *Die Anfänge der neueren Dominikanermission in China* (Münster 1927), 163–65.

[166] H. Verhaeren, C.M., "Ordonnances de la Sainte Église," *Monumenta Serica* 4 (Peking 1939–46), 451–77 (Chinese text with French trans.)

[167] Op. cit., 456 f. We should mention the areas of Christian art, the liturgical vestments and the churches (as late as 1936 I was permitted to visit the church in Shanghai built by Father Brancati in 1640, which had the shape of a Chinese temple) (S. Schüller, *Die Gesch. der christlichen Kunst in China* [Berlin 1940]).

[168] J. M. González, O.P., *El primer Obispo Chino* (Villalva 1967).

[169] J. Jennes, "A propos de la liturgie chinoise. Le Bref Romanae Sedis Antistes de Paul V (1615)," *NZM* 2 (1964), 241–54; for a treatment of the entire problem, see F. Bontinck, *La lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise au XVI*e *et XVIII*e *siècles* (Louvain 1962).

It was strictly an expedient, for all the orders tried to give their Chinese clerics a thorough education in Latin, the Jesuits in Macao, the Dominicans in Manila, and the Paris Missionaries in their Seminary General in Siam. There the German Lazarist Johannes Müllener (1673–1742), vicar apostolic of Szechwan since 1715, had personally trained men for the priesthood and was able to ordain four of them before he died.[171] The Propaganda missionary Mateo Pipa (1682–1746) even tried to educate seminarians in the imperial city of Peking, but defamations forced him to give up his undertaking. Yet as one of few European missionaries he received permission to take his Chinese students to Europe in 1723. In Naples he founded a college, the congregation for secular priests of the Holy Family. Since the missionaries of the Propaganda, especially those of the vicariate of Shensi, regularly sent over candidates who were already trained, more and more new missionaries could be sent from Naples to China.[172] However, the perils of the trip and the disadvantages of a lengthy and alienating sojourn abroad prompted the missionaries to educate native priests in China. The blessed J. M. Moyë, one of the most eager champions of this idea, was the first to take on this task, which he later transferred to his fellow religious, Thomas Hamel (1745–1812). The latter continued this work for thirty-five years in the hard-to-approach border region between Szechwan and Yünnan. Before he died, he graduated twenty priests from his seminary.[173] All of these Chinese priests pursued their apostolic work during the periods of persecution in the eighteenth century.[174] The diary (not intended for publication) of one of them, Andreas Li (1692–1775), for a long time the only priest of the province of Szechwan, offers an intimate insight into the details of the work and problems of the Chinese clergy.[175] He refused the rank of bishop, which his European brethren intended for him to have. In view of this attitude during a period of persecution the Propaganda seriously considered the consecration of bishops from the ranks of the Chinese priests,[176] even though the larger circles were lacking the necessary sympathy for this plan.

---

[170] J. Beckmann, *Die lateinische Bildung des chinesischen Klerus im 17. und 18. Jh.;* J. Beckmann, *Der einheimische Klerus in Gesch. und Gegenwart* (*Festschr. L. Kilger*) (Schöneck/Beckenried 1950), 163–87.

[171] J. v. den Brandt. op. cit., 17.

[172] M. Ripa, *Storia della Fondazione della Congregazione et del Collegio dei Cinesi,* 3 vols. (Naples 1832). Until the closing of the college by the Italian government in 1869 it had graduated 106 Chinese priests (*Elenchus Alumnorum, Decreta et Documenta quae spectant ad Collegium S. Familiae Neapolis* [Shanghai 1917], 1–10).

[173] A. Launay, *Mémorial,* 307.

[174] X. Bürkler, "Die Bewährungsgeschichte des chinesischen Klerus im 17. und 18. Jh.," in: J. Beckmann, *Der einheimische Klerus in Gesch. und Gegenwart* (*Festschr. Kilger*) (Schöneck/Beckenried 1950), 119–42.

In 1762, in the midst of persecutions and quarrels within the missionary community, Pombal's order to arrest the Jesuits arrived; twenty-four fathers and brothers were taken to Lisbon. In the interior of China it was the actual papal abolition of the order in 1773 that had a disastrous effect after it arrived in 1775 and was announced by Bishop von Laimbeckhoven in his role as bishop of Nanking and administrator of Peking. The few Jesuits in the interior were able to continue their work because the power of Portugal could not reach them there. In Peking this measure caused a schism. After almost ten years of negotiations the Portuguese and French Lazarists were finally willing to continue the work of the Jesuits.[177] The advances on the part of the French and the Spanish to establish a French patronage bishopric in Mukden (Manchuria)[178] and a Spanish one in Fukien[179] were rejected by Rome. On 29 April 1785 when the first French Lazarists arrived in Peking with the new bishop of Peking, A. de Gouvea, the latter succeeded in allaying the schism. The new superior of the French Lazarists and of the *Peitang,* Joseph Raux (1754–1801), was not only a superior mathematician (in 1795 he was appointed mandarin of the mathematical institute), but he also had a well-balanced personality. Thus he was able to win over the French Jesuits while opposing all attempts for autonomy of the French mission.

It was during the last decades of the eighteenth century that the Korean Church originated. After some initial fleeting contacts and a few conversions in the course of the Japanese wars of conquest of the 16th century,[180] Christian ideas were spread in Korea by means of religious literature created by the Peking missionaries in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. It is certain that the first Korean baptized in the Church of the *Peitang* in 1784 already knew of the necessity for baptism; he became the first apostle of the as yet priestless Church of his country. The Korean embassies to Peking were a way to create firmer ties with the young lay Church. But not until 1793 did Bishop de Gouvea, to whom the Propaganda had expressly given the direction of the Korean Church, succeed in sending one of his Chinese priests to Korea; he was executed in 1801 as a victim of persecution. As early as 1791 persecutions had flared up here and there; cases of martyrdom show that the Church was firmly anchored. In his report to the Propaganda of 1797 Bishop de Gouvea spoke of four thousand Korean Christians.[181]

---

[175] *Journal d'André Ly, 1746–1763,* ed. by A. Launay (Paris 1906). The diary containing almost seven hundred pages consists of the annual reports.

[176] J. Beckmann, "Beratungen der Propaganda-Kongregation über die Weihe chinesischer Bischöfe (1787–1819)," *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 3 (Münster 1940), 199–217.

[177] H. Cordier, "La suppression de la Compagnie de Jésus et la Mission de Pékin," *T'oung Pao* 17 (Leiden 1916), 217–347, 561–623; *Mémoires de la Congrégation de la Mission. La Chine* II (Paris 1912); C. de Rochemonteix, *Jos. Amoit* (Paris 1915), 258ff., 379ff.

[178] C. de Rochemonteix, op. cit., 437–53. Memorandum by Jos. Amiot of 1 October 1774; this was supported by another by the Count de Vergennes in Paris of 1 March 1779 (text in the Propaganda Archives, Rome, *Scritture riferite nei Congressi,* Vol. 36, fol. 35ff.).

[179] J. Beckmann, "Ein spanischer Versuch zur Errichtung von Patronatsbistümern in China und Hinterindien (1778–82)," *ZMR* 27 (1937), 164–72.

JAPAN

Most accounts of missionary history end the presentation of the Kirishitan period with a note on the persecutions. The actual time of suffering by the Japanese Christians, however, did not start until Japan was completely sealed off from the outside.[182] Yet by no means did the efforts by Christendom to aid the Japanese Church stop. After the peasant revolt of 1637/38, initially a social act of desperation on the part of the exploited populace, the Christians had to pay a high tribute in blood. Thirty thousand men, women, and children were executed. The most stringent regulations forbade any and all connections with other countries, including the Philippines and Macao. In 1640 when Macao, hit hard by the prohibition of trade, tried to change the minds of the Japanese by sending its own delegation of ambassadors, the four ambassadors and fifty-seven of the ship's crew were executed. Thirteen were allowed to return to Macao in order to spread the word of the horrible deed.[183] Deshima, a small island off Nagasaki, which had served as a residence for Portuguese merchants, was assigned to the Dutch in 1640; from there they barely managed to maintain their trade monopoly with Japan until 1854.[184] The closing off to the outside world, applying of course also to Japanese who wanted to travel abroad, was accompanied by ruthless actions against the native Christians. In 1640 the "Office of Inquisition for Christian Affairs" was established in Edo (i.e., Tokyo) with its own buildings, jails, trial procedures, and judges. Approximately two thousand trials against Christians were conducted under its first inquisitor, Inoue Masashige (1585–1661).[185] The surveillance of Christians was closely tied to the social system of the "Five Families," which were answerable for one another.[186] Especially artful was the procedure of the E-Fumi.[187] Usually around New Year's all inhabitants of the island of Kyushu, but also those of other areas, had to step on a Christian picture or a cross, an act which was carefully recorded by the authorities in the form of a protocol. Even foreign merchants, with the exception of the Dutch, were forced to undergo this test upon landing on Japanese shores. This procedure was not abolished until 1857. In addition there were official rewards for the denunciation of Christians the amounts of which were scaled in accordance with the stature of the accused within the Church.[188] The uncovered Christians were taken to the jail of the inqusition in Edo, most of them to be tortured most horribly. During the *tsurushi* those tortured were hung by their feet above a deep hole; the slightest movement was considered a sign of apostasy. In 1633 the Jesuit provincial Cristovão Ferreira broke under this torture. He married and became a spy and interpreter for the Japanese inquistion.[189] But the apostates did not have it easy; for generations they and their descendants were subject to humiliating special rules. When the persecution reached its climax (about 1680–1700), all visible signs of Christianity had disappeared, but the Japanese authorities knew their countrymen well: the uncovering of the Old Christians of Nagasaki in the nineteenth century attested to the presence of a

---

[180] J. Laures, "Koreas erste Berührung mit dem Christentum," *ZMR* (1956), 177–89, 282–87.

[181] A. Choi, *L'Érection du premier Vicariat Apostolique et les origines du catholicisme en Corée* (Schöneck/Beckenried 1961), 1–60.

[182] Arimichi Ebisawa, "The Jesuits and their Cultural Activities in the Far East," *Cahiers de l'Histoire Mondiale* 5 (Neuchâtel 1959), 345–74.

[183] C. R. Boxer, *The Great Ship from Amacon, Annals of Macao and the old Japan Trade, 1555–1640* (Lisbon 1959), 163ff., 331ff.

[184] It is not true that the Dutch also demanded "stepping on the pictures."

---

[185] For the official accounts of his activities, his guidelines for the conduct of trials, etc., see *Kirishito-Ki;* German by G. Voss and H. Cielsik, *Kirishito-Ki und Sayoyo-roku. Japanische Dokumente zur Missiongeschichte des 17. Jh.* (Tokyo 1940); H. Cieslik, "Das Christen-Verbot in Japan unter dem Tokugawa-Regime," *NZM* 6 (1950), 175–92, 256–72; 7 (1951), 24–36.

[186] H. Cielsik, "Die Fünferschaft im Dienste der Christenüberwachung," *Monumenta Nipponica* 7 (Tokyo 1951), 102–55.

[187] M. Marega, "E-Fumi," *Monumenta Nipponica* 2 (Tokyo 1939), 281–86; idem, "Memorie cristiane della Regione di Oita," *Annali Lateranensi* 3 (1939), 9–59.

[188] Details in H. Cieslik in *NZM* 6 (1950), 188f.

[189] Ibid., 259; Ferreira died in 1650; it can probably not be ascertained whether he died a repentant martyr as rumored in India. There were also local persecutions of Christians where they were killed on the spot: Cieslik lists a number of such cases of martyrdom involving hundreds of Christians from 1657 to 1680 on the island of Kyushu (ibid., 262).

Christian underground. Missionaries kept arriving, such as the second Rubino group of four fathers, one brother, and five catechists, who were caught immediately upon landing. Although the inquisitor Inoue later told the Dutch that they had apostatized during the *tsurushi,* this was not likely because none of them was freed, as Ferreira had been. All of them, in fact, died in prison.

The former missionaries of Macao, especially, tried to help the Japanese Christians by means of literature, but the authorities quickly composed lists of banned books.[190] Even at the end of the century it was decreed: "Whoever secretly introduces Christian writings or articles into Japan, will be executed without exception."[191] Yet again and again European ideas, especially in the fields of the natural sciences and medicine, but also in religion, infiltrated Japanese writings. At about this time there were lively discussions by Buddhist and other parties about Christianity.[192] Some learned Japanese who no longer wanted to be apart from European sciences published their work under a Dutch name, under the tolerated "Dutch Flag." They even managed to designate Jesuit works imported from China as works by Dutch scientists.[193]

As soon as it was established, the Propaganda paid close attention to the Japanese mission, especially after the Dominican Diego Collado arrived in Rome in 1622. The long negotiations resulted in the bull *Ex debito Pastoralis officii* (1633), which assured missionaries of all orders free access to Japan by any and all routes.[194] The lack of familiarity with conditions in Japan and the efforts by Rome to exclude Japan from the Portuguese *Padroado* led to difficulties and delays in the appointment of new bishops.[195] But the Propaganda did not neglect the Japan mission; it sought information from the missionaries in China.[196] A remarkable undertaking was that of the Italian secular priest Giovanni B. Sidotti (1668–1715), who arrived in Manila in 1704 and four years later made a covert landing on the Japanese coast. After three days he was caught and taken to the inquisition's jail in Edo, where he died in 1715 what was probably a martyr's death.[197] During his imprisonment he encountered the Japanese philosopher and statesman Arai Hakuseki (1657–1725), who interrogated him for three years. In the process Hakuseki obtained excellent insight into the Christian religion, which he put down in two works. Although he rejected Christianity as an absurdity, his was one of the best presentations written in Japanese. It was helped by the fact that he was a confirmed Confucian who did not hide his rejection of Buddhism and Shintoism. Thus, through him Sidotti influenced the educated Japanese well into the nineteenth century.[198]

---

[190] Such lists also form the basis of the works by H. Bernard, "Traductions chinoises d'ouvrages européens au Japon durant la période de fermeture (1614–1853)." *Monumenta Nipponica* 3 (1949), 40–60.

[191] H. Cieslik in *NZM* 6 (1950), 185.

[192] J. van Hecken, "Le problème du dialogue chrétien avec les Bouddhistes du Japon," *NZM* 23 (1967), 3ff.; H. Cieslik, "Nambanzi-Romane der Tokugawa-Zeit," *Monumenta Nipponica* 6 (1943), 13–51. These anti-Christian novels, some of which were not printed until the Meiji period, especially demonstrated the fact that Christian views among the people remained alive for centuries.

[193] Cf. Arimichi Ebisawa, op. cit., esp. 369ff.

[194] L. M. Pedot, *La S. C. de Propaganda Fide e le Missioni del Giappone (1622–1838)* (Vicenza 1946); Text of the bull in L. Magnino, *Pontificia Nipponica* I (Rome 1947), 160–64.

[195] H. Cieslik, "Zur Gesch. der kirchlichen Hierarchie in der alten Japanmission," *NZM* 18 (1962), 42–58, 81–107, 177–95 (esp. 188–95); also L. M. Pedot, op. cit., 163–221.

[196] L. M. Pedot, op. cit., 314–41.

The continued spread of persecutions after the 1720s prompted many Japanese Christians to flee abroad, as long as flight was still possible. This is how the Japanese Christian congregations in the large port and mercantile city of Faifo originated. In this Japanese quarter the expelled missionaries found a new field of action.[199] Another refuge was Ajuthia, the capital of Siam, where the Japanese merchants already had a base. Here, too, the Jesuits took care of the Christians and converted others.[200] Manila also became a haven for many Christians from the missions of the Spanish mendicant orders. Japanese seminarians and religious were able to receive their ordination either in Macao or Manila and some of them were able to return to their native land as missionaries.[201] Yet the congregations abroad did not endure, since the Japanese were assimilated more and more by their host countries. But the interest in Japan stayed alive among the missionaries. Even in distant Mexico a Japanese grammar was printed as late as 1738 in the unshakable hope that it would serve new missionaries in Japan.[202]

---

[197] A bio-bibliographical sketch in Streit VI, 403–5; for the years in Edo, see R. Tassinari, "The End of Padre Sidotti. Some New Discoveries," *Monumenta Nipponica* 5 (1942), 246–53.

[198] Furukawa Tetsushi, "The Growth of Anti-Religious Rationalism and the Development of the Scientific Method in Japan," *Cahiers de l'Histoire Mondiale* 7 (1963), 739–55.

[199] H. Chappoulie, op. cit. I, 170, 180.

[200] H. Cieslik, "Die erste Jesuitenmission in Siam 1626–30," *NZM* 26 (1970).

[201] H. Cieslik, "Das Schicksal der letzten Japan-Missionare im 17. Jh.," *NZM* 13 (1957), 9–28, 119–38; idem, "The Training of a Japanese Clergy in the Seventeenth Century," *Studies in Japanese Culture* (Tokyo 1963), 41–73.

[202] J. Laures, *Kirishitan Bunko* (Tokyo 1957), 125–26.

The Philippines and the South Seas

Concerning the Philippine Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth century there is abundant source material[203] which has hardly been evaluated.[204] And yet these two centuries were of decisive importance for the Christianization of the Philippines. After 1595 Manila and its suffragan bishoprics of Nueva Segovia, Nueva Cáceres and Cebú were an archbishopric. Five orders had organized their own provinces: the Augustinian Hermits, the Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, and the Augustinian Recollects. As far back as 1594 Philip II had divided that vast island realm among the various orders. The most important islands were conquered by the Spanish almost without bloodshed; the natives joined the Christian faith without resistance. To be sure, violent acts by the Spanish, who initially thought they could continue their American methods of colonialization on the Philippines, here and there led to bloody revolt and the assassination of missionaries, but by and large the islands enjoyed a tranquil political and religious development.

By the end of the seventeenth century the Islamic faith, whose missionaries were active mostly on Mindanao, but also on Luzon among the Malay tribes at the time of the arrival of the Spaniards, had been pushed back. As a consequence Islam made no additional progress towards the east. This was made possible only through the Christianization of the Philippine populace and the tight organization of their congregations. In the cities these formed around the core of the Spanish population; in the more sizeable villages they were centered around the churches and monasteries. The attempt at enslaving the Filipinos, a continuation of the method in South America, was quickly turned back by the government and the Church. The country was poor; the colonists subsisted mainly on the trade between China and Mexico. A population on such a low level did not have a particular attraction for the missionaries either. The first generation considered the Philippines to be no more than a transit station on the way to China.[205] In fact the mendicant orders always maintained missions there, as they did in China, East India, and previously in Japan, whereas the Jesuits were prohibited by their superiors from any sort of activity in the provinces of their brethren of the Portuguese *Padroado.*[206] In the course of the seventeenth century the direction of the missionary effort seems to have changed, concentrating as it did on the Philippines. More and more reinforcements arrived from Mexico and Spain. Missionizing the population in the environs of the bases on the major islands was concluded around 1650. It was then expanded to the less accessible islands. The Augustinian Hermits, carrying the main burden of mission and ministry, had to request protection by royal laws from having their reinforcements, destined for the Philippines, intercepted in Mexico.[207] When local superiors in Spain put up increasing numbers of obstacles, the Philippine province of the Name of Jesus founded the Real Colegio Seminario of Valladolid (1743), which is still a replacement center even today.[208]

---

[203] Streit V, 237–361 for the seventeenth century and VI, 239–400 for the eighteenth century. The most important collection of sources, *The Philippine Island,* by Blair-Robertson, comprises fifty-five vols. of documents, mostly trans. from the Spanish (Cleveland 1903–9). The collection by Torres y Lanzas, *Catálogo de los documentos relativos a las islas Filipinas* (Barcelona 1925–36) totaled nine vols.

[204] E. g., the four-volume work by S. Delacroix II. The most recent Catholic history of the mission by A. Mulders (1960) also deals very briefly with the beginnings in the sixteenth and seventeenth century (221–23), continuing with the history of the nineteenth century (387–88). Only K. S. Latourette, Vol. III, 307–21 continues to the end of the eighteenth century.

[205] J. Beckmann, *China im Blickfeld der mexikanischen Bettelorden im 16. Jh.* (Schöneck/Beckenried 1964), 46–65.

This uninterrupted supply of missionaries demands deep respect[209] inasmuch as the work outside the urban centers required extreme physical exertion.[210] It was there that a realistic counterweight to the China rapture was created which can compare even with the martyrdom in Japan.[211]

The tranquility of the development of the Philippine Church was disturbed by disputes between the bishops and the regular clergy.[212] In 1567 upon the request of Philipp II, Pope Pius V made an exception for the mission countries with their vast distances and small number of bishops. He granted permission to the orders to pursue their ministry independently of all episcopal authority. But in 1585 the Spanish king, first for the Council of Mexico and then for all Spanish dominions, ruled that the orders be subject to episcopal visitation. This led to many a conflict in the Philippines. For all practical purposes the bishops throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century had to give in on this issue, especially since the privations during travel did not make the visitations very attractive. Archbishop Felipe Pardo (1611–89) therefore attempted to prevail in his privileges in Manila against the opposition of the secular authorities as well as the Jesuits.[213] But the latter enjoyed enough political support to make the archbishop lose the ensuing lawsuits.[214] A closely related issue was the authority to be granted the secular clergy to whom the organized parishes were to be transferred according to an order of Philip III (1603). But almost all the Spanish secular priests were living in the cities, occupying the positions of the cathedral chapters, so that every time there was the merest threat of a conflict with the bishop, the orders threatened to remove all their members from the mission stations. This invariably forced the bishop to give in. The idea of a native clergy was as yet rejected, even by Archbishop Pardo, although he changed his mind shortly before his death in 1689.[215] It does appear that while Pallu was being held by the Philippine authorities in 1672 he first formulated a plan for training a native clergy.[216] In 1680 high ranking civil servants sent a pertinent letter to Madrid. In 1702 Philip V ordered the establishment of a seminary for eight seminarians. Two years later Sidotti arrived in Manila and with the help of the citizens there founded the seminary, but large enough for seventy-two seminarians. It was demolished by order of the King and replaced by one for eight seminarians, as had been ordered. This aroused a spirit of opposition in Manila. Although its seminary was not built until 1772, Dominicans and Jesuits, in the spirit of sincere competition, must have admitted Filipinos to the study of theology before that. At any rate, around the middle of the century there was already a relatively strong native clergy in existence who were not limited to auxiliary service, as Philip V had ordered.

---

[206] Some Jesuits even considered this prohibition the cause of many a case of depression of younger missionaries and of their untimely death (H. de la Costa, op. cit., 244–45).

[207] J. Beckmann in *NZM* 23 (1967), 148.

[208] M. Merino, op. cit., XVIII–XX.

[209] The number of Augustinian Hermits until about the eighteenth century would have been over fifteen hundred according to the necrology compiled by M. Merino for the occasion of the four hundredth Anniversary of the Christianization of the Philippines (op. cit.). Until their abolition the number of Jesuits was on the average one hundred fifty in the course of the eighteenth century (H. de la Costa, op. cit., 553).

[210] A vivid picture is provided by J. Schmitz, *Die Abra-Mission auf Nordluzón, Philippinen (1598–1955)* (St. Augustin 1964).

[211] Cases of martyrdom were exceptions in the Philippines.

[212] H. de la Costa, "Episcopal Jurisdiction in the Philippines During the Spanish Regime," in G. H. Anderson, op. cit., 44–64.

This sign of opposition[217] can be seen as well in connection with the attempted Hispanization of the islands, demanded again and again by Madrid. The state wanted to suppress the native languages by any means. Yet with the exception of Manila no country did as little as the Philippines in cultivating the Spanish language. The missionaries everywhere were propagating the faith in the native languages and the orders, in fact, demanded of them the requisite linguistic skills.[218] Paradoxically, Spain owed its great success in the Philippines precisely to the opposition of the lower level provincial bureaucrats and to the missionaries.[219] Not only did the latter create the linguistic basis, such as grammars and dictionaries, needed for research in the most important languages of the Philippines,[220] but an abundant Christian literature as well.[221]

---

[213] H. de la Costa, *The Jesuits,* esp. 489–502 and passim; F. Fernandez, op. cit., 189–93.

[214] In the anti-Jesuit disputes this trial was given widespread attention in Europe. See the work about him published in Lugano in 1760 (Streit VI, 308).

[215] J. S. Cummins, "Archbishop Felipo Padro's 'Last Will,' " G. H. Anderson, op. cit., 105–12.

[216] H. de la Costa, "The Development of the Native Clergy in the Philippines," in G. H. Anderson, op. cit., 65–104.

[217] H. de la Costa, *The Development,* 86ff.

The tranquil development of the Philippine Church was suddenly interrupted by the expulsion of the Jesuits by Charles III in 1767. It involved 148 Jesuits, six colleges, nine residences and three missions.[222] But since the Society of Jesus did not have a dominant part in the ministry there, their expulsion could be compensated for more quickly in the Philippines than in other countries. But the state absolutism which manifested itself in this matter was fraught with serious consequences.[223]

Because their general had forbidden the Jesuits to work in the territories of the Portuguese *Padroado,* they looked for other missionary fields in the Pacific, foremost on the Mariana and Caroline Islands. The founder of the first permanent mission on Guam was Diego Luis Sanvitore (1627–72), who was murdered by an apostate a few years later. In the ensuing revolts of the natives in 1674–76 and 1684/85 twelve more Jesuit missionaries were killed. Yet the main islands were already predominantly Christian around 1740. The Mariana and Caroline Islands gradually turned into way stations and were no longer attended by missionaries on a regular basis.[224]

As early as the turn of the seventeenth century Franciscans from Peru who had come to the South Seas with the discoverer Pedro Fernando de Quirós explored the Solomon Islands and the New Hebrides.

---

[218] The Augustinian Recollects even planned the establishment of a monastery in Salamanca for the study of the major language, Tagalog. The plan was approved by the Propaganda in 1626, but probably disallowed by Madrid (see *Bullarium Ordinis Recollectorum S. Augustini* II [Rome 1961], 77, 78, 82).

[219] J. L. Phelan, *The Hispanization of the Philippines. Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses 1565–1700* (Madison 1959).

[220] J. L. Phelan, op. cit., 51f.; idem, "Philippine Linguistics and Spanish Missionaries 1565–1700," *Mid-America* 37 (Chicago 1955), 153–70; N. Cushner, "A Note on Jesuits, Linguistics and the Philippine Missions," *NZM* 19 (1963), 116–21.

[221] The references in the volumes of Streit alone provide abundant material for a history of this Christian literature yet to be written.

[222] N. Cushner, *Philippine Jesuits in Exile. The Journal of Francisco Puig SJ 1768–1770* (Rome 1964).

[223] K. S. Latourette, *History* III, 313.

[224] E. J. Burrus, "Jesuits and Terra Australis," *NZM* 22 (1966) 89–97; idem, "Sanvitores" Grammar and Catechism in the Mariana (or Chamorro) Language (1668)," *Anthropos* 49 (Fribourg 1954), 934–60; Streit XXI, 1–82.

But their plans for a mission became illusory after the untimely death of de Quirós.[225] Later attempts by Juan de Silva (1617–94) were also unsuccessful, as was an expedition to Tahiti in 1774/75, inasmuch as it did not result in a permanent mission station there. But successes are not a measure of Christian missionary spirit.

---

[225] C. Kelly, *La Austrialia del Espíritu Santo,* 2 vols. (Cambridge 1966).

PART TWO

The Established Church and the Enlightenment

SECTION ONE

Concepts

CHAPTER 18

Foundations and Forms of the Established Church in the Bourbon States of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

The decline of papal power from the middle of the seventeenth century, contrasted with the intellectual and spiritual flowering of baroque Catholicism and the development of royal absolutism, is manifested not only by the European peace congresses,[1] the unsuccessful protests against the Prussian demand for the royal title (1701), and the establishment of the house of Hanover as the ninth electorate (1707). The papal elections and the use of the *ius exclusivae* by Catholic powers[2] demonstrate even more clearly the deterioration of the international esteem in which the papacy had been held previously[3] and the growing strength of the concept of the established Church. To be sure, the papal elections during the seventeenth and eighteenth century almost invariably fell on deserving candidates. Yet they were aged and in many cases because of age and illness they were unable to respond to the demands of their office.

The interests of the state and the ambitions of absolutist rule over the Church turned almost every conclave into a battleground mainly between France on one side and Spain and Austria on the other, with all parties seeking preliminary decisions reflecting their ambitions for an established and national Church. Until the middle of the eighteenth century each succeeding pontificate endured growing pressure from Spain, France, Austria, and the Bourbon secundogenitures of Italy. In addition, the militarily helpless, irreparably indebted Papal States, which could no longer fulfill their original purpose of ensuring freedom of action for the head of the Church, inescapably enmeshed the Popes in the tumult of the Italian policies of the great powers. Rigid adherence to outdated legal claims, such as feudal supremacy over the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the duchy of Parma-Piacenza challenged those states which were in the process of integrating to take ever harsher countermeasures against palpal church supremacy, *pirateria beneficiale,* nunciatures, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

---

[1] J. Müller, *Das Friedenswerk der Kirche* (1927) (inadequate). Except in Pastor XIV–XVI, the role of the Popes in the European congresses after 1648 and the peace nunciatures is only treated in monographs, e.g., A. v. Reumont, "Mons. Agostino Franciotti und der Aachener Friede von 1668," *Zschr. des Aachener Geschichtsvereins* 5 (1883), 53–74; C. Terlinden, "La diplomatie pontificale et la paix d'Aix-la-Chapelle de 1668," *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 27 (1952), 249–68; S. v. Lengefeld, *Graf Domenico Passionei, päpstlicher Legat in der Schweiz 1714–16* (Zurich 1900) (needs to be supplemented); G. V. Vella, *Il Passionei e la politica di Clemente IX, 1708–16* (Rome 1953); I. P. Dengel, *Die politische und kirchliche Tätigkeit des Monsignor Josef Garampi in Deutschland 1761–63. Geheime Sendung zum geplanten Friedenskongreß in Augsburg und Visitation des Reichsstiftes Salem* (Rome 1905).

[2] E. H. Feine, *RG*, 575f., with biblio.

[3] "The conditions under Benedict XIII reduced the Pope to an object of ridicule by the European governments, as clearly indicated by the reports of ambassadors" (Seppelt-Schwaiger V, 424).

The desire to influence the papal elections had grown in proportion to Italy's having become the battleground of the European powers and the growing conviction that the inviolability of the Papal States appeared better safeguarded by an Italian prince than by the head of Christianity. The *ius exclusivae* of the Kings of Spain, France, and the German Emperor, applied more and more frequently since the middle of the seventeenth century and based on legalities of the established Church, was "in reality a demand of the voters not to give their vote to a certain candidate in the interest of peace between the state and the Church"[4] and to exclude that candidate legally.

At the very beginning of the conclave following the death of Urban VIII (d. 29 July 1644) Spain eliminated the candidate of the Barberini party, Cardinal Giulio Sacchetti, by means of the *ius exclusivae.* It repeated this action against the same candidate in the conclave of 1655. In 1644, however, Mazarin's veto against Cardinal Giambattista Pamfili arrived too late to forestall his election (Innocent X, 1644–55). At the next election in 1655 Mazarin also failed in his opposition to Fabio Chigi (Alexander VII, 1655–67). The election of Giulio Rospigliosi was by no means owing to the protection of Louis XIV alone, even though it was later represented in this manner by the French. The Spanish, not knowing of France's sympathy for him, had also supported Rospigliosi. Finally, the latter had also impressed the *Squadrone volante* as the most suitable candidate. Clement IX, whose election, then, had not been clouded by any exclusion, was granted the privilege of having a part in ending the war between Spain and France and bringing about the Peace of Aachen (2 May 1668). By doing so, he was able to attenuate the humiliation of the papacy by the Peace of Pisa (1664) and to weaken the French concept of an established Church.[5]

---

[4] Wahrmund, *Die kaiserliche Exklusive im Konklave Innozenz' XIII.,* 15.

[5] Regarding the intention of Franz Egon von Fürstenberg to play the role of a peace

The conclave upon his death was again characterized by opposition between Spain and France and a heretofore unprecedented influence by the ambassadors. The French ambassador Chaulnes formally applied the *ius exclusivae* to Cardinal d'Elce, whereas the Spanish ambassador Astorga presented the reservations of his queen-regent against Cardinal Vidoni and caused the candidacy of Cardinal Brancaccio to run aground on the *ius exclusivae.* The mediation of Venice finally steered the election to the eighty-year-old, kind, but insignificant Emilio Altieri (29 April 1670, Clement X, 1670–76). His successor, Innocent XI (Benedetto Odescalchi) was not elected until the approval of Louis XIV had been delivered to the entrance of the conclave on 20 September 1676. Although the War of the Spanish Succession prompted great efforts in connection with the election of Alexander VIII (1689–91), neither Louis XIV nor Leopold I was able to exert any decisive influence this time. The next lengthy conclave (12 February–12 July 1691) was again dominated by opposition between the French and the Spanish-Austrian parties. The promising candidacy of Gregorio Barbarigo, who was later canonized, failed by virtue of the fact that Emperor Leopold I, while foregoing formal exclusion, called his election undesirable, the Spanish ambassador conspired against it, and Louis XIV resisted it out of consideration for his allies. Cardinal Antonio Pignatelli (Innocent XII, 1691–1700), who was elected in the end, was a compromise candidate already seventy-five years of age.

The Spanish succession—Charles II, the last of the Habsburgs on the Spanish throne had died little more than a month after Innocent XII (d. 27 September 1700)—and the prospect that because of the dead Pope's partisanship for the French succession, the feudal claim over the Kingdom of the two Sicilies, and the helpless military condition of the Papal States the Apostolic See would be involved in that European conflict overshadowed the conclave (9 October to 20 November 1700). In this conclave the *Zelanti* were finally able to prevail with their candidate, Gian Francesco Albani (Clement XI,[6] 1700–1721). On 2 April 1721 during the scrutiny prior to reaching a two-third's majority, Cardinal Althan announced the imperial exclusion preventing the election of the

---

mediator in Aachen, see A. Franzen, "Französische Politik und Kurkölns Beziehungen zu Frankreich unter Erzbischof Max Heinrich (1650–88) in römischer Sicht," *RQ* 52 (1957), 200.

[6] "Clement XI was the last Pope who represented the lofty ideas and principles of Gregory VII in all respects with the energy and firmness of his great predecessor. A noble, dignified personality with the most sensitive conscience and full of the fear of God, imbued with the desire to restore the peace between Church and state, he personally pursued that peace for fully twenty years with the greatest sacrifices, but never came to enjoy it" (F. J. Sentis, *Monarchia Sicula,* 157f.).

candidate of the nepotist party, Fabrizio Paolucci.[7] After the Emperor and France had reached an understanding, Cardinal Conti (Innocent XIII, 1721–24) was elected. Nine years later the candidate of the *Zelanti*, Lorenzo Imperiali, foundered on the protest of the Bourbon courts and Paolucci on the exclusion of the previous conclave. The papal election of 1730 also marked the first appearance of the Savoy Party. The last public exclusion was issued by France on 24 June 1758 against Cardinal Cavalchini because of his position in the canonization of Bellarmine and on the issue of the constitution *Unigenitus*.

The *ius exclusivae* was to serve the fulfillment of aims regarding the established Church and the attainment of other long-range goals. For the common disputes with the Church either the already existing institutions of the pre-Tridentine established Church were further developed or new means created. The confinement of the nunciatures to a position of mere diplomatic representation of the Papal States,[8] put into effect by the established Churches in an alliance with episcopalism, was complemented by the institution of the *Agenzie*,[9] developed in Spain and France and taken over in 1714–17 by Charles VI first for his Dutch and Italian possessions and then for the hereditary lands and the Empire as well. In 1759 the ordinariates of the Habsburg monarchy were ordered to make use of the Roman *Agenzie;* after 1767 all business with Rome, with the exception of the *forum internum*, had to go exclusively through this state institution. More than anything else the established Church made use of the *Appellatio tanquam ab abusu* and of the *placet* in its disputes with the hierarchy.

The *Appellatio ab abusu*, also called *Recursus ab abusu, Recursus ad principem, Appel comme d'abus,* or *Recurso de fuerza,* is the appeal to state authority against an alleged misuse of church authority, especially in connection with jurisprudence and administration.[10] Even in its initial stages this institution, which grew from various roots in Spain, France, and in the medieval communities and principalities of Italy, signaled the claim of absolute rule over the Church. If possible all jurisdiction competing with that of the state was to be eliminated. In conjunction with the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), the *Appel comme d'abus* had been expanded, acknowledged by Leo X in the Concordat of 1516, and legalized in the *Ordonnance* of Villers Cotterêts of 1539. In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century the *Recursus ab abusu,* although condemned since 1581 by the bull *In Coena Domini* and censured by the Church, was developed in all Catholic states "as a weapon of territorialism against the hierocratic system."[11] In Lorraine, where the conflict regarding the Code Léopold (1701–10) was almost exclusively focused on the *Recursus ab abusu,*[12] it represented a means of defense on the part of national autonomy. The *Recursus ab abusu* was intended to express the territorial sovereignty of the state and to complete the development initiated by the *Privilegium de nonevocando,* with state control of church jurisdiction. But it was also intended to delineate the respective competencies of the state and the Church. While it was primarily an instrument of the established Church, it also contributed towards putting into disuse the Pope's recourse to a general council.

---

[7] For Paolucci, who had been nuncio in Cologne from 1696 to 1698 and cardinal secretary under Clement XI, see H. Raab, "Die Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Fabrizio Paolucci," *RQ* 55 (1960), 129–50; L. Jadin, *L'Europe au début du XVIII^e siècle. Correspondance du Baron Karg de Bebenbourg, Chancellier du Prince-Évêque de Liège Joseph Clément de Bavière, Archevêque Électeur de Cologne avec le Cardinal Paolucci, Secrétaire d'État (1700–19)* (Brussels and Rome 1968).—Wahrmund (*Die kaiserliche Exklusive im Konklave Innozenz' XIII.*, 23) views the exclusion of Paolucci perhaps as the "somewhat rash step of a cardinal less experienced in the practice of the elections in Rome."

[8] See Chap. 23; K. Walf, *Die Entwicklung des päpstlichen Gesandtschaftswesens in dem Abschnitt zwischen Dekretalenrecht und Wiener Konkordat (1159 bis 1815)* (Munich 1966), 219f.

[9] R. Blaas, "Die k. k. Agenzie für geistliche Angelegenheiten," *MOESTA* 7 (1954), 47–98; H. Herrmann, "Die Römische Agenzie für kirchliche Angelegenheiten Deutschlands und Österreichs," *RömHM* 11 (1968), 188.

[10] E. Eichmann, *Der Recursus ab abusu nach deutschem Recht* (Breslau 1903); P. G. Caron, *L'appello per abuso* (Milan 1954).

The sharpest weapon of the established Church, "the main guarantee of the rights of the state,"[13] was the *placet* (also called the *Placetum regium, Exequatur, Jus retentionis,* and, in Lorraine, *Pareatis*). It was first formulated in England; after the tumult of obedience ensuing from the Great Western Schism it was used as a prescriptive right by the sovereign princes. It represents the right on the part of the sovereign or those offices charged by him—as the Inquisition tribunal in Spain—to examine with a view towards the interests of the state certain church decrees, especially by foreign superiors, to permit their publication and execution or to prohibit them under certain penalties, of which those ordered by Philip II in 1569 were especially harsh (they included banishment and even the death penalty). Within the concept of the established Church the *placet* was part of the *Jura circa sacra* and of the sovereignty of the state. It was based on council resolutions, the Catholic view of the state, the responsibilities of the sovereign prince, and, during the eighteenth century, increasingly on natural law. The state has the *placet* vis-à-vis the Church, but not the other way around because the Church is in the state, whereas the state is not within the Church. In the seventeenth and eighteenth century the *placet* was applied against papal and episcopal decrees of disciplinary as well as dogmatic content, even though Philip IV (10 June 1659), emphasizing that it was unnecessary in connection with instructional announcements, at that time prohibited such innovative application in the Netherlands. The greater duchy of Tuscany, as well as Spain, France, Venice, Naples, and Vienna, denied the *Exequatur* for the bull *Auctorem Fidei* (28 August 1794) of Pius VI condemning the Synod of Pistoia.

---

[11] E. Eichmann, op. cit., 58.

[12] L. Just, *Clemens XI. und der Code Léopold* (*1702–10*). *Die kuriale Politik im Kampf mit dem lothringischen Staatskirchentum* (Frankfurt a. M. 1935).

[13] E. Friedberg, *Die Gränzen zwischen Staat und Kirche*, 799.

The *placet* had the purpose of maintaining law and order in the state, preventing intervention or abuse by the Roman Curia in the affairs either of the state or the competent bishops. Ever since Innocent VIII and his Bull *In Coena Domini* the *placet* was censured, but not until the middle of the nineteenth century was the *ius, quod vocant* "exequatur" actually condemned.[14] An ordinance of 1475 by Louis XI had ordered the *placet* for papal edicts as part of the Gallican Liberties. An inspection *placet* had existed in Lorraine since 1484. Recommended by Cardinal Ximenes and emphatically prescribed for all Catholics by Ferdinand (1509), it was one of the fundaments of the Spanish concept of the established Church. It became a model via the Netherlands and Northern Italy for the Habsburg established Church, which increased its application even under Leopold I.

A treatise published in 1712 by the well-known Louvain canonist van Espen took on special importance for the theoretical justification of the *placet*.[15] Van Espen viewed the *placet* not as a means of limiting the independence of the Church, but rather as a means of the authorities, who were instituted by God, of maintaining both ecclesiastical and political order. Van Espen's views were of enduring influence on the Josephinist study of canon law. During the last few years of Charles VI the glare of public attention focused on the discussion regarding the appointment to the chair of canon law at the University of Innsbruck, which was to be taken away from the Jesuits and conferred on Paul Josef Rieger. As admitted by the government, the crux of the matter was to protect the students from the very injurious principles aimed at the predominance of the clergy and instead to teach them "the true doctrine as reflected in Covarruvias, Van Espen *et similibus*."[16]

In an unsuccesful effort Innocent X and Clement XI tried to counter the *placet* by the bull *Nova semper* of 9 November 1714. The fight with the established Church, which had grown in strength since the Counter Reformation and had displayed ever stronger aspirations in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, is reflected in the history of *In Coena Domini,* in the form of its text as well as in the measures by the various sovereign princes. Its publication in Spain had led to serious conflicts even under Charles V and Philip II. In 1763 a new prohibition was issued in Spain. In retaliation to the papal monitory, *In Coena Domini* was suppressed in 1768 in Parma, Venice, Naples, Spain, Austrian Lombardy, and Bohemia. After 1770 it was no longer announced. The established Church also ignored the Roman *Index librorum prohibitorum.* Under the principle of advocation the *Ius proscribendi libros perniciosos* was claimed for the state, which then could refuse the request of the Church for intervention and could even act against the wishes of the Church. The Church was forced to suffer its most infamous defeats of the eighteenth century in this arena in the form of repeated failure to proscribe Hontheim's ("Febronius") *De statu ecclesiae* and Osterwald's *Wider die geistliche Immunität in zeitlichen Dingen,* and, finally, it had to tolerate the abolition of the Apostolic Book Commissariat in Frankfurt am Main.[17]

---

[14] *Litt. Apost. Ad Apostolicae,* 22. 8. 1851; Syllabus 8. 12. 1864, par. 6, ART. 41.

[15] E. Von Espen, *Tractatus de promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum ac speciatim bullarum et rescriptorum Curiae Romanae ubi et de placito regeo, quod ante earum publicationem et executionem in provinciis requiritur* (1712); see also L. Willaert, "Le Placet royal aux Pays-Bas," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 32 (1954), 466–506, 1075–1117.

[16] G. Mraz, *Geschichte der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck von ihrer Gründung bis zum Jahre 1740* (Innsbruck 1968), 193.

The established church system, promoted by the Church during the Counter Reformation for the sake of self-preservation and reform, differed in the structure attained during the seventeenth and eighteenth century from the pre-Tridentine form by its consistent systematism and doctrinarianism. It flourished in the absolutist Catholic states, in Spain and France, the Bourbon states of Italy, in the Spanish Netherlands, Lorraine, the Republic of Venice, several Catholic cantons of Switzerland, in the Electorate of Bavaria, and in Austria.[18] In regard to canon law the established Church was a complex system whose bent for episcopacy, national Church, and opposition to the Curia differed from one state to the other. Gallicanism, deeply rooted in French history and closely related to the growing strength of a national kingdom, the weakness of the papacy during the Avignon exile and the Great Western Schism, was firmly placed on a course of maintaining the national unity of the Church in the time following the Reformation. Its goal in counteraction to papalism was the reform of the church constitution in the episcopal or Richerian sense, but above all it aimed at the predominance of the state over the Church. Its claim was based on the Pragmatic

---

[17] The end of the apostolic book commission, connected with the imperial one by personal union, came about on 28 February 1780 when Emperor Joseph II appointed the Reformed book dealer Johann Konrad Deinet to take the place of the deceased Worms suffragan bishop Franz Xaver Anton v. Scheben (H. Raab, "Apostolische Bücherkommissare in Frankfurt a. M.," *HJ* 87 [1967], 326–54).

[18] See Chap. 24.

Sanction of Bourges (1438) and, after its abolition by the Concordat of 1516, on the latter's stipulations which granted the King the right of appointment to almost all bishoprics and abbeys and, with it, factual dominance over the Church of France. The introduction of the *placet* for papal decrees (1475), the *Appel comme d'abus* (1539), and the writings of Pierre Pithou, Dupuy, de Marca, and Richer[19] around the turn of the sixteenth century strengthened the system of the established Church and the concept of the so-called Gallican Liberties, which according to Pithou's authoritative interpretation merely paraphrased the rule of the King over the Church in France.

Following the quarrel over the quartering privilege and the Peace of Pisa (1664), which humiliated the papacy, the issue of Gallicanism reached its climax in the regalia dispute and the *Declaratio cleri gallicani* of 19 March 1682. Next, Louis XIV treated the regalia right as an essential right to the crown. He extended the right of nomination according to the Concordat of 1516 to all the bishoprics and abbeys; he also claimed the ecclesiastical regalia, which enabled him to fill all the benefices of a bishopric while the latter was vacant. When Innocent XI demanded the revocation of the edict, the Assembly of the Clergy under the influence of the King and with decisive participation by Bossuet, who had been appointed bishop of Meaux, decided to accept the expanded regalia right and the *Declaratio cleri gallicani de potestate ecclesiastica*. According to these four Gallican articles (19 March 1682), which constituted a revival of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, the authority of the Pope did not extend to civic and temporal matters (John 18:36; Luke 20:25, Rom. 13:1f.). According to divine order, kings and princes are not subject to ecclesiastical authority in temporal matters. Thus they can neither be directly deposed by it, nor indirectly by releasing their subjects from their oath of loyalty. In spiritual matters as well the authority of the Apostolic See was limited in France by the decrees of the Council of Constance concerning the superiority of the council. These decrees had been approved by the Apostolic See, acknowledged by their application throughout the Church, and most scrupulously observed, especially by the Gallican Church. The exercise of papal power was regulated by the *canones*, the statutes of the church Fathers, tradition, and the prescriptive law of France and the Gallican Church. In matters of faith the Pope was most favored, but his judgment was subject to change unless the total Church agreed to it.

The four articles were published as state law and taught at the universities. Not until 1690 was a declaration of nullification pronounced by Alexander VIII. The tensions with Rome concerning the regalia right and the *Declaratio* were aggravated by the quarrel about the quartering privilege, but a schism was avoided. Innocent XII reached a compromise (1693) by which Louis XIV forewent the implementation of the four articles in exchange for toleration of his regalia right and recognition of the bishops appointed by him. But well into the nineteenth century the established church law continued to be determined largely by the *Declaratio cleri gallicani.* In 1749 an amortization law against the acquisition of property by the Church was passed; in 1762 the Society of Jesus in the French province was dissolved by application of the *Appel comme d'abus.*

---

[19] See Chap. 4.

The Spanish established Church was tightly structured. Owning a disproportionate part of the real property and national income, it was totally in the hands of the state. Its rise and fall proceeded in tandem with the political development. The King had nomination right for all bishoprics and—as under the weak Habsburgs in the seventeenth century and the Bourbons of the eighteenth century—many an unworthy person was appointed. The princely income of many bishops was in glaring disproportion to the condition of the ministering clergy, to the poverty of the lower classes, and the meager theological education among large segments of the regular and secular clergy. Attempts at reform by the Jesuit Eberhard Nidhard (d. 1681 as a cardinal), whom Queen-Regent Anna Maria had appointed grand inquisitor and member of the Secret Council of State, were doomed to failure. The consolidation of absolutism under Philip V also began to have its effects on the relationship with the Church. When Clement XI recognized the Habsburg pretender to the crown, Charles III (1709), the results were the cessation of diplomatic relations with Rome, the closing of the nunciature in Madrid, the suspension of the temporalities, and—as a countermeasure—refusal by the Pope to confirm the bishops appointed by Philip V. In 1713 Melchior Raphael de Macanaz, treasurer of the Council of Castile, summarized the doctrines and demands of the regalists: abolition of the bull *In Coena Domini,* abolition of the Pope's supremacy over the kings, and universal patronage over all church benefices. The concordats of 1717 and 1732 could not allay all the disputes; they actually pleased neither party. The concordat, concluded in dire straights by Benedict XIV, gave to the Spanish King the universal patronage he demanded, with the exception of fifty-two benefices, besides "creating an almost total change in the discipline of the Spanish Church."[20] And yet new conflicts were created under Charles III when

---

[20] P. A. Kirsch, "Das durch Benedikt XIV. im Jahre 1753 mit Spanien geschlossene Konkordat," *AkathKR* 80 (1900), 320.

P. R. Conde de Campomanes (1723–1892) intensified the *placet* (1761) and expelled the Jesuits.

On the basis of the privilege *Quia propter prudentiam tuam*, granted Count Roger by Urban II (5 July 1098), the kings of the Two Sicilies ever since the end of the Middle Ages had claimed the title and rights of a *legatus natus papae* or a *legatus a latere* and with them all those rights not expressly reserved for the Pope. Ever since the sixteenth century this legatine power was characteristically called *Monarchia Sicula*. Ferdinand I, "the Catholic" (d. 1516), possessing the ecclesiastical jurisdiction as well, had himself called *Monarca*. The *Monarchia Sicula* involved the claim of the right of visitation of dioceses and monasteries, the right of decision in the election of church superiors, the right of excommunication and absolution even of cases in the papal reserve, the penal right for bishops, nuncios, and cardinals, and the right of demoting secular and regular clerics. When Philipp II failed to obtain a confirmation of the *Monarchia Sicula* from Rome, he appointed Nicolaus Stizzia to the position of the first permanent judge of the "Monarchy" (*Judex Monarchiae Siculae*) on 13 July 1579. In so doing he created "a central authority which systematically combined the highest ecclesiastical jurisdiction in one hand."[21] The trials before the tribunal of the "Monarchy" were not permitted to be advocated by the Pope nor brought to Rome by way of recourse.

The constant conflicts with the *Monarchia Sicula*, the latter being motivated by rigorous principles of an established Church and extreme "schismatic principles,"[22] reached a climax under Pope Clement XI during the Spanish War of Succession and the disputes connected with the efforts by Joseph I and Charles VI towards an established Church. The cause, insignificant on the surface, was the filling of the episcopal see of the Lipari Islands, on which occasion a small tax was levied. This appeared to Bishop Tedeschi, the secretary of the Congregation of Rites, a violation of ecclesiastical immunity in the sense of the bull *Coena Domini*.[23] So he reacted by excommunicating the responsible civil servants, whereupon the judge of the "Monarchy" pronounced absolution. When the dispute went to the Congregation of Immunities in Rome by way of recourse, it quickly became part of the fierce quarrel between Clement XI and Philip V.

By recognizing the Habsburg pretender Charles III as "Catholic King of Spain" (10 October 1709) Clement XI had gained some concessions in the Emperor's Italian policy, but at the same time he had to suffer harsh retaliatory measures by Philip V: Nuncio Zondadari was expelled from Madrid, all relations with Rome were prohibited, all revenues of the Holy See in Spain were frozen, ecclesiastical immunity and jurisdiction came under attack. On 11 October 1711, Clement XI declared all decrees directed against church immunity and jurisdiction null and void, and their originators to be subject to church censure. In addition he refused to confirm the bishops nominated by Philip V.

---

[21] F. J. Sentis, op. cit., 130.

[22] Ibid., 139.

[23] K. Pfaff, "Beiträge zur Gesch. der Abendmahlsbulle 51," Censure of encumbering ecclesiastical persons and institutions without papal permission.

This immediate quarrel intensified the conflict over the *Monarchia Sicula*. A decree by the Congregation of Immunities (26 January 1712) and a brief by Clement XI (12 June 1712) declared the absolution by the judge of the "Monarchy" of those involved in the excommunication as being invalid and reconfirmed their excommunication. The response was given in the form of an edict by the viceroy: all papal decrees and edicts were null and void because they violated municipal laws, privileges, customs, and the regalia of the realm. The battle was then propelled to its climax by excommunications and local interdicts by one side, countered on the other side by absolution from Church censure by delegates of the "Judge of the Monarchy," suspension of temporalities, and the expulsion of the bishops of Catania, Girgenti, and the archbishop of Messina.

Disregarding the feudal claims of the Pope, the Peace of Utrecht (1713) demanded the transfer of Sicily from Spain to Duke Victor Amadeus II of Savoy. Additionally, the already tense relations between the Curia and Piedmont were aggravated to the extreme by exceedingly harsh measures in Sicily. As a consequence Clement XI on 20 February 1715 annulled the *Monarchia Sicula* by his bull *Romanus Pontifex*, predated by exactly one year.

The annulment received attention only because of an appeal by the procurator of the treasury prompting Philip V of Spain to insist on his rights by means of a formal protest. Less than three years later the establishment of the Quadruple Alliance (2 August 1718) gave Sicily to Austria in exchange for Sardinia. After difficult negotiations Emperor Charles VI agreed to return Comacchio to the Papal States (1725), a process in which Prosper Lambertini, the future Pope Benedict XIV, collaborated. This opened the door to a compromise regarding the *Monarchia Sicula*. Benedict XIII—while not expressly revoking the absolution bull—insisted in his bull *Fideli* (ratified 30 August 1728; in Vienna: 10 November 1728) that the *causae vere maiores* remain in the province of the Roman Curia or a special papal delegation in Sicily, that, furthermore, the title "Judge of the Royal Monarchy" be changed to *iudex ecclesiasticus delegatus*. The King received the privilege to appoint as the highest juridical office a *Iudex delegatus in partibus.*

The Vienna Treaty (3 October 1735)—again in complete disregard of the papal feudal rights—gave Naples and Sicily to Don Carlos as a Spanish-Bourbon secundogeniture. Under his rule (which he assumed after the death of his half-brother), but even more so under his minor son Ferdinand IV, the minister of state and chairman of the council of regents, Bernardo Tanucci,[24] articulated the claims of dominance of an enlightened absolutist state by means of passionate attacks on the Church, harsh reforms, and endless harrassment. The excommunication of the duke of Parma by Clement XIII (30 January 1768) furnished the pretense for reprisals by the Bourbon family alliance against the "ridiculous and scandalous pretentiousness" of the Roman Curia. These reprisals included the occupation of the papal enclaves of Benevento and Pontecorvo. Only after the abolition of the Society of Jesus, which Clement XIII was still rejecting at that time, were these territories returned (1774).

In implementing his church reforms, many of which were not without inner justification, Tanucci invoked the *Monarchia Sicula* and the presuppositions created by the unfortunate Pietro Giannone (1676–1748),[25] whose *Istoria civile del Regno di Napoli* (4 vols., 1723) has been called "the bible of anticurialism."[26] He also invoked kindred spirits among Jansenists and enlightened Freemasons. An Italian translation of Mesenguy's *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne* appeared between 1758 and 1760.[27] The Enlightenment, regalism of the Spanish variety, Jansenist and Freemasonic influences under Tanucci were meshed into a system whose anticlericalism continued well beyond his fall, brought about by Maria Carolina (1776).

Even the enfeoffment of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (10 May 1738) granted by Clement XII did not improve the tense relations between Rome and Naples. Nor did the concordat[28] concluded by Benedict XIV after difficult negotiations (2 June 1741) lead to a modus vivendi, but instead to ever new conflicts in spite of the fact that the Pope—much to the chagrin of several cardinals—made substantial concessions. Agreement concerning the controversial "Tribunal of the Monarchy" was reached by which a court consisting of three clerics and two laymen appointed by the King was to execute church jurisdiction on a higher level as well. Rome made concessions in the matter of personal, local, and property immunity; the right of sanctuary was circumscribed; foreigners were excluded from holding benefices in the kingdom and a few smaller bishoprics were abolished. In exchange the *placet* was to be eliminated and the *Recursus ad principem* modified.

---

[24] Most recent monograph: R. Mincuzzi, *Bernardo Tanucci, ministro di Ferdinando di Borbone 1759–76* (Bari 1967).

[25] L. Marini, *Pietro Giannone e il giannonesimo a Napoli nel Settecento* (Bari 1950).

[26] G. Schnürer, *Katholische Kirsche und Kultur im 18. Jh.* (Paderborn 1941), 13.

[27] E. Passerin d'Entrèves, "La riforma "giansenista" della Chiesa e la lotta anticuriale in Italia nella seconda metà del Settecento," *RSIt* 71 (1959), 210: according to the author there was a close "collaborazione fra riformatori . . . giansenisti e filogiansenisti e campioni della lotta anticuriale."

[28] A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati*, 338–64.

But soon the interpretation of the concordat and the unchanged establishmentarian, anticlerical course set by Tanucci in Naples resulted in endless new disputes. Tanucci, who made the Church responsible for the economic miseries of the kingdom, disregarded the Benedictine concordat; he reduced the number of monasteries, restored the amortization regulations, eliminated the spolia right, and claimed for himself the power of appointment to all bishoprics and the awarding of all benefices. The unscrupulous expansion of the *placet,* which had been founded in "international law and the peaceful spirit of religion," to include even the *forum internum*, the confinement of the Church to the sacraments and liturgy, and, finally, the expulsion of the Jesuits from the realm (1769) were expressions of that harsh establishmentarianism and radical anticlericalism for which Tanucci formulated the recipe regarding relations with Rome: "Raise the stick high! Keep your mouth shut! That is the way to tame that Roman tiger."[29]

Tanucci's fall meant the end of the reforms, but not the end of anticlericalism and vexatious oppression of the Church. In 1778 all connections between the monasteries and Rome were interrupted. The *placet* was refused for all briefs and dispensations if the royal permission for recourse to Rome, the so-called *Liceat scribere*, was not obtained first. In point of fact, this procedure cut off all communication with the head of the Church. The claim of a royal presentation right in all bishoprics led to thirty vacant sees in 1784 in Naples alone; in 1798 there were more than sixty.[30] In 1787 the King of the Two Sicilies formally refused to recognize papal feudal rights by refusing the presentation of the White Horse (*Chinea*), customary sign of vassalage since the time of Charles of Anjou, and payment of the usual seven thousand gold ducats, invoking international law and historical grounds. The papal protest ceremoniously pronounced in Saint Peter's on 29 June 1788 fell on deaf ears.

During the second half of the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century as well, anticlerical policies and strict establishmentarianism continued to flourish in the Republic of Venice even after the worst of the conflicts over Paolo Sarpi was overcome. In 1754 the republic demanded government permission for all communication of its subjects with Rome, as well as for the execution of papal bulls and decrees. Gifts to the dead hand were forbidden, monasteries were closed, and the religious orders were placed under the authority of the bishops, who were not permitted to leave their dioceses without government permission.

---

[29] From Tanucci to Galiani, dated 30 April 1768. Quoted in Pastor XVI, I, 875.

[30] F. J. Sentis, 195.

Establishmentarianism assumed even harsher forms in Parma under Guglielmo Du Tillot and after the excommunication of the duke (30 January 1768), but after the fall of the prime minister the latter's successor reverted to a more moderate course (1771). In Sardinia the *Appel comme d'abus* remained in effect even after the concordats of 1727 and 1742; it was further expanded by additional regulations in 1770 and 1771. The right of sanctuary was modified, but the bishop was enabled to invoke the aid of the temporal authorities against the clergy. Establishmentarianism in Tuscany was not developed until the rule of the dukes of Lorraine. Francis I transferred the book censorship to the temporal authorities; he issued an amortization law and closed several monasteries and convents. The canonical reforms of his son Leopold, for which Pompeo Nero and Giulio Rucellai had paved the way, with some few modifications were basically identical to those in Austrian Lombardy, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Parma, and Piacenza, but Leopold's aims went far beyond theirs and the establishmentarianism of Josephinism. The formative development of the Habsburg establishmentarianism, starting with the consolidation of imperial power and the integration of the state under Leopold I, Joseph I—the conflict involving Comacchio and the recuperation policy in Italy—and under Charles VI was influenced by the model of Venice, the Spanish Netherlands, and Lorraine.

CHAPTER 19

The Enlightenment

Concept

The epoch of intellectual history called "La crise de la conscience européenne,"[1] "Lumières" (French), "Enlightenment" (English), "Illuminismo" (Italian) indicated not so much a tendency towards crisis but rather its distant origin: the metaphysics of light[2] left to the formative

---

[1] P. Hazard, *Krise* (1939).

[2] L. Oeing-Hanhoff, "Licht, II Philosophisch," *LThK* VI (1961), 1024.

Western world by Augustine. The designation "Aufklärung" (C. W. Wieland), applied since the middle of the eighteenth century to the intellectual progress taking place, corresponds to the older French "éclaircissement."[3] But the Augustinian "illuminatio" of God within man was now conceived to mean man's self-illumination in the light of autonomous reason. This authorization of the human intellect which had its prehistory in the power asserted by Thomism that enables man in the knowledge of creation to rise to an analogous knowledge of God, except that rationality (according to Scholastic philosophy) is to be combined with the belief in revealed religion, now sought its reason within itself. The rationalism of Enlightenment is historically inconceivable without the philosophy of Scholasticism.[4] By the same token, the anti-institutionalism of Enlightenment, initially aimed at the constituted Church and accepting for the time being the absolutist state, which in turn took its ideological foundation from the rational law of nature, but then ended in the Revolution, had its roots, through its ties with the religious inwardness of Pietism,[5] in the Christian concept of the uniqueness and freedom of the individual person. Rationalism and anti-institutionalism, which was in the process of emancipation from its own tradition, furnished the conditions for the universal concept of Enlightenment of the one humanity. But for its part the latter is inconceivable without the Passion and Salvation of Christ, which in its original form was universal ("Jews and Gentiles" in Rom. 11:25; 1:16; 10:12), but then again historically particular (*gesta Dei per Francos*). But even if Enlightenment can be viewed as the result of centuries of "diastasis" of medieval history (Mayer-Pfannholz),[6] the diastasis between the ecclesiastical and political realm, between inwardness and institution, freedom and authority, the world and God, it is precisely because of the result of that diastasis that it constituted a crisis of the European intellect. This crisis is institutionally characterized by the fact that the Church now "lost its position of leadership" and that Christianity, from which Enlightenment stemmed, was "publicly put on trial"[7]—with different degrees of intensity, to be sure, varying in accordance with the people and countries involved—without the accuser being able to be distinguished from the accused even before the end of the epoch had been determined. In looking at the characteristics of this crisis, not only

---

[3] Regarding the concept of the period of Enlightenment, absolutism, and baroque, see F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 2–5 (incl. biblio.).

[4] "The deepest roots of Enlightenment reach back to the Middle Ages." (F. Valjavec, op. cit., 16).

[5] See below, p. 537.

[6] A. Mayer-Pfannholz, "Phasen des Mittelalters," *Hochland* 36 (1938/39), 188.

[7] P. Hazard, *Vernunft,* 25.

its origin in the tradition of Western thought,[8] but also its complexity, indeed its inner contradictoriness must be taken into account. Skepticism was not only turned on the dogmas of Christian faith; it was the innermost element of man's reason itself and this reason could therefore be celebrated enthusiastically, be subjected to criticism and—although only on the periphery at first—be cynically discredited. Against the certainty of Cartesian consciousness and its "innate ideas" the psychological empiricism of J. Locke was raised, for whom the soul is a blank page. He was to have a profound influence on Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau and others, finally ending in sensualism. Hume attacked Locke's deism as a new dogma and criticized the concept of "natural religion," which was to be the dome over all the revealed religions, as an empty construct. In its place he posited, in terms of psychology, the religious need, rooted in fear and hope, as only one of the many other needs. Theology, more substantially than in the course of the English Enlightenment, continued to be an ever present partner in the dialogue of the German philosophy of Enlightenment from Leibniz to Kant, albeit a partner separated by a critical line of demarcation. This clearly supports for the overall context of Europe the fact that in the aspirations towards Enlightenment "Christianity was the infinite object of toil for the centuries constituting the modern age."[9] And if one is not deceived by the acid quality of the language, this partnership was also felt in French Enlightenment, in the person of Pierre Bayle, son of a pastor, whose relationship with Calvinism is controversial, and in the anticlerical hatred of Voltaire's "Ecrasez l'Infame." If one considers the Enlightenment in its totality without arbitrarily separating the great personalities from the multiplicators, who had a profound effect on the broad segment of the educated, including those people who, while they could not read, had themselves read to, then the scope of the Enlightenment reached from an "insipid striving for bliss to the sublime mysticism of Spinoza and Malebranche."[10]

---

[8] This element is usually given scant attention in the Catholic literature on the Enlightenment. The undifferentiated negative cliché of "indifferentism, rationalism, agnosticism, naturalism, materialism" (Funk-Bihlmeyer III [1934], 217f.; more subtle in the seventeenth ed. [1961], 249 ed. by H. Tüchle) regularly appears together with the positive cliché "humanization of the law, the fight against superstition esp. the belief in witchcraft, interest in pedagogy, bourgeois tolerance" (the latter with some qualifications); see also A. Schwarz, "Aufklärung," *LThK* I (1957), 1058 with the additional remark that the positive, to be sure, refers "only to watered-down Christian ideals."

[9] H. Freyer, *Weltgeschichte Europas* (Stuttgart 1954), 527.—"Too credulous and too sceptical" is the appraisal of the Enlightenment by C. L. Becker (op. cit., 30f. He continues: "There is more of Christian philosophy in the writings of the 'Philosophes' than has yet been dreamt in our histories." Critical of this "brilliant" piece of work, A. Cobban (op. cit., 228) stresses that "the Enlightenment is correctly identified as the source of the current conflict in ethical values and the consequent pessimism."

Next to the concept of philosophy as the "universal process of philosophizing," which intended to bring about a new order,[11] the natural sciences were a determining element of this epoch. Their observations and experiments provided an ever growing consciousness of man's sovereignty. Although the mathematics and physics of Newton created a lasting understanding, whereas the biology of the seventeenth and eighteenth century in the aggregate is no more than historically significant, an epochal turn of events made all of nature including man the object of empirical research. Its results confronted the traditional theory of creation, a confrontation not lightly undertaken by the prominent natural scientists.[12]

This endogenous process of the European Enlightenment corresponds with the criticism prompted by reaction to world exploration, a criticism of Western traditions, of Christianity (or at least its practice in Europe), brought about by comparison with the high cultures of Asia or primitive peoples of America. Its significance—at the time unintended yet innate—lies in the fact that it was above all the reports by missionaries from Asia, especially China, and from America which caused a "cultural crisis," just as Saint Francis Xavier had done before, intending at first to raise up a Tacitean mirror to their native countries. But the result was that precisely those men who had stepped out into the world for the sake of Christian faith and its propagation unintentionally laid the foundation for doubting the complex claim of Christianity's absolute nature through criticism which had actually been intended for only that form of the claim representing an identification of *christianitas* with Western culture.[13] Thus the Christian faith proved to be an "enlightenment" inasmuch as it questioned its own historical embodiment and with it the whole Eurocentric view of the historical world. Just as the doctrine of creation became a problem vis-à-vis empirical knowledge of nature, so did the doctrine of salvation become problematic for the experience of a universal history, notwithstanding the lack of clear factual knowledge.

---

[10] F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 129.—"Not only was there in some of the intellectual leaders a great aspiration to demonstrate that the universe ran like a piece of clockwork, but this was itself initially a religious aspiration" (H. Butterfield, *Origins,* 119).

[11] E. Cassirer, op. cit., Foreword, X.

[12] In the bibliography to Chap. 6 see esp. E. J. Dijksterhuis, H. Butterfield, H. Lange, E. Ungerer; in Chap. 7: O. Zöckler, W. Philipp, P. Althaus, R. S. Westfall, and the individual scholars of the period.

[13] See above, p. 305.

The "rationalism" of the Enlightenment represents radicalization of Western rationality as well as misunderstanding of the secret which man will always be; "naturalism" is both discovery of the world and the loss of its total dimension in the abbreviation of materialistic interpretation; the detheologization of natural law in a line from Grotius to Pufendorf and Thomasius is at once the foundation of the tolerant state as well as its becoming an absolute concept as the *primum principium* of political and social life; in actuality "indifferentism" is both nihilistic skepticism and the tolerance which was indicated intellectually and politically after the dissolution of medieval universalism (which had its own problems) and was reaching for a new universality of truth. The Enlightenment can only be understood in the light of this ambivalence, which is especially noticeable in its mixed relationship with the idea of progress which had taken the place of the promise represented by the traditional belief in salvation.

The altercation with tradition was reflected also in the system of education. The old institutions, the universities and the ecclesiastic and municipal schools for a long time were averse to the Enlightenment. Its major influence emanated from the academies and scientific associations, followed by the private tutors of the aristocratic families and the salons. Almost all the proponents of the Enlightenment were occupied with pedagogical questions. The most prominent pedagogues of this period were John Amos Comenius (1592–1670 [Amsterdam]) with his *Orbis sensualium pictus* (1654) and his *Didactica magna* (1672)[14] and J.-J. Rousseau (see below). Reaching the broad masses of the people with the spirit of the Enlightenment, however, is a long process which—moved from within by a "second Enlightenment"—has lasted into our century. The communications media played an important part in this.[15]

If the Enlightenment is considered solely in its historical context, it is not easy to determine its beginning. It is different from humanism inasmuch as the latter—in spite of its strong pagan features—is yet part of criticism and reform within the Church;[16] where it initiated secularization, it tended generally to avoid the theological realm. This can be seen most clearly in the development of its attitude towards history. Regional areas are subjects of humanistic historiography; it takes them out of the medieval horizon of Christian salvation, applies its criticism to its proper objects, but—contrary to Voltaire—it leaves the *Historia Divina* unscathed. It can hardly be said that "only a return to life on a Christian basis" after humanism led to overcoming the "static thinking of antiquity" (which was not all that static).[17] This much of it is indeed valid, namely, that the radical argument between the Enlightenment and the Christian faith received both from this argument and from the secular reinterpretation of Christian eschatology those dynamics which characterized the new age. The Enlightenment was by the knowledge of itself distinguished from the Renaissance and humanism. Because of this the dispute between the "Ancients" and the "Moderns" conducted in French literature since the seventeenth century inclined progressively towards the side of emancipation from antiquity (Fontenelle [1657–1757] spoke of the "absurdities" of Greek mythology;[18] Voltaire criticized the "blind adoration of antiquity,[19] although the art of antiquity at the same time remained the absolute model for the Neoplatonism of A. Shaftesbury [1671–1713]). Criticism of antiquity and of the relationship between humanism and antiquity is part of the Enlightenment's criticism of tradition on the whole. Benedetto Croce viewed the intellectual consciouness of the time by saying that it not only emerged from the "darkness" of the Middle Ages, but also from the "dawn" of humanism and the Renaissance into the full light of reason.[20] The changed relationship with the Christian faith is the most essential element of the connection as well as of the difference between humanism and the Enlightenment—not only in the context of church history.

---

[14] K. Schaller, *Die Pädagogik des J. A. Comenius* (Heidelberg 1962).—See chap. biblio.

[15] C. Ledré, *Histoire de la Presse* (Paris 1958).—See biblio. under the heading of individual countries.

[16] Humanism and the Reformation "merely reduced the decisive importance of tradition" (F. Valjavec, op. cit., 9). The "destruction of universalism" in the vast political-economic spaces of absolutism was first described by F. Wagner (*Europa im Zeitalter des Absolutismus* [Munich 1948], 3f.) as the end of the Middle Ages.

The Enlightenment within the Political and Social Conditions of Individual Countries

The course of the Enlightenment proceeded in several phases, in intellectual climates which differed according to the countries involved. The individual proponents of the Enlightenment also occupied opposing positions; their personal relationship to each other could change from affinity to pronounced hostility. Regardless of the way in which the Enlightenment was a consequence of processes in the history of Western ideas, it was conditioned in the totality of history by the extremely rapid consumption of religious views during the religious wars for the purpose of undergirding positions of political power. This consumption was aggravated by the indifference of purely political acts of tolerance, in the bottleneck of establishmentarian censorship of French absolutism as much as in the abolition of precensorship and the supervision of book imports in England (1695). In the context of social history the consumption took place mainly in the rise of an educated bourgeoisie,[21] which relegated the orthodox clergy to backwardness. Even though it was isolated from the common folk, it yet claimed a monopoly in education.

---

[17] H. Lange, *Physik* I, 166.

[18] Quoted in P. Hazard, *Vernunft,* 79.

[19] *L'Histoire du Parlement de Paris,* cap. 50.

[20] B. Croce, *Theorie,* 208; E. Cassirer, on the other hand, emphasizes that the Enlightenment, regardless of loosening its traditional ties, "relishes a return to intellectual motives and problems of antiquity" (op. cit., 314).

In England[22] the religious opposition of the Puritans and the parliamentary opposition established an alliance against the Anglican absolutism of James I (1603–25). This was followed by the "Holy War" of Oliver Cromwell, to which not only Charles I (1649) fell victim but also the Presbyterians of parliament. Yet during the Restoration under Charles II (1660–85) religious engagement of the public had remained so strong that religious statements were among the most important arguments in the fight for seats in parliament. But in this body the "genuine Protestantism was defended by those who unscrupulously fulfilled the Test Act (1673; prescribing the Anglican Communion and the oath of supremacy of the Anglican Church for all occupants of government offices), because they were for the most part freethinkers."[23] After the Glorious Revolution the Toleration Act of 1689, while still stipulating the Anglican faith to be that of the realm and at least for the time being not barring nonconformists from holding state office, provided an arena[24] in which the Enlightenment could develop in a more or less unfettered way, especially after the succession of George I (1714) from the Lutheran house of Hanover. The Royal Society[25] had been founded in 1662; ten years later it counted Isaac Newton as its most prominent member among such others as the founder of scientific chemistry, Robert Boyle, the mathematician John Wallis, the physicist, astronomer, and architect Christopher Wren, and others. The Royal

---

[21] E. Labrousse, "Voies nouvelles vers une histoire de la bourgeoisie occidentale aux XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles (1700–1850)," *Relazioni del X Congresso Int. di Scienze Storiche* IV (Florence 1955), 365–96; O. Brunner, " 'Bürgertum' und 'Feudalwelt' in der europ. Sozialgeschichte," *Gesch. in Wiss. u. Unterricht* 7 (1956), 599–614.

[22] C. R. Cragg, *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason 1660 to 1700* (Cambridge 1950, 1966); L. Stephen, *English Literature and Society in the 18th Century* (London 1904, 1963); H. M. Carre, *Phases of Thought in England* (Oxford 1949); W. K. L. Clarke, *18th Century Piety* (London 1944).

[23] K. Kluxen in F. Wagner, *Handbuch*, 319.

[24] R. B. Barlow, *Citizenship and Conscience. A Study in the Theory and Practice of Religious Toleration in England during the 18th Century* (Philadelphia 1963).

[25] M. Purver, *The Royal Society. Concept and Creation* (London 1967); M. Ornstein, *The Role of the Scientific Societies in the 17th Century* (Chicago 1928).

Society was a model for the founding of academies everywhere; they were progressive institutions compared to the universities. In 1709 the *Tatler* appeared, followed in 1711 by the *Spectator,* the model for the daily and weekly papers which spread the great intellectual movement for the benefit of the progressively minded reader. Following the *London Gazette,* which appeared at irregular intervals (1665), the *Daily Courant* appeared (1712), on which the leading intellectuals of England were collaborating.[26]

In the *Discourse on Freethinking* (London 1713) Anthony Collins (1676–1729) for the first time generally applied the term "freethinker" to fellow deists (formerly used for John Toland specifically), whereas in France "libres penseurs" primarily denoted atheists such as Helvetius and Holbach. It was also in England that Freemasonry originated, that "self-demonstration of a European society which was freeing itself from the ties of the estates, from political forms of authority, and from church dogmata."[27] In the course of the seventeenth century the associations of church stonemasons that also had technicians and natural scientists as honorary members had grown into intellectual groups, into lodges. The association of the Greater Lodge of England (1717), whose constitution was drafted in 1723 by the Anglican cleric James Anderson at Saint Paul's in London, was a signal for similar foundings in almost all the European countries, albeit with different intellectual tendencies which indeed led to some divisions.[28] English Freemasonry was dedicated to the moralistic ideal of "Men of Honor and Honesty," to be enhanced by deistic piety.

Such was the political and social context which permitted England to be the first country in which the Enlightenment developed, although with a certain degree of dispassionate moderation. The movement was able, moreover, to benefit from the footing of centuries of empiricism as an intellectual trait of the nation. In his *Novum organum scientiarum sive indicia vera de interpretatione naturae* (1620) Francis Bacon (1561–1626)[29] had tried to refute atheism by means of a sharp separation of *theologia naturalis* and *theologia revelata.* He offered a theory of empiric-inductive science founded on philosophy as one who, much like a bee, not only (empirically) gathers, but also (interpretatively) alters. The *Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica* (1687) of Isaac Newton (1643–1727), insisting on an absolutely inductive method, is as different from Bacon as it is from Cartesianism. In his introduction Newton defined the method according to which the "force of gravity" is deduced from "celestial phenomena" by means of mathematical postulates and maintained that "the other phenomena of nature should be deduced from mathematical principles" as well. As an author of theological works on the Old Testament, the discoverer of calculus was "ever intent on investigating the total intellectual structure of the empirical world, which permitted an inference of the Christian God of creation."[30] From the first to the third edition of his *Principia,* to be sure, he exhibited a tendency towards a theory of an absolute absence of presuppositions in natural science. Around the middle of the seventeenth century the physician William Harvey (1578–1657), who had studied in Padua and become professor of anatomy in London in 1615, gained fame as the discoverer of the circulatory system, for which he was censured by the Sorbonne. In his *Exercitationes de generatione animalium* (London and Amsterdam, 1651) he applied the causal-inductive method. To be sure, he formulated his theory "ovum esse primordium commune omnibus animalibus" without ever having seen a mammalian egg. The turn of the century brought the English form of empirical criticism, systematic empiricism. In his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) John Locke (1632–1704),[31] not one of the most profound, yet one of the most successful intellectuals of his time, especially in his political writings, turned the subject of who investigates nature into the object of his concern. This empiricism rather than the "innate ideas" of Descartes henceforth dominated the period (even though George Berkeley [1685–1753], continuing in Locke's footsteps, considered human perceptions as being arranged by God [*Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Understanding* (1710)]). Locke's substantiation of deism in the *Letters Concerning Toleration* (1689/92) were no less important than his influence on political theory (contract, separation of powers). In the *Letters* Locke attempted to imbed historical revelation and the proof of its reasonableness in the general system of rationality (*The Reasonableness of Christianity* [1695]). The doctrine of "Natural Religion" had already been offered by Herbert of Cherbury (1582–1648) under the title *De veritate, prout distinguitur a revelatione, a verosimili, a possibili et falso* (1624). John Toland (1670–1722), initially raised in the Catholic faith, who influenced such materialists as Holbach, drew more radical conclusions than Locke from the rationalization of revealed religion. In his publicly burned essay *Christianity not mysterious* (1696; reprint 1969) he maintained that faith did not contradict reason, but conversely did not contain anything beyond that either. Matthew Tindal (1656–1733) on the other hand interpreted the Gospel as a restoration of natural religion (Republication of the Religion of Nature) in his *Christianity as old as the Creation* (1730). In addition to his psychological writings (*Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* [1758]), those on moral philosophy (*Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals,* [1751]), and political science (*Political Discourses,* [1752]) David Hume (1711–76), probably the most important figure of the English Enlightenment, was also an incisive critic of natural religion and deism. His *Natural History of Religion* (1755) and *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (posthumously; 1779) influenced Rousseau, J. G. Herder, and especially Kant. According to Hume, man is determined not by his perceptions, part of which is natural religion, but by his behavioral modes (in the case of religion, by fear and hope), which should be analyzed by psychology. The theologians, he maintained, are intent on proving the greatest paradox; instead, man should admit that "the whole of the world is an enigma, an unfathomable mystery" (*History of Religion,* sec. XV).[32] In his important early work *A Treatise of Human Nature* Hume prophetically related all sciences to the doctrine of man, from which a "complete system" was to be developed (Introduction). A work by the Socinian J. Priestley (1733–1804),[33] *A Comparison of the Institutes of Moses with those of the Hindoos and other Ancient Nations* (1799), is characterized by one of the most important elements of the Enlightenment: the knowledge of non-Christian religions, promoted most of all by Christian missionaries. His *History of the Corruption of Christianity* (1782), a theme also of the pietist J. G. Arnold, is an example of the kind of criticism to which Christian morality, too, was subjected. Sociological and political theories—although characteristic for all of the Enlightenment and its rationalization of natural law—are yet a special feature of the English variant. Whereas an individual and social catalogue of virtues could be derived from the psychology of the liberal David Hume, H. Bolingbroke (1678–1751),[34] politically a Tory (in 1714 he was forced to flee to France), but intellectually an extreme freethinker, replaced the moral idea with his sensualism, of influence also on Voltaire. His ideas were followed by Bernard de Mandeville (1670–1733), born the son of French parents in Holland, who developed the thesis that egoism is the only real social principle (*The Table of the Bees* [1714]). Next Adam Ferguson (1723–1816)[35] attempted to elevate sensualism into a sociohistorical concept. In it, history, brought about by the human species, becomes the essential differentiation from the animal world (*Essay on the History of Civil Society* [1766]). Egoism was viewed as the central principle of social life regardless of the fact that T. Hobbes (1588–1679)[36] developed a theory of absolutism (*Leviathan sive de materia, forma et potestate civitatis ecclesiasticae et civilis* [1651]; *De homine* [1658]) from the formula "Homo homini lupus" or that Adam Smith (1723–1790) a century later offered a theory of liberalism (*Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* [1776]).

---

[26] K. K. Weed and R. P. Bond, *Studies of British Newspapers and Periodicals from their Beginning to 1800. A Bibliography* (Chapel Hill 1946); F. S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England. 1476–1776; the Rise and Decline of Government Controls* (Urbana, Ill. 1952); J. Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspapers, 1620–1660* (Cambridge, Mass. 1961).

[27] F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 123.

[28] J. Anderson, *The Constitutions of the Free-Masons* (London 1723; reproduction, Twickenham 1952); G. Martin, *Manuel d'Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie française* (Paris 1934); H. Boos, *Gesch. der Freimaurerei. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- und Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jh.* (Aarau 1906; reprint 1967); B. Fay, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la révolution intellectuelle du XVIII^e Siècle* (Paris 1935, 1942); R. F. Gould, *The History of Freemasonry,* 6 vols. (London 1884–87; revised ed. by H. Poole, 4 vols., London 1951); G. Serbanesco, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie universelle,* 6 vols. (Paris 1963ff.), Vol. I; P. Naudon, *La Franc-Maçonnerie* (Paris 1963); idem, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et le divin* (Paris 1960). See biblio. under individual countries.

---

[29] *The Works,* coll. and ed. by J. Spedding, R. L. Ellis and D. D. Heath, 14 vols. (London 1858–74; reprint, Stuttgart 1963).—Lit. in P. Hassfeld, "Francis Bacon und die naturwissenschaftl. Begriffe seiner Zeit" (unpubl. diss., Bonn 1951).

[30] F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 137; idem, "Kirchengeschichte und Profanhistorie im Spiegel Newtons und seiner Zeit," *Saeculum* 17 (1966), 193–204; F. Dessauer, *Weltfahrt der Erkenntnis. Leben und Werk Isaac Newtons* (Zurich 1945); *Isaac Newton. Theological Manuscripts,* selected and ed. with an introduction by H. McLachlan (Liverpool 1950); L. T. More, *Isaac Newton, A Biography* (London and New York 1934); F. E. Manuel, *Isaac Newton as Historian* (Harvard 1963); A. Koyré, *Newtonian Studies* (London 1965); M. C. Jakob, "John Toland and the Newtonian Ideology," *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 32 (1969), 307–31.

[31] *The Works of John Locke,* a new ed., corrected, 10 vols. (London 1823; reprint, Aalen 1963); M. W. Cranston, *John Locke. A Biography* (London 1957).

---

[32] Quoted in Cassirer, op. cit., 244f.—*D. Hume: The Philosophical Works,* ed. by H. Green and T. H. Grose, 4 vols. (1882–86; reprint, Aalen 1964).—Lit. in F. H. Heinemann, *David Hume. The man and his Science of Man* (Paris 1940).

[33] A. Holt, *A Life of Joseph Priestley* (London 1931).

In France[37] the politically motivated confessional toleration under

---

[34] C. A. Petrie, *Bolingbroke* (London 1937).

[35] W. C. Lehmann, *A. Ferguson and the Beginnings of Modern Sociology* (New York 1930).

[36] *Opera philosophica quae latine scripsit omnia,* 5 vols. (1839–45; reprint, Aalen 1961);—*English Works,* ed. by W. Molesworth, 11 vols. (1839–45; reprint, Aalen 1966); *Leviathan,* ed. with intro. by M. Oakeshott (Oxford 1957)—Lit. in F. C. Hood, *The Divine Politics of Thomas Hobbes. An Interpretation of Leviathan* (Oxford 1964); M. M. Goldsmith, *Hobbes's Science of Politics* (New York 1966).

[37] P. Sagnac, "La Révolution des idées et des mœurs et le déclin de l'Ancien Régime (1715–1788)," *La formation de la societé française moderne* 2 (Paris 1946); B. Benichou, *Morales du Grand siècle* (Paris 1948); L. G. Crocker, *An Age of Crisis. Man and World in the Eighteenth Century French Thought* (Baltimore 1959); H. Kirkinen, *Les origines et la conception moderne de l'homme-machine. Le problème de l'âme en France à la fin de règne de Louis XIV sur l'histoire des idées* (Helsinki 1960); P. Gay, *The Party of Humanity. Essays in the French Enlightenment* (New York 1964); L. G. Crocker, "Recent Interpretations of the French Enlightenment," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* (1964), 426–56; R. R. Palmer, *Catholics and Unbelievers in 18th Century France* (Princeton 1939); C. Le Bras, *Introduction à l'histoire de la pratique religieuse en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942–45); idem, *Études de sociologie religieuse,* 2 vols. (Paris 1955–56); R. L. Bach, *Die Entwicklung der frz. Ge-*

Henry IV (Edict of Nantes [1598]) had created a climate in which, parallel to Catholic renewal in the first half of the seventeenth century, an attitude ranging from indifference in matters of Church and religion all the way to atheism was able to flourish as well. Indifference was indirectly promoted by the conflict with Jansenism, whose political persecution (aside from that by the Church) finally led to its own politicization, just as its religious spiritualism gradually converged with the Enlightenment. But the most important element was the radical move initiated by Richelieu to make the Church into a function of the state whether it be an antipapal move (Declaration of the Gallican Liberties [1682]) or—following an understanding with the Curia—consisted of granting the bishops special privileges vis-á-vis parliament and the lower clergy (Edict of 1695). The revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), an outgrowth of establishmentarianism and the authoritative attitude of Louis XIV, had a considerable impact within France when it prompted the emigration of about half a million Huguenots. It was especially important within the European intellectual context, for in addition to the lodges of the Freemasons these refugees represented an "adhesive of European consciousness." Furthermore, their younger, elitist generation, outgrowing their church ties, "replaced the parish congregation with an international republic of letters" (F. Wagner).[38] Aside from the religious nonconformists of France, the Calvinists and Jansenists, who were fighting among themselves, the rationalists as well became increasingly suspect to the absolutist state. While the state had founded the Académie des Sciences in Paris (Colbert in 1666), it also maintained the strictest control over the system of publication and the press within the framework of its mercantile policies. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie,[39] experiencing a powerful rise under Louis XIV, was both bearer and audience of the intellectual movement. During the political and economic decline and in spite of continuing censorship after the death of Louis XIV[40] the Enlightenment was able to develop strongly

---

schichtsauffassung im 18. Jh. (diss., Freiburg i. Brsg. 1932); H. Vyverberg, *Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment* (Harvard 1958); G. Snyders, *La pédagogie en France aux XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles* (Paris 1965).

[38] F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 118, 120; idem, "Die Hugenotten—ein europäisches Schicksal," *Der deutsche Hugenott* 27 (1963), 103–16; E. Haase, *Einführung in die Literatur des Refuge. Der Beitrag der frz. Protestanten zur Entwicklung analytischer Denkformen am Ende des 17. Jh.* (Berlin 1959).

[39] B. Groethuysen, *Die Entstehung der bürgerlichen Welt- und Lebensanschauung in Frankreich,* 2 vols. (Halle 1927–30); C. Moraze, *La France bourgeoise. XVIII^e–XX^e siècles* (Paris 1946).

[40] D. T. Pottinger, *The French Book Trade in the Ancien Régime. 1500–1791* (Cambridge 1958).

and even to deviate into extremes. The literary circles and salons, whose members had equal rights of membership after the middle of the century, were the centers of the movement. But the most significant propagator was the *Encyclopedia,* initiated by Jean-Lérond d'Alembert (1717–83); he was named Jean le Pond after the church where he had been abandoned as an illegitimate baby;[41] his intellectual guide was Denis Diderot (1713–84) who was the son of a smith and had studied with the Jesuits.[42] His *Pensées philosophiques* (Paris 1746), publicly burned as anti-Christian, was crowned by the *Promenade d'un sceptique* and a materialistic philosophy of nature. The *Encyclopedia*[43] documented the second half of the century of France by the different positions of its authors, the predominance of empiric sciences, and in its history (1751–72: twenty-four volumes, by 1780: seven supplementary volumes); it was initially granted imprimatur by the Sorbonne, prohibited in vain in 1752, and indexed by Clement XIII. About a decade before the Revolution, almost a century after England, the censorship laws were practically overcome. In 1771 the *Journal de Paris* began to appear. Together with the literary salons the lodges of the Freemasons[44] were the social foundation of the Enlightenment; the Scottish current was conservative, the merger of many lodges forming the *Grand Orient de France* (1773) was a radical and emphatically anticlerical move. In 1738 and 1751 papal prohibitions were issued against it.

Twenty years after the death of René Descartes (1596–1650),[45] his philosophy was banned in France. Its method of doubt was considered as absolute skepticism; there was fear that it was dissolving the authority of the state and society. The Jesuit pupil Descartes (1606–14 at the college of La Flèche), who all his life considered himself to be a devout Catholic, but for the most part was forced to live outside of France, had questioned daily experience as well as general concepts. In this process of critical thinking he had found "clear and explicit" certainty only in the *res cognitans* itself. Equally clear to him was the concept of God: as He is perfection, human *cognatio* possesses but one aspect of Him (his major works: *Meditationes de prima philosophia* [1641]; *Principia philosophiae* [1644]). To speak of Descartes's emancipation of philosophy from theology is valid only in a limited sense by virtue of the fact that only by means of the theological implication of the truth of God can the *res extensa* of divisible matter of physical things be called certain, representing of course a single geometric mechanism. Yet within this mechanism Descartes's *Discours de la méthode* (1637) qualitatively equates the universal saving nature of God's help in the execution of the natural laws, initially created for the chaos, with the act of creation itself. Here is a profound difference from the physicist Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655), who, contrary to both Aristotelian and Cartesian philosophy, viewed all processes in nature as being caused by forces contained in the atoms.[46] The philosophy of Descartes can be interpreted as an endeavor to overtake the emancipation—triggered by Galileo's[47] interpretation of the Copernican view of the world—not only from theology but also from traditional philosophy in an attempt to "trace mathematics back to philosophy"[48] and to do so by means of logic and its direction from the general to the specific. This led to the anti-Cartesian reaction of the empirically oriented eighteenth century. Based on Descartes, the Oratorian Nicole Malebranche (1638–1715)[49] attempted to go back to Augustinian metaphysics of light. In his concept of "Vision en Dieu," merely stimulated by sensual experience, in which all ideas are directly seen (as distinguished from Descartes's "innate ideas") he sees in God the sole *causa activa seu efficiens,* which makes use of human action as the *causes occasionelles* (*Recherche de la verité* [1674]). This was of great influence on Leibniz. But these attempts to obtain in an era of autonomous reason and mathematical-scientific thought a new central position for theology were rejected alike by the Sorbonne, the traditional theologians (especially the Jesuits), and in part by the Jansenists, as well as by the intellectuals of the Enlightenment, whose philosopher was not Descartes but Locke. In the person of Pierre Bayle (1647–

---

[41] R. Grimsley, *Jean d'Alembert, 1717–83* (Oxford 1963).

[42] A. M. Wilson, *Diderot. The Testing Years 1713–1759* (New York 1957); J. Proust, *Diderot et l' "Encyclopédie"* (Paris 1963); L. G. Crocker, *Diderot. The Embattled Philosopher* (New York 1966); P. Altari, *Voltaire, Diderot e il Partito filosofico* (1965).

[43] F. Venturi, *Le origini dell'Enciclopedia* (Turin 1963); J. Proust, *L'Encyclopédie* (Paris 1965).

[44] D. Ligou, *La Franc-Maçonnerie française au XVIII^e siècle: L'Information historique* (Paris 1955); G.-H. Luquet, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et l'Église en France au XVIII^e siècle* (n. p., 1955); for the connection between Freemasons and the French Revolution, see E. Weis in F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 297, n. 29–33.

[45] *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by C. Adam and P. Tannéry, 12 vols. (Paris 1897–1910); *Prinzipien der Philosophie,* trans. by A. Buchenau (Leipzig 1922).—Lit. in R. Lefèvre, *La vocation de Descartes* (Paris 1956); idem, *L'humanisme de Descartes* (Paris 1957).

---

[46] J. S. Spink, *French Free-Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire* (London 1960).

[47] Whereas Gassendi knew how to defend Galileo's views of the universe without leaving himself vulnerable to censorship, Descartes in his treatise on the method left the possibility of error open. The fact that Galileo determined his fate by treating his question as a theological one as well "instead of relegating it to the theologians" became the problem of the Enlightenment, which no longer thought such relegation possible.

[48] H. Lange, *Physik* I, 193.

[49] G. Sebba, *Nicolas Malebranche, 1638–1715. A preliminary Bibliography* (Athens, Georgia 1959); G. Stieler, *Leibniz und Malebranche und das Theodiceeproblem* (Darmstadt 1930). See Cognet above.

1706)[50]—son of a Huguenot pastor, attended the Jesuit school at Toulouse in 1669, a Catholic for a period of seventeen months, and after 1681 professor of philosophy in Rotterdam—France produced the man who largely determined the intellectual climate of the century. He did so by his unsparing and exceedingly effective criticism of tradition, by the categorical separation of faith and knowledge, by his criticism of the moral discrimination of atheists, but also by his skepticism towards reason (which he considered stronger in the discovery of errors than in positive cognition). He was opposed to Leibniz, Descartes, and Spinoza, yet also cognizant enough of the consequences of the "Pyrrhonisme" to hold fast to the natural idea of reasonableness as the basis for an autonomous moral law. His *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1697) often adds to insignificant keywords lengthy footnotes which contain the actual substance of the work. But while Bayle could unequivocally state that he would rather be godless than an idolator, the aristocratic Montesquieu (1698–1755)[51] in his *Esprit des lois* (1748) considered the various religions from the point of view of their usefulness to the state. In his conservative criticism of absolutism he held religion to function as the only existing limitation upon those who disregard human laws. This work, which first appeared anonymously in Geneva, exercised great influence by its many editions and translations, representing as it does a biological (climate) and sociological comparative constitutional doctrine. But there exists for him an original ground of being to which the laws are connected, since the absurdity of blind fate would not have been able to produce intelligent beings. Montesquieu rendered one of the most characteristic judgments of Voltaire (1694–1778; son of a notary)[52]: Just as monks did for the glory of their order, so did Voltaire write history for the glory of "his monastery," but bad history. Voltaire's partisanship for his "monastery" of restless spirits is the pendant of his fanatical hatred of the Catholic Church (*Sermon des Cinquantes* [1761], *Le philosophe ignorant* [1766], *Profession de foi des Théistes* [1768], and *Dieu et les hommes*[1769]). His life and voluminous literary work cannot be reduced to a formula. The deist philosophy he received from England is meager, but the *Eléments de la philosophie de Newton* (1738)[53] were deadlier for Cartesianism in France than its prohibition by the established Church. Like all those in France who called themselves "philosophes" Voltaire is the prototype of the *écrivain* who was equally able to write the cynical epic *La pucelle d'Orléans* (1739) as well as the profoundly moving *Poème sur le désastre de Lisbonne*" (1755). Following is a brief biographical sketch: from 1704 to 1710 he was at the Jesuit college Louis-le-Grand; in 1717 he spent eleven months in the Bastille; as an eminent writer he was received into aristocratic society, this permitted his secret return from banishment in England (1726–28). A successful financial speculator, member of the Academie in 1746, intellectual vagabond after 1750, he spent his final twenty years in Fernay near Geneva. From there he exerted his intellectual influence on all of Europe by means of his voluminous correspondence, aside from the *Encyclopedia* the most important factor in the propagation of the thought of the Enlightenment. His *Candide ou l'optimisme* (1759) documented in exemplary fashion the ever-present possibility of a sudden shift into pessimism. The *Essai sur les mœurs et l'esprit de nations* (1756)[54] gained fame through its added introduction entitled "Philosophie de l'histoire." It represents a fundamental attack on the interpretation of world history according to the details of the Christian Gospel. Next to Bayle, Montesquieu, and Voltaire—his life in many respects is comparable to Voltaire's but a complete opposite in the course of his intellect—Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78),[55] the son of a watchmaker from a Huguenot family who had emigrated to Geneva, was the most signifi-

---

[50] E. Beyreuther, "Zinzendorf und Pierre Bayle," *Herrnhuter Hefte* 8 (Hamburg 1955); J.-P. Jossua, "P. Bayle précurseur des théologies modernes . . . ," *RevSR* 39, 2 (1965), 113–57.

[51] *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by A. Masson, 3 vols. (Paris 1950–55); German trans. of *Esprit des lois* by E. Forsthoff, with an important intro., 2 vols. (Tübingen 1951).—Lit. in J. Mailhol "Die Methode des Kulturkritikers u. Geschichtsdenkers Montesquieu" (unpubl. diss., Mainz 1955); M. Göhring, *Montesquieu. Historismus und moderner Verfassungsstaat* (Wiesbaden 1956); R. Shackleton, *Montesquieu. A Critical Biography* (London 1961, with biblio.).

[52] *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire,* Nouvelle éd., 52 vols., ed. by A. Beuchot and L. Moland (Paris 1877–85); *Voltaire. Correspondance,* ed. by T. Besterman, 2 vols. (Paris 1964–65).—Lit. in W. Kaegi, *Voltaire u. der Zerfall des Geschichtsbildes: Historische Meditationen* (Zurich 1942); R. Naves, ed., *Voltaire. Dialogues et anecdotes philosophiques* (Paris 1955, with biblio.); J. H. Brumfitt, *Voltaire Historian* (London 1958); A. Noyes, *Voltaire* (Paris 1936, German: Munich 1958; attempts to show the Christian Voltaire); R. P. Pomeau, *La religion de Voltaire* (Paris 1956); W. Weischedel, *Voltaire: Große Geschichtsdenker. Ein Zyklus Tübinger Vorlesungen von K. A. Fink u. a.,* ed. by K. Stadelmann (Tübingen and

---

Stuttgart 1949); H. T. Mason, *Pierre Bayle et Voltaire* (London 1963); R. A. Brooks, *Voltaire and Leibniz* (Geneva 1964); *Studies on Voltaire and the 18th Century,* ed. by T. Besterman (Geneva 1955).

[53] P. Brunet, *L'introduction des théories de Newton en France au XVIII^e siècle. Avant 1738* (Paris 1931), treats the reception of Newton to that point.

[54] Vol. 11 of the ed. by A. Beuchot and L. Moland.

[55] Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by B. Gagnebin and M. Raymond (Paris 1959–64).—Lit. in E. Hirsch, "Rousseaus Geschichtsphilosophie," *Rechtsidee u. Staatsgedanke. Festgabe für Julius Binder* (Berlin 1930); F. C. Green, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau. A Critical Study of his Life and Writings* (Cambridge 1955); M. Rang, *Rousseaus Lehre vom Menschen* (Göttingen 1959); F. Jost, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau suisse,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Ue. 1961); O. Vossler, *Rousseaus Freiheitslehre* (Göttingen 1963).

cant figure of the French Enlightenment. Under the guidance of the convert Mme von Warens in Annecy (Savoy), who later became his lover, he converted to Catholicism in 1728. But neither his conversion nor his return to the Reformed Church in Geneva (1754) were among the essential inner stations of his life to which his literary work corresponds. All self-stylization aside, his "Inspiration of Vincennes" (conceived in 1749 on his way to visit Diderot in jail) described in the *Confessions* ("en remontant aux traces de mon etre sensible," finished in 1770) may be ascribed the significance of a turning point. As it says in the *Confessions,* it is solely the institutions which make man evil. Following the criticism of culture represented by his *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* (1750), criticism of its institutions was also the thesis of the second discourse ("Sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes") in 1754. It was this radical inwardness, this resolute anti-institutionalism with its pietistic extension in J. G. Arnold which—aside from determining Rousseau's pedagogy of self-development (*Émile ou sur l'éducation* [1762]; burned as atheistic)—produced the immediate revolutionary impact of Rousseau. The *Contrat sociale* (1762) in one of its possible interpretations did not become truly significant until the French Revolution. There were individual reasons for Rousseau's disassociating himself in 1758 from Diderot, who had influenced him so strongly, for opposing Voltaire, and becoming alienated from D. Hume, with whom he had gone to England in 1765. What these actions demonstrate is the transition from an Enlightenment of reason to an Enlightenment of the "heart," which loses none of its explosive power in the course of nineteenth century intellectual and social history. Rousseau's temporary intellectual companion Diderot, at least initially, had moral reservations against atheism, as did Voltaire. These were not shared by the physician Julien Offroy de La Mettrie (1709–51),[56] who viewed human intellectual powers as pure bodily functions (*Histoire naturelle de l'âme* [1745]). In the Netherlands, where he went after the condemnation of this work, he published the radically materialist, atheist essay *L'homme machine* (Leiden 1748), in which he transferred the mechanism of the physical world, asserted by Descartes, to man as an intellectual being. The same anthropology was advocated by Claude Helvetius (1715–71)[57], son of a Dutch doctor, in his *De l'esprit* (1758), which was placed on the Index by the Sorbonne. Differing from Helvetius, Étienne Condillac (1715–80)[58] in his sensualism based on J. Locke (*Traité des sensation* [1754]) does not touch on the immorality of an immaterial soul nor on the issue of deist faith. As many of the writers of the Enlightenment, he was still worried about securing the moral bases of society. The extreme representative of materialist atheism in France was P. H. D. von Holbach (1723–89).[59] Raised in France as the son of a wealthy upstart from the Palatinate, his vulgarly materialist *Système de la nature* (1770) also appeared in a German translation (1783). His pamphlet *Les Prêtres démasqués* (1768) was rejected even by the likes of Diderot as tasteless. Voltaire, Rousseau, and Georges-Louis de Buffon (1707–88), the famous author of the *Histoire naturelle* (1749–88: thirty-six volumes; 1804: a total of forty-four volumes), withdrew from the circle which Holbach attracted around himself. In contrast to the materialism of the literary figures the important natural scientists of the eighteenth century for the most part were reluctant to accept generalizations—regardless of the radical manner by which they delimited their empirical methods from theology and metaphysics. This was also true of G.-L. de Buffon,[60] intendant of the royal gardens in Paris since 1739, to whom Louis XIV dedicated a bust with the inscription "Majestati naturae par ingenium." He held fast to the "infinite distinction" between man and "the most perfect animal"; for him the "unnoticeable degrees" of gradation in nature were "suddenly rendered invalid" by virtue of the difference between the thinking and the material being.[61] His original theory of the constancy of species, which—it was long felt—could not be abandoned in view of the doctrine of creation, was corrected by de Buffon after 1753. This theory was even more decisively polemicized against by de Buffon's friend and protége Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck (1744–1829),[62] who offered an initial theory of evolution (*Philosophie zoologique,* 2 vols. [Paris 1809]; *Histoire naturelle des Animaux sans vertèbres,* 7 vols. [1815–22]). But avowed atheism is encountered more among the literati than the truly scholarly natural scientists. The idea of progress,[63] just as atheism, was in its enthusiastic form of expression mainly a phenomenon of the French Enlightenment. But it was also a case where the French Enlightenment retained an amount of skepticism towards that faith, as was nowhere more clearly expressed than with Voltaire. Robert-Jacques Turgot (1727–81)[64] who initially studied theology and then turned to economics—he was finance minister from 1774 to 1776—in 1750 read two essays at the Sorbonne entitled "Sur les progrès successifs de l'esprit humain" (not published until 1809). In them he established a correspondence between the historical development of production stages and global commerce on the one hand, and the development of moral forces towards a moderation of customs and habits and a peaceful rapprochement of nations on the other, which includes the influence of Christianity. A friend of Turgot's was the Girondist Antoine de Condorcet (1743–94).[65] His *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain,* written in 1794 when he faced death at the hands of the Revolution, in such a situation could not fail to go beyond the question of perfectivizing the satisfaction of basic needs, posing the question which fundamentally contradicts the belief in progress, the question of individual death, which cannot be extinguished by any collective perfectibility of mankind. The answer lies in the hope for a time in which individual life expectancy has been expanded far enough so that man slowly looses his energies and desire for life and, while not becoming immortal, dies satiated by life. To be sure, in such a meditation, eye to eye with one's own violent death, the possibility of the "unusual coincidence" cannot be excluded.

---

[56] G.-F. Tuloup, *Julien Offroy de la Mettrie. Un précurseur méconnu* (Paris 1938).

[57] J. Cumming, *Helvetius: his Life and Place in the History of Educational Thought* (London 1955).

---

[58] R. Bizzarri, *Condillac* (Brescia 1945).

[59] P. Naville, *Paul Thiry d'Holbach et la philosophie scientifique au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1943); V. W. Topazio, *D'Holbach's Moral Philosophy* (Geneva 1956).

[60] Georges Louis Leclerc Buffon, *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by H. R. Duthilloeul, 12 vols. (Paris 1822); G. L. L. Buffon, *Œuvres complètes avec la nomenclature Linnéenne et la classification de Cuvier, par M. Florens,* 12 vols. (Paris 1853–55).—Lit. in L. Roule, *L'histoire de la nature vivante d'après l'œuvre des grands naturalistes français,* 6 vols. (Paris 1924–32), Vol. I on Buffon; O. Fellows, *Buffon's Place in the Enlightenment* in T. Besterman, ed., *Studies on Voltaire and the 18th Century* (Geneva 1955ff.); E. Genet-Varcin and J. Roger, *Bibliographie de Buffon* (Paris 1955).

[61] G. L. L. de Buffon, *Histoire naturelle de l'homme* (Paris 1749) II, 8.

[62] L. Roule, *L'histoire . . .* IV; G. Wiehler, "Lamarck," *Der Biologe* 9 (1940).

In 1621 after the Synod of Dordrecht (1619) the Remonstrant Hugo Grotius was forced to flee to France and was banished again upon his return in 1632 from the Republic of the United Netherlands, which had been founded in 1588 following the battle against religious and political oppression. In his Dutch refuge Descartes had met with the opposition of the Calvinists, just as he had met with the opposition of the Sorbonne and the Jesuits in France. But in 1638 Galilei's main work, the *Discorsi e dimonstrazioni,* was able to appear in Leiden. For the Trinitarians, expelled from Poland in 1658, the federation became the same refuge which it later became for the Huguenots. It was celebrated by Pierre Bayle, who had been in Rotterdam since 1681, where he met with John Locke[66] as "l'arche des fugitifs." There Bayle founded the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres,* a journal read by modern intellectuals all over Europe (Amsterdam 1684–89 in six volumes; edited by Bayle himself until February 1687). But in 1693 he was forced to relinquish his chair of philosophy. Yet the Netherlands, led by an urban bourgeoisie with their avant-garde gazettes in Leiden and Utrecht,[67] their presses, whose names appear in the best-known works of the Enlightenment, and with its book trade became an intellectual market place. The botanical collections in Leiden, as well, became an attraction for critical spirits such as Carl v. Linné.

---

[63] C. Frankel, *The Faith of Reason; the Idea of Progress in the French Enlightenment* (New York 1948); M. Ghio. *L'Idea di progresso nell'illuminismo francese e tedesco* (Turin 1962); G. Iggers, "Der Fortschrittsgedanke noch einmal kritisch betrachtet," *Saeculum* 16 (1965), 409–22.

[64] *Œuvres de Turgot et documents le concernant,* ed. by G. Schelle, 5 vols. (Paris 1913–23); F. Alenguy, *Turgot (1727–1781). Homme privé, homme d'État* (Paris 1942); P. Jolly, *Turgot* (Paris 1944); C.-J. Gignoux, *Turgot* (Paris 1946).

[65] *Œuvres de Condorcet,* ed. by A. Condorcet O'Conor and M. F. Arago, 12 vols. (Paris 1847–49); E. Kohn-Bramstedt, "Condorcet u. das Geschichtsbild der späten Aufklärung," *AKG* 20 (1930) 52f.; A. Cento, *Condorcet e l'idea di progesso* (Florence 1956); J. Bouissounouse, *Condorcet. Le philosophe dans la révolution* (Paris 1962).

The philosopher Baruch (Benedictus in his own Latinization) de Spinoza (1632–77),[68] of Portuguese Jewish parentage, is only geographically Dutch. Ceremoniously expelled from the synagogue in 1656, he lived in lonely poverty in The Hague from 1670 on as a grinder of optical instruments. In his philosophy—the main work being his *Ethica ordine geometrico demonstrata,* published posthumously in 1677—he takes up the basic problem of Cartesian dualism, asserting the *res cogitans* and the *res extensa* is being the two recognizeable ones under the attributes of the *deus omnium rerum causa immanens, non transiens* of the *natura naturans.* This philosophy was rejected by Leibniz and did not have a full impact until the post-Kantian philosophy of monism in Germany, even though it had had some influence on G. E. Lessing and J. G. Herder.

In the German Empire and its countries[69] the principles of the Religious Peace of Augsburg concerning the determination of 1624 as the fixed year had been modified in 1648 inasmuch as a change of denominations occurring between 1624 and 1648 was tolerated, although with some exceptions. The formation of larger territories had resulted in a mixing of denominations (the Reformed Churches were also recognized); in individual cases the immigration of new elements of population had been promoted (especially through the admittance of Huguenots); the "enlightened absolutism," theoretically based on Pufendorf's and Thomasius's doctrine of natural law, had developed (although at different times) in the various countries. But in spite of some modern features in government, conditions had on the whole remained conservative in comparison to western Europe. A primary reason for this is the fact that even under the enlightened regimes the bourgeoisie did not play as prominent a role by far as it did in England and France. Additionally the Reformation had continued to constitute a much more serious religious and theological problem in the Empire than in western Europe. This also contributed to the fact that church historiography, as presented elsewhere in this volume, was a specific medium for the process of Enlightenment in western Europe. Corresponding in its mathematical spirit to the Enlightenment, the worldly age of the baroque, in addition to its music and architecture, also created religious monuments of exceptional splendor in the German countries and Italy. Because of the chronological lag of the German Enlightenment compared with that of western Europe, arising from historical conditions, the intellectual movement in Germany was confronted with the extremes of the late Western Enlightenment and especially the terrorist phase of the French Revolution, and thus became susceptible to restorative ideas. Romanticism subsequently created revolutionary elements of its own kind.

---

[66] P. Dibon, ed., *Pierre Bayle le philosophe de Rotterdam* (Amsterdam and Paris 1959); according to Ivo Schöffer in F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 654, n. 3, the lit. on the Huguenots in the Netherlands is very outdated.

[67] E. Hatin, *Les gazettes de Hollande et la presse clandestine aux XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles* (Paris 1865).

[68] K. Fischer, *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie* 2: *Spinozas Leben, Werke und Lehre* (Heidelberg 1946); L. Strauss, *Die Religionsphilosophie Spinozas als Grundlage seiner Bibelwissenschaft* (Berlin 1930); P. Vernière, *Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution,* 2 vols. (Paris 1954); H. M. Wolff, *Spinozas Ethik. Eine kritische Einführung* (Berne 1958); G. Friedmann, *Leibniz et Spinoza* (Paris 1962); A. S. Oko, *The Spinoza Bibliography* (Boston 1964).

[69] F. Brüggemann, ed., *Das Weltbild der deutschen Aufklärung. Philosophische Grundlagen und literarische Auswirkung* (Leipzig 1930); E. Ermatinger, "Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter der Aufklärung," *Hdb. der Kulturgeschichte,* ed. by H. Kindermann, Abt. 1 (Potsdam 1934–35); H. M. Wolff, *Die Weltanschauung der deutschen Aufklärung in geschichtlicher Entwicklung* (Berne 1949); H. Schöffler, *Deutscher Geist im 18. Jh. Essays zur Geistes-*

Important centers of German Enlightenment were the universities of Halle (1694), part of Brandenburg since 1680, and Göttingen (1737),[70] whose Hanoverian rulers became kings of England in 1714, a factor which influenced the political and historical sciences taught there. Among those founded in Germany on the model of the Berlin Academy

---

und Religionsgeschichte (Göttingen 1956); W. Krauss, *Studien zur deutschen und französischen Aufklärung* (Berlin 1963); F. Valjavec, *Der Josephinismus. Zur geistigen Entwicklung Österreichs im 18. und 19. Jh.* (Munich 1945); E. Winter, "Der Josefinismus und seine Geschichte. Beiträge zur Geistesgesch. Österreichs 1740–1848," *Prager Studien . . . zur Geistes- und Gesinnungsgeschichte Ostmitteleuropas* (Brünn and Munich 1943).

[70] K. Hunger, *Die Bedeutung der Universität Göttingen für die Geschichtsforschung am Ausgang des 18. Jh.* (diss., Leipzig 1933); G. v. Selle, *Die Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen. 1737–1937* (Göttingen 1937).

(1700) whose establishment was assisted by Leibniz, the Göttingen Academy was one of the most important ones (1751).[71] In 1732 the *Göttingische Zeitungen von Gelehrten Sachen* started to appear; as the *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* it became the leading voice of liberal science in Germany. Among the numerous "Moralische Wochenschriften" in Germany, appealing especially to women eager for education, *Die vernünftigen Tadlerinnen* (from 1725) by J. C. Gottsched (1700–1766), based on Wolff's philosophy of rationalism, was very successful. Its competition was the *Discourse der Mahlern* (from 1721), edited by the Swiss J. J. Bodmer (1698–1783) and J. J. Breitinger (1701–76), which was critical of Gottsched's rationalistic poetry. In 1773 the *Teutsche Merkur,* edited by C. M. Wieland (1733–1813), appeared as an organ of confirmed Enlightenment.[72] Following the *Lexicon universale* (1697) of J. J. Hofmann of Basel, the *Große Vollständige Universallexikon aller Wissenschaften und Künste* (1732–50) represented the new status of general education and the difference in spirit from the French *Encyclopedia.* But the most prominent propagandist of German Enlightenment was the Berlin publisher Friedrich Nicolai, editor from 1765 of the journal *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* (106 volumes). Starting in 1761 he also edited the *Briefe, die neueste Literatur betreffend,* one of whose contributors was G. E. Lessing. In 1788 Nicolai published his *Öffentliche Erklärung über seine geheime Verbindung mit dem Illuminatenorden*. This order had been established in 1776 by the Ingolstadt professor, A. Weishaupt and suppressed in 1783.

Along with Descartes and Spinoza, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716)[73] was the most important philosopher of the pre-Kantian period. After serving the elector of Mainz from 1666 to 1673, he traveled to Paris and London for three years, subsequently serving as librarian and privy councilor at the court of Hanover. A scientist and mathematician, he wrote a criticism of the anti-Cartesian empiricism of Locke (*Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain,* posthumously [1765]). In his *Monadologie* (1714) he attempted to overcome both Descartes's dualism and Spinoza's monism by positing the universe as joined in the form of monads in "prästabilierter Harmonie" (predetermined harmony), but independent of each other and immaterial. Since they are nonconstructed units they can only "come about and perish all at once," that is they can only be created by creation and perish by destruction.[74] They are ordered according to Cartesian "distinctness and clarity"—man on an intermediate level is unclear regarding his senses and therefore only conditionally clear regarding his reason—in ascending order to God as the uncreated "central monad." While God is called "inventor and master builder" for the "works of nature," He manifests himself "on the other hand as king and father of substances endowed with intellect whose souls are formed according to His image."[75] In his *Essai de Théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal* (Amsterdam 1710) against Bayle, Leibniz addressed one of the major problems of the whole epoch, the question of the origin of evil in the world, to a greater extent than Shaftesbury, Pope, Rousseau, and, in his own way, Voltaire had done. In it he states that the world is of necessity imperfect because it is necessarily limited. Just as Leibniz's monadology and theodicy at important junctures function theologically, so is his position on history determined by religion. His confidence in the progress of humanity in the sense of an infinite process in the last analysis is founded in his faith in a divine universal design: "It is not in keeping with divine harmony to err frequently in the same manner."[76] Regardless of the rationalism of his philosophical theology, his differentiation of the two kinds of truth, the *vérités de fait* and the *vérités de raison,* prevents a rationalization of faith as that of Toland and Tindal. In contrast to historical pyrrhonism the *vérités de fait* are actual truths, part of which are the doctrinal truths of revelation. Christian Wolff (1679–1754), a protégé of Leibniz's at the University of Halle (1706), did not reach the latter's profundity. As a reaction to psychologism Wolff took up elements of "Scholasticism which had until then been pushed into the background."[77] Because of a speech about Chinese moral philoso-

---

[71] A. Kraus, *Vernunft u. Geschichte–Die Bedeutung der deutschen Akademien für die Entwicklung der Geschichtswissenschaft im späten 18. Jh.* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1963).

[72] L. Salomon, *Geschichte des deutschen Zeitungswesens,* 3 vols. (Oldenburg 1900–1906), Vol. I; J. Kirchner, *Die Grundlagen des dt. Zeitschriftenwesens mit einer Gesamtbibliographie der dt. Zeitschriften* (Leipzig 1931); idem, *Das dt. Zeitschriftenwesen, seine Geschichte und seine Probleme,* 2 parts (1958–62), Part 1; F. Hertz, *The Development of the German Public Mind,* 2 vols., II: *The Age of Enlightenment* (London and New York 1957), D. Freiberg, *Der Wiener literarische Journalismus im 18. Jh.* (unpubl. diss., Vienna 1954).

[73] Leibniz, *Sämtl. Schriften u. Briefe,* ed. by the Preuß. Akad. d. Wiss., 40 vols. (Darmstadt 1924ff.); Leibniz, *Philosophische Werke,* ed. by A. Buchenau and E. Cassirer (*Philos. Bibliothek* [Leipzig 1924ff.]); "Apokatastasis panton," see M. Ettlinger.—Lit.: W. Dilthey, "Leibniz und sein Zeitalter," *Ges. Schriften* III (Stuttgart and Göttingen 1959), 1–80; M. Ettlinger, *Leibniz als Geschichtsphilosoph* (Munich 1921); W. Conze, *Leibniz als Historiker* (Berlin 1951); J. O. Fleckenstein, *G. W. Leibniz. Barock und Universalismus* (Thun and Munich 1958); H. H. Holz, *Leibniz* (*Urban-Bücher* 34 [Stuttgart 1958]); R. Wisser, "Leibniz u. Vico" (unpubl. diss., Mainz 1954); W. H. Barber, *Leibniz in France, from Arnauld to Voltaire; a Study in French Reactions to Leibnizianism* (Oxford 1955).

---

[74] E. Cassirer II, 435.

[75] Ibid. II, 63.

[76] Fragment "Apokatastasis panton" (1715); see n. 3.

[77] M. Wundt, op. cit., 124.

phy he got into a conflict with the orthodox segment; as a result of their agitation he was banished from Halle by Friedrich Wilhelm I in 1723. Friedrich II permitted him to return from Marburg seventeen years later. Because of this conflict, and even more so because of his conciliatory attitude (which fit in with the German intellectual climate) Wolff obtained great influence, which extended even to Russia (*Vernünftige Gedanken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt* [1719]). Among his colleagues in Halle who had found refuge there was the lawyer Christian Thomasius (1655–1728),[78] whose theory of natural law continued the process of rationalization started by Hugo Grotius by separating the legal duties from the inner moral ones. His teacher, Samuel Pufendorf (1632–94), the first German to be appointed professor of natural and international law in Heidelberg,[79] had already established the separation from theology in his major work *De Jure Naturae et Gentium* (1672). To be sure, he defined the *primum principium* as constituting the divine will, but in practice as the absolute state: it is "the pinnacle of human achievement if one, supported by the totality of the powers of the state, can say that one recognizes none higher."[80] But in his doctrine of duty he demonstrated a conservative attitude. Yet in the German domains theological issues retained their priority. The fact that Leibniz's philosophy, oriented towards theology, continued to dominate that geographic area until the arrival of Kant is manifest even in Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's (1729–81)[81] essay *Das Christentum der Vernunft* (1753). But Lessing, the son of a Lutheran pastor, a considerable part of whose literary work was occupied by the issue of the Christian doctrine of revelation, was at the intersection of differing intellectual currents. He was impressed by P. Bayle, for a time by Voltaire, but also by the philosophy of Spinoza. Although he applied as a criterion the correspondence with "Natural Religion" in his work *Über die Entstehung der geoffenbarten Religionen* (1755), he differed from French deism by adhering to the historic necessity of true and false positive religions. These were ideas which he expanded in a more profound fashion in his *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* (1780). It is here—more so than in his polemic with the Hamburg pastor J. M. Göze, caused by Lessing's edition of the radically rationalist *Wolfenbütteler Fragmente eines Ungenannten* (by the orientalist H. S. Reimarus [d. 1768]; 1774–78)—that Lessing's specific relationship with Christianity is expressed. For him it was not a matter of finding an abstract rational concept for the truth of revelation. Instead he traces the education of mankind as an analogy of Christian salvation through the stages of the revelation (warning against its untimely abandonment) to the God-given *ratio* which is a category of the future, the "new eternal Gospel"[82] which Lessing invokes with reference to Joachim von Fiore. Just as Lessing's "Natural Religion" differs from the indifference of late French Enlightenment, so does his concept of tolerance: the model for his drama *Nathan der Weise* was the philosopher Moses Mendelssohn (1728–86),[83] who had remained true to his Jewish faith. Enlightenment as history, as in the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts,* was a lifelong topic of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803),[84] a church official in Bückeburg from 1771 to 1776. But he sounds more like a Christian in the *Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* (1774), where he investigates the difference between the biblical and the general manifestation of God in nature, and in his *Auch eine Philosophie der Geschichte zur Bildung der Menschheit* (1774), a combination of philosophy and theology (a second part, which he planned under the title *Religion, Christus, Ende der Welt mit einer glorreichen seligen Entwicklung,* did not come about). But only in his *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (1784–91) does the Christian religiosity recede behind a concept of universal nature initiating Romanticism. As F. Meinecke stressed, Jesus is now designated as the teacher of "the most genuine humanitarianism." Yet for Herder's total undertaking the words of Kant in his critique of the *Ideen* apply: ". . . a sagacity skillful in the finding of analogies . . . combined with the skill to captivate one through feelings and perceptions for a subject always kept at a mysterious distance."[85] Immanuel Kant (1724–1804),[86] whose critique of metaphysics and the bases of perception was prompted by the Enlightenment, overcame the latter by attempting to fathom it. He raised it to a universal principle with his famous definition: "Enlightenment is the emergence of man from a state of minority of his own making." (1784). In his essay *Mutmaßlicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte* (1786) he applied Lessing's method of interpretation to Genesis 2–4, without Herder's application of feeling, but also without the historical sense with which Lessing lets the revelation pass in his *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts.* By interpreting the transgression of God's command as the "first attempt at a free choice," which was connected with "the discharge from the maternal womb of nature," Kant defined man in his historical relevance more thoroughly than Voltaire and Herder. By his fall from grace man exits "from the era . . . of peace into that of work and discord, as the prelude to joining in society"; but the goal, the use of reason—as it is expressed in his essay *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht* (1784)—is not reached within the individual, but rather against the individual of the species, in the "antagonism of unsocial sociability of man," which causes the birth from history of "Enlightenment as a great possession." Here the detheologization of history is radical. But at the same time Kant's *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte . . .* seeks to forestall a concept of history as "a purposeless aggregate of human actions." This is not only an historiographical problem, one that was discussed explicitly by the Göttingen historian August Ludwig Schlözer (1735–1809),[87] who had had a falling out with Herder. More so than the moral work *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft* (1793)—suppressed by order of the Prussian council as a "disparagement of Christianity"—the two above-mentioned works from 1784 and 1786 manifest the critique of religious tradition, whose Western themes nonetheless continued to be the guiding ideas in the great works of Kant: soul, world, God—immortality, freedom, God (G. Söhngen).

---

[78] E. Wolf, *Große Rechtsdenker der deutschen Geistesgeschichte* (Tübingen 1963), 371–423 (with biblio.).

[79] Ibid., 311–70 (with biblio.); H. Rabe, *Naturrecht u. Kirche bei Samuel von Pufendorf* (Tübingen 1958); H. Welzel, *Die Naturrechtslehre Samuel Pufendorfs* (Berlin 1958).

[80] *De Jure Nat. et Gent.* II, 2, par. 4.

[81] A. v. Arx, *Lessing und die geschichtliche Welt* (Frauenfeld 1944).

---

[82] *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes,* par. 86.—Thus Lessing overcomes the opposites of reason and history, one of the main problems of his epoch ("Die Form der Zeitlichkeit als solche ist kein Gegensatz zum Sein" [E. Cassirer, op. cit., 256]).

[83] Lessing is the best example for Cassirer's remark (op. cit., 218f.) that tolerance was indifferentism only among the small minds; but among the great minds it was the pathos of truth which should be divorced from all merely partial orthodoxy.

[84] *Sämtliche Werke,* ed. by B. Suphan, 33 vols. (Berlin 1877–1913).—Lit.: T. Litt, *Die Befreiung des geschichtl. Bewußtseins durch J. G. Herder* (Leipzig 1943); A. Gillies, *Herder. Der Mensch und sein Werk* (German; Hamburg 1949); D. W. Joens, "Begriff und Problem der histor. Zeit bei J. G. Herder," *Göteborgs Universitets Arskrift* 62.5 (1956); *J. G. Herder, Mensch und Geschichte. Sein Werk im Grundriß,* ed. by W. A. Koch (Stuttgart 1957).

[85] Insel-Edition 1, 243.

[86] In addition to the ed. by the Berliner Akademie: *Philos. Bibliothek,* ed. by K. Vorländer et al., 10 vols. (Leipzig 1903ff.); ed. by E. Cassirer, 11 vols. (Berlin 1912–22); ed. by W. Weischedel, 6 vols. (Frankfurt 1956ff.).—Lit.: T. Litt, *Kant und Herder als Deuter der*

If anything, the Enlightenment in Switzerland was even more conservative than in the territories of the Empire. Here the differences in the intellectual climate of the cities played a considerable role; the German-speaking part of Switzerland was more practical than speculative.[88] The first masonic lodges were established in the French part of

---

geistigen Welt (Heidelberg 1949); G. Söhngen, *Die Theologie im "Streit der Fakultäten": Die Einheit in der Theologie* (Munich 1952).

[87] T. Benz, *Die Anthropologie in der Geschichtsschreibung des 18. Jh. An Hand einer Auswahl* (Wuppertal and Elberfeld 1932).

[88] P. Wernle, *Der schweizerische Protestantismus im 18. Jh.*, 3 vols. (Tübingen 1923–25; also deals with the Enlightenment); H. Hubschmid, *Gott, Mensch u. Welt in der schweizerischen Aufklärung* (Affoltern 1950); E. Fueter, *Geschichte der exakten Wis-*

Switzerland, in Geneva and Lausanne, then in Basel and Zurich, whereas Bern suppressed the order. In all of these cities (except for Berne) academies were founded. The fact that members from both denominations could belong to the *Helvetische Gesellschaft* (1761)[89] was a first step beyond the long-lasting Swiss confessionalism. Among the most important figures of modern science in Switzerland were the brothers Jakob (1654–1705) and Johann Bernoulli (1667–1748), both of them mathematicians in Basel. Jakob Bernoulli, initially a pastor and widely traveled in France, the Netherlands, and England brought up again the suppressed Copernican system, but in the spirit of Newton he considered the mathematical laws a natural manifestation of God. Jean-Alphonse Turretini (1671–1733) can be seen as representative of the French part of Switzerland. He was a theologian and naturalist in Geneva who represented a moderate orthodox Enlightenment based on ethics. The Berne patrician Albrecht von Haller (1709–77), who had studied medicine in Tübingen and Leiden, became a pupil of Johann Bernoulli. He described his naturalist observations as poetic impressions (as in the didactic poem "The Alps"), but got into difficulties with his research in anatomy. In 1738 he became a professor at the University of Göttingen and, having attracted considerable fame, returned to his native city in 1753. He was a preformationist who considered the germ cell to contain the whole animal in miniature (*Elementa physiologiae corporis humani,* 8 vols. [Berne 1757–66]) and polemicized against La Mettrie's "godless opinion" of the soul (*De partibus corporis humani, sensibilibus et irritabilibus*). The Genevan Charles Bonnet (1720–93) was able to combine Locke's empiricism with the theory of preformation. He was widely criticized for his *Palingénésie philosophique* (1769), which attempted to combine the belief in revealed religion with Voltaire's empiricism. For his research concerning the reproduction of plant lice he was appointed a corresponding member of the Paris Academy at the age of twenty. He developed a theory of the stages of nature according to their organizational perfection, excluding not even the angles (*Idée d'une échelle des êtres naturels* [1745]) and believed in the possibility of "constant progress of all species towards a higher state of

---

senschaften in der schweizerischen Aufklärung, 1680–1780 (Aarau 1941); R. Feller, *Geschichte Berns* III (Berne 1955) 575f.; M. Wehrli, *Das geistige Zürich im 18. Jh.* (Zurich 1943); P. Kälin, *Die Aufklärung in Uri, Schwyz und Unterwalden im 18 Jh.* (Schwyz 1945); L. Weber, *Pädagogik der Aufklärungszeit* (Frauenfeld 1941), treats esp. J. Locke and Rousseau; contains a separate chapter on the Enlightenment in Switzerland (52–103).

[89] H. Nabholz, *Die Helvetische Gesellschaft 1761–1848* (Zurich 1961).

perfection."[90] The naturalist and historian Isaac Iselin (1728–82)[91] worked in the tradition of Basel humanism; in 1747 he lived in Göttingen, in 1752 in Paris, where he met J.-J. Rousseau, whose criticism of culture he rejected. Raised with the philosophy of Christian Wolff and deeply impressed by the *Esprit des lois,* he advanced a utilitarian ethic. After an illness in his thirties he changed his attitude towards Enlightenment: Voltaire now appeared to him to be "a witty poisoner of the human heart." In 1764 after a long period of preparation his *Geschichte der Menschheit* appeared.

French Enlightenment extended to the southern European countries, but its influence within society was limited, but least so in Portugal[92] under the rule of Pombal (1699–1782; prime minister after 1756). In Spain[93] under Charles III (1759–88) the reading of works by Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau became proof of a progressive mind; authors of the English Enlightenment were translated. Enlightenment in Italy[94] came from the same sources, but there it was Jansenism which represented the actual critical element. The native modernistic literature in the southern European countries ran the gamut from critical Catholic reform to a moderate Enlightenment (with the exception of Portugal). The Italian physician and physiologist Mariello Malpighi (1628–94, in 1691 appointed as his personal physician by Innocent XII) was epoch-making in the biological developmental theory; he investigated the egg of a chicken and of a silkworm microscopically and advanced the hypothesis of the universal unity of developmental laws in flora and fauna. At the same time he maintained that since "the essence of things is hidden," one would have to "go through the whole range of phenomena" empirically (*Anatome plantarum,* 2 vols. [London 1675–79])[95] A solitary figure within his century, misunderstood even by many of his late discoverers, was the highly gifted historian Gianbattista Vico (1670–1744),[96] an unappreciated professor of rhetoric in his native Naples. In his *Scienza nuovo* (1725, revised 1744)—contrary to the geometric ideas of Cartesianism, but tying in with Augustine—he attempted to discover the one "ideal, eternal history, in accordance with which the course of all the histories of all peoples passes chronologically." Whereas man cannot recognize the order of nature in which God rules "freely and unimpeded," he can recognize the world of history which he himself made. But since man, "intending the opposite," was led to a just society only by providence, the object of the "New Science" must be a "rational theology of divine providence in history."[97]

---

[90] *Palingénésie* III, 3; R. Savioz, *La philosophie de Charles Bonnet* (Paris 1948).

[91] U. Im Hof, *I. Iselin, Sein Leben und die Entwicklung seines Denkens bis zur Abfassung der "Geschichte der Menschheit" von 1764* (Basel 1947); idem, *I. Iselin u. die Spätaufklärung* (Basel and Munich 1967).

[92] H. Juretschke, "Die Aufklärung und innere Entwicklung in Spanien und Portugal von 1700–1808," *Historia Mundi* IX (Berne and Munich 1960), 135–57.

[93] O. V. Quiroz-Martínez, *La introducción de la filosofía moderna en España; el eclecticismo español de los siglos XVII y XVIII* (Mexico City 1949); R. Ceñal, "Cartesianismo en España," *Revista Universidad de Oviodeo* (1945), 5–17; P. Mérimée, *L'influence française en Espagne au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1936); L. Rodríguez, "La recepción e influjo de la Filosofía de Locke en España," *Revista de Filosofía* 14 (1944), 359–81; M. Defourneaux, *L'inquisition espagnole et les livres français au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1963).

[94] C. Ottaviano, *L'unità del pensiero cartesiano e il Cartesianismo in Italia* (Padua 1943); H. Bedarida and P. Hazard, *L'influence française en Italie au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1934); E. Godignola, *Illuministi, giansenisti, giacobini nell'Italia del settecento* (Florence 1947); M. Fubini, ed., *La cultura illuministica in Italia* (Turin 1957); F. Catalano, *Illuministi e Giacobini del Nettecento italiano* (Milan 1959); F. Venturi, "Le siècle des lumières en Italie," *Cahiers d'Histoire mondiales* 8 (Paris 1960); A. Noyer-Weidner, *Die Aufklärung in Oberitalien* (Munich 1957); E. W. Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment in the Tuscan Academies 1690–1800* (Rome 1961); idem, "French Literature and the Italian Tradition in 18th Century Tuscany," *J. of the History of Ideas* 22 (Lancaster, Pa. 1962).

The Scandinavian countries reacted to Enlightenment primarily in a receptive manner. Stockholm had the reputation of being a refuge (although not always an auspicious one) for great foreigners or a place where their work would come to fruition, as it was for Descartes and Pufendorf respectively. The son of a Swedish country pastor, the physician Carl von Linné (1707–78),[98] who during his studies in Uppsala was asked to assist the theologian Olaf Celsius in compiling a work about biblical plants, represented his country prominently in the history of natural sciences, although many of his works appeared in the Netherlands, where he had investigated the botanical collections in Leiden. He attempted to discover a natural system of organisms in which their "rational order" would be visible. For purposes of the flora he chose—although not exclusively—the reproductive organs as a principle of classification. The sentence which has become a classic in the constancy of the species is found as thesis 157 of the *Fundamenta botanica* (1736): "Species tot sunt, quot diversas formas ab initio produxit infinitum Ens, quae formae produxere plures et sibi semper similes." Like Buffon before him, Linné later abandoned this theory and considered the generation of new species possible. Characteristic of the enlightened optimism is the transference of absolutistic notions to nature where God has "police supervision" and the animals have the duty "to maintain the balance among the plants . . . so that the perfection of the creator can shine in its full glory everywhere" (*Politia naturae* [Uppsala 1760]).

---

[95] M. Cardini, *La vita e l'opera di Marcello Malpighi* (Rome 1927).

[96] *Opera,* ed. by B. Croce, G. Gentile and F. Nicolini, 11 vols. (Bari 1911–41); *Scienza nuova,* (1744).—Lit.: B. Croce, *La filosofia di G. Vico* (Bari 1911, 1953), R. Stadelmann, "Die Geschichtsphilosophie G. B. Vicos," *Geistige Welt, Vjschr. für Kultur- u. Geisteswiss.* (Munich 1947; best work about Vico's Christianity); E. de Negri, "Theologien des Historismus [Vico u. Hegel]," *Roman. Forschungen* 62 (1950), 277–93; G. B. Vico, *La Scienza nuova e opere scelte,* ed. by N. Abbagnano (Turin 1952); H. J. Daus, *Selbstverständnis und Menschenbild in den Selbstdarstellungen G. B. Vicos u. P. Giannones: ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der italienischen Autobiographie* (Geneva 1962); B. Croce, *Bibliografia vichiana* (Naples 1904); idem, *Bibliografia vichiana, accresciuta e rielaborata da F. Nicolini,* 2 vols. (Naples 1947–48).

[97] See *Scienza nuova* 44.

[98] K. Hagberg, *Carl Linnaeus* (Stockholm 1939); E. Malmeström, "Die relig. Entwicklung und die Weltanschauung C. von Linnés," *ZSTh* 19 (1943), 31–58.

The history of the Enlightenment in eastern Europe was similar to that in northern and southern Europe. As a consequence of the political history in Poland, French Enlightenment—especially that of Rousseau—did not have a noticeable influence there until the end of the eighteenth century. The Enlightenment was received both sooner and more extensively—yet also in an adapted form—in Russia,[99] where it also became an element in its native literature. In a country without a bourgeoisie this was a process initiated from above. The Academy of Sciences in Petersburg[100] was built in the spirit of Peter the Great (1689–1725), but for a long time it had to rely on a foreign faculty. A significant role was played by the Western doctrine of natural law, which was, however, subject to certain limits because of the Russian concept of sacred rule. Suvalov, minister of state to Elizabeth (1741–62), the daughter of Peter the Great, who founded the first Russian university in Moscow (1755), commissioned Voltaire to write the *Histoire de l'empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand* (1759–63). Under her rule M. V. Lomonosov (1711–65)[101] was appointed professor of the academy at Petersburg. A follower of the philosophy of Christian Wolff, which had generally spread in Russia, he combined an unorthodox religiosity with an optimistic rationalism. Princess Sophie Auguste von Anhalt-Zerbst, who became Tsarina Catherine II (1762–96), opened her court to the influence of French Enlightenment. Under her rule it was possible to publish the five-volume *History of Russia from its most Ancient Times,* written by V. N. Tatiscev from 1686 to 1705. Its theological and philosophical interspersions represented anti-Church criticism as well as the principles of a "Natural Religion." Catherine read Pierre Bayle and Montesquieu, corresponded with Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, and permitted masonic lodges. To be sure, the effects of this sort of literature were limited. But the elements carried into the educated aristocracy by French tutors by means of the French language—the latter having been made the European educational medium by the Enlightenment—can be traced throughout the modern history of Russia.

---

[99] R. Wittram, *Peter I., Czar und Kaiser, Zur Geschichte Peters des Großen in seiner Zeit* II (Göttingen 1964); H. Jablonowski, "Die geistige Bewegung in Rußland in der 2. Hälfte des 18. Jh.," *Collana di Ricerche Slavistiche* 2 (1962); A. S. Vucinich, *Science in Russian Culture* I: *A history to 1860* (Stanford, Calif. 1963); M. Raeff, *Origins of the Russian Intelligentsia, the 18th Century Nobility* (New York 1966); E. Haumant, *La culture francaise en Russie, 1700–1900* (Paris 1910).

[100] E. Amburger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutsch-russ. kulturellen Beziehungen* (Giessen 1961).

[101] M. V. Lomonosov, A. L. V. Schlözer and P. S. Pallas, *Deutsch-russ. Wissenschaftsbeziehungen im 18. Jh.*, ed. by E. Winter et al. (Berlin 1962).

Creation and Natural Law—The History of Salvation and the World of History

As far as the Enlightenment was concerned, the objectionable theses of the Christian faith were identical with those to which the classical opponents of Christianity and those involved in present-day theological discussion have objected: original sin, the incarnation, and the resurrection. The deist concept of God cannot be reduced to a simple formula. It was characterized by two elements of intellectual history: the perception of a universal law in the natural world and the experience of plurality in the world of history, either recognizable in its laws (the *ricorso* of Vico or the variously perceived progress) or unrecognizable in its context (as in Pierre Bayle), a world no longer identifiable with the world of Christian salvation. The concept of a *providentia divina,* although often used as an empty moralistic formula—especially during the late Enlightenment—continued to pose a problem, preventing a monistic idea of the world among the significant thinkers such as Descartes, Newton, Leibniz, or Vico. Regardless of the various interpretations of the concept of "soul," the idea of the difference between man and the world was adhered to, except by the representatives of a radical materialism. Although the variations of customs, laws and morality, conditioned by nature or history, were stressed (as by Montesquieu), the uniformity of humanity was not questioned, but was rather to be reconceived beyond the level of historical differences.

The two typical forms which furnished the battleground for the fundamental conflict between tradition and the present were represented within the movement of the Enlightenment: harmonizing the opposites and controversy, both on a high and low level. The Anglican bishop J. Butler gained fame with his conciliatory essay *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (1736).[102] A classical representative of a decisive separation of the two realms was Pierre Bayle, whose Calvinist tradition has been underestimated heretofore. He demanded a resolution of the *difficultés de la raison* solely by means of *raison*. But to the Christians he said—and there is no reason to interpret his words as scoffing: "C'est aux Métaphysiciens à examiner s'il y a un Dieu et s'il est infaillible; mais les Chrétiens, en tant que chrétiens, doivent supposer que c'est une chose déja jugée." And, not so far from Pascal's position, he writes about Jesus ("Il a voulu que son Évangile choquât"), religion, and pagan aphorisms in Paulinian terms.[103] Bayle's harsh "all or nothing" was for those who wanted to save the Trinitarian faith, but abandon original sin. Yet attempts at reducing the nature of the conflict to a superficial and harmless level should be distinguished from the true intellectual effort in this period to preserve the continuity of tradition while trying to resolve the crisis. These efforts revolved around two main problems.

---

[102] J. L. Murphy, "The Influence of Bishop Butler on Religious Thought," *ThSt* 24 (1963), 361–401.

The laws of mathematics and physics could be conceived as the work of the *factor coeli et terrae,* the master builder of the world. Just as Leibniz emphatically considered himself a "Christian mathematician," so did Newton call the "omnipotent" God the one who "guides all things and knows all things which are or can be created."[104] But the problem—while not in the case of Newton himself—consisted of describing the divine will in mathematical terms, from which resulted in the perception of the eighteenth century the absolutely regular course of the world in accordance with theoretical principles and without the need for the continued presence of God once it was set in motion. The topic is broached when Newton mentions God's "unlimited, uniform sensorium," in which God moves the bodies and in so doing is able "to create and recreate the parts of the universe."[105] He posits his sensorium, namely absolute space, in terms of physics, whereas Leibniz ascribes the latter to the "seat" of God. From then on the dilemma was created between the laws of the world—open to *ratio*—and the mystery of the world. This was a dilemma which G. Berkeley in his *Analyst* (1734) would only name but not solve when, in his polemic against the astronomer Edmond Halley (1656–1742; discoverer of the autonomous motion of the fixed stars) and in disagreement with the principles of calculus, he posed the question whether such findings were more plausible than the "religious mysteries and the articles of faith." The course of rationalism was indeed unstoppable; it was a distant path to the rediscovery of the mystery. But the issue concerning God had yet another aspect for mathematicians and physical scientists such as Newton and Leibniz. The *factor coeli et terrae* is also a recognition of the *pater omnipotens,* the God of history who led Israel out of Egypt. The importance of Newton's essays on the Bible, long excluded from his biographies as mere eccentricity, is now recognized.[106] Leibniz's writings concerning biblical language and history as well as his fragment on the history of theology are more than the work of a "polyhistor."

---

[103] In *Eclaircissement* on the article "Pyrrhonisme": *DHGE.*

[104] See H. Lange, *Physik* II, 212, according to Dampier, op. cit., 210: "Er lenkt alle Dinge und kennt alle Dinge, die sind oder geschaffen werden können . . . , der, an allen Orten gegenwärtig, leichter imstande ist . . ."

[105] Ibid., 210.

Historiographers completely disregarded Newton's theological writings. Other theologically motivated theories on the problems of biology in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth century take on the appearance merely of burdensome elements retarding the course of research if one regards them solely in the perspective of modern biological insight. But seen in the historical perspective they represent an admirable effort in the conflict between empirical research and religious interpretation.[107] Two main theories were involved, that of the preformation of the living being in the germ cell and that of the constancy of species. Jan Swammerdam (1637–80), cofounder with Malpighi of microscopic anatomy, attempted by means of insects and parts of their bodies to prove the thesis that all parts are preformed in miniature in the germ cell. Except for Caspar Friedrich Wolff (1733–94), who did not accept "the idea which is inherent in the uterus"[108] and whose epigenetic theory had already been implied by W. Harvey, the preformation theory was generally accepted. It was given a religious foundation by A. von Haller and C. Bonnet, whose *Paligenesis* was translated by Lavater with the title *Philosophische Untersuchung der Beweise für das Christentum* (Zurich 1771). The thesis of all succeeding generations also being contained in the germ cell was comprised in Leibniz's theory of the preformed germ cells existing continuously since creation. The idea of extreme constancy of the species because their propagation is "vera continuatio," as formulated by the early Linné in his *Philosophia botanica* (1751), is based on the theory of the initial perfection of creation. This was accepted in principle by Descartes, although he added the proviso that it would improve the understanding of this matter if "the gradual genesis from the seed were observed."[109] Linné himself modified the theory of the constancy of the species. His contemporary opponent, G.-L. Buffon, called Linné's classification an invented construct and considered "the nature of the species" to be constant, "just as old and constant as nature," even if there are variabilities resulting from climatic effects, but all of them within the "idea of an initial plan." In opposition to the "rash" classification by Linné, which postulates the "omnipotence of nature, capable of extracting" all organized beings from a single one, he emphatically invokes the Book of Genesis.[110] But Buffon, too, arrived at a point where he modified his thesis. Lamarck considered the constancy of the species for the duration of many generations merely a rare special case. If all organisms are products of nature, their gradual subsequent origin begins with the simplest organizations without a goal being involved—this was in contradiction to Leibniz's image of the world. What appears to us as a goal "is in reality only a necessity."[111] An opponent of his was Erasmus Darwin (1731–1802). In his *Zoonomia* (1794) he combined the change of species with the faith in the creation by the assumption of a "first great cause" which gave to changeability the direction towards perfection. Joseph Gottlieb Koelreuter (1733–1806) represented a caesura inasmuch as he violated the taboo of "unnatural propagation" by attempting crossbreeding.[112]

---

[106] F. Wagner in *Saeculum* 17 (1966), 202f.

[107] Unreflected naivety, prevalent even at the beginning of our century, leads F. Dannemann (op. cit. III, 3) to maintain that the empirical method alone is able to "distinguish between truth and error," whereas the Church's "religion with its eye toward the hereafter," lacking empirical means, adheres to its antiscientific authority. This remark certainly addresses a historical factor. But the problem is more subtle. E. Ungerer (op. cit. I/1, 6) remarks that while the "opposite world views" in the history of natural sciences appear to us now like "temporary diversions," they should nonetheless be respected because "the 'existential' view" too, has its rights. While O. Zöckler (op. cit. II, 3) is too intent on placating the opponents when he speaks of the "intimate relations between theology and science," W. Philipp (*Zeitalter der Aufklärung,* p. LIX) uses the example of Newton to demonstrate "that in this case the religious impulse carried the research," a fact which was insufficiently appreciated if one registered with great astonishment no more than "the 'religious returns' among the heroes of progress and Enlightenment." It is perhaps exaggerated, but not unfounded, if he maintains that "the investigation of the intellectual and theological history of the period of Enlightenment is in its infancy" (ibid., p. XI).—See F. Wagner, *Saeculum* 17 (1966), 193–204.

[108] *Theoria generationis* (1759), quoted in "Ostwalds Klassikern der exakten Wissenschaften" Nr. 84 (Leipzig 1896), vol. II, 84.

With all the consequences resulting from the total scientism, progressively applied to the world view (including present-day space travel), the issue of the human being was a decisive one. The fact that much existed in the world prior to the arrival of man, as Descartes emphasized,[113] could be reconciled with the report of the creation. But has the world been created with a view towards man? Leibniz gave an affirmative answer to this question, albeit with some provisos. On his "échelle des êtres naturels," C. Bonnet (1745) placed man at the top because his organization was the highest; above him were the angels. But like most of the natural scientists he too underwent a change in his world view, even though he continued to adhere to the "fins" of creation. Still concealed, but nonetheless efficacious, was the documentation of the sort of masochism which prompted man, who was just then reaching for his godlike humanity, to kick himself from the throne of creation by pronouncing an unreflected evolutionism deriving man from the fishes, as proved by the scales on his skin.[114] For Holbach's materialistic anthropology the question of the origin of man was essentially irrelevant; La Mettrie introduced a temporary parting from philosophy by remarking that "an unlimited number of experiences and observations . . . can be found in the annals of medical scientists who were philosophers, but nowhere among the philosophers who were not medical scientists."

---

[109] *Principia* III, 45.

[110] *Œuvres complètes* (ed. by Florens, see n. 60) II, 412–16.

[111] *Philosophie zoologique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1809), Vol. I, 217; *Hist. nat. des animaux sans vertèbres* (Paris 1815–22) I, 323.—But as Dijkerhous (op. cit., 551) stresses, this "necessity" is not conceived according to the literary model of the Enlightenment as that of a clockwork because the classical natural sciences did not pose the question of beginning and purpose.

[112] J. G. Koelreuter, *Vorläufige Nachrichten von einigen das Geschlecht der Pflanzen betreffenden Versuchen . . .* (Leipzig 1761–66).

[113] *Principia* III, 3.

Perhaps the discussion of Kant's critique of divine proof on the part of New Scholasticism permitted the problem "creation and natural law" to gain inordinate prominence in the development of Enlightenment vis-à-vis the other process, which touches more profoundly on the Christian faith because the latter is essentially a historical faith: the "Enlightenment" of the Christian history of salvation. The exact formulation of that which happened there comes from Voltaire. In his polemic against Bossuet he called it ridiculous "to attempt to prove that the God of all nations of the earth and of all creatures of other stars did not occupy himself with the revolutions of Asia and that only with a view upon the small Jewish nation did he send so many conquerers, one after the other, in order to humiliate that nation and then again to lift it up . . . , and that this small stubborn and rebellious horde were the center and the object of world revolutions."[115] This points up two aspects: the denial of the specific history of salvation explodes the medieval congruence of world history and the history of salvation; at the same time it poses the question of a universal view of history to include all cultures. We must hasten to add that the same Voltaire for whom "true history is the history of progress of the human intellect" expressed the profound skepticism of his age towards history: "Les temps passés sont comme s'ils n'avaient jamais eté. Il faut toujours partir du point où l'on est

---

[114] B. de Maillet (1656–1738), French consul general in Egypt in his work: *Telliamed, ou entretiens d'un philosophe Indien avec un Missionnaire François, sur la diminution de la mer, la formation de la terre, l'origine de l'homme* . . . , 2 vols. (Amsterdam 1748, The Hague 1755; Engl. trans., London 1750); "Telliamed" is an anagram of Maillet.

[115] *Essai sur les mœurs* . . . , op. cit. (n. 54), XI, 158.

. . ."[116] No matter the point of time in the present, which latter can be celebrated and also scorned: these words by Voltaire mark with brilliant trenchancy what would be called the "loss of history" in the twentieth century, the break with tradition. The words of Pierre Bayle: "A historian as such is like Melchizedek without a father, without a mother, and without parentage,"[117] cited most often as testimony for the approaching objectivity of historicism, should rather be viewed as witness of precisely that break. Origin and future designated by Christian salvation has been lost. But all of these and other similar utterances must be kept in mind in order not to have the relationship between the Enlightenment and history (containing the problem of salvation) blocked by the scolding of it by the Romanticists. The latter were first refuted by W. Dilthey when he said: "Enlightenment . . . has brought about a new perception of history. . . . The view of the solidarity and the progress of the human race in these works spread its light across all peoples and eras."[118] In view of the enduring Eurocentricity of the Enlightenment these words cannot be accepted without reservation. B. Croce's remark, on the other hand, according to which the Asian cultures had served Enlightenment only for the purpose of "expressing its love of tolerance or rather of religious indifference" without their representatives having taken the "historic realities" seriously,[119] requires an added remark: while Orientalistics in the strict sense belongs to a later time, the idea of viewing all nations and ages from the perspective of the human race is indeed a fruit of the Enlightenment. The fact that the problem of the presentation of universal history was one involving the subject matter itself if it was to be more than a mere aggregate was demonstrated with astonishing farsightedness by August Wilhelm Schlözer of Göttingen in his *Vorstellung einer Universalhistorie* (1772). He obviously refers to Bayle in demanding of a universal history that it should spread "without a fatherland" across all geographic areas. With reference to Voltaire he demands that it not have a predilection for "the people of God, nor Greeks and Romans," but rather be occupied with everything, "be it on the Hwang Ho and Nile, as well as on the Tiber and Vistula." The criterion of selection, he maintains, could not be gleaned from "special histories" but only with a view towards its "influence in the whole or in large parts of the world," thence a world history will order the "special histories" into a "lucid whole." In view of the fact that a universal connection of events appears only with the advent of modernity, "the universal history will connect nations who formerly had no connection or no visible one and will create a system by means of which the multiplicity can be comprehended all at once." But, contrary to J. G. Herder, this is not to be a system of philosophers but of historians. What is to be demonstrated is the way in which man, "this mighty sub-God," recreated the earth into his dwelling, this man who, to be sure, "is kept on a long chain" by the highest of beings.[120] Schlözer did not write this world history, but—except for the rational-theological concept of Vico—he formulated the problems it entailed as hardly another. In this way he was a creature of the Enlightenment, which, after all, only created the designs for a universal history, but no world history deserving that name. Yet the Enlightenment recognized that such a history could no longer be comprehended in a state of identity with the history of salvation, which was Vico's main problem. No doubt this is also reflected in the Enlightenment's doctrine of the state, in the rationalization of international law from Grotius to Thomasius, in the rationalization of administration and politics. In addition, the question should be brought up as to what distinguishes the sacred foundation of the absolutist kingdom from the sacredness of the medieval ruler to the point when finally "the theocratic charge is viewed in a more and more conventional manner."[121]

---

[116] E. Cassirer, op. cit., 224.

[119] Art. "Usson", note F in *DHGE*.

[118] W. Dilthey, *18. Jahrhundert*, 209.

[119] B. Croce, *Theorie*, 216.

The causes of this profound change in the relationship to history were contained partly in the endogenous process of European Enlightenment and partly in the concrete experience of the world outside of Europe. In the process the two elements intensified each other. The strongest impression was made by the reports of missionaries since the late sixteenth century, upon which the Augustinian Juan Gonzales de Mendoza relied in his description of China. Foremost among them were the reports of Jesuits, those of Matteo Ricci (1552–1610), followed by the *Nouveaux mémories sur l'état présent de la Chine* (1696) by Louis Le Comte,[122] who reflected on the relativity of traditional customs. They also included the *Description . . . de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise* (1735) by Father Du Halde. The other authentic and fictional travelogues cannot be explicitly mentioned here.[123] The fact that François de la Mothe Le Vayer (1588–1672; tutor of Louis XIV), in his essay *De la vertu de payens* (1642) was tempted to exclaim "Sancte Confuci, ora pro nobis," not only anticipated Arnold Toynbee's syncretistic litany, but it also demonstrates the profound impression made by this figure who was instrumental in bringing about the China rapture enduring until the end of the eighteenth century, parallel to which criticism of Chinese absolutism also grew stronger and stronger as a vehicle of criticism of European absolutism. The fascinating aspects of China were its sophisticated culture without a religious doctrine of revelation, the moral philosophy on a purely natural, societal fundament, and the high culture based on it. With an astonishing intuition Leibniz in his *Novissima Sinica historiam nostri temporis illustratura* (1697) called China "orientalis quaedam Europa," endorsing in that way the only high culture which had a global opportunity like that of Europe. In accord with his harmonizing way of thinking he expressed the idea that China send missionaries of natural theology to the corrupt Europeans, while the Christians should dispatch missionaries of revealed theology to China. Following the erroneous opinion that Chinese philosophy originated long before Greek philosophy, he condemned as unwise the prejudice that "nous autres nouveaux vénus après eux, et sortis a peine de la barbarie" condemn Chinese philosophy because it does not correspond with Scholastic concepts.[124]

---

[120] A. W. Schlözer, *Vorstellung einer Universalhistorie,* 2 parts (Göttingen 1772–73), pt. 1, 28, 20, 34, 32, 10, 38.

[121] F. Wagner, *Handbuch,* 87.

[122] J. Davy, "La condamnation en Sorbonne des 'Nouveaux . . . ,'" *RSR* 37 (1950), 366–97.

[123] W. Franke, *China und das Abendland* (Göttingen 1962, -Kleine Vandenhoeck-Reihe 146–48).

Perhaps more profound yet than the ideas of the high culture of China was the effect of the encounter with the primitives of America[125] on European historical consciousness, primarily because the enduring topic of the "noble savage," originating in the sixteenth century, was a means of cultural criticism. Here, too, missionary reports played a large part. In his *General History of the Antilles* (1654, enlarged in 1667) the Dominican Du Tertre does not tire to contrast the natural morality and simplicity of the people falsely called "savages" with the evils of European civilization. Programatic by virtue of their title are the two volumes *Moeurs des Sauvages Amériquains comparées aux Moeurs des Prémiers temps* (1724) by the Jesuit Lafiteau, in which the Iroquois and Hurons of Canada are described as witnesses of original manifestation and as counterwitnesses of Bayle's assertion of atheism among the primitives. While the missionary reports only indirectly resulted in criticism of the Christian tradition, it was different in the case of Baron de La Hontan, who had served with the French army in Canada, had gone over to the Indians, and returned in 1715. Protected by the mantle of a fictitious polemic with an Indian, his *Travels, Memories and Dialogues* (1703) attacked the Christian faith head on by awarding victory to the "natural religion" of the primitive. Enlightenment itself attacked the legend of the "noble savage," Voltaire with sarcastic scorn, Kant based on his principle of societal antagonism. Rousseau's "homme naturel" is not the primitive who is already a representative of a developing society, but the ideal construct of man prior to history. This going beyond all history back to the "beginning," from which vantage point one hoped to arrive at a critical judgment of history as a whole and win the future, was the revolutionary element. Whether it was a case of praising the "noble savage" in his heavenly countryside and his "natural religion," which was superior to revelation, or a case of outdoing each other in imagining the beginnings of mankind in animalistic ways, the origins of the history of mankind became a problem which the Bible no longer appeared to solve.

---

[124] *Leibniz to de Remond,* ed. by Dutens, vol. IV/1, 171; see A. Hilckmann, "Leibniz und die Pluralität der Kulturen," *Saeculum* 18 (1967), 317–21; U. Aurich, "China im Spiegel der dt. Lit. des 18. Jh.," *Germanist. Studien* 169 (1935); A. H. Powbotham, "China in the *Esprit des lois," Comparative Literature* 2, 4 (1950), 354–359; D. F. Flach, "The Sinophilism of Christian Wolff," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14, 4 (1953), 561–74.

[125] G. Chinard, *L'Amérique et le rêve exotique dans la littérature française au dix-septième et au dix-huitième siècle* (Paris 1913, 1934).

This loss of an answer in terms of salvation history to the question concerning the origin and the future, the latter either pessimistically conceived or optimistically envisioned as progress, constitutes the general historical situation of the Enlightenment. Its attempts to find new answers is only judged fairly if one views this situation not as an unavoidable but as a logical result of Western history and if one reflects upon the reasons why the Church "lost its leadership."

SECTION TWO

Church Life under the Influence of the Established Church and the Enlightenment

CHAPTER 20

Jansenism in Eighteenth-Century France

The Bull *Unigenitus*

On Friday, 8 September 1713, Clement XI signed the bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, which condemned 101 theses from the *Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament* by Pasquier Quesnel.[1] This was the first official condemnation of Quesnel, who was generally considered the head of the Jansenist party after the death of Arnauld; the brief of 1708 had not been accepted, although it could have been assumed that this document, requested by the King, would meet with strong sympathy. In spite of the initiatives undertaken by the Holy See, France was not immediately informed of the text of the bull; on 9 September it was simply handed to Cardinal de La Trémoille and not made public until 11 September. Louis XIV received it on 24 September at Fontainebleau and immediately expressed his extreme satisfaction because with it he believed to have found the argument necessary for the liquidation of Jansenism. According to Gallican prescriptive law the bull, in order to become legal, had to be provided with letters patent, accepted by the bishops and registered by the chambers of parliament. The text was therefore carefully designed not to affect the sensitivities of Gallicanism. But difficulties arose from another side. The 101 articles selected for condemnation from a list of 155 were to be arranged in such a way as to furnish a sort of summary of the Jansenist doctrine. But a number of these articles could be authenticated by means of patristic texts; some of them in fact seemed to be nothing but quotes from the most esteemed of the Fathers. Furthermore, several of them on first perusal appeared to express the traditional Augustinian doctrines, especially those of unmerited predestination and efficacious grace. Obviously an interpretive effort was needed to glean from them a heretic meaning. The fact that Quesnel was the author was beyond doubt: the

---

[1] Text: *BullRom* XXI, 568 ff.

Latin translation was a faithful rendition of theses from the *Réflexions morales*. In contrast to what had happened in Jansen's case, the *quaestio facti* caused no problems here. But in the eyes of many readers the bull seemed to go beyond Quesnel and actually to condemn Augustinianism, to which many of the theologians and the faithful continued to adhere passionately, considering it one of the cornerstones of Christian thought. For them the bull was totally erroneous regarding the *quaestio facti*. One should also not disregard the fact that at this time the personal infallibility of the Pope was advocated by hardly any of the French theologians and that there was no agreement that this privilege even extended to so simple a bull. Thus the circumstances were quite different from those at the time of the Jansenist conflict.

Louis XIV at first did not conceive of any difficulties in getting the bull accepted. Accustomed for a long time to absolute subservience, he did not take into account that he had aged, that the end of his reign had become predictable, and his opponents now dared act much more openly. It can be assumed as almost certain that he had assured Clement XI that the bull would be accepted without prior discussion. Initial events seemed to prove him right. By means of a pastoral letter dated 28 September the vacillating archbishop of Paris, Noailles, retracted his approbation of the *Réflexions morales,* but without expressly recognizing the bull. On 27 and 28 September it was submitted to a group of parliamentarians, and Procurator General Daguesseau determined the central aspect of the debate by declaring that for him the bull was proof of the fallibility of the Popes. The parliamentarians did recognize that the bull contained nothing contradictory to the Gallican Liberties, yet they demanded provincial synods to be convened which were to accept the bull prior to its registration. At this point Louis XIV and Le Tellier, his confessor and advisor, recognized that their plan was more difficult than they had expected. Since the solution involving the provincial synods appeared to be all too difficult, the court decided to have the bull accepted by a special synod which was to be convened as quickly as possible and include all bishops present in Paris and those who could be summoned without delay. A letter of 5 October convened this synod for the sixteenth of the month. On that day twenty-nine prelates gathered at the episcopal see in Paris under the chairmanship of Noailles; during the following few weeks they were joined by another twenty prelates. The motion for an immediate acceptance of the bull was at once rejected in spite of the efforts of a small minority because the bishops were claiming the right of an examination of the papal decision. A commission of six members under the direction of Cardinal de Rohan was entrusted with an examination of the bull. In the process, Msgr. Bissy, bishop of Meaux, quickly assumed a significant position because of the confidence he enjoyed on the part of the King and Le Tellier. Clement XI predictably felt insulted; through his nuncio he complained about the fact that his decision was not to be subjected to judgment by the bishops.

By the court's request one of the first actions of the commission around 4 November was the dissemination of a French translation of the bull.[2] But this proved to be a mistake since it prompted the formation of a spirited opposition movement within the clergy and the public. The deliberations by the committee were protracted. By the end of December it finally became quite clear that a majority of the assembly were resisting the King's pressure, refusing simple acceptance. As a condition for any acceptance at all they demanded explanations which would preserve the Augustinian doctrine. Arguments for and against the bull were circulated; memoranda composed by Quesnel himself were sent to the commission.[3] In the course of January 1714 Clermont-Tonnerre, bishop of Langres, with the collaboration of Rohan suggested acceptance of an annotated version of the bull by means of an episcopal pastoral instruction. At first Noailles seemed to be agreeable, but then his friends moved him to revert to his earlier decision. On 12 January eight bishops, among them Noailles's brother, gathered about him and declared their intention not to take part in the meeting scheduled for the fifteenth. But the King, informed of their decision, ordered them to attend, so that the assembly finally included all forty-nine prelates present in Paris. The sessions were lengthy and stormy. On 1 February Noailles and the eight opponents declared their unwillingness to take any action until the Pope had been requested to furnish explanations which they considered indispensable for the preservation of the inviolate doctrine. The assembly dissolved on 5 February after forty bishops had accepted the constitution and the nine opponents had rejected it. Louis XIV denied them permission to send a collective letter to the Pope. On 8 February Noailles was ordered not to appear at court; the other eight were told by secret letter to return to their dioceses. From this point on the split in the episcopate became common knowledge.

Yet the King considered the acceptance by forty bishops sufficient to have the bull registered in parliament. The letters patent were issued without delay despite the heated opposition of numerous members of parliament who rejected the formulation "we are making it the bishops' duty to accept the bull." But the King insisted on precisely this wording because it was intended to enable him to proceed harshly against the opponents. The registration took place during a session of parliament on 15 February where several members refused to take part; Daguesseau and Pucelle especially were marked in their opposition. The resistance in parliament aggravated the King to such an extent that he burst into veritable fits of anger at Versailles in the presence of Daguesseau and the advocate general, Joly de Fleury.[4] In the meantime the declaration of acceptance had been sent to Rome and Clement XI thanked the forty bishops involved in a brief full of praise. But the Gallican public was shocked by the significance which the brief ascribed to this act of submission to the Holy See. On 28 February Noailles reacted by circulating a pastoral instruction dated 25 February in which he forbade the clergy in his diocese to accept the bull, pending further instruction. Several other opponents followed his example. The King thereupon decided to force the Sorbonne into accepting the bull. It was submitted at a regular meeting on 1 March and accepted over the violent opposition of Dr. Witasse in a vote which took place under very dubious circumstances. A number of professors protested; five of them were exiled by secret letter.[5] Shortly thereafter the pastoral instruction, composed by the assembly and edited by Bissy, the bishop of Meaux, was sent to the entire episcopate. During the following months the bull was published in 112 of the 126 dioceses of France. No doubt this constituted a large majority, but not the unanimity which the King desired.

---

[2] Text: C. du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus* (Paris 1728), 3 vols., 3/II, 462 ff.

[3] List and Analysis: Louail-Cadry I, 80–105.

The most grievous problem was that those bishops who had accepted the bull were in fact not supported by any sizeable part of their clergy. A number of priests refused to read the pastoral instruction of their bishop from the pulpit or did so only with reservations. The same split occurred in the orders and monasteries. The opposing bishops, for their part, issued pastoral letters expressing the desire for a papal explanation of the bull. Yet most of them accepted a temporary condemnation of Quesnel's works in their dioceses with the notable exception of Jean Soanen, bishop of Senez, a former Oratorian who was soon to occupy a central position within the Jansenist resistance. At any rate, the debate was now conducted before the public and prompted the appearance of an incredible number of works of any and all format, ranging from brief brochures to voluminous folios: in 1714 alone the contemporary catalogues listed more than 180 titles. This large volume of writing actually made use of only a very limited number of basic arguments. Those favorable to the bull, a small minority by far, stressed that submission was due the King as well as the Pope and strove to demonstrate the identity of Quesnel's Augustianism with that of Jansenism. This was the basic idea especially of a memoir ("où l'on prouve que les évêques de France doivent accepter la Constitution par voie de soumission et d'obéissance") which was widely circulated in the form of a manuscript. No doubt for good reason it was ascribed to a professor of the Sorbonne, Honoré Tournély (1658–1729), at the time a highly esteemed personality. On the side of the opposition, too, the fight was conducted on two levels. The primary intent was to present the basic orthodoxy of Quesnel, his absolute conformity with the Fathers, and, most of all, with Augustine. The most important of those works is *Les Hexaples ou les six colonnes sur la Constitution Unigenitus* (Amsterdam 1714), in which the 101 condemned theses are juxtaposed with the Holy Gospel and tradition and are justified by other passages from the works of Quesnel and by additional long treatises. All the great theologians of the Jansenist party contributed to it. The work, originally comprising one quarto, was enlarged with each succeeding edition until in 1721 it reached the very respectable extent of six volumes. In addition to these, the same group of collaborators published a four-volume *Histoire du livre des Réflexions morales* which, while partisan, was admirably well documented, thus representing an important source. Beyond this, the opponents had to justify their position vis-à-vis a formal decision by the Pope in a question which no longer, as in the case of Jansen, concerned the *quaestio facti*, but the *quaestio juris*. Characteristic in this regard was the treatise by the Oratorian Vivien de la Borde (1680–1748) entitled *Du témoignage de la vérité dans l'Église* (1714). Its author wanted to show that within the Church it is the totality of the faithful and clergy and not only the Holy See and the hierarchy who are the custodians of the truth of revelation. It follows from this that the bishops and the Pope can err; it can even happen that the majority of the bishops can be in error. In such a case, it is the reaction of the Christian conscience on the part of the faithful which is the sign of the truth. The author does not hesitate to push his principles to the very extreme by asking all his readers to consider themselves judges of the doctrine by the same right as the hierarchy. By encouraging them into unfettered examination he manifests the motive force of E. Richer, whose influence on Quesnel we have already pointed out. The Jansenist literature of this period generally manifested an increasing receptivity to Richer's ideas, accentuated by the demands of the lower clergy, who were hard put to bear the absolutism of the episcopate. This literature shows the first designs of political Jansenism and its agreement with Gallicanism.

---

[4] See "Fragment inédit des mémoires du chancelier Daguesseau," ed. by A. Gazier in *Bulletin philologique et historique* (1918).

[5] See (Witasse), *Relation des délibérations de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris au sujet de l'acceptation de la bulle Unigenitus* (n. p., 1714).

Louis XIV and the people around him did not grasp the seriousness of the problem. The animosity against the bull was to them merely the sort of resistance which had to be broken. Moreover, a brief by Clement

XI of 8 May 1714 recalled to the King in a veiled fashion the obligations which he had contracted.[6] But to find the right methods was not easy. Since it was evident that the Holy See would never give the explanations demanded by the opposition, Cardinals d'Estrées and de Polignac attempted to act as mediators in order to induce the King to accept the following solution: In a pastoral instruction Noailles was to give his own explanation and under this condition to accept the bull. In the course of the summer of 1714 a hesitant Noailles appeared to tend towards this suggestion, but then Rohan and Bissey managed to interfere in the negotiations and to insert clauses which Noailles held to be unacceptable. The result was a renewed split by the end of October. Irritated by the delays, the Pope at times seems to have mentioned his inclination to let the French bishops lacerate each other without intervening. But at this point the intervention of Fénelon became decisive. The latter's anti-Jansenist sentiments had become stronger than ever, especially since he now saw an opportunity to take revenge on Noailles. For the purpose of publishing the bull *Unigenitus* in the French part of his diocese of Cambrai he had used—with some modifications—the model of the pastoral instruction stipulated by the February assembly. For the Flemish area he composed a separate pastoral letter, dated 29 June, which represented an emphatic defense of the bull. In the course of the summer he also published his voluminous "Instruction pastorale en forme de dialogue sur le système de Jansénius." As of 1709 the relationship between Fénelon and the Holy See had improved. Fénelon thus was a suitable mediator; it is certain that Le Tellier more than once asked for his advice. After all, it was well known that Fénelon had had a part in the dispatch of the brief of 8 May 1714. In October 1714, after the negotiations had failed to produce an agreement, Louis XIV decided to proceed against Noailles although this was difficult to do without arousing the opposition of his colleagues in the episcopate. Around 25 October a system advocated by Fénelon was adopted: the convocation of a national council which was to condemn the opponents and pronounce their removal from office. This plan was not without a certain amount of danger. On the one hand, even the weight of the King's authority could not ensure the assembled bishops to be prepared to accept such injurious measures against their colleagues in the episcopate. On the other hand, it was certain that Rome—distrustful of national councils, especially in the Gallican Church—would not be particularly eager to agree to the scheme. But Fénelon was not to be deterred by these obstacles. He was more than ever convinced that forcible measures were needed, because any attempts at conciliation with Noailles would be to the advantage of Jansenism. Also he was now mentioned as possible president of the proposed future council, which would give him far-reaching possibilities to proceed against Noailles and the other opponents. In addition, the esteem that he was held in by the Pope and the Curia had reached its high point; shortly before Christmas 1714 Clement XI openly alluded to his intention to appoint Fénelon to the cardinalate in the very near future. At this point Fénelon decided to make use of his influence by sending the Holy See two memoranda concerning the necessity for a national council and for promulgating the bull in every single church.[7] At the same time Louis XIV dispatched his minister of state, Amelot, to Rome, where he was to negotiate this matter. The King had a great deal of confidence that Fénelon's intervention in this undertaking would be crowned by success. The archbishop of Cambrai for his part was quite ready to do everything in his power when his untimely death on 6 January 1715 robbed both the Pope and the King of an irreplaceable mediator.

---

[6] Text: Louail-Cadry I, 238.

Given this situation, Amelot's negotiations in Rome took a difficult turn. Renewed attempts in Paris to reach a compromise failed and Bissy, the bishop of Meaux, was appointed cardinal at the request of the King (June 1715). In July 1715 the King announced that the council would be convened even without the agreement of the Pope. Parliament stayed in the background; several memoranda favoring the opponents mentioned the possibility of an appeal to the general council, an idea which soon began to spread. Shortly thereafter the King made known his intention to have parliament pass a formal resolution excluding the opponents from the future council. But this idea encountered resistance on the part of several parliamentary councilors, especially Procurator General Daguesseau and the advocate general Joly de Fleury. In order to have his way the King prepared for a formal trial proceeding in parliament. But neither in Rome nor in Paris had any final decision been made when Louis XIV died on 1 September 1715. The idea of a national council died with him.

In his memoranda to Rome and his correspondence with Le Tellier Fénelon again and again had stressed the fact that for the most part public opinion, in spite of an outward show of submission prompted by fear of the authorities, in reality adhered to Jansenism. Events following the death of Louis XIV proved him right. The regent, Philipp of Orleans, who was almost wholly without faith in religious matters, initially went against the policies of the deceased King and deliberately favored the Jansenists, especially since there were many personal enemies of his among those who had accepted the bull. After he had the testament of Louis XIV (which only granted him the chairmanship of the council of regents) declared invalid and had himself appointed sole regent of the realm, he rewarded parliament by creating six councils charged with conducting public affairs in which the parliamentary councilors were to occupy an important position. One of them was the *Conseil de Conscience*, whose function had been severely limited under Louis XIV. Now it was enlarged and Noailles was made its president. The archbishop of Paris once again was an important personality at court; Daguesseau and Pucelle, well known for their opposition to the bull, were also invited to court, whereas Bissy and Rohan were excluded. Le Tellier was exiled, first to Amiens and then to La Flèche. At the beginning of October Clement XI expressed his dissatisfaction in a brief. The majority of persons exiled or jailed because of their advocacy of Jansenism regained their freedom. For a while recalling Quesnel to France was even contemplated, but in a communication by Pouillon several of his friends advised him "not to acceed to the urgings to relinquish a state which derived to his glory."[8] The old man elected to remain in his seclusion. In his first appointments to bishoprics the regent favored persons who openly showed their Jansenist sympathies, as in the case of Bossuet's nephew, Jacques Bénigne, who was appointed bishop of Troyes, a person of more than dubious morality who used the fame of his uncle as a cover. Clement XI refused his bulls of investiture for the regent's candidates. But an Assembly of the Clergy, convened on 25 May 1715, had not been interrupted by the death of Louis XIV. One of its most marked decisions was the condemnation of the *Hexaples* (15 October) and of the *Témoignage de la vérité* (29 October), which permits the conclusion that these two works were considered the two most important ones in opposition to the bull. The regent promptly forbade publication of these censures.[9] But this did not represent any progress in the issue of the original condemnation either.

---

[7] Fénelon, *Œuvres complètes,* 10 vols. (Paris 1851), VIII, 269–81.

During this time, public opinion considered the pro-Jansenist attitude of the regent a veritable liberation. Numerous people and bodies of people now retracted their original acceptance of the bull, pointing to the pressure to which they had submitted. This was the case with the Sorbonne when it elected a syndic in the person of Ravechet, who openly favored Jansenism. The result was a number of stormy sessions, characterized by acrimonious disputes with the acceptants among the bishops. Yet the Sorbonne did not expressly retract its acceptance of the bull. But other theological faculties did so, among them those of Nantes (2 January 1716) and Rheims (1 July 1716). Yet the problem of the opposing bishops was not removed. Initially the regent hoped to solve the issue in a way to which Noailles had agreed in principle: an acceptance of the bull in connection with a pastoral instruction which was to give a more explicit explanation compared to that of 1714. In December 1715, eighteen bishops from among the acceptants signed a letter to the regent asking him to request explanations from the Pope. A second, more satisfactory letter increased the number of signatories to thirty-two.[10] The rest of the original acceptants adhered to their decision in spite of the regent's requests, to whom it would have been useful to have a majority of the episcopate demand an explanation. Shortly thereafter Clement XI let it be known that he would not give any explanation until the bull was accepted unanimously; in May 1716 he sent a brief with threats against the opponents, which was rejected by the regent. At this point a different plan was formulated. Since the fall of 1715 the opposing bishops, with the concurrence of the regent, had gathered around Noailles in Paris. They had agreed to compose a "corps de difficultés" containing their objections to the bull, and a "corps de doctrine" which was to present their opinions regarding the controversial points. Yet agreement on this was also not easily achieved; from this point on four of the bishops seceded from the group as protagonists of extreme resistance against a bull which they considered irreparably bad. These were Jean Soanen, bishop of Senez; Colbert de Croissy, bishop of Montpellier; Pierre de la Broue, bishop of Mirepoix; and Pierre de Langle, bishop of Boulogne. The documents were finally published in May 1716, albeit not without difficulties. What remained was to induce Rome to accept this solution. The regent decided to entrust the negotiations to a man whom he trusted completely, the Abbé Chevalier, vicar general of Bissy, who tended somewhat towards Jansenism. The Abbé's sympathies became obvious when he chose de la Borde, author of the *Témoignage de la vérité*, as his traveling companion. This could not have a convincing effect on Clement XI. Provided with instructions by Noailles, Chevalier set out on 14 May.

---

[8] J. Tans, *Quesnel,* 491.

[9] Text: Louail-Cadry I, 458.

The negotiations were difficult from the start. Chevalier was not received by the Pope; not until 25 June did he even receive an audience with Secretary of State Paolucci, which was hardly encouraging. On 26 June Clement XI convened a general congregation of cardinals present in Rome, which was extremely unusual. In a speech lasting two and a half hours he presented the background of the bull and announced the dispatch of two briefs which were to demand of Noailles and the opponents to accept the bull within two months. Then he asked the cardinals how they would proceed against the opponents. The Pope did agree to have Chevalier meet separately with the cardinals and since he did not want to receive him in audience he appointed two cardinals who were to hear Chevalier and give him an account. The letters of Chevalier show that he was laboring under some illusions concerning his talks with the cardinals. These submitted their opinions around the middle of July; on the whole they were strongly against Noailles and the opponents. The more moderate cardinals were satisfied to request one more attempt at reconciliation before proceeding harshly. Chevalier meanwhile continued his negotiations until the middle of August. At that point Clement XI told the representative of France, Cardinal de la Trémoille, that he did not intend to give any explanations of the bull *Unigenitus* because he assumed that they would not be any better received than the bull itself. Although Chevalier remained in Rome until the fall of 1717, his mission had actually failed. Rome and Paris agreed on another negotiator, the Jesuit Pierre-François Lafitau, whose service was rewarded with the bishopric of Sisteron in 1719. At the time he was living in Rome and in September 1716 he spent about three weeks in Paris, without an official title. He, too, was to pass on the "corps de difficultés" and the "corps de doctrine" compiled by Noailles and the other opponents and to effect their acceptance. These documents were dispatched to him shortly after his departure for Rome. But Lafitau could achieve no more than Chevalier. He was not received by Clement XI either. The latter, in fact, hardened his position. On 6 December 1716 a courier extraordinary arrived in Paris carrying a letter from the Sacred College to Noailles exhorting him to accept the constitution. He also delivered a papal brief for the regent demanding that he proceed against Jansenism and a brief for the acceptants encouraging them to reject any and all compromises and to announce measures against the opponents, and, lastly, a brief for the Sorbonne canceling its privileges.[11]

---

[10] Ibid., 490–97.

The regent and his advisers were disappointed and confused by this renewed opening of hostilities. Noailles, on the other hand, sensing support from the court, had more and more stiffened his resistance. On 17 August 1716 he had announced to the Jesuits of his diocese that he would not renew their right of sermon and confession, with the exception of the five Jesuits active at the court. But before his authority had run out Cardinal de Rohan, grand almoner of France, had appointed a Jesuit, de la Ferté, Advent preacher at the court. Consequently the Jesuit assumed himself to be fully authorized to begin his sermons on All Saints' Day, according to custom and with the concurrence of the regent. But Noailles, incited by part of his clergy, obtained a revision from the regent and then revoked all privileges from the Jesuits. There was growing agitation on the part of the lower clergy manifesting violent opposition to the bull. Noailles felt overwhelmed by the letters and expressions of solidarity heaped upon him by his priests.[12] Publications for and against the bull continued to appear with great rapidity in 1716, although not quite as numerous as in the preceeding year. Those concerned with the disputes of the Sorbonne constituted a large number, but all of them evidenced the rise of Richer's ideas. In such an atmosphere it is understandable that new papal statements met with a negative reception. The regent refused to accept the brief addressed to him and forbade the letter by the cardinals to Noailles. On 9 December in a letter written by Maupéou, representative general of the clergy, he forbade the acceptants among the bishops to accept the brief addressed to them. Finally, a decree of parliament dated 16 December, followed by numerous provincial parliaments, prohibited the acceptance of the brief against the Sorbonne. Going back to Gallican positions once again made it possible to completely neutralize the Roman intervention.

---

[11] Text of the briefs: *Suite de la relation des délibérations de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*, 3 vols. (n.p., 1718), II, 1–39.

Although an Assembly of the Clergy was planned for 20 November, the regent preferred to cancel it in view of the unsettled circumstances and instead to permit only partial conferences conducted on a private level. These again dealt with the issue of a "corps de doctrine" as a precondition for accepting the bull. In spite of conciliatory efforts by the regent the positions of the opposing parties proved to be farther apart than ever, especially since Colbert and Soanen heatedly announced that they were prepared to resist to the utmost. At this time the Sorbonne managed to clarify its position in an extraordinary assembly on 12 January 1717. It declared the bull to be unacceptable and assured Noailles of its alliance. All the while the negotiations were continued. On 1 February 1717 Daguesseau became chancellor and minister of justice. His great authority in this area enabled him to support his regent's efforts at conciliation. Noailles did not cease to vacillate, creating ever more difficulties. In spite of a warning from the papal state secretary Paolucci, Rohan and the other acceptants appeared to be ready for some concessions, which met with some positive inclination by the regent. A final meeting on 26 February 1717, while not reaching a definitive goal, did show some progress. For a while it appeared as if agreement was near, but then one incident was to put everything in doubt again.

---

[12] Texts of the letters to Noailles, collected: *Témoignage de MM. les curés de Paris*, (n. p., 1717) and: *Cri de la foi* I.

The Appellation

With the convening of new conferences in November 1716 an extremist group within the ranks of the opponents gradually had a significant impact. The initiative leading to its formation appears to have come from Jean Soanen (1646–1740). An Oratorian from the Auvergne, he had started his brilliant career as court chaplain. Jansenist correspondents accused him of being ambitious and having obtained his modest bishopric of Senez (1695) merely by virtue of his complacency towards de la Chaise. He was pious and charitable and an excellent bishop[13] who did not enter the controversy until the bull *Unigenitus* was published. A solid theologian and confirmed Augustinian, he expressed his opposition from the start. Gradually he became convinced that any attempt at reaching a compromise was dangerous. The death of Louis XIV increased his hopes and prompted him to spend some time in Paris in order to follow further developments there. Noailles's indecisiveness began to irritate him to the point of creating friction between them. In the fall of 1714 he appears to have decided upon a method designed to exclude any possibility of compromise: an appeal to a general council. In his radical opposition to the bull he had found support in the person of Colbert de Croissy (1667–1738), son of the minister to Louis XIV, bishop of Montpellier since 1696. He was a member of a powerful and wealthy family, no doubt accustomed a little too much to pomp and luxury. Yet he was an upright bishop who did his duty faithfully. Early on he had had some problems with the Jesuits in his diocese, but had not involved himself officially in the Jansenist issue until he started to express his opinions in 1713. At that point he did not hesitate to join Soanen in the latter's emphatic opposition.[14]

In November 1716 Soanen and Colbert decided to appeal to the general council. We do not know just what prevented them from going ahead with it at that time. In the course of the following weeks Soanen and Colbert gained two more allies for their appeal: Pierre de Langle (1644–1724), bishop of Boulogne, and Pierre de la Broue (1643–1720), bishop of Mirepoix, both of them virtuous and highly respected prelates. But in this issue they only played a subordinate role. Consultations between these four bishops were kept secret and nothing seems to have been divulged to the general public. It is certain that Noailles was informed and that he encouraged the appellants, but was unwilling to compromise himself. After several corrections demanded by La Broue the appellation document written by the theologian Boursier was signed in the presence of a notary from Paris, Chouvenot, on 1 March 1717.[15] Most of the text had been taken from the "corps de difficultés" of the opponents. What was left was to negotiate the canonical significance of the appellation. The four bishops considered the theological faculty to be the most suitable organ for the implementation of their plan. Ravechet, the syndic, had been won over and the faculty had been alienated by a very recent *lettre de cachet* from the regent which demanded that the act of 12 January containing a pronouncement against the bull be eliminated from the register. Ravechet was taken into confidence, but the vast majority of the public was totally surprised on the morning of 5 March 1717 when the four bishops requested to be admitted to the extraordinary session of the faculty about to begin. La Broue read a preamble and Soanen read the appeals document, which was then deposited in the chancellery of the Sorbonne. Of the 110 professors present 97 immediately voted for the appeal. At the beginning of the session one of the professors left in order to notify Rohan and the regent, who immediately had Noailles informed of the proceedings. On the very next day the archbishop expressed his sympathy for the four bishops by having their appeal registered with his office. After this the matter entered a new phase.

---

[13] See M. Laurent, "Jean Soanen évêque de Senez devant le concile d'Embrun," *Revue d'Auvergne* (Clermont 1968), 82, n. 2, 95–112.

[14] See V. Durand, *Le jansénisme au XVIII^e siècle et Joachim Colbert* (Toulouse 1907).

One of the initial effects of the appeal consisted of the regent switching to the anti-Jansenist side. On the evening of 5 March a council of which Rohan and Bissy were members decided to banish the four bishops to their dioceses, to exile the syndic Ravechet by means of a *lettre de cachet*, and to throw the notary Chouvenot into the Bastille, where he remained from 15 to 24 March. Ravechet died on his way into exile in Rennes on 24 April 1717 and was celebrated as a martyr by the entire party. But it was too late to stop the movement. Almost two years of policies sympathetic to Jansenism were bearing fruit and the regent was soon to become aware of it. News of the appeal spread rapidly, causing enthusiasm among many of the clergy. It is very difficult to get a precise idea of the situation because the contemporary literature did not give an objective account of it and we have no accurate statistics. It appears that those priests who favored the appeal were especially numerous around the universities and among the urban clergy. Montempuys, the rector of the University of Paris, on 6 March started to get other universities to join in the appeal, but the regent forebade discussion of the matter, though without success. Shortly thereafter the theological faculties of Nantes and Rheims joined the appeal. After their return to their dioceses the four bishops immediately published pastoral letters containing their appeal. In the course of a few

---

[15] Text: Louail-Cadry I, 764–70.

months fourteen colleagues in the episcopate joined them. On 3 April 1717 Noailles also signed the appeals document, but to the chagrin of the other appellants kept the fact secret for a long time. In fact, several among them did not divulge their position until much later. This was especially true for the bishop of Auzerre, Charles de Caylus, who had signed his appellation on 14 May 1717, but did not make it known until 4 October 1718 in a pastoral letter. Later he nonetheless assumed a very important position within the Jansenist party. Among the lower clergy, too, the appellations increased. It is impossible to make a listing; given the present state of documentation even a numerical estimate will perforce be inaccurate since some kept their appellation secret, others retracted it very quickly. On the other hand, the united support of numerous parishes must be qualified by the fact that genuine unanimity was never really achieved. Based on the very well-documented collective work edited by the Jansenist Nivelle, *La Constitution Unigenitus déférrée à l'Église universelle* (Cologne 1757), it can be assumed that the number of appellants ranged between 3,000 and 4,000, while the total number of clerics in France was approximately 100,000. But these numbers again have to be interpreted by taking into account that, on the one hand, there were appellations based on mere favor which—if one is to believe the acceptants—were even bought with money; on the other hand, many of the nonappellants accepted the bull against their will because they did not dare expose themselves; yet in their hearts they were on the side of the appellants. In addition, there were appellants among the nuns and laymen. On the whole the number of appellants formed a relatively small minority, but one that was very active and enjoyed the sympathy of a broad segment of the public. The action by the four bishops was highly effective since it placed the problem on safe ground, given the prevailing Gallican atmosphere.

It could, in fact, invoke a well-known precedent: the appellation by Louis XIV to the council against Innocent XI (January 1688), which has already been mentioned. This appellation, while not having the desired results, had not been condemned by the Pope. On 22 June 1716 in a speech to a general assembly of the university its rector, Montempuys, had recalled that in 1688 Procurator General Harlay had requested only one second to the appellation, namely that of the university.[16] Thus the precedent had not been forgotten. Parliament on the whole considered the appellation canonically unimpeachable. The regent was of like opinion and in an audience of 10 March 1717 he told Noailles and the opponents so. His only complaint was that the appellation had been undertaken without his knowledge. Several of the acceptants among the bishops confirmed the canonicity of the appellation. Memoranda on this issue were circulated in the form of brochures. The acceptants on their part merely countered that the appellation was null and void and could not be supported because the bull had already been implicitly accepted by the whole Church. Thus the Gallican principles which had formed the clergy for more than thirty years gave the appellants a solid base for their undertaking. Under these conditions the publication of the appeal changed the situation and led the whole issue into a new phase. It is now understandable why there were seven bishops among the appellants who had initially accepted the bull; this was the case, among others, with Caylus, who had published the bull in his diocese on 28 March 1714. Furthermore, it should be stated that all the appellant bishops had been appointed by Louis XIV, who was intent on keeping clerics sympathetic to Jansenism out of the episcopate; further, that all of them had signed the formulary against Jansenism, that almost all of them continued to demand its signing in their dioceses, and that some of them even asserted that Quesnel's book renewed the errors of Jansenism: this fact reveals the extent to which the issue of Jansenism was perceived as being independent from the issue of the bull *Unigenitus*. Lastly, the appellation in its broad spectrum reveals the influence of Richerism, which had gradually permeated the lower clergy and even the faithful, who now frequently considered themselves judges of the doctrine. In this regard a reading of the appeals document is important. Here, too, the events of 1688 represent a precedent because Louis XIV had ordered Harlay to obtain the consent of the Parisian clergy. In the ensuing period of time the theoretical positions had been formulated. Publications openly inspired by Richer were now multiplying. We have already mentioned the *Témoignage de la vérité* by de la Borde. In June 1716 Nicolas Le Gros, canon of Rheims, who had been exiled because of his Jansenist position and returned after the death of Louis XIV, published his treatise *Du renversement des libertés de l'Église gallicane* (1716), which was an immediate success. This work is more moderate than that of de la Borde. But it is based on the principle that within the Church the authority of the body of the faithful is fitting and the members of the hierarchy are only its delegates. He designates the priests as successors of the seventy-two disciples of Christ and demands a special position for them. Lastly, he concedes validity to the judgment of the bishops only inasmuch as it expresses that of their flock and especially that of the body of the priests. Thus a sort of church democracy began to take shape which was destined to develop further throughout the century. As a consequence the Church of France was placed in a state of war, since all its dioceses were divided into appellants and acceptants and the bishop's authority was generally disregarded by the followers of the party opposed to him. For many years French Catholicism was split because of a number of conflicts which had a debilitating effect, although this was not being admitted. The regent recognized it, however, and tried to prevent appellation by priests and laymen, but it was too late for such a reaction.

---

[16] Ibid., 726.

Pursuant to the desire of the four bishops, the appellation temporarily blocked all attempts at conciliation. The disquiet it had caused in Rome was partly ameliorated by the news that the regent had joined the party of the anti-Jansenists. Yet Rome and Paris alike were unclear about the method to be applied now. On 21 April Clement XI sent a personal letter dated 25 March to Noailles, couched in paternal and imploring terms.[17] It had no effect on Noailles, who—as was known—had signed the appellation on 3 April and confidentially began to talk about it now. By the end of May even Rome was informed. The regent sent the Duke de La Feuillade to Rome in order to renew negotiations. To the bishops he sent an encyclical prohibiting appellations "without need and as long as the negotiations are under way." Around 6 July Noailles answered the letters by the cardinals and the Pope, warning against forcible and severe methods which could not but embitter the people and lead to unrest. These letters reached Rome on 23 July, spreading great disappointment. At about this time the regent made desperate attempts to regain control of the situation. On 7 October he issued a royal decree ordering both parties to be silent on the matter. In fact, he distrusted all parties involved, including Clement XI, who found out about this on 19 October and was injured by the fact that both appellants and acceptants were put on the same level with each other. Next, the regent had an outline of the doctrine, written by one of the acceptants, sent to the Pope in an attempt to obtain approbation by the Holy See and in the hope that this would induce Noailles and his party to accept the bull. But on 9 November Clement sent a severely negative answer. Meantime, in order to again disrupt the search for a compromise, the appellants had printed and circulated Noailles's appeals document, a copy of which had probably been found among the papers of the deceased bishop of Lectoure.Noailles, although angered, emphatically refused to deny his text, ignoring pressure by the court. At the beginning of December the regent pushed through parliament several decrees which suppressed Noailles's appellation and condemned a publication running counter to the royal decree. Some success in Rome gave rise to the hope that an agreement could yet be reached. But again the regent encountered an unbending attitude on the part of the appellants and unwillingness by Nuncio Bentivoglio, who was hostile to any compromise. Once more the regent tried to demonstrate his preparedness to Rome by dismissing Daguesseau and replacing him as chancellor with Voyer d'Argenson, lieutenant general of the police, who was known as a friend of the Jesuits. But even this had no positive results: France ignored the order of silence and Rome initiated forcible measures.

---

[17] Text: Dorsanne I, 337.

On 8 March an inquisition decree surfaced condemning the appellation of the four bishops and that of Noailles. Parliament countered by condemning that decree on 28 March. Now the regent tried another way of putting pressure on the Holy See. Since the Pope had stubbornly refused to issue bulls of investiture for the bishops appointed by the regent, the latter convened a commission at the beginning of May which was to find a solution to this problem. Saint Simon, one of the members, solicited pertinent memoranda from experts, among them several of the great Jansenist theologians: Du Guet, Petitpied, Boursier, and Le Gros.[18] The majority of answers demanded the right of the chapters in the election of their bishop, some with the proviso that it had to take place upon nomination by the King. The person elected could thus be consecrated independently of any bull from Rome. These recommendations were favorably received in France and discussed publicly. The Holy See was informed about this by the nuncio. In the regency council mention was made of appealing to a general council the name of the French nation. In an attempt to intimidate Rome the regent mentioned in a letter the possibility of return to the old customs. This time Clement XI gave way; on 15 May 1718 the bulls of investiture arrived in Paris. But the regent seems not to have intended to reintroduce the right to appoint bishops, he merely wanted to scare Rome. But the idea went its own way and was soon to be realized in the Dutch Church. The dispatch of the bulls did not defuse the tense situation in Rome. Clement XI appeared less and less inclined towards a compromise. Correspondence from Rome in the summer of 1718 more and more frequently alluded to new forcible measures. In Paris one bishops' conference was followed by another, all of them gradually running out. But in them a new personality played an ever more significant part. This was Jean-Joseph Languet de Gergy (1677–1753), appointed to the bishopric of Soissons in 1715. He was consecrated by virtue of the recently arrived bull and was to become archbishop of Sens in 1730. Because the situation continued to stagnate, Clement XI intended to decide the matter by publishing the *Pastoralis officii* (8 September 1718), a letter addressed to all the faithful which excommunicated all those who did not accept the bull, yet did not make mention of the appellation. Predictably, the opponents hardened their position. On 24 November Noailles officially published his appeals document,[19] causing another wave of approval. On 3 October he issued another pastoral letter protesting the *Pastoralis officii*. This met with the approval of the majority of his clergy, while within the dioceses tension and unrest were on the increase. Also on 3 October the parliament in Paris issued an appellation decree against the *Pastoralis officii*; it was immediately followed by the provincial parliaments. In practical terms this deprived the excommunication of any actual effect and consequence.

---

[18] Their views are contained in L. T. Hérissant, *Avis aux princes catholiques*, 2 vols. (n. p., 1768).

In the meantime a new personality had come upon the scene on the side of the regent: Abbé Dubois, who fancied himself the Richelieu of his time. The acceptants held a large majority, so he thought it best to bet on them and to influence the regent accordingly. On the other hand he was hoping to be rewarded with a cardinalate, for which Rome made him wait until the following pontificate in July 1721. But Dubois completely failed to master the events. In the course of the summer of 1718 Bissy and the bishop of Nîmes Laparisière, an acceptant, published a collection of pastoral letters by French and foreign bishops favoring the constitution under the title *Témoignage de l'Église universelle en faveur de la bulle Unigenitus*. On 14 January 1719 Noailles countered with a pastoral instruction couched in extremely sharp terms. In Rome, as in Paris, it was recognized more and more that Noailles would never accept the bull. In the course of 1718 Languet de Gergy had become prominent by the publication of his blunt *Avertissements de Msgr. l'évêque de Soissons à ceux qui dans son diocèse se sont déclarés appelants de la Constitution*, which had brought him heated answers by Guillaume Dagoumer and Nicolas Petitpied. De Gergy was also the one who used a pastoral letter of 2 February and another one of 25 March 1719 to reply both to Noailles and to a pastoral letter by the appellant bishop of Angoulême. Bissy also answered by a pastoral letter of 22 February. In his own pastoral instruction of January, Noailles seemed to make some concessions that were disquieting to the rest of the appellants. The latter clarified the matter on 25 May 1719 in a pastoral letter by Langle, who published the appellation of the four bishops against the *Pastoralis officii*. To complicate matters further, the accepting archbishop of Rheims, the hotheaded Mailly, published a letter dated 14 May to all cardinals, archbishops, and bishops energetically advocating the cause of the bull. This letter was rejected by parliament on 22 June. Shortly before that, on 5 June, another royal decree tried to impose quiet on both parties for one year. Neither in Rome nor in Paris was it received any better than the one before and it had just as little effect. It could also not prevent parliament from proceeding severely against de Gergy in the following few weeks.

---

[19] Text: Louail-Cadry II, 149–56.

While he engaged in intrigues in Rome by means of Lafitau and at the same time tried to secure for himself the archbishopric of Cambrai and the cardinalate, Dubois was also concerned with achieving religious peace. From his retreat in Fresnes, Daguesseau, still out of favor, took an active part in the religious issues but moderated his position. In three memoranda he authored in December 1719 and January 1720 he considered the appellation a failure because the number of appellants was too small. The memoranda indicated that he had returned to the idea of an interpretation of the bull by a "corps de doctrine." A new text, written under the watchful eye of the regent by one of Noailles's theologians, the Abbé Couet, was submitted to Noailles, Rohan, and Bissy in January 1719. The latter two had demanded of Noailles that he retract his appellation and his instruction of January 1719; the prelate seemed ready to give in. In March thirty-eight bishops present in Paris were prepared to sign the "Explications sur la bulle Unigenitus." Mailly, too, accepted the signing after de Gergy had intervened with him. Emissaries of the regent were to obtain the signature of the other bishops in the provinces. By 10 May 1720 a total of ninety-four prelates had approved the agreement. Approval by Noailles, which would have brought around a large number of the opponents, was counted upon. But in the meantime the safeguards to ensure secrecy had been broken and the public had been informed. Among the ranks of the priests and the laity violent opposition was aroused against any compromise at all and the four bishops, joined by Caylus, sharply criticized Noailles's "apostacy." The Pope, on the other hand, appeared little inclined towards a compromise which he viewed as an impairment of the rights of the Holy See. A letter of Noailles to his priests explaining his actions was condemned sharply in his diocese. In a parallel action many of the acceptants accused Languet de Gergy of having weakened. In addition to that, parliament, which had been exiled to Pontoise as a result of the Law affair, refused to register a royal declaration of 4 August sanctioning the agreement, in spite of the fact that Daguesseau, who had returned to the chancellorship a few weeks prior and had changed his position, exerted all his influence. Having delayed his acceptance all summer long, Noailles finally gave in and published a pastoral letter on 19 November containing his acceptance coupled with explanations. At that time parliament also joined a compromise and was recalled to Paris on 16 December. Then the Sorbonne submitted. Dubois and the regent thought they had won the day. La Broue had died on 20 September, but not before he and the three other bishops had signed a reappeal document on 12 September, authored by Laurent Boursier, which sharply admonished Noailles.[20] It was published by the three other bishops almost simultaneously with Noailles's pastoral letter and his acceptance. A decree by the regency council of 31 December prohibited the reappeal document. In the meantime a reappeal document for the lower clergy dated 19 November had appeared.[21] It contained the signatures of a large number of appellants, about fifteen hundred. But this number was far below that of the appellations of 1717, so the court was not visibly moved by it. Shortly thereafter a handwritten list of appellants was circulated and printed in 1721; this put the reappellants within the grasp of the authorities. At the head of this list was Abbé Jacques de Bidal d'Asfeld, a friend of Du Guet, who had to appear before a police lieutenant and was exiled to Villeneuve-le-Roi. At that point the three reappealing bishops wrote to the regent explaining their position. None of their colleagues from the episcopate followed suit. Languet redoubled his polemics. The death of Clement XI caused a moment's confusion, but soon it was clear that his successor, Innocent XIII, would continue somewhat the same policy. The confused polemics which filled his brief pontificate of three years hardly changed the elements of the problem. Initiated on 9 June by a letter to the Pope, signed by seven appealing bishops,[22] these conflicts provoked a large number of publications in which Languet de Gergy was in the forefront of the acceptants, while Colbert and Caylus played an ever more significant role on the side of the appellants. Bissy joined the fray with a sharply worded lengthy pastoral instruction of 17 June 1722 which provoked an answer in much the same tone by the six appellants in February 1723.[23] Dubois and the regent tried to control the situation by reintroducing the signing of the formulary against Jansenism as a condition for obtaining benefices and university titles; this custom had been discontinued in many faculties and dioceses. The result of this measure, implemented on 11 July 1722, was renewed unrest, especially in the university circles. The majority of the appellants obeyed because for them the issue of Jansenism was quite apart from that of the bull. But Colbert signaled the connection by prescribing the signing in conjunction with the distinction between the *quaesto juris* and the *quaesto facti* and the words of Clement IX concerning the keeping of the peace. In doing so he became involved in a long and embarrassing affair which we shall discuss later. The year 1723 was characterized by profound changes among the main actors on the stage. On 15 February Louis XV was declared of age; Dubois died on 10 August; the regent on 2 December. A little later, on 7 March 1724,

---

[20] Text: Colbert, *Œuvres* I, 265.

[21] Text: Louail-Cadry II, 518.

[22] Text: Colbert I, 303–54.

[23] Ibid., I 381–580.

Innocent XIII also died. At the same time a new protagonist appeared in the person of André de Fleury, bishop of Fréjus and former teacher of the King, who had enjoyed the latter's complete trust.

The new Pope, Benedict XIII, a former Dominican friar, was very open to the doctrines of Augustine and Thomas, but could not simply cancel the problem caused by the bull. But he issued the brief *Demissa preces* of 6 November 1724,[24] addressed to the Dominican general, which expressed his great sympathy for Augustinianism and Thomism and gave renewed hope to the opponents of the bull. But Noailles, in spite of the Pope's conciliatory stance, persistently refused to retract his appellation. At the beginning of January, following a very disappointing series of correspondence with Rome, he sent to Rome a collection of twelve doctrinal articles, characterized strongly by Augustinianism (which were probably edited by Boursier), and asked for their approbation by the Holy See.[25] Some of these articles openly seemed to favor Jansenism and the Roman authorities were scarcely inclined to accept them. In France, Rohan and Bissy, supported by Fleury, took a position against negotiations which they thought could cause acceptants to leave the fold, and the bishops of Saintes and Marseille condemned the twelve articles by pastoral letter. By an encyclical dated 20 June 1725 Colbert finally let the opponents know that in his opinion the twelve articles would not make the bull any more acceptable. Under these conditions there was no use in continuing the negotiations. A short time later, in June 1726, the duke of Bourbon fell from favor and was replaced by Fleury, who occupied this post until 1743. Smooth and agile, but of steely persistence, Fleury was firmly resolved to weaken the Jansenist opposition. With support by the moderates and those inclined towards reconciliation he did not hesitate to proceed severely against the extremists; more and more he resorted to the weapon of the *lettre de cachet,* a policy that proved effective in the end.

First he had to make an example of one of the appellant bishops in order to frighten the others. The most rebellious among them was without a doubt Colbert, who strove for the signing of the formulary after 1722. On 21 September 1724, a decree of the council of state had even deprived him of his temporal revenues. But Colbert had strong support. The aged Du Guet had a letter printed which he had written to the bishop on 25 July 1724 and which strongly influenced public opinion. On 13 February 1725, by the way, this letter and the publications of Colbert regarding the same topic were condemned by the Holy Office. The Assembly of the Clergy of 1726 demanded the convening of provincial councils to counteract the unrest and, in this regard, joined forces with Fleury. But the latter did not dare attack Colbert, who was protected by the power of his family. On the other hand, the utterly defenseless Soanen, bishop of the tiny diocese of Senez, was a suitable victim. Soanen himself furnished the weapons for his adversaries. Towards the end of 1727—believing that he had only a short while to live—he made public a pastoral instruction dated 28 August 1726 which was to represent his spiritual testament. In it he emphatically took the part of Colbert and, unraveling the whole background of the bull, he violently attacked its acceptants. This seemed a sufficient pretext. By 24 May 1727, all the bishops of the province of Embrun, to which the diocese of Senez belonged had *lettres de cachet* delivered to them. Their metropolitan was Pierre Guérin de Tencin (1680–1758), formerly a close collaborator of Dubois and the latter's representative in Rome, a prelate of more than dubious morality. Tencin convened a provincial council for 16 August 1727, which Soanen attended. This council was characterized by complex and stormy episodes where irregularities abounded. On 18 August Soanen had rejected the jurisdictional competence of his judges, whose partisanship and hostility were beyond doubt, but an appeal based on misuse of power filed by Soanen on 26 August was ignored. On 27 August he protested against the irregularity of his trial in an encyclical to all the bishops. The judgment was dated 20 September and pronounced two days later. Soanen was dismissed from all his functions as bishop and priest, pending retraction of his pastoral instruction. Shortly thereafter he was exiled by *lettre de cachet* to the abbey of La Chaise-Dieu. He left Embrun on 13 October and arrived at the abbey ten days later. In spite of his advanced age he lived there for another thirteen years; he died on 25 December 1740 at the age of ninety-three, revered by the entire Jansenist party as a saint and martyr. All the while he had conducted a voluminous correspondence and taken an active part in most of the affairs that concerned public opinion. After his death even the smallest objects which he had used were preserved as relics. The council of Embrun, called by the opponents "the Synod of Robbers," did not have quite the effect hoped for by Fleury. To be sure, the Holy See approved it by brief of 17 December 1727, and it induced about ten opponents to switch sides. But the unrest it caused was lasting and violent. On 28 October 1727, twelve bishops, among them Noailles, Colbert, and Caylus, sent a letter of protest to the King authored by Petitpied, which was returned to them on 15 March 1728, together with a legal opinion which was disquieting to some of the signers. Boursier collected and published a *Consultation de 50 avocats* which asserted the invalidity of the council of Embrun. This was protested on the part of the acceptants by a *Lettre de 26 évêques au rois* (4 May 1728), which in turn provoked a polemic by the lower clergy calling attention to its rights. Since Soanen had demanded a general council beyond the provincial one, petitions were circulating in the dioceses for his appeal; they contained no less than two thousand signatures. Innumerable polemics appeared; the portrait of Soanen, the "Prisoner of Jesus," was distributed in copper etchings; a number of his followers managed to visit him at La Chaise-Dieu. The conflicts which were tearing the diocese of Senez apart were passionately commented on. In the end the total result was uncertain. The procedure was not repeated even though there was a plan afoot to convene a provincial council at Narbonne for the purpose of condemning Colbert, who had emphatically defended Soanen.

---

[24] See Louail-Cadry IV, 165–67.

[25] See Colbert I, 635; Louail-Cadry IV, 341.

One of Fleury's major goals continued to be the neutralization of Noailles. At the end of 1726 the rumor surfaced that Noailles would give in to pressure by the minister and publish a pastoral letter containing an unqualified acceptance. It prompted a large number of the Parisian clergy to rise up against it. On 3 February 1727, a letter to Noailles, edited by Petitpied, appeared in which thirty parish priests who considered themselves successors of the seventy-two disciples refused to follow Noailles in any act of submission. Furthermore, they demanded that a general synod of the diocese be convened. The movement was lead by Goy, the appellant priest of Sainte-Marguerite, and Feu, appellant priest of Saint-Gervais. A decree of 14 June prohibited this letter, but in the "Très humbles remontrances des curés de Paris" of 5 September Petitpied again brought up this topic. In the meantime—as we have mentioned—the affair of Embrun had led Noailles back to the opposition. After he signed the letter of the twelve bishops, he also signed (on 7 May 1728) a document opposing the registration of the papal brief which had approved the council of Embrun. But soon the situation changed. By this time Noailles was visibly weakened by age and his ideas became increasingly unclear. Towards the end of February 1718 sickness had deprived him of his most valued adviser, who had always encouraged him to resist: Antoine Dorsanne, official of Paris and author of a *Journal* which was published posthumously in 1753. Fleury, on the other hand, found allies among those around the cardinal in the persons of the chancellor Daguesseau and especially the archbishop's niece, wife of the Maréchal de Grammont. They obtained Noailles's signature on a document revoking his stand against registration of the papal brief of 7 May. On 19 July he also signed a letter to Benedict XIII assuring him of his submission and absolute obedience.[26] At this point several appellants appear to have regained some influence over him inducing him to sign a declaration (22 August; the original version was sent to Soanen) in which Noailles revoked the document of 19 May and in advance repealed any public document accepting the bull which might be wrung from him in the future. On 24 September, furthermore, he signed another document protesting in advance against any forced dismissal from his archbishopric. This did not prevent a pastoral letter by Noailles, dated 11 October and containing an unqualified acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus*, from being posted in Paris on 24 October. As a countermeasure the appellants had the revocation act of 22 August posted as well. The Duke de Noailles, nephew of the archbishop, managed to induce him to write a letter to Fleury in which he revoked this act of the twenty-second. But a few weeks later, on 17 December, he reaffirmed it. In addition he signed another declaration on 26 February 1729 in which he revoked his pastoral letter of 11 October; the manuscript of that declaration was also sent to Soanen. The death of the unfortunate cardinal on 4 May 1729 finally put an end to these embarrassing conflicts revolving around an old man whose weakness and instability had been cruelly exploited.

---

[26] Text: Dorsanne II, 463–66, also for the following documents.

The Defeat of Jansenism

The death of Noailles represented a turning point in the history of Jansenism. It marked the disappearance of the most important man of the party, whose personal deficiencies had nonetheless been clad with the aura of the cardinalate. More deaths and desertions from the ranks of the appellants followed, soon leaving a mere four. Aside from Soanen, who was exiled to his faraway mountains and deprived of all his authority, there were Colbert in Montpellier (d. 1738), Bossuet in Troyes (d. 1743), and Caylus in Auxerre, who survived the others until 1754. Although Jansenism, to the extent that it was inspired by Quesnel, developed more and more in the direction of parochialism by according a growing importance to the parish priests and the lower clergy, it found no leader. There was nothing that could make up for the lack of leadership, properly provided by a bishop; none of the three remaining appellant bishops were able to fill that role. Nor did anyone take the place of Quesnel, who died on 2 December 1719 in Amsterdam at the age of eighty-five. In spite of some internal disagreements the Jansenist party did preserve a real cohesion, but in the future it was an army without a general.

Noailles's successor was Charles-Gaspard de Vintimille du Luc, until then archbishop of Aix. He was moderate yet an acceptant by conviction, fully in agreement with Fleury's opinions. Henceforth *Unigenitus* posed no more problems regarding compromise. The French court and the Holy See agreed in their demand of an unreserved acceptance.

Vintimille was firmly resolved to break all Jansenist resistance in his diocese of Paris, even though it initially appeared that he underestimated the difficulties of such an undertaking and the impossibility of destroying an opposition which, to some extent, was to endure until the Revolution. Within a few days of taking office, on 6 September 1729 he obtained approval of the bull from twenty-five canons of Notre-Dame, but met with resistance among the lower clergy. This did not keep him from enforcing the signing of the bull by a pastoral instruction of 29 September. At the beginning of November a *lettre de cachet* declared the appellant professors to be dismissed from the Sorbonne, depriving it of a number of famous theologians; the remaining faculty was characterized by Pucelle as a "rump." Other opponents were eliminated posthaste by *lettre de cachet*, especially those among the parish clergy. On 29 October all confessors and priests were ordered to appear within four months at the episcopal see in order to have their ecclesiastical authority renewed. This enabled Vintimille to refuse that authority to about thirty appellants among approximately eleven hundred priests. The others had to accept the bull.

It was probably by request of Vintimille that Fleury initiated even harsher measures. A royal declaration of 24 May 1730 elevated the bull *Unigenitus* to the level of a state law; it again ordered the signing of the formulary of Alexander VII and declared the benefices of those who did not sign it as "vacant and available for reappointment by full legal power."[27] The weight of economic and financial sanctions of this declaration brought about the desired effect. Since church life in the *ancien régime* was founded on the system of benefices, such a measure put the Jansenists outside the pale of the existing order. But the text of the declaration, recognizing a papal act as state law, clearly manifested an ultramontane inspiration. Owing to Fleury's skill, it demonstrated a new posture, through which France and Rome found a modus vivendi which for a long time eliminated this perilous problem from the relationship between the two courts. It was in the nature of things that the most spirited resistance to this scheme came from parliamentary circles. In fact, the parliaments in their opposition took the place of the clergy, who, due to their very insecure position, could hardly express their opinion anymore. This explains the growing connection between Jansenism and parliamentarianism, a connection which cannot but seem paradoxical because a growing number of parliamentarians left the faith and turned to the Enlightenment instead. Parliament refused to register the declaration of 24 March. It took a formal trial proceeding to change its mind on 3 April 1730. The declarations of the ecclesiastical councilors concerning this topic were substantially inspired by E. Richer, they strongly advocated the demands of the parish priests. Applying the same principles a short time later, parliament supported three parish priests of the diocese of Orléans against their bishop, Fleuriau d'Armenonville. This explains why the Assembly of the Clergy in 1730 complained about the rebelliousness of the lower clergy and the transgressions by parliament. The growing importance of parliamentarians led to the Jansenist theologians placing more and more stress on an argument taken over from Quesnel and de la Borde: the validity of lay witness. Innumerable polemics continued to develop this argument and defended it against attacks by the proponents of the bull.

---

[27] See Cerveau, *Nécrologe* V, 270–79.

When Daguesseau and Joly de Fleury submitted the royal declaration to parliament, they assumed that it would be a purely theoretical matter without any practical application. But in fact this declaration opened the floodgates for persecution of the Jansenists. The *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*, numerous polemics, and an incredible number of archival documents testify to numerous unpleasant incidents concerning priests, laymen, parishes, and whole congregations. By means of the simple *lettres de cachet*, which dispensed with all due process, a large number of opponents were sent into jail or exile. Since there are no statistics available, it is impossible to list accurate figures, but it can be assumed as certain that practically all dioceses and orders were affected, including the women's congregations, the Benedictines and the Oratorians, the Carmelites and the Sisters of the Visitation, and even the Carthusians. In the fall of 1725 about thirty Carthusians and fifteen Cistercians of Orval thought it wise to leave France and seek refuge in Holland. In order to reduce the extent of resistance, the powers that be unscrupulously resorted to forcible measures: several houses were closed and their members either deported or dispersed. Several episodes, such as the ones involving the Sisters of the Visitation of Castellane, who sympathised with Soanen, the Carmelite nuns of the Rue Saint-Jacques in Paris, and the abbey of Saint-Polycarpe in the diocese of Narbonne agitated public opinion to a great extent. It all contributed to the creation of a martyrdom mentality in Jansenist circles. But the measures were effective; by and by the various congregations officially accepted the bull, albeit generally without enthusiasm. The Dominicans had done so in 1728; the Benedictines and Doctrinarians followed suit in 1744, the Genovevians in 1745, and the Oratorians a year later in 1746. But it must be added that the acceptance was never general and that a good many members of religious families more or less admittedly continued to be sympathetic towards Jansenism. This was true especially in the case of the Oratorians and the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, many of whom remained loyal to the Jansenist party. The dioceses of the appellant bishops continued to represent a natural refuge for those who managed to escape exile or jail: Montpellier, Troyes, and Auxerre took in many refugees; others sought asylum in Holland. Others were accepted into communities covertly under an assumed name. Numerous laymen placed themselves, their homes, and fortunes in the service of those persecuted. After the death of Nicole in 1695 his inheritance had been handed over to the Oratorian Fouquet and the Abbot d'Eau. It laid the foundation for a fund providing assistance to persecuted clerics, and in the course of the eighteenth century it was augmented by numerous private gifts.

Vintimille's tenure in office also abounded in parliamentary conflicts. The first dispute ensued when a council decree suppressed a memorandum by forty lawyers from Paris in favor of opposing priests from Orléans. At first the other lawyers reacted heatedly, but calmed down when Daguesseau intervened and ameliorated some of the harshness. But the forty lawyers were called to task by some of the bishops, among them Vintimille. They were about to formulate a reply when another council decree again put them in the wrong. Thereupon they went on strike. In retaliation ten of them were exiled, but the others did not give in and so the ten had to be recalled from exile in November 1731. The highly complex and more or less emotional hostilities continued and parliament had to suffer a *lettre de cachet* forbidding any discussion of matters pertaining to the bull. By publishing a pastoral letter on 27 April 1732, abruptly suppressing the party organ *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* Vintimille initiated a new phase in the conflict. As many as twenty-one priests in Paris refused to disseminate the pastoral letter; in other parishes some of the faithful left the church while it was read. A royal declaration of 10 May 1732 forbade the parliament from dealing with this affair. The ecclesiastical councilor Pucelle and another by the name of Titon protested loudly and were promptly arrested. A strike suppressed by royal decree provoked new incidents and 158 officials of the magistrate were dismissed on 20 June. When parliament remonstrated, the dismissals were retracted by the court. The remonstrations by parliament were very serious and on 8 August the court replied with a harsh statement which could only be registered after a formal trial on 1 September. This led to renewed protests resulting in 140 parliamentarians being exiled. But now the public was so enraged that the government had to give in, admonish Vintimille, and forgo proceedings against twenty-one protesting priests. This is a good example of the way in which ecclesiastical matters were again taken up by parliament.

Thereafter Vintimille avoided any additional problems. He shunned conflicts with priests who were undeterred and continued in their appeals; he even maintained friendly relations with some of them. He extended authorizations for hearing confession or renewed them in the case of opponents and asked well-known Jansenists for their services. When he died in 1746 he had succeeded relatively well in keeping peace in his immediate environs. The church policy of Fleury has been subject to various kinds of judgment. It could be considered brutal and repressive and it is certain that he did everything he could to diminish the ranks of the appellants. The forty-thousand *lettres de cachet* supposedly issued under his government as asserted by some historians demand closer examination. Without doubt he was interested in a peaceful settlement of the problem. His appointments placed moderate bishops at the head of dioceses. He avoided chicanery towards those prelates who were suspected of Jansenist sympathies. In 1735, for example, the bishop of the small diocese of Saint-Papoul, Jean-Charles de Ségur, submitted his resignation after he published a pastoral letter explaining his scruples and acknowledging the appellation of 1717. The pastoral letter was suppressed by council decree, but the prelate was left unscathed. He died peacefully at the parish house of Saint-Gervais in Paris, whose appellant priest François Feu gave the eulogy. Fleury died in 1743; his successor in the Ministry of Culture was the Theatine Jean-François Boyer, who had become Bishop of Mirepoix in 1730 and tutor of the Dauphin in 1736. Boyer proved to be much more unyielding than Fleury, often brutal. Although he was the black sheep of the Jansenists, as explained in the many articles about him in the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*, he was not even respected by the enemies of Jansenism. His death in 1755 was generally felt to be a liberation.

Boyer had to undergo the last embarrassing affair of the Jansenist conflict, that of the certificate of confession. A preliminary sign was the fact that some of the acceptants among the bishops were refusing the last rites to notoriously obstinate appellants. Towards the end of 1739 the bishop of Laon, La Fare, issued a pastoral instruction forbidding the priests either to administer the sacraments to appellants or to give them ecclesiastical burial. In 1746 the bishop of Amiens, La Motte, issued a proclamation containing similar rules. This affair reached its climax with the intervention of the archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, the uncompromising successor of Vintimille. He resumed the fight against Jansenism and ordered his priests who were ministering to the dying to demand from them a certificate of confession, written by a regularly approved priest, in which the dying would accept the bull *Unigenitus*. The most astonishing aspect was that this measure was applied without reservation even in the case of poor and totally uneducated people. One of the first incidents (on 17 February 1749) involved the Jansenist theologian Boursier, whom the priest of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet, Garnot, gave the last rites and a formal burial with the complete rites of the church without having demanded a recantation. Garnot was exiled to Senlis. On 21 June 1749, the former rector of the university, Charles Coffin, died without the last rites because he refused to show the required certificate of confession, though he did receive a church burial in Saint-Eustache. During the following months several more incidents occurred and the problem spread to other dioceses in the provinces whose bishops had issued similar rules. Parliament, of course, repeatedly intervened in favor of the opponents and its relationship with the court became so critical that it was exiled from May 1753 until September 1754.

At this point Louis XV resolved to put an end to this conflict which weakened royal authority and could even call into question the very institutions themselves. Upon the return of parliament he issued a declaration, written on 2 September and registered on 5 September, which imposed silence on both parties.[28] This important declaration marked the beginning of yet a new phase because the King, especially as of 1756, was bent on having it respected. In order to set an example, several bishops who violated it—among them Beaumont himself—were temporarily exiled. Then, too, the Holy See was at this time occupied by a well-educated and moderate man, Benedict XIV. The divided Assembly of the Clergy of 1755 turned to him and in reply received the brief *Ex omnibus* (16 October 1755), which approved the silencing and treated the matter of the certificate of confession in an acceptable manner. Boyer died in 1755; his successors, Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld and after him Jarente de la Bruyère were intent on pacification and succeeded in having the order of silence respected. More and more bishops concurred in their views. This attitude, combined with the progressive deterioration of the Jansenist party, altered the elements of the problem.

The scene of events also changed. Although the Society of Jesus had played a relatively subordinate role in the context of political Jansenism, it incurred violent hostility, not only from the Jansenists but also from several acceptants among the bishops. Several incidents occurred in quick succession. The first one revolved around a work by the Jesuit Jean Pichon, which appeared in 1745 under the title *L'esprit de Jésus-Christ et de l'Église sur la fréquente communion*. In it Pichon resurrected a problem treated a century before in the famous work by Arnauld. He attacked any delay of absolution, advocated communion immediately following confession of even the most grievous sins, and—according to a formula of P. Sirmond attacked by Pascal in his *Provinciales*—reduced the love of God to the fact of not hating God in any way. In 1747 the

---

[28] Ibid., 363.

Nouvelles ecclésiastiques sat in judgment over Pichon's book. Then several pastoral instructions condemned the work, the first few of which were issued by bishops who were either known to be Jansenists or who sympathized with them: Caylus; Rastignac, bishop of Tours; Fitz-James, bishop of Soissons. Languet de Gergy pronounced a prohibition. Then Beaumont had to publish a recantation by Pichon in the diocese of Paris, dated 24 January 1748. But he was unable to avert condemnation of Pichon; during the next few months twenty-seven additional bishops censured the book. In August 1748 Pichon was exiled to Mauriac by *lettre de cachet*. On 11 December 1748, his book was condemned by the Holy Office. Parallel to the Pichon affair another one had erupted which was to reach its climax just a little later. In 1738 Isaac-Joseph Berruyer, a Jesuit, published the first part of a voluminous *Histoire du peuple de Dieu* which presented the passion and salvation of Christ in the form of a novel. It was condemned by Colbert, enabling Daguesseau to resist publication of the following volumes. The eight volumes of the second part did not appear until June 1753. They were not approved by the Jesuit superiors, a fact which incurred for them the reproach of duplicity. The ensuing scandal was of considerable proportions. In December 1753 the work was condemned by twenty-seven bishops. But Berruyer defended himself; a condemnation issued by Benedict XIV on 16 February 1758 did not keep him from publishing the remaining five volumes of the third part, which were condemned on 2 December 1758. Numerous polemics against Berruyer appeared, the most significant of which was written by a former theologian of Colbert's, Jean-Baptiste Gaultier. His *Lettres théologiques* also attacked another Jesuit, Jean Hardouin, who—although he had died in 1729—was considered to be the source of Berruyer's ideas. On 1 August 1759, Fitz-James joined the fray with a pastoral instruction of several thousand pages, composed by a well-known Jansenist theologian, Étienne Gourlin, and containing a severe refutation of Hardouin and Berruyer. It was followed by other censures, including one by the Sorbonne.

All this created an atmosphere favoring further attacks against the Society of Jesus, whose reputation had been declining—even in Rome—since the end of the seventeenth century and which was now coming under attack from almost all sides. At a time when political power was increasingly based on a growing nationalist sentiment, the society was accused of being allied with a foreign power, the temporal power of the papacy. Conversely, contemporary philosophy saw the society as the strongest barrier against the deism of Voltaire. Henceforth even the slightest incidents were pounced upon. In 1756 a regrettable financial affair involving a Jesuit, de la Valette, furnished the desired pretext. The parliaments went on the attack against the society, a decree of 8 August 1761, the first of several others, declared its constitution irreconcilable with the laws of the realm. After several cases involving promissory notes the King gave in to the pressure exerted by Mme de Pompadour and his minister Choiseul: a decree of 18 November 1764 banned the Society of Jesus in France. A similar campaign had been carried out in a number of European countries and led to the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* by Clement XIV (see also Chap. 30), by which he abolished the Jesuit order. These measures were celebrated as victories by the Jansenists, who were unable to see that it was a triumph of skepticism and not of Saint Augustine. On both sides of the issue the conflict led to a great number of publications, the most interesting of which is still the *Annales de la Société des soi-disant jésuites,* an ambitious work which was probably financed by Choiseul himself and compiled by the Jansenist Gazaignes. It remained unfinished but its completed five volumes (1764–71) contain a wealth of valuable details.

These polemics involving the Society of Jesus refrained from resuming the Jansenist issue because the court was firmly resolved to enforce the law of silence and to avoid any rekindling of the conflict. Proof of that was an incident involving the appellant François-Philippe Mésenguy (1677–1763), who—out of modesty—had remained a mere acolyte and whose views had forced him in 1728 to resign his function as superior at the Collège de Dormans-Beauvais. Mésenguy was a respected theologian; without regard to his views Vintimille had employed him to improve the second edition of the *Bréviaire de Paris* in 1736 and had entrusted him with the editing of the *Missel de Paris* two years later. In 1744 Mésenguy had published his lectures under the title *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne.*[29] The *Exposition* had been mentioned in 1752 by the *Dictionnaire des livres jansénistes* by the Jesuit Patouillet, but its being placed on the Index in 1757 was based exclusively on its Gallican tendencies. One year later the book was translated into Italian and this translation was considered Jansenist. As a consequence it was condemned by Clement XIII in his brief *Dum inter gravissima* (1761). But the courts of France, Spain, Naples, Vienna, and the Republic of Venice refused to accept the brief. Louis XIV forbade the nuncio to promulgate it in any way in France and Choiseul sent a severe official protest to the Pope. Even Rome now understood that it was better not to permit the matter to be revived. The pontificate of Clement XIV was ready to let things rest. Pius VI on the occasion of his trip to Vienna on 20 April 1782 publicly announced to the bishops of Hungary that the bull *Unigenitus* should be spoken of in historical terms and not in dogmatic ones, "historice, non dogmatice." Several years later, with the advent of the French Revolution, the political aspect of the problem was to enter a completely new phase.

---

[29] Mésenguy himself composed a "Mémoire justificatif" about this affair which was published shortly after his death (n. p., 1763).

In the meantime political Jansenism—as opposed to the religious Jansenism of the seventeenth century, which had been limited to France and Louvain—had gained considerable ground. In the Netherlands, where the Jansenist group enjoyed firm support, the situation quickly came to a head. The eight dioceses had accepted the bull *Unigenitus* almost immediately after it had been issued. Prior to that the faculty of the University of Louvain had accepted it, although not without spirited resistance by part of its members. In 1716 Thomas-Philippe d'Alsace de Bossu, hostile to Jansenism, became archbishop of Mechelen. On 17 October 1718, he issued a pastoral letter which excommunicated the opponents of the bull. The other seven dioceses, as well as the Louvain faculty, followed suit. Supported by officialdom, the archbishop initiated a number of forcible measures against the opponents. Towards the end of 1727 the famous canonist Zeger-Bernard Van Espen (1646–1728) had to flee to Holland, where he died six months later.[30] In the meantime Van Espen's advice had contributed considerably towards the creation of a schism in the Dutch Church.[31] Since the end of the sixteenth century the Church had been governed by vicars apostolic with the title "in partibus infidelium." Jean de Néercassel, vicar apostolic of Utrecht, had been a close friend of Arnauld's and had facilitated the Jansenist infiltration into Holland. His successor in 1688 was Pierre Codde, archbishop of Sebaste, who had flatly refused to sign the formulary. He was cited to Rome, but even there he adhered to his position and was banished for it (May 1702). The chapters of Utrecht and Harlem stood up for him; the latter quickly gave in, but Utrecht, followed by a large number of its faithful, stood fast in its opposition to the Holy See and refused to recognize the vicars apostolic who succeeded Pierre Codde. Several French prelates were willing to ordain priests who had been issued letters dimissory by the chapter acting as administrator of the archbishopric, but the regent prohibited the bishops from continuing this practice. Thereupon the chapter of Utrecht and its faithful who had joined in the appellation of the bull *Unigenitus* consulted several canonists, among them Van Espen, who had always supported the legitimacy of the rights of the chapter. The majority of the replies reaffirmed the chapter's right to elect its bishop and to have him consecrated. A priest of the foreign mission, Dominikus Varlet, consecrated bishop "in partibus" of Babylon, was willing to act as consecrator upon the request of the Dutch chapter but was suspended for so doing (1720). He took up residence in the United Provinces and on 15 October 1724 he consecrated Cornelius Steenoven, the elected candidate of the Utrecht chapter, who in turn consecrated the first three of his successors. Furthermore, the archbishopric of Utrecht created suffragan seats in Harlem (1742) and Deventer (1758), ensuring the continuity of apostolic succession. Although supported by the Dutch government, the Church of Utrecht suffered a rapid decrease in its membership: around 1750 it had less than ten thousand members, contrasted to the total of two hundred thousand Catholics in Holland. Several attempts at rapprochement with Rome were undertaken, but all of them foundered upon the steadfast refusal by the chapter to recognize the bull *Unigenitus*. Throughout the eighteenth century the Church of Holland served as a refuge for numerous appellants; even today their archives, enriched by many documents from France, constitute one of the most important sources regarding the history of Jansenism. The French immigrants, several of whom, such as Leclerc and Le Sesne d'Étemare, were widely acknowledged theologians, contributed to maintaining an undeniable intellectual vitality in the Utrecht schism in spite of its numerical minority. The Jansenist infiltration in Ireland, England, Germany, Austria, and Spain was of minor importance, but not so in Italy. There the problem took on a special aspect, which is to be examined later (Chap. 26).

---

[30] See G. Dupac de Bellegarde, *Mémoires historiques sur l'affair de la bulle Unigenitus dans les Pays-Bas,* 4 vols. (Brussels 1755); G. Leclerc, "Zeger Bernard van Espen (1646–1728), un canoniste janséniste," *Miscellanea jansenistica offerts à Lucien Ceyssens* (Herverlee and Louvain 1963), 174–200.

[31] See G. Dupac de Bellegarde, *Histoire abrégée de l'Église d'Utrecht* (Utrecht 1755); B. Van Bilsen, *Het schisma van Utrecht* (Utrecht and Brussels 1949); J. Tans and M. Kok, *Rome - Utrecht* (Hilversum and Antwerp 1966).

Jansenism and the Religious Mentality of the Eighteenth Century

When the conflict involving the bull *Unigenitus* broke out, Jansenism included a large number of first-rate theologians in its ranks. Several of them by their age were still part of seventeenth-century Jansenism. Pasquier Quesnel, who, as we have seen, occupied a place of extraordinary importance, possessed an amazing vitality belying his eighty years. The incredible number of memoranda, polemics, and replies which he authored until shortly before his death on 2 December 1719 in Amsterdam is astonishing. But this wealth of literature did not augment his system. He continued to represent a moderate Augustinianism as coined by Bérulle. Richer's ideas, advocated by him, combined with the fact that the army of appellants was composed primarily of priests and faithful, led him to accord increasing value to the rights of the lower clergy and laity without, however, going as far as the almost Protestant exaggerations of de la Borde. While he did, in fact, remain a revered figure within the Jansenist group, he was surpassed by some of the younger of his allies, over whom he no longer had the uncontested authority he did during the period between 1690 and 1710. Not so in the case of Jacques-Joseph du Guet (1649–1733), his younger companion who had accompanied him to his refuge with Arnauld in 1685 but was forced to return to France soon afterwards.[32] Although thereafter he lived in cautious seclusion, his voluminous correspondence with numerous friends even outside the Jansenist circle had proved his extraordinary intellectual and literary abilities and had obtained for him a position of high respect expressed by the sobriquet "the Seer," given to him by his friends. Although he had at first shown little inclination for writing, he had two small treatises printed in 1717 (*Traité de la prière publique* and *Traité des saints mystères*) which enjoyed great success and made his name as an author. He also continued his career as a moralist, especially in the ten volumes of his *Lettres de Morale et de piété*, several of which had been printed in 1707 without his permission and which he edited himself after 1718. The last few volumes appeared posthumously. He was a gracious and shy person who eschewed public appearances. For that reason he refused to take on a prominent role of leadership in the controversy involving the bull. But he was frequently asked for advice; he checked and corrected numerous writings of his friends. Himself an appellant and reappellant, he had advised the four bishops at the time of the appellation. But the number of polemics published by him is small, the most important one being his letter to Colbert of 25 July 1724 concerning the signing of the formulary which he had printed the following November. His actual theological work is limited to a small volume entitled *Dissertation théologique* (1727) which deals primarily with baptism and the Eucharist. In addition there are the two volumes published posthumously of the *Conférences ecclésiastiques* (1742), actually a work of his youth. Written around 1678 it demonstrates the influence of Richer's doctrine as advocated by Quesnel. But in general, Du Guet's ideas, dominated by Augustinianism, are sharp, penetrating, very subtle and solid, his morality determined by a relatively moderate rigorism. Innumerable reprints throughout the eighteenth century popularized this admirable, talented author who deserves better than the oblivion which has been his fate.

François-Laurent Boursier (1679–1748), professor at the Sorbonne, was a much stronger and more aggressive personality. Highly respected as a theologian by his peers, he made a name for himself in 1713 by his book *De l'action de Dieu sur les créatures, traité dans lequel on prouve la prémotion physique par le raisonnement*, a powerful defense of Augustinian-Thomistic ideas. Malebranche, who felt himself and his *Traité de la nature et de la grâce* attacked, considered the work worthy of an answer and replied in his *Réflexion sur la prémotion physique* (1715). Unfortunately, the ensuing polemic claimed all of Boursier's strength, so that he did not find time to realize his plan for a comprehensive work concerning the *gratia efficax.* As a confidant of Noailles and the appellants he composed a respectable number of texts for them, including the appeals documents of 1717, 1719, and 1720 and several of Soanen's pastoral instructions. He also achieved merit as the central figure in the negotiations, initiated with Jubé, the priest of Asnières, and eighteen other professors, which were to bring about a rapprochement with the Russian Orthodox Church.[33] His exclusion from the Sorbonne (1730) was predictable and his death in the parish house of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet, as mentioned above, provoked an incident. An important theologian with a comprehensive patristic as well as Scholastic education, courageous and unselfish, Boursier enjoyed an undisputed authority within the Jansenist party and his intervention was usually decisive. Comparable to him was another professor of the Sorbonne, Nicolas Petitpied (1665–1747), who had expressed his views on the issue of conscience at the beginning of the century and for that reason was forced to flee to Holland. He was a highly respected canonist; in 1718 Saint-Simon had him return to France in order to ask his advice in the matter of the bulls of renewal rejected by Rome. On 1 June 1719, he was readmitted to the Sorbonne. The anti-Jansenist reaction forced him to go into hiding and then again to flee to Utrecht in 1728. As a moderate yet unyielding spirit, he objected to the deviations of the Jansenists and their acts of violence against the hierarchy and because of that was accused of weakness. But his sterling character ensured him of high esteem even on the part of his adversaries and in 1734 the court permitted him to return to France. But his esteem within the party gradually decreased, his intervention against several polemics met with heated criticism. Soanen was the only one who kept him in his confidence and Bossuet of Troyes asked him until the end to write his pastoral instructions for him. His work is considerable: it comprises more than eighty titles, but is submerged totally in his polemics. There are three major works: two volumes entitled *Oboedientiae credulae vana religio* (1708), defending the *silentium respectuosum*; the five volumes of his *Réponses aux avertissements de M. l'évêque de Soissons* (1719–24), a powerful refutation of Languet de Gergy; and the posthumously published *Examen pacifique de l'acceptation de la bulle*. The lucid and prolific intelligence of Petitpied's was able to contribute new and unassailable arguments on a number of ever-recurring problems and many of his writings deserve to be read even today. Along the same lines, albeit of a lesser intellect, the deacon (who also had licentiate from Sorbonne) Jacques Fouillou (1670–1736) deserves mention. He was also prominent in the issue of conscience and joined Quesnel in Holland in 1705. He did not return to France until 1720, where he helped formulate Boursier's *Prémotion physique* and furnished a significant contribution to the famous *Hexaples* concerning the bull *Unigenitus*. But his major work is the three volumes of his *Justification du silence respectueux* (1707). Jean-Baptiste Louail (d. 1724), prior of Auzay, is best known as the author of the first part of the *Histoire du livre de Réflexions morales*, which has already been discussed. The main author of the remainder of the work is Jean-Baptiste Cadry (1680–1756), former teacher of theology at the cathedral chapter of Laon, who also wrote numerous polemics of lesser interest.

---

[32] P. Chételat, *Étude sur Du Guet* (Paris 1877).

---

[33] The documents of this affair are compiled in: *Histoire et analyse du livre de l'action de Dieu*, 3 vols. (n. p., 1753), III.

In the person of Nicolas Le Gros (1675–1751), doctor of theology and canon of Rheims, forced by his quarrels with Bishop Mailly in 1714 to take refuge with Quesnel, we encounter a personality of a different spirit. He returned from his exile after less than a year to resume the fight. In 1716 he brought out the best known of his works, *Du renversement des libertés de l'Église gallicane dans l'affaire de la Constitution Unigenitus.* In it he advocates a very traditional Gallicanism, modified by a few theses of Richer's concerning the rights of the parish priests, whom he calls shepherds just like the bishops. The latter are therefore obliged to act in concert with their priests and to listen to their advice. But he also upholds the rights of the hierarchy. Although he accords to the Christian people the right to elect their bishops and priests, he nonetheless stipulates that this election does not give them the power of consecration or jurisdiction, which they must receive from God through the mediation of the established hierarchy. This starting point leads him to a very subtle theory combining Gallicanism and the position of Richer with great success. An appellant and reappellant, he barely managed to evade a *lettre de cachet* and, following a sojourn in Rome and England, he once again returned to Holland. He joined the Church of Utrecht, to which he was of great service in the years between 1726 and his death. He was one of the first to create close connections between the French Jansenist faction and the Dutch schism. While in Holland he worked on a comprehensive volume, part of which is dedicated to a commentary on the Holy Gospel applying the mode of allegorical exegesis favored in Jansenist circles. Around 1745 the Utrecht Church had a somewhat more burdensome guest in the person of Pierre Leclerc (1706 until approx. 1781), subdeacon of the diocese of Rouen, a strange and in some respects eccentric figure with an obscure past. In 1756 he published two slim volumes under the title *Renversement de la religion et des lois divine et humaines par toutes les bulles et brefs donnés depuis près de 200 ans contre Baius, Jansénius, les cinq propositions, pour le formulaire et contre le P. Quesnel.* In it he develops an exaggerated presbyterianism by equating priests with bishops and insulting the Pope and the hierarchy. The same ideas are repeated in other works in which he called himself another Gilles de Wittes, former priest of Mechelen who also had strong Presbyterian tendencies. He found followers in the Church of Utrecht and created disciples for himself, but for the Jansenist faction both of France and Holland he was a disappointment. In September 1763 the archbishop of Utrecht convened a provincial council in which the parish priests had the same vote as the bishops; this council was strongly protested by Leclerc. Although he published a few more tracts marked by extraordinary vehemence, all traces of him were eventually lost.

In spite of his excesses the personality of Pierre Leclerc manifested the problem of the propagation of Richer's ideas within the Jansenist faction. In the meantime a canonist who possessed the requisite erudition which Leclerc was lacking had given voice to the most daring demands of the lower clergy. This was Nicolas Travers, (1674–1750), a prolific writer and local historian. He became known in 1734 by virtue of his work *Consultation sur la juridiction et approbation nécessaires pour confessor,* followed in 1744 by the *Pouvoirs légitimes du second ordre dans l'administration des sacrements et le gouvernement de l'Église*. He denies the bishops any and all priority of *jura divina,* regarding them as of purely human origin; he also denies them any special power of ordination and advocates that all functions reserved for the bishops can also be delegated to simple priests. From this he draws the conclusion that all priests by virtue of their own ordination receive the power of ordination and of jurisdiction and consequently have no need for an authorization by the local ordinary to hear confessions and to grant absolution validly and licitly. Travers's ideas produced mixed reactions among the Jansenists; they were virtually put on the Index; the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* speaks of the work with contempt and no necrology of the Jansenist party even mentions it. But it is possible that his ideas spread and were actually practiced by some Jansenist priests; at least they are emphatically accused of this by their opponents. Similar theses, but based on a wealth of extraordinary erudition, are found in the large body of works of a lay canonist, the lawyer Guilleaume-Nicolas Maultrot (1714–1803). A specialist in curial law, he tried to prove in a series of twenty-nine volumes the most daring positions of Richer's and the right of the parish priests to jurisdiction on the basis of their ordination. During the second half of the eighteenth century Maultrot met with a relatively favorable response in Jansenist circles and was supported by another renowned lawyer and canonist, Adrien Le Paige.

Among the last great theologians of Jansenism at least three deserve mention. First among them is Jean-Baptiste Le Sesne de Ménilles d'Étemare (1682–1770). He became a cleric at the suggestion of Du Guet and was ordained in 1709. He read one of his first Masses at Port-Royal, shortly before the expulsion of the nuns. Part of his superabundant work is as yet unpublished, a significant part, as we shall see later, is occupied with allegorical exegesis. He took an active part in all the controversies and maintained an intensive correspondence with the entire Jansenist group. In order to retain his independence, he carefully avoided all official titles and functions. He loved to travel, spent time in Rome, England, and frequently visited Holland, where he took up residence in 1754 and died in 1770. In Rhynwick he founded a sort of French seminary under the auspices of the Church of Utrecht, to which he had close ties, leaving to it an admirable collection of documents. D'Étemare was an important spirit with a profound and comprehensive education whose work, though extremely interesting, is never even marred by his allegorical exegesis. Another theologian worth mentioning was a friend of D'Étemare's, Jean-Baptiste Raymond de Beccarie de Pavie de Fourquevaux (1693–1767), a former officer whose modesty prompted him to remain a mere acolyte. The regular correspondence which he maintained with D'Étemare represents an extremely fertile source of information deserving publication. As a confirmed appellant he published several polemics, the most interesting of which is the *Catéchisme historique et dogmatique*. Its first two volumes appeared in 1729; a new edition of 1758 enlarged the work to five volumes. It is a historic presentation of the controversies surrounding the bull *Unigenitus*. Because of its admirable documentation it is in many aspects a valuable source for us. But the horizon of Fourquevaux's presentation is very narrow. Such cannot be said of the third theologian to be mentioned in this context: Pierre-Étienne Gourlin (1695–1775), bachelor of theology, vicar at Saint-Benoît, appellant, and victim of the interdict by Vintimille, which forced him to spend his life in seclusion. He authored several very important polemical works, the best of which is the comprehensive *Mémoire justificatif* (1742; for the appellation of the priests of Sens against Languet de Gergy). He put his pen in the service of several bishops, among others the previously mentioned author of Fitz-James's pastoral instruction against Berruyer. He also left a considerable number of theological treatises in manuscript form; unfortunately, not all of them have been published. But two of the most important ones did appear: *Tractatus theologicus de gratia Christi salvatoris* (1781) and *De Jansenio et de Jansenismo* (1790). At a time when no one was occupied with Jansenism anymore and even Augustinianism had fallen into the background, these two works witness an unusual erudition and a thinking of rare profundity. In the France of this epoch Gourlin is probably the last heir of the great theological tradition. One must acknowledge also that the Jansenist group was at that time the only one in which theological thought remained truly active. Independently of the great controversies, this group was also involved in several other interesting theological disputes. The first of them—concerning the relationships between the *timor servilis* and the *fiducia filialis*—was caused in 1728 by the appearance of Fourquevaux's *Traité de la confiance chrétienne,* attacked by Petitpied in 1734 in nine successive letters but defended by D'Étemare, who in turn was disputed by his fellow member of the Oratory, Mariette. Other controversialists entered the fray until Boursier, in his *Lettre sur l'espérance et la confiance chrétiennes,* finally put an end to the conflict in notable fashion (1739). Petitpied and Boursier also were the protagonists in a controversy concerning the theological virtues (1742–46) in the course of which Boursier wrote a very interesting *Dissertation sur les vertus théologales* (1744) which was primarily directed against a new treatise by his fellow Oratorian Mariette. Unfortunately, all the great minds of Jansenism had already passed away by 1778 when a last great doctrinal controversy broke out involving the *Traité du sacrifice de Jésus-Christ* by Abbé François Plowden, a cleric of English origin who sympathized with the Jansenists. He viewed the essence of the sacrifice of the Mass not in the destructive change of the offering, but in the presentation of a sacrifice made once and for all. The entire Jansenist contingent entered this controversy; the publications in this context deserve a careful investigation.

After 1730 the Jansenist party was irrevocably condemned and it was aware of it. A minority from the start, it now watched its substance gradually melt away without a chance to renew itself. Even the diligence of its members could not deceive anyone about the impending fateful end. The mentality of the group changed progressively: it assumed the attitude of a clan withdrawn unto itself, embittered, full of resentment, belligerent, narrow-minded, suspicious; the tenor of Jansenist polemics became more and more unpleasant. The most significant document in this regard was the famous *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*. During the Council of Embrun (1727) the party had planned establishment of an informational journal which was to replace the hand-copied *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* which had appeared in the seventeenth century. This plan seems to have originated primarily with D'Étemare and two very wealthy Jansenist clerics, Jean-Baptiste and Alexis Desessarts. Du Guet, whose advice had been solicited, responded positively. The editorship was initially entrusted to a deacon, Boucher, and to a chaplain of Bicêtre, de Troya, but the latter was incarcerated a short while later. A few months later Boucher, who continued to collaborate on the journal, handed its direction over to a priest of the diocese of Tours whose Jansenist membership had forced him into exile, Jacques Fontaine de la Roche (1688–1771). The latter quickly demonstrated an extraordinary organizational talent; he built up a network of information and distribution of such perfection that he was able to thwart investigation by the police throughout the century. The first issue of the *Nouvelles* appeared on 23 February 1728. But the authors also published a fascicle reviewing the sequence of events since the issuance of the bull. In the face of all sorts of difficulties Fontaine succeeded in maintaining the weekly appearance of the publication almost without interruption. D'Étemare, the brothers Desessarts, and Fourquevaux were regular contributors, especially noted for the reviews and the doctrinal articles. After the death of Fontaine, his responsibilities were taken over by Marc-Claude Guénin de Saint-Marc, supported by a group which included Gourlin and Maultrot. After 1794 the *Nouvelles* was continued in Utrecht by a refugee priest, Jean-Baptiste-Sylvain Mouton, who reduced it to two issues a month. The last one appeared on 24 May 1803; Mouton died on the following 13 June. The basic tone of the *Nouvelle* is one of incredible vehemence. Everything coming from the appellants is heaped with praise; the slightest utterances by an acceptant or a Jesuit is mercilessly criticized. Reading the journal is simply unpleasant, yet one must acknowledge the extraordinary accuracy of the information used in it. This makes it for us an extremely valuable source. Predictably the *Nouvelles* was subject to repeated condemnations, among them a decree of parliament of February 1731, a pastoral letter by Noailles of April 1732, and a decree by the Holy Office of April 1740. Starting in 1734 the Jesuits tried to counter the *Nouvelles* by their own *Suppléments*, which was by no means any more objective and had to be discontinued in 1748. The *Nouvelles* also reflected the controversies which split the Jansenist milieu. Its vehement tone caused them to be condemned by some of the most famous Jansenist theologians. Du Guet was a case in point: he condemned the *Nouvelles* in a letter (dated 9 February 1732) to a young fellow Oratorian of the Collège de Juilly, Pinel. At the instigation of a niece of Du Guet's, Mme Mol, who was hostile to the Jansenists, this letter was publicized. This resulted in a long series of polemics between D'Étemare and Le Gros. This was also the case with a letter by Petitpied made public in 1735. As a countermove Fontaine welcomed the touching approbations of Soanen and gave them all the desired publicity he could. In addition to the *Nouvelles* there was a wealth of published material the majority of which were pamphlets of the most regrettable satire, some of which, however, are publications of valuable documents, especially the irreplaceable *Journal* by Dorsanne (1753) and the *Anecdotes ou mémoires secrets sur la Constitution Unigenitus* by a member of the Academy, Joseph Bourgoin de Villefore (1744).

On the whole the spirituality of the Jansenist milieu of the eighteenth century continues to be of the intellectual, psychological, and rational kind. The doctrinal reliability of the works it created could not, however, hide the progressive withering coming about as a consequence of its break with the living sources of inner experience. The literary production is more than abundant. Jérôme Besoigne (1686–1763) and René Cerveau (1700–1780), best known as historians, published a considerable number of devotional books. Yet more frequent were reprints or editions of hitherto unpublished works of the seventeenth century. The fourteen volumes of the *Essais de morale* by Nicole came out in incredibly quick succession and were even incorporated in non-Jansenist libraries. In addition, there were the *Instructions chrétienne* by Singlin (1744); about twenty works by the doctor of Port-Royal, Jean Hamon, among them some previously unpublished ones; the interesting *Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles* by Saint-Cyran, which had also been previously unpublished (1744); the *Exercices de piété* of Port-Royal (1787), and many others. Naturally the Jansenists were emphatically antimystical, manifest in the irony with which the *Nouvelles* announced the publication in 1752 of the admirable *Instructions spirituelles en forme de dialogue* by de Caussade. But the main target of the Jansenists was the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.[34] Strangely enough, the people of Port-Royal had frequently talked of the Heart of Jesus devotion in their devotional literature. But in 1729 when Languet de Gergy published a voluminous *Vie de la Vénerable Mère Marguerite Alacoque,* the *Nouvelles* published a malicious review in January 1730 in which the Heart of Jesus, however, was hardly mentioned. Not until 1758 did its opposition to this devotion become apparent. It became more virulent in 1765 when a brief by Clement XIII officially recognized the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Thereupon the *Nouvelles* increased the number of articles rejecting the devotion. In 1781 the most vehement polemicist in the person of Marc-Antoine Raynaud, the priest of Vaux (1717–96), joined the battle, heaping insults and sarcasm upon those whom he called "cordicoles."

The Jansenist faction, nonetheless, must also have been aware of the fascination of the miraculous and irrational. Ever since the famous Miracle of the Sacred Thorn in 1656 most of their representatives were forced to accept the idea that God manifests himself in favor of His cause by means of miracles. Yet miraculous events within the group of appellants did not occur until relatively late. On 31 May 1725, Anne Charlier, the wife of Lafosse was suddenly healed of a chronic uterine bleeding during a sacramental procession in which the appellant priest of Sainte-Marguerite, Jean-Baptiste Goy, was carrying the Blessed Sacrament. Noailles recognized the reality of the miracle in a pastoral letter and the parish of Sainte-Marguerite introduced a service commemorating the event. The appellants, of course, viewed that event as a sign in their favor and hastened to publicize it. They increased the publicity in 1727 when suddenly miracles began to happen at the grave of a well-known appellant, Gérard Rousse, canon of Avenay in the diocese of Rheims. These constant references by the appellants led to a heated polemic between Languet de Gergy and Colbert which at least had one positive result: In a printed letter of 5 February 1727, Colbert published Pascal's thoughts concerning miracles. These were previously unpublished fragments of his unfinished letter about the Miracle of the Sacred Thorn, copies of which were circulating in the Jansenist faction. But the most spectacular events occurred in Paris in the small cemetery surrounding the church of Saint-Médard at the grave of an appellant and reappellant, François de Paris (1680–1727), the eldest son of a rich parliamentary councilor, who had modestly remained a mere deacon. He had lived and worked in seclusion and written a few commentaries on the Holy Gospel and several devotional works. The occasionally frightening asceticism of his way of life and his inexhaustible charity towards the poor had made him famous; his personal holiness cannot be doubted. His funeral on 3 May 1727 was triumphal and there was talk of miracles reputed to have happened at that occasion. Noailles finally ordered an investigation which was interrupted by his death and the unwillingness of his successor to resume it. But the masses continued to come and pray at the grave of François de Paris. Again and again miracles were said to have occurred. But on 3 November 1730, the sensational healing of a certain Anne Lefranc occurred, which was doubted and declared false by a pastoral letter of Vintimille dated 15 July 1731. Additional miracles created great excitement among the public, which now veritably flooded the small cemetery of Saint-Médard.

---

[34] See L. Cognet, "Les jansénistes et le Sacré-Cœur," *Le cœur, Études carmélitaines* (Paris 1950), 234–53.

A short time later another episode began.[35] On 21 July 1731, a poor and almost totally paralyzed servant woman by the name of Aimée Pivert was healed at the deacon's grave and immediately afflicted by violent nervous seizures. During the next few weeks the phenomenon reoccurred with other patients. At the beginning of September a cleric, the Abbé de Bescherand, was seized at each of his visits at the cemetery, his reactions evident to all. This phenomenon proved to be more and more contagious, turning the cemetery into a scene of extraordinary mass hysteria in the course of autumn 1732; soon the discussions of the onlookers degenerated into brawls. Several interventions by the police led to a royal decree on 27 January 1732 ordering the cemetery to be closed and placed under police surveillance. But the convulsions did not cease.[36] They merely assumed a different character. Until then they had been a healing process, but now they turned into a prophetic manifestation. Several people, as a general rule members of the highest society and among them even a brother of Voltaire,[37] had strange meetings at their homes around a crucifix or some Jansenist relic, most often one of Deacon de Paris. Following a period of prayer an individual participant, especially gifted in this manner, fell into a trance and began to prophecy in favor of the appellants while the rest of those present reverently collected and wrote down his words. Among these were some privileged beings, such as the famous Sister Holda, who were given warlike names and considered genuine oracles. The wealth of manuscripts with her prophesies contains, among a lot of verbiage, some beautiful pages.[38] Several participants fulfilled prophetic deeds, others regressed into a childlike state. All of the participants, of course, viewed the phenomenon as a divine sign in favor of the appellation. Then various phenomena of yet another kind occurred. At the end of 1732 several among them in a trance asked the others to beat them or wound them in order to give them relief. This practice spread rapidly and became customary among the convulsionaries. Truly sadistic meetings ensued. A distinction was made between the "small assistance"—beatings with whips, sticks, or wooden trestles—and the "large assistance" or "murderous assistance," for which nails, daggers and swords were used. There were women whose breasts or extremities were pierced, others who were crucified for several hours. What had started as acts of penance became the miraculous manifestation of insensitivity, invulnerability, and sudden healing of injuries. The participants wrote exceedingly accurate reports, many of which were left to us but are hard to judge so long after the events. In many cases fraud or hysteria are easy to distinguish, but in some cases one seems in fact to be confronted by strange and extraordinary phenomena which are hard to understand. In all of this the participants, of course, saw miracles in favor of Jansenism. It is, on the other hand, quite certain that this system of "assistance" which gradually spread over a large part of France made possible a number of moral aberrations and sexual excesses. The abominations happening among the pupils of a certain Abbé Causse, called Brother Augustin, and among those of a certain Vaillant created a tremendous scandal.

---

[35] See P. F. Mathieu, *Histoire des miraculés et des convulsionnaires de Saint-Médard* (Paris 1864).

---

[36] See P. Gagnol, *Le jansénisme convulsionnaire et l'affaire de la Planchette d'aprés les archives de la Bastille* (Paris 1911).

[37] See A. Gazier, "Le frère de Voltaire," *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1 April 1906.

[38] Interesting texts by Marie-Anne Fronteau, called Sœur Holda, have been summarized by L. Silvy: *Extraits d'un recueil de discours de piété sur nos derniers temps*, 5 vols. (Paris 1822).

The authorities tried to restrict the convulsionaries to their homes. Then a royal decree of 17 February spoke against them and their meetings were prosecuted by the police. From 1732 on there were innumerable arrests; the questionnaires kept in the archives of the Bastille furnish a number of interesting details in this matter. Yet the meetings of the convulsionaries continued into the nineteenth century. Such an unsettling phenomenon predictably led to heated conflicts within the Jansenist party, where the positions differed considerably. There were avowed opponents of both the convulsionaries and their assistance. The best known among them was no doubt Du Guet, who died in 1733 and witnessed only the beginnings of it. But his niece, Mme Mol, continued the fight in his name, followed by a number of the great theologians of the party: Fouillou, Boursier, Petitpied, and Gourlin. The expert opinion against the convulsions signed by thirty doctors on 7 February 1735 includes many Jansenists. The most vehement opponent no doubt was Debonnaire, who thundered against the convulsions in a number of pamphlets. By all accord, the one who showed the most common sense was the physician Pierre Hécquet. In his book *Naturalisme des convulsions* (1733) he characterized them as either fraud or sickness. Most characteristic is the case of the bishop of Auxerre, Caylus, who at first recognized the miracles of the deacon François de Paris, but then emphatically turned against the movement of the convulsionaries. The attitude of the Jansenist opponents in this matter naturally furnished a welcome issue to the defenders of the bull, especially to the Benedictine Dom Lataste. Others, while they approved the convulsions as a prophetic manifestation, condemned the so-called assistance as most immoral. This was the position of Colbert, Soanen, D'Étemare, and the *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques*. But there were also some passionate advocates of the so-called assistance, as well as of the convulsions, whose leader apparently was the parliamentary councilor Louis Carré de Montgeron (1686–1754), an atheist who had converted at the grave of F. de Paris on 7 September 1731. As a manifestation of his conviction he wrote a comprehensive work, lavishly illustrated by Restout, *La vérité des miracles opérés à l'intercession de M. de Paris* (1737). He was daring enough to go to Versailles and submit the first volume to the King, whereupon he was interned for the rest of his life. Yet he was able to have the remaining two volumes of his work, which were dedicated to a passionate defense of the convulsions and the assistance, published as well. This strange personality attracted followers such as the brothers Desessarts, the Oratorians Pierre Boyer and Julien de Gennes. The wealth of literature produced by this controversy, which dragged on until the Revolution, is astonishing.

The bull *Unigenitus* posed a difficult problem for the Jansenist party. They considered it totally erroneous in the area of the faith, but were forced to admit that the majority of the Church had recognized it. What then was the state of the promise of infallibility which Christ had given to his Church? The main features of the answer to this question were outlined even prior to 1720, they took on a clear form after 1730: this almost general apostasy of the Church is the sign that the end of time is drawing nigh. This was presaged in the Holy Gospel and the appellants are the small remainder of the steadfast mentioned by the prophesies. This is the cause for the strange eschatological mentality in the Jansenist faction, the expectation of the impending and victorious return of Jesus Christ. Many theologians of the group sought their justification in the Holy Gospel, interpreting it according to the principles of a very specific allegorical exegesis practiced neither by the great theologians of the seventeenth century nor by Quesnel, but whose initial features can be encountered in Pascal. Du Guet's system, which can be called figurism, consists of viewing everything that has happened to the Jewish people as an allegory, a figure of that which is fated for the Church. By this perspective he arrived at the conviction that the end of time had to be preceded by a general conversion of Israel. It is possible that he even managed to convert Bossuet to his ideas around 1682.[39] The exegetic principles of Du Guet's, however, were not published until later, in his *Régles de l'intelligence des Saintes Écritures* (1716), on which his friend D'Asfeld had collaborated. This slim volume also contains an (important) appendix concerning the conversion of the Jews. In the course of his long career Du Guet applied his method to lengthy commentaries on a part of the Bible. For the most part they were not published until the end of his life or after his death. The entire work comprises about fifty volumes, but the text has been emendated several times. These commentaries, whose spiritual aspects often result in some admirable perspectives, enjoyed success even outside of the Jansenist milieu. But in the meantime Du Guet had been passed by his pupils. On 8 April

---

[39] See A. F. Vaucher, *Une célébrité oubliée, le P. Manuel de Lacunza y Diaz* (Collonges-sous-Salève 1941); idem, *Lacunziana* I (Collonges-sous-Salève 1949).

1722, D'Étemare had been present at a conversation about this topic between Du Guet and Charles de Sévigné, son of the famous Marquise de Sévigné, and this talk which converted him to figurism had opened up broad perspectives for him. He followed Du Guet's system to its outer limits and arrived at a point where he viewed the entire Holy Gospel as a chain of symbols concerning the Church, the future of the Jewish people, and the end of time. In it he thought to have found proof that the apostasy of almost the entire Church had to be followed immediately by the conversion of the Jews. In 1723 he started developing his views in several works, primarily in his *Tradition sur la conversion des Juifs* (1724). Du Guet, who held these ideas to be exaggerated, was irritated and criticized them in his conferences. Yet D'Étemare had become popular and found many followers, among them Le Gros, Fourquevaux, and many others. The expectation of the conversion of the Jews to the Christian faith and that of the arrival of Elijah as a sign of the end of time played a significant role in the Jansenist milieu. The convulsionaries spoke of it in their prophesies and the famous/infamous Vaillant called himself Elijah. The apocalypse offered the ideal subject matter for such commentaries, but these were generally so audacious that no one dared to publish them. Those of D'Étemare did not appear until the nineteenth century (1866), those of Le Gros have remained unpublished. D'Étemare clearly expressed the idea that the locusts are identical with the Society of Jesus and Le Gros thought that Babylon represents the Christian and corrupt Rome. In addition, D'Étemare advocated the idea of a "millenium," a spiritual reign of Christ on earth prior to the end of the world. Some of the exegetes attempted by means of calculations, whose perspicacity, however, was again and again deceived, to determine the date of the conversion of the Jews. Today we are hard put to imagine the strange climate of this eschatological expectation which brought about such an incredible volume of writing.

One last feature characterized the Jansenist faction, one that stemmed from its mentality as a minority: its hero cult. Initially its heroes were essentially the great men of Port-Royal, the nuns and friends of Port-Royal. Then towards the end of the century the famous appellants became objects of veneration. Some Jansenists remembered them during Mass on the same level with the canonized saints. Their relics developed into a veritable cult; even the smallest vestiges of bone or clothing were kept in valuable reliquaries. But this veneration is interesting to us primarily because of the preservation and publication of important documents which fortunately were left to us and represent an irreplaceable source. The Church of Utrecht has a collection of documents of incredible abundance the most important part of which is kept at the seminary of Amersfoort, which has possession of it today. Another collection was compiled by Françoise-Marguerite de Joncoux (1668–1715), a loyal friend of the last nuns of Port-Royal, who managed with the help of a Lieutenant Voyer d'Argenson to save the documents confiscated at the destruction of the convent. She also collected a wealth of other items or had them copied. Mlle de Joncoux, who had received an extraordinarily thorough theological education, took an active part in the controversies and in 1699 originated the idea of publishing the *Provinciales,* in which she translated Nicole's Latin annotations into French. During the eighteenth century her work went through fifteen reprints. At her death her collection was left to the Abbey Saint-Germain-des-Pres and is now in the National Library. Another much larger and more complete collection was compiled by Marie-Scholastique de Ménilles de Thémericourt (1671–1745), who had been a pupil at Port-Royal and had close ties to the nuns and their friends. About 1715 she undertook a systematic listing of all historical documents relating to the dissolved convent. She was supported in her task by some devoted friends, such as Mme de Bourdun, the mother of D'Étemare. She could only collect a few of the original documents, but employed several professional copiers who copied and carefully compared all documents which she was able to borrow. Then she put them together into various methodically arranged collections which she then annotated. She also inspired several publications. Later on she added her manuscripts to the rich collection of documents relating to the controversies which was compiled by Adrien Le Paige; the entire collection remained in the possession of the Society of Port-Royal. Several other holdings have been transferred to public libraries without any sizeable losses.

These archives were able to satisfy the needs of Jansenist circles for veneration because they placed at their disposal the works of their heroes and the recollection of the authors of memoirs. According to the custom of the times these publications changed the text to some extent, leaving out what could be troublesome or superfluous; yet they are very informative. A close determination of the conditions under which these editions originated is quite difficult. Some of the collaborators can be identified, such as Michel Tronchay (1666–1733), the former secretary of Tillemont; Claude Goujet (1697–1767), literary figure, historian, and contributor of the *Nouvelles*; Favret de Fontette and Barbeau de la Bruyère. Pierre Leclerc was responsible for the *Vies intéressantes et édifiantes des religieuses de Port-Royal* (1750–52), the *Vies des amis de Port-Royal* (1751), and the curious *Recueil de pièces sur le formulaire* (1754). The production was especially intensive around the middle of the century; thereafter there were hardly any more new editions, proof that interest was gradually lessening. Instead there appeared the *Lettres* of Mother Angélique (1742), the "memoirs" about her written by various nuns, which have become known under the title *Mémoires d'Utrecht* (1742), numerous devotionals by her niece Angélique de Saint-Jean, and the famous *Recueil d'Utrecht*, containing voluminous documentation about Pascal (1740). The great memoirists of Port-Royal were presented to the public: Lancelot and Fontaine in 1738, Thomas du Fosse in 1739. There were several attempts at historical synthesis which, although tendentious in favor of the Jansenists, are nonetheless interesting. The best work is the *Histoire générale de Port-Royal* (1757) by the Benedictine monk Dom Clémencet. Also deserving mention are the somewhat anecdotal work by Jérôme Besoigne *Histoire de l'abbaye de Port-Royal* (1752) and the strange *Mémoires historiques* (1759) by Pierre Guilbert, both full of theretofore unpublished but unfortunately unfinished writings. In 1737 Fouillou published the *Lettres* of Arnauld, but later on this work was relegated to less importance by the monumental edition of the *Œuvres complètes* of Arnauld in forty-three volumes, edited by Dupac de Bellegarde, Larrière, and Hautefage (1775–83) and printed in Lausanne with historically valuable introductions. This remarkable work, no doubt the most important one produced in this field during the eighteenth century, which far surpassed similar ones dedicated to Fénelon and Bossuet, is a testimonial to the collapse of Jansenism.

CHAPTER 21

Spirituality and Its Development in Eighteenth Century-France

Christian Life

In eighteenth-century France the religious energies were for the most part consumed by the Jansenist conflict and its aftereffects. This led to impoverishment in other areas as well. Embroiled in daily battles which left room for only the most immediate questions, even the best minds were unable to recognize that the actual danger was lurking in the growing influence of deist philosophy. On 18 November 1751, a collaborator of the *Encyclopedia,* Abbé Jean Martin de Prades (1720–82), submitted to the Sorbonne several theses inspired by philosophic deism which the syndic Dugard naively found to be "full of nice sentiments in favor of religion." Although parliament reacted soon after, it was only against a contumacious thesis regarding the inequality of the classes. The Jansenist Étienne Gourlin was the only one to attack the problem perspicaciously, making the bull *Unigenitus* responsible for this pervasive blindness. This explains to a great extent the weakness of Catholic apologetics in the century of the Enlightenment.[1]

Spiritual life itself was impoverished because of the crisis of quietism, which for a long time discredited all mystical elements, cutting off Christian piety from its living sources of inner experience. Henceforth psychologizing moralism, whose gradual advance we have already examined, was to triumph. Several authors who were actually part of the seventeenth century had their widest dissemination in the eighteenth century. As mentioned above, this was the case with the great Jansenist moralists: Nicole, Du Guet, and Quesnel; Jean-Jacques Boileau (1649–1735) who sympathized with the Jansenists but was clever enough never to expose himself unduly, also belongs to this group. He was the author of several very conventional devotional books, but above all he was appreciated as a spiritual guide. After his death two volumes of *Lettres sur différents sujets de morale et de piété* (1737–47) were published which really deserve our interest. They are the source for the famous story of the chasm which Pascal constantly thought he saw on his left side.[2] Lastly, it should be remembered that Bossuet also did not become famous as a religious author until the eighteenth century, since his great works in that field *Élévations sur les mystères* (1727), *Méditations sur l'Évangile* (1731), and the *Lettres et opuscules* (1748) were not published until then.

The Jansenist tradition was continued by numerous authors the majority of whom have deservedly been relegated to oblivion. One of the most interesting authors among them was no doubt Paul Collard (1698–1775), superior of the small seminary of Troyes at the time when Bossuet's nephew was bishop there. He was a keen spiritual guide, dedicated to a rigorism that made no concession, author of the posthumously published *Lettres spirituelles* (1784) in which he developed a severe spirituality raised to extremes. Similar qualities are encountered in the historians Jérôme Besoigne (1686–1763) and René Cerveau (1700–1780), who also wrote devotional literature. Their works are doctrinally sound and their devotion to the incarnate word places them among the successors of Bérulle. But their style is dry and artificial, their psychology insufficient and conventional, which makes them hardly worth reading. Similar qualities can be ascertained in several of their non-Jansenist contemporaries.

This situation attests to an undeniable deterioration of the intellectual level while that of Christian practice was maintained—or so it appears—throughout the century. There were villages even in 1788 whose number of inhabitants was determined by attendance at the Easter Communion and where this number was destined to sink almost to zero in 1804, after the concordat. The congregations, especially the contemplative ones, attracted fewer and fewer members; the nadir appears to have been reached around 1765, at the time when the government took up the problem by means of the famous *Commission des Réguliers.*[3] Later on the houses again attracted a greater number of recruits and this increase continued until the Revolution.[4] In this climate new foundations were rare, yet where they were undertaken they were invariably dedicated to teaching or the care of the sick. But the charitable organizations of the laity remained active; the secret "A.A." associations (*Associatio amicorum*) were formed everywhere. The work of the popular missions was continued, ensuring a periodic renewal of parish life. Religious zeal stayed alive to the extent that it made possible the Catholic resistance during the Revolution and the subsequent renewal.[5]

---

[1] See F. Bouillier, "L'abbé de Prades," *Revue politique et littéraire,* 11 October 1884; A. Gazier, *Mélanges d'histoire et de littérature* (Paris 1903).

[2] See A. Durengues, *Monsieur Boileau de l'Archevêché* (Agen 1907).

In addition, we have to call attention to the liturgical efforts in eighteenth-century France. The best example was the initiative by Vintimille, the archbishop of Paris, who provided for his diocese a new missal (1736) and a new breviary (1738), which latter enjoyed a great success. The missal was the work of Mésenguy, an appellant and reappellant; the breviary had been adapted by the Oratorian Vigier, who was sympathetic to the Jansenists. Both books contained admirable Latin poetry in the form of hymns, prose texts, and sequences, among them the older creations of the canon of Saint-Victor, Santeul, and the very beautiful ones by the rector of the university, Charles Coffin (1676–1749), as well as hymns by other authors. The breviary offered a new order of psalter which made its weekly recital possible since the excessively long psalms had been shortened. As we know this was the model for the breviary of Pius X. Although both the missal and the breviary were very controversial, they made their way and were adopted or imitated by many other dioceses.

The Continuance of Mysticism

It would be wrong to assume that the crisis of quietism extinguished mysticism; it merely pushed it to the periphery and almost made it into a secret movement. A detailed examination of the documents shows, for instance, that the number of nuns in the convents who received the grace of mysticism stayed exactly as high as in the preceding century. But whereas it had once been surrounded by an interested environment and almost invariably attracted a biographer, they were now enveloped by silence and secrecy, penetrated only by a few of the initiated. This was true for the Marseille Sister of the Visitation Anne-Madeleine de Rémusat,[6] a champion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus devotion. Her spiritual guide was the Jesuit Claude-François Milley (1668–1720), who died as the result of his caring for the plague-stricken. He did not publish anything during his lifetime, but his very beautiful spiritual correspondence appeared in print not too long ago.[7] To his charges he preached unreserved surrender of the self, disassociation from all temporal ties, the secluded life in God and pure love; thus he continued the great seventeenth-century mystical tradition of the Society. No doubt he was also influenced by Guillore and Surin. In his proximity—although not on his level of teaching and coherence—was Claude Judde (1661–1735), whose *Oeuvres spirituelle* was published posthumously in 1781;[8] he, too, is part of the tradition begun by Lallemant and Surin.

---

[3] See P. Chevallier, *Loménic de Brienne et l'ordre monastique 1766–1789,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959).

[4] See B. Plongeron, *Les réguliers de Paris et les serments révolutionnaires* (Paris 1963).

[5] See P. Mouly, *L'association secrète denommée Aa* (Montgeron, n. d.).

Other congregations furnished just as interesting a contribution. The *Avis sur différents états de l'oraison mentale* by the Dominican Jean-Baptiste Rousseau (d. 1756), which came out after the quietistic crisis, courageously fights for the legitimacy, indeed the necessity of contemplative prayer, manifesting the influence of the great Rhenish-Flemish mystical tradition down to Saint Theresa and Saint John of the Cross. This little but very valuable work unfortunately seems to have remained almost unnoticed. The Pauline Jean-Baptiste-Élie Avrillon (1652–1729), on the other hand, was a well-known preacher, famous spiritual guide, and author of numerous works. His mysticism is primarily characterized by the emphasis on the affective elements of spirituality, but he often speaks openly, if with some reservation, about the passive stages and the unifying life. His most characteristic work in this regard is the *Année affective ou sentiments de l'amour de Dieu sur le Cantique des Cantiques* (1707).

The best religious author of the eighteenth century no doubt was the Jesuit Jean-Pierre de Caussade (1675–1751), who seems to have owed much to the Sisters of the Visitation of Nancy, with whom he resided from 1729 to 1731 and again from 1733 to 1739.[9] He published only one work, the *Instruction spirituelle en forme de dialogues sur les divers états d'oraison suivant la doctrine de M. Bossuet* (Perpignan 1741).[10] In it he undertakes the difficult task of demonstrating that Fénelon and Bossuet concurred in the essential points and that Bossuet was basically a defender of mysticism. To prove his point he referred to a text entitled "Manière courte et facile pour faire l'oraison en foi et de simple présence de Dieu" which had been ascribed to Bossuet by the Sisters of the Visitation of Meaux and which de Caussade published in an appendix. Ironically, it appears that this originally anonymous little work was actually by Mme Guyon. Although de Caussade's argumentation is not totally convincing, his essays on contemplative prayer and the unifying life are most interesting. His correspondents and the Sisters of the Visitation had gathered several collections of his letters on the topic of spiritual guidance. In the nineteenth century Ramière compiled from them the book *L'abandon à la Providence divine* (1861), which gained posthumous fame for Caussade, acknowledged by numerous reprints and a critical edition which appeared quite recently.[11] Caussade shows himself to be heir to the great authentically mystical Ignatian tradition as well as to Salesian influences. It is easily noticeable that he is also indebted to Surin and the Jesuits of the seventeenth century; moreover, Fénelon remains in many aspects his major stimulus. Just like the latter, Caussade wanted to lead man to pure faith and pure love, to guide him in holy indifference to a total devotion to God and to introduce him to contemplation beyond all conceptual and didactic ways. Caussade's remarkable literary talent ranks him among the foremost of the religious authors, a position granted him by our time, whereas in his own time he was scarcely known beyond the circle of his charges.

---

[6] See G. van den Berghe, *Anne-Madeleine de Rémusat* (Paris 1877).

[7] See J. Bremond, *Le courant mystique au XVIII^e^ siècle, l'abandon dans les lettres du P. Milley* (Paris 1943).

[8] See R. Daeschler, "Le P. Judde et la 'tradition mystique,'" *RAM* 11 (1930), 17–36.

[9] See Madeleine Huillet d'Istria, *Le P. de Caussade et la querelle du Pur amour* (Paris 1964).

Aside from him—albeit on a slightly lower level—a few others should be mentioned. The Capuchin friar Ambroise de Lombez (1708–87) was the author of a small *Traité de la paix intérieure* (1757). Reprinted frequently even today, it manifests a very subtle and well-balanced moralism with a discreet mystical quality. The Jesuit Guilleaume Berthier (1704–82) was a defender of the great mystics, especially John of the Cross and Jean de Bernières in his treatises collected under the title *Réflexions spirituelles* (1790). The work of yet another Jesuit of this period, Barthélémy Baudrand, (1701–87), which demonstrates a great wealth of spiritual themes, looses by its prolixity. But towards the end of the century we encounter a truly great author in the Jesuit Jean-Nicolas Grou (1731–1803), who was also influenced by the Sisters of the Visitation. In England, where he was forced to seek refuge in 1792, he composed the major part of his voluminous work, which was not published until the nineteenth century and is read even now. It presents to us in an admirable form a profound mystically oriented doctrine of the inner life. This context also requires mention of Pierre-Joseph Picot de Clorivière (1735–1820) who, although active in the subsequent period, played a significant part in the reconstruction of the Society of Jesus.[12]

---

[10] Reedited by H. Bremond under the title: *Bossuet maître d'oraison* (Paris 1931).

[11] J. P. de Caussade, *Lettres spirituelles,* ed. by M. Olphe-Gaillard, 2 vols. (Paris 1961–64); *L'abandon à la Providence divine,* ed. by M. Olphe-Gaillard (Paris 1966).

Popular Devotions

We have already mentioned that devotions continued to be popular among the people in the seventeenth century, but the educated public took a critical stance towards them, demanding moderation and theological distinctions. Some aspects of the devotion to Mary, especially, were questioned. But the spirited controversy provoked in 1673 by Widenfeld's *Monita salutaria* and continued in 1693 by the pamphlet *De la vraie dévotion à la Sainte Vierge et du culte qui lui est dû* by the Jansenist sympathizer Andrien Baillet barely reached into the eighteenth century. It was simply a case of special caution being applied on this point. But it was precisely this epoch that witnessed the work of Saint Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort (1673–1716),[13] whom posterity has considered one of the great apostles of the devotion to Mary. Yet the question arises of whether (at least to some extent) this might not be a case of optical illusion. His work has been handed down to us under very unsure circumstances. His career, short but checkered, was primarily occupied with his missionary work, in which the devotion to Mary played a significant although not exclusive role. This is the case in the only work he ever published, the *Lettres aux amis de la Croix. L'amour de la Sagesse éternelle,* which he left in manuscript form and the accurate text of which was not published until 1929, is certainly the best of his writings. In it the influence of Suso is combined with that of the Bérulle school, which he received during his education at Saint-Sulpice. But the significance of his *Traité de la vraie dévotion à la Sainte Vierge,* now his best-known work, should not be exaggerated. To be sure, the idea of Marian servitude advocated by him is highly interesting, yet it resumes—in a very personal form—a practice reaching back into the sixteenth century and used by Bérulle. But one must question to what extent Montfort actually disseminated it beyond just a small circle of the initiated. It is certain that the manuscript of the *Vraie devotion* was forgotten after the death of its author. Rediscovered in 1842, it was published a year later and did not find an echo until the nineteenth century. Although the doctrine presented in the pamphlet cannot be faulted, some of its formulations would hardly have permitted its publication in the eighteenth century.

---

[12] See P. de Clorivière, *Prière et oraison,* ed. by A. Rayez (Paris 1961).

[13] See Saint Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort, *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by M. Gendrot et al. (Paris 1966).

The spread of the Sacred Heart devotion within the framework treated here was in fact one of the most significant elements characterizing the eighteenth century. Although it prevailed in the end, it was preceeded by lengthy controversies. We have seen that at the end of the preceding century this devotion had assumed two forms: that of Saint John Eudes, the more theologically oriented form, and the more emotional one of Saint Margaret Mary Alacoque, whose central idea was penance. This latter form was able to prevail very quickly, propagated by the Sisters of the Visitation and the Society of Jesus, who then accorded a central position to the revelations of Saint Margaret Mary and emphasized the painful and human aspect, as symbolized by the human heart of Jesus. These traits appeared very clearly even in the first of the significant works dedicated to this topic, that of the Jesuit Jean Croiset (1656–1738). Published in Louvain, it was very successful, but it was also resisted to the same extent, especially from within the ranks of the Jesuits. In 1704 it was finally placed on the Index. In the meantime another Jesuit, François Froment (1649–1702) had published his *Véritable dévotion au Sacré-Cœur* (1699), in which the theological reasoning is more thoroughly worked out. But the decisive work was written by Joseph de Gallifet (1663–1749), who occupied an especially influential position by virtue of his office as assistant to the Jesuit general in Rome. In 1726 he submitted to the Congregation of Rites a very important memorandum "De cultu sacrosancti Cordis," in which he developed the theological reasons for the devotion, perhaps insisting too much on the heart as the seat of the emotions and on the revelations of Margaret Mary. Prosper Lambertini, the future Pope Benedict XIV, took a stand against him and on 12 July 1727 the congregation gave him a negative reply, reiterated in 1729, concerning the introduction of the celebration of this feast. This did not discourage Gallifet; in 1733 he had a French translation of his work published under the title *L'excellence de la dévotion au Cœur adorable de Jésus-Christ* in which the major part of Margaret Mary's autobiography appeared for the first time.

At about this point a rather important episode occurred in this connection. In 1729 Languet de Gergy, bishop of Soissons and late archbishop of Sens, had published his *Vie de la Vénérable Mère Marguerite Alacoque.* Although at this time the work was attributed to the Jesuits, to whom Languet had merely lent his name, the latter does seem to have been the actual author who had edited the documents placed at his disposal by the convent of Paray-le-Monial. By the criteria of his time the work was not bad. But Languet was then one of the celebrities of anti-Jansenism and the book inevitably provoked the opposition of that group which had earlier been indifferent to the Sacred Heart devotion. This hostility, which we have already mentioned earlier, became especially virulent after 1765. But in view of the progressive weakening of the Jansenist party at that time its opposition had no more than a limited effect, presenting no obstacle to the continued development of the devotion, which was able to spread almost everywhere.[14]

On 26 January 1765 a brief by Clement XIII finally approved a Mass and an office for the Sacred Heart of Jesus for Poland and the Roman archfraternity. This made possible the liturgical devotion wherever there was a desire to introduce it. In 1748 an altar had been dedicated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus at the church of Saint-Sulpice in Paris. On 22 June 1767 a pastoral letter by the archbishop of Paris, Christophe de Beaumont, ordered the feast of the Sacred Heart to be celebrated in his diocese, and several other dioceses followed suit. The polemic now reached its climax. Disregarding it, Fumel, the bishop of Lodève, published a pamphlet *Le cult de l'amour divin ou la dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus* which was violently attacked by the Jansenists. Yet the confraternities dedicated to the Sacred Heart multiplied almost everywhere and attracted followers even among that segment of the aristocracy who remained tied to the traditional religion. This astonishing growth explains the fact that devotion to the Sacred Heart continued to flourish unimpaired even during the Revolution.

---

[14] See L. Cognet, "Les jansénistes et le Sacré-Cœur," *Le Cœur, Études carmélitaines* (Paris 1950), 234–53.

CHAPTER 22

Anglican Spirituality in the Eighteenth Century

The Anglican spirituality of the seventeenth century produced fruitful and manifold impulses. They reflect the essence of a profound but highly intellectual piety tied strictly to the Gospel, best exemplified by Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626).[1] His *Preces privatae* is an admirable collection of poetry compiled from biblical texts and written almost exclusively in Greek. Newman, a great admirer of this work, published its well-known translation in a series of pamphlets by the Oxford movement. Other authors express this sort of piety by poetry of a tender mystical lyricism. This is the case with John Donne (1572–1631), a passionate and complex figure, and more so with the admirable Henry Vaughan (1622–95), some of whose poems, as for example "The Night," remind us of John of the Cross.[2] Yet other poets anticipated pietism, especially the strange Nicholas Ferrar and the Puritan Thomas Goodwin (1600–1680), whose work *The Heart of Christ in Heaven towards Sinners on Earth* (1642) was a precursor to the Sacred Heart devotion.[3] The Platonizing tendency, well developed especially among the educated circles of Oxford, brought forth interesting and curious works, especially those of Henry More. He was under the influence of the esoteric mysticism of Jakob Böhme, who enjoyed great esteem in seventeenth-century England; Charles I had a personal interest in him and had his works translated. One of the most interesting works from the Puritan circles is that of John Bunyan (1628–88), a tinker who became a popular preacher. He achieved lasting fame through his treatise *Grace abounding to the Chief of Sinners* (1666), but even more so through his *Pilgrim's Progress* (1678),[4] expressing a spirituality which—while intellectually meager—is pragmatic and soulful. Even more interesting—by virtue of his position at the periphery of the official Churches—is the case of the founder of the Quaker movement, George Fox (1624–91).[5] His intriguing diary offers a beautiful itinerary of his calling; his numerous spiritual treatises develop an illumination theory sharply opposed to all institutional Churches, but especially to Catholicism.[6] His protégé, William Penn (1644–1719), the founder of the Quaker state of Pennsylvania, was much more tolerant. In his famous treatise *No Cross, no Crown* (1669) he defends the Quaker view of life and does not hesitate to quote an excerpt from the biography of the Baron de Renty by the Jesuit Saint-Jure as proof of his thesis that the soul must concentrate on a point in the sea of destruction.

---

[1] See P. A. Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes* (London 1958).

This quote raises the question of the influence of continental spirituality on Anglicanism. An examination of the total picture shows that this influence was very significant even in the seventeenth century and that it deepened even more during the following centuries. The English public was very much interested in the religious controversies which were stirring up France and frequently interpreted them in an antipapal sense. In general their sympathies were with Port-Royal and the Jansenists, who were viewed as the least corrupted among the Roman Catholics. Numerous texts of Jansenist origin were quickly translated into English, among them the *Provinciales* (1657) and the *Pensées* (1704) by Pascal. In 1669 Theophile Gale published *The True Idea of Jansenism;* based on his stay in France, his work is remarkably well informed and perspicacious. But some other representatives of French spirituality were also highly respected. The Puritan J. Alleine invoked De Renty, just as Penn had. The famous historian G. Burnet (1643–1715), a bishop with latitudinarian tendencies, did likewise. R. Roach, who had at first been a member of the sect of the Philadelphians, inspired by Böhme, and had then become a millenarian, expressed his admiration for the mystics from Francis de Sales to Fénelon (1725).

---

[2] See F. E. Huntchinson, *Henry Vaughan, a Life and Interpretation* (Oxford 1947).

[3] See M. Kyne, "Goodwin," *DSAM* 6 (1966), 601.

[4] See A. Talon, *John Bunyan, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1948).

[5] See P. Held, *Der Quäker George Fox, sein Leben, Wirken, Kämpfen, Leiden, Siegen* (Basel 1953).

[6] See P. Janelle, "Fox," *DSAM* 5 (1963), 770–79.

At the very beginning of the eighteenth century the influence of Fénelon and Mme Guyon in England was indeed very considerable.[7] There was also a noticeable influence of a much less convincing mystic, Antoinette Bourignon (1616–80), who was officially a Catholic but joined a variation of illuminatism, similar to that of the Quakers. While English publicists ironically compared the Quakers with the quietists of the continent, the Quakers themselves devoutly invoked Fénelon, Mme Guyon, and Antoinette Bourignon. Between 1727 and 1738 one of them, Josiah Martin, published translations of Fénelon and Mme Guyon, while Nathanael Hooke, a Catholic sympathizer and friend of Pope's, translated the *Vie de Fénelon* by Ramsay. Personal ties were soon formed. Numerous members of the English aristocracy visited Fénelon at Cambrai, where he had been banished, and Mme Guyon, exiled to Blois after she was set free. Both of them had a profound influence on the Protestant segment of England, especially on the followers of James II in Scotland, where several of their friends were arrested and executed during the rebellion of 1715. The most prominent personality of the Protestant group was André Michel Ramsay (1686–1743), who converted to Catholicism when he was with Fénelon and became secretary to Mme Guyon until her death.[8] A well-known physician from London, John Keith served as a focus for the whole group where all the correspondence converged. Through him Mme Guyon sent a copy of her autobiography to England. This entire group also had great appreciation for Pierre Poiret (1646–1719), a pietist pastor of Calvinist origin, editor of the works of Mme Guyon, Antoinette Bourignon, and of many other mystical texts. Their admiration was, by the way, quite eclectic, extending as it did to Francis de Sales, Pascal, Renty, Olier, Surin, Laurent de la Résurrection, a fellow Carmelite well liked by Fénelon, as well as to a simple Breton servant woman, Armelle Nicolas (1606–71), called the Bonne Armelle.[9]

---

[7] See J. Orcibal, "L'influence spirituelle de Fénelon dans les pays anglo-saxons au XVIII^e siècle," *XVII^e siècle* 12–14 (1951/52), 276–87.

[8] See A. Chérel, *Histoire de l'idée de tolérance: un aventurier religieux au XVIII^e siècle, A. M. Ramsay* (Paris 1926); G. D. Henderson, *Chevalier Ramsay* (London 1952).

The Episcopalian milieu of Scotland was in fact strongly influenced by the mysticism of the continent since a command of French was widespread among the educated. Robert Leighton, originally Presbyterian and then Archbishop of Glasgow, had lived on the continent for a long time and maintained close ties with the Jansenists; like them he favored Augustinianism and had a certain preference for the early Church. In regard to spiritualism his most sincere sympathies were reserved for Francis de Sales, in whom he sought the idea of a preeminent inner religion beyond all dogmatic controversies. His pupil Henry Scongal, before his untimely death at a very young age, was able to publish a small volume oriented along those lines, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man,* whose many reprints attested to its success. Two of his friends, James and George Garden, Episcopalians and pastors in Aberdeen, continued his work. In 1699 James attacked the intransigent dogmatism of the Presbyterians in his *Theologia comparativa,* published by Poiret in a translation. George was initially a pupil of Antoinette Bourignon, but her strange ways worried him a bit and around 1710 when he discovered his ideal in Mme Guyon he embraced the latter's cause with great zeal.

Similar influences were at work in the circle of those clerics who had refused to swear the oath of loyalty to William of Orange after the revolution of 1688. Spiritually and liturgically they formed a very interesting group, asserting themselves until the very beginning of the eighteenth century. They had close ties with French Gallicanism and Bossuet. In 1712 and 1718 efforts were made toward reunion. The pious bishop of Bath and Wells, Thomas Ken, who had a reputation for saintliness, sought his ideal in the Jansenist Nicolas Pavillon and was inspired by Pascal and Saint-Cyran. A member of the group, Francis Lee, translated Fénelon's pastoral letter concerning the love of God in 1715. Thus their ritualistic tendency by no means kept them from making the personal inner life the foremost goal of their efforts.

Among those who had refused the oath of loyalty, William Law (1686–1781) was an interesting personality and a great author. His convictions had forced him to leave Cambridge and he withdrew to the house of the historian Gibbon as tutor of the latter's family. As an author of devotional literature he was strongly influenced by Francis de Sales. While God must be the only object of human activity, he asserted that the Christian can arrive at holiness under all conditions. An expert in German religious thought, he was also influenced by Tauler and the *Theologia teutsch.* This concept of Christian perfection, at once challenging and elastic, is expressed in his two best works, *Treatise of Christian Perfection* (1726) and *Serious Call to a Holy Life* (1728), both of which—though especially the latter—are classics of the Anglican spiritual literature. Around 1733 he made the acquaintance of George Cheyne, a fashionable physician who took a passionate interest in mysticism. He was a friend of Pope's and pupil of the brothers Garden, as well as of the French eccentric Saint-Georges de Marsay. Under Cheyne's influence Law discovered Böhme, whom he learned to admire and through whom he arrived at a unique esoteric position. On the other hand, he severely criticized Antoinette Bourignon and Marsay; yet he consistently respected Fénelon and Mme Guyon.[10] Among Law's friends, John Heylin should be mentioned. He was a teacher at the cathedral school of Westminster Abbey and had lived in France for some time. In 1724 Heylin published *Devotional Tracts concerning the Presence of God and other Religious Subjects,* which includes texts by Fénelon, Mme Guyon, and, above all, Laurent de la Résurrection. In 1721 Heylin also published a translation of the homilies of the pseudo-Macarius, which had a strong influence on Wesley, who was one of his friends. Lastly, we cannot leave the topic of the High Church without making mention of Joseph Butler (1692–1752), bishop of Bristol and later of Durham, author of a work entitled *The Analogy of Religion Natural and Revealed* (1736), remarkable by virtue of its view of conscience and the supernatural which greatly influenced Newman during the latter's youth.

---

[9] See Le Gouvello, *Armelle Nicolas dite la Bonne Armelle* (Paris 1913).

John Wesley (1703–91) and Methodism

Of all the religious currents which were shaping England in the eighteenth century Methodism possessed the greatest vitality. Its founder's family was of Puritan origin; his parents, Samuel and Susanna Wesley, however, had staunchly adhered to the High Church and faithfully kept to its principles in their small parish of Epworth. The parents gave their large progeny of nineteen children an example of piety and learning. Samuel was enthusiastic about the early Church and occupied himself with the works of Bossuet and Arnauld; Susanna had memorized almost the entire translation of Pascal's *Pensées* by Kenneth

---

[10] See M. Grainger, *William Law and the Life of the Spirit* (London 1948); A. W. Hopkinson, *About William Law* (London 1948).

(1704). The example set by his family could not but influence Wesley strongly; he belonged to the High Church until 1737. Later on he reproached himself for indifference in his spiritual life until 1725. At this point he experienced his first conversion, in which he also involved his brother Charles, who appears to have played a prominent role in the subsequent events. This first experience, which prompted Wesley to devote himself entirely to God, was influenced by reading the *Imitation* by Jeremy Taylor and the works of Scongal and Law. As we know, the latter two were very much steeped in the mystics of the continent. Wesley now sought to go back to the sources. Around 1730 he read Francis de Sales, Pascal, Quesnel, and Fénelon. At this time he was also influenced by Heylin in a clearly mystical sense. In 1732 he had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of William Law, but as a person the latter disappointed him.[11] On the other hand, he was still fascinated by the vision of the original Church. He now read *Les mœurs des chrétiens* by the confirmed Gallican historian Claude Fleury (1640–1723), who was a friend of Fénelon's and Bossuet's. At about this time he also read Tillemont and in 1733 he even sought the acquaintance of the latter's translator, Thomas Deacon. Together with his brother and some other fellow students he founded a student society in Oxford, the "Holy Club," where he lectured about his ideas. At that time he discovered the work *Vie de Renty* by Saint-Jure, who was also revered by his father. Its discovery was followed by that of Tauler, Mme Guyon, and Molinos.

In point of fact, Wesley, during the years 1731–36, underwent a severe inner crisis and sought help from the Catholic mystics. Towards the end of this crisis he took part in a missionary expedition to Georgia. But the meager success of this mission caused him great disappointment and affected him profoundly. In the course of this mission he met the Moravian Brethren, pupils of Zinzendorf, who was a strange mystic of illuminism. After his return to England a short time later Wesley initiated personal ties with Zinzendorf. For a time the Lutheran-inspired Moravian Brethren caused him to give primary importance to the idea of justification solely on the basis of faith and the idea that the justification of man is solely the justice of Christ imputed to him.[12] At the occasion of a conference of the Moravian Brethren on 24 May 1738 Wesley heard a reading of Luther's introduction to the letter to the Romans. This became a decisive element, causing his second, his "evangelical" conversion. He felt his heart "strangely warmed" and received the inner conviction that Christ had forgiven his sins and saved him from the law of sin and death. After a short sojourn in Germany, where he visited the communities of the Moravian Brethren, Wesley, supported by his brother Charles and some of his pupils, began to pronounce his ideas by means of open-air or field preaching. To this task he dedicated himself until his death with a courage and stamina that shrank from nothing. He gave about forty thousand sermons, and we also have a considerable number of hymns composed by his brother Charles for those camp meetings. But John Wesley did not want to be a "dissenter" at all. What he actually wanted was to give people a personal religious life within the framework of the established Church and he consistently refused to give up those ties which connected him with official Anglicanism. He was accused of "enthusiasm," meaning an irrational illuminism, and for that reason he encountered strenuous resistance, especially on the part of Joseph Butler. But Wesley did not change his position. He knew how to organize and sweep along his listeners so that soon he had strong groups of followers. He divided them into classes of twelve faithful each who were under the direction of a leader who was responsible for their spiritual progress. These firm and clearly delineated structures impressed public opinion; hence the name "Methodism," initially given to them somewhat scoffingly. As a matter of fact, the activities of Wesley and his group had the effect generally of raising the social and human level of his followers, having a positive and beneficial influence on English society.

---

[11] See J. B. Green, *John Wesley and William Law* (London 1948).

[12] See J. E. Rattenbury, *The Conversion of the Wesleys* (London 1937).

Early on Wesley apparently started to keep a diary whose entries as of 1735 have come down to us, still partly unpublished. Aside from being a fascinating document concerning his travels and sermons, it also offers us a spiritual experience of rare quality, some points of which, however, remain obscure. It is, for example, not easy to find out why Wesley in 1736, towards the end of his crisis, turned against the same mystics from whom he had sought help and solace before. He reproaches them for their excessive desire to isolate the Christian in solitude and for their attempt to reinterpret the inner trials as constituting grace while he saw in it nothing but a sign of God's anger. His brother Charles, although his confidant, did not follow him in this. As we shall see, Wesley later on changed his position without, however, expressly revoking it and included the mystics in his anthologies. At any rate, it is certain that his experience of 24 May 1728 was not the last of his spiritual trials; his state of depression lasted for several months until he regained his inner peace. Several commentators think that this is proof enough for questioning the actual significance of that experience. But the value which Wesley himself gave to it contradicts this interpretation. There can be no doubt that the analysis of his own case led him to put his "evangelical" experience on a much less sentimental level than some of his successors did and to put it manifestly in the area of a moral decision.

Thus Wesley arrived at very complex points of view regarding certain Protestant positions. He had always been an opponent of the Calvinist idea of predestination and on this point he soon contradicted his pupil Whitefield. But to the extent in which he became aware that conversion had to be translated into a challenge within practical life he rejected the Lutheran idea of justification solely through faith and without good works. No doubt he held the opinion that Christ is the sole savior and that man is saved only by believing in Him. On this point he completely shared the Christocentricity of the Moravian Brethren, but without accepting its sentimental and pious aspects. More and more he arrived at the conviction that faith could be given valid expression only through works. Luther's commentary on the letter to the Galatians and his reflection on the letter of James which Luther called an "epistle of straw" seemed blasphemous to him. At the same time he began to reject the idea of imputed justice as absurd. On this point he was contradicted by the Moravian Brethren and Zinzendorf; he conferred with the latter on 3 September 1741, but their talk was disappointing because each persisted in his position. Shortly thereafter Wesley encountered similar resistance from some of the members of his own movement.

Yet his ideas continued to develop in this direction. More and more he arrived at the conviction that justification had to be connected with a progressive sanctification through man, a sanctification achieved through his own efforts under divine grace, leading man to a genuine moral progress. In his eyes, faith acted through love and love was developed through deeds. Factually he drew away farther and farther from the positions of Protestantism while approaching traditional Catholic ethics; from this he unhesitatingly drew the moral consequences necessary for the actual ministry. Once he did this, he encountered the problem of creating the instruments and aids for his faithful which they needed on this path towards perfection. For this purpose he published the fifty volumes of his *Christian Library* (1750–56), a collection of spiritual anthologies to which more volumes of the same genre were added later on.[13] Its very eclectic selection is highly significant. Naturally the English and among them the Anglicans are most prominently represented, but there are also many Puritans whose seriousness and Christocentrism Wesley appreciated. There are some German Pietists, especially Arndt. The Spanish are represented by John of Ávila, Gregor López and Molinos. Because of their exclusively mystical orientation, Wesley did not include Saint Teresa and Saint John of the

---

[13] See J. Orcibal, "Les spirituels français et espagnols chez John Wesley et ses contemporains," *RHR* (1951), 50–109; idem, "L'originalité théologique de John Wesley et les spiritualités du continent," *RH* (1959), 51–80.

Cross. The French are heavily represented with Laurent de la Résurrection, Fénelon, Mme Guyon, Antoinette Bourignon, Saint-Cyran, Pascal, Du Guet, De Renty, and Armelle Nicolas. In his selection Wesley seems to have been inspired by similar anthologies of Pierre Poiret, although he limited the proportion of mystics.

In such a perspective the spirituality of John Wesley, without loosing its elasticity, gradually reassumed the moral and even pragmatic shadings which were given a rare communicative value by virtue of his eloquence. Of course he encountered the spirited resistance not only of the Calvinists, who accused him of giving man the possibility of saving himself by his own power, but also that of the established Church, which he stirred from its lethargy by reminding it emphatically of the urgency of its apostolic task. But it must also be admitted that he developed, especially towards the end of his life, a certain indifferentism towards the strictly dogmatic aspects by moderating their severities and lessening their significance. This point of departure, to be sure, enabled him to create an attractive, albeit fragile, synthesis between the Protestant doctrine of grace and the Catholic ethic of sanctification. The respectable spread of Methodism after Wesley's death attests to the vitality of the spiritual enthusiasm he created. But the Calvinist orientation of many of his disciples shows how difficult it was to maintain that doctrinal balance for which Wesley had hoped.[14]

---

[14] See H. Lindeström, *John Wesley and Sanctification* (Uppsala 1946); C. G. Cell, *John Wesley's Theology* (Cokesbury 1950).

CHAPTER 23

Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire from the Middle of the Seventeenth to the End of the Eighteenth Century

Practical Episcopalism from the End of the Seventeenth to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century

The roots of the seventeenth and eighteenth-century episcopalism of the Church of the Empire extend back to the late Middle Ages.[1] Spanning the Council of Trent and the Reformation, it tied in with the reaction against papal claims in the late Middle Ages, with the church reform movement of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Councils of Constance and Basel and the prereformational *gravamina.* As a practical episcopalism it initially based its claims concerning beneficiary rights, episcopal jurisdiction, and payments to the Curia on the Concordat of Vienna of 1448. Using the controversial clause "In aliis autem" (buttressed by historical research) as its point of departure, episcopalism next extended the basis of its claim to the Princes Concordats of 1447, which were acknowledged in the above clause and were much more advantageous to the Church of the Empire. Finally it advanced as a rationale the Mainz Acceptation of 1439, comparable to the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, the basic law of the Gallican Church. After 1762 the episcopalism of the Church of the Empire viewed as its basic law and program the Basel Decrees accepted in Mainz.[2] The attempt to reform the Church's constitution in favor of episcopalism, simultaneously changing the ecclesiastical principalities into modern, enlightened absolutist states on a Catholic foundation was shaky from the start. It was to be brought about by reviving the decrees of the Council of Basel; in some places there was even talk of overcoming the religious schism. This attempt, however, was immediately countered by more than three hundred years of ecclesiastical and imperial history; it was full of inner contradictions and doomed to failure by the empiric-historic method it was based on.

---

[1] L. Mergentheim, "Die Wurzeln des deutschen Febronianismus," *HPBl* 139 (1907), 180–92; H. Raab, *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae* (Wiesbaden 1956); A. Werminghoff, *Nationalkirchliche Bestrebungen* (Stuttgart 1910); F. Vigener, "Gallikanismus und episkopalistische Strömungen," *HZ* 111 (1913), 495–581.

The Council of Trent had created decisively positive as well as negative conditions for the revival of episcopalism a century after its last sessions. The less the ecclesiastical territories were threatened in their existence and the more the prince-bishops concentrated on their ecclesiastical and political tasks,[3] the more frequent were the quarrels with the papal nuncios in Cologne, Vienna, Lucerne, and with the Roman Curia about violations of the Vienna Concordat, the archiepiscopal indults for the papal months, quinquennial faculties, the jurisdiction of the nunciatures, annates, confirmation fees, pallium payments, exemptions, and decimations.[4]

---

[2] H. F. Hürten, "Die Mainzer Akzeptation," (unpubl. diss., Münster 1955); H. Raab, *Concordata,* 125 ff.

[3] The archbishop of Salzburg, Wolf Dietrich, had already prepared the theory that he was a prince of the Empire holding the archdiocese as a vassal of the Emperor. As a prince, he asserted, he was not subject to the authority of the Pope and would furthermore remain a prince even if he resigned as bishop (F. Martin, *Salzburgs Fürsten in der Barockzeit* [Salzburg 1966], 36).

[4] W. Michel, *Das Wiener Konkordat vom Jahre 1448 und die nachfolgenden Gravamina des Primarklerus der Mainzer Kirchenprovinz* (diss., Heidelberg 1929); L. Mergentheim, *Die Quinquennalfakultäten pro foro externo* (Stuttgart 1908); A. Franzen, "Eine Krise der deutschen Kirche im 17. Jh.?" *RQ* 49 (1954), 56–111.

In the first decades after the Treaty of Westphalia, leadership of the opposition in the Church of the Empire was represented by the elector-archbishops of Mainz and Cologne, Johann Philipp von Schönborn[5] and Max Heinrich von Bayern. In his capacity as lord chancellor of the Empire, Johann Philipp considered it his foremost task to watch over the liberties and rights of the German nation. As archbishop of the *Metropolis Germaniae,* concerned with the reform of the higher and lower clergy, he complained in 1648 about the diminution of his ordinary rights by the Cologne nunciature. He was confirmed in his hostility to the nunciature by his political and Gallican views as well as by the unionist intentions and anti-Roman sentiments on the part of several of his advisers, especially the convert Johann Christian von Boineburg.[6] For the Cologne elector Max Heinrich, whose heated disputes with Johann Philipp concerning the right of coronation had been resolved in the so-called Coronation Tractate of 1657,[7] there were several causes for the outbreak of tensions with Rome in 1659. Among them were theological and canonical misgivings regarding the direct interference of the nuncios, especially those of Cologne and Liège, with their idea of the special rights of a "born legate of the Holy See"; the influence of his favorite, Franz Egon von Fürstenberg, who was oriented towards the Gallican model; and, most importantly, the Wittelsbach church policy.

In this regard it should be stressed that nine years earlier, in 1650, the election of the very pious, yet weak Max Heinrich in Münster had been rejected by Christoph Bernhard von Galen because Max Heinrich "was too much a cleric to be a good ruler and general as demanded by the times."[8] When his brother Albrecht Sigismund planned to resign,[9] he sought to succeed him in the bishopric of Freising, although he already held the Cologne electorate and the prince-bishoprics of Hildesheim and Liège; as far as political power was concerned Freising was insignificant. With some justification it was later designated as "our parish" by the elector Max Emanuel.[10] With only two interruptions, the Wittelsbach dynasty ruled the prince-bishopric from the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century. But it was an "arcanum" of Freising politics in no case ever to separate from the Emperor and the Empire. One of the goals of the Wittelsbach church policy had always been to unite Freising in a personal union with either the old Bavarian bishopric of Regensburg or the ecclesiastic secundogeniture in the northwest German *Germania Sacra,* founded by Duke Ernst. In addition to Max Heinrich, the other candidates for Freising were Cardinal Friedrich of Hesse,[11] Franz Egon von Fürstenberg, and the prince-bishop of Osnabrück and Regensburg, Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg, progeny of the marriage of Duke Ferdinand of Bavaria to a commoner.

---

[5] G. Mentz, *Johann Philipp v. Schönborn. Kurfürst von Mainz, Bischof von Würzburg u. Worms 1605–73* (Jena 1899) 172 f.; re. Johann Philipp see also *LThK* IX (1964), 451 and biblio.

[6] *NDB* 2 (1955), 424 f.; St. v. Dunin Borkowski, "Aus der Briefmappe eines berühmten Konvertiten des 17. Jh.," *StdZ* 105 (1923), 132–47. The following quote from a letter by Boineburg to Hermann Conring (23 January 1659) is characteristic: "Let the Romans hate us, as long as they fear us."

[7] G. Mentz, *Johann Philipp* II, 20 f.; A. M. Reitzel, *Das Mainzer Krönungsrecht und die politische Problematik* (Mainz 1963); G. Wallner, *Der Krönungsstreit zwischen Kurköln und Kurmainz* (1653—57) (diss., Mainz 1967).

[8] W. Kohl, *Christoph Bernhard von Galen. Politische Geschichte des Fürstbistums Münster 1650–1678* (Münster 1964), 3.

[9] Albrecht Sigismund had been elected coadjutor of Freising at the age of sixteen; he was religious and without blemish. Upon entering his office he applied for dispensation from consecration (H. E. Feine, *Die Besetzung der Reichsbistümer vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zur Säkularisation* [Stuttgart 1921; reprint, Amsterdam 1964], 35, 38f.).

But Pope Alexander VII refused to accept Albrecht Sigismund's resignation unless the Holy See were granted the unreserved right to the new appointment; he withdrew the election rights from the Freising chapter and ordered the nuncio to thwart the election of the Cologne elector.[12] These differences, stemming from the policies of the Wittelsbach imperial Church were intensified by the failure of Max Heinrich's designs on Paderborn, because of the quarrels covering the quinquennial faculties and the archiepiscopal indults to fill the benefices becoming vacant during the papal months. In the fall of 1660—probably on the advice of his minister Franz Egon von Fürstenberg, who was hostile to Rome—Max Heinrich suggested the convocation of a national council to counter the presumptiousness of the Holy See and the abuses in the Church of the Empire.

According to the Vienna nuncio, this was to be accompanied by the reunion project, the so-called "Mainz Plan," propagated in September 1660 by Frankfurt.[13] Its goal was said to be the reunion of the Church into a national Church achieved by means of far-reaching concessions to the Protestants. One year later, in November 1661, the Cologne nuncio, Marco Gallio, declared that he had heard of a plan of an intended union between the three ecclesiastical electors in order to "realize an absolute power of disposition over all church benefices, independent of Rome."[14]

[10] B. Hubensteiner, *Vom Geist des Barock. Kultur und Frömmigkeit im alten Bayern* (Munich 1967), 37.

[11] F. Noack, "Kardinal Friedrich von Hessen. Großprior in Heitersheim," *ZGObRh* 80 (1928), 341–86.

[12] A. Franzen, *Krise der deutschen Kirche,* 87 f.; A. A. Levinson, "Nuntiaturberichte vom Kaiserhofe Leopolds I.," *AÖG* 103 (1913), 667ff.

[13] See Chap. 27 : "Attempts at Church Reunion."

[14] A. Franzen, *Krise der deutschen Kirche,* 103.

At the Imperial Diet in Regensburg violent attacks against Rome were to be expected. According to testimony by the Salzburg archbishop Guidobald von Thun, the elector-archbishop of Cologne intended "di costituire un patriarca in Germania e di costituire o almeno d'introdurre nel clero dell'imperio la prattica e lo stilo della chiesa Gallicana."[15] The compromise, achieved by conciliatory action of the Pope, was of short duration. In 1665 the Diet and the Supreme Court in Speyer unequivocally opposed the practice of appeals to the Pope and the nuncios in trials concerned with temporal matters.

A first climax in the opposition by the Church of the Empire is the *gravamina* of the three Rhenish elector-archbishops in 1673.[16] Max Heinrich, elector-archbishop of Cologne and prince-bishop of Liège and Hildesheim; Lothar Friedrich von Metternich, elector-archbishop of Mainz and prince-bishop of Speyer and Worms; and Karl Kaspar von der Leyen, elector-archbishop of Trier formally protested the violations of the Vienna Concordat concerning the freedom of episcopal elections, the annates, and the right of appointing beneficiaries. They demanded that the Curia respect the indults granted the archbishops when the Vienna Concordat was accepted and, further, that the German Church not be placed at a disadvantage compared to the French and Spanish Church.

Nor was there any lack of complaints in the future about violations of the concordat and interferences by the nuncios in the ordinary episcopal jurisdiction. When Archduke Joseph was elected Roman King (1690), the electorate of Trier moved to renew the formulation of *gravamina* against the Holy See. The pertinent article of the electoral capitulation,[17] which had bound even Ferdinand III in 1654 to remove jurisdiction in temporal matters from the nunciatures and the Roman Curia and to insist on the observance of the concordat, had been discussed again and again. At the election of Charles VI in 1711 that article was reformulated as ARTICLE XIV, remaining valid until the time of Leopold II. A "language quite corresponding"[18] to the Punctation of Ems in 1786 appeared in a complaint by the *Corpus Evangelicorum* as early as 1703, when it intervened in the quarrel that began in 1699 between the Roman Curia and the cathedral chapter of Münster concerning the appointment to the provostship. Similar conflicts ensued between the Curia and the cathedral chapters of Worms and Constance.[19] The episcopal attitude of the Mainz chapter during the waning seventeenth century, hostile to the nunciatures, is sufficiently characterized by the remarks of the Cologne nuncio Buonvisi: "Non essendoci niuno provisto dalla Santa Sede, non vi è chi voglia havere corrispondenza col Nuntio."[20] Elector-Archbishop Lothar Franz von Schönborn resolutely opposed all attempts on the part of the Cologne nunciature to communicate officially with Mainz or Bamberg, since "neither the archbishopric of Mainz nor the local bishopric (Bamberg) are located within the boundaries of his legation, but are both *ab omni nuntiatura* free and directly subject to the Holy See."[21]

---

[15] Caraffa, Regensburg, 26 Dec. 1663 quoted in A. Levinson, *Nuntiaturberichte,* 763.—G. Mentz (*Johann Philipp,* 184) mentions demands to convoke a combined German-French council towards resisting the presumptions of the Holy See.

[16] The *Gravamina* of 1673 in Gärtner, *Corp. jur.* II (1799), 322f.; F. J. Buß, *Urkundliche Gesch. des National- und Territorialkirchentums in der kath. Kirche Deutschlands* (Schaffhausen 1851), 702–10; H. Raab, *Concordata,* 67; concerning Lothar Friedrich, successor of Johann Philipp von Schönborn, elected with the help of the French, see M. Braubach, "Politische Hintergründe der Mainzer Koadjutorwahl von 1670," *RhVjBl.* 15/16 (1951), 313–38; also in M. Braubach, *Diplomatie und geistiges Leben im 17. u. 18 Jh.* (Bonn 1969), 43–77; on Max Heinrich, see A. Franzen, *Krise der deutschen Kirche* (with biblio.) and M. Braubach, *Kurkölnische Miniaturen* (Münster 1954), 1–24; concerning Karl Kaspar von der Leyen, see P. Pillorget, "La France et l'Électorat de Trèves au temps de Charles Gaspard de la Leyen (1652–76)," *Revue d'histoire diplom.* 78 (1964).—It is noteworthy that none of the elector-archbishops advocated the same political line. The archbishop of Trier was one of the most reliable followers of the Emperor. Metternich was expected to fix Mainz more firmly into the French system. Max Heinrich was weak and unreliable; under Fürstenberg's influence he tended towards France.

For a time it might have seemed as though Lothar Franz von Schönborn[22]—after his uncle Johann Philipp the second prominent lord chancellor of the Empire from that family which for three generations determined the episcopal history of Germany—would place himself at the head of the aspirations for a national Church. The relationship between the Rhenish archbishops and the Cologne nunciature deteriorated "to the outer limits of tolerance"[23] as a result of the proscription of Elector Joseph Clemens von Bayern, the most recent armed conflict between the Emperor and the Pope involving Comacchio, the execution of the controversial *preces primariae.* and, finally, the *Privilegium illiminatum de non appellando* granted to the electorate of Trier. As the executor of "First Prayers" and uncle of the imperial vice chancellor Friedrich Karl von Schönborn,[24] who with Joseph I was held responsible for the latter's anti-Roman policy (dictated by specific Habsburg interests), Lothar Franz was made to feel Rome's irritation at his coadjutor election in Bamberg and the demanded recantation. He found himself in a very delicate situation between the Emperor and the Pope. Yet in spite of his episcopal antipathy towards Rome and his patriotism for the Empire he did not permit himself to be made a tool of Josephinist church policy. This emerging dilemma of episcopal Germany caught between the Pope and the Emperor, or rather between Rome and Vienna, was at the same time aggravated by differences with the Catholic lay princes, as in the case of Elector Palatine Karl Philipp (from 1731 to 1734),[25] who managed—against the resistance of the prince-bishops—to shift their oppressive tax burdens onto the Church, thanks to papal indults. Practical episcopalism, even before it was provided with a sufficient theoretical foundation, was confronted at the beginning of the eighteenth century with the same constellation of forces which had frustrated it earlier in the fifteenth century.

---

[17] F. Hartung, "Die Wahlkapitulationen der deutschen Kaiser und Könige," *HZ* 107 (1911), 306–44; idem, *Volk und Staat in der deutschen Gesch.* (Leipzig 1940); G. Kleinheyer (*Die kaiserliche Wahlkapitulation. Gesch. Wesen und Funktionen* [Karlsruhe 1968]; does not deal with this problem.

[18] *Mainzer Monatsschrift von geistlichen Sachen* IV (1788), 420–23; H. Raab, *Concordata*, 68; F. Keinemann, *Das Domkapitel zu Münster im 18. Jh.* (Münster 1967), 85ff.

[19] K. Wild, *Lothar Franz von Schönborn. Bischof von Bamberg u. Erzbischof von Mainz 1693–1729* (Heidelberg 1904), 154.—For the provision by the Swiss A. S. Reding which led to a lengthy conflict between the bishop and the cathedral chapter of Constance on one side and the Roman Curia, the nunciature of Lucerne, and the Helvetic Confederation on the other, see R. Reinhardt, *Die Beziehungen von Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz zu Habsburg-Österreich in der Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden 1966) 75f. The German party urged a settlement in Mainz where the "customs" of the German Church were well known and sought to obtain "as a matter of principle the imperial court or at least an ecclesiastic trial court in Germany as the place of venue for all disputes concerning aristocratic origin in the Church of the Empire." Emperor Leopold, in order to protect the imperial-Austrian position in the Lake Constance area against the influence of France and the Helvetic Confederation, emphatically took the part of the cathedral chapter.

[20] Buonvisi to Paluzzo-Altieri, Cologne, 2 Nov. 1670. F. Diaz, ed., *Francesco Buonvisi. Nuntiatura a Colonia* I (Rome 1959), 86.

[21] H. Weber, "Die Privilegien des alten Bistums Bamberg," *HJ* 20 (1899), 40, 634; A. Veit, "Die Kölner Nuntiatur und der Mainzer Hof," *HPBl* 167 (1921), 208–16.

The Canonical and Theological Foundation of Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire

The political-ecclesiastical opposition within the Church of the Empire against Rome, notwithstanding its severity in the first third of the eighteenth century, lacked a real theological and canonical foundation; it was only peripherally touched by the Enlightenment and not at all by theological rationalism. Only occasionally did such opposition arise because of the striving by ecclesiastical principalities for an order corresponding to their dual function within Church and Empire. Since the "evolution of Austria from the Empire" and the strengthening of the established Church within the monarchy the opposition could only occasionally rely on the Emperor as the *Advocatus Ecclesiae,* as the *Vindex canonum.* Aside from such occasions as the rejection of Gregory VII's "Offizium," the false "Hildebrandism," and "ultramontane"[26] principles practiced too openly, an appreciable reaction among the faithful occurred only during the conflict involving the Munich nunciature or the Udligenschwyl dispute. The episcopalism of the Church of the Empire can only vaguely be compared with Gallicanism. Even in its most radical utterances it never put in doubt the unity of the Church; it never strove for a German national Church, but merely for the securing of its rights and liberties.

---

[22] See *LThK* IX (1964), 452; H. Reifenberg, "Lothar Franz von Schönborn und die Liturgie im Bistum Bamberg," *103. Bericht des Histor. Vereins für die Pflege der Gesch. des ehemaligen Fürstbistums Bamberg* (Bamberg 1967), 419–66.

[23] K. Walf, *Entwicklung des päpstlichen Gesandtschaftswesens.* 151.

[24] H. Hantsch, *Reichsvizekanzler Friedrich Karl von Schönborn:* M. Braubach, "Friedrich Karl von Schönborn und Prinz Eugen," *Festgabe für H. Hantsch* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1965), 111–31; also M. Braubach, *Diplomatie und geistiges Leben im 17. und 18. Jh.* (Bonn 1969), 301–20.

[25] H. Duchhardt, *Philipp Karl von Eltz. Kurfürst von Mainz, Erzkanzler des Reiches (1732–1743)* (Mainz 1969), 119f.

Efforts towards a justification of practical episcopalism based upon canon law and theology did not start until the end of the seventeenth century under the impact of the conflicts between Louis XIV and Innocent XI, the growing particular differences with the nuncios and Rome and with the acceptance of Gallican and Jansenist ideas and those concerning an enlightened established Church.[27] One of the pioneers of German church freedoms, the Protestant canonist Johannes Schilter, was indebted to Petrus de Marca in his work *De libertate ecclesiarum Germaniae,*[28] written one year after the *Declaratio Cleri Gallicani.* It contains the germ of Febronianism, intending to prepare the way for a reunification of the denominations by means of a reduction of the papal primacy of jurisdiction and the abandonment of the doctrine of papal infallibility. By its glorification of the medieval imperial power it reinforced the anti-Roman tendencies in the Church of the Empire. Episcopal, established Church, and Jansenist ideas were assimilated into the Church of the Empire from the theories of Zeger-Bernard Van Espen,[29] who published his pioneering *Jus ecclesiasticum* in 1700. The decisive stimuli for the canon law of the Empire and the theoretical justification of German episcopalism in the second third of the eighteenth century emanated from the Schönborn sphere of influence, even though the later Mainz suffragan bishop Schnernauer, during the years of feud between Cardinal Damian Hugo von Schönborn and his metropolitan, developed ideas which almost anticipated the Koblenz and Ems Punctations.

---

[26] H. Raab, "Zur Gesch. und Bedeutung des Schlagwortes 'ultramontan' im 18. und im frühen 19. Hh.," *HJ* 81 (1962), 159–73.

[27] For Bossuet's influence on Febronius, see J. Kuntziger, op. cit., 30, 40f. As yet a history of the reception of Bossuet in the Church of the Empire is lacking. Some references in this connection in H. Raab, *Concordata,* 64, 157. In the announcement of Bossuet's defense in the *Mainzer Monatsschrift* IV (1788), 496f., we find the following: ". . . daß dieses treffliche Buch an recht vielen Orten seine gesunden und wahren Grundsätze verbreite, curialistische Maßnahmen und den gesamten Isidorischen Sauerteig verbannen helfe."—On Jansenism in Germany, see the following work, which, while very much in need of updating, is still of primary importance: W. Deinhardt, *Der Jansenismus in deutschen Landen* (Munich 1929); also L. Just, "Die Bekämpfung des Jansenismus in der Erzdiözese Köln unter Josef Clemens (1703)," *AHVNrh* 136 (1940), 131–38; idem, "Der Trierer Weihbishchof Johann Mathias v. Eyss im Kampf gegen den Jansenismus (1714–1729)," *AMrhKG* 11 (1959), 160–89; H. Tüchle, "Die Bulle Unigenitus und die süddeutschen Prämonstratenser," *HJ* 74 (1955), 342–50; H. Raab, "Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels und der Jansenismus," *AMrhKG* 19 (1967), 41–60.

[28] J. Schilter, *De libertate ecclesiarum Germaniae libri* VII (Jena 1683); H. Raab, *Concordata,* 71ff. and Chap. 27 of this volume.

Among the professors at the seminary and university at Würzburg, where the former vice-chancellor Friedrich Karl von Schönborn had been rector since 1734, was a former pupil of Lambertini's, Johann Kaspar Barthel.[30] He was celebrated by his contemporaries as the prince of canonists and oracle of his century. In accordance with the charge by his bishop and ruler he taught a canon law which, adapted to the special German conditions, was at variance from what was taught in Rome. As the future Würzburg suffragan bishop Gregor Zirkel wrote in 1794, Barthel taught "the German Church to feel its rights and independence."[31] He contradicted the Jesuits and the Roman Curia with "German frankness," transplanted principles of French canonists to Germany, exposed Roman policies from history and thus created as many opponents to Rome as he had listeners. Barthel rejected an absolute form of governance by the Church for theological, historical and ecclesiopolitical reasons. According to him the doctrine of papal primacy should distinguish between *essentialia,* based on divine right, and *accessoria,* acquired by prescriptive right and historical development ("Olim non erat sic"). Papal primacy has not been granted "in destructionem sed in aedificationem ecclesiae" and could be limited in the interest of harmony between *imperium* and *sacerdotium.* The independence, coexistence, and orientation of ecclesiastical and temporal power towards a common goal makes it difficult, says Barthel, to delimit the authority and rights of the two since from the fulfillment of a common divine mandate grows the "quasi confusio" of ecclesiastical and temporal laws; from necessary mutual subordination arises the obligation to create harmony between Church and state.

---

[29] G. Leclerc, *Zeger-Bernard van Espen (1648–1728) et l'autorité ecclésiastique. Contribution à l'histoire des théories gallicanes et du jansénisme* (Zurich 1964).

[30] H. Raab, "Johann Kaspar Barthels Stellung in der Diskussion um die Concordata Nationis Germanicae," *Heropolis jubilans* (Würzburg 1953), 599–616; idem, *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae,* 79–96; idem, *Neller und Febronius.*

[31] A. F. Ludwig, *Weihbischof Zirkel von Würzburg in seiner Stellung zur theologischen Aufklärung und zur kirchlichen Restauration* I (Paderborn 1904), 91.

The episcopalism of the Barthel school,[32] following the lines of the Schönborn sphere of influence, spread from Würzburg to the ecclesiastical states on the Main and Middle Rhine and from there to Bonn, Cologne, Salzburg, and to almost all the Catholic universities. Georg Christoph Neller,[33] the most prominent pupil of Barthel, was called to the chair for canon law at the University of Trier by Franz Georg von Schönborn.[34] His appointment, opposed by the Jesuits, had important consequences. It established the connection between the Franconian Enlightenment and the political and canonical views of the Church arising from the border situation of the archdiocese and from the differences with the Austrian Netherlands and France promoted by the spread of Jansenist ideas and those of the established Church. Such views were represented at the court of Ehrenbreitstein by the convert Jakob Georg von Spangenberg and his friend, the former officialis and later suffragan bishop Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim, especially after the negotiations involving the election stipulations of Emperor Charles VII (1742). Neller's tenure in Trier, his friendship and collaboration with Hontheim marked the turning point from episcopalism to Febronianism. His *Principia juris ecclesiastici ad statum Germaniae accommodata,* compiled substantially from Gallican authors and published anonymously in Frankfurt in 1746, made his name as a scholar. In it he sharply attacked the traditional constitutional doctrine of the Jesuit canonical position and intensified the episcopal theses. Spangenberg's wish—it is probable that Neller had already made Hontheim's acquaintance at that time—for a canonist who could differentiate between the original power of the Pope in church matters and the mere presumptions of the Curia appeared to be fulfilled by Neller's appointment. In his more than thirty years of teaching, in numerous publications Neller was largely responsible for the breakthrough of episcopal canon law in the Empire. As a friend and collaborator of Hontheim he occupies a superior place in the history of Febronianism.

---

[32] Students of Barthel from Franconia included the brothers Georg Christoph and Georg Franz Neller, their nephew Georg Philipp Leuxner, who was destined to succeed his uncle in Trier, and the ecclesiastical advisor of Archbishop Hieronymus von Colloredo and Salzburg's representative to the Ems Congress, Johann Michael Bönicke, the canonist and future suffragan bishop of Speyer, Philipp Anton Schmidt, his brother Michael Ignaz, "the historian of the Germans," as well as the canonists Johann Nepomuk Endres and Johann Josef Sündermahler. Franz Carl Joseph von Hillesheim (1731–1803), who played a prominent role in Cologne as an advocate of the episcopal interests, also studied under Barthel. Neller went on to become "the father of learning" in Trier. Most of the Rhenish episcopalians of the second half of the eighteenth century came from his school.

[33] H. Raab, *Neller u. Febronius,* 185–206.

[34] *NDB* V (1961), 370–71; *LThK* IX (1964), 453; E. H. Fischer, *Ellwangen, Augsburg, Rom. Die Exemtion des Ellwanger Stifts und seine Exemtionspolitik unter Fürstpropst Franz Georg von Schönborn in den Jahren 1732–1749: Ellwangen 764–1964* [1964], 423) stresses that Franz Georg tied "his see of Ellwangen closely to the Holy See through his wise and purposeful exemption policy."

Febronius and Febronianism

According to corresponding testimony by Hontheim and Spangenberg, the immediate impetus for the genesis of Febronianism[35] was furnished during the negotiations for the election of Emperor Charles VII by the discussion of ARTICLE XIV of the imperial electoral capitulation concerning the German concordats, the *Gravamina contra Curiam Romanam,* and the demand by the electorate of Trier to abolish the jurisdiction of the nunciatures in Germany. Based on his study of the *gravamina* and the reform councils, Spangenberg suggested that a future work summarize the rights and liberties of the Church of the Empire after the model of the Gallicans Pithou, Dupuy, de Marca, as well as the Protestant canonist Johannes Schilter and that it create better conditions for surmounting the "Calamitas Imperii," for the reunification of the denominations, by a far-reaching reduction of papal claims. The erudite, personally irreproachable suffragan bishop Hontheim,[36] who followed in the tradition of Van Espen's school, encountered these problems in the course of his two decades of ministry in a large diocese. Through historical research, efforts to reform both the Church and the universities, but above all through scholarly collaboration with his friend Neller he hit upon possible solutions. Considerations for the Dutch and French part of the archbishopric of Trier required a modus vivendi with those governments which were oriented towards an established Church. Schönborn episcopalism had to be defended against Roman claims based upon ecclesiastical and political considerations. Religious and ecclesiastical reforms and political practice in the Church began to orient themselves after the ideal of the *Ecclesia primitiva*—the ex-Jesuit F. X. Feller called it "a whim of souls with a mania for innovation"—and to demand the restoration of a historically transfigured church constitution which had been spoiled by pseudo-Isidorianism and "Hildebrandism." Their demands were addressed one-sidedly to Rome, so that the transformation of ecclesiastical territories into enlightened absolutist states was not made impossible. These aims and a delimitation of the rights of the prince-bishops and the Pope, better corresponding to the interests of the Church of the Empire, were to be achieved, at least in part, by a work written under the pseudonym Justinus Febronius, *De statu ecclesiase et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione christanos compositus*[37] (Frankfurt 1763; reprints and supplements 1765–70; expanded to five volumes in 1770–74). The means to the goal were to be the revival of the *Concordata Nationis Germanica integra,* of the Mainz Acceptation of 1439, and the decrees of the reform Council of Basel. Reviving an idealized pre-Hildebrandian or pseudo-Isidorian church constitution was to provide the stimulus for a religious and ecclesiastical reform in connection with a moderate Enlightenment.[38] By means of the empirical-historical method, based on the Gallicans, Van Espen, and the Würzburg school of canonists, Febronius used the well-known distinction between the *jura essentialia, quae tendeunt ad unitatis ecclesiae*

---

[35] L. Just, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Febronius;* idem, "Die römische Kurie und das Reich unter Karl VII. (1742–45)," *HJ* 52 (1932).

[36] A Hontheim biography is lacking. One-sided but still essential: O. Mejer, *Febronius;* also L. Just, *Hontheim. Ein Gedenkblatt;* H. Raab, *Neller u. Febronius;* L. Rechenmacher, *Episkopalismus;* F. Stümper, *Kirchenrechtl. Ideen des Febronius;* E. Reifart, *Kirchenstaat Trier;* H. Petersen, *Febronianismus und Nationalkirche.* Influenced by the church policy and "völkisch"-biological views of the National Socialist period, the author poses the question whether Febronius strove for a national Church in which the "national law of life" would find expression and all "alien intellectual claim of leadership is eliminated." But he concludes sadly that "Hontheim was lacking the fundament of a national world view ["völkische Weltanschauung"], which alone would have been capable of overcoming the universalistic exaggerations of the papal system" (154). The extent of agreement with Petersen, Mejer, and Zillich that a "national feeling" was the motive force behind Febronius' and the entire current of episcopalism is yet to be investigated. The designations "national feeling" and also "national Church" appear to me to be misapplied. Hontheim and the episcopals of the eighteenth century advocated "liberties" of the Church of the Empire. Imperial patriotism and anti-Roman sentiments were indeed among their impulses but not a "national feeling" or "völkische Weltanschauung."

---

[37] The original title of the work was: "Symbola quam(!) ad reuniendos in Religione dissidentes Christianos . . . in qua primario agitur de genuino statu et forma regiminis Ecclesiastici nec non legitima potestate Rom. Pontificis" (L. Just, *Entstehung des Febronius,* 377).—Originally it was planned, probably under the influence of Spangenberg, to have it printed in Göttingen, but then, just like Neller's first work, it appeared with Eßlinger in Frankfurt, most likely because Eßlinger's discretion was sufficiently well known to the Trier episcopals ever since the dispute involving Neller's *Principia.* Another reason was that Hontheim's friend Krufft knew that his old acquaintance Damian Friedrich Dumeiz there could supervise the printing.

[38] We should add a reminder that in 1748 Hontheim newly edited the *Brevarium Trevirense* and in 1767, following the Strasbourg example, edited a new *rituale* for the archdiocese. He also strove for improving university studies.

conservationem and the *jura accessoria* in order to relegate the papal primacy to a preeminence of honor after the model of the first eight Christian centuries. According to him, the Pope is not entitled to a jurisdiction competing with that of the bishops since the latter are not his *vicarii* but are reigning as successors of the apostles by the authority of divine right. With the help of the Holy Spirit only the Church and the General Council as representation of the *Corpus ecclesiasticum* are infallible. The Pope is the *centrum unitatis* only insofar as the representation of a federalist system permits. As is evident by the title Febronius borrowed from Pufendorf, the *Analogia Ecclesiae cum Imperio* was the godfather of his doctrine of the *status mixtus* of the Church constitution. Febronius also considers a reduction of papal rights and supervision of all undertakings of the Roman Curia necessary in the interest of the state. In spite of a basic recognition of independence, coexistence, and submission to a common final goal his ideas of the relationship between Church and state amount to a superiority of the state. It passes into Josephinism by virtue of concessions to the temporal princes—according to divine right they are the born defenders of the Church—and in view of the doctrine of the *Jus circa sacra* (*jus advocatiae, jus cavendi*). The corresponding theory of a *Jus circa civilia* is characteristically lacking.

In spite of the fact that his work was a compilation and contained innate contradictions, Febronius exercised a very strong influence on the ecclesiastical and intellectual history of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Beginning in 1774, under the influence of undercurrents of Enlightenment and Jansenism, Febronianism was either increasingly opposed by elements of an established Church, or accepted in a radicalized form, but it was also rejected by many moderate episcopalists, such as Abbot Martin II Gerbert.

An intense battle involving countless attacks and counterattacks by such as the brothers Ballerini, Johann Gottfried Kauffmann, Tomaso Maria Mamachi, Ladislaus Sappel, and Francesco Antonio Zaccaria was waged against Febronius. It took place on the literary and scholarly level, but beginning around 1770 it was also conducted for and against a revocation by the aged author. Not until April 1764 did the elective nuncio Niccolò Oddi with the help of the Frankfurt canon Damian Friedrich Dumeiz manage to identify Suffragan Bishop Hontheim as the author.[39] Prior to that several others had been suspected of the author-

---

[39] The question whether Neller coauthored or contributed to the Febronius, posed by the famous Salzburg episcopal Gregorius Zallwein as early as 1763, has not been clarified in detail but can generally be answered in the affirmative. Father Ferdinand Söhr, confessor of Clemens Wenzeslaus of Saxony, elector of Trier, affirmed on 27

ship, among them Barthel, Neller,[40] the enlightened Mainz lawyer Johann Baptist Horix, the future suffragan bishop Ludwig Philipp Behlen, and the canonist Benedikt Oberhauser from Fulda.[41] Hontheim's persistent denial of his authorship was facilitated by the compiled nature of the work of Febronius, the fact that his collaborator Neller was also suspected, and the benevolent attitude of the imperial court and a considerable segment of the episcopate. This denial cannot be explained sufficiently by weakness of character, being of two minds, or Jansenist insincerity. Finally, in 1778 a heavy-hearted Hontheim, upon the urging of his elector-archbishop Clemens Wenzeslaus and the "Counsel of Conscience" of the Alsatian Franz Heinrich Beck, agreed to a formal revocation.[42] On the advice of his friends and under the pressure of the discussions provoked by his revocation, and especially

---

October 1768 in a letter to the secretary of the cologne nuncio Caprara "che il maledetto Febronio è veramenta opere del Neller, e che il Suffraganeo non ha fatto altro che mettere la materia in buon stile, e ha di più avute l'imprudenza di mandare il manuscritto come suo allo stampatore." Other affirmations were similar.—A comparison between Neller's *Principia,* some of his older dissertations, and Febronius leaves no doubt that entire passages of the latter are Neller's ideas, so that he can be called a collaborator even if he did disavow Febronius under pressure by his opponents and even offered to disprove it. On this see H. Raab, *Neller und Febronius,* 200f.

[40] W. A. Mühl, *Die Aufklärung an der Universität Fulda mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der philosophischen und juristischen Fakultät (1734–1805)* (Fulda 1961), 46–49.

[41] H. Raab, "Damian Friedrich Dumeiz und Kardinal Oddi. Zur Entdeckung des Febronius und zur Aufklärung im Erzstift Mainz und in der Reichsstadt Frankfurt," *AMrhKG* 10 (1958), 217–40; A. Bach, *Goethes Dechant Dumeiz, Ein rheinischer Prälat der Aufklärungszeit* (Heidelberg 1964); corrected and supplemented by H. Raab, "Zur Geschichte der Aufklärung im Rhein-Main-Gebiet," *HJ* 88 (1968), 423–33, 442–43.

[42] L. Just, *Widerruf des Febronius;* concerning early attempts to clear up the Febronius affair, see H. Raab, *Franz Eustach von Hornstein,* 124–29 (plans of Giacomelli, Maillot de la Treille, and Suffragan Bishop Scheben).—The group of Hontheim's opponents ranged from the Worms suffragan bishop and book commissioner Franz Xaver Anton v. Scheben (see H. Raab, "Apostolische Bücherkommissare in Frankfurt am Main," *HJ* 87 [1967], 345–51), the Alsatian Beck, Suffragan Bishop Jean Marie Cuchot d'Herbain, appointed coadjutor to the encumbered Hontheim, the chancellor of the episcopal University of Strasbourg, François Philippe Louis, the Mannheim court librarian Maillot de la Treille, to Jean Pey, whose *Traité de l'autorité des deux puissances* had been called by Prince-Abbot Martin Gerbert of Sankt Blasien an iron wall against the flood of Febronian ideas, and the nuncios Carlo Bellisoni and Guiseppe Garampi. Noticeable among Hontheim's opponents were the Alsatian theologians. Alsace, measurably affected by neither Jansenism nor Gallicanism, began to prepare a restoration of the Church as early as the eighteenth century.—The Febronius affair was actually reignited in connection with Johann Lorenz Isenbiehl's attempt concerning the prophesy of Emmanuel. Hontheim's expert opinion about Isenbiehl provoked the demand for his recantation. See also F. R. Reichert, "Johann Gertz (1744–1824)," *AMrhKG,* 16 (1966), 96f.; P. Fuchs, "Der Pfalzbesuch des Kölner Nuntius Bellisomi von 1778 und die Affäre Seelmann in der Korrespondenz des Kurplfälzischen Gesandten in Rom," *AMrhKG* 20 (1968), 170f.

the press campaign involving the voluntary nature and sincerity of his utterances, Hontheim substantially attenuated his retraction by his *Commentarius in suam retractationem,*[43] (based on the Gallican theses of 1682) and by his correspondence. His ambiguous and somewhat insincere conduct, whose motives have not been clarified yet, but even more so the clumsy steps taken by the Roman Curia abetted the efforts to make him into a martyr for the freedom of the German Church against "ultramontane" positions, intrigues by the Curia, and ecclesiastical obscurantism. The assumption that Hontheim "revoked his revocation prior to his death (2 September 1790)" was countered even by his contemporaries by means of his correspondence with Prince-Abbot Martin Gerbert of Sankt Blasien and the testimony of the Luxemburg ex-Jesuit Jardin, who called attention to Hontheim's "true Catholic and apostolic-Roman' faith."[44] Yet the history of his revocation remains obscure on many points and requires additional clarification and complement.

Although the traditional constitutional doctrine was defended skillfully by Joseph Kleiner, Johann Mathias Carrich, Hartzheim, Eusebius Amort, Kauffmann, and others, the progression of the "Catholic revolution of ideas"[45] led to an ever-growing spread of episcopalism-Febronianism at the German universities and prince-episcopal sees. Even in 1758 Johann Baptist Horix in Mainz had called attention to the acceptance of the Basel Decrees of 1439. The interest he aroused gave a new impetus to the opposition of the Church against Rome. In 1763 the document of acceptation appeared in print for the first time and immediately became the charter of German episcopalism. The future suffragan bishops Behlen and Würdtwein supported the Mainz policies with their historical and canonical writings. In Salzburg the famous canonist Gregorius Zallwein[46] advocated a quasimonarchical church constitution; he called for the liberties of the Church of the Empire, which he called preferable by far to the *Libertés de l'Église Gallicane,* and the special privileges of the Salzburg archbishop. The legal proceedings between the disputatious dean August von Limburg-Styrum and his cathedral chapter of Speyer (1763–64) threatened to escalate into a frontal attack of German episcopalism on the appellations, the nunciatures, and all interferences into episcopal jurisdiction, especially after the Palatinate and the archbishop of Mainz joined the action. Yet the Palatine monition during the negotiations for the electoral capitulation of Joseph II failed, as did the Trier petition of 1742 requesting limitation of the jurisdiction of the nunciatures. Febronian positions and those of the established Church merged in a work by Joseph Anton Felix Balthasar, *De Helvetiorum juribus circa sacra,* which had grown from a decimation conflict of the Republic of Lucerne with the Curia. The book was fought by the bishop of Constance and put on the Index by Rome on 1 February 1769. It nonetheless formed the basis for "the entire system of the modern-day established Church of Lucerne, starting with the monastic reform at the end of the eighteenth century to the articles of the Baden Conference," indeed, all the way to the battle against the Vatican decrees of 1870/72.[47]

---

[43] *Justini Febroni ICti commentarius in suam retractionem Pio VI Pont. Max. Kalend. Novemb. a. 1778 submissam* (Frankfurt a. M., Eßlinger 1781).

[44] In connection with the Isenbiehl affair Hontheim explained to his elector-archbishop Clemens Wenzeslaus of Trier (9 April 1778) that he was "prepared to give my blood and life for the Roman Catholic Church . . . yet I make a great distinction between the Roman Church and the exaggerated demands of the Roman court, which have caused many bad things, have impugned the holy religion in the eyes of our enemies, and are making it impossible to bring about this much-desired union, hoped for also in the imperial constitution."

[45] L. T. Spittler (*Sämtl. Werke* VIII [1835], 473) dates the beginnings of the "Catholic revolution of ideas" with the publication of Febronius's book and the Mainz acceptation of the dual election of Liège of 1763.

[46] His major work: *Principia juris ecclesiastici universalis et particularis Germaniae,* 4 vols. (Augsburg 1763); H. Raab, *Concordata,* 117f.; M. Spindler, *Electoralis Academiae Scientiarum Boicae Primordia* (Munich 1959); passim.

The Coblenz *Gravamina* of 1769

Among the high points of episcopal aspirations in the Church of the Empire was the compilation of the Coblenz *gravamina.* It came about under the influence of publications concerning the concordats, the canonical works of the episcopalists of Würzburg, Trier, Mainz, and Cologne, and the influence of the enlightened ministers of state in the ecclesiastical electorates. On the one hand, these *gravamina* were the result of enlightened-absolutist concepts[48] which were making an advance at the ecclesiastical courts in the years of peace after Hubertusburg. These concepts were aimed at reordering the relationship between Church and state primarily for political and economic reasons. On the other hand, these *gravamina* represented a reaction on the part of episcopalism within the Empire to the constant disputes with the nunciatures and the papal refusal for the retention of the prince-bishoprics of Regensburg and Freising by Clemens Wenzeslaus of Saxony, who had been elected elector-archbishop in Trier and had succeeded the deceased prince-bishop Joseph von Hessen-Darmstadt as coadjutor in Augsburg. In this connection the Apostolic See had claimed the right to fill the two vacant Bavarian bishoprics, ignoring their right to an election as guaranteed by canon, concordat, and the law of the Empire.[49] When Clement XIII, under pressure of the Church of the Empire, finally granted an election to the two cathedral chapters, it was interpreted as an attack on the freedom of the German Church.[50] In March 1769 it was countered by the electorate of Mainz with a request to all ecclesiastical princes for a confidential exchange of ideas directed against the ultramontane claims of rulership. In Mainz, during the disputes of the Speyer cathedral dean Damian August Philipp von Limburg-Styrum with his chapter and because of the exemption of the new bishopric of Fulda, the position, by tradition scarcely friendly to Rome and definitely hostile to the nunciature, had hardened. The reformative, moderately enlightened elector-archbishop Emmerich Joseph von Breidbach-Bürresheim,[51] embroiled in a violent fight with Rome over the annates, taxes, and confirmation fees for Worms and Mainz, on the advice of his minister Groschlag and his official and later suffragan bishop Ludwig Philipp Behlen,[52] strove to unite the ecclesiastical princes in a concerted action against Roman presumptions and to become the "Patriarca in Germania."[53]

---

[47] The appraisal of J. Schwendimann quoted in B. Laube, *Joseph Anton Balthasar* (Basel 1956), 87. Also U. Im Hof, *Isaak Iselin* (Bern 1967), 191f.

[48] In this connection the written justification of the Mainz minister of state Groschlag for Pergen in the spring of 1769 is revealing (K. J. Krüger, *Groschlag,* 128); H. W. Jung (*Anselm Franz von Bentzel,* 15) states the view that in electoral Mainz "claims of the absolutist state were raised under the mantle of suggestions for ecclesiopolitical reforms." The economic aspect is stressed in the little-noticed article by H. Illich, "Maßnahmen der Mainzer Erzbischöfe gegen kirchlichen Gütererwerb 1462–1792. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Aufklärungszeit," *Mainzer Zeitschrift* 34 (1939), 53–82; E. Hegel (*Febronianismus,* 156) stresses the "deep religious worry of the German archbishops" in this undertaking; Emmerich Joseph, regardless of the other motives he may have had, stated his conviction that it was his duty to restore episcopal authority vis-à-vis the incursions of Rome to the state to which it was entitled according to the will of the donor of the Church.

---

[49] H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen,* 286ff.—In Mainz J. Baptist v. Horix, who must be regarded as a protégé of the enlightened minister of state Friedrich v. Stadion, characteristically was asked to investigate the Regensburg-Freising problem. Horix, "Betrachtungen, welche zur Erörterung der Frage dienen, ob den Domkapiteln in Teutschland das Recht zustehe, in die Stelle des zu einen sonstigen Bisthum gewählten oder postulierten Bischofs einen anderen zu wählen (1769)," *Concordata Nationis Germanicae integra* III, 83–109.—In 1769 the Regensburg cathedral chapter elected Anton Ignaz Fugger as bishop, who in turn appointed Clemens Wenzeslaus coadjutor for the prince-priory of Ellwangen. On Fugger see E. E. Meissner, *Fürstbischof Anton Ignaz Fugger (1711–87)* (Tübingen 1969).

[50] In this connection see also the imperial rescript to the cathedral chapter of Regensburg, Vienna, 30 September 1768. The Emperor as "highest guardian and protector of the German Churches" rejects the Roman claim "to reserve unto the Papal See for its own appointment and disposition without canonical election the bishoprics falling vacant in such cases" (J. B. Horix, *Concordata Nationis Germ.* III [1773], 110–13).

[51] On 3 July 1763 the Cologne nuncio Lucini reported to Cardinal-Minister Torregiani: "La di lui famiglia è di massime contrarie alla giurisdizione Apostolica in questi parti." On 8 March 1768 the French ambassador Entraiques attested to the archbishop's attitude against the nunciature: "Il ne reconnait en rien la jurisdiction du Nonce, il employe tous les moyens légaux pour prevenir les appels en Cour de Rome."—A biography of Emmerich Joseph has not yet been written. For now see L. A. Veit,

Two other canonical conflicts drove the Cologne elector-archbishop Max Friedrich von Königsegg-Rothenfels to the side of Mainz. Max Friedrich, whose vicar general Johann Philipp von Horn-Goldschmidt and the latter's adviser Franz C. J. von Hillesheim held Febronian views, was enmeshed in an argument with the Cologne nunciature over the visitation of the Augustinian house of Saint Michael at Weidenbach[54] and with the Curia in Rome because of the intended closing of the Benedictine seminary of Überwasser[55] in favor of a university in Münster. In spite of a basic agreement, Cologne and even more so Münster, where Fürstenberg emphasized that he was not a Febronian,[56] were not terribly enthused about the far-reaching plans by Mainz and caused the pertinent suggestions to be attenuated. The Mainz initiative also met with misgivings on the part of the prince-bishops of Hildesheim, Paderborn, and Würzburg-Bamberg. They were worried that a realization of the Febronian program would bring no advantages to the bishops but

---

"Emmerich Joseph v. Breidbach-Bürresheim und die Verminderung der Feiertage," *Festschr. für Sebastian Merkle* (1922), 348–69; H. Illich, op. cit.; H. Raab, "Die Breidbach-Bürresheim in der Germania-Sacra," *Mainzer Almanach* (1961), 91–106; idem, *Clemens Wenzeslaus,* passim.

[52] According to the French ambassador in Mainz, Groschlag was "le premier auteur d'un nouveau sisteme ecclésiastique" (Entraiques to Choiseul, Mainz, 12 Dec. 1768).—On Behlen see H. Raab, "Der Mainzer Weihbischof Ludwig Philipp Behlen (1714–77)," *Mainzer Almanach* (1968), 59–79.

[53] This was the appraisal of the nuncio Caprara in his final relation about the aims of the Mainz archbishops, held "da tempo immemorabile." On 18 February 1770, Caprara reported about Emmerich Joseph that the latter "acknowledges totally the system of Febronius. Foremost he is intent upon his own rights as German primate. But he does not enjoy the full trust of his ecclesiastical brothers." (A. Schnütgen, *Ein Kölner Nuntius,* 751); see also H. Becher, *Der deutsche Primas* (Colmar, n. d. [1944]).

[54] C. Löffler, "Das Fraterhaus Weidenbach in Köln," *AHVNrh* 102 (1918), 174ff.; E. Hegel, *Febronianismus,* 147–286; A. Schnütgen, *Kölner Nuntiatur,* 207–41; H. Hinsen, *Kaspar Anton von Belderbusch und der Einbruch der Aufklärung in Kurköln* (diss., Bonn 1952), 140ff.

[55] R. Schulze, *Das adelige Frauen-(Kanonissen-)Stift der hl. Maria (1043/1773) und die Pfarre Liebfrauen-Überwasser zu Münster/Westfalen. Ihre Verhältnisse und Schicksale* (Münster 1952).

[56] In this connection we refer to Fürstenberg's statement in a letter to Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi of 20 June 1779: "We have never been Febronians or anti-Febronians. We are, briefly stated, orthodox without any distinction as to party." (A. Hanschmidt, *Fürstenberg,* 199).

would merely expand the metropolitan rights and, in the end, exchange dependence on Rome for an increased dependence on the German archbishops. The initiative for a union and concerted action by the ecclesiastical princes, initially the Rhenish electors, was clearly started in Mainz. It raised the threat of a national council, an assembly of the Catholic princes and dignitaries of the Imperial Diet after the model of 1523, and a new concordat. For the extreme case it toyed with the idea "that perhaps even a separation of the harmony and concurrence between Church and state might have to ensue and the rights granted to the sovereigns immediately by the grace of God prevail."[57]

On 27 January 1769, after toilsome negotiations an eight-point preliminary convention[58] between Mainz and Cologne was signed, obligating the two parties to list the "old original" episcopal rights, not to withdraw unilaterally from the concerted action, and to induce the Emperor and the elector-archbishop of Trier to join them. To be sure, considerable efforts and the diplomatic skill of the Mainz minister C. W. von Groschlag were initially required to obtain the support of Suffragan Bishop Hontheim for the plans of Mainz and, towards the end of 1769, with his help to overcome the reservations of Elector-Archbishop Clemens Wenzeslaus, which had been caused by political considerations and his innate caution. Clemens Wenzeslaus appears to have borne a grudge against the Mainz group around Emmerich Joseph, who had opposed him at the election of Trier by nominating the brother of Elector Ernst von Breidbach-Bürresheim and had thwarted his designs on the bishopric of Worms. But above all it had been his persistent designs on the foremost electoral bishopric of the Empire and for the establishment of a Wettin episcopal realm extending from Trier via Liège, Cologne, and Münster to Paderborn and Hildesheim which prompted him to use extreme caution towards Rome, the Cologne nunciature, and the Imperial court. Neither in Rome nor in Vienna did he want to see the Wettin church policy damaged by Febronian-metropolitan actions.[59]

A firm union of the three ecclesiastical princes had not yet been effected and the misgivings of the suffragans of Cologne and Mainz[60] concerning the archiepiscopal enterprise not yet overcome when the Mainz lawyer Deel, the Cologne ecclesiastical councilor Hillesheim,[61] and the sixty-eight-year-old Trier suffragan bishop Hontheim met in conference to put the finishing touches on the complaints against Rome and to agree on the manner of asking the Emperor, the *defensor ecclesiae,* to support their plan. In the opinion of Mainz the aid of the Emperor and a firm union of the three ecclesiastical electors were indispensable conditions for the realization of their Febronian ideas.

---

[57] From Bentzel's memorandum of 30 Oct. 1788 (H. W. Jung, *Anselm Franz von Bentzel,* 15).

[58] Preliminary convention reprinted in M. Höhler, *Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 317–20.

[59] H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus,* 307ff.

[60] Nuncio Caprara reported to the cardinal-minister on 18 February 1770 that "they (the suffragan bishops of Mainz) see no chance to obtain the advantages promised by the Febronian system. In case of its implementation they fear that they will remain in the same state of dependence, free of the Roman yoke, but encumbered by a new Mainz yoke" (A. Schnütgen, *Ein Kölner Nuntius,* 751).

Within a short time, on 13 December 1769, Deel, Hillesheim, and Hontheim, who had already been agreed on the most important issues as a result of lengthy preliminary negotiations, concurred in thirty-one *gravamina* and the text of a letter which was to submit the complaints to the Emperor.[62] Under "Imperial protection" the German Churches were to regain "their hereditary freedom so that they would not be behind the churches of other countries" in order that the German church system could be reordered according to the requirements of a modern state.[63] The frailties of the church constitution and the disregard of the *gravamina* by Rome were generally considered as "one of the main causes of the weakness and debility of the Catholic lands of the Empire." The Coblenz desiderata invoked the Councils of Constance and Basel, the Mainz Acceptation of 1439, the *Concordata Nationis Germanicae,* and especially the concordats with Eugene IV (1447). All of the accepted Basel decrees "in favorem atque utilitatem Ecclesiarum Germaniae promanare possunt" would have to be executed. Episcopal authority, "the freedom of the German Church,"[64] was to be restored to its original extent, the reforms executed in a manner corresponding to the demands of the time. The initial *gravamina* were concerned with the abuses in awarding benefices. Henceforth the archiepiscopal indult to fill the benefices of the papal months was no longer to be limited to five years but extended to life or abolished.[65] The higher nonpontifical dignities at the cathedral and collegiate churches were no longer to be subject to papal reservation but to be bestowed by the ordinary collators. The reservations of the extravagants, *execrabilis* and *ad regimen* were to cease and all chancery rules,[66] with the exception of *de idiomate, de viginti, de triennali possessione,* were to become invalid within the Church of the Empire. The annates and monastic exemptions were to be abolished. The episcopal informatory process was to be followed according to the Tridentine decrees and the "vassal oath" of the bishops, customary since Gregory VII, was to be replaced by its original form. Papal orders and decrees by Roman congregations were not to be published without prior knowledge and concurrence of the ordinaries. The power "to bind and loose" of the bishops in their sees was to be unrestricted. In legal proceedings the successive appeals were to be strictly observed; the nunciatures were to be abolished. The accepted Basel Decrees, acknowledged by the *Concordata Nationis Germanicae,* were to be the basic laws of the Church of the Empire.

---

[61] Franz Carl Joseph v. Hillesheim, born in Cologne on 11 April 1731, studied in Würzburg under Johann Kaspar Barthel and became rector of the University of Cologne (1760–66). In the preparation of the Coblenz *gravamina* he played an important yet so far insufficiently determined role. He soon turned away from Febronianism and opposed Isenbiehl. He died in 1803 at his retreat in Niehl near Cologne (see A. Stelzmann, *Hillesheim*); H. H. Kurth *Das kölnische Domkapitel im 18. Jh.* (diss., Bonn 1953).

[62] M. Höhler, *Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 25–30, 253–65; older printings in Le Bret, *Magazin* VIII (1783), 1–21; Gärtner, *Corpus jur. eccl. cath.* (Salzburg 1799), II, 330–46; abundant material also in *Deutsche Blätter für Protestanten und Katholiken* 1 (1839), 38ff.: "Die Koblenzer Artikel vom Jahre 1769 nebst historischen Anmerkungen derselben," *Deutsche Blätter für Protestanten und Katholiken* 6 (Heidelberg 1840) 1–40; also "Gutachten der churfürstlich-erzbischöflichen Rechtsgelehrten und Staatsmänner über die Rechtmäßigkeit und Ausführbarkeit der Koblenzer Artkel vom Jahre 1769."

[63] M. Höhler, *Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 253f.

[64] The concept of "Freedom of the German Church"—as is stated in the cover letter under that title by Clemens Wenzeslaus and Max Friedrich to Joseph II—"does not mean an independence which is opposed to the general structure of the hierarchical constitution. The aim of sincere conviction and of the efforts in the here and now is the

Attempts to strengthen the union of the Rhenish archbishops by effecting participation by the archbishop of Salzburg, Cardinal-Bishop Franz Konrad Kasimir von Rodt of Constance and Cardinal-Bishop Franz Christoph von Hutten in Speyer failed. In Vienna, where the Coblenz *gravamina* were not submitted until July 1770, the desired support did not materialize, just as the Mainz ambassador J. G. von Brée had correctly predicted[67]; "to the immense detriment of the Ger-

---

maintenance of the Church and its original and inalienable rights and the justified redress of the well-based complaints of a whole nation" (M. Höhler, *Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 266; E. Hegel, *Febronianismus,* 156–57).

[65] A special aspect of the desideratum for electoral Trier is stressed by the reference of the viciarate general of Mainz to the great cost of registering the indults with the French parliaments. "It is therefore indicated to ask that it (the indult) be granted the respective archbishop for his lifetime" (E. Reifart, *Der Kurstaat Trier und das Staatskirchentum* [diss., Freiburg 1950], 84).

[66] L. Jackowski, "Die päpstlichen Kanzleiregeln und ihre Bedeutung für Deutschland," *AkathKR* 90 (1910), 1–47, 147–235, 432–63.

[67] On 8 October 1769, von Brée on the basis of thirty years of experience had warned against false hopes for the help of the Emperor. The court of Vienna, he said, would espouse the cause of the *gravamina* of the German Churches only if it would obtain advantages for itself from the Pope (decimation, a Turkish tax, etc.); Vienna, he continued, was very satisfied with Clement XIV, who "does everything he can to please the potentates of Europe" (M. Höhler, *Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 339–41); see E. Hegel, *Febronianismus,* 187–88 regarding the negative attitude of the Emperor.

man Church and the German Nation," as Hontheim's friend and biographer Krufft thought. Joseph II let the archiepiscopal initiative come to nothing, not because a "movement away from Rome" would have meant at the same time "a movement away from the Empire,"[68] but—this is evidently the motivation of Vice-Chancellor Colloredo—because a realization of the episcopal reform program would have strengthened those forces which were resisting the territorial established Churches and would have consolidated the position of the ecclesiastical princes in the Empire vis-à-vis the Emperor as well. In order not to endanger his own plans for an established Church, Joseph II did not want to burden himself with the complaints of the German archbishops against Rome. No doubt his delaying tactics, dictated by long-range political goals and the negative attitude of the Mainz ambassador to Vienna, Friedrich Karl von Erthal, towards the action of the Rhenish archbishops contributed to its failure.[69] The reaction in Vienna had the effect of causing Clemens Wenzeslaus to distance himself from the three ecclesiastical electors out of consideration for the Wettin church policies. Suggestions by the Mainz archbishop concerning a second meeting in Coblenz and a congress in Frankfurt for the end of August 1771 or for the dispatch of a common negotiator to Vienna foundered on the conflicts of interest between the Rhenish electoral courts.[70] The large-scale attempt to turn episcopal ideas and concepts into reality came to naught. The enlightened episcopal movement steadily gained ground as a result of the monastic regulations (30 July 1771), the amortization law (6 June 1772), the school and university reforms, and, lastly, the substantial elimination of the cathedral chapter from participation in the government until the death of Emmerich Joseph (1774). During the interregnum and the first few years of the reign of Friedrich Karl von Erthal this prompted a countermovement.

---

[68] E. Hegel, *Febronianismus,* 157.

[69] In the following two decades Erthal's views changed completely. In 1774 as candidate of the "anti-Emmerich" group, i. e., a rather conservative segment in the cathedral chapter, he was elected elector-archbishop of Mainz and soon continued the policies of his predecessor Emmerich Joseph. At the time of the Congress of Ems and the dispute over the Munich nunciature he and his suffragan bishops Valentin Heimes and Stephan Alexander Würdtwein became the spokesmen of the Church of the Empire opposition against Rome.

[70] The complex reason for the behavior of the Trier elector given by M. Höhler (*Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 46,) is not convincing. H. Schotte (*Emser Kongress,* 90) uses the argument of the ecclesiopolitical caution prevailing in Trier at that time. O. Mejer (*Zur römisch-deutschen Frage* I [1871], 38) emphasizes that temporal and not ecclesiastical considerations had prevailed. E. Reifart (op. cit., 71) blames "temporal political expedience" for Clemens Wenzeslaus's turning away from the League of Rhenish Electors.

The Nunciature Dispute and the Congress of Ems

It was not long before an anti-Roman current regained the upper hand. Stephan Alexander Würdtwein, Franz Anton Dürr, Johann Georg Schör, and Johann Jung[71] broadcast their episcopal views in numerous theses and in most of the journals. Not only the elector-archbishop of Mainz, but also the ecclesiastical electors in Coblenz and Bonn persistently tried to apply Febronian principles in cases of marriage dispensations, disputes concerning benefices, visitations, on the issue of the archiepiscopal "first prayers," and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[72] The number of conflicts between the Church and Rome increased steadily and some of the south German prince-bishops had to wage hard-fought defensive battles against the Bavarian established church system.[73] The last great conflict of the Church of the Empire with Rome and the movement representing an established Church broke out when the Palatine-Bavarian Elector Karl Theodor tried to bring about an adaptation of the church organization of southern Germany to political borders and the replacement of prince-bishoprics by provincial ones. Eighteen nonresident bishops and archbishops were responsible for the Palatine-Bavarian territories, combined since 1777. Each of them resided outside the borders of these territories and, by means of his own territory, which was subject to the Emperor only, possessed a last independent ecclesiastical and political sphere vis-à-vis the absolutist claims of powerful temporal neighbors.

For a period of about two hundred years, the aspirations for the establishment of Bavarian provincial bishoprics had to some extent been compensated by the Wittelsbach secundogenitures, especially in the old Bavarian bishoprics of Freising and Regensburg. When Cardinal Johann Theodor died in 1763[74] the dynasty was no longer able to present proper candidates for the episcopal see and the rule over the prince-bishoprics and the Church in Bavaria had to be put on a different basis, corresponding more to the enlightened absolutist political concept of the state. An added reason was the fact that the elections were getting very hard to arrange for eligible aristocrats who could be assumed to put up little or no resistance against the Bavarian established Church. This was clearly shown by the example of the related Clemens Wenzeslaus of the Wettin dynasty in Freising, Regensburg (1763, 1768), and Augsburg (1765). To be sure, the plan for a Munich provincial bishopric (1780–83), aimed against the aristocratic liberties of the Church of the Empire, failed. But an alliance of expedience against the common enemy represented by episcopalism, strengthened by personal meetings between Elector Karl Theodor and Pope Pius VI, produced the compromise of establishing a nunciature in Munich (7 June 1784). The new nunciature, consistent neither with the constitution of the Empire nor with tradition, was obviously intended to strengthen papal authority in the *Germania Sacra,* to meet the Bavarian established Church halfway, and to form a counterweight against Josephinism. The new nuncio Cesare Zoglio,[75] who also was to occupy the see of a provincial archdiocese, was equipped with extraordinary powers. This would enable the forces of the established Church to encompass the far-flung Palatine-Bavarian territories like a pincer and push back the episcopal movement. On the other hand it inevitably challenged the episcopate of the Empire to ward off the "curial pretensions" and the territorial established Church.

---

[71] H. Raab, *Concordata,* 143ff.; A. P. Brück, *Die Mainzer theologische Fakultät im 18. Jh.* (Wiesbaden 1961); F. G. Dreyfus, *Sociétés et mentalités à Mayence dans la seconde moitié du dix-huitième siècle* (Paris 1968), 403–41.

[72] H. Raab, "Die Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Carlo Bellisomi (1785–86), *RQ* 51 (1956), 70–124.

[73] G. Pfeilschifter, *Salzburger Kongreß;* K. O. v. Aretin, *Heiliges Römisches Reich* I, 379.

[74] H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus,* 130–33, 135–49, 160–66, 216–22; Reinhardt, *Hochstift Konstanz,* 103–6, 127–30f.

The battle of the nunciatures, smouldering for a long time with varying intensity, broke into the open even before the new nuncio arrived in Munich when the immediately affected metropolitans of Salzburg and Mainz and the Freising prince-bishop Ludwig Joseph von Welden[76] raised formal complaints. The major participant in the second phase was Elector-Archbishop Max Franz of Cologne, the brother of Joseph II,[77] whose request for the installation of *Judices in partibus* had been rejected by Rome. He now found his episcopal rights transgressed not only by the Cologne nunciature, but in addition by the Munich nunciature, responsible for the Palatine-Bavarian territories of his see. But the main defense by the Church of the Empire had to be directed against the territorial established Church. If Karl Theodor were emulated by others, "the day would come when the prince-bishops and their dioceses would be limited to their territories and lose the reason for their existence."[78] In their fight against the two fronts of Rome and the established Church, conducted against the background of the growing threat of secularization, the German archbishops, while basically encouraged by Emperor Joseph II, were only insufficiently supported by him. The change in the endangered *Nunziatura ad tractum Rheni* by the transfer of the moderate titular Archbishop Carlo Bellisomi to Lisbon and the subsequent appointment of the merely twenty-eight-year-old Bartolomeo Pacca,[79] who was unfamiliar with the German situation, increased the tensions.

---

[75] B. Zittel, *Vertretung des Heiligen Stuhls in München,* 419f.

[76] Information on Welden in J. Angermeier, *Das Bistum Freising im Nuntiaturstreit* (1921); see also H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus* (Index).

[77] G. J. Jansen, *Kurfürst-Erzbischof Max Franz von Köln und die episkopalistischen Bestrebungen seiner Zeit;* M. Braubach, *Maria Theresias jüngster Sohn Max Franz.*

[78] K. O. v. Aretin, *Heiliges Römisches Reich* I, 385.

At a conference of the representatives of the four German archbishops in Bad Ems (July–August 1786), convened after lengthy preliminary negotiations and characterized by considerable differences of opinions, a twenty-two-point reform program for the Church of the Empire was formulated which constituted a declaration of war against the nunciatures.[80] The Ems Punctation (25 August 1786) took up where the *gravamina* of 1673 of the Rhenish archbishops, the Coblenz desiderata of 1769, Febronius and the *Massime moguntine,* going beyond Febronius, left off.[81] The independence of the episcopal from the Roman authority was most strenuously emphasized in Ems.[82] Additional demands included: the cancellation of the exemptions and the quinquennial faculties, the complete abolition of the nunciatures, but at least of their competing jurisdiction,[83] the right of the bishops to dispose of charitable contributions,[84] the episcopal *placet* for Roman bulls and briefs, and the conduct of ecclesiastical legal proceedings by native judges. The prereformational demand to reduce the annates and pallia was renewed. No longer was the Vienna Concordat (1448), but rather the Mainz Acceptation (1439) and the *Concordata Principum* (1447) to be the basis for the constitution of the Church of the Empire. Lastly, the Emperor was asked to restore the archiepiscopal rights and "to bring about the council at least on a national level which had been promised [in the German concordats] by His most high intercession to take place within two years at the most for the purpose of definitively removing all of these complaints" and in the case of insurmountable obstacles to effect redress by constitutional means.[85]

---

[79] *LThK* VII (1962), 1329.

[80] Text in M. Höhler, *Arnoldis Tagebuch,* 171–83. The significance of the concurrent synod of Pistoia for the Church of the Empire is pointed out in F. G. Dreyfus, op. cit., 435; comparisons are contained in A. Wandruszka, "Ems und Pistoia: Spiegel der Geschichte," *Festgabe für M. Braubach* (Münster 1964), 627–34.—The most striking figure among the archbishops' delegation was the Mainz suffragan bishop Valentin Heimes. His rigidity and radical program repeatedly jeopardized the whole congress. For Heimes, see H. Raab, *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 7 (Mainz 1955/57), 172–89; A. Bach, *RhVjBl* 27 (1962), 97–116; idem. *Germ.-Histor. Studien* (Bonn 1964), 475–92; idem, *Aus Geothes rheinischem Lebensraum* (Neuss 1968), 329–49. The representative of Salzburg, Johann Michael Bönike, stayed in the background completely. The delegate of the electorate of Trier was the skillful vicar general Beck. He was supported by the ecclesiastical councilor Arnoldi, whose diary is one of the most important sources for the course of the conference. Electoral Cologne was represented by the administrator of the vicariate Tautphäus, a moderate, and the lector of the elector, Karl Joseph v. Wreden, who was the actual representative of Cologne although he was not officially active at the conference (H. Raab, "Briefe von K. J. v. Wreden an Stephan Alexander Würdtwein [1785–1787]," *AHVNrh,* 153–54, 170–200).

[81] Regarding the intentions of Mainz the French ambassador O'Kelli reported: "L'électeur de Mayence en proposant le congrès d'Ems avait le projet de séparer l'Église germanique du Saint-Siège et d'établir un concile national permanent qu'il aurait dirigé plus particulièrement que la Diète" (F. G. Dreyfus, op. cit., 435).

[82] "Christus . . . hat den Aposteln und ihren Nachfolgern, den Bischöfen, eine *unbeschränkte* Gewalt zu binden und zu lösen für alle jene Fälle gegeben, wo es die Notwendig- oder Nutzbarkeit ihrer Kirchen oder der zu denselben angehörigen Gläubigen immer befördern mag" (ART. I) (M. Höhler, op. cit., 172).

The difficulties militating against the Ems program, in spite of the positive consent of a part of the educated public, and the weakness of the archiepiscopal position in its fight against the alliance of expedience between Rome and Munich were soon evident. Emperor Joseph II had indeed declared inadmissible "the exercise of jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters" by the nunciatures[86] and had also annulled an encyclical by Pacca. Yet he could not make up his mind about the far-reaching political plans for his Church which his brother Leopold had advised. These called for "throwing off the selfish and despotic yoke of the Roman court in Germany forever by encouraging and supporting with all one's might the German bishops, by abolishing the nunciatures in Germany forever, and convincing the bishops and ecclesiastical princes to convene and to form a national council."[87] The distrust and, finally, the resistance of the suffragan bishops against an expansion of the metropolitan authority and the power of the ecclesiastical electors assumed the character of an anti-Ems movement, especially when Prince-Bishop August von Limburg-Styrum of Speyer began to exert his efforts and when an assembly in Waghäusel or Bruchsal was suggested. The union of the four archbishops dissolved rather quickly. The Mainz electorate was pried from the ranks of the opponents of the nunciatures through Prussia, with which it was joined in the Alliance of Princes and in connection with the election of Karl Theodor von Dalberg to the position of coadjutor of Elector-Archbishop Friedrich Karl. In view of its desire for a special ecclesiastical position for its northwest German possessions, Prussia was not interested in strengthening the metropolitans' power.[88] Consequently, it recognized the jurisdiction of the Cologne nunciature. Theological, canonical, and personal doubts, but especially considerations of his second bishopric of Augsburg (which extended onto Bavarian territory), as well as growing difficulties in the French parts of his archbishopric of Trier induced Clemens Wenzeslaus to disavow the Ems program. The early death of Joseph II prevented a hearing of the nunciature dispute in the Imperial Diet. Max Franz of Cologne almost single-handedly continued the fight against the nunciatures and the established Church. The only concrete result of all the efforts was the inclusion in ARTICLE XIV of the Imperial Electoral Capitulation of 1790 of a stipulation aimed at abolishing the jurisdiction of the nunciatures in ecclesiastical courts.[89] The Ems Punctation thus remained "the mere declaration of a feud against Rome, not followed by the feud itself" (Werminghoff). Under the threat of the impending French Revolution, the events in the Netherlands and their impact in western Germany the archbishops' opposition to Rome and the modern established Church collapsed. But far into the nineteenth century, when the established Church had long turned against its erstwhile ally, the papal central authority, and when the Church prepared to fight the late absolutist state for a modicum of freedom, the ideas of Ems stayed alive, to be called up again by many a government in their conflicts with Rome, even though they misunderstood the historical connections.

---

[83] ". . . ebenso hören d) die Nuntiziaturen in Zukunft völlig auf. Die Nuntien können nichts anders als päpstliche Gesandte sein und dörfen . . . keine actus jurisdictionis voluntariae oder contentiosae mehr ausüben" (ART. IV) (M. Höhler, op. cit., 174).

[84] ART. III (M. Höhler, op. cit., 174).

[85] ART. XXII (M. Höhler, op. cit., 183); G. J. Jansen, op. cit., 68: Cologne and Trier prevailed over the objection of Mainz regarding the two-year deadline.

[86] Rescript of Joseph II, dated 12 Oct. 1785 (M. Höhler, op. cit., 277).

[87] Leopold to Joseph, 5 Dec. 1786 (A. v. Arneth, *Joseph II. und Leopold von Toscana. Ihr Briefwechsel* II [1869], 48f.).

---

[88] According to Dreyfus: "Les princes protestants, à leur tête le roi de Prusse, défendaient le Saint-Père, car ils craignaient que tout ce que le Saint-Siège perdrait en Allemagne ne fut gagné par l'Empereur" (F. G. Dreyfus, op. cit., 435).

[89] F. W. Becker, *Die Kaiserwahl Leopolds II. 1790. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des alten Reiches und der Nachwirkungen des Fürstenbundes* (diss., Bonn 1943).

CHAPTER 24

The Established Church and the Enlightenment in the Temporal Territories of the Empire—Theresianism and Josephinism

The eighteenth-century upheaval regarding the respective rights within the system of the established Church is inadequately described as a usurpation of the ecclesiastical realm or as an absolutist abuse by the ruling princes with the goal of making the state omnipotent. Neither is it sufficiently characterized as an outgrowth of enlightened absolutism, dominated by the concept of the "welfare state." As the reductions in the number of monastic establishments and the case of Josephinist charity demonstrate, the induced participation of the Church in the service of the enlightened welfare state had a special importance for the realization of the rationalistic postulate of "the greatest possible happiness of all." But this also involved the fulfillment of partly neglected yet genuine demands of Christian morality, the state as the guardian of public morality, and the creation of a Church, reformed in the Jansenist-enlightened sense, eliminating baroque abuses in the interest of a better order in this world and salvation in the hereafter.

In the Empire the problem of "state versus Church" emerged to a lesser extent as one between the Pope as the supreme head of the totality of the Church and the Emperor as the protector of the Church of the Empire. Instead it was a dispute between the larger territories rising to the status of modern states on one side and the bishops, nunciatures, and the Roman Curia on the other. As a consequence of ecclesiastical and temporal rule being combined in one person, the fact that in these cases there could be no integration into a modern state, and, lastly, because of a lack in self-reform, the ecclesiastical principalities experienced the problem more as an "internal affair," as an episcopal opposition[1] to the nunciatures and the Roman Curia or as moderate administrative enlightenment on the well-known battlefields of monastic reform, reduction on the religious feast days, amortization laws, matrimonial legislation, and the field of education.[2]

In the Catholic temporal territories the relationship between Church and state in the matter of their respective rights hardly differed from that of the Protestant states. The necessity for reforms in many areas was widely recognized here too. The realization that if the nascent enlightened welfare state wanted to fulfill its comprehensive tasks it needed an enlarged material basis and therefore had to break with the traditional preferences and privileges of the Church was not limited to enlightened enemies of the Church. The amalgamation of the ecclesiastical and the temporal had reached a highpoint in the late seventeenth century. The rise to absolutist principalities had taken place thanks to extensive support to the Church inspired by the Counter Reformation. But even in the period of the Enlightenment, especially in the years of economic distress and reconstruction following the Austrian War of Succession and the Seven Years' War, the Church with its possessions and revenues continued to represent a potential reservoir of state power. By way of ecclesiastical secundogenitures it offered the Catholic dynasties a possibility of providing for their sons, of increasing their prestige and power, and promoting their foreign and domestic policies. By means of cathedral chapters and religious establishments it secured for the feudal aristocracy and the knights of the Empire a sphere of freedom against the absolutist principalities. To the chagrin of the enlightened and the reform-minded, the territory, the rise to statehood, the jurisdictions, finances, and the economy everywhere were permeated by the Church. This made it advisable for the Catholic princes who at the time of the Enlightenment were still considering themselves as protectors of both tables of law to find better ways to control the Church, both in the interest of the state and for the sake of needed reforms in the Church. The respective limits were to be redetermined based on rational law and a deepened understanding of each other's nature and tasks.

---

[1] See above, pp. 443ff.

[2] Among the abundant literature concerning these problems, see L. A. Veit, "Emmerich Joseph von Breidbach-Bürresheim und die Verminderung der Feiertage," *Festschr. für Sebastian Merkle* (1922), 348–69; H. Illich, "Maßnahmen der Mainzer Erzbischöfe gegen kirchlichen Gütererwerb 1462–1792. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Aufklärungszeit," *Mainzer Zschr.* 34 (1939), 53–82; H. W. Jung, *Anselm Franz von Bentzel im Dienst der Kurfürsten von Mainz* (Wiesbaden 1966); J. Mack, *Die Reform- und Aufklärungsbestrebungen im Erzstift Salzburg unter Hieronymus von Colloredo* (Munich 1912); M. Schmidt, *Die Aufklärung im Fürstbistum Passau* (Munich 1933); M. Braubach, *Maria Theresias jüngster Sohn Max Franz, letzter Kurfürst von Köln und Bischof von Münster*; K. J. Krüger, *Carl Willibald Frh. von Groschlag* (diss., Munich 1967, Cologne 1970); R. Reinhardt, *Die Beziehungen von Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz zu Habsburg-Österreich in der Neuzeit. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur archivalischen Erforschung des Problems "Kirche und Staat"* (Wiesbaden 1966).

When the Catholic states began to consolidate and to take on new tasks it was but a small step from protection of the Church (*ius advocatiae, sive protectionis*) to protectorate or tutelage by means of Enlightenment. In many respects this step could appear to be almost one of self-defense by the princes against exaggerated ideas and oppressive power of the Church.[3] Dispensation from taxes and local immunity were issues well suited to promote the idea of the Church as a state within the state. The assets of the mortmain, the great number of mendicant houses, the many feast days, processionals, and pilgrimages could be represented as weakening the economic and financial strength of the territory, this in turn being responsible for the political weakness of the Catholic states. Furthermore, it could be attacked as being inconsistent with genuine piety.

There is no doubt that the growth of the established Church—especially since the middle of the eighteenth century—and its distinct

---

[3] R. Reinhardt, *Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat*, 173.

Austrian variety inadequately called Josephinism intended to reduce ecclesiastical power and ultimately achieve state supremacy over the Church. Yet this movement was neither inimical to the Church, nor was it innately synonymous with Enlightenment. Max III Joseph of Bavaria went relatively far in his sympathy with the Enlightenment; Joseph II wanted to assign it no more than a certain precisely limited sphere; and Karl Theodor, who implemented his system of an established Church in league with Rome, fought against Enlightenment in a variety of ways. A good many regulations of the established Church in the second half of the eighteenth century in ecclesiastical as well as temporal states were intended to remove abuses in the Church and to effect a church reform whose aim, dictated by the selfish interests of the state, by Jansenist, episcopal, and reform Catholic currents, was an approximation of the ideal of the *Ecclesia primitiva*.

Josephinism differs sharply from the old established church movement which reaches back into the late Middle Ages and reassumes a more prominent role as of the sixteenth century. It is "a 'harmonizing' of disparate elements of tension—disharmonious within itself"—and came about "through the mutual permeation of all movements and tendencies at work during the reign of Maria Theresa which did not unreservedly support baroque Catholicism."[4]

Theresianism and Josephinism

A fairly accurate conceptual determination of Josephinism encounters considerable difficulties because of the variety of the Habsburg territories, their rulers, and most influential personalities, and because of the interaction of disparate phases of its development. E. Winter, restricting himself to Bohemia and Moravia with their Protestant tendencies, provokingly calls Josephinism a reform Catholicism and the result of bourgeois ideas in the nascent national state. Making the unyielding established church system seem less offensive, he interprets Josephinism as "an attempt of a basic reform of the Roman Catholic Church in favor of the original Church."[5] In a narrow jurisdictional approach, F. Maaß calls it an enlightened Austrian established Church.[6] Not church reform, he continues, but omnipotence of the state was the ultimate goal of Josephinism. Valjavec, on the other hand, views it in its totality as an intellectual, spiritual, political, and economic phenomenon, determining Austria's history less in the eighteenth century than in the nineteenth century, whose mode of expression during the reign of Joseph II was not even its most typical. Josephinism, he maintains, was the result of attempts to harmonize the political, eccelesiastical, and cultural perceptions of the prior period and the spirit of the Enlightenment.[7] Kann minimizes the significance of the church reforms, but stresses the totalitarian features and the national component of Josephinism.[8] According to Rieser "the liquidation of the sphere of power of the Church within the state" represented the means of achieving the ultimate goal, "the omnipotence of the state."[9] Josephinism is also interpreted as a "latent decline from a revealed religion to a natural religion."[10] Reinhardt avers that Josephinism was not pointed in the direction of the future but instead represented "a reactionary force." It strove for dominance over a Church which had long before been emancipated, at least in its claims and doctrine. According to Reinhardt it attempted to glue together certain areas which had fallen apart.[11]

---

[4] P. F. Barton, *Ignatius Aurelius Fessler. Vom Barockkatholizismus zur Erweckungsbewegung* (Vienna, Graz and Cologne 1969), 36. On the origins of Josephinism, see also P. Bernard, *The Origins of Josephinism: Two Studies* (Colorado Springs 1964).

[5] E. Winter, *Der Josephinismus u. seine Geschichte* (Brünn, Munich and Vienna 1943), VII; idem, *Der Josephinismus. Die Gesch. des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus* (Berlin 1962), 7. In opposition to Winter, cf. Sissulak, *Das Christentum des Josephinismus*, 89; Maaß I, p. XIX.

The immediate prior history of Josephinism, among whose pioneers the "ultra-Catholic"[12] Ferdinand II is also included, was the established church system of Maria Theresa. She was the impulsive, ambitious daughter of the pious, intolerant Charles VI, who had promoted re-Catholization in Silesia, warded off renascent heresy in Carinthia and Styria, but steered the hard Bourbon course of an established Church against the Roman Curia. Maria Theresa was part of the tradition of a crumbling Habsburg baroque piety and anticurial concepts[13] of which even Jesuits at the Vienna court of the seventeenth century were not entirely free. There were hardly any typical features of that baroque piety present in her husband, Franz Stephan of Lorraine, who appears to have been the religiously and intellectually dominant part of that marriage.[14] During her widowhood after 1765 Maria Theresa herself was not closed to the ascetic way of Jansenism nor to reform Catholic tendencies. Privy Councilor Heinke, one of the most prominent representatives of Josephinism, showed the way towards harmonizing orthodox piety with the new enlightened established Church: "God alone entrusted the prince with his power; with it the right to protect religion and Church is inseparably connected, to the extent that he may never divest himself of this responsibility, for not without cause has God given him that right. But he protects the sanctuary of the Lord best if he redresses that which in itself can cause incurable wounds to be inflicted on the saving faith and in fact has done so."

---

[6] Maaß I, 71–73; F. Maaß, *Frühjosephinismus*, 8.

[7] Valjavec, *Der Josephinismus*, 7.

[8] Kann, *Kanzel und Katheder*, 136.

[9] H. Rieser, *Der Geist des Josephinismus und sein Fortleben* (Vienna 1963), 81.

[10] Ibid., 77.

[11] R. Reinhardt, *Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat*, 178.

[12] A. v. Luschin, *Grundriß der österreichischen Reichsgeschichte* (1918), 264; H. v. Srbik, *Wallensteins Ende* (Salzburg 1952), 116.

[13] F. Maaß (*Frühjosephinismus*, 13) stresses that she "had no profound theological knowledge and, moreover, had received an antipapal historical instruction in her youth."—On the "Pietas Austriaca," see A. Coreth (Vienna 1959).

The intensified consolidation of the Austrian established Church, which under Maria Theresa and Joseph II professed to be as ecclesiastical as before, can be attributed in part to the economic and political distress following the Austrian War of Succession and the Silesian Wars. Their contemporaries considered the cofounders of Theresianism to be the "Great Four" in Vienna: the impetuous personal physician to the Empress, Gerard von Swieten, moved by Jansenist ideas and hatred for the Jesuits, although a very religious man who in his capacity as censor released the book of Febronius and initiated university reforms; the Jansenist-leaning confessor of the Empress, Ignaz Müller, provost of the Augustinian prebendaries of Sankt Dorothea; the jurist Karl Anton von Martini, who made a name for himself as an opponent of torture; and, lastly, Ambros von Stock, prebendary of Sankt Stephan and future suffragan bishop. But the actual driving force behind the Theresian reforms and creator of the established church system based on the tenets of rationalistic law was Count Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz-Tietberg, prince of the Empire after 1764, who was a free thinker like Voltaire and a dispassionate proponent of power politics. He was supported by Privy Councilor Franz Joseph von Heinke. Kaunitz's program to transform the territories of the Habsburg monarchy into an absolutist modern state with the Church in its service contained the basic features of Theresianism and Josephinism, whose most radical manifestations he nonetheless eschewed. But the suggestion to replace the designation "Josephinism" by "Kaunitzianism"[15] is prompted by an overestimation of his influence and the erroneous assumption that this established church system can be reduced to one great personality.

---

[14] A. Wandruszka, "Die Religiosität Franz Stephans von Lothringen. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der "Pietas Austriaca" und zur Vorgeschichte des Josephinismus in Österreich," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 12 (1959), 172.

[15] Ellemunter, *Antonio Eugenio Visconti und die Anfänge des Josephinismus,* 179.

As a field of experimentation for the new system Kaunitz chose the Austrian Lombardy. In 1765 the *Giunta Economale* was established in Milan as the highest authority in ecclesiastical matters. The Milan governor Count Karl von Firmian was already familiar with Catholic reform concepts through his sojourn at the knights' academy of Ettal and his connections with the Salzburg Muratori circle. When difficulties with Clement XIII ensued over the appointments to the sees of Como and Mantua, the *placet* was introduced in Lombardy after the Spanish, Venetian, and Sicilian model. Next to be solved were the issues of church property, the taxation of the clergy, ecclesiastical censorship, and limiting the authority of monastic superiors. The suppression of small orders, which had been variously desired by the monks themselves, began in 1769 after compromises with the Pope. The excommunication on 30 January 1768 of Duke Ferdinand of Parma, the future son-in-law of the Empress, gave impetus to the Habsburg aspirations for an established Church. Having charged an imperial commission with the supervision of all ecclesiastical institutions in 1750, Maria Theresa radically restricted the assets of the mortmain by means of an amortization law in 1771. Regulations forbidding the taking of solemn vows before the age of twenty-four and others regarding termination, the presence of regulars outside their monastic institutions, and the abolition of monastic jails were to serve the reform of the regular clergy. Under the influence of reform Catholic and enlightened ideas, Maria Theresa then proceeded against the use of exorcism and processions. According to the canonist P. J. von Riegger, who was highly esteemed by the Empress, the reduction of church holidays, executed with the concurrence of the Pope, was an excellent means of promoting religiosity, reducing idleness, and creating due respect for useful activities and deserved scorn for useless ones.

Maria Theresa basically claimed all *Iura circa sacra*, so that the Theresian established Church differed from Josephinism merely in subtle distinctions and a stronger influence of the Enlightenment. We can no longer call Maria Theresa's attitude consistent with the traditional Catholicism of the Church; we should rather consider her the "mother of Josephinism."[16] As supreme protector and guardian of the Church, supported by Kaunitz, Joseph von Sonnenfels, Marc Anton Wittola, and Abbot Rautenstrauch (who submitted a curriculum for philosophical and theological studies), Joseph II—even during his coregency—had demanded complete subjugation of the Church under his enlightened system of an established Church. During his own reign he tried to effect this by measures which were frequently despotic and petty.[17] In the course of one decade more than six thousand decrees were issued in order to eliminate any voice by the Church in mixed matters, to restrict the Church to the administration of the sacraments, to intrachurch matters, and a service function in the enlightened welfare state. According to Sonnenfels the Church was a police institution, obliged to serve the aims of the state to the point where enlightenment of the people permits its replacement by the temporal police. The suppression of the Society of Jesus, pronounced by Clement XIII under pressure from the Bourbon courts (21 July 1773), was celebrated as a triumph of Enlightenment. "General seminaries" (1783) under the direction of Abbot Rautenstrauch were to educate a new sort of parish priest corresponding to the ideal of the "pastor bonus." The entire church assets were considered by Joseph II as "a patrimony for the benefit of spiritual welfare and human nature of which the clerical individuals and establishments are beneficiaries only to the extent of their needs appropriate to their station, while the secure disposition of the surplus for the above designation is a matter for the ruler as supreme guardian of the Church and the *canones*."

---

[16] F. Maaß, *Vorbereitung und Anfänge des Josephinismus*, 297.

The evaluation of Josephinism has often been decisively influenced by its hostility to monasticism and the orders; even today this is one of the determining factors. But a one-sided picture must perforce emerge if the antimonastic attitude of the baroque is contrasted with the promonastic tendency of the Enlightenment. This is also the case if the monastic reductions are justified only by the abuses which were certainly present but tendentiously exaggerated by the contemporary printed media. The decree of 29 November 1781 initiated the abolition of all houses of contemplative orders which did not fulfill charitable, pedagogical, or ministerial tasks because—according to the influential opinion of Kaunitz—they "were incapable of promoting the best in their fellow men and were consequently useless for bourgeois society." The reductions were subsequently extended to noncontemplative orders as well. This resulted in immeasurable loss of cultural assets, considerable damage to learning, and a rather large financial loss. The confiscated assets were to be transferred to a "Religious Fund" for ecclesiastical, charitable, and educational purposes. But this did not always happen. Monastic reductions and parish regulation were closely connected with the financial aspects involved.[18] But it is debatable whether the injurious effects of the reductions on the ministry and religious life could be made up for by the establishment of new parishes from the religious fund and the intensification of parish ministry as demanded by Jansenists and reform Catholics since the parish priests had to assume an increasing number of administrative tasks including the role of "health and veterinary police."[19] In regard to fiscal policy, which was one of the main motives for the abolition of the monastic houses, the profit does not seem to have fulfilled expectations. Also abolished in 1783 were the numerous brotherhoods, closely connected with the system of guilds, whose customs and personal religiosity were called "superstitious and fanatical" and not consistent with Catholic reform concepts. They were to be merged into a single charitable association with "all ecclesiastical privileges, indulgences, and favors" whose task it was to ameliorate existing social miseries.

---

[17] Regulations for the service prescribed the number of candles and the length of sermons. No church was to contain more than three altars. This pedantic intervention gave Joseph II the sobriquet of "Brother Sacristan."

[18] G. Winner, *Die Klosteraufhebungen in Niederösterreich und Wien* (Vienna and Munich 1967), 147.

The diocesan regulation by Joseph II stemmed from an old demand by the established Church to make the diocesan borders coincide with those of the territories; it was also prompted by economic and religious motives. The organization of the bishoprics in the hereditary lands, no doubt in need of reform, was to be made independent of nonresident foreign ordinaries; Austria was to be lifted out of the Empire in this regard with a concomitant practical reorganization of the indigenous sees. The new delineation of their borders was another step towards the subjugation of the Church, yet also a reform measure which held out the promise—at least to the native episcopate—of an intensification of the ministry and "the greatest possible independence from Rome and in some individual cases an expansion of the diocese."[20] To the affected prince-bishops the reordering of the dioceses could not but represent an attack on the constitution of the Church of the Empire, a violation of their "liberty"; it called for political consequences. The restructuring ran counter to the law of the Empire, all tradition, and amounted to toppling the constitution of the Church. It met with resistance in Rome. The reaction of the affected bishops ran the gamut from weak remonstrances to energetic protests (which were echoed in the Imperial Diet) to entreaties to the League of German Princes. The Mainz metropolitan and archchancellor Friedrich Karl von Erthal, in his capacity as "first archbishop and primate of the German Church," was considering joint action by the episcopate of the Empire "in order to maintain the constitutions of the Empire and the Church, so intimately interwoven in their time-honored state."

---

[19] Ibid., 70.

[20] Aretin, *Heiliges Römisches Reich* I, 138; ibid., 139: "Joseph was encouraged by his own episcopate, who were hoping that the energetic Emperor would protect them against Rome: they were convinced that the imperial reforms would be a blessing for the ministry." Kušej (26) emphasizes that "regarding the Austrian clergy and especially that of Austria proper, the reform project held no risk for Joseph II."

Right after the beginning of his independent reign Joseph II initiated the reordering of the dioceses in Tyrol and Upper and Lower Austria. Following the death of Bishop Leopold Ernst Cardinal von Firmian (13 February 1783), he separated the Austrian part from the diocese of Passau, dividing it between the newly created bishopric of Linz and the former bishopric of Wiener Neustadt, which latter was transferred to Sankt Pölten. The issue was not brought up in the Imperial Diet because the cathedral chapter, consisting mainly of members of the Austrian nobility, shrank from such a step and the new prince-bishop, Count von Auersperg, was satisfied with the return of his confiscated Passau properties. In 1786 the archbishop of Salzburg, Colloredo, was forced by Joseph II to forego his diocesan rights in Styria and Carinthia, but Salzburg did retain its diocesan rights in Tyrol and the metropolitan, confirmation, and consecration rights for the enlarged sees of Seckau, Lavant, Gurk and the newly established but short-lived bishopric of Leoben. It retained the nomination right for only the three first-named bishoprics; the right of appointment was reserved for the Emperor, who was endowing Leoben.[21] The death of the Regensburg prince-bishop Anton Ignaz von Fugger in 1787[22] was exploited by Joseph II "according to the old recipe";[23] during the *sedes vacans* he separated the district of Eger from the archdiocese of Regensburg and incorporated it into the archbishopric of Prague (1787). The newly elected prince-bishop of Regensburg, Max Prokop von Törring-Tettenbach, solicited the help of the archchancellor in Mainz and of Rome protesting the separation of the Eger district, since it was a pledged imperial fief and had never belonged to the crown of Bohemia. In 1789 Joseph II finally acquiesced to the appointment of an episcopal commissioner for that district. His death in 1790 delayed the final separation of Eger until after the decline of the Empire (1807–18). Hardly a stir was caused by the separation of the districts of Freising located in Styria, and of those diocesean parts of Liège which extended into the Austrian Netherlands. A realignment of the borders of Trier did not occur for political considerations, although here, too, Joseph II severely curtailed the rights of his relative, Archbishop Clemens Wenzeslaus. The strange suggestion of adapting the Silesian bishopric to the territorial borders—the Austrian part of the Breslau diocese was to be separated in exchange for Prague and Olmütz foregoing their Prussian parts—foundered on the refusal of Prussia. Efforts to realign the diocesean borders of Augsburg, Chur, and Constance also failed. Nor were plans realized to create a territorial bishopric of Bregenz[24] or to elevate the prince-abbey of Sankt Blasien to the status of a bishopric for Lower Austria. But the Austrian parts of the Venetian dioceses of Udine and Pola were separated and the diocesan borders in Bohemia, Moravia, and Galicia were realigned.

---

[21] Austria thus had the advantage "unlike any other states, of having four independent bishops and bishoprics of its own who were dependent on the Salzburg metropolitan in accordance with the wishes and intentions of the state instead of Rome in regard to any required changes of the bishoprics, translation of the residences, certification, and consecration of the bishops, as well as all other hierarchical matters" (Kušej, 175ff.; Seidenschnur, 280).

[22] E. Meissner, *Fürstbischof Anton Ignaz Fugger (1711–87)* (Tübingen 1969), 268.

[23] Aretin I, 145.

The bishops of the newly established dioceses were "in a certain sense civil servants and closely tied to the Josephinist concept of the state and the established Church" (Hugo Hantsch). Even today the cross on the chest of the vestment of the prebendaries of Linz and Sankt Pölten recalls the origin of these dioceses in the established Church. The diocesan realignment by Joseph II severed the last ties between Austria and the Empire. The reputation of the Emperor in the ecclesiastical territories, indeed in all of Catholic Europe, was damaged to such an extent that King Peter III of Portugal instituted in his realm "public hours of prayer for the Emperor blinded by the devil."[25]

Maria Theresa rejected the free exercise of religion for religious and political reasons, viewing the Catholic Church as a unifying element in the *Monarchia Austriaca*. In the second half of the century, under the influence of the Enlightenment, as well as for political and economic considerations, various German territories developed religious toleration on a legal basis which no longer took into account the existing law of the Empire.[26]

The Patent of Toleration (13 October 1781) by Joseph II, shaped by the ideas of the constitutional expert Martini[27] and Privy Councilor

---

[24] G. Karlinger and C. Holböck, *Die Vorarlberger Bistumsfrage. Geschichtliche Entwicklung und kirchenrechtliche Bedeutung* (Cologne 1963). See also F. Dörrer, *Bistrumsfragen Tirols nach der Grenzziehung von 1918* (Innsburck 1955); idem, "Der Wandel der Diözesaneinteilung Tirols und Vorarlbergs," *Tiroler Heimt, Jb. f. Gesch, und Volkskunde* 17 (1953), 41–74.

[25] Aretin I, 147.

[26] *IPO,* ART. VII, par. 2. One of the violations of imperial law was the toleration legislation in Austria which recognized the non-Uniate Greeks as a tolerated religious community. On toleration legislation by Joseph II, see the most recent work by C. H. O'Brien, *Ideas of Religious Toleration at the Time of Joseph II. A Study of the Enlightenment among Catholics in Austria* (Philadelphia 1969).

[27] Karl Anton Freiherr von Martini, who, unlike Christian August Freiherr von Beck, was not among the teachers of Joseph II, advocated a freedom of conscience beyond the intervention of the prince, but also a difference between the true and reigning religion on the one hand and the false and merely tolerated religion on the other. Beck with his

Beck, granted to the Augsburg and Helvetian Lutherans and members of the Reformed Churches as well as to the non-Uniate Greeks the right to private exercise of their religion and certain civil rights which amounted to a limited equality with the Catholics.[28] To the extent that non-Catholics already had the right of public exercise of their religion, they were not affected. The preferential position of the Roman Catholic Church—which in principle was the only one permitted to have public religious exercise—was also not to be affected by the patent. Non-Catholic churches were not to have spires, bell ringing, or access from the main street; surplice fees were to be reserved for the appropriate parish priest. Beyond the sanctioned denominations, no sects or deists were tolerated, but the emancipation of the Jews was initiated in spite of the Emperor's antipathy to them.[29]

Over the objections of the Curia and the nunciatures,[30] the toleration patent of Joseph II was soon emulated in the ecclesiastical territories of the Empire: in the archbishopric of Salzburg under the enlightened Hieronymus Colloredo, in Cologne under the youngest brother of the Emperor, Max Franz, and in Trier under Clemens Wenzeslaus of Saxony. These initiatives did not restrict the dominant position of the Catholic Church nor did they pave the way for religious indifference.

In the end, the hectic, often ruthless reforms, the petty interventions in the life of the Church and popular religious customs, the "intolerable tutelage" (H. Tüchle) of the Church by the state discredited Josephinism as a reform movement. While it stopped many an abuse and introduced welcome innovations, it also shook the fundaments of the living faith in a manner which threatened the state as well.

The objections by the Curia and the Vienna nuncios Giuseppe Garampi and G. B. Caprara against the Josephinist established church system were ineffective. The "apostolic" trip by Pius VI to Vienna (1782) brought about insignificant concessions, made out of courtesy rather than as a result of having come to an understanding about the

---

natural and international law is on the side of toleration without, however, giving any details on the legal structure of toleration.

[28] G. Frank, *Das Toleranz-Patent Kaiser Josephs II.* (Vienna 1882), 37; G. Mecenseffy, *Gesch. des Protestantismus in Österreich* (Graz 1956), 208.

[29] As of 2 January 1782, the personal customs duty for foreign Jews was abolished and on 29 March 1788 the regulations governing their mode of dress in Galicia were revoked. Furthermore, the Jews were granted the right to learn a trade, to study at the university and to establish factories. Letters patent prescribed the male and female names henceforth permitted "for use by the Jewish nation."

[30] H. Stevens, *Toleranzbestrebungen im Rheinland während der Zeit der Aufklärung* (diss., Bonn 1938); H. Raab, "Die Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Carlo Bellisomi," *RQ* 51 (1956), 88f., 114f.

essential problems. Emperor and Pope at first talked in a conciliatory but nonbinding fashion about the Patent of Toleration, the cancellation of the bulls *In coena Domini* and *Unigenitus*, and finally, accompanied by growing alienation, about almost all the political issues concerning the Church. An open break was avoided only by the Emperor's sudden but precisely calculated return visit to Rome in December 1783. One other result of this visit was the concordat of 20 January 1784 concerning the right of appointment for the duchies of Milan and Mantua, which had hitherto been exercised by the Holy See.

The archbishop of Vienna, Cardinal Christoph Anton Migazzi, headed the generally weak opposition against Josephinism in the hereditary lands. In Hungary, where "the desire was for an aristocratic monarchy instead of an enlightened despotism,"[31] the primate, Cardinal Joseph Batthyány, was a consistent opponent of the established Church. The rather inglorious campaign against the Turks was followed by open resistance in that kingdom and Joseph II, except for the Patent of Toleration, revoked his reform measures. From within the Empire the archbishops of Cologne and Trier registered their misgivings concerning a good many of the reforms.[32] But the most vehement opposition to Josephinism and the centralist bureaucratic system was encountered among the clergy of the Austrian Netherlands, at their head the archbishop of Mechelen, Count Johann Heinrich Ferdinand von Frackenberg, and among the cities and estates of that province. When Joseph II revoked the *Joyeuse Entrée*, the Austrian rule, except for the area around Luxemburg, collapsed in the Brabant revolution.[33]

The "deterioration in the psyche, body, and morale of the solitary and embittered Emperor"[34] and the accession of his more deliberate brother Leopold II initiated an amelioration of the Josephinist system, although Leopold was no less in favor of the established Church. The alleviation signaled by the restoration of some bishoprics and monastic establishments and the change of the order of worship, however, should not be taken as a dismantling of the established Church but rather as a contribution towards making peace. After all, Leopold's program regarding the established Church in the end went far beyond that of his brother. Because of the resistance by the bureaucracy, which continued to be dominated by the Josephinist spirit, there could be no retrenchment for some time yet. Even after 1815 when the Vienna Romanticism and ecclesiastical restoration around Friedrich Schlegel, Adam Müller, Zacharias Werner, and Clemens Maria Hofbauer signaled a movement against the Enlightenment and Josephinism, it never went beyond the starting point. Ideologically and politically radicalized after the July Revolution and then becoming gradually weaker and weaker, Josephinism represented a decisive force in the history of Austria until 1859.[35] Its aftereffects are still present in many areas.

---

[31] H. L. Mikoletzky, *Österreich. Das große 18. Jh. Von Leopold I. bis Leopold II.* (Vienna 1967), 367.

[32] G. Mohnike, "Briefwechsel zwischen Kaiser Joseph II. und Clemens Wenzel, Churfürsten von Trier," *ZHTh* 4 (Leipzig 1834), 241–90.

[33] H. Stradal, "Die brabantische Revolution des Jahres 1789 aus Wiener Sicht," *Anciens Pays et Assemblées d'État* 47 (Brussels 1968), 273–317.

[34] A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II.* II, 97.

The Established Church in Electoral Bavaria

The transition from the firmly traditional church sovereignty of the *Bavaria Sacra,* often rigorously maintained at the time of the Counter Reformation and denominational absolutism, to an enlightened established Church was initiated around the middle of the eighteenth century. Elector Max III Joseph (1745–77), to be sure, went "before his public as its Catholic ruler on many days of the year,"[36] just like his predecessors had done, adhering to the exclusivity of Catholicism in his land. Yet in theory and practice the established church system became stricter under his rule and more irritating to the orthodox believers. Enlightenment enveloped the Catholic territories of the Empire somewhat later than the Protestant ones; rationalism did so to a lesser degree. The older aspirations concerning the rights of the established Church were not completely transformed by the Enlightenment. They were merely given a new direction and a justification, misunderstood as a loss of religious substance, but instead derived from rationalistic law, to a lesser extent from history, but foremost from the concept of the all-encompassing enlightened welfare state.

At the core of Bavarian church policies from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century was the issue of separating the Bavarian lands from the old diocesan and metropolitan arrangement guaranteed by the constitution of the Empire. The secularization project under Charles VII, which could have decided the issue all at once and opened the road to a rearrangement, could not be realized.[37] All attempts to establish indigenous territorial bishoprics also failed.

A measured sort of Enlightenment fashioned by Barthel's Würzburg school of canonists and the concepts of Christian Wolff (1679–1754) and Christian Thomasius (1655–1728) was started under the influence of Johann Adam von Ickstatt (1702–66).[38] He was called to Munich as tutor to the future elector Max III Joseph in 1741 and five years later took over the first chair for jurisprudence and the office of director of the Bavarian university of Ingolstadt. Ickstatt's pupil Johann Georg von Lori, like his teacher a firm opponent of the Jesuits,[39] continued the development and laid the foundation for the "Churbayerische Akademie."[40] The reform, aimed at a consolidation of the established Church and a new foundation for the *Tura circa sacra*, whose urgency was caused largely by the economic and political distress after the Austrian War of Succession and during the Seven Years' War, goes back less to Ickstatt's teacher Wolff than to Pufendorf, Thomasius,[41] and the church law of the Würzburg school of canonists, getting support also from the older laws of the Bavarian established Church. In 1750, the privy council regulation, along the lines of the territorial Church policies of the eighteenth century which viewed the Church as a state institution, called it the duty of the sovereign "to undertake to augment the glory of God, to propagate the true Catholic religion, and to prevent all superstition, heresy, and injurious error."

---

[35] E. Winter, *Romantismus, Restauration und Frühliberalismus im österreichischen Vormärz* (Vienna 1968).

[36] Rall, *Kurbayern*, 255.

[37] See below, pp. 493f.

The actual initiator of pertinent measures which began in 1761 and no longer were based on privileges and concordats but on local law was Peter von Osterwald (1717–77),[42] a convert from Weilburg, pupil of

---

[38] A. Kluckhohn, *Der Freiherr von Ickstatt und das Unterrichtswesen in Bayern unter dem Churfürsten Maximilian Joseph* (Munich 1869); M. Spindler, *Electoralis Academiae Primordia* (Munich 1959), index; L. Hammermayer, *Gründungs- und Frühgeschichte der Bayerischen Akademie* (Kallmünz 1959), index.

[39] R. v. Dülmen, "Antijesuitismus und Aufklärung in Deutschland," *HJ* 89 (1969), 52–80.—On the anti-Jesuit attitude and Enlightenment among the clergy of the Church of the Empire, esp. the canonists of the Barthel school, see H. Raab, "Georg Christoph Neller und Febronius," *AMrhKG* 11 (1959), 186ff.

[40] L. Hammermayer, *Gründungs- und Frühgeschichte,* 44f.; M. A. v. Bergmann, *De Ducum Boioariae Jure regio praesertim succedendi in Nobilium Patriae feuda activa gentilitia exstinctis Masculis* (Munich 1754), a student of Lori, he based the automomy of the Bavarian Church on history, tracing it to the Agilolfingians.

[41] Habenschaden, *Die Kirchenpolitik Bayerns unter Kurfürst Karl Theodor*, 335, n. 3; in contrast to Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, who stresses the influence of Wolff, he traces "all the reforms of the established Church, implemented under the influence of Ickstatt" back to Pufendorf and Thomasius. In regard to the genesis of the reform movement, Rall (260) also refers to the "orientation with the doctrine of English natural law."

[42] H. Raab, *LThK* VII (1962), 1284; Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, 101ff.; Osterwald, for the rest of his life, maintained "something of the typical severity of a convert." For him "the exclusively Catholic state remained the central axiom of his ideas regarding the canon law of the established Church. Josephinian toleration or that of the Montgelas epoch is totally alien to Osterwald's system of reforms" (Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, 103). J. Gebele, *Peter von Osterwald, ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Aufklärung unter Kurfürst Max III. Joseph* (Munich 1891); Rall, *Kurbayern,* passim; M. Spindler, op. cit., esp. 521; L. Hammermayer, op. cit., passim.

Wolff, and temporal director of the Ecclesiastical Council as of 1761. His programmatic work *Veremund von Lochsteins Gründe sowohl für als wider die geistliche Immunität in zeitlichen Dingen* (Strasbourg 1766)[43] emanated from the disputes with the Bavarian monasteries about the decimations and was built on the writings of Van Espen, Giannone, Grotius, and Pufendorf. In it he rejects as presumptions not only the principle of immunity, hitherto claimed by the ecclesiastical authorities, but also the curialist theory of the relationship between Church and state as a "monstrous doctrine" and as "the language of all violators of royal sovereignty." Contradicting the existing view of the personal and real immunity of the clergy, which lifts it from the subject structure of the state, Osterwald points out that such immunity and the clergy's subordination under another sovereign power contradicts the sovereignty of the state. Ecclesiastical immunity in temporal matters, he continues, is a state privilege and therefore subject to immediate restriction or recall. Local immunity (the right of asylum) must be abolished. All mixed matters, merely annexed to the *spiritualia,* such as weddings, charitable bequests, exemptions of the clergy, and *spiritualia* not directly required for the blessedness of man (for instance, pilgrimages, processions, etc.) are by their nature essentially within the province of the state.

Osterwald's goal was the replacement of the numerous arrangements—often unclear in their stipulations and varying in their basic tenor—made with the prince-bishops in the last 150 years by a single uniform concordat. He strove for the extension of state sovereignty over the Church and the realization of a moderately enlightened welfare state. Osterwald's theses offered the state possibilities for far-reaching interventions even in the actual ecclesiastical realm, but on the other hand rejected any interference by the Church in temporal affairs. As a result, the Bavarian government taxed the clergy "for the needs of the land" on the basis of sovereign right (1769, 1770), creating difficulties with its own clergy. This problem as well as financial considerations soon prompted the government to seek papal decimation approvals which were quickly granted on 21 September 1771.

The amortization law of 13 October 1764 was a result of economic considerations. After previous amortization laws proved ineffective, (1672, 1704, 1730), the fight against the mortmain (with its origins in the late Middle Ages) was to be pursued more energetically in

---

[43] When the Freising prince-bishop Clemens Wenzeslaus of Saxony suppressed Osterwald's book, which had reached four printings by 1770, the elector issued a mandate against the prince-bishop (28 August 1766).

Bavaria.[44] The reorganization of the Ecclesiastical Council (1768) which restored the influence of the laity to its status prior to the concordat of 1583 improved the possibilities for putting the territorialist ideas into practice. The first monastic mandate (29 September 1768) demanded precise numerical details about the houses and submission of the letters of endowment. The founding of brotherhoods was made subject to government approval on 9 December 1768; those already in existence had to submit painstaking reports concerning their origin and founder, statutes, activities, and assets (1769). The mandate of indigenousness of 20 December 1768 excluded foreigners and nonnatives from all benefices.[45]

The reform mandates of the next few years invoked the protectionary power over Church and religion entrusted by God to the elector. On 16 February 1769, a governmental book censorship, independent of ecclesiastical censorship, was installed."The especially urgent need for a reform of the ecclesiastical right of betrothal"[46] led to the sponsalia mandate of 1769, which contained strict regulations: betrothals were henceforth to be made only in the presence of two witnesses and, in the case of young or indigent persons, only with the permission of parents, guardians, or the state; disputes involving betrothals were to be subject to temporal justice. The mandates in monastic matters, partly justified and aimed at the condition of "first investiture" were hastened by discovery and disclosures of abuses and the monachal tendency of Enlightenment. A mandate for the reform of religious orders in 1769 prohibited the taking of solemn vows before the age of twenty-one, largely limited the penal authority of the superiors, and abolished monastic incarceration. For certain cases it permitted the *Recursus ad principem,* applied since the end of the sixteenth century against excesses of ecclesiastical authority, and generally forbade collections by religious. In 1763 after the prohibition of visitations and election supervision by nonresident prelates in Bavaria, a law of 30 December 1769 aimed at a total separation of the Bavarian monasteries and convents from foreign superiors and provinces. If there were more than three institutions of the same order within Bavaria, an independent Bavarian province was to be established. The number of foreigners in monastic communities was to be no more than one sixth of the regulars; only natives were to be entitled to the passive franchise. The episcopal elections in Freising, Regensburg, Passau, and Chiemsee were to include the presence of Bavarian election commissioners in addition to the imperial ones and the rights of the former at the elections were to be substantially expanded. On 3 April 1770, the occasionally practiced *placet* was prescribed for all ecclesiastical regulations and the practice of recourse was expanded. The congress of delegates of the Bavarian bishops in Salzburg (1770–71) represented an episcopal-Febronian reaction to this enlightened-territorial church program which culminated in the establishment of one or several territorial bishoprics.[47] The suggestions, formulated in the main by the dean of the Salzburg cathedral chapter and later bishop of Chiemsee, Count Ferdinand Christoph zu Zeil, foundered on the difficult legal situation, the lack of unanimity among the Bavarian episcopate, and on the fact that the Bavarian government came to an understanding with the Curia. Zeil managed to bring about a conciliatory agreement concerning the election of prelates (1774), but the negotiations for a uniform concordat were at an impasse when the elector died in 1777. As could be ascertained a year earlier at the talks regarding the establishment of a nunciature in Munich, the goals of an established Church in Bavaria were intended to be achieved in concert with Rome and in the face of the imperial episcopate.

---

[44] M. Doeberl, "Der Ursprung der Amortisations gesetzgebung in Bayern," *Forschungen zur Gesch. Bayerns* 10 (1902).—For a comparison we refer to the legislation on amortization in electoral Mainz going back to Adolf II of Nassau (1462); see the thorough treatise by H. Illich.

[45] On the difference stemming from the civil rights mandate between Bavaria and Austria, see Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, 120f.

[46] Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, 125.

Elector Max III Joseph was succeeded by the sensitive Karl Theodor (1742/77–99), who united the Palatine Electorate and Bavaria under his rule after the Wilhelminian line of the Wittelsbachs became extinct. While he vacillated "between the Enlightenment and its opposite and in 1790 once again from one pole to the other,"[48] the Bavarian established Church was not only basically maintained but further developed by means of individual regulations which extended the sovereign protection of the Church into a sort of church administration[49] and ended in the "complete muzzling of the Church" (Schwaiger). When the Ecclesiastical Council was reconstituted, the *Recursus ab abusu* was expanded, regulated by law, and the *placet* was again enjoined. In 1781 the court ordered the founding of an independent Bavarian branch of the Knights of Malta; its partial secularization was designed to provide for the court's protégés. This course was abandoned in favor of tapping the considerable assets of the suppressed Society of Jesus. The initial plan triggered a quickly collapsing reaction by the Bavarian prelates but no objection by Rome. In spite of his measures towards an established Church, Karl Theodor remained on good terms with the Curia. These were consolidated by his personal meeting with Pius VI in Munich and stood the test of opposition by the imperial Church on the occasion of the Munich nunciature conflict.[50] Karl Theodor did not achieve his ultimate goal, the separation of Bavaria from the Church of the Empire and the establishment of one or more territorial bishoprics, a goal inherited from the Wittelsbach political tradition.[51] But he was able to obtain from Pius VI the compromise solution of a permanent nunciature in Munich (1785) and, in an alliance of expedience with Rome, to substantially subjugate the *Bavaria Sacra.*[52] By the brief *Convenit provide* (1789) Rome agreed to the founding of a court diocese after the model of Sardinia and Naples, restricted to the newly organized collegiate see of Our Lady and the court churches, but exempt from ties with the Freising diocese and the Salzburg metropolitanate. The connection between the court diocese and the presidium of the Ecclesiastical Council confirmed the political intentions of the Bavarian government in relation to the episcopate. It was—as the most immediately affected bishop of Freising had already been forced to realize when the electoral capitulation was changed by the cathedral chapter—a revolutionary intervention in the thousand-year-old German church constitution and an initial, albeit modest, beginning in the reorganization of the Bavarian episcopate.

---

[47] L. Hammermayer (M. Spindler, ed., *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte* II [Munich 1966], 1096) calls the congress of Salzburg "the most dangerous attack of the episcopal Church of the Empire against Bavarian territorialism."

[48] Rall, *Kurbayern*, 256.

[49] Ibid., 270.

The tensions between the Munich court bishopric and the Freising ordinariate partly explain the intervention by Karl Theodor in the Freising episcopal election, conducted during the interregnum of 1790 and vehemently attacked by the episcopal media. In contradiction to the statutes of the cathedral chapter, by applying his rights as the Palatine imperial vicar[53] and by effectively setting aside the right of free election

---

[50] See above, p. 465.

[51] Habenschaden, *Die Kirchenpolitik Bayerns,* 339.

[52] See above, pp. 465–69. The passive role of the prince-bishop of Regensburg is referred to by E. Meissner, *Fürstbischof Anton Ignaz Fugger* (*1711–1787*) (Tübingen 1969), 225f. Fugger saw "the main danger to the jurisdiction of the ordinaries in the claims of the four archbishops at the Congress of Ems" and less so in the rights of the Munich nuncio.

[53] W. Hermkes, *Das Reichsvikariat in Deutschland. Reichsvikare nach dem Tode des Kaisers von der Goldenen Bulle bis zum Ende des Reiches* (Karlsruhe 1968), 110 ff.; also J. R. v. Roth, *Von dem anmaßlichen Rechte eines Reichsverwesers, Reichsvikariatskommissarien zu den teutschen Bischofswahlen zu schicken* (1780); idem, *Einige staatsrechtliche Betrachtungen ueber die in den zwischen Kurmainz und Kurpfalz gewechselten Staatsschriften aufgestellten Grundsaetze, die kurpfaelzischen Reichsvikariats und kurmainzischen Erzkanzlariats-Gerechtsamen, waehrenden Zwischenreiche betreffend* (1790).

Karl Theodor prevailed with his candidate, the prince-provost of Berchtesgaden, Joseph Conrad von Schroffenberg, known as an opponent of episcopalism. Against the protests of the cathedral chapters and the Mainz elector Friedrich Karl von Erthal (in the latter's capacity as lord chancellor and "first bishop of the German Church"), he dispatched vicariate commissioners to the episcopal elections in Regensburg and Eichstätt. Although his candidate prevailed only in Regensburg—again it was Schroffenberg, who agreed in 1795 to the annexation of his chapter of Berchtesgaden by Bavaria, which was the equivalent of secularization—and he failed to obtain the right to first prayers during the imperial vicariate,[54] Karl Theodor had nonetheless succeeded in these episcopal elections "to prevail with a principle which opened new possibilities for the Bavarian established Church in future interregnums."[55]

The rights of Bavarian election commissioners regarding elections in native monasteries, consolidated under Max III Joseph, were again expanded by a decree dated 5 February 1791 for the purpose of "maintaining canonical freedom."[56] The attacks against the monasteries came to a head in 1793 with the regulation regarding investiture and profession examinations. A reform-Catholic tendency for stopping abuses appears to have determined the reduction of processions and pilgrimages, the prohibition of passion plays, and the attenuated application of regulations concerning holidays. The decimations, approved by Pius VI in 1787 and 1798 for the purpose of alleviating the state of emergency, can be taken as a result of the alliance between Rome and the Bavarian established church system. Their implementation, prepared with the help of the nuncio Ziucci for the latter's personal advantage, demonstrate the absolute sovereignty of the state in taxation. It consolidated the state's dominance over a Church already under the shadow of secularization and raised the specter of an even more oppressive established church system for a future already threatened by political unrest and wars. The secularization of 1803 eliminated the ecclesiastical states, which—as irritating foreign bodies in the Bavarian territory—had been the actual opponents of the established Church and opened the way for the reorganization of the Church, an object of aspirations since the sixteenth century.

---

[54] On the right of first petition claimed also by electoral Saxony, see the ref. by H. Bauer, *Das Recht der ersten Bitte bei den deutschen Königen bis auf Karl IV.* (Stuttgart 1919), 128. On the claims by the Palatine electorate, see L. Jadin, *L'Europe au début du XVIII^e siècle. Correspondance du Baron Karg de Bebenbourg, Chancellier du Prince-Évêque de Liège, Joseph Clément de Bavière, Archevêque Électeur de Cologne, avec le Cardinal Paolucci* I (Rome and Brussels 1968), 476, 486.

[55] Aretin I, 420.

[56] M. Doeberl, *Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns* II (Munich 1928), 363; B. Walcher, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der bayerischen Abtswahlen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Benediktinerklöster* (1930), 26.—On the dispatch of Bavarian election commissioners to the elections of bishops, see H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus* I (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1962), 355–59. It was justified by the "Landsasserey, mit welcher diese Bischöfe (Freising, Regensburg, Eichstätt, Passau) denen Hertzögen seit den ältesten Zeiten bis weit in das 14. Jh. hinein zugetan waren."

CHAPTER 25

State and Church in Poland-Lithuania to the End of the Republic of the Aristocracy

After the Counter Reformation in Poland-Lithuania had prevailed under Sigismund III (1587–1632) and Ladislas IV (1632–48), the Roman Curia expected the Polish kings to support its diplomacy in eastern Europe and consequently involved them in the coalition against the Turks and its efforts to persuade the Orthodox into union with Rome. In 1648 when the Jesuit John Casimir was elected king, Pope Innocent X granted him dispensation from his vows and laicized him. The King temporarily succeeded in pacifying his country, which had been ravaged by Swedish, Russian, and Turkish invasions, and by Cossack rebellions. The heroic defense of the Pauline monastery on the Jasna Góra near Częstochowa in 1655 turned this place of pilgrimage to Mary into a Polish national shrine. In 1656 the King declared the Virgin Mary Queen of Poland (*Regina Poloniae*). The contest by the French and Habsburg courts for influence in Poland, as well as domestic and foreign difficulties prompted him to abdicate. Successes against the Turks could not be achieved until the reign of John Sobieski (1674–96), who was instrumental in lifting the siege of Vienna by the Turks in 1683, regaining for Poland the designation of "The Outer Wall of the Occident" (*antemurale christianitatis*). But Sobieski was unable to prevail when the nobles continued to insist on their privileges. As a consequence the Polish-Lithuanian state suffered greatly under the unrestrained liberties exercised by the nobility and the disastrous veto right of any delegate to the Sejm (diet) (*liberum veto*).

During the interregnum Primate Cardinal Radziejowski solicited votes for the French candidate, Prince François Louis Conti, while the nobility were in favor of the Wettin elector Friedrich August the Strong. Prior to the election the latter secretly converted to Catholicism[1] and when elected called himself Augustus II (1697–1733). The rival King Stanislas Leszczyński,[2] supported by Sweden and later on by his father-in-law Louis XIV, was able to maintain himself only during the Northern War (1704–09) and the Polish War of Succession (1733–35). After the death of Augustus II, Emperor Charles VI and Tsarina Anna Ivanovna made sure that the son of the dead King succeeded him to the throne as Augustus III.

---

[1] P. Hildebrand, *Die polnische Königswahl von 1697 und die Konversion Augusts I. des Starken* (Rome 1907).

The Counter Reformation had excessively enlarged the power of Catholicism. The Protestants were oppressed; they were not allowed to build any new churches after 1717; in 1724 after the Protestant population stormed the Jesuit school in Thorn, the mayor and nine other Protestants were executed. The Uniates, treated as second-class Catholics even in the seventeenth century, were forced to accept certain rites and customs of the Roman Catholic established Church.[3] The rights of the Orthodox were also restricted. The kings of Prussia and the tsars gave protection to the Protestants and Orthodox respectively. As early as the reign of the Saxon kings the Russians intervened repeatedly in Polish affairs; their troops were stationed on Polish soil after 1717 in order to break any opposition to Russian interests. After the death of Augustus III, Catherine II[4] helped her favorite, Stanisłas Augustus Poniatowski, to ascend to the Polish throne (1764–95).[5] Aside from the supremacy and discord of the Polish nobility it was the expansionist tendencies of the neighboring great powers that brought about the disintegration of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century.[6]

The Catholic patriotic opposition, founded in 1768 by Bishop Adam Stanisłas Krašinski of Kamieniec as the Confederation of Bar, was unable to stem the tide of Russian power; the rebels were crushed by the Russians after four years of fighting. The first partition, decreed by Russia, Austria, and Prussia in 1772, cost Poland about 30 percent of its territory and almost half its population. Well-known clerics participated in attempts to stabilize the domestic conditions by means of reforms. They included the Piarist Stanisłas Konarski (1700–1773),[7] famous as a preacher and politician, Bishop Adam Stanisłas Naruszevicz of Łuck (1733–96), recognized as the founder of modern Polish historiography, and the prebend Hugo Kołłatej (1750–1812), who reestablished the Cracow academy. They also participated in formulating the constitution of 3 May 1791, which recognized Catholicism as the state religion but also guaranteed the free exercise of religion for all dissidents. The efforts of inner renewal came to an abrupt end through the second partition of Poland by Russia and Prussia and through the third partition, wherein the three neighboring countries occupied the remainder of the country. The name of Poland was removed from all maps. Nuncio Lorenzo Litta (1793–95) protested in vain against the dismemberment of Poland-Lithuania, of which Russia had seized 465,000, Prussia 145,000, and Austria 115,000 square kilometers.

---

[2] J. Staszewski, *Stosunki Augusta II z kuria rzymska w latach 1704–06* (Torun 1965).

[3] See Chap. 14 above, p. 223.

[4] See Chap. 13 above, p. 206.

[5] K. Zernack, "Stanislaus August Poniatowski," *JGO* n.s. 15 (1967), 391–92.

[6] Lord Eversley, *The Partitions of Poland* (London 1915); H. H. Kaplan, *The First Partition of Poland* (New York and London 1962).

[7] W. Konopczyński, *Stanisław Konarski* (Warsaw 1926); M. Plezia, *Dookola reformy szkolnej St. Konarskiego* (Lublin 1953); Ł. Kurdybacha, *Działalnośé pedagogiczna Stanisława Konarskiego* (Wroclaw and Warsaw 1957).

The Church was substantially weakened by confiscations and secularization. Its organization with its two church provinces of Gnesen and Lemberg was enmeshed in political disputes. The religious orders which had shaped Polish Catholicism under the successive influence of Spain and France lost many of their establishments. In spite of the threat represented by Orthodox Russia, the Josephinist established Church of Austria, and Protestant Prussia during the following decades, membership in the Catholic Church was a factor which united the majority of Poles across the borders of their partitioned country.

CHAPTER 26

The Decline of the Church of the Empire in the Great Secularization

The suspension of the Restitution Edict, the imperial offer to Brandenburg of 1 February 1647 to satisfy its compensatory claims by means of secularizations meant the beginning of the end for the ecclesiastical states and thereby the initiation of the dissolution of the Empire, concluded a century and a half later with the total secularization of 1803. Secularization, the deterioration of the Empire, and the rise of modern, absolutist German principalities in the seventeenth and eighteenth century were intertwined in a very complex process. This is demonstrated by the printed media, the political theory of the state, the peace negotiations of Osnabrück and Münster, Nijmegen, Rijswijk, and Baden, and by the secularization projects between 1648 and 1789. The Peace of Westphalia acknowledged the secularizations as a means of restitution after the standard year of 1624, as compensation and reparation. In assigning ecclesiastical principalities to temporal territories it took into account the actual denominational status and the political necessities, even to the extent of the compromise of a partial secularization of the prince-bishopric of Osnabrück by means of an alternation principle between a Catholic bishop and a prince of the Guelfs ("pseudobishop"). While the surviving ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Imperial Diet and holders of benefices did have certain guaranties by virtue of the standard year and day as well as the Imperial electoral capitulation, there were a number of secularization projects and actual secularizations of church assets by the various principalities during the seventeenth and eighteenth century. According to Pufendorf the most serious political omission by the Empire was not to go ahead with a total secularization at the Peace of Westphalia after the Swedish or Danish model. The course of church history in the period between that peace treaty and the imperial delegates' final recess was decisively determined by a number of elements: aspirations for secularization initially on the part of Protestant princes, the fear of secularization, the desire by the Church of the Empire to secure its existence by deferring to the dynastic church policies of the Habsburgs, Wittelsbachs, Lorrainers, and Wettins, and, finally, the accumulation of benefices by the eligible nobility.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth century the secularizations in their various stages of development have to be considered as a fight for the continued existence or the dissolution of the Empire, for Catholic or Protestant hegemony, and as preliminaries of the total secularization of 1803. They emanated from those territories and dynasties who thought themselves disadvantaged in the great give-and-take of administrative realignment and compensation of the Peace of Westphalia and who felt they could raise claims for ecclesiastical properties either on the basis of their being intermingled with ecclesiastical states or because of certain stipulations of the peace agreements. Among the prime objects for secularization were the archbishopric of Hildesheim, a Catholic island in the midst of the Protestant territory of the Guelfs and rendered helpless by the Quedlinburg Recession; the archbishopric of Osnabrück, partially secularized by the disastrous alternation principle; and, lastly, the small archbishopric of Worms, situated as it was in the tense area between the electorates of Mainz and the Palatinate. These ecclesiastical states were saved from secularization in the seventeenth and eighteenth century only by personal union with more powerful imperial bishoprics (such as the electorates of Cologne, Mainz, and Trier) and by the church policies of the great Catholic dynasties, who exploited the territorial and political disputes between the Protestant princes.

The plans for secularization in the seventeenth century are permeated with vaguely formulated intentions of conversion and negotiations for church reunion, especially in the cases of Ernst August von Braunschweig-Lüneburg, first in his capacity as "pseudobishop" of Osnabrück and then as duke of Hanover, and the elector Karl Ludwig of the Palatinate. The dynastic policies vis-à-vis the Church of the Empire with the expectation of consolidating ecclesiastical secundogenitures in general delayed plans for secularization in the Catholic part of the Empire. On the other hand, there were reformers of the Church and the Empire, such as Antoine Arnauld or the learned Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels, a convert to Catholicism who intended to establish a total of sixty new German bishoprics from secularized properties of the Church of the Empire, create an electorate reserved for the Emperor, and make an offer to the Protestant princes for a reunion with a reformed Catholic Church.

None of the revolutionary plans for reform amounting to a complete secularization—probably at the expense of the Church—were realized. A greater danger for the ecclesiastical states was the desire for expansion and administrative realignment of the temporal territories combined with inner reforms. According to the well-known words of Ranke, Prussia was not the only state founded on the principle of secularization since the time of the Great Elector. As the ecclesiastical states were gradually reduced to the status of a political sop, as manifested in the negotiations of the Nijmegen Peace, in the Austrian War of Succession, and the third Silesian War, the will on the part of the Catholic Emperor and that of the papacy as well to defend "God's inheritance" in the Empire steadily slackened. Plans to revoke the secularizations in connection with a territorial reorganization of the Empire as proffered by Nuncio Bevilacqua at the peace negotiations of Nijmegen and by Passionei at Baden came to nought because of the weak position of the Catholic powers relative to the prevailing interests and alliances.

Fears of secularization of the *Germania Sacra* were repeatedly used in the eighteenth century as weapons of Wittelbach and Hapsburg politics in the context of the Church of the Empire, especially so by Maria Theresa in her fight against the Wittelsbach Emperor Charles VII, at the episcopal elections around the middle of the century, and during the Seven Years' War against Frederick the Great for Silesia and hegemony in the Empire. At the time of the Austrian War of Succession and during the crisis of the Empire when there was a possibility of a Swabian kingdom for Charles VII and a southern German buffer state between Austria and France, Berlin promoted a secularization project. It intended to use the southern German archbishoprics of Freising, Regensburg, Salzburg, and Eichstätt as imperial reserves for the formation of a household force for the Wittelsbach Emperor Charles VII, to expand Prussia by the addition of the ecclesiastical territories of Breslau-Neiße and Münster, and, lastly, to compensate Austria with the prince-bishopric of Passau. A weak Charles VII, who had not given a clear negative reply to that tempting secularization project advocated by his Prussian ally, tried the traditional path of imperial church politics. He had in mind securing for his brother Johann Theodor—in addition to the archbishoprics of Regensburg and Freising—the prince-bishoprics of Eichstätt, Speyer, Worms, Liège, Trier, and the prince-diocese of Ellwangen. Such a second Wittelsbach episcopal realm would have created the required additional power for his dynasty by a partial, "Catholic" secularization.

Maria Theresa, at odds with Prussia and Bavaria, employed all the means at her disposal to oppose this secularization project and to discredit the powerless and landless Wittelsbach Emperor in the Catholic part of the Empire. That part of the country was dissatisfied not only with the church policies of the *Defensor ecclesiae*, but also with the attitude toward the ecclesiastical princes of the Francophile Pope Benedict XIV, who distrusted the pragmatic powers. Episcopal Germany felt the growing discomfort of Rome over the consolidation of crosier and sword, of bishopric and sovereign power. But in the interest of the Church it was unwilling to give up this consolidation, since the will and the power to protect the ecclesiastical states seemed to decrease in direct proportion to the growing authoritarian demeanor of the prince-bishops towards the nunciatures and the Roman church offices, and the more they tried to realize episcopal concepts regarding the church constitution and to execute the transition from a late medieval territory to a modern absolutist state.

By the end of 1743 the most acute danger to the ecclesiastical states had passed, even though the following year Wilhelm VIII of Hesse-Kassel staked his claim to the secularization of the prince-bishopric of Paderborn and the abbeys of Fulda and Corvey and although there was a possibility that the secularization project of the Westphalian ecclesiastic territories in favor of a new electorate of Hesse-Kassel might surface again. Plans for secularization entered a new phase with the beginning of the Seven Years' War, which Ranke thought had been a religious war, "not explicitly so, but by its nature and perceived as such by everyone."[1] An end to the alternation principle in the archdiocese of Osnabrück, the secularization of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Münster in favor of England-Hanover, of Erfurt and Eichsfeld (at that time part of the Mainz electorate) in favor of Hesse-Kassel, Hanover, or other Protestant states played a very prominent role in the projects of Frederick the Great until 1759. Combined with other intended changes they would have enabled Prussia and Hanover "to tear Northern Germany from the

---

[1] L. v. Ranke, *Zur Gesch. von Österreich und Preußen zwischen den Friedensschlüssen von Aachen und Hubertusburg* (Leipzig 1875), 316.

Holy Roman Empire and to create independent realms."[2] In the last few years of the Seven Years' War, following the death of Elector-Archbishop Clemens August (d. 6 February 1761), the vacant archdioceses of the Wittelsbach ecclesiastical secundogenitures in the northwestern part of Germany were ideal objects for administrative realignment and compensation, not only for Prussia, England-Hanover, and Hesse-Kassel, but for a number of Catholic powers as well in order to heal the wounds of the allied electorate of Saxony and by the election of Clemens Wenzeslaus to provide for the Catholic Wettin dynasty an episcopal realm in northwestern Germany. For the northwestern German *Germania Sacra* the worst was in the end averted less by the efforts of the Emperor, the Catholic princes of the diet, or France than by the emerging differences between Prussia and England-Hanover and Holland's policy regarding the prince-bishopric of Münster. A Wettin ecclesiastical secundogeniture which would have been established at the expense of the eligible nobility was prevented by the elections *ex gremio* in Cologne, Münster, Hildesheim, and Paderborn. But in Osnabrück the election of the barely six-month-old Frederick of York, whose governmental affairs were conducted by two councilors appointed by his father, George III of England, was a step towards correcting the Peace of Westphalia.

The discrepancy between the aspirations and the capabilities in the militarily powerless ecclesiastical states, dependent for better or for worse on the Empire, and between the aspirations and obligations of the imperial and also the papal policies became more and more manifest during the second third of the eighteenth century. For the states under the crosier and infula the three peaceful decades between the Peace of Hubertusburg and the outbreak of the Wars of Revolution were neither tired and stifling nor were they the halcyon days that they were called by contemporary sources and historical presentations. Indeed, the vast majority of the ecclesiastical territories were flourishing to a greater or lesser degree under a moderate enlightenment, and respectable scholarly activities developed at many Catholic universities and monastic institutions which did not have to shrink from a comparison with developments in the Protestant parts of the Empire; perhaps no other period can better claim the old proverb that life under the crosier was good. Yet this blossoming in the bishoprics and abbeys and the eudaemonia of the Catholic Enlightenment was frequently achieved at the expense of the basic religious-ecclesiastical ideas. At the same time, the belletrists, hostile to the Church, and the enlightened advocates of the rights of the state raised more and more probing questions regarding the justification for being of the ecclesiastical states and authority over the Church assets.

---

[2] G. Volz, "Friedrichs des Großen Plan einer Losreißung Polens von Deutschland," *HZ* 122 (1920), 272.

It is difficult to determine with any precision the significance of the publicity campaign of the cathedral canon Philipp Anton von Bibra of Fulda, the writings of Baron K. von Moser, Schnaubert, and Weiße for the preparation of secularization. The veritable flood of paper was certainly not quite as harmless to the existence of the ecclesiastical states as even some contemporary episcopal censors, such as Turin in Mainz, or later historians have occasionally assumed. It was actually more a signal for the attack of secularization and—inasmuch as it came from within the ecclesiastical states themselves—an expression of a growing "feeling of impending doom" (F. Schlegel). The signs of an inner readiness for secularization on the part of ecclesiastical institutions and territories increased, as shown by the transformation of abbeys and convents into secular institutions for nobles or institutes for secular priests, by the suppression of monastic establishments even by ecclesiastical princes with or without papal permission, and, lastly, by the growing severity of the amortization laws. The application for secularization by the prince-bishop of Trent, Peter Vigil von Thun, in 1781/82 lends credence to the fact that a secure pension could be more tempting to an ecclesiastical prince than the rule over a small, scarcely profitable territory, pressed by powerful neighbors. No doubt the tendency towards secularization was also promoted by the old rivalry between the secular and the regular clergy, by comparisons between the economic backwardness of Catholic states and the prosperity of Protestant ones, as well as by strong immanent forces within the Catholic reform movement, the concepts of Muratori, the Jansenists, and Catholic advocates of Catholic enlightenment.

After the expulsion of the Society of Jesus from the Bourbon states and its suppression in 1773 its assets were claimed by the respective states and used in accordance with the enlightened doctrines of state law which held that it was within the competency of the state to dispose of the church property in a manner most useful for the commonweal. Fiscal policies and the argument of the commonweal played a decisive role in secularizations, not least in the abolition of monastic establishments for the purpose of reform or the creation of new Catholic universities (for instance Mainz and Münster). But it is quite telling that in the process of monastic secularization in the Electorate of Mainz the state of Hesse-Darmstadt seized part of the monastic property with the justification that it was a case of ownerless property and retained it despite a vehement literary battle and a lawsuit by Mainz. Next to fiscal policy it was for reasons of ecclesiastical reform, especially parish regulation, that the Josephinist "Klostersturm" took place in 1781, to which more than seven hundred monastic houses fell victim in Austria. Disciplinary problems or economic abuses were rarely the reason for the abolitions. The loss of cultural assets was immeasurable, the damage to learning considerable, but most serious were the negative effects on the ministry and religious life, which were certainly not made up for by the reforms actually achieved.

In connection with the Bavarian succession on the one hand and the Josephinist established church system reaching over into the Church of the Empire on the other, the ecclesiastical territories were not only confronted by "northern despotism" (Franz v. Fürstenberg) but by the Catholic power of Austria as well. In addition to the northwestern German archbishoprics, those of Fulda, Bamberg (for Saxony), and Würzburg also played a part in the exchange and compensation projects of the time; there was even talk of a secularization of Cologne in favor of Prussia and fears for the continued existence of the other two Rhenish archbishoprics were not without foundation. As the state minister of Münster, Franz von Fürstenberg, remarked bitterly in April 1778: "The most convenient thing would be to abolish a few bishoprics and justify it by saying that the property of the Church could never be put to a better use than to prevent bloodshed."[3] Plans to realize the concept of a third, neutral Germany in addition to the great powers Prussia and Austria failed. They were to secure the continued existence of the ecclesiastical principalities within the framework of an interdenominational union to include the princes of the Imperial Diet. Efforts to unite the episcopate on the basis of the old constitution of the Church of the Empire in order to counter the territorial claims of princely proponents of their respective established Churches and their plans for secularization were also unsuccessful. These efforts met with the resistance not only of Austria, whose policy regarding the Empire rested largely on the ecclesiastical princes and—after the issue of the Bavarian succession—was predicated on the unavoidability of secularizations. They were also resisted by Prussia, which was "prone to conquest," and by Bavaria with its established Church.

The danger of members of the Imperial Diet being affected by secularization surfaced when Archduke Max Franz was elected prince-bishop of Münster, again when Joseph II made a surprise attack on the prince bishopric of Passau following the death of Bishop Leopold Ernst von Firmian (d. 11 March 1783), and when the Emperor spawned the fantastic plan to transfer the archbishopric of Salzburg to Liège, but to secularize that prince-bishopric together with the chapter of Berchtesgaden in favor of Austria. This project, originating as it did with the Emperor, the *Defensor ecclesiae,* five years before the outbreak of the French Revolution, and plans discussed in the electorate of Bavaria and executed in the form of "cold secularizations"[4] made abundantly clear just what the situation of the ecclesiastical states would be if the decaying Empire were to fall apart because of the egotistical interests of the states or if a European conflict were to place the "conquering" states in a position where they could cut equivalents from the last remaining patches of the ecclesiastical "robe of the old Empire" (J. J. Moser).

---

[3] Quoted from A. Hanschmidt, *Franz v. Fürstenberg als Staatsmann. Die Politik des münsterschen Ministers 1762–80* (Münster 1969), 211.

After the warning signals of the late eighteenth century the strongest impulses for a comprehensive secularization emanated from the French Revolution. A proposal by Talleyrand was followed on 2 November by a decree nationalizing all church property. The Civil Constitution of 12 July 1790 shattered the hierarchical order of the old France. More than fifty bishoprics, all church offices without ministry, all religious orders and congregations were abolished; in 1792 papal Avignon and Venaissin and in 1798 and 1808 the Papal States were secularized.

The attitude of the ecclesiastical princes towards the French Revolution, by no means negative at first, although it was determined by totally varying motives and differing views, became noticeably more negative after the issuance of a Civil Constitution. The ecclesiastical princes of the western German border areas were involved in their first conflict with revolutionary France when the manorial and ecclesiastical rights of princes of the Empire were abolished in Alsace. The Civil Constitution eliminated the dependence of the dioceses of Metz, Toul, Verdun, Nancy, and Saint-Dié on the archbishopric of Trier, that of Strasbourg on Mainz, and revoked the jurisdiction of the bishop of Speyer in the Alsatian part of his see; in addition, it transferred the deanery of Carignan to the newly established bishopric of Sedan. The demand by the imperial bishops[5] for the restoration of the imperial and ecclesiastical status quo in Alsace, Lorraine, and in the *Terra Gallica* belonging to the bishopric of Trier had no tangible results; neither did the call for help to Russia as a guarantor of the Peace of Westphalia nor the condemnation of the Civil Constitution by Pope Pius VI. Leopold II was unwilling to make the violation of the rights of German princes and bishops by revolutionary France the cause for an intervention. He especially warned the Rhenish elector-archbishops not to take any intemperate steps in connection with their emigration policies.

---

[4] The concept of "cold secularization" in H. Liermann, *Deutsches Evangelisches Kirchenrecht* (Stuttgart 1933), 214.—On secularizations and their plans in Bavaria, see G. Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, *Der Salzburger Kongreß und seine Auswirkung 1770–77* (Paderborn 1929), passim; L. Hammermayer, "Das Ende des alten Bayern," M. Spindler, ed., *Hdb. der Bayerischen Gesch.* II (Munich 1966), 1101 f.

[5] Raised most emphatically by the prince-bishop of Speyer, August von Limburg-Styrum, of whom Madam von Condenhoven in Mainz mockingly remarked that he harbored within himself the counterrevolution (J. Wille, *August Graf von Limburg-Stirum, Fürstbischof von Speier* [Heidelberg 1913], 93).

The direct confrontation with France was overshadowed by the rebellion in the Austrian Netherlands, arising from opposition of the estates and ecclesiastical circles to the policies of Joseph II and the resistance of the estates against the prince-bishop of Liège, Konstantin Franz von Hoensbroech. The electors of Cologne, Trier, and Mainz, together with the neighboring estates of the Empire had to pay with a defeat for their attempt, ordered by the supreme court of the Empire, to return the Liège prince-bishop to the fold. Only after the Liège issue had widened into a real crisis for the Empire and an agreement between the two great powers had been laboriously achieved did Austria take over the imperial execution and restore the original status in Liège by force of arms.

It was under the impact of the events on the western border of the Empire and individual cases of unrest in certain German territories that the governments started to dismantle enlightened reforms and to disavow Febronianism and the Congress of Ems. This point also marked the transition from a moderate Catholic enlightenment to an ecclesiastical restoration, from indifferentism to a more profound religiosity.[6] Flight onto the harassed ship of Saint Peter seems to have been the only way out of "punishment by temporal potentates."

The relationship of several ecclesiastical states (Speyer, Mainz, Trier) with revolutionary France was complicated by their policy regarding the royalist-aristocratic and ecclesiastical emigrants. Worms or Mainz, Coblenz or Schönbornslust might have appeared to the royal and aristocratic emigrants like a small foreign Versailles, a Versailles *in partibus,* with its favorites and mistresses. While these emigrants—in spite of their political and military activities—did not pose a danger to France as long as they were not supported by the European powers, unwise and provocative policies which went beyond their merely being tolerated by their host countries offered sufficient grounds to the Girondists for counterprovocation and warnings to the ecclesiastical states. Clearly distinct from the aristocratic emigrants, who were often seen as an economic burden and an offense to the religious population, were the ecclesiastical emigrants. Through their generally exemplary religious work and their ministry they enjoyed a hospitable reception by the population and the ecclesiasts. The emigration initially flowed into the parts of the archdioceses of Basel and Strasbourg on the right bank of the Rhine, then into the electorates of Trier and Mainz, Switzerland, and the extreme southwest of the Empire to Constance, Feldkirch, to the right-bank ecclesiastical principalities, to Bavaria and Austria. Their religious activities during the last few years of the Empire and during the Napoleonic period deserves to be investigated in more detail than has been done so far.

---

[6] It would be totally wrong to interpret the Catholic restoration as a mere relapse vis-à-vis the enlightenment of the Church. The extent of the infusion of intellectual elements from the Enlightenment, esp. the moderate ecclesiastical enlightenment, into the church renewal of the early nineteenth century should be demonstrated by the example of such as Sailer, Fürstenberg, Stolberg, Dießach, Beroldingen, and others. Their respective biographies each raise the question concerning the relationship between Enlightenment and church renewal in different ways.

On 20 April 1792, opposed by the group around Robespierre, the Girondists prevailed on Louis XVI to declare war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia to defend France against alleged unjust attacks, to maintain freedom, and to demonstrate the will to expand its power. The Austro-Prussian campaign, in which the ecclesiastical electors did not take part, did not, however, result in the restoration of the status of 1789 or 1782 as had been hoped within the Church of the Empire. Instead the cannonade of Valmy on 20 September 1792 led to the occupation a few days later of the episcopal residences of Speyer and Mainz, the archdiocese of Liège, the left-bank territories of the rivers Erft and Roer. The archdiocese of Basel was declared the Raurachian Republic and united with France as the Departement Mont-Terrible. Church property in all the conquered territories was to be confiscated; an oath on the Civil Constitution was to effect apostasy to the schismatic national Church. After the declaration of war by the Empire (22 March 1793) the Austrian Netherlands and the left-bank ecclesiastical territories of the middle Rhine were reconquered. Yet the disunity of the allies, a general aversion to the war, and especially the political-military disinterest of Prussia prompted the proposal by the lord chancellor, the elector-archbishop of Mainz, at the Imperial Diet in Regensburg on 24 October 1794 that the Empire should attempt to make peace with France.

In the meantime new plans for secularization were discussed in Vienna and Berlin. Prussia, the "natural opponent of the ecclesiastical states" (H. von Treitschke), raised a demand for the secularization of several prince-bishoprics to satisfy its cost of the war, since this was "sufficiently justified by history" and moreover "would not create any actual disadvantage nor dissatisfaction." Reports by agents said that even Rome was not entirely against these secularizations. By virtue of the separate peace of Basel (5 April 1795) and the secret supplemental agreements (5 August 1795) Prussia received assurances for right-bank compensations (parts of the archdiocese of Münster and Recklinghausen), with the proviso for adding other stipulations should they become suitable, in exchange for the commitment of strict neutrality. The Prussian example was followed by Hesse-Kassel (28 August 1795), whose dynasty was related to the Hohenzollern, Württemberg (7 August 1796), Baden (22 August 1796), and Bavaria (7 September 1796). The fact that the principle of compensation by means of secularizations was intended even then to be considerably expanded and not limited to fiefs of the Empire is shown by the secret treaty between Prussia and France in favor of the hereditary governor of the Netherlands, a brother-in-law of the Prussian King. He was to be compensated by the prince-bishoprics of Würzburg and Bamberg in exchange for the commitment that these areas were to go to Prussia when the house of Orange became extinct.

Military successes by Austria in the southern German theater of war did not change the development presaged by these treaties since Napoleon, by advancing through northern Italy into the heart of the Austrian hereditary lands, was able to force Austria to accept the armistice of Leoben (18 April 1797) and the subsequent Peace of Campoformio (17 November 1797). The agreements of Campoformio went well beyond the contradictory ones of Leoben concerning the recognition of the constitutional borders of France and the integrity of the Empire: Francis II as King of Hungary and Bohemia promised to take an active part in the cession of the left-bank areas from Basel to the Nette-Roer line. This agreement would not have ceded the Cologne electorate and the Prussian duchies of Cleves and Gelderland to France and Prussian compensations on the right bank of the Rhine would have been prevented. All the ecclesiastical states west of the line of Basel-Andernach-Venlo went to France and were secularized (Speyer, Worms, Mainz, Trier, Stablo-Malmedy, Liège, Prüm, etc.). The archdiocese of Salzburg was to compensate Austria for its loss of the Netherlands and northern Italy and in exchange for the Prussian territorial gains in Poland. While Austria had not basically been an opponent of secularization since the period of Josephinism, it did want to prevent a large-scale liquidation of ecclesiastical states. According to the stipulations of Campoformio, therefore, the ecclesiastical electors were to be assured of compensation on the right bank for their left-bank losses. Detailed arrangements were to be worked out at a congress in agreement with the French republic.

In spite of the formal announcement asserting the integrity of the Empire and contrary to the misgivings held by some of the estates (especially the Saxon electorate and Würzburg) the imperial delegates in Rastatt, yielding to pressure from France, accepted the principle of indemnification by means of secularization as the basis for peace. Thereupon "the legates of the knights of the Empire in savage greed crowded upon the plenipotentiaries of the Directorate in order to obtain by favor of the enemy of the Empire a rich piece from the territories of their ecclesiastical compatriots" (Treitschke). Partial secularization would have sufficed for compensation, but the tendency, only temporarily slowed down by the victories of the second coalition, was in the direction of total secularization. Since the Austrian withdrawal from Mainz there was a growing fear of total secularization in the ecclesiastical territories on the right bank of the Rhine not only because the appropriation of ecclesiastical property was fiscally expedient given the expenditures for the war, but also because the Pope, already on his way into French imprisonment, had helped bring about a situation in Bavaria "which could not but trigger directly the process of secularization."[7]

Following the military defeats in the second war of the coalition (Marengo, Hohenlinden) the Peace of Lunéville (7 March 1801; 16 March 1801) forced the Empire to cede the left-bank areas and—implying a secularization of the ecclesiastical states—to compensate the dispossessed hereditary princes "from the womb of the Empire" (*dans le sein de l'Empire*). In regard to these compensations, which were to be born by the Empire in its totality (*collectivement*), the indefinite guidelines of the Congress of Rastatt were invoked. The four ceded Rhenish *départements* were declared part of the French Republic by law of 9 March 1801; the Napoleonic concordat (15 July 1801; 8 April 1802) signaled the end of the Church of the Empire in the left-bank territories. In conjunction with the ratification bull *Ecclesia Christi* (15 August 1801) Pope Pius VII asked all the bishops of France and those in the ceded areas of the Empire to resign. In the subsequent new circumscription Mainz and Trier lost their position as metropolitanates; Cologne did not even retain its see; the *départements* of the Roer and the Rhine-Mosel were combined into a new bishopric with its residence in Aachen. Together with the newly circumscribed bishoprics of Ghent, Liège, Mainz, Namur and Tournai it formed the archdiocese of Mechelen. With some exceptions, the total secularization of the entire ecclesiastical property and the abolition of the monastic institutions were decreed (9 June 1802) in order to put the left-bank territories of the Church of the Empire on an equal footing with the rest of France. In many cases the right-bank real properties and taxed revenues of the abolished left-bank sees were immediately confiscated (for instance in Hesse-Darmstadt and Hesse-Kassel) and transferred to the respective territories even prior to ratification by the Imperial delegates' final recess.

Rome had recognized the secularization in France as well as in the ceded left-bank areas in the concordat of 1801. It had also substantially agreed in advance to the secularization in the Empire even though other promulgations designed for the German Church were to create a different impression. Severing the left-bank parts of dioceses, abolishing the left-bank bishoprics, and realigning these areas as implemented by Caprara practically brought the Church of the Empire to ruin. The papal bull *Qui Christi Domini,* which expressly excepted the remainder of the archdioceses and sees outside the French rule from recircumscription and guaranteed them the maintenance of their ecclesiastical status quo, had no effect. The fact that France sought to have the bishops of the abolished sees of Basel and Liège transferred to vacant right-bank sees in order to avoid having to pay their pensions—Franz Xaver von Neveu, bishop of Basel, personally tried for a future new Baden bishopric—puts a characteristic light on the waning days of the Church of the Empire, as does the strange reserve of Rome when Archduke Anton Viktor was elected bishop of Münster.

---

[7] L. Hammermayer in M. Spindler, ed., *Hdb. der Bayerischen Gesch.* II, 1102.

Since the imperial delegation was totally unable to solve the issue of compensation, the role of arbitration—implied but not expressly mentioned in the treaty of Lunéville—devolved upon France. It created the foreign policy conditions for a territorial reorganization and disintegration of the Empire by peace treaties with England (1802) and an understanding with Russia (1801), which had claimed the right of participation as a guarantor of the Westphalian peace. On 23 November 1802, the design for compensation, submitted by the arbitrating powers France and Russia, was accepted by the imperial delegation with a few changes. The imperial decree by the ratification commission (27 April 1803), brought about by a Russian threat, elevated the final recess to the status of a binding basic law of the Empire. This sealed the fate of the ecclesiastical states by shifting the burden of compensation on them and by sanctioning the secularizations. In fact, the secularization, more trenchant in its effects than the Reformation and the Peace of Westphalia, "shook the last vestiges of imperial authority, which rested on the ecclesiastical states, whose rise, after all, had given birth to the Holy Roman Empire and from whose existence it could not be separated."[8] Henceforth the union of crosier and sword was prevented, the interlacing of Church and Empire severed, and the constitution of the German Church shattered, or rather changed to a provisional arrangement.

There was an almost total absence of resistance to the secularization on the part both of Rome and the ecclesiastical princes, either from helplessness or political considerations, from indifference or curial antipathy against the Church of the Empire. Rome was neither able nor willing to prevent the secularization; it merely wanted to see it limited. It condemned secularization as unjust and an act of violence, but did not consider it a misfortune for the Church and at times even emphasized its beneficial effects. In many cases, even ecclesiastics did not shrink from making demands for compensation from church assets and secularization. Elector-Archbishop Clemens Wenzeslaus of Trier had designs on the prince-bishopric of Constance and the prince-abbey of Kempten; the Mainz elector Friedrich Karl von Erthal demanded the prince-bishopric of Fulda as compensation; Dalberg professed himself basically in agreement with the secularization; Wessenberg advocated a partial secularization; the Knights of Malta tried to enrich themselves by means of ecclesiastical property. The bitter remark by von Lang was probably not far off the mark: "The bishops were inclined to surrender the assets of the monasteries; the archbishops thought it not amiss if only the bishoprics were affected and used to provide some consolation for the ecclesiastical electors in the form of a small expansion . . . ; among the latter, Mainz wanted to say yes in God's name if only it was assured that Mainz would remain as a German partriarch and primate, for who would want to have the dear German fatherland exist without an *Archicancellarius Imperii per Germaniam.*"

---

[8] D. Schäfer, *Deutsche Gesch.* II (Jena 1916), 271.

Among the stipulations of the Imperial delegates' final recess we have to distinguish between: 1. the political secularization or that of estates of the Empire, which consisted of awarding ecclesiastical compensatory territories as sovereign states to new temporal sovereigns and was based on the supreme liegedom of the Emperor, benefiting primarily the states of medium size; 2. secularization in right of one's property (paragraphs 34–36), which granted "all properties of the cathedral chapters and their dignitaries together with the episcopal domains, all properties of the endowed sees, abbeys and monastic establishments . . . to the free and full disposition of the respective sovereign for the benefit of expenditures for church services, educational institutions, and others of public benefit, as well as for the alleviation of their finances . . . with the firm proviso of certain and constant provision of the cathedral churches . . . and pensions for the suspended clergy."

The Imperial delegates' final recess secularized on the right bank of the Rhine all imperially immediate ecclesiastical territories (two ecclesiastical electoral states, one prince-archbishopric, nineteen prince-bishoprics, numerous abbeys of the Empire), with the exception of the territories of the Knights of Malta and those of the Knights of the Teutonic Order (abolished in 1809), as well as the state of the lord chancellor under K. T. von Dalberg, which was newly created from the remainders of ecclesiastical territories. It represented an enclave primarily in the expanded Bavarian state and was essentially incorporated in the Kingdom of Bavaria after the ratification of the Peace of Paris. The Imperial delegates' final recess transferred the Mainz archiepiscopal see to Regensburg, combining in this way the dignities of an elector, lord chancellor, metropolitan-archbishop, and primate of Germany. More than two hundred monastic institutions were secularized. In the Habsburg realm, which was in the incipient stage of an ecclesiopolitical restoration under Francis II, those monastic institutions which had avoided secularization in 1781 were not affected.

Also not affected was the old diocesan organization until "another decision is made on the basis of imperial law" (par. 62). Bishops and cathedral chapters were to be awarded pensions, the exercise of ecclesiastical office not to be obstructed, the existing exercise of religion "protected against all sorts of abolition and injury" (par. 63). Yet the denominational status quo guarantee was restricted by the proviso that the sovereign had the privilege to tolerate hitherto not admitted denominations in his land and to grant their followers "the full enjoyment of civil rights."

The compensatory transactions of secularization were, from an overall point of view, political instead of lawful ones, even though they were clad in the mantle of the basic law of the Empire by the Imperial delegates' final recess. "Few among the upheavals of state in modern history appear as ugly, as common, as low as this revolt of the princes of 1803" (Treitschke). Even such princes who had not suffered any territorial losses on the left bank of the Rhine, such as the archduke of Tuscany, the duke of Modena, and the hereditary governor of the Netherlands were awarded compensations by secularization. Secularized ecclesiastical territories and property also went the Helvetian Federation, the imperial city of Frankfurt, and others. Frequently the loss bore no relationship to the compensation. Prussia, for example, received five times the compensation of its loss, Hesse-Darmstadt eight times, and Baden ten times.

An immediate political consequence of the secularization was that the ratio of Catholics to Protestants in the Imperial Diet shifted at the expense of the Catholics and that a decisive step was taken towards the removal of Austria from the Empire. The future political development was presaged by the territorial expansion of Prussia, Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and the two Hesses. Secularization placed the majority of those ecclesiastical states which were almost entirely Catholic under rulers of another denomination. The Protestant powers and the non-Catholic segment of the population were provided a numerical, political, and economic superiority and the foundation was laid for the typical diaspora situation of the Catholic population. The transition to parity was not without great tension and harsh disputes.

As a revolt of the princes and an attempt at state reform, secularization resulted in the elimination of the Church of the Empire, the end of the Empire itself, and of the German Middle Ages. The surviving temporal territories, now enlarged, strove to adapt their church organization to their state borders either by joining the secularized areas to already existing state bishoprics or by establishing their own state or "national bishoprics." According to the Imperial delegates' final recess a reorganization of the dioceses was to be undertaken by imperial law, but before the necessary foundation could be laid on the basis of law and concordats, the Empire ceased to exist as a result of Napoleon's dictum and the resignation of the imperial crown by Francis II. The reordering of the German church organization was then—if not put in doubt—at least pushed into a distant future and placed in the hands of the individual territories, whose late-absolutist, bureaucratic established church systems welcomed the fact that sees and cathedral chapters were now orphaned.

Prior to secularization the centers of the church administration had been situated in the imperially immediate, prince-episcopal areas. The established Churches of the temporal governments faced a final barrier in the sovereign independence of the imperial episcopate. At a time of vacant sees, following the secularization of the ecclesiastical states, the absolutist states were enabled to prevail in their claims vis-à-vis a powerless and disowned Church which was thoroughly shaken in its organization. The fifteen years between the Peace of Lunéville and the beginning of the vast circumscriptions were a period of more recent German church history, which had neither concordats nor bishops. By 1811 the German Church had all of nine bishops left, including those not in residence or living in exile; five of them were well into their seventies, Dalberg at the age of sixty-seven was one of the youngest. "How long," was the question Suffragan Bishop Kolborn asked in a letter to Wessenberg at the beginning of 1811, "can we wait without being totally bereft of bishops?" The cathedral chapters, largely deprived of their revenues, were dispersed here and there. Many capitulars had withdrawn to the quietude and obscurity of private life, demoralized and humiliated by the events. A regeneration of the chapters, whose members were all advanced in years, could not take place because the sustentation and pension obligation of the states extended only to those ecclesiastics who had been suspended from positions recognized by imperial law, but not to their successors. The German Church was threatened by anarchy. The vagaries of the times had uprooted the leadership of those nobles who were eligible for ecclesiastical office and had dispersed them in every direction. The feeling of humiliation, the distrust by Rome of advocates of Enlightenment and Febronianism, fear and the prospect of a dark future led to passivity and resignation. Those who were eager to get into the consistories and to seize the administration of the remainders of dioceses usually bowed, dumb and obsequious, to the established church system.[9] For a considerable part of the regular clergy the transfer to collective monasteries ("Krepierinstitute") was not a good solution. The vacant sees, the negligent search, at times determined by the sovereign's desire for splendor, for one's own, if possible a "cheap" bishop—to quote the words of a minister of Nassau-Weilburg—the usurpation of episcopal rights, the expansion of the rights of sovereignty not only *circa sacra* but *in sacra* were elements, according to the mild-mannered bishop of Augsburg, Clemens Wenzeslaus, which constituted a fatal danger for the Church. It was largely due to the efforts of Prince-Primate von Dalberg that this danger was averted.

The closing of Catholic universities, schools, and orders had an extremely negative effect on the intellectual life of the Catholic population. The education of future clerics and an orderly ministry were put in doubt; the closings marked the downfall of episcopal culture in southern Germany and the beginning of the decline of Catholic education and culture. Henceforth the patronage by the ecclesiastically eligible nobility was lacking, as was the possibility for social, economic, and intellectual rise which entering the large monastic institutions and rich abbeys had offered the Catholic segment of the population.[10] A most regrettable concomitant phenomenon was the cheap sale of works of art, libraries, manuscripts, and archives, the use for other purposes and the profanation of ecclesiastical structures. In Cologne more than fifty churches and chapels were torn down; some of the most precious library holdings in Trier were used for heating purposes,[11] the tradition of rich artistic work, of respectable scholarly achievement among the Catholics was suddenly interrupted. The economic loss due to secularization was considerable. Redistribution of wealth—while it had been initiated before—reached a climax with the sale of church property.

---

[9] Even I. H. v. Wessenberg, whose weakness regarding the established Church is well known, speaks of the "servility" into which a dependent clergy is tempted.

[10] The learned Roman Zirngibl of Sankt Emmeram in Regensburg complains: "Es hat ein französischer, preußisch-russischer Wink alle Stifter und Klöster Deutschlands zu Boden gestürzt. Die Kinder der gemeinen Älteren haben nur mehr allein eine Aussicht zum Soldatenstand. Die gründliche Litteratur wird sich nach und nach verliehren, die nach den evangelischen Grundsätzen aufgeklärte Priester, und mit denselben die positive Religion wird abnehmen und am Ende wird aus unserm Vaterlande ein militärischer Staat nach dem Modell der altpreußischen und heßischen Staaten werden" (A. Kraus, *Die Briefe Roman Zirngibls von St. Emmeram in Regensburg* [Regensburg 1965], 104).—On the aspect of economic and social elevation, in addition to the works by E. Krausen, see J. Salzgeber, O.S.B., *Die Klöster Einsiedeln und St. Gallen im Barockzeitalter. Historisch-soziologische Studie* (Münster 1967).

In the period between secularization and its laboriously achieved legal position and relative freedom, the Church "instead of the scepter of lost sovereignty bore the cane of impotence and the crown of thorns of servitude" (J. Görres). But the loss of almost a thousand years of ballast, of feudal abuses, aristocratic exclusivity of the cathedral chapters and the episcopate,[12] of nepotism, at times abundant, and of Febronianism, connected with the favored position of the Church of the Empire, were beneficial to the Church. Fruitful impulses and forces from the very roots of religion and Church were freed in the bitter years following the secularization. The soil was prepared for the alliance of "Church and nation." Not only under the Napoleonic bishops, the zealous Colmar in Mainz, Mannay in Trier, Berdolet in Aachen, did new life begin to flourish in the Church, but even in the pseudo-constitutional states of the Rhenish Confederation as well. Within the powerless, impoverished Church, oppressed by the established church system, the concept of church unity and papal authority took on added strength. The new generation of clerics "had no home other than the Church" (Treitschkse). The fight against episcopalism, Febronianism, established Church, and Wessenbergianism assumed a more determined character. The ecclesiastical space was tightened, as it were, and filled up from within by an atmosphere of struggle; it was quite frugal in comparison with the old Church of the Empire. "As a consequence of secularization the Church was more modern than the state which gave it lodging." In the nineteenth century it "was able to become the champion of an extraterritorial sphere of freedom, not intent on successes of the day vis-à-vis the omnipotence of the state."[13]

---

[11] H. Raab, "Clemens Wenzeslaus und seine Zeit (1739–1812)," I: *Dynastie, Kirche und Reich im 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1962), 14 f.; "Die Tatsache, daß die Säkularisation letztlich einen segensreichen geistig-religiösen Erneuerungsprozeß innerhalb der katholischen Kirche des 19. Jh. einleitet, wiegt jene (kulturellen) Verluste nicht auf" (S. Reicke, *RGG* V [1961],1286).

[12] The number of bourgeois suffragan bishops was considerable. The image of an aristocratic Church of the Empire should be treated in a more discriminating and less distorted manner.

[13] W. H. Stuck, "Zur Säkularisation im Lande Nassau," *Hess Jb. für Landesgesch.* 13 (1963), 309.

CHAPTER 27

Attempts at Church Reunion

The outcome of the Thirty Years' War, which had, at least in part, been conducted as a religious war, and the stipulations of the Peace of Westphalia had all but dashed the expectation of a restoration of religious unity in the Empire.[1] The irritant of a split Christianity had grown apace with the consolidation of denominational consciousness and denominational territories. But at the same time it had become less objectionable, since it denoted the triumph of politics in the widest sense over theology, the victory of state authority, and a beginning awareness in the German territories which indicated a shift from goals in the hereafter to the task in this world. The withdrawal from specifically religioecclesiastical tasks in the early absolutist territories began as a process of general secularization; in the leading segments of the population it started as a renunciation of the theological spirit of strife and disputatiousness, as indifferentism and skepticism in which rationalist and materialist ideas gained ground. Friedrich von Logau expressed the sentiments of his generation in his well-known distich: "Lutheranism, Papism, and Calvinism, these faiths, all three of them, are here; yet there is doubt where Christianity could be."[2] The bitter words of the "Augsburg confusion" made the rounds. The different religious parties had to learn to coexist peacefully within the Empire, a laborious process full of quarrels and hatred among territories of different denominations. The political and military impotence in the face of the enemies of Christianity to the east and those of the Empire to the north and west, the *calamitas imperii,* was to some extent held to be a consequence of the denominational strife. For that reason plans for religious reunion on the one hand and reform in the Empire on the other had had some relationship with each other since the seventeenth century. This was also the case in the opposition of the Church of the Empire to Rome as well as in Pietism and Enlightenment. Motives of patriotism for the Empire, episcopalism, Pietism, and Enlightenment played concomitant and successive roles in the history of reunion projects, as did indifferentism, credulity, theological ignorance, and material and political interests.

---

[1] *IPO* ART. V, par. 14: "Si vero, quod Deus prohibeat, de religionis dissidiis conveniri non possit, nihilominus haec conventio perpetua sit et pax duratura."

[2] F. v. Logau, *Sämtliche Sinngedichte*, ed. by G. Eitner (Tübingen 1872), 246.

"All dogmatic questions," admitted the philosophical wife of the bishop of Osnabrück, Sophie of the Palatinate, "touch my heart but little." To her, religion is love of God and one's neighbor, everything else is "a bunch of priestish squabbling, up to the princes to settle."[3] Reasonable people are not bothered by it. Yet Sophie, like her religiously indifferent brother, Elector Karl Ludwig, who built the Concordia church in Mannheim and wanted to tolerate "all sorts of religions" in the Palatine electorate, discussed the possibility of conversion with her sister Louise Hollandine, the abbess of Maubuisson, and showed a massive material and political interest in reunion transactions.[4]

Indifferentism, rationalism, and materialism on the one hand, religiosity (deepened by the dire straights of the Thirty Years' War), eschatological and pietistic currents, religioecclesiastic and political motives on the other are all in league with one another in the irenical efforts and those aimed at reunion. Tolerance became the political motto of state in the denominationally mixed territories and in the flourishing mercantilist thinking. The idea of the authority of the state began to surmount denominational limits and prejudice. The connection between the schism and the decline of the Empire, the question of religious reunion, reform of the Empire, and a European structure of peace were acute topics for discussion.

A bridge for reunion were those "in between things" (Latin chant, liturgical vestments, crucifixes, auricular confession, the hours), continued in the Lutheran Church and, above all, the Catholic canon law, to which the Protestant cathedral and collegiate chapters adhered "with admirable tenacity."[5] Numerous historical relics also pointed to a reunion. These included the existence of mixed chapters in Strasbourg, Lübeck, Osnabrück; the observance of celibacy in Protestant institutions, the alternation in the archdiocese of Osnabrück and the effects of the Volmar list in the parish of Goldenstedt, where the pastor was Catholic, the sexton Protestant, and where the Protestants attended Catholic Mass in which songs from the Lutheran hymnal were sung.

---

[3] E. Bodemann, "Briefe der Kurfürstin Sophie von Hannover an die Raugräfinnen und Raugrafen zu Pfalz," *Publicationen aus den preuss. Staatsarchiven* 37 (Leipzig 1888), 91; about Sophie von der Pfalz, see P. Hiltebrandt, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsverhandlungen,* passim and M. Knoop, *Kurfürstin Sophie von Hannover* (Hildesheim 1964).

[4] The family of the "Winter King," Elector Palatine Friedrich, was totally divided in their religion and partly for that reason involved in the talks concerning the respective religions. The oldest son, Elector Karl Ludwig, and his sister Elizabeth, prince-abbess of Herford, a friend of Descartes, Labadie, and William Penn, was Reformed in name only; privately she was completely indifferent and not at all disinclined towards a conversion, given the right sort of gain (secularization of the archbishoprics of Worms and Speyer). Karl Ludwig's sister, Louise Hollandine, had turned Catholic and become abbess of the convent of Maubisson near Paris, where Mme de Brinon promoted the correspondence between Leibniz and Bossuet. Sophie, the "philosophic" daughter of the Winter King, wife of the "Pseudo-Bishop" Ernst August of Osnabrück was Lutheran in name but prepared to convert if given the right advantages. "I hope all Christians will soon be one," she wrote to Countess Louise. Two younger brothers, Eduard, who married Anne of Gonzaga in 1645, and Gustav Adolf had converted to Catholicism. Anne of Gonzaga was able to have her daughter Benedicta Henriette marry the Catholic convert Duke Johann Friedrich of Hanover (1668) and mediate the marriage between Elisabeth Charlotte of the Palatinate (Liselotte) and Duke Philipp of Orléans. Liselotte converted after the marriage contract was signed in 1671.

After the Peace of Westphalia the different currents tending towards reunification all converged at the court of the senior ecclesiastical elector, the lord chancellor and *Primas Germaniae* in Mainz. Johann Philipp von Schönborn, the "German Solomon," his suffragan bishop Peter van Walenburch, and his minister of state Johann Christian von Boineburg, who defended the rights of the *Natio Germanica* against the Roman Curia, together with other irenicists and reunionists worked on reunion projects and promoted the reduction of denominational differences. Yet the so-called Mainz Plan for Reunion of 1660 is not likely to have originated with either the elector, Boineburg, or Leibniz;[6] it is probably the product of Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels. As an intellectual broker of his time, a friend of Boineburg and the brothers Adrian and Peter van Walenburch from their Düsseldorf period, this prince was a member of the innermost circle of reunion politicians. By means of his worldwide correspondence, especially with Georg Calixt, Leibniz, Spener, Antoine Arnauld, Johannes Neercassel, the administrator of the Utrecht diocese, the reunionist dukes of the Guelfs, the nuncios in Cologne, and through numerous writings of his own he supported the efforts for reunion in his time.[7]

In connection with his own conversion Landgrave Ernst, who had become familiar with the mediation theology of Georg Witzel in Vienna, brought together the theologians Eberhard Happel, Peter Haberkorn, Balthasar Menser, a fellow student of Boineburg's, and the famous Capuchin friar Valerian Magni for a religious discussion in

---

[5] H. Nottarp, *Zur "Communicatio in sacris cum haereticis"* (Halle 1933), 116; also idem, *Das katholische Kirchenwesen in der Grafschaft Ravensberg im 17. u. 18. Jh.* (Paderborn 1961).

[6] A. P. Brück, "Der Mainzer 'Unionsplan' aus dem Jahre 1660," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 8 (1960), 148–62.

[7] A contribution to reunion was to be the "Christlich Catholische zu S. Goar uebliche Gesang-Buch" edited by Ernst.—In the *Pia vota et recta desideria* the petition has a central role: "Dass alle sowohl Orientalische, als auch den Protestierenden Secten zugethane Christen Menschen sich wieder zur Einigkeit der Catholischen Apostolischen Römischen Kirche begeben, und durch bessern Unterricht ihren Irrthumb erkennen."

December 1651 at his castle Rheinfels above Sankt Goar.[8] In 1652 he set up a like discussion in Kassel between his confessor, the Jesuit Johannes Rosenthal, and Johannes Crocius, and a year later between Rosenthal and Haberkorn in Gießen. Although these three discussions had no tangible results other than unpleasant literary feuds for the landgrave and a campaign by the Jesuits against Valerian Magni because of his pronouncement at Rheinfels that the infallibility of the Pope as *ex solo sancto textu* could not be proved, the reunion of a split Christianity continued to be his primary and most important desire.

The connection with Erasmian spirit and the Mainz efforts is manifest in the *Motiva Conversionis Ernesti Landgravii* by the brothers Adrian and Peter van Walenburch, and, more so, in the best-known work by the landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels himself, the *Discrete Catholische.*[9] According to his own testimony he wrote this work for all the Catholics and Protestants "whose hearts are sincerely touched by the grievous split in Christendom." Leibniz became familiar with the *Discrete Catholische* in his Mainz period and received important suggestions from it for his own efforts towards reunion. He thought the book contained an exhortation to the Protestants that they were obliged to seek reunification with the Catholic Church with all their strength, but also a challenge to the Catholics to smooth the path for reunion by eliminating the abuses and by bringing about a true reform.

For Landgrave Ernst, his Mainz friends, and for his "more than dear Leibniz," for whose conversion he was hoping, the conditions for a reunion were *discretio,* the wise differentiation in the sense of due proportion, combined with the elimination of abuses, the *consensus quinquesaecularis,* and especially the discreet view of papal primacy. "The wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job," he says, tolerance, brotherly love and God's help in a "desperate matter" were required to bring it about. With the help of church reform and reunion a new and better order would be established in Europe—a first step being the establishment of a European court of arbitration in Lucerne—and peace would be secured within Christianity. His opinion regarding the plans of the bishop of Tina, Christoph de Rojas y Spinola, showed that Landgrave Ernst was sophisticated enough and sufficiently well versed in the history of reunionist endeavors to have the right estimate of their chances for success.

After Mainz under the reign of Johann Philipp von Schönborn the courts of Braunschweig-Lüneburg were the most fertile and receptive soil for reunion in the last third of the seventeenth century. This had primarily political as well as denominational, personal, and ideological reasons. Duke Johann Friedrich of Hanover (d. 1679), who had converted to the Catholic Church in Rome in 1650, had close connections to the reunionist *aula laboriosa* of the Mainz elector Johann Philipp. Leibniz's entering the service of the duke of Hanover was due in some measure to the assistance of Landgrave Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels. The latter, moreover, supported the Catholic succession in Hanover, so that Rome's hopes raised by the princely conversion would not again be dashed in this case, "di vedere un giorno ritornato al grembo della chiesa quella numerosissima e noblissima Natione."[10]

---

[8] Most recent: G. Denzler, *Die Propagandakongregation in Rom und die Kirche in Deutschland im ersten Jahrzehnt nach dem Westfälischen Frieden* (Paderborn 1969), 185–212.
[9] H. Raab, *Der "Discrete Catholische,"* 175–98.

The expectation that negotiations in Hanover would lead to reunion proved to be unfounded when the Catholic Duke Johann Friedrich was succeeded by his denominationally indifferent brother Ernst August, who was interested solely in expanding his power. When he was still pseudo-bishop of Osnabrück and then again as duke of Hanover after 1679 he repeatedly made vaguely formulated offers for his or his sons' conversion to Catholicism in exchange for the secularization of Hildesheim and the cancellation of the alternation in the diocese of Osnabrück in favor of his house. The Hanover negotiations of 1683 played a particular role in the reunion attempted by the bishop of Tina, Christoph de Rojas y Spinola. This reunion was supported by Emperor Leopold primarily for political reasons and encouraged by Clement X and Innocent XI. While the danger posed by the Turks in the east grew to alarming proportions and more and more territories were lost by reunions in the west, discussions took place in Hanover between Spinola, Walter Molanus, the abbot of Loccum, the younger Calixt, and Theodor Mayer. But a firm programmatic draft could not be obtained. Among the concessions from the Lutheran side were: celibacy for the pastors, provided the existing marriages were recognized, infallibility of the councils, recognition of the Pope as the visible head of the Church, the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and submission to a future universal council. Additional demands raised by Molanus in 1683, the resistance of the French party in Rome, who feared that reunion would strengthen the Empire, and, lastly, the fact that the "sacred cause" was subordinated to the power politics of the Guelfs led to the failure of Spinola's efforts. As Landgrave Ernst wrote in a letter to Spener and in his memoranda to Duke Anton Ulrich von Wolfenbüttel and to Leibniz, the two parties were "*in principiis et suppositis* too far apart from each other," separated by political interests, for theological issues according to the opinion of the court of Hanover were mere insignificant details.

---

[10] Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels to the Pope, 13 February 1665; H. Raab, "De negotio Hannoveriano Religionis," 404.

Attempts by Spinola to eliminate the denominational tensions in Hungary failed as well,[11] nor did the union negotiated by his successor at Wiener Neustadt, Bishop Franz Anton von Buchheim, Leibniz and Molanus in 1686 come about. In the meantime Rome's reticence became more and more manifest. The political situation, influenced by the expulsion of the Huguenots, the religious clause in the Peace of Rijswijk (1697), and the expectation of a Hanoverian succession in England were unfavorable to a reunion.[12]

There was no notable reaction to the *Friedreiche Gedanken über die Religionsvereinigung in Teutschland* (1679) by Johann Friedrich Ignaz Karg von Bebenburg, the future supreme chancellor of the Cologne electorate and abbot of Saint-Michel au Péril de la Mer (in the diocese of Avranches).[13] Irenics and polemics were merged in the *Via pacis* (1686) by the Capuchin friar Dionysius of Werl.[14] *Libertas ecclesiae Germanicae* and reunion in the faith by restoration of the "original" pre-Hildebrandian church constitution were the goals of the Protestant canonist Johannes Schilter in his seven books about the freedom of the German Church modeled on the *Declaratio Cleri Gallicani.* According to testimony by the Trier minister of state J. G. von Spangenberg, friend and collaborator of Hontheim, and by Marshal B. F. von Zurlauben, the Febronian ideas were gleaned at least in part from Schilter's work.[15]

---

[11] Upon Spinola's death Molanus wrote the poem: "In Te renatos vidimus pios Fratres / Doctosque Walenburgicos, decora aeterna / Germaniae nomenque dulce Cassandri, / Et quotquot uspiam fuere fautores / Concordiae sacrae Deoque dilectae" (H. Weidemann, *Molanus* II, 173).

[12] S. J. T. Miller and J. P. Spielman, *Cristobal Rojas y Spinola,* 79: "If all Christian princes or at least as many as supported Rojas in 1683 had for a few years remained loyal to the idea of church unity and especially if Louis XIV had subordinated his dynastic selfishness, his devious foreign policy, his insatiable addiction to glory and his brutal treatment of the Huguenots to the welfare of the Christian world, an irenical climate would most probably have been created which would have led to the restoration of unity between Rome and large groups of German Protestants."

[13] *Friedreiche Gedanken über die Religions Vereinigung in Teutschland aus dem Worte Gottes, Conciliis, Patribus, Kirchenhistorie zusammengetragen* (Würzburg 1679). The book was dedicated to Prince-Bishop Peter Philipp von Dernbach.—A biographical sketch of Karg (1648–1719), who was engaged to a considerable extent in controversial political activities and at the very least sympathized with Jansenism, is contained in M. Braubach, *Kurkölnische Miniaturen* (Münster 1954), 78–104; L. Jadin, *L'Europe au début du XVIII^e siècle. Correspondance du Baron Karg de Bebenbourg, Chancelier du Prince-Évêque de Liège Joseph Clément de Bavière, Archevêque Électeur de Cologne avec le Cardinal Paolucci, Secrétaire d'État (1700–1719)*, 2 vols. (Brussels and Rome 1968).

[14] Dionysius aus Werl, *Via pacis inter homines per Germaniam in fide dissidents . . .* (Hildesii Saxonum 1686).—A. Jacobs, *Die Rheinischen Kapuziner 1611–1725. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der katholischen Reform* (Münster i. W. 1933), 68ff.

The sermons by the Jesuit Jean Dez in Strasbourg and his book *La réunion des Protestants de Strasbourg à l'Église Romaine,* translated into German by the convert Ulrich Obrecht, attempted to demonstrate that there was no obstacle to reunification and that the *Confessio Augustana* contained nothing un-Catholic. The suggestions for a reunion by the Königsberg professor Praetorius and especially his recognition of the papal primacy which he pronounced in the preface of his *Tuba pacis* (1685) after his conversion to the Catholic Church encountered opposition in Protestant Germany.[16] The Helmstedt theologian Johann Fabricius, as did Praetorius, lost his chair at the university because he was made responsible for the expert opinion written in 1707 in connection with the conversion of Elisabeth Christine von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel and her marriage to Archduke Karl, the future Emperor. The Helmstedt theological faculty had stated: "We are convinced that the Catholics are the same as the Protestants and that the quarrels among them amount only to words. The basis of religion is also found in the Roman Catholic Church; one can be orthodox there, live right, die well and obtain salvation. Princess von Wolfenbüttel therefore can accept the Catholic religion for the purpose of promoting the intended marriage."[17] As the "abbot of Königslutter," Fabricius continued to work for the idea of a religious reunification. In 1704 he published a *Via ad pacem ecclesiasticam;* invoking Cassander, Witzel and Bossuet he presented the differences between the Catholics, Lutherans and Reformed as minor.

Bossuet's *Exposition de la doctrine chrétienne* (1671), which was to have the function of reclaiming the Huguenots (see Chap. 4), gave an impulse to controversial theology. Seven years later, in 1678, he started his correspondence with Leibniz. It was interrupted for a while and then resumed through Duchess Sophie of Hanover, her sister Louise Hollandine, abbess of Maubuisson, the latter's secretary Mme de Brinon, and the duchess's niece Benedicta Henrietta, who had withdrawn to Maubuisson following the death of her husband, Johann Friedrich, duke of Hanover. Parallel to Leibniz's exchange of ideas with Bossuet was his correspondence with the convert and court historiographer of Louis XIV, Pellison, and—through mediation by Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels—with the great Jansenist Antoine Arnauld. Pellison's *Réflexions sur les différends en matière de religion,* Bossuet's monumental *Histoire des variations des Églises protestantes* (1688), and Arnauld's zealous unionism marked a promising point of departure for religious discussion. But the difficulties bound to be encountered were sufficiently characterized by the ambivalence in the behavior of the most important among the discussants.

---

[15] J. Schilter, *De libertate ecclesiarum Germaniae libri* VII (Jena 1683); cf. H. Raab, *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae in der kanonistischen Diskussion des 17.–19. Jh.* (Wiesbaden 1957); idem, "Ad reuniendos dissidentes," 129ff.; Zurlauben to Martin Gerbert, 19 February 1779; "Je sais de bonne source, que M. de Hontheim avoit puisé ses opinions 'febroniennes' dans l'ouvrage de Schilter sur 'la puissance ecclésiastique d'Allemagne' " (G. Pfeilschifter, *Korrespondenz* II, 411).

[16] In this connection see also the translation edited and annotated by the severely denominational Anton Josef Binterim (1779–1855): *Des Matthäus Prätorius aus preußisch Memel, der lutherischen Gemeinde zu Nibbudz Predigers Aufruf zur Vereinigung an alle in Glaubenssachen im Occident von einander abweichende Kirchen* (Aachen 1822).

[17] C. W. Hering, op. cit. II, 303; M. P. Fleischer, op. cit., 53; Maximilian Prechtl, abbot of Michelfeld, see n. 40 below.

Leibniz wanted religious unity as a condition for a European union based on Christianity first, and only then have the dogmatic issues solved by a lawful council, similar to Basel. Bossuet suggested the reverse way. The Council of Trent could not but enter into the center of the discussion: Leibniz considered it the most serious obstacle to a reunion, for Bossuet it was a position which he could not surrender. In vain Leibniz invoked patriotic motives, the Gallican provisos, the refusal by Catherine de Medici and Henry IV to recognize the council. He also argued that there existed a widespread tendency in the Church of the Empire, especially in the archdiocese of Mainz, either to ignore or even to reexamine and reject the Council of Trent. Leibniz's efforts failed because of resistance on the part of Bossuet, who in defending the Council of Trent was also defending the infallibility of the Church.

The traditional line of denominational power struggles apparently reemerged more strongly during the waning seventeenth and early eighteenth century: under William of Orange in England, with the persecution of the Huguenots in France, the Palatine religious quarrel and the "acts of revenge" by the Protestant territories in the Empire,[18] the counterreformational actions of the Habsburgs in Silesia, and, finally, the Toggenburg tumults and the second war of Villmerg in Switzerland. By their ambivalent nature these events demonstrate on the one hand a revival of denominational differences and on the other a tendency towards pacification, tolerance, and equality. But a dismantling of denominationalism by means of enlightenment and tolerance alone could not revitalize the overall efforts, which had become noticeably weaker since the failure of the discussions between Leibniz and Bossuet.

---

[18] H. Schmidt, *Kurfürst Karl Philipp von der Pfalz als Reichsfürst* (Mannheim 1963), 114ff.; M. Schwaab, "Die Wiederherstellung des Katholizismus in der Kurpfalz im 17. und 18. Jh.," *ZGObrh* 114 (1966), 147–205.

On the Catholic side some hopes were connected with the conversion of Protestant princes, as in the case of Hontheim-Febronius and the Benedictine Karl von Piesport, who evinced great interest in the reunion with the Eastern Churches around the middle of the century and who was substantially involved in the Fulda plan for reunification.

In his anniversary bull of 5 May 1749, Pope Benedict XIV reiterated his desire for the reunification of Christendom. Cardinal Angelo Maria Quirini discussed Cardinal Reginald Pole's ideas for reunion with Johann Georg Schellhorn; with Johann Rudolf Kiesling he discussed Cardinal Contarini's doctrine of justification. When Johann Joseph von Trautson became archbishop of Vienna he took steps to bring the denominations closer together.

Attempts to overcome the "unnatural separation" of the Small Church after the Council of Utrecht in 1763 climaxed in the efforts by the acolyte Gabriel Dupac de Bellegarde (1717–89)[19] at the courts of the German prince-bishops, the court of Vienna, and in Rome. Dupac de Bellegarde, in the canonical tradition of van Espen—he published Espen's biography in 1767—was profoundly influenced by Antoine Arnauld. He reintroduced the transfigured concept of the *Ecclesia primitiva,* combined with a strong anti-Roman sentiment, to the episcopalists of the Church of the Empire, to the reformists and reunionists. He was able to call on the support of the most prominent Würzburg canonist, Johann Kaspar Barthel, and the Fulda Benedictine Karl von Piesport; his efforts were applauded by the reformists in Mainz, Passau, Laibach, and the Jansenists-Josephinists de Haen, Wittola and van Swieten in Vienna.

Whether or to what extent the Utrecht views had any influence on the reunification ideas of the *Febronius* can not yet be said with any degree of assurance. It would be natural to assume such influence from Hontheim's course of study, from the older Jansenist connections between the archdiocese of Trier and the Netherlands, and in view of the rather strong propaganda by the Utrecht Church, but proof of it is hard to obtain because of the fact that the most important arguments for reunion were very widespread and the worldwide correspondence of Dupac has not yet been adequately investigated. At any rate, the Utrecht cleric followed the Febronian disputes and the revocation affair with great interest and was persistently identified with Febronianism and its consequences by his contemporaries.

---

[19] E. Winter, *Der Josephinismus und seine Geschichte. Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Österreichs 1740–1848* (Vienna 1943), 112ff.; W. Deinhardt, *Der Jansenismus in deutschen Landen* (Munich 1929), 84f.; V. Rodolico, *Gli amici e i tempi di Scipione di Ricci* (Florence 1920), 54–113; G. Leclerc, *Zeger-Berhard van Espen (1646–1728) et l'autorité ecclésiastique* (Zurich 1964); A. Ellemunter, *Antonio Eugenio Visconti* (Graz and Cologne 1963), 173f.; L. Ceyssens, "L'affaire du Séminaire de Liège d'après l'historien janséniste G. du Pac de Bellegarde," *Annales de la Commission communale de l'histoire de Liège* 3 (1947), 603–762; F. Kenninck, "Les idées religieuses en Autriche de 1767 à 1789. Correspondance du Dr. Wittola avec le Comte Dupac de Bellegarde," *Revue internationale de Théologie* 6 (1898), 308ff., 584ff.; M. Vaussard, "L'epistolaria di G. M. Pujati con canonico Dupac de Bellegarde," *Studi Veneziani* 7 (1965), 443–88.

When Febronius's *De statu ecclesiae* was finally published, reunification, the exclusive, dominating concern in the original concept, was pushed into the background by the problems involving the rights of the Church of the Empire. Reunification was to be achieved by the elimination of the *gravamina* and the reduction of the papal primacy within the limits drawn by the original church constitution and newly circumscribed by the Councils of Constance and Basel and the *Concordata Nationis Germanicae.* Aside from the Utrecht influences, Hontheim's ideas for reunion can be explained from two roots: the tradition of the Church of the Empire and imperial patriotism as well as the personal impulses he received from his friend and collaborator, the convert Jakob Georg von Spangenberg.[20] Even after his conversion to the Catholic Church Spangenberg's ideas were still largely determined by the late medieval-pietistic Christ mysticism, by Pietism and the Church of the Bohemian Brothers, whose episcopal head was his youngest brother August Gottlieb, and by his very personal form of piety. The Swabian Pietist Moser characterized him as God's very own creature from childhood on; the Viennese privy councillor Adolf von Krufft called him the only confidant of the Febronian secrets. The experience of Spangenberg's own life and his patriotism for the Empire must have made him feel very painfully the abuses of the church constitution and the *Calamitas Imperii,* prompting his desire for a reconciliation of denominational differences and yet—two decades after the appearance of the *Febronius*—reject the Fulda plan for reunion.

---

[20] G. Reichel, *August Gottlieb Spangenberg, Bischof der Brüderkirche* (Tübingen 1908).—In his instruction for Lucini in March 1760 Nuncio Oddi characterized him as "di grandissima abilità, condotta e politica ed allievo del defonto Elettore di Treveri (Franz Georg von Schönborn) da cui ha succhiato tutte le massime. Questo è uomo difficile, per ottenersi la menoma cosa che riquardi la corte di Roma"; L. Just, "Die westdeutschen Höfe um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts im Blick der Kölner Nuntiatur," *AHVNrh* 135 (1939), 64; R. Reichert, "Johann Gertz (1744–1824). Ein katholischer Bibelwissenschaftler der Aufklärungszeit im Spiegel seiner Bibliothek," *AMrhKG* 18 (1966), 98; H. Faas, "J. G. von Spangenberg," *Kurtrierisches Jb.* 8 (1968), 153–65.

No doubt Febronius—as the Protestant opponents of his ideas such as Walch, Bahrdt, C. G. Hofmann, and also the Heidelberg Jesuit J. Kleiner explained to him[21]—did not sufficiently recognize the divisive elements of the denominations and exaggerated the common ones out of anti-Roman sentiments and a confirmed patriotism for the Empire. His "Romantic" attitude, strengthened by his intensive historical studies, hoped that the problems of his own time could be solved through the contrast of a past historical epoch of idealized early Christian and medieval conditions. But even "if the Roman Church were to be given the shape which Febronius wants so laboriously to give it and in the process the Roman-Catholic doctrine and its pure source, the tradition so highly praised by Febronius, were to remain unchanged,"[22] the unification of the divided Christians would be impossible. The suggestions by Febronius were not judged quite so negatively by Abbot Jerusalem and Friedrich Karl von Moser. The latter publicised Spangenberg's credo and the reunion projects of 1614 and 1640 in his *Patriotisches Archiv* and defended Hontheim's honest desire for reunion. "Yet his suggestions for a union will remain mere dreams so long as he cannot demonstrate to the fiscally minded religious Protestant princes that they will gain something in the process. A lottery of 100 abbeys would much sooner meet with their applause."[23]

Whether the plan for reunion was only of secondary importance to Febronius or whether—according to testimony by Martin Gerber—"he was convinced that everything possible had to be sacrificed to peace and Christian unity"[24] has not yet been determined. Febronius's idea of striving for reunion on the basis of a purified canon law and a reformed church constitution was encountered at the court of the Mainz electorate in 1771, contained in the theses of the barrister Betzel,[25] the canonist Benedikt Oberhauser from Fulda,[26] in the writings of Ulrich

---

[21] H. Raab, "Ad reuniendos dissidentes," 136f.

[22] *GGA* 1765, 531; see also C. W. F. Walch, "Geschichte des von Justino Febroni herausgegebenen Buches und der darüber entstandenen Streitigkeiten," *Neueste Religionsgeschichte* I (Lemgo 1771), 189–90.—Negative appraisal also by Christoph Birkmann, senior at Sankt Egidien near Nuremberg. P. Schattenmann, *Georg Adam Michel, Generalsuperintendent in Oettingen und sein gelehrter Briefwechsel* (Nuremberg 1962), 69f.

[23] F. K. v. Moser, *Patriotisches Archiv* VI (1787), 361–89; VII (1787), 193–372; *von der Kirchenvereinigung. Ein Bedenken des Herrn Abts Jerusalem. Mit einem Vorbericht* (n. p., 1772), 42.

[24] Gerbert to Petrus Böhm in Fulda, 6 March 1780 (G. Pfeilschifter, *Korrespondenz* II, 500).

[25] H. Raab, "Ad reuniendos dissidentes," 138.

[26] Oberhauser, an extreme episcopalist who had himself celebrated as "malleus Ultramontanorum" on his headstone, was, however, "not prepared, as were some Fulda

Mayr from Kaisheim, and in the programmatic essay on reunion by Beda Mayr from Donauwörth.[27] The elector of Trier, Clemens Wenzeslaus, repeatedly demonstrating his concern for the elimination of the Utrecht schism in his talks with the Cologne nuncios, nonetheless condemned Mayr's "scrittura scandalose sul pretesto della reunione coi Protestanti" in his capacity as bishop of Augsburg. Yet shortly thereafter in his famous pastoral letter of 1780, coauthored by Johann Michael Sailer, he called the return of those "separated from the faith into the one sheeps' pen of Christ" one of the most pressing concerns.[28] But in this pastoral letter he is far from paving the way for reunion by dogmatic compromise or invoking Febronian or Jansenist ideas. "The doctrine of the Church has always been one and the same," and the Pope as Christ's deputy has always been charged with the unity of the Church and the purity of the doctrine. At the same time, the religious journals of the ex-Jesuit Hermann Goldhagen and the schoolteacher Johann Kaspar Mülle of Mainz, and also the enlightened journal of the Benedictine monks of Banz had reservations regarding reunification. Heretofore they had invariably published favorable and detailed reports about the literature of reunion, but now they joined Martin Gerbert of Sankt Blasien in the conclusion that a reunification of the Churches would be possible only by a return to the Catholic Church. All three parts were to be either Catholic or eternally separated.[29]

Among the numerous more or less successful attempts at reunion in the last third of the eighteenth century the Fulda Plan was the best known and also the strangest one. In 1768 the correspondence concerning a particular case of conversion to the Catholic Church between the Fulda Benedictine Karl von Piesport and Rudolph Wedekind, a professor in Göttingen and parish priest at the Church of Our Lady, suggested an association "to unite the warring factions of the faith."[30] Although Piesport as an episcopalist was ready "in good conscience" to give in on the issue of papal infallibility and almost implored Wedekind to "Let us conciliate; let us compromise," the latter suggested breaking

---

Benedictines two decades later, to make even seeming concessions at the expense of the true elements of faith" (W. A. Mühl, *Die Aufklärung an der Universität Fulda mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der philosophischen und juristischen Fakultät* [*1734–1805*] [Fulda 1961], 49). The same holds true for the Salzburg canonist Gregor Zallwein, a leading episcopalist of the Church of the Empire.

[27] J. Hörmann, *Beda Mayr*; J. Beumer, *Auf dem Wege zur christlichen Einheit,* 203f.

[28] The Augsburg pastoral letter was translated into French, Italian, and Latin. In 1843 it appeared again under the title *Beweise der wahren Kirche* (Regensburg).

[29] W. Forster, "Die kirchliche Aufklärung bei den Benediktinern der Abtei Banz im Spiegel ihrer von 1772–1798 herausgegebenen Zeitschrift," *SM* 64 (1952), 184f.

[30] Piespont to Wedekind, 1768 (Mühl, *Aufklärung in Fulda,* 70, n. 41).

off this fruitless exchange because "Doctrine, rationality and church history have to take precedence over the Pope and the council."[31]

But a decade later the climate for discussions had become more favorable by virtue of the general mood for tolerance and the threat of the Enlightenment, which was hostile to revealed religion. The efforts to bring about reunion were no doubt partly prompted by the ferment of a "negative" union, recognizeable by the growing fear of additional schisms threatened by the abused "Protestant principle," and by growing admiration for the strength of the resistance and unity of the Catholic Church. As indicated in the introduction by a Benedictine monk from Fulda to *Aurelius Augustinus, Von der Nutzbarkeit des Glaubens* (1771), a future ideological front is discernible. A generation later Adam Müller, Carl Ludwig von Haller, and after them Ludwig von Gerlach and Carl Maria von Radowitz tried to establish this front by means of a reunion of faithful Catholics and Protestants or at least by drawing them closer together for the defense of "the most sacred properties" against revolution and radicalism.

In 1778/79 the plan for the formation of a private association emerged from the collaboration between five Benedictine monks in Fulda under the direction of Petrus Böhm and Johann Rudolph Piderit, professor at the Carolinum at Kassel. The association was to contribute to the reunion of the divided denominations. According to the statutes drawn up by Piderit,[32] a committee of twelve members—six Catholic, three Calvinist, and three Lutheran theologians—in an atmosphere of "sincerity and Christian love" were to discuss the truths of the faith, formulate the differences, and investigate the possiblities for restoring harmony.

Reservations were soon announced by Johann Schmitt, a professor of theology at Mainz. The influential Kasimir Haeffelin in Mannheim reacted negatively. His friend, the abbot and librarian Maillot de la Treille, an opponent of Febronianism who used his good connections with the ultramontanes in Alsace to firm up the ecclesiastical defense from Strasbourg to Trier against the innovations of his time, raised the alarm with nuncio Garampi in Vienna. As a result of the negative reaction by the courts of Mannheim and Mainz, the solicitation of the association in Trier, Coblenz, Cologne, and Erfurt were unsuccessful. Even

---

[31] Wedekind to Piespont, 11 November 1768 (H. Raab, "Ad reuniendos dissidentes," 134).

[32] *Einleitung und Entwurf zum Versuch einer zwischen den streitigen Theilen im Römischen Reich vorzunehmenden Religionsvereinigung von verschiedenen Katholischen und Evangelischen Personen, welche sich zu dieser Absicht in eine Gesellschaft verabredet haben* (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1781).

Spangenberg, who had provided the strongest impulses to Hontheim's reunion efforts, rejected the plan; the theologian Johann Gertz from Trier had growing doubts concerning the efficacy of such a heterogeneous association[33] and terminated his participation in January 1782. It was alleged that Stephan Alexander Würdtwein, later suffragan bishop of Worms, was recruited to take the place of the Mainz theologian Schmitt. The prince-abbot of Sankt Blasien, Martin II Gerbert, refused his participation,[34] and the enlightened Abbot Stefan Rautenstrauch from Braunau distanced himself when a negative review appeared in the Vienna *Realzeitung* and Emperor Joseph II, Kaunitz, and Cardinal Herzan did not react to the reunion project. There was hardly any need for the papal letter to Prince-Bishop Heinrich VIII of Bibra to make the efforts by the Benedictines of Fulda founder. Disregarding the instructions of their bishop, they maintained the connections with their Protestant partners. But the Lutherans and Calvinists were unable to agree on a common dogma and as a consequence news of the "Fulda Plan" stopped appearing after the fall of 1782.

In the last third of the eighteenth century a positive attitude towards reunion was furthered by the promotion of tolerance on the part of the Enlightenment and by its concept of an understanding and forgiving humanity. The differences between the denominations were to be reduced to the simple basic tenets of a natural religion with the help of an increasingly secularized education. In his *Betrachtungen über das Universum*[35] Karl Theodor von Dalberg posed the question whether the time had not come to get closer to "the original Church," to the union of the "different religious parties." Christoph von Schmidt wanted to see the controversial sermons, which had been forbidden according to the Josephinist model, in the archdioceses of Cologne and Trier replaced by "union sermons" in order to "convince the Christian people that we are one in all the essentials of Christianity."[36]

The interdenominational irenic efforts towards the end of the eighteenth century received strong impulses from the ex-Jesuit Benedikt Stattler. In his *Demonstratio catholica,* edited and published several times by his pupil Johann Michael Sailer, but primarily in his *Plan* (1781)[37] he emphatically advocated reunion; not "in the heat of disputation" but only "in love" could this goal "of common longing" be achieved. Only dogma was to be obligatory, theories were to be voluntarily accepted. But Stattler did set one condition for Protestants in the case of a reunion: "humble submission under the unerring judgment of the Church in every matter of faith." Stattler's *Kanones der Union* were condemned in Rome, but the procedure and publication of the condemnation were delayed until 1796 because the bishop of Eichstätt took Stattler's part.

---

[33] R. Reichert, *Johann Gertz,* 98f.

[34] G. Pfeilschifter, *Korrespondenz* II, 483f., 500f., 506f.; G. Richter, *Wiedervereinigung,* 27f.

[35] C. T. v. Dalberg, *Betrachtungen über das Universum* (Erfurt 1777).

[36] C. v. Schmid, *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben* I, 6.

[37] B. Stattler, *Plan zu der allein möglichen Vereinigung der Protestanten mit der katholischen Kirche und von den Grenzen dieser Möglichkeiten* (Munich and Augsburg 1781); F. X.

With Stattler's pupil Johann Michael Sailer (1751–1832) and his followers in Dillingen and Augsburg, in Switzerland and northern Germany the irenic mood reached a climax.[38] Sailer saw the way to unify the Church in emulating Christ's comprehensive self-sacrificing love. The Romantic philosopher Franz von Baader interpreted the denominational splits as a mere transitional stage on the way to a higher unity, introducing an idea into the interdenominational discussions that was pursued by Sebastian Drey and by Joseph Görres until well into the latter's Strasbourg period. Johann Nikolaus Friedrich Bauer (d. 1813) attempted to take a step in the direction of reunion with the help of "sovereign reform authority." He established a theological faculty at the University of Heidelberg consisting of nine professors of all three denominations, but in 1807 the Catholic faculty members left to join the University of Freiburg.[39] Enlightened and irenic concepts merged in the desire for reunion of Prince-Primate Karl Theodor von Dalberg, his vicar general from Constance, Ignaz Heinrich von Wessenberg, and their friends.

Political and nationalist motives played a role in the attempt by the archbishop of Besançon to glorify the coronation of Napoleon by a reunion of the denominations. The extent to which such motives were connected with the desire for reunification in Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a desire fed by the Enlightenment and older roots, is shown not only by the passionate discussion of the writings of Claude Le Coz and Beaufort of the reception of the history of reunion attempts written by Mathieu Tabaraud (1808), but also by the contribution of the last abbot of Michelfeld, Maximilian Prechtl.[40] "From his

---

Haimerl, "Die irenische Beeinflussung Johann Michael Sailers durch Benedikt Stattler," *Jb. des Historischen Vereins Dillingen* 52 (1950), 78–94; H. Graßl, *Aufbruch zur Romantik. Bayerns Beitrag zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte 1765–1785* (Munich 1968), 84ff.

[38] F. W. Kantzenbach, *Johann Michael Sailer und der ökumenische Gedanke* (Nuremberg 1955).

[39] G. A. Benrath, "Drei theologische Fakultäten in Heidelberg (1805–1807) und Karl Friedrichs Unionspolitik," *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* n.s. 1952/53, 85–97.

[40] M. Prechtl, *Friedensworte an die katholische und protestantische Kirche für ihre Wiedervereinigung* (Sulzbach 1810); idem, *Gutachten der Helmstedter Universität bei der einer*

personal conviction that the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century was either the immediate or secondary cause of most of the political and ecclesiastical storms, including the most recent secularization," he attempted to establish " in the religious unification of Germany the best, albeit not the only means and main conditions for forceful resistance against the nascent universal Napoleonic rule." Among the irenic efforts in the conservative Prussian camp, in the Christian Germanic circles, and elsewhere the striving for denominational unity was henceforth most intimately connected with the striving for national unity. The historian and conservative politician Heinrich Leo saw the fusion of religious reunification and national unity in the nineteenth century more distinctly than Radowitz and Diepenbrock had: "Whoever wants a German state must first have a unified strong German Church again—this has been taught by six centuries of history."[41]

---

protestantischen Prinzessin angenommenen Annahme der katholischen Religion, beleuchtet von dem Verfasser der Friedensworte (Salzburg 1815); idem, *Friedensbenehmen zwischen Bossuet, Leibnitz und Molan für die Wiedervereinigung der Katholiken und Protestanten* (Sulzbach 1815); cf. H. Raab, "Ad reuniendos dissidentes," 145.

[41] H.-J. Schoeps, *Das andere Preußen. Konservative Gestalten und Probleme im Zeitalter Friedrich Wilhelms IV.* (Honnef 1957), 199; E. Hannay, *Der Gedanke der Wiedervereinigung der Konfessionen in den Anfängen der konservativen Bewegung* (Düsseldorf 1936).

CHAPTER 28

Ecclesiastical Learning in the Eighteenth Century—Theology of Enlightenment and Pietism

Catholic Theology

In the history of theology the period from the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century marks the decline of Scholasticism; Grabmann speaks of an epigonal period. While the achievements of earlier generations were diligently collected and promulgated in compendia and textbooks, hardly anything new was added. And yet in a broad context this period was not without its own characteristics. Even the fact that moral theology was separated from dogmatics points towards growth. The theology of the period was strongly influenced by the requirements of practical ministry. Linked to medieval confessional handbooks and not without the influence of canonist tendencies, it constructed a case theory which was intended to facilitate the decisions in actual cases. To be sure, the realization of Christian faith is substantially depersonalized by this and one might well regret that such phenomena as laxism, the moral dispute over probabilism, and probabiliorism emerged. Yet behind all of it was a forceful attempt to cope with everyday problems. Moreover, the possiblity of development in the area of ethical norms is visible. Parallel to all this was the great genesis of historical research which laid foundations especially in the field of Catholic theology. Since all the facts were important to them the historiographers of the baroque compiled an immense mass of materials, but they also devised methods in the science of history which are still alive. And, lastly, the Enlightenment stimulated new branches of theological science, such as scriptural science, religious science, pastoral theology with its subcategories, liturgics, catechetics, and homiletics. It is not hard to see a common element behind all these phenomena: theological speculation decreased, but actual church life was more decisively included in theological cognition. The entire situation, moreover, opened possibilities for theological points of departure which were no longer limited to the foundations derived from antiquity or the ideas of the Middle Ages.

Speculative theology was not, of course, totally extinguished; many a name is still deserving of mention. But none can be compared with the great theologians of the Middle Ages or the Spaniards of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. There was still a confrontation of the old theological schools. Thomism was represented by the Benedictines of Salzburg, among them Paul Mezger (1637–1702) and Ludwig Babenstuber (1660–1715), by Dominicans such as Cardinal Vincenzo Ludovico Gotti (1664–1742), Hyacinth Drouin (1680–1740), and Bernardo Maria de Rossi (1687–1775). Among the Jesuits we must mention especially the Spanish Cardinal Álvaro Cienfuegos (1657–1739) because of his special doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. From 1766 to 1777 four members of the Society of Jesus, professors of the University of Würzburg, wrote a remarkable *Theologia Wirceburgensis,* with reference to positive-theological and speculative elements. Its concerns were presented almost simultaneously and in similar fashion by the Spanish Jesuit J. B. Genér (1711–81). A theology resembling Augustinianism was offered by August Reding (1625–92) of Salzburg, who later became abbot of Einsiedeln; Enrico Noris and Giovanni Laurenzio Berti (1696–1766) were the main representatives of the younger Augustinian school. The Franciscan Claude Frasien (1620–1711), as much as he based his ideas on Aristotle, was a Scotist. The Capuchin theologians generally went back to Bonaventure. Interest in Raymond Lull was also revived: Ivo Salzinger (1669–1728) suggested a new edition of his works (1721–42).[1] The most important Lullist of the century, Antonio Raymundo Pascual y Flexas (1708–91), spent some time in Mainz before continuing on to Palma di Mallorca, where he worked for some decades. From the large field of controversial theology we should single out the *Ecclesiologia* (1677) by the convert Johannes Scheffler, who also created an immortal body of religious poetry under the name of Angelus Silesius. The first apologia in German was published (1787–89) by Beda Mayr, *Verteidigung der natürlichen, christlichen und katholischen Religion nach den Bedürfnissen unserer Zeit.* The title alone demonstrates that an apologia could no longer be fulfilled merely in the fight of the denominations.

There were times when a question of moral theology excited the seventeenth century: when there was serious doubt concerning the existence of a moral law, probabilism offered the possibility of a free decision if there were probable reasons for it. A stricter view demanded *more* probable reasons (probabiliorism, tutiorism); a milder view admitted weak reasons (laxism). The systematic foundation of probabilism goes back to Bartholomaeus de Medina (1577). His views were frequently represented by Dominicans and Jesuits. De Medina and all the variations of laxism were opposed by the Jansenists, especially by Blaise Pascal (see Chaps. 3 and 6). In 1665 and 1666 Alexander VII condemned laxism, as did Innocent XI in 1679 (see Chap. 3); Alexander VIII opposed tutiorism in 1690.

Practical need alone would have prompted the growth of works in the new field of moral theology; among the many authors there were some whose works were reprinted a number of times. Unfortunately, we must limit ourselves to a mere few of them.[2] These were the moral theologies of Martin Bonacina (1624) and the Jesuit Paul Laymann (1625); the *Resolutiones morales* by the Theatine friar Antonio Diana (1629–59) offered approximately six thousand cases of law and conscience; later editions were categorized either systematically or alphabetically to facilitate their use. The Cistercian Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz (1641) and the Jesuit Ambrosio de Escobar Mendoza (1644 and 1652) published extreme laxist views in their moral theologies and were attacked by Pascal (see Chaps. 3 and 6). The Jesuit Hermann Busenbaum's *Medulla theologiae moralis* (1645) was entirely practice-oriented, while the widely disseminated work of the Franciscan Anaklet Reiffenstuel (1692), the "classicist of practical theology," paid strict attention to the separation of law and morals. The most respected moral theologian was Alphonsus Liguori (1696–1787), whose influence endured for a century and a half. His harmonizing *Theologia moralis* (1748) was based on Busenbaum; he was an equiprobabilist, entirely fulfilled by the idea of God's mercy; his *Homo apostolicus* (1757) is constructed primarily by the casuistic method.

---

[1] On Lullism in Mainz, see A. T. Brück in *Jb. des Bistums Mainz* 4 (1949), 314–38.

[2] On the French moralists, see Chap. 6 above.

The great period of emotional mysticism had passed and none had an effect like Teresa of Ávila or John of the Cross. Yet this century of religiosity, moved by various baroque forms in which a comprehensive mode of Pietism crystallized among the Protestant believers, was not without examples of a profoundly religious life and ascetic discipline. John Eudes (1601–80) and Jean Jacques Olier (1608–57) have already been mentioned (Chap. 1). The ascetic writings of the Cistercian Cardinal John Bona (1609–80), such as *De sacrificio missae* (1658) and *Cursus vitae spiritualis* (1674) were widely disseminated (Bona was also an important scholar of liturgics). Saint Louis Marie Grignion de Montfort (1673–1716), one of the great missionaries who had a broad impact, wrote the *Traité de la vraie dévotion à la Sainte Vierge*, his most profound and best known ascetic work. The writings of the Jesuit Jean-Pierre Caussade (1675–1751), such as the *Instructions spirituelles* (1741), have met with renewed interest in the twentieth century. Dominik Schramm's (1723–97) *Institutiones theologiae mysticae* (1774) attempted a bridge to Enlightenment.

The severe change in the intellectual life of the period which we designate as the "Enlightenment" (see Chap. 18)[3] could, of course, not remain without impact on the concepts of systematic theology. After 1740 Cartesian ideas and those of Leibniz, presented in the rationalistic form of Christian Wolff, whose philosophy predominated among the Protestant thinkers of the time until the arrival of Kant, were frequently though eclectically used among the Catholics as well and had to be confronted with traditional speculative theology. This was undertaken rather radically by Ulrich Weiß (1713–63) in his *Liber de emendatione intellectus humani* (1747). The Augustinian friar Eusebius Amort (1692–1775),[4] a prolific author, who was also interested in natural sciences, worked in a historicocritical manner. Using the Scriptures intensively, he combined tradition with the new and applied a simplified Scholastic method to his work. As a moral theologian he was an equiprobabilist akin to Alphonsus Liguori. As late as 1768 Simpert Schwarzhueber (1727–95)[5] wrote his Thomist *Ethica;* in his *Praktisch-katholisches Religionshandbuch für nachdenkende Christen* (1784–85) he also tried to combine the old and the new, though less fortuitously than Amort. The writings of the Ingolstadt Jesuit Benedikt Stattler (1728–97),[6] the teacher of Johann Michael Sailer, are characterized by an impressive universal conception. His *Demonstratio evangelica* (1770) and *Demonstratio catholica* (1775), although stylistically ponderous, should be mentioned for their strict methodology if for no other reason. In 1788 he wrote an *Anti-Kant.* In the end he was subjected to church censorship and received little attention until recently, when he evoked renewed esteem. Engelbert Klüpfel (1733–1811), a dogmatist in Freiburg, was a pioneer in historical theology and not a rationalist in his *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (1789). But there were some confirmed rationalists, such as Lorenz Isenbiehl (1744–1818; exegete and author of *Neuer Versuch über die Weissagung von Emmanuel* [1788]) and Felix Anton Blau (1754–98; a dogmatist), both of them professors in Mainz, and Franz Berg (1753–1821), a confirmed skeptic in spite of his anti-Kantian position.

---

[3] The appraisal of Catholic enlightenment in Germany has taken a noticeably positive turn, along with a more precise and differentiated evaluation, at the beginning of the twentieth century through the work of Sebastian Merkle; see S. Merkle, *Ausgewählte Reden und Aufsätze* (Würzburg 1965), esp. 361–441.

[4] G. Rückert, *Eusebius Amort und das bayer. Geistesleben im 18. Jh.* (Munich 1956); O. Schaffner, *Eusebius Amort 1692–1775 als Moraltheologe* (Paderborn 1962).

By combining Kant's categorical imperative and the biblical commandment of love, Sebastian Mutschelle (1749–1800) tried to establish a new speculative moral theology. After the condemnation of Jakob Danzer (1743–96) because of his *Anleitung zur christlichen Moral* (1787), the University of Salzburg was dominated once more by Scholasticism. The exegete Thaddäus Anton Dereser (1757–1827)[7] had a broad impact with his *Erbauungsbuch für alle Christen auf alle Tage des Kirchenjahres* (1792). In 1813 the liturgist Vitus Anton Winter (1754–1814)[8] published a *Deutsches kath. ausübendes Ritual* which manifested the rationalist spirit of the time more than any other contemporary work. But there were also some effective opponents of rationalism, among them Hermann Goldhagen (1718–94), with his *Religions journal* (1776–94; edited by the professors of Mainz), and Franz Oberthür (1745–1831),[9] who was an opponent of Scholasticism but nonetheless in favor of a biblical theology. Gregor Zirkel (1762–1817), suffragan bishop of Würzburg after 1812, who was initially a Kantian, became a representative of a positive Catholicism. *Das Wichtigste für Eltern, Lehrer und Seelsorger* (1786) by Aegidius Jais (1750–1822)[10] was the best example of sex education in the period of Enlightenment. Together with Johann Michael Sailer, Jais was instrumental in overcoming the rationalism of that period.

---

[5] A. Teleman, *Der Benediktiner Simpert Schwarzhueber 1727–1795, Prof. in Salzburg, als Moraltheologe. Seine Beziehungen zur Moraltheologie des Protestanten Gottfried Leß, zum Salzburger Moraltheologen Jakob Dauser und Ignaz von Fellani* (Regensburg 1961).

[6] F. Scholz, *Benedikt Stattler und die Grundzüge seiner Sittlichkeitslehre* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1957).

[7] E. Hegel, "Thaddäus Anton Dereser und sein Verhältnis zum Karmeliterorden," *JKölGV* 36/37 (1961–62), 157–72.

[8] A. Vierbach, *Die liturgischen Anschauungen des Vitus Anton Winter* (Munich 1929).

[9] O. Volk et al., *Professor Franz Oberthür. Persönlichkeit und Wrk* (Neustadt a. d. Aisch 1966).

The departure into new fields of theological learning towards an overall consolidation of church history[11] started at the turn of the seventeenth century. It was the Maurist congregation in France whose ranks provided the most prominent personalities in the field of historical research, foremost among them Mabillon (see Chap. 6). During the eighteenth century church history continued to flourish in France. Whereas the *Selecta historiae ecclesiasticae capita* (1676–86) by the Dominican Alexander Natalis,[12] the first comprehensive church history of the modern era, was still written in a polemical and apologetical fashion, the frequently translated *Histoire ecclésiastique* (1691–1720) by the secular priest Claude Fleury (1640–1723) was influenced by Mabillon and Tillemont, showing close attention to the sources and a pleasant style. Although it had a broad effect, it also provoked criticism because of its Gallican tendencies. While these church histories were written, work continued on the sources. The Jesuit Philippe Labbé (1607–67) edited the *Sacrosancta Concilia* (1671–72), providing it with valuable annotations. He was followed by his fellow monk Jean Hardouin (1646–1729), whose *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima* (1714–15) represented a more reliable edition than that of Mansi. Jacques Goar (1601–53) was among the first to establish Byzantinistics, a field to which Charles Dufresne Sieur Du Cange (1610–88) also dedicated himself. An indispensable contribution to the field of church history is Du Cange's *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis* (1678). In 1715–16 the cleric Eusèbe Renaudot (1648–1720) published his *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio.* Especially prominent among the Maurists were Gabriel Gerberon (1628–1711), who suggested the controversial edition of Saint Augustine; and Achery's and Mabillon's pupil Edmond Martène (1654–1739) with his *Commentar zur Regel des heiligen Benedikt* (1690) and his work in liturgics. In the field of exegesis there were Augustin Calmet's (1672–1757) *Dictionaire historique . . . de la Bible* (1719) and Pierre Sabatier's (1683–1742) fundamental work on the *Vetus Latina, Bibliorum sacrorum versiones antiquae* (1743–49). In the area of patristics Pierre Coustant (1654–1721) published an edition of Hilarius (1693); Remy Ceillier (1688–1761)[13] created a comprehensive *Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques* (1729–63).

---

[10] H. Dussler, "P. Aegidius Jais von Benediktbeuren 1750–1822," *SM* 69 (1958), 214–35.

[11] For the historical view, see Chap. 19.

[12] A. Hänggi, *Der Kirchenhistoriker Natalis Alexander* (Fribourg 1955).

In the Netherlands Daniel Papebroch (1628–1714) persisted in his work on the *Acta sanctorum* of Johannes Bollandus, which differentiated between the older and newer sources. Papebroch established a methodology for hagiography and very strict rules for paleography, too strict in fact to be maintained. The Augustinian Hermit Christian Lupus (1612–81) of Louvain occupied himself with the provincial councils in his *Synodorum Generalium ac Provincialism decreta et canones* (1665). The Maurists had a profound influence on the scholarly efforts of the Benedictines in southern Germany. The first great mediator was Bernhard Pez[14] (1683–1735) of Melk, who had the help of his brother Hieronymus (1685–1762). His fundamental works are *Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana* (1716) and *Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova* (1721–29). Historically more important were the efforts of the abbot of Göttweig, Gottfried Bessel (1672–1749); his prodromus on the *Chronicon Gottwicense* (1732) represents a first general German diplomatics. In collaboration with Pez and Bessel, Magnoald Ziegelbauer (1689–1750)[15] of Zwiefalten worked on a source edition for the history of the Benedictine order. Anselm Desing (1699–1772), later the abbot of Ensdorf, worked in the spirit of the Maurists at the University of Salzburg, where Frobenius Forster (1709–1791) was one of his colleagues. As the abbot of Sankt Emmeram in Regensburg, Forster led this monastery to a high scholarly level; his edition of Alcuin (1777) won acclaim throughout Europe. Marquart Herrgott (1694–1762) visited the Maurists for personal instruction; after his *Vetus disciplina Monastica* (1726) he directed his efforts to the history of the archdynasty of Austria. Through him Sankt Blasien became a center of historical studies. Martin Gerbert (1720–93), abbot after 1764, became the most prominent of this group of Benedictines from the Black Forest through his works in liturgics and the history of music; his efforts are indispensable even today: *Iter alemannicum* (1765), *De cantu et musica sacra* (1774), *Monumenta veteris liturgicae Alemanniae* (1777–79) and *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica sacra* (1784). His most important undertaking was to organize the edition of a *Germania sacra.* With it he continued the effort of the Vienna Jesuit Markus Hansiz (1683–1766; *Germania sacra* [1727–58]), which had also been pursued by the Cologne Jesuit Joseph Hartzheim (1694–1762) in the field of the councils by his edition of the *Concilia Germaniae* (1759–63). The eight volumes of the Sankt Blasien *Germania sacra* appeared from 1790 to 1803;[16] this promising endeavor was abruptly ended by secularization. In the geographical area of the Rhine we should mention Johann Friedrich Schannat (1683–39) from Luxemburg, who maintained close connections with the Maurists and provided preliminary work for the *Concilia Germaniae,* and, lastly, Stephan Alexander Würdtwein (1722–96),[17] who furnished access to an abundance of source material in his two series of *Subsidia diplomatica*.

---

[13] J. Villerot-Reboul, "Dom Remi Ceillier et le prieur de Flavigny-sur-Moselle 1733–61," *AE* (1959), 5ᵉ sér, X, 161–72.

[14] H. Hantsch, "Bernhard Pez und Abt Berthold Dietmayr," *MIÖG* 71 (1963), 128–39; G. Heer, "Bernhard Pez von Melk OSB (1683–1735) in seinen Beziehungen zu den Schweizer Klöstern," *Festschr. Vasella* (Fribourg 1964), 403–55.

[15] I. Stricher, "Les rétractions du mariologue bénédictin Dom Magnoald Ziegelbauer," *EThL* 35 (1959), 59–76.

The new discipline of pastoral theology, at first also called practical theology—pastoral theology taking over some practical fields hitherto served by moral theology—was not founded extensively on actual theological ideas. Instead it was shaped by the image of man and the world on the basis of common sense using the Bible and the Fathers "for useful remarks concerning the unselfish execution of the office of a minister." It was lacking a pneumatic concept of the Church. Sailer was the one who finally resorted to biblical foundations, seeking genuine Christocentricity. In fact, the first pastoral theologies (by F. C. Pitroff [1778], Franz Giftschütz [1785], Carl Schwarzel [1799], Dominik Gollowitz [1803], A. Reichenberger, and M. Fingerlos [1805]) were devoid of actual theology. Even the basic idea of a shepherd confronted by a herd he is to lead was inadequate, especially so if the minister was considered merely as a "servant of religion" and the pastoral as a description of the duties of his office. The weaknesses in this initial attempt were not overcome until the Tübingen school developed its more genuine concept of the Church (Anton Graf, 1841).

The individual disciplines in the pastoral field did not arrive at a truly scientific theology either. The oldest, liturgics, had been blessed with an abundance of sources since the seventeenth century, but did not evaluate them correspondingly. Catechetics, which proceeded radically against the existing method of memorization in Christology, was not provided with a theological foundation until the work of Johann Joseph Augustin Gruber (1832), in spite of the relatively good start by Johann Ignaz von Felbiger (1724–88; in 1767 he also published the first Catholic school Bible in German) and Michael Ignaz Schmidt (1736–94, *Methodus tradendi prima elementa religionis . . .* [1769]). In the field of homiletics the ex-Jesuit Ignaz Wurz (1727–84) became the most prominent scholar in the German language with his *Anleitung zur geistlichen Beredsamkeit* (Vienna 1775); he based his approach entirely on the great French forerunners such as Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, and de la Rue. But homiletics did not become a science until the nineteenth century.

---

[16] Another volume was printed in 1862.

[17] H. Raab, "Christian Frh. v. Eberstein und Stephan Alex. Würdtwein," *AMrhKG* (1955) 378–87.

For a time the eighteenth century also promulgated the concept of pastoral medicine (M. A. Alberti, 1732 [Halle] and G. M. Matthiae, 1734 [Göttingen] among the Protestants; F. E. Cangiamilia, 1751 [Milan] among the Catholics). But towards the end of the century it was replaced by the concept of a *medicina ruralis* which provided for the training of rural clerics to help out as doctors where none were available.

Scholarship in Italy

While the great speculative minds in post-Tridentine theology were in Spain, the first steps in historical theology were taken in Italy. The challenge of the Magdeburg centurists was answered by Baronius and continued in Italy as well by Raynald and Laderchi. The Venetian Sarpi turned his attention to the most recent events; his history of the Council of Trent is a very sober account, yet full of antipapal tendencies which Pallavicino tried to counter. The first Christian archeologist worked in Bosio; Lippomani created a prodromus of the *Acta sanctorum.* Lucas Wadding (1588–1657), an Irish Franciscan who lived in Rome for forty years, created the first scholarly history of the religious orders in his *Annales* (1627–54) and the *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (1650). The *Italia sacra* (1644–62) by the Cistercian Ferdinando Ughelli (1594–1670), categorized by dioceses, was the first church history of its kind and a model for the *Gallia christiana* and Gerbert's *Germania sacra.* This form of historiography is an especially impressive testimony of the importance ascribed to the history of the institutions by Catholic church historiography. Cardinal Enrico Noris, an Augustinian Hermit, (1631–1704) is considered the father of the younger Augustinian school. Not only was he a historian, but he was also very much involved in the emotional issues of his time concerning the interpretation of the Augustinian doctrine of grace. Yet his *Historica Pelagiana* (1673) is a superior achievement in the history of dogmatics. The Theatine Cardinal Joseph Maria Tomasi (1649–1714) published comprehensive collections of sources in the field of patristics and the history of liturgics: the *Codices Sacramentorum* (1680), *Responsalia et Antiphonaria* (1686), *Antiqui libri Missarum* (1691), and *Institutiones theologicae antiquorum Patrum* (1709–12). The Syrian Josef Simonius Assemani (1687–1768) provided productive access to the Christian East; he made the Vatican a reservoir of Eastern sources and unlocked these treasures in his *Bib-*

liotheca Orientalis (1719–28) and the *Bibliotheca juris Orientalis* (1762–66). Equally important was his edition of Ephraim (1732–46). Ludovico Antonio Muratori (1672–1750)[18] enjoyed high esteem, and not only in the area of historiography. His publication of sources for the history of the Italian Middle Ages (*Rerum italicarum scriptores* [1723–51] and *Antiquitates italici medii aevi* [1738–43]) is as indispensable for Italy as the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* started a hundred years later is for Germany. The brothers Pietro (1698–1769) and Girolamo (1702–81) Ballerini published the works of Leo the Great (1753–57). The learned canonist Prosper Lambertini (1675–1758), who occupied the papal throne as Benedict XIV and liked to encourage scholarly endeavors, had arrived at the themes for his two main works from his own practice: in his role as the *Promotor fidei* in the canonization procedures on *De servorum Dei beatificatione* (1734–38) and as archbishop of Bologna on *De Synodo diocesana* (1755). The versatile Scipio Maffei (1675–1755) edited the works of Hilarius. In Guiseppe Bianchini we again encounter an editor of liturgical sources: in 1735 he edited the *Sacramentarium Leonianum;* in his *Evangeliarium quadruplex* (1749) he supplemented Sabatier's work on the *Itala.* The canonist Lucius Ferraris (d. 1763) created a popular lexicon *Prompta bibliotheca canonica* (1746). The Dominican Cardinal Guiseppe Agostino Orsi (1692–1761) presented a comprehensive history of the Church for the first six centuries in his *Istoria ecclesiastica* (1747–62). Giovanni Domenico Mansi joined the ranks of the great editors; his collection of the councils in two series (1748–52 and 1759–98) is indispensable even today. The Dominican Thomas M. Mamachi (1713–92) pioneered the investigation of Christian antiquity by his *Origines et antiquitates christianae* (1749–55), but he also initiated work on the history of the orders in his *Annales Ordinis Praedicatorum* (1756). Joseph Alois (1710–82), one of the two younger Assemanis, edited the *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universae* (1749–66), while Stefan Evodius (1711–82) and his uncle edited the Vatican manuscript catalog (1756–59). The Jesuit Francesco Antonio Zaccaria (1714–92), also well versed in archaeology, wrote a *Storia letteraria d'Italia* (1750–59), as did his fellow religious Girolamo Tiraboschi (1731–94) twenty years later with his *Storia della letteratura italiana,* which was at the same time a cultural history. We should not leave unmentioned the patient work of the high-minded prefect of the Vatican archives, Cardinal Guiseppe Garampi, whose 124 volumes of *Schedulae* are still making the treasures of these archives available. If we add Giambattista Vico (Chap. 18), who has to be considered the greatest philosophical historian of the century, we can safely say that the achievements of Italy can hold their own next to the luminescence of France, which was so important for the development of the science of history. Italy excelled especially through the broad scope of its aspects.[19]

---

[18] S. Bertelli, *Erudizione e storia in Ludovico Antonio Muratori* (Naples 1960).

Jansenism in Italy; The Synod of Pistoia, 1786

While Italy developed much initiative of its own, especially in the area of historical theology, Jansenism—although fairly widespread in Italy—received its impulses from outside, from France and Utrecht. But only small groups of the educated were open to its ideas, often with characteristic differences in the individual cities, as in papal Rome, for instance, with its representatives of Augustinian thought expressing sharp anti-Jesuit tendencies, in Pavia (Pietro Tamburini), Genoa (Vincenzo Palmieri), Turin, Milan, Venice and Naples. Jansenism was given a special characteristic in a surprising late phase in Habsburg Tuscany, where it was combined with Gallican and regalist concepts and engaged in provocative activities. Grand Duke Peter Leopold (1765–90), the younger brother of Emperor Joseph II and his successor to the imperial throne as Leopold II (1790–1792), initiated reforms similar to those of his brother in the administration, economy, the universities, and penal law. He paid particular attention to the ecclesiastical realm, where he was assisted by the Jansenist Scipione de' Ricci. In 1780 he procured for de' Ricci the conjoined bishoprics of Prato and Pistoia so that there was now a bishop who would support the reforms vigorously. These rested on a meager theological fundament, which might have been found in Quesnel's works, disproportionately affecting the practical aspects: abolition of the Inquisition, the concentration of Mass stipends for the benefit of poor priests, the equalization of benefices, parish bankruptcy, the residence obligation for parish priests, the study in episcopal seminaries instead of monastic schools, the obligation to give sermons, education of the youth, the translation of the missal, Communion during Mass, reform of the breviary, revision of the hagiographies, a minimum age of twenty-four for profession, rejection of private Masses, of the Sacred Heart cult, indulgences, exercises, and the popular mission, but on the other hand strengthening the idea of the parish. The original Church was perceived as a model, the infallibility of the Church was to rest on the totality of the faithful and not on the papacy; the jurisdiction of the bishops was held to be derived from Jesus himself. Pertinent articles were passed on 18 September 1786 by a diocesan synod in Pistoia. The acts of the synod were edited immediately and distributed internationally. But only three additional Tuscan priests embraced these same principles, so that the overwhelming majority of the national synod convened in Florence in 1787 reacted negatively. Resistance among the population was also strong. When the grand duke left, the reforms were quickly terminated and Ricci had to resign his bishopric in 1791. In his bull *Auctorem fidei,* dated 28 August 1794, Pius VI condemned, in varying degrees, eighty-five of the theses established at the synod. Ricci submitted in 1805. In spite of the rapid victory by the papacy over this last outgrowth of Jansenism, the significance of this movement especially for Italy is today seen in a new light: in this totally Catholic country it paved the way for the *Risorgimento,* in which many became accustomed—in spite of an anticurial attitude—to seriously seeking religious modes which seemed to be more Catholic than those proclaimed by the Curia.

---

[19] For an interpretive church history in Italy, see A. Noger-Weidner, *Die Aufklärung in Oberitalien* (Munich 1957).

Protestant Theology

After the Church was deprived of its educational function, Protestant theology and through it the universities gained a profound importance which can only be briefly discussed within the framework of this book (see especially the standard work by E. Hirsch). It was initially shaped by the old Protestant orthodoxy which in both of its currents, the Lutheran and Reformed, overcame Luther's move away from philosophy. Following Melanchthon's example, Aristotle again was made the basis for ideas; this made possible many lateral connections to Thomas and also Suárez. The directional disputes and the canonization of the reformers notwithstanding, the importance of the Holy Scripture was stressed if only through the consolidation of the concept of verbal inspiration in an attempt to elevate the Scripture as opposed to tradition. At the same time the analytical method applied since Gerhard (1582–1637) gave greater weight to systematic thought relative to the Scriptures. In addition, such concepts as federal theology (Coccius) or the theology of the Kingdom of God directed attention from the individual word of the Scripture to the total meaning of divine revelation and divine mercy. In addition there was a growing appreciation of natural theology. The security of orthodoxy was shaken by two intellectual movements: Pietism and the Enlightenment. Basic to the latter was the philosophical development in England through which the so-called deism originated. While its most prominent representatives fought against the traditional Church and its doctrine, they adhered to the unity of rationalism and revelation. But their meaning was reduced to some basic truths. By this, Herbert of Cherbury hoped for a new foundation of the faith, which by that time he viewed from an exclusively anthropological standpoint. In his moderate theological rationalism Locke still recognized the function of Jesus as the messiah and accepted verification through miracles as proof of divine revelation. To him revelation was not irrational but supprarational, sharpening the vision. Locke especially established the right of the individual to think and to act for himself. Christianity in many ways became a matter of ethics for him. An aggressive deism was advocated by John Toland, who attacked the canon of the Scripture and saw the proof of the revelation not in miracles but rather in the rational nature of its content. In this he was followed by Anthony Collins, Thomas Woolston, and the most mature of the deists, Matthew Tindal (1730), for whom revelation was the promulgation of natural religion. The deist "storm flood" (Hirsch) triggered sharp reactions. But with the best of its representatives, Samuel Clarke and Joseph Butler, these could emanate only from the basis of a rational supranaturalism. David Hume criticized the security of deism as well. But its impact was greater in France and Germany than in its place of origin (see Chap. 18).

In Germany a transitional theology (Baumgarten, Buddeus, Mosheim, et al.), adhering to the existing foundations, began to stress their moral-practical aspects. For many the philosophy presented by Wolff became an important base. Also gaining in importance was the physicotheology first pronounced by the Englishman Robert Boyle. In it the work of God within all of creation is theologically formulated—an attempt to stop the separation of the temporal world from theological thought brought about by Copernicus. Very much under the influence of the Enlightenment were the so-called neologists (Ernesti, Spalding, et al.). Faith and religion were separated from theology (Semler), the Bible and dogma distinguished from one other. The Scripture was perceived as a human-historical testimony of the revelation, important wherever it serves the promotion of spirituality. Michaelis (d. 1791) advocated an explanation of the Bible free of dogma, paving the way for a historicocritical treatment of the Bible. Christian faith was reduced to those elements considered most essential, retaining recognition of the revelation and the miracles. Denominational polemics, hitherto undertaken zealously, began to recede.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century an extreme rationalism among some of the representatives of Protestant theology gained ground. The radical biblical critic Reimarus became especially well known through G. E. Lessing's defense of him.[20] In his defense of natural religion Lessing himself dissolved the belief in the revelation and the miracles so that the dogmatic foundations were lost and the Fall and redemption as facts of salvation dissappeared from view. But revelation for him goes beyond nature; the Bible does not represent revelation but instead the profession of revelation, which can be perceived ever more clearly in God's work according to the *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes*. A borderline case was Bahrdt, to whom Christianity appeared as mere fraud on a large scale.

---

[20] Beginning in 1774 Lessing participated in the theological dispute. He considered revelation to go beyond nature; yet the Bible is not revelation, but acknowledgment of

Pietism, while definitely connected with the Enlightenment, was more effective in Protestant theology and spirituality by virtue of the fact that it was located overwhelmingly within the Church. It originated with P. I. Spener (1635–1705) and his main work, the *Pia Desideria* (1675). Following its publication, the orthodoxy and church administrations were subjected to increasing criticism by advocates of an individual religion on the basis of the inner self. The fact that subjectivity enhanced in Pietism did not contradict social efficacy and instead substantially furthered it was shown by Spener's pupil A. H. Francke (1663–1727), who made Halle a center of Pietism. His "endowed institutions," among them an orphanage and school, and his involvement with the Christian mission in India and the diaspora ministry characterized his life's work. The same missionary spirit inspired N. L. Zinzendorf (1700–1760), who came from the Halle group of Pietists and founded the Herrnhut Brotherhood in 1722, an independent community, yet following the Augsburg Confession. More radical than Zinzendorf's ecclesiology (the churches as "tropes") was the historical concept of the Church of G. Arnold (see below). Eighteenth-century Pietism continued in the "revival movement." The reformed Pietism stems from seventeenth-century Puritanism and developed its own communities in the Netherlands. G. Tersteegen (1697–1769) wrote his hymns and sermons in the area of the lower Rhine.[21]

The development of Protestant church history proceeded—while not exclusively yet most vigorously—in the German domain. It placed less emphasis on creating new methods, establishing source criticism, or providing an abundance of material than the Catholic side, concentrating instead on new points of departure for the total conception. The concept of decline as a basis of church history which had governed the

---

revelation; Christianity, he maintained, is older than the Bible. His special concern was to recognize the workings of God towards the education of mankind (see Chap. 19).

[21] A. Ritschl, *Gesch. des Pietismus,* 3 vols. (Bonn 1880–86); H. Bornkamm, *Mystik, Spiritualismus und die Anfänge des Pietismus im Luthertum* (Giessen 1926); M. Beyer-Frölich, ed., *Pietismus und Rationalismus* (Leipzig 1933); O. Söhngen, ed., *Die bleibende Bedeutung des Pietismus* (Berlin 1960).

Magdeburg centurists was, of course, dominant also among the Baptists and in all of mystical spiritualism and was capable of intensification to the extent that all Churches, even the Protestant ones, resembled nothing short of the iniquitous Babel. The *Summarium* (1697) by the Old Orthodox Adam Rechenberg, too, is still characterized by the theory of decline, with the difference that it is turned into the opposite by the Reformation. The *Unpartheische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie* (1699) by the Pietist Gottfried Arnold achieved great importance. Carefully following the sources, this work deinstitutionalizes the history of the Church and, above all, deals with the question of Christian faith through rebirth. The shape of all givens is seen as being in constant motion. His basic ideas made it possible for the concept of history to be viewed as a history of the forming of man. In 1726 Johann Lorenz von Mosheim attempted a "pragmatic," that is an undogmatic factual presentation, of church history, taking it out of the context of theology. In accordance with enlightened concepts, Johann Salomo Semler applied the idea of progress to church history (1667–69), while the rationalistic Ludwig Spittler wrote his church history (1782) much like the history of a state, radically secularized. Highly influential works were written by the rationalist supernaturalists Johann Matthias Schöckh (1768–1812; forty-five volumes, also used extensively at Catholic universities) and Gottlieb Jakob Planck (1803–09).

The first attempts in the direction of dogmatic history led to several treatments of this topic around 1800. Other new theological disciplines owe their consolidation to the Enlightenment. Among them are the denominational studies (especially by Planck in 1796) and biblical theology, which was given an important impetus by the demand of Philipp Gabler (1787) to pay attention to the development of biblical ideas. Biblical studies overall received its earliest impulses in the field of the Old Testament (by the Oratorian Richard Simon in 1678). Regarding introductory studies we should mention Michaelis (1750). Semler's canonical history (1771–75) became one of the fundamental works in its field.

An assessment of Protestant theology in this period (which cannot be given in this framework) will have to take into consideration the fact that—platitudes aside, which exist in abundance within contemporary Catholic, conservative, and enlightened theology—an honest attempt was made to prevent Christian faith and modern rationality from being split apart.

Catholic Universities

After their auspicious start in the thirteenth century the history of the universities is usually viewed in terms of a productive revival by the spirit of humanism and a flourishing in Spain followed by a long period of sterility until another upswing occurred in the nineteenth century. The fact that in the meantime the universities underwent a development of their own is most often not taken into account. In accordance with the denominational character of the period they had been founded or revived by the princes or bishops with a clear predetermination of their purpose. Most of them were therefore caught up in the fight between the denominations, whether they were newly founded or not. This held true for the Protestant universities (the Saxon universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig, the Palatine university in Heidelberg, the one of Württemberg in Tübingen or the Swiss one in Basel, the new foundation by Philipp von Hesse in Marburg (1527), which was reformed in 1605, whereupon Hesse-Darmstadt established a Lutheran university in Gießen, and the university founded by Calvin in Geneva in 1559), as well as for the Catholic universities (the Austrian universities in Vienna and Freiburg, the Bavarian one in Ingolstadt, the Belgian university in Louvain, the episcopal ones in Trier and Mainz, and the municipal university in Cologne).

Catholic foundations and revivals were generally undertaken in such a way that the new teaching order, the Society of Jesus, (which was very effective) was not only given a large part if not all of the chairs of the theological faculty, but also those of the philosophical faculty, for it was here that the basic education of all the students took place even if they chose one of the "higher" courses of study in theology, law, or medicine. A university was often started with merely philosophy and theology and supplemented by the other two faculties only after decades or much longer. Such faculty assignments to the Jesuits had been practiced since the middle of the sixteenth century, the first in 1548 in Ingolstadt, 1551 in Vienna (initially with very few chairs and a good many more in 1623), 1561 in Trier, and the year after in Mainz. Jesuits were called to the university in Dillingen in 1563 after its establishment by the bishop of Augsburg in 1551. While Dillingen achieved an importance far beyond the borders of the bishopric, it was eventually outpaced by Ingolstadt. The university in Olmütz, founded by the bishop there in 1581, had a clear counterreformational purpose from the start, as did the Austrian university of Graz (1585), which gained significance for Carinthia and had an impact even in Belgium and Poland. From their inception both universities had Jesuit professors. For the bishop of Würzburg, Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn, who was not always in agreement with the Jesuits, there was no question as to who the professors would be when he established his university in 1582. The same choice prevailed when the universities of Paderborn (1614) and Osnabrück (1629) were founded. The latter was initially spared by the war but closed four years later when the fortunes of war turned. In 1620 the Austrian sovereign had also brought the Jesuits to the university of Freiburg in the Black Forest, granting them the philosophical faculty and half of the chairs in theology. Jesuits were installed in Prague when the sovereign power obtained jurisdiction over the university, which had been Protestant until then. Another Austrian university where the Jesuit order, aspiring to monopoly over the schools, was used as faculty opened in Innsbruck in 1669. Finally, the Jesuit school in Breslau, in existence since 1635, was given university status in 1702. In Erfurt, a university of the Mainz electorate, which had to admit Protestant faculty as well, only a single chair was reserved for the Jesuits. When the Wittelsbach Pfalz-Neuburg line took over the Palatinate in 1685, it was unable to change the Reformed denomination of the land but actively favored Catholicism. The University of Heidelberg, too, was no exception. Jesuits were represented on the faculty since 1706 and Catholic theology was taught along with the Calvinist brand. Only a few Catholic universities were without Jesuits: Cologne, which nonetheless maintained a definite conservative position, and Louvain, where the disputes involving Jansenism were especially vehement and episcopalism was represented prominently by van Espen. The episcopal university in Salzburg (1617) had a character of its own; it was given to the Benedictine order, which made its best people from the southern German monasteries available as professors for the university and, in fact, had a good many of its young monks educated there. Thomistic and canonical subjects were taught extremely well there, as was history as early as the seventeenth century. In 1734 when the abbot of Fulda founded a new university and split the faculty into equal parts between Benedictines and Jesuits, the resulting tensions showed how little the two factions had in common.

But in the meantime the intellectual climate had changed, leaving the rigid system of the Jesuits, who were still following the unchanged *ratio studiorum* of 1599, out of tune. The demand for the introduction of history, a field in whose research the Benedictine order as well as the Jesuits had excelled and which had been taught at the Protestant universities for a long time, could no longer be rejected. Since the chairs of philosophy were for the most part held by Jesuits, they had to occupy themselves with history whether they wanted to or not. Also important was the acceptance of new problems in the natural sciences and practical experimental methods. It took some time to overcome the concept that no new knowledge was possible beyond Aristotle. But finally, around the middle of the century, sufficient strides were made especially in the Jesuit order. Jesuits even became leaders in the field of astronomy. Clinging to the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy—although the latter had already been modified to some degree by Suárez and subsequently by Gregory of Valencia—constituted the one great obstacle to Cartesian ideas and, more so, to dealing with the philosophy of Leibniz and Wolff. But by around 1740 it was abundantly clear that stubborn adherence to outmoded tradition was no longer feasible. The initial resort was to a sort of eclecticism until—another thirty years later—the modern ideas achieved dominance. And yet around the mid 1750s Bertold Hauser (Dillingen) attempted to obtain a world view by means of Scholastic principles, as did (although in a different fashion) Joseph Mangold (Ingolstadt). Benedikt Sattler, the teacher of Sailer, made the most significant effort to incorporate Leibniz and Wolff. The practice by the Society of Jesus of transferring their members in quick succession from one university, college, or seminary to another and in medieval fashion to consider the lecturing of philosophy as a mere transitional stage for one's own educational process long constituted the most serious obstacle to the development of significant scholars in any individual subject. The training of specialists, attempted in Würzburg in 1731, was initially possible in law and medicine only.

In the last few years prior to the great turn of events marked by the French Revolution German bishops succeeded in three cases in opening a university in their dioceses: when the Jesuit order was suppressed in 1773, the two faculties established by that order in 1648 were expanded into a university. In 1780 the extraordinary Vicar General Franz von Fürstenberg opened a university in Münster which was characterized by the open mind and profoundly religious spirit of its initiator. The endowment of an academy in Bonn (1777), the residence of the Cologne archbishop, which was elevated to the rank of a university in 1786, was clearly undertaken with the thought in mind of training capable civil servants, a deviation of purpose influenced by the Enlightenment.

The universities, including those in the episcopal territories, were turned more and more into territorial universities, obliged to serve the training of civil servants, an area in which the clergy serving the interests of a temporal state were also increasingly involved. The most telling sign of this situation was the Theresian-Josephinist university reform which changed them completely from freely endowed into state institutions. At that point all applicants for a parish in the Austrian territories were obliged to pass a full course of theological studies, documented in detail and followed by an examination. Josephinism extended these rules to the regular clergy as well, simultaneously abolishing formal study within the monasteries. Everyone had to study at the universities, where they were installed at the newly established general seminaries. But these did not last long (1783–90). The content of theological studies was enriched considerably. Up to that point dogmatics and, beginning in the seventeenth century, the case study of morals, controversial theology, and the Holy Scripture had been taught. The Rautenstrauch curriculum[22] of the Austrian government (1774) expanded scriptural study by introducing Oriental languages and, as new courses, church history (including patristics) and the pastoral. Canon law was of course taught only in accordance with the laws of the established Church. This curriculum with its attention to biblical, historical, and practical subjects prevailed in the entire German-speaking area and its basic structure has been retained until the present day. The method of teaching also changed. The tedious method of dictation was changed to the use of textbooks, at times even Protestant ones wherever Catholic books were not yet available. The language of instruction was generally changed from the traditional Latin to German. Here and there the strict denominationalism of the universities, which had never prevailed in Erfurt and Heidelberg, was relaxed. After 1746 there were Protestant students in Mainz (and Würzburg) and, following the Mainz university reform of 1784 by the elector Friedrich Karl von Erthal (under the curator Benzel-Sternau[23]), there were also Protestant professors there. This was the case also in Freiburg after the toleration edict of Joseph II.

This express form of a state university was strongest in the University of Halle, founded in 1694. The University of Göttingen, opened in 1737, incorporated the spirit of the future (Chap. 18). At that university it was possible to develop the ideal of a free pursuit of learning, unfettered by regulations and particular purposes, where learning was governed by the determination of truth and no longer tied to any tradition. Many impulses for a more or less radical "Enlightenment" emanated from Göttingen which had some impact on Catholic universities as well. A new spirit frequently manifested itself in journals such as the decidedly enlightened *Religions journal* (Mainz), *Der Freimütige* (Freiburg), the moderate *Journal von und für Deutschland* (Fulda), and the *Mainzer Monatsschrift.* Around 1790 Kantian philosophy was frequently advocated at universities such as Fulda, Bamberg, and Heidelberg. The terror of the Revolution provoked countermovements with measures taken against overly rationalistic professors. Best known are the Dillingen events, actions against Sailer and Zimmer; similar incidents occurred in Mainz and also in Freiburg. A highly respected form of open-minded university life succeeded in Würzburg under the dynamic promotion by Prince-Bishop Franz Ludwig von Erthal.

---

[22] J. Müller, *Der pastoraltheologisch-didaktische Ansatz in Franz Stephan Rautenstrauchs "Entwurf zur Einrichtung der theologischen Schulen"* (Vienna 1969; biblio.), Beda Franz Menzel, *Abt. Franz Stephan Rautenstrauch von Brevna-Braunau. Herkunft, Umwelt und Wirkungskreis* (Königstein/Taunus 1969).

[23] H. W. Jung, *Anselm Franz von Benzel im Dienst der Kurfürsten von Mainz* (Wiesbaden 1966).

Academies

While the universities through their transformation into state institutions were ever more concentrated on the training of civil servants, (in Germany this included the clergy), new associations, the academies, were formed to promote research. Such relatively loose associations had already existed in the Italian Renaissance, the "Academies" for literature and the arts. In an endeavor to encourage serious research in the natural sciences, history, or philosophy (though not in theology), various approaches were used. Among them were lectures before an audience of experts, the pursuit of topics by the dissemination of examinations, the review of submitted works, publication of discussions and treatises, or preparing editions of historical sources on well-defined themes. One of the first of its kind was the Roman Accademia dei Lincei (1603), whose research was exemplary. In 1635 the idea was adopted by Richelieu (see Chap. 18), who turned the academies into state institutions with a national accentuation. Colbert's foundation in 1662 (Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres) became highly significant because of its strong historical orientation and an abundance of publications, in part due to its intensive collaboration with the Maurists. This was in contrast to the provincial academies in France formed in the course of the eighteenth century; the finished works had little effective impact since they were left unprinted in their libraries. A private foundation in London (1645) which emerged in 1663 as the Royal Academy was devoted to research in the natural sciences; it published Newton's discoveries. Early on Leibniz also pursued the idea of an academy, but his goal, the establishment of the Berlin Academy, was not realized until 1700. The early examples of such state institutions were not emulated until the middle of the century: 1752 in Hanoverian Göttingen, 1753 in Erfurt, an outpost of the Mainz electorate in the middle of a Protestant environment, 1759 in Munich, the capital of electoral Bavaria, where the motive force behind the academy was the Jurist Johann Georg Lori, who was familiar with the Italian models. Another was founded in 1763 in Palatine Mannheim, whose reigning dynasty was Catholic but whose population was overwhelmingly Calvinist. Its establishment was aided substantially by the most prominent Protestant historian of his time, Schöpflin from Strasbourg. In the Habsburg domains only one academy, the one in Prague, founded privately in 1770 and recognized by the state in 1784, was able to maintain itself.[24] It was devoted primarily to topics prompted by the ever growing consolidation of Czech national consciousness, its own early history, and the Slavic language. While the pursuit of natural sciences prevailed in northern Germany, historical studies predominated in the Mannheim and Munich academies, giving them their high reputation. Mannheim, under the direction of Schöpflin's secretary and pupil, Andreas Lamey, primarily concentrated on four topics. The academy of Munich, which enjoyed substantial cooperation throughout the country, became the most efficient one after obtaining the services of the Protestant Alsatian Christian Friedrich Pfeffel (1763–68). It began the edition of the *Monumenta Boica* which, although somewhat deficient at first, achieved growing reliability in making an abundance of material available until the present day.

The historical themes were taken mostly from the Middle Ages and created a counterweight to the popular contemporary view of that period as one of darkness vis-à-vis the prevailing luminescence of the age of Enlightenment. The initially tendentious view of history caused by the general state of dependency on the sovereign was soon overcome, giving way to an impartial criticism; in this way a number of highly effective and long-enduring medieval falsifications were uncovered. Although themes in church history were not especially sought after, early sources kept in the domain of the Church were made available and thus much preliminary work on the history of church institutions was done. Most decisive were the dissemination and augmentation of the Maurist method. The universities of the eighteenth century did not teach the historical method, but the work of the academies brought about its adoption. This happened primarily in France (by the Académie des Inscriptions) and in Germany. The process of printing not only made the source material accessible but it also revealed and thereby disseminated the method applied to it. This made it possible to enlarge the principle of collaboration and the exchange of ideas beyond the immediate circle of the members of a particular academy. One may have misgivings concerning the fact that the academies did not exploit the coherent force of their collective membership for more comprehensive undertakings. Only Munich made a start in this direction. In general there was a lack of purposeful planning.

Occasional mention is made of an academy movement of the seventeenth and eighteenth century (which includes even the more loosely connected forms of scientific societies and associations of the time).

---

[24] On the academy of Olmütz (1746–51), see J. Hemmerle in *Stifter-Jahrbuch* 5 (1957), 79–101.

Such a movement existed in Switzerland.[25] One would also have to include the diverse forms of collaboration among the Benedictine monasteries that endeavored for a time to establish their own academy. Their inclusion is justified especially by such a comprehensive program as the Sankt Blasien *Germania sacra* by Martin Gerbert (after the model of the Maurists), which intended to compile an accurately documented history of the individual dioceses for all of Germany.

In Italy the Instituto delle Scienze in papal Bologna, founded in 1712, investigated the natural sciences on a level comparable to the Tuscan academies. The erudite Benedict XIV gave Rome its very efficient academies for church history (1741), for the history of ancient Rome (1744), and for the history of liturgics (1748). The academy of Madrid set an example for all of Spain (1735); it devoted itself exclusively to historical research. Its goal was a geographic-historical lexicon which actually started to appear in 1802. Next to that, its greatest undertaking was the *Espanã Sagrada*, whose first few volumes were edited by the Augustinian friar Enrique Flórez. The Madrid academy was the dominant center of diverse research activities which spread far and wide.

Education

When the printing press made it possible to extend the ability to read (and to write) it was used by the Reformation above all in the service of its demand for a personal encounter with the Holy Scripture. When the sexton was charged to assist the pastor in teaching the catechism, the seeds were planted for a broad-based establishment of schools. Early school regulations are left to us from Württemberg (1558) and electoral Saxony (1580). The idea of introducing schools everywhere was formulated in Frankfurt in 1612; mandatory attendance for all was planned in Strasbourg in 1598 and required in Anhalt (1607), Weimar (1619), Gotha (1642), Brunswick (1647), and Württemberg (1649). In rural areas it was difficult to conduct classes during the summer. Pietism not only helped in the understanding of the catechism, but also in the popularization of confirmation, customary in Hesse since Bucer, as an affirmation of baptism and preparation for Communion. In the beginning of the eighteenth century the practice of confirmation gradually prevailed (Württemberg, 1722; electoral Saxony, 1723; Denmark, 1736; Lübeck, 1817; and Hamburg, 1832), giving the school a concrete goal.

By establishing a number of schools the theologian Hermann Francke (1663–1727), a leader in the Pietist revival movement, broke through the social exclusivity of the educational system; he was the first to concern himself with the training of teachers.[26] In 1774 Johann Bernhard Basedow (1724–94), a rationalist imbued with the ideas of Rousseau, founded a boarding school in Dessau (Philanthropinum) which had no church affiliation; it became an example for others.

---

[25] R. Reinhardt in *ZSKG* 61 (1967), 341–50.

Schools were increasingly established in the Catholic territories as well. Visitation reports of the seventeenth century reflect the efforts by the bishops to introduce them. When they wanted to have control over the employment of teachers, it was for reasons of ensuring themselves of their orthodoxy. Fénelon's *Traité de l'éducation des filles* (1687) also had a considerable impact in Germany. In the second half of the century the Catholic states also issued school regulations. This included the various prince-bishoprics and prince-abbeys, some of whom conscientiously took on the badly neglected task of teacher education (the teacher academy in Mainz, 1771; the teacher seminary of Saint Urban in Lucerne, 1777; bishopric of Fulda, 1781). A shining example was the work of the abbot J. I. von Felbiger at Sagan in Prussian Silesia in 1765 (*Plan der neuen Schuleinrichtung* [1770]), who was called to Vienna by Empress Maria Theresa in 1774. He divided the schools into three different kinds (the so-called trivial, main, and normal schools), introduced classroom instead of individual teaching, and incorporated religion as a regular subject, whereas before religious instruction had simply been done through the religious reading material (catechism) used in the general lessons. In western Germany Vicar General von Fürstenberg in Münster had Bernard Overberg appointed organizer of the Catholic elementary schools. His *Anweisung zum zweckmäßigen Schulunterricht* appeared in 1793. The great pedagogical verve of the period of Enlightenment helped create the teaching profession as such and finally brought some financial security. It also helped provide a proper education and to divorce the teacher from local authority. Still, it was natural for the school to be part of the respective denominational area, so that the teacher remained closely tied to the functions of the church service in his role as sexton and organist.

---

[26] Johann Baptist de la Salle founded a pedagogical seminary in Rheims as early as 1684.

CHAPTER 29

Liturgy and Popular Piety—New Religious Orders

The Liturgy

After the Council of Trent had created the prerequisites for bringing about a uniform liturgy cleansed of excesses for the entire Catholic Church, the subsequent five decades witnessed the development of the required tools; the *Breviarium Romanum* appeared in 1568, the *Missale Romanum* in 1570, the *Martyrologium Romanum* in 1584, the *Pontificale Romanum* in 1596, and the *Caerimoniale Episcoporum* in 1600. The final touch was the *Rituale Romanum* in 1614, which contained the rite of the administering of the sacraments and the sacramentals; it was not binding but rather intended as a model. This enabled the multifarious diocesan rites to be maintained along with them and made it possible to some extent to use the native language. But wherever there was no tradition with its own spontaneous forms, as in the missions, the unifying force of the centrally created liturgical materials had an effect.

In the history of liturgy the three centuries following 1614 until the reforms under Pius X proved to be the centuries of "liturgical stagnation" (Klauser). The scant "improvements," for instance, of the breviary under Urban VIII, were insignificant and pedantic. A reform prepared under Benedict XIV was not implemented. The powerful advance of historical research especially in the area of liturgics did bring about rich encounters with the forms of earlier periods, including the abundance of Eastern litugies, but had no effect on the existing ways of celebrating the official Mass, which had become rigid and inflexible with the passing of time. Regarding the breviary as well as the missal, Council of Trent had created the possibility of retaining customary forms if it could be ascertained that the tradition was more than 200 years old. But even where these conditions were met, it was not always possible to withstand the unifying forces for long; as a consequence the indigenous forms—with the exception of diocesan celebrations—were gradually abandoned.[1] In France, however, the affirmation of traditional Gallicanism was too strong for a similar development to take place. During a time of emphatic canonical Gallicanism, in fact, the right to retain the old traditional ways were expanded to the point where they were further developed under the influence of contemporary ideas. New breviaries were created in France (Cluny, 1686; Paris, 1736 [for the secular clergy]; Saint Vanne, 1777; and, as a sort of continuation of the latter, Saint Maur, 1787). These were introduced even where the Roman liturgy had already been accepted. Their main characteristic was an intensive cultivation of Scripture reading to include especially the Fathers. They also manifested a strong tendency to moralize, which corresponded with the enlightened spirit of the period. A notable fact is that the Paris Breviary distributed the whole psalter over one week, using nine psalms for Matins, and that it restored the Sundays and ferial days to their customary place, two elements which were fully taken over by the Roman breviary reform of 1911. Western German dioceses were also quick to issue new breviaries which were not entirely closed to the ideas of the Gallican breviaries (Trier, 1748; Cologne, 1780). Martin II Gerbert immediately adopted the Saint Vanne Breviary for his diocese of Sankt Blasien.[2] But aside from the calendar of religious holidays, which steadily increased the feasts of the saints and diminished the celebration of the liturgical year, public worship on the whole stayed the same. The intensity of liturgical life appears to have run aground on the excessively fastidious consolidation of the abundantly annotated rubrics; canonistic formalism and casuistry displaced the inner life of the liturgy.

---

[1] Thus Mainz had its own missal in 1698; see H. Reifenberg, *Messe und Missalien im Bistum Mainz* (Münster i. W. 1960).

The gap between liturgy and the believers, existing since the Middle Ages, was not overcome but deepened instead. The liturgy had become a liturgy for the clergy, touching the people only inasmuch as it could serve as a spectacle. The holy Mass was no longer a participatory event; the sermon had been removed from it and the Communion had become isolated from it as a separate devotion. The Mass merely had the ceremonious function of making the Eucharistic Lord present whose real presence in the sacrament was stressed most strongly. The most formal ceremony was the Mass in front of the exposed Host, where the Eucharistic blessing was pronounced right at the beginning and repeated after the sequence and again at the end. The altar was centered on the throne of exposition above the tabernacle—the latter had been prescribed by the ritual of 1614 to replace the shrine in the wall of the chancel—and on it was the monstrance, now shaped like a sun. In front of it the clergy and the acolytes performed what amounted to a courtly service. But this baroque period knew how to turn the Mass into a celebration through the splendor of the church, in which all the skill of architecture, painting, and sculpture combined to form an all-inclusive artistic frame of lofty and joyous ceremony, intensified by the multiplicity of vestments and ever more profuse music. No matter that the words of the liturgy and the individual acts were no longer taken in, the awareness of a great mystery and the will for devotion were still present.

---

[2] On the introduction of the Maurist Breviary of 1787 in Hungary (1842), see *ALW* 8 (1963), 79–84.

Given the great discrepancy between the official church service and a religiosity that people were able to comprehend, it is not surprising that they intensively cultivated extraliturgical forms. The suitable organization for that purpose was still the fraternity. Under different names (Rosary, Sacred Heart, Happy Death, Saint Sebastian, etc.), infused with recurrent waves of piety, they gathered their members from far afield, calling them to fraternal celebrations with impressive processions and endowing altars in their name. The number of fraternities increased greatly, as did that of the Marian congregations promoted by the Jesuits. Beginning in 1751 such congregations were also established for girls and women, whereas formerly they had been reserved for boys and men. Different from those of the baroque, the fraternities were distinguished by social standing; some were for students, others for the bourgeoisie, for priests, and so forth. Often it was the fraternities that organized the great pilgrimages which reached their climax at this time. New ones originated, especially Marian pilgrimages. In addition to the famous places of pilgrimage, visited by groups of pilgrims who sometimes walked for days to get there, many small local shrines were set up for people from the immediate environs. The popularity of the Holy House in Loreto was reflected by the many Loreto chapels, most of them outside the city entrances, which sought to copy the Italian shrine. The devotion of relics was given a great, in fact, an excessive impetus. They were collected and displayed behind glass windows or pyramids, some of them augmented to form dressed skeletal figures kept in glass coffins; they were placed on the altar, under the mensa, or carried along at processions. A great role was played by the so-called saints of the catacombs, which were bones from the Roman catacombs. In spite of an alleged authentication, they were of highly dubious origin, most of the time given a fictitious name, brought in ceremoniously, and often elevated to the position of copatron of a church.[3]

The desire for a chance to obtain indulgences had extraordinarily intensified. The contemporary mania for intoxicating themselves with large numbers led people not only to seek out as many opportunities as possible to obtain a plenary indulgence, but also partial ones for thousands and thousands of years. Membership in certain fraternities, which for their part had managed to participate in the indulgence privileges of others, provided offers of such possibilities: fastidiously compiled in calendars, they would tell the believer how many indulgences he could obtain on a given day.[4] In addition, celebrations of indulgences were also very popular, especially at certain places of pilgrimage or monastic churches where the faithful came together in droves for the pronouncement of special indulgences, granted after receiving the sacrament of penance and Holy Communion. The intensification of the popular mission, organized at times with great baroque pomp and penitential processions which might involve the carrying of hundreds of crosses, went parallel to a sort of confessional movement which was intended to stimulate more frequent confessions. This explains the increased devotion of Saint John Nepomuk, promoted especially by the Jesuits, as a martyr to the seal of the confessional; his likeness soon adorned many streets and bridges and could be found in many churches.

---

[3] *LThK* VIII, 711.

There is no doubt that in many cases superstitions were mixed in with popular exercises of piety. The use of sacramentals was often falsified because of it. Many superstitions, carried over into our time, had a religious form in the period of the baroque; that age, in fact, was still given too much to such ideas. We have to remember that the madness of witchcraft was barely fading; here and there the fires of the autos-da-fé continued to burn the unfortunates accused of witchcraft, putting them to an agonizing death. Among the last burnings were those in Würzburg (1749), Endingen (1751; at the Kaiserstuhl), Kempten (1775), Glarus (1782), and Posen (1793).

The sermons of the baroque were in danger of getting lost in a welter of effects and external trappings. Their scriptural base was frequently inadequate. But not a few were imbued with religious depth, full of wisdom and popular, as those of the Capuchin friar Prokop von Templin (1609–80) in Austria; the Augustinian Hermit Abraham a Santa Clara (1644–1709), who was active primarily at the court of Vienna displaying creativity and great imagination in the use of language, as well as a pointed wit; and, lastly, the Portuguese Jesuit Antonio Vieira (1608–97), who was a most moving preacher. In 1760 the excesses of the baroque sermons were attacked by an outstanding satirist in the person of Josef de Isla (1703–81), who used his *Gerundio* novel to uncover their weaknesses to such an extent that he contributed substantially to removing them from the pulpits.

At a time when more than just a few of the faithful were able to read, literary forms could be developed which had a broad impact. Among them were, on the Protestant side, Johann Arnd's *Vier Bücher vom wahren Christentum* (1605), on the Catholic side a *Hauspostille* (1690) by the Premonstratensian Leonhard Goffiné (1648–1719) and the diverse writings of the Capuchin friar Martin von Cochem (1634–1712), especially his *Meßerklärung* and *Leben und Leiden Jesu Christi* (1677).[5]

---

[4] W. Müller, "Ein Gnadenkalender der Rosenkranzbruderschaft," *FreibDiözArch* 88 (1968), 359–79.

The great religious strength of the century—regardless of the extent of anthropocentrism—is manifest in its works of art. The stylistic means of the fine arts were formed in Italy. As signs of a living faith in the nearness of God's grace, especially in those lands which had remained Catholic, they were used to build perfect structures which imply in many ways an extension into the supernatural. The period manifested a cheerful, confident, generous, and affirmative spirit which was able to create a great abundance of multifarious religious programs. At times they addressed a certain ethnic group, such as the Romance or the Austrian-Bavarian people. While Calvinism continued to be hostile to art and music (their churches were without paintings and for a long time without organs), the depth of Lutheran religious emotion was characterized by hymns, which are precious both in text and melody, and by immortal religious music: the passions, chorales, and cantatas of Heinrich Schütz (1585–1672), Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750), and the oratorios of George Frederick Handel (1685–1759). On the Catholic side we should mention the great masses and oratorios of Franz Joseph Haydn (1732–1809) and the masses by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756–91). Bach's great Mass in B-Minor, which he composed for the Catholic court of Dresden, shows the extent to which the denominations can converge in their most profound aspects. Beethoven's religious music belongs to another period.

This exuberant and varied scope of religious life was bound at some point to encounter a limiting and reducing force. Secular governments, playing an increasing role which gradually encompassed all aspects of human life, demanded a reduction in the number of holidays for economic reasons (in 1642 they had already been limited to thirty-four by Urban VIII). Spain initiated this move; under Benedict XIII it succeeded in having seventeen saints' feast days changed into half-holidays. They were still holy days of obligation, but the work prohibition was canceled. In 1748 the same ruling was applied to the Two Sicilies and in 1753 to Austria as well. Clement XIV abolished these half-holidays completely. Similar holiday limitations were requested by some archbishoprics (Würzburg [1770], Bamberg [1770], and Mainz [1763–74]) and by such states as Bavaria, Prussia (1772), and Spain (1791). These measures were generally unpopular and could often be implemented only by force after a long period of time. Wherever such canceled holy days were shifted to either the preceding or the following

---

[5] L. Signer, *Martin von Cochem, ein großer Geist des rheinischen Barock* (Wiesbaden 1963).

Sunday, the reduction caused the purpose of Sunday as the day of the Lord to be obscured.

In the changing spirit of the time the curtailment of the excessive number of feasts was only a beginning; such abundance and variety were increasingly considered unessential and annoying distractions. The striving was for unadorned simplicity, which alone permits the sublime to come to the fore. Only "noble artlessness," a "purified, genuine principle" was still in demand. The idea was to separate the essential from the "coincidental," only to declare in the same breath the latter to be dispensable, indeed to be something that needed to be removed like an obstacle or could at least be neglected without harm. The application of such a differentiation was certainly indicated since it permitted a clearer perspective of things which had in many instances become hidden. So the fight began against the many processions, the pilgrimages to all sorts of large and small places of grace, against the many fraternities, and the benedictions often suffused with superstitious expectations. The use of exorcism especially seemed outmoded; now the bishops frequently made it dependent on the permission of the ordinaries. The constant repetition of the Eucharistic blessing was felt to be an exaggeration. In contrast to the overwhelming abundance of the most varied forms of veneration of saints, piety with Christ at its center was to be reemphasized. The late stage of these enlightened ideas also brought about a deeper occupation with the Holy Scripture.

These changes, penetrating as they were, did not happen all at once; they took place in phases with considerable chronological differences. The pastoral letter by the Viennese Prince-Archbishop Trautson of 1 January 1752, whose formulations were looked upon as guidelines far beyond his diocese, appeared when the art of the baroque had just entered its last formal, albeit playful stage of the rococo. In 1768 when the monastery of Sankt Blasien burned down, Martin Gerbert decided to have d'Ixnard rebuild it in the form of a classical round temple which was admired all the way to northern Germany because of its impression of sublime peace. The measures instituted by Joseph II (1780–90) were the climax of enlightened activities in the ecclesiastical realm. Not only were they frequently copied during his lifetime, but they also served as models for the position of the established church system in the first half of the nineteenth century. The extent of conformity on the part of the ecclesiastical circles is shown by the pastoral letter of Prince-Archbishop Colloredo of Salzburg dated 29 January 1782. The Synod of Pistoia promulgated a number of good ideas (especially in the area of the liturgy) which are only now having a real impact. And yet the "modern" Mainz hymnal of 1787 caused bitter disputes. The attempt to write a ritual in German was first made by C. Schwarzel around the turn of the century and concluded with the ritual by Wessenberg in 1831. The work by the most prominent reform liturgist of the Enlightenment, Vitus Anton Winter, in Ingolstadt and Landshut is also part of the new century.

The Enlightenment definitely perceived the gap between the liturgy and the people and tried to bridge it on the one hand by curtailing the indigenous forms of popular piety and on the other by establishing a connection between the believers and the liturgical event. The strides made to include the sermon in the Mass again were notable, as were the attempts to connect the Communion with the Mass. It was tempting, of course, to make the liturgy generally accessible by translating it into the native language, that is by giving up the unintelligible Latin as the liturgical language. Generally this was dared only for the administration of the sacraments and the benedictions, or for new celebrations such as first Communion or the investiture of a parish priest, but only sporadically for the celebration of the Mass. It was not done at all under Wessenberg,[6] who held back his friends when they wanted to forge ahead on this point. At first he tried to get the people to participate by means of a sort of prayer-song Mass using many different texts for the various times of the church year (Constance Hymnal, 1812). Praying something other than indicated by the context of the Mass, for instance the traditional rosary, was considered extremely improper. Masses at side altars, customarily conducted concurrently with the main Mass, were abolished. Preference was for only one altar in the church.

The basic idea of the enlightened service was eminently ministerial: The priest who knows his flock—it was improper to leave the parish for a monastery, pilgrimage, or an outside fraternity—takes care of them in the truest sense of the word. He imparts to them the word of God according to a deliberate plan and instructs them in all that they need. The service has to be organized so that it edifies and improves the participants. It should serve to make them recognize that they are all brothers of the common Father who is in heaven. This was the true brotherhood, the only one still admitted. Under Joseph II it was called the "brotherhood of the love of one's fellow man"; under Wessenberg "of God's love and the love of one's fellow man." All mechanical aspects were to disappear from prayer and the service. The ties between shepherd and flock were to be deepened so that confessions were made only to one's own priest, who knew the individual best and was therefore the only who could instruct him properly. In accordance with Wessenberg's views, the responsibility of the minister for those entrusted to him was increased considerably. Seen from this point of view, the service in the period of Enlightenment did not only consist of teaching and dry moralizing mixed with a few pious sentimentalities, as it has often been represented. To be sure, the didacticism which filled the texts of the hymns as well was overstressed. Subjectivism, with its initial growth in the baroque, became dominant and the idea of the liturgy as a service before God receded to too great a degree. There is also no doubt that in the most profound sense the initial attempts in the Enlightenment to reform the service failed because the theocentricity of the service was overlooked and the attempt to improve its form missed the reality of the cultic mysticism. The strong desire for cult was no longer accorded enough significance. Piety emanating from the world all too often got stuck in the world. But to the extent that the responsibility for one another was emphasized, God, before whom the responsibility is discharged, was again included.

---

[6] See E. Keller, "Die Konstanzer Liturgiereform," *FreibDiözArch* 85 (1965); on Wessenberg's *Deutsche Vespern*, see F. Poppin ibid. 87 (1967).

New Religious Orders

The history of the religious orders of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century is strongly imbued with the idea of the apostolate. This was true even more so for the following centuries. Certain characteristic concerns gained prominence, such as the construction of seminaries for the training of secular clerics among the Oratorians, the Sulpicians, and the *Congrégation de Jésus et Marie* of John Eudes; in its own fashion the work of Vincent de Paul ran parallel to that. Vincent and his Lazarists—as did the two Jesuits Paolo Segneri (1624–94) and Paolo the Younger (1673–1713) in Italy—built the type of popular mission which stayed alive until the twentieth century, representing a very important form of the apostolate of the orders. By founding the *Filles de la Charité* with the assistance of Louise de Marillac (see Chap. 5), Vincent de Paul approached the very concrete tasks of caring for orphans, the aged, and the sick in a more efficacious fashion than had ever been done before in the history of ecclesiastical charity. Similar organizations were the *Soeurs de Notre-Dame de charité de refuge* of John Eudes (1640), from whom the congregation of Our Lady of the Love of the Good Shepherd emerged in the nineteenth century, and the *Soeurs de Saint Charles* or Borromaeans who originated in Nancy and spread primarily in Lorraine after 1652. That same year the *Filles de la Charité* also started working in Poland and as late as the eighteenth century went to other European countries and America. This social and charitable service of nuns, which enabled women to take part in superior fashion in common tasks of Christian love,[7] could be possible only by abolishing the cloistral regulations which had always been inflexible in regard to nuns. These regulations had just been reapplied more severely in order to eliminate increasing abuses. This explains the considerable difficulties initially encountered by the foundations. The order of the Elizabethan nuns which developed from the medieval Begines and spread into Italy, France, the Netherlands, and the east of the Empire during the seventeenth century were never able to overcome the requirement of reclusion. For that reason they were reduced to installing hospitals solely in their own houses. The order of the Hospitallers was not impeded by the cloistral regulations.

Overcoming this obstacle was even harder for those women's orders who were active in the third area of the apostolate, the schools. Thus the Salesians could teach only girls who lived in a boarding school. And yet there was an actual school movement among the womens's orders: the Ursulines were founded in Liège in 1622 and from there spread to Germany; in 1639 they established a house in Canadian Quebec. In 1606 a free form, forgoing reclusion and vows, was established in Dôle in the diocese of Besançon; eventually this order established houses in Switzerland and southern Germany (Freiburg, Villingen). The most spirited fight for new forms for which Mary Ward aspired when she adopted the constitution of the Society of Jesus was waged by the English Ladies. Their work on the basis of less stringent vows was not fully recognized until Benedict XIV. Other women's orders also turned to the teaching of girls: the Dominican nuns in the form of congregations or the Frauen vom Heiligen Grab who flourished in their dedication to this goal especially in the Netherlands. Among the schools for boys those of the Jesuits were the most important ones, not just in France but everywhere. But other orders, such as the Benedictine monks, also dedicated part of their energies to the schools. A specific school order were the School Brothers. The order of the Piarists, specializing in building primary and secondary schools, was now spreading far and wide. When the Jesuit order was suppressed, members of these orders often jumped into the breach and kept the schools from being closed.

The few orders newly founded in the one and a half centuries prior to the great change signaled by the French Revolution were also imbued with the idea of the apostolate. In 1640 Bartholomäus Holzhauser (1613–58) founded a priestly congregation in Tittmoning (in the archdiocese of Salzburg) which was dedicated to the training of clerics and to the mission. After 1655 he worked in the archdiocese of Mainz consolidating his institute of the Bartholomites. The Passionists founded by Paul of the Cross (1694–1775) in Orbetello (on the shores of the Ligurian Sea between Civitavecchia and Livorno), whose generalate has been located at the monastery of Giovanni e Paolo in Rome since 1773, while dedicated to contemplation, were nonetheless active in the popular mission as well. Paul also founded a women's branch of this order which lived a strictly contemplative life. Alphonsus Liguori (1696–1787) initially founded the contemplative women's order of the Redemptorists (1731); it was followed by the male order a year later in Scala near Amalfi. Their main purpose was the mission to the most neglected among the inhabitants of the mountains near Naples. This order, looked on with suspicion by the temporal government, first spread in the Kingdom of Naples and then in the Papal States. For a while political tensions led to a split of the order into a Neapolitan and a Papal States branch. Not until 1784 were the first non-Italians permitted to join, among them Clemens Maria Hofbauer, who paved the way for the congregation's expansion into Germany.

---

[7] Not until the nineteenth century were similar female orders (deaconesses) established in the Lutheran Church.

In the course of the eighteenth century the interest in all forms of monastic life decreased. To the enlightened spirit of the century monasticism appeared to be the essence of the obscure and fanatical, forever dominated by impenetrable darkness and defending a useless life of indolence. As an outgrowth of pointed discussion of the principle of usefulness—as seen from a purely worldly point of view—a spirit of decided hostility against monasticism arose which stifled monastic vocations. There are some important data which characterize this movement: the agitation against the Jesuit order leading to its abolition (see Chap. 29); the suppression and consolidation beginning in 1766 of 386 monastic establishments which had in many cases already shrunk drastically in size; the secularization of monasteries and convents in Austria under Joseph II involving all the contemplative orders; and the facile manner in which monastic establishments were abolished in Germany even by bishops (as in Mainz or Münster) in order to use their assets for other good causes. These events did not occur everywhere or in equal fashion; thus the attack during the French Revolution, for example, on the covents involved establishments which had in no way declined and, indeed, had preserved an excellent spirit. The case of the religious orders of men was different. For 250 years the newer orders had been dedicated to obvious usefulness, such as the ministry, the inner mission, teaching, or social and charitable work, soon emulated by most of the old orders. And should not dedication to scholarly work in accordance with the most modern of methods also be considered useful? And yet in

France and Germany the axe of secularization was applied impartially to all kinds of monastic life.

Indeed, many a demand was justifiable, e.g., that the age for profession not be too young—Joseph II raised the minimum age to twenty-four—and that the size of the dowry be restricted. The growing self-confidence of man demanded a greater sense of responsibility especially on the part of monastic institutions. But this total blow against all monastic forms of existence cannot be understood merely on the basis of the argument that improvements were necessarily based on the demands of the times. Antipathy to monastic life grew to the extent that its complete dissolution appeared imminent, a fact accepted with surprising equanimity by those affected.

SECTION THREE

The Papacy under the Increasing Pressure of the Established Church

In the course of the eighteenth century the Catholic powers—France and Austria in the wake of Portugal and Spain—lost their position of primacy in Europe and overseas. Their place was taken by non-Catholic powers, Prussia in central Europe and England, which became the primary maritime power, establishing its Empire and seeking to preserve the balance of power between the states on the European continent by means of its policy of alliances and subsidies. The general development of countries into modern states, especially in the administrative and economic sectors, was not shared by the Papal States primarily because they were lacking dynastic continuity, an absolutely necessary prerequisite for long-range policies. In the crucial first half of the century, moreover, the Papal States had been sorely and repeatedly affected by wars because they were militarily and politically too weak to maintain their proclaimed neutrality and to protect themselves against violations. The discrepancy between the temporal rule of the Pope and that of the other contemporary states was steadily growing. The Papal States became a liability rather than fulfilling their original function of ensuring the Pope of the freedom and independence required for the guidance of the total Church. As the eighteenth century progressed the Papal States reached a condition which was deplored by the eminent Cardinal Consalvi in his memoirs at the beginning of the next century: "One would have to overcome all the various kinds of resistance against changes and reforms which are necessary and make sense because certain of the existing forms have become antiquated or outmoded, demeaned by abuses, or, finally, because the times and circumstances as well as the general views were changing."[1]

In those states which were still nominally Catholic the leading personalities came under the influence of an ever more radical Enlightenment, so that they could hardly be called Catholic any more. These states developed an established Church down to the smallest details, which was distinguished from the Gallicanism of the preceding century primarily by a total absence of actual religiosity as well as by a brutal arbitrariness divorced from all tradition. The Church was considered a mere instrument of the state to be employed at the discretion of the state as a state institution without regard to its specific character and inner laws. The papacy was virtually helpless in the face of demands by this type of established Church. Confronted on the part of the Catholic powers by extortionist tactics which included the threat of schism, perhaps not always intended seriously, the papacy had to make one concession after another. The extreme helplessness of the papacy can best be seen by the example of the suppression of the Jesuit order when the Holy See had to lend itself to sanctioning and actively bringing to its conclusion the hunt against the Society of Jesus which had been started by the so-called Catholic states. Although future Popes also had to endure persecution, even expulsion from Rome and imprisonment, this case of compelled complicity in the destruction of an institution of great merit to Church and papacy whose downfall was destined to do noticeable damage to both was a singularly flagrant result of the weakness of the Holy See and its dependence on outer influences.

---

[1] *Alcune brevi memorie sul mio ministero: Memorie del cardinale Consalvi*, ed. by M. Nasalli Rocca (Rome 1950), 149.

Also a sign of weakness and considerable indecision was that the leadership of the Church tried to delay long-overdue reforms and simply refused to heed justified desires submitted to the Holy See. Concerns reflecting the demands of the time which could have been solved without particular difficulty—issues concerning monastic law, ecclesiastical immunity, the adaptation of liturgical forms—while often coupled with other demands contradictory to the essence of the Church, were rejected out of hand as attacks on the rights of the Church. Conversely, positions were adhered to which had long been outmoded and were destined shortly to be destroyed by force. The negative attitude of the Church towards the demands of the Enlightenment continuously widened the gap between the Church and contemporary culture. By the same token, adherence to such formally valid but actually outmoded structures as the Vienna Concordat of 1448 for the German Empire or the Concordat of 1516 for France, made the Church drift farther and farther away from the real and constantly changing world round it. It was nothing short of fatal that in this period no actual initiatives were taken by the church leadership to adapt ecclesiastical forms and pastoral efforts to modern circumstances. In point of fact, the violent upheaval towards the end of the century found the Church basically unprepared.

CHAPTER 30

The Popes from Innocent XIII to Clement XII

Innocent XIII (1721–24)

During his long pontificate (1700–1721) Clement XI had appointed seventy cardinals, sixteen of whom had not survived the Pope. Within the traditional factions of the conclave beginning on 31 March 1721 the imperial cardinals could no longer rely on the support of their Spanish colleagues; the change of the dynasty now allied that group with the French faction. On the first day of the conclave, with barely half the cardinals present, the election of Paolucci, the secretary of state of Clement XI, appeared to be imminent. Since Vienna blamed him for the policies of the dead Pope, said to be friendly to the Bourbons, the imperial legate, Cardinal Althan, pronounced the formal exclusion against him. During the lengthy conclave many unsuccessful efforts were made until finally the candidacy of the French Cardinal Michel Angelo de' Conti was promoted, who raised the expectation of cooperation both with the French crown and the Emperor. On 8 May 1721, he was elected unanimously. The newly elected Pope took his name after the most famous member of his family, Innocent III, who had granted his brother the fiefdom of Poli, where Conti was born in 1655. He had been nuncio in Lisbon for ten years; in 1719 he had resigned from his diocese of Viterbo for reasons of health, so a lasting pontificate could not be expected. Although the Pope did invest the Emperor with Sicily and Naples, for which the latter had waited since the beginning of the War of the Spanish Succession, the negotiations for the already decided return of Comacchio turned out to be so prolonged that Innocent XIII did not live to see it. In the first year of his pontificate he appointed a total of three cardinals in two consistories. At the beginning of his second year his old affliction of lithiasis flared up again; several times he was not expected to live. His constant illness cast a shadow over his pontificate. He was released from his suffering on 7 March 1724. He is the only Pope in the history of the modern papacy who did not get a monument in Saint Peter's, although he was entombed there.

Benedict XIII (1724–30)

In the conclave beginning on 20 March 1724 the constellation of the factions was identical to the previous one. After several unsuccessful attempts a dark horse again was nominated in order to end the conclave which had already lasted far too long. On 29 May the Dominican Cardinal Vincenzo Maria (Pietro Francesco) Orsini was elected unanimously. But only after considerable resistance could he be persuaded to accept the election. He was the eldest son of the duke of Gravina near Bari, but had forgone his hereditary rights in order to enter the Dominican order. At the time of the election he was already seventy-five years old. Urged by his family, Clement X had appointed him cardinal at the age of twenty-three; he had been bishop of Manfredonia, Cesena, and Benevento (since 1686) in succession. His pastoral zeal and his ascetic life were praised everywhere. But he had no political experience. He chose his name in memory of the Dominican Pope Benedict XI. He was given the ordinal after some initial hesitation because Pedro de Luna, Benedict XIII at the time of the western schism and the Council of Constance, was considered an anti-Pope. In his personal life he continued to be a modest religious, refusing to move into the splendorous rooms of the Vatican. Even as Pope his main concern was the conduct of the diocese of Rome; the major part of his time was spent with consecrations of churches and altars, visits to the sick, religious instruction, and the administration of sacraments.

Given this attitude to his office, the selection of the Pope's coworkers took on extreme importance. While Benedict XIII made a fortuitous move in selecting Paolucci as secretary of state, his next appointment was to be fatal for his entire pontificate. As archbishop of Benevento, he had placed unlimited trust in Niccolò Coscia from the vicinity of Benevento. Now he gave him the kind of influential position at the papal court that in earlier times would most likely have been occupied only by a papal nephew. Greedy and unscrupulous, Coscia abused his position from the very start. In 1725, against the open disagreement of several cardinals, among them Secretary of State Paolucci, the Pope appointed him cardinal. Coscia promptly put a number of other Beneventans into influential positions. The climax was reached on 12 June 1726 after the death of Paolucci when the Pope, following a suggestion by Coscia, appointed the *Maestro di Camera,* Niccolò Maria Lercari, the new secretary of state. Lercari was totally dependent on Coscia. In spite of all the accusations raised against Coscia and incontrovertible evidence of his avarice and mismanagement, Benedict XIII held fast to his favorite as though blinded. Coscia sold vacant positions or divided the revenues with their holders. He managed to isolate the Pope to such a degree that in the end the latter was advised by no one but the group around Coscia. If the financial affairs of the Papal States got into a state of total disorder as a result of his mismanagement, the all powerful Coscia would intervene in the field of foreign policy and have himself paid princely sums for his services by the ambassadors of foreign powers.

A case in point was the bothersome issue of the *Monarchia Sicula*. It designated the full ecclesiastical jurisdiction claimed by the rules of Sicily since the sixteenth century on the basis of a privilege granted by Urban II to Roger I of Sicily. This privilege had already been formally rescinded by Clement XI, but now the imperial legate, Cardinal Cienfuegos, with the help of Coscia and the canonist Prospero Lambertini, who was soon after appointed cardinal, induced the Pope to make a decision which was most favorable to the imperial government. In the negotiations which dragged on from 1725 to 1728 the negotiators appointed by the Pope actually took the part of the imperial side. Even though a formal recognition of the *Monarchia Sicula* was avoided, the solution incorporated in the bull *Fideli* for all practical purposes granted the Sicilian ruler the jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters, undermining the rescission by Clement XI.

The house of Savoy, like that of the Emperor, knew how to exploit the situation in Rome to its advantage. Victor Amadeus II, who had assumed the royal title in 1713, managed—again with the help of Coscia, Secretary of State Lercari, and Lambertini—to obtain recognition of his royal title along with the presentation right for the bishoprics on the island of Sardinia. Although the Pope declared emphatically that he was unwilling to surrender a single right of the Church, the legate of Savoy succeeded by means of the concordat of 1727 in obtaining a solution which was most advantageous for Piedmont. The opinion of Cardinal Lambertini that nuisances had to be endured in order to prevent worse had made an impression on the Pope. The King was granted the right of episcopal appointments and the administration of the revenues during a *sedes vacans* virtually for the whole territory. All the officials of the Holy See who had had a part in the conclusion of the concordat were generously rewarded by the Turin government. This makes it obvious how the negotiations were conducted. By appointing a number of Dominicans to the sees the King assured himself of the Pope's continued benevolence in spite of the enormous concessions the Holy See had made in the concordat.

The Pope's lack of concern for the political issues confronting the Church was contrasted by his desire to do justice to his office as supreme head of the Church. He issued numerous orders for reforms and the restoration of discipline in the Church. But all too often his regulations were burdened by minutiae and were therefore without lasting effect. The jubilee of 1725, in the course of which the Spanish Stairs, under construction for four years, were consecrated, gave the Pope reason for many ceremonial Masses. The staircase, leading from the Piazza di Spagna to the church of the Trinità dei Monti was a legacy of the former French ambassador. In opposition to the cardinals he convened a

Roman provincial council after Easter which he conducted in person. This claimed his attention for weeks to the point that all other affairs came to a halt. Benedict XIII also pursued the execution of the Tridentine resolutions concerning the establishment of diocesan seminaries; he even appointed a special congregation for seminaries. Given the Pope's nature, it is not surprising that the number of beautifications and canonizations during his pontificate was noticeably high. He also continued to be attached to his former diocese of Benevento, which he visited twice, in 1727 and 1729.

Of his twenty-nine appointments to the cardinalate, made in twelve consistories, the ones of Coscia and Lercari were disastrous because of their negative influence on the Pope, while the one of Lambertini (at the end of 1726) was to be significant. The Catholic powers pressured Benedict XIII more than any other Pope before him to have their favorites elevated to the purple. It must be mentioned, however, that he did not agree to appoint Nuncio Bichi in Portugal, where he was zealously promoted by that government.

Characteristic for the situation of the Church and the papacy was the negative reaction of the powers to the Pope's efforts to have the feast of Saint Pope Gregory VII and the appropriate readings from the breviary adopted by the entire Church. Actually a minor issue, it came to be viewed as a highly political matter because of Gregory's position in the controversy over the investiture and his stand against Emperor Henry IV. In France, Naples, Belgium, and Venice the printing and distribution of the new liturgical texts were made subject to heavy penalties because this act was considered a violation of the ecclesiastical sovereignty of the state.

Benedict XIII died on 21 February 1730 after a brief illness. In accordance with his wishes he was laid to rest in the Dominican church of Maria sopra Minerva.

Clement XII (1730–40)

The death of the Pope brought with it the immediate fall of the Beneventan group in the Curia. Coscia had to leave the Vatican on the very first day after the Pope's demise. Because the wrath of the population was directed especially against him, he was forced to flee Rome in the dead of night. A month after the start of the conclave he was permitted to return with reservations; again he had to make his way through Rome at night. In addition to the traditional factions among the papal electors there was now a Savoyard party among whom were those cardinals who had participated in the concordat of 1727. In the course of the conclave more than half of the cardinals present were at one time or another nominated as candidates. After four months, on 12 July 1730, the seventy-eight-year-old Florentine Lorenzo Corsini was elected. He had been nominated two months prior by the French faction, but at that time, being a Tuscan, he had been rejected by the imperial party, which anticipated complications upon the extinction of the Medici line. In the meantime there had been successful intercession in his behalf in Vienna. But when the imperial concurrence arrived on 7 July, the French faction demurred because it forced them to relinquish their candidate Banchieri, whom they had promoted in the interim. Moreover, they suspected some sort of imperial machination behind the suddenly resumed candidacy of Corsini. The newly elected Pope had pursued his career in Rome. His domicile in the Palazzo Pamfili on the Piazza Navona had been the center of intellectual and scholarly life in Rome. Highly esteemed, he had been close to election in the two previous conclaves, but had been excluded by the great powers. By now he was too old and his vision so impaired that he became totally blind in 1732. This left the conduct of business to the immediate circle around the Pope.

The new Pope, taking his name after Clement XI, who had appointed him to the cardinalate, immediately tried to repair the damage done during the preceding pontificate. Coscia and his group were put on trial. Having fled to Naples because he was hoping for support from the Emperor for his efforts on behalf of the *Monarchia Sicula,* Coscia was now faced by the threat of demotion and excommunication. In 1732 he decided to stand trial in order to defend himself. On 9 May 1733, he was condemned to ten years at the Castel Sant'Angelo, restitution of all unlawful gains, and payment of 100,000 scudi; his franchise was revoked for the duration of his incarceration. But at the subsequent conclave in 1740 Coscia was readmitted with full rights; Prospero Lambertini, elected at that conclave, who was heavily indebted to Coscia, canceled the remainder of his prison term.

Clement XII urged revision of the concordat with Piedmont because it had been concluded illegally. In 1731 he pronounced it invalid. After initial protests Piedmont was forced to give in and agree to renegotiate the concordat. This had not been concluded by the time the Pope died. Efforts to cure the chaotic fiscal situation proved to be extremely difficult. Although new sources of revenue were found the burden of debt carried by the Papal States kept increasing.

Initially Clement XII was able to resist pressure by the great powers, installing only Italian cardinals. The single exception was the Portuguese nuncio Bichi, whose appointment had been urged by Lisbon for more than a decade. The agreement to elevate him after Bichi tendered a formal apology for his disobedience was a special act of conciliation as well as a political necessity in order to reestablish normal relations with

Portugal. In the second half of his pontificate Clement XII had to be more accessible to the wishes of the great powers. Since Portugal insisted on the appointment of the patriarch of Lisbon to the cardinalate, the Pope also had to take the demands of the larger states into account, which he did in a promotion at the end of 1737.

The first papal condemnation of the Freemasons took place in 1738. The lodges had formed about two decades before in England and spread across the continent including Rome. The condemnation can be explained by an apprehension of indifferentism and hostility to revealed religion. It was based on incomplete and one-sided information and did not do adequate justice to the many different currents represented in Freemasonry at the time.[1]

The decade brought about a new shift of power in Italy. When Duke Antonio Farnese of Parma and Piacenza died heirless on 20 January 1731, the issue of the feudal rights over these territories resurfaced. According to the peace treaty of 1720, Don Carlos, the son of Queen Elizabeth of Spain, was to receive the inheritance of the Farnese; Spain wanted his investiture by the Pope. But the Emperor claimed the feudal rights and had the territory occupied for Don Carlos. The Pope's protest was to no avail.

When the Polish King Augustus of Saxony died on 1 February 1732, the Pope initially sided with his son Friedrich August. But France, with the support of the Polish primate, promoted the candidacy of Stanislas Leszczyński, who was promptly elected. Encircled in Danzig by Russian and Saxon troops, he was reduced to waiting for help from the French. In the meantime France, Spain, and Piedmont had agreed to use the Polish War of Succession for the purpose of exploiting the difficult situation of the Empire and depriving the Emperor of his Italian possessions. By fall of 1733 Lombardy was in the hands of Piedmont. At the beginning of 1734 the Pope had to grant permission for an army under Don Carlos which was to occupy Naples to cross his territories. By the end of 1734 the entire Kingdom of Naples including Sicily was conquered by Spanish troops. Given the military helplessness of the Papal States, the Pope had no recourse when the Spaniards recruited soldiers there and passed through his territories at will. In the meantime the Peace of Vienna between the Emperor and France stipulated that Leszczyński would forego the Polish crown and in exchange receive the duchies of Bar and Lorraine, which were to go to France after his death. Duke Francis of Lorraine was to be compensated by the Grand Duchy of Tuscany after the death of the last of the Medici. Don Carlos was assured of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The Emperor retained Lombardy, with the exception of a few areas which went to Piedmont, and the duchies of Parma and Piacenza. Lastly, the Pragmatic Sanction, intended to regulate the Austrian succession, was recognized by France. This shift of power in Italy was arranged without consulting the Pope and without regard to his feudal rights. Since Spain did not accept the Peace of Vienna, the war in northern Italy continued, repeatedly affecting the Papal States. In March 1736 the population of Rome revolted against the recruitment of troops by the Spanish. As a consequence several towns of the Papal States were occupied by Spanish troops. In May 1736 Spain, followed by Naples, broke diplomatic relations with the Holy See. To restore them, the Pope was forced to make large concessions in a concordat with Spain.

---

[1] See K. Algermissen: *LThK* IV, 343–48; G. Schenkel: *RGG U*, 1113–18.

Notable administrative improvements in the Papal States were the promotion of trade and industry and the regulatory work in the Romagna. It was here that Cardinal Alberoni, back in favor since 1735, was active as papal legate. He established a permanent monument for himself by his generous endowment of a college in Piacenza named after him, which combined a theological boarding institution with a philosophical and theological university.[2] But his attempt to incorporate San Marino into the Papal States failed because Clement XII decided that the annexation could not be made without the free consent of its citizens.

For the last several years of his life the blind Pope was almost constantly bedridden. He died on 6 February 1740.

---

[2] For a detailed account, see the unpublished dissertation by A. Mezzadri submitted to the Gregoriana in 1969: *La formazione sacerdotale al collegio Alberoni di Piacenza.*

CHAPTER 31

Benedict XIV

The conclave beginning on 19 February 1740 and lasting for exactly six months was the longest since the Western Schism. For the first time the Austrian and French interests coincided; they were opposed by the Spanish cardinals, supported by those of Naples and Tuscany. Also important was the opposition between the cardinals installed by the deceased Pope and the "old" ones, appointed by his predecessor and led by Cardinal Albani. One candidate after the other failed, often on the balance of a single vote. Four cardinals died in the course of the conclave. Finally, in about the middle of August, the crown cardinals united behind the sixty-five-year-old Prospero Lambertini, archbishop of Bologna since 1731. At the beginning of the conclave he had been able to attract a few votes, but the scrutinies of the last few days prior to the decisive agreement had not given him a single vote. Yet on 17 August he was elected unanimously. He assumed his name in memory of Benedict XIII, who had elevated him to the cardinalate. The new Pope had made an excellent reputation for himself as a canonist; his work on the beatifications and canonizations became a classic in the field. Active in the Curia since the beginning of the century, he had gained influence by virtue of his thoroughness and stamina. Benedict XIII consulted him on political issues several times. More often than not Lambertini favored a policy of conciliation with an opposing state; often enough the resulting solutions did no more than save the bare principles. Beyond his specialty of canon law he was interested in the learning of his time, especially in literature and history; he was considered an "enlightened" and modern ecclesiastical prince. Witty and liberal in his private conversations, he did not shrink from criticizing institutions and personalities of the Church. He was a generous and open man, yet not always a good judge of human character. His trust in the French ambassador to Rome (until 1742), Crown Cardinal de Tencin, reflected by his friendship and voluminous private correspondence, was certainly misplaced. The Pope frankly and without reservations entrusted his thoughts on all kinds of issues to his correspondent—among them matters of policy which required the strictest secrecy. Cardinal de Tencin, who was a dependent of his immoral sister, the mother of the Encyclopedist d'Alembert, had copies and translations of the Pope's letters made and sent to the French government.

The fifty-year-old Silvio Valenti Gonzaga, nuncio in Brussels and Madrid, became secretary of state. Like the Pope, he was open to the arts and sciences. His rural estate, later called the Villa Bonaparte at the Porta Pia, became a center for scholars and artists, including foreigners.

In attempting to solve pending issues with the Catholic powers Benedict XIV in his capacity as Pope was just as ready for large concessions as he had been as Cardinal Lambertini. First to be settled were the disputes with Naples. The Pope agreed to the establishment of a mixed court of law to include laymen which was to judge ecclesiastical issues and persons. In a secret article, moreover, the *Placetum regium* was implicitly granted. More favorable to the Church was the agreement with Piedmont, but here too most of the wishes of that government were granted. The most far-reaching concession was the concordat with Spain in 1753. After initial resistance the demand for an extension of the royal patronage, already in existence in Granada and Spanish America, to all of Spain, was in the end granted by Benedict XIV. It had been demanded by Madrid for a number of decades and rejected again by the late Pope Clement XII. In secret negotiations, with sole participation by the Pope and his secretary of state and without the nuncio, Benedict acquiesced in all the important points. A mere fifty-two benefices were left to the Holy See to fill, while the King obtained the right of appointment to approximately twelve thousand of them. To make up the financial loss to the Curia the Spanish government was prepared to pay a compensation. At that time it was already a well-known fact that the secretary of state had received a significant sum of money from Spain. This put an onus on the concordat, which was made public only after its conclusion.

Of all the political changes taking place in the year 1740 the death of Emperor Charles IV on 20 October had the greatest impact. As far as the Austrian hereditary lands were concerned, female succession had been regulated by the Pragmatic Sanction. Yet Bavaria, Spain, and Prussia raised claims to parts of the inheritance. After some delay Benedict XIV recognized the hereditary right of Maria Theresa. In view of the impending imperial election, the Pope decided upon strict neutrality, to which he adhered in the face of tremendous pressure by the great powers, primarily France, which had entered into an alliance with Prussia against Austria. Only after Karl Albert von Wittelsbach had been elected Emperor Charles VII did Benedict announce his recognition of him. In the meantime Friedrich II of Prussia had occupied Silesia and Bavaria had invaded Austria with help by the French. Spain exploited the threat to Austria by attacking its possessions in Italy. In the course of their advance, Spanish and Austrian troops, unmindful of papal protests, marched through the papal territories unimpeded and even turned them into theaters of war. In May and June 1743, battles took place in the immediate environs of Rome, where the Austrian army remained until the fall of 1744. When Charles VII died on 20 January 1745, Benedict XIV assumed the same stance of neutrality as he had found years before.

In the Peace of Aachen (1748), Parma and Piacenza were again disposed of in total disregard of the Pope's feudal rights. The protest submitted by the papal legate and repeated by Benedict XIV in person was merely noted as the dissenting point of view of the Holy See.

The years of war placed a constant financial burden on the administration of the Papal States, reflected in increased debts and diminished revenues. The Peace of Aachen, which granted Italy a period of rest lasting almost half a century, initiated a time of economic recovery. The city of Rome started to regain its stature as a center of cultural life. The engravings by Giuseppe Vasi (1747–61) and especially the *Antichità Romane* (1756) and the *Vedute di Roma* (as of 1748) by Giovanni Battista Piranesi resurrected the Rome of yesteryear. Most of the restorations undertaken during the pontificate of Benedict XIV, especially during the Holy Year 1750, among them Santa Maria Maggiore, San Croce in

Gerusalemme, and Santa Maria degli Angeli, must be considered less than felicitous because they changed the original character of the churches too much in accordance with contemporary taste.

Interested in all areas of the sciences, the Pope supported individual scholars as well as large research projects not only in the humanities, foremost among them historical studies, but also in the natural sciences. A remarkable occurrence was his agreement for calling two women to the university of Bologna, his old diocese. He maintained close ties of friendship with the greatest contemporary Italian historian, Ludovico Muratori. Ill feelings were caused when the Pope accepted Voltaire's drama *Mahomet*, handed him by Cardinal Passionei, who had close ties to that representative of French Enlightenment, and the famous hexameters composed by Voltaire for the painting of the Pope. Voltaire himself soon let it be known that Benedict had thanked him, started a correspondence with him, and sent him two gold medals. This was injurious to the Pope's public esteem.

The revision of the Index and the procedure whereby printed matter was placed on the Index constituted true progress. Subsequent practice, to be sure, did not keep pace with the more modern procedure desired by Benedict XIV. He wanted the objectionable passages—in the case of a well-known Catholic author—made known to him; if the author was prepared to improve them, the prohibition was not to be published. The author, moreover, was to have the chance to defend and justify himself.[1]

Benedict XIV was especially intent on augmenting the Vatican collections and enlarging the library. He acquired the largest private collection of books in Rome, the so called *Ottoboniana*, following the death of the last Ottoboni from the family of Pope Alexander VIII. He also planned to make the manuscript holdings of the Vatican generally accessible by means of a printed catalogue to consist of twenty volumes.

---

[1] In a memorial speech based on a draft by Robert Leiber, S.J., and intended for the 1958 congress for canonists, which was not given because of the prior death of the Pope, Pius XII had quoted a statement from a letter of Benedict to Cardinal de Tencin. In it he had expressed his basic thoughts concerning the prohibition of books: ". . . We would burden ourselves with guilt if we did not take the necessary measures to let justice prevail. But We are convinced that We remain guiltless before God or man in as much as he loves justice if We refuse to, or better yet if We do not engage at all in condemning a work simply upon the accusation of others and without a thorough examination both of the work itself as well as of the justification submitted by the author in his defense." It can be presumed that Pius XII at the time intended to use this quotation to initiate a basic change in the prevailing practice of censorship, but that the text of his speech was changed at this place. For in the extant text in the *Osservatore Romano* the lengthy quotation from Pope Benedict's letter is introduced by the kind of banal and unnecessary remark that can not be found in any other text by Pius XII: "Likewise he (Benedict XIV) did not want a condemnation of a book without having it examined thoroughly" (*Osservatore Romano*, 9 April 1959, no. 82, 3).

In regard to the appointment of cardinals Benedict XIV, as did his predecessors, often had to accede to the wishes of certain governments to elevate their candidates. A special case at the promotion of July 1747 was the elevation to the cardinalate of the last of the Stuarts, Duke Henry of York (d. 1807), who had joined the ecclesiastical estate after the Stuarts lost the battle of Culloden in 1746.

In questions of theology, especially in the doctrine of grace, Benedict XIV tended towards the Augustinian school. The indexing of the works of Cardinal Noris by the Spanish Inquisition was revoked by him: he succeeded in having them struck from the Spanish Index after ten years of negotiations. Prior to his election to the papacy he had once mentioned that Jansenism was merely a phantom and an invention of the Jesuits. But even though he publicly rejected complaints that he was a friend of the Jansenists and an opponent of the Jesuits, the fact remains that during his pontificate Rome became a major center of the Jesuits' opponents, whose esteem and influence were rising. Focal point and head of that group was Cardinal Passionei, who had built a popular rural retreat with a valuable library in Camaldoli near Frascati. Even at that time the efforts to have the Jesuit order suppressed, pursued by the general of the Augustinian order, Vázquez, the Spanish ambassador Roda, and several prelates of the Curia, were common knowledge.

The first blow against the society was struck in the mission territories. The controversy over the rites (see Chap. 16) with its disastrous consequences for the Asiatic missions had already lasted the entire century. The pertinent condemnations pronounced by Benedict XIV in 1742 and 1744 represented a long-expected outcome. But during his pontificate the Jesuit missions in Latin America and especially their reductions were also placed in extreme jeopardy and finally marked for extinction. At the very beginning of his office Benedict XIV had already acceeded to the claims of the established church of Portugal in order to alleviate the pastoral problems caused by the long *sede* vacancies in many of the Portuguese dioceses. Also fulfilled by the Pope were other demands by Portugal, such as the special recognition of the patriarch of Lisbon and his canonists and the awarding of a special title to the King (*rex fidelissimus,* in adaptation to the title *rex christianissimus,* to which the King of France was entitled). When Joseph de Varcalho e Melho, Marquis de Pombal after 1770, who had become familiar with the administration of modern state government as a diplomat in Vienna and London, was appointed secretary of state, the attack against the Jesuits began in earnest. In order to effect economic reforms in Portugal, Pombal wanted to incorporate the Church into the mechanism of the state. His measures were directed against the orders in general. After the death of the queen mother (1754) and the earthquake in Lisbon on 1

November 1755, which gave rise to some unwise utterances by a few priests, he dropped his initial caution. The Jesuits, especially, were accused of all sorts of violations and crimes. In 1758 Pombal demanded that Benedict XIV appoint the Portuguese Cardinal Saldanha, a relative of the all-powerful secretary of state and totally dependent on him, to the office of visitor of the Jesuit order for Portugal with all the requisite authority. When the Pope gave in to this demand, the fate of the order in Portugal and its overseas possessions was sealed.

In the Austro-Venetian quarrel over the patriarchate of Aquileia the Pope was also intent on a settlement which would meet the two powers halfway. In 1418/20 when Venice had annexed Friaul and terminated the temporal rule of the patriarch over that territory, the diocese was politically partitioned. The larger part with its cathedral church was given to Austria, whereas Friaul with its actual patriarchal residence of Udine became part of Venice. Since the fifteenth century Austria had repeatedly tried to be assigned its own bishop; in 1628 it finally forbade the patriarch to exercise his functions in the Austrian part and kept its subjects from turning to the bishop in Udine. In 1748 Maria Theresa again applied for the establishment of a separate bishopric. The initial solution, the establishment of an apostolic vicariate in Görz, was rejected by the seigniory, which broke off relations with Rome in the summer of 1750 after its protests had been to no avail. Upon the suggestion of France, which had intervened as a mediator in order to keep the conflict from spreading, the patriarchate of Aquileia was abolished and the two bishoprics of Udine and Görz were established. The old cathedral of Aquileia was declared exempt and the patriarch permitted to retain the title for his person.[2]

The same conciliatory attitude which Benedict XIV manifested towards the Catholic powers and which at times prompted him to make excessive concessions was also applied to non-Catholic powers in order to improve the lot of the Catholic minorities in those countries. By means of its conquest of Silesia following the death of Charles VI, Prussia had significantly increased its Catholic population. Although the peace treaty of Breslau (1742) had assured the Catholic Church that the status quo would be maintained, the Catholics in fact became second-class citizens. According to the King's view the state was to exercise supreme supervisory power over the Protestant as well as the Catholic Church. The bishop of Breslau, Cardinal von Sinzendorf, was in no position to effectively counter the extreme steps of the established Church. He himself developed the plan for a vicariate for Prussia which was actually conceived as a "royal" rather than an "apostolic" vicariate. But Benedict XIV, whose concurrence was vigorously solicited by the Breslau cardinal, insisted that the future vicar general be lawfully installed, that is by the Pope. At the same time, Friedrich II prevailed in having the twenty-six-year-old Count Schaffgotsch, whom he liked but whose general conduct caused a lot of chagrin, accepted into the Breslau cathedral chapter. Without the count's participation and against the opposition of Rome the King appointed Schaffgotsch coadjutor to Cardinal von Sinzendorf. The Pope thereupon forbade the appointed coadjutor to be consecrated bishop. Upon Sinzendorf's death in 1747 Schaffgotsch, supported by Friedrich II's favor and skillfully feigning an inner rebirth, managed to have Benedict XIV appoint him as Sinzendorf's successor. It is probable that Benedict XIV saw through Schaffgotsch's insincerity. In connection with this affair the Pope for the first time implicitly recognized the Prussian royal title by mentioning in March 1748 the "royal person of Friedrich II." Up to that time the Curia had persistently used the earlier annoying title "Margrave of Brandenburg."

---

[2] See F. Seneca, *La fine del Patriarcato Aquileiese 1748–1751* (Venice 1954); C. Gode, "Angelo Maria Querini, umanista e diplomatico per Aquileia," *RSTI* 18 (1964), 23–45; J. Rainer, "Versuche zur Errichtung neuer Bistümer in Innerösterreich unter Erzherzog Karl II. und Kaiser Ferdinand II.," *MIÖG* 68 (1960), 457–69 (background).

Even in his advanced years Benedict XIV displayed an astonishing stamina; after the serious illness of Secretary of State Valenti Gonzaga in 1751 until the latter's death in 1756 he did not appoint a successor but burdened himself with the major portion of the additional work. As a result his own health deteriorated; after 1756 he was feared to be on the verge of death several times. He died on 3 May 1758; according to witnesses he remarked immediately before his passing that he had been betrayed by Spain in the matter of the concordat.

In his papal history Pastor makes an unqualified positive judgment regarding the pontificate of Benedict XIV and especially concerning his political efforts.[3] Yet some serious misgivings have been raised about that position. Even Pope Pius XII in a prepared but undelivered allocution on the occasion of the two-hundredth anniversary of Benedict XIV mentions that the Pope probably manifested too much acquiescence and weakness in the concordats with Naples, Savoy, and Spain as well as in his attitude towards Friedrich II of Prussia.[4]

---

[3] "That such a man would refrain from surrendering ecclesiastical rights is understood. As a skillful canonist and theologian he could distinguish very well between essential and unessential rights, between that which had to be maintained under any circumstances and that which could be surrendered without damage and, indeed, should not be adhered to in order to avoid even greater problems. . . . The fact that he yielded as far as possible in matters which did not affect dogma could only be of benefit to the Church" (XVI/1, 437).

---

[4] "Mentre, nella difficile controversia . . . per l'elezione imperiale di Carolo VII e di Francesco I . . . , il suo comportamento si dimostrò un esempio di saggezza non può dirsi senz'altro lo stesso, almeno con unanime consenso, per le conclusioni dei Concordati con le Corti di Sardegna-Piemonte, di Napoli e di Spagna, e per il grande riguardo da lui avuto verso le esigenze del Re Federico II di Prussia. Si può porre cioè il quesito, se egli sia stato troppo conciliante ed arrendevole di fronte alle veementi ed eccessive pretese delle Corti secolari. La risposta non è concorde tra gli storici, che, come già i contemporanei, si dividono in difensori e critici."

CHAPTER 32

Clement XIII and Clement XIV

Clement XIII (1758–69)

In the conclave starting on 15 May 1758 there was an initial agreement by more than two thirds of the cardinals on the candidacy of Cardinal Cavalchini when the formal exclusion was pronounced against him by the French Crown Cardinal Luynes because of Cavalchini's position in the beatification of Bellarmine (this was the last formal exclusion of the eighteenth century and the only one from the French side). On 6 July the Venetian Cardinal Carlo Rezzonico was elected. He had been elevated to the cardinalate by Clement XII in 1737 and for that reason he chose the name of Clement. Bishop of Padua since 1743, he had proved himself to be an ardent and strict ecclesiastic.

The Jesuit issue became the dominant one of his pontificate. A few weeks after the election Secretary of State Archinto, reappointed by the Pope's predecessor, died. In the person of Luigi Torrigiani, Clement XIII appointed a confirmed friend of the society to that office. But Torrigiani was unable to stop the anti-Jesuit momentum. The rapidly spreading persecution of the Jesuit order was unique in the annals of church history by virtue of its extent and effect. A parallel has been drawn between this persecution and the fragmentation of Poland, for in addition to the coincidence of the events there was also the common element of a degree of cynicism which disregarded all existing rights.[1]

---

[1] A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française* I (Paris 1897), 67: "Dans tout le dix-huitième siècle, je ne vois, en matière d'intervention, qu'une ligue se former entre les couronnes . . .: c'est la ligue de puissances du nord contre la Pologne et contre la

The attack on the order has also been viewed as an attack on the Church itself and especially on the papacy.[2] There were also a variety of additional forces, such as theological and ecclesiastical special interests in a complex combination with political, anti-Church, and enlightened tendencies. All of this finally led to the vehement demand for basic changes in the structure of the Jesuit order and, in the end, for its suppression. Certainly there were faults and abuses within the ranks of the order and many of the complaints and accusations were not without justification. Yet an objective investigation will show that the discrepancy between ideal and reality in the Jesuit order was no more serious than in other ecclesiastical communities of the time.

The attack against the order began in Portugal, where a brief of Benedict XIV, dated 1 April 1758, had appointed Cardinal Saldanha, who was totally dependent on Pombal, to the office of apostolic visitor of the order with full authority. Without an actual investigation, the Jesuits were first accused of illegal commercial transactions; next, some time after the unsuccessful assassination attempt on the King on 3 September 1758, they were accused of participation in that conspiracy. In June 1759 all the assets of the order in Portugal and its overseas territories were confiscated. In September in spite of energetic intervention by Clement XIII the members of the order were deported first from Portugal and then gradually from the overseas possessions and sent to the Papal States. Many died during transport (about 90 to 100) or were kept in Portuguese jails, often under inhuman conditions (about 180), or left the order (about 250, constituting 15 percent of the Portuguese contingent of the order).

France was the first country to follow Portugal's example. But in contrast to Portugal and the other states from which the Jesuits were destined to be expelled in subsequent years, France had a strong and in part well-organized opposition against the Jesuits, especially in the parliament. This opposition increased around the middle of the seven-

---

Suède. Quant aux puissances de l'ouest et du midi de l'Europe, je n'aperçois qu'une circonstance où elles aient poursuivi de concert un objet commun, c'est la suppression de l'ordre des Jésuites. L'incident est caractéristique: il présente comme une sorte de bas-relief où s'accusent, en quelques traits saillants, les mœurs politiques de l'époque."

[2] See Pastor XVI/1, 602: "The attack was instead mostly directed against the papacy; inasmuch as it was against the Jesuit order it was only because the latter represented a kind of outer battlement which had to be breached in order to facilitate the fight with the actual opponent"; and J. Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche,* 339f.: "In all the great conflicts of the seventeenth century the Jesuit order was the object of the attack. The explanation for that was the strictly centralist, papal, ecclesiastical nature of this order. Quite naturally it also became the single great enemy of the anti-Church Enlightenment arising from those conflicts."

teenth century, fueled by the disputes with the Jansenist movement and literarily well documented in Pascal's *Provincial Letters.* Immediately after the middle of the century some individual cases aggravated the already serious tensions. The year 1755 marked the beginning of the affair involving Lavalette, an economist and superior of the Jesuit order on the Antilles. In order to secure the economic aspects of the mission work he operated plantations and tried to sell their products in Europe. Losses due to war and the bankruptcy of his correspondent commercial house in France led to the failure of his undertakings. Initially the French courts made Lavalette personally liable for the damages, but then in 1760 the order as a whole and its assets in France in particular were declared liable. Furthermore, Mme Pompadour, rising to the position of favorite of the King in 1756 and becoming all powerful, disliked the Jesuits because they disapproved of her position at the court. After the assassination attempt on Louis XV (15 January 1757) public opinion was aroused against the Jesuits when they were accused of complicity on the basis of their doctrine regarding tyrannicide.

Desperate attempts by the French superiors of the order, extending to a formal recognition of the four Gallican articles of 1682 and, in some cases, advocating a secession from the united order by the establishment of a separate French vicariate general,[3] were unable to avert the disaster. Although the great majority of the French episcopate had pronounced themselves in favor of the Jesuits, and in spite of several interventions by Clement XIII with the bishops and Louis XV, all assets of the order were confiscated in April 1762. The following August marked the beginning of deportation. A significant percentage, especially of the scholastics and the lay brothers among the almost three thousand French Jesuits, left the order with the agreement of their superiors. On 1 December 1764, the Society of Jesus in France was officially abolished. The previously prepared bull *Apostolicum pascendi,* which reacknowledged the order and made an unequivocal statement in favor of the Jesuits, was published on 7 January 1765 as a direct answer to the French abolition. As could be expected, this public pronouncement by Clement XIII had no practical result.

In 1759 Charles III, formerly King of Naples, ascended to the Spanish throne. Dependent on his prime minister, Tanucci, he inclined towards an expansion of the established Church and a restriction of the liberties of the Church of Rome. But Tanucci was also a confirmed opponent of the Jesuit order.[4] His influence and some skillfully manipulated changes in the first rank of government affected the heretofore friendly attitude towards the Jesuits. In a later stage of the investigation but without actual proof the "Hat Rebellion" of March 1766, caused by economic and social abuses, was blamed on the Jesuits. The death of Queen Mother Elizabeth Farnese precisely that same year caused the order to lose an influential patron. Certain ecclesiastical circles, especially the Augustine General Vázquez,[5] urged the government to take steps against the Jesuit order. Giving no reasons, a royal decree of 27 February 1767 ordered the banishment of all Jesuits from Spanish territory and the confiscation of all Jesuit assets. The rules for the implementation of the decree were issued in the strictest secrecy. On 2 April the Spanish members of the order, numbering about twenty-eight hundred, were confined and deported. In the course of the year the approximately sixteen hundred Jesuits living in the overseas possessions met the same fate. In a show of resistance to the unilateral, forcible action by Spain, the papal government denied landing rights to the Spanish ships transporting the Jesuits to its ports. They finally found refuge on Corsica. In the following year when the island had become French they were able to travel to the territories of the Papal States. The protest by the Pope with the King of Spain had no effect whatsoever.

---

[3] In connection with these efforts, which were also pursued by French circles outside the order, Clement XIII is said to have remarked to Ricci, the general of the order: "aut sint ut sunt, aut non sint," although it is not clear whether this meaningful formulation should be attributed to the Pope himself or perhaps rather to Cesare Giulio Cordara, who quoted it.

After the actions of Spain, the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish secundogenitures of Naples (20 November 1767), Parma-Piacenza (7 February 1768), as well as from the island of Malta (22 April 1768) was no more than expected.

It is not surprising that an outgrowth of these individual actions would be a united plan for the total abolition of the Jesuit order by authority of the Pope. This plan seems to have been developed almost simultaneously in both France and Portugal with affirmation by Spain being assumed. The only difficult element which also took some time to overcome was the anticipated resistance of Maria Theresa, whose support could not be enlisted. Finally in 1770 she declared her neutrality and agreed not to undertake anything in favor of the Jesuits if the other powers could obtain from the Pope the abolition of the order; furthermore, she would not withhold her concurrence in the ultimate decision of the Holy See. A pretext for this alliance was the situation in Parma. Its prime minister, Du Tillot, had repeatedly violated the rights of the

---

[4] Even though he recognized that the individual Jesuit could not be reproached: "Ottimi sacerdoti ho sempre conosciuto i particolari Gesuiti, che io ho trattato, pieni di carità, di prudenza e di tutte le virtù cristiane" (Pastor XVI/1 718 n. 1).

[5] After the expulsion Vázquez did not hide his jubilation over the goal which had finally been reached; see the passage from the letter quoted by Pastor XVI/1, 786, n. 3.

Church. In a decree of 16 January 1768 he stopped any and all cases from being submitted to foreign courts, meaning also the ecclesiastical courts in Rome. On 30 January a monitory declared those violations null and void and made their perpetrators subject to the penalties of the Church according to the Eucharistic bull *In coena Domini.* Since all the Bourbon courts felt affected by this monitory they decided to undertake a concerted action. In April 1768 the respective ambassadors demanded of Clement XIII the immediate revocation of the document under threat of reprisals. When the Pope did not give in, the papal enclaves of Benevento and Pontecorvo, Avignon and Venaissin were occupied. The stubborn refusal of the Pope did not deter the Catholic powers from making additional demands. A climax was reached in January 1769 when the ambassadors formally requested the Pope for the abolition of the Jesuit order.

The financial difficulties of the Papal States, aggravated by famine and rising prices in 1763 and 1764, continued because reforms could not be implemented against the will of the large property holders. Regarding architectural projects, only the completion of the Fontana Trevi and the Villa Albani took place in these years. In 1763, following a recommendation of Cardinal Albani, the Pope appointed Winckelmann commissioner of antiquities. Before that, the Pope, scrupulously fearful, had had a number of antique sculptures covered and the *Last Judgment* in the Sistine Chapel painted over again. Even then these measures had incurred Winckelmann's scorn, but he nonetheless accepted the Pope's offer.

Like his predecessors, Clement XIII favored Italian prelates for promotion, mostly those in the service of the Curia and a few candidates suggested by the Catholic powers. The appointment of his nephew met with general agreement since the latter kept aloof from the affairs of state. Unfortunate, although unavoidable, was the elevation of the short-term French foreign minister de Bernis, whose unedifying, totally secular way of life was well known. The most important of Clement XIII's appointments turned out to be that of Lorenzo Ganganelli, the future Pope Clement XIV, who was elevated to the purple in 1759.

Clement XIII died on 2 February 1769 of a heart attack after he celebrated Mass early in the morning and consecrated the candles of the day. His tomb in Saint Peter's, created by Canova, was not unveiled until twenty-three years after his death.

Clement XIV (1769–74)

The conclave beginning on 15 February 1769 was marked by the Jesuit issue. No election could take place until the Spanish cardinals arrived in

Rome because the French, having arrived there a month earlier, had made it clear that they would use their exclusion against anyone who might be elected prior to the arrival of the Spaniards. The Catholic powers were agreed that no friend of the Jesuits should be elected, but there were noticeable differences regarding procedure. Whereas the great powers, with Spain in the lead, demanded a formal prior assurance from any serious candidate that he would abolish the Jesuit order, the crown cardinals viewed such a step as fulfilling the fact of simony and therefore rejected such a method. The favored candidate of the powers was the archbishop of Naples, Sersale, who failed because of his excessive acquiescence to the state. On the advice of the Spanish ambassador Azpuru, the candidacy of Cardinal Ganganelli was then promoted. It is certain that he did not give a promise prior to his election to abolish the order. When asked he merely explained that in his opinion a Pope could abolish the Society of Jesus just like any other order for very important reasons and with the proper observance of wisdom and justice. He was elected unanimously on 19 May 1769.

Ganganelli, born in 1705 in Sant'Arcangelo near Rimini, had joined the Franciscan Conventuals in 1723 and exchanged his baptismal name of Giovanni Vincenzo for that of his father Lorenzo. After several years of teaching in various Italian schools of his order, he became rector of the Bonaventura college in Rome and consultant of the Inquisition in 1746. He twice rejected election to the post of general of his order, probably in order to remain eligible for higher office. In 1759 Clement XIII elevated him to the cardinalate. At that time and previous to it he had been considered a friend of the Jesuits; as cardinal he gradually removed himself from them, seeking ties instead with the ambassadors of the Bourbon powers. The reproach of ambition and calculation, raised against him by Pastor, seems not to have been completely unfounded.

During his pontificate his fellow Augustinian Bontempi became his indispensable confidant. Cardinal Pallavicini, nuncio in Madrid from 1760 to 1767 and a confirmed friend of Spain, was appointed secretary of state. The first important step taken by the new Pope was to restore normal relations with Portugal, which had been broken off in 1759. Vacant dioceses could then be filled again, although only by candidates agreeable to Pombal. A nuncio was dispatched to Lisbon, but at the same time the Pope had to appoint Pombal's brother to the cardinalate and, when he died shortly after, he was forced to elevate the favorite of the all-powerful minister. The Pope was applauded by all the enlightened circles for omitting on Maundy Thursday 1770 the customary pronouncement of the bull *In coena Domini,* an action implicitly correcting his predecessor, who had expressly referred to that bull in his monitory to Parma in 1768. In 1774 the bull was formally revoked.

From the beginning of the Pope's pontificate Spain was the motive force behind the Jesuit issue. A routine brief acknowledging the customary indulgences granted to missionaries of the Jesuit order and their faithful provoked outrage. It prompted the united powers to have the French ambassador, Cardinal Bernis, formally approach Clement XIV with a demand for the abolition of the order. The Pope, unsure because of his earlier oblique assent and fearful of being poisoned by the Jesuits, finally gave in to the urging of France, which was reinforced by the threat of breaking off diplomatic relations. In a letter to Louis XIV in September 1769 he promised to abolish the order but did not set a firm date. He made the same promise in a letter to Charles III of Spain at the end of November, at the same time asking for the King's patience.

In spite of such firm assurances the next three years were marked by a noticeable wavering on the part of the Pope vis-à-vis the Jesuits. Individual harsh steps against the order, as for instance the punishment of members without a reason, discriminatory visitations of colleges, brusque treatment of the superiors, were not sufficient to pacify the united powers. Their ambassadors incessantly pressured the Pope, not without intriguing and raising suspicions among one another. The fall of Choiseul at the end of 1770, triggered by the influence of Mme Du Barry, did not make a difference in the French policy regarding the Jesuits. The actual turn of events in this matter, called "el negocio grande," was brought about with the change of Spanish ambassadors to Rome. Azpuru, who resigned at the end of 1771 for reasons of health, was followed by José Moñino, appointed count of Florida-blanca in 1773.[6] His first audience with the Pope initiated the final phase of the fight against the Jesuit order. In answer to an attempt by the Pope to bring about a gradual attrition without the need for a formal document of abolition by forbidding the acceptance of novices in the order, the ambassador threatened the expulsion of all religious orders from Spain and, finally, the breaking off of diplomatic relations. The Spanish embassy then prepared a draft of an abolition bull which was submitted to the Pope at the beginning of 1773 and approved by him in all the essential points. The fact that Madrid was satisfied with the text need hardly be mentioned since the bull was drafted in its own embassy. The Spanish member of the Curia, Zelada, who was substantially involved in the editing of the text, was appointed cardinal soon after, on 19 April

---

[6] Since he did not die until 1819, he lived to see the restoration of the order in whose suppression he had been instrumental.

1773 and—as were other pliable collaborators, foremost among them the Pope's confidant, Bontempi—richly rewarded by Spain. The last possible obstacle was overcome in the spring of 1773 when Maria Theresa, urged by Spain, reiterated Austria's neutrality of the Jesuit issue. In June—probably 9 June—Clement XIV signed the abolition document.[7] For practical and stylistic reasons it was not composed as a bull as previously planned but in the form of a brief. The printing—as yet without a date—was provided by the Spanish ambassador, the better to ensure secrecy. In the middle of July the congregation of cardinals to be charged with the implementation of the abolition was appointed. But not until 22 July did Moñino receive permission to send copies of the brief, dated the day before, to the governments involved. On 16 August it was published in Rome and implemented the very same day.

A general historical preamble to the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor noster* presents the right of the Pope regarding the recognition as well as the abolition of religious orders. It then states the difficulties—although in a very one-sided selection of facts—which the Jesuit order had had with other orders and with temporal princes in the course of its history. This is followed by the actual decree of abolition. The voluminous document concludes with the rules of implementation.

The abolition of the Jesuit order was seen as a victory of rationalism and Clement XIV was widely celebrated for his decision. In the medal for the year 1774 he referred—although discreetly—to the abolition as a peace-making event. The enemies of the Jesuits expressed their triumph more directly in an imitation of the papal medal; in a reference to the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise the reverse side of the medal shows the expulsion of the Jesuits with the circular notation "I know ye not" and in reference to the psalm "This is the day which the Lord hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it."

The various countries where any Jesuits were left implemented the abolition in different ways. Because of pressure and surveillance by the Bourbon powers the procedure was harshest in the Papal States. The general of the order, Lorenzo Ricci—and with him the more important members of the order—was held in strict incarceration at the Castel Sant'Angelo until his death. Moñino successfully opposed the release of Ricci, planned by Pius VI, the successor of Clement XIV, and also tried to prevent any alleviation of the conditions at the prison. In Austria and

---

[7] The frequently mentioned assertion that before signing the brief Clement XIV looked up the founder of the Passionists, the highly esteemed Paul of the Cross, and signed the brief only after his talk with him is probably not correct; see Gaetano dell'Addolorata, O.P., in *RSTI* 13 (1959), 102–12.

Germany the abolition was generally executed without harshness. Attention was paid that the work of former Jesuits was impaired as little as possible. Maria Theresa and other princes successfully resisted the demand intended by Clement XIV that the assets of the order, which were greatly overestimated, be placed at the disposal of the Holy See. Instead the property of the order was taken over by the respective states.

Only Friedrich II of Prussia, who in 1767 had welcomed the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain, and Catherine II of Russia (in order to maintain the Catholic school system in Silesia or White Russia) prohibited the publication and implementation of the abolition brief. Whereas Prussia did formally abolish the order a few years later, the tsarina persisted in her policy and the competent bishop ordered the Jesuits to continue their work. The assurance by the suffragan bishop of Mogilev in 1785 that Pius VI had approved of the conduct of the White Russian ex-Jesuits in a conversation with him cannot be proved historically, but it was binding for the members of the order at that time. In 1801 Pope Pius VI formally recognized the Society of Jesus for White Russia.

The abolition of the order caused severe damage especially to the Catholic school system in Europe. The deportation from Portugal and Spain had already put a stop to the missionary work of the order. The Jesuits overwhelmingly acquiesced to the papal decision although it brought with it utter distress and persecution for many. Not a few ex-Jesuits continued to excel in the service of the Church.

In exchange for the abolition of the order the Catholic powers had promised the Pope to return the occupied exclaves of the Papal States. But Clement XIV could not prevail in his suggestion to have the territories returned prior to publicizing the abolition brief. Since Tanucci wanted to retain Benevento for Naples at any price, the restitution of the occupied areas was delayed until 1774 and was, moreover, encumbered with humiliating provisos.

In twelve promotions Clement XIV installed a total of seventeen new cardinals. At the last creation (26 April 1774) two new cardinals were installed by name, among them Braschi, the successor of Clement, and eleven *in petto*. The Pope never divulged the names of these candidates although he was put under extreme pressure to do so when he was seriously ill just before his death; according to contemporary opinion all of them were most likely from the ranks of opponents of the Jesuit order.

After the abolition of the order the Pope's fears of possible poisoning by his imagined opponents increased. The state of his health, not very stable at best, deteriorated steadily, probably aggravated by his depressions and the excitements. Death came on 21 September 1774.

Rumors of poisoning immediately spread, but are generally rejected as baseless by more recent research. At the exequies of Clement XIV the customary presentation of special achievements made no mention at all of the abolition of the Society of Jesus. Clement XIV was initially put to rest in Saint Peter's; in 1802 he was transferred to the monastic church of SS. Apostoli, where the tomb created by Canova had been ready since 1787.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The fact that relatively few comprehensive presentations exist is due partly to the period of church history treated in this volume and partly to the state of historical literature. We therefore call attention to the literature listed under the various sections and chapters. The titles overlapping from the sixteenth century, cited in Volume V, will not be repeated here.

I. GENERAL HISTORY

WORLD HISTORY: F. Valjavec, *Historia Mundi* VII and VIII (Berne 1957ff.).; G. Mann and A. Nitschke, *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte* VII (Berlin 1964); H. Franke et al.; *Saeculum Weltgeschichte* V (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1970), VI (in preparation); *Cambridge Modern History* III, IV (Cambridge 1904, 1906).

EUROPE: F. Hartung, *Neuzeit. Von der Mitte des 17. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart* I: *Bis zur Französischen Revolution* (*Handbuch für den Geschichtslehrer* V, 1) (Vienna 1932, reprint Darmstadt 1965); R. M. Rayner, *European History 1648–1789* (London 1949); L. Gottschalk and D. Lach, *Europe and the Modern World* I: *The Rise of Modern Europe* (Chicago 1951); M. Crouzet, ed., *Histoire générale des civilisations* IV: R. Mousnier, *Les XVI^{e} et XVII^{e} siècles: 1492–1715* (Paris 1961); V.: R. Mousnier, E. Labrousse, and M. Bouljoiseau, *Le XVIII^{e} siècle. 1715–1815* (Paris 1967); F. Wagner, *Europa im Zeitalter des Absolutismus. 1648–1789* (Munich 1959); G. Ritter, ed., *Geschichte der Neuzeit* II: W. Hubatsch, *Das Zeitalter des Absolutismus, 1600–1789* (Brunswick 1965); M. Beloff, *The Age of Absolutism 1660–1815* (London 1966); T. Schieder, ed., *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte* IV: *Europa im Zeitalter des Absolutismus und der Aufklärung* (Stuttgart 1968); F. Wagner, *Europa im Zeitalter des Absolutismus und der Aufklärung* (Stuttgart 1968); P. Chaunu, *La Civilisation de l'Europe classique. 1620–1750* (Paris 1966); D. Ogg, *Europe in the Seventeenth Century* (New York 1962); C. J. Friedrich, *The Age of the Baroque, 1610–1660* (New York 1952); F. L. Nussbaum, *The Triumph of Science and Reason, 1660–1685* (New York 1953).

FRANCE: E. Lavisse, ed., *Histoire de France . . .*: VI, 2: J. H. Mariéjol, *Henri IV, Louis XIII* (*1598–1643*) (Paris 1905); III, 1 and 2: E. Lavisse, *Louis XIV* (Paris 1906); VIII, 1: A. de Saint-Léger et al., *Louis XIV. La Fin Du Règne* (Paris 1908); VIII, 2: H. Carré, *Le règne de Louis XV* (Paris 1909); IX, 1: H. Carré et al., *Le règne de Louis XVI* (Paris 1910); H. Méthivier, *Le siècle de Louis XIV* (Paris 1966); H. Méthivier, *L'Ancien Régime* (Paris 1964); C. J. Burckhardt, *Richelieu and His Age* I: *His Rise to Power,* trans. and abridged, Edwin and Willa Muir; II: *Assertion of Power and Cold War;* III: *Power, Politics and the Cardinal's Death* (New York 1972); W. F. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State* (Princeton 1972); V. Tapié, *La France de Louis XIII et de Richelieu* (Paris 1967); A. Lublinskaya, *French Absolutism. The Crucial Phase 1620–1629* (London 1968); G. Hanotaux and Duc de la Force, *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu,* 5 vols. (Paris 1893–1944); A. Chéruel, *Histoire de France sous le ministère de Mazarin* (*1651–61*), 3 vols. (Paris 1882).

SPAIN: W. Coxe, *L'Espagne sous les rois de la maison Bourbon,* 5 vols. (Paris 1827); A. Baudrillart, *Philippe V et la Cour de France,* 5 vols. (Paris 1890–1901); R. Altamira, *Historia de españa y de la civilización española* III (Barcelona 1928); A. Ballesteros y Beretta, *Historia de España* IV and V (Barcelona 1926ff.); R. Konetzke, *Geschichte des spanischen und portugiesischen Volkes* (Leipzig 1939); P. Aguado Bleye, *Manual de historia de España* II and III (Madrid 1954); A. Ballesteros y Beretta, *Geschichte Spaniens* (Munich and Berlin 1943); F. Soldevila, *Historia de España* IV–VI (Barcelona 1956ff.); R. Heer, *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain* (New Jersey 1958); L. Pfandl, *Spanische Literaturgeschichte* (Leipzig 1923); R. Konetzke, *Süd- und Mittelamerika* (*Fischer-Weltgeschichte* 22) (Frankfurt am Main 1953).

ITALY: B. Croce, *A History of Italy, 1871–1915* (New York 1963); G. Candeloro, *Storia dell'Italia moderna* I (Milan 1956); F. Valsecchi, *L'Italia nel settecento dal 1714 al 1788* (Milan 1959).

GERMAN STATES AND SWITZERLAND: O. Brandt et al., *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* II: L. Just, *Der aufgeklärte Absolutismus* (Constance 1956); B. Gebhardt and H. Grundmann, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* II: M. Braubach, *Vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zur Französischen Revolution* (Stuttgart 1965); A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II.,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1963–65); H. Nabholz et al., *Geschichte der Schweiz* II: R. Feller, *Geschichte der Schweiz im 17. u. 18. Jh.* (1938); J. Lortz, *Reformation in Germany* (New York 1968).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND: G. N. Clark, ed., *Oxford History of England* X: G. N. Clark, *The Later Stuarts 1660–1714* (Oxford 1955); XI: B. Williams, *The Whig Supremacy 1714–1760* (Oxford 1962); XII: I. Steven Watson, *The Reign of George III 1760–1865* (Oxford 1960); W. E. H. Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,* 5 vols. (London 1892).

POLAND: H. Łowminański, *Historia Polski* I and II (Warsaw 1958–61); G. Rhode, *Kleine Geschichte Polens* (Darmstadt 1965).

RUSSIA: G. Stökl, *Russische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Stuttgart 1965).

THE ENLIGHTENMENT

P. Hazard, *La crise de la conscience Européenne. 1680–1715* (Paris 1935); P. Hazard, *La pensée Européenne aux XVIII^{e} siècle de Montesquieu à Lessing* (Paris 1946); F. Valjevec, *Geschichte der abendländischen Aufklärung* (Vienna and Munich 1961); R. Mousnier, E. Labrousse, and M. Bouloiseau, *Le XVIII^{e} siècle. 1715–1815. L'époque des "lumières"* (Paris 1967); E. Cassirer, *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment,* trans. by F. Koelln and J. Pettegrove (Boston 1955); W. Dilthey, *Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation* (=*Ges. Schr.* 2) (Göttingen 1960); W. Dilthey, *Selected Writings* (New York 1976); W. Dilthey, "Das 18. Jh. u. die geschichtliche Welt," *Deutsche Rundschau* (Aug./Sept. 1901) (=*Ges. Schr.* 3) (Göttingen 1959), 209–68; F. Meinecke, *Die Entstehung des Historismus* (Munich 1936, 1946); K. Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago 1949); B. Croce, *History. Its Theory and Practice,* trans. by D. Ainslie. Reprint of 1920 edition (New York 1979); H. v. Srbik, *Geist u. Geschichte vom deutschen Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* I (Munich and Salzburg 1950), 69–166; O. Zöckler, *Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen Theologie und Naturwissenschaft mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Schöpfungsgeschichte,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh 1877–79); W. Philipp, *Das Werden der Aufklärung in theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht* (Göttingen 1957); P. Gay, *The Enlightenment,* 2 vols. (New York 1966–69).

II. CHURCH HISTORY

1. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

J. H. Nichols, *History of Christianity (1650–1950)* (New York 1956); L. A. Veit, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* I *(1648–1800)* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1931); G. Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit* (Paderborn 1937); id., *Katholische Kirche und Kultur im 18. Jh.* (Paderborn 1941); A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église* 19, Parts 1 and 2: E. Préclin and E. Jarry, *Les luttes politiques et doctrinales aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles* (Paris 1955–56); K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Church History* III: *Recent and Modern Times* (New York 1970); J. Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung* II (Münster 1964); J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient* (Paris 1962); K. Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen 1960); K. D. Schmidt, *Grundriß der Kirchengeschichte* IV: *Geschichte der Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus und des Säkularismus* (Göttingen 1960); K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch:* 4, fasc. N, part 1: F. Heyer, *Die kath. Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum ersten Vatikanischen Konzil* (Göttingen 1963); R. Aubert, *The Church in a Secularized Society* 5: *The Christian Centuries* (New York 1969).

2. THE PAPACY

L. v. Ranke, *The History of the Popes during the Last Four Centuries* (London 1907); L. v. Pastor, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages* (St. Louis, Mo. 1938–61); F. X. Seppelt and G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte des Papsttums* V.: *Das Papsttum im Kampf mit Staatsabsolutismus und Aufklärung* (Munich 1959); M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates* (Gotha 1882); V. Mariani, *Le chiese di Roma dal XVII al XVIII secolo* (*Roma Christiana* 5) (Bologna 1963); L. Karttunen, *Les nonciatures apostoliques permanentes de 1650 à 1800* (Geneva 1912); E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1960–61); W. de Vries in collaboration with O. Bârlea, J. Gill, and M. Lacko, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens* (Freiburg and Munich 1963).

3. THE HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

A. Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* 3 vols. (Paris 1893–1903); P. B. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* III/2 (Regensburg 1862–79; reprint Graz 1956); V. Lafuente, *Historia eclesiástica de España* V and VI (Madrid 1875); B. N. Ward, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England 1781–1803,* 2 vols. (London 1909); D. Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation 1750–1829* (London 1928); P. Hughes, *The Catholic Question 1685–1929* (London 1929); R. Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts,* 3 vols. (London 1909–16); reprint London 1963); E. Tomek and H. Hantsch, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* III: *Die Zeit der Aufklärung und des Absolutismus* (Innsbruck 1959); H. E. Feine, *Die Besetzung der Reichsbistümer vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zur Säkularisation 1648–1803* (Amsterdam 1964).

4. THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

P. Brezzi, *Stato e Chiesa nell'Ottocento* (Turin 1964); H. Raab, *Kirche und Staat. Von der Mitte des 15. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1966); V. Martin, *Les origines du gallicanisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939); A. G. Martimort, *Le gallicanisme de Bossuet* (Paris 1953); M. F.

Miguélez, *Jansenismo y Regalismo en España* (Madrid 1895); Q. Aldea, *Iglesia y Estado en la España del siglo XVII* (Comillas 1961); J. Saarailh, *L'Espagne éclairée de la seconde moitié du XVIIIᵉ siècle* (Paris 1954); A. de la Hera, *El regalismo borbónico* (Madrid 1963); B. Duhr, *Pombal. Sein Charakter und seine Politik* (Freiburg 1891); C. Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège* (Paris 1894); J. Orcibal, *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI: les appels au futur concile de 1688 et l'opinion française* (Paris 1949).

5. CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALITY

P. Pourrat, *The Christian Spirituality* (Westminster, Md. 1953–55); J. Gautier, *La spiritualité catholique* (Paris 1953); L. Cognet, *De la Dévotion moderne à la spiritualité française* (Paris 1958); L. Cognet, *La spiritualité moderne* I: *L'essor, 1500–1650* (Paris 1966); H. Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France,* 11 vols; (Paris 1916–33). Especially Vol. IV: *L'École de Port-Royal* (Paris 1919); L. Prunel, *La Renaissance catholique en France au XVIIIᵉ siècle* (Paris 1921); G. Le Bras, *Introduction à l'histoire de la pratique religieuse en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942–45); H. Busson, *La pensée religieuse française de Charron à Pascal* (Paris 1933); H. Busson, *La religion des classiques 1660–1685* (Paris 1948); H. Gouhier, *La pensée religieuse de Descartes* (Paris 1924); É. Gilson, *La doctrine cartésienne de la liberté et la théologie* (Paris 1913); J. Mesnard, *Pascal, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1951); L. A. Veit and L. Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1956); W. Trapp, *Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung* (Regensburg 1940); C. Schreiber, *Aufklärung und Frömmigkeit. Die katholische Predigt im deutschen Aufklärungszeitalter* (Munich 1940).

6. JANSENISM

A. Gazier, *Histoire générale du mouvement janséniste,* 2 vols. (Paris 1924); J. Orcibal, *Les origines du Jansénisme,* 3 vols. (Louvain and Paris 1947–48); L. Cognet, *Le jansénisme* (Paris 1961); L. Ceyssens, *Jansenistica,* 4 vols. (Mechlin 1950–62); C. Gazier, *Histoire du monastère de Port-Royal* (Paris 1929); C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal* 3 vols. (Paris 1953–55); L. Cognet, *La réforme de Port-Royal* (Paris 1950); J. Laporte, *La doctrine de Port-Royal, la morale d'après Arnauld,* 2 vols. (Paris 1951–52); P. Jansen, *Le cardinal Mazarin et le mouvement janséniste* (Paris 1967); W. Deinhardt, *Der Jansenismus in deutschen Landen* (Munich 1929); A. C. Iemole, *Il Giansenismo in Italia prima della Rivoluzione* (Bari 1928); E. Dammig, *Il movimento giansenista a Roma* (Vatican City 1945); B. Van Kley, *The Jansenists and the Expulsion of the Jews from France 1757–1765* (New Haven 1975).

7. THE NON-ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES

E. Léonard, *A History of Protestantism* (London 1965); C. M. Schröder, ed., *Klassiker des Protestantismus* V: W. Zeller, *Der Protestantismus des 17. Jh.* (Bremen 1962); VII.: W. Philipp, *Das Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Bremen 1963); G. R. Cragg, *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason. A Study of Changes in Religious Thought within the Church of England 1600–1700* (Cambridge 1966); E. and E. Haag, *La France protestante,* 10 vols. (Paris 1846–59); J. Pannier, *L'Église réformée de France sous Louis XIII,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); J. Viénot, *Histoire de la Réforme française de l'édit de Nantes à sa révocation,* 2 vols. (Paris 1934); A. Aymon, *Actes ecclésiastiques et civils de tous les synodes nationaux des Églises réformées de France,* 2 vols. (The Hague 1710–56); P. Wernle, *Der schweizerische Protestantismus im 18. Jh.,* 3 vols. (1923–25); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los Heterodoxos españoles* VI and VII (Madrid 1930–33); C. W. Towlson, *Moravian and Methodist Relationships and Influence in the Eighteenth*

Century (London 1957); L. Bouyer, *Orthodox Spirituality and Protestant and Anglican Spirituality* (London 1969); J. T. Dorosh, *The Eastern Orthodox Church, a Bibliography of Publications Printed in the Roman Alphabet with Indication of Location* (Washington, D.C. 1946); D. T. Andrews, *The Eastern Orthodox Church, a Bibliography* (New York 1953); A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950; with biblio.); W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1951); D. Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1961–62); K. Onasch, *Grundzüge der russischen Kirchengeschichte: Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* III (Göttingen 1967), M 1 to M 122; J. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche 1700–1917* I (1964); J. Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum* (Würzburg 1953); A. S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* (London 1968); R. Janin, *Les églises orientales et les rites orientaux* (Paris 1955); W. Kantzenbach, *Protestantisches Christentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Gütersloh 1965).

8. ATTEMPTS AT ECCLESIASTIC REUNIFICATION

C. W. Hering, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche seit der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1836–38); R. Rouse and S. C. Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948* (Philadelphia 1954); J. Beumer, *Auf dem Wege zur christlichen Einheit. Vorläufer der ökumenischen Bewegung von den Anfängen des Humanismus bis zum Ende des 19. Jh. Ausgewählte Texte* (Bremen 1966); F. X. Kiefl, *Leibniz und die Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen* (1925).

9. THEOLOGY AND THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

J. Turmel, *Histoire de la théologie positive du concile de Trente au concil du Vatican* (Paris 1906); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg 1933), 179–212; H. Schuster, "Die Geschichte der Pastoraltheologie," *Hdb. der Pastoraltheologie* I (Freiburg 1964), 40–92; E. Hirsch, *Geschichte der neueren evangelischen Theologie,* 5 vols. (Gütersloh 1964); W. Nigg, *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung* (Munich 1934); E. C. Scherer, *Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten; Ihre Anfänge im Zeitalter des Humanismus und ihre Ausbildung zur selbständigen Disziplin* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1927); L. Scheffczyk, *F. L. Stolbergs "Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi." Die Abwendung der kath. Kirchengeschichtsschreibung von der Aufklärung . . .* (Munich 1952); P. Meinhold, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Historiographie,* 2 vols. (Freiburg and Munich 1967) (sources and presentation); A. Anwander, *Die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte im kath. Deutschland während der Aufklärung und der Romantik* (Salzburg 1932).

10. ICONOGRAPHY

H. Aurenhammer, *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie,* to date only Vol. I (Vienna 1967); E. Kirschbaum, *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie,* publ. Vols. I and II of *Allg. Ikonographie* (A–K) (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1969–70).

11. UNIVERSITIES AND ACADEMIES

L. E. Du Pin, *Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques du XVII^e siècle,* 7 vols. (Paris 1708); S. Stelling-Michaud, ed., *Les universités européennes du 14^e–18^e siècle* (Geneva 1967); C. Jourdain, *Histoire de l'université de Paris au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1862–66); P. Féret, *La faculté de Théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres, Époque moderne,* 7 vols. (Paris 1900–1916); G. Ajo and C. M. Sáinz de Zúñiga,

Historia de las Universidades hispánicas . . . III–IV (Madrid 1957–67); A. Kraus, *Vernunft und Geschichte. Die Bedeutung der Deutschen Akademien für die Entwicklung und Geschichtswissenschaft im späten 18. Jh.* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1963); H. Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius recentioris Theologiae catholicae,* 4 vols. (Innsbruck 1903–13).

12. MISSION

K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* III (New York 1940); S. Delacroix, *Histoire des Missions Catholiques* II (Paris 1957).

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One

The Leadership Position of France

SECTION ONE

Ecclesiastical Life in France

1. *Christian Renewal after 1615*

SOURCES

Richelieu, *Mémoires,* ed. by Delavaud-Gaucheron, 10 vols., Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris 1908–31); Saint Vincent de Paul, *Correspondance, entretiens, documents,* ed. by P. Coste, 14 vols. (Paris 1921–25); J. F. de Gondi, *Cardinal de Retz, Mémoires,* ed. by M. Allem (Paris 1956); P. de L'Estoile, *Mémoires-Journeaux,* ed. by Brunet-Champollion, 12 vols. (Paris 1875–76); P. de Bérulle, *Correspondance,* ed. by J. Dagens, 3 vols. (Louvain and Paris 1937–39); F. Garasse, *Histoire des jésuites de Paris pendant trois années, 1624–1626,* ed. by A. Carayon (Poitiers and Paris 1864); J. Godefroy, *Le Mercure jésuite,* 2 vols. (Geneva 1630–31); R. Arnauld d'Andilly, *Mémoires* (Hamburg 1734); P. Descourveaux, *La vie de M. Bourdoise* (Paris 1714); L. Abelly, *Vie du Vénérable Serviteur de Dieu Vincent de Paul* (Paris 1664); L. Batterel, *Mémoires domestiques pour servir à l'histoire de l'Oratoire,* ed. by A. Ingold and P. Bonnardet, 5 vols. (Paris 1902–11); G. Habert, *Vie du Cardinal de Bérulle* (Paris 1646); Saint Jean Eudes, *Œuvres complètes,* 12 vols. (Vannes 1905–11).

LITERATURE

BIBLIOGRAPHIES: R. Taveneaux, "La vie religieuse en France de l'avènement d'Henri IV à la mort de Louis XIV," *Histoire et Géographie* 200 (1961), 119–30; P. Chanu, "Le XVII^{e} siècle religieux, réflexions préalables," *Annales: Économies, sociétés, civilisations* 22 (1967), 279–302.

MONOGRAPHS: J. H. Mariéjol, *Henri IV, Louis XIII (1598–1643), Histoire de France de Lavisse* 2, 6 (Paris 1905); J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin with a Review of the Administration of Richelieu,* 2 vols. (London 1887); J. Pannier, *L'Église réformée de France sous Louis XIII,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); J. M. Prat, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur la Compagnie de Jésus en France au temps de P. Coton (1564–1626),* 5 vols. (Lyons 1876–78); F. T. Perrens, *L'Église et l'État en France sous le règne d'Henri IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis,* 2 vols. (Paris 1872); K. v. Raumer, *Heinrich IV v. Frankreich* (Iserlohn 1947); G. d'Avenel, *Richelieu et la monarchie absolue,* 4 vols. (Paris 1884–90); L. Batiffol, *Richelieu et Louis XIII* (Paris 1934); G. Hanotaux and Duc de la Force, *Histoire du Cardinal de*

Richelieu, 5 vols. (Paris 1893–1944); C. J. Burckhardt, *Richelieu* (Munich 1935); S. Skalweit, "Richelieus Machtidee," *Gesch. in Wiss. u. Unterricht* 2 (1951), 719–30; V. Tormetta, "La Politica del Mazzarino verso il Papato (1644–46)," *Archivo storico Italiano* 99 (1941) and 100 (1942); A. Sicard, *L'ancien clergé en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1893–1903); A. Degert, *Histoire des séminaires français,* 2 vols. (Paris 1912); M. Houssaye, I: *Monsieur de Bérulle et les Carmélites de France, 1575–1611* (Paris 1872); II: *Le Père de Bérulle et l'Oratoire de Jésus, 1611–1625* (Paris 1874); III: *Le Cardinal de Bérulle et le Cardinal de Richelieu, 1625–1629* (Paris 1875); J. Dagens, *Die Beziehungen Franz' v. Sales zu Kard. Bérulle* (Erlangen 1956); P. Coste, *Le grand saint du grand siècle, Monsieur Vincent,* 3 vols. (Paris 1932); G. Fagniez, "L'opinion publique et la presse politique sous Louis XIII," *Revue d'Histoire diplomatique* (1900); L. Prunel, *La Renaissance catholique en France au XVII^e siècle* (Paris 1921); O. Schneider, *Jean Eudes—Der Prophet des Herzens Jesu* (Vienna 1947).

2. *Origin and Development of Jansenism to 1653*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

L. Willaert, *Bibliotheca Janseniana Belgica,* 3 vols. (Namur and Paris 1949–51); A. Maire, *Bibliographie générale des œuvres de Blaise Pascal,* 3 vols. (Paris 1925–27); A. Malvault, *Répertoire alphabétique de Port-Royal* (Paris 1902).

SOURCES

C. Jansenius, *Augustinus* (Louvain 1640, Paris 1641, Rouen 1643, Frankfurt 1964); A. Arnauld, *Œuvres,* 43 vols. (Paris and Lausanne 1775–83); F. Pinthereau, *La naissance du jansénisme découverte* (Louvain 1645); idem., *Nouvelles et anciennes reliques de l'abbeé de Saint-Cyran* (n.p., 1648); id., *Le progrès du jansénisme découvert* (Avignon 1655); id., *Reliques de l'abbé de Saint-Cyran* (Louvain 1646); *L'Histoire de Jansénius et de Saint-Cyran* (n.p., 1695); R. Rapin, *Histoire du jansénisme depuis son origine jusqu'en 1644,* ed. by Domenech (Paris 1861); R. Rapin, *Mémoires,* 3 vols. ed. by L. Aubineau (Paris 1865); G. Gerberon, *Histoire générale du jansénisme,* 3 vols. (Amsterdam 1700); H. Dumas, *Histoire des cinq propositions de Jansénius* Liège 1700); H. Robillard d'Avrigny, *Mémoires chronologiques et dogmatiques,* 4 vols. (n.p., 1723); D. de Colonia and L. Patouillet, *Dictionnaire des livres jansénistes,* 4 vols. (Antwerp 1752); Saint-Cyran, *Œuvres chrétiennes et spirituelles,* 4 vols. (Lyons 1675–79); id., *Lettres chrétiennes et spirituelles,* 2 vols. (n.p., 1744); R. Arnauld d'Andilly, *Mémoires* (Hamburg 1734); id., *Lettres* (Paris 1680); id., *Journal,* ed. by A. and E. Halphen, 6 vols. (Paris 1857–1909); C. Lancelot, *Mémoires touchant la vie de M. de Saint-Cyran,* 2 vols. (Cologne 1738); Angélique Arnauld, *Lettres,* 3 vols. (Utrecht 1742–44); Agnès Arnauld, *Lettres,* 2 vols. (Paris 1858); *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Port-Royal,* 3 vols. (Utrecht 1742); G. Hermant, *Mémoires sur l'histoire ecclésiastique du XVII^e siècle,* ed. by A. Gazier, 6 vols. (Paris 1905–10); J. Bourgeois, *Relation sur la défense de la Fréquente communion* (n.p., 1695); L. Gorin de Saint-Amour, *Journal* (n.p., 1662); C. Clémencet, *Histoire générale de Port-Royal,* 10 vols. (Amsterdam 1755–57); J. Besoigne, *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal,* 6 vols. (Cologne 1752–53); P. Guilbert, *Mémoires historiques et chronologiques sur l'Abbaye de Port-Royal,* 9 vols. (Utrecht 1755–58); *Recueil historique des bulles concernant les erreurs de ces deux derniers siècles* (Mons 1704); C. Duplessis d'Argentré. *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus,* 3 vols. (Paris 1728–36); L. E. Dupin, *Histoire ecclésiastique du XVII^e siècle,* 5 vols. (Paris 1714); L.

Ceyssens, *La correspondance antijanséniste de Fabio Chigi* (Rome and Brussels 1957); id., *Sources relatives au début du jansénisme et de l'antijansénisme* (Louvain 1957); id., *La première bulle contre Jansénius, sources relatives à son histoire,* 2 vols. (Rome and Brussels 1961–62); J. Orcibal, *La correspondance de Jansénius* (Louvain and Paris 1947); id., *La spiritualité de Saint-Cyran avec ses textes de piété inédits* (Paris 1962); A. Barnes, *Lettres inédites de Saint-Cyran* (Paris 1962); A. Cauchie and R. Maere, *Recueil des instructions générales aux Nonces de Flandre (1596–1635)* (Brussels 1904); L. Goldmann, *Correspondance de Martin de Barcos* (Paris 1956).

LITERATURE

Pastor XIII/2, XIV/1 and 2; A. de Meyer, *Les premières controverses jansénistes en France* (Louvain 1919); N. Abercombie, *The Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford 1936); L. Willaert, *Les origines du jansénisme dans les Pays-Bas catholiques* (Paris 1948); A. Gazier, *Histoire générale du mouvement janséniste,* 2 vols. (Paris 1922); C. Gazier, *Histoire du monastère de Port-Royal* (Paris 1929); M. Krüger, *Die Entwicklung . . . des Nonnenklosters Port-Royal im 17. Jh.* (Halle 1936); X. Le Bachelet, *Prédestination et grâce efficace, controverses dans la Compagnie de Jésus au temps d'Aquaviva* (Louvain 1931); H. de Lubac, *Surnaturel* (Paris 1946); C. van Sull, *L. Lessius de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Louvain 1930); W. Haermann, *The Doctrine of L. Lessius on Mortal Sin* (San Francisco 1947); J. Paquier, *Qu'est-ce que le jansénisme?* (Paris 1909); L. Cognet, *Le jansénisme* (Paris 1961); H. Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France* IV: *L'École de Port-Royal* (Paris 1919); P. Schneider, *Saint-Cyran u. Augustinus im Kulturkreis von Port-Royal* (Berlin 1932); J. Orcibal, *Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, abbé de Saint-Cyran, et son temps,* 2 vols. (Paris 1947–48); id., *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme* (Paris 1961); J. Laporte, *La doctrine de Port-Royal* I: *Saint-Cyran,* II: *Les vérités de la grâce,* 2 vols. (Paris 1923); P. Féret, *La Faculté de Théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres, Époque moderne,* 7 vols. (Paris 1900–1916); L. Ceyssens, *Jansenistica,* 4 vols. (Mechelen 1950–62); L. Ceyssens et al., *Miscellanea jansenistica* (Louvain 1963); R. Allier, *La cabale des dévots* (Paris 1902); H. Busson, *La pensée relieuse française de Charron à Pascal* (Paris 1933); E. Wasmuth, *Die Philosophie Pascals* (Heidelberg 1949); R. Guardini, *Christl. Bewußtsein* [on Pascal] (Munich 1954); C. Cochin, *Henry Arnauld* (Paris 1921); A. Douarche, *L'Université de Paris et les jésuites* (Paris 1888); J. Frencken, *Agnès Arnauld* (Nijmegen and Utrecht 1932); P. Varin, *La vérité sur les Arnauld complétée à l'aide de leur correspondance inédite* (Paris 1847); C.-A. Sainte Beuve, *Port-Royal,* 3 vols. (Paris 1953–55).

3. *The Jansenist Conflict to 1713*

SOURCES

E. Deschamps, *De haeresi janseniana* (Paris 1728); B. Pascal, *Œuvres,* ed. by L. Brunschvicg, F. Boutroux and F. Gazier, 14 vols. (Paris 1904–14); B. Pascal, *Les Provinçiales,* ed. by L. Cognet (Paris 1965); C. Goujet, *Vie de M. Nicole* (Liège 1767); N. de Larrière, *Vie de Messire Antoine Arnauld* (Paris and Lausanne 1783); V. Cousin, *Jacqueline Pascal* (Paris 1878); P. Thomas du Fossé, *Mémoires,* 4 vols. (Rouen 1876–79); N. Fontaine, *Mémoires,* 2 vols. (Utrecht 1736); *Recueil de plusieurs pièces pour servir à l'histoire de Port-Royal* (Utrecht 1740); P. Nicole, *Lettres sur l'hérésie imaginaire,* 2 vols. (Liège 1667); id., *Lettres et Nouvelles lettres,* 3 vols. (Paris 1755–67); id., *Apologie de M. Nicole écrite par lui-même* (Amsterdam 1734); M. Feydeau, *Mémoires inédits,* ed. by E. Jovy (Vitry-le François 1905); J. Besoigne, *Vie des quatre évêques engagés dans la cause de*

Port-Royal, 2 vols. (Cologne 1756); G. Patin, *Lettres,* ed. by J.-H. Réveillé-Parise, 3 vols. (Paris 1846); Saint-Simon, *Mémoires,* ed. by A. de Boislisle, 41 vols. (Paris 1879–1928); Sourches, *Mémoires,* 13 vols. (Paris 1882–93); L. Ceyssens, *La fin de la première période du jansénisme, sources des années 1654–1660* (Brussels and Rome 1963); Angélique de Saint-Jean Arnauld d'Andilly, *Relation de captivité,* ed. by L. Cognet (Paris 1954); *Histoire des persécutions des religieuses de Port-Royal écrites par elles-mêmes* (Villefranche 1753); *Journaux de ce qui s'est passé à Port-Royal depuis que la communauté fut transférée à Port-Royal des Champs jusqu'en 1669* (n.p., 1724); P. Quesnel, *Correspondance,* ed. by Mme A. Le Roy, 2 vols. (Paris 1900); id., *La Paix de Clément IX,* 2 vols. (Chambéry 1700); id. *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de M. Arnauld* (Liège 1697); J. A. G. Tans, *Pasquier Quesnel et les Pays-Bas* (Groningen and Paris 1960); A. Varet, *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'Église,* 2 vols. (n.p., 1706); Dom Rivet de la Grange, *Nécrologe de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal* (Amsterdam 1723); C. Le Febvre de Saint Marc *Supplément au nécrologe de Port-Royal* (n.p., 1735); Louail, Fouillou, and Joncoux, *Histoire abrégée du Jansénisme* (Cologne 1697); id., *Histoire du cas de conscience,* 8 vols. (Nancy 1705–11); J. Fouillou, *Mémoire sur la destruction de Port-Royal des Champs* (n.p., 1711); F. Guelphe, *Relation de la retraite de M. Arnauld dans les Pays-Bas en 1679* (Mons 1733); N. Pinault, *Histoire abrégée de la dernière persécution de Port-Royal,* 3 vols. (n.p., 1750); J. Racine, *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port-Royal,* ed. by A. Gazier (Paris 1908); *Recueil de pièces qui n'ont pas encore paru sur le formulaire* (Avignon 1754); *Vies intéressantes et édifiantes des religieuses de Port-Royal,* 4 vols. (n.p., 1750–52); *Histoire de la sortie du P. Quesnel des prisons de l'archevêché de Malines* (n.p., 1743); G. Vuillart, *Lettres à M. de Préfontaine,* ed. by R. Clark (Geneva and Lille 1951); Fénelon, *Œuvres complètes,* 10 vols. (Paris 1851–52); Bossuet, *Œuvres complètes,* 31 vols. (Paris 1862–66); id., *Correspondance,* ed. by C. Urbain and E. Levesque, 15 vols. (Paris 1909–25).

LITERATURE

A. Chéruel, *Histoire de France sous le ministère de Mazarin (1651–61),* 3 vols. (Paris 1882); L. E. Du Pin, *Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques du XVII^{e} siècles,* 7 vols. (Paris 1708); A. Gits, *La foi ecclésiastique aux faits dogmatiques dans la théologie moderne* (Louvain 1940); J. Laporte, *La doctrine de Port-Royal, la morale d'après Arnauld,* 2 vols. (Paris 1951–52); J. Mesnard, *Pascal, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1951); id., *Pascal et les Roannez,* 2 vols. (Paris 1965); L. Goldmann, *Le Dieu caché* (Paris 1965); J. Orcibal, *Port-Royal entre le miracle et l'obéissance: Flavie Passart et Angélique de Saint-Jean* (Paris 1967); P. Jansen, *Le cardinal Mazarin et le mouvement janséniste* (Paris 1967); P. Blet, *Le clergé de France et la monarchie, étude sur les assemblées générales du clergé de 1651 à 1666,* 2 vols. (Rome 1959); J. Bourlon, *Les Asssemblées du Clergé et le jansénisme* (Paris 1909); A. Gazier, *Les dernières années du Cardinal de Retz (1655–1679)* (Paris 1875); G. Namer, *L'abbé Le Roy et ses amis, essai sur le jansénisme extrémiste intramondain* (Paris 1964); A. Le Roy, *Le gallicanisme au XVIII^{e} siècle, la France et Rome de 1700 à 1715* (Paris 1892); G. Delassault, *Le Maistre de Sacy et son temps* (Paris 1957); L. Cognet, *Claude Lancelot Solitaire de Port-Royal* (Paris 1951); P. Chételat, *Étude sur Du Guet* (Paris 1879); E. Dejean, *Un prélat indépendant au XVII^{e} siècle Nicolas Pavillon évêque d'Alet* (Paris 1909); R. Traveneaux, *Le jansénisme en Lorraine* (Paris 1960); B. Neveu, *Sébastien-Joseph du Cambout de Pontchâteau et ses missions à Rome* (Paris 1969); id., *Un historien à l'école de Port-Royal, Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont* (The Hague 1966); A. Janssen, *Un polémiste antijanséniste, le P. Annat: Mélanges C. Moeller* (Louvain and Paris 1914); R. Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners at Port-Royal* (Cambridge 1932); P. Hoffer, *La dévotion à Marie au déclin du XVII^{e} siècle* (Juvisy 1938); P. Blet, *Les Assemblées du Clergé et Louis XIV de*

1670 à 1693 [Analecta Gregoriana, Cura Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae edita, Vol. 189. Series Facultatis Historiae Ecclesiasticae: sectio A, n. 11] (Rome 1972).

4. *Gallicanism and Protestantism*

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Bourgeois and L. André, *Les sources de l'histoire de France,* Part 3: *le XVII^e siècle, 1610–1715,* 6 vols. (Paris 1913–24).

GALLICANISM

SOURCES: *Joannis Gersonii et cancellarii Parisiensis opera,* ed. by E. Richer, 2 vols. (Paris 1606); E. Richer, *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate libellus* (Paris 1611); id., *Histoire du Syndicat d'Edmond Richer* (n.p., 1753); S. Vigor, *Opera omnia* (Paris 1683); C. de Montchal, *Mémoires,* 2 vols. (Rotterdam 1718); P. Lemerre and A. Dorsanne, *Recueil des actes titres et mémoires concernant les affaires du Clergé de France,* 15 vols. (Paris 1716–52); A. Duranthon, *Collection des procès-verbaux des Assemblées générales du Clergé de France depuis 1560 jusqu'à présent,* 9 vols. (Paris 1767–78); P. Pithou, *Les libertés de l'Église gallicane* (Paris 1594); J. Boileau, *Recueil de diverses pièces concernant les censures de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris sur la hiérarchie de l'Église et sur la morale chrétienne* (Münster 1666); *Recueil des indults accordés au roi par les papes Alexandre VII et Clément IX pour la disposition des bénéfices consistoriaux et autres* (Paris 1670); A. Leman, *Recueil des instructions générales aux nonces ordinaires de France de 1624 à 1634* (Lille and Paris 1920); G. Hanotaux, *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs et ministres de France depuis les traités de Westphalie jusqu'à Révolution,* 2 vols. (Paris 1888–1911); J. B. Bossuet, *Correspondance,* ed. by C. Urbain and E. Levesque, 15 vols. (Paris 1909–25); id. *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by F. Lachat, 31 vols. (Paris 1863–67); J. J. Berthier, *Innocentii pp. XI epistolae ad principes,* 2 vols. (Rome 1890–95); L. E. du Pin, *Histoire ecclésiastique du XVII^e siècle,* 4 vols. (Paris 1714); G. Hermant, *Mémoires sur l'histoire ecclésiastique du XVII^e siècle,* ed. by A. Gazier, 6 vols. (Paris 1905–10); E. le Camus, *Lettres,* ed. by A. Ingold (Paris 1892) L. Legendre, *Mémoires,* ed. by M. Roux (Paris 1863); P. Pellisson, *Histoire de Louis XIV,* 3 vols. (Paris 1749); N. S. Arnauld marquis de Pomponne, *Mémoires,* ed. by J. Mavidal, 2 vols. (Paris 1868); L. Delavaud, *Le marquis de Pomponne* (Paris 1911); R. Rapin, *Mémoires,* ed. by L. Aubineau, 3 vols. (Paris 1865); L. Mention, *Documents relatifs aux rapports du clergé avec la royauté de 1682 a 1705,* 2 vols. (Paris 1893–1903).

LITERATURE: A. G. Martimort, *Le gallicanisme de Bossuet* (Paris 1953); V. Martin, *Les origines du gallicanisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939); id., *Le gallicanisme et la réforme catholique. Essai historique sur l'introduction en France des décrets du Concile de Trente* (Paris 1919); id., *Le gallicanisme politique et le Clergé de France* (Paris 1928); J. Orcibal, *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI: les appels au futur concile de 1688 et l'opinion française* (Paris 1949); L. Dedouvres, *Le P. Joseph de Paris, capucin,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); A. Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France,* 3 vols. (Paris 1893–1903); C. Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège* (Paris 1894); id., *Recherches historiques sur l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de 1682* (Paris 1869); M. Dubruel, *En plein conflit, la nonciature de France, la Secrétairerie d'État du Vatican, les Congrégations des affaires de France pendant la querelle de la Régale* (Paris 1927); M. d'Angelo, *Luigi XIV e la Santa Sede* (Rome 1914); F. de Bojani, *Innocent XI, sa correspondance avec ses nonces,* 3 vols. (Rome 1910–12); J. T. Loyson, *L'assemblée du Clergé de France de 1682* (Paris 1870); M. Immich, *Papst Innocenz XI.* (Berlin 1900); C. Bellet, *Histoire du Cardinal Le Camus* (Paris 1886); L. André, *M. Le Tellier et Louvois* (Paris 1942); E. Dejean, *Un prélat indépendant au XVII^e siècle, Nicolas Pavillon* (Paris 1909); M. Lauras, *Nouveaux éclaircisse-*

ments sur l'Assemblée de 1682 (Paris 1878); L. Madelin, *France et Rome* (Paris 1913); E. Michaud, *Louis XIV et Innocent XI d'apres les correspondances inédites du ministère des Affaires étrangères,* 4 vols. (Paris 1883); J. M. Vidal, *François-Étienne de Caulet, évêque de Pamiers* (Paris 1939); id., *Jean Cerle et le schisme de la régale au diocèse de Pamiers* (Paris 1938); J. Tans, *Bossuet en Hollande* (Paris 1949).

PROTESTANTISM

SOURCES: L. Pilatte, *Édits, déclarations et arrêts concernant la religion protestante réformée* (Paris 1885); A. Aymon, *Actes ecclésiastiques et civils de tous les synodes nationaux des Églises réformées de France* 2 vols. (The Hague 1710–1756); I. d'Huisseau, *La discipline des Églises réformées de France* (Orléans 1675); E. Benoist, *Histoire de l'Édit de Nantes,* 5 vols. (Delft 1693–95); P. Soulier, *Histoire du Calvinisme* (Paris 1686); P. Meynier, *De l'exécution de l'Édit de Nantes* (Pézenas 1662); P. Bernard, *Explication de l'Édit de Nantes par les autres édits de pacification et arrêts de règlement* (Paris 1666); C. Brousson, *L'état des réformés en France,* 3 vols. (Cologne 1684); J. Lefevre, *Recueil de ce qui s'est fait en France de plus considérable pour et contre les protestants depuis la révocation de l'Édit de Nantes* (Paris 1686); R. Isambert, *Recueil des édits, déclarations et arrêts du Conseil rendus au sujet des gens de la religion prétendue réformée* (Paris 1714); R. Allier, *Anthologie protestante française,* 2 vols. (Paris 1920).

LITERATURE: J. Viénot, *Histoire de la Réforme française de l'édit de Nantes à sa révocation,* 2 vols. (Paris 1934); D. Bourchenin, *Étude sur les Académies protestantes en France aux XVI^{e} et XVII^{e} siècles* (Paris 1882); E. Léonard, *Histoire du protestantisme* (Paris 1950); A. Rébelliau, *Bossuet historien du protestantisme* (Paris 1909); P. Hazard, *La crise de la conscience européenne,* 2 vols. (Paris 1934); E. and E. Haag, *La France protestante,* 10 vols. (Paris 1846–59); J. Chambon, *Der franz. Protestantismus* (Munich 1948); J. Pannier, *L'Église réformée de Paris sous Louis XIII,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932); A. Paul, *L'unité chrétienne, schismes et rapprochements* (Paris 1930); L. O'Brien, *Innocent XI and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (Berkeley 1930); O. Douen, *La révocation de l'Édit de Nantes à Paris,* 3 vols. (Paris 1894); id., *L'intolérance de Fénelon* (Paris 1875); J. Dedieu, *Le rôle politique des protestants français 1685–1715* (Paris 1920); R. Nürnberger, *Die Politisierung des franz. Protestantismus* (Tübingen 1948); C. Weiss, *Histoire des réfugiés français protestants de France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1853); F. Puaux and A. Sabatier, *Études sur la révocation de l'Édit de Nantes* (Paris 1886); E. Guitard, *Colbert et Seignelay contre la religion réformée* (Paris 1912); E. Léonard, *Problèmes et expériences du protestantisme français* (Paris 1940); L. Bourlon, *Les Assemblées du Clergé et le protestantisme* (Paris 1909); J. Orcibal, *Louis XIV et les protestants* (Paris 1951); id. *État présent des recherches sur la répartition géographique des Nouveaux catholiques à la fin du XVII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1948).

5. *Spirituality in Seventeenth-Century France*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: H. Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France,* 11 vols. (Paris 1916–33); P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* 4 vols. (Paris 1926–28); J. Gautier, *La spiritualité catholique* (Paris 1953); L. Cognet, *La spiritualité moderne,* I: *L'essor, 1500–1650* (Paris 1966); id., *De la Dévotion moderne à la spiritualité française* (Paris 1958); Daniel-Rops, *L'Église des temps classiques,* 2 vols. (Paris 1958); D. Poinsenet, *La France* *religieuse au XVII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1954); R. Bady, *L'homme et son "institution" de Montaigne à Bérulle* (Paris 1964).

Canfield: Optat de Veghel, *Benoît de Canfield, sa vie, sa doctrine et son influence* (Rome 1949); P. Renaudin, *Benoît de Canfield* (Paris 1955); J. Orcibal, *La rencontre du Carmel thérésien avec les mystiques du Nord* (Paris 1959).

Francis de Sales: V. Brasier, E. Morganti, and M. Durica, *Bibliographia salesiana* (Turin 1956); E. Lajeunie, *Saint François de Sales,* 2 vols. (Paris 1966); H. Bremond, *Sainte Chantal* (Paris 1912); E. Stopp, *Mme de Chantal* (London 1962); G. Thomas, *Sainte Chantal et la spiritualité salesienne* (Paris 1963); F. Boulas, *Un ami de s. François de Sales, Camus, évêque de Belley* (Lyons 1878); F. Eggersdorfer, *Die Aszetik des hl. Franz v. Sales* (Munich 1909); M. Müller, *Die Freundschaft des hl. Franz v. Sales mit der hl. Franziska v. Chantal* (Munich 1923); J. Martin, *Die Theologie des hl. Franz v. Sales* (Rottenburg 1934).

Bérulle and His Followers: A. Ingold, *Essai de bibliographie oratorienne* (Farnborough 1968); J. Dagens, *Bérulle et les origines de la restauration catholique* (Paris 1952); P. Cochois, *Bérulle et l'École française* (Paris 1963); M. Dupuy, *Bérulle, une spiritualité de l'adoration* (Paris 1964); J. Orcibal, *Le cardinal de Bérulle, évolution d'une spiritualité* (Paris 1965); R. Bellemare, *Le sens de la créature dans la doctrine de Bérulle* (Paris 1949); C. de Condren, *Lettres,* ed. by P. Auvray and A. Jouffrey (Paris 1943); J. Galy, *Le sacrifice dans l'École française de spiritualité* (Paris 1951); L. Bertrand, *Bibliothèque sulpicienne ou histoire littéraire de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice,* 3 vols. (Paris 1900); J. J. Olier, *Lettres,* ed. by E. Levesque, 2 vols. (Paris 1935); P. Michallon, *La communion aux mystères de Jésus-Christ selon J. J. Olier* (Lyons 1943); D. Boulay, *Vie de vénérable Jean Eudes,* 4 vols. (Paris 1905–8); C. Lebrun, *La spiritualité de saint Jean Eudes* (Paris 1932); L. Tronson, *Correspondance,* ed. by L. Bertrand, 3 vols. (Paris 1904).

Vincent de Paul: Saint Vincent de Paul, *Entretiens aux missionnaires,* ed. by A. Dodin (Paris 1960); L. Cognet, *Saint Vincent de Paul* (Paris 1959); A. Dodin, *Saint Vincent de Paul et la charité* (Paris 1960); D. Poinsenet, *Sainte Louise de Marillac* (Paris 1958); H. Kühner, *Vinzenz v. Paul* (Cologne 1963).

Jesuits: A. Pottier, *Le P. Louis Lallemant et les grands spirituels de son temps,* 3 vols. (Paris 1927–29); id., *Le P. Pierre Champion* (Paris 1938); C. de Rochemonteix, *N. Caussin, confesseur de Louis XIII et le Cardinal de Richelieu* (Paris 1911); P. Guitton, *Claude de la Colombière* (Paris 1943).

Bossuet, Fénelon and Quietism: J. Calvet, *Bossuet, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1941); J. Truchet, *La prédication de Bossuet,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960); T. Goyet, *L'humanisme de Bossuet,* 2 vols. (Paris 1965); E. Carcassonne, *État présent des travaux sur Fénelon* (Paris 1939); id., *Fénelon, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1946); F. Varillon, *Fénelon et le Pur amour* (Paris 1957); J. L. Goré, *L'itinéraire de Fénelon, humanisme et spiritualité* (Paris 1957); id., *La notion d'indifférence chez Fénelon et ses sources* (Paris 1956); H. Bremond, *Apologie pour Fénelon* (Paris 1910); B. V. Kostsull, *Fénelon* (Munich 1950); R. Schmittlein, *L'aspect politique du différend Bossuet-Fénelon* (Baden-Baden 1954); L. Cognet, *Crépuscule des Mystiques* (Paris and Tournai 1958); P. Zovatto, *La polemica Bossuet-Fénelon, introduzione critico-bibliografica* (Padua 1968); H. Hillenaar, *Fénelon et les jésuites* (The Hague 1967); A. de la Gorce, *Le vrai visage de Fénelon* (Paris 1958); J. Kraus and J. Calvet, eds. *Fénelon, Persönlichkeit und Werk* (Baden-Baden 1953).

Miscellaneous: On Saint John-Baptist de la Salle see the comprehensive documents in *Cahiers lasalliens,* 30 vols. (Rome 1959–69); P. Renaudin, *Marie de l'Incarnation, essai*

de psychologie religieuse (Paris 1935); R. Daeschler, *La spiritualité de Bourdaloue, grâce et vie unitive* (Louvain 1927).

6. *Christian Thought in Seventeenth-Century France*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

H. Hurter, *Nomenclator litterarius recentioris Theologiae catholicae,* 4 vols. (Innsbruck 1903–13); A. Maire, *Bibliographie générale des œuvres de Blaise Pascal,* 5 vols. (Paris 1925–27).

SOURCES

P. de Gamaches, *Summa theologica,* 3 vols. (Paris 1627); M. Isambert, *Disputationes in secundam secundae s. Thomae* (Paris 1648); A. Duval, *Commentarii in secundam secundae partis summae d. Thomae* (Paris 1636); M. Grandin, *Opera theologica,* 6 vols. (Paris 1710–12); R. Tassin, *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Paris 1770); F. Lecerf de la Viéville, *Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (The Hague 1726); M. Valéry, *Correspondance inédite de Mabillon et de Montfaucon avec l'Italie,* 3 vols. (Paris 1846); J. Martène, *Histoire de la congrégation de Saint-Maur,* ed. by Charvin, 10 vols. (Ligugé 1923–54); C. Cloyseault, *Recueil des vies de quelques prêtres de l'Oratoire,* 3 vols. (Paris 1882–83); R. Simon, *Bibliothèque critique ou recueil de diverses pièces critiques,* ed. by M. de Sainjore, 4 vols. (Amsterdam 1708–10); id., *Lettres choisies,* 3 vols. (Amsterdam 1702–5); J. P. Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres dans la république des lettres,* 43 vols. (Paris 1727–45); C. Goujet, *Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques du XVII*ᵉ *siècle pour servir de continuation à celle de M. Du Pin,* 3 vols. (Paris 1736); B. d'Argonne, *Mélanges d'histoire et de littérature,* compiled by M. de Vigneul-Marville, 3 vols. (Paris 1701); J. Lelong, *Bibliothèque historique de la France,* 5 vols. (Paris 1768–78); R. Descartes, *Œuvres,* ed. by C. Adam and P. Tannery, 11 vols. (Paris 1897–1913); id., *Correspondance,* ed. by C. Adam and G. Milhaud, 8 vols. to date (Paris 1936ff.); B. Pascal, *Pensées sur la religion et sur quelques autres sujets,* ed. by L. Lafuma, 3 vols. (Paris 1951); N. Malebranche, *Œuvres complètes,* ed. by A. Robinet et al., 20 vols. (Paris 1958–67).

LITERATURE

P. Hazard, *La crise de la conscience européenne 1680–1715,* 3 vols. (Paris 1935); H. Busson, *La pensée religieuse française de Charron à Pascal* (Paris 1933); id., *La religion des classiques 1660–1685* (Paris 1948); É. Gilson, *La doctrine cartésienne de la liberté et la théologie* (Paris 1913); J. Turmel, *Histoire de la théologie positive du concile de Trente au concile du Vatican* (Paris 1906); A. Humbert, *Les origines de la théologie moderne,* I: *La renaissance de l'antiquité chrétienne 1450–1521* (Paris 1911); C. Jourdain, *Histoire de l'université de Paris au XVII*ᵉ *et au XVIII*ᵉ *siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1862–66); A. Douarche, *L'université de Paris et les jésuites* (Paris 1888); R. Pintard, *Le libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVII*ᵉ *siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1943); R. Snoeks, *L'argument de tradition dans la controverse eucharistique entre catholiques et réformés français au XVII*ᵉ *siècle* (Louvain 1951); P. Mesnard, *L'essor de la philosophie politique au XVII*ᵉ *siècle* (Paris 1936); F. Bouillier, *Histoire de la philosophie cartésienne,* 2 vols. (Paris and Lyons 1854); H. Gouhier, *La pensée religieuse de Descartes* (Paris 1924); id., *La philosophie religieuse de Malebranche et son expérience religieuse* (Paris 1926); J. Mesnard, *Pascal, l'homme et l'œuvre* (Paris 1951); id., *Pascal et les Roannez,* 2 vols. (Paris 1965); L. Lafuma, *Histoire des Pensées de Pascal* (Paris 1954).

SECTION TWO

The Papacy in the Period of French Hegemony

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE HISTORY OF THE POPES

F. Bartolotti, *La medaglia annuale dei Romani Pontefici da Paolo V a Paolo VI, 1605–1967* (Rimini 1967); K. J. Beloch, *Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens,* II. *Die Bevölkerung des Kirchenstaates, Toscanas und der Herzogtümer am Po* (Berlin 1965); M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates* (Gotha 1882); *Bullarum, Privilegiorum ac Diplomatum Romanorum Pontificum amplissima collectio, opera et studio Caroli Cocquelines* VI, 4ff. (Rome 1761); *Bullarii Romani Continuatio,* ed. by A. Barberi and A. Spetia (Rome 1835ff.); *Bullarum, Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis* 16ff. (Turin 1869ff.); A. Ciaconis, A. Oldoini, and M. Guarnacci, *Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium* (Rome 1751); *Collectio Lacensis: Acta et Decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum* I (Freiburg 1870); *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* Iff. (Rome 1960); I. v. Döllinger and F. H. Reusch, *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten seit dem 16. Jh.,* 2 vols. (Munich 1889; reprint Aalen 1968); A. P. Frutaz, *Le piante di Roma,* 3 vols. (Rome 1962); A. Haidacher, *Geschichte der Päpste in Bildern* (Heidelberg 1965); F. Heyer, *Die kath. Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum ersten Vatikanischen Konzil* (= *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch,* von K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf 4, Fasc. N, part 1) (Göttingen 1963); *Hierarchia catholica medii et recentioris aevi,* ed. by P. Gauchat, Ritzler, and Sefrin, IV–VI (Münster and Padua 1935–58); C. Hollis, *The Papacy, an Illustrated History from St. Peter to Paul VI* (London 1964), contains valuable illustrations; *Istituzioni finanziarie, contabili e di controllo dello Stato Pontificio dalle origini al 1870,* ed. by the Ministero del Tesoro (Rome 1961); L. Karttunen, *Les nonciatures apostoliques permanentes de 1650 à 1800* (Geneva 1912); A. Kraus, "Secretarius und Sekretariat. Der Ursprung der Institution des Staatssekretariats und ihr Einfluß auf die Entwicklung moderner Regierungsformen in Europa," *RQ* 55 (1961), 43–84; Mansi; V. Mariani, *Le chiese di Roma dal XVII al XVIII secolo* (*Roma Christiana* 5) (Bologna 1963); L. v. Matt and H. Kühner, *Die Päpste. Eine Papstgeschichte in Bild und Wort* (Würzburg 1963), excellent collection of portraits of Popes; A. Mercati, *Raccolta di concordati* (Rome 1919); C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus* (Tübingen 1934) (of the new expanded edition only Vol. 1 of 2 vols has appeared); V. Monachino, ed., *La carità cristiana a Roma* (*Roma Christiana* 10) (Bologna 1967); G. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica* (Venice 1840–61); R. and F. Silezi, *500 pasquinate* (Milan 1932); Pastor XIV/1–XVI/2; H. Raab, *Kirche und Staat von der Mitte des 15. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1966); L. v. Ranke, *Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten* (*Werke,* Vols 37–39, newly edited by F. Baethgen, 1953); A. v. Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom* III (Berlin 1870); F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn 1883–85); L. J. Rogier, *Siècle des Lumières, Révolutions, Restauration* (*1715–1848*) (Paris 1966); G. Schreiber," Das päpstliche Staatssekretariat," *HJ* 79 (1960), 175–98; F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte des Papsttums,* V: *Das Papsttum im Kampf mit Staatsabsolutismus und Aufklärung* (Munich 1959); L. Wahrmund, *Das Ausschließungsrecht der katholischen Staaten . . . bei den Papstwahlen* (Vienna 1888); K. Walf, *Die Entwicklund des päpstlichen Gesandtschaftswesens in dem Zeitabschnitt zwischen Dekretalenrecht und Wiener Kongreß* (Munich 1966); M. Dell'Arco, *Pasquino statua parlante* (Rome 1967); R. A. Graham, *Vatican Diplomacy, A Study of Church and State on the International Plane* (Princeton, N.J. 1959).

7. *The Popes from Alexander VII to Clement X*

LITERATURE

ALEXANDER VII: *BullRom Cocq.* VI 4; VI 5; VI6, 1–161; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XVI, XVII 1–511; *Hierarchia Catholica* IV, 32–35; *D,* 447–55; V. Kybal and G. Incisa della Rocchetta, *La nunziatura di Fabio Chigi* (*1640–51*) (Rome 1943); *La correspondance antijanséniste de Fabio Chigi, nonce à Cologne, plus tard Alexandre VII,* ed. by A. Legrand and L. Ceyssens (Rome 1957); S. Pallavicino, *La vita di Alessandro VII* (new edition) (Prato 1939–40); Ciaconius IV, 707–78; Pastor XIV/1, 301–524; Seppelt V, 322–34; P. Richard: *DHGE* II, 229–44; K. Repgen in *LThK* I, 318; M. Rosa in *Dizionario Biogr. degli Italiani* II, 205–15; L. Sandri in *Bolletino Senese di Storia Patria* 68 (1961), 3–27; F. Calley, "La physionomie spirituelle de Fabio Chigi d'après sa correspondance avec le P. Charles d'Arenberg, Fr. Mineur Capucin," *MiscMercati* V, 451–76; G. Incisa della Rocchetta, "Gli appunti autobiografici d'Alessandro VII nell'Archivio Chigi," *Mélanges Tisserant* VI, 439–57; Ae. Springhetti, "Alexander VII poeta latinus," *AHPont* 1 (1963), 265–94; B. Cialdea, *Gli Stati Italiani e la pace dei Pirenei* (Milan 1961); R. Darricau, "Louis XIV et le S. Siège. La negotiation du Traité de Pise (1664)," *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. de France,* 1964/75, 81–156; Darricau, "Les indultes de nomination aux bénéfices consistoriaux," *BLE* 66 (1965), 16–34, 107–31; J. Rainer, "Rom und der Türkenkrieg 1663–1664," *AcModena* 6 (1964), 174–94; A. Bastiaanse, *Teodore Ameyden* (*1586–1656*). *Un neerlandese alla corte di Roma* (The Hague 1967); R. Wittkower, *Gian Lorenzo Bernini. The Sculptor of the Roman Baroque* (London 1966); P. Marconi, *La Roma del Borromini* (Rome 1968).

CLEMENT IX: *BullRom Cocq.* VI 6, 162–369; *BullRom* (e. by Taur.) XVII, 512–839; *Hierarchia Catholica* V, 3–5; Ciaconius IV, 779–96; Pastor XIV/1, 525–610; Seppelt V, 334–43; G. Beani, *Clemente IX, Notizie storiche* (Prato 1893); R. Mols in *DHGE* XII, 1297–1313; A. Cornaro *LThK* II, 1227; G. Canevazzi, *Papa Clemente IX poeta* (Modena 1900); G. Beani, *Clemente IX e l'isola di Candia* (Pistoia 1897); C. Terlinden, *Le pape Clément IX et la guerre de Candie* (Louvain and Paris 1904).

CLEMENT X: *BullRom Cocq.* VII; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XVIII; *Hierarchia catholica* V, 6–9; A. de la Houssaye, *Relation du conclave de Clément X* (Paris 1676); Pastor XIV/1, 611–65; Seppelt V, 344–46; Ciaconius V, 1–104; R. Mols in *DHGE* XII, 1313–26; A. Cornaro in *LThK* II, 1227; E. Arizio, *Memorie sulla vita di Clemente X* (Rome 1863); C. de Bildt, *Christine de Suède et le Conclave de Clément X* (Paris 1906); id., *Christine de Suède et le Cardinal Azzolini, lettres inédites* (Paris 1899).

8. *Innocent XI*

LITERATURE

BullRom Cocq. VIII; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XIX; *Hierarchia Catholica* V, 10–14; *Epistolae ad principes,* ed. by J. J. Berthier (Rome 1891–95); F. de Bojani, *Innocent XI, sa correspondance avec ses nonces 1676–84* (Rome 1910–12); *D,* 456–77; S. Monti, *Bibliografia di papa* I: *fino al 1927,* ed. by M. Zecchinelli (Como 1957); Ciaconius V, 105–312; Pastor XIV/2, 667–1043; Seppelt V, 346–70; P. Gini in *Biblioth. Sanctorum* 7 (Rome 1966), 848–56; G. Schwaiger in *LThK* V, 693–95; M. G. Lippi, *Vita,* ed. by G. Berthier (Rome 1889); C. Miccinelli (Rome 1956); G. Papasogli (Rome 1956); A. Latreille, "Innocent XI pape janséniste, directeur de conscience de Louis XIV," *Cahiers* *d'histoire* 1 (Grenoble 1956), 9–39; J. Orcibal, *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI* (Paris 1949); B. Neveu, "Jacques II médiateur entre Louis XIV et Innocent XI," *MAH* 79 (1967), 699–764; P. Blet, "I. et l'Assemblée du Clergé de France de 1682. La rédaction du Bref "Paternae Charitati" *AHPont* 7 (1969); G. J. Philipps, *Das Regalienrecht in Frankreich* (Halle 1873: reprint Aalen 1967); F. Margiotta Broglio, "Il conflitto della Regalia," *AcLincei Mem.* 9 (1963), 173–292; C. H. Gérin, *Louis XIV et le S. Siège* (Paris 1894); M. Dubruel, "La cour de Rome et l'extension de la Régale," *RHEF* 9 (1923), 161–76; L. O'Brian, *Innocent XI and the Révocation of the Edict of Nantes* (Berkeley 1930); A. Latreille, "La révocation de l'Édit de Nantes," *Bull. de la Soc. de l'hist. du protestant. franç.* 103 (1957), 229–36; G. Fraknoi, *Papa I. e la liberazione dell'Ungheria del giogo ottomano* (Florence 1903); A. Levinson, "Nuntiaturberichte vom Kaiserhof Leopolds I," *AÖG* 106 (1918); V. Thein, *Papst I. und die Türkengefahr im Jahre 1683* (Breslau 1912); A. Posch, "Ein kaiserlicher Gesandtschaftsbericht aus Rom 1686," *Festschr. Eder* (Innsbruck 1959), 141–54; V.-L. Tapie, "Europe et chrétienté," *Gr* 42 (1961), 268–89; J. Stoye, *The Siege of Vienna* (London 1964); *Beatificationis et canonisationis . . . Summarium. Testimonia, Documenta, Causae cursus* (Vaticano 1943); *Nova positio super virtutibus* (Vaticano 1944); *AAS* 48 (1956), 754–59, 762–78 (Beatification).

9. *The Popes from Alexander VIII to Clement XI*

LITERATURE

ALEXANDER VIII: *BullRom Cocq.* IX, 1–101; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XX, 1–167; *D,* 478–84; *Hierarchia Catholica* V, 15–17; Ciaconius V, 313–86; Pastor XIV/2, 1045–72; Seppelt V, 370–74; P. Richard in *DHGE* II, 244–51; K. Repgen in *LThK* I, 318 f.; A. Petrucci in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* II, 215–219; S. v. Bischoffshausen, *Papst A. und der Wiener Hof* (Vienna 1900); J. Bignami Odler, "Les collections d'un pape juriste," *StG* 13 (Bologna 1967), 257–72; S. Tramontin, "Recenti studi su S. Gregorio Barbarigo," *Boll. Ist. Storia Venezie* 3 (1961), 331–348; S. Serena, *Gr. Barbarigo* (Padua 1963); S. La Sorsa, "Pasquinate contro i cardinali," *Zagaglia* 5 (Lecce 1963), 54–73.

INNOCENT XII: *BullRom Cocq.* IX, 102–547; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XX, 168–947; *D,* 484–88; *Hierarachia Catholica* V, 18–22; Ciaconius V, 389–542; Pastor XIV/2, 1073–1166; Seppelt V, 374–81; G. Schwaiger in *LThK* V, 695; M. de Forbin, "Le cardinal de Forbin-Janson à Rome, le conclave d'I," *Rev. d'Hist. diplom.* 38 (1924), 132–213; H. Raab, "Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Paolucci," *RQ* 55 (1960), 129–56.

CLEMENT XI: *BullRom Cocq.* XI 1; XI 2, 1–182; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XXI, 1–866; *Bullarium,* 3 parts in Vol. 1 (Rome 1723); *Clementis XI opera omnia* (Frankfurt 1729); *Epistolae et brevia selectiora,* 2 vols. (Rome 1724); *D,* 488–98; *Hierarchia Catholica* V, 22–32; L. Jadin, *L'Europe au début du XVIII^{e} siècle. Correspondance du Baron Karg de Bebenbourg . . . avec le card. Paolucci, secrétaire d'État (1700–1719)* (Brussels and Rome 1968); Mercati, *Raccolta,* 282–86; *De vita et rebus gestis Clementis XI* (Urbino 1727); Ciaconius VI, 1–380; Pastor XV, 1–388; Seppelt V, 382–413; F. Pometti, "Studi sul pontificato di Clemente," *ASRomana* 21 (1898), 279–484; 22 (1899), 109–79; 23 (1900), 239–76, 449–515; R. Mols in *DHGE* XII, 1326–61; A. Cornaro in *LThK* II, 1227f.; I. Galland, "Die Papstwahl des Jahres 1700," *HJ* 3 (1882), 208–54, 355–87, 596–630; P. Roi, *La guerra di successione di Spagna negli stati dell'Alta Italia* (Rome 1931); H. Kramer, *Habsburg und Rom in den Jahren 1708–1709* (Innsbruck 1936;

reprint Rome 1967); G. V. Vella, *Il Passionei e la politica di Clemente XI* (Rome 1953); A. Caracciolo, *D. Passionei tra Roma e la repubblica delle lettere* (Rome 1968); M. Braubach, *Prinz Eugen v. Savoyen* II–III (Vienna 1964); N. Huber, *Österreich und der Hl. Stuhl vom Ende des span. Erbfolgekriegs bis zum Tode Papst Klemens'* (Graz 1967); L. Just, *Klemens XI. und der Code Leopold* (Freiburg 1935).

SECTION THREE

The End of the Denominational Era in Europe—Progress and Stagnation of the World Mission

10. *Reconstruction and Constitution of the Church of the Empire*

LITERATURE

INDIVIDUAL BISHOPRICS: J. Kist, *Fürst- und Erzbistum Bamberg. Leitfaden durch ihre Geschichte von 1007 bis 1955* (Bamberg 1958); J. Looshorn, *Die Geschichte des Bistums Bamberg,* reprint of 1886/91 edition (Bamberg 1967–68); W. Kern, *Die Finanzwirtschaft des Hochstifts Bamberg nach dem Dreißigjährigen Krieg 1648–83* (diss., Erlangen 1966); L. Vautrey, *Histoire des Évêques de Bâle,* 4 vols. (Einsiedeln 1884–86); H. R. Heyer, "Die Übersiedlung des Basler Domkapitels von seinem Exil in Freiburg i. Br. nach Arlesheim im Jahre 1678 und das Schicksal seines Archivs während der Französischen Revolution," *Basler Zschr. für Gesch. u. Altertumskunde* 67 (1967), 170–83; J. Burckle, *Les chapitres ruraux des anciens évêchés de Strasbourg et de Bâle* (Colmar 1935); G. Mayer, *Geschichte des Bistums Chur* II (Stams 1914); J. Danuser, *Die staatlichen Hoheitsrechte des Kantons Graubünden gegenüber dem Bistum Chur* (Zurich 1897); G. v. Lojewski, *Bayerns Weg nach Köln. Geschichte der bayerischen Bistumspolitik in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jh.* (Bonn 1962); J. Oswald, "Die baierischen Landesbistumsbestrebungen im 16. und 17. Jh.," *ZSavRGkan* 33 (1944), 224–64; F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte des Bistums Breslau* (Breslau 1929); L. Petry, "Das Haus Neuburg und die Ausläufer der Gegenreformation in Schlesien und der Pfalz," *Veröff. des Vereins für pfälz. KG* 4 (1952), 87–106; A. A. Strnad, "Wahl und Informativprozeß Erzherzog Leopold Wilhelms von Österreich, Fürstbischof von Breslau (1656–62)," *ArSKG* 26 (1968), 153–90; K. Wolfsgruber, "Die Wahlkapitulationen der Fürstbischöfe von Brixen (1613 bis 1791)," *ZSavRGkan* 73 (1956), 248–323; B. Hubensteiner, *Die geistliche Stadt. Welt und Leben des Johann Eckher von Kapfing und Liechteneck, Fürstbischofs von Freising* (Munich 1954); J. Sax, *Geschichte des Hochstifts und der Stadt Eichstätt* (Nuremberg 1885); H. Hack, "Eine authentische Rechtsauslegung unter Papst Klemens XI. und der kirchenrechtliche Status des Stifts Fulda," *Miscellanea Fuldensia. Festgabe für Dr. A. Bolte, Bischof von Fulda* (Fulda 1966), 25–71; A. Bertram, *Geschichte des Bistums Hildesheim* III (Hildesheim and Leipzig 1925); M. Braubach, *Kurkölnische Miniaturen* (Münster 1954); P. Harsin, *Les relations extérieures de la Principauté de Liège sous Jean Louis d'Elderen et Joseph Clément de Bavière (1688–*

1718) (Liège and Paris 1927); A. Franzen, "Französische Politik und Kurkölns Beziehungen zu Frankreich unter Erzbischof Max Heinrich in französischer Sicht," *RQ* 52 (1957), 169–210; G. Mentz, *Johann Philipp von Schönborn, Kurfürst von Mainz, Bischof von Würzburg und Worms,* 2 vols. (Jena 1896–99); W. Kohl, *Christoph Bernhard von Galen. Politische Geschichte des Fürstbistums Münster 1650–78* (Münster 1964); J. Staber, *Kirchengeschichte des Bistums Regensburg* (Regensburg 1966); G. Schwaiger, *Kardinal Franz Wilhelm von Wartenberg als Bischof von Regensburg* (*1649–61*) (Munich 1954); F. Martin, *Salzburgs Fürsten in der Barockzeit* (*1587–1812*) (Salzburg 1966); A. M. Burg, "Die alte Diözese Straßburg von der bonifazischen Reform (ca 750) bis zum napoleonischen Konkordat. Ein geschichtlicher Überblick mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des elsässischen Teils," *FreibDiözArch* 86 (1966), 220–51; J. Duft, *Die Glaubenssorge der Fürstäbte von St. Gallen im 17. und 18. Jh.* (Lucerne 1944); J. Kögl, *La sovranità dei vescovi di Trento e di Bressanone. Diritti derivati al clero diocesano dalla sua soppressione* (Trent 1964); J. Marx, *Geschichte des Erzstifts Trier von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1816,* 5 vols. (Trier 1858–64); A. Wendehorst, "Das Bistum Würzburg. Ein Überblick von den Anfängen bis zur Säkularisation," *FreibDiözArch* 86 (1966), 9–93; H. Hack, *Der Rechtsstreit zwischen dem Fürstbischof von Würzburg und dem Fürstabt von Fulda an der Römischen Kurie um die geistliche Hoheit im Gebiet des Stifts Fulda* (*1688–1717*) (Fulda 1956).

THE AFTERMATH OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR: G. Franz, *Der Dreißigjährige Krieg und das deutsche Volk* (Stuttgart 1961); K. Kollnig, *Die Pfalz nach dem Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Heidelberg 1949); A. P. Brück, "Aus der Schwedenzeit Aschaffenburgs 1631–34," *Aschaffenburger Jb.* 4 (1957), 719–36; H. Steinberg, *Der Dreißigjährige Krieg in Europa und der Kampf um die Vorherrschaft in Europa 1600–60* (Göttingen 1967); J. Schmidlin, *Kirchliche Zustände und Schicksale des deutschen Katholizismus während des Dreißigjährigen Krieges nach den bischöflichen Romberichten* (Freiburg 1940).

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL STATES; FILLING THE BISHOPRICS OF THE EMPIRE: Feine *RG;* L. Glier, *Die Advocatia ecclesiae Romanae imperatoris in der Zeit von 1519–1648* (diss., Erlangen 1897); H. E. Feine, *Die Besetzung der Reichsbistümer vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zur Säkularisation 1648–1803* (Amsterdam 1964); R. Reinhardt, *Die Beziehungen von Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz zu Habsburg-Österreich in der Neuzeit* (Wiesbaden 1966); H. E. Feine, "Papst, Erste Bitten und Regierungsantritt des Kaisers seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters," *ZSavRGkan* 20 (1931), 1–101; A. H. Benna, "Preces Primariae und Reichshofkanzlei," *MÖSTA* 5 (1952); F. J. Heyen, "Die kaiserlichen Ersten Bitten für das Erzbistum Trier von Ferdinand I. bis Franz II. (1531–1792)," *Festschr. für Alois Thomas* (Trier 1967), 175–88; H. Czischke, *Die verfassungsrechtliche Lage der geistlichen Kurfürstentümer Mainz, Trier und Köln am Ende des alten Reiches* (diss., Mainz 1953); R. Reinhardt, "Zur Reichskirchenpolitik der Pfalz-Neuburger," *HJ* 84 (1964), 118–28; M. Braubach, "Lothringische Absichten auf den Kölner Kurstuhl 1712/13," *HJ* 56 (1936), 59–66; H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen und seine Zeit* (*1739–1812*) I: *Dynastie. Kirche und Reich im 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1962).

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE ESTATES IN THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE: GENERAL: A. Schulte, "Der Adel und die deutsche Kirche im Mittelalter," *KRA* 63/64 (Stuttgart 1922); A. L. Veit, "Geschichte und Recht der Stiftsmäßigkeit auf die ehemals adeligen Domstifte von Mainz, Würzburg und Bamberg," *HJ* 32 (1912), 323–58; id. *Der stiftsmäßige deutsche Adel im Bilde seiner Ahnenproben* (Freiburg 1935); E. Riedenauer, *Reichsritterschaft und Konfession: Deutscher Adel 1555–1740,* ed. by H. Rössler (Darmstadt 1965), 1–63; M. Domarus, "Der Reichsadel in den geistlichen Fürstentümern," *Deutscher Adel,* ed. by H. Rössler (Darmstadt 1965), 147–71; N. v. Preradovich, "Die soziale Herkunft der österreichischen Kirchenfürsten (1648–1918),"*Festschr. Karl Eder* (Innsbruck 1959), 223–43.

CATHEDRAL CHAPTERS: A. Haemmerle, *Die Canoniker des hohen Domstifts Augsburg bis zur Säkularisation* (n.p., 1955); J. Kist, *Das Bamberger Domkapitel 1391–1556* (Weimar 1943); G. Zimmermann, *Das Breslauer Domkapitel im Zeitalter der Reformation und Gegenreformation (1500–1600)* (Weimar 1938); K. Wolfsgruber, *Das Brixener Domkapitel in seiner persönlichen Zusammensetzung in der Neuzeit 1500–1803 = Schlern Schriften* 80 (Innsbruck 1951); C. M. Tuor, *Reihenfolge der residierenden Domherren in Chur = XXXIV. Jber. der Histor. antiquarischen Gesellschaft von Graubünden* (Chur 1905); J. Obersteiner, "Die persönliche Zusammensetzung des adligen Gurker Domkapitels und Domstiftes in der Zeit von 1620–1787," *Geschichtliche und volkskundliche Beiträge zur Heimatkunde Kärntens* CLIV (Klagenfurt 1964), 221–56; H. H. Kurth, "Das Kölnische Domkapitel im 18. Jh. Verfassung und Verwaltung, Wirtschaft und persönliche Zusammensetzung" (unpubl. diss., Bonn 1953); M. Braubach, "Kölner Domherren im 18. Jh.," *Zur Geschichte und Kunst im Erzbistum Köln. Festschr. für Wilhelm Neuss—Studien zur Kölner KG* 5 (Düsseldorf 1960), 238–58; H. H. Roth, *Das Kölner Domkapitel von 1503 bis zu seinem Erlöschen 1803 = Veröff des Köln. Geschichtsvereins* 5 (Cologne 1930); J. de Theux, *Le chapitre de Saint-Lambert à Liège,* 4 vols. (Brussels 1871–73); A. Dubois, *Le chapitre cathédrale de Saint-Lambert de Liège au XVII^{e} siècle* (Liège 1949); L. A. Veit, *Mainzer Domherren vom Ende des 16. bis zum Anfang des 18. Jh. in Leben, Haus und Habe* (Mainz 1924); F. Keinemann, *Das Domkapitel zu Münster im 18. Jh.* (Münster in Westphalia 1967); id., "Das Domstift Mainz und der mediate Adel. Der Streit um die Zulassung von Angehörigen der landsässigen Ritterschaften zu Mainzer Dompräbenden," *HJ* 89 (1969), 153–70; L. H. Krick, *Das ehemalige Domstift Passau und die ehemaligen Kollegiatstifte des Bistums Passau. Chronologische Reihenfolgen ihrer Mitglieder von der Gründung der Stifte bis zu ihrer Auflösung* (Passau 1922); J. Oswald, *Das alte Passauer Domkapitel* (Munich 1933); H. Wagner and H. Klein, *Salzburgs Domherren 1300–1514* (Salzburg 1952); J. Riedl, "Salzburgs Domherren 1514–1806," *Mitt. der Ges. für Salzburg. Landeskunde* 7 (1867), 122–286; O. Rommel, "Das Seckauer Domkapitel in seiner persönlichen Zusammensetzung (1218–1782)" (unpubl. diss., Vienna 1955); M. Dohna, Gräfin, *Die ständischen Verhältnisse am Domkapitel von Trier vom 16. bis zum 18. Jh.* (Trier 1960), (cf. review by P. Neu in *RhVjbl* 26 (1961), 354–59); D. Leopold, "Das Wiener Domkapitel zum hl. Stephan in seiner personellen Zusammensetzung in der Zeit von der Reformation Ferdinands I. bis zu seiner Erhebung zum Metropolitankapitel, 1554–1722" (unpubl. diss., Vienna 1947); J. Embach, "Das Wormser Domkapitel in den Jahren 1789–1802" (unpubl. diss., Mainz 1952); A. Amrhein, "Reihenfolge der Mitglieder des adeligen Domstiftes zu Würzburg, St. Kiliansbrüder genannt, von seiner Gründung bis zur Säkularisation (742–1803)," *Archiv des histor. Vereins für Unterfranken u. Aschaffenburg* 33 (1890), 3–380.

INDIVIDUAL PREBENDAL FAMILIES AND PREBENDARIES: J. Kist, "Bamberger Domherren aus dem Geschlecht von Guttenberg im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation," *Jb. für fränk. Landesforschung* 11/12 (1953), 277–82; P. Michels, *Ahnentafeln Paderborner Domherren* (Paderborn 1966); M. Domarus, "Die Grafen von Dernbach, Aufstieg und Ende eines reichsständischen Hauses," *Mainfränkisches Jb.* 16 (Würzburg 1964); H. Gerig, *Der Kölner Dompropst Christian August Herzog von Sachsen-Zeitz, Bischof von Raab. Seine diplomatische Tätigkeit am Niederrhein zu Beginn des Spanischen Erbfolgekriegs im Dienst der Politik Kaiser Leopolds I. 1701–03* (Bonn 1930); H. Nottarp, "Ein Mindener Dompropst des 18. Jh," *WZ* 103–4 (1954), 93–106, reprinted in: H. Nottarp, *Aus*

Rechtsgeschichte und Kirchenrecht. Gesammelte Abhandlungen, ed. by F. Merzbacher (Cologne and Graz 1967), 96–175; H. Rössler, *Graf Johann Philipp Stadion. Napoleons deutscher Gegenspieler,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1966); H. Budenbender, "Das Familiendrama Sickingen. Sein Verlauf und sein möglicher Zusammenhang mit Schillers Räubern," *Mitt. des Historischen Vereins der Pfalz* 61 (1963), 161–200.

THE NONARISTOCRATIC ELEMENT IN THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE: E. Krausen, "Die Herkunft der bayerischen Prälaten des 17. u. 18. Jh," *ZBLG* 27 (1964), 259–85; id., "Die Zusammensetzung der bayerischen Prämonstratenserkonvente," *HJ* 86 (1966), 157–66; A. Lederle, "Prälaten des 17. u. 18. Jh. aus dem Kinzigtal," *FreibDiözArch* 74 (1954), 208–14; G. Richter, "Die bürgerlichen Benediktiner der Abtei Fulda von 1627–1802," *Quellen und Abh. zur Gesch. der Abtei und Diözese Fulda* 7 (1911), 73–240; J. Salzgeber, *Die Klöster Einsiedeln und St. Gallen im Barockzeitalter. Historisch-soziologische Studie* (Münster 1966).

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS: GENERAL ASPECTS; INDIVIDUAL DIOCESES: H. Hofmann, "Hilfsmittel zur Bestimmung der Titular- und Weihbischöfe in Bayern," *Mitt. für die Archivpflege in Bayern* 10 (1964), 6–14; A. Schröder, "Die Augsburger Weihbischöfe," *Archiv für die Gesch. des Hochstifts Augsburg* V (1919); J. Jungnitz, *Die Breslauer Weihbischöfe* (Breslau 1914); F. A. Koch, "Die Erfurter Weihbischöfe. Ein Beitrag zur thüringischen Kirchengeschichte," *Zschr. des Vereins für thüring. Gesch. und Altertumskunde* 6 (Jena 1865); F. E. v. Mering, *Die hohen Würdenträger der Erzdiözese Köln, zunächst die Weihbischöfe, Generalvikare u. Offiziale* (Cologne 1846); W. Haid, "Die Constanzer Weihbischöfe 1550–1803," *FreibDiözArch* 9 (1875), 1–24, 24–31; U. Berlière, Les *évêques auxiliaires de Liège* (Bruges 1919); A. Tibus, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten über die Weihbischöfe von Münster* (Münster 1862); J. C. Möller, *Gesch. der Weihbischöfe von Osnabrück* (Lingen 1887); J. Evelt, *Die Weihbischöfe von Paderborn* (Paderborn 1869–79); K. J. Holzer, *De proepiscopis Trevirensibus* (Coblenz 1845); J. A. J. Hansen, *Die Weihbischöfe von Trier* (Cologne 1834); J. Torsy, *Die Weihehandlungen der Kölner Weihbischöfe 1661–1680. Nach den weihbischöflichen Protokollen* (Düsseldorf 1969).

INDIVIDUAL SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS: H. Enger, "Weihbischof Adam Adami und sein Wirken im Bistum Hildesheim," *Unsere Diözese in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* 32 (1963), 13–31; H. Wamper, *Das Leben der Brüder Adrian und Peter van Walenburch aus Rotterdam und ihr Wirken in der Erzdiözese Köln bis zum Jahre 1649. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation* (Cologne 1968); K. Opladen, "Johann Sternenberg gen. Düsseldorf, Dechant zu Rees, Propst zu Xanten, Weihbischof von Münster (d. 1662). Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Gegenreformation," *AHVNrh* 157 (1955), 98–146; G. Scherz and J. Raeder, (eds.), *Nicolai Stenonis Epistolae,* 2 vols. (Copenhagen and Fribourg 1952); M. Bierbaum, *Niels Stensen. Von der Anatomie zur Theologie (1638–86)* (Münster in Westphalia, n.d.); J. Köhne, "Die Tätigkeit des Weihbischofs Nicolaus Steno im Bistum Paderborn," *ThGl* 34 (1942); J. Torsy, "Die Dienstreisen des Kölner Weihbischofs Paulus Aussemius 1677–79," *Festschr. Wilhelm Neuss* (Düsseldorf 1960), 164–82; G. Schwaiger, "Römische Briefe des Regensburger Weihbischofs Sebastian Denich (1654/55)," *ZKG* 73 (1962), 299–326; M. Barth, "Der Straßburger Weihbischof Paul Graf Aldringen 1627–44," *AElsKG* 7 (1932) 363–374; id., "Peter Creagh, Erzbischof von Dublin und Primas von Irland, als Weihbischof von Straßburg 1694–1705," *AElsKG* 8 (1933), 269–86; L. Lenhart, "Zwei Mainzer Weihbischöfe des 17. Jh. als ehemalige Heppenheimer Pfarrer. Adolf Gottfried Volusius (1676–79) und Mathias Starck (1679–1708)," *1200 Jahre Heppenheim a. d. Bergstraße* (1955), 129–49; H. Raab, "Der Informativprozeß des Stiftskanonikers Johann Jakob Senft anläßlich seiner

Ernennung zum Weihbischof von Erfurt 1695," *Aschaffenburger Jb.* 4 (1957), 770–76; O. v. Looz-Corswarem, "Eine Firmungsreise des Trierer Weihbischofs Otto v. Senheim (1633–62)," *Festschr. für Alois Thomas* (Trier 1967), 259–66; B. Fischer, "Pontifikalhandlungen der beiden Speyerer Weihbischöfe Johann Philipp Burckhardt (d. 1698) und Peter Kornel von Beywegh (d. 1744) im Raume des heutigen Bistums Trier in den Jahren 1685–87 und 1708–10. Nach ihrem bisher unveröffentlichten Weihetagebuch in der Bibliothek des Priesterseminars St. Peter im Schwarzwald," *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 311–24; L. Just, "Der Trierer Weihbischof Johann Mathias v. Eyss im Kampf gegen den Jansenismus (1714–29)," *AMrhKG* 11 (1959), 160–89; F. Schäfer, *Lothar Friedrich v. Nalbach. Sein Wirken für den Kurstaat Trier als Weihbischof 1691–1748* (Cologne 1937); H. Schmitt, "Die Aushilfe der Speyerer Weihbischöfe Johann Philipp Burckhardt u. Peter Kornel von Beywegh im Bistum Worms," *AMrhKg* 12 (1960), 237–50; id., "Der Wormser Weihbischof Johann Baptist Gegg aus Eichstätt (1716–30)," *AMrhKG* 15 (1963), 95–146; id., "Christian Albert Anton v. Merle, Weihbischof von Worms (1734–65)," *AMrhKG* 16 (1964), 200–248; R. Haaß, "Das religiös-kirchliche Leben in Köln unter dem Einfluß der Francken-Siersdorf (1724–70)," *Spiegel der Geschichte, Festschr. für Max Braubach* (Münster 1964), 581–89; A. P. Brück, "Stephan Alexander Würdtwein," *AMrhKG* 2 (1950), 193–216: H. Raab, "Valentin Heimes' Informativprozeß anläßlich seiner Ernennung zum Weihbischof von Worms (1780) und Mainz (1782)," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 7 (1957), 172–89; A. Bach, "Der Mainzer Weihbischof Valentin Heimes und die 'Weinpredigt' in Goethes 'St. Rochusfest zu Bingen,' " *RhVjbl* 27 (1962), 97–116; A. F. Ludwig, *Weihbischof Zirkel von Würzburg in seiner Stellung zur theolog. Aufklärung und kirchl. Restauration,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1904–6).

11. *Spain and Portugal to 1815*

SOURCES

P. Díaz Plaja, *La vida española en el siglo XVIII* (Barcelona 1946); G. M. Jovelannos, "Obras publicadas e inéditas," *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles,* 85–87 (Madrid 1950); J. A. Llorente, *Colección diplomática de varios papeles antiguos y modernos sobre dispensas matrimoniales y otros puntos de disciplina eclesiástica* (Madrid 1809); A. Martínez Salazar, *Colección de memorias y noticias del gobierno general y político del Consejo de Castilla* (Madrid 1764); G. Maura Gamazo, *Documentos inéditos referentes a las postrimerías de la casa de Austria,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1927–30); G. Mayáns y Síscar, *Observaciones legales, histórico-críticas sobre el Concordato de 1753* (Madrid 1847); A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati* (Rome 1954); A. Muriel, "Historia del reinade de Carlos IV," *BAE* 114–115 (Madrid 1959); id., "El gobierno de Carlos III o Instrucción reservada para dirección de la Junta de Estado que creó este monarca," *BAE* 115 (Madrid 1839); Edition: *Novísima Recopilación de las leyes de España* (Madrid 1805); L. M. Portocarrero, *Sinodales de Toledo 1682* (Madrid 1682); P. Rodríguez Campomanes, *Tratado de la regalía de España* (Paris 1830); J. Tejada y Ramiro, *Colección de Cánones y de todos los concilios de la Iglesia de España y de América* VI (Madrid 1859); A. Valladares, *Seminario Erudito,* 34 vols. (important historical sources in all volumes); R. de Vélez, *Apología del altar y del trono o historia de las llamadas Cortes e impugnaciones de algunas doctrinas publicadas en la Constitución, diarios y otros escritos contra la Religión y el Estado,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1818); José Vives, "Informe del obispo Climent sobre beneficencia (text)," *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 30 (1957), 159–82.

LITERATURE

A. Baudrillart, *Philippe V et la Cour de France,* 5 vols. (Paris 1890–1901); C. Corona, *Revolución y reacción en el reinado de Carlos IV* (Madrid 1957); W. Coxe, *L'Espagne sous les rois de la maison Bourbon,* 5 vols. (Paris 1827); M. Danvila, *Reinado de Carlos III,* 6 vols. (Madrid 1891); M. Defourneaux, *Pablo de Olavide ou l'afrancesado (1725–1803)* (Paris 1959); Desdevises du Desert, "Les institutions de l'Espagne au XVIII^e siècle," *Revue Hispanique* 70 (1927), 1–556 (New York-Paris edition 1928); id., *La société espagnole au XVIII^e siècle* (New York and Paris 1925); R. Konetzke, *Gesch. des spanischen und portugiesischen Volkes* (Leipzig 1939); A. Domínguez Ortiz, *La Sociedad española en el s. XVIII* (Madrid 1955); Conde de Fernán Núñez, *Vida de Carlos III,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1898); J. Fernández, "Un período de las relaciones entre Felipe V y la S. Sede (1707–17)," *Anthologica Annua* 3 (1955), 9–88; A. Ferrer del Río, *Historia del reinado de Carlos III,* 4 vols. (Madrid 1858); P. B. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien,* 5 vols. (Regensburg, 1862–79; reprint Graz 1956), III/2; R. Heer, *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain* (New Jersey 1958); J. Gómez Arteche, *Reinado de Carlos IV,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1894); M. Jiménez Salas, *Historia de la Asistencia Social en España en la Edad Moderna* (Madrid 1958); V. Lafuente, *Historia eclesiástica de España,* 6 vols. (Madrid 1875), V and VI; Duque de Maura, *Vida y reinado de Carlos II* 3 vols. (Madrid 1942); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los Heterodoxos españoles,* 7 vols. (Madrid 1930–33), VI and VII; V. Palacio Atard, *Los españoles de la Ilustración* (Madrid 1964); L. Pastor, *Gesch. der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des MA* XIV/1–XVI/3 (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1929–32; reprint 1958ff.); V. Rodríguez Casado, "El intento español de Ilustración cristiana," *Estudios Americanos* 9 (1955), 141–69; id., *La política y los políticos en el reinado de Carlos III* (Madrid 1962); J. Sarrailh, *L'Espagne eclairée de la seconde moitié du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1954); Spanish edition: *La España ilustrada de la segunda mitad del s. XVIII* (Mexico 1957); L. Pfandl, *Spanische Literaturgesch.* (Leipzig 1923).

THE EPISCOPATE: J. Gómez Bravo, *Catálogo de los obispos de Córdoba y breve noticia histórica de su iglesia catedral y obispado,* 2 vols. (Córdoba 1778), II; R. de Huesca, *Teatro histórico de las iglesias del reino de Aragón* (continued by Lamberto de Zaragoza) (Pamplona and Zaragoza 1796–1807), IV and VI–IX; A. López Ferreiro, *Historia de la santa A. M. iglesia de Santiago de Compostela,* 11 vols. (Santiago 1898–1909), IX–XI; J. Martín Carramolino, *Historia de Ávila, su provincia y obispado* (Madrid 1873); T. Minguella y Arnedo, *Historia de la diócesis de Sigüenza y de sus obispos,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1910–13), III; E. Morera Llauradó, *Tarragona cristiana,* 5 vols. (Tarragona 1898–1959), IV and V; T. Muñoz y Soliva, *Noticia de todos los Ilmos. señores obispos que han regido la diócesis de Cuenca, aumentadas con los sucesos . . .* (Cuenca 1860); L. B. Nadal, *Episcopologio de Vich,* 3 vols. (Vich 1891–1904), III; V. Núñez Marqués, *Guía de la S. I. catedral del Burgo de Osma y breve historia del obsipado de Osma* (Madrid 1949); E. Olmos y Canalda, *Los prelados valentinos* (Madrid 1949); D. Ortiz de Zúñiga, *Anales eclesiásticos . . . de Sevilla,* 5 vols. (Madrid 1795–96), V; M. R. Pazos, *El episcopado gallego a la luz de documentos romanos,* 3 vols. (Madrid 1946); J. M. Sanz y Artibucilla, *Historia de la fidelísima y vencedora ciudad de Tarazona,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1929–30), II; J. Solano de Figueroa, *Historia eclesiástica de la ciudad y obispado de Badajoz,* 8 vols. (Badajoz 1929–35), VIII–IX; J. A. Tapia Garrido, *Los obispos de Almería* (Almería 1968).

CHURCH AND STATE: Q. Aldea, *Iglesia y Estado en la España del siglo XVII* (Comillas 1961); J. de Covarruvias, *Máximas sobre recursos de fuerza y protección,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1829); L. Cuesta, "Jesuítas confesores de reyes y directores de la Biblioteca Nacional," *Rev. Arch., Bibl. y Museos* 69 (1961), 129–74; C. García Martín, "El Tribunal de la Rota de la Nunciatura de España," *Anthologica Annua* 8 (1960), 143–278; L. G. Alonso

Getino, "Dominicos españoles confesores de Reyes," *La Ciencia Tomista* 14 (1916), 374–451; A. de la Hera, *El regalismo borbónico* (Madrid 1963); V. Lafuente, *La retención de Bulas en España ante la Historia y el Derecho,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1865); R. S. de Lamadrid, *El Concordato español de 1753 . . .* (Jerez de la Frontera 1937); R. Olaechea, *Las relaciones hispano-romanas en la segunda mitad del XVIII,* 2 vols. (Zaragoza 1965); V. Rodríguez Casado, "Iglesia y Estado en el reinado de Carlos III," *Estudios Americanos* 1 (1948–49), 5–57; L. Sierra, *La reacción del episcopado español ante los decretos de matrimonio del ministro Urquijo de 1799 a 1813* (Bilbao 1964).

UNIVERSITIES: C. M^{a}. Ajo G. Sáinz de Zúñiga, *Historia de las Universidades hispánicas . . .*, 6 vols. (Madrid 1957–67), III–VI; L. Sala Balust, *Reales reformas de los antiguos Colegios de Salamanca anteriores a las del reinado de Carlos III* (*1623–1770*) (Valladolid 1956); id., *Visitas y reforma de los Colegios Mayores de Salamanca en el reinado de Carlos III* (Valladolid 1958).

JESUITS: A. Astraín, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España,* 7 vols. (Madrid 1909–12); F. Rodrigues, *História da Companhia de Jesus na Assistência de Portugal,* 7 vols. (Porto 1931–50); M. Batllori, *La cultura hispano-italiana de los jesuítas expulsos* (Madrid 1966); C. Eguía, *Los jesuítas y el motín de Esquilache* (Madrid 1947); L. Frías, "Los jesuítas y el motín de Esquilache en la Historia de España por L. Altamira," *RF* 29 (1911), 160–74; F. Rousseau, "Expulsion des jésuites en Espagne. Demarches de Charles III pour leur secularisation," *RQH* 75 (1904), I, 113–79.

INDIVIDUALS: María de Jesús de Agreda, *Cartas de la Venerable Madre Sor—y del señor Rey Don Felipe IV,* ed. by Ozcoidi y Udave, 2 vols. (Madrid 1885–86) and *BAE* 108; P. Castagnoli, *Il cardinale Giulio Alberoni,* 3 vols. (Piacenza 1929–31); F. Tort Mitjans, *Biografía histórica de Francisco Armanyá Font OSA* (Villanueva and Geltrú 1967); C. Corona, *J. N. de Azara. Un embajador español en Roma* (Zaragoza 1948); J. Báguena, *El cardenal Belluga. Su vida y su obra* (Murcia 1935); A. Echánove, S.J., "La preparación intelectual del P. Andrés Marcos Burriel SJ (1731–50)," *Hispania Sacra;* S. de Ubrique, *Vida del Beato Diego José de Cádiz,* 2 vols. (Seville 1926); C. Gómez Rodeles, *Vida del P. Calatayud* (Madrid 1882); V. de la Fuente, "Obras escogidas del P. Fray Benito Jerónimo Feijóo y Montenegro con una noticia de su vida y juicio crítico de sus escritos," *BAE* 56; *BAE,* 141; *BAE,* 142; *BAE* 143; Francisco Mendez, O.S.A., *Noticias sobre la vida, escritos y viajes del Rmo. P. Mtro. Fr. Enrique Flórez . . .* (Madrid 1860); E. Reyero, *Misiones del P. Tirso González de Santalla* (Santiago 1913); José Francisco de Isla, "Obras escogidas, con una noticia de su vida y escritos," ed. by Don Pedro Felipe Monlau, *BAE* 15; Hans Juretschke, *Vida, obra y pensamiento de Alberto Lista* (Madrid, CSIC, 1951) (extensive biblio. 698–99); A. Mestre, *Ilustración y reforma de la Iglesia. Pensamiento político-religioso de don Gregorio Mayáns y Siscar* (Valencia 1968); J. M. March, *El restaurador de la Compañía de Jesús, beato, José Pignatelli y su tiempo,* 2 vols. (Barcelona 1935–44); C. Pérez Bustamante, *Correspondencia reservada e inédita del P. Francisco de Rávago, confesor de Fernando VI,* introductory essay by Carlos Pereyra (Madrid 1936); A. Jiménez, *Biografiia del R. Padre Fray Martín Sarmiento y notas de sus obras impresas y manuscritas* (Pontevedra 1884).

PORTUGAL: Fortunato de Almeida, *Historia da Igreja em Portugal,* 8 vols. (Matosinhos 1921); B. J. Wenzel, *Portugal und der Heilige Stuhl* (Lisbon 1958); J. S. da Silva Dias, *Correntes de sentimento religioso em Portugal* (*séculos XVI a XVIII*), 2 vols. (Coimbra 1960); F. Rodrigues, *História da Companhia de Jesus na Assistência de Portugal,* 7 vols. (Porto 1931–50).

12. *The Condition of the Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*

BIBLIOGRAPHIES: For recent studies see especially *RHE; Recusant History* (Nijmegen 1958ff.); *Irish Historical Studies* (Dublin 1938ff.).

SOURCES: *Catholic Record Society,* 60 vols. (London 1904ff.) (see *A Catalogue of Fifty Volumes* published by the Catholic Record Society, 1904–57); *Archivum Hibernicum* (Journal of the Catholic Record Society of Ireland, 28 vols. (Maynooth 1912ff.); *Collectanea Hibernica,* 12 vols. (Dublin 1958ff.); J. Brady, ed., *Catholics and Catholicism in the [Irish] Eighteenth-Century Press* (Maynooth 1965).

LITERATURE: W. E. H. Lecky, *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,* 5 vols. (London 1892); E. H. Burton, *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner* (London 1909); R. Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts,* 3 vols. (London 1909–16; reprint London 1963); W. Forbes-Leith, *Memoirs of Scottish Catholics during the 17th and 18th Centuries* (London 1909); B. N. Ward, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England 1781–1803,* 2 vols. (London 1909); P. Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558–1793* (London 1914); W. P. Burke, *Irish Priests in the Penal Times* (Waterford 1914; reprint Shannon 1969); D. Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation 1750–1829* (London 1928); P. Hughes, *The Catholic Question 1685–1929* (London 1929); M. J. Hynes, *The Mission of Rinuccini* (Dublin 1932); B. Hemphill, *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England 1685–1750* (London 1954); M. Wall, *The Penal Laws 1691–1760* (Dublin 1961; reprint Dublin 1968); B. Millett, *The Irish Franciscans 1651–1665* (Rome 1664); id., *Survival and Reorganization 1650–1695,* and P. J. Corish, *The Origins of Catholic Nationalism* (Dublin 1968).

PERIODICALS: *Biographical Studies* (*Bognor Regis* [England] 1951–56, continued as *Recusant History* in 1957); *Innes Review* (Glasgow 1950ff.); *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (Dublin 1864–1968); *Proceedings of the Irish Catholic Historical Committee* (Dublin 1955ff.); *Irish Historical Studies* (Dublin 1938ff.).

13. *The Russian Orthodox Church*

SOURCES: *Polnoe sobranie zakonov rossijskoj imperii. Sobranie 1,* 45 vols. (St. Petersburg 1826–30); A. Theiner, *Monuments historiques relatifs aux règnes d'Alexis Michaélowitch, Féodor III et Pierre le Grand czars de Russie* (Rome 1859); *Opisanie dokumentov i del, chranjaščichsja v archive svjatejšago pravitel' stvujaščago sinoda,* 22 vols. (St. Petersburg 1868–1914); W. Regel, ed., *Analecta byzantino-russica* (St. Petersburg 1891); A. Herman, *De fontibus iuris ecclesiastici Russorum. Commentarius historico-canonicus* (Rome 1936).

REPORTS ON THE STATE OF RESEARCH: G. Stöckl, "Russische Gesch. von der Entstehung des Kiever Reiches bis zum Ende der Wirren," *JGO* n.s. 6 (1958), 201–54, 468–88; W. Leitsch, "Russische Gesch. von der Wahl Michail Romanovs bis zur Ermordung Pauls," *JGO* n.s. 9 (1961), 541–80; 10 (1962), 215–64.

LITERATURE: J. C. Grot, *Bemerkungen über die Religionsfreiheit der Ausländer im Russischen Reiche,* 3 vols. (St. Petersburg and Leipzig 1797–98); T. V. Barsov, *Svjatejšij synod v ego prošlom* (St. Petersburg 1896); A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950; with biblio.); I. Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum* (Würzburg 1953); E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1960–61);

H. Koch, *Kleine Schriften zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte Osteuropas* (Wiesbaden 1962); H. Neubauer, *Zar und Selbstherrscher* (Wiesbaden 1964); I. Smolitsch, *Gesch. der russischen Kirche 1700–1917* (Leiden 1964; with biblio.); K. Onasch, *Grundzüge der russischen Kirchengeschichte: Die Kirche in ihrer Gesch.* III (Göttingen 1967), M1–M122.

14. *The Autonomous and the Uniate Churches in the East*

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

J. T. Dorosh, *The Eastern Orthodox Church, a Bibliography of Publications Printed in the Roman Alphabet with Indication of Location* (Washington, D.C. 1946); A. Salmasliam, *Bibliographie de l'Arménie* (Paris 1946); D. T. Andrews, *The Eastern Orthodox Church, a Bibliography* (New York 1953); D. Attwater, *A List of Books about the Eastern Churches* (Newport, R.I. 1960); A. S. Hernández, *Iglesias de Oriente* II: *Repertorio bibliográfico* (Santander 1963); I. Doens, "Bibliographie de la Sainte Montagne de l'Athos," *Le millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963* II (Chevetogne 1964), 337–495. —See also the bibliographies in: *OstKSt* (1951ff.).

LITERATURE

M. Spinka, *A History of Christianity in the Balkans* (Chicago 1933); F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (Munich 1937; reprint Munich 1969); *Ekklesia X: Die Orthodoxe Kirche auf dem Balkan und in Vorderasien. Die orthodoxen Patriarchate von Konstantinopel, Alexandrien, Antiochien, Jerusalem und das Erzbistum von Cypern* (Leipzig 1941); W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten in Gesch. und Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1951); R. Janin, *Les églises orientales et les rites orientaux* (Paris 1955); D. Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1961–62); B. Spuler, ed., *Hdb. der Orientalistik* 1 VIII/2: *Religionsgeschichte des Orients in der Zeit der Weltreligionen* (Leiden and Cologne 1961; biblio.); A. S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* (London 1968); A. J. Arberry, *Religion in the Middle East, Three Religions in Concord and Conflict,* 2 vols. (Cambridge 1969).

THE PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE: G. M. Drabadjeglon, "Gesch. und Verfassung des Ökumenischen Patriarchats," *Ekklesia* X, 45–59; G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate* (London 1947); G. Zananiri, *Histoire de l'Église byzantine* (Paris 1954); F. W. Fernau, *Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn, Gegenwart und Tradition des orthodoxen Orients* (Opladen 1967); A. T. Khoury, "Die Einstellung der Byzantinischen Kirche zur islamitischen Welt nach dem Fall von Konstantinopel," *Concilium* 3 (1967), 538–43; E. V. Ivánka, *Rhomäerreich und Gottesvolk. Das Glaubens-, Staats- und Volksbewußtsein der Byzantiner und seine Auswirkung auf die ostkirchlich-osteuropäische Geisteshaltung* (Munich 1968); S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge 1968).

THE PATRIARCHATES OF ALEXANDRIA, ANTIOCH, AND JERUSALEM: C. Korolewski, *Histoire des patriarcats melkites* II–III (Rome 1910–11); T. E. Dowling, *The Orthodox Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem* (London 1913); G. Bardy, *L'Église d'Antioche* (Paris 1918); Patriarch Alexandros, "Das Patriarchat von Antiochien," *Ekklesia* X, 80–92; K. Meliaras, "Die Kirche von Jerusalem," *Ekklesia* X, 106–14; E. Michailides, "Gesch., Verfassung und Statistik des Patriarchats von Alexandrien," *Ekklesia* X, 71–79; T. Mosconas, "Das griechisch-orthodoxe Patriarchat von Alexandrien," *Kyrios* n.s. 1 (1960/61), 129–39; I. Totzke, "Die alten Patriarchate Alexandrien, Antiochien und Jerusalem," *Una Sancta* 14 (1959), 300–307; 15 (1960), 203–12.

THE UNIATE CHURCHES: B. Homsy, *Les capitulations et la protection des chrétiens au Proche-Orient* (Paris 1962); F. Heyer, "Die katholische Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum Ersten Vatikanischen Konzil," *Die Kirche in ihrer Gesch.* IV (Göttingen 1963) fasc. N 175–95; W. de Vries in cooperation with O. Barlea, J. Gill, and M. Lacko, *Proche-Orient* (Paris 1962); F. Heyer, "Die katholische Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum Ersten Vatikanischen Konzil," *Die Kirche in ihrer Gesch.* IV (Göttingen 1963) fasc. N 175–95; W. de Vries in cooperation with O. Barlea, J. Gill, and M. Lacko, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens* (Freiburg and Munich 1963); J. Hajjar, *Die Kirche im Nahen Osten: Gesch. der Kirche* IV (Einsiedeln, Zurich and Cologne 1966), 347–90 (biblio.); J. Madey, *Kirche zwischen Ost und West* (Munich 1969).

The Propagation of the Faith and European Absolutism

GENERAL: Streit I–XXVI; Ambrosius a S. Theresias, *Bio-bibliographia Missionaria Ordinis Carm. Disc., 1584–1940* (Rome 1941); Clemente da Terzorio, *Le Missioni dei Minori Capuccini* I–IV (Rome 1913–38); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, 7 vols. (New York and London 1937–45), Vols. 3–5; S. Delacroix, *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques* II (Paris 1957); *Historia Missionum Ordinis Fratrum Minorum* I–III (Rome 1967–68); N. Kowalsky, *Stand der kath. Missionen um das Jahr 1765 an Hand der Übersicht des Propaganda-Sekretärs, Stefano Borgia, aus dem Jahre 1773* (Beckenried 1957); L. Lemmens, *Gesch. der Franziskanermissionen* (Münster 1929); A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte* (Regensburg 1960); A. da Silva Rego, *O Ultramar Português no Século XVIII* (Lisbon 1967): H.-W. Gensichen, *Missionsgeschichte der neueren Zeit* (Göttingen 1961).

15. *The Propagation of the Faith in America*

SOURCES

F. Ajofrín, O.F.M.Cap., *Diario del Viaje que por orden de la sagrada Congregación de Propaganda Fide hizo a la América Septentrional en el siglo XVIII*, 2 vols. (Madrid 1958–59); F. J. Alegre, *Historia de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Nueva España* I–IV (Rome 1956–60); D. Basalenque, O.E.S.A., *Historia de la Provincia de San Nicolás de Tolentino de Michoacán* (Mexico City 1963); A. de Egaña, S.J., *Monumenta Peruana* I–IV (Rome 1954–66); F.J. Hernáez, S.J., *Colección de bulas y breves y otros documentos relativos a la Iglesia de América y Filipinas*, 2 vols. (Brussels 1879–95); O. Maas, O.F.M., *Las Órdenes Religiosas de España y la Colonización de America en la segunda parte del siglo XVIII*, 2 vols. (Barcelona 1918–29); F. Zubillaga, S.J., *Monumenta Mexicana* I–III (Rome 1959–68).

LITERATURE

L. de Aspurz, O.F.M.Cap., *La aportación extranjera a las Misiones Españolas del Patronato regio* (Madrid 1946); A. Astraín, S.J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España* I–VII (Madrid 1902–25); P. Borges, O.F.M., *Métodos misionales en la cristianización de América* (Madrid 1960); M. Cuevas, S.J., *Historia de la Iglesia en México* I–V (El Paso 1928); A. de Egaña, S. J., *Historia de la Iglesia en la América Española. Hemisferio Sur* (Madrid 1966); N. M. Farriss, *Crown and Clergy in Colonial Mexico 1759–1821. The Crisis of Ecclesiastical Privilege* (London 1968); R. Konetzke, *Süd- und Mittelamerika* (*Fischer-Weltgeschichte* 22) (Frankfurt am Main 1965); P. de Leturia, S.J., *Relaciones entre la Santa Sede e Hispanoamérica 1493–1835* I: *Época del Real Patronato 1493–1800* (Rome and Caracas 1959); A. Ybot León, *La Iglesia y los Eclesiásticos españoles en la empresa de Indias* I (Barcelona 1954); II (Barcelona 1962); L. Lopetegui, S.J., and F. Zubillaga, S.J., *Historia de la Iglesia en la América Española. México, América Central, Antillas* (Madrid 1965); R. Ricard, *La "conquête spirituelle" du Mexique. Essai sur l'apostolat et les méthodes missionnaires des Ordres mendicants en Nouvelle Espagne de 1523/24 à 1572* (Paris 1933); G. Arcila Robledo, *La Orden Franciscana en la América Meridional* (Rome 1948); J.

Specker, S.M.B., *Die Missionsmethode in Spanisch-Amerika im 16. Jh. mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Konzilien und Synoden* (Beckenried 1953); R. Vargas Ugarte, S.J., *Historia de la Iglesia en el Perú* I (Lima 1953); II (Burgos 1959).

16. *The Propagation of the Faith in Africa*

SOURCES

A. Brásio, C.Sp., *Monumenta Missionaria Africa Ocidental* 6–10 (Lisbon 1955–65); G. A. Cavazzi de Montecuccolo, *Istoria Descrittione de' tre Regni Congo, Matamba et Angola* (Milan 1690) (Port. ed.: 2 vols. [Lisbon 1965]); J. Cuvelier, ed., *Relations sur le Congo du P. Laurent de Lucques (1700–17)* (Brussels 1953); G. M. Theal, *Records of South-Eastern Africa*, 9 vols. (London 1898–1903); C. Beccari, S.J., *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores Occidentales inediti*, 15 vols. (Rome 1903–17); T. Somigli di S. Detole, O.F.M., *Etiopia Francescana*, 2 vols. (Karachi 1928–48).

LITERATURE

C. P. Groves, *The Planting of Christianity in Africa I (to 1840)* (London 1948); L. Jadin, "L'Afrique et Rome depuis l'époque des découvertes jusqu'au XVII^{e} siècle," *XII^{e} Congrès International des Sciences Historiques. Rapports*, II: *Histoire des Continents* (Louvain 1965), 33–69; J. Cuvelier, *L'ancien royaume du Congo* (Brussels 1946); Durval Piros de Lima, *O Oriente e a Africa desde a Restauração a Pombal* (Lisbon 1946); A. L. Farinha, *A expansão da Fé na Africa e no Brasil* (Lisbon 1942); J. Janin, *La Religion aux Colonies Françaises sous l'ancien régime (de 1626 à la Révolution)* (Paris 1942); Sidney R. Welch, *Portuguese and Dutch in South Africa 1641–1806* (Cape Town 1951); G. M. Theal, *History of Africa South of the Zambesi from the Settlement of the Portuguese at Sofala in Sept. 1505 to the Conquest of the Cape Colony by the British in Sept. 1795*, 3 vols. (London 1910).

17. *The Propagation of the Faith in Asia*

SOURCES: Streit V, VI; *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* (1622 to 1866) (Rome 1907); *Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide*, Pars prima I–VII (Rome 1888–97), Pars secunda I (Rome 1909).

LITERATURE: H. Chappoulie, *Aux origines d'une église. Rome et les Missions d'Indochine au XVII^{e} siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris 1943–48); K. S. Latourette, *Gesch. der Ausbreitung des Christentums* (Göttingen 1956); A. Jann, *Die katholischen Missionen in Indien, China und Japan. Ihre Organisation und das portugiesische Patronat vom 15. bis 18. Jh.* (Paderborn 1915); A. Launay, *Histoire générale de la Société des Missions Étrangères* I (Paris 1912); id., *Mémorial de la Société des Missions Étrangères* II (Paris 1916); A. da Silva Rêgo, *Curso de Missionologia* (Lisbon 1956–61); G. de Vaumas, *L'éveil missionnaire de la France* (Lyon 1942).

INDIA

SOURCES: *Documenta Indica*, ed. by J. Wicki, S.J., I–XI (Rome 1948–70); Paulo da Trindade, O.F.M., *Historia espiritual do Oriente*, ed. by F. Lopes, I–III (Lisbon 1962–67); A. Meersman, O.F.M., "The Chapter-Lists of the Madre de Deus Province in India," *Studia* VI (Lisbon 1960), 121–350.

LITERATURE: Ambrosius a S. Theresia, *Hierarchia Carmelitana* III: *De Praesulibus Ecclesiae Magni Mogolis seu Bombayensis* (Rome 1936); IV: *De Praesulibus Missionis Malabaricae. Pars Prior. Ecclesia Verapolitana* (Rome 1939); F. Coutinho, *Le régime paroissial des Diocèses de rite latin de l'Inde* (Louvain 1965); A. L. Farinha, *A expansão da fé no Estremo Oriente* (Lisbon 1946); D. Ferroli, S.J., *The Jesuits in Malabar* I/II (Bangalore 1939–51); P. Thomas, *Christians and Christianity in India and Pakistan* (London 1954).

CHINA

LITERATURE: Streit VI, VII, XII, XIII, XIV, 1–3; J. Beckmann, *Neuerscheinungen zur chinesischen Missionsgeschichte von 1945–1955; Monumenta Serica* XV (Tokyo 1956), 378–462; J. M. González, *Historia de las Misiones de China* V: *Bibliografías* (Madrid 1967); Toung-Li Yuan, *China in Western Literature* (New Haven 1958); K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China* (New York 1929); O. Ferreux, "Histoire de la Mission en Chine (1699–1950)," *Annales de la Congrégation de la Mission* 127 (Paris 1963), 3–530; J. de Moidrey, *La Hiérarchie Catholique en Chine, en Corée et au Japon* (*1307–1914*) (Shanghai 1914); N. Gubbels, *Trois siècles d'apostolat. Histoire du Catholicisme au Hukwang* (*1587–1870*) (Wuchang and Paris 1934); F. Margiotti, *Il cattolicismo nello Shansi delle origini al 1738* (Rome 1958); L. Pfister, *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne Mission de Chine* (*1552–1773*) I, II (Shanghai 1932–34); K. Menz, *Necrologium Fratrum Minorum in Sinis* (Peking 1948); J. van den Brandt, *Les Lazaristes en Chine 1667–1935* (Peking 1936).

THE PHILIPPINES AND THE SOUTH SEAS

LITERATURE: Streit V, VI; G. H. Anderson, ed., *Studies in Philippine Church History* (Ithaca and London 1969); *IV Centenario de la Evangelización de Filipinas 1565–1965: Boletín de la Provincia de San Nicolás de Tolentino de filipinas* 55 (Marcillo, Navarra 1965) 49-303; H. de la Costa, *The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581–1768* (Cambridge, Mass. 1961); P. Fernández, *Domínicos donde nace el sol* (Barcelona 1958); M. Valentin, *Ensayo de una Síntesis de los trabajos realizados por las Corporaziones religiosas Filipinas* I (Manila 1901); M. Merino, *Augustinos Evangelizadores de Filipinas 1565–1965* (Madrid 1965).

Part Two
The Established Church and the Enlightenment

SECTION ONE

Concepts

18. *Foundations and Forms of the Established Church in the Bourbon States of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: Hinschius; E. Friedberg, *Die Gränzen zwischen Staat und Kirche und die Garantien gegen deren Verletzung* (Tübingen 1872); E. H. Feine; G. Schnürer, *Katholische Kirche und Kultur in der Barockzeit* (Paderborn 1937); id., *Katholische Kirche und Kultur im 18. Jh.* (Paderborn, 1941); Seppelt-Schwaiger V; L. A. Veit, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* I (1648–1800) (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1931); Pastor XIII–XVI; H. Raab, *Kirche und Staat. Von der Mitte des 15. Jh. bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1966); P. Brezzi, *Stato e Chiesa nel Ottocento* (Turin 1964); J. F. le Bret, *Gesch. der so verrufenen Bulle In Coena Domini* (Frankfurt am Main 1769); K. Pfaff, "Beiträge zur Gesch. der Abendmahlsbulle vom 16.–18. Jh," *RQ* 38 (1930), 23–76; R. Giura Longo, "La bolla in Coena Domini et le franchigie al clero meridionale," *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 32 (Rome 1963), 275–96; 33 (Rome 1964), 81–128; P. G. Caron, *L'Appello per abuso* (Milan 1954).

FRANCE: R. Holtzmann, *Französische Verfassungsgeschichte von der Mitte des 9. Jh. bis zur Revolution* (Munich and Berlin 1910); G. J. Phillips, *Das Regalienrecht in Frankreich* (Halle 1873; reprint Aalen 1967); V. Martin, *Les origines du gallicanisme,* 2 vols. (Paris 1939); J. Thomas, *Le concordat de 1516. Les origines, son histoire,* 3 vols. (Paris 1910); R. Folz, "Le concordat germanique et l'élection des évêques de Metz," *Annuaire de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de la Lorraine* 40 (1931), 157–305; R. Metz, *La Monarchie française et la provision des bénéfices ecclésiastiques en Alsace de la paix de Westphalie à la fin de l'ancien Régime* (*1648–1789*) (Strasbourg and Paris 1947); H. G. Judge, "Church and State under Louis XIV," *History* 45 (1960), 217–33; R. Darricau, "Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège, les indultes de nominations aux bénéfices consistoriaux 1643–1670," *BLE* 65 (1965), 16–34, 107–31; id., "Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège. La négociation du Traité de Pise (1664)," *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France* (1964/65), 81–156; A. G. Martimort, *Le gallicanisme de Bossuet* (Paris 1953); J. Orcibal, *Louis XIV contre Innocent XI, les appels au futur concile de 1688 et l'opinion française* (Paris 1949); N. Ravitch, "The Taxing of the Clergy in 18th Century France," *CH* 33 (1964), 157–74; A. Guth, *Le don gratuit de clergé d'Alsace sous l'Ancien régime* (Strasbourg 1960); id. "Les dernières impositions royales du clergé d'Alsace," *Archives d'histoire et l'Église d'Alsace* 30 (1964), 205–72; B. Wunder, "Ludwig XIV. und die Konstanzer Bischofswahl 1689," *ZGObrh* 114 (1966), 381–91; P. Blet, *Le clergé de France et la monarchie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959).

THE TWO SICILIES: F. J. Sentis, *Die "Monarchia Sicula." Eine historisch-canonistische Untersuchung* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1869); E. Papa, "Politica ecclesiastica nel regno di Napoli tra il 1708 e il 1710," *Gregorianum* 36 (1955), 626–68; 37 (1956), 55–87; id., *Il regno di Napoli tra Roma e Vienna nei primi decenni del settecento* (diss. and Rome 1955); M. Schipa, *Il Regno di Napoli al tempo di Carlo Borbone* (Milan and Rome 1923); G. Falzone, *Il regno di Carlo di Borbone in Sicilia 1734–1759* (Rome 1964); R. Moscatti, *Nella Sicilia di Carlo VI. Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino II* (Florence 1958); G. Catalano, *Le ultimi vicente della Legazia apostolica di Sicilia nella controversia Liparitana alle legge quarentigie (1711–1871)* (Catania 1950); P. Onnis, "Bernardo Tanucci nel moto anticurialista del '700," *Nuova Rivista storica* 10 (1926), 328–65; id., "L'abolizione della Compagnia di Gesù nel Regno di Napoli," *Rassegna storica del Risorgimento* 15 (1938), 759–822: E. Viviani della Robbia, *Bernardo Tanucci e il suo piu importante carteggio,* 2 vols. (Florence 1942); A. Melpignano, *L'anticuralismo napoletano sotto Carlo III di Borbone* (Rome 1965); M. Rosa, "Politica concordataria, giurisdizionalismo e organizzazione ecclesiastica nel Regno di Napoli sotto Carlo di Borbone," *Critica storica* 4 (1967), 494–531; L. Spinelli, "La politica ecclesiastica di Bernardo Tanucci in tema di provista dei benefici Maggiori," *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Arturo Carlo Jemolo* I (Milan 1963), 1187–1236; R. Mincuzzi, *Bernardo Tanucci, ministro di Ferdinando di Borbone 1759–76* (Bari 1967).

TUSCANY: N. Rodolico, *Stato e Chiesa in Toscana durante la Regenza lorenese (1737–65)* (Florence 1910); F. Scaduto, *Stato e Chiese sotto Leopoldo I granduca di Toscana* (1765–90) (Florence 1885); A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II.,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1963–65); G. König, *Rom und die toskanische Kirchenpolitik (1765–90)* (diss., Cologne 1964); M. Rosa, "Giurisdizionalismo e riforma religiosa nella politica ecclesiastica leopoldina," *Rassegna storica toscana* 11 (1965), 257–300; E. Passerin d'Entrèves, "L'instruzione dei patrimoni ecclesiastici e il dissidio fra il vescovo Scipione de' Ricci e i funzionari leopoldini 1783–89," *Rassegna storica toscana* 1 (1955); id., "La riforma 'giansenista' della Chiesa e la lotta anticuriale in Italia nella seconda metà del Settecento," *RSIt* 71 (1959), 209–34.

PARMA AND PIACENZA; PIEDMONT: P. A. Kirsch, "Ein päpstliches Lehensprojekt für Parma und Piacenza unter Benedikt XIV.," *HJ* 24 (1903), 517–52; U. Benassi, "Gugliemo Du Tillot, un ministro riformatore del sec. XVIII. (1759–71)," *La politica eccles.: Arch. Stor. per le prov. Parmensi,* n.s., 24 (1924); P. C. Broglio, *Stato e Chiesa in Piemonte dal sec. XVIII al 1854* (Rome 1965); C. Caristia, "Riflessi politici del giansenismo italiano. La republica democratica in Piemonte 1798–1800," *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Arturo Carlo Jemolo* I (Milan 1963), 95–110; P. Stella, *Giurisdizionalismo e giansenismo all'Università di Torino nel secolo XVIII* (Turin 1958); id., "La bolla 'Unigenitus' e i nuovi orientamenti religiosi e politici in Piemonte sotto Vittorio Emanuele II, 1713–20," *RSTI* 15 (1961); R. Ciasca, "Contrasti giurisdizionali a Genova nel secolo XVII," *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Arturo Carlo Jemolo* I (Milan 1963), 195–213.

VENICE: B. Cechetti, *La Repubblica di Venezia e la corte di Roma nei rapporti di religione,* 2 vols. (Venice 1890); A. Battistella, *La politica ecclesiastica della Repubblica di Venezia* (Venice 1898); A. Stella, "La proprietà ecclesiastica nella Repubblica di Venezia dal sec. XV al XVII," *Nuova Rivista storica* 42 (1958), 4–30; id., *Chiesa e stato nelle relazioni dei nunzie pontifici a Venezia* (Vatican City 1964); A. M. Bettanini, *Benedetto XIV e la Repubblica di Venezia. Storia delle trattative diplomatiche per la difesa dei diritti giurisdizionali ecclesiastici* (Padua 1966).

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL: Q. Aldea, "Iglesia y Estado en la España del siglo XVII. Ideario político eclesiástico," *MCom* 36 (1961), 134–539; id., *Iglesia y Estado en la España del siglo XVII* (Comillas 1961); P. A. Kirsch, "Das durch Benedikt XIV. i. J. 1753 mit Spanien abgeschlossene Konkordat," *AkathKR* 80 (1900); R. S. Lamadrid, *El concordato español de 1753 según los documentos de su negociación* (Jerez de la Frontera 1938); B. Duhr, *Pombal. Sein Charakter und seine Politik* (Freiburg 1891); A. de la Hera, *El Regalismo Borbónico en su proyección indiana* (Madrid 1963); M. F. Miguélez,*Jansenismo y Regalismo en España* (Madrid 1895); V. Rodríquez, *Iglesia y Estado en el reinado de Carlos III = Estudios americanos* 1 (1948); R. Olachea, *Las relaciones hispano-romanas en la segunda mitad del XVIII,* 2 vols. (Zaragoza 1965).

19. *The Enlightenment*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: W. Dilthey, *Weltanschauung u. Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance u. Reformation* [=*Ges. Schr.* 2] (Göttingen 1960); P. Hazard, *La crise de la conscience Européenne. 1680–1715* (Paris 1935); id., *La pensée Européenne aux XVIII^{e} siècle de Montesquieu à Lessing* (Paris 1946); R. Mousnier, E. Labrousse, and M. Bouloiseau, *Le XVIII^{e} siècle. 1715–1815. L'époque des "lumières"* (Paris 1967); R. Kosellek, *Kritik und Krise. Ein Beitrag zur Pathogenese der bürgerlichen Welt* [=*Orbis Academicus*] (Freiburg and Munich 1959); J. L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy* (New York 1960); H. Nicolson, *The Age of Reason 1700–1789* (London 1961); A. Cobban, *In Search of Humanity. The Role of the Enlightenment in Modern History* (London 1960); L. I. Brevold, *The Brave New World of Enlightenment* (Ann Arbor 1961); F. Valjavec, *Geschichte der abendländischen Aufklärung* (Vienna and Munich 1961); A. Wolf, *A History of Science, Technology and Philosophy in the 18th Century,* 2 vols. (New York 1961); G. Funke, *Die Aufklärung. In ausgewählten Texten dargestellt und eingeleitet* (Stuttgart 1963); P. Chaunu, *La civilisation de l'Europe classique, restituée dans son unité profonde et sa diversité* (Paris 1966); F. Wagner, ed., *Europa im Zeitalter des Absolutismus und der Aufklärung* [=*Hdb. der europäischen Geschichte* IV] (Stuttgart 1968), see especially F. Wagner, "Die Einheit der Epoche," 1–163 (space devoted to the intellectual history of individual countries varies greatly); B. Willey, *The 17th Century Background, Studies in the Thought of the Age in Relation to Poetry and Religion* (Garden City 1953); R. Mousnier, *Les XVI^{e} et XVII^{e} Siècles. La grande mutation intellectuelle de l'humanité* (Paris 1965); B. Willey, *The 18th Century Background. Studies on the Idea of Nature in the Thought of the Period* (London 1961); *Transactions of the First International Congress on the Enlightenment,* 4 vols. (Geneva 1963) [=*Studies on Voltaire and the 18th Century,* ed. by T. Besterman, Vols. 24–27]; *Transactions of the Second International Congress on the Enlightenment,* 4 vols. (Geneva 1967) [=*Studies on Voltaire and the 18th Century,* ed. by T. Bestermann, Vols. 55–58]; W. Andreas, "Literaturberichte. Absolutismus und Aufklärung," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 5 (1954), 494–501; id., in *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 9 (1958), 107–14; id. in *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 16 (1965), 51–59.

PHILOSOPHY: J. Kremer, *Das Problem der Theodizee in der Philosophie und Literatur des 18. Jr.* (Berlin 1909); E. Cassirer, *Die Philosophie der Aufklärung* (1912) [=*Grundriß der philosophischen Wissenschaften*] (Tübingen 1932); S. Hampshire, ed., *The Age of*

Reason. The 17th Century Philosophers, Selected, with Introduction and Interpretative Commentary (Boston 1956); M. Wundt, *Die deutsche Schulphilosophie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Tübingen 1945); C. L. Becker, *The Heavenly City of the 18th Century Philosophers* (New Haven 1932, 1952); see especially the chapter on "The Laws of Nature and of Nature's God," pp. 33–70.

PEDAGOGY: L. Weber, *Pädagogik der Aufklärungszeit* (Frauenfeld and Leipzig 1941); H. Weimer, *Geschichte der Pädagogik* (Berlin 1967) [=*Sammlung Göschen* 145/145a]; A. Reble, *Geschichte der Pädagogik* (Stuttgart 1962), especially 123–59.

STATE AND INTERNATIONAL LAW: F. Meinecke, *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte* (1924) [=*Werke* I] (Munich 1957), 245–400; L. Strauss and J. Cropsey, eds., *History of Political Philosophy* (Chicago 1963); G. Möbus, *Die politischen Theorien im Zeitalter der absoluten Monarchie bis zur Französischen Revolution* (Cologne 1966); T. Ramm, *Die großen Sozialisten als Rechts- und Sozialphilosophen* I,1 and I,2 (Stuttgart 1955); E. Reibstein, *Völkerrecht. Eine Geschichte seiner Ideen in Lehre und Praxis* I [=*Orbis Academicus* I,5] (Freiburg and Munich 1957), 237–609; A. Geouffre de Lapradelle, *Maîtres et doctrines du droit des gens* (Paris 1950); J. J. Chévallier, *Les grandes œuvres politiques; de Machiavel à nos jours* (Paris 1957); K. v. Raumer, *Ewiger Friede. Friedensrufe und Friedenspläne seit der Renaissance* [=*Orbis Academicus*] (Freiburg and Munich 1953); H. J. Schlochauer, *Die Idee des Ewigen Friedens. Ein Überblick über Entwicklung und Gestaltung des Friedenssicherungsgedankens auf der Grundlage einer Quellenauswahl* (Bonn 1953), 76–129.

HISTORICAL CONNECTIONS: W. Dilthey, "Das 18. Jh. u. die geschichtliche Welt," *Deutsche Rundschau* (Aug./Sept. 1901) [=*Ges. Schriften* 3] (Göttingen 1959), 209–68; B. Croce, *Theorie u. Geschichte der Historiographie u. Betrachtungen zur Philosophie der Politik* [=*Gesammelte philosophische Schriften in dt. Übertragung,* I. Reihe, 4. Bd.] (Tübingen 1930), 3–136, 188–220; F. Meinecke, *Die Entstehung des Historismus* (Munich 1936, 1946); K. Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago 1949); F. Wagner, *Geschichtswissenschaft* [=*Orbis Academicus* I, 1] (Freiburg and Munich 1951, 1966), 63–140 (with biblio.); H. Gollwitzer, *Europabild u. Europagedanke. Beiträge zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte des 18. u. 19. Jh.* (Munich 1951); 54–118; H. v. Srbik, *Geist u. Geschichte vom deutschen Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* I (Munich and Salzburg 1950), 69–166; A. Kraus, *Vernunft und Geschichte* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1963) [Part I, "Das Jahrhundert und seine Geschichte," provides an aspect of the historical connections of the Enlightenment which goes far beyond the actual topic]; F. Günther, *Die Wissenschaft vom Menschen. Ein Beitrag zum deutschen Geistesleben im Zeitalter des Rationalismus mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Entwicklung der deutschen Geschichtsphilosophie im 18. Jh.* (Gotha 1906); A. Schreiber, "Das Mittelalter, universalhistorisches Problem vor der Romantik," *AKG* 31 (1943), 93–120.

MATHEMATICS AND THE NATURAL SCIENCES: F. Dannemann, *Die Naturwissenschaften in ihrer Entwicklung und in ihrem Zusammenhang,* 4 vols. (Leipzig 1920–23); I: *Von den Anfängen bis zum Wiederaufleben der Wissenschaften* (403ff.); II: *Von Galilei bis zur Mitte des 18. Jh.;* III: *Das Emporblüthen der modernen Naturwissenschaften bis zur Aufstellung des Energieprinzips* (starts in the middle of the eighteenth century); W. C. Dampier, *Geschichte der Naturwissenschaft in ihrer Beziehung zu Philosophie und Weltanschauung* (Vienna and Stuttgart 1952), 179–239; A. Meier, *Die Mechanisierung des Weltbilds im 17. Jh.* [=*Forsch. zur Gesch. der Philosophie u. Pädergogik* 18] (Leipzig 1938); J. Krüger, *Das Weltbild der Naturwissenschaft im Wandel der Zeiten. Eine Geschichte der Naturforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Paderborn 1953); E. J. Dijksterhuis, *Die Mechanisierung des Weltbildes* (Berlin, Göttingen and Heidelberg 1956), [pp. 319ff. to the end and especially the closing statement take religious issues into account]; H. Butterfield, *The Origins of Modern Science 1300–1800* (London 1958); R. A. Hall, *Die Geburt der naturwissenschaftlichen Methode 1630–1720 von Galilei bis Newton* (Gütersloh 1965); L. Roule, *L'histoire de la nature vivante d'après l'œuvre des grands naturalistes français,* 6 vols. (Paris 1924–32); O. Becker, *Die Grundlagen der Mathematik in geschichtl. Entwicklung* [=*Orbis Academicus* II, 6] (Freiburg and Munich 1964), 131–67; H. Weyl, *Philosophie der Mathematik und der Naturwissenschaft* [=*Hdb. der Philosophie,* newly ed. by M. Schröder] (Munich 1948); M. v. Laue, *Geschichte der Physik* (Bonn 1947); H. Lange, *Geschichte der Grundlagen der Physik,* 2 vols. [=*Orbis Academicus* II,7 and II,13] (Freiburg and Munich 1954–61), I, 165–239, II, 258–97; E. Zinner, *Astronomie. Geschichte ihrer Probleme* [=*Orbis Academicus* II,1] (Freiburg and Munich 1951); J. Anker and S. Dahl, *Werdegang der Biologie* (Leipzig 1938), 67–180; E. Ungerer, *Die Erkenntnisgrundlagen der Biologie. Ihre Geschichte und ihr gegenwärtiger Stand* [=*Hdb. der Biologie* I/1] founded by L. von Bertalanffy, ed. by F. Gessner (Constance 1965), here 26–42; E. Uhlmann, "Entwicklungsgedanke und Artbegriff in ihrer geschichtlichen Entstehung und sachlichen Beziehung," *Jenaische Zschr. für Naturwiss.* 59, M.S. 52 (Jena 1923), here 14–31; P. G. Hesse, *Der Lebensbegriff bei den Klassikern der Naturforschung. Seine Entwicklung bei 60 Denkern und Forschern bis zur Goethezeit* (Jena 1943), 30–79; E. Guyénot, *Les sciences de la vie aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles, L'idée d'évolution* (Paris 1941); A. Barthelmess, *Vererbungswissenschaft* [=*Orbis Academicus* II,2] (Freiburg and Munich 1952), 21–43; W. Zimmermann, *Evolution. Die Geschichte ihrer Probleme und Erkenntnisse* [=*Orbis Academicus* II,3] (Freiburg and Munich 1953), 158–336; T. Ballauff, *Die Wissenschaft vom Leben* I [=*Orbis Academicus* II,8] (Freiburg and Munich 1954), 121–343; J. Roger, *Les sciences de la vie dans la pensée français du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1963).

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE: O. Zöckler, *Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen Theologie und Naturwissenschaft mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Schöpfungsgeschichte,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh 1877–79); I: *Von den Anfängen der christlichen Kirchen bis auf Newton und Leibniz;* II: *Von Newton und Leibniz bis zur Gegenwart;* L. A. Veit, *Das Aufklärungsschrifttum des 18. Jh. und die deutsche Kirche. Ein Zeitbild aus der deutschen Geistesgeschichte* [=Görres-Ges. zur Pflege der Wiss. im kath. Dtl., Zweite Vereinsschrift] (Cologne 1937); W. Philipp, *Das Werden der Aufklärung in theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht* (Göttingen 1957), investigates the physicotheology of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century; concentrates expressly on the early Enlightenment; W. Philipp, ed., *Das Zeitalter der Aufklärung* [=Sammlung Dietrich 272, Series: *Klassiker des Protestantismus* VII] (Bremen 1963); the intention of this series explains the selection of personalities and textual excerpts, among them J. G. Hamann, J. K. Lavater, and M. Claudius, whereas J. Locke, D. Hume, and Voltaire, among others, are missing; id., *Das Werden der Aufklärung;* P. Althaus, *Die christliche Wahrheit. Lehrbuch der Dogmatik,* 2 vols. (Gütersloh 1947–48), a Protestant work on dogma which takes into account especially the historical problems between the natural sciences and theology; M. Scheele, *Wissen und Glauben in der Geschichtswissenschaft. Studien zum historischen Pyrrhonismus in Frankreich und Dtl.* (Heidelberg 1930); R. S. Westfall, *Science and Religion in 17th Century England* [=Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany 67] (New Haven 1958).

SECTION TWO

Church Life under the Influence of the Established Church and the Enlightenment

20. *Jansenism in Eighteenth-Century France*

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

L. Willaert, *Bibliotheca janseniana belgica,* 3 vols. (Namur and Paris 1949–51); J. Carreyre, "Les luttes du jansénisme," *RHEF* 10 (1924), 441–60; J. Dedieu, "L'agonie du jansénisme, essai de bio-bibliographie," *RHEF* 14 (1928), 161–214; V. Carrière, *Introduction aux études d'histoire ecclésiastique locale* III (Paris 1936).

SOURCES

J. Louail and J. B. Cadry, *Histoire du livre des Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament et de la Constitution Unigenitus,* 4 vols. (Amsterdam 1726–34); P. F. Lafitau, *Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus,* 2 vols. (Avignon 1737); A. Dorsanne, *Journal de M. l'abbé Dorsanne,* 2 vols. (Rome 1753); Dom V. Thuillier, *Histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus,* Bibl. Nat. Mss. F. Fr. 1731–37, partial edition of A. Ingold, *Rome et la France, la deuxième phase du jansénisme* (Paris 1901); F. Bourgoin de Villefore, *Anecdotes ou mémoires secrets sur la Constitution Unigenitus,* 3 vols. (n.p., 1730); Louis de Saint-Simon, *Mémoires,* ed. by A. de Boislisle, 41 vols. (Paris 1879–1927); Dangeau, *Journal,* ed. by Soulié-Dussieux, with a supplement by Saint-Simon, 19 vols. (Paris 1860); H. F. Daguessseau, *Œuvres,* 13 vols. (Paris 1780–89); Louis Le Gendre, *Mémoires,* ed. by M. Roux (Paris 1865); J. Buvat, *Journal de la Régence,* ed. by E. Campardon, 2 vols. (Paris 1865); N. Lenglet du Fresnoy, *Mémoires de la Régence,* 5 vols. (Amsterdam 1749); R. L. Voyer d'Argenson, *Mémoires,* ed. by Rathery, 9 vols. (Paris 1859–67); E. Barbier, *Journal du règne de Louis XV,* ed. by De la Villegille, 4 vols. (Paris 1847–49); M. Marais, *Journal et mémoires,* ed. by Lescure, 4 vols. (Paris 1863); N. de Lamoignon de Basville, *Journal historique,* ed. by H. Courteault (Paris 1910); F. de Fénelon, *Œuvres,* 10 vols. (Paris 1851–52); H. Robillard d'Avrigny, *Mémoires chronologiques et dogmatiques* (*1600–1716*), 2 vols. (Nîmes 1781); M. J. Picot, *Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire ecclésiastique pendant le XVIII^e siècle,* 7 vols. (Paris 1855–57); J. Tans, *Pasquier Quesnel et les Pays-Bas* (Quesnel's correspondence) (Groningen and Paris 1960); Mme A. Le Roy, *Un janséniste en exil, correspondance de Pasquier Quesnel,* 2 vols. (Paris 1900); R. Cerveau, *Nécrologe des plus célèbres défenseurs et confesseurs de la vérité,* 7 vols. (n.p., 1760–78); J. Soanen, *Lettres,* 7 vols. (Cologne 1750); J. B. Gautier, *La vie de Messire Jean Soanen* (Cologne 1750); C. J. Colbert de Croissy, *Œuvres,* 3 vols. (Cologne 1740); G. N. Nivelle, *Le cri de la foi* (*actes d'appel*), 3 vols. (n.p., 1719); id., *La Constitution Unigenitus déférée a l'Église universelle ou recueil des actes d'appel,* 3 vols. (Cologne 1757); Dettey, *Vie de M. de Caylus,* 2 vols. (Amsterdam 1765); C. G. de Caylus, *Œuvres,* 4 vols. (Cologne 1751); R. de Fourquevaux, *Catéchisme historique et dogmatique,* 5 vols. (Nancy 1750–58); *Nouvelles*

ecclésiastiques ou mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Constitution Unigenitus (1728–1803).

LITERATURE

E. Préclin, *Les jansénistes du XVIII^e siècle et la Constitution civile du clergé* (Paris 1929); J. Carreyre, *Le jansénisme durant la Régence,* 3 vols. (Louvain 1929–33); J. F. Thomas, *La querelle de l'Unigenitus* (Paris 1950); E. Préclin and E. Jarry, "Les luttes politiques et doctrinales aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles," *Fliche-Martin* XIX/2 (Paris 1955); A. Gazier, *Histoire générale du mouvement janséniste,* 2 vols. (Paris 1924); I. Bourlon, *Les Assemblées du Clergé et le jansénisme* (Paris 1909); L. Cognet, *Le jansénisme* (Paris 1961); J. Orcibal, "Fénelon et la Cour romaine (1700–1715)," *MAH* 57 (1940), 235–348; A. Le Roy, *Le gallicanisme au XVIII^e siècle, la France et Rome de 1700 à 1715* (Paris 1892); Dom H. Leclercq, *Histoire de la Régence pendant la minorité de Louis XV,* 3 vols. (Paris 1921); L. Cahen, *Les querelles religieuses et parlamentaires sous Louis XV* (Paris 1913); G. Hardy, *Le cardinal de Fleury et le mouvement janséniste* (Paris 1925); E. Bourgeois, *Le secret du Régent et la politique de Dubois* (Paris 1909); id., *Le secret de Dubois cardinal et premier ministre* (Paris 1912); E. Appolis, "La collaboration de Soanen aux Nouvelles ecclésiastiques," *RHEF* 30 (1944); H. Blanc, *Le merveilleux dans le jansénisme* (Paris 1865). For an extensive survey of recent works on Jansenism see W. H. Williams, "Jansenism Revisited," *CHR* LXII, no. 4 (1977), 573–82 and B. Van Kley, *The Jansenists and the Expulsion of the Jesuits from France, 1757-1-65* (New Haven 1975).

21. *Spirituality and Its Development in Eighteenth-Century France*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* 4 vols. (Paris 1926–28); L. Cognet, *De la Dévotion moderne à la spiritualité français* (Paris 1958); J. Le Brun, "Le Grand Siècle de la spiritualité française et ses lendemains," *Histoire spirituelle de la France* (Paris 1964), 227–86; G. Le Bras, *Introduction à l'histoire de la pratique religieuse en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942–45); J. de Guibert, *La spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus, esquisse historique* (Rome 1953); H. du Manoir et al., *Maria,* 6 vols. (Paris 1949–61); A. Hamon, *Histoire de la dévotion au Sacré-Cœur,* 5 vols. (Paris 1923–40); *Cor Jesu* (selected anthology), 2 vols. (Rome 1959).

22. *Anglican Spirituality in the Eighteenth Century*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité orthodoxe et la spiritualité protestante et anglicane* (Paris 1965; E.T.: *History of Christian Spirituality* III, *Orthodox Spirituality and Protestant and Anglican Spirituality* [New York 1969]); R. W. Church, *Masters of English Theology* (London 1877); E. J. Watkin, *Poets and Mystics* (London 1953); G. D. Henderson, *Mystics of the North-East* (Aberdeen 1934); R. Knox, *Enthusiasm* (London 1951); C. W. Towlson, *Moravian and Methodist, Relationship and Influence in the Eighteenth Century* (London 1957); U. Lee, *The Historical Backgrounds of the Early Methodist Enthusiasm* (New York 1931); R. Green, *Antimethodist Publications* (London

1902); W. R. Inge, *Studies of the English Mystics* (London 1906); A. de la Gorce, *Wesley maître d'un peuple* (Paris 1940); M. Schmidt, *John Wesley* (Zurich and Frankfurt 1953).

23. *Episcopalism in the Church of the Empire from the Middle of the Seventeenth Century to the End of the Eighteenth*

LITERATURE

A. v. Roskovány, *Romanus Pontifex tamquam Primas ecclesiae et princeps civilis,* 16 vols. (Neutra and Komorn 1867ff.); A. Werminghoff, *Nationalkirchliche Bestrebungen im deutschen Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1910); B. Gebhardt, *Die Gravamina der deutschen Nation gegen den römischen Hof* (Breslau 1895); K. Hofmann, "Die kirchenrechtliche Bedeutung des Konzils von Trient," G. Schreiber, ed. *Das Weltkonzil von Trient* I, 281–96; L. Mergentheim, "Die Wurzeln des deutschen Febronianismus," *HPBl* 139 (1907), 180–92; id., *Die Quinquennalfakultäten pro foro externo. Ihre Entstehung und Einführung in den deutschen Bistümern* [=*KRA* 52–55] (Stuttgart 1908); F. Vigener, "Gallikanismus und episkopalistische Strömungen im deutschen Katholizismus zwischen Tridentinum und Vatikanum," *HZ* 111 (1913), 495–581; id., *Bischofsamt und Papstgewalt. Zur Diskussion um Universalepiskopat und Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes im deutschen Katholizismus zwischen Tridentinum und Vatikanum* (Göttingen 1964); H. Jedin, "Die Reichskirche der Schönbornzeit," *TThZ* 65 (1956), 202–16; H. Hantsch, *Reichsvizekanzler Friedrich Karl von Schönborn (1674–1746). Einige Kapitel zur politischen Geschichte Kaiser Josefs I. und Karls VI.* (Augsburg 1929); A. Rösch, "Das Kirchenrecht im Zeitalter der Aufklärung," *AkathKR* 83 (1903), 446–82, 620–52; 84 (1904), 56–82, 244–62, 465–526; 85 (1905), 29–63; P. Muschard, "Das Kirchenrecht bei den deutschen Benediktinern und Zisterziensern des 18. Jh.," *SM,* NF 16 (47) (1929), 255–315, 477–596; id., "Die kanonistischen Schulen des deutschen Katholizismus im 18. Jh. außerhalb des Benediktinerordens," *ThQ* 112 (1931), 350–400; P. Kopfermann, *Das Wormser Konkordat im deutschen Staatsrecht* (diss., Berlin 1908); H. F. Hürten, "Die Mainzer Akzeptation" (unpubl. diss., Münster 1955); id., "Die Mainzer Akzeptation," *AMrhKG* 11 (1959), 42–75; H. Raab, "Johann Kaspar Barthels Stellung in der Diskussion um die Concordata Nationis Germanicae. Ein Beitrag zur Würzburger Kanonistik im 18. Jh." *Herbiopolis jubilans* (1952), 599–616; id., *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae in der kanonistischen Diskussion des 17. bis 19. Jh. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der episkopalistischen Theorie in Deutschland* (Wiesbaden 1956); J. Hemmerle, "Wessobrunn und seine geistige Stellung im 18. Jh.," *SM* 64 (1952), 13–71; E. Plassmann, *Staatskirchenrechtliche Grundgedanken der deutschen Kanonisten an der Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jh.* (Freiburg 1968); H. Raab, "Kirche und Staat im Urteil deutscher Kanonisten 1780–1830," *ZSKG* 63 (1969), 188–202.

HONTHEIM—FEBRONIUS—FEBRONIANISM

SOURCES: J. N. v. Hontheim and J. W. v. Hontheim, *Dissertatio juridica inauguralis de jurisprudentia naturali et summo imperio* (Trier 1724); J. N. v. Hontheim, *Historia Trevirensis diplomatica et pragmatica . . . ,* 3 vols. (Augsburg and Würzburg 1750); id., *Prodromus historiae Trevirensis diplomaticae et pragmaticae . . . ,* 2 vols. (Augsburg 1757); id., *De statu Ecclesiae et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis, ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione christianos compositus* (Boullion [Frankfurt] 1763); id., *Editio altera; priore emendatior, et multo auctior* 5 in 4 vols. (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1765–74); *Justini Febronii Buch von dem Zustand der Kirche und der rechtmässigen*

Gewalt des Römischen Papstes, die in der Religion widriggesinnten Christen zu vereinigen (Wardingen 1764); J. N. v. Hontheim, *Justinus Febronius abbreviatus et emendatus id est, de statu Ecclesiae Tractatus ex Sacra Scriptura, traditione, et melioris novae Catholicis scriptoribus adornatus ab auctore in compendium redactus* (Cologne and Frankfurt 1777); id., *Justini Febronii Commentarius in suam retractationem Pio VI. Pont. Max. Kalendis Novemb. An. 1778 submissam* (Frankfurt 1781); L. Just, "Justini Febronii epistola ad T. Mamachium," *QFIAB* 22 (1930/31), 256–88; (N. Vogt), *Briefwechsel zwischen weiland Ihrer Durchlaucht, dem Herren Kurfürsten von Trier, Clemens Wenzeslaus und dem Herrn Weihbischof Niklas von Hontheim über das Buch Justini Febronii de statu Ecclesiae et legitima Romani Pontificis potestate* (Frankfurt am Main 1813); *Einiges über Justinus Febronius und seine Meinungen* (Frankfurt and Leipzig 1779); L. Just, *Der Widerruf des Febronius in der Korrespondenz des Abbé Franz Heinrich Beck mit dem Wiener Nuntius Giuseppe Garampi* (Wiesbaden 1960).

LITERATURE: The articles on Febronianism and Hontheim in *DThC* V, 2 (Paris 1939), 2115–24; *StL* III (1959), 233–35; *LThK* V (1960) 479–80; *Evangelisches Staatslexikon*, 499–500; Feine, *RG* (1964); W. Wyttenbach-Baur, "Febronius," J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, 2d Section (Volume H–N), Part 10 (Leipzig 1833), 382–90; C. W. F. Walch, *Neueste Religions Geschichte* I (Lemgo 1771), 145–98; VI, 175; VII, 193ff., 453ff.; VII, 529ff.; G. Leclerc, *Zeger Bernard van Espen (1648–1748) et l'authorité ecclésiastique. Contribution à l'histoire des théories gallicanes et du jansénisme* (Zurich 1964); O. Mejer, *Febronius. Weihbischof Johann Nicolaus von Hontheim und sein Widerruf* (Tübingen 1885); L. Just, *Das Erzbistum Trier und die luxemburgische Kirchenpolitik von Philipp II. bis Joseph II.* (Leipzig 1931); id., "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Febronius," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 5 (1950), 369–82; id., "Hontheim. Ein Gedenkblatt zum 250. Geburtstag," *AMrhKG* 4 (1952), 204–16; F. Kenninck, *Les idées religieuses en Autriche de 1767 à 1787. Correspondance du Dr. Wittola avec le Comte Dupac de Bellegarde = Revue internationale de Théologie* 6 (Berne 1898); H. Keussen, "Weihbischof Hontheim und die Universität Köln," *Trierer Zschr.* 5 (1930); J. Kuntziger, *Fébronius et le Febronianisme = Mémoires de l'Académie royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Bruxelles* 44 (Brussels 1891); L. Rechenmacher, *Der Episkopalismus des 18. Jh. in Deutschland und seine Lehren über das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat* (Würzburg 1908); F. Stümper, *Die kirchenrechtlichen Ideen des Febronius* (Aschaffenburg 1908); H. Petersen, "Febronianismus und Nationalkirche" (unpubl. diss., Strasbourg 1942); E. Reifart, "Der Kirchenstaat Trier und das Staatskirchentum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Säkularisation" (unpubl. diss., Freiburg 1950); H. Raab, "Damian Friedrich Dumeiz und Kardinal Oddi. Zur Endtdeckung des Febronius und zur Aufklärung im Erzstift Mainz und in der Reichsstadt Frankfurt," *AMrhKG* 10 (1958), 217–40; id., "Neller und Febronius," *AMrhKG* 11 (1959), 185–206; id., *Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen und seine Zeit (1739–1812)* I: *Dynastie, Kirche und Reich im 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1962) (Vol. II, which is more extensively about Hontheim, will be published soon); id., "Der Augsburger Domdekan und Kurtrierische Konferenzminister Franz Eustach von Hohenstein. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der 'katholischen Aufklärung' und zum Kampf um Febronius," *HJ* 83 (1964), 113–34; P. Fuchs, "Der Pfalzbesuch des Kölner Nuntius Bellisomi und die Affäre Seelmann in der Korrespondenz des Kurpfälzischen Gesandten in Rom, Tommaso Marchese Antici," *AMrhKG* 20 (1968), 167–226; V. Conzemius, "Le testament de Mgr. de Hontheim," *T'Hémecht* 11 (1958) 4, 85–99; F. R. Reichert, "Johann Gertz (1744–1824). Ein katholischer Bibelwissenschaftler der Aufklärungszeit im Spiegel seiner Bibliothek," *AMrhKG* 18 (1966), 41–104.

EFFECTS OF FEBRONIANISM: G. Pfeilschifter, *Korrespondenz des Fürstabtes Martin II. Gerbert von St. Blasien,* 2 vols. (Karlsruhe 1931–43); W. Müller, *Briefe u. Akten des Fürstabtes Martin II. Gerbert von St. Blasien,* 2 vols. (Karlsruhe 1957–62); A. Cloer, "Fürstabt Martin Gerbert und der Streit um die Verfassung der römisch-katholischen Kirche in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jh." (unpubl. diss., Münster 1949); H. Raab, "Der Mainzer Weihbischof Ludwig Philipp Behlen (1714–77)," *Mainzer Almanach* (1968), 59–79; id., "Valentin Heimes' Informativprozesse anläßlich seiner Ernennung zum Weihbischof von Worms (1780) und Mainz (1782)," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 7 (1957); A. Bach, "Der Mainzer Weihbischof Valentin Heimes und die 'Weinpredigt' in Goethes 'St. Rochusfest zu Bingen,'" *RhVjBl* 27 (1962), 97–116; A. P. Brück, "Stephan Alexander Würdtwein, eine Lebensskizze," AMrhKG 2 (1950), 193–216; H. Sturmberger, "Studien zur Gesch. der Aufklärung in Kremsmünster," *MIÖG* 53 (1939), 423–80; B. Laube, *Joseph Anton Balthasar* (Basel 1956); J. Friedrich, "Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des 18. Jh. Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß des regul. Chorherrn Eusebius Amort" =*AAM* 13, II (Munich 1876), 1–142; M. Braubach, *Die erste Bonner Hochschule* (Bonn 1965); H. Becker, "Der nassauische Kirchen- und Oberschulrat Dr. Johannes Ludwig Koch (1772 bis 1853). Ein Exponent der episkopalistisch-staatskirchlichen und antizölibatären Bewegung," *AMrhKG* 15 (1963), 147–79; A. Müller, *Febronius der Neue oder Grundlagen für die Reformangelegenheiten der deutschen Kirchenverfassung im Geiste der Baseler Beschlüssse, der Fürstenkonkordate, der Emser Punktationen und der Frankfurter Grundzüge* (Karlsruhe 1838); C. Radlspeck, *Die nationalkirchliche Idee I. H. v. Wessenbergs im Urteil der Flugschriftenliteratur 1803–21. Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte und Restauration* (diss., Kallmünz 1930); H. Raab, "Aus dem Briefwechsel des Aschaffenburger Weihbischofs Joseph Hieronymus Karl von Kolborn mit dem Generalvikar von Konstanz Ignaz Heinrich von Wessenberg," *Aschaffenburger Jb.* 2 (1955), 98–133.

THE COBLENZ GRAVAMINA (1769)

SOURCES: M. Höhler, ed., *Des kurtrierischen Geistlichen Rats Heinrich Aloys Arnoldi Tagebuch über die zu Ems gehaltene Zusammenkunft der vier Erzbischöflichen deutschen Herrn Deputierten, die Beschwerde der deutschen Nation gegen den Römischen stuhl und sonstige Gerechtsame betreffend 1786* (Mainz 1915); B. Pacca, *Memorie storiche sul soggiorno del Cardinale Pacca in Germania 1785–94* (Rome 1832); G. Eilers, "Der Kardinal B. Pacca und der Nuntiaturstreit," *Deutsche Bl. für Protestanten u. Katholiken* 5 (Heidelberg 1840); "Mittheilungen aus dem Erzbischöflich-Trier'schen Geheimen Kabinetts-Archiv zur Charakteristik teutscher geistlicher Fürsten zum päpstlichen Stuhl," *Deutsche Bl. für Protestanten u. Katholiken* 6 (Heidelberg 1840), 69–107.

LITERATURE: H. Nottarp, "Der Koblenzer Kongreß von 1769 und Arnoldis Tagebuch vom Emser Kongrß," *ThGl* 7 (1915), 812–21; I. P. Dengel, *Die politische und kirchliche Tätigkeit des Monsignore Josef Garampi in Deutschland (1761–63)* (Rome 1905); L. Just, "Die westdeutschen Höfe um die Mitte des 18. Jh. im Blick der Kölner Nuntiatur," *AHVNrh* 134 (1939), 50–91; A. Schnütgen, "Ein Kölner Nuntius der Aufklärungszeit und die rheinischen Kurfürsten und Bischöfe. Nach vatikanischen Nuntiaturakten von 1770," *Ehrengabe der deutschen Wissenschaft,* ed. by F. Feßler (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1920), 743–66; id., "Aus der Kölner Nuntiatur um den Regierungsantritt von Clemens Wenzeslaus in Trier," *AHVNrh* 142/143 (1943), 207–41; C. Löffler, "Das Fraterhaus Weidenbach in Köln," *AHVNrh* 102 (1918), 125ff.; E. Hegel, "Febronianismus und Aufklärung im Erzbistum Köln," *AHVNrh* 142/143 (1943), 146–206; H. Raab, *Die Concordata Nationis Germanicae* (Wiesbaden 1956); id., "Die Finalrelation des Kölner Nuntius Giovanni Battista Caprara," *RQ* 50 (1955), 207–29; id., "Die Finalrelation des

Kölner Nuntius Carlo Bellisomi 1785–86," *RQ* 51 (1956), 70–124; H.-W. Jung, *Anselm Franz von Bentzel im Dienste der Kurfürsten von Mainz* (Wiesbaden 1966); K. J. Krüger, *Karl Friedrich Willibald von Groschlag (1729–99). Ein Beitrag zur Kurmainzer Politik und zur Aufklärung im Rhein- Main-Gebiet* (diss., Munich 1967); A. Stelzmann, "Franz Carl J. von Hillesheim. Ein Beitrag zur rheinischen Geistesgeschichte des 18. Jh.," *AHVNrh* 149/150 (1950/51), 181–232; A. Schulte, "Ein englischer Gesandter am Rhein. Georg Cressener als Bevollmächtigter Gesandter an den Höfen der geistlichen Kurfürsten und beim Niederrheinisch-Westfälischen Kreis (1763–1781)" (unpubl. diss., Bonn 1954); K. O. v. Aretin, *Heiliges Römisches Reich 1776–1806. Reichsverfassung und Souveränität,* Part I (Wiesbaden 1967); id., "Die Konfessionen als politische Kräfte am Ausgang des alten Reiches," *Festschrift Lortz* II, 181–84; A. Hanschmidt, *Franz von Fürstenberg als Staatsmann. Die Politik des münsterschen Ministers 1762–80* (Münster 1969).

Salzburg Congress: G. Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, *Der Salzburger Kongreß und seine Auswirkung 1770–77. Der Kampf des bayr. Episkopats gegen die staatskirchenrechtliche Aufklärung unter Kurfürst Max III. Joseph 1745–77. Verhandlungen zu einem ersten bayr. Einheitskonkordat* (Paderborn 1929); J. W. Weber, *Die Kirchenrechtswissenschaft in Bayern im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (diss. Würzburg 1904).

Congress of Ems: *Sanctissimi Domini nostri PII Papae Sexti Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mogunt., Trevir., Colonien. et Salisburgensem super Nuntiaturis Apostolicis* (Rome 1789) (The authors are: Cardinals Garampi and Zaccaria; the materials were furnished by, among others, the Cologne nuncio B. Pacca; the *Responsio* was edited by Cardinal Campanelli); *Brief Sr. Päpstlichen Heiligkeit Pius VI. an den Erzbischof von Köln als ein Nachtrag eben seiner Heiligkeit an die Metropoliten von Maynz, Trier, Köln und Salzburg mit der Widerlegung der Vredensischen Bemerkungen* (Düsseldorf 1790); among the contemporary literature about the congress (cf. Habenschaden, *Publizistik* [see below] and Raab, *Concordata*), we merely mention the following: F. X. Feller, *Coup d'œil oder Blick auf den Congress, der im Jahr 1786 von den vier Abgeordneten der vier Metropolitan Deutschlands zu Ems gehalten wurde,* 2 vols. (Düsseldorf 1789); K. J. Wreden, *Gesch. der Appellationen von geistlichen Gerichtshöfen zur Erläuterung des Art. XXII des Embser Kongresses* (1788); id., *Kurze Beleuchtung der Fakultäten päpstlicher Nunzien in Deutschland, Zur Erläuterung des in der Nunziatursache erlassenen kaiserlichen Hofdekrets und Art. IV des Embser Kongresses* (Cologne 1789); E. v. Münch, *Geschichte des Emser Kongresses und seiner Punktate, sowie der damit zusammenhängenden Nuntiatur-und Dispensstreitigkeiten, Reformen und Fortschritte der teutschen katholischen Kirche zu Ende des 18. Jh.* (Karlsruhe 1840) (tendentious but informative for the continuing effect of the Ems program); A. Coulin, "Der Emser Kongreß des Jahres 1786. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Kirchenrechts der Aufklärungszeit," *DZKR,* 3d ser., XXV (Tübingen 1916–17), 1–79; H. Schotte, "Zur Gesch. des Emser Kongresses," *HJ* 35 (1914), 86–109, 319–48, 781–820; F. X. Münch, "Der Kölner Stadtpfarrer Peter Anth (Theodolph Joseph van den Elsken). Ein Beitrag zur Kölner Kirchengeschichte an der Wende des 18. u. 19. Jh.," *AHVNrh* 82 (1907), 92–118; 84 (1909), 181–208; H. Raab, "Briefe von Karl Joseph Wreden an Stephan Alexander Würdtwein 1785–87," *AHVNrh* 153/154 (1953), 170–200; A. Wandruszka, "Ems und Pistoia," *Festschr. Max Braubach* (Bonn 1964), 627–34.

The Conflict over the Nunciatures: H. Raab, "Nuntiaturstreit," *LThK* VII (1962), 1072–73; K. Walf, *Die Entwicklung des päpstlichen Gesandtschaftswesens in dem Zeitabschnitt zwischen Dekretalenrecht und Wiener Kongreß (1159–1815)* (Munich 1966); see also: H. Raab, "Sieben Jahrhunderte päpstlichen Gesandtschaftswesens," *HJ* 89 (1969), 409–19; L. Just, "Die Erforschung der päpstlichen Nuntiaturen. Stand und

Aufgaben, besonders in Deutschland," *QFIAB* 24 (1933), 244–77; id., "Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Kölner Nuntiatur in Archiv und Bibliothek des Vatikans," *QFIAB* 29 (1938/39), 249–96; L. E. Halkin, *Les archives des nonciatures* (Brussels and Rome 1968); A. Veit, "Die Kölner Nuntiatur und der Mainzer Hof," *HPBl* 157 (1921), 208–16; M. Stigloher, *Die Errichtung der päpstlichen Nuntiatur in München und der Emser Kongreß* (Regensburg 1867); F. Endres, "Die Errichtung der Münchener Nuntiatur und der Nuntiaturstreit bis zum Emser Kongress," *Beitr. zur bayer. KG* 14/15 (Erlangen 1908–9); K. Habenschaden, *Der Münchener Nuntiaturstreit in der Publizistik* (Munich 1933); id., "Die Kirchenpolitik Bayerns unter Kurfürst Karl Theodor und ihr Verhältnis zum Emser Kongreß," *ZSavRGkan* 28 (1939), 333–417; B. Zittel, "Die Vertretung des Heiligen Stuhles in München 1785–1934," *Der Mönch im Wappen. Aus Geschichte und Gegenwart des katholischen München* (Munich 1960), 419–94; G. Schwaiger, *Die altbayerischen Bistümer Freising, Passau und Regensburg zwischen Säkularisation und Konkordat 1803–1817* (Munich 1959); A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II., Erzherzog von Österreich, Großherzog von Toskana, König von Ungarn und Böhmen, Römischer Kaiser,* 2 vols. (Vienna and Munich 1963–65); F. W. Becker, "Die Kaiserwahl Leopolds II. 1790. Eine Untersuchung zur Gesch. des alten Reiches und der Nachwirkung des Fürstenbundes" (unpubl. diss., Bonn 1943); G. J. Jansen, *Kurfürst Erzbischof Max Franz von Köln und die episkopalistischen Bestrebungen seiner Zeit. Nuntiaturstreit und Emser Kongreß* (Essen 1933); M. Braubach, *Maria Theresias jüngster Sohn Max Franz, Letzter Kurfürst von Köln und Fürstbischof von Münster* (Vienna 1961); K. Schottenloher," Der bayerische Gesandte Kasimir Haeffelin in Malta, Rom und Neapel, 1796–1827," *ZBLG* 5 (1932), 380–415; L. Litzenburger, "Der bischöfliche Informativprozeß des Münchener Hofbibliothekars C. Haeffelin," *RQ* 50 (1955), 230–47; J. Angermeier, *Das Bistum Freising im Nuntiaturstreit* (Munich 1921); A. Hoffmann, *Beda Aschenbrenner, letzter Abt von Oberaltaich* (diss., Munich 1964); R. v. Dülmen, *Propst Franziskus Töpsl (1711–96) und das Augustinerchorherrenstift Polling* (Kallmünz 1967); J. Mack, *Die Reformen und Aufklärungsbestrebungen Erzbischof Colloredos* (diss., Munich 1912); J. Schöttel, *Kirchliche Reformen des Salzburger Erzbischofs Hieronymus von Colloredo im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Passau 1939); H. Schlapp, *Dionys Reichsgraf von Rost, Reichsgraf und Bischof von Chur 1777–1793. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Bistums Chur im Zeitalter des Josephinismus = 93. Jahresbericht der Histor.-Antiquar. Gesellschaft von Graubünden* (Chur 1965).

24. *The Established Church and the Enlightenment in the Temporal Territories of the Empire—Theresianism and Josephinism*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: L. A. Veit, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* (Freiburg 1931); Seppelt-Schwaiger V (1959); E. Préclin and E. Jarry in *Fliche-Martin* XIX/1 (1956); F. Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche:* K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte;* H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte* (Weimar 1955) (supplementary: H. F. Schmid: *MIÖG* 63 [1955], 67–79); W. M. Plöchl, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* III (Vienna and Munich 1959); H. Conrad, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte, Neuzeit bis 1806* (Karlsruhe 1966); K. u. M. Uhlirz, *Handbuch der Geschichte Österreich-Ungarns* II; H. Hantsch, *Die Geschichte Österreichs* II (Graz and Vienna 1954); J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich. Wegweiser durch ihre Geschichte* (Vienna 1959); M. Spindler, *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte* II (Munich 1969), 1090ff.; H. Raab, *Kirche und Staat von der Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1966); H. Conrad, "Religionsbann, Toleranz

und Parität am Ende des Alten Reiches," *RQ* 56 (1961), 167–99; R. Reinhardt, "Bemerkungen zum geschichtlichen Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat," *Theologie im Wandel. Festschrift zum 150 jährigen Bestehen der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät an der Universität Tübingen 1817–1967* (Munich and Freiburg 1967), 155–78; E. Zöllner, "Bemerkungen zum Problem der Beziehungen zwischen Aufklärung und Josephinismus," *Österreich und Europa.* Festgabe für Hugo Hantsch (Graz Vienna and Cologne 1965), 203–19; K. Schlaich, "Der rationale Territorialismus. Die Kirche unter dem staatsrechtlichen Absolutismus um die Wende vom 17. zum 18. Jahrhundert," *ZSavRGkan* 54 (1968), 269–340; P. Muschard, "Das Kirchenrecht bei den deutschen Benediktinern und Zisterziensern des 18. Jahrhunderts," *SM* n.s. 16 (1929), 225–315, 477–596; id., "Die kanonistischen Schulen des deutschen Katholizismus im 18. Jahrhundert außerhalb des Benediktinerordens," *ThQ* 112 (1931), 350–400.

AUSTRIA UNTIL 1740: I. Höss, "Die konfessionelle Lage in Brandenburg-Preußen und Österreich im Zeitalter des Absolutismus," *GWU* 15 (1964); R. A. Kann, *Kanzel und Katheder. Studien zur österreichischen Geistesgeschichte vom Spätbarock zur Frühromantik* (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1962); F. Wessely, "Beitrag zur Kirchenpolitik unter Kaiser Josef I." (unpublished research paper prepared by the Österreichisches Institut für Geschichtsforschung, Vienna 1925); H. Künnel, *Staat und Kirche in den Jahren 1700–1740. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Staatskirchentums in Österreich* (diss., Vienna 1951); N. Miko, "Kirche und Staat im alten Österreich," *Linzer prakt. Quartalschrift* 104 (1956), 42–60; J. Sattek, *Der niederösterreichische Klosterrat. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Staatskirchentums in Österreich im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (diss., Vienna 1949); S. Santoli, "Wirtschaftliche Grundlagen des Josephinismus," *ÖAKR* 17 (1962), 213–33; H. Kramer, *Habsburg und Rom in den Jahren 1708–1709* (Innsbruck 1936); N. Huber, *Österreich und der Heilige Stuhl vom Ende des spanischen Erbfolgekrieges bis zum Tode Klemens' XI. (1714–1721)* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1967).

JOSEPHINISM; MARIA THERESA; JOSEPH II; LEOPOLD II; LATE JOSEPHINISM: A Coreth, *Pietas Austriaca. Ursprung und Entwicklung barocker Frömmigkeit in Österreich* (Vienna 1957); P. Meinhold, *Maria Theresia* (Wiesbaden, 1957); O. Wormser, *Marie-Thérèse impératrice* (Paris 1960); F. Walter, *Die Theresianische Staatsreform von 1749* (Vienna 1958); id., "Die religiöse Stellung Maria Theresias," *ThPQ* 105 (1957), 34–47; A. Wandruszka, "Maria Theresia und der oesterreichische Staatsgedanke," *MIÖG* 76 (1968), 174–88; R. Reinhardt, "Zur Kirchenreform unter Maria Theresia," *ZKG* 77 (1966); A. Wandruszka, "Die Religiosität Franz Stephans von Lothringen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der 'Pietas Austriaca' und zur Vorgeschichte des Josephinismus in Österreich," *MÖSTA* 12 (1959); J. Mössner, *Sonn- und Feiertage in Österreich, Preußen und Bayern im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (1915); H. Benedikt, "Der Josephinismus vor Joseph II," *Österreich und Europa. Festgabe für Hugo Hantsch* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1965), 183–201; P. Bernard, *The Origins of Josephinism. Two Studies* (Colorado Springs 1964); F. Maaß, *Der Frühjosephinismus* (Vienna 1969); id., *Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich 1760–1850,* 5 vols. (Vienna 1951–61); F. Valjavec, *Der Josephinismus* (Munich 1945); id., "Die josephinischen Wurzeln des österreichischen Konservativismus," *Ausgewählte Aufsätze,* ed. by K. A. Fischer and M. Bernath (Munich 1963), 323–30; id., "Der Josephinismus als politische und weltanschauliche Strömung," *Ausgewählte Aufsätze,* 307–22; F. Walter, *Die Geschichte der österreichischen Zentralverwaltung,* Parts 1 and 2 (Vienna 1950–56); E. Winter, *Der Josefinismus. Die Geschichte des österreichischen Reformkatholizismus 1740–1748* (Berlin 1962) (revised version of: E. Winter, *Der Josefinismus* [1943]); id., *Romantismus, Restauration und Frühliberalismus im österreichischen Vormärz* (Vienna 1968); H. Rieser, *Der Geist des*

Josephinismus und sein Fortleben. Der Kampf der Kirche um ihre Freiheit (Vienna 1963); E. Schenner, *Der Postjosephinismus und die frühfranziskische Reaktion* (diss., Vienna 1949); G. Holzknecht, *Herkunft und Ursprung der Reformideen Kaiser Josefs* (Innsbruck 1914); H. Franz, *Studien zur kirchlichen Reform Josephs II.* (Freiburg 1908); H. v. Voltelini, "Die naturrechtlichen Lehren und die Reformen des 18. Jahrhunderts," *HZ* 105 (1910), 65–104; F. Fejtö, *Joseph II. Kaiser und Revolutionäre* (Stuttgart 1956); P. Bernard, *Joseph II* (New York 1968); E. Winter, *Josef II. Von den geistigen Quellen und letzten Beweggründen seiner Reformideen* (Vienna 1946); H. Conrad, "Recht und Verfassung des Reiches in der Zeit Maria Theresias. Aus den Erziehungsvorträgen für den Erzherzog Joseph," *HJ* 82 (1962), 163–86; id., *Recht und Verfassung des Reiches in der Zeit Maria Theresias. Die Vorträge zum Unterricht des Erzherzogs Joseph in Natur- und Völkerrecht sowie im Deutschen Staats-und Lehnrecht* (Cologne and Opladen 1964); E. Zlabinger, *Lodovico Antonio Muratori und Österreich* (Innsbruck 1970); A Novotny, *Staatskanzler Kaunitz als geistige Persönlichkeit* (Vienna 1947); F. Maaß, "Die Stellungnahme des Fürsten Kaunitz zur staatlichen Festsetzung der Altersgrenze für die Ablegung der Ordensgelübde in Österreich im Jahre 1770/71," *MIÖG* 58 (1950), 656–67; W. Högl, "Bartenstein als Erzieher Josephs II." (unpubl. diss., Vienna 1959); E. Winter, "Kaiser Joseph II. und der Kardinalprotektor der deutschen Reichskirche, F. Herzan Reichsgraf v. Harras," *Prager Festgabe für Theodor Mayer* (Freilassing and Salzburg 1953), 148–55; F. Klein-Bruckschwaiger, "Franz Anton von Martini in der Zeit des späten Naturrechts," *Festschr. f. Karl Haff,* ed. by K. Bussmann and N. Grass (Innsbruck 1950), 120–29; H. Conrad, "Joseph von Sonnenfels (1733–1817). Zum 150. Todestag eines Vorkämpfers gegen die Folter," *Juristen-Jahrbuch* 8 (1967/68) (Cologne 1968), 1–16; H. Lentze, "Joseph von Spergs und der Josephinismus," *MÖSTA* supplementary Vol. III (1951), 392–412; F. Pascher, *Joseph Freiherr von Sperges auf Palens und Reisdorf* (diss., Vienna 1965). F. Dörrer, "Der Schriftverkehr zwischen dem päpstlichen Staatssekretariat und der apostolischen Nuntiatur Wien in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Römische historische Mitteilungen* 4 (1960/61), 63–246; id., "Römische Stimmen zum Frühjosephinismus," *MIÖG* 63 (1965), 460–83; A. Ellemunter, *Antonio Eugenio Visconti und die Anfänge des Josephinismus* (Graz and Cologne 1963); H. Schlitter, *Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien und sein Aufenthalt daselbst* (Vienna 1892); G. Soranzo, *Peregrinus Apostolicus. Lo spirito pubblico e il viaggio di Pio VI a Vienna* (Milan 1937); M. C. Goodwin, *The Papal Conflict with Josephinism* (New York 1938); L. Just, "Zur kirchenpolitischen Lage in Österreich bei Regierungsantritt Franz' II.," *QFIAB* 23 (1931/32), 242–66; F. Sissulak, "Das Christentum des Josefinismus. Die josefinische Pastoraltheologie in dogmatischer Sicht," *ZKTh* 71 (1949), 54–88; E. Glas, *Studien über den Einfluß Josephs II. auf die deutschen Bischofswahlen* (diss., Vienna 1949); J. A. K. Haas, "De Roermondse bisschopbenoemingen in de eerste helft van de Oostenrijkse periode, 1717–1749," *Archief voor de geschiedenis van de katholieke kerk in Nederland* 11 (1969); G. de Schepper, *La réorganisation des paroisses et la suppression des couvents dans les Pays-Bas autrichiens sous le régne de Joseph II* (Louvain and Brussels 1942); G. Winner, *Die Klosteraufhebungen in Niederösterriech und Wien* (Vienna and Munich 1967); N. Grass, "Österreichische Kanonistenschulen aus drei Jahrhunderten," *ZSavRGkan* 85 (1955), 290–411; J. Müller, "Zu den theologiegeschichtlichen Grundlagen der Studienreform Rautenstrauchs," *ThQ* 146 (1966), 62–97; F. Wehrl, "Der 'Neue Geist.' Eine Untersuchung der Geistesrichtungen des Klerus in Wien von 1750–1790," *MÖSTA* 20 (1967), 36–114; R. Reinhardt, *Die Beziehungen von Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz zu Habsburg-Österreich in der Neuzeit. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur archivalischen Erforschung des Problems "Staat und Kirche"* (Wiesbaden 1966); F. Geier, *Die Durchführung der kirchlichen Reformen Josephs II. im vorderösterreichischen Breisgau* (Stuttgart 1905); J. R.

Kušej, *Joseph II. und die äußere Kirchenverfassung Innerösterreichs* (Stuttgart 1908); F. Dörrer, *Zur sog. Pfarregulierung Josephs II. in Deutschtirol* (diss., Innsbruck 1950); id., "Der Wandel der Diözesaneinteilung Tirols und Vorarlbergs," *Tiroler Heimat. Jahrbuch für Geschichte und Volkskunde* 17 (1953), 41–74; H. Kröll, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aufhebung der Gesellschaft Jesu in Wien und in Niederösterreich" (unpubl. diss., Vienna 1964); A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II. Erzherzog von Österreich, Großherzog von Toskana, König von Ungarn und Böhmen, Römischer Kaiser,* 2 vols. (Vienna and Munich 1963–65); id., "Geheimprotestantismus, Josephinismus und Volksliturgie in Österreich," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 78 (1967), 94–101; H. Ferihumer, "Kaiser Leopold II. und der Episkopat der Erbländer. Die Rolle des Linzer Bischofs J. G. Gall," *Festschrift K. Eder* (Innsbruck 1959), 181–96; A. Ernstberger, *Zur Wiederherherstellung des Jesuitenordens. Vorschläge an Kaiser Franz II. 1794, 1799, 1800* = Sb. Bayer, Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Fasz. 7 (Munich 1962); E. Weinzierl-Fischer, *Der Toleranzbegriff in der österreichischen Kirchenpolitik. XIIe Congrès international des sciences historiques. Rapports* I (Vienna 1965), 135–50; D. Appelt, *Die Idee der Toleranz unter Kaiser Josef II.* (diss., Vienna 1950); C. H. O'Brien, *Ideas of Religious Toleration at the Time of Joseph II. A Study of the Enlightenment among Catholics in Austria* (Philadelphia 1969); H. Conrad, "Staatliche Theorie und kirchliche Dogmatik im Ringen um die Ehegesetzgebung Josephs II," *Wahrheit und Verkündigung, Michael Schmaus zum 70. Geburtstag* (Paderborn 1967), 1171–90; J. Mühlsteiger, *Der Geist des josephinischen Eherechts* (Vienna 1967); B. Primetshofer, *Rechtsgeschichte der gemischten Ehen in Oesterreich und Ungarn (1781–1841). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen Kirche und Recht* (Vienna 1967); D. Schwab, *Grundlagen und Gestalt der staatlichen Ehegesetzgebung in der Neuzeit bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Bielefeld 1967); F. Maaß, "Der Wiener Nuntius Severoli und der Spätjosephinismus," *MIÖG* 63 (1955), 484–99; E. Plaßmann, *Staatskirchenrechtliche Grundgedanken der deutschen Kanonisten an der Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg 1968); H. Raab, "Kirche und Staat im Urteil deutscher Kanonisten 1780–1830," *ZSKG* 63 (1969), 188–202; K. Reitbauer, *Erzbischof Johann Josef Trautson* (diss., Graz 1955); V. Einspieler, *Johann Karl Graf von Herberstein, Bischof von Laibach. Sein Leben, Wirken und seine Stellung in der Geschichte des Josephinismus* (diss., Vienna 1951); E. Hosp, *Bischof Gregorius Thomas Ziegler. Ein Vorkämpfer gegen den Josephinismus* (Linz a. D. 1956); C. Wolfsgruber, *Christian Anton Kardinal Migazzi* (Saulgau 1890); J. Obersteiner, *Die Bischöfe von Gurk (1072–1822)* (Klagenfurt 1969); H. Ferihumer, *Die kirchliche Gliederung des Landes ob der Enns im Zeitalter Kaiser Josefs II.* (Linz 1952); J. B. Lehner, "Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des Egerlands," *Jahresbericht zur Erforschung der Regensburger Diözesangeschichte* 13 (1939), 79–211; G. Prichan, "Über die Beziehungen Österreichs zur katholischen Kirche in Schlesien," *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen* 1 (1926); W. Sponner, *Kirchenpolitik im Banat von 1717–1778* (diss., Vienna 1941); G. Prokoptschuk, *Die österreichische Kirchenpolitik in der Westukraine unter der Regierung Maria Theresias von 1772–1780* (diss., Munich 1942); J. Tomko, *Die Errichtung der Diözesen Zips, Neusohl und Rosenau (1776) und das königliche Patronatsrecht in Ungarn* = *Kirche und Recht* 8 (Freiburg, Vienna and Basel 1968).

BAVARIA: M. Spindler, *Handbuch der bayer. Geschichte* II (Munich 1969); M. Doeberl, "Der Ursprung der Amortisationsgesetzgebung in Bayern. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts," *Forschungen zur Geschichte Bayerns* X (Munich 1902), 186–262; H. Rall, *Kurbayern in der letzten Epoche der alten Reichsverfassung (1745–1801)* (Munich 1951); P. Krinner, *Die Quellen des bayerischen Staatskirchenrechts* *in der Zeit von 1583 bis 1799* (diss., Würzburg 1907); J. Weber, *Die Kirchenrechtswissenschaft in Bayern im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Würzburg 1907); K. Habenschaden, "Die Kirchenpolitik Bayerns unter Kurfürst Karl Theodor," *ZSavRGkan* 28 (1939), 333–417; H. Lazik, *Die Entwicklung der geistlichen Gerichtsbarkeit im Kurfürstentum Bayern* (diss., Munich 1953); G. Pfeilschifter-Baumeister, *Der Salzburger Kongreß und seine Auswirkungen 1770–1777* (Paderborn 1929); W. Fichtl, "Das bayerische Bücherzensurkollegium (1769–1797)" (unpubl. diss., Munich 1941); B. Wacher, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der bayerischen Abtswahlen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Benediktinerklöster* (Munich 1930); E. Krausen, "Am Vorabend der Säkularisation. Die Abtwahl vom 1. Oktober 1801 im Kloster Raitenhaslach," *HJ* 80 (1961), 160–73; G. Schwaiger, *Die altbayerischen Bistümer Freising, Passau und Regensburg zwischen Säkularisation und Konkordat (1803–1817)* (Munich 1959); H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen und seine Zeit. Dynastie, Kirche und Reich im 18. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg 1962); E. M. Eder, "Beiträge zum Passauer Exemtionsstreit" (unpubl. diss., Vienna 1962); A. Leidl, *Kardinal Leopold Ernst von Firmian (1708–83)* (Munich 1968); E. Meissner, *Fürstbischof Anton Ignaz Fugger (1711–1787)* (Tübingen 1969); G. Schwaiger, "Pius VI. in München (1782)," *MThZ* (1959), 122–36.

LORRAINE AND OTHER TERRITORIES: P. le Sourd, *La Lorraine, le Barrois, les Trois-Évêchés dans l'histoire de la France et, demain, de l'Europe* (Paris 1966); E. Dursy, *Das Staatskirchenrecht in Elsaß-Lothringen* (Strasbourg 1876); R. Folz, *Le concordat germanique et l'élection des évêques de Metz* (Metz 1931); L. Just. *Clemens XI. und der Code Léopold (1701–1710). Die kuriale Politik im Kampf mit dem lothringischen Staatskirchentum zu Beginn des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main 1935); id., "Das Staatskirchentum der Herzöge von Lothringen-Bar von 1445–1633," *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 223–66; J. Krisinger, "Die Religionspolitik des Kurfürsten Johann Wilhelm von der Pfalz," *Düsseldorfer Jahrbuch* 47 (1955); H. Tüchle, *Die Kirchenpolitik des Herzogs Karl Alexander von Württemberg (1733–1737)* (Würzburg 1937); H. Krezdorn, "Das Kirchenpatronat über katholische Pfarreien in Hohenzollern. Geschichte und Rechtsentwicklung," *Hohenzollerische Jahreshefte* 16 (1956), 5–109; W. Thoma, *Die Kirchenpolitik der Grafen von Fürstenberg im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe (1520–1660)* (Münster 1963).

25. *State and Church in Poland-Lithuania to the End of the Republic of the Aristocracy*

LITERATURE

A. Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitorum historiam illustrantia* IV (Rome 1864); K. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin and Leipzig 1930); A Klawek, *Zarys dziejów teologii katolickiej w Polsce* (Crakow 1948); A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); *The Cambridge History of Poland,* ed. by W. F. Reddaway, J. H. Penson, O. Halecki, and R. Dyboski, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1950–51); Z. Szostkiewicz, "Katalog biskupów obrz. łac. przedrozbiorowej Polski," *Sacrum Poloniae Millennium* I (Rome 1954), 391–608; J. Umiński, *Historia Kościola,* ed. by W. Urban, II (Oppeln 1960); K. Górski, *Od religijności do mistyki, zarys dziejów życia wewnętrznego w Polsce* I (Lublin 1962); G. Rhode, *Kleine Geschichte Polens* (Darmstadt 1965); J. Tazbir, *Historia kościola katolickiego w Polsce 1460–1795* (Warsaw 1966); *History of Poland* (Warsaw 1968); B. Stasiewski, "Tausend Jahre polnischer Kirchengeschichte," *Kirche im Osten* 10 (1967), 48–67; *Le millénaire du catholicisme en Pologne* (Lublin 1969).

26. *The Decline of the Church of the Empire in the Great Secularization*

SOURCES

Protokoll der außerordentlichen Reichsdeputation zu Regensburg, 6 vols. (2 vols. of protocols, 4 vols. of supplements) (Regensburg 1803); A. C. Gaspari, *Der Deputations-Rezeß mit histor., geograph. und statist. Erläuterungen und einer Vergleichungstafel,* 2 vols. (Hamburg 1803); id., *Der französisch-russische Entschädigungsplan mit histor., geograph. und statist. Erläuterungen* (Hamburg 1802); T. v. Traitteur, *Der deutschen Reichsstände Verlust auf dem linken Rheinufer und der Besitzungen der katholischen Geistlichkeit auf dem rechten, nach Größe, Bevölkerung und Einkünften geschätzt* (Mannheim 1799); G. F. Martens, *Recueil des principaux traités . . . conclus par les puissances de l'Europe . . . depuis 1761 jusqu'à present,* 8 vols. (Göttingen 1817–35); C. W. v. Lancizolle, *Übersicht der deutschen Reichsstandschafts- u. Territorial-Verhältnisse vor dem frz. Religionskriege, der seitdem eingetretenen Veränderungen und der gegenwärtigen Bestandtheile des deutschen Bundes und der deutschen Bundesstaaten* (Berlin 1830); A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le Autorità Civili* (Rome 1954); A. v. Vivenot and H. v. Zeissberg, *Quellen zur Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserpolitik Österreichs während der frz. Revolutionskriege 1789–1801,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1873–74); H. Granier, *Preußen und die kathol. Kirche seit 1640* 8 and 9 (1797–1803, 1803–7) (Leipzig 1902); J. Hansen, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Rheinlandes im Zeitalter der Frz. Revolution, 1780–1801* 1–4 (Bonn 1931–38); E. R. Huber, *Dokumente zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte* I (Stuttgart 1961); K. O. v. Aretin, *Heiliges Römisches Reich 1776 bis 1806* II (selection of official documents) (Wiesbaden 1967); R. Freiin v. Oer, *Die Säkularisation 1803* (Göttingen 1970); U. Engelmann, ed., *Das Tagebuch von Ignaz Speckle, Abt von St. Peter im Schwarzwald,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1966); A Kraus, ed., *Die Briefe Roman Zirngibls von St. Emmeram in Regensburg* (Regensburg 1965).

LITERATURE

ON THE HISTORY OF SECULARIZATION TO THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: Pastor XIV–XVI, 3; P. Volk, "Die kirchlichen Fragen auf dem Westfälischen Frieden," *Pax optima rerum,* ed. by E. Hövel (Münster 1948), 99–138; P. Hiltebrandt, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsverhandlungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jh.* (Rome 1922); A. M. Trivellini, *Il cardinale Francesco Buonvisi, nunzio a Vienna* (*1675–89*) (Florence 1958); F. Díaz, *Francesco Buonvisi. Nunziatura a Colonia* (*1670–72*), 2 vols. (Rome 1959); T. Vollbehr, "Der Ursprung der Säkularisationsprojekte in den Jahren 1742/43," *FDG* 26 (1886); W. v. Hofmann, "Das Säkularisationsprojekt von 1743, Kaiser Karl VII. und die röm. Kurie," *Festschr. S. Riezler* (1913); L. Just, "Die römische Kurie und das Reich unter Kaiser Karl VII.," *HJ* 52 (1932); I. P. Dengel, *Die politische und kirchliche Tätigkeit des Monsignor Josef Garampi in Deutschland, 1761–63* (Rome 1905); Maaß; A. Ellemunter, *Antonio Eugenio Visconti und die Anfänge des Josephinismus* (Graz and Cologne 1963); L. P. Behlen, *Diss. de causis secularisationum illegitimis et legitimis* (Mainz 1746); P. v. Osterwald, *Veremund von Lochsteins Gründe sowohl für als wider die geistliche Immunität in zeitlichen Dingen* (Strasbourg 1766); A. Desing, *Staatsfrage: Sind die Güter und Einkünfte der Geistlichkeit dem Staate schädlich oder nicht?* 2 parts (Munich 1768); A Molitor, *Theologische Abhandlung von der Macht der Kirche über die Kirchengüter* (Freysing 1768); B. Wöhrmüller, "Literarische Sturmzeichen von der Säkularisation," *SM* n.s. 14 (1927); H. Raab, *Clemens Wenzeslaus von Sachsen und seine Zeit* I: *Dynastie, Kirche und Reich im 18. Jh.* (Freiburg 1962); G. Winner, *Die Klosteraufhebungen in Niederösterreich und Wien* (Vienna and Munich 1967); H. v. Voltelini, "Ein Antrag des Bischofs von Trient auf

Säkularisierung und Einverleibung seines Fürstentums in die Grafschaft Tirol vom Jahre 1781/82," *Veröff. des Museum Ferdinandeum* 16, Jg. 1936 (1938); P. Wende, *Die geistlichen Staaten und ihre Auflösung im Urteil der zeitgenöss. Publizistik* (Lübeck and Hamburg 1966).

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND ITS EFFECT ON THE CHURCH OF THE EMPIRE

A) PREREVOLUTIONARY UNREST; THE EXECUTION AGAINST LIÈGE: P. Harsin, *La révolution liègeoise de 1789* (Brussels 1954); J. Kühn, *Wie Lüttich dem Reich verlorenging. Rückblick auf die Reichsexekution 1790/91* (1914); E. Schulte, *Der Krieg Münsters gegen Lüttich, 1789–92 = Quellen und Forschungen zur Gesch. der Stadt Münster* 3 (1927); P. Strothotte, *Die Exekution gegen Lüttich 1789–92. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Heiligen Römischen Reiches deutscher Nation* (Bonn 1936); H. Stradal, "Die brabantische Revolution des Jahres 1789 aus Wiener Sicht," *Anciens Pays et Assemblées d'États* 47 (1968), 273–317; A Sprunck, "Die Lage in den österreichischen Niederlanden 1790 nach den Berichten der Statthalterin Marie Christine an die Wiener Regierung," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 11 (1958); K. Julku, *Die revolutionäre Bewegung im Rheinland am Ende des 18. Jh.* (Helsinki 1965); L. Vautrey, *Histoire des évêques de Bâle* II (Einsiedeln 1886); J. Rebetez, *Les relations de l'Évêché de Bâle avec la France au XVIII^e siècle* (St-Maurice 1943); M. Braubach, "Bischof Gobel, Kurfürst Max Franz von Köln und das Bistum Basel," *HJ* 60 (1940), 300–311; R. Bohlender, *Dom und Bistum Speyer. Eine Bibliographie* (Speyer 1962); L. Litzenburger, "Stadt und Bistum Speyer im frz. Revolutionsradius im Jahre 1794," *RQ* 52 (1957), 240–49; L. Vezin, *Die Politik des Mainzer Kurfürsten Friedrich Karl v. Erthal 1789–92* (Bonn 1932); F. G. Dreyfus, *Sociétés et mentalités à Mayence dans la seconde moitié du 18^e siècle* (Paris 1968); H. Telöken, *Kurtrierische Politik zur Zeit der Französischen Revolution* (unpubl. diss., Bonn 1951); E. Zenz, "Die kirchenpolitischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Erzstift Trier und Frankreich nach Ausbruch der Französischen Revolution," *AMrhKG* 4 (1952); W. Lüdtke, "Kurtrier und die revolutionären Unruhen in den Jahren 1789–1790," *Trierer Zsch.* 5 (1930); M. Braubach, "Die kath. Universitäten Deutschlands und die Frz. Revolution," *HJ* 49 (1929); id., *Maria Theresias jüngster Sohn Max Franz. Letzter Kurfürst von Köln und Fürstbischof von Münster* (Vienna and Munich 1961); H. Flurschütz, *Die Verwaltung des Hochstifts Würzburg unter Franz Ludwig v. Erthal (1779–95)* (Würzburg 1965).

B) THE REVOLUTION AND ITS EFFECT: K. T. Heigel, *Deutsche Gesch. vom Tode Friedrichs d. Gr. bis zur Auflösung des alten Reiches,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 2nd Berlin 1911); B. Gebhardt, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* III: *Von der Französischen Revolution bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg,* ed. by H. Grundmann (Stuttgart 1969); K. v. Raumer, *Deutschland um 1800 = Hdb. der deutschen Gesch.*, ed. by L. Just (n.d.); F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,* 4 vols. (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1949–59); E. R. Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* I (Berlin, Cologne and Mainz 1957); Seppelt-Schwaiger V; A. Latreille, *L'église catholique et la Révolution Française,* 2 vols. (Paris 1946–50); J. Droz, *L'Allemagne et la Révolution française* (Paris 1949); K. D. Erdmann, *Volkssouveränität und Kirche 1789–91. Studien über das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in Frankreich vom Zusammentritt der Generalstände bis zum Schisma* (Cologne 1949); S. S. Biro, *The Germany Policy of Revolutionary France,* 2 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. 1957); A. Ernstberger, *Österreich und Preußen von Basel bis Campoformio 1795–97* (Reichenberg 1932); A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II. Erzherzog von Österreich, Großherzog von Toskana, König von Ungarn und Böhmen, Römischer Kaiser,* 2 vols. (1963–65).

Emigration: W. Wühr, *Die Emigranten der Frz. Revolution im bayerischen und fränkischen Kreis* (Munich 1938); id., "Emigranten der Frz. Revolution im Kurfürstentum Mainz," *Aschaffenburger Jb.* 2 (1955); id., "Emigranten der Frz. Revolution im Erzstift Salzburg," *Mitt. der Gesellschaft für Salzburgische Landeskunde* 79 (1939), 33–64; A. Gain, *Liste des émigrés, deportés, condamnés pour cause révolutionnaire du départment de la Moselle,* 2 vols. (1925–29); M. Barth, "Seminaristen und Benediktiner des Elsaß als Flüchtlinge im Kloster Ettenheimmünster während der Frz. Revolution," *Freib. Diöz. Arch.* 71 (1951); J. Vidalenc, *Les émigrés français 1789–1825* (Caen 1963); P. de Vaissière, *A Coblence ou les Émigrés français dans les pays Rhénans de 1789* à 1792 (Paris 1924); F. Baldensperger, *Le mouvement des idées dans l'émigration française,* 2 vols. (Paris 1924); M. Pawlik, "Emigranten der frz. Revolution in Österreich (1789–1814)," *MIÖG* 77 (1969), 78–127.

The Regions on the Left Bank of the Rhine: A. Quiquerrez, *Histoire de la révolution dans l'évêché de Bâle en 1791* (Porrentruy 1881); R. Reuss, *La constitution civile du clergé et la crise religieuse en Alsace* (1790–95), 2 vols. (Strasbourg 1922–23); L. Stamer, *Kirchengeschichte der Pfalz* IV (Speyer 1964); E. Isele, *Die Säkularisation des Bistums Konstanz und die Reorganisation des Bistums Basel* (Basel and Freiburg 1932); L. A. Veit, *Der Zusammenbruch des Mainzer Erzstuhls infolge der frz. Revolution* (Mainz 1927); R. Usinger, *Das Bistum Mainz unter frz. Herrschaft* (Mainz 1912); R. Werner, *Die Nationalgüter im Department Donnersberg* (Heidelberg 1922); J. Marx, *Gesch. des Erzstifts Trier* V (Trier 1867); A Eismann, *Umschreibung der Diözese Trier und ihrer Pfarreien 1802–21* (Saarbrücken 1941); G. Groß, *Trierer Giestesleben unter dem Einfluß von Aufklärung und Romantik (1750–1850)* (Trier 1956); M. Höhler, *Gesch. des Bistums Limburg* (Limburg 1908); G. Kliesing, *Die Säkularisation in den kurköln. Ämtern Bonn. Brühl, Lechenich und Zülpich in der Zeit der frz. Fremdherrschaft* (Bonn 1933); W. Klompen, *Die Säkularisation im Arrondissement Krefeld 1794–1814* (Kempen 1962); H. Mosler, "Die Zisterzienserabtei Kamp in ihrem letzten Jahrhundert," *AHVNrh* 170 (1968), 22–119.

THE IMPERIAL DELEGATES FINAL RECESS AND THE GREAT SECULARIZATION OF 1803: I. Rinieri, *Le secolarizzazione degli stati ecclesiastici in Germania* (Rome 1906); H. Bastgen, *Dalberg und Napoleons Kirchenpolitik in Deutschland* (Paderborn 1917); id., "Die Ursachen der Säkularisation der Bistümer und Domkapitel von Trient und Brixen und ihr Verhältnis zur Grafschaft Tirol," *HJ* 34 (1913); id., *Bayern und der Heilige Stuhl in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jh.*, 2 vols. (Munich 1940); E. Bauernfeind, *Die Säkularisationsperiode im Hochstift Eichstätt bis zum endgültigen Übergang an Bayern 1790–1806* (1927); J. A. Bornewasser, *Kirche und Staat in Fulda unter Wilhelm Friedrich von Oranien 1802–06* (Nijmegen 1956); E. Buchholtz, *Die Einwirkungen des Reichsdeputationshauptschlusses zu Regensburg im Jahre 1803 und die Bulle "Impensa Romanorum Pontificum" auf das Bistum Osnabrück* (Osnabrück 1930); E. Deuerlein, *Die reichsständische Säkularisation des Hochstifts Würzburg* (Würzburg 1958); H. H. Dunkhase, *Das Fürstentum Krautheim. Eine Staatsgründung um Jagst und Tauber 1802–1806* (1839) (Nuremberg 1968); N. Enneking, *Das Hochstift Fulda unter seinem letzten Fürstbischof Adalbert III. von Harstall 1788–1802* (Fulda 1935); W. Engel, "Aus den letzten Tagen des Hochstifts Würzburg," *Mainfränk. Hefte* 6 (1954); M. Erzberger, *Die Säkularisation in Württemberg von 1802 bis 1810* (Stuttgart 1902); E. Fleig, "K. T. v. Dalberg und die Säkularisation des Fürstbistums Konstanz," *Freib. Diöz. Arch.* 29 (1928); M. Fleischhauer, *Das geistliche Fürstentum Konstanz beim Übergang an Baden* (Heidelberg 1934); D. Froitzheim, *Das Staatskirchenrecht im ehemaligen Großherzogtum Berg* (Amsterdam 1967); E. G. Gerhard, *Gesch. der Säku-*

larisation in Frankfurt a. M. (Paderborn 1935); L. Günther, *Der Übergang des Fürstbistums Würzburg an Bayern* (Leipzig 1910); L. Hammermayer, "Die europäischen Mächte und die Bewahrung von Abtei und Seminar der Schotten in Regensburg (1802/03)," *Verhandlungen d. Histor. Vereins f. Oberpfalz u. Regensburg* 106 (1966), 291–306; L. Hoffmann, *Die Säkularisation Salzburgs* (diss., Vienna 1943); P. Hofmeister, "Die Reorganisation des Malteserordens nach 1798," *AkathKR* 137 (1968), 463–523; R. Haderstorfer, *Die Säkularisation der oberbayerischen Klöster Baumburg und Seeon* (Stuttgart 1967); E. Isele, *Die Säkularisation des Bistums Konstanz und die Reorganisation des Bistums Basel* (Basel and Freiburg 1933); F. Köppel, "Dahlberg und die Säkularisation des Bistums Konstanz," *ZGObrh* 102 (1954); L. Körholz, *Die Säkularisation und Organisation in den preußischen Entschädigungsländern Essen, Werden und Elten 1802–06* (Münster 1907); F. Keinemann, *Das Domkapitel zu Münster im 18. Jh.* (Münster 1967); A Meier, *Abt Pankraz Vorster und die Aufhebung der Fürstabtei St. Gallen* (Fribourg 1954); R. Morsey, "Wirtschaftliche und soziale Auswirkungen der Säkularisation in Deutschland," *Festgabe für K. v. Raumer* (Münster 1968), 361–83; W. G. Neukam, "Der Übergang des Hochstifts Bamberg an die Krone Bayern 1802/03," *Bayern-Staat und Kirche, Land und Reich. Wilh. Winkler zum Gedächtnis* (Munich 1961); H. Raab, "K. T. v. Dalberg. Das Ende der Reichskirche und das Ringen um den Wiederaufbau des kirchlichen Lebens 1802—15," *AmrhKG* 18 (1966), 27–39; H. Reich, *Die Säkularisation des rechtsrheinischen Teiles des Hochstifts Speyer* (Bottrop 1935); H. Reichert, *Studien zur Säkularisation in Hessen-Darmstadt* (Mainz 1927); E. Ringelmann, *Die Säkularisation des Hochstifts und des Domkapitels Passau* (Passau 1939); E. Probst, "Würzburg—vom Hochstift zum Rheinbundstaat," *Mainfränk. Jb. für Gesch. und Kunst* 9 (1957), 70–102; J. C. Nattermann, *Das Ende des alten Kölner Domstiftes* (Cologne 1953); R. Reinhardt, *Die Beziehungen von Hochstift und Diözese Konstanz zu Habsburg-Österreich* (Wiesbaden 1966); P. Ruf, *Säkularisation und Bayerische Staatsbibliothek* (Wiesbaden 1962); H. W. Schlaich, "Das Ende der Regensburger Reichsstifte St. Emmeram, Ober- und Niedermünster," *Vhh. des Hist. Vereins für Oberpfalz* 97 (1956), 163–376; A Scharnagl, "Zur Gesch. des Reichsdeputationshauptschlusses vom Jahre 1803," *HJ* 70 (1950); A. M. Schegelmann, *Gesch. der Säkularisation im rechtsrhein. Bayern,* 3 vols. (Regensburg 1903–8); A. Schlittmeier, *Die wirtschaftl. Auswirkungen der Säkularisation in Niederbayern, untersucht am Beispiel der Abtei Niederaltaich und seiner Propsteien Rinchnach und St. Oswald* (diss. Munich 1962); G. Schwaiger, *Die altbayerischen Bistümer Freising, Passau und Regensburg zwischen Säkularisation und Konkordat* (Munich 1959); id., "Das dalbergische Fürstentum Regensburg 1803–1810," *Zeitschrift für bayr. Landesgeschichte* 23 (1960), 42–65; id., "Die Kirchenpläne des Fürstprimas K. T. von Dalberg," *Münchener Theol. Zeitschrift* 9 (1958), 186–204; id., "Das Ende der Reichskirche und seine unmittelbaren Folgen," *SM* 79 (1968), 136–48; W. Steffen, "Rheingrenze und territoriale Entschädigungsfrage in der preuß. Politik der Jahre 1795–1798," *Westfäl Forschungen* 6 (1943/52), 149–81; P. E. Stellwag, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Abtei Münster Schwarzach a. M. um die Zeit ihrer Auflösung 1803* (diss., Würzburg 1946); G. Seith, "Die rechtsrhein. Gebiete des Bistums Basel und ihr Übergang an Baden" (unpubl. diss., Freiburg i. Brsg. 1951); W. H. Struck, "Zur Säkularisation im Lande Nassau," *Hess Jb. für Landsgesch.* 18 (1963); M. Schöne, *Das Herzogtum Westfalen unter hessen-darmstädtischer Herrschaft 1802–16* (Olpe 1966); F. Täubl, *Der Deutsche Orden im Zeitalter Napoleons* (Bonn 1966); H. Tremel, *Die säkularisierten Klosterwaldungen in Altbayern* (1924); L. A. Veit, "Die Säkularisierung in Nassau-Usingen," *ZGOwrh* 80 (1928); B. Wagner, *Die Säkularisation der Klöster im Gebiet der heutigen Stadt Passau, 1802–03* (Passau 1935); A. Wendehorst, "Der

Untergang der alten Abteikirche Münsterschwarzach 1803/04," *Mainfränk. Hefte* 17 (Würzburg 1953); B. Wenisch, "Der Kampf um den Bestand des Erzbistums Salzburg, 1743–1825," *Mitt. der Gesellschaft für Salzburgische Landeskunde* 106 (1966), 303–46; A. Schneider, *Der Gewinn des bayerischen Staates von den säkularisierten landständischen Klöstern in Altbayern* (Munich 1970).

27. *Attempts at Church Reunion*

LITERATURE

J. Beumer, *Auf dem Wege zur christlichen Einheit. Vorläufer der ökumenischen Bewegung von den Anfängen des Humanismus bis zum Ende des 19. Jh. Ausgewählte Texte* (Bremen 1966); C. W. Hering, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche seit der Reformation bis auf unsere Zeit,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1836–38); L. Cardauns, *Zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Unions- und Reformbestregbungen von 1538–1542* (Rome 1910); T. Schieder, "Kirchenspaltungen und Kirchenunionspläne," *Wissenschaft in Geschichte und Unterricht* 3 (1952), 591–605; G. Menge, *Versuche zur Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands im Glauben* (Steyl 1921); H. Weidemann, *Gerard Wolter Molanus, Abt zu Loccum* (Göttingen 1925–29); F. Ranft, *Das katholisch-protestantische Problem* (Fulda 1947); M. P. Fleischer, *Katholische und lutherische Ireniker, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des 19. Jh.* (Göttingen, Frankfurt and Zurich 1968); J. Müller, "Karl Ludwig und die Wiedervereinigung der Konfessionen," *Blätter für Pfälzische Kirchengeschichte* 29 (1962), 130–79; E. W. Zeeden, "Der ökumenische Gedanke in Veit Ludwig von Seckendorffs Historia Lutheranismi. Über die Idee einer religiösen Überwindung des intoleranten Konfessionalismus im späten 17. Jh.," *Festschr. für Gerhard Ritter zu seinem 60. Geburtstag* (Tübingen 1950); H. Schüßler, *Georg Calixt. Theologie und Kirchenpolitik. Eine Studie zur Ökumenizität des Luthertums* (Wiesbaden 1961); A. L. Veit, *Kirchliche Reunionsbestrebungen im ehemaligen Erzstift Mainz unter Erzbischof Johann Philipp von Schönborn 1647–1673* (Freiburg 1910); A. P. Brück, "Der Mainzer 'Unionsplan' aus dem Jahre 1660," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 8 (1960), 148–62; H. Raab, "Der 'Discrete Catholische' des Landgrafen Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels (1623–1693). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reunionsbemühungen und Toleranzbestrebungen im 17. Jh.," *AMrhKG* 12 (1960), 175–98; id., *Landgraf Ernst v. Hessen-Rheinfels* (St. Goar 1964); id., "Ernest, landgrave de Hesse-Rhinfels," *DHGE* XV (1963), 800–806; H. Wamper, *Das Leben der Brüder Adrian u. Peter van Walenburch aus Rotterdam und ihr Wirken in der Erzdiözese Köln bis zum Jahre 1649* (Cologne 1968); P. Wiedeburg, *Der junge Leibniz, das Reich und Europa,* Part 1: *Mainz* (Wiesbaden 1962); F. X. Kiefl, *Leibniz und die religiöse Wiedervereinigung Deutschlands* (Regensburg 1925); E. Benz, "Leibniz u. d. Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen," *ZRGG* 2 (1950), 97–113; L. Winterswyl, *Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. Über die Reunion der Kirchen. Auswahl und Übersetzung* (Freiburg 1939); F. Gaquère, *Le dialogue irénique Bossuet-Leibniz. La réunion des Églises en échec (1691–1702)* (Paris 1966); M. Prechtl, *Friedens-Benehmen zwischen Bossuet, Leibniz und Molanus* (1815); P. Hiltebrandt, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsverhandlungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jh.* (Rome 1922); H. Nottarp, *Zur "Communicatio in sacris cum haereticis"* (Halle 1933); S.J. T. Miller and J. P. Spielman, Jr., *Cristóbal Rojas y Spinola, Cameralist and Irenicist* (Philadelphia 1962); H. Tüchle, "Neue Quellen zu den Reunionsverhandlungen des Bischofs Spinola und seines Nachfolgers," *Einsicht und Glaube, Festschr. für Gottlieb Söhngen* (Freiburg 1962), 405–37; H. Raab, "De negotio Hannoveriano Religionis." Die Reunionsbemühungen des Bischofs Christoph de Rojas y Spinola im Urteil des Landgrafen Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels," *Volk Gottes. Festschr. für Joseph Höfer* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1967), 395–417; id., "Ad reuniendos dissidentes." Zur Gesch. der kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen im ausge-

henden 18. und im beginnenden 19. Jh.," *Jb. für das Bistum Mainz* 8 (1960), 128–47; G. Richter, "Ein Fuldaer Plan zur Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Konfessionen in Deutschland," *Fuldaer Geschichtsblätter* 9 (1911), 1–7, 17–32, 57–64, 184–252; B. Menzel, "Der 'Fuldaer Plan' zur Kirchenunion und der Braunauer Abt Stefan Rautenstrauch (1779–1783)," *Heimat und Volk. Festschr. für Prof. Wilhelm Wostry* (Brünn 1937); G. Pfeilschifter, ed., *Korrespondenz des Fürstabtes Martin II. Gerbert von St. Blasien,* 2 vols. (Karlsruhe 1931–37); J. Hörmann, "Beda Mayer von Donauwörth, ein Ireniker der Aufklärungszeit," *Festgabe H. Knöpfler zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres* (Freiburg 1917), 188–209; J. B. Blößner, *Maximilian Prechtl, der letzte Abt des Benediktinerklosters Michelfeld* (Kallmünz 1938). *Die Oberpfalz* 32, nos. 6–7; H. Graßl, "Ökumenisches Bayern," *Festschr. für M. Spindler* (Munich 1969), 529–52; U. im Hof, "Die Helvetische Überbrückung des konfessionellen Gegensatzes. Zur Frage der Begegnung zwischen katholischer und reformierter Schweiz im 18. Jh.," *Gottesreich und Menschenreich. Ernst Staehelin zum 80. Geburtstag* (Basel and Stuttgart 1969), 345–60; G. A. Benrath, "Die konfessionellen Unionsbestrebungen des Kurfürsten Karl Ludwig von der Pfalz (d. 1680)," *ZGObrh* 116 (1968), 187–252; G. May, *Interkonfessionalismus in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn 1969).

28. *Ecclesiastical Learning in the Eighteenth Century—Theology of the Enlightenment and Pietism*

CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

GENERAL LITERATURE: Grabmann *G,* 179–212; Werner; Hurter IV–V: F. Stegmüller, "Barock, II. Theologie," *LThK* I, 1260–65; L. Scheffczyk, "Aufklärung, III. Theologie," *LThK* I, 1063–66.

LITERATURE: A. Anwander, *Die allgemeine Religionsgesch. im kath. Deutschland während der Aufklärung und der Romantik* (Salzburg 1932); M. Braubach, "Die kirchliche Aufklärung im kath. Deutschland im Spiegel des Journal von und für Deutschland," *HJ* 54 (1934), 1–63, 178–200; W. Forster, "Die kirchliche Aufklärung der Abtei Banz im Spiegel ihrer von 1772–98 herausgegebenen Zeitschrift," *SM* 63 (1951), 172–233; 64 (1952), 110–233; E. Tomek, *Kirchengesch. Österreichs* III: *Die Zeit der Aufklärung und des Absolutismus* (Innsbruck 1959); *Laurens. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen und französischen Aufklärung* (Berlin 1963); E. Winter, *Frühaufklärung. Der Kampf gegen den Konfessionalismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa und die deutsch-slawische Begegnung* (Berlin 1966); G. Otruba, "Kirche und Kultur in Aufklärung und Barock," *Jb. f. Landeskunde von Niederösterreich,* n.s. 31 (1934), 238–66; P. Kälin, *Die Aufklärung in Uri, Schwyz und Unterwalden im 18. Jahrhundert* (diss., Fribourg 1946); H. Wagner, "Die Aufklärung im Erzstift Salzburg," *Salzburger Universitätsreden* 26 (Salzburg and Munich 1968); A. Kraus, "Bürgerlicher Geist und Wissenschaft. Wissenschaftliches Leben in Zeitalter des Barock und der Aufklärung in Augsburg, Regensburg und Nürnberg," *Arch. f. Kulturgesch.* 49 (1967), 340–90; G. Groß, *Trierer Geistesleben unter dem Einfluß von Aufklärung und Romantik 1750–1850* (trier 1956), 15–110; F. Wetzel, *Geschichte der kath. Presse Deutschlands im 18. Jahrhundert* (diss., Heidelberg 1913); L. A. Veit, *Das Aufklärungsschrifttum des 18. Jahrhunderts und die deutsche Kirche* (Görres-Gesellschaft Vereinsschrift) (Cologne 1937); G. Schwaiger, "Die Aufklärung in kath. Sicht," *Concilium* 3 (1967), 559–66; B. Plongeron, "Recherches sur l''Aufklärung' catholique en Europe occidentale (1770–1830)," RHMC 16 (1969), 555–605; R. van Dülmen, "Antijesuitismus und kath. Aufklärung in Deutschland," *HJ* 89 (1969), 52–80. For literature on individual theologians see: *LThK* and the following supplementary notes.

Systematic Theology: T. Müller, "Die Disentiser Barockscholastik," *ZSKG* 52 (1958), 1–26, 150–82.

Moral Theology: J. Klein, "Ursprung und Grenzen der Kasuistik," *Festschr. Fritz Tillmann* (Düsseldorf 1950), 229–45; H. Klomps, *Tradition und Fortschritt in der Moraltheologie. Die grundsätzliche Bedeutung der Kontroverse zwischen Jansenismus und Probabilismus* (Cologne 1963); W. Martens, *Die Botschaft der Tugend. Die Aufklärung im Spiegel der deutschen moralischen Wochenschriften* (Stuttgart 1968).

Pastoral Theology: A. Schrott, *Seelsorge im Wandel der Zeit* (Graz 1949); F. Dorfmann, *Die Ausgestaltung der Pastoraltheologie zur Universitätsdisziplin* (Vienna and Leipzig 1910; biblio.); R. Füglister, *Die Pastoraltheologie als Universitätsdisziplin* (Basel 1951); H. Schuster, "Die Gesch. der Pastoraltheologie," *Hdb. der Pastoraltheologie* I (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1964), 40–92; F. X. Arnold, *Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Theologie der Seelsorge* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1949).

Catechetics: J. Schmitt, "Der Kampf um den Katechismus in der Aufklärungsperiode Deutschlands" (unpubl. diss., Munich 1935); L. Leutner, *Katechetik und Religionsunterricht in Österreich,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1955–59); J. Rabas, *Katechetisches Erbe der Aufklärungszeit, kritisch dargestellt am Lehrbuch der christkathol. Religion von J. F. Batz. Bamberg 1799* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1963).

Church History: E. C. Scherer, *Gesch. und Kirchengesch. an den deutschen Universitäten. Ihre Anfänge im Zeitalter des Humanismus und ihre Ausbildung zur selbständigen Disziplin* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1927); L. Scheffczyk, *F. L. Stolbergs "Gesch. der Religion Jesu Christi." Die Abwendung der kath. Kirchengeschichtsschreibung von der Aufklärung . . .* (Munich 1952); I. A. Endres, *Korrespondenz der Mauriner mit den Emmeramern* (Stuttgart and Vienna 1899); G. Pfeilschifter, *Die sanktblasische Germania sacra* (Kempten 1921); A. Pérez Goyena, "Los orígines del estudio de la Historia eclesiástica en España," *RF* 79 (1927); K. Zinke, *Zustände und Strömungen in der kath. Kirchengeschichtsschreibung des Aufklärungs-Zeitalters im deutschen Sprachgebiet* (diss., Breslau 1933); G. Heer, *Mabillon und die Schweizer Benediktinerklöster* (St. Gallen 1938); A. Walz, *Studi storiografici* (Rome 1940), 40–72; O. Köhler, "Der Gegenstand der Kirchengesch.," *HJ* 77 (1958), 254–69; T. Stowikowski, *Les opinions sur l'enseignement de l'histoire en Pologne au XVIII^{e} siècle et les conceptions didactiques de Joachim Lelcwel* (Polish) (Crakow 1960); A. Kraus, "Grundzüge barocker Geschichtsschreibung," *HJ* 88 (1968), 54–77.

SCHOLARSHIP IN ITALY: F. Venturi, "Le siècle des lumières en Italie," *Cahiers d'histoire* 5 (1960), 225–39; id., *Settecento riformatore. Da Muratori a Beccaria* (Turin 1969); A Prandi, *Religiosità e cultura nel '700 italiano* (Bologna 1966).

JANSENISM IN ITALY; SYNOD OF PISTOIA 1786: SOURCES: E. Codignola, *Carsteggi di giansenisti liguri,* 3 vols. (Florence 1941–42). LITERATURE: A. C. Jemolo, *Il giansenismo in Italia prima delle rivoluzioni* (Bari 1928); B. Matteucci, *Scipione de' Ricci* (Brescia 1941); E. Dammig, *Il movimento giansenista a Roma nella seconda metà del sec. XVIII* (Vatican City 1945); E. Codignola, *Il giansenismo toscano,* 2 vols. (Florence 1944); id., *Illuministi, giacobini e giansenisti nell'Italia del '700* (Florence 1947); F. Valsecchi, *Le riforme dell'assolutismo illuminato negli Stati italiani 1748–1789* (Milan 1953); G. Quazza, *Il problema italiano alla vigilia della riforme 1720–1738* (Rome 1954); P. de Leturia, "Il concetto di nazione italiana nel grande antigiansenista F. A. Zaccaria (1714–1795), secondo fonti dell'archivio di Loyola," *Analecta Gregoriana* 71 (1954), 231–57; P. de Leturia, *Nuove ricerche sul giansenismo* (Rome 1954); B. Matteucci, *Il giansenismo* (Rome 1954); G. Candelero, *Storia dell'Italia moderna I: Le origini del Risorgimento 1700–1815* (Milan 1956); G. Quazza, *Le riforme in Piemonte nella prima metà del Settecento,* 2 vols. (Modena 1957); E. W. Cochrane, "Le riforme Leopoldine in Toscana nella corrispondenza degli invitati francesi 1766–1791." *RSRis* 45 (1958), 199–218; M. Vaussard, *Jansénisme et gallicanisme aux origines religieuses du Risorgimento* (Paris 1959); E. Passerin d'Entréves, "La riforma 'giansenista' dell Chiesa e la lotta anticuriale in Italia nella seconda metà del Settecento," *Riv. Storica Italiana* 71 (1959), 209–34; F. Catalano, *Illuministi e giacobini del '700 italiano* (Milan 1959); M. Vaussard, *Correspondance Scipione de'Ricci-Henri Grégoire (1796–1807)* (Florence and Paris, 1963); A. Wandruszka, *Leopold II.*, 2 vols. (Vienna 1963–65); G. König, *Rom und die toskanische Kirchenpolitik 1765–1790* (diss., Cologne 1964); A. Wandruszka, F. Diaz, L. Dal Pane, and M. Rosa, "L'opera di Pietro Leopoldo, granduca di Toscana," *Rassegna storica toscana* 11 (1965), 179–300; C. Caristia, *Riflessi politici di giansenismo italiano* (Naples 1965); P. C. Cannarozzi, "I Collaboratori giansenisti di Pietro Leopoldo, granduca di Toscana," *Rassegna storica toscana* 12 (1966), 5–59; F. Diaz, *Francesco Maria Gianni. Dalla burocrazia alla politica sotto Pietro Leopoldo di Toscana* (Milan 1966); M. Rosa, *Riformatori e ribelli nell '700 religioso italiano* (Bari 1969); C. A. Belton, *Church Reform in 18th Century Italy (The Synod of Pistoia, 1786)* (The Hague 1969).

PROTESTANT THEOLOGY: SOURCES: W. Philipp, *Das Werden der Aufklärung in theologiegeschichtlicher Sicht* (Göttingen 1957) [texts]. LITERATURE: E. Hirsch, *Gesch. der neueren evangelischen Theologie,* 5 vols. (Gütersloh 1964); W. Kantzenbach, *Protestantisches Christentum im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Gütersloh 1965); A. Schlingensiepe-Pogge, *Das Sozialethos der lutherischen Aufklärungsteologie am Vorabend der industriellen Revolution* (Göttingen, Berlin and Frankfurt 1967); H. Hubschmid, *Gott. Mensch und Welt in der schweizerischen Aufklärung. Eine Untersuchung über Optimismus und Fortschrittsgedanken bei Joh. Jak. Scheuchzer, Joh. Heinrich Tschudi, Joh. Jak. Bodmer und Jakob Iselin* (Ph.D. diss., I Bern, Affoltern a. A. 1950); R. Bruch, "Das Verhältnis zwischen der kath. und prot. Moraltheologie zur Zeit der Aufklärung," *Festschrift Lorenz Jäger* (Paderborn 1962), 278–92; W. Nigg, *Die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung* (Munich 1934) [the title is misleading; Catholic historiography has been deliberately disregarded because, the author asserts, it does not contribute anything to the modern problem]; A. Klempt, *Die Säkularisierung der universalhistorischen Auffassung. Zum Wandel des Geschichtsdenkens im 16. und 17. Jh.* (Göttingen 1960) [important for the attention given to Protestant theology]; P. Meinhold, *Gesch. der kirchlichen Historiographie,* 2 vols. (Freiburg and Munich 1967) [sources and presentation].

UNIVERSITIES: LITERATURE: K. Goldman, *Verzeichnis der Hochschulen* (Neustadt an der Aisch 1967; contains precise catalog of all matriculations and their issues); *Les universités européennes du XIV^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècle. Aspects et problemes. Actes du colloque int. à l'occasion du 6. centenaire de l'Univ. Jagelonne de Cracovie 6–8 mai 1964* (Geneva 1967); E. C. Scherer, *Gesch. und Kirchengesch. an den deutschen Universitäten* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1927); R. Haaß, *Die geistige Haltung der katholischen Universitäten Deutschlands im 18. Jh.* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1952) (accounts only for Germany within the borders of 1919 and investigates the position regarding the newly emerging philosopy); see additional literature under individual universities; M. Andrés, "Las facultades de teología en las universidades españolas (1396–1868)," *RET* 28 (1968), 319–58; H. Jedin, "Ein nicht realisierter Universitätsgründungsplan im 16. Jh.," *Festschr. L. Brandt* (Cologne 1969), 405–15 (beginning of denominationalism).

Bonn: M. Braubach, *Die erste Bonner Universität* (Bonn 1947); id., "Rheinische Aufklärung. Neue Funde zur Gesch. der l. Bonner Universität," *AHVNrh* 149/150 (1950/51), 74–180; 151/152 (1952), 257–348.

Dillingen: A. Biglmaier and F. Zoepfl. *Stadt und Universität Dillingen* (Dillingen 1950).

Freiburg: E. Säger, "Die Vertretung der Kirchengesch. in Freiburg von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 19. Jh," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 1 (1952); P. Diepgen 2nd E. T. Nauck, "Die Freidburger Medizinische Fakultät in der österreichischen Zeit," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 16 (1957); E. W. Zeeden, "Die Freiburger Philosophische Fakultät im Umbruch des 18. Jh.," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 17 (1957), 9–139; E. Zentgraf, ed., "Aus der Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften an der Universität Freiburg," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Unversitätsgeschichte* 18 (1957); W. Müller, "Fünfhundert Jahre theologische Promotion an der Universität Freiburg," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 19 (1957); T. Kurrus, "Die Jesuiten an der Universität Freiburg 1620–1773," I: *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 21 (1963); C. Schott, "Rat und Spruch der Juristenfakultät Freiburg i. Br.," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 30 (1965); T. Kurrus, "Zur Einführung der Experimentalphysik durch die Jesuiten an der Universität Freiburg," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 33 (1966), 119–24; F. Biesenbach, "Die Entwicklung der Nationalökonomie an der Universität Freiburg 1768–1896," *Beiträge zur Freiburger Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte* 36 (1969).

Fulda: W. A. Mühl, *Die Aufklärung an der Universität Fulda mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der philosophischen und juristischen Fakultät (1734–1805)* (Fulda 1961).

Graz: J. Matl, "Die Bedeutung der Universität Graz für die kulturelle Entwicklung des europäischen Ostens," *Festschr. Universität Graz* (Graz 1936), 167–226; A. Posch, "Die Bedeutung der Grazer theologischen Fakultät für den Südosten der ehemaligen Monarchie in der Zeit von 1773 bis 1827," *Festschr. Universität Graz* (Graz 1936), 105–19; id., "Die kirchliche Aufklärung in Graz und an der Grazer Hochschule," *Festschrift der Universität Graz* (1937).

Ingolstadt: R. Obermeier, *Die Universität Ingolstadt* (Ingolstadt 1959).

Innsbruck: *Forschungen zur Innsbrucker Universitätsgesch.* (Innsbruck 1960ff.); A. Haidacher, "Ein Gnadenstreit zwischen dem Stifte Wilten und der Universität Innsbruck aus dem Beginn des 18. Jh.," *APraem* 31 (1955), 100–135, 193–226; A. Mitterbacher, *Der Einfluß der Aufklärung an der theologischen Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck (1790–1823)* (Innsbruck 1962); F. Huter, "Die Anfänge der Innsbrucker Juristenfakultät (1671–1686)," *ASavRGgerm* 85 (1968), 223–47; G. Mraz, *Gesch. der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck von ihrer Gründung bis zum Jahre 1740* (Innsbruck 1968); *Die Matrikel der Universität Innsbruck,* Part 3: *Matricula Universitatis* I 1755/56–1763/64, revised by E. Weiler (Innsbruck 1968).

Louvain: J. Wils, *L'université de Louvain à travers 5 siècles* (Brussels 1927); R. Guelluye, "L'évolution des méthodes de théologie à Louvain d'Érasme à Jansenius," *RHE* 37 (1941), 31–144; L. van der Essen, *L'université de Louvain 1425–1940* (Brussels 1945); F. Claeys Bouuaert, *L'ancienne université de Louvain* (Louvain 1956).

Mainz: *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Universität Mainz* (Wiesbaden 1955ff.); A. P. Brück, *Die Mainzer Theologische Fakultät im 18. Jh.* (Wiesbaden 1955); L. Just, *Die alte Universität Mainz 1477–1798* (Wiesbaden 1957); L. Just and H. Mathy, *Die Universität Mainz* (Mainz 1965).

Münster: E. Hegel, *Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät Münster in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung 1773 bis 1961* (Münster 1961).

Olmütz: G. Deutsch, *Die theologische Fakultät Olmütz* (Brünn 1885).

Osnabrück: C. Riepe, *Gesch. der Universität Osnabrück* (Osnabrück 1965).

Paderborn: K. Honselmann, *Die philosophisch-theologische Akademie in Paderborn und ihr Stiftungsvermögen* (Paderborn 1954).

Prague: R. Schreiber, *Studien zur Gesch. der Karls-Universität zu Prag* (Freilassing and Salzburg 1954).

Salzburg: A. Kalb, "Präsidium und Professorenkolleg der Benediktineruniv. Salzburg 1617–1743," *Mitt. der Ges. für Salzburger Landeskunde* 102 (1962), 117–66; M. Kaindl-Hoenig and K. H. Ritschel, *Die Salzburger Universität 1622–1964* (Salzburg 1964).

Vienna: A. Wappler, *Gesch. der theologischen Fakultät der k. k. Universität zu Wien* (Vienna 1884); R. Meister, *Entwicklung und Reformen des österreichischen Studienwesens*, 2 vols. (Vienna 1963).

ACADEMIES: LITERATURE: Especially: A. Kraus, *Vernunft und Geschichte. Die Bedeutung der deutschen Akademien für die Entwicklung der Geschichtswissenschaft im späten 18. Jh.* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1963; with detailed biblio.); M. Maylender, *Storia delle Accademie d'Italia,* 5 vols. (Bologna and Turin 1926–30); V. Castañada y Alcover, *La Real Academia de la Historia 1735–1930* (Madrid 1930); E. W. Cochrane, *Tradition and Enlightenment in the Tuscan Academies* (Rome 1961); L. Hammermayer, "Die Benediktiner und die Akademiebewegung im katholischen Deutschland (1720–1770)," *SM* 70 (1959), 45–146; id., "Europäische Akademiebewegung und italienische Aufklärung," *HJ* 81 (1962), 247–63; P. Fuchs, *Palatinus Illustratus. Die historische Forschung an der kurpfälzischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Mannheim 1963); R. Rurup, "Die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft im 18. Jh.," *ZGObrh* 113 (1965), 231–61.

EDUCATION: LITERATURE: J. Rößler, "Die kirchliche Aufklärung unter dem Speierer Fürstbischof August von Limburg-Stirum," *Mitt. des hist. Vereins der Pfalz* 34/35 (1915), 1–160; A. Messer, *Die Reform des Schulwesens im Kurfürstentum Mainz unter Emmerich Joseph 1763–1774* (Mainz 1897); P. Mauel, *Das Volksschulwesen des Hochstiftes Speyer im 18. Jh. 3.–4. Jahrb, des Vereins für christl. Erziehungswissenschaft 1910/11;* H. Hardewig, *Die Tätigkeit des Freiherrn Franz von Fürstenberg für die Schulen des Fürstbistums Münster* (Hildesheim 1912); E. Jehle, *Das niedere Schulwesen unter Limburg-Stirum* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1923); N. Konrad, *Franz Ludwig von Erthal. Ein Organisator der Volksschule der Aufklärung* (Düsseldorf 1932); M. Schmidt, *Die Aufklärung im Fürstbistum Passau* (diss., Munich 1933): *Vh. des hist. Vereins für Nordbayern* 67/68 (1934, 1935); W. Roeßler, *Die Entstehung des modernen Erziehungswesens in Deutschland* (Stuttgart 1961); E. Schumacher, "Das kölnische Westfalen im Zeitalter der Aufklärung" (unpubl. diss., Bonn 1952); A. P. Brück, *Kurmainzer Schulgeschichte. Texte, Berichte. Memoranden* (Wiesbaden 1960); M. Renner, "Fuldaer Einfluß auf die Würzburger Schulreform Fürstbischofs Franz Ludwig von Erthal," *ZBLG* 28 (1965), 368–91; H. Flurschültz, *Die Verwaltung des Hochstiftes Würzburg unter Franz Ludwig von Erthal 1779–95* (Würzburg 1965); H. M. Elzer, ed., *Zwei Schriften der Kurmainzer Schulreform von 1770–1784* (Frankfurt, Berlin, Bonn and Munich 1967).

29. *Liturgy and Popular Piety—New Religious Orders*

LITERATURE

LITURGY: A. L. Mayer, "Liturgie, Aufklärung und Klassizismus," *JLW* 9 (1929), 67–127; A. Vierbach, *Die liturgischen Anschauungen des Vitus Anton Winter. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Aufklärung* (Munich 1929); J. Schöttl, *Kirchliche Reformen des Salzburger Erzbischofs Hieronymus v. Colloredo im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Hirschenhausen 1939); W. Trapp, *Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung* (Regensburg 1940); A. L. Mayer, "Liturgie und Barock," *JLW* 15 (1941), 67–154; P. Salmon, *L'office divin.*

Histoire de la formation du brévaire (Paris 1959); J. A. Jungmann, "Liturgisches Leben im Barock," J. A. Jungmann, *Erbe und Pastorale Gegenwart* (Innsbruck, Vienna and Munich 1960), 108–19; id., "Liturgische Erneuerung zwischen Barock und Gegenwart," *LJ* 12 (1962), 1–15; A.-G. Martimort, *Hdb. der Liturgiewissenschaft* I (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1963); B. Fischer, "Das Rituale Romanum (1614–1964)," *TThZ* 73 (1964), 257–71; W. Müller, "Wessenberg in heutiger Sicht," *ZSKG* 58 (1964), 293–308; T. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (Bonn 1965); A. Häußling, "Die Systematik der Väterlesungen in den Benediktinischen Reformbrevieren Frankreichs von 1777 und 1787," *ALW* 9 (1966), 418–24; A. Kurzeja, "Die Etappen in der Entwicklung des Stundengebets in der Trierer Kirche," *TThZ* 77 (1968), 104–19.

POPULAR PIETY: H. Schnell, *Der bairische Barock. Die volkliche, die geschichtliche und religiöse Grundlage* (Munich 1936); H. Hoffmann, "Die Frömmigkeit der deutschen Aufklärung," *Zs. f. Theol. u. Kirche* 16 (1906), 234–50; J. Hacker, "Die Messe in den deutschen Diözesan-Gesang- und Gebetbüchern von der Aufklärungszeit bis zur Gegenwart," *MthSt* (H) II. 1 (1950); K. Berger, *Barock und Aufklärung im geistl. Lied* (Marburg 1951); I. Müller, "Barocke Geistigkeit einer Benediktinerabtei," *ZSKG* 49 (1955), 257–87; L. A. Veit and L. Lenhart, *Kirche und Volksfrömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1956); A. Coreth, *Pietas Austriaca. Ursprung und Entwicklung barocker Frömmigkeit in Österreich* (Vienna 1959); A. Angyal, *Die slawische Barockwelt* (Leipzig 1961); P. Hankamer, *Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutscher Barock. Die deutsche Lit. im Zeitraum des 17. Jh.* (Stuttgart 1964); R. Alewyn, ed., *Deutsche Barockforschung* (Cologne and Berlin 1966); E. Krausen, "Die Verehrung römischer Katakombenheiliger in Altbayern im Zeitalter des Barock," *Bayer. Jb. für Volkskunde* 67 (1966), 37–47; B. Hubensteiner, *Vom Geist des Barock, Kultur und Frömmigkeit im alten Bayern* (Munich 1967); B. Goy, *Aufklärung und Volksfrömmigkeit in den Bistümern Würzburg und Bamberg* (Würzburg 1969).

THE SERMON: L. Signer, "Zur Forschungsgesch. der kath. Barockpredigt," *Kirche und Kanzel* XII (Paderborn 1929), 235–48; C. Schreiber, *Aufklärung und Frömmigkeit. Die katholische Predigt im deutschen Aufklärungszeitalter* (Munich 1940); B. v. Mehr, *Das Predigtwesen in Köln u. Rheinischen Kapuzinerprovinzen im 17. und 18. Jh.* (Rome 1945); B. Dreher, *Die Osterpredigt. Von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1951); G. Lohmaier, *Bayerische Barockpredigt* (Munich 1961); L. Intorp, *Die westfälische Barockpredigt* (diss., Mainz 1962); E. Moser-Rath, *Predigtmärlein der Barockzeit* (Berlin 1964); R. Krause, *Die Predigt der späten deutschen Aufklärung 1770–1805* (Stuttgart 1965); J. B. Schneyer, "Wesenszüge des Barock in den Titeln seiner Predigtbücher," *MThZ* 19 (1968), 295–310.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS: Heimbucher; M. Escobar, *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose,* 2 vols. (Turin 1951–53); M. Vettori, "Die Tertiar-Schulschwestern in Süd- und Nordtirol. Ihr Werden und Wirken 1700–1955," *Schlern-Schriften* 141 (Innsbruck 1955); P. Hofmeister, "Die Verfassung der Benediktinerkongregationen," *SM* 66 (1955), 5–27; M. De Meulemeester, *Origines de la Congrégation du Très Saint Rédempteur* (Louvain 1957); I. Gautier, *Les Messieurs de Saint-Sulpice* (Paris 1957); L. J. Lekai, *Geschichte und Wirken der weißen Mönche* (Cologne 1958); M. de Meulemeester, *Histoire sommaire de la Congrégation du T. S. Rédempteur* (Louvain 1959); P. Schmitz, *Gesch. des Benediktinerordens* IV [from Trent to 1500] (Einsiedeln 1960); M. de C. Guendré, *Histoire de l'ordre des Ursulines en France;* II: *Les monastères d'Ursulines sous l'Ancien régime* (Paris 1960); C. Almeras, *S. Pablo de la Cruz, fundator de los Pasionistos* (Bilbao 1960); K. Zähringer, *Die Schulbrüder des hl. Joh. Bapt. de La Salle* (Fribourg 1962); C. Gérin, "Les Augustins en France avant 1789," *AAug* 24 (1961), 242–61; S. Leussen, *La Trappe, Schets van ontstaan*

en ontwikkeling 1664–1898 (Tilburg 1965); J. Salzgeber, *Die Klöster Einsiedeln und St. Gallen im Barockzeitalter* (Mürster 1967); O. Gregorio and A. Sampers, *Documenti interno alla regula della Congregazione de SS. Redentore 1725–1749 SHCSR* 16 (1968), 1–270; Alberto de la Virgen del Carmen, *Historia de la reforma Teresiana 1562–1962* (Madrid 1969); *Atlas geographicus ordinis FF. MM. Capuccinorum* (Rome 1968); A. Vernaschi, *Una istituzione originale. Le figlie della Carità di S. Vincenzo de' Paoli* (Rome 1968); M.-P. Desaing, *Die Ursulinen* (Fribourg 1968); G. Russotto, *San Giovanni di Dio e il suo ordine ospedaliero,* 2 vols. (Rome 1969); C. Catena, *Le Carmelitane. Storia e spiritualità* (Rome 1969); M. Arneth, *Das Ringen um Geist und Form der Priesterbildung im Säkularklerus des 17. Jh.* (Würzburg 1970).

SECTION THREE

The Papacy under the Increasing Pressure of the Established Church

30. *The Popes from Innocent XIII to Clement XII*

LITERATURE

F. Venturi, *Illuministi italiani. Riformatori lombardi, piemontesi e toscani* (Milan 1958); L. Dollot, "Conclaves et diplomatie française au XVIII^{e} siècle," *Rev. d'Hist. diplom.* 75 (1961), 124–35; G. Caristia, "Riflessi politici del Giansenismo italiano IV. Il Giansenismo regalista," *AcTorino* 96 (1961/62), 665–776; L. Dal Pane, *Lo Stato Pontificio e il movimento riformatorio del Settecento* (Milan 1959); M. Andrieux, *La vie quotidienne dans la Rome pontificale au XVIII^{e} siècle* (Paris 1962); F. Margiotta Broglio, "Appunti storiografici sul giansenismo italiano" *Scritti Jemolo* (Milan 1963), 781–849; F. Venturi, "Elementi e tentativi di riforme nello Stato Pontificio del Settecento," *RSIt* 75 (1963), 119–39; id. *Illuministi italiani. Riformatori napolitani* (Milan 1962); U. Marcelli, *Riforme e rivoluzione in Italia del secolo XVIII* (Bologna 1964); H. Benedikt, *Kaiseradler über den Apenninen. Die Österreicher in Italien 1700–1866* (Vienna 1964); G. Quazza, *Il problema italiano e l'equilibrio europea 1720–1738* (Turin 1965); G. Giarrizzo et al., *Illuministi Italiani. Riformatori delle antiche Repubbliche, dei Ducati, dello Stato Pontificio e delle Isole* (Milan 1965); V. E. Giuntella, "Roma nel Settecento," *StRom* 14 (1966), 269–91; F. Valsecchi, *Riformismo e antico regime nel secolo XVIII. Il riformismo borbonico a Napoli e a Parma, lo Stato della Chiesa* (Rome 1967); G. Schwaiger, "Die Geltung des Papsttums im 18. Jh.," *Festschr. Schmaus* (Munich 1967), 1153–69.

INNOCENT XIII: *BullRom Cocq* XI 2, 183–278; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XXI, 867–958; *Hierarchia Catholica* V, 33f.; A. Mercati, *Raccolta,* 286–97; Ciaconius VI, 381–408; Pastor XV, 391–460; Seppelt V, 413–15; G. Schwaiger in *LThK* V, 695f.; M. v. Mayer, *Die Papstwahl I.'XIII.* (Vienna 1874); E. Michaud, "La fin de Clément XI et le commencement du pontificat d'I.," *Rev. internat. de théol.* 5 (Berne 1897), 42–60,

304–31; L. Wahrmund, "Die kaiserliche Exklusive im Konklave I.," *SAW* 170 (1912).

Benedict XIII: *BullRom Cocq* XI 2, 279–424; XII; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XXII; *Opuscula varia* . . . (Rome 1726); *Concilium Romanum* . . . *celebratum anno 1725* (Rome 1725); *Collectio Lacensis* I, 341–466; *Hierarchia Catholica* V, 34–39; Quétif III, 471–81; Ciaconius VI, 409–572; A. Mercati, *Raccolta,* 297–311; G. B. Pittoni (Venice 1730); A. Borgia (Rome 1752); Pastor XV, 461–604; Seppelt V, 415–22; J. Carreyre: DHGE VIII, 163f.; P. Mikat in LThK II, 177; G. de Caro in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* VIII, 384–93; G. Vignato, *Storia di B.* (Milan 1953); G. Cardillo, "B. e il giansenismo," *Memorie Domenic.* 58 (1941), 217–22; 59 (1942), 38–43.

Clement XII: *BullRom Cocq* XIII; XIV; *BullRom* (ed. by Taur.) XXIII–XXIV; *D,* 498–500; *Hierarchia Catholica* VI, 3–9; Ciaconius VI, 575–772; A. Mercati, *Raccolta,* 311–30; A. Fabroni, *De vita et rebus gestis* (Rome 1760); Pastor XV, 605–754; Seppelt V, 422–28; R. Mols in *DHGE* XII, 1361–81; H. Raab in *LThK* II, 1228f.; L. P. Raybaud. *Papauté et pouvoir temporel sous les pontificats de Clément XII et Benoît XIV* (Paris 1963); A. Zanelli, *Il conclave per elezione di Clemente* (Rome 1890); H. Hermelink, "Klemens XII. und die Kirchengüter in den protestantischen Ländern," *ZKG* 24 (1930), 609–15.

31. *Benedict XIV*

Literature

Bullarium, 4 vols. (Rome 1746–57, Venice 1768); *Opera,* 12 vols. (Rome 1747–51); 15 vols. (Venice 1767); 18 vols. (Prato 1839–47); *Opera omnia in synopsim redacta ab E. de Azevedo,* 5 vols. (Rome 1766); *Opera inedita,* ed. by F. Heiner (Freiburg 1904); *D,* 500–513; E. de Heeckeren, *Correspondance* (Paris 1912; still significant until publication of Vol. 3 of the following edition); E. Morelli, ed., *Le lettere . . . al card. de Tencin,* 2 vols. (Rome 1955–65); L. Fresco, *Lettere inedite . . . a M. Querini* (Venice 1910); F. X. Kraus, *Briefe B.s an den Canon. P. F. Peggi . . .* (Freiburg 1888); *Hierarchia Catholica* VI, 10–18; A. Mercati, *Raccolta,* 330–81, 405–43; Pastor XVI/1, 1–439; Seppelt V, 428–55; J. Carreyre in *DHGE* VIII, 164–67; P. Mikat in *LThK* II, 177f.; M. Rosa in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* VIII, 393–408; F. Montanari, *Il card. Lambertini fra la leggenda e la storia* (Milan 1943); P. Sighinolfi, *Il card. Lambertini* (Milan 1935); E. Morelli in *Tre Profili* (Rome 1955), 1–45; L. Dal Pane in *ASRomana* 10 (1958/59), 35–63; id. "Voti e speranze . . . per il conclave del 1740," *Accad. Bologna* 8 (1957/58), 140–63; R. Reinhardt, "Zur Kirchenpolitik B.s," *RQ* 60 (1965), 259–68; P. A. Kirsch, "Das von B. XIV . . . mit Spanien abgeschlossene Konkordat," *AkathKR* 80 (1900), 313–22; C. Bandi di Vesme," La pace di Aquisgrana (1748) . . . ," *Boll. Stor. Subalpino* 45 (1967), 249–314; 46 (1968), 103–74; A. A. Bettanini, *B. e la Repubblica di Venezia* (Padua 1966); L. Dal Pane, "La Congregazione economica . . . e la libertà di commercio," *Riv. Stor. Agricol.* 5 (1965), 371–418.

32. *Clement XIII and Clement XIV*

Literature

F. Dörrer, "Der Schriftverkehr zwischen dem päpstl. Staatssekretariat und der Apost. Nuntiatur Wien . . . ," *RömHM* 4 (1960/61), 63–248; R. Olaechea, *Las relaciones* *hispano-romanas en la 2. mitad del XVIII* (Zaragoza 1965); A. C. Jemolo, *Il giansenismo in Italia prima della rivoluzione* (Bari 1928); E. Damming, *Il movimento giansenista a Roma nella seconda metà del sec. XVIII* (Rome 1945; reprint 1968); S. Traniello and E. Passerin d'Entrèves, "Ricerche sul tardo giansenismo italiano," *Riv. Storia e Letterat. Relig.* 3 (1967), 379–413; A. Melpignano, *L'anticurialismo napoletano sotto Carlo III* (Rome 1965); R. Mincuzzi, *B. Tanucci* . . . (Bari 1967).

Clement XIII: *BullRom Continuatio* I–III; *D,* 513f.; *Hierarchia Catholica* VI, 19–24; A. Mercati, *Raccolta,* 381–85, 443–82; Pastor XVI/1, 441–1011; Seppelt V, 456–69; R. Mols in *DHGE* XII, 1381–1410; H. Raab in *LThK* II, 1229; X. de Ravignan, *Clément XIII et Clément XIV* (Paris 1854); G. Gonzi, *L'espulsione dei Gesuiti dai Ducati parmesi* (Parma 1967).

Clement XIV: *BullRom Continuatio* IV; *Lettere ed altre opere* (Milan 1831); *Lettere, bolle e discorsi,* ed. by C. Frediani (Florence 1845); *Epistolae et brevia selectiora* . . . , ed. by A. Theiner (Florence 1854); *D,* 514f.; *Hierarchia Catholica* VI, 25–28; Caraccioli, *Vita* (Florence 1776); A. v. Reumont, *Ganganelli . . . Seine Briefe und seine Zeit* (Berlin 1847); *Vita . . . e una lettera di Vincenzo Gioberti* (Rome 1847); J. Crétineau-Joly, *Clément et les jésuites* (Paris 1848); A. Theiner, *Geschichte des Pontificats* . . . (Leipzig and Paris 1853); J. Crétineau-Joly, *Lettre au P. A. Theiner* (Liège 1853); G. Boero, *Osservazioni sopra l'historia . . . scritta dal P. A. Theiner* (Monza 1854); Pastor XVI/2, 1–440; Seppelt V, 469–84; A. Mercati, *Raccolta,* 385–95, 484–92; E. Préclin in *DHGE* XII, 1411–23; H. Raab in *LThK* II, 1229f.; L. Cicchitto, *Il pontefice Clemente* (Rome 1934); W. Kratz, *Intorno al "Clemente XIV" del barone von Pastor* (Rome 1935); L. Berra, "Il diario del conclave di Clemente," *ASRomana* 85–86 (1962/63), 25–319; E. Duda, "Le Saint-Siège devant les événements politiques de Pologne . . . ," *SPM* 1, 139–207; G. C. Cordara, *De suppressione Societatis Jesu commentarii,* ed. by G. Albertotti (Padua 1925); id. *De suis ac suorum rebus . . . commentarii,* ed. by G. Albertotti (Turin 1933); E. Pacheco y de Leyva, "La intervención de Floridablanca . . . ," *Escuela española de arqueología e historia en Roma* 3 (1914), 37–198; H. Hoffmann, *Friedrich II. von Preußen und die Aufhebung* . . . (Leipzig 1962); R. van Dülmen, "Antijesuitismus und kath. Aufklärung in Deutschland," *HJ* 89 (1969), 52–80; A. Galessi, "La malattia e morte di Clemente," *Riv. Storia delle Scienze* 41 (1950), 153–65.

INDEX

Aachen 502
—Peace of (1668) 115, 330
—Peace of (1699) 72
—Peace of (1748) 135, 494, 568
Abbas I, shah of Iran 222
Abraham a Santa Clara 550
Abraham Peter I Ardzivian, Uniate Armenian catholicos 228
Absolutism xx, 352, 356
—enlightened 362
Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres 543, 544
Academies 349, 371, 543ff
—in Switzerland 368
Acarie, Madame 10f
Accademia dei Lincei 543
Achards de la Beaume, E.F. des 285
Achéry, Luc d' 110
Achrida, archbishopric 212, 215
Acquaviva, Claudio 24, 239, 256, 288
Act of Renunciation (1709) 179
Adrian, patriarch of Moscow 193
Ad sacram, bull (1656) 45
Afanasi, metropolitan of Moscow 185
Africa, propagation of the faith 270ff
Agenzie, of Charles VI 332
Agia, Miguel 234
Agnès, Mother 47
Aguado, Pedro 238
Aguiriano, Francisco Mateo 165
Aguirre, José Sáenz de 168
Ahmad ibn Ibrahim al Ghazi 221
Aiguillon, duchess of 80, 271
Ailly, Pierre d' 57
Ajofrín, Francisco de 262
Akbar, grand mogul 298
Alacoque, Margaret Mary 86, 434
Alais, edict (1629) 71
Alba Julia, Synods of (1698, 1700) 226
Albani, Giovanni Francesco, *see* Clement XI
Albani, cardinal 566, 577
Albania 211
Alberoni, Giulio 132ff, 566
Alberti, M. A. 532
Albizzi, Francesco 34f
Albornoz, Gil de 170
Albrecht Sigismund, prince-bishop of Freising 445f
Alcantarines 250
Aldeias 246
Aldringen, Paul 154
Aldrovandi, nuncio 133
Alembert, Jean le Rond d' 354, 371
Alexander I, tsar of Russia 217
Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi), pope xvi, 18, 34, 44, 45f, 48f, 66, 87, 107, 109ff, 116, 310, 405, 446, 526
Alexander VIII (Pietro Ottoboni), pope 126f, 129, 305, 331, 336, 526, 569
Alexander Parampil, vicar apostolic 231
Alexandria, patriarchate 212ff
Alexei, tsarevich 194f
Alexei Mihailovitch, tsar of Russia 188ff
Alleine, J. 437
Almain, Jacques 57
Alsace 498
Alsace de Bossu, Thomas Philippe d' 412
Althan, cardinal 331, 560
Altieri, Emilio, *see* Clement X
Altieri, Gaspare 115f, 118
Álvarez, Bernardino 263
Álvarez, Diego 24
Alvarez de Abreu, A. J. 235
Amboise, Georges d' 62
Amelot, French minister 387f
Amelote, Denys 88
America, Latin
—Enlightenment and its consequences 264ff, 268f
—independence movement 269f
—propagation of the faith 232f
— — radical regalism 236f
— — secular and regular clergy 242f
— — women's orders 261f
Amiens, Treaty of (1802) 275, 503
Amort, Eusebius 457, 527
Amortization laws 484
Ancestors, tests 150f
Anderson, James 349
Andrade, Alonso d' 168
Andrade, Antonio de 298
Andreas Akidjian, patriarch 229
Andrewes, Lancelot 435
Andriani, Abakum 212
Angelus Silesius, *see* Scheffler, Johannes
Anghel, Atanas 226

Anglicanism
—Anglican spirituality in 18th century 435ff
— — influence of continental spirituality 436f
— — John Wesley and Methodism 439ff
— — oath of loyalty, nonjurors 438
Angola, mission 272
Anguiano, Mateo de 274
Anna Ivanovna, tsarina of Russia 199f, 490
Anna Nzinga, ruler of Matamba 273
Annat, François 41, 44, 48, 65, 72
Annates 447, 463, 468
Anne of Austria 19, 36
Annur, autonomous Church 219
Ans, Ernest Ruth d' 87
Anthimos, patriarch of Jerusalem 215
Antiinstitutionalism 343f, 358
Anti-Jansenism 31ff, 35f, 36, 37ff, 40ff, 46, 55, 64f, 385f
Antioch, patriarchate 213f
—Melcite Uniate patriarchate 213
Antoinette d'Orléans 19
Antoni, metropolitan of Moscow 185
Antonios II, catholicos of Georgia 217
Antonites, Armenian 228
Anton Ulrich, von Wolfenbüttel, duke 513
Anton Viktor, bishop of Münster 503
Apologetics 104f, 428
Apostolate of orders 554
Apostolici ministerii, bull (1723) 165
Apostolicum pascendi, bull (1765) 575
Appel comme d'abus, see *Appellatio ab abusu*
Appellatio (recursus) ab abusu 332ff, 341, 342, 486
Aquileia, patriarchate 571
Aranda, de, count 266, 269
Archetti, Giovanni Andrea 206
Archinto, secretary of state 573
Ardizone Spinola, Antonio 291
Argenson, René de Voyer d' 397, 427
Argentina 269
Argüelles, Canga 162
Aristotle 535
Arizona 252
Armañá, Francisco 167
Armenia, Armenians 208, 218
—Monophysite Church 221f
Arnauld (d'Andilly), Agnès 29
Arnauld (d'Andilly), Angélique (Mother Angélique) xviii, 7f, 16, 29f, 44, 47, 428
Arnauld (d'Andilly), Angélique de Saint-Jean 47f, 428
Arnauld (d'Andilly), Antoine (le Grand Arnauld) xviii, 32ff, 36f, 37f, 39, 41ff, 48f, 49f, 65, 68, 72, 73, 87f, 96, 99, 103, 105, 154, 381, 409, 414, 428, 439, 493, 511, 516, 517
Arnauld (d'Andilly) Henri 39, 48, 50ff
Arnauld (d'Andilly), Robert 29
Arnd, Johann 550
Arnold Gottfried 352, 358, 537, 538
Arnoldi, ecclesiastical councilor 467
Aron, Peter Paul 226
Arriago, Pablo José de 244
Arsenije III, patriarch of Ipek 216
Arsenije IV, patriarch of Ipek 216
Aschaffenburg 137
Asia, trade colonization 281
Asia, mission to 279ff
—commercial policy 287f
—mission method 285f, 289f
—rise and fall 289ff
Assemani (as-Simani), family 230
Assemani, Joseph Alois 533
Assemani, Joseph Simon (ius) 230, 532
Assemani, Stefan Evodius 533
Assyrians 218
Astorga, Spanish ambassador 331
Astronomy 540
Athanasios, Coptic bishop of Jerusalem 231
Athanasios, Melchite patriarch 228
Athanasios III Patellaros, ecumenical patriarch 189
Atheism 359, 360
Athos 212
Atjehr (Achin) 301
Atnas Sagas (Za Denghel), negus 221
Attritionism 31, 32
Auctorem fidei, bull (1794) 334, 535
Auersperg, count 478f
Augsburg 138, 153, 155, 157, 469, 479
Augsburg, Peace of 142
Augustine 26ff, 30, 32, 34, 38, 51, 343, 370, 385, 401
Augustinianism xviii, 27ff, 30, 32, 40, 51f, 381f, 385, 401, 413, 414, 419
—in France: Saint-Cyran and Port-Royal 28ff
—in Louvain and Jansen 24ff
Augustinians
—Africa mission 271, 276, 277
—Asia mission 260, 283, 285
—India mission 290, 298f
—Philippine mission 321
—South American mission 260
Augustinus of Jansenism 25ff, 31ff, 45, 41f, 45, 99
—Paris edition 32
Augustus II, king of Poland 128, 490, 565
Augustus III, king of Poland xvi, 490
Austria xvii, 329ff, 335, 500, 504, 558, 568, 571
—diocesan regulation under Josephinism 477ff
—dissolution of Jesuit order 581
—and first coalition war 499f
—and imperial Church 143
—imperial policy 497f
—Josephinist attack on monasteries 497
—and papal elections 531
—state Church 473ff
— — under Leopold II 481
—territorial Church, 144
—threat to the ecclesiastical territories in empire 497

Austrian Succession, War of xv, 493
Authier de Sisgaud, Christophe d' 24
Ava 300
Avedaño, Diego de 235
Avendaño, Hernando de 244
Avignon 69, 111, 498, 577
Ávila, Francisco de 244
Avrillon, Jean-Baptiste-Élie 431
Avvakum 189, 191
Azpuru, Spanish ambassador 578, 579
Azzolini, Decio 113, 115

Baader, Franz von 523
Babenstuber, Ludwig 525
Bach, Johann Sebastian xiv, 551
Bacon, Francis 350
Baden 501, 505
Baden, Switzerland, peace (1714) 132, 135, 493
Bahia 245, 247
Bahrdt 519, 537
Bail, Louis 95f
Baillet, Andrien 433
Baius, Michael 25, 27, 56
Ballerini, Girolamo 455, 533
Ballerini, Pietro 455, 533
Ballon, Mother de 18
Balthasar, Johann Anton 257
Balthasar, Joseph Anton Felix 458
Balzac, Guez de 14
Bamberg 147, 150, 448, 497, 501
—bishopric 137
—seminary 160
Banchieri, cardinal 564
Bar, Cathérine de (Mother Mechthilde) 19
Bar, Confederation of (1768) 490
Barbanson, Constantin de 77
Barbarigo, Gregorio 112, 127, 331
Barberini, Francesco, cardinal 34
Barberini, Maffeo, *see* Urban VIII
Barcos, Martin de 8, 32f, 36, 37, 46, 52, 86
Bargellini, nuncio 48, 72
Barnabites
—Asia mission 285
—Burma mission 285, 300f
Baronius 100, 532
Baroque xiv, 362f, 550
—and Enlightenment 550ff
Barthel, Johann Kaspar 451, 456, 482, 517
Bartholomites 158, 556
Basedow, Johann Bernhard 546
Basel 149, 153, 154, 157, 500f, 503
—bishopric 136
—peace (1795) 500
Basilians 205, 224, 226
—in Russia 206
Batavia, treaty (1660) 300
Batthyány, Joseph 481
Baudrand, Barthélémy 432
Bauer, Johann Nikolaus Friedrich 523f
Baumgarten, Sigmund Jakob 536
Bauny, Étienne 96
Bavaria 335, 497, 500, 501, 502, 505, 568
—amortization law (1764) 484
—censorship office 485
—Enlightenment and established Church 482ff
—established Church 464f, 482f
—mandate of indigenousness (1768) 485
—mandate to reform orders (1769) 485
—privy council regulation (1750) 483
—religious policy 482ff
—sponsalia mandate (1769) 485
Bayle, Pierre 73, 265, 344, 355f, 357, 361, 364, 365, 371, 372, 377, 379
Mayr, Beda 520
Beatas 262f, 314f
Beaterios 262f
Beaucousin, prior of Paris Carthusians 10, 76
Beaufort 523
Beaufort, Eustache de 18
Beaumanoir de Lavardin 5
Beaumont, Christophe de 408, 410, 435
Beccarie de Pavie de Fourquevaux, Jean-Baptiste Raymond de 418
Beck, Christian August von, baron 479
Beck, Franz Heinrich 456, 467
Beethoven, Ludwig van 551
Behlen, Ludwig Philipp 155, 456, 457, 460
Belgrade, conquest (1717) 133
Bellarmine, Robert 58, 60, 227, 332
Belle Gabrielle 6
Bellegarde, Octave de 29
Bellisomi,Carlo 456, 467
Bénard, prior of the Collège de Cluny 18
Benavente, P. de 311
Benavente, Toribio de 237
Benedicta Henrietta of Hanover 510, 516
Benedict XI, pope 561
Benedict XIII (Pietro Francesco Orsini), pope 339, 401, 403, 551, 560ff
Benedict XIV (Prospero Lambertini), pope xv, 169, 178, 180, 227, 230, 231, 285, 297, 312, 337, 339, 409, 410, 434, 494, 517, 533, 545, 555, 562f, 566ff
Benedictines 18, 19, 246, 406, 530, 540, 555
—at Catholic universities 540
—of the Holy Sacrament 19
—of Mount Calvary 19
—schools 555
Benedict of Canfield 3, 10, 76, 94
Benefices 405
—accumulation of 7f, 492
—claim to 444
Benevento 340, 577, 581
Bénigne, Jacques 388
Benin 271f
Bentivoglio, nuncio 396
Bentzel, lawyer 461
Benzel-Sternau, Anselm Franz 542
Berchtesgaden 497
Berdolet, bishop of Aachen 508
Berg, duchy 153
Berg, Franz 528

Berkeley, George 351, 373
Bernardes, Manuel 166
Bernières, Charles Maignart de 81, 82
Bernières, Jean de 81, 432
Bernini, Giovanni Lorenzo 88, 113f
Bernis, François de 577, 579
Bernoulli, Jakob 368
Bernoulli, Johann 368
Berruyer, Isaac-Joseph 410f, 418
Berthier, Guillaume 432
Berti, Giovanni Laurenzio 525
Bertrán, Felipe 164
Bérulle, Pierre de xviii, 3, 10, 11f, 12ff, 20, 21, 23, 28f, 29, 33, 71, 76, 77f, 79, 83, 85, 93, 97, 102, 413, 429, 433f
Bérullism 78
Bescherand, Abbé de 423
Beschi, G. Constancio 297f
Besoigne, Jérôme 421, 428, 429
Besse, Pierre de 87
Bessel, Gottfried 530
Betancur, Pedro de San José 263
Bethlehem-Jerusalem, synod (1672) 214
Bethlemites 263
Betzel, lawyer 519
Bevilacqua, nuncio 122, 493
Bianchini, Giuseppe 533
Bible, criticism 99
Bible, exegesis 536
Bible, scholarship 525, 538
Bible, translations, French 49, 87
Biblical theology 538
Biblioteca Alessandrina 113
Bibra, Philipp Anton von 496
Bichi, Antonio 35
Bichi, nuncio 563, 564
Bidal d'Asfeld, Jacques de 400
Bigne, Marguerin de la 97
Bijapur 295
Binet, Étienne 79
Biology 374f
Biron, Ernst Johann von 199
Bishop, William 176
Bishoprics, accumulation of 146ff
Bishops, elections 147, 447
Bissy, bishop of Meaux 382, 384, 386, 388, 393, 398, 399, 400
Bkerke, Synod of (1790) 230
Blampin, Thomas 98
Blau, Felix Anton 528
Bochart de Saron, abbot 56
Bodin, Jean 102
Bodmer, J. J. 363
Böhm, Petrus 521
Böhme, Jakob 436, 437, 439
Boileau, Jean-Jacques 429
Boileau, Nicolas 105
Boineburg, Johann Christian von 445, 511
Bolingbroke, Henry 352
Bolivia 250, 253
Bollandists 100
Bollandus, Johannes 530
Bolognetti, nuncio 63
Boltin, J. V. 196
Bolton, H. E. 257
Bombay 295
Bona, John 527
Bonacina, Martin 526
Bönike, Johann Michael 467
Bonne Armelle, *see* Nicolas, Armelle
Bonnet, Charles 368, 374, 376
Bontempi 578, 580
Bordeaux, provincial council (1582) 9
Borri, Cristoforo 279
Bosio, Antonio 532
Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne 9, 23, 42, 50, 53, 66, 68, 72, 73, 81, 85, 91f, 95, 99, 106, 120, 169, 336, 376, 388, 404, 425, 428, 429, 432, 438, 439, 510, 515f, 532
—and the question of reunification 515ff
Boucher 420
Boucherat, Nicolas 16, 17
Boudon, Henri-Marie 6
Bouhours, Dominique 83
Bourbons 169, 171, 337, 340
Bourdaloue, Louis 73, 85, 96, 532
Bourdoise, Adrien 20f
Bourdon, Madame de 427
Bourgeois, professor at the Sorbonne 37
Bourges, Jacques de 302
Bourgfontaine, Carthusian monastery 42
Bourgoin de Villefore, Joseph 421
Bourgoing, François 14, 24, 78
Bourignon, Antoinette 437f, 439, 445
Boursier, François-Laurent 385, 392, 397, 399, 401, 402, 408, 414f, 419, 424
Bouthilliers, Sébastien 12
Bouvet, Joachim 304
Bouvier de la Motte, Jeanne-Marie 90
Boyer, Jean-François 408f
Boyer, Pierre 425
Boyle, Robert 348, 536
Braganza 280
Brancaccio, cardinal 115, 331
Brandão, Luis 168
Brazil 269ff, 282, 245ff
—mission to 245ff
—patronage 246
—slavery 246
Brée, J. G. von 463
Bregenz 479
Breidbach-Bürresheim, Emmerich Joseph von 459f
Breidbach-Bürresheim, Ernst von 461
Breidbach-Bürresheim, family 150
Breitinger, J. J. 363
Breslau 154, 157, 493
—peace (1742) 571
Brest 207
—synod (1596) 224
—Union of (1595/96) 205, 210f
Breviary 86, 87, 547
—editions 547
—new one in Paris (1738) 430

Brinon, Madame de 510, 516
Brisacier, P. 39
Britto, João de 296
Brixen 137, 146, 151
Brunetti, Johannes 154
Bruyère, Barbeau de la 427
Bruyère, Jarente de la 409
Bucer, Martin 545
Buchheim, Franz Anton von 514
Buchholtz, Ferdinand von 160
Buddeus, Johann Franz 536
Buffon, Georges-Louis de 359, 371, 375
Buglio, Ludovico 314
Bulgaria 208, 211
—patriarchate 215f
Bulgaris, Eugenios 212
Bunyan, John 436
Buoncompagni, Ugo, *see* Gregory XIII
Buonvisi, nuncio 116, 448
Burdeu, Augustinian provincial 6
Burnet, G. 437
Burriel, Andrés 168
Busenbaum, Hermann 527
Butler, Joseph 372, 439, 441, 536
Byzantine-Ukrainian Rite 225
Byzantinistics 529

Cádiz, Diego de 166
Caerimoniale Episcoporum 547
Calancha, Antonio de la 260
Calatayud, Pedro de 166
Calenus, Henri 26f, 40
California 237, 251f, 256
Calixt, Georg 511, 513
Calmet, Augustin 529
Calvairiennes 19
Calvinism, Calvinists 63, 97
—French 3
—in Siebenbürgen 226f
Cambodia 302
Camilis, John Joseph 225
Camisards, rebellion 74
Camp de Ninove, Edict of (1676) 50
Campeggi, nuncio in Madrid 170
Campoformio, Peace of (1797) 501f
Campomanes, Pedro R. de 162, 338
Camus, Jean-Pierre 9f, 77
Canada 258
—mission 258
Candia (Megalo Castro) 112
—Turkish victory (1669) 115
Cangiamilia, F. E. 532
Canova, Antonio 577, 582
Cape Verde Islands, bishopric 271
Caprara, G. B. 456, 460, 461, 480, 503
Capuchins 9, 10, 156, 166, 210, 217, 228, 229, 231, 246, 261
—Africa mission 272
—Angola mission 272f
—Congo mission 272f
—Ethiopia mission 278
—India mission 297f
—in Russia 205
— — expulsion (1747) 205
—and slavery 275
—Spanish America mission 261
—Tibet mission 298f
Caramuel y Lobkowitz, Juan 526
Cardaveraz 166
Cardinals, appointments 108, 112, 115, 117f, 124, 126, 563, 564, 569f, 577, 581
Carignan 258, 498
Carmel 20, 78, 86
Carmelites 10, 11, 12, 19, 156, 228, 231f, 246, 406
—Asia mission 285
—India mission 295f, 298
—and Jansenism 32
—Madagascar mission 279
Caroline Islands 324
Carré de Montgeron, Louis 424
Carrich, Johann Mathias 457
Cartegena 255
Cartesianism 95, 101ff, 355, 370
—Cartesian dualism 361
—and learning 103
Carthusians 6
Casanate, Jerome 125
Casini, Francesco Maria 109
Cassander 515
Castile 233
Castle Rheinfels, religious discussion (1651) 512
Castro, Matthaeus de 294ff
Casuistry 44, 96
Catechesis 85
Cathechetics 525, 531
Cathedra Petri 113
Catherine I, tsarina of Russia 194, 198
Catherine II, tsarina of Russia 200ff, 204, 206, 371, 490, 581
Catherine of Braganza 295
Catherine of Genoa 75
Catherine de Medici 516
Catholicism in non-Catholic countries xix
—in England 13f
—in Russia 203f
Caulet, Étienne 67f, 119
Caussade, Jean-Pierre de 421, 431f, 527
Causse (Brother Augustin) 424
Cavalchini, cardinal 332
Caylus, Charles de 394, 395, 399f, 402, 404, 410, 424f
Cebú, bishopric 321
Ceillier, Remy 530
Celsius, Olaf 370
Cerveau, René 421, 429
Ceylon 293
Chaco 251
Chaldeans, Uniate 218, 229f
Challoner, Richard 178f, 181f
Champaigne, Philippe de 88
Champion, Pierre 79
Champvallon, Harlay de 86, 90

Chantal, Jane Frances de 11
Charcas (Sucre), provincial synod (1629) 262
Charitas ille, bull (1777) 227
Charles I, king of England 13, 174f, 436
Charles II, king of England 179, 295, 348
Charles II, king of Spain 129, 168, 331
Charles III, king of Spain (later, as German emperor, Charles VI) 130f, 167, 171, 324, 338, 369f, 575, 579
Charles IV, king of Spain 168, 171
Charles V, king of Spain 335
Charles VI, German emperor (earlier, as Charles III, king of Spain) 334, 337, 338, 339, 448, 473, 490, 515, 568, 571
Charles VI, king of Spain 332
Charles VII, German emperor xv, 452ff, 493, 568
—secularization project 482
Charles IX, king of Sweden 116
Charles of Anjou 341
Charles de Nevers 13
Charlier, Anne 422
Charron, Pierre 102
Chastel, Violante du 6
Chatel, Jean 58
Chaulnes, Charles, duke de 111, 331
Chelm 206
Chevalier, Abbé 389f
Cheyne, George 439
Chiemsee 146
Chiesa, Bernardino della 285
Chigi, Fabio, *see* Alexander VII
Chigi, Flavio, cardinal 118
Chile 250
Chiloé 250
China
—civilization 379
—mission 282, 303ff
— — missionaries of the *Padroado* 311
— — new orientation of missionary methods 313
— — Propaganda missionaries 312
— — training of native priests 314ff
—persecution of Christians (1784/85) 307ff
China rapture 379
Chiquitos 253
Chiriguanos 250
Chlysty 203
Choiseul, Étienne François 411f, 579
Choiseul, Gilbert de 47
Christ, piety 552
Christian Brothers 84, 555
Christianity
—claim to absolute nature 345
—and Enlightenment 343ff
Christina, queen of Sweden 113, 115f, 125
Chrysanthos Notaras, patriarch of Jerusalem 197, 214
Chumacero, Spanish ambassador 170
Chur 138, 151, 159, 160, 479
Church
—and contemporary culture 559
—and Enlightenment 108f
—loss of leadership 343
—reform xvii, 471
— — in the Church of the German Empire 146ff
Church and state 170f, 559
—after Febronius 454ff
—in France 57ff
—in German religious legislation 451f, 470
— — after the Coblenz *gravamina* 458ff
Church history, historiography xix, 100f, 362, 524, 529, 532, 543ff
—Protestant 536f
Church hymns 551
Cienfuegos, Álvaro 167, 525, 562
Cisalpine Club 182
Cistercians 17, 18
Cîteaux, abbey 17
Civil constitution 500
Clairvaux, abbey 17
Clarke, Samuel 536
Claudius, negus 221
Claver, Pedro 256
Clémencet, Dom 428
Clemens August, elector of Cologne 149, 154, 495
Clemens Wenzeslaus of Saxony, elector of Trier 160, 456f, 459, 461, 464, 466, 469, 478, 480, 495, 504, 507, 520
Clement VIII, pope 263
Clement IX (Giulio Rospigliosi), pope 56, 114f, 282, 289, 330
Clement X (Emilio Altieri), pope xiv, xv, 115ff, 119, 282, 331, 513, 561
Clement XI (Giovanni Francesco Albani), pope xv, 54ff, 92, 125, 129ff, 171, 311, 331, 334, 337, 338f, 381ff, 385ff, 396, 399f, 560, 562
—bull *Unigenitus* 381ff
—dispute with Philip V 338f
—Inquisition decree against Jansenism (1718) 397
—and War of the Spanish Succession 129ff
Clement XII (Lorenzo Corsini), pope 340, 563ff
Clement XIII (Carlo Rezzonico), pope 340, 354, 411, 421, 435, 459, 475, 476, 573ff
—conflict with Bourbon courts 577
Clement XIV (Lorenzo Ganganelli), pope, xvi, 167, 206, 226, 411f, 551, 577ff
—and problem of Jesuits 579
Clément, Jacques 58
Clementine Peace (1668) 49ff, 67, 114
Clergy 59, 124
—in France 4ff
——reform 20ff, 80, 84
—immunity 483f
Clermont-Tonnerre, bishop of Langres 383
Clerselier 106
Climent, José 164
Cluny, abbey 18f
Coadjutorships 146f

Coblenz *Gravamina,* see *Gravamina*
Coccius, Johann 535
Cochin China 320
—mission 301f
Codde, Pierre 412
Code Léopold 333
Coffin, Charles 409, 430
Colbert, Jean-Baptiste 288, 353, 543
Colbert de Croissy, Charles 70, 389, 392, 400, 401f, 404, 410, 414, 422, 424
Coles 250
Collado, Diego 319
Collard, Paul 429
Collin du Juanet 34
Collins, Anthony 349, 536
Colloredo, Hieronymus von, count 464, 478, 480, 552
Colmar, Joseph Ludwig 508
Colombière, Claude de la 86
Cologne 139, 146, 148, 445, 495, 497, 502, 507
—archbishopric 138
Colombia 232, 250, 255
Comacchio 129f, 339, 342, 449, 560
Combéfis, François 97
Comenius, Johann Amos 346
Commonwealth 174
Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice 22
Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement 73, 81f
Concini, Maréchal d'Ancre 12
Concordata Nationis Germanicae 462f, 518
Concordata Principum (1447) 468
Concubinage 6
Condillac, Étienne 359
Condorcet, Antoine de 360
Condren, Charles de 15, 22, 78, 93
Confession, study of 538
Confessional movement 550
Confraternities 549f, 555
—in America 262
—in Bavaria 484
—dissolution of Josephinism 476f
Confrérie de la Charité 80
Congo
—mission 272
— — French secular priests 273f
Congregación del clero de Castilla y de León 163
Congrégation de France 17
Congrégation de Jésus et Marie 24, 78, 554
Congrégation de Saint-Benoît 19
Congrégation de Saint-Louis 19
Congrégation de Saint-Maur 18
Congrégation des Pères de la Mission 24
—see also Lazarists
Congregation for seminaries 563
Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith xx
—Africa mission 270ff
—America mission 233ff
—Asia mission 281ff
—China mission 305ff
—and demands of Philip II for an "Indian patriarchate" or a "royal vicariate" in Spanish America 232
—East Asia mission 312
—India mission 293f
—Japan mission 319
—and missionary method 288f
—and Portuguese *Padroado* 280ff
—reorganization of Irish mission 173f
—and Spanish patronate and regalism in the missions 234ff
Congregazione delle Apostoliche Missioni 285
Conry (Conrius), Florent 25, 33
Consalvi, Ercole 558
Conseil de conscience 70
Constantinople
—synod (1590) 186
—synod (1593) 187
—synod (1638) 211
—synod (1643) 211
—synod (1672) 214
—synod (1728) 229
Constantinos XI, Byzantine emperor 184
Constitutio Innocentiana (1695) 148
Contenson, Guilleaume de 95
Conti, François Louis 128, 489
Conti, Michelangelo dei, *see* Innocent XIII
Conti, Riccardo 560
Contritionism 31, 32
Controversy, theology of 526
Convenit provide, brief (1789) 487
Conversion, according to Wesley 441
Convulsionism 422ff
Copernicus, Nicolaus 536
Coptic Church of Egypt 220f
Copts 209, 213, 218, 230
Corbin 87
Cordemoy, Géraud de 106
Coret, P. 65f
Corfu 132
Cornet, Nicolas 38f
Coronation Tractate (1657) 445
"Corps de doctrine" 389f, 391, 399
"Corps des difficultés" 389f, 393
Corsini, nuncio 21
Corsini, Lorenzo, *see* Clement XII
Corvey, abbey 143, 494
Coscia, Niccolò 561ff, 564
Cotolendi, Ignatius 282
Coton, Pierre 3, 10, 79
Couet, Abbé 399
Council 57
—authority 57ff
—and ecclesiastical infallibility 59
Councils, ecumenical
—Basel (1431–49) 142, 454, 457, 462f
—Constance (1414–18) 142, 462
—Florence (1439) 223
—Louvain (second; 1274) 119
Couplet, Philipp 304
Courcelle de Pourlan, Jeanne de 18
Coustant, Pierre 530

Creation, doctrine of 346
Creation, theology of
—and natural sciences 373f
Creoles
—role during Enlightenment 268f
Créqui, duke de 111f
Crete, 111, 115
Croce, Benedetto 347, 377
Crocius, Johannes 512
Croiset, Jean 434
Cromwell, Oliver 174, 175, 348
Crown cardinals 108, 112
Cuchot d'Herbain, Jean Marie 456
Cum ad aures, bull (1665) 66
Cum alias, brief (1699) 92
Cum alias, bull (1687) 69
cum occasione, bull (1653) 40, 41
Curia
—and German Church 443ff
—and Spain 163
Cuzco
—provincial chapter S. J. (1576) 252
Cyprus 209, 214
Cyrano de Bergerac 102
Cyril II Contares, patriarch of Constantinople 211f
Cyril III, metropolitan of Moscow 185
Cyril VI (Seraphim Tanas), Uniate Melchite patriarch 228
Częstochowa 489

Dagoumer, Guillaume 397
Daguesseau, procurator general 382, 384, 387, 391, 397, 399f, 403, 406, 410
Dahomey 272
Dalberg, family 140, 150
Dalberg, Karl Theodor von 469, 504, 506, 522f
Dames de Charité 80f
Danes 280
Danzer, Jakob 528
Darien 261
Darwin, Erasmus 375
D'Asfeld 425
Dashkov, Georgi 199
Daubenton, P. 168
Deacon, Thomas 440
Debonnaire 424
Declaratio cleri gallicani (1682) 68, 336f
Declaration of Indulgence (1672) 175
Declaration of Rights 182
Deel, P. K. von 461, 462
Deinet, Johann Konrad 335
Deism 343, 348ff, 358, 371, 536
De la Mothe Le Vayer, François 378
Demissa preces, brief (1724) 401
Denich, Sebastian 154
Denys de Sainte-Marthe 101
Depositum fidei 59
—and the whole Church 59
Dereser, Thaddäus Anton 528
Descartes, René 102ff, 266, 351, 355, 360, 363, 372, 375f
Deschamps, Étienne 37, 42
Desessarts, Alexis 419f, 425
Desessarts, Jean-Baptiste 419f, 425
Desideri, Ippolito 299
Desing, Anselm 529
Desmares, Jean 37
Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin 48, 88
Desplantes, Laurent 66
D'Étemare 419, 420, 424, 426
De Troya 420
Deventer 413
Deville 87
Devolution, War of 115
Devotional literature 85
De Witte, Louvain theologian 55
Deydier, François 302
Dez, Jean 514
Diamper (Urdiamperur), synod (1599) 219
Diana, Antonio 526
Diarbekr (Amida), patriarchate 218, 229f
Díaz Bravo, José Vicente 268
Diderot, Denis 354, 359, 371
Diepenbrock 524
Dillingen 157
—seminary 159
Dilthey, Wilhelm 377
Dionisi, metropolitan of Moscow 185f
Dionysios, patriarch of Constantinople 192
Dionysios I, metropolitan of the Thomas Christians 219
Dionysios of Werl 514
Diplomacy 530
Discalced Augustinians 250
—Tonking mission 302
—*see also* Carmelites
Divine service 86
—enlightened 552f
Dmitri, the False 187
Dnjestr, victory over Turks (1673) 116
Dobritzhofer, Martin 254
Doctriniarians 406
Doctrinas 242f, 247, 252
Dogmatic history, Protestant 538
Dominicans 19, 165, 228, 245, 406, 555
—Africa mission 270f, 275f
—Asia mission 283
—China mission 307, 313
—India mission 291f
—and Jansenism 32
—Philippine mission 321, 323
—Siam mission 301
—Solor mission 300
—South America mission 259f
—Tonking mission 303
Dominis, Marco Antonio 59f
Dominus ac Redemptor noster, brief (1773) 167f, 411, 580
Don Carlos 133, 340, 565f
Donne, John 436

Dordrecht, synod (1619) 360
Dorsanne, Antoine 403, 420f
Dositheos II, patriarch of Jerusalem 214
Dostoevski, F. M. 198
Dover, treaty of (1670) 176
Drey, Sebastian 523
Drouet de Villeneuve, Gabriel 66
Drouin, Hyacinth 525
Du Barry, countess 579
Dublin, synod (1666) 176
Dubois, Jean Antoine 300, 398, 399, 400
Du Four, Charles 82
Dufresne Sieur Du Cange, Charles 529
Dugard, lawyer 428
Du Guet, Jacques-Joseph 51, 89f, 397, 400, 401, 414f, 418, 419, 424, 425f, 429, 443
Du Halde 378
Dukhobors 203
Dumeiz, Damian Friedrich 456
Dum inter gravissima, brief (1761) 411
Dupac de Bellegarde, Gabriel 428, 516f
Du Perron, Jacques Davy 59, 61
Du Plessis d'Argentré, Charles 95
Dupuy, brothers 63, 98, 102, 337, 453
Duran, Diego 238
Dürr, Franz Anton 465
Du Tertre 379
Du Tillot, Guglielmo 342, 576
Duval, André 10, 11, 61, 93
Du Vaucel 51
Duvergier de Hauranne, Jean (Saint-Cyran, Petrus Aurelius) xviii, 8, 9, 14f, 25f, 28f, 29ff, 32ff, 49, 77f, 99, 438, 443, 498
Duvernin, Toussaint 155

East Africa, mission 276
Eastern Churches, independent 208ff
East India 281f, 283, 288
—mission 300ff
East India Company 278
Eau, Abbé d' 407
Ecclesia Christi, bull (1801) 502
Ecclesia catholicae, constitution (1695) 148
Ecclesiastical immunity 483
Ecclesiastical territories 444
—and French Revolution 498ff
—internal readiness for secularization 495
—and secularization 491ff
Echter von Mespelbrunn, Julius 539
Eckher von Kapfing, Johann Franz 149
Ecuador 253
Edumenical patriarchate 208ff
Education, in France 82ff
Eger 478
Egypt 270
Eichsfeld 494
Eichstätt 143, 146, 147, 150, 157, 493
Eisenburg, Peace of (1664) 112
Elce, d', cardinal 331
Electoral capitulation 141f, 145, 146f, 451f, 458, 569
El Greco 215
Eliano, Giambattista 230
Elias XII Denha, patriarch of Babylon 229
Elizabeth, princess-abbess of Herford 510
Elizabeth, Sisters of Saint 554
Elizabeth I, queen of England 173
Elizabeth I Petrovna, tsarina of Russia 199f, 205, 371
Elizabeth Charlotte of the Palatine 510
Elizabeth Christine of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel 515f
Ellwangen 493
Elna, bishopric 162
Eltz, family 140, 150
Embrun, provincial council (1727) 419
Emperor, German
—*Advocatus ecclesiae* 144f
Empire, German, Church of the xviif
—anti-Roman tendencies 444f, 449f, 451, 457ff, 464ff
—aristocracy 148f
—cession of left bank of Rhine 500ff
—consequences of secularization 506f
—crisis of existence 140
—dynastic national church policy 147f, 492f
—ecclesiastical restoration 499f
—ecclesiastical territories 136ff
—episcopalism
— — from middle of 17th to end of 18th centuries 443ff
— — between Rome and Vienna 449
—fall in the great secularization 491ff
—fundamental laws 144
—hierarchy 147
—indebtedness 138
—influence of the French Revolution 497f
—law 451
— — episcopalistic 141, 451ff
—nunciature controversy 444ff, 465f
—pastoral clergy 155f
—reconstruction and constitution 135ff, 467, 477
—reform 146ff, 153
—religious ecclesiastical rejuvenation 140
—secularization as revolution of princes and reform attempts by state 505
—seminaries 156ff
—suffragan bishops 152f
Empiricism 350, 363, 368
Ems, congress (1786) 467ff
Ems draft agreement (1786) 467ff
Encyclopedia, French 354f, 357, 362
England xv, xix, 115, 129, 131, 175, 280, 333
—Africa mission 271
—Enlightenment 347ff
—India mission 293ff
—persecution of papists 73
—and War of Spanish Succession 129ff
—*see also* Great Britain
England-Hanover 495

English Ladies 555
Enlightenment xiv, xix, 107f, 342ff, 509, 535
—Catholic 109, 495
—concept 342ff
—creation and natural law 371f
—doctrine of state 377
—effect on systematic theology 526
—French 371
—history 376ff
—inspiration for theological studies 525
—and Josephinism 475ff
—in Latin America and its consequences 263ff
—and liturgical piety 553
—natural sciences 371ff
—with respect to political and social conditions of countries 347ff
—Second xiv
—in secular territories of the German Empire 469ff
—and state Church 482
—story of salvation and world of history 371ff
—striving for toleration and attempts at reunion 521f
—theology 526f
—and Theresianism 473f
Episcopal elections 146, 447
Episcopalism xviif, 332, 507, 539
—in German Church 334, 357
— — canonical and theological justification 449ff
— — Coblenz *gravamina* (1769) 458ff
— — Febronius and Febronianism 452ff
— — nunciature dispute and Congress of Ems 464ff
— — practical, of late 17th and early 18th centuries 443ff
— — between Rome and state Church 465f
Episcopate 57f, 59
—in England 177
—in France 3ff
—in German Empire 152
—jurisdiction 59, 147, 455, 535
—in Spain 163f
—*see also* episcopalism, papacy, Church of German Empire
Erasmus, Desiderius 264
Erekle II, king of East Georgia 314
Erfurt 494
Ermland 157
Ernesti, Johann August 536
Ernst, von Hessen-Rheinfels, landgrave 143, 493, 511ff, 516
Ernst August, duke of Braunschweig-Lüneburg 492
Ernst August, duke of Hanover 512
Erthal, Franz Ludwig 543
Erthal, Friedrich Karl von 463f, 477, 487, 503, 542
Esclaves de l'église 275
Escobar Mendoza, Ambrosio de 527
Este, clan 111
Estonia 203f
Estrées, Angélique d' 7, 17
Estrées, César d' 117, 119, 120
Estrées, d', cardinal 385
Estrées, d', duke 62, 117f, 121
Etchmiadzin, catholicate 222f
Eternal Statute (1606) 146
Ethiopia 209, 217, 231
—mission 301f, 274f
—Monophysite Church 220
Etsi pastoralis, constitution (1742) 227
Eudes, John 23, 78, 86, 100, 434, 527, 554
Eugene, prince xvi, 130, 133
Eugene IV, pope 462
Europe, end of denominational era 135ff
Euthymios, archbishop of Sidon and Tyre 213, 229
Evangelical theology 535ff
Evolutionism 375, 379
Exclusions during papal elections 330ff
Ex debito Pastoralis officii, bull (1633) 319
Exegesis 98f
—in France in 17th century 98ff
—Jansenist 424f
Exemption dispute between Salzburg and Passau 143
Exemptions 462, 467
Eximia regalium, bull (1771) 226
Ex omnibus, brief (1755) 409
Exorcism 76, 475, 552
Ex quo singulari, bull (1742) 312
Eyss, Matthias von 154

Fabert, Marshal 73
Fabian y Fuero 267f
Fabricius, Johann 514f
Facchinetti, nuncio 170
Fagaras, bishopric 226
Falkner, Thomas 265f
Famille du saint Enfant-Jésus 86
Farnese, Antonio 565
Farnese, clan 111
Farnese, Elizabeth 131f, 575
Fasiladas (Basilides), negus 221
Faure, Charles 7, 17
Feast days, ecclesiastical
—reduction 475, 551
Febronianism xviii, 453ff, 498, 508
Febronius, Justinus, *see* Hontheim, J. N. von
Fedor I, tsar of Russia 185
Fedor Romanov, *see* Filaret
Feijóo y Montenegro, Benito Gerónimo 162, 168, 265
Felbiger, Johann Ignaz von 531, 545
Feldkirch 495
—Jesuit college 159
Feller, F. X. 454
Female orders, convents 7, 554f
—in the American mission 260f
—instruction and education of girls 555
Fénelon, François 8, 53f, 55f, 72, 84, 89, 90f, 105, 385ff, 427, 432, 436f, 438, 440, 442, 545

—and Madame Guyon 89ff
—*Maximes* and dispute with Bossuet 91f
—and Saint-Cyr 91
Ferdinand, duke of Bavaria, elector of Cologne 136, 148, 157, 446
Ferdinand, duke of Parma 475
Ferdinand I, German emperor 146
Ferdinand II (I), the Catholic, of Aragon-Naples 334, 339
Ferdinand II, German emperor 101, 473
Ferdinand III, German emperor 225, 448
Ferdinand IV, king of Naples 341
Ferdinand VI, king of Spain 167
Ferguson, Adam 352
Ferrar, Nicholas 436
Ferraris, Lucius 533
Ferreira, Christovao 318
Ferry, Pastor 73
Feu, François 403, 408
Feydear, Jansenist 39
Fidalgos 277
Fideli, bull (1728) 339, 562
Figurism, Figurists 311, 424f
Filaret, patriarch of Moscow 187f
Filleau de la Chaise 42
Filles de la Charité (Vincentians) 80
Filles de la Croix 11
Filles de Notre-Dame 11
Filofei, monk 184
Fingerlos, M. 531
Fini, Uditore 139
Finland 203
Firmian, family 150
Firmian, Karl von, count 474
Firmian, Leopold Ernst von 477, 497
Fitz-James, bishop of Soissons 409f, 418
Flèche, Timothée de la 56
Fléchier, Esprit 85
Fleury, Claude 439, 529
Fleury, Joly de 383, 387, 401f, 403f, 405, 406, 408
Florence, national synod (1787) 535
Flórez, Enrique 162, 167, 545
Fontaine, Nicolas 99
Fontainebleau, Edict of (1685) 74
Fontaine de la Roche, Jacques 420, 421, 427
Fontenelle, Bernard 346
Fontette, Favret de 427
Forbin-Janson, Toussaint de 126f, 128
Force, spiritual and temporal in Church of German Empire 451
Forster, Frobenius 529
Fossé, Thomas du 427
Foucault, governor of Montauban 74
Fouillou, Jacques 384, 415f, 423, 428
Fouquet, P. 407
Fouquet, superintendent 73
Fourier, Pierre 11
Fourquevaux 420, 426
Fox, George 436f
France xiv, xv, 126, 129, 329ff, 334, 335, 516, 547, 558, 565
—academies 543ff
—anti-Spanish policy 12ff
—appeal to general council after *Unigenitus* 391ff
—*appeal comme d'abus* 332ff
—and Asia mission 288
—bishops' appointments 5, 110f
—Catholicism under Louis XIII 3ff
—certificate of confession 408f
—Christian renewal after 1615 9ff
—Christian thought in 17th century 92ff
—Cartesianism and religious thought 101ff
— — development of historical theology 97f
— — systematic and scholastic theology 93ff
—Church and papal authority 57f
—Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790) 498f
—Clergy, Assemblies of the 61, 67, 71, 87, 119f
— — (1654) 45
— — (1657) 45
— — (1661) 46
— — (1680) 119
— — (1681) 68f, 120
— — (1682) 68f, 128
— — (1715) 388
— — (1726) 401
— — (1730) 406
— — (1755) 409
—clergy, pastoral 4f
—clergy, reform of 15ff, 20ff
—clergy, regular 5ff
—clergy and hierarchy 416f
—concordat (1516) 62, 65, 67, 335, 336
—concordat of Napoleon (1801) 502
—conquest, wars of 115f, 123, 127
—democracy, ecclesiastical 395f
—ecclesiastical estates 4f
—education 82f
—emigration of nobility and clergy 499
—Enlightenment 352ff
—episcopal sees 4f
—episcopate 5, 62f
—era of hegemony 107ff
—exemptions 8f
—expansionist policy 123, 129
—and historical research 529
—missions to parishes 23f
—monasteries, reform of 9ff, 15f
—national council, plan of (1715) 386f
—and papacy 109ff, 118ff
—and papal elections 329f
—parliament and ecclesiastical problems 407ff
—pastoral care 8f
—patriarchate, Richelieu's plan of 15, 63f
—persecution and dissolution (1764) of Society of Jesus 574f
—priests, training of 21ff
—Protestantism in 17th century 70ff
— — ban on Reformed 74
— — reunification attempts 73
—provincial council of Embrun (1727) 402ff

—Reformed 61, 63
—regalia dispute 63f, 67ff, 128
—royal authority in area of Church and religion 57ff
—schism, danger of 64
—secularization 497, 502
—and Spain 110f
—spirituality of 17th century 75ff
— — art 87f
— — Bérulle's school 77f
— — Bible translations 87
— — from Cartesianism to quietism 88ff
— — Christian life 84ff
— — Christological piety 77f
— — devil exorcisms 76
— — education: schools and colleges 82f
— — elementary school education 84
— — great Christian works 80
— — liturgy and piety 85f
— — mass hysteria 76
— — Platonized mysticism 75f
— — political tendencies 81
— — prevailing tendencies 75ff
— — psychologism and moralism in devotional literature 88ff
— — Salesian piety 77
— — translations of liturgical books 86f
—spirituality of 18th century 428ff
— — Christian life 428ff
— — continuation of mystical tendencies 430ff
— — devotions 433ff
—split in Catholicism 396
—split in episcopate over *Unigenitus* 381ff
—state Church 331
—trial proceeding (1657) 45
—trial proceeding (1730) 405
—and war of First Coalition 499f
—and wars against Turks xvi
—war with Spain (1635) 14
Franciscans 165, 213, 214, 231, 238, 242f, 245f, 247ff, 251f
—Africa mission 270, 276
—Asia mission 280, 283
—Burma mission 299f
—China mission 305
—Ethiopia mission 231, 278
—India mission 291ff, 297f
—Indonesia mission 301
—Islamic mission in North Africa 271
—mission and pastoral care in America 247ff
—mission in England 172
—Philippines mission 321
—Sudan mission 278
Francis Borgia 232, 234
Francis de Sales xviii, 3, 9, 11, 19, 29, 77, 436f, 439, 440
Francis Xavier 291, 345
Franco-Dutch War (1672–78) xiv
Franco-Spanish War (1635) 62
Franz I, German emperor 342, 566
Franz II, German emperor 501, 505, 506
Franz Ludwig, prince-bishop of Pfalz-Neuburg 135, 160
Franz Stephan of Lorraine 473
Frasella, Francesco Antonio de S. Felice 294
Frasien, Claude 525
Frederick of York 495
Freemasonry 354
—condemnation by Clement XII (1738) 565
—English 348
—in Russia 371
—in Switzerland 367
Freethinkers 101ff, 349
Fréhel, pastor in Clermont 53
Freising 138, 146, 149, 445f, 459, 466, 478, 487, 493
—seminary 159
French Revolution xx
Fréquente communion of Antoine Arnauld 36f, 65
Frères de la Charité 10
Fresso, Pedro 235
Friaul 571
Friede, Juan 238
Friedrich II, the Great, king of Prussia XV, 365, 494, 568, 572, 581
Friedrich V, elector Palatine 13, 510
Friedrich August the Strong, *see* Augustus II of Poland
Friedrich Karl, elector-archbishop of Mainz 469
Friedrich of Hesse, cardinal 446
Friedrich Wilhelm I, king of Prussia 365
Frizon 87
Froidmont, Liber 25f, 40
Froment, François 434
Fuenta, Angel de la 289
Fugger, Anton Ignaz von 158, 478
Fugger, Jakob 158
Fukien 305, 308
Fulaifil, Antonius, Coptic archbishop 231
Fulda 143, 497
—abbey 540
—seminary 159
Fulda, reunification plan 516, 518, 520f
Fumel, bishop of Lodève 435
Funchal, bishopric 271
Furlong, G. 269
Fürstenberg, Egon von 124
Fürstenberg, family 149f
Fürstenberg, Franz Egon von 445f
Fürstenberg, Franz von 157, 497f, 541
Fürstenberg, Wilhelm Egon von 122, 138, 159

Gabler, Philipp 538
Gabriel, Serbian patriarch 189
Galdo, Maria Anna del 263
Gale, Theophile 437
Galen, Christoph Bernhard von 137, 445
Galicia 225
Galilei, Galileo 355, 361

Gallemant, Sorbonne professor 10
Gallican Articles 336, 535
Gallicanism xvii, 39f, 57ff, 67, 73, 108, 124, 335, 336f, 381, 416, 439, 547, 559
—at beginning of 17th century 57ff
—of Louis XIV 65ff
Gallican Liberties 57ff, 63f, 66, 120, 127, 336, 353, 382
—condemnation (1690) 127
Gallifet, Joseph de 434
Gallio, Marco, Cologne nuncio 446
Gamaches, Philippe de 8, 93
Ganganelli, Lorenzo, *see* Clement XIV
Garampi, Giuseppe 457, 480, 521, 533
Garasse, François 103
Garcia, Franciscus 218f
Garcia II, king of the Congo 273
Garden, George 438f
Garden, James 438f
Garnot, pastor 408
Garweh, Ignatius Michael, Syrian-Catholic patriarch 224, 229
Gassendi, Pierre 102, 355
Gaston d'Orléans 15f, 62, 102
Gaubil, Antonio 307
Gauhari, Ibrahim 220
Gaultier, Jean-Baptiste 410
Gazaignes 411
Geel, Georg von 273
Gemona, Basilio Brollo de 304
Gener, Juan Baptist 525
Gennadios Scholarius, patriarch of Constantinople 209
Gennes, Julien de 425
Genovevians 406
Genoa, French conquest (1684) 123
George I, king of Great Britain 348
George II, king of Great Britain 181
George III, king of Great Britain 181, 182, 495
George III, patriarch of Antioch 224
Georgia, Georgians 208, 228
—autocephalous Orthodox Church 216
Gerasimos Spartaliotes, patriarch of Alexandria 213
Gerberon, Gabriel 52, 53, 54, 55f, 529
Gerbert, Martin II 142, 455ff, 519f, 521, 530f, 545, 548, 552
Gerhard, Johann 535
Gerlach, Ludwig von 521
German, metropolitan of Moscow 187
Germanos Peloponnesios, patriarch of Jerusalem 214
Germany, empire 516
—academies 543f
—denominational mixing 505
—dissolution of Jesuit order 580
—ecclesiastical reunion attempts 508ff
—Enlightenment 361f
—after secularization 505f
—universities 362
Germogen, patriarch of Moscow 187
Gerson, Jean 57, 58
Gertz, Johann 522
Ghebragzer, Tobias Georg 277f
Ghent 502
Giannone, Pietro 340, 484
Gibbon, English historian 438
Gibieuf, Guillaume 28, 78, 94f, 97
Gießen, religious discussion (1653) 492
Giffard, vicar apostolic 178
Giftschütz, Franz 531
Giunta Economale in Milan (1765) 475f
Gnesen 491
Goa 271, 282, 285, 291, 295
—councils 291
Goar, Jacques 529
Godunov, Boris, tsar of Russia 185f
Goffiné, Leonhard 551
Goldhagen, Hermann 520, 528
Gollowitz, Dominik 531
Gonçalvez, Jacome 294
Gondi, family 23
Gondi, François de 34, 65
Gondi, Henri de 17
Gondi, Jean-François Paul de, *see* Retz, Jean
Gondi, Philippe de 5
Gondrin, archbishop of Sens 48
Gonzaga, Anna of 510
Gonzaga, Silvio Valenti 567, 572
González, Tirso 124, 166, 305
Goodwin, Thomas 436
Görres, Johann Joseph von 498, 508, 523
Görz 571
Gotti, Vincenzo Ludovico 525
Gottsched, Johann Christoph 355, 363
Goujet, Claude 427
Goulu, Feuillantine monk 75
Gourlin, Pierre-Étienne 410, 418, 420, 424, 428
Gouvea, Alexander de 307, 316f
Goy, Jean-Baptiste 403, 421
Göze, J. M. 365
Grabmann, Martin 524
Grace 26f
—and predestination in Quesnel 51
Grace, doctrine of 36, 570
Grace, dispute over 24f, 27f, 31f
Graf, Anton 531
Grammont, wife of marshal 403
Gran 123
Grand Alliance 128ff
gratia efficax 105
Gravamina 453, 518
—of Coblenz (1769) 458ff, 462, 467
—of the three Rhenish elector-archbishops (1673) 447f, 467
Great Britain (England)
—Catholic emancipation 181f
—Catholics, persecutions of (1678ff) 176ff
—king and parliament 175
—under Oliver Cromwell 174
—penal code of 18th century 177ff
—Royal Society 348

—situation of Catholics in 17th and 18th centuries 172ff
Greece 211
Greek College at Rome 223
Greeks, non-Uniate 480
Gregorian Church, *see* Armenia
Gregorios of Jerusalem, Jacobite bishop 219
Gregory V, ecumenical patriarch 212
Gregory VII, Pope 450, 463, 563
—liturgical feast 563
Gregory XIII (Ugo Buoncampagni), pope 34, 230
Gregory XV (Alessandro Ludovisi), pope 17, 296
Gregory of Valencia 541
Gregory the Enlightener 222
Grignion de Montfort, Louis-Marie 433f, 527
Grimaldi, Girolamo 224
Grimaldi, Jerome 35
Groschlag, C. W. von 460, 461
Grosswardein 112
Grotius, Hugo 346, 360, 365, 378, 484
Grottaferrata 227
Grou, Jean-Nicholas 432
Gruber, Johann Joseph Augustin 531
Guadalupe 250
Guam 324
Guatemala 250f
—university 147
Guénin de Saint-Marc, Marc-Claude 420
Guilbert, Pierre 428
Guilloré, François 79, 431
Guimenius 66
Guinea 271, 272
Guise, family 5
Gurk 146, 478
Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden 113
Guttenberg, Johann Gottfried II von 147f
Guyart, Marie (de l'Incarnation) 75, 82f
Guyon, Madame 86, 89ff, 432, 436f, 438, 440, 443
Guyon du Chesnoy, Jacques 89ff

Haberkorn, Peter 511
Habert, Isaac 33f, 36, 37f
Habsburg XV, 136, 140, 146, 169, 170, 207, 337, 492, 516
Hadrian VI, pope 169
Haeffelin, Kasimir 521
Haen, de 517
Haga, Cornelius 210
Hagiography 529
Hakuseki, Arai 320
Halde, J. B. du 305
Haller, A. von 375
Haller, Carl Ludwig von 521
Halley, Edmond 373
Hallier, François 37, 96
Hamel, Thomas 315
Hamelius 24
Hamon, Jean 89, 421
Hamon, M. 49
Händel, Georg Friedrich xiv
Hanover 132, 329, 495, 513f
Hansiz, Markus 531
Hantsch, Hugo 479
Hanxleden, E. 297
Happel, Eberhard 511
Hardouin, Jean 410f, 529
Harlay, procurator general 394f
Harlay de Champvallon, François 50, 68f, 120
Harlem 412
Harphius (Herp), Henri 75f, 94f
Hartzheim, Joseph 457, 531
Harvey, William 350, 374
Hassan Udin, sultan 300
Haug, Gabriel 155
Hauser, Bertold 541
Hautefage 428
Haydn, Franz Joseph 551
Hécquet, Pierre 424
Hegel, Georg Wihelm Friedrich xix
Heimes, Valentin 155, 466
Heinke, Franz Joseph Ritter von 474f
Helvetius, Claude Adrien 349, 358
Hennepin, Louis 259
Henrici, Thomas 154
Henriette de France, sister of Louis XIII 13
Henriette de Lorraine 9
Henry IV, king of France 3f, 6, 10, 70, 77, 79, 93, 353, 516
Henry VIII, prince-bishop of Bibra 522
Henry of York 570
Herbert of Cherbury 351, 535
Herder, Johann Gottfried 351, 361, 366f, 368, 378
Hérédie, Bonaventura (Vernant) 66
Hermant, Godefroy 101
Hermits, houses of 160
Herrgott, Marquart 530
Herrnhut Brotherhood 537
Hersent, Charles 64
Hesse-Darmstadt 505
Hesse-Kassel 495, 501
Heylin, John 439f
Hierarchy 59
—*see also* episcopate, papacy
High Church 174
Hildebrandism 450, 454
Hildesheim 138, 151, 492, 494f, 512
Hillesheim, Franz Carl Joseph von 460, 462
Hippolitens 263
Hirsch, E. 535f
Historical theology xix, 528ff
—in 17th century France 97f
History, historiography 93, 346
—at academies 543f
—detheologization 367
—at universities 539f
—world of history 371f
History, secular 377f
—and history of salvation 376ff
Hobbes, Thomas 352

Hoensbroech, Konstantin Franz von 498
Hofbauer, Clemens Maria 481, 556
Hofman, C. G. 519
Hofman, J. J. 294
Holbach, Paul Heinrich Dietrich 348, 350, 359, 376
Holda, Sister 423
Holland, *see* Netherlands
Hollandine, Louise 516
Holy League 123f
Holy Scripture 535, 552
—Jansenism and Holy Scripture 424f
Holy Synod 196ff
Holzhauser, Bartholomäus 158, 555
Homiletics 525, 532
Hontheim, Johann Nikolaus von (Justinus Febronius) 155, 451, 452f, 454f, 460, 462, 514, 516ff
—and reunion attempts 517ff
—*see also* Febronianism
Hooke, Nathanel 437f
Hopei 281
Horix, Johann Baptist 456, 457
Hormez, Johannes, patriarch of Babylon 230
Horn-Goldschmidt, Johann Philipp von 460
Hoyos, Bernardo de 166
Hrzan, cardinal 522
Hubertusburg, Peace of (1763) 495
Huby, Vincent 79
Huguenots 61, 70, 121, 353, 360, 516
—persecution and emigration 73f
Hukuang 306, 308
Humanism
—and Enlightenment 346f
Humanisme dévot 77, 79
Humanity 107, 343
Humankind, unity of 372
Hume, David 344, 351, 358, 367, 536
Hundred Chapters, Synod of the (1551) 185
Hungary 122, 514
Huonder, A. 253
Hurons 258, 379
Hutten, Franz Christoph von 463

Ibiza, bishopric 162
Icazbalceta, J. García 237
Ickstatt, Johann Adam von 483
Ickon painting 192
Ignati, patriarch of Moscow 187
Ignatius XII Noah, Jacobite-Syrian patriarch 218
Ignatius XXIII, Jacobite-Syrian patriarch 218
Ignatius Petrus IV, patriarch of the Syrian nation 229
Ilanz, Articles of (1526) 151
Imperial bishoprics
—appointments to 145f
—re-catholicization 140
Imperial delegates' final recess 502ff
—secularization of imperial estates 503f
Imperiali, Lorenzo 332
In Coena Domini, Communion bull (1581) 121, 333f, 335, 337, 338, 481, 577, 578
—repeal (1774) 579
Index 335
—revision 569
India 279, 280f, 282, 288
—mission 285, 289ff, 301ff
—native clergy 291f
—Protestant mission 297
Indian convents 261
Indian mission and pastoral care 234ff, 237ff, 248
—activity of secular priests 241f
—in Brazil 246
—*doctrinas* (mission stations) 242, 247
—by Franciscans 247ff
—Indian Church 234, 237f, 240
— — prevention 237f
—by Jesuits 252ff
—training of Indian priests 238f
Indians, victims of Enlightenment 269
—reductions 253f
Indian slavery 246
Indies, council of the 234f, 239, 247, 261
Indifferentism 74, 346
Indonesia 278
—mission 301
Indulgences 549
In eminenti, bull (1643) 34f, 40
Infallibility
—ecclesiastical 58
— — and general council 455
—papal 53f, 60, 65ff
Information process, episcopal 463
Ingoli, Francesco 239, 285, 294
Innocent III, pope 560
Innocent VIII, pope 334
Innocent X (Giambattista Pamfili), pope 34, 39, 41f, 45, 64, 107, 109f, 310, 330, 334, 489
Innocent XI (Benedetto Odescalchi), pope xiv, xvi, 44, 50, 67ff, 73, 74, 116, 118ff, 127, 128, 159, 168, 248, 331, 336, 394, 450, 513f, 526
—and France 118ff
—internal ecclesiastical activity 124f
—and Louis XIV 66ff
—and Turkish danger 122f
Innocent XII (Antonio Pignatelli), pope xv, 70f, 92f, 127ff, 148, 305, 331, 337, 369
Innocent XIII (Michelangelo dei Conti), pope 133, 165, 226, 295, 331, 400f, 560
Inquisition 168, 260, 266, 282
—in India 291
Institut du Saint-Sacrement 29f
In suprema, constitution (1666) 18
Ioanna, bishop of Riazan 183
Ioakim, patriarch of Moscow 191, 192f
Ioasaf I, patriarch of Moscow 188
Ioasaf II, patriarch of Moscow 190
Iosif, archimandrite 191
Iosif, patriarch of Moscow 188

Iosif of Volokalamsk 185
Ireland xix, 175
—banishment of regular priests (1697) 179
—Catholic emancipation 181f
—Catholics, persecution of (1649/50) 176
— — (1678ff) 177
—clergy 176, 179f
—episcopate 173, 175f, 179f
—groups in Ireland 192
—Irish Church Act (1869) 183
—mass house 176, 180
—mass rock 175, 176, 180
—parish system 174, 176, 179
—priests, lack of 174f
—Protestant interest 175, 177f
—regular clergy 174, 176, 178ff
—religiosity and spirituality 180f
—situation of Catholics in 17th and 18th centuries 172ff
—social situation of Catholics 180
Iroquois 258, 380
Isabella, queen of Spain 261
Isambert, Nicolas 93
Iselin, Isaac 369
Isenbiehl, Johann Lorenz 457, 508
Isla, Francisco 165, 168
Isla, Josef de 550
Islam 207, 271, 277
—and Christianity in Africa 271
Issy, discussions (1695) 91
Istituto delle Scienze, Bologna 545
Italo-Albanians (Italo-Greeks) 227
Italy 130, 329ff, 362, 565
—academies 543, 545
—Enlightenment 369
—historical theology 531ff
—Italian policy of great powers 329f
—shift in power relationships 565f
Ivan III Vasilevich, tsar of Russia 184
Ivan IV, the Terrible, tsar of Russia 185, 187
Ivan V, tsar of Russia 191, 193
Ivan VI, tsar of Russia 199
Ivanov, Foma 194
Ixnard, Michel d' 552

Jacobites 209, 218, 229
Jacobite-Syrian Church 218
Jacquet, suffragan bishop of Liège 155
Jahangir, grand mogul 298
Jais, Aegidius 529
Jakusic, George 225
James I, king of England 172f, 183, 348
James II, king of England xv, 122, 175, 438
James III, king of England 131
Jamovski, Feodosi 198
Jansen (Jansenius), Cornelius xix, 14, 15, 25ff, 28, 33f, 37f, 40, 41f, 57, 98, 382, 384, 395, 400
Jansenism, Jansenists xviiff, 31ff, 37ff, 51, 55, 60, 67, 70, 108, 112, 124, 353, 401, 437
—appeal to general council 391ff
—defeat 404ff
—development to 1653 24ff
—in 18th century France 380ff
—and 18th century religious attitudes 413ff
— — convulsionism 422f
—and devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus 435
— — eschatological attitudes 425ff
— — hero worship 426
— — miracles and irrationality 421ff
—and Enlightenment 352
—Fénelon and Jansenism 53ff
—five theses 37, 40, 45
—and Gallicanism 64f, 385
—in Italy 533f
—Jansenist dispute xviii, 64, 66
— — beginnings 31ff
— — Jansenist conflict until 1713 40ff
— — Jansenists and anti-Jansenists in Rome 38ff
—literature concerning *Unigenitus* 384f, 390f
—and parliamentarianism 405
—persecutions 406
—political xviii, 411
—*quaestio juris* and *quaestio facti* 41ff
—Quesnel and Jansenism 50ff
—rigorism against laxism of Jesuits 44f
—in Spain 164
—struggle against Port-Royal 46f
—theologians of Jansenism 413ff
Jansson, Jacques 25, 28
Japan 287
—"Office of Inquisition for Christian Affairs" 318
—persecution of Christians and mission 317ff
Jardin, ex-Jesuit 457
Jassy, Synod of (1642) 211
Javorski, Stefan 193ff, 199, 201, 205f
Jean de Saint-Samson 77
Jeanne des Anges 76
Jeannin, president 13
Jeremias II, patriarch of Constantinople 186f, 210
Jeremias III, Melchite patriarch 228
Jeremias III, patriarch of Constantinople 197, 213
Jerusalem, abbot 519
Jerusalem, patriarchate 214f
Jesse, catholicos of Georgia 217
Jesuits, *see* Society of Jesus
Joachim V, patriarch of Antioch 186, 213
Joachim of Fiore 367
Job, patriarch of Moscow 185
Johann Franz Vogt von Altensumerau und Praßberg 137
Johann Friedrich, duke of Hanover 510, 513, 516
Johann Philipp, elector of Mainz 512
Johann Theodor of Bavaria 149, 154, 465, 494
Johann Wilhelm, count Palatine of Neuburg 129
John XVI, Coptic patriarch 230

John Golod, patriarch of Constantinople 222
John of Ávila 49, 75, 442
John of God 10
John of the Cross 75, 431, 432, 436, 442, 527
John Sulaga, Chaldean patriarch 217
Joncoux, Françoise-Marguerite de 427
José I, king of Portugal 166
José Antonio de San Alberto 234
Joseph, Père 62
Joseph I, Chaldean patriarch 229
Joseph I, German emperor 130, 144, 338, 342, 447, 449
Joseph II, Chaldean patriarch 229
Joseph II, German emperor 143, 156, 335, 458, 466f, 468f, 472, 474ff, 497, 499, 522, 552, 553, 557
—and Coblenz *gravamina* 462f
Joseph von Hessen-Darmstadt, prince-bishop 459
Joseph Clemens of Bavaria 155, 449
Joseph Estephan, Maronite patriarch 230
Joseph Ferdinand, electoral prince of Bavaria 129
Josephinism 334, 455, 466, 471, 472ff, 476ff, 541
—ecclesiastical opposition 480f
—and Leopold II 481
—Toleration, Patent of (1781) 479
"Josephites" 185
Jouarre, abbey 9
Journée des Dupes (12 November 1630) 14f
Jovellanos 162
Juan IV, king of Portugal 169
Juana Ines de la Cruz 262
Juan de Santo Tomas 168
Jubé 415
Jubilee (1725) 562
—(1750) 568
Judde, Claude 431
Juli (mission center) 253
Julius III, pope 218
Jung, Johann 465
Junta Magna 171, 233f, 237, 239
Jurieu, Pierre 73, 99
Jurisdiction
—Church and state 332f
—ecclesiastical 58f, 416f
—episcopal 444, 462, 467
—of nuncios 468
—papal 467
Jurisdiction, primacy of papal 450ff
Jus circa civilia 455
Jus circa sacra 455, 475
Jus primarium precum 145
Jussuf ben Hassani 277
Justification
—according to Wesley 441f

Kageneck, Austrian ambassador 165, 171
Kandy 293
Kanghsi, emperor of China 304, 307, 309, 311
Kann, R. A. 473
Kansu 306
Kant, Immanuel 344, 351, 366f
Kara Mustafa, grand vizier 122f
Karg von Bebenburg, Johann Friedrich Ignaz 514f
Karl Emanual, bishop of Trent 137
Karl Joseph, archduke 147
Karl Ludwig of the Palatinate 492, 510
Karl Philipp of the Palatinate 449
Karl Theodor of the Palatinate 466, 472, 487f
Kassel, religious discussion (1652) 511
Kauffmann, Johann Gottfried 455, 457
Kaunitz-Rietberg, Wenzel Anton von 474ff, 522
Kasimierz, Jan 489
Keith, John 437
Kempten 504
Ken, Thomas 438
Kenneth, B. 440
Kesrowan, Synod (1736) 230
Khanzeris, Samuel, ecumenical patriarch 212
Kienlung, emperor of China 307
Kiesling, Johann Rudolf 517
Kiev, academy 192
Kilger, L. 274, 278
Kilkenny, Confederation of 174
Kino, Eusebio Francisco 256
Klausenburg, battle (1660) 112
Klauser, Theodor 547
Kleiner, Joseph 457, 519
Klemens of Bavaria 122
Klüpfel, Engelbert 528
Koblenz, seminary 160
Koelreuter, Joseph Gottlieb 375
Kolborn, J. H. K. von 155, 506
Kołłatej, Hugo 491
Kollonics, Leopold Karl, cardinal 226
Konarski, Stanisłas 490
Konetzke, Richard 266, 270
Königgrätz, seminary 160
Königsegg-Rothenfels, Max Friedrich von 460
Koran 207f
Korea, mission 316f
Krašinski, Adam Stanisłas 490
Kridt, Johannes 157
Krufft, Adolf von 464, 518
Krump, Theodor 231
Kurdistan 217
Kwangsi 306
Kweichow 306
Kyushu 318

Labbé, Philippe 529
La Belle Acarie 75f
La Borde, Vivien de 385, 389, 395, 406, 414
La Broue, Pierre de 389, 392, 399
Lacadones 250

La Chaize, François d'Aix de 56, 65, 70, 74, 120f, 305
La Combe, François 90
Laderchi, Giacomo 532
Ladies of the Holy Sepulcher 555
La Fare, bishop of Laon 408
La Ferté, P. de 390
La Feuillade, duke 396
Lafitau, Pierre-François 379, 390, 399
La Hontan, Baron de 379
Laimbeckhoven, Gottfried von 307, 316
Lallemant, Louis 79, 431
Lamarck, Jean-Baptiste de 359, 375
Lambertini, Prospero, *see* Benedict XIV
La Mettrie, Julien Offroy de 358, 368, 376
La Motte, bishop of Amiens 408
La Motte, Pierre Lambert de 282, 284, 302
Lamy, Bernard 100
Lamy, François de 105
Lancelot 428
Laneau, Louis 301
Lang, Matthäus 146
Lang, Ritter von 504
Langle, Pierre de 389, 392, 398
Langobardi, Nic. 310
Languet de Gergy, Jean-Joseph 397, 410, 416, 418, 421, 422, 434
Langwerth von Simmern, Gottfried Johann, baron 154
Lansink, Jan 275
Laparisière, bishop of Nîmes 398
La Plata, synod (1772) 268
Largentier, Denis 17
La Rochefoucauld, François Joseph de 17ff, 20, 61, 63, 409
La Rochelle
—Assembly of Huguenots (1627) 71
La Rocheposay, bishop of Poitiers 9
Larrière 428
Las Casas, Bartolomé de 235, 237
Lataste, Dom 424
Latin America
—Enlightenment and its consequences 264ff
—expulsion of Jesuits 267
—libraries 264f
—universities 265f
Latinity of the Uniates 224f
La Tour, Georges de 88
La Trappe, abbey 18f
La Trémoille, de, cardinal 381, 390
Launoy, Jean de 100
Laurent de la Résurrection 438, 439, 443
Laurent de Paris 76
Laurenzana, Ludovico de 278
Laval, de, vicar apostolic of Quebec 284
Lavalette, Antoine 575
Lavant 146, 478
Lavardin, Marquis de 69, 121, 126
Lavater, Johann Kaspar 374
Law, William 438–439f
Laxism 525
Laymen
—and doctrine of the faith of the Church 59
—and episcopalism 59
Laymann, Paul 526
Lazarists 23, 271, 554
—China mission 316
—Madagascar mission 279
Leandro de la Anunciacion 285
Lebanon
—Maronite national church 230
Le Blanc de Beaulieu 72
Lebna Denghel, Negus 221
Le Bouthilier de Rancé, Armand-Jean 18f
Le Brun, Charles 88
Leclerc, Pierre 413, 417, 427
Leclerc du Tremblay, Joseph 284
Lecointe, Charles 100
Le Comte, Louis 378
Le Coz, Claude 523
Lee, Francis 438
Lefranc, Anne 422
Léger, Antoine 210
Le Gras, Antoine 80
Le Gros, Nicolas 395, 397, 416, 420, 426
Leiber, Robert 569
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm von 106, 109, 123, 142, 344, 355, 361, 363, 365, 372, 379, 510, 511, 512, 514, 515f, 527, 541, 543
—and question of reunification 516
Leighton, Robert 438
Leitmeritz, seminary 160
Le Jay, Guillaume 99
Le Jeune, Jean 85
Lelong, Jacques 101
Lemaistre, Antoine 30, 36
Lemaistre de Sacy, Isaac 41, 47, 49, 49, 88, 99, 101
Lemberg 491
—Armenian bishopric 227
—victory over Turks (1675) 116
Lemmens, Leonhard 251
Le Moyne, Alphonse 39
Le Nain de Tillemont, Sébastien 101
Lenclos, Ninon de 102
Leo X, pope 333
Leo, Henrich 524
Leo II Kiszka, archbishop 224
Leoben 478
—armistice (1797) 501
Leopold, I, German emperor XVI 112, 116, 122, 126, 129f, 148, 205, 331, 334, 513f
—and papal elections 331
Leopold II, German emperor (Leopold I, as grand duke of Tuscany) 342, 448, 468, 481, 498
Leopold III, German emperor 534
Leopold Wilhelm, archduke of Austria 148, 154, 156
Leopoldovna, Anna 199
Le Paige, Adrien 418, 427

Le Quieu, Antoine 19
Lercari, Niccolo Maria 561ff
Le Roy, Guillaume 46
Le Bons Amis 281
Le Sesne de Ménilles d'Étemare, Jean-Baptiste 55, 384, 386, 418f
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim 361, 363, 365, 367, 536
Lessius, Leonhard 27, 94
Lestonnac, Jeanne de 11
Le Sueur, Eustache 88
Lesczynski, Stanislav 490, 565f
Le Tellier, Michel 56, 66, 72, 120f, 382f, 386, 387
Le Tourneux, Nicholas 87
Lettres Provinciales, see *Provinciales*
Leucosia (Nicosia), synod (1668) 214
Le Vayer de Boutigny 68
Lévis, Henri de 81
Le Voyer d'Argenson, René 81
Levshin, Platon 202
Leyburn, John 178
Leyen, von der, family 140, 150
Leyen, Karl Kaspar von der 447
Liancourt, Duke de 450
Liberalism 172, 352
libertins érudits, see Freethinkers
Licques Indians 250
Liège 136, 141, 151, 478, 494, 497ff, 499, 502
Liechtenstein, legate in Rome 128
Light, metaphysics of 342, 355
Ligny, bishop of Meaux 48
Ligue, French 3, 10
Liguori, Alfons von 526, 556
Lima 250
—synod (1772) 268
—Third Council (1567/68) 238, 240, 242
—university 148
Limburg-Styrum, Damian August Philipp von 458, 459, 468
Limerick, Treaty of (1691) 179
Linné, Carl von 361, 370, 375
Lionne, French ambassador to Rome 65
Lippay, Georg 225
Lippomain, Luigi 532
Lisowsky, Heraklius 206
Litta, Lorenzo 207, 491
Liturgics 525, 530
Liturgy 86f, 547ff
—and popular piety 549
—history 532
—new breviary in Paris (1738) 430
—translations and piety in France 49, 86f
Livonia 204f
Llinas, Antonio 247f
Loango 274
Locke, John 344, 350, 355, 359, 361, 364, 536
Lodron, Paris 136
Logau, Friedrich von 509
Lombardy 129, 475, 565f
Lombez, Ambroise de 432
Lomonosov, M. V. 371
Longueville, de, duchess 49, 50
Lopatinski, archbishop 198
Lopez, Gregor 442
Lopez, Jeronimo 166
Lopuchina, Evdokia 194, 199
Loranzana, Francisco Antonio de 166, 245, 268
Loreto 549
Lori, Johann Georg von 483, 543
Lorraine 148, 333, 335, 492, 498
—inspection placet 334
Losada, Luis de 167
Louail, Jean-Baptiste 384, 416
Louis XI, king of France 334
Louis XIII, king of France 5, 8, 10, 17, 18, 81, 85, 102, 119
Louis XIV, king of France XIV, XVI, 5, 37, 40, 45, 47, 48ff, 54f, 56, 65ff, 71, 74f, 92, 101f, 111f, 114, 115, 116, 118ff, 122, 127ff, 175, 213, 283, 304f, 311, 330f, 336, 353, 378, 381, 385ff, 394f, 409, 450, 490
—and papal elections 330f
—and Protestantism 71ff
—and right of regalia 119
—and War of the Spanish Succession 130f
—appeal to general council (1688) 69f, 394f
—*Unigenitus* 381ff
—excommunication 69f
—Gallicanism 65ff
— — and Gallican Articles 336f
—war against Grand Coalition 128
—war of conquest against Holland 116
Louis XV, king of France 400, 411, 411, 575, 579
Louis XVI, king of France 359, 500
Louis of Blois 75
Louis of Granada 75
Louis, Francois Philippe 456
Louise Hollandine, abbess of Maubuisson 509
Louvain
—university 124
— — and Jansenism 31ff, 52
Louvois, French minister 74
Louys, Epiphanius 77
Lo Wen tsao 314
Loyer, Gottfried 272
Loyola, Juan de 166
Luanda 271, 273
Lübeck, 511
Lucaris, Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem 210f, 212f, 214
Luck, bishopric 206, 207
Luders, abbey 138
Ludovisi, Allessandro, *see* Gregory XV
Lullus, Raimundus 526
Luna, Pedro de 561
Lunéville
—Peace (1801) 502

Lupus, Christian 530
Lutherans, 480
Luynes, crown cardinal 573
Luynes, minister 13
Li, Andreas 315

Maaß, F. 473
Mabillon, Jean 98, 100, 101, 529
Macanaz, Melchior Raphael de 337
Macao 305, 317f
Madagascar, mission 279
Madeira, Dom. 297
Madeleine de Saint-Joseph (Fontaines-Marans) 10
Madrid
—treaty (1626) 13
— — (1750) 254
Madura 296
—mission 296f
Maffei, Scipio 533
Magdeburg Centurions 531
Magni, Valerian 511
Magnin, Jean 266
Maidalchini, Olympia 110
Maignelay, Madame de 10
Maigrot, Charles 311
Maillard de Tournon 287, 297, 311
Maillot de la Treille 456, 521
Mailly, archbishop of Rheims 398, 416
Maimbourg, Louis 119
Maintenon, Madame de 54ff, 74, 84, 90, 90, 102
Mainz 137, 142, 150, 446, 448, 451, 459ff, 465, 496, 498f, 502, 504, 505, 516
—amortization law (1772) 465
—archbishopric 138
—Acceptation (1439) 142, 444, 454, 462, 468
—monastic regulation (1771) 465
—plan of union (1660) 446, 511
—seminary 158
Mair, Jean 57
Major, Gregor 226
Makari, metropolitan of Moscow 185
Makarios III, patriarch of Antioch 189f, 213
Makarios, patriarch of Ipek 216
Malabaric rites 296
Malabar, mission 295ff
Malak Saga III (Susenyos), Negus 221
Malaval, François 77f
Maldonatus, Johannes 99
Malebranche, Nicolas xix 50, 96, 100, 105f, 345, 355, 415
Malpighi, Mariello 369, 374
Malplaquet, defeat of Louis XIV (1709) 131
Maltese 486, 504
Mamachi, Tomaso Maria 455, 533
Manderscheid, archbishop 144
Mandeville, Bernard de 352
Mangold, Joseph 541
Manila 320ff
Mannay, bishop of Trier 508
Mansi, Giovanni Domenico 533
Manso, Pedro 167
Mantua, surrender to French (1701) 130
Manuel, Frei 276
Maraghi, Justus 231
Marandé, almoner 42
Maranhão 245, 257
Marca, Pierre de 47, 63f, 336, 450, 453
Marcus VIII, Coptic patriarch 220
Margaret of Lorraine 15f
Margil, Antonio 251f
Maria Anna, queen, regent of Spain 337
Maria Carolina 340
Maria Theresia xv 111, 473ff, 479, 493, 546, 568, 571, 576, 580, 581
—and dissolution of Jesuit order 581
—neutrality in question of Jesuits 576, 580
Mariana, queen of Spain 168
Mariana, Juana de 58, 169
Marianas 324
Marian congregations 549
Marie de L'Incarnation, *see* Guyart, Marie
Marie de Medici 12, 16, 61, 71
Marie des Vallées 75, 78
Mariette 419
Marillac, governor of Poitou 74
Marillac, Louis de 14, 80
Marillac, Louise de 80, 554
Marillac, Michel de 14
Marion, Simon 7
Maronites 224, 254
Maronite college in Rome 223, 254
Marquemont, archbishop of Lyon 11
Marquette, Jacques 259
Marsay 439
Martène, Edmond 529
Martillac, de 314
Martin, Claude 82
Martin, Josiah 437
Martin von Cochem 551
Martini, Karl Anton von 474, 479
Martini, Martin 310
Martinitz, envoy in Rome 128
Martyrologium Romanum 547
Mary, daughter of James II of England 177
Mary, worship 85, 433f
Masashige, Inoue 318f
Mascaron, Jules 85
Masejevich, Arseni, metropolitan of Rostov 201
Mass, celebration 548
Mass, composition 551
Mass, sacrifice 419
Massillon, Jean 85, 531
Massoulié 95
Matamba 273
Mathematics 373f
Mattei, Gasparo 225
Matthew, Jacobite patriarch 230
Matthiae, G. M. 532
Maubuisson, Cistercian abbey 16
Maugier, Étienne 17

Maultrot, Guillaume-Nicholas 417, 420
Maunoir, Julien 79
Maupéou 391
Maurists 19f, 98f, 100f, 529f, 543, 545
—*see also* Saint Maur
Mauritius 279
Max Emanuel, elector 446
Max Franz, elector-archbishop of Cologne 138, 466, 469, 480
Max Heinrich of Bavaria 152, 445ff
Max III Joseph, elector of Bavaria 472, 483, 486, 488
Maxims of Parisian School 57
Maximilian von Wittelsbach 121
Mayans y Siscar, Gregorio 164
Mayer, Theodor 513
Mayer-Pfannholz, A. 343
Maynas 253
Maynooth College 180, 182
Mayr, Beda 525
Mayr, Leonhard 156
Mayr, Ulrich 519f
Mazarin, Jules 19, 36, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 45, 62, 64ff, 71, 82, 83, 109ff, 330
Mechelen 502
Mechithar of Sebaste 228
Mechitharists 228
Mechthilde, Mère, *see* Bar
Medina, Bartolomeo de 526
Medvedev, Silvester 192
Mehmed, II, sultan 209, 222
Mehmet Sokolovich, grand vizier 186
Meinecke, Friedrich 366
Melanchthon, Philipp 535
Meletios Pigas, patriarch of Alexandria 187, 213, 215
Meletios Sygiros 211
Meliapur 300
Melissino, J. J. 201
Melkites 213, 228
Mendelssohn, Moses 366
Mendes, Alonso 221, 278
Mendicant orders 242f
—and problem of Chinese rites 310f
—Brazil mission 245
—China mission 303ff
—India mission 290ff
—Indian mission 241f
—*see also* Franciscans, Dominicans
Mendieta, Geronimo de 237
Mendoza, Juan Gonzalez de 378
Ménilles de Thémericourt, Marie-Scholastique de 427
Menzer, Balthasar 511
Merano, seminary 160
Mercedarians
—Africa mission 270
Mère Agnès, *see* Arnauld, Agnès
Mère Angélique, *see* Arnauld, Angélique
Mersenne, Marin 103
Mésenguy, François-Philippe 340, 411f, 430
Mestizos 270
Métézeau, Paul 94
Methodism 439ff
Metternich, family 140
Metternich, Lothar Friedrich von 447
Metz 140, 498
Mexico 237, 239, 252, 256
—First Provincial Council (1555) 238, 242
—Second Provincial Council (1565) 240, 242
—Fourth Provincial Council (1771) 236, 268f
—mission colleges 249ff
—university 148
Mézeray, Eudes de 100
Metzger, Paul 525
Mezzabarba, A. 312
Michael, king of Poland 116
Michaelis, Johann David 536, 538
Michaelis, Sebastian 19
Migazzi, Christoph Anton 481
Mignard, Pierre 88
Milan 534
Milieu catholique 80, 83
Milieu dévot (*parti dévot*) 3, 7, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 23, 29, 36, 61, 65, 71, 75, 97
Millet system 208f
Milley, Claude-François 431
Minorca, bishopric 162
Missal 86f, 547
—new, in Paris (1736) 430
Mission (propagation of the faith) XX
—and European absolutism 231ff
— — renewal of missionary spirit and expansion of missionary activity 247ff
— — weakening of missionary spirit and decline of missions 232ff
—in Africa 271
—in America 231ff
—in Asia 279ff
—in Spanish America 234ff
—Nordic 152, 154
— — loss through dissolution of Jesuit order 581
Mission colleges 248ff
—in Mexico 248ff
—in Spain 249
Mission Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer 228
Mission, history xxf
Mission, method 285f, 289
Mistrella, Francisco de 278
Mogilas, Petrus, metropolitan of Kiev 192, 211
Mogilev 206, 207
Mol, Madame 420, 423
Molanus, Walter 513
Moldavia 216
Molé, Louis Matthieu 4, 33, 38
Molière, Jean-Baptiste 82
Molina, Luis de 24, 94, 169
Molinism 24, 27, 32
Molinos, Miguel de 90, 125, 167, 440, 442
Mombasa 276, 277
Monadology 364

Monarchia Sicula 338f, 562, 564
Monasteries 7f
—dissolutions 502f, 502
—reductions under Josephinism 476f
—reforms under Theresianism 475
—secularizations 496, 556
Moñino, José, 167, 579, 580f
Monism 363
Monks-hospitaler of St. John of God 263f, 555
Monnier, Hilarion 52
Monomotapa 275
Monophysitism, monophysites 209, 213, 217ff
Montaigne, Michel 102
Montempuys 393, 394
Montenegro, Orthodox Church 216
Montesquieu, Charles 344, 356, 357, 369f, 371, 372
Montfaucon, Bernard de 98
Montijo, countess 164
Montmartre, abbey 10
Montufar, Alonso de 240
Morales, J. B. de 310
Moralism 428f
Moral theology xix 95, 525ff
Moravian Brethren 440f
More, Henry 436
More, Thomas 264
Morel, dean at Sorbonne 105
Morin, Jean 97, 99, 100
Morocco 270
Mortmain 484
Moser, Friedrich Carl von 139, 496, 519f
Moser, J. J. 498
Moses III, catholicos of Etchmiadzin 222
Mosheim, Johann Lorenz XIX 536, 538
Moscow, academy 192, 202f
Moscow, patriarchate XIX 185ff, 208, 230
—*see also* Russia
Moscow, the Third Rome 183ff
—synods (1448) and (1459) 183
— — (1653-56) 189
— — (1666/67) 190f
— — (1675) 191
— — (1682) 191f
— — (1689/90) 192
Mothe le Vayer, François de la 102
Mouton, Jean-Baptiste-Sylvain 420
Moxos 253
Moya, Mateo 66
Moyë, Jean-Martin 314, 315
Mozambique
—mission 276f
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus 551
Mukacevo, Orthodox bishopric 225
Mulard 39
Mulattos 270
Müllener, Johannes 315
Müller, Adam 482, 521
Müller, Ignaz 474
Müller, Johann Kaspar 520
Multitudinism 59
Munich
—bishopric 487
—establishment of nunciature (1784) 466
—dispute over nunciature 450, 466
Münster in Westphalia 137, 151, 448, 493, 494f, 497
—bishopric 138
—peace congress (1643-45) 107, 110
Münster, Kaspar 154
Muratori, Ludovico Antonio 472, 496, 533, 569
Murbach, abbey 137, 143
Muriel, Domingo 266
Music, religious, of the Baroque 551
Mustafa III, Sultan 212, 215, 216
Mutschelle, Sebastian 528
Mysticism 75ff, 89ff
—Christocentrism 77ff
—Ignatian 79
—in French 18th-century spirituality 430ff

Nahapet, catholicos of Etchmiadzin 222
Nalbach, suffragan bishop of Trier 155
Namur 502
Nancy 498
Nanking, bishopric 305
Nantes
—Edict (1598) 4, 71, 73f, 353
— — revocation (1685) 121, 353
Naples 130, 334, 340, 560, 565, 581
—concordat (1741) 340
—expulsion of Jesuits (1769) 341
—*see also* Sicily
Napoleon 501
Naruszevicz, Adam Stanistas 490
Natalis, Alexander 529
Natural Law 352, 365, 372ff
—detheologization 346
Natural religion (theology) 344, 351f, 365, 371, 379f, 535, 537
Natural sciences xix, 345
—in academies 543ff
—in universities 541
Navarrete, D. F. 310
Nebel, Christian 153
Neercassel, Johannes 412, 511
Néez, Louis 302
Negro mission 255
Negro, slavery 246
Negro, trade 255
Nektarios, patriarch of Jerusalem 214
Neller, Georg Christoph 452, 455
Neo-Scholasticism
—and Kantian critisms of proofs of God 376f
Nepomuk, Johannes 550
Nepotism 108, 110, 118, 126, 128, 164
Neri, Philip 21, 294
Nero, Pompeo 342
Neronov, Ivan 189
Nestorians 209, 217ff, 229
Netherlands (Holland) XV, 74, 115, 116,

129, 280, 334, 335, 360 412, 495, 499, 518
—and India mission 293
—and Jansenism 412ff
—Africa mission 271
—Austrian and Josephinism 481
—Enlightenment 361f
—schism of Utrecht 412f
—trade monopoly with Japan 317
Neuburg 136
Neumann, Balthasar xiv
Neveu, Franz Xaver von 503
New Granada, *see* Colombia
New Hebrides 324
Newman, John Henry 436
Newton, Henry 543
Newton, Isaac 345, 348, 350, 368, 372f
Nicolai, Friedrich 363
Nicolas, Armelle 438, 443
Nicole, Pierre 43f, 47f, 49f, 89f, 96, 103, 407, 421, 427, 429
Nicholson, Thomas 178
Nidhard, Johann Eberhard 168, 337
Nijmegen
—Peace (1678/79) XIV, 122, 493
Nikephoros, archbishop of Cyprus 214
Nikon, patriarch of Moscow X, 187ff
Nivelle, Jansenist 394
Noailles, duke 404
Noailles, Louis Antoine 52, 53, 55, 91, 382ff, 386ff, 389ff, 394ff, 398, 402, 403f, 415, 420, 422
Nobili, Robert 296f
Nomination, right of 336
Northern War 132
Noris, Enrico 525, 532, 570
Nouet, Jacques 36
Nouvelles ecclésiastiques 419ff, 424
Nova semper, Bull (1714) 334
Nueva Caceres, bishopric 321
Nueva Segovia, bishopric 321
Nunciatures, nuncios 140f, 332, 450, 463, 467
—in German Church 444ff
—in Spain 163
—dispute 486

Oates, Titus 176
Oberhauser, Benedikt 456, 519
Oberthür, Franz 528
Obrecht, Ulrich 515
O'Connell, Daniel 183
Oddi, Niccolo 456
Odescalchi, Cardinal 125
Odescalchi, Benedetto, *see* Innocent XI
Ofen 123
—siege (1684) 123
Olier, Jean-Jacques 8, 22, 42, 78, 437, 527
Olinda-Recife, bishopric 245
Olmütz 479
Omnimoda, bull (1952) 242
Omnium sollicitudo, bull (1744) 297
Oratoire de Jésus 24
Oratory, Oratorians XVIII, 11, 14, 21ff, 78f, 83, 85f, 97, 99, 105, 294, 406, 558
—and Jansenism 32
—schools 83f
Oratory of the Holy Cross in Goa 293
Order of Saint Anthony of Saint Isaiah 230
Orders, history 531
Orders, regular clergy 159
—in France 6ff
Orders, life 554ff
Orders, reform
—in France 16
Orders xx, 6, 124, 156
—and secular clergy in Spanish America 242ff
—and slavery 291f
—African mission 270
—American mission 247ff, 259ff
—in Brazil 245f
—in Spanish America 234ff, 241
—new orders 554ff
—*see also* individual orders
Ordonnances de la Sainte Église for China 314
Orduna, Luis de 242
Orientalistics 533
Oriol, José 168
Orsbeck, Johann Hugo von 154
Orsi, Giuseppe Agostino 533
Orsini, Pietro Francesco (Vincenzo Maria), *see* Benedict XIII
Orthodoxae Fidei, bull (1486) 169
Orthodox Church
—patriarchates 187
Orthodox Churches 208ff
—Christological disputes 221
Orthodoxy, early Protestant 535f
Osnabrück 143, 491, 492, 494f, 511, 513
Ostein, Friedrich Karl von 138
Osterwald, Peter von 483f
Otomis 275
Ottoboni, Pietro, *see* Alexander VIII
Ottoboni, Pietro, nephew of Alexander VIII 126
Ottoboniana 569
Ottomans 207
Overberg, Bernard 546
Oxford Movement 436

Pacca, Bartolomeo 467f
Paderborn 138, 151, 446, 494f
—seminary 160
Paepe, Cornelius de 35
Paez, Pedro 221
Pai dos Cristaos 291
Pais, Pêro 277
Paisios, patriarch of Alexandria 213
Paisios I, patriarch of Constantinople 188f
Paisios, patriarch of Jerusalem 187, 214
Paisios Ligarides 190
Palafox y Mendoza, Juan de 242ff, 247, 310
Palkovic, Gabriel 227
Pallavicini, Cardinal 578

Pallavicino, Pietro Sforza 110, 112, 532
Pallu, François 282ff, 288, 302, 311, 323
Palma-Pignatelli, Petrus 295
Palmieri, Vincenzo 534
Palou, Francesco 236
Paluzzi-Altieri, Cardinal 115
Pamfili, Giambattista, *see* Innocent X
Pamplona, Francisco de 261, 271
Pany, Joachim, patriarch of Alexandria 213
Paolucci, Frabrizio 332f, 389, 391, 561
Papalism xvii
Papal States xv, 118, 130, 330f, 339, 340, 498, 558, 561, 565ff, 568, 577
—administration under Benedict XIV 568
—administration under Clement XII 566
—dissolution of Jesuit order 580
—during War of Spanish Succession 130f
—indebtedness 564, 568
Pascual y Flexas, Antonio Raymundo 526
Passarowitz
—Peace (1718) 135
Passart, Flavie 48
Passau 143, 146, 149, 150, 478, 494, 497
Passionei, Domenico 130f, 494, 569, 570
Passionists 556
Pastor, Ludwig von 572, 578
Pastoral clergy 155f
Pastoralis officii, bull (1718) 397ff
Pastoral medicine 532
Pastoral theology xix, 525, 531
Patin, Guy 44
Patouillet, P. 411
Patriarchate, ecumenical
—and Sultanate 208ff
Patristics 93, 97f, 101, 530, 533
Patronate
—in Spanish America 233ff
Patronate, Portuguese 280ff
—and India mission 290ff
—in Africa 272f
—mission and politics 286f
Paucke, Florian 254
Paul V, pope 24f, 314
Paul I, tsar of Russia 203f, 207
Paulinus a. S. Bartholomeo 296
Paul of the Cross 556
Pavia 534
Pavillon, Nicolas 46, 48, 67f, 86, 119, 124, 428
Peć (Ipek)
—patriarchate 212, 216, 226, 227
Pedro II, king of Portugal 305
Pegu 300
Peking 305, 306
—Church in Peking 306f
—schism 307
Pellisson-Fontanier, Paul 73, 516
Peña Montenegro, Alonso de 244
Penn, William 436
Penna di Billi, Francesco Orazio Oliverio della 299
People, mission to 80, 109, 430, 549, 554, 555
Percoto, Giovanni M. 300
Perdreau, Dorothée 48
Péréfixe, Hardouin de 47
Pereira, Gabriel 169
Perejaslav
—treaty (1654) 189
Pérez, Franz 302
Pérez Bocanegro, Juan 244
Périer, Louis 53
Périer, Marguerite 45
Peru 168, 238, 254
Petau, Denis 98, 100
Peter III, king of Portugal 479
Peter I, the Great, tsar of Russia XIX, 190, 193ff, 203, 205, 371
Peter II, tsar of Russia 198
Peter III, tsar of Russia 200
Petersburg Academy 371
Peterwardein
—victory of Prince Eugene over Turks (1716) xvi, 132
Petitpied, Nicolas 53, 397, 398, 402, 403, 415, 419, 420, 424
Petrovic, Petrus Partheneus 225
Petrov, Gavril 202
Petrucci, Pier Matteo 125
Petrus Aurelius, *see* Duvergier de Hauranne
Petrus Mogilas, archbishop of Kiev 224
Pey, Jean 456
Pez, Bernhard 530
Pez, Hieronymus 530
Pfalz-Neuburg 136, 140, 146, 148
Pfalz-Simmern 135
Pfeffel, Christian Friedrich 544
Philip, metropolitan of Moscow 185
Philip II, king of Spain 169, 232, 234f, 240f, 247, 321, 322, 333, 335, 337, 338
Philip III, king of Spain 323
Philip IV, king of Spain 168, 168, 169, 244, 261, 334
Philip V, king of Spain 129f, 131, 133, 168, 168, 171f, 310, 323, 337, 338f
Philip d'Orléans 387ff, 400, 510
Philippines 280, 289
—absolutism 324
—Christianization during 17th and 18th centuries 322
—expulsion of Jesuits (1767) 324
—Islam.321
Philosophy
—and Enlightenment 345
Photios, patriarch of Constantinople 188
Physics 373f
Physico-theology xix, 536
Piacenza 130ff, 565f, 569
Piana 228
Piarists 555
Piccolomini, nuncio 45
Pichon, Jean 409

Picot de Clorivière, Pierre-Joseph 433
Picoté, vicar of Saint-Sulpice 42
Piderit, Johann Rudolph 521f
Piedmont 339, 565f, 567f
—problem of concordat 614
Pierre de Saint-Joseph 34
Piesport, Karl von 517, 517, 520
Pietism xix, 436, 509, 527, 535, 537f
—and education 545
Piety, popular 549f
Pignatelli, Antonio, *see* Innocent XII
Pignatelli, José 168
Pigneaux de Béhaine, Pierre 288, 312
Pilar, Franciscus del 250
Pilgrimages 488, 550, 552
Pimentel, Spanish ambassador 170
Pinel, P. 420
Pinho, Custodio de 295
Pinthereau, P. 37
Pipa, Mateo 315
Piranesi, Giovan Battista 568
Pirot, Georges 44, 96
Pisa
—Peace (1664) 66, 111, 330, 336
Pistoia 534
—synod (1786) 334, 535, 552
Pithou, Pierre 57, 336, 453
Pitirim, patriarch of Moscow 191
Pitroff, F. C. 531
Pitt, William 182
Pius V, pope 34, 233, 240, 242, 322
Pius VI, pope 227, 230, 334, 411, 466, 480, 487, 488, 498, 535, 580
Pius VII (Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti), pope 183, 502, 581
Pius X, pope 430, 547
Pius XII, pope 125, 570, 572f
Pivert, Aimée 422
Placet (*placetum regium*) 333ff, 341, 475, 486, 486, 567
Planck, Gottleib Jakob 538
Platonism 94f
Plowden, François 419
Plunkett, Oliver 177
Poiret, Pierre 90, 437, 443
Poisson, Nicolas 106
Pöking, Sebastian von, count 149
Poland (-Lithuania) xv, 116, 122, 128f, 205, 208, 224f
—constitution (1791) 491
—Counter Reformation 489f
—Enlightenment 371
—monasteries and orders 491
—state and Church until end of republic of nobility 488ff
—Uniate Armenian monophysites 228
Pole, Reginald 517
Polignac, de, Cardinal 386
Polish partitions (1772, 1793, 1795) 206, 225, 489f
Polock, archbishopric 207
Pombal, Marquis de 166, 247, 258, 267, 269, 298, 300, 316, 369, 570, 578
Pompadour, Madame de 411, 575f
Pomponne, Arnauld de 68
Pondichéry
—decree (1704) 297
Pontchâteau, hermit of Port-Royal 67
Pontchâteau, M. de 51
Poniatowski, Stanislav August, king of Poland 206, 490
Pontecorvo 340, 577
Pontificale Romanum 547
Pope, Papacy 57ff, 125ff, 168, 364, 437, 439
—and council 59, 66, 69
—and defense against Turks xvi
—and episcopalism of German Church 449ff
—and Europe xvii
—and French monarchy 57ff
—and French regalism 62, 67ff
—and Jesuit order 573ff
— — dissolution 559
—and Louis XIV 128
—and Naples 339ff
—and Papal States 558
—and Piedmont 339
—and Portugal 564f
—and Prussia 571f
—and Spain 168ff
—and state church in Spain 337ff
—and state church placet 332ff
—decline of prestige and power 329
—during period of French hegemony 107ff, 118ff
—episcopate, clergy, and flock 59
—exercise of papal power for France 336f
—from Alexander VIII to Clement XI 125ff
—infallibility 381
—internal ecclesiastical position 108f
—jurisdiction 453f
—primacy 66ff, 78, 451f, 512, 518
—role and power according to French theologians and canonists 57f
—secularization 502f
—under increasing pressure from state churches 558ff
— — Benedict XIV 564ff
— — from Innocent XIII to Clement XII 560ff
— — under Clement XIII and Clement XIV 573ff
Porras (Porres), Martin de 259f
Portocarrero, cardinal 129
Portugal, 172, 290, 558, 570
—Africa mission 271
—and Clement XIV 578
—and Islam in Africa 277
—Church during 18th century 161ff
—claims to jurisdiction over missions 287f
—development of ecclesiastical institutions 163ff
—Enlightenment 369

—geographical, sociographical, and economic situation 161f
—Indian mission 292f
—Indian reductions 255
—Jesuit persecutions and ban 166, 570f, 574
—measures against orders 570
—training of priests 166f
Port-Royal, abbey xviii, 10, 12, 15, 20, 29f, 37, 39, 41, 43ff, 46ff, 55, 72, 83, 86, 86f, 89, 99, 101, 103f, 421, 426, 437
—closing by Louis XIV 55
—hermits of Port-Royal 30, 43, 84
—*Heures de Port-Royal* 87
—schools 84
Port-Royal des Champs 47, 55
Possion 124
Pouillon 388
Power, spiritual and temporal in Church of the Empire 451
Prades, Jean Martin de 428
Praetorius, Matthäus 515f
Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438) 333, 335, 336, 444, 566, 568
Prague 479
Prato 534
Prebends, system of 8
Prebends, accumulation 8f, 492
Prechtl, Maximilian 523
Predestination 27f, 94, 105, 442
Preformation theory, preformationists 368, 374
Prémare, P. de 313
Premonstratensians 19
Prémontré, abbey 20
Presbyterialism 417
Presbyterians 348
Priests, education 156ff
—at universities 541
Priesthood 59
Priestley, J. 351
Primacy, papal, *see* Pope, papacy
Primas Germaniae 142
Primitives in America 379f
Prince Eugene, *see* Eugene
Prince-bishops 444f
Prince-bishoprics 138ff
Princes, concordats (1447) 444
Princes, spiritual 136ff
—dual function 141f
Probabiliorism 124, 525, 526
Probabilism 96f, 112, 124f, 167, 525, 526
Progress, belief in, -doctrine 346, 360f
Prokop von Templin 550
Prokopovich, Feofan 195f, 198f, 202, 205f
Propagation of the Faith, Congregation for xx
—and mission method 289f
—and Philip II's demands for Indian patriarchate resp. royal vicariate in Spanish America 232
—and Portuguese patronate 280ff
—and Spanish right of patronage and regalism in missions 233ff
—Africa mission 271ff
—American mission 234ff
—Asia mission 280ff
—China mission 305ff
—East Asia mission 312
—India mission 294f
—Japan mission 319
—reorganization of Irish mission 174f
Prosper Lambertini, *see* Benedict XIV
Processions 475, 488
Protestantism 3, 13
—and Orthodoxy 210f
—in 17th-century France 70ff
—in Russia 203f
Provinciales, Lettres 49ff, 427, 575
Prussia xv, xix, 132, 490, 493, 495, 497, 505, 558, 571
—and ban of Jesuit order 581
—and war of First Coalition 500f
Pucelle 384, 388, 405, 407
Puebla, bishopric 242
Pufendorf, Samuel 346, 362, 365, 370, 483, 492
Purchase, of offices 128
Puritans 348
Putscher, Gottfried 160
Psychologism 365
Pyrenees, Peace of the (1659) xiv, 111

Quadruple Alliance (1718) 133, 339
Quakers 436f
Quarters, freedom 69, 121, 336
Québec 259
Quedlinburg Recess 492
Quentel, Johann Peter 155
Quéretaro, monastery of the Holy Cross 248ff
Quesnel, Pasquier, 41, 57ff, 61ff, 89, 381ff, 384, 388, 395, 404, 406, 414, 416, 425, 429, 440
Quia propter prudentiam tuam, privilege (1098) 338
Qui Christi Domini, bull 503
Quietism 52ff, 56, 90f, 124, 429, 430
Quinquennual faculties 446, 467
Quirini, Angelo Maria 517
Quiroga, Vasco de 264f
Quiros, Pedro Fernando de 325

Rabardeau, P. 64
Racine, Jean-Baptiste 84
Radowitz, Carl Maria von 521, 524
Radziejowski, Michal 489
Rakoczy, princes 225
Rakoczy, Georg I. 225
Rakoczy, Sophie 225
Ramière, P. 432
Ramsay, André Michel 437
Rancé, Armand-Jean 8, 20

Ranfaing, Elisabeth de 76
Ranke, Leopold von 492, 494
Ranuzzi, Angelo 69, 121f
Rastatt
—Peace (1714) xv, 131, 135
—Congress (1797–99) 501
Rastignac, bishop of Tours 410
Rastelli, Carlo Bartolomeo 205
Rationalism 343ff, 363
—in Protestant theology 536
Rautenstrauch, Stefan 475f, 522, 542
Raux, Joseph 316
Ravago, Francisco de 168
Ravaillac, François 3, 58
Ravechet, attorney 388, 393
Raynald, Oderich 532
Raynaud, Marc-Antoine 421f
Raynaud, Théophile 94, 97
Rebours, Antoine de 103
Rechenberg, Adam 538
Recursus ab abusu (*ad principem*), see *Appelatio*
Redemptorists 556f
Redin, Tiburcio de 261, 272
Reding, August 526
Rednik, Athanasios 226
Reductions 570
Réflexions morales by Quesnels 53ff
Reformed 97, 480
Reform Catholicism of Theresianism and Josephinism 474ff
Regalia, right, dispute 119ff, 121, 127, 336f
Regalism xv, 171, 251, 268
—credits
—in Spanish America 234ff, 239
—*see also* France, Spain
Regensburg 138, 138, 149, 150, 155, 446, 459, 466, 478, 488, 493, 505
—Reichstag (1665) 447
— — (1794) 500
Regiminis apostolici, bull (1665) 48ff
Registration Act (1703) 179
Reguera y Alvarez de Paz, Manuel de 168
Regular canons 17
Reichenberger, A. 531
Reiffenstuel, Anaklet 526
Reimarus, H. S. 365, 536
Reinach, Johann Konrad von 157
Reinegg, Anton Sepp von 253
Reinhardt, R. 473
Relativism 74
Relief Act (1782) 180
Religious wars, French 3
Religious instruction 85, 546
Religious studies 525
Reliquaries, worship 549
Remonstrants 360
Rémusat, Anne-Madeleine de 431
Renaissance
—and Enlightenment 347
Renaudot, Eusèbe 529
Renty, Gaston de 81, 436f, 443
Repnin, Nikolai Vasiljevich, Count 206
Reservations, papal 463
Residence obligation 147
Restout 424
Resurrection 372
Retz, Jean-François-Paul de Gondi 5, 41, 47, 65, 110
Réunion 279
Reunion society 521f
Reunion attempts, ecclesiastical
—and Enlightenment 525
—and national unity 523
—after Westphalian Peace xx, 509ff
—writings 514
Revelation, in Protestant theology 536
Revival movement 537
Revolutionary wars 496
Rezzonico, Carlo, *see* Clement XIII
Reims 5
Rhine, Confederation of the 508
Rhodes, Alfonso de 281f, 302
Rhodesia
—mission 276
Ribadeneyra y Barrientos, A. J. 235
Ricci, Lorenzo 580
Ricci, Matteo 309f, 378
Ricci, Scipione de 534f
Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis xiv, 4f, 18, 20, 29ff, 32ff, 60, 71, 76, 353, 593
—and Holy See 60ff
—and *milieu dévot* 11ff
—and Urban VIII 61
Richelieu, Henri 12
Richeome, Louis 79
Richer, Edmond 51, 52, 58ff, 61, 336, 385, 391, 395, 406, 413, 414, 416f
Riegger, Paul Josef von 334, 475
Rieser, H. 473
Rijswijk
—Peace (1697) xv, 129, 179, 514
Rijswijk clause xv, 129, 131f, 135, 142
Rinuccini, papal nuncio 174, 176
Rio de Janeiro, bishopric 245
Rites, problem, dispute (China) xv, 290, 305, 309f, 311ff, 570
Rituals 598, 552
—in the vernacular 553
Roach, R. 437
Roannez, de, duke 104
Roberval 103
Robespierre 500
Rococo 552
Roda, Spanish envoy 570
Rodt, Franz Konrad Kasimir von 463
Rohan, family 149
Rohan, Armand Gaston de 382, 386, 388, 390, 391, 393, 396, 399, 401
Rojas y Spinola, Christoph de 513f
Romanae Sedis Antistes, brief (1615) 314
Rumania 211
Romanov, Michail, tsar of Russia 187

Romanus Pontifex, bull (1715) 339
Rome 534, 569
—concordat (1784) with Joseph II 480
—provincial council (1725) 563
Romero, Francisco 260
Rosa von Lima 259
Rosario, Constantino de 276
Rosenthal, Johannes 512
Rospiliosi, Cardinal 118
Rospigliosi, Giulio, *see* Clement IX
Rossi, Bernardo Maria de 525
Rostovski Feodosi 206
Roth, Heinrich 298
Rousse, Gérard 422
Rousseau, Jean-Baptiste 431
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 265, 344, 346, 351, 357f, 364, 369f, 371, 380, 431
Rouvray 62
Royal Society 544
Rucellai, Giulio 342
Rue, de la 532
Ruggieri, Michele 310
Ruinart, Thierry 100
Ruiz, Felipe 162
Russia xix, 115, 207
—and ban of Jesuit order 581
—and Imperial Delegates Final Recess 503f
—Church and state 194ff
—development of state church 198f
—dissolution of Uniate Catholic bishoprics 206
—Enlightenment 200f, 370f
—monastic reform 197
—new Church regulation 195ff
—Old Believers xix, 190f, 202
—Orthodox Church xix, 183ff
—— autocephaly 183
—— Baroque culture 216f
—— dependency on state 185ff
—— displacement from public life 200
—— dissolution of patriarchate and establishment of Holy Synod 193ff
—— ecclesiastical jurisdiction 190, 193
—— ecclesiastical organization 186, 192
—— internal reform 188f
—— internal threat by Enlightenment, rationalism, and Freemasonry 202
—— liturgy 188f
—— nationalization of Church property 200f
—— Old Believers and reform 189
—— priests, training 192
—— relaxation of tradition 192
—— Russian state church under Holy Synod 198ff
—— secularization 200
—— spiritual regulation 196
—— Tsar and Church 187ff, 203
—Protestants and Catholics in Russia 203ff
—regulation for Catholic Church of Latin and Uniate rites 207
—state church 198ff
—toleration edict of Peter I (1702) 203
Ruthenia, White 224f
Ruthenians (Carpatho-Ukrainians)
—union with Rome 225f
Ruysbroeck, Jan van 75, 95f

Sabatier, Pierre 529
Sacchetti, Giulio 109, 330
Sacramentals 550
Sacred Heart of Jesus devotion 78, 86, 166, 421, 432, 434, 436
Sacred Heart of Mary devotion 78
Sacy, *see* Lemaistre de Sacy, Isaac
Sahagun, Bernardino de 237
Sailer, Johann Michael 520, 523, 529, 531, 542
Saint-Amant 102
Saint-Amour, professor at Sorbonne 39f
Saint-Cyr, former abbey 84, 90
Saint-Cyran, abbey 8, 14
Saint-Cyran, *see* Duvergier de Hauranne
Sainte-Beuve, Madame de 10f
Saint-Georges de Marsay 439
Saint-Germain des Près, abbey 18, 98f
Saint-Hydulphe, Benedictine congregation 18
Saint-Jure, Jean-Baptiste de 79, 436, 440
Saint-Lazare 23
Saint-Lucien-lès-Beauvais, abbey 8
Saint-Magloire, seminary 22
Saint-Martin, de 312
Saint-Maur, abbey 97f, 100, 406
—*see also* Maurists
Saint-Sacrement, convent 30
Saint-Simon 397, 415
Saint-Sulpice 21, 78
Saint-Valéry, abbey 8
Saint-Vanne, Benedictine congregation 18f
Saints, veneration 552
Salas, Asensio 164
Saldanha, Cardinal 571, 574
Salesians 11, 555
Salignac, Marquis de 81f
Salle, Jean-Baptiste de la 84, 259
Salm-Salm, archbishop 144
Solomon Islands 324
Salusti, J. D. 307
Salzburg 143, 145, 148, 157, 458, 466, 478, 493, 497, 525
—congress of electoral Bavarian bishops (1770/71) 486
—synod (1569) 159
Salzinger, Ivo 526
Samuel Kapasulis, patriarch of Alexandria 213
Sandoval, Alonso de 256
Sanfelice, Cologne nuncio 139
San Marino 566
Santander, bishopric 162
Santarelli, Antonio 58, 60, 61
Santeul 430
Sanvitore, Diego Luis 324
Sanz, Pedro Martyr 308
Sao Paulo, bishopric 245
Sao Tomé, bishopric 271

Sapienza, Roman university 113
Sappel, Ladislaus 455
Sardinia 133, 339, 342
Sarpi, Paolo 532
Sarrailh, J. 164
Savoy, 131f, 133, 563
Saxony 495
Salvation, story of Christian 343, 345, 358
—and secular history 358, 372f
—Enlightenment 376ff
Scandinavia
—Enlightenment 370
Schaffgotsch, Philipp Gotthard von, Count 571
Schall von Bell, Johann Adam 303f
Schannat, Johann Friedrich 531
Schaumburg, Martin von 157
Scheben, Franz Xaver Anton von 335
Scheffler, Johannes 526
Schelhorn, Johann Georg 517
Schickelius, Dean at Louvain 35
Schilter, Johannes 450, 453, 514
Schlegel, Friedrich 482, 496
Schlör, Johann Georg 465
Schlözer, August Ludwig 367, 377
Schmid, Christoph von 522
Schmid, Martin 253
Schmidt, Michael Ignaz 531
Schmidt, Philipp Anton 155
Schmitt, Johann 521
Schnaubert 496
Schnernauer 451
Schöckh, Johann Matthias 538
Scholarship
—ecclesiastical scholarship in 18th century 524ff
— — academies 543f
— — Catholic theology 524ff
— — Catholic universities 538ff
— — education 545f
— — evangelical theology 535ff
— — in Italy 532ff
— — Jansenism in Italy 534f
Scholastics 96, 99, 105, 167, 343, 524, 527
Schönborn, family 136, 139, 140, 149, 150
Schönborn, Damian Hugo von 160, 451
Schönborn, Franz Georg von 452
Schönborn, Friedrich Karl von 160, 449
Schönborn, Johann Philipp von 137, 158, 445, 449, 511, 512
Schönborn, Lothar Franz von 448
Schöpflin 543
Schramm, Dominik 527
Schroffenberg, Joseph Conrad von 488
Schütz, Heinrich 551
Schwaiger 486
Schwarzel, Carl 531, 552
Schwarzhueber, Simpert 527
Scongal, Henry 438, 440
Scotland 175
—Catholics under discrimination 178
—mysticism 438
—*see also* Great Britain
Scotti, nuncio in Paris 62
Secular Priests of the Holy Family, Congregation for 315
Secular Priests of Battistini, Congregation 285
Secularization xviii, 347
—and the end of German Church 491ff
— — political consequences 505
—during 17th and 18th centuries 491f
Seckau 146, 478
Sedan 498
Seelmann, suffragan bishop of Speyer 155
Segneri, Paolo the Elder 109, 125, 554
Segneri, Paolo the Younger 109, 554
Séguenot, Claude 30
Séguir, family 11
Séguir, chancellor 30, 45, 63
Ségur, Jean-Charles de 408
Seligenstadt 136
Selim I, sultan 207, 213
Séminaire pour la conversion des Infidèles dans les pays étrangers 284
Seminaries, Protestant 511
Semler, Johann Salomo 536, 538
Sénault 85
Seniorios 163
Sens
—provincial council (1617) 59
Sensualism 344, 352, 359
Sept-Fons, abbey 18
Sepulveda, Gines de 235
Serbia 208
—patriarchate 216f
Sermon 85, 548, 553
—in the Baroque period 550
Serra, Junipero 236f, 251f
Sersale, archbishop of Naples 578
Sesmaisons, P. 36
Seshchenov, Dimitri 200
Seuse, Heinrich 76, 433
Seven Years War 493
Sévigné, Marquise de 45, 426
Shaftesbury, Anthony A. C. 347f, 364
Shansi 306, 308
Shakovskoi, Russian prince 200
Shebyshchev, P. P. 201
Shensi 306, 308
Siam 282f, 320
—mission 301f
Sidotti, Giovanni B. 320f, 323
Siebenbürgen
—Union of Rumanian Church with Rome 225f
Sierra Leone 271, 272
Siestrzencewicz-Bohusz, Stanisław 226, 207
Sigismund III, king of Poland 489
Silesia XV, 516, 568, 571
Silva, Juan de 325
Silvester, patriarch of Alexandria 186
Sicily 131f, 133, 330f, 338ff, 560, 565
—concordat (1741) 340f
—ecclesiastical and state jurisdiction 340f

—state church 339ff
Simeon of Polock 192
Simon, Richard 99f, 538
Simon XIII, patriarch of Chaldeans 229
Simon VII bar Mamma, patriarch of Nestorians 217
Sinai 208
—Church 215f
Sind 298
Singlin, Antoine 39, 44, 421
Sinnich, Johannes 35f
Sinzendorf, cardinal 571
Sirmond, Jacques 34, 97, 409
Sixtus IV, pope 169
Sisters of Notre-Dame de Lorraine 11
Sisters of Saint Charles 554
Skepticism 346
Skoptsy 203
Skavronka, Catherine, *see* Catherine I
Smith, Adam 352
Smola, Ignati 199
Soanen, Jean 384, 389, 392, 402f, 403f, 406, 415f, 421, 424
Sobieski, Jan, king of Poland XVI, 116, 122f, 123, 128, 224, 489
Soeurs de Notre-Dame de charité de refuge 554
Society of Jesus (Jesuits) 9, 10, 11, 21, 24, 28, 33, 44, 79f, 85, 96f, 105, 113, 124, 156, 158, 166, 206, 210, 213, 228, 229, 230, 234, 239, 243, 246f, 251, 259, 434, 496, 511, 549, 555, 556, 559
—African mission 271, 276
—and Catholic universities 538ff
—and conflict between Louis XIV and papacy 69
—and Enlightenment in Latin America 266
—and French spirituality in 17th century 79f
—and Jansenism 31ff, 44f, 96f, 409f
— — casuistry, laxism, and Jansenist controversy 44f, 96f
—and *Nouvelles ecclésiastiques* 419
—and slavery 275
—Asia mission 282f
— — mission and politics (patronate) 287f
—Benedict XIV and the Jesuits 570
—China mission 303ff, 311f, 314f
— — and rites controversy 311ff
—Clement XIII and problem of Jesuits 573ff
—dissolution (1773) VIII, 316, 411, 477, 579ff
—dissolution of French province (1762) 337
—education, schools 83, 555
—Ethiopia mission 220, 278
—expulsion (1759/60) from Portugal and Latin America 267
—expulsion from Russia (1689 and 1719) 205
—in Spanish America 234
—in White Russia 581
—India mission 290ff, 299
—Indian mission 251ff
— — in Brazil 257
— — in Mexico 256ff
—Japan mission 288f
—missions and schools in America 251ff
—missions in Latin America 570
—Negro mission in America 255
—persecution and expulsion from France, Portugal, and Spain 188f, 574ff
—Philippine mission 321, 323
—polemics against order in France and ban (1764) 410f
—Siam mission 301, 320
—Tibet mission 298
—Tonkin mission 303
Söhngen, G. 367
Söhr, Ferdinand 452
Sokolovic, Mehmed, grand vizier 216
Suleiman I 207
Solis, Francisco de 171f
Sollicitudo Pastoralis officii, brief (1669) 289
Solminihac, Alain de 17
Solorzano Pereira, Juan de 235
Solovecki, monastery on White Sea 191
Soltyk, Kajetan 206
Sommerfeld, Elias Daniel von 154
Sonnenfels, Joseph von 475
Sophia (Zoë), wife of Ivan III 184
Sophia, tsarina of Russia 191
Sophie, duchess of Hanover 516
Sophie of the Palatinate 510
Sorbonne 28, 32, 61, 66, 87, 93ff
—and Jansenism 32, 53f
—and traditional 17th-century theology 93ff
Sorski, Nil 185, 203
Sotomayor, Antonio de 168
South America
—right of patronate 234f
South Seas mission 321ff
Souza, Polykarp de 307
Spain 4, 116, 121, 129, 290, 329ff, 333ff, 559, 565f, 567f
—academy in Madrid 545
—and Holy See 168
— — rupture of diplomatic relations 566
—and papal elections 330f
—and Portugal 161ff, 169
—and Turkish war (1714–18) XVI, 131f
—Asia mission 279
—Church in 18th century 161ff
—Church and state 168ff, 338
—clergy 165
—colonization of Philippines 321ff
—concordat (1717) 171
— — (1717 and 1732) 337
— — (1753) 169f, 567
—development of ecclesiastical institutions 163ff
—Enlightenment 161f, 369f
—episcopate 163

—geographical, sociographical, and economic situation 162f
—Jesuits, persecution, ban, and expulsion 166, 338, 629f, 633ff
—patronate of king 169, 337, 567
—patronate, right of, and regalism in America mission 234
—people, mission 166f
—placet 334
—priests, training 166f
—regalism 170, 171
—sciences 167
—state church 131, 337, 575
Spalding 536
Spangenberg, August Gottlieb von 514
Spangenberg, Jakob Georg von 451f, 514, 518f, 521
Spanheim, Ezechiel 73
Spanish America
—Church and Council of Trent 240ff
Spanish-French War 330
Spanish Succession, war of (1701–14) xv, 129ff, 171, 331
Species, preservation of 375f
Spener, P. I. 511, 513, 537
Speyer 138, 147, 151, 494, 498f
—Note (1571) 146
—pastoral seminary 159
Spinoza, Baruch de 345, 356, 361f, 363, 365
Spirituality xviii
—Anglican xix
—Christian xix
—in 17th-century France 75
—in 18th-century France 430ff
Spittler, Ludwig 538
Stablo-Malmedy 152
Stadion, family 140, 150
Stravius, Richard 26, 34f
Strobl, Andreas 298
Stuarts 172ff
Suarez, Francisco de 24, 169, 535, 541
Sudan
—mission 279
Sulaqua, John, patriarch of Chaldeans 229
Sully, Maximilien 4, 8
Sulpicians 22, 554
Sumatra 301
Surin, Jean-Joseph 76, 79, 431f, 438
Susa
—treaty (1629) 13
Suvalov, Russian minister 371
Swammerdam, Jan 374
Sweden 115
Swieten Gerard van 474, 517
Switzerland
—Enlightenment 367
Symbolists 311
Syrmia 227
Szeremy, Theophilos 226
Szechwan 306
—synod (1803) 314
Tabaraud, Mathieu 523
Talamanca, mission 249
Talleyrand, Charles Maurice 22, 498
Tallon, French advocate general 67, 69
Tamburini, Pietro 534
Tanucci, Bernardo 340f, 576, 581
Tarasovic, Basilios 225
Tarragona 165
Tarisse, Grégoire 18, 98
Tatiscev, V. N. 371
Tauler, Johannes 75, 439, 440
Tautphäus, Heinrich 461, 466
Tavira, Antonio 164f
Taylor, Jeremy 440
Teachers, training 546f
Tedeschi, bishop 338
Tencin, Pierre Guérin de 402, 567, 569
Tersteegen, G. 537
Test Acts (1673, 1678) 175
Texas 252
Teysonnier, Marie (Marie de Valence) 85
Thais 301
Theatines 217
Theologia Indiana 241
Theology
—and Enlightenment 344, 355
—and history 371
—Catholic 524ff
—development of university studies 541
—federal 535
—Protestant 535ff
—rationalism xix
—systematic and scholastic xix, 93ff
Theology, history 525
Theological virtues 419
Theophanes III, patriarch of Jerusalem 214
Theotokopoulos, Domenikos 215
The Remonstrance 176
Theresianism 472ff
Thirty Years War 135f
Thököly 123
Thomas I, Mar 231
Thomas I Palakomot, metropolitan of Thomas Christians 219f
Thomas II, metropolitan of Thomas Christians 219
Thomas V, metropolitan of Thomas Christians 219
Thomas VI, *see* Dionysios I
Thomas Aquinas 24, 94, 95, 99, 401, 535
Thomas Christians 208, 218, 219, 231f, 296
Thomasius, Christian 343, 362, 365, 378, 482f
Thomassin, Louis de 98, 100
Thomism 24, 27, 93, 343, 401, 525
Thouvenot, notary 392
Thun, family 149
Thun, Johann Ernst von 149
Thun, Peter Vigil von 496
Tibet
—mission 298

Tieffenthaler, Joseph 298
Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista xiv
Tillemont, Louis Sébastien 427, 440, 529
Timor servilis 419
Timur, grand khan 218f
Tindal, Matthew 351f, 536
Tiraboschi, Girolamo 533
Titon 407
Tixon, bishop of Voronezh 202
Tlaxcaltecs 250
Tobar, Juan de 239
Tobias, Georg Ghebragzer 231
Toggenburg tumults 516
Toland, John 349, 351, 536
Toleration 109
Toleration Act (1689) 348
Toleration patent of Joseph II (1781) 479f
Tomba, Marco della 294
Tommasi, Joseph Maria 532
Tonkin
—mission 302f
— — native clergy 303
Torosowič, Nikolaus 227
Torrigiani, Luigi 573
Törring-Tettenbach, Max Prokop von 478
Toul 140, 498
Tournai 502
Tournély, Honoré 385
Tours, M. de 297
Toynbee, Arnold 379
Tuscany 334, 534, 565
—state church 342
Tradition 535
Trautson, Johann Joseph von 517, 552
Travers, Nicolas 417
Treitschke, Heinrich von 500, 502, 505, 508
Tremblay, Joseph du 19
Trent 137, 146, 151
—effect in Spanish America 240f
—in discussion of reunion attempts 516
—mission problems 240f
Trier 138, 151, 154, 454, 469, 478, 494, 498f, 502, 508, 578
—archbishopric 135
—seminaries 160
Trinitarians 361
—Africa mission 270
Tristan 102
Tronchay, Michel 427
Tronson, Louis 90, 91
Truth, essence of truth 364
Tübingen school 531
Tüchle, Herman 480
Tudela, bishopric 162
Tudors 173
Turenne, Henri 72f
Turgot, Robert-Jacques 360
Turin 496, 534
—victory of Prince Eugene over French (1706) 130
Turkey xvi
Turkish threat, wars 111f, 114f, 116, 119, 120ff, 122, 126, 136
—(1683–99) XVI
—(1714–18) 132ff
Trnovo 215
Turretini, Jean-Alphonse 368
Tuitorism 526
Tverentinov, Dimitri 194

Überwasser, monastery 157
Udine 571
Udligenschwyl trade 450
Ughelli, Ferdinando 532
Ukrainians 223f
—Uniate 223
Ulster 173
Ultramontanism 61f
Ungelter, suffragan bishop of Augsburg 155
Uniate Eastern Churches 223ff, 223
—Latinizing tendencies of Rome 223f
Unigenitus Dei Filius, bull (1713) 57, 89, 332, 381ff, 411, 418, 425, 428, 481
—state law of 1730 in France 405
Universi Dominci gregis, brief (1708) 56
Universities 496, 535
—Catholic 495, 538ff
—Theresian-Josephinist reform 541
—transformation into state institutions 541ff
Urban II, pope 337
Urban VIII (Maffeo Barberini), pope 24, 34, 35f, 60, 61, 64, 221, 330, 547, 551
—and Richelieu 61ff
Urquijo
—decree (1799) 165
Urquijo, Spanish minister 172
Ursulines 10, 84, 555
Ushakov, Simeon 192
Utrecht, Church of 413f, 416f, 418, 426, 518
Utrecht
—Peace (1712/13) XV, 131, 135, 171, 339
—provincial council (1763) 417, 517
—schism 413f
Uzhorod
—Union (1646) 225f

Vagetius, Barthold 194
Vaillant 424, 426
Val-de-Grâce, abbey 19f
Valero, Francisco 165
Valette, P. de la 410
Valignano, A. 288
Valjavec, F. 473
Valmy
—bombardment (1792) 500
Van Espen, Zeger-Bernard 334, 412f, 451, 453, 484, 517, 540
Varcalho e Melho, Joseph de, *see* Pombal
Varlet, Dominikus 413
Varo, Francisco 313
Vasi, Giuseppe 568
Vasili I, grand duke of Moscow 183

Vasili II, grand duke of Moscow 183
Vasili III, grand duke of Moscow 184
Vasili IV Shuski, tsar of Russia 187
Vatan Hunanian 227
Vatican
—collections and library 569
Vatopädi, monastery 212
Vauban 74
Vaucel, Louis de 124
Vaughan, Henry 436
Vaz, Cassian 278
Vaz, Joseph 293
Vazquez, Augustinian general 570, 576
Velarde, Pedro Murillo 235
Velichkovski, Paisi 202
Venaissin 69, 498, 577
Vendôme, Agathangelus von 278
Venezuela 255, 261
Venice 121, 126, 132f, 307, 334, 335, 534, 571
—state church and anti-curial policy 341f
Veny d'Arbouze, Jacques de 18
Veny d'Arbouze, Marguerite de 19
Vera Cruz, Alonso de la 259
Verapaz 250
Verbal inspiration 535
Verbiest, Ferdinand 304f
Verdun 140, 498
Verhorst, Peter 154
Vernant, *see* Hérédie, Bonaventura
Vialart, bishop of Châlons 48
Viau, Théophile de 102
Vico, Giambattista 370, 372, 378, 533
Vida, Sebastian da 247
Vidoni, cardinal 115, 331
Vieira, Antonio 166, 257, 550
Vienna xvi
—concordat (1448) 444, 468, 559
—liberation from Turks (1683) 123
—peace (1735/38) 565f
—preliminary treaty (1735) 339f
Victor Amadeus II, duke of Savoy 339, 562
Vigier 430
Vignier, Hieronymus 99
Vigor, Simon 59f
Villacañas, Benito de 262
Villanueva, Jaime 168
Villaroel, Gaspar de 234
Villeneuve, Madame de 11
Villers Coterets
—ordinance (1539) 333
Villmerg war, second 516
Vineam Domini Sabaoth, bull (1705) 54f
Vintimille du Luc, Charles-Gaspard de 404f, 407f, 411, 418, 422, 430
Vincentians 80, 554
Vincent de Paul xviii, 4f, 15, 20, 22f, 37, 42, 80f, 270, 279, 554
Visitation, Sisters of the 11, 20, 84, 406, 431ff, 434
Vitoria, Francisco de 167
Vives, J. Vicens 161
Vladimir 206
Vladislav IV, king of Poland 489
Vogt, dean of [illegible]gen 156
Voisin, Jacques de 85
Voit von Rieneck, Philipp Velentin 138
Voltaire, F.-M. xiii, 265, 344f, 347, 356f, 358f, 364, 365, 367, 368f, 371, 376, 378, 380, 410, 569
Voltaire, brother of F.-M. 423
Volusius, Adolf Gottfried 153
Vossius, Gerhard 99
Vouet, Simon 88
Voyer d'Argenson, *see* Argenson
Vratanja, Simeon 227
Vuillart, Germain 54

Wadding, Lucas 39, 532
Wagner, F. 353
Walachia 216
Walch, C. W. F. 519
Walderdorff, family 140, 150
Walderdorff, Wilderich 144
Walenbusch, Adrian van 153, 511ff
Walenbusch, Peter van 153, 511ff
Wallis, John 348
Ward, Mary 555
Warens, Mrs. von 358
Wartenberg, Franz Wilhelm zu 112, 149, 158, 446
Wedekind, Rudolph 520
Weishaupt, A. 363
Weiss, Liberatus 231, 277
Weiß, Ulrich 527
Welden, Ludwig Joseph von 466
Welfare state, enlightened 470f, 476, 482
Werner, Zacharias 482
Wesley, Charles 439ff
Wesley, John 439ff
—and Moravian Brethren 440ff
—and Luther 440, 442
—and Zinzendorf 440, 442
Wesley, Samuel 439
Wesley, Susanne 439
Wessenberg, Ignaz Heinrich von 143, 505, 506, 523, 553, 553
Wessenbergianism 508
—and secularization 492ff
Westphalian Peace (1648) 107, 135, 141, 145
Wettin, family 146, 148, 492, 495f
Whites 496
White Ruthenians 224f
Whitefield 442
Widenfeld 433
Wieland, C. M. 343, 363
Wilhelm VIII of Hessen-Kassel 494
William III of Orange, king of Great Britain 70, 177ff, 438, 516
Will 27
Winckelmann, Johann Joachim 577
Winter, E. 472

Winter, Vitus Anton 529, 553
Wisnowiecki, Michael, king of Poland 116
Witasse 384
Witches 550
Witte, Gilles de 417
Wittelsbachs xv, 136, 140, 146, 148, 445f, 465f, 492, 495
—ecclesiastical policy 445f
Wittola, Marc Anton 475, 517
Witzel, Georg 511, 515
Wolff, Caspar Friedrich 374
Wolff, Christian 266f, 364, 369, 371, 482f, 527, 541
Wolffianism xix
Women hospitals 554
Woolston, Thomas 535
World, view
—scientific 373f
Worms 138, 151, 448, 492, 494, 499
—archbishopric 135
Worms Concordat (1448) 142, 145
Wreden, Karl Joseph von 467
Wren, Christopher 348
Würdtwein, Stephan Alexander 155, 457f, 465, 522, 531
Württemberg 501, 505
Wurz, Ignaz 531
Würzburg 147, 148, 150, 157, 451f, 497, 501
—archbishopric 138
—seminary 158
—school for canons 482f

Ximenes, Cardinal 334
Ximenes Samaniego, José 248

Yugoslavia 211
Yung tsheh, Emperor of China 307, 309
Yünnan 306
Yves de Paris 104

Zabokricki, Dionysius 205
Zacatecas 250
Zaccaria, Francesco Antonio 455, 533
Zaga Christos 278
Zallwein, Gregorius 456, 457
Zaluski, Jozef Andrzej 206
Zamet, Sébastien 18, 29
Zamosc
—synod (1720) 224
Zapata, Cardinal 170f
Zeil, Ferdinand Christoph zu 485f
Zeiler, Kaspar 154
Zelada, curial official 579
Zelus Domus Dei, brief (1648) 107
Ziegelbauer, Magnoald 530
Ziegenbalg 297
Zimapan 250
Zimmer 542
Zinzendorf, N. L. 440, 537
Zirkel, Gregor 451, 528
Ziucci, nuncio 488
Zmajevich, Matvej 205
Zoglio, Cesare
Zondadari, nuncio 339
Zosima, metropolitan 184
Zülpich 156
Zumarraga, Juan de 239, 261, 264
Zurlauben, B. F. von 515
Zygmunt III, king of Poland 489

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

VII

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume VII

THE CHURCH BETWEEN REVOLUTION AND RESTORATION

by

Roger Aubert

Johannes Beckmann

Patrick J. Corish

Rudolf Lill

Translated by

Peter Becker

CROSSROAD · NEW YORK

1981
The Crossroad Publishing Company
18 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y. 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. VI/1: *Die Kirche in der Gegenwart: Die Kirche zwischen Revolution und Restauration,* chapters 1 through 21, 2d edition
© Verlag Herder Freiburg im Breisgau 1971

English translation © 1980 by The Seabury Press, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:
The Church between revolution and restoration.
(History of the church; 7)
Translation of Die Kirche in der Gegenwart,
pt. 1: Die Kirche zwischen Revolution und
Restauration, chapters 1–21.
"A Crossroad book."
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Catholic Church—History—Modern period,
1500– I. Aubert, Roger. II. Series:
Jedin, Hubert, 1900– ed. Handbuch der
Kirchengeschichte. English; v. 7.

BR145.2.J413 1980, vol. 7 [BX1386] 270s
[282'.09'034] 80-16017

ISBN: 0-8245-0004-0 Previously ISBN: 0-8164-0446-1

CONTENTS

Preface ix

Preface to the English Edition xi

List of Abbreviations xiii

PART ONE: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE REVOLUTION

(Roger Aubert)

Introduction: The Catholic Church at the End of the Eighteenth Century 3
  The Crisis of the Church during the Old Regime 3
  Pius VI 8

Chapter 1: The French Revolution and Pius VI 11
  The Gallican Church on the Eve of the Revolution 12
  The Constituent Assembly and the Church 18
  The Two Churches: Constituent and Refractory Priests 25
  Persecutions and Dechristianization 29
  The Separation of Church and State 34
  Effects in Neighboring Countries 38
  The Destruction of the Holy See 46

Chapter 2: Napoleon and Pius VII 50
  The Election of Pius VII and the First Restoration of the Papal States 50
  The Concordat of 1801 54
  The Reorganization of the Church of France 60
  Religious Revival 67
  The Pope and the Emperor 71
  Southern Europe 76

PART TWO: THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE RESTORATION

SECTION ONE: THE REORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCHES (Roger Aubert; ch. 7: Rudolf Lill; ch. 11: Johannes Beckman) 85

Chapter 3: The Catholic Church after the Congress of Vienna 85
  The *orbis catholicus* in 1815 85
  Problems and Alternatives for the Catholic Church 87
  The Three Restoration Popes 92
  The Restoration of the Papal States 100

Chapter 4: The Rejuvenated Position of the Holy See within the Church 104
  Rome, the Center of the Universal Church 104
  Concordat Policy 106
  The Ultramontane Offensive in France 108
  The Beginnings of the Development in Germany 111
  Roman Catholics and Separated Christians 113

Chapter 5: The Alliance of Throne and Altar in France 115
  The Restoration of the Catholic State 116
  Strengthening of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy 118

The Attempt to Regain Society and Anticlerical Reactions 120
Balance Sheet of the Restoration 124

Chapter 6: The Continuation of the Old Regime in Southern Europe 125
The Italian States 125
The Iberian Peninsula 129

Chapter 7: Ecclesiastical Reorganization and Established Church in the German Confederation and Switzerland 132

Chapter 8: The Other European Churches 142
The Catholics in the Kingdom of the Netherlands 142
The Political Emancipation of Catholics in the British Isles 147
The Difficult Situation of Catholics in the Russian Empire 152
The Latin Catholics in the Ottoman Empire 158

Chapter 9: The Churches of America 162
Spanish America 163
Brazil 170
The United States 171
Canada 177

Chapter 10: The Churches of the Eastern Rite 179
The Uniates of the Near East 179
The Romanian and Slavic Groups 185

Chapter 11: The Resumption of Missionary Work 189
The Beginnings of Restoration prior to Gregory XVI 189
The Restoration of Missionary Work under Gregory XVI (1831–46) 195

SECTION TWO: THE AWAKENING OF CATHOLIC VITALITY (Roger Aubert; ch. 13: Rudolf Lill) 206

Chapter 12: The Rebirth of the Old Orders and the Blossoming of New Congregations 207

Chapter 13: The Beginnings of the Catholic Movement in Germany and Switzerland 216

Chapter 14: The Catholic Movement in France and Italy 227
The Catholic Action of the Laity in France 227
Catholic Publications in France 230
The Appearance of Abbé de Lamennais 232
The Beginnings of Catholic Action in Italy 235

Chapter 15: The Complex Revival of Religious Studies 240
Germany: Between Rationalism and Romantic Idealism 241
France: On the Way to a New Apologia 248
Italy: Renaissance of the Christian Philosophy 254

PART THREE: BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1830 AND 1848

Introduction: Gregory XVI 261

SECTION ONE: THE FIRST PHASE OF CATHOLIC LIBERALISM (Roger Aubert) . 269

Chapter 16: From Belgian Unionism to the Campaign of *L'Avenir* 271
The Decision of Belgian Catholics in Favor of Liberty 271

Lamennais's Development as a Liberal 273
The Belgian Constitution of 1831 279

Chapter 17: The Roman Reaction 282
The Appeal to Rome 282
The Encyclical *Mirari vos* 286
From *Mirari vos* to *Singulari nos* 288

SECTION TWO: CHURCH AND STATE IN EUROPE FROM 1830 TO 1848 (chs. 18, 19: Roger Aubert; 20: Rudolf Lill; 21: Patrick J. Corish) 293

Chapter 18: The Continuation of Catholic Liberalism in Western Europe 294
France 294
Belgium 302
The Netherlands 306

Chapter 19: The Beginning of the Risorgimento in Italy 310
Ferment in the Papal States 310
The Catholics and the Problem of Italian Unity 314
The Varieties of Catholic Liberalism in Italy 314

Chapter 20: The States of the German Confederation and Switzerland, 1830–1848 329

Chapter 21: Great Britain and Ireland, 1830–1848 344

BIBLIOGRAPHY 351

General Bibliography 353
Bibliography to Individual Chapters 365

INDEX 409

PREFACE

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Church became in fact what it always had claimed to be: a World Church. While Europe retained its spiritual leadership, the old and new churches on the other continents assumed greater importance, promoted by a world economy and world-wide communications. The speed and the extent of their growth become evident when one compares the composition of the participants at the First and Second Vatican Councils. But these councils also demonstrated that in matters of theology and spirituality Europe held on to its leading role. In order to do justice to both aspects, it became necessary to allow more space in this series to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Thus we have several volumes dealing with this period in an attempt to trace the roots of ecclesiastical developments during the past century. Needless to say, the small temporal distance separating us from the nineteenth century and the availability of sources do not permit us to make final judgments.

While volume VI was able to continue the subsequent developments which had started with the Reformation in volume V, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries present such a differentiated picture of the Churches of the Reformation that it is no longer possible in this series to give them the attention due to them. They are therefore mentioned in this and the subsequent volumes only to the extent necessary for the understanding of the history of the Catholic Church. We want this limitation to be understood as an ecumenical expression which was also the basis for the *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte* with whose help the external development of the Christian Churches can be followed.

Hubert Jedin

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

The decision to divide the original German *Die Kirche in der Gegenwart* into three volumes was, at least in part, dictated by the revisionism that has characterized so much of historical writing in recent times. As the reader will find, this is reflected in the content of this work as well. It is now generally agreed that the two salient features of the early nineteenth century, revolution and romanticism, demonstrate how expectations far outrun the realities of objective change. As the Jewish historian J. L. Talmon remarks, the vast discordant forces released in 1789 reached a tragic denouement in 1848. All the problems, ideas, and conflicts of the modern age are there in *statu nascendi.*

In this volume the authors are concerned to a great extent with the Restoration and how the Church attempted to come to grips with a world drastically changed by a generation of war and revolution. In the twilight zone between revolutionary rationalism and romanticism, some ecclesiastics attempted a synthesis of the two. Few personalities of this period better epitomize the traumatic effects of the revolution on an entire generation than Lamennais, the counterrevolutionary apologist who turned to the social salvation of religious authority to counter the effects of extreme rationalism. Called by Dupanloup "the idol of the young priests, but a thorn in the side of the older clergy and the pious faithful," he fought a losing battle in his efforts to reconcile the Church and democracy. Many will find parallels between his call for reform and the avant-garde of postconciliarism in our own time, the impetuosity, the lack of sound theological training, and a superficial understanding of religion.

Of special interest in this volume are the fresh treatment of the origins of neo-scholasticism, the Church in Congress Poland, the role of Consalvi in reestablishing the Papal States, and the revived interest in the Eastern Churches and the missions. In the former one finds the Latinization and centralization so much a part of the ecumenical effort of the nineteenth century. Much of the adulation given the missionary efforts of Gregory XVI, "le grand pape missionnaire du XIX^{e} siècle," has been toned down. It is now clear that the new direction in missionary activity during his pontificate harbored serious shortcomings. Active missionary work became almost exclusively the concern of religious orders and congregations, while the administration of the reorganized Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was in the hands of secular priests completely lacking in missionary experience. Association with the colonial powers, especially England and France, formed the basis of a political reorientation of the missions which have repercussions in the Third World to this day.

Like other institutions of this time, the Church was often ill prepared to deal with the new problems because it failed to distinguish between the surviving framework of an earlier society and the tremendous change of self-awareness in the people it served.

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADRomana	*Archivio della Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1935seqq. (1878–1934: *ASRomana*).
AFP	*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,* Rome 1931seqq.
AGKKN	*Archief voor de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland,* Utrecht 1959seqq.
AHPont	*Archivum historiae pontificiae,* Rome 1963seqq.
AHR	*The American Historical Review,* New York 1895seqq.
AHRF	*Annales historiques de la Révolution française,* Paris 1924seqq.
AHSI	*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu,* Rome 1932seqq.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855seqq.
AIA	*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Madrid 1914seqq.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857seqq.
Albers, *Herstel*	P. Albers, *Geschiedenis van het herstel der hiërarchie in de Nederlanden,* 2 vols., Nijmegen–The Hague 1903–04.
Albers, *Lib. saec.*	(P. Albers) *Liber saecularis historiae Societatis Iesu ab anno 1814 ad annum 1914,* Rome 1914.
Ammann	A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte,* Vienna 1950.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949seqq.
Anthropos	*Anthroposophische Internationale Zeitschrift für Völker- und Sprachenkunde,* Mödling 1906seqq.
Antonianum	*Antonianum,* Rome 1926 seqq.
AÖG	*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte,* Vienna 1865seqq.
AOP	*Analecta Sacri Ordinis Praedicatorum,* Rome 1892seqq.
ArchSR	*Archives de Sociologie des religions,* Paris 1956seqq.
ArSKG	*Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte,* K. Engelbert, ed., I–VI Breslau 1936–41, VIIseqq. Hildesheim 1949seqq.
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1878–1934 (*ADRomana* after 1935).
ASS	*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* Rome 1865–1908.
AstIt	*Archivio storico Italiano,* Florence 1842seqq.
Aubert, *Pie IX*	R. Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (ed. by A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* 21) Paris 1962.
Aubert, *Vat*	R. Aubert, *Vaticanum I,* Mainz 1965.
Aubert-Martina	R. Aubert, *Il pontificato di Pio IX,* translated by G. Martina with notes and supplement, Turin 1969.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Backmund	N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense* I–III, Straubing 1949seqq.
Bastgen	F. Bastgen, *Die römische Frage,* 3 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau 1917–19.
Baunard	L. Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Église de France 1800–1900,* Paris 1902.
Becqué	M. Becqué, *Le cardinal Dechamps,* 2 vols., Louvain 1956.
Bellesheim, *Irland*	A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland,* 3 volumes, Mainz 1890–91.
Bellesheim, *Schottland*	A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Schottland,* Mainz 1883.
Belvederi	R. Belvederi, *Il'papato di fronte alla Rivoluzione ed alle conseguenze del Congresso di Vienna* (1775–1846): P. Paschini and P. Brezzi, eds.,.*I Papi nella storia* II, Rome 1951, 767–930.
Bernasconi	A. M. Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii Papae XVI, auspice cardinal Vanutelli recensita,* 4 vols., Rome 1901–04.
BIHBR	*Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome,* Brussels–Rome 1919seqq.
Bihlmeyer-Tüchle	K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte,* I: *Das christliche Altertum,* Paderborn 1955; II: *Das Mittelalter,* Paderborn 1955; III: *Die Neuzeit und die neueste Zeit,* Paderborn 1968.
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* Toulouse 1899seqq.
BnatBelg	*Biographie nationale. Publiée par l'Académie de Belgique,* 35 vols., Brussels 1866–1970.
Boudou	A. Boudou, *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie. Leurs relations diplomatiques au XIX^e siècle,* 2 vols., Paris 1922–25.
Brugerette	J. Brugerette, *Le prêtre français et la société contemporaine,* 3 vols., Paris 1933–38.
BStBiS	*Bolletino storico-bibliografico subalpino,* Turin 1896seqq.
BullRomCont	*Bullarii Romani Continuatio,* A. Berberi and A. Spetia, eds., 19 vols., Rome 1835–58.
Burnichon	J. Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France. Histoire d'un siècle,* 4 vols., Paris 1914–22.

Cath	*Catholica. Jahrbuch (Vierteljahresschrift) für Kontroverstheologie,* (Paderborn) Münster 1932seqq.
CathEnc	*The Catholic Encyclopedia,* C. Herbermann, ed., 15 vols., New York 1907–12.
Catholicisme	*Catholicisme. Hier-Aujourd'hui-Demain,* G. Jacquemet, ed., Paris 1948seqq.
CH	*Church History,* New York–Chicago 1932seqq.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915seqq.
ChStato	*Chiesa e Stato nell' Ottocento. Miscellanea in onore di P. Pirri,* ed. by R. Aubert, A. M. Ghisalberti, E. Passerin d'Entrèves, 2 vols., Padua 1962.
Cîteaux	*Cîteaux. Commentarii cistercienses,* Westmalle (Belg.) 1950seqq.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Catthlica,* Rome 1850seqq. (1871–87 Florence).
CodCanOrFonti	*S. Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale. Codificazione Canonica Orientale. Fonti,* 3rd ser., Rome 1931seqq.
Colapietra	R. Colapietra, *La Chiesa tra Lamennais e Metternich,* Brescia 1963.
ColLac	*Collectio Lacensis: Acta et Decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum,* ed. by Jesuits from Maria Laach, 7 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau 1870–90.
CollFr	*Collectanea Franciscana,* Rome 1931seqq.
CPF	*Collectanea Sancta Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (1622–1866), II (1867–1906) Rome 1907.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

D	H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1967.
DACL	*Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, eds., 15 vols., Paris 1903–53.
Daniel-Rops	Daniel-Rops, *L'Église des Révolutions,* 2 vols., Paris 1960–63.
Dansette	A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine,* 2 vols., Paris 1948–51.
DBI	*Dizionario biografico degli Italiani,* A. M. Ghisalberti, ed., Rome 1960seqq.
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* R. Naz, ed., 7 vols., Paris 1935–65.
Debidour, *Histoire*	A. Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870,* 2 vols., Paris 1891.
Debidour, *III*^{e} *République*	A. Debidour, *L'Église catholique et l'État sous la Troisième République, 1870–1906,* 2 vols., Paris 1906.
de Clercq	C. de Clercq, *Conciles des Orientaux catholiques* (*Histoire des conciles* XI), 2 vols., Paris 1949–52.
Delacroix	*Histoire universelle des missions catholiques,* S. Delacroix, ed., 4 vols., Paris–Monaco 1957–59.
de Montclos	X. de Montclos, *Lavigerie, le Saint-Siège et l'Église, 1846–1878,* Paris 1965.
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* A. Baudrillart, ed., Paris 1912seqq.
DictEngCath	*A Literary and Biographical History or Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics from 1534 to the Present Time,* by J. Gillow, 5 vols., London–New York, 1885seqq.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* M. Viller, ed., Paris 1932seqq.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* A. Vacant, E. Mangenot and É. Amann, eds., 15 vols., Paris 1930.
Dupeux	G. Dupeux, *La société française 1789–1969* (*Collection U, série Histoire contemporaine*) Paris 1964.
Duroselle	J.-B. Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social en France 1822–1870,* Paris 1951.
DVfLG	*Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* Halle 1923seqq.

ECatt	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* 12 vols., Rome 1949–54.
ED	*Euntes docete* (*Commentaria urbana*), Rome 1948seqq.
EEAm	*Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo-Americana,* 70 vols., Barcelona 1908–30.
Éfranc	*Études franciscaines,* Paris 1909–40; n.s. 1950seqq.
Ellis, *AmCath*	J. T. Ellis, *American Catholicism* (*The Chicago History of American Civilization*), Chicago 1956.
Ellis, *Documents*	*Documents of American Catholic History,* J. T. Ellis, ed., Milwaukee 1956.
Engel-Janosi	F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan,* 2 vols., Graz 1958–60.
EnI	*Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti,* 35 vols., Rome 1929–37, Supplement 1938, Index volume 1939, 2 Supplements (1938–48), Rome 1948–49.
ÉO	*Échos d'Orient,* Paris 1897seqq.

EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (Bruges), Gembloux 1924seqq.
Études	*Études,* Paris 1856seqq. (until 1896: *Études religieuses*).
Feine *RG*	H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte* I: *Die katholische Kirche,* Graz 1964.
Fliche-Martin	*Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* published under the direction of A. Fliche and V. Martin, Paris 1935seqq.
FreibDiözArch	*Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1865seqq.
Friedrich	J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Conzils,* 3 vols., Nördlingen 1877–87.
FZThPh	*Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie* (before 1914: *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie;* 1914–54: *DTh*), Fribourg.
Goyau	G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse au XIX^e siècle,* 4 vols., Paris 1905–09.
Gr	*Gregorianum,* Rome 1920seqq.
Grabmann *G*	M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1933.
GregMC	*Gregorio XVI. Miscellanea commemorativa* (*Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* XIII/XIV), 2 vols., Rome 1958.
Grimaud	L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France,* 6 vols., Grenoble–Paris 1944–54.
GRM	*Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift,* Heidelberg 1909–42 and 1951seqq.
Gurian	W. Gurian, *Die politischen und sozialen Ideen des französischen Katholizismus 1789–1914,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1929.
Hagen *R*	A. Hagen, *Geschichte der Diözese Rottenburg,* 3 vols., I, Stuttgart 1957.
HAHR	*Hispanic American Historical Review,* Durham (N.C.) 1918seqq.
Hajjar	J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiennes uniates du Proche-Orient,* Paris 1962.
Hales	*Pio Nono, A Study in European Politics and Religion in the 19th Century,* London 1954.
Heimbucher	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 3 vols., Paderborn 1907–08.
Hermelink	H. Hermelink, *Das Christentum in der Menschheitsgeschichte von der Französischen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart* I–III, Stuttgart–Tübingen 1951–55.
HistCathFr	A. Latreille, J. R. Palanque, É. Delaruelle, and R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III: *La période contemporaine,* Paris 1962.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* (Cologne 1880seqq.), Munich 1950seqq.
Hocedez	E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la Théologie au XIX^e siècle,* Brussels–Paris, I, 1948, II, 1952, III 1947.
Hochland	*Hochland,* Munich 1903seqq.
Holzapfel	H. Holzapfel, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1909.
HPBl	*Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland,* F. Binder and G. Jochner, eds., 171 vols., Munich 1838–1923.
HRSt	*Historical Records and Studies of the United States Catholic Historical Society,* Philadelphia 1884seqq.
HS	*Hispania Sacra,* Madrid 1948seqq.
Hurter	H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae,* 6 vols., Innsbruck 1903–13; I, 1926, F. Pangerl, ed.

IER	*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* Dublin 1864seqq.
Irénikon	*Irénikon,* Amay-Chevetogne 1926seqq.
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* London 1950seqq.
Jemolo	A. C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni,* Turin 1963.
JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41 (now: *ALW*).
JP	*Jus pontificium de Propaganda fide, Pars I complectens Bullas, Brevia, Acta Sancta Sedis,* R. De Martinis, ed., 7 vols., Rome 1888–97.
Jürgensen	K. Jürgensen, *Lamennais und die Gestaltung des belgischen Staates. Der liberale Katholizismus in der Verfassungsbewegung des 19. Jahrhunderts,* Wiesbaden 1963.
Katholik	*Der Katholik,* Mainz 1821seqq.
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen 1955seqq.
Latourette, *Christianity*	K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age. A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,* 5 vols., New York 1958–62.
Latourette, *Expansion*	K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* 7 vols., New York–London 1937–45.
Le Bras S	G. Le Bras, *Études de sociologie religieuse,* 2 vols., Paris 1955–56.
Lecanuet	E. Lecanuet, *L'Église et l'État en France sous la Troisième République,* 4 vols., Paris 1907–30.
Leflon	J. Leflon, *La crise révolutionnaire 1789–1846* (*Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* 20, A. Fliche and V. Martin, eds.) Paris 1949.
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* Münster 1951seqq.
Lösch	S. Lösch, *Döllinger und Frankreich. Eine geistige Allianz, 1823–1871,* Munich 1955.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* Freiburg 1957–68.
Maass	F. Maass, *Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich* I–V, Vienna 1951seqq. (*Fontes rerum Austriacarum* II/71–74).
MAH	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* Paris 1880seqq.
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 31 vols., Florence–Venice 1757–98; reprinted and continued by L. Petit and J. B. Martin, eds., in 60 vols., Paris 1899–1927.
Mathew	D. Mathew, *Catholicism in England,* London 1936.
McAvoy	T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* Notre Dame 1969.
MCom	*Miscelánea Comillas,* Comillas/Santander 1943seqq.
MD	*Maison-Dieu,* Paris 1945seqq.
Mellor	A. Mellor, *Histoire de l'anticléricalisme français,* Paris 1966.
Mercati	A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le autorità civili,* 2 vols., Rome 1919–54.
Meulemeester	M. de Meulemeester, *Bibliographie générale des écrivains rédemptoristes* I–III, Louvain 1933–39.
MF	*Miscellanea francescana,* Rome 1886seqq.
MH	*Missionalia Hispanica*
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* (Innsbruck) Graz–Cologne 1880 seqq.

MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati,* 6 vols., Rome 1946.
Mollat	G. Mollat, *La Question romaine de Pie VI à Pie XI,* Paris 1932.
Moroni	G. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica,* 103 vols., Venice 1840–61.
Mortier	A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs,* Paris 1903seqq.
MÖSTA	*Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs,* Vienna 1948seqq.
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1950seqq.
NAG	*Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (until 1940: *NGG*), Göttingen 1941seqq.
NDB	*Neue Deutsche Biographie,* Berlin 1953seqq.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Tournai–Louvain–Paris 1849seqq.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945seqq.
ÖAKR	*Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht,* Vienna 1950seqq.
ÖBL	*Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon,* Graz–Cologne 1954seqq.
OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Rome 1935seqq.
Pastor	L. von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 16 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1885seqq.
Pouthas	C. Pouthas, *L'Église catholique de l'avènement de Pie VII à l'avènement de Pie IX* (*Les Cours de Sorbonne*), Paris 1945.
PrJ	*Preußische Jahrbücher,* Berlin 1858seqq.
PrOrChr	*Le Proche-Orient chrétien,* Jerusalem 1951seqq.
QLP	*Questions liturgiques et paroissiales,* Louvain 1921seqq.
RACHS	*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society,* Philadelphia 1884 seqq.
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920seqq.
Rémond	R. Rémond, *La Droite en France, de la Première Restauration à la V*^{e} *République,* Paris 1963.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921seqq.
RF	*Rázon y Fe,* Madrid 1901seqq.
RGB	*Revue générale belge,* Brussels 1945seqq.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876seqq.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900seqq.
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France,* Paris 1910seqq.
RHLR	*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* Paris 1896–1907.
RHM	*Revue d'histoire des missions,* Paris 1924seqq.
RHPhR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921seqq.
RhVJBll	*Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter,* Bonn 1941seqq.
Rigault	G. Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes,* 9 vols., Paris 1936–53.
Ris	*Risorgimento,* Brussels 1958seqq.
ROC	*Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* Paris 1896seqq.
Rogier *KG*	*Geschichte der Kirche,* ed. by L. Rogier, R. Aubert, and D. Knowles, IV, Einsiedeln 1966.
Rogier, *KathHerleving*	L. Rogier, *Katholieke Herleving. Geschiedenis van Katholiek Nederland sinds 1851,* The Hague, 1956.

RömHM	*Römische Historische Mitteilungen,* Graz–Cologne 1958seqq.
Roskovany	A. de Roskovany, *Romanus Pontifex tamquam Primas Ecclesiae et Princeps civilis e monumentis omnium saeculorum demonstratus,* 20 vols., Nitra 1867–90.
RPol	*Review of Politics,* Notre Dame 1939seqq.
RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1887seqq.
RQH	*Revue des question historiques,* Paris 1866seqq.
RRosm	*Rivista Rosminiana,* Stresa 1906seqq.
RSIt	*Rivista storica Italiana,* Naples 1884seqq.
RSoc	*Recherches sociographiques,* Quebec 1960seqq.
RSPhTh	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris 1907seqq.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910seqq.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947seqq.
RStRis	*Rassegna storica del Risorgimento,* Rome 1913seqq.
RStT	*Rassegna storica toscana,* Florence 1955seqq.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1950seqq.
Salvatorelli	L. Salvatorelli, *Chiesa e Stato dalla Rivoluzione francese ad oggi,* Florence 1955.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica,* Milan 1873seqq.
Scheffczyk	*Theologie in Aufbruch und Widerstreit. Die deutsche katholische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert,* ed. by L. Scheffczyk, Bremen 1965.
Schmidlin *PG*	J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit* I–IV, Munich 1933–39.
Schmitz *GB*	P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoît* IV and VII, Maredsous 1948/56.
Schnabel *G*	F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,* Freiburg im Breisgau, I, 1948, II, 1949, III, 1954, IV, 1955.
Scholastik	*Scholastik,* Freiburg im Breisgau 1926seqq.
Schrörs, *Braun*	H. Schrörs, *Ein vergessener Führer aus der rheinischen Geistesgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts, Johann Wilhelm Joseph Braun,* Bonn 1925.
Schulte	J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts,* 3 vols., Stuttgart 1875–80.
SE	*Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschapen,* Bruges 1948seqq.
Seppelt-Schwaiger	F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts,* I, II, IV, V, Leipzig 1931–41; I, Munich 1954, II, Munich 1955, III, Munich 1956, IV, Munich 1959.
Simon, *Rencontres*	A. Simon, *Rencontres mennaisiennes en Belgique* (*Académie royale de Belgique, Mémoires de la Classe des Lettres* LVI/3), Brussels 1963.
Simon, *Sterckx*	A. Simon, *Le cardinal Sterckx et son temps,* 2 vols., Wetteren 1950–51.
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden bzw. zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-ordens und seiner Zweige,* Munich 1880seqq.
Sommervogel	C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* I–IX, Brussels–Paris 1890–1900; X (Supplements by E. M. Rivière), Toulouse 1911seqq.; XI (*Histoire* by P. Bliard), Paris 1932.
SourcesHist.rel.Belg.	*Sources de l'histoire religieuse de la Belgique. Époque contemporaine. Colloque Bruxelles 1967* (*Centre interuniversitaire d'histoire contemporaine, Cahiers* 54), Louvain–Paris 1968.
SpAzLCIt	*Spiritualità e Azione del laicato cattolico italiano,* 2 vols. (*Italia sacra* 11/12), Padua 1969.

Spini	G. Spini, *Risorgimento e protestanti,* Naples 1956.
SPM	*Sacrum Poloniae Millenium,* Rome 1954.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (before 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*), Freiburg im Breisgau 1871seqq.
StL	*Staatslexikon,* ed. by H. Sacher, Freiburg im Breisgau 1926–32.
StMis	*Studia Missionalia,* Rome 1943seqq.
Streit	*Bibliotheca Missionum,* started by R. Streit, continued by J. Dindinger, (Münster-Aachen) Freiburg im Breisgau 1916seqq.
StudFr	*Studi francescani,* Arezzo–Florence 1903seqq.
SZG	*Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte,* Zürich 1951seqq.
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909seqq.
ThJ	*Theologische Jahrbücher,* Leipzig 1842seqq.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819seqq.; Stuttgart 1946seqq.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (until 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888seqq.
Villoslada	R. G. Villoslada, *Manual de historia de la Compañia de Jesús,* Madrid 1954.
Walz	A. Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum,* Rome 1948.
Weill, *Cath. lib.*	G. Weill, *Histoire du catholicisme libéral en France 1828–1908,* Paris 1909.
Weill, *Idée laïque*	G. Weill, *Histoire de l'idée laïque en France au XIX*^{e} *siècle,* Paris 1929.
Winter, *Byzanz*	E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rome im Kampf um die Ukraine,* Leipzig 1942.
Winter, *Russland*	E. Winter, *Russland und das Papsttum II: Von der Aufklärung bis zur Oktoberrevolution,* Berlin 1961.
WiWei	*Wissenschaft und Weisheit,* Düsseldorf 1934seqq.
WZ	*Westfälische Zeitschrift. Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte,* Münster 1838seqq.
ZAGV	*Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins,* Aachen 1879seqq.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928seqq.
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851seqq.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1876seqq.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* (Innsbruck) Vienna 1877seqq.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 34seqq., Münster 1950seqq. (*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 1–17, Münster 1911–27; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 18–25, Münster 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 26–27, Münster 1935–37; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 28–33, Münster 1938–41, 1947–49).
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948seqq.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte,* (Stans) Fribourg 1907seqq.

PART ONE

The Catholic Church and the Revolution

INTRODUCTION

The Catholic Church at the End of the Eighteenth Century

The Crisis of the Church during the Old Regime

Today it is increasingly recognized that the "crisis of the European spirit, between 1680 and 1715," of which the French literary historian Paul Hazard wrote in 1935, was in reality a crisis of growth during which many positive elements which were important for the future attempted to find cautious expression and form on the level of thought and institutions. On the other hand, it can not be ignored that the eighteenth century was an exceedingly difficult period for all Christian Churches and that the Roman Church especially displayed the appearance more of decadence than of renewal. While on the surface the Church still possessed the power of immeasurable riches, countless privileges, and state support, its authority was shaken. Each year there were further discords. Finally, the disparity between a world which was in the process of full economic, social, and cultural development and that of a clerical hierarchy which was simply incapable of differentiating between the real requirements of faith and the nonessential accessories with which the Church and religion had surrounded themselves in the course of centuries became evident. The Church clung tenaciously to completely obsolete positions.

This was especially evident in the case of the Holy See. Gallicanism and Febronianism were not limited to the theses of a certain school of thought. Both were more accurately the doctrinaire expression of a sentiment hostile to Rome which became more widely accepted throughout Catholic Europe. Many members of the clergy, of the higher civil service, and of the judiciary came to accept the notion that the spiritual supremacy of the Pope was nothing more than an honorary privilege. The devaluation of the authority of the Pope was strengthened by the ambiguity of his position as a small Italian territorial ruler. Under Europe's enlightened despotism, governments attempted to improve the economic conditions of their states, and to reform governmental institutions so as to provide a more rational direction, and to promote general education. In light of such circumstances, the backward administration of the Papal States generated widespread sarcastic and critical commentary. This vulnerable state was also in a rather difficult position internationally. It was the object of rivalry between Vienna, Paris, and Madrid, and thus forced its ruler constantly into accommodations and compromises. It was impossible for the Father of all the faithful to rise above party factions and to exercise his really supranational authority. Temporal power, which was demanded from the world as an irreducible prerequisite for the independence of the papacy, had in reality become an additional cause of the weakness of this institution. Other matters were becoming of even graver consequence.

With the exception of the pontificate of Benedict XIV, one must agree with Professor Rogier's assessment of the papacy in the eighteenth century. "In general, the actual influence of Rome on international happenings was extremely small; its contributions to the development of thought exhausted themselves in stereotype and sterile protest. Surveying the cultural history of the eighteenth century, one repeatedly misses the participation of the Church and its supreme leadership in the discussions of the burning issues of the period. If Rome contributed at all, it did so only negatively: with an admonition, an anathema, or an exhortation to silence. Regrettably, Rome not only failed to join in dialogue with a generation as strongly affected by the currents of the age as that of the eighteenth century, it systematically avoided it."[1] On the eve of the upheavals of 1789, the 1740 formulation of President Charles de Brosses was still valid: "If in Europe the credit of the Holy See is shrinking daily, this loss stems from an unawareness by the papacy of its antiquated modes of expression."

The broad masses of the population continued to perform their religious duties. The performance of these duties, however, was frequently more an accommodation to the structure of social tradition than a matter of conviction. In particular, the nobility and the educated bourgeoisie, under the influence of the Enlightenment, adopted an increasingly emancipated stance. Philosophy, influenced positively by the progress of the empirical sciences, and negatively by the endless and fruitless Jansenist controversies, gradually came to provide the intellectual constructs which formerly had their origins in theology. This shift was promoted by the insistence of the official Church that it was the champion of a global concept of the world, science, society, and education which was immutably fixed. Consequently, in the area of thought or of practical implementation, there was no room left for progress. The reaction against these increasingly anachronistic pretensions was unavoidable in a world obsessed by modernity. The tendency grew stronger to reorder social life on a secular basis, to glorify the autonomy of the individual against all political and clerical authorities, and to demand a "natural religion" corresponding to what man had determined. Religion was to tolerate all opinions and to replace not only ridiculous exercises of piety, regarded as revelations of superstition, but also dogmas, sacraments and the entire clerical organization.

---

[1] Rogier, *KG* 29.

The movement began in England and rapidly spread first to France and then to Germany. In Germany, the Protestant north quickly caught up with the Catholic south, whose urban areas after the Thirty Years War were the cultural centers of the country. After the middle of the century, the Protestant north actually became the carrier of fûture values, in contrast to the stagnation of the important Catholic centers of learning, for which the old Jesuitic *ratio studiorum* was in the process of becoming an antiquated iron collar. The "Catholic Enlightenment" attempted to marshal all its vital forces to defeat the Protestant challenge, to prevent the spread of religious indifference and unbelief, to fight the sclerosis of the Church of the Counter Reformation, and to bring about the victory of the mysticism of salvation parallel to the development of the profane sciences and the striving of mankind for an improvement of its earthly condition.[2] The number of its followers, however, was relatively small. In addition, the Catholic Enlightenment was frequently compromised in France and Italy because of its relationship to the Jansenists. Above all, its searching attempts, although intuitively auguring well for the future, were for the time being a rather shy groping, which among many—similar to the fermentation following the Second Vatican Council—awakened an impression of doctrinal confusion and disintegration of traditional Catholicism. All of this could only strengthen the impression among contemporaries that Catholicism was dealing with a double crisis, because to the attacks from the outside had been added a profound internal discontent.

The responsible leaders of the Catholic Church lacked the acuity necessary to develop a new religious anthropology to respond to the message of revelation as well as the spiritual reorientation of the age. They were equally incapable of clearing away the confusion which stemmed from the Middle Ages with respect to the difference between real clerical structures based on the gospel and the aristocratic structure of the Church of the Old Regime. One of the chief sources of dissatisfaction was the system of benefices. Since the Council of Trent it had been impossible to improve or to abolish the system of benefices, because sovereign princes, who used it to satisfy the nobility by assigning them to younger sons, resisted any change. The intolerable nature of the system, which had been aggravated by numerous abuses, became increasingly evident on the pastoral as well as the social level. It was not inconceivable that if the opportunity were provided, it would be swept away in a large part of Europe by the spirit of the age. Even though reform of the structure might be basically healthy, there was danger that it might be regarded by many as a prelude to the disappearance of the Church as a whole.

---

[2] See the illuminating discourse of B. Plongeron in his article "L'Aufklärung catholique en Europe occidentale, 1770–1830" in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 16 (1969) 557–605.

Toward the end of the Old Regime many ecclesiastical institutions were failing to function well. Noteworthy were the problems within the monastic systems. It would be an inaccurate generalization to say there were not large numbers of zealous monks. But in the eyes of the world the monastery had for some time ceased to be a place to exercise the virtues of the Gospel. To be sure, monasteries were not the dens of iniquity painted in certain types of literature, but it must be admitted that the religious atmosphere within their walls was in general rather mediocre. Aside from some particularly strict orders such as the Carthusians, the Trappists, and the Carmelites, the world often regarded monasticism as an easy life which provided good incomes to the monks who administered extensive pieces of real estate and undertook expensive construction projects. It was also complained that many of the monasteries which had been founded in the Middle Ages were now half empty. The mendicant orders provoked less criticism with their lack of riches, but their members suffered from a crisis of belief to which was added, especially in the southern countries, a crisis of discipline. One found among the mendicant orders many an eager preacher and apostle of charity, but a substantial number of their members formed a rather less impressive ecclesiastical lower class which was an easy target for the scorners of monastic vows. The opponents of monastic life criticized not only the frequent enervation of these institutions, but also asserted that the orders were totally useless to society. In their eyes only those orders were acceptable which devoted themselves exclusively to education and the care of the sick. Consequently, in the second half of the eighteenth century, it was not surprising to see governments, encouraged by public opinion, secularize a part of the monasteries. The proceeds from secularization were used to found parsonages for the growing population and to subsidize public education and welfare, areas which many people would have preferred to be made into public agencies. In this sense, the radical measures ultimately taken during the French Revolution were only the culmination of a policy which had been developing for a quarter of a century in all Catholic countries and against which the ecclesiastical authorities, although fully aware of the unhealthy conditions, had protested only feebly. An example of government secularization may be found in the Republic of Venice where, between 1748 and 1797, 127 monasteries were closed down. Similar measures were taken in Tuscany, the Duchy of Parma, Lombardy, Spain, and, in an especially systematic way between 1780 and 1790, in the various provinces of the Austrian monarchy. In France, such an action had been suggested and organized by the clergy itself despite the protests of the Pope. A Commission of Regulars[3] was formed under the driving force of Lomenie de Brienne, the archbishop of Toulouse. The archbishop, an expert administrator and a man worried about the good standing of the Church in society, but "closer to the philosophes than to Christianity," in 1768 suggested a number of steps to the King. The proposed changes would raise the age for taking monastic vows, in order to better guarantee the voluntariness of the action; reform the structure of the old orders in order to take into account their spiritual progress since their founding; strengthen the control of the bishops over the monasteries not under their jurisdiction; and prescribe a minimum number of monks for each house. The result of the proposal by the commission was the dissolution of 426 monasteries, whose lands were turned over to the dioceses, and the disappearance of a number of smaller congregations which, admittedly, as Chevallier said "constituted the truly ruinous part of the monasteries." The Commission of Regulars doubtless had in mind more a reform of orders than their abolition, but nevertheless it appealed to the power of the state, ignored systematically all protests of the Holy See, and assumed a far more utilitarian than religious position. Precisely this kind of procedure created a "precedent which the Constituent Assembly was to remember twenty years later" (Latreille).

While the crisis was particularly painful for the monasteries, it was also felt among the secular clergy with major differences from country to country. In the Belgian provinces and in the Rhineland, for example, the situation was relatively satisfactory, but lamentable in the kingdom of Naples and in some areas of Spain. The fact that a very large number of priests lived from the income of benefices or other murky sources without performing any pastoral work illuminates one of the most evident defects of the Church toward the end of the Old Regime. One could in fact notice during the course of the eighteenth century an attempt in many areas to upgrade the intellectual and spiritual education of the lower clergy, and, by the end of the century, educated priests and self-sacrificing pastors were more numerous than a century earlier. This did not alter, however, the existence of many abuses which an enlightened public opinion was no longer willing to countenance. In this context, as in so many others, factual determinations must not allow the historian to forget that psychological reactions also played a considerable role. A striving for an improved education did indeed exist among the lower clergy, but a large number of the clergy, not only in France but in Italy and western Germany as well, became interested in Richeristic doctrines whose goal it was to reduce the authority of the Pope and the bishops and which prepared the way for the democratic notions which found a reflection in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The acceptance of Richeristic doctrine was facilitated by the desire of many pastors to reduce episcopal "despotism" and an unjust distribution of the income from the estates of the Church. To this must be added that in the rural areas of such countries as France the dissatisfaction created by unpopular tithing was aggravated by a feudal reaction of the landlords. Further friction arose from the attitude, taken by many civil servants, that the clergy was merely a depository of immense land wealth and that its prerogatives were dependent upon the decisions of the sovereign. This view won increasing acceptance among the circles concerned with the modernization of religious and secular institutions.

---

[3] Cf. P. Chevallier, *Lomenie de Brienne et l'ordre monastique, 1776–1789,* 2 vols. (Paris 1959).

The various foundations of the power of the Church in the Old Regime, its wealth, its prestige, and its moral authority were questioned systematically. In spite of sporadic and embryonic attempts to reach a highly necessary adjustment, the Catholic Church on the eve of the revolution made a weakened impression, and the still remaining spiritual forces, whose strength became evident in the course of affliction and which were to explain why the Church was able to regenerate itself so quickly, proved ineffective. Catholic resistance was made more difficult because not only did it lack a cohesive leadership but also because of the prevailing confusion of concept and opinion regarding the role of the Church. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the upper clergy and the secular leadership were accustomed to intervention by the government in ecclesiastic affairs. Missing at the head of the Church was a highly gifted man with extraordinary energy. When the storm of revolution broke loose in France, the greater part of Catholic Europe eventually became involved. At that moment, there sat on Peter's chair a Pope who was conscientious but who lacked precisely those characteristics which were needed under such trying circumstances.

Pius VI

After the death of Clement XIV, the more than four-month-long conclave between October 1774 and February 1775 faced the nightmare question to what extent the Society of Jesus was to be dissolved. The cardinals representing the chief powers could not agree among themselves. Representatives from Austria and France desired a moderate interpretation, while those from Spain and Portugal were in favor of a radical implementation. Although both factions faced opposition from the group of so-called "zealots" who regretted Clement XIV's capitulation to the great powers, they were undecided among the several candidates. After numerous vain attempts, Zelada, who functioned as mediator, succeeded in getting all zealots to unite behind Braschi, who, although he was regarded as a partisan of the Jesuits, had kept away from political and religious controversies under the two previous pontificates. The candidacy of Braschi was supported emphatically by Cardinal de Bernis, the French legate, who skillfully managed to remove the remaining doubts of the Austrians and Spaniards. The result was Braschi's unanimous election.

Gianangelo Braschi, who adopted the name of Pius VI because of his high esteem for Pius V, was born on 25 December 1717 at Cesena in the northern region of the Papal States. He studied law and only became a priest in 1758. The protection of Cardinal Ruffo, legate at Ferrara, and his personal characteristics assured him of a quick rise in the Curia. In 1766, Clement XIII appointed him treasurer of the apostolic chamber, i.e., as secretary of the treasury, and he succeeded in improving somewhat the strongly shaken economic and financial position of the Papal States. Misfortune which pursued Pius VI in his later years has given rise to his idealization and has marked him as a martyr Pope. There was a great difference, however, between the myth and the reality. The new Pope was indeed pious and honest, and he demonstrated irreproachable and genuine courage in the face of adversity. But Pius VI was not a prepossessing personality. He was vain, worldly, and proud of his handsome appearance. Moreover, he was determined to imitate Leo X as promotor of art and architecture. Pius VI spent large amounts of money for the beautification of the Eternal City, encouraged archeological digs, and surrounded himself with such scholars as Cardinal Garampi and Cardinal Gerdil. He also revived nepotism once more and practiced it to a greater degree than any other Pope during the eighteenth century. For his sister's son, Luigi, he built a splendid palace in Rome. During the course of his quarter of a century pontificate he repeatedly showed that he lacked both energy and acuity. Pius VI was reluctant to make decisions and was totally absorbed by secondary problems of prestige. For example, he became absorbed in a ridiculous dispute with the King of Naples over the white horse which the King owed in annual tribute to the Pope as his liege lord. Yet Pius VI was also able to act independently. In the conclave he had been the candidate of the zealots, but he immediately disassociated himself from their position and pursued a flexible and moderate policy which did not offend the European courts. In pursuing this policy, however, he ignored his secretary of state, Cardinal Pallavicini, who had been pressed on him by the powers, and allowed the Cardinal little initiative. Concerned with both the welfare of his subjects and the defense of the rights of the Church, Pius VI conscientiously pursued the double task of secular ruler and Pontiff.

Still relatively young at the time of his election, Pius VI nurtured a number of major plans. With regard to the administration of the Papal States, he introduced reforms which were in part inspired by mercantilistic theories. These undertakings were frequently badly planned or badly implemented, but some of them are of interest. For example, the introduction with the help of Cardinal Boncompagni Ludovisi[4] of a land register, even though this reform foundered on the opposition of the large landlords. The Pope also improved roads, modernized the ports of Anzio and Terracina, and drained a large part of the Pontine Swamp. These public works projects required financial means which Pius VI did not have at his disposal and, in combination with the huge expenditures which he committed toward immortalizing his memory in Rome, led to a tremendous rise in the public debt. Pius constantly wavered between a policy of improving conditions in the Roman Campagna and a protectionist policy in the area of manufacture and trade. Moreover, he was unfortunate in the selection of his staff and suffered from the indifference of influential Roman factions, even though their leaders were infected by the spirit of reform.

From the beginning, Pius VI met with difficulty in maintaining the traditional position of the Pope. The Holy See encountered increasingly hostile public opinion toward the Curia, and governments became more determined to exact from the Pope one concession after another, with the goal of strengthening their influence over the national clergy. The situation was not altered by the fact that in France and Portugal a certain improvement of the general situation was recorded. The new French King, Louis XIV, showed himself to be favorably inclined toward the position of the Pope, and in Portugal Pombal fell into disgrace and was dismissed after the coronation of the pious queen, Mary I, in 1777. Examples of the weakening papal position were the futile defense which Pius VI mounted against the religious policy of the Austrian Emperor, Joseph II; the conflict between the Pope and the German prince-bishops in the Munich nunciature controversy and the Ems draft treaty; the problems arising from the reforms of the Grand Duke Pietro Leopoldo and the adjacent position of the Duchy of Tuscany to the Papal States; and the recurring tension with Russia over the integration of Polish Catholics as a result of the annexations of 1772, 1793, and 1795. Aware of his weakness, Pius VI tried within reason to gain time. The Pope was more forceful in counteracting attempts at Jansenist reform in Rome, and he succeeded in the resignation of Bishop Scipione de Ricci. After hesitating for eight years, Pius VI, with the Bull *Auctorem fidei* of 28 August 1794, finally condemned the main decrees of the Synod of Pistoia. With regard to the Jesuits, he maneuvered exceedingly carefully so as not to offend the Bourbon courts, and finally tacitly allowed the Jesuits to secretly regroup themselves around the nucleus which continued to exist in the western part of the Russian Empire.

---

[4] See U. Coldagelli in *DBI* XI, 713–19.

The outbreak and the subsequent effects of the French Revolution in 1789 introduced a much more threatening period for the Catholic Church in general and for the Holy See in particular. But during his last years Pius VI increasingly failed to supply a much needed decisive stance and became torn by the opposing factions of his entourage. He displayed, as Godechot stated, "more courageous obstinacy than real political sensitivity."

CHAPTER 1

The French Revolution and Pius VI

For a number of years following the French Revolution, the concept grew not only in France but also in the United States that the revolution and the period beginning around 1770 was not merely a remarkable national event, but one which comprised a part of a larger "Atlantic Revolution," which had transformed the entire western world.[1] This interpretation is certainly justified from a social and political point of view; yet it does not change the fact that from the point of view of the Catholic Church the events which occurred specifically in France between 1789 and 1801 were totally predominant. France was not only the country with the largest Catholic population, it also was the country in which the monastic orders had their largest number of houses; the country whose theological and spiritual influence was particularly strong both for all of Europe and America. It was incontestably the epicenter of the earthquake which within a few years caused the fall of the antiquated structures of the Catholic Church in a large part of Europe and profoundly transformed the position of the Catholic Church, especially in Germany and the Netherlands, relative to the Protestant Churches. Beyond this, the policy of revolutionary France in Italy considerably affected the situation of the papacy. After a decade of conflict, the new solutions worked out by Napoleon and Pius VII influenced and lastingly determined the relationship between Church and state in the course of the nineteenth century. For this reason the first two chapters of this volume are devoted exclusively to the development of the religious crisis in France.

---

[1] See R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution* (Princeton 1959); J. Godechot, *Les Révolutions, 1770–99* (Paris 1963).

The Gallican Church on the Eve of the Revolution

A first view of the Church in France in 1789 gives a solid impression of strength and power. In reality, though, its standing among the educated had been weakened. Debilitated by internal wrangles and new ideas which had found fertile soil, the level of institutions showed indications of arteriosclerosis that became ever more noticeable.

The Catholic Church in France, as in other Catholic European countries, was an official institution linked to the state and one which enjoyed significant political, juridical, and financial privileges. Roman Catholicism was the established religion in France, and as such it was supported by the secular power. The concept of religious tolerance, which increasingly had gained ground during the past several decades in the Anglo-Saxon and German states, found hardly an echo among the bourgeois institutions of France. Public divine services for non-Catholic denominations remained outlawed. Although the Protestants had succeeded by the edict of 1787 in gaining recognition for marriages performed without the services of a Catholic priest, this regulation was opposed by clergy and laymen alike. The principle of unity of faith in the kingdom thrived and toleration continued to be equated with atheism. In spite of the concessions of 1784, which were limited to Alsace, the position of Jews also remained a delicate one.

The relationship between the Church in France and the Holy See continued to be governed by the concordat of 1516, whose implementation gave rise to no major complaints. The concordat conceded important rights to the King. Among these were the right to distribute benefices. Even though in the case of bishoprics and abbeys the King was required to seek the consent of the Pope, his selection always was the decisive one. Thereby the King assured himself the loyalty of the clergy. To these rights were added the traditional esteem in which the monarch always had been held. Coexistent was the equally traditional distrust toward all ultramontane demands and the frequent differences of opinion between Rome and Versailles in the arena of international politics. The combination of these factors explains the widespread popularity of the Gallican doctrines. During this time a balance had been reached between the rights of the Holy See and the rights of the crown, and both the clergy and the faithful felt more commitment to the Pope than might be gathered at first sight.

The clergy enjoyed a predominant position in every respect. It constituted an estate equal to those of the nobility and the commoners and was in fact the only estate with an organization which acted increasingly like a pressure group of nobles. The delegates of this estate met every five years in general convention. In Paris, its representative was the *Agence Générale.* Talleyrand had succeeded between 1780 and 1785 in changing this agency into a type of permanent ministry of the clergy.[2] The clergy retained the right to its own system of justice, although interventions by the fiscal solicitor as representative of the state became more frequent and occasionally extended even to religious matters. The French Church was divided into 135 remarkably unequal dioceses with antiquated and inexpedient districts.[3] The clergy consisted of approximately fifty thousand priests laboring in the parishes and between fifteen thousand and eighteen thousand canons who served virtually no function. There were also twenty thousand to twenty-five thousand monks and thirty thousand to forty thousand nuns. The French clergy thus comprised approximately one hundred twenty thousand persons. Additionally, there were a large number of sacristans and chorists, as well as businessmen and staff who took care of worldly concerns. This secular and regular clergy possessed impressive economic power. It owned numerous urban buildings and, more importantly, ecclesiastical real estate in the countryside in amounts which fluctuated from region to region. In the south, the Church owned between 4 and 6 percent of the land. The actual amount in the Auvergne was only 3.5 percent, but rose as high as 20 percent in Brie and in Picardie and constituted as much as two-thirds of the land in Cambresis. In the whole country, the

---

[2] See L. S. Greenbaum, *Talleyrand, Statesman Priest. The Agent-General of the Clergy and the Church of France at the End of the Old Regime* (Washington 1970). Also M. Peronnet in *AHRF* 34 (1962), 8–35.

[3] In Provence and also in Languedoc there were numerous tiny dioceses, stemming from the time of Gallico-Roman settlements. Several dioceses ranged on both sides of a border, for example the diocese Glandève which numbered thirty-four parishes in France and twenty-five in the Kingdom of Sardinia. Seven dioceses even had their capitals in foreign countries, for example Tournai and Basel. The diocese of Strasbourg belonged to the church province of Mainz, while the dioceses of Metz, Toul, and Verdun belonged to that of Trier. With respect to income there was a tremendous disparity between the poor bishoprics in the south (incomes between seven thousand and fourteen thousand Livres) and some large dioceses in the north or the east (diocese of Strasbourg forty thousand Livres, diocese of Cambrai two hundred thousand Livres, and the diocese of Beauvais ninety-six thousand Livres).

Church owned about 10 percent of the land and received an annual income of more than 100 million Livres. The tithe, which also fluctuated from region to region and which, after 1770, led to actual peasant uprisings, produced an equal amount. Wherever the Church owned little land, it contributed as much as 80 percent of the income of the parish priests. The income was almost tax-free. The Church was obliged to pay no more than a voluntary contribution to the state, and toward the end of the Old Regime this amounted to no more than 4 million Livres, or less than 2 percent. On the other hand, this tax privilege was compensated for by heavy expenditures, especially the costs of education and welfare. In spite of their high cost, however, these activities guaranteed the Church a considerable influence in French society and one which it was to long for during the subsequent century.

The influence of the Church was especially strong in the countryside. While the monks and cathedral canons were often regarded as burdensome landlords, the parish clergy was held in esteem, because it provided education, maintained the register, and supported the poor. In some areas, however, the peasants gradually dissociated themselves from the Church. This was especially true in Bordelais, Santogne, and Aunis, where the forced conversion of Protestants in the preceeding century had led to religious indifference. Among many segments of society, above all among the landed bourgeoisie, local civil servants, innkeepers, and retired soldiers, free spirits abounded. The distancing process was acute in the cities, where in such places as Auxerre, Rouen, and Bordeaux a considerable number of people no longer performed their Easter rites.[4] The concepts of the philosophes touched not only the educated circles, but other population groups as well. This condition should not be generalized too much, however, as foreign travelers in France in 1780 reported that the people continued to cling to their traditional religion in more than a merely surface fashion. Foreign travelers were particularly impressed by the seriousness and the piety which people displayed during services, even in such urban centers as Paris. Even the civil service was not lacking in pious families, and among the nobility, according to D. Mornet, the "philosophical" landlords were hardly in the majority. The success of the Freemasons should not lead to erroneous conclusions about a general lack of piety. While it is true that Freemasonry created a suitable climate for the idea of a "natural religion," one which frees man from submission to a Church, no respectable historian will defend the assertion that in the lodges of the eighteenth century there existed a systematic conspiracy against the

---

[4] Y. Hilaire in *L' information historique* 25 (1963), 57–58.

Church.[5] This reservation must be made, because it makes comprehensible the resilience of the old religion during the storms of the revolution. On the other hand, it must be admitted that, aside from the older anticlericalism of the trade guilds, the influence of the philosophes increasingly constituted the major competition to the influence of the Church among the rising bourgeoisie.[6] The impact of this development was enhanced by the fact that the refutations of enlightened thought by Catholic apologists were overwhelmingly of rather mediocre quality, and that responsible officials generally preferred to hide behind the skirts of secular power and censorship instead of acknowledging that in many areas a serious attempt at accommodation was urgently needed.

The situation was especially apparent among the orders in France as well as elsewhere. The contemporary literature illustrates a fashionable trend toward denouncing the sloth, greed, and immorality of the monks. Indeed, many of the monks had been urged into monastic life by their families and consequently led frivolous and occasionally scandalous lives, read the most daring works of the philosophes, and a few years later constituted a significant portion of the revolutionary nucleus. Many a monastery had abandoned completely its vows of poverty and had squandered its best efforts in controversies with debtors. Such orders no longer were concerned with works of charity and serving God. The case was especially so in the many monasteries whose abbots were nominated by the King. These monasteries had become ecclesiastical sinecures, distributed among courtly favorites, most of whom did not take up residence. In 1789, of a total of 740 abbeys no fewer than 625 had been awarded as prebends. Their tenants enjoyed the income of their benefices while being exempted from clerical duties. Countless abuses and grievances, therefore, called urgently for reforms; reforms which needed to go deeper than the rather inept efforts which had been considered by the Commission of Regulars between 1766 and 1768. It would be too simplistic to assert that on the eve of 1789 a general decadence prevailed. Spiritual laxity was the exception rather than the rule in the convents. The contemplative female orders recorded a constant stream of admissions in spite of the spirit of the time. Public opinion, formed in the light of Diderot's novel *La religieuse,* viewed the solemn vows of the old orders with hostility, but valued the services of the numerous new congregations with their simple or total lack of vows. Such congregations as the Sisters of Mercy, who performed services in the areas of education and charity, met with approval. With respect to the monasteries, historians note the reduction in the number of monks between 1768 and 1789.[7] The depopulation differed among orders and between regions. It is remarkable that in the case of such different orders as the Benedictines, Dominicans, and the regular canons of Saint Geneviève, the curve of admissions began to rise again after 1780. This development, coming after a long decline, caused a problematical relationship between the younger members, who were more open to the new ideas, and the older monks, who did not understand the desire for reform. Although there were many poorly qualified monks who were pleased to regain their freedom as a result of the decisions of the Constituent Assembly, B. Plongeron has noted some cases of genuine fervor and the "continuation of truly religious and priestly attitudes." This is a confirmation of the fact that one cannot characterize the entire spiritual history of the eighteenth century, as Bremond did, as a "retreat of the mystics." The hasty generalizations of earlier historians are explained also by Plongeron, who pointed out that one could find "firm religious convictions under totally irreligious behavior." The palpable existence of abuses and grievances all too easily permitted the assumption of a general decay, and one cannot overemphasize the fact of crisis within the monasteries. This condition, however, should not be equated with general decadence. It can be interpreted as a crisis of adaptation which in actuality was a sign of vitality. Such an interpretation cannot be expected to have been reached by the upper clergy prior to the events of 1789 nor could they be expected to assign a proper perspective to the strivings of numerous orders for a trenchant reform of monastic life.

---

[5] On Freemasonry in France on the eve of the revolution see *AHRF* 197 (1969) and as an example of monographic treatment see A. Le Bihay, *Francs-Maçons, parisiens du Grand Orient de France à la fin du XVIII^e siècle,* 3 vols. (Paris 1966–72). See also the bibliographic entries in the *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte* IV, ed. by F. Wagner, 297–98, notes 29–33. On the thesis of the alleged plot against the Church which was promoted by the Eudist Lefranc in 1791 and spread in popular form by the Jesuit Barruel in his *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du jacobinisme,* 3 vols. (Hamburg 1797–99), see A. Gérard, *La Révolution française, mythes et interprétations* (Paris 1970), 22–24; M. Defourneaux in *AHRF* 37 (1965), 170–86; J. Droz in *RH* 226 (1961), 313–38.

[6] In connection with R. R. Palmer, *Catholics and Unbelievers in XVIIIth-Century France* (Princeton 1940) it is advisable to read the analyses of L. Trenard and Y. Hilaire, "Idées, croyances et sensibilité religieuse du XVIII^{e} au XIX^{e} siècle," *Bulletin de la section d'histoire moderne du Comité des travaux historiques* 5 (1964), 7–27.

Even the upper clergy, who occupied a position of major responsibility, cannot be condemned out of hand. Neither scandal, scepticism, or unbelief associated with some of the bishops, nor the worldly conduct of others, who preferred to live at court and left the administration of their dioceses to subordinates, should make one forget that the overwhelming majority of the French bishops in the second half of the eighteenth century led a life of dignity and conscientiously attempted to fulfill the duties of office. There was no lack of such genuinely pious and virtuous pastors as Lefranc de Pompignan. Others, as Gurian points out, acted more "as provincial administrators than as administrators of sacraments," and concerned themselves primarily with economic and social reforms. Their conduct was determined by their conviction, growing out of the spirit of the time, that faithful adherence to the Gospel required them to labor for the improvement of the lot of the common man. These members of the episcopate for some years had been recruited from the nobility and the aristocracy and therefore demonstrated the bad as well as the good characteristics of this social class. Their social background provided them with a broad education, magnanimity, and a sense of honor; but these aristocratic bishops, who owed their appointments more to their birth and their connections than to their personal qualifications, had only a superficial theological knowledge; a deficiency which was particularly alarming at the moment when the French Church required an extraordinarily strong and firm spiritual leadership. Privileges were jealousy defended and benefices were regarded as the quite natural accumulation necessary for the kind of life which these aristocratic bishops expected to be accorded their position. Moreover, bishops of this type moved almost exclusively within circles of clerics and laity from their own background. They appeared as nothing more than part of a caste system to the middle clergy of canons, seminary professors, and scholarly priests who came from the upper middle class and whose spiritual role and influence at the local level was considerable. The parish clergy, which was drawn also from the middle class, resented the arrogance of the aristocratic bishops and angrily compared the ostentatious life style of these bishops with their own often meager incomes.

---

[7] Between 1768 and 1789 the number of monks at Cluny sank from 671 to 301. The Franciscans went from 2385 to 1544, the Capuchins from 4937 to 2674, and the Dominicans from 1432 to 1006.

Monographs concerning individual dioceses, however, require a correction of the popular conception regarding the small incomes of the country clergy.[8] They demonstrate that parish priests in many dioceses enjoyed genuine comfort. This was particularly true wherever the official incomes were augmented by generous contributions of the parishioners. It is true that this was not the case everywhere, and in some areas the withholding of the tithe by the landlords made the salaries of country clergy inadequate; an inadequacy which these parsons, who mostly stemmed from the middle urban bourgeoisie, felt acutely, as they were desirous of maintaining the life style of their class. There were some isolated cases, as in the Dauphiné and in Provence in 1779, where, in defiance of the law, parish priests formed a kind of labor union to effect an improvement of their situation. However, on the eve of the events of 1789, the complaints of the lower clergy were primarily concerned with the social, pastoral, and theological situation, rather than with their economic status. These sons of the middle class utilized their strength to defend an elitist position which they saw as threatened and were angered by the aristocratic pretensions displayed toward them by the bishops. Agreeing with Richer, who saw in the parsons the successors of the seventy-two disciples, they assumed the point of view that "the real ecclesiastical body is the body of the officiating pastors which is merely presided over by the bishop and that everything else, such as cathedral benefices, abbeys, other property, and colleges with the right to tithe, is the result of a history of centuries." They demanded from the bishops, who never bothered to consult them, the reintroduction of diocesan synods in order to discuss with them the means for a reform of the Church to achieve greater equality and spiritualization. The indifference with which the Church hierarchy responded to a movement which was agitating the lower clergy from one end of France to the other contributed to the deepening division between the bishops and the priests. Even if it did not result in actual class warfare, as it did in Nancy, there is no doubt that many priests were prepared to accept radical changes in the position of the oligarchy; an oligarchy which had established a leadership monopoly within the Gallican Church.[9] One has to agree with A. Latreille when he writes: "The resentment of a bourgeoisie, which was aware of its economic and social importance, and enraged that the privileged classes continued to oppress them, has often been mentioned among the causes of the revolution; analogously, one must realize that a sizable portion of the clergy was convinced of the injustice of its established order and was driven spontaneously to rise against it."[10] The meeting of the Estates General left no doubt that the Church in France constituted its own estate within the state, but one which was severely lacking in homogeneous social unity.

---

[8] See for example the articles by D. Julia on the diocese of Reims in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 13 (1966), 195–216 and by Ch. Girault on the Department of Sarthe in *La Province du Maine* 33 (1953), 69–88.

The Constituent Assembly and the Church

Nothing in the summer of 1789 signaled that the incipient revolution was to develop into the most dramatic period in the history of the

---

[9] See M. G. Hutt, "The Curés and the Third Estate. The ideas of reform in the pamphlets of the French lower clergy in the period 1787–89" in *JEH* 8 (1957), 74–92.

[10] *HistCathFr* III, 51.

French Church. In the grievances prepared for the Estates General, there were rather frequent complaints about the privileges and the abuses of the Church, and about the tithe and the degeneration of monasticism, but only rarely was a dissolution of the orders mentioned and even less often was the official position of the Church and its leading role in the fields of education and charity called into question. Generally, there was a desire that necessary reforms be effected with the advice and cooperation of concerned circles. Under pressure from the priests, those groups concerned with reform made a number of suggestions and supported various political, legal, and fiscal demands of the Third Estate.[11] During the period in which the Estates General transformed themselves into the Constituent Assembly, it became clear that the clergy, after an initial hesitation, was again willing to be cooperative. However, at first, a rather considerable number of the lower clergy as well as the upper clergy did not show itself in agreement with the reform proposed by the Third Estate to vote by heads instead of by Estates; a reform which would grant it a predominating position with respect to the other two privileged Estates. Finally, the small group of priests who were in favor of this change were able to convince two-thirds of their brethren to vote for it. On 23 June the King attempted to save the situation by closing the meeting hall. About eighty priests joined with the members of the Third Estate in refusing to disperse and, by remaining, contributed to the success of the revolution.

A few weeks later, on the famous night of 4 August, the clergy accepted almost unanimously the abolition of feudalism, the discarding of the tithe, and all of the consequences for the Church resulting from this action. In the following week the Assembly declared that it bore no ill will toward the Church and would take care that expenses for services, for the support of acolytes, and for the support of the poor would be covered in other ways. On 12 August an ecclesiastical committee was constituted to find solutions to these problems.

A much more radical measure was to be considered on 2 November. The increasing gravity of the financial situation made it obligatory to discuss once again a problem which for years had concerned both lawyers and economists. This was the confiscation by the state of Church lands. This time, many members of the Church, even priests like Henri Grégoire, who normally were favorably inclined toward reforms, resisted such a proposal. They considered it dangerous to change the clergy into salaried officials of the state. Many of the secular delegates also hesitated to break with the tradition of centuries. The bishop of Autun, Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand, who was disappointed by the incoherence of royal policy and wanted to confirm the new order, delivered a skillful address and helped to change the prevailing sentiment. In all, the debate lasted three weeks. In its course, Abbé Maury forcefully defended the legal thesis of the inviolability of the rights of the Church, while a few moderate groups, following the respected Bishop Boisgelin of Aix, in vain suggested a compromise solution. The Assembly's final decision was influenced more by the specter of bankruptcy than by the ideal of secularization. By a vote of 510 to 346, the Church lands were nationalized under the conditions that priests were to be paid a minimum salary of 1,200 Livres, more than double the amount which many had received, and that the state would assume the care of the poor. The sale of Church lands began in the following month.[12] Initially, the bishops exerted little pressure upon the faithful to abstain from the purchase of Church lands. Soon, however, such pressure began to be exerted on the local level, and as early as 1790 in many areas of France good Catholics hesitated to bid during sales. In subsequent years, the clergy, especially the emigrated clergy, increasingly opposed such sales and characterized them as sacrilegious. This attitude resulted in a marked anticlericalism among many of those who bought such properties.

---

[11] In addition to the outdated work of L. Chassin, *Les cahiers des curés de 1789* (Paris 1882), see B. Hyslop, *A Guide to the General Cahiers of 1789* (New York 1936); J. Richard, *L'élaboration d'un cahier de doléances. P. Cl. Perrot, curé de Brazey* (Dijon 1961); A. Dupront, "Cahiers de doléances et mentalités collectives" in *Acts du 89ᵉ Congrès des Sociétés savantes* (Paris 1969), 375 ff.

At the same time in which the Constituent Assembly dealt with the problem of Church property, it also took up the question of the monasteries, as the nationalization of Church lands implied their secularization. Many of the regular clergy were convinced in any event that monastic vows were incompatible with the Rights of Man. A decree of 13 February 1790 forbade such vows for the future and, simultaneously, dissolved all orders and congregations with solemn vows which were not active in education or the care of the sick. Monks and nuns had two alternatives: they could return to public life and draw a pension from the state or they could gather in a number of houses which would remain at their disposal until they died. Even though in the past civil law had regulated the legal consequences of monastic vows, the matter was carried much further this time, and many bishops protested that this decree constituted secular intervention into an area where it had no jurisdiction. The new regulation, which, for the time being, allowed the "useful" orders to continue their work, caused hardly a ripple in the country, where, initially, it was interpreted fairly benevolently. Whereas the male orders recorded many departures, most of the nuns declared their intention to remain faithful to their houses. The nuns were permitted to remain in their houses, which were then merely sequestered. Only in August 1792 did the Legislative Assembly dissolve all congregations, including those in the service of the poor, and complete the dispersal of the monastic orders.

---

[12] Numerous regional monographs concern themselves with these countless transfers of title and their social consequences. For ten years they constituted a substantial portion of the income of the republic, regardless of corruption in some instances. The bourgeoisie benefitted most and so did the wealthy peasants; in contrast the condition of the poor peasants was often aggravated by the sale, because the old collective rights had been changed in favor of the property rights of the new owners. See a tentative conclusion by G. Lefebvre in *Revue d'histoire moderne* 3 (1958), 189–219.

Many members of the Church noted with concern the progressive destruction of the traditional structures of the Gallican Church. In Paris, several anticlerical demonstrations by the excited masses had been staged. A number of bishops and aristocratic priests expressly dissociated themselves from the measures taken, but, initially, most of the clergy, some with resignation and some with enthusiasm, accepted the religious policy of the National Assembly. The Assembly, far from having decreed the separation of Church and state, attempted to connect the Church intimately with the revolution. This was shown by the decree of 23 February 1790, which ordered all decisions of the Assembly to be read and commented upon from the pulpit in all parishes. Subsequent developments demonstrated, however, that the general acceptance of the alliance between the Church and Third Estate had come about on the basis of mutual misconceptions. The problem of the legal status of non-Catholics caused the first major rift in April 1790. In August of the previous year, a small group of Protestant delegates, supported by liberal nobles, had demanded complete equality of religion during the vote on the Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizen, a vote against which no objection had been raised from the Catholic side. The Assembly failed to grant the equality to Protestants, and instead limited itself to a negative formulation which provided that no one could be molested because of his convictions, including his religious beliefs. In the south, however, the fanaticism of the priests and of the population directed itself against the wealthy Huguenots. This situation subsequently was to be exploited by the forces of counterrevolution. The Catholics of the south demanded recognition of Catholicism as the established religion in the constitution. When a motion to this effect was introduced on 12 April by the Carthusian monk Gerle and voted down, many Catholics saw in this rejection a national apostasy. Although this rejection had in truth a political rationale, many priests overreacted and dissociated themselves from the progressive wing of the revolution. A more serious result, illustrated by contemporary newspapers, was that the unrest among many Catholics was capitalized upon by several bishops in organizing resistance in the provinces against the whole religious policy of the National Assembly. Consequently, the Left became convinced of an aristocratic and clerical conspiracy. It was in this aggravated political and religious atmosphere that the debates on the new status of the French Church took place; debates which were to lead to an open break between Church and state.

The reform of the ecclesiastical organization appeared to the Constituent Assembly as a natural consequence of the general transformation of all institutions and of the radical change of the economic foundations of the French Church. The bishops would have preferred to leave the implementation of reform to a national council. There was the fear, however, that such a council, which would be composed almost exclusively of aristocrats, might become a tool of the reactionaries. Therefore the legal experts adopted the eighteenth-century principle that the Church stood within the state, and joined with numerous priests in accepting the difference in canon law between dogma and discipline. They, therefore, asserted that the Constituent Assembly had the right, as long as it did not touch doctrine, to reform ecclesiastical institutions along with all others. This was held to be doubly true as the state had agreed to pay the salaries of clergymen and thus needed to be able to control their number and recruitment. The idea of a Civil Constitution of the Clergy was born.

The formulation of this constitution was placed in the hands of the church committee of the National Assembly, whose composition had been changed in favor of the Gallican Jansenists in order to assure a majority. One accepted position was that a substantial reduction of the personnel of the Church was absolutely necessary, for reasons of economics as well as with respect to the principle of social utility which did not justify a preservation of cathedral or collegiate chapters and monasteries. In conflict with this aim was the desire to return as much as possible to the customs of the early Church. Antiquity was fashionable and all proponents of such a course were seduced by different principles. The philosophes dreamed of a return to a golden age of equality and brotherhood; the Gallicans were inveigled by the prospect of a Church independent from Rome; the Jansenists were motivated by the prospect of a life which adhered more closely to the Gospel; and the Richerists hoped to restore presbyterial collegiality.

After two months of sometimes heated debate,[13] the Constituent

---

[13] Parallel to the debates within the Constituent Assembly (see *Archives parlementaires* 1st Series, vols. XV–XVII) there were also heated polemical exchanges in the press, analyzed by J. Haak.

Assembly, on 12 July 1790, passed the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. It produced three substantive changes. First, dioceses were to be redivided and reduced to eighty-three and their boundaries were to be made the same as those of the Departments. This meant the disappearance of fifty-two dioceses and a strong reduction in the number of parishes. Secondly, bishops, priests, and vicars were to be paid salaries by the state with the condition of performing all religious services free of charge. Thirdly, there was to be election of bishops and priests by electoral colleges on the level of Department and districts, and the canonical investment of the bishops by the metropolitan without prior confirmation by the Pope. Bishops only were to be entitled to inform the Pope of their election. Allied with this regulation was to be a severe reduction of episcopal authority through a council of priests, which was to participate in the administration of the diocese.

In spite of their appearance, these decrees had no specifically revolutionary content. They were simply an inheritance of the past and belonged more to the Old Regime than to the new.[14] They owed very little to a philosophy of laicistic inspiration and instead were designed to underline the intimate connection of Church and state. In their essential part, the decrees were the expression of the Gallicanism of the eighteenth century; a Gallicanism which demanded not only the autonomy of the priests toward the bishops and the autonomy of the bishops toward the Pontiff; but also, primarily, the political Gallicanism of the jurists and parliamentarians, who, aside from dogma, regarded the state as having the responsibility for the whole field of ecclesiastical life. This last position was the cardinal error of the Constitution. Many ordinances of the decree were acceptable in themselves, especially if one looks at them from the perspective of Gallican ecclesiology rather than from the viewpoint of later concepts which gained validity after Vatican I. Some of the ordinances were excellent, regardless of such small details as the inclusion of a few non-Catholics among the electors for priests and bishops. But the Constitution raised the claim to have the right to make changes in the area of religion without the participation of the Church, and the error of this position was stated firmly by thirty dissenting bishops (not including Talleyrand and Gobel) who were still members of the Constituent Assembly.[15]

Even if one concedes that quite special circumstances justified the unilateral cancellation of the concordat of 1516, with respect to ecclesiastical legal considerations so closely concerning the life and the fundamental structures of the Church, spiritual authority should have been consulted. This point was made throughout the debate by almost all of the bishops, even those with the most opportunistic and conciliatory views.[16] Inasmuch as the Constituent Assembly rejected the idea of a national council, only the Pope would have been competent to play this role. The Assembly, however, refused to consult him and tacitly allowed the King and the bishops to act for it. On 1 August, Louis XVI ordered Cardinal de Bernis, the French ambassador in Rome, to obtain the agreement of Pius VI.

---

[14] Leflon, 59

[15] *Exposition des principes de la constitution civile,* published on 30 October 1790.

In Rome, even before the arrival of the first emigrants, who formed themselves into a powerful group and exerted strong antirevolutionary pressure, the reaction to the events of the summer of 1789 in France had been negative. Without focusing upon the depressing turn of events at Avignon, one discovers objections being raised to the abolition of the annates, the confiscation of Church property, and the destruction of the monasteries, as well as to the declaration of political and religious freedom which was seen as incompatible with the God-given social order. Although the enemies of the revolution tried to drive the Pope to a firm statement of objection, Pius VI, determined not to aggravate the position of Louis XVI, whom he trusted, decided to adopt a reserved attitude and to limit himself secretly to condemning the Rights of Man in an address to the consistory. He stuck to this cautious conduct even when he was asked to comment on the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. The Pope charged a special congregation of cardinals with an examination of the problem.[17] These cardinals, confused by the rapid changes which had taken place in France and concerned not to engage the Holy See carelessly, examined the truly complex issues in detail and came to decisions only with great caution. There were also very real problems of both a political and religious nature.

On the political level, a confrontation with the French Assembly was to be avoided so as not to cause the sudden annexation of the county of Avignon, whose inhabitants were demanding union with France. On the religious level, irritation of the sensitive Gallicans was to be avoided, as well as the temptation to dictate the conduct of the French episcopate which jealously guarded its prerogatives. The danger was exaggerated that a strong statement could drive the most powerful established Church into schism. Finally, the view prevailed everywhere that the revolution was a fever attack which would pass quickly, and that it was better to leave things alone and not compromise oneself. The result was an eight-month irreparable delay, during the course of which in an unforeseen way a concatenation of circumstances caused the very schism which it had been hoped would be avoided.

---

[16] With respect to the central problem the episcopate was indeed of divided opinion: while many bishops, and not only those who had emigrated toward the end of 1789, but also a portion of those who had remained in France, more or less clearly opposed the draft of the civil constitution, others thought it a suitable vehicle to improve the situation of the Church.

[17] For the appointment of this *Congrégation pour les affaires ecclésiastiques de France* see L. Pásztor in *AHPont* 6 (1968), 193.

The French bishops demanded to await the papal agreement and to put the constitution into effect only after its arrival. The death on 30 September of the bishop of Quimper forced the Constituent Assembly to a decision. It ordered the election of a successor according to the procedures laid down in the Constitution. Expilly, priest, delegate, and chairman of the religious committee, was designated by the electoral college of Finistere[18] to fill the vacancy. This action signaled the intention systematically to ignore the Pope and to introduce without delay innovations which would make clergymen who were in no way allied with the aristocratic opposition into enemies. Such action reinforced the fermentation which had begun to spread throughout the countryside and which aimed against other directives of the National Assembly. In such areas as Alsace and the south of France, agitation against the sale of Church lands intensified. Notified by the local authorities, the National Assembly determined to have its way and, with the decrees of 27 November and 26 December 1790, demanded from all clergymen in a public function, i.e., from all bishops, priests, and vicars, the same oath as from all other civil servants. Clergymen were to swear to be loyal to state, to the laws, and to the King and to protect the constitution with all of their power. The oath included agreement to the new regulations of ecclesiastical affairs which were embodied in the constitution. Refusal to swear the oath was tantamount to resignation from office, and agitators were to be tried in court.

The Two Churches: Constituent and Refractory Priests

Much to the surprise of everyone, two thirds of the clerical representatives and all but seven bishops, four of whom were already discredited because of their unbelief or their scandalous lives, refused to take the oath. Almost half of the parish clergy refused as well. In some areas in the north and in Alsace, between 80 to 90 percent of the lower clergy refused to swear the oath. In other areas between 60 and 70 percent also refused. Even though in Paris and its environs and in the southeast of France a large, and sometimes very large, majority took the oath,[19] it frequently was with reservations which the local authorities silently accepted. Moreover, recantations followed soon afterward. The National Assembly refused to rescind its decisions in spite of the disappointing vote. Although it was driven by its old longing for political unity based on religion and by an increasing desire to extirpate any and all opposition, it removed the refractory priests from their offices and substituted for them priests who had taken the oath. In the beginning this was fairly easy to do in many dioceses with respect to the parish clergy, as the government was able to employ former monks, many of whom, at least for the time being, were willing to take the oath.[20]

---

[18] See *DHGE* XVI, 257–61.

The situation was different wherever massive refusals occurred. In spite of the reduction of the number of parishes, an action which was highly resented by the rural population, hundreds of positions needed to be filled and the number of applicants was small in spite of the decree of 7 January 1791 which eased the conditions for taking over a parish. Consequently, some refractory priests had to be left in office for a time. The reconstruction of the dioceses posed other problems as well, because there were virtually no metropolitans who could ordain new bishops. The Constituent Assembly, on 15 November 1790, ordered that the newly elected clergy were to address themselves to the departmental authorities, who would nominate French bishops who would ordain them. But six of the seven prelates who had taken the oath refused to perform this function. Finally Talleyrand, who according to Pioro's findings[21] played a much more significant role in the reordering of the dioceses than had been known, agreed to ordain two bishops. During the subsequent two months, Gobel, who had meanwhile advanced to the position of archbishop of Paris, ordained another twenty-six bishops.

---

[19] These are rather approximate numbers, for the statistical examination by Ph. Sagnacs in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 8 (1906–07), 97–115, as well as other monographs which later attempted to add to it, was rendered questionable by the neglect of methodological prerequisites to which B. Plongeron drew attention in a basic article in *AHRF* 39 (1967), 145–98, continued in *Conscience religieuse en Révolution,* 17–100.

[20] Here also, with respect to motivation, the too simplistic judgments of earlier historians must be differentiated. See above all B. Plongeron, *Les réguliers de Paris devant le serment constitutionnel. Sens et conséquences d'une option* (Paris 1964), to be augmented by his articles in *Notre vie eudiste* 9 (1962), 68–80 and *Oratoriana* 4 (1964), 34–65. Because of the representative situation of Paris toward the rest of the country, Plongeron comes to the conclusion that the number of members of orders taking the oath was, contrary to widespread opinion, rather small and that in many cases they were men whose religious values and whose honesty could not be doubted.

[21] "Institution canonique et consécration des premiers évêques constitutionnels" in *AHRF* 28 (1956), 346–80.

The Pope was compelled to react. On 10 March 1791, in his Brief *Quot aliquantum,*[22] he condemned the Civil Constitution of the Clergy because it had mortally wounded the divine constitution of the Church with its canonical investment of bishops, the election of priests, and the creation of episcopal councils. In the following Brief *Caritas,* he declared the ordinations of the new bishops sacrilegious, prohibited them from performing their offices, and threatened with suspension all priests who refused to recant their oaths. On the same occasion, the Pope strongly condemned the declaration of the Rights of Man as contradictory to Catholic doctrine regarding the origin of the authority of the state, freedom of religion, and social inequality.

The Constituent Assembly was disappointed and fought back by expanding the required oath to still other groups of clergymen. While on the one hand the Constituent bishops denied the authenticity of the papal briefs and relied on the Gallican liberties to assert that the Pope had no authority to punish the French Church, during the summer other priests, who had honestly believed that they were permitted to take the oath, began to recant in substantial numbers. The Church, which eighteen months earlier had been so united, was now deeply cleft, and the rift increased for religious, social, cultural, and political reasons. The controversy between the two ecclesiologies, which disagreed about the rights of the Pope and of the state to intervene in the affairs of the Church, was complicated further by a far-reaching difference of opinion that the rights of man could be deduced from the Christian principle that Christianity is a religion of freedom and fraternity, and that the revolution would bring about a Christian renewal. One of the most representative defenders of this group was Henri Grégoire, priest and representative in the Constituent Assembly, who at the beginning of 1791 was elected as Constituent bishop of Blois.[23] Another part of the Church was convinced that the principle of equality necessarily had to lead to the republicanization of the Church and that the principle of liberty left the common man no opportunity to defend himself against religious error. For these clerics, the political and social principles of the Old Regime constituted the necessary prerequisites for the defense of Catholicism. For this reason, any other social philosophy which might have been able to reconcile the Catholic faith with the democratic movement was ruled out. Opposition to the Assembly grew more fierce also because the dissatisfaction of many of the faithful, who were encouraged by the priests loyal to Rome to reject the priests not recognized by Rome, was exploited by the royalist forces for the benefit of their counterrevolutionary plans. This situation led quickly to the simplistic identification of the clergy loyal to Rome with the reactionary aristocrats and salved the consciences of all those who were newly congregated to the Constituent church.

---

[22] A. Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France 1790–1800* I (1857), 32–71. On the papal brief of 13 April 1791, ibid. I, 75–88.

[23] On Henri Grégoire, whose actions and concepts for a long time were portrayed in a rather partisan light, and who has not yet received the exhaustive treatment he deserves, see J. Tild, *L'abbé Grégoire* (Paris 1946); L. Pouget, *Les idées religieuses et réformatrices de Grégoire* (Paris 1905); N. Ravitch in *CH* 36 (1967), 419–39; chiefly "L'abbé Grégoire" in *Europe* 34 (Paris 1956) no. 128–129.

For a long time, traditional Catholic historiography harshly condemned the Constituent clergy. Today it has become clearer that it was not merely a ragbag of renegades and apostates, but that there belonged to it many respectable priests and important personages. Without a doubt, the vacancies in many dioceses were filled with hasty ordinations and through the employment of questionable people. But many Constituent bishops and priests were irreproachable and hard-working clergymen who proved themselves in the hour of danger. Also it should not be overlooked that the reasons which made them take the oath were complex and occasionally very honorable. Many of these clerics wished to underscore their break with an ecclesiastical organization from which the revolution had freed them or, if they were aged, to avoid having to lead a life of difficulty. Others took the oath because an educated and pious adviser had assured them that it was all right to do so; because their ecclesiastical principles allowed them to judge the civil constitution less harshly; or because they were convinced that the oath was a necessary evil if they were to be able to serve the Church better and not abandon their flocks. Many also did not view their election by political corporations as evil. They regarded election as totally and doctrinally justified in the name of an ecclesiology and a political theory which was condemned wholesale by the ultramontanes and counterrevolutionaries of the nineteenth century, but whose significance and validity are again acknowledged today.[24]

Both hostile parties were convinced of the rightness of their positions and fought one another with the passion commonly associated with religious controversies. If, for religious reasons, most of the former bishops preferred to vacate their sees in favor of their Constituent competitors and to join the emigrants outside of France, the same was not true of all parish clergy. Frequently the non-juring priests stayed, celebrated the Mass, and contested the church-building with the new priest. This created confusion for the faithful, many of whom, especially in the rural areas, did not comprehend the jurisdictional struggles. In many areas the only important matter was that somehow the parish be administered, and it did not matter whether the priest had taken the loyalty oath or not, as the parishioners could not understand why an oath of a political nature should make a priest a schismatic. However, the liberality of the Constituent priests, some of whom even demanded the right to marry, together with the accusations of the non-juring priests, led many of the faithful to doubt the validity of the sacraments dispensed to them. Conflict broke out between priest and parishioners, with the faithful demanding to have "good" priests again. In the cities, where the issues were better understood, the competition between the two Churches was particularly sharp. The Constituents attempted at first to end the controversies through radical measures. Soon they were forced into the realization that it was impossible to impose the Constituent Church on the whole country. A limited legalization of the nonconformist religion was attempted, according to which the non-juring priests would be entitled to celebrate the Mass in a parish church, but could not preach, baptize, or perform weddings. This attempt satisfied neither the Constituent nor the refractory priests, as both parties were intent on seeing their Church recognized as the established one. Under pressure from the political clubs, which fell prey to the error of marking the non-jurors as enemies of the revolution, the authorities were finally forced into administrative persecutions.

---

[24] See the chapter on the two contrasting ecclesiologies in B. Plongeron, *Conscience religieuse*, 179–290.

Persecutions and Dechristianization

The Legislative Assembly which followed the Constituent Assembly on 1 October 1791 was composed of people who were farther to the left both politically and religiously. Their major faction and driving force, the Girondists, were members of the bourgeoisie who, completely absorbed by the contemporary philosophy, had dissociated themselves from the Church and were occasionally irreligious. The Girondists considered the pangs of conscience of the refractory priests as irrelevant. The Constituent Assembly had recognized that the religious unrest which spread in many areas of France, chiefly in the West, was a warning sign which threatened national unity. Shortly before the end of its mandate, the Constituent Assembly had attempted a defusion of the issues by ordering a general amnesty. The Legislative Assembly, however, under pressure from the press and the political clubs in the larger cities which continued to characterize the non-jurors as bad citizens and agents of the counterrevolution, made a complete turnabout. In spite of protests from many representatives, who on the basis of the Rights of Man demanded freedom of conscience, it began to persecute its opponents. A decree of 29 November 1791 ordered that clergymen, regardless of whether they ministered to parishes or not, who did not take the oath within eight days would be regarded as rebelling against the law and as having evil intentions against the country. These clergymen would lose their pensions and would be removed from their residences. The veto which Louis XVI cast against the measure, as well as against the measures taken against the emigrants, compromised the priests loyal to Rome by lumping together their religious cause with the political reaction of the aristocrats. Under pressure from a campaign directed by the Jacobin Club and implemented on the local level, the civil authorities immediately began to jail clergy who refused to comply with the November decree.

In May 1792, France went to war with Austria and Prussia. When the Pope subsequently appointed Abbé Maury, who was known for his antirevolutionary stance, as legate to the Emperor in Germany, his action was seen as a direct challenge to the Legislative Assembly. The result was that clergymen who had refused to swear the oath because of their loyalty to the Pope now began to be regarded not merely as accomplices of the reactionaries but also as a "fifth column" prepared to assist the invaders. The "second revolution" on 10 August 1792, and the seizure of power by the radicals hastened the process. The congregations in the service of education and charity, which in the decree of 1790 had been spared for being "useful," were dissolved; the remaining monasteries were closed; the property of church administrations was sold; the wearing of clerical garb was prohibited; processions in Paris were forbidden; and, after the deposition of the King, when all earlier oaths had become invalid, a new oath, the so-called Liberty-Equality Oath, was instituted. The oath was visibly without religious significance, and as such explains why Jacques-André Émery, a highly respected theologian and general superior of the Congregation of Saint-Sulpice, declared it as permissible. However, the oath posed a problem of conscience for those who asked themselves whether it was possible to preserve liberty and equality after the Pope had condemned the Rights of Man.[25] On 26 August the deportation of all priests loyal to Rome was ordered. This action was followed a few days later by the September

---

[25] Bibliography on this oath, about which Pius VI in spite of contrary claims by the Roman college of cardinals and most of the migrated bishops made no official statement, see Leflon 86 and 99, note 3.

Massacres of 300 clergymen and three bishops who had been jailed in Paris prisons.[26]

In the following months, more than thirty thousand clergymen fled the country. During the first few months of the revolution the upper clergy had emigrated voluntarily. Now, the lower clergy were being exiled by legal means.[27] On 7 July 1793 two additional decrees of the National Assembly further aggravated the situation. These decrees provided for the death penalty within twenty-four hours for all priests who had not obeyed the decree of 26 August and left France, and the deportation to Guyana of all non-officiating priests who had refused to take the Liberty-Equality Oath. In spite of this, several thousand priests endangered their lives by remaining in France and going into hiding in order to continue to dispense the sacraments to their flocks.

By the end of 1792, the situation was desperate for the clerics who had remained loyal to Rome. In spite of their courage and inventiveness. the support which they enjoyed from many of their flocks, and even the tacit help of authorities in some areas,[28] they were under persecution and bereft of all structural support. The Constituent Church, which had succeeded in taking hold in most of France and which occasionally had gloated over the measures taken against its rivals, soon found itself in the same unenviable situation. At first, Constituent clergy had to suffer the step-by-step deprivation of their official status. On 20 September 1792 the Assembly removed the keeping of civil registries from the Church and transferred it to the civil authorities. Thus began the process of separating Church and state. Then legal permission for divorces and priests to marry was decreed, and the

---

[26] The works of P. Caron, *Les massacres de septembre* (Paris 1935) and J. Hérissay, *Les journées de septembre* (Paris 1946) receive required differentiation by B. Plongeron, *Conscience religieuse*, 36–74, who shows that the motives for this massacre, which was occasioned by the excitement of the mob upon hearing of the approach of Prussian troops, were essentially political in nature.

[27] With respect to the emigrated or deported clergymen, consult the copious bibliographies in G. Bourgin, *La France et Rome* XIII, note 6 and Leflon, 88. They can be augmented by T. de Raemy, *L'émigration française dans le canton de Fribourg* (Fribourg 1935); R. Picheloup, *Les ecclésiastiques français émigrés dans l'État pontifical* (Diss. Tulouse 1968); L. Sierra, "La inmigración del clero francés en España" in *Hispania* 28 (1968), 393–422. These works are confined almost exclusively to statistics and methodology and concern themselves very little with the mentality and activities of the immigrants.

[28] The reasons for this support were complex. Sometimes the motive was a superficial but genuine Catholic conviction; occasionally also the devotion to tradition, or the pleasure of outwitting the bureaucrats, or the social antagonism which pitted the peasants against the revolutionary bourgeoisie who was buying up property.

Constituent Church found itself undermined and confronting the same stricture of conscience as the non-jurors of 1791. Torn between compliance with the law and adherence to its theological principles, the Constituent Church split into two camps. Much to the great consternation of their confreres for whom the intervention of the state in ecclesiastical matters had gone much too far, a number of priests and a few bishops pushed revolutionary logic so far as to marry. The second camp of the Constituent Church sincerely deplored the political development which had led from a limited monarchy to a republic. In numerous locations, the Constituent clergy supported the federalist movement which by July 1793 agitated about sixty Departments and thereby made the Constituent Church as suspect to the revolutionaries as the non-jurors. Now the Constituent Church also began to be called an enemy of the people. The enormous wave of dechristianization which swept over the country between the summer of 1793 and the summer of 1794 completed the ruin of the Constituent Church and drove it underground.

Of course, the role of dechristianization[29] in the history of the Church during the revolution should not be exaggerated. It must be noted that the impulse for the dechristianization came from the Departments and not from Paris, and also that its extent differed markedly from region to region.[30] The area between the Saône and Loire was most affected, and more so within the villages than the cities. Above all, it must be understood that the concept of dechristianization was totally alien to the eighteenth century and would more correctly be interpreted as anticlericalism or secularization. Except in those areas where this phenomenon had developed since the middle of the century, there was actually little genuine effect. Often, what was seen in the course of the revolutionary changes was a more or less vehement reaction against the excessive interference of the Church in the everyday life of the population. This effect was aggravated by the fact that the entire Church, Constituent as well as Roman, was regarded as a social class politically hostile to the Jacobin ideology.

---

[29] A good summary of the theories about dechristianization from Aulard on can be found in Leflon, 104–06. The problem has been raised anew by B. Plongeron in *AHRF* 40 (1968), 145–205 and his *Conscience religieuse en Révolution,* 101–77. He provides more room for sociological aspects and an analysis of the various attitudes.

[30] A. Soboul, *Les sans-culottes parisiens de l'an II* (Paris 1958), 290–91; R. Cobb, *Les armées révolutionaires, instument de la Terreur dans les départements*, 2 vols. (Paris 1961–63). This work provides numerous precise details about the antireligious action of these political police organizations that were used to fight domestic opposition and a very useful calendar, but several interpretations have been questioned. See among others J. Godechot in *RH* 232 (1964), 502 and chiefly B. Plongeron in *AHRF* 40 (1968), 145–205. Concerning the special case of the southeast, see M. Vovelle in *Annales du Midi* 76 (1964), 529–42.

Although it is known now that the National Convention and the majority of the Committee of Public Safety were opposed to exaggerated hostility toward religion, extremists such as Hébert succeeded in pushing through a number of radical measures designed to extirpate any and all of the country's memories of the Christian legacy. The old calendar was replaced by a republican calendar; Sundays were eliminated in favor of the tenth day of the three decades into which each month was divided; purely secular feast days were organized; and a revolutionary cult of the Goddess of Reason was introduced, although its ridiculousness was soon recognized and countered by Robespierre's own spiritualistic cult of the Supreme Being. For several months, however, the observance of Catholic ritual and even that of the Protestants and Jews as well was radically disturbed. The persecution of suspected clergymen was stepped up and pressure was exerted to effect the apostasy of priests, although the extent of this phenomenon has more nuances than has been acknowledged so far in traditional historiography.[31] Most of the churches were closed or torn down, and their liturgical equipment was looted.[32] When the faithful attempted to organize services away from the churches, these also were forbidden under the pretext that they were only a cover for counterrevolutionary intrigues. Even the lodges of the Freemasons were not spared, an act which confirms the predominant political motivation of the measures. It should be noted, however, that radicalism was implemented with little overall planning and frequently was of temporary duration. Its effect was minimized wherever the faith was still strong, ecclesiastics could organize effective resistance,[33] and in areas where religious conformism was shaken by the excesses of the reign of terror and genuine revivals were taking place.[34] However, enormous dislocations, whose traces were visible for a long time, occurred in those areas which had been undermined by skepticism or, as was the case around Paris and Vendée, had experienced the systematic extremism of nearby large urban areas.

---

[31] On 17 November 1793, the Sansculottes forced the Parisian archbishop Gobel and his vicars general to do so. Such renunciations were particularly frequent among the Constituent clergy, but it must be remembered that by this time the refractory priests in the great majority had left France. The topic was reexamined in a regional context under the direction of M. Reinhard and collected under the title *Les prêtres abdicataires pendant la Révolution française* (Paris 1965). They confirm the regional differences of the phenomenon and underscore its complexity. The resignations were sometimes the manifestation of militant apostasy, sometimes the result of a collective panic, occasionally also a meaningless formality which did not prevent the continued celebration of the Mass.

[32] See S. J. Idzerda, "Iconoclasm during the French Revolution" in *AHR* 60 (1954), 13–26. On the attempts to save the artistic and literary heritage of the ecclesiastical institutions see P. Riberette, *Les bibliothèques françaises pendant la révolution* (Paris 1970).

[33] There is no dearth of stories about the vitality of religion during these dark years. But information is not nearly so rich about the clandestine administration of dioceses during this period. For example, see J. -B. Lechat in *Annales de Normandie* 17 (1957), 263–79.

The Separation of Church and State

Confronted by the growing dissatisfaction of the population, the National Convention was forced to reverse its course. At first it attempted to stop the attempts to finish off Catholicism. When this met with qualified success, the Convention moved in the direction of separation of Church and state, a move more motivated by the pressure of events than by philosophical preference. In April 1794, the payment of salaries to the Constituent priests was stopped, and on 18 September the budget item for public religious exercises was officially removed. At the same time, the spirit of toleration made progress in spite of the hostility toward the Church of the Thermidoreans. In the course of negotiations with Spain and Tuscany, the French government agreed to treat Catholicism considerately, and in France itself freedom of religion was demanded both by Grégoire, who called for it in the name of the Constituent Church, and by the rebels in the Vendée, who made permission for religious freedom a nonnegotiable issue for the restoration of order. Religious freedom was granted by the decree of 21 February 1795, although with some important reservations. Catholics, for example, were prohibited from using churches. However, the fall of Robespierre was erroneously interpreted in many of the provinces as the end of the system of oppression, and many churches reopened spontaneously and many priests, Constituent as well as Roman, resumed their priestly functions.[35] The Convention had no choice but to accept these changes as accomplished facts, and a new decree of 30 May 1795 liberalized the previous one. The Convention demanded from the priests in return for this concession a declaration that they would submit to the laws of the republic and be obedient to it. In theory, the Roman priests as well as the Constituent ones were entitled to make this declaration.

---

[34] For an example see B. Plongeron, "Autopsie d'une Église constitutionelle, l'Indre-et-Loire de 1793 à 1802" in *Actes du 93ᵉCongrès des Sociétés savantes* II (Paris 1971), 134–90.

[35] Numerous examples are listed by E. Soreau, "La résurrection religieuse après la Terreur" in *Revue des études historiques* 100 (1933), 557–74 and by L. Mirot, ibid. 101 (1934), 193–206.

The Church, however, was split over the permissibility of the oath. Some, such as Jacques-André Émery, were of the opinion that this oath had a purely political meaning, while others regarded it as a global submission to legislation, totally in opposition to the principles of the Church. Dissension increased with regard to the reconciliation of Constituent priests, priests who had resigned from their offices, and repentant married priests. Some churchmen, led by Émery and the eleven bishops who had remained in France, were in favor of leniency, which they felt was justified by the extraordinary circumstances; while others, on the advice of the emigrated bishops, demanded humiliating recantations and long atonements.[36] An additional confrontation arose between the followers of the Jesuits and the Jansenists over the question of what attitude should be taken toward the faithful. Here it was a conflict between the active priests, who were of the opinion that the salvation of souls could compensate for many arrangements with regard to doctrinal strictness, and the purists, who placed purity even above evangelization.[37]

These controversies made the restoration of the Catholic religion immensely more difficult. In many cases extraordinarily confused situations arose because most of the legitimate bishops remained outside of France. However, until 1797, the reorganization of the Church was largely successful, and many emigrated priests returned, even though it was difficult for them to adapt to radically altered conditions.

Paralleling these attempts, the Constituent Church, which now presented itself as the Gallican Church, also tried to attain a renewal. The driving force behind this rejuvenation was Grégoire, who cooperated with such deeply religious and intelligent men as Le Cox and joined in the Committee of Reunited Bishops which expressed episcopal collegiality and was totally opposed to religious democracy. In August 1797, they succeeded in bringing about a National Council, the ground for which had been prepared by consulting the diocesan presbyteries.[38] More interested in giving preference to quality than quantity and in planting in France a Church true to Catholic tradition, these men jointly worked out a rechristianization program which was directed less exclusively toward a return to the past than the program which eventually received Rome's concurrence. The program had the merit of making allowances for the psychological and structural shifts and for the universal longing and changes in mentality which were the constant preoccupation of the priests who had remained in France.[39] This attempted reform met with many obstacles. Foremost was a shortage of qualified people, because both episcopate and Church had been decimated by resignations, marriages, deaths, and still increasing recantations. Added to these problems were the internal struggles between episcopalists and presbyterians, and between adherents and opponents of the use of the native language in worship.[40]

---

[36] On the "Parisian method" see P. Pisani, *L'Église de Paris et la Révolution IV,* ch. 3; on the "Lyon method", Ch. Ledré, *Le culte caché sous la Révolution. Les missions de l'abbé Linsolas* (Paris 1949). It is to be noted that under the influence of Jansenistic rigorism the Constituent Church often acted even more harshly against the abdicators and the married priests.

[37] J. R. Suratteau, *Le département du Mont-Terrible sous le régime du Directoire* (Paris 1965), 250.

[38] J. Leflon, "La reconstitution de l'épiscopat constitutionnel après Thermidor" in *Actes du 81^e Congrès National des Sociétés savantes* (Paris 1956), 475–81. On the council of 1797 see also the correspondence between Grégoire, Dufraisse, and Ricci, published by M. Vaussard.

At the beginning of the Directory, Catholics of both persuasions enjoyed relative freedom. They were permitted to distribute their own publications; the *Annales de la religion* by the Constituents, and the *Annales religieuses, politiques et littéraires* by the Romans. At the end of the summer of 1797, however, the political crisis which led to the coup d'état of 18 Fructidor again endangered the precarious improvement of the preceding two years. Not without reason, the Directory accused the Catholic clergy of continuing to support the royalist opposition and decided to return to a sharply anticlerical policy. One of the Directors, La Révellière, wanted to fashion a new revolutionary religion out of the "Theophilanthropy" which was being promoted by the end of 1796. La Révellière attempted to make it into an official religion, an attempt which was countered by Merlin de Douai. The supporters of this government-protected sect occupied many of the churches, especially in the cities; yet at no time were they a realistic danger to the old religion.

Much more important were the measures taken against the priests. The decrees of 1792 and 1793, which had exiled the Roman priests from France, were activated again. All priests were required to swear a new oath of "royal hatred." A number of bishops and casuists considered it acceptable, while all of the emigrated bishops and many theologians declared publicly that it was insupportable, especially for a priest, to make God witness to a vow of hatred. The Roman congregation for French affairs reached the same conclusion, but Pius VI again declined to publicize this decision officially. A strong minority of the priests swore the oath in the conviction that its formulation made it the lesser of two evils and that to take it would be better than to leave their flocks again without worship or religious instruction. Many priests refused to take this oath, however, and became subject to legal punishments which, while no longer as bloody as during the reign of terror, were of a more calculated cruelty. These priests were either incarcerated in prison ships or deported to Guyana. The number of victims of this renewed persecution was smaller than during 1792 and 1793, however, because there were fewer priests and the execution of the decrees fluctuated widely from Department to Department. In some areas the law remained a dead letter due to the cooperation of the population and occasionally even that of the local authorities. The other extreme could be found in the Department of Yonne where not a single church remained open and in Sarthe where a quarter of the Roman priests were arrested even though the population remained loyal to the old religion.[41]

---

[39] B. Plongeron, *Dom Grappin correspondant de l'abbé Grégoire* (Paris 1969), 4.

[40] See M. D. Forstier in *MD* 1 (1945), 74–93.

Certain positive facets of this situation must not be overlooked, regardless of how grim the final period of the Directory may have been. Many of the faithful, who earlier had practiced a largely passive conformism, now became aware of their responsibility to the Church. In areas where there were no longer any priests, prayer meetings were organized, children were given religious instruction, and Mass was celebrated. Former nuns took advantage of the article of the Constitution of the Year III which permitted private instruction and formed new groups,[42] thus preparing during this chaotic time for the resumption of monastic life. In the rural areas, especially in the north and the west, many priests, disturbed by the growing religious ignorance of children and the neglect of the sick, encouraged pious young girls to devote themselves to these duties, thereby planting the seed for the future congregations so typical of the nineteenth century. Another indication of the surviving vitality of the French Church during these harsh times were the Daughters of the Heart of Mary, whose congregation was founded in 1791 in the search for a modern form of life devoted to God and adjusted to the new conditions.[43] By 1799 there were 267

---

[41] V. Pierre, *La déportation ecclésiastique sous le Directoire* (Paris 1895). An insufficient number of monographs have been written on the regions of France under the Directory, but see R. Daniel in *Bulletin de la société archéologique du Finistère* 92 (1966), 212–53.

[42] A number of examples for Paris are recounted by J. Boussoulade, *Moniales et hospitalières dans la tourmente révolutionnaire* (Paris 1962), 179–216. Characteristic is the subtitle "Épreuves et renouveau"—"Visitation and renewal."

[43] See A. Rayez, *Ad. de Cicé et P. de Clorivière* (Paris 1966).

Daughters of the Heart of Mary in ten dioceses from Brittany to the Jura. The members of this new congregation wore no external sign, retained their occupations, and continued to live with their families.[44]

Effects in Neighboring Countries

By the end of 1792, the French Republic was bent on conquest. In November 1792, it annexed Savoy and shortly afterwards Nice, both belonging to the Kingdom of Sardinia, and in March 1793, the region of Pruntrut in the Jura, from which the Department of Mont-Terrible was formed. Belgium, at that time comprised of the Austrian Netherlands and the Ecclesiastical Principality of Liège, was first occupied in the winter of 1792–93, reoccupied after the victory of Fleurus in June 1794, and annexed on 1 October 1795. The left bank of the Rhine, which had been occupied temporarily in the fall of 1792, was again occupied in the summer of 1794. French institutions were introduced, but the Rhine territory was not officially incorporated into France until the time of Napoleon. The Greek islands won from Venice were annexed in October 1797, and French authorities were brought in contact with the Orthodox Church.[45] Geneva became a French Department in April 1798, and Piedmont was annexed in February 1799. With the aid of the army of the Directory six satellite republics were created on the borders of France, whose institutions corresponded to those of the *Grande Nation.* These were the Batavian Republic (1795), the Cisalpine Republic and the Ligurian Republic (1797), the Roman Republic and the Helvetic Republic (1798), and the Parthenopean Republic (1799). Together with the principles of 1789 and the institutions which embodied them, France also exported its religious policy to these countries, aided by the French army. The army was not interested in providing those populations which clung firmly to their belief[46] with additional reasons for resistance. It was eager to prevent brutal conduct and local traditions survived best in the religious sphere.

---

[44] Religious freedom was in effect not only for the two rival Catholic Churches, but also for Protestants and Jews who, especially after 1796, were able to reorganize their communities without in any way having to suffer from the revival of anticlericalism after Fructidor.

[45] E. Rodocanachi, *Bonaparte et les Îles Ioniennes* (Paris 1899). The commissioner of the Directory attempted to introduce equality for the Orthodox, the Jewish, and the Roman religion. This irritated the majority of the population which, consequently, warmly received the Russian troops in 1799.

[46] Indeed, the difficulties which the French conqueror encountered were only secondarily the result of religious factors. At least this is one of the conclusions of the colloquium *Occupants, occupés, 1792–1815* (Brussels 1969) which J. R. Suratteau summarizes as follows: "It was known already that the importance of this factor was of lesser weight in Belgium. The religious motivations in Switzerland as well as in Spain were smaller than has often been said, and weak in the Rhineland and in Switzerland. In any case they evidently belong into a socio-religious context," *RH* 240 (1968), 257.

Belgium was a country strongly rooted in the Catholic religion. Its reaction to the reform attempts of Joseph II had proven clearly how ultramontane it was. Therefore, the occupation troops at first were considerate of the "prejudices" of the population. The Convention ordered the confiscation of Church property, but delayed its sale for months. Only in the summer of 1796 did the Directory dare to transfer civil registers to the authorities of the state and to close the monasteries. Even then, the orders devoted to education and the care of the sick were not touched. But the openly demonstrated anticlericalism of officers and officials, especially that of the Belgian Jacobins, led to the arrest of priests and monks on the local level, about thirty of whom were executed. The Cult of Reason destroyed monasteries and profaned churches. Aside from the short and bloody persecution of the summer of 1794, however, the exercise of religion was little affected until 1797. This enabled the vicars general, who remained in communication with the bishops who had left the country, to administer the dioceses in a more or less regular fashion. Interestingly, the officials of the Departments and communities showed no hurry to force the priests to take the oath of submission to the laws of the republic.

The Belgian Church rejected the oath much more completely than in France, even though several vicars general considered it permissible. Conditions worsened with the arrival of Fructidor. The congregations which had been spared so far were dispersed, the University of Louvain and the seminaries were closed, the wearing of clerical garb was prohibited, and each priest was obligated to take the oath of hate against royalty as a precondition for conducting religious ceremonies. Led by Cardinal von Franckenberg, who was jailed and then deported to Germany, the majority of the clergy, except in the Department of Ourthe, refused to take the oath. Shortly thereafter the priests were unjustly made responsible for the peasant revolts in Kempenland and the Ardennes,[47] and the government ordered all non-jurors to be deported. Of more than eight thousand priests thus affected, only about 10 percent actually were arrested, however, because the almost unanimous help of the population enabled them to hide themselves and to exercise their pastoral tasks in secrecy. These three years of secret religious exercises indeed did give the coup de grâce to such old forms of piety as confraternities, but, at the same time, they were the foundation for the new more individualistic forms of piety which later were to become characteristic of the piety of the nineteenth century.[48]

---

[47] See T. Vandebeeck-J. Grauwels, *De boerenkrijg in het departement van de Nedermaas* (Hasselt 1961) and G. Trausch, *La répression des soulèvements paysans dans le département des Forêts* (Hasselt-Luxembourg 1967).

In the Rhineland, the French occupation brought about the disappearance of the ecclesiastical principalities, but did not affect the structure of the Church. Initially the troops, who did not molest the Protestants, adopted a hostile stance toward the Catholic clergy because of its resistance to the propaganda for unification with France. But Hoche, who at the beginning of 1797 became commander of the Army of the Rhine, introduced a much more moderate religious policy. He saw a great similarity between the conditions in the Vendée, where he had recently restored order, and those of the Rhineland, where the population strongly clung to its traditional religion. Hoche granted favorable treatment to the lower clergy and allowed the orders to continue, and his successor continued Hoche's policy after his death. No restrictions were placed on the continued exercise of religion within the churches, and clergymen continued to receive their salaries from the sequestered Church lands. But the bishops who had emigrated to the right bank of the Rhine incited the priests and monks against the French, which resulted in a stiffer attitude toward the monasteries in particular, even though they were not closed. As in Belgium, the Rhineland population also helped those priests to go underground who had run into difficulties with the occupation forces. The local authorities also frequently sabotaged the measures against the Church.

In the former United Netherlands, in contrast to Belgium and the Rhineland, Protestantism was the privileged religion, and Catholics, who constituted approximately 40 percent of the population, were oppressed by the ruling oligarchy. Therefore, they generally acclaimed the French revolutionaries as liberators, much to the dismay of Nuncio Brancadoro, who headed the Dutch mission. Only the southern provinces, which initially had witnessed the hostility of the French troops toward the Belgian Church, remained rather reserved. The majority of the Catholic clergy, on the other hand, under the leadership of a group of Amsterdam priests supported the Patriot Party, which early in 1795 overthrew the Old Regime with the aid of the French. The constitution of the new Batavian Republic granted Catholics full civil rights and complete freedom of religion, and most of the priests at once took the oath of "eternal hate" against the Old Regime.

The time of the Batavian Republic was for the Catholics in the United Netherlands a period of emancipation and progress, without dissonances and persecutions. Within a few years, scores of new churches were opened and were staffed without difficulty due to the number of Flemish and Rhenish priests who had gone into exile. Inasmuch as the University of Louvain had been closed by the French, three seminaries were opened in the Batavian Republic in 1799. Beyond this, a few Catholic notables and a number of priests drew the logical consequence from the new liberal regime which resulted from the separation of Church and state. Because they no longer wished to have Italians, who were unfamiliar with the country, at the head of the Church, they raised the question of the restoration of the episcopal hierarchy.[49] But the Holy See, for which the period of the Directory was a period of increasing hardship, was not in any condition to deal with this problem.

---

[48] See L. Preneel in *Sources Hist. rel. Belg.,* 7–36 and J. Grauwels, *Het Oude land van Loon* 13 (1958), 177–246.

In Switzerland, as well, the Catholics were less numerous than the Protestants. Until the end of the eighteenth century they had been grouped in homogeneous masses in the nearly sovereign cantons. On the basis of the constitution of the Helvetic Republic created in 1798,[50] they suddenly found themselves as a minority in a Protestant state, a circumstance which led to great discontent and to armed revolts in Wallis and the small original cantons.[51] While the constitution granted freedom of religion and conscience, it contained some limitations directed at the Catholics and their relationship to the papacy. With respect to the practical implementation of these ordinances, the Roman Church suffered additional limitations. The Helvetic government prohibited those bishops who resided outside of Switzerland, and this was true in most cases, from exercising their jurisdiction in Switzerland. The right to assign benefices, the tithe, and the separate judicial system of canon law were abolished. Although not all orders were dissolved, they were forbidden to recruit novices, their lands were sequestered, and some monasteries were closed immediately. In contrast to Holland, Jews were not granted legal equality. Thus the religious policy of the Helvetic Republic differed fundamentally from the truly liberal religious policy of the Batavian Republic.

In Italy, the religious policy had a much more conservative character.

---

[49] Rogier, *KathHerleving* 10–11.

[50] It should be remembered that at the same time the old republic of Geneva was incorporated into France in the same way in which this had been done in March 1793 with the ephemeral Rauracic Republic, which in the preceeding year had been formed with the old bishopric of Basel. In this area the revolutionary laws against the Catholic clergy were applied as in the rest of France and most of the priests fled to the Catholic cantons which remained independent until 1798; guided by a vicar from Solothurn they could easily return and exercise their offices. Some of them preferred, however, to await the end of visitation in safety. See J. R. Suratteau in *Mémoires pour l'histoire du droit et des institutions des anciens pays bourguignons, comtois et romands* 24 (1963), 167–88.

[51] See J. R. Suratteau, *Occupants, occupés 1792–1815* (Brussels 1969), 165–220.

The understanding with the French occupation forces was facilitated by the fact that numerous Italian priests and officials, who earlier had been won to Josephinist policies, were inclined to regard positively any reform measures directed against ultramontane practices. At the same time, the leaders of the French military and many Italian patriots who wanted to introduce a republican form of government strove not to alienate the broad mass of the people, which was strongly Catholic. Bonaparte, the commander of the Army of Italy, because he was both a realist and of Mediterranean background, understood the situation much better than the Directory. He made a few concessions to the hardline Italian Jacobins, and depended chiefly on moderate Catholics. He agreed to the preferential position granted the Catholic Church by the Italian Republics between 1796 and 1799, even though the French constitution of the year III with its radical separation of Church and state had been their model. This direction had also been taken in 1796 by the authors of the first constitution written after the arrival of the French. This Constitution of Bologna made no reference to religion, but an advisory of the senate stated that with respect to faith and dogmas no innovations would be introduced. Although this led most of the clergy, despite the protest of a few Catholics, to accept this constitution, it never became effective, because Bologna shortly afterwards was incorporated in the new Zispadanic Republic.

The Zispadanic Republic was comprised of the Duchy of Modena and the provinces of Romagna and Emilia which had been taken from the Pope. During the sessions devoted to the writing of the constitution for the new republic, the problem of the position of the Church in the state had led to passionate discussion. The thesis defended by democrats and enlightened people that religion is a private matter was supported by the Jansenists, who expected a renewal of religious fervor with the separation of Church and state. Victory was carried by the contrary thesis. Catholicism became the established religion of the republic (the Jewish religion was tolerated but did not receive equality) because religion "constrains the masses." After brief hesitation, Bonaparte concurred with this article even though it completely deviated from the principles of the Directory, because he realized that this would win him the sympathy of the people and the clergy. But a few months later, in 1797, when he himself wrote the constitution of the Cisalpine Republic, he returned to the principle of complete equality of religions and the religious neutrality of the state. The Cisalpine constitution contained a limitation, later removed from the second constitution of 1798, which empowered the executive to deny the right to officiate to those ministers who had lost the confidence of the government. Consequently, many clergymen, although they favored the republican system, felt that their consciences did not permit them to take the oath under these circumstances.[52] In the process of the practical application of the constitution local influences became noticeable. The new republic accepted a nuncio in Milan and in turn sent an ambassador to Rome. In fact, a number of ordinances which had been in effect since the time of Joseph II simply were applied again. Concrete reality resulted in the following: while separation of Church and state had been nearly accomplished in France, the Catholic Church in the Cisalpine Republic depended strongly upon the state and was subjected to a renewed Josephinism. The only really new aspect was religious equality, although civil equality of Jews was not implemented without resistance by the population. The influence of the Jansenists led to the introduction in 1797 of difficult-to-enforce compulsory civil marriages. The influence of the Jacobins, in turn, spawned a number of increasingly petty measures, irritating the people severely.[53] It was Jacobin agitation which resulted in the dissolution of the ecclesiastical orders. But their plan to nationalize the lands of the parish clergy failed just as did their intention to abolish the tithe.

The constitution of Rome in 1798 and that of the Parthenopean Republic in 1799 adopted the principle of separation of Church and state from the constitution of the year III and the constitution of the Cisalpine Republic. In contrast, the constitution of the Ligurian Republic appears as the most Catholic of all of the constitutions adopted on the Italian peninsula. The Jansenists, who were especially influential in Liguria, refused to agree to the principle of separation, but, on the other hand, wanted to specify that the awarding of all ecclesiastical benefices and the granting of marriage and other dispensations should occur independently from the Roman Curia. The majority of the clergy protested against this intention, and Bonaparte, eager to avoid conflict, urged a change in the draft in order to accommodate the priests and monks. The Jansenists immediately availed themselves of freedom of the press, revived Degola's[54] *Annali politico-ecclesiastici,* and continued to plead their case after the ratification of the constitution. Their harsh criticism of the wealth of the monasteries, together with the criticism of the writers of the Enlightenment, who also were interested in a thorough ecclesiastical reform, led to the law of 4 October 1798, which permitted the dissolution of certain monasteries if this was deemed of value to the state.

---

[52] There is no work and no statistics available on the problem of taking the oath in the Cisalpine Republic.It is known, however, that in the diocese of Brescia alone not fewer than 484 priests were suspended *a divinis* upon the return of the Austrians in 1799, because they had applied Cisalpine religious laws. Cf. A. de Gubernatis, *E. Degola* (Florence 1882), 246.

[53] See Leflon, *Pie VII,* 380: "Bonaparte, whose clear plans the Italian Jacobins far exceeded, was not to forget in 1800 the lessons of such an irritating experience."

[54] Eustachio Degola (1761–1826) was the "most original and strongest personality of Italian Jansenism" at the end of the eighteenth century (Codignola). He was a deeply religious man of great and inflexible moral strength who was in close touch with Sc. de'Ricci and then with Abbé Grégoire. See *DHGE* XIV, 160–62; E. Codignola, *Carteggi di giansenisti liguri* I (Florence 1941) CIII–CCLIX and III 105–563; S. Banacchi, *La vita e la teologia di Eustachio Degola* (Pistoia 1949).

Although the revolutionary period in Italy from 1796 to 1799 changed the institutional situation of the Catholic Church in Italy much less than elsewhere, one cannot conclude that this brief period was without significance. For the past thirty years Italian historians have focused their attention upon the influence which the controversies and the hopes kindled during these years exercised upon the development of the mental attitude of the Italian Catholics with respect to liberal and patriotic ideas as well as to the striving for reform of the Church; ideas which ultimately converged in the movement of the *Risorgimento* in the second half of the nineteenth century.

While in Belgium and the Rhineland the antichristian policy of the French national convention had driven an already conservative clergy completely into the camp of the antirevolutionaries, the attitude of the Italian clergymen was more differentiated. Many priests, chiefly from the upper clergy, faced the new regime with distrust, but only a few resisted from the beginning. Most of them considered it wise in view of the conciliatory stance of the French to go along with them and to attempt to save as many rights of the Church as possible. They promoted reconciliation with the new governments by pointing to the indifference of the Church toward matters of civil authority. Many of the clergy, including some bishops,[55] emphasized the Christian character of the principles of equality and fraternity. Others went further and openly welcomed the French republicans. While constituting only a small minority,[56] they had a large influence because they included monks who had been absolved of their vows, as well as many intellectuals and honorable priests. Can these persons be characterized simply as Jacobins? Stamped with this brand[57] were such diverse groups as cardinals who had adapted their religion to the Enlightenment, vague Deists hostile to the Christian religion, and followers of a *Vicaire savoyard.* It is better to speak with V. Giuntella of "Catholic democrats" if one wishes to characterize priests and laymen who endeavored to return to the sources of Holy Scripture and patristics and to separate the essence of the Christian faith from the contingent aspects which it had assumed in the course of centuries. The Catholic democrats thought they could demonstrate the complete harmony of genuine Catholicism with democracy by separating the spiritual area from the secular.

---

[55] Best known is the case of Cardinal Chiaramonti, bishop of Imola (the future Pope Pius VII); but there were other bishops of like mind, for example Bishop Dolfini of Bergamo. On the Romagna see J. Leflon, *Pie VII*, 439–43. The *Raccolta di tutte le lettere pastorale*, published by G. Zatta, contains several forgeries.

[56] In Piedmont during the reaction of 1799 a total of 448 clergymen were persecuted as "Jacobins". They were not quite 3 percent of the secular clergy and 4.36 percent of the regular clergy. Cf. G. Vaccarino, *RSIt* 77 (1965), 27–77. After the lawyers, however, these clergymen were the largest faction (14 percent) of the Jacobins.

[57] See D. Cantimori, *Giacobini italiani* I, 407–13; P. Villani, *La storiografia italiana nei ultimi vent'anni* I (Milan 1970), 612–18.

Often these democratic Catholics have been identified with the Jansenists, and they in turn with the Jacobins. Today the profound differences between these groups are more easily recognizable. Most of the Jansenists cooperated with the Jacobins in order to obtain a new religious policy, but this was only a tactical alliance. After the Jansenists failed to obtain backing for their program from the princes, they saw in the structural reforms which the Jacobins urged out of hostility toward the Church the prerequisite for a return to the Church in its original purity. To the Jansenists such prerequisites included renunciation of all Church treasure not essential for worship, abolition of ecclesiastical titles, abolition of benefices, colleges, monasteries and confraternities, and the reduction of the number of ecclesiastical feast days. This was the intention of Degola, who devised a plan for the civil organization of the Ligurian Church. The aim of the plan was to free this Church from the authority of Rome and to rejuvenate it according to the example which the French Constituent Church had provided in keeping with the guidelines worked out by Grégoire at the national council of 1797.[58] Such sympathies with the Civil Constitution of the Clergy should not be misunderstood, however. There were, after all, fundamental differences between the Jacobins who wanted to destroy the Church and the Jansenists who wanted to reform it. Most of the Jacobins were Deists and put their trust in human nature; the Jansenists, disciples of Augustine, regarded the principles of 1789 with distrust and interpreted the enthusiasm of the Jacobins for liberty and progress as Pelagianism. Thus the Jansenists and the democratic Catholics, regardless of their frequent cooperation in the area of practical implementation, adopted fundamentally different points of view on an ideological level.

The common efforts of the Catholics and Jansenists favorably inclined toward the French Revolution formed a significant connection between the writers of the Enlightenment of the 1770s and the reformers at the Synod of Pistoia on the one hand, and liberal Catholics and reformers of the 1830s such as Raffaele Lambruschini and Rosmini on the other, a connection which deserves the special attention of the historian. At that time, however, their expectations were quickly disappointed. The resumption of persecutions in France after Fructidor, the looting of Church treasures and monasteries, and finally the expulsion of the Pope from Rome awakened in many the fear of a return to the antireligious excesses of the years 1793–94. Such apprehensions together with other social and political stresses resulted in 1799 in several popular revolts. These revolts, frequently led by priests or monks, appeared as a defense of the faith against those who cooperated with the occupation forces.[59] The democratic Catholics, never more than a minority, lost all credibility among the broad masses, and the political developments after 18 Brumaire completed their total defeat. The concordat concluded between Bonaparte and Pius VII destroyed the plans of the Jansenists to establish in Italy a rejuvenated Church according to the example set by the French Constituent Church.

---

[58] On the echo which this council and that of 1801, in which several Italian Jansenists participated, found in Italy, see M. Vaussard, *Jansénistes et gallicans aux origines religieuses du Risorgimento*, 55–59.

The Destruction of the Holy See

The revolutionary wave which swept over Italy did not spare the Papal States. The central administration of the Church was damaged to such a degree that many came to the conclusion that they were witnessing the end of the papacy as an institution.

The events in France left Pius VI in a particularly difficult position. He felt lonely after the departure of his secretary of state, Boncompagni, and was informed rather tendentiously. The émigrés who flooded Rome during the first two years saw the events through the distorted lens of their own political prejudices. After the termination of diplomatic relations between Paris and Rome in May 1791 there remained only one official envoy in France, who combined much naivety and vacillation with exaggerated obstinacy.[60]

At the beginning of 1791, Pius VI had missed the opportunity to clearly define the true significance of his condemnations of the revolution. In spite of suggestions by several French bishops and representatives of the Constituent Assembly, he refused to deal with the difference between the necessarily immutable principles of religious order and acceptable transactions in the civil sphere. He totally compromised himself a year later when he sent Abbé Maury to Germany with the charge to win the sovereigns for armed support of the counterrevolution in France.[61] In spite of the warm reception of many French émigrés in the Papal States;[62] in spite of the harsh measures which were taken against Romans suspected of sympathy for the French ideas; and even in spite of the assassination of the French legate Bassville by the mob in January 1793, the French Republic after the annexation of Avignon was not in the position to intervene against the papacy directly. The peninsula was cordoned off by Austria's military forces in conjunction with those of Piedmont and was additionally protected by the British and Neapolitan fleets.

---

[59] See also the chapter "Paura e religiosità popolare nello Stato della Chiesa" in R. De Felice, *Italia giacobina* (Naples 1965), as well as G. Cingari, *Giacobini e sanfedisti in Calabria nel 1799* (Messina 1957).

[60] Cf. Ch. Ledré, *L'abbé de Salamon, correspondant et agent du Saint-Siège pendant la Révolution* (Paris 1965).

This situation changed drastically, however, in the spring of 1796 after the lightning strikes of General Bonaparte and the occupation of Milan. In the preceeding year, Pius VI had contemptuously rejected an offer of the Spanish ambassador, Azara, to mediate between France and Rome with a view toward resuming full relations. Confronted with the new dangers, the Pope was now prepared to avail himself of such mediation services, but initial talks foundered on the French conditions. The French demanded heavy reparations, and above all the renunciation of all condemnations which the Pope had uttered against the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the revolutionary principles since 1790. After the French conditions were rejected by Rome, Bonaparte occupied the northern portion of the Papal States. A march on Rome was threatened when negotiations continued to stall. Now the Pope, who feared a revolt of his subjects if the French advanced, decided to submit in order to save the essentials. On 20 June an armistice was signed which contained only territorial and financial clauses; the problem of his renunciation of his condemnations was postponed until a treaty of peace.

The question of who first had the idea to use military pressure on the Papal States in order to obtain from the Pope a pacifying intervention in the religious affairs of France has been much discussed. Was it Bonaparte who regarded as both unrealistic and politically unwise the express directives of the Directory to shake the foundations of the universal Church?[63] This view has been maintained by A. Sorel, L.

---

[61] Consult also L. Madelin, "Pie VII et la première coalition" in *RH* 81 (1903), 292–306.

[62] See Surrel de Saint-Julien, *L'œuvre pontificale des émigrés français et son organisation.* Mgr. L Caleppi in *Annales de St-Louis des Français* 1 (1897).

[63] *Actes du Directoire*, ed. by A. Debidour IV, 787.

Madelin, and, more recently, by G. Filippone. Or was it, as R. Guyot maintains, the Directory itself which was less obstinate and less simplistic than has been thought? As in so many things, the truth of the matter is probably to be found in the middle between these two extremes. Within the Directory there were two opposing factions. Some of its members did not close their minds to the view of those like F. Cacault who stated that contrary to appearances the papacy still constituted a considerable spiritual and diplomatic strength and one which it would be better to spare and to dominate and use in order to erect the banner of liberty in Rome. But while the Directory wallowed in conflicting intentions which were not followed by actions, Bonaparte immediately recognized the advantage of their suggestions and managed to translate them into a coherent policy.

The negotiations for a peace treaty began in Paris during the summer. Following Azara's advice, the Curia composed a memorandum which reminded French Catholics that the true faith was not created to overturn civil laws and which recommended their submission to the government. This action implicitly recognized the legality of the government's existence. The Directory, however, was not satisfied with the concession of the Brief *Pastoralis sollicitudo,* although it was so significant that Royalists and Romans alike thought it incredible. Upon the urgings of Grégoire, who at all costs wanted to prove that the Constituent Church had never ceased its ties to Rome, the Directory continued to demand from the Pope the renunciation of the condemnations of the Constituent Church. Pius VI refused, of course. In September there were further negotiations in Florence, but they also produced no results. In the meantime, the military situation in Italy appeared to develop favorably for Austria, and Secretary of State Zelada, who favored a conciliatory approach, was replaced by Cardinal Busca. Busca called off the armistice and attempted in vain to persuade the kings of Spain and Naples as well as the Emperor to resume armed resistance. As soon as Bonaparte had solved his problems in northern Italy, he began preparations to march on Rome and forced the Pope, on 16 February 1797, to accept the treaty of Tolentino. By agreeing to additional heavy reparations and ceding to France the wealthiest part of his states, the Pope saved his secular position which, in view of the current conditions, he regarded as the indispensable foundation for the functioning of the government of the Church. Bonaparte, who now felt strong enough to ignore the orders of the Directory, also no longer spoke of a renunciation of earlier papal documents, and thereby laid the groundwork for the future religious pacification of France.

After the bellicose Cardinal Busca had been replaced by the moderate francophile Cardinal Doria, and after France had appointed as its emissary in Rome[64] Joseph Bonaparte, the brother of the general who had refused to destroy the Holy See, the Pope could rest in the conviction that the essence of his power had been saved. However, the situation deteriorated again. In France the coup d'état of Fructidor restored the old virulence of Jacobin anticlericalism. The zealots in Rome interpreted the popular revolts which occurred in several places as the harbingers of a general rising against the French occupation and poured oil upon the flames. In this tense atmosphere, General Duphot was assassinated on 27 December 1797. The Directory, dominated by La Révellière-Lépeaux, a sworn enemy of Catholicism and apostle of the new religious movement of Theophilanthropy, ordered the immediate occupation of the Papal States. On 15 February 1798 Roman Jacobins, covertly led by French agents, proclaimed the Roman Republic.[65] For the first time, the secular sovereignty of the territory, which for a thousand years had constituted the Papal States, was placed in question. An indication of the rapid maturing of opinions in the matter was the advice of the ultramontane theologian Bolgeni who urged, much to the irritation of the zealots, the acceptance of the new political regime in order to preserve the spiritual authority of the Pontiff.[66]

The Pope, now eighty-one years old, pleaded to be allowed to die in peace in Rome. Instead, he was forced to flee to the still-independent Duchy of Tuscany. Separated from almost all of his advisers and in very frail health, the Pope found it difficult to act effectively as supreme head of the Church. He did publish a few briefs; among them on 13 November 1798 an addendum to the constitution of 11 February 1797, regarding how to conduct the conclave under these emergency conditions. With the aid of the nuncio in Florence, who acted as secretary of state, he directed appeals to all sovereigns of Europe, including Paul I of Russia, in which he asked for their help against the occupation of the Papal States. Thus, to some degree the Pope promoted the formation of the second coalition against France. Its successes induced the French, who had occupied Tuscany, to deport Pius VI to France. The dying Pope was transported first to Grenoble, and then to Valence, where he died on 29 August.

---

[64] For the first time the Vatican was in this case willing to receive a diplomat who represented a not officially Catholic state. Cf. R. Graham, *Vatican Diplomacy* (Princeton 1959), 40–41.

[65] This Roman Republic found it difficult to exercise its authority outside the city limits of Rome. During the entire year of 1798 there were domestic rebellions and even where the new regime asserted itself without friction it was frequently a case of "Holy-water-Jacobinism." For an example see R. Lefèvre, "La rivoluzione giacobina all'Ariccia" in *RStRis* 47 (1960) 467–520.

[66] *DBI* XI, 276.

At this point little remained of the former machinery of the Holy See. The work of the Curia was totally disorganized, the Sacred College was dispersed, and several cardinals had been imprisoned. It was not surprising that many people thought, some with joy and others with apprehension, that with the death of Pius VI, the papacy as the coping stone of the Catholic Church was disappearing under the hammer blows of the French Jacobins.

CHAPTER 2

Napoleon and Pius VII

The Election of Pius VII and the First Restoration of the Papal States

Pius VI realized that the next conclave would take place under quite extraordinary circumstances. For this reason he decreed even before his death that it should be convoked by the most senior cardinal at a place in the territory of any Catholic sovereign. Actually, Rome was meanwhile liberated by Neapolitan troops who drove out Frenchmen and Jacobins; about ten cardinals were residing in Rome. But King Ferdinand was suspected of wishing to increase his territory at the expense of the Holy See and to attempt to obtain a new Pope who would be favorably inclined toward his territorial ambitions. Spain was far away and in any case had been an ally of the French for five years and was thus suspected of being dependent. For this reason Cardinal Albani, the senior cardinal of the Sacred College who, with many other cardinals had fled to Venice (Austrian territory since 1797), preferred to place the conclave under the protection of Emperor Francis II. The Emperor had the monastery on the Island of San Giorgio refurbished for the purpose and assumed the expenses of the conclave which began its work on 1 December 1799. Of the forty-six living cardinals thirty-five participated. Of the latter, thirty were Italians. Two parties quickly opposed one another. The first was composed of the "politicians," whose concern was to adapt themselves to the new European situation and to maintain the bridges with France; they were discreetly supported by Spain. The other consisted of the "zealots," whose primary interest was to retain the heritage of the past undiminished and to maintain good relations with Austria. Good relations with this state seemed important to them because of Austria's hostility toward France and because they considered it the best means to regain from the Emperor the largest portion of the Papal States, which he had meanwhile conquered. The "politicians" were led by Cardinal Braschi and agreed on Cardinal Bellisomi, who quickly was able to obtain two-thirds of the votes. The "zealots" were led by the authoritarian Cardinal Antonelli, who was not moved by egotistical considerations, of which he was later accused by Consalvi, but by the consequences resulting from an objective analysis of the situation.[1] They were supported by Maury, the only French cardinal present who acted under power of attorney from Louis XVIII (whom the Sacred College had officially recognized as King of France, after Pius VI had steadfastly refused to do so) and by the Austrian cardinal Herzan, who was ordered to express the imperial veto against any candidate suspected of not being fully behind Vienna. The candidate of this party was Mattei, moderately opposed to the French. The bumbling manner with which the Emperor's plenipotentiary opposed the almost certain election of Bellisomi and pushed that of Mattei irritated the majority, and Mattei's last chances were gone when the cardinals learned that Spain would in no way recognize him. Spain was being directed by Bonaparte, who meanwhile had become France's virtual master. For three months a stalemate existed. By 12 March there was the outline of a solution: Antonelli was to get the support of the zealots—who would thus have the honor of having cast the decisive votes—for Cardinal Chiaramonti. A moderate and intelligent man, he had consistently voted with the "politicians," but had not made enemies of the opposition. The action was started by Cardinal Ruffo of condottieri fame who, with his Sanfedisti, had liberated Calabria. As we know from the recently discovered diary of Consalvi, the tactic "was skillfully suggested to him by someone who was not a cardinal but had a great part in the success without anyone being aware of it." Was it, as L. Pásztor thought, Consalvi himself, inasmuch as he was responsible for the material organization of the meeting? Or was it, as Monsignor Leflon wrote, the secret Spanish legate Despuig, who from the beginning had favored the candidacy of Chiaramonti? Both men knew one another well from business with the Rota, probably acted in agreement with one another, and with accomplished patience created the conditions for their successful candidate, whom they preferred much more for diplomatic and political than religious reasons. Be that as it may, Antonelli agreed to this compromise solution and so did Herzan after a discussion with the new candidate. Within forty-eight hours everything was settled and on 4 March 1800, Chiaramonti, in spite of the unconcealed displeasure of Maury and the reluctance of some colleagues who considered this fifty-eight-year-old cardinal rather young, was elected with only one negative vote. For reasons of devotion to his predecessor, who had also been his protector, he assumed the name of Pius VII.

---

[1] On his apprehensions immediately before the conclave, see L. Briguglio in *RStRis* 45 (1958), 449–57.

Barnaba Chiaramonti came from a noble family closely related to the Braschi family. Like Pius VI he was born in Cesena, a small town of the Papal States, on 14 August 1742. The vivacious, vigorous, independent man from the Romagna, always open to new ideas, came to control the biting, arrogant aspects of his temperament. In mature age he displayed energy tempered by friendliness, an untiring patience, and realism fed by acuity and a sense of proportion. In contrast to his predecessors in the eighteenth century, who chiefly had been administrators or politicians, he turned out to be a man of doctrine and a shepherd of souls, always interested in distinguishing between the spiritual and the secular concerns of the Church and always giving pronounced preference to the religious goals. He had the courage of his convictions, but always had great tolerance for opinions which differed from his own. His earlier experiences prepared him well for the serious problems which a world in full transition posed for the Holy See. J. Leflon has illuminated for us the early segment of his life. During the conflict which in the eighteenth century confronted the supporters of the Jesuits with those who were vaguely called "Jansenists," the young Chiaramonti did not fight on the side of the Jesuits. Later, during the three years of revolution, he did not regard the undifferentiated condemnation of the principles of 1789 as the best method for defending religious interests.

In view of this conduct it is understandable that earlier biographers at the time of the reawakening of ultramontanism preferred to leave the formative years of Pius VII in a cautious and imprecise twilight. At the age of fourteen, Chiaramonti joined the Benedictines, studied in Padua and Rome, and from 1766 to 1775 was professor of theology in Parma. It was a period when in the circle around du Tillot and his French supporters plans for a reform of society, Church, and state were being discussed. The catalogue of his library at that time reveals that his mind was open to the modern ferment of thought; his library held few works of scholastic theology, but many critical editions of the Church Fathers, works by Muratori, Mabillon, Martène, and Tillemont, and the *Encyclopedia* of d'Alembert and Diderot. After he became professor at Saint Anselm in Rome, many colleagues accused him of too much sympathy for the reform attempts of young monks, and Pius VI, in order to remove him from such hostility, appointed him Bishop of Tivoli in 1783. In 1785 he was created a cardinal and transferred to Imola in the Romagna where he had an opportunity to learn of the shortcomings of the papal government. For a period of fifteen years he demonstrated that he possessed considerable pastoral ability and that he knew how to preserve his independence from the papal legate in Ferrara as much as from Jacobin officials and the occupation forces. In a situation which was particularly difficult because three different regimes—the papal, the Cisalpine Republican, and the Austrian regime—followed one another, he proved to be a courageous, skillful and imaginative leader during the difficult times of reaction and white terror. As a diplomatic mediator he had an outstanding ability to hold without breaking and to reconcile without bending. Shortly after the French invasion took place, he preached a sensational homily on Church and democracy[2] at Christmas 1797. He declared that the democratic form of government was not in opposition to the Gospel, and that religion was even more important in a democracy than in any other form of government. During the three-year existence of the republic he constantly attempted to separate the political and religious aspects of problems, tried not to identify the clergy with the opposition to the democratic regime, and demonstrated his ability to compromise in trivial matters in order to preserve the essentials.

Immediately after his election, the new Pope demonstrated that he had insight, was independent, and decisive. He refused Herzan's recommendation to appoint as his secretary of state a cardinal who was obligated to Austria. Instead his choice was Consalvi,[3] the young prelate to whom he owed his tiara. Consalvi was a conservative reformer, in keeping with the enlightened spirit of the eighteenth century, possessing both energy and flexibility. Consalvi had no experience in diplomacy but assisted the Pope, who concentrated on the religious aspects of problems, with his strong talent for an intelligent and cautious policy. He remained his right-hand man until the end of his pontificate. Emperor Francis II tried to hold the new Pope in his state, but Pius VII was firmly determined to free himself from Austrian tutelage and returned to Rome as soon as the opportunity presented itself (3 July 1800).

Consalvi began his diplomatic and administrative tasks without delay. One was the restitution of the papal territories occupied by Austrians, Neapolitans, and Frenchmen. Although the French maintained their position, the others eventually gave in and gradually the powers restored their representations at the Holy See.[4] Another problem was a papal administration completely disorganized by more than thirty months of foreign occupations; it needed to be made functional again. In addition, institutions whose obsolete character had been underscored by the introduction of the French system needed to be rejuvenated. Consalvi was fully aware of these matters, which were aggravated by numerous abuses, and was prepared to introduce a number of innovations, but encountered the reactionary opposition of the majority of the Curia. For this reason the papal Bull *Post diuturnas* of 30 October 1800,[5] prepared by a commission of cardinals, prelates, and expert laymen, provided only for a rather modest reform of institutions. It removed a number of evident abuses and added a few noble laymen to an administration which heretofore was completely reserved for clergymen. Economically, a number of useful steps was taken. These were chiefly freedom of trade (11 March 1801); a limited land reform (15 September 1802); a compromise solution with respect to the secularized estates of the Church; a partial solution for the catastrophic financial condition; and a simplification of the fiscal system. Such initiatives, in practical terms continuing the reforms envisioned by some popes of the eighteenth century, were no doubt commendable in a state in which there was a tendency to regard as sacrosanct every condition once it had reached a certain age. Professor Demarco, for example, described some of the measures as revolutionary. But on the whole the realization remained far behind the plans, the more so as Pius VII, who was so clear and decisive when important decisions for the Church were at stake, liked to leave details of administration to subordinates, who by a long shot were not all men like Consalvi.[6] Thus the Papal States, undermined by passive resistance of opponents from right to left, in spite of some incontestable improvements remained in an extraordinarily precarious administrative and economic situation until its annexation by Napoleon.

---

[2] Imola 1797. Subsequently this homily found wide distribution.

[3] Ercole Consalvi (1757–1824) was the perfect type of a non-ordained prelate (he became a priest only in 1822), passionately devoted to the Roman Church. He advanced quickly in the papal administration, in 1799 became secretary in the conclave of Pius VII, then pro-secretary of state, and on 11 August 1800, cardinal and secretary of state.

[4] For the first time in history a Protestant came to Rome as a diplomat, the Prussian Minister Humboldt. Cf. R. A. Graham, *Vatican Diplomacy* (Princeton 1959), 42–53.

The Concordat of 1801

Shortly after the return of Pius VII to Rome, at the very time when the renewed arrival of French troops for the purpose of restoring the republic was feared, the Bishop of Vercelli arrived with a suggestion by the First Consul to begin negotiations with the aim of settling the religious affairs of France.

---

[5] *BullRomCont* XI, 48–71.

[6] L. Pásztor points out that the creation of cardinals during the first years of Pius VII's pontificate were not made with the intention to gain fresh forces for the reorganization of the life of the Church and the Papal States, but to reward the closest collaborators of his predecessor and some nuncios; see *RHE* 65 (1970), 479.

Immediately after the elimination of the Directory by the coup d'état of 18 Brumaire (9 November 1799), a reduction of tension on the religious level had set in. The persecution of the non-oath takers was suspended, many churches reopened again, and adherence to the "decades" was no longer obligatory. All of this indicated that the policy of systematic dechristianization was being abandoned. This development, regretted by many republicans in leading positions, was the direct result of a decision by the First Consul. It was not made for religious reasons—although it seems that he was less areligious than has been asserted[7]—but for political ones. He had become convinced that France, especially rural France, wished to remain Catholic, and his experiences in Italy had taught him that in a Catholic country the influence of priests constitutes a power which it is better to use than to fight. Some people advised him to depend for support on the Constituent Church as a republican and Gallican Church, then involved with its reorganization and about to convene its second national council for 29 June 1801. But Bonaparte realized that if he took the side of the Constituent Church he would force the numerically strongest and most influential clergy back into dependence on the hostile emigrant bishops, not to mention the strongly ultramontane Belgian and Rhenish Departments. He also sensed that an agreement with the papacy would redound to his prestige among Italians, Spaniards, and the great powers of the Old Regime. The victory of Marengo (14 June 1800) enabled him to negotiate with Rome from a position of strength. He hurried to exploit his opportunity without worrying too much about the discontent of the numerous opponents of the Church among political and administrative officials, in the army and among the buyers of Church lands. Pius VII on his part knew well that a better understanding with revolutionary France would be protested strongly by a large segment of the Curia and the majority of the émigrés. He was irritated when he realized that Napoleon wanted to bargain for an agreement, but also immediately recognized the tremendous advantage which he could gain. He understood completely what the restoration of peace and religious unity in the most important Catholic country of Europe would mean for the Holy See and for a French Church shaken to its foundations. Besides, a ceremonious act of international law would also acknowledge the superior position of the *pontifex maximus* at the head of the Catholic hierarchy.

Negotiations were begun, proved to be extraordinarily protracted, and were concluded successfully only after a year. The first session took place in Paris between November and February. The Church negotiators were Monsignor Spina, a prelate of the Curia who had accompanied Pius VI to France, and Father Caselli, a theologian. France was represented by Abbé Bernier. He had played a large role in the pacification of the Vendée and now placed the tools of a subtle theology and an occasionally ambiguous diplomacy in the service of a reconciliation between France and Rome. He also succeeded in neutralizing the opposition of the French secretary of state, Talleyrand, without bringing the fight into the open. After four drafts a fifth one was finally sent to Rome, where the second phase of negotiations took place between March and May. The Curia, under the leadership of Cardinal Antonelli, declared the text which had been suggested by Bonaparte as unacceptable. The Curia drafted a counterproposal, which in turn occasioned numerous objections by the French legate Cacault. Angered by the Roman delays, Bonaparte transmitted an ultimatum and Pius VII decided to send Consalvi with power of attorney to Paris. In the time from 20 June to 15 July frequently stormy discussions took place at the highest level. Until the last minute there was the danger of a termination of the negotiations, for Bonaparte absolutely refused to yield in several points, as he had to reckon with the stiff-necked opposition of a large part of his entourage, among whom Jacobin anticlericalism remained virulent. But Consalvi used all of the abilities of his flexible genius in order to achieve the acceptance of conciliatory formulations, and an agreement was finally reached at midnight on 15 July.

---

[7] See M. Guerrini, *Napoléon devant Dieu* (Paris 1960).

The relatively brief text,[8] including the recognition by the Pope of the republic as the rightful government of France, was preceded by a preamble in which the Catholic religion was acknowledged as "the religion of a large majority of Frenchmen." This was a compromise wording, for the Curia had insisted that the Catholic religion be acknowledged as the dominant religion among all religions whose equality before the law was tacitly affirmed by Rome. Article 1 declared the Catholic religion to be public and free, but with the limitation that "it must agree with police regulations which the government might pass in the interest of maintaining public peace." Consalvi had vainly tried to exclude this clause, as it seemed to open the door to all kinds of chicanery, but had to be satisfied with the addition of the last part of the sentence which at least put a limit on capricious acts. After this basic declaration, which carried with it the renunciation of all earlier laws of restrictive character, the subsequent articles had a double objective.

The difficulties which had arisen between Church and state since 1790 were to be removed and the French Church was to be reorganized on new foundations. Two problems created difficulties. One was the sale of nationalized Church lands, with which the Holy See agreed after it had vainly attempted to achieve at least the restitution of those lands which had not yet been sold. The second was the existence of a dual episcopate. Bonaparte quietly left the Constituent Church to its own devices, and the Pope agreed in embarrassed language (Article 3) to ask all surviving bishops of the Old Regime for their resignation in order to clear the way for the creation of a totally new episcopate. With respect to the future organization of the Church of France, only general principles were stated. These included the right of the Holy See to a reorganization of the dioceses, and the right of bishops to a reorganization of the parishes, but in both cases only with the prior agreement of the government; the appointment of bishops as under the Old Regime by the head of state, their canonical investment by the Pope; appointment of parish priests by the bishops after agreement by the government; the right of bishops to a cathedral chapter and a seminary, but without any obligation of the government to pay for their maintenance; the obligation of the government to pay appropriate salaries to bishops and parish priests as compensation for the nationalization of Church lands; and finally, in spite of initially brusk rejection, the right of the faithful to make gifts to the Church. Nothing was said in the concordat about religious congregations.

---

[8] Mercati I, 561–65.

Now the compromise had to be ratified. Without a doubt it was of considerable benefit for both sides. It strengthened Bonaparte's prestige, confirmed several important accomplishments of the revolution, and conceded to the French government the right to control the Church in several significant areas. On the other hand it was the Holy See which had granted these privileges to the state on the basis of its own authority and not on the basis of a right of the state. This afforded the Church a good deal of satisfaction, as it was a matter of principle. Furthermore, the schism which had split the Church for more than ten years was healed and the foundation had been laid for a modernized restoration of the old ideal of a Christian Church based on the state. Finally, last but not least, the right of the Pope to intervene in the affairs of national Churches was strengthened. To be sure, every or almost every article contained as many intended or inadvertent ambiguities as it resolved. The commission of cardinals in Rome began to demand changes. Consalvi, in any case convinced that the achieved political advantages outweighed the theological and pastoral worries of the zealots, judged the situation with greater realism and assured the cardinals that no further improvement could be attained. Cardinal Antonelli noted with deep regret that only the shadow of a religion was being restored in France, but in spite of everything also considered it necessary to accept the document which, paradoxically, underlined the supreme spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope in the former stronghold of Gallicanism. Yet only fourteen of twenty-eight cardinals voted for unconditional acceptance. Pius, however, ignored the vote, publicly declared the Holy See's acceptance on 15 August 1801, and asked the legitimate bishops to submit their resignations. In Paris, strangely enough, Bonaparte hesitated to confront the hostility of the deliberative assemblies. In order at least partially to counter their objections, which were supported by the determined resistance of Talleyrand and Fouché, he resorted to a subterfuge: the text of the "Convention de Messidor," as the concordat was officially called in France, was submitted for approval with two other bills. One regulated the Protestant religion, attesting the willingness to be totally nonpartisan in religious questions, and the other placed Catholics under a comprehensive church regulation, consisting of seventy-seven "Organic Articles."[9]

They in part retracted what had been conceded, as the Church was now being subordinated to the state in the old royal fashion. The clergy required the permission of the government before it could publish papal documents, convoke a provincial or national council, create new parishes, and even establish private chapels. Seminarians had to be taught about the Declaration of 1682; the old diocesan catechisms had to be replaced by a uniform catechism; priests were forbidden to perform church weddings before the civil ceremony; the confirmation of nuncios and other papal legates was strongly limited; each infraction of rules by priests or even bishops was to be treated like a felony and to be dealt with by the Council of State.

Other articles defined the rights and obligations of bishops with the harshness and precision of military regulations, and imposed upon the Church an organization corresponding to that of other state agencies. From now on there was no longer a French episcopate, but only bishops strictly controlled by the Ministry of Religion, permitting the bishops no organic connection and prohibiting any collective action. In their turn, the bishops were virtually given the rights of prefects in their dioceses, with a discretionary power over their parish priests, which exceeded what had been known under the Old Regime. The formerly so powerful and growing cathedral chapters were relegated to a purely decorative function, while the priests, whose desire for a synodal and democratic rejuvenation of diocesan life had been fulfilled by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, saw themselves reduced to the role of merely carrying out orders. They were obligated to strict obedience, having lost the protection which their benefices once afforded them. The vast majority of them could be removed upon the slightest suspicion. Napoleon granted the bishops this virtually unlimited power because he wanted to utilize the concordat to assure the cohesion of a nation rent by the existence of two Churches, and because he realized that this extremely difficult fusion could only be accomplished by imperial means. This strengthening of episcopal authority, dictated by the moment, was to have lasting consequences. Assured of an obedient civil-service-like clergy, the bishops lost their taste for criticism within the Church. Among the priests, likewise, the parallel between the ecclesiastical organization and the civil service and the fact that they received their salaries from the state also augmented their view of themselves as regular officials. They increasingly adopted the mentality of officials, with increased respectability and punctuality and decreased initiative and sense of responsibility. The institution thereby won cohesion and functioned better, but lost freedom and innovative spirit.[10] These changes strongly influenced the image of bishops and priests not only in France, but in all of western Europe. Aside from all this, Napoleon, by authoritatively substituting his ideal of administrative centralism for the old Gallican and presbyterian traditions of the old Church of France, unwittingly helped to prepare the triumph of ultramontanism. It would raise its head again as soon as the government was no longer sufficiently despotic to pose a counterweight to papal power.

---

[9] See *DDC* I, 1064–72.

But these future consequences could not be foreseen at that time. More immediately, Rome was worried about the unilateral changes, and therefore falsification, of the concordat by means of a strong state control over the life of the Church. Pius VII protested vigorously.[11] In Paris, where Bonaparte's maneuver had succeeded in disarming the opposition so that the new laws on religion were passed on 8 April 1802,[12] the government pretended amazement and replied that the Organic Articles did not introduce new law, but were merely a renewed sanction of old principles of the Gallican Church.[13] This was only partially correct, of course, inasmuch as the articles intensified earlier directives through the introduction of new ones which could be reconciled with the letter of the concordat (only with difficulty).[14] Pius VII and Consalvi once again proved their realism. They knew that the reconciliation of the Church with the new society created by the revolution was possible only by paying this price. They did not pursue the matter further, inspired by the hope that the future would permit them to improve a situation which they were helpless to change unless they wished to jeopardize what had been gained.

---

[10] Observe the appropriate notes of J. Godel in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 17 (1970), 837–45.

[11] Consistorial address of 24 May 1802, in A. Boulay, *Documents* V, 584 ff.

[12] Still, there were twenty-one nays and fifty-one abstentions.

[13] J. Portalis, *Discours* 113.

[14] See the concise criticism of Pouthas, 112–14.

The Reorganization of the Church of France

The concordat and the Organic Articles established the principles for the reorganization of the Church of France. They needed to be implemented on both national and local levels. On the national level the work was done jointly by three men. One was Cardinal Caprara,[15] whose age, physical constitution and character disposed to a willingness to compromise bordering on weakness. He had already demonstrated this as nuncio in Vienna. In spite of reluctance by Pius VII and Consalvi, Bonaparte had succeeded in having him appointed as papal legate. Another man was Jean Portalis,[16] in charge of religious affairs, one of the few Catholics among the leading politicians, and a conscientious lawyer. He was a dedicated proponent of the principles of parliamentary Gallicanism, but within the framework of the possible also willing to advance the cause of the Church. Finally and foremost there was the inconstant Bernier. He provided undeniable services in sometimes questionable fashion, especially by lending his skillful and subtle pen to both sides in an attempt to formulate the questions as well as the answers, which to him seemed the best means to reconcile both.

On the whole, Bonaparte succeeded in gaining most of his objectives with the concordat. He saw in it an essential element of his policy of pacification and wanted to fashion the Church into one of his most useful tools.

The first problem was the adjustment of the dioceses to the administrative organization of France. The simplest solution would have been a return to the civil constitution, i.e., one bishopric for each Department. But Pius VII was reluctant to favor what had been rejected by Pius VI. Chiefly, however, it was the French government which deemed this solution as too expensive. Its proposal envisioned ten archbishoprics, to correspond to the area of jurisdiction of the appellate courts, and forty bishoprics for the 102 Departments of which France was then composed. At the last minute Bonaparte raised the figure to sixty. He did this not for pastoral reasons, but with the intention to strengthen the ecclesiastical organization of the conquered areas.[17] The papal bull of 13 December 1801 and Caprara's executive order of 9 April 1802 confirmed the reorganization legally. There were now twenty-four dioceses consisting of two, and 6 consisting of three departments each. About ten dioceses were larger than 5750 square miles and thirty-seven had more than five hundred thousand inhabitants. Some memorable episcopal sees such as Reims, Arles, and Sens disappeared, while many of the new dioceses formed an artificial mosaic composed of fragments of sometimes up to eight of the old dioceses, all with their own traditions and mentality. Naturally this mixture caused the bishops great difficulties during the first generation.

---

[15] See *DHGE* XI, 944–57 and S. Delacroix, 60–64, on Giovanni Battista Caprara (1733–1810).

[16] See L. Adolphe, *Portalis et son temps* (Paris 1936) and S. Delacroix, 77–97.

[17] Half of the additional bishoprics were established in the following areas: Liège and Ghent in Belgium, Mainz on the left bank of the Rhine, and Chambéry and Nice in Savoy.

Before appointments could be made to the new sees, the resignation of the old office holders had to be effected. Reluctantly, fifty-nine Constituent bishops went along with the wishes of the government. After some disputes with respect to the eventual formulation, they directed a common letter to the Pope in which they accepted the condordat and the principles which the French government and His Holiness confirmed in it. Of the ninety-two surviving bishops of the Old Regime, all those who had returned to France and those who had fled to Italy submitted their resignations without creating any difficulties. Not so with some others. Monsignor Dillon was the leader of an opposition group in England and his ideas spread to a considerable number of the prelates who had fled to Germany and Spain. Among this group loyalty to the King assumed precedence over loyalty to the Pope, the more so as their Gallican theology[18] convinced them that the Pope had exceeded his constitutional authority. Finally only fifty-five bishops, including nine from the annexed territories, resigned. Most of the others were at least prudent enough no longer to intervene in their old dioceses and to go so far as to advise their clergy and their laity to subordinate themselves to their new bishops. Two of them, however, Thémines and Coucy, organized an open resistance to the concordat and thus created a new schism. It was numerically insignificant, but in some areas persisted until Vatican II.[19] Generally, though, the old refractory clergy, after a brief period of being upset, acted like the future bishop Eugène de Mazenod: "Loyal to the monarchy, he considered Bonaparte as a usurper, but as a son of the Church he placed the interest of his religion and his obedience toward the Holy See ahead of everything else."[20]

---

[18] It found its reflection in their *Mémoire* of 23 December 1801, and in their *Réclamations canoniques* of 6 April 1803 and 15 April 1804.

[19] Behind the *Petite Église* with which we are here dealing, there is in actuality concealed a complex movement which commingles to varying degrees Gallican traditions, royalist sentiments, religious fanaticism, peasant resistance against innovations, and the actions of some leaders with a peculiar psychology. See C. Latreille, *L'opposition religieuse au concordat* II (Paris 1910), augmented by the revealing article by M. Rebouillat, "Étude comparée des schismes anti-concordataires en France" in *Revue du Bas-Poitou* 73 (1962), 27–38, 212–19, 458–83. Depending on the area, the movement had different effects. Three main centers can be differentiated: a) the west, to which can be added the area of Blois. Here the schism, centering on Bishops Coucy and Thémines, was chiefly regally inspired and initially numbered thirty thousand dissidents. The at first episcopal

The designation of the new bishops raised a sticky problem. Bonaparte insisted that as with his appointments to prefectures, so also with the appointment of bishops, his principle of integration be applied. The new episcopate was to consist simultaneously of bishops of the Old Regime, of Constituent bishops, and of new men. The Holy See, which regarded the Constituent bishops as schismatics, demanded from them an official recantation. Most of the government nominees from this group refused, however, to declare themselves as schismatics. Caprara, on whom Bernier worked skillfully, eventually had to be satisfied with a compromise, even though it was inadequate in the eyes of Rome.

Delicate negotiations took place in which Bernier and Émery played an eminent role; they went on from October 1801 to October 1802. Eventually the new episcopate consisted of sixteen, in some cases rather aged, bishops of the Old Regime; twelve former Constituent bishops, among them many vicars general, most of them relatively young. To this group also belonged an uncle of Bonaparte, Fesch, who was named Archbishop of Lyon. Although political considerations played a role, the nominations generally turned out to be good. While there were few strong personalities, the episcopate on the whole consisted of fair, level-headed, and conciliatory men—at that time of utmost importance—who performed their tasks conscientiously and proved to be excellent administrators under extremely difficult conditions.

---

and then presbyterian schism quickly became a popular issue, which explains why it persisted even after the demise of its originators. See A. Billaud, *La Petite Église dans la Vendée et les Deux-Sèvres, 1800–30* (Paris 1962); R. de Chauvigny, *La résistance au concordat de 1801* (Paris 1921); L. Chesneau, *Les dissidents vendômois de la Petite Église* (Vendôme 1924); J. Leflon, *Bernier* II, 252–58. b) the area of Lyon, in which the schism was not so vociferous, but cooler and more persistent, and colored by Jansenism; see C. Latreille, *Histoire de la Petite Église de Lyon* (Paris 1910); E. Dermenghem: *Bulletin de la Société d'Études historiques des Hautes-Alpes* (1957), 115–47. c) the south; see P. Mouly, *Concordataires, constitutionnels et enfarinés en Quercy et Rouergue* (Sarlat 1945); Gabent, *Les illuminés ou anticoncordataires de l'ancien diocèse de Lombez* (Auch 1906). In England there was a clerical schism without believers. Almost nine hundred priests followed Abbé Blanchard who distributed numerous pamphlets; see A. Dechêne, *Contre Pie VII et Bonaparte. Le blanchardisme* (Paris 1932). The case was different with the Belgian Stevenists; they protested not against the concordat, but against the acceptance of the Organic Articles by the new bishops. See J. Soille, *C. Stevens* (Gembloux 1957); id., *Notes pour servir à l'histoire du stévenisme,* 2 vols. (Gembloux 1958/63); E. Torfs: *Annales du Cercle archéologique d'Enghien* 10 (1955), 9–154, 11 (1956), 2–56; Th. Van Biervliet, *Het stevenisme in Vlaanderen* (Louvain 1956).

[20] J. Leflon, *E. de Mazenod* I (Paris 1957), 248–49, 317.

Everything had to be reconstructed and newly created. The new diocesan administrations not only needed to be put in place, but also had to adjust to the meager means available. The parish boundaries had to be arranged according to the directives of the government, and in them economic considerations also had to be taken into account. Church buildings which during the revolution were alienated from worship and employed for profane purposes[21] had to be reconsecrated for divine services. A new parish clergy had to be created and this point raised complex problems. At first sight there seemed to be no lack of qualified personnel. To be sure, there had been few ordinations during the past few years and many priests had resigned from their offices; but now, after the signing of the concordat,[22] many of these and married priests attempted to reconcile themselves with the Church. The former prebendiaries and monks also constituted a formidable reserve.[23] But aside from those who for political or theological reasons declined to enter the concordat Church, many were actually unsuited for a parish position. Some were too old or too discouraged by the new material or psychological conditions; the members of former chapters generally belonged to a university and had no pastoral training, while among the former monks many hesitated to become so engaged, as they momentarily expected a restoration of their orders or simply preferred the life of an itinerant preacher, sheltered by pious old ladies, to the sedentary existence of a poorly paid vicar.[24] Consequently quite a number of posts could not immediately be filled and this situation did not change for years. As late as 1808, 10,477 places, i.e., 21.2 percent, were vacant.

Another problem was that this numerically inadequate clergy was also quite disparate in other respects. It consisted of persons who came from different dioceses with different traditions; of monks alien to their new areas who brought with them new aspects of spirituality; of émigrés who for ten years had virtually lived a life of idleness; and of former Constituents, who were regarded suspiciously by their confreres and their parishioners, and whose reconciliation posed a number of delicate problems.[25] According to Bonaparte's plans one-third of the clergy was to come from the former Constituents. In reality this proportion was not reached, unless a bishop happened to be a former Constituent himself. State officials closed their eyes to this fact, knowing fully well that the rural population did not care for priests who had sworn the oath.

---

[21] On 14 October 1801, Napoleon had banned the adherents of Theophilanthropy from the churches.

[22] A precise census of the priests in 1801 is virtually impossible. See J. Leflon, *Bernier* II, 283, 356–91, and S. Delacroix, 134–44.

[23] A brief of 15 August 1801 had given Caprara far-reaching authority. A total of 3,224 priests, 2,313 of them secular priests and 911 priests of orders, sought absolution. Cf. S. Delacroix, 443–56.

[24] In 1808 in all of France 25 percent of the priests were still without office, in some dioceses such as Mecheln the percentage rose to 46. Many of them, especially those in the cities, raised formidable difficulties for the concordat bishops because of their latent opposition.

The absolutely essential personnel were placed quickly, sometimes too quickly. No serious repercussions occurred, unless a bishop or a prefect, as in Namur, lacked the necessary tact. Thought also had to be given to replacements, for in contrast to the bishops, the clergy had reached advanced middle age. In 1809 more than 33 percent of the priests were older than sixty years of age, and this ratio increased from year to year.

The reopening of the seminaries was a troublesome and protracted project. Money was lacking, as the government initially had not budgeted any sums for this purpose. Many bishops had to wait five or ten years for the return of the former seminary buildings. There was also a lack of competent teachers. It was necessary to fall back on prerevolutionary teachers, who in no way were able to cope with the temper of the times.[26] Finally, there was also an initial lack of students for the seminaries, because the small parochial schools in which they received their first training had disappeared ten years earlier, and the high officials of the public education system were eager to preserve their monopoly and reluctant to see them reintroduced. Ordinations increased from year to year, especially after seminarians had been exempted from military service and the government provided stipends for them. Still, there were only six thousand ordinations between 1801 and 1815, a figure which corresponded to ordinations in 1789 alone. Besides, the material condition of the rural clergy during the first few years was anything but attractive; only district pastors were paid by the state, the other nine-tenths received room and board from their communities which were not always generous.[27] Under such conditions, the reorganization of ecclesiastical administrations could be completed only after 1809.[28] Gradually the general situation improved, for the government was eager to retain the good will of the clergy. The budget rose from 1,200,000 francs in 1802 to 17,000,000 francs in 1807, making it possible to pay all parish administrators an annual salary of 500 francs (Decree of 31 May 1804).

---

[25] See S. Delacroix, 315–35 on the conflict of May–June 1802 between Caprara and the government over the phrasing of recantation. On the local level, the attitude differed among the various dioceses. Some bishops, like Fesch or d'Aviau were very strict, others, like Bernier, generous; the Constituent bishops were understandably even more generous, going so far in some cases, such as that of Saurine, bishop of Strasbourg, to question the principle of recantation. Other difficulties resulted especially in the Belgian dioceses in connection with the renunciation of the oath of hate against the monarchy. See, for example, J. Plumet, op. cit. 211–35 and C. de Clercq, *Bulletin de la Société d'art et d'histoire du diocèse de Liège* 38 (1953), 71–107. There were even disputes among the former refractory clergy, some of them, the "Purists," accusing the others of having taken the oath to the constitution of the year VIII even before the regulation of the religious question. The faithful sided in part with one, in part with the other group, giving rise to suspicion and arguments.

[26] In order to obtain higher standards of education, Portalis would have preferred to create in each Church province a metropolitan seminary reserved for the most talented. But the bishops opposed his plan, fearing that they would not be able to control his activity. On the reorganization of the seminaries, see J. Leflon, *M. Émery* II, 202–64.

Cooperation between state and Church took place not only in the financial sphere. Several measures strengthened the prestige of the Catholic Church. A law of 1 April 1803 decreed that children had to be given names of saints; a decree of 13 July 1804 ordered military honors for altar sacraments carried in processions and granted ecclesiastic dignitaries a place of honor in the official sequence of precedence (cardinals before state ministers, archbishops before prefects). On the local level, the bishops generally could count on the cooperation of officials, even if some prefects did not display their best side. Of course, the Church in turn had the obligation to cooperate with the state in maintaining order and the strict control to which all of its activities were subjected by the ministry of religion. After all, it was created by Bonaparte for the purpose of supervising the Church in the same way in which other ministries supervised other state agencies.[29] The rigidity and strictness of this centralization should not be overestimated, however. The men who had to implement on the local level decisions which had been reached at the national one, acted less servile, especially in important matters, than had long been thought. Occasionally they interpreted their directives in a rather personal way, such as was done in the diocese of Grenoble or the diocese of Ghent. All told, the situation differed from region to region, sometimes from one diocese to a neighboring one, depending on local circumstances as well as on the personality of the bishop or the prefect.

---

[27] E. Dupont, *La part des communes dans les frais du culte paroissial* (Paris 1906). See also A. Sicard, "Quinze années de budget des cultes à la charge des fidèles 1792–1807" in *Le Correspondant* 220 (1905), 209–38.

[28] See J. Gennart in *Annales de droit et de sciences politiques* 21 (Brussels 1961), 3–42.

[29] Portalis died in 1807. His successor was Bigot de Préameneu, a devoted Catholic, who felt he had to comply with every wish of the master of France. See J. Savant, *Les préfets de Napoléon* (Paris 1959), 69–72.

Although the concordat was silent on them, a limited official restoration of religious congregations took place. Napoleon and most of his advisers were quite hostile toward male orders; not only did they consider them useless, but even dangerous, as they were not under the control of the bishops. When it was noted that the Fathers of the Faith, who correctly were suspected of preparing the way for the resurrection of the Society of Jesus, had opened a number of schools thanks to the protection of Cardinal Fesch, a decree on 22 June 1804 ordered the immediate dissolution of all not officially sanctioned congregations. Government permission was granted only to mission congregations (priests of foreign missions, Fathers of the Holy Spirit, and the Lazarists) who were considered useful for the dissemination of the French spirit abroad, to the friars in the parochial schools on the basis of the irreplaceable and practically free services which they rendered for the education of the people,[30] and to some monasteries which were used as way stations at Alpine passes. The "useful" female congregations, on the other hand, i.e., congregations which devoted themselves to education and the care of the sick, not only were not molested in any way, but were in fact often encouraged officially. A breach in the revolutionary laws was made in December 1800, with the permission for the Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul. They also received permission to train pupils for service in hospitals and eight years later there were 1653 Daughters of Charity in 274 houses. In the course of the first decade of the new century a thoroughgoing revival took place. The restoration of dissolved monasteries which had begun under the Directory continued. The contemplatives often emphasized education and explained that their novices were to take care of the aged Sisters. There were several new creations, some of which were to have a great future. Following the example of the Fathers of the Faith, Madeleine Barat in 1800 founded the Sacred Heart Society in Paris for women who devoted themselves to the education of girls. In 1803, the Belgian Pierre-Joseph Triest founded in Ghent the Sisters of Charity of Jesus and Mary, who in 1806 were officially acknowledged as the first new congregation. In 1804, Marie-Rose-Julie Billiart founded the Sisters of Notre Dame in Amiens for the education and training of girls; in 1809 the order was transferred to Namur. In 1807, Jeanne-Elisabeth Bichier des Ages founded the Daughters of the Holy Cross of Saint Andrew in

---

[30] Napoleon was much concerned with control over higher education which trained the future leadership, and the decree of 15 November 1811 strengthened his supervision of the private high schools and the boys' schools, but he was not interested in elementary education. See L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France III/IV* (Paris 1946).

Poitiers for the purpose of educating children, nursing the sick, and taking care of the poor.[31]

A decree of the Emperor of 23 March 1805 made his mother the protector of the Sisters of Mercy in the entire Empire. In 1807, Napoleon convoked in Paris a meeting of all congregations devoted to the care of the sick. His penchant for organization was disturbed by the great number of small congregations and he wished to see them unite in one large organization. When he realized that it was not possible to effect this plan, he limited himself to decreeing on 18 February 1809 common guidelines defining the age of novices, the duration of their vows and similar matters, and ordered the congregations to have their statutes approved by the government before the end of the year. By this time there were 2057 convents with 16,447 nuns devoted to the care of the sick and the poor.

Religious Revival

"It was not Napoleon's intention to rechristianize France, but to exploit for his own benefit the religious feeling which still existed," stated G. Lefebvre correctly. The work by S. Delacroix illustrates in detail this utilitarian and often cynical attitude toward religion. Yet the aim of rechristianizing France, not shared by Napoleon, was pursued by a considerable number of the concordat clergy, assisted by the reviving religious congregations and an elite of laymen. They were able to record a limited but undeniable success. These forces were aided by the ministry of religion, at least in the first few years after the signing of the concordat, a support which was due to the circle of clergymen from Provence who gathered around Portalis and Cardinal Fesch.

There were, of course, many priests among the randomly collected clergy who were totally lacking in apostolic spirit and who had no difficulty performing their office of "pious administration" to which the government wished to limit them. But many others and numerous bishops, among them many former Constituents who stood out by their special zeal (regardless of what may have been said about them before), were firmly convinced that reintroduction of religion and worship was not enough. They undertook a gigantic effort to clean up a situation whose roots went back to prerevolutionary times, but which had been aggravated by the revolution. It must be noted, though, that the reopening of the churches almost everywhere was greeted joyfully, that the faithful set about putting up the torn-down crosses, and that the jubilee pronounced at the end of 1803 was a great success. But despite all external devotion to old customs, festivities, and forms, religious indifference prevailed quite frequently in the cities. It was encountered even in the rural regions, where for a decade the population had not observed religious customs, where many abnormal conditions, especially in the area of marriages, had to be cleared up, and where most of the young people had had no exposure to a catechism and lived in deep religious ignorance.

---

[31] See L. Baunard, *Histoire de Madame Barat,* 2 vols. (Paris 1876, 1925); L. Cnockaert, *Le chanoine Triest et ses fondations* (Diss. Louvain 1971); Th. Réjalot, *La bienheureuse Julie Billiart* (Namur 1922); E. Domec, *Vie de Ste. Jeanne-Élisabeth Bichier des Ages* (Paris 1950).

The number of confirmations attests the seriousness with which the bishops undertook the systematic visitation of their dioceses. Some of them, like Monsignor d'Aviau, the pious Archbishop of Bordeaux, did not hesitate to preach all day long and hear confessions;[32] others organized catechismal instruction on the model of Saint Sulpice and were inspired by the advice of the respected Émery. After 1800, he transformed his revived society into one of the most active centers of religious revival and secretly remained the conscience of the Church of France until his death in 1811.[33]

The lower clergy was not idle either. Many priests organized retreats in order to encourage the zeal of their brethren. As early as 1799, still under the Directory, Abbé Allemand founded the first youth center in Marseille, an institution which was to have a great future in the nineteenth century. Others wanted to lead the intellectuals back to the Church and concentrated on a renewal of apologetic sermons, represented chiefly by Frayssinous in Paris. One must also look at the more modest parallel attempts which were undertaken in the provinces, with different rates of success and in different directions. Some, rejecting the compromise of the eighteenth century, preached an open return to the great religious century of Malebranche and Bossuet, while others tried to see the future of the Church in light of the undeniable facts of the revolution. Others again, more concerned with the salvation of the masses, organized missions in the parishes,[34] which assumed large proportions after the jubilee of 1803, owing to the assistance provided by de

---

[32] See Dom du Bourg, *Mgr du Bourg, évêque de Limoges* (Paris 1907), 391–408; J.-P. Lyonnet, *Histoire de Mgr d'Aviau* IV (Paris 1847), 528–31.

[33] See J. Leflon, *M. Émery* II, 177–99. On the Compagnie de St-Sulpice under Napoleon see J. Leflon, *E. de Mazenod* I, 309–409; C. Maréchal, *La jeunesse de Lamennais* (Paris 1913), 125–48; de Montclos, 5–17; J. Audinet, *L'Ecclésiologie au XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris 1960), 115–39.

[34] See E. Sevrin, *Les missions religieuses en France sous la Restauration* I (Paris 1948), 11–21.

Clorivière's Priests of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and chiefly to Father Varin's Fathers of the Faith. While these missions were sharply watched by the police, they also frequently were aided and occasionally subsidized by the civil authorities. Cardinal Fesch planned a national mission society which was to be made part of the Grand Almonry under the direction of Abbé Rauzan, a famous missionary. But after his disagreement with Pius VII, Napoleon, on 26 September 1809, forbade the continuation of these missions, as he feared that these "itinerant and vagabond" priests could become propaganda agents in the papal cause. Through measures of this nature, which during the last years of the Empire followed one another in rapid succession and which impeded the traditional priestly apostolate, several initiatives of a more modest scope were of great value. Among others there were the Marian Congregations for students, founded in 1801 in Paris by the former Jesuit P. Delpuits. After their elimination in 1809, they played an active role in the religious resistance;[35] the congregations of young men and young women from all walks of life which after 1806 were founded in Bordeaux by Abbé J. Chaminade, secular institutions with the aim of forming religious nuclei on the level of different social classes;[36] and the Congregation of Lyon with an even more pronounced lay character. Its origins fell in the time before the concordat and contributed to placing the church of Lyon in the vanguard of the religious restoration of the nineteenth century.[37] On the other hand it must be noted that the disappearance of most of the confraternities during the revolution allowed the parish priest in all of France an exclusive leadership role. This, in turn, was all too often a reason for the faithful to ignore the religious life in the parish.

The various evangelization attempts bore fruit only slowly. There were indeed baptisms and first communions of adults, and the prominent people in communities once again attended Mass, but until the end of the Empire there was little call, especially among men, for the Sacraments. One characteristic detail serves to illuminate the picture. Only a few of the thousands of wounded in the Moscow military hospitals in 1812 demanded to see a priest. Such facts justify Grégoire's disappointed statement that while there was religious exercise in France, there was little religious feeling.[38] But in one area an encouraging development had begun: in the world of the intellectuals.

---

[35] See G. de Grandmaison, *La Congrégation* (Paris 1890), 14–137. Not much is known about the activity in the provinces.

[36] P. Broutin, *NRTh* 65 (1938), 413–36; A. Windisch, *The Marianist Social System* (Fribourg 1964).

[37] Cl. Embruyen, *La vie a jailli des ruines. Le P. Roger* (Lyon 1947) and especially A. Lestra, *Histoire secrète de la congrègation de Lyon* (Paris 1967).

Revolutionary excesses and the failure of an ethical philosophy without God had caused many heads to turn away from the rationalistic philosophy of the eighteenth century. They began to see again in a religion of revelation the irrevocable basis for all of social life, and inextricably tied together the ideas of truth, tradition, and authority, applying the concept of authority to the authority of the monarch in a state as well as to the authority of God and the Church. If the works of Joseph de Maistre and Vicomte de Bonald, published in 1796 during the emigration and sketching the outlines of their traditionalist systems, found only a limited echo in France before 1815, they were nevertheless symptomatic of the mentality which grew from year to year. At the very moment when Napoleon reopened the churches, the great writer Chateaubriand contributed much to making Catholicism acceptable again in the eyes of the intellectuals. On 4 April 1802, he published *Le Génie du christianisme,* a radical "No" to Voltairean enlightenment. The book was a tremendous and lasting success, proving that it appeared at just the right time. In admirable language and with original force he orchestrated themes touched upon by many apologetic writers of the eighteenth century and directed the religious yearning of his contempories no longer to the vague Christianity of a Rousseau but directly to the Catholic Church, its dogmas, its Sacraments, its rites.[39] It savaged the prejudices of the eighteenth century, which had portrayed Catholicism as barbaric and mediocre, and described it instead as a wholesome haven for all whose bodies and souls suffer. To Chateaubriand it was the source of poetic inspiration, equally as fruitful as heathen antiquity.

Chateaubriand continued the success of *Le Génie du christianisme* in 1809 with his novel *Les martyrs ou le triomphe de la religion,* a Christian epic. In the meantime other writers, mostly émigrés, had also taken up the battle against the philosophy of the eighteenth century as the source of atheism, among them Ballanche, Michaud, and Royer-Collard with his *Journal de l'Empire.* These men found support in the drawing rooms of Paris, such as those of Madame de Rémusat, Madame de la Briche, and Élisa Bonaparte. After 1803 they were also supported by Fontanes, the chancellor of the university, a personally rather skeptical epicurean, who was convinced of the social utility of religion. He appointed Émery and Bonald to his General Council, and sent many members of the old congregations with teaching experience into the high schools so that they could attack the dangerous philosophy of the eighteenth century.

---

[38] *Mémoires* II, 423. On the situation in Paris see especially L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Paris sous Napoléon* IV (Paris 1907), chapter 3.

[39] See V. Giraud, *Le christianisme de Chateaubriand,* 2 vols. (Paris 1925/28).

To be sure, as Fontanes shows exemplarily, many of these Neo-Christians, as they were then called, were only sympathizers on the surface. They also constituted only a minority, for the ideologues, the heirs of the atheistic encyclopedists, still occupied strong positions in the important areas of the press, the literary salons, the scientific societies, and the humanities at universities.

In summary it can be said that by 1810 the concordat Church had justified reasons to be proud of the regained territory, but that in spite of everything its strength was weak and its successes mere seeds, to bear fruit only during the time of restoration. Before it, another storm had to be weathered.

The Pope and the Emperor

In May 1804, Bonaparte was proclaimed as Emperor of the French. To a high degree the leaders of the Church of France had fostered this development with the extravagant praises in their pastoral letters of the "modern Cyrus," the "new Constantine," and the "restorer of altars." Against the advice of the Curia, Pius VII decided to travel to Paris in order to anoint the new Emperor (2 December 1804), even though in the entire history of the Holy Roman Empire a Pope had never journeyed to Vienna for the coronation of an Emperor. Fesch, appointed ambassador to Rome in April 1803, convinced the Pope that direct contact with Napoleon could effect a change in the Organic Articles and the legislation on marriage and at the same time regulate the worrisome problems which the development of the situation in Germany and Italy posed for the Church. With respect to these issues, the Pope's stay in Paris produced only meager results. But it had useful effects for the Holy See insofar as the former Constituent bishops were finally forced to clear up their situation, a result which in France and Italy was seen as a victory of papal authority. It also gave numerous priests and the faithful, for whom the papacy in the past had been nothing more than an abstract concept, an opportunity to laud a man whose spiritual aura made such a deep impression that this journey saw the beginning of that devotion to the Pope which was to play such a large role in the church history of France during the nineteenth century. The anointment of the Emperor officially confirmed the rejection of the revolutionary ideology; it proclaimed the new alliance between throne and altar, which at that time appeared to most observers as the essential prerequisite for a religious restoration. For this reason the episcopate, followed by a large portion of the clergy, during the next three years increasingly lent the government a hand. Eventually this went so far as to include in the uniform catechism in use in all churches of the French Empire a passage which, under threat of eternal perdition, required from all the faithful "love, respect, obedience, loyalty toward Napoleon, our Emperor, service in the army, and payment of the taxes necessary for the maintenance and defense of the fatherland and its throne."[40]

The loyalty of the French clergy toward the Emperor, which only too frequently degenerated into servility, was shaken after 1808 by the conflict between Napoleon and Pius VII. Gradually such a change occurred in Napoleon's attitude toward the Church that during the last years of his reign one could believe to be back in the sad years of the Directory.

The conflict broke out when war with Europe was renewed. Napoleon, expanding his religious policy to continental dimensions, wanted to use the Pope in western Europe as he used his bishops in France, and wanted to force Pius VII to join him politically and morally. This pretension met categorical rejection because the Pope, as head of the universal Church, wished to maintain a strict neutrality. Convinced that Consalvi was behind the Pope's resistance, Napoleon demanded his dismissal. But Consalvi's resignation (17 June 1806) only strengthened the influence of the reactionaries. In 1807 a number of peremptory demands reached the Pope: Napoleon insisted not only on the Pope's joining an Italian league against "heretical England," but also made unacceptable demands with respect to church policy in Italy, and demanded the inclusion of additional French cardinals into the Sacred College until their number had reached a third of the total. Pius VII, accusing himself of having been too weak in the question of the Organic Articles, the equality of religions,[41] and the imperial catechism, this time did not give in and rejected Napoleon's demands.

---

[40] The catechism was edited independently from the bishops in the office of the *Direction des Cultes* by Abbé d'Astros and Bernier and personally corrected by Napoleon. To the great dismay of Rome it was accepted by the old legate Caprara, who once again had allowed himself to be outmaneuvered, as well as (with certain reservations) by the entire episcopate. In actuality it was hardly taught and many bishops avoided prescribing it in areas where there was strong resistance. See A. Latreille, *Le catéchisme impérial de 1806* (Paris 1935). In the Belgian departments resistance was almost universal, as their ultramontane sentiments were hurt by a procedure which reminded people of the interventions of Joseph II in ecclesiastical matters. See C. de Clercq: *Annales de la Féderation historique et archéologique de Belgique* 35 (1953), 319–78; id., *SE* 8 (1956), 378–420. On the resistance in Italy see R. Paschini in *RSTI* 17 (1963), 406–12.

[41] A last step in this direction was taken in 1806 when Napoleon decreed the equality of the Jewish with the Catholic and Protestant religions and permitted the reestablishment of the Great Sanhedrin. It is to be noted that Napoleonic policy was not favorable in all

The Emperor now ordered general Miollis to occupy Rome (2 February 1808), but left the Pontiff a faint degree of sovereignty in the hope that he would give in. Pius VII was not intimidated by this massive pressure. Quite the contrary: When fifteen papal officials were deported from Rome, he publicly accused the emperor of enchaining the government of the Church, and replied with the recall of ambassador Caprara from Paris and the refusal to perform the investment of bishops according to the concordat, i.e., by mentioning their nomination by the Emperor. After his secretary of state had also been exiled, he appointed Cardinal Pacca, the best head among the zealots, as his successor. Napoleon did not react immediately. But after his decisive victory over Austria he was firmly convinced that the collapse of Europe's sole remaining large Catholic monarchy had removed the Pope's last support. On 17 May 1809, he annexed the Papal States to France in order to put an end to the "improper combination of secular and spiritual power." On 10 June, as the papal flag was taken down and replaced by the French tricolor, Pius VII answered with the excommunication of all "robbers of Peter's patrimony," without mentioning Napoleon by name. Several weeks of indecisiveness followed. When the occupation forces feared a rebellion of the Roman population, they exceeded the directives of the Emperor[42] and placed the Pope and Cardinal Pacca in a carriage going north. After a hard journey of longer than a month, the Pope was given Savona on the Italian Riviera as residence. There he remained until the beginning of 1812, separated from all advisers and—in spite of the official respect which he was shown—increasingly cut off from contact with the outside world. It was impossible for him to act as Pope, i.e., to concern himself with the affairs of the universal Church.

The French administration concerned itself with the modernization of the Papal States, dividing it into three departments, and closed the foreign colleges, such as the German, the Spanish, and the Irish college. A number of the papal offices were transferred to Paris, where Napoleon intended to move the seat of the papacy as well. In the meantime, the Curia cardinals and the head of orders had to move to the French capital. They were treated at first with respect, but this changed rapidly when, upon the advice of Consalvi, thirteen of them refused to attend the wedding of Napoleon and Marie-Louise, the daughter of the Emperor of Austria. They refused to recognize the nullification of his first

---

points to the Protestants. Those of the Organic Articles applying to them robbed them of an essential element of Calvinistic church organization, the synods. Thus the restoration of the Protestant churches proceeded even slower than that of the Catholic churches. See D. Robert, *Les Églises reformées en France, 1800–30* (Paris 1961), 47–259; R. Anchel, *Napoléon et les Juifs* (Paris 1928).

[42] See H. Aureas, *Un général de Napoléon, Miollis* (Paris 1961), 151–54.

marriage, issued by the Paris office.[43] Napoleon at first prohibited them from wearing their insignias (resulting in the nickname "black cardinals"), then sequestered their possessions, and finally exiled them to the provinces.[44]

As a result of the vigilance of the office of censorship, the mass of the clergy and the faithful in France at first took no notice of the conflict, as it seemed to be a political struggle concerning merely the secular position of the Pope. Thus a vicar general could state to the pastors of Lyon: "The clergy of France lost its possessions, now the Pope lost his. But that did not change religion or his spiritual powers." But after the autumn of 1809, as a result of the activity of clandestine groups of laymen and clergymen,[45] a number of documents found their way into circulation, among them the papal bull of excommunication. Additionally, reports spoke of the inability of the imprisoned Pope to exercise his duties as the head of the Church. The people hostile to the Emperor, especially the members of the royalist opposition, were only too pleased to exploit his break with the papacy, a break which the sanctions against the "black cardinals" made completely evident.

The bishops were afraid that the French Church, so recently recovered, would be drawn into a new conflict with the state, a state which now was much more powerful than at the time of the Directory. At first there was therefore the attempt to still the increasing discontent with the expectation that soon a satisfactory solution would be achieved. Additionally, Gallican traditions and the memory of a similar conflict between Louis XIV and Innocent XI encouraged them not to take the whole matter too seriously. But the tactic of Pius VII to deny the canonical investiture to the bishops nominated by the Emperor eventually forced them to assume a less complacent attitude. By the summer of 1810 there were twenty-seven vacant dioceses and the flocks began to get worried. Some of the new imperially appointed bishops tried to assume their duties without papal investment, but met the opposition of the clergy, which was being seized by ultramontane ideas. When the

---

[43] The officialate made its decision according to Gallican law and no French bishop criticized it, not even Émery, whom no one could suspect of subservience toward the power of the state. But the Roman teachers of canon law judged differently. See L. Grégoire, *Le "divorce" de Napoléon. Étude du dossier canonique* (Paris 1957).

[44] See U. Beseghi, *I tredici cardinali neri* (Florence 1944). Also G. de Grandmaison, *Napoléon et les cardinaux noirs* (Paris 1895) and V. Bindel, *Le Vatican à Paris 1809–14* (Paris, no date).

[45] Mainly the "Congrégation de Lyon" and the "Aa" of the Sulpician seminaries. J. Verrier in *RHE* 54 (1959), 71–121, 453–91 shows the great role played by the Lyon layman F. D. Aynès in the spreading of these documents, and C. Bona, *Le "Amicizie"* (Turin 1962), describes the activity of the Turin group of Pio Lanteri.

Chapter of Paris under the influence of Vicar General d'Astros refused to reassign the administration of the diocese to Cardinal Maury, popular opinion was strongly impressed.[46] When several probes elicited no response from the Pope, Napoleon had no choice but to follow the advice of the committee of theologians, which he consulted in the matter. Their advice was to convoke a national council, which in view of the special circumstances was to decide to return to the "earlier custom" of investment of bishops by the metropolitan bishop. One hundred forty French, Italian, and German bishops participated in this council, which opened on 17 June 1811, in Paris.[47] Although a good number of the participants regarded the tactics of Pius VII as exaggerated, the council proved itself much more recalcitrant than had been expected. It stated that a council decree would not be possible without the agreement of the Pope. Napoleon was angry and imprisoned the three bishops leading the opposition.[48] But in actuality all of the bishops, even the most Gallican among them, after the experience with the revolution, refused to take the path toward a schism again. They understood full well that this time they would encounter the resistance of a large part of the lower clergy and of militant laymen, who were increasingly worried about the course of events.

After this attempt had failed, Napoleon tried to master the situation through political chicanery against the priests and against the Sulpicians, who were made responsible for the ultramontane behavior of the young clergy. After his return from Russia, he tried to force the Pope to give in. The Pope meanwhile had been brought to Fontainebleau and, after several days of angry negotiations, completely weakened by illness, agreed on 25 January 1813 to sign the draft of a convention which in essential points corresponded to the demands of the Emperor. Although the agreement was to remain secret and to serve merely as the basis for a final settlement, the Emperor published it immediately under the name of Concordat of Fontainebleau. But three days later the Pope decided to recant his act of weakness[49] and on 25 March wrote a long letter to the Emperor. Napoleon pretended that he was unaware of the letter and celebrated the reconciliation between Church and state with religious services of praise and thanksgiving.

---

[46] See G. de Bertier in *RHEF* 35 (1949), 49–58.

[47] The inadequate work by A. Ricard, *Le concile de 1811* (Paris 1894), has not yet been supplanted. See in addition to A. Latreille, op. cit. 214–25 and *RH* 194 (1944), 1–22, J.-B. Vanell, "Le concile de 1811 d'après les papiers du cardinal Fesch" in *Bulletin d'histoire du diocèse de Lyon* (1912/13) and V. Bindel, *Le Vatican à Paris* (Paris, no date).

[48] These were Mgr. de Boulogne, bishop of Troyes, Mgr. de Broglie, bishop of Ghent, and Mgr. Hirn, bishop of Tournai. The last two had allowed themselves to be influenced by the very ultramontane views of their clergy.

[49] This was proved by L. Pásztor: *ChStato* II, 597–606. See the text of the draft of Fontainebleau in Mercati I, 579–81 and the letter of Pius VII of 23 March 1813, id. 581–85.

There was no doubt that the time of the concordat was over. Napoleon's conduct toward the spiritual power deeply angered the Catholic conscience. Catholics became increasingly excited and agitated, especially by an extraordinarily active secret society, the "Chevaliers de la foi," recruited from the ranks of congregations. This secret society was founded in May 1810 by a royalist nobleman, F. de Bertier, with the double objective of returning to the Pope his freedom and secular power and restoring the monarchy.[50] These "Knights of the Faith" accepted the views of Abbé Barruel on the freemasonic origins of the revolution,[51] and were largely responsible for convincing French Catholics that their faith was severely endangered as long as they had a government inspired by the principles of the Revolution. This secret propaganda actively prepared the Catholics to connect the cause of religion with the restoration of the Bourbons. The quickly flaring fire of anticlericalism accompanying Napoleon's Hundred Days completely stiffened the attitude of those who, after the disappointments of the final years of Napoleon's domination, saw the salvation of the Church solely in the triumph of counterrevolution. This was the negative aspect of this collision between wordly and spiritual power, and for several generations was to be a heavy burden for French Catholics. For the papacy it had a double advantage. For one, the problem of the freedom of the Church and the neutrality of the Holy See was posed for the whole world as a problem of international policy. For another, the fact that the papacy had had the courage to defy the tyrant when all other governments bowed before him, lent the papacy a moral prestige of which the governments of the subsequent generation had to take account.

Southern Europe

A large part of Italy did not belong to the French state, even though it was under the control of French armies. In this part the concordat of 1801 was, of course, not applied.

In the north, the former Cisalpine Republic was reorganized as the Italian Republic. Napoleon, aware that its population was even fonder of its religion than the French,[52] in Article 1 of the new constitution recognized Catholicism as the established religion, much to the dismay of the local Jacobins. Allowing for the influence which the clergy had retained for itself, he appointed a committee of clerics—and not lay jurists as in France—under the leadership of Cardinal Bellisomi for the purpose of preparing the "Organic Law for the Clergy of the Italian Republic" (27 January 1802). In part, this law was modeled on the French concordat, but, in a whole series of points, was more favorable to the Church. It maintained the jurisdiction of the clergy in marriages, cathedral chapters and seminaries received subsidies, and Church lands not yet employed for other purposes were restored. Napoleon desired the confirmation of this law through a concordat with the Holy See. The negotiations in Paris between Cardinal Caprara and the Italian Republic's emissary dragged on for longer than a year, because in the meantime Vice-President Melzi d'Eril had passed a decree of pure Josephine inspiration (23 June 1802), subordinating almost every ecclesiastical activity to the power of the state. Pius VII expressly demanded the cancellation of the decree in the text of the concordat. A compromise formulation was eventually adopted, and the concordat was signed on 16 September 1803.[53] It was even more favorable for the Church than the Organic Law of 1802.

---

[50] See G. de Bertier, *Le comte F. de Bertier* (Paris 1948); Also A. Saitta in *RSIt* 62 (1950), 124–33.

[51] On the origin and the success of this thesis see chapter 1, footnote 5.

A severe disappointment was in store, though. On 24 January 1804, Melzi published an implementation order, which put in question several important gains. Not only did it enact a portion of the republican church regulations preceding the concordat—thus violating it—but also declared the government of the republic to be the successor to the rights of the former duke of Milan. In practical terms this amounted to the reintroduction of the Josephine laws in effect before the revolution. Strong protests of the Holy See had no immediate effect. But when in 1805 the republic, through the inclusion of Venetia, was changed into the Kingdom of Italy, Napoleon with his decree of 22 May 1805 lifted the Melzi order of 1804. In the following month several steps were taken, which on a disciplinary and financial level regulated the clergy, dissolved a number of monasteries, and reduced the number of parishes in order to increase the subsidies for the remaining ones. These steps on the whole were sensible and were received well by the clergy. But their unilateral character caused new Roman protests. The extension of the concordat of 1803 and the laws resulting from it to Venetia without prior consultation also were protested, because these laws introduced the secularization of institutions to another area of the Italian peninsula. The introduction of the French civil code, and therefore of divorce, also raised objections from the Holy See. In the following years tensions between Rome and Milan increased. In October 1806 Pius VII began to deny investment to the bishops nominated by Napoleon for Italy, justifying it with the violation of the concordat. The introduction of the imperial catechism in Italy during 1807 occasioned additional polemics, just as did the inclusion of the Papal States in the Kingdom.[54] But the heightening tensions between Pope and Emperor soon moved the focus of conflict to France.

---

[52] Which was not to say that everything was satisfactory. In June 1809 the bishop of Vercelli wrote: "A good third of the faithful no longer performs its Easterly obligations, especially since the revolution."

[53] Mercati I, 565–72.

The situation in the other Italian states was hardly more satisfying for the Roman Curia. The only exception was Tuscany which had become the Kingdom of Etruria. Bishop Scipione de' Ricci completely subordinated himself to the Pope and the new King, Louis of Parma, in a way which was particularly favorable to Rome, thereby restoring almost total freedom to the Church. In 1802 the first Catholic journal in the nineteenth century was founded[55] in Florence as the organ of the militant Catholic group of the "Amicizie." Yet the objections of the French embassy and the incorporation of the Etrurian Kingdom in the French Empire after the battle of Austerlitz put a quick stop to the hopes of the Holy See, which after 1808 also had to suffer the dissolution of all monasteries.

In the Duchy of Parma and the Republic of Lucca the interference of the civil authorities with ecclesiastical matters caused Pius VII to protest repeatedly. But it was in vain, especially as the clergy, even before annexation, showed itself very subservient.

In the Kingdom of Naples, the negotiations toward a concordat foundered, in part because of Acton's refusal to give up the old Josephinistic laws, and in part because of the refusal of Pius VII to reduce the number of dioceses from 131 (in a population of five million!) to 50. When Napoleon's brother Joseph succeeded King Ferdinand in 1805, he at once began a radical reform of the Church, which until then had retained its Old Regime character. For ideological and primarily financial reasons, all abbeys and priories as well as a large portion of the houses of the mendicant orders[56] were dissolved between August 1806 and August 1809, beginning with the wealthiest. The secular clergy also was the objective of several steps designed to reduce the excessively high number of clergymen (there was one priest for every eight hundred inhabitants, and many priests lived in degrading circumstances). A considerable reduction of the number of dioceses was also planned, but diplomatic and military events as well as internal disturbances kept Joseph's successor, King Murat, so busy that he had no time left to pursue the plan. Additionally, Napoleon's violent conduct toward the Pope and other reform measures so alienated the clergy that now its secret opposition, just as effective as hard to defeat, stirred up the latent hostility of the population against the French.

---

[54] Bishops at first and then hundreds of priests refused to take the oath. See G. Cornaggia-Medici, "Una pagina di politica del Regno italico. Il giuramento di fedeltà dei vescovi dei dipartimenti del Metauro, Musone et Tronto (1808)," *Archivio storico lombardo* 41 (1934), 169–222; L. Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon* (Paris 1906), 330–45, 435–53; A. Mercati in *RSTI* 7 (1953), 51–96. Other problems were raised by the dissolution of the monasteries. See C. A. Naselli, *La soppressione napoleonica delle corporazioni religiose. Il caso dei passionisti* (Rome 1970).

[55] "Ape" under active collaboration of Cesare d'Azeglio. Cf. C. Bona, *Le "Amicizie"* (Turin 1962), 248–52.

Revolutionary ideas had not nearly the same success in Spain as in Italy. The reason was in part the strength of the political unity of the country at this time, in part the still strong influence of the Church and the power of the Inquisition.[57] Yet Spain was the only Catholic state which throughout the storms maintained cordial relations with revolutionary France. Godoy, King Charles IV's favorite, even based his foreign policy on the alliance with France. This also explains why Monsignor Despuig, the official representative of Spain, worked together with France during the conclave of Venice leading to the election of Pius VII.

Thus the last years of the eighteenth century did not mean for Spain, as they did for France, Italy, and Germany, the end of the Church of the Old Regime. Nevertheless, the church policy of the Spanish government created some concern for the Holy See. On one hand Madrid had the not unjustified impression that secular interests, especially Avignon and the Papal States, occupied the Pope and his advisers more than religious problems. It did not hide the opinion that the Church would gain enormously if the Pope were to renounce his secular power in order to become a purely spiritual force. On the other hand, the old claims of the government to deal with ecclesiastical matters independently from Rome, and the episcopal leanings of a part of the clergy, freshly fueled by the recent influence of Italian Jansenism, were strengthened by the political developments after 1797 in Italy. After all, it was not at all clear how the centralized system was to continue to function in the area of ecclesiastical appointments to benefices and the granting of dispensations, once Rome had come under French control and the Roman Curia was completely disorganized. For this reason—and not because of freemasonic and Jacobin influence as Menendez Pelayo asserted—M. L. de Urquijo with the support of the Jansenists started campaigning for a return to the old church discipline. He utilized the vacancy of Saint Peter's after the death of Pius VI to publish a decree by J. Espiga, a member of the Spanish Rota, on 5 September 1799, which transferred the right of dispensation of marriages from the Roman congregation to the Spanish bishops.

---

[56] See P. Villani in *RStRis* 44 (1957), 508–13. Ultimately more than eleven hundred monasteries were sold and the proportion of real property owned by the clergy sank from 26 percent at the end of the eighteenth century to 13 percent in 1815. See also U. Caldora, *Calabria napoleonica* (Naples 1960).

[57] See R. Herr, *The Eighteenth-Century Revolution in Spain* (Princeton 1958). The bishops tried everything to prevent the incursion of revolutionary ideas. Even the emigrated French priests were looked upon with suspicion and carefully kept separate under surveillance. On the Spanish Inquisition at the end of the eighteenth century, see F. Marti Gilabert, op. cit., 155–90.

This decree was declared void immediately after the elevation of Pius VII because of the resistance of the majority of the Spanish clergy and the pangs of conscience of the King, and Urquijo was pushed aside. But in the following years Godoy wrested from the King a number of measures which limited the influence of the nuncio and the Inquisition and obtained from Rome the authorization to dispose of certain Church lands and to subordinate the orders more to the King. The orders were in fact a serious problem for the Church, for in 1797 there were no fewer than 53,098 monks and 24,471 nuns, approximately 1 percent of the population, with signs of decadence visible everywhere. Godoy succeeded in having the young Cardinal Luis de Borbon, who was sympathetic to his plans, put in charge of visiting all of the more than two thousand Spanish monasteries. After a rather superficial inquiry he had the King submit plans to the Pope on 30 May 1803, with the purpose of strengthening the supervision of the monasteries by the bishops and of obtaining for the mendicant orders, which constituted 84 percent of all monasteries, virtual independence from their superiors in Rome. After more than one year of negotiations the Spanish government was ready to reduce some of its demands, but the papal Bull *Inter graviores* of 15 May 1804 was still a satisfactory arrangement.[58]

After Napoleon had substituted his brother Joseph as King of Spain[59] for the dynasty of the Bourbons in 1808, the French administration backed the interests of the old Spanish royal prerogatives. They were represented at court by the expert in canon law, J. A. Llorente,[60] and by

---

[58] See chapter 12, footnote 8.

[59] Catalonia was incorporated into France. In 1811 the bishops retreated to Mallorca under the protection of the British fleet.

[60] See *EEAm* XXXI, 1063–65 and Schulte III, 766–67.

Urquijo, who again had become Minister. Consequently the interventions of the government in the ecclesiastical sphere multiplied. The court of the Inquisition was immediately dissolved and the estates of the confraternities were put up for sale. The decree of 1799 on the granting of dispensations from marriages was immediately reinstituted on 16 November 1809, even though this measure could be implemented only partially, owing to the revolt which, depending on the region, lasted until the return of King Ferdinand VII in December 1813. Napoleon contemptuously called it a monkish rebellion, but in actuality it was the consequence of the tremendous dissatisfaction which the French occupation caused in the economic, social, and political areas. Undeniably it was the religious factor which gave the resistance its special flavor. Only a few prelates such as Cardinal de Borbon, archbishop of Toledo, and the archbishop of Saragossa initially supported Joseph Bonaparte in the hope that the French administration would at long last modernize the worm-eaten structures of Church and state. The majority of the episcopate, which since 1790 had castigated the revolution as the work of Satan, played a significant role in the rebellious juntas, which called upon the very religious people to rise simultaneously for the liberation of the country and the preservation of the orthodoxy and purity of their religion. The papal bull of excommunication of July 1809 strengthened the campaign against "atheistic France." Many monasteries became centers of resistance, and numerous priests and monks, not satisfied with stoking the religious fanaticism of their flocks, frequently fought together with the guerrillas.

In liberated Spain the central junta, residing at first in Seville, cancelled the measures for the confiscation of Church lands and reintroduced the Inquisition on 28 December 1808. Even the old Jesuits were permitted to return. But during the work on the constitution by the Cortes of Cádiz in March 1812, the enlightened minority, which in no way should be identified with the adherents of French revolutionary ideas, carried the day over the traditionalist majority. They were supported by Jansenist clergymen like Joaquín Villanueva,[61] who desired a thorough overhaul of church law. They did not dare go so far as a civil constitution of the clergy, but fell back on a strengthened version of Godoy's policy. In the face of financial difficulties, the bishops did not dare protest against the economic measures, such as the collection of certain taxes and confiscation of certain church lands by the state, or the decision to close about one thousand monasteries with too few members. Although the occupation of a part of the area made collective action impossible, the bishops, especially those of the north,[62] reacted sharply against the introduction of freedom of the press and against the declaration of the incompatibility of the court of the Inquisition with the liberal principles of the constitution. It must also be noted, however, that a portion of the episcopate reacted less hostilely to the demands of the civil power for independence from the Holy See, and that about one-half of the bishops sided with Cardinal de Borbon in the jurisdictional struggles which he carried on with Nuncio Gravina after 1809. The opposition reached its peak when the Primate and the government demanded the right to fill seats made vacant by death[63] as long as the Pope was Napoleon's prisoner. Ultimately, the nuncio was expelled in April 1813 and resided in Portugal until the restoration of Ferdinand VII.

---

[61] See J. S. Boa, *Doctrina canónica del doctor Villanueva* (Vitoria 1957).

---

[62] It must be remembered that in view of the chaotic conditions of the country many decisions of the Cortes of Cádiz remained dead letters outside of Andalusia and a few large cities.

[63] In 1813, sixteen sees, a quarter of the total, were vacant.

PART TWO

The Catholic Church and the Restoration

To a much more marked degree than at the election of Pius VII, the Church, now faced with a new Europe erected by the counterrevolutionary movement upon the ruins of the Napoleonic Empire and still deeply marked by the modern ideas which contemporaries termed "liberalism," had to begin a reconstruction. Pius VII concerned himself with this task immediately after his return to Rome in May 1814. With the increasing assistance of the brilliant Consalvi,[1] whom he reappointed as secretary of state, and supported by a religious renascence which had grown spontaneously in various countries, the Pope devoted the final nine years of his pontificate to laying a solid foundation for the rapid rise of the Church. His activity, on the spiritual level more than in the political sphere, determined the history of the Church in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The effort of Pius VII and his successor Leo XII toward the reorganization of the Church was the prerequisite for the revival of Catholic vitality.

Only Austria, Spain, and Portugal had not been affected by the French Revolution and therefore experienced no essential alterations of their ecclesiastical structures. In all other countries it was necessary to adjust dioceses to the new political boundaries, to rebuild ecclesiastical institutions, and to restore the almost extinct orders and patrimony of the Church. The conditions for this restoration differed in the individual countries. In France, the basic structure of the Church was already in line with the new conditions, even though religious policy had a changed orientation after the return of the Bourbons. In Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy, the spread of French ideas and secularizations had resulted in a profound shock, and for the Church there were also important territorial changes to which it had to adjust. In Great Britain, the growth of liberal ideas was used for the liberation of the Irish Catholics from their oppressed condition. In Russia, the new situation, created at the end of the eighteenth century by the inclusion of several million Polish Catholics into an Orthodox state, had to be negotiated with an autocratic ruler. Overseas there were serious problems as well. The declarations of independence in Spanish America required a new approach to the status of the Church, which heretofore had been dependent on Spanish patronage. With respect to the Near East, which had come much closer to the Occident psychologically in the course of the Napoleonic wars, the Holy See desired to establish closer ties with the Uniate patriarchs. Even the missionary apostolate had been compelled to acknowledge the result of the changes in Europe and was in need of a reconstruction.

---

[1] See chapter 2, footnote 3.

Consalvi deplored the fact that an overwhelming number of cardinals in Rome were engaged in the restoration of the Papal States and the German ecclesiastical states and, therefore, must neglect the regulation of religious problems. During the Congress of Vienna[2] he negotiated future concordats with the representatives of Austria, Bavaria, Prussia, Württemberg, Switzerland, Russia, and France, and had discussions with Lord Castlereagh about the situation of the English Catholics. These were among the first achievements of an ecclesiastical restoration for which he labored untiringly until his death. It was a huge and difficult task, aggravated by the previous isolation in captivity of Pope and Curia. Thus, the major task was to regain firm control of the administration of the Church and to reconfirm papal authority.

---

[2] On the Holy See and the Congress of Vienna, consult I. Rinieri, *Il Congresso di Vienna e la Santa Sede* (Rome 1904); id., *Corrispondenza inedita dei cardinali Consalvi e Pacca nel tempo del Congresso di Vienna* (Turin 1903); A. Omodeo, *Aspetti del cattolicesimo della Restaurazione* (Turin 1946), 81–180; E. Ruch, *Die römische Kurie und die deutsche Kirchenfrage auf dem Wiener Kongress* (Basel 1917); Mollat, 102–27; *La missione Consalvi e il Congresso di Vienna*, ed. by A. Roveri, I (Rome 1970).

SECTION ONE

The Reorganization of the Churches

CHAPTER 3

The Catholic Church after the Congress of Vienna

The *orbis catholicus* in 1815

Until the end of the Napoleonic era, the Catholic Church, in spite of earlier missionary successes, remained in essence a European church, defined by the urban areas of Vienna-Naples-Cádiz-Brussels.

In Africa only a few missionary settlements were left in Senegal and Angola, and the number of Uniate Copts in the Nile valley had sunk to a few thousand. The number of believers in other Uniate patriarchates in the Near East was hardly higher, the only exception being the approximately two hundred thousand Maronites in Lebanon.[3] India numbered about one hundred thousand Catholics of the Eastern rite and fifty thousand of the Latin rite. In East Asia there were, aside from the Philippines, where a majority of the 1.5 million inhabitants were Catholic, and Annam with four hundred thousand Christians and 180 priests, only a few tens of thousands of Christians in China and Japan, who were virtually cut off from contact with Rome because of persecution.

Even the American churches constituted only a relatively small contingent in numerical terms. In North America there were barely two hundred thousand Catholics among the French-Canadians and in the United States only one hundred fifty thousand. Among the 15 to 18 million inhabitants of Latin America, most of whom were concentrated around the Antilles, many Indians and Mestizos had become Christian in name only.

In Europe in 1815 there were about 100 million Catholics, compared to 40 million Orthodox, 30 million Protestants, 9 million Anglicans, and a few million Mohammedans and Jews. Of the 100 million Catholics, more than 60 percent lived in three countries relatively untouched by the Industrial Revolution and in which the clergy, in spite of the increasing importance of urbanization, continued to reflect mainly the values of their agrarian congregations. France numbered 28.5 million Catholics and seven hundred thousand Protestants; Spain had 10 million, and in the Habsburg Empire there were 24 million Catholics (about 80 percent of the population). The distribution of influence among these three Catholic states had changed since 1789. For a time, defeated France was forced to lay aside its claim to hegemony in Europe. Austria became the leading power and, of particular importance for Roman policy, gained a strong influence over Italy. In addition to Lombardy, Austria had also acquired Venetia and Liguria and exercised undisguised hegemony over the duchies of central Italy. After the treaty of Laibach (1821), this was also true with respect to the Kingdom of Naples. Spain, weakened by Napoleonic wars, dynastic quarrels, and the secession of its American colonies, lost much of its ecclesiastical importance. In fact, for the immediate future, only Austria and France remained great Catholic powers, engaged primarily in rivalries with one another.

---

[3] Precise statistics for this period do not exist, hence only magnitudes can be indicated.

Of the remaining 40 million Catholics, 14 million lived in the seven independent Italian states, 3 million in Portugal (which lost Brazil in 1822), nearly 3 million in Bavaria, and 4 million (out of a total of 6 million inhabitants) in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The remaining 16 million Catholics constituted minorities in the non-Catholic states: among these were 4 million in Prussia, 1.5 million in the other German states, 4.5 million in Ireland, which was part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, 3 million in Russian Poland, seven hundred fifty thousand in Switzerland, and five hundred thousand in Turkey.

The new distribution of Catholics which resulted from the changes in borders after the Congress of Vienna was not a satisfactory situation for the Holy See. The papacy noted with great sadness the dissolution of the ecclesiastical principalities in Germany, a dissolution which it had not been able to prevent. The shift in Catholic population centers resulted in the subordination of several million Catholics to Protestant princes and, compared with the Old Regime, resulted in a marked increase in the number of states with mixed religions. The Holy See also regretted the incorporation of Belgian Catholics into a state with Protestant leadership and the continuing subjugation of Polish Catholics by an Orthodox autocracy. Rome was further disturbed that a papal diplomatic inquiry concerning the sad lot of Christians in the Ottoman Empire remained unanswered. Finally, the influence of the powerful Habsburg Empire, whose church policy was still marked by Josephinism, over the old republics of Genoa and Venice, could hardly find approval in Rome, where Italian problems were always regarded with special concern.

Problems and Alternatives for the Catholic Church

The problems of adjusting the ecclesiastical geography following the shifts in state boundaries were neither the only nor the most difficult ones facing the Church. At the conclusion of a crisis which had lasted a quarter of a century, a new beginning had to be made in almost every area. For a certain group, called "ultras" in France, but with adherents to be found everywhere, the solution to the problem of reconstruction consisted simply of the destruction of the revolution and its results and the restoration of the order of yesterday. These groups wanted to reintroduce the Old Regime out of a double justification of legitimacy and counterrevolution. But was such a program possible or even desirable?

It is surprising to see that the so-called new institutions of administration, justice, finances, economics, and the military, encompassing more nominal than real changes, retained those forms which the French had given them. Where this form was destroyed, it was often restored a few years later as a result of revolutionary risings. In many instances, these new institutions were copied by countries which had not experienced a French occupation. These institutions were the juridical realization of an economic and social development which was unavoidable and irreversible. The development occurred in the individual countries rather quickly, and brought with it the destruction of the Old Regime and the creation of a new society of the bourgeoisie, which embodied the new tendencies and which was to play the predominant role for the next century.

Parallel to the social changes, there also took place a transformation of ideas, a development of far greater significance from the religious viewpoint. Was it not senseless to use police powers to attempt to turn back the clock for those who had absorbed the concepts of liberty and equality? Was the revolution really only an event brought about by violence or did one not have to recognize in it the result of a development reaching back to the Renaissance? Was it intelligent to try to reverse the wheel of history? Were these new tendencies wrong, or were there not beyond all the errors and excesses some basic values to be fostered? Pius VII had discussed this concept in his Christmas homily of 1797 on Christianity and democracy while he was still bishop of Imola. But only few of the men of 1815, having been victims of the painful experiences of the past, were prepared to pursue such a path. Totally misinterpreting the social and economic roots of the revolution, most believed to have found the explanation for it in the liberation of satanic forces. They preferred to long for what they called the golden days of Christianity in the past; an attitude which for decades was to support the reactionary stance of a majority of the Catholic clergy. Many a time it was acknowledged that the Old Regime had not been only good for the Church. In the Catholic countries it meant Gallicanism and Josephinism, among other evils, and such principles remained vital even in the Austria of Metternich, the France of the Bourbons, in Spain, and in the Kingdom of Naples in which the reaction triumphed.

Thus it became clear very quickly that the religious counterrevolution, in spite of the theses proclaimed by such lay theoreticians as Haller and Bonald, was, in fact, not identical with the political counterrevolution. This discrepancy became visible when Pius VII restored the Society of Jesus despite the disapproving attitude of most of the governments and rejected a proposal to join the Holy Alliance. Even if the Holy Alliance was undoubtedly inspired by a greater religiosity than historians have been willing to admit,[4] it nevertheless stemmed from an understanding of Christianity which was too little oriented toward the institutional not to cause the Roman authorities grave concern. The Holy See could not conceive of states in which the Church did not occupy a central position, and it was afraid to become involved in political plans whose originators believed in regalism.

The most fervent propagandists for revolutionary ideas were and remained the adherents of the philosophers of the eighteenth century, and as such declared enemies of the Church. Wherever the revolution had been successful, the Church had had to suffer. Was not, therefore, the expectation of advantages from a compromise with the revolution a game of self-deception? The dilemma which was to come into focus more dramatically during the nineteenth century was sketched only in vague outlines in 1815, and even circles advocating concessions limited to secondary aspects of the liberal demands saw in them merely a policy of the lesser evil. The rancor of the many victims of revolutionary unrest combined with the conviction that there existed a fundamental contradiction between the two dominant ideologies. Intitially this led Catholic laymen and clergy almost without exception to the side of counterrevolution. Their only uncertainty was whether the counterrevolution was to be conducted implacably or with a limited tactical flexibility.

Aside from this fundamental ideological decision, there also remained problems of a practical nature. In numerous countries the Church had lost the majority of its property. While the impoverishment was advantageous as a kind of purification, it created the problem of how to finance seminaries, schools, charitable institutions, and apostolic organizations. In Rome as almost everywhere, the ecclesiastical administration was in shambles, archives dispersed, and communications disrupted. Furthermore, the clergy in many countries had not only lost its privileged position, but in many areas had suffered also from a diminished interest among young people. The problem of successors became acute. The religious orders, always a valuable apostolic tool, also suffered acutely.

---

[4] See also E. Susini, *L'Allemagne religieuse au XIX^{e} siècle* (Cours de Sorbonne 1959/60) I, 97–107.

Far-reaching regeneration was imperative. But, as has been stated, the Revolution had disturbed minds even more than administrations. Spread by officials of the French Empire and its military throughout Europe, the new ideas had shaken the foundations of the traditional social and political order and had intensified a crisis of European conscience which had been developing for a century. The Church through its clergy still had a firm grip on the rural populations, as had been demonstrated by the revolts in the Vendée, the peasants' war in Belgium, the rising of the Neapolitan Sanfedists, the Spanish resistance, and the Tirolean rebellion. However, the young intellectuals had been awakened. Liberated suddenly from the strict control which the Inquisition and the censorship of books had exercised over them, many intellectuals had gone to the opposite extreme. Many crises of conscience were helped along also by the general laxity of morals. The task, therefore, consisted not merely of reopening monasteries and churches, but of healing souls.

Fortunately, the Church possessed several means with which to accomplish its enormous task. In addition to the spiritual advantage which the Church had gained through the secularization of its property, Catholicism could now count on the active support of the public purse. In addition, sovereigns as well as governments were one in believing that the altar provided the best protection for a throne and that the Church ought to have a place of priority among the institutions to be restored. Inasmuch as the institutions which served to maintain religion for the masses were of the utmost importance, the Church, at least for the moment, experienced enormous gain from the benevolent attitude of the state. A dangerous aspect for the Church of this common cause with the reactionary elements was that the young and dynamic elements among Catholics might be irretrievably driven to the ideas of the revolution. In the atmosphere of the moment, however, when upper and lower classes were still under the impact of the terrors of the revolutionary time, it was not easy to take account of the influence which these young elements would have in the future. The clergy's ability to look into the future was dimmed by the deceptive expectation of creating a new Christian society with the aid of counterrevolutionary governments and by the immediate advantage which this help constituted in the area of pastoral care and the rapid restoration of ecclesiastical foundations.

The signs of religious revival, evident in France after the end of Napoleon's reign, now became visible in all countries. This was a universal phenomenon; reversions to the faith on the Catholic side were mirrored in the Protestant world by revival movements. From both directions voices were raised calling for an alliance of all Christians against the propagators of the Enlightenment. The disorder of the past twenty years had made many people look toward religion for consolation and to doubt the validity of the rationalistic ideology which they held responsible for past catastrophes. Everywhere people turned away from the modern ideas of progress and back toward a tradition rooted in the Catholic Middle Ages. The influence of this return to tradition was felt even in Protestant circles, where a series of spectacular conversions to Roman Catholicism took place.

The shift in the intellectual climate, caused by the French counterrevolutionary thinkers, was intensified by the spreading of romanticism. The most deadly weapon against the Church had been its derogation by the aesthetes, who presented religion and especially Catholicism as marks of intellectual mediocrity and of obscurantism. But now, artists and writers, led by Chateaubriand in France, Stolberg in Germany, Schlegel in Austria, and Manzoni in Italy, praised Christianity as guarantor of high culture and Catholic rites as the fertile source of artistic inspiration. The romantic movement was not free of religious imperfections. It fostered immorality and uncritical raptures and thus was distrusted by many clergymen. Furthermore, even in the guise of Catholic romanticism, it frequently exchanged the Christian faith for pseudomysticism and a vague religiosity determined more by feeling than intellect. Romanticism was also ill-suited to deal with the problems of positivism which soon were to characterize the nineteenth century. But for the moment the Church had found powerful support in the change of mentality which led spirits from the progressive rationalism of the Enlightenment to mysticism and the heritage of medieval traditions.

These problems faced the entire Church, but especially Rome where the principles had to be determined which would govern not only the conduct of the Church in general, but the restoration of secular conditions in the Papal States in particular. In 1825 the Roman Curia was of divided mind in this matter.

One group, led by Consalvi, who were called "liberals" in a denigrating fashion by their opponents, wished to use chiefly political means to achieve the desired Catholic restoration. Its members possessed that awareness of realities which is needed for effective political action. The group considered it advantageous to keep an open mind toward some of the modern tendencies or at least not to oppose them too openly as long as the faith was not affected. Aware of the benefits which the Church could derive from the benevolent attitude of officials, these politically oriented men also exercised moderation in their relations with governments, preferring a cautious stance or even partial concession in the questions of juridical claims, if this price would assure good relations.

They encountered the determined opposition of the large majority of cardinals and prelates who were absolutely hostile to modern philosophy and all modern institutions. These churchmen favored political absolutism and return to an established religion. Simultaneously, they also wanted to see a Church free from any influence of the government and without any interference in the exercise of its doctrine and its apostolic mission.

This group of zealots, led by the aged Cardinal Pacca, consisted of conservatives who psychologically and sociologically were tied to the old customs and privileges and who placed their trust more in power and force than in admonitions and the peaceful power of clemency and tolerance. Many historians have made the mistake of seeing them only in this light. In actuality, they were driven much more by religious considerations than by reactionary attitudes; unpretentious men whose piety sometimes turned into bigotry, their chief interest was pastoral care, and they were uncompromising in moral matters and unshakeable in questions of faith. The group believed that the modern spirit of the liberals was basically nothing more than a continuation of the principles of the Protestant Reformation and that any, even the smallest, concession would invite heresy. In their attempt to shape society according to the dictates of religion, they were convinced that ecclesiastical power which represented God on earth stood above that of the princes, the servants of God and his Church. They also firmly believed that the victory of the true religion, if it was to be brought about by men of weak faith using diplomacy, would require the aid of providence. Therefore they preferred to look to the religious orders for assistance rather than to those clerics who had too much contact with the world. Finally, they saw no benefits arising from the compromises which the Church had made with the new ideas of the eighteenth century and thought an uncompromising attitude more appropriate. With the superior assurance of those who tend to see in human affairs merely the supernatural in action, they assumed an unyielding stance to all who did not think as they did. These zealots regarded the modernists as traitors to their religion and some went so far as to call them Freemasons.[5]

With the passing of the years, two subgroups formed within the camp of these uncompromising opponents to liberalism and religious Gallicanism; a split which was similar to a gap between generations. The proponents of one position remained essentially persons of the eighteenth century. Fixed in their fearful rejection of Jansenism and democratic Jacobinism and defenders of a total return to an idealized past, they saw a solution in a closer cooperation between princes and ecclesiastical authorities, with the princes absolutely subordinate to the Church. The adherents of the second position, involved as they were with the beginnings of the new ultramontane movement, did not hesitate to recommend the employment of some modern methods for the realization of their ideal. Disappointed by the insistent jurisdictionalism of the courts, and out of their knowledge of the support the masses had given the Church in its struggle against Napoleon, they favored an active Christian policy for regaining lost ground. Their plan would include a popular base and would make more use of the press and of lay organizations than of the powers of the police in addressing consciences directly and inculcating true principles as a foundation for the restoration of a society in the Christian spirit.[6]

The Three Restoration Popes

Pius VII was a religious person with a spiritual power which reached far beyond the limits of the Church. In the performance of his apostolic duties he was extremely conscientious. He showed an understanding for the concerns of the zealots and did not hesitate to hurl new condemnations against the Freemasons, who[7] in his eyes personified the incarnation of antichristian philosophy. The Pope also warned of the Bible societies,[8] whose Protestant origins made them suspect of spreading indifferentism. Cleverly and tactfully he tried to reestablish close relations between Rome and the clergy of the different countries. He was also concerned with reviving expressions of religious life. Where he could, Pius VII fostered the organization of parish missions and looked into the devotions of the clergy. Through the granting of indulgences,

[5] See V. Giuntella, "Profilo di uno zelante, Mgr. B. Gazzola" in *RstRis* (1956), 413–18.

[6] See R. Colapietra, op. cit. 36–55, 240–41, 247, 255–56.

[7] Bull of 21 September 1821 (*BullRomCont* XV, 446–48).

[8] Briefs of 29 June and 3 September 1816 (*ASS* IX, 580–87).The first Catholic Bible society was founded in 1805 in Regensburg by seminary regent Wittmann. On the influence of the conditions in Poland and Russia on the condemnation, see Boudou I, 110–123.

he encouraged the formation of confraternities and called for processions and pilgrimages. He increased the number of Marian feasts and began new sanctification processes in the conviction that the heroic virtues of the saints would inspire the simple believer to imitation. The Pope's abilities were evident from the beginning of his pontificate. Among his many strengths were his comprehensive education and alert intelligence, combined with a conciliatory spirit; his mistrust of systematicians; his sense for appropriate judgments, which enabled him to recognize essential points and to champion them while neglecting inconsequential details; and his realism which enabled him in spite of his respect for tradition to accept the good aspects of modern institutions. With respect to the administration of the Papal States and the orientation of religious policy in different countries, Pius VII agreed with the direction favored by Consalvi, and after Pius had reached the age of seventy he left these matters frequently to this cardinal. The strength of the Pope's personality was far greater, though, than has often been asserted, and his mind was also open to other currents of the times. When he thought it required by the interests of religion, he was capable of intervening in a way which often made the work of Consalvi much more difficult.

Supported by the confidence of his sovereign and enjoying the high reputation which his wide and moderate opinions had won him even among non-Catholic politicians, between 1815 and 1823 Consalvi guided the fortunes of the Papal States virtually by himself and with remarkable skill. Faithful to his training in the tradition of the great Roman canonists of the preceding century, he held to his belief in the irreducibility of papal sovereignty on earth and in the connection of throne and altar in individual countries. At the same time he was free of any prejudice, open to the currents of the time, and convinced that the majority of the changes during the past quarter century in Europe were irreversible. Consalvi was prepared to accept the loss of many concrete forms of the Old Regime and to acknowledge the utility of a clear separation of the ecclesiastical and secular spheres of interest. With this perspective, and almost alone in the Roman world of that period, he worked out a new method, better adapted to the circumstances of the nineteenth century, which would assure the Church a maximum of freedom of action in the political Europe of the restoration.

While Consalvi supported the work of the counterrevolution in countries such as France, Spain, and Portugal, where he hoped to gain advantages, in the interest of the Church he did not hesitate to emphasize the new ideals of liberty in the face of various forms of regalism or to improve the legal condition of Catholics in those countries in which they constituted a minority. Consalvi also recognized that the policy of the Popes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to seek the support of Catholic monarchs was no longer appropriate for the new Europe. He attempted, with success, an improvement of the relations between the Holy See and the two great victorious powers of the Napoleonic wars, England and Russia. In particular, he sought the support of Russia in order to diminish Austria's influence in Italy, because he was aware of the negative effect of this influence on the patriotic tendencies of the younger generation. In spite of his basically antiliberal attitude, Consalvi recognized the danger of an uncritical acceptance of Metternich's system.[9] Ever since the Congress of Vienna, it was clear to Consalvi that, regardless of all attempts to stifle it, the spirit of revolution was alive. It seemed to him the better course to guide this new spirit and to channel it in order to avoid being swamped by it again.

But Consalvi was becoming increasingly more isolated within the Sacred College. The authoritarian and untiring secretary of state was accused of having concentrated all matters in his own hands. Some of the politically oriented regarded his attempts to loosen Austrian influence as unrealistic. But it was the zealots in particular who raised fundamental objections to his policy. They criticized his orientation toward reform of the administration of the Papal States and the continuation of some measures which had been introduced by French revolutionaries. They found fault in his weakness toward those governments who refused to countenance fully the demands of the Church. They disapproved of the signing of concordats, which served only to confirm government usurpations and which, under cover of an apparent peaceful agreement restoring some rights to the Holy See, actually encouraged new demands. But the fundamental objection, hitherto overlooked by many historians, was to the apparent preference which the secretary of state accorded to diplomacy over the religious concerns. Indeed, Consalvi wished to improve relations with the non-Catholic powers, especially England and Russia, in order to strengthen the position of the papacy within the European context,[10] and to assure institutionally the effective representation of the Holy See to these governments; more so, in fact, to maintain strict orthodoxy in doctrinal questions and to exercise a direct apostolate among the Christian masses.

---

[9] Typical is his attitude during the revolution in Naples, where he acted very cautiously in spite of pressure applied by Austria, which wanted to see Rome participate in a forceful repression. See J. H. Brady, *Rome and the Neapolitan Revolution of 1820–21* (New York 1937); S. Furlani in *Nuova Rivista storica* 39 (1955), 465–91, 40 (1956), 14–47; A. Tamborra in *AStIt* 118 (1960), 190–211.

[10] The interest of the great powers in the conclave of 1823 is proof of the success of his work.

When Pius VII died on 20 August 1823, the zealots, constituting a majority in the conclave, were determined to bar anyone's way who was not willing to remove Consalvi and to accord preference to a religious restoration which would take full account of the rights of ecclesiastical power. In vain, the "Party of the Crowns," led by Cardinal Albani but weakened by the division between Austria and France, promoted the candidacy of Castiglione, a moderate "zealot." The majority of the zealots feared that his election would not result in the necessary break with Consalvi. A bitter battle was waged over a period of three weeks, and the chances of the inflexible Severoli increased. But when Austria cast its veto against him because of his attitude toward Vienna's policies, Severoli threw his support to Cardinal della Genga. Della Genga was elected on 28 September 1823, and as Leo XII governed the Church until the beginning of 1829.[11]

Leo XII, relatively young but mature in outlook, was a strict and pious, simple and good man, who possessed extraordinary moral strength. He devoted a great deal of time to his pastoral tasks in the diocese of Rome. Motivated by a rigorous and active spirit of reform, he wanted to give Church and Curia a less political and more religious orientation, and soon aroused the ire of all those whose habits he disturbed. In addition, the Pope planned a necessary raising of standards in religious studies. Unfortunately, there existed a tremendous discrepancy between the leadership and administrative qualities of this former diplomat, who hardly had been successful in his various offices, and the degree of his personal ardor and virtue. Without the necessary skill, and always hesitant and too easily influenced by advisers who did not deserve his trust, Leo XII was not the man to master the delicate situation within the Church at that time. In spite of a few clearsighted judgments, he left the impression of a somewhat pale figure who was not in control of events.

Because the "zealots" had elected the Pope in order to put an end to the Consalvic system, many historians have regarded Leo XII as nothing more than a reactionary; but this opinion is too one-sided and takes into consideration only the last years of Leo's pontificate during which he relied on obsolete paternalism and police methods to administer the Papal States. The reality was much more diverse and, above all, much more complex.

---

[11] Annibale della Genga was born on 22 August 1760 near Spoleto as the son of an aristocratic family. Pius VI had noticed him and appointed him as nuncio in Cologne in 1794, and subsequently as nuncio in Bavaria, and sent him on missions to Vienna and Rastatt. Pius VII had also entrusted him with several diplomatic missions and placed concordat negotiations with the courts of Bavaria, Baden, and Württemberg in his hands. Consalvi reproached him in 1814 for the failure of his negotiations concerning Avignon, whereupon Genga withdrew to his abbacy of Monticelli. In 1820 he became vicar general. See R. Colapietra, *La formazione diplomatica di Leone XII* (Rome 1966) and A. F. Artaud de Montor, op. cit.

The first actions of the new Pope indeed seem to indicate a clear break with the policy of the preceding administration. Merciless disfavor was shown to Consalvi, and a Congregation of State was created which, according to the wishes of the Pope's electors, consisted of declared enemies of Consalvi. The Congregation was to advise the Pope in all political and religious questions. Yet the appointment of the aged Cardinal della Somaglia (1744–1830) as secretary of state indicated an attempt by Leo not to be beholden to the group of intransigents who severely disapproved of his choice. Della Somaglia was a man without vision and his opinions placed him on the far left fringes of the zealots. After less than three months the Pope caused raised eyebrows by calling on Consalvi for advice.[12] After the meeting he appointed him prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, a position to which the Pope attributed special importance in light of his apostolic zeal and his concern over the maintenance of communications with the non-Catholic countries. The sensational rehabilitation of Consalvi occurred at almost the same time that the newly created Congregation of State diminished in influence. To be sure, measures such as the Pope's first encyclical in which indifferentism and tolerance received his condemnation, his strengthening of vigilance by the Index and the Holy Officiate, his favors granted to the Jesuits, his more religiously motivated selection of new cardinals, and his decision to celebrate the Holy Year of 1825 despite the general resistance of the state chancellory, all indicated that the Pope had not changed sides to the "politicals." The Pope's attitude became even clearer with his decision once again to levy a small tribute on commuters as a symbol of the vassal status of the King of Naples to the Holy See. In an astonishing letter to King Louis XVIII of France, on 4 June 1824, Leo accused him of failing to support the clergy sufficiently and of having failed to change laws inspired by revolutionary maxims.[13] At the same time, however, and particularly after the death of Severoli on 8 September 1824, Leo XII tended to become more independent and to exercise a moderate policy. Matters were arranged with the aid of his former secretary Consalvi and without the knowledge of his secretary of state. Of his own accord, Leo resumed Consalvi's concordat policy and, after only a momentary yielding to the demands of the very reactionary Spanish ambassador, the Pope adopted an understanding policy toward Latin America.

---

[12] Consalvi's advice concerned the following subjects: the increasingly close relationship with France because of its influence in the Levant; discretion in the hospitality toward the Bonaparte family; the usefulness of the Holy Year 1825; the attitude to be taken toward the new Spanish-American republics; distrust of the projects of the archbishop of Mogilev and the feasibility of an approach to the Russian church; and the emancipation of English Catholics.

[13] Printed in A. F. Artaud de Montor, op. cit., 234–39.

Was Leo XII, then, a genuine zealot? The answer is yes. Among the zealots there were many gradations from the strict severity of Severoli to the eighteenth-century empiricism of della Somaglia.[14] Della Genga, like Pacca, stood in the center between these two extremes. He combined rigorism in religious matters with moderation in his relations to governments. His religious achievements consisted of strengthening the clerical influence in the administration of the Papal States, a closer alignment of the monasteries with the apostolic efforts of the Church; the introduction of a stricter way of life and an improved education for the clergy; the promotion of all initiatives designed to awaken the religious spirit of the masses and to facilitate Christian knowledge in society; resistance in work and deed against liberal indifferentism; and the attempt to remind Catholic sovereigns of their calling with respect to God and Church. At the time he was mindful of the fact that the religious division of Europe and its post-revolutionary conditions no longer permitted the traditional solutions which might have been appropriate for medieval Christianity. He was aware of the dangers inherent in antagonizing the possessors of power, and he had enough experience to realize that in his relationships with them moderation generally was more rewarding than inflexibility.[15]

Yet to understand the policy of Leo XII in all of its variations, another aspect needs to be considered. While the Pope as Cardinal della Genga had shared the restrained views of Pacca, during the first years of his pontificate he came under the strong influence of the young ultramontane generation and especially that of Father Ventura. This new type of zealot was convinced that after the irrevocable decay of the political and social structures of the Old Regime, the great chance for the Church consisted in using its intellectual and spiritual prestige to influence the new leading classes instead of putting all its hopes in the support of Catholic princes. They were also convinced that the papacy and not, as Metternich believed, the governments had to bring about the religious and social restoration of Europe by presenting itself as the spiritual leader of humanity and by no longer relying on political action but on what later was called "Catholic Action." For a short time, Leo XII was swayed by these ideas, and they explain his first Encyclicals *Ubi primum* and *Quo graviora*,[16] and the declaration of 1825 as a Holy Year in order to afford an opportunity for restored contact between the Pope and the Christian people. It was during the time of this persuasion as well that Leo convoked a council of the Italian bishops in Rome in order to lend more weight to the apostolic initiatives of the Pope[17] and gave such a cordial reception to Lamennais when he visited Rome. Leo XII even seriously considered inviting Lamennais to be an expert to the council.[18]

---

[14] See the analysis by R. Colapietra in *AstIt* 120 (1962), 82–84.

[15] Symptomatic is his declaration of 1828 with respect to a moderate attitude toward Martignac's decrees against boys seminaries in France: "This is perhaps not the language of a Pope of the zealots, but all decisions which I have made in my political career and the desire to apply them without hesitation to the situation in which God has placed me, have proven to me that the peace of the Church can only be preserved by this system of moderation" (cited by Leflon 395).

But Leo XII did not wish to commit himself fully to this direction which, although it held possibilities for the future, was also fraught with danger. Would it not promote the growth of revolution if one placed his confidence in peoples rather than in kings? There was also the danger that the Holy See might become too isolated during such a process, the more so as the European episcopates were very reserved toward the ultramontane movements. After 1826, the removal of Ventura from his chair;[19] the rise of Cappellari; the appointment of Lambruschini as nuncio in Paris; and Bernetti's mission to the Tsar, who was regarded as the real foundation of the established order, demonstrated that the Pope had given up the course charted by Lamennais and his admirers and returned to the policy of collaboration by the Holy See with the conservative powers to fashion a common front against the rise of liberalism, a policy desired by Metternich, Villèle, and Nesselrode. This increasingly defensive and political orientation of Leo's pontificate, a pontificate which had begun under the sign of religious renewal and apostolic reconquest, intensified when della Somaglia was replaced by Bernetti, whom Consalvi had once regarded highly. But little time was left for Leo XII to profit from the new appointment. Continually ill, the Pope died on 10 February 1829, at a peak of unpopularity, despised by the Roman people, who did not think highly of his attempts at moral reform, looked down upon by the liberals who called him a tyrant beholden to the Holy Alliance, and unforgiven by the disappointed zealots for his turning away from their party.

In the conclave of 1829, lasting from 13 February to 31 March, politicians and zealots opposed one another as they had in 1823. Even though they were in the majority, the zealots were weakened in their prestige by the unpopularity of Leo XII. The zealots also lacked the unity of purpose which their common enmity to Consalvi had given them during the last conclave. The politicians, under the clever direction of Cardinal Albani, now had the support of the ambassadors of the Catholic powers and managed to form a sufficiently large block to eliminate de Gregorio, the candidate of the zealots, and to force them to accept the election of Francesco Saverio Castiglioni,[20] a candidate who had been rejected in 1823.

---

[16] *BullRomCont* XVI, 45–49 (5 May 1824) and Roskovany II, 240ff (13 March 1825).

[17] See P. Perali, ed., *Memoriale del Card. Pacca a Leone XII dell' 11.4.1825 sul projetto di convocare un concilio romano* (Rome 1928).

[18] About a possible elevation of Lamennais to a cardinalate, see chapter 14, footnote 16.

[19] R. Colapietra, "L'insegnamento del P. Ventura alla Sapiena" in *Regnum Dei* 17 (1961), 230–59.

Choosing the name Pius VIII, Castiglioni indicated his intention to resume the tradition of Pius VII, who had wished to see him as his successor. But he was not given time to prove himself. Upon his election at the age of sixty-seven, he was seriously ill and died on 30 November 1830, after only twenty months in office. As an individual primarily interested in pastorate and orthodoxy, he was more concerned with the aftershocks of Jansenism than with the new problems which occupied the attention of the younger generation. He was little interested in political questions, and his training placed Castiglioni near the zealots, but he tended more toward the smooth policy which Consalvi had conducted within the Papal States as well as in his relations to foreign governments. Yet Pius XIII remained faithful to his office as Pope. He stood unflinchingly by his principles and the defense of the rights of the Church. He knew how to deal with contingencies and was prepared to make concessions in subordinate matters and to be conciliatory in exclusively political areas. He demonstrated the latter ability in his position toward mixed marriages and "ecclesiastical pragmatism," problems which had arisen in Germany, as well as in his decision, made without hesitation and against the advice of the majority of his Curia, to recognize Louis-Philippe as King of the French after the revolution of 1830.

But in other areas Pius VIII proved to be less open. In the matter of the former dioceses of Spanish America he remained closer to the legitimist view than either Leo XII or Cappellari. He also did not disguise his hostile attitude to the national emancipation movements which broke out in Belgium, Poland, and Ireland during the last months of 1830. Toward these movements, the influence of his most important elector, Cardinal Albani, who was totally in agreement with the Austria of the Holy Alliance, was noticeable. Pius VIII named Albani as his secretary of state and left the larger part of political matters to him, while the Pope devoted himself to religious problems. It is also partly as a result of Albani's influence that the policy which Pius VIII pursued during his pontificate was no longer the policy of the Church which Consalvi, the model of so many churchmen of the nineteenth century, had perfected. Instead it was the same policy as that of the dynasties in Vienna, Paris, and Madrid. This places Pius VIII politically as well as theologically among the stragglers of the eighteenth century, who were still so numerous in the period of restoration. These were certainly outstanding minds and men who by no means deserve to be cast simply as reactionaries, but none the less they failed to understand the problems of the new world forged by the Revolution.

---

[20] Born on 20 November 1761, as son of a noble family of the Papal States, he had received a chiefly canonistic education. He gained his first experiences in the diocesan administrations of zealous bishops, and in 1800 he himself became bishop of Montalto. Exiled by Napoleon between 1808 and 1814, he was transferred to Cesena and appointed cardinal in 1816. In 1821 he became Grand Penitentiary and Prefect of the Index congregation; in the conduct of his office he was always interested in balanced arrangements.

The Restoration of the Papal States

The Papal States were the only ones of the former ecclesiastical states which were restored by the Congress of Vienna and were placed under the international protection of Europe. At the time of Napoleon's fall, the allied sovereigns, who from their recent experiences had gained the conviction that a totality of spiritual power in the person of a sovereign Pope would be a valuable guarantee for them, were most willing to acknowledge him. But the state chancellories at first understood this restoration to be limited in area. They stated that the papal provinces, which the Pope had renounced in the treaty of Tolentino, were French areas of conquest of which they could dispose freely. It required all of Consalvi's skill and months of negotiations to obtain the almost total restoration of the old territories.[21]

Even this success was to be the source of a number of problems for the Popes. The most developed areas of the states, with about 2.5 million inhabitants, particularly in the districts of the Romagna, which for more than fifteen years had been separate from Rome, had enjoyed modern methods of administration and feared even a partial return to the archaic prerevolutionary system. It would be easier, it was said, to transform the goddesses, whom Napoleon had painted in the papal palaces, into madonnas than to change the minds of the young, who had known only the French regime. The difficulties which continued to surface during the course of the subsequent half century were to become an increasing source of worries to the Popes and one which would divert them from important religious problems.

---

[21] Agreement of 12 June 1815. The Austrian and Napoleonic officials showed reluctance to implement the conditions of the treaty, and negotiations over the enclave of Benevento and the evacuation of the northern provinces dragged on for several more years. See the unpublished dissertation of H. Breitenstein, *Metternich und Consalvi* (Vienna 1959) and for Benevento see A. Zazo in *Samnium* 26 (1953), 1–32.

While Consalvi was still negotiating in Vienna, the reorganization of the nucleus of the state, in which the Pope already exercised his rule, was begun immediately. In May 1814 Pius VII turned the reorganization over to a kind of provisional government under the chairmanship of Cardinal Rivarola. Rivarola was not satisfied to proceed against the collaborators of the destroyed Empire, as had been the case in all other countries which had belonged to the French Empire, but, with the unfortunate edict of 13 May 1814, managed to do away with all French governmental offices. In their place he restored the old terribly complicated administration together with the feudal law of the barons, a unique occurrence in western Europe.

Consalvi possessed an acute sense of historical development and, as early as 1801 on the occasion of the first restoration of pontifical power, emphasized the impossibility of a total elimination of the Jacobin-introduced French institutions. He protested sharply to Pacca against this inept and reactionary policy. This policy, which caused protests even in fairly backward areas, which had experienced the French only briefly, was totally inapplicable in the Marches and the Romagna, which had been regained as a result of the difficult negotiations in Vienna and which had attained a much higher stage of development. An edict of 5 July 1815 guaranteed them, for the immediate future, the continuance of the French administrative system, except in those matters which were in disagreement with canon law, as well as the continuation in office of all officials.

A year later, on 6 July 1816, a rescript gave final shape to the Papal States and thereby ended the governmental dualism.[22] It introduced a number of desirable administrative and judicial reforms, inspired by the Napoleonic system, which were designed to centralize and simplify institutions and which involved a more equitable tax system. The serious attempt to reform the archaic structure of the Papal States could not but produce a longing for Consalvi after the departure of the secretary of state. It was the source of the neo-guelfism of the following generation. But the significance of the reform should not be overestimated. For example, the part dealing with judicial reform was actually a regression when measured against the experiences of the Napoleonic times, and even the publication of a civil code modeled on the French civil code on 22 November 1817 was not able to improve matters. While Consalvi was a moderate with an open mind, he was not a liberal reformer. He was a representative of enlightened despotism and convinced that the independence of a Holy See which had to be assured by temporal power was incompatible with a constitutional government in which the Pope had to share responsibility with his subjects. Thus not only did the political leadership remain unchanged in spite of the suggestions made by Austria and Russia at the congress of Laibach, but even in the sphere of administration Consalvi, in spite of his serious concern with an improvement of administrative methods, was unable to disregard a number of aspects which were incompatible with the spirit of modern institutions. In particular, the laicization of personnel remained strictly limited to subordinate functions.

---

[22] *BullRomCont* XIV, 47–196. See Schmidlin *PG* I, 149–54 and R. Colapietra, op. cit., 21–22.

The reform of 1816, limited as it was, nonetheless could have been the starting point for further improvements. But many felt it already had gone too far. For example, the conservatives who were damaged by the suppression of local particularisms or feudal privileges, the cardinals whose role was reduced as the reorganization transferred more decision-making to the secretary of state,[23] and, finally, the zealots who regarded Consalvi's work as a sign of philosophical Jacobinism, all opposed reform. This opposition from the right, under the leadership of cardinals Severoli, Rivarola, della Genga, and Somaglia, attempted to sabotage the implementation of the rescript, to prevent the promulgation of new and more modern civil and penal codes, and to reintroduce the old privileges and exemptions.

In resisting this systematic reaction, Consalvi remained isolated and often had to do with mediocre subordinates. Not only in the Sacred College and among the higher prelates did he encounter men who did not share his views and therefore whom he could not place at the head of provinces, but even among the Roman laity there was no segment which afforded him support. He could not count on the developing bourgeoisie, which, in spite of welcoming some of his measures, accused him of limiting himself to secondary reforms in economic affairs and of ignoring the awakening of Italian national feelings. The masses in turn were dissatisfied because the crisis following the French occupation had brought in its train a reduction of income, and they were unable to generate any enthusiasm for a government which in principle remained aristocratic. Thus, especially in the more developed Marches and the

---

[23] Cf. L. Pásztor, "Per la storia della Segreteria di Stato, la riforma del 1816" in *Mélanges Tisserant* V (Vatican City 1964), 209–72. Following Consalvi's order a filing system was introduced, inspired by the one employed in the Kingdom of Italy during the French regime. On the transformation and reduction of the Sacred College and the attempts of the cardinals to react to the situation, see L. Pásztor in *RHE* 65 (1970), 479–84.

Romagna, the opposition developed in the climate of general discontent. This opposition found expression in the revolutionary secret societies, harking back to the French era, and of which the "Carbonari" and the "Gulfi" were the most important. Pressured by Metternich, the Pope vainly renewed his condemnations of them because of their revolutionary character and their connections to the Freemasons.[24] Because of their more political than religious nature, these condemnations hardly made a dent in minds agitated by the liberal mystique, and contributed to making the Church appear in the eyes of all of Europe as an enemy of modern institutions and national movements alike.

In short, the restoration in the Papal States brought about less of a synthesis of traditions and new tendencies than in the neighboring states, and the deficiencies of the Consalvic reforms were magnified by the unwise opposition of conservatives and zealots.

After the death of Pius VII, the zealots took over the management of internal affairs and began to oppose previous policies directly. In retrospect it is clear that, just as the modern nature of Consalvi's work has often been exaggerated, the regressive character of Leo's XII government has been overemphasized. One should not overlook the administrative and judicial reforms of Pius VII. The new structure which he had given the state was left essentially untouched, regardless of a number of changes which found their organic expression in the rescripts of 5 October 1824 and 21 December 1827,[25] and this structure led in part to a strengthening of authoritarian centralization. The edict of 27 February 1826, reforming the charitable institutions, contained a number of positive aspects and was progressive in comparison to other Italian states. Useful but unpopular saving measures made it possible to lower taxes and to make financial policy more liberal, but they were not able to prevent a downturn in the economic situation. In some other areas, however, a clear regressive movement was evident: Jews were again confined to their ghettos; the feudal aristocracy regained its commanding position; the ecclesiastical courts returned to the position preceding the year 1800; the cautious laicization of the administration was slowed down; and university education was reformed according to regressive concepts with the aim of hindering the development of criticism.[26] But the most important change which also took place in the neighboring states, with the exception of Tuscany, was not a legal one, but one of attitude. It was manifested as a narrow-minded puritanism which had the aim of governing daily life; in systematic attempts to extinguish all memories of the atmosphere of the "Italian rule" in clerical circles; in having only bishops appointed who were either very old or too young to have occupied important positions during the Napoleonic time; in arrogant indifference toward the constantly increasing stagnation of the political, economic, and social life; and finally in replacement of the spirit of self-possessed moderation prevailing under Consalvi by a police state.

---

[24] Bulls of 13 September 1821 and 13 March 1825.

[25] *BullRomCont* XVI, 128–255, XVII, 113–291.

[26] Constitution *Quod divina sapientia* of 28 August 1824 (*BullRomCont* XVI, 85–112). About their preparation see A. Gemelli and S. Vimara, *La riforma degli studi universitari negli Stati pontifici, 1816–24* (Milan 1932).

This change in attitude engendered a spy system which embittered moderates, and the brutal methods of repression—symbolized by the edict of Palotta in Campagna in May 1824, and Rivarola's judgment of 31 August 1825 in Bologna,[27] which were enforced only intermittently—could not stop the increasing activity of the Carbonari. The policy of the zealots, embodied in the Congregation of Vigilance, became increasingly illiberal in the hope of gaining the confidence of the conservative courts, and only led to the strengthening of the revolutionary movement which Consalvi had hoped to dampen. Even when Pius VIII softened the police state with his return to the policies of Consalvi and effected some sensible changes in the economic and social sphere, the gap between the papal government and the rising classes, especially in the Romagna, was too wide to hope for a peaceful development within the heated atmosphere of 1830.

---

[27] D. Berardi, ed., *Sentenza del Card. A. Rivarola legato a latere* (Ravenna 1970); R. Colapietra, op. cit., 189–214, 261–69.

CHAPTER 4

The Rejuvenated Position of the Holy See within the Church

Rome, the Center of the Universal Church

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the position of a sovereign Pope in the Church seemed to be endangered by the confluence of two streams of thought: the Febronianist canonists and theoreticians of Josephinism and the Gallican jurists of the French Revolution and the Empire. However, the brutal conduct of Napoleon, who intended to limit the role of the Pope to that of a high ecclesiastical functionary in the Empire, had two results. First, it earned his intended victim the respectful adoration of the faithful, especially those north of the Alps, who in the past centuries had been rather indifferent toward a Pope who never left Rome, and secondly, it called the Pope to the attention of European state governments. The restoration of the Pope's earlier prestige received another support through the recognition by the governments and leading elements that it would be useful to anchor the work of counterrevolutionary restoration on the moral authority of the Pope, who suddenly appeared in the eyes of all of Europe as the symbol of the principle of order and authority. A twofold sign of this recognition were the decisions of the Congress of Vienna to acknowledge the nuncios as doyens of the diplomatic corps[1] and to increase the number of accredited diplomats in Rome. Between 1816 and 1823 the number of diplomats rose from eight to sixteen, among them eight representatives of Protestant sovereigns and the ambassador of Orthodox Russia.

Rome managed to exploit the new situation not only to the advantage of the secular interests of the Holy See, but also with respect to purely ecclesiastical concerns. Pouthas could justifiably say: "The papacy under Pius VII approached with determination the monarchization of the Church, reaching its peak with the victory of ultramontanism under Pius IX." At the very time that the principle of nationalism had come to the fore, a restoration of Roman authority in a supranational sense occurred; one which seemed to usher in a return to traditional Christianity.

The policy of concordats jointly carried out by Pius VII and Consalvi was one of the most important means toward this end. At the same time, as his predecessors after the great schism had done, Pius VII attempted to make Rome once again into a center of art and culture. He invited to Rome scientists such as Mai and artists such as Canova and Thorwaldsen, heaped gifts on the academies, the Vatican Library and the papal museums, promoted the construction or restoration of monuments, and continued the excavations in the center of Rome begun by the French. This policy had the disadvantage that monies were diverted for purposes which lacked economic usefulness; monies which could have been employed to finance the public works of which the Papal States were in such need. This was only one example of the antinomy which existed within the two-fold tasks of the Pope as both head of the universal Church and sovereign of an Italian state.

Leo XII not only continued this patronage, which contributed to directing the eyes of the Christian world to Rome, but also, in keeping with his personal predilections, directed activities of a more religious nature. Contrary to the advice of the political party of the Curia and in the face of the disapproval of most of the European Catholic and non-Catholic governments, the Pope decided to celebrate 1825 as a Holy Year. It was the first one in fifty years and attracted hordes of Italians, including a few sovereigns, and a small but remarkable number of foreign pilgrims, who once again discovered the path to Rome.[2]

---

[1] S. Schröcker, *Der Nuntius als Doyen des Diplomatischen Korps: Reich und Reichsfeinde IV* (1943), 214ff.

In his effort to portray the papacy as the spiritual leader of the Christian world, Leo XII renewed the tradition of the great magisterial messages. On 3 May 1824, the Pope addressed the programmatic Encyclical *Ubi primum*[3] to the world. The encyclical condemned Gallicanism and Josephinism together with indifferentism and its two consequences: tolerance and liberalism. Pius VIII continued this tradition by beginning his pontificate with the Encyclical *Traditi humilitati nostrae,*[4] a renewed affirmation of Rome's supreme magisterial office. While in the preceding century it had met stiff resistance, the claim to the spiritual leadership of mankind was now well received among the younger clergymen. These clergymen were not familiar with the conditions of the Old Regime and were convinced, in these hard times for the Church, of the necessity to emphasize Roman unity more than Catholic pluralism.

Concordat Policy

Pius VII had begun his pontificate with the signing of a concordat with Napoleon which enabled the Pope to demonstrate the full extent of his powers through the recognition of the right to remove bishops on his authority alone. This was a particularly heavy blow to Gallican traditions. The mere fact that a concordat had been concluded which reorganized completely all aspects of the Church in a country was, by itself, a moral victory for the papacy. Now the Pope no longer was regarded as he had been during the preceding centuries, as a force to be ignored or, far worse, as a foreign power against which the governments might mobilize the national episcopate. On the contrary, he was viewed as an ally, whose supreme authority over the local clergy was acknowledged and whose cooperation was sought as a desirable alternative to regulating religious questions unilaterally.

That Pius VII once again had the opportunity actually to guide the fortunes of the Church makes understandable the path which he followed.[5] In a situation which was more diplomatically favorable than in 1801, the Pope could make higher demands and protect the interests of the Church more effectively. The result was an even more pronounced and fundamental recognition of the rights of the Holy See. The zealots, on the contrary, argued that the concordats embodied some exaggerated limits to the right of the Pope to intervene. Actually, though, Consalvi, the intelligent negotiator of the concordats, had a clear understanding of reality and the possible. In addition to the creation of solid foundations for the rebuilding of the Church shaken by revolution (even at the price of concessions in some secondary matters), he recognized how important it was to induce numerous governments,[6] among them Protestant and Orthodox ones, through these diplomatic instruments to agree to a recognition of the Church as an independent and perfect society and to an acknowledgment of the leading position of Rome within the structure of the Catholic Church. Retrospect makes it easy for the historian of today to see that in large part it is owing to Pius VII's secretary of state that during the nineteenth century the universal Church assumed the place which the national Churches had occupied in the Old Regime.

---

[2] See G. de Grandmaison, *Le Jubilé de 1825* (Paris 1910) and Colapietra, 143–44, 226–27, 237–38, 252–54, 291.

[3] *BullRomCont* XVI, 45–49.

[4] Ibid. XVIII, 17–20.

In order to guide the reconstruction of Churches from Rome, Pius VII created a new Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs.[7] Because Consalvi was in Vienna at the time of its founding in 1814, Pacca implemented the new Congregation. Thus its membership, drawn from cardinals and theologians, consisted almost exclusively of zealots, a condition which was to complicate life for the secretary of state upon more than one occasion. Consalvi was also severely handicapped by the presence of cardinals who were heads of several other important congregations and who did not agree with him with respect to the general policy line of the Church. Consalvi's intention to improve the mobility of the Curia caused him to concentrate in the secretariat of the state not only the leadership of the Papal States, but also of the universal Church. In order to put life into his plans, he created organizations outside of the institutional framework of the Curia. He appointed special ad hoc commissions and staffed them with prelates such as Capaccini, Sala, and Mazio rather than with cardinals. In addition to Consalvi, these prelates were the real authors of the policy of restoration. Hence in the history of the Roman Curia, the pontificate of Pius VII occupies a remarkable place in that it attempted to improve the functioning of the Curia not through a reform of already existing institutions, but by creating new ones.

---

[5] Treaty with Tuscany in 1815; with Bavaria, France, and Piedmont in 1817; with Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and Russia in 1818; with Prussia and the Upper Rhenish states in 1821. Other agreements, sta[illegible] by Consalvi, were concluded during the following pontificate: with Hanover in 1824, with Duchy of Lucca in 1826; with Netherlands in 1827, and with Swiss Cantons in 1828.

[6] Two large Catholic states remained outside of this movement: Austria, because there the agreements entered into by the Emperor and also by Metternich encountered the opposition of the Viennese bureaucracy, and Spain, where anticurial prejudices were equally alive among the absolutist Godoy and the liberals.

[7] In contrast to what has often been said, there was no connection between this congregation, founded by decree on 19 July 1814, and that of the ecclesiastical affairs of France, created by Pius VI in 1790, nor with that of the same name established by Pius VII at the time of the preparations for the concordat with Bonaparte. Since the beginning, its organization was clear and unmistakable, but its nomenclature changed, and especially its tasks underwent strong changes during the first fifteen years. Its role during the preparations for the concordats at the time of Consalvi (and even under Leo XII) was much more limited than has been thought. During the short pontificate of Pius VIII the significant role of the new congregation was confirmed and simultaneously its function became more precise. On the first years of its efforts see the very rare collection *Raccolta dei rapporti delle sessioni tenute nell'anno (1814–1819) della S. Congregazione deputata sugli affari ecclesiastici del mondo cattolico*, 8 vols.

The Ultramontane Offensive in France

At the same time that Rome attempted to gain firm control of the central leadership of the Church, the countries in which Gallicanism and Febronianism had grown underwent a similar and parallel development in their own awareness.

Robbed of its privileges and the support of the monarchy during the years of the revolution and the French Empire, the French clergy had come to acknowledge that its best policy would consist of closer relations with the head of the Church. The attempt to subdue the clergy through the civil constitution and Napoleon's efforts at the time of the council of 1811 to erect an established church had opened the eyes of many to the dangers of the principles of Gallicanism.

A remarkable proof for this spiritual development was provided on 8 November 1816 when five prelates of the Old Regime, who had been opponents of the concordat of 1801, following a request by the government, renounced their opposition and in the name of the entire Gallican Church promised their unconditional obedience to all measures which Pius VII might have to take for the welfare of religion in France. This step, which gave the *Petite Église*[8] a blow from which it did not recover, was an important moment in the decline of Gallicanism. With this decision, the French clergy, long before the recognition of this principle by Vatican I, acknowledged de facto the right of the Pope to intervene and unilaterally to decide matters for a national Church.

---

[8] Where the opposition to the concordat gathered, now finding only the support of five of the old bishops, among them Thémines of Blois.

Even though the development did not stop, at first it seemed to slow down with the restoration of the Bourbons. The apparatus of this government remained wedded to the parliamentary Gallicanism of Pithou, which represented not only the independence of the state from the Church, but also the dependence of the Church upon the state in all matters which were not purely spiritual. The Bourbons emphasized and strengthened Gallicanism by continuing Napoleon's authoritarian methods of state socialism. They tended to regard relations between bishops and the Holy See as requiring royal permission, to maintain the grievance appeals embodied in the Organic Articles, and to appoint bishops without reference to Rome. The subjection of the Church to the government was designed to strengthen absolutism and to disarm the liberal opposition, whose aggressive tendencies were then to be diverted to the Holy See. The theoretical writings of André Dupin and Count de Montlosier in the defense of this system found an echo in public opinion, which regarded some of the clauses of the concordat of 1817 as humiliating to the state.

While the opposition of the clergy to the Organic Articles and to the submission of the Church to royal power was unanimous, a clear shift took place in favor of the articles of 1682, which now were interpreted very moderately. The prelates of the Old Regime who had returned with the King to France ordered the teaching of these Gallican articles. The Congregation of Saint Sulpice, which was in charge of many seminaries, remained faithful to Bossuet's tradition, and many clerics, who out of opposition to the Napoleonic despotism were open to ultramontanism and who, like Monsignor d'Astros, had defended the rights of the Pope even while they were in jail, now tended to give another chance to a traditionally moderate Gallicanism. It is also possible that they did so in order not to offend a government which so openly favored the Church.

Many individuals, especially the young, did not follow this line of thought, and soon ultramontanism became increasingly strong. Following the distribution of a Jesuit translation in French of the works of Italian ultramontanes, the first manifestation of the reawakening occurred in 1819 with the publication of the book *Du Pape* by Joseph de Maistre,[9] a Savoyard layman. In a simplified manner, Maistre defends the most extreme positions of the papalists by relying less on biblical or patristic witnesses than on analogies with political society as seen from the perspective of an absolute monarchy. Too theocratic to influence the politicians for whom it was chiefly intended and insufficiently theological for the clergy, the book nonetheless found readers among the broad public, whom it began to convert to the thesis of the infallibility of the Pope.

---

[9] On de Maistre see bibliography, chapter 14. Critical edition of *Du Pape* with introduction by J. Levie and J. Chetail (Geneva 1966).

It was to be Abbé de Lamennais[10] who was to achieve the conversion of the French clergy to ultramontanism. Lamennais had become a follower of a moderate ultramontane position after 1810 and upon reading Maistre's book he was confirmed in his views. On the occasion of a press campaign for unrestricted education, he seized on ultramontane justifications. This was done in part to underscore the rights of the Church against the state and in part to discredit in the eyes of Rome and of Catholic public opinion the Gallican-oriented bishops who refused to oppose a school monopoly which endangered the faith of the young. Without advocating a return to theocracy (on the contrary, he depicted the Holy See as an arbiter who protects right against might), he now accused Gallicanism at every opportunity of introducing democratic principles into the Church. Lamennais accused Gallicanism of making attacks upon the divine constitution of the Church, which if successful would lead to the dependence of the spiritual power upon the political power and, in this case, upon a government corrupted by liberal ideas.

The author of the *Essai sur l'indifférence* had already gained a reputation as an apologist, and his ultramontane partisanship, or opposition to Gallicanism, to be more precise, quickly drew the attention of several young priests. With their help Lamennais was able within a few years to spread "Roman views" among the young clergy, in spite of the resistance of the hierarchy and the reserve of many older priests, who were alienated by the impetuous nature of these innovators and their lack of the sense of proportion so dear to their Sulpician teachers.

The bishops were not only angry at the disrespect with which the young clerics treated them; they also were concerned with justification about the development of a movement in which they saw the expression of a clerical anarchy; an anarchy which elevated a distantly residing sovereign in order to ignore an immediate superior. Yet many of them, especially the younger ones, realized that the Gallican system was obsolete. This became evident in 1826, when Monsignor Frayssinous, the minister for ecclesiastical affairs and the author of a classical and very modern work on *Les vrai principes de l'Église gallicane* wanted to see the episcopate take a stand against the slogans of Lamennais. The results of the consultation demonstrated the degree to which even at this time the principles of Gallicanism within the French episcopate had begun to waver, including the moderate wing.

---

[10] On Lamennais, see bibliography, chapter 14.

Because Rome was aware of the inner logic of this development, it preferred to let it mature without hasty intervention which might lead to a more rigid attitude on the part of the bishops. The Holy See maintained a diplomatic silence because it did not wish to offend the pious King Charles X, and refused to lend open support to those who defended the ultramontane cause in France. This lack of support was a bitter disappointment to Lamennais. There was an additional reason for the Roman reticence.[11] Just as Rome had received de Maistre's *Du Pape* with reserve, in this case its theologians were dissatisfied with a depiction of ultramontane doctrine which gave insufficient importance to divine institutions and furthermore lacked clear definitions of the area of canon law and of the relationship of papacy and episcopate. Therefore, Rome avoided open approbation and confined itself to receiving with satisfaction the reports of success from the nuncio in Paris;[12] reports which recounted the steady progress of the ultramontane movement among the clergy and the pious laity.[13]

The Beginnings of the Development in Germany

The rebirth of ultramontanism in the German areas proceeded more modestly and at a slower pace. That it occurred, however, was an undeniable fact and the more remarkable because the way there was a more difficult one. The generally very moderate views of the school of Saint Sulpice had to be overcome as well as the much more radical and clearly episcopal outlook of Febronius and of the Josephinist canonists. Furthermore, the German bishops had for a long time shown themselves much more independent toward the Curia than was the case in France.

Secularization had reduced the power of the Rhenish archbishops. Once so proud in their relations to the Holy See, after twenty years of war and the numerous and long-lasting vacancies of episcopal sees which resulted from the many territorial redistributions, they now were forced to ask Rome for dispensations which heretofore they had reserved to themselves. This development led to a rediscovery of the thesis of the universal episcopate of the Pope. At the same time, several of the governments wished to avoid the creation of an adversary in the form of a strong and unified Church. After the Congress of Vienna, they thought it better not to foster the reorganization of the German established Church which was promoted by all those who longed to return to the Old Regime. The governments merely wanted to regulate the condition of their Catholic subjects through an agreement with the Holy See, which at this time still appeared weak and distant.

---

[11] Cf. Colapietra, 443–47 and, with respect to de Maistre, J. Levie and J. Chetail, XXX–XXXIV.

[12] Who on his part acted very intelligently; see L. Lambruschini, *La mia nunziatura di Francia* (Bologna 1934), 50–55.

[13] The nuncio in Spain transmitted similar reports. At the University of Sevilla, for example, the works of the Roman canonist Devoti replaced those of Van Espen and Tamburini after the restoration of 1823 by Ferdinand VII.

Conditions, therefore, became more favorable for the awakening of ultramontanism in Germany. We see the first signs in the numerous influential circles which characterized the German Catholic restoration after the turn of the century. Among these were the Vienna circle of Clemens Maria Hofbauer and the convert Friedrich Schlegel; those of Münster and Munich in which the friends of Princess Gallitzin and of Görres placed the accent on unity with Rome as a factor of Catholic regeneration in Germany; and finally and chiefly the Mainz circle formed around a group from Alsace: the bishop of Colmar, the seminary director Liebermann, and Professor Räss, all of whom had received their training from Strasbourg Jesuits outside of the Gallican and Febronian tradition. All of them wanted to train the clergy in a Roman and very anti-Protestant spirit and for this purpose spread the ultramontane views of Bellarmine through their seminaries and their journal *Der Katholik.*

Gradually, ultramontane views entered theological education. Even Möhler, who had little interest in the hierarchical aspects of the Church, depicted the Pope as the vital center of the unity of the Church. Ultramontanism also became visible in the teaching of many canonists who broke with the Josephinist tradition and polemicized against the idea of a German established Church which had been propagated by Dalberg and Wessenberg. This was true with respect to Frey and Schenkle; Scheill, who belonged to the younger generation, continued the work of the other two, and was able to win a portion of the young clergy to their ideas. The movement was encouraged by the bold gesture of Pius VII, who, after long hesitation in 1820, finally dared to place the textbooks of canon law and church history by G. Reichsberger and R. Dannenmayer, which had been in use for the past thirty years in all Austrian universities, on the Index of Forbidden Books.

In contrast to the French radical ultramontanism of Joseph de Maistre and the followers of de Lamennais, during the first decades of the nineteenth century this German ultramontanism was a very moderate one. It was much more a reaction against the extreme positions of Febronius and of Josephinism than a general reconciliation with Roman theologians and canonists on the question of the privileges of the Pope. Although many bishops spurned the doctrine of the superiority of a general council over the Pope, they thought themselves entitled to guide their dioceses without recourse to the Curia and, especially in the case of mixed marriages, to do so without heed to Rome's specific directives. Similarly, the majority of theologians rejected the interpretation of papal primacy which would have concentrated virtually all ecclesiastical authority in the offices of the Roman Curia. Gradually, however, the thesis of the personal infallibility of the Pope gained ground. The German translation of de Maistre's *Du Pape* in 1822 influenced a few laymen who sympathized with the new movement from France, as in their romantic enthusiasm they held an idealized image of the medieval theocratic state. Terrified by the spiritual anarchy which had sprung from the rationalism of the eighteenth century, they now willingly emphasized the necessity for a magisterial office which expressed itself with absolute authority. From a base within the laity, these ideas gradually reached the clergy, and, after 1830, they were introduced into some of the universities by men such as Klee and Phillips.

Roman Catholics and Separated Christians

As a consequence of ultramontane enthusiasm, which brought with it a denominational hardening and a virtual expulsion of the Christians separated from Rome, the nineteenth century was to produce the peak of ghetto mentality within Catholic Church history. In spite of this, the Catholic Church, as well as other Christian denominations, experienced a revival of unifying tendencies during the first quarter of the nineteenth century; a revival generated by a variety of motives. In some cases, as in Germany and in Holland, unification was a manifestation of a dogmatic interconfessionalism which had developed in the course of the preceeding century within circles which had been in contact with the Enlightenment or pietism. It was fed by a romantic tendency to prefer religious subjectiveness to precisely defined aspects of dogma and church discipline. In other cases, there was no other aim than to gather all of the disciples of Christ in order better to counter the dangers of secularism and rationalism. Still others propagated the religious unity of Europe[14] as the best means against the progress of revolutionary ideologies. Many thought of this unity as following the precepts of the Holy Alliance and as a gathering in of all Christians regardless of frontiers and denominational boundaries. Finally, for such as Bonald, de Maistre, and Lamennais in France, it was a question of speeding up the "return" of the separated "sects" into an all-embracing Catholic unity.

---

[14] This is the title of an 1806 article by Bonald. See *Oeuvres* VII (Brussels 1845), 164–202.

In the view of these men the Roman Church, based on the principles of authority, was the only useful bulwark against atheism in religion and individualism in politics.

Considerations of this nature were in fact the cause for a number of conversions to the Roman Church; especially among the Russian aristocracy and in Germany, where enthusiasm for the Middle Ages was a contributing factor. Some people believed that these were the first signs of a movement which would spread in coming years. Some, encouraged in their utopian hopes by the rumors of the unity projects ascribed to the Tsars Paul I and Alexander I,[15] even thought possible an incorporation of the Russian Orthodox Church into the Roman Catholic Church.[16]

With respect to the Protestants in France, where even during the Empire rumors of a fusion or absorption abounded, it was hardly possible to escape triumphalistic apologetics. One example was the assertion, spread by the Catalan J. Balmes in 1841–1844 in the four volumes of his *El protestantismo comparado con al catolicismo*, that Protestantism corrupted all social virtues, while Catholicism fostered them. In Ireland in 1826, Bishop Doyle urged the government to begin theological talks between Anglicans and Catholics; talks which he wished to conduct in a spirit of irenicism and spiritual competition. In Germany, ultramontane circles fostered certain controversial apologetics, because they were concerned about tendencies toward syncretism and doctrinal indifferentism. Occasionally, however, as in Frankfurt, such individuals as Schlegel and the historian Boehmer began dialogues, which in some cases lasted until the middle of the century and demonstrated a serious effort to overcome divergences and a spirit approaching that of modern ecumenism.[17] Sailer also wrote in a spirit which exceeded the Catholic world,[18] and he counted many Protestants among his friends. Without a doubt the work of J. A. Möhler[19] at the beginning of the nineteenth century was the most fruitful contribution of Catholic Germany toward Christian unity, even though the majority of his ideas were to mature only at a later time. Study of the Church Fathers had enabled Möhler to regain a concept of the Church which had been lost to theology for a long time. He presented the Church as a dynamic unit encompassing all differences and possessing an inner affinity for all of them.

---

[15] On Paul I see M. J. Rouët de Journel in *RHE* 55 (1960), 838–63. On Alexander I see Boudou I, 131–39; Winter, *Russland* II, 205–07; and "Lettres du Général Michaud à Nicolas Ier" in *L'Unité de l'Église* (1937), 129–33.

[16] So also the Bavarian priest H. J. Schmitt, who in 1824 published *Harmonie der morgenländischen und abendländischen Kirche. Ein Entwurf zur Vereinigung beider Kirchen.* Some time later the French priest L. Bautain entered into a very irenical correspondence with two Russians. See E. Baudin in *RevSR* 2 (1922), 393–410, 3 (1923), 1–23.

[17] A few examples in A. Mouchoux, *L'Allemagne devant les lettres françaises de 1814 à 1835* (Toulouse 1953), 315–16.

[18] See below, p. 221.

[19] See below, p. 246.

Rome, on the other hand, was receptive primarily to the conversion movement which characterized the first decades of the century and to the fact that a growing number of non-Catholic visitors were converging on Rome. These two occurrences were seen as an indication of diminishing antipapal prejudices. Although the Apostolic See would have liked to see itself again as the center of Christian unity, it hesitated to take steps which might cause consternation in London or Saint Petersburg. When the Greeks, after their first rising against the Turks in 1822, appealed for support from Rome, Pius VII did not dare to discuss their cause.[20] When in 1829 Chateaubriand invited Leo XII to place himself at the head of a comprehensive movement for Christian unity at the expense of a few concessions in the area of discipline, the Pope replied: "Matters must first mature and God himself must complete his work. Popes can only wait."[21] On the other hand, the Popes of this period did not hesitate to obstruct everything that might promote panchristian mixing, and this, above all else, was the reason for the negative attitude of the Holy See toward the Bible societies. It was quite evident that the papacy of this time did not wish to bring about the restoration of the Catholic Church by way of a genuine ecumenism.

---

[20] E. Duhaut-Lhéritier, *Histoire diplomatique de la Grèce* I (Paris 1925), 208–13.

[21] *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, Edition Garnier, V, 110–12.

CHAPTER 5

The Alliance of Throne and Altar in France

The church history of the restoration period in France, long viewed only through the distorting prism of ideological passions, gradually has become the object of genuine scientific attention. It illuminates the naivety of a clergy believing it possible to regain the preeminent position it had occupied before 1789 through the support of the reigning nobility and compromising itself in the eyes of the rising classes by its agreement with the political and social forces of reaction. It also depicts the ecclesiastical and spiritual rebuilding of these fifteen years and its lasting effect.

The Restoration of the Catholic State

"The throne of Saint Louis without the religion of Saint Louis is an absurd concept." Chateaubriand's statement, which breaks with the ideal of those in the eighteenth century who wanted to revive the old monarchical institution by transforming it according to the precepts of the encyclopedists, corresponds to an attitude which reached far beyond the group of émigrés. During the trials of the revolution many people returned to religion; some of them came to believe that it was the first duty of a ruler to lead his subjects to God; others, more concerned with political reality, concluded that the best protection for the throne lay in the social power which Catholicism represented. Integrating their social and political philosophies of counterrevolution into a religious perspective, they united in the common task of restoring the traditional church system and a powerful and respected Church in a Christian state. This goal was pursued by the ultras to its extreme, but they had to take into consideration liberal opinion which, while only weakly represented in parliament, held strong positions in society. Hence, the individualistic and liberal civil code remained untouched. For a century it governed the religious and moral life of the country, in part through an increase in birth control, which had been introduced in the preceding century. In many areas a policy of compromise was mandatory. For this reason numerous prelates and especially Catholic journalists complained bitterly about the "weakness" of the government with respect to the support which the government afforded the Church. The majority of the episcopate exercised moderation, as factually and legally there was no doubt that the Church profited considerably from the favorable attitude of the government.

Immediately after his return in 1814, Louis XVIII established Catholicism as the official religion of the state and required the honoring of the sabbath. There were also movements for the abolition of freedom of religion and the restitution of Church lands. In the following year the Chamber outlawed divorce and attempted to return to the clergy all functions of the civil registry and education. At the same time, secret negotiations were undertaken at the behest of the representatives of the *Petite Église* who were behind the religious policy of the first restoration. This aim was to annul the concordat of 1801, return to the concordat of 1516, restore the old dissolved dioceses, and replace the Napoleonic episcopate. Pius VII and the zealots around him were indeed interested in negotiating a new treaty which would cancel the Organic Articles and be more favorable for the Church. But the Holy See did not wish to create the impression that it had erred and now disapproved of its negotiations with the "usurper," nor did it desire to return to the traditional status of the Church in France with its old Gallicanism. Besides, Consalvi was very skeptical about such a far-reaching counterrevolution. After three years of difficult negotiations a compromise was finally reached on 11 June 1817. In spite of the intentional vagueness of many of its clauses, it was a success for Rome and restored forty-two of the old dioceses.[1] But the reaction of Gallican jurists and of liberal opinion was such that the government did not dare submit the treaty to the ratification of both Chambers. This placed it in a quandary, but the skillful mediation of Portalis's son and the King's promise gradually to increase the number of dioceses from fifty to eighty (effected by October 1822), persuaded Pius VII to discard the idea of a new concordat. The concordat of 1801 remained in effect, paradoxically saved by the extreme demands of the ultras.

The failure of the concordat of 1817 is explained by the fact that upon the advice of Decazes Louis XVIII was seeking a reconciliation with liberal opinion. Basically prepared to improve the material and legal position of the Catholic Church, Louis above all tried to keep the state independent from the clergy, thus preventing the complete realization of the program of the ultras. But the assassination of the heir to the throne on 13 February 1820 fueled the resistance of clergy and nobility anew. It expressed itself in chicanery against the Protestants, a newspaper law of March 1822 which placed blasphemy of religion under penalty, and in increasing influence of the Church on education. The reaction deepened with the accession of Charles X in September 1824. He was the prototype of an émigré who, converted to piety, "atoned for the thoughtless sins of his youth through equally thoughtless exercises of devotion in his old age" (Dansette). His coronation at Reims appeared to be both symbol and program.

This clerical policy was supported by the even more extremist religious press, as well as by the secret ultra royalist and religious society known as Knights of the Faith,[2] a kind of Catholic counterfreemasonry. Its supreme goal was to serve religion and the monarchy; but soon it was infiltrated by a number of ambitious people. During the first years of the restoration it formed a regular secret government and until 1826, the year of its dissolution, not satisfied with bringing about the complete Christianization of institutions through legal reforms, it tried to gain control over the administration, systematically filled all influential positions with its members, and let it be known that religious zeal was the most important prerequisite for gaining high office.

---

[1] Text *MiscMercati* I, 597–601.

[2] See below, p. 229.

Strengthening of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy

Parallel to this questionable public action, which soon turned against the very Church it professed to serve, the work of ecclesiastical reconstruction begun in 1801 proceeded in a less spectacular but much more useful way.

The rebuilding was done by an episcopate which on the basis of vacancies, of attrition, and the creation of thirty new sees was quickly "purified" (of ninety bishops appointed between 1815 and 1830, seventy were noblemen). But on the whole, the bishops of the restoration, selected by the Grand Almonry chiefly from émigrés and priests who had resisted Napoleon, were noticeably different from those of the Old Regime. Similar to the Napoleonic bishops, they were conscientious administrators, were too old, and had too little contact with the faithful and their priests. Yet they fulfilled their obligations eagerly if not always intelligently, and were irreproachable in their personal conduct. Dupanloup applauded their eagerness, but Foisset regretted the absence of new pastoral initiatives called for by the new situation ("Nothing was done to prevent the nineteenth century from being a continuation of the eighteenth century.") In the face of a society incapable of admitting that the past quarter century was not merely an episode, this episcopate certainly was the wrong one for the times.

One of the most important tasks was to recruit enough priests, and the results were good. With the aid of the government, which provided considerable sums[3] for stipends, seminarists, and higher salaries for the clergy, the bishops succeeded in overcoming the critical situation within a few years. Seen superficially, the number of thirty-six thousand priests in France in 1814 seemed to be adequate, even if it was only half the number of 1789, but many of the priests were rather old; only 4 percent were under forty. The steps taken to ameliorate the situation resulted in an improvement. The number of ordinations increased from year to year (918 in 1815, 1400 in 1820, 1620 in 1825, and 2337 in 1830; the last figure constituted an absolute high-point, as it was never reached again). The average age of the clergy decreased, and after 1825 a small increase in the absolute number of priests took place.

The young clergy, often from an agrarian background, was occasionally attracted by the glitter of a career newly provided with respect by the government, but Jean-Marie Vianney,[4] who in 1818 became pastor of Ars, was certainly not the only one who took his pastoral obligations seriously. Many priests came from families with strong religious traditions, had gone through the trials of the revolution, and received their calling in contact with uncompromising and strict priests of the "resistance." In newly organized seminaries in which the influence of Saint Sulpice predominated, they received a solid ascetic training which, compared to the neighboring states, gave the French clergy a relatively high standard. Some bishops attempted to uphold these standards with the help of retreats and priests' conferences. But with respect to humanistic and even theological knowledge, this clergy, even in the cities, was only half educated. The reason for this was the low standard of education in the seminaries and the total destruction of higher ecclesiastical education during the revolution.[5] Bautain, Lamennais, and a few others were rare autodidacts with the usual shortcomings.[6] Bishops like Monsignor Trévern of Strasbourg were exceptions and tried to deal with the unfavorable situation during a period of extraordinary spiritual ferment.

---

[3] The church budget gradually increased from 12 to 33 million Francs per year. Simultaneously the contributions of the faithful increased considerably (42 million compared to 2.5 million during the Empire); they were favored by the law of 2 January 1817, which made possible the purchase of real estate and the receipt of legacies.

[4] R. Fourrey, *Le curé d'Ars authentique* (Paris 1964).

The regular clergy was not able to make up for the failure of the secular clergy in this respect, for of the old "intellectual" orders only the Jesuits played a role in the France of the restoration. Still small in numbers, they were absorbed with the reintroduction of their colleges and the missions to the people. Congregations engaged in ministering to the sick or teaching elementary school, however, were in full bloom, especially in the east, the southeast, and the west of France. As early as 1815 there were 14,226 sisters, divided among forty-three congregations in 1,829 houses; by 1830 there were 24,995 sisters in sixty-five congregations and 2,875 houses. The rapid increase of local congregations,[7] resulting from the isolation of some of the provinces, the attempts of some bishops to remain masters of their territory, and the narrowness of some founders, unfortunately were a waste of strength. Among the school brothers, there were local groups as well, but with much greater unity. Three congregations were particularly active: the institute of the Brothers of Christian Instruction at Ploërmel in Brittany,[8] founded in 1820 by Jean-Marie de Lamennais; the Marist Brothers of Marcellin Champagnat, founded at the same time in Lyon; and the Christian Brothers, who had never disappeared and whose strength quadrupled in fifteen years. In addition to these congregations, officially recognized because of their public usefulness, some old congregations reappeared in spite of the disapproval of some Gallican bishops opposed to any exceptions.[9] Others were new and ignored the regalistic laws which the government inherited from Napoleon. The government eventually weakened these laws by superceding them in 1825 with a new law. Because of its moderate nature it remained in effect until the end of the century.

---

[5] See below, pp. 248ff.

[6] On Bautain, see below, pp. 249f.; on Lamennais see bibliography chapter 14. See also pp. 251–54 and 273–76 on the Mennaisian movement.

[7] List, incomplete in *NRTh* 82 (1960), 609–10; on the congregations of brethren see id., 612.

[8] H. C. Rulon and Ph. Friot, *Histoire des méthodes et des manuels scolaires utilisés dans l'Institut des Frères de Ploërmel* (Paris 1962).

The Attempt to Regain Society and Anticlerical Reactions

Administrative and legal advantages for the clergy, one-sided selection of civil servants, and reordering of ecclesiastical structures, all were in part designed to strengthen the monarchy; but for the Church the supreme goal was the rechristianization of society. The actual degree of dechristianization in the France of 1815 is difficult to ascertain. But in general the following can be said: The constant wars, the mutual recriminations after Napoleon's rupture with the Pope, and the discontent growing out of the tactlessness of the first restoration and its unrestrained exploitation during the Hundred Days, placed the Church in a very difficult situation, in spite of the religious renewal associated with the concordat of 1801. Of course, the conditions were different in different parts of the country. While, for example, not a single male inhabitant was religiously active in Périgueux, the population of Marseille was still very religious, and while some rural departments like Yonne and Charente contained a considerable number of unbaptized children, other areas were hardly touched by such phenomena. This was especially true for the areas on the periphery of France, like the north, the Vendée and Anjou, Aquitaine, the Provence, Franche-Comté, Lorraine, and Alsace. Generally it can be said that the old aristocracy as well as a few intellectuals returned to the old faith, professionals and notables of the provinces continued to be openly hostile to the clergy, and religious indifference was widespread in the world of commerce and industry. The mass of the people, on the other hand, in the rural areas as well as in some provincial towns, continued to adhere to Christian practices. But religious ignorance was profound, morals clearly had sunk lower, and the reception of Sacraments, especially among the men, had virtually disappeared.[10] The masses were influenced by the freethinking press, which was read aloud in drinking halls, and by the dime novels sold by street vendors. In short, even though not quite as catastrophic as depicted in some pastoral letters, the situation was worrisome. In addition to the comprehensive movements, to be treated in detail later,[11] the Church of France could look toward two significant means to regain its hold on the society which seemed to be slipping from its grip: the Christian education of the young and people's missions for adults.

---

[9] The actual attitude of the local authorities differs with time and place. See for example F. Tavernier, "L'affaire des capucins à Aix et à Marseille" in *Provence historique* 8 (1958), 235–64.

The awareness that the rechristianization of the people would have to begin in elementary school explains both the hostility of the clergy to an education which was not single-minded[12] and the flourishing of the teaching congregations. Their work was facilitated by several legislative measures assigning the clergy an important role in the elementary schools, especially the ordinance of 2 April 1824, which placed all elementary education under the control of the Church. The Church was chiefly interested in secondary schools which were educating the future leaders. It would have liked the restoration to return to it the monopoly of education which, after it had been lost to the revolution, was turned over by Napoleon to the *"Université."* But the change could not occur from one day to the next. Therefore an attempt was made to establish a secondary ecclesiastical school system on the fringes of the state system,[13] and with the tacit permission of the government. At the same time, the state schools were given a more religious character. In addition to the catechism, daily Mass and weekly confession became obligatory. The almoners were given great authority; some pressure was exerted on young Protestants, although only rarely. Then Monsignor Frayssinous, after 1822 in charge of education, purged the universities and replaced important professors, whose religious or monarchical sentiments were suspect, by clerics (in 1818, 139 of 309 deans and 66 of 80 professors of philosophy were clerics). The purge seems to have had some positive results in a few small towns, but in many places, especially Paris, it was a dismal failure. It merely resulted in hypocrisy on the part of the professors and animosity on the part of students, who were more hostile to religion when they left the royal secondary schools than when they had entered. This partial failure of the protectionist system also explains the success of Lamennais's work toward a liberal education,[14] in spite of the mistrust of most of the bishops, who suspected anything that had any connection with liberalism.

---

[10] The situation was particularly bad in Paris. In 1825 Nuncio Macchi wrote: "In Paris hardly an eighth of the population practices its religion and it is questionable whether there are ten thousand practicing Christians."

[11] See chapter 14. pp. 227–30.

[12] See R. Limouzin-Lamothe in *BLE* 57 (1956), 71–83.

[13] Seminaries for boys to which, in addition to future priests, young people were accepted who wanted to enter a professional career; private schools organized by pastors; even secondary schools established by orders which were entitled by the ordinance of 27 February 1821 to grade the same way as the royal secondary schools. One actually feared the bad influence which the children from liberal or enlightened circles might exert on children from Christian families.

With respect to the missions to the people, the method employed reached back to the seventeenth century and was employed under Napoleon until he abolished it. In 1816 it was resumed with a hitherto unknown intensity. Several societies of diocesan missionaries were founded (in the south, in Lyon, in Besançon, in Tours) the most successful of which was the congregation of the Priests of Mercy of Abbé Jean-Baptiste Rauzan of Bordeaux. Some religious orders, Jesuits, Lazarists and Monfortians participated in this apostolate. Supported by the majority of the bishops and the parish clergy as well as occasionally by the civil and military authorities, these inspired apostles seized every opportunity for spectacular appearances in order to instill and revive the faith. At the same time, they urged them to be loyal to the Bourbons, as they were convinced of the solidarity between monarchy and religion. The frequent mixing of politics and religion was a severe mistake in an ideologically divided country, and the missionaries often emphasized the existing divergencies instead of bringing people closer together. Their provocative attitude toward the nonbelievers, their sermons on the restitution of Church lands, their diatribes against dancing, and the burning of books, reminding people in unpleasant fashion of the Inquisition, angered an influential minority. They were ultimately the reason for the rejection of these missions as well as for the stormy reaction directed toward the "mission crosses," whose theatrical erection usually concluded ceremonies. An objective examination of the missionary activity must admit, though, that it was relatively successful. Even if it had hardly any influence on the educated, it temporarily succeeded in stopping the process of secularization among the simple people, even if the emphasis all too frequently was more on public adherence to Catholicism than on the regular exercise of faith. In some cases the missionaries organized a "work of persistence," whose activity was felt for a long time. The general aim of the rechristianization of France certainly was not achieved; but one has to consider that, contrary to appearances, the number of these missions was rather small: perhaps fifteen hundred in fifteen years, perhaps one hundred per year, in a total of thirty-six thousand parishes.

---

[14] See below, pp. 233ff.

The outbreak of hate and violence against the Church accompanying the fall of the Bourbons in 1830 was the result of a steadily growing opposition. The provocative and tactless policy of the ultras, who identified religion with the counterrevolution and wanted to subordinate the state to the Church, produced hostility in a France which had not known the Old Regime and in the survivors of the old Gallican parliamentarism. The liberals constituted only a small but very dynamic minority; out of an enlightened hostility against religion and with the intention of taking a slap at the throne, which was in solidarity with the clerical reaction, they used all possible means to undermine the activity of the clergy. Inexpensive editions of the encyclopedists were distributed among the lower middle class and in most villages: 2,740,000 copies between 1817 and 1824, i.e., more than in the entire eighteenth century.[15] The liberal papers daily informed their readers of cases of intolerance or scandals among the clergy. The pamphletist Paul-Louis Courrier and the songwriter Béranger assisted the bitter struggle with their talents. A widespread concern with maintaining the predominating position of the state over the Church gained them the support of the moderate wing of the constitutional monarchists, who were very influential in the Chamber of Peers, in the academy, in the courts, and in the university. The uneasiness of the heirs to the Jansenist tradition, in the face of the increasing activity of the ultramontane congregations, also moved a number of Gallicans to join the anticlerical opposition. In 1826 an old Catholic nobleman, the Count of Montlosier, who also was a fanatic Gallicanist, placed himself at the head of a campaign against the Jesuits, who for many had become the symbol of the subordination of the state under the papacy.

The disappearance of the ultraroyalist majority after the elections of 1827 and the replacement of Martignac's ministry by Villèle assured the ordinance of 21 April 1828, withdrawing from the bishops a portion of their authority with respect to elementary schools, and the ordinance of 16 June, which removed members of nonauthorized orders from the educational system and which regulated the small seminaries in such a way that they could not be transformed into secondary schools. These were limited measures, but the Left was jubilant: "The scepter of the Inquisition has been broken." While the Jesuits dispersed without commotion, the episcopate, stirred up by the right-wing press, began to react with firmness. Leo XII, however, skillfully influenced by the emissaries of Charles X, did not wish to add to the problems of such a devout ruler and, happy to be able to exercise his pontifical authority over the French upper clergy, advised the bishops to give in. The government also showed itself tolerant in the application of the laws.[16] This first defeat of the priestly party far from pacified the liberal opposition, however; on the contrary it incited it more.

---

[15] Precise figures in *Mémorial catholique* of May 1825 (III, 261–99).

Balance Sheet of the Restoration

At the level of institutions, the zeal of the ultras and of the pious, ill-advised by the nunciature, brought the Church no gains. "Everytime it was thought that the lines drawn by coercion at the time of Louis XVIII could be erased with the hope of a social and religious counterrevolution, it was necessary to return wholly or in part to the Napoleonic solution of a differentiation between the spheres of jurisdiction of Church and state, as this solution corresponded best to the situation of a country changed by the revolution."[17] The intensity of the anticlerical reaction which became stronger in the fifteen years of the restoration, and the deplorable attitude of the students, educated in the royal secondary schools under strong ecclesiastical influence, sufficed to make evident the futility of a policy designed to change the religious thinking of Frenchmen by placing at the disposal of the Church the centralized administrative machinery created by Napoleon. To the thoughtless demands of a clergy incapable of analyzing the sociological causes of the religious indifference of the people or the true motives for the irreligiosity of the intellectuals was added the stupid resort to the secular power. It compromised the clergy with the reactionary party and damaged the Church permanently.

But, as we have seen, the balance sheet of the restoration with respect to religion is not entirely negative. A tremendous spiritual rebuilding was effected, to which the rapid increase in ordinations, the continuing renewal of the traditional life in the parishes, the flourishing of charities, an apostolate served by an elite of laymen, and the numerous cases of a return to the faith and to religious practice were eloquent testimony. Not all of these results were superficial and the intensity of the reaction of the enemies of the Church seems to confirm that France was more Christian in 1830 than in 1815. But it must not be forgotten that it was the aid and protection of the government which made possible the rebuilding of the Church in France and, at least in the provinces, a genuine and permanent change of the spiritual climate. One can therefore justifiably ask with G. de Bertier: "Would the Church of France have been able, without these fifteen years of reconstruction and reconquest, to maintain and develop its enthusiasm for charity and the apostolate to the degree to which this was the case in the nineteenth century?"[18] It was an enthusiasm whose emanation to Europe and the world was significant, and it justifies the place which historians assign to the diverse manifestations of the Catholic life of this country.

---

[16] In Marseilles, for example, everything remained unchanged (J. Leflon, *Mazenod* II, 332–33). Similarly in Lyon, where the authorities insisted on the implementation of the ordinances only under the July monarchy (C. Latreille: *Revue d'Histoire de Lyon* 11 [1912], 5–25).

[17] *HistCathFr,* 250.

---

[18] *La Restauration,* 324.

CHAPTER 6

The Continuation of the Old Regime in Southern Europe

The Italian States

After the end of the Napoleonic interlude, Italy had once again become a "geographic expression." It consisted of eight individual states: the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, enlarged by the former Republic of Genoa; the "Kingdom" of Lombardy-Venetia, which was a part of the Habsburg possessions; the Duchies of Parma, Modena, and Lucca, and the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, which were nominally independent but in reality were Austrian protectorates; the Papal States; and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

The shortage of priests which France experienced did not exist in Italy, where the superabundance of clergy continued. But its quality often left much to be desired. In the southern part of the country, many priests had chosen the clerical vocation only because this was the customary prerequisite to becoming an educator or being able to devote oneself to studies. In central Italy, the landed nobility often used priests with a small living as administrators of their estates. In the Papal States, Monsignor Sala complained about the idleness of many priests who served no real function. In the northern part of the country, though, where the bishops were interested in an improvement of the seminaries and, like Monsignor Lambruschini in Genoa, began to organize exercises and retreats for the priests, the clergy definitely had higher standards. In Piedmont a number of lesser known imitators joined people like Giuseppe Cottolengo and Pio Lanteri.

But there were other urgent problems: determination of the relations between the Holy See and the new governments; adjustment of the diocesan borders (which received the form they have retained to this day) in keeping with the territorial changes; regulation of the problems caused by the nationalization of Church lands and the suppression of the monasteries during the French period; and regaining of the minds influenced by the anti-Roman Jansenism of the eighteenth century and the liberal ideas spread by the French.

The institutional reorganization was completed within a few years through a series of agreements, not all of which were easily reached. While the government counted on the assistance of the clergy in its counterrevolutionary undertakings, it was not at all prepared to give up old regalistic laws. In fact, the caesaro-papism of the eighteenth century developed into a kind of modern secular jurisdictionalism of Napoleonic character. Despite objections by the zealots, Consalvi ultimately accepted a number of concessions to this mentality. He acknowledged that, in spite of its unavoidably reactionary character, society refused to revert to the spirit of the Middle Ages. Besides, seen as a whole, this agreeable policy resulted in genuine benefits.

Immediately after his return to Naples, King Ferdinand I requested negotiations for a concordat. They proved particularly difficult, because the Roman zealots in their anachronistic pretensions wanted to see the feudal dependence of Naples on the Holy See confirmed and made demands on a state in which the jurisdictional tradition of Giannone had been strengthened by Murat's bureaucracy. But under the pressure exerted on the court by the pro-Jesuit party and by the flexible position of Consalvi, the negotiations were successfully concluded on 13 February 1818.[1] Like the concordat of 1801 with France, this one made concessions to modern ideas (ending the privileged position of the estates of the Church; limitation of ecclesiastical courts; reform of the dioceses which were too small;[2] and reduction of feast days) as well as to regalistic concepts (the right of the King to appoint bishops; the right of the government to intervene in the administration of estates of the Church). These concessions were compensated, however, by far greater advantages than the French concordat had permitted. Catholicism was recognized as the only religion, with all of the rights in the field of education and censorship of publications resulting from the privileged position; royal permission for administrative acts of the Church was abolished, and the right to appeal to Rome was authorized; the bishops received the exclusive right of jurisdiction over clerics; and the state granted far-reaching guarantees for the material support of the Church by providing the clergy with fixed incomes, restoring unsold Church estates, and providing the monasteries with land. A bilateral commission was entrusted with the implementation, and in 1819 it began to reintroduce religious orders.

---

[1] Text in Mercati I, 620–37.

[2] Fifty bishoprics were dissolved or consolidated by the bull of 3 April 1818 (*BullRomCont* XV 31f.). In Sicily, on the other hand, their number was slightly increased for pastoral reasons (Bulls of 28 June 1818 and 23 March 1822, id., 36–40, 487ff.).

The agreement appeared to the inflexible as too advantageous for the state, and it caused the strong opposition of the upper classes because of the economic clauses. The government, counting on the customary docility of the southern episcopate, tried to expand the rights left to it and to maintain as much as possible the old privileges of the monarchy. Disagreements over several points endured until the time of Leo XII, especially the question of returning the jurisdiction over the convents to the nunciature. The zealots, on the other hand, had a certain satisfaction in a policy which was decidedly opposed to any softening toward the liberals; after the unrest of 1820–21 they were led by the Prince of Canosa,[3] who for some years was regarded as the head of the intransigent Catholics of Italy.

But the intransigents were not very numerous in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. They found no support among the educated classes, which lived under the influence of the enlightened reformism of the eighteenth century, and among whom the Freemasons of the Scottish Rite had numerous followers, nor among the people whose superstitious religiosity had nothing clerical about it. They found no echo even among the clergy itself, for in the south the clergy more often than not was liberally oriented.

In the states to the north of the Papal States, the Jansenist clergy, which frequently had concluded compromises with the French government, lost part of its influence. While this did away with one cause of opposition to the Roman Curia, Josephinist tendencies remained alive.

In Tuscany, Grand Duke Ferdinand III demonstrated a certain degree of flexibility after the brief interlude of Prince Rospigliosi, who had annulled all French ordinances which seemed to conflict with the Catholic religion. Although Ferdinand III refused the recision of the laws of mortmain desired by Pius VII as compensation for yielding a portion of the church lands, and equally was not prepared to readmit the Jesuits to his territories, a convention was relatively easily reached on 4 December 1815.[4] It permitted the continuation of the orders which still existed at the time of the conquest, but reduced the monasteries numerically, in view of the diminished patrimony of the Church. A compromise was also found with respect to the jurisdiction of canon law. But the jurisdictionalistic tradition which had come down from Grand Duke Leopold soon proved so strong that a regression took place, and as early as 1819 the situation at the close of the eighteenth century had been reached again, namely a privileged but strictly controlled established religion. The accession of Leopold II in 1824 led to a reduction in the tensions with the Roman Curia, finding its expression in 1828 in the reestablishment of the nunciature at Florence, which had ceased to exist in 1788.

---

[3] See W. Maturi, *Il principe di Canosa* (Florence 1944).

[4] Mercati I, 585–90.

The situation was very similar in the duchies.[5] The authorities counted on the favorable cooperation of the clergy in their consolidation of absolutist governments and were therefore willing to restore the external power of the Church, which in turn was agreeable with respect to the secularized Church lands. But the governments were not prepared to renounce the Josephinist habits of the eighteenth century.

The same was especially true for the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia, which was under the direct influence of Vienna. It enjoyed a Josephinist administration and enlightened bishops like Archbishop Gaysruck of Milan, a conscientious pastor who objected to the gradually spreading religious congregations.

In the Kingdom of Sardinia, where the French concordat remained in force, King Victor Emmanuel I and his ministers, considering the Church as the best support for the throne, were well-disposed toward the Holy See. One of the first actions of the restoration rescinded the Napoleonic laws which had emancipated the Waldensians. The bishop of Pinerolo started a conversion campaign, supported by means of coercion, heralding a return to the persecutions of the preceding centuries. In 1817 a number of dioceses which Napoleon had abolished were reestablished and their boundaries were drawn in keeping with pastoral requirements.[6] The Jesuits, who in the eighteenth century had not experienced the same hostility as in the Bourbon states, quickly regained their dominant position, especially in the field of education. To be sure, the lay members, former Napoleonic civil servants, of the commission charged with the restitution of the unsold Church lands and the reestablishment of monasteries, dragged their feet so that a definitive agreement was reached only in 1828. But it must be admitted that the conduct of many monks and nuns gave rise to complaints and after 1825 Rome had to send out apostolic visitors in order to restore discipline and to eliminate sometimes scandalous abuses. On the other hand, the secular clergy was of higher quality than in the rest of the peninsula and succeeded in forming small militant groups which, in a very reactionary spirit, became the forerunners of the future Catholic Action.[7]

---

[5] Where dioceses were newly established in order to adjust them to the changes in borders (Bull of 11 December 1821, *BullRomCont* XV, 462–65).

[6] Mercati I, 601–19.

But it proved to be more difficult to shape minds than to change institutions. Tridentine Catholicism without a doubt governed the conduct of the people. Its faith generally was viable, but lacked enlightenment. Even the elite uncritically accepted the slanderous pamphlets of the Jesuits and Redemptorists against modern ideas, which were represented as derived from Protestantism. For this reason the counterrevolution in Italy more than in other countries occurred in the spirit of the Counter-Reformation. But simultaneously there were, even in the patriarchal monarchy of Savoy, enough enlightened Catholics who, as heirs to the Jansenist tradition in Italy or to the encyclopedists, desired a reform of the Church as well as of the state. Especially among the middle-class youth in large parts of Italy a development could be noted which was analogous to that of France during the same period. In defiance of official coercion the students of Turin, Padua, Pavia, Pisa, and even of Bologna and the Papal States, evinced an anticlericalism which rarely went so far as unbelief, but which differentiated between Church and state. They complained loudly about the growing influence of the Jesuits and, particularly after the intensification of Roman antiliberalism occasioned by the election of Leo XII, turned more and more away from the papacy. Limited as the movement was to the intellectuals, it made visible, in spite of officially shown optimism, the growing rift between the Church and the "young Italy" of the Risorgimento.

The Iberian Peninsula

In Spain as well as in Portugal the French occupation had been too short and too violent to cause a profound change in thinking. Thus the restoration of the Old Regime was total. It was undertaken by an altogether too eager political party, which more than elsewhere equated religious with political restoration.

This was no real advantage for the Church. The governments continued to adhere to the regalistic ways of the eighteenth century and were not forced, as in other countries, to seek a just balance between tradition and new ideas. The clergy thus increasingly identified itself with a past which the intellectual elite and the bourgeoisie had outgrown. After having been under the influence of the encyclopedists,[8] they looked with envy toward England.

---

[7] See below, pp. 235ff.

[8] Without going as far as they did toward an absence of piety or even anticlericalism, for they spoke of adaptation, and not of discarding national traditions.

Yet the organization of the Spanish Church demanded far-reaching reforms. It suffered from unsuitable diocesan and parish boundaries and excessive wealth;[9] ignorance and sometimes lack of morality among the lower clergy; an unusually high number of people in orders (forty thousand monks and twenty-two thousand nuns in a population of 10 million) and forty-six thousand diocesan priests (proportionately twice as many as the considerable number of priests in Italy). The otherwise qualified episcopate lacked clearsighted men.

Consequently the interference of the Cortes of Cádiz in purely ecclesiastical affairs,[10] together with certain forms of conduct engendering a revolutionary demagogy according to the French model, brought into discredit any type of liberalism, even the most moderate kind derived from Suarez and Thomas Aquinas. For this reason the clergy passionately supported the violent absolutist reaction accompanying the return of King Ferdinand VII to Madrid in 1814, and during the suppression confused the "afrancesados" with the patriotic liberals. During the following years "Black Spain," supported by the masses of the people loyal to the Church, triumphed over an "enlightened" minority. The Inquisition was immediately restored and turned against all who between 1808 and 1814 had toyed with the "revolution," closed monasteries were reopened, and the Jesuits were permitted to settle again, but only on condition that they respect the rights of the crown. The crown determinedly held on to some aspects of the Old Regime, leading to occasional tensions with Rome, especially in the question of the appointment of bishops, not to mention American affairs.[11] Pius VII, with his acute sense for reality, gave in to several royal demands. In 1817 he agreed to charging nuns with the education of boys and girls wherever schools were inadequate. In 1818 he turned over a respectable portion of the income of the Church for cultural and social purposes.

Between 1820 and 1823 the liberals succeeded in gaining power and exacted heavy punishment from the Church for its concession to the reaction. Clerics who resisted the immediately restored constitution of 1812 were incarcerated or deported;[12] half of all monasteries were closed; the Jesuits were expelled; many Church lands were expropriated; and the Inquisition and episcopal censorship were outlawed.

---

[9] See some remarks in E. A. Peers, *Spain. The Church and the Orders* (London 1939), 18–20. See also the remarks of the author on the development of Spanish anticlericalism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: "What had originally been in the main a struggle for power between Church and King became a struggle for property" (p. 63).

[10] See above, pp. 81f.

[11] See below, pp. 163–70.

[12] The episcopal resistance was led by P. Inguanzo y Rivero, bishop of Zamora, who became archbishop of Toledo in 1824.

Finally, the appointment of Canon Villanueva, a highly anti-Curial Jansenist, who had been the soul of all ecclesiastical reform projects, as ambassador to the Holy See led to a break with Rome and the expulsion of the nuncio.

Under these circumstances it was not surprising that bishops, priests, and members of orders fervently assisted the counterrevolution, and that numerous monasteries became bulwarks in the service of the traditionalist party and the so-called *Junta apostólica.* With the restoration of the absolutist government for another ten years (1823–33) by the "one hundred thousand sons of Saint Louis," the Church was again placed in its former position. Buyers of Church property were not compensated. But the few concessions which the King made to the liberals, such as his refusal to restore the Inquisition,[13] irritated the intransigents or "apostólicos," led by the Franciscan general and supported by Nuncio Giustiniani. Giustiniani was a representative of the Roman zealots and wanted to make of Spain an object lesson for a Catholic reconstruction of Europe on an antiliberal basis. Keeping this objective in mind, the clergy, and especially the regular clergy, placed its hopes in the impending accession to the throne of the brother of the King, Don Carlos. In spite of the firm trust of the people in the traditional religious customs, the clergy was incapable of understanding that the anachronistic attitude of the Church of the Old Regime could not but jeopardize it.

The restoration of the Church in Portugal was hardly more satisfying. Even more than in Spain, the entire Church needed to be cleansed, for the decadence of the orders and the low morals of the clergy[14] were even more pronounced. In its relationship to the Holy See the episcopate was much more emancipated, and the ideas of the French philosophes and of Freemasonry had developed deeper roots. Continuing along the guidelines of Pombal, the government wanted to reform the religious orders without Rome's involvement and experienced constant difficulties with the Pope over the appointment of bishops and their jurisdiction. But this did not protect the Church from the hostility of the liberals. Consequently, the seizure of power by the Freemasons after the revolution of 1821 was accompanied not only by the abolition of a series of ecclesiastical privileges and the closing of several monasteries, but also by violence against the clergy, including bishops. In order to find protection, they were compelled to seek it from Rome. The accession of Don Miguel in 1829 reintroduced absolutism as well as the privileged position of the Church.[15] But the removal of the fetters from the anticlerical press during the liberal administration had made evident the deep rift between the clergy and the intellectuals. The few clergymen open to modern ideas, like the Benedictine Father Saraiva, author of a constitutional draft in 1821 along the lines of the Cortes of Cádiz, were helpless to change the situation, the more so as they were chastised by both Rome and the Portuguese episcopate.

---

[13] This restoration was of symbolic value for the *Apostólicos.* They saw in it a challenge to liberal Europe. But the Holy See thought it more prudent not to add fuel to the fire (and also was not sad at the disappearance of this national tribunal which had not allowed appeals to Rome).

[14] There were very many of them, for in 1822 there were eighteen thousand priests in a population of fewer than 3.5 million (i.e., one priest per two hundred inhabitants).

---

[15] Including, fourteen years later than Spain, the reinstatement of the Jesuits, although between 1834 and 1857 they were to be suppressed again. See L. Frías, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en su asistencia moderna de España* II/1 (Madrid 1944), 536–73.

CHAPTER 7

Ecclesiastical Reorganization and Established Church in the German Confederation and Switzerland

As a consequence of secularization the Catholic Church of Germany was bereft of its material foundations, its political backing, and its educational institutions, and was dependent on the states. It also needed to be adjusted to the new conditions and reorganized from the bottom up.

The Imperial Delegates Final Recess had promised an adjustment in imperial law, which, however, had not been effected during the agony of Germany's secularization, in spite of the efforts of Prince-Bishop Dalberg and the Court of Vienna. Dalberg's plans for a concordat for the Rhenish Confederation also had foundered.[1] The Curia, having just succeeded with the French concordat in setting up the prerequisites for a centralized reconstruction, was not interested in seeing an autonomous ecclesiastical organization reestablished in Germany. Even more determinedly, several medium-sized states, especially Bavaria and Württemberg, opposed any national or federal solution. They insisted on preserving their recently gained sovereignty, and for the first time in German history ecclesiastical particularism prevailed. It was combined with a blunt application of absolutist ecclesiastical sovereignty; in the medium-sized states whose borders had just been redefined, the established Church, bereft of its independence, was intended to be an instrument of the states' integration policies.

---

[1] Concerning Dalberg's religious policy, see also R. Reinhardt, "Fürstprimas Carl Theodor von Dalberg im Lichte der neuen Forschung," *ThQ* 144 (1964); G. Schwaiger, "Carl Theodor von Dalberg," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* I (1967); *MThZ* 18 (1967).

Only the collapse of the insecure and unstable Napoleonic system and the political reorganization by the Congress of Vienna (September 1814 to June 1815) created the prerequisites for an ecclesiastical reorganization. An all-German solution was in the realm of the possible at Vienna and was promoted by the wise and tireless Coadjutor Ignaz Heinrich von Wessenberg, Dalberg's representative at the congress.[2] Adhering to a Febronian concept, Wessenberg strove for the creation of a national Church under the prince-bishop, virtually independent from Rome and secured by a federal concordat, and the inclusion in the constitution of the new German Confederation of the right to a state Church. While Wessenberg gained the support of Austria and Prussia, he met opposition by Rome and the medium-sized states. Cardinal Consalvi, successful in Vienna with the restoration of the Papal States and of the Pope as a European sovereign, had to fight on two fronts with respect to the problems of the German Church. He opposed Wessenberg's episcopalism as well as the demands of the individual states. Supported by the Hofbauer circle (see chapter 13 below) and the representatives of the ultramontane wing of the German Church, F. von Wambold, J. A. Helfferich, and J. Schiess, the cardinal favored a federal solution, allowing the Curia direct administrative powers over the Church in Germany. Wessenberg's as well as Consalvi's plans were defeated in Vienna primarily by Bavaria and Württemberg, which rejected any infringement of their ecclesiastical sovereignty. A single religious reference (Art. 16) was ultimately included in the Federal Act. It stated that the differences among the Christian denominations in the states of the confederation were not to be the basis for civil and political discrimination. Thus the denominations were not granted any corporative privileges but only equality of civil rights for their adherents.

This left the regulation of ecclesiastical problems to the individual states. While still in Vienna, Consalvi started negotiations with several state governments and continued them from Rome. The cardinal succeeded in including in his system of concordats the German states with large Catholic populations, even though a formal concordat was signed only with Bavaria. For the Protestant states, there were bulls of circumscription and annotated briefs, i.e., papal decrees in form but genuine treaties with respect to their content.[3] They fixed the results of bilateral negotiations, and the participating states gave them the force of law without establishing precedents for the sovereign powers.

---

[2] See Wessenberg's autobiographical notes, especially 155–67, as well as his 1815 work *Die deutsche Kirche* (concerning it, see Becher, op. cit., 98f., 131ff.) More recent works on Wessenberg are W. Müller, "Die liturgischen Bestrebungen des Konstanzer Generalvikars Wessenberg," *LJ* 10 (1960); id., "Wessenberg in heutiger Sicht," *ZSKG* 58 (1964); E. Keller, "Die Konstanzer Liturgiereformen unter Ignaz Heinrich von Wessenberg," *FreibDiözArch* 85 (1965); F. Popp, "Studien zu liturgischen Reformbemühungen im Zeitalter der Aufklärung," ibid., 87 (1967).

After the mediation of the bishops had removed the chief obstacle to the achievement of old Febronian demands, Bavaria between 1806 and 1809 had negotiated a concordat, but then decreed parity, toleration, and extensive state supervision of the Church with the religious decree of 24 March 1809. The negotiations, resumed again in 1815 and conducted on the Bavarian side by titular bishop (after 1818 cardinal) von Haeffelin, led to the concordat of 5 June 1817, giving in to the demand of the Church for independence from the state.[4] The Catholic Church was guaranteed the undiminished preservation of its privileges based on the "divine order and on canon law" (Art. 1). The bishops were assured of the right to administer their dioceses according to canon law, to communicate unhindered with Rome, and the unrestricted right to train their clergy (Art. 12). They were permitted to inform the state of books in conflict with faith and Church regulations, and the state promised their suppression (Art. 13). Insults to the Catholic religion were forbidden (Art. 14), and the reestablishment of monasteries was permitted (Art. 7). Conflicting state laws were to be repealed (Art. 16), and ecclesiastical matters not specifically mentioned in the concordat were to be settled only according to the doctrines and regulations of the Church (Art. 17). The state was divided into two Church provinces; Munich-Freising encompassed Augsburg, Passau, and Regensburg, and Bamberg consisted of Würzburg, Eichstätt, and Speyer (Art. 2); the Curia had objected to only one Church province, as its metropolitan might become too powerful and grow into the role of a Primate. The state promised adequate landed property for the bishoprics, cathedral chapters, and seminaries (Art. 4 and 5), amounting to a partial reversal of secularization.

In turn, the King and his Catholic successor were granted the right to appoint bishops, who had to swear an oath of loyalty and obedience (Art. 9, 15). The state also gained significant influence on the composition of cathedral chapters (priors, deacons, ten or eight canons). The appointment of priors was left to the Pope, but shortly afterwards he agreed to the right of the King to submit nominations; the King appointed the deacons and also the canons during the six "papal" (uneven) months (Art. 10). The patronage of the sovereign was confirmed and extended to all parishes which previously had belonged to secularized monasteries and cathedrals (Art. 11).

---

[3] Concerning the legal aspects of the bulls of circumscription, see Huber, *Verfassungsgeschichte* I, 418f.

[4] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 204–12; Mercati, *Raccolta,* 591–96.

Appointments, patronage, and the bishop's oath involved a degree of participation in the filling of Church offices that no other German state outside of Austria enjoyed in the nineteenth century. Yet the concordat encountered lasting resistance among the enlightened civil servants, the Protestants, and the liberal Catholics. The monopoly granted the Catholic Church was incompatible with the modern concept of state, the edict of 1809, and the existence of a substantial Protestant minority in Franconia, Swabia, and the Palatinate. In order to remove the self-inflicted difficulties, the Bavarian government employed a legally questionable procedure. The concordat was published in conjunction with the new constitution and as a supplement to the religious edict of 26 May 1818,[5] which imitated Napoleon's Organic Articles. The edict guaranteed religious freedom and equality of the three main Christian denominations, and the state's supervision of the Church was reinstated (such as royal consent and appeal of abuses). A good number of clergymen thereupon refused the oath to the constitution with the religious edict, and the representative of the Curia, Nuncio Serra di Cassano,[6] insisted on adherence to the treaty. The state ultimately agreed nominally: In the Tegernsee Declaration[7] of 15 September 1821, King Max I Joseph declared that the oath referred only to civil matters. He also promised strict compliance with the concordat, but the absence of any real-estate transfers denied it. The contradictions between edict and concordat were papered over but not removed, and during the subsequent century numerous misunderstandings resulted from them.

Prussia's population, traditionally intimately connected with Protestantism, had become two-fifths Catholic as a consequence of the Polish partitions, secularization, and the territorial shifts after the Congress of Vienna. About half of Prussia's Catholics were Poles. The result was a blending of denominational and national contrasts, as well as a fusion of German and Polish Catholics. Prussian law (1793) had granted freedom of religion and conscience to all subjects, but simultaneously it had strengthened the state's supervision of the Churches. Its application to the territories gained in the West complicated their already difficult integration. The Rhineland and Westphalia socially and politically had developed quite differently from Prussia, and the inclusion of the left bank of the Rhine in Napoleon's progressive legal system had amplified the differences. Both government and papacy were interested in at least a formal regulation of the situation of the Catholic Church. Thanks to Prussian generosity in financial questions and to the skill of Niebuhr, after 1816 Prussian envoy to the Holy See, a partial agreement was reached relatively quickly; the Bull *De salute animarum*[8] and the Brief *Quod de fidelium*[9] (both of 16 July 1821) summarized the content.

---

[5] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 213–26.

[6] The Munich nunciature, vacant since 1800, was filled immediately following the signing of the concordat. Until 1925 it remained the only diplomatic representation of the Holy See in Germany. Prussia (and temporarily Hanover and the southwest German states) only maintained missions in Rome.

[7] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 212f.

The bull founded the Church provinces of Cologne (with Münster, Paderborn, and Trier) and Gnesen-Posen (with Kulm); the bishoprics of Breslau[10] and Ermland remained separate. The bishopric of Aachen, established by Napoleon, was dissolved.[11] In the cathedral chapters (priors, deacons, ten or eight canons, and four voting honorific canons), the appointment of priors was always based on royal nominations and that of canons only during the "papal" months. This, for a Protestant sovereign, unusual concession was the more important for the state, as the bull confirmed the right of cathedral chapters to elect bishops. The Brief *Quod de fidelium* exhorted the chapters to select only candidates acceptable to the King. It did not establish the positive right of nomination demanded by Prussia and always denied to non-Catholic sovereigns, but only a negative right of exclusion. An ambiguous formulation in the bull also enabled the government to continue the right of nominations employed in the chapters of Gnesen-Posen, Ermland, and Kulm.

The agreed-upon financial settlement after 1833 was to be based on real estate and property taxes, but, as in Bavaria, the implementation of this promise, which would have given the Church more independence, did not take place. Annual payments from the state were the rule.

The Bull *De salute animarum* was essentially implemented in the decade after 1821 by its executor, Bishop Joseph von Hohenzollern of Ermland, and the first bishops for the largely vacant dioceses were appointed by the Pope upon suggestions of the government. The bull regulated primarily organizational problems; in all other areas the dominant sovereignty of state law and the Organic Articles (in the Rhineland) prevailed. *Placet* and appeal of abuses were maintained, the state controlled the administration of ecclesiastical property and educational institutions, and correspondence between bishops and Curia had to go through state agencies. Additionally, during the administration of Friedrich Wilhelm III (until 1840), the state in practice exercised the right of nomination in the filling of bishoprics, contrary to Rome's reservations, by indicating a *persona grata* to the voting chapter.

---

[8] Text: Walter, *Fontes*, 239–62; Mercati, *Raccolta*, 648–65.

[9] Text: Walter, *Fontes*, 262f.; Mercati, *Raccolta*, 665f.

[10] Berlin, the province of Brandenburg and the province of Pomerania were subordinated to the bishopric of Breslau. See L. Jablonski, *Geschichte der fürstbischöflichen Delegatur Brandenburg-Pommern*, 2 vols. (Breslau 1929). Breslau retained its portions of Austrian Silesia, but the autonomous administrative district of County Glatz remained with the archbishopric of Prague.

[11] J. Torsy, *Geschichte des Bistums Aachen während der Französischen Zeit 1802–1814* (Bonn 1940).

Negotiations were also started with the Kingdom of Hanover which since the secularization also comprised appreciable numbers of Catholics. Begun in 1817, they continued until 1824 because of the large demands of the state, especially in the right of nominating bishops. The Bull *Impensa Romanorum Pontificum,*[12] on 26 March 1824, confirmed the continued existence of the bishoprics of Hildesheim and Osnabrück which were adjusted to the state's borders. The cathedral chapters received the right to elect bishops based on the so-called Irish election system. Before the election the chapters had to submit to the government a list of candidates from which it could strike the less acceptable ones, although it was expected to leave an adequate number. The real-estate transfers agreed to by the state in Hanover also were replaced by monetary payments, and even these were made to the full extent initially only for the bishopric of Hildesheim. Osnabrück consequently remained under the provisional direction of a suffragan bishop; only in 1857 did it receive the endowment which made possible the establishment of a regular diocesan administration.

The Catholics of the other north and central German states were subordinated to neighboring bishops or vicars apostolic. For the Grand Duchy of Oldenburg, an officialate was founded in Vechta in 1830 and joined with the bishopric of Münster. The vicariate apostolic established in 1743 for the Kingdom of Saxony, whose Catholic dynasty governed a largely Protestant state, after 1816 was under the direction of a titular bishop. The vicar was nominated by the King, and after 1831 he also functioned in personal union as deacon of the cathedral of Bautzen. The seventeenth century vicariate of the northern missions remained responsible for Denmark, together with Schleswig-Holstein, the two Mecklenburgs, the Hanseatic cities, and the Duchy of Braunschweig. After 1841 the suffragan (after 1857 bishop) of Osnabrück acted as a provicar. In many small Protestant states, the Catholic religion long remained subject to restrictions contradicting the modern concept of state.

The reorganization was protracted and problematical in southwestern Germany, where established Church and Enlightenment were not deeply rooted. The problems were aggravated by the dispute over Wessenberg; because of his reforms in Constance (revival of social structures, introduction of the native language into the liturgy) as well as because of his religious policy after 1815, when he favored a common religious policy of at least the southwest German states, he was in full disgrace in Rome. After the Pope had rejected his election as chapter vicar (after Dalberg's death in 1817), he could remain in office, in spite of his following, only as long as the government of Baden supported him. He thus suffered the fate which many reformers experienced in the nineteenth century: in order to realize at least a part of their anti-Curial plans, they were compelled to ally themselves with established church governments and therefore were doubly suspect to the Church.

---

[12] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 265–75; Mercati, *Raccolta,* 689–96.

But the Febronian concept won a partial victory, in that the governments of Baden, Württemberg, Hesse-Darmstadt, Electoral Hesse, and Nassau banded together for common action against Rome. At the Frankfurt Conferences, under the leadership of the Württemberg representative to the Federal Diet, K. A. von Wangenheim, they agreed in 1818 on a declaration designed for Rome based on Josephinistic principles. It was to be kept secret for the moment and later to be decreed as the law for an established Church. In the form of an ultimatum, the declaration demanded the establishment of state bishoprics and state governmental appointment of bishops from a list of three submitted by the chapters and the deacons.

When Consalvi rejected such a right of appointment, the governments at first pretended to act as defenders of the freedom of the Church; they knew they had the support of their own clergymen. But under the impact of the restoration after 1820 they became more conciliatory, as an understanding with the ecclesiastical authority appeared more important to them than the realization of the liberalizing ideas of Wessenberg and his friends. On 16 August 1821, Pius VII published the Bull of Circumscription *Provida sollersque.*[13] It provided for the establishment of the archbishopric of Freiburg (for Baden, instead of Constance) and the bishoprics of Rottenburg (for Württemberg), Mainz (for Hesse-Darmstadt), Fulda (for Electoral Hesse), and Limburg (for Nassau and Frankfurt), and determined the composition of the cathedral chapters (deacons, and between four and six canons) and their endowment. Only Mainz and Fulda had been bishoprics before.

The governments made the implementation of the bull dependent on a compromise in the question of filling episcopal sees, and in tough negotiations achieved an effective combination of the Prussian and Hanoverian veto rights. Leo's XII's Bull *Ad Dominici gregis custodiam,*[14] of 11 April 1827, decreed the right to election by the cathedral chapters according to the listing procedure and equal participation by the states in the appointment of cathedral canons; the Brief *Re sacra,*[15] of 28 May 1827, obliged the chapters to confine themselves to nominating only candidates who were acceptable to the sovereigns. Both bulls were implemented and the first bishops appointed. The governments insisted on Febronian-oriented clergymen, but Wessenberg, the exposed head of the movement, had to retire from his offices as a consequence of the dissolution of the bishopric of Constance.

---

[13] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 322–35; Mercati, *Raccolta,* 667–78.

[14] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 335–39; Mercati, *Raccolta,* 700–03.

The reservation of sovereign privileges had particularly grave consequences in southwestern Germany. On 30 January 1830, the five governments published identical ordinances,[16] imposing on the Church a uniform system of state control as secretly agreed to in 1818. These involved assent, *recursus ab abusu* with simultaneous exclusion of Roman tribunals, loyalty oath of bishops and clergymen, participation of the state in ecclesiastical education and administration of property, adaptation of the ecclesiastical administrative structure to that of the state, state service instructions for deans, and sovereign patronage for most parishes. Synods also had to have governmental permission. In addition to pushing back Rome's participation, the ordinances also agreed with some of the other demands of Wessenberg. Education of clergymen was to take place in the theological departments of state universities, and an excellent theological knowledge and pastoral experience, an academic position, or a public office were to be prerequisites for the appointment as bishop or cathedral canon. The ordinances by the sovereigns were accepted by the bishops and firmly applied by state agencies in which clergymen also were active (in Baden the High Consistory, in Württemberg the Catholic Consistory). Papal protests were successful only in Electoral Hesse, where the regulations were applied less stringently.

The ecclesiastical reorganization of Germany, which in its basic forms has continued into the present, largely followed the example of the French concordat. It also corresponded far more to the schema of a universal Church than the arrangement ending in 1803, whose complex legal titles and traditions had fostered autonomy and self-assurance. In contrast, the new arrangement rested solely on legal actions of the papacy and on its agreements with the governments; it practiced visibly and efficiently a combination of Roman jurisdictional primacy and ecclesiastical sovereignty of the state. In the process, the Curia had been compelled to make more concessions than the ultramontane doctrine wished to acknowledge, viewing the Pope as the only guarantee of ecclesiastical freedom. Especially in the question of filling episcopal sees and other high Church offices, the governments had achieved an extensive participation not justified by the subject matter.

---

[15] Text: Mercati, *Raccolta,* 703.

[16] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 340–45. The papal protest (Brief by Pius VIII of 30 June 1830) ibid., 345–48.

The division of the Church of Germany into small, weak, and isolated territorial Churches corresponded exactly to the wishes of the states and of the Curia. Intermediate layers had not been reinstated. From now on, no priors and archdeacons stood between pastors and bishops, no powerful metropolitans between bishops and Pope, and for political reasons the rights of archbishops were reduced and several bishoprics were exempt. The new, more "Roman," church organization afforded the Curia numerous opportunities for intervention. The system of established Churches served to stimulate this movement, for the time being inhibited but in the long run increasingly centralized, and fostered the development of an alliance between papacy and people's Church. As dependent minorities, the German Catholics had no recourse but to affiliate more with the Roman central office. Initiatives for the expansion of ecclesiastical freedom generally could not be expected by the cathedral chapters and diocesan curias staffed with people trusted by the state, but only from the secular clergy and laity. Appeals against abusive extensions of governmental privileges could only be made to the Pope, who alone was entitled to negotiate with the governments on the level of international law and diplomacy.

Austria was relatively little affected by the secularization. The bishoprics, whose incumbents had to renounce their sovereign rights (Salzburg, Brixen, Trent), continued to exist with adequate financial means, just as much as the monasteries permitted by Joseph II. But the government utilized the secularization in order to implement in Salzburg, Tirol, and Vorarlberg[17] the new alignment of diocesan borders, which in the other Habsburg possessions had been undertaken between 1782 and 1788. Since then, the dioceses of the monarchy were almost exclusively limited to Austrian territory,[18] approximately equally large, and corresponded to the political and administrative organization of the state. The emperor nominated almost all bishops. Only in Olmütz and Salzburg was the election privilege of the cathedral chapters unchanged, and the archbishop of Salzburg retained the singular privilege of appointing bishops in three of his suffragan bishoprics.[19]

---

[17] The definitive reorganization took place in 1818. Salzburg lost its episcopal territory and its metropolitan privileges in Bavaria. The portions of Chur in South Tyrol were divided among Brixen and Trent; Brixen received Vorarlberg (until then largely with Constance) and as compensation ceded South Tyrolean deanships to Trent, which after 1825 became part of the Salzburg church province.

[18] The Josephinist principle of church organization was not implemented only in Silesia. Concerning the problem of adapting ecclesiastical to state boundaries, see R. Kottje, "Diözesan- und Landesgrenzen" in *Reformata Reformanda, Festgabe für Hubert Jedin* II (Münster 1965), 304–16.

In general, Austrian religious policy during the long reign (1792–1835) of Emperor Francis II (I), was conducted under the precepts of moderate Josephinism, and not without difficulties it was extended to the newly won and regained territories after 1815. Its principles also initially guided Metternich, who after 1809 was in charge of foreign policy. Between 1814 and 1816 he promoted Wessenberg's plans for a federal concordat, with whose help he hoped to extend Josephinism to the other German territories, to give the new confederation a greater uniformity, and to enlarge Austria's influence. Peace between Church and state occupied an eminent position in Metternich's conservative concept of society. Earlier than others he recognized the utility of close cooperation between a restored papacy and a restored Empire, and he did not ignore suggestions from Hofbauer's circle with respect to ecclesiastical policy.[20] After the foundering of the plans for a federal concordat, he weighed the possibility of mitigating Josephinist laws and concluding a concordat between Austria and the Holy See. But the Emperor and the highest officials, led by Count Wallis, insisted on preserving the state's sovereignty over the Church, achieved under Maria Theresia and Joseph II, which, of course, also meant protection for the Church and its activities within the limits drawn by the state. Only in the last years of his reign did Emperor Francis adopt Metternich's suggestions and start the alliance of throne and altar.

The French occupation of Switzerland (Helvetic Republic 1798–1803) had resulted in the dissolution of the monasteries and the expulsion of the nuncio, but the mediation constitution written in 1803 under Napoleon's influence improved the situation. A new nuncio, Testaferrata, was sent to Lucerne; fought against the reforms being introduced from Constance, which found many followers in Switzerland, and passed on to Rome the complaints and suspicions about Wessenberg. In order to prevent a further spreading of his ideas, Swiss territory was separated from Constance and placed under the provisional direction of the strictly Catholic-minded prior of Beromünster, Goldin von Tiefenau.

---

[19] In Lavant and Seckau the archbishop had the right of appointment every time, in Gurk every third time. See H. Bastgen, "Die Prärogativen der Salzburger Metropole," in *HJ* 33 (1912).

[20] Metternich's turning away from Josephinism: H. von Srbik, *Metternich. Der Staatsmann und der Mensch* (Munich 1925, reprint Munich 1957) I, 308ff., II, 40–45, 455, and elsewhere; A. Posch, "Die Vorgeschichte des österreichischen Konkordats von 1855," in *Religion, Wissenschaft, Kultur,* 7/1 (1956); Weinzierl-Fischer, *Konkordate,* 15ff. See also chapter 13, pp. 219ff. and especially chapter 20, pp. 340ff.

The federal treaty of 1815, reconstituting Switzerland as a federal state with twenty-two cantons under guarantee of the Congress of Vienna, essentially reintroduced an established Church and contained a guarantee for monasteries. Similar to the constitution of 1803, the federal treaty adjusted several borders, creating religiously heterogeneous cantons and sowing the seed for many future discords. The reorganization also made evident the main cause for the conflicts beginning in the 1830s, namely the radicalism of many liberals and the continuing contrast between Febronian and ultramontane Catholics.

The Church in Switzerland also needed to be reorganized. After the idea of one national bishopric which the Swiss had favored was rejected by Rome, the difficulty was how to reconcile the rival demands of the cantons. The creation of a new structure for the entire country required the constant efforts of ten years, mediated by the nunciature in Lucerne. Only the bishopric of Sitten remained unchanged. The area of Constance and the Swiss portion of the prince-bishopric of Basel in 1828 were combined in the bishopric of Basel, with its seat in Solothurn. It comprised seven cantons, whose governments had the right to influence the composition of the cathedral chapters electing the bishop. Only candidates could be chosen who were acceptable to the governments.[21] Chur, reduced by the loss of its Austrian territory, was united in 1823 with Sankt Gallen (until 1836). In western Switzerland, enlarged by a few Catholic strips of land, the old bishopric of Geneva was reconstituted in 1821 and combined with Lausanne. The four bishoprics remained exempt, allowing the Holy See a direct influence. Tessin remained a part of the Italian dioceses of Milan and Como until 1859.

---

[21] The treaties on the founding of the bishopric of Basel together with circumscription bull: Mercati, *Raccolta,* 711–24.

CHAPTER 8

The Other European Churches

The Catholics in the Kingdom of the Netherlands

As an artificial creation of the Congress of Vienna, comprising the former, mainly Calvinistic, United Provinces and the nine Catholic Belgian departments and ruled by a Protestant monarch, William I of Orange, the new Kingdom of the Netherlands ecclesiastically presented a most disparate view. In the north, the "Dutch mission," dependent on the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, numbered about three hundred twenty-five thousand Catholics, i.e., one fifth of the population of the area. Since the closing of the nunciature in Brussels it was administered by a Vice Superior, Monsignor Ciamberlani, who resided in Münster in Westphalia. In reality, however, the archpriests and members of orders who supervised numerous city parishes possessed a large degree of autonomy, naturally leading to inadequate religious discipline. The centralized training of the clergy in the seminary at Warmond was strongly influenced by the German Catholic Enlightenment with all of its positive and negative aspects. In north Brabant and the other areas conquered by the Dutch in the seventeenth century, Catholics were in the majority (about four hundred thousand) and, except for the remainder of the old diocese of Roermond, whose bishop was still alive, divided into two vicariates apostolic: 's-Hertogenbosch and Breda (where in 1811 Napoleon intended to create a bishopric by decree). The cultural standards of the clergy, accustomed to being on the fringe of national life, left much to be desired. In the southern provinces lived 3.5 million Belgians with a long tradition of post-Tridentine Catholicism, divided into five dioceses which were established by the concordat of 1801.[1] Their reorganization, after the troubles of the revolutionary period a dire necessity, was not yet completed. This was the more necessary as during Napoleon's final years the administration by prelates, installed without permission of the Pope, encountered the growing resistance of a strongly ultramontane clergy, which was encouraged by its successful resistance against Joseph II. The difficulties which almost from the beginning placed the Church in opposition to the Dutch government delayed reorganization even longer. But at least the number of ordinations rose appreciably and, at least until the closing of the seminaries as a consequence of the decisions of 1825, permitted a gradual filling of the vacancies caused by the revolution.

In this denominationally divided state the only sensible solution was the principle of religious freedom, which was in fact imposed by the powers in July 1814 and anchored in the constitution. But while the Dutch Catholics, long treated like second-class citizens, regarded the new system as progressive in spite of the limitations imposed by the Organic Articles, the Belgian and above all the Flemish clergy, whose reactionary position had been strengthened by Napoleon's religious policy, would have preferred a restoration of the Church in the southern provinces to the privileged position it had occupied before the French occupation. This was especially true for the field of education. Consequently, the diocesan authorities under the leadership of the energetic bishop of Ghent, Monsignor de Broglie, the heroic opponent of Napoleon, by their doctrinal judgment of September 1815 condemned the indifferentism of the new constitution and forbade Catholics to take the oath on it. Incited by the *Spectateur catholique* of Abbé De Foere, founded in 1815 in the service of counterrevolutionary traditionalism, many bowed to this exhortation. On the other hand, the former prince-bishop of Liège, Francois-Antoine de Méan, a member of the Estates General and raised in a less strict theological tradition than the clergy of the former Austrian Netherlands, was prepared to swear the oath. Shortly afterwards he was appointed by the King as archbishop of Mechelen. In Rome, where a commission of cardinals had approved the doctrinal judgment, there was initial reluctance to confirm the appointment. But under pressure from Metternich and thanks to the flexibility of Consalvi, ultimately a compromise formula was adopted, which stated that the oath applied only to civil matters and had no dogmatic significance. In 1817 the archbishop received his bull of appointment, and in 1821 after months of protracted negotiations the King finally agreed that Catholics could take the oath "with the understanding of de Méan." This calmed the emotions for the time being.

---

[1] Rome and The Hague at first hesitated, but after 1816 there was indeed a partial provisional renewal. See H. Wagnon, "La reconductions du Concordat de 1801 dans les provinces belges du Royaume Uni des Pays-Bas" in *Scrinium Lovaniense* (Louvain 1961), 514–42.

In the meantime new difficulties had arisen. The government, brooking no interference in its sphere of competence, in 1815 had prohibited Monsignor Ciamberlani from concerning himself with the affairs of the Belgian dioceses and had ordered his deportation. Additionally, in order to counter the resistance of a portion of the clergy, it reinstated in 1816 the Napoleonic Organic Articles, which became a source of many administrative and police chicaneries. Likewise in 1818, Napoleonic laws concerning orders were reinstated in order to limit the reestablishment of orders to those which were devoted to works of charity.[2] Even if the laws were applied only very cautiously in the beginning, obstacles increased noticeably after 1822. At the same time, these steps led to the laicization of education, an area in which the Belgian clergy was particularly sensitive. Between 1822 and 1824 numerous Catholic schools were closed, especially those of the Christian Brothers, who were accused of being French agents. In June 1825, two royal ordinances dissolved all free secondary schools, including the boys' seminaries. Simultaneously, there was established at Louvain a College of Philosophy, attendance at which was to be obligatory for all young men interested in becoming clergymen. Its entire faculty was to be appointed by the King independently from the bishops.

---

[2] A list of the monasteries with the number of their members can be found in Stockmann, op. cit., 404–50. Additional facts can be gleaned from the numerous descriptions concerning themselves with local conditions.

These measures, hardly touching the Catholics in the north, were joyously greeted by the Catholic middle class of the south, which had absorbed the ideas of the eighteenth century and viewed as an anachronism the intention of the clergy to resume control over public life. They were also accorded a friendly reception by some priests, influenced by the Enlightenment and German Febronianism, especially in the north and in the province of Luxemburg, which before the revolution had belonged to the diocese of Trier. The diocesan officials were worried, but protested only mildly; the majority of the bishoprics were vacant or occupied by prelates weakened by old age and illness. Archbishop Méan was chiefly interested in maintaining cordial relations with the government. But the majority of the clergy as well as some militant Catholics reacted vociferously. Following the ordinances of 1825, two Dutchmen, the lawyer Van der Horst and the priest Van Bommel, soon joined by the vicar general of Mechelen, E. Sterckx, opened a vehement campaign against the educational policy of the government.

Belgians especially were convinced that the King secretly aimed at Protestantizing the country, but actually the King was only interested in raising the cultural standards of the southern provinces, which were far inferior to the United Provinces. In the tradition of enlightened despotism[3] and based on his *ius circa sacra,* the King wished to exercise strict control over the Church, which was regarded as the chief educational institution (interestingly enough, he behaved even more dictatorially toward the Reformed Church when he imposed a regulation on it in 1816).

Under the influence of his minister Van Maanen, a good legal mind but bare of all psychological sensitivity, and surrounded by advisers, who for the most part were Catholic but motivated by Febronianism, Josephinism, and Napoleonic Gallicanism and prepared to smash clerical power, William I, after the foundering of the concordat negotiations in 1822 and 1824 and in order to settle the problem of nominating bishops, adopted the idea of a national Church guided by the state and only tenuously connected with the Holy See.

But the objections to the College of Philosophy touched on the training of the clergy, and the diocesan curias considered this as the limit of possible concessions. The resumption of negotiations with Rome for a new concordat became unavoidable. These led to an agreement[4] for the entire country on 18 June 1827. It extended the conditions of the 1801 concordat to the northern provinces, where two new bishoprics were to be created (Amsterdam and 's-Hertogenbosch), and compromised on the nomination of bishops: the Protestant monarch was not to nominate the bishops who would be elected by cathedral chapters, but he had the right of veto.

---

[3] Concerning his earlier attitude to the Catholics, see J. A. Bornewasser, *Kirche und Staat in Fulda unter Wilhelm Friedrich von Oranien, 1802–06* (Fulda 1956).

Calm returned for only a few months, however. Giving in to the complaints of the Dutch Calvinists and Belgian liberals, the government let it be known that it intended to defer the application of the concordat, viewing it as too favorable to the Catholics. Indeed, the efforts of Monsignor Capaccini, sent by Leo XII, failed in spite of some partial successes because of the visibly lacking desire of the commission charged with the affairs of the Catholic religion. As before, the commission was Josephinistic and anticlerical. While de facto religious instruction in the schools was continued, the government persevered in its intentions to laicize education and thereby drove Catholics to increasingly bitter resistance. Van Bommel, elected bishop of Liège in 1829, continued to hope for an agreement with the King, who in fact was ready to make concessions. But the Belgian clergy, more ultramontane than the Pope himself, had definitely lost confidence in a solution by the government. Under the leadership of Sterckx it now demanded the complete independence of the Church from the state, and was willing to conclude an alliance with the opponents of the government in order to obtain "freedom in everything and for everything."[5]

In this situation, the Belgian clergy was almost exclusively occupied with institutional problems and the rebuilding of a Catholic society which was supposed to resemble the prerevolutionary one. Severely handicapped by the rudimentary training which the clergy received in the seminaries, staffed by professors who were self-taught themselves, and paralyzed by the largely unfounded fears of a Protestantization of the country, the clergy was little concerned with adapting the Gospel to the antireligious ideas imported from France and Germany. The only positive note was that the clergy, supported by some active laymen, as for example L. de Robiano and P. Kersten, was quick to recognize the importance of the press.

It was also a layman, J. G. Le Sage ten Broek, who in 1818 in Holland founded the first Catholic monthly, *De Godsdienstvriend.* This successful publicist, a man of action, eccentric, and full of initiative, was more responsible than anyone else for shaking the Dutch Catholics out of their lethargy, forcing them to emerge from the virtual underground in which they had lived since the seventeenth century, and publicly defending their rights. Son of a Protestant minister and convert, inspired by the great movement of the "Awakening," he was tirelessly working to win his peaceloving countrymen for a militant ultramontanism and did not limit himself to confronting medieval Catholic tradition with Protestant innovations. With equal passion he attacked the infiltration of rationalistic ideas among some of his fellow believers, such as the priest Schrant, who preferred to seek their inspiration from the Germany of the Enlightenment rather than from the France of de Maistre and the early Lamennais. In this fashion he warned the Dutch Catholics of the temptation of a dogmatic Christianity based on natural morality. He equally participated in shaping a strictly denominational mentality, viewed all manifestations of tolerance and irenicism with suspicion, and categorically rejected Sailer's heritage as well as the Catholicism of those clergymen who had accepted Hegelianism and Josephinism.

---

[4] Mercati I, 704–10.

[5] Concerning the stages of this development, see below, pp. 271ff.

Briefly, the developments after 1815 were disappointing from the institutional point of view. But they served to strengthen Catholicism in the north, and allowed to grow a new attitude in the south, which soon would seize Europe under the name of Catholic liberalism.

The Political Emancipation of Catholics in the British Isles

After the Act of Union by which Ireland in 1800 became a part of the United Kingdom, Catholics constituted a quarter of the population. Except for the community of faith and the common loss of many civil and political rights, there hardly existed anywhere else larger differences than those between the handful of English Catholics, with their status of a missionary society, and the Church of Ireland. Through all persecutions it had preserved its episcopal hierarchy and its hold on 4 million faithful, and since the middle of the eighteenth century had seen increasing normalization.

Unaffected by any establishment tradition,[6] the Irish Church drew its strength from the people. They had the status of semi-serfs, as the English conquerors had taken approximately 95 percent of all land, but for centuries they had been accustomed to defend with equal passion their religious faith and their national traditions. French revolutionary ideas encouraged them in vigorously demanding their religious, social, and political independence, three aspects closely intertwined in their eyes. In this atmosphere, a new generation of priests, not trained abroad but in the national seminary of Maynooth and unfamiliar with the punitive laws directed against Catholics, turned uninhibitedly to a reorganization of pastoral life and promoted the development of expressions of faith. The clergy, which maintained close contact with the people in spite of an improved material condition, continued to be assisted by the religious congregations, which after a downturn in the eighteenth century[7] experienced a rapid growth in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The old orders, again able to function more freely, were joined by native foundings such as the Christian Brothers, who were an Irish imitation of the French Christian Brothers. Founded in 1804, the Christian Brothers received their ultimate form in 1817 from Monsignor D. Murray, archbishop coadjutor in Dublin.

---

[6] The suggestion spread in 1801 and 1824 that the state should take over the remuneration of the clergy was rejected by the great majority of bishops and priests.

In England, on the other hand, the members of the Roman Church constituted only 2 percent of the total population. Their preference for a Catholicism of stark sobriety resulted in part from their desire not to attract undue attention from the public, in part from the British temperament, and in part from their reaction against the emotionalism of the Protestant sects. The Roman Church was divided into four vicariates apostolic, whose geographical extension made an effective guidance of pastoral care difficult. Even in 1815, most of the Catholics lived isolated lives in the rural areas in the vicinity of manor houses, whose owners maintained an almoner more because of tradition than because of religious convictions. With the beginning of the nineteenth century and Irish immigration to London and the industrial cities of the north, the Catholic community began to orient itself to them. The number of the faithful doubled within one generation, and in 1814 surpassed the two hundred thousand mark, requiring the construction of nine hundred new chapels. Catholicism began to develop an urban character, while the landed gentry gradually lost its monopoly on the Church to the enterprising middle class.

Simultaneously, there occurred in the leading segments of England a transformation in the attitude toward Catholicism. The decadence of the Anglican Church and the growth of indifferentism among the upper class favored a tolerant attitude. Contact with French émigrés, together with the romantic rediscovery of the Middle Ages by Walter Scott, removed some deep prejudices against "papism." They even effected some conversions such as those of Kenelm Henry Digby in 1823 and of Ambrose Phillipp de Lisle in 1829. The attitudinal change was fostered by the firm position assumed by Pius VII toward Napoleon and promoted the resumption of official contacts between the Holy See and the British government after two hundred years of nearly complete interruption.[8]

---

[7] As a consequence of the closing of the noviciates, imposed by Rome in 1751 upon the suggestion of some bishops, the number of regular clergy, consisting in 1742 of between seven hundred and fourteen hundred priests, by 1802 had sunk to two hundred fifty compared to nineteen hundred secular clergy.

The confluence of these diverse elements contributed to an easier resolution of the problem of the emancipation of Catholics, i.e., the lifting of the legal restrictions under which they had been forced to live since the Reformation, a problem which for decades had presented itself with increasing intensity. In 1813 a solution was close, even at the price of numerous concessions which the Catholic nobles as well as the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith were willing to make. But the Irish were supported in their opinion by John Milner (1752–1826), the fervent vicar apostolic of the Midlands. He was an Englishman, but a decided opponent of the exclusive Anglo-Gallicanism of the Cisalpine Club, and regarded such a solution as an attempt to subordinate the Church to a Protestant state. The efforts for a resumption of negotiations by Consalvi, who had no objections to a limited control of the clergy by the government and by Castlereagh, who viewed the British arrangement as anachronistic, foundered on the uncompromising stance of the Irish, who under no circumstances were willing to diverge from their demand for the freedom of the Church. They also failed because the Irish did not believe they had to take account of the Roman viewpoint or of the Tories in the House of Lords. The latter's demand to have veto power over the appointment of bishops was not merely a sign of antipapism, but also, in view of the situation in Canada, a security measure.

In spite of growing sympathy by the Liberals, negotiations for years remained at dead center. Regularly introduced petitions in Parliament produced virtually no result, the only exception being a bill in 1817 facilitating the appointment of Catholic officers to the army. The English Catholics were willing to wait patiently for better times, but not the Irish Catholics, whose national concerns fueled their religious demands. The press campaign started in *The Chronicle* by John England, the director of the seminary of Cork, and the thirty-two letters published by Hierophilus between 1820 and 1823 against the preferential rights of the Anglican Church in Ireland, were the first signs of a new tactic. Hierophilus was the pseudonym of John McHale,[9] a professor of dogmatics at Maynooth who, like John England, was typical of the new generation of the clergy. Their efforts supplanted diplomatic negotiations and cautious initiatives, most of which had been undertaken by the English. A mass action was started in Ireland with the intention to ease up on the pressure only after victory had been achieved. A first decisive step was taken by Daniel O'Connell, a popular speaker and eminent organizer, who for twenty years had headed the struggle for national and religious freedom. In 1823 he transformed the old Catholic Association, heretofore confined to bourgeois circles, into a mass movement by decreasing the annual contribution of twenty shillings to one penny a month. With the aid of voluntary propagandists, who undertook the political indoctrination of the uneducated peasants even in the smallest of villages, the association organized peaceful agitation within the law.

---

[8] These contacts were made at the Congress of Vienna and were increasingly necessary as a result of the growing importance of the Catholics in Ireland and Canada, and the establishment of England in Malta and the Ionian Islands. The deaths of Castlereagh and Consalvi and the accession of the very antipapal George IV after 1823 resulted in a cooling of relations, without, however, leading to a rupture. See N. Miko in *ZKTh* 78 (1956), 206–14.

Many priests at first hesitated to join a movement which clearly had political objectives, but following the example of some bishops like Monsignor Doyle of Kildare and under the influence of the seminary of Maynooth, the clergy gradually joined and supported the Catholic rent by making their churches available for election meetings. Soon the entire firmly united Catholic population of the island joined the man who was called the uncrowned King of Ireland in the spirit of a crusade. The British government, vainly having attempted to stop O'Connell's campaign, felt overwhelmed. The triumphant election of the Irishman in 1828 as the Member of Parliament for Clare, even though legally he did not qualify, made the more clearsighted Tories understand that concessions had to be made if a civil war was to be avoided. In the face of resistance by the royal family, the Anglican bishops, numerous peers, and the majority of the population, Wellington, who by no means was the blind enemy of Catholics as he was often depicted, threw his reputation as the victor of Waterloo behind the Catholics. Supported by Robert Peel, he managed to curtail drastically the political activities in Ireland; in return, he received the King's approval in April 1829 for a bill which with few exceptions granted Catholics equality in civil and personal rights[10] without compelling them to concede to the government the right to veto in the election of bishops. This victory, gained through Irish agitation, was beneficial for all Catholics under the British crown, in England and Scotland as well as in Canada and the other colonies.

---

[9] See *The Letters of M. Rev. J. MacHale* (Dublin 1847), 9–155.

[10] Catholics could fill all offices except those of the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Keeper, and the Lord Lieutenant for Ireland; they could be elected to Parliament, but had to take a special oath "not to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion" and affirm that the Pope had no political rights over England. Additionally, the recruitment of regular clergy was forbidden, but not that of nuns. Their presence, especially that of the Jesuits, was subject to strict control.

The undeniable significance of the legal restructuring for the future of Catholicism in the British Empire does not alone account for the changes which the Catholic community underwent. In Ireland, Protestant propaganda during the 1820's grew more intensive and was able to record some successes. On the other hand, the work of ecclesiastical renewal begun since the end of the eighteenth century began to quicken, especially under the favorable leadership of a number of capable prelates such as P. Curtis in Armagh (1819–32); J. Doyle in Kildare (1819–34); and chiefly D. Murray in Dublin (1823–52; coadjutor after 1809), one of the principal promoters of Catholic renewal on the island during the first half of the century. The development in England was slower, but no less effective. To be sure, the weight of the few hundreds of landed gentry around whom the Catholic population had centered for two hundred years remained noticeable until the 1820s; their social and economic influence and the Gallican and Jansenist education given to the French-educated clergy was the explanation for the continuing existence of the "Cisalpine" spirit. It insisted strongly not only on independence from Rome but also from the hierarchical authorities in England, and was hostile to any Catholic initiative which might offend the Protestants. But the vicars apostolic who in 1818 had reopened the English College in Rome distanced themselves from the lay nobility and strove to regain firm control over a clergy accustomed by long tradition to being independent. In 1826, William Poynter prescribed annual priestly exercises for the first time. But the new mentality was best represented by John Milner, from 1803 until 1826 the pugnacious vicar apostolic of the Midlands. He was the dominating figure during the first quarter of the century not only because of his uncompromising support of emancipation for the Irish, but equally because of the strength of his ultramontanism[11] and his innovative pastoral methods, which made him the forerunner of Manning. He was vehemently polemical and narrow-minded in his view of Protestants, but he was one of the first to grasp the significance of Irish immigration to England and to recognize that the future of English Catholicism was in the cities. He also opposed the formality of exercises of piety and introduced continental forms of devotion, such as the Sacred Heart of Jesus devotion. Finally he was one of the first to take advantage of the influence of the press. He supported the efforts of William Eusebius Andrews, who in 1813 had founded the

---

[11] The eagerness with which he defended the rights of the Holy See against his Gallican-infected confreres earned him the nickname "Athanasius of England."

Orthodox Journal, the first English Catholic monthly, whose polemic harshness gradually disturbed Rome's clever tactics.

Intellectual life also showed some tentative signs of renewal. Without a doubt, seminary training generally remained highly superficial and was limited to morals and practice, but progress could be noted in Ushaw College.[12] Even if the works of Poynter and Milner betrayed a very one-sided anti-Protestantism, they nevertheless pointed to the desire of Catholics to be heard again. But above all it was John Lingard's[13] *History of England,* appearing between 1819 and 1830, which impressed everyone by its scholarly character and objectivity and persuaded many Englishmen to throw their antipapal and outdated prejudices overboard. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of the Bible Society, founded in 1803 by laymen, was soon hampered by ecclesiastical censorship.

The Difficult Situation of Catholics in the Russian Empire

While the condition of the Catholics dependent on the British crown appreciably improved between 1815 and 1830, a worsening of the situation occurred in the Russian Empire, which with the annexation of a large part of Poland numbered several million Catholics of both rites. After the 1830 Polish revolution, the situation grew worse yet.

But immediately after 1815 hope did not appear unfounded. At the Congress of Vienna, Tsar Alexander I in the name of conservative principles actively contributed to the restoration of the Papal States, and Consalvi after an interruption of ten years succeeded in reestablishing diplomatic relations. The Tsar desired direct contacts with the Holy See in order better to counter Austrian influence in the Balkan states and, in spite of Pius VII's disappointing refusal to join the Holy Alliance, to gain the support of the Roman Church in the political restoration of Europe. Perhaps he also was interested in a unification of the Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches and harbored certain personal sympathies for Catholicism.[14] General Tuyll's mission from 1815 to 1816 was a failure, but that of Italinski, Alexander's emissary to Rome from 1817 to 1823, brought some positive results, which were enhanced by Alexander's visit to Pius VII in 1822. Yet while the Tsar and his advisers were willing to regard the Pope as an ally in their common resistance to the rise of revolutionary forces, they wanted the Catholic Church in the Empire to remain under the strict control of the government and contacts with Rome were to be held to a minimum. The Russian state, since Peter the Great directly involved in its own national Church, could not but regard as unacceptable the demands of the papacy in favor of an alien, barely tolerated, Church. This was true all the more so as the Catholic Church was seen as the soul of the resistance in Poland and as a Trojan horse in the service of Austrian aims in Eastern Europe. Besides, the Church could hardly be called independent from the state in the neighboring Habsburg Empire in which Josephinist laws were still in effect. To this initial material for conflict between the two great powers, which started from two incompatible totalitarian principles, another one was added. After being open to western influences during the Enlightenment, explaining the success of the Jesuits and the forming of a group of "papalists" around the ambassador from Savoy, Joseph de Maistre, the campaign of 1812 had awakened the patriotic spirit in Russia and caused a movement of national reaction. Considering revolutionary Europe on the way to dechristianization, it insisted on bringing back the virtues of Slavism as embodied by the Orthodox Church. A few spectacular conversions to Catholicism in the aristocracy[15] spurred in the circles of the reaction, fostered by Prince Golitsin, minister for education and religion, a strong desire to fight back. In 1816 the Jesuits were expelled from Moscow and Saint Petersburg, and in 1820 from all of Russia. Fed by romanticism and the success of idealist philosophy, the slavophile movement came into its own with the ascendancy of Nicholas I in 1825. He was determined to proceed even more determinedly than his brother and without paying any attention to Roman complaints. Until the eventual realization of his ideal, a Russia united by the single faith of Orthodoxy, the Catholic clergy of the Empire was to be increasingly isolated from Rome and subjected to the sole jurisdiction of the Russian state. He systematically avoided all discussions with the Holy See on the grounds of religious freedom of his subjects and denied the justification of the concerns presented to him. The implementation of this policy of tacit and continuing infringements was initially facilitated by the hesitation of the Pope and his advisers to oppose tsarist Russia, which, having emerged strengthened from the Napoleonic wars, appeared to them as a model of order.

---

[12] See D. Milburn, *A History of Ushaw College* (Durham 1964), 26–145. The seminary was not controlled by the bishop, but by the clergy of the district.

[13] See M. Haile and E. Bonney, *Life and Letters of J. Lingard* (London 1911); G. Culkin in *The Month* 192 (1951), 7–18.

[14] See the description of the situation in Winter, *Russland,* 205–07.

In this continuingly worsening atmosphere there were repeated discussions between Rome and Petersburg which hoped to find a mode for coexistence, even though the fundamental differences made this virtually impossible. Three problems were in the center of these negotiations: the condition of the Catholic Church in the autonomous Kingdom of Poland, the condition of Roman Catholicism in Russia proper, and finally the condition of the Uniates.

---

[15] See Winter, *Russland,* 165–66, 178; J. Gagarine, *Le salon de la comtesse Golovine* (Paris 1879); M. J. Rouët de Journel, *Une russe catholique, Mme Swetchine* (Paris 1929). In 1817 Joseph de Maistre departed, having been one of the promoters of the group of "papalists" and whose *Du Pape* was intended as the answer to A. Sturdza, *Considérations sur la doctrine et l'esprit de l'Église orthodoxe.*

The blows of fate which the last ones had been forced to endure in 1839 led to a forced incorporation into the Orthodox Church. Until his death in 1826 the very controversial Monsignor Siestrzencewicz, archbishop of Mogilev, was the leading figure of Latin Catholicism in Russia.[16] Ultramontane historiography of the nineteenth century, influenced by the Jesuits, who often were unhappy with him, depicts him as an ambitious courtier, more concerned with winning the favor of the Russian sovereign than with representing the rights of the Holy See, and as a man hostile to the orders, especially the Society of Jesus. From a more precise examination by A. Brumanis, however, he emerges as a zealous defender of the Church, even though he liked worldly honors and power. Like many other bishops, he did not appreciate the exemption of regular clergy, but his skillful and sometimes unpredictable actions on the whole produced positive results. Through his persistent efforts to remain *persona grata* at the court, a matter of outstanding importance in an autocratic regime, he left at his death a blossoming diocese with dozens of new parishes, an almost adequate secular and regular clergy, and active charitable works. At the price of some manipulations of canon law, he also succeeded in gaining respect for the Catholic Church from the authorities, who regarded it as an alien body, and in securing for it the prerequisites for its viability without loss of its fundamental principles.

Between 1815 and 1820 he was severely reproached by the Jesuit-influenced Catholic circles of Russia and by Rome for his membership in the Russian Bible Association, which was of Protestant origin and counted several Orthodox bishops among the members of its general council.[17] In part his position was doubtless determined by an enlightened interdenominationalism, but he also took care that the translation for the Catholics was done according to the Vulgata. After the Congress of Vienna, the archbishop was also accused of supporting, possibly of provoking, the demands by the tsarist government to make him a primate. In most matters, including the canonical investment of bishops appointed by the Tsar, such a position would have freed him from consulting Rome. But in the light of the most recent developments in ecclesiology we have a better understanding of the resistance which Monsignor Siestrzencewicz put up against the centralizing tendencies of the Curia[18] by appealing to the autonomy that the Churches enjoyed during the first centuries. Our understanding also rests on the knowledge that he was there at the time and probably knew better the limits of the possible; he also knew that by open confrontation instead of skillful tactics nothing would have been gained, and probably a lot would have been lost.

---

[16] In addition to the Catholics in the annexed Polish provinces after 1795 and the Baltic states, there were also German colonies in the area of the Volga and around Odessa; Catholics of French and Flemish origin lived on the shores of the Black Sea in the Caucasus. The former largely inhabited the dioceses of Vilna, Samogitia, Minsk, Luck, and Kamenez, while the latter formed the huge archdiocese Mogilev.

[17] Concerning the Russian Bible Society, see Boudou I, 105–23 and A. Brumanis, op. cit., 282–91.

This is not to say that the situation was ideal. While the diocese of Mogilev was in a relatively good position, this was not the case in the other dioceses in which most of the Catholics lived. The material and moral condition of the priests was often inadequate, inasmuch as the authorities disagreed with the bishops over the training of the clergy. Several dioceses were without leadership for long years (Vilna from 1815 to 1830, Minsk from 1816 to 1831), or the Tsar assigned them unqualified and unsuitable bishops. Siestrzencewicz's successor as archbishop of Mogilev, Monsignor G. Cieciszewski, also appointed without prior consultation with Rome, was an energetic and learned prelate, but he was a frail old man of eighty years of age no longer able to oppose the Russification policies of the authorities in Petersburg and Moscow. When he died in April 1831, the government, planning a reorganization of the dioceses in Russia, delayed the appointment of a successor until 1839. In 1832 Catholic institutions were hard hit by a series of ukases. Of the total of 291 monasteries and convents 202 were dissolved[19] with the claim, only justified in a few cases, that they had decayed morally, and parish schools in Podolia and Volhynia were taken away from Catholic priests and assigned to Orthodox priests.

In Congress Poland the situation was hardly better, in spite of its relative autonomy and the fact that by the constitution of 1815 Catholicism had been declared the established religion. The rationalistic tendencies of the eighteenth century had resulted in decreasing religious interest among the upper class. The Latin clergy, especially in the rural areas, were accused, often with reason, of ignorance and immorality, and the orders, although they still possessed many houses, suffered heavily from the various partitions of the country. Only in the second third of the century did Poland experience the religious revival which the other European Churches had seen since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

---

[18] Who justifiably could fear that in this period of the prevailing regalistic and Josephinistic atmosphere a concession of quasi-patriarchal rights, which Austria and other countries would have demanded immediately, would have endangered not only the Roman primacy but all of ecclesiastical life.

[19] See documents X and XI in *Allocuzione . . . del 22 luglio seguita de una Esposizione corredata di documenti* (Rome 1842), 16–25.

Without consulting the Holy See, Tsar Alexander I in 1817 had changed the Organic Fundamental Law of the Church in the direction of larger royal influence. A commission for religion and education was established for the purpose of supervising the clergy, acting as obligatory arbiter between the clergy and the authorities, nominating bishops according to the suggestions of the chapters, and authorizing the publication of papal bulls. Pius VII, in need of the Tsar's support, thought it better to ignore the new regulations and to accept the establishment of the archbishopric of Warsaw[20] in order to cooperate with the Russian government in freeing the Polish dioceses from the influence of the Primate of Gnesen, whose seat was on Prussian territory. A brief of 3 October 1816 granted the University of Warsaw the privilege to award doctoral degrees in theology and canon law, thereby substantially facilitating the control of the government over the education of the upper clergy. The Pope, always eager to prove his willingness to accommodate, empowered the archbishop of Warsaw to dissolve some monasteries. But this permission was far exeeded, and the decree of 17 April 1819, forced from the mortally ill archbishop, dissolved more than forty abbeys and monasteries in spite of Roman objections.[21] A further step on the path toward regalism was taken in 1825 when the Diet, ignoring objections from the episcopate, placed marriage under the jurisdiction of the civil courts and thereby made divorce possible even for Catholics. At the same time, the orderly administration of the dioceses became increasingly difficult through the suppression of synods and canonical visitors, the appointment of questionable ambitious creatures to important positions, and arbitrary sanctions against clergymen who refused to violate canon laws and to follow the dictates of the government. These conditions were aggravated by the lengthy vacancies of the episcopal sees.

A further worsening of the situation occurred after the failed Polish revolution of 1830, in which the clergy and several bishops had actively participated. After the constitution of 1817 was repealed and Poland became an integral part of the Russian Empire, the Catholic Church was subjected to increasing control by the authorities and Russification of its leading personnel. The mobility of the clergy was limited in 1834, and the faithful were pressured to convert to Eastern Orthodoxy. Gregory XVI, very disconcerted by the wave of revolutions shaking Europe, regarded the Polish uprising not as a crusade against a schismatic oppressor, but as a subversive movement instigated by radicals and Freemasons. Following the suggestions of Metternich and some reactionary cardinals, he twice, on 19 February 1831 and 9 June 1832, condemned[22] the rising against the "legitimate power of the sovereigns," which he ascribed to "a few cunning and treacherous agitators." To the utter horror of western Europe's liberal Catholics, he advised the bishops to heed Saint Paul and preach submission and recommended to the Polish Catholics loyalty "to their powerful sovereign, who would show himself gracious to them." The position of the Pope originated from a feeling of mutual interest of the conservative powers. In return for his intervention, which gravely offended many Polish Catholics and led to their apostasy, he also expected the Tsar to alter his religious policy. For this reason he followed up his encyclical of 9 June 1832 with a confidential memorandum to Prince Gagarin, in which, citing precise cases, he denounced "the malice and chicanery of the government in Poland which had caused the decline of the Church."[23] The document remained unanswered, as did a complementary note by Secretary of State Bernetti. When Gregory XVI a while later was about to protest even more vehemently against the closing of two-thirds of Russia's monasteries, Metternich persuaded him not to do so. He promised a personal intervention of the Austrian monarch with the Tsar, but it produced no results. Equally unproductive were protest notes between 1836 and 1840 against the coercive measures to which Monsignor Gutkowski, O.P., bishop of Podlachia, was subjected. He was one of the few prelates who dared to protest the measures of the government and had to pay for his courage with expulsion.[24] Only after the affray of 1842 was there finally hope for alleviation.[25]

---

[20] Bull *Militantis Ecclesiae* of 12 March 1818 (*JP* IV, 552; see 568–69). It was complemented by the Bull *Ex imposita Nobis* of 30 June 1818 (Mercati I, 638–48), which adjusted the borders of the eight dioceses of the Kingdom to the border changes caused by the Congress of Vienna.

[21] Concerning the dissolution see Z. Olszamowska: *Ochrona Zabytków* (Warsaw 1952).

---

[22] *Acta Gregorii* XVI, I, 143–44 and *BullRomCont* XIX, 571–72. Erroneously the second document has been called *Cum primum,* occasionally with the words *Superiori anno,* which, however, introduced a harsher document, which was never sent (Lamennais received word of it). Concerning the drafting of this encyclical and the possible role of the Russian ambassador, see Boudou I, 178–87 (against F. Lamennais, *Les affaires de Rome* [Brussels 1836], 122–28), M. Żywczyński, op. cit., 168ff. and K. Piwarski, op. cit., 42ff. Did Gregory XVI regret the sending of this document when he learned of the large degree of the Russian suppression? The question cannot be answered unequivocally (see P. Lescœur, *L'Église catholique en Pologne* I, 201–16 and A. Simon, *Rencontres mennaisiennes en Belgique,* 259; on the other hand, Boudou I, 187–88). On the reactions in Poland see G. Bozzolato in *RStRis* 51 (1964), 328–38 and L. Le Guillou, *Les Discussions critiques. Journal de la crise mennaisienne* (Paris 1967), 23–25.

[23] Text in *Allocuzione . . . del 22 luglio seguita da una Esposizione corredata di documenti,* 11–14 (see ibid., 26–27).

The Latin Catholics in the Ottoman Empire

For the first three decades of the nineteenth century all Balkan and Danube states, with the exception of the Ionian Islands,[26] which passed from the Venetian sphere of influence under British protection, remained with the Ottoman Empire. In spite of the Muslim preponderance in this enormous Empire, about one-third of the population was Christian and almost 10 percent were Roman Catholics.

Since their conquest, the Christians enjoyed a limited freedom in the exercise of their religion and the organization of their communities. Nevertheless, their situation was not an easy one. Quite to the contrary, despite the right of protection officially accorded the French consuls but also exercised by the Austrian and Russian representatives, Christians were exposed to constant injustices at the hand of the local authorities. Occasionally the Christians were affected by measures which were caused less by religious antagonism than by political agitation or racial hate. The first interventions of the Christian powers—France, Austria, Russia, and England—in the Ottoman Empire produced political spoils which they hungrily wished to divide among themselves. Similarly, the successful Greek revolt of 1829 produced only greater Turkish suspicions of the Christians, who were thought to be receiving their orders from foreign countries and awaiting an opportunity to revolt also.

The Catholic group, imbedded in the mass of the Orthodox Christians among whom the Greek element attempted to gain dominance over the Slavs and Arabs, did not constitute a homogeneous bloc. More than half of them, especially in Syria and Egypt, belonged to other rites and had their own hierarchy. But there was also an appreciable number of Latin Catholics spread over the entire Empire. They numbered about two hundred thousand in 1815 and steadily increased in the course of the century. The growth was caused in part by conversions which the prestige of the West, then at its height, occasioned, in part by high birth rates in the rural and mountainous areas, and in part by Italian, French, and Austrian immigration to the centers of commerce.

The majority of the Latin communities were in a very bad position. The interruption of normal communications with Rome and the chaos following the Austrian-Turkish and Napoleonic wars had produced frequent vacancies in the episcopal sees, a reduction of missionaries, and a lack of discipline among the lower clergy. The delegates of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith systematically devoted themselves to an alleviation of these conditions as soon as they had reorganized themselves after the return of Pius VII to Rome, but often lacked the necessary desirable tact.

---

[24] See Boudou I, 246–96.

[25] See vol. VIII in this series, chap. 11.

[26] Where at this time there were about four thousand Catholics, who were chiefly concentrated on the island of Corfu and had a native secular and regular clergy.

The densest Latin center, even then accounting for only 20 percent of the population, was Albania (seventy-five thousand Catholics), where six bishoprics existed from the time of the Middle Ages, and Bosnia-Herzegovina (one hundred thousand Catholics), where in contrast to Albania virtually no secular clergy were left and where the parishes were administered by Franciscans, whose three authorized monasteries were the centers of Catholic education.

Another relatively important center was the Rumanian principality of Moldavia, which during the first half of the century experienced a particularly rapid growth of Catholics (from sixteen thousand to sixty thousand). But the apostolate in this area, entrusted to Italian and Hungarian conventuals, encountered great difficulties because of the wide dispersion of the believers and the ethnic hatreds between Rumanians and Magyars. Attempts undertaken between 1808 and 1818 by Rome with the aid of Vienna, which had assumed the place of the former protector Poland, to restore the old bishopric of Bakau met determined resistance from the Orthodox hierarchy which received support from the Rumanian boyars. Catholicism was the religion of Hungary, which was even more hated than the Turks.

An analogous reaction developed at the same time in Wallachia, whose prince tolerated the unobtrusive existence of some rather insignificant Catholic centers but who rejected proselytism. Inasmuch as the missions in Bulgaria had been totally dissolved on account of the wars between Turkey and Austria, the bishop of Nikopolis, an Italian Passionist, at the beginning of the nineteenth century had withdrawn with the paltry survivors of his flock to the area of Bucharest, an area with relative autonomy. At first this fact remained unnoticed, but when in 1815 the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith selected Monsignor Ercolani as new bishop, there quickly came protests from the Orthodox bishops when Ercolani, an antischismatic zealot, ignored the advice of the Austrian resident to act cautiously. Monsignor Ercolani, who with his reforming inflexibility also aroused the enmity of the few Franciscans who long had been residents of the area, was forced to resign in 1822 and the see remained vacant for several years. Through skillful behavior his successor gradually succeeded in reducing mistrust, and in 1833 he was able to settle in Bucharest and with Austrian aid establish a few Catholic schools.

In the south of Bulgaria, where the few surviving Catholics lived without resident clergy, Austrian Redemptorists settled in 1830 in Philippopel, and from there began to spread over the country. The situation in Serbia was hardly better, although the Orthodox clergy there was more tolerant than in other areas.

Before 1830, Roman Catholicism was hardly represented on the Greek peninsula, and on the islands, where for a long time Latin groups of Venetian and Genoan origin had resided, the Catholic presence had been reduced to scant remains by the exodus of Italian settlers as well as by mixed marriages. The center of Catholicism was on the island of Syros. Between 1815 and 1822, the group was severely disturbed by the justified grievances of the clergy and their flocks against Bishop Rossini, who finally was forced to resign. The arrival of numerous Orthodox refugees during the course of the wars of independence caused this "Island of the Pope" to lose its long preserved exclusively Latin character. On the other hand, the recognition of independence by the London Protocol of 1830, which guaranteed complete freedom to the Catholic religion, and the subsequent installation of a Catholic sovereign, Otto von Wittelsbach, in Athens,[27] allowed Catholicism to take hold in continental Greece. Monsignor Blancis, the new bishop of Syros (1830–51), was appointed as apostolic delegate in 1834. Concurrently he was charged with the reorganization of the Latin Church in the entire Kingdom, in the course of which he had to remove abuses in the diocese of Naxos. He was also to maintain contact with the government, which in 1838 accredited him as the official representative. But Gregory XVI was looking farther into the future. As former prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith he was fully informed of the problems of the Christian East. He knew that the Latin rite had no future among the Greek population, and in 1836 offered to send young Greeks to the reopened Greek College in Rome, there to train them in the Eastern rite. But this was a false hope; for in spite of the successes which the schools established by French and Italian orders had with the Orthodox Christians, the articles of the constitution of 1844 forbade proselytism and decreed that the successor to the throne had to belong to the Orthodox religion. There was no doubt that the new Greece wished to remain faithful to its national Church.

In Constantinople and even more in the other port cities of the Levant, the Catholic missions were in full decay after the suppression of the Society of Jesus. In 1800, they had fewer than six thousand members. They were mainly foreigners and barely held together by a few Italian Lazarists and Capuchins. After French diplomats, not entirely altruistically, had succeeded in achieving a limited improvement, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1817 began the reorganization of this area. It reestablished the Archbishopric of Smyrna, which for two centuries had been reduced to the rank of a vicariate apostolic, and the vicariate apostolic of Aleppo, vacant since 1774, and conferred on it the jurisdiction over all missions in Syria, Palestine,[28] and Egypt.

---

[27] The selection was a relief for the Vatican, which feared the influence of Russia. Earlier, Leo XII had made representations to the king of France for the same reason (see L. Manzini, *Il cardinale Lambruschini* [Vatican City 1960], 121–23.

Around 1830, new prospects developed for the Christians in the wake of the growing interest of the European chancellories in the eastern problems and the shift in the balance of power occasioned by the temporary occupation of Syria and Palestine by Egyptian pascha Mohammed Ali. The suggestion by the historian-diplomat Bunsen to declare Palestine an open area, in which Christianity could freely develop under a Christian government, was ignored. But the denominational map quickly changed with the acceleration of Anglo-Saxon missionary penetration,[29] begun in 1825. The establishment of an Anglo-Prussian episcopal see in Jerusalem in 1841 was symbolic of the new interplay of political and ecclesiastical forces at work in the Middle East.[30]

The Roman authorities observed with concern this growing influence of Protestant England and Orthodox Russia[31] in areas in which heretofore Rome had enjoyed the nearly total support of French and Austrian diplomats. Nevertheless, they tried to gain the greatest possible benefit from the settlement of a growing number of Europeans in the Levant, which the crisis of the Ottoman Empire opened to the political and economic competition of Europe. The growth of the Catholic population, largely of European origin, justified the establishment of new Latin missionary stations. They were expected, more than the still insignificant numbers of the Uniates, to become centers of attraction for schismatic easterners, thanks to the prestige of western schools and in recognition of the services performed by hospitals and dispensaries for the poor. The revival of the orders in the European countries, especially France, favored this policy. The numbers of Franciscans, Capuchins, and Lazarists, pitifully small at the beginning of the nineteenth century, underwent a steady growth. The Jesuits reappeared in Syria at the beginning of the 1830s, and in 1839 settled in Beirut, the new Lebanese capital. The Sisters of Charity in 1838 settled in Constantinople and in 1839 in Smyrna; they were followed in 1841 by the Christian Brothers, and the entire movement grew until the end of the nineteenth century.

---

[28] In Jerusalem the custody of the Holy Land entrusted to the Franciscans continued its traditional policy of a slow infiltration of the Eastern communities. In 1818 the Greek patriarch asked the Sultan for a decree which would force the converts to return to the Orthodox Church, but at the request of Pius VII the Catholic powers intervened in Constantinople in order to avert the threat (*JP* IV, 566, and note 1. F. Engel-Janosi, *Die politische Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den österreichischen Kaisern,* 137–40).

[29] Latourette, *Expansion* VI, 20–26, 38–55; Rogier *KG,* 374–79; J. Hajjar, *L'Europe et les destinées du Proche-Orient,* 5–16, 33–62, 230–60.

[30] See J. Hajjar, op. cit., 373–458.

[31] Concerning the Russian action in Palestine, see J. Hajjar, op. cit., 17–26, 460–82.

The vast majority of the members of these orders, whose cultural and spiritual influence was without a doubt beneficial for the moment, unfortunately had received no introduction to the specific problems of the Christian East. Therefore only a systematic Latinization appeared to them as an effective guarantee of Catholic unity. They refused to consider the objections which their blind zeal caused among the Uniate hierarchy already established in the area. They also ignored exhortations to be prudent by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, which with its historical experience had a deeper insight. They were only interested in increasing the conversions of Uniates to the Latin rite and gradually were able to win to their view the responsible people in Rome. It was in this connection that the thought of a reestablishment of the Latin Patriarchate in Jerusalem arose. But it was effected only ten years later, during the first months of the pontificate of Pius IX,[32] as Rome feared offending the Uniate hierarchy. It constituted a landmark in the Latinization process of the Christian East, and was to have its effects in the second half of the century.

[32] Bull *Nulla celebrior* of 23 July 1847 (*JP* VI/1, 42ff.). See J. Hajjar, op. cit., 482–514.

CHAPTER 9

The Churches of America

Schmidlin described well the paradoxical situation of Catholicism in America at the beginning of the nineteenth century in this fashion: "In Latin, Central and South America, the Church, although overtly both Christian and Catholic, was internally deteriorating and close to dissolution; in Anglo-Saxon and French North America, Catholicism was only in its infancy and still partially in the phase of persecution, but everywhere nascent and spreading its wings."[1]

[1] *PG* I, 314.

Spanish America

When the Napoleonic interlude came to an end in 1814, and the Roman Curia was again free to make contact with the Churches of the world, there were forty bishoprics in Spanish America[2] serving a population of about 15 million, which was centered largely in the Caribbean area. In spite of the continuing attachment of the population to the Catholic faith, an attachment which was especially concerned with external manifestations and a clear tendency toward religious syncretism among the American Indians in Mexico, Peru, and Bolivia, the Church was confronted with some extraordinarily difficult problems after the revolt of the old colonies against Spain. The revolutions, which had begun toward the end of the eighteenth century, by 1810 had led to the actual independence of most of the colonies.

Among these were financial problems. The substantial ecclesiastical property had been used by the two contending parties to cover their expenditures, and the Church, although formerly too wealthy, now was compelled to cancel some of its charities and even to close seminaries due to a lack of funds.

There were also problems of internal discipline. To the quantitative as well as qualitative regression and the turmoil produced by years of civil and military unrest for both the secular and the regular clergy[3] there often was added a kind of ecclesiastical anarchy. A majority of the Spanish upper clergy, many of whom were closely allied with the legitimist party, left the country voluntarily or by force and it was nearly impossible for the members of the orders (who also were angry over the confiscation of the majority of their lands) to remain in contact with the commissioners general of their orders, who resided in Spain and for centuries had been the normal link to the central authority.

Finally, the relationship between Church and state and the consequences of this relationship carried with them extremely delicate problems. The King of Spain resorted to his patronage, which his lawyers did not regard as a papal privilege but as an irrevocable right of the civil power. Without his permission, he did not allow the Pope to install new bishops in the area in which revolts had broken out but which he still considered as part of his Empire. The new republican governments, however, considered themselves heirs to that same patronage, and wanted to have direct influence not merely upon the administration of Church lands but also upon such internal affairs of the Church as the election of the chapter vicars in vacant dioceses and the decisions of the provincial chapters of the orders. This made the jurisdiction of those who had been placed in positions of authority through violations of canon law questionable, if not invalid. In many places situations were created which, strictly speaking, were "schismatic." But concretely and psychologically the situation was much more fluid, and the only formal schism occurred much later in 1829 in the diocese of San Salvador.[4]

---

[2] Eight dioceses for Mexico, four for the Antilles, four in Central America, three constitute the province of Caracas, four that of Bogotá, ten that of Lima, and seven that of Charcas or Chuquisaca in Bolivia.

[3] Concerning the frequently very active role of the young clergymen (especially the secular clergy, in which Creoles played a larger role than among the regular clergy) in the movement for independence, see principally M. André, *La fin de l'empire espagnol d'Amérique* (Paris 1922). One must not look upon all patriotic priests as bad priests, however. Cf. the biography of the Colombian Dominican *Fray I. Mariño OP, Capellán general del Ejercito libertador* (who always behaved exemplarily) (Bogotá 1963) by R. M. Tisnes. And even if the examples of priests and friars living in concubinage or being more devoted to politics than to the apostolate were very numerous in all areas, Monsignor Muzi during his stay in Buenos Aires in 1824 was nevertheless highly impressed by the exemplary conduct of secular and regular clergy alike.

With the exception of some politicians, whose regalism exceeded even that of the radical Gallicanists of Europe, the majority of the leading laymen as well as the entire clergy were soon convinced that the only possible solution was contact with the Holy See, which, because of its universal significance, alone could correct this fundamentally irregular situation. The first efforts in this direction were made in 1813 and 1814 when the Spanish King Ferdinand VII was a prisoner at Bayonne and it was hoped that Napoleon, whose sympathies for American independence were well known, could exert pressure on the Pope to be as conciliatory as possible. However, the developments in both America and Europe delayed the continuation of such efforts by several years. Between 1814 and 1817, the significant military successes of Spain made possible the provisional restoration of its authority over the area except for the provinces of La Plata, and Rome, under the influence of the spirit of restoration, saw in the nationalistic American movements only a delayed effect of the French Revolution, which it hoped could be assigned to the past. In these circumstances, Pius VII, who until 1819 received inadequate information about America solely by way of Madrid, tacitly accepted the measures of the Spanish King against the patriotic bishops. Without the slightest pressure from the Spanish King, on 13 January 1816, the Pope, in his Encyclical *Etsi longissimo,* exhorted the bishops of the New World to aid the reinstallation of the legitimate authorities.[5] Vehement polemics by the republican press[6] against Rome and the loyalist bishops followed, and the Church in America became the victim of the same principle of legitimacy which was beneficial for the Church in Europe.

---

[4] P. de Leturia, *Relaciones* II, 296–97, 317–19.

[5] Text ibid., 110–12. With respect to all documents concerning this problem, consult P. de Leturia, ibid. II, 95–116, III, 385–437. Father de Leturia was the first to point to the role played in this matter by F. Badan, a Genovese in the service of Spain.

[6] Especially in the independent United Provinces of La Plata where he contributed for many years to amplify the anti-Roman sentiments of the government.

Soon the encyclical itself was to be overtaken by events, and Consalvi was astute enough to recognize this fact quickly. Between 1818 and 1820, as a result of Bolivar's victories, Latin America regained its independence. Then, when between 1820 and 1823 a liberal regime came to power in Spain and followed a pronounced anticlerical policy, the pro-Spanish sympathies still harbored by many South American clergymen disappeared quickly. The Holy See also, turning more to the pastoral aspects of the matter, disregarded the Spanish viewpoint in the solution of the problem. Under the changed conditions, many of the bishops appointed since 1814 with the approval of Ferdinand now fled or were handicapped in the exercise of their authority. The condition of the Church constantly worsened, and Rome began to eye a new, more realistic stance. A first public echo of this was a letter of 7 September 1822, from Pius VII to Bishop Lasso, who, after having been a glowing defender of legitimism until 1820, had taken Bolivar's side. In the letter, which was widely publicized by the South American press, the Pope affirmed the neutrality of the Holy See with respect to the political changes in America, an affirmation which was tantamount to an actual desertion of the Spanish cause, and was an implicit renunciation of the unfortunate "legitimist encyclical" of 1816.

The new papal position coincided with the arrival in Rome of the first official emissary from a South American republic, Canon Cienfuegos. Cienfuegos had been delegated by the Chilean government[7] to ask the Pope to fill the vacant dioceses, if only with titular bishops, and to transfer the right of patronage, once held by the King of Spain, to the new government. In the spring of 1823, Pius VII sent Monsignor Muzi as vicar apostolic to Chile. The vicar apostolic arrived with extensive authorization to deal with the ecclesiastical situation in Chile. Before his departure, Monsignor Muzi was given jurisdiction over all areas of America no longer administered by Spain and whose further development Consalvi observed with growing concern. Unfortunately, Muzi's mission ended in failure. In Buenos Aires, where the vicar apostolic in keeping with his secret instructions was to attempt the settlement of a number of very delicate ecclesiastical problems, he encountered the firm regalism of Rivadavia and of the administrator of the diocese of Zavaleta, in addition to a hostile climate, which had been in existence since the encyclical of 1816. While Muzi received a friendlier reception in the provinces of La Plata, his lack of tact and political sensibility poisoned the situation in Chile. Dictator O'Higgins,[8] who had occasioned the Roman mission, had just been replaced by a government which was much more hostile toward the intervention of the Holy See in national ecclesiastical concerns.

---

[7] In 1821 Greater Colombia and Mexico also considered sending agents to Rome to settle ecclesiastical problems, but such plans did not mature.

The new head of government, General Freire, and his foreign minister, Pinto, posed unacceptable conditions for the consecration of two new titular bishops, whose appointment was one of the most important objectives of the mission, and were equally unwilling to negotiate with respect to the orders. Muzi also encountered the intrigues of chapter dean Cienfuegos. Cienfuegos wanted to become bishop and did not hesitate to accept his appointment from the government as administrator of the diocese of Santiago, the legitimate bishop being accused of having sided with the Roman emissary and driven out. Thus Muzi, who had come to Chile to stabilize the hierarchy, through his ineptitude deprived the country of its only remaining bishop and thus the source of priests for years to come. Furthermore, blinded by his reactionary attitude, which equated striving for independence with revolution, he made the mistake of rejecting Bolívar's official invitation to visit Greater Colombia. In doing so, he failed to employ his stay to begin the reorganization of these areas which were much more densely settled than those south of the equator.

In the meantime, Leo XII had become Pius VII's successor, and with the end of the liberal regime in Madrid, the Spanish ambassador Vargas Laguna, then at the height of his prestige, reappeared in Rome. Laguna was a bitter defender of the principle of legitimacy and for this reason was hostile to any contacts between the Holy See and the insurgents even for the settlement of purely spiritual problems. Supported by the ambassadors of Austria and Russia, Laguna succeeded on 24 September 1824 in wringing from the new Pope the legitimist Encyclical *Etsi iam diu.*[9] This document was to constitute no more than an interlude. In America it did not lead to the feared reaction against Rome, because many regarded it as apocryphal. Its effect was further weakened by knowledge of the true feelings of the Pope and his advisers. Leo XII was extremely sensitive in pastoral matters, and Monsignor Muzi's first-hand information had confirmed the leaders of the secretariat of state and of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in their conviction that there was much to be lost if Rome adopted an extreme position. After Varga's sudden death, this opinion gained ground, and the Holy See was convinced that it should not become involved in the political struggle between Spain and its former colonies, but should confine itself to safeguarding the spiritual interests of America's dioceses. A first important step in this direction was taken in the summer of 1825. In agreement with Fra Mauro Cappellari, the future Pope Gregory XVI, who soon was to grow into an expert on Latin American affairs, Leo XII decided to follow the advice of the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to comply with the request of the episcopate of Greater Colombia. He appointed a bishop *in partibus* without informing the government in Madrid.

---

[8] See J. Eyzguirre, "La actitud religiosa de don Bernardo O'Higgins" in *Historia* 1 (Santiago de Chile 1962), 7–46.

[9] Text in P. de Leturia, *Relaciones* II, 165–271. Concerning the origin of this document and the reactions it caused, see ibid., 241–81 and G. Mönkeberg Barros, *Anales de la Universidad católica de Valparaiso* 3 (1956), 239–58. Several historians have questioned its authenticity (for a critical discussion, see P. de Leturia, *Relaciones* II, 243–59).

This was only a provisional step. In order not to provoke the radical elements and to have to face the equivalent of a Civil Constitution of the Clergy, direct negotiations with the government with respect to the entire situation of the Church were imperative. In March 1826, due to the intercession of the French cabinet, the Spanish King agreed to have J. Sánchez de Tejada, one of Bolívar's delegates, who had been recalled from Rome in 1824 at Madrid's request, approved as a simple emissary of the bishops and the chapter of Greater Colombia. Negotiations were now finally begun and facilitated by Rome's growing fear that South America's new governments would join the schism. Tejada, who as a good Catholic desired a positive conclusion, exercised great diplomacy and managed to reduce the demands of his superiors without losing patience in the face of Rome's hesitation. Additionally, Bolívar himself, regardless of his own religious attitude, realized that a policy favorable to Catholic interests, symbolized by an agreement with Rome, would make it easier to tie the clergy, which still exercised a considerable influence on the masses, to the new government.[10] Such circumstances and Cappellari's bold vision introduced a new phase in 1827. Without regard to the prerogatives once accorded the Spanish King, the Pope appointed resident bishops rather than titular ones to the vacant sees of Greater Colombia. In order to avoid the appearance of a political arrangement, the appointments were made *motu proprio* and not officially in response to the suggestions of the government (even though in every case the appointed bishops corresponded to Bolívar's nominations).

Hardly had Leo XII made this gesture, which raised great hopes in all of Spanish America, than he appeared to reverse his position. Having always had legitimist tendencies, the Pope bowed to Ferdinand's furious objections and, in spite of the advice of Cappellari, who meanwhile had become prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, promised to appoint only vicars apostolic in the future,[11] except in the evidently very rare case in which the King had approved the particular person. In line with this decision, the Pope on 15 December 1828 suggested to the Consistory the appointment of two vicars apostolic for Chile, where the prejudices against Rome had diminished since Muzi's visit and where the constitution of 1833 soon was to concede numerous privileges to the Church. The Argentine crisis, particularly serious because the provinces of La Plata had not had a single bishop for years and because the government with its unilateral interference in ecclesiastical matters had gone very far, was handled by Pius VIII in similar manner in the following year when political forces propelled men into power who were less hostile to Rome.

---

[10] On Bolívar's church policy, see P. de Leturia, *Relaciones* III, Supplement 1, 4, 12, 13, and 15, and C. Mendoza, ibid. I, XXI–XXXV.

A parallel development in Mexico, where almost half of the Catholics of Spanish America resided, also raised hopes for an arrangement before too long. But the government's emissary, canon Vázquez, was uncompromising in one point. He considered it humiliating for his country to have to be satisfied with vicars apostolic, while Greater Colombia had been assigned resident bishops. Cappellari advised the Pope to fulfill this reasonable request, but Pius VIII remained true to the views enunciated eight years earlier by Consalvi as more in agreement with his own legitimist principles. The election of Cappellari, who in 1831 became Gregory XVI, put an end to the problem. Within three weeks, the new Pope appointed six resident bishops in Mexico and published his reasons in the Bull *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum.*[12] In the following year, the vicars apostolic of Argentina and Chile received the status of resident bishops and shortly afterwards (1834–35) moved to reorganize the Peruvian hierarchy, to end the schism in San Salvador (1839–42), and to settle the ambiguous situation of Paraguay (1844).

After the official recognition of New Granada (Colombia) by the Holy See in 1836, an internuncio was sent to Bogotá. His jurisdiction was to encompass all of Spanish America,[13] and his appointment signalled a new phase in the normalization of the relations between Holy See and the new South American republics.[14]

---

[11] This compromise solution was naturally of a kind which irritated the sensibilities of the republics; beyond that, they also had the disadvantage of having no connection with the ecclesiastical traditions of Spanish America, soon creating legal conflicts between the new apostolic vicars and the governments.

[12] See below, p. 266.

[13] The nunciature in Rio de Janeiro established in 1829 had the secret mission to concern itself with all of Latin America, but the communications with Colombia, Central America, and Mexico were extremely bad (see W. J. Coleman, op. cit., 59). Yet the apostolic delegation for Latin America soon had to be entrusted to the nuncio of Rio de Janeiro, as the internuncio of Bogotá was not able to fulfill his responsibilities. An attempt in 1837 to establish a third nunciature was not successful (P. de Leturia, *Relaciones* II, 4–5).

The length of time required for this normalization was owing in part to grave legitimistic scruples and antirevolutionary reflexes on the part of the Roman Curia and in part to the all too frequent compromises by the native clergy with the colonial governments. But the influence of these compromises should not be overestimated. The frictions between Church and state in the La Plata states were particularly vehement, and the episcopate soon took the side of the national revolution. Moreover, after 1820, agreement between Church and Spanish monarchy became rare. Difficulties from other basic causes did continue, however. These problems were primarily of a social nature, because the Church was often allied with the large land owners, while the new government officials came from the intellectuals of the cities. There were also ideological causes. The majority of the clergy wished to retain as much as possible the former control of the Church over the press, education, and society in general. The class now in power, which had been strongly affected by Freemasonry, was not yet ready for a rationalistic laicism—most of the constitutions still embodied Catholicism as the state religion[15]—but was in favor of the main principles of the Enlightenment, the independence of the civil power, and a control of the Church by the government. The orders became the first victims of this attitude. In a way similar to Europe in the eighteenth century, the state did not confine itself to the partial confiscation of property, but also limited recruitment, designated a minimum age for taking vows, forbade the recruitment of foreigners, and occasionally suppressed such institutions as the Franciscan missions to the Indians in Mexico. The secular clergy, not immediately affected, was concerned nevertheless when its traditional privileges were limited by an appeal to the principles of 1789. This concern was indeed justified, as the politically liberal governments still laden with the regalistic heritage of the Bourbon era rarely were able to reconcile themselves to liberty for the Church. The result was that the lower clergy, which at the beginning of the independence movements often had sympathized with the liberal constitutions, after 1830 tended to become more conservative. This tendency was reinforced by the influence of the priests and regular clergy arriving from Europe.

---

[14] The recognition of New Granada in October 1835 was followed in 1836 with Mexico, 1838 with Ecuador, and 1840 with Chile. In the case of the other republics, Rome waited until their political situation was clarified.

[15] Even in Argentina, where non-Catholic religions were treated with great toleration in deference to the English, whose support had been decisive in the liberation of the country. In other countries the opinion of the Chilean jurist J. de Egaña generally prevailed. In his repeatedly printed work *Memoria política sobre si conviene en Chile la libertad de cultos* he defended the thesis that allowing several religions would lead to unbelief and, in the civil sphere, to discords. See M. Gongora, "El pensamiento de J. de Egaña sobre la reforma eclesiástica" in *Boletín de la Academia chilena de la historia* 30 (1963), 30–53.

Brazil

The political development of Brazil was far less problematical for the Holy See than that of the former Spanish colonies; in spite of some republican riots in which a number of clergy also participated, it did not lead to the same clear break with the Old Regime. In 1808, the Portuguese King João VI had settled in Rio de Janeiro after fleeing Napoleon's invasion. He was followed by the nuncio of Lisbon, Caleppi, who handled the sale of Church lands well and was able to prevent the appointment of bishops by the archbishops without the participation of Rome. In 1822, after João VI's return to his capital, the large Brazilian landowners persuaded Don Pedro, the hereditary prince, to declare himself as the ruler of an independent Empire which was officially recognized by Portugal. Leo XII received the ambassador of the new state in 1826.

With the continuation of the monarchial organization and the common dynasty assured, Rome did not hesitate to transfer to the Emperor the rights of patronage which heretofore the King of Portugal[16] had exercised over the Church and to arrange a reorganization of the diocesan hierarchy in line with this change. In view of the extremely regalistic pretensions of the government, Rome quickly dropped plans for a concordat and decided to solve problems on an ad hoc basis. After some initial difficulties, it was possible to establish in Rio de Janeiro the first nunciature on the American continent; a symbol of the cooperation between Church and state.

But the cooperation was not entirely untroubled; it also produced difficult moments for the Holy See. These problems were occasioned principally by the Gallican and Febronianist attitudes of the clergy, attitudes strongly influenced by the writings of the Oratorian Pereira de Figueiredo and by Freemasonry. Monsignor Azevedo Coutinho (1743–1821), who had reorganized the seminary of Olinda, and the learned Monsignor da Silva Coutinho, bishop of Rio de Janeiro (1767–1833), both of whom had been trained at Coimbra, were typical representatives of an "enlightened" clergy. They regarded it as normal that the government subjected all acts of the Holy See to its approval, viewed the Church as a kind of state service controlled by the government, and took increasingly restrictive steps at the expense of the orders. This latter act quickly brought about the deterioration of the once flourishing Benedictine abbeys. Even if Brazil did not experience the same tensions that were created in Portugal by liberal anticlericalism, the spirit of Pombal was more alive there than ever.

---

[16] Bull of 15 May 1827 (*JP* IV, 685). On the relations between Church and state as determined by the constitution of 1824 and the amendment of 12 August 1824, see K. Rothenbücher, *Die Trennung von Staat und Kirche* (Munich 1908), 362ff.

The United States

At the time of the Declaration of Independence of the thirteen American states, the Catholic population was very small: only twenty-five thousand in a population of 4 million in 1785. Catholics were chiefly concentrated in the two states with more tolerant legislation: sixteen thousand in Maryland, and seven thousand in Pennsylvania. There were nineteen priests in Maryland and five in Pennsylvania, principally members of the Jesuit Order. The remainder of the faithful was spread among the other states and had no native priests. In the course of the last twenty years of the eighteenth century, however, a rapid change came about. Under the influence of democratic ideals, the principle of religious freedom and the equality of all faiths was recognized.[17] At the same time, a native Catholic hierarchy developed. After the vicar apostolic of London was no longer able to exercise his authority in the former colonies, the Holy See decided, after contemplating placing the territories under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Quebec, to succumb to the insistence of the Jesuits and to appoint one of them as head of the missions, although directly subordinated to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The choice was John Carroll (1735–1815), brother of one of the authors of the Declaration of Independence of 1776. Carroll, an experienced priest, although a man of the world, was both deeply Roman Catholic and fully American and completely convinced of the principles of separation of Church and state and of tolerance toward other religions. In the course of the years, he came to believe that only someone with episcopal authority could lead the diverse flock which posed so many problems for him. The Holy See concurred with his assessment and on 6 November 1789 established the diocese of Baltimore.[18] After Carroll's consecration in England on 15

---

[17] Article 6 of the constitution of 1789 and the first amendment, adopted in 1791 ("Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof").

[18] Letters *Ex hac apostolicae,* whose text is in D. C. Shearer, *Pontificia Americana,* 81–84.

August 1790, he successfully continued the difficult work of organizing the new diocese. He made use of a few French priests whom the revolution had driven from France, and, with the help of four Sulpicians, in 1792 opened the first seminary in the United States in Baltimore. In the preceding year he had founded a boys college at Georgetown, under the direction of the Jesuits, who again were given regular status as an order in 1806. A good number of settlers moved to the Middle West, and a few Irish Dominicans followed them. It was much more difficult, however, to find nuns in Europe willing to take care of parish schools. In 1809, a young widow, the convert Elizabeth Bayley Seton (1774–1821), founded the first native congregation, the Sisters of Charity. It developed rapidly and acted as model for other similar congregations.

The growth of the young Church soon required the division of the huge diocese of Baltimore, which comprised the entire United States with the exception of Louisiana, which, as a French colony, had its own bishops residing in New Orleans since 1793 and was annexed in 1803. On 8 April 1808, Pius VII established four new dioceses: Boston, Philadelphia, and New York (vacant until 1814) on the East coast and Bardstown (renamed Louisville in 1841) in Kentucky. When Archbishop Carroll died in 1815, the number of Catholics had grown to one hundred fifty thousand, ministered to by one hundred priests. This figure corresponded to only a small diocese in western Europe, but the progress was to continue unabated. A quarter of a century later, shortly before the huge wave of immigrants began in the 1840s, the number of Catholics had quadrupled. This was a consequence both of the general increase in population as well as the steady immigration, particularly from Catholic Ireland. Success occurred in spite of the problems posed by the Protestant environment and the vast geographical distances. To be sure, the six hundred sixty-three thousand Catholics in the United States in 1840 were less than the Catholic population of Cuba and only 4 percent of the total population of the United States, but the percentage had doubled since 1815. The fact that the Holy See founded twenty new dioceses between 1820 and 1837 demonstrated its prompt efforts to provide this new, growing Church with ecclesiastical administration. In Rome, the United States was still viewed as a missionary area, but in spite of many obstacles the North American Church quickly developed its own character and orientation.

The first of these difficulties was the shortage of priests. In spite of the gradual growth of the Sulpician seminary in Baltimore and the efforts of the bishops to establish boys' schools, native priests remained few for a long time. In order to provide the huge areas coming under settlement with a minimum of service, it was necessary to use European priests even at the risk that Catholicism might be viewed as an alien religion. A record of 1838 shows that of 430 priests and vicars in America only 20 percent were native born; and 132 were Irish, 95 French, and 41 Belgian. Among the priests who had come from Europe there were a substantial number of adventurers and vagabond members of orders, who were gladly released for emigration by their superiors and who created quite a few worries for their new bishops.

The national rivalries of this heterogeneous clergy further complicated the situation. The priests who had left France in order not to expose themselves to the iniquities of the revolution were without a doubt the best educated and almost always irreproachable in their conduct. Many of the new bishops and their assistants were selected from their ranks and from the persons recommended by them. Unfortunately this was sometimes a course of action fraught with disadvantages. These pastors had mastered the English language only imperfectly. The increasing number of Irish priests, full of enterprise and often boisterous, suffered under the moderation of the French prelates educated in the Sulpician spirit, a moderation which appeared to the Irish as lack of ability. Indeed, the impression could not be avoided that the Frenchmen were too rigid in their views for a country which was developing quickly and in a spirit alien to the European mentality. Repeated representations of American Irishmen at the Holy See, supported by the Irish bishops and by Irishmen residing in Rome, gradually resulted in a change. In the 1840s, the American episcopate began to take on the Irish character which was to remain for almost a century. The Irish characteristics were not without disadvantages, but at least they had the advantage that they provided American Catholicism with pastors who did not expect state subsidies or who were able to exercise their apostolate in a society dominated by Protestant leaders.

To the problems of an impetuous clergy was added the independent spirit of the laity in some parishes, an independence which led to the crisis of trusteeship with effects throughout the century. Religious denominations were not permitted to own property, and therefore an administrative corporation was created in each parish. Its members, the trustees, were laymen chosen by the community through election. In some areas, particularly in New England and the Middle West, this system generally functioned without many problems. However, some trustees, influenced by their Protestant environment, imbued with a radical democratic spirit, and often backed by rebellious priests, thought they had a right of patronage, which extended even to the selection of the communal clergy. The matter had already been a grave problem as early as the time of Monsignor Carroll.

After Carroll's death, a number of particularly grave incidents occurred in Charleston, Philadelphia, New Orleans, and Norfolk. The trustees in Norfolk went so far as to encourage a disgruntled Irish Franciscan to have himself consecrated bishop by the Jansenist prelate of the Netherlands in order to found an independent Church. Between 1817 and 1826, the Pope was forced to intervene several times.[19] Monsignor England, an Irishman who had been appointed as the first bishop of Charleston in order to deal with the crisis there, devised a system which associated the clergy and the lay delegates of the parishes with the bishop in administering the diocese. But this solution appeared as too democratic to his colleagues. The problem of the trustees gradually was normalized during the second third of the century with the legal rulings of the provincial councils of Baltimore, which decided that new churches could be constructed only if the contracts were drawn up in the name of the bishop.

After 1825, the Catholic Church was confronted with another problem, this time coming from outside the Church. A wave of hostility toward aliens, which gave the name of nativism to the movement, caused an aggressive revival of anti-Catholic sentiments. An objection by the Catholic hierarchy to the obligation of Catholic students in the public schools to attend Protestant Bible classes was presented at the very moment when there was a general renewed interest in the Bible. The objection was interpreted as proof of Catholic disregard of Holy Scripture, and a ferocious campaign began in the press, and meetings, backed by the Protestant Association, were held against the "godlessness and the corruption of papism." The growing number of Catholic immigrants from Ireland and Germany buoyed the agitation. A part of the population saw its standard of living threatened by cheap immigrant labor, and others saw in it a plot by the Holy See and the Holy Alliance to smother political and religious freedom in the United States with a flood of Catholic immigrants who would blindly obey a reactionary clergy. The result was a number of assaults on churches and monasteries between 1834 and 1836 which, after a brief phase of quietude, erupted again with renewed virulence after 1840.

The "nativist" campaign had at least the one positive result that it impelled Catholics to leave their ghettos and to defend their cause in word and print. Thus it brought about the rise of the Catholic press. Following the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* the first Catholic weekly in the United States, published in 1822 by the former journalist Monsignor England, scarcely a year passed during the subsequent quarter of a century in which a Catholic paper was not founded somewhere in the country.

---

[19] Letters *Litteras tuas* of 9 July 1817 (*JP* IV, 557f.), *Non sine magno* of 24 August 1822 (ibid., 619f.), and *Quo longius* of 16 August 1828 (ibid., 705ff.).

Publication was not the only area in which the influence of John England (1786–1842), Charleston's dynamic bishop, became known. A contemporary said of him that he was the first person to gain respect for the Catholic religion in the eyes of the American public. It was because of his persistence that the first council of the Church province of Baltimore, which had been scheduled to convene in 1812, was finally convoked in October 1829. The immediate results were a series of decrees regarding the rights of the bishops as opposed to the clergy and the trustees, the construction and maintenance of churches; catechisms and schools; clothing of the clergy; sports; the Catholic press; and the living conditions of orders. At the conclusion of the session the archbishop and his six suffragans composed two pastoral letters. One was directed to the clergy with the admonition to study the Scriptures and not to become too involved in earthly matters, and the other exhorted the laity to contribute to education and the press and to beware of religious indifferentism under the guise of liberalism. The second council, meeting in 1833, urged Rome to consider the advice of the bishops when appointing new ones. Reserving the principle of freedom of action to the Holy See, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith accepted an arrangement according to which the names of candidates should be suggested by the American episcopate in the future. This system was retained until 1866. A third provincial council took place in 1837, and subsequently the bishops met regularly every three years.

As already mentioned, one of the problems dealt with by the first provincial council of Baltimore concerned the orders. To alleviate the shortage of secular clergy, the bishops had sent a plea for help to the European orders and congregations. The Jesuits, Sulpicians, Augustinians, and Dominicans already present at the time of Monsignor Carroll were joined by the Lazarists (1816); the Redemptorists (1832), chiefly active in the Middle West among the people of German descent; the Holy Cross Fathers (1841); and the Franciscans (1844). Among the convents of such European congregations as the Sisters of the Sacred Heart (1818), the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Cluny (1831), and the Sisters of Our Lady of Namur (1840), there very soon were native congregations to testify to the vitality of the young American Church. To the first native congregation of Elizabeth Seton's Sisters of Charity were added, in 1812, the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth and the Sisters of Loreto in Kentucky, and shortly afterward the black congregations of the Sisters of Providence (1829) and the Sisters of the Holy Family (1842).

The sisters were engaged chiefly in the parish schools and charitable efforts. The Church hierarchy was also involved with the creation of reception stations for Catholic immigrants through the generous help of

European mission organizations such as the French Society for the Spreading of the Faith, Austria's Leopoldine Foundation, and the Bavarian Mission Society. The Church administration in the United States had no experience in the area of Catholic education, but the necessity to acquire such experience very quickly became evident. The arrival of the Irish had a positive effect, and the start provided by Monsignor Carroll produced a gradual growth. In 1840, there were two hundred parish schools, half of them west of the Alleghenies. With respect to charitable works, the first Catholic orphan home was opened in Philadelphia in 1814 by the Sisters of Charity, who because of the generosity of a layman from St. Louis also were able to open the first Catholic hospital there. Thus the tight network of institutions independent from the government, which is so characteristic of present-day Catholicism in the United States, had its roots in the first decades of the nineteenth century. They were generated by the immediate needs of a Church which constituted a minority in a Protestant country, but which because of a constitutionally guaranteed separation of Church and state could develop unhindered and in complete freedom.

The young American Church was firmly determined to turn away from French and Spanish traditions which might have expanded from the mission stations of the Great Lakes or the eighteenth century Churches of Louisiana and Florida. The atmosphere of Catholic romanticism and the longing for medieval Christianity was alien to this new Church, and it developed its strength by concentrating increasingly upon the urban centers of the East Coast, charting a new hitherto unknown path toward the future of its visionary prelates. As early as 1784, John Carroll had written: "America may give proof to the world that general and equal toleration, by providing a free climate for fair argument, is the most effectual method of bringing all denominations of Christians into a unity of faith."[20]

Forty years later, the most important Church leader of the next generation, John England, sounded the same note with increased optimism in a letter to O'Connell: "I am convinced that a total separation from the temporal government is the most natural and safest state for the Church in any place where it is not, as in papal territory, a complete government of churchmen."[21] These and similar concepts appeared in the Roman Curia as dangerous paradoxes, and Rome was frequently concerned about the happenings in a Church about which it knew so little. Yet the American example soon impressed European observers, and, from

---

[20] Quoted by Ellis, *Documents,* 151.

[21] Quoted by J. T. Ellis in *Harper's Magazine* 207 (1953), 64.

Lamennais to the "Americanists" of the closing nineteenth century, it continued to encourage the defenders of Catholic liberalism.

Canada

While only a few tens of thousands of Catholics lived in the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there were one hundred fifty thousand of them in Canada, and this number grew to four hundred sixty-five thousand by 1931. Under the aegis of Bishop John Octave Plessis (1806–25) the Canadian Church, which since the conquest by England had to suffer under administrative chicaneries, experienced a period of prosperity. In 1763, the clauses of the Treaty of Paris, detailed in the Quebec Act of 22 June 1774, guaranteed the Canadian Catholics "the free exercise of the faith of the Church of Rome" and the retention of its traditional institutions, among them the right of the clergy to tithe. After some hesitation, the British government also granted permission for the establishment of a bishopric in Quebec. The head of the bishopric was only to employ the title of "Superintendent of the Romish Church," but was to have the privilege of appointing parish priests without the approval of the governor.[22] The rebellion in the colonies of the United States had a positive effect upon the Canadian Church, because the Catholics constituted a rather significant element in the portion of the British colonies which survived the War of Independence. The government in turn was prepared to augment the loyalty of the Catholics with new concessions. It permitted the Catholics to hold political meetings with a simple oath of loyalty to the King instead of the anti-Catholic formulation demanded in England. Furthermore, in 1791, the Sulpician seminaries of Quebec and Montreal were allowed to reopen and regained the use of their property. Finally, several dozens of French priests, victims of the revolution, were permitted to settle in Canada in spite of the ban decreed after the British conquest.

New vexations began, however, with the new Anglican Bishop Mountain, whom George III in 1794 appointed as "Lord Bishop of Quebec." Mountain had the backing of Governor Craig and especially of the secretary for South Canada, Ryland, both of whom held that the best means of Anglicizing the new colony was the promotion of the development of the Anglican Church. The Catholics, among others, were compelled to accept the control of the government over ecclesiastical appointments and the income of the Church.

It was under these conditions that Monsignor Plessis, coadjutor since

---

[22] See A. Gosselin, *L'Église du Canada après la conquête, 1760–75* (Quebec 1916).

1800, became bishop of Quebec in 1806. This prelate, combining strength of character with an enterprising spirit, became the backbone of resistance to the anti-Catholic attacks of British local governments. At the same time, he was clever enough to remain loyal to London and gained the appreciation of the British during the War of 1812 with the United States. Bishop Plessis was rewarded with membership in the Legislative Council, where he became rather influential, as well as with the official recognition of his title as bishop of Quebec (1817); a title which initially had been rejected. Now thought could be given to dividing the Quebec diocese, which hitherto had stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In spite of some obstacles posed by London, five vicariates apostolic were established between 1817 and 1820. Two of these were in the maritime provinces, where many Irish and Scottish immigrants had joined the descendants of the original Nova Scotians. One of the new vicariates, that in Montreal, even began to overtake Quebec in importance, and in the one in Kingston on Lake Ontario after 1817 an English-speaking Catholic community grew up around A. Macdonnell, a former army chaplain. In a fifth vicariate in Manitoba, Lord Selkirk called for priests for the settlers of the new community of Rivière Rouge, whose German population explains the name Saint Boniface for the new church. After Kingston (1826) and Charlottetown (1829), Montreal received in 1836 the rank of an independent diocese, following a lengthy quarrel with the Sulpicians.

The Catholic schools were severely threatened by the founding, at the urging of the Anglican bishop, of the *Institution royale,* but were saved by the *Société d'éducation* of Quebec. With the backing of Protestant dissenters, who also fought against Anglican confiscation, a pluralistic school regulation was ultimately agreed upon, which allowed the parochial schools to develop without hindrance. There was a long fight over the property of the seminary of Quebec which was finally settled satisfactorily in 1839.

Monsignor Plessis always took a legal approach in his actions and thus incurred the displeasure of some fanatics who envisioned a rapid increase in the number of French Canadians. After Plessis's death, against the will of the bishops, an autonomist agitation developed under the pretext of religious demands, which between 1837 and 1838 led to armed riots that could have created an uncomfortable situation for the Church. But the government was understanding, and the act of union between Quebec and Ontario in 1840, which initially was viewed with suspicion by the Catholics, eventually proved to be very advantageous because it extended to the entire country the religious guarantees which in 1791 had only been granted to Lower Canada.

Yet while the legal position of Catholicism improved, its religious condition seemed to be rather mediocre, at least in Quebec, where the majority of the Catholics were located. The faithful demonstrated an undeniable religious indifference fed by Enlightened thoughts, a reaction against the English loyalism among the high clergy, and also by the excessive rigorism of many priests who during the eighteenth century stopped being missionaries in order to become officials.[23] The number of priests was far too small, and the ban on recruiting priests in France led to a Canadianization of the clergy.[24] In spite of the founding of seminary colleges in several small towns such as Nicolet in 1807 and Saint Hyacinthe in 1811, the first part of the nineteenth century was a poor time for recruiting priests. The number of the faithful per priest rose from three hundred fifty at the time of conquest to eighteen hundred in 1830. The shortage of priests, the vast distances, the long winters, and the open way of settling made already difficult working conditions even more difficult. Under such conditions it was not surprising that some priests, influenced by Richer's thought, were little concerned with the authority of the bishop, even though they led irreproachable lives. On the other hand, the clergy of this time were not concerned with politics.

---

[23] M. Trudel, *Situation de la recherche sur le Canada français* (Quebec 1963), 25.

[24] Forty-five priests, fleeing before the revolution, did indeed enter the country between 1794 and 1802, but as welcome as their addition was, it was inadequate in the face of the rapid growth of the population.

CHAPTER 10

The Churches of the Eastern Rite

The Uniates of the Near East

In the West, ecclesiastical reorganization began as early as 1815, but the efforts to regain the Christian communities in the Ottoman Empire met great obstacles. This is particularly true for the religious minorities which, with the exception of the Maronite Patiarchate, had just begun to mature by the beginning of the nineteenth century. In order to bring the work of renewal to fruition it was necessary, even more than in the European provinces of Turkey, to effect those structural changes which after 1830 were to change the civil and religious physiognomy of the Near East. But this change also had its dark side. The liberal attitude of the Ottoman government favored the Uniates, but at the same time facilitated missionary penetration from the West, exposing the still-weak Uniate communities to Protestant, Anglican, and Russian-Orthodox competition. It also promoted the Latinizing infiltration and the Roman process of centralization, which was to become characteristic for the history of the unity movement of the entire nineteenth century.

The Maronite Patriarchate was by far the most important group of Uniate Christians in the Near East. The crisis of authority which it underwent in the second half of the eighteenth century was resolved under the leadership of the patriarchs Yohanna Al-Halu (1809–23) and Yussef Hobeich (1823–45). Hobeich was a man of energy and vision, who based his work of ecclesiastical reconstruction on full cooperation with the apostolic delegates and a political and religious France.

After his reconciliation with Monsignor Gandolfi, the representative of the Holy See, Yohanna Al-Halu in 1818 convoked a council at Lowaizeh.[1] It decided at last to implement the decisions of the council of Lebanon, made a century earlier in 1736. But the most important objectives were implemented only under Hobeich. In 1826 he dissolved the double or mixed monastic institutions and established an episcopal residence in each diocese, so that after 1835 the bishops at long last had a firm place of residence. He also founded several new seminaries and thereby assured the training of a relatively well educated clergy and of many school principals. But the support of his work by the French resulted in a strengthening of Latinizing tendencies, to which the publication of the ritual (1839–40) attests. With its close to two hundred thousand faithful,[2] the Maronite Church numerically far surpassed all other Eastern Uniate communities, many of which were still at a very low stage of development in 1815.

This was especially true for the Copts, who were still dependent on the Franciscan mission in Egypt and received an autonomous ecclesiastical organization only under the pontificate of Leo XIII. The letter with which in 1822 Pius VII asked the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria to profess the Catholic faith and to send young Copts to Rome for study[3] remained unanswered, and until 1831 the number of the Uniates was only 2,624 with fourteen priests, dispersed over the entire country. Nevertheless, trusting in forged letters from Mohammed Ali, Leo XII in 1824 decided to reestablish a Coptic patriarchate. The consequences of the forgery, originated by a Sicilian Franciscan, were avoided through the quick action of the French consul at Alexandria,[4] but for a long time burdened the fate of the Coptic movement of union.

---

[1] Decrees in de Clercq I, 479–83; cf. 308–13.

[2] According to a report of 1844 they were ministered to by 1205 priests, with an additional 1420 monks and 330 nuns in eighty-two monasteries and convents.

[3] *JP* IV, 529–30.

The Uniate Chaldean Church, developed as a consequence of the Roman adherence by several Nestorian prelates in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,[5] was buffeted by a number of vicissitudes at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Its hierarchy was firmly established by this time, though, and the Church numbered twenty thousand faithful. In addition to being isolated in Upper Mesopotamia under extremely poor living conditions, the Uniate Chaldeans were also split by the rivalry of the two candidates for the patriarchal position, the metropolitan of Mosul, John Hormez, and the metropolitan of Diarbekr, Augustine Hindi. After the death of the latter in 1828, a decision by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith put a stop to the crisis which had reached its peak in 1826. The Congregation decided to unify the patriarchal jurisdiction and to appoint as "Patriarch of Babylonia" John Hormez, who until this time had been viewed by Rome with mistrust. Under the new designation, which replaced the traditional title *Katholikos,* Hormez became the first of the patriarchs of the contemporary Uniate Chaldean Church. A further step in the process of reorganization was taken by the Congregation in 1838. Breaking with a 300-year tradition, according to which a patriarch was always succeeded by a nephew, it attached Nicholas Zeya as coadjutor with the right of succession to Patriarch Hormez. It could not be foreseen that his selection was so unfortunate as to compel Gregory XVI in 1846 to withdraw him from office. More important than these institutional changes was the adherence to Rome in 1828 of the influential monastery Rabban Hurmuz. With this monastic center as focal point, the Chaldean union movement was immensely strengthened spiritually. In 1845, Gregory XVI recognized the rules of the monastery, which were based on the ideas of Saint Anthony.

The small Syrian community, newly organized in 1782, underwent a fairly parallel development during the first half of the nineteenth century. Here also the fights of rivaling parties delayed a reorganization until 1830, a delay which was complicated by the clumsy interference of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Following the tendentious information submitted by Monsignor Gandolfi, the Congregation wanted to remove Pierre Jarweh (1820–51) from the patriarchal see. He had been duly elected, but was suspected of being willing to make compromises with English Protestants. But after the circumstances of Gandolfi's inadequate information had been cleared up, the Congregation recognized Jarweh in 1828. It gave this dynamic man the chance to devote himself to a restructuring of his Church more in keeping with the demands of modern times. He changed the monastery of Scharfeh, in which he lived, into a seminary and replaced the monastic vows by the simple acceptance of celibacy, a vow of obedience, and some testamentary obligations of the former students. The Congregation in 1828 at first rejected the proposal, but accepted it in 1841. Between 1827 and 1836 the Syrian community became known as the Syrian Church in order to distinguish it from the Jacobite-Monophysites and so that it would profit from the traditional reputation of the Christian community of Antioch. The Church experienced a very fortunate development in that several Jacobite bishops declared their loyalty to Rome and thereby added about twenty thousand believers to the Church. But the resulting predominance of the formerly "heretical" bishops worried Rome, and Jarweh was encouraged to exploit the liberalizing steps of the Ottoman Empire for the transfer of his patriarchal see to Aleppo so as to provide him with a better center of operations.

---

[4] For details of this embarrassing affair, typical for the improvisational character of the policy of the Holy See during those years concerning the Christian East as the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was then only just being formed, see G. B. Brocchi, *Giornale IV* (Bassano 1841), 210–14.

[5] In Malabar also, in southern India, there lived a number of Catholics of Nestorian origin who, however, had no bishops and were subordinate to the jurisdiction of a Latin vicar apostolic. Only after 1850 did they make contact with the patriarchate of Mesopotamia.

The return of Jacobite prelates to Roman Catholicism was due to the new Melkite Patriarch Maximos III Mazlum (1833–55). Through his diverse and persistent activities he transformed his languishing community[6] into a flourishing Church, yet was determined to defend the autonomy of the Byzantine tradition within the framework of the Roman Church. Until 1830, the Melkite Church suffered from the consequences of the council of Karkafeh (1806)[7] to which some bishops, headed by Germanos Adam, had given a definitely Gallican orientation because they were tired of the interference of Latin missionaries and were disadvantaged by their theological inferiority. The joint reaction of the Maronite patriarch and all of the missionaries placed the Melkite Church in dependence on the apostolic delegate, Monsignor Gandolfi, who intended to master the situation by "breaking the back of the eminent personalities, weakening the hierarchy, and forcing upon it the awareness of defeat" (Hajjar). Fearing Gallican indoctrination, he demanded that the seminary of Ain-Traz, founded in 1811, remain closed. As the Melkite clergy had no other educational institutions available, and since the best educated among the laity demanded a schooled clergy, they preferred to confess to the Latin missionaries and listen to their sermons. A first step toward the reopening of Ain-Traz in 1831 was taken when Mazlum, who since 1814 had lived in exile in Rome where he had earned the respect of the future Gregory XVI, returned and brought with him a few Jesuits for the seminary. Two years later he was elected patriarch and with determination devoted himself to a general reform of the ecclesiastical institutions. He raised the religious standards of his flock, encouraged the training of an educated and pious clergy, and adjusted the legislation and the structure of the diocesan organization, which stretched across the entire Near East, to the new political and social realities of his country.[8] As defender of patriarchal privileges against the missionaries, the apostolic delegates, and the Roman congregations, this "indefatigable fighter," very suspect in ultramontane circles, but ultimately and justifiably rehabilitated by P. Hajjar, succeeded in freeing his Church from the oppressive monopoly of official orthodoxy. He did so with great persistence by emancipating his national Church, a process which was started in 1831 by an ordinance of the Sultan in favor of Catholic Armenians.

---

[6] Whose numbers he was able to increase from thirty-thousand to seventy-five thousand through individual and collective memberships. Around the middle of the century there were about two hundred clergymen, chiefly members of orders.

[7] Concerning the council of Karkafeh, given life by the Gallican bishop of Aleppo, Germanos Adam, and his condemnation by Rome (1835), see de Clercq I, 337–60.

As trading people, the Armenians were spread across the entire Near East and some of them had entered a union with the Roman Catholic Church. A few thousand lived dispersed in the Russian Empire, and after 1635 a Uniate Armenian archbishop resided in Lemberg in Poland, while in Venice, and after 1811 also in Vienna,[9] two communities of learned monks, the Mechitharists, contributed to acquainting the West with some traditions of the Christian East. Within the Ottoman Empire they were found especially in Cilicia and Syria—headed by a *Katholikos*, who after 1750 resided in Bzommar in Lebanon—and in Constantinople, where in spite of the impressive number of fifteen thousand members they did not have their own prelate but were dependent on the Latin vicar apostolic. In 1830 they received an archbishop of their rite, who was independent of the patriarch. In keeping with the secular legislation of the Ottoman Empire, the Uniate Armenians were dependent on the schismatic Armenian patriarch for all civil needs, just as the other Uniate Churches were subordinated to the Orthodox patriarch. The Turkish government did not distinguish between Catholic and non-Catholic Christians as long as they belonged to the Eastern rite. In connection with the Greek rebellion in 1827, the Gregorian (i.e., non-Uniate Armenian) patriarch denounced Constantinople's Catholics as accomplices of the rebels and caused them to be persecuted. Leo XII, deeply shocked by such conduct, intervened together with France and Austria and in 1830 obtained from the Sultan, in addition to a limit to the expulsions, the emancipation of the Catholic Armenian communities. From now on they were free to build new churches and received their own civil *patrik.* As a consequence of the liberal development after Mohammed Ali's victories, the jurisdiction of this priest by the decree of 3 June 1834 was expanded to all Uniates, Maronites, Melkites, Syrians, and Chaldeans. The government at Constantinople thereby acknowledged their legal existence for the first time.

---

[8] See de Clercq I, 379–414 on the two councils of Ain-Traz (1835) and Jerusalem (1849).

[9] About the origins of this founding see V. Inglisian, *150 Jahre Mechitaristen in Wien* (Vienna 1961).

The next step was the recognition of the autonomy of each of these communities. The Melkite Patriarch Mazlum played an eminent role in the process. At the same time that he vehemently fought and won the "Battle of Kallous" (a cylindrical cap which only Orthodox priests were permitted to wear), he also suceeded in 1837, with the backing of French diplomacy and despite Russian objections, in obtaining from the Sultan recognition as the civil head of the Catholic Melkites. He remained subordinate to the Armenian *patrik* only formally. A further step was taken in 1844 when, again under the protection of the French ambassador, the Uniate patriarchs of the Syrians and Chaldeans were given an analogous position. But they lived rather reclusive lives and thought it advisable to reach an agreement with the Armenian *patrik.* Mazlum, however, continued his fight and finally on 7 January 1848 obtained a decree which freed his Church community even from any nominal tutelage.

The emancipation of the Uniate groups from the corresponding Eastern Churches, resulting from the political developments in the Near East, constituted an important turning point in the history of the unification movement. The Uniate Churches from now on were able to develop and organize freely and unhindered. But the consolidation at the same time led to a deepening of the rift which separated the Uniate Churches from those from which they had sprung. Thus they could no longer function as bridges between them and Rome. Their growth and the cultural and apostolic rejuvenation of which they had urgent need could only be effected with aid from the West; by the same token, the West's juridical, theological, and spiritual impact could be nothing but disastrous for communities which tended to have feelings of inferiority. The spontaneous and often unintentional development which increasingly estranged the Uniate Churches from the unadulterated Eastern tradition was amplified by the policy of the apostolic delegates. Sometimes with good intentions and often with tactless intransigence, which in some cases exceeded their instruction, they attempted to subordinate the Uniate patriarchates to Rome's central control. To be sure, the efforts of the Holy See to establish closer bonds between these Churches and Rome were understandable. But the almost total ignorance of the Eastern institutions and the general opinion that true unity could only be achieved through uniformity had the consequence of removing, even though done in good faith, the substance of the institution of the patriarchate and the synodal organization of the Church. This Roman policy, which aimed at a redefinition of the authority of the patriarchs in keeping with the purely nominal prerogatives of the Latin archbishops, was pursued with utmost determination only by Pius IX, but its beginnings could be noted during the pontificate of Gregory XVI. An important way station was the decision of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of 23 May 1837, based on the initiative of Monsignor R. Fornari.[10] It decreed that the Uniate patriarchs had to ask the Roman Pope for a confirmation of their election and the investiture with the pallium, and were entitled to assume the other aspects of their jurisdiction only after receiving it. Furthermore, it demanded the approval of the Holy See for decisions of councils before they were published, and forbade the patriarch and his synod to publish decrees which deviated, even if only implicitly, from the discipline approved by the Roman authority. This decree, hardly noticed at the time, introduced a veritable revolution in Eastern law, signifying the distance which within a few decades had been traversed concerning the restoration of papal prerogatives.

The Romanian and Slavic Groups

While the Uniate Churches of the Near East were the focus of attention because of initially appearing difficulties and their pronounced efforts in the defense of the autonomy of the Eastern patriarchical system against Latin attacks, they were not alone among the Uniate Christian communities of the Eastern rite tied to the Apostolic See. In Eastern Europe there were several millions of Uniates, mostly belonging to the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy, who even in the eyes of Rome were a natural bridge for the encounter with Slavic Orthodoxy.

Transylvania was the home of half a million Romanians,[11] grouped in two dioceses of the Hungarian Church province of Gran; Blaj was their ecclesiastical and cultural center and also served as the residence of the bishop of Făgăras. Between 1782 and 1830 the position was held by John Bob, educated in the Josephine spirit, who put an end to Uniate Monachism which counted among its followers such eminent men as Peter Maior, one of the pillars of the Romanian cultural renaissance. He and his colleague Vulcan, bishop of Oradea Mare (Grosswardein) (1806–39), continued the reintegration into the Catholic Church of the schismatic parishes from the time of Maria Theresia and awakened in the secular clergy a new awareness of its pastoral obligations. In spite of receiving little help from Latin Catholics, they developed a network of educational institutions,[12] which assured the flock of their Church an intellectual level far above that of the other Uniate Churches, as the synods of Blaj (1821 and 1833) attest.[13] John Bob's successor, I. Lomeni (1833–50), continued his work by promoting the religious impact of his clergy and gathered able professors in Blaj to serve both religious and national aims. In the revolution of 1848 he, together with the Orthodox bishop, presided over the National Assembly; his role caused the Hungarian government to call for his dismissal during the reaction following the revolution.

---

[10] *CodCanOrFonti,* 1st ser., II (Rome 1931), 439. Cf. Hajjar, 270.

[11] In 1840 there were 571,400 Greek Uniates in Transylvania compared to 686,300 Orthodox, 601,100 Protestants, and 207,400 Roman Catholics.

Much more important was the group of the Ruthenians or Ukrainians who after the Union of Brest (1595) had fallen away from the Russian Church. After two centuries of uninterrupted Polish oppression, the Ruthenians had succumbed to the attraction of the powerful and rich Latin Church to a larger degree than the other Uniates and adopted a number of western customs in the area of devotional exercises and discipline. These were acknowledged and strengthened by the Council of Zamosc in 1720 and ultimately led to their clear differentiation from the Orthodox Church.

The Polish partitions at the end of the eighteenth century split the Ruthenians into Austrian and Russian groups. The Russian government understandably was hostile to the Latin and Polish strains of the Uniate Church of the Ukraine and immediately began efforts to lead them back to the fold of Orthodoxy through the use of force, attempts at conversion, and elimination of the clergy. Alexander I's (1801–25) desire to effect a union of the two Churches made possible a lessening of the tension, leading to a partial restoration of the hierarchy which had been suppressed almost totally under Catherine II. But the deterioration could no longer be stopped. The relation of the Holy See to the Uniate

---

[12] Details in *DThC* XIV, 31–51.

[13] Text in J. Moldovanu, *Acte sinodali* II (Blaj 1872), 68–74, 63–68. On the synod of 1821, see L. Pásztor in *AHPont* 6 (1968), 251–52, 300.

Church continued to be difficult, and the representative of the Catholic Church in Russia, Monsignor Siestrzencewicz, who viewed the end of the Uniates as inevitable, attempted to lead as many Uniates as possible to the Latin rite, mindless of the protests of the Ruthenian clergy and the prohibitions of Rome. At the time of the accession of Nicholas I in 1825, the Uniate Church in the Russian Empire was still represented by 1.5 million believers, two thousand priests, and six hundred monks, but it was in the process of decay. The deterioration was enhanced by the fighting between some secular clerical dignitaries, trained in the Josephine spirit at the general seminary of Vilna, with the pro-Roman Basilian monks, whose wealth was the envy of the others. Catherine II's plan of a radical Russification was disinterred with the help of some ambitious subjects like that of the intriguer J. Siemaszko. Under the pretext of strengthening the Uniate Church, its structure was refashioned in the likeness of the Orthodox Church by the ukase of 22 April 1828. The liturgy was adapted; the clergy systematically indoctrinated; and the episcopal sees were staffed, without paying any attention to Rome, with men who agreed with the government. After they had circulated among the clergy a petition with 1305 signatures, Siemaszko together with two other bishops in February 1829 at the Synod of Polozk drafted a bill of union with the Orthodox Church. Opposition from the population was ignored, and a number of the opponents thereupon fled to Galicia, while others secretly maintained their loyalty to Rome. Only the diocese of Chelm escaped immediate integration, as it was located in the Kingdom of Poland and thus belonged to another governmental jurisdiction. Its agony was delayed for about forty years because of the resistance of its bishop, Monsignor Szumborski.

The fate of the Ruthenians of Galicia, subordinated to Austria, was a happier one. In order to make them immune to Russian influence, Pius VII in 1807 created a new Church province[14] and revived the old title of the Metropolitan of Halicz which he awarded to the bishop of Lvov, with Přzemysl and Chelm as suffragan sees.[15] Within this new framework, the Uniate Ruthenian Church of the Habsburg Empire, numbering 2 million believers in 1840, was able to reorganize itself under the leadership of the able prelates Monsignor M. Lewicki in Lvov (1816–58) and Monsignor J. Suigurski in Přzemysl (1818–47). Pursuing the directives of the synod of Přzemysl of 1818,[16] they increased the number of parishes and schools and worked at a quantitative and qualitative improvement of the spirit of the Enlightenment. But the results of these efforts were limited, as the Ruthenians no longer had a leading class ever since the majority of the aristocracy had turned away from the Eastern rite in order to enjoy the privileges reserved to the Poles. People ultimately became accustomed to have the "peasant faith" of the Ruthenian serfs on one side and the "landlord faith" of the Latin rite on the other. The feeling of inferiority growing out of this situation was the reason for a greater inclination to adopt western rites. Yet the development did not prevent frequent tensions with the Latin clergy inasmuch as it, especially on the urging of Primate Archbishop A. A. Ankwicz (1815–33), favored the change of rite. The Latin clergy thus followed its own nationalistic Polish feelings and the conviction that in this fashion the Ruthenians could best be strengthened in their Catholic faith. The attitude of the Holy See, however, was more differentiated. It encouraged Latinization, but did not wish to see the suppression of the Ruthenian rite. On the contrary, Gregory XVI in 1843 considered the appointment of a patriarch for the Uniates in the Habsburg Dual Monarchy,[17] because he wanted to encourage the return to the Roman faith of many of the Orthodox still there (nearly 3 million, principally in Hungary) and to protect the Uniates better against the attraction of the Russian Church.

---

[14] *JP* IV, 493ff.

[15] From 1795 until 1815 the diocese of Chelm actually was part of the areas belonging to the Habsburgs. After it had come under Russian domination, Leo XII in 1828 separated it from the Lemberg metropole.

[16] Documents in G. Lakota, *Tri sinodi peremiski* (Přzemysl 1939), 153–65.

In the Habsburg Empire of the seventeenth century, there lived in Podcarpathia another group of several hundred thousand Uniate Ruthenians who had never belonged to Poland and whose customs therefore in some points deviated from those of the Galician Ruthenians. After 1781 they had their own diocese of Mukačevo. The growing number of converts moved Pius VII in 1818 to establish a second diocese in Presov. Zealous and expert bishops, who towered above the intended mediocrity of the prelates of the Russian Ukraine, lent a new buoyancy to the religious life with the help of the Catholic revival of the Habsburg Empire. The rivalry between Austria, to which Galicia belonged, and Hungary, to which Podcarpathia was subordinated, prevented the connection of the two dioceses with the metropolitan see of Lvov. Thus, just as the Romanian Uniate dioceses of Transylvania, they remained part of the Latin province of Gran, with the result that regulations concerning the Hungarian clergy were also accepted by these Uniates.

Immediately after 1815, the Austrian government for a brief time nourished the hope that the Serbs of Dalmatia, who after the dissolution of the Venetian republic in 1799 had hurriedly returned to Orthodoxy, could be induced to return to Rome and thus form another group of "Uniate Greeks." But all of its efforts were to no avail;[18] in this area there survived only the small diocese of Križevci, founded in 1777 in Bosnia, which in 1847 was attached to the metropolitan see of Zagreb.

---

[17] A. Baran in *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii* 3 (1958/60), 454–88.

The unsuccessful efforts of the Vienna government in Dalmatia, as well as the more effective support which it granted to the more or less Latinized reorganization of the Uniate dioceses in Transylvania, Galicia, and Podcarpathia, were part of a comprehensive larger plan aiming at the largest possible absorption of the remaining Orthodox groups in the Empire. It did not do so, as was the case with Rome,[19] for confessional reasons, but rather for the political reason of preventing the formation of beachheads of Russian influence in the area of the Balkans and Danube. Such ulterior motives behind the Uniate policy of the Habsburg states for a long time to come poisoned the relationship between the Vatican and the Russian Orthodox Church.

---

[18] See G. Markovič, *Gli Slavi e i Papi* II (Zagreb 1897), 431–34.

[19] And also for some Eastern clergymen in the Dual Monarchy such as the priest A. Horvath, the bishop of Székesfehérvár, J. Horvath, and chiefly the Benedictine abbot I. Guzmics, who wrote extensively on Christian unity (see *DSAM* VII, 697–98).

CHAPTER 11

The Resumption of Missionary Work

The Beginnings of Restoration prior to Gregory XVI

The French Revolution had no direct catastrophic effect upon missionary work. Only a few French possessions in the Antilles and in India were affected by it. At home, however, the destructive consequences of the activity of the encyclopedists and the deists were more than evident. Until the turn of the century, the situation in the missionary countries was approximately as described by the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Stefano Borgia, in his comprehensive treatment of 1773.[1]

This far-seeing secretary and future prefect of the Congregation also attempted to help the Chinese Church, threatened by continuing persecutions and a growing shortage of missionaries, by ordaining Chinese bishops. Although his memoranda of 1785 were dealt with negatively by the cardinals of the Congregation in 1787,[2] they were taken up again in 1817 after his death in response to the deteriorating situation. Ultimately they were rejected in 1819,[3] and only one hundred years later were his suggestions implemented.

---

[1] N. Kowalsky OMI, *Stand der katholischen Missionen um das Jahr 1765 an Hand der Übersicht des Propagandasekretärs Stefano Borgia aus dem Jahre 1773* (Part of the series of *NZM* 16) (Beckenried 1957).

At the turn of the century, the problems of the missions required particular attention because it was a time of growing turbulence. The uninterrupted wars following the French Revolution and especially those under Napoleon made normal communications between the central office of the missions and the non-European areas almost impossible, and even the work of the central office itself was seriously disrupted. This disruption occurred first in 1798, when General Berthier occupied Rome and the offices of the Congregation. Hardly reorganized after 1800, the Congregation was almost totally destroyed after 1808 when Pius VII was taken into French captivity. The estates of the Congregation became the property of the French state; the printing house was closed down and its valuable type was handed over to the French state printing house; and finally, the entire archives of the Congregation were transferred to Paris.[4] Only after the fall of Napoleon and the return of Pius VII was the Congregation gradually able to resume its orderly function and, after 1817, to improve its financial situation slightly.[5]

Although Napoleon's plans to transfer the Pope and the Congregation as well to Paris failed, they indicate that the Emperor appreciated the great importance of missionary work, at least as a political activity. In a letter to Pius VII of 28 August 1802, Napoleon offered the Pope the protection of France for all missions in the Near East and China.[6] In a memorandum in the same year Minister Portalis spoke of the political value of French missionary work, citing concrete examples of English efforts to establish such a protectorate in China.[7]

---

[2] Published by V. Bartocetti in *Pensiero Missionario* VI (1934), 231–47.

[3] J. Beckmann, "Beratungen der Propagandakongregation über die Weihe chinesischer Bischöfe von 1787–1819" in *ZMR* 30 (1940), 199–217.—The great concern of Rome to help the threatened missions was embodied in the plans of the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Monsignor Coppola, in 1805 and subsequent years to found a seminary for secular priests who were to function as professors for the training of a native clergy in the various countries. J. Metzler OMI, "Missionsseminarien und Missionskollegien. Ein Plan zur Förderung des einheimischen Klerus um 1805" in *ZMR* 44 (1960), 257–71.

[4] J. Schmidlin, "Die Propaganda während der napoleonischen Invasion" in *ZMR* 12 (1922), 112–15.

[5] The archives were returned in 1817, but many volumes were lost. Only in 1925 were seventy-four volumes returned from the Vienna State Archives to the Propaganda archives in consequence of the efforts of the Austrian legate and historian Baron von Pastor. These volumes constituted the *"Fondo di Vienna."* N. Kowalsky, *Inventario dell'Archivio storico della Santa Congregazione "de Propaganda Fide"* (Publication of the *NZM* 17) (Beckenried 1961); id., "L'Archivio della Santa Congregazione "de Propaganda Fide" ed i suoi Archivisti" in *Annales Pont. Univ. Urbaniana* (Rome 1964), 33–53.

The leading circles in France soon added to this political interpretation by an understanding of the religious concern for the propagation of the faith. The savior of the mission seminary in Paris and future general of the Congregation, Denis Chaumont (1752–1819) was a quiet but successful spokesman for missionary work. From his exile in London he tried to revive the missionary spirit through strong exhortations and the publication of mission reports.[8] In 1805, an imperial decree restored the Paris mission seminary together with the seminary of the Fathers of the Holy Spirit, who were chiefly active in the French Antilles.[9]

This success was prepared by René de Chateaubriand's (1768–1848) *Le Génie du Christianisme* (1802). The work principally served to revive the Catholic religion in France and the missions, especially in America, with which Chateaubriand was personally acquainted.[10]

The book by this romantic was proof of the intimate connection between a revived Catholicism and the activity of spreading the faith. This connection explains why the Church in France, although for a long time affected by rationalistic and anti-Christian forces, was gradually able to hold a position of supremacy in Catholic missions. The focus of spreading the faith increasingly shifted from the Iberian countries to

---

[6] Streit XII, 17.

[7] F. Combaluzier CM, "Les missions au temps de Napoléon" in *RHM* 14 (1937), 258–66, 395–402, 521–24 (Portalis's memorandum, 261f.). A summary of the efforts of England to gain the favor of Catholic missionaries and a missionary protectorate can be found in L. Wei Tsing-sing, *La politique missionnaire de la France en Chine 1842–1856* (Paris 1960), 70–76.

[8] In China since 1776, he went to Paris in 1874 as the representative of the China mission, was forced to flee in 1792, and returned in 1814. His financial contribution made possible the purchase of the confiscated seminary buildings. After 1814 he was general-superior. A. Launay, *Mémorial de la Société des Missions Étrangères* II (Paris 1916), 126f.

[9] Text of the decree in A. Launay, *Histoire Générale* II (Paris 1894), 377–78. The mother house of the Lazarists was returned to Paris only in 1817 in response to a rather optimistic memorandum of the former China missionary J. Fr. Richenet (1759–1836): "Note de M. Richenet CM sur la Mission des Lazaristes en Chine" in *T'oung Pao* XX (1920/21), 117–29. The government paid for the newly acquired generalate in the Rue de Sèvres.

[10] He described them in the fourth book and parts of the fifth and sixth books. J. Schmidlin, "Chateaubriand und Maistre über die Mission" in *ZMR* 21 (1931), 295–97; J. Beckmann, "Chateaubriand et les Bethléemites," *NZM* 19 (1963), 130f.

France. Here new missionary orders and congregations sprang up. In 1805, the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary (Picpus Fathers) was founded, a congregation which provided the first complete group of Catholic missionaries in Oceania,[11] and in 1807 the Sisters of Joseph of Cluny began continuous work in Africa and Asia.[12] In 1816, the Oblates of the Immaculate Virgin Mary became the modern apostles to Canada,[13] and in 1836 the Marian Society (Marists) was given responsibility for a huge area in the South Seas.[14]

While French orders and societies trained and sent out new missionaries, Marie-Pauline Jaricot as well (1799–1862) sought to help the missionaries by founding in Lyon in 1822 the Association for the Spreading of the Faith. The Association offered its help through regular prayers by the members and through collection of a weekly "penny for the missions."[15] Although the initial efforts of Marie-Pauline Jaricot were made in close contact with the Paris mission seminary, as early as the founding meeting plans were made to encompass all Catholic missions, a plan heartily supported and inspired by the two French bishops in America, Flaget (1763–1850) and Dubourg (1766–1833). The fact of such "Catholicity" was probably the reason for the fast growth of the association beyond the French borders at first to the neighboring countries of Savoy and Piedmont,[16] then to Switzerland (1827)[17] and the Netherlands (1830),[18] and ultimately to America, Portugal, and Spain.[19] Due to the exclusively French direction and administration, independent associations sprang up in Austria and Germany, where several missionary circles had been formed. People in Vienna founded the Leopoldine Foundation[20] in 1828; people in the Rhineland organized themselves as the Xaverius Society[21] in 1834, and in Bavaria the Ludwig Society[22] was founded in 1838. In 1824, the journal *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* began to appear regularly, at first in French and then in translation throughout most of Europe.[23] After the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had been looted twice, first by revolutionary troops and then by Napoleon, the Association for the Spreading of the Faith became the most important source of money for the missions in modern times.[24]

---

[11] St. Perron, *Vie du T.R.P. M.-J. Coudrin, fondateur et premier supérieur de la Congrégation des Sacrés-Cœurs de Jésus et Marie* (Paris 1940).

[12] Founded by Anne-Marie Javouhey (1779–1851). G. Goyau, *Un grand Homme: Mère Javouhey, apôtre des Noirs* (Paris 1929).

[13] Founded by Ch. J. E. de Mazenod (1782–1861). J. Leflon, *Eugène de Mazenod. Évêque de Marseilles, Fondateur des Missionnaires Oblats de Marie* I-III (Paris 1957/65).

[14] Founded by J. Cl. Colin (1790–1875). G. Goyau, *Le Vénérable Jean Colin* (Paris 1913). See also the summary description of these orders in L. Deries, *Les congrégations religieuses au temps de Napoléon* (Paris 1928). (*Les missions et les missionnaires au temps de Napoléon*, 107–19).

[15] De Lathoud, *Marie-Pauline Jaricot*, 2 vols. (Paris 1937).—On the precursors of the association, especially within the framework of the Paris mission seminary, see H. Sy, "Précurseurs de L'Œuvre de la Propagation de la Foi" in *NZM* 5 (1949), 170–88.

[16] On the quick expansion of the association see A. Schmidlin, "Zur Zentenarfeier des Vereins der Glaubensverbreitung" in *ZMR* 12 (1922), 65–76; M.-A. Sadrain, "Les premières années de la Propagation de la Foi" in *RHM* 16 (1939), 321–48, 554–79. In Piedmont the establishment of the association was intimately connected with the religious renewal. See C. Bona IMC, *La rinascita Missionaria in Italia* (Turin 1964).

[17] J. Beckmann, "Die katholischen Schweizermissionen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart" in *StMis* 9 (Rome 1956), 135–36.

[18] A. J. J. M. van den Eerenbeent, *Die Missie-actie in Nederland (1600–1940)* (Nijmegen 1945), 81–84.

[19] A. Schmidlin, op. cit., (Note 16), 88.

The Bull *Sollicitudo omnium,* published by Pius VII on 17 August 1814, restored the Society of Jesus. This was an act of the greatest consequence for the missions. Shortly after assuming office, the Pope had affirmed the existence of the order in Russia. The Society had continued to exist there under the protection of Catherine II, but only papal recognition brought about an increase in its membership in Russia.[25] The restoration of the Society was intended to rejuvenate the old Jesuit mission to China as well. The Russian government expected that by placing this mission under its protection, an improvement of its relations with China could be effected. Several attempts to do this were fruitless.[26] But they illustrated symbolically the great esteem which the China mission still enjoyed in leading circles. Together with that in

---

[20] J. Thauren, *Ein Gnadenstrom zur Neuen Welt und seine Quelle. Die Leopoldinenstiftung zur Unterstützung der amerikanischen Missionen* (Mödling 1940); G. Kummer, *Die Leopoldinen-Stiftung (1829–1914)* (Vienna 1966).

[21] The Rhenish Circle was active for the Association for the Spreading of the Faith in Lyon as early as 1827, but the founding of the Xavier Association was possible under a new name and independent direction only in 1834. The Aachen physician Heinrich Hahn (1800–82) was the life and soul of the efforts. Biography by C. Bäumker (Aachen 1930); G. Schückler, *Brücken zur Welt. 125 Jahre Aachener Missionszentrale* (Aachen 1967).

[22] W. Mathäser OSB, *Der Ludwig-Missionsverein in der Zeit König Ludwigs I. von Bayern* (Munich 1939). In Bavaria also support for the central office in Lyon went back to the year 1827.

[23] Streit, I 571–73, lists editions in nineteen languages. Inasmuch as especially in the first decades the missionary bishops themselves or their representatives composed the reports, the volumes covering the nineteenth century are one of the most important sources for missionary history in our time.

[24] According to the accounting of the association, it contributed 500 million francs to the missions during the first hundred years of its existence (A. Schmidlin, op. cit., [Note 16], 69).

[25] J. A. Otto, *P. Roothaan,* 9ff.—When the order was dissolved in Russia in 1820, 350 Jesuits, who were active in thirty-two settlements, were forced to leave the country.

[26] J. A. Otto, op. cit., 64–81; G. Garraghan SJ, "John Anthony Grassi SJ (1775–1849)" in *CHR* 23 (1937), 273–92.

Indochina, the China mission was the only one which, in spite of all obstacles, had maintained a vibrant religious life.

Of fundamental importance for all of China was the first synod in Szechuan conducted by the martyr Bishop Gabriel Taurin Dufresse (1750–1815) together with fourteen Chinese and three European priests. The minutes of the synod were approved and published by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1822, and a decree of 1832 made the decisions of the synod applicable to all of China.[27] Although this synod with its far-reaching decisions gave the impression of peaceful conditions in China, in fact, local chicaneries continued and in 1805 and 1811 grew into general persecutions. The mission in Peking became a victim of the persecution of 1805, and its missionaries were forced to leave the country. In consequence of the imperial decrees of 1811, Bishop Dufresse of Szechuan died a martyr's death in 1815, and the same fate befell the Italian Franciscan Giovanni da Triora of Shansi in 1816 and the French Lazarist Francois Clet (1748–1820) in 1820. In addition to persecutions, the Franciscan missions in the north suffered also from internal difficulties. The vicar apostolic G. B. de Mandello was removed from office because of differences with native priests.[28]

However, despite all of these persecutions, the external organization of the dioceses and vicariates apostolic in China not only remained intact, but the European and Chinese missionaries also managed to create new Christian centers. These centers were small and widely scattered, but, in the course of the nineteenth century, they expanded to regular communities.[29] By 1815, eighty-nine Chinese and eighty European priests devoted themselves to missionary work and ministered to two hundred ten thousand Christians.[30] The relatively high number of Chinese clergymen illustrates the active way in which the European missionaries had conducted their training and education. To the existing training centers in Macao and distant places in inner China was added in 1808 the newly opened general seminary of the Paris missionaries in Pulo-Penang.[31]

---

[27] Streit, XII, 22f., 89.

[28] K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China* (New York 1929), 175ff.

[29] Monsignor Dufresse in 1814 reported the following details for his area: in East Szechuan there were 123 centers, 73 in the west, 73 in the north, and 183 in the south, altogether 577. In addition, the provinces of Kweichow (10) and Yinnan (25) were under his jurisdiction. J. Beckmann, "Die Lage der katholischen Missionen in China um 1815" in *NZM* 2 (1946), 222.

[30] Ibid., 217–23.

[31] P. Destombes, *Le Collège Général de la Société des Missions Étrangères* (Hong Kong 1934). The seminary had existed since 1665 in Siam, had to flee a hundred years later after the invasion of the Burmese, but after several attempts was finally reestablished on British territory.

Efforts by Pius VII to provide support for beleaguered Catholics elsewhere, such as in South Africa, Australia, India and Oceania, had only short-lived results or were total failures. It was his missionary zeal, however, that reorganized the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, restored the Society of Jesus, confirmed new missionary societies, and aided the Association for the Spreading of the Faith. Pius VII prepared the way for the restoration period under the pontificates of Leo XII (1823–29) and Pius VIII (1829–30).[32]

The Restoration of Missionary Work under Gregory XVI (1831–46)

In 1831, the Camaldolensian Cardinal Mauro Cappellari was elected Pope. Since 1826 he had been prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith,[33] and as such was well acquainted with the deficiencies, obstacles, needs, and tasks of missionary work. As Pope, he was eager to promote and to instill new life into the various missionary endeavors.[34]

Gregory XVI saw as his first task the acquainting of the Church of the western world with the duties and tasks of spreading the faith, a task which heretofore had been conducted primarily by the use of patronage powers. To do this, the Pope used his first papal mission Encyclical *Probe nostis* of 15 August 1840,[35] extensive support of the Association for the Spreading of the Faith,[36] and recognition and support of the Holy Childhood Association,[37] founded in 1843 by Bishop Charles de Forbin-Janson of Nancy. The national mission associations in Aachen,

---

[32] Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte* I, 307–43, Leflon, 343–56, Delacroix, III, 45–51.

[33] J. Schmidlin, "Gregor XVI. als Missionspapst (1831–46)" in *ZMR* 21 (1931), 209–28; id., *Papstgeschichte* I, 662–75; C. Costantini, "Gregorio XVI e le Missioni" in *Gregorio XVI, Miscellanea Commemorativa* II (*Misc. Hist. Pont.* XIV/2) (Rome 1948), 1–23; R. S. Maloney SX, *Mission Directives of Pope Gregory XVI (1831–1846)*, Partial edition (Rome 1959).

[34] C. Costantini, op. cit., 6–8 with a list of all decrees issued by Gregory as prefect of the Congregation.

[35] *JP* V, 250–53.

[36] The partial edition of Maloney's dissertation mentioned in footnote 33 deals with this aid. It was the Pope's purpose to establish the international and missionary character of the association. With this objective in mind even the work of the Catholic apostolate of Vincent Pallotti, personally approved by the Pope earlier, was dissolved in 1838. On the other hand, he approved the expenditure of association funds for the construction of a new Jesuit college at Schwyz but withdrew his permission in 1835 after a protest by Cardinal Fransoni, prefect of the Congregation.

[37] P. Lesourd, *Un grand cœur missionnaire: Monsignor de Forbin-Janson (1785–1844), Fondateur de l'Œuvre de la Sainte-Enfance* (Paris 1944).

Vienna, and Munich also received support from Gregory XVI, who attempted to subordinate them to the direction of Lyon.[38]

One of the chief concerns of the Pope was to increase mission personnel. Spain and Portugal, which in the past had provided most of them, in the course of persecutions between 1834 and 1836 had dissolved almost all of the orders and religious associations and expelled or imprisoned their members.[39] These persecutions had detrimental consequences for the Spanish successor states in America and for the Portuguese missions. Although the Jesuits were the most persecuted group in the Iberian states, France and Switzerland, Gregory XVI sought help for their beleaguered missions. The Pope's position was also adopted by the Jesuit General Johann Philipp Roothaan (1785–1853), and found enthusiastic readiness among the Jesuits just as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Ever since the Dutch general had taken over direction of the order in 1829, it had become internally and externally strengthened; and at his death it again numbered 5209 members.[40] Even more important for the organic growth of the Church was the fundamentally positive attitude of General Roothaan toward the central mission office of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. He engaged tirelessly in completely adjusting the work of the Jesuit missions to this highest organ of missionary activity. His struggle for cooperation by both parties was to be of benefit not only for all mission work, but also for the activity of other orders and congregations.[41] The end of this development saw a strategy in effect to this very day: the division of missionary areas and their transfer to the various orders and congregations.

The Paris mission seminary also followed the new trend. Until the nineteenth century it had provided the vicars apostolic for the Far Eastern mission areas, but had sent missionaries only in isolated cases. Now the bishops were joined by missionaries of specific societies, who took entire mission areas under their care. Bishop Luquet (1810–58) exercised lasting influence in the process. As seminarist, he wrote the guidelines for the establishment of a native hierarchy, including cardinals, and the training of a native clergy, thereby reviving the ideas which had guided the seminary in the period of its beginnings.[42] In fact, the seminary became the principal mission society for the Far East in the nineteenth century.

---

[38] Maloney, op. cit., 49–55.—These different associations became branches of the Association for the Spreading of the Faith, tied in more or less closely, depending on the circumstances.

[39] Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte* I, 614–27.

[40] J. A. Otto, *P. Roothaan*, 106.

[41] Ibid., 504–20.—Concerning the historical development of the legal aspect, see S. Masarei, *De missionum institutione ac de relationibus inter Superiores Missionum et Superiores Religiosos* (Rome 1940), especially 59–84.

One of Monsignor Luquet's associates was Franz Maria Libermann (1802–52),[43] the son of a rabbi and a converted Catholic. In 1841, Libermann founded the Association of the Missionaries of the Holy Heart of Mary, which, in 1848, united with the Society of the Holy Ghost[44] and adopted its name. This association operated entirely in the service of the blacks, who at his time were virtually without missionaries. In 1841, the association began its mission and pastoral work on the island of Mauritius and in 1842 on the island of Réunion. The first ten missionaries, seven priests and three friars, arrived in Senegal in West Africa in 1843, but within one year all but one of them had succumbed to the tropical climate. In spite of all losses the ranks were refilled again and again, and in West and East Africa[45] one mission area after the other was entrusted to the Congregation of the Holy Ghost. The fruitful development of missionary work was due not only to the heroic efforts of the missionaries, but also to the visionary instructions of Libermann, who, very much like Monsignor Luquet, never lost sight of a native Church.[46]

Before Libermann's spiritual sons reached Africa, a devout woman,

---

[42] *Lettres à Monseigneur l'évêque de Langres sur la Congrégation des Missions Étrangères* (Paris 1842).—In 1845 Luquet was appointed suffragan bishop of Pondichéry by Gregory XVI, but was not accepted by his co-workers. A. Launay, *Mémorial de la Société des Missions Étrangères* II (Paris 1916), 411–13; R. Roussel, *Un Précurseur: Monseigneur Luquet, 1810–1858* (Langres 1960); J. Millet, *La Pensée missionnaire de Monseigneur Luquet* (Unpublished dissertation, Paris 1962).

[43] Literature by and on Libermann in Streit XVII, 422–28; also P. Blanchard, *Le Vénérable Libermann 1802–52,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960).

[44] The society, founded by Father Poullart des Places (1679–1719), devoted itself principally to missionary and pastoral work in the French colonies. J. Michel CSSp, *Claude-François Poullart des Places. Fondateur de la Congrégation du St. Esprit, 1679–1719* (Paris 1962); J. Janin CSSp, *La Religion aux Colonies Françaises sous l'Ancien Régime* (Paris 1942); V. Lithard CSSp, *Spiritualité Spiritaine. Étude sur les Écrits Spirituels de Monseigneur Poullart des Places et du Vénérable Libermann* (Paris 1948); H. J. Koren and M. Carrignan, *Les Écrits de Monseigneur Claude-François Poullart des Places, fondateur de la Congrégation du Saint Esprit* (Pittsburgh-Louvain 1959).

[45] H. J. Koren, *The Spiritans. A History of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost* (Pittsburgh-Louvain 1958).

[46] For example, Libermann wrote to the first missionaries in Dakar: "Become Negroes with the Negroes in order to educate them the way they need to be educated. Do not educate them in the European fashion, but let them keep their characteristics! Act toward them like servants toward their master . . ." Cited in A. Engel CSSp, *Die Missionsmethode der Missionare vom Heiligen Geiste auf dem afrikanischen Festland* (Knechtsteden 1934), 41.

Anna Maria Javouhey (1779–1851) had begun the work of spreading the faith. In 1807, she founded the Congregation of the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Cluny with the purpose of reviving the languishing religious life in France. When she heard of the great misery in Africa, she sent her sisters to the island of Réunion in 1817 and to Senegal in 1819. Accompanied by six companions, she herself brought aid to the suffering sisters in West Africa, organized mission work in Senegal and neighboring Sierra Leone and, after 1827, devoted herself principally to the blacks in America and Guyana. Convinced of the urgent necessity of having missionary priests, she intended founding such an organization but deferred to Father Libermann when she heard of his efforts. Mother Anna's enterprise laid the foundation for the work of the sisters in Africa.[47] Moreover, not only did she act as the pathfinder for missions in Africa; the example of her sisters was also the signal for a general participation of women in the modern Catholic apostolate overseas.

Even before the dissolution of the orders in the Iberian countries, the shortage of missionaries had negative results in the vast reaches of Asia which were part of the Portuguese patronage. Gregory XVI, as former prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, was well acquainted with the local conditions and from the beginning of his pontificate sought to ameliorate the situation. In 1832 he gave Portugal the choice of either fulfilling its duties as patron or of resigning from the patronage. When Portugal failed to respond to the papal request, the Pope himself undertook the reorganization of ecclesiastical affairs in Asia, beginning first in India.

After solving a number of problems which had originated in part from the participating orders and in part from the governments of Portugal and England, Gregory XVI in 1834 reestablished the vicariate apostolic of Bengal (Calcutta),[48] where the British East India Company, which virtually ruled the area, had its headquarters ever since 1733. Here, in 1819, was created the first Anglo-Indian bishopric. But here also the Portuguese Augustinians tenaciously clung to their traditional patronage and acknowledged only the bishop of Meliapur or his representative as their ecclesiastical superior.[49]

A similar situation existed in Madras, where the British had built a fort as early as 1641, and never had permitted admission to Portuguese missionaries. Pastoral care here was in the hands of French Capuchins.[50] As in Calcutta, the establishment of the vicariate apostolic of Madras in 1832 did not fully untangle the jurisdictional problems. The same was true for the vicariates of Pondichéry, Ceylon, and Madura, all of which were established in 1836.[51]

---

[47] Literature in Streit XVII, 383–86. The best biography is G. Goyau, *Un grand Homme: Mère Javouhey, apôtre des Noirs* (Paris 1929). Her letters appeared in 5 volumes (Paris 1909/17). Beatified in 1950.

[48] *JP* V, 95f.; The separation from Meliapur occurred in 1835, ibid., 135–36.

[49] N. Kowalski OMI, "Die Errichtung des Apostolischen Vikariats Kalkutta nach den Akten des Propagandaarchivs" in *ZMR* 36 (1952), 117–27, 187–201, 37 (1953), 209–28. For the history of the Jesuits in Calcutta at this time, see J. A. Otto, *P. Roothaan*, 257–83.

Rome's unusual and significant intervention in India's mission situation was not accepted well everywhere by the patronage clergy. Some priests and their communities refused to obey the new bishops, who in turn demanded from Rome an unequivocal decision which would put an end to the disastrous double jurisdiction. It was not until 28 April 1838 that Gregory XVI signed the Decree *Multa praeclare,*[52] and he failed to inform Portugal and the corresponding administrative levels in India of his decree in the correct form. His brief dissolved the patronage bishoprics of Kotschin, Kranganore, and Meliapur in India and the bishopric of Malacca in Indochina. The effect was disastrous, and the sporadic opposition to the vicar apostolic now hardened to a united front and in the subsequent period resulted in increased confusion.

Multa praeclare shook Portugal out of its lethargy. The Portuguese government nominated the Benedictine José Maria da Silva Torres (1800–54) for the archepiscopal see of Goa, vacant since 1831, and in 1843 Gregory XVI accepted him.[53] Unfortunately the Pope appointed Torres according to the example of earlier bulls and only a private letter *Nuntium ad te* obligated the new archbishop to acknowledge the Brief *Multa praeclare* and the subsequent reduction of the archbishop's jurisdiction.[54] As a Portuguese national, the new archbishop was compelled to act in accordance with *Multa praeclare,* while the vicars apostolic acted according to *Nuntium ad te.* Thus from the beginning the two points of view clashed irreconcilably and poisoned India's religious-ecclesiastical climate.[55]

[50] N. Kowalsky OMI, "Die Errichtung des Apostolischen Vikariats Madras nach den Akten des Propagandaarchivs" in *NZM* 8 (1952), 36–48, 119–26, 193–210.

[51] *JP* V, 97, 161, 168.—For Ceylon: J. Rommerskirchen OMI, "Die Errichtung des Apostolischen Vikariats Ceylon" in *ZMR* 28 (1938), 124–32. For Madura: J. A. Otto, *P. Roothaan,* 283–339.

[52] *JP* V, 195–98.—J. Metzler OMI, "Die Aufnahme des Apostolischen Breve *Multa praeclare* in Indien" in *ZMR* 38 (1954), 295–317.

[53] J. Metzler OMI, "Die Patronatswirren in Indien unter Erzbischof Silva Torres (1843–49)" in *ZMR* 42 (1958), 292–308.

[54] *JP* V, 316–17.

[55] It is no longer correct to describe the situation thus created as "Goan schism", as—aside from subjective opinion and ignorance—the position of the archbishop cannot be called schismatic. A. Lourenço, *Utrum fuerit Schisma Goanum post Breve "Multa praeclare" usque ad annum 1849* (Goa 1947) rejects the earlier interpretation with documents and fresh reasoning.

Gregory XVI in 1834 established the vicariate apostolic of Sardhana[56] and in 1845 the vicariate of Patna in the Capuchin mission of Hindustan. To the latter, he appointed the Swiss Capuchin Anastasius Hartmann.[57] Less troublesome than the reorganization of the dissolved Portuguese dioceses of India was that of Malacca which, first joined with Burma (vicariate apostolic of Ava and Pegu) and then after 1840 combined with Siam, was divided into two vicariates in 1841.[58]

The most vivid growth of Christianity in Indochina took place in the former empires of Tonking and Cochinchina. Under Emperor Gialong (died 1821), who had ascended the throne with the help of the French and notably that of the vicar apostolic Pierre Pigneau de Behaine (died 1799), the mission experienced a period of rest which enabled it to heal the damages of the persecutions of the eighteenth century. In 1830, under his successor, Ming Mang (died 1841), however, a bloody persecution began which claimed hundreds of Christians, twenty Vietnamese priests, nine European missionaries, and four bishops as its victims.[59] Gregory XVI in 1839 directed a letter of consolation and encouragement[60] to the persecuted Church and, in a public consistory of 27 April 1840, praised the Christian fortitude of the individual martyrs.[61] The Church was able to continue its existence only under the protection of the forests and rivers.

In spite of persecutions and a shortage of missionaries, the China mission survived relatively intact during the first half of the nineteenth century.[62] That this was so was owed principally to the uninterrupted maintenance of the office of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Macao.[63] Another factor was that Gregory XVI dealt more circumspectly with the bishoprics there than in India.[64] For example, in 1838, after the death of the last bishop of Nanking, Gaetano Pirés Pereira, who was never able to leave his residence and work in Peking, the Pope appointed only an apostolic administrator, the Italian secular priest L. de Besi. The establishment of the vicariate apostolic of Korea in 1831 and of the vicariates apostolic of Manchuria in 1838 and Mongolia in 1840 hardly touched upon Peking's interests. Only the vicariate apostolic of Shantung was separated from the bishopric in 1839. The establishment of other vicariates in 1838 in Hu-Kuang, Kiangsi, and Chekiang concerned only areas which were already under the jurisdiction of the Congregation. A real collision with Portuguese officials did occur, however, when the Congregation claimed jurisdiction over Hong Kong, which the Chinese had ceded to the British. In 1841, the Congregation elevated the area to a prefecture apostolic and appointed the procurator in Macao, Theodor Joset, as prefect apostolic. Joset was expelled from Macao and in 1842 died of deprivation in a straw hut in Hong Kong.[65]

---

[56] *JP* V, 108–10 in addition to other documents of Gregory (letter to the prince), S. Noti SJ, *Das Fürstentum Sardhana* (Freiburg 1906).

[57] *JP* V, 351, 352.—A. Jann a Stans OMCap, ed., *Monumenta Anastasiana* I/1 (Lucerne 1939), 1st appendix 970–1152, also documents for the antecedents of Patna, i.e., of the Capuchin mission of Hindustan; W. Bühlmann OFMCap, *Pionier der Einheit. Bischof Anastasius Hartmann* (Paderborn-Zürich 1966).

[58] Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte* I, 670.

[59] F. Schwager SVD, "Aus der Vorgeschichte der hinterindischen Missionen" in *ZMR* 3 (1913), 146–56.

[60] *JP* V, 318–20.

[61] *JP* V, 229–31.

[62] J. Beckmann, "Die Lage der katholischen Kirche in China um 1815" in *NZM* 2 (1946), 217–22.

[63] Under Gregory as cardinal prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and as Pope, this office was held by Raffaele Umpierres (until 1834), then Theodore Joset, and by Antonio Feliciani after 1842. A history of this institution, so significant for the Asiatic missions, has not yet been written. For the years 1834–42, see J. Beckmann, "Monsignor Theodor Joset, Prokurator der Propaganda in China und erster Apostolischer Präfekt von Hongkong (1804–42)" in *ZSKG* (1942), 19–38, 121–39.

It was also during Gregory XVI's pontificate that the first three missionaries of the recently reinstated Society of Jesus were sent out. In 1841 the missionaries arrived in Macao and soon became active in the diocese of Nanking.[66] According to the plans of General Roothaan, the China mission was to be a bridge for the reopening of the mission in Japan. Korea, the nearest and most natural connection with Japan, was difficult to reach. Only in 1837 was a missionary priest able to step upon Korean soil, to be followed in 1838 by the first bishop, Monsignor Imbert, who in the following year became the victim of bloody persecution. In 1836, the Ryukyu Islands were assigned to the Korea mission in the expectation that they would facilitate the entry into Japan. The Paris missionary Father Forcade was appointed in 1846 as vicar apostolic,[67] but all attempts to establish a mission in Japan proper failed.

A new epoch in Chinese mission history was introduced with the Chinese-French treaty of Whampoa in 1844, which had arisen out of the unfortunate Opium War and the subsequent treaty of Nanking. At Whampoa, the French plenipotentiary De Lagrené succeeded in obtaining not only the freedom of action which France wanted, but also, albeit to a limited degree, freedom of religion as well.[68] This treaty concluded the period of the old China mission. The new mission, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century and the twentieth century, stood in the shadow of the French protectorate.

---

[64] The reason for such caution was probably the procurate of the Congregation in Macao. It exercised its function until 1842.

[65] J. Beckmann, "Monsignor Theodor Joset," 132–37; A. Choi, *L'érection du premier vicariat apostolique et les origines du Catholicisme en Corée* (Schöneck–Beckenried 1961).

[66] J. A. Otto, *P. Roothaan*, 350–83.—The administrator of Nanking, Count de Besi, had fallen out with the French Lazarists. A conflict with the new missionaries caused him to resign in 1848 and to leave China.

[67] *JP* V, 359.

In the Philippines, the spreading of the faith was continued during the nineteenth century within the framework of the established hierarchy, and in Indonesia, established in 1831 and designated as vicariate apostolic in 1842, was compelled to limit its activity to the European population. The missions in Oceania, however, found a vast new field.[69] The first Catholic representatives, the Picpus Fathers, arrived in Honolulu in 1827; Protestant missionaries had been active there since 1797. In 1833, Polynesia became a vicariate apostolic,[70] and in 1836 West Oceania was separated from Lyon for the benefit of the Marists, a portion of which was elevated to the vicariate of Central Oceania in 1842.[71]

The contrast between denominations, so evident in Oceania from the very beginning, was accentuated by political differences as well, with the Protestants siding with England and the Catholics with France. Both denominations, following the example of the old Paraguay mission, had established autonomous theocracies in their areas, headed by native chieftains. But these social creations were not impervious to the increasing European penetration of the South Seas, and the missionaries were forced to look for new supports. They found these in their home states, with the Protestants looking toward England and the Catholics toward

---

[68] A. Grosse-Aschhoff OFM, *The Negotiations between Ch'i-Ying and Lagrené 1844 to 1846* (St. Bonaventura/N.Y. 1950).—According to this examination, resting on Chinese documents, Lagrené had neither the order nor the personal inclination to demand religious freedom for the missionaries. The pertinent clauses were virtually pressed upon him by the Chinese, who probably had the hope of playing the French against the English. Aside from a few private letters, missionaries did not influence the negotiations. Older descriptions, as well as that by B. Wirth, *Imperialistische Übersee- und Missionspolitik, dargestellt am Beispiel Chinas* (Münster 1968), 20, are therefore incorrect. See also L. Wei Tsing-sing, *La Politique missionnaire de la France en Chine 1842–1856* (Paris 1960).

[69] Of the literature listed by Streit XXI, the following two surveys stand out: J. Braam MSC, "Die Gestaltung der ozeanischen Kirche" in *ZMR* 26 (1936), 241–55; J. Schmidlin, "Missionsmethode und Politik der ersten Südsee-Missionare" in *ZMR* 26 (1936), 255–63. It was against the latter article that A. Perbal OMI directed his defense *Les missionnaires français et le nationalisme* (Paris 1939).

[70] *JP* V, 78–80 and letter of appointment of the first apostolic vicar Monsignor Saint Rouchouz.

[71] *JP* V, 157–58, 295–98.—Bishop Pompallier SM arrived in his mission area in 1837, and transferred Wallis Island to the future Bishop Bataillon and Futuna Island to Saint Pierre Chanel, the first martyr of Oceania. See Streit XXI, 174–83, as well as *Écrits du P. Chanel 1803–41,* ed. by Claude Rozier (Paris 1960).

France, thus laying the base for the political attitudes of the future.[72] On the other hand, it was often the Catholic missionaries who tried to protect their Christian flocks from French exploitation. An example was Father Honoré Laval (1838–80), who after 1834 built up a Christian center at Mangareva in the Gambier islands. Because of his defense of the natives, the French exiled him to Tahiti.[73]

With colonial powers as well as missions expanding into the South Seas, the African continent, aside from a few areas on its rim, had not yet awakened any great colonial or missionary interest.[74] In North Africa, after the French occupation, the diocese of Algiers was established in 1838 and the vicariate apostolic of Tunis in 1843. In Abyssinia, the Lazarist Giustino de Jacobis (1800–60) resumed the long-interrupted missionary work,[75] and the Capuchin Guglielmo Massaia (1809–89) was appointed by Gregory as vicar apostolic to the heathen Gallas.[76] Missionary work in West Africa first began in Liberia, a new state formed with liberated slaves from America. Monsignor Edward Barron (1801–54) arrived in Liberia from the United States in 1841, as a result of the council of Baltimore in 1833, which had stipulated that Catholics in the United States should be involved in the establishment of black missions. In 1842, Barron also became vicar apostolic for Upper Guinea, but was unable to take care of this gigantic area. Almost all of the missionaries to Upper Guinea died within a short period of time.[77] Senegambia and Gabun were ceded to the Holy Ghost Fathers[78] in 1844, and Monsignor Barron returned to the United States a sick man. In South

---

[72] A. Koskinen, *Missionary Influence as a Political Factor in the Pacific Islands* (Helsinki 1953).—This work exceeds all earlier ones in thoroughness and depth, although it is limited to Polynesia. The author concludes that both denominations could not act differently in the interest of the missionary work they had started. A good survey of the French-Catholic point of view is offered by C. W. Newbury and P. O'Reilly in the introduction to P Honoré Laval, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Mangareva ère chrétienne 1834–1871* (Paris 1968), LXXXVIII–CVIII and 244–49.

[73] H. Laval, *Mémoires.* He concludes his remarks about his expulsion and his memoirs with the words: "Est-ce donc là ma récompense de trente-six ans de Mission!!" (p. 629). Gregory XVI already in 1840 had sent a congratulatory letter to the newly converted Prince of Mangareva (*JP* V, 256–57).

[74] Even the secular priest Henri de Solages, who in 1829 was appointed apostolic prefect of the island of Réunion, directed his gaze principally to Oceania and in 1830 became prefect of the South Sea Islands. But in 1832 he went to Madagascar, where he died the same year. G. Goyau *Les grands Desseins Missionnaires d'Henri de Solages (1786–1832),* (Paris 1933) and valuable additions in A. Boudou SJ, *Les Jésuits à Madagascar au XIX^e^ siècle* I (Paris 1942).

[75] Streit XVII, 428–33.

[76] Ibid., 540–48.—Massaia was able to reach his field of activity only in 1852.

[77] M. Bane, *The Catholic Story of Liberia* (New York 1950).

[78] Streit XVII, 448–51.

Africa, the vicariate of Cape Town was established in 1837, and the first missionaries ministered principally to the white Catholics.[79] Although the Pope, who knew little about the still-unexplored continent, was able to take few positive actions on behalf of Africa, he nevertheless tried to help the blacks through his Apostolic Constitution of 3 December 1839, in which he condemned the slave trade.[80]

Georges Goyau has called Gregory XVI *"le grand pape missionnaire du 19^e^ siècle,"*[81] and J. Schmidlin has called him *"Missionspapst."*[82] Other historians, however, have been more reluctant to give him such titles.[83] Certainly Gregory XVI was not the "great missionary Pope of the nineteenth century." He generated no deep or lastingly effective missionary efforts, either with respect to strategy or method. He did approve the directives of 1845 from the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith regarding the formation of a native clergy in India,[84] but careful examination of the origins of these directives indicates that the instructions were inspired by the Synod of Pondichéry in 1844 and brought about by a detailed memorandum written by Monsignor Luquet.[85] Gregory did give all mission work a new imprint, but he did so less because of personal considerations than because he was prompted by contemporary events. In many instances, in fact, he was virtually forced to do so. The system of vicars apostolic, only tentatively begun by his predecessors, became regular procedure during his pontificate. "Under Gregory XVI the papacy finally assumed the leadership of the entire missionary movement through the efforts of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and during this pontificate forty-four new mission bishoprics were established."[86]

---

[79] *JP* V, 188–89 with the letter of appointment for Monsignor Raym. Griffith OP. W. Rörig OMI, "Die Entwicklung der katholischen Mission in Südafrika von 1836–1850" in *ED* 22 (1969), 129–75.

[80] *JP* V, 223–25; *CPF* I, 503–05; J. Margraf, *Kirche und Sklaverei seit der Entdeckung Amerikas* (Tübingen 1865), 227–30. Gregory's Constitution, more than the ordinances of his predecessors which he cited, was a futile gesture against the slave trade, for neither the Arab slave traders in the east nor the Portuguese in the west of Africa worried about the papal decree (Brazil outlawed slavery only in 1888). England, on the other hand, banned slavery in its territories as early as 1834.

[81] Chapter heading in his work *Missions et Missionnaires* (Paris 1931), 106–27, similarly Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte,* 364.

[82] "Gregor XVI. als Missionspapst" in *ZMR* 21 (1931), 209, similarly *Papstgeschichte* I, 662; also Cardinal C. Costantini headed a chapter of his assessment with "Il Papa Missionario" (Note 33), 8–10.

[83] Thus P. Lesourd in Delacroix III, 52–71; J. A. Otto, P. Roothaan, 102 ("The great restorer of world missions").

[84] *CPF* I, 541–45.

[85] C. Costantini, "Ricerche d'Archivio sull'istruzione 'De Clero Indigeno'" in *Miscellanea Pietro Fumasoni-Biondi* (Rome 1947), 1–78.

[86] J. A. Otto, *P. Roothaan*, 103.

The increased number of vicariates apostolic established during subsequent pontificates "renewed" all missions in the sense that they received a structure which they hitherto had not known. By assigning entire vicariates or mission areas to single orders or religious associations, a number of advantages ensued. Among these was that the earlier tensions between missionary orders and the hierarchy ended, because the new bishops were selected from the missionaries of the same order. Also, gradual separation of powers between superiors of Church and orders enabled the orders not merely to concern themselves with the religious-ethical life of their members but actually obligated them to do so. This practice involved the officials of the orders back home, to whom was left the task of appointing the superiors in the field, more closely than before in the missionary activity of their confreres. As a consequence, the home orders gave more material help to the missions and simultaneously enhanced their own spirituality. Finally, the logical consequence of this reorientation was that the entire academic and religious education of the missionaries was no longer a matter for the mission administration but instead for the individual orders themselves.[87]

However, the new direction of missionary activity also harbored grave disadvantages. The missions now felt more acutely the effects of centralization and bureaucracy. Active missionary work became almost exclusively the concern of orders and congregations. The administration of the Congregation, however, with few exceptions, remained in the hands of secular priests who often lacked the most fundamental knowledge of missionary work. To this was added a new political direction. The Spanish-Portuguese influence had diminished, but its place was now occupied by the modern colonial powers, in particular England and France. Although connection with them was not sought by the missionaries, it was actively sought by the congregations and the vicars apostolic of the various countries.[88] There can be no doubt that Gregory's close cooperation with the restoration and the conservative powers formed the basis for the political reorientation of the missions. The reason for any lack of missionary effort may be found in these political and spiritual ties.

---

[87] As a consequence of the anticlerical, rationalistic, and freemasonic tendencies of most state universities, the education of the orders and thereby also of missionaries increasingly went its own ways, i.e., separate from the education of the nation as it used to be in preceding centuries. See J. Beckmann, "Die Universitäten vom 16.—18. Jahrhundert im Dienste der Glaubensverkündigung" in *NZM* 17 (1961), 24–47.

[88] In this connection must also be mentioned the as yet unexamined position of the apostolic vicar in London for missionary concerns; also the incontestable preference given to the American missions, i.e., the strengthening of the Church in the United States. Into the twentieth century, the term "missionary" in German-speaking countries had the same meaning as pastor in America.

SECTION TWO

The Awakening of Catholic Vitality

CHAPTER 12

The Rebirth of the Old Orders and the Blossoming of New Congregations

Although by the end of the Napoleonic era all clerical institutions suffered from revolutionary unrest and its consequences, none of them were harder hit than the religious orders. Severely shaken in the second half of the eighteenth century by the spirit of the Enlightenment and Josephinism, the orders appeared to have received the coup de grâce through the secularization measures in all of western Europe during the final quarter of the century. Although Bonaparte had dissolved only a portion of the monasteries, such was the case in France in 1790, in Belgium in 1796, in Germany between 1803 and 1807, in Italy between 1807 and 1811, and in Spain in 1809. A few countries escaped the storm, but the decadence of many monasteries in these areas had progressed so far that a resurgence was highly improbable. Within less than a generation, however, a restoration movement was initiated which "in breadth and complexity has no equal in history" (H. Marc-Bonnet) and which became one of the focal points of Church history in the nineteenth century. With the exception of the disappearance of some twenty houses, the old orders began to be restored, and particularly in France and in northern Italy numerous new congregations were formed. These congregations were better adapted to the needs of the time and provided an undeniable sign of a revitalized Catholicism.

A spectacular decision by Pius VII, himself a former member of an order, brought about a sudden change in events. The Society of Jesus, which since 1773 had been officially suppressed, was reestablished. In reality the society had never totally disappeared; with the tacit consent of Pius VI, it continued to exist in Russia and served as a haven for many former members. Pius VI had encouraged the diplomatic José Pignatelli[1] to keep in contact with the Russian Jesuits, though without traveling to Russia. Until his death in 1811, Pignatelli was so active in his attempts to keep alive the spirit of Saint Ignatius that today he is rightfully regarded as the connecting link between the old and the new Society of Jesus. It was Pignatelli who in 1795 established a noviciate in the Duchy of Parma and in 1804, with the official permission of Pius VII, once again established the Jesuits in the Kingdom of Naples. Other simultaneous initiatives also prepared the ground for the general restoration of the Society of Jesus. In England and in the United States shortly after 1800 groups of ex-Jesuits joined with the Russian Jesuits. In France, during the time of suppression Father de Clorivière founded the Institute of the Heart of Jesus, a secret organization modeled on the Society of Jesus. In Louvain, two emigrated Sulpicians, Tournely and de Broglie, in 1794 founded the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which in 1799 fused with a similar congregation founded two years earlier by N. Paccanari at Spoleto. This society was then known as the Society of the Faith of Jesus. Under the leadership of Father Varin and with the cooperation of the Knights of the Faith this society actively supported the resistance of Pius VII against Napoleon. Thus the restoration of the Society of Jesus spread throughout the entire Church. Upon his return to Rome in 1814, Pius VII accepted a petition from the Jesuits asking for formal restoration. Encouraged by Cardinals Pacca and Consalvi, who had abandoned their old prejudices, the Pope immediately granted the petition.[2] In doing so the Pope ignored all political caution, especially with respect to Spain and Austria, both of which could have been expected to advise postponement of the decision.

---

[1] J. M. March, *El restaurador de la Compañia de Jesús, Beato José Pignatelli y su tiempo,* 2 vols. (Barcelona 1935/36).

The Pope's action was greeted with strong reservations by such enlightened Catholics and romantics as Görres and his friends. Liberals also reacted with dismay to this act of "counterrevolution," and for several years the government in Vienna resisted the resumption of Jesuit activity in the Empire.[3] Many bishops and the majority of militant Catholics, however, greeted the readmission of the Society of Jesus with acclaim. After 1805 the general of the order was Thaddeus Brzozowski, who maintained the headquarters of the society in Russia in order to dispel the suspicions of the tsarist government toward an organization which was again beginning to assume an international character. Brzozowski received many inquiries regarding the reopening of old colleges and residences of the order, and the now somewhat more heterogeneous membership increased.[4] The increased membership brought about certain problems in subsequent years, because the temptation was great to be lax in selection in view of the need of new members. These difficulties were amplified by the conflicts between different trends within the order. Some, especially the older members, saw the preservation of the true spirit of the Society of Jesus in a full return to the order as it had been prior to 1773. Others, under the leadership of Father Angiolini, who was very influential with Pius VII, were deterred by the mistakes of the order at the time of its dissolution and were inclined toward an accommodation. This group was supported by a number of the younger members, who were led by Father Rezzi and Father Pietroboni, the assistant for Italy. These younger members did not cling to the old traditions and, conscious of the tremendous changes in the world in consequence of the French Revolution, attempted to adapt the spirit of the society and its institutions to the new times by using the dubious terminology of the bull of restoration. After the death of Brzozowski (5 February 1820) the younger faction succeeded in winning the vicar general of the order, Petrucci, and Cardinal della Genga to their ideas. Thanks to the perspicacity of Consalvi, however, the general congregation,[5] convened in Rome in September 1820, saw through the maneuver, and insisted on retaining the society as an effective instrument for the Holy See. The innovators were excluded, and Father Luigi Fortis was elected general (1820–29). The rules and constitutions of the old society were adopted and an end was put to all attempts to refashion the society. After Della Genga became Pope Leo XII, he returned the Collegium Romanum to the Jesuits and in 1826 confirmed their old privileges, including those in the area of exemptions.[6]

---

[2] Bull *Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum,* 7 August 1814 (*BullRomCont* XIII, 325–27).

[3] In Spain, however, the pressure exerted by the bishops was successful in countering the footdragging of the administration. On 29 May 1815 a royal decree authorized the partial resumption of the activity of the Society of Jesus, and a new decree of 17 June 1816 lifted all restriction in the entire kingdom (see also L. Frias, op. cit. I, 69–97, 349–88).

Just as the material condition of the society was restored, its activity in the areas of the colleges, preaching, and missions to the people were redeveloped. To be sure, growing opposition was encountered from the liberals in Spain, where the society was once again banished during the three years of constitutional government from 1820 to 1823, and in France, where the "Black Men" were treated as scapegoats for all sins committed by the ultras; but the society had the satisfaction of once again establishing itself in the Habsburg Empire. In 1820, the Habsburg government permitted the entry of some Jesuit Fathers who had been banished from Russia so that they might conduct the education of Polish youth in Galicia. Finally, after long negotiations and difficulties with some bishops and the civil government, a modus vivendi was reached on 18 November 1817. The first breach in the Josephinist legislation had been made.[7]

---

[4] Immediately after the readmission of the Jesuits, there were about 800 Fathers (337 in Russia, 199 in Sicily, 84 in England, 86 in the United States, and 47 in France). As early as 1820 there were about 2,000 (436 of them in Spain, 400 in the Papal States, 198 in France).

[5] The Jesuits were banished from Russia in 1820.

[6] *BullRomCont* XXVIII, 449–52.

While the Society of Jesus experienced a rebirth which was as rapid as it was brilliant, the reorganization of the old orders proceeded rather slowly. The problem was a dual one. It was necessary to reopen a number of houses for the surviving members and to provide them with the material conditions for the resumption of their communal life. In addition, in those provinces not affected by secularization a number of abuses which had spread for two hundred years and had become aggravated owing to the unusual circumstances of the past few years needed to be abolished. These were laxness of discipline and communal life; violations of the vow of poverty; neglect of choir prayer; and, in some convents, disregard of seclusion. The abolition of abuses was a rather difficult task, because of the obstacles posed by some of the more regalistic governments and by bishops who were anxious over their jurisdictions. These groups resented the interventions of the generals of orders established in Rome or the visitors sent by the Holy See. As a result of such problems, a genuine revival in Austria was possible only after the middle of the century.

In Spanish America as well, the monasteries, which had lost a good portion of their estates as a result of the wars of independence, were no longer able to maintain contact with their superiors in Europe. This had fateful consequences for their discipline and religious life and offered a further justification for systematic attempts at suppression by the diverse liberal governments during the course of the century. In Spain, the papal Bull *Inter graviores* of 15 May 1804[8] posed a special problem. Under the pretext that after the dissolution of a number of houses of the mendicant orders in western Europe the monasteries dependent on the Spanish crown (including the Philippines) were now in the majority, King Charles IV managed to obtain from Pius VII a separation of the Spanish provinces. It was agreed that the two groups were to be governed in turn by a general and a virtually independent vicar general.

After his return to Rome in 1814, Pius VII was eager to provide a model for restoring the orders. In the Papal States he created a special reform congregation and charged it with conducting disciplinary reforms as well as the regrouping of a number of houses in an effort to increase their vitality. For a brief time Pius even considered dividing all the monasteries of his state into two congregations, one for the black monks and another one for the white ones. The project was reconsidered by Leo XII and ultimately was not implemented. Pius VII also watched with great interest the revival of the large mendicant orders and more than once intervened personally, with differing results, in order to promote necessary reforms.

---

[7] Maass, V, 74–96, 271–72.

[8] *BullRomCont* XIII, 164ff. See also B. de Rubi, *Reforma de regulares en España a principio del siglo XIX. Estudio histórico-jurídico de la bula "Inter Graviores"* (Barcelona 1943).

The mendicant orders emerged from the revolutionary age weakened from two causes. All monasteries in France, Belgium, and Germany, and some of those in Italy, had been dissolved; and the monasteries in Spain, the only other country beside the Russian part of Poland in which they had continued to exist in large numbers, were removed from the jurisdiction of the central administration and finally dissolved during the secularizations of 1834–36. The Dominicans, eager to save what they could attempted a regrouping of their Fathers in Italy. In this way, eighty of the five hundred monasteries in existence at the end of the eighteenth century were reestablished. For forty years these monasteries provided the order with new blood for its central administration and enabled it to safeguard its traditions, although in a somewhat attenuated form. At the same time a new beginning, led by Father Hill, was evident in England as well as in Holland where, in 1824, a school was opened. In the United States, Father E. A. Fenwick laid the foundation for the Province of Saint Joseph.

Unlike the Dominicans, the Franciscans managed to recover only with great difficulty. The Capuchins were able to revive themselves under the leadership of their energetic general, the future Cardinal Micara (1824–30), who pushed reform at the risk of his own life, and the order was able to regain a foothold in France in 1824. The Conventuals, however, whose large monasteries had been especially desirable to civil officials looking for administrative buildings, never completely recovered from the crisis.[9] The Minor Friars were weakened by tension between their various orientations, especially between the two largest groups, the Spanish and the Italians. An inept attempt by General J. Tecca de Capestrano to impose a uniform statute on all Franciscans in 1827 failed. None of the non-Spanish provinces was willing to attend the general meeting called for 1830 at Alcalá de Henares. Only in 1844 was the Belgian province finally reconstituted, to be followed by France in 1850. The Clarissas, who except in Spain had almost totally disappeared, quickly rose again. Even before the fall of Napoleon the former sisters had begun to regroup, and the order quickly spread under the influx of new members. The same was true for the Carmelite Sisters, who reappeared in the first few years of the nineteenth century in France. The Carmelite Brothers, on the other hand, did not appear again until 1830, and were never able to regain the influence which they had exercised prior to the revolution. An apostolic visitation noted several abuses within the order, together with a general decline in education, and even the measures taken by Leo XII in 1830 had only limited success. This was also true for the Augustinian Eremites, who in the post-Napoleonic period managed to hold a few places in Ireland, Holland, and, in addition to the sporadically recreated Italian provinces, in the United States, where they grew into flourishing provinces.

---

[9] By the middle of the nineteenth century they had not yet reached a membership of fifteen hundred, while in 1773 there had been twenty-five thousand. By the same time the Minorites had already reached 20 percent and the Capuchins 40 percent of their memberships prior to the revolution.

The different branches of the Benedictine community as well as the monasteries of the regular canons were especially hard hit. The crisis of the resolution had come to them in an already attenuated condition. In most instances that vital force which the mendicant orders possessed in their tight organizations was also absent. Such organization among these orders either had never existed, as in the case of the Benedictines, or, as in the case of the Cistercians and the Premonstratensians, who had their seat in France, had been destroyed. However, a number of reopenings came about through personal initiatives. Dom de Lestrange, having newly constituted his Trappist community at La Valsainte in Switzerland, regained his former monastery in 1814. During subsequent months, the Trappist monasteries of Melleraye, Aiguebelle, and Gard were occupied again. Repossession of Westmalle in Belgium occurred in 1814, and of the two Roman abbeys of Santa Croce and San Bernardo in 1817. To be sure, the rather strict rules which de Lestrange wished to impose upon his monks had to be canceled after his death in 1827 but, nevertheless, with full justification he can be called the "Savior of the Trappist Order."

The Cistercians of the *observantia communis,* who had survived in part in Spain and Portugal, reorganized themselves in southern Germany. In 1821, Pius VII gathered the monasteries of Italy within one congregation. Inasmuch as Cîtaux had been dissolved, the Pope had appointed the abbot of one of the Roman monasteries as general superior in 1816. In 1816 also, the Grande Chartreuse was reopened. The Premonstratensians, who had regained their large abbeys in central Europe, revived slowly in Belgium after 1830 and in France after 1856. It was not until 1869, however that they were able to convene their first general chapter.

The experience of the Benedictines was similar to that of the Premonstratensians, even though the Benedictines enjoyed the personal sympathy of the Pope. In the course of the revolutionary disturbances they had lost more than a thousand houses, and the remaining monasteries were beset by uncertainty in the face of the enmity of the regalistic governments in the Habsburg and Russian Empires and the temporary closing of numerous houses in Spain in 1809 and in 1820–23. It was possible to reopen twelve abbeys in Italy, and in 1821 the congregation of Monte Cassino was reorganized. In France and Belgium, a number of Benedictine convents reappeared, in some instances before Napoleon's fall, but it was not possible to reopen the monasteries until the second third of the nineteenth century. In spite of the concordat with Bavaria in 1817, which had called for the restoration of a few monasteries, the Bavarian government procrastinated. Also lacking was a readiness on the part of former monks to return to the life of the order. Thus only in 1830, thanks to the enthusiasm of Ludwig I for all things medieval, was there a gradual restoration of the abbey of Metten, followed by the abbeys of Saint Stephen in Augsburg in 1834, of Saint Boniface in Munich in 1835, of Scheyern in 1838, and Weltenburg in 1842.

In contrast to the rapid revival of the Society of Jesus, therefore, the rebirth of the old orders of medieval origin proved to be much more difficult. Yet the foundations were laid at this time from which their renewal was to come during the two next generations. This happened in spite of the Spanish and Portuguese decrees between 1834 and 1836 which destroyed the still existing representative centers of the orders. A few modern institutions, however, which were better adapted to the times, as early as the first decades of the nineteenth century profited from a development which would have been unthinkable during the Old Regime. This was particularly true for some charitable women's congregations such as in France the Sisters of Saint Joseph, inspired by Mother Saint Jean Fontbonne; the Daughters of Wisdom, led by Father Gabriel Deshayes (1820–41); and, especially, the Sisters of Saint Vincent de Paul. The last-named, after their official recognition by the government in 1809, spread outward from France and developed their specific religious character during the course of the nineteenth century.

Several male congregations also flourished at the beginning of the restoration. Among these were the Brothers of Christian Schools, who had retained only a few of their houses in the Papal States. In 1803, they were reintroduced by Brother Frumence, whom Pius VI had appointed in 1795 as vicar general. As early as 1810, the order held a general chapter and by 1814 already numbered fifty-five houses. Such a revival was experienced by the Redemptorists whom Klemens Maria Hofbauer (1751–1820) had introduced in central Europe, chiefly in Austria. Emperor Francis I, after his trip to Rome in 1819, guaranteed their safety, in spite of the Josephinist legislation inimical to the orders. From Austria, the order, under the leadership of Hofbauer's successor J. Passerat (1772–1858), expanded to France (1820), Portugal (1826), Switzerland (1827), Belgium (1833), Bulgaria (1836), and the United States (1832). In spite of the rapid revival of the Italian mother congregation, the new houses of the order generated a far more impressive apostalic dynamic.

The most noteworthy development during the period was the growth of new congregations. Frequently the influence of these congregations, especially in the case of women's congregations, did not extend beyond a diocese, and in many cases not even beyond a few parishes, but some of them developed both extensively and quickly and within a few decades assumed a place of prominence next to the great old orders. The male congregations were oriented chiefly toward two models: The school brothers followed the system introduced by Jean-Baptiste de la Salle during the preceding century. The priestly congregations followed French models of the seventeenth century, which allowed them a supple formula for many apostolic activities. The de la Salle model was followed by the Marist Brothers of M. Champagnat in the area of Lyon (1817, 1839); the Brothers of Christian Instruction of Jean Marie Lamennais; the Brothers of Saint Gabriel, founded by Father G. Deshayes (1821); The Sacred Heart Brothers of Abbé A. Coindre (1821); the Christian Brothers (1802, 1820), created in Ireland through episcopal initiative: the Brothers of Saint Patrick (1808); and the Brothers of Charity of Peter Joseph Triest at Ghent (1807), who in addition to education also devoted themselves to caring for the sick and the insane.[10] Among those congregations adopting the French models were the Picpus Society (1800, 1817) founded in France in the midst of the revolution by J. P. Coudrin. This society devoted itself to both Eucharistic veneration and preaching and, after 1826, with missions to Oceania. Others established on the French model were the Fathers of Mercy of Jean-Baptiste Rauzan, (1808, 1834); the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (1816, 1826), founded by Eugène de Mazenod, who concentrated on the missions to Canada after 1841; the Fathers of Jean Claude Colin, who at first devoted themselves to preaching in the rural areas around Lyon and then were selected by Gregory XVI for missions to foreign countries (1816, 1822); the Priests of the School of Charity of the brothers Cavanis in Venetia (1802, 1828); the Oblates of the Virgin Mary of Bruno Lanteri in Piedmont (1815, 1826); the Institute of Charity of A. Rosmini in Lombardy (1828, 1838); and the Marianists of

---

[10] The dates in parentheses indicate the founding of each institute and, when listed, of the first papal approbation.

Guilleaume-Joseph Chaminade (1817, 1839), forerunner of the Catholic Action and of secular institutes. He was aware of the necessity to organize different social groups as a counterweight to the individualism of the time and, in contrast to most of his contemporaries, recognized the need for a close cooperation between priests and laymen.

Among the women's congregations, it is noteworthy that there was an increase in a type of small congregation which devoted itself equally to charity and education. These congregations were in the immediate service of the parish clergy and generally were created by them for specific purposes such as the education of novices. Such small groups had the disadvantages of creating local splintering. The precise number of such communities has never been determined; nor would it be easy to discover it, because of the numerous fusions and splits and great similarity of names. Father de Berthier described the history of the creation and development of these numerous small congregations of sisters in picturesque fashion: "The history of these foundings is the same in almost all cases. In order to grasp the confusing multiplicity in such identical tasks, one must always be aware of the isolation in which the various provinces lived. A pious girl spontaneously or upon the advice of a priest devotes herself to the care of the sick or the poor or to education; soon she is joined by likeminded companions; the lady of the local manor grants her moral and financial support and the priest either encourages her or raises obstacles in her path; a spiritual guide from the Jesuits or some other order then appears in the background; soon the foundation takes form; a house is bought and the bishop becomes involved; in order to receive the bishop's permission, rules for the group must be established, a habit be selected, and a responsible superior, name, patron saint, and noviciate be chosen. All of this crystallizes gradually and the day for applying for authorization by the Holy See and the government arrives. A new congregation has been born."[11]

This phenomenon was particularly evident in France[12] after the concordat, but could be seen everywhere in western Europe during the subsequent years.[13] To the ulterior designs of some parish priests to remain masters in their own houses was frequently joined the impossibility of receiving assistance from the busy larger congregations. At the outset, the founding priests could often turn to former sisters who had been secularized during the French Revolution, but soon most of these sisters were motivated not only by the serious purpose of aiding Church and neighbors in daily life, but also by other considerations. The surplus of women and the late date of marriage made possible a longer time for choosing a spiritual life; and the respect that women in orders enjoyed in the religious community, together with the expectation of upward social mobility provided especially in the teaching orders, made such a choice attractive. In contrast to the conditions under the Old Regime, most of the aspirants came from the lower economic strata and occasionally from the aristocracy. Rarely did the middle class choose the vocation.

---

[11] *La Restauration*, 312.

[12] Where legislation was petty for male congregations, but was much more liberal for women's institutes, especially after the law of 24 May 1825. The sisters raised their numbers from 12,400 in 1829 houses in 1815 to 25,000 in 2872 houses in 1830, not counting the many communities still in a tentative stage of development which had not yet asked for administrative authorization.

[13] With local variations, of course. While in France the majority of the foundings took place in the rural areas, they occurred in Italy primarily in the cities. Custom in Italy for a long time forbade that the sisters, unlike those north of the Alps, also devote themselves to the care of sick males. In the Germanic countries, on the other hand, there was much less demand than in France and Italy for teaching sisters.

Among the founders were many simple souls who passively had allowed themselves to be guided by a clerical adviser. But there were also among them some strong, complex personalities, who combined great spiritual abilities with a developed sense of action and organization. To these belong St. Marie Madeleine Postel, the Norman founder of the Sisters of the Christian Schools of Mercy (1807), who later were widely accepted in the Germanic countries; the blessed Julie Billiart, founder of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur (1808); the Marchesa di Canossa, founder of the Daughters of Charity (1816) in Verona; and St. Emilie de Rodat, founder of the Sisters of the Holy Family (1817) in southern France. Many of these congregations grew quickly beyond regional boundaries and underwent a national or, in some cases, even international expansion. This was the case with the Society of the Sacred Heart begun by St. Madeleine Sophie Barat in 1800. Her congregation, inspired by Saint Ignatius, was of an apostolic character. Its nuns were to be a female elite of the Christian spirit. After receiving their constitution in 1815, houses were established in the United States in 1818, in Turin in 1823, in Rome in 1828, in Brussels in 1825, and in Austria and England a short time afterwards. Another important figure was Mother Javouhey, the founder of the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Cluny. After 1817, these sisters became active as nurses and teachers in African missions and by the middle of the century had settlements in all five continents. These types of orders were not begun only by French women, however. The Sisters of Mercy, founded in Münster in 1808, after the model of the French Sisters of Charity, gradually spread to the various states of Germany and Austria. The Poor Teaching Sisters of Our Lady, founded in 1833 by K. Gerhardinger, a pupil of G. M. Wittmann, settled in thirteen European countries and in the United States. The Sisters of Mercy, founded in Ireland in 1829 by

C. MacAuley, quickly spread to England, the Colonies, and the United States. This list could easily be expanded.

The rapid development of these numerous congregations, so different from the old orders and so often delayed in acquiring a definitive form, presented the Holy See with subtle problems of canon law. "The multiplicity of inquiries which frequently reach us from France," Leo XII explained to Mazenod in 1825, "persuaded the congregation to devise a special type of approval and to applaud and to encourage, without, however, granting formal approbation."[14] The *decretum laudis,* the first step of a papal approbation, originated in this time in answer to problems of these congregations. The Holy See, long hesitant about women's congregations with simple vows and whose members were not secluded, changed its attitude when it was realized that this new type of order was especially well suited to many of the new conditions. The Sisters of Love of Ghent were the first to receive the special approbation from the Congregation of Bishops and Religious in 1816.[15] Once again the circumstances of changing times provided the impulse to adapt canon law.

---

[14] Quoted by J. Leflon, *Mazenod* II, 281–82.

[15] Father Callahan, *The Centralization of Government in Pontifical Institutes of Women with Simple Vows* (Rome 1948) 34, 44–45. The author lists the following approbations: Filles du S. Cœur de Marie d'Angers (1821), Sœurs de la Miséricorde de Cahors (1824), Sœurs de l'Instruction chrétienne of Ghent (1827), Canossiane (1828), Sœurs de Ste. Thérèse de Bordeaux and Sœurs du Bon Pasteur d'Angers (1835).

CHAPTER 13

The Beginnings of the Catholic Movement in Germany and Switzerland

Historically speaking, the spiritual rebirth which the Catholic Church in Germany experienced during the first decades of the nineteenth century was more significant than the organizational reconstruction. This rebirth received its impulse from native forces, independent of the official Church. The common denominator was the determination to overcome the crisis caused by the radical Enlightenment. Redefinition of the essence and the tradition of the Church became a valid alternative to the rationalistic depletion of theology, tendencies toward secularization of society, and the far-reaching submission of the Church to the state. An important prerequisite was the existence of an unbroken tradition in all areas of the Church, especially outside of the courtly and urban elements of educated society. Some achievements of the moderate Enlightenment, such as the cultivation of positive theology, reforms of liturgy, preaching and pastoral care, as well as a basic ecumenical sentiment present in some localities also contributed their share. The experience of the French Revolution and its consequences shook the Church out of its lethargy and simultaneously heightened the defensive character of the incipient movement. Because of radical consequences of the Enlightenment and the modern theories of the state, both revolution and secularization made themselves suspect in the eyes of Catholics. From its beginnings, therefore, the Catholic defense had to aim at the two concrete goals of restoring ecclesiastical liberty and replacing destroyed centers of education.

Romanticism provided strongly differing impulses in keeping with the multiplicity of its essence. In its universal aspects, romanticism reached back to early Christian ideas and values in the areas of the arts, science, and societal order. It emphasized the irrational, historic, and organic roots of the present. In contrast to the focus of the Enlightenment upon the individual, reason, and progress, romanticism often went to the opposite extreme of awarding primary value to community, feeling, mysticism, tradition, and continuity. The Church was again viewed as a living and historical organism, and romantic inclusiveness strove for a synthesis of religious and profane cultures. Among the Protestants, romanticism promoted the concepts of revival and nation, but many of its representatives were attracted by the Catholic Church, whose structure and forms of piety corresponded more closely to their ideals. Eminent converts had a decisive influence on the beginnings of the Catholic movement in Germany. The new appreciation of the Catholic Church was often a consequence of the rediscovery of the essentially Catholic Middle Ages and its artistic and spiritual creations. In addition, romanticism fostered the German patriotism of Catholics. Its emphasis on continuity and organic structures led to a concept of restoration which idealized Emperor and Empire and, following the wars of liberation, the value placed upon people and nation allowed the growth among German Catholics of a feeling of affinity for religion and nationality.

Consonant with the customs of society at the time, the Catholic movement grew out of small circles, often in conjunction with attempts to revive religious studies.[1] Roman influence was totally absent and French philosophy of restoration only began to play a role in the 1820's, primarily through the people involved with the Mainz seminary and associated circles in the Rhineland.[2]

---

[1] Thus the Tübingen School of Theology together with its publication *Theologische Quartalschrift* after 1819 provided educated Catholics with a new and profound self-assurance.

Even before the French Revolution, Princess Amalie Gallitzin (1748–1806), who had resided in Münster since 1779, gathered around her a number of people who were concerned with deepening their faith through imbuing it with emotion and who raised the reaction against the Enlightenment to the level of an antiintellectual belief. Among the advisers of the princess were the religious instructor and educator Bernard Overberg (1754–1826) and the canon Franz von Fürstenberg (1729–1810). Since 1762, Fürstenberg had administered the cathedral chapter of Münster in exemplary fashion, and, in contrast to his own bishop, who was also the Elector of Cologne and had freely opened his court at Bonn to modern ideas, had resolutely resisted the Enlightenment. After Fürstenberg in 1780 had been forced to give up his political offices, he concentrated on internal improvements and pedagogical reforms, aided by his close collaborator Overberg, whom he entrusted with the training of teachers. The Gallitzin circle, regarding itself as a *"familia sacra,"* also counted as members several professors of the academy founded by Fürstenberg. Among these were the Church historian Theodor Katerkamp and the exegete Bernard Georg Kellermann, as well as younger people who were deeply influenced by the circle, such as the brothers Droste-Vischering.

Close relations existed with the pietistic Lutherans, such as Matthias Claudius, Friedrich Perthes, Count Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg, and Johann Georg Hamann. The Enlightenment had influenced the circle insofar as it had emphasized the common elements of the denominations, albeit the aims of the circle were of an anti-Enlightenment direction. The faithful were supposed to unite against rationalism as the common enemy. In 1800 Stolberg became a Catholic, and his conversion, the first of an impressive number, created a sensation. He settled in Münster and together with other members of the *"familia sacra"* wrote the *History of the Religion of Jesus Christ,* which interpreted Church history in a universal sense and as the passion and salvation of Christ. This interpretation reawakened in German Catholicism the historical consciousness buried by the Enlightenment.[3] In spite of his apologetic approach, Stolberg also incorporated such Lutheran elements as the belief in salvation exclusively through God's mercy, and his concept of the Church was comprehensive and included episcopal elements.

---

[2] E. Fleig, "Zur Geschichte des Einströmens französischen Restaurationsdenkens nach Deutschland" in *HJ* 55 (1935), 501–22.

[3] The work appeared in 15 volumes (Hamburg 1806/18). See L. Scheffczyk, *Friedrich Leopold Stolbergs "Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi"* (Munich 1952).

The writings of Overberg, together with those of Sailer, founded a new Catholic pedagogy. Although Overberg favored educational discourse and growth of the students within the meaning of the Enlightenment, he saw the "higher assurance of the Christian faith" exclusively in revelation. For this reason he made revelation the focal point of religious instruction and acquainted a wide readership among teachers and families with this concept through his frequently reprinted *History of the Old and New Testaments.*

Under the impact of the rising against Napoleon (1809), Vienna developed into a radiating center of German romanticism. Through the circles around Clemens Maria Hofbauer (1751–1820) and Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829) it also raised a new religious consciousness. Hofbauer, the first German Redemptorist from southern Moravia, addressed members of all classes as teacher, preacher, missionary, and organizer of ecclesiastical life. Schlegel, who had converted in Cologne, entered the Austrian civil service. He also taught religious history in Vienna and developed his comprehensive interpretation of European spirit and culture against the background of a Catholic Christianity[4] which was influencing all aspects of romanticism. Other North German converts with great influence joined him. Among these were the political scientist Adam Müller, the painter and educator Klinckowström, and the poet Zacharias Werner. For a time Franz von Baader, Brentano, Eichendorff, and Johann Friedrich Schlosser also joined the circle which, especially during the time of the Congress of Vienna, established continuing relations with like-minded people in all of the German states.

Schlegel, Müller,[5] and their friends attempted to prove monarchical authority and hierarchical social order as natural and divinely inspired. For this reason they propagated a corporative state, based on religion and national characteristics and modeled on medieval concepts. State and Church were to be connected and equal partners. They saw the most legitimate guarantee of the preservation of continuity within the hierarchical order of the Catholic Church. They agreed with the objectives of de Maistre and tried to provide them with the deeper religious and philosophical support which they found missing in his writings. The concept of society held by the Vienna circle contributed to that ideology of the restoration in whose formulation another convert, Karl Ludwig von Haller (1768–1854), political scientist from Bern, played a leading role.[6] Schlegel, Müller, and Baader also derived the first postulates of social Catholicism from the corporative principle. Their demands for a just wage and the integration of the lower classes, for subordinating the economy to social policy, and for a just balance between agriculture and industry had no direct effect, but did have lasting influence upon the development of Catholic social theory.

---

[4] Especially in his lecture series of 1810 and 1812 *On Modern History* (Vienna 1811) and *History of Classical and Modern Literature* (Vienna 1815), also in the periodicals *Deutsches Museum* (Vienna 1812/13) and *Concordia* (Vienna 1820/22).

[5] Müller's chief works: *Die Elemente der Staatskunst,* 3 vol. (Berlin 1810, reissued by J. Baxa, Jena 1922); *Von der Notwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlegung der gesamten Staatswissenschaft* (Leipzig 1820, reissue Vienna 1898); *Ausgewählte Schriften Müllers zur Staatsphilosophie,* ed. by R. Kohler (Munich 1923).

While the Emperor, the government, and the majority of Austrian clergy, especially the prelates, still adhered to Josephinism, the Hofbauer circle initiated its spiritual conquest.[7] Bishops Zengerle (1824–48 bishop of Seckau) and Ziegler (1827–52 bishop of Linz), who emerged from the Hofbauer circle, promoted the new spirit in their dioceses. As a young priest the future Cardinal Rauscher received his direction from the Hofbauer circle.

Hofbauer fought the Enlightenment with uncompromising and often abrasive vigor, and during the Congress of Vienna he was Wessenberg's most important spiritual opponent. The argumentative Redemptorist also favored the restoration of a church organization applicable to all of Germany. Moreover, his group was the first among the circles of Catholic revival to conduct this reconstruction in close collaboration with Rome. Hofbauer and his friends presented this position to the Vienna nuncio Severoli and also to Cardinal Consalvi during the Congress. After 1815, the Hofbauer circle attempted by way of Schlegel and Schlosser to influence the religious negotiations referred to the Frankfurt Diet. The circle was convinced that only the papacy, which was regaining its strength at that time, could provide the German dioceses with bishops who were free of the belief in an established Church and Febronianism. This position explains the group's strong defense of a centralistic and authoritarian church regulation. Secretly Hofbauer's circle informed on people who thought differently and thus started in Germany the denunciation of ecclesiastical opponents. It was an embarrassing accompaniment to ultramontanism. At the same time Hofbauer demanded a greater consideration of Germany from the Curia in the interest of the Roman-German alliance which he envisioned, and he joined many anti-Curialists in their criticism of Roman ignorance of German conditions.

---

[6] Especially through his *Handbuch der allgemeinen Staatskunde* (Winterthur 1808) and *Die Restauration der Staatswissenschaften,* 6 vol. (Winterthur 1816/26, ^{2} 1820/34), which coined the name of the period.

[7] Beginnings of an overcoming of Josephinism in A. Reinermann, "The Return of the Jesuits to the Austrian Empire and the Decline of Josephinism 1820–1822" in *CHR* 52 (1966/67).

The Hofbauer circle influenced similar groups in neighboring Bavaria, such as the confederates of the Würzburg Suffragan Bishop Zirkel and the Görres circle in Munich. Hofbauer also approached the Bavarian Crown Prince Ludwig who, however, preferred to follow the suggestions from Landshut and Munich.

Johann Michael Sailer (1751–1832), the leader of the Landshut circle, built upon the philosophical and literary heritage of the period and initiated the encounter of Catholicism with the modern intellectual culture of the nation. At the same time, his main concern was the intensification of traditional religion, and he early began to oppose deism. Adopting a position similar to that of the Münster group, Sailer maintained a friendly relationship with such Protestants as Lavater, Claudius, Savigny, and the princes of Stolberg-Wernigerode. Sailer, an eclectic, adopted the moral philosophy of Kant, the religious philosophy of Jacobi, and the pedagogy of Pestalozzi.

Accused of illuminatism and being a proponent of the Enlightenment, Sailer was forced to leave the University of Dillingen in 1794. Five years later Montgelas, the defender of a bureaucratic established Church, appointed Sailer professor of moral and pastoral theology at the University of Ingolstadt, which, in 1800, was transferred as a Bavarian state university to Landshut. Holding fast to his humanism and the rejection of scholasticism during the following two decades, Sailer became involved in activities which ran counter to the ideas of Montgelas and thus were stopped. Sailer pleaded for a rejuvenation of the Church arising from its internal strengths, and it was his very acquaintance with the Enlightenment which qualified him as a credible opponent. He developed a theology of revelation and spirituality which was new for his time and which had a biblical and patristic basis.[8] His concept of the Church, which was related to Stolberg's, attempted to mediate between Curialism and Febronianism. In his Bible-oriented pedagogy, Sailer, as had Overberg, transcended the Enlightment.

Sailer was not only an effective teacher and publicist, but also a charismatic pastor and counselor. He gathered around him an unusually large circle of students and friends from all walks of life and faculties. The zealotry of Hofbauer, who regarded him as suspect, was alien to him. It was due to the intrigues of Sailer's enemies that he failed to be appointed bishop of Augsburg in 1819. Only after difficult negotiations between the government and the Holy See did he become suffragan bishop and coadjutor of Regensburg in 1822 and bishop in 1829. Other clerics from Sailer's circle continued to promote his religious and ecclesiastical concerns. Among them were Georg Michael Wittmann (1760–1833) and Franz Xaver Schwäbl (1778–1841), his successors as bishops of Regensburg; the educator Christoph von Schmid (1768–1854); the exegete and Bible translator Joseph Franz von Allioli (1793–1853); and Melchior von Diepenbrock (1798–1853).

---

[8] Sailer's chief works: *Vorlesungen aus der Pastoraltheologie,* 3 vol. (Munich 1788/89; *Neue Beiträge aus der Pastoraltheologie,* 2 vol. (Munich 1809/11); *Beleuchtung einiger Hauptideen der katholischen Theologie,* 3 brochures (Munich 1816/21); *Handbuch der christlichen Moral,* 3 vol. (Munich 1817).

Because Crown Prince Ludwig belonged to Sailer's admirers, the Landshut circle influenced Bavarian domestic policies. Two members of the circle, the physician Johann Nepomuk Ringseis (1785–1880) and the jurist Eduard von Schenk (1788–1841) became his advisers on cultural policy. Crown Prince Ludwig, having brought about the fall of Montgelas in 1817, ascended the throne in 1825 as Ludwig I. The King held fast to parity and established Church, but in all other respects he followed the path of romantic restoration. He also wanted to see Bavaria become the leading state of German Catholicism. Schenk headed the new section for religion and education in the ministry of justice. Benedictines, Franciscans, and several women's congregations were permitted to return; teacher training was largely turned over to the Church; royal seminaries for priests were established; the missions received financial support; and numerous church buildings were restored.

Ringseis became the first president of the Bavarian State University, which was moved from Landshut to Munich in 1826, and his consistent policy of appointments made it into the most important Catholic center of the period. In addition to Ringseis, important leaders were found in three of the new professors, Josef von Görres,[9] Franz von Baader, and Ignaz von Döllinger. These men prepared the ground for Catholic federations and fought rationalism and liberalism on the level of philosophy and history. To an increasing degree this group also fought an alliance between Protestantism, rationalism and liberalism. The anniversary of the Reformation in 1817 produced a first confrontation, and in general the revived Churches were developing a new denominational self-assurance.

The circle around Ringseis and Görres initiated the periodical *Eos,* but had to relinquish it only two years later in 1830. The antiliberal polemics of the publication had aroused the ire of the King, who did not wish to be totally identified with any party. Yet almost at the same time, his religious policy permitted the introduction of two Church newspapers,[10] which also treated non-Bavarian matters and became very influential in Church policy. These periodicals, together with *Katholik,* founded a few years earlier in Mainz, constituted the first development of a German Catholic press.

---

[9] Görres must be counted in the conversion movement of the time insofar as he, like Brentano, returned to his innate Catholic faith under the influence of romanticism.

With greater efficiency than Hofbauer's friends, a number of people in Mainz began to promote a centralistic-authoritarian rejuvenation of the Church. Its first leaders were Johann Ludwig Colmar (1760–1818), who had been appointed by Napoleon as bishop of Mainz, and Franz Leopold Liebermann (1759–1844). Both men had been part of Alsatian Catholicism, which had kept out of internal French developments but which finally was forced to undergo the most radical consequences of the Enlightenment during the revolutionary disturbances. In 1805, Colmar founded a Tridentine seminary headed by Liebermann in place of the theological faculty of the university, which had been destroyed by secularization. In 1816, another Alsatian and student of Liebermann, Andreas Räss (1794–1887), was appointed to teach there. In contrast to the other circles of revival, the leaders of the Mainz group were all clerics. Like all defenders of purely ecclesiastical concentration, they were opposed to theological departments at state universities. Because of this, they contributed greatly to the training of priests at seminaries in Germany, a method which was also desired by Rome. Their justification was that at many state universities theologians were teaching who were rationalistic and in favor of an established Church. Colmar and Liebermann based theological instruction upon a return to scholasticism,[11] while Räss and his friend Nikolaus Weis (1796–1869) also included French restoration philosophy. The Mainz circle was convinced that strict spiritual and organizational concentration of the Church was of the essence in the face of the Enlightenment and its consequent concept of an established Church. They pleaded for a retreat to the seemingly secure bastion of the old doctrine, coupled with an innovative activation of the faithful, while remaining unaffected by romanticism. Their program coincided with that of the "zealots" in the Roman Curia, who had gained the upper hand after the election of Leo XII in

---

[10] With the active support of Räss (Mainz) and of members of the Munich Görres circle, Johann Baptist von Pfeilschifter in 1829 in Aschaffenburg founded the *Katholische Kirchenzeitung,* which during the following decade achieved great eminence; in Würzburg there appeared after 1828 the *Allgemeiner Religions- und Kirchenfreund* (ed. Franz Georg Benkert).

[11] Liebermann's textbook, the *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (Mainz 1819/21) was read widely and long (^{10} 1870), just as the speculative, sharply anti-Hermesian dogmatic of his student Heinrich Klee (Mainz 1834/35, ^{4} 1861), who shortly before his early death in 1840 received an appointment at Munich University.

1824.[12] Since that time, the Mainz group had been even more in favor of close collaboration with Rome. Their simplistic belief was that episcopalism would lead to the established Church of the Enlightenment, while papalism would bring with it freedom of the Church. They had been forced to suffer Napoleon's sovereignty over the Church, but they opposed the religious policy of the weaker German states. This brought them quickly into opposition to the Hessian government.

In order to influence the clergy and laity toward the Mainz program, in 1821 Räss and Weis founded the monthly publication *Der Katholik.* Under pressure from the government the editor's office had to be transferred to Strasbourg a year later, and in 1827 it was possible to move it to Speyer in Bavaria. Through *Der Katholik* and several popular pamphlets, the Mainz theologians fought against the Enlightenment, an established Church, and the forces of Protestantism. They also opposed Catholic lines of thought which were unacceptable to them, such as Hermesianism, which was spreading in the Prussian Rhineland.[13] The authoritarian defense upon which they relied throughout this process was well suited to the exigencies of the period, but their generalizations contributed toward excluding the Catholic Church from intellectual developments and toward placing it within the very ghetto in which its enemies wished it to be.

Three eminent bishops came from the Mainz circle; the first two were Räss (bishop of Strasbourg after 1842) and Weis (after 1841 bishop of Speyer); the third was Johannes von Geissel, who as archbishop of Cologne was the leader of the Prussian episcopate in the 1840s and 1850s.

The fighting spirit of the Mainz seminary also reached to Bavaria and influenced many another Catholic circle. At first such Catholic circles initiated internal revivals on the local level, but with increasing effectiveness they defended themselves against bureaucratic ecclesiastical regimens. Among such groups were one in Kassel led by Josef Maria von Radowitz; another in Frankfurt led by Johann Friedrich Schlosser, one in Koblenz led by Clemens Brentano and Hermann Josef Dietz, and finally one at Bonn led by the professor of canon law Ferdinand Walter[14] and the philosopher Karl Josef Windischmann. Circles also formed at Cologne, led by Haxthausen, in Aachen led by Martin Wilhelm Fonck and Leonhard Aloys Nellessen, and in Düsseldorf under the guidance of Josef Binterim. The Rhenish circles maintained close contact with one another. Common to all of them was the hostility to the Hermes School which was pursued so markedly at Bonn. In Koblenz the first steps toward a modern Caritas were developed, while at Cologne attention was primarily directed to the maintenance of medieval-Catholic traditions and buildings.

---

[12] See above, pp. 95–99.

[13] See below, pp. 243ff.

[14] The textbook of canon law, published by Ferdinand Walter (1794–1879) as early as 1822 at Bonn (^{14}1871), contributed considerably to the defeat of Febronianism. As most of the other representatives of his movement, Walter, of course, did not hold the same concept of the Church as accepted under Gregory XVI and Pius IX. He taught papal infallibility as little as Liebermann; only from the eighth edition of his work

Persons and forces contributing to the ecclesiastical renewal were later opposed or pushed aside by the strengthening Catholic movement. Wessenberg initiated a biblical-liturgical reform movement which was in force for a long period.[15] Out of the Hermes School came a generation with an optimistic pastoral outlook; a generation which was convinced of the compatibility of the old faith with new ideas.[16] Many outstanding bishops such as Spiegel in Cologne, Gebsattel in Munich, and Hommer in Trier promoted internal reconstruction. By incorporating positive aspects of the Enlightenment and attempting to evade conflicts with the governments, they distinguished themselves from their pugnacious successors who stood under the influence of the revival movement.

The beginnings of the revival movement in Germany included the entire range of Catholic thought ranging from a universal interpretation resting on the spirit and the tradition of the Church to a defensive-hierarchical concentration. From this broad beginning, reaching into romanticism, it was possible for the last time in modern German history to have active cooperation in the shaping of the intellectual and artistic life of the nation.[17] But for the inner development of the Church, the narrower and stricter direction was decisive. The circles around Hofbauer and the Mainz seminary understood how to provide a clear and easily acceptable program to the majority of Catholics, who were confused by the intellectual shifts and oppressed by the established Church. Recognizing the fundamentally conservative state, these circles de-

---

onward (1839) did he begin to accept the spreading doctrine. See Vigener, op. cit., 62–70.—Under the influence of the Bonn circle, Carl Ernst Jarcke, then Instructor of Law, converted to Catholicism in 1825.

[15] See Th. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (Bonn 1965), 122.

[16] H. Schrörs, "Hermesianische Pfarrer" in *AHVNrh* 103 (1919), 76–183.

[17] Beyond the general influence on romanticism, the Catholic movement also participated in the forming of the Nazarene movement and New Gothic, as well as a revival of classical polyphony.—H. Beenken, *Das 19. Jahrhundert in der deutschen Kunst* (Munich 1944); Schnabel, *G* IV, 220–49; W. Nauss in *LThK* VII, 849ff.; H. Schade-H. Kirchmeyer in *LThK* VII, 9, 21ff. See also W. Weyres-H. Mann, *Handbuch zur rheinischen Baukunst des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne 1968).

manded from it fulfillment of the promised parity. Within Catholicism they created the first modern mass consciousness in Germany; a consciousness which achieved political relevance after the unrest at Cologne.[18] The movement, initially varied, eventually joined the forces of the ultramontane restoration, which had come to the fore in Rome in the 1820s and were systematically supported by the papacy after the election of Gregory XVI.

The regrouping of the Swiss dioceses[19] was only a prerequisite for the revival of Catholic life in Switzerland, a revival which was as urgent there as it had been in neighboring countries. In Geneva the most active pastor was Vuarin, who was in close contact with the French Catholic movement. However, the indifferentism of the Enlightenment and the anti-Roman stance of Wessenberg deeply influenced the minds of laity and clergy in many cantons. Wessenberg's ideas were spread chiefly through the "Helvetic Society" and men such as pastor Müller and the teacher Dereser of Lucerne. The reaction against philosophes and Jacobins and against the Febronian reformers was led in an especially active fashion by a group of professors of the Lucerne seminary. These professors, headed by J. Gügler, one of the first representatives of romantic theology, and by F. Geiger, the founder of the *Swiss Church Newspaper,* were students of Sailer. At the same time, the great schools of Solothurn and Einsiedeln resumed their activity in a clearly clerical sense. In addition, the Jesuits became active again in Brig in 1814 and in Fribourg in 1818 and, as the Capuchins had done, missionized the people and founded confraternities and congregations. Although the efforts of the governments to control the work of the seminaries did not simplify matters, pious and hard-working prelates effectively contributed to a revival. Among them were the vicar apostolic B. Göldlin, who from 1815 to 1819 was administrator of the areas which were separated from the diocese of Constance; C. -R. Buol, bishop of Chur from 1793 to 1833; and, at a later date, A. Salzmann, the new bishop of Basel. These men also influenced the revival of Swiss Protestantism, even though their development was quite distinct with respect to their goals and manifestations.

Finally, the Catholic revival was accompanied, as in Germany, by a number of conversions.[20] Some of them, especially that of K. L. von Haller (1817), a jurist from Bern, aroused special attention. In spite of his voluntary exile in Paris from 1820 to 1830, a number of Catholic ultras gathered around Haller, who, in violent opposition to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the revolution, and liberalism, combined an irreconcilable ultramontanism with political concepts of a patriarchal and legitimistic inspiration. The majority of Haller's compatriots, however, turned toward a liberal progressivism.

---

[18] See chapter 20.

[19] For example, in 1826 the archbishop of Paris on a journey to the abbey Rheinau had to confirm six thousand persons (Henrion, *Vie de Mgr. de Quélen* [Paris 1840], 168–70).

[20] See D. A. Rosenthal, *Konvertitenbilder aus dem 19. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg 1868), 348ff.

CHAPTER 14

The Catholic Movement in France and Italy

The Catholic Action of the Laity in France

The French clergy counted on the strong support of the government, but saw no reason to remain inactive itself. Its efforts were effective especially within the framework of the parishes. These efforts consisted of extended instructions in the catechism;[1] services which were made more attractive by the addition of music which, corresponding to a tradition of the eighteenth century, was derived from popular songs; and membership for the faithful in pious organizations, chiefly in the confraternities of penance, which became attractive again during this period. Some enterprising priests set up youth organizations, analogous to those of Abbé Allemand at Marseille,[2] but more often with the atmosphere of a hothouse than in the style of training for the apostolate.

This priestly activity, however, could flourish only in the more backward rural areas; for the needs of urban populations it was inadequate. In order to appeal to them, a large number of organizations were created during the course of the restoration in which the laity assumed an eminent place. Of course, the clergy continued to hold a leading position in founding and direction of these works, but the laity played a great participatory role not only as executors but also as initiators and cofounders. This was a new phenomenon, and one must go back as far as the *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrament* in the seventeenth century in order to find an analogous event in France. The intrusion of the laity into a sphere long reserved to the clergy is in part explained by the lack of priests and orders, but it was also the result of an awareness of the new conditions of the apostolate: "I am convinced that priests can no longer be the most successful apostles," one of them wrote. We see here the beginnings of the modern Catholic Action, an action directed toward a specific social environment.

---

[1] Some later bishops such as Quélen, Borderies, Feutrier, and Gallard gained their reputation through their activity in the *catéchisme de persévérance.* See p. 434.

[2] P. Gaduel, *Le directeur de la jeunesse, J. J. Allemand* (Marseille 1885).

At the beginning of many of these laymen's works stood the Congregation, whose description as the "Central Office of Catholic Action" may perhaps be overblown, but whose efforts on the national level resulted in a significant achievement. Founded in Paris in 1801 by an ex-Jesuit in imitation of the Marian Congregation, it was banned by Napoleon in 1809 and ultimately reestablished in 1814. The Jesuit Pierre Ronsin was its spiritual creator, but its prefects and assistants were laymen. Approximately sixty similar bodies, often founded in provincial towns in connection with missions to the people, were associated with it. It comprised only a limited number of members, almost all of whom came from socially prominent circles. In contrast to the former confraternities, for which religion was often no more than a pretext for merry get-togethers, the Congregation charged its members with performing all kinds of charitable and apostolic works designed to influence the masses and represented by branches throughout the country. To them belonged the Society of Good Works, founded in 1816, which engaged in three forms of charity—visits to hospitals, visits to prisons, and religious instruction for young chimney sweeps—performed by the members on an individual basis; the Society of Saint Joseph, founded in 1822, which comprised about one thousand small employers in order to assure the Christian welfare of young workers; the Society of Beneficial Studies, also founded in 1822, which was a forerunner of study groups of university students; and the Catholic Society of Good Books, founded in 1824, whose purpose in imitation of similar groups in Bordeaux, Grenoble, and Turin[3] was to counter the spread of antireligious tracts through the publication of books of monarchical and Catholic content. They were priced moderately in order to appeal to the middle class (1,600,000 were published within six years).

The Congregation was attacked severely by opponents of what they called the "Party of Priests." It was accused of being a secret club, dominated by the Jesuits, for the purpose of controlling state and society. Historians for a long time were uncertain about the justness of this allegation. But Father de Bertier succeeded in clearing up the matter conclusively through the use of hitherto unknown documents. He proved what Catholic authors, and especially G. de Grandmaison, had always asserted. The Congregation as such always avoided any direct political activity and neither it nor its branches ever acted as lobby groups for the filling of influential positions. But there was also no doubt that the majority of the leaders of this organization were convinced that the religious future of France was closely tied to the Bourbon dynasty; this orientation gave Catholic Action an undeniable monarchical direction. A number of influential members of the Congregation were also, in conjunction with their official positions in the government or their prominent social standing, eager partisans of an ultramontane policy and active members of the secret monarchical Knights of the Faith. Thus the liberals were not wrong when they accused the people associated with the Congregation of being leaders of a secret club bent on acquiring control of the government. "Their understandable error consisted of ascribing to the Congregation the function of an organization responsible for all of these political and religious activities, while in reality it was only one of those clearly differentiated institutions whose undeniable simultaneous appearance found sufficient explanation in the fact that they were all headed by the same people with identical ideals and principles."[4]

---

[3] See below, p. 236.

It remains to be added that even on the purely religious level the Congregation possessed no monopoly of inspiration. It had no connections at all either with the Society of Good Literature or with the Catholic Library. It was independent from the congregation founded in Bordeaux by Father Chaminade for young people, adults, and women. The same is true for the Congregation of Lyon which was founded by laymen at the end of the Revolution and was connected to groups from Savoy and Piedmont as well as to the Knights of the Faith. In spite of the veil of secrecy with which it surrounded itself, this society was very active under the leadership of the merchant Coste. Because of his zeal he was called the "First Christian of the Diocese" and in 1818 founded several autonomous branches, which pursued varied activities in the area of charitable works. This group from Lyon played a signal role, especially in cooperation with Pauline Jaricot, a pious young girl, in the founding of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.[5]

Nonetheless, many of these lay works, even if they were not creations of the Paris Congregation, lived under its strong influence, at least until the death in 1826 of Mathieu de Montmorency, the leading personality of the first generation of the Congregation. After his death, which coincided with the great offensive of Montlosier and the liberals against the Congregation, a new generation took over its leadership. Berryer, Bailly, and Gerbet and Salinis, followers of Lamennais, introduced a new spirit. They exercised little influence on the government—which, incidentally, explains the quick decline of all those organizations which existed because of official support—and instead turned more directly to fashioning public opinion. It was they above all who were involved in the beginning of the Association for the Defense of the Catholic Religion, the first of the societies for the defense of Catholicism against anticlerical currents. Founded in June 1828 following the formation of the Martignac ministry, it aimed at the establishment of branches in all of France, and for this purpose founded the paper *Le Correspondant.*[6]

---

[4] G. de Bertier, op. cit., 406.

[5] See A. Lestia, op. cit. and G. Gorrée, *Père Jaricot, une laïque engagé* (Paris 1962). Abbé Jaricot and his sister Pauline founded a society for the support of the missions in America. The principle of aid for missions in the entire world was agreed on in a convention of the congregation on 3 May 1822 at Lyon; the cooperation of the Knights of the Faith expanded the activity to Paris and all of France.

Catholic Publications in France

Several of the societies listed above took it upon themselves to promote the distribution of good books, as the Catholics had clearly recognized the great importance of the press for winning public opinion on behalf of the Church. After being freed from Napoleonic censorship, Catholic publishing houses developed a remarkable activity. Reprints of apologetic works of the eighteenth century and publications of new apologies of the Catholic Church as well as of monarchical government became increasingly numerous, a process in which quality was often sacrificed to quantity. In addition to Lamennais, there were four figures who for a period of fifteen years radiated from Paris to the rest of Europe a political-religious ideology based on the combination of Catholicism and monarchical authority. It was an ideology which took the place of the earlier rationalistic and liberal ideology which likewise had emanated from France during the two preceding generations. It was characteristic for the intellectual condition of the Church in France toward the end of the revolutionary era that these four persons were laymen and that three of them were foreigners.

Count Louis de Bonald (1754–1840) throughout the restoration period continued his little-read but frequently quoted publications against the individualistic and critical philosophy of the eighteenth century. Tirelessly and with imperturbable logic he treated topics which for half a century became the focus and point of departure of political and social traditionalism on one hand and of philosophical and religious traditionalism on the other. The Savoyard Joseph de Maistre (1754–1821), a writer with a brilliant and sharp pen, who became for the Society of Jesus, under rather different conditions, what Pascal was for Port-Royal (Thibaudet); he paled much sooner, but was also much more appropriate for his time. From the excesses of the revolution he derived the necessity of monarchical absolutism and theocracy and became the defender of the infallibility of the Pope. In his *Soirées de Saint-Pétersbourg* (1821) he became the "lay theologian of providence" (Brunetière). The Swiss Karl Ludwig von Haller (1768–1854), opponent of Rousseau and defender of the principle of authority, arrived at a rejection of Protestantism through the extension of his ideas to the field of religion. His *Letter to his Family, in Order to explain to it his Return to the Catholic Church* (1821) saw more than fifty editions. It was published in Paris, where he lived from 1824 to 1831, and through his writings and personal contacts exercised a remarkable influence on the Catholic restoration in the intellectual world. Finally there was the Dane Nikolaus von Eckstein (1790–1861), who in 1809 converted to Catholicism and after 1816 resided in Paris. He was a prolific, often confused, but also occasionally original author, thanks to his German professors Schlegel and Görres, for the spread of whose thoughts in France he was largely responsible. He intended to collect in a comprehensive synthesis everything that in contemporary research concerned the Christian dogma and seemed to support the Christian faith. He wanted to incorporate the findings of Brognart, Cuvier, and Humboldt in geology and ethnology, as well as those of philology, jurisprudence, orientalism, and prehistory. As a defender of tradition within the meaning of the German historical school, but more open-minded toward political freedom, Eckstein in a certain sense was also the precursor of Catholic liberalism. This unfortunately rather neglected publicist for a number of years, in addition to Lamennais, constituted "a focus for some young Christians who, like him, saw the essence of modern times in science and politics" (L. de Carné). In order better to propagate his ideas, he founded the monthly *Le Catholique* in 1826, following the example of the Mainz *Katholik.*

---

[6] See below, p. 276, footnote 8.

The Catholic champions intended to serve throne and altar not only through books and pamphlets. Lamennais as early as 1814 thought of founding a paper for the defense of Catholic interests, and on a regular basis he contributed articles to political newspapers which he regarded "not only as a tribune, but as a pulpit." Thus he contributed to Chateaubriand's *Conservateur,* to Genoude's and Bonald's *Défenseur,* and finally he published in *Drapeau blanc,* whose editor he was temporarily, eloquent indictments of the politics of concessions to the secular state as it had emerged from the revolution.[7] To be sure, many Catholics turned to journalism, but few possessed the talent of the Breton abbé. Most of the Catholic papers founded during the period of the restoration were rather colorless, first among them the most widely read *L'ami de la religion et du roi,* edited by Michel Picot, a man full of zeal but also of great limitation.

---

[7] His articles were printed in the *Premier mélanges* (Paris 1819) and *Nouveaux mélanges* (1826). Concerning Lamennais as journalist, consult C. Maréchal, *La dispute de l'Essai,* 81–195 and *Lamennais au "Drapeau blanc."*

In addition to the support provided by writers and a few journalists, Catholicism during the restoration could also count on poets who continued to travel the path first taken by Chateaubriand twenty years earlier. In his *Méditations,* which turned out to be the literary event of 1820, Lamartine demonstrated that and how religion illuminated the problems of human destiny. Under the influence of Lamennais and as a result of his own experiences, Lamartine reverted to the faith of his youth. In spite of some vagueness in his thinking, his writings during the subsequent ten years created an atmosphere favorable to the Christian faith. In the circle around Nodier, the leaders of the new romantic school, especially the young Victor Hugo, celebrated the beauty of the Bible, of Gothic cathedrals, and of Catholic liturgy. But the situation was not as favorable as it might appear at first glance, and among the French romantics one could not speak of a Catholic culture to the same degree as with Görres and Manzoni. A few years sufficed to demonstrate the superficial character of an "elastic Christianity" (Viatte), in which the desire to merge with nature or the longing for a medieval past outweighed a rational agreement with a clearly defined faith. Besides, the romantics, after certain circumstances had connected them temporarily with the extreme right, began to distance themselves from this unnatural connection under Charles X and turned to the new liberal generation, the opponents of the established order, whose anticlericalism and even freethinking they frequently adopted.

The Appearance of Abbé de Lamennais

Several times the activity of Lamennais has been mentioned. In the course of the last years of the restoration he dominated to an increasing degree the Catholic movement in France and in other countries, chiefly in the Netherlands and Italy, and in some manner was connected with the beginning of the great intellectual development of Catholicism in the nineteenth century.

Félicité Robert de Lamennais (1782–1854) in 1804 found his way back to his faith and decided to work in the service of the Church in the future. He read extensively, especially the Bible, Bossuet, Malebranche, and Bonald. Interrupted by long periods of depression, together with his brother Jean-Marie he wrote a work against rationalism and another one against the religious policy of Napoleon. After long hesitation he finally allowed himself to be persuaded by his spiritual mentors to enter the priesthood in 1815.[8] In addition to his collaboration with ultraroyalist newspapers he then turned to the writing of comprehensive apologetic works designed to establish an effective protection of religion and the freedom of the Catholic Church. In the *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* he attacked less the unwillingness of individuals to concern themselves with religious questions as the attitude of the government, which refused openly to defend the only true religion.

The first volume, published in December 1817, reveals an intimate knowledge of the mentality of his time. It was written in a style of concentrated emotion which to us may appear high-flown, but it met the taste of the readers of the *Génie du Christianisme* and in the following years became a gigantic success in spite of the reticence of the left as well as the right press. "This book could bring the dead back to life," admitted Frayssinous. Overnight the young unknown priest had risen to the first rank of literary eminence, even though since the death of Massillon (1742) "no cleric in France had achieved the reputation of a writer or an outstanding person" (Lacordaire). It was his pleasure to witness that under his influence several of the young romantic writers again came closer to the Church. The volumes subsequently published between 1820 and 1823 were written in a more sober style, confused the public, and displeased the critics. But they inspired a number of young priests, who in consequence of an inadequate philosophical training in the seminaries were without protection exposed to the thought processes of an apparently relentless logic. They believed to have found in Lamennais the man of the future, able to breathe life into the religious restoration by adapting it to the spirit of the times.

To the same degree they applauded the passionate polemicist who in the press directed severe attacks against the weakness of a government whose policy, especially with respect to education, lacked sufficient Christian content. He also attacked the submissive spirit rooted in the Gallican influence with respect to the civil powers which prevented the bishops from taking effective action against this "treason." The famous *Lettre au grand-maître* of August 1823 was a high-point of his attacks in which he accused Monsignor Frayssinous of using his authority in covering up the "practical atheism" of the royal high schools.[9] It earned Lamennais the first episcopal reprimand and he was excluded from the *Drapeau blanc.* But two of his initial admirers, the Abbés Gerbet and

---

[8] See P. Dudon, *La vocation ecclésiastique de Lamennais: Le recrutement sacerdotal* (Reims 1912), no. 1.

[9] See C. Maréchal, *Lamennais au "Drapeau blanc"*, 160–285; M. R. Henrion, *Vie de Mgr. Frayssinous* II (Paris 1844), 425ff.; A. Garnier, *Frayssinous et la jeunesse* (Paris 1932).

Salinis, pastors to the students,[10] in January 1824 decided to take a page from models in Germany and Italy and founded an independent newspaper. With the cooperation of their master and with the intent to spread his ideas, it was designed to deal with religious, philosophical, and literary problems from a modern vantage point in place of political discussions. The resulting *Mémorial catholique* generated a vivid echo even in liberal minds, and was a surprise not only because of its "youthful verve and fervent proselytizing spirit" (Sainte-Beuve) but also because of the breadth and variety of the questions raised.[11] It went considerably beyond what the remaining contemporary press had to offer,[12] and strove to acquaint its readership with the most important foreign publications. But it had the disadvantage of introducing into ecclesiastical literature a belligerent, provocative, and frequently intolerant tone which characterized Lamennais and his adherents and a good deal of French publications in the nineteenth century.

It increasingly strengthened the opposition to Lamennais and the young reformers of the apostolate surrounding him. The bishops were enraged over the lack of constraint with which these "religious Jacobins" (Frayssinous) treated hierarchical authority in their attacks against Gallicanism. The sense of tradition and of the fitting of the Sulpicians was offended, and the Jesuits were not at all convinced that Lamennais was the greatest thinker whom the French Church had produced since Bossuet; they feared that his intemperance could cause a reaction among the liberals, whose first victims they would be. Finally the clerics had to fear for the advantages which the Church derived from the protection of the civil power, and therefore they condemned the virulent attacks of the new school against the state. The reproaches became even stronger when Lamennais published his sensational *De la religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil* (1825/26). In it he attacked Gallicanism more strongly than ever before and recommended that the Church separate itself openly from the government of the Bourbons. The overdrawn formulations especially attracted the young, who, as so often is the case, were exposed to great danger in an apparently favorable situation. With the electric effect of his writings, the prophetic character of his ingenious intuitions, and the magical charm of his personality,[13] Lamennais succeeded in surrounding himself with an enthusiastic elite of young clerics and laymen. Among them were most of the leading minds of French Catholicism of the subsequent decades,[14] even though more than one of them, as for example Guéranger, later preferred to treat these youthful associations with silence.[15] Encouraged by the benevolent reception which Leo XII accorded the talented apologist and defender of ultramontane doctrine on the occasion of his journey to Italy in 1824,[16] the sickly little priest became the leader of a new generation, and his influence ultimately was so great that Duine could speak of his spiritual dictatorship over the French Church.

---

[10] As almoners of the College of Henry IV, they created a new type of study group called "conferences," which served to train a number of men for the Catholic movement of the middle of the century, such as E. d'Alzon, the brothers Boré, L. Dulac, E. de Casalès, and L. de Carné.

[11] C. de Ladoue, *Gerbet* II, 74–81 and chiefly J. R. Derré, op. cit., 169–225.

[12] The much more solid *Catholique* of Eckstein appeared only two years later.

One of the reasons for this extraordinarily great influence was that Lamennais, however much importance he attached to his intellectual work, in equal measure was concerned with the "Catholic Action"—he coined the term—as the practical realization of his new Christian philosophy and the vital religious currents which inspired it. He wanted to encourage his followers in a complete reform of Catholic society[17] and the work of the Church in the world by asking them to solve all problems of social life not with a respectful neutrality toward all opinions but from the vantage point of revealed divine doctrine. His passionate interest, which he brought to bear especially on the question of a free Catholic education, must be seen from this perspective. It gained strength following the laws of 1828, as did the development of his political ideas. This former ultra eventually became the leader of Catholic liberalism, but still pursued the reconquest of society for Catholicism.[18]

The Beginnings of Catholic Action in Italy

In Italy also the Catholic restoration, as in other countries of western Europe, was not only a political movement, but to an equal degree a manifestation of religious vitality in which laymen played a significant role. To be sure, there was nothing on the Italian peninsula which could rival the dynamic of the religious circles of the Rhineland or Bavaria or the initiative of the groups around Lamennais. But there also, especially in the north, were a number of priests and laymen who placed all of their strength in the service of religious restoration. Some of them, such as the future Monsignor J. M. Favre or Father Mermier, concentrated on preaching to the people according to the French example. Others, like B. Rubino, the founder of the Oblates of Saint Louis of Gonzaga, and Father Aporti devoted themselves to the apostolate among the young or tried to ameliorate the needs of the poor, as was done by the unique Giuseppe Cottolengo.[19] Others attempted to influence the opinion of the educated and to make a front against the prevailing mentality at the end of the eighteenth century. They attacked philosophies which were hardly compatible with Christian spiritualism, turned against the *Illuminismo* which sailed in the wake of the encyclopedists and followed rigoristic tendencies in morality, and were opposed to regalism and to those who disapproved of papal prerogatives. Among the latter, three names were dominant in 1820: Ventura in Naples, Rosmini in Lombardy, and Lanteri in Piedmont. Pio Brunone Lanteri (1759–1830), whom circumstances often forced to act secretly or anonymously, is least known. Historians have only recently recognized the significance of the role which he played for half a century after the deluge of the French Revolution. He was a witness to priestly work which all too often was neglected. As a teacher he used a portion of his wealth to distribute small pamphlets, often written by him, in order to dispel the errors of his time. But he was also an organizer who wanted to assure his activities of the greatest possible effectiveness through the creation of clubs[20] or the rejuvenation of already existing organizations.

---

[13] Especially evocative in this respect are the *Souvenirs de jeunesse by* Charles Sainte-Foi (=Elie Jourdain) (Paris 1911) and the *Journal* by Maurice de Guérin (Paris 1862).

[14] Not all of them, however. Lacordaire remained reserved for a long time and Dupanloup, closely affiliated with the Sulpician circle, always remained hostile to him.

[15] See E. Sevrin, *Dom Guéranger et Lamennais* (Paris 1933).

[16] Whether he actually wanted to make him a cardinal is dealt with by L. Le Guillou, *L'évolution de la pensée religieuse de Lamennais* (Paris 1966), 135–36 and Colapietra, 326–29.

[17] Already in 1822 he had written in *Drapeau blanc* of the unhappy conditions of the workers in the new liberal society, the first landmark of social Catholicism in France. See Duroselle, 36–40.

[18] See chapter 16.

It was primarily his efforts which brought back to life in completely new form in 1817 a society for the distribution of good books which had been founded forty years earlier by the ex-Jesuit Diesbach. This *Amicizia cattolica* was subsequently headed exclusively by laymen, without exception members of the nobility, and no longer placed the personal salvation of its members into the foreground but concentrated on mass action to be effected through publications. In its spiritual form, it adopted the organization of the Freemasons. Its chief supporter was the

---

[19] Concerning Cottolengo (1786–1842), see A. Scheiwiller, *G. Cottolengo* (Freiburg i. Br. 1937); *Il Cottolengo. L'uomo, l'opera, lo spirito* (Turin 1950).

[20] He was involved in the creation of the Oblati di Maria Vergine, for which in 1826 he received the approbation of Leo XII against the will of his archbishop, as well as of the Convitto ecclesiastico of Turin, which in 1817 was founded by his student Guala and from which later G. Cafasso and Don Bosco were to emerge.

Marchese Cesare d'Azeglio, who in 1824 introduced in Piedmont the French work of dissemination of the faith and thus established the first center of missionary lay work outside of France.[21] Several societies related to the *Amicizia* of Turin were created either under its direct influence (in Rome and Novara) or in imitation of its principles and methods.[22] Among the latter a special place was occupied by the *Società degli amici* and its branches in Venice and Lombardy, founded in 1819 by Rosmini in Rovereto. Its attitude was neither fearful nor conservative and it was oriented toward Italy. On the other hand, its aims were far-reaching; it wanted to devote itself both to charitable work and to an intensification of Catholic education. The *Amicizie* in general concentrated their efforts on the struggle against liberalism, and for this purpose distributed small pamphlets, easily accessible to the public, which were not limited to religious-political polemics or an emphasis of the social utility of religion. Simultaneously they promoted spiritual and theological aims awakened by the Society of Jesus, such as the veneration of the Sacred Heart of Jesus or the Virgin Mary, frequent communion, a less rigoristic morality, and the belief in the infallibility of the Pope.

After the unrest of 1820/21, Catholic publications received a new form through the founding of newspapers for the defense of Catholic and monarchical principles. The first, the *Enciclopedia ecclesiastica e morale,* was founded in Naples in 1821 as a result of collaboration between Father Ventura and the Prince of Canosa, a layman. It was their aim to confront liberal tendencies, against which the police were powerless, with an ideological bulwark based on religion. In the following year, Cesare d'Azeglio realized a long-planned project by founding in Turin the *Amico d'Italia.* Father Baraldi in Modena founded the *Memorie di religione, di morale e di letteratura,* and in 1825 similar papers appeared,[23] in Rome the *Giornale ecclesiastico,* strongly influenced by Ventura, and in Florence the *Giornale degli apologisti della religione cattolica.* But already by this time the mediocre results of these efforts brought about a weakening of the initial zeal; genuine journalistic talent was lacking and this also limited the power to influence. All of these papers, which unceasingly and in all areas countered social and intellectual anarchy with the principle of authority, were inspired, albeit with considerable variations, by the counterrevolutionary ideology developed at this time in Paris and Vienna. In contrast to many conservatives, who above all desired a political and social restoration for whose implementation they wished to use the Church, the editors of these Italian Catholic papers were more or less firmly convinced that the Church was the only and indispensable guarantee for social order. They also believed that the political revolution of 1789 was nothing more than the logical consequence of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century and that for this reason an integrated religious restoration was necessary. With the aid of this restoration they wanted to return, aside from all deviations of the Gallicanism of the Old Regime, to a medieval Christianity in which the Church, represented by the Pope, formulated the duties of the state.

---

[21] See C. Bona, *La rinascita missionaria in Italia. Dalle "Amicizie" all'Opera per la propagazione della fede* (Turin 1964).

[22] His influence reached to France and even to the Netherlands. See C. Bona, *Le "Amicizie,"* 357–61.

[23] Concerning the differentiating nuances of the *Memorie* (Modena) from the *Giornale ecclesiastico* which was designed to appeal chiefly to the common Christians, see Colapietra, 238–42.

Such ideas, which even some members of the Roman Curia considered excessive or at least inopportune under the prevailing circumstances, could hardly be to the liking of the regalistic governments of the time, and in fact the papers were one by one suppressed. The enthusiasm, however, with which these circles greeted the campaign of Lamennais in favor of theocracy and ultramontanism is easily understandable. In this connection there was often talk of influence; rather, it was a confluence of several strains of thought. Frequently there were laudatory allusions to Lamennais in these papers. His works were translated several times, and contacts by letter with the main representatives of the Catholic movement, especially with the Piedmontese group, became more frequent and reached a peak on the occasion of his journey to Italy in 1824. Yet it was not Lamennais to whom they owed their convictions; they merely recognized in the French writer an excellent means to propagate their ideas. Thus it was not surprising that in contrast to Belgium his Italian readership dwindled at the very moment when, in 1825, he began to promote the separation of Church and state. After the publication of his *Progrès de la révolution* in 1829, outright hostility developed in many cases, one of whose exceptions was Father Ventura.

This development in the attitude toward Lamennais was characteristic for the Italian, and above all the Piedmontese, Catholic movement of the restoration period. It lacked a certain cultural open-mindedness—the unequivocal opposition to romanticism is typical—and that sensitivity for new religious and political problems which lent the French movement of Lamennais its conquering dynamic. Their efforts were limited to a rather superficial concept of the activity of the Church in the world, assigning more significance to the Christianization of institutions than to the development of conscience. We see here—and this consideration justifies the importance assigned to this movement in spite of its immediate lack of success—the beginnings of the intransigent current whose strength in Italian Catholic life grew more important in the second half of the century.

Not all Catholic forces, however, oriented themselves in this conservative direction. Rosmini separated himself from it in spite of his connections to the restoration movement and his sympathies for Haller and German traditionalism. On the cultural level he was concerned with a rejuvenation of traditional Christian philosophy and on the political level with the national problem. On the other hand there were also convinced Catholics in the romantic movement which, in contrast to France and especially to Germany, in Italy had a much stronger continuity with the *Illuminismo* of the eighteenth century. The most striking figure in this context is Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873), much more so than Gioberti, who despite his influence on liberal Catholics remained on the fringes of Catholicism and wavered between deism and skepticism. Manzoni moved from revolutionary encyclopedism to Catholicism by way of the moral endeavors of Jansenism and Calvinism. His religious ideas were the cause for many controversies,[24] but there can be no doubt about the seriousness of his faith following his conversion in Paris in 1810. His frequently reprinted *Osservazioni sulla morale cattolica* (1819), in which he corrects the Protestant Sigismondi, who attributed the political decadence of the Italians to Catholicism, constituted the first remarkable manifesto of a cultural patriotism in Italy which openly was as one with the Catholic tradition. The ethical-religious topics here sketched were taken up again a few years later in the famous novel *I promessi sposi* (1826/27) which gave the Italy of the nineteenth century a literary masterpiece of a depth different from that of Chateaubriand's *Génie du Christianisme.* Even if Manzoni's thinking at this time cannot yet be called liberal, it implied liberal consequences which made Manzoni one of the most important originators of Catholic liberalism in Italy during the second third of the century. In an environment, then, which in essence remained reactionary, the seeds for a rejuvenation of Catholic mentality were planted which approached modern values with greater openness.

---

[24] See G. Busnelli, *La conversione di A. Manzoni* (Rome 1913); G. Salvadori, *Libertà e servitù nel pensiero-giansenista e in A. Manzoni* (Brescia 1932); F. Ruffini, *La vita religiosa di A. Manzoni* (Bari 1931); and P. Fossi, *La conversione di A. Manzoni* (Bari 1933).

CHAPTER 15

The Complex Revival of Religious Studies

The eighteenth century, although productive in the areas of exegesis, Church history, and pastoral care, was on the whole not a glorious time for theology. The following century began under even worse conditions. In spite of a rich apologetic literature, Catholic thought lacked force and determination. In Italy and Spain, theologians were absorbed by sterile polemics and religious thought languished in mediocrity. In France, the magical style of a Chateaubriand could not conceal the doctrinal poverty, and works which were tied to the classics were ill-suited to a modern mentality. In Germany, a majority of theologians, influenced by the rationalism of their environment, stood in danger of emptying Christianity of its supernatural content. In addition, the old centers of education were disorganized as a consequence of the French Revolution.

Between 1810 and 1820, the very depth of the crisis in Catholic thought, a crisis which could no longer be ignored, brought about a reaction. Within a few years, a number of initiatives were taken. Although inept, these actions were more impressive and positive than the neo-scholasticism at the turn of the century was willing to admit. They had as their aim the regaining for Catholicism of that esteem among the educated which it had lost almost completely. These attempts were strongly supported by the romantics, in spite of the inherent ambivalence of their philosophy. The literary and theological revival not only occurred simultaneously, but theology also received lasting influences from romantic thought and adopted such concepts as a sensibility to the coldness of reason, a mystical understanding of the universe, a reaction against individualism in favor of the values of the community, and a desire for the rehabilitation of tradition and history. This mentality was reflected in a somewhat exaggerated philosophy, which fostered a daring idealism in search of comprehensive harmonious syntheses and a history in which the organic development of the idea through the ages was accentuated. In theology, this attitude led to a revaluation of the confession of faith, occasionally even sliding into fideism; to a shift in emphasis in religion from the moralism of the eighteenth century to a mystical and supernatural position; to a view of the Church as a living organism which, although it had occasionally neglected the personality of the believer, was also the soil from which dogmas developed; to a rediscovery of the meaning of the past and especially of the Church Fathers; and even, in consequence of the admiration of the Middle Ages, to a renewed interest in scholasticism. It was also recognized that there were internal connections and an organic unity between the various theological sciences, such as between dogmatism and morality, and exegesis and Church history. This new view led in similar fashion to a rapprochement between theology and profane culture. In spite of the profound differences which separated the two, in this area the strivings of the Hermes School and the Tübingen theologians coincided with those of a Lamennais in France or a Rosmini in Italy.

Germany: Between Rationalism and Romantic Idealism

In contrast to Austria, where the structure of the theological university departments had hardly been touched by the disruptions at the end of the eighteenth century, in Germany the secularization of the ecclesiastical principalities and abbeys in the wake of the suppression of the Jesuits had led to the dissolution of most of the ecclesiastical centers of education. Thanks to the firm organization of the Catholic theological departments at a number of universities the interruption was mercifully brief. The new arrangement whereby theology was studied at state universities, an arrangement which has lasted to this day, offered the Catholic scholars the opportunity of close contact with non-Catholic sciences; an exchange which turned out to be fruitful. However, the new order noticeably limited the degree of control over educational content exercised by the ecclesiastical authorities. This academic freedom occasionally promoted an exaggerated sense of independence[1] and even actual deviations from correct doctrine. The danger was particularly great during the first years, when teaching appointments were made without adequate consideration of the orthodoxy of the candidates.

The Mainz seminary, which was reorganized by the French regime, under Liebermann became the center of the future neo-scholastic movement in Germany.[2] Two strong and equally dangerous tendencies dominated theology and apologetics at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The rationalism of the preceding century, strengthened by the success of the great post-Kantian philosophical systems, still exerted a strong attraction. Many efforts to defend Christianity were characterized by an unjustified accommodation to the positions of the opponents and thus incurred the risk of unseemly concessions. In some cases the tendencies to make a compromise were very strong. Professors like Fingerlos, Berg, and Gratz interpreted the miracles of the Gospel according to the method introduced by Heinrich Paulus and disregarded certain dogmas which they qualified as mere subtleties, even, upon occasion, questioning the Godhead of Christ. In addition to these extreme cases, the thinking of many pious theologians remained anchored in the Enlightenment or succumbed to Kantian criticism and idealistic pantheism. To this group belonged men such as Oberthür, who described theology in the language of Herder's humanism, and Zimmer, who interpreted dogma according to Schelling. In contrast to these tendencies, however, there was a reaction against the dry moralism and the cold rationalism of natural religion. The concepts adopted by such philosophers as Jacobi and Schleiermacher, the Protestant "Court Philosopher of Romanticism," in spite of the superiority of their emphasis on the nonreducible originality of the Christian experience and religious dynamism, led frequently to an antiintellectualism which endangered the rational foundations of the confession of faith. In some cases, they encompassed a concordism which regarded Catholicism and Protestantism merely as two different aspects of the same mystical Church. Even circles such as that of the Princess Gallitzin in Münster, whose orthodoxy was beyond question, believed to have found in fideism the true Christian answer to the excesses of rationalism.

---

[1] The declaration of the Bonn professors of 1820 was characteristic for this tendency. See H. Schrörs, op. cit., 134ff.

[2] Between 1819 and 1820 he published a four-volume textbook, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae,* frequently reprinted during the first half of the century. He intended to provide in it a precise description of the doctrines of the Church from an unequivocally anti-Protestant perspective. See L. Lenhart, op. cit., 25–53.

As always in turbulent times and intensive intellectual fermentation, a few probing attempts were made to combine the different movements of the period. Two converts, Count Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg[3] and Friedrich von Schlegel,[4] whose intellect and character had been formed by the classicism of the eighteenth century, but who also had adopted the findings and values of romanticism, contributed substantially to the rehabilitation of Catholicism among the educated classes. Through their writings, the style of which was more impressive than their content, they treated history, literature, and the philosophy of religion in equal measure. Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg, from 1800 on a member of the Münster circle, placed all of the knowledge which his excellent classical education had provided him in the service of his passionate faith in order to demonstrate the superiority of the Catholic faith over that inspired by ancient philosophy. His fifteen-volume *History of the Religion of Jesus Christ* (1806/18), written with more spiritual zeal than scholarship and critical spirit, opened to the study of Church history, which hitherto had been influenced by a Febronian and Josephinist mentality, a new and more universal horizon and one which did justice to the essentially religious and saving mission of the Church in the development of humankind. Another attempt at synthesis arose from the work of Schlegel, an admirer of Goethe and student of Fichte and Schelling, who, after 1810, taught at Vienna in close contact with the circle led by Clemens Maria Hofbauer. Schlegel's research in the history of religion led him to explore the concept of revelation. In his *Lectures on Modern History* (1811) he developed the basis for a Catholic philosophy of history,[5] and his *History of Ancient and Modern Literature* (1813), with its revelation of the literary and artistic significance of the Bible and the Middle Ages, played a role in Germany comparable to that of the *Génie du Christianisme.*

---

[3] See above, p. 218.

[4] See above, p. 219.

Johann Michael Sailer,[6] professor of pastoral theology at Landshut from 1800 to 1821, is characteristic of the theologians of the transition from the Enlightenment to Catholic romanticism. Sailer was an eclectic, but possessed a certain creativity, and was one of the first to again integrate theology with Christian spirituality. Starting from a position still firmly imbedded in the views of the eighteenth century, he gradually moved from vivacious religiosity to the life of the Church by first discovering the patristic concept of tradition and then that of the Church as a spiritual organism whose supernatural life is shared by its members.[7]

Between 1820 and 1830, Bonn, Tübingen, and Munich were the three centers of learning which most influenced religious thought in Germany.[8] At Bonn, after 1819, the influence of a school founded by Georg Hermes (1775–1831) was to last for a generation. Hermes, who earlier had been a professor of dogma at Münster and a member of the circle of the Princess Gallitzin, was a priest with great apostolic zeal. He wished to contribute to the Catholic restoration by transcending the apparent antagonism between modern philosophy and the teachings of the Church. Although he recognized the great danger which Kant's criticism and Fichte's idealism posed for the Christian faith, he was too fascinated by these philosophical systems to discard them completely.

---

[5] He continued to develop it in his *Philosophie der Geschichte* (1829).

[6] See above, pp. 221f.

[7] Sailer shows a similar development in his attitude toward the catechism. His constant concern for concrete and Bible-oriented thought is manifested by the emphasis with which he repeatedly refers to the moral example of biblical personalities; but subsequently he demanded above all that religious instruction emphasize the Passion and Salvation of Christ.

[8] Considering Schlegel, Vienna should be added to a certain degree. But Schlegel's strong influence was effective chiefly in the areas related to ecclesiastical knowledge. After the departure of Jam in 1806, the theological department, being under strict secular control, no longer exercised significant influence. See A. Wappler, op. cit., 254–62.

Instead, he wanted to fight Kant with his own weapons. Hermes carried the criticism of human knowledge a step further than Kant by regarding agreement with the truths of faith as a necessary conclusion of proof. He then proceeded to give an a priori description of all—including supernatural—reality on a rational basis, consonant with the demands of idealism.[9] Because of his remarkable teaching ability and his priestly charisma, together with the support of Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne, who was desirous of providing his diocese with educated and open-minded priests, Hermes was able to gain the enthusiasm of a portion of the young intellectuals. Upon his death, he left convinced followers in more than thirty philosophical and theological teaching posts and, in some cases, also in important positions in ecclesiastical life. But in reality, his work, which seemed so modern at the time, lacked a sense of history. Hermes' limited interest in ecclesiastical tradition, coupled with his concept of religion as a doctrine which could be understood rationally rather than spiritually, caused him to regard the development of dogmas and the history of dogmas as genuine latecomers of the Enlightenment. Therefore, he had to suffer not only the well-founded criticism of a few far-seeing minds who chided him for his Pelagian and semirationalistic position, but also of those, particularly those outside of the universities, who, influenced by romanticism, placed feeling and heartfelt belief before cold reason or were under the influence of French traditionalism.[10]

Among Hermes' opponents, many of whom adhered to fideism, which relativized their position, his Bonn colleague Karl Joseph Windischmann (1775–1839) requires special treatment. This physician and philosopher, after having wavered between pantheism and deism, finally returned to the Catholic faith in 1813. Windischmann wanted to establish a Hegelian-oriented Christian philosophy based on revelation. Through his teaching, correspondence, and numerous personal contacts, much more than through his esoteric writings, he exerted a great influence and led many people back to their Christian faith. At the same time, he directed attention to the great teachers of the Middle Ages, whose essence he sought more in their mystical writings than in their doctrinal systems.

---

[9] The essence of his principles is presented in his *Philosophische Einleitung in die Christkatholische Theologie* (1819) and its supplement *Positive Einleitung* (1829). His *Christkatholische Dogmatik* was published posthumously by his student Achterfeld.

[10] On the remarkable influence of Lamennais's traditionalism in Germany and especially in the Rhineland, see H. Schrörs, *Ein vergessener Führer aus der rheinischen Geistesgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts, J. W. J. Braun* (Bonn 1925), 289–95, and St. Lösch, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (München 1955). The chief publication of the movement was the *Aschaffenburger Kirchenzeitung; Der Katholik* (Mainz) also evinced some sympathies.

While in the Rhineland Hermes was working on an apologia with which to confront the problems caused by Kantianism and rationalism, a group of theologians at Tübingen,[11] fascinated by the philosophy of idealism but determined not to deviate from Catholic orthodoxy, sought a happy medium between the unhealthy mysticism of many romantics and the narrow-minded rationalism of many late students of the Enlightenment. They were courageous researchers, open to contemporary movements, who took advantage of the fact that certain terms of the new philosophy were already theologically adapted by contemporary Protestant thinkers. On this basis they presented a new theological synthesis which, although critical of the basic positions of Protestantism, was both modern and traditional and presented a bold program for the reform of liturgy and Church discipline.

In some areas the Tübingen theologians followed those precursors who have received attention through most recent historiography.[12] Among these men were Sailer, whose profound influence on the theology of romanticism has become increasingly clear; Geiger and Gügler, Sailer's students at Lucerne, who may be regarded as the link between the beginning of traditionalism and Hegel's philosophy; Brener, a professor at the Bamberg seminary, who, in an outline which was at the same time theology, philosophy, and history,[13] sketched dogma from the vantage point of the idea of the Empire of God; Seber, a professor at Bonn and later at Louvain, who saw the Church under the guidelines of a developing spiritual organism; and Ziegler at Vienna, who already employed the concept of a "living tradition." But only the Tübingen School managed to articulate the intellectual currents and to combine the great topics of romanticism in a comprehensive synthesis.

For Godet it was "primarily a school of speculative theology," but for Bihlmeyer it was "chiefly historically and critically" oriented. In reality, the Tübingen School stands out precisely because of its close blend of positive and speculative methods. It attempted to understand dogmatism not in the narrow sense of classical theology, for which it was merely a kind of catalogue of orthodox doctrines, but speculatively as revealed realities which demonstrate their inner harmony. The Tübingen theologians desired a more suitable instrument for the expansion of Schelling's philosophy or Hegel's dialectic, then very much in vogue, than was the case with regard to scholastic philosophy. From Schelling's philosophy, which closely related to the romantic movement, they took the idea of life and the organism as well as the strong emphasis on mystical knowledge. From Hegel they adopted, among others, the concept of a living spirit giving life to the continuing unfolding of the "Christian idea." In fact, as a result of its encounter with the writings of the Church Fathers, the history of dogma, together with the concept of a living tradition, constituted a kind of collective conscience of the Church acting under the effect of God's spirit. As such it became significant for theological renewal. In Germany, earlier than in Romance countries, the turn to the genetic method became compelling as the significance of the researches of Protestant scholars in the history of the development of Christianity became accepted. The development of a historical perspective became the characteristic method with which the nineteenth century approached all questions.

---

[11] The Catholic Theological department created in 1812 was moved from Ellwangen to Tübingen in 1817. See *ThQ* 108 (1927), 77–158. A number of professors in 1819 founded the *Theologische Quartalschrift,* the hallmark of the new school.

[12] See the document collection of J. R. Geiselmann, *Geist des Christentums und des Katholizismus. Ausgewählte Schriften katholischer Theologie im Zeitalter des deutschen Idealismus und der Romantik* (Mainz 1938).

[13] See F. Dressler, *Lebensläufe aus Franken* VI, (München 1960), 32–53.

Three names dominated the Tübingen School. Its founder, Johann Sebastian Drey (1777–1851), was still tentative in his progress and tied to the ideas of Schelling and Schleiermacher. Yet his services were twofold; he incorporated the contributions of Protestant historians in his theology without falling victim to archeologism, and he developed a theology from the perspective of transcendental idealism in order to lead Catholicism back to a fundamental and comprehensive idea. He emphasized that this idea was not based a priori upon reason, but was grounded in revealed realities; and that it was not a pure idea, but God's eternal plan manifesting itself in time: a gift from supernatural life to man. These considerations led him to a treatment of the organic unity of the Church, its continuing development, and the life of the community inspired by the Holy Spirit; topics which were to concern German theology for a long time and later all of European theology.

Johann Baptist Hirscher (1788–1865) was a reformer of the pastoral and catechetical areas and developed daring and useful thoughts, some of which were rather far from reality. He was also a rejuvenator of moral theology[14] and introduced, as Drey had, a social dimension into this discipline. Hirscher presented moral theology in a less abstract manner, which was reminiscent of Pauline kerygma, and strove for a close connection between dogma and spirituality in order to counteract the naturalistic moralism of the eighteenth century and the casuistry of the preceding centuries.

Johann Adam Möhler (1776–38) towered above both Drey and

---

[14] There were forerunners in the first years of the nineteenth century. See, for example, C. Schmeing, *Studien zur "Ethica christiana" M. v. Schenkls und zu ihren Quellen* (Regensburg 1959).

Hirscher just as "genius surpasses talent" (de Grandmaison). In the course of his brief professorship he reformulated all topics which he treated: the basic dogmas of Christianity as much as the knowledge of faith, the supernatural, grace, and the Church. Not only did his thought grow in precision between his impressive early *The Unity of the Church* (1825) and his later *Symbolism* (1832), but also in the four later editions of this latter work,[15] which came to be the most important treatment of controversial theology since the end of the sixteenth century. Möhler was an autodidact to a much smaller degree than assumed by Goyau. Instead we see in him the unfolding of a theological renewal influenced in its beginnings by rich, deep, and tradition-molded insights but also including a nonreflective enthusiasm vulnerable in its philosophical assumptions. If Möhler was inferior to Drey in speculative thought, he was yet the greater of the two in that he succeeded in freeing his synthesis from the system-immanent pantheistic tendencies of idealistic philosophy. Thus his well-considered and balanced work, in a style which conveys an enthusiastic conviction, can be regarded as the most significant example of the intellectually awakened and fundamentally very Catholic theology of romanticism.[16]

The University of Munich, transferred from Landshut in 1825, did not contribute to the theological rejuvenation of the first third of the century to the same degree as Tübingen. However, through the activity of King Ludwig I and his intimate friend Ringseis, the first president of the university, it grew within a few years into the most important intellectual center of Catholicism in central Europe in the areas of philosophy, history, literature, and the arts. Among its professors were Schelling, a Protestant who was very open-minded toward Catholicism and whose brilliant philosophical-religious synthesis of Christianity was universally acclaimed; the historian Döllinger; the able exegete Allioli; and the poet Brentano, who popularized the *Revelations* of Katharina Emmerick. In addition to these, two others, both laymen, drew attention. The philosopher Franz von Baader (1765–1841), enthusiastically acclaimed by some contemporaries as the rejuvenator of speculative theology, was closer in his work to theosophy than theology. Inspired by Thomas Aquinas and Meister Eckhart as well as by the Protestant mystic Jakob Böhme, his was a very religious, daring, and original mind.

---

[15] Of these two works, J. R. Geiselmann issued critical editions (Cologne-Olten 1957 and 1958/61), preceded by important introductions which reconstruct the history of their development.

[16] A. Minon in *EThL* 16 (1939), 375. Counter to the currently rejected view of Vermeil, who saw in Möhler the founding father of modernism, see L. de Grandmaison in *RSR* 9 (1919), 400–09 and especially S. Lösch in ThQ 99 (1917/18), 28–59, 129–52.

He was interested in bringing about a union of the Churches outside of the domination of the Pope. Although very difficult to understand as a writer, he was incomparable as a conversationalist and "as shrewd as Plato and as witty as Voltaire" (C. Sainte-Foi). Baader drew attention once again to medieval scholasticism, while simultaneously working toward the destruction of rationalism.

The second influential layman was Johann Joseph Görres (1776–1848), a typical representative of the development which returned a number of young intellectuals to their faith. These young intellectuals, without losing the positive values of their intellectual positions, moved from a lack of faith, so popular in the eighteenth century, to a rediscovery of the spiritual demands within the atmosphere of romanticism, to the Christian faith, and finally to a vital and profound understanding of the Catholic Church. In 1826 Görres became a professor of history and literature at Munich and for about twenty years was the leader of an intellectually and artistically very active group. He also provided the stimulus for a German Catholic movement against an established Church.[17] His lectures, conducted with a high degree of scholarship, were more concerned with the philosophy of history than with history as a science. He developed a universal view of history in the romantic style, and his "eagle's perspective" (Diepenbrock) was impressive to his contemporaries. These views became the foundation for Görres's work on *Christian Mysticism* (1836/42), a work which displayed very little critical spirit, but which for half a century was a point of departure for many scholarly works on speculative mysticism.

The Munich School, in which the spirit of the Illuminati occupied a wide berth, exerted an unusual force. The significance of the Munich School for all of Europe was demonstrated by its contacts with Lamennais, Rio, and Montalembert in France, and Wiseman in England.

France: On the Way to a New Apologia

The revival of theological studies proceeded much slower in France than in Germany, as a result of the lack of an institutional framework. The suppression of the religious orders and the destruction of monastic libraries had occurred at roughly the same time as the disappearance of the theological schools of the Old Regime and most of the French centers of learning. The few schools which were reestablished by Napoleon after an interval of fifteen years remained insignificant and were not able to replace what had been lost, as they were not canonically constituted. The plan devised in 1824 by Monsignor Frayssinous, minister for ecclesiastical concerns and education, to found an institute in Paris for the university training of the clergy foundered on the lack of understanding on the part of the episcopate. For several generations, therefore, the entire intellectual training of the clergy was concentrated in the seminaries of the dioceses. There the curriculum left much to be desired for two reasons. Competent professors were not available, as a consequence of the interruption occasioned by the Revolution, and the shortage of priests compelled the bishops to be more concerned with rapid ordinations than with the quality of their education. Training of priests was of a purely practical nature. In seventy-five out of eighty seminaries, Church history was not taught at all, exegesis was generally limited to a devotional commentary without any critical content, moral theology was limited to the usual casuistry, and the study of dogma consisted of the memorization of simple and antiquated texts.[18] Only two seminaries stood a little above this general mediocrity. The first of these was the seminary of Saint Sulpice, in which a few competent people taught the Old Testament, but where tradition was hostile to all innovations, including attempts to adapt theology to modern thought. Above average training was also provided after 1827 by the seminary of Strasbourg in conjunction with the École des Hautes-Études at Molsheim. The École des Hautes-Études had been entrusted to Abbé Bautain, a convert who kept in touch with German academic developments and succeeded in gathering around him such excellent professors as Gratry. However, the hostile influence of Lamennais's followers, who saw it as competition, and that of the conservative clergy, who were alarmed about the new doctrines of Bautain and his students, soon dispersed the small school.[19]

---

[17] See above, p. 222, and below, p. 333.

Louis Bautain (1796–1867) is generally regarded only as a champion of fideism. But in reality, as Father Poupard has demonstrated, his orientation toward Plato and Augustine made him much more differentiated. Bautain possessed a profound if somewhat fanatical mind, and his university education made him a rarity in those days. He was very much concerned with a unity of thought and life, and he attempted to solve the intellectual problems of his age with a truly Catholic spirit. Unfortunately, Bautain was not familiar with scholastic tradition, a dangerous ignorance, but it allowed him a fresh and free approach to problems.[20] Beyond a sharp criticism of rationalism, his work was designed to offer a genuinely theological synthesis from the perspective of German idealism. Reflecting upon the wealth of ideas contained in revelation, he attempted to describe the complete agreement of dogmas and to demonstrate how they explained the riddles of nature and human life. His theological wisdom, presented to the faithless as the only true philosophy, acquired an apologetic significance. Throughout this time, apologetic intentions dominated Catholic thought in France, where destruction as a consequence of unbelief had been greater than in other countries. In many instances, however, the need for a rejuvenation in the area of methodology was not recognized. Until 1830, only the polemical writings of Duvoisin, Cardinal de la Luzerne, and Abbé Bergier against Voltaire and the encyclopedists were issued over and over. Most of the apologetic works published in the first quarter of the nineteenth century were written from this same perspective. Even the *Conférences de Monseigneur Frayssinous sur la Defénse du christianisme,*[21] which were so successful, were imbedded in classicism. The numerous editions of these works, many of which were merely mediocre efforts, point up how undemanding the ecclesiastical public was.

---

[18] The gradual replacement of the *Institutiones Theologicae* (1818/33) by J.-B. Bouvier by L. Bailly's *Theologia dogmatica et moralis* or *Theologie de Toulouse* improved the situation only marginally.

[19] See P. Poupard, op. cit., 184–91, 255–56.

[20] See H. Walgrave in *RHE* 58 (1963), 641–42. A synthesis of Bautain's thought can be found in his *Philosophie du christianisme* (1835).

Occasionally an attempt was made to channel apologetics into new paths which would be better suited to the mentality of the period. These attempts contributed to a certain degree of revival in Catholic education, without, however, being able to achieve a solid and lasting synthesis.

Eckstein,[22] who had studied in Germany, followed the example of Görres in favoring a comprehensive study of the past of humanity with the aim of discovering within it the essence of the one divine history.[23] As a student of Schlegel, Eckstein opened up for the contemporaries of Champollion the significance of Near Eastern studies for the defense of Christianity. In this scientific area, Catholics occupied an honorable place until the middle of the century.

In a number of new books, two other laymen, Louis de Bonald and Joseph de Maistre, whose writings first appeared at the time of the Revolution, took up the topics raised since 1796.[24] Their intention was not that of the classical apologists to prove the truth of religion, but rather its necessity. This they did by applying the pragmatic perspective of Chateaubriand to the area of politics. Not only does revelation satisfy to the highest degree the demands of the heart and man's noblest motives, but it also confirms through experience that it is the necessary foundation of the activities of spiritual and social life, just as the destructive nature of the revolution had proved the error of the philosophy of the Enlightenment. For Bonald, individual reason, incapable of arriving at the truth, must be replaced by external authority, divine in origin and social in its realization, a revelation transmitted with the aid of tradition. This philosophically and theologically questionable concept became in France the impulse for the development of the study of the history of religion and of sociology and guided the attention of theologians to the social aspects of Christianity. De Maistre took an analogous but clearly differentiated direction. In a visionary fashion and without concern for early tradition, he examined the historical experience of the past few centuries in order to divine the laws of providence and the immutable principles of society. He also arrived at the conclusion that monarchy was the best form of government, but he insisted on the necessity of its association with Catholicism and warned that any attempt at independence with respect to the Holy See would necessarily lead to disruptions. In this way de Maistre became a champion of ultramontane revival as well as of that movement which favored the return of divided Christianity to Roman unity.[25]

---

[21] Held from 1803 to 1809 and 1814 to 1820; published in 1825, reprinted seventeen times; translated into English, German, Italian, and Spanish.

[22] See above, p. 231.

[23] It should be noted that even the Protestant Benjamin Constant with his multi-volume *De la religion*—rich in facts and ideas and also influenced by contemporary German scholarship—in his own way contributed to the success of traditional apologetics by showing that a documented work on prehistory confirms the unique nature of Christian revelation.

[24] See above, p. 70, and G. Constant in *RHE* 30 (1934), 54–60.

This counterrevolutionary apologetic, abandoning individualistic rationalism for social salvation based upon a return to a religion of authority, had much to offer a world which saw society shaken to its foundations. But in order to be truly acceptable, especially to the young, it had to be less dogmatic and had to be able to express itself in a language fitted to the romantic mentality. In addition, it had to be shown as less directly political and no longer primarily as justification for a monarchical social order. It must stand as a strongly intellectual system of Catholic philosophy. This task was left for Lamennais, whom we encounter once more in this connection in his *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (4 volumes, 1817–23). Lamennais continued to be inspired by themes of the apologists of the seventeenth century: Pascal, Bossuet, de Maistre, and especially Bonald. These themes were newly expressed by Lamennais even if not newly thought through. In a remarkable way Lamennais understood the mentality and the difficulties of his contemporaries and for that reason allowed himself momentarily to be fascinated by the ideology of the eighteenth century. He returned to the Church, however, not out of a reactionary reflex as so many followers of de Maistre or Bonald had done, nor through a purely emotional attraction like Chateaubriand, but in the name of the demands of spiritual and intellectual freedom, which had been threatened by the despotism of the state and the domination of Napoleon.[26]

---

[25] See above, pp. 109f., and M. Jugie, *Joseph de Maistre et l'Église gréco-russe* (Paris 1922).

This brilliant apologia of Lamennais, which articulated many commonly held ideas with prophetic force and enriched them with fruitful if immature insights, was paired with a philosophical traditionalism which in Lamennais's eyes constituted its irreducible rational foundation. Out of the genuine desire to provide the doctrine of the Church with a valid philosophical justification, he started with a theory of knowledge which, inspired by Bonald, placed the criterion of certainty in the *sensus communis* instead of with the insight of the individual and that of general reason. Lamennais saw his justification in a dimension of social reality which had been a constant part of the faith of humankind since its beginnings. For him, Catholic Christianity was its only valid form of expression. His system contained positive aspects which had been neglected in preceding centuries. These were the emphasis on the social character of religious man and on the historical perspective of the intellectual development of mankind; a demonstration of the thesis confirming the moral necessity of revelation; the thought, in contrast to the Protestant view, that tradition preceding the writing of Holy Scripture is the chief organ of revelation; and the working out of a non-a priori religious theory based on fact. But the passionate criticism of individual reason which is the basis for Lamennais's apologia contains dual dangers. One is fideism, which in the act of accepting religious faith suspends the autonomy of the individual conscience; the other is naturalism, which confuses the truths of general reason with supernaturally revealed truth and the authority of humankind with the authority of the Church.

The new system therefore not only earned the scorn of the rationalists but also the partially justified criticism of the theologians from Saint Sulpice who had remained true to the classical concepts. In more than three hundred small pamphlets the critics attempted a refutation, but they found only a small echo outside of the group of expert theologians. Their criticism was formulated in the name of a traditional and no longer living philosophy and one whose Cartesian infiltration Lamennais demonstrated with temperament. The educated public was much more receptive to the striving of Lamennais for a Catholic doctrine which would integrate the tradition of the Church with the philosophies of classical antiquity and classical religions while keeping itself open to the future. Lamennais, a self-taught man, who was "ignorant of the classics" (Lambruschini) and who stood chronologically and ideologically at the turn from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, became the originator of a new Christian humanism. For a decade he was the leading spiritual power of the most dynamic wing of the young clergy. These young clergymen were equally interested in an unmerciful criticism of Gallicanism and in the new and more modern political theology which Lamennais presented in *De la religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil* (1826). Lamennais's influence reached far beyond the borders of France. He had admirers not only in Belgium,[27] which was traditionally tied to France, but there was also a numerically small but highly interested public in the northern part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands,[28] in Italy,[29] and even in Germany.[30]

---

[26] Lamennais principally fought against "political indifference," i.e., the attitude of a state whose institutions do not rest on the voluntary and exclusive acknowledgment of Catholic truth; he did not do so merely because Catholicism through legitimizing monarchical authority formed the only firm foundation for an enduring society, but equally as much because in obligating this authority to act only in agreement with a moral law respecting the individual as a human being could freedom of conscience be effectively protected.

The dynamic effect of Lamennais on the revival of speculative theology and philosophy in France resulted not only from his writings but also from his charisma. Convinced that one of the principal causes of the inferiority of Catholics in France for the past several centuries must be seen in the cultural and scientific backwardness of the clergy, together with his brother Jean-Marie[31] he developed in 1828 the idea of a new congregation which was to take the place of the old orders which were no longer capable of meeting the needs of the time. Aware that the task surpassed the strength of any individual, he hoped to enlist the assistance of the young intellectuals who had gathered around him. Under a simple rule which would permit membership to priests as well as to laymen, the new congregation would train scholars according to the example of the Benedictines, college and seminary professors according to the model of the Jesuits and Sulpicians, and preachers according to the way of the Dominicans.

---

[27] The philosophy of the *sensus communis,* enthusiastically presented in the *Spectateur belge,* edited by Abbé De Foere, quickly spread in the Belgian seminaries, especially through the efforts of Abbé De Ram, the future organizer of the University of Louvain. See E. de Moreau in *NRTh* 55 (1928), 560–601; Jürgensen, 107–13; Simon, *Rencontres,* 54–56, 107–12.

[28] The spread of Lamennais's apologetics was accomplished chiefly by the publicists Broere and Le Sage ten Broek as well as by van Bommel, the future archbishop of Liège. See Vrijmoed, op. cit.

[29] See below, p. 255.

[30] See above, p. 244, footnote 10.

[31] He was of decisive importance as organizer. See Le Guillou, op. cit., 76–78 and A. Dargis, op. cit.

In order to solve the great problems of the nineteenth century through a reconciliation of science and faith, the new congregation was to intensify learning through a development of Eckstein's ideas and a reliance on German philosophy and science.[32] The scope of study was to include philosophy, theology, exegesis, Church history, languages, and all of the profane sciences including mathematics and chemistry. Within this ambitious and rather unrealistic program, ideals frequently assumed the place of clear concepts and empty phrases replaced serious scientific work. A major cause was that Lamennais and his followers "like the whole clergy in France suffered from a lack of basic education in spite of their prophetic intuitions" (Leflon), and their activity proved it. Even though Lamennais's apostasy caused the circle at La Chênaie and the Congrégation de St. Pierre to last only briefly, they did impart a lasting impulse to the intellectual revival of the French clergy. In this area, as well as in many others, Lamennais was a great initiator even though the concepts he presented did not have lasting value.

Among Lamennais's associates at La Chênaie, his closest confidant, Philippe Gerbet (1798–1864), was the outstanding theologian. His sharp intelligence impressed all who met him. As the most active promoter of the *Mémorial catholique* after 1826, Gerbet, employing Lamennais's theory of proof, developed an analysis of the act of faith which attracted the justified attention of theologians. More important was the publication of his *Considérations sur le dogme générateur de la piété catholique* (1829), a treatise of the Eucharist which was both a dogmatic and a devotional tract.[33] It was the most perfect and typical result of Lamennais's method and, according to J. R. Derré, "perhaps the chief work of piety of the romantic period." It was also the start of a comparative examination of Catholicism and Protestantism which, had it been completed, might have become the French counterpart to Möhler's *Symbolism.*

Italy: Renaissance of the Christian Philosophy

Despite the upheavals of the revolution, the ecclesiastical centers of education in Italy survived in greater numbers than in France. The scholarly tradition of the eighteenth century was continued laudably in the areas of patrology, epigraphics, and Near Eastern studies, but stagnated in that of theology. No rejuvenation could be expected from the northern university departments, which were strongly supervised by government. The Roman schools, reorganized by Leo XII, and especially the Gregorian University, which had been entrusted again to the Jesuits in 1824, together with the Spanish schools were almost the only ones preserving the scholastic tradition in higher education. But it was an obdurate scholasticism, corrupted by the doctrines of Locke and Condillac, whose views were very much in fashion among the Italian clergy at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even apologetics, which had reached a high point north of the Alps, did not achieve its potential in Italy. Caught up in long-outdated polemics against Protestantism, Jansenism, and Febronianism, Italian apologetics justified the harsh remarks of Lamennais: "If I had to judge the Romans according to the books coming out of their country, I would be forced to say that they have fallen behind their society. Reading them I gain the impression that for half a century nothing has changed in the world."[34]

---

[32] Lamennais himself was familiar with the publications on the other side of the Rhine only second-hand through Eckstein, B. Constant, Villers, etc., but he recommended his students urgently to learn German, "a language which appears to have taken the place of Latin" (C. Sainte-Foi, *Souvenirs de jeunesse,* 125).

[33] Introduction, p. v.

These conditions in Italy make understandable the enthusiastic attitude which the public held toward the work of Lamennais, which had been translated by the Neapolitan Theatine G. Ventura. The first volume of the *Essai sur l'indifférence* was received with great acclaim, and the sympathies for the author increased on the occasion of his journey to Italy in 1824. This was the case above all in Piedmont, where Lamennais and the *Mémorial catholique* were frequently and positively mentioned in the *Amico d'Italia.* Yet the effect of Lamennais in Italy must not be overstated; it was less a case of influence than of a meeting of analogous thoughts. If Lamennais's views received acceptance it was because he expressed already existing ideas more fittingly and elegantly and because he was regarded as disseminating the ideas which de Maistre had already publicized for a number of years. Lamennais was admired as the defender of the Church against revolutionary rationalism, as the champion of theocracy, as the rejuvenator of the concept of authority, and as the apologist who voiced a general agreement with religious truth. The Italians evinced more reserve toward the philosophical system which he wanted to make the foundation of his intellectual revival. The doctrine of the *sensus communis* found a few adherents, in particular Ventura, who favored it in his *De methodo philosophandi* (1828). But most others were disturbed by the unclear relationship between the authorities of Church and humankind and by the consequences of a radical rejection of the possibilities of individual reason.

---

[34] Letter of 2 January 1821, reproduced in *Lettres et opuscules inédits du comte Joseph de Maistre* I (Paris 1873), 120–221; this judgment is confirmed by the *Memoriale* of Cardinal Pacca of 11 April 1829 (edited by P. Perali [Rome 1928]). See Gemelli-Vismara, op. cit., 20ff., 83ff. and Colapietra, 111–12.

Thus at the very moment when the German Catholics were fascinated by post-Kantian systems and the French for a generation were involved with traditionalism, there grew in Italy, within a scholasticism corrupted by Cartesianism and empiricism, tender shoots of a renascence of original Thomism. The center of this movement was Piacenza. There, after 1806, Canon Vincenzo Buzzetti[35] (1777–1824) taught and succeeded in winning to his ideas two young Jesuits, the brothers Sordi, and Father Taparelli d'Azeglio. The latter, rector of the *Collegium Romanum* from 1824 to 1829, attempted in vain to introduce Thomism into this citadel of Suarezianism.[36] After his "promotion" to provincial of Naples in 1831, d'Azeglio entrusted Serafino Sordi with the teaching of philosophy at the school in Naples, which henceforth became a second center of this movement.

Other Catholic thinkers in Italy did not believe, however, that a simple return to the Middle Ages would effect the liberation of the educated from the sensualism of Locke or Condillac or from the moderate rationalism of the encyclopedists. They were convinced that traditional philosophy was in need of rejuvenation. This was the path taken by Pasquale Galuppi (1770–1846), who introduced Kant to Italy. His effort was continued in comprehensive fashion by Antonio Rosmini (1797–1855), one of the best Italian metaphysicians of the nineteenth century. Rosmini also began with the suggestion of a return to Thomism, but he gradually developed a more personal system in which Thomistic elements were combined with inspirations by Plato, Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury, Leibniz, and Hegel. He was a pious and ardent priest, a champion of the Catholic cause in the north of the Italian peninsula,[37] a personal friend of Manzoni, and a skilled educator, whose *Dell'unita dell'educazione* (1826) is still regarded well today. Pius VIII encouraged Rosmini in his philosophical and theological work,

[35] There has not yet been an end to the discussion of whether Buzzetti rediscovered Thomism by himself (the view adopted in 1923 by Masnovo and Fermi and repeated by Dezza) or through his Lazarist professors at the Collegio Alberoni (the view taken by Fabro, adopted by numerous scholars, and recently defended by Rossi on the basis of hitherto important unpublished documents). Even though it must be admitted that Buzzetti in fact, albeit only to a limited degree, fell under the influence of the eclectic scholasticism taught at his time at the Collegio Alberoni and under that of the brothers Masdeu, two Spanish ex-Jesuits, the direct sources of his philosophical development seem to stem from the continuing tradition of Thomism of the Dominicans in Italy. See M. Batllori in *AHSI* 29 (1960), 180–85.

[36] He was able at least to win the brothers Pecci to his views.

[37] See above, p. 236.

and, in 1830, there appeared the first fruit of these labors, his *Nuove saggio sull'origine delle idee,* which has become his fundamental work. The first reaction to his attacks upon contemporary idols was negative on the part of shocked laymen. There soon followed attacks by Gioberti, another defender of spiritualism in Italy, who even at that time could not be regarded as a Catholic thinker, and by scholastic circles who thought they detected in Rosmini's system traces of ontologism. Yet gradually Rosmini's philosophy, modern and religious in equal measure, was accepted. This acceptance was due in large part to the ease with which Rosmini's philosophy adapted itself to many characteristics of the national temperament. Between 1830 and 1850, large numbers of Rosminic groups of priests and laymen were formed. Their members admired in him the thinker as much as the priest. In the course of time, Rosmini's ideas were taught at the universities and in numerous seminaries of Northern Italy, where they remained strongly influential until the time of Leo XIII.

PART THREE

Between the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848

INTRODUCTION

Gregory XVI

Pius VIII died on 30 November 1830, at a critical point in European history. Even if the year 1830 was not as important a turning point as 1789, 1815, and 1848, it was nevertheless a significant caesura. The July revolution in France marked the victory of the middle class and of the parliamentary system over the vain attempts to restore the Old Regime, and caused a chain reaction in Europe: from Belgium, where the Vienna settlement was first breached, to Poland, Ireland, Piedmont, the Duchies of Parma and Modena, and the Papal States. This political fermentation, which soon involved the Iberian Peninsula with its dynastic and ideological conflicts, was only the symptom of a much deeper discontent. Intelligence and fantasy had advanced faster than the general development of a world whose economic and social structures were only just beginning to change and in which large landed estates continued to play a predominant role. New ideas of freedom and justice were born and raised expectations for the future. These new ideas were expressed in liberal newspapers and pamphlets, in the systems of utopian socialism, and in romanticism, which was, as Victor Hugo explained in his foreword to *Hernani* (March 1830), only "liberalism in literature." The desire for change was an overwhelming concern of the young intellectuals, whose dreams of transformations were impossible because they did not correspond to actual power realities. These suppressed desires came to the fore at the slightest opportunities and finally exploded in 1848.

The members of the Sacred College were as little able as any other statesmen of the period to analyze the situation in ways possible to the historian of a hundred years later. But all of them sensed that the Pope whom they had to choose would have to confront a particularly difficult situation. They sought a solution in traditional approaches, especially as the two parties opposing one another at the conclave of 1829 were present in virtually unchanged strength. There were the "politicals" who were still interested in a defense of the Papal States through close cooperation with Metternich's Austria, and the "zealots," who were more interested in the independence of the Church from governments than in diplomatic combinations. Of fifty-five cardinals, thirty-four were present at the opening of the conclave on 14 December 1830. Contrary to all expectations, the conclave lasted for fifty days. Pacca's candidacy was supported by the pro-Austrian party led by the old Cardinal Albani.

Victory for Pacca seemed likely, especially as the hesitant reply given by the candidate of the "zealots," Cardinal de Gregorio, to the speech of the French ambassador, was received with disappointment and reduced his initially strong chances. On 28 December the "zealots" voted for Giustiniani, who received twenty-one votes. But on 9 January the Spanish ambassador rejected this candidate, because during his nunciature at Madrid he had defended the rights of the clergy so energetically as to arouse the hostility of the government. Now the "zealots" cast their votes for the Camaldolese Cardinal Cappellari, prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, who earlier had been considered one of the *papabili* but who so far had never received more than seven votes. Finally, the pro-Austrian party gave up the hope of winning a two-thirds majority for Pacca and presented Macchi as their new candidate. But his candidacy also lacked a good chance of success, as he was suspected by the French government because of his relationship with ex-King Charles X. The duel between Pacca and Cappellari continued for three weeks, in spite of the growing dissatisfaction of the Roman population and the worsening political situation in Italy. It required all of the skills of Cardinal Bernetti and the announcement of a rebellion in the Romagna to persuade Albani to give up. Thus Cappellari was elected Pope on 2 February 1831. He chose the name Gregory XVI.[1]

Bartolomeo Alberto Cappellari, known in his order as Fra Mauro, was born on 18 September 1765 at Belluno in Venetia. In 1783 he had joined the Camaldolese, the strictest offshoot of the Benedictines, and for more than a quarter of a century devoted himself to theological studies. In 1799, at the nadir of the papacy, he published *Il trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa contro gli assalti dei Novatori (The Triumph of the Holy See and the Church over the Attacks by the Innovators).* Directed against Febronians and Jansenists, it was to have great influence on the development of the ultramontane movement.[2] Gradually this monk, theologian, and scholar became acquainted with the complexities of ecclesiastical affairs. After he had been sent to Rome in 1795, he became abbot of San Gregorio al Celio in 1805 and shortly afterwards procurator superior of his order. This position enabled him to show his administrative talents at a particularly difficult time. Shortly after his return to Rome in 1814, Pius VII followed the advice of Cardinal Fontana and appointed Cappellari as consultant to several congregations, including the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, and as examiner of candidates for the episcopate. After he had become vicar general of his order in 1823, Leo XII, who regarded his knowledge of doctrinal matters highly, made Cappellari a cardinal in 1826 and appointed him prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. As such he was concerned not only with missions in general, but also with the Churches in America, the Uniate Churches of the Near East and Russia, and Catholic affairs in England and the Netherlands. The secretary of state consulted Cappellari regularly, and frequently his opinion was decisive.

---

[1] The last Pope of the same name had founded the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* at the beginning of the seventeenth century. But the newly elected Pope surely also was thinking of Gregory the Great as well as possibly of Gregory VII, the medieval champion of freedom of the Church against the intervention of secular power.

[2] Concerning this work and its influence, see vol. VIII in this series, chap. 1, n. 1.

Although he had spent the greatest part of his life in a monk's cell, as Pope Cappellari was surprisingly well versed not only in the affairs of the Curia, but also with the concrete difficulties facing the Church almost everywhere. Historians, frequently more politically oriented, tended to lose sight of this aspect. Capellari was intelligent and quite capable of grasping the ramifications of problems, as long as their aspects were within the framework of his thinking, which was linked to the eighteenth century. He was also an educated man according to the standards of this century and encouraged scholarly work, especially archeological research.[3] On the other hand, this monk had difficulties in his contacts with people and hardly any sensitivity for the interests of the laity of the Papal States. This was a handicap for a Pope who also must function as a secular ruler. A further obstacle was that Cappellari knew no foreign languages, had never met any of the statesmen of his time, and did not know much about politics. This left him at the mercy of advisers who were not always either enlightened or nonpartisan. This strict theologian, who had gleaned all of his knowledge from books, was incapable of grasping the problems of the new currents swirling around him. As a man of tradition, who had lived in the climate of counter-revolution for forty years, Cappellari harbored nothing but mistrust toward the liberal aspirations of the coming new society and resolutely took the part of the defenders of the established order.[4]

One can better understand the general directions of Gregory XVI's pontificate if one keeps in mind his basic orientation. This obstinate and authoritarian doctrinarian, ascending the chair of Saint Peter in far better health than his predecessors, was determined to face the dangers against which the "zealots" had warned for half a century. Interested wholly in religious concerns, the Pope opposed vague romantic religiosity and, in particular, rationalistic naturalism. For the purpose of combatting them, he preferred to employ the religious orders, whose difficult rebirth he promoted with all of his strength. He saw the root of the evil from which the Church suffered in the secret societies. Therefore he charged the French writer Crétineau-Joly to prepare an exposé of their activities. Tenaciously the Pope used his magisterial office to remind people of the great traditional principles and to characterize as error whatever attempted to evade submission to the supernatural.

---

[3] On this aspect of his papal activity, see in *Gregorio XVI, Miscellanea commemorativa* I, the articles by A. Bartoli, "Gregorio XVI, le antichità e belle arti" (1–98), R. Fausti, "Gregorio XVI e l'archeologia cristiana" (405–56), and by P. Perali (365–403), R. Lefèvre (223–87), and E. Josi (201–21) on the organization of the papal museum for Etruscan art in 1837, the museum for Egyptian art in 1839, and the Greco-Roman Lateran museum in 1841.

[4] The statement "One must never revolt" (*Ris* 5 [1962], 82–83), made to the Belgian envoy in 1833, is typical for him. It explains especially his conduct during the Polish rising (cf. above, pp. 156f.), for which he was criticized.

He also made himself the unbending defender of ecclesiastical principles and of the independence of the Church from all notions of an established Church. Energetically he opposed all governmental systems which asserted the right to subjugate the pastoral office to secular domination,[5] especially in the area of nomination of bishops. Equally energetically the Pope rejected compromises in questions involving dogmatic principles, especially in the case of mixed marriages,[6] which had been treated rather laxly by Rome for many years. With equal determination he defended the supreme authority of the Pope within the Church against all remnants of Febronianism and Gallicanism. Without realizing the anachronism of such pretensions, he systematically employed the nunciatures to obtain the acknowledgment by the Catholic governments of papal monarchy, as whose savior he saw himself ever since the publication of his *Trionfo della Santa Sede.*[7] Sharing the shortsightedness of the "zealots" concerning the changes modern society was undergoing; incapable of recognizing the weakness of the political and social system of the Old Regime, which he regarded as an expression of divine will; and haunted by the thought that the Papal States, in which he saw the guarantee for the spiritual independence of the Pope, could be destroyed by liberal aspirations, Gregory XVI was determined to mobilize all means at the disposal of the reviving papacy in order to stop all further advances of the "revolution." For the same reasons the Pope obstinately refused to cooperate with any "subversive forces," even in Poland and Ireland, where they seemed to work toward the liberation of Catholics.

---

[5] Encyclical *Commissum divinitus* of 17 May 1835 (Roskovany IV, 134).

[6] In addition to the affairs at Cologne and Gnesen (see below, pp. 331–34), the most spectacular events, Gregory XVI repeatedly referred to this question: Encyclical of 27 May 1832 (A. Bernasconi, op. cit. I, 140ff.); letter of 8 February 1836 (id. II, 97f.); brief of 9 February 1839 (id. II, 292ff.); letter of 30 November 1839 (id. II, 385f.); instructions of 30 April and 22 May 1841 (id. III, 122ff., 132ff.); and letter of 23 May 1846 (id. III, 357f.).

[7] Concerning this new policy, see the comments by A. Simon, "Signification politique de la nonciature de Bruxelles" in *BIHBR* 33 (1961), 617–48.

The pontificate of Gregory XVI appears as a "pontificate of struggle" (Pouthas), in the service of a conservative, even a reactionary, ideal. Thus it is not astonishing that in contrast to the events half a century later under Leo XIII, laity and clergy engaged in initiatives aimed at a reconciliation of the Church with modern society without the participation of the papacy. They provided Catholicism with a face totally different from that of 1815. Among many people the impression grew that a new and more progressive attitude prevailed, and it is this impression which explains the many illusions during the first months of Pius IX's pontificate.

During the fifteen years in which Gregory XVI guided the fortunes of the Church, such a development was possible not only because the Holy See—in contrast to the subsequent pontificate—was not yet able effectively to restrain the tendencies of which it disapproved. It was also possible because the work of Gregory XVI had many positive aspects which were directed toward the future; so much so that in more than one case Pius IX only needed to pluck the fruits of the patient preparations undertaken by his predecessor. For example, the former prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith gave new impulses to missionary work, even if these impulses are overrated by most historians. In addition to this frequently mentioned aspect there were others which many liberal historians tended to overlook. Gregory XVI's battle against the excesses of rationalism, indifferentism, and Kantian subjectivism helped to achieve a balance between the sense of the supernatural and the value of human reason, and thus laid the firm foundations for the future development of the Catholic spirit and Catholic spirituality. By insisting inflexibly on the prerogatives of the Holy See and the independence of the Church, however, the Pope also prepared the way for those future successes of ultramontanism which ultimately stifled pluralism and endangered the collegial nature of ecclesiastical authority.

The immediate effect of Gregory's position, however, was the overcoming of that ecclesiastical nationalism in which the autonomy won by the regional Churches with respect to Rome had to be paid for with the submission of the Church to secular power. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that in spite of the unyielding nature of the Camaldolese Pope, Gregory could be flexible in the practical applications of his principles. He proved this, for example, in the events at Cologne when he agreed to the dismissal of Archbishop Clemens August von Droste zu Vischering after the archbishop had gained his objectives;[8] by supporting Louis-Philippe in the Guillon affair in 1831; and by the temporary expulsion of the Jesuits in 1845.[9] In addition, many "zealots" had accused Cardinal Cappellari before the papal election of being too soft with respect to the Protestants in the negotiations for a concordat with King William I of the Netherlands. In addition to these special cases, Gregory XVI demonstrated his suppleness in his Bull *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum* of 7 August 1831. Although personally holding the legitimist view, he declared that in case of changes of political regimes the Holy See would negotiate with the governments in de facto possession of power.[10] He employed this principle in the delicate case of the new South American republics, which had been a continuing problem for his three predecessors. Here, as well as with respect to the problem caused by the passing of a liberal constitution[11] in Catholic Belgium, the Pope understood how to apply in practical terms the famous difference between "thesis" and "hypothesis," even before it was coined. Monsignor Simon even wrote that occasionally Gregory XVI showed himself "not as a Pope of the past, but as a Pontiff introducing the future." Such characterization is misleading, for it must not be forgotten that Gregory XVI agreed to such political accommodations only with extreme reluctance and attempted to limit them as far as possible.

The Pope showed the same ambivalence with respect to past and future in the selection of his assistants and advisers. Cappellari, counted among the "zealots," chose as his first secretary of state a former associate and friend of Consalvi. Cardinal Bernetti[12] was a man of the world, little concerned with the religious aspect of problems, a pure technician of politics and diplomacy, who clearly recognized the deficiencies in the administration of the Papal States. Metternich valued his "knowledge of the needs of the time," while Lamennais accused him of giving in too much to the demands of governments.[13] But, formed in the atmosphere of the first Roman restoration following the Jacobin interlude, Bernetti shared with the "zealots" the resolute hostility to liberal political regimes and the conviction that the only hope for a continuation of the Papal States rested in a conservative policy.

---

[8] Below, p. 335.

[9] See J. P. Martin, *La nonciature de Paris* (Paris 1949), 127, 130, 354.

[10] Text in A. Bernasconi I, 38ff.; commentary in Leflon, 453–54.

[11] See below, pp. 279ff.

[12] Tommaso Bernetti (1779–1852) was an energetic, selfless, and intelligent man, albeit with a rather limited horizon, and occasionally very impulsive. As governor of Rome and director of police he had demonstrated that he could be forceful without brutality. After he had been secretary of state for a few months under the pontificate of Leo XII, he acted during the conclave as the head of the group opposing Albani's pro-Austrian policy. See *ECatt,* 1443–44 and *DBI* IX, 338–43 (Lit.). A good study is E. Morelli, *La politica estera di Tommaso Bernetti* (Rome 1953). Nothing, however, is available on his entire Church policy.

[13] J. R. Derré, *Metternich et Lamennais* (Paris 1963), 27.

The growing opposition of the College of Cardinals, which accused Bernetti of attempting—like Consalvi—to centralize all power in his hands,[14] caused Gregory XVI to dismiss him in 1836.[15] His next choice, Cardinal Lambruschini,[16] was a man of totally different character, a strictly pious son of the Church. Like the Pope himself, he sympathized with the pastoral aspect of problems and was closely allied with the Jesuits. But he belonged to those members of the Curia who most resolutely closed their minds to modern ideas. Yet if he was a reactionary as a result of his innate personality and his development, and very much intent on fighting unmercifully any legacies of the revolution, his diplomatic experience had taught him that in practice he must moderate the rigidity of his principles. This showed itself in the administration of the Papal States, whose harsh police regime has been exaggerated, as well as in his general ecclesiastical policy which, when necessary, he adapted to constitutional conditions.

One must also take into account that Gregory XVI, to a far higher degree than his predecessors, personally participated in the conduct of papal affairs. He worked hard and in addition to his secretaries also relied on other advisers. Lützow noted in 1833 that Bernetti complained that the decisions of the Pope did not always agree with his suggestions and that the Pope allowed himself to be influenced by more rigorous prelates.[17] On the other hand, Monsignor Simon has reported that the influence of Monsignor Capaccini, the deputy secretary of state and a man more open to modern currents, occasionally outweighed Lambruschini's.[18] This does not alter the fact that Lambruschini was chiefly responsible for the immobility characterizing the last years of the pontificate of Gregory XVI in many areas. It contrasted glaringly with the vitality which the Catholic Church outside of Rome displayed at this same time.

---

[14] An accusation which was not quite justified. See L. Pásztor in *AHPont* 6 (1968), 269–70. It must be added that the mediocrity of the higher Roman prelates noted by several observers (for example, Lützow in H. Bastgen, op. cit., 240, or Bautain in P. Poupard, *Journal romain de l'abbé L. Bautain 1838* [Rome 1964], 31) in part explains the decline of the influence of the college of cardinals.

[15] Concerning Bernetti's fall, in which Austrian intrigues apparently played a lesser role than has hitherto been assumed, see E. Morelli, op. cit., 156–68; E. Morelli in *ChStato* II, 559–60; N. Nada, *Metternich e le riforme nello Stato Pontificio* (Turin 1957), 170–87; and H. Bastgen, op. cit., 2.

[16] Concerning Luigi Lambruschini (1776–1854)—Barnabite, theologian, archbishop of Genoa (1819–27), nuncio in France (1827–31), where he was intimately involved in the Lamennais affair, prefect of the SC Stud. (1831–36), where he demonstrated that he opposed new currents of thought—see L. Manzini, *Il Cardinale Lambruschini* (together with *RStRis* 48 [1961], 319–24); *ECatt* VII, 844–45; *DThC* VIII, 2471–73; M. A. Giampaolo, "La preparazione politica del cardinale Lambruschini" in *RStRis* 18 (1931), 81–163; E. Piscitelli in *RStRis* 40 (1953), 158–82; F. Andreu, "Il cardinale Lambruschini e il P. Ventura" in *Regnum Dei* 10 (1954), 219–49; G. Bofitto, *Scrittori barnabiti* II, (Florence 1933), 312–36.

[17] H. Bastgen, op. cit., 237–38.

---

[18] *Documents relatifs à la nonciature de Bruxelles* (Brussels-Rome 1958) 12.—Concerning Franceso Capaccini (1784–1845), former secretary of Consalvi, deputy of the state secretariat from 1831–37, then secretary of the *Sacra Congregatio pro Negotiis Ecclesiasticis extraordinariis* from 1839–44—see *Biographie Nationale* XXX (Brussels 1958), 262–64.

SECTION ONE

The First Phase of Catholic Liberalism

In the eyes of the Catholics of the restoration period, liberal concepts were identified with the revolution and needed to be rooted out. In France, the last remaining sympathies disappeared which a number of the Constituent clergy held for the liberal ideas of the eighteenth century. But around 1830, when in all of Europe the majority of the priests and of the faithful continued to see salvation for the Church exclusively in a restoration of the political conditions of the Old Regime and in the reconquest of the privileged position of the Church in society, a growing number of young clergymen and laymen began to question this course. Fascinated by the mysticism of freedom which jointly inspired the writers and artists of romanticism, liberal conspirators, and people opposed to the Holy Alliance, they began to wonder about the possibility of reconciling Catholicism with liberalism to a certain extent and, without betraying their own faith, of accepting a social order based on the principles of 1789. These principles were: personal freedom in place of despotism; political freedoms which were no longer conceded privileges but legally anchored; the right of peoples to self-determination; primacy of the principle of nationality over the principle of legitimacy; and, in the area directly concerning religious life, freedom of the press and freedom of religion together with a limitation of ecclesiastical privileges, possibly even separation of Church and state.

Some promoted the reconciliation of Church and liberalism for practical reasons. For them it was either a means of winning the young intellectuals back to the Church or an unavoidable necessity in light of irreversible developments which should be adapted in the best possible way to the interests of the Church. Some voiced the thought that in countries with a Protestant or Orthodox majority and in which Catholics were the victims of a system of established religions, the introduction of a more liberal government would result in noticeable advantages for the Catholics. Others pointed out that the same advantages would accrue in Catholic countries in which regalistic governments posed serious obstacles to the work of the Church. Thinking that from the apostolic point of view liberal institutions were to be preferred to the protectionism to which the union of throne and altar frequently degenerated, they believed it to be necessary not merely to tolerate the contemporary movement but to encourage it. In fact, where it had not yet started, they thought it ought to be provoked. Others favored closer relations between Church and liberalism for reasons of principle. They shared the optimistic confidence of the philosophes of the eighteenth century in man's potential and regarded the development of society in a liberal direction as progress. Put differently, they regarded the democratic ideal which inspired the liberals as a realization of the message of the Gospel which invites the replacement of the inequality of conditions with the equality of nature and the domination of a few with the freedom for all. Others would soon go even further and want to introduce liberal ideas in the Church itself: less authoritarian relations between bishops and flock; greater autonomy of Catholic thinkers with respect to the official theological systems; greater leeway for the clergy in relation to traditional pastoral methods. No matter of what type the concrete applications might be, they were fundamentally an outgrowth of the same freedom which inspired the reform efforts of Hirscher in Tübingen, of Raffaele Lambruschini and Rosmini in Italy, and of Lamennais in France.

This general movement, comprising some very different tendencies, was called "Catholic liberalism" or "liberal Catholicism." It was to develop into one of the main problems, especially in the Latin countries, which agitated Catholics throughout the nineteenth century. The solution was the more difficult as the liberals, when the ecclesiastical authorities refused to follow the path suggested by them, now became emphatic in their anticlericalism. In their eyes, the Church was the main obstacle to political freedom, intellectual liberation, and progress in general. This attitude in turn stiffened the backs of the leaders of the Church, who saw themselves confirmed in their view of the incompatibility of the Church with those forces which, in collaboration with Freemasons and the heirs of the philosophes of the eighteenth century, wished to overturn the established religious and political order.

For a long time, Lamennais was considered to be the founder of Catholic liberalism. He was seen as the first person who with prophetic vision had enunciated the advantages which would accrue to the Church once it entered the arena of modern liberties. More recent examinations have brought forth a more differentiated picture. It was recognized that for several years prior to Lamennais others in France had begun to develop analogous ideas. This is true especially for Eckstein, who produced some of the first followers of Lamennais. The examinations undertaken by A. Simon and H. Haag and confirmed by K. Jürgensen have also definitively proven that the connection between Catholicism and modern liberties was systematically established in Belgium between 1825 and 1828. It did not, as had been assumed, receive its impulses from Lamennais's theories. On the contrary, the practical union between Belgian Catholics and liberals influenced the intellectual development of Lamennais. Yet Lamennais's ingenious intuition immediately grasped that the new procedure used by the Belgians to solve specific problems could be applied generally. He developed it into a theoretical system which included a new social philosophy, and he did not hesitate to urge the Church to follow the movement which was pushing nations toward democracy. By placing his considerable reputation in the service of this idea, he obtained for it the widespread attention which it had hitherto lacked. In this respect he continues to deserve to occupy a leading position in the beginnings of Catholic liberalism.

CHAPTER 16

From Belgian Unionism to the Campaign of L'Avenir

The Decision of Belgian Catholics in Favor of Liberty

Belgian Catholics in general and the clergy in particular had shown themselves very reactionary in 1815. The episcopate had gone so far as to forbid the oath of the constitution because it proclaimed freedom of the press and freedom of religion. This attitude had only served to increase the hostility of the liberals toward the clergy, which appeared to them as the defender of an anachronistic theocracy.

The remarkable aspect of the campaign ten years later against the seminary decrees of June 1825[1] was that, while it rested on an appeal to the right of the Church to train its priests, it soon took on broader outlines. At the end of 1825, Catholic parliamentarians and journalists liked to refer to constitutional freedoms. They demanded freedom of education as a natural extension of the freedom of conscience, and called for the independence of the Church from any governmental interference in the appointment of ecclesiastical dignitaries in the name of religious freedom. Publicists eventually discovered in freedom of the press the best protection against arbitrary governmental actions to which the Catholics were exposed. Even in entering this arena, though, the Catholics did not renounce their principles, which were very different from the ideals of the liberals who desired an increasing laicization of society. But in order to safeguard the permanent goal of instilling Christian values in public life, the Catholics considered it more realistic to resort to means other than those of the Old Regime. The Catholic view could be summarized as follows: In a parliamentary state, guaranteeing freedom of education and the press, Catholics would have the unrestricted right to influence consciences and to gain predominance legally. Laws passed by a majority would then enable them to construct a Christian society which heretofore had always depended exclusively on the good will of a Catholic sovereign.

---

[1] See above, pp. 144f.

In the course of 1826 the two most important Catholic newspapers began to emphasize the advantages of liberty; cautiously in the case of the *Courrier de la Meuse,* animated by Pierre Kersten of Liège, and with greater emphasis by the *Catholique des Pays-Bas* of Ghent. Adolphe Bartels used it to say that truth could prevail without official protection, and that the political desire of the liberals to have a government which expressed the will of the citizens and was no longer the governing instrument of a monarch was compatible with Catholic orthodoxy.

With the Catholics embarking on this course, some young liberals became convinced that the tactic of the old freethinkers of supporting the government in its chicanery of the Church was nothing more than a fool's paradise, as it enabled the government to pursue a policy of enlightened despotism. They considered it more important to oppose the absolutist tendencies of the monarchical government than to stifle the Church at any price. They thought of offering the Catholics a broad-based alliance on the following quid pro quo basis: We renounce any exclusion of the Church from education or any control over its activity aimed at limiting its influence on society; you, in turn, will no longer attempt to reach a privileged position in the state by way of a concordat or any other method, and will join us in demanding the exercise of modern freedoms.

When Devaux made this liberal appeal in the spring of 1827, many Catholics hesitated. At that very time they thought that they could reach a separate agreement with the King. They believed that they could achieve the most important of their demands on the basis of the concordat of 18 June 1827 without having to make common cause with the liberals. But when it became clear four months later that the government was delaying an agreement,[2] they began to have second thoughts. On 1 November the *Courrier de la Meuse* agreed to Devaux's offer and during 1828 the idea of a union of Catholics and liberals on the basis of the mutual demand for constitutional freedoms became widely accepted in the country, especially in Flanders. It did so without arousing the opposition of the clergy, which hated the government more than it disliked the liberals. Publicly the ecclesiastical authorities were reserved, but basically they viewed the development approvingly in spite of the warnings of internuncio Capaccini, who was horrified by the "monstrous alliance" between Catholics and liberals.

---

[2] See above, p. 146.

Hence by the end of 1828 Catholics had been won for "unionism," i.e., for the tactic of uniting with the liberals in order to demand the independence of the Church on the basis of modern liberty and its right to establish an educational system directed exclusively by itself. Can one say that from this moment on they became the "liberal Catholics" who favored those theories which Lamennais presented two years later in *L'Avenir?* That would simplify matters too much. The unionists of 1828 in reality regarded their alliance with the liberals and the acceptance of the liberal viewpoint only as a provisional arrangement and not as a system representing a permanent ideal. They had no intention, as Lamennais was to do soon, to speak of a "natural alliance between Catholicism and democracy," nor to raise their demands for freedom to the point of a complete separation of Church and state. Matters were very clear for the ecclesiastical authorities as well as for the young noblemen of the Robiana-Merode group, whose real intentions were revealed in their private papers. In no way did they favor the principles of 1789; on the contrary, they wished to have the Church once again assume the spiritual control of civil society. De Gerlache and Kersten also insisted on avoiding an overemphasis of human rights. They were unwilling to accept the principle of popular sovereignty, just as much as they viewed the union with the liberals merely as the smaller of two evils, dictated by the circumstances. To be sure, Bartels—with the approval of a number of Flemish clerics—continued to be progressive and in 1828 developed several theses which appeared in the writings of Lamennais in the following year. One of them was that the people had primacy over the King, but he qualified this by saying that he desired general liberty not as an inherent good but as the smaller evil. This was still quite different from the demand for liberty for its own sake, as *L'Avenir* was to champion it later. But the positions assumed by the Belgian Catholics in their opposition to William I were by themselves and in spite of their limited character a revelation for Lamennais.

Lamennais's Development as a Liberal

Lamennais, the reactionary editor of the *Conservateur* and the *Drapeau blanc,* appeared hardly destined to become the leader of Catholic liberalism. During the first decade of the restoration[3] he was one of the most ardent advocates of a return to the Old Regime. His ideal of a protected Church in a divine-right monarchy was opposed to a free Church in a free state. When in 1826 in his book *De la Religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique* he advised the Church to cast itself free from the Bourbon regime, he did so because he thought that its compromises with liberalism would destroy it. His ideal was still a Christian, nay, a theocratic state.

---

[3] Concerning Lamennais and his activity during these years, see above, pp. 232–35, 251–54.

Christian Maréchal[4] believed to have discovered several indications proving that Lamennais's turn to liberalism had started as early as 1820. True, the seed of change can be seen in his Bretonic temperament with its inherent desire for independence, his disgust with any type of absolutism, and his great concern for the spiritual freedom of Christians and the independence of the Church in the wake of anti-Gallican struggles. But Maréchal attached a meaning to these elements which they did not have in their contemporary context. Although in his articles Lamennais often wrote of freedom, and although his ultramontanism was based, as A. Simon and G. Verucci have shown, on the idea of freedom, he meant the freedom of the Christian against the powers of evil and the freedom of the Church with respect to the government. It was not, as Jürgensen states, a freedom for all, "but a freedom without toleration." In his writings before 1828 there is no sympathy for political liberalism or democracy. But Maréchal was quite correct in pointing out that during this period Lamennais thought more theocratically than monarchically. From this vantage point it becomes understandable that—once he grew disillusioned with monarchy—he found it easy to turn away from it. He associated the Church with the growing cause of the people and strove to achieve what Verucci has called a "democratic theocracy." In this perspective, illustrated by a few examples from the Middle Ages to Pius VII, the Pope appears as the protector of the weak and as the arbiter guaranteeing right over might. This development must have come about the more easily as Lamennais had already demonstrated in his apologetics the extent to which he understood the mentality of his time and the necessity to adapt to it.[5]

The struggles for the independence of the Church, especially in the field of education, brought Lamennais to a tentative acceptance of the idea of separation of Church and state. He openly defended it in his book *De la Religion* (1825/26), at the same time as he began to develop the thesis that truth was more powerful than institutions. Strengthened in this idea by the writings of Eckstein and Benjamin Constant and especially by the example of foreign countries (the United States, Ireland, and especially Belgium, where for their defense the Catholics did not appeal to protection by the state but to the principle of freedom), Lamennais frequently mentioned his idea in his correspondence during the following months. At the same time he discovered in Paris in the newspaper *Le Globe* a less antireligious liberalism, which demanded not additional supervision of the Church but "all freedoms for all."

---

[4] Especially in *La dispute de "l'Essai sur l'indifférence"* (Paris 1925) VIII, 443 and *passim* and in *Lamennais au "Drapeau blanc"* (Paris 1946), where he "discovers the ultra behind the democrat" (Moreau).

[5] He provides proof for this adaptability in his *Mémoire confidentiel à Léon XII*, written at the beginning of 1827, in which he points to the danger in allowing the Church to appear "as the natural ally of all kinds of despotism" (Text of the first chapters in A. Blaise, *Œuvres inédites de Lamennais* II, 311–40, and of the last two chapters in *RSR* 1 [1910], 476–85).

Under the impact of these diverse influences, Lamennais in February 1829 published his book *Des progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'Église.* He still regarded an ultramontane Catholicism as the only solution for society, and rejected liberalism, statism, and secularism. But he also touched upon a number of new ideas. Liberalism, he wrote, could be different from the way it presented itself in France at the time, and there was an essential inner connection between Catholicism and a healthy liberalism which aimed at the liberation of people from any suppression by other people. He stated that freedom of the press was a small evil and could be advantageous for the Church, and that revolutions could be instruments of providence for the purpose of discarding a number of antiquated institutions under which the Church had suffered for a long time.

The book was a great success, and even if it encountered the violent opposition of royalists, jurists, and the episcopate, it confirmed his position in the eyes of his young followers, who to an increasing degree were disgruntled with the compromises the bishops made with the royal government. With rather romantic optimism they concluded that only a few gestures by the Church were required to give liberalism a different turn and to place this growing force in the service of the Catholic apostolate. They expressed these sentiments with increasing vehemence in their journals *Mémorial catholique* and *Revue catholique.* The evolution of the events in Belgium only confirmed them in these beliefs and soon they no longer hesitated to go even further than the Belgians and to assert that the alliance between Catholicism and liberalism was the only way of salvation for the Church.

These ideas fell on prepared soil.[6] Baron Eckstein in his journal *Le Catholique* emphasized the "admirable alliance" between Catholicism and a regime of political liberty.[7] Historians have not properly gauged the influence which he thereby exercised on a part of Parisian Catholic youth. Young noblemen, who had worked with him and hardly ever had had contact with Lamennais, founded the *Correspondant*[8] in March 1829. In it they declared themselves in favor of religious freedom for Protestants, which Lamennais had rejected, demanded the right for members of orders to join together, emphasized freedom of education independent from a state monopoly, and pointed to the dangers of too close a relationship between throne and altar. They did not go as far as Lamennais's followers later in demanding a complete separation of state and Church and a complete cessation of Church support in the state budget. It was these young people from the *Correspondant* who first received the appellation "liberal Catholics" from the editors of the *Globe* with whom they had opened a dialogue.

---

[6] M. Prélot, op. cit., 53–72.

[7] See J. R. Derré, op. cit., 156–66, 199–206.

The July Revolution of 1830 and the outbreak of anticlericalism associated with it confirmed Lamennais and his followers in their conviction. The Church should welcome those political forms of government which replaced arbitrary action with control by the people, in order both to avoid accusations against it and to provide these new forms of government "with a soul." In the face of the hostile attitude of the government, separation of Church and state was more imperative than ever.

Harel de Tancrel, a young convert, suggested to Abbé Gerbet, Lamennais's most important assistant, the creation of a newspaper for the purpose of publicizing these views. Lamennais liked the idea greatly; even though he did not accept the position of editor, he settled near Paris at the Collège Juilly in order to be able to keep a close eye on it. On 20 August Gerbet announced the impending publication, an announcement which was received enthusiastically.[9] Among the supporters were most notably the young Charles Montalembert,[10] Abbé Lacordaire, and the economist Charles de Coux. On 16 October 1830, the first issue of *L'Avenir* saw the light of day with a lead article from the pen of Lamennais.[11]

---

[8] This group has been examined much less than the followers of Lamennais. See L. de Carné, *Souvenirs de ma jeunesse* (Paris 1873); E. Trogan in *Le Correspondant* 315 (1929), 5–13; L. C. Gimpfl, *The "Correspondant"* (Washington 1959), 2–8; see also the unpublished dissertation by Mother Flavia-Augustina, "*Le Correspondant,* liberal Catholic Review, 1829–55" (Catholic University of America 1958) and the unpublished work by J. Darmon, "Le groupe du premier *Correspondant* 1829–31" (Sorbonne 1959).

[9] Text in *Articles de "L'Avenir"* I, i–viii.

[10] Concerning Charles de Montalembert (1810–70), the well-documented but one-sided biography by Lecanuet (3 vol., Paris 1895/1902) is to be complemented by A. Trannoy, *Le romantisme politique de Montalembert avant 1843* (Paris 1942); P. de Lallemand, *Montalembert et ses amis dans le romantisme* (Paris 1927); A. Schnütgen in *AHVNrh* 148 (1949), 62–144; Lösch, 138–75. See also C. Trannoy, *Montalembert, Dieu et la liberté* (Paris 1970). Works: *Œuvres de Montalembert,* 9 vol. (Paris 1860/68; see *DThC* X, 2344–55) and *Les Moines d'Occident,* 7 vol. (Paris 1860/77). Letters: *LThK* VII, 294.

The name of the paper said much, but even more its motto: "God and Liberty." The paper intended to fight a two-front war. On the one hand it gave the liberals the assurance to support impartially and enthusiastically the freedoms announced by the revolution of 1789. This was to be valid for all freedoms, however, including that of education, which many liberals were reluctant to concede for fear of aiding and abetting ultramontane propaganda. On the other hand, *L'Avenir* tried to make Catholics and clergy understand that it was time to dissociate themselves from the Old Regime and to turn to the future for the creation of a new humanism. The comprehensive attempt to rejuvenate Catholic thought and action, incorporating the new artistic, scientific, and democratic trends of the time, explains the attraction of this paper and its founder for many young people. A decided turn to modernity became indeed evident in all areas. *L'Avenir* proved itself open to the new romantic literature;[12] it demanded general disarmament and the unification of Europe;[13] and it supported the national revolts of the Belgians, the Irish, and the Poles in the name of the right of peoples to self-determination.[14] Increasingly it accepted universal franchise and republican government,[15] and emphasized the providential character of the revolutions then shaking Europe. It also displayed an open mind with respect to social democracy[16] and underscored the connection between the independence of the Church and its voluntary poverty, as only through it could it feel solidarity with all of humankind and become meaningful to common and oppressed people.

On the political and religious level, *L'Avenir* at first limited itself to praising the regime of liberty and the separation—or better, the differentiation—of Church and state as the most suitable springboard for winning back the faithless. The paper presented this relationship between Church and state as a necessity, without, however, accepting it as the ideal. It demanded the renunciation of the concordat, because in a society "which God had forgotten" it actually hindered the freedom of the Pope and bishops. If the clergy were rid of this unholy tie, Catholicism would experience a new awakening, as Ireland had shown. By the spring and summer of 1831, the paper progressed to an acceptance of the liberal system as the ideal form of government for a mature society.

---

[11] On the campaign of *L'Avenir* see especially Lecanuet, *Montalembert* I, 152–218, *DThC* IX, 527–45, and M. Prélot, op. cit., 84–109; and for the facts, in addition to the biographies of Lamennais, C. de Ladoue, *Mgr. Gerbet* (Paris 1872), I, 176–207, Lecanuet, op. cit., 132–51, 219–68, and A. Trannoy, *Le romantisme,* 143–62. Also *Procès de "L'Avenir"* (Paris 1831).

[12] J. R. Derré, op. cit., 529–614.

[13] M. Prélot, op. cit., 102–09.

[14] But he was much more reserved with respect to the revolts in Spain and Italy, plotted by secret societies of Jacobin tendencies, which appeared to him to go counter to the true spirit of liberalism as it developed in America. See G. Verucci in *RSIt* 67 (1955), 31–51.

[15] See the introduction by G. Verucci, *L'Avenir,* XIII–LXIV.

[16] See Duroselle, 36–59.

While the paper, whose circulation never exceeded three thousand, day by day spread its ideas with a zeal which cared little for concrete conditions, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and de Coux, not satisfied with a mere campaign of ideas, established a "general agency for the defense of religious freedom."[17] It organized in the provinces a systematic campaign of influencing public opinion, attacking administrative chicanery about which Catholics had reason to complain, especially in the field of education. By doing so legally with small groups of people in the name of constitutional liberties, they succeeded in gaining the sympathies of the young clergy and in shaking a relatively large number of laity out of its lethargy.

Following a suggestion by the Dutch journalist Le Sage ten Broek, the campaign was quickly expanded to foreign countries, where it appealed for support of Catholics in Ireland, Poland, Germany, and the Netherlands. With the intention of creating genuine international solidarity in obtaining religious and political freedoms, and of opposing the Holy Alliance of Kings with a "Holy Alliance of Peoples," *L'Avenir* on 15 November 1831 published the draft of an "Act of Union, to be submitted to all who, despite the murder of Poland, still hope for freedom in the world and want to bring it about."[18] It was a manifesto which governments interpreted as an instrument of international revolution.

To what extent were the religious-political ideas propagated by *L'Avenir* accepted in the neighboring countries? In Germany, Lamennais's philosophy was received with interest by the Munich group, but the leaders of the Catholic movement regarded the attempt to come to an accommodation with liberalism with suspicion.[19] In Italy, the conservative Catholics who once had acclaimed the defender of throne and altar rejected his ideas. Liberal Catholics were disappointed by the ultramontane doctrines of *L'Avenir* and its defense of the secular power of the Pope; some members of orders, though, especially in Tuscany (with the exception of Father Ventura), greeted them with approval.[20] In Holland, on the other hand, the campaign of *L'Avenir* was observed with wide acclaim. It was a justification for those who, in a country with a Catholic minority, had discovered the advantages of religious freedom while they lived under the French regime. In addition to Le Sage ten Broek, the publicist Broere and the Redemptorist Bernard Haskenscheid supported Lamennais.[21] But nowhere was the influence of *L'Avenir* greater and more effective than in Belgium.

---

[17] Statutes in *Articles de "L'Avenir"* I, 456–58. Lamennais's role in this campaign, planned and executed by his assistants, was a secondary one, as he was not a man of action.

[18] *Articles de "L'Avenir"* VII, 176–85.

[19] The influence of Lamennais in Germany has hardly been touched (the work by L. Ahrens, *La Mennais und Deutschland* examines only the German influence on Lamennais). See some references in J. R. Derré, op. cit., 461–92, Schnabel, *G* IV, 181–202, and Lösch, 88–137.

The Belgian Constitution of 1831

Until the beginning of 1831, unionism was for Belgian Catholics nothing more than a tactic, a temporary coalition, from which they expected to derive the greatest possible advantages; as a purely empirical innovation it owed nothing to Lamennais. After the publication of *Progrès de la Révolution,* which in Belgium generated an unbelievable echo because a man as famous as Lamennais used Belgium as an example, a goodly number of Catholics began to hold a different view.[22] Inspired by the recent publications by Lamennais and his associates, many people came to the conclusion that a regime of modern freedoms was inherently the best form of government. It corresponded to the wishes of the people in accordance with the principle of *vox populi vox Dei* and the views of philosophical traditionalism, and provided the essential connection between Christianity and freedom. Hence, on the eve of the September revolution of 1830, several currents of thought were in evidence among Belgian Catholics. There was the group around Lamennais, numerically clearly in the minority, which with its enthusiasm soon infected the majority of Catholics and was instrumental in renewing the somewhat loosened bonds between Catholicism and liberalism. In the group, swelling from month to month, especially in Flanders and around Tournai, were laymen as well as priests. The latter had more confidence in their faith, which had survived recent persecutions, than in the protection offered by the civil powers. Without completely identifying with the liberals, they shared their admiration for the opportunities offered by liberty in apostolic and political respects. Some of them openly acknowledged themselves as democrats or republicans. In opposition to episcopal directives they emphasized their personal freedom of interpretation in matters of theological tradition as long as defined dogmas were not involved. The followers of Lamennais were joined by many other liberal Catholics who actually admired English institutions more than Lamennais's thought.

---

[20] See A. Gambaro, "La fortuna di Lamennais in Italia" in *Studi francesi* 2 (1958), 198–219.

[21] See F. Vrijmoed, *Lamennais avant sa défection et la Néerlande catholique* (Paris 1930), to be complemented by G. Gorris, *J. Le Sage ten Broek* II, (Amsterdam 1949).

[22] H. Haag, A. Simon, and K. Jürgensen agree in a number of important points, but their opinions differ about the extent of the ties between the Belgian Catholics and liberalism: Is there an ideological growth or did they stop, as Haag thinks, with the simple tactic introduced in 1828? See especially H. Haag in *RHE* 54 (1959), 593–98 and A. Simon in *Revue belge de philosophie et d'histoire* 37 (1959), 408–18.

There were also numerous conservatives who were unionists only from necessity. Unwilling to concede the natural character of an alliance between Catholicism and liberalism, they instead, as loyal monarchists, hoped for a quick return to the old unity of throne and altar.

Between these two extremes stood the Mechelen group.[23] Numerically it was very small, but it became very influential through the support of the archbishop of the Belgian Church, the strong personality of his vicar general Sterckx, and the new bishop of Liège, Van Bommel. Their thought also spread to other dioceses. Although showing sympathies for Lamennais's theories, the adherents of this third group, relatively strongly represented in the clergy, were not persuaded by them. Quite realistically they concluded that a return to the Old Regime was no longer possible in view of the revolution which thinking had undergone. In fact, such a return was no longer even desirable, as a close connection between Church and state invariably produced secular interference in ecclesiastical matters which, as the experience of the past fifty years had demonstrated, quickly became intolerable. Mutual independence of the two forces seemed preferable, and all religious communities should be afforded religious freedom. The decision for freedom was not taken in the name of Lamennais's demand for a total separation of Church and state. The Mechelen group attempted to combine the advantages of the liberal system and the Old Regime in keeping with Van Bommel's view, who was thinking chiefly of financial subsidies, that "freedom should not exclude protection, and protection should not stifle freedom."

The Dutch-Belgian union came to an end in September 1830, after a revolution which had been made by people who generally were not strong in their faith[24] and whose outbreak the majority of the clergy had observed with concern. Now a constitution for the new state had to be drafted. The bishops did everything in their power to assure that the constituent assembly had a Catholic majority.[25] But many of the elected Catholics, open to the ideas of Lamennais, were more than ready to trust completely in liberty. The Mechelen group, however, which desired a certain protection of the Church within the framework of religious freedom, attempted to amend the first draft of the constitution with this objective. In November it published the brochure *Considérations sur la liberté religieuse, par une unioniste.* It received widespread attention and was supported a month later in a letter from Archbishop de Méan to the president of the national congress.

---

[23] See *Collectanea Mechliniensia* 22 (1952), 349–64. The conceptions of this group find expression in the voluminous correspondence held in the archives of the archbishopric of Mechelen and in the Rijksarchief at The Hague, as well as in a brochure by C. Van Bommel published in October 1829: *Système de liberté illimitée des cultes et des opinions religieuses.*

The letter was well received, as it proved in a semi-official manner that the Belgian Church abjured the system of an established Church and unequivocally accepted the notion of freedom. But the atmosphere of the national congress, and the Catholics represented in it, was too strongly influenced by Lamennais as to be able to realize fully the program enumerated in the brochure and the letter. But even if the Church was not successful in obtaining all desired concessions, especially with reference to religious congregations, the constitution adopted on 7 February 1831 granted it a rather advantageous position. Freedom of education was guaranteed (Art. 17), as well as the right to free association (Art. 20), i.e., freedom for orders. The state continued to be responsible for ecclesiastical salaries (Article 117).[26] Article 16 guaranteed the Church a degree of independence unknown at this time in any other Catholic country. The state was permitted neither to impose any conditions for the appointment of bishops and the publication of papal announcements nor to attempt to achieve this control through a concordat.

The lifting of all ecclesiastical privileges, and especially the liberal atmosphere in which the constitution had been worked out, worried the Holy See, which thought it detected the influence of Lamennais. Warned by Capaccini, Sterckx, who meanwhile had become chapter vicar of Mechelen, wrote a skillful defense in which he pointed out that while the traditional union between the two powers no longer existed, the separation actually was only apparent and was not complete.[27] His explanations were crafty, but from his position in the midst of the Belgian religious and political reality he comprehended that this *modus vivendi* was the only possible one. He hoped that the Church in Belgium possessed enough respect to regain in practice what it had lost in theory. At least his intervention, supported by several Jesuits, succeeded in warding off a formal disapproval by the Holy See. Henceforth the Belgian constitution gained European significance for the future development of Catholic liberalism. For many years it was the ideal of many Catholics who likewise demanded freedom as it was practiced in Belgium.

---

[24] Concerning the religious policy of the Provisional Government, which was very liberal and yet considerate of the Church, see A. Simon, *L'Église catholique et les débuts de la Belgique indépendante* (Wetteren 1949), 14–24.

[25] Concerning their debates, see L. de Lichtervelde, *Le Congrès national* (Brussels 1945). Suggestions, amendments, and speeches in E. Huyttens, *Discussions du Congrès national de Belgique,* 5 vols. (Brussels 1844/45).

[26] See R. Georges in *Revue diocèse de Namur* 17 (1963), 1–46.

Briefly summarized, the unionism of the Belgian Catholics in its beginnings intended to be only a temporary and tactical association with modern liberty. But a genuine Catholic liberalism developed in dual fashion in the years 1829–31. One resulted from the theoretical writings of Lamennais and his associates, especially in *L'Avenir,* and the other from the embodiment in the Belgian constitution of conditions which would prove the fruitfulness of these ideas.

---

[27] Printed in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à L. van der Essen* II, (Brussels-Louvain 1947), 983–90.

CHAPTER 17

The Roman Reaction

The Appeal to Rome

Lamennais's polemics against Gallicanism and scholastic philosophy earned him the animosity of bishops and theologians, especially the Sulpicians and the Jesuits.[1] His liberalism and the campaign waged by *L'Avenir* for a reconciliation of Church and democracy increased the number of his opponents.They were additionally embittered by the provocative tone and the personal attacks of *L'Avenir,* which for longer than a generation were to be the hallmark of Lamennais's followers. The government of Louis-Philippe accused him of political radicalism and resented his attacks on the religious policy of the July Monarchy. The legitimists, who had not forgiven him his turnabout, were incensed about his unjustified criticism of them and attacked him stridently in their press. Dupanloup hardly exaggerated when he described Lamennais as "the idol of the young priests . . . but a vexation to all old clergymen and pious believers."[2] They resented his bold political ideas and suspected him of wanting to reform the Catholic religion itself. The bishops were irritated because, being legitimists and Gallicans, they were unable to distinguish between what was false and exaggerated in this movement and what was reasonable. They accused *L'Avenir* of asking for the cancellation of the concordat, whose advantages in their eyes made up for its disadvantages, and of undermining episcopal authority by its constant sarcasm and by permitting laymen to discuss questions which were subject to ecclesiastical authority. They did not wish to see such difficult questions debated on a journalistic level and were justifiably worried by the divisions which it generated among their clergy.[3] Most of them hesitated, however, to attack the well-known apologist and defender of the Roman cause with pastoral letters. But many of them purged their seminaries and pressured their priests to stop reading the paper. A number of older followers, actually in favor of a more open attitude toward liberal tendencies, were worried by the increasingly radical posture of *L'Avenir* in political matters. They thought like Father Ventura, who, in an article published in February 1831, approved of the liberal Catholic view of the paper but accused it of "preaching revolution in the name of religion." This reaction of a Roman friend was the more telling as the nunciature was increasingly reserved.

---

[1] See L. Le Guillou, *L'évolution et la pensée religieuse de Félicité Lamennais,* 199–216.

The editors of *L'Avenir* attempted to clarify the situation with the aid of a declaration[4] addressed to the new Pope, in which they extensively explained their philosophical, theological, religious, and political positions. But when Rome did not respond positively, cancellations of subscriptions increased and the financial condition of the paper became untenable. At the end of October it was decided to cease publication of *L'Avenir* and the activities of the agency.

---

[2] Letter to Cardinal de Rohan, quoted in F. Lagrange, *Vie de Mgr. Dupanloup* I, 132. To be compared with the letter by the internuncio in P. Dudon, op. cit., 123.

[3] For in this lay the whole problem of the apostolate beyond the relationship between Church and state in a fundamentally new world. Even graver was that of the relationship between faith and reason and between Church and world based on man's position outside of a hierarchical and authoritarian concept of society. Numerous unpublished letters, which L. Le Guillou is preparing for publication, show to what extent the problems posed by Lamennais, being pressing and essential for the conscience of many priests, split even the religious orders. Followers and opponents struggled so violently that occasionally they ignored the most elementary commandments of love. (*L'Information littéraire* 18 [1966], 141).

[4] Text in G. Verucci, *L'Avenir* (Rome 1967), 288–307. The Pope probably never saw this declaration written by Gerbet and published on 6 February.

An unexpected turn of events occurred when Lacordaire suggested that Lamennais present his case to the Pope personally. Then, equipped with a certification of his orthodoxy, he could return and begin anew with strengthened authority.[5] On 15 November *L'Avenir* appeared for the last time, with the announcement that for the time being it would cease publication. One week later, Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert started on their journey to Rome. They did so in the face of the warnings of the archbishop of Paris, who pointed out to them the danger of forcing the Holy See to adopt a position. Lamennais, deeply engaged in the battle for what he considered to be the only way of salvation for the Church, believed that the only reason the Pope did not support his cause was that the Curia had failed to inform the Pope of the actual situation. The Holy See, he believed, could not afford to remain neutral between good and evil, between the true and the false. Preoccupied with matters in France, Lamennais failed to realize that aside from ecclesiastical aspects and from the worries which the Pope had about the developments in Belgium,[6] the campaign of *L'Avenir* for democracy had to be particularly threatening to Rome. After all, it was the capital of a state whose existence most recently had been endangered by a liberal revolution.

Arriving in Rome on 30 December, the "Pilgrims of God and Freedom" visited a few well-disposed influential persons. They wanted to see Lamennais well received in spite of the "real errors" of his political writings, because they acknowledged his achievements as apologist, as champion of ultramontanism, and as defender of the freedom of the Church. They were also impressed by the evangelistic echo which *L'Avenir*'s appeals to a poorer Church, less compromised by Metternich's system, evoked. This view was shared by the Capuchin Cardinal Micara, a few other members of the Sacred College, a few theologians like Father Olivieri, *Magister Sacri Palatii,* and Father Ventura, who was once again totally reconciled with Lamennais and eager to help him.[7]

The opponents were many and powerful. There were the secretary of state, whom the judgment of *L'Avenir* concerning his suppression of the revolts in the Papal States had offended, and Cardinal Lambruschini, who as former nuncio in Paris was regarded as the expert on matters affecting France. He was a decided reactionary, who found it easy to gather adherents for his indignation about this "arrogant spirit" who thought he could give lessons in diplomacy to experienced nuncios and lessons in religion to the Pope. There were several theologians and canonists, especially Jesuits under the leadership of Father Rozaven, always a bitter enemy of Lamennais's philosophical ideas, who were outraged by the condescension with which Lamennais treated respected theologians. Finally there were French legitimists—supported by the Austrian and Russian embassies—assembled around the auditor of the *Rota* and Cardinal de Rohan, who articulated the concerns of the bishops.

---

[5] See his autobiographical comments in P. Foisset, *Vie du R. P. Lacordaire* I (Paris 1870), 180–81.

[6] Concerning the importance of the Belgian situation in Lamennais's condemnation, see A. Simon in *Ris* 6 (1963), 15–16; id., *Reccontres*, 129–38.

[7] See his vote in P. Dudon, op. cit., 126–32.

The role of the foreign diplomats was discussed heatedly, and Lamennais himself in his *Affaires de Rome* ascribed to them a predominant influence. Access to the archives has made possible a more balanced view. The French government did not intervene directly, but its hostility to *L'Avenir* was known, and Gregory XVI under no circumstances wanted to increase the tensions between the Church and the new government. The influence of Russia, extremely irritated by *L'Avenir*'s support of the Polish revolt, seems to have been much more important than historians have generally admitted.[8] They have been more concerned with Metternich's role, which Father Dudon was at pains to minimize.[9] But the archives of Vienna, which Dudon did not consult, demand, as L. Ahrens and J. R. Derré have shown, a correction of some of his assertions. It is true that Gregory XVI even before the complaints of Austria's ambassador in December 1831[10] was not kindly disposed toward Lamennais and regarded as unbecoming his presumption to demand from the Holy See a declaration concerning his case. But the intervention of the ambassador strengthened the unfavorable impression of the Pope and militated against those who suggested that the pilgrims should be given a friendly reception. Metternich intervened several times during Lamennais's stay in Rome. Later, after the publication of *Mirari vos,* Metternich sent the Holy See numerous compromising letters which had been intercepted by his censor. Metternich had annotated them with comments and advice which corresponded to the personal opinion of the Pope and contributed to his hardening attitude. The vivid interest of the representatives of the Holy Alliance in Lamennais's case definitely convinced the Pope that he had to take a stand and publicly condemn the new school of thought.

---

[8] See especially Montalembert's letter to Guéranger in P. Dudon, op. cit., 151–52 and the passage of his diary quoted by A. Trannoy, op. cit., 181. See also A. Vidler, op. cit., 210–12, as well as more generally A. Boudou, *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie* I, chap. 5. The Tsar did not ascribe to *L'Avenir* the revolt in Poland, but its prolongation and the religious character which the battle had assumed.

[9] His article in *BLE* 33 (1932), 16–34, an answer to the book by L. Ahrens, presents no new aspects.

[10] See the telegrams by Lützow of 18 December and 25 December 1831, in L. Ahrens, op. cit., 237–40.

Whatever the case may be, Lamennais and his associates met a wall of polite silence during their first weeks in Rome. At the beginning of February they delivered to the Pope a lengthy memorandum, written by Lacordaire,[11] in which they presented their views. Cardinal Pacca, the deacon of the Sacred College, brought a reply. It was a polite plea to let the matter rest. Lacordaire understood immediately and decided to return to France without delay.[12] But Lamennais, convinced that the opposition against him was exclusively of a political nature and that he was blameless with respect to doctrine, was determined to force Rome to reply. He extended his stay until July. When by that time he still had not heard anything, he decided, encouraged by some Roman friends, to resume publication of *L'Avenir.* He left Rome, bitter that he had been denied the opportunity to present his case personally. The fact that the authorities had systematically avoided any serious discussion convinced him that Rome, overly busy with problems of the day and purely secular problems, had no interest in the general welfare of the Church.

The Encyclical *Mirari vos*

Contrary to Lamennais's assumption, his case had been under serious investigation by the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs since March. The report edited by Cardinal Lambruschini emphasized the international aftereffects of *L'Avenir*'s campaign: discontent among the bishops of France and Belgium[13] and concern in the cabinets of the Catholic powers. The advisers were unanimous in their view that the Pope could be silent no longer, as he otherwise might create the impression that he approved the subversive doctrine published by Lamennais during the past two years. Instead of compiling a list of the theses to be condemned, a process which would have taken too much time, the advisers suggested to the Pope that, without mentioning *L'Avenir* expressly, he condemn the theses about the legitimacy of revolution, the separation of Church and state, and freedom of religion and the press. A draft of the encyclical, presented by Monsignor Frezza, the secretary of the congregation, was ratified on August 9. The arguments set forth were primarily of a theological nature. The incriminated theories were accused of being derived from a "certain religious indifferentism, which faith must reject," and countered notions of popular sovereignty with texts like *"omnis potestas a Deo."* But it is likely that the cardinals and the Pope himself were also persuaded to intervene by extratheological factors, such as renewed remarks by the diplomats, renewed outbreaks of liberal agitation in the Papal States, and the Belgian problem.

---

[11] Text in *Les Affaires de Rome,* 45–104.

[12] Concerning this decision, see P. Foisset, *Vie du R. P. Lacordaire* I, 197–99.

[13] See the letter of 29 January 1832 by Van Bommel to Gregory XVI in A. Simon, *Rencontres,* 136–37.

The Encyclical *Mirari vos* of 15 August 1832[14] painted a pessimistic picture of the conditions which Gregory XVI encountered upon his accession to the throne. After a condemnation of rationalism and Gallicanism, which Lamennais also had opposed for fifteen years, the encyclical railed against liberalism in its various manifestations, "this false and absurd maxim, or better this madness, that everyone should have and practice freedom of conscience." It spoke against freedom of the press, "this loathsome freedom which one cannot despise too strongly" and from which to expect anything good would be an illusion, attacked the invitation to revolt against sovereigns (this point was developed with special pathos), and opposed the separation of Church and state. Yielding on any of these points was condemned "with a biblical tone which seemed to stem from another age" (Droulers). Neither Lamennais nor *L'Avenir* were mentioned directly, but all of their theses were rejected by connecting them erroneously with naturalistic indifferentism. The fact that Rome did not regard this encyclical as a condemnation of the Belgian constitution indicated a willingness to remain on the ground of principles and to accept a regime which tolerated modern freedoms, under the condition that the essential rights of the Church remained untouched. What was condemned was the assertion of the legal equality of all religions and that the freedom to dispense any doctrine was an ideal and progress.[15] Equally, the doctrine of popular sovereignty was condemned, inspired more by the theoreticians of the divine right of Kings than by the Aristotelian positions of Thomas of Aquinas about the origin of power. It motivated a few Dominicans to react, even in Rome where they were not the only ones to question the opportunism of the encyclical or its authority.

Lamennais was sent a copy of the encyclical, accompanied by a letter from Cardinal Pacca, who explained that Lamennais was alluded to because of his tactics which he seemed to believe necessary for the defense of the Church, and because of his doctrines on religious policies. Lamennais received the message in Munich, where he wanted to make contact with some of his German followers.[16] In agreement with his collaborators he published a declaration which recanted nothing but announced that, "devoted to the supreme authority of the Vicar of Christ, the battleground would be vacated on which for two years a loyal fight had taken place." Furthermore, *L'Avenir* would not appear again and the agency would remain closed. The declaration satisfied Rome, which had feared a storm of indignation.

---

[14] Text in *Acta Gregorii PP XVI,* ed. by A. Bernasconi (Rome 1901), I, 169–74.

[15] See R. Aubert, "L'enseignement du magistère ecclésiastique au XIX^{e} siècle sur le libéralisme" in *Tolérance et communauté humaine* (Tournai 1952), 75–82.

[16] Concerning the stay in Munich, see L. Ahrens, op. cit., 86ff.

From *Mirari vos* to *Singulari nos*

The encyclical convinced a number of Lamennais's followers that they had been on the wrong path and they renounced the theories which heretofore they had defended. But Lamennais and many of his students—convinced that the encyclical was "more an act of government than of magisterial office" (Le Guillou)—believed that they were merely enjoined to silence and could continue to hold their earlier ideas without change.

The Belgian Catholics faced a special conflict of conscience,[17] as for them Catholic liberalism was not only a theoretical system but was also embodied in a constitution whose concrete advantages were appreciated more every day. The conservatives, who had criticized this constitution, which was too liberal in their eyes, were jubilant; the unionists were at first dismayed, and some of them asked themselves whether the antirevolutionary statements of the encyclical did not also condemn their active opposition to the regalism of William I and the revolution of 1830. But the bishops were not worried at all. They rightly assumed that the declarations of principle concerning an ideal regime did not refer to the constitution, an agreement of civil and not theological nature. Soon the Catholic papers began to interpret the encyclical in the same sense, and some of them added that an encyclical was not binding for the faith. Some early unionists like Gerlache, out of loyalty to the Roman doctrine, felt obliged to give up their parliamentary activity; but most of them after a few weeks of contemplation decided that for them nothing had changed. Metternich was extremely incensed and did not hesitate to pass his alarm on to Rome, insisting that a new, clearer declaration was mandatory.

Numerous French voices also called for another papal intervention, one which would obligate the followers of Lamennais to a genuine recantation. They desired above all that the Pope condemn the list of fifty-six theses by Lamennais which Monsignor d'Astros had submitted to the Holy See in 1832 and which for this reason was known by the name of "Censure of Toulouse."[18] But while some secretly hoped to compel Lamennais to throw off his mask and believed they could triumph over the rebellious apostle of ultramontanism, Gregory XVI, disregarding the advice which he received from Metternich, the Jesuits, and many others, preferred to wait. He agreed with the opinion of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs not to follow the "Censure of Toulouse"; instead, a brief was composed in which the Pope confined himself to an expression of unmitigated joy over the way in which his encyclical had been received.

---

[17] See H. Haag, op. cit., 180–96, Jürgensen, op. cit., 254–69, and A. Simon, *Rencontres*, 149–53.

At the same time two other events occupied the center of attention. A Belgian paper published an excerpt from a letter by Lamennais in which he expressed his intention of resuming publication of *L'Avenir.* In spite of appearances, the letter actually was written prior to the encyclical,[19] but in Rome the news was received as proof of his duplicity. The effect of this tragic misunderstanding was heightened by the shattering foreword of Mickiewicz's *Book of the Polish Pilgrims.* The papal brief to Monsignor d'Astros (8 May 1833) was immediately amended by the insertion of a statement directed at Lamennais. Lamennais's letter of explanation failed to satisfy the Pope, who addressed an even stricter brief to the bishop of Rennes. An exchange of letters between Lamennais and Rome followed. The Breton abbé, no longer concerned with religious freedom or the separation of Church and state, but now interested in the cause of exploited peoples and oppressed nations, was prepared to announce his submission to the Holy See in questions of faith, morals, and Church discipline. But, relying on the radical difference between spiritual and secular matters, he wanted to retain his full freedom of thought and action in the political sphere, even after the encyclical. Gregory XVI was unwilling to concede this, as he was of the opinion that the call to revolt against established authorities questioned moral and religious principles. Lamennais was therefore asked to agree expressly to the totality of the statements made in *Mirari vos,* including those concerned with political activity.

Physically exhausted by the weeks of tiring discussions, embittered by the intensified attacks of the Catholic press doubting his loyalty, and desirous of "peace at any price," Lamennais finally surrendered on 11 December. His private letters, though, reveal his true attitude: he was ready to sign everything, "even if it had been an acknowledgement that the Pope were God."[20] It was the end of the process which had begun with his stay in Rome. He now harbored "very strong reservations about several points of Catholicism," convinced that "the Church could not remain as it is, because no attempt had ever been made to distinguish in it between the divine and the human."

---

[18] On its origin and history, see P. Droulers, op. cit., 132–44, complemented by P. Dudon, op. cit., 243–63. Two thirds of the sentences concerned the philosophical theory of certainty and about one third the church-political theses of *L'Avenir.*

[19] This fact was discovered by G. Charlier. See *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 11 (1933), 109–14.

It is probable that the papal brief of June 1832 to the Polish bishops made a deeper impression on Lamennais than the condemnation of *L'Avenir*. The brief condemned the national insurgency and justified its brutal suppression by the Tsar in the name of the obedience owed to a legitimate rule.[21] The Polish revolt was for Lamennais not only an attempt to liberate a people, but also a religious rising for the defense of the rights of Catholics violated by the Russian schismatics. The more he now reflected on these events during the following months, the more he began to wonder to what extent a Pope could be believed who so clearly betrayed his spiritual mission for political reasons. To Lamennais it appeared as though the Pope was looking for support from Russia, the better to resist the rebellious Romagna. Logically this led him to the question: "What is the Church?" Is it the hierarchy and the papacy, opposing the strivings of a people for its liberty, or is it all of humankind?" With his apocalyptic view, he saw the beginning of a development analogous to that which replaced the Jewish synagogue with a hierarchical Church. Henceforth the time had passed for him in which the papacy acted in the divinely sanctioned role of interpreter of the truth entrusted by God and humankind. Now it was necessary to await the coming of a new religious society, emerging from the Catholic Church like a butterfly from its chrysalis. More than a rebel incapable of obeying a reprimand, Lamennais thus appeared as a disappointed man who had placed precipitous hope in the Catholic Church for the liberation of man; when he realized that it did not act accordingly, he concluded that its hierarchy could not possibly be God's instrument on earth.

His outward submission gained him a few weeks of respite, but soon he began to accuse himself for his lukewarm attitude. From Ventura and other Roman friends he learned that even at the center of Catholicism the views of Gregory XVI were not accepted without reservations and that French and European policy was becoming increasingly reactionary. He decided to take an unequivocal stand. In April 1834, against the advice of his friends, he published a series of poems under the title

---

[20] Letter to Montalembert of 1 January 1834 (op. cit., 231). See also the letter to Marion of 4 January 1834 in A. du Bois de la Villerabel, *Confidences de Lamennais, lettres inédites* (Paris 1886), 94–95.

[21] See above, pp. 156f.

Paroles d'un croyant. He had written them in order to proclaim in the style of the prophets of the Old Testament the arrival of a new age in which the renewed intervention of Christ would free the peoples from the tyranny of despots and rulers. This hymn to everything the Pope had condemned in *Mirari vos* made a great stir.[22] Catholics saw in the work, which was very religious but whose concept of Christianity was vaguely drawn, a proof of Lamennais's definite apostasy. This was actually a premature conclusion,[23] but Rome reacted without delay. Lambruschini was ordered to prepare a report, and although he came to the conclusion that a papal brief would suffice, and although the archbishop of Paris recommended total silence, the Pope on 21 June 1834 published the Encyclical *Singulari nos.*[24] It recounted the events, extensively condemned the revolutionary doctrines of Lamennais's work, especially as these purported to be based on the doctrines of the Bible, and concluded with a short and rather generally worded condemnation of philosophical traditionalism.

Lamennais did not react immediately and his break with the Pope became evident only with the publication of *Affaires de Rome*[25] in November 1836. All of his former followers quickly announced their submission to the papal decision. Yet the influence of the movement started by Lamennais was a deep and lasting one in the Catholic Church. As the following chapters will show, the impetus generated by the Breton prophet retained its influence on thought and action, notwithstanding the severe strain to which the impatience of its founder exposed it. Lamennais was unable to respect God's patience and incapable of surrendering his excessive individualism, an individualism which did not permit his prolific intuitions to be cleansed and purged by the contact with the experience of ecclesiastical collectivity. He also suffered from a superficial understanding of religion, a lack which was to be a burden for the various forms of "political Catholicism" generated in the nineteenth century in the wake of Lammenais.

---

[22] See in Forgues, *Correspondance* II, 368–69 the collection of ingenious expressions, collected by Vitrolles in Paris: *"un bonnet rouge planté sur une croix," "Babeuf débité par le prophète Ezéchiel," "Robespierre en surplis"* . . .

[23] Lamennais stopped believing in the fundamental truths of Christianity only in 1835–36. See the last two chapters of L. Le Guillou, *L'évolution de la pensée religieuse de Félicité Lamennais.*

[24] Texts in *Acta Gregorii PP XVI* I, 433–34. Concerning the preparation of the encyclical, see P. Dudon, op. cit., 323–29, to be supplemented by the letter of E. d'Alzon of 5 July 1834 (*Lettres inédites de Lamennais à Montalembert,* 307–09). The archives at Vienna indicate Metternich's extraordinary activity in the weeks before the issuance of the encyclical, but in contrast to Harispe, L. Ahrens believes that the stunning parallels between the encyclical and the letters of the Austrian chancellor are more the expression of an already existing agreement than the result of an express influence.

[25] He announced in it that he gave up the "Christianity of the Pontificate" in favor of a "Christianity of Humanity," analogous to deism. He took up residence in Paris, devoted himself to journalism, but henceforth remained isolated even among the groups of the left, for whom he was too religious. After a vain attempt in 1848 to enter politics, he died on 17 February 1854.

SECTION TWO

Church and State in Europe from 1830 to 1848

More than once it was assumed that the condemnation of *L'Avenir* in the Encyclical *Mirari vos* dealt a deathblow to Catholic liberalism. But this was not the case. Those followers of Lamennais who continued to be convinced of the viability of his ideas gave up developing theories about the ideal relationship between Church and state and ceased pursuing a systematic apologetics of the separation of the two powers. They turned to a translation of theory into practice by employing modern institutions in favor of religion and by demanding the application of common law instead of privileges wherever the freedom of Catholics was constrained as a consequence of governmental actions. At the same time, they tried to adapt Catholic culture to the movements and tendencies of modern society. The militant wing of Catholicism was resolutely engaged in this development, especially in France. It was also the policy of Belgian and Dutch Catholics, noticeably supported by their bishops. In Italy some attempted to take the same path. In the German states, only little influenced by Lamennais, there were parallel tendencies in the attempts of Görres and the Munich group to make Catholic thought palatable to Protestant intellectuals and to free the Church from the yoke of the regionalism of the Old Regime. It was not happenstance that the followers of Lamennais in France and Belgium observed the resistance of Prussian Catholics during the events at Cologne with enthusiasm. The second spring (Newman) which English Catholicism experienced during these years was due above all to the Emancipation Act of 1829, a Catholic and liberal success. It had its origin in O'Connell's activity; his example convinced the followers of Lamennais, and Montalembert emphasized its significance. In spite of the prevailing reactionary atmosphere in Rome and Vienna the most important Catholic developments in western and central Europe during the fifteen years of Gregory's pontificate thus occurred under the banner of liberty.

CHAPTER 18

The Continuation of Catholic Liberalism in Western Europe

France

The July Revolution of 1830, replacing the alliance of throne and altar so beneficial for the French clergy with a regime in which the influence of the anticlerical and liberal middle class was predominant, caused great consternation among the clergy. Upon the advice of Austria and against the counsel of his Curia and the nuncio in Paris, Pius VIII quickly recognized the new regime, which promised to honor the concordat. But a few anticlerical institutional measures[1] generated in the already suspicious clergy the fear that persecutions would begin anew. These measures were often of a local nature,[2] but they were augmented by attacks of the Paris press and theaters on the clergy. Additionally, there was the tendency of some community councils, especially in the cities, to reduce clerical influence on public life, and finally there were some unfortunate appointments of bishops during the first months following the revolution. Several priests and three bishops, among them Cardinals de Latil and de Rohan, left France and regarded themselves as the first in a wave of emigration similar to that of 1789. Actually, ecclesiastical reconstruction was consolidated during the eighteen years of the July Monarchy. In some areas—thanks to the sensible application of the tactic recommended by *L'Avenir*—there was even a continuation of the Catholic renewal which had begun during the restoration period.

Although they were indifferent in religious matters, neither the King nor his ministers were hostile to the Church. Not wanting anarchy to spread among the people, they made their peace with the clergy, whose influence in the countryside and the small towns remained considerable. In order to prevent the clergy from placing its influence at the disposal of the legitimist opposition it was necessary to prove that there was no intention of restricting its apostolic work. To be sure, at the beginning the government was not able to commit itself to a certain policy, as it had to be mindful of public opinion, but thanks to the skills of the internuncio Garibaldi, who in August 1831 became the successor of the extremely reactionary Lambruschini, it was possible to overcome the initial difficulties. To the degree that the government felt more secure, the authorities became more sympathetic.

---

[1] Abrogation of the article of the constitution which named Catholicism as the established religion, abolition of military chaplains and hospital chaplains, reduction of the salaries of bishops and canons and suspension of the subsidies for boys' seminaries, removal of crucifixes from court houses, and designation of the church of Saint Geneviève as a mausoleum of great men (Pantheon).

[2] The majority of the cases concerned Paris: destruction of the residence of the archbishop and of the church Saint Germain l'Auxerrois (see R. Limouzin-Lamothe in *Éfranc* 13 [1963], 184–208, 14 [1964], 58–76), destruction of the Jesuit novitiate and demonstrations against habit-wearing priests. The atmosphere in the provinces was hardly disturbed, except for the looting of the seminaries of Metz, Lille, and Nîmes, and the destruction of mission crosses displaying the Bourbon coat of arms.

This development was enhanced by the death in 1839 of the archbishop of Paris, Monsignor de Quélen, who was one of the few bishops who resolutely refused to become reconciled to the "usurper." Increasingly the clergy was valued as the most important preserver of public order in the face of the threat of socialism. The ministries of religion also from the very beginning showed their good intentions. When the Chambers in 1832 demanded the dissolution of the thirty dioceses which during the restoration period had been added to the concordat dioceses, the demand was ignored. In fact, an additional one was created in 1838 in Algiers.[3] After 1837, the religious budget was increased regularly, and the number of parishes grew by 10 percent. Although the Council of State put more obstacles in the way of ecclesiastical purchase requisitions than during the restoration period, the Church invested 25,220,548 francs during the eighteen years of the July Monarchy, in contrast to the 13,664,760 francs during the fifteen years of the preceding government. The biographies of bishops of this period demonstrate throughout that after the first few years, notwithstanding local opposition and the reserve of nobles loyal to the Bourbons, the government and the local authorities did not hinder the creation of pious foundations and Catholic welfare organizations; occasionally they even assisted them.[4]

The handling of episcopal appointments was characteristic of the improvement of relations. After the unfortunate selections of the first few months, the government agreed to make appointments with the advice of the bishops. The correspondence between Monsignor Garibaldi and Mathieu, archbishop of Besançon, reveals the important role played by the latter. He was effective in bringing about a genuine separation of the prerogatives of episcopal appointments between the secular and spiritual forces, a separation far exceeding the provisions of the condordat. Government and nunciature jointly tried to exclude the most intimate followers of the deposed King as well as those of Lamennais, the progressivists of the time. The majority of the seventy-seven bishops appointed by Louis-Philippe came from the middle class and were relatively young (between forty and fifty), gradually displacing the pre-1789 generation. Many of them were former vicars general who with great prudence took care of the business of their dioceses. The result was a solid and pious episcopate more concerned with administration than with problems of intellectual and pastoral accommodation caused by the new society.[5] These bishops strove to keep the Church free from any political exposure and to maintain their independence from the government. Yet their conduct toward their clergy was often very authoritarian, as the concordat permitted them to act as they pleased. Their capriciousness was aggravated by a general ignorance of canon law: In 1837 alone, thirty-five hundred irremovable priests, more than 10 percent of the total, were transferred; in some dioceses, all priests were forced to change locations between 1836 and 1842. This led to a protest movement, meetings, and publications, started by the brothers Allignol from the diocese of Viviers. Their book *De l'état actuel du clergé de France* (1839) was moving proof of the precarious situation of the country clergy, the victims of dual dependence on lay notables and ecclesiastical superiors.

---

[3] Concerning the difficulties in establishing the Catholic Church in Algeria after the conquest, see M. Emerit in *Revue africaine* 97 (1953), 66–97; J. Leflon, *E. de Mazenod* III, 26–29; P. Poupard, op. cit., 166–70.

[4] The support given to the Church by the traditional forces of society in spite of the change in government is emphasized by A. J. Tudesq, *Les grands notables,* 124–26, 199, 213–15, 227–28, 439–40. Too many historians have erroneously judged the French attitude toward Catholicism exclusively on the basis of the Paris press.

The numbers of active clergy changed dramatically. At first, the fear caused by the new government's hostility to the Church and the cancellation of stipends for the seminaries resulted in a clear reduction of ordinations, from 2357 in 1830 to 1095 in 1845. The time span between entrance into minor seminary and ordination normally was ten years. But owing to a low mortality rate, the total number of active priests increased from 38,388 to 45,456; thus in spite of a population increase of 21 percent, there was one priest for every 752 inhabitants in contrast to one for every 777 in 1830.[6] This was the result of the rejuvenation of the clergy during the preceding twenty years, a process which continued. The proportion of sixty-year-olds sank from 29 percent in 1830 to 10 percent in 1840 and in 1847 reached its lowest point with 5.6 percent. Unfortunately, the young clergy, while more dynamic than the clergy of the restoration period and free from a longing for the Old Regime, which it had not experienced, was hardly better educated than the older clergy. Trained in seminaries whose standards continued to remain mediocre, the clergy did not adapt its pastoral efforts to new problems and its effectiveness remained limited.

---

[5] With a few brilliant exceptions: Doney, Parisis, and principally the new archbishop of Paris, Affre (1839–48), appointed under the influence of Montalembert, who most astutely of all prelates seems to have recognized the problems, but whose tendency to exercise a certain primacy over the Church of France met the resistance of his colleagues.

[6] With great differences among the dioceses: one priest for 1450 people in 1841 in the dioceses of Bourges, but one for 348 people in the diocese of Rodez.

The mediocrity of the diocesan clergy opened a wide field of activity for the orders which suffered from the July Revolution. There were riots against the Jesuits, and Casimir Périer, minister of religion, banished the Trappists, Carthusians, and Capuchins from Marseille. But by 1835 tolerance gained ground. New male and female congregations devoted to elementary education and welfare were permitted, together with the old orders which had been absent since the great revolution. In 1833 Dom Guéranger again introduced the Benedictines in France, and when Lacordaire in 1841 did the same with the Dominicans, the government did not dare oppose the move, in spite of the warnings of anticlerical deputies and newspapers which pointed to the orders' illegality.[7] The Jesuits, who in 1828 had only twelve houses, by 1840 had seventy-four of them. When in 1845 the dissolution of the order was demanded as revenge for the Jesuits' fight for freedom of education, the matter ended with a compromise, arranged by Pellegrino Rossi, Louis-Philippe's envoy, and Secretary of State Lambruschini. Officially, the Jesuits remained dispersed across the country as simple priests, but in actuality they were hardly restricted in their work.[8] In 1845, Emmanuel d'Alzon formed a new congregation, the Assumptionists. The growing influence assumed by the orders in the French Church was not to the liking of all bishops. Some of them did not care at all for these "guerillas," who were not subject to episcopal jurisdiction and whose untimely initiatives could endanger the détente between Church and state. Moreover, the new congregations, frequently favored by the upper classes, siphoned off contributions by the faithful.

Even more than on the structural level, the vitality of the Church proved itself in the field of Catholic action. Of course, not only successes could be recorded. After the apostasy of Lamennais, the romanticists, representing the active wing of the literary movement, became alienated from the Church. Many people of the middle class respected the Church, but in their religious practices confined themselves to an uncommitted conformism and directed all of their attention to material pursuits. In several rural areas like Bauce, there was a noticeable shrinking in the number of communicants and a diminution of religious feeling.[9] Protestantism competitively intensified its efforts and thanks to the dynamic of its revival movement was able to register some successes.[10] On the other hand, the urban youth was frequently more open to religious impulses than it had been during the restoration period. In a few dioceses, able prelates contributed to the growth which had started even before 1830. But above all there was a growth of small but very dynamic elite groups led by noted personalities, such as Bautain at Strasbourg, Blanc de Saint-Bonnet at Lyon, Guerrier de Dumast at Nancy, Salinis at the Collège de Juilly, and Madame Swetchine and Count de Montalembert at Paris.

---

[7] See vol. VIII in this series, chap. 1.

[8] For details see Burnichon II, 611–73, III, 1–113.

Additionally, there were the young student Frédéric Ozanam,[11] who in 1833 together with E. Bailly organized the first Vincent Conference, L. Rendu, the creative force behind the *Cercle catholique scientifique et littéraire* (1840), and Abbé Ledreuille, the "workers' priest" and founder of the Society of Saint Francis Xavier (1840), which comprised thousands of workers and even had branches across the country. The groups were numerous and their most active members were legitimists with ties to the notables.[12] Their militant wing was formed by the disciples of Lamennais, who unmercifully made life difficult for a clergy trained in the old ways. Without having given up their old ideal of a reconciliation between the Church and the modern movements, they recognized that *L'Avenir*'s mistake had been to propagate ideas for which the time was not yet ripe, and that it would be more productive to act in a practical way in order to prove the validity of the recommended methods. They advocated cooperation between laity and clergy in a joint struggle for the faith, realizing that effective work in the Church was possible only in agreement with the hierarchy and not in opposition to it. Between 1832 and 1848 their activity developed in two-fold fashion.

---

[9] Inasmuch as systematic studies have not yet been undertaken, we have to rely on rather vague impressions with respect to the religious condition of the working class in 1848. It must be taken into consideration that it was still far from homogeneous, and one has to differentiate between Paris, where the areligiosity of the workers stretches back to the Jacobin clubs of 1793, and the provinces; between the few industrial centers and the handcraft industries; between the elite with a certain education, which preserved a weak Christian feeling but could hardly bear ecclesiastical paternalism, and the masses of the proletariat who were positively affected by the considerable measures of support made by the Church after 1830, differing from the egotism of the primarily anticlerical employers.

[10] Concerning the situation of the Protestants in France under the constitutional monarchy, see E. Léonard, *Histoire générale du protestantisme* III (Paris 1964), 217–48.

[11] No reliable study is available on Frédéric Ozanam (1813–53). See *LThK* VII, 1325–26 and also L. Baunard, *Frédéric Ozanam d'après sa correspondance* (Paris 1913); Duroselle, 154–83 (social action); C. Moeller in *RHE* 14 (1913), 304–30 (historical achievement); *Lettres de Frédéric Ozanam*, ed. by L. Celier and J. Caron, 2 vol. (Paris 1960/71).

[12] J. B. Duroselle on the national level and P. Droulers within the framework of Toulouse have clearly shown the extremely active participation of the legitimists in the Catholic efforts of this period.

A number of young Catholics, inspired by the ambitious program of Lamennais at La Chênaie, continued to develop an academic basis for Catholicism to make it acceptable to future generations and to regain for the Church the respect of the intellectual world. After 1830, A. Bonnetty published the *Annals of Christian Philosophy* for the purpose of finding in ancient history and ethnology the proof for primitive revelation, thereby responding to the historicist and positivist needs of the nineteenth century. Ozanam, professor at the Sorbonne after 1841, revived the study of the Christian Middle Ages. In the Notre Dame Conferences, started in 1835 by Ozanam, Lacordaire continued the efforts to establish a revived apologetics by removing Catholicism from antiquated forms of thought. E. d'Alzon assigned tasks to his Assumptionists quite similar to those earlier developed by Lamennais for his Congregation of Saint Peter. In November 1833, Abbé Migne began to publish a new newspaper, *L'Univers,* which looked at events from the Catholic point of view; its beginnings were difficult, but soon it received the support of an extraordinary convert, Louis Veuillot.[13] In 1843, Lenormant resumed the publication of the *Correspondant* and campaigned for freedom of education.[14]

Montalembert, who had held back after *Mirari vos,* during the last ten years of the July Monarchy fought for freedom of education on the parliamentary level. He also was active on behalf of the right to existence for religious congregations, a right which was continually questioned by the authorities. In view of the lacking willingness of the authorities to make compromises, he sought the backing of the people instead of waiting for a solution through diplomatic negotiations between the Holy See and the King, a course of action favored by the Pope and most of the bishops.

The question of freedom of education, embodied in the constitution but in need of statutory regulation, had been discussed by *L'Avenir.* When at the beginning of 1831 the administration of Casimir Périer closed the music schools of Lyon, in which choirboys had been trained free of charge, the editors of *L'Avenir* decided to establish an elementary school without official permission in order to bring the question into the open.[15] Two years later the Guizot Law of 28 June 1833 granted freedom of education for elementary schools and recognized members of orders as public teachers, thereby breaching the monopoly of the universities. The rapid growth of the congregations of teaching brothers and sisters enabled the Church to make comprehensive use of the law, even though it was regretted that the state's teachers were not sufficiently subordinated to the parish priests.[16]

---

[13] An impartial biography of Louis Veuillot (1813–83) is not yet written. See E. and F. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* 4 vol. (Paris 1899/1913); *DThC* XV, 2799–2835; E. Gauthier, *Le vrai Louis Veuillot* (Paris, no date); E. Gauthier, *Le génie satirique de Louis Veuillot* (Paris 1953); J. Gadille in *Cahiers d'histoire* 14 (1969), 275–88. Works: *Œuvres complètes,* 40 vol. (Paris 1924/40), of them 12 volumes are correspondence.

[14] Details concerning the founding of Catholic newspapers and journals in C. de Ladoue, *Monseigneur Gerbet* II, 71–146.

Montalembert's enthusiasm and oratorical gift succeeded in imbuing the French with a crusade mentality with respect to secondary schools, a mentality which was at work during the next several generations. In practice, however, this attitude—contrary to the idealizing reports by Lecanuet and many other Catholic historians—frequently degenerated into a "war without discipline" (Dupanloup), marked by excesses and polemics in which laymen and clerics competed with one another in stridency and spitefulness. For many years, Catholic newspapers and pamphlets accused the public high schools of being "breeding grounds of pestilence," offering "atheistic and materialistic" instruction, and changing children into "dirty and wild animals." In fact, the majority of the teachers were freethinkers, and in philosophy classes the eclecticism of Victor Cousin predominated, regarded as infamous by clerics.

At the same time, though, 5 percent of public teachers were priests, among them many principals, and more than 20 percent of the teachers were practicing Catholics. For this reason, the bishops, basically satisfied with freedom of education for minor seminaries, would have preferred a discreet agreement with the government to a public debate. But Montalembert, who in the Chamber of Peers had developed into a courageous representative of Catholic interests, decided to act on the basis of common law. He demanded for the Church neither the privilege nor the right—which many bishops still called for[17]—to control public education, but only the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of education. Properly applied, it would permit the Church to organize its own school system, in addition to the public one, not only for future priests, but for all children. Many Catholics actually did not see the public schools in sinister colors, and public opinion initially was only hesitantly on Montalembert's side, especially after it was recognized that the episcopate itself held back because it saw in his demands a revival of Lamennais's ideas. But the draft presented by Secretary of Education François Villemain in 1841 disappointed many and persuaded a few prelates to become more vocal. This new attitude was also supported by the growing number of militant Catholics who demanded for Catholic education the same degree of unrestricted freedom which prevailed in Belgium after the adoption of the constitution of 1831. The struggle raged until 1847. While many bishops like Monsignor Affre preferred to send secret petitions to the government, others joined the fray openly. Among them were Monsignor Clausel de Montals, the choleric bishop of Chartres, fighting in the name of the rights of the Church, and Monsignor Parisis, the young bishop of Langres, who in close contact with the bishop of Liège, Van Bommel, followed the path outlined by Montalembert. In 1843 he published a pamphlet, *Du devoir des catholiques dans la question de la liberté d'enseignement,* and created a great stir. Parisis followed this with the pamphlet *Liberté de l'enseignement, examen de la question au point de vue constitutionnel et social,* whose theses were approved by fifty-six bishops, including the cautious Monsignor Affre, as a direct consequence of their agitation over the recent publication of a pamphlet by Michelet against the Jesuits. At the same time, Abbé Dupanloup[18] became reconciled with Montalembert. He was well known in Paris society and the clergy as the only one among the leaders of the Catholic movement in the July Monarchy who from the beginning had opposed Lamennais. He adopted Montalembert's tactic of regarding the question of education as part of the constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. Inasmuch as the new draft presented by Villemain conceded only limited freedom to Catholic education (it was denied to the religious congregations, specifically the Jesuits), Monsignor Parisis came out with further aggressive pamphlets and a petition campaign was organized in 1844 and 1845. Dupanloup issued a moderately worded brochure in June 1845, *De la pacification religieuse.* In it he developed in large outlines a kind of concordat for schools, resting on mutual concessions by Church and state.

---

[15] Lecanuet, *Montalembert* I, 229–51.

[16] The discontent of many parish priests about the "kind of equality" (Parisis) assigned to the teachers in relation to the priests led to many disputes on the local level. A few examples in L. A. Meunier, *Défense des instituteurs laïcs contre les attaques du clergé* (Évreux 1847).

[17] The *Mémoire adressé au roi par les évêques de la province de Paris* of 1841 (Paris 1844) is characteristic.

But the lack of cooperation of chambers and government, which attempted to divert attention by a direct attack on the Jesuits, led Montalembert, in spite of his youth the leader of the Catholic movement of this time, to a change of tactics. Following the Belgian example, he tried to organize all Catholics in a large political party. He did so against the will of many bishops who, like the archbishop of Rouen, were of the opinion that laymen did not have any business in ecclesiastical matters, and the Holy See, which accused the leaders of the Catholic movement of jeopardizing with their loud methods Rome's attempts to reconstitute the former alliance between Church and state.[19] Encouraged by his friend Lacordaire, Montalembert together with de Vatimesnil and de Riancey founded the Committee for the Defense of Religious Freedom. It became very active outside of Paris, in spite of the resistance of many clerics who were enraged by this direct intervention in parliamentary politics. With the support of the newspaper *L'Univers* Montalembert in 1846 achieved the election of 144 representatives who favored freedom of education. It also happened to be the time of the election of Pius IX, which dispelled the fears of Rome. But this success, badly exploited by a leader "of more belligerent than political temperament" (Trannoy), was not translated into victory; for the Salvandy Law of April 1847 was hardly more satisfactory than preceding legislation, and the fall of the July Monarchy took place before the question was settled. The long conflict, in many respects regrettable because it deepened the rift between clergy and public teachers, yet produced two tangible advantages. It reawakened the energies of laymen who became aware of their responsibility to defend Catholic interests in the parliament (although these interests were pursued in rather narrow clerical fashion), and it broke the ties of the French Church to a government which shortly was to be brought down by the revolution of 1848.

---

[18] Concerning Félix Dupanloup (1802–78), see in view of the lack of a reliable biography, F. Lagrange, *Vie de Monseigneur Dupanloup,* 3 vols. (Paris 1883/84; also E. de Pressensé in *Revue bleue* 34 [1884], 582–87 and U. Maynard, *Monseigneur Dupanloup et M. Lagrange son historien* [Paris 1884]); E. Faguet, *Monseigneur Dupanloup* (Paris 1914); R. Aubert in *DHGE* XIV, 1070–1122. Works: *De l'Éducation,* 6 vols. (Paris 1850/66); *Œuvres choisies,* 6 vols. (Paris 1862); *Nouvelles œuvres choisies,* 7 vols. (Paris 1874); *Dupanloup. Les meilleurs textes,* ed. by H. Duthoit (Paris 1933).

Belgium

With every reason, the leaders of the Catholic movement in France enviously looked to Belgium in 1840. There, in the years after achieving independence, a truly remarkable upswing took place. It was the result of a Catholic, even clerical offensive on the basis of the constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of religion and education. The systematic intervention of the clergy, especially in Flanders,[20] gave the Catholics strong positions in parliament and government. Although a Protestant himself, Leopold I favored the Catholic Church, as he saw in it the best protection against the revolutionary spirit. His support assured the Church of an important position in the life of the nation, in spite of the constitutional regime which had an affinity for those who favored separation.[21] Laws and agreements, concluded in a spirit of friendship between Church and state for the protection of morals among the people, Catholicized liberal institutions. The outstanding success of this policy was the law of 23 September 1842, concerning elementary schools.[22] It established complete freedom of the Church in education and made religious instruction in public schools mandatory. The implementation of the law, thanks to the efforts of the Catholic minister de Theux, virtually gave the Catholic clergy control over education in elementary schools. In the area of secondary education, fifteen years after independence two-thirds of the seventy-four high schools of the country were directed by clerics or members of orders.

---

[19] Concerning this reaction by Gregory XVI and especially by Secretary of State Lambruschini, see J. Martin, op. cit., 315–27.

[20] In addition to the publications by A. Simon (especially *Lettres de Pecci,* 39–41), see E. Witte in *Revue belge d'histoire contemporaine* I (1969), 216–53.

These positive results finally led to the recognition of the liberal constitution by all those who, through the Encyclicals *Mirari vos* and *Singulari nos,* had been strengthened in their opposition to everything which, rightly or wrongly, seemed to be inspired by Lamennais. The opposition was further strengthened by the unyielding attitude of large numbers of the Flanders clergy, which was very receptive to the democratic ideas of the lower middle class from which most of them came. By 1835, tension between the two camps was strong, but it soon was relieved. With the exception of the people around the *Journal des Flandres,* the majority of the former followers of Lamennais adopted a more conservative attitude as a consequence of the break between him and the Church. From a Catholic liberalism, retaining from the liberal ideal everything that appeared compatible with the Catholic faith, they changed to a liberal Catholicism which used liberty as a means for Christian activity. Many of the so-called "encyclicalists," even though they continued to yearn for the officially privileged position of the Church under the Old Regime, acknowledged the great apostolic advantages of a system which offered the clergy the support of the state without forcing it under its yoke. Consequently they took the position that, in spite of their concern over strict Roman orthodoxy, they had the freedom to support a system which was no longer a theoretical ideal but a small evil actually useful to the Church.

This was also the opinion of the bishops, who clearly distanced themselves from the encyclicalists, to the great dismay of the nunciature, many Jesuits, and Metternich. Without a doubt, the efforts of some of them to safeguard clerical influence within the framework of legality were motivated by the old theocratic desire to dominate civil society. But their supreme goal was pure: in spite of the mixture of politics and religion, characteristic of Belgian Catholicism for a century, they were above all pastors desirous of enabling the Church to perform its primary mission, the saving of souls. Nonetheless they were pastors who retained from the time of the Napoleonic regime and the enlightened despotism of William I the tendency to exercise their offices in strongly administrative and centralistic terms. They were also the heirs of a long tradition which knew how to combine an unconditional loyalty to the Pope with a remarkable independence from the Roman influence on the life of the local Churches. In this spirit they approached the planning of a reconstitution of diocesan administrations, taking account of the new situation but not always of canonical regulations.[23]

---

[21] Although the government constitutionally played no role in the election of bishops, Rome quickly got accustomed to inquire by way of the nunciature about possible objections against the planned candidates.

[22] See M. Leveugle, "L' 'Exposé des vrais principes' de Monseigneur Van Bommel: son influence en Belgique et en France" (unpublished dissertation, Louvain 1956).

The unity of action of the six bishops—in 1834 the diocese of Bruges was added to the five dioceses of the concordat of 1801—was guaranteed by an annual conference. It was the first of this type in Europe and in the eyes of the bishops replaced the provincial councils. But the unity of action of the bishops was guaranteed even more by the pressure exerted by the archbishop of Mechelen, Cardinal E. Sterckx (1831–67), on his suffragans. A pious and industrious prince of the Church without special theological training, he appeared with his prudent behavior as a "remarkable precursor of the bishops of our own time, the time of a free Church in a free state" (Simon). He respected the autonomy of the state and was conciliatory to the new currents of thought, but remained loyal to the Holy See.

The long vacancies in most of the episcopal sees during the era of the Dutch government retarded the Catholic restoration, which was so necessary in view of the indifference toward religion among the population. Immediately after the achievement of independence restoration was renewed with emphasis. The foundation for the effort was the parish missions[24] which in the course of about 20 years were conducted in two-thirds of all parishes. They had an undeniable success in the countryside, where the number of people participating in Easter Communion increased noticeably.

In their reconstruction efforts the bishops could count on a numerically adequate clergy, whose quality improved in the course of the years. While the clergy after 1830 behaved rather independently, the bishops gradually assumed the leadership. After the turn of the century the Belgian priests accepted the increasing centralization of diocesan life with a greater degree of submission than their French brothers. Trained in seminaries whose programs were revised and unified in the years 1842–48, but taught by professors who were largely autodidacts and strongly under the influence of Lamennais, the Belgian clergy for a long time remained on a low qualitative level. But supported by annual exercises and monthly retreats which were reinstituted toward the end of the 1830s, the clergy was characterized by a strictness of morals, a simple and open attitude, the realism of its apostolic methods, and a piety which was regulated very methodically but contained few elements of mysticism. Even so, the main work of the parish clergy for a long time was confined to confessions, administration of the sacraments, and visits to the sick.

---

[23] See A. Simon, *Documents relatifs á la nonciature de Bruxelles,* 19–21, 39–42.

[24] See A. Simon, *Sterckx* II, 253–58; J. Vieujean in *Revue ecclésiastique de Liège* 25 (1934), 14–24; F. Holemans, *Le saint curé de Tildonck* (Brussels 1926); A. Marlier, *Missionaris in eigen land. I. van de Kerkhove* (Brussels 1960); E. de Moreau in *AHSI* 10 (1941), 259–82; S. d'Ydewalle in *Sources hist. rel. Belg.,* 64–69; and the Master's Theses by L. Grégoire, "Les missions paroissiales prêchées par les rédemptoristes dans le diocese de Liège de 1833 à 1852" (Louvain 1966) and M. Bodranghien, "Les missions paroissiales à Bruxelles et dans les environs 1833–1914" (Louvain 1970).

Owing to the constitutional freedom of association, religious congregations developed quickly. The bishops favored the small congregations, which were a valuable aid to them in education and welfare work, but they were much more reserved toward the older orders. The bishops wished to see their privileges restricted in order better to control their apostolic efforts, the more so as after a 40-year-long anomalous situation their discipline left much to be desired. The Holy See proved very understanding in this respect and allowed the direction of the orders temporarily to be withdrawn from the superiors and entrusted to an apostolic visitor whom the archbishop wished to see selected from the Belgian clergy.[25]

Orders and secular clergy could count on the cooperation of many influential laymen, serving the Catholic cause not only in parliament and communal councils, but also through their active participation in often subordinate positions and in those undertakings which were designed to keep the masses under the influence of the Church. In 1834 the bishops reopened the University of Louvain in order to assure themselves of a Catholic elite among the secular professions on which society rested in the nineteenth century. The reopening of the university was a consequence of freedom of education in Belgium, and quite consciously the bishops ignored the Roman desire to make it a papal institution.

But the successes which accrued to the Belgian Church from the skillful manipulation of constitutional freedoms could not conceal some weak points. One was the failure to understand the problem of the workers, especially regrettable in a country which was in the midst of industrialization. While a few agencies were created for the purpose of raising morals among the lower classes or of ameliorating misery, priests as well as laymen, absorbed by the problem of adapting the Church to the new middle-class society, closed their eyes to the problems of social reform which the capitalist system made urgent. The few beginnings of a Christian socialism made by a few Flemish followers of Lamennais were quickly stifled by the conservative reaction introduced by Leopold I with the aid of the nunciature. Pastoral problems generated by the rapid development of workmen's districts in the industrial areas were ignored; the numerous new parishes in this period were generally created in the rural areas. It was not surprising, therefore, that the workers gradually lost touch with the official Church. In 1834 it was noted that a large proportion of the population in the Walloon area no longer bothered to receive the Sacraments. The liberal middle class, around 1830 still religious and practicing, also began to distance itself from the Church. The unfortunate circular of the bishops in 1837, which with the attitude of Catholic purism repeated the papal condemnation of the Freemasons,[26] contributed a great deal to the rift between Catholics and liberals and strengthened the anti-Christian orientation of the Freemasons. But the reconciliation in 1840 of the ultramontanes with the constitutional freedoms was the primary impulse for a transformation of the liberal Catholic spirit. The goal of most clerics and militants was no longer freedom for all in everything in the sense of mutual toleration, but the greatest possible freedom for the Church so that it could exercise its influence on society under the best possible conditions. This attitude, appearing to many as a planned clerical offensive, unavoidably resulted in a reawakening of anti-clericalism, which after the middle of the century was ever more aggressive.

---

[25] Concerning the achievements of the latter, Monseigneur F.-T. Corselis, see P. Frederix in *Sources hist. rel. Belg.,* 113–23.

The Netherlands

After the end of the Dutch-Belgian union, the Dutch Catholics were again in a minority.[27] While it took almost a quarter of a century to replace the mission administration with a diocesan organization, a continual development to a less anomalous situation occurred. In 1833, a former professor at the seminary of Warmond, Baron van Wijckerslooth, was ordained as bishop *in partibus;* his elevation made the Netherlands independent from foreign clerics with respect to confirmations and ordinations of priests. In 1840, a royal decree granted the Catholic Church certain subsidies, but under conditions regarded as controversial by the clergy.[28] New vistas were opened by the accession of William II (1840–49). He was an intimate friend of the pastor of Tilburg, J. Zwijsen, and saw Catholicism as an antirevolutionary force; there was talk of a new concordat. The Agreement of 1827 had been badly received by most of the Dutch clergy, who thought it conceded too much influence in ecclesiastical affairs to the monarchy. Thereafter the influence of Lamennais and his followers, who had emphasized the great advantages of freedom, had strengthened the revulsion against a concordatic solution. But Rome was always in favor of such an approach, and in the fall of 1840 negotiations were begun by the internuncio Capaccini. After a few months the talks produced a partial success: the Dutch government accepted the principle of a concordat which was to bring about the establishment of a diocesan hierarchy in the southern provinces. But in view of the vehement opposition of the Protestants it was decided to postpone an agreement. In the meantime, the number of vicariates apostolic in these provinces was to be raised[29] and their titulars were to receive episcopal rank, but without involving the King in their nomination in any way.

---

[26] About this circular, see Somon, *Sterckx* I, 320–28, and J. Bartier in *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles,* n. ser. 16 (1963/64), 162–71, 203–11.

[27] A little bit less than 40 percent of the total population. Contrary to the general assumption, they were relatively numerous in the north: while Catholics constituted 87.64 percent in Brabant and 97.80 percent in Limburg, and only 9.05 percent in Friesland and 3.83 percent in Drenthe, they constituted 39.43 percent in the province of Utrecht, 38.03 percent in Geldern, and 27.15 percent and 24.46 percent in the provinces of South and North Holland.

The good will of William II for the future development of Dutch Catholicism was significant. The lifting of the restrictions against the orders permitted their rapid recovery even to the north of Moerdijk, and especially the congregations of women active in education and charity flourished.

This blossoming was proof of the vitality of Dutch Catholicism and also became visible in the spiritual and intellectual growth of the clergy. It came about under the influence of the new director of the seminary at Warmond, F. J. Van Vree, and one of his professors, C. Broere. The latter was an able writer, deeply influenced by Lamennais, and placed his energies into the service of the Church. He followed the example of Le Sage ten Broek, but on a less popular level.

---

[28] See J. Gasman in *Archief voor de Geschiedenis von de Aartsb. Utrecht* 72 (1952), 47–84.

[29] In 1840 an apostolic vicariate was established for the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, which in 1839 was separated from Belgium and subordinated to the King of the Netherlands. Its first titular was J. T. Laurent, who in 1848 was forced to leave the country because of a conflict with the liberals (see J. Goedert in *Biographie nationale du pays de Luxembourg,* VIII [1957]). Frequently interrupted negotiations with Rome finally led to the establishment of a bishopric in 1870. See N. Majerus, *L'érection de l'évêché de Luxembourg* (Luxemburg 1951).

In order to promote the growth of a necessary Catholic intellectual class, Van Vree and Broere in 1842 founded the newspaper *De Katholiek* which, while it did not succeed in breaking out of the isolation which characterized Dutch Catholicism for a long time to come, yet made a remarkable contribution to the Catholic revival for half a century. Three years later, Abbé J. Smits founded the daily *De Tijd* and gained the cooperation of two talented laymen: J. W. Cramer, an admirer of Veuillot, whose cutting intransigence he shared, and J. Alberdingk Thijm, an enthusiastic follower of the romantic movement, who contributed materially to supplying the paper with that cultural prestige and genuine national spirit which at the middle of the century was still very rare among the Catholics of the Netherlands.

The improvement of the condition of Catholicism in the Netherlands during the second third of the nineteenth century was without a doubt the fruit of the dynamic activity of such enterprising personalities as Le Sage and Broere, as well as of the zeal of numerous clerics like Zwijsens[30] who were not particularly intelligent but conscientiously carried out their pastoral duties. Catholicism profited also from two broader currents which contributed to a change of minds in its favor, namely romanticism and liberalism.

Under the influence of the novels of Walter Scott and studies by German philologists of Dutch literature during the Middle Ages, many Protestants became interested in their national traditions preceding the Reformation. Simultaneously, they gained an understanding of some Catholic values, as for example liturgy, which previously had been treated with nothing more than proud contempt. Prejudices dissolved, the more easily as the romantic rediscovery of the Middle Ages was not the work of Catholics who actually for a long time were tied to a limited classicism, but of pastors and scholars without any connection to the Church. It freed them of any tinge of suspect apologetics.

Liberalism pilloried as anachronistic the Calvinistic attempts to preserve a privileged established religion, and at the same time actively supported the entrance of the Catholics into public life. It has been shown earlier[31] with what enthusiasm the writings of Lamennais had been greeted by some of the most important spiritual leaders of Dutch Catholicism. Especially Le Sage ten Broek was very liberal in his pronouncements before the publication of *Mirari vos.* Not satisfied with calling concordats useless and even dangerous, he did not hesitate to declare that "truth owed its victory to itself and therefore error must be permitted to be free." The condemnation by Gregory XVI effected a change. Le Sage conceded that "liberty has its dangers and excesses" and that wisdom must "set limits" for it. Ten years later he no longer even encouraged a détente between Catholics and liberals on the parliamentary level, although earlier he had seen Belgian unionism as a victory over prejudices.

---

[30] Concerning Johannes Zwijsen (1794–1877), who in 1853 became the first bishop of Utrecht, see J. Witlox, *Mgr. Johannes Zwijsen* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1927, 1941), to be read with Rogier, *Kath. Herleving,* passim, especially 192–95.

[31] See above, p. 279.

If this reserved attitude predominated until 1848 in the traditionally more conservative southern provinces, such was not the case in the area north of Moerdijk, where many Catholics, without wishing to bring about a doctrinary reconciliation between Church and liberalism, felt that there were reasons to support the liberal opposition. The opposition's program corresponded to the interests of Catholics in trade and economics, strongly represented in the large cities (25 percent in Amsterdam, 35 percent in Rotterdam, and 40 percent in Utrecht and Haarlem), and the religious indifference of many liberals fostered hopes for a more tolerant attitude toward the Church than that of the conservative Protestants in power. The work by Witlox on the early history of the Catholic Party[32] traces this slow shift of the Catholics to the left which took place in spite of Le Sage's reservations. A significant role in this context was played by a man long overlooked: the intelligent F. J. Van Vree, the future bishop of Haarlem. Together with the journalist Smits he encouraged and carefully and tenaciously guided the development of the new Catholic populations of the northern provinces.They gathered in the movement "Young Holland" and contributed a great deal to the electoral victory of the liberals, which in turn produced the change in the laws in 1848. This change produced a double advantage for the Catholics. The introduction of ministerial responsibility provided protection from royal arbitrariness, and it gave the Church a hitherto unknown independence. Its first result was the restoration of the hierarchy in 1853, achieved independently from any concordat by the more or less conscious application of Lamennais's principle of a free Church in a free state.

---

[32] To be supplemented by G. Beekelaar, *Rond grondwetherziening en herstel der hierarchie. De Hollandse Katholieke jongeren 1847–52* (Hilversum 1964).

CHAPTER 19

The Beginning of the Risorgimento in Italy

Ferment in the Papal States

The secretly growing discontent of the middle class and the young intellectuals after 1815 with the "priest government" continued to grow with Consalvi's resignation. The July Revolution in France and the revolution in Belgium brought it to a head. This double failure of the principle of legitimacy and the blow given to some important clauses of the Vienna Settlement encouraged renewed doubts about the maintenance of the traditional system of government in the Papal States as well as in the rest of Italy. A few French politicians declared their willingness to help the Italians against the intervention of Metternich's Austria. On 4 February 1831, two days after the election of Gregory XVI, Bologna, following the example of Parma and Modena, rose in revolt and under pressure from the *Carbonari* proclaimed the end of the Pope's secular rule in the province. During the subsequent days the revolt extended to the entire Romagna, the Marches, and Umbria, i.e., to four-fifths of the Papal States. Cardinal Benvenuti, bishop of Osimo, who because of his popularity in the area had been appointed special legate in charge of organizing counterrevolutionary resistance, was taken prisoner. On 25 February a "Provisional Government of the United Italian Provinces" was formed and expected French support in warding off Austrian intervention. It immediately undertook the drafting of a constitution and attempted to march on Rome, where the bulk of the people remained faithful to the Papal government. The revolution had been improvised by lawyers intoxicated by romantic notions, but it was not supported by the majority of the people. Thus it was quelled within a few weeks by an Austrian army for the intervention of which the papal government asked on 17 February after it had failed to put the revolution down with its own forces.[1] The revolt had weighty consequences. It proved the uselessness of local plots prepared by secret societies, brought about the decline of the *Carbonari,* and led to the rise of a new national movement. This was Giuseppe Mazzini's "Young Italy," with the much further-reaching aim of establishing a united republic with Rome as its capital. The consequences on the international level were even more important, as public opinion saw the Roman question in a new light, which predominated until 1870. It was no longer as in the eighteenth century a matter of incompatibility of religious values with the problems of politics, but a concern for the interests of the subjects of the Papal States as part of the interplay of the two great Catholic powers of Austria and France, with the latter once again resuming a central role on the stage of European politics after a fifteen-year hiatus.

---

[1] Bologna was occupied on 31 March, and Ancona, the last remaining holdout, surrendered on 26 March.

Occasioned by the Austrian intervention in the Romagna, the rivalry between the two states concerning supremacy in Italy surfaced again. An international conference was convened in Rome by the great powers of England, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and France, and in spite of differences of opinion, skillfully exploited by Bernetti, they drafted a memorandum and handed it to the secretary of state on 21 May.[2] The document suggested a number of reforms regarded as absolutely necessary if the Roman government was to have the foundation required by the European interest. It demanded especially the restitution of the *motu proprio* of 1816, partially ignored by Leo XII, allowing general admission of laymen to offices of justice and administration, and the introduction of elections in the municipalities and provinces. The Pope was irritated by the intervention of the European powers in the internal affairs of the Roman state and together with his advisers regarded the suggested program as too liberal. Consequently the edict of 5 July confined itself to a few unimportant changes in the administration of the municipalities and provinces[3] and caused deep disappointment. Shortly after the Austrian troops left the Papal States on 15 July, fresh disturbances occurred in the Romagna. Four other edicts made slight concessions to the Romagna in the fall.[4] When they failed to bring about an improvement, the papal Curia resorted to the use of force and in December appointed Cardinal Albani to supervise the action.[5] The brutal behavior of his troops in Forli caused a general uprising. In order to quell it and without consulting with the Pope, he asked the Austrians for help, and once again they marched into the Romagna in January 1832. But this time France, interested in preventing the Papal States from becoming an Austrian satellite, reacted immediately and occupied Ancona. In spite of his indignation, shared by the other European governments, the Pope was forced to reconcile himself to the situation and agreed to the French occupation until the departure of Austria's army.

---

[2] Text in F. A. Gualterio, op. cit. I, 277–79 (better than Bastgen I, 91–92).

[3] A. M. Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii Papae XVI* IV (Rome 1904), 25–31.

[4] Edicts of 5 and 31 October and 5 and 15 November 1831 (ibid. IV, 42, 53, 74, 117).

[5] L. Pásztor has clearly shown that for a long time historians overemphasized the antagonism which is supposed to have existed between Albani and Bernetti. The latter tried to use the prestige enjoyed by Albani at Vienna in order to save the independence of the Roman government.

This took place only at the end of 1838, however. While Bernetti wanted to retain Austria's conservative influence, he did not wish the Papal States to fall under Austria's tutelage.[6]

Propped up by foreign bayonets, the papal government ruthlessly punished the ringleaders, but afterwards was still confronted with the problem of reforms. These were demanded not only by the liberal governments of England and France, but from a different perspective also by Metternich, who was an enlightened and realistic conservative. He shared the hostility of Gregory XVI and his advisers to anything that smacked of constitutional government and regarded the maintenance of an absolutist government in the Italian states as mandatory for the preservation of Austria's interests. But in contrast to reactionary elements in Vienna and Rome he considered changes necessary if an end was to be put to the endemic discontent in central Italy. In his opinion, the discontent was largely caused by the incompetence of the Roman administration. He considered it absolutely necessary to make improvements designed to take into account the justified complaints of the population and to organize the powers of the state in such a way that in case of danger it could react effectively. In February 1832 he sent Court Councillor G. Sebregondi to Bologna as adviser to Cardinal Albani, who was entrusted with restoring order in the Romagna. But the Austrian envoy was powerless with the old cardinal, who was unwilling to make any changes. Gregory XVI then spontaneously invited Sebregondi to Rome, where for the next three years he was the moving power behind attempts to reorganize the Papal States.

Gregory XVI and Bernetti were radical opponents of political reforms which would permit the population to share in the governing of the state and refused to entrust laymen with important positions, but they genuinely desired administrative and economic improvements. Thus they took some useful steps even though these were esteemed too highly by the defenders of the Holy See. Sebregondi was not able completely to cure the catastrophic financial condition, but he succeeded in reducing the budget deficits. Some members of the Curia passively resisted his efforts, and he was able to realize only a portion of his original reform program. During the first years of the pontificate, he was also supported by others. Monsignor Brignole and Cardinal Bernetti in February 1833 reorganized the secretariat of state by dividing it into two branches, one for internal and one for external affairs, each one headed by a cardinal. It was without a doubt the first step in the direction of significant reforms.[7]

---

[6] Hoping no longer to be dependent on foreign aid in the defense of public order, Bernetti, after vain attempts to reorganize the regular army, hit upon the idea of forming local militias consisting of volunteers, the "Centurions." Their capricious behavior in the service of the counterrevolution occasioned many justified complaints (see E. Morelli, *La politica estera di T. Bernetti,* 148–54).

For various reasons, the reform plans devised by Metternich produced only very limited results. It was insufficient to pass edicts which then were not implemented as a consequence of the lethargy of the bureaucracy and the lack of support by high government officials. Reforms were moreover difficult in a state whose economy rested on a backward agriculture, crafts ill suited to modern means of production, a primitive industry, and a totally inadequate network of transportation. Above all, it was anachronistic to exclude laymen from the government of a state with three million inhabitants. Bernetti, like Consalvi before him, agreed only to reforms which did not go beyond the paternalistic despotism of the eighteenth century, even though almost everywhere else in Europe after 1830 attempts at a complete restoration were running afoul of liberal attitudes.

But even this timid and long overdue reformism was too progressive for the majority of the "zealots." In 1836 they welcomed with satisfaction the replacement of Bernetti by Lambruschini. As has already been shown, he was no blind reactionary and attempted to moderate police repression as well as to improve elementary education[8] and the road system. Neither was he a total slave to the Austrians.[9] But rot dominated the entire system. The policy of the secretary of state was limited to reserving the important positions and privileges for the followers of the government. This naturally embittered the liberals, who had no difficulty in presenting to the enlightened public opinion of Europe the backwardness of the government, in particular the refusal of Gregory XVI to permit railroads in his state.[10] It was typical that most of the members of the committees of revolutionary Italian refugees came from the Papal States. There the situation grew worse in the course of the years. After 1843 local revolts multiplied and the Dutch envoy in

---

[7] L. Pásztor, "La riforma della Segreteria di Stato di Gregorio XVI," *La Bibliofilia* 60 (Florence 1958), 285–305.

[8] Formiggini-Santamaria, *L'istruzzione popolare nello Stato pontificio 1824–70* (Rome 1909). He was much less open-minded concerning secondary schools and universities. See M. A. Giampaolo in *RStRis* 18 (1931), 124–30.

[9] See, for example, M. A. Giampaolo, ibid., 137–39.

[10] As P. Negri has shown in "Gregorio XVI e le ferrovie," *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato* 28 (1968), 103–26, the rejection was occasioned chiefly by political reasons, although this was denied with apologetic intentions. See also C. de Biase, *Il problema delle ferrovie nel Risorgimento* (Modena 1940).

Rome wrote that "all elements of the population are struggling against the yoke and are eager to throw it off."[11] Special military courts were in session permanently, and thousands of people were persecuted, banished, and punished for their political opinions. But repression was not able to maintain internal peace. In the fall of 1845, the Bolognese lawyer Galetti distributed broadsheets in which he exhorted the "brothers" of the Romagna to kill officials and loot churches under the banner of "Liberty, Order, Unity!" A group of revolutionaries from San Marino occupied Rimini and distributed a "Manifesto of the Population of the Roman State to the Princes and Peoples of Europe."[12] The suggested reforms were very moderate and less demanding than the memorandum of 1831. But in his reply[13] Lambruschini spoke of the "criminal declarations of a mad mob," revealing the depth of incomprehension which separated the papal government from the aspirations of a considerable portion of the people of the Papal States outside of the city of Rome.

The expressions of joy which greeted the news of the death of the Pope on 1 June 1846 provided a picture of the hatred of the Pope and the system of government embodied by him that had grown in the population. Discontent had been further fueled by the completely negative attitude of Gregory XVI and his secretary of state toward the attempts of Italian patriots to free the peninsula from Austrian intervention and toward the manifestations of national feeling which for a decade had grown mightily in the population, including the clergy.

The Catholics and the Problem of Italian Unity

A national consciousness, awake in Italy since the middle of the eighteenth century, gradually spread among a Jacobin minority when the French invasion toppled the dynasties. This national consciousness was fostered both by the revolutionary principle of the right of people to self-determination and the concrete experiences in the Kingdom of Italy. After 1815, the often rather vague concepts of unification of a peninsula liberated from the antiliberal Austrian yoke survived chiefly among the young from middle class backgrounds who longed for the Italy of Napoleon, but also among a part of the educated public living on the memories of the grandeur of Rome and the resistance of the Lombard cities to the German Emperors. The broad masses also were infected by the movement of the *Risorgimento,* fed by the atmosphere of romanticism which promoted historical awareness. It was further promoted by such literary bestsellers as Silvio Pellico's *Le mie prigione* which related the terrible experiences of the author during his imprisonment in Austrian jails, constituting a terrible indictment of the methods of the Austrian police. The unrest of 1830/31 enlarged the number of Italian patriots; renewed Austrian intervention made it clear to all that constitutional and liberal aspirations could only be satisfied by a common front of all Italians. In subsequent years, the periodic congresses of scientists held in Italian capitals contributed to the breakdown of parochialism by pushing national questions[14] into the foreground. The economic development, illustrated by the growth of railroads, tended in the same direction. Initially there were among the *Carbonari* convinced Catholics, even priests and members of orders, often with a tradition of Jansenism.[15] But between 1830 and 1840 the wish for the unification of all of Italy was represented chiefly by men who were hostile to the Church, either because they saw in the Pope, the secular ruler obedient to the Austrians, the primary obstacle, or because under the influence of Freemasonry they regarded liberty incompatible with religion and viewed the priests as the main defenders of an authoritarian society opposed to their striving for popular sovereignty. There was also Mazzini, who in 1831 founded the organization "Young Italy." His program called for liberation from all dogmas and Churches, so that under the motto "God and People" a new religion of humanity could be created and with universal brotherhood a democracy of the future could be realized. The systematic use of violence by the secret societies and the radical character of Mazzini's program, aimed at replacing the legitimate rulers with a democratic republic, tended to increase the distrust of many Catholics and explained the almost totally negative reaction of the hierarchy toward the national movement. Around 1840 a new development occurred under the influence of intellectuals who favored a somewhat vague but genuinely religious Christianity and realized that in Italy loyalty to Catholicism represented the foremost national tradition. Consequently they tried to bring about the unification of their country not against the will of the Church, but with its support. This movement of neo-Guelphism replaced with convergence, cooperation, and occasionally even uniformity the antithesis of the revolutionary left, which saw *Risorgimento* and Catholicism and Italy and Papacy as mutually exclusive hostile forces.

---

[11] Quoted by A. M. Ghisalberti, *Cospirazioni del Risorgimento* (Palermo 1938), 8–11.

[12] Text in F. A. Gualterio, op. cit. II, 359–69. See also P. Zama in *Studi romagnoli* 2 (1951), 373–87.

[13] Reproduced by G. Margotti, *Le vittorie della Chiesa* (Milan 1857), 490ff.

---

[14] Lambruschini was well aware of the political significance of these congresses and refused to permit them in Rome. On the importance of the congresses, see F. Bartocini-S. Verdini, *Sui congressi degli scienzati* (Rome 1952).

[15] See M. Vaussard, *Jansénisme et gallicanisme aux origines religieuses du Risorgimento* (Paris 1959), 101–36.—On the Carbonari-priests in the kingdom of Naples, see A. de Santis in *Archivi,* 2nd ser. 25 (1958), 13–28.

The starting point of neo-Guelphism was the conviction that the combination of religious and patriotic sentiments could form a powerful national lever, as had been shown by the examples of Spanish resistance to Napoleon, the liberation of Greece from the Ottoman yoke, and the emancipation of Belgium from Protestant Dutch domination. A few years earlier, Manzoni had attempted to awaken national feeling through an appeal to religious sentiment and by drawing attention to the role of protector played by the Pope at the time of the Lombards, when he had become the focal point for Italy after the collapse of the Roman Empire. At the same time, historians were attempting to bring back into prominence the tradition of national Guelphism through dubious reconstructions of the resistance to the Hohenstaufen Emperors. Among others there was the Neapolitan G. Troya (1782–1858), who wrote a monumental work in order to prove that the Pope, representing in medieval Italy the opposition to the "barbarians" from north of the Alps, once again had to wrest it from them.

Only Tommaseo,[16] banished to France since 1833, suggested in his work *Dell'Italia* (1835) that the Pope should take the lead in Italy's rebirth. He demanded the expulsion of the Austrians from the Italian peninsula, called for a united Italy, and proclaimed his belief in the unity of liberty and Christianity. The true initiator and spiritual leader of neo-Guelphism, however, was Vincenzo Gioberti,[17] a Piedmontese priest who because of his publicly announced sympathies for Mazzini had been banished to Brussels. Later he had broken with Mazzini's followers. The reason for the break was the fruitlessness of their agitation and their ideological inconsistency, which prevented them from supplying the Italians with a constructive concept. After wavering between skepticism and pantheism, Gioberti retraced his way to a position close to his original Catholicism, and in January 1843 published a huge, almost indigestible tome, *Del primato morale e civile degli Italiani.* The response to it was compared to that which Fichte had evoked with his *Addresses to the German Nation.* After praising in his book the genius of Italy and reminding the readers of its contributions to the cultural legacy of humanity, he announced that the rebirth of the country, which encompassed liberty, national unity, and independence, in cooperation with a moderate liberalism, should utilize the alliance between modern currents and existing institutions, i.e., between monarchy and Catholicism. From this vantage point he called for the unification of Italy in a federation of states, with the Pope as president. As in almost all such cases, his thoughts were not quite new; some of them had been expressed by Rosmini some time before.[18] But never before had these thoughts been offered with such eloquence, and never before had the secular, political, and practical value of Catholicism and its main support, the papacy, been glorified as the spiritual source of national rebirth with such force. Of course, the book was not welcomed by anticlerical liberal circles; they had no difficulty in contrasting Gioberti's ideal Pope with the reality of Rome under Gregory XVI. Traditional Catholics also criticized the study because they were disturbed by its innovative views and its call for reform. For this reason Lambruschini quickly forbade the distribution of the book in the Papal States. But it was welcomed by very many Catholics and clergy, including some cardinals,[19] and immediately after its publication it was said that the idea of Italian unification was no longer identified with Mazzini but with Gioberti. The book's surprising success was especially astonishing in view of its difficult style. It proved that its content corresponded to a widespread attitude. People longed to reconcile what previously appeared irreconcilable: attachment to the ancestral religion and the desire for political rejuvenation, national sentiment and the revulsion against revolutionary violence. Marxist historiography has explained the success of the neo-Guelph program with an equivocal class reaction, with the antiquated nobility seeing in the Pope the protector of the feudal hierarchy, and with the propertied middle class tying its interests to a limited monarchy which in the name of Christian personal rights was to guarantee the essential principles of 1789, i.e., liberty and property.[20] In any case, for whatever reasons, neo-Guelphism for several years was considerably successful, even after Gioberti in his *Prolegomeni al Primato* (1845) admitted reduced confidence in a reform pope and directed attention to the reactionary forces within the Church, especially the Society of Jesus.

---

[16] Concerning Niccolò Tommaseo (1802–74), poet, philologist, and essayist, see R. Ciampini, *Vita di Niccolò Tommaseo* (Florence 1945); M. L. Astaldi, *Tommaseo come era* (Florence 1966); R. Ciampini, *Studi e ricerche su Niccolò Tommaseo* (Rome 1944), especially 107–210.

[17] Vincenzo Gioberti (1801–52) was a professor in the Department of Theology at Turin and almoner of the court from 1825 to 1833, even though he maintained intimate contact with the liberal and revolutionary movements; 1848–49 he was president of the Piedmontese government. See A. Bruers, *Gioberti* (Rome 1924); A. Anzilotti, *Gioberti* (Milan 1922; fundamental); U. Padovani, *Vincenzo Gioberti ed il cattolicismo* (Milan 1927); R. Rinaldi, *Gioberti e il problema religioso del Risorgimento* (Florence 1929); T. Vecchietti, *Il pensiero politico di Vincenzo Gioberti* (Milan 1941); A. Omodeo, *Vincenzo Gioberti e la sua evoluzione politica* (Turin 1941); G. Bonafede, *Gioberti e la critica* (Palermo 1950). Works: *Opere complete,* 35 vols. (Naples 1877/1937); new critical edition (Rome-Milan 1938ff.); *Epistolario,* 11 vols. (Florence 1927/37).

---

[18] See C. Callovini, "Il primato del neoguelfismo rosminiano," *Atti del Congresso internazionale di filosofia A. Rosmini* I (Florence 1957), 481–95. A. Anzilotti, *Gioberti,* 242, had already said: "Rosmini appare più neoguelfo del Gioberti stesso." Concerning Rosmini and the Risorgimento, see also below, pp. 323ff. and footnote 42.

[19] It is known that the work made a deep impression on the future Pope Pius IX, then bishop of Imola in the Romagna.

Gioberti's thoughts were seized upon by several Catholic writers. They regarded the continuation of the secular power of the Pope as the guarantee for the free exercise of his spiritual office, but they also thought that this principle could be reconciled with a federative Italy by a few changes in the statute of the Papal States. In his book *Speranze d'Italia,* published in 1844 and dedicated to Gioberti, the Piedmontese nobleman Cesare Balbo[21] concerned himself less with the future situation of the Pope than with Europe's diplomatic perspectives which justified the expectation of an evacuation of the Italian peninsula by the Austrians in the near future. Four other books, appearing in the first months of 1846, three of them outside of Italy and one in the Italian underground, dealt with the problem of adjusting the secular powers of the Pope to the political realities of the nineteenth century. In his *Pensieri sull'Italia,* the Lombard Luigi Torelli[22] suggested the division of an Italy liberated from the Austrians into three kingdoms, Savoy, Central Italy, and Naples, with Rome, as the seat of the Pope, a free city. In his *Della nazionalità italiana,* Giacomo Durando[23] developed the plan of withdrawing the Pope from the influence of the various European powers, so damaging to his freedom as head of the Church, leaving him only Rome and Civitavecchia, with the remainder of his states being turned over to the kings of Piedmont and Naples; they were expected to replace the absolutist system by parliamentary institutions. The Tuscan Leopoldo Galeotti,[24] one of the best liberal Catholic publicists of his time, concluded a sharp criticism of the leadership of the Papal States in his *Della sovranità e del governo temporale dei Papi* with the suggestion that the solution consisted of a return to the conditions of the Middle Ages: nominal sovereignty of the Pope over the communes, which would retain their full local liberties. Massimo d'Azeglio,[25] one of the few Piedmontese aristocrats passionately in favor of Italy's unity, in his *Degli ultimi casi de Romagna* concluded his attacks on the persecutions after the Rimini matter with an enthusiastic portrait of a liberal reform pope whom he desired to see as successor to Gregory XVI.

---

[20] See L. Bulferetti, "Il Neoguelfismo," *Quaderni di Rinascita* I (Rome 1948).

[21] Cesare Balbo (1789–1853) came from a liberal family and wrote several art-historical and art-philosophical works before becoming actively involved in politics after 1848. See *DBI* V, 395–405 (Lit.) and N. Valerie, *Cesare Balbo. Pagine scelte precedute da un saggio* (Milan 1960).

[22] Concerning Luigi Torelli (1810–67), aristocrat and scientist, see A. Monti, *Il conte Luigi Torelli* (Milan 1931) and E. Morelli in *RStRis* 36 (1949), 3–25.

[23] Concerning Giacomo Durando (1807–94), banished after 1831, soldier and after 1848 a very active politician, see N. Nada in *BStBis* 60 (1962), 147–60 and P. M. Toesca, "Italia e cattolicesimo nel pensiero di Giacomo Durando," *Il Saggiatore* 3 (1953).

[24] On Leopoldo Galeotti (1813–84), see G. Calamari, *Leopoldo Galeotti e il moderatismo toscano* (Modena 1935).

It must be noted that in the case of all of these neo-Guelphs, national and unitary striving went hand in hand with the desire to create liberal institutions. These two aspects were intimately tied together since the beginnings of the *Risorgimento.* It explains to a large degree the mistrust and the often unconcealed hostility with which the movement was regarded by many members of orders, especially the Jesuits,[26] and by the majority of the hierarchy. They could not permit this attempt, reminiscent of Lamennais, to "Catholicize the revolution." Yet the success achieved by the neo-Guelphs among a considerable portion of Italy's Catholic population on the eve of the pontificate of Pius IX proved that in Italy also, even though in forms substantially different from the various West European countries and in spite of the much less favorable political and social conditions, a liberal Catholic movement was in the making.

The Varieties of Catholic Liberalism in Italy

Even though it is common usage in Italian historiography to speak of "liberal Catholics" and "intransigents," some people have doubted for a number of years that there ever existed before 1848 a Catholic liberalism comparable to that developing at the same time in France or Belgium. In contrast to French Catholics under the July Monarchy or Belgian Catholics after 1830, Italian Catholics in fact did not have to confront the question of what advantages and disadvantages a regime of constitutional liberties or the possible separation of Church and state would entail for the Catholic apostolate. In spite of the agitation of a dynamic but numerically small portion of the middle class and intellectuals, liberal institutions were nowhere in Italy introduced before the big crisis of the middle of the century, and relations between Church and state continued to function within the framework of the Old Regime. There existed a privileged established Church, strictly supervised by the government, a situation confirmed by the various concordats and agreements from the time of the pontificate of Gregory XVI.

---

[25] Massimo Taparelli d'Azeglio (1798–1866) was the son of one of the strongest representatives of Piedmontese Catholicism during the restoration period, in his youth a painter and novelist, later active in politics as a very moderate constitutionalist. See N. Vaccaluzzo, *Massimo d'Azeglio* (Rome 1930); A. M. Ghisalberti, *Massimo d'Azeglio, un moderato realizzatore* (Rome 1953); *DBI* IV, 746–52.

[26] In fairness it must be added that the resistance of some Jesuits to the neo-Guelph program had other reasons than fear of liberal reforms. P. Curci in his *Fatti ed argomenti in risposta alle molte parole di Vincenzo Gioberti* (1845) declared that men of the Church should not be concerned with political problems but should confine themselves to be apostles of the gospels. Concerning the criticism by Father Taparelli d'Azeglio of the "braggarts of patriotism," see Jemolo, 34, footnotes 1 and 2.

On 16 April 1834 a concordat was concluded between the Holy See and the State of Naples, supplemented by the convention of 29 August 1839,[27] concerning the prerogatives of ecclesiastical courts and the continuation of the personal immunity of clerics. On 30 April 1841, the duke of Modena signed a similar concordat, guaranteeing the juridical privileges of the clergy and the statute of the ecclesiastical estates.[28] Piedmont, the first Italian state to travel a liberal path after 1848, until this date also followed a traditional course. In 1836 an agreement was concluded by Rome and Turin concerning the keeping of personal registries by the clergy.[29] In 1839 the nunciature in Turin, which had been closed in 1753, was reopened, largely as a result of the personal efforts of Count Solaro della Margarita, who wished to strengthen the alliance between Church and state.[30] In 1841 a concordat was signed concerning the privileged juridical status of the clergy.[31] This agreement, required by the political opposition and the plots in which clerics participated, was without a doubt a genuine concession of the Holy See to the legal needs of a state which under pressure from an anti-Curial administration was increasingly becoming secularized. Yet it still rested on a recognition of the principle of a privileged clergy and therefore, similar to all of the other cited examples, was not liberally motivated.

With exceptions, the majority of militant Catholics in France and Belgium went along with the liberal tendencies. The situation was fundamentally different in Italy, however. There, even in the northern provinces which were more receptive to modern currents of thought, militant Catholics joined the ranks of the counterrevolutionaries and traditionalists of the preceding period. It can be said that the failure of the revolutionary movements of 1831 actually strengthened the reactionary character of the "intransigents" and their alliance with legitimism. Weekly or monthly periodicals such as *La Voce della verita*[32] in Modena (1831/41), *La Voce della ragione*[33] in Pesaro (1832/35), and *La Pragmalogia*[34] in Lucca (1828), were indicative of this attitude. Among its most marked defenders was Count Monaldo Leopardi,[35] a foe of any revolution, even if the ruler was clearly violating the principle of justice, as in his opinion nothing could justify a rebellion against constituted authority. Unceasingly he castigated liberty, the "dearest and most faithful friend of the devil," and especially freedom of the press, for it made possible "obscenities and scandalous stupidities of all kinds, rebellious writings, and blasphemous expressions against God and saints." These intransigent Catholics promoted a stiffer attitude toward the Protestants, especially in Tuscany and Piedmont,[36] and were emphatically suspicious of all initiatives not hewing to the denominational line. They were opposed to the religious indifferentism of the Bible societies as well as to activities concerning education and charities, because they threatened the monopoly of the Church in these areas. They commended the essentially religious and essentially monarchial kind of education of the Jesuit colleges and attacked the custom of the schools to leave groups of students in charge of student monitors, as they did not keep the children under the "precious yoke" of authority. The bitter campaign for years against the kindergartens of Ferrante Aporti,[37] which were accused of preparing the ground for a secularization of education, were partly the result of the recognition that liberals used such institutions for their own purposes, but even more so revealed the reactionary and fearful attitude toward any innovation which characterized a large part of Italy's Catholics at the time.

---

[27] Mercati I, 724–25. See W. Maturi in *Archivio storico per le Prov. Napoletane* 73 (1955), 319–69.

[28] Mercati I, 739–42. It was supplemented on 13 April 1846 and 24 February 1851 by additional documents (ibid., 742–47). See P. Forni in *RSTI* 8 (1954), 356–82.

[29] Mercati I, 727–36; see 725–26. See J. A. Albo, *Relationes inter Santa Sedem et Gubernium Sardiniae 1831–46* (Rome 1940).

[30] See C. Ricciardi in *RSTI* 10 (1956), 396–436. Also L. Madaro in *Il Risorgimento italiano* 23 (1930), 515–26 and N. Nada in *BstBiS* 48 (1950), 119–38.

[31] Mercati I, 736–38. See V. Naymiller in *Il Risorgimento italiano* 24 (1931), 424–41.

---

[32] See E. Clerici in *La Nuova Antologia* 221 (1908), 646–55.

[33] See N. Quilici in *Otto Saggi* (Ferrara 1934), 256ff.

[34] See M. Stanghellini in *RSTI* 9 (1955), 58–69. After 1838, when Monsignor Bertolozzi, a follower of Rosmini, became director, the weekly embarked on a more open-minded course.

[35] Concerning M. Leopardi (1776–1847), the father of the poet, and editor of *Voce della ragione,* see M. Angelastri, *Monaldo Leopardi* (Milan 1948) and L. Salvatorelli, op. cit., 191–96. His *Dialoghetti sulle materie correnti* (1831) were reissued by A. Moravia under the title *Viaggio di Pulcinella* (Rome 1945).

[36] At the beginning of the thirties, several factors contributed to making Protestant propaganda appear in a special and worrisome light, especially the effect generated in Florence by Vieusseux and his *Antologia* and the temporary turn of the young duke of Lucca to the Reformation. See G. Spini, 153–210, especially 188, 202–06, 210 and N. Nada in *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 89 (1954/55), 39–115.

[37] Ferrante Aporti (1791–1858), director of elementary schools at Cremona, one of the most important Italian pedagogues of the first half of the nineteenth century, after 1829 founded kindergartens for the broad masses (*"Asili infantili"*), which from Lombardy spread to Tuscany and then gradually to all Italian states. The Protestant origin of this method and the fact that laymen were used caused a violent reaction among the "intransigents." See A. Gambaro, *Ferrante Aporti e gli asili infantili nel Risorgimento,* 2 vols. (Turin 1937) and *Ferrante Aporti nel primo centenario della morte* (Brescia 1962).

Although these attitudes prevailed among the majority of people, there were also some Catholics in Italy during the two decades before 1848 who were seriously concerned with the problem of confronting religious beliefs with the liberal tendencies of the time.But they did not band together, even though it would have been quite easy for like-minded men to acquaint one another with the doctrines of *L'Avenir* of how to use constitutional liberties for the benefit of the Church. On the contrary, they remained split in many small groups, with hardly any contact among them, attacked problems from totally different perspectives, and differed in many important respects.

There were indeed free spirits who raised the question of reform of Catholicism in its institutions and occasionally even in its dogmas, in order to adapt it to modern currents of thought. This was especially the case in Tuscany, where under the joint influence of the Enlightenment under Grand Duke Leopold, Jansenism, and Swiss Protestanism,[38] a number of people joined Marquis Gino Capponi[39] and Raffaele Lambruschini.[40] They strove for tolerance, human progress, and a reduction of ecclesiastical power and its increasing spiritualization. But above all they desired a reform of Catholicism and papacy analogous to the principles of the Protestant revival movement. Lambruschini developed plans for a reform of the Church which were as far-reaching as those of Ricci and Degola. Parishes were to be governed jointly by an elected parish priest and an elected lay consistory, both of them forming a counterweight to ecclesiastical power. Beyond such organizational reform plans, these men were opposed to a religion of authority and in favor of an intensification of Christianity, which they looked upon more as a force for individual ethical perfection than as a communal religion of salvation.

---

[38] G. Capponi (1792–1876) developed his thoughts in the course of travels to Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, and Holland. He wrote several books on the Italian Middle Ages from a romantic perspective, but was known primarily through his educational writings. See G. Capponi, *Scritti inediti preceduti da una bibliografia ragionata,* ed. by G. Macchia (Florence 1957) and *Lettere di Gino Capponi e di altri a lui,* ed. by A. Carraresi, 6 vols. (Florence 1884/90). Also A. Gambaro, *La critica pedagogica di Gino Capponi* (Bari 1956); G. Gentile, op. cit.; E. Sestan, "Gino Capponi storico," *Nuova Rivista storica* 27 (1943), 270–306.

[39] Raffaele Lambruschini (1788–1873) came from Genoa. After having held ecclesiastical positions until 1817, he retired to his estates in Tuscany in order to concern himself with pedagogy and religious problems. See A. Gambaro, op. cit. (basic); R. Gentili, *Lambruschini. Un liberale cattolico dell'800* (Florence 1967); M. Casotti, *Raffaele Lambruschini e la pedagogia italiana dell'Ottocento* (Brescia 1964); G. Sofri, "Ricerche sulla formazione religiosa e culturale di Raffaele Lambruschini," *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa,* 2nd Series, 29 (1960), 149–89. Lambruschini's very dispersed works were collected and critically edited by A. Gambaro, *Primi scritti religiosi* (Florence 1918); *Dell'autorità e della libertà* (id. 1932; critical edition with many hitherto unpublished documents); *Scritti politici e di istruzione pubblica* (id. 1937); *Scritti di varia filosofia e di religione* (id. 1939).

[40] Either directly through the Genevan Sismondi (as his *Epistolario,* ed. by C. Pellegrini, 4 vols. [Florence 1933/54], shows) or indirectly with Vieusseux as intermediary (see R. Ciampini, *G. P. Vieusseux. I suoi viaggi, i suoi giornali, i suoi amici* [Turin 1953]; also G. Spini in *RStRis* 45 [1954], 30ff.); the significant influence of Vieusseux was confirmed by the *Carteggio inedito Niccolò Tommaseo-G. P. Vieusseux,* ed. by R. Ciampini-P. Ciureanu, I (Rome 1956).

In addition to this liberal Catholicism, touching the limits of ecclesiastical doctrine and occasionally overstepping them and demonstrating certain similarities with contemporary liberal Protestantism, there were also reformers who not in the least wished to question Catholic dogma in its Tridentine formulation, but who were interested in a limited democratization of ecclesiastical institutions. They were primarily the spiritual heirs of the Jansenists of the preceding generation, whose aims in this respect coincided with certain liberal tendencies: priests or members of orders who demanded the election of bishops by the faithful and a greater degree of independence from their superiors, and laymen such as the Tuscan Bettino Ricasoli,[41] who considered it unseemly to endanger the message of the gospels by concordatal negotiations with the secular power. For this reason they demanded the separation of Church and state, not in the name of the laicism of the state, but in the name of the transcendentalism of religion.

Special mention must be made of the philosopher, theologian, and political theorist Antonio Rosmini.[42] He was probably the strongest personality of Italian Catholicism in the nineteenth century, in part because of the originality of some of his propositions, and in part because of the reception given his ideas, especially in northern Italy. The young aristocrat in his early years was a follower of religious and political restoration along theocratic and legitimist lines as represented by de Maistre and Haller. Thanks to a deeper connection with patristic and scholastic tradition he grew beyond them, and became increasingly aware of the difference between bourgeois society and the Church as an essentially spiritual community, without subscribing to their separation. Yet in many important points he differed from the purely liberal point of view. Until the end he remained an opponent of the Enlightenment and the principles of the French Revolution, but attempted to revive their deepest aspirations in another context, as he was convinced of the necessity to differentiate between destructive innovations and those which enrich the values inherited from the past. Thus he placed more and more emphasis on freedom of the person, the right of nationalities to develop freely, and the necessity of reconciling Catholicism with modern civilization.

---

[41] Bettino Ricasoli (1809–80) was more a man of action than a thinker, one of the leaders of the moderate liberal movement in Tuscany. During the first years of the kingdom of Italy he held an important position (see *ECatt* X, 853–54); see especially his *Carteggio,* ed. by S. Camerani (Rome 1939ff.) and the articles by P. Gismondi, "Dottrina e politica ecclesiastica in Ricasoli," *RStRis* 24 (1937), 1071–1113, 1256–1301 and by G. Gentile, "Bettino Ricasoli e il problema dei rapporti tra Stato e Chiesa," *Gino Capponi e la cultura toscana* (Florence 1942).

[42] On Antonio Rosmini-Serbati (1797–1855) there exists extraordinarily rich bibliographical material; see p. 396. Biography by G. B. Pagani, newly issued by G. Rossi, 2 vols. (Rovereto 1959); *Epistolario,* 13 vols. (Casale Monferrato 1889/94). From the point of view of interest here, there are especially L. Bulferetti, *Antonio Rosmini nella Restaurazione* (Florence 1942); P. Piovani, *La teodicea sociale di Rosmini* (Padua 1957); above all, F. Traniello, *Società civile e società religiosa in Rosmini* (Bologna 1966; also *Rivista di storia e lettera religiosa* 4 [1968], 397–401 and *CivCatt* III, [1967] 402–05). Also, "Il pensiero di Antonio Rosmini e il Risorgimento," (Convegno of Turin 1961) *RRosm* 56 (1962), 81–339 (especially E. Passerin, *La fortuna del pensiero di Rosmini nella*

In this fashion he appeared as early as 1830 as a forerunner of the neo-Guelphs of the 1840s. In contrast to Gioberti, who attempted to draw the Church into the service of his political and national ideals by assigning it a mission in the secular area, Rosmini was chiefly interested in the freedom of the Church to exercise its apostolic mission and to pursue its supernatural goal. Equating the independence of the Pope from regalistic governments with Italy's independence from Austria, he demanded national freedom as a prerequisite for the freedom of the Church. On the other hand, his radical rejection of regalistic governments, which he shared with the "intransigents" of the restoration period, caused him—unlike them—to turn against absolutism of any kind. In the name of the cultural traditions of medieval Italy discovered by the romanticists, he developed a Christian concept of politics and law which opposed equally Metternich's despotism in the style of the eighteenth century and the Jacobin predominance of the state preached by some so-called liberals of the time. In contrast to Lamennais and Gioberti, Rosmini underscored the essentially supernatural character of the Church, but assigned it the task within bourgeois society of defend-

---

cultura del Risorgimento, 97–109); C. Callovini, *Antonio Rosmini come uomo del Risorgimento italiano* (Rome 1953); S. Colonna, *L'educazione religiosa nella pedagogia di Antonio Rosmini* (Lecce 1963); G. Ferrarese, *Ricerche sulle riflessioni teologiche di Antonio Rosmini negli anni 1819–28* (Milan 1967). A good anthology is M. F. Sciacca, *Il pensiero giuridico e politico di Antonio Rosmini* (Florence 1962).

ing and promoting true freedom (a freedom not totally identical with that expounded by democratic liberals).

But Rosmini was also deeply convinced, thereby approaching the reform movement of Tuscany's liberal Catholics from another direction, that the independence of the Church from the governments, which alone would enable the Church to become the "Mother of Liberty," was tied essentially to an inner renewal of eccleciastical society. The Church, he said, which is primarily a spiritual entity, must gain its influence through truth and an appeal to conscience, not through force, and in the process it must renounce many an expensive support which it frequently seeks from the secular power. It must also come closer to the people by making a place for the Christian laity parallel to the hierarchy and show the utmost respect for the traditional rights of the particular Churches threatened by post-Tridentine centralization. This was also one of Lamennais's themes, but Rosmini approached it from a totally different perspective.

For a long time, this ecclesiological aspect of Rosmini's thought—at the time a bold innovation, but in its nucleus of a traditional nature—was not given the attention it deserved. It is the great accomplishment of F. Traniello to have brought it to light and to have demonstrated that it is the key which makes it possible correctly to understand *Le cinque piaghe della Santa Chiesa.*[43] Rosmini dared only in 1848 to publish this critical diagnosis of the Italian and Austrian Catholicism of his time, even though he wrote the work between November 1832 and March 1833 after an exchange of views with N. Tommaseo. He also frequently expressed his thoughts during this time in discussions and letters.[44] But before 1848 these expressions were limited to a number of his students and did not develop into a large movement, as was the case with Lamennais in France and with Gioberti in Italy.

The desire for greater freedom, focusing on reforms within the Church, which one encounters with variations in Rosmini, Capponi, Raffaele Lambruschini, and the men who more or less were under their influence, lent Italian Catholicism between 1830 and 1850 a façade differing fundamentally from the Catholic liberalism of Montalembert's friends and the constitutionalism of the Belgian Catholics. To be sure, there were also in Italy Catholics who were primarily interested in the question of bourgeois and liberal freedoms. But they approached them from a perspective quite different from that of their fellow believers north of the Alps. There it was chiefly a case of militant Catholics, for whom the reconciliation with the modern and liberal governmental systems come to power in the course of the revolutions of 1830 posed a problem of conscience, inasmuch as liberal thought since the end of the eighteenth century tended to be anticlerical and occasionally anti-Christian. Still, the Catholics north of the Alps were of the opinion that by making peace with the new regime the Church had more to gain than to lose. After all, reconciliation would allow it to defend its rights more effectively and provide it with the opportunity to perform its apostolic work in a sector of leading public opinion which was threatening to slip away.

---

[43] The "five wounds of the Holy Church" indicated were: the rift between clergy and the faithful, caused by the use of Latin in liturgy; the inadequate education of the clergy; the excessive dependence of the episcopate on the princes; the exclusion of the lower clergy and the faithful from the nomination of bishops; and the control of the estates of the Church by the state. A critical edition of the work with an introduction placing it in its historical context was published by C. Riva (Brescia 1966). See also G. Martina in *RRosm* 62 (1968), 384–409, 63 (1969), 24–49.

[44] See, for example, G. Radice, *Antonio Rosmini e il clero ambrosiano. Epistolario,* 3 vols. (Milan 1962/64).

In Italy, however, Catholics engaged in reform politics faced the task of replacing the still prevailing absolutist governments with liberal institutions. They were primarily concerned not with the defense and the rights of the Church, but with the victory of liberalism. They were more comparable to the still believing and practicing liberals of France and Belgium than to the disciples of Lamennais. Several historians have therefore suggested designating them as "liberals and Catholics" rather than "Catholic liberals," as they had no difficulty reconciling their liberal views with their religious convictions. After all, the Italian liberalism of 1825 was not Voltairean and certainly not atheistic, not even in the secret societies in which the oath was often taken on a crucifix. As for foreign influence, that of the Cortes of Cádiz was more a guiding factor than that of the revolutionary French assemblies. Besides, in Italy, where the demand for liberal institutions was concretely tried to the awakening of a national consciousness and a rejection of foreign influences, the support was appreciated which the clergy in Spain, in Tyrol, and even in Italy itself had provided for the resistance to the Napoleonic policy of conquest. Even the almost total counterrevolutionary attitude of the ecclesiastical hierarchy hardly posed a problem for these men. Many of them had learned from Jansenism how to separate their religious convictions from submission to the ecclesiastical authorities in nondogmatic areas; condemnations of liberalism by the Pope diverted them from Catholicism as little as their teachers were diverted earlier by the papal condemnation at the Synod of Pistoia.

But the fact that a Jansenist mentality possibly facilitated the concurrence of some Catholics with liberalism does not mean at all that one has to seek in the Jansenism of the eighteenth century the source of

Catholic liberalism in Italy. A. Jemolo has clearly put forth the radical difference which, in spite of many parallels, separated the Jansenists from those who placed their confidence in progress and liberty. The decisive influence is to be sought in the ideas of the philosophes of the eighteenth century and in the innovations effected during the period of the Directory. Again in contrast to France, there was no such deep gap in Italy between the democratic Catholics of the last years of the eighteenth century and the liberal Catholics after 1830. Because Italy had not experienced the excesses of the Reign of Terror, there also did not exist, as north of the Alps, the radical reaction against everything reminiscent of the revolutionary epoch. These ideas came down from one generation to the next in diverse fashion: through clerics, who initially had harbored genuine sympathies for the new thought at the time of the French invasion and who had not completely forgotten them in the restoration period, and through former Jacobins who initially had been decidedly anticlerical, but later returned to the traditional loyalty toward the Catholic Church without renouncing their youthful enthusiasm for liberty. After giving up the revolutionary formula "Liberty without Religion" without adopting that of "Religion without Liberty" within the meaning of the Holy Alliance, they now were the heralds of the liberal Catholic "Religion with Liberty."

The "liberals and Catholics" of this movement, standing between the followers of Mazzini who clearly had divorced themselves from Church and Christianity and the reactionary militant Catholics, had many followers among the intellectuals. Two persons among them stand out: Niccolo Tommaseo and Allessandro Manzoni. Tommaseo combined the influences of the Tuscan group, of Rosmini, and of Lamennais. His passionate work *Dell'Italia* (1935) was an echo to the motto of *L'Avenir:* "Christianity separated from liberty will always remain a slave; the combination of the two will be an indication of the nearness of world peace. Only the banner having both names on it will rise victoriously. . . ." It is difficult to define Manzoni's precise attitude toward Catholic liberalism.[45] After his conversion under Jansenist auspices he discovered in religion the source of true spiritual liberty, the principle of autonomy of conscience with respect to those forces which exert pressure on it from the outside, and the leader of liberty who will keep it within reasonable boundaries and will prevent its descent into anarchy and tyranny as was the case during the French Revolution. This view is reminiscent of Lamennais's position in 1826–27. But Manzoni developed it completely independently from the French theoretician and fitted it into the framework of a national tradition reminiscent of Savonarola's aphorism: *"Unus ex potissimis vitae christianae effectibus est animi libertas."* There is also no trace in him and others of Lamennais's earlier theocratic tendencies. In the case of Manzoni it was not a matter of a renascence of society through a free Church, but of the development of the person owing to a free conscience;[46] this explains his statement that the Lamennaic temptation of a "political Catholicism" was incompatible with the purity of religion.

---

[45] See A. Jemolo in *RStT* 4 (1958), 242–43. On Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873), see above, p. 239.

Does this mean that there was in Italy no equivalent to the liberal Catholicism as it existed in France under the July Monarchy? That would go too far. The Lamennais of *L'Avenir* found no great response[47] in Italy, and the liberals generally regarded with skepticism his hope to effect an agreement between liberalism and an excessive papal sovereignty. But he had the satisfaction of approval by several recognized Italian ecclesiastics, among them the Servite Superior General Battini, the Capuchin Cardinal Micara, a few Roman theologians, and Father Ventura, the general of the Theatines.[48] There were even a few genuine disciples, especially among the young regular and secular clergy of Tuscany[49] and Lombardy.

Mirari vos put a quick end to the enthusiasm for Lamennais's doctrines among many clerics and laymen who were excited by the concept of a liberal ultramontanism. Possibly, though, the hopes awakened by Lamennais explain to a certain extent the success which the neo-Guelphs had ten years later among broad masses of the ecclesiastical world. Many people saw in neo-Guelphism an opportunity to reconcile their loyalty to Roman Catholicism with their patriotic and liberal tendencies, in spite of the skepticism of many liberals who immediately diagnosed the illusionary nature of the movement, which was a late product of romantic enthusiasm.

Finally, there were in Italy on the eve of 1848 also many Catholics whose principles were much like those of Montalembert. This was the case, for example, with the Jesuit Taparelli d'Azeglio. He not only unequivocally opposed despotism, thereby departing from the accepted political theology of the Society of Jesus and approaching that of Thomism, but also declared his confidence that a governmental system of constitutional liberties would bring advantages for the Church. He called upon Catholic laymen to organize themselves on the basis of common law for the defense of their religious interests.[50] This proves that the ideas matured elsewhere slowly made their way and penetrated even to the Jesuits, of whom it was too quickly thought that in Italy they were always identified with the defense of reactionary absolutism.

---

[46] This aspect was underscored by P. Scoppola, *Dal neoguelfismo alla democrazia cristiana* (Rome 1957), 13–14.

[47] Concerning the influence of Lamennais in Italy during his liberal Catholic phase, see A. Gambaro in *Studi francesi* I (1958), 204–06, 211–15. According to A. Simon in *RHE* 54 (1959), 213, Lamennais is supposed to have exerted a greater influence on Gioberti than is commonly assumed.

[48] Gioacchino Ventura (1792–1861) was a Sicilian. Gregory XVI did not permit him to continue as general of his order after 1833. See L. Tomeucci, "'Libertà e religione' nel pensiero di Gioacchino Ventura," *Archivio storico messinese* 55 (1954/55), 21–62. About his relationship to Lamennais, see F. Salinitti in *Salesianum* 2 (1940), 318–48. Concerning his support of the Sicilian revolution in 1848, see E. Di Carlo in *Regnum Dei* 5 (1949), 134–47 and *RstRis* 37 (1950), 119–24.

[49] See, for example, C. Cannarozzi, "I Frati Minori di Toscana e il Risorgimento," *StudFr* 52 (1955), 406–12.

At the end of this survey it is understandable that A. Jemolo could ask whether with respect to Italy the phrase "Catholic liberalism" was more than a mere label, as the realities which the term subsumed were fundamentally different from case to case. Yet all these diverse attempts, regardless of the differences of viewpoints and suggested solutions, were based on a common reality. Jemolo himself spoke of the encounter of the Catholic sentiment and the liberal sentiment. Passerin d'Entrèves declared that numerous Catholics were beginning to realize that in order to do justice to the new problems posed by modern society and modern civilization, it was no longer possible to be satisfied with a return to traditional solutions, but that a somewhat radical adaptation was unavoidably necessary. But while this conviction was widely accepted by many Catholics north of the Alps, it was present in Italy before the middle of the century only in a small circle of intellectuals, none of whom was able to find acceptance by the public. The only exception was neo-Guelphism at the end of this period, and even it was more concerned with national than with liberal considerations.

---

[50] This fact was brought to light by G. De Rosa, *I gesuiti in Sicilia e la rivoluzione del 48* (Rome 1963). On the religious policy of the Sicilian Republic of 1848, see M. Condorelli, *Stato e Chiesa nella rivoluzione siciliana del 1848* (Catania 1965).

CHAPTER 20

The States of the German Confederation and Switzerland, 1830–1848

The July Revolution demonstrated to all who believed that revolutionary ideas had been overcome the continuing vitality of such ideas, put in question the political system of 1815, and raised fears of a new age of crisis. Its general impact was more significant than its concrete effects, which differed from country to country. Of the states treated in this chapter, Switzerland experienced the most profound changes, while the structure of the German Confederation and its member states generally survived the crisis. It had far-reaching consequences, however, which touched upon the ecclesiastical realm. Everywhere conservative forces found themselves on the defensive, and in Austria especially the tendency toward an alliance between throne and altar was strengthened. More important, liberal movements, the efforts to acquire modern constitutions, and protests against the authoritarian use of power by the states were buoyed. Changed views also impinged upon the renewed Catholic movement.[1] Resistance to the system of established Churches and demands for the realization at last of the religious parity promised in most constitutions were articulated more emphatically. Occasionally there was limited cooperation between liberals and Catholics against the common foe,[2] and in the Catholic camp more than in the liberal one there were the beginnings of popular movements.

The Roman Curia held back until the 1840s, when it seized the leadership. Gregory XVI, in any case a full-blown reactionary, became Pope during the July Revolution which created the first crisis endangering the existence of the internally weak Papal States. For this reason the new Pope sought the backing of the authoritarian states even more than before. Gregory XVI shortly after his election influenced the development in Germany by the first German publication of his *Triumph of the Holy See.*[3] It became one of the programmatic tracts of the movement of renewal and contributed substantially to its ultramontane orientation.

Clinging to the system of absolutist established Churches, most of the governments exacerbated the existing tensions. Denominational minorities resided mostly in areas acquired by the states between 1803 and 1815. Church policy, therefore, was part of the larger context of integrating these territories, and the opposition to the new authorities often combined ecclesiastical, regional, and historical desires for autonomy. This was most pronounced in the Rhineland, acquired by Prussia in 1815, where in the decade after 1830 the first great dispute between state and Church took place at Cologne. The occasion for it was the Roman condemnation of the Bonn philosopher Hermes[4] and the problem of mixed marriages. For the population, the latter issue was a very weighty problem, as it affected ecclesiastical policy in no longer denominationally uniform states.

---

[1] See chapter 13.

[2] In the Rhineland, for example, where middle-class liberalism comprised many active Catholics and where the Belgian example was remembered. On the latter, see L. Schwahn, *Die Beziehungen der katholischen Rheinlande und Belgiens in den Jahren 1830–40* (Strasbourg 1914); H. Schrörs in *AHVNrh* 107–08 (1923/26).

[3] Capellari's work *Il trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa contro gli assalti dei novatori,* which championed the universal episcopate and the infallibility of the Pope, first appeared in 1799 in Venice. The first German edition was published in 1833 in Augsburg.

[4] See above, pp. 243f.

Count Ferdinand August von Spiegel,[5] archbishop of Cologne, had invited Hermes to the University of Bonn and found in him as well as in many of his students suitable supporters for the spiritual and organizational reconstruction of ecclesiastical life. Strict opponents denounced Hermes' doctrine, Rome subjected it to lengthy examinations, and Gregory XVI condemned it in his summary Brief *Dum acerbissimas* of 26 September 1835.[6] The Curia did not notify the state authorities of the brief, it was not published officially, and its implementation caused difficulties. For the Hermesians, the papal decision came as a great surprise. The nuncios at Munich and Brussels assigned the task of distributing the brief to the opponents of Hermes, who were most eager to do so and who used the brief as a weapon in their fight against an established Church. The Catholic press supported them, and the involvement of the nuncios was a clear indication of the expanding ultramontanism.

The strictly Tridentine law concerning mixed marriages proved impossible to maintain everywhere in the eighteenth century. Mitigation of the law was conceded to Prussia, whose government refused to apply the law in its original form; with respect to Silesia, Pius VI in 1777 had left the implementation to the bishop of Breslau. The clergy was generally content with the provisions of the Common Law Code of Prussia, according to which sons were brought up in the religion of the father, daughters in that of the mother. Even the declaration of 1803, according to which legitimate children were to be raised in the religion of the father, raised no objections. The government hesitated to take further steps before the ecclesiastical reorganization was finished; but in 1825 a cabinet order extended the declaration of 1803 to the western provinces where canon law applied and where an established Church of the Prussian type had no tradition. The order violated the guarantees which had been given to the Church when Prussia assumed possession of the Rhenish provinces and was a determined effort to Protestantize the western provinces, as almost only Protestant officials and officers were stationed there. Bishops and Curia did not dare resist, but many clerics, especially those close to the movement of revival, refused to carry out the order. Their appeal to freedom of conscience was also supported by many liberals. Because the government was unwilling to give up its claims and insisted on the clerical blessing of mixed marriages, it began new negotiations with the Curia, conducted by Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen (1791–1860), Niebuhr's active successor as envoy to Rome.[7] With his Brief *Litteris altero abhinc* of 25 March 1830, Pius VIII tried to be conciliatory. He permitted priests to provide "passive help" in all cases in which a mixed marriage was not preventable in spite of attempts at dissuasion and in which agreement was not obtained to raise children as Roman Catholics. But the government refused the official acceptance of the papal brief, insisting on formal wedding ceremonies and renunciation of the priestly attempts at dissuasion.

---

[5] See above, p. 225. The biography by Lipgens and Schrörs, *Kölner Wirren,* chapters II and III, as well as Bastgen in *RQ* 39 (1931) provide the most thorough information on Spiegel's multifaceted work and eminent personality.

[6] Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii XVI* I, 85f.; D 1618–20.

Inasmuch as Rome now stuck to its position, the government attempted to persuade the Rhenish-Westphalian bishops to interpret the papal decision most liberally, using massive pressure in the process as well as promises which later were not kept. The bishops of Münster, Paderborn, and Trier gave in quickly; not so Archbishop Spiegel of Cologne, on whom everything depended and who was always interested in asserting the Church's independence. Eventually he also agreed, only because the Prussian emissaries were able to convince him that the Pope desired the most liberal interpretation of the brief possible. When the Prussian government then accepted the brief for transmission to the bishops, the Curia was convinced that it had won a victory. But on 19 June 1834 Spiegel and Bunsen signed a secret convention in Berlin which required for formal marriage vows no more than the "religious intention on the part of the Catholic partner to adhere to the faith and fulfill the duties involved in raising children" and limited passive assistance to cases of evident frivolity. Spiegel's suffragan bishops concurred.

But the expected calming of the waters failed to occur. In fact, the protest against Prussia's religious policy, now combined with criticism of the archbishop's yielding and Rome's silence, only grew more vehement. In Prussia, police and censorship were able to suppress many expressions of opposition, but outside of its borders leading publicists of the Catholic movement such as Räss and Weis[8] took up the cudgels.

Clemens August Baron von Droste-Vischering (1773–1845)[9] became Spiegel's successor in 1836. As a member of the Gallitzin circle he had acquired a fideistic hostility to science, lived an ascetic life, and because of his authoritarian regimen in Cologne failed to win the sympathies of either subordinates or associates. The few advisers whom he trusted all came from the militant wing of the Catholic movement. Droste's first aim was the destruction of Hermesianism, which he had always distrusted; he also wanted to hurt the University of Bonn's department of theology. His distant goal was a type of Tridentine seminary for all theological instruction. To achieve his objectives, Droste used means which were illegal in the eyes of state and Church and maneuvered himself into a corner. He and his advisers were aching for a test of strength with the state and the time seemed right for it. In the spring of 1837 the archbishop seized upon the problem of mixed marriages, which appeared to him as a wonderful battle instrument. He was determined to apply the Berlin convention, which by now as a result of better information was also contested by the Curia,[10] only to the extent to which it corresponded to the brief of Pius VIII. He refused to be intimidated by the ultimatum of the Prussian government either to give in or to resign. Employing the means of an authoritarian police state, the government on 20 November 1837 had Droste arrested and incarcerated in the fortress of Minden. An official explanation accused him of having broken his word and of revolutionary intentions.

---

[7] After the failure of the Prussian mixed marriage policy, Bunsen was forced to resign his position. In addition to the literature about the Cologne disturbances, there is a three-volume biography about him by F. Nippold (Leipzig 1868/69), and concerning his ecclesiastical concepts there is L. v.Ranke, *Aus dem Briefwechsel Friedrich Wilhelms IV. mit Bunsen* (Leipzig 1874); F. H. Reusch, *Briefe an Bunsen . . .* (Leipzig 1897); W. Bussmann, *NDB* 3, 17f.

[8] See above, p. 223.

[9] An adequate biography is lacking. So far the most thorough but occasionally too critical treatment is Schrörs, *Kölner Wirren,* chapters IV–IX. See also Schnabel, *G* IV, 133–38.

Gregory XVI on 10 December 1837 protested against this act of violence in the solemn form of an allocution to the cardinals. At the same time he placed in question Prussia's entire conduct in the question of mixed marriages and rejected the convention of Berlin. But Görres with his polemic *Athanasius* (January 1838) was much more effective. The talented publicist succeeded in painting Droste as the great champion of freedom of the Church and to make his cause that of all German Catholics. Numerous brochures followed, and Church newsletters experienced a tremendous rise in circulation. In 1838 Görres and his friends founded the *Historisch-politische Blätter,*[11] which under the leadership of George Phillips,[12] Görres's son Guido, and Carl Ernst Jarcke[13] laid the foundations for the Catholic-conservative doctrine of state and society. To an increasing degree the polemic was also directed to Protestants, the great majority of whom sided with the Prussian government; the events at Cologne contributed to a lasting hardening of the denominational fronts.

---

[10] Broad revelations in the Liège *Journal historique et littéraire* (October 1835) caused the Curia to protest. It took an even harder line after Bishop von Hommer of Trier immediately before his death had withdrawn from the Convention and informed the Pope of its creation and content. In the face of the Roman protests, Bunsen employed a shortsighted tactic of stonewalling.

[11] F. Rhein, *10 Jahre Hist.-Pol. Blätter 1838–48* (Diss., Bonn 1916); K.-H. Lucas, *Joseph Edmund Jörg. Konservative Publizistik zwischen Revolution und Reichsgründung 1852 bis 1871* (Diss., Cologne 1969); Pesch, *Kirchlich-politische Presse,* 166f. The rise of the other Catholic presses is treated by Pesch, op. cit., 167–84, 209–19.

Out of the dispute over mixed marriages grew the first mass movement for freedom of the Church, finding support in the Pope, and forcing the Prussian state to the limits of its power in a way previously unknown. Within a few months after Droste's arrest the government had to endure "modest inquiries" about the Catholic education of children from mixed marriages. Immediately after the papal allocution, canon law with respect to mixed marriages was applied in the western provinces and soon it was also employed in the eastern provinces, where for the time being only Leopold Count Sedlnitzky,[14] prince-bishop of Breslau and a defender of the concept of an established Church, continued the old practice. A further attempt by the government to stabilize the situation with the arrest of Archbishop Martin von Dunin of Gnesen-Posen (1774–1842)[15] also was a failure. Almost completely united, the Poles took the side of their archbishop, whose cause was also supported by all of Catholic Germany.

---

[12] George Phillips (1804–72), historian of law, canonist, publicist, Catholic since 1828, became a professor in Munich in 1834, in Innsbruck in 1850, and in Vienna in 1851. His work on Church law (7 vols., Regensburg 1845/72) did much to promote the papalistic concept of the Church. G. von Pölnitz in *HZ* 155 (1937); Vigener, op. cit., 99ff.

[13] Carl Ernst Jarcke, lawyer (see chapter 13, footnote 14), was professor in Vienna after 1832 and became one of Metternich's associates with respect to religious policy. F. Peters, *Jarckes Staatsauffassung* (Berlin 1926); O. Weinberger in *HF* 46 (1926); A. Wegener in *Festschrift für Ernst Heinrich Rosenfeld* (Berlin 1949); O. Köhler in *StL* IV, 621f.

[14] Leopold Count Sedlnitzky von Choltitz (1787–1871), prince-bishop after 1835, believed that conciliation served peace with the state as well as among the denominations; he was severely attacked by the Catholic press in connection with the dispute over mixed marriages. Although Frederick William IV approved of his policy, he followed a request by the Pope and resigned in 1840 without struggle, evidently realizing that his enlightened views were being overtaken by events. Sedlnitzky continued to live in Berlin and became a Protestant in 1863. Sedlnitzky's autobiography (Berlin 1872); *Schlesische Lebensbilder* IV (Breslau 1931); J. Gottschalk in *ArSKG* 2 (1936), 5 (1940); W. Urban (Warsaw 1955, chauvinistic distortion); Lill, *Beilegung der Kölner Wirren* 64–67, 102–06; H. Jedin, "Von Sedlnitzky zu Diepenbrock," *ArSKG* 29 (1971), 173–204 (letters of chapter vicar Ritter, 1841–47).

[15] In Dunin's case at least due process was applied. The archbishop was removed from his office by the Posen district court and sentenced to confinement in a fortress. B. Stasiewski in *LThK* III, 601 (Lit.).

The ascension of the throne of Prussia by Frederick William IV in June 1840 brought about a fundamental turn of events. The new King was imbued with the thought of political romanticism and despised established Churches and bureaucracies. Believing in one Church with different denominations, he wanted to create a Christian state. He desired the independence of the Churches and their coordination with the state, and in Berlin he displayed an unusual degree of sympathy for specifically Catholic forms of worship and traditions.[16] In negotiations with the Curia, in which Ludwig I of Bavaria and Metternich acted as mediators, the King quickly made far-reaching concessions. Gregory XVI's diplomacy thus succeeded in reaching the compromise in the summer of 1841 which granted the Catholic Church in Prussia a larger degree of freedom than it enjoyed in any other German state and which considerably enhanced the reputation of the Holy See in Germany. The Munich nuncio Viale-Prela acted as the prudent interpreter of Roman intentions and generally extended the influence of the nunciature to non-Bavarian dioceses.[17] Prussia gave up the demand to approve and interfere in the practice of mixed marriages, the bishops were allowed to correspond freely with Rome, the freedom of episcopal elections was guaranteed according to the agreement of 1821, and a separate branch for Catholic affairs was created in the ministry of religion.[18] Dunin was permitted to return to his office; Droste, whom the Curia was not loath to see pushed into the background because of his rudeness, had to be content with an apology.

The administration of the archbishopric of Cologne was assumed by the bishop of Speyer, Johannes von Geissel (1796–1864).[19] Geissel energetically used the freedoms granted to the Church and integrated the impulses generated by the Catholic movement into his hierarchical concept. By way of Viale-Prela he maintained close contact with Rome, but always safeguarded his own autonomy. The unnecessarily harsh exclusion of the last remaining Hermesians was Geissel's first measure to achieve internal uniformity; he regarded it as necessary for the struggle with opposing forces, for the organizational expansion of the Church, and for the activation of its remaining reserves. Soon he began the creation of Catholic clubs which reached beyond the borders of his diocese; the founding of the Borromäus Association in 1844 was a promising beginning.[20] Geissel also established contact with many other German bishops, preparing the ground for common action by the episcopate, first tested in 1848. Even before the revolution he achieved concerted action on the part of his bishops in a way which the government had not permitted before 1840. He was supported by Wilhelm Arnoldi (1798–1864), whose appointment as bishop of Trier in 1842 was also possible only as a result of the change in Prussia's religious policy.[21] In 1844 he organized a pilgrimage to the Holy Coat; with more than a million pilgrims it was a powerful proof of the revival of Catholicism, even though it was attacked by many Protestants and liberals as a challenge to the spirit of the century. It was the overt reason for the splitting-off of German Catholicism,[22] which as a national and superficially rationalistic countermovement against the ecclesiastical rejuvenation in eastern and central Germany achieved initial successes. The short-lived movement, supported by liberal and democratic publicists, used essentially nonecclesiastical arguments incapable of supporting a separate Church; it was eventually absorbed partially by Protestantism, partially by folkish groups. The sensible defense against German Catholic attacks was guided by Melchior von Diepenbrock (1789–1853), a student of Sailer, who became prince-bishop of Breslau in 1845 after having overcome strong reservations on the part of conservative clerics.[23] In contrast to the belligerent and defensive activism of

---

[16] E. Schaper, *Die geistespolitischen Voraussetzungen der Kirchenpolitik Friedrich Wilhelms IV.* (Stuttgart 1938); W. Bussmann, "Spiegel der Geschichte," *Festschrift für Max Braubach* (Münster 1964); K. Borries in *NDB* 5, 563–66. On the church policy of the King, see also his correspondence with Bunsen; E. Friedberg, *Die Grundlagen der preussischen Kirchenpolitik unter König Friedrich Wilhelm IV.* (Leipzig 1882); Lill, op. cit.

[17] Michele Viale-Prelà (1798–1860), nuncio in Munich (1838–45) and Vienna (1845–55, after 1852 cardinal and pronuncio), after 1855 archbishop of Bologna. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan* I, 39, 71, 117; Hacker, *Bayern und der Heilige Stuhl,* 109–13, 115–29.

[18] V. Conzemius, *Die Briefe Aulikes an Döllinger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der "Katholischen Abteilung" im preussischen Kultusministerium* (Rome–Freiburg–Vienna 1968).

[19] *Schriften und Reden Geissels,* 4 vols., ed. by K. Th. Dumont (Cologne 1869/76); biographies by J. A. F. Baudri (Cologne 1881) and O. Pfülf (2 vols., Freiburg 1895/96); Schnabel *G* IV, 75–80, 153ff., 197f.; R. Haas in *NDB* 6, 157f.; R. Lill, *Rheinische Lebensbilder* 3 (Düsseldorf 1968).

---

[20] The aim of the association was to deepen Catholic sentiments through the distribution of good books and to provide an alternative to the liberal works widely available in the Rhineland. The founders, Franz X. Dieringer (professor of dogma at Bonn and adviser to Geissel), Baron Max von Loë, and August Reichensperger came from the social class which continued to provide the leaders of the association movement (clergy, nobility, middle class intellectuals). W. Spael, *Das Buch im Geisteskampf. 100 Jahre Borromäus-Verein* (Bonn 1950).

[21] Biography by J. Kraft (Trier 1862, 1865); A. Thomas in *NDB* 1, 390f.

[22] The leaders of the movement were Johannes Ronge (1813–87) and Johann Czerski (1813–93). K. Algermissen, *Konfessionskunde* (Hanover 1930), 181–221; K. Algermissen in *LThK* III, 279; H. J. Christiani, *J. Ronges Werdegang bis zu seiner Exkommunikation* (Breslau 1924).

[23] Biographies by H. Förster (Breslau 1878) and J. H. Reinkens (Leipzig 1881); H. Finke in *Westfälische Zeitschrift* 55 (1897); J. Jungnitz, *Die Beziehungen des Kardinals M. von Diepenbrock zu König Friedrich Wilhelm IV.* (Breslau 1903); F. Vigener, *Drei Gestalten*

Geissel, Diepenbrock adhered to the conciliatory principles and broad ecclesiastical concept of his mentor and thereby gained the full confidence of Frederick William IV. In a period of ultramontane hardening, he preserved a decided awareness of episcopal autonomy.

The development in Bavaria at first proceeded totally within the course mapped out by Ludwig I.[24] The revolution was followed by a more conservative policy. The King knew how to combine adherence to an established Church with strictly conservative ecclesiastical rejuvenation. As he strongly supported the Church, the Curia was willing to make concessions to his regalism, for example in the dispute over mixed marriages in which Gregory XVI initially attempted to have canon norms accepted.[25] Pressured by the King and his government, the Holy See gave in with respect to this problem which was of such great importance to Catholic rejuvenation. An instruction to the Bavarian bishops[26] of 12 September 1834 contained the same concessions which Pius VIII had granted the Prussians. Ludwig, in contrast to the government in Berlin familiar with the limits of Roman willingness to compromise, was satisfied.

The men led by Ringseis, Görres, and Döllinger reached their greatest effectiveness during the thirties; among the younger associates there were George Phillips, the lawyer Karl Ernst von Moy de Sons (1799–1867), and the theologian Friedrich Windischmann (1811–61). Phillips influenced Carl August von Abel (1788–1859), secretary of the interior after 1837. Abel continued the Catholic state traditions of Bavaria and followed an extremely conservative, and at the same time militantly Catholic policy; conversions were favored, and new creations of Protestant communities were hindered.

Abel's appointment was symptomatic for the reaction of Ludwig I to the religious events in Prussia. Especially during the Cologne disturbances, the King believed that he had to act as *defensor ecclesiae*[27]; it was due to him and Abel that Bavaria presented the Catholic point of view.

---

aus dem modernen Katholizismus (Munich 1926); J. H. Beckmann, *Westfälische Lebensbilder* 1 (Münster 1930); J. H. Beckmann in *HJ* 55 (1935); A. Nowack, *Ungedruckte Briefe von und an Kardinal M. von Diepenbrock* (Breslau 1931); *M. Kardinal von Diepenbrock, Gedenkschrift,* ed. by E. Bröker (Bocholt 1953); J. Glossner-Gitschner in *NDB* 3, 651f.

[24] See above, p. 222.

[25] Brief *Summo iugiter studio* (27 May 1832). Text in Bernasconi I, 140ff.

[26] Text in Bernasconi I, 459ff.

[27] With the historical concept of his office, the King liked to refer to the Catholic Counter-Reformation traditions of the House of Wittelsbach. Hacker, op. cit., 106. On the reaction of the King to the Cologne events, see also J. Grisar, "Bayern und Preussen zur Zeit der Kölner Wirren" (typed dissertation, Munich 1923).

The Cologne events and Ludwig's partisanship had the effect in Bavaria of aiding the growth of the Catholic movement and especially of strengthening its intransigent wing. In the heat of the dispute, Sailer's conciliatory legacy receded into the background. A short period of particularly close ties between Rome and Munich began; Ludwig's mediation role in the Cologne dispute has already been mentioned; following the Prussian example, he also in 1841 permitted the bishops of his state and the Curia to correspond freely.

In the appointment of bishops, Ludwig generally steered a middle course, but the nomination of the young Count of Reisach[28] as bishop of Eichstätt in 1836 meant a strengthening of the militant forces. Reisach, personally close to Gregory XVI, was the first real curialist among the German bishops of the nineteenth century. While most of his fellow bishops wanted to retain a modest degree of autonomy even during the height of ultramontanism, Reisach was eager to adjust all ecclesiastical structures and forms to the Roman standards and examples.

While the King tried to follow a moderate course once the situation had become calm again, the Catholic leaders retained their militancy. Their intransigence, often protected by Abel, increased,[29] they turned against Ludwig's established Church, endangered the internal peace of the state, and provided the strong liberal attacks on the ministry with nourishment. Reisach, archbishop of Munich after 1846, and Windischmann, whom he appointed to be his vicar general, were mainly responsible for the hardening of the fronts. The consequence was a gradual alientation between the Catholic movement and the King, who remembered his earlier dislike of ecclesiastical excesses and once again exercised his prerogatives over the Church. Abel's influence decreased, and in 1846 he was forced to resign from the ministry. A few months later the crisis erupted openly in conjunction with the Lola Montez scandal. After Abel's critical memorandum concerning the attempt to give the King's lover citizenship became public, he and his colleagues were replaced by a liberal cabinet and leading Catholic civil servants and professors lost their positions.

---

[28] Karl August Count von Reisach (1800–69), after studies at the Germanicum appointed as teacher in 1830 at the Roman College of the Propaganda Congreation, bishop of Eichstätt in 1836, coadjutor in 1841, archbishop of Munich-Freising in 1846, and Curia cardinal in 1855 after disputes with King Maximilian II (see chapter 29). He negotiated the Convention between the Holy See and Württemberg and Baden and became a member of all important congregations. After 1865 he was also a member of the executive committee in charge of preparations for Vatican I, after 1867 also president of the council commission concerned with Church policy. H. Rall in *LThK* VIII, 1151f.

[29] The objections by Baader and Diepenbrock against this intransigence caused by the continuing violent anti-Catholicism of many Protestants and the Southwest German system of an established church signal the internal Catholic disagreements of the 1850s and 1860s. Although Döllinger warned against unnecessary excesses in the crisis of 1847, he nevertheless was a militant. In many articles in the *Historisch-Politische Blätter* and especially through his *History of the Reformation* (3 vols, Regensburg 1846/48), directed against Ranke, he participated in the battle against Protestantism.

In southwest Germany, the rigorously applied laws imposed on the Church in 1830[30] precluded any free development of ecclesiastical life. The bishops essentially were confined to the ordination of priests, diocesan coordination was impossible, and the bishop became alientated from his clergy because of his dependence on the state's authority. As in neighboring Switzerland, internal tensions complicated the situation. The rejuvenation of the Church gained ground only slowly; many clerics saw in Josephinist ties to the state a better guarantee for effective religious work than in closer ties to Rome; a considerable portion of the clergy derived radical consequences from Wessenberg's reforms and demanded far-reaching democratization; and frequently there was solidarity with parallel political movements.

The first two archbishops of Freiburg, Bernhard Boll (1756–1836)[31] and Ignaz Anton Demeter (1773–1842),[32] attempted to obtain concessions from the state through conciliation and continuation of Wessenberg's liturgical reforms. Demeter opposed the synodal movement; he obtained the establishment of a state school of theology and the appointment of two eminent theologians, the catechist Hirscher and the dogmatist Staudenmaier, at the University of Freiburg. Archbishop Hermann von Vicari, after the revolution an outspoken champion of freedom of the Church,[33] during the first years of his long episcopate (1842–68) also had to make many concessions, but under the impact of the Cologne disturbances he was at least able to have the canon law on mixed marriages recognized. Josph Vitus Burg (1786–1833)[34] and Johann Baptist von Keller (1774–1845),[35] the first bishops of Mainz and Rottenburg, were convinced Josephinists and partisans of the government. Keller's weak efforts at a reconciliation among the different factions of his bishopric were in vain, and the movement of revival, with its spiritual center in the Tübingen School, he never understood. Only under pressure from Rome and the Catholic public did he become active in the cause of greater ecclesiastical autonomy; but an appeal which he directed to the provincial diet for this purpose was rejected in 1841.

---

[30] See above, p. 139.

[31] P. P. Albert in *FreibDiözArch* 56 (1928); J. Klein in *FreibDiözArch* 61 (1933); W. Müller in *LThK* II, 570.

[32] W. Reinhard-H. Bastgen in *FreibDiözArch* 56 (1928); H. Schiel in *FreibDiözArch* 57 (1929); H. Baier in *FreibDiözArch* 61 (1933); W. Müller in *NDB* 3, 591; *LThK* III, 214f.

[33] Vicari (1773–1868) was named spiritual councillor in 1802, official in Constance in 1816, and as the only member of that curia was called as cathedral canon to Freiburg, where he became suffragan bishop in 1832. Inadequate biographies exist by L. von Kübel (Freiburg 1869), H. Hansjakob (Würzburg 1873), and R. Aichele (Stuttgart 1932). A. Rösch in *FreibDiözArch* 55 (1927); H. Bastgen in *FreibDiözArch* 56 (1928), 57 (1930); W. Müller in *LThK* X, 764f.

The more important attempts to free the Church from supervision by the police state in southwest Germany were made by laymen. The process was accompanied by the first stirrings of a Catholic party. In Baden, Heinrich Bernhard von Andlaw-Birseck (1802–71)[36] and Franz Josef Buss (1803–78, after 1836 professor of law in Freiburg)[37] were active. Andlaw was in favor of a strictly conservative course, Buss attempted a synthesis of conservative and liberal forces. Buss independently continued to develop the doctrine of a corporative state, and more strongly than the Viennese political romanticists he emphasized individual responsibility. He was the first to designate the solution of social problems, in addition to achieving freedom for the Church, as the chief task of German Catholics. In Württemberg, the Catholic nobility of Upper Swabia, with the Hereditary Count Konstantin von Waldburg-Zeil and Baron von Hornstein in the forefront, led the mostly conservatively motivated opposition to the established Church.[38]

After 1830, Metternich championed an alliance with the Church more strongly than before. He was doubtless motivated more by political sentiments than by religious conviction.[39] He had become completely convinced that the universal authoritarian power of the Catholic Church and the supra-national monarchy of the Habsburgs had to take a common stand against revolutionary forces. He was also interested in a recovery of Austrian prestige in the Catholic world, obscured by Josephinism and its repercussions on Austria's international and German positions.[40] It was easy for the chancellor to confirm Gregory XVI in his reactionary principles. The military aid given the Papal States in 1830–31 enhanced the solidarity. It was more difficult to make the concessions desired by the Pope and recognized as necessary by Metternich. The concessions were opposed by the liberal civil service, which continued to see in Josephinism the best guarantee for the monarchy. But the chancellor gained considerable ground domestically under the reign of the incompetent Emperor Ferdinand (1835–48).[41] Besides, the ecclesiastical policy testament of Francis II, in whose formulation Metternich had had a hand, formally empowered him to revise Josephinist legislation.[42] Metternich therefore strove for a cautious coordination of the two powers; the contradictions between the laws of the state and the Church were to be removed through joint agreement, and the demands of both sides were to be carefully separated.[43] Carl Ernst Jarcke[44] and the titular Abbot Joseph Otmar von Rauscher (1797–1875) aided him; Rauscher[45] came from a family of civil servants with strong ties to the state and had received his intellectual impulses from Hofbauer. Viale-Prela, nuncio in Vienna after 1845, also was in close agreement with Metternich. The efforts of Metternich and his associates helped prepare the concordat of 1855, but prior to 1848 success was denied to them; their proposals died in committees.

---

[34] L. Lenhart in *Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz* 2 (1947); L. Lenhart in *LThK* X, 786; A. Ph. Brück in *NDB* 3, 43.

[35] Hagen *R* I.

[36] Biography by F. Dor (Freiburg 1910); M. Wellner in *NDB* 1, 272.

[37] Biography by F. Dor (Freiburg 1910); J. Dorneich, *Der badische Politiker F. J. Buss* (Dissertation, Freiburg 1921); R. Lange, *F. J. Ritter von Buss und die soziale Frage seiner Zeit* (Freiburg 1955); J. Dorneich in *NDB* 3, 72f.

[38] Waldburg-Zeil to an increasing degree used liberal arguments and became a liberal in 1848.

[39] See above, pp. 141 and 219f.

But partial results were achieved, as for instance in the problem of mixed marriages. Under the impact of the Cologne disturbances, the problem grew into a serious one for Austria. As the most important prerequisite for a normalization of relations, the Curia demanded the removal of the Josephinist marriage laws which contravened the Tridentine marriage laws. In opposition to Kolowrat, Metternich insisted on bilateral talks as suggested by Rome in 1839. The result of the negotiations[46] in 1841 corresponded to the principles of the chancellor, who insisted on retaining religious toleration and freedom of conscience as long as they coincided with his concepts of the state. For Hungary, the validity of a mixed marriage performed by a non-Catholic pastor was expressly recognized. For the other parts of the monarchy, the validity of mixed marriages without a commitment to raise children as Catholics was made dependent on the passive assistance of the Catholic priest, but could not be denied by the clergy.

---

[40] Presentation by Metternich at the State Conference on 13 June 1841 in Hussarek, op. cit., 688ff.; Weinzierl-Fischer, op. cit., 24.

[41] Metternich's violent opposition to Minister Count Kolowrat, who together with him was a member of the State Conference governing for Emperor Ferdinand, also extended to Church policy. Kolowrat was a convinced Josephinist. Srbik, op. cit., 8f., 42ff. Liberal resistance against Vienna's reactionary Church policy was fueled by the brutal and unwise expulsion of the "inclinants" of the Zillertal, ordered by the government in 1837 in the interest of the religious conformity of Tyrol. The expulsion was compatible with the Federal Act, Article 16, because the "inclinants" belonged to none of the recognized religions.

[42] Text in Weinzierl-Fischer, op. cit., 18.

[43] Among other things, Metternich was interested in easing the restrictions on the correspondence between bishops and Pope, permitted only by way of the State Conference, the restoration of the connection between Austrian superiors of orders and their Roman generals, and the renewed permission of theological studies at the Collegium Germanicum.

[44] See above, p. 334.

[45] On Rauscher, in addition to the biography by Wolfsgruber, see M. Hussarek in *AÖG* 109 (1922), 112 (1933); E. Weinzierl-Fischer, *Grosse Österreicher* XI (1957).

In Switzerland, the July Revolution put an end to the predominance of conservative principles of state, and in twelve cantons liberal democratic constitutions were introduced. In the process of change, many Catholics also expressed desires for reform along Josephinist-Wessenberg lines and found support among the liberals. The seven cantons which in 1832 had united for a liberal change of the federal constitution, in 1834 at the Baden conferences also formulated a joint program of religious policy. They demanded the sovereignty of the state over the Church to the same degree as achieved in southwest Germany,[47] including permission for all ecclesiastical decrees; state supervision of synods, positions, and legal and educational systems of the Church; and the oath of clerics. They also wanted a nationally influenced uniformity and autonomy of the Church, in particular the creation of a Swiss Church province with Basel as archbishopric, and the expansion of episcopal prerogatives vis-à-vis Pope and nunciature. Monasteries were to lose their exemption and were to pay taxes for social purposes.

The Articles of Baden lastingly aggravated the differences among Catholics as well as between Catholics and liberals. They were condemned by Pope and episcopate alike,[48] and a large majority of the Catholic population voted against them. In consequence, the radical-liberal forces grew more hostile to Catholicism, and the initially political opposition between liberal and conservative estates shifted to the religious area. Liberal Catholics, who in the cantons of Aargau, Saint Gallen, and Solothurn had won great political influence, attempted to impose their program on the majority, The most excessive action was taken by the canton of Aargau, which in 1841 in violation of the constitution dissolved all monasteries.[49] The general anger of the Catholics, not pacified by the restoration of a few convents, brought about the fall of the liberals in the neighboring canton of Lucerne. The new Catholic administration recalled the Jesuits, thereby arousing the ire not only of the radicals but of all Swiss Protestants.[50] Both sides were increasingly dominated by militants. When in 1844 the radicals organized irregular troops for the purpose of toppling the Lucerne government and favored a far-reaching revision of the federal constitution in order to make it centralistic and liberal, the Catholic cantons[51] formed a defensive alliance, seeing in the undiminished maintenance of their sovereignty the irreducible prerequisite for freedom of the Church. They refused the demand of the Diet to disband their league (1846/47). The Diet consequently resolved to use military force. In the short war of the Separatist League, the last religious war in central Europe, the Catholics were defeated.[52]

---

[46] Brief of Gregory XVI of 30 April 1841; Instructions of the cardinal secretary of state, 30 April, and 22 May 1841. Texts in Bernasconi III 122ff., 125f., 132ff. See also O. Weinberger in *Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht* 5 (1925).

[47] See above, pp. 339 and 137ff.

[48] Encyclical of Gregory XVI, 17 May 1835. Text in Bernasconi II, 32–36.

The liberal majority of the Diet was now in a position to pursue its program. The Protestant victory was cheered lustily by the liberals in all of Europe and stimulated the development of events in 1848. In several cantons monasteries were dissolved, several of the defeated cantons received liberal governments in favor of established Churches, and the federal constitution of 1848 contained the discriminating prohibition of the Jesuits. The Swiss Catholics were forced into a ghetto to which they adjusted spiritually and socially. The connection with Rome was intensified, the greatest possible internal cohesion was attempted, and all areas of life were dominated by the Church. Encounters with new ideas were avoided, and participation in public life was reduced to the absolutely essential. Catholic principles and interests were equated with those of the ultramontane and conservative movements.

---

[49] Among them the famous abbeys of Muri (OSB) and Wettingen (OCist), which found new homes in Austria (Bozen/Gries and Bregenz/Mehrerau).

[50] The old anti-Catholic resentments of Reformed Switzerland had increased with the renewed strength of Catholicism and especially with the spectacular conversions of the Bern political scientist von Haller (see above, pp. 220 and 226) and of Friedrich Hurter (1787–1863) from Schaffhausen.

[51] Freiburg, Lucerne, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Uri, Wallis, and Zug.

[52] In vain Metternich tried to obtain the intervention of the European powers in favor of the Catholic cantons and thus in favor of the system of 1815. See E. Streiff, *Die Einflussnahme der europäischen Mächte auf die Entwicklungskämpfe in der Schweiz 1839–45* (Zurich 1931), and Näf, op. cit., passim and Srbik, op. cit., 160–74.

CHAPTER 21

Great Britain and Ireland, 1830–1848

English Catholicism survived punitive legislation as a small community, dominated by a lay aristocracy. Even before the Emancipation Act of 1829, however, forces were at work which were to change its nature. Influenced by romanticism, there were a number of famous conversions, among them those of Kenelm Digby (1823), Ambrose Philips de Lisle (1825), George Spencer (1829), and Augustus Welby Pugin (1834), the neo-Gothic architect. Actually, these converts fit badly into traditional Catholicism, which continued to be suspicious of religious enthusiasm and only slowly emerged from its tradition of isolation from public life.

The converts, finding their way to the Catholic Church via romanticism, raised hopes of mass conversions, but their influence was much smaller than that of the Oxford Movement. The Oxford Movement arose from a dissatisfaction within the Church of England, a dissatisfaction which turned more toward contemporary Rome than to the Church of the Middle Ages. There was general agreement on the need for reform of the Anglican Church, but it was not quite so clear from where the spiritual strength for reform was to come, considering that the Church in many of its aspects was controlled by Parliament. After 1829, Parliament was open to men of all Christian denominations. A crisis erupted in 1833, when Parliament dissolved a number of Protestant bishoprics in Ireland. While it could not be denied that these sees were not needed by Irish Protestants, the action of Parliament raised the general question of parliamentary control, and the possibility of disestablishmentarianism was discussed. A number of prominent people at Oxford concluded that the danger of submitting the Church to the state according to the theory of Erastus could be avoided effectively only if the Church reformed itself.

The leaders of this group were clerics belonging to the established Church. Some of them, like Keble and Pusey, remained loyal to it, but others, especially the representatives of the younger generation like Ward and Faber, converted to Catholicism. The most famous of these converts was John Henry Newman (1801–90). Although in no way an official leader of the movement, he became its spiritual and intellectual focus because of his character and his intellectual capacity.

Newman's all-encompassing sense of religion and responsibility for human beings, as well as his life-long concern with Scripture and Church Fathers, can be traced back to a spiritual crisis during his early years in 1826. In 1817 he entered Trinity College at Oxford and became a Fellow of Oriel in 1822, even though he did not achieve honors. He was ordained in 1825 and in 1828 was appointed vicar of the university church of Saint Mary's. It was during these years that he began to develop his ideas of the Church: the Church as connecting link between man and Christ, based on the teachings resting on its tradition, its Sacraments, and the apostolic succession of its hierarchy. When the crisis came in 1833, he already had gained considerable influence in the religious circles of Oxford.

The protest began in July with Keble's sermon, "The National Apostasy." It was continued in the writings known as *Tracts for the Times,* as a result of which the Anglo-Catholics gained a powerful position within the established Church.[1] The group met resistance, even though Newman in the tracts written by him interpreted the Anglican Church as the *via media* between the errors of Protestantism on the one hand and those of Rome on the other. The *via media* opposed both, and instead relied on antiquity, Scripture, and the Fathers. He opposed what constituted in his eyes a constant threat for Anglicanism, namely the "liberalism" which wanted to submit revealed truth to human judgment.[2]

Gradually he was forced to admit that age alone could not be regarded as a source of ecclesiastical authority in modern times. Catholicity, not age, was the sole measuring stick; but Catholicity, he asserted, was only incompletely realized in the Anglican, Roman, and Eastern branches of the Church, and Rome had deformed its Catholicity through accretions to the symbols of the early Church. Tract 90 appeared on 27 February 1841. It asserted that the Anglican 39 Articles were not incompatible with the nature of Catholicism. The tract created a storm of indignation[3] and was condemned by the university and twenty-four bishops. In consequence, Newman retired to Littlemore near Oxford. Later he said that with respect to the Anglican Church he was at that time already on his death bed, even though he was becoming aware of this only gradually.[4] Rome's accretions to the original symbols continued to be for him a real obstacle. There is only one faith, the Anglican in him argued, and Rome failed to preserve it; his reading of the Fathers always made him reject the Roman reply that "there is only one Church, and the Anglicans are not part of it."[5] But by 1843 he was "much more certain that England was schismatic than that the Roman accretions to the confession of faith were not developments springing from a bold and vital articulation of the *depositum fidei.*"[6] After his sermon in September on "The Parting of Friends," he quietly retired to the lay community in order to devote himself to what eventually emerged as his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* Even before it was published, he was received into the Catholic Church on 9 October 1845, by the Italian Passionist Dominicus Barberi.

---

[1] John Henry Newman, *Apologia pro Vita sua,* 76.

[2] See *Tracts* 38, 40, 71; *The Prophetical Office of the Church* (1847); *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* (1838).

[3] Newman, *Apologia,* 88.

[4] Ibid., 147.

[5] Ibid., 106.

Influenced by Newman, a number of his friends took the same step; but hopes for a mass conversion, harbored by many, especially by Nicholas Wiseman, who in 1840 had become coadjutor to Bishop Walsh in the Midland District, were not realized. Wiseman, born in Spain as the son of an Irish father and a Spanish mother, received his education at Ushaw and the English College in Rome, whose dean he became in 1828. His London lectures, held on the occasion of a stay in England in 1835, received great attention not only because of their scholarship, but also because he presented in them something which went beyond the traditional and insular nature of Catholic England. In 1836, financially supported and encouraged by Daniel O'Connell, he founded the *Dublin Review* as the organ for Catholic scholarship.[7] When he returned to England for good in 1840, it was only natural that he placed great hopes in the Oxford Movement. But at this time the most pressing problem for the bishops in England consisted of the growing number of Catholic immigrants from Ireland.

Irishmen had migrated to England in small numbers during the eighteenth century and had settled chiefly in London. The immigration quota rose with British industrialization, especially after the Act of Union in 1800. By 1840, there were four hundred fifty thousand Catholics in England and Wales. About half of them were native Irishmen, and about 80 percent were Irish by birth and extraction. In Scotland, there were about one hundred fifty thousand Catholics, 80 percent of them also of Irish extraction. Many Irish Catholics served in the army and the navy, but most of them worked in heavy industry, in railway construction, in ports and mines, and in steel and textile mills. Most of them were very poor and lived under confined and terrifying conditions in London and the industrial areas of the Midlands, Lancashire, South Wales, and Scotland. They were ill adjusted to English life, which began to develop into a democracy under the impact of the Reform Bill of 1832. The Irish proletariat was viewed with suspicion and fear as the germ cell of political and radical unrest. Catholic England was badly prepared for the spiritual care which they required, but it was precisely the needs of this Irish Catholic proletariat which broke the traditional mold far more than the conversions of Englishmen, no matter how important those might be. Although wealthy English Catholics proved themselves very generous, churches and schools in the industrial centers had to rely largely on the contributions of the poor.[8] As long as England continued to regard education primarily as a task of the Churches, the schools could rely on a certain amount of state subsidies for whose optimal utilization organizations were founded. The rapid numerical increase of the Catholics and the pastoral problems connected with it led in 1840 to an increase in the number of vicars apostolic from four to eight. But the establishment of a diocesan hierarchy was only possible in 1850, given the suspicions by English Catholics of such an organization.

---

[6] Ibid., 208–09.

[7] The title was in recognition of O'Connell's generous financial support, but in reality the journal always remained an English publication.

In Ireland, the emigration to England had contributed only little to the easing of the job situation. Ireland's population had grown from about 5 million people in 1780 to more than 8 million in 1840. But industry was present only in Protestant Ulster. In all other areas, cities and centers were in decay, as English manufactured goods drove out local industrial production. Two-thirds of the population were directly dependent on agriculture and, especially in the west, constituted a large rural proletariat subjected to very uncertain conditions of life.

The Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 was of little significance for the poor. Political power was closely tied to property and that was largely in Protestant hands. The Protestant established Church continued tithing, even though its members everywhere constituted only a minority and in some areas only a very small minority. Daniel O'Connell decided to use his political organization, which he had built for obtaining Catholic emancipation, to achieve the repeal of the Act of Union. He argued convincingly that the clergy should support his new movement as it had supported the old one, because repeal was also a religious problem. His reason was that in return for supporting the union the Catholics had been promised full emancipation but had not been granted it.

Emancipation had been granted in 1829, because political opinion in the United Kingdom was generally convinced of its reasonableness and necessity. There was no such unity with respect to repealing the union, but O'Connell succeeded in building a mighty organization in Ireland. Although some bishops hesitated to support it, most clerics had no difficulty in doing so. It was most strongly supported by the influential bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, James Doyle. When he died in 1834 at the age of forty-eight, his place was taken by John MacHale, who in the same year had been appointed archbishop of Tuam despite the opposition of the government.

---

[8] For an exact description of the problems in a key area of London, see B. Bogan, *The Great Link: A History of St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, 1786–1958* (London 1958).

The government attempted to deal with the Irish discontent through such laws as the Tithe Composition Act and the new Poor Law, both passed in 1838. Neither of these laws was radical enough to be effective. The government also tried to keep the Irish clergy within bounds through pressure on Rome. But here it was in a difficult position; formal diplomatic relations were unacceptable, and the loyalty oath imposed on the Catholics in connection with the Emancipation Act forced them to swear that the Pope had no political authority in the United Kingdom. But the Curia of Gregory XVI feared the risks of revolution and in general was so badly informed about conditions in Ireland that it sharply remonstrated with MacHale.

When the Tories came to power in 1841 with Robert Peel as Prime Minister, they were determined to suppress the repeal movement. By this time, Archbishop Murray of Dublin (1768–1852) was almost the only bishop opposed to the movement. Additional laws were passed: the Charitable Bequests Act of 1844, the Queen's Colleges Act of 1845, and the Maynooth Act of 1845 for the increase of the state's subsidy to this college. Pressure on Rome continued and finally on 15 October 1844 led to a decree[9] in which the priests were requested to keep away from politics. But the phrasing of the decree was cautious and vague and devoid of any judgment concerning the repeal movement and the right of Catholic laymen to support it.

Neither Rome's warnings nor the palliative laws were able to stop the support of the clergy for the repeal movement. In 1846 the organization Young Ireland was created as a challenge to O'Connell's unqualified rejection of physical force. By this time O'Connell's health was debilitated and his death in 1847, together with the great famine of that year, put an end to the problem of repeal.

Despite their poverty, the Irish Catholics built churches, hospitals, and schools. The modest repentance chapels were replaced. For the schools and hospitals, the new orders were of great help: the Presentation Sisters (1782), the Irish Christian Brothers (1802), the Sisters of Charity (1815), the Loreto Sisters (1821), and the Sisters of Mercy (1831). In 1834 the Sisters of Charity opened Saint Vincent Hospital, the first Catholic hospital in Dublin.

---

[9] Cardinal Fransoni to Archbishop Crolly of Armagh, 15 October 1844, printed in Broderick, *The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Union with England,* 232f.

Finances, especially in the field of education, were always inadequate. The first census in 1841 revealed an illiteracy rate of 53 percent, and whatever interpretation one wishes to give this figure, it can not have been far from the truth. The Stanley Act of 1831 created a governmental system of elementary schools by creating a national office for the administration of nondenominational schools and offering guarantees for the faith of the pupils. The Irish Catholics already had enough experience with state subsidies for education, designed to win the children for Protestantism, but the system of 1831 appeared to offer enough guarantees and was generally accepted. With its approval of state supervision it was far ahead of contemporary developments in England. A Roman rescript of 1841 left the regulation of education to each bishop and his diocese. Only the archbishop of Tuam, MacHale, refused to recognize these publicly administered schools. The bishops were in much less agreement on the Queen's Colleges Act of 1845, concerning nondenominational higher education. The problem was eventually solved in 1850 at the Synod of Thurles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. GENERAL HISTORY

World History: O. Westphal, *Weltgeschichte der Neuzeit, 1750–1950* (Stuttgart 1953); F. Valjavec, ed., *Historia Mundi* IX and X (Bern 1961); G. Mann, ed., *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte* VII and VIII (Berlin 1960); D. K. Fieldhouse, *Die Kolonialreiche seit dem 18. Jahrhundert (Fischer-Weltgeschichte* 29*)*, (Frankfurt am Main 1965); G. N. Clark, ed., *The New Cambridge Modern European History* VIII, IX, and X (Cambridge 1960, 1960, 1965).

Europe: B. Croce, *History of Europe in the 19th Century* (New York 1963); W. Mommsen, *Geschichte des Abendlandes von der Französischen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart, 1789–1945* (Munich 1951); H. Herzfeld, *Die moderne Welt, 1789–1945,* 2 vols. (Brunswick 1966); L. Salvatorelli, *Storia del novecento* (Florence 1957); C. Zaghi, *Napoleone e Europa* (Naples 1969); R. R. Palmer, *The Age of Democratic Revolution,* 2 vols. (Princeton 1959–64); M. Beloff, ed., *L'Europe du XIX^e et du XX^e siècle* I (Paris 1959); J. B. Duroselle, *L'Europe de 1815 à nos jours. Vie politique et relations internationales* (*Nouvelle Clio* 38), (Paris 1964); G. A. Craig, *Europe since 1815* (Englewood 1966); G. Lefebvre, *La Révolution Française* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 13), (Paris 1968); G. Lefebvre, *Napoléon* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 14), (Paris 1953); F. Ponteil *L'Éveil des Nationalités et le Mouvement Libéral, 1815–1848* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 15), (Paris 1968); C. H. Pouthas, *Démocraties et Capitalisme, 1848–1860* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 16), (Paris 1948); H. Hauser et al., *Du Libéralisme à L'Impérialisme* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 17), (Paris 1952); E. Weis, *Der Durchbruch des Bürgertums, 1776–1847* (*Propyläengeschichte Europas* 4), (Frankfurt am Main 1978); T. Schieder, *Staatensystem als Vormacht der Welt, 1848–1918 (Propyläengeschichte Europas* 5*)*, (Frankfurt am Main 1977); A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* 8 vols; (Paris 1885–1911). J. L. Godechot, *La grande nation. L'expansion révolutionnaire de la France dans le monde de 1789 à 1799,* 2 vols. (Paris 1956); E. Naujoks, *Die Französische Revolution und Europa* (Stuttgart 1969); L. Bergeron, F. Furet, and R. Koselleck, *Das Zeitalter der europäischen Revolution 1780–1848* (*Fischer-Weltgeschichte* 26), (Frankfurt am Main 1969); L. Salvatorelli, *La rivoluzione europea. 1848–1849* (Milan 1949); P. Robertson, *Revolutions of 1848* (New York 1960); A. J. P. Taylor, *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848–1918* (Oxford 1954); C. Brinton, *A Decade of Revolution, 1789–1799* (New York 1934); G. Bruun, *Europe and the French Imperium, 1799–1814* (New York 1938); F. B. Artz, *Reaction and Revolution, 1814–1832* (New York 1934); W. F. Langer, *Political and Social Upheaval, 1832–1852* (New York 1969); R. C. Binkley, *Realism and Nationalism, 1852–1871* (New York 1935).

France: *Nouvelle histoire de la France,* 1–10. Editions du Seuil (Paris 1972); P. Gaxotte, *La Révolution française.* Nouvelle edition avec Jean Tulard (Paris 1977); M. Vovelle, *Religion et Révolution: La dechristianisation de l'An II* (Paris 1976); P. H. Beik, *The French Revolution Seen from the Right* (New York 1970); J. N. Moody, *French Education since Napoleon* (Syracuse 1978); F. Furet and D. Richet, *The French Revolution* (London 1970);

J. Godechot, *The Counter-Revolution* (New York 1971); G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, *The Restoration* (New York 1967); R. Rémond, *La vie politique en France depuis 1789,* 2 vols. (Paris 1965/69); R. Rémond, *La Droite en France de 1815 à nos jours* (Paris 1963); J. L. Godechot, *Les révolutions, 1770–1799* (Paris 1965); J. L. Godechot, *L'Europe et l'Amérique à l'époque napoléonienne, 1800–1815* (Paris 1967); B. Groethuysen, *Philosophie de la Révolution française* (Paris 1956); I. Kaplow, ed., *New Perspectives on the French Revolution* (New York 1965); A. Gérard, *La Révolution française, mythes et interprétations, 1799–1970* (Paris 1970); J. Chastenet, *Histoire de la Troisième République,* 7 vols. (Paris 1952/63); G. Dupeux, *La Société française, 1789–1960* (Paris 1964); J. L. Godechot, *Les institutions de la France sous la Révolution et l'Empire* (Paris 1968); F. Ponteil, *Les institutions de la France de 1814 à 1870* (Paris 1966); A. Prost, *L'enseignement en France 1800–1967* (Paris 1968); L. Duguit, H. Monnier, R. Bonnard, *Les constitutions et les principales lois politiques de la France depuis 1789* (Paris 1952); *Le Moniteur Universel* (1799/1868) and *Journal officiel* (Paris 1869seqq.) for legislation and parliamentary debates.

Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg: S. Schama, *Patriots and Liberators: Revolution in the Netherlands, 1780–1813* (New York 1977); C. H. E. De Wit, *De Strijd tussen Aristocratie en Democratie in Nederland, 1780–1848* (Heerlen 1965); P. Gerin, S. Vervaeck, J. De Belder, J. Hannes, *Bibliographie de l'histoire de Belgique, 1789–1914,* 3 vols. (Louvain 1960/66); H. Pirenne, *Histoire de Belgique* VI/VII (Brussels 1926/32); J. Van Houtte, ed., *Algemene Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* VIII/XII (Antwerp-Zeist 1955/58); J. Deharveng, ed., *Histoire de la Belgique contemporaine, 1830–1914,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1928/30); T. Luykx, *Politieke geschiedenis van Belgie van 1789 tot heden* (Brussels 1969); A. Simon, *Le parti catholique belge* (Brussels 1958).

Spain and Portugal: M. Artola, *Los origines de la España contemporanea,* 2 vols. (Barcelona 1958); F. G. Bruguera, *Histoire contemporaine d'Espagne. 1789–1950* (Paris 1953); R. Carr, *Spain, 1808–1939* (Oxford 1966); M. Fernández Almagro, *Historia politica de la España contemporánea,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1956/59); H. V. Livermore, *A New History of Portugal* (Cambridge, 1966).

Italy: C. Spellanzon, *Storia del Risorgimento e dell' unità d'Italia,* 5 vols. (Milan 1932/40); W. Maturi, *Interpretazioni del Risorgimento* (Turin 1962); L. Salvatorelli, *Spiriti e figure del Risorgimento* (Florence 1962); D. Mack Smith, *Italy. A Modern History* (Ann Arbor 1959).

German States and Switzerland: B. Gebhardt, H. Grundmann, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* I and II (Stuttgart 1960); L. Just, ed., *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* III (Constance 1956); H. Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany* II and III (New York 1959); E. Marcks, *Der Aufstieg des Reiches, 1807–78,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1936); A. H. Springer, *Geschichte Österreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1863/65); G. Mann, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main 1966); A. Ramm, *Germany, 1789–1919* (London 1967); T. S. Hamerow, *Restoration, Revolution, Reaction. Economics and Politics in Germany, 1815–71* (Princeton 1958); H. Hantsch, *Die Geschichte Österreichs* II (Graz 1962); G. A. Craig, *Germany, 1866–1945* (New York 1978); F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,* 4 vols. (Freiburg 1929/37); V. Valentin, *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution von 1848–49,* 2 vols., (Berlin 1930/31); R. Charmatz, *Österreichs innere Geschichte von 1848 bis 1895,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1918); V. Bibl, *Der Zerfall Österreichs,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1922/24); H. v. Srbik, *Deutsche Einheit,* 4 vols. (Munich 1935/42); E. Fueter, *Die Schweiz seit 1848* (Zurich 1928).

GREAT BRITAIN: G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century and after* (London 1937); E. Halévy, *History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century,* 6 vols. (London 1949/52); L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform, 1815–70 (Oxford History of England),* (Oxford 1962).

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: H. G. Dahms, *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Munich 1953); E. Samhaber, *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika* (Munich 1954); E. Angermann, "Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika," *Historia Mundi* X (1961), 253–331; R. Hofstadter, W. Miller, D. Aaron, W. Jordan, and L. Litwack, *The United States* (Englewood Cliffs 1976); J. A. Garraty, *The American Nation* (New York 1979); J. M. Blum, E. S. Morgan, W. L. Rose, A. M. Schlesinger, Jr., K. M. Stampp, C. Vann Woodward, *The National Experience: A History of the United States* (New York 1973); R. N. Current, T. H. Williams, F. Freidel, *American History: A Survey* (New York 1979); B. Bailyn, D. B. Davis, D. H. Donald, J. L. Thomas, R. H. Wiebe, G. S. Wood, *The Great Republic: A History of the American People* (Lexington, Mass. 1977).

LATIN AMERICA: S. de Madariaga, *The Fall of the Spanish American Empire* (London 1947); H. V. Livermore, ed., *Portugal and Brazil* (Oxford 1953); A. P. Whitaker, "Die iberoamerikanische Welt von 1825–1920," *Historia Mundi* X (1961), 332–57.

II. CHURCH HISTORY

1. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

L. A. Veit, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* II: *1800 bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg i. Br. 1933); L. Rogier, R. Aubert, D. Knowles, *Geschichte der Kirche* IV (Einsiedeln 1966); E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World. A Survey from the French Revolution to the present* (London 1958); K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age. A History of Christianity in the 19th and 20th Centuries,* 5 vols. (New York 1958/62); J. Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung* II (Münster 1964); L. Girard, *Le catholicisme en Europe de 1814 à 1878* (Les Cours de Sorbonne), (Paris 1962); Daniel-Rops, *L'Église des Révolutions,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960/63); H. Hermelink, *Das Christentum in der Menschheitsgeschichte von der Französischen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1951/55); K. D. Schmitt, *Grundriss der Kirchengeschichte* IV: *Geschichte der Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus und des Säkularismus* (Göttingen 1960); K. D. Schmitt, E. Wolf, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch* IV, Lieferung Nl; F. Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum ersten Vatikanischen Konzil* (Göttingen 1963); A. Fliche-V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église* XX, XXI (Paris 1949, 1964); K. Bihlmeyer-H. Tüchle, *Church History,* 3 vols., (New York 1979).

2. PAPACY

J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit,* 4 vols. (Munich 1933/39); F. X. Seppelt, G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste* (Munich 1964); P. Paschini, P. Brezzi, *I papi nella storia* II (Rome 1961); C. Ledré, *Un siècle sous la tiare. De Pie IX à Pie XII* (Paris 1955); G. Mollat, *La Question romaine de Pie VI à Pie XI* (Paris 1932); V. Del Giudice, *La Questione romana* (Rome 1948); C. Berthelet, *Conclavi pontifici e cardinali nel secolo XIX* (Rome 1903); E. De Marchi, *Le Nunziature apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956* (Rome 1957);

Notizie dell'anno (until 1860); *Annuario pontificio* (1861/70, 1912seqq.); *La Gerarchia cattolica* (1872/1911).

3. The Catholic Church in Individual Countries

Germany: H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Mainz 1902/03); G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse. Le Catholicisme,* 4 vols. (Paris 1905/09); F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19, Jahrhundert* IV: *Die religiösen Kräfte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1937); P. Funk, *Von der Aufklärung zur Romantik* (Munich 1925); F. Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche von 1648 bis 1870* (Göttingen 1963); H. Schrörs, *Die Kölner Wirren. Studien zu ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin–Bonn 1927); H. Bastgen, *Die Verhandlungen zwischen dem Berliner Hof und dem Heiligen Stuhl über die konfessionell gemischten Ehen* (Paderborn 1936); H. Bastgen, *Die Besetzung der Bischofssitze in Preussen in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 2 parts (Paderborn 1941); R. Lill, *Die Beilegung der Kölner Wirren* (Düsseldorf 1962); J.-B. Kissling, *Geschichte der deutschen Katholikentage,* 3 vols. (Münster 1920/21); R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1964); A. K. Huber, *Kirche und deutsche Einheit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Königstein 1966); K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1963); K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* I (Cologne 1927, reprint Aalen 1967); F. Hanus, *Die preussische Vatikangesandtschaft, 1747–1920* (Munich 1954); G. Franz-Willing, *Die bayerische Vatikangesandtschaft, 1803–1934* (Munich 1965); F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* I (Graz– Vienna– Cologne 1958); R. Hacker, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Bayern und dem Heiligen Stuhl in der Regierungszeit Ludwigs I.* (Tübingen 1967); H. Schiel, *Johann Michael Sailer,* 2 vols. (Regensburg 1948/52); W. Schellberg, *Johann Görres* (Cologne 1926); J. Janssen, *Friedrich Leopold Graf zu Stolberg* (Freiburg i. Br. 1877); E. Hosp, *Hofbauer* (Vienna 1951); R. Till, *Hofbauer und sein Kreis* (Vienna 1951); O. Pfülf, *Kardinal Johannes von Geissel,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1895/96); L. Lenhart, *Bischof Ketteler,* 3 vols. (Mainz 1966/68); L. v. Pastor, *August Reichensperger,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1899); F. Schmidt, *Peter Reichensperger* (Mönchengladbach 1913); S. J. Schäffer, J. Dahl, *Adolf Kolping* (Cologne 1961); J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger,* 3 vols. (Munich 1899/1901).

Austria: F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan,* 2 vols. (Graz 1958/60); F. Engel-Janosi, *Die politische Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den österreichischen Kaisern 1804–1918* (Vienna 1964); J. Grisar, *De historia Ecclesiae catholicae austriacae saeculi XIX* (Rome 1936); A. Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918* (Munich 1952); C. Wolfsgruber, *Joseph Otmar von Rauscher* (Vienna 1888); C. Wolfsgruber, *Kardinal Schwarzenberg,* 3 vols. (Vienna 1905/17).

France: A. Latreille, *L'Église catholique et la révolution française,* 2 vols. (Paris 1950); G. Bourgin, "Les sources manuscrites de l'histoire religieuse de la France moderne," *RHEF* 10 (1924), 27–66, 172–206, 333–58, 466–92; J. Gadille, "Les sources privées de l'histoire contemporaine du catholicisme en France," *RH* 238 (1967), 333–46; G. Weill, "Le catholicisme français au XIX^{e} siècle," *Revue de synthèse historique* 15 (1907), 319–56; A. Latreille, J.-R. Palanque, É. Delaruelle, R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III (Paris 1962); W. Gurian, *Die politischen und sozialen Ideen des französischen Katholizismus, 1789–1914* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1929); A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine,* 2 vols. (Paris 1948/51); A. Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870,* 2 vols. (Paris 1891); A. Debidour, *L'Église* *catholique et l'État sous la III^e Republique, 1870–1906,* 2 vols. (Paris 1906); A. Rivet, *Traité du culte catholique et des lois civiles d'ordre religieux* (Paris 1947); J. Brugerette, *Le prêtre français et la société contemporaine,* 3 vols. (Paris 1933/38); F. Boulard, *Essor ou déclin du clergé français* (Paris 1950); L. Baunard, *L'Épiscopat français depuis le Concordat jusqu'à la Séparation* (Paris 1907); L. Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Église de France, 1800–1900* (Paris 1901); L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France,* 6 vols. (Grenoble–Paris 1944/54); P. Nourisson, *Histoire légale des congrégations religieuses en France depuis 1789,* 2 vols. (Paris 1928); G. Le Bras. *Études de sociologie religieuse,* 2 vols. (Paris 1955/56); G Weill, *Histoire de l'idée laïque en France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1929); A. Mellor, *Histoire de l'anticléricalisme français* (Paris 1966); P. Droulers, *Action pastorale et problèmes sociaux sous la Monarchie de Juillet chez Monseigneur d'Astros* (Paris 1954); E. Sevrin, *Un évêque militant et gallican au XIX^e siècle, Monseigneur Clausel de Montals,* 2 vols. (Paris 1955); F. Lagrange, *Vie de Monseigneur Dupanloup,* 3 vols. (Paris 1883/84); also *DHGE* XIV, 1070–1122; A. de Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste,* 2 vols. (Paris 1888); E. Veuillot, *Le comte de Falloux et ses Mémoires* (Paris 1888); C. de Ladoue, *Monseigneur Gerbet, sa vie, ses œuvres,* 3 vols. (Paris 1870); F. Gousset, *Le cardinal Gousset* (Besançon 1903); P. Delatte, *Dom Guéranger, abbé de Solesmes,* 2 vols. (Paris 1909/10); J. Paguelle de Follenay, *Vie du cardinal Guibert,* 2 vols. (Paris 1896); T. Foisset, *Vie du R. P. Lacordaire,* 2 vols. (Paris 1870); L. Baunard, *Le cardinal Lavigerie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1896); X. de Montclos, *Lavigerie, le Saint-Siège et l'Église, 1846–78* (Paris 1965); G. Bazin, *Vie de Monseigneur Maret,* 3 vols. (Paris 1891/92); F. Besson, *Vie de S. É. le cardinal Mathieu,* 2 vols. (Paris 1882); J. Leflon, *Eugène de Mazenod,* 3 vols. (Paris 1896/1902); A. d'Andigné, *Un apôtre de la charité, Armand de Melun* (Paris 1962); E. Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* 3 vols. (Paris 1896/1902); C. Guillemant, *P.-L. Parisis,* 3 vols. (Paris 1916/25); L. Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1893); C.-J. Destombes, *Vie de S.É. le cardinal Régnier,* 2 vols. (Paris 1885); M. de Hédouville, *Monseigneur de Ségur, sa vie, son action* (Paris 1957); F. Poujoulat, *Vie de Monseigneur Sibour* (Paris 1857); M. J. Rouet de Journel, *Une russe catholique. La vie de Madame Swetchine* (Paris 1953); E. and F. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* 4 vols. (Paris 1902/13).

ITALY: *Archiva Ecclesiae* 3/4 (1960/61), 87–179, 223–87; Silvino da Nadro OFMCap, *Sinodi diocesani italiani. Catalogo bibliografico degli atti a stampa, 1574–1878* (Vatican City 1960); A.-C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni* (Turin 1963); P. Scoppola, *Chiesa e Stato nella storia d'Italia. Storia documentaria dall'Unità alla Repubblica* (Bari 1967); P. Scoppola, *Dal Neoguelfismo alla Democrazia cristiana* (Rome 1957); A. Della Torre, *Il cristianesimo in Italia dai filosofisti ai modernisti* (Milan 1912); G. De Rosa, *Storia del movimento cattolico in Italia,* 2 vols. (Bari 1966); *I cattolici italiani dall'800 ad oggi* (Brescia 1964); T. Chiuso, *La Chiesa in Piemonte dal 1797 ai giorni nostri,* 4 vols. (Turin 1888); T. Salvemini, *La statistica ecclesiastica con speciale riguardo al clero in Italia* (Ferrara 1941); G. Spini, *Risorgimento e protestanti* (Naples 1956); C. Castiglioni, *Gaysruck e Romilli, arcivescovi di Milano* (Milan 1938); C. Castiglioni, *Monsignor Nazari di Calabiana* (Milan 1952); E. Federici, *Sisto Riario Sforza* (Rome 1945); G. Russo, *Il cardinale Sisto Riario Sforza e l'unità d'Italia* (Naples 1962); J. E. Borrel, *Vie de Monseigneur Charvaz* (Chambéry 1909); P. Stella, *Don Bosco nella storia della religiosità cattolica,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1968/69); A. Castellani, *Il b. Leonardo Murialdo,* 2 vols. (Rome 1966/68).

SPAIN: J. del Burgo, *Fuentes de la Historia de España. Bibliografia de las guerras carlistas y de las luchas políticas del siglo XIX,* 4 vols. (Pamplona 1954/60); V. de la Fuente, *Historia ecclesiástica de España* VI (Barcelona 1875); P. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* III/2 (Regensburg 1872, reprint Graz 1956); E. A. Peers, *The Church in Spain, 1737–*

1937 (London 1938); E. A. Peers, *Spain, the Church, and the Orders* (London 1939); J. M. Cuenca, *La Iglesia española ante la Revolución liberal* (Madrid 1971); J. Becker, *Relaciones diplomáticas entre España y la Santa Sede durante el siglo XIX* (Madrid 1909); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodojos españoles* VII (Madrid 1932).

BELGIUM: *Sources de l'histoire religieuse de la Belgique. Époque contemporaine. Colloque de Bruxelles 1967* (Louvain 1968); A. Simon, *Réunions des évêques de Belgique. Procès-verbaux, 1830–83,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1960/61); A. Simon, *Instructions aux nonces de Bruxelles, 1835–89* (Brussels 1961); R. Aubert, "Kirche und Staat in Belgien im 19. Jahrhundert," W. Conze, ed., *Beiträge zur deutschen und belgischen Verfassungsgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1967); V. Mallinson, *Power and Politics in Belgian Education, 1815–1961* (London 1963); A. Tihon, *Le clergé et l'enseignement moyen pour garçons dans le diocèse de Malines, 1802–1914* (diss., Louvain 1970); "Prêtres de Belgique, 1838–1930," *NRTh* 57 (1930), 617–744; S. Scholl, ed., *150 jaar katholieke arbeidersbeweging in België, 1789–1939,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1963/66); N. Piepers, *La "Revue générale" de 1865 à 1940* (Louvain 1968).

PORTUGAL: F. de Almeida, *Historia da Igreja em Portugal* IV, 1/4 (Coimbra 1917/23); M. de Oliveira, *Historia eclesiástica de Portugal* (Lisbon 1940).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND: J. H. Whyte, "Historians of XIXth-century English Catholicism," *Clergy Review* 52 (1967), 791–801; G. A. Beck, ed., *The English Catholics, 1850–1950* (London 1950); D. Mathew, *Catholicism in England* (London 1936); P. J. Corish, ed., *A History of Irish Catholicism* IV/V (Dublin 1968seqq.) A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Schottland* (Mainz 1883); P. Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle,* 3 vols. (Paris 1899/1906); O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church,* 2 vols. (London 1966/70); C. Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* 2 vols. (London 1926); W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* 2 vols. (London 1897); W. Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman,* 2 vols. (London 1912); E. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning,* 2 vols. (London 1895).

THE NETHERLANDS: L. J. Rogier, N. De Rooy, *In vrijheid herboren. Katholiek Nederland, 1853–1953* (The Hague 1957); P. Albers, *Geschiedenis van het herstel der hiërarchie in de Nederlanden,* 2 vols. (Nijmegen–The Hague 1903/04); A. Commissaris, *Van toen wij vrij werden, 1795–1903,* 2 vols. (Groningen 1929); J. Witlox, *De Katholieke Staatspartij,* 2 vols. ('s-Hertogenbosch 1919/27); J. A. De Kok, *Nederland op de breuklijn Rome-Reformatie. Numerieke aspecten van protestantisering en katholieke herleving in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 1580–1880* (Assen 1964).

SWITZERLAND: A. Büchi, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz* (Munich 1902); T. Schwegler, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in der Schweiz* (Stans 1945); K. Müller, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz seit dem Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Einsiedeln 1928); F. Strobel, *Die Jesuiten und die Schweiz im 19. Jahrhundert* (Olten 1954).

SCANDINAVIA: A. Palmqvist, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche in Schweden nach 1781,* 2 vols. (Uppsala 1954/58); K. Kjelstrup, *Norvegia catholica, 1843–1943* (Rome 1947); J. Metzler, *Die apostolischen Vikariate des Nordens* (Paderborn 1919).

RUSSIA AND POLAND: A. M. Ammann, *Abriss der Ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); A. Boudou, *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1922/25); E. Winter, *Russland und das Papsttum* II (Berlin 1961); W. Urban, *Ostatni etap dziejów Kościola w Polsce przed nowym tysiącleciem, 1815–1965* (Rome 1966); O. Beiersdorf, *Papietswo wobec sprawy polskiej w latach 1772–1864 wybor źródel* (Wroclaw 1960); J. Wasilewski, *Arcybiskupi i administratorowie archidiecezji Mohylowskiej* (Pinsk 1930); J. A. Malinowski, *Die deutschen katholischen Kolonien am Schwarzen Meere* (Stuttgart 1927); S. Załęski, *Jezuici w Polsce,* V (Cracow 1907); J. Bjelogolovov, *Akten und Dokumente in Bezug auf die Organisation und Verwaltung der römisch-katholischen Kirche in Russland* (St. Petersburg 1905); A. Welykyj, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ukrainiae illustrantia* II (Rome 1954); S. Olszamowska-Skowronska, *La correspondance des papes et des empereurs de Russie (1814–78) selon les documents authentiques* (Rome 1970).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE AND THE NEAR EAST: G. G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente cristiano,* 8 vols. (Karachi 1906/30); E. von Mülinen, *Die lateinische Kirche im Türkischen Reiche* (Berlin 1903); F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1929); A. Schopoff, *Les Réformes et la protection des chrétiens en Turquie, 1673–1904* (Paris 1904); G. Goyau, *Le protectorat de la France sur les chrétiens de l'Empire ottoman* (Paris 1895); J. Friedrich, *Die christlichen Balkanstaaten in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Munich 1916); B. Rupčič, *Entstehung der Franziskanerpfarreien in Bosnien und Herzegowina und ihre Entwicklung bis zum Jahre 1878* (Breslau 1937); I. Simrak, *Graeco-catholica Ecclesia in Jugoslavia* (Zagreb 1931); P. Tocanel, *Storia della Chiesa cattolica in Romania* III: *Il Vicariato apostolico e le missioni dei Frati Minori Conventuali in Moldavia,* 2 vols. (Padua 1960/65); K. Lübeck, *Die katholische Orientmission in ihrer Entwicklung dargestellt* (Cologne 1917); Hilaire de Barenton OFMCap, *La France catholique en Orient durant les trois derniers siècles* (Paris 1912); *Les jésuites en Syrie, 1831–1931* (Paris 1931); A. Posseto, *Il patriarcato latino di Gerusalemme* (Milan 1938); F. de Portu, *Notice sur le diocèse de Smyrne et le vicariat apostolique de l'Asie Mineure* (Smyrna 1908).

UNITED STATES: J. T. Ellis, *A Guide to American Catholic History* (Milwaukee 1959); C. R. Fish, *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives* (Washington 1911); T. McAvoy, "Catholic Archives and Manuscript Collections," *The American Archivist* 24 (1961), 409–14; P. Cadden, *The Historiography of the American Catholic Church, 1785–1943* (Washington 1944); H. J. Browne, "American Catholic History, A Progress Report, Research and Study," *CH* 26 (1957), 372–80; J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* 4 vols. (New York 1886/92); T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Notre Dame 1969); J. T. Ellis, *American Catholicism* (Chicago 1956); L. Hertling, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Berlin 1954); R. F. McNamara, "Etats-Unis," *DHGE* XV, 1109–47; A. Greeley, *The Catholic Experience. An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism* (Garden City 1968); F. Kenneally, *United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives,* 2 vols. (Washington 1966/68); J. T. Ellis, *Documents of American Catholic History* (Milwaukee 1956); D. Shearer, *Pontificia Americana. A Documentary History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1784–1884* (Washington 1933); P. Guilday, *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1910* (Washington 1923); P. Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore* (New York 1932); E. Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant kept the Faith? A Study of Immigration and Catholic Growth in the United States* (New York 1925); J. A. Burns, *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States* (New York 1912); J. A. Burns, J. Kohlbrenner, *A History of Catholic Education in the United States* (New York 1937); D. T. McColgan, *A Century of Charity: the first one hundred Years of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the United States,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1951); P. J. Dignan, *A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Property in the United States, 1784–1932* (Washington 1933); F. McDonald, *The Catholic Church and the Secret Societies in the United States* (New York 1946); R. Corrigan, *Die Propaganda-Kongregation und ihre Tätigkeit in Nord-Amerika*

(Munich 1928); T. Roemer, *The Ludwig-Missionsverein and the Catholic Church in the United States, 1838–1918* (Washington 1933); R. Clarke, *Lives of Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States,* 3 vols. (New York 1888); J. B. Code, *Dictionary of the American Hierarchy* (New York 1940); R. Baudier, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana* (New Orleans 1939); W. Casper, *History of the Catholic Church in Nebraska,* 3 vols. (Milwaukee 1960/66); R. Trisco, *The Holy See and the Nascent Church in the Middle Western United States* (Rome 1962); W. Schoenberg, *A Chronicle of the Catholic Historiography of the Pacific Northwest, 1743–1960* (Spokane 1962); E. V. O'Hara, *Pioneer Catholic History of Oregon* (Portland 1907); C. Blanchard, *History of the Catholic Church in Indiana,* 2 vols. (Logansport 1898); H. H. Heming, *The Catholic Church in Wisconsin* (Milwaukee 1895/98); J. F. Kempker, *History of the Catholic Church in Iowa* (Iowa City 1887); J. H. Lamott, *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (New York 1921); M. J. Hynes, *History of the Diocese of Cleveland* (Cleveland 1953); G. Garraghan, *The Catholic Church in Chicago* (Chicago 1921); G. Paré, *The Catholic Church in Detroit* (Detroit 1951); J. Smith, *The Catholic Church in New York,* 2 vols. (New York 1905); L. J. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia 1909); F. J. Magri, *The Catholic Church in the City and Diocese of Richmond* (Richmond 1906); J. H. Bailey, *A History of the Diocese of Richmond, the Formative Years* (Richmond 1956); J. E. Rothensteiner, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis,* 2 vols. (St. Louis 1928); J. M. Reardon, *The Catholic Church in the Diocese of St. Paul* (St. Paul 1952); F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America* (Boston 1963); V. O'Daniel, *The Dominican Province of St. Joseph* (New York 1942); G. Herbermann, *The Sulpicians in the United States* (New York 1916); A. Gabriel, *The Christian Brothers in the United States* (New York 1948); M. de L. Walsh, *The Sisters of Charity of New York, 1809–1959,* 3 vols. (New York 1960); T. P. McCarty, *Guide to the Catholic Sisterhoods in the United States* (Washington 1964); W. Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (New York 1950); C. Olmstead, *History of Religion in the United States* (New Jersey 1960); S. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven 1972); S. Ahlstrom, *Theology in America: The Major Protestant Voices from Puritanism to Neo-Orthodoxy* (Indianapolis 1976); N. Burr, *A Critical Bibliography of Religion in America* (New Jersey 1961); N. Burr, *Religion in American Life* (New York 1971); L. Loetscher, *American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents,* 2 vols. (New York 1960–63); J. Brauer, *Reinterpretation in American Church History* (Chicago 1968); E. Gaustad, *Historical Atlas of Religion in America* (New York 1962); R. Handy, *A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada* (Oxford 1976); M. Marty, *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America* (New York 1970); A. Stokes, *Church and State in the United States,* 3 vols. (New York 1950); S. Mead, *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America* (New York 1963); E. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America* (New York 1965); W. McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham* (New York 1959); W. Kennedy, *The Shaping of Protestant Education: An Interpretation of the Sunday School and the Development of Protestant Educational Strategy in the United States, 1789–1860* (New York 1966); R. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York 1938); C. Griffin, *Their Brother's Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800–1865* (New Brunswick 1960); D. Riemers, *White Protestantism and the Negro* (New York 1975); R. Michaelson, *Piety in the Public Schools: Trends and Issues in the Relationship Between Religion and the Public School in the United States* (New York 1970); R. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities* (New York 1971); K. Bailey, *Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century* (New York 1964); P. Gaston, *The New South Creed, A Study in Southern Mythology* (New York 1970); G. Lenski, *The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics,* *Economics, and Family Life* (New York 1961); M. Ewens, *The Role of the Nun in Nineteenth-Century America* (University of Minnesota 1971); B. J. Meiring, *Educational Aspects of the Legislation of the Councils of Baltimore, 1829–1884* (diss., University of California 1963); P. Gleason, ed., *Documentary Reports on Early American Catholicism* (New York 1978); A. H. Dorsey, *The Flemmings* (New York 1869); J. England, *The Works of the Right Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston,* 5 vols. (New York 1849); A. M. Greeley, "Catholicism in America: 200 Years and Counting," *The Critic* XXXIV (1976), 14–47, 54–70; H. J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1970* (Huntington 1971); R. F. Hueston, *The Catholic Press and Nativism, 1840–1860* (New York 1976); W. B. Faherty, *Dream by the River. Two Centuries of Saint Louis Catholicism, 1766–1967* (St. Louis 1973); J. P. Gallagher, *A Century of History: the Diocese of Scranton, 1869–1968* (Scranton 1968); R. H. Lord, J. E. Sexton, E. T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston in the various Stages of its Development 1604 to 1943,* 3 vols. (New York 1944); G. J. Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States,* 3 vols. (New York 1938); J. Rippinger, "Some Historical Determinants of American Benedictine Monasticism, 1846–1900," *American Benedictine Review* XXVII (1976), 63–84; T. Radzialowski, "Reflections on the History of the Felicians in America," *Polish-American Studies* XXXII (1975), 19–28; J. M. Daley, *Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years* (Washington 1957); J. T. Ellis, *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington 1946); M. H. Sanfilippo, "Personal Religious Expressions of Roman Catholicism: A Transcendental Critique," *Catholic Historical Review* LXII (1976), 366–87; J. Dolan, *Catholic Revivalism in the United States, 1830–1900* (Notre Dame 1977); J. P. Gaffey, "Patterns of Ecclesiastical Authority: The Problem of the Chicago Succession," *Church History* XLII (1973), 257–70; D. Spalding, "Martin John Spalding's 'Dissertation on the American Civil War,'" *Catholic Historical Review* LII (1966), 66–85; J. R. G. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D., First Archbishop of New York* (New York 1969); T. W. Spalding, *Martin John Spalding: American Churchman* (Washington 1973); T. R. Ryan, *Orestes A. Brownson* (Huntington 1976); R. M. Leliaert, "The Religious Significance of Democracy in the Thought of Orestes A. Brownson," *Review of Politics* XXXVIII (1976), 3–26; P. H. Lemcke, *Life and Work of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin* (London–New York 1940); J. Oetgen, *An American Abbott: Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B., 1809–1887* (Latrobe, Pa. 1976); P. L. Johnson, *Crosier on the Frontier: A Life of John Martin Henni, Archbishop of Milwaukee* (Madison 1959); P. L. Johnson, *Stuffed Saddlebags: The Life of Martin Kundig, Priest, 1805–1879* (Milwaukee 1942); P. Horgan, *Lamy of Santa Fe; His Life and Times* (New York 1975); V. R. Greene, *For God and Country: The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Ethnic Consciousness in America, 1860–1910* (Madison 1975); W. Galush, "The Polish National Catholic Church: A Survey of its Origins, Development and Missions," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* LXXXIII (1972), 131–49; A. Kuzniewski, "The Polish National Catholic Church—The View From People's Poland," *Polish-American Studies* XXXI (1974) 30–34; H. B. Leonard, "Ethnic Conflict and Episcopal Power: The Diocese of Cleveland, 1847–1870," *Catholic Historical Review* LXII (1976), 388–407; D. P. Killen, "Americanism Revisited: John Spalding and *Testem Benevolentiae,*" *Harvard Theological Review* LXVI (1973), 413–54; A. I. Abell, *American Catholicism and Social Action; A Search for Social Justice* (Garden City 1960); T. O. Hanley, ed., *The John Carroll Papers,* 3 vols. (Notre Dame 1976); P. Gleason, "The Main Sheet Anchor: John Carroll and Catholic Higher Education," *Review of Politics* XXXVIII (1976), 576–613; J. W. Sanders, *The Education of an Urban Minority: Catholicism in Chicago, 1833–1965* (New York 1977); V. P. Lannie, "The Emergence of Catholic Education in America," *Notre Dame Journal of Education* III (1973), 297–309.

CANADA: M. Sheehan, *A Current Bibliography of Canadian Church History: Canadian Historical Association Report;* D. de St-Denis OFMCap, *L'Église catholique au Canada. Précis historique et statistique* (Montreal 1956); H. H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto 1956); J. S. Moir, *Church and State in Canada, 1627–1867. Basic documents* (Toronto 1967); L. Pouliot, "Canada," *DHGE* XI, 675–98; A. de Barbézieux OFMCap, *Histoire de la province ecclésiastique d'Ottawa,* 2 vols. (Paris 1925); W. P. Bull, *From MacDonnell to McGuignan. The History of the Growth of the Roman Catholic Church in Upper Canada* (Toronto 1939); A. Morice, *Histoire de l'Église catholique dans l'Ouest canadien* III/IV (Winnipeg 1928); A. A. Johnston, *A History of the Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia* (Antigonish 1963); H. Têtu, *Les évêques de Québec. Notices biographiques* (Québec 1889); Mgr. Tangay, *Répertoire général du clergé canadien* (Montréal 1893); L. E. Hamelin, "Évolution numérique du clergé catholique dans le Québec," *Recherches sociographiques* 2 (1961), 189–243; *Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des évêques de Québec,* 9 vols. (Québec 1887/98); *Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des évêques publiés dans le diocèse de Montréal,* 13 vols. (Montréal 1887/1926); J. Grant, *A History of the Christian Church in Canada,* 3 vols. (Toronto 1966/72); J. Moir, *Church and State in Canada, 1627–1867: Basic Documents* (Toronto 1967); P. Carrington, *The Anglican Church in Canada: A History* (Toronto 1963); W. Reid, *The Church of Scotland in Lower Canada: Its Struggle for Establishment* (Toronto 1936); M. Armstrong, *The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776–1809* (Hartford 1948); E. Norman, *The Conscience of the State in North America* (Cambridge 1968); S. Crysdale, *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethic in Canada* (Toronto 1961); J. Grant, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (London 1967); C. Silcox, *Church Union in Canada: Its Causes and Consequences* (New York 1933); C. Sissons, *Church and State in Canadian Education* (Toronto 1959).

AUSTRALIA: P. F. Moran, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia,* 2 vols. (Sydney 1896); P. O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church in Australia, 1788–1967* (London 1968); P. O'Farrell, ed., *Documents in Australian Catholic History,* 2 vols. (London 1969).

LATIN AMERICA: R. Streit, J. Dindinger, *Bibliotheca Missionum* III (Freiburg i. Br. 1927); J. L. Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America* (Chapel Hill 1966); E. Ryan, *The Church in the South American Republics* (New York 1932); F. B. Pike, ed., *The Conflict between Church and State in Latin America* (New York 1964); J. J. Kennedy, *Catholicism, Nationalism and Democracy in Argentina* (Notre Dame 1958); J. S. Campobassi, *Laicismo y catolicismo en la educación pública argentina* (Buenos Aires 1961); F. López Menéndez, *Compendio de la historia eclesiástica de Bolivia* (La Paz 1965); P. F. da Silveria Camargo, *Historia eclesiástica do Brasil* (Petrópolis 1955); J. Dornas Filho, *O padroado e la Igreja brasileira* (São Paulo 1939); Julio Maria, *A Religião: Livro do Centenario* I (Rio de Janeiro 1900); C. Silva Cotapos, *Historia eclesiástica de Chile* (Santiago de Chile 1925); M. Cruchaga Montt, *De las relaciones entre la Iglesia y el Estado en Chile* (Madrid 1929); J. M. Groot, *Historia eclesiástica y civil de Nueva Granada,* 4 vols. (Bogotá 1889/93); J. P. Restrepo, *La Iglesia y el Estado en Colombia* (London 1885); B. E. Haddox, *Sociedad y religion en Colombia* (Bogotá 1965); J. Maramillo, *El pensiamento colombiano en el siglo XIX* (Bogotá 1964); J. T. Donoso, *La Iglesia ecuatoriana en el siglo XIX,* 2 vols. (Quito 1934/36); M. Cuevas, *Historia de la Iglesia en México,* V (Mexico 1928); J. Bravo Ugarte, *Diocesis y obispos de la Iglesia mexicana, 1519–1939* (Mexico 1941); J. Ramirez Cabañas, *Las relaciones entre México y el Vaticano* (Mexico 1928); G. Decorme, *Historia de la Campañia de Jesús en la República Mexicana durante el siglo XIX,* 2 vols. (Guadalajara 1914/21); R. Vargas Ugarte, *Historia de la Iglesia en el Perú* V (Burgos 1962); A. Watters, *A History of the Church in Vnezuela, 1819–1930* (Chapel

Hill 1933); F. B. Pike, "The Catholic Church in Central America," *RPol* 21 (1959), 83–113.

4. CATHOLIC CHURCHES WITH EASTERN RITES

J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient* (Paris 1962); J. Hajjar, *L'apostolat des missionnaires latins dans le Proche-Orient selon les directives romaines* (Jerusalem 1956); S. Sidarous, *Les patriarcats dans l'Empire ottoman et spécialement en Égypte* (Paris 1907); *Statistica con cenni storici della gerarchia e dei fedeli di rito orientale* (Vatican City 1932); C. de Clercq, *Conciles des Orientaux catholiques,* 2 vols. (Paris 1949/52); *S. Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale. Codificazione canonica orientale. Fonti,* 3rd series, (Rome 1931seqq.); C. Charon (= C. Korolewski), *Histoire des patriarcats melkites* II/III (Rome–Paris 1910/11); A. D'Avril: *ROC* 3 (1898), 1–30, 265–81; T. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum* (Rome 1911); G. Beltrami, *La Chiesa caldea nel secolo dell'unione* (Rome 1933); M. Cramer, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten einst und heute. Eine Orientierung* (Wiesbaden 1959); V. Inglisian, *Hundertfünfzig Jahre Mechitaristen in Wien, 1811–1961* (Vienna 1961); The articles "Maronites," "Nestorienne (Église)," "Roumanie," "Syrienne (Église)," *DThC;* The articles "Alep," "Antioche," "Antonins," "Arménie," "Audo," "Beyrouth," "Constantinople," "Égypte," *DHGE;* E. Likowski, *Dzieje Kosciola unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku,* 2 vols. (Warsaw 1906); A. Korczok, *Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien* (Leipzig 1921); N. Nilles, *Symbolae ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiae in terris Coronae S. Stephani,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1885); I. Radu, *Istoria diocezei romane-unite a Orazü-Mari* (Oradea Mare 1930).

5. MISSION HISTORY

Bibliotheca Missionum, R. Streit, J. Dindinger, eds. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1916seqq.), VIII, XII–XIV, XVII–XXI, XXVII; *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (1622–1866), II (1867–1906), (Rome 1907); S. Delacroix, *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques* III: *Les Missions Contemporaines* (1800–1957), (Paris 1958); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* IV/VI: *The Great Century* (New York 1941); A. Launay, *Histoire Générale de la Société des Missions Étrangères,* 3 vols. (Paris 1894); F. Schwager, *Die katholische Heidenmission der Gegenwart* I–IV (Steyl 1907).

6. ORDERS AND CONGREGATIONS

M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1932/34); M. Escobar, ed., *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose,* 2 vols. (Turin 1951/53); C. Tyck, *Notices historiques sur les congrégations et communautés religieuses et les instituts missionnaires du XIX^{e} siècle* (Louvain 1892); H. C. Wendlandt, *Die weiblichen Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche und ihre Wirksamkeit in Preussen von 1818 bis 1918* (Paderborn 1924); S. Hilpisch, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1929); P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoît* VI/VII (Maredsous 1948/56); P. Weissenberger, *Das benediktinische Mönchtum im 19./20. Jahrhundert* (Beuron 1958); L. F. Lekai, *Geschichte und Wirken der Weissen Mönche. Der Orden der Cisterzienser* (Cologne 1958); N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense,* 3 vols. (Straubing 1949/56); A. Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome 1948); A. Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* VII (Paris 1915); H. Holzapfel, *Manuale historiae Ordinis FF. Minorum* (Freiburg i. Br. 1909); M. de Pobladura, *Historia* *generalis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum capucinorum* III (Rome 1951); R. Villoslada, *Manual de historia de la Compañia de Jesús* (Madrid 1954); P. Albers, *Liber saecularis historiae Societatis Iesu ab anno 1814 ad annum 1914* (Rome 1914); H. Azzolini in *AHSI* 2 (1933), 88–92; J. Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France. Histoire d'un siècle. 1814–1914,* 4 vols. (Paris 1914/22); L. Frias, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en su Asistencia moderna de España,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1923/44); B. Basset, *The English Jesuits* (New York 1968); P. Galletti, *Memorie storiche intorno alla Provincia Romana della Compagnia di Gesù, 1814–1914* (Prato 1914); A. Monti, *La Compagnia di Gesù nel territorio della Provincia torinese* V (Chieri 1920); A. Aldegheri, *Breve storia della Provincia veneta della Compagnia di Gesù, 1814–1914* (Venice 1914); Volpe, *I Gesuiti nel Napoletano, 1804–1914,* 3 vols. (Naples 1914/15); F. Strobel, *Die Jesuiten und die Schweiz* (Olten 1955); G. Decorme, *Historia de la Compañiá de Jesús en la República mejicana durante del siglo XIX* (Guadalajara 1914); T. Hugues, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America* II/IV (New York 1908/14); A. Brou, *Cent ans de missions, 1815–1934. Les jésuites missionnaires au XIX^e^ et XX^e^ siècle* (Paris 1935); E. Hosp, *Die Kongregation des Allerheiligsten Erlösers* (Graz 1924); M. de Meulemeester, *Histoire sommaire de la Congrégation du T. S. Rédempteur* (Louvain 1958); G. Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes,* 9 vols. (Paris 1936/53); K. Zähringer, *Die Schulbrüder* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1962); H. Neufeld, *Die Gesellschaft Mariens* (Munich 1962); P. Coste, G. Goyau, *Les Filles de la Charité* (Paris 1933); J. F. Devaux, *Les Filles de la Sagesse* II (Cholet 1955); L. Ziegler, *Die Armen Schulschwestern von Unserer Lieben Frau* (Munich 1935); A. Hillengass, *Die Gesellschaft vom heiligen Herz Jesu* (Stuttgart 1917).

7. HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^{e} siècle,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1947/52); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg i. Br. 1933); L. Scheffczyk, *Theologie in Aufbruch und Widerstreit. Die deutsche katholische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bremen 1965).

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One

The Catholic Church and the Revolution

Introduction: *The Catholic Church at the End of the Eighteenth Century*

PIUS VI: Pastor XVI/3 (Lit.); V. Gendry, *Pie VI,* 2 vols. (Paris 1907); J. Flory, *Pie VI* (Paris 1942); *DThC* XII, 1653–69; Seppelt-Schwaiger V (Munich 1959), 484–90, 547 (Lit.); I. Rinieri, *Relazioni storiche tra Pio VI e la corte di Napoli negli anni 1776–1799* (Turin 1910); G. Soranzo, *Peregrinus Apostolicus. Lo spirito pubblico e il viaggio di Pio VI a Vienna* (Milan 1937).

ON THE CONCLAVE: E. Pacheco y de Leyva, *El conclave de 1774–1775* (Madrid 1915); J. Gendry: *Revue des questions historiques* 51 (1892), 424–85; F. Masson, *Le cardinal de Bernis* (Paris 1903), 300–18; E. Harder, *Der Einfluss Portugals bei der Wahl Pius' VI.* (Königsberg 1882).

ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PAPAL STATES: C. De Cupis, *Le vicende dell'agricoltura e della pastorizia nell'agro romano* (Rome 1911), 330–47, 367; E. Piscitelli, *La riforma di Pio VI e gli scrittori economici italiani* (Milan 1958); F. Venturi in *RSIt* 71 (1959), 135–42; L. Del Pane, *Lo Stato pontificio e il movimento riformatore del Settecento* (Milan 1959).

1. *The French Revolution and Pius VI*

SOURCES

Overviews, especially with respect to still unpublished sources, are to be found in P. Caron, *Manuel pratique pour l'étude de la Révolution française* (Paris 1947); L. Le Grand, *Les sources de l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution aux Archives Nationales* (Paris 1914); G. Bourgin, *Les sources manuscrites de l'histoire religieuse de la France moderne* (Paris 1929), 97–115; E. Audard, "Histoire religieuse de la Révolution française aux Archives Vaticanes," *RHEF* 4 (1913), 516–45; E. Sevestre, *Étude critique des sources de l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution en Normandie* (Paris 1916).

A. Theiner, *Documents inédits relatifs aux affaires religieuses de la France 1790–1800,* 2 vols. (Paris 1857); J. Guillon, ed., *Collection générale des brefs et instructions du Pape Pie VI relatifs à la Révolution française* (Paris 1798); G. Bourgin, *La France et Rome de 1788 à 1797. Regeste des dépêches du cardinal secretaire d'État* (Paris 1909); de Richemont, ed., *Correspondance secrète de l'abbé de Salamon, chargé d'affaire du Saint-Siège pendant la Révolution* (Paris 1898), complemented in *MAH* 18 (1898), 419–50; A. Barruel, *Collection ecclésiastique,* 14 vols. (Paris 1791–92); S. Viviani, *Témoignage de l'Église de France sur la Constitution civile du clergé,* 16 vols. (Rome 1791–94); J. Maury, *Correspondance dip-*

lomatique et mémoirs inédits, ed. by A. Ricard, 2 vols. (Lille 1891); *Archives parlementaires,* 1st series: 1787–99, 87 vols. (Paris 1867–1968); A. Debidour, ed., *Actes du Directoire exécutif,* 4 vols. (Paris 1910–17); A. Aulard, *La Révolution française et les congrégations* (Paris 1903).

ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE CLERGY IN THE ESTATES-GENERAL AND THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY: The diaries of *Jallet,* ed. by J. J. Brethé (Fontenay-le-Comte 1871), *Thibault* and *Coster,* ed. by A. Houtin (Paris 1916); Durand de Maillane, *Histoire apologétique du Comité ecclésiastique de l'Assemblée nationale* (Paris 1791).

ON THE CONSTITUENT CHURCH: H. Carnot, ed., *Mémoires de Grégoire,* 2 vols. (Paris 1840); The correspondence of *Grégoire* with *Ricci* and *Defraisse,* ed. by M. Vaussard (Florence 1963, Paris 1962), with *Le Coz,* ed. by L. Pingaud (Besançon 1906), and with *Dom Grappin,* ed. by B. Plongeron (Paris 1969); The correspondence of *Le Coz,* ed. by A. Roussel (Paris 1900); *Annales de la Religion* (1795–1803).

LITERATURE

A. Martin and G. Walter, *Catalogue de l'histoire de la Révolution française,* 5 vols. (Paris 1936–43).

GENERAL WORKS: A. Latreille, *L'Église catholique et la Révolution française* I (Paris 1946); K. D. Erdmann, *Volkssouveränität und Kirche* (Cologne 1949); C. Ledré, *L'Église de France sous la Révolution* (Paris 1949); Leflon, 7–158; Hermelink I, 1–95; Daniel-Rops I, 7–116; H. Maier, *Revolution und Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br. 1965); J. Godechot, *Les institutions de la France sous la Révolution et l'Empire* (Paris 1968), 250–70, 421–32, 526–35; A. Gazier, *Étude sur l'histoire religieuse de la Révolution* (Paris 1887); A. Sicard, *Les évêques pendant la Révolution* (Paris 1894); id., *Le clergé de France pendant la Révolution,* 2 vols. (Paris 1912–27); Giobbio, *La Chiesa e lo Stato in Francia durante la Rivoluzione* (Rome 1905); P. de la Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution,* 5 vols. (Paris 1909–23); A. Mathiez, *La Révolution et l'Église* (Paris 1910); J. Lacouture, *La politique religieuse de la Révolution* (Paris 1924); B. Plongeron, *Conscience religieuse en Révolution. Regards sur l'historiographie religieuse de la Révolution française* (Paris 1969).

THE CONDITION OF THE FRENCH CHURCH ON THE EVE OF THE REVOLUTION: A. Sicard, *L'ancien clergé de France* I (Paris 1912); E. Sevestre, *Les idées gallicanes et royalistes du haut-clergé à la fin de l'Ancien Régime* (Paris 1917); id., *L'organisation du clergé paroissial à la veille de la Révolution* (Paris 1911); P. de Vaissière, *Curés de campagne de l'ancienne France* (Paris 1933); C. Gérin in *RQH* 19 (1876), 449–91, 21 (1877), 35–99 (Benedictines, Augustinians, and Dominicans); P. Lecarpentier, *La propriété foncière du clergé sous l'Ancien Régime* (Paris 1902); H. Marion, *La dîme ecclésiastique en France au XVIII^e siècle et sa suppression* (Paris 1912); E. Préclin, *Les jansénistes du XVIII^e siècle et la Constitution civile du clergé* (Paris 1929); J. Delumeau, *Le catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (Paris 1971).

THE CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE CLERGY AND THE CONSTITUENT CHURCH: L. Sciout, *Histoire de la constitution civile du clergé 1790–1801,* 4 vols. (1872–81); A. Mathiez, *Rome et le clergé français sous la Constituante* (Paris 1910); H. Leclercq, *L'Église constitutionnelle 1790–1791* (Paris 1934); J. Haak, *De discussie over de Constitution civile du clergé, 1790* (Groningen 1964); *DThC* III, 1537–1604. There is as yet no comprehensive work on the Constituent Church, but see P. Pisani, *Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel* (Paris 1907). The most notable monographs are: J. Leflon, *N.*

Philibert, évêque constitutionnel des Ardennes (Mézières 1954); H. Lacape, *P. Pontard, évêque constitutionnel de la Dordogne* (Bordeaux 1962); C. Grelier, *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de Nantes* 99 (1960), 177–88 (for the Vendée); A. Sabathès in *BLE* 62 (1961), 245–74 (election of priests in Aude); E. Sevestre, *L'acceptation de la Constitution civile du clergé en Normandie* (Laval 1922); C. Constantin, *L'évêché du département de la Meurthe* (Nancy 1935); R. Reuss, *La constitution civile du clergé et la crise religieuse en Alsace,* 2 vols. (Strasbourg 1922–23); P. Mesple in *Mémoire de l'Académie de Toulouse* 128 (1966), 73–83; M. Chartier: *Revue du Nord* 45 (1963), 307–16; P. Tartat in *AHRF* 22 (1950), 221–46; W. Edington in *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie* 54 (1957–58), 492–501; J. Camelin, *Les Prêtres de la Révolution* (Lyon 1944; for the diocese of Rhône-et-Loire).

REVOLUTIONARY RELIGIONS: A. Aulard, *Le culte de la Raison et de l'Etre suprême* (Paris 1901); A. Mathiez, *Les origines des cultes révolutionnaires* (Paris 1904); id., *La Théophilanthropie et le culte décadaire* (Paris 1904); A. Soboul in *AHRF* 29 (1957), 193–213; M. Dommanget, *Le symbolisme et le prosélytisme révolutionnaire à Beauvais et dans l'Oise* (Beauvais 1932).

THE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF THE DIRECTORY: L. Séché, *Les origines du concordat* I (Paris 1894); E. Sol, *Sous le régime de la séparation* (Paris 1931); V. Pierre, *La déportation ecclésiastique sous le Directoire* (Paris 1896); A. C. Sabatié, *La déportation révolutionnaire du clergé français* (Paris 1916).

RELIGIOUS ORDERS DURING THE REVOLUTION: P. Nourisson, *Histoire légale des congrégations religieuses en France depuis 1789* I (Paris 1928); B. Plongeron, *Les réguliers de Paris devant le serment constitutionnel* (Paris 1964); J. Boussoulade, *Moniales et hospitalières dans la tourmente révolutionnaire* (Paris 1962; for the bishopric of Paris); A. Lestra, *Le P. Coudrin, fondateur de Picpus* I (Lyon 1952); J. Letort in *Cahiers L. Delisle* 15 (1966), 107–31 (for the bishopric of Évreux); C. Schmitt in *Mémoires de l'Académie de Metz,* 5th ser. 10 (1964–65), 21–61; Armel d'Etel, "Les historiens et la question des réguliers," *Éfranc* (1925), 355–79, 601–16, (1926), 57–77.

REGIONAL MONOGRAPHS: Many of them limit themselves to what actually happened and to anecdotes and are written from an outdated point of view. Most noteworthy are: J. Gallerand, *Les cultes sous la Terreur en Loir-et-Cher* (Blois 1929); P. Clémendot, *Le département de la Meurthe à l'époque du Directoire* (Nancy 1966); C. Aimond, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution dans le département de la Meuse* (Paris 1949); J. Annat, *Le clergé du diocèse de Lescar pendant la Révolution* (Paris 1954); P. Bois, *Paysans de l'Ouest* (Paris 1959); E. Bouchez, *Le clergé du pays rémois pendant la Révolution* (Reims 1913); C. Brelot, "Besançon révolutionnaire" in *Cahiers d'Études comtoises* 9 (1966), 33–212; F. Bridoux, *Histoire religieuse du département de Seine-et-Marne pendant la Révolution,* 2 vols. (Paris 1953–55); J. Eich, *Histoire religieuse du département de la Moselle pendant la Révolution* (Metz 1964); id., *Les prêtres mosellans pendant la Révolution,* 2 vols. (Metz 1959–64); M. Giraud, *Essai sur l'histoire religieuse de la Sarthe de 1789 à l'an IV* (La Flêche 1920); J. Hérissay, *La vie catholique à Paris sous la Terreur* (Paris 1952); J. Boussoulade, *L'Église de Paris du 9 thermidor au Concordat* (Paris 1950); C. Ledré, *Le diocèse de Rouen et la législation révolutionnaire de 1793 à 1800* (Paris 1939); J. Nicolas, "Annecy sous la Révolution," *Annesci* 13 (1966), 11–148; J. Peter and C. Poulet, *Histoire religieuse du département du Nord pendant la Révolution,* 2 vols. (Lille 1930); A. Prevost, *Histoire du diocèse de Troyes pendant la Révolution,* 3 vols. (Troyes 1908–09); id., *Répertoire biographique* (Troyes 1914); M. Reinhard, *Le département de la Sarthe sous le régime directorial* (St-Brieuc 1935); de Roux, *Histoire religieuse de la Révolution dans la Vienne* (Paris 1952); E. Sevestre, *La vie religieuse dans les principales villes normandes pendant la Révolution,* 2

vols. (Paris 1945); C. Tilly, *The Vendée* (London 1964), 100–12, 227–62; E. Lavaquery, "L'histoire religieuse de la Révolution dans le cadre diocésain," *RHEF* 20 (1934), 216–30.

BIOGRAPHIES: J. Leflon, *M. Émery* I (Paris 1944; according to Godechot one of the keys to the history of the Church during the revolution); id., *É. A. Bernier* I (Paris 1938); F. Masson, *Le cardinal de Bernis* (Paris 1903), 449–560; J. Sudreau, *Un cardinal diplomate F. J. de Pierre de Bernis* (Paris 1969); C. Ledré, *L'abbé de Salamon* (Paris 1966); E. Lavaquery, *Le cardinal de Boisgelin* II (Paris 1920); L. Mahieu, *Mgr L. Belmas* I (Paris 1934).

NON-CATHOLIC RELIGIONS: B. C. Poland, *French Protestantism and the French Revolution* (Princeton 1957); D. Ligou: *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire du protestantisme français* 103 (1957), 25–52; M. A. Wemyss in *Annales du Midi* 69 (1957), 307–22; Z. Szakowsky, "The Attitude of the French Jacobines toward the Jewish Religion," *Historia judaica* 18 (1956), 107–20.

EFFECTS IN NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES: J. Godechot, *La grande nation* II (Paris 1956), 501–35. The only comprehensive work on the religious problems in Belgium is that by P. Verhaegen, *La Belgique sous la domination française,* 5 vols. (Brussels–Paris 1922–29) especially II, 268–349, III, 203–82. It has the advantage of resting on the sources, but requires revision in view of its systematic hostility toward the revolutionary regime. See also *DHGE* VII, 711–16. Monographs are available in large numbers, but frequently they lack the required scientific discipline. Of note are: J. Plumet, *L'évêché de Tournai pendant la révolution française* (Louvain 1963); and F. Claeys-Bounaert, *Les déclarations et serments imposés par la loi civile aux membres du clergé belge sous le Directoire* (Gembloux 1960), whose questions are obsolete but which exploit a comprehensive and still unpublished documentation. With respect to the oath see also the correspondence of *S. P. Ernst,* published by C. de Clercq (Reference in *DHGE* XV, 812); id., *SE* 8 (1956), 349–78; id., *Taxandria* 27 (Turnhout 1955), 3–35; W. Munier, *Bulletin de la Société d'art et d'histoire du diocèse de Liège* 44 (1964), 51–124. On the sale of church lands: J. Delatte, *La vente de biens nationaux dans le département de Jemappes* (Brussels 1938); id., *La vente des biens du clergé dans le département de l'Ourthe* (Liège 1951); id., *Annales de la Société archéologique de Namur* 40 (1934), 189–339; J. Paquay, *Bulletin de la Société scientifique et littéraire du Limbourg* 42 (1928), 25–52. Also A. Thys, *La persécution religieuse en Belgique sous le Directoire* (Antwerp 1898); F. Prims, "De Kerk van Antwerpen onder het Directoire," *Antwerpiensia* VIII (Antwerp 1935), 231–87; L. Lefebvre, "La crise religieuse dans la region de Bastogne 1794–1814," *Mémorial A. Bertrang* (Arlon 1964), 127–58; A. Verhaegen, *Le cardinal de Franckenberg* (Bruges–Lille 1889), 299–426. C. De Clercq, *SE* 10 (1958), 298–328, 15 (1964), 341–411; id., *SE* 9 (1957), 286–375, 10 (1958), 238–97 (on Bishop Nelis of Antwerp).

RHINELAND: P. Sagnac, *Le Rhin français pendant la Révolution et l'Empire* (Paris 1918); F. C. Dreyfus, *Sociétés et mentalités à Mayence dans la 2^e moitié du XVIII^e siècle* (Paris 1968).

UNITED NETHERLANDS: M. van der Heyden, *De dageraad van de emancipatie der Katholieken* (Nijmegen 1947; basic). Also *Romeinse bescheiden voor de geschiedenis der Rooms-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland,* II: *1754–1795,* edited by P. Polman (The Hague 1963), 467–877; id., *Katholieke Nederland in de 18^e eeuw* (Hilversum 1968), II, 246–86 III, 291–305; P. Noordeloos, *De restitutie der Kerken in de Fransche tijd* (Utrecht 1937); M Spiertz, *Maastricht in het vierde kwart van de 18^e eeuw* (Assen 1964); H. van den Eerenbeemt, *'s-Hertogenbosch in de Bataafse en Franse tijd 1794–1814* (Nijmegen 1955).

SWITZERLAND: E. Chapusat, *La Suisse et la Révolution française* (Geneva 1945); G. Gautherot, *La Révolution française et l'évêché de Bâle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1907); J. R. Suratteau, *Le département du Mont-Terrible sous le régime du Directoire* (Paris 1965) 227–79.

ITALY: A. de Stefano, *Rivoluzione e religione nelle prime esperienze constituzionali italiane* (Milan 1954); M. Vaussard, *Jansénisme et gallicanisme aux origines religieuses du Risorgimento* (Paris 1959); id., "Les jansénistes italiens et la constitution civile du clergé," *RH* 205 (1951), 243–59; id., *Correspondance Sc. de'Ricci H. Grégoire 1796–1807* (Florence 1963); V. Giuntella, *Nuove questioni di storia di Risorgimento* I (Milan 1961), 320–25; id., *RStRis* 42 (1955), 289–96 (inspiring research program); M. Finocchiaro in *Archivio giuridico F. Serafini* 171 (1966), 136–54; A. Aquarone, "Giansenismo italiano e rivoluzione francese prima del triennio giacobino," *RStRis* 49 (1962), 559–624; P. Stella, *Il Giansenismo in Italia. Piemonte* (Zürich 1970); B. Plongeron, "Questions pour l'Aufklärung catholique en Italie," *Il pensiero politico* 3 (1970), 30–58; R. De Felice, *Italia giacobina* (Naples 1965); id., *Giacobini italiani, a cura di D. Cantimori,* 2 vols. (Bari 1956–64).

CISALPINE REPUBLIC: J. Leflon, *Pie VII* (Paris 1958), 360–529; U. Marcelli, *La vendita dei beni nazionali nella Repubblica cisalpina* (Bologna 1967); id., "Polemiche religiose a Bologna nel sec. XVIII," *Atti e Memorie della Dep. di storia patria per la Romagna* n. s. 6 (1954–55), 103–177.

LIGURIAN REPUBLIC: C. Caristia, "La Repubblica ligure e il giansenismo democratico," *Atti dell'Accademia di Torino* 94 (1960), 427–505; Cassiano di Langasco, *Nuove ricerche storiche sul Giansenismo* (Rome 1954), 211–29; A. Coletti, *La chiesa durante la Repubblica ligure* (Genoa 1950).

ON DEMOCRATIC PRIESTS: R. De Felice, "L'evangelismo giacobino e l'abate Cl. Della Valle," *RSIt* 60 (1957), 196–249, 378–410; A. Bersano, *L'abate F. Bonardi e i suoi tempi* (Turin 1957).

THE DIRECTORY AND THE HOLY SEE: P. Gaffarel, *Bonaparte et la République italienne* (Paris 1895); A. Sorel, *Hoche et Bonaparte en 1797* (Paris 1896); A. Dufourcq, *Le régime jacobin en Italie* (Paris 1900); J. du Teil, *Rome, Naples et le Directoire* (Paris 1902); R. Guyot, *Le Directoire et la paix de l'Europe* (Paris 1911); de Richemont: *Correspondant* 188 (1897) 801–49; F. Bouvier, "Bonaparte, Cacault et la papauté," *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 21 (1907), 340–56.

THE TREATY OF TOLENTINO: G. Filippone, *Le relazioni tra lo Stato pontificio et la Francia rivoluzionaria,* 2 vols. (Milan 1961–67); also *RSTI* 16 (1962), 145–49; R. Olaecha in *MCom* 43 (1965), 95–292; L. Pásztor in *AHPont* 1 (1963), 295–383.

ROMAN REPUBLIC: V. Giuntella, *Bibliografia della Repubblica romana* (Rome 1957); id., *ASRomana* 73 (1950), 1–213; id., *La crisi del potere temporara alle fine del Settecento e la parentesi constituzionale del 1798–99* (Bologna 1954); R. De Felice, *La vendita dei beni nazionali nella Repubblica Romana* (Rome 1960); M. Battaglini, "La soppressione dei conventi nella Repubblica Romana giacobina," *Palatino* 9 (1965), 13–23.

THE LAST MONTHS OF PIUS VI: G. Merck, *La captivité et la mort de Pie VI* (London 1814); P. Baldassari, *Histoire de l'enlèvement et de la captivité du pape Pie VI* (Paris–Lyon 1839); T. de la Rive, *L'esilo e la morte di Pio VI* (Rome 1899); C. Poncet, *Pie VI à Valence* (Paris 1868).

2. *Napoleon and Pius VII*

SOURCES

BullRomCont XI–XIII (Rome 1846–47); G. Sala, ed., *Documenti relativi alle contestazioni insorte fra la S. Sede ed il Governo Francese,* 6 vols. (Rome 1833–34); *Correspondance de Napoléon Ier,* 32 vols. (Paris 1958–70); P. Feret, *La France et le St-Siège sous le Ier Empire* (Paris 1911; diplomatic correspondence); Bastgen I, 42–72; E. Consalvi, *Memorie,* ed. by M. Nasalli Rocca, 2 vols. (Rome 1950; also *DHGE* XIII, 521–22; the French translation by J. Crétineau-Joly which appeared in Paris in 1864 is not reliable); B. Pacca, *Memorie,* 3 vols. (Rome 1830; also J. Leflon and C. Perrat in *ChStato* II, 355–81); E. de Lévis-Mirepoix, ed., *Mémoires et papiers de Lebzeltern* (Paris 1949; Austrian ambassador to the Pope); J. Jauffret, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la religion au XIXe siècle,* 3 vols. (Paris, n.d.; very useful for reorganization of the Church in France); E. A. Bernier, *Lettres, Notes diplomatiques, Mémoires inédits,* ed. by J. Leflon (Reims 1938); A. Roussel, ed., *Correspondance de Le Coz, archevêque de Besançon,* 2 vols. (Paris 1900–03); L. Pingaud, ed., *Correspondance de Le Coz et Grégoire 1801–15* (Besançon 1906); J. Puraye, ed., *La correspondance de Mgr Zaepfel* (Bruges-Paris 1951; bishop of Liège); Mgr. de Barral, *Fragments relatifs à l'histoire ecclésiastique du XIXe siècle* (Paris 1814); F. de Lamennais, *Réflexions sur l'état de l'Église de France et sur sa situation actuelle* (Paris 1821; written in 1808); *Annales littéraires et morales,* 4 vols. (Paris 1803–06; viewpoint of former refractory priests); *Journal des curés,* 6 vols. (Paris 1806–11; viewpoint of former Constituent Church members); Lemière d'Argy, *Précis historique du voyage et de la captivité de Pie VII* (Paris 1804); A. de Beauchamp, *Histoire des malheurs et de la captivité de Pie VII* (Paris 1815).

LITERATURE

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS VII UNTIL 1815: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 39–130; Leflon, 159–273; Pouthas, 60–172; Hermelink, I, 95–171; Belvederi, 820–67; *DThC* XII, 1670–83; *ECatt* IX, 1504–08; Rogier, *KG* IV, 183–203; Daniel-Rops I, 117–234; C. Wunderlich, *Der Pontifikat Pius' VII. in der Beurteilung der deutschen Umwelt* (Leipzig 1913); Mollat, 69–99; Salvatorelli, 16–26; A. Latreille, *Napoléon et le Saint-Siège 1801–08. L'ambassade du cardinal Fesch à Rome* (Paris 1935).

CONSALVI: G. A. Angelucci, *Il grande segretario della S. Sede, E. Consalvi* (Rome 1924); M. R. Wichterich, *Sein Schicksal war Napoleon. Leben und Zeit des Kardinals Consalvi* (Heidelberg 1951); L. von Ranke, *Cardinal Consalvi und seine Staatsverwaltung unter dem Pontifikat Pius' VII.* in *Sämtliche Werke* XLI/XLII (Leipzig 1877–78), 3–180; *Nel primo centenario della morte del cardinale Consalvi* (Rome 1925); I. Rinieri in *CivCatt* I (1925), 289–300, 395–402; *DHGE* XIII, 509–23; Colapietra, 18–36, 139.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH IN FRANCE: J. Leflon in *RHEF* 34 (1948), 103–17, a good introduction; The best comprehensive work is A. Latreille, *L'Église catholique et la Révolution* II: *L'Ère napoléonienne* (Paris 1950); *HistCathFr,* 155–218; S. Delacroix, *La réorganisation de l'Église de France* (Paris 1962; the first part of a typed doctoral dissertation, Sorbonne, 1957, together with a volume of documents. A basic work); J. d'Haussonville, *L'Église romaine et le Premier Empire,* 5 vols. (Paris 1866–68; still useful, although neither the state archives nor the Vatican archives could be consulted and the work was written from an anti-Bonapartist viewpoint); I. Rinieri, *La diplomazia pontificia nel sec. XIX* II (Rome 1904); id., *Napoleone e Pio VII, 1804–13,* 2 vols. (Rome

1906); Debidour, *Histoire* II (Paris 1891), 5–324; V. Bindel, *Histoire religieuse de Napoléon,* 2 vols. (Paris 1940); Dansette I, 159–231; E. Walder, *Staat und Kirche in Frankreich* II (Bern 1953).

NAPOLEON'S CORONATION: E. Celani, *Il viaggio di Pio VII a Parigi* (Rome 1893); F. Masson, *Le sacre et le couronnement de Napoléon* (Paris 1908); J. Leflon, *Bernier* II, 197–222.

CLERGY AND ORDERS: J. Leflon, "Le clergé de second ordre sous le Consulat et L'Empire," *RHEF* 31 (1945), 97–119; L. Preneel in *De Leiegouw* 4 (Kortrijk 1962), 73–101, 205–30, 5 (1963), 5–29 (on the clergy of the diocese of Ghent); id. in *Bijdragen* 23 (Nijmegen 1962), 63–74 (on clerical garb); L. Deries, *Les congrégrations religieuses au temps de Napoléon* (Paris 1928); P. Imbert, *Le droit hospitalier de la Révolution et de l'Empire* (Paris 1954); C. Rigault, *Histoire de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes* IV (Paris 1942), 1–413; P. Zind, *Les nouvelles congrégations de Frères enseignants en France de 1800 à 1830* I (Le Montet 1969), 47–71; *DSAM* II, 974–79 (on the foundings of P. de Clorivière).

REGIONAL MONOGRAPHS: C. Ledré, *La réorganisation d'un diocèse au lendemain de la Révolution. Le cardinal Cambacerès* (Paris 1943); P. Mouly, *Le concordat en Lozère et en Ardèche* (Mende 1943); F. Le Douarec, *Le concordat dans un diocèse de l'Ouest, Mgr Cafarelli et le préfet Boullé* (Paris 1958); R. Pinet, *Le diocèse de Valence 1802–15* (Valence 1963); G. Lacroix, *Ch. de la Tour d'Auvergne* (Arras 1965); J. Godel, *La reconstruction concordataire dans le diocèse Grenoble* (Grenoble 1968); F. Uzureau, *Les premières applications du concordat dans le diocèse d'Angers* (Paris 1901); J. Contrasty, *Le mouvement religieux en Haute-Garonne sous le consulat* (Paris 1907); P. Pisani, *Histoire de l'Église de Paris sous la Révolution* V (Paris 1911); L. Lévy-Schneider, *L'application du consulat par une évêque d'Ancien régime, Champion de Cicé* (Paris 1921; for the diocese of Aix); P. Genevray, *L'administration et la vie ecclésiastique dans le diocèse de Toulouse* (Paris 1921); A. Poirier, *Mgr Paillou et les débuts du concordat en Vendée* (Paris 1924); C. Le Sueur, *Le clergé picard et le Concordat,* 2 vols. (Paris 1929–30); On the Belgian dioceses: L. Preneel in *RHE* 57 (1962), 871–900 (concerning the determination of diocesan boundaries); C. de Clercq, "L'opposition à Mgr de Roquelaure dans le département de la Dyle," *SE* 13 (1962), 194–265; F. Jacques, *Le rètablissement du culte catholique à Namur* (Gembloux 1962); W. Munier, "Het concordaat van Napoleon en de opheffing van het oude bisdom Roermond," *Publications de la Société historique et archéologique dans le Limbourg* 98/99 (1962–63), 147–214.

THE REBIRTH OF RELIGIOUS FEELING: G. Constant, "Le réveil religieux en France au début du XIX^e siècle," *RHE* 29 (1933), 905–50, 30 (1934), 54–84; J. Goretti, *Bonald. La Révolution française et le réveil religieux* (Paris 1962); C. Sainte-Beuve, *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire* 2 vols. (Paris 1960); C. Pouthas, *La jeunesse de Guizot* (Paris 1936).

BIOGRAPHIES: J. Leflon, *E. A. Bernier,* 2 vols. (Paris 1938) id., *M. Émery* II (Paris 1946); L. Mahieu, *Belmas,* 2 vols. (Paris 1934); A. Delacroix, *Boulogne* (Paris 1880); J. Lenfant, "Broglie," *RHEF* 17 (1931), 312–47; E. Gabory, *Duvoisin* (Nantes 1947); J. P. Lyonnet, *Fesch,* 2 vols. (Paris-Lyon 1841, to be augmented by *DHGE* XVI, 1315–19); A. Roussel, *Le Coz* (Paris 1898); A. G. Bonet-Maury, *Maury* (Paris 1892, inadequate); A. Durand, *Périer* (Paris 1902); F. L'Huillier, *Recherches sur l'Alsace napoléonienne* (Paris 1947).

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PIUS VII AND NAPOLEON: H. Welschinger, *Le pape et l'empereur* (Paris 1905); L. Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon* (Paris 1906); B. Melchior-

Bonet, *Napoléon et le pape* (Paris 1958); E. Hales, *The Emperor and the Pope* (New York 1961); H. de Mayol de Luppé, *La captivité de Pie VII* (Paris 1912); M. Crépon, "Nomination et institution canonique des évêques," *Le Correspondant* 210 (1903), 843–78; L. Maddi in *RStRis* 22 (1935), 685–745; A. LeGlay, *Mgr d'Arezzo, une victime de Napoléon* (Cambrai 1908); J. Destrem, "Documents sur les déportations de prêtres sous le Premier Empire," *RH* 11 (1879), 331–88; Borrey, *L'esprit public chez les prêtres franc-comtois pendant la crise de 1813 à 1815* (Paris 1912); F. Claeys-Bouvaert, *Le diocèse et le séminaire de Gand pendant les dernières années de la domination française* (Ghent 1913); A. Milet, *L'opposition à la politique religieuse de Napoléon dans le département de Jemappes* (Tournai 1970).

BIOGRAPHIES OF PIUS VII: E. Pistolesi, *Vita del S. Pontefice Pio VII,* 2 vols. (Rome 1824/30); A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Histoire de la vie et du pontificat du Pie VII* (Paris 1836); G. Giucci, *Storia della vita e del pontificato di Pio VII* (Rome 1857); M. Allies, *The Life of Pope Pius the Seventh* (London 1875); D. Bertolotti, *Vita di Pio VII* (Turin 1881); J. Leflon, *Pie VII* (Paris 1958; basic, but only to 1800).

THE CONCLAVE: J. Leflon, *Pie VII* I, 532–606, to be supplemented by L. Pásztor, *ASRomana* 83 (1960), 99–187 (newly discovered diary of Consalvi); see also id., *AHPont* 3 (1965), 239–308; G. Incisa della Rocchetta: *Boll. dell'Istituto di storia della societa e dello Stato veneziano* (1962), 268–323 (diary of Prince Chigi); E. Celani, "I preliminari del conclave di Venezia," *ASRomana* 26 (1913), 475–518; C. Van Duerm, *Un peu plus de lumière sur le conclave de Venise et sur les commencements du pontificat de Pie VII* (Louvain 1896); A. Ricard, *Correspondances et Mémoires du cardinal Maury* I (Lille 1891), 200–374; R. Cessi, "L'Austria al conclave di Venezia," *Il Risorgimento italiano* 15 (1922), 356–413; A. Mater, *La République au conclave* (Paris 1923); G. Damerini, *L'Isola e il cenobio di S. Giorgio Maggiore* (Venice 1956), 201–36 (following the diary of cardinal L. Flangini); B. Bastgen in *HJ* 79 (1960), 146–74 (Letters of Consalvi).

THE FIRST RESTORATION OF THE PAPAL STATES: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 28–39; Mollat, 73–86; J. Leflon in *Revue des travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques* 114/II (1961), 173–182 (following the diary of Despuig); L. Dal Pane, "Le riforme economiche di Pio VII," *Studi romagnoli* 16 (1965), 257–76; F. Grosse-Wietfeld, *Justizreformen im Kirchenstaat* (Paderborn 1932), 1–27; Ardent, *Pape et paysans* (Paris 1891); L. Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon* (Paris 1906).

THE CONCORDAT OF 1801: A. Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du concordat,* 6 vols. (Paris 1901–05); J. Portalis, *Discours, rapports et travaux inédits sur le concordat de 1801* (Paris 1845); F. D. Mathieu, *Le concordat de 1801* (Paris 1902); I. Rinieri, *Il concordato tra Pio VII e il Primo Console* (Rome 1902); E. Sevestre, *L'histoire, le texte et la destinée du concordat de 1801* (Paris 1905); A. Boulay de la Meurthe, *Histoire de la négociation du concordat* (Tours 1920); A. Rayez in *RHE* 46 (1951), 624–80, 47 (1952), 142–62.

SOUTHERN EUROPE, ITALY: I. Rinieri, *La diplomazia pontificia nel sec. XIX* II (Rome 1902); F. Melzi d'Eril, *Memorie,* 2 vols. (Milan 1865); A. Fugier, *Napoléon et l'Italie* (Paris 1947); M. Roberti, "La legislazione ecclesiastica nel periodo napoleonico," *Chiesa e Stato, Studi storici* I (Milan 1939), 253–332; A. Theiner, *Histoire des deux concordats de la République française et de la République Cisalpine* II (Bar-le-Duc 1869), 1–53; id., *Pièces justificatives,* 249–85; A. Latreille, *L'ambassade du cardinal Fesch* (Paris 1935); G. Manganella, "L'applicazione del Concordato italiano," *Miscellanea di studi storici ad A. Luzio II* (Florence 1933), 143–68; Stanislao da Campagnola in *Laurentianum* 5 (1964), 245–

82, 11 (1970), 129–53; id. in *Collectanea franciscana* 39 (1969), 304–61; J. Rambaud, "L'Église de Naples sous la domination française," *RHE* 9 (1908), 294–312; C. Tori, "Lo schema di concordato del 1804 fra la Repubblica democratica di Lucca e la Santa Sede," *RSTI* 20 (1966), 328–52; P. Barbaini, *Problemi religiosi del Risorgimento in Toscana* (Turin 1961), 56–58.

SOUTHERN EUROPE, SPAIN: F. Marti Gilabert, *La Iglesia en España durante la Revolución francesa* (Pamplona 1971); M. Artola, *Los orígenes de la España contemporanea,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1959), especially I, 34–44, 506–36, II, 115–245; L. Sierra, *La reacción del episcopado español ante los decretos de matrimonios del ministro Urquijo de 1799 a 1803* (Bilbao 1964); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* II (BAC Madrid 1956), 770–841; G. de Grandmaison, *L'Espagne et Napoléon,* 3 vols. (Paris 1908/31); J. M. Cuenca Toribio, "La actitud de la jerarquía barcelonesa ante la Revolucíon francesa 1790–95," *Analecta sacra Tarraconensia* 40 (1967), 355–69; A. Pérez Goyena, "El espíritu religioso de la guerra de la Independencia," *RF* 21 (1908), 5–18; id., "La masonería en España durante la guerra de la Independencia," *RF* 22 (1908), 413–28; Isidoro de la Villapadierna, "Conflicto entre el Cardenal Primado y el Nuncio Mons. Gravina en 1809–14," *Anthologica annua* 5 (1957), 261–311; id. in *Nuove ricerche storiche sul giansenismo* (Rome 1954), 275–303; on the Cortes of Cádiz; id. in *HS* 8 (1955), 275–335; L. M. de Mendijur, *Scriptorium Victoriense* 12 (1965), 300–41; J. M. Cuenca Toribio, *HS* 15 (1962), 149–62.

Part Two

The Catholic Church and the Restoration

SECTION ONE

The Reorganization of the Churches

3. *The Catholic Church after the Congress of Vienna*

On the world and Europe after the Napoleonic wars see in addition to the general works "Bilan du monde en 1815" in *XII^e^Congrès international des sciences historiques* I: *Grands Thèmes* (Vienna 1965), 451–573, especially L. Trénard, "Bilan idéologique," 547–73.

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL AND INFLUENCE OF ROMANTICISM: P. Funk, *Von der Aufklärung zur Romantik* (Munich 1925); A. Béguin, *L'âme romantique et le rêve* (Paris 1947); H. F. Hedderich, *Die Gedanken der Romantik über Kirche und Staat* (Gütersloh 1941); B. Magnino, *Romanticismo e cristianesimo,* 3 vols. (Brescia 1962/63); L. Cellier, *Fabre d'Olivet. Contribution à l'étude des aspects religieux du romantisme* (Paris 1953); L. Guinet, *De la franc-maçonnerie mystique au sacerdoce ou la vie romantique de F. L. Z. Werner* (Caen 1964); A. von Martin, *Logos* 17 (1928), 141–64; L. Trénard, Y. M. Hilaire, "Idées, croyances et sensibilité religieuse du XVIII^{e} siècle," *Comité des travaux historiques. Bulletin de la section d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 5 (1964), 7–27.

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS VII AFTER 1814: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 131–366; Belvederi, 832–87; Pouthas, 173–261; Rogier, *KG,* 204–09; L. von Ranke, *Cardinal Consalvi und siene Staatsverwaltung: Sämtliche Werke* XLI/XLII (Leipzig 1877/78), 3–180 and *Historische Meisterwerke. Geschichte der Päpste* III/IV (Hamburg, no date), 301–439.

LEO XII: R. Colapietra, *La Chiesa tra Lamennais et Metternich. Il pontificato di Leone XII* (Brescia 1963; basic); Schmidlin, *PG* I, 367–474; also A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Léon XII,* 2 vols. (Paris 1843); Belvederi, 887–98; Pouthas, 262–73; Leflon, 379–408.

THE CONCLAVE OF 1823: M. Rossi, *Il conclave di Leone XII* (Perugia 1935); R. Colapietra: *AstIt* 120 (1962), 76–146; also C. Terlinden in *RHE* 14 (1913), 272–343.

PIUS VIII: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 474–510 and O. Fusi-Pecci, *La vita di Papa Pio VIII* (Rome 1965); A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du pape Pie VIII* (Paris 1844); G. Malazanza, *Cenni storico-biografici su Pio VIII* (Cingoli 1931); Belvederi, 898–903; Leflon, 409–25; C. Vidal, "La Santa Sede e la spedizione francese in Algeria," *ASRomana* 77 (1954),

77–89; id., "La Monarchie de Juillet et le St-Siège au lendemain de la Révolution de 1830," *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 46 (1932), 497–517.

THE CONCLAVE OF 1829: P. Dardano, *Diario dei conclavi del 1829 e del 1830–31* (Florence 1879); *Chateaubriand, Journal d'un conclave,* ed. by Thomas (Paris 1913); M. Y. Durry, *L'ambassade romaine de Chateaubriand* (Paris 1927); R. Jacquin in *RevSR* 31 (1957), 299–308; R. Moscati in *RstRis* 20 (1933), 257–74; J. Marche in *RHEF* 48 (1962), 49–53; R. Colapietra in *Critica storica* 1 (1962), 517–41, 636–61.

RESTORATION IN THE PAPAL STATES: M. Petrocchi, *La restaurazione, il cardinale Consalvi e la Riforma del 1816* (Florence 1941); id., *La restaurazione romana, 1815–23* (Florence 1943); details by A. Aquarone, "La restaurazione nello Stato pontificio ed i suoi indirizzi legislativi," *ASRomana* 78 (1955), 119–88. Also R. Colapietra, *La dottrina economica della Restaurazione romana* (Naples 1966); also Card. B. Pacca, *Il mio secondo ministero,* ed. by A. Quacquarelli, *La ricostituzione dello Stato Pontificio* (Città di Castello 1969), 160ff.; Mollat, 128–50; A. Ventrone, *L'amministrazione dello Stato Pontificio dal 1814 al 1850* (Rome 1942); G. Cassi, *Il cardinale Consalvi ed i primi anni della Restaurazione pontificia 1815–1819* (Milan 1931); M. Moscarini, *La Restaurazione pontificia nelle provincie di prima recupera* (Rome 1933); F. Grosse-Wietfeld, *Justizreformen im Kirchenstaat in den ersten Jahren der Restauration, 1814–16* (Paderborn 1932); E. Lodolini, "L'ordinamento giudiziario nello Stato pontificio," *Ferrara viva* (1959), 43–73; id., "L'amministrazione periferica e locale nello Stato pontificio dopo la Restaurazione," *Ferrara viva* (1959), 5–32; G. Forchellini, "Un progetto di codice civile del 1818 nello Stato Pontificio," *Scritti in onore di U. Borsi* (Bologna 1955), 89–164.

SECRET SOCIETIES: D. Spadoni, *Sette, cospirazioni e cospiratori nello Stato Pontificio all'indomani della Restaurazione* (Macerata 1904); G. Bandini, *Giornali e scritti politici clandestini della Carboneria Romagnola, 1819–21* (Rome 1908); G. Leti, *Carboneria e Massoneria nel Risorgimento* (Genoa 1925), 98ff.; A. Berselli: *L'apporto delle Marche al Risorgimento* (Florence 1961), 67–106; A. Bersano, *L'abate Fr. Bonardi e i suoi tempi* (Turin 1957); G. De Caesaris in *RstRis* 19/II (1932), 335–56.

4. *The Rejuvenated Position of the Holy See within the Church*

ARCHITECTURAL AND ARTISTIC IMPROVEMENTS IN ROME: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 163–78.

CONCORDAT POLICIES: See chapters 5–7 below and works on Consalvi (bibliography for chapter 2); Also Ranke, *Consalvi und seine Staatsverwaltung,* chap. 5; I. Rinieri, *La diplomazia pontificia nel sec. XIX,* 2 vols. (Rome 1902); Hermelink I, 356–62; Colapietra, 71–90; L. Pásztor in *AHPont* 6 (1968), 220–34.

THE ROMAN CURIA: L. Pásztor in *RHE* 65 (1970), 474–85.

PROGRESS OF ULTRAMONTANISM: Y. Congar, "L'ecclésiologie . . . sous le signe de l'affirmation de l'autorité," *L'ecclésiology au XIX*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1960), 77–114; R. Aubert, "La géographie ecclésiologique au XIX^{e} siècle," id., 11–32; Colapietra, 56–69, 429–47; Maass V, 244–59; Friedrich I, 1–95, 173–202; G. Alberigo, *Lo sviluppo della dottrina sui poteri nella Chiesa universale* (Bologna 1964), 349–89. In France: C. Latreille, *J. de Maistre et la papauté* (Paris 1906); C. Maréchal, *La jeunesse de La Mennais* (Paris 1913), 299–357, 386–434, 468–92; id., *La Mennais. La dispute de l' "Essai sur l'indifférence"* (Paris 1925), 147–64; A. Bardoux, *Le comte de Montlosier et le gallicanisme*

(Paris 1881); E. Sevrin, *Mgr Clausel de Montals* I (Paris 1955), 94–100; R. Limouzin-Lamothe, *Mgr de Quélen* I (Paris 1955), 230ff. See also the biographies of Frayssinous, Gerbet, Rohrbacher, and Combalot.

In Germany and Austria: F. Vigener, "Gallikanismus und episkopalistische Strömungen im deutschen Katholizismus," *HZ* 111 (1913), 495–581; H. Becher, *Der deutsche Primas* (Colmar 1943); G. Krüger, "Der Mainzer Kreis und die katholische Bewegung," *PrJ* 148 (1912), 395–414; Schulte III; Maass V, especially 51–73, 173–95, 275ff.

CHURCH UNITY: O. Rousseau, "Les attitudes de pensée concernant l'unité chrétienne au XIX^{e} siècle," *L'ecclésiologie au XIX^{e} siècle* (Paris 1960), 351–65; M. Jugie, *J. de Maistre et l'Église gréco-russe* (Paris 1922); F. Kantzenbach, *J.M. Sailer und der ökumenische Gedanke* (Munich 1955); J. M. Congar, "La signification œcuménique de l'œuvre de Moehler," *Irénikon* 15 (1938), 113–30; J. Doyle, *Letters on the Reunion of the Churches of England and Rome* (Dublin 1824); D. Robert, *Les Églises réformées en France* (Paris 1961), 177–85, 193–203, 446–57.

5. *The Alliance of Throne and Altar in France*

SOURCES

For laws and parliamentary debates, see the General Bibliography. Numerous memoirs and correspondences for this period are available (see G. de Bertier, *La Restauration,* 462) and especially Card. Lambruschini, *La mia nunziature di Francia* (Bologna 1934) and L. de Carné, *Souvenirs de ma jeunesse* (Paris 1872) as well as the correspondence of Lamennais, which unfortunately is rather dispersed (see literature to chapter 14). The most important newspapers and journals are: *L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi, Le Drapeau blanc, Le Journal des débats, La Quotidienne, and Le Mémorial Catholique.* Additionally, there is a large number of pamphlets (see *Catalogue de l'Histoire de France* III, 280–554, and XI, 230–92 at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). These soures can be augmented by the numerous unpublished documents in the Archives Nationales, Paris (especially Series F), the archives of departments and dioceses, and the Roman archives. See G. de Bertier, "L'histoire religieuse de la Restauration aux Archives du Vatican," *RHEF* 38 (1952), 77–89.

LITERATURE

GENERAL: In addition to the works of Schmidlin, *PG* (I, 178–86, 394–405), Leflon (328–36, 393–401), Debidour, *Histoire* (II, 325–412), Brugerette (I, 1–62), Dansette (I, 233–84), Gurian, (76–101), Dupeux (103–29), Rémond (25–59), see especially *HistCathFr* (III, 219–93), C. Pouthas, *L'Église de France sous la Monarchie constitutionelle* (Cours de Sorbonne [Paris 1942]), and G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, *La Restauration* (Paris 1963), especially 299–326. Also E. de Guichen, *La France morale et religieuse sous la Restauration,* 2 vols. (Paris 1911); S. Charléty, *La Restauration* (Paris 1921); F. Artz, *France under the Bourbon Restoration* (Cambridge 1931); P. Dudon in *RHEF* 20 (1934), 79–114.

SPECIAL ASPECTS: P. Pouthas, "Le clergé sous la Monarchie constitutionelle," *RHEF* 29 (1943), 19–53; P. Broutin, "La piété sacerdotale au début du XIX^{e} siècle," *RAM* 20

(1939), 158–80; R. Limouzin-Lamothe in *BLE* 55 (1954), 144–63; H. Forestier in *Annales de Bourgogne* 28 (1956), 195–203; Burnichon I; E. Piscitelli, "Lambruschini e alcune fasi della sua attività diplomatica," *RStRis* 40 (1953), 158–82; Colapietra, 73–74, 371–79, 387–98, 413–17, 431–43; D. Robert, *Les Églises réformées en France, 1800–1830* (Paris 1861), Park II, especially 446–61. On the anticlerical movement in Weill, *Histoire,* 11–55; Mellor, 262–79; R. Casanova, *Montlosier et le Parti prêtre* (Paris 1970).

EDUCATION: R. Severin, *L'enseignement primaire en France sous la Restauration* (Paris 1933); Grimaud; A. Garnier, *Frayssinous, son rôle dans l'Université sous la Restauration* (Paris 1925); id., *Les ordonnances du 16 juin 1828* (Paris 1919); R. Limouzin-Lamothe in *Annales du Midi* 65 (1953), 457–74, 69 (1957), 259–65; G. de Bertier in *RHEF* 46 (1960), 70–78.

MISSIONS: E. Sevrin, *Les missions religieuses en France sous la Restauration* 2 vols. (Paris 1948/59); A. Omodeo, *Aspetti del cattolicesimo della Restaurazione* (Turin 1946), 11–78; G. Richard in *Annales de l'Est,* 5th ser. 10 (1959), 39–71.

BIOGRAPHIES: There are numerous biographies of bishops and of founders of religious societies, many of which are too uncritical; most useful are: C. Baillé, *Le cardinal de Rohan-Chabot* (Paris 1904); A. Garnier, *Frayssinous;* J. Dissard, *Mgr Ch.-Fr. d'Aviau* (Bordeaux 1953); E. Sevrin, *Mgr Clausel de Montals, évêque de Chartres* I (Paris 1955); R. Limouzin-Lamothe, *Mgr de Quélen, archevêque de Paris* I (Paris 1955); J. Leflon, *É. de Mazenod* II (Paris 1960); A. P. Laveille, *Jean-Marie de Lamennais,* 2 vols. (Paris 1903).

MONOGRAPHS: There are few that concern themselves with local matters. P. Genevray, *L'administration et la vie ecclésiastique dans le grand diocèse de Toulouse* (Toulouse 1943); P. Guillaume, *Essai sur la vie religieuse dans l'Orléanais de 1801 à 1878* (Orléans 1959); P. Leuillot, *L'Alsace au début du XIX*^{e} *siècle* III (Paris 1960), especially 1–154; J. Vidalenc, *Le département de l'Eure sous la Monarchie constitutionelle* (Paris 1952), especially 546–602; P. Huot-Pleuroux, *Le recrutement sacerdotal dans le diocèse de Besançon de 1801 à 1960* (Besançon 1966); M. Faugeras, *Le diocèse de Nantes sous la Monarchie censitaire,* 2 vols. (Fontenay 1964).

6. *The Continuation of the Old Regime in Southern Europe*

ITALY

Schmidlin, *PG* I, 186–96, 425–26, 500–01; Leflon, 322–25, 402; S. Fontana, *La controrivoluzione cattolica in Italia, 1820–30* (Brescia 1968), especially 211–344; L. Bulferetti, "La Restaurazione 1815–30," *Storia d'Italia* III (Turin 1959), 361–504; Spini, 70–152.

KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES: W. Maturi, *Il concordato del 1818* (Florence 1929); L. Pásztor: *AHPont* 6 (1968), 226–31; R. Romeo in *RSIt* 67 (1955), 402–08; G. Catalano, "I Borboni e la manomorta ecclesiastica di Sicilia," *Il diritto ecclesiastico* 59 (1948), 198–213; G. M. Monti, *Chiesa e Stato* I (Milan 1939), 355–405 (concerning the revolution of 1820–21).

TUSCANY: P. Pieri, *La Restaurazione in Toscana, 1814–21* (Pisa 1922), especially 79ff.; A. Aquarone in *RStRis* 43 (1956), 18–21; P. Barbaini, *Problemi religiosi del Risorgimento in Toscana* (Turin 1961), 58–69.

DUCHIES: D. Corsi in *RSTI* 7 (1953), 256–66.

KINGDOM OF LOMBARDY-VENETIA: Maass IV and V (Vienna 1957 and 1961); C. Castiglione, *Gaysruck e Romilli* (Milan 1938); G. Mantese in *AHPont* 4 (1966), 259–80.

PIEDMONT: G. Pellicia, "Il concordato del 17 luglio 1817" *Palestra del clero* 32 (1953), 1173–83, 1243–54, 33 (1954), 36–54 (new documents); R. Colapietra, "Le relazioni tra Roma e Torino sotto Leone XII," *Rassegna di politica e di storia* 12 (1966), 23–32; P. Stella, *Crisi religiose nel primo Ottocento piemontese* (Turin 1959); L. Berra in *Bolletino della Società per gli studi storici nella provincia di Cuneo* 36 (1955), 18–59.

SPAIN

In addition to the works cited in the General Bibliography, see Schmidlin, *PG* I, 200–03, 427–28; J. A. Díaz Merino, *Colección ecclesiástica española,* 14 vols. (Madrid 1823/24; documents concerning the religious policy of the liberal government from 1820 to 1823); P. Leturia in *HJ* 46 (1926), 233–332; M. Pinto-Vieites, *La politica de Fernando VII entre 1814 y 1820* (Pamplona 1958); M. Artola Gallego, *La España de Fernando VII* (Madrid 1968); J. S. Laboa, *Doctrina canónica del Dr. Villanueva. Su actuación en el conflicto entre la Sancta Sede y el gobierno de España, 1820–23* (Vitoria 1957); see also *Revista española de derecho canónico* 12 (1957), 747–61; J. M. Cuenca Toribio, *D. Pedro de Inguanzo y Rivero (1764–1836), último primado del antiguo régimen* (Pamplona 1965); id., "La Iglesia española en el trienio constitucional," *HS* 18 (1965), 333–64; id. in *Ius Canonicum* 10 (Pamplona 1970), 412–25; A. Rodríguez Eiras, "La Junta apostólica y la restauración realista en Galicia," *Cuadernos de estudios galegos* 22 (1967), 198–220; A. C. Jemolo, "Il conte Solaro della Margarita ed il nunzio Tiberi," *Atti della Reale Accademia di Torino* 77 (1941/42), 119–43; Colapietra, 379–87, 399, 402; F. Suárez, ed., *Informes sobre el Estado de España, 1825* (Pamplona 1966).

CONCERNING THE END OF THE SPANISH INQUISITION: L. Alonso Tejada, *Ocaso de la Inquisición* (Madrid 1969); M. Defourneaux in *Annales histoires de la Révolution française* 35 (1963), 160–84; A. C. Jemolo in *Atti della Reale Accademia di Torino* 76 (1940/41), 433–58.

PORTUGAL: In addition to F. de Almeida (General Bibliography), especially IV/2, 205–89, see Schmidlin, *PG* I, 205–06, 428–29.

7. *Ecclesiastical Reorganization and Established Church in the German Confederation and Switzerland*

SOURCES

F. Walter, *Fontes iuris ecclesiastici antiqui et hodierni* (Bonn 1862); P. Schneider, *Die partikulären Kirchenrechtsquellen in Deutschland und in Österreich* (Regensburg 1898); A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le Autorità Civili* I (Vatican City 1954); L. Schöppe, *Konkordate seit 1800. Originaltext und deutsche Übersetzung der geltenden Kondordate* (Frankfurt-Berlin 1954; limited to continuing valid provisions!), E. R. Huber, *Dokumente zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte* I (Stuttgart 1961); F. Maass, *Der Jospehinismus* IV (Vienna-Munich 1957); I. H. von Wessenberg, *Autobiog-*

raphische Aufzeichnungen (Unpublished manuscripts and letters I/1), ed. by K. Aland (Freiburg–Basel–Vienna 1968).

LITERATURE

GENERAL: H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* I (Mainz 1902), 254–62, II (Mainz 1903), 1–273; Schmidlin, *PG* I, 206–65, 270–87, 492ff.; Leflon (Fliche-Martin 20) 232ff., 336f., 340–49; Schnabel, *G* IV: *Die religiösen Kräfte* (Freiburg 1955), 21–43; E. R. Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungesgeschichte seit 1789* I (Stuttgart 1957, reprint 1961), 387–450; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 312–21; Feine, *RG, Die katholische Kirche* (Cologne–Graz 1964), 613–27; F. Vigener, *Gallikanismus und episkopalistische Strömungen im deutschen Katholizismus zwischen Tridentinum und Vatikanum* (first published 1913; now under the title: *Bischofsamt und Papstgewalt . . ., ed. by G. Maron* [Göttingen 1964]); H. Becher, *Der deutsche Primas* (Colmar 1943); E. Plassmann, *Staatskirchenrechtliche Grundgedanken der deutschen Kanonisten an der Wende vom 18. zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg-Basel-Vienna 1968).

NATIONAL CONCORDAT AND CHURCH AT THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA: H. Bastgen, *Dalbergs und Napoleons Kirchenpolitik in Deutschland* (Paderborn 1917); E. Ruck, *Die römische Kurie und die deutsche Kirchenfrage auf dem Wiener Kongress* (Basel 1917); Becher, op. cit., 31–130; A. K. Huber, *Kirche und deutsche Einheit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Königstein 1966), 18–24; H. Raab, "Karl Theodor von Dalberg. Das Ende der Reichskirche und das Ringen um den Wiederaufbau des kirchlichen Lebens 1803–15," *AMrhKG* 18 (1966), 27–39.

REORGANIZATION ON THE LEVEL OF INDIVIDUAL STATES: E. Friedberg, "Der Staat und die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland . . . Mit Aktenstücken," *Das 19. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig 1874; reprint Aalen 1965); U. Stutz, *Der neueste Stand des deutschen Bischofswahlrechtes. Mit Exkursen in das Recht des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart 1909); H. E. Feine, "Persona grata, minus grata," *Festschrift A. Schultze* (Weimar 1934); W. Weber, *Die politische Klausel in den Konkordaten. Staat und Bischofsamt* (Hamburg 1939); L. Link, *Die Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter in den Konkordaten Pius' XI.* (Bonn 1942, reprint Amsterdam 1964; with an extensive description of the legal situation in the nineteenth century); J. H. Kaiser, *Die politische Klausel der Konkordate* (Berlin-Munich 1949).

BAVARIA: H. von Sicherer, *Staat und Kirche in Bayern . . . 1799–1821* (Munich 1873); M. Freiherr von Lerchenfeld, *Zur Geschichte des bayerischen Konkordates* (Nördlingen 1883); K. A. Geiger, *Das bayerische Konkordat vom 5. Juni 1817* (Regensburg 1917); M. Doeberl, *Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns* II (Munich 1928), 480ff., 576ff.; A. Scharnagle, "Das königliche Nominationsrecht für die Bistümer in Bayern 1817–1918," *ZSavRGkan* 17 (1928); B. Bastgen, *Bayern und der Heilige Stuhl in der l. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 2 vols. (Munich 1940); Link, *Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter,* 112ff., 231ff., 345ff.; G. Schwaiger, *Die altbayerischen Bistümer Freising, Passau und Regensburg zwischen Säkularisation und Konkordat 1803–17* (Munich 1959); G. Franz-Willing, *Die bayerische Vatikangesandtschaft 1803–1934* (Munich 1965), 13–32.

PRUSSIA: W. Rudolphi, *Zur Kirchenpolitik Preussens* (Paderborn 1897); C. Mirbt, *Die preussische Gesandtschaft am Hofe des Papstes* (Leipzig 1899); W. Wendland, *Die Religiösität und die kirchenpolitischen Grundsätze König Friedrich Wilhelms III.* (Giessen 1909); J. B. Kissling, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes im Deutschen Reiche I: Vorgeschichte* (Freiburg 1911); L. Kaas, *Die geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit der katholischen Kirche in Preussen,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1915/16); J. Löhr, *Das Preussische Allgemeine Landrecht und die katholischen Kirchengesellschaften* (Paderborn 1917); J. Hansen, ed., J. Hansen and U. Stutz, *Die Rheinprovinz 1815–1915*, 2 vols. (Bonn 1917); H. Müssener, *Die finanziellen Ansprüche der katholischen Kirche an den preussischen Staat auf Grund der Bulle De salute animarum* (Mönchengladbach 1926); M. Bierbaum, *Vorverhandlungen zur Bulle De salute animarum* (Paderborn 1927); Link, *Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter*, 119ff., 239ff., 356ff.; F. Hanus, *Die preussische Vatikangesandtschaft 1747–1920* (Munich 1954), 78–195; W. Lipgens, *Ferdinand August Graf Spiegel und das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat 1789–1835*, 2 vols. (Münster 1965).

HANOVER AND CENTRAL AND NORTH GERMAN STATES: L. Dreves, *Geschichte der katholischen Gemeinden zu Hamburg und Altona* (Schaffhausen 1866); H. Meurer, "Die Säkularisation und Wiederherstellung des Stifts Osnabrück," *AkathKR* 33 (1875); J. Freisen, *Staat und katholische Kirche in den deutschen Bundesstaaten Lippe, Waldeck, Anhalt . . .*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1906); J. Metzler, *Die Apostolischen Vikariate des Nordens* (Paderborn 1919); A. Bertram, *Geschichte des Bistums Hildesheim* III (Hildesheim–Leipzig 1925); G. Langer, *Landesherrliches Patronatsrecht und staatliches Oberaufsichtsrecht gegenüber der katholischen Kirche Sachsens* (Leipzig 1929); E. Hegel, *Die kirchenpolitischen Beziehungen Hannovers, Sachsens und der norddeutschen Kleinstaaten zur römischen Kurie 1800–46* (Paderborn 1934); Link, *Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter*, 244f., note 81, 356, note 78, 367f., note 109, 422, note 42.

UPPER RHENISH CHURCH PROVINCES: I. von Longner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz* (Tübingen 1863); H. Brück, *Die oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz* (Mainz 1868); E. Göller, "Zur Vorgeschichte der Bulle *Provida sollersque*," *FreibDiözArch* 55 (1927), 56 (1928); M. Miller, "Die Errichtung der oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz, im besonderen des Bistums Rottenburg," *HJ* 54 (1934); Link, *Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter*, 125ff., 255ff., 375ff.; Frankfurter Konferenzen: A. Williard, *FreibDiözArch* 61 (1933), 63 (1935); H. Maas, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im Grossherzogtum Baden* (Freiburg 1891); H. Lauer, id. (Freiburg 1908); R. Gönner, J. Sester, *Das Kirchenpatronatsrecht im Grossherzogtum Baden* (Stuttgart 1904).—A. Hagen, *Geschichte der Diözese Rottenburg* I (Stuttgart 1957).—C. J. Reidel, *Die katholische Kirche im Grossherzogtum Hessen* (Paderborn 1904); K. Walther, *Hessen-Darmstadt und die katholische Kirche 1803–1830* (Darmstadt 1933). T. Apel, "Die Versuche zur Errichtung eines katholischen Bistums für Kurhessen . . .," *ZSavRGkan* 41 (1920); St. Hilpisch, *Die Bischöfe von Fulda von der Gründung des Bistums (1752) bis zur Gegenwart (1957)*.—M. Höhler, *Geschichte des Bistums Limburg* (Limburg 1908); W. Nicolay, *Die Beteiligung der Freien Stadt Frankfurt an der Stiftung des Bistums Limburg* (Frankfurt 1921); id., "Zur Vorgeschichte des Bistums Limburg," *FreibDiözArch* 55 (1927); H. Natale, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Bistums Limburg," *AMrhKG* 21 (1969); J. Weier, "Das bischöfliche Kommissariat Frankfurt am Main," *AMrhKG* 7 (1955).

AUSTRIA: A. Beer, "Kirchliche Angelegenheiten in Österreich 1816–1842," *MIÖG* 18 (1897); H. Bastgen, *Die Neueinrichtung der Bistümer in Österreich nach der Säkularisation* (Vienna 1914); Maass, *Josephinismus* IV; E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* III (Innsbruck–Vienna–Munich 1959), 507–677; E. Weinzierl-Fischer, *Die österreichischen Konkordate von 1855 und 1933* (Vienna–Munich 1960), 10–25; E. Winter, *Der Josefinismus* (Berlin 1962), 204ff.; P. Pototschnig, "Die Entwicklung des österreichischen Patronatsrechtes im 19. Jahrhundert," *ÖAKR* 18 (1967).

SWITZERLAND: In addition to the works of K. Müller, T. Schwegler, W. Martin (General Bibliography) and of Schmidlin, *PG* I, 279–88, 413–16, 492–98, see *Urkunden zur*

Geschichte der kirchlichen Veränderungen in der Schweiz 1803–30 (Mannheim 1851); C. Gareis und P. Zorn, *Staat und Kirche in der Schweiz,* 2 vols. (Zürich 1877/78); A. Büchi, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz* (Munich 1902); H. Seeholzer, *Staat und römisch-katholische Kirche in den paritätischen Kantonen der Schweiz* (Zürich–Leipzig 1912); E. His, *Geschichte des neueren Schweizer Staatsrechts,* 3 vols. (Basel 1920/38), I, 360ff., II, 539ff., III, 2, 828ff.; U. Lampert, *Kirche und Staat in der Schweiz,* 3 vols. (Basel 1929/39).—C. Attenhofer, "Die Besetzung des bischöflichen Stuhls und der Domkapitularstellen in . . . Basel," *AKKR* 19 (1868), 20 (1869); F. Fleiner, *Staat und Bischofswahl im Bistum Basel* (Leipzig 1897); J. Kälin et al., *Das Bistum Basel 1828–1928* (Solothurn 1928); G. Boner, "Das Bistum Basel . . . bis zur Neuordnung 1828," *FreibDiözArch* 88 (1968), 5–101; A. Bölle, *Die Seminarfrage im Bistum Basel* (Rome 1964); J. Danuser, *Die staatlichen Hoheitsrechte des Kantons Graubünden gegenüber dem Bistum Chur* (Diss., Zürich 1897); H. Fehr, *Staat und Kirche im Kanton St. Gallen* (Diss., Bern 1899); F. Gschwend, *Die Errichtung des Bistums St. Gallen* (Stans 1909); J. Meile, ed., *Hundert Jahre Diözese St. Gallen* (Uznach 1947); C. Trezzini, *Le diocèse de Lugano . . .* (Fribourg 1948); G. Staffelbach, "Der Plan eines von Konstanz gelösten schweizerischen Nationalbistums der Waldstätte," *HJ* 72 (1953); O. Karmin, *Le transfert de Chambéry à Fribourg de l'évêché de Genève* (Annecy 1890); Martin-Fleury, *Histoire de M. Vuarin et du rétablissement du catholicisme à Genève* (Geneva 1861); J. Widmer, *Chorherr F. Geiger* (Lucerne 1843); J. L. Schiffmann, *Lebensgeschichte A. Güglers,* 2 vols. (Augsburg 1833); A. Renner, *Görres und die Schweiz* (Freiburg i. Br. 1930); E. Reinhard, *Schweizer Rundschau* 25 (1925/26), 557ff., 669ff., 768ff.; id., *C. L. von Haller. Ein Lebensbild aus der Zeit der Restauration* (Cologne 1915); id., *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* 111 (1955), 115–30.

8. *The Other European Churches*

THE NETHERLANDS: In addition to Rogier, *KathHerleving,* and Albers, *Herstel,* see C. Terlinden, *Guilleaume I^{er}, roi de Pays-Bas, et l'Église catholique en Belgique, 1814–30,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1906); J. Witlox, *De Noord-Nederlandsche Katholieken in de politiek onder Koning Willem I* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1919); S. Stokman, *De religieuzen en de onderwijspolitiek der Regering in het Ver. Kon. der Nederlanden 1814–30* (The Hague 1935); A. F. Manning, *De betekenis van C.R.A. van Bommel voor de Noordelijke Nederlanden* (Utrecht 1946); G. Gorris, *J. G. Le Sage ten Broek en de eerste faze van de emancipatie der katholieken* I (Amsterdam 1947); Simon, *Sterckx* I, 31–123; Jürgensen, 62–158. also H. J. Allard, *A. van Gils* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1875); J. Demarteau, *F.A. de Méan* Brussels 1944); J. Kleyntjens, "Les instructions données par le St Siège à Mgr Capaccini en 1827," *Bulletin de la Commission royale d'histoire* 114 (1949), 227–55; A. van Peer in *Bossche Bijdragen* 19 (1948), 113–37; A. M. Frenken in ibid. 20 (1950/51), 118–226; id. in ibid. 22 (1954), 69–96; W. Munier in ibid. 29 (1969), 1–61, 30 (1970), 1–59; J. Muyldermans, "Vereeniging ter verspreiding van goede boeken 1826–30," *Ons Geloof* 15 (Antwerp 1929), 49–64, 111–27; A. Marlier, *L. V. Donche* (Louvain 1948); A. Alkemade, *Geschiedenis van 19 religieuze congregaties 1800–1850* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1966); M. De Vroede, "Het openbaar lager onderwijs in België onder Willem I," *Bijdragen en mededelingen van het Hist. Gennootschap* 78 (1964), 10–44; A. Ribberink in *AGKKN* 8 (1966), 98–110; J. Bornewasser, "Duitse bemoeienissen met de strijd om het collegium philosophicum," *Bijdragen tot geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 14 (1960), 273–301; L. Rogier, *Het tijdschrift "Katholikon" 1827–30* (Amsterdam 1957); J. C. Van der Loos, *Geschiedenis van het Seminarie Warmond tot 1853* (Haarlem 1932); J. Meyhoffer, "Le protestantisme belge de 1815 à 1830," *Annales de la Société d'histoire du protestantisme belge* 16 (1955), 152–74.

GREAT BRITAIN: In addition to Matthew, 150–86, Bellesheim, *Irland* III, 273–377, Schmidlin, *PG* I, 298–307, 429–32, 501–02, and Leflon, 349–51, 405–06, 461–62, see B. Ward, *The Eve of the Catholic Emancipation,* 3 vols. (London 1911/13); J. T. Ellis, *Cardinal Consalvi and Anglo-papal Relations 1814–24* (Washington 1942); G. I. Machin, *The Catholic Question in English Politics 1820 to 1830* (Oxford 1964); J. W. Osborne in *CHR* 49 (1963/64), 382–89; D. Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation 1750–1829* (London 1928); J. Reynolds, *The Catholic Emancipation's Crisis in Ireland 1823–29* (New Haven 1954); R. B. McDowell, *Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland 1801–46* (London 1952); T. Wyse, *Historical Sketch of the Late Catholic Association of Ireland,* 2 vols. (London 1829); J. A. Murphy, "The Support of the Catholic Clergy in Ireland 1750–1850," *Historical Studies* 5 (1965), 103–21; J. B. Bockery, *Collingridge* (Newport 1959; Apostolic vicar of the Western District from 1809 to 1829).

Biographies of *D. O'Connell* by A. Zimmermann (Paderborn 1909), D. Gwynn (London 1929), and M. Thierney (Dublin 1949; also J. Hennig in *Modern Language Review* 54 [1959], 573–78); *Correspondence* ed. by W. J. Fitzpatrick, 2 vols. (London 1888).—F. Husenbeth, *J. Milner* (Dublin 1862); *DictEnglCath* V, 15–53.—F. P. Carey, *J. Murray* (Dublin 1951); *Pastoral Letters and Religious Discourses,* 2 vols. (Dublin 1859); W. J. Fitzpatrick, *J. Doyle,* 2 vols. (Dublin 1861); *DHGE* XIV, 771–73.

RUSSIA: In addition to the general works by Lescœur, Boudou I, Ammann, Winter, Wasilewski, Malinowski, Schmidlin, *PG* I, 325–32, 433–36, 505, 627–32, the two collections of documents by J. Bieloholowy, *Akty i dokumenty otnosjaśćiesja k nstrojstvu i upravlenju rimsko-katoliskoj cerkvi v Rossii I 1762–1825* (Petrograd 1915) and *Allocuzione della Santità di . . . Gregorio P. P. XVI . . . seguita da una Esposizione corredata di documenti sulle incessanti cure della stessa S.S. a riparo dei gravi mali da cui è afflitta la Religione Cattolica negli imperiali e reali dominii di Russia e Pologna* (Rome 1842; 90 documents), see E. Theiner, *Die neuesten Zustände der katholischen Kirche beider Ritus in Polen und Russland seit Katharina II. bis auf ünsere Tage,* 2 vols. (Augsburg 1841); M. Loret, *Watykan a Polska 1815–32* (Warsaw 1913); K. Piwarski, *Kuria rzymska a polski ruch naradowo-wyzwolenczy 1794–1863* (Warsaw 1955); B. Pawloski, *Grzegorz XVI a Polska po powstaniu listopadowem* (Warsaw 1911); M. Żywczyński, *Geneza i nasępstwa encykliki "Cum primum"* (Warsaw 1935); G. Bozzolato, *RStRis* 51 (1964), 319–44, 455–80. Also H. Lutteroth, *Russland und die Jesuiten von 1772 bis 1820* (Stuttgart 1846); P. Bliard, "L'empereur Alexandre Ier, les jésuites et J. de Maistre," *Études* 130 (1912), 234–44; A. Brumanis, *Mgr St Siestrzencewicz* (Louvain 1968); L. Chodzko, *Un évêque polonais, K.G. Colonna Cieciszewski et son temps 1745–1831* (Paris 1866); M. Czapska, "Stosunek Michiewicza do religii i Kościola w świetle jego listów i przemowień," *SPM* 2 (1955), 73–128 (concerning the religious views of A. Mickiewicz); F. A. Symon, "De seminario principali Vilnensi," *Academia Rom. Cath. Ecclesiastica Petropolitana 1887/88* (see also M. Godlewski, *Documenta ad historiam seminarii principalis Vilnensis pertinentia 1805–22,* (St. Petersburg 1911).

OTTOMAN EMPIRE: In addition to works listed in the General Bibliography such as Schmidlin, *PG* I, 333–36, 462–64, 505–06, 664–67, see P. Gams, *Geschichte der Kirche Christi im XIX. Jahrhundert* I (Innsbruck 1854), 175ff.; Article "Türkei," *Kirchenlexikon,* ed. by H. Wetzer and B. Welte, 2nd ed., XII, 126–34; J. Hajjar, *L'Europe et les destinées du Proche-Orient, 1819–1848* (Paris 1970).

BULGARIA: *DHGE* X, 1188–89.

RUMANIA: Tocanel III/1; N. Jorga, *Studii si documente cu privire la istoria Românilor* I, (Bucharest 1901), 340–405, 443–44; R. Cândea, *Der Katholizismus in den Donaufürstentümern. Sein Verhältnis zum Staat und zur Gesellschaft* (Leipzig 1916); F. Pall, "Les consuls des Puissances étrangères et le clergé catholique en Valachie au début du XIX^e siècle," *Mélanges de l'École rou maine en France* 15 (1939/40), 145–264.

GREECE: G. Hoffmann in *OrCHrP* 2 (1936), 164–90, 395–436; id., "Papa Gregorio XVI e la Grecia," *Gregorio XVI. Miscellanea commemorativa* II (Rome 1948), 135–57.

9. *The Churches of America*

SPANISH AMERICA

P. de Leturia, *Relaciones entre la Santa Sede e Hispano-américa* II, III (Rome-Caracas 1959/60; basic). Also Schmidlin, *PG* I, 313–21, 437–45, 504; L. Tormo, *Historia de la Iglesia en América latina II: La Iglesia en la crisis de independencia* (Bogotá 1962); D. Olmedo, "La crisis máxima de la Iglesia católica en la América española," *Memorias de la Academia mexicana de la historia* 9 (1950), 274–324; R. Vargas Ugarte, *El episcopado en los tiempos de la emancipación sudamericana* (Buenos Aires 1945); G. Furlong, *La Santa Sede y la emancipación hispano-americana* (Buenos Aires 1957); R. F. Schwaller, "The Episcopal Succession in Spanish America 1800–50," *The Americas* 24 (1968), 207–71; P. de Leturia, M. Batllori, *La primera misión pontificia a Hispanoamérica 1823–25* (Vatican City 1963); A. de la Peña y Reyes, *León XII y los países hispanoamericanos* (Mexico 1924); J. Pérez de Guzmán, "El ambajador de España en Roma, don Antonio de Vargas Laguna," *La ilustración española y americana* 29 (Madrid 1906), 18–79; C. Sáenz de Santa María, "Bolívar y Pio VIII," *Rev. de Hist. de América* 49 (Mexico 1960), 147–71, L. Frias, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en su asistencia moderna de España* I (Madrid 1923), 94–97, 274–83, 349ff.; F. Blanco and R. Azpurúa, *Documentos para la historia de la vida pública del Libertador de Colombia, Perú y Bolivia,* 14 vols. (Caracas 1875/78).

Concerning individual countries, the reader should consult the following works in addition to those mentioned in the General Bibliography:

CHILE: S. Cotapos, *Don J.S. Rodríguez Zorrilla, obispo de Santiago de Chile 1752–1832* (Santiago 1915); W. J. Coleman, *La restauración del episcopado chileno en 1828 según fuentes Vaticanos* (Santiago 1954); A. Undurraga Huidobro, *Don Manuel Vicuña Larrain* (Santiago 1887).

ECUADOR: J. J. Donoso, op. cit. (General Bibliography).

MEXICO: M. Cuevas, op. cit. (General Bibliography) V, 73–209; L. Medina Ascensio, *La Santa Sede y la emancipación mexicana* (Guadalajara 1946, 1965) A. Gómez Robledo, *Historia Mexicana* 13 (1963/64), 18–58; E. Shiels in *CHR* 28 (1942), 206–28; M. P. Costeloe, *Church Wealth in Mexico. A Study of the "Juzgado de capellanias," 1800–56* (Cambridge 1967); L. Frías, op. cit., 349–88, 668–700.

PERU: J. P. de Rada y Gamio, *El arzobispo Goyeneche y apuntes para la historia del Perú* (Rome 1917).

RIO DE LA PLATA: R. Carbia, *La revolución de mayo y la Iglesia* (Buenos Aires 1945); J. F. Sallaberry, *La Iglesia en la independencia del Uruguay* (Montevideo 1930); A. A. Tonda,

Rivadavia y Medrano, sus actuaciones en la reforma eclesiástica (Sante Fe 1952); id., *Las facultades de los vicarios capitulares porteños, 1812–53* (Buenos Aires 1953); id., *El deán Funes y la reforma de Rivadavia* (Sante Fe 1961; concerning the support of a portion of the secular clergy for the steps against the religious Orders); A. P. Carranza, *El clero argentino de 1810 a 1820* (Buenos Aires 1917); G. Furlong, "Clero patriótico y clero apatriótico entre 1810–16," *Archivum* 4 (Buenos Aires 1960), 569–612; G. Gallardo in ibid., 106–56; R. C. González, "Las órdenes religiosas y la revolución de mayo," ibid., 42–86; E. Ruiz Guiñazu, *El deán de Buenos Aires, D.E. de Zavaleta* (Buenos Aires 1952); G. Nowack, *La personalidad de monsignor M. Escalada* (Zamora 1958).

San Salvador: S. Malaina, *Historia de la erección de la diócesis de San Salvador* (San Salvador 1944); S. R. Vilanova, *Apuntamientos de historia patria eclesiástica* (San Salvador 1911), 92–141.

Brazil: In addition to the works listed in the General Bibliography, see M. de Oliveira Lima, *O movimento da Independencia 1821–22* (São Paulo 1922); C. Magalhaes de Azevedo, *O reconhecimento da Independencia e do Imperio do Brasil pela Santa Sè* (Rome 1932); L. Silva, *O clero nacional e a independencia do Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro 1922); M. C. Thornton, *The Church and Freemasonry in Brazil. A Study in Regalism* (Washington 1958), 27–68; W. J. Coleman, *The First Apostolic Delegation in Rio de Janeiro and its Influence in Spanish America, 1830–40* (Washington 1950); H. Accioly, *Os primeros nuncios do Brasil* (São Paulo 1948); I. Silveira, "Tentativas de concordato no Brasil Imperio," *Revista eclesiastica brasileira* 21 (1961), 361–79 (covering 1824 to 1837); Metodio da Nambro, "Le missioni cappuccine nel Brasile 1822–40," *CollFr* 27 (1957), 385–415; R. B. Lopes, *Monte Alverno, pregador imperial* (Petropolis 1958).

The United States

In addition to Shea III, Ellis, *AmCath*, 40–81, and *Documents*, 167–259; McAvoy, 61–162, and *DHGE* XV, 1121–26, see Schmidlin, *PG* I, 321–24, 445–46, 645–48, Latourette, *Christianity* III, 4–241 and Rogier, *KG*, 272–84. Also F. Kenneally, *United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives* I (Washington 1966); C. Metzger, *Catholics and the American Revolution* (Chicago 1962); J. Baisnée, *The Catholic in the United States, 1784–1829; RACHS* 56 (1945), 133–62, 245–92; T. McAvoy, "The Catholic Minority in the United States 1789–1821," *HRSt*, 39–40 (1952), 33–50; P. J. Foik, *Pioneer Catholic Journalism* (New York 1930); M. C. Sullivan, "Some Non-Permanent Foundations of Religious Orders and Congregations of Women in the United States 1793–1850," *HRSt* 31 (1940), 7–118; V. J. Fecher, *A Study of the Movement for German National Parishes in Philadelphia and Baltimore, 1784–1832* (Rome 1955).

Regional Monographs: P. Guilday, *The Catholic Church in Virginia 1815–22* (New York 1924); R. F. Trisco, *The Holy See and the Nascent Church in the Middle Western United States, 1826–50* (Rome 1962); R. Mattingly, *The Catholic Church on the Kentucky Frontier 1785–1812* (Washington 1936); T. McAvoy, *The Catholic Church in Indiana 1780–1834* (New York 1940); W. McNamara, *The Catholic Church in the Northern Indiana Frontier 1789–1844* (Washington 1931). See also the reports addressed to Rome by Monsignor Flaget, 1815 (*CHR* 1 [1915/16], 305–09), by Monsignor Maréchal, 1818 (ibid., 439–53), and by Monsignor Bruté, 1836 (ibid. 29 [1943], 177–233) as well as the correspondence of Monsignor Dubourg with the Congregation Propaganda Fide

(*St. Louis Catholic Historical Review* 1–3 [1918/21], *passim*) and M. J. Spalding, *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky 1787–1826* (Louisville 1844).

THE PROVINCIAL COUNCILS OF BALTIMORE: *Concilia provincialia Baltimori habita ab anno 1829 ad anno 1849* (Baltimore 1851). See T. Casey, *The Sacred Congegation de propaganda fide and the Revision of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore* (Rome 1957).

CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF THE CLERGY: E. J. Goebel, *A Study of Catholic Secondary Education during the Colonial Period up to 1852* (New York 1957); F. P. Cassidy, *Catholic College Foundations in the United States 1667 to 1850* (Washington 1924); H. J. Browne, "Public Support of Catholic Education in New York 1825–42," *CHR* 39 (1953), 1–27; J. M. Daley, *Georgetown University, Origin and Early Years* (Washington 1957); P. P. McDonald, *The Seminary Movement in the United States 1784–1833* (Washington 1927); J. W. Ruane, *The Beginnings of the Society of St. Sulpice in the United States 1791–1829* (Washington 1935).

FOREIGN SUPPORT THROUGH SENDING OF PRIESTS AND FINANCIAL AID: J. A. Baisnée, *France and the Establishment of the American Catholic Hierarchy* (Baltimore 1934); J. Griffin, *The Contribution of Belgium to the Catholic Church in America* (Washington 1932), 63–189; J. Thauren, *Ein Gnadenstrom zur Neuen Welt: Die Leopoldinen–Stiftung* (Vienna 1940); G. Kummer, *Die Leopoldinen–Stiftung 1829 bis 1914* (Vienna 1966); L. Laurent, *Québec et l'Église aux États-Unis sous Monsignor Briand et Monsignor Plessis* (Washington–Montreal 1945).

TRUSTEEISM: P. J. Dignan, *A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in the United States* (New York 1935); R. F. McNamara, "Trusteeism in the Atlantic States," *CHR* 30 (1944), 136–54; A. G. Stritch, "Trusteeism in the North-West," ibid., 155–64.

NATIVISM: R. A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade 1800–50* (New York 1938). For a study of this phenomenon on the local level see L. D. Scisco, *Political Nativism in New York State* (New York 1901) and W. D. Overdyke, *The Know-Nothing Party in the South* (Baton Rouge 1950) as well as "A Selection of Sources dealing with the Nativist Riots of 1844," *RACHS* 80 (1969), 68ff. and a number of dissertations written for the Catholic University of America.

BIOGRAPHIES: American historiography is especially rich in biographies. See P. Guilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll* (New York 1922); id., *The Life and Times of John England,* 2 vols. (New York 1927); H. J. Nolan, *The Most Rev. Father P. Kenrick* (Washington 1948); also the biographies of the bishops *Rosati* (by F. J. Easterly, Washington 1942), *David* (by M. C. Fox, New York 1925), *Bruté* (by T. Maynard, New York 1943), *de Cheverus* (by A. M. Melville, Milwaukee 1958), *Flaget* (J. H. Schauinger, *Cathedrals in the Wilderness,* Milwaukee 1952) and *E. D. Fenwick* (by V. F. O'Daniel, Washington 1921); those of *Saint Elizabeth Seton,* founder of the Sisters of Charity (by A. M. Melville, New York 1951, and by J. I. Dirvin, id., 1962) and those of two laymen, *W. Gaston,* one of the first Catholic politicians (by J. H. Schauinger, Milwaukee 1939) and *R. B. Taney,* the first Catholic chief justice (by C. B. Swisher, New York 1935).

CANADA

L. Lemieux, *L'établissement de la première province ecclésiastique au Canada 1783–1844* (Montreal 1968); J.-P. Wallot, "Jewell et son projet d'asservir le clergé canadien, 1801," *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française* 16 (1963), 549–66; Ferland, *J. O. Plessis* (Quebec 1864); H. J. Somers, *The Life and Times of A. McDonnell, First Bishop of Upper Canada* (Washington 1931); L. Pouliot, "Lord Gosford and Monsignor Lartigue," *Canadian Historical Review* 46 (1965), 238–46; id., *Monsignor Bourget et son temps I: Les années de préparation 1799–1840* (Montreal 1955); A. A. Johnston, *A History of the Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia* I (Antigonish 1960; until 1827); M. Trudel, *L'influence de Voltaire au Canada,* 2 vols. (Montreal 1945); F. Quellet, "L'enseignement primaire, responsabilité des Églises ou de l'État 1801–36," *Recherches sociographiques* 2 (Quebec 1961), 171–87 (also L. Lemieux, op. cit., 27–28, note 22). See also H. Têtu, ed., *Journal d'un voyage en Europe de Monsignor J. O. Plessis 1819–20* (Quebec 1903), and the *Report on the Affairs of British North America from the Earl of Durham* (London 1839).

10. *The Churches of the Eastern Rite*

UNIATES OF THE NEAR EAST

MARONITES: P. Curzon, *Visits to the Monasteries in the Levant* (London 1849); A. Laurent, *Relation historique des affaires de Syrie 1840–42.* 2 vols. (Paris 1846).

MELKITES: J. Hajjar, *Un lutteur infatigable, le patriarch Maximos III Mazloum* (Harissa 1957), which replaces the work of K. Lübeck (Aachen 1919).

CHALDEANS: S. Bello, *La congrégation de S. Hormisdas et l'Église chaldéenne dans la première moitié du XIX^e siècle* (Rome 1939); I. X. Morand, *Voyage en Turquie et en Perse 1846–48,* 4 vols. (Paris 1854/60).

COPTS: J. Metzlar in *ED* 14 (1961), 36–62, 15 (1962), 70–105.

ARMENIANS: Berberian, *History of the Armenians 1772–1860* (Constantinople 1871; in Armenian; from the Gregorian point of view; many documents); A. Alexandrian, *Historical Sketch of the 12 Catholicos of Cilicia* (Venice 1906; in Armenian).

RUMANIA: Article "Roumanie," *DThC* XIV; de Clercq I, 211–14; A. de Gerando, *La Transylvanie et ses habitants,* 2 vols. (Paris 1845); C. Sucin, *Missionari greco-cattolici in Valachia 1718–1829* (Blaj 1934).

RUTHENIANS: Ammann, 637–58; Boudou I, 153–69, 213–40; Winter, *Byzanz,* 138–64; de Clercq I, 184–90; A. Theiner, *Die neuesten Zustände der Katholischen Kirche beider Riten in Polen und Russland* (Augsburg 1841); J. Zelechowski, *Joann Sniegurski, ego zizn i djejatelnost v Galitskoj Rusi* (Lemberg 1894); W. Lencyk, *The Eastern Catholic Church and Czar Nicholas I* (Rome 1966); disagrees with N. Riazanowsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia 1825–1855,* Berkeley 1950).

11. *The Resumption of Missionary Work*

Streit, VIII, XII–XIV, XVII–XXI, XXVII. *Collectanea Santa Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (1622–1866) (Rome 1907) (=*CPF*); *Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide,* Pars V (Rome 1898) (=*JP*); S. Delacroix, "Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques III," *Les Missions Contemporaines (1800–1957)* (Paris 1958); K. S.

Latourette, "A History of the Expansion of Christianity IV/V," *The Great Century* (New York 1941); A. Launay, *Histoire Générale de la Société des Missions Étrangères,* 3 vols. (Paris 1894); J. Leflon, *La crise révolutionnaire 1789–1846* (*Histoire de l'Église* XX) (Paris 1951); A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte* (Regensburg 1960); J. A. Otto SJ, *Gründung der neuen Jesuitenmission durch General Johann Philipp Roothaan* (Freiburg 1939); F. Schwager, *Die katholische Heidenmission der Gegenwart* I–IV (Steyl 1907); J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit* I (Munich 1933).

SECTION TWO

The Awakening of Catholic Vitality

12. *The Rebirth of the Old Orders and the Blossoming of New Congregations*

READMISSION OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS: *Synopsis historiae SJ* (Louvain 1950), 368–426; Albers, *Lib. saec.,* 5–74; P. Dudon, "La résurrection de la Compagnie de Jésus 1773–1814," *Revue des questions historiques* 133 (1939), 21–59; M. J. Rouët de Journel, *La Compagnie de Jésus en Russie* (Paris 1922); P. Galletti, *Brevie notizie intorno alla Compagnia di Gesù in Italia dall'1773 all'1814,* 2 volumes, (Rome 1926); P. Chadwick, "Paccanarists in England," *AHSI* 20 (1951), 142–66; E. I. Dewitt, "The Suppression and Restauration of the Society in Maryland," *Woodstock Letters* 34 (1905), 113–30, 203–35; O. Pfülf, *Die Anfänge der deutschen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu und ihr Wirken in der Schweiz 1805–47* (Freiburg i. Br. 1922); J. Joachim, *Le P.A. Kohlmann* (Paris 1938: on Germany and the Dutch); A. Rayez, "Clorivière et les Pères de la Foi," *AHSI* 21 (1952), 300–28; A. Guidée, *Vie du Père Varin* (Paris 1860); J. Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France* I (Paris 1914); L. Frías, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en su Asistencia moderna de España,* 2 volumes (Madrid 1923/44) I, 69–187, 274–83, 349–88, 668–700; I. Beretti, *De vita Al. Fortis* (Verona 1833); *DHGE* XVII, 1160–63.

OLD ORDERS: In addition to M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 2 volumes (Paderborn 1932/34) and M. Escobar, ed., *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose,* 2 volumes (Turino 1951/53), see the great works of A. Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome 1948) and A. Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* VII (Paris 1914) and S. M. Villaro, *Del ristabilimento della Provincia domenicana nel Piemonte dopo la soppressione francese* (Chieri 1929; V. F. O'Daniel *Dominican Province of St. Joseph* (New York 1942) on the Dominicans. On the Franciscans, see H. Holzapfel, *Manuale historiae Ordinis FF. Minorum* (Freiburg i. Br. 1909); A. Barrado Manzano in *AIA* 24 (1964), 353–87. Concerning the Capuchins there is Melchior de Pobladura, *Historia generalis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum capucinorum* III (Rome 1951). The Benedictines are treated by P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoît* VI and VII (Maredsous 1948 and 1956); S. Hilpisch, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums* (Freiburg i. Br. 1929); P. Weissenberger, *Das benediktinische Mönchtum im 19./20. Jahrhundert* (Beuron 1958); P. Sattler, *Die Wiederherstellung des Benediktinerordens durch Ludwig I. von Bayern* (Munich 1931), and the Cistercians by L. F. Lekai, *Geschichte und Wirken der Weissen Mönche. Der Orden der Cisterzienser* (Cologne 1958); J. du Halgoüet in *Cîtaux* 17 (1966), 89–118, 18 (1967), 51–74, 240–62, 20 (1969), 36–68. For the Premonstratensians see N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense,* 3 vols. (Straubing 1949/56), and for the Redemptorists see E. Hosp, *Die Kongregation des Allerheiligsten Erlösers* (Graz 1924); M. De Meulemeester, *Histoire sommaire de la Congrégation du T.S. Rédempteur* (Louvain 1958); J. Hofer, *Der hl. Klemens Maria Hofbauer* (Freiburg i. Br. 1923); *Monumenta Hofbaueriana,* 8 vols., (Cracow 1915/39); H. Girouille, *Vie du vén. P.J. Passerat* (Paris 1924); A. Sampers in *Spicilegium hist. Congr. SS Redempt.* 9 (1961), 129–202. On the Christian Schoolbrothers, see G.

Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes,* 9 vols. (Paris 1936/53); M. de Vroede in *Paedagogica historica* 10 (Ghent 1970), 49–79; The Daughters of Charity are treated by P. Coste, G. Goyau, *Les Filles de la Charité* (Paris 1933); Marboutin in *Revue de l'Agenais 1916,* 267–87, and the Daughters of Wisdom by J. F. Devaux, *Les Filles de la Sagesse* II (Cholet 1955); A. P. Laveille, C. Collin, *G. Deshayes et ses familles religieuses* (Brussels 1924).

NEW CONGREGATIONS: See Heimbucher II, Escobar II, and K. Zähringer, *Die Schulbrüder* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962); also P. Zind, *Les nouvelles congrégations de frères enseignants en France de 1800 à 1830* (St. Genis–Laval 1969); P. Broutin in *NRTh* 82 (1960), 607–32; J.-B. Furet, *Marcellin Champagnat* (Landshut 1958); A. P. Laveille, *Jean-Marie de Lamennais,* 2 vols. (Paris 1903); F. Symphorien-Auguste, *A travers la correspondance de l'abbé J.-M. de Lamennais,* 7 vols. (Vannes 1937/60); L. Cnockaert, "Le chanoine Triest et ses fondations" (unpublished dissertation, Louvain 1971); K. G. Reichgelt, *De Broeders van Liefde* I (Ghent 1957); S. Perron, *Vie du T. R. P. Coudrin* (Paris 1900); A. Delaporte, *Vie du T. R. P. J.-B. Rauzan* (Paris 1857); J. Leflon, *Eug. de Mazenod* (Paris 1957/65) II, 38–198, 260–97, 604–14, III, 129–84; P. Mayet, *Le T. R. P. J. C. Colin* (Lyon 1895); H. Neufeld, *Die Gesellschaft Mariens* (Munich 1962); G. Goyau, *Chaminade, fondateur des marianistes* (Paris 1914); P. Broutin in *NRTh* 65 (1938), 413–36; F. S. Zanon, *I servi di Dio P.A.A. e P.M. Cavanis,* 2 vols. (Venice 1925); T. Piatti, *Un precursore dell'Azione cattolica, Br. Lanteri* (Turin 1934); A. P. Frutaz, *Positio super introductione causae . . .* (Vatican City 1945); G. Pusineri, *Rosmini, fondatore dell'Istuto della carità* (Domodossola 1929); T. Réjalot, *La bienheureuse Julie Billiart* (Namur 1922); D. Voss, *Die hl. M.M. Postel* (Werl 1959); G. Bernoville, *Ste Émilie de Rodat* (Paris 1959); I. Giordani, *Maddalena di Canossa* (Rome 1963); L. Baunard, *Histoire de Madame Barat,* 2 vols. (Paris 1925); A. Hillengass, *Die Gesellschaft vom heiligen Herz Jesu* (Stuttgart 1917); G. Goyau, *Un grand homme, Mère Javouhey* (Paris 1929); E. C. Scherer, *Schwester J. Jorth und die Einführung der Barmherzigen Schwestern in Bayern* (Cologne 1932); L. Ziegler, *Mutter Theresia v. J. Gerhardinger* (Munich 1950); L. Ziegler, *Die Armen Schulschwestern von Unserer Lieben Frau* (Munich 1935); M. B. Degnan, *Mercy unto thousands: Life of Mother Mary Catherine McAuley* (Westminster, Md. 1957); A. J. Alkemade, *Vrouwen XIX. Geschiedenis van 19 religieuze congregaties 1800–50* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1966).

13. *The Beginnings of the Catholic Movement in Germany and Switzerland*

GENERAL

V. Cramer, *Bücherkunde zur Geschichte der katholischen Bewegungen in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Mönchengladbach 1914); P. Funk, *Von der Aufklärung zur Romantik* (Munich 1925); K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* I (Cologne 1927, reprint Aalen 1967); Leflon (Fliche-Martin 20), 359ff., 474ff.; Schnabel IV, 44–97; E. Ritter, *Die katholisch-soziale Bewegung Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954), chaps. 1–2; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 326–30, 336f.; K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1963); F. Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche von 1648 bis 1870 (Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch,* ed. by K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, vol. 4, Section N, Part I, Göttingen 1963), 94–100, 102–05, 108f.; Vigener, 57–77. K. Löffler, *Geschichte der katholischen Presse Deutschlands* (Mönchengladbach 1924); R. Pesch, *Die kirchlich-politische Presse der Katholiken in der Rheinprovinz vor 1848*

(Mainz 1966). A. von Martin, "Das Wesen der romantischen Religiosität," *DVfLG* 2 (1924); id., "Romantische Konversionen," *Logos* 17 (1928); A. L. Mayer, "Liturgie, Romantik und Restauration," *JLW* 10 (1930); H. F. Hedderich, *Die Gedanken der Romantik über Kirche und Staat* (Gütersloh 1941); R. Benz, *Die deutsche Romantik* (Leipzig 1956); J. Droz, *Le Romantisme allemand et l'État* (Paris 1966).

INDIVIDUAL CENTERS

MÜNSTER: J. Galland, *Die Fürstin Gallitzin und ihre Freunde* (Cologne 1880); P. Brachin, *Le cercle de Münster et la pensée religieuse de F. L. Stolberg* (Lyon-Paris 1952); E. Reinhard, *Die Münsterische familia sacra* (Münster 1953); E. Trunz, *Fürstenberg, Fürstin Gallitzin und ihr Kreis* (Münster 1955); S. Sudhof, *Hochland* 52 (1960); E. Hegel, *Geschichte der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät Münster 1773–1964,* I (Münster 1966), 21–79; H. Heuveldop, *Bernard Overberg* (Münster 1933); W. Sahner, *Overberg als Pädagoge* (Gelsenkirchen 1949; K. Kruchen, *Die Bibel Overbergs* (Diss. Münster 1956); T. Rensing, *Franz von Fürstenberg* (Münster 1961); A. Hanschmidt, *Franz von Fürstenberg als Staatsmann . . .* (Münster 1969); J. Janssen, *Friedrich Leopold Graf zu Stolberg* (Freiburg 1877, 1910 ed. by L.v.Pastor); P. Brachin, "Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg und die deutsche Romantik," *LJ,* new ed. 1 (1960); H. Raab, "Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg und Karl L. von Haller," *ZSKG* 62 (1968); F. Beelert, *Bernard Georg Kellermann* (Münster 1935); K. Gründer, "Hamann in Münster," *Westfalen* 33 (1955); W. H. Bruford, *Fürstin Gallitzin und Goethe* (Cologne–Opladen 1957).

VIENNA: *Monumenta Hofbaueriana,* 15 vols. (Thorun–Cracow–Rome 1915/51); M. B. Schweitzer in *HJ* 48 (1928); E. Winter, "Die Differenzierungen der katholischen Restauration in Österreich," *HJ* 52 (1932); E. Hosp, *Hofbauer* (Vienna 1951); R. Till, *Hofbauer und sein Kreis* (Vienna 1951); E. Winter, *Romantismus, Restauration und Frühliberalismus im österreichischen Vormärz* (Vienna 1968); F. Schlegel, *Kritische Ausgabe der Werke,* ed. by E. Behler (Paderborn 1958seqq.); B. v. Wiese, *F. Schlegel* (Berlin 1927); L. Wirz, *F. Schlegels philosophische Entwicklung* (Bonn 1939); J. J. Anstett, *La pensée religieuse de F. Schlegel* (Paris 1941); E. Behler, "Neue Ergebnisse der F. -Schlegel-Forschung," *GRM,* new ed. 8 (1958); G. P. Hendrix, *Das politische Weltbild F. Schlegels* (Diss., Cologne 1962); A. von Martin, "Die politische Ideenwelt Adam Müllers," *Festschrift für Walter Goetz* (Leipzig 1927); J. Baxa, *Adam Müller* (Jena 1930); A. von Klinckowström, *Friedrich August von Klinckowström* (Vienna 1877); P. Hankamer, *Zacharias Werner* (Bonn 1920).

LANDSHUT: J. M. Sailer, *Werke,* 41 vols. (Sulzbach 1830/45); B. Lang, *Bischof Sailer und seine Zeitgenossen* (Regensburg 1932); H. Schiel, *J.M. Sailer,* 2 vols. (Regensburg 1948/52); J. R. Geiselmann, *Von lebendiger Religiosität zum Leben der Kirche* (Stuttgart 1952); G. Fischer, *Sailer und Kant* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953); *idem, Sailer und Pestalozzi* (Freiburg i. Br. 1954); id., *Sailer und Jacobi* (Freiburg i. Br. 1955); F. W. Kantzenbach, *J.M. Sailer und der ökumenische Gedanke* (Nuremberg 1955); H. J. Müller, *Die ganze Bekehrung* (Salzburg 1956); J. Vonderach, "Sailer und die Aufklärung," *FZThPh* 5 (1958); R. Adamski in *ThJ* (Leipzig 1960).

MUNICH: M. Spindler, "Die kirchlichen Erneuerungsbestrebungen in Bayern im 19. Jahrhundert," *HJ* 71 (1952), now also in M. Spindler, *Erbe und Verpflichtung. Aufsätze und Vorträge zur bayerischen Geschichte* (Munich 1966); J. Görres, *Historischkritische Neuausgabe der Werke,* ed. by W. Schellenberg, A. Dryoff, L. Just (Cologne 1926seqq., so far 16 vols.); J. N. Sepp, *J. Görres und seine Zeitgenossen* (Nördlingen 1877);

H. Kapfinger, *Der Eos-Kreis 1828–32* (Munich 1928); W. Schellberg, *J. Görres* (Cologne 1926); *Görres-Festschrift,* ed. by K. Hoeber (Cologne 1926); J. Grisar, "Görres' religiöse Entwicklung," *StdZ* 112 (1927); A. Schorn, *Görres' religiöse Entwicklung* (Diss., Cologne 1927); R. Saitschick, *J. Görres und die abendländische Kultur* (Olten-Freiburg 1953); G. Bürke, *Vom Mythos zur Mystik* (Einsiedeln 1958); E. R. Huber, "J. Görres und die Anfänge des katholischen Integralismus in Deutschland," E.R. Huber, *Nationalstaat und Verfassungsstaat* (Stuttgart 1965); B. Lang, *J. N. Ringseis* (Fribourg 1931); D. Baumgardt, *F. Baader und die philosophische Romantik* (Halle 1927); E. Susini, *F. Baader et le romantisme mystique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942); J. Friedrich, *I.v. Döllinger* I and II, (Munich 1899); G. Schwaiger, *I.v. Döllinger* (Munich 1963); J. Finsterhölzl, *I.v. Döllinger* (Graz–Vienna–Cologne 1969); A. Doeberl, "Ludwig I. und die katholische, Kirche," *HPBl* (1916/17), 158–60; M. Spindler, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen König Ludwig I. und Ed. v. Schenk 1824–41* (Munich 1930); R. Hacker, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Bayern und dem Heiligen Stuhl in der Regierungszeit Ludwigs I.* (Tübingen 1967); G. Schwaiger, "Ludwig I. von Bayern," *ZKG* 79 (1968).

MAINZ: J. Guerber, *F. L. Liebermann* (Freiburg 1880); J. Wirth, *Monsign. Colmar* (Paris 1906); A. Schnütgen, *Das Elsass und die Erneuerung des katholischen Lebens in Deutschland von 1814 bis 1848* (Strassburg 1913); S. Merkle, "Zu Görres' theologischer Arbeit am *Katholik,*" *(Görres-Festschrift 1926);* L. Lenhart, *Das Mainzer Priesterseminar als Brücke von der alten zur neuen Mainzer Universität* (Mainz 1947); id., *Die erste Mainzer Theologenschule des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz 1956); H. Schwalbach, *Der Mainzer "Katholik" . . . 1821–1850* (Diss. Mainz 1966).

OTHER PERSONALITIES AND CIRCLES

A. F. Ludwig, *Weihbischof Zirkel von Würzburg . . .,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1904/06); A. Dyroff, *Karl Josef Windischmann und sein Kreis* (Cologne 1916); W. Schellberg, *Klemens Brentano* (Mönchengladbach 1916); H. Rupprich, *Brentano, Luise Hensel und Ludwig v. Gerlach* (Vienna–Leipzig 1927); G. Schönig, *Anton Jos. Binterim (1779–1855) als Kirchenpolitiker und Gelehrter* (Düsseldorf 1933); O. Dammann, "Johann Friedrich Schlosser auf Stift Neuburg und sein Kreis," *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* (1934); E. Ritter, *Radowitz* (Cologne 1948); A. Klein, "Werner v. Haxthausen und sein Freundeskreis am Rhein," *AHVNrh* 155/156 (1954); K. G. Faber, "Rheinisches Geistesleben zwischen Restauration und Romantik," *RhVJBll* 21 (1956); E. Kleinstück, *Johann Friedrich Böhmer* (Frankfurt 1959); A. Brecher, "L. A. Nellessen (1783–1859) und der Aachener Priesterkreis," *ZAGV* 76 (1964); H. Witetschek, *Studien zur kirchlichen Erneuerung im Bistum Augsburg in der l. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Augsburg 1965); W. Hoffmann, *Clemens Brentano* (Berlin–Munich 1966); C. Weber, *Orthodoxie und Aufklärung am Mittelrhein 1820–50* (in preparation).

EMINENT BISHOPS

A. Schnütgen, "Das religiös-kirchliche Leben im Rheinland unter den Bischöfen Graf Spiegel und Hommer," *AHVNrh* 119 (1931); W. Lipgens, *Ferdinand August v. Spiegel* (see ch. 7); P. Sieweck, *L. A. Freiherr v. Gebsattel* (Diss., Munich 1955); On Hommer, see A. Thomas in *TThZ* 58 (1949), *AMrhKG* 1 (1949), 15 (1963); J. Schiffhauer in *Festschrift für Alois Thomas* (Trier 1967).

14. *The Catholic Movement in France and Italy*

FRANCE

CATHOLIC CLUBS: G. de Grandmaison, *La Congrégation* (Paris 1889); J. B. Duroselle, "Les "filiales" de la Congrégation," *RHE* 50 (1955), 867–91; G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, *Ferdinand de Bertier et l'énigme de la Congrégation* (Paris 1948), especially 353–407; A. Lestra, *Histoire secrète de la Congrégation de Lyon. De la clandestinité à la fondation de la Propagation de la Foi, 1801–31* (Paris 1967).

CATHOLIC PUBLICATIONS: On Bonald and Maistre see *LThK* II, 581–82 and VI, 1305–06; also R. A. Lebrun, *Throne and Altar. The Political and Religious Thought of J. de Maistre* (Ottawa 1965).—E. Reinhard, *Haller, Ein Lebensbild aus der Zeit der Restauration* (Cologne 1915); H. Weilenmann, *Untersuchungen zur Staatstheorie C.L. von Hallers* (Aarau 1955).—P. M. Burtin, *Un semeur d'idées au temps de la Restauration, le baron d'Eckstein* (Paris 1931); *DHGE* XIV, 1405–06.—A. Viatte, *Le catholicisme chez les romantiques* (Paris 1922); V. Giraud, *De Chateaubriand à Brunetière* (Paris 1939), 113–19; J. R. Derré, *Lamennais, ses amis et le mouvement des idées à l'époque romantique, 1824–34* (Paris 1962).

LAMENNAIS: *Œuvres complètes,* 12 vols. (Paris 1836/37) and 10 vols. (Paris 1844), also contain the three volumes of *Mélanges* (Paris 1819, 1826, 1835) in which Lamennais published collections of his smaller writings and newspaper articles; *Œuvres posthume,* ed. by E. Forgues, 6 vols. (Paris 1855/59).—Lamennais's correspondence, which constitutes a main source, unfortunately is widely dispersed and in part still has not yet been published (L. Le Guillou is preparing the publication of general correspondence: Volume I, 1805–20 (Paris 1971); the chief collections are listed in *Catholicisme* V, 1723; see also the chronological listing of the printed letters (which, however, needs complementing) in A. Feugère, *Lamennais avant l' "Essai sur l'Indifférence"* (Paris 1906), 249–437 (Index 445–50). F. Duine, *Essai de bibliographie de Lamennais* (Paris 1923). On life and thought there are A. Roussel, *Lamennais d'après des documents inédits,* 2 vols. (Rennes 1893); C. Boutard, *Lamennais, sa vie et ses doctrines,* 3 vols. (Paris 1905/13); F. Duine, *Lamennais* (Paris 1922); A. Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy. A Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Revolution* (London 1954); L. Foucher, *La philosophie catholique en France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1955), 31–71; G. Verucci, *F. Lamennais dal cattolicesimo autoritario al radicalismo democratico* (Naples 1963); L. Le Guillou, *L'évolution de la pensée religieuse de F. Lamennais* (Paris 1966); volume I of the *Bulletin Lamennais,* ed. by L. Le Guillou (Paris 1971).—For the epoch of the restoration there are also C. Maréchal, *La jeunesse de Lamennais* (Paris 1913), *La Dispute de l' "Essai sur l'Indifférence"* (Paris 1925), and *Lamennais au "Drapeau blanc"* (Paris 1946); E. Sevrin, *Dom Guéranger et Lamennais* (Paris 1933); Y. Le Hir, *Lamennais écrivain* (Paris 1948). On Lamennais's influence outside of France, there are A. Gambaro in *Studi francesi* 2 (1958), 198–219; A. Simon, *Rencontres mennaisiennes en Belgique* (Brussels 1963); F. Vrijmoed, *Lamennais avant sa défection et la Néerlande catholique* (Paris 1930); S. Lösch, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (Münster 1955), 88ff.; W. G. Roe, *Lamennais and England* (London 1966); C. de Carilla, "Lamennais y el Río de la Plata," *Rev. de hist. de las ideas . . . (1950), 63–68.*

ITALY

A broad overview and literature are provided by G. Verucci, "Per una storia del cattolicesimo intransigente in Italia dal 1815 al 1848," *Rassegna storia toscana* 4 (1958),

251–85. Basic are the works of S. Fontana, *La controrivoluzione cattolica in Italia 1820–30* (Brescia 1968) and C. Bona, *Le "Amicizie". Società segrete e rinascita religiosa, 1770–1830* (Turin 1962). Also G. De Rosa, *L'Azione cattolica I* (Bari 1953), 28–45; P. Pirri, "C. d'Azeglio e gli albori della stampa cattolica in Italia," *CivCatt* III (1930), 193–212; G. Verucci in *Rassegna di politica e di storia* 5 (1959), 12–16; L. Bulferetti, *A. Rosmini nella Restaurazione* (Florence 1942); G. Pusineri, "La 'Società degli amici.' Rosmini precursore dell'Azione cattolica," *Charitas* 5 (1931), 7 (1933), *passim;* U. Biglia in *Novarien,* 3 (1969), 207–46 (concerning the fraternities for young intellectuals carried on by P. Scavini).

ON THE INFLUENCE OF LAMENNAIS: A. Gambaro, *Sulle orme del Lamennais in Italia* I (Turin 1958; basic). Also P. Pirri in *CivCatt* IV (1930), 3–19, III (1932), 313–27, 567–83; P. Dudon in *Gr* 18 (1937), 88–106; G. Verucci, op. cit., 264–67; C. Bona, op. cit., 396–406.

ON LANTERI: A. P. Frutaz, *Positio . . . Servi Dei P. B. Lanteri* (Vatican City 1945); T. Piatti, *Un precursore dell'Azione cattolica, P. B. Lanteri* (Turin 1954).

ON VENTURA: A. Rastoul, *Le Père Ventura* (Paris 1906); A. Cristofoli, *Il pensiero religioso del P. Ventura* (Milan 1927); R. Rizzo, *Teocrazia e neocatolicismo nel Risorgimento. Genesi e sviluppo del pensiero politico del P. Ventura* (Palermo 1938); F. Salinitri in *Salesianum* 2 (1940), 318–48 (Ventura and Lamennais); works and literature in *Regnum Dei* 20 (1969), 148–210.

ON ROSMINI AND GIOBERTI: Survey and literature in *ECatt* X, 1359–71, VI, 414–22.

ON MANZONI: M. Parenti, *Bibliografia manzoniana* (Florence 1936) to be supplemented by F. Ghisalberti, *Critica manzoniana di un decennio 1939–48* (Milan 1949); A. Galletti, *Le origini del romanticismo italiano e l'opera di A. Manzoni* (Milan 1942); id., *Manzoni* (Milan 1958); R. Amerio, *A. Manzoni filosofo e teologo* (Turin 1958); M. Bendiscioli, *Scritti stor. e giurid, in memoria di A. Visconti* (Milan 1955), 145–55.

15. *The Complex Revival of Religious Studies*

GENERAL DESCRIPTIONS

Hocedez I (with literature); Grabmann, 218ff. (Literature 337ff.); B. Magnino, *Romanticismo e cristianesimo,* 3 vols. (Brescia 1962/63). Also Hurter, *Nomenclator* V/l (Innsbruck 1912).

GERMANY

K. Werner, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Munich 1889); D. Gla, *Repertorium der katholisch-theologischen Literatur in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz* I (Paderborn 1895/1904); Goyau I, 161–391, II, 2–111; Schnabel IV, 62–97, 164f.f.; Scheffczyk, 1–233; P. Funk, *Von der Aufklärung zur Romantik. Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Münchener Romantik* (Munich 1925); A. Reatz, *Reformversuche in der katholischen Dogmatik Deutschlands zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz 1917); J. Diebolt, *La théologie morale catholique en Allemagne 1750–1850* (Strasbourg 1926); A. Anwander, *Die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte im katholischen Deutschland während der Aufklärung und Romantik* (Salzburg 1932).

THEOLOGICAL FACULTIES: M. Braubach, "Die katholischen Universitäten Deutschlands und die französische Revolution," *HJ* 49 (1929), 263–303; H. Schrörs, *Geschichte der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät zu Bonn 1818–31* (Cologne 1922); M. Huber, *Ludwig I. von Bayern und die Universität in München* (Würzburg 1939); H. Witetschek in *HJ* 86 (1966), 107–137 (for Munich); S. Merkle, A. Bigelmair et al., *Aus der Vergangenheit der Universität Würzburg* (Berlin 1932); F. Haase, *Die schriftstellerische Tätigkeit der Breslauer theologischen Fakultäten 1811–1911* (Breslau 1911); A. Wappler, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Wien* (Vienna 1884).—L. Lenhart, *Die erste Mainzer Theologenschule 1805–30* (Maize 1956); A. F. Ludwig, *Weihbischof Zirkel von Würzburg in seiner Stellung zur theologischen Aufklärung und zur kirchlichen Restauration,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1904/06); L. Scheffczyk, *L.F. zu Stolbergs Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi. Die Abwendung der katholischen Kirchengeschichtsschreibung von der Aufklärung und ihre Neuorientierung im Zeitalter der Romantik* (Munich 1952); P. Brachin, *Le Cercle de Munster et la pensée religieuse de F.L. Stolberg* (Paris 1952); L. Wirz, *Fr. Schlegels philosophische Entwicklung* (Bonn 1939); J. Anstett, *La pensée religieuse de Fr. Schlegel* (Paris 1941); J. R. Geiselmann, *Von lebendiger Religiosität zum Leben der Kirche. J.M. Sailers Verständnis der Kirche geistesgeschichtlich gedeutet* (Stuttgart 1952); A. Dyroff, *C.J. Windischmann und sein Kreis* (Cologne 1916); A. Sonnenschein, *Görres, Windischmann und Deutinger als christliche Philosophen* (Bonn 1937); E. Susini, *F. Baader et le romantisme mystique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942); T. Steinbüchel: *WiWei* 10 (1943), 41–60, 103–26; S. Lösch, *Professor A. Gengler. Die Beziehungen des Bamberger Theologen zu I. Döllinger und J.A. Möhler* (Würzburg 1963).

HERMES: K. Eschweiler, *Die zwei Wege der neueren Theologie. G. Hermes - M.J. Scheeben* (Augsburg 1926); K. Thimm, *Die Autonomie der praktischen Vernunft in der Philosophie und Theologie des Hermesianismus* (Munich 1939); other literature in R. Schlund in *LThK* V, 258–60. On the beginning of the dispute, see H. Schrörs, op. cit., 69–91, 166–90, 371–79.

TÜBINGEN SCHOOL: J. Zeller, "Die Errichtung der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät in Tübingen 1817," *ThQ* 108 (1927), 77–158; S. Lösch, *Die Anfänge der Tübinger Theologischen Schule, 1819–31* (Rottenburg 1938); P. Schanz in *ThQ* 80 (1898), 1–49; E. Vermeil, *J. A. Möhler et l'école catholique de Tubingue, 1815–40* (Paris 1913); P. Chaillet in *RSPhTh* 26 (1937), 483–98, 713–26; J. R. Geiselmann, *Lebendiger Glaube aus geheiligter Überlieferung. Der Grundgedanke der Theologie J.A. Möhlers und der katholischen Tübinger Schule* (Mainz 1942); id., *Die katholische Tübinger Schule* (Freiburg 1964; also B. Dupuy in *RSPhTh* 50 (1966), 311; H. J. Brosch, *Das Übernatürliche in der katholischen Tübinger Schule* (Essen 1962); F. W. Kantzenbuch in *ZRGG* 15 (1963), 55–86; A. Hagen, *Gestalten aus dem schwäbischen Katholizismus I und II* (Stuttgart 1948/50). Survey and literature concerning Drey, see J. R. Geiselmann in *LThK* III, 574.—Concerning Hirscher, see works and literature in F.X. Arnold in *LThK* V, 383–84; also J. Rief, *Reich Gottes und Gesellschaft nach J.S. Drey und J.B. Hirscher* (Paderborn 1965); E. Keller, *J. B. Hirscher* (Graz 1969). Concerning Möhler, see older literature in S. Lösch, *J.A. Möhler* I (Munich 1928), XXIIff.; recent literature in J. R. Geiselmann in *LThK* VII, 521–22.

FRANCE

A. Baudrillart, *Le renouvellement intellectuel du clergé en France au XIX^e^ siècle. Les hommes, les institutions* (Paris 1903); *DThC* VI, 695–712; L. Foucher, *La philosophie catholique en France au XIX^e^ siècle* (Paris 1955), 11–98; J. A. At, *Les apologists français au XIX^e^ siècle*

(Paris 1909); N. Hötzel, *Die Uroffenbarung im französischen Traditionalismus* (Munich 1962).

MONOGRAPHS: P. Poupard, *L'abbé L. Bautain* (Paris 1961); S. Merkle, "Die Anfänge französischer Laientheologie im 19. Jahrhundert," *Festschrift K. Muth* (Munich 1927), 325–27.

SCHOOL OF LA CHÊNAIE: C. Sainte-Foi (=É. Jourdain), *Souvenirs de jeunesse,* ed. by C. Latreille (Paris 1911), 37–134; A. Roussel, *Lamennais à la Chênaie* (Paris 1909); J. R. Derré, *Lamennais, ses amis et le mouvement des idées à l'époque romantique* (Paris 1962), 278–305; A. Dargis, "La Congrégation de Saint-Pierre" (unpubl. Diss., Louvain 1971), 248–66, 346–83; *LThK* IV, 711.

ITALY

A. Gemelli, S. Vismara, *La riforma degli studi universitari negli Stati pontifici* (Milan 1933); *L'Università Gregoriana nel 1° secolo della restituzione* (Rome 1924).

BEGINNINGS OF NEOTHOMISM: A. Masnovo, *Il neotomismo in Italia, origine e prime vicende* (Milan 1923); P. Dezza, *Alle origini del neotomismo* (Milan 1940); C. Fabro in *ECatt* XI, 135–40; G. F. Rossi, *La filosofia nel Collegio Alberoni e il neotomismo* (Piacenza 1959); A. Fermi, *Origine del tomismo piacentino* (Piacenza 1959).

ROSMINI: *Works, Edizione nazionale,* ed. by E. Castelli (Rome 1934ff.); older literature in Volume I, recent literature in *LThK* IX, 55. See also C. Bergamaschi, *Bibliografia rosminiana,* 2 vols. (Milan 1967); G. Pagani, *Vita di A. Rosmini,* revised by G. Rossi, 2 vols. (Rovereto 1959); *A. Rosmini nel l° centenario della morte,* ed. by C. Riva (Florence 1958); *Atti del Congresso internazionale di filosofia A. Rosmini* (Florence 1957); A. Gambaro, "A. Rosmini nella cultura del suo tempo," *Rivista Rosminiana* 49 (1955), 162–96; F. Traniello, *Società religiosa e società civile in Rosmini* (Bologna 1966); G. Ferrarese, *Ricerche sulle riflessione teologiche di A. Rosmini negli anni 1819–1928* (Milan 1967); D. Mancini, *Il giovane Rosmini* I (Urbino 1963).

Part Three

Between the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848

Introduction: *Gregory XVI*

SOURCES

BullRomCont XIX (Rome 1835); *Acta Gregorii Papae,* ed. by A. M. Bernasconi, 4 vols. (Rome 1901/04); *Raccolta delle leggi e disposizioni di pubblica amministrazione dello Stato Pontificio* (Rome 1834/71); H. Bastgen, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchenpolitik Gregors XVI.* (Paderborn 1929); Moroni XXXII, 312–28; N. Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes* (London 1858).

LITERATURE

There exists as yet no scholarly study of Gregory's life and his whole pontificate. Numerous valuable elements concerning various aspects of his personality and his activities as Pope and secular ruler can be found in *Gregorio XVI, Miscellanea commemorativa,* 2 vols. (Rome 1948). D. Federici, *Gregorio XVI tra favola e realtà* (Rovigo 1948; literature pp. 17–25; too glorifying, but in reaction to the prevailing tendency to view Gregory XVI more as sovereign than as Pope). F. Fabi-Montanari, *Notizie istoriche di Gregori XVI* (Rome 1846); B. Wagner, *Papst Gregor XVI., sein Leben und sein Pontifikat* (Sulzbach 1846); G. Audisio, *Storia religiosa e civile dei Papi* V (Rome 1868), 356–94; C. Sylvain, *Grégoire XVI et son pontificat* (Lille 1889); F. Hayward, *Le dernier siècle de la Rome pontificale* II (Paris 1928), 174–215; E. Vercesi, *Tre pontificati. Leone XII, Pio VIII, Gregorio XVI* (Turin 1936); M. Vincenti, *Gregorio XVI* (Rome 1941).

TREATMENTS OF THE PONTIFICATE: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 511–687; Leflon, 426–516; Pouthas, 275–315; Belvederi, 903–22; Daniel-Rops I, 341–427; *DThC* VI, 1822–36; *ECatt* VI, 1148–56; A. Simon, "Vues nouvelles sur Grégoire XVI," *RGB* 63 (1951), 395–408.

CONCERNING THE CONCLAVE: L. Alpago-Novello, "Il conclave di Gregorio XVI," *Archivio veneto-tridentino* 6 (1924), 68–114; G. Cacciamani, *Storia del conclave di Papa Gregorio XVI* (Camaldoli 1960); D. Silvagni, *Diarii dei conclavi di Mons. Dardano* (Rome 1879), 73ff.; L. Wahrmund, *Das Ausschliessungsrecht bei den Papstwahlen* (Vienna 1888), 233f. (based on Vienna archives); A. Eisler, *Das Veto der katholischen Staaten bei den Papstwahlen* (Vienna 1907), 238ff.; T. M. March, "La exclusiva dada por España contra el cardinale Giustiniani en el conclave de 1830–31," *RF* 98 (1932), 50–64, 337–48, 99 (1932), 43–61.

SECTION ONE

The First Phase of Catholic Liberalism

STATUS OF RESEARCH

R. Aubert, J.-B. Duroselle, A. Jemolo, "Le libéralisme religieux au XIX^e siècle" in *X Congresso internazionale di Scienze storiche. Relazioni* V (Florence 1955), 305–83.

LITERATURE

Beyond the more general description in handbooks of the church history of the nineteenth century and the historiography of the pontificate of Gregory XVI, see the general surveys by Weill, *Cath. lib.* and by P. Constantin in *DThC* IX, 506–65 (outdated, but still useful for facts), by Gurian, 101–47, and Salvatorelli, 21–49; the anthology by M. Prélot, *Le libéralisme catholique* (Paris 1969), 9–141; H. Maier, *Revolution und Kirche. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der christlichen Demokratie* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959); the works on Lamennais listed on p. 393, especially those by G. Verucci and L. Le Guillou, to which should be added: K. Jürgensen, *Lamennais und die Gestaltung des belgischen Staates. Der liberale Katholizismus in der Verfassungsbewegung des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden 1963); E. Sevrin, *Dom Guéranger et Lamennais* (Paris 1933); and the biographies (listed in General Bibliography) of Lacordaire, Montalembert, Gerbet, d'Astros, and Mazenod.

16. *From Belgian Unionism to the Campaign of* L'Avenir

BELGIUM: C. Terlinden, *Guillaume I^{er} roi des Pays-Bas, et l'Église catholique en Belgique* II (Paris–Louvain 1906; antiquated, but still useful); H. Haag, *Les origines du catholicisme libéral en Belgique* (Louvain 1950); A. Simon, *Rencontres;* A. Simon, *Aspects de l'unionisme* (Wetteren 1958), 9–81; A. Simon, *Sterckx* I, 65–155, II, 461; K. Jürgensen, op. cit., 62–228 (in addition, A. Simon, *Revue belge de philosophie et d'histoire* 37 [1959], 408–18); S. Stockman, *De religieuzen en de onderwijspolitiek der regering in het Vereenigd Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* (The Hague 1935); A. Manning, *De betekenis van C.R.A. Van Bommel voor de Noordelijke Nederlanden* (Utrecht 1956), 42–161; E. Perniola, "De internuntius Cappaccini en de belgische Omwenteling," *Mededelingen van het Nederl. hist. Instituut te Rome,* 3rd s. 4 (1947), 53–169; H. Wagnon, "Le Congrès national belge de 1830–31 a-t-il établi la séparation de l'Église et de l'État?," *Études d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à G. Le Bras* II (Paris 1965), 753–81. A. Boland, *Adolphe Bartels, révolutionnaire et démocrate* (Louvain 1960).

FRANCE: In addition to the newspaper articles and books by Lamennais, his correspondence is the most important source. See especially E. Forgues, *Lamennais, Correspondance,* 2 vols. (Paris 1863); E. Forgues, *Correspondance inédite entre Lamennais et le baron de Vitrolles* (Paris 1886); A. Blaize, *Œuvres inédites de Félicité Lamennais,* 2 vols.

(Paris 1866); G. Goyau, *Le portefeuille de Lamennais 1818–36* (Paris 1930). The most important articles of *L'Avenir,* systematically arranged, were at that time published again with a few cuts in the *Mélanges catholiques. Extraits de "l'Avenir",* 2 vols. (Paris 1831) and chronologically in *Articles de "l'Avenir",* 7 vols. (Louvain 1830/31); and recently, with an introduction and comments, by G. Verucci, *"L'Avenir." Antologia degli articoli* (Rome 1967).—To the works on Lamennais listed above on p. 398 are to be added J. R. Derré, *Lamennais, ses amis et le mouvement des idées à l'époque romantique* (Paris 1962), especially 156–63, 199–206, 385–459, and Weill, *Histoire,* 28–50.

17. *The Roman Reaction*

SOURCES

Lamennais stated his views in *Les affaires de Rome* (Paris 1836); see also his correspondence listed on p. 393 and *Lettres inédites de Lamennais à Montalembert,* ed. by E. Forgues (Paris 1898). P. Dudon, *Lamennais et le Saint-Siège* (Paris 1911) is valuable because of its numerous extracts and documents from the Vatican Archives, but must be supplemented and differentiated by L. Ahrens, *Lamennais und Deutschland* (Münster 1930) and J. L. Derré, *Metternich und Lamennais* (Paris 1963), both of whom have also used the archives at Vienna. In addition there should be consulted the diaries of Montalembert (at the castle of La-Roche-en-Breny); selections from his biography by Lecanuet and by A. Trannoy, *Le romantisme politique de Montalembert avant 1843* (Paris 1942) and his correspondence (especially *Lettres de Montalembert à Lamennais,* ed. by G. Goyau [Paris 1932]), the memoirs of Lacordaire (*Le testament du Père Lacordaire* [Paris 1865]), and the memoirs of the period as well as G. Procacci, *Le relazioni diplomatiche fra lo Stato pontificio e la Francia,* 2nd ser., I–II (Rome 1962/63).

LITERATURE

Consult the works listed in the bibliography to chapter 16. The two most recent treatments, differentiated and familiar with sources and monographs, are A. Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy* (London 1954), 184–284 and P. Droulers, *Action pastorale et problèmes sociaux chez Mgr d'Astros* (Paris 1954), 125–62. Concerning the development of Lamennais after *Mirari vos* see primarily L. Le Guillou, *L'évolution de la pensée religieuse de Félicité Lamennais* (Paris 1966), 170–402; L. Le Guillou, *Les "Discussions critiques," journal de la crise mennaisienne* (Paris 1967); L. Le Guillou, "L'information romaine de Lamennais," *Annales de Bretagne* 71 (1964), 373–421; G. Verucci, *Félicité Lamennais dal cattolicesimo autoritario al radicalismo democratico* (Naples 1963), 228–339, and the introduction by Y. LeHir of the critical edition of *Paroles d'un croyant* (Paris 1949).

SECTION TWO

Church and State in Europe from 1830 to 1848

18. *The Continuation of Catholic Liberalism in Western Europe*

FRANCE

SOURCES: For legal codes and parliamentary debates, see the General Bibliography. The episcopal pastoral letters are one of the most important sources (incomplete collection in the National Archives of Paris, F 5473–88, and in the *Bibliothèque Nationale,* ser. E). Numerous memoirs, especially those of Guizot, 8 vols. (Paris 1857/58), and correspondence, especially of Lamennais, Lacordaire (consult *LThK* VI, 726), and Veuillot (*Œuvres complètes* XV–XVI, [Paris 1931]). The most important newspapers are *L'Avenir* (1830/31), *L'Ami de la Religion* (since 1830), *L'Univers religieux* (since 1833), and *Le Journal des villes et des campagnes.* For brochures, consult the *Catalogue de l'histoire de France* of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, III, 555–804 and XI, 292–319. Also G. Procacci, *Le relazioni diplomatiche fra lo Stato pontificio e la Francia, 2nd Series, 1830–48,* 3 vols. (Rome 1962/69, to 1838); P. Poupard, *Correspondance inédite entre Mgr. Garibaldi, internonce à Paris, et Mgr Mathieu, archevêque de Besançon* (Paris 1961). For unpublished sources, consult G. Bourgin, *Les sources manuscrites de l'histoire religieuse de la France moderne* (Paris 1925). Especially important are the Series F in the National Archives of Paris and the archival collections of the *Nunziatura di Francia* in the Vatican Archives.

LITERATURE: In addition to the works of Schmidlin, *PG* (I, 556–67), Leflon (440–52, 478–84, 489–509), Brugerette (I, 63–122), Gurian (124–84), Dansette (I, 285–337), and *HistCathFr* (274–365), see C. Pouthas, *L'Église de France sous la Monarchie constitutionnelle* (Cours de Sorbonne 1942).

Among the numerous biographies of bishops, clerics, and other important men of the period, note especially P. Droulers, *Action pastorale et problèmes sociaux sous la Monarchie de Juillet chez Mgr d'Astros* (Paris 1954; the concern of the work exceeds considerably the character of a biography); J. Leflon, *E. de Mazenod* II–III (Paris 1960/65; the same as above applies here); E. Sevrin, *Mgr Clausel de Montals,* 2 vols. (Paris 1957); R. Limouzin-Lamothe, *Mgr de Quélen, archevêque de Paris* II (Paris 1957); R. Limouzin-Lamothe and J. Leflon, *Mgr D.-A. Affre* (Paris 1971); C. Guillemant, *P.L. Parisis* I–II (Paris 1916/17); S. Vailhé, *Le P.E. d'Alzon,* 2 vols. (Paris 1927); Lecanuet, *Montalembert* I–II (Paris 1895/99); M. J. Rouë de Journel, *M^{me} Swetchine* (Paris 1929).—Equally useful, though less critical, are the biographies of Dupanloup (by F. Lagrange I [Paris 1883]), Mathieu (by Besson I [Paris 1882]), Gerbet (by C. de Ladoue I–II [Paris 1882]), Sibour (by Poujoulat [Paris 1857]), Gousset (by F. Gousset [Besançon 1903]), Guibert (by J. Paguelle de Follenay, 2 vols. [Paris 1896]), Lacordaire (by T. Foisset, 2 vols. [Paris 1870]), and Veuillot (by E. and F. Veuillot I–II [Paris 1899/1901]).

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE: P. Thureau-Dangin, *L'Église et l'État sous la Monarchie de Juillet* (Paris 1895); Debidour, *Histoire* II, 413–90; Rémond, 75–94; E. Piscitelli, *Stato e Chiesa sotto la Monarchia di Luglio attraverso i documenti vaticani* (Rome

1950); J. P. Martin, *La nonciature de Paris et les affaires ecclésiastiques en France sous le règne de Louis-Philippe* (Paris 1949); L. Manzini, *Il cardinale Lambruschini* (Vatican City 1960), 160–238.—Concerning the recognition of the July Monarchy by the Holy See, see C. Vidal in *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 46 (1932), 497–517; S. Celli in *ChStato* I, 67–104.

Dioceses.

C. Pouthas, "Le clergé sous la Monarchie constitutionnelle," *RHEF* 29 (1943), 19–74; P. Poupard, "L'épiscopat angevin sous la Monarchie de Juillet," *Mémoires de l'Académie d'Angers,* 8th ser. 5 (1961), 15–29 and especially the introduction to the correspondence Garibaldi-Mathieu by the same author with the subtitle *Contribution à l'histoire de l'administration ecclésiastique sous la Monarchie de Juillet;* J.-B. Duroselle, "L'abbé Clavel et les revendications du bas-clergé sous Louis-Philippe," *Études d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 1 (1947), 99–126.

Freedom of Education: In addition to the biographies of Montalembert, Parisis, Dupanloup, Clausel and Veuillot, see Grimaud VI; L. Follioley, *Montalembert et Mgr Parisis* (Paris 1901); L. Trénard, *Salvandy et son temps* (Paris 1968); P. Gerbod, *La condition universitaire en France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1965), 141–56, 176–81; A. J. Tudesq, *Les grands notables en France 1840*–49 (Paris 1964), 695–730; A. Rivet in *Actes du 88^e congrès national des sociétés savantes* (Paris 1964), 181–200 (elementary schools).

Catholic Movement: F. Mourret, *Le mouvement catholique en France de 1830 à 1850* (Paris 1917); Weill, *Cath. lib.,* 51–90; M. Prélot, *Le libéralisme catholique* (Paris 1969), 148–78; P. Fernessole, *Les conférenciers de Notre-Dame* I (Paris 1935); E. Martin, *La Mère de Gondrecourt* (Nancy 1895), 1–54 (for Nancy).

Religious Life: Y. M. Hilaire in *L'information historique* 25 (1963), 57–69, 29 (1967), 31–35; C. Marcilhacy, *Le diocèse d'Orléans au milieu du XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1964); C. Marcilhacy in *ArchSR* 6 (1958), 91–103; the works (listed in chap. 5) by M. Faugeras, P. Huot-Pleuroux, and J. Vidalenc; G. de Bertier in *RHEF* 55 (1969), 273–78; L. Trénard, "Aux origines de la déchristianisation, le diocèse de Cambrai de 1830 à 1848," *Revue du Nord* 47 (1965), 399–459; H. Pomme, "La pratique religieuse dans les campagnes de la Meurthe vers 1840," *Annales de l'Est,* 5th ser. 21 (1968), 137–157; H. Forestier in *Bulletin de la société des sciences histoires et naturelles de l'Yonne* 97 (1957/58), 33–54; M. Vincienne-H. Courtois in *ArchSR* 6 (1958), 104–18; F. Isambert in *ArchSR* 6 (1958), 7–35; M.-H. Vicaire, "Les ouvriers parisiens en face du catholicisme de 1830 à 1870," *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 1 (1951), 226–45; R. Voog, "Le problème religieux à Lyon pendant la Monarchie de Juillet d'après les journaux ouvriers," *Cahiers d'histoire* 8 (1963), 405–21. Concerning anticlericalism, see Weill, *Idée laïque,* 56–104; Mellor, 271–85.

Catholics and the Social Question: Duroselle, 80–287, to be complemented by the cited work of P. Droulers about Mgr. d'Astros and by the articles of the same author in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 4 (1957), 281–301; *Cahiers d'histoire* 6 (1961), 265–85; *Revue de l'Action populaire* 47 (1961), 442–60; *Saggi storici intorno al Papato* (Rome 1959), 401–63. Also, A. d'Andigné, *Un apôtre de la charité, A. de Melun* (Paris 1962); F.-A. Isambert, *Politique, religion et science de l'homme chez Ph. Buchez* (Paris 1967).

Belgium

Sources: In addition to pastoral letters and the *Journal historique et littéraire* (1834seqq.), the publications of documents by A. Simon, with their valuable introduc-

tions, are of fundamental importance: *Réunions des évêques de Belgique 1830–1867. Procès-verbaux* (Louvain 1960); *Documents relatifs à la nonciature de Bruxelles 1834–38* (Brussels 1958); *Correspondance du nonce Fornari 1838–43* (Brussels 1956; also *BIHBR* 29 [1955], 33–68 and *RHE* 49 [1954], 462–506, 808–34); *Lettres de Pecci 1843–46* (Brussels 1959); *La politique religieuse de Léopold Ier* (Brussels 1953); *Aspects de l'Unionisme 1830–57* (Wetteren 1958). Also L. Jadin in *BIHBR* 11 (1931), 421–62 (concerning the bishops).

LITERATURE: In addition to the titles listed in the General Bibliography, see especially Simon, *Sterckx;* Simon, *Rencontres,* 147–265; H. Haag, *Les origines du catholicisme libéral en Belgique* (Louvain 1950), 199–292; C. Lebas, *L'union des catholiques et des libéraux de 1839 à 1847* (Louvain 1960); H. Wagnon, "Le Saint-Siège et la nomination des évêques belges," *Miscellanea hist. A. De Meyer* (Louvain 1946), 1248–67; G. Simenon, "Mgr Van Bommel," *Revue ecclésiastique de Liège* 32 (1945), 313–27, 33 (1946), 341–51 (also A. Simon, *Catholicisme et politique* [Wetteren 1959], 41–61); E. de Moreau, *A. Deschamps* (Brussels 1911), 43–199; C. Pieraerts, A. Desmet, *Vie du chan. C. Van Crombrugghe* (Brussels 1937); J. Willequet, *La vie tumultueuse de l'abbé Helsen* (Brussels 1956); A. Milet in *Revue diocésaine de Tournai* 9 (1954), 209–28, 10 (1955), 355–61 (about the seminary of Tournai); P. Janssens in *Spicilegium hist. Congregationis SS. Redemptoris* 12 (1964), 185–202, 13 (1965), 380–403; P. Gérin, *150 Jaar katholieke Arbeidersbeweging in België*, ed. by S. Scholl, I (Brussels 1963), 223–45. On the Catholic press, E. Lamberts in *BIHBR* 40 (1969), 389–467; A. Cordewiener, *Revue belge d'histoire contemporaine* 2 (1970), 27–44; R. Van Eenoo in *Revue belge d'histoire contemporaine* 2 (1970), 55–100. There are also the unpublished dissertation of E. Lamberts, "Kerk en liberalisme in het bisdom Gent 1821–57" (Louvain 1970) and the theses (Louvain) by A. Arnould, "Le clergé paroissial dans le diocèse de Namur 1836–65" (1964), St. van Outryve d'Ydewalle, "Structuren van het bisdom Brugge 1834–48" (1966), and L. Billiouw, "De sekuliere roepingen in het arrondissement Roeselare, 1833–63" (1964).

NETHERLANDS

In addition to the cited works in the General Bibliography and in chap. 8, there are chiefly Albers, *Herstel* I, 432–67, II, 1–92; J. Witlox, *De katholieke Staatspartij,* 2 vols. ('s-Hertogenbosch 1919/27); G. Brom, *Romantiek en Katholicisme in Nederland,* 2 vols. (Groningen 1926); G. Brom, *Corn. Broere* (Utrecht 1955); G. Gorris, *J. Le Sage ten Broek* II (Amsterdam 1949); A. Manning, *C. van Bommel* (op. cit. in chap. 16), 162–83; R. Reinsma in *AGKKN* 3 (1961), 50–72; W. Munier in *AGKKN* 9 (1967), 259–321; A. J. Alkemade, *Vrouwen XIX. Geschiedenis van 19 religieuze congregaties, 1800–1850* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1966).

19. *The Beginning of the Risorgimento in Italy*

THE FERMENT IN THE PAPAL STATES

Schmidlin, *PG* I, 520–56; Leflon, 432–40; Mollat, 150–90; E. Morelli, *La politica estera di T. Bernetti* (Rome 1953); L. Manzini, *Il cardinale Lambruschini* (Vatican City 1960), 188–208, 280–306, 539–43 (panegyrical; see also M. G. Giampaolo in *RStRis* 18 [1931], 103–36); F. A. Gualterio, *Gli ultimi rivolgimenti italiani. Memorie storiche con documenti inediti* I (Naples 1861); F. Engel-Janosi, *Die politische Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den österreichischen Kaisern* (Vienna 1964), 21–25, 199–222; *Le relazioni diplomatiche*

fra lo Stato pontificio e la Francia, 2nd ser. 1830–48, 3 vols. (Rome 1962/69); see also E. Calvi, *Bibliografia di Roma nel Risorgimento* (Rome 1912), nos. 2083–2281.

THE DISTURBANCES OF 1831–32: E. Morelli, *Lo Stato pontificio e l'Europa nel 1831–32* (Rome 1966); E. Morelli, *Studi storici in onore di G. Volpi* II (Florence 1958), 665–77; E. Morelli in *ChStato* II, 549–62; N. Nada, *L'Austria e la Questione Romana, agosto 1830–luglio 1831* (Turin 1953); N. Nada, *La polemica fra Palmerston e Metternich sulla Questione romana nel 1832* (Turin 1955); L. Pásztor, P. Pirri, *L'archivio dei Governi provvisori di Bologna e delle Provincie Unite del 1831* (Vatican City 1956); P. Pirri, "Il Memorandum del 1831 nei dispacci del cardinale Bernetti al Nunzio di Vienna," *GregMC* II, 353–72; L. Pásztor in *RSTI* 8 (1954), 95–128; L. Pásztor, *Boll. del Museo del Risorgimento di Bologna* 3 (1958), 167–202; L. Pásztor in *Studi romagnoli* 8 (1957), 529–95; S. Celli, "Il cardinale Benvenuti nella rivoluzione del 1831," *RSTI* 14 (1960), 48–93. Also *Nel primo centenario della Rivoluzione del 1831* (Bologna 1931); *Contributi alla storia della rivoluzione italiana del 1831* (Bologna 1931); B. Gamberale in *RStRis* 14 (1927), 657–715; R. Dal Piano, *Roma e la rivoluzione del 1831* (Imola 1931); P. Zama, *La marcia su Roma del 1831* (Milan 1931); F. Falaschi in *RStRis* 19 suppl. (1932), 117–27; E. Docci, *Deputati romagnoli a Roma nel maggio 1831* (Faenza 1957).

THE PAPAL STATES AND REFORM ATTEMPTS: D. Demarco, *Il tramonto dello Stato pontificio. Il papato di Gregorio XVI* (Turin 1949; see also *RStRis* 44 [1957], 191–258); G. Quazza, *La lotta sociale nel Risorgimento* (Turin 1951), 113–42; N. Nada, *Metternich e la Riforma nello Stato pontificio. La missione Sebregondi a Roma 1832–1836* (Turin 1957; important, but to be qualified according to E. Morelli in *ChStato* II, 554–60 and L. Pásztor in *La Bibliofilia* 60 [1958], 285–97); P. Dalla Torre, "L'opera riformatrice e amministrativa di Gregorio XVI," *GregMC,* 29–121; P. Ciprotti in *GregMC* I, 113–121. See also A. Boyer d'Agen, *La prélature de Léon XIII. De Bénévent à Pérouse, 1838–45* (Paris 1907).

RECENT DISTURBANCES: In addition to Schmidlin, *PG* I, 549–56, see A. M. Ghisalberti in *GregMC* II, 123–34; A. M. Ghisalberti in *RStRis* 19 (1932), 70–88; O. Montenovesi, "I casi di Romagna, sett. 1845," *RStRis* 8 (1921), 307–426; J. A. v. Helfert, *Gregor XVI. und Pius IX. vom Oktober 1845 bis November 1846* (Prague 1895). See also M. d'Azeglio, *Degli ultimi casi di Romagna* (Florence 1846).

CATHOLICS AND THE PROBLEM OF ITALIAN UNITY

A. M. Ghisalberti, *Il movimento nazionale del 1831 alla vigilia della prima guerra d'indipendenza d'Italia* III, ed. by N. Valeri (Turin 1965), 533–712; Jemolo, 19–36; W. Maturi in *EnI* XXIX, 437–39; A. Anzilotti, *La funzione storica del giobertismo* (Florence 1923); S. A. Kähler, "Über zwei italienische Programmschriften zur Neuordnung Italiens und Europas von 1843," *NAG,* Phil.-Hist. Kl. (1944), 33–62; A. M. Ghisalberti, "Reazioni cattoliche alle 'Speranze d'Italia'" AstIt 112 (1954), 195–216; A. Luzio, *La massoneria e il Risorgimento* I (Bologna 1925); G. Ambrosetti, "Illuminismo e tradizione cattolica nei concetti del Risorgimento," *I cattolici e il Risorgimento* (Rome 1963), 35–49; L. Bulferetti, "Albori del Risorgimento fra illuminismo e diritto naturale cristiano," *BStBiS* 19 (1947), 55–75; D. Massè, *Il caso di coscienza del Risorgimento italiano* (Alba 1946); D. Massè, *Cattolici e Risorgimento* (Rome 1961); M. Apollonio, "La letteratura d'ispirazione cattolica e il Risorgimento," *Vita e Pensiero* 42 (1959), 918–32; A. Manno, *L'opinione religiosa e conservatrice in Italia del 1830 al 1850* (Turin 1912); P. Treves, *L'idea di Roma e la cultura italiana del secolo XIX* (Milan–Naples 1962).

THE VARIETIES OF CATHOLIC LIBERALISM IN ITALY

This topic is treated in the publications on the origins of the Risorgimento and in the numerous studies devoted to its leaders: Manzoni (see p. 394), G. Capponi (see p. 322, footnote 38), R. Lambruschini (see p. 322, footnote 39), A. Rosmini (see p. 323, footnote 42), V. Gioberti (see p. 316, footnote 17), G. Ventura (see p. 394 and 328 footnote 48) etc. For a general view, see A. C. Jemolo in *Relazioni del X Congresso internazionale di scienze storichi* V (Florence 1955), 325–31, 365–71; A. C. Jemolo, "Il cattolicesimo liberale dal 1815 al 1848," *RStT* 4 (1958), 239–50; E. Artom, "Il problema politico dei cattolici italiani nel XIX secolo," *RStT* 4(1958), 215–37; E. Passerin d'Entrèves, "Il cattolicesimo liberale ed il movimento neoguelfo in Italia," *Nuove Questioni di storia del Risorgimento* I (Milan 1961), 565–88; L. Salvatorelli, "Il problema religioso nel Risorgimento," *RStRis* 43 (1956), 193–216; L. Salvatorelli, *Il pensiero politico italiano del 1700 al 1870* (Bari 1943), 187–221, 259–90. Also, F. De Sanctis: *Opere,* ed. by C. Muscetta, G. Candeloro, XI (Turin 1953); A. Anzilotti, "Dal neoguelfismo all'idea liberale," *Nuova Rivista storica* 1 (1917), 227–56, 385–422; F. Landogna, *Saggio sul cattolicesimo liberale in Italia* (Livorno 1925); P. Fossi, *Italiani dell'Ottocento, Rosmini, Capponi, Lambruschini, Tommaseo, Manzoni* (Florence 1941); A. Pietra, *Storia del movimento cattolico liberale* (Milan 1947). The anthology by R. Tisato, *I liberali cattolici. Testi scelti e commentati* (Treviso 1959) is very disputable (see *Nuova Rivista storica* 44 [1960], 156–61).

Concerning the Tuscan group, see A. Gambara, *Riforma religiosa nel carteggio inedito di R. Lambruschini,* 2 vols. (Turin 1926); P. Barbaini, *Problemi religiosi nella vita politica-culturale del Risorgimento in Toscana* (Turin 1961), 157–215; R. Mori in *I cattolici italiani dall'800 ad oggi* (Brescia 1964), 29–47; G. Gentile, *G. Capponi e la cultura toscana nel secolo XIX* (Florence 1942); S. Jacini, *Un reformatore toscano dell'epoca del Risorgimento, il conte P. Guicciardini* (Florence 1940); M. L. Trebiliani in *Studium* 53 (1957), 527–40.

20. *The States of the German Confederation and Switzerland, 1830–1848*

GENERAL: Brück, *Geschichte* II, 274–592; L. Bergsträsser, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Zentrumspartei* (Tübingen 1910); Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* I; Schmidlin, *PG* I, 488–92, 567–95, II, 190 ff.; Leflon (Fliche-Martin 20), 415f., 464f., 465–70; Schnabel, *G* IV, 97–220; Ritter, *Die Katholisch-soziale Bewegung,* chap. 3; S. Huber, *Verfassungsgeschichte* II (Stuttgart 1960), 185–265, 345–70; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 321, 328–35, 336f.; Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie,* 25ff., 48–55; Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche 1648–1870,* 93f., 99f., 117–22, 129; Pesch, *Die kirchlich-politische Presse,* 154–94, 203–26.

PRUSSIA: J. Bachem, *Preussen und die katholische Kirche* (Cologne 1887), 56–71; J. Hansen: *Geschichte des Rheinlandes* I (Bonn 1922), 270–98; W. Schulte, *Volk und Staat. Westfalen im Vormärz und in der Revolution 1848/49* (Münster 1954); F. H. Fonk, *Das staatliche Mischehenrecht in Preussen vom Allgemeinen Landrecht an* (Bielefeld 1961); B. Poll, "Preussen und die Rheinlande," *ZAGV* 76 (1964); R. Vierhaus, "Preussen und die Rheinlande," *RhVJBll* 30 (1965); Lipgens, *Spiegel;* K.-G. Faber, *Die Rheinlande zwischen Restauration und Revolution. Probleme der rheinischen Geschichte 1814–1848 im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Publizistik* (Wiesbaden 1966); A. Klein, *Die Personalpolitik der Hohenzollernmonarchie bei der Kölner Regierung* (Düsseldorf 1967).

COLOGNE DISTURBANCES: H. Schrörs, *Die Kölner Wirren. Studien zu ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin–Bonn 1927); H. Bastgen, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchenpolitik Gregors*

XVI. (Paderborn 1929); H. Bastgen, *Die Verhandlungen zwischen dem Berliner Hof und dem Heiligen Stuhl über die konfessionell gemischten Ehen* (Paderborn 1936); Schönig, *Binterim;* J. Grisar, "Die Allokution Gregors XVI. vom 10. Dezember 1837," *Misc. Hist. Pont.* XIV (Rome 1948); R. Lill, *Die Beilegung der Kölner Wirren* (Düsseldorf 1962).

BAVARIA: M. Doeberl, *Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns* III, ed. by M. Spindler (Munich 1931), 15–31, 123f., 125–47; B. (H.) Bastgen, *Bayern und der Heilige Stuhl* and articles by Bastgen in *HJ* 49 (1929), *AkathKR* 109 (1929), *Mitteilungen des Historischen Vereins der Pfalz* 50 (1930/32); W. Mathäser, *Der Ludwigs-Missionsverein in der Zeit Ludwigs I.* (Munich 1939); H. Gollwitzer, "Carl v. Abel und seine Politik 1837–47" (unpubl. diss., Munich 1944); M. Spindler, "Die politische Wendung von 1847/48 in Bayern," *Bayern. Staat und Kirche, Land und Reich, Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Winkler* (Munich 1961), now also in Spindler, *Erbe und Verpflichtung* (Munich 1966); Franz-Willing, *Bayerische Vatikangesandtschaft,* 36–45; W. M. Hahn, *Romantik und katholische Restauration. Das Wirken des Sailerschülers und Bischofs von Regensburg Franz X. von Schwäbl* (*Misc. Bavarica Monacensis,* 24, Munich 1970).

SOUTHWEST GERMANY: Literature on the Upper Rhenish Church Province in chapter 7, especially the works by Brück, Maas, Lauer, Gönner-Sester, Hagen, Reidel, and Höhler. Also O. Bechtold, *Der "Ruf nach Synoden" als kirchenpolitische Erscheinung im jungen Erzbistum Freiburg 1827–60* (diss., Freiburg 1958); E. Keller, "Das erste Freiburger Rituale von 1835," *FreibDiözArch* 80 (1960).—C. Bauer, *Politischer Katholizismus in Württemberg bis 1848* (Freiburg 1929); A. Hagen, *Der Mischehenstreit in Württemberg 1837–55* (Paderborn 1931); A. Hagen, *Gestalten aus dem schwäbischen Katholizismus,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1948/54); A. Hagen, *Die kirchliche Aufklärung in der Diözese Rottenburg* (Stuttgart 1953); P. Blickle, "Katholizismus, Aristokratie und Bürokratie im Württemberg des Vormärz," *HJ,* 88 (1968).—H. Becker, "Der nassauische Geheime Kirchenrat Johann Ludwig Koch, ein Exponent der episkopalistischen . . . Bewegung," *AMrhKG* 15 (1963).

AUSTRIA: Literature in chapter 7, especially the works of Beer, Maass, Tomek, Weinzierl-Fischer, and Pototschnig, also C. Wolfsgruber, *Joseph Othmar Cardinal Rauscher* (Freiburg 1888); M. Hussarek, "Die Verhandlung des Konkordates vom 18. August 1855," *AÖG* 109 (1921); H. v. Srbik, *Metternich. Der Staatsmann und der Mensch* II (Munich 1925, reprint 1957), 1–45; F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* I (Graz–Vienna–Cologne 1958), chaps. 1 and 2; Winter, *Romantismus, Restauration und Frühliberalismus im österreichischen Vormärz* (Vienna 1968).

SWITZERLAND: Literature in chapter 7, especially the works by Gareis, Zorn, Büchi, Seeholzer, Lampert, and Schwengler, as well as W. Näf, *Der schweizerische Sonderbundskrieg als Vorspiel der deutschen Revolution* (diss., Munich 1920); H. Dommann, "Die Kirchenpolitik im ersten Jahrzehnt des neuen Bistums Basel," *ZSKG* 22/23 (1928/29); E. J. J. Müller, "Religion und Politik. Vom Sinn des 'Sonderbund'-Geschehens," *Schweizer Rundschau* 47 (1947); E. F. J. Müller-Büchi, "Die Anfänge der katholisch-konservativen Tagespresse in der Schweiz," *ZSKG* 54 (1960); F. Glauser, "Der Kanton Solothurn und die Badener Artikel 1834–35," *Jahrbücher für solothurnische Geschichte* 33/34 (1960/61); F. Glauser, "Ludwig von Roll und die solothurnische Ausgleichsbewegung von 1830–31," *SZG* 12 (1962); F. Glauser, "Luzern und der Zürcher Putsch von 1839," *ZSKG* 57 (1963); R. Flury, *Johann Matthias Hungerbühler . . . Werdegang und Wirken bis 1848* (St. Gallen 1962); E. Bucher, *Die Geschichte des Sonderbundkrieges* (Zürich 1966); K. Büchi, *Die Krise der Luzerner Regeneration 1839–41*

(Zürich 1967); H. Raab, "Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg und Karl Ludwig von Haller," *ZSKG* 62 (1968); K. Büchi, "Joseph von Görres und die Schweiz," *HJ* 89 (1969).

21. *Great Britain and Ireland 1830–1848*

The Letters of the Most Reverend John MacHale (Dublin 1847); W. J. Fitzpatrick, *The Life, Times, and Correspondence of Right Reverend Dr. Doyle,* 2 vols. (Dublin 1880); B. O'Reilly, *John MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam,* 2 vols. (New York 1890); J. Healy, *Maynooth College 1795–1895* (Dublin 1895); W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* 2 vols. (London 1897); B. Ward, *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation 1830–1850,* 2 vols. (London 1915); J. E. Handley, *The Irish in Scotland 1798–1845* (Cork 1943); J. D. Fitzpatrick, *Edmund Ignatius Rice* (Dublin 1945); D. Gwynn, *O'Connell, Davis, and the Colleges Bill* (Cork 1948); M. Tierney, ed., *Daniel O'Connell* (Dublin 1949); J. F. Broderick, *The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Union with England* (Rome 1951); R. B. MacDowell, ed., *Social Life in Ireland 1800–1845* (Dublin 1957); T. J. Walsh, *Nano Nagle and the Presentation Sisters* (Dublin 1959); R. Chapman, *Father Faber* (London 1961); J. A. Jackson, *The Irish in Britain* (London 1963); B. Fothergill, *Nicholas Wiseman* (London 1963); K. B. Nowlan, *The Politics of Repeal* (London 1965); O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* I (London 1966); J. Hickey, *Urban Catholicism in England and Wales from 1829 to the Present Day* (London 1967); D. H. Akenson, *The Irish Education Experiment* (London 1970).

The following parts of P. J. Corish, ed., *A History of Irish Catholicism* have been published: D. Gwynn, J. E. Handley, *Great Britain* (Dublin 1968); T. P. Cunningham, *Church Reorganization;* T. P. Kennedy, *Church Building;* J. Corkery, *Ecclesiastical Learning* (Dublin 1970); I. Murphy, S. V. Ó. Súilleabháin, F. McGrath, *Catholic Education* (Dublin 1970).

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT AND JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

SOURCES: *Newman's Works* (London 1868/81); A. Mozley, ed., *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his Life in the English Church,* 2 vols. (London 1891); *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others 1839–45* (Birmingham 1917); H. Tristram, ed., *John Henry Newman, Autobiographical Writings* (London 1956); C. S. Dessain, V. Blehl, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* XI–XX (1845–63), (London 1961/70; to be continued).

LITERATURE: H. Tristram, J. Bacchus, "Newman," *DThC* XI, 327–98; R.W. Church, *The Oxford Movement* (London 1891); P. Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIXe siècle,* 3 vols. (Paris 1899/1906); W. Ward, *The Life of John Henry Newman,* 2 vols. (London 1912); M. Laros, *Newman* (Mainz 1921); H. Tristram, *Newman and His Friends* (London 1933); J. Guitton, *La philosophie de Newman* (Paris 1933); M. Nédoncelle, *La philosophie religieuse de J. H. Newman* (Strasbourg 1946); G. Söhngen, *Newman, sein Gottesgedanke und seine Denkergestalt* (Bonn 1946); H. Fries, *Die Religionsphilosophie Newmans* (Stuttgart 1948); H. Fries,W. Becker, eds., *Newman-Studien* (Nuremberg 1948seqq.); F. McGrath, *Newman's University: Idea and Reality* (London 1951); J. Seynaeve, *Cardinal Newman's Doctrine on Holy Scripture* (Louvain 1953); J. H. Walgrave, *Newman, le développement du dogme* (Paris–Tournai 1957); H. Fries, "Newmans Beitrag zum Verständnis der Tradition," M. Schmaus, ed., *Die mündliche Überlieferung* (Munich 1957), 281–308; G. Biemer, *Überlieferung und Offen-*

barung: Die Lehre von der Tradition nach J. H. Newman (Freiburg 1960); J. Artz, "Der Ansatz der Newmanschen Glaubensbegründung," *Newman-Studien* IV (1960), 249–68; A. T. Bochraad, H. Tristram, *The Argument from Conscience to the Existence of God according to John Henry Newman* (Louvain 1961); F. McGrath, *The Consecration of Learning* (Dublin 1962); J. Altholz, *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England* (London 1962); H. A. MacDougall, *The Acton-Newman Relations* (New York 1962); M. Trevor, *Newman,* 2 vols. (London 1962); C. S. Dessain, *John Henry Newman* (London 1966).

INDEX

"Aa" of the Sulpician seminaries 74
Aachen, bishopric 136
Abel, Carl August von 337ff
Abyssinia 203
Achterfeld, J. A. 244
Adam, Germanos, Melkite bishop 182
Ad Dominici gregis custodiam, bull (1827) 138
Affre, Denis Auguste, archbishop of Paris 301
Africa mission 198
—under Gregory XVI 203
Agence générale of the French clergy 13
Ahrens, L. 285, 291
Albani, Joseph, cardinal 50, 95, 99, 261, 311
Albania 159
Alberdingk Thijm, Joseph 308
Aleppo, vicariate apostolic 161
Alexander I, tsar of Russia 114, 152, 156, 186
Algiers, diocese 295
Al-Halu, Yohanna, Maronite patriarch 180
Allemand, J. J. 68, 227
Allgemeiner Religions- und Kirchenfreund (Würzburg) 223
Allignol, brothers 296
Allioli, Joseph Franz von 222, 247
Alzon, Emmanuel d' 234, 297, 299
America 85
—the churches 162–179
—the churches of Latin America 163ff
—Negro misssions 197
—*see also* Latin America, United States of America
Amicizia cattolica 236f
Amicizie 78, 236f
Amico d'Italia 237, 255
Andlaw-Birseck, Heinrich Bernhard von 340
Andrews, W. E. 151
Angiolini, P., S. J. 208
Anglicanism, Anglicans 85, 345
—and Catholicism 114
Angola 85
Ankwicz, A. A., archbishop 188
Annales de philosophie chrétienne 299
Anselm of Canterbury 256
Anti-intellectualism 242
Antiliberalism
—Roman 129
Antilles 85
Antonelli, Giacomo, cardinal 51f, 56, 57
Ape, first Catholic journal in 19th century 78
Apologetics 245, 255, 269, 299
Aporti, Ferrante 236, 321
Apostolate 227, 234, 283
Appeals from abuse 109
Argentina 168, 169
Armenian Uniate Church 184
Arnoldi, Wilhelm, bishop of Trier 336
Asia
—ecclesiastical development under Gregory XVI 198ff
Association for the Defense of the Catholic Religion 230
Assumptionists 297, 299
Astros, d', vicar general in Paris72,75,109, 288
Auctorem fidei, bull (1794) 11
Augsburg, bishopric 134
Augustine 249, 256
Augustinians (-Hermits, -Recollects) 211
—in India 198
—in the USA 175
Australia 195
Austria 83, 84, 86f, 94, 99, 102, 107, 133, 140, 158, 330
—and Papal States 311ff
—and readmission of Society of Jesus 207, 209
—concordat (1855) 341
—ecclesiastical reorganization and established church 139ff
—intervention in Romagna (1831/32) 310f
—mixed marriages 342
—renewal of old orders 209
—secularization 6, 140
Aviau, d', archbishop of Bordeaux 64, 68
Avignon 24, 79, 95
—annexation 47
Aynès, F. D. 74
Azara, Spanish ambassador to Rome 47f
Azeglio, Cesare d' 78, 237
Azeglio, Massimo d' 319

Baader, Franz von 219f, 222, 247, 337
Badan, F. 164
Baden, grand duchy 138
—mixed marriages 340
Baden conferences (1834) 342
Bailly, E. 229, 298
Bailly, L. 249
Balbo, Cesare 318
Balmes, Jaime 114
Baltimore, diocese 171
—provincial councils (1829, 1833, 1837) 174f, 203
Bamberg, archbishopric 134
Baraldi, P. 237
Barat, Madeleine Sophie 67, 215
Barberi, Dominicus 346
Barron, Edward 203
Barruel, Abbé 76
Bartels, Adolphe 272, 273
Basel, bishopric 41, 142
Basilians 187f
Bassville, French envoy 47
Batavian Republic 38, 40
Batlori, P. 164
Bautain, Louis Eugène Marie 114, 119, 249f, 298
Bavaria 84, 86, 107, 133, 221f, 337
—appointment of bishops under Ludwig I 338
—concordat (1871) 134f
—Declaration of Tegernsee (1821) 135
—religious edict (1818) 135
—state church under Ludwig I 337
Belgium 44, 86, 89, 99, 238, 253, 261, 266, 275, 279ff, 286, 293, 301, 316, 320
—anticlericalism 306
—Catholic liberalism and the encyclical *Mirari vos* 289
—Catholic restoration 304
—Church and education 271f
—clergy (after 1830) 304ff
—confraternities 39
—constitution (1831) 279ff
—continuation of Catholic liberalism 302ff
—decision of Belgian Catholics in favor of freedom 271ff
—education policy 303
—episcopate (after 1830) 304ff
—laity 305
—peasant revolts 39
—priest training 271
—problem of social reform 305f
—provisional government (1830) 281
—religious instruction 303
—revolution (1830) 280, 288
—under Convention and Directory 38ff
—unionism 271f, 279, 282
Bellarmine 112
Bellisomi, cardinal 51, 77
Belvederi, R. 76
Benedict XIV, pope 4
Benedictines 16, 211f, 222
—in Bavaria 222
—in Brazil 170f
—in France 297
Benedictines, female congregations 212f
Benefices, system of 5
—in France 12, 17
Benkut, Franz Georg 223
Benvenuti, cardinal-bishop of Osimo 310
Béranger, Pierre Jean de 123
Berg, Franz 242
Bergier, Nicolas Sylvestre 250
Bernetti, Tommaso, cardinal 98, 157, 262, 266f, 312f
Bernier, Abbé 56, 59, 60, 62, 72
Bernis, de, cardinal 9, 24
Berthier, Louis Alexandre, French general 190
Bertier, Ferdinand de 76
Bertier, G. de 125, 214, 228
Besi, L. de 201
Bible 232
Bible societies 92, 115, 154, 321
Bichier des Ages, Jeanne Elisabeth 66
Bigot de Préameneu 65
Bihlmeyer, Karl 245
Billiart, Marie Rose Julie 66, 215
Binterim, Anton Josef 224
Blaj, synods (1821, 1833) 186
Blanc de Saint-Bonnet 298
Blancis, bishop of Syros 160
Bob, John, bishop of Fagaras 186
Böhme, Jakob 247
Boehmer, Johann Friedrich 114
Boisgelin, bishop of Aix 20
Bolivar, Simon 165, 166f
Bolivia 163
Boll, Bernhard, archbishop of Freiburg 339
Bommel, C. van, bishop of Liège 145f, 253, 280f, 301, 303
Bonald, Louis Gabriel Ambroise de 70, 88, 113, 230f, 250f, 252
Bonaparte, Elisa 70
Bonaparte, Joseph 49, 78, 80, 206
Bonaparte, Napoleon, *see* Napoleon I
Boncompagni Ludovisi, cardinal 10, 46
Boni, de 317
Bonn circle 224
Bonnetty, Augustin 299
Borbon, Luis de, cardinal 80ff
Boré, brothers 233
Borgia, Stefano 189
Borromäus Association 336
Bosnia-Herzegovina 159
Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne 109, 251
Boston, diocese 172
Boulogne, de, archbishop of Troyes 75
Bourbons 83, 88, 109f, 229, 234
—fall (1830) 123
Bouvier, J. B. 249
Brancadoro, nuncio 40
Braschi, Gianangelo, *see* Pius VI
Brazil 86
—political and ecclesiastical development 170f
Braunschweig, duchy 137

Breda, vicariate apostolic 143
Brentano, Clemens 219, 224, 247
Breslau, bishopric 136
Brest, Union of (1595) 186
Briche, Madame de la 70
Brixen, bishopric 140
Broeders van Liefde 213
Broglie, Maurice Jean M. de, bishop of Ghent 75, 144
Broglie, de, Sulpician 207
Broere, C. 253, 279, 307f
Brosses, Charles de, president 4
Brother congregations in France 297
Brothers of Christian Instruction 119, 213
Brothers of Christian Schools, Christian Brothers 119f, 144, 162
Brothers of Ploermel 213
Brothers of the Sacred Heart of Puy 213
Brothers of St. Gabriel 213
Brothers of St. Patrick 213
Brumanis, A. 154
Brunetière, F. 231
Brzozowski, Thaddeus, general S.J. 207
Bulgaria 159f
Buol, C. R., bishop of Chur 226
Bunsen, Christian Karl von 161, 332
Burg, Joseph Vitus, bishop of Mainz 340
Burma 200
Busca, cardinal 48
Buss, Franz Josef von 340
Buzzetti, Vincenzo 256

Calendar, republican, in France 32
Caleppi, nuncio at Lisbon 170
Canada 151
—anti-Catholicism 177
—Catholic Church 177ff
—priests, lack of 179
—Quebec Act (1774) 177
—school regulation 178
—Treaty of Paris (1763) 177f
—Union Act (1840) 178
Canosa, Prince of 127, 237
Canossa, Marchesa di 215
Canova, Antonio 105
Capaccini, Francesco, cardinal 108, 146, 268, 273, 281, 307
Cappellari, Bartolomeo Alberto (Mauro), *see* Gregory XVI
Capponi, Gino 322, 325
Caprara, Giovanni Battista, cardinal 60, 61, 62, 63, 72f, 77
Capuchins 162, 210
—in France 15, 297
—in Hindustan 200
—in Switzerland 226
—in Turkey 160f
Carbonari 103, 104, 310, 315
Carbonelle 48
Caritas, brief (1791) 27
Carmelites 6, 211
—female congregations 211
Carné, L. de 231, 234
Carroll, John, S. J. 171f, 173, 176f
Carthusians 6, 297
Casalès, E. de 234
Caselli, P. 56
Castiglione, Francesco Saverio, *see* Pius VIII
Castlereagh, Lord 84, 149
Casuistry 247, 249
Catalonia 80
Catechesis 247
Catharine II, tsarina of Russia 186f, 193
Catholic Action 98, 129, 228, 235
—in France 297
—in Italy 235ff
Catholic Association 150
Catholic Library 229
Catholic movement
—in France 227ff
—in Germany 216ff, 333
—in Italy 235ff
—in Switzerland 226
Catholic rent 150
Catholic Society of Good Books 228
Catholicism
—and liberalism 269ff
—and modern civilization 324
—political 292
Cavanis, brothers 213
Censorship of books 89
Censure of Toulouse 289
Chaldeans, Uniate 181, 184f
Chaminade, Guillaume-Joseph 69, 214f, 229
Champagnat, Marcellin 119, 213
Charitable Bequests Act (1844) 348
Charles IV, king of Spain 79, 209
Charles X, king of France 111, 117, 123, 232, 262
Charlottetown, bishopric 178
Chateaubriand, Francois René de 70, 90, 115, 116, 191, 239
Chaumont, Denis 191
Chevallier, L. 7
Chiaramonti, Luigi Barnaba, *see* Pius VII
Chile 168f
—ecclesiastical development 165f, 168
China 85
—Portuguese patronage 200f
China mission 189f, 193f
—under Gregory XVI 200f
Christian Brothers 66, 119, 212, 213
Chur, bishopric 142
Church, established 220, 225, 330, 331
Church Fathers 239, 246
Church history 218, 239, 242, 249
Churches, Eastern rite 179–189
Ciamberlani, vice superior of Dutch mission 143f
Cieciszewski, G., archbishop of Mogilev 155
Cienfuegos, canon 165
Circumscription, bulls of 133f
Cisalpine Republic 38, 42f, 76

Cispadanian Republic 42
Cistercians 211
—of *observantia communis* 211
Civil Constitution of the Clergy (1790) 8, 23f, 45, 47, 58
Clarissas 210
Claudius, Matthias 218, 221
Clausel de Montals, archbishop of Chartres 301
Clement XIII, pope 9
Clement XIV, pope 8
Clergy 88f, 97
Clergy, secular, crisis in 18th century 8f
Clet, J. F., Lazarist 194
Clorivière, P. de 69, 207
Cluny 16
Cobb, R. 32
Cochinchina 200
Code civil 116
Coindre, A. 213
Colapietra, R. 95
Colin, J. U., general superior of Marists 213
Collège de Juilly 298
Colmar, Johann Ludwig 223
Cologne, archbishopric 136
Cologne dispute 264, 266, 293, 330, 334, 337f
Colombia 165, 168
Committee of Public Safety 33
Committee of Reunited Bishops 35
Committee for the Defense of Religious Liberty 302
Commission of Regulars 7f, 16
Commissum divinitus, encyclical (1835) 264
Condillac 256
Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs 107
Congrégation de Lyon 74
Congrégation de Saint Pierre 254, 299
Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary 192
Congregations, religious
—blossoming of new congregations and institutions 213ff
—in France 228ff
Concordat policy 94, 97, 106ff
Consalvi, Ercole, cardinal-secretary of state 51, 53, 56f, 59, 72, 80, 83, 93ff, 96ff, 98f, 100ff, 105, 107, 117, 126, 133, 138, 144, 149, 165, 168, 207, 208, 220, 236, 267, 310, 313
Conseil de prêtres 23f
Conservateur 231, 273
Constance, bishopric 139
Constant, Benjamin 250, 254, 275
Convention de Messidor (concordat between France and the Holy See, 1801) 58
Convents, in France 15f, 21
Conventuals 210
—in Moldavia 159
Copts, Uniate 85, 180f
Costantini, C. 204
Coste 229
Cottolengo, Guiseppe 125, 236
Coucy, bishop of La Rochelle 61
Coudrin, J. P. 213
Courrier, Paul Louis 123
Courrier de la Meuse 272
Counterrevolution 87ff, 105
—in France 115f, 123
—in Italy 125ff
—in Spain 131
Cousin, Victor 300
Coutinho, Azevedo de 170
Coux, Charles de 276, 278
Craig, governor of Canada 177
Cramer, J. W. 308
Creoles 163
Crétineau-Joly 264
Criticism, Kantian 242, 244
Croce, Benedetto 90
Cuba 172
Cum primum, papal missive (1832) 157
Curtis, P. 151
Cuvier, George de 231

Dalberg, Karl Theodor von 112, 132f, 138
Dannenmayer, R. 112
Daughters of Charity (Verona) 215
Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul 15f, 66, 162, 212, 215
Daughters of the Heart of Mary 37f
Daughters of the Holy Cross of St. Andrew 66
Daughters of Wisdom 212
Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizen 21, 24, 31
De Foere, Abbé 144, 253
Degola, Eustachio 43, 45, 323
De Katholiek 308
Delacroix, S. 62, 67
Delpuits, P. 69
Demeter, Ignaz Anton, archbishop of Freiburg 339
Democracy 320f
—and gospel 270
Denmark 137
Dereser, teacher in Lucerne 226
Der Katholik (Mainz) 223, 231
Derré, J. R. 254, 285
Deterioration of morals as consequence of revolution 89
De salute animarum, bull (1821) 136f
Deshayes, P. G. 212, 213
Despuig, cardinal 52, 79
De Tijd 308
Devoti, Giovanni 111
Diderot, Denis 16
Diepenbrock, Melchior von, prince-bishop of Breslau 222, 249, 336f
Diesbach 236
Dietz, Hermann Josef 224
Digby, Kenelm 149, 344
Dillon, archbishop of Narbonne 61
Directory 47f, 55
—and Pope 47f
Dissenters 178

Dogma 240f
Dogmatics 240, 245, 246, 248f
Dogma, history of 246
Dolfini, bishop of Bergamo 44
Döllinger, Ignaz von 222, 247, 337
Dominicans 210f
—in Colombia 163
—in France 16, 297
—in Italy 210
—in Netherlands 210f
—in USA 171, 175, 211
Don Bosco, Giovanni 236
Don Carlos 131
Doria, cardinal 48
Doyle, James Warren, bishop of Kildare and Leighlin 114, 150, 151, 348
Drapeau blanc 231, 233, 235, 273
Drey, Johann Sebastian 245, 246
Droste zu Vischering, Clemens August von, archbishop of Cologne 266, 332f
Droulers, P. 287
Dublin Review 346
Dubourg, bishop 192
Dudon, P. 284f
Dufresse, J. G. T., bishop of Szechwan 194
Duine, F. 235
Dulac, L. 233
Dum acerbissimas, brief (1835) 331
Dunin, Martin von, archbishop of Gnesen-Posen 334
Dupanloup, Félix 118, 234, 283, 300, 301
Duphot, general 49
Dupin, André 109
Durando, Giacomo 318
Dutch mission 145f
Duvoisin, bishop 250

East Asia 85
Ecclesiastic principalities in Germany 39, 86
Ecclesiology 18, 240, 245f
—and Rosmini 324f
Eckhart, Meister 247
Eckstein, Nikolaus von 231, 250, 254, 270, 275
Ecuador 169
Egana, J. de 169
Eichendorff, Joseph von 219
Eichstätt, bishopric 134
Egypt 161
Electoral Hesse 138
Émery, Jacques André 30, 35f, 62, 68, 70, 73
Emmerick, Anna Katharina 247
Empiricism 5
Ems draft treaty 10
Encyclopedists 189
England, *see* Great Britain
England, John, bishop of Charleston 149, 175, 176
Enlightenment 4f, 14, 216, 220, 226, 242
Eos, journal 222
Epigraphy, Christian 255
Episcopalism 36, 224
Ercolani, bishop of Nicopolis 159
Ermland, bishopric 136
Espen, Zeger Bernard van 111
Espiga, J. 80
Etruria, kingdom 78
Etsi iam diu, encyclical (1824) 166
Etsi longissimo, encyclical (1816) 164f
Europe 85
Exegesis 240f, 249
Expilly, designated bishop of Quimper 25

Faber, Frederick William 344
Faith and reason 283
Faith, crisis of, as consequence of revolution 90
Farini, L. C. 314
Fathers of Mercy 122, 213
Fathers of the Faith 66, 67, 69, 207
Fathers of the Holy Ghost 66, 192
Favre, J. M. 236
Febronianism 3f, 104, 108, 111f, 112, 220, 224, 264
Feliciani, Antonio 200
Fenwick, E. A., O. P. 210
Ferdinand I, emperor of Austria 341
Ferdinand I, king of the Two Sicilies (Naples) 50, 78, 126
Ferdinand III, grand duke of Tuscany 127
Ferdinand VII, king of Spain 81f, 111, 130
—and Spanish America 163f, 167
Fesch, Joseph, cardinal-archbishop of Lyon 62, 64, 66, 67, 69, 71
Feudal system, abolition in France 19
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb 243, 317
Fideism 241, 242, 244, 249, 252
Figueiredo, Pereira de 170
Filippone, G. 48
Fingerlos, Mathias 242
Flaget, B. J., bishop 192
Foisset 118
Fonck, Martin Wilhelm 225
Fontainebleau, concordat (1813) 75
Fontana, cardinal 263
Fontanes, grand master of the University of Paris 70
Fontbonne, S. Jean 212
Forbin-Janson, Charles de, bishop of Nancy 195
Forcade, P., vicar apostolic 201
Fornari, R., cardinal 185
Fortis, Luigi, general S. J. 208
Fouché, Joseph 57
France 11f, 86f, 90, 93, 106, 113, 158, 269, 311, 320
—academic freedom 295, 299ff
—alleviation of lack of priests 118f
—alliance of throne and altar 115–125
—and encyclical *Mirari vos* 288
—and missions 190ff, 205
—and missions in Oceania 202
—and Papal States 310ff

—attempt to reconquer society and anticlerical reaction 120ff
—birth control 116
—Catholic action of laity 227f, 297, 302
—Catholic Church during Second Republic
——(after 1801) 59f
——reorganization of the Catholic Church (1795–97) 34f
——reorganization of dioceses 60
——schism in Catholic Church 25ff, 56f, 58
—Catholic press 230ff
—Catholic movement 227ff
—Christian education of the young 121
—church and state 108f
—clergy 12f, 17f, 253
——after 1801 63ff
——and Third Estate 21
——and hierarchy 17f
——during July monarchy 294f
——retreats and priests' conferences 119
—concordat (1516) 12, 23, 116
—concordat between Napoleon I and Pius VII (1801) 46, 55ff
—concordat of Fontainebleau (1813) 75
—concordat (1817) 109, 116f
—concordat, opposition to 61f
—Constituent Church and non-juring priests 25ff
—Constituent Assembly and the Church 18ff
—continuation of Catholic liberalism 294ff
—dechristianization 32f, 55, 120
—diocesan synods 18
—Enlightenment 5, 15
—episcopate 117f, 275
——and appointment of bishops during July monarchy 295f
——and Lamennais 282f
—equality of religion under Napoleon I 72
—founding of new congregations 206ff
—freedom of religion (1795) 34f, 37
—Gallican Church on eve of revolution 12ff
—hierarchy 16f, 58, 61f
——and Civil Constitution 26, 29
——solidification 118f
—July revolution (1830) 294ff
—migration laws 30ff
—missions to the people 121f
—monasteries and orders, dissolution of 6f, 30
—national council (1797) 35
—national council (1801) 55
—national council (1811) 75, 108
—nationalization of ecclesiastical estates 19f
—oath of "hate against monarchy" 36
—orders and congregations 119, 123f, 162
—Organic Articles (1801) 58f
—persecutions and dechristianization 29f
—*Petite Église* 61
—preparation for resumption of monastic life 37f
—press law (1822) 117
—priests, persecution of (1798) 36f
—rechristianization: the religious awakening 67ff, 120f
—relations to the Holy See 12f
—restoration of the Catholic state 116ff
——summary 124f
—restoration of monasteries, orders, and congregations 66f
—revolution (1789), *see* French Revolution
—"second revolution" (1792) 30
—secular and regular clergy and constitutional oath 25f
—secularization of monastic estates and regular clergy 20
—separation of church and state 31, 34ff
—theology on the way to a new apologetics 248ff
—ultramontane offensive 108ff
—ultramontanism 108ff
—uniform catechism of Nappoleon 72f
Francis I (II), emperor of Austria 50, 53, 141, 212, 341
Franciscans 161, 210, 222
—in Bavaria 222
—in Bosnia-Herzegovina 159
—in China 194
—in France 15f
—in Jerusalem 161
—in Mexico 169
—in USA 176
Franckenberg, Johann Heinrich Ferdinand von, cardinal 39
Frankfurt Conferences (1818) 138
Frayssinous, Denis 68, 110f, 121, 233, 234, 248, 250
Freemasonry 15, 92, 103, 127, 169, 322
—in Belgium 306
—in France 33
—in Italy 315
—in Portugal 131
French-Canadians 178
French Revolution 11ff
—and Catholic Church in Europe 12
—and mission work 189f
—and Pius VI 11–50
—causes 18
—effects on neighboring countries 38ff
Freiburg im Breisgau, archbishopric 138
Freire, general 166
Frey, Franz Andreas 112
Frezza, monsignor 286
Friedrich Wilhelm III, king of Prussia 137
Friedrich Wilhelm IV, king of Prussia 334f, 337
Frumence, Christian brother 212
Fulda, bishopric 138
Fürstenberg, Franz von 218

Gagarin, I. 157
Galeotti, Leopoldo 318
Galetti, lawyer in Bologna 314
Gallican (Constituent) Church 35
Gallicanism, Gallicans 3f, 22, 23, 27, 61, 88, 104, 108f, 116, 123f, 234, 253, 264, 287
Galicia 187

Gallitzin, Amalie, princess 112, 218, 242
Gallitzin circle 218, 242f, 333
Galuppi, Pasquale 256
Gandolfi 180, 182
Garampi, Giuseppe, cardinal 9
Garibaldi, nuncio in France 295
Gaysruck, archbishop of Milan 128
Gebsattel, L. A. von, bishop of Munich 225
Geiger, F. 226, 245
Geiselmann, Rudolf 243
Geissel, Johannes von, archbishop of Cologne 224, 335ff
General agency for the defense of religious freedom 278
Geneva, republic 38, 41
Geneva-Lausanne, bishopric 142
Genga, Annibale della, *see* Leo XII
Genoude, Antoine de 231
Genoa, republic 86, 125
George III, king of England 177
George IV, king of England 149
Gerbet, Philippe 229, 233, 254, 329
Gerdil, Hyacinthe Sigismond, cardinal 9
Gerhardinger, K. 215
Gerlache, de 273, 279, 288
Gerle, Carthusian 21
German Catholicism 336
Germany 5, 71, 83f, 112, 253, 278, 293, 329ff
—Catholic association movement 336
—Catholic press 222f
—Catholic restoration 111f
—ecclesiastic reorganization and established church in the states of the German Confederation 132–142
—ecclesiastic scholarship between rationalism and romantic idealism 241ff
—ecclesiastic situation and renewal in southwest Germany (after 1830) 339f
—established church law particularism 132
—states of the German Confederation (1830–48) 329ff
—theological rejuvenation 240
—ultramontanism 111f
Gialong, emperor 200
Giannone, Pietro 126
Gioberti, Vincenzo 239, 257, 316ff, 324, 325
Giornale degli apologisti della religione cattolica 237
Giornale ecclesiastico 237
Girondists 29
Giuntella, V. 45
Giustiniani, nuncio in Spain 131, 262
Gnesen dispute 264
Gnesen-Posen, archbishopric 136f
Gobel, Jean Baptiste, archbishop of Paris 23, 26, 33
"God and People" 315
Godechot, J. 11, 38, 43, 58
Godet 295
Godoy, Pedro de, O. P. 79, 81, 107
Göldlin, B., vicar apostolic 226
Goldlin von Tiefenau, prior of Beromünster 142
Golizin, prince 153f
Görres, Guido 333
Görres, Johann Joseph von 112, 207, 222, 231, 232, 248f, 251, 293, 333, 337
Goyau, Georges 203, 247, 302
Grande Chartreuse 211
Grandmaison, G. de 228, 247
Grassi, Antonio 193
Gratry, A. J. Alphonse 249
Gratz, Peter Alois 242
Gravina, nuncio in Spain 82
Great Britain 5, 83f, 86, 94, 158
—and India mission 198f
—and missions 205
—and missions in Oceania 202
—and Papal States 311
—Catholic emancipation 147f, 151, 293
—Catholic Emancipation Act (1829) 347f
—church and state (1830–48) 344ff
—contacts between government and Rome 149
—Enlightenment 5
—Irish immigration 346f
Greater German patriotism 217
Greece 316
—Catholicism 160
—revolution (1820) 158
—revolution (1827) 184
Grégoire, Henri, bishop of Blois 19, 27, 34, 35, 45, 48, 62, 69
Gregorian University 255
Gregorio de, cardinal 99
Gregory XVI (Bartolomeo Alberto Cappellari, Fra Mauro), pope 98, 99, 156f, 160, 167, 195, 213, 224, 226, 261–268, 285, 287, 293, 309, 310, 312, 313, 317, 330, 333, 335, 337, 338, 341, 348
—and churches in Spanish America 167ff, 168
—and Lamennais 285ff, 288ff
—and Polish church 156f
—and Portuguese patronage 199
—and Russian church policy 157
—and Uniate Churches of the Near East 181f, 185, 187
—China mission 201f
—India mission 199ff
—missionary work 195ff, 204
—reforms in Papal States 310ff
Grignion de Montfort, Louis Maria 212
Guelphism 316
Guéranger, Prosper Louis Pascal 235, 297
Guérin, Maurice de 234
Guerrier de Dumast 298
Gügler, J. 226, 245
Guizot Law (1833) 299
Gulfi 125
Gurian, W. 17
Gutkowski, O. P., bishop of Podlachia 157
Guyot, R. 48

Haag, H. 270
Haak, J. 22
Haeffelin, Kasimir von, cardinal 134

Hahn, Heinrich 192
Hajjar, J. 182
Haller, Karl Ludwig von 88, 220, 226f, 231, 324, 343
Hamann, Johann Georg 218
Hanover, kingdom 106
—concordat (1824) 137
Hanseatic cities 137
Harel de Tancrel 276
Hartmann, Anastasius, O. F. M. Cap., vicar apostolic of Bombay 200
Haskenscheid, Bernard 279
Haxthausen, Werner von 224
Hazard, Paul 3
Hébert, Jacques René 33
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 244, 245, 256
Hegelianism 147
Helfferich, J. A. 133
Helvetic Society 226
Helvetic Republic 38, 41, 141
Herder, Johann Gottfried von 242
Hermes, Georg 225, 241, 243f, 245, 330
Hermesianism, Hermesians 224f, 333, 336
Herzan, Franz von 51, 53
Hesse-Darmstadt 138
Hierarchy in 18th century 3ff
—and Risorgimento 319
Hildesheim, bishopric 137
Hill, P., O. P. 210
Hindi, Augustin, metropolitan of Diarbekr 181
Hindustan, Capuchin mission 200
Hirn, bishop of Tournai 75
Hirscher, Johann Baptist 246, 270, 339
Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland 333
History, early 251
Hobeich, Yussuf, Maronite patriarch 180
Hoche, Lazare, French commander of Army of the Rhine 40
Hofbauer, Clemens Maria 112, 213, 219ff, 225, 243
Holland, *see* Netherlands
Holy Alliance 88f, 269, 285f
Holy Childhood Association 195
Holy Cross Fathers, in the United States 175
Holy See, *see* Pope, papacy
Holy Year (1825) 96, 98, 106
Hommer, Joseph von, bishop of Trier 225, 333
Hormez, John, patriarch of Babylon 181f
Hornstein, Baron von 340
Hugo, Victor 232f, 261
Humanism, Christian 252, 277
Humboldt, Alexander von 231
Humboldt, Wilhelm von 53
Hungary 159
—mixed marriages 341
Hutt, M. G. 21

Idealism 240, 243
Illuminati, illuminism 44, 45, 236, 239, 248
Imbert, L. J. M., vicar apostolic of Korea 201
Impensa Romanorum Pontificum, bull 137
Imperial Delegates Final Recess (1803) 132
Index of Forbidden Books 96
Indians 85
India 85, 195
—ecclesiastical development under Gregory XVI 198f
—establishment of vicariates apostolic 198f
India mission 193
Indifferentism 96f, 106, 175, 226, 265, 287
Indochina
—persecution of Christians 200
Indonesia mission 202
Infallibility, papal 110, 112f, 224, 231, 237
Innocent XI, pope 74
Inquisition 79ff, 89, 130
Institute of Charity 214
Inter graviores, bull (1804) 80, 209
Interdenominationalism 113f
Intransigents (Italy) 319, 320, 321, 324, 326f
Ionian Islands 158
Irish
—in the United States 176
Irish Christian Brothers 348
Ireland 83f, 86, 99, 147f, 172, 261, 265, 275, 278
—church and state (1830–48) 344ff
—emancipation of English Catholics 149
Italy 44, 71, 76f, 83f, 86, 94, 125ff, 232, 253, 278, 293
—anticlericalism 129
—awakening of national consciousness 314f
—beginnings of Catholic action 235ff
—Catholicism and papacy as "spiritual sources" of national renascence 317f
—Catholic reform attempts to democratize the Church 323ff
—Catholics and the problem of Italian unity 314ff
—church and state during first half of 19th century 319ff
—clergy 125
—concordat (1803) 77f
—constitution of Bologna (1796) 42
—introduction of Code Napoléon 78
—liberal Catholic currents 319
—renascence of Christian philosophy 254ff
—rise of new congregations 206
—scholarly congresses in various capitals 315
—secret societies 310
—theological renewal 240ff
—under French occupation 42f
Italian Republic 76f
—introduction of Napoleonic catechism 78

Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich 221, 242
Jacobins 39, 42, 43, 45f, 49, 77, 327
Jacobis, Giustino de 203
Jacobite-Monophysites 182
Jansenism, Jansenists 4, 22, 35, 42, 43, 45f, 52, 80, 126, 127, 326

Janssen, Johannes 242
Jarcke, Carl Ernst 224, 334, 341
Jaricot, Marie Pauline 192, 229
Jarweh, Pierre, patriarch of Aleppo 182
Javouhey, Maria Anna 198, 215
Jemolo, A. 327, 329
Jerusalem 161
—custody of the Holy Land 161
—reestablishment of Latin patriarchate 162
Jesuits, *see* Society of Jesus
Jews 85
—in France 12, 72f
—in Italy 42f
—in Papal States 103
—in Switzerland 41
João VI, king of Portugal 170
Joseph II, emperor of Austria 10, 39, 141, 143
Joseph von Hohenzollern, bishop of Ermland 136
Josephinism 43, 86, 104, 106, 111f, 112, 127, 141, 147, 220, 340
Joset, Theodor 200
Journal des Flandres 303
Jugement doctrinal 144
July monarchy and the Church in France 294ff
Junta apostolica 131
Jurors and non-jurors 25ff, 29
Jürgensen, K. 270, 274
Jurisdiction, ecclesiastical
—in Spanish America 163

Kant, Immanuel 243f, 256
Kantianism 245, 265
Karkafeh, council (1806) 182
Katerkamp, Theodor 218
Katholische Kirchenzeitung (Aschaffenburg) 223
Keble, John 344
Keller, Johann Baptist von, bishop of Rottenburg 340
Kellermann, Bernard Georg 218
Kersten, Pierre 146, 272, 273, 306
Kindergartens 321
Kingston, bishopric 178
Klee, Heinrich 113
Klinckowström, F. A. von 219
Knights of the Faith 76f, 207, 229
Kolowrat, Franz Anton 341
Korea 85, 200f
—mission and persecution of Christians 201
Kulm, bishopric 136

La Chênaie, Lamennais' school 254, 299
Lacordaire, Henri Dominique 233, 234, 276, 278, 284, 286, 297, 299, 302
Lagrené, de 201
Laibach, congress and treaty (1821) 86, 102
Lamartine, Alphonse de 232
Lambruschini, Luigi, cardinal-secretary of state 98, 125, 253, 267f, 284, 295, 297, 313, 315, 317
Lambruschini, Raffaele 46, 270, 322f, 325
La Mennais (Lamennais), Hugo Félicité Robert de 98, 110, 112, 119, 122, 146, 157, 177, 229f, 230, 232f, 238, 241, 244, 248, 251, 253, 255, 266, 270, 273, 293, 296, 297, 299, 303, 305, 308, 324f
—and encyclical *Mirari vos* 288ff
—and *L'Avenir* 289
—appeal to Rome 282ff
—influence on Italy 327
—turn toward liberalism 273ff
Lamennais, Jean Marie de 119, 213, 232
L'ami de la religion et du roi 232
Landshut circle 221
Lanteri, Pio Brunone 125, 214, 236
La Plata 164, 168
—church and state 169
La Révellière-Lépeaux 36, 49
Lasso de la Vega, bishop 165
Latin America 85
Latil, Jean Baptiste de, cardinal 294
Latreille, A. 7, 18, 24, 56, 58, 67, 295
Latreille, Camille 108
Laurent, J. T. 307
Laval, Honoré 203
Lavater, Johann Kaspar 221
L'Avenir 276f, 282f, 282ff, 286f, 289, 293, 294, 298, 322, 327
La Valsainte 211
Laymen
—and hierarchy 325
—Catholic action in France 227f
Lay associations 92
Lazarists 66, 122, 162
—in Turkey 161
—in USA 174
Lebanon 85
Le Bras, G. 67
Lecanuet, E. 300
Le Catholique 231
Le Catholique des Pays-Bas 272
Le Correspondant 276f, 299
Le Cox, bishop 35, 62
Ledreuille, Abbé 298
Lefebvre, G. 29, 67
Leflon, J. 23, 52, 53, 60, 67, 254
Lefranc de Pompignan 17
Le Globe 276
Le Guillou, L. 288, 290
Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 256
Leo X, pope 9
Leo XII (Annibale della Genga), pope 83, 95f, 99, 102, 103, 105, 107, 115, 123, 137, 129, 138f, 146, 160, 184, 195, 208, 210, 211, 216, 223, 235f, 236, 255, 263, 267, 311
—and Latin American Churches 167f
Leo XIII (Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci), pope 180, 257, 265
Leopardi, Monaldo 321
Leopold I, king of Belgium 302, 306
Leopold I, grand duke of Tuscany 128, 322
Leopold Foundation 176, 192, 195

Le Pappe du Trévern, Jean Francois, bishop of Strasbourg 119
Lercari, archbishop 43
Le Sage ten Broek, J. G. 146, 253, 278f, 308ff
Lestrange, Dom de 211
Leturia, P. de 164
Levant, Catholic missions 160f
Lewicki, M., cardinal 187
Liberals and Catholics 90f, 325f
Liberalism 83, 98, 106, 126, 175, 269ff, 275
—anticlericalism 270f
—in Netherlands 308
Liberalism, Catholic 177, 231, 239
—continuation in Western Europe 294–309
—first phase 269–292
—from Belgian unionism to the campaign of *L'Avenir* 271–282
—in Belgium 281
—in Italy 325ff
varieties of Catholic liberalism in Italy 319ff
Liberia 203
Libermann, Franz Maria 197f
Liberty-Equality Oath 30f
Liebermann, Bruno Franz Leopold 112, 223, 224, 241
Liège, principality 38
Liguria 86
Ligurian Republic 38
—constitution of 1797 50f
Limburg, bishopric 138
Lingard, J. 152
Litteris altero abhinc, brief (1830) 332
Liturgy 217, 232, 245, 308
Llorente, J. A. 80
Locke, John 255, 256
Lola Montez scandal 339
Lombardy 86, 125, 328
—secularization of monasteries 6
Lombard-Venetian kingdom 125, 128
Lomeni, I., bishop of Fagaras 186
Loménie de Brienne, archbishop of Toulouse 7
Loreto Sisters 348
Louis XIV, king of France 74
Louis XVI, king of France 10, 24, 30
Louis XVIII, king of France 51, 116, 124
Louis of Parma 78
Louisiana, diocese 172
Louis-Philippe, king of France 99, 266, 282, 296
Louvain, Catholic university 305
Lowaizeh, council (1818) 180
Lucca, duchy 106, 125, 128
—republic 78
Ludwig I, king of Bavaria 212, 221f, 247, 335, 337f
Ludwig Missionary Association 176, 193, 195
L'Univers 299, 302
Luquet, bishop 196f, 204
Lützow, count 267
Luzerne, de la, cardinal 250
Lyon, Association for the Propagation of the Faith 192, 195
Lyon method 35
MacAuley, C. 216
Macchi, nuncio at Paris 121, 262
Macdonnell, A. 178
MacHale, John, archbishop of Tuam 150, 348
Madelin, L. 48
Mai, Angelo, cardinal 105
Mainz circle 112, 223
Mainz seminary 223, 241
Major, Peter 186
Maistre, Joseph de 70, 109f, 113, 147, 153, 220, 230, 250, 255, 324
—and his book *Du Pape* 109, 111, 113
Malacca 199
Manchuria 201
Mandello, G. B. de 194
Manitoba, bishopric 178
Manning, Henry Edward, cardinal 151
Manzoni, Alessandro 90, 232, 239, 256, 316, 327f
Marc-Bonnet, H. 206
Marches 101, 102, 310
Marco, professor 54
Maréchal, Christian 274
Marengo, victory of Napoleon (1800) 55
Maria I, queen of Portugal 10
Marian congregations 69, 226
Maria Theresa, empress of Austria 141, 186
Marino, I., O. P. 163
Marists 192, 213
—in Oceania 202
Marist Brothers 119, 213
Maronites, Maronite Church 85, 180, 184
—Maronite patriarchate 180
Martignac 97, 123, 230
Mary, veneration of 237
Masdeu, brothers 256
Masnovo 256
Massaia, Guglielmo, O. F. M. Cap. 203
Massillon, Jean Baptiste 233
Mastai-Ferretti, Giovanni Maria, *see* Pius IX
Mathieu, Adrien Jacques Marie, archbishop of Besancon 295
Mattei, Marius, cardinal 51
Maury, Jean L., cardinal 20, 30, 47, 51f, 75
Max I Joseph, king of Bavaria 135
Maximilian II, king of Bavaria 338
Maximos III Mazlum, Melkite patriarch 182, 184
Maynooth, seminary 148, 150
Maynooth Act (1845) 348
Mazenod, Eugène, bishop 62, 213, 216
Mazio, Raphael, cardinal 108
Mazzini, Giuseppe 310, 315, 317, 327
Méan, Francois Antoine de, archbishop of Mechelen 144, 281
Mechelen School 280
Mechitharists 183
Mecklenburg 137
Melkites, Uniate 182, 184
Melzi d'Eril 77
Mémorial catholique 234f, 254, 275
Memorie di religione, di morale e di letteratura 237

Mendicant orders 6, 209
—in Spain 80
—*see* also Dominicans, Franciscans
Menendez Pelayo 80
Mermier, P. 236
Mestizos 85
Metternich, Klemens, prince 88, 97, 103, 107, 141f, 144, 157, 266, 284, 285f, 289, 291, 310, 312f, 324, 335, 340f, 343
Mexico 163, 165, 168, 169
Micara, cardinal, general superior of Capuchins 210, 284, 328
Michaud, general 70, 114
Michelet, Jules 301
Mickiewicz, Adam 289
Miguel, Don M., king of Portugal 132
Milan, duchy 47, 78
Milner, John 149, 151f
Ming Mang, king of Tonkin 200
Minsk, diocese 155
Miollis, general 73
Mirari vos, encyclical (1832) 285, 286ff, 293, 303, 308, 328
Missionaries of the Most Holy Heart of Mary 197
Mission(s) 84
—and colonial powers 205
—Gregory XVI's missionary impulses 265
—lack of missionaries 189, 198
—Portuguese 195
—restoration under Gregory XVI 195ff
—start of restoration prior to Gregory XVI 189ff
—structural change 204
Missions to the people, parish missions 93
—in France 121ff
—in Switzerland 226
Mission works
—activity of European mission works in the USA 176
Mixed marriages, problem of 99, 113, 264, 331, 340, 342
Modena, duchy 42, 125, 128, 261, 310
—concordat 320
Mogilev, diocese 155
Mohammed Ali 161, 180, 184
Möhler, Johann Adam 112, 114, 247, 254
Moldavia, principality 159
Molé, Louis Matthieu 295
Mollat, G. 56
Monasteries 6ff, 97
—decadence 206
—in France 15ff, 20, 29f
—in Spanish America 209
—secularization in the 18th century 6
Monfortians 122
Mongolia 201
Montalembert, Charles René Forbes 276, 278, 284, 289, 293, 298, 299ff, 329
Monte Cassino 212
Montegelas, Maximilian 221, 222
Montlosier, de, count 109, 123, 229
Montmorency, Mathieu de 229
Montreal, bishopric 178
Moralism of 18th century 240, 247
Moral theology 240, 247, 249
Morelli, E. 312
Mornet, D. 14
Mountain, Anglican bishop of Quebec 177
Moy de Sons, Karl Ernst von 337
Müller, Adam 219f
Müller, Swiss pastor 226
Multa praeclare, decree (1838) 199
Munich circle, Görres circle 221, 278, 293, 333f
Munich nunciature dispute 10
Munich-Freising, archbishopric 134
Münster, bishopric 136
Murat, king of Naples 79, 126
Murray, Daniel, archbishop of Dublin 148, 151, 348
Muzi, vicar apostolic 163, 165f
mysticism 90, 248

Nada, N. 312
Naples, kingdom (of Two Sicilies) 78, 86, 88, 126f, 127, 318
—concordat (1818) 126
—concordat (1834/39) 319f
Napoleon I, emperor of France 12, 42, 43, 46, 47, 55ff, 71, 104, 106, 108, 122, 143, 149, 164f, 207, 248
—and Catholic missions 190f
—and Pius VII 50–82
—attack on Papal States and march on Rome 47f
—marriage to Marie-Louise of Austria 73
Nassau 138
National Protestantism 217
Nativism in the USA 174
"Natural religion" 4, 14, 242
Naxos, diocese 160
Nazarenes 225
Near Eastern studies 250, 255
Near East, Latinization 161f
Negro missions 203
Nellessen, Leonhard Aloys 225
Neogothic 225
Neoguelphism 101, 315f, 324, 328, 329
Neo-scholasticism 240
Nesselrode, Karl Robert 98
Netherlands 83f, 86, 113, 232, 253, 279, 293
—Belgian provinces 143ff
—Catholics in the kingdom of the Netherlands 142ff
—clergy, monasteries, and orders 143ff
—concordat attempts 146
—development of the Catholic Church (after 1830) 306ff
—laicization of education 144f
—religious freedom and equality of religion 143f
New England 174

New Granada, *see* Colombia
Newman, John Henry, cardinal 344f
New York, diocese 172
Nice 38
Nicholas I, tsar of Russia 114, 153, 187
Niebuhr, Barthold Georg 136, 332
Nodier, Charles 232
Notre Dame conferences 299
Nuncios, as heads of diplomatic corps 105
Nuntiam ad te, brief 199

Oath of hate 36f, 64
Oblates of St. Louis of Gonzaga 236
Oblates of the Immaculate Virgin Mary 192, 213
Oblates of the Virgin Mary 213, 236
Oberthür, Franz 242
Oceania, mission 202
O'Connell, Daniel 150, 176, 293, 346, 347
O'Higgins, Bernardo 166
Oldenburg, grand duchy 137
Old Regime 87f
—continuation in southern Europe 125–132
—restoration in Spain and Portugal 129ff
Olivieri, P. 284
Ontologism 257
Orbis catholicus (1815) 85ff
Orders 6f, 83, 88f, 91, 106, 191f
—decadence 209
—in Bavaria 222
—in Belgium 282, 305f
—in Brazil 170
—in France 15f, 30, 119, 123f, 161, 283, 297
—in Naples 126
—in Netherlands 307
—in Portugal 196
—in Russia 154
—in Spain 196
—in Spanish America 163f, 165, 169, 196
—in Tuscany 127
—in USA 171–177
—missionary activity 204f
—missionary spirit 205
—reestablishment in Catholic countries of Europe 161f
—secularization and its consequences 206
Organic Articles 71, 72, 109, 116, 136f, 143f
Orthodox denomination 86
Orthodox Journal, first English Catholic monthly 152
Osnabrück, bishopric 137
Otto von Wittelsbach 160
Ottoman Empire, *see* Turkey
Overberg, Bernard 218f
Oxford Movement 344, 346
Ozanam, Frédéric 194, 298f

Pacca, Bartolomeo, cardinal 73f, 91, 96f, 101, 107, 207, 255, 261, 284, 287
Paccanari, N. 207
Paderborn, bishopric 136
Palestine 161
Pallavicini, cardinal 9
Palotta, edict (1824) 104
Pantheism 242
Papacy, pope 84, 97, 133, 220, 315ff
—and churches in Spanish America 163ff
—and ecclesiastical development in the USA 171ff
—and Papal States 100ff
—and Russian Orthodox Church 189
—and Uniate Churches of the Near East 184
—destruction of the Holy See 46ff
—devaluation of authority of papacy in 18th century 4
—in the view of Lamennais 297f
—magisterial office 106, 110, 113
—primacy and infallibility, *see* Vatican Council I
—rejuvenated position of Holy See in the Church of the 19th century 104–115
—universal episcopate 111
Papal elections 8, 50f, 95, 98, 195, 261f
Papal States 79, 84, 90, 93, 94, 96, 97, 125, 133, 152, 261, 266f, 284, 287, 330, 341
—administrative reforms under Gregory XVI 312
—backwardness in 18th century 3
—civil code (1817) 101
—during French Revolution 46ff
—ferment in 310ff
—laicization of administration 101, 103
—motu proprio on reform of (1816) 101
—occupation (1798) 49
—occupation of Rome by Napoleon I (1808) 73
—reform of secretariat of state 313
—renewal of orders 209
—restoration 100ff
—revolution (1831) 310
—revolution (1832) 311
—union with France 73f
—under Pius VI 9f
—under Pius VII 53f
—welfare institutions 103
Paris congregation 228ff
Paris method 35
Paris mission seminary 191ff, 196
Parisis, Pierre Louis, bishop of Arras 301f
Parma, duchy 78, 125, 128, 261, 310
—secularization of monasteries 6f
Parthenopeian Republic 38, 43
Pascal, Blaise 231, 251
Passau, bishopric 134
Passerat, J. 213
Passerin d'Entrèves 329
Pastor, Ludwig von 190
Pastoralis sollicitudo, bull (1718) 48
Pasztor, L. 51, 54, 108, 311
Patriarchates, Uniate 84, 85
Patrology 255

Patronage, right of
—of the Brazilian emperor 170f
—Spanish 83, 86, 163f
— —in Spanish America 163ff
Paul I, tsar of Russia 49, 114
Paulus, Heinrich 242
Pedro I, emperor of Brazil 170
Peel, Robert 150, 348
Pellico, Silvio 315
Périer, Casimir 297, 299
Perthes, Friedrich 218
Peru 163, 168
Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich 221
Peter the Great, tsar of Russia 153
Petite Église 108, 116
Petrucci, vicar general S. J. 208
Pfeilschifter, Johann Baptist von 223
Philadelphia, diocese 172
Philippines 85
—missions and ecclesiastical development 202
Philipps de Lisle, Ambrose 149, 344
Phillips, George 113, 334, 337
Philosophes, deist 189
Philosophy 4, 240, 253
—*philosophes* in France 14f, 22
—and theology 5
Picot, Michel 232
Picpus Society 192, 213
—in Oceania 202
Piedmont 106, 255, 261, 318, 321
Piedmont-Sardinia, kingdom 125
Pietroboni, P., S. J. 208
Pietro Leopoldo, grand duke of Tuscany 10
Pignatelli, Joseph Maria, S. J. 206f
Pigneau de Behaine, Pierre 200
Pilgrimages 93
Pinto, Chilean secretary of state 166
Pires Pereira, Gaetano 201
Pisani, P. 35
Pistoia, synod (1789) 326
Pius VI (Gianangelo Braschi), pope 9f, 24, 30, 36, 46f, 50f, 52, 56, 72, 95, 107, 207, 212, 331
—and civil constitution of the clergy 24f, 27
—and declaration of human rights 27
—and ecclesiastical developments in France during the Revolution 24
—and French Revolution 46ff
—flight from Rome and deportation to France 49
—peace negotiations with France and peace of Tolentino (1797) 47f
Pius VII (Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti), pope 12, 44, 46, 69, 81, 83, 95, 103, 105f, 107f, 115, 116, 127, 130, 138, 149, 152f, 156, 159, 161, 186, 190, 194, 206, 208, 209, 211, 262, 274
—and Church in Spanish America 165ff
—and Church in the USA 172
—and Italian Republic 77f
—and missions 193f
—and Napoleon I 50–82
—and Spanish ecclesiastical policy 79
—and Uniate Ruthenians 187f
—abduction to Savona (1809) 73
—characteristics 52f
—Christmas homily (1797) 88
—concordat with France (1801) 55ff
—coronation of Napoleon I 71f
—election 50f
—in Fontainebleau and concordat of Fontainebleau (1813) 75
—protest against Organic Articles 53
—readmission of the Society of Jesus 206
—reform of Curia and Papal States 54
—religious reconstruction and reorganization of churches 83ff
—reorganization of Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith 195
—restoration of Papal States 100f
—restoration pope 92ff
—return to Rome (1814) 83
Pius VIII (Francesco Saverio Castiglioni), pope 95, 99f, 104, 106, 107, 195, 256, 261, 294f, 332, 337
—and churches in Spanish America 168
Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti), pope 106, 162, 224, 265, 302, 319
—and Uniate Churches in the Near East 185
Plato 249, 256
Placet, by the state 136, 138, 170, 335, 342
Plessis, O., bishop of Quebec 177f
Ploërmel, Christian Brothers of 119
Plongeron, B. 15, 26
Poland 86, 99, 135, 152f, 154, 261, 265
—Catholic Church in autonomous kingdom 153, 155ff
—dissolution of monasteries 156
—nationalization and Russification of Catholic Church 156
—revolution (1830/31) 156, 285, 290
Polish Catholicism 328
Polozk, synod (1829) 187
Polyphony, ancient 225
Pombal, Marquis de 10, 131, 170
Pompallier, S. M., bishop 202
Pondichéry, synod (1844) 204
Pontons de Rochefort 37
Poor Teaching Sisters of Our Lady 215
Portalis, Jean 59, 60, 65, 67, 189
Portalis, jr. 117
Port-Royal 230
Portugal 10, 83, 86, 129, 131, 261
—and India mission 198f
—restoration of the Church 131f
Positivism 90
Post diuturnas, bull (1800) 54
Postel, M. M. 215
Poupard, P. 249, 295
Pouthas, C. 71, 105, 165, 265
Poynter, W. 151
Premonstratensians 211
Premysl, synod (1818) 187f

Presbyterians 36
Presentation Sisters 348
Press, publications, Catholic
—in France 230ff
—in Germany 222f
—in Italy 237f
—in Switzerland 226
—in USA 175
Press, freedom of 269, 271f, 275, 286, 321
Priests of foreign missions 66
Priests of the Schools of Charity 213
Priests, marriage of 29, 31
Priests, associations of 213
Primacy, papal 112f
Probe nostis, mission encyclical (1843) 195
Processions 93
Propagation of the Faith, Congregation for the 204, 262
—and Church in USA 171, 175
—and churches in Spanish America 167
—and Jesuit missions 196
—and missions in non-European countries 189ff
—and Uniates in Near East 181f, 185
Protestant Association 174
Protestantism 85, 114f
—and Catholicism 113f
—in France 298
——under Napoleon I 72
—in Italy 321
—in Switzerland 226
Provida sollersque, bull of circumscription (1821) 138
Prussia 84, 86, 106, 133, 135
—and Papal States 311
—Common Law (1793) 135
—mixed marriages 331ff
—religious policy 331ff
Pugin, Augustus Welby 344
Pusey, Edward 344

Quebec, bishopric 177f
Queen's Colleges Act (1845) 348f
Quélen, de, archbishop of Paris 295
Quod de fidelium, brief (1821) 136
Quod divina sapientia, constitution (1824) 103
Quo graviora, encyclical of Leo XII 98
Quot aliquantum, brief (1791) 27

Rabban Hurmuz, monastery 181
Radowitz, Josef Maria von 224
Ram, Xavier de 253
Räss, Andreas, bishop of Strasbourg 112, 224f
Rationalism 241f, 245, 247, 264, 265, 287
Ratio studiorum of the Jesuits 5
Rauracic Republic 41
Rauscher, Joseph Otmar von, cardinal 220, 341
Rauzan, J. B. 68, 122, 213
Recursus ab abusu 136, 139
Redemptorists 129
—in Bulgaria 160
Reformation, anniversary of (1817) 222
Reform congregation for restoration of orders 209
Refractory priests 26ff, 33
Regalism 236, 293
Regensburg, bishopric 134
Regular canons 210f
—in France 15f
Reichsberger, G. 112
Reinhard, M. 33
Reisach, Karl August von, cardinal 338
Religion, freedom 269, 271, 276, 280, 287f
Religion, history of 243, 250
"Religion with Liberty" 327
Religious studies 252
—complex revival 240–257
Rémusat, Madame de 70
Rendu, L. 298
Re sacra, brief (1827) 139
Restoration, ecclesiastical 90f
—under Leo XII 95ff
Restoration of Europe 97f
Restoration ideology 217
Restoration popes 92ff
Revelation 219, 221, 243, 250, 252, 299
Revival movement, Protestant 90, 217, 298, 323
Revolution 217, 261, 265, 275, 277, 286
—and counterrevolution 87f
Revue catholique 275
Rezzi, P., S. J. 208
Rhenish circles 224f
Rhineland 44, 135, 330f
—under French occupation 40f
Riancey, de 301
Ricasoli, Bettino 323
Ricci, Scipione de, bishop 11, 78, 323
Richer, Edmond 18, 179
Richerists 22
Ringseis, Johann Nepomuk 222, 247, 337
Rio, Alexis Francois 248
Risorgimento 44, 129, 310–329
Rivadavia 165
Rivarola, A., cardinal 101, 102, 104
—judgment of Rivarola (Bologna 1825) 104
Robespierre, Maximilien 33
Robiana-Merode 273
Robiana, L. de 146
Rodat, Émilie de 215
Roermond, dicocese 143
Rogier, L. 4, 40
Rohan, Louis René, cardinal 285, 294
Romagna 100, 102, 104, 290, 310f, 312, 314
Roman Republic (1848) 38, 49
Romanians, Uniate 185f
Romanticism 90, 217f, 225, 240, 246, 261, 264, 269, 308
—French 231f
Romeo, O. Carm. 126
Ronsin, P., S. J. 228
Roothaan, Philipp, general S. J. 196, 201

Rosmini-Serbati, Antonio 46, 214, 236, 237, 239, 241, 256f, 270, 317, 323ff, 325, 327
Rospigliosi, prince of Tuscany 127
Rossi, Pellegrino 256, 297
Rossini, bishop of Syros 160
Rota, E. 327
Rottenburg, bishopric 138
Rousseau, Jean Jacques 227
Royer-Collard 70
Rozaven, P., S. J. 285
Rubino, B. 236
Ruffo, T., cardinal-legate in Ferrara 9, 51
Russia 84, 94, 102, 106, 158, 285, 290
—and Papal States 311
—and Uniate Church of the Ukraine 186
—contacts with the Holy See 152ff
—difficult situation of the Catholics (after 1815) 152ff
—dissolution of monasteries 155
—Jesuit mission in China 193
Ruthenians, Uniate 186ff
—in Galicia 187
—in Podcarpathia 188
—in Ukraine 186
Ryland, secretary of Southern Canada 177

Sacred Heart veneration 237
Sailer, Johann Michael 114, 147, 219, 221f, 243, 245, 336, 338
Sainte-Beuve, Charles-Augustin de 234
Sainte-Foi, Charles (Élie Jourdain) 234, 248
Saint-Sulpice 68, 109, 119
Sala, Joseph Anton, cardinal 108, 125
Salamon, papal legate at Paris 47
Salinis 229, 234, 298
Salle, Jean Baptiste de la 213
Salvandy Law (1847) 302
Salzburg, archbishopric 140
Salzmann, A., bishop of Basel 226
Sanchez de Tejada, J. 167
Sanfedists 45, 51, 89
San Salvador, bishopric 163
—schism 163, 168
Sansculottes 30f, 33
Saraiva, F., O. S. B. 132
Sardinia, kingdom 38, 128
—clergy 128
—monasteries and orders 128
Savigny, Friedrich Karl von 221
Savonarola, Girolamo, O. P. 328
Savoy 38, 129, 235, 318
Saxony, kingdom 137
Scharfeh, monastery 181
Scheill, Joseph 112
Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von 242, 246, 248
Schenk, Eduard von 222
Schiess, J. 133
Schlegel, Friedrich von 90, 112, 114, 219f, 231, 242f, 250
Schleiermacher, Friedrich 242, 246
Schleswig-Holstein 137
Schlosser, Johann Friedrich 219f, 224
Schmid, Christoph von 222
Schmidlin, Joseph 162, 204
Schmitt, H. J. 114
Scholasticism 240, 246, 247, 255
Schrant, priest 147
Schrörs, Heinrich 244
Schwäbl, Franz Xaver 222
Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung 226
Science and faith 254
Scotland 151
Scott, Walter 148, 308
Sebregondi, G. 312
Secret societies in Italy 264, 315
Secular institutes 69
Secularization 83f, 89, 216
Sedlnitzky von Choltitz, Leopold von, prince-bishop of Breslau 334
Self-determination of peoples 269f
Selkirk, Lord 178
Senegal 85
September massacres 30f
Serbia, Serbs 161, 189
Serra di Cassano, nuncio in Bavaria 135
Seton, Elizabeth 172, 175
Severoli, Antonio G., cardinal 95, 96, 102, 220
's-Hertogenbosch, vicariate apostolic 143
Siam (Thailand) 200
Siemaszko, J. 187
Siestrzencewicz, archbishop of Mogilev 154f, 187
Sigismondi 239
Silesia 331
Silva Coutinho, da, bishop of Rio de Janeiro 170
Silva Torres, José Maria da 199
Simon, A. 266, 267, 270, 274, 302, 303, 304, 306
Singulari nos, encyclical (1834) 291, 303
Sismondi, Jean Charles 322
Sisters of Charity 172, 175
Sisters of Charity of Jesus and Mary 66
Sisters of Charity of Nazareth 175
Sisters of Christian Schools of Mercy 215
Sisters of Joseph of Cluny 192, 198, 212, 215
—in Africa 198
Sisters of the Holy Family 215
Sisters of Loreto 175
Sisters of Love of Ghent 216
Sisters of Mercy 66, 215
Sisters of Notre Dame 66
Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur 175, 215
Sisters of Providence 175
Sitten, bishopric 142
Sicily, kingdom, *see* Naples
Smits, J. 308, 309
Smyrna, archbishopric 161
Snigurski, J. 187
Social doctrine, Catholic 220
Socialism, utopian 261
Società degli amici 237

Société d'education 178
Society for the Propagation of the Faith 176, 229
Society of Beneficial Studies 228
Society of Good Works 228
Society of Jesus 35, 52, 66, 96, 98, 109, 119, 122, 123, 127, 129, 193, 234, 237, 255, 266, 282, 285, 288, 318, 329
—among the Melkites 182
—and *Risorgimento* 319
—brief on dissolution of the Society 9
—in Austria 207, 209
—in China 193, 201
—in England 207
—in France 207, 209, 297
—in Russia 153, 193, 206, 209
—in Sardinia 128
—in Spain 130, 207, 209
—in Switzerland 226
—in Syria 162
—in Turkey 160
—in USA 171, 175, 207
—persecution and expulsion from European countries (1830–48) 195f
—readmission under Pius VII and reestablishment of former provinces in Europe and overseas (1830–51) 87, 206f
Society of Priests of the Heart of Jesus 69
Society of Priests of the Sacred Heart 207
Society of St. Francis Xavier 298
Society of St. Joseph 228
Society of the Holy Ghost 198
Society of the Sacred Heart 66, 175, 215
Sovereignty, popular 287
Spain 79, 83, 86, 88, 89, 107, 129ff, 261
—and mendicant orders 210
—and readmission of the Society of Jesus 207
—clergy and orders 129f
—dissolution of monasteries and orders 6
—ecclesiastical reforms 129ff
—juntas 81
—monasteries and orders 80f, 130
—theological renewal 240ff
—war of independence (1809) 80f
Spencer, George 344
Speyer, bishopric 134
Spiegel, Ferdinand August, archbishop of Cologne 225, 244, 331
Spina, cardinal 55f
Spiritans, *see* Fathers of the Holy Ghost
State church, established church 220, 225, 330
State congregation 163
State, secretariat of, papal 102, 107
Staudenmaier, Franz Anton 339
Sterckx, E., cardinal-archbishop of Mechelen 145, 146, 280, 281, 304
Stolberg, Friedrich Leopold zu 90, 218, 242
Stolberg-Wernigerode, princes 221
Strasbourg, seminary 249
Sturdza, A. 152
Suarez, Francisco de, S. J. 130
Sulpicians 75, 234, 249, 252
—in Canada 177
—in USA 172, 174f
Swetchine, Madame 298
Switzerland 84, 86, 106, 330
—beginnings of Catholic movement 226
—constitution (1803) 141
—ecclesiastical development (1830–48) 342ff
—ecclesiastical reorganization and established church 141f
—regeneration (after 1830) 342ff
—Sonderbund (Catholic League), war of (1847) 343
—under French occupation 41
Syria 161, 162
Syrian Uniate Church 181f, 184
Syros, "Island of the Pope" 160
Szechwan, synod (1803) 193f
Szumborski, bishop of Chelm 187

Talleyrand, Charles Maurice de 20, 23, 26, 56, 58
Tamburini, Michel Angelo 111
Taparelli d'Azeglio, Luigi, S. J. 256, 329
Taparelli d'Azeglio, Massimo, *see* Azeglio
Teaching brothers, congregations of 300
Teaching sisters, congregations of 300
Tecca da Capestrano, J., O. F. M. 210
Tessin 142
Testaferrata, nuncio in Switzerland 142
Thailand, *see* Siam
The Chronicle 149
Thémines, bishop of Blois 61, 108
Theocracy 238, 273
Theology 217f, 240ff, 243, 245ff, 253
—political 253
—profane culture 240
Theophilanthropy 36, 49
Thermidorians 34
Theux, de 303
Thibaudet, Albert 231
Third Estate 19
Thomas Aquinas 130, 247, 287
Thorwaldsen, Bertel 106
Throne and altar 89, 93, 115ff, 142, 269, 276, 279, 294, 394
Tithe 7f, 13, 19
Tolentino, peace (1797) 48, 100
Tommaseo, Niccolo 316, 325, 327f,
Tonkin 199
Torelli, Luigi 318
Tournely, Sulpician 207
Traditi humilitati nostrae, encyclical (1829) 106
Tradition 90, 240, 243, 245f, 252
Traditionalism 230, 239, 244, 252, 256, 279
—condemnation by Gregory XVI's encyclical *Singulari nos* 291
Traniellos, F. 325
Trannoy 302
Transsylvania 185f
Trappists 6, 211, 297
Trent, bishopric 140

Trévern, *see* Le Pappe
Tribute, horse 10
Trier, bishopric 136
Triest, Pierre Joseph 66, 213
Triora, Giovanni da, O. F. M. 194
Troya, G. 316
Trusteeism, trustees 173f
Tübingen School 218, 241, 245ff, 340
Turin, concordat (1841) 320
Turkey, Turks 86, 115
—Latin Catholics in Ottoman Empire 158ff
—Uniate Churches 179ff
Tuscany, grand duchy 78, 107, 125, 127, 279, 321, 322, 325, 328
—convention (1815) 127
—monasteries and orders 127
—secularization of monasteries 6
Tuyll, general 152
Tyrol 341
Tyrol rebellion 89

Ubi primum, encyclical (1824) 98, 106
Ultramontanism 105f, 238, 262, 265, 328, 331
Umbria 310
Umpierres, Raffaele 200
Uniate Churches
—emancipation from Near Eastern Churches 184
—in Eastern Europe 185ff
—in Russia 153
—of the Near East 179ff
United States of America 85, 274
—Catholic education 175f
—Catholic press 174
—charitable works 176
—ecclesiastical development 171ff
—episcopate 172f
—European priests 172f
—priests, lack of 172
—religious freedom 171
—separation of church and state 175f
Union attempts, ecclesiastical 113f
Urquijo, M. L. de 80

Van der Horst, priest 145
Van Maanen, Dutch minister 145
Vargas Laguna, Spanish ambassador 166f
Varin, P. 73, 207
Vatimesnil, de 302
Vázquez, canon 168
Vechta, officialate 137
Venetia 78, 86, 125
Ventura, Gioacchino 98, 236, 237, 255, 279, 283, 284, 290, 328
Venice, republic 42, 86
—secularization of monasteries 6
Verucci, G. 274
Veuillot, Louis 299
Viale-Prela, Michele 335
Vianney, Jean Marie 118
Viatte, A. 232
Vicari, Hermann von, archbishop of Freiburg 339
Vicariate of northern missions 137
Vicariates apostolic 205
Victor Emanuel I, king of Sardinia 128
Vienna circle 243
Vienna, Congress of 84, 86, 105, 133, 148
Vieusseux, G. P. 321
Villanueva, Joaquin 81, 131
Villèle, Joseph 98, 123
Villemain, Francois 301
Villers, Charles 254
Vilna, diocese 155
Vincent Conferences 298
Vree, F. J. van, bishop of Haarlem 307, 309
Vuarin, parish priest 226
Vulcan, bishop of Oradea Mare 186

Wallachia 159
Waldburg-Zeil, Konstantin von 340
Waldensians 128
Wallis, count 141
Walsh, William, archbishop of Dublin 346
Walter, Ferdinand 224
Wambold, F. von 133
Wangenheim, K. A. von 138
Ward, William George 344
Wars of Liberation 217
Warsaw, archbishopric 156
Weis, Nikolaus, bishop of Speyer 223f
Wellington, Arthur 150
Werner, Zacharias 219
Wessenberg, Ignaz Heinrich von 112, 133f, 138, 140, 220, 226, 339, 403
Westphalia 135
Whampoa, Chinese-French treaty (1844) 201
Wijckerslooth, Baron van 307
William I, king of the Netherlands 142ff, 266, 273, 288, 304
William II, king of the Netherlands 307
Windischmann, Friedrich 337, 339
Windischmann, Karl Joseph 224, 244
Wiseman, Nicholas 95, 248, 346
Witlox 309
Wittmann, Georg Michael 92, 215, 222
Women's apostolate overseas 198
Women's congregations 213ff
Women's orders in Bavaria 222
Württemberg 84, 132f, 138, 340
Würzburg, bishopric 134

Xaverius Society 193

Young Holland 309
Young Ireland 348
Young Italy 310, 315

Zamosc, council of Ruthenians (1720) 186
Zavaleta, bishopric 165
Zealots 9f, 49f, 50, 57, 73, 91, 94, 95f, 97f, 102f, 116, 125ff, 131, 223, 261, 264, 266, 313
—and concordat policy 106f
Zelada, cardinal 9, 48
Zengerle, bishop of Seckau 220
Zeya, Nikolaus 181
Ziegler, Gregor Thomas, bishop of Linz 220, 245
Zillertal "inclinants" 341
Zimmer, Patrituis 242
Zirkel, suffragan of Würzburg 221
Zwijsen, Johannes, bishop of Utrecht 307f

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

VIII

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume VIII

THE CHURCH IN THE AGE OF LIBERALISM

by

ROGER AUBERT

JOHANNES BECKMANN

PATRICK J. CORISH

RUDOLF LILL

Translated by

Peter Becker

CROSSROAD • NEW YORK

1981
The Crossroad Publishing Company
18 East 41st Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. VI/I *Die Kirche in der Gegenwart: Die Kirche zwischen Revolution*
und Restauration, chapters 22 through 44, 2d edition
© Verlag Herder Freiburg im Breisgau 1971

English translation © 1981 by The Crossroad Publishing Company
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or
by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording,
or otherwise, without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:
The Church in the age of liberalism.
(History of the church; v. 8)
"Translated from the Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte,
vol. VI, 1, Die Kirche in der Gegenwart: Die Kirche
zwischen Revolution und Restrauration, chapters 22
through 44, 2d edition."
Includes bibliographies and index.
1. Catholic Church—History—19th century.
I. Aubert, Roger. II. Series: Jedin, Hubert, 1900–
ed. Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. English; v. 8.
BR145.2.J413 1980, vol. 8 [BX1386] 282'.09'034 80-25830
ISBN 0-8245-0011-3 Previously: 0-8164-0447-X

CONTENTS

Preface to the English Edition ix
List of Abbreviations xi

PART ONE: BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1830 AND 1848

Section One: The Continuation of Catholic Renewal in Europe (Roger Aubert) 3

Chapter 1: The Progress of Ultramontanism and the Growth of the International Orders 3
Progress of Ultramontanism 3
The Large Orders 9

Chapter 2: Old and New in Pastoral Care and Moral Theology 14
The Modernization of Ecclesiastical Institutions 14
The Methods of Catechetical Instruction 16
Pastoral Theology and Pastoral Practice 20
The Reaction of Moral Theology to the Rationalism of Enlightenment and Rigorism 27

Chapter 3: Catholic Thought Searching for New Ways 31
The Hermesian Controversy 32
Rise and Fall of Güntherianism 35
Tübingen and Munich 39
The Catholic University of Louvain 43
Tentative Attempts by the Catholic Intellectuals in France 45
The Growth of the Catholic Press 53

Section Two: The Ascension of Pius IX and the Crisis of 1848 (chs. 4, 5, 6/II: Roger Aubert; ch. 6/I: Rudolf Lill) 57

Chapter 4: The First Years of the Pontificate of Pius IX: From the Neoguelf Mythos to the Roman Revolution 57

Chapter 5: The Consequences of the Events of 1848 in France 66

Chapter 6: The Consequences of the 1848 Revolution in the States of the German Confederation and the Netherlands 70
The States of the German Confederation 70
The Netherlands 77

PART TWO: THE CATHOLIC REACTION TO LIBERALISM

Introduction: Pius IX after 1848 83

SECTION ONE: THE TEMPORARY IMPROVEMENT IN THE SITUATION OF THE CHURCH (chs. 7, 9/II, 10, 11: Roger Aubert; ch. 8: Rudolf Lill; ch. 9/I: Patrick J. Corish) 91

Chapter 7: The Seeming Success of the Church in France during the Second Empire and the "Moral Order" 92
  The Privileged Status of the Church 92
  The Ambivalence of the Actual Religious Situation 98

Chapter 8: The States of the German Confederation and Switzerland, 1848–70 104

Chapter 9: The Rise of Catholicism in the Anglo-Saxon World 121
  England 121
  Scotland 125
  Ireland 126
  The United States 130
  Canada 138
  Australia 142

Chapter 10: The Easing of Tensions in the Iberian World 143
  Spain 143
  Portugal 148
  The Spanish-American Republics 149
  Brazil 153

Chapter 11: The Catholic Church in the Orthodox World 154
  Unionist Prospects in the East 154
  The Russian Empire 158
  The Slavs in Austria-Hungary 165
  Progress of Catholicism in Southeastern Europe and the Levant 167
  The Eastern Patriarchates 171

SECTION TWO: THE MISSIONS BETWEEN 1840 AND 1870 (Johannes Beckmann) 175

Chapter 12: The Strengthening of the Gregorian Restoration 175
  The Weakening of the Portuguese Patronage and the Reorganization of the Asian Missions 178
    In the British Sphere of Influence 178
    In the French Sphere of Influence 186
  Philippines, Indonesia, Oceania, Africa 193

Chapter 13: The First Vatican Council and the Missions 199

SECTION THREE: LIGHT AND SHADOWS OF CATHOLIC VITALITY (Roger Aubert) 208

Chapter 14: Regular and Secular Clergy 208
  Orders and Congregations 208
  The Diocesan Clergy and Pastoral Work 213

Chapter 15: The Growth of Piety 218

Chapter 16: The Backwardness of Religious Studies and the Controversy about the "German Theologians" 228
  Religious Studies Outside of Germany 228
  Scholastics and Germanics vs. the "German Theologians" 237

SECTION FOUR: THE ALTERCATION BETWEEN CATHOLICISM AND LIBERALISM (chs. 17, 18, 20: Roger Aubert; ch. 19: Rudolf Lill) 248

Chapter 17: The Roman Question 248
  From the Papal Restoration to the Italian War 248
  From the Establishment of the Kingdom of Italy to the Occupation of Rome 250

Chapter 18: The Offensive of the Liberal Governments in the Non-German Speaking Countries 255
  The Secularization Policy in Italy 255
  Anticlericalism in Belgium and in the Netherlands 262
  The Confused Situation in the Iberian Peninsula 267
  Regalistic Liberals and Freemasons in Latin America 269

Chapter 19: Preliminary Phases of the *Kulturkampf* in Austria, Bavaria, Baden, and Switzerland 272

Chapter 20: Internal Catholic Controversies in Connection with Liberalism 283
  Catholicism and Liberalism after 1848 283
  The Division of the Catholics in France 285
  Catholic Liberalism outside France around 1860 289
  The *Syllabus* and its Consequences 293
  Antiliberalism and Social Catholicism 299

SECTION FIVE: THE VICTORY OF ULTRAMONTANISM (chs. 21, 22: Roger Aubert; 23: Rudolf Lill) 304

Chapter 21: Ultramontane Progress and Final Gallican Resistance 304
  The Ultramontane Movement around 1850 304
  Rome's Systematic Activity 306
  The Excesses of Neo-Ultramontanism and the Reaction in Germany and France 312

Chapter 22: The Vatican Council 315
  Preparation 315
  Infallibilists and Anti-Infallibilists 318
  First Council Debates 322
  Agitation concerning Papal Infallibility 325
  The Constitution *Pastor Aeternus* 328

Chapter 23: The Rise of the Old Catholic Community 330

BIBLIOGRAPHY 335
  General Bibliography 337
  Bibliography to Individual Chapters 349

INDEX 383

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

The decision to entitle this volume of the *History of the Church The Church in the Age of Liberalism* was not arrived at without taking into account the fact that the decades of the nineteenth century examined here witnessed a waning of much of what the expression "liberalism" signified: freedom of thought, laissez-faire in economics, and representative and parliamentary government. All of these declined in the face of nationalism, Romanticism, and especially political democracy. Yet in the Church it was the struggle over liberalism that overshadowed all else and it was Pio Nono who, holding the see of Rome longer than any other Pontiff, in opting for the Middle Ages treated all liberals as revolutionaries and all revolutionaries as devils. To many the anathemas of the *Syllabus Errorum* against all forms of Enlightenment-inspired liberalism were no less vituperous than Voltaire's *écrasez l'infâme.*

It is ironic that the temporal power of the papacy, based to a large extent on the slogans of Gregory VII on *libertas,* should have witnessed in its final moments an unprecedented attack on the same basic concept. Ironic also that the same Pope, who so vehemently denounced democracy as a form of government, was forced, due to a lack of evidence, to proclaim his infallibility on the basis of a plurality vote, albeit seemingly coerced from the cardinals. The notion of tradition was required to produce what it had not preserved.

Lord Acton, who was the outstanding spokesman of liberalism during this period, was angered not by the feeling that infallibility was a theological error but by the belief that it enshrined in the Church a monarchical autocracy which could never maintain itself apart from crime committed or condoned. The same author also maintained that almost every writer who really served Catholicism fell sooner or later under the disgrace or suspicion of Rome. This is certainly true of two of the great minds of the time, Döllinger and Newman. It is the genius and personality of the latter that is both the embodiment and the contradiction of the period. He, as Christopher Dawson writes, realized with perception and clarity of vision the new dangers which threatened the Christian faith and the whole traditional order of Christian civilization. At the same time he discovered and investigated the internal principle of development in the life of the Church by which what is already implicitly contained in Christian faith and tradition is unfolded and applied to meet the needs of the age, so that every new challenge to the faith becomes an opportunity for the conquest of new truths and reveals unsuspected depths of meaning in truths that are already familiar.

Newman saw that it was only in history that the divine process of progressive revelation and spiritual renovation could be fulfilled. "The Church does not teach that human nature is irreclaimable, else wherefore should she be sent?" For Newman, who along with Acton brought to the Church the long overdue influence of the Anglo-Saxon world once resplendent with the works of Bede, Anselm, Scotus, and More, if not for Pius, *ecclesia subjectos non habet ut servos, sed ut filios.*

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADRomana	*Archivio della Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1935seqq. (1878–1934: *ASRomana*).
AFP	*Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum,* Rome 1931seqq.
AGKKN	*Archief voor de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland,* Utrecht 1959seqq.
AHPont	*Archivum historiae pontificiae,* Rome 1963seqq.
AHR	*The American Historical Review,* New York, 1895seqq.
AHRF	*Annales historiques de la Révolution française,* Paris 1924seqq.
AHSI	*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu,* Rome 1932seqq.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855seqq.
AIA	*Archivo Ibero-Americano,* Madrid 1914seqq.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857seqq.
Albers, *Herstel*	P. Albers, *Geschiedenis van het herstel der hiërarchie in de Nederlanden,* 2 vols., Nijmegen and The Hague 1903–04.
Albers, *Lib. saec.*	[P. Albers] *Liber saecularis historiae Societatis Iesu ab anno 1814 ad annum 1914,* Rome 1914.
Ammann	A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte,* Vienna 1950.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949seqq.
Anthropos	*Anthroposophische Internationale Zeitschrift für Völker- und Sprachenkunde,* Mödling 1906seqq.
Antonianum	*Antonianum,* Rome 1926seqq.
AÖG	*Archiv für österreichische Geschichte,* Vienna 1865seqq.
AOP	*Analecta Sacri Ordinis Praedicatorum,* Rome 1892seqq.
ArchSR	*Archives de Sociologie des religions,* Paris 1956seqq.
ArSKG	*Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte,* K. Engelbert, ed., I–IV, Breslau 1936–41; VIIseqq., Hildesheim 1949seqq.
ASRomana	*Archivio della Reale Società Romana di Storia Patria,* Rome 1878–1934 (*ADRomana* after 1935).
ASS	*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* Rome 1865–1908.
AstIt	*Archivio storico Italiano,* Florence 1842seqq.
Aubert, *Pie IX*	R. Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (A. Fliche and V. Martin, eds., *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* 21) Paris 1962.
Aubert, *Vat*	R. Aubert, *Vaticanum I,* Mainz 1965.
Aubert-Martina	R. Aubert, *Il pontificato di Pio IX,* translated by G. Martina with notes and supplement, Turin 1969.

Backmund	N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense* I–III, Straubing 1949seqq.
Bastgen	F. Bastgen, *Die römische Frage,* 3 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1917–19.
Baunard	L. Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Église de France 1800–1900,* Paris 1902.
Becqué	M. Becqué, *Le cardinal Dechamps,* 2 vols., Louvain 1956.
Bellesheim, *Irland*	A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland,* 3 vols., Mainz 1890–91.
Bellesheim, *Schottland*	A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Schottland,* Mainz 1883.
Belvederi	R. Belvederi, *Il papato di fronte alla Rivoluzione ed alle conseguenze del Congresso di Vienna (1775–1846)*: P. Paschini and P. Brezzi, eds., *I Papi nella storia* II, Rome 1951, 767–930.
Bernasconi	A. M. Bernasconi, *Acta Gregorii Papae XVI, auspice cardinal Vanutelli recensita,* 4 vols., Rome 1901–04.
BIHBR	*Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome,* Brussels and Rome 1919seqq.
Bihlmeyer-Tüchle	K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte* I: *Das christliche Altertum,* Paderborn 1955; II: *Das Mittelalter,* Paderborn 1955; III: *Die Neuzeit und die neueste Zeit,* Paderborn 1968.
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* Toulouse 1899seqq.
BnatBelg	*Biographie nationale. Publiée par l'Académie de Belgique,* 35 vols., Brussels 1866–1970.
Boudou	A. Boudou, *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie. Leurs relations diplomatiques au XIX^e siècle,* 2 vols., Paris 1922–25.
Brugerette	J. Brugerette, *Le prêtre français et la société contemporaine,* 3 vols., Paris 1933–38.
BStBiS	*Bolletino storico-bibliografico subalpino,* Turin 1896seqq.
BullRomCont	*Bullarii Romani Continuatio,* A. Berberi and A. Spetia, eds., 19 vols., Rome 1835–58.
Burnichon	J. Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France. Histoire d'un siècle,* 4 vols., Paris 1914–22.

Cath	*Catholica. Jahrbuch (Vierteljahresschrift) für Kontroverstheologie,* (Paderborn) Münster 1932seqq.
CathEnc	*The Catholic Encyclopedia,* C. Herbermann, ed., 15 vols., New York 1907–12.
Catholicisme	*Catholicisme. Hier-Aujourd'hui-Demain,* G. Jacquemet, ed., Paris 1948seqq.
CH	*Church History,* New York and Chicago 1932seqq.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915seqq.
ChStato	*Chiesa e Stato nell'Ottocento. Miscellanea in onore di P. Pirri,* ed. by R. Aubert, A. M. Ghisalberti, E. Passerin d'Entrèves, 2 vols., Padua 1962.
Cîteaux	*Cîteaux. Commentarii cistercienses,* Westmalle (Belg.) 1950seqq.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850seqq. (1871–87 Florence).
CodCanOrFonti	*S. Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale. Codificazione Canonica Orientale. Fonti,* 3rd ser., Rome 1931seqq.
Colapietra	R. Colapietra, *La Chiesa tra Lamennais e Metternich,* Brescia 1963.
ColLac	*Collectio Lacensis: Acta et Decreta sacrorum conciliorum recentiorum,* ed. by Jesuits of Maria Laach, 7 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1870–90.
CollFr	*Collectanea Franciscana,* Rome 1931seqq.
CPF	*Collectanea Sancta Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (1622–1866), II (1867–1906), Rome 1907.

D	H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* Freiburg i. Br. 1967.
DACL	*Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, eds., 15 vols., Paris 1903–53.
Daniel-Rops	Daniel-Rops, *L'Église des Révolutions,* 2 vols., Paris 1960–63.
Dansette	A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine,* 2 vols., Paris 1948–51.
DBI	*Dizionario biografico degli Italiani,* A. M. Ghisalberti, ed., Rome 1960seqq.
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* R. Naz, ed., 7 vols., Paris 1935–65.
Debidour, *Histoire*	A. Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870,* 2 vols., Paris 1891.
Debidour, *III^e République*	A. Debidour, *L'Église catholique et l'État sous la Troisième République, 1870–1906,* 2 vols., Paris 1906.
de Clercq	C. de Clercq, *Conciles des Orientaux catholique* (*Histoire des conciles* XI), 2 vols., Paris 1949–52.
Delacroix	*Histoire universelle des missions catholiques,* S. Delacroix, ed., 4 vols., Paris and Monaco 1957–59.
de Montclos	X. de Montclos, *Lavigerie, le Saint-Siège et l'Église, 1846–1878,* Paris 1965.
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* A. Baudrillart, ed., Paris 1912seqq.
DictEngCath	*A Literary and Biographical History or Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics from 1534 to the Present Time,* by J. Gillow, 5 vols., London and New York 1885seqq.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* M. Viller, ed., Paris 1932seqq.
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* A. Vacant and E. Mangenot and É. Amann, 15 vols., Paris 1930.
Dupeux	G. Dupeux, *La société française 1789–1960* (Collection U, Histoire contemporaine), Paris 1964.
Duroselle	J.-B. Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social en France 1822–1870,* Paris 1951.
DVfLG	*Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte,* Halle 1923seqq.

ECatt	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* 12 vols., Rome 1949–54.
ED	*Euntes docete* (Commentaria urbana), Rome 1948seqq.
EEAm	*Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo-Americana,* 70 vols., Barcelona 1908–1930.
Éfranc	*Études franciscaines,* Paris 1909–40; n.s. 1950seqq.
Ellis, *AmCath*	J. T. Ellis, *American Catholicism* (The Chicago History of American Civilization), Chicago 1956.
Ellis, *Documents*	*Documents of American Catholic History,* J. T. Ellis, ed., Milwaukee 1956.
Engel-Janosi	F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan,* 2 vols., Graz 1958–60.
EnI	*Enciclopedia Italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti,* 35 vols., Rome 1929–37, Supplement 1938, Index volume 1939, 2 Supplements (1938–48), Rome 1948–49.
ÉO	*Échos d'Orient,* Paris 1897seqq.
EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* (Bruges) Gembloux 1924seqq.
Études	*Études,* Paris 1856seqq. (until 1896: *Études religieuses*).

Feine, *RG*	H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte* I: *Die katholische Kirche,* Graz 1964.
Fliche-Martin	*Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours,* published under the direction of A. Fliche and V. Martin, Paris 1935seqq.
FreibDiözArch	*Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv,* Freiburg i. Br. 1865seqq.
Friedrich	J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Conzils,* 3 vols., Nördlingen 1877–87.
FZThPh	*Freiburger Zeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie* (before 1914: *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie;* 1914–54: *DTh*), Fribourg.

Goyau	G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse au XIX^e siècle,* 4 vols., Paris 1905–09.
Gr	*Gregorianum,* Rome 1920seqq.
Grabmann *G*	M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit,* Freiburg i. Br. 1933.
GregMC	*Gregorio XVI. Miscellanea commemorativa* (*Miscellanea historiae pontificiae* XIII/XIV), 2 vols., Rome 1958.
Grimaud	L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France,* 6 vols., Grenoble and Paris 1944–54.
GRM	*Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift,* Heidelberg 1909–42 and 1951seqq.
Gurian	W. Gurian, *Die politischen und sozialen Ideen des französischen Katholizismus 1789–1914,* Freiburg i. Br. 1929.

Hagen *R*	A. Hagen, *Geschichte der Diözese Rottenburg,* 3 vols., I, Stuttgart 1957.
HAHR	*Hispanic American Historical Review,* Durham (N.C.) 1918seqq.
Hajjar	J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiennes uniates du Proche-Orient,* Paris 1962.
Hales	*Pio Nono, A Study in European Politics and Religion in the 19th Century,* London 1954.
Heimbucher	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 3 vols., Paderborn 1907–08.
Hermelink	H. Hermelink, *Das Christentum in der Menschheitsgeschichte von der Französischen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart* I–III, Stuttgart and Tübingen 1951–55.
HistCathFr	A. Latreille, J. R. Palanque, É. Delaruelle, and R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III: *La période contemporaine,* Paris 1962.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* (Cologne 1880seqq.) Munich 1950seqq.
Hocedez	E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la Théologie au XIX^e siècle,* Brussels and Paris, I, 1948; II, 1952; III, 1947.
Hochland	*Hochland,* Munich 1903seqq.
Holzapfel	H. Holzapfel, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens,* Freiburg i. Br. 1909.
HPBl	*Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland,* F. Binder and G. Jochner, eds., 171 vols., Munich 1838–1923.
HRSt	*Historical Records and Studies of the United States Catholic Historical Society,* Philadelphia 1884seqq.
HS	*Hispania Sacra,* Madrid 1948seqq.
Hurter	H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae,* 6 vols., Innsbruck 1903–13, F. Pangerl, ed.

IER	*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* Dublin 1864seqq.
Irénikon	*Irénikon,* Amay and Chevetogne 1926seqq.

JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* London 1950seqq.
Jemolo	A. C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni,* Turin 1963.
JLW	*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Münster 1921–41 (now: *ALW*).
JP	*Jus pontificium de Propaganda fide, Pars I complectens Bullas, Brevia, Acta Sancta Sedis,* R. De Martinis, ed., 7 vols., Rome 1888–97.
Jürgensen	K. Jürgensen, *Lamennais und die Gestaltung des belgischen Staates. Der liberale Katholizismus in der Verfassungsbewegung des 19. Jahrhunderts,* Wiesbaden 1963.
Katholik	*Der Katholik,* Mainz 1821seqq.
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen 1955seqq.
Latourette, *Christianity*	K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age. A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,* 5 vols., New York 1958–62.
Latourette, *Expansion*	K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* 7 vols., New York and London 1937–45.
Le Bras S	G. Le Bras, *Études de sociologie religieuse,* 2 vols., Paris 1955–56.
Lecanuet	E. Lecanuet, *L'Église et l'État en France sous la Troisième République,* 4 vols., Paris 1907–30.
Leflon	J. Leflon, *La crise révolutionnaire 1789–1846* (*Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* 20, A. Fliche and V. Martin, eds.) Paris 1949.
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* Münster 1951seqq.
Lösch	S. Lösch, *Döllinger und Frankreich. Eine geistige Allianz, 1823–1871,* Munich 1955.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* Freiburg 1957–68.
Maaß	F. Maaß, *Der Josephinismus. Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Österreich* I–V, Vienna 1951seqq. (*Fontes rerum Austriacarum* II/71–74).
MAH	*Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* Paris 1880seqq.
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 31 vols., Florence and Venice 1757–98; reprinted and continued by L. Petit and J. B. Martin, eds., in 60 vols., Paris 1899–1927.
Mathew	D. Mathew, *Catholicism in England,* London 1936.
McAvoy	T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* Notre Dame 1969.
MCom	*Miscelánea Comillas,* Comillas/Santander 1943seqq.
MD	*Maison-Dieu,* Paris 1945seqq.
Mellor	A. Mellor, *Histoire de l'anticléricalisme français,* Paris 1966.
Mercati	A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le autorità civili,* 2 vols., Rome 1919–54.
Meulemeester	M. de Meulemeester, *Bibliographie générale des écrivains rédemptoristes* I–III, Louvain 1933–39.
MF	*Miscellanea francescana,* Rome 1886seqq.
MH	*Missionalia Hispanica*
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung,* (Innsbruck) Graz and Cologne 1880seqq.
MiscMercati	*Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati,* 6 vols., Rome 1946.
Mollat	G. Mollat, *La Question romaine de Pie VI à Pie XI,* Paris 1932.
Moroni	G. Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica,* 103 vols., Venice 1840–61.

Mortier	A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généraux de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs,* Paris 1903seqq.
MÖSTA	*Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs,* Vienna 1948seqq.
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1950seqq.
NAG	*Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* (until 1940: *NGG*), Göttingen 1941seqq.
NDB	*Neue Deutsche Biographie,* Berlin 1953seqq.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Tournai, Louvain and Paris 1849seqq.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945seqq.
ÖAKR	*Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht,* Vienna 1950seqq.
ÖBL	*Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon,* Graz and Cologne 1954seqq.
OrChrP	*Orientalia Christiana periodica,* Rome 1935seqq.
Pastor	L. von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters,* 16 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1885seqq.
Pouthas	C. Pouthas, *L'Église catholique de l'avènement de Pie VII à l'avènement de Pie IX* (Les Cours de Sorbonne), Paris 1945.
PrJ	*Preußische Jahrbücher,* Berlin 1858seqq.
PrOrChr	*Le Proche-Orient chrétien,* Jerusalem 1951seqq.
QLP	*Questions liturgiques et paroissiales,* Louvain 1921seqq.
RACHS	*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society,* Philadelphia 1884seqq.
RAM	*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* Toulouse 1920seqq.
Rémond	R. Rémond, *La Droite en France, de la Première Restauration à la V*^{e} *République,* Paris 1963.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921seqq.
RF	*Razón y Fe,* Madrid 1901seqq.
RGB	*Revue générale belge,* Brussels 1945seqq.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876seqq.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900seqq.
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France,* Paris 1910seqq.
RHLR	*Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* Paris 1896–1907.
RHM	*Revue d'histoire des missions,* Paris 1924seqq.
RHPhR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921seqq.
RhVJBll	*Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter,* Bonn 1941seqq.
Rigault	G. Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes,* 9 vols., Paris 1936–53.
Ris	*Risorgimento,* Brussels 1958seqq.
ROC	*Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* Paris 1896seqq.
Rogier *KG*	*Geschichte der Kirche,* ed. by L. Rogier, R. Aubert, and D. Knowles, IV, Einsiedeln 1966.
Rogier, *KathHerleving*	L. Rogier, *Katholieke Herleving. Geschiedenis van Katholiek Nederland sinds 1851,* The Hague, 1956.
RömHM	*Römische Historische Mitteilungen,* Graz and Cologne 1958seqq.
Roskovany	A. de Roskovany, *Romanus Pontifex tamquam Primas Ecclesiae et Princeps civilis e monumentis omnium saeculorum demonstratus,* 20 vols., Nitra 1867–90.

RPol	*Review of Politics,* Notre Dame 1939seqq.
RQ	*Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1887seqq.
RQH	*Revue des question historiques,* Paris 1866seqq.
RRosm	*Rivista Rosminiana,* Stresa 1906seqq.
RSIt	*Rivista storica Italiana,* Naples 1884seqq.
RSoc	*Recherches sociographiques,* Quebec 1960seqq.
RSPhTh	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris 1907seqq.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910seqq.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947seqq.
RStRis	*Rassegna storica del Risorgimento,* Rome 1913seqq.
RStT	*Rassegna storica toscana,* Florence 1955seqq.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1950seqq.
Salvatorelli	L. Salvatorelli, *Chiesa e Stato dalla Rivoluzione francese ad oggi,* Florence 1955.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica,* Milan 1873seqq.
Scheffczyk	*Theologie in Aufbruch und Widerstreit. Die deutsche katholische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert,* ed. by L. Scheffczyk, Bremen 1965.
Schmidlin *PG*	J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit* I–IV, Munich 1933–39.
Schmitz *GB*	P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoît* IV and VII, Maredsous 1948 and 1956.
Schnabel *G*	F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,* Freiburg i. Br. I, 1948; II, 1949; III, 1954; IV 1955.
Scholastik	*Scholastik,* Freiburg i. Br. 1926seqq.
Schrörs, *Braun*	H. Schrörs, *Ein vergessener Führer aus der rheinischen Gestesgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts, Johann Wilhelm Joseph Braun,* Bonn 1925.
Schulte	J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des kanonischen Rechts,* 3 vols., Stuttgart 1875–80.
SE	*Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschapen,* Bruges 1948seqq.
Seppelt-Schwaiger	F. X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts* I, II, IV, V, Leipzig 1931–41.
Simon, *Rencontres*	A. Simon, *Rencontres mennaisiennes en Belgique* (Académie royale de Belgique, Mémoires de la Classe des Lettres, LVI/3), Brussels 1963.
Simon, *Sterckx*	A. Simon, *Le cardinal Sterckx et son temps,* 2 vols., Wetteren 1950–51.
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden bzw. zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige,* Munich 1880seqq.
Sommervogel	C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* I–IX, Brussels and Paris 1890–1900; X (Supplements by E. M. Rivière), Toulouse 1911seqq.; XI (*History* by P. Bliard), Paris 1932.
SourcesHist.rel.Belg.	*Sources de l'histoire religieuse de la Belgique. Époque contemporaine. Colloque Bruxelles 1967* (Centre interuniversitaire d'histoire contemporaine, Cahiers 54), Louvain and Paris 1968.
SpAzLCIt	*Spiritualità e Azione del laicato cattolico italiano,* 2 vols. (Italia sacra 11/12), Padua 1969.
Spini	G. Spini, *Risorgimento e protestanti,* Naples 1956.
SPM	*Sacrum Poloniae Millenium,* Rome 1954.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (before 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*), Freiburg i. Br. 1871seqq.
StL	*Staatslexikon,* ed. by H. Sacher, Freiburg i. Br. 1926–32.
StMis	*Studia Missionalia,* Rome 1943seqq.

Streit	*Bibliotheca Missionum,* started by R. Streit, continued by J. Dindinger, (Münster and Aachen) Freiburg i. Br. 1916seqq.
StudFr	*Studi francescani,* Arezzo and Florence 1903seqq.
SZG	*Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte,* Zurich 1951seqq.
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909seqq.
ThJ	*Theologische Jahrbücher,* Leipzig 1842seqq.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819seqq.; Stuttgart 1946seqq.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (until 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888seqq.
Villoslada	R. G. Villoslada, *Manual de historia de la Compañia de Jesús,* Madrid 1954.
Walz	A. Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum,* Rome 1948.
Weill, *Cath. lib.*	G. Weill, *Histoire du catholicisme libéral en France 1828–1908,* Paris 1909
Weill, *Idée laïque*	G. Weill, *Histoire de l'idée laïque en France au XIX^e siècle,* Paris 1929.
Winter, *Byzanz*	E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine,* Leipzig 1942.
Winter, *Rußland*	E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum* II: *Von der Aufklärung bis zur Oktoberrevolution,* Berlin 1961.
WiWei	*Wissenschaft und Weisheit,* Düsseldorf 1934seqq.
WZ	*Westfälische Zeitschrift. Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte,* Münster 1838seqq.
ZAGV	*Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins,* Aachen 1879seqq.
ZBLG	*Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte,* Munich 1928seqq.
ZGObrh	*Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins,* Karlsruhe 1851seqq.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1876seqq.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie,* (Innsbruck) Vienna 1877seqq.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 34seqq., Münster 1950seqq. (*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 1–17, Münster 1911–27; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 18–25, Münster 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 26–27, Münster 1935–37; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 28–33, Münster 1938–41, 1947–49).
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948seqq.
ZSKG	*Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte,* (Stans) Fribourg 1907seqq.

PART ONE

Between the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848

SECTION ONE

The Continuation of Catholic Renewal in Europe

CHAPTER 1

The Progress of Ultramontanism and the Growth of the International Orders

Progress of Ultramontanism

The fifteen years of the pontificate of Gregory XVI saw significant steps toward the victory of ultramontanism,[1] and the weakening of ecclesiastical influence upon civil society turned the Church inward. During the Restoration period, the influence of these internal forces was already noticeable throughout Europe and in particular in France and Germany. From this time forward, the ultramontane movement enjoyed increasing encouragement even from Rome itself.

Resistance to the interference of the Roman Curia in the life of the national Churches continued far beyond the middle of the century, but increasingly it met with countervailing opinion. Many of the scholars and theologians in England, such as historian J. Lingard, archeologist M. A. Tierney, liturgist D. Rock,[2] and E. Cox, the director of the seminary of Saint Edmund's, clung fiercely to the concept of the national Church and rejected new customs coming from Italy and the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope. Wiseman, on the other hand, supported by the first generation of liberal Catholics and Italian missionaries, developed contacts with Rome and favored the "new" continental exercises of piety. Thus the situation gradually changed. In Piedmont, where Josephinistic tendencies were still very much alive in the theological departments and seminaries, a number of young clergymen and militant Catholics began to charge that such tendencies constituted an expression of the despised Austrian influence and to represent an orientation toward Rome as an affirmation of membership in the Italian nation.

---

[1] In contrast to Pius VII, who was trained in a slightly Jansenist environment, Mauro Cappellari became an adherent of the strictest ultramontanism. His *Trionfo della Santa Sede,* written in 1799, articulated the strictly papalist point of view according to which the entire church is subjected to the Pope without any collegial aspects (see Y. Congar, *L'ecclésiologie au XIX^e siècle,* 92f., 96ff.). Reissued after the elevation of its author to Pope, the book was translated into French and German in 1833 and contributed to the spread of ultramontane ideas among the clergy.

[2] *The Church of Our Fathers,* 3 vol. (1849–53).

After 1830, true Gallicanism had few defenders in France. Relations between the bishops and the Holy See, however, remained at best tentative. That part of the clergy which had not been won by Lamennais continued to maintain the position of the bishop within the hierarchy as well as to adhere to special ecclesiastical customs, particularly in the liturgical and canonical areas. In order to promote unifying elements with Rome, Lamennais's former adherents used this particularism in the field of Church discipline to complain about what they not unjustifiably regarded as functional Gallicanism. It was in this atmosphere, then, that during the July Monarchy the ultramontane campaign gained ground quickly and simultaneously at many different levels and in many different areas.

Abbé Combalot,[3] a diocesan missionary, made himself the champion of Roman ideas among the lower clergy. On the other hand, the campaign for a Roman liturgy,[4] led by Dom Guéranger with the support of some young priests, was directed chiefly against the Gallican sympathies still harbored by some members of the upper clergy. The fact that even before 1848 many dioceses rejected modern French liturgies seemed to be a victory for ultramontanism over ecclesiastical particularism. In the years between 1842 and 1849, Abbé Rohrbacher[5] realized his intention to revise Fleury's *Histoire ecclésiastique* in an ultramontane direction for use by the young generation of clerics. Assisted by Father Gaultier,[6] a scholarly member of the Congregation of the Holy Spirit, he did so with more good intention than critical acumen. Rohrbacher's cell was the "Roman salon of Paris," and his library well represented that Gallican position. Two of the most zealous defenders of the ultramontane movement in the French episcopate, Monsignor Gousset and Monsignor Parisis, stayed with him on the occasion of their journey to Paris. Monsignor Gousset's efforts were directed chiefly toward making theological principles clearer to the common man. Monsignor Parisis promoted the desire of the Holy See that the French dioceses give up their customary privileges and regularly consult the Roman congregations in matters of religion and church discipline; a position which caused great dismay on the part of those who had long been opposed to the intervention of the Curia in the internal affairs of France.

---

[3] Théodore Combalot (1797–1873), until 1833 one of the strongest supporters of Lamennais's movement in southeastern France, won great influence as a retreat master (biography by Ricard [Paris 1891]).

[4] On Dom Guéranger and the founding of Solesmes, see below, n. 17. Guéranger was neither the first nor the only one demanding a return to the Roman liturgy, but only after the publication of volume 2 of his *Institutions liturgique* (1842) did the movement go beyond the circle of a few intimates. Guéranger bitterly opposed what he called the "antiliturgical heresy." More than sixty bishops protested his attack, complaining about the tone and attitude of Lamennais's school and his lack of respect for the bishops.

[5] Concerning René-François Rohrbacher (1789–1856), the former companion of Lamennais and professor at the seminary of Nancy as well as author of a *Histoire de l'Eglise* in 28 volumes, see A. Ricard, *Gerbet, Salinis et Rohrbacher* (Paris 1886), 269–365.

[6] *Notice sur le R. P. Gaultier* (Paris, n.d.). On Gaultier's circle, see also F. Cabrol, *Le cardinal Pitra,* 205f.

Many factors worked in support of the ultramontane campaign. Loyalty to the monarchy, that very foundation of Gallicanism, had lost much of its meaning with the fall of the Bourbons, and the anticlericalism of the July Monarchy was an added reason to look for support from Rome. In addition, the lethargy of certain bishops in the struggle for educational freedom also favored the Roman position. Montalembert and his friends won the Catholic masses to ultramontanism with the aid of the newspaper *L'Univers.* From this time on ultramontanism found enthusiastic support among the elite of French laymen. Another decisive factor was that the lower clergy disliked accepting the unlimited power of the bishops and desired nothing more than to have the Roman congregations provide protection against episcopal capriciousness. Even the bishops recognized the de facto privilege of the Holy See to intervene in doctrinary or disciplinary questions concerning the Church of France. This was particularly evident when they asked the Pope to intervene against Lamennais. The nunciature intervened ever more openly. While Monsignor Garibaldi, who was interested in keeping relations with the government as good as possible, considered it best to let Gallicanism die out by itself, his successor, Fornari, supported the militant ultramontanes fully even when their conduct was questionable. Not satisfied with opposing the demands of some bishops for independence in the liturgical and canonical areas, Fornari supported the vehement reactions which these demands evoked in many priests or monks. This was especially evident with regard to some of the former students of Lamennais, who adopted an arrogant stance toward the bishops whom they suspected of moderation.

In 1844, Montalembert could announce: "I would wager that among the eighty French bishops there are not three supporters of the Four Articles." The general approval which met the condemnation of the *Manuel de droit ecclésiastique* by Dupin in 1845 proved that political Gallicanism was completely discredited in France. The changes in the church treatise used at this time by Saint Sulpice,[7] which was especially strongly tied to the traditions of the old France, as well as the revisions of the commonly used catechisms and handbooks[8] were also symptomatic of the decline of theological Gallicanism. In practice, however, moderate Gallicanism continued to enjoy considerable sympathy. Several pastoral letters lauding Bossuet, the attitude of Monsignor Affre to the exemption of the cloistered clergy, and the position of the bishops in the conflict with Dom Guéranger over the introduction of the Roman liturgy witness areas of continuing Gallican commitment. Prelates reacting in this fashion were only a minority by the end of Gregory's pontificate and were regarded with mistrust by the younger clergy. The sympathies of a number of older priests, however, remained attached to the traditions of the old French clergy and its specific concepts of hierarchy, liturgy, and piety. These advocates became the most serious obstacle to the complete victory of Roman ideas in France, but the group lacked a cohesive core. In this respect the failure to reestablish the old theological departments destroyed by the Revolution was of great significance; had they succeeded, the encounter with the history of Christian antiquity could have resulted in a concept of the church according to the Gallican model.

---

[7] De Montclos, 40–58; A. Castellani, *Il b. Leonardo Murialdo* (Turin 1966), 769–74; M. de Hédouville, *Monseigneur de Ségur* (Paris 1957), 177–207.

In Germany, an analogous but much slower development took place. Here there was much more resistance than in France. Although Liebermann, in his textbook in 1831, modified the views of the Pope in a more Roman direction, Klee, a teacher of dogmatics in Bonn, presented papal infallibility as "highly deserving of respect," and G. Phillips, professor of canon law in Munich, defended with enthusiasm the ideal of the greatest possible centralization of the Church around the Roman Curia. Many theologians, however, continued to defend a moderate episcopalism, which in their eyes seemed to correspond better to the organization of the old Church as well as to the German concept of authority and society. They viewed this position as less influenced by Roman law and thus more patriarchal and corporative. They saw the relationship between the Pope and the bishops from the organic perspective of the Holy Roman Empire, where sovereign and feudal lords cooperated together in the Diet. In addition, a large number of bishops continued to act independently from the Roman congregations. Knowing from experience that the congregations generally failed to take into account the true situation in the Protestant areas, they tried to reserve decisions for themselves in cases which the Holy See regarded as its province. This was true the more so because the frequent appeals to Rome were often made by men notable for neither intelligence nor moderation. Such men as Binterim, who once had been regarded as a champion of Catholic renewal in Germany,[9] denounced to Rome without consideration of justice and truth all those with whom they disagreed.

---

[8] See the tendentiously interpreted information supplied by E. Michaud, *De la falsification des catéchismes français et de manuels de théologie par le parti romaniste* (Paris 1872). Among others, the *Institutiones thelogicae* were corrected by Bailly in 1842.

Many of the opponents of the planned centralization of Catholic life in the Roman Curia resisted this development for various reasons both theoretical and practical. They were outmaneuvered, however, by those who believed that this resistance gave aid to a number of fearful and neglectful ecclesiastics and to governments that wanted to prevent the escape of the Church from their tutelage. Thus, as it had happened in France, albeit with a ten-year delay, a genuine ultramontane party was formed in Germany to which clerics as well as such laymen as Buß and Andlaw could belong. The spiritual center of this party was at Mainz, where the influence of Maistre and Lamennais[10] joined with a development arising from the Catholic Action. The leaders at Mainz, trailblazing in the area of the apostolate and clearly aware of the demands of the modern world, sensed that traditional ecclesiastical particularism was no longer tenable in a world which ignored national borders. They were convinced that the destructive power of the antireligious forces could be countered only through a mobilization of the masses, who were guided strictly and uniformly. Only the Holy See was capable of providing this guidance. As Schnabel very astutely demonstrated, this was less a case of national opposition between the Germanic spirit and the Roman influence than a conflict of generations. Under the pressure of increasingly complex problems, Germany was developing from the collegiate and corporative system of the Old Regime toward modern centralization.

Strengthened by the so-called "Germanists," the former students of the German College in Rome which was reopened in 1824, this ultramontane party published its ideas in *Der Katholik* and experienced an increase of its reputation as a result of two circumstances. They gained the trust of the masses because the ultramontane bishops and priests successfully intervened with Protestant governments for greater religious freedom of the Catholics. The opponents of the ultramontanes, sympathizing with the doctrines of Hermes, lost their standing in the eyes of the faithful when these doctrines, after years of discussion, were finally condemned. Thus, the movement spread and new centers were formed. In Cologne a center formed around Archbishop Geissel, who was inspired by the principles which had been taught to him at the seminary of Mainz, and in Speyer, Bishop Weis, the successor to Geissel in 1841, also formed a center in the spirit of Mainz. In Munich, also in 1841, the Germanist Karl August von Reisach, a personal friend of Cardinal Cappellari, became coadjutor and for twenty years remained one of the most active representatives of Roman influence in southern Germany. He was skillfully supported by Monsignor Viale-Prela, nuncio to Vienna.

---

[9] See his biography by C. Schoenig, *A.J. Binterim (1779–1855) als Kirchenpolitiker und Gelehrter* (Düsseldorf 1933), which corrects the picture.

[10] One of the most important links was the Alsatian Räß, professor of dogmatics in Mainz before he became Superior of the seminary of Strasbourg in 1829. But he was not the only one. In *Die Gemeinsamkeit der Rechte,* whose first volume appeared in 1847, Buß cited several French writings, especially those by Montalembert.

In Austria ultramontanism developed even more slowly than in Germany. It is characteristic of the Austrian movement that as late as 1842, when four bishops were consulted whether to lift the ban of 1781 forbidding seminarists to study in Rome, two were opposed to a change and another had serious objections.[11] But in Austria also the consciousness of the Church awakened, and the opposition of the militant Catholics, even though they were still in a minority, began to shake the foundations of the Josephinist system. A decision in 1833, probably made through the intervention of Bishop Wagner of Sankt Pölten directly with the Emperor, to withdraw from use in the educational system the textbooks of canon law and church history which had been placed on the Index in 1820, was an almost revolutionary turning point. A few years later the Austrian ambassador drew Metternich's attention to the growing threat to Austrian influence in Rome. He pointed out that the civil service in Vienna was determined to curtail the relations between the Holy See and the Church of Austria at a time when, as the Curia emphasized at every opportunity, France was in the process of relinquishing this antiquated system.

Rome, aware of its growing strength, no longer hesitated to influence and encourage firmly a movement which pointed both faithful and clergy toward the center of Catholicism. At times, as it did in Austria, Rome attempted to loosen the regalistic policies of governments; at other times, the nuncios supported the work of the ultramontane clerics and tried to increase the number of ultramontane seminarists at Roman colleges. In order to break down resistance, and to encourage the efforts of some and to hasten the development of others, a systematic policy was employed with great skill. This policy included direct and indirect pressure with a scale of finely differentiated expressions and briefs of approval and disapproval, tailored in each case to the special circumstances. It also included the awarding of benefices as well as the delay of honors and rewards. Rome's policy was developed by Pius IX, but it was inaugurated during the last years of Gregory XVI with increasing benefit.

---

[11] Maaß op. cit., 673f.

The Large Orders

The Generals of the large international orders had since the Middle Ages had their seat in Rome and actively had assisted in the Roman centralization as well as provided able members for the congregations.[12] Even if the mendicant orders recuperated only slowly and played only a secondary role in this connection, the pontificate of Gregory XVI was marked by a triple phenomenon whose consequences were of significance for the efficiency of the Holy See during subsequent pontificates. It consisted of the rapid growth of the Society of Jesus, the new impulse which the Dominicans received from Lacordaire, and the founding of the Benedictine congregation in France by Dom Guéranger.

Once the Society of Jesus had overcome its developmental crisis of the first decade, it experienced a remarkable growth under the generalate of the Dutchman Philipp Roothaan[13] (1829–53). Roothaan was able to skillfully employ his great influence on Gregory XVI for the benefit of his order, while also fashioning it into a marvellously reliable instrument in the service of Roman unity and ultramontane ideals. In a very short time the Jesuits grew in numbers from 2,137 in 1830 to 4,757 in 1847. They reestablished their former provinces: in 1831 in Piedmont, in 1832 in Belgium, in 1833 in America, in 1836 a second house in France, and in 1846 in Austria. They exerted growing influence upon the direction of ecclesiastical studies and piety in these countries in a post-Tridentine sense, that is, contrary to the spirit of the eighteenth century. In the Roman congregations they also gradually acquired a position which, as a consequence of the decline of the mendicant orders, soon surpassed their position in the Old Regime; a condition which gave rise to complaints even in Rome. Father Roothaan also urged the Jesuits in 1833 to devote themselves to missions among the heathens as they had done under the Old Regime. Thus, to the old missions in India and the Missouri region, there were added within a few years missions in Bengal (1834), Madeira and Argentina (1836), Jamaica (1837), China, Algeria, and the Rocky Mountains (1840), Australia (1849), and California and Guatemala (1851). In 1851, there were 975 Jesuits active in mission work, a fifth of the total membership of the society.

---

[12] Concerning the damaging consequences for the Holy See of the crisis which the orders experienced since the end of the eighteenth century, see the letter by Lambruschini of 6 July 1829, quoted by L. Manzini, *Lambruschini* (Vatican City 1960), 151.

[13] On his election, see P. Grootens in *AHSI* 33 (1964), 235–68.

Father Roothaan provided pious as well as skillful leadership for the society. He has been called its "second founder." Systematically promoting the external development of his order and adapting (with limited success) the *Ratio studiorum* (1822) to the new conditions, he endeavored at the same time to intensify the order's internal life. He strove to reawaken in it the full spirit of its founder. He interpreted the spirit more narrowly, however, by placing emphasis more upon ascetic exercises than on mystical enthusiasm. Roothaan saw to it that the two years of the novitiate and the third year (terciate) were served under normal conditions. Beginning in 1832, he convened a meeting of all procurator generals regularly every three years in order to achieve a strict observance of the rules. More frequently than any other general before him, Roothaan directed letters to all members of the society in order to keep awake in them the religious spirit peculiar to the Jesuits.

But the remarkable successes which the Society of Jesus experienced within only a few years were not without repercussions. Some bishops, especially in Belgium, regarded the society as too aggressive. The liberals in particular were uncomfortable with their rapid rise. What appeared to many as the Jesuits' tendency "to confuse revolutionary disorder with the inevitable tendency of the modern world to replace absolute monarchy with the principle and practice of national sovereignty" (Montalembert) provided their enemies with an easy pretext to incite the public against them. In 1834 the Jesuits again were expelled from Spain and Portugal. In 1845 the order experienced a general attack. In France this occurred upon the occasion of the controversy concerning freedom of education, but with very limited practical results. In Switzerland the radicals used Jesuit mistakes in the Wallis to persuade the Swiss Diet to expel them from the whole of Switzerland (3 September 1847) and then to confirm this ban in a separate article of the new constitution drawn after the end of the Sonderbund War. In Italy the accusation against the order was that it was in league with Austria and constituted an obstacle to a harmony between religion and modern society. This accusation was formulated by V. Gioberti in his *Il Gesuita moderno* (1847). Finally, although the order retained fervent adherents, the Jesuits were expelled from the Kingdom of Naples, from Piedmont, and, at the beginning of 1848, from the Papal State. But the storm was only of short duration; favored by the conservative reaction following the crisis of 1848, the progress of the Society of Jesus was even more rapid than before.

The mendicant orders, however, only slowly recovered from the crisis which had overcome them at the end of the eighteenth century. This was especially true because the Iberian peninsula, in which they had been able to retain their strong position,[14] was now being shaken by the secularizations being conducted by Madrid and Lisbon between 1833 and 1837. The Augustinian Hermits disappeared forever from Portugal, where they once had possessed about fifty monasteries. In Spain they only retained the missionary college of Valladolid.

The Franciscans, counting about ten thousand members in Spain, were reduced to a few hundred; this enabled the Italians once again to regain their leading position in the order, the more so as the monasteries of Poland and Russia, having escaped the dissolution measures of 1831, suffered from the decline to which the tsarist government condemned them. The development of the order in the German-speaking and Anglo-Saxon countries became significant only in the second half of the century.

The Dominicans were reduced in numbers in Mexico, Russia, Portugal, Cuba, and especially Spain, where 221 monasteries were dissolved. A number of monks found refuge in the missions in the Far East, and the seminary of Ocana, their source of growth, remained open. Even the provinces of Italy, constituting 40 percent of the membership of the order,[15] did not display great vitality. But under the pontificate of Gregory XVI a change of fortunes occurred. In 1838, Abbé Lacordaire,[16] who had received great acclaim from the students of Paris as a result of his Lenten sermons at Notre-Dame, announced his intention to reestablish the order in France. His objective was a diverse intellectual apostolate in keeping with the movement of rejuvenation started by Lamennais and the Congregation of Saint Peter. Lacordaire envisioned sermons in town and country, the instruction of the young, and, in keeping with the temper of the time, the writing of religious and profane tracts from an apologetic perspective. After contacting Master General Ancaroni, Lacordaire published his *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France des Fréres Prêcheurs,* (7 March 1839), appealing to the country for freedom for the orders. He finished his novitiate in Italy and, armed with papal encouragement, returned to France, where the government, after some hesitation, treated him with benign neutrality. In 1850 he had a sufficient number of adherents to enable him to establish a French Dominican province. In the same year, one of Lacordaire's companions, Alexander Jandel, was appointed Vicar General by Pius IX (he became Master General in 1855), with the charge of reorganizing the order.

---

[14] At least quantitatively. Immediately before the catastrophe, Gregory XVI in June 1833 had asked the nuncio in Madrid to undertake the very necessary reform of the discipline in the Spanish monasteries and convents after the mode of election of their higher superiors had been changed.

[15] In 1844, of 4,562 Dominicans 1,709 were in Italy (and Malta), 1,048 in Spain and the Philippines, 709 in Russia, and 626 in Latin America (Walz, 576).

[16] On Henri Lacordaire (1802–61), Lamennais's supporter in the campaign of *L'Avenir,* see the biographies by B. Chocarne (2 vols., Paris 1866), T. Foisset (2 vols., Paris 1870), P. Baron, *La jeunesse de Lacordaire* (Paris 1961; until 1830), and *Le testament du Père Lacordaire,* ed. by C. de Montalembert (Paris 1870; autobiography to 1851). Complementing bibliography: *Catholicisme* VI, 1572. Works: *Oeuvres complètes du R. P. H.-D. Lacordaire* (9 vol., Paris 1911–12), and *Lacordaire journaliste (1830–48),* ed. by P. Fesch (Paris 1897).

Another French initiative in the second half of the century led to an almost simultaneous rejuvenation of the Benedictine order, an event which met with a certain amount of resistance by the Curia, but eventually was supported by Gregory XVI. Moved by a romantic longing for the medieval past and the desire of Lamennais to reestablish the centers of cloistered scholarship so lacking in postrevolutionary France, Prosper Guéranger,[17] together with three companions, ignored all legal hindrances and settled in the former priorate of Solesmes. In 1837 the Pope confirmed Solesmes as an abbey and recognized it as a focal point for a new Congregation of France. The constitutions approved by the Pope were essentially similar to those of the Maurists. Only on two points did Dom Guéranger go back to the old tradition which had been abandoned almost everywhere else: these were the autonomy of each house and the appointment of abbots for life, a request approved by Rome only after long hesitation. These positions, as paradoxical as they may seem, did not prevent him from becoming one of the strongest proponents of liturgical centralization and the most extreme ultramontane theses. Dom Guéranger had to overcome numerous difficulties: distrust because of his earlier connection with Lamennais and because of his vocal support of the ultramontane movement; the enmity of the bishop of Le Mans against the monastic exemption; repeated financial worries; and the internal disputes among his students, which were aggravated by his administrative mistakes. But Dom Guéranger's persistence succeeded in overcoming these obstacles. His abbey of Solesmes, in spite of its moderate size, became a beacon of influence toward a return to the traditions of the past, an influence which was felt during the subsequent decades throughout the various branches of the Benedictine family. Of course, such a tradition contained the danger of artificially reawakening a monastic life which had been created in a social and economic context totally different from a Europe in the process of developing an industrial society.

---

[17] Concerning the very controversial personality of Dom Guéranger, the panegyrical but well-documented biography by P. M. Delatte, *Dom Guéranger, Abbé de Solesmes* (2 vols., Paris 1909–10) was complemented critically by E. Sevrin, *Dom Guéranger et Lamennais* (Paris 1933) and A. Ledru, *Dom Guéranger et Monseignieur Bouvier* (Paris 1911). He had great faults (narrow, combatant, excessive spirit, lack of critical sense), but his indomitable energy enabled him to effect lasting changes in many different areas. Sevrin, who otherwise is very critical of him, is of the opinion that except for Lamennais no one else had a greater effect on the Catholic life of his time.

It was precisely this effort to meet the religious needs of a changing society which explains the success of the congregations devoted to education and the care of the sick. The educational congregations, in particular, experienced a marked revival during the course of the first decades of the century. Old congregations like the Daughters of Charity, whose number between 1807 and 1849 increased from 1,600 to 1,800, experienced a new bloom. Many new congregations were founded also: in 1830, the Vincentian Brothers of Abbé Glorieux; in 1839, the Brothers of Our Lady of Mercy of Monsignor Scheppers in Belgium; in 1832, the Sisters of Charity of Lovere of Saint Bartolomea Capitanio and in 1833, the Sisters of Providence of Rosmini in Italy. Many more followed, among them, in 1840, the Brothers of the Immaculate Conception; in 1844, the Brothers of Our Lady of Mercy in the Netherlands; in 1841, the Little Sisters of the Poor of Jeanne Jugan; and in 1849, the Sisters of the Most Holy Savior, the so-called Niederbronn Sisters, in France. The growth of these congregations contributed its part to the progress of Roman centralization. While under the Old Regime each convent and numerous smaller congregations founded during the first quarter of the century remained autonomous and subject only to the local bishop, Rome now encouraged the tendency to gather the novices and concentrate the members under the authority of a General Superior. It was an authority which, in spite of the protests of the diocesan bishops, frequently resulted in liberation from the supervision of the bishops and in direct submission to the authority of the Congregation of Bishops and Orders in Rome.[18] This congregation, aware of the great dissimilarity of objectives and local conditions, very carefully refrained from forcing a uniform type of constitution upon the smaller congregations and convents, but left to each the formulation of its rules, as long as it could control them and suggest changes. Thus, there gradually came into being a new canon of members of orders, codified only much later, whose development after the second quarter of the nineteenth century occurred under the vigilant control of Rome. On the other hand, the increasingly important role assigned to the superiors of these new congregations in comparison to that of their ordinary members favored the development of a mentality which facilitated the progress of ultramontanism by placing emphasis more on authority and obedience than on collegial responsibility.

---

[18] See F. Callahan, *The Centralization of Government in Pontifical Institutes of Women* (Rome 1948), 48–62.

CHAPTER 2

Old and New in Pastoral Care and Moral Theology

The Modernization of Ecclesiastical Institutions

Historians have noted the lasting effect of Napoleonic institutions in a large part of Europe: wherever the French introduced them, they were generally retained, and occasionally they were imitated even in countries which did not experience any French occupation. This development was nothing more than the legal recognition of an irreversible economic and social evolution. The development in the ecclesiastical area was similar. Gradually the profound changes resulting from the nationalization of the estates of the Church and from the concordat of 1801 spread. The concordat turned the bishop into a "violet prefect." Geissel in the Rhineland, Sterckx in Belgium, and Mathieu and Bonald in France were characteristic of the new bishop's generation. These bishops had come to acknowledge that the restoration of disturbed Catholic life and the increasing complexity of problems needing solution demanded much more in the way of organization and administrative work than had been the case during the Old Regime. Clearly cognizant of their episcopal authority as it had been determined by Napoleon's Organic Articles, they were eager to systematically guide the pastoral activity of their priests. Abbé Combalot, contemporary witness of this change of the episcopal office into a centralized and bureaucratized ecclesiastical activity, bitterly suggested the alteration of the phrase used in the ordination of bishops from "Accipe baculum pastorale" into "Accipe calamum administrativum, ut possis scribere, scribere scribere usque in sempiternum et ultra."

In parallel fashion, the situation of the lower clergy also changed fundamentally. The priest without a precisely defined task became a rarity, in contrast to their high numbers under the Old Regime. The decline occurred less rapidly in the southern countries, where there were still too many clergy. Some of the priests continued to exercise their apostolate on the fringes of the diocesan clergy as preachers and private or public teachers. But most of them were now employed in the incumbency, where they began to constitute a parish clergy whose social status completely changed within a few years. Instead of receiving income from a benefice, the clergy in most countries were paid by the state. At the same time they were to a high degree exposed to the capriciousness of the bishops. Indeed, officialities and diocesan courts frequently played a much less distinctive role than at the time of the Old

Regime, and in many countries most of the pastors had to endure being transferred against their will from one parish to another. In Austria, Bavaria, and southern Europe the obligation of advertising vacant positions continued and the canonical principle of being irremovable remained. Some bishops in Spain and Italy circumvented this rule, however, by declaring that they were the only irremovable pastors. Geissel managed to persuade the Prussian government to accept the removability of parish priests which had been introduced in France and Belgium with the concordat of 1801.[1] This facilitated control of the administration of the parishes, but the system also gave rise to abuses which—especially in France—led to serious discontent. Only a few bishops, like Monsignor Sibour, the bishop of Digne, were interested (from a collegial point of view) in creating safeguards for their priests.[2] By the middle of the century, a few bishops began to establish pension funds for their old priests.

The chapters also lost much of their independence and importance. Their members, personally selected by the bishop from the diocesan curia officials, were only subordinates and did not have the faintest intention of risking a conflict with their superiors. Besides, the tasks once carried out by the canons were more and more assumed by the secretaries, who, in conjunction with the vicars general, became the real assistants of the bishops.

Furthermore, the bishop, whose jurisdiction over his clergy was so strongly expanded, to an increasing degree was elected without any participation of the clergy. The concordats of the early nineteenth century generally granted the right of nomination to the governments, whose choice ordinarily was more influenced by administrative than by pastoral criteria. Suggestions by Rosmini in Italy (in his *Cinque piaghe*) or Affre in 1848 in France to change this procedure fell on deaf ears in the Roman Curia.[3] In countries like the United States or Belgium,[4] where the governments were not interested in participating, the bishops selected the nominees without consulting the priests of the diocese in question. And even where, such as in parts of Germany or Switzerland, a chapter election, or, as in Ireland, a limited participation of the clergy was retained, the Holy See gradually took such suggestions less into account, a practice which was increasingly adopted after the middle of the century.[5] It must be said, however, that Rome generally chose genuine pastors from all walks of life. Yet the weight of the past was such, especially in countries where a violent break with the Old Regime had not occurred, that the upper clergy was more concerned with the sensibilities of the governing class than with those of the common people. Still, in fulfilling its pastoral obligations, the upper clergy remained interested in a limited independence from state officials. The bishops were also aware of the necessity to coordinate their actions with respect to the governments and their activity on the pastoral level. For this reason they attempted to revive the old practice of synods, which had fallen out of use because of the suspicion by the states and the Roman Curia. The Organic Articles denied the French bishops any collective action, and only after the revolution of 1848 was it possible for the first provincial councils to meet again. On the other hand, the primate of Hungary as early as 1822 called a national council at Bratislava, and the American bishops regularly held their councils at Baltimore. Other episcopates preferred the more subtle formula of informal annual gatherings. This was the case with the Irish bishops after the emancipation of 1829 and the Belgian bishops after independence. The German bishops followed this example in 1848.[6]

---

[1] See *DDC* I, 492–500; also IV, 895–96.

[2] His *Institutions diocésaines* (2 vols. [Paris 1845–48]; see Montclos, 246 and 251, n. 4) found only a slight echo among the episcopate.

[3] See G. Martina in *RRosm* 62 (1968), 384–409, especially 394–98.

[4] Concerning the United States, see *ColLac* III, 47–48, 153 (decrees of 16 June 1834 and 10 August 1850); concerning Belgium, see Simon, *Sterckx* II, 280–90.

The Methods of Catechetical Instruction

The transformations at the end of the eighteenth century occasioned profound and lasting changes not only in the area of institutions, but also in the various aspects of pastoral care. Added to them were the influences of the new currents of thought. This explains why the catechism, especially in the German states and in France, became the object of several revival efforts.[7]

The introduction of compulsory education in Germany resulted in the transfer of catechetical instruction from the Church to the school. While this made it possible to devote more time to religious instruction, it changed this instruction to nothing more than another academic subject which was taught in a profane environment. Thus there was the danger of infection by the intellectualism and naturalism prevailing in the atmosphere of the Enlightenment. But it was the influence of the

---

[5] See, for example, J. H. Whyte, "The Appointment of the Catholic Bishops in 19th Century Ireland," *CHR* 48 (1962–63), 12–32.

[6] R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1964), 5–8. See also A. Simon, *Réunions des évêques de Belgique* (Louvain 1960); J. Ahern in *IER* 75 (1951), 385–403, 78 (1952), 1–20.

[7] In other countries there were only a few publications on the question of catechisms before the middle of the century. In Italy several catechisms were placed on the Index in 1817 (see H. Reusch, *Der Index* [Bonn 1885], 1056).

Enlightenment which caused educators to include biblical history in catechetical instruction and to adopt the Socratic method in order to accommodate themselves to the intellectual receptivity of the children. This method avoided the need to introduce concepts which had not been explained properly before, but it also held the danger of overlooking the transcendental character of God's word. The consequence was that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the dogmatic substance of ecclesiastical doctrine was almost eliminated from many catechisms, which were governed by moralism and more directed toward man than toward the gospels. During the first half of the century there was a reaction which attempted to deepen and to evolve the valuable impulses of the Enlightenment, but to exclude a too rationalistic way of thinking. The first to choose this path was Bernard Overberg from Westphalia. His main works (published in 1804), the *Katechismus* and the *Christkatholische Religionshandbuch,* were used for decades in the dioceses of northern Germany and in 1824 were adopted by Vienna and translated into Dutch. His *Biblische Geschichte* (1799) underwent several revisions in almost one hundred editions.[8] The largest influence on the overcoming of the Enlightenment without discarding its positive elements was exercised by Johann Michael Sailer. He shared the interest of the people of his time in all aspects of education and emphatically underscored the importance of the personality of the catechist by pointing out that not even the best instruction book could replace a pious and dedicated teacher. More than Overberg he was also concerned with the educational content of the catechism, gave it a stronger biblical and dogmatic foundation, and demanded that it be concerned with the message of salvation.

In Austria the legal situation of the state before the signing of the concordat in 1855 made it difficult to replace the official catechism of 1777. But efforts were made on the methodological level. Galura, one of the pioneers of modern catechetical revision, urged the use of biblical stories and emphasized the necessity of orienting religious instruction toward the idea of God's empire.[9] Milde, the future archbishop of Vienna, very much concerned with the catechetical education of his clergy, emphasized psychological aspects in his *Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Erziehungslehre* (1811–13). Archbishop Gruber of Salzburg in the catechetical instructions for his clergy *(Praktisches Handbuch der Katechetik,* 2 vols. [Salzburg 1832–34]), inspired by Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus,* exhorted the catechists to present themselves to the children as the deputies of God. In contrast to the Socratic method of the Enlightenment the catechists were to act as messengers of God, and he demanded that catechesis transmit more than pure knowledge in order to bring to full bloom in the child the three chief Christian virtues.[10]

---

[8] W. Sahner, *Overberg als Pädagoge und Katechet* (Gelsenkirchen 1949).

[9] J. Hemlein, *B. Galuras Beitrag zur Erneuerung der Kerygmatik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1952).

In Germany the thoughts of Sailer and others were translated into practice by Christoph Schmid. He was the author of catechisms (1801, 1836, 1844–45) and a *Biblische Geschichte*, which was in use for several generations. He also wrote Catholic children's literature with edifying stories in order to point out the hand of God in man's life.[11] Sailer's ideas were most strongly employed by J. B. Hirscher.[12] From 1817 to 1863 Hirscher was professor of pastoral and moral theology, first in Tübingen, then in Freiburg. He criticized as too abstract the catechisms inherited from the Counter-Reformation, such as the so-called *Mainz Catechism,* adapted from the French by Räß and Weis, and demanded a greater consideration of the emotional side of the child. He emphasized as chief goal of catechesis the religious instruction and not the transmittal of an overly large body of knowledge. Throughout his entire life he urged that Christianity be presented as a message of salvation, as a doctrine of God's realm emerging from the biblical stories. He attempted to apply his principles in practical terms and for this purpose wrote a large and a small catechism (1842–47) for the diocese of Freiburg, in which he emphasized the organic and communal aspects of the realities of faith. But the presentation of these thoughts was too compact and the theological precision occasionally inadequate. The main obstacle was that Hirscher's program presupposed a level of education that far exceeded the powers of the average clergy of that time.

Hirscher attracted some enthusiastic students like Ignaz Schuster and G. Mey, who helped to make a place for the Bible in religious instruction for the next several decades. But Hirscher's promising beginning was negated within a few years by the new Scholasticism and the tendency once again to emphasize the doctrinal differences among the Christian denominations. In this kind of atmosphere the bishops, looking for uniformity in catechisms, accepted the catechism of the Jesuit Deharbe. It offered a short survey of scholastic theology with clear and precise formulations, was concerned more with theological accuracy than with educational adaptation, was very strongly apologetic and anti-Protestant, and was free from all biblical and kerygmatic perspectives. After its appearance in 1847 and a revision in 1853, it was initially adopted by the Bavarian bishops, then adopted by most of the German dioceses, and used until 1924. During the second half of the century it was used also in several other countries: in England, the United States, Austria, and the missions in India and in China. After 1850, the practice of discussing the problems of the concepts and the content of the catechism was ended, and only purely didactic and educational questions were raised.

---

[10] F. Ranft, *Fürstbischof A. Gruber. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der katholischen Religionspädagogik* (Innsbruck 1938).

[11] See *LThK* IX, 432–33.

[12] F. Bläcker, *Johann Baptist von Hirscher und seine Katechismen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953); W. Nastainczyk, *Johann Baptist von Hirschers Beitrag zur Heilpädagogik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1957).

In France there were no chairs for pastoral theology and theoretical problems were much less debated there than in Germany. But on the practical level many interesting efforts were undertaken. The most interesting one started at the seminary of Saint Sulpice. J.-A. Émery, who had started Saint Sulpice again, returned to the tradition of J. -J. Olier and initially introduced young clerics to pastoral care by way of catechetical exercises in the parish. This method was adjusted to the new times by a few priests who understood the psychology of children. They knew how to make catechetical instruction come alive through the use of approving letters and other rewards and by interspersing it with songs and prayers. Notable among them were Teysseyrre, Frayssinous, de Quélen, and Borderies, the author of "Adeste fidelis" and director of the catechists in the parish of Saint Thomas Aquinas from 1802 to 1819.[13] The essential aspects—especially the recesses—were summarized in the *Méthode de St-Sulpice dans la direction des catéchismes,* published in 1832 by Abbé Faillon. The direct heir of these innovators was Dupanloup, who was inspired by their example and their spirit and who added his own educational genius. Even if the old clergy accused the young vicar of adding too much drama and profane accents to his catechetical instruction at La Madeleine in Paris (1826–34), his method, aiming equally at the training of the religious sensibililities and the theoretical knowledge of the child, was gradually accepted. The works in which he commented[14] upon his method became for several generations the breviary of catechists in the world outside of the German states.

On the whole, the French province lagged behind during the first decades of the new century. Only when the group of the Paris catechists was dispersed across the country as a consequence of successive bishops' promotions, did the catechetical movement spread there also. It was then anchored in the decrees of the provincial councils which met after 1848. But here and there interesting initiatives had been undertaken before. One needs to think only of the extraordinary success achieved before 1830 by the catechists of the Curé d'Ars, who stood out because of their continual attempt to speak a language which was understood by the common people. His bishop, Monsignor Devie, was inspired by his example and published several works on teaching the Christian doctrine which, in his time, were very successful. During the Second Empire, Abbé Timon-David in Marseille and Father Chevrier in Lyon were similarly engaged in simplifying religious instruction. Timon-David frequently relied on biblical stories, insisting on "education through the heart"; Chevrier added pictures to catechetical instruction and no longer employed the traditional organization in use since the sixteenth century (truths of the faith, obligatory commandments, and means of grace), instead concentrating on three concrete topics: God, Jesus Christ, and the Church.

---

[13] See F. Dupanloup, *La vie de Monseigneur Borderies* (Paris 1905), especially 61–67, 89–185.

[14] *Manuel de catéchismes* (1831); *Méthode générale de catéchisme,* 2 vols. (1839); and especially *L'oeuvre par excellence ou entretiens sur le catéchisme* (1868).

Without a doubt, important catechetical work was being done in France during the time between the First and Second Empire. But it was hampered by a much too individualistic view of religion as the means to "achieve salvation"[15] and the lack of a connection with liturgical life; its chief deficiency was that it was directed at the young communicants, in spite of the efforts at developing "catéchismes de persévérance" for young men and women. During the July Monarchy first communion was dressed up as a spectacular celebration, which doubtless underscored its importance, but also produced the impression in children and parents alike that catechetical instruction was more a preparation for the rite of first communion than an introduction to the daily life of a Christian. The result was that after first communion many ceased practicing. Catechetical instruction, on which so much effort had been spent, was not adequately integrated into the totality of pastoral care.

Pastoral Theology and Pastoral Practice

So far we have only a few monographs on pastoral theology in the nineteenth century, but it can be said that its situation corresponded pretty much to what was already noted about catechetical instruction. In the theological departments of German universities emphasis was placed on theoretical considerations of how the Catholic Enlightenment could be overcome without doing away with its positive aspects. France was more concerned with practical initiatives, even if they were hesitant, unsure, and much more isolated. Their aim was accommodation to the new situation as it had resulted, on the one hand, from the transformations of the political revolution and the decisively changed position of the clergy in the nation, and, on the other hand, from the industrial revolution, gradually presenting astute Catholics with the completely new problem of pastoral care for the urban proletariat.

---

[15] See E. Germain, *Parler du salut? Le catéchèse du salut dans la France de la Restauration* (Paris 1968).

Moralism and the anthropocentric inclination of the Enlightenment left their mark on the first suggestions for pastoral theology in Germany. This was particularly true for the Church, which saw its mission from an almost exclusively sociological perspective. Sermons and catechesis were seen as nothing more than mere instruction according to the rules of the profane world, and liturgy was reduced to an exercise in the virtue of religion. From this perspective, the essentially Christian and supernatural aspect was lost sight of and pastoral theology was narrowed to a professional ethic for the use of the clergy, whose function seemed to be limited to the moral and cultural education of the parish members. This view continued to dominate the textbooks like the *Systema theologiae pastoralis* (1818) by T. Powondra. A change came with Johann Michael Sailer at the turn of the century.[16] As professor of pastoral theology at Dillingen from 1784 to 1794 and at Landshut from 1800 to 1822 he exerted great influence on the clergy of southern Germany, strengthened by the success of his *Vorlesungen aus der Pastoraltheologie.*[17] His teaching effected a break with the naturalistic pastoral of the Enlightenment, but he tried to retain the positive elements developed in reaction to the Jansenist mentality, the pietistic anthropology, and the excessive objectivism of the post-Tridentine pastoral. Although Sailer was also interested in an improvement of homiletics, he was primarily concerned with the content of the sermon, to which he devoted the entire second volume of his *Vorlesungen.* Instead of moralizing and dogmatically poor observations he demanded the preaching of the fundamentals of Christianity, free from scholastic formulations which went beyond the understanding of the people and consisted of nothing more than scholarly commentaries on theological concepts. The best method to achieve the ideal consisted for him of direct and continual contact with Holy Scripture. For this reason he devoted the first volume of his *Vorlesungen* to an "Introduction to the Practical Study of Holy Scripture." Initially, the Bible interested him only as a collection of edifying examples, but gradually he arrived at a view oriented toward the Passion and Salvation of Christ in which Christianity functioned primarily not as a doctrine but as an event, as the story of God's activity in the world.

In spite of everything, Sailer was still strongly tied to the influence of the sentimental individualism of the "Sturm und Drang" period and the contemporary Protestant theology of "experience." The Tübingen School represented a step forward, as it emphasized the positive and historical character of Christianity as well as the ecclesiastical perspective from which the pastoral theology needed to be derived. Hirscher already had taken this path, but had stopped short: convinced that the kerygmatic function was by far the most important aspect of the pastoral office—one sees here the didactic intention of the Enlightenment—he confined his efforts at rejuvenation to the preaching of the faith and neglected the sacramental side. His student and successor Anton Graf[18] expanded the views of his teacher by adding to the function of pastoral theology of sermon and catechesis the task of treating the entire range of activities by which the Church rejuvenates itself thanks to the work of the constantly present Holy Spirit, active among God's people. Unfortunately, the expectations maturing around 1840 at Tübingen failed to bear fruit, in part because Hirscher's school was dispersed, in part for more general reasons. After 1850, the ecclesiological direction which Graf had wanted to impart to pastoral theology was neglected, and it became more and more a science of practical work in which psychological, ascetic, and canonical considerations won out over the theological aspects. This was the case with J. Amberger's[19] *Pastoraltheologie* (1850–57), and the textbooks of subsequent years, such as that by the Austrian I. Schüch, which between 1865 and 1924 came out in twenty editions, followed the same line. Another indication of the development of this time, damaging the efforts at biblical and theological rejuvenation in Germany, was the success gained around the middle of the century by German versions of French works with characteristic titles. They were chiefly designed to supply the parish clergy with "recipes": *Pflichten des Priesters* by F. Hurter (1844), *Anleitung zur Selbstprüfung für Weltgeistliche* by T. Katerkamp (1845), and *Der praktische Seelsorger* by H. Dubois, adapted by a priest from Mainz (1856).

---

[16] Concerning his influence in the German Catholic movement at the beginning of the nineteenth century, see vol. VII, pp. 216f.

[17] Three volumes (Munich 1788); 2nd edition 1794; 3rd edition 1812; 4th edition 1820.

As long as it was not a matter of purely theological consideration of the pastoral, but one of practical realization, France was indeed the country which set the pace until, beginning with the middle of the century, the "movement of union" pushed Catholic Germany into the forefront. Increasingly, priests and laymen concerned with the rejuvenation of the forms and methods of the apostolate turned to the movement.

---

[18] On Anton Graf (1811–67), professor of pastoral theology at Tübingen, and author of a noteworthy *Kritische Darstellung des gegenwärtigen Zustands der praktischen Theologie* (1841), see F. X. Arnold, *Seelsorge aus der Mitte der Heilsgeschichte,* 178–94.

[19] See H. Schuster, *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie* I, 63–66.

The pastoral, as it was understood by the French priest and his helpers during the first half of the nineteenth century,[20] was filled with a longing for the past, governed by the desire to rejuvenate the Christian community and the express feeling of hostility toward the world. It was in fact a pastoral of preservation, which attempted not to lose all those who still clung to the Church, i.e., chiefly women and children. This emphasis was not without consequences. The center of gravity of pastoral care moved increasingly to the world of women and children, attested to during this time by many church songs, pictures of saints, statues, and religious paintings.

All too frequently priests were tempted to concentrate on the small loyal group of followers who were willing to bow to their authority without resistance. Yet they did not totally ignore the lost sheep. For this purpose they employed the missions to the people or parish missions from the preceding period. Gradually these had developed into a coherent system using instruction, exercises, and ceremonies to reach their limited goal. The new conditions imposed some accommodations, but essentially the system remained true to its tested traditions. After an interruption of several years toward the end of the Empire, these popular missions were immediately resumed in France after the return of the Bourbons. At first they were under the leadership of secular priests, then their place was taken by preachers who were supplied by the congregations specializing in the apostolate. The July revolution stopped this movement, which often had assumed a political character; gradually it was resumed with less fanfare but with greater emphasis on depth.

In Italy also the parish missions had developed into firm fixtures and were resumed almost everywhere after the end of the revolutionary upheavals. In the Papal State, Pius VII in 1815 entrusted a reliable priest, Gaspare del Bufalo (1786–1837), with the task. Bufalo was later canonized; in Umbria be founded a congregation of priests which was to be important in the future. This congregation, the Society of the Precious Blood,[21] was introduced in 1840 by Franz Brunner[22] into Switzerland, where, at the beginning of the 1820s, Father Roothaan had encouraged the Jesuits to become active in the missions to the people.

---

[20] See among other reference books J. S. Dieulin, *Le bon curé au XIX^e siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1842; four printings between 1845 and 1864) or *Rituel du diocèse de Belley,* 3 vols., by Mgr. Devie (1830–31), dealing extensively with the question of the administration of parishes and sacraments.

[21] See G. de Libero, *S. Gaspare del Bufalo* (Rome 1954), and Heimbucher II, 611–13.

[22] See J. J. Simonet, *F.S. Brunner und seine Mutter* (Chur 1935).

Italians like the Rosminian L. Gentili and the Passionist Dominicus Barberi[23] introduced such missions into England and Ireland after 1843. As a result of the limitations imposed by the governments, the missions in the German states were not very successful until the middle of the century. But after 1840 they were permitted to spread in Austria and after 1848 also in Germany.[24] In the United States an Austrian Jesuit, F. X. Weninger (1805–88), conducted about eight hundred missions after 1848.[25]

The organization of a mission was always an extraordinary event, and in between them the priests had to search for suitable means of drawing the people into the churches, where they could learn how to fulfill their obligations, to avoid sins, and to gain salvation. The parish priests of that time viewed their task in this formalistic fashion. A high point of the year was first communion, establishing a connection, strengthened by folklore, between parish, school, and family. An attempt was made to transform the ceremony into a kind of popular mission in order to induce indifferent families once again to partake of the sacraments.

But the popular missions were not the only institutions which the French priests of the nineteenth century, in admiration of the traditions of the old French clergy, wished to revive. They also tried to restore a number of former confraternities such as the Black and White Penitents in the south of France, and the confraternity of the Sacred Childhood of Jesus in Burgundy, which was restored in 1821 by the bishop of Dijon and raised to the rank of an archconfraternity by Pius IX in 1855. But it was above all the Marian congregations which experienced a lively revival in similar forms. They had been dissolved in France in 1760 under pressure from the Jansenists, but in the nineteenth century enjoyed the advantages of the veneration of Mary. Among them were the classic congregations associated with Roman *Prima Primaria,* which, after the decree of 7 March 1825 by Leo XII, no longer needed to be associated with Jesuit settlements and which during the first decades of the century increased annually by a thousand: the Association of Sons of Mary the Immaculate, which, between 1820 and 1830, was founded by the Daughters of Charity for the children of their boarding schools, but which after the appearances of Mary to Catherine Labouré and their official acknowledgment by Pius IX in 1847 became a worldwide phenomenon without regard to social class (six hundred thousand members by the end of the century); and the Association of Ladies of the Children of Mary, which was founded in Lyon in 1832 for the former pupils of the boarding schools of the Religious of the Sacred Heart and quickly spread among upper-class women in Europe and America.[26]

---

[23] See D. Gwynn in *IER* 70 (1948), 169–84; C. Charles in *JEH* 15 (1964), 60–75.

[24] See E. Gatz, *Rheinische Volksmission im 19. Jahrhundert* (Düsseldorf 1963); K. Jockwig, "Die Volksmission der Redemptoristen in Bayern von 1843 bis 1873," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg* I (Regensburg 1967), 41–408.

[25] F. Weiser, *Apostel der Neuen Welt* (Vienna 1937).

In addition to these traditional forms, there were others which endeavored to take into account the new needs of an increasingly urban society. Of chief importance in this connection were the juvenile homes which attempted to compensate for the lack of moral and religious instruction among the common people. They were established in different forms and countries: in France by J. J. Allemand (1772–1836) and his student Timon-David (1821–91), supported by energetic laymen like Armand de Melun;[27] in Piedmont under the leadership of Don Bosco; in Belgium; and in the Rhineland, where Kolping with his developed understanding of the needs of a modern industrial society expanded this pastoral arrangement by founding the Catholic Association of Journeymen in 1849.

In France and Belgium such protective pastoral organizations developed especially under the influence of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul. The Vincentians, started by young French laymen, the best known among them being Frédéric Ozanam,[28] had given themselves three goals: assistance for the poor, not only materially, but also psychologically through contacts between human beings; strengthening of the faith of the members through the common exercise of charity; and apologetic witness before the world by attesting to the viability of Catholicism through action. Founded in 1833 in Paris, the Vincentians quickly spread in France (39 conferences in 1839, 141 in 1844, and 282 in 1848) and subsequently in other countries as well: in 1844 in Italy, in 1845 in Germany and the United States,[29] and by 1848 they counted 108 branches outside of France.

The Vincentian Conferences were an enterprise in which laymen played the primary role. The increasingly large role played by laymen in the service of the Church was one of the most significant innovations in the pastoral of the nineteenth century, in the course of which this trend became more pronounced. The lay movement is connected with a number of famous names: Princess Gallitzin, Görres and Buß in Germany; Montalembert, Melun, Veuillot, and Pauline Jaricot in France; Cesare d'Azeglio in Piedmont, O'Connell in Ireland; and Donoso Cortés in Spain. They were the men and women, generally from the social elite, who placed their wealth or their active interest in the service of the parishes in order to preserve already existing institutions or to help with the creation of new ones. Year by year the number of journalists and parliamentarians increased who often quite selflessly defended the interests of the Church with word and pen. In a world which within a few decades had changed fundamentally, in which large numbers of people had distanced themselves from the Church while simultaneously the number of priests and monks had decreased together with the support once given to the clergy by the state, astute people recognized that attracting laymen was an absolute necessity. Laymen were necessary in order to regain contact with the world through the presentation and defense of the faith in a language understood by all. The use of laymen as mediators for the purpose of representing the Church in the nerve centers of the new society was imperative. (The theology of the time had not yet understood that laymen, in fact, are the Church.) These centers were located in parliamentary bodies, in the offices of the civil service, in communal administrations, and in the editorial offices of newspapers. In 1820, Ferdinand de Bertier, one of the leaders of the movement, wrote: "I am convinced that priests are no longer the most effective apostles." Chaminade in Bordeaux had recognized this fact twenty years earlier. It was even better understood by Vincent Pallotti (1795–1850), who in 1835 in Rome attempted to create the Society for the Catholic Apostolate by calling upon Catholics—not only notables, but also craftsmen, teachers, servants, farmers, housewives, and mothers—to spread the principles of Christianity in their neighborhoods and their places of work.[30] But the intentions of this man, whom Pius IX characterized as the "Pioneer and Champion of the Catholic Action," met with violent resistance by the ecclesiastical authorities who thought that the apostolate should remain a monopoly of the clergy. In the same way, the activities of Montalembert and Veuillot in France about ten years later in the interest of Catholic education were regarded by the episcopates and the old clergy as an interference in the traditional rights of the hierarchy. In spite of complaints and lamentations based on old habits difficult to shed and on a too narrowly interpreted ecclesiology,[31] the people who looked to the future with awareness hesitated less and less to identify themselves with Lacordaire when he wrote: "The layman has a mission; he must add whatever the secular clergy and the religious orders lack. The faithful must join in their efforts to defend truth against the continual influence of bad doctrines; their love must work together in order to repair the breaches in the Church and the social order."[32]

---

[26] See *Un centenaire. Enfants de Marie du Sacre-Cœur,* 2 vols. (Paris 1932).

[27] See Duroselle, 183–97, and 548–604 for the rise in the third quarter of the century.

[28] Concerning the beginnings of the "Conférences de St. Vincent de Paul," see A. Foucault, *Histoire de la société de S. Vincent de Paul* (Paris 1933), *Livre du centenaire,* 2 vols. (Paris 1933), and J. Schall, *A. Baudon* (Paris 1897); also *Lettres de Frédéric Ozanam 1819–40,* ed. by L. Celier (Paris 1960).

[29] See B. Kühle, *Der Münchener Vincenzverein* (Wuppertal 1935); F. Molinari, "Le Conferenze di S. Vincenzo in Italia," *Spiritualita e Azione del laicato italiano* (Padua 1969), 59–103. A first attempt had taken place in Rome in 1836.

---

[30] See G. Ranocchini, *Vincenzo Pallotti, antesignano e collaboratore dell'Azione cattolica* (Rome 1943) and H. Schulte, *Priesterbildner und Künder des Laienapostolates, Vinzenz Pallotti* (Limburg 1967).

The Reaction of Moral Theology to the Rationalism of Enlightenment and Rigorism

As in so many other areas, moral theology and pastoral theology often have been characterized by the contrasting views of decadence on the one hand and restoration on the other in connection with the period of the Enlightenment and the first half of the nineteenth century. In reality, the reaction of numerous moralists of the eighteenth century against the reduction of moral theology to casuistry or against the discussions about probabilism also contained many positive values and justified objectives. But all too frequently there was the tendency to lose sight of the peculiar nature of Christian morality in comparison to a purely philosophical morality and to lend more weight to psychological considerations than to the biblical and ecclesiastical foundations of moral theology. This antidogmatic tendency was encountered in a number of German moralists of the first decades of the nineteenth century, such as J. Salat, guided by F. H. Jacobi, H. Schreiber, whose *Lehrbuch der Moraltheologie* (1831–34) was strongly influenced by post-Kantian rationalism, and the students of Hermes, P. Elvenich and G. Braun. There was also the parallel development both in moral theology and dogmatic theology of a growing reaction to rationalism. But even if the German moralists endeavored to seek their primary source of inspiration in Holy Scripture and increasingly to respect the entire range of doctrines of the Church, they were much more concerned with developing syntheses in close contact with the philosophy and the problems of their time than were their colleagues in the Latin countries.

Rejuvenation was only weakly in evidence in the case of G. Riegler (1778–1847). His *Christliche Moral* (1825; 1836) was merely an amplification in German of the *Ethica christiana universalis* (1801) by

---

[31] An ecclesiology with which most of the laity itself was imbued. The following lines by Montalembert from the year 1834 may serve as proof: "I am only a layman and therefore am responsible to Church and God only for my personal salvation" (*Lettres de Montalembert à Lamennais*, ed. by G. Goyau [Paris 1932], 209).

[32] *Le Journal de Bruxelles*, 27 April 1849.

Maurus von Schenkl[33] and like it lacked a deeper understanding of the supernatural order. The matter was much clearer with the Austrian J. A. Stapf (1785–1844), who in his *Theologia moralis,*[34] in contrast to Kant, emphasized the importance of dogma as the root of morality and who gave credit to the great moralists of the past, even though he himself employed a more modern and more synthetic method. But even in this context reference must be made to the work by Sailer and Hirscher,[35] whose productive intuitions developed in part in contact with other contemporary Protestant theologians such as Heß, Schwarz, and Schleiermacher.

In their argument with the naturalism of the preceding generation, they tried to restore biblical morality with its original force and to point out the intimate ties existing between it and the dogmas. But they also turned against the classical moral theology which seemed to limit itself to drawing the line between mortal and venial sins. As far as they were concerned, it was the function of moral theology to present the ideal of a Christian life in its totality. They did not consider the methods and the language of jurisprudence as suitable for a morality based on the gospel. Thus, Sailer's *Handbuch der christlichen Moral* (1817), written without much system and in an elevated style, yet filled with a host of original ideas, was a kind of introduction to a life of devotion. It was designed, as the subtitle explained, primarily for future Catholic pastors and secondarily for every educated Christian. In the reaction against the casuistry of the Jesuits and also against the rationalism predominating in the universities toward the end of the eighteenth century, Sailer traced the essential nature of Christian law to the love of God without, however, adequately delineating the subjective conditions of this love. Hirscher, whose accomplishments in the area of moral theology have already been mentioned, surpassed his predecessor "in the acuteness of psychological observation, by the greater actuality and contemporaneity, and not least through the cohesiveness of the systematical presentation, even if he does not always reach Sailer's mystical drive" (B. Häring). It was his intention to reconstruct morality on the biblical concept of "God's realm"[36] just as Drey had done with dogmatics.[37] It should be noted, though, that he did not really derive his concept of God's realm from the New Testament but from his teachers as they had understood it from the Romantic perspective of the period.[38] A critical examination reveals other inadequacies as well without, however, detracting from his great achievement.

---

[33] Concerning this book, which was not without merit, see C. Schmeine, *Studien zur "Ethica christiana" M. von Schenkls und zu ihren Quellen* (Regensburg 1959).

[34] Four vols. (Innsbruck 1827/31). He compiled his thoughts in his *Compendium,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1832), which was in use in Austria for many years. In 1841 he published *Die christliche Moral,* 4 vols., reflecting the influence of Hirscher.

[35] Concerning its contribution to moral theology with respect to Sailer, see, in addition to H. J. Müller, op. cit., P. Klotz, *J.M. Sailer als Moralphilosoph* (Paderborn 1909); J. Ammer, *Christliche Lebensgestaltung nach der Ethik J.M. Sailers* (Düsseldorf 1941); with respect to Hirscher, J. Scharl, *Freiheit und Gesetz. Die theologische Begründung der christlichen Sittlichkeit bei Johann Baptist Hirscher* (Munich 1941); A. Exeler, *Eine Frohbotschaft vom christlichen Leben, die Eigenart der Moraltheologie Johann Baptist Hirschers* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959).

One finds traces of the influence of Hirscher, Sailer, and Möhler in the writings of several authors of the subsequent generation such as Magnus Jocham, Bernhard Fuchs, Martin Deutinger, Karl Werner, and Ferdinand Probst. These authors, with their chief works appearing around 1850, partially returned to the classical tradition so strongly criticized by their predecessors, but they inherited from the Tübingen professors the concern of providing moral theology with its own organic unity in contrast to a merely external systematization. They also gained from them the conviction that the unique foundation of Christian morality must lie "in the nature of God's children, sanctified by the sacraments" (Jocham). Additionally, they emphasized the idea of development inasmuch as they show a moral life not based statically on fixed definitions and standards but rather dynamic, as a battle between grace, encouraging the perfect life, and the earthly forces pulling toward the darkness of sin.

Most of these moralists neither aimed at an approximation of morality with ascetic and mystical theology nor desired to have their books viewed narrowly as a guide for fathers confessor but wanted them to be regarded as useful scholarly works of edification for catechists, preachers, and educated believers.

The situation was totally different in the Latin countries. Here the classical form of the seminary textbook of a canonical-pastoral type was retained, designed to educate future fathers confessor and assembling a dry codification of obligations and sins on a casuistic basis. Here the innovation consisted of the replacement of the rigoristic or at least probabilistic principles by the moderate equiprobalistic doctrine of Saint Alphonsus Liguori in the French-speaking countries. This development, taking place in the second quarter of the century, was "one of the chief events of French Church history during the nineteenth century" (Guerber). It was in fact one of the primary factors for the victory of ultramontanism over the Gallican tradition. It also facilitated access to the sacraments for the faithful and revitalized Christian life.

---

[36] *Die christliche Moral als Lehre von der Verwirklichung des göttlichen Reiches in der Menschheit,* 3 vols. (Tübingen 1835; 5th printing 1851).

[37] See J. Geiselmann in *ThQ* 111 (1930), 116.

[38] J. Stelzenberger, "Biblisch oder romantisch ausgerichtete Moraltheologie," *ThQ* 140 (1960), 291–303.

The adherence by the moralists and the clergy to Liguori's system was promoted by the frequent favorable indications given it by the Roman authorities: the Congregation of Rites in 1803; Pius VII in 1816 on the occasion of the blessing of Alphonsus Liguori; Leo XII in 1825 in a letter to the publisher of his collected works; Pius VIII in 1829; the "Sacred Penitentiary" in 1831 in a reply confirmed by the Pope; and Gregory XVI in 1839 with the bull of canonization.[39] Liguori's victory over the rigorism taught by the Sulpician seminaries was due primarily to Abbé Gousset, a seminary professor at Besançon, as it was he who had occasioned the reply of the Penitentiary in 1831. But he was not the only one—as has been asserted—to spread Liguori's doctrines in France: aside from three French editions of the *Theologia moralis* during the restoration period, there were published in Lyon in 1823 and 1824 two anonymous pamphlets by the priest Pio Bruno Lanteri of Turin in defense of the Liguoristic position against the criticism of the rigorists; in 1828 the brothers Lamennais in their curriculum for the Congregation of Saint Peter made Liguori's work the basis for moral theology; and in 1830 Monsignor Devie praised it in his *Rituel du diocèse de Belley.* Yet it touched only small groups and the clergy in the countryside were hardly influenced by the movement. But when Abbé Gousset in 1832 published his *Justification de la théologie morale du bienheureux Alphonse de Liguori,* he created a deep impression and during the following decade more than thirty thousand copies of Liguori's *Theologia moralis* were sold in France. After he became archbishop of Reims, Gousset added to this success by publishing a *Théologie morale à l'usage des curés et des confesseurs,* in which he presented Liguori's doctrines simply and impressively. The work saw seventeen editions in France, was reprinted in Switzerland and in Belgium, and was translated into Italian, German, Polish, and Latin. In addition to this simply written work for the parish clergy, J. B. Bouvier with his widely distributed *Institutiones theologicae* opened the doors of the seminaries for Liguori. The same was done a short time later by the Jesuit P. Gury, who had discovered Liguori during his years of study in Rome. His *Compendium theologiae moralis,* partially inspired by Gousset, was used at Vals after 1833, within a few years saw twenty editions, and was adopted by many seminaries in France and other countries.

Probabilism was the prevailing doctrine in Belgium until the end of the eighteenth century. A few priests who had emigrated to Germany during the revolution there discovered Liguori's *Theologia moralis,* of which two editions were published in Mechelen and Antwerp in 1822. The settling of the Redemptorists in the country contributed to the success of Liguori's doctrine among the clergy in spite of persistent resistance in the seminaries and by the old clergy. As in France, it was accepted in Belgium between 1830 and 1840, thanks especially to the support given it by the theology department of the University of Louvain.

---

[39] See *Vindiciae Alphonsianae* I (Paris-Tournai 1874) LXXVIII–LXXX. While the Holy See applauded Liguori's doctrine, it carefully avoided taking a position against probabilism (see O. Fusi-Pecci, *La vita del papa Pio VIII* [Rome 1965], 157–60).

At the same time Liguori also was accepted in Germany, where he had always had a number of followers. A portion of the clergy became interested in good casuistic works in addition to the more synthetic ones mentioned earlier. In 1839 the Franciscan A. Waibel published his *Moraltheologie nach dem Geiste des heiligen Alphons von Liguori mit reichlicher Kasuistik,* and after 1844 K. Martin, professor of moral and pastoral theology at the University of Bonn, also introduced Alphonsus Liguori to the university curriculum. Several editions of the *Theologia moralis* were published during the following years in Mainz, Regensburg, and other cities. Incidentally, the textbook by Gury, reprinted several times, ultimately was more successful than those of native moralists. Just as in other areas, so also in moral theology parallel to the growing success of ultramontanism, a return to increasingly traditional positions could be noted. It was at the expense, of course, of the frequently interesting attempts at innovation. These had matured in the atmosphere of the Enlightenment and of Catholic Romanticism and were now smothered for almost a century.

CHAPTER 3

Catholic Thought Searching for New Ways

As in the preceding fifteen years, attempts were continued under the pontificate of Gregory XVI to guide Catholic thought into channels more suitable to the modern way of thinking than Scholasticism. The result of such efforts was uneven in Germany, France, and Italy. The defenders of tradition resisted innovations passionately, and the Holy See, whose authority was growing firmer, after a long interval once again began to censor those Catholic theologians and philosophers whose writings it regarded as threatening the faith. Most of the theological discussions took place in Germany, such as the posthumous controversies over the theories of Hermes, the admiration for Günther and the attacks against him, and the influence of the schools of Tübingen and Munich. But the Catholic University of Louvain also rose as a new center of higher education in Belgium. The failure of Lamennais and Bautain in France must not let one forget that numerous, often hapless, often interesting initiatives were taken. They were a testament to the efforts of open-minded Catholic intellectuals to leave the old worn-out paths and to accommodate themselves to the thinking of their contemporaries. One of the most notable indications of such efforts is the growth of the Catholic press; not of dailies as yet, but of journals and periodicals. It is especially noteworthy that this phenomenon characterized all of western Europe.

The Hermesian Controversy

After the death of Georg Hermes on 26 May 1831, at the height of his fame, criticism immediately became stronger and more virulent. This was especially the case with the new scholastics of the Mainz *Katholik,* but also with the groups espousing the Romantic theory of experience. They lacked the intellectual force for a precise limning of his errors, but they sensed that Hermes had assigned reason too high a place in the doctrine of faith. In order to be able to answer the accusations of Pelagianism, Socinianism, and rationalism, the students of Hermes, on their part accusing their opponents of fideism, in 1832 founded the *Zeitschrift für Philosophie and katholische Theologie.* An increasingly bitter and often confused polemic was carried on in periodicals and anonymous pamphlets without any notable result, until Anton Josef Binterim (after 1805 pastor in Bilk near Düsseldorf), one of the bitterest opponents of Hermes, succeeded in convincing the nuncio in Munich to warn the Roman authorities. Until then they had relied on the Cologne Archbishop Count Spiegel, who had defended the orthodoxy of the Bonn professor. But in consequence of the report by the nuncio, the *Philosophische Einleitung in die christ-katholische Theologie* was placed before the Index congregation. Toward the end of 1833 two German-speaking theologians, the Alsatian Kohlmann and the future Cardinal Reisach, were asked to translate the contested passages into Latin and to evaluate them. The nuncios in Munich and Vienna were requested to obtain the testimony of experts and to forward it to Rome. The Munich nuncio turned to two bitter enemies of Hermes, C. H. Windischmann and Binterim, the latter of whom was hardly competent to make a judgment. The Vienna nuncio consulted the Güntherian J. E. Veith, who was favorably inclined towards Hermes, but also the theologically untrained jurist K. E. Jarcke (cofounder of the *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland),* who was very hostile to Hermes.

In Germany the controversy was renewed when J. A. Achterfeld in 1834 posthumously published the hitherto unpublished first volume of

Hermes' *Dogmatik.* With public opinion being agitated, the examination of Hermes' doctrines continued. Father Giovanni Perrone played a large role in the proceedings, even though his ignorance of the German language was a hindrance in arriving at a judgment. In view of the extent assumed by the controversy it was decided not to be satisfied with a simple indication. On 26 September 1835 a sharply worded papal brief[1] globally condemned Hermes' writings as "absurda et a doctrina Catholicae Ecclesiae aliena." Branded were numerous errors concerning God, grace, original sin and ecclesiastical tradition, especially the method of using positive doubt as the foundation of all theological inquiry, and the rationalistic principle which sees reason as the only means of obtaining knowledge of supernatural truth. The papal document, distributed through the nuncios in Brussels and Munich, filled Hermes' opponents with joy and prompted them to demand the immediate dismissal of his students from all university teaching posts. But aside from the bishops of Osnabrück and Posen, the bishops took no action, as the brief had not been transmitted through governmental channels. The chapter vicar of Cologne even imposed total silence about the brief on his priests.

The Hermesians, totally unprepared for the condemnation and thunderstruck by the judgment as well as by the harsh language used in connection with their revered master, quickly went over to the counterattack. They declared that Hermes' doctrinal opinions had been badly interpreted and that the papal brief attacked only a heresy of the imagination. They asserted that the recent condemnation of Bautain's fideism by the bishop of Strasbourg justified Hermes and proved at the same time the weakness of the position of their opponents. The last was a point valid for many of the involved. For no matter how bitter their attacks, they still were not able to write a decisive refutation (the first really serious criticism philosophically was leveled by A. Kreuzlage in 1838, theologically by J. Kuhn in 1839 and especially by the Austrian Franz Werner in 1845). In contrast, the leading Hermesian, P. J. Elvenich, succeeded with his extraordinarily well written *Acta Hermesiana* (1836) in creating a deep impression.

The controversy raged again after the appointment of Archbishop Droste zu Vischering. In his youth he had belonged to the circle around the Princess Gallitzin with its mystic and Platonic tendencies. Now, quite unjustly, he suspected the Hermesians of making common cause with the Prussian government in order to secretly undermine Catholicism. The archbishop also intended to destroy the influence of the department of theology at the University of Bonn and to replace it with the diocesan seminary in Cologne.[2] He demanded from the professors an express submission to the papal brief and from all ecclesiastical candidates a sworn agreement with the eighteen theses in which the errors condemned by the Pope were even more sharply formulated; they were in fact very tactlessly phrased.[3] According to the anti-Hermesian Franz Werner, Droste also was guilty of a number of mistakes: he was incapable of recognizing what was correct in some of the scholarly demands of the Hermesians. But primarily he lacked the pastoral tact and the conciliatoriness which would have allowed the Hermesians a graceful retreat. He wanted to drive them to an unconditional surrender, but instead only succeeded in embittering them and confirming them in their excessive adherence to the doctrines of their teacher, of which they did not want to change one iota. They also were contemptuous of the archbishop's magisterial office, which desired to contradict with arguments of authority a philosophical system whose spirit it had evidently not grasped at all.

---

[1] Bernasconi II, 85ff. This papal brief was supplemented by another one on 7 January 1836 condemning the last two volumes of the *Dogmatik,* which had appeared in the meantime.

Toward the end of 1835 F. X. Biunde, professor at the seminary at Trier, established contact with Rome in order to enable the Hermesians to explain the meaning of the condemned writings, which, according to their opinion, had been misunderstood by the Roman censors. The result was that at the beginning of 1837 two delegates went to Rome. They were P. J. Elvenich, layman and philosopher, fully acquainted with the Hermesian system and also a capable Latinist, and J. W. Braun, a theologian of great erudition, "the best mind of the Bonn faculty" (Schrörs), with good connections in Rome. They were initially well received—much better than Lamennais—and asked to discuss their case with the Jesuit general Roothaan, who spoke German. But they quickly discovered that everything rested on a misunderstanding: The Roman authorities were solely interested in determining whether the Latin translation which the censors had used was correct, while Elvenich and Braun wished to explain the essential nature of the doctrines in order to justify them. The Index congregation refused to consider this approach and did not even wish to see the Latin summary, *Meletemata theologica,*[4] which the two had prepared. Other misunderstandings and the intervention of Metternich, who saw in rationalism a danger to the principle of authority and feared that the religious ferment could degenerate into political disturbances,[5] served to discredit them entirely. With the departure from Rome of Capaccini and the Prussian envoy Bunsen they lost two valuable supporters, and their eleven-month stay ended in total defeat. Because they insisted that they agreed with the Pope in condemning all of the errors which he had cited, including the method of positive doubt, but denied that Hermes' writings contained such errors, Secretary of State Lambruschini in a letter of 6 April 1838 accused them of lacking obedience and of taking recourse to the Jansenist differentiation between *quaestio iuris* and *quaestio facti.*[6] The letter, immediately published by their opponents, hastened the decline of Hermesianism which had begun two to three years earlier. Although the Hermesians active in pastoral care delivered excellent service, the majority of the clergy and the militant Catholics, who were increasingly ultramontane, distanced themselves completely from these "ivory tower theologians" who openly opposed the Holy See. The intellectuals began to turn to Anton Günther, the new rising star, who also attracted some of the best speculative minds among the Hermesians. After a renewed attempt by the Breslau Church historian Ritter in 1845–46 in defense of Hermes failed even to reach Rome, the bishops had no difficulty in gradually purging the main centers of Hermesianism at the universities of Bonn, Munich, and Breslau, and the seminary of Trier. Nor were the rearguard actions by the uncompromising Hermesians, among others Braun and Achterfeld, to any avail. They believed to have reasons for hope when Pius IX in his inaugural encyclical *Qui pluribus,*[7] directed against the fideists, emphasized the importance of the rational basis of the act of faith. The Hermesians interpreted the passage as a revocation of the brief of 1835. But the Pope put a quick end to this tactical maneuver.[8] The time of the Hermesians was gone irrevocably.

---

[2] The importance of these nontheological aspects in the Hermesian controversy—not to mention the personal rivalries which occasionally poisoned the atmosphere even more—were underscored by H. Schrörs, according to whom the Cologne events were "basically more caused by Hermesianism than by the question of mixed marriages" (*Geschichte der katholisch-theologischen Fakultät zu Bonn* [Cologne 1922], 69, n. 1).

[3] *ThGl* 21 (1929), 316–28.

[4] I.e., "Theological Studies." Concerning the weaknesses of this study, first published in Latin and then, after the return of the two to Germany also published in German, see Schrörs, *Braun,* 272–73.

Rise and Fall of Güntherianism

Anton Günther (1783–1863), like Hermes a pious and concerned priest, attempted to reconcile faith and reason and to enable Catholic intellectuals to remain in the Church while they confronted the great philosophical currents of their time. Like Hermes he became the revered teacher of a whole generation of philosophers and theologians who rejoiced that Catholic speculation was exploring new paths better suited to the modern mentality. And like Hermes he was accused—not without grounds—of semirationalism. But the differences between the two thinkers were considerable. Hermes endeavored to overcome Kantian criticism and to create a rational basis for the acceptance of revelation. Günther dealt with Hegel's pantheistic idealism and Feuerbach's materialistic monism in order to work out a philosophical justification of the great Christian dogmas. The differences between the two men were even greater when one considers their intellectual background. Hermes and his followers were late representatives of the dry rationalism of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, while Günther and most of his enthusiastic students were deeply influenced by the Catholic romanticism of the restoration period. P. Wenzel characterized their system as a kind of gnosis of romanticism and added that their semirationalism was also a type of semi-irrationalism.[9]

---

[5] With respect to the political importance which the Austrian chancellor attached to the Hermesian controversy and his intervention in the matter in Rome after 1833, see J. Pritz, op. cit., 133–35 and H. Bastgen, op. cit., 27, 408.

[6] After their return to Germany, Elvenich and Braun published all documents concerning their negotiations in Rome under the title *Acta Romana* (1838).

[7] Text in *Acta Pii IX* I (Rome 1854), 4–24.

[8] Letter to the archbishop of Cologne, 25 July 1847. See H. J. Stupp, *Pius IX. und die Katholische Kirche in Deutschland mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Hermesianismus* (Solingen 1848).

Günther was born in northern Bohemia and received his philosophical education in the rationalistic atmosphere of Prague, where he studied under Bernhard Bolzano.[10] After surviving a personal crisis of faith, caused by studying the idealistic German philosophers, he developed an intense religiosity and began the study of theology with the help of the Redemptorist Clemens Maria Hofbauer. In 1821 he became a priest and settled in Vienna, where he lived as a private scholar until his death. He failed to obtain a teaching position in Vienna and rejected all offers coming from Germany. He lived surrounded by like-minded admirers, clerics, and laymen, who were equally attracted to his apostolic temperament, his metaphysical genius, and the charm of his discourse. Among them were the Cartesian naturalist J. H. Pabst, Günther's chief collaborator, and the famous preacher J. E. Veith, a former Jew.[11]

With his numerous books,[12] written in a very personal, sometimes very condensed, sometimes free and humorous style, Günther's influence reached far beyond this personal circle. Without much system they offered original and often far-seeing observations and astute criticisms of the most important philosophical systems, especially of Hegelianism. There is no doubt that Günther recognized the intellectual greatness of Hegelianism, but he also recognized the danger it presented much more clearly than most of the other theologians of his time. He was also convinced that Scholasticism was not only outdated but, like any philosophy of concepts, was connected to a kind of semipantheism, and therefore he devoted himself with unusual intellectual enthusiasm to a new scholarly proof of theology with an anthropological base. He presented Catholic dogma in the language of the "phenomenology of the mind" and tried to show how it is possible to understand creation through the Trinity and the Trinity through human self-consciousness. As in all of German idealism, the accent was placed on the concept of man as "nature and mind." Worked out between 1822 and 1835, Günther's essential thought was contained in his *Vorschule zur spekulativen Theologie* (1828–29). From that point onward, his influence superceded that of Hermes. During the 1840s Günther dominated the German Catholic intellectual world, the more so as the Prussian government appointed numerous Güntherians to philosophical and theological university teaching posts. It wanted to avoid appointing Hermesians in order not to anger the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but it also did not wish to appoint men who were compromised by the Catholic reaction to the Cologne events.

---

[9] H. Witetschek is also of the opinion that Günther "connected theology with a radical belief in reason as well as with irrational romantic aspects" (*HJ* 86 [1966], 110).

[10] Concerning Bernhard Bolzano (1781–1841), a priest with progressive ideas who quickly became suspect to the defenders of the Catholic restoration, a religious philosopher who was primarily notable as a precursor in the area of logic and mathematics, see E. Winter, *Bernhard Bolzano und sein Kreis* (Leipzig 1933); E. Winter, *Bernhard Bolzano, ein Denker und Erzieher im österreichischen Vormärz* (Vienna 1967); E. and M. Winter, *Der Bolzanokreis 1824–33* (Vienna 1970).

[11] Among Günther's followers were a good number of Jewish converts.

[12] Index, *LThK* IV, 1277.

The chief centers of the movement were Vienna, Silesia, and the Rhineland. In Silesia, Güntherianism dominated the theological department at the University of Breslau, thanks to the protection of Prince-Bishop Diepenbrock, the former Hermesian Baltzer, and J. H. Reinkens, the future Old Catholic bishop. In the Rhineland, there was formed a "German Port-Royal" (P. Wenzel) by F. Knoodt and H. Nickes. The brothers Wolter, who founded the abbey of Beuron, also belonged to their circle. In the atmosphere of a romantic mysticism they dreamed of overcoming the rationalism around them through the combined effect of Güntherian speculation and a return to the monastic Middle Ages. In addition to enthusiastic and frequently intolerant adherents, there were also numerous sympathizers elsewhere. Among them were Professor Löwe in Prague, the future Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Tarnoczy, the bishop of Ermland, A. Thiel, several professors in Trier and Bamberg, the Benedictine abbot Gangauf in Augsburg, Görres in Munich, Zukrigl in Tübingen, as well as a good number of Protestants. The Güntherians had an eager protector even in Rome in the person of Pappalettere, the abbot of Monte Cassino, who saw in them the agents for Germany's liberation from rationalism.[13]

But soon there were also opposing voices. The philosophers whom Günther had criticized mercilessly, especially the students of Baader and those who favored a return to Scholasticism, were the first ones to counterattack. Then theologians became involved, accusing Günther of claiming to provide a rational proof of supernatural mysteries. The philosopher F. J. Clemens and the jurist K. E. Jarcke in *Katholik* and *Historisch-Politische Blätter* wrote of his disregard of the great thinkers of earlier times. The arrogance of Günther's students, many of whom did not share the deep religiosity and the apostolic dash of their teacher and who, as is often the case, emphasized the debatable aspects of many of his thoughts, only magnified the discontent. By 1845, the old front of the anti-Hermesians, who rigorously rejected any compromise with modern philosophy, deployed itself against Güntherianism, especially in the Rhineland, where Knoodt, having made of Bonn a very active center of the movement, managed to arouse the ire of Archbishop Geissel. After the crisis of 1848, during which the Güntherians played a predominant role in the Catholic movement, they founded the new philosophical journal *Lydia* (1849–54) for the purpose of spreading their views, but the absolutist reaction in Austria, accusing them of sympathy for the liberal tendencies of the time, was ill-disposed toward them. The position of the Güntherians was endangered by the appointment in 1853 of Rauscher as archbishop of Vienna; for the past twenty years he had been their enemy. This happened precisely at a time when attacks against them increased on the doctrinal level. These were started in 1851 by the Benedictine Sorg, in 1852 by Dieringer and Schwetz, in 1854 by Michelis, and especially by F. J. Clemens, their bitterest enemy, whose pamphlet *Die spekulative Theologie Anton Günthers und die katholische Kirchenlehre* (1853) found a great echo and started a war of pamphlets. When the controversy passionately agitated Germany's and Austria's theologians and philosophers, surpassing in acidity the dispute over Hermesianism fifteen years earlier, the archbishop of Cologne submitted the problem to the Holy See. Günther had powerful protectors, who were grateful to him for having freed Catholic intellectuals from their fascination with Hegel and who sensed the danger of offending the universities, which already viewed the official Church hierarchy with mistrust. Matters probably could have been settled satisfactorily had not Baltzer and Knoodt, authorized to defend their system in Rome directly, spoiled everything by their cool attitude toward the Jesuits and the contempt which they showed for the development of Roman philosophy. Still, Rome hesitated two years before it finally decided to act. The opponents of the Güntherians did not cease their attacks, especially the authoritarian Archbishop Geissel, who made condemnation a point of prestige. Finally, in January 1857, Pius IX decided to place Günther's works on the Index, even though he paid strong compliments to the person and the intentions of the author.[14] Günther submitted despite his deep disappointment. But many of his friends asserted that it was perfectly all right to continue to teach the essentials of his system, as the papal decree had not condemned a single one of his theses. Geissel, supported in Rome by Cardinal Count von Reisach, therefore extracted a papal brief which defined the condemnation.[15] The moderate Güntherians submitted, while the radical ones, like Baltzer, Knoodt, and Reinkens, refused, arguing that it was a matter of academic integrity. They continued the controversy for many more years and provided the most active support for Old Catholicism after 1870.

---

[13] On the support which Günther received from Simplicio Pappalettere, abbot of Subiaco since 1846, see P. Wenzel, *Der Freundeskreis um Anton Günther,* 133–245.

Tübingen and Munich

Theological life in the German-speaking countries was not limited to the activity of the Hermesians and Güntherians and the controversies which they caused. Even in Bonn, one of their citadels, not all professors agreed with their teachings. H. Klee (1800–40), "the outstanding mind of the first Mainz circle" (Lenhart), taught there from 1829 to 1839 and in 1843 Archbishop Geissel succeeded in placing F. X. Dieringer (1811–76) on the chair of dogmatics. He was a priest strongly engaged in the Catholic movement which in 1844 founded the *Katholische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Kunst* in response to the journal of the Hermesians. Klee[16] lacked speculative acumen, but he had a very pronounced feeling for the supernatural character of revealed religion and was also one of the rare Catholics capable of holding his own in comparison with his Protestant colleagues. His unusual patristic scholarship enabled him to write a *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (2 vols. [1832]), one of the first written by a Catholic and of value. Dieringer[17] had studied in Tübingen and was better known for his inspired love of the Church and the ingenious clarity of his teaching than for his creative powers or his depth. The honorary doctoral degree awarded to him by the University of Munich was a response to his book *System der göttlichen Thaten des Christentums* (1841).

---

[14] E. Winter, op. cit., 232 ff. and supplement B, provides a wealth of documentation on the trial.

[15] Papal brief *Eximiam tuam,* 15 June 1857, in *Acta Pii* II, 585–90.

[16] See the biographical sketch in volume 1 of the *Katholische Dogmatik* (Mainz 1844), XXIII–XLIII and *LThK* VI, 324.

[17] See J. Wetzel in *FreibDiözArch* 72(1952), 198–212, and *NDB* III, 657.

In southern Germany, theological life was concentrated chiefly in the theological departments of the universities of Tübingen and Munich. The generation of the founders gradually disappeared in Tübingen—Möhler and Herbst in 1836, Hirscher in 1837, and Drey in 1846—and their places were taken by younger men. There was A. Graf, who as holder of the chair for pastoral theology developed remarkable ecclesiological points of view; he left the university too early in 1843, a victim of the tensions existing for about ten years between a number of the faculty and the Württemberg government over church political issues;[18] K. J. Hefele, who took Möhler's place as professor of church history and demonstrated his abilities after the middle of the century; and J. E. Kuhn,[19] professor of dogmatics after 1839, who for forty years remained the uncontested head of the school, impressing his students and the readers of his many books[20] by the clarity and depth of his thoughts and the brilliance of his dialectic. In his evolutionary view, Scholasticism was a useful phase in the history of Christian thought, but now outdated. Inspired by Hegel's method, he tried to get to the bottom of the Christian mystery; but his faith-rooted speculation was based on the facts of revelation and took account of the history of dogma. Kuhn remained faithful to the principles of the Tübingen School and was also a talented metaphysician and thoroughly familiar with the Greek Church Fathers and Saint Augustine. He also was an able exegete and in 1832 published his *Leben Jesu wissenschaftlich bearbeitet* to counteract the book on the life of Jesus by David Friedrich Strauß. Kuhn was less tied to romantic idealism than his teachers and placed the concept of mind, spirit, intellect before that of life. In him and his younger colleagues of the Tübingen School "the movement gained speculative depth and systematizing power" (Scheffczyk).

The influence of the Tübingen School extended to other universities. To Münster, where Anton Berlage,[21] a student of Drey and Möhler, became professor of moral theology and dogmatics in 1835; but especially to Gießen and Freiburg im Breisgau. The department of theology at Gießen[22] was established in 1830 as a substitute for the Mainz seminary in spite of the protest of the chapter. From the beginning two Tübingen-educated professors left their imprint: Kuhn, holding the chair for New Testament studies from 1832 to 1837, and Franz Anton Staudenmaier,[23] who taught dogmatics from 1830 until 1837, when he moved to Freiburg. In Freiburg he was joined by Hirscher, another respected Tübingen-educated professor. After its reorganization in 1832, the theology department at Freiburg had gone through a crisis which was ended with the arrival of these two. There was also Alban Stolz (1808–83), who in 1847 assumed Hirscher's chair of pastoral theology. The influence of Staudenmaier, long neglected by historians of theology, was not any less than that of the Tübingen people. In his time his *Geist des Christentums* (1835), which saw eight editions within half a century and was a seminal work in liturgical theology, was even compared to Chateaubriand's[24] *Gênie du christianisme.* His *Christliche Dogmatik* (4 vol. [1844–52]) also was a very personal work, in which the central ecclesiological perspectives are grounded in a trinitarian theology and in a history of theology which replaces Hegel's dialectical philosophy of history with the living and free working of God among men as revealed by revelation.

---

[18] On this conflict, see M. Müller, op. cit.

[19] Concerning Johann Evangelist Kuhn (1806–87), see in addition to *LThK* VI, 656–57, A. Hagen, *Gestalten aus dem schwäbischen Katholizismus* II (Stuttgart 1948–54), 59–95, and J. R. Geiselmann, *Die lebendige Überlieferung als Norm des christlichen Glaubens dargestellt im Geiste der Traditionslehre Johann Evangelist Kuhns* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959).

[20] His major book, *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik,* appeared in three volumes between 1846 and 1868. As early as 1832, he had presented his views in an article of the *ThQ*, "Über den Begriff und das Wesen der spekulativen Theologie."

[21] On Anton Berlage (1805–81), see *LThK* II, 231. He also was under the influence of Hermes and Günther and in Munich also under that of Baader, Schelling, and Görres. His *Christ-katholische Dogmatik* (7 vols. [1839–64]), together with Liebermann's *Institutiones,* became one of the most widely used reference books in ecclesiastical circles.

In Munich it was the lay professors who initially played a role. Görres remained the center of the group until his death in 1848. Inspired by the native initiative of Sailer as well as the influence of Tübingen, especially Möhler's presence from 1835 to 1838, the department of theology also improved over time. Of course, not all areas were equally well covered. Work in dogmatics remained tentative in spite of the contributions made by A. Buchner between 1827 and 1838, and moral theology remained inadequately taught for a long time. Canon law, however, did not escape the influence of George Phillips,[25] who as a member of the law school opened new avenues by employing the methods of historical law in the service of his ultramontane views. After the rather lackluster Joseph Franz von Allioli[26] retired in 1835, exegesis was given new life by Möhler, who was equally interested in finding a firm philological base and in confronting Protestant views; his successors Reithmayr and Haneberg continued the trend. Church history gradually acquired a scholarly character through the young Döllinger and Franz Michael Permaneder,[27] who during the Lola Montez crisis between 1847 and 1849 assumed Döllinger's place. Under Möhler's prodding, the theological faculty at Munich gradually moved away from the intoxicating speculations of Baader and Schelling and adopted a genetic view of history.

---

[22] It existed only for a short time, for in 1851 Ketteler stopped its students from attending by reopening the seminary at Mainz. The undeniably rationalistic tendencies of two professors (L. Schmid and A. Lutterbeck) provided him with a good pretext. See F. Vigener, "Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät in Gießen und ihr Ende," *Mitteilungen des oberhessischen Geschichtsvereins,* n.s. 24 (1922), 28–96.

[23] Concerning Franz Anton Staudenmaier (1800–56), see F. Lauchert, *Franz Anton Staudenmaier* (Freiburg i. Br. 1901); P. Weindel, *Das Verhältnis von Glauben und Wissen in der Theologie Staudenmaiers* (Düsseldorf 1940); A. Burhart, *Der Mensch, Gottes Ebenbild und Gleichnis. Ein Beitrag zur dogmatischen Anthropologie Staudenmaiers* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962); P. Hünermann, *Trinitarische Anthropologie bei Staudenmaier* (Munich 1962); A. Scholz in *ThQ* 147 (1967), 210–39.

[24] See W. Trapp in *Liturgische Zeitschrift* 4 (1931–32), 52–54, and F. X. Arnold, *Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Theologie der Seelsorge* (Freiburg i. Br. 1949).

After 1826, Döllinger[28] belonged to the faculty to which he had been appointed in consequence of Sailer's help. Connected in his youth with the Mainz group, he had become acquainted with Görres and for two decades stood in the forefront of the journalistic polemic for religious and academic freedom. He had a remarkable talent for dogmatic analysis, which he displayed in his doctoral thesis, *Die Lehre von der Eucharistie in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten.* Regarding university teaching as an apostolate, he turned to church history in the awareness that the Catholics were far inferior to the Protestants in this area. After initial work on Hartig's textbook he published his own *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (2 vols. [1836–38]), which was acclaimed for the clarity of his presentation and the originality of his thought. Not merely chronicling events, it treated the development of ecclesiastical institutions in the areas of religion, discipline, and constitution. The book was quickly translated into other languages: into English in 1840–42, French in 1841, and Italian in 1845. In 1837 Döllinger was elected as a member of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences. In 1842 he founded an Archive for Theological Literature as the organ of expression of the professors of the theology department.

---

[25] Volume I of his *Kirchenrecht* appeared in 1845.

[26] On Joseph Franz von Allioli (1793–1873), see *LThK* I, 352, and J. Zinkl, *Magnus Jocham* (Freiburg i. Br. 1950), 54ff. He became known chiefly through his Bible translation, the notes for which were taken from the best commentaries of the time (6 vols. [1830–32]); it was approved by numerous German and Austrian bishops and by the Pope in 1838 and of all German versions was the most widely read.

[27] Concerning Franz Michael Permaneder (1794–1862), see *LThK* VIII, 279–80. He taught canon law and church history at the high-school for girls in Freising and published a reliable *Bibliotheca patristica* (2 vols. [1841–44]), which introduced into Catholic education the Protestant differentiation between "patrology" (literary history of early Christian writings) and "patristics" (theological treatment of doctrines).

[28] Of Ignaz von Döllinger (1799–1890), one of the most remarkable personalities of German Catholicism in the second and third quarter of the nineteenth century, there exists as yet no satisfying biography. See J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger,* 3 vols. (Munich 1899–1901); F. Vigener, *Drei Gestalten aus dem modernen Katholizismus* (Munich 1926), 108–88; S. Lösch, *Döllinger und Frankreich. Eine geistige Allianz* (Munich 1955); G. Schwaiger, *Ignaz von Döllinger* (Munich 1963); *DHGE* XIV 553–63. His correspondence is widely dispersed and so far only a small portion has been published.

In the course of the following years he was affected by the hardening of the denominational fronts which under the influence of the converts Jarcke and Phillips superceded the indifferentism of the Enlightenment as well as Sailer's irenism and Möhler's dialogue. His first great work, *Die Reformation, ihre Entwicklung und ihre Wirkung* (3 vols. [1846–48]) was an anti-Protestant polemic. It was designed to refute the assertions made by Ranke in his *Deutsche Geschichte im Reformationszeitalter.* Based on a considerable number of primary sources drawn from the reformers, he attempted to show the destructive character of the Reformation and its unfortunate cultural consequences; yet he also tried to indicate the reasons for it. This portrait of Lutheranism was rejected by the Protestants because it only treated the dark side of the Reformation, but it caused Catholics to look upon the author as one of the outstanding champions of the Church and to regard Munich as the shining center of Catholic scholarship.

The Catholic University of Louvain

Soon after the creation of the Kingdom of Belgium, the episcopate, suspicious of the moral and religious atmosphere of the state universities, started an experiment which during the nineteenth century frequently attracted the attention of foreign Catholics. In October 1832 it decided to establish a Catholic university with academic freedom and two years later translated this decision into reality. In the attempt to avoid the impression among the liberals that profane education was subject to Rome, the episcopate refused to make it into a papal university. The decision was quite contrary to the usage under the Old Regime and worried the Holy See. Its fears that the new institution could grow into a citadel of Catholic liberalism were confirmed by the appointment of several of Lamennais's followers, among them the university president Xavier De Ram,[29] the metaphysician Gerhard Ubaghs, and especially the Frenchman Charles de Coux, a former editor of *L'Avenir.* Considering the lack of qualified personnel in the country, it was necessary to turn to foreign professors.[30] They were won with salaries equivalent to those paid by the state universities. Although the faculty included several autodidacts, it became possible from the beginning to provide students with an education qualitatively comparable to that of the other universities of the country. The medical school, for example, opened the first clinic for ophthalmology in Belgium. During its first period, the university became particularly well known for its Middle Eastern studies. In 1841–43 the Dutchman T. Beelen, a Hebraicist, published a *Chrestomathia rabbinica et chaldaica,* which displayed an originality rare for its time, and his research was augmented by that of F. Nève, a specialist in Sanskrit. The president, a sound scholar, was the first to remove national church history from a hagiographic and edifying emphasis and instead based it on a study of the original sources. Thanks to his intervention, the Belgian Jesuits were able in 1837—after an interruption of half a century—to continue the work of the Bollandists.[31] Twenty years later Renan assigned this enterprise first place among the products of the Catholic renaissance of the nineteenth century which he considered serious.

---

[29] Concerning Xavier De Ram (1804–65), the real organizer of the new university which he headed for thirty-one years, see *LThK* VIII, 982–83.

In the theology department, which quickly attracted students from the neighboring countries, the outstanding person was Jean-Baptiste Malou,[32] professor of dogmatics from 1837 to 1849. He displayed his patristic scholarship in the book which he published a few years later on *L'Immaculée Conception de la bienheureuse Vierge Marie* (1857). Educated in Rome, he became at Louvain the defender of Scholasticism against his ontological and traditionalist colleagues Arnould Tits[33] and Ubaghs.[34] Their views were published in the *Revue catholique,* established in 1843 by the professors at Louvain, and read in the seminaries and by educated laymen, but met growing resistance by the Jesuits and the opponents of Lamennais. The rather lively dispute ultimately was decided by Rome. Ubaghs's *Théodicée* and *Logique* were sent to the Congregation of the Index by Nuncio Fornari, and on 23 June 1843 the congregation came to the conclusion that several theses needed to be corrected. But the Holy See considered it advisable not to publish this decision, in order not to hurt the Catholic university. Thus Ubaghs felt justified in continuing his courses in the same vein, which he regarded as more suitable than traditional Scholasticism to ward off the perils of rationalism. After Malou became bishop in 1849, he reopened the case and obtained an unequivocal condemnation from Rome. Ubaghs obediently submitted and resigned his professorial chair.

---

[30] Two eminent converts came from Germany: W. Arendt for Greek and Roman antiquity, and J. Moeller, a student of Niebuhr's, for history. Windischmann joined the medical school.

[31] See H. Delahaye, *L'œuvre des Bollandistes* (Brussels 1959), 129–35.

[32] On Jean-Baptiste Malou (1809–64), the future bishop of Bruges, see B. Jungmann in *Katholik* 46 (1866) I, 716–41, II, 74–90, 129–56.

[33] Concerning Arnould Tits (1807–51), professor of fundamental theology since 1840, who died early but left a lasting impression, and whom Monsignor De Ram compared to Klee, see *Annuaire de l'Université catholique de Louvain* 16 (1852), 171–94.

[34] On Gerhard Casimir Ubaghs (1800–75), professor of philosophy from 1834 to 1866, see H. van Grunsven, *Gerhard Ubaghs* (Heerlen 1933) and *LThK* X, 427–28.

Tentative Attempts by the Catholic Intellectuals in France

While Germany retained the considerable lead of the first decades of the century and even enlarged it, the Latin countries on the whole presented a sad picture.

In Spain, with the Church suffering the aftereffects of the chaotic political situation, theological studies stagnated.[35] But the training of the clergy in the seminaries was clearly superior to that in France and Italy, even though it was limited to reading the great writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Any openness to modern problems was lacking, with the result that Spanish theologians exerted no influence outside of Spain before the Thomist renaissance during the last third of the century. The only exception—aside from the essayist Donoso Cortés, a layman who in 1851 published the strictly conservative monograph *Essai sur le catholicisme, le libéralisme et le socialisme*—was the Catalan priest Jaime Balmes (1810–48), a prolific author of philosophical, historical, and apologetic books. His work was seminal in several areas, but precisely for that reason he found only limited reception among the Spanish clergy.[36] His fame was based on a refutation of Guizot; his *El Protestantismo comparado con el catolicsismo en sus relaciones con la civilizacion europea* (1842) was immediately translated into French.

Italy enjoyed three advantages: the scholarly tradition of the eighteenth century was not totally disrupted by the revolutionary events; it had in Rosmini a Christian philosopher of great stature; and the Roman College was for some of its theologians the means by which they attained international acclaim. But other scholars were not able to work within the framework of famous universities and this could not but have an impact on the quality of their work, no matter how meritorious it was. A case in point was Cardinal Angelo Mai,[37] the tireless editor of classical and patristic texts.

---

[35] This judgment by Hocedez II, 185, is confirmed by the very small number of Spanish authors of the nineteenth century cited in the *DThC* (see *Tables générales,* 1226).

[36] Concerning the limited degree to which he became a precursor of Neo-Thomism, see Hocedez II, 195–97.

[37] On Angelo Mai (1782–1854), see *LThK* VI, 1289–90; *DACL* X, 1196–1202; G. Gervasoni, *Angelo Mai* (Bergamo 1954).

Rosmini was admired by the educated public as well as in the Lombard seminaries, where he contributed to freeing instruction from Febronian tendencies. But after 1840 he saw his doctrines passionately attacked.[38] In the area of philosophy he was accused by Gioberti[39] and his students and the adherents of the Scholastic tradition of ontological inclinations; theologically he was attacked by the Jesuits, who, reacting sharply to the criticism to which Rosmini had subjected probabilism in his *Trattato della coscienza morale* (1840), polemicized against what they regarded as his erroneous concept of original sin, in which they saw the basis of his moral doctrines.[40] Although Gregory XVI, asked by the Jesuits to intervene, in 1843 imposed silence on both parties, the spreading of Rosmini's thought in the Catholic circles under the influence of the Jesuits suffered in consequence of these polemics.

The Roman College, closed to innovation in methods and the perception of problems, offered a qualitatively disappointing education. The German professors complained about it and so did the general of the Jesuits.[41] In philosophy the authors of the preceding century were studied without any originality, and the pioneers of the Thomist renaissance were ignored, as for example Father Taparelli with his work on natural law.[42] In the field of theology, only two names stand out from the general mediocrity. They were F. X. Patrizi, professor of exegesis, a conscientious scholar whose *De interpretatione Scriptuarum sacrarum* (1844) was the first Catholic monograph on the typological interpretation of the Bible, and Giovanni Perrone,[43] from 1824 to 1848 professor of dogmatics, whose *Praelectiones theologicae* (9 vols. [1835–42]) saw thirty-four editions. He was a vulgarizer without much originality who much preferred the dispute with the Protestants and the rationalists to genuine theological reflection. But it was to his credit that the relatively new treatment of the relationship between reason and faith was introduced into classical theology. He also sensed the importance of positive theology, which during the pontificate of Pius IX came to full bloom in the Roman College under his students Carlo Passaglia and Johannes Franzelin.

---

[38] New documentation in G. Martina in *RRosm* 61 (1967), 130–70.

[39] Gioberti, whose influence was great among a portion of the Italian clergy, in 1841 published a bitter indictment, *Degli errori di Antonio Rosmini,* which started a long controversy.

[40] F. Ruffini, *La vita religiosa di Alessandro Manzoni* II (Bari 1931), 247ff., justifiably pointed out that the conflict between the Society of Jesus and Rosmini was based not only on the competition between two religious congregations, active in the same field, but also on profoundly differing doctrinal and spiritual concepts.

[41] See P. Pirri, *P. Giov. Roothaan* (Isola del Liri 1930), 306–7, citing a letter of 20 December 1842.

[42] On Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio (1793–1862), whose principal book *Saggio teoretico di Diritto naturale appoggiato sul fatto* dates from 1840, see R. Jacquin, *Taparelli d'Azeglio* (Paris 1943), B. Armando, *Il concetto di proprieta nel Padre Taparelli* (Pinerolo 1960), and Aubert-Martina, 299, n. 20.

[43] On Giovanni Perrone (1794–1876), see *DThC* XII, 1255–56, and Hocedez II, 353–55.

In France around 1830 there had been two hopes for renewal of Catholic thought: the School of La Chênaie and Malestroit under Lamennais and, on a much more modest level, the School of Molsheim near Strasbourg under Louis Bautain. Lamennais's condemnation was especially disastrous for his school because the Holy See had condemned both his church-political theories and his philosophical system, which constituted the basis for his program of renewal. In addition, of course, the vague and moderate condemnation[44] was exploited extensively by his enemies.[45] It did not immediately curtail the influence of philosophical traditionalism, especially not in Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Poland.[46] But after 1835 most of Lamennais's students preferred practical work to now suspect speculations. Thus the changing of the guard which the school of La Chênaie had promised ultimately did not take place and instruction was mediocre, not least because Bautain's work, undertaken completely independently from Lamennais, gradually atrophied.

In 1832 Bautain[47] published a pamphlet on *L'enseignement de la philosophie en France au XIX^e^ siècle* which became the manifesto of his school. He criticized in it both the eclecticism of Victor Cousin and the Cartesian Scholasticism reigning in the seminaries. Bautain's numerous opponents asked the bishop of Strasbourg, Monsignor Le Pappe de Trévern, to intercede. His opponents consisted of Sulpicians offended by his attacks against their methods of instruction, Jesuits, among them the influential Father Rozaven, followers of Lamennais who did not care for his criticism of the philosophy of common reason, a portion of the Strasbourg clergy, who regarded him as an interloper, and the seminary teachers of Besançon who were jealous of the competition by the Molsheim group. In the spring of 1834, Monsignor de Trévern, who for six years had had no complaints about Bautain, submitted to him six questions on the relationship between faith and reason. There is no doubt that Bautain, lacking adequate theological training, presented fairly correct views on religious knowledge in terms seemingly incompatible with traditional formulations, and that under the influence of Kantianism he was inclined to denigrate human reasoning. But the questions of the bishop were also unfortunately framed. The consequence was a dialogue among deaf people, carried on for years and worsened by personal dislikes. After the bishop had deemed Bautain's answers unsatisfactory, he published a notice on 15 September 1834 and sent it to the Holy See and to all bishops in France. He desired Roman intervention against the "new Lamennais." But the exploitation of the notice by the Hermesians in favor of their semirationalistic views caused Rome to react circumspectly.

---

[44] See L. Le Guillou, *L'évolution de la pensée de F. Lamennais* (Paris 1966), 197–98.

[45] Ibid., 213–22.

[46] See Hocedez II, 83–112. Concerning Germany, see Schrörs, *Braun,* 289–95, 426.

[47] Concerning the controversy of 1834 to 1840, see F. Ponteil in *RH* 164 (1930), 225–87 and especially P. Poupard, *L'abbé Louis Bautain* (Tournai-Paris 1961), 181–226; concerning his stay in Rome in 1838, see P. Poupard, *Journal romain de l'abbé Louis Bautain* (Rome 1964), also the letters from Rozaven (*Bulletin critique* 23 [1902], 194–98, 353–60) and from Roothaan (*CivCatt* [1929] III, 316–19).

Bautain was convinced that the bishop was exceeding his jurisdiction, as in his opinion it was not a problem of dogmatic but only of philosophical questions. In addition he failed to comprehend how a philosophical doctrine based on faith could be accused of "destroying religion." He published a comprehensive work, *La philosophie du christianisme,* in which he presented the essence of his thought in the form of letters to his students. Except for some small exceptions, it was accepted by Möhler at Tübingen, which awarded him the title of doctor of theology.[48] Toward the end of 1835 everything seemed to calm down when Bautain indicated his willingness to sign statements modified with the help of the suffragan bishop of Nancy, Monsignor Donnet. But the Strasbourg bishop insisted that the new sentences were not really any different from his earlier formulations and sent Bautain's writings to Rome so that with the help of his friend Rozaven they would be placed on the Index. Following Lacordaire's advice, Bautain traveled to Rome in order to defend himself personally.

He was received politely, as Rome did not wish to give the Hermesians new food for thought. He also made an excellent impression during his three months in Rome with his declared willingness to submit himself to Rome's decision, so different from the arrogance of the German professors. The authorities limited themselves to requesting him to correct a few passages of his book and of a new one which he carried with him in manuscript form. Bautain was more than willing to do so, as the discussions with Roman theologians had revealed to him where he was exaggerating and as he had also discovered that condemnation of rationalism was a far cry from condemnation of reason. He acknowledged that it was possible to regard reason as a first step toward faith without denying the necessity of grace for the awakening of the soul.

---

[48] See P. Poupard in *RSPhTh* 42 (1958), 455–82; also *ThQ* 17 (1835), 421–53.

From this perspective he published his *Psychologie expérimentale* (2 vols. [1839]), on which he had labored for longer than eighteen years and which he considered as the major achievement of his life. But the old bishop of Strasbourg refused to reinstate Bautain and his followers in their former positions in spite of a request from Rome. On 8 September 1840, Bautain signed a more refined version of his questionable propositions, drafted by Monsignor Räß, the new suffragan of Strasbourg,[49] and retired to Paris. There, for a quarter of a century, he was active as a respected lecturer and preacher. But the long debate over a single point of his system diverted attention from the importance of his attempt to rejuvenate apologetics. Additionally, he failed to raise the standards of priestly education with respect to the problems caused by modern currents of thought.

Most of the seminaries clearly ignored these problems. Especially at Saint Sulpice "the cult of modesty and caution prevented any attempt at a spiritual rejuvenation" (X. de Montclos). The only notable exception was Charles Baudry,[50] a great patristic scholar who liked to be innovative. In the episcopate as well there was only one man with any sensitivity for these questions: Monsignor Affre, who in 1840 became archbishop of Paris. Results, unfortunately, corresponded little to his intentions.[51] He succeeded as little as his predecessor in breathing new life into the department of theology at the Sorbonne,[52] and he was able only to plan a graduate school of ecclesiastical studies, subordinated to the archbishop. Newman detected in this plan the seed for a future Catholic university, but actually the plan found little echo in France.

Yet the overall balance of the July Monarchy was not only negative. Some—in view of the contemporary circumstances even much—of the vitality and originality of Lamennais's movement survived. It had the goal of reaching the intellectual standards of the Protestants and the faithless and to establish a new humanism in which Catholic dogma was to be the guide for all manifestations of intellectual life without putting the mind in a straitjacket. Even if the plan to send a number of young Catholic intellectuals to Munich (1833–34) was dropped again within a few months, it at least led to important translations. They enabled the French public to become acquainted with some characteristic writings from beyond the Rhine, among them Möhler's *Symbolik* (1836) and Döllinger's *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (1841). The good reputation which Lamennais's followers gained for German Catholic scholarship survived among French Catholics for a long time. It encouraged a few clerics—unfortunately much too few—to study at German universities. One who did so was Henri Maret, one of the few great French theologians of the next generation.

---

[49] The text of the various proposition lists is in P. Poupard, *L'abbé Louis Bautain,* 393–96. In 1844, on the occasion of a canonical approbation by the *Congregatio Episcoporum et Regularium* of a congregation founded by him, Bautain was requested to sign a number of new statements revised by P. Perrone. They were even more refined than the statements worked out in 1840 in Strasbourg.

[50] On Charles Baudry (1817–63), see de Montclos, 64–75, 605–6.

[51] See R. Limouzin-Lamothe, J. Leflon, *Monseigneur D.-A. Affre* (Paris 1971), 179–87.

[52] On this question which repeatedly surfaced during the second third of the nineteenth century, but was never resolved owing to the mistrust of the Holy See, see R. Limouzin-Lamothe, *Monseigneur de Quélen* (Paris 1955–57) I, 263–66, II, 247–52; R. Limouzin-Lamothe, "Monseigneur d'Astros et la réorganisation des facultés de théologie en 1838–39," *BLE* 52 (1951), 178–86; de Montclos, 108–10; J. Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du Second Empire* (Paris 1930), 104–10, 688–92; G. Bazin, *Vie de Monseigneur Maret* (Paris 1891) I, 397–419, II, 9–21, III, passim; *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* 26 (1843), 72–80.

The attempt by Gerbet to reconstitute in the college of Juilly a part of the group from Malestroit failed to have a lasting effect. But with the help of some of them he founded in 1836 the periodical *L'Université Catholique,*[53] with the intent of interesting a wide readership. It had a circulation of 1,600, a considerable figure for that period, among them Germans and Englishmen. Because a university independent from the state analogous to the Catholic University of Louvain could not be established in France, the founders of the journal wanted to offer the educated public the equivalent of lectures and presentations in the spirit of Lamennais: research capable of enriching the interpretation of dogma, and critical studies with the aim of refuting rationalistic propositions through extensive reliance on German research, especially that of the Munich School. One of the chief contributors of the new journal was Augustin Bonnetty, who also continued to publish his *Annales de philosophie chrétienne.*[54] With prodigious amounts of labor he collected gigantic numbers of historical documents for the defense of Christianity. He became a precursor of comparative religious studies and his findings and documents were used by other authors for their successful books. Chief among them were the *Histoire du monde depuis sa création* by Henri de Riancé (4 vols. [1838–44]) and the *Études philosophiques sur le christianisme* by Auguste Nicolas (4 vols. [1843–45]; twenty-six editions in forty years). Enthusiasm in the service of truth and the acknowledgement of the central importance of history in intellectual studies unfortunately did not provide for these self-taught writers the critical spirit and methodical discipline, the lack of which was one of the chief deficiencies of French Catholicism until the end of the century. Such deficiencies were quite evident in the voluminous *Histoire universelle de l'Église catholique* by René-François Rohrbacher (29 vols. [1842–

---

[53] See C. de Ladoue, *Monseignieur Gerbet* II (Paris 1872), 118–46.

[54] On Augustin Bonnetty (1798–1879), see *DHGE* IX, 1058–60, and N. Hötzel, op. cit., XVI–XVIII and 140–369 passim.

49]). A great number of the French clergy regarded this work as a monument to scholarship, but compared to Döllinger's writings it was a sad enterprise. Similar deficiences explain the naivety of the short-lived *Société hagiographique,* founded in 1836 with the aim of completing within a span of ten years, with three volumes per year, the *Acta sanctorum* of the Bollandists.

In the absence of genuinely scholarly works, it was nevertheless to the credit of French Catholics under the July Monarchy that they reissued the classical writers of ecclesiastical scholarship. Advised by clerics, a number of Catholic publishers issued collections of old texts, added fresh commentaries, and hoped to adapt traditional instruction to the progress of modern society. Among them were Antoine de Genoud,[55] also a former follower of Lamennais, who published twelve volumes with excerpts from 196 writers of the preceding four centuries with the aim of providing an apologetics (*La Raison du christianisme* [1834–35]) and seven volumes of translations of the Church Fathers (1835–49). Another one was Jacques-Paul Migne.[56] With the help of a number of excellent scholars and thanks to his own business acumen, Migne published three parallel series as tools for the clergy. These were: the most important Bible commentaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (25 vols. [1834–40]); a number of theological tracts of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries (28 vols. [1839–45]); and the most important apologists from Tertullian to Wiseman (16 vols. [1842–43]). He also published a *Collection universelle et complète des orateurs sacrés* (99 vols. [1844–66]), an *Encyclopédie théologique* (52 vols. [1844–52], supplemented from 1851 to 1866 by another 119 volumes) which combined updated excerpts from old encyclopedias (like that by Bergier) with articles by contemporary authors, and finally the two famous Patrologia series (the *Series Latina,* 217 vols. [1844–55], and the *Series Graeca,* 161 vols. [1857–66]). The last was the more meritorious, as a similar project in Italy a few years earlier with the financial support of Gregory XVI had foundered.

To a large degree Migne was able to publish the two Patrologia series owing to the assistance of a monk from Solesmes, Dom Jean-Baptiste Pitra,[57] a scholar of high caliber. Unfortunately, Pitra remained an exception among the French Benedictines. Dom Guéranger, in his youth an adherent of Lamennais's ideal of a rejuvenation of ecclesiastical scholarship in France, intended to fashion his abbey into a workshop in which the tradition of the Maurists, albeit with an anti-Gallican orientation, could again blossom. Unfortunately, he was not able to gather the necessary qualified people, and even Dom Pitra's work was handicapped by the financial difficulties of the monastery. Guéranger's own works, his *Institutions liturgiques,* of which the first two volumes appeared in 1840 and 1841,[58] and even more his *Histoire de Sainte Cécile* (1849) suffered, like all writings of French theologians at that time, from a fundamental lack of sound scholarship. On the other hand, he started an original and remarkable undertaking in 1841 when he published the first volume of his *Annéе liturgique,*[59] at first not very successful, but later regarded as a true monument of Christian culture through the ages. Eventually it contributed more than any other work to the rejuvenation of Catholic piety.

---

[55] Concerning the journalist Antoine de Genoude (1792–1849), who in 1835 after the death of his wife became a priest, see *CThC* VI, 1225f.

[56] On Jacques-Paul Migne (1800–75), see F. de Mely in *Revue apologétique,* 5th ser. 2 (1915), 203–58; *DThC* X, 1722–40; *DACL* XI, 948–57.

[57] Concerning Jean-Baptiste Pitra (1812–89), see the two complementing biographies by F. Cabrol (Paris 1891) and A. Battandier (Paris 1896).

On this level of Catholic culture, the French could be proud of a number of other original and contemporary achievements. Lamennais's former student Alexis-François Rio[60] was concerned with the essence of Christian culture, for which he became what Winckelmann had been for the art of classical antiquity. His book *De la poésie chretiénne* (1836), in reality an introduction to early Italian art in which Schelling's aesthetics can be seen, had only limited success in France, but found great acclaim in Italy and Germany. With all of its preconceived apologetic opinions and methodological weaknesses, his book tried to demonstrate that the paintings of the Middle Ages were inseparably connected with a definite Christian view of man and life. Surpassing the *Génie du christianisme,* it wished "to cause a revolution in aesthetics equal to that which metaphysics based on original revelation had tried to cause in the area of philosophy" (Derre). Montalembert started a similar work in the field of Gothic architecture. He fought the demolition of monasteries and in his *Histoire de Sainte Élisabeth de Hongrie* (1836) he wrote a poetic hagiography in honor of the Christian Middle Ages. He intended to demonstrate the atmosphere of medieval piety through a representative which German romanticism had made accessible to him. At the same time he devoted pages of panegyrics to the Marburg Elizabeth Church, connecting the achievement of Gothic art with the religious sentiments of the contemporaries of Saint Francis of Assisi and Saint Louis. His book was similar to that which Ozanam, with greater scholarship, wrote on the literature of the Middle Ages. In his lectures at the Sorbonne on Saint Francis of Assisi, in his two books on Dante (1838 and 1839), and in his *Études germaniques* (1847–49) Ozanam, within the framework of comparative literature, always also taught religion and made "the long and arduous education which the Church imparted to modern peoples" the central topic.

---

[58] Volume I was translated into German in 1854.

[59] Nine volumes appeared between 1841 and 1866; they were later completed by the students of Guéranger. See O. Rousseau, *Histoire du mouvement liturgique* (Paris 1945), 45–53.

[60] On Alexis-François Rio (1797–1874), see M. C. Bowe, *F. Rio, sa place dans le renouveau catholique en Europe* (Paris, n.d.), and J. R. Derré, op. cit., 615–69.

It was another accomplishment of Ozanam that at the age of twenty he persuaded the archbishop of Paris to introduce at Notre-Dame on the occasion of Lent a style of preaching designed for the young intellectuals and radically different from usual sermons; additionally he convinced the archbishop to assign these Lent sermons to Abbé Henri Lacordaire,[61] in spite of the prevailing preconceptions about this former follower of Lamennais. As a romanticist who completely grasped the attitude of the new generation, Lacordaire introduced a new style of preaching in 1835 and followed new avenues in apologetics. To a generation captured by the picturesque and by emotions, he offered the eloquence of paintings, colors, enthusiasm, and indignation. He knew how to speak of eternity in everyday language without fruitless bemoaning of the lost past and without condemning the values held by his audiences. Instead of offering methodically a philosophy of spiritualism in the fashion of Frayssinous, proceeding from there to a presentation of the facts of revelation, he allowed himself to be guided by the experience of his own conversion. He accepted Christianity and the Church as givens by attempting to show how much they corresponded to the needs of the present as well as to the essential needs of human nature. His success[62] indicated that he had found the right approach.[63]

The Growth of the Catholic Press

The picture of Catholic achievements in the intellectual sphere is not complete without reference to newspapers and periodicals. Many of them have been mentioned earlier. But it is useful to summarize the essence of these publications in order to show the universality of this phenomenon which started during the first quarter of the century and increasingly grew after 1830. In 1844, the *Revue des deux mondes* noted: "In order to preach more freely on topics other than morality and charity, the press was employed. Priests in large numbers entered the new arena; laymen became theologians and theologians turned into journalists. Today, journalism has become for some members of the clergy a branch of the pulpit in the recognition that the power of the press is mightier than sermons." This observation was true not only for France, but for all of western Europe.

---

[61] Lacordaire preached the Lent sermons in Notre-Dame de Paris in 1835 and 1836, and after his return from Rome, having become a Dominican, he preached the Advent sermons from 1843 to 1846 and the Lent sermons from 1848 to 1851. From 1837 to 1846 his place was taken by the Jesuit de Ravignan, an excellent but more classical orator.

[62] He did not find approval everywhere. By the old clergy as well as by the rationalists, this "Savonarola of the modern pulpit" was accused of acting more like a religious tribune than like a theologian.

[63] At the same period there were in Italy some similar but less famous attempts to adapt sermons to modern concerns. This was the case, for example, with the young Franciscan Arrigoni (see M. Maccarrone, *Il concilio Vaticano e il "Giornale" di Monsignor Arrigoni* I [Padua 1966], 15–17).

In Germany some astute leaders of the Catholic movement like Lennig and Döllinger quickly grasped the importance of the press. Yet at first great obstacles had to be overcome, not only because there was a dearth of qualified people and of money, but also because of administrative red tape and the hostility of a part of the clergy which was apprehensive about the interference of journalists in internal Church matters. Quickly there appeared a number of journals which addressed themselves to clerics and educated laymen.[64] Among them were *Der Katholik,*[65] founded in Mainz in 1821 "for instruction, warning, and defense against attacks on the Church"; because of state censorship (Görres as editor strove for greater discipline, more careful selection, and reliable expertise), the journal moved to Strasbourg in 1823, where it remained until 1827, then moving to Speyer and publishing there until 1844 under the editorship of Dieringer, finally returning to Mainz in 1844, when it became a weekly; the journal *Eos,* edited by Görres in Munich and transformed by him into the organ of conservative Catholicism in southern Germany, treating both literary questions and church-political problems, although it was published only from 1828 to 1832; the *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und katholische Theologie,*[66] founded in 1832 in Bonn by Braun, a few other Hermesians, and a few bishops in order to provide Catholicism in Prussia with a respectable publication in place of the banned *Katholik,* even though after a few years it adopted an increasingly hostile stance toward the hierarchy; the *Historisch-Politische Blätter* of Jarcke and Phillips in Munich, more accessible to the broad public but, in the view of Prussian Catholics, edited from a too strongly southern German perspective; and the *Rheinisches Kirchenblatt,*[67] founded in 1844 in Düsseldorf as a monthly and converted into a weekly in 1848 in order better to spread Archbishop Geissel's views. The daily press, on the other hand, especially in the Rhineland, had a difficult beginning and for a long time was limited to papers with purely local circulation, edited in pronounced anti-Protestant, apologetic fashion.[68] They only came into their own during the second half of the century.

---

[64] Not mentioned there were scholarly theological journals like the *Theologische Quartalschrift* in Tübingen. Its index is listed in *CathEnc* XI, 678.

[65] See H. Schwalbach, *Der Mainzer "Katholik" 1821–50* (diss., Mainz 1966).

[66] See Schrörs, *Braun,* 153–87.

[67] See R. Pesch, *Die kirchlich-politische Presse der Katholiken in der Rheinprovinz vor 1848* (Mainz 1966), 25–82.

In France there also appeared a few notable periodicals: the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* (since 1830) and the *Université Catholique* (since 1836); also the *Revue européenne,*[69] which between 1831 and 1834 took the place of the *Correspondant* and after the demise of *L'Avenir*—with the exception of political aims—served as forum for the followers of Lamennais; and *Le Correspondant* itself, reappearing in 1843 in order to support Montalembert in his struggle for freedom of education. There were also journals of more popular bent, such as the *Journal des personnes pieuses,* founded by P. d'Exauvillez and Abbé Glaire. With the exception of *Le Correspondant,* the French periodicals were more concerned with the problems of ideas than with church-political questions. Such questions were treated in the daily press and especially in *L'Univers,* founded in 1833 by Abbé Migne. In 1843, Louis Veuillot became its dynamic and pugnacious chief editor.[70] The fact that France in the 1830s could boast of several Catholic dailies with a national circulation must not be misread, however. It was at best a modest beginning, for their combined circulation was less than that of a single large liberal paper. Besides, they were scarcely read in Paris, the center of intellectual and political movements and controversies.[71]

In Belgium also there were a number of Catholic newspapers in the provinces, but hardly in the capital. But in 1834 the layman Pierre Kersten founded in Liège a journal of general interest, the *Journal historique et littéraire.*[72] This excellently edited monthly found readers even beyond the borders of the country. Shortly afterwards there appeared in the Netherlands the monthly *De Katholiek* (1842) and the daily *De Tijd* (1845), both of which were to have a long and productive life.[73]

---

[68] Ibid., 197–226, with a chronological listing of the Catholic newspapers of Germany.

[69] See J. R. Derré, op. cit., 500–528 and passim.

[70] Concerning the beginning period, see C. de Ladoue, *Monseigneur Gerbet* II (Paris 1872), 91–118, and A. Trannoy, *Le romantisme politique de Montalembert* (Paris 1942), 437–56; on the role of Veuillot, see E. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot* (Paris 1899seqq.) I, 282–90, 313–25, II, passim.

[71] A few figures are given in the *Revue des deux mondes* 25 (1844), 355–56.

[72] See A. Vermeersch, *Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis van de Belgische Pers 1830–48* (Louvain 1958), 36–44.

[73] Concerning the beginnings of *De Tijd,* see Rogier, *KathHerleving,* 257–61.

In Great Britain, the first Catholic monthly appeared in 1831; but the regular Catholic press really began to appear only between 1835 and 1840. At first there was the *Dublin Review,* founded in 1836 by Wiseman with the support of two Irish laymen, Daniel O'Connell and M. Quin, as a counterweight to the strongly anti-Catholic *Edinburgh Review.* It was followed by the monthly *The Tablet,* founded in 1840 by the convert F. Lucas.[74] These were joined by a few less important publications.[75] In 1846 *The Lamp* was founded as an inexpensive paper for the workers.

Religious periodicals also appeared in the Mediterranean countries. In Italy this was due chiefly to the labors of the *Amicizia cattolica.* In Spain, thanks chiefly to Balmes, there appeared in 1830 in quick succession *La Civilizacion, La Sociedad,* and *El Pensamiento de la Nacion.*[76]

Even if the history of the Church in the nineteenth century in many areas was a series of missed opportunities, it must be noted that the Catholics in most countries quickly recognized that the press was destined to play a large role in modern society. But it must also be mentioned that owing to a lack of material and intellectual means, the journalistic achievements, especially with respect to the daily press, were only second-best compared to the freethinking press.

---

[74] See J. J. Dwyer, *English Catholics,* ed. by G. A. Beck (London 1950), 475–76, 482–84. The participation of the converts of the Oxford movement in the Catholic press was weak before the turn of the century (see J. Altholz, *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England* [London 1962], 7).

[75] See T. Wall, "Catholic Periodicals of the Past," *IER* 101 (1964), 206–23, 234–44, 289–303, 375–88, 102 (1964), 17–27, 86–100.

[76] See *CathEnc* XI, 690.

SECTION TWO

The Ascension of Pius IX and the Crisis of 1848

CHAPTER 4

The First Years of the Pontificate of Pius IX: From the Neoguelf Mythos to the Roman Revolution

When Gregory XVI died on 1 June 1846, the religious situation of the Church posed no problems, but the political condition of the Papal State was tense. In view of the administrative and constitutional attempts at reform and the desire of patriots to free Italy from the tutelage of Austria, the regime represented by the late Pope and Secretary of State Lambruschini was at the nadir of its prestige. For this reason internal political considerations were of primary concern in the conclave, the more so as it was decided in view of the serious political situation to open the conclave immediately, without waiting for the arrival of the foreign cardinals. The intransigents favored the election of Lambruschini, as it would guarantee the continued support of Austria in the suppression of revolutionary elements. Others, led by Cardinal Bernetti, considered a few concessions to public opinion necessary and were in favor of a Pope from the Papal State in order to manifest their independence from foreign influences. The preferred candidate of this second group was Cardinal Mastai. Gizzi was regarded by many as too progressive.[1] On the first ballot, Mastai received fifteen votes, Lambruschini seventeen. Those who feared a victory of Lambruschini then rallied behind Mastai, who received a two-thirds majority on 16 June, the second day of the conclave.

Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti was relatively young; in memory of his benefactor Pius VII he chose the name Pius IX. He was born on 13 May 1792 in Senigallia in the Marches, and from the beginning of his clerical career demonstrated piety, pastoral concern, and administrative ability. A journey to South America (1823–25), undertaken as auditor of the apostolic delegate to Chile, provided him with insight into the new dimensions of missionary problems and into the difficulties which liberal, regalistically oriented governments could cause for the Church. But as archbishop of Spoleto (1827–32), and as bishop of Imola he succeeded in gaining the respect of the area's very active liberals. He was full of charity toward the members of his diocese, regardless of their views, he was open-minded, and he seriously tried to improve the antiquated nature and the police-state aspects of the government of the Papal State.[2] Yet these administrative reforms were not designed to allow the public actively to participate in affairs of state, as this seemed to him incompatible with the religious character of the papal government. On the other hand, there is no doubt that he was open to the stirring of Italian patriotism. Contrary to the widely accepted view, he thought it impossible to implement the neoguelf program and thought that the Pope as the spiritual head of all Christians should not play the role of the president of an Italian federation. But he intensely felt the national enthusiasm which was being fed by the romantic movement, and the brutalities of which the Austrian troops were accused deeply hurt his generous soul. They brought him into agreement with the forces which desired Italy's liberation from the foreign yoke.

---

[1] It should be noted that the Austrian veto was not directed against him but against Bernetti. It allows the conclusion that Metternich was less concerned with the Italian problem than with the fear of French influence on Rome. (Engel-Janosi I, 15–16).

The first decision of the new Pope seemed to confirm the "liberal" attitude of which Rome's reactionaries accused this enlightened conservative: On 17 July he decreed a generous amnesty; he appointed Cardinal Gizzi, wrongly suspected of being a representative of Massimo d'Azeglio's ideas, as secretary of state;[3] he selected Monsignor Corboli-Bussi, a young prelate with an open mind for new ideas, as his confidential adviser; he was generous to Father Ventura, the eloquent follower of Lamennais; he kindly received a number of persons known for their connection with the moderate liberals; and he fully agreed to some long-desired reforms, even though they were not part of a comprehensive concept.

In this heated atmosphere and at a time, just before 1848, when the romantic concepts of Catholicism joined with the goals of democracy, even these very limited gestures of the Pope received the acclaim of the masses. Ignoring the encyclical *Qui pluribus* of 8 November 1846, which again condemned the basic principles of liberalism,[4] people preferred to see in Pius IX "a messenger of God sent to complete the great work of the nineteenth century, the alliance between religion and liberty" (Ozanam). Metternich, on the other hand, whose initial response to the attitude of the Pope had been favorable, was beginning to worry that the Church was headed by a man "with the fire of the heart, but weak in planning and without any real ability to lead." All of liberal Europe responded positively, even such countries as England,[5] which could not be said to be harboring any papist sympathies.

---

[2] In 1845 he had even drafted a characteristic reform program (see G. Soranzo in *Aevum* 27 [1953], 22–46). It was more a reform of abuses than a change of structures, either administratively or politically.

[3] On the true personality of Gizzi (1787–1849), who basically was conservative and antiliberal, see the revealing remarks by A. Simon, *Documents relatifs à la nonciature de Bruxelles 1834–38* (Brussels 1958), 51–91.

[4] Text in *Acta Pii IX* I, 4–24. See A. Latreille, *L'explication des textes historiques* (Paris 1944), 228–230.

For several months the authority of the papacy was at a peak, the more so as at the same time a reconciliation between Rome and the Ottoman Empire seemed possible and the negotiations with Russia, begun in 1845 after a visit of Tsar Nicholas I to Gregory XVI, led to the signing of a relatively favorable treaty.

In Italy, where all demonstrations against the rule of the Austrians or against reactionary governments were accompanied by shouts of "Long live Pius IX," enthusiasm reached a high point. The myth of the "liberal Pope" acted like a catalyst for the disparate elements which before 1848 held progressive opinions; former opponents of the Church, Catholics won over to modern ideas, and the patriotic clergy,[6] all were temporarily united in a common hope. Their disappointment was so much greater when facts began to speak and the actions of the Pope failed to fulfill the hopes which had been placed in him.

The disenchantment began in the area of internal reforms. Pius IX had to take account of the growing opposition on the part of most of the Curia prelates; although he was seriously concerned with an improvement of the situation of his subjects, he himself was not prepared to go beyond the limits of what can be called ecclesiastical paternalism. He was afraid that by relinquishing a part of his priestly kingdom to laymen he would limit the independence which the Holy See required for the fulfillment of its spiritual tasks. Quazza in his book *Pio IX e Massimo d'Azeglio nelle vicende romane del 1847* shows in great detail that Pius IX, even during the period of the most trusting cooperation with Massimo d'Azeglio, when he appeared to approve of the daring opinions of Father Ventura, never went beyond a limited benevolent despotism. He remained far from a liberal attitude toward people and society and by no means wished to change the Papal State into a constitutional and modern state based on the precepts of 1789. A few activists, playing with great skill on his desire to be popular, succeeded in pushing him in this direction, without, however, changing his basic convictions. The results were freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, formation of a council of twenty-four notables in October 1847, and introduction of a lay element into the government in January 1848. Gradually he agreed to several concessions and also immediately attempted to circumscribe them as much as possible. But after the fall of Louis-Philippe in France he was forced to a hasty approval of the constitution which had been demanded for months.[7] Even this decision appeared only as a half-measure and agitated more than it satisfied the increasingly impatient public opinion.

---

[5] In the United States as well the reaction to the election was enthusiastic. See H. R. Marraro: *CH* 25 (1956), 42–44.

[6] See, for example, B. De Giorgio, *Aspetti dei moti del 1847 e del 1848 in Calabria* (Reggio 1955).

Such hesitation on the part of the Pope, who constantly wavered between advice from the right and the left and thought that he could avoid offending anyone with his decisions, was displayed also and with grave consequences in his attitude toward the Italian movement. On the one hand it is impossible to agree with many historians of the *Risorgimento* that Pius IX initially supported the liberal program of Italian unification, only to abandon it later; it would be equally incorrect to assert, as has been done by many Catholic historians, that the Pope never had a clear Italian policy and only made a few meaningless gestures to which more significance was attached than they warranted. The truth lies between the two extremes. Pius IX evidently could not accept Mazzini's idea of a unified Italian republic, as it would mean the suppression of papal sovereignty; equally unacceptable was the neoguelf program.

Still, after a period of tentative moves he agreed with some moderates who wanted to reduce Austrian influence in Italy and who wanted to establish the prerequisites for such a development through strengthening the bonds among the various Italian states. Therefore the Pope tried to give a political direction to the negotiations which began in August 1847 with the objective of establishing a customs union with Tuscany and Piedmont. The idea of a union of the Italian sovereigns in a defensive league, sponsored by Florence and supported by the Pope's chief adviser, Monsignor Corboli-Bussi, was also very agreeable to him. This solution automatically would have associated the Papal State with a national resistance in case of military intervention by Austria for the suppression of revolts which were threatening everywhere, without directly forcing the Pope into a declaration of war. But the ambitions of Piedmont, desirous of claiming for itself all of the advantages accruing from a war of liberation, prevented the formation of the league. Thereafter, events quickly overtook Pius IX.

---

[7] Text of the "Statuto" of 14 March 1848 in *Atti del S. Pontefice Pio IX* V/1 (Rome 1857), 222–38. See L. Wollenberg in *RStRis* 22 (1935), 527–94, and A. Ara, *Lo statuto fondamentale dello Stato della Chiesa* (Milan 1966; also G. Martina in *RSTI* 21 [1967], 131–46). The latter clearly demonstrates the vain attempt to change the Papal States into a constitutional state.

What has been called the "miracle of 1848" rested in part on a misunderstanding; but for a few months it actually existed. A few remarks by Pius IX, contradicting the negative attitude of Gregory XVI, sufficed to awaken in many Italians the conviction that the new Pope was willing to implement the entire national program and was prepared, according to a promise by Gioberti, to place himself at the head of a crusade in order to drive the Austrians from the peninsula and to effect national unification. Such illusions were also nourished by the evident reserve which Pius IX since the beginning of his pontificate had exercised toward the Austrian ambassador; this reserve, however, stemmed not only from his sympathy for the Italian cause, but also from his dissatisfaction with the Josephinist religious policy of the Empire, especially in Lombardy. When on 10 November 1848 Pius IX in a public address attempted to lessen belligerency but at the same time implored God's blessing for Italy, public enthusiam reached its zenith. Convinced that the Pope was on their side, the clergy as well as the faithful in all of Italy during the subsequent weeks of national agitation lent a large degree of support to the national uprisings.[8] When the Piedmontese government went to war against Austria in support of the nationalists, it was expected that the papal troops would follow suit. A number of papal advisers in Rome encouraged such a step in order to avoid the displeasure of the people. But the majority of the Curia theologians and cardinals spoke out for neutrality, which seemed more fitting for the head of the Church. Pius IX himself, overcome by the events, was in conflict between his genuine Italian patriotism and the awareness of his religious responsibility, which went beyond national concerns. In order to clear the air, the Pope made his famous speech of 29 April, whose recently discovered draft allows us a direct glimpse at his contradictory feelings.[9] In the first version of the speech the Pope said that while he could not intervene against Austria militarily because its subjects like his own were his spiritual sons, he had full sympathy for the Italian demands. The published text, however, probably corrected by Cardinal

---

[8] The clergy, including the upper clergy, in the north provided strong and in the central part (except for Rome proper) considerable help. In the Kingdom of Naples the bishops on the whole continued to support the Bourbons, but although the lower secular and regular clergy were divided, the majority favored the national cause. A good number of bibliographical references can be found in *Rassegna storica toscana* 4 (1948), 277, n. 28. Not even the Jesuits everywhere assumed the reactionary position generally ascribed to them. See G. De Rosa, *I Gesuiti in Sicilia e la rivoluzione del '48* (Rome 1963).

[9] Text in *Acta Pii IX* I, 92–98. See J. Muller, *Die Allokution Pius' IX. vom 29. April 1848* (Basel 1928); M. Monaco in *Studi Romani* 3 (1955), 175–94; especially G. Martina in *RStRis* 53 (1966), 527–82, 54 (1967), 40–47.

Antonelli, placed the chief emphasis on the first point and left the second one obscure. In his simplicity, Pius IX was unaware of the consequences of these changes, and when a few days later in response to the angry reaction of the Italian opposition he explained that his words had been designed to clarify the special position of the Pope and were in no way to be a disapproval of the national struggle, it was too late.[10] The equivocal epithet of "liberal pope" was replaced by the equally erroneous designation of "antinational pope."

The progressives in Rome immediately tried to benefit from the deep disappointment, caused by what many considered to be traitorous conduct, at the expense of the moderate liberals, who were discredited by the trust which they had placed in the Pope.

The situation was aggravated by the discontent caused by the economic crisis affecting the Papal State and all of Europe. It made the people an easy prey of agitators. Anarchy continued to spread. At the end of March, public demonstrations forced the Pope to ask the Jesuits to leave the Papal State. They were generally thought to be reactionary and pro-Austrian. In May he had to accept a lay ministry exposed to the continuous pressure of radical elements. Political assassinations increased. To establish mastery over such a volatile situation would have required the abilities of an extraordinary statesman. Pius IX, however, very receptive to superficial suggestions, wavered between the reformatory advice tendered him by the likes of Rosmini[11] and the fear of losing his religious independence. It was a fear fed by the reactionary party at the papal court and the result was a growing lack of morale. He finally consented to entrust the administration to the energetic Count Pellegrino Rossi,[12] who wanted to form a constitutional government after the model of France. But he was unpopular with both the parties of the right and the left and was assassinated shortly after his appointment.

Now things happened quickly: The revolutionaries besieged the Pope in the Quirinal Palace and demanded the convocation of a constituent assembly and a declaration of war on Austria. In the city, cardinals and prelates were exposed to all kinds of threats. Under these circumstances the Pope decided on 24 November, primarily advised by Cardinal Antonelli, who feared that the Pope could be pressured into making ill-considered concessions, to leave Rome Disguised, he went to the Neapolitan port of Gaeta[13] in order to board ship for France. He was dissuaded, however, by those who feared that he would fall under the influence of a republican country, and instead accepted the invitation of the king of Naples to seek refuge in his kingdom, where he stayed for seventeen months. Two days after his flight Pius IX dissolved the government which he had left behind and placed Cardinal Antonelli at the helm of the papal administration with the title of prosecretary of state. For the next twenty-five years, Antonelli was in charge of the fate of the Holy See.

---

[10] On 3 May he sent a letter to the Austrian chancellor (see F. Gentili in *Nuova Antologia* 256 [1914], 458–59), in which he advised him to forgo imposing Austrian domination on the Italian provinces by force and thus implicitly to acknowledge the superiority of the right of nationality over the divine right of kings or the unassailable character of treaties. Concerning the imperial reply, see F. Engel-Janosi in *RömHM* 10 (1967), 244–48.

[11] Consult F. Traniello, *Societa religiosa e societa civile in Rosmini* (Bologna 1966), 283–335.

[12] See M. Ruini, *La vita di Pellegrino Rossi* (Milan 1962).

Antonelli[14] was an easy-going prelate, ambitious and avaricious, and in spite of his genuine faith more a man of the world than a man of the cloth. He was industrious and energetic and possessed a limited intelligence, but without any perspicacity. He had those abilities peculiar to excellent civil servants, and in fact he had risen quickly in the papal administration, successful on each rung of the ladder. Sensitive and observant, cunning and winning in his ways, a diligent pupil of Bernetti, but without any convictions of his own, he now showed himself as a nimble diplomat. But his ability consisted primarily in finding excuses, in adjusting to the conditions of the moment, and in avoiding difficulties, rather than in attacking a problem at its roots and finding new solutions. He was by no means a reactionary and initially supported the reform movement introduced by Pius IX. But events convinced him that a partial laicization and liberalization of the government of the Papal State would not produce results and that the independence of the Pope as head of the Church could be guaranteed only by the return to a theocratic form of government. He thus decided to pursue a hard-line policy toward the politically active in Rome, and placed all of his hopes in a foreign intervention which would return the Pope to his throne. While Rosmini advised the Pope not to burn his bridges to the Roman parliament, Antonelli emphatically refused to receive a Roman delegation which wanted to ask the Pope to return to the capital. On 4 December he urged the European powers to use force in order to return the Pope to his temporal position. He then advised the Pope against a proclamation in the conciliatory form drafted by Rosmini and encouraged him to disavow the provisional government officially. Rosmini, who clearly recognized the disadvantages of a connection of the papal cause with Austria and the conservative powers, in vain advised the Pope to seek a solution with Piedmont as intermediary rather than through the aid of foreign troops. Antonelli, determined to achieve a solution through force, easily succeeded in exploiting the prejudices of Pius IX against the government of Turin and after a few weeks the rivalry between Rosmini and Antonelli ended with a complete victory of the latter. The Pope valued the devotion and skill which he displayed during the critical November days.

---

[13] About the flight to Gaeta see, complementary to the article by G. Mollat in *RHE* 35 (1939), 266–82, the treatments by P. Pirri: *Miscellanea P. Paschini* II (Rome 1949), 421–51 and F. L. Berro in *Studi romani* 5 (1957), 672–82. See also *Positio super introductione causae* I, 59–60, 69, 117–26, 336, 878–80.

[14] On Giacomo Antonelli (1806–76), see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* III, 484–93. A definitive study has not yet been written.

In Rome, where the flight of Pius IX made a very bad impression, Antonelli's inflexibility completely discredited the moderates and allowed the radicals to gain the upper hand. The constituent assembly, elected on 21 January 1849 with 134 against 123 votes, declared the Pope devoid of all claims to political power over the Roman state and proclaimed a republic. The government was entrusted to a triumvirate under the leadership of Guiseppe Mazzini. Ghisalberti accurately described the peculiarly Roman character of the republic; it was much more the work of the Roman people than of agitators from other Italian states. Moreover, the people had been won over less because of the republican ideology than because of extreme irritation with the "government of priests" and the abuses associated with it. Of the three phases of this six-month republic, only the second one can be regarded as influenced by Mazzini. But Mazzini's role had great significance, for it was he who, like a prophet, made Rome the focal point in the struggle for Italian rejuvenation, a role which it had not played during the time of Gregory XVI. It was now the ideological capital of the Risorgimento.

Joint military action by Austria, Spain, Naples, and France within a few months put an end to the republican government. The Catholics in France, encouraged by the events in Austria, were able to persuade Louis Napoleon to undertake the Roman campaign despite the opposition of the democratic elements.[15] The conference of Gaeta (30 March to 22 September 1849) established the foundation for the restoration of papal power. The French government desired the restoration to take place in a liberal atmosphere. But while Antonelli considered a return to the form of government of 1848 impossible, he untiringly worked to prevent the implementation of the statute of March 1848 which the Pope had conceded. He was supported by the diplomats of the conservative powers; contrary to expectations, Austria's representative was not the most obstinate; in fact, he was very much aware of the dangers of an excessive reaction. The end result was the motu proprio[16] of 12 September 1849, which promised great freedom on the communal level and reforms of the judiciary and the administration, but which brought no political freedom. The regulation, which in effect merely implemented the recommendations of the memorandum of 1831, was "about eighteen years behind the requirements of the present" (Ghisalberti). Even so, there was a large number of cardinals who considered even this regime as too progressive. They were supported by the Neapolitan court in their delay of the implementation of the recommendations of the motu proprio. They undertook repressive measures in an atmosphere of passionate prejudices, totally justifying Monsignor Corboli-Bussi's description of the papal restoration as reactionary and inept.

---

[15] After an initial failure in April, the occupation of Rome finally took place on 3 July 1849 under the leadership of General Oudinot.

Even more remarkable than the obsolete character of the political restoration was the change in the attitude subsequently demonstrated by Pius IX. At Gaeta, in contrast to the people around him, his concern for a religious revival predominated and was the real cause for the ideas of political reaction. It is well known to what extent people can be influenced by disappointed illusions. His advisers missed no opportunity to keep alive in his impressionable soul the memories of the bloody Roman revolution and especially the murder of Pellegrino Rossi, the defender of a far-reaching liberalization of institutions, by radical elements. Aside from the psychological level, the opinions of Pius IX also hardened, especially his distrust of principles whose dangerous consequences had become evident. More than ever before he was now convinced of the connection between the principles of 1789 and the destruction of traditional social, moral, and religious values. As A. M. Ghisalberti noted with respect to the address by Pius IX on 20 April 1849,[17] the entire *Syllabus* was embryonically present in these experiences. The new orientation began with the placing on the Index on 30 May 1849 of the works in which Gioberti, Rosmini, and Ventura had presented their reform program.[18] The *Civiltà cattolica* became for the Pope, who very much encouraged its founding by a group of Jesuits under the leadership of Father Curci,[19] an instrument of doctrine and a carrier of propaganda effective far beyond the borders of Italy.

---

[16] Text in *Atti del S. Pont. Pio IX* V/1, 286–90 (cf. 293–94).

[17] Text in *Acta Pii IX* I, 167–94. See also A. Gambaro, *Ferrante Aporti nel I° centenario della morte* (Brescia 1962), 235–50.

[18] See R. Rensch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* II (Bonn 1885), 1132–41, and G. Martina, "La censura romana del 1848 alle opere di Rosmini," *Rivista rosminiana* 62 (1968), 384–409, 63 (1969), 24–49.

[19] On the beginnings of the *Civiltà cattolica,* see *CivCatt* (1949) II, 5–40; P. Pirri, *Il P. Roothaan* (Rome 1930), 463ff.; A. Dioscoridi in *RStRis* 42 (1955), 258–66.

CHAPTER 5

The Consequences of the Events of 1848 in France

French Catholics initially were chagrined by the news of the abolition of the monarchy, evoking in them sad memories of the Terror. But then they noted with joy that the new government harbored no hostile sentiments and that the revolutionaries even displayed a respectful attitude toward the Church. It would be too simplistic, of course, to equate the insults hurled at priests in 1830 or the destruction of the residence of the archbishop in Paris with the appeal of 1848 which asked the clergy to bless the liberty trees, for the short period of friendship between Church and Republic was essentially limited to Paris. Yet there is no doubt that a change of mind had taken place since 1830 and that many people in 1848 as heirs of romanticism were motivated by a kind of Christian sentimentalism and were taken by the evangelical message of brotherly love and human equality. They were also impressed by the liberal stance taken by Pius IX at the beginning of his pontificate and by the fact that the clergy, less involved in politics than during the restoration period and even occasionally treated with coldness by the authorities, had come closer to the people. Thus, clergy and flocks, after a momentary disquiet, were calmed by the thought that religion flourished in the American republics and accepted the new government with sympathy. Numerous clerics, regarding themselves as successors to the priests of 1789, became candidates for the constituent assembly, which confirmed their initial hopes. Through the introduction of the universal franchise in a country in which many peasants were still under the influence of the clergy, the Church was assured of a larger political role than under the earlier class voting arrangement.

But the revolution of 1848 posed a much more difficult problem for the conscience of French Catholics than the simple acceptance of the Republic: it was its socialistic character which exercised a disturbing influence on the broad masses of the Catholics, especially in the rural areas, and among the petite bourgeoisie and the landowners. There were also a few groups who under the July Monarchy had become concerned with the problems of the workers. From the beginning these people favored the socialistic tendencies of the young republic. A few clerics and laymen, among them Ozanam and Lacordaire, were even willing to support them actively, and with the approval of the archbishop of Paris, Monsignor Affre, they founded the newspaper *L'Ère Nouvelle,* designed to defend not merely the principles of 1789 and the republican ideal, but also various social reforms, some of which were still rather daring at this time.

The program also found an echo in some Catholic newspapers in the provinces and initially was somewhat successful chiefly among the young clergy. But a large majority of Catholics were above all interested in the maintenance of order and the inviolability of property. Their worries, caused by financial impositions designed to pay for the initial social legislation, turned into panic after the June disturbances which were caused by the closing of the state-run workshops. They convinced the French Church for the next twenty years that religion, morality, and the traditional social order were threatened. Confirmed in its fears by the events in Rome, it essentially returned to a conservative position, and because of its fear of the socialists was prepared for all kinds of compromises. While the bishops painted democracy as the heresy of the nineteenth century and Louis Veuillot began to attack socialism, to which were attributed the areligious antifamilial tendencies of some of its leaders, Montalembert became the leader of the countermovement against the radicals, in whose aims he saw a threat to the true concept of freedom.

This rapid development was favored by the Orleanist bourgeoisie, which now was perfectly willing to make common cause with the Church for the purpose of defending property. To be sure, Montalembert and Falloux,[1] together with Thiers and Molé, the leaders of the large "party of order," were concerned about the preservation of the interests of religion and obtained significant advantages for the Church; but their clever calculation on the parliamentary level took insufficient account of the dangers inherent in this pact between religion and capitalist interests. On the other hand, French Catholics strongly supported the increasingly antidemocratic measures with which the National Assembly in 1849 and 1850 attempted to reduce the influence of the left. Thus they appeared not only as antisocialists but as antirepublicans as well and their attitude toward Louis Napoleon Bonaparte reinforced the impression. Without a doubt, they preferred him to Cavaignac as president because he promised them the freedom of secondary education and the support of France for the restoration of the secular power of the Pope. To the same degree that he revealed himself as dictator, clergymen flocked to him, as the traditionalist movement increased their sympathies for the authoritarian forms of power.

The attitude of the Catholics to the coup d'état of 2 December 1851 was therefore predictable. With a few exceptions—among them Lacordaire, Ozanam, Dupanloup, and the small group of Christian Democrats—they agreed after brief hesitation with Veuillot: "There is only a choice between Bonaparte as Emperor and the socialistic republic." Montalembert exhorted people to vote "yes" in the plebiscite "in order to defend our churches, houses, and women against those whose greed does not respect anything." The legitimist Monsignor Clausel de Montals was not the only bishop who regarded the coup d'état which drove away the specter of a red republic "as the greatest miracle of God's benevolence known to history." But the praises to God which the clergy sang in public on the occasion of the coup d'état aroused the anger of the republican leaders. Unceasingly they denounced the "alliance between saber and aspergillum" and gradually imbued their followers with their violent anticlericalism.

---

[1] On Alfred de Falloux (1811–86), who played a significant role during this period, see *DHGE* XVI, 1499–1513.

For the moment, however, the four years of the Second Republic had clearly been positive for the French Church. The tactic employed by Montalembert during the July Monarchy had borne fruit. The Catholics, well represented in the parliament and needed against the left, succeeded in obtaining a number of institutionally and administratively favorable decisions. They were not able, as they had hoped initially, to do away with the so-called Organic Articles which limited the freedom of the Church,[2] but the new constitution quite satisfactorily regulated some points important to the Catholic interests. Favored by generous legislation, orders expanded quickly.[3] Relations with the authorities were easy and often even friendly, and the reconstruction of parish churches increased. Three new dioceses for the Antilles and Réunion Island were established. Advised by Dupanloup, Falloux appointed excellent bishops and they, strictly supervised by the nuncio, gradually grew accustomed to dealing directly with Rome without interference from the government, which in any case granted them more freedom than they had had under the monarchy. After brief hesitation, the government even gave in to the importunings of Monsignor Sibours and permitted the convocation of provincial synods, last held in 1727. These councils regulated a number of ecclesiastical administrative problems which had been left unattended for more than fifty years. They also provided proof for the clergy that large portions of the population had become estranged from the Church and that new methods of pastoral care needed to be employed.

---

[2] Monsignor Affre, archbishop of Paris, supported by some other bishops, planned an even more radical reform which intended to renounce the advantages of the concordat in order to assure the independence of the Church from the government. The election of the bishops by the bishops of their church province further was to replace the appointment of bishops by the government. A letter from the Pope, inspired by the nuncio, put an end to the plan. On the fruitless efforts of the *Comité des Cults,* see P. Pradie, *La question religieuse en 1682, 1790, 1802 et 1848* (Paris 1849) and E. Ponteil, *Les institutions de la France de 1814 à 1870* (Paris 1966), 328–30; on the initiative of Monsignor Affre, see J. Leflon in *Revue des travaux de l'Academie des sciences morales* 121 (1968) I, 221–28.

[3] There were 207 new authorizations within three years compared to 384 during the eighteen years of the July Monarchy, and the total number of regular clergy rose from 28,000 in 1848 to 37,357 in 1851.

The major advantage for the Church during the Second Republic was in the field of education. Fear of the "socialist danger" and apprehension of the elementary school teachers, many of whom seemed to be enamored of socialism, drove the middle class to the Church which it had fought for so long. Thiers was willing to entrust the entire primary school education to the clergy, whose expectations had been far lower. In secondary education, however, designed for the children of the bourgeoisie, there were still numerous defenders of the monopoly of the state. At all costs they were determined to achieve a series of conditions which seriously would have restricted the freedom promised in ARTICLE 9 of the constitution. For four months the matter was discussed in a special committee created by Secretary of Education Falloux, but finally the skill of Abbé Dupanloup, Thiers, and Cousin succeeded in winning substantial concessions. The draft developed by the commission was adopted on 15 March 1850 by the Chamber of Deputies in spite of the opposition of university professors and the left. The Falloux Law,[4] for thirty years the basis of a dual school system, brought about a total reform of the state and private systems of education. It was based on two principles: freedom of private education, producing some very favorable conditions for schools run by the Church, and influence by the Church on the education system of the state.

The Falloux Law promoted an increase in the number of Catholic schools and perforce gradually deepened the gap which ideologically separated the former pupils of the ecclesiastical colleges from the high schools of the state and the former pupils of the school brothers from the lay schools. By increasingly making the Church a rival of the state in the area of education, this law contributed to the formation of a broad anticlerical movement, which half a century later led to drastic measures against the orders, through which it was hoped to deliver a mortal blow to Catholic education. For the moment, however, the law was a great victory for the Church after forty years of a monopoly by the university.

But it was also a victory for Catholic liberalism. The tactic inspired by Montalembert had made success possible. On the other hand, the acceptance of this compromise law meant for the Church the official renunciation of its claims to the monopoly of education which it had had under the Old Regime and of which many still dreamed. A portion of the clergy, supported by intransigent journalists led by Louis Veuillot, regarded this "Edict of Nantes of the nineteenth century" (Lacordaire) as an unacceptable capitulation, signifying in an essential point the end of the system of an established religion. The discussions soon grew so heated that the Pope, warned by Montalembert and Dupanloup, had to force the episcopate to accept the law. It made the split in the Catholic bloc final and any small incident could not but deepen it. This was demonstrated, for example, in the discussion of the ideas of Abbé Gaume concerning the treatment of pagan classics in the Catholic colleges.[5] Initially a bagatelle, it quickly grew with the aid of the newspaper *L'Univers* into a controversy between lay journalists and the bishops, and sharpened the contrast between Gallicans and ultramontanes.

---

[4] Text in H. Michel, op. cit., 484ff. By this time Falloux was no longer secretary of education, but his name remains connected with the law whose real creator he was.

---

[5] See *DThC* XV, 2807–8.

CHAPTER 6

The Consequences of the 1848 Revolution in the States of the German Confederation and the Netherlands

The States of the German Confederation

Buoyed by the news from France of the revolution in February 1848, the liberal movement in Germany in March 1848 could have either taken over the government in various German federal states or gained a degree of participation. After general elections, the National Assembly met in Frankfurt in May, confronted with the double responsibility of creating a unified state and a liberal constitution. It wrote the constitution, but by the time it was passed in March 1849 the Assembly no longer had the strength to withstand the individual states, which had regained much of their power. In the larger states by this time the governments had managed to impose constitutions of their own—in Prussia in December 1848, in Austria in March 1849—and while these realized many liberal demands, they actually started a counterrevolutionary phase.

Most of the German Catholics greeted the changes in March 1848 with approval. Brought up in the tradition of empire, they desired national unification and welcomed the fall of police state administrations which had oppressed the Church. The old ecclesiastical demands for freedom could be articulated effectively within the framework of the

March movement and the leaders of the Catholics immediately took advantage of the recently decreed principles of freedom of the press, association, and assembly. From now on they pursued two large goals: The Church in Germany was to gain effective unity of action and lasting autonomy with respect to the governments; and in the desired national state the Catholics were to regain their proportional influence, lost after the secularization. Catholic activity was focused on the three new areas of associations, parliaments, and joint actions of the episcopate. Once again laymen and lower clergy were in the vanguard.

The first impulses which pointed the way were generated in Mainz. In March, Adam Franz Lennig,[1] cathedral chapter member, together with Professor Kaspar Riffel, Pastor Moufang and Chaplain Heinrich,[2] founded the "Pius Association for Religious Freedom," whose program was publicized by the *Katholik* and the *Mainzer Journal* (editor Franz Sausen),[3] founded in the spring of 1848. Several other associations followed, first in the Rhineland, in Westphalia, and in Baden, where Andlaw and Buß were the organizers, then also in Bavaria, Tyrol, and the east (Breslau and Danzig). By September there existed seven central associations and several hundred branches, many of them directed by laymen. In addition to religious freedom, the associations demanded social measures and some, especially in the Rhineland, also favored political liberalism.[4] The most important daily papers founded in 1848 were the Greater-German federalist *Deutsches Volksblatt* (Stuttgart) and the *Rheinische Volkshalle* (Cologne), with the motto: "Freedom for everything and for everyone."

During the elections for the National Assembly, the associations, together with Catholic election committees and the active support of the clergy, worked for the election of Catholic candidates. When the role of religion was debated in Frankfurt in the summer of 1848, the associations generated a flood of petitions which made the public aware of the Catholic demands.

In Prussia, the movement was led by Archbishop Geissel. In consultation with his suffragans he adopted Lennig's suggestion of a synod of all German bishops and pursued it diligently. He drafted a religious policy program which attenuated the desire of liberal Catholics for a separation of church and state and held fast to a continued parallelism to the extent that it was useful for the Church. It demanded autonomy but simultaneously also the maintenance of protection by the state and of legal privileges for the Church. It had great significance for the future development of the Church in Germany.

---

[1] Adam Franz Lennig (1803–66), in 1845 cathedral chapter member in Mainz, and after 1848 one of the most influential leaders of the Catholic association movement, decisively involved in the elevation of Ketteler as bishop of Mainz, his vicar general since 1852 (see, besides the biography of Brück, G. Lenhart: *StL* III, 924ff.; L. Lenhart in *LThK* VI, 944).

[2] Kaspar Riffel (1807–56), professor of moral theology at Gießen, forced to retire in 1842, in 1851 professor at the new clerical seminary in Mainz.

[3] H. J. Wieseotte, "F.J. Sausen und die Gründung des Mainzer Journals," *AMrhKG* 5 (1953), 267–98.

[4] See the program of the Cologne election committee: Heinen I, 115–19.

The active Catholics among the Frankfurt delegates worked for the realization of this program. They belonged to different political factions and were therefore not yet a regular party but only a working group under the name of "Catholic Club." Its leading members were the bishops Diepenbrock, Geritz (Ermland), Müller (Münster), and Sedlag (Kulm); the clerics Döllinger, Ketteler, and Beda Weber; and the laymen Buß, Gagern, Lasaulx, Linde, Müller (Würzburg), Osterrath, Phillips, Radowitz, and August Reichensperger.

Geissel, attempting skillfully to coordinate these forces, was a member of the Prussian Diet, where he led the Catholic representatives, among them Peter Reichensperger and the Bonn law professors Walter and Bauerband. At the same time the archbishop followed the path of direct negotiations with the government. As parliamentary work in Berlin made only slow progress and there were strongly anticlerical forces on the left, this way was realistic as well as programmatic. Most of the Church leaders wanted greater freedom, but they also wanted to maintain the alliance between throne and altar. Alternatives were not considered. Geissel was not in favor of cooperation between Rhenish Catholics and political liberalism, and he and Diepenbrock defended the threatened authority of the crown. In this matter Geissel was a tough politician: he demanded a price for the services which he offered the state.

In Frankfurt the position of the Church also was debated vigorously, but in September a compromise was found which satisfied central demands of the Churches.[5] In the section on basic rights, all Germans were guaranteed freedom of religion and of conscience; all groups were permitted the public exercise of religion, and civil rights were neither a precondition of nor limited by religion. The greatest success of the Churches consisted of being granted the right to regulate and administer themselves within the framework of general laws. Autonomy was achieved and separation from the state was avoided. Combined with the freedom for Churches was their equality; the privileged existence of some denominations was abandoned. The liberal parliamentary majority also insisted on some core demands of its concepts of state and society, in the face of which the Churches were pushed into a helpless defensive. Civil marriage was introduced, and all public education was placed under the authority of the state, with the exception of religious instruction. Private schools, however, were permitted.

---

[5] *Reichsverfassung* Section VI, ARTICLE V, pars. 144–51, ART. VI, pars. 152–54. Text: Huber, *Dokumente* I, 319f.

In spite of the failure of the National Assembly, the religious policy compromise of the constitution was significant and even influenced the Weimar constitution. It also had direct results, thanks to Geissel's exertions. The Frankfurt concessions to the Churches became part of the Prussian constitution imposed by the King. It renounced the right of approval, the right of the state to participate in the filling of clerical positions, and it facilitated the founding of orders.[6] The revised constitution of January 1850 confirmed these rights.[7] Under the influence of the conservative reaction it also accepted the Christian religion as the basis of all those state institutions which were connected with religion. It was generally assumed that this basis was provided by the two major denominations. The regulation of civil marriage was postponed until later (it was introduced only during the *Kulturkampf*), and for elementary schools consideration of denominational conditions was accepted. The relaxation of tension in the relationship between church and state thus reached its zenith and the religious paragraphs of the Prussian constitution were regarded justifiably as the Magna Carta of religious freedom.

During the celebration of the building of the Cologne Cathedral in August 1848, an affair equally ecclesiastic and national, Lennig's suggestion of a national meeting of the representatives of Catholic associations met with general approval. At the beginning of October the first German Catholic Conference took place in Mainz; it was characteristic for its structure that it was presided over by a layman, Buß, and that the bishop of Mainz, Kaiser, did not take part in the proceedings. Twenty-three representatives came from Frankfurt, and Döllinger made a programmatic speech in which he demanded a greater degree of freedom for the Church than the National Assembly had granted. He pleaded for a uniform, nationally and historically based organization of the German Church; it would not limit papal primacy, but it would give the Church the weight it deserved. While the majority applauded the speech, the ultramontanes began to have their first doubts. They did not know how to reconcile such autonomy with their centralistic concept. Ketteler, confronting the assembly with the social problems facing the Church, received undivided approval.

---

[6] Constitution imposed by Prussia, II, ARTICLES 11–21. Text: Huber, *Dokumente* I, 386f.

[7] Prussian revised constitution, II, ARTICLES 12–24. Text: Huber, *Dokumente* I, 402f.

The Mainz Catholic Conference was the start of a lasting integration of German Catholicism. The most important concrete results were the creation of a central organization, the "German Catholic Association," and religious decisions which were directed not against the thrones but merely against the concept of established Churches, demanding freedom of religion as well as guarantees under law. The Catholic Association was to be led by laymen and to pursue national goals, very much like O'Connell's Irish Catholic Organization. But the increasing anticlericalism of many liberals, the failure of the Frankfurt National Assembly, and the subsequent rise of a revolutionary radicalism allowed the growth of uncertainty with respect to political goals. The two Catholic conferences in Breslau and Regensburg in 1849 agreed on political neutrality and on concentration of energies on ecclesiastical concerns. The Regensburg conference declared religious freedom to be the prerequisite for national unity and accused the Frankfurt National Assembly of not having considered this historical truth adequately.

In 1848 Archbishop Geissel managed to convince most of his colleagues to convene a bishops' conference and to invite eminent theologians, among them Döllinger, and laymen as advisers. He designed a tentative program, calling for freedom of religion and reforms in ecclesiastical structure and preaching. Reiterating Döllinger, the archbishop came out in favor of a structural unity of the German Church, which measure was not to be understood as directed against Rome but only against tutelage by the state. He also favored greater rights for the lower clergy and laity and greater use of German in liturgy.

The first German bishops' conference took place from 22 October to 16 November 1848 in Würzburg under Geissel's chairmanship and largely adopted his program. Of the Austrian bishops, only Cardinal Schwarzenberg (Salzburg) participated.[8] In an extensive memorandum to all German governments the conference formulated its religious demands, thus placing the episcopate in the lead of the ecclesiastical movement for freedom. The memorandum contained a consistent maximal program for the emancipation of the Church from the state and thereby determined the direction for future disputes, especially in southern and southwestern Germany. After lively discussions the majority of the bishops voted in favor of a national organization under the leadership of a primate as well as for timely reforms of church regulations and liturgy. The Pope was asked for permission for a formal national council which was to implement the decisions.

---

[8] Friedrich Prince zu Schwarzenberg (1809–85), 1836 archbishop of Salzburg, 1842 cardinal, 1850 archbishop of Prague, as a defender of Bohemian autonomy opponent of Viennese centralism, remained in Prague, where in 1860 a general meeting of German Catholics took place. In the 1860s Schwarzenberg occasionally was active as a mediator between Rome and German theologians. In 1869–70 he belonged to the most vocal opponents of the dogma of infallibility (see, in addition to the biography by Wolfsgruber, Wurzbach, 33, 71–78; E. Winter, *Die geistige Entwicklung Anton Günthers und seiner Schule* [Paderborn 1931]; K. zu Schwarzenberg, *Geschichte des reichsständischen Hauses Schwarzenberg* II [Neustadt/Aisch, 1964]).

The papal reply was half a year in coming and was negative. The novel initiative of the German bishops had caused suspicion and doubts in the Curia; in fact, Rome had tried to torpedo the conference. Pius IX was not prepared to grant the bishops supradiocesan responsibilities and in ignorance of the people active in Germany (including Döllinger!), shades of Febronius and of the Ems Congress were conjured. Suspicion was awakened and fed persistently by the intransigent Munich internuncio Sacconi[9] and Archbishop Reisach, who closely cooperated with him. Their criticism was focused on the plans for a national church organization and the liturgical reforms and clearly presaged the internal divisions of the Church during the subsequent two decades.

The German bishops accepted the papal decision postponing a national council for an indefinite period of time. After all, they had not intended an action unacceptable to the Pope, and besides, national enthusiasm had considerably diminished in the meantime. Once again the Church had to deal with the individual states after the revolutions. Geissel therefore distanced himself from some of his reform proposals, in part because they had contributed to some far-reaching demands for codetermination by his clergy under the leadership of Pastor Binterim. In southwestern Germany as well the old demands for diocesan synods were strongly raised in the wake of the revolution.[10] Perhaps Geissel and the majority of his colleagues realized only during the period of disenchantment in 1849 that the organizational concentration without the participation of intermediate levels was inseparable from the authoritarian restoration which they also regarded as necessary.

---

[9] Carlo Sacconi (1808–89), in 1845 envoy in Florence, in 1847 internuncio, in 1851 nuncio in Munich and in 1853 in Paris, in 1861 Curia cardinal. (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 162, 302, 338ff., 345f.; Aubert, *Pie IX,* 110f.; Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 17–51).

[10] The Freiburg professor and cathedral chapter member J. B. Hirscher, with his sensational pamphlet *Die kirchlichen Zustände der Gegenwart* (Tübingen 1849), pleaded for the introduction of synods at which clergy and laymen should jointly formulate canon law. At the same time he attacked Catholic associations, which he accused of superficiality and lack of concern for the real tasks of the Church. He thus assumed an antipolitically motivated position, connected with the polemicism of F. X. Kraus and his pupils against political Catholicism. On the synodal movement under the Rhenish clergy, see especially H. Schrörs in *AHVNrh* 105 (1921), 106 (1922).

Thanks to the bold efforts of Anton Günther, Sebastian Brunner (1814–93),[11] and Emanuel Veith (1787–1870),[12] the association movement in 1848 spread to Austria. The leaders of restoration Catholicism were compromised by their connection with Metternich, and the majority of bishops remained silent for Josephinist reasons. Cardinal Schwarzenberg, a disciple of Günther's, in August 1848 conducted a conference with his suffragan bishops and sent petitions to the Reichstag; after his return from Würzburg he intensified his efforts for the activation of the episcopate. Only when there was no longer any doubt about the victory of the counterrevolution did the Josephinist Viennese archbishop Vincenz Milde (1777–1853) ask the young Emperor Franz Joseph for the convocation of an all-Austrian bishops' conference. The Emperor, who in the Patent of 4 March appended to the Constitution had granted all Christian denominations the right to the autonomous regulation of their affairs, and the government led by Prince Felix Schwarzenberg, a brother of the Cardinal, agreed to the project. The conference took place in Vienna between 27 April and 17 June 1849; its chief participants were Schwarzenberg, Rauscher (prince-bishop of Seckau and administrator of Leoben since 1849),[13] and Diepenbrock, entitled to participate because of the Austrian part of Breslau. Basing itself on the Patent of 4 March, the conference appealed to Emperor and government for the dismantling of Josephinist legislation and for a concordat for the border areas. From now on, this was a persistent demand by the bishops. Franz Joseph, a pupil of Rauscher's, quite in keeping with the recommendations by Metternich, was desirous of assuring his restoration policy through an agreement with the Church. His decrees of 18 and 23 April 1850 satisfied the most important demands of the bishops (among others lifting of the *placet,* freedom of communication with Rome, free exercise of episcopal disciplinary powers),[14] thus starting the Church policy which led to the concordat of 1855.

---

[11] On Brunner, the founder (1848) and editor of the *Wiener Kirchenzeitung,* see especially K. Ammerl, *Sebastian Brunner und seine publizistische Stellungnahme in der Wiener Kirchenzeitung* (diss., Vienna 1934); J. Treimer, *Sebastian Brunner als Historiker* (diss., Vienna 1945); E. Alker in *NDB* 2, 683f.; *ÖBL* 1, 121f.

[12] C. Wolfsgruber, *Veith als Homileth* (Vienna 1911); E. Hosp, *Das Erbe des heiligen Klemens Maria Hofbauer* (Vienna 1953).

[13] Rauscher owed his bishopric to Schwarzenberg, who as archbishop of Salzburg had the right of appointment for three of his suffragan bishoprics (Lavant, Seckau-Loeben, Gurk).

[14] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 276–80.

The Netherlands

The support given to Thorbecke's liberal party by the Catholic middle class in the northern provinces made a peaceful revolution possible, leading to the constitution of 1848. The Catholics, desirous of complete freedom in education, had to be satisfied with a compromise, but received full satisfaction in all other areas. Owing to freedom of assembly, the last obstacles were removed for religious orders. In spite of the efforts of the conservatives among the Reformed to give the country the character of a "Protestant nation," the new constitution proclaimed the equality of all religious denominations before the law and the right of each denominational community to regulate its own affairs.

The restoration of a regular episcopal organization, on the agenda for longer than thirty years, had to appear as the crowning point of this complete and legal emancipation. But in reality it was not desired by many priests. In the rural south they were satisfied, ever since in 1842 the vicars apostolic had assumed the character of an *Ordinarius loci,* and in the cities of the north the archpriests and regular clergy feared the loss of their autonomy. The laymen of the north, supported by a few priests of the group clustered around Warmond and the bishop of Liège, Van Bommel, who was of Dutch descent,[15] pleaded with Rome for real bishops. Their main reason was their wish to have a local authority capable of guiding them in all political questions touching the interests of the Church.

They all agreed in principle, but differed in the modalities. Those who were close to the office in The Hague responsible for the Catholic religion would have preferred a concordatory solution or at least an agreement with the state negotiated on the basis of the Mechelen School; the strongly liberal group of the young Papo-Thorbeckians of the *Tijd* chiefly desired the independence of the Church from the state, even at the cost of complete separation. The demands of the government, which had to take into account the rejection by the Protestants of the establishment of dioceses in the north, forced the Holy See to accept the second solution and to decide unilaterally how to restore the hierarchy. In order to offend the Protestants as little as possible, it was at first planned, in agreement with the suggestions of the inter-nuncio and vicar apostolic of 's-Hertogenbosch, Monsignor Zwijsen, to establish only one diocese in the north and three in the south, including the see of the metropolitan. But the prefect of the Propaganda, on the occasion of a visit, convinced himself not only of the numerically growing importance of Catholicism in the north, but also of its dynamic nature,[16] and it was finally decided in a kind of restoration of the pre-Reformation hierarchy to make Utrecht the archepiscopal see and to add four suffragen dioceses: Haarlem for the large coastal cities, Breda, 's-Hertogenbosch, and Roermond for Brabant and Limburg.

---

[15] See A. Manning, *De betekenis van C. Van Bommel* (Utrecht 1956), 218–60.

The establishment bull of 4 March 1853 caused a wave of protest on the part of the Protestants which became known as the "April Movement," but it had a more political than religious nature. The prejudices of many Calvinists against the Pope were exploited by the reactionaries opposed to the liberal cabinet which had made the Roman decision possible. These attempts to place in question the favorable articles of the constitution of 1848 nevertheless failed because of the hesitant attitude of King Willem II. The King held no sympathies for the Roman Church, but considered it dangerous for the unity of the country to drive the Catholics to the extreme. In spite of a few offending decrees, ultimately everything ended with a rather harmless law on the exercise of religion.[17]

Disregarding the Protestant agitation, the new bishops, under the directorship of Zwijsen,[18] who was appointed archbishop of Utrecht, immediately began to rewrite Church regulations according to canon law. He was an industrious pastor, had no interest in intellectual pursuits, but possessed common sense and strength of character. During this difficult period these virtues were of use, but they also contributed their healthy share to the ultramontane ghetto character of Dutch Catholicism for the next one hundred years.

Under the strict leadership of an episcopate whose authority was limited by neither government nor traditions, surrounded by a pious, active and steadily growing clergy,[19] and ministered to by regular clergy of both sexes, whose growth was even greater, the faithful had hardly any opportunity to make efforts of their own. Like the Irish Catholics they accepted this clericalism, unthinkable in any other environment, without any hesitation and supported the clergy with remarkable generosity. For all areas of life the Catholics founded associations. Thus they guaranteed the maintenance of religious life, and nonpracticing Catholics, aside from the workers, remained an exception. But at the same time these social organizations contributed to keeping the Catholics away from most expressions of national life.

---

[16] Among others, through the immigration of a number of enterprising Germans from the Münster area.

[17] Among others, it raised the small Jansenist Church with about ten thousand members to the rank of an officially recognized religious community. The bishops of this Church—with seats in Utrecht and Haarlem—lodged protests with the government against the appointments by Rome of prelates to sees already occupied by "regular" successors of the former bishops (see B. Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement* [London 1948], 161–68, and Albers, *Herstel* I, 253–57, II, 433–34).

[18] On the other hand, because of the impossibility of cooperation between the internuncio Vecchiotti and the Dutch bishops it was not until 1865 that the first provincial council took place (see J. van Laarhoven, *Een Kerkprovincie in concilie* [Utrecht 1965]).

[19] The number of priests under the pontificate of Pius IX rose from 1,500 to 2,200, while the Catholic population increased by only 15 percent (1,439,137 in the year 1878, i.e., 35.86 percent of the total population; in 1840 it was 38.28 percent).

The isolation was noticeable especially on the cultural level. While a small body of Catholic intellectuals came into being among the urban middle class, intellectual life on the whole stagnated, especially in comparison to the ferment of the 1830s. While Catholics were well represented in music and architecture—here as everywhere else the Neo-Gothic was in full flower—their contribution to literature was minimal. Much more serious was the fact that their shortsighted suspicions of educational literature mired them in an almost total ignorance of the great literary movements of the time. In philosophy and theology, Catholic Dutch publications hardly rose above the level of reference books for seminaries or popular apologetic writings. Only a few exceptions stood out from the prevailing mediocrity. There were Theodor Borret,[20] who on the basis of his knowledge of Christian archeology became the first Catholic member of the Royal Academy; Willem Nuyens,[21] a talented polemicist who undertook a reassessment of the history of the religious wars of the sixteenth century; and especially Joseph Alberdingk Thijm,[22] the author of scholarly works on art history and Dutch literature. His sympathetic understanding and his intellectual qualities gained him recognition outside of Catholic circles and for many years he alone acted as the mediator between Catholics and Protestants. Only around 1870 did a moderate rejuvenation begin, finding expression primarily in higher academic standards of the *Katholiek* and in the founding of a new journal, *De Wachter.* The latter was especially concerned with those problems which resulted from the participation of Catholics in public life. It was the beginning of a new phase in the gradual emancipation of the Catholics.

---

[20] Concerning Theodor Borret (1812–90), see P. Dessens in *De Katholiek* 99 (1891), 4–35; a more detailed presentation is given by Rogier, *KathHerleving,* 239–41.

[21] On Willem Nuyens (1823–94), see G. Gorries, *Willem Nuyens* (Nijmegen 1908).

[22] On Joseph Alberdingk Thijm (1820–89), see W. Bennink, *Alberdingk Thijm* (Utrecht 1952) and G. Brom, *Alberdingk Thijm* (Utrecht 1956).

PART TWO

The Catholic Reaction to Liberalism

INTRODUCTION

Pius IX after 1848

Pius IX was still relatively young when at the age of fifty-four he was chosen Pope by cardinals chiefly concerned with a solution of the political problems of the Papal State. Yet in this very area he failed completely. On the other hand, his unusually long pontificate (1846–78) profoundly and lastingly affected the fate of the Catholic Church.

He was not at all a strong personality, such as his successor Leo XIII. But in contrast to his predecessor, Gregory XVI, who lived isolated from the world and whose influence did not reach beyond the narrow circle of his immediate collaborators, Pius IX managed rather effortlessly to win a large number of the clerics and of the faithful for his ecclesiastic, theological, and spiritual concepts.

His contemporaries were unanimous in agreeing on his fascinating charm. He loved being in contact with people and increased the number of audiences, during which with loving good nature he received not only a few notables, as his predecessors had done, but also numerous priests and laymen, who, owing to the improvement of transportation, flocked to Rome in ever greater numbers. The visitors, taken by their kind reception, after returning to their home countries broadcast their impressions, and consequently there developed a real papal adulation in the Catholic world, whose excesses, according to inclination, generated either smiles or irritation. The adulation facilitated to a high degree the enthusiastic agreement of many to an increasingly centralized leadership of the Church and to a coordination of the regional Churches with a certain type of Catholicism preferred by Rome.

The Pope, because of his fervent piety, trust in providence, and strength of soul in adversity, praised by many as a saint during his lifetime, appeared to others, including many clerics and many a militant layman whose devotion to the Church was unquestioned, as no more than a vain autocrat or a puppet maneuvered by insensitive reactionaries. Both impressions are one-sided and simplistic. It is possible to arrive at a realistic portrait, in spite of the absence of a good biography going beyond the framework of a naive hagiography, and to show both man and Pope as a concrete and differentiated personality.

Pius IX labored under three handicaps. In his youth he suffered from epileptic attacks which left him with an extreme excitability. It makes understandable many of his summary declarations and the fact that he frequently changed his mind according to the opinion last heard. Consequently, many observers regarded him as a hesitant and indecisive person. Only when he was convinced that it was a matter of consequence did he demonstrate unshakable resolution and boldly defended his position. The second handicap was that like most of the Italian clerics of his age, raised during the first two decades of the nineteenth century with the upheavals of the Napoleonic era, his education was rather inadequate. His superficial training often did not permit him to recognize the complexity of problems or the implications of many statements which he was expected to judge. This lack was partly compensated for by his Italian shrewdness, which allowed him to understand much without being very erudite. Thus Pius IX was able to apply common sense in assessing concrete situations, at least as long as they were reported to him accurately. Unfortunately, and that was his third handicap, his staff was not always able to inform him with the required care. His trusted advisers were generally conscientious and industrious, but also rather exalted and often viewed matters with the uncompromising attitude of theoreticians out of touch with contemporary views. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that Pius IX failed to adapt the Church to new conditions. These were on the one hand the profound evolution which was in the process of completely altering the structures of bourgeois society, and on the other the totally changed perspectives by which certain theological positions needed to be viewed in light of the progress made in the natural sciences and historical research.

If the capabilities of Pius IX had undeniable limits, especially regrettable in a superior who increasingly was compelled to make solitary decisions in many areas, he must also be credited with qualities and achievements which cannot be regarded as small. This was first of all true on the personal level. Pius IX was a genuinely unpretentious and good person,[1] equipped with a sensitivity which permitted him to make charming gestures and have happy ideas, without excluding, if he considered it advisable, a sometimes rude frankness. He was sufficiently supple to make occasional concessions which at first sight looked dangerous, because more than the tacticians in his environment, he relied on trust built on personal relations. Father Isaac Hecker, who regretted that Pius frequently allowed himself to be guided more by impulses than by judgment, also thought that his impulses were great, noble, and universal.[2] He was not an intellectual, but was interested in all kinds of problems, and in his youth had read extensively.[3] After he became Pope, he kept abreast of modern inventions. He knew how to pray, and the depth of his religious sentiments was undeniable, even if in this area, as in others, he combined weaknesses with virtues. He attached too much weight to prophecies and other manifestations of the miraculous, and tended to see in the political convulsions which involved the Church a new episode in the great battle between God and Satan instead of realistically subjecting the events to a technical analysis.

---

[1] With two provisos: the excessive receptivity for impressions stemming from the illness of his youth occasionally drove him to fits of anger, as violent as they were sudden, but they never lasted long and had few consequences for those who had occasioned them. To this was added toward the end of his life a predisposition for flattery and the inability to be contradicted. But it would not be just to take account only of the weaknesses of an eighty-year-old man when assessing the personality of Pius IX.

At the beginning of his priestly life, at a time when most young clerics are concerned with making a career, he completely renounced ecclesiastical honors and devoted himself to orphans and other poor. As bishop he impressed the people of his diocese by the apostolic strength with which he rose above party struggles in order to minister to everyone, including the enemies of the papal government. Even after he became Pope, his chief concern was to act as priest and pastor, responsible before God for the defense of Christian values, which were jeopardized by rationalism and the increasing ungodliness of laicism. He increasingly encouraged the ultramontane movement, but not for reasons of personal ambition or love of theocracy, which tempted him less than his successor Leo XIII. He was ultramontane only because this movement appeared to him as the prerequisite for a rejuvenation of Catholic life wherever the intervention of governments in the Church seemed to throttle it, and because he saw it as the best means to coordinate all vital forces of Catholicism for the struggle against the rising flood of anti-Christian liberalism. This attitude explains his resistance to liberalism and his ever more violent condemnation of it. The Pope was part of the political philosophy of the traditionalistic type prevalent among Catholics during the middle of the nineteenth century. As such he was incapable of differentiating among the confused strivings of his time between those of positive value, which actually prepare the ground for a stronger spiritualization of the Catholic understanding of faith, and senseless concessions to fleeting fashions or even unconscious compromises with ideologies which failed to correspond to the Christian spirit. Above all he lacked realism in his church-political ideal, which throughout his entire pontificate he chased with an uncontrollable energy better expended on a worthier cause. As P. Martina pointed out astutely, it was "a historical impossibility to achieve at one and the same time complete freedom for the Church and the support of the state: a choice needed to be made."[4]

---

[2] Quoted by W. Elliot, *Vie du Père Hecker* (Paris 1897), 250. Many contemporaries emphasized the degree to which Pius IX allowed himself to be guided "by impressions and the heart."

[3] See L. Sandri, "La biblioteca privata di Pio IX," *RstRis* 25 (1938), 1426–32. Concerning the interest of Pius IX in scientific problems, see L. v. Pastor, *Tagebücher*, ed. by W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950), 362.

In contrast to these doubtlessly grave defects and missed opportunities, which we can easily see from today's perspective, stands the fact that the long pontificate also had great positive effects. Many things changed in the world and in the Church after Pius IX became Pope. The strongest ecclesiastical change took place with respect to the quality of the average Catholic life, beginning with the spiritual and pastoral standards of the clergy, the chief instrument of preaching the faith in the view of that century. Without a doubt, many elements contributed to this development, but Pius IX also contributed a considerable share, primarily by providing his contemporaries with his personal example of piety and Christian rebirth, which characterized the second third of the nineteenth century. Even more important than his personal example was Pius's activity. Determined and conscious of his authority, he devoted a great deal of his time and of his energy to the activation and promotion of the slow development which started immediately after the great revolutionary crisis. Because a tough attitude in practical and doctrinal terms appeared to him as indispensable for complete success, he forced himself, in spite of a personal inclination to mediation and mitigation, to the reiteration of principles which constituted the basis of his doctrine. Occasionally he did so with a deplorable lack of subtlety.

No Pope, no matter how active and independent, can perform without advisers. Of those who for many years enjoyed the confidence of Pius IX there were chiefly Monsignor Borromeo, Monsignor Ricci, and Monsignor Stella, devoted and scrupulous men, yet without great vision and guided by reactionary tendencies. Of greater weight were two foreigners, Monsignor George Talbot,[5] an Englishman related to Borghese, and Monsignor Xavier de Merode,[6] half Belgian, half French, who together with Prince Gustav von Hohenlohe[7] were appointed in 1850 after the return of Pius IX to Rome for the purpose of underscoring the international role of the papacy. Talbot and Merode were intelligent men, holding less simplistic views with respect to modern society than was generally the case in Rome. But in their judgments both failed to consider the pros and cons and more than once encouraged the Pope, who placed great confidence in them, to assume an intransigent stance. Talbot did so in connection with English persons and affairs, in which his views generally were identical with those of Manning, and Merode did so with respect to the Roman Question and the French prelates with good connections to the government of Napoleon III.

---

[4] *Pio IX e Leopoldo II* (Rome 1967), 50.

[5] On George Talbot de Malahide (1816–86), see *Wiseman Review* no. 502 (1964), 290–308.

[6] Concerning Xavier de Merode (1820–74), see L. Besson, *F.F.X. de Merode* (Lille 1908) and R. Aubert in *Revue générale belge* (May and June 1956), 1102–43, 1316–34.

[7] Prince Gustav Adolf Hohenlohe (1823–96) was liked by Pius IX because of his modesty and was useful because of his linguistic skills, but he exercised no political influence; he became a cardinal in 1866, but fell into disgrace because of his relationship to the opposition during the First Vatican Council (see Hubert Jedin, "Gustav Hohenlohe und Augustin Theiner," *RQ* 66 [1971]).

While Pius IX's immediate entourage thus played a larger, if unofficial, role than that of his predecessors and successors—"influence without responsibility" Dom C. Butler called it—a noticeable reduction in the importance of the College of Cardinals took place, both with respect to the secular administration of the Papal State and the religious direction of the Church. With respect to the Papal State, Antonelli conducted affairs; concerning the cardinals, their selection occurred under new criteria. When in 1850 Pius IX created ten foreign and only four Italian cardinals, he signalled clearly that the essential task of the Sacred College was no longer that of administering the Papal State. The internationalization of the College of Cardinals continued. At the time of the death of Gregory XVI there were eight foreign and fifty-four Italian cardinals; when Pius IX died, there were twenty-five foreign and thirty-nine Italian cardinals.[8] The Italians by themselves were no longer able to produce the two-thirds majority required for the election of a Pope. The internationalization went hand in hand with another change. The representatives of the Roman aristocracy and the high functionaries in important administrative and political positions, who in the past had constituted the majority in the College of Cardinals, were gradually replaced by men of the Church of often modest background who excelled in pastoral work, theological knowledge, or ultramontane zeal. But in spite of this development the role of the College of Cardinals in the religious leadership of the Church grew smaller to such a degree that on the eve of the council the French ambassador wrote: "Never before was the role of the cardinals so modest and their influence so insignificant as today." The reason was in part the lack of personalities of high caliber, noted by many contemporary observers, but primarily it was Pius IX's personal style. He liked to inform himself directly about matters and did not hesitate, in the process of reaching a decision, to ignore regular channels. Unfortunately, all too often he relied on informants who were partisan or who lacked a sense for the complexity of concrete situations daily facing the Church.[9] While the meetings of the consistories and commissions of cardinals for the discussion of problems touching upon the Church became rarer, individual cardinals personally played a significant role. Some of them headed primary agencies—the most important of them were Giacomo Antonelli,[10] secretary of state from 1848 until his death in 1876, and Alessandro Barnabo, the competent and energetic head of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith from 1856 until 1874—others simply enjoyed the personal confidence of the Pope. Among the latter were Cardinals Gaude and Bilio, in charge of dogmatic questions, Mertel for legal affairs, Franchi for church-political problems, and Reisach for the concerns of German-speaking countries but especially there was Cardinal Patrizi, a friend of the Pope, who for thirty years had unhindered access to him. Patrizi was an example of virtue and piety, but with a rather narrow mind.[11]

---

[8] Of the 123 cardinals created by Pius IX, 71 were Italians and 52 were foreigners, including 16 Frenchmen, 12 Spaniards, 11 Austrians, 4 Germans, and 3 Portuguese.

The continuing centralization of the Church naturally enlarged the importance of the nunciatures and of the Roman congregations. But most of the contemporary observers noted with regret the frequent mediocrity of the staff of both institutions. The men concerned were generally very respectable concerning their morals and piety and well versed in the subtleties of canon law and the theology of reference books, but overwhelmingly they lacked an understanding of the modern world and its developments. They "favored everything that was old, from dress to opinions, from labels to theology," Cochin wrote in 1862. They displayed a hostility toward critical methods which expressed not only their distrust of the new direction of philosophy, history, and natural sciences, but also the thoughtlessness with which they accepted and even encouraged denunciations of all who intellectually and religiously failed to share their conformist views. This well-meant but short-sighted attitude merely postponed the solution of problems, and the more open-minded approaches under Leo XIII often came too late. These could not completely make up for lost time, so that, even recognizing the positive aspects, the actual roots of the crisis of modernism go back to the pontificate of Pius IX.

---

[9] See, for example, G. Martina, *Pio IX e Leopoldo II,* 375.

[10] During the first two years of the pontificate, one secretary of state replaced another one in quick succession: Gizzi (8 August 1846–7 July 1847); Ferretti (17 July 1847–20 January 1848); Bofondi (1 February–9 March 1848); Antonelli (10 March–2 May 1848); Orioli, *ad interim* (4 May–2 June 1848); Soglia (3 June–29 November 1848). See also G. de Marchi, *Le Nunziature apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956* (Rome 1957), 10–11, and L. Pasztor in *Annali della Fondazione italiana per la storia amministrativa* 3 (1966), 314–18. After the death of Antonelli (6 November 1876) Pius IX appointed Cardinal Giovanni Simeoni (1816–92) as his successor (on him see L. Teste, op. cit., 257–61). Pius IX is supposed to have explained this appointment which created great astonishment as follows: "This is not going to be for long and I thus leave to my successor and to the conclave full freedom of action by selecting a cardinal who is destined for neither the papacy nor for political office" (quoted by Aubert, *Pie IX,* 498).

[11] Concerning Costantino Patrizi (1798–1876), see L. Teste, op. cit., 73—81, and M. Maccarrone, *Il concilio Vaticano I* (Padua 1966 I, 399–400 and n. 2.

There were numerous positive sides. Already mentioned as one of the most important was the intensification of Christian life, in which, in addition to local efforts, Pius IX and some of his collaborators had a large personal share. At the expense of many valuable traditions which once had made up the prestige of the French clergy or Sailer's school, but whose quality seems to have affected only a small elite, there now arose a large movement of popular piety and priestly spirituality. It has often been accused of too much superficiality, but this simplifying condemnation is contradicted by the flowering of church activities and the tremendous growth of orders. At the same time, during these three decades, the Church also became stronger externally. Promoted by the colonial expansion of Europe, there was on all five continents a missionary expansion under the centralizing impulse of the Vatican. The immigration of Catholics led to the creation of new Churches in Canada, Australia, the United States, and Latin America. The old Churches, existing under difficult conditions since the Reformation, were reorganized in England, the Netherlands, and above all in Germany. The resistance recorded during the *Kulturkampf* demonstrated the vitality which this Church was able to develop within a few years through its connection with the Holy See. For together with the quantitative expansion of the Catholic Church[12] went its closer ties with the Pope. The growth of Roman centralization, solemnly sanctioned by the Vatican Council, without a doubt represented one of the most striking phenomena of this pontificate. It caused bitter regret among those who knew the advantages of pluralism, but had positive effects where the regalistic traditions of the Old Regime had weakened the Churches.

The triumph of ultramontanism caused the reaction of governments which did not like the removal of the local clergy from their influence. Additionally, the parties of the left mobilized against the Church in the wake of its compromises with the antirevolutionary systems, underscored by sensational condemnations of liberalism. Thus the last years of the pontificate were darkened by numerous conflicts. At the moment of Pius IX's death (7 February 1878) it was easy to assume at first sight that the Church was totally stranded in a sea of hostile public opinion.

---

[12] Between 1846 and 1878, Pius IX established 206 new dioceses and apostolic vicariates.

But in reality it was not only consolidated internally, but had begun, precisely at the moment when the disappearance of the Papal State eliminated the papacy from the traditional diplomatic chess board of Europe, "to become a world power of which every policy must take account" (H. Marc-Bonnet). This was demonstrated at the start of the pontificate of Leo XIII.

SECTION ONE

The Temporary Improvement in the Situation of the Church

The Church appeared to have emerged with flying colors from the crisis of 1848, so worrisome to its officials, on two levels. In part it profited from a turn toward conservatism, which, concerned about the rise of democratic demands, expected from it assistance in stabilizing the bourgeois order. After all, Tocqueville's statement that "the fear of socialism has the same effect on the bourgeoisie as the Revolution had on the aristocracy," applied not only to France. At the same time the Church benefitted from the concessions to liberalism of which governments were compelled to take account through a moderation of their regalistic policies or even through the granting of complete independence to the Church. This stabilized condition enabled the Holy See to arrange a number of favorable concordats.[1] The most spectacular one was that signed with Austria in 1855. Recognition of freedom of religion, already in effect for Belgium, Great Britain, and the United States, was also incorporated in the new constitutions of Prussia and the Netherlands and produced the same beneficial results for the growth of Catholicism in these states. Finally, systematically resumed missionary work, in conjunction with European colonial expansion, resulted in noticeable successes after the middle of the century. They permitted the impression that the Church had overcome the great crisis of the past one hundred years and could look optimistically to the future. But the euphoria was of short duration. The situation worsened again after the 1860s and again brought home the truth that it was always a mistake for the Church to rely too much on institutional advantages which it had obtained through nothing more than good fortune. Yet the favorable condition almost everywhere in evidence during the first years of the pontificate of Pius IX made possible the stabilization and spiritual intensification of the Catholic renaissance. In spite of the uncertainties in many countries this condition must therefore not be underestimated when one attempts to form an exact picture of the religious situation during the final quarter of the nineteenth century.

---

[1] In 1851 with Spain, Tuscany, and Bolivia; in 1852 with Costa Rica and Guatemala; in 1855 with Austria; in 1857 with Portugal, Württemberg, and the Duchy of Modena; in 1859 with the Grand Duchy of Baden; in 1860 with Haiti; in 1861 with Honduras and Nicaragua; in 1862 with San Salvador, Venezuela, Ecuador, and Brazil. This policy of concordats was only resumed much later in 1881.

CHAPTER 7

The Seeming Success of the Church in France during the Second Empire and the "Moral Order"

The Privileged Status of the Church

The favoritisms extended to the Church under the Second Republic were increased at the beginning of the Second Empire. The Emperor and his advisers were not particularly interested in giving preference to the Church, but as conservative opportunists they were aware of the advantages of the moral and social force of religion in checking revolutionary propaganda. Moreover, association with the Church seemed to them a good way of binding legitimist circles to the Empire.

The government visibly enlarged the religious budget, made virtually no attempt to apply the Organic Articles, closed its eyes to the rapid growth of orders, suppressed antireligious tendencies in public education, and looked for opportunities to let the Church share in the prestige of the state. In response to the revolutionary excesses a good number of the middle class—and not only property owners—returned to the Church, seeing in it an effective guaranty for the maintenance of the social order. Having gradually regained its influence on the leading elements since the beginning of the century, the clergy now also obtained the assistance of many high officials. In an authoritarian regime their power was not to be underestimated and through them the benevolent attitude of the government toward the Church found strong expression. In addition, the universal right to vote, introduced in 1848, provided the lower clergy, which had maintained close contact with the people in the rural areas and small towns, a power which it had not yielded before.

But the clergy failed to exercise restraint, and to the extent that revolutionary threats diminished the government began to be suspicious of the growing importance of clerics in public life. The tactless policy of Nuncio Sacconi (1853–61) and the systematic efforts of the ultramontane party to exclude completely any influence of the government in ecclesiastical matters led to a reawakening of the Gallican tradition of a Ministry of Religion. The crisis, present in embryo after 1856, erupted with the development of the Roman Question after the Italian War (1859). The leaders of the Catholic movement, having until now hailed Napoleon III as a latter-day Charlemagne, were very disappointed when the Emperor agreed to a division of the Papal State. They tried to raise a wave of protest in the country, but did not have much success. This convinced the government that the people no longer followed the lead of the clergy as much as before. It decided to deal with the advances of the Church by introducing a plan worked out by Minister Rouland. It appointed bishops who refused to accept the increasing interference of the Roman Curia in France, stopped the further growth of orders and religious communities, and gave preference to the public schools. It increasingly resorted to chicanery in order to destroy the influence of the clergy, but ostensibly continued to promote religion in and outside of the country[1] so as not to lose the confidence of the Catholic population.

The policy, moderated by the benevolent neutrality of many Catholic civil servants, created indignation among the clergy. It also succeeded in drawing a number of notables to the side of the opposition. The growth of the Republican Party after 1863 therefore persuaded the government to return to a less hostile policy in order to regain the good will of the "Clerical Faction."[2] While the cabinet continued to tolerate the attacks of the anticlerical press against the Church, it tried in other ways to regain the confidence of the clergy. It hoped that after the appointment of a number of Gallican-oriented bishops[3] the clergy would less compliantly adhere to the increasingly intransigent positions of the Vatican with respect to problems of modern civilization.

Owing to the Roman Question and the convention of September 1864, this pacification policy did not have immediate results. But after the intervention of French troops in Mentana (1867) nothing stood any longer in the way of the reconciliation desired by both sides. The joint fear of the republican opposition led the two powers to cooperation. Once again it tied the declining Empire to the conservative force of the clergy, which, in turn, was apprehensive of the anticlericalism displayed by the republicans.

---

[1] In Syria, where French troops protected the Maronites; in China and Indochina where they defended the persecuted missionaries; in Mexico, where they attempted to replace the anticlerical republic of Juárez with the Catholic empire of Maximilian, the Emperor appeared as the defender of the Church, whose interests happened to coincide with those of France.

[2] With the exception of a few areas, the clergy was without a doubt increasingly less able to influence the majority of the voters; this fact was pointed out by Maurain and confirmed by L. M. Case (*French Opinion on War and Diplomacy during the Second Empire* [Philadelphia 1954]). But the vote of the followers of the clergy nevertheless in many instances was a significant factor.

[3] On this policy, applied especially by Minister Baroche, see numerous references in J. Maurain, op. cit. and recent more detailed indications, especially about the important role played by Lavigerie, in de Montclos, 288–99.

The reputable standing of religion and the improvement of the material and moral condition of the rural clergy, which until the middle of the century stood on the sidelines of Christian intellectual life, soon had its effects on the number of priests. This increase was also affected by the Falloux Law. The number of ordinations in France climbed by more than a third,[4] and the total number of priests rose from 46,969 in 1853 to 56,295 in 1869. The increase enabled the bishops to fill numerous vicariates, to raise the number of clerics in public service from 1,541 to 2,467, and to establish 1,600 new parishes. This made the Second Empire appear as the "high point between a period of moderate development during the July Monarchy and a period of hastening decline under the Third Republic" (Pouthas).

The training of the clergy, however, remained deficient. In spite of the efforts of a few discerning bishops—Cardinal de Bonald in Lyon, Dupanloup in Orléans, and Lavigerie and Foulon in Nancy—seminary instruction, imparted by insufficiently educated teachers, hardly rose above the level of a catechism taught in Latin. The priests trained in them were virtuous,[5] but more inclined to minister to the "converted" than to make contact with the increasingly indifferent populace or to counter the prejudices of upwardly mobile people. It is not surprising, therefore, that the clergy—with the exception of a numerically limited elite—regarded Louis Veuillot as their model. With absolutely uncritical zeal they followed the directions of *L'Univers,* a paper which fed the clergy's ultramontane enthusiasm and its mistrust of the "modern world."

If the majority of the lower clergy after the 1850s became ultramontane, they did so primarily in the hope of gaining in the Roman Curia a counterweight to the authoritarian stance of the bishops. While the majority of the bishops did not openly agree with Cardinal de Bonnechose, who compared himself to a general in charge of a regiment, they nevertheless displayed a decided bent for the centralization of diocesan administrations. They strengthened controls, transferred personnel without consideration of their personal desires, put out detailed regulations on Church discipline and pastoral work, and left little initiative to their priests. This systematic and dutiful activity[6] resulted from their wish to guide their dioceses in the best interest of religion, but in most cases their efforts regrettably were not matched by pastoral sensitivity. On the whole, the upper clergy was extremely colorless and—with a few exceptions, such as Dupanloup or Freppel—not at all the belligerent episcopate depicted by the anticlerical press. Instead of thoroughly rethinking the methods of the apostolate, the bishops were satisfied with the institutionalization of those methods which had proved effective during the first half of the century. Thus, disregarding the migration of people resulting from the industrialization, positions in the countryside were increased while there was a crying need for additional parishes in the burgeoning cities.[7]

---

[4] This favorable development was not universal, however, and in the center of the countries concerns were being raised over the decline of applications.

[5] Only a small elite, which was at the same time a social elite, attended the French Seminary opened in Rome in 1853 (see Y. -M. Hilaire in *ArchSR* 23 [1967], 135–40) or the seminary of Saint Sulpice in Paris, whose standards by no means equalled those of clerical training in Germany, but which was clearly above those of the provincial seminaries (details in A. Castellani, *Il beato Leonardo Murialdo,* I [Rome 1966], 767–806).

The work of the bishops and the clergy was much facilitated by the assistance of the orders. For them the Second Empire was a time of growth; this was especially true for the female congregations, which were favored by the law of 31 January 1852. Between 1851 and 1861 the number of nuns increased from 34,208 to 89,243. During the same period, membership in the male orders rose from 3,000 to 17,656.

The rapid growth of orders and congregations provided the Church with the necessary manpower for reaching two goals. These were entry into public education and free education. The Church was not satisfied with the exercise of supervision of the teachers by the pastors; the practice was made possible by the Falloux Law, but gave rise to frequent friction. The Church wanted to obtain from communal councils, which were often kindly disposed toward the Church, permission to entrust public schools to the supervision by members of orders. Simultaneously, advantage was taken of a favorable tax law facilitating gifts of money and property to increase the number of Catholic schools and colleges. By preferentially admitting students from socially prominent families they attracted the attention of the middle class and contributed to a change in its attitude. Between 1850 and 1875 the number of children educated by teachers of orders rose from 953,000 to 2,168,000, while the number of students in the lay schools rose only from 2,309,000 to 2,649,000.

---

[6] The best-known case is that of Dupanloup in Orléans, thanks to the researches of Madame Marcilhacy. But he was not alone. On the French episcopate around 1870, see the well-documented description by J. Gadille, op. cit. I, 15–45.

[7] Two typical cases: Paris, where in 1861 there was one priest for 2,498 inhabitants of the parishes in the center, and one priest for 4,955 inhabitants in the parishes of the suburbs, inhabited by the common people (see Y. Daniel, *L'équipement paroissial d'un diocèse urbain, Paris 1802–1956* [Paris 1957]); Lille, where in spite of the population explosion only one church was built before 1870 and after 1854 in some parishes there were more than four thousand people for one priest (see P. Pierrard, op. cit., 372–78).

The dubious character of this achievement was clearly recognized by A. Latreille: "The kind disposition of the government of Napoleon III to congregations and their schools must be regarded as the most significant fact of the history of French Catholicism between 1830 and 1880. It provided the Church with a large degree of satisfaction and possibilities of influence which it had been denied ever since the Revolution. But more than anything else it contributed to the growing distrust of the Church." This distrust became militant especially after 1870, but even during the Second Empire the desire to stop the progress of the Church grew stronger among those who suspiciously watched the influence of the "clericals" (the expression was coined during this period). After a few years, during which public education in view of the republican sympathies of the public teachers consciously had been neglected, Rouland undertook his reorganization in order to fashion public schools into a viable competitor for the schools maintained by the congregations. In spite of repeated protests by the episcopate, Victor Duruy after 1863 with varying success obstructed the development of free Catholic education and freed public schools from the influence of the Church.[8] His ministerial policy found a ready echo as the success of the *Ligue française pour l'enseignement public* attested. This organization was founded by Jean Macé in 1866 and by 1870 counted one thousand eight hundred members.

Although the government was not willing to allow the Church to drive it out of charitable work, it nevertheless pointedly requested the Catholics to participate in this social work. Thus, in addition to poorhouses and hospitals, Catholic facilities of all kinds were established. There were welfare associations and works for poor sick people; mutual help associations, especially in southern France; youth homes and other organizations devoted to young laborers, although their growth was a slow one (in 1866 there were only 165 homes in all of France). The initiators of these enterprises generally were religious congregations (some of them founded expressly for this purpose), laymen from the rural nobility, and wealthy people from the middle class. Many of them were branches of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, whose legitimist orientation on the part of some of its leaders in 1861 occasioned sensational interference by the Ministry of the Interior, or of the *Société d'économie charitable.* The latter, reorganized in 1855, had as its chief sponsor Vicomte Armand de Melun, whose name—in addition to that of Monsignor de Segur—was closely connected with the French Caritas movement until his death in 1877.

---

[8] J. Rohr, op. cit., 163–75. Although the opposite has been asserted, Duruy, anticlerical but not sectarian-oriented, can hardly be regarded as the precursor of the defenders of lay schools in the Third Republic.

In addition to these charitable actions there were many others which, while very active, were too fragmented to achieve a national stature. There were apologetic works, directed against the "bad press"; missionary works which enjoyed particular popularity; and works of piety (eternal adoration, nocturnal adoration, priest associations, congregations of the Most Blessed Virgin, etc.), all of which showed that beyond the social utility of religion an elite of the French middle class rediscovered genuine Christian values. Finally, one event in the France of the Second Empire must not be forgotten: Lourdes in a very short time "became not only the most visited object of pilgrimage in a country already rich in historical holy places, but the world center of prayer and active charity" (Latreille).

This apparently magnificent condition was hardly affected by the fall of the Empire in 1870. The seizure of power by the republicans, almost without exception anticlerical and Freemasons, initially worried the Catholics, but the excesses of the Commune led, just as in 1848, to a shift to the right. The National Assembly, consisting largely of conservative rural nobility and upper bourgeoisie, was especially friendly to the Church. The government of the "Moral Order," whose leaders were friends of Monsignor Dupanloup, tried, much to the dismay of the paper *L'Univers,* to present Catholicism more as a useful social force than as the official state religion. But it did not at all object to the desire of the Church to infuse the state's institutions with a Christian spirit. Disregarding the republican concept of secularization, it strengthened the influence of the clergy in the army, public welfare, and education. Dupanloup succeeded in thwarting the plans of Jules Simon, which were to be the first steps toward the laicization of elementary education. Dupanloup in 1875 obtained freedom of higher education; soon several Catholic universities opened their doors, even though this legislation only barely passed the National Assembly.

The Church was able to exploit its legal advantages because it could call on more personnel. There was also a dark cloud, however: except for a few secluded areas like the Jura or the southern part of the central region of the country, the number of seminarists was declining. Inasmuch as the mortality rate of the clergy was still low and the number of active priests increasing, the threat was not yet perceived. In 1870 the ratio of priests to flock was 1:730, by 1876 it was 1:654. Membership in the orders grew so much that M. Pouthas regarded the growth of the congregations as a characteristic of the Church during the beginning years of the republic. In 1877 there were 30,287 male and 127,753 female members of orders, a three-fold increase from the year 1789. It enabled France to provide by far the strongest contingent of missionaries for the evangelization of the pagan peoples.

This large number of people alone, coming from all walks of life and signifying more than mere social climbing, together with the continued rise in piety and good works on the regional and national level, would be sufficient proof that the impression of a powerful Church was anything but a facade and that it still commanded large reserves of Christian strength. Actually, the religious awakening in 1870 extended far beyond this elite. Many people viewed the military defeats and the tragic convulsions of the Commune as divine punishment or at least as the logical consequence of the spread of "socialistic atheism" and the frivolity displayed by the Second Empire. The religious awakening found expression in more faithful attendance at Sunday services, greater morality, and in the growth of popular literature devoted to the adoration of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, Mary, and the saints. More spectacularly it was displayed in large pilgramages of faith and repentence centered on the shrines of Lourdes, La Salette, and Paray-le-Monial. Under the direction of the dynamic Assumptionists thousands of pilgrims visited them under the motto *Gallia poenitens et devota.* It was through the efforts of the Assumptionists that Catholicism in these years again became popular and developed into the religion of the people. They took a long-range approach, addressed a broad public, moved the masses, and talked to them in plain language. After an interval of fifty years they resumed the work of the missions of the period of restoration. The visible crowning of their efforts was the construction of the cathedral of Sacre-Cœur on Montmartre.

The Ambivalence of the Actual Religious Situation

The just-described favorable conditions should not obscure the truth, however. There was no doubt that the successes of the established Church—accompanied especially on the local level by the clergy's will to dominate—were matched by a religious intensification. It found expression in pious fraternities, in the rise of the veneration of Mary and the Eucharist, in the growth of the comtemplative and missionary orders, and in the great number of outstanding Christians and saints. But at the very moment when contemporaries were able to record these achievements, the signs of that religious crisis began to appear which was to emerge fully during the final quarter of the century. The seemingly brilliant condition of the institutions on one hand and the effects of a small spiritual elite on the other tended too often to conceal the actual condition of the great mass of the people, which, after all, was the important ingredient of the Church. Thanks to the sociological and historical research inspired by G. Le Bras and conducted during the recent past on the regional level, we have a detailed, if incomplete, image of the situation.

First of all, geographical differences must be considered. A large part of the west, the central region, the Alps, and the Jura, remained closely tied to their faith until the end of the century. Religion was practiced there by many men, the supply of recruits for the priesthood, missions, and orders was abundant, and the new types of piety were received well, especially in the rural areas. The populace, increasingly well integrated with a growing number of priests and a network of Catholic schools, resisted fairly well the blandishments of a society which tried to laicize it.

In other areas, even under the July Monarchy in the process of becoming alienated from Christianity, considerable efforts were undertaken to win them back. The efforts were guided by active bishops such as Dupanloup in Orléans, Dupont des Loges in Metz, and Parisis in Arras. These prelates were actively assisted by people specially trained for preaching in the parish missions. This intensive missionary activity during the Second Empire has been inadequately studied. These efforts, spurred on by the administration and high notables, in some cases resulted in a considerable revival of religious practices, at least before 1870. But in essence they touched only the middle class of small towns and the stale parishes in devout areas. Elsewhere, the differences between the sexes became more pronounced. The women tended to take their religion seriously, while the men largely stayed away from Sunday and Easter services.[9]

The situation was worse in the area of Paris, in the departments of the Charente, in the southeast, and in Provence, where religious practice, weak even before 1848, sank to a level below the present one, in spite of hundreds of missions which had been conducted there. In some parishes not a single soul attended Easter services; the religious practice of the men was close to zero; about half of all marriages took place in front of a civil registrar only; many boys no longer went to their first Communion; and processions were molested. As the years went by, such conditions became more widespread.

Seen as a whole, a considerable part of France fell prey to religious indifference, notwithstanding the efforts of the regular and secular clergy, an indifference generally accompanied by a relentless hostility to the Church. In the countryside the hostility was strengthened by the growth of the means of communication and the more intimate contacts with the new urban civilization which they facilitated. There was also the systematic drumfire of the anticlerical newspapers, only feebly countered by the Catholic press, which was not sufficiently popular. It was further encouraged by the frequent conflicts erupting in the villages over the establishment of Catholic schools and the expensive building of parsonages. Frequently a role was played by the clergy's lust for power and money, their identification with the legitimist landlords,[10] and their rigoristic and negative habit of preaching morality.

---

[9] Thus, in the diocese of Orléans the receipt of the Easter sacrament by men rose from 3.8 percent in 1852 to 5.8 percent in 1868. Frequent Communion by women, on the other hand, was habit with 28 percent of them (detailed information in C. Marcilhacy, op. cit., [II], 239–339).

The world of artisans and laborers, still a minority but visibly growing, adhered to a kind of Christian atavism; in most areas of the country their alienation from the Catholic Church grew more pronounced.[11] Separated from their rural roots, the workers easily succumbed to the immorality and the anticlericalism of the burgeoning cities.[12] Generally, the clergy neglected them. Scheduling of services and ecclesiastical customs were not fitted to the working conditions of the industrial proletariat. The proletariat was being pushed to the sidelines of the Church, and many priests of rural background were discouraged by the difficulties of the workers' environment. The active religious participation of these people, aside from a small female minority, was limited to the chief events in life. The *Oeuvre des cercles* in which Albert de Mun and Abbé Maignen wanted to gather the workers after 1870 lasted only briefly, as they failed to reach the real laborers. Doubtlessly, the workers were also repulsed by the paternalistic attitude of the middle class to social problems. While the mass of the workers had not yet articulated its discontent, the militants accused the Church of hindering the social rise of the working class. Priests and bishops, in their own view tied to a divinely inspired static and hierarchical concept of society, condemned the attempts to improve the lot of the working class as "antisocial" and only emphasized in their sermons that earthly miseries would be rewarded in the next world. The outbreaks of violence directed against the clergy after the fall of the Empire in Paris, Lyon, and along the Mediterranean coast, all in sharp contrast to their indulgent behavior in 1848, was an indication of the rapid change in the attitude of the workers. The proletariat increasingly developed its own class consciousness, felt alienated socially and psychologically from traditional Catholicism, and began to regard the priests as enemies in the battle against the conservative forces. Only a few areas were spared this development. In Lille and other municipalities in the east small but strong Christian workers' associations were formed, and around the turn of the century their membership constituted the first Christian labor unions.

---

[10] It must be noted that most Catholic-influenced regional newspapers (there were about fifty) were legitimist.

[11] Without, however, turning to Protestantism, which appeared to them as a "religion of aristocrats," insufficiently affable, and too sober (see G. Duveau, "Protestantisme et prolétariat en France au milieu du XIX^e siècle", *RHPhR* 31 [1951], 417–28).

[12] See G. Duveau, *Histoire du peuple français* IV (Paris 1953), 72–141.

While the Church lost ground among the mass of the people, especially in the cities, it could console itself with gains among the middle class. But even here the situation was not entirely satisfactory. To be sure, a large part of the middle class, especially in the provinces in which the population remained faithful to the Church, returned to a genuine Christianity, generously gave of its time and money for Catholic works, and provided young people for the orders. But many others returned to the Church only because romanticism had made cathedrals fashionable and because, after the great fear of 1848, they saw in the Church a guarantee for social stability. Their attitude was more clerical than believing and contributed to exposing the Church in the eyes of the people, the more so as its morality, castigated by Veuillot in his *Odeurs de Paris,* left much to be desired.

On the other hand, religion, especially in the provinces, became an external sign of respectability, even though the professions largely continued to remain anticlerical. In fact, especially among the left, which was angered by the agreement between Church and the Bonapartist government, anticlericalism was on the rise. Among the important reasons for this attitude were the anachronistic character of the Papal State, stoutly defended by the clergy, and the publication of the *Syllabus,* which was seen as the manifesto of the unreasonable demands of traditionalistic Catholic circles on society. Even more serious was the fact that the intellectuals—writers, scientists, historians, and philosophers—influenced by rationalism and positivism, which had taken the place of romanticism, became alienated not only from the Church but from the Christian faith and religion itself. The success of the book *La vie de Jésus* by Renan (1863) was symptomatic. Especially devastating around 1870 was the spiritualism of Jules Simon.

At about the same time the spiritualistic Freemasons adopted that hostility to religion which was to become characteristic for them. The lodges, increasing from 244 to 392 between 1857 and 1870, became the active centers of the idea of laicization. Based on the progress of science, it was not only to free society from the clerical yoke but also to liberate the human spirit from the fetters of dogma and the false belief in supernaturalism.[13]

The men responsible for the fate of the Church in France began to be concerned, but they failed to grasp the true situation and, especially after 1870, their views lagged far behind the developments in their country. Most of them believed that all difficulties would cease if only the government gave stronger support to the Church. This was the view of all those who agreed with Monsignor Pie and Louis Veuillot; basically, however, Monsignor Dupanloup and other bishops did not see things differently.[14] Even the small group of liberal Catholics around the *Correspondant,* which was aware of the illusory character of state protection, was unable to go beyond considerations of principles. They did not initiate actions comparable to those started at the same time by German and Belgian Catholics.

---

[13] An example: A. Bouton, *Les luttes ardentes des francs-maçons manceaux pour l'établissement de la République* (Le Mans 1966).

The deficiencies of French Catholicism were also evident in its intellectual life. Catholicism seemed to be incapable of countering lack of faith in its very own bailiwick of philosophy and the history of Christian origins. Apologetic literature as well as episcopal pastoral letters and sermons were characteristic of a vague and romantic phraseology, marked by the total absence of introducing the clergy to a critical spirit and the new methods of scholarship. The bishops refused to acknowledge the necessity of such acquaintance, and with few exceptions they feared that by attending universities no longer under the control of the Church the priests would absorb dangerous ideas.[15] The negotiations for the reestablishment of theological departments at universities, on the other hand, were stalled because of the distrust by the Holy See of the continuation of Gallican tendencies in France. A. J. Alphonse Gratry, conscious of the necessity to confront philosophical and religious problems, tried to give body to an idea held before him by Lamennais and Bautain. He wanted to select a few qualified priests for a kind of "apologetic workshop," but the Oratory of France, reestablished in 1852, was diverted from its original aim by the more practical enterprises of its superior. Only with the founding of Catholic universities, made possible by the law of 1875, was a serious attempt made fifty years later to remove the intellectual deficiencies of the Church.

A further weakness of the Church in France during the Second Empire was the increasingly bitter disagreements of Catholics in various areas. The opponents of an excessive Roman centralization, clinging to the traditional habits of the old French clergy, were worried about the aggressive stance of the defenders of neo-ultramontanism. Many who earlier had favored the ultramontane activity of Lamennais because they wanted to see the Church liberated from the heavy hand of the state, now moved closer to Gallicanism again because they feared that the papacy was developing into a despotic authoritarianism. Liberal

---

[14] See the astute observations by J. Gadille, op. cit., 81–89.

[15] Monsignor Meignan and Monsignor Lavigerie especially.

Catholics, convinced that the Church could regain the respect of the new leading elements through being more open-minded, and intransigent Catholics, seeing in modern liberties the reason for the decline of religious practice, accused one another of being responsible for the worsening of the situation, but failed to seek concrete ways to alleviate it. Liberal Catholics condemned the ultramontane integralism, but could not agree among themselves. While the friends of Monsignor Dupanloup and Montalembert missed no opportunity to present themselves as unreconcilable opponents of the government of Napoleon III and defenders of the secular power of the Pope, many Catholics replied to them that the rights of modern man, still totally unacknowledged by the archaic institutions of the Papal State, were adequately guaranteed by the imperial constitution. Consumed by such internal disputes, the majority did not realize that not only the future of Catholicism but of religion itself was at stake and that it was most urgent to close ranks in intellectual and social areas, where delay had worsened the situation since the time of Monsignor Affre.

The convulsions of 1870–71, far from opening the eyes of the responsible people, contributed to a further intensification of opposing views. The most agitated element of French Catholicism, confirmed in its authority by the defeat of the minority at the Vatican Council, wanted to connect the movement of religious revival with a two-fold restoration from which it expected the secular and spiritual salvation of France. These were the elevation of the Count of Chambord to the throne of the Bourbons and the installation of Pius IX in his restored Papal State. In an atmosphere of providentialistic historical interpretation and of an illuminism which reads from the calamities of today the triumphs of tomorrow, and seeing both positions threatened by the same enemy, they believed in miracles with a childlike confidence which took the place of political awareness.

The tactless manner in which this restoration was promoted, less so by the bishops, who remained relatively reserved,[16] than by the lower clergy and militant Catholics, quickly mobilized the moderates. They saw in the "most Christian King" a herald of theocracy and feared that France would be driven to "make war for the Pope." The friends of Dupanloup and Duke de Broglie recognized the danger and disavowed the anachronistic goals of the radicals. But their moderate approach, diametrically opposed to that of the ultras, angered many adherents of "political supernaturalism," who condemned such a policy as spinelessness. The dispute between liberal Catholics and intransigent Catholics grew even more bitter than it had been under the Empire.

---

[16] And not only on the liberal Catholic side. J. Gadille, op. cit., has clearly demonstrated that Monsignor Pie, for example, was a far less intransigent legitimist than presented by his first biographer, Baunard.

While the clergy in this fashion involved itself in noisy and fruitless controversies over the ideal political form of government, it continued to ignore the real problems of the hour: the training of modern-minded laymen, capable of effectively serving the Church in a society undergoing rapid secularization;[17] the definition of its position with respect to the material and intellectual progress which the Church, to the great dismay of the multiplying admirers of scientific discoveries, was disregarding; and finally, and possibly foremost, the problem of social development. As A. Latreille has pointedly noted, most of the Catholics and the leaders of the Church reacted to the rise of anticlericalism "like moralists and not as sociologists." They were convinced that the anticlerical movement had not come about spontaneously. They believed that it had been thought up by a radical intelligentsia and was not a reflection of the actual feelings of the French people, whom they saw as still strongly tied to their religious customs. They concluded that the intellectual crisis could be ended through censorship of the press. They failed to see the close connection which after 1870 in a kind of "messianic hope for the egalitarian, fraternal, and laicistic republic"[18] developed between the militant, radical, and anticlerical wing of the republican middle class and the progressive elements of the urban and agrarian working class. The workers actually remembered only with hate the brutal suppression of the Commune, for which they also held the clergy responsible, as it was sociologically related to the conservative classes. The peasants suspected the clergy of wishing to reintroduce the tithe of the Old Regime together with the restoration of the monarchy. The middle class, finally, was more than ever convinced of the incompatibility of modern society with a Church which looked upon the *Syllabus* as its ideal. The anticlerical offensive started in 1878 with the seizure of power by the radicals thus encountered a well-prepared soil.

---

[17] E. d'Alzon was one of the few who concerned themselves with it before 1870, but he did not arrive at a precise formulation (C. Molette, *L'Association catholique de la Jeunesse Française* [Paris 1968], 12).

[18] *HistCathFr*, 391; f. 363.

CHAPTER 8

The States of the German Confederation and Switzerland, 1848–70

The years 1848–49 showed that the partial alliance between Catholics and liberals rested on a weak foundation. Political and philosophical liberalism were difficult to separate. The same liberals who were engaged in the struggle for greater freedom, which was also of benefit for the Church, in their majority also asked for separation of Church and state, civil marriage, and public schools. Thus, they fought against positions regarded by the Church as unalterable. Furthermore, economic liberalism hurt the lower middle class and the peasants who were still loosely tied to the Church. These opposing views and the reliance of Catholics on the Roman Curia with its reactionary concepts had grave consequences after 1848. While the leaders of German Catholicism were eager to preserve the freedoms obtained in 1848 and extend them to all German states, they also turned away from liberalism and democracy and toward patriarchal conservatism. The consequence of the failed German revolution for the Church was that once again it was compelled to negotiate with the restored states and to take account of their reactionary policies during the subsequent decades.

Following the Roman example, the German bishops and leaders of the lay movement became convinced that only a monolithic Church would be able to counteract the prevailing liberalism, rationalism, and atheism. They also therefore tried to erect barriers against the intrusion of new ideas; while these barriers succeeded in preserving much of ecclesiastical substance, they also promoted the very isolation desired by opponents. The Church could think of nothing better to counter the turn to political liberalism, experienced by most of the German states toward the end of the 1850s, than an authoritarian defense. Catholics no longer participated in Germany's intellectual development, which was increasingly influenced by the technical and historical sciences.[1] Anyone who adopted the new historical view of the world came in conflict with the scholastic-juridical concepts promoted by Rome.

The leadership of the Catholic movement more and more was taken over by the circles in Mainz and Munich which most thoroughly turned away from liberalism and most effectively propagated their departure in Heinrich's and Moufang's *Katholik* and Jörg's *Historisch-politische Blätter*. Only the Rhenish Catholics remained relatively close to political liberalism; they had ties with progressive western Europe and, as a minority in the Prussian state, could expect benefits from the application of liberal principles.

In the national question as well, of tremendous concern to a large number of people, an unbridgeable rift developed in the 1850s between liberals and Catholics. The majority of the liberals were predominantly in favor of a Little German-Prussian solution. The liberals hailed the Italian unification (1859–60), whose fundamental principles were their own, regardless of the fact that implicitly it was directed against Austria and the Papal State. It encouraged their own activity,[2] and they denied the inherent validity of the Catholic protests against the Pope's loss of territory. The majority of the Catholics continued to cling to the concept of a Greater Germany, even though hopes for unification under Austria's auspices were increasingly improbable.

---

[1] The only notable exceptions were Adalbert Stifter in literature and Anton Bruckner in music. See L. Nowak in *Große Österreicher* XI (1957), 144–53; H. Cysarz in *Große Österreicher* XV (1963), 48–61.

In Prussia, thanks to the constitutions of 1848 and 1850, the Church gained a new stature and new life, which affected other German states. Geissel and Diepenbrock, the most important persons in the Prussian episcopate, were created cardinals in 1850, but Diepenbrock was able to devote himself to the solution of old and new problems only for a few more years, as he died in 1853. After that date, leadership was completely in the hands of Geissel, dynamic organizer and church politician. He tried to preserve and enlarge the legal position obtained in 1848, to intensify religious life with the aid of ultramontane forms of piety, and to coordinate pastoral care and fresh activities of laymen. He also promoted uniformity of action by the episcopate and was able to hold a provincial council in 1860 in which most of the bishops of northern and western Germany participated. Through the assistance of the bishops the association movement was able to spread, and religious orders and congregations returned, thus permitting the establishment of hospitals, orphan homes, and schools. Sacramental and rosary prayers, pilgrimages and processions were reintroduced, and the dogma of 1854 encouraged the veneration of Mary.[3] The orders also enabled Geissel to revive the missions to the people, which had languished since the Enlightenment.[4] They deepened religious knowledge and interest in the Church among the lower classes. After initial distrust, the missionaries were assisted by some state officials, as the preachers also defended conservative authority and spoke against revolution, socialism, and democracy. But the missionaries did not really have any helpful alternative suggestions for the workers mired in the proletariat. In general, the social efforts of Geissel and his people did not go beyond the traditional limits of charity; this was only done by Ketteler, who at first agreed with much of Geissel's activity and eventually grew into his position of leadership.

---

[2] See E. Portner, *Die Einigung Italiens im Urteil liberaler deutscher Zeitgenossen* (Bonn 1959).

[3] G. Müller, "Die Immaculata Conceptio im Urteil der mitteleuropäischen Bischöfe," *KuD* 14 (1968), 46–70.

[4] E. Gatz, *Rheinische Volksmission im 19. Jahrhundert, dargestellt am Beispiel des Erzbistums Köln* . . . (Düsseldorf 1963).

The reactionary ministry of Manteuffel (1850–58) applied specifically Prussian and therefore often anti-Catholic traditions of state, and the largely Lutheran state bureaucracy continued to prevent the full implementation of constitutional parity. In 1852, Friedrich von Raumer, minister of religion, decreed a ban on studying at the Collegium Germanicum in Rome, established state supervision of foreign clerics and of parish missions, and confined the latter to purely Catholic areas. The decrees were primarily directed against the Jesuits, as a result of whose activities a reduction in the number of Lutherans was feared. Geissel and Bishop Müller of Münster protested immediately. In addition, a political opposition came into being, leading in 1852 to the formation of a "Catholic Faction" with sixty-two representatives in the Prussian Diet. Under this dual pressure the government moderated Raumer's decrees in a way acceptable to the Catholics. Subsequently the Catholic Section in the Ministry of Religion, headed by Matthias Aulike, successfully worked toward a better understanding between state and religious interests, but the increasing gravity of the differences between Catholicism and liberalism as well as between the two denominations began to hinder its work in the 1860s. The government tried to interfere in the election of the Cologne archbishop after Geissel's death (1864), when it was called upon for help by the liberal chapter minority against the ultramontane chapter majority, but ultimately it accepted Bishop Melchers of Osnabrück, who had the approbation of the Roman Curia.[5] In Gnesen-Posen as well, Rome was able to place its candidate, Count Ledóchowski.[6]

The leaders of the Catholic Faction[7] (called "Faction of the Center" after the assignment of seats in the Diet), August and Peter

---

[5] Paulus Melchers (1813–95), in 1857 bishop of Osnabrück, in 1866 archbishop of Cologne, as such leader of the Prussian episcopate during the *Kulturkampf*. He was imprisoned in 1874 and after 1875 guided his diocese from exile. In the interest of religious peace, he resigned in 1885 and became a Curia cardinal (biography by H. M. Ludwigs [Cologne 1909]; A. Franzen, *LThK* VII, 251).

[6] Mieczyslaw Halka Count von Ledóchowski (1822–1902), in the papal diplomatic service after studies at Warsaw and Rome, in 1861 nuncio at Brussels in 1866 archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, in 1875 cardinal. Ledochówski was arrested in 1874, expelled from Prussia in 1876, after which he lived in Rome and resigned his position in 1886. After 1885 he was secretary of the briefs, in 1892 he became prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (biography by W. Klimkiewicz, 2 vols. [Cracow 1938–39]; G. Maron in *RGG* IV, 261f.; B. Stasiewski in *LThK* VI, 874).

[7] Bachem (*Zentrumspartei* II, 96–220) is basic for the history of the faction and its influence on the formation of other Catholic parties (renewed founding of the Center Party in 1870). See also H. Donner, *Die katholische Fraktion in Preußen 1852–58* (diss., Leipzig 1909); L. Bergsträßer, *Geschichte der politischen Parteien in Deutschland* (Munich 1960), 110f.

Reichensperger[8] and Hermann von Mallinckrodt,[9] were interested in developing a general political party. The immediate goal of the faction was the defense of ecclesiastical freedom, and it was only sensible to argue for the observance of the consitution as a whole. This led to the splitting off of a number of noble representatives who began to support the Catholic-conservative movement propagated in Mainz and Munich. In its church policy and its Greater German attitude the Catholic Faction differed from the liberals, in its constitutionalism it differed from the conservatives. Together with the liberals it fought against the reactionary tendencies of the 1850s; in this connection it also favored equality for the Jews. But together with the conservatives it fought bitter battles after 1859 with the liberals against the introduction of civil marriage and for the preservation of the organic unity of Church and elementary schools. Its inability to formulate for all of its members a common position during the great Prussian constitutional conflict (1862–67), however, led to its demise. The decline of the Pius Associations and the resignation of many Catholics because of the political developments contributed considerably to its decline.

In Austria, Emperor Franz Joseph, steadfastly converting his restoration policy after 1850 to a neo-absolutism, in religious questions also remained on the path taken in 1848–49. He started negotiations for a concordat, headed on the part of the state by Josef Otmar von Rauscher, who had become archbishop of Vienna; the negotiator for the Curia was Viale-Prela. Franz Joseph and his representative regarded the Catholic Church as the unifying factor in holding together the multinational state, and they also wished to make of Austria the preeminent political power of Catholicism; for this reason the Emperor strongly desired a concordat at any price.[10] The Curia exploited this desire and successfully created a precedent for its negotiations with other states. The concordat was signed on 18 August 1855; it not only liquidated Josephinism and fulfilled justified ecclesiastical expectations, but it derived these from ultramontane principles.[11] Throughout, it reflected the militantly defensive antiliberalism of both contracting partners. Literally duplicating the Bavarian concordat of 1817, the Catholic Church in the entire monarchy was guaranteed all rights to which it was entitled in keeping with "the divine order and canonical statutes" (ARTICLE 1), laws conflicting with the concordat were repealed (ART. 35), and all religious issues not specifically treated by the concordat were to be settled according to the doctrines of the Church and its regulations as authorized by the Holy See (ART. 34). The Emperor assured the Church and its institutions of his special protection (ART. 16), and he retained his right of nomination to episcopal sees (ART. 19) and most of the cathedral canonships (ART. 22). The appointment of bishops was clearly designated as a papal privilege; the permission to correspond freely with Rome was justified with the jurisdictional primacy of the Pope by divine right. The Catholic Church retained considerable influence on the education system: In general, instruction in the schools was to coincide with Catholic doctrine, and elementary schools were placed under the control of the Catholic Church (ARTS. 5,7,8). The state agreed to the suppression of all books antagonistic to the Church (ART. 9), and marriages were subjected to canon law (ART. 10).

---

[8] Biographies by L. v. Pastor and F. Schmidt. See also E. Deuerlein in *StL* VI, 777f.

[9] Biography by O. Pfülf. See also E. Deuerlein in *StL* V, 519f.

[10] Against the objections of the Hungarian episcopate, which, under its primate Cardinal Scitowski, favored the continuation of Hungary's special religious status (Weinzierl-Fischer, *Konkordate,* 73f).

[11] Text: Weinzierl-Fischer, *Konkordate,* 250–58. Text of the concordat and pertinent documents: Walter, *Fontes,* 280–303; Mercati I, 821–44.

The legal monopoly of the Catholic Church engendered passionate opposition among liberals, Protestants, and Josephinist Catholics. Yet the Curia and the majority of the bishops believed that they had won a great victory. They failed to recognize that less would have been more and that this concordat could not but generate new and profound controversies.

Cardinal Rauscher, who in 1856 gathered the bishops of the monarchy in Vienna and subsequently guided the episcopate in authoritarian fashion, saw to it that the concordat was strictly implemented. Through it he wanted to preserve the Christian character of all public institutions. He was convinced that he was safeguarding ecclesiastical and state interests alike. But the cardinal and the like-minded minister for religion and education, Count Thun, were faced with growing difficulties. The ratification of the concordat also saw the beginning of the struggle for its repeal or changes in it, a struggle which was to burden domestic Austrian politics for the next fifteen years. When in the 1860s Austria started on a path of liberalization (October Patent of 1860, February Patent of 1861),[12] its leading politicians realized that the concordat had pushed the state into a dead-end street; but their attempts to ameliorate the marriage and education articles, ultimately supported partially even by Rauscher, met the obstinate and short-sighted resistance of the Curia.

The domestic and foreign policy defeats of the conservatives in 1866 intensified the controversies. Beust, the new chancellor, pointed to the concordat and its propagandistic exploitation by the liberals in Germany and Italy as one of the causes of Austrian defeat. As it was his intention to gain new respect and influence in German affairs through a liberal Austrian policy, he closely cooperated with the liberal parliamentary majority.[13] In the spring of 1868 denominational laws were passed which once again subjected marriage and education to the state and guaranteed the free choice of religion. The most important clauses of the concordat were thus liberally modified.[14]

---

[12] No calming of the waters in the battle over the concordat occurred as a result of the patents published on 1 September 1859 and 8 April 1861, granting autonomy to Austria's Protestant Churches (texts: Walter, *Fontes,* 303–22).

While the revolution and its results in the two major states of the German Confederation produced liberalization of the legal position of the Church, the other German states continued to adhere to the practice of state regulation. Maximilian II, who became King of Bavaria in 1848, was a confirmed Catholic, but he also regarded himself as the guardian of parity and tolerance.[15] He was determined to preserve the sovereign rights of the state, and disliked ultramontanism and its representative Reisach. He pursued moderate, liberal education and religious policies, but consulted advisers of different persuasions, among them C. A. von Abel, whose influence on the liberal-conservative ministry of von der Pfordten effected some concessions to the reactionaries. Only after Pfordten's resignation in 1859 was Bavaria's domestic policy guided by liberalism. King Ludwig II (after 1864) also was a liberal.

Archbishop Reisach attempted to satisfy the demands of the Würzburg bishops' conference in Bavaria. At a Bavarian bishops' conference in Freising (October 1850) a memorandum drafted by Reisach and Windischmann was passed, demanding the complete realization of the concordat and the repeal of the religious edict. Disregarding Döllinger's warnings—in spite of his differences with Reisach he still acted as adviser to the bishops—the conference also raised educational demands, such as participation in the filling of positions, which were unacceptable for a state pledged to parity.[16]

---

[13] See H. Potthoff, *Die deutsche Politik Beusts von seiner Berufung zum österreichischen Außenminister 1866 bis zum Ausbruch des deutsch-französischen Krieges 1870–71* (Bonn 1968).

[14] The controversies over these laws are treated in connection with the tensions of the late 1860s which constituted the beginnings of the *Kulturkampf.*

[15] H. Rall, "König Max II. von Bayern und die katholische Kirche," *HJ* 74 (1955), 739–47; H. Rall, "Ausblicke auf Weltentwicklung und Religion im Kreise Max' II. und Ludwigs II.," *ZBLG* 27 (1964), 488–522.

[16] Döllinger was also firmly opposed to Windischmann's suggestion to establish episcopal theological teaching institutes because it was directed against the departments of religion at universities (see Friedrich, *Döllinger* III, 90–99).

The Freising demands caused a protracted debate. The government realized that the old system could not be maintained as it was and therefore looked for an acceptable compromise. The royal decisions[17] of 8 April 1852 and 9 October 1854 met the bishops' demands with respect to priest seminaries and control of schools. In return for the concessions the government asked for the removal of Reisach, a request which Pius IX eventually granted. In December 1855 the archbishop became a Curia cardinal and in his new position had great influence on German religious affairs; his successor in Munich was the Benedictine Gregor von Scherr.

The Bavarian bishops met again in 1864 for the purpose of weighing defensive measures against the government's liberal religious and education policies; even in Catholic Bavaria, the Church had become rather isolated because of its undifferentiated resistance to the prevailing thought of the time. Also in 1864 it came to a conflict with the government leading to the closing of the seminary at Speyer which Bishop Weis had established.[18]

Under the chairmanship of Freiburg Archbishop von Vicari, a conference of the Upper Rhenish bishops in March 1851 sent a memorandum to the government which was based on the Würzburg demands. It was published and seen as a fundamental attack against the concept of a state church. The government did not respond until two years later, when it offered a number of concessions, which, however, a further joint declaration of the bishops characterized as inadequate.

Inasmuch as the governments refused to give in or to accept the conference of bishops as a negotiating partner, the five bishops were compelled in the succeeding years to negotiate individually. In electoral Hesse, Bishop Kött of Fulda achieved a temporary agreement. In Hesse-Darmstadt, Ketteler, bishop of Mainz since 1850, had considerable success.[19] He displayed an unusual degree of assurance, but also supported the government in its Greater German conservative policies and its battle against liberalism and democracy. Their mutual aversion to these movements produced an alliance, prudently employed by the bishop and his advisers Lennig, Heinrich, and Moufang[20] in the service of religious freedom. In 1851 Ketteler opened a theological studies institute at the Mainz seminary, thereby removing the reason for the existence of the state's institute at Gießen. The Dalwigk government lodged only a verbal protest. In 1854 Ketteler and Dalwigk signed an agreement which took account of the interests of both sides and kept religious peace for longer than a decade.[21] The Curia in the meantime had begun to insist on the Pope's exclusive right to negotiate concordats and was irritated by the bishop's unauthorized action and his failure to make maximum demands; Ketteler succeeded in obtaining Rome's consent only after further concessions by the government. Such success was denied to the Rottenburg Bishop Lipp, who with the aid of his vicar general Oehler in 1854 negotiated a similar agreement with the government of Württemberg; the Curia insisted on opening negotiations for a concordat, which after 1856 took place in Rome.

---

[17] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 233–39. See *AkathKR* VIII, 403ff., 430ff.

[18] L. Stamer, "Der Streit zwischen Staat und Kirche um den Ausbau des Speyrer Priesterseminars 1864," *AMrhKG* 16 (1964), 249–80.

[19] The majority of the Mainz cathedral chapter in 1849 elected the moderate liberal Gießen theology professor Leopold Schmid; he was sharply opposed by Lennig and his friends and upon their instigation was not confirmed by Pius IX. The Hessian government, eager to avoid conflicts, gave in, and under pressure from Rome and Darmstadt the chapter eventually agreed on a list of three non-Hessian clerics. One of them, as a result of Lennig's intervention, was Ketteler.

The development in Baden was much more discordant. To attempts by Vicari to exercise his episcopal rights without reference to the demands of the government, the government reacted with repression. Temporarily it placed the archbishop under house arrest and punished clerics who obeyed him. Vicari responded by excommunicating several members of the High Consistory. In order to settle the resulting conflict, which was widely publicized, the Baden government in 1854 began negotiations for a concordat.

In the negotiations with the governments of Württemberg, Baden, and Nassau,[22] the Holy See, represented by Cardinal Reisach, was able to obtain some central objectives analogous to the concordat with Austria. This, however, went too far again: The concordats with Württemberg[23] (1857) and Baden[24] (1859) required parliamentary consent, which was obtained in neither state. After heated debates, the Baden concordat was rejected in 1860, that with Württemberg in 1861.

---

[20] Johann Baptist Heinrich (1816–91), in 1851 professor of dogmatics at the new Mainz seminary, in 1855 member of the cathedral chapter, in 1867 cathedral dean, in 1869 vicar general, from 1850–90, together with Moufang, editor of *Katholik* (see, in addition to the biography by Pastor, H. Lenhart in *AMrhKG* 5 [1953], 325–59; L. Lenhart in *LThK* V, 204).—Franz Christoph Moufang (1817–90), in 1851 regent and professor of moral philosophy and pastoral care at the Mainz seminary, after 1854 also member of the cathedral chapter, after Ketteler's death administrator of the bishopric from 1877 to 1886, and representative in the Hessian parliament after 1863 (see, in addition to the biography by Götten, K. Forschner, *Hessische Biographien* I [1918], 241–47; L. Lenhart in *Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz* 5 [1950], 400–441; L. Lenhart in *AMrhKG* 19 [1967], 157–91; G. May in *AMrhKG* 22 [1970], 227–36).

[21] Text: Walter, *Fontes,* 359–63. See Vigener, *Ketteler,* 258–61.

[22] The Nassau government, after 1857 again negotiating with the Limburg Bishop Blum, on 25 May 1861 published a provisional regulation for religious affairs (text: Brück, *Oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz,* 550). Only the annexation of the duchy by Prussia (1866) produced a brief period of religious freedom (see Höhler, *Geschichte des Bistums Limburg*).

Subsequently, both states regulated the affairs between Church and state unilaterally in keeping with their prevailing liberal orientation. The legislation of 9 October 1860 in Baden[25] for the first time reflected liberal goals in a German state; the compromise clauses of the National Constitution of Frankfurt, which served as a model, were interpreted to the disadvantage of the Church. The Churches were granted a position as public corporations and the autonomous regulation of their affairs (ARTICLES 1,7), but otherwise they remained subject to the laws of the state; ecclesiastic regulations which affected "the rights of citizens" required the consent of the states (ARTS. 13,15). Evidence of a "general academic education" became a prerequisite for the holding of a Church office; the government was entitled to reject applicants of whom it did not approve for "civic or political reasons" (ART. 9). Property of the Church was administered jointly by the Church and state agencies (ART. 10), the establishment of religious orders was subject to state approval (ART. 11). The entire system of public education was placed under the control of the state (ART. 6), even though the Church was empowered to establish parochial schools (ART. 12). Religious legislation in Württemberg,[26] passed on 30 January 1862, rested on the same principles, but in a few points was more favorable to the Church.

Many of the new regulations were ambivalent; it all depended on how they were applied. In Württemberg, thanks to the conciliatory conduct of King Wilhelm and to the moderate attitude of Bishop Lipp and his successor Hefele, often misunderstood by zealots among the clergy, battles were avoided. In Baden, the administration of August Lamey (1860–66) was equally conciliatory, but the subsequent ministry of Julius Jolly (1866–76) used the legislation to start the first fundamental conflict between a liberal state and the Catholic Church in Germany.

Between 1850 and 1870, seventeen Catholic Conferences continued the work begun by the previous ones. They served to unite the Catholic forces, and enabled them to look at the associations, the press, and pastoral care; to an unprecented degree, laymen became involved in ecclesiastical affairs.

---

[23] Text of the Württemberg concordat and official supplements: Walter, *Fontes,* 363–76; Mercati I, 853–75.

[24] Text of the Baden concordat and official supplements: Walter, *Fontes,* 376–404; Mercati I, 880–920.

[25] Text (with the pertinent laws, also passed on 9 October 1860): Walter, *Fontes,* 405–10; Friedberg, *Staat und katholische Kirche im Großherzogtum Baden seit dem Jahre 1860* (Leipzig 1874), 237–40; M. Stadelhofer, *Der Abbau der Kulturkampfgesetzgebung im Großherzogtum Baden 1878–1918* (Mainz 1969), 392ff.

[26] Text: Golther, *Staat und Kirche in Württemberg,* 541–47.

Most of the associations were founded at the Conferences, such as in 1848 in Mainz the Vincent Association by August Reichensperger, and the Boniface Association in 1849 at Regensburg upon the suggestion of Döllinger. The Vincent Association devoted itself to charity;[27] the Boniface Association, whose first president was Count Josef Stolberg (1804–59), the son of the famous convert, assisted the communities of the Diaspora.[28] Active support was also given to the journeymen associations. Their founder, Adolf Kolping (1813–65), a practical-minded educator, after 1848 developed them into a network for young craftsmen, covering all of Germany and Switzerland. When they finished their training, the journeymen often joined these associations. Kolping's concern for craftsmen and skilled workers characterizes the middle class origin of the Catholic social movement, which one encounters also in the contemporary Catholic press and in Alban Stolz's apologetics. It was an attempt to preserve the old social order by improving it and by fighting against liberalism, capitalism, and socialism. Unfortunately, the movement had no solutions for the novel problems of an industrial society and its proletariat. Ketteler was the first one to address this problem and to say that traditional methods of charity were inadequate.[29] He called for a state social program which would also engage the Church,[30] and at the same time pointed to new areas of activity for it. He singled out such matters as pastoral care for the workers, diocesan workers' associations directed by the local bishop, and social-pastoral instruction for theology students. In 1869 Ketteler confronted the entire German episcopate with the problem of the workers, but failed to induce it to make a decision along the line of his suggestions. The bishops at the time were absorbed by the problems and controversies which had arisen after the announcement of the Vatican council; the plight of the workers took a second seat behind the struggle for papal infallibility.

---

[27] H. Bolzau, *Vinzenzverein und Vinzenzgeist* (Cologne 1933); H. Auer, "100 Jahre Vinzenzverein in Deutschland," *Vinzenz-Blätter* 33 (1950), 40–54.

[28] *In heiliger Sendung. 100 Jahre Diaspora-Arbeit,* ed. by Generalvorstand des Bonifatiusvereins (Paderborn 1949); *Handbuch des Bonifatiusvereins* (Paderborn 1953).

[29] Especially with his book *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum* (Mainz 1864, 1890), countless sermons, and in his report at the Fulda bishops' conference (September 1869) on "Fürsorge der Kirche für die Fabrikarbeiter" (Vigener, *Ketteler,* 435–70, 552–61; Lenhart, *Ketteler* I, 92–118; Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 91f.).

[30] Important suggestions in this respect were made at the Frankfurt Catholic Conference (1863) by the Cologne religion teacher Christian Hermann Vosen (1815–71), a collaborator of Kolping.

Other organizations inspired by the Catholic Conferences were art associations, even though one-sidedly and retrospectively they clung to the examples of the Nazarenes and Neo-Gothics, as well as a Catholic Academy, which, while it was first suggested in 1852, was realized only partially in 1876 with the founding of the Görres Society.[31] In the same context belongs the project of a Catholic university, discussed during the conferences of the 1860s and promoted by the bishops. It was an understandable reaction to the snubbing of Catholics by the universities outside of Austria and Bavaria, but in view of the attitude of the governments it was impossible to realize.

The Catholic Conferences adhered to the decision made in 1849 not to become involved in everyday politics, but, interested in achieving the broadest possible effect by their attempt at rejuvenation, they voiced their opinions with respect to fundamental questions of public life. Defending the ecclesiastical status quo and opposing the spreading secularization, the Catholic Conferences and associations were increasingly pushed into the defensive by liberals and their Protestant comrades.

Controversies over the national question and the Papal State intensified the differences. The Conferences came out in favor of a Greater Germany.[32] In a Germany which included Austria, the Catholics were in the majority and therefore in a better position to obtain the rights denied them by individual German state governments; contrary to liberal polemics, the Catholic Church was an intimate part of many national traditions and wished to participate actively in the nation's unification. But Döllinger's logical call for national ecclesiastical cooperation was met with reserve which grew to decided resistance with the gradual merger of German Catholicism and ultramontanism.

The combination of ultramontane religiosity and Greater German objectives was unable to make headway, because the non-Catholic majority in the non-Austrian German states favored a Little Germany and an alliance with liberalism. The German National Association (after 1859) organizationally and ideologically modeled itself on the Italian Risorgimento. Resignation spread among the Catholics and many Pius Associations were dissolved. The Catholic Conference of 1858 at Cologne shifted the emphasis of the movement to the area of social charity, and Moufang's Greater German Party (1862) was nothing more than an episode.

---

[31] H. Finke, "Gründung, Entwicklung und Erfolge der Görres-Gesellschaft," *Jahresberichte der Görres-Gesellschaft 1937* (Cologne 1938), 68–73; A. Allgeier, "Geschichtlicher Rückblick," *Jahresberichte der Görres-Gesellschaft 1937,* 1–62; W. Spael, *Die Görres-Gesellschaft 1876–1941* (Paderborn 1957). See also J. Spörl in *StL* III, 1007f.

[32] Five of the Catholic Conferences between 1850 and 1870 took place in Austrian cities.

In this situation the defense of the Papal State, clearly enunciated for the first time by the Catholic Conference in 1861 at Munich, assumed an integrative character. Leaders and members of the movement were guided by their special feeling of solidarity with the Pope, a solidarity derived from the ultramontane concept of the Church. The activity of the Michael Confraternity (after 1860), the "Peter's Pence," pilgrimages, and demonstrations provided the Pope with material and spiritual assistance. With dangerous oversimplification, only comprehensible against the background of the liberal attacks on papacy and Church, the liberty of the Church was seen as dependent on that of the Pope, and his, in turn, dependent on that of the Papal State. In the course of the actual injustices inflicted on the Pope it was overlooked that the Roman priest state went counter to the political and legal principles of the century. The defense of its continued existence, which the liberals inherently denied, could not but bring further isolation and divert attention from the urgent problems of the time. Modifying statements like those of Döllinger, who doubted the necessity of the Papal State, were rejected out of hand;[33] they only fed the mistrust of the intellectual minority which objected to the growing Romanization of German Catholicism. The Catholic Conference in 1862 at Aachen merely intensified the activity. It also inspired the Club movement; it brought together Catholics of the upper and middle classes in social clubs which also in the 1860s in many areas became bases for the Catholic movement to counter the strength of the liberals through increased voting.

The reaction of the *Syllabus* (1864) was characteristic of the intellectual orientation of the Catholic movement. Without reserve the Catholics accepted the summary condemnation, in some points unjustified, in others inadequately reasoned, of ideological and political liberalism, even though a moderate interpretation, taking account of Germany's situation, was necessary. New disputes became unavoidable, for the papal document created tremendous excitement among liberals and Protestants, to be exceeded only by the dogma of infallibility. Although the *Syllabus* did not say anything new, it was seen as a declaration of war on the modern state and modern science, in view of its claim to authority and the sharpness of its formulations.

The political decisions of 1866 accentuated the contrasts further. Prussia's destruction of the German Confederation and exclusion of Austria from German affairs put an end to the political hopes of the Catholics. At first they looked upon the events more as a revolutionary break with legitimate tradition than as the beginning of a new form of national unity. The removal of Austria as a great power from the concerns of Germany and Italy was also a defeat of Catholicism. In the new North German Confederation the Catholics were only a minority; the Italian national state required only the remainders of the Papal State for its completion, whose disappearance was thus only a question of time. The change in Germany was heightened by the fact that liberal and Protestant publicists viewed the events as a victory of Protestantism; with dangerous simplification they viewed Prussia as the embodiment of progress and disposed of the Austrian Empire as a relic of the Middle Ages.[34]

---

[33] See the controversies over Döllinger's Munich Odeon lectures (1860); Friedrich, *Döllinger* III, 233–69; Conzemius, *Briefwechsel Döllinger-Acton* I.

In 1867 the Catholic Conference took place at Innsbruck, and, employing the example of Tyrol to demonstrate the synthesis of Germandom and Catholicism, it once more came out in favor of a Greater Germany. But soon the realization gained ground that an effective representation of Catholic interests could only be made on the basis of the new realities and that national unification could be achieved under Prussia's auspices only. The first to plead impressively for the integration of Catholics with the North German Confederation was Ketteler;[35] of the politicians only Peter Reichensperger seconded him.[36] This integration during the subsequent years was much more of a fact than the polemics of the 1860s against what were called the "enemies of the nation" indicated. It was facilitated by Prussia's adherence to its friendly policy toward the denominations. Initially, Bismarck wooed the Catholics and for their sake denied Italy, Prussia's ally in the war against Austria, any assistance in Italy's hostile stance to the Papal State. But Bismarck's policies in 1866 also initiated his alliance with the National Liberals, which during the succeeding decade decisively influenced Prussian-German domestic politics and steered it into the *Kulturkampf*.

The political transformation and the announcement of the Vatican Council gave birth in the German episcopate to the desire for closer cooperation and to the plan of a joint conference like that of 1848. This realistic plan encountered objections only in Rome, but Cardinal Rauscher succeeded in removing them. The centralism of Pius IX refused to concede initiatives and jurisdictions to the bishops which transcended the borders of their German states. In September 1867 the bishops from the North German Confederation and the south German states met at Fulda; the most important outcome of their deliberations was the institutionalization of the bishops' conference, which was to be held every two years.[37]

---

[34] See J. C. Bluntschli, *Denkwürdiges,* ed. by R. Seyerlen, III (Nördlingen 1884), 145; F. Gregorovius, *Römische Tagebücher 1852–74* (Stuttgart 1892), entry 8, 14 July 1866; H. von Treitschke, *Aufsätze, Reden und Briefe,* ed. by K. M. Schiller, III (Meersburg 1929), 311, 312–30, 331–39, 360 f. Also K. G. Faber, *Die nationalpolitische Publizistik Deutschlands von 1866 bis 1871* II (Düsseldorf 1963), nos. 581, 583, 591f., 596f., 599, 603, 608, 610, 612, 615ff.

[35] In the sensational book *Deutschland nach dem Kriege von 1866* (Mainz 1867).

[36] August Reichensperger withdrew from active politics; Mallinckrodt and Windthorst in Diet and Reichstag remained very reserved toward Prussia but nevertheless loyal to the constitution.

The gathering of Germany's Catholic scholars in 1863, suggested by Döllinger and observed with fearful mistrust by Rome, produced no understanding between the representatives of historical and Neo-Scholastic theology; the *Syllabus* and the announcement of the Vatican Council only served to intensify the contrasts. The monopolization of Neo-Scholasticism, eagerly promoted by Rome, was propounded by Heinrich, Moufang, and Paul Haffner (1829–99, after 1886 bishop of Mainz); they saw in Scholasticism the best ideological basis for their own antiliberal concentration. The Cologne seminary professor Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835–83), who far surpassed his collaborators in speculative talent, and the Würzburg professors Joseph Hergenröther (1824–90, in 1879 prefect of the Vatican Archives and cardinal) and Franz Hettinger (1819–90) worked in the same direction. The writings of the German Jesuit Joseph Kleutgen (1811–83), who taught at Rome, and the Jesuit-directed theology department at the University of Innsbruck also established Roman Neo-Scholasticism.

But the larger majority of the German theology professors, including Döllinger, who had fought for religious freedom during the 1850s, resisted the Roman uniformity of thought with theological, historical, economic, and religious arguments. They feared that the extreme ultramontanism imposed on the Church by Pius IX's Curia would destroy legitimate religious structures and traditions and would produce an intensification of the conflict with the liberal forces which was as dangerous as it was unnecessary. In contrast to the Neo-Scholastics who were harking back to an idealized past, they sought a dialogue with other scholars and a reconciliation with modern thought in general. In addition to Döllinger there were two Tübingen professors, the dogmatist Johannes E. Kuhn (1806–87) and the historian Karl Joseph von Hefele (1809–93, after 1869 bishop of Rottenburg), and the Munich abbot Daniel Bonifaz von Haneberg (1816–76, after 1872 bishop of Speyer). Friedrich Michelis (1815–86) and Döllinger's student Johannes Friedrich (1836–1917) acted very polemically. Next to Bishop Maret's French neo-Gallicans, the German theology professors were regarded as the most dangerous opponents of the Curial movement.

---

[37] The invited Austrian bishops were unable to attend the meeting at Fulda because of domestic difficulties, especially the concordat controversy, which required their presence in Austria.

Their enemies, with the Catholic masses behind them, fought, defamed, and largely isolated them. The Munich nuncio accused them frequently of rebellion against authority and of sympathies for Protestanism.

In Switzerland, the liberals consistently exploited to their advantage the victory of 1846–48 over the Catholics. Their policy, designed to narrow further the freedom of movement of the Catholic Church, was viewed as exemplary by the liberals of other countries and was imitated in the religious battles during the 1860s and 1870s; the first state to do so was neighboring Baden. After 1848 as well, a good number of monasteries and religious schools were closed, the curricula of the remaining schools and the administration of ecclesiastical property were placed under cantonal control, and the clerics were compelled to swear an oath promising to uphold the laws; some cantons suppressed religious instruction entirely. But the constitutional guarantee of freedom of religion made possible the establishment of religious communities in the Protestant cantons, aided by gifts from foreign Catholics.

Bishop Marilley of Lausanne-Geneva was the first to be involved in a basic conflict. The governments of the five cantons of Berne, Fribourg, Geneva, Neuenburg, and Waadt, which his bishopric encompassed, in 1848 concluded a concordat in which they regulated religious problems unilaterally and in disregard of ecclesiastical principles. In the concordat the governments demanded the right to designate bishops and the adaptation of religious laws to those of the state; candidates for ecclesiastical offices had to undergo an examination before cantonal officials. Marilley's protests and his order to his clerics not to swear loyalty to the laws of the state were answered by the governments first with his arrest and then with his expulsion. A large majority of the clerics and laity remained loyal to their bishop, and under pressure from public opinion the governments in 1852 began negotiations with the Vatican. By 1856 these led to an agreement. Additionally, an agreement was reached two years later in Fribourg concerning Church property.

The radical behavior of the governments met the approval of only a minority of the Catholics which had continued to develop Wessenberg's reforms in a democratic direction and which believed that it could do so in continued cooperation with the governments. Groups with such aims continued to exist in most of Switzerland's cantons and eventually joined the Old Catholic protest movement against the dogma of papal infallibility. Those antiultramontanes who remained in the Church were isolated, and such men of compromise as the Lucerne politician Anton Philipp von Segesser[38] were unable to make their voices heard as mediators between the hardened fronts. The liberals asserted to be fighting not against the Church as such, but only against hierarchism and ultramontanism, but actually their attitudes helped the growth of the movements to which they objected.

---

[38] E. F. J. Müller-Büchi in *ZSKG* 56 (1962), 185–200, 301–31, 60 (1966), 76–102, 275–304, 368–98, 64 (1970), 328–69; *Conzemius, Katholizismus ohne Rom,* 72f.

The closest possible cooperation with Rome seemed to be the best guarantee for development and continuation of religious life, and ultramontane activists like Gaspard Mermillod (1824–92) dominated the situation.[39] Mermillod worked in Geneva, where the number of Catholics increased substantially in consequence of immigration from Savoy. As the federal constitution did not permit the establishment of additional bishoprics, Pius IX in 1864 appointed Mermillod as suffragan bishop for Geneva; it seems that the Pope harbored totally unrealistic expectations of "converting" the city of Calvin.

The pressure exerted upon the Church strengthened the need for organization, which often was set up according to the German example. After the 1850s, Pius Associations and other charitable organizations sprung up, the latter under the guidance of the Capuchin Theodosius Florentini,[40] the founder of the Menzing and Ingenbohl congregations of sisters.

The predominantly agrarian structure of the Catholic cantons, which burdened the struggle with the urban liberals with additional social tensions, did not permit much intellectual activity. Only Fribourg and the abbey of Einsiedeln under the leadership of Abbot Heinrich Schmid were productive. Independent scholarly work was done by Bishop Karl Johann Greith of Saint Gallen,[41] the educator and historian Gall Morel, an Einsiedeln Benedictine,[42] and the politician and journalist Count Theodor von Scherer-Boccard.[43]

---

[39] Mermillod, who after his appointment as apostolic vicar of Geneva (1873) was exiled by the Federal Council, in 1883 became bishop of Lausanne-Geneva, and in 1890 was created Curia cardinal. Mermillod combined great social activity with extreme efforts on behalf of papalistic church doctrine (see Aubert, *Pie IX,* 303; biographies by L. Jeantet [Paris 1906] and C. Comte [Paris 1924]; C. Massard, *L'oeuvre sociale du Cardinale Mermillod* [Louvain 1914]; A. Hammann in *LThK* VII, 310).

[40] P. V. Gadient, *Der Caritasapostel Theodosius Florentini* (Lucerne 1946); A. von Wolfenschießen, *Die industriellen Unternehmungen von Pater Theodosius Florentini* (diss., Rome 1956), B. v. Mehr in *LThK* IV, 170.

[41] J. Oesch, *Karl Johann Greith* (St. Gallen 1909); J. B. Villiger in *LThK* IV, 1220.

[42] B. Kuehne, *Pater Gall Morel* (Einsiedeln 1875); R. Henggeler in *LThK* VII, 628.

[43] J. G. Mayer, *Graf Theodor von Scherer-Boccard* (Fribourg 1900).

CHAPTER 9

The Rise of Catholicism in the Anglo-Saxon World

England

In 1840 the number of vicars apostolic was raised from four to eight, but the solution of the problems of the Catholic Church in England, resulting from the growing number of Irish immigrants to the industrial cities, was possible only through the establishment of a diocesan episcopate. After the elevation of Pius IX, representatives of the vicars apostolic asked Rome in 1847 and in 1848 to give them immediate relief. But the Roman revolution and the exile of the Pope delayed a decision until 1850. In the meantime, the arrival of great numbers of destitute Irishmen following the great famine of 1847 burdened the ecclesiastical organization heavily.

The papal brief of 29 September 1850 established in England and Wales a Catholic hierarchy, with Westminster as the metropolitan see and twelve suffragan bishops. Wiseman was named archbishop and cardinal. A few days before journeying from Rome to England, he addressed a pastoral letter to all English Catholics in which he expressed his tremendous joy "that Catholic England once again was placed in its orbit in the ecclesiastical heavens." He was by nature effusive and optimistic, but his letter merely confirmed many Catholics in their conviction that Wiseman basically did not understand the English situation and the English character. The news of the establishment of the hierarchy generally had been well received, but his letter caused irritation. The press reacted with an outburst of bigotry, and there were street demonstrations against what was called "papal aggression," as illustrated by Wiseman's claim to govern the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, and Essex as bishop. In the process of choosing the twelve suffragan bishops mention of the Anglican dioceses had been tactfully avoided, but the designation of Westminster as residence of the archbishop caused indignation. Even though Westminster was not an Anglican diocese, the abbey was regarded as a national shrine.

Wiseman poured oil on the waters, which he had roiled unwittingly, with his skillful and effective *Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People,* published shortly after his return to England. Even though in August 1851 an Ecclesiastical Titles Bill became law, imposing a penalty of one hundred pounds sterling on anyone accepting title to a non-existing episcopal see in the United Kingdom, the law was not enforced and was repealed twenty years later.

There were still conversions, but only in small numbers. The most notable one was that of Henry Edward Manning. He belonged to a group of people who in 1851 left the Anglican Church because of the Gorham decision. It involved the decision of a council of state committee which overruled an Anglican bishop who had refused to install the Rev. J. C. Gorham because his belief in the efficacy of baptism was in question. But the primary concern of the hierarchy was not the proselytization of England, but the creation of a system of parishes and the construction of churches and schools for the impoverished Catholics in the industrial areas. More than half of all Catholics lived in Lancashire (dioceses of Liverpool and Salford), whose population had swelled as a result of the strong influx of Irishmen after the famine of 1847. The rest was concentrated in London (dioceses of Westminster and Southwark) and in the industrial area of the Midlands (chiefly the diocese of Birmingham). In the remaining part of England Catholics lived so dispersed and in such small numbers that it was almost impossible to establish a diocesan organization for them.

Much, however, was achieved at the three provincial synods of 1852, 1855, and 1859, convoked by Wiseman.[1] The parish missions received their final status and the problem of obtaining priests for them was tackled. Some priests, of course, came from Ireland. In addition, Wiseman continued to employ regular clergy. This led to some difficulties, as the interests of the exempt regular clergy did not always coincide with those of the bishops. The cardinal himself founded a diocesan organization, the Oblates of Saint Charles, and appointed Manning as their superior. Additional problems resulted from the tendency of Wiseman and Manning to promote seminaries with strict Tridentine principles. Until then, it had been English practice to train candidates for the priesthood and candidates for lay occupations together. After an upsetting period of doubt and of changing methods, tradition finally won out.

Wiseman's state of health was rather bad during the last years of his life, and in 1855 George Errington from Plymouth was appointed his coadjutor. But the natures of the two men were so contrasting that Wiseman leaned more and more on Manning. When Wiseman died on 15 February 1865, it was the personal decision of Pope Pius IX to designate Manning as his successor, even though the chapter had chosen Errington for the post.

Manning, a man of iron will and firm determination, remained archbishop for twenty-seven years. Almost immediately after his conversion he had been ordained a priest and had then spent three years in Rome. There he developed extreme ultramontane views, but yet became a national figure in Victorian England. His social conscience and his concern for the poor were probably the outstanding features of his activity. This tendency had become clear even before his conversion and reached its zenith with his successful mediation during the great London dock strike in 1889. His life was also filled with the battle to obtain a fair proportion of public funds for Catholic elementary schools when, as a result of the Education Bill of 1870, public schools came into being. His genuine sympathy for Ireland also was of benefit for his pastoral care, as 80 percent of the English Catholics were of Irish descent.

---

[1] At this synod, Newman delivered one of his most important sermons: "The Second Spring." It indicated that his imagination also was fired by the hope for a conversion of England, even though temperamentally he was far more subdued than Wiseman.

Manning had a firm grasp of the intellectual problems of his age, but also a deep distrust of their effect on the Catholic faith. Although supported in the matter by almost all of the bishops, it was he who was responsible for the absolute ban on Catholics studying at Oxford or Cambridge. In 1874 he founded a Catholic university in Kensington, but it was a failure and closed its doors eight years later. Three years after his death in 1885 the prohibition on Catholics attending state universities was lifted.

The problem of university attendance led to discord between Manning and Newman. It was only a part of the underlying tensions between the so-called "Old Catholics" and the "converts." The "Protestant" tendencies of Newman agreed with much of traditional English Catholicism; Newman and the Old Catholic group were brothers under the skin and viewed with distrust the enthusiastic ultramontanism of Manning and other converts. Even though these divisions disappeared by 1880, the personal animosities between Manning and Newman continued.

After his conversion, Newman had studied theology in Rome. There he had become aware of his spiritual affinity to the oratory of Saint Philipp Neri, and after his return he founded the first English oratory in Birmingham. Its growth faced many obstacles. In view of the tensions between him and Frederick William Faber, the oratories in Birmingham and London developed independently from one another and even with a certain degree of hostility. In 1852, Newman accepted the invitation of Archbishop Cullen to go to Dublin as president of Dublin University. But his tenure was not very successful and in 1858 he resigned his position. But he left a lasting memorial to his presidency in the form of a series of lectures which he had given in May 1852 and which were published under the title *The Idea of a University*.

Returned to England, he founded the oratory school in 1859 and thus made a notable contribution to the tradition of Benedictine and Jesuit education.[2] In the same year, his bishop, Ullathorne of Birmingham, asked him to take over the *Rambler,* a journal founded in 1848 by John Moore Capes. In 1854, Richard Simpson had become its publisher, and in 1858 John Acton[3] had become a partner. The reason for Newman's appointment was ecclesiastical suspicion of the *Rambler,* but his own contribution to the July issue of 1858[4] was denounced by Rome, and George Talbot, the Pope's English informant, characterized Newman as the most dangerous man in England. During the next five years his attitudes were questioned, he was treated with disrespect, and became a man without influence. His earlier position was restored with the publication of his *Apologia pro vita sua.* It appeared in 1864 in monthly installments as a reply to accusations by the Rev. Charles Kingsley that Newman and the Catholic clergy did not regard "truth for its own sake" as a virtue.

The core of the reply bears the title: "A history of my religious opinions," and the honesty displayed by Newman was a very effective defense of his personal honor. He could hardly hope to have a similar success in 1864 when he attempted to refute the assertion that Catholic theologians were severely handicapped in their scholarly work. Two years later, Ullathorne offered him a church in Oxford, but the suggestion was blocked by Manning, Ward, and Talbot, who did not consider Newman sufficiently orthodox. In the following year, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith prohibited Catholics from attending public universities.

In 1870 Newman published *A Grammar of Assent.* He had spent twenty years on it, and it is perhaps his only work which was not written as an immediate response but was the fruit of long reflection.[5] Its theme was the fundamentals of certainty and, more specifically, the reasons of faith: How can one believe something that is beyond comprehension or proof? His approach—the more interesting as it takes place independently from the scholastic tradition—is essentially a psychological analysis of "moral proof, of a collection of probabilities,"[6] not a single one of which is proof in itself, but which as a whole can produce an act of faith based on what Newman calls the "illative sense," the ability of reason to draw conclusions and arrive at judgments.

---

[2] Another important date in the development of higher education for boys is the year 1855, in which the Salesians in London opened Clapham College, the first of its kind for the middle class.

[3] John Emmerich Edward Dalberg Acton (1834–1902) was one of Döllinger's most significant students at Munich. As a political liberal and defender of freedom of religion he fought actively against ultramontanism. Unlike Döllinger he did not break with the Church after the First Vatican Council but retired to a strictly academic life. In 1886 he founded the *English Historical Review.* In 1895 he was appointed Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Cambridge. During his final years he planned the *Cambridge Modern History* (published 1901–11) (see U. Noack, *Katholizität und Geistesfreiheit nach den Schriften von John Dalberg-Acton* [Frankfurt 1936]; G. E. Fasnacht, *Acton's Political Philosophy* [London 1952].

[4] Later published separately as "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine."

[5] See H. Tristram, ed., *John Henry Newman, Autobiographical Writings* (London 1956), 273.

Also in 1870 there was a growth of tension between Newman and Manning with respect to the definition of papal infallibility. Newman had no difficulties with the dogma as such—in fact, in a very real sense it had been a motive for his conversion—but he feared that a formal definition would create hostility outside of the Church and discontent within it, especially if it were to be pronounced in the extreme form which he had reason to believe would be used. He had no difficulty with accepting the doctrine as defined by the council.

In 1877 he returned to Oxford after thirty years in order to accept the first honorary fellowship awarded by Trinity College. Two years later Leo XIII created him a cardinal with the unusual privilege of residing in Birmingham, even though he was only a priest. There he spent the last eleven years of his life in peace. His gravestone bore the inscription, which he had written himself: "Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem."

Scotland

The number of Catholics in Scotland also grew noticeably as a result of Irish immigration to the industrial areas. In 1851, 18 percent of the population of Glasgow were Irish. Most of the immigrants came from the province of Ulster and brought with them the tension existing there between Catholics and Protestants. In addition, they encountered the hostility of the Scottish Presbyterians and were incapable of adjusting themselves to the native Catholics. Ever since the days of O'Connell the Irish Catholics in Glasgow were very nationalistic. Many of their priests came from Ireland and there was discord between Irish and Scottish priests. In 1851, the Irish in Glasgow started a newspaper, the *Free Press,* whose incessant polemics against Dr. Murdoch, the vicar apostolic, probably hastened his death. Murdoch's successor was John Gray, his former coadjutor. Rome suggested that Gray should choose his own coadjutor and hinted that an Irish priest would be suitable. But Gray was unwilling to do this and was supported by the other vicars apostolic, who, in the case of an Irish appointment, feared a general worsening of the situation of the Church in Scotland.

---

[6] *Grammar of Assent,* 217.

At the urging of Archbishop Cullen of Dublin the president of the Irish College in Paris, James Lynch, C.M., was finally appointed Gray's coadjutor. Regrettably, but unavoidably, the appointment increased tensions in Glasgow, where the Irish clergy followed Lynch and the Scottish clergy followed Gray. In 1867, Archbishop Manning was named apostolic visitor.[7] He suggested the transfer of both Gray and Lynch and thought that the Scottish problems could be solved only through the establishment of a diocesan hierarchy. But the government regarded such a step as premature and relayed its reservations to Manning and Rome.

Consequently, Rome hesitated to establish such a hierarchy in Scotland. The selection of the metropolitan see also proved difficult. Two-thirds of the three hundred fifty thousand Catholics lived in the metropolitan area of Glasgow. The next larger concentration was Edinburgh, Scotland's capital; Saint Andrews, the seat of the medieval archbishopric, was only a small town with very few Catholics. When the hierarchy was finally established in March 1878, an attempt was made to take all of these considerations into account. The metropolitan see was established in Saint Andrews and Edinburgh with four suffragan bishoprics, and Glasgow as archbishopric without suffragan sees was subordinated directly to the Holy See.

Ireland

It is generally taken for granted that the great famine of 1847 was a decisive turning point in the modern history of Ireland. It marked the beginning of a strong emigration which possibly raised the standard of living in Ireland slightly, but nevertheless still left behind a large agrarian proletariat, which had little hope of improvement as long as the laws concerning landownership remained unchanged. In spite of many developments which seem to point to progress, such as the construction of new churches and an increase in ecclesiastical institutions, the emigration after the famine left behind a Catholic population without any self-confidence and exposed to constant economic and political shocks.

Catholics constituted almost 80 percent of the population. The majority of the Protestants were concentrated in Ulster, while in most of the south and the west the population was almost totally Catholic. The predominant Protestants gave up their essential monopoly of wealth and political power only slowly. In 1873, a very important court judgment stated that papal jurisdiction in Ireland was still illegal, according to an unrepealed statute from the sixteenth century. In practice, however, civil courts respected the jurisdiction of the Church, as its decisions were easily accepted by the Catholics.

---

[7] V. A. McClelland, "The Irish Clergy and Archbishop Manning's Apostolic Visitation of the Western District of Scotland 1867," *CHR* 53 (1967), 1–27, 229–50; "A Hierarchy for Scotland 1868–78," *CHR* 56 (1970), 474–500.

Under the force of the Penal Code and during the days of O'Connell, a feeling of closeness had developed between the Catholic clergy and the laity; it became stronger during the nineteenth century as a consequence of the fact that the large majority of the parish clergy was educated in Ireland, chiefly at Maynooth. Only a small minority attended the few seminaries on the continent which had been reopened after the French Revolution.

In 1849, Paul Cullen, head of the Irish College at Rome, was appointed archbishop of Armagh. In 1852 he was transferred to Dublin and in 1866 became the first Irish cardinal; he dominated the Irish hierarchy until his death in 1878. He was equipped with the authority of an apostolic delegate and thus empowered to convoke a national synod at Thurles in 1850. There, Church discipline and religious practices were adapted to common canon law and the prevailing ultramontane tendencies, the planned Queen's Colleges were condemned, and the political activity of the Irish clergy was restricted.

Attempts to define these restrictions were only partially successful and resulted in the complete alienation of Cullen and the influential Archbishop MacHale of Tuam. After 1860, there was the revolutionary movement of the Fenians, which, according to Cullen's conviction, posed the same threat to the Church in Ireland as the revolutionaries on the continent or in Italy. But Cullen was wrong, for even though the Fenians refused to continue to recognize the leadership of the clergy in Irish politics, they were not unbelievers.

In his opposition, Cullen was supported by the bishops, but the clerics in some instances hesitated to follow him, as they shared the anti-British sentiments of the people. But it was not easy for them to find a theological justification for the rebellion at the very time of the *Syllabus,* and therefore on the whole they refrained from openly supporting the revolutionary movement. After a failed uprising in 1867, many Fenians were imprisoned; now the clerics acted less restrained and participated in the public demonstrations of sympathy for the prisoners. In order to counter this threat, Cullen in 1870 managed to obtain a formal Roman condemnation of the Fenian movement.

In 1869, Odo Russell, the unofficial British representative at Rome, reported that Cardinal Antonelli had informed him that the "conditions in Ireland filled him with distaste and pain and that he did not understand the Irish character."[8] Five years earlier, Cullen had accepted a cautious participation in politics and in spite of his Roman training and early history had shown himself to be the type of liberal Catholic which Antonelli had difficulty in understanding. Ultimately, Cullen was prepared to cooperate with the Liberal Party, then in the process of formation under the leadership of Gladstone, even though it was hostile to an ultramontane papacy.

---

[8] Odo Russell to the Earl of Clarendon, Rome, 5 May 1869; quoted in N. Blakiston, *The Roman Question* (London 1962), 363.

English liberals and Irish Catholics were in agreement that the Protestant Church in Ireland should be disestablished. Both parties wanted to distribute its property to all Churches in Ireland. But Cullen insisted that no Church be subsidized by the state and that each should instead be a voluntary association before the law, just as the Catholic Church had been since the Reformation. This principle was embodied in the Irish Church Act of 1869.

Cullen's association with the English liberals remained more in the area of common interests than in common principles, and his support of a "free Church in a free state" was primarily based on his Irish thought and not on any principles of liberalism. This became clear in the question of education. After 1850, the developments in the system of nondenominational elementary schools introduced in 1831 gave the bishops reasons for concern, and they tried repeatedly to gain the support of the government for a system of denominational schools. They were not able to effect such a change, but in practice it became quite denominational, as almost all children in Ireland attending public schools were Catholic. The system of secondary schools had always been established on the basis of private denominational schools. In 1878 the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act granted small salaries for principals and stipends for students according to the scores achieved on state examinations.

University education had long been a source of conflict. In 1850 the synod of Thurles had prohibited Catholics from attending interdenominational universities, known as Queen's Colleges. Cullen returned from Rome with the charge of establishing a university modeled on Louvain. Newman accepted the invitation to become its president, but the institution was always in trouble. There were many reasons. The government was unwilling to accredit the institution, and its degrees were therefore not recognized. The Irish Catholic middle class, which was ready to send its sons to this university, was numerically too small, and Newman's hope to erect in Dublin a Catholic university for all of Great Britain and Ireland was unrealistic. Some of the bishops denied the new university their active support, and MacHale was soon its bitter enemy. This aspect was particularly grave, as the finances of the university depended on church collections. With respect to practical matters, Newman could deal solely with Cullen, but the temperaments of the two men were too different.[9] After Newman's departure in 1858 the Catholic University was constantly in difficulties. The government still refused to grant it a constitution, even though in 1879 it installed the Royal University of Ireland as a supervisory agency which examined the students of the Catholic University together with those of all other colleges for the granting of degrees.

The frailty of the Catholic University and the concentration of seminary training in Maynooth led to a strictly clerical orientation of the Catholic professors in Ireland. Two of the Maynooth theologians deserve mention. They were Patrick Murray, whose *De ecclesia Christi* (3 vols. [Dublin 1860–66]) revealed the ultramontane orientation of the college, and George Crolly, who, in his *De iustitia et iure* (3 vols. [Dublin 1870–77]), was the first one to discuss this topic within the context of British law. Cullen's nephew, Patrick F. Moran, the future archbishop of Sydney, was the first person to utilize the papal archives in his numerous publications. Together with Cullen he was responsible for the founding of the monthly *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (1864).

Experience taught Cullen that it was impossible for a priest or bishop in the Ireland of the nineteenth century not to become involved in politics. But the involvement of the clergy in politics had a particularly sad consequence. The Protestants concluded that an independent Ireland would be ruled by the Catholic clergy and that "Home Rule" would in fact mean "Rome Rule." After 1860, the Orange Order, started in 1795 as an instrument of Protestant domination, was revitalized.

The break between the Irish Catholics and the Protestant Liberals over the question of university education in 1873 led to the fall of Gladstone's government. After six years of political instability, a number of bad harvests at the end of the decade once again raised the problem of the tenant farmers. Charles Stewart Parnell, a Protestant, acted as the leader of a strong parliamentary group which demanded agrarian reform and a limited degree of autonomy known as Home Rule. He gained the support of the revolutionary leaders and of the Catholic hierarchy, especially of Archbishop Walsh of Dublin and Archbishop Croke of Cashel. Gladstone, returned to office in 1880, was sympathetic, but the English conservatives, including some prominent

---

[9] The failure of the university has often erroneously been ascribed to this last factor alone. Cullen and Newman had managed to cooperate, even if only with difficulty. "We were different," Newman wrote to C. W. Russell, the president of Maynooth, on 17 November 1878 after Cullen's death, "but I was always attached to him with love and gratitude, and because of his work regarded him very highly." Cullen also esteemed Newman and defended his orthodoxy when Newman was suspected by Rome (see F. McGrath, *Newman's University: Idea and Reality* [Dublin 1951], 503–4).

Catholics, depicted the Irish movement in Rome as revolutionary. Papal intervention and condemnation made life more difficult, but the movement held together until 1889, when Parnell was named a corespondent in a divorce suit. The bishops declared that he could no longer act as spokesman, and the consequent split led to a further period of political instability. When it was overcome, it was recognized that the involvement of the clergy in politics, peculiar to the 19th century, had also passed.

The United States

During the second third of the nineteenth century, the Catholic Church in the United States was able to record some significant progress. After 1870 it was not only numerically the largest English-speaking Catholic group in the world, but it was also during this time that American Catholicism acquired its peculiar characteristics.

Originally consisting of former English and French settlers, and former Spanish ones in the southern states, the Catholic community of the United States gradually assumed different characteristics with the immigration of Irish Catholics. The great famine between 1845 and 1847 in Ireland speeded up this movement, and additional German immigrants journeyed to the United States in the wake of the 1848–49 revolutions. This dual movement, which coincided with the rapid economic development of the country, continued during the two subsequent decades. The majority of the Irish were Catholics, and so were many Germans.[10] Although many of them, and especially their children, isolated in a Protestant environment, left the church of their fathers,[11] the immigration, together with the natural increase, resulted in a growth of the Catholic population which exceeded all expectations. According to Shaughnessy's findings, resting on a critical examination of the available data, there were in the United States in 1840 approximately 663,000 Catholics, i.e., 4 percent of the total population. Ten years later, they had increased by one million people, of whom 700,000 were immigrants from fourteen different countries; in 1860, there were 3,103,000 and in 1870 there were 4,504,000 Catholics, corresponding respectively to 7 percent, 10 percent, and 11 percent of the total population.

But the distribution of the Catholics was quite different from region to region. While around 1870 one out of nine Americans was Catholic, the ratio in the southern states, which the immigrants avoided because of their black population, was only one in twenty-five or less. The immigration of Catholics benefited chiefly the states of the North, such as Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota. The Germans, settling chiefly in the triangle between Cincinnati, Milwaukee, and Saint Louis, generally settled in rural areas, while the Irish, too poor for agrarian colonization,[12] and dependent on immediate employment as workers or domestics, congregated mostly in the port and industrial cities of the North. Inasmuch as the Irish were by far the largest group, American Catholicism for a long time had an urban, even proletarian, character.

---

[10] The number of Catholic immigrants during the years from 1820 to 1870 has been estimated at 1,683,791 Irish and 606,791 Germans.

[11] The significance of these departures during the second half of the century used to be overestimated, as the precise calculations by G. Shaughnessy, op. cit. prove.

The steady stream of immigrants from Ireland led to a rekindling of the nativist campaign which had been declining in the 1840s, and under the new name of Know-Nothingism anticlerical violence started again. It reached its apogee between 1854 and 1855 and only came to an end with the Civil War.[13]

The rapid increase of the Catholic population, together with the westward movement and the addition of Oregon, Idaho, Texas, New Mexico, and California, presented the ecclesiastical authorities with difficult problems of organization.

In the open areas of the Far West a new beginning had to be made, and in 1846 the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith founded a new church province with Oregon City as its capital upon the instigation of the adventurous vicar apostolic Monsignor Blanchet.

Even in the former Mexican provinces a new beginning needed to be made, for the Church had had to suffer grievously in these seemingly Catholic areas as a consequence of Freemason-inspired government action against the regular clergy and from a corrupt clergy. Through the establishment of the dioceses of Galveston for Texas (1847), Santa Fe (1850) for New Mexico, Monterey-Los Angeles (1850) and San Francisco (1853) for California, the situation was mastered. This was facilitated by the freedom of religion which prevailed in the United States and which permitted the Franciscans to resume their missions to the Indians.

---

[12] There were some attempts to help them with settling, but the Irish did not like living in the countryside because of its isolation.

[13] One of the most spectacular episodes was the campaign of demonstrations directed at Monsignor Bedini, whom Pius IX had sent to the United States for the purpose of examining the possibility of establishing an apostolic delegation and who after a short stay was forced to flee. To xenophobia and antipapism was added in his case the rejection of the Italian immigrants because of the temporal power of the Pope (see J. F. Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop G. Bedini to the United States* [Rome 1960] and R. Sylvain, *A. Gavazzi* II [Quebec 1962], 426–40.

In the largely rural areas of the Midwest and the South, in which the majority of the population lived dispersed in the country, the situation for a long time was similar to that of the missionary countries, as the few priests could travel through the vast areas only at long intervals. But with the active support of bishops like J. B. Purcell, from 1833 to 1883 archbishop of Cincinnati and, outside of the dioceses of the East Coast, the preeminent American prelate of his time, new dioceses were established with the growing cities as centers. In spite of the sparse financial means and the lack of priests (at the beginning hardly more than ten), gradually there were established Chicago, Milwaukee, and Little Rock in 1843; Cleveland in 1847; Saint Paul and Savannah in 1850; Springfield, Covington, and Alexandria in 1853; Marquette and Fort Wayne in 1857; and Green Bay, La Crosse, and Columbus in 1868.

In the states of the Northeast in which the majority of the immigrants was concentrated, the delicate question of trusteeism was only solved in the 1860s. His energy and his influence on the public enabled G. Hughes, from 1842 to 1866 bishop, then archbishop of New York, to obtain in 1860 a law for the state of New York which provided the Church with the desired degree of freedom and simultaneously maintained a sufficient degree of lay control over the property of the Church. Gradually the other states also adopted this law. But the main difficulty was posed for the Catholic authorities by the ever increasing stream of immigrants. The priests, although industrious and agile, could no longer do all of their work, and the great number of languages spoken by their flock confused matters totally. What is more, the poverty of the faithful, who earned their daily bread as workers or domestics, in spite of a high degree of altruism did not permit them to do more than supply a portion of the financial needs of the Church.

Fortunately, the American bishops, of whom two thirds came from Europe,[14] excelled with their sense of the practical and their enterprising spirit, and Europe responded generously to their appeals. Irish priests arrived in great numbers and placed themselves in the service of their emigrated brethren. In 1857, at the request of Monsignor Spalding, a college was established at Louvain for the purpose of training European seminarians who volunteered for the apostolate in the United

---

[14] Of the thirty-two bishops who attended the council of Baltimore in 1852, only nine were born in the United States; eight were of Irish, eight of French, two of Belgian, two of Canadian, one of Austrian, one of Spanish, and one of Savoyard extraction. Of the forty-five bishops attending the council of 1866, fourteen were born in the United States, eleven in Ireland, one in Belgium, one in Austria, one in Germany, and one in Savoy. Almost all metropolitan sees were in Irish hands, which in addition to other disadvantages to be mentioned later had the advantage of providing the American episcopate with a large degree of homogeneity in this difficult transition period.

States. By way of these additions and the slowly growing number of native priests,[15] the active number of clergy rose from about 700 at the time of the accession of Pius IX to 1320 in 1852, to 2,770 in 1866, and in 1875 reached 6,000. A good number of new parishes were founded, but the Irish character of the Church in the United States, and especially the tendency of the Irish priests to treat their flocks as minors and to leave only little initiative to laymen in religious matters, was strengthened by this development.

At the same time that the clergy was growing, the continuous arrival of regular clergy (both men and women) from France, Belgium, and Austria, and the financial assistance of French, German, and Austrian missionary societies made possible the building of Catholic schools, the creation of charitable institutions for the reception of the immigrants in the ports, and the organization of parish missions according to the method which had proved itself in Europe (the Austrian Jesuit Xavier Weninger after 1848 preached more than eight hundred sermons in such parish missions).

The Civil War, in which the southern states rose against the Union between 1861 and 1865, tested the mettle of the young American Church. The Church had never taken an unequivocal stand in the controversy over slavery. In the South, the ecclesiastical authorities were not completely opposed to slavery as long as it was humane, and even in the North, where the attitude of the Catholic clergy was virtually the same as that of the Protestant ministers, many Catholics were irritated by the alliance between the abolitionists and the nativists. The ideals as well as the practical consideration, touched by resignation, of America's most representative Catholic theologian of the time, P. Kenrick, which he presented in his *Theologia Moralis,*[16] are characteristic of the official attitude of the hierarchy. It left the faithful with the complete freedom of decision, and itself was completely engrossed in maintaining the political neutrality of the Church in temporal affairs, a tradition reaching back to Carroll.[17] The outbreak of the war, kindled less by slavery than by the concern to preserve national traditions, made the situation easier for the Catholics. Almost throughout, they followed the leaders of their respective states, and Catholics fought in both armies. The absence of a clear position among the Catholics, in a question whose moral relevance was evident, engendered fresh attacks by the Yankees against the Roman Church. Yet its standing was enhanced by the charitable activity in which priests and cloistered women engaged in the Confederate states as well as in the Union states. It was furthermore aided by the fact that the Catholic Church was the only one among the various religious communities which managed to maintain its unity, even though its faithful and occasionally its pastors[18]—although on their own authority—declared themselves unequivocally for one camp or the other.

---

[15] In 1854 there were already thirty-four diocesan seminaries, but in 1860 only 15 percent of the active priests were born in the United States. In 1859, Pius IX opened the American College in Rome, so as to provide a number of young Americans with a higher theological education (see R. McNamara, *The American College in Rome* [Rochester 1956]).

[16] 1841. Last edition (Baltimore 1861), I, 166. See J. D. Brokhage, *Father P. Kenrick's Opinion on Slavery* (Washington 1955).

[17] As an example, see the pastoral letter of May 1840 following the Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore (in P. Guilday, *The National Pastorals,* 142–43) and the observations by J. T. Ellis, op. cit., 68–75.

After the end of the war, the Catholics began immediately to heal the material and moral wounds. In this effort they were led by such bishops as Monsignor Verot, the vicar apostolic of Florida and one of the originators of the period of reconstruction in the South; not even his infantile behavior at the Vatican Council could overshadow the remarkable achievement of these chaotic times. There was also Monsignor Spalding, between 1864 and 1872 archbishop of Baltimore. He was a typical American, who combined the talents of the man of science, the ability to administer, advocacy of the Church, and concern for the nation.[19]

One of the first actions of the Church after the end of the war was the convocation of a plenary council.[20] It was held in October 1866 in Baltimore. Although it was able only partially to solve the difficulties confronting the Church in the United States during the last third of the nineteenth century, it at least strengthened the idea of a collegiate leadership of the Church. This was a concept rarely encountered in Europe at the time, but it became one of the characteristics of the American episcopate. In addition to many practical regulations, Spalding suggested the writing of a textbook-like explanation of the council, which amounted to a departure from earlier councils. The intention was to present the great topics raised in the encyclical *Quanta cura* and the *Syllabus* in a positive form and to adapt them to the American mentality, especially with respect to the demands which the apostolate was making on the Church in a pluralistic society.[21]

---

[18] Thus, Bishop Hughes and Bishop Domenec in favor of President Lincoln and Bishop Lynch in favor of the Confederates.

[19] The biography by his nephew J. L. Spalding (1873) has not yet been replaced by a more recent one. See also A. A. Micek, *The Apologetics of M.J. Spalding* (Washington 1951).

[20] The first one took place in 1852 following the division of the Church province of Baltimore, which until then comprised the entire United States. It was replaced by five new provinces: in 1846 Oregon, in 1847 Saint Louis, in 1850 New York, Cincinnati, and New Orleans, and San Francisco in 1853.

Among the many council decrees, an entire chapter was devoted to the pastoral care of millions of blacks, whose sudden emancipation created great problems. The Protestant blacks suffered much less under the new situation, as their pastors belonged to their race. While in the South relations between black and white Catholics were cordial, the mutual embitterment carried separation of the races into the Church and resulted in a further decline of contacts. The blacks, constituting about 10 percent of the total population of the United States, were effectively lost to Catholicism in spite of the care which members of foreign orders lavished on them. Outstanding among them were the Fathers of Saint Joseph of Mill Hill, whom the future cardinal Vaughan had sent from England in 1871 at the behest of the Pope.[22]

Another difficult problem with which the council of 1866 had to grapple was the membership of Catholics in secret societies. In addition to the Irish societies connected with the Fenian movement, other groups with philanthropic aims grew considerably. Although these groups, unlike Freemasons in Europe, did not have any revolutionary or anti-Christian objectives, their indifferentism posed a real threat. The bishops could not agree on a united stand and the decree of the council of Baltimore which attempted to formulate binding regulations was not very suitable in practice. This was so in part because it occasioned constant inquiries in Rome, where no clear understanding of the American situation existed.

Most of the council's attention, however, was devoted to the problem of education. Since the constitution guaranteed religious freedom, the secretary of education, Horace Mann, at first attempted to include nondenominational religious instruction in the curriculum of the public schools. But in practice this plan encountered obstacles, and public instruction quickly developed in an almost exclusively laicistic direction. This convinced the Catholics that, following the Irish example, they had to organize their own schools, in spite of the heavy burden involved. The motto of Archbishop Hughes of "school before Church" was gradually accepted by most of the other bishops. The plenary council of 1866 referred to a decree of the provincial council of Cincinnati of 1858 and declared that the establishment of parish schools was a serious moral duty of parish pastors. Urgent appeals were directed to Catholic families to keep their children from attending public schools as much as possible. After 1870 some militant laymen, like the journalist J. McMaster—a second Louis Veuillot in the United States—and Miss Edes, who believed that some bishops were slack in implementing their demands, carried the matter to Rome. In November 1876 the American episcopate was informed by Rome that it must follow the same strict directives which then were valid in England and Ireland.

---

[21] See the interesting article by J. Hennesey, "The Baltimore Council of 1866, an American Syllabus," *RACHS* 77 (1966), 1–18.

[22] It should be noted that almost all Indian missions were the work of foreigners, after 1830 especially of the Austrian priest A. F. Baraga and after 1838 of the Belgian Jesuit P. Desmet.

The emphasis with which the organization of Catholic schools was pursued was only one, albeit a fundamental, aspect of a more general policy, the objective of which was to keep the faithful in strictly closed communities, to avoid the use of Protestant institutions as much as possible, and to keep Catholics on the periphery of normal American society. Many priests and bishops, especially Monsignor Hughes, whose personal prestige among the Irish contributed to winning them to his side in opposition to the native American Catholics, thought that the faith of the immigrants, who in the majority were very simple people and in the past had been tied to the Church by environment and local traditions, was not capable of resisting the influence of a Protestant or indifferent environment. The inherited hostility of the Irish toward the Anglo-Saxons and the awareness of being a socially despised proletariat, an awareness that was constantly being nourished by the repeated attacks of the nativist movement, as well as the mistrust of the traditionalist German farmers of the materialistic character of the new American civilization, finally drove the Catholics into denominational ghettos. The enterprising spirit of the Irish coupled with the organizational talent of the Germans[23] resulted in the creation of a number of organizations, the listing of which in 1867 in the *National Catholic Almanac* covered nine pages of small print: charitable organizations, hospitals, newspapers and journals, and societies of all kinds. Their growth received a further boost by the arrival after 1870 of numerous nuns whom the *Kulturkampf* had driven out of Germany.

Their encapsulation compelled the Catholics to develop a degree of activity that had no equal in the European Churches; an activity which simultaneously strengthened the vitality of their faith. Beneficial for the moment, this separation in the long run produced serious problems. For one thing, it held the vast majority of the Catholics at a very low cultural level, as at this time their lack of money and people did not yet permit them to establish a system of higher education.[24] According to T. McAvoy it also delayed the upward mobility of the Irish immigrants by a whole generation. This low cultural and social level of the Catholic minority also explained its relatively weak ability to influence the society around it. As Comte de Meaux after a voyage to the United States noted, "the fear of sinking to a lower class kept many a prominent American from the Church of the Irish and domestics, in a country in which social and racial differences play a much greater role than is customarily believed in Europe."

---

[23] In 1855 they created a central organization, the German Roman Catholic Central Union, suggested by the Pius Association.

As most of them came from countries in which for centuries they were looked upon as second-class citizens, the immigrants had a natural tendency not to proselytize. But the desire for a less passive attitude grew among the converts of American origin who also were influenced by the Oxford movement. One of the first to become engaged in this fashion was Orestes Brownson.[25] He was a genuine American, upset by the Irish predominance in the Church, often eccentric and obstinate, yet one of the guiding spirits of American Catholicism in the nineteenth century. He was the founder and from 1844 until 1875 the editor of *Brownson's Quarterly,* a nonconformist and lively journal. In 1859, another enterprising convert, Isaac Hecker,[26] together with some former Redemptorists who objected to the European mentality of their superiors, founded the congregation of the Paulists, whose chief objective was the proselytization of Protestants. But men like Brownson and Hecker were for a long time only exceptions.

It is part of the same development that the Catholics and above all the clergy in the United States did not participate in the solution of the great social problems. Reference to this fact was already made in connection with slavery. The same is true for the movements directed against alcoholism and the attempts to gain greater social justice for the workers. At first sight this particular failure appears most astonishing in view of the connection of American Catholicism with the lower social classes. But it must not be forgotten that the social programs were generally imported from Europe by anticlerical revolutionaries, whose radical proclivities seemed to threaten the Church.

---

[24] There were a number of attempts, especially by Jesuits, to establish Catholic colleges, but most of them survived only a few years. Also characteristic is the small interest shown by the bishops at the council of 1866 when Monsignor Spalding suggested the creation of a Catholic university.

[25] On Orestes Brownson (1803–76), see in addition to the biography by his son (3 vols. [Detroit 1898–1900]) the works by A. M. Schlesinger (Boston 1939) and T. Maynard (New York 1942), as well as T. McAvoy, *RPol* 24 (1962), 19–47. Edition: *The Works of Orestes Brownson,* 20 vols. (Detroit 1882–87).

[26] On Isaac Hecker (1819–88), see the biographies by W. Elliot (New York 1891) and J. McSorley, *Father Hecker and his Friends* (Saint Louis 1952). The book by V. F. Holden, *The Yankee Paul, Isaac T. Hecker* I (Milwaukee 1958) breaks off with the year 1853.

The isolation of the Catholic minority in the United States on the periphery of American public life provided it with peculiar characteristics for a long time to come. Still, there was a gradual development after the Civil War; it began in the Midwest and spread to the East Coast. It was favored by the fact that in such places as New York and Baltimore the Irishmen Hughes and Kenrick were replaced in 1864 by the American-born McCloskey and Spalding. Simultaneously it became evident that the young American Church, which had so successfully applied the well-known formula of a free Church in a free state beyond all ideology, was beginning to assume a place of its own in the universal picture. The first time this happened was at the Vatican Council. When in 1875 McCloskey was elevated to cardinal, it was spectacular proof that the New World had at last outgrown the missionary phase.

Canada

The years after the Act of Union in 1840 were fruitful for Catholicism. The liberal inclinations of Governor Lord Elgin, embodied in the law of 1851, ended the official predominance of the Anglican Church, especially as the high birth rate of the French Canadians and the immigration of Irishmen into the Great Lakes area temporarily resulted in the numerical superiority of Catholics (650,000 vs. 550,000 in 1840). In the subsequent period, immigration favored the Catholics, but the absolute number of Catholics also continued to rise noticeably. The census of 1851 registered more than one million, and by 1881 there were 1,600,000, approximately 40 percent of the total population of 4,300,000. The numerical progression was reflected in the establishment of additional dioceses: four under Gregory XVI and five under Pius IX.[27] The Church province of Quebec, founded in 1844 after lengthy negotiations,[28] was gradually dismantled and three other dioceses took its place: in 1862 Halifax for the Maritime Provinces, in 1870 Toronto, and in 1871 Saint-Boniface in the West. Despite the premature attempt to establish a hierarchy on the Pacific Coast, which at the time of the death of Pius IX was inhabited by only a few thousand Catholics, and despite the missionary work of pioneers like Monsignor Provencher and Monsignor Taché, whom the Oblates of Immaculate Mary assisted in Manitoba, the essential strength of Canadian Catholicism remained concentrated in the area of the Saint Lawrence. But even there they were unevenly distributed. At the time of the formation of the Canadian confederation in 1867, which on the whole was well received by the Catholics,[29] they constituted 86 percent of the population in the province of Quebec, consisting of descendants of French settlers and fifty thousand Irish; they constituted 16 percent in Ontario, five-sixths of whom were English-speaking and economically weak; they were 24 percent of the population in Nova Scotia, chiefly of Scottish descent; and they constituted 33 percent of New Brunswick, largely as descendants of the French-speaking Acadians.

---

[27] At the same period in Newfoundland, which only joined the Canadian confederation a century later, the number of Catholics rose from fifteen thousand at the beginning of the century to sixty-four thousand in 1874; in 1847, 1856, and 1870, three new dioceses were established on the island (see M. F. Howley, *Ecclesiastical History of New Foundland* [Boston 1888]).

[28] The London government did not agree; additionally, the very ponderous bishop of Quebec, Monsignor Signay, who feared the responsibility of the metropolitans, sabotaged the plan as well as he could (see L. Lemieux, op. cit., 432–518).

In the province of Quebec the development started at the end of the 1820s by Monsignor Lartigue,[30] the first bishop of Montreal (1821–40), continued. The young clerics, influenced by the theocratic direction of the French ultramontane school of the restoration period and its subliminal social thought, turned the nationalistic reaction, which lost its initial liberal ties, to their advantage. They became the propelling force of a clerically oriented society with focus on the rural population. In the decade from 1840 to 1850, the Church slowly and gradually grew to be the strongest institution in French Canada, largely as a result of the numerical and qualitative growth of the clergy. In contrast to the United States, the native recruitment of clergy in Canada was high even before the middle of the century, and between 1840 and 1880 the ratio of 1700 Catholics per priest decreased to 520. Coupled with rising standards of training in the seminaries, priestly exercises were reintroduced in 1840, and a short time afterwards periodical meetings for the purpose of studying theological questions were begun. The bishops did good work in establishing uniform regulations for the work of the priests, and the Canadian clergy, which at one time had been extremely independent, during the second half of the century became highly disciplined.

This change in the attitude of the clergy, and especially its "Romanization," were hastened by the arrival of many French members of religious orders, both male and female,[31] during the 1840s. They were invited by Monsignor Bourget, the enterprising, authoritarian bishop of Montreal (1840–76) and the outstanding ecclesiastical personality in Canada during the nineteenth century; for more than a generation he guided the religious fortunes of the province of Quebec in a strictly clerical sense. The enthusiastic ultramontanism and the reactionary political concepts of the regular clergy from France consolidated tendencies already present in Quebec. They fueled the embryonic religious-political struggles and led to difficulties with the native clergy. Their influence on the spiritual development was considerable; they were largely responsible for the acceptance of new forms of piety. They turned against the moralistic rigorism of the old priests; the establishment of new classical colleges contributed to the training of future clergy; and they promoted the founding and spreading of conventual orders like the Gray Sisters of Ottawa and the Daughters of Charity of Montreal,[32] who later spread to all of North America and attested to the vitality of the Canadian Church.

---

[29] The support of the Catholics in favor of the confederation met a certain opposition by the French-Canadians and the Irish; but the majority of the bishops regarded the plan as a smaller evil, and those who were opposed, like Monsignor Bourget, were realistic enough not to oppose an unavoidable development (see W. Ullman, *Canadian Historical Review* 44 [1963], 213–34, and J. K. Farrell in *CHR* 55 [1969], 7–25.

[30] See F. Ouellet, *Histoire économique et sociale du Québec, 1760–1850* (Montreal 1966), 373, 476–77, 589–90.

Within the entire Church, the province of Quebec constituted the unique case of a society which in the midst of the nineteenth century was formed by Catholic principles. In their desire to preserve their cultural heritage within an English-speaking and Protestant majority, the French-Canadians spontaneously accepted the influence of the Church in all areas of private, social, and political life. This became clear with the interference of the clergy in elections,[33] inspired by the fear of the radicalism of many liberals, and even Rome felt constrained to urge the bishops to exercise greater restraint. But this situation, in which the Church with a minimum of official privileges exercised an almost unlimited moral authority, also had its disadvantages. It very soon resulted in a clericalism which systematically prevented any efforts by laymen. Characteristic of this condition was the opposition of the hierarchy to the *Institut Canadien,* a series of public libraries organized by some young, liberal Catholics, and to the development of teacher associations.[34] This attitude encouraged the development of a strictly conformist Catholic civilization, in spite of the founding by the first provincial council (1851) of a Catholic university in Quebec which, in a province in which Louis Veuillot was regarded as an uncontested oracle, became one of the few centers of a moderate Catholic liberalism.

---

[31] In 1841, the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (who became very active in the Saint Lawrence area as well as in northern Canada and western Canada), in 1843 the Jesuits (who in 1880 numbered 130 members, more than 100 of them natives); in 1847 the Clercs de Saint-Viateur and the Fathers of the Holy Cross, who grew better in Canada than in France. Among the conventuals were the nuns of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, and many others.

[32] See M. A. Blanchard, *L'Institut de la Providence,* 6 vols. (Montreal 1925–40).

[33] A few examples are in C. Lindsey, *Rome in Canda. The Ultramontane Struggle for Supremacy over the Civil Authority* (Toronto 1877) and in J. Willison, *Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal Party* I (Toronto 1926).

In the Maritime Provinces, P. C. Lefebvre was especially active; he placed himself in the service of the social improvement of the inhabitants of Nova Scotia. The brief struggle over education (1871–74) between the Catholics and the Protestant majority of New Brunswick is also noteworthy.

In the province of Ontario, where the Catholics constituted a minority, the bishops were confronted with two problems at the middle of the century. One of them was the necessity to integrate the stream of immigrants, especially in the countryside, and the difficulty of priests and nuns, imported from France and Quebec for that purpose, in adapting themselves to an environment so totally different from their native soil. The other great problem was the question of Catholic schools. The Catholic campaign for the improvement of the status of the schools was intensified after the passing of legislation in 1850 under the leadership of the Toronto Catholic Institute, but the bishops themselves disagreed on how much to demand.[35] The most active among them was the bishop of Toronto, Monsignor Charbonnel, who had recently arrived from France and whose sympathies in the discussions of the Falloux Law were more in keeping with the intransigence of Louis Veuillot than with the tempered realism of Dupanloup and Montalembert. Protracted negotiations with the government and Superintendent Ryerson[36] ultimately resulted in insufficient though noticeable improvements (in 1853 with the Taché Bill and in 1862 with the Scott Bill). In this instance as well as in the matter of Church property (clergy reserve) a solution was reached which combined the limited denominational protectionism desired by the Church with the American ideal of the complete neutrality of the state in religious affairs.

The appointment of an apostolic delegate in 1877 acknowledged the growing importance of Canadian Catholicism. Despite many problems which it had in common with the United States, such as immigration and borders, the mixing of races and languages, and secularization, Canadian Catholicism came to have its own peculiar characteristics. The factor chiefly responsible for this separate development was the French element, which was determined to survive in an Anglo-Saxon world.

---

[34] See A. Labarrère-Paulé, *Les instituteurs laïques au Canada français, 1836–1900* (Quebec 1963).

[35] See P. Hurtubize, "Monseigneur de Charbonnel et Monseigneur Guigues, La lutte en faveur des écoles séparées," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 33 (1963), 38–61.

[36] His enemies accused him of systematic hostility to the Catholics; but he pointed to the low standards of the rural Catholic schools.

Australia

Although more modest than in America, the progress of Catholicism in Australia within a single generation resulted in the growth of a new Church with half a million faithful (25 percent of the total population).

Initially a penal colony, Australia gradually also attracted free immigrants; the Irish were especially strongly represented in both groups. After the turn of the century the government permitted the dispatch of clerics, who naturally also were Irishmen. But after the Emancipation Act of 1829, the government insisted that the chief representatives of the new Church be Englishmen. Benedictines, in the majority from Downside Priory, assumed this function. John Bede Polding, the first vicar apostolic, appointed in 1834 and archbishop of Sydney after 1842, was an energetic man and full of missionary zeal.[37] It was his intention to train the future clergy in a monastic environment in order to impress the Anglicans with its sense of liturgy and good education and the faithful with its detachment from the goods of the world. But the growth of the population made the realization of his dream impossible. At the time of his appointment in Sydney, 90 percent of the forty thousand Australian Catholics resided in New South Wales, but the increasing Irish immigration to other areas of Australia and the gold rush in 1851 in the area of Melbourne demanded an increase in the number of parishes and dioceses.[38] These were by necessity primarily staffed with Irish priests, and even the majority of the additional bishops were of Irish descent. These, however, followed pastoral principles which were quite different from those of the Benedictines, inasmuch as they emphasized education and an increase in the number of elementary schools. Frequent tensions among the bishops; conflicts between the bishops and their active and independent-minded priests; misunderstandings between the English Benedictines and the Irish clergy, which often placed its patriotic feelings above obedience to superiors; and the opposition of some liberal laymen desirous of a more democratic organization of the Church; all of these resulted in frequent disturbances of the Australian

---

[37] The establishment of the hierarchy in Australia, which was the first in the British Empire, caused a violent reaction on the part of the Anglicans of the colony; thanks to the tactful handling of the matter by Monsignor Polding, calm quickly returned.

[38] Six between 1842 and 1848 and five additional ones subsequently; a second Church province was finally established in Melbourne in 1874.

Church during the second third of the century.[39] But these troubles must not be permitted to overshadow the missionary efforts by all clergy, an effort which found a visible reward in the growth of religious activity. Nor should the devotion be forgotten of some lay people like Caroline Chisholm, whose charitable work for the immigrants (1838–57) was admirable.

As in many other countries, the problem of education assumed a central role in Australia after 1865. The increased withholding of state subsidies for parochial schools, which led to the closing of many Protestant schools, hardly affected the growth of the Catholic elementary schools, which bishops and priests regarded as one of the most important foundations of pastoral care.[40]

---

[39] And even later: Intrigues resulted in a petition to Rome to withdraw the nomination of the Benedictine R. W. Vaughan, who in 1873 was named Polding's coadjutor.

[40] In New Zealand, the organization of the Catholic Church was started much later. Although two dioceses were established in 1848 and entrusted to the Marists, there were only a few thousand Catholics of European descent; the uprising of the Maoris in 1859 put an end to all missionary activity for a decade. Only in 1887 was the Catholic hierarchy reorganized upon the suggestion of the plenary synod of Australia, which had met two years earlier (the archbishopric of Wellington with three suffragan dioceses). The number of white Catholics was hardly higher than one hundred thousand by the turn of the century (see A. Landes in *RHM* 6 [1929], 8–36, 220–59).

South Africa, as far as Catholics were concerned, remained a missionary area until the end of the century. When an apostolic vicariate was established there in 1837, there were only seven hundred Catholics who were organized in a system similar to that of trusteeism in the United States; it posed great difficulties for Monsignor Griffith (1837–62). There were about one thousand Catholics when the vicariate, in keeping with the political division, was divided into two vicariates (Englishmen in the West and Boers in the East; the Boers granted full religious freedom to the Catholics only after 1870) (see W. E. Brown, *The Catholic Church in South Africa* [New York 1960]).

CHAPTER 10

The Easing of Tensions in the Iberian World

Spain

Spain lost much of its significance for the Holy See when its former American colonies declared their independence. Even so, it remained one of the three great Catholic powers of Europe. In fact, until the accession of Pius IX Spain was of greater concern to Rome than the France of Louis-Philippe or the Josephinist Austria of Metternich.

The crisis began in 1833 upon the death of King Ferdinand VII. He had annulled the Salic law and assured the throne for his daughter

Isabella. But the "apostolic faction," afraid that the regency of María Cristina would return the liberals to power, supported the claims of Don Carlos, who was known for his reactionary political and religious views and also had the support of the regionalists of the northern provinces. The resulting dynastic war lasted until 1839, openly supported by most of the clergy of Navarre, León, and the Basque country. The war intensified the contrast between the liberals and the intransigent Catholics because Gregory refused to acknowledge Isabella. Partly out of a spontaneous sympathy for the traditionalist ideology represented by the Carlists, and partially under the pressure from Austria and Russia, Gregory openly took the side of Don Carlos.

Gregory was also motivated to do so by the anticlerical policy of the new government, even though during the first months of his regency the moderate Minister Martínez de la Rosa tried not to break with Rome and, without diverging from canonic forms, attempted to adjust the statute concerning the Spanish Church. This statute still conformed to the concordat of 1753 and corresponded neither to the ideas nor to the political realities of the present. But it was soon removed by the radicals. The change began with widespread outbreaks of violence, the burning of monasteries, the murder of regular clergy in Madrid, Saragossa, Murcia, and Barcelona, and violent acts aimed at the clergy in other cities. Beginning in 1835, the new minister, Mendizábal, proclaimed a number of anticlerical laws. The first, the confiscation of Church property, chiefly grew out of economic considerations and was an attempt to deal with the growing deficit in the state's budget. But all of the others had their origin in an ideology which combined the dreams of the Alumbrados of the eighteenth century and of the liberals of the nineteenth century. The laws effected the dissolution of all monasteries except those devoted to education and the care of the sick, the unconditional dissolution of the large orders,[1] the confiscation of the property of the parishes and chapters, and the abolition of the tithe, which constituted the chief source of income for the clergy (approximately 400 million reales). The state, now expected to assume the tasks hitherto performed by the Church, failed to live up to its public welfare obligations. The government passed punitive legislation against the "abuse" of pulpit and confessional, and expelled with military force the prelates accused of opposition to the government. In no time at all the most important episcopal sees such as Toledo, Valencia, Burgos, and Granada were vacant. For the first time, the Protestants received permission to proselytize. Finally, a plan was conceived for a general reform of the Church according to the example of the French Civil Constitution of the Clergy of 1790.

---

[1] Between 1830 and 1835, the number of regular clergy declined from 61,723 to 52,627: 22,342 nuns and 30,285 monks (in 1898 convents and monasteries), among them 11,232 Franciscans, 3,202 Carmelites, 3,118 Dominicans, 2,829 Capuchins, but only 363 Jesuits. There were sixty Benedictine monasteries and fifty-three Cistercian monasteries.

The opposition of María Cristina resulted in three years of calm (1837–39) and an attempt to put the finances of the Church on a new footing. But eventually María Cristina was forced to flee the country, and under the regency of General Espartero (1840–43) anticlerical policy came to the fore again. Espartero not only refused to pay the clergy the salaries to which it had agreed in return for the confiscations, but also on his own authority established new parishes and without consulting the Holy See appointed administrators for forty-seven of the vacant sixty-two episcopal sees. His Catholic opponents, among them preeminently the Catalan canon Jaime Balmes,[2] based their opposition to his policies on Espartero's own principles of liberalism. There was no doubt that the radicalism of this religious policy began to worry a good number of moderates in a country in which the Catholic faith was still deeply rooted even among the bourgeoisie. The career of Donoso Cortés[3] was characteristic of this attitude.

After ten years of an uninterrupted degeneration of the old Spanish Church regimen, a relaxation of tensions set in with the return of the moderates. It lasted for a whole decade and began with the maturity of Queen Isabella, who had warm feelings for the Church. In 1844 the laws providing for the state's supervision of ecclesiastical activities were repealed. A short time later the expelled bishops returned and the court of the Rota was reinstated. The sale of Church property[4] continued for a while, but was fully stopped during 1845. While the government was revising its policies, some sensible bishops like P. P. Romo, the new archbishop of Seville, began to recognize that a regime willing to allow constitutional freedoms would permit the Church to have a degree of independence which would more than compensate for the loss of certain privileges. They began to draft a pastoral program which better corresponded to the new mentality and whose objective was freedom of education. This attempt was facilitated by the open atmosphere prevailing in Rome during the first months of the pontificate of Pius IX. After it failed, the Spanish Church limited itself to regain as fully as possible the restoration of the position earlier achieved in 1814 and 1825. But it was an erroneous expectation, as the change of thought among the middle class, especially among the university students, this time was much more profound.

---

[2] Jaime Balmes (1810–48), a powerful apologist, champion of Neo-Thomism, who nevertheless tried to maintain contact with modern philosophy, politically controversial and social activist, was the dominating intellectual figure of the Spanish clergy during the second third of the nineteenth century; nonetheless, his influence was limited during his lifetime (see I. Casanovas, *Balmes, su vida sus obras y su tiempo,* 2 vols. [Barcelona 1942] and *LThK* I, 1211–12).

[3] See E. Schramm, *Donoso Cortés. Leben und Werk eines spanischen Antiliberalen* (Hamburg 1935) and *DHGE* XIV, 668–71.

[4] While the sale of monastic property had begun in 1835, the land belonging to the secular clergy was not sold until 1842. All told, between 1835 and 1844, 76,734 pieces of property of the regular clergy were sold for 2,762,202,415 reales and 69,539 pieces of property of the secular clergy were sold for 774,983,086 reales. The tremendous transfer of property was very advantageous for the liberal aristocracy and the middle class, but, even more than during the French Revolution, it had grave social consequences, as on the whole it aggravated the situation of the peasants.

In the meantime, negotiations with Rome had been started with a view toward restoring the relationship interrupted in 1835 and toward a new arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs. The most difficult point was the statute for the financing of the Spanish clergy, as it involved not only financial questions but fiscal ones as well. Additionally, the negotiations were handicapped by the mistrust of the Holy See toward a government which the papacy considered as too liberal and by some regalistic demands on the part of the Spanish government. A draft providing for some reforms was initialed in April 1845.[5] Among them were the reopening of a few monasteries and the return to the secular clergy of unsold Church property. But the Holy See did not want to acknowledge the sale of Church property officially until the question of paying salaries to the clergy had been answered satisfactorily by the parliament. But, faced with the demand of the liberals to have the sales officially accepted immediately, the Spanish government refused to ratify the treaty. The government was also disappointed in not seeing included in the treaty several clauses, included in the concordat of 1753, which granted the state a number of concessions, particularly in the matter of the *placet.*

Yet both sides were interested in finding a solution, and the negotiations were resumed. After being interrupted by the death of Gregory XVI, they were continued in 1847 on a new basis and with a willingness on both sides to compromise. After extremely frank exchanges of views, the delicate question of salaries for the clergy was settled by the law of April 1849.[6] Eventually the negotiations produced the concordat of 16 March 1851.[7] It was a partial success for the Holy See, because the events of 1848 produced a shift of the moderates to the right.[8]

---

[5] Text in Mercati I, 796–99.

[6] Text in J. Pérez Alhama, *La Iglesia y el Estado español,* 269–70.

[7] Text in Mercati I, 770–96.

[8] The intervention of Spanish, Austrian, French, and Neapolitan troops in 1849 for the purpose of restoring the temporal power of the Pope was significant.

The agreement, in spite of some concessions to the spirit of the times, indeed confirmed Spain's Catholic nature. It also differed from the concordat of 1753 in removing the interference by the state in purely ecclesiastical matters and in granting the Church a large degree of autonomy. It thus was the "most liberal" of all Spanish concordats. It should also be noted that the loss of the majority of Church lands was a liberating experience for the Church and that after fifteen years of troubles the clergy felt closer to the Holy See than before. At the same time, the excesses of the liberals convinced the clergy that a guarantee of religion and social order could only be expected from the conservatives. This conviction moved the Church closer to the parties of the right, on whom the fate of the concordat seemed to depend. This was demonstrated clearly in 1854 when Espartero returned to power and immediately repealed the concordat with accompanying transgressions against Church property and religious orders. The debates of the new parliamentary assembly were the opportunity "for the first real discussion of the relationship of Church and state in the history of Spain" (Kiernan). But in the fall of 1856 the government returned to the hands of the moderates under the leadership of Narváez. Until the revolution of 1868, the Church was permitted to live in relative peace, sanctioned by an agreement with the Holy See.[9]

The concordat granted the Church a decisive position in the state. It made possible a limited restoration of the Church, facilitated by the protection of Queen Isabella II. She was a narrow-minded bigot, who was advised by Antonio-Maria Claret,[10] her overly zealous father confessor. External reconstruction expressed itself in a high number of applicants for the seminaries, on whose reorganization the episcopate spent a large degree of effort. It was also shown by the founding of new active convents, especially in Catalonia, devoted to education and charity. But the underpinnings were provided by the genuine Christian sentiment among the masses. Unfortunately, the blossoming of the Church was only external. The clergy was still very numerous proportionally; despite a reduction of 20 percent since the time of Ferdinand VII, there was still one priest for every 380 people. Moreover, the clergy all too often was satisfied with a mere religion of rite and routine and frequently confused its apostolate with inflexibility. It maintained its claim to the moral leadership of the nation without justifying it with an adequate education, and by relying on an outdated Scholasticism which lacked any originality. The attempts by Balmes and Donoso Cortés to revive traditional apologetics were ignored.

---

[9] On 25 August 1859; Text in Mercati I, 920–29. Supplementary agreement concerning religious foundations, ibid., 18–24.

[10] On A. M. Claret (1807–70), founder of two missionary congregations, extremely active archbishop of Santiago de Cuba from 1850 to 1857, father confessor of the Queen from 1857 to 1868, see C. Fernández, *Antonio-Maria Claret,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1942) and J. M. Viñas, ed., *Escritos autobiográficos y espirituales* (Madrid 1959). Also, C. Fernández, *El confesor de Isabel II y sus actividades en Madrid* (Madrid 1964).

While during the preceding generation many anticlericals had remained believing Christians, after 1860 the number of intellectuals whose faith was shaken increased. Romanticism was introduced in Spain only belatedly after 1833 by the exiles who returned from France, at a time when its chief proponents were already alienated from the Church. It opened the way to free thought and under the influence of post-Hegelian philosophies found its Spanish expression in "Krausism." Many of the intellectuals were discouraged by a Catholicism which, under the leadership of the Neo-Catholics of Nocedal, the spiritual heirs of the Carlists, and their paper *Pensiamento español,* was fanatically antimodern. Their noisy conduct, joyfully greeted by Pius IX, produced nothing but a stronger anti-clericalism among the educated middle class.

Portugal

The religious situation in Portugal during the pontificate of Gregory XVI developed parallel to that of Spain, just as had been the case during the restoration period. Portugal also had two pretenders: Don Miguel on one hand, and Don Pedro and his daughter Maria da Gloria on the other. The dynastic conflict was made graver by the ideological struggle between the absolutists, supported by clergy and Pope, and the constitutionalists, supported by the Freemasons. After the victory of Don Pedro in 1832, a number of anticlerical steps were taken: expulsion of the nuncio; establishment of a commission for the reform of the clergy, which in addition to sensible suggestions like a reduction of the overly large number of dioceses came up with projects of Gallican and Jansenist origin which were at direct variance with Roman ideas; suppression of the Jesuits, who had only just returned in 1829; and the closing of all monasteries, including those in the overseas possessions (in Spain, the liberals at least allowed the missions to continue). Even graver was the fact that Don Pedro refused to acknowledge bishops who between 1826 and 1832 had been appointed by his rival Don Miguel, while on their part the majority of the bishops refused to cooperate with the liberal government. Many episcopal sees were soon declared vacant, and the government proceeded to noncanonical elections of chapter vicars. These came in conflict with the legitimate Church authorities, and priests and faithful who refused to recognize them were subject to persecution. A virtually schismatic condition existed for several years.

But, as in Spain, the political developments produced a relaxation of tension, starting in 1835. Even so, the negotiations with Rome, skillfully conducted by Monsignor Capaccini since 1842, made only slow progress. An agreement was reached only in October 1848 after the death of Gregory XVI; it dealt primarily with the question of the seminaries and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in law.[11] In 1857, the agreement was supplemented with a convention on the right of patronage by the Portuguese King with respect to the missions in India and China.[12] Seminaries were reformed, a matter of dire necessity in light of the low standards of training of the clergy, whose conduct and pastoral negligence the nuncios had frequently criticized in their reports. In spite of the obstacles put up by the Freemasons, the orders, including the Jesuits, gradually regained a foothold in the country after 1858. Even more than in Spain, the common people remained faithful to the traditions of Catholicism. But the rationalistic orientation of the educated middle class became more prominent, and the indifference of the Portuguese Catholics to the attacks by the antireligious press stood in uncomfortable contrast to the Spanish endeavors to create a Catholic press during the second third of the nineteenth century.

The Spanish American Republics

The dozen republics of former Spanish America were far from bringing much joy to the Holy See during the middle of the nineteenth century. While most of their constitutions continued to acknowledge Catholicism as the official state religion, the governments were unwilling to give up the tradition of a strict supervision of the Church and insisted that the Holy See recognize their right of patronage over the Church. At the same time they tried in the name of the new liberal ideology to reduce the influence of the clergy on the population, to do away with the clergy's legal privileges, and to incorporate the Church's considerable land holdings in the public economy. This attempt led to repeated conflicts and occasionally, as in Colombia and Mexico, to a rupture.

In some cases the conflicts were caused by the insistence of the Church on rejecting the state tutelage, which was incompatible with the new ultramontane ideas. But in most cases they resulted from a reactionary attitude of the clergy, which obstinately fought rearguard actions in defense of increasingly outmoded positions. Simultaneously, with the exception of Chile, the clergy, whose condition had changed radically, was no longer up to its tasks. There was a great lack of priests, especially in the rural areas.[13] It grew worse with the break with Spain, especially as the immigrants, in contrast to the United States, were almost never accompanied by priests from their native homelands. In addition, there was a lowering of morality, a lack of discipline, and the total loss of a pastoral dynamic, leading to the total abandonment of the Indian missions within fifty years. The religious orders, which had remained after the secularization at the beginning of the century, were in full decline. Thus, even with the assistance of foreign confreres, they were able to compensate the losses in the parish clergy only with limited success, the more so as they were constantly harassed and even expelled by the governments.

---

[11] Text in J. Ferreira Borges de Castro, *Colecçao dos tratados . . .* VII (Lisbon 1856seqq.), 221f.

[12] Text in Mercati I, 844–52. It dealt with the termination of the so-called Goan schism.

But after the deep crisis which had shaken these Christian communities during the wars of independence, a new beginning dawned by the middle of the century. It started with the pontificate of Gregory XVI. At first, the long-vacant episcopal sees were filled gradually. This was the prerequisite for establishing better ecclesiastical discipline. In South America, the dioceses of the colonial period were augmented by six additional ones, their number having become inadequate as a consequence of immigration from Europe and the steady increase in the population.[14] Apostolic visitors with extensive authorization were sent to restore discipline in the orders. The Jesuits settled again in some of the republics (in 1836 in Argentina, in 1842 in New Granada, and in 1843 in Chile).

Restoration proceeded slowly but steadily. Pius IX, who had a vivid interest in these countries ever since his trip to Latin America, supported the initiatives. Additional dioceses made possible closer contact between priests and their flocks; Church provinces were reorganized in order to adjust them to the new political borders; attempts were made to regain control over the local clergy through the appointment of delegates who tried to ameliorate the crassest abuses, although only with limited success; regular clergy from Europe were encouraged to open schools, and in spite of obstacles put up by the governments their number increased gradually, even though their influence was limited to the propertied people. In Rome, the *Collegio Pio latino-americano* was established in 1858, with the aim of training an elite clergy obedient to the Holy See.

---

[13] One example: In Mexico, the total number of priests in 1810 was 7,341 (4,229 secular and 3,112 regular clergy), but in 1850 it was only 3,275 (2,084 secular and 1,191 regular priests), while the population grew from 6 to 7.5 million.

[14] Twenty-four (without Brazil) in the south of the Gulf of Mexico in 1815, at a time when of the 15 million Spanish-Americans only a third lived south of Panama. While the population of Mexico and Central America until 1850 only increased by 30 percent (13 million), the population of South America grew by 250 percent, to 12.5 million, who resided in an area encompassing 5.8 million square miles.

To be sure, almost the entire pontificate of Pius IX passed before official diplomatic relations between Rome and the most important South American republics could be established; prior to 1877, there were only a few delegates apostolic. But between 1852 and 1862 the Holy See succeeded in negotiating seven concordats or conventions.[15] Some of them remained in effect only temporarily, but at least they brought about an improvement in the relations between the Church and the governments. This was usually the case both after the conservatives returned to power in the course of the second third of the century and after the subsequent triumph of the liberals during the final decades of the century.

This was especially true for Central America, where the dictator of Guatemala, General R. Carrera (1839–65), repealed the anticlerical laws introduced after 1829 by the liberal President Marazán. He restored the ecclesiastical privileges and the control of the clergy over the schools and the press, returned the land of the orders, and forced the smaller neighboring states to conclude concordats with the Holy See which were advantageous for the Church. This was also true, even though to a lesser degree, for Chile. There, Archbishop R. V. Valdivieso (1847–78), a diligent pastor, inflexible defender of the rights of the Church, and bitter antiliberal, complained unceasingly about the regalism of the government and the relief granted to the Protestants. But the Church received considerable compensation payments for the abolition of the tithe (1853), and during the twenty-five years that D. Portales was minister of education the influence of the Catholic Church in the schools was fostered, because Portales saw in it the best guarantee for public order. He also promoted the immigration of active orders from Europe, such as the Jesuits and the Ladies of the Sacred Heart.

In Venezuela the Church had to accept the loss of its own legal jurisdiction and of the tithe and the decision of the government to establish two new dioceses without consultation with Rome. But the conservative oligarchy which governed almost without interruption from 1830 to 1864 favored the clergy, culminating in the concordat of 1862. Bolivia almost concluded a concordat in 1851.[16] In view of the small influence of the Church in public life, the government was friendlier than in many other countries, but refused to ratify the treaty when Rome insisted on "granting" the government the right of patronage over the Church, while the government demanded this recognition as a matter of right. Relations nevertheless remained cordial, because Rome tolerated the exercise of the national patronage de facto, without recognizing it officially.

---

[15] With Guatemala and Costa Rica in 1852 (Text in Mercati I, 800–821); with Honduras and Nicaragua in 1861 (Mercati I, 936–59); with San Salvador, Venezuela, and Ecuador in 1862 (Mercati I, 960–99). Negotiations for a concordat were also started with Bolivia (1851), Peru (1853), and Argentina (1855 and 1857), but were not concluded chiefly due to the demand concerning patronage. After half a century of tension and difficulties, a concordat was negotiated with the black republic of Haiti in 1860 (Mercati I, 929–36); Haiti's Church was reorganized by French missionaries (see A. Caron, *Notes sur l'histoire religieuse d'Haiti de la Révolution au concordat, 1789–1860* (Port-au-Prince 1933).

[16] Text in Mercati I, 3–14.

In Peru the moderate liberal President R. Castilla was able to effect a compromise solution with the assistance of the conciliatory Archbishops F. X. de Luna Pizarro (1845–55) and J. S. Goyeneche (1859–72), in spite of the protests of a group of priests connected with the conservative party who tried to impose their reactionary views on the government. It was not possible to save the legal jurisdiction of the Church, the tithe, and the control of the Church over education, but the Church retained the majority of its property. Chiefly, however, the Church enjoyed an independence from the state which went far beyond that in any other South American state. Even in Argentina the end of the "golden age of the clergy" came with the departure of dictator Rosas in 1852. There, the clerics had adjusted to a pronounced regalism, but it was favorable to them.[17] Still, the Church enjoyed another ten years of peace, because the constitution of 1853 contained several articles favoring the Church.

The Church registered a spectacular success in the years after 1860 in Ecuador. President García Moreno, a fiery but authoritarian Catholic,[18] admired by the ultramontanes of the world, between 1861 and 1875 attempted to mold his country into a model Christian state. Legislation was fashioned along the lines of the encyclicals of Pius IX and especially of the *Syllabus.* For the implementation of his ideal the president to a large degree relied on European orders, in which he saw the guarantee for regeneration.

This policy clearly illuminates one of the principal weaknesses of Catholicism in Latin America throughout the nineteenth century. Social life, at least in those areas in which the Church had firm roots under the Old Regime,[19] was inherently Christian. But these Christian traditions were not capable of making necessary internal changes. Local Catholicism, with few exceptions, like those of Bartolomé Herrera in Peru[20] for the clergy and of José Manuel Estrada, "the Argentinian Louis Veuillot," for the laity, was passive and without vitality or originality culturally, socially, and apostolically. The reason was the absence of a middle class in these countries, the social structure of which was hardly changed by the political revolutions. It is chiefly to be found in the fact that the Church until the end of the Old Regime had retained a colonial structure too dependent on Spain and had become sterile and incapable of thought or action. Additionally, there was a very individualistic mentality, which under the influence of Freemasonry neglected organized ecclesiastical life in order to find salvation in a pietistic attitude toward faith.

---

[17] Many details concerning the relations between Rosas and the Church are found in the book of the anticlerical J. Ingenieros, *Evolución de las ideas argentinas: Obras completas* XVI, (Buenos Aires 1947), 99–142.

[18] Concerning the very controversial person of Gabriel Garcia Moreno (1821–75), see, in addition to R. Pattee, op. cit., P. H. Smith in *HAHR* 45 (1965), 1–24.

[19] Especially Mexico, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador. But in the interior of Venezuela and Bolivia the institutional presence of the Church was almost completely absent, and it was very modest on the Rio de la Plata and in Chile.

Brazil

The Empire of Brazil was the largest and most populated state in South America, with a size of 3.3 million square miles and 5.5 million inhabitants in 1830, who grew to more than ten million by the end of Pius IX's pontificate. Under the regency and long reign of Pedro II (1831–88), the Church lived in relative peace, even though the government, which, following the example of Pombal, desired to govern the Church by protecting it, periodically created tensions. For example, in 1834 it supported the attempts of the political priest D. A. Feijo, who strove for a legalization of priest marriages with the argument that celibacy of the clergy de facto did not exist in Brazil and that this fact favored public immorality to a high degree. In 1844 the government appointed the archbishop of the capital contrary to canon usage. The measures against the old orders, "victims of internal abuses which without radical reforms inevitably would lead to their dissolution" (Y. de la Brière), were intensified in 1855. On the other hand, however, new active congregations were founded,[21] and the European congregations which devoted themselves to education and charity were freely accepted. From the 1860s on, these congregations were able to conduct parish missions of several weeks duration, an undertaking very much needed, considering the profound religious ignorance of the people.

---

[20] See O. Barrenechea, *Bartolomé Herrera, 1808–64* (Buenos Aires 1947). The collection *Escritos y discursos,* 2 vols. (Lima 1929–30) gives insight into the thinking of this most highly qualified representative of the conservative clergy in Peru during the nineteenth century.

[21] See, for example, the biography of the founder of the congregation of N. -D. d'Amparo, devoted to the care of orphans (1871), *O Padre Siqueira, sua vida e sua obra* (Petropolis 1957).

The regalistic mentality of the government was approved by the clergy until about 1860, proof of which was the distribution of the handbooks by Monsignor M. de Araujo. But not everything was perfect. Freemasonry gained a considerable influence, even touching the religious confraternities. Another inheritance of the eighteenth century was the growth of rationalism and positivism among the educated and the deplorable situation of the clergy. The clergy was not only weak numerically; in 1872, there were fewer than one thousand priests. They were chiefly concentrated in the coastal cities, while in the interior of the country perhaps twenty parishes, covering thousands of square miles, were administered by a single priest and many faithful did not see a priest for ten years or longer. In addition, the morality of the clergy often left much to be desired, and their attitude also gave cause for alarm. Until 1850, many priests were influenced by the ideas of Rousseau and the encyclopedists, and even if a portion of them turned away from Freemasonry on account of its hostility to the Holy See, by 1870 approximately more than half of the clergy still belonged to its adherents. Some of the bishops, of whom there were only eleven, tried to strengthen the seminaries, and gradually the Catholic lay leaders became better educated also. But on the whole the period of the Empire was a time of stagnation behind a facade of peace and quiet. In fact, more to the truth, it was a period of decay for Catholicism.

CHAPTER 11

The Catholic Church in the Orthodox World

Unionist Prospects in the East

In the middle of the nineteenth century, two phenomena drew attention to the Eastern Churches. One was the development of the Eastern Question; the expected disintegration of the Ottoman Empire presaged profound political and religious changes. The other one was the clear recognition of the role which Russia's Pan-Slavic policy would play in connection with the budding nationalism of eastern Europe. Toward the end of the pontificate of Gregory XVI, a group led by Princess Volkonskaya, a wealthy convert residing in Rome since 1825, took up the question of the return of the separated Eastern Churches to Rome.[1] Among the members of the group were Monsignor Corboli-Bussi, Augustin Theiner, Monsignor Luquet, a former French missionary,[2] several consultants of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, a number of Uniates, and the founders of the Polish Resurrectionists. Under the presidency of the prefect of the Propaganda, the group in 1847 suggested to Pius IX that he address a solemn appeal to the separated brethren in the East. The Pope combined this plan with his own intention to send an apostolic visitor who was to inform himself of the prevailing conditions in the East. In January 1848 he directed the encyclical *In suprema Petri sede*[3] to the Eastern Christians. He informed the Uniates of the impending arrival of the apostolic visitor, who was well-known among the Catholic Armenians. He praised the customary advantages of the Catholic faith and invited the separated Uniates to join the Roman Church "as no conceivable reason could prevent their return to the true Church." The Uniates saw this document as a provocation. In May 1848 four partriarchs and twenty-nine archbishops wrote a negative reply in which they condemned Latin innovations, the pretensions of the Pope, and the proselytism of the Latin missionaries.[4]

---

[1] See C. Korolevsky in *Unitas* 2 (1949–50), 189–90.

This failure did not discourage those, however, who regarded the upper clergy of the Orthodox Churches as no longer representing the true feelings of the people, who were in turmoil as a result of changes. At first they looked toward Russia, where they believed they saw a tentative opening for a rapprochement in the reforms of Alexander II and in the growing interest in Roman Catholicism among some noblemen who were searching for an effective antirevolutionary ideology. With the covert and overt assistance of this nobility, the writings of Joseph de Maistre enjoyed renewed popularity in Russia for a number of years and occasioned a series of foundations after the Crimean War (1854–56). Under the patronage of the bishops of Münster and Paderborn, Baron von Haxthausen in 1857 founded the Saint Peter's Association in Germany, prayer groups for the conversion of Russia, and entered into correspondence with Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow. In Italy, the convert P. Schuvarov inspired Father Tondini to action on behalf of the cause of Christian unity, and Tondini founded a similar prayer organization.

---

[2] On his ideas, which were in advance of the time, see R. Roussel, *Un précurseur: Monseigneur Luquet* (Langres 1960), 83–89.

[3] *Acta Pii IX* I, 78–91. See A. Tamborra, "Pio IX, la lettera agli orientali del 1848 e il mondo ortodosso," *RStRis* 56 (1959), 347–67.

[4] Mansi XL, 377–418. See T. Popescu, *Enciclica Patriarhilor ortodosci dela 1848* (Bucharest 1935) and A. Tamborra, op. cit., 357–66. The Russian Church did not join in this protest, but A. Stourdza published another vehement book against Rome: *Le double parallèle ou l'Église en présence de la papauté* (Athens 1849).

But it was especially in the Austrian Empire and France that a vivid interest was awakened in the return of the Eastern Christians to Rome (the problem of union was always approached in this way, going counter to any ideas of ecumenism). In Austria an attempt was made to draw the Orthodox believers in the border areas away from Russian influence and to orient them toward Rome; Franz Joseph and his advisers in this instance were motivated by both genuine religious concerns and reasons of state. Such attempts were also aided by some Slavic clerics in the Empire. Monsignor A. M. Slomšek, the bishop of Lavant, in 1851 in Slovenia founded the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, which quickly grew in Moravia under the leadership of Father Sušil and also among the Ukrainians of Hungary and Galicia.

In France, the death of Madame Swetchine in 1857 led to the dissolution of her circle, but her work was continued even more systematically with the aid of the general of the Jesuits, Father J. Pierling, and her relative, Father I. Gagarin.[5] In his book *La Russie, sera-t-elle catholique?* (1856), which was translated into several other languages, Gagarin recommended a reconciliation which was not to end in the absorption of the Russian Church by the Roman Church; he thought that diplomatic negotiations between the Tsar and the Pope could bring about such a union. He was more realistic when, in 1856, being aware of the need for a fundamentally academic approach, he founded *Études de théologie, de philosophie et d'histoire* with the aid of his fellow countrymen Father J. Martinov and P. Balabin. The journal was designed to make the Orthodox understand Catholicism and Catholics to understand the Orthodox religion better. In the same climate of unionist ideas, but from a strongly apologetic point of view, Hergenröther wrote his books on Photius during the same period.[6]

After 1860, the expectations with respect to Russia gradually disappeared. They were replaced by a new interest in the potential return to the Roman Church of the Christian communities of the Ottoman Empire. Such expectations were raised as a result of French intervention in Syria, and the model thought of were the Uniate communities. Public opinion was especially enthused by this question in France,[7] where interest in the Christian East had grown for the past two decades. The issue had been kept alive by the speeches of men like Monsignor Dupanloup, by publications like the bimonthly journal *La Terre Sainte et les Églises orientales,* founded in 1864 by C. R. Girard, and by the *Oeuvres des Écoles d'Orient,* founded in 1855 and given strong leadership by Lavigerie.[8] Finally, in 1862, Father d'Alzon, at the request of the vicar apostolic at Constantinople, Paolo Brunoni, and of Pius IX, engaged his Assumptionists under the leadership of Father Galabert in the unionist apostolate in the East. After a difficult beginning they played an important role for the next seventy-five years.

---

[5] Shortly after his conversion he wrote a memorandum in 1845 on "Das Wirken der Gesellschaft Jesu im Blick auf die Bekehrung des Orients und vor allem Rußlands" (printed in *SPM* 2 [1955], 205–28). In it he suggested the establishment of a school for Jesuits of the Eastern Rite for the apostolate in Russia; however, the general at the time, Philipp Roothaan, had little interest in this project.

[6] The three volumes of his *Photius*, published between 1867 and 1869, were begun in 1855 and indicated by his *Mystagogia* of 1857. See the praising review by Döllinger in J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger* III, 444.

Rome could not remain indifferent to this interest in the East which agitated the Catholic world of the West, especially as the efforts of the Russians and chiefly the Protestant missions aided by the British were cause for concern. For several years, the rather simplistic efforts of J. G. Pitzipios, a Greek who thrived on intrigue,[9] were aided by Rome. His voluminous *L'Église orientale* was published by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1855. Much more serious were the efforts of Cardinal Reisach, who became interested in the Slavic problem by way of his contacts with Austria. He acquainted the Pope with the necessity of having available in Rome a number of specialists for the East. Following his suggestion, the Benedictine Pitra was ordered to undertake a study trip to Russia (1859–60), during which he was also to gather material for a broad documentation of the sources of Orthodox canon law.[10] In 1862 Pius IX decided to divide the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith into two sections, one of which was to concern itself with the affairs of the Churches of the Eastern Rite. Each cardinal belonging to the new section was assigned to a certain rite and asked to acquire competency in his area, and some of the best experts on the East were employed as consultants. There was no doubt that Pius IX and the leaders of the Propaganda genuinely desired to respect the different liturgical usages of the Eastern Churches, in contrast to many Western missionaries who were bent on forcing the Eastern Catholics into loyalty to Rome by making them replace their traditions with Latin customs, or in contrast to men like Father d'Alzon, who were convinced that the advance of European ideas necessarily would be followed by the disappearances of the Eastern rites.

---

[7] Especially in France, but not exclusively: in Austria, the Association of the Immaculate Conception of Mary for the Support of the Catholics in the Turkish Empire, founded in 1857 for the mission in the Sudan, turned increasingly to the support of the Catholic Churches of the Eastern Rite.

[8] H. de Lacombe, *Note sur l'œuvre d'Orient* (Paris 1906) and de Montclos, 143–55.

[9] See A. Tamborra in *Balkan Studies* 10 (1969), 51–68.

[10] See A. Battandier, *Le cardinal Pitra* (Paris 1893), 351–440; F. Cabrol, *Histoire du cardinal Pitra* (Paris 1893), 220–40.

Rome also tried to reestablish the influence of the Curia over the life of these Churches and gradually to gain entry for the principles of post-Tridentine Catholicism into the canon law of the Eastern Churches. But the optimistic expectations of a mass return of the separated Eastern Churches to the Church of Rome were not realized. In fact, the extreme centralization policy of Cardinal Barnabo by 1870 resulted in serious crises in the Uniate communities, crises which were intensified by the Vatican Council. Only in southeastern Europe and the Near East was Catholicism able to register some rather superficial progress, while its position in Russia once again deteriorated.

The Russian Empire

Contrary to the expectations which Gregory XVI at the beginning of his pontificate attached to the condemnation of the Polish rebellion, Tsar Nicholas I did not change his policy toward the Catholic Church; in fact, its condition behind "a curtain of silence" (de Bertier) grew worse. The Section for Religion at Saint Petersburg openly promoted the conversion of three Uniate dioceses of the Empire (1839) to the Russian Orthodox Church. Measures limiting the freedom of action of the Latin Church and its contacts with Rome in Poland and in the Russian Empire intensified from year to year. It is not to say too much that the Catholic Church legally was so integrated in the Russian state that it did not differ at all from any other state religion. While papal diplomacy in 1840 took up contacts with Polish conservatives in exile, through whom pressure was to be exerted on Russia, Gregory XVI's violent dislike of any revolutionary enterprise[11] quickly regained the upper hand, and Rome returned to the usual method of secret negotiations through diplomatic channels.

In return for new concessions by Rome in 1841, Russia's envoy made some vague promises. In fact, however, nothing changed. The ukase of 25 December 1841, which secularized all property of the Churches in the western provinces and reduced still further the authorized number of regular clergy, only confirmed the failure of this method. Catholics in Russia, Austria, and western Europe could not understand the long silence of the Holy See. Incited by B. Kopitar, the leader of Austro-Slavism, Augustin Theiner and the Jesuit Secchi emphatically implored the Pope. All questioned cardinals regarded a public protest as unavoidable. At this point, Gregory XVI again asked the Austrian Emperor and Metternich to mediate, only to learn that they were interested in a prolongation of the ecclesiastical abuses in the western provinces of neighboring and hostile Russia. This attempt having failed, the Pope in July 1842 published an address[12] in which he complained to the world about the repressive measures applied to Polish and Russian Catholics and about the disloyal conduct of the Tsar. The appeal, accompanied by a formal exposé of the Secretariat of State, received great attention, as everyone knew that the Pope would have preferred to protect the Tsar for political reasons.

---

[11] "The Pope had to condemn your revolution," Gregory XVI told the envoy of Prince Czartoryski on 7 May 1841, "and if necessary he will, with regret, condemn it again" (quoted in *RStRis* 51, [1964], 474).

Angry over the unexpected outburst, the Tsar, as many people had feared, began to intensify the measures against seminaries and orders. But upon the advice of Chancellor and Secretary of State Nesselrode, he started a policy of détente after a few months. He had two reasons. One was that at the very moment when Russia, in the eyes of a "revolutionary" Europe, tried to appear as a country in which, under the paternal authority of the Tsar, religion and order prevailed without compulsion, such an appeal to the world did not fit the Tsar's policy. He also feared that Austria would exploit the situation and would present itself to Rome as the only Christian great power. The recall of the Russian envoy from Rome (1843), his replacement by the moderate Butenev, and contacts made in 1844 through the mediation of the nuncios at Vienna and Munich paved the way for a personal encounter between Nicholas I and Gregory XVI. They met in December 1845, and Gregory XVI submitted to the Tsar an agenda which he had personally prepared.

Negotiations were started in November 1846 in Rome, after Nesselrode had made the necessary preparations first in Rome in talks with Monsignor Corboli-Bussi and Cardinal Lambruschini and then in Saint Petersburg with a special ministerial committee for Catholic affairs. Gregory XVI had died in the meantime, but Pius IX insisted that former Secretary of State Lambruschini, who was well versed in the problems, should continue to represent the Holy See. On the Russian side, negotiations were conducted by Bludov, former minister of the interior and justice, who was assisted by Butenev. The plenipotentiaries faced a difficult task; after all, they had to find solutions for the reconciliation of two powers with incompatible principles. Rome desired a total revision of Russian legislation, designed to return freedom to the Catholic Church. Saint Petersburg desired an improvement of its relations with Rome for the purpose of pacifying Polish agitation and winning the opinion of Europe for Russia. Russia was prepared to make some concessions, but was unyielding in the question of strict control over the Churches by the state. After twenty conferences (19 November 1846 to 1 March 1847), agreement was reached on some points, including the question of appointment of bishops. But the representatives of the Tsar again refused to discuss the suppression of the Uniate Church in the Ukraine. They insisted on demands unacceptable to Rome, among them those concerning mixed marriages and contacts of the bishops with Rome.

---

[12] *Acta Gregorii XVI* III, 224; see also *Allocuzione* . . . , 3–4; the exposé of the secretariat of state, ibid., 5–19.

An impasse was reached, and both the Tsar and Lambruschini were willing to break off the negotiations. But the more conciliatory Nesselrode implored the delegates to resume their talks after a certain interval. At the same time the same opinion was voiced in Rome by a commission of cardinals headed by Pius IX. Considering that the Catholic Church in Russia was facing an extreme emergency situation, the opportunity for an ever so limited improvement should not be allowed to pass. Consequently, negotiations were resumed on 15 June and by 3 August 1847 led to a settlement. It listed all points on which the two parties had agreed, as well as those on which agreement had not been reached and which were reserved for future discussions.[13] A completely satisfying concordat was still a long way off, but at least a clear break was made with the policy of unilateral decisions, followed by the Tsars since the beginning of the eighteenth century. The agreement, which Nicholas I in the absence of a better one ultimately signed, could be viewed as a success by the Holy See.

Yet the particular conditions made normalization difficult, the more so as after initial proofs of good will the administrative chicaneries increased as soon as the fears raised by the revolutions of 1848–49 dissipated. Even graver was the government's tactic of appointing to higher offices prelates who for reasons of cowardice or ambition were willing to do the government's bidding. Finally, in the 1860s, after the Crimean War, slavophile influences replaced the party friendly toward Rome, and a campaign for the conversion of Latin Catholics to the

---

[13] Text in S. Olszamowska, op. cit., 790–802; attached documents, ibid., 779–807. The bull set the new diocesan areas in the Russian Empire by applying the Convention according to which the diocesan borders coincided with those of the provinces and a new diocese of Cherson for the south of Russia was created, where many Catholics of German extraction lived; it was published on 3 July 1848 (*Acta Pii IX.* I, 134–49). The agreement also regulated the condition of the Uniate Armenians, especially those living in the Caucasus (see Ammann, 517–18 and M. Tamarti, *L'Église géorgienne* [Rome 1910]).

Orthodox Church was begun.[14] There was no doubt that in the eyes of many Russians the western provinces of the Empire were seen as foreign bodies as long as Catholicism, which was called the "Polish faith," continued to exist. Even the insufficient attempts to adhere to the concordat were justification for the convinced Orthodox Russians to emphasize all those points which gave them reason for their opposition to "Romanism." This attitude produced a number of controversies among the intellectuals[15] until the end of the century. They are reflected in Dostoevski's *Idiot* (1868), where Prince Myshkin evaluates Catholicism as worse than atheism.

As for Poland, the tsarist government understood that it could not eliminate Latin Catholicism, but was nevertheless determined to control all ecclesiastical life as much as possible. It kept episcopal sees vacant and tried to limit the contacts between bishops and Rome to a minimum. It forbade the bishops to convoke their priests in synods and to make public appeals in pastoral letters to the faithful. It intervened in the running of seminaries, which were badly off in any case owing to insufficient funds, and limited the number of postulants admitted to orders. At the beginning of 1862 the government created a committee for religion which strictly separated Catholics, Orthodox, Protestants, and Jews and, ignoring canon law and the Convention of 1847, deprived ordinaries of a majority of their jurisdiction.

It was not so much a matter of persecution of a denomination as one of regalistic practices. These had been a matter of course during the Old Regime in all of Europe, but in view of the developments in the Catholic world, for which the Austrian concordat of 1855 was a benchmark, appeared anachronistic and offensive. Thus, it was not surprising that priests and regular clergy, who had expected a democratic government to free the Church from its fetters, increasingly made common cause with the leftist opposition, which in addition to propagating social reforms knew how to exploit the Polish nationalism of the lower clergy. In spite of the reserved attitude of the Holy See and the episcopate, these patriotic priests with their revolutionary agitation discredited the Catholic Church and strengthened the distrust of the Russian officials and encouraged them to take stronger action against the Church. Yet, in spite of the growing discontent, the resistance of the Catholic people was not strong enough. The mass of the rural population did not comprehend the extent of the violations of canon law brought about by governmental decrees. Most important, however, was the absence of any foundation on which a movement analogous to the Irish struggle for the emancipation of Catholics or to the resistance of the German Catholics to the *Kulturkampf* after 1870 could have developed. In this police state there were no political platforms, no newspapers, nor any other means by which information could have been disseminated. Additionally, many episcopal sees were either vacant or occupied by incompetent men who were willing to accept a mutilated canon law to the extent that their ecclesiastical training was determined by Josephinism and Febronianism. Finally, a number of the upper clergy, often of aristocratic origin, partially for reason of social conservatism, partially for reason of hostility to the Germans, regarded collaboration with Russia as the lesser evil.

---

[14] Boudou II, 347–98.

[15] Some details in Winter, *Rußland* II, 274–78.

The Holy See, very well informed of the difficulties of the Church in Poland by emigrants[16] and its numerous contacts in the Hapsburg Empire, repeatedly protested to the Russian embassy at Rome against the violations of the 1847 agreement. At the same time, the Holy See tried to establish a nunciature at Saint Petersburg, in the expectation that it would facilitate the solution of many local problems and the supervision of the efforts of the Polish clergy, which the Holy See frequently regarded as unfortunate. The more liberal attitude of the new Tsar, Alexander II, seemed to justify such hopes during the initial period of his rule, and, in fact, negotiations had reached a promising state by 1862. But the Polish rebellion of 1863–64 once again put everything in question and thereafter relations between Rome and Saint Petersburg grew chillier.

The reaction by the Russian government to the assistance provided the rebels by the clergy was very strong[17] More than four hundred clerics, including several bishops, were deported to Siberia. Of 197 monasteries, 114 were closed; because the regular clergy was strongly allied with the rebels, bans of processions and pilgrimages multiplied, as did police surveillance of sermons and the confessional. Between 1866 and 1869, three dioceses were dissolved without the consent of Rome and were attached to neighboring dioceses.

---

[16] In addition to the very active political role of the Polish emigrants during the second third of the nineteenth century, some efforts of a religious nature are notable, for example the founding of the Congregation of the Resurrectionists in 1836 in Paris, which set as its task the Christianization of socialist radicalism. Pius IX entrusted the Bulgarian mission to the Resurrectionists, who also became active among the Polish immigrants of the United States and Canada. They also originated the founding of the Polish College at Rome (1866) (see L. Long, *The Resurrectionists* [Chicago 1947] and W. Kwiatkowski, *O. Piotr Semenenco, C.R.* [Vienna 1952]).

[17] See, for example, K. Gadacz, "Capucins déportés pour leur participation à l'insurrection en 1863," *Miscellanea Melchor de Pobladura* II (Rome 1964), 455–82. On the national and religious agreement, see R. Bender in *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 7 (Lublin 1960), 257–88. Outside of the Church, Polish nationalism was born in Freemasonry, but it developed chiefly among the upper classes, from which, until the end of the nineteenth century, the majority of the clergy emerged. The clergy in turn increasingly influenced the rural population, which until then had shown little interest in national affairs.

Pius IX harbored as little sympathy for revolutionaries as Gregory XVI; but the brutality of the Russian reprisals against the Church angered him. On 24 April 1864 he lodged a strong protest. A complete rupture of diplomatic relations was delayed by Austrian mediation, but when the situation continued to deteriorate, the Pope again complained in a speech on 29 October 1866. It had been drafted by a commission of cardinals and was accompanied by rich documentation for the press.[18] On 4 December the Russian government replied by revoking the concordat. In May 1867 it decreed that in the future all contacts of the bishops, including the Polish ones, with Rome were to be subject to official control by the Roman Catholic College at Saint Petersburg. The majority of the bishops was willing to comply with the new regulation, but the Pope described it as incompatible with the divine constitution of the Church.[19] In 1869 the administrator of Mogilev, Monsignor Staniewski, was excommunicated because he failed to take account of this condemnation. The Russian government in turn forbade the bishops of Russia and Poland to attend the Vatican Council. After the council, attempts were made by several factions to start a movement in favor of establishing a separate Slavic Catholic Church with a Latin rite, modeled after the Old Catholics. The project was utopian and the Russian government paid hardly any heed to it. On the other hand, it effectively assisted the campaign of some Ukrainian priests led by Michael Popiel. Blinded by the prestige of the Orthodox Church and their own anti-Polish sentiments, they tried to attach to the Russian Orthodox Church the only Uniate Church, that of Chelm, still existing in Poland.[20]

The matter was started in 1865 by a legitimate effort, but which, given the circumstances, was nothing more than a threadbare ruse. Initially, the Ruthenian rite was cleansed of all the Latinisms which had crept in since the Council of Zamosc. It was hoped that the removal of anything which provided the Uniates with a structure of their own would facilitate their conversion to Orthodoxy. The reforms were carried out without consideration of Roman objections. When the soil had been prepared, Popiel, whom the government had entrusted with the administration of the diocese, did not hesitate to call on the police in order to break the resistance of some Catholics loyal to Rome. After a petition campaign which was supported by two-thirds of the clergy, he announced at the beginning of 1875 the "reunion of the Uniate Greeks with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, the Church of our forefathers."

---

[18] Text: *L'Esposizione documentata,* 303–6.

[19] Encyclical *Levate* of October 17, 1867: *Acta Pii IX* IV, 371–78.

[20] Details in Boudou II, 105–14, 263–74, 399–447.

The Russian government, which since 1870 seemed to be interested in improving relations with Rome, from which it expected a pacifying influence on Poland, made a gesture of good will. It announced its willingness to reform the Roman Catholic College at Saint Petersburg in a way acceptable to the Holy See. But renewed attempts in 1877 to introduce the Russian language into the religion, as well as the discovery by the British during the Russo-Turkish war of police measures against the Uniates who refused to bend to the dictates of the "robber synod of Chelm," occasioned another Roman protest.[21] It led to the final break between the two parties.

On balance, however, the situation was not as negative for Poland as it might seem. While the rationalistic influence of the Enlightenment was long in evidence among the educated people, the upper levels of society, who recognized the pacifying influence of the Church in relation to revolutionary social demands, experienced a development very similar to that which France had undergone a few decades earlier. This change of atmosphere, even though it was tied to certain interests, promoted a profound religious awakening. It was strengthened by the new wave of spirituality then coursing through all of Europe.

A more significant indication of the rejuvenation of the vitality of Catholicism was the development of the religious orders. Many among them bore unmistakable signs of decadence, which fully justified the measures taken by the Russian government. There were too many monasteries with too few people, and there was a lack of novice-masters. Violations of seclusion regulations and the vow of poverty and the admittance of candidates who had no real vocation and merely wished to escape military service were very frequent. On the other hand, the Capuchins, especially in Warsaw, performed extremely valuable work in the areas of piety—particularly as it concerned the Virgin Mary—charity, and social work. After the middle of the century, there were also numerous new foundings of women's congregations, as for example those of the Felicians[22] in 1856. The movement continued even after the setbacks of 1864. The Capuchin Honorat Kominski (1829–1916), for example, founded about twenty secret Tertian congregations which, in order to avoid a ban by the government, wore civilian clothes while teaching and devoting themselves to the social apostolate among the workers.[23]

---

[21] Memorandum by Cardinal Simeoni of 26 July 1877 on "the greatest injustices under which the Catholic Church suffers in Russia and Poland," and encyclical to the nuncios of 20 October 1877 (Text in *L'Univers,* 20 January 1878).

[22] *DHGE* XVI, 855–59; *CollFr* 37 (1967), 343–65.

The Slavs in Austria-Hungary

As a country of nationalities on the borders of the Slavic world, the Hapsburg Empire was a place of encounter and also conflict between Eastern and Western Christendom. In 1870, the Empire comprised 24 million Latin Catholics, 3.5 million Protestants, 4 million Catholics of the Eastern rite, and 3 million Orthodox. The last two enjoyed freedom of religion and of organization, but both the government and the Catholic hierarchy hoped that they would return to Rome.

In Croatia, where the Orthodox comprised 30 percent of the population and were in close contact with their brethren still under Turkish domination, unionist efforts were embodied by Monsignor J. G. Stroßmayer, Bishop of Diakovar from 1849 to 1905. A conscientious prelate and ardent patriot, he had gradually become the moral leader of the Croatian opposition to the Magyar oligarchy. Instead of becoming involved in fruitless political battles, he preferred to advance the Slavic cause on the cultural level. He employed a majority of his high income to subsidize journals and publications on Slavic literature, history, and folklore and to give his country two important institutions, an academy (1867) and a university (1874). His contributions earned him an incomparable popularity among all Slavs of the south, Orthodox and Catholic alike. He intended to use his popularity to gain his second objective, the unification of the Churches. As far as he was concerned, this union was the prerequisite for the adoption of Western culture by the Slavs without risk. In order to facilitate an approach, he favored the Roman liturgy in Old Slavic and at the Vatican Council suggested a policy of decentralization of the Church. But his irenic way of approaching the problem of unifying the divided Christians met a favorable echo in Rome only during the pontificate of Leo XIII.

At the other end of the Empire, the growth of Pan-Slavism and the resultant tension between Austria and Russia had repercussions on the Ruthenian Church of Galicia. Its leader, Monsignor Lewicki, after 1813 archbishop of Lvov, was created cardinal in 1856; this dignity had not been awarded to a prelate of the Eastern rite since the sixteenth century. The clergy, cognizant since 1848 of the humiliating condition which Poland had imposed on the Ruthenian people, increasingly devoted itself to the political struggle in the name of Ukrainian nationalism. Some saw in it a means to regroup all Uniates on both sides of the border for a more effective resistance to the attractions of Russian Orthodoxy, but others, especially among the young, began to view Orthodox Russia as the protector of the Slavs. With the secret support of tsarist agents they viewed with sympathy the efforts of Michael Popiel in the diocese of Chelm, because after the concordat of 1855, which was binding for all Catholics of the Empire, the tendency to adjust Eastern ecclesiastical regulations to Latin canon law was intensified under pressure from the Vienna government.

---

[23] K. Gorski in *Roczniki teologiczno-kanoniczne* 11 (1964), 5–50.

In this atmosphere, the century-old controversies between the clerics of both rites could not but become aggravated,[24] but the resistance of the Ruthenian clergy to the Latin pressures of Poland served to tighten the connection between Church and people. With the consent of the nuncio, the Galician bishops worked out a sensible plan for an agreement, which was presented to the Holy See in 1853. Regrettably, Rome did not make an immediate decision, and soon the situation worsened again when both sides accused one another of proselytism, especially in connection with mixed marriages. Only in 1863, under the impact of the Polish revolution, was an agreement finally reached.[25]

The Ruthenian dioceses of Podcarpathia, living in complete peace until the middle of the century, now also began to feel the effects of nationalistic agitation. For it was at this time that an effort was started in liturgy to substitute Hungarian for those Magyars who no longer understood Old Slavic.[26] The government in Budapest, interested in weakening the influence of Slavism in its territory, supported these efforts, while the Russophile propaganda was encouraging the awakening of Slavic consciousness and obtained a number of conversions to the Orthodox religion.

The Uniate Rumanians of Transylvania had to thank the hostility to the Orthodox Serbs for many conversions. Upon the suggestion of the bishop of Grosswardein, Monsignor Erdeli (1843–62), two new dioceses were established together with an autonomous province with its capital at Fogaras.[27] The reorganization of this Church was undertaken in close cooperation between Rome and the Rumanian Uniate hierarchy. In 1858, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith directed three instructions concerning marriage law to the hierarchy, asking for urgent reforms.[28] A Roman delegation headed by the Vienna nuncio went to Transylvania in order to examine the situation which had become doubtful in light of the right of the Emperor, acknowledged in the concordat of 1855, to intervene in various matters, including the election of bishops. After conferences between Monsignor De Luca and the Rumanian bishops it was decided to hold a provincial council. After some delay, but well prepared by the new Metropolitan Ioan Vancea (1868–92), an extremely active prelate with Roman training, and Monsignor J. Papp-Szilaggi, the author of one of the few handbooks on Eastern canon law of the sixteenth century,[29] the council met in Blaj in May of 1872. Its decrees[30] were well considered and complete. In addition to this juridical rejuvenation, the clergy continued its efforts in the pastoral and cultural areas by becoming the ardent defender of the Rumanian language and national idea in the face of Magyar domination.

---

[24] Some examples in Winter, *Byzanz,* 162–64.

[25] *ColLac* II, 561–66.

[26] C. Korolevský, *Liturgie en langue vivante* (Paris 1955), 44–46.

[27] Bull of 26 November 1853 (Mansi XLII, 619–26; see also 638–40).

[28] Mansi XLII, 645–708.

Progress of Catholicism in Southeastern Europe and the Levant

In 1860 it looked for a moment as though a new Uniate Church were to be established in Bulgaria. Faced with the consistent refusal of the Phanariot to allow the Bulgarians to have their own bishops as a first step to their cultural and political emancipation, the Polish Committee in Paris began to suggest that the Bulgarians could expect their religious emancipation only from the Pope; they propagated the union with Rome under the condition that Old Slavic be retained as the liturgical language. Pius IX was well disposed toward the suggestion; after he had personally consecrated the aged Hegumenos, J. Sokolski, as archbishop of the Uniate Bulgarians in April 1861, a conversion movement was started in which politics played as much of a role as did religion. But the intervention of Russia, which desired the emancipation of Bulgaria for Russia's benefit, and the tactlessness of the apostolic delegate, Monsignor Brunoni,[31] soon nipped the movement in the bud. After the mysterious disappearance of Sokolski only a small flock was left, entrusted by Pius IX to the Assumptionists of Father d'Alzon and to the Polish

---

[29] Published in Latin: *Enchiridion juris Ecclesiae orientalis catholicae* (Grosswardein 1862).

[30] Mansi XLII, 463–710. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, which forbade any mention of the Councils of Photius, of the Nomokanones, and of the Byzantine canonists, finally gave its approval in 1881. The Roman authorities had already been dissatisfied with the positions of the diocesan synod of Blaj in 1868, a synod which pointed to the collegial structure of the Church and which assigned a significant role in the Church to the laity (see de Clercq II, 632–34).

[31] This story, writes C. Dumont, "makes clear the degree to which some persons in the Latin Church at that time failed to understand anything which legitimized the loyalty of our Eastern brethren to their own traditions" (I. Sofranov, op. cit., X).

Resurrectionists. When a new Bulgarian bishop was finally appointed four years later, the opportunity had passed.

During the events in Bulgaria, the conversion in 1861 of Archbishop Meletios in Greece raised hopes which were just as false, as the Greeks remained unshakeably true to their national religion. When as a consequence of the growing number of Catholics in Athens and Piraeus Pius IX in 1875 established an archbishopric in Athens, it was as a diocese with Latin rite, whose followers, overwhelmingly of Western descent, were viewed as an alien element by the Greeks.

In all areas which for centuries had been under Ottoman domination, Catholicism of the Latin rite made progress during the second third of the nineteenth century; today, this progress seems very questionable to us, but in its own time it was very significant.

In Rumania, autonomy grew until the establishment of an independent monarchy in 1866. In the same way the activity of the regular clergy in Moldavia increased in spite of the occasionally justified criticism leveled against it, and within a period of fifty years increased the number of faithful from forty-eight thousand to seventy-five thousand. In the liberal atmosphere prevailing in 1859 during the reorganization of the Polish status of the principalities, the Catholics were granted civil and political equality. In 1864 the government, which wished to end the Austrian protectorate over the Catholics, even planned a concordat with the Holy See. But sensitivitiy on the part of the Orthodox did not permit the replacement of the apostolic visitor by the establishment of a diocese at Jassy before 1884. In the preceding year an archbishopric had been established in Bucharest,[32] after the number of Catholics in Wallachia, insignificant until the middle of the century, had grown tenfold within a few decades. The reorganization of the Catholic Church in the new kingdom was facilitated by the benevolence of King Carol.

But this progress on the level of institutions should not lead to false conclusions. The spiritual tension between the national Orthodox Church and the Catholic minority continued. The majority of the Latin clergy were foreigners and the mission of the Conventuals in Moldavia was accused of being a tool of Magyarization. In fact, there were people who, with reference to the Hungarian descent of a part of the Catholic population, for a long time tried to entrust the mission to Hungarian members of the order and to withdraw it from the authority of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in order to place it directly under the ecclesiastical administration of Hungary. The government of the new kingdom in its striving for national independence insisted on the training of a native clergy, a demand which as early as 1842 had been acknowledged as justified by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The Conventuals, however, jealous of their privileges, thwarted the opening of a seminary until 1866 by claiming to have financial difficulties. For some time in this area, in which the priests because of their low numbers were not able to minister regularly to the faithful, who lived dispersed in many villages, a native organization had grown, the lay didascales. These were not only catechists and sacristans, but they also conducted Sunday prayer services, conducted funerals, and took the place of missionaries in civil matters. But as most of them were former seminarians from Transylvania and partisans of the Hungarian cause, the efforts to train the Rumanian didascales was persistently thwarted by the Hungarian Conventuals. It was accomplished only in the final years of the century.

---

[32] See *DHGE* X, 1011–12.

In Bosnia, which until 1878 belonged to the Ottoman Empire, the long conflict between Vicar Apostolic Barišić and the Croatian Franciscans, who defended the South Slavic idea against Austria's influence, was solved in 1847 by dividing the country into the two vicariates of Bosnia (one hundred twenty-five thousand faithful) and Herzegovina (thirty-five thousand faithful.)[33] In the expectation of the establishment of a regular hierarchy, which was erected between 1878 and 1881, an increase in the number of monasteries was allowed; in 1878 there were ten, instead of the four of thirty years earlier. However, the Catholics in these areas remained isolated and had only a small share in the improvement of the legal position of the Christians in the Ottoman Empire as a result of the decrees of 1839 and 1856.

At Constantinople and the ports of the Levant, the Catholic presence as well as the activity of Protestant missions was no longer concealed. In 1839, the new sultan, Abdul Mejid, following the advice of his liberal grand vizier, published the Hatti Sherif of Gulhané, which promised to all, regardless of religion or sect, complete safety of their lives, their honor, and their property. He wanted the Western powers to feel obligated and to assure himself of the loyalty of the Christians. The application of this regulation often was only theoretical, especially in the Balkan countries. But a first step toward emancipation had been taken, of particular benefit to the Uniate communities.

The Crimean War and the resultant Hatti-Humayun of 1856 produced another noticeable improvement in the legal position of the Christians, which improved even further after the Syria expedition of 1860. The holding of the regional Council of Smyrna in 1869, which brought together the Latin episcopate of Greece and the Greek islands, the vicar apostolic of Constantinople, and the archbishop, would have been unthinkable twenty years earlier.[34] Nevertheless, the steady growth of the missions founded by religious congregations, most of which were of French origin, was surprising.[35] In close contact with the French consuls, who under the Third Republic were even more concerned with limiting Italian influence in the Near East than under the Second Empire, the activity of the Lazarists, of the Christian Brothers, of the Sisters of Charity, and of the Sisters of Saint Joseph increased; they were joined by the Assumptionists, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, the Sisters of Notre Dame of Zion, and many other congregations. The Jesuits of Beirut were especially active. In an attempt to protect the educated classes from the Protestant influence, they founded a modern publishing company which published Arab translations of Western religious tracts; they also established a large Catholic newspaper, the *Al-Bashir* (1871), and finally a modern college which in 1881 became the University of Saint Joseph.

---

[33] See I. Kecmanovic, *Barisiceva afera* (Sarajevo 1957).

Incidentally, no matter how great the zeal of its members may have been, these missions contributed much more to the spread of French culture than of Christianity. And if their spiritual and intellectual abilities, coupled with the prestige of the West, enabled these institutions to take hold in the Eastern communities, it must still be admitted that the Latin Catholics of the Near East, whose numbers increased very satisfactorily, were for the most part foreigners. They came primarily from Malta and Italy, and as they grew in numbers they were increasingly regarded as alien intruders. But at the time their progress was greeted in Rome with joy, and the Holy See tended to see in their growth the future of Catholicism in the East. In order to coordinate the multifaceted missionary work and to assure Rome of control over the organization of the various Catholic communities in the Ottoman Empire, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith put its hope in the work of the apostolic delegates. It also continued to send out visitors who supervised the implementation of reforms and reported back to Rome. The most active representative of the Roman and Latin presence in the East was Monsignor Giuseppe Valerga,[36] after 1847 Latin patriarch of Jerusalem and after 1858 apostolic delegate to Syria; he bent all of his efforts toward a policy of centralization which the Holy See practiced with respect to the Uniate patriarchates.[37]

---

[34] *ColLac* VI, 565–91.

[35] See a concrete example of this growth by leaps and bounds of missionary congregations between 1840 and 1890 in the article "Alexandrie" in *DHGE* II, 364–65.

[36] On Giuseppe Valerga (1813–72), see the unedited dissertation of S. Manna (Pont. Istituto Orientale in Rome, 1969). Also, de Montclos, 533–34; Hajjar, 279–81.

The Eastern Patriarchates

In the course of the third quarter of the nineteenth century two developments characterized the Uniate Churches. There was a quantitative growth and with it a continuation of institutional consolidation, but there was also the threat of new schisms as a result of Rome's intensified policy of centralization. This policy of the pontificate of Pius IX expressed itself in the interference of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in the elections of patriarchs and bishops, in the alteration of decisions of the local synods, and in the introduction of reforms in traditional institutions. It also showed itself in the activity of the apostolic delegates in favor of an accommodation of Eastern ecclesiastical regulations to those of the Latin West.

This could be noted particularly in the Armenian Church. Numerous conversions, especially in Constantinople, raised the total number of the faithful in Turkey to about one hundred twenty thousand by 1870. Allowing for this progress, Pius IX in 1850 had created six new dioceses in northern Asia Minor and subordinated them to the primate archbishop of Constantinople. This archbishop, Monsignor Hassun, with enterprising energy and with the assistance of the Jesuits and other Western missionaries as well as the Armenian Congregation of Antonites, who were experiencing an incomparable growth, increased the number of churches and schools several times over. In order to crown this progress with a uniform canon discipline[38] and a further improvement in the relations between Turkey and Rome, the Holy See after the death of the patriarch of Cilicia decided in 1866 to fuse the two supra-episcopal jurisdictions by the election of Monsignor Hassun as patriarch. But this very step, which seen from the Roman point of view would promote the cohesion of the Armenian Church, in fact caused a great crisis. The reason was that the document which reorganized the Armenian patriarchate, the famous bull *Reversurus,* also and fundamentally altered the Eastern laws with respect to the privileges of the patriarch and the method of election of the bishops. The upper crust of the laity after 1850 repeatedly had complained about the virtual abolition of its right of participation; now it protested again, supported by clergy and bishops who also accused the patriarch of despotism in the leading of his Church and too much subservience to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The opposition became stronger at the council which the patriarch convoked at Constantinople from July to November 1869. While Hassun was attending the Vatican Council, a dissident movement was formed under the leadership of the superior of the Antonites, Monsignor Kasandschan. After the opposition declared Hassun deposed, it obtained recognition by the Turkish government as the true Armenian Church, and took over a number of churches and schools. The schism lasted for ten years, until Leo XIII in 1880 replaced Hassun, who had been created a Curia cardinal, with the more flexible Monsignor Azarian.

---

[37] He was also concerned with the return of a number of consecrated places in Palestine, which the Turks assigned to the Orthodox in the course of the eighteenth century. As is well known, the harsh discussions concerning the holy places were one of the reasons for the Crimean War, but de facto the status quo was maintained until the end of the nineteenth century (see B. Collin, *Les lieux saints* (Paris 1948); A. Popov, *La question des lieux saints de Jérusalem dans la correspondance diplomatique russe,* 2 vols. [St. Petersburg 1910–11]).

[38] A first step in this sense was attempted in 1851 by the patriarch of Cilicia, but the council convened by him for this purpose unified only the churches under his jurisdiction. The council's decrees (Mansi XL, 783–890), which strongly resembled those of the Maronite Council of 1736, were clumsily worded and thus not recognized by Rome.

The Chaldean Church was fortunate in being led between 1847 and 1878 by Joseph Audo, an energetic and dynamic person, even though he was an only moderately educated patriarch. After 1856 it also had the assistance of the French Dominicans of Mossul. At the Council of Rabban Hurmuz[39] in 1853 the Church for the first time codified its canon discipline in a Latin form under the influence of the apostolic delegate, the Jesuit Planchet. Within a period of twenty-five years it grew from forty thousand members to sixty thousand, but was shaken after 1860 by the increasingly fierce conflict between Audo and the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Rome objected to the patriarch extending his jurisdiction to the Chaldeans of Malabar, who since the seventeenth century had been under Latin sovereignty.[40] After a preliminary settlement of the question in 1863 and the recall of the apostolic delegate, who had exceeded his instructions, the struggle was renewed when the applicability of the bull *Reversurus* was extended to the Chaldeans by the constitution *Cum ecclesiastica disciplina*[41] of 31 August 1869. Furthermore, the resentment caused by the Vatican Council was still smoldering. The Chaldean episcopate split into two groups, and in 1876 the aged and ill-advised Audo was about to break with Rome. But the loyalty of the old patriarch to Catholicism and a gesture of peace by Pius IX were able to prevent this catastrophe at the last moment.

---

[39] J. Vosté, op. cit., 35–76.

[40] For details, see C. Korolevsky in *DHGE* V, 326–35, 343–49.

[41] De Martinis, *Ius pont.* VI/2, 32–35.

The Syrian Church did not have to go through such a crisis, even though a tense atmosphere lasted throughout the pontificate of Pius IX. The founding of the patriarchate by Antonius Samhiri (1854–66), which was occasioned by the Council of Sarfeh in 1853,[42] was accompanied by some disagreements and some new efforts. It laid the basis for the future of the Syrian Church, whose center was transferred from Aleppo to Mardin upon the request of Rome. But the succeeding patriarch, Philipp Arqus (1866–74), was hesitant and assumed a very vague and waiting stance in view of the uncertainties caused by the bull *Reversurus* and the Vatican Council.

The patriarch of the Melchites, Mazlum, heatedly opposed Roman interference with the rights of the patriarch. After the deaths of Gregory XVI and Cardinal Litta, who had personally known and trusted the patriarch, violent clashes took place, especially as the authoritarian and power-hungry Mazlum caused some of his opponents within his own Church to ally themselves with the Western partisans of a systematic Latinization. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith succeeded in having Clement Bahut (1856–64) chosen as Mazlum's successor. Bahut was very loyal to Rome, where he had studied, but he was more of an ascetic than a man of action. His ineptitude created a schism in his Church, but fortunately it was of short duration. It was caused by a question of seemingly secondary importance, but it once again illuminated the policy of adaptation to the Latin discipline which was pursued by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. In 1836 and 1837, the Syrian and the Chaldean Church had adopted the Gregorian calendar in order to disavow the schismatics. Upon the request of the Propaganda, Bahut decreed the same step in 1857, but met strong opposition. The metropolitan of Beirut, Riachi, angry at Rome because he had not been chosen as patriarch, exploited the unrest and with the assistance of the Russian Orthodox mission formed his own community.

Fortunately, the massacres of 1860, in which the Druses were responsible for almost as many cruelties among the Melchites as among the Maronites, put an end to the squabbles. Everything was put right again by Bahut's conciliatory successor, the eminent Gregory Yussef (1864–97). One of his greatest concerns was the improvement in the education of the local clergy, which was still inadequate in spite of Mazlum's efforts. Through the establishment of native schools, designed as a counterweight to the education provided by the Protestants, he tried to counter the annoyance caused by the schools maintained by certain Latin missionaries for the Churches of the Eastern rite. But he did not convene a council, in spite of the advantages which would have accrued to his reorganization, because he would have required the help of Rome and did not wish to ask for it. There was no doubt that Yussef, although he was a former student of the college of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith at Rome, was convinced by the bull *Reversurus* and the undifferentiated program of the neo-ultramontanes at the Vatican Council that Rome desired the destruction of the traditional privileges of the patriarchs. The reorganization of the Melchite Church had been started by the Council of Jerusalem, but its decrees had not been ratified by the Holy See during the time of the sharp conflict with Mazlum.

---

[42] Which, complemented by the Council of Aleppo (1866), attempted to achieve a certain uniformity in canonical and liturgical discipline, which until then was rather vague; but it did not produce final results (Texts in de Clercq II, 1037–72, 1072–93).

The Maronite Church suffered heavily from the revolt of the Lebanese peasants against the feudal domination of the sheiks and the Druse massacres in 1845 and 1860.[43] But the decline of the civilian leadership ultimately turned the patriarchate into the most important political power of the country. For half a century it was guided by Paul Masad (1854–1890), who combined great leadership qualities with considerable erudition. He opened his pontificate in 1856 with a national council[44] at Bkerke under the chairmanship of the apostolic delegate; the council was attended by the superiors of the three Maronite orders, which at this time comprised about eighteen hundred members and eight hundred priests. The long-standing and close connection with France, the strong protector of Lebanon, prepared the ground for a good understanding with the Latin missionaries. The disagreements caused by the bull *Reversurus* and by the definitions of the Vatican Council only slightly disrupted the Maronite Church, whose connection with the Holy See went much further back in history than that of the other Uniates.[45] Regrettably, little is known to this day about the inner life, the pastoral work of the clergy, the religious life of the faithful, and the development of the monastic customs of this vital Church, as well as of the other Uniate Churches. It is hoped that research in the archives of the Church by native historians will soon throw more light on these topics.

---

[43] Concerning their actual nature, see de Montclos, 144–54.

[44] Text in de Clercq II, 1093–1135. Its files, like those of most other Eastern councils of the time, were not acknowledged by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith; it was increasingly obsessed with the idea of a fundamental reordering of Eastern discipline and its accommodation to Latin canon law.

[45] The patriarch did not hesitate to point out to Pius IX in polite but unmistakable form that these steps contradicted the solemn promises of Benedict XIV.

SECTION TWO

The Missions between 1840 and 1870

CHAPTER 12

The Strengthening of the Gregorian Restoration

The long pontificate of Pius IX, seen from the missionary point of view, was essentially a continuation of the reforms of Gregory XVI, but also an amplification. The actual work was done by Alessandro Barnabo (1801–74). Serving the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith since 1831, Pius IX in 1847 made him its secretary and chose him as its cardinal prefect in 1856. He had a strong sense of duty and was a conscientious administrator, but not even his contemporaries, let alone posterity, knew much about his many accomplishments.[1] Schmidlin mentions that Pius IX was responsible for the creation of thirty-three vicariates, fifteen prefectures, and three delegates for missions to the pagans, numbers which indicate the degree of Barnabo's intensive missionary activity.[2] Barnabo not only prepared all new foundings to the point of papal briefs and appointments, but also took care that missionary personnel were increased accordingly. Even the separation of the Eastern missions from the missions to the pagans, an act of importance for the future within the jurisdiction of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, can be traced back to Barnabo's preparations and suggestions.[3]

While during the first half of the nineteenth century new missionary institutes were established chiefly in France, it was Italy which became very much engaged in this area of activity during the second half of the nineteenth century. Until the twentieth century, all of the Italian foundations were rooted in the renewal and intensification of the religious life of the closing eighteenth and beginning nineteenth centuries, carefully nurtured through generations of outstanding priests and bishops.[4] This explains the fact that all new religious foundations, created and carried by the secular clergy, had an apostolic-missionary character. Some of the institutions, owing to the Italian revolutions, could become active only after a long period of preparation. So, for example, the Milan mission seminary was founded in 1850 by Monsignor Ramazotti, named bishop of Pavia in 1849. This seminary in organization and spirit was a duplicate of the Paris mission seminary and retained its exclusively missionary nature.[5]

---

[1] It is characteristic that there is no biography of this man who headed the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for so many years. His selfless nature and his devotion to the dissemination of the faith can be seen in the modest obituary of 2 March 1874 in the archives of the Congregation (*S. Cong. Cardinali, Segretarii . . .*, vol. 3, 1850–92, 253–55; see *DHGE* VI, 858).

[2] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 226.

[3] In 1862, the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis ritus Orientalis* was established with its own administration and its own secretary. At first still a part of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, it eventually became an independent body (*JP* VI/1, 381–86). Barnabo's obituary assigned responsibility for this change to him.

The foundations by Giovanni Don Bosco (1815–88) of the Oratory and in 1859 of the Society of Saint Francis de Sales (Salesians) were primarily directed to local religious and social needs, but the apostolic spirit soon carried members beyond the borders of Italy to all continents, where they took over individual missions and also worked successfully as educators and journalists.[6] Another institute, created solely for Africa, was that which Daniel Comboni founded in 1866 in northern Italy. It was the Mission Institute for Africa (Nigricia, as he called it), which later was transferred to Verona and in 1885 renamed the Society of the Sons of the Sacred Heart. The impetus for it came from the Sudan mission established in 1846 in central Africa and maintained largely by Austrian secular priests. Monsignor Comboni's interest was to provide it with a stable foundation.[7] In Rome in 1867, the papal seminary of Saints Peter and Paul was established; its members, active in China, were later combined with the Milan mission seminary.[8]

---

[4] A typical example are the *Amicizie,* religious secret societies which were modeled on the secret political and antireligious associations in Italy (C. Bona, I.M.C., *Le Amicizie. Società segreta e rinascita religiosa (1770 a 1830*), [Turin 1962]). The soul of these societies and this rejuvenation was the Swiss convert and ex-Jesuit N. J. A. von Dießbach (1732–98) (ibid., 1–230 [documents, 471–528]). The members of these secret religious societies of the eighteenth century became the initial promoters of the Italian missionary movement in the 19th century (C. Bona I.M.C., *La Rinascita missionaria in Italia dalle "Amicizie" all'opera per la Propagazione della Fede* [Turin 1964]).

[5] G. B. Tragella, *Le Missioni Estere di Milano* I (Milan 1950), 1–89.

[6] Heimbucher II, 392–99; E. Cervia, *Annali della Società Salesiana 1841–1888* (Turin 1941); Pietro Stella, *Don Bosco nella storia della religiosità cattolica,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1968–69); see F. Desramaut, *RHE* 65 (1970), 926–33.

[7] H. Wohnhaas, *Bischof Daniel Comboni, Apostolischer Vikar von Zentralafrika* (Ellwangen 1937); Streit XVI, 714–18; *Comboniani. Numero speciale di Nigrizia. Dic. 1962* (Verona).

[8] Other institutions of similar structure were created at Parma in 1895 (*Xaveriani*) and at Turin in 1901 (*Missionari della Consolata*) (G. B. Tragella, *Italia Missionaria* [Rome 1939]).

In France also new mission institutions came into being. Father Jules Chevalier in Issoudun established the Association of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which devoted itself chiefly to the mission in the South Seas.[9] In 1856 some clerics at Lyon joined the former Paris missionary and bishop in India, Melchior de Marion Brésillac (1813–59), to form the Society for the African Mission for the conversion of the blacks. In 1858, the vicariate of Sierra Leone was entrusted to them, but within a year the bishop and his associates died of fever. Leadership at Lyon was assumed by the youthful Augustin Planque (1826–1907), who led the society through obstacles and sacrifices to a stable existence.[10] The Holy Ghost Fathers and the Lyon missionaries were able to send missionaries only to the coastal areas of East and West Africa, as they lacked the personnel for missions in the interior. The farseeing and energetic Cardinal Lavigerie (1825–92) became their apostle. In 1868 he established the Society of the White Fathers, organized their first caravans to the interior of the continent, and fostered the work of the missionaries with his practical and prudent directives.[11] In 1860 Pius IX confirmed the Society of Saint Francis de Sales (Salesians of Annecy), founded in 1833 at Annecy, which in 1845 had begun to send missions to Central Africa.[12]

The founding of two other important missionary societies took place at about the same time: the Belgian missionaries of Scheut and the English missionaries of Mill Hill. In 1862, a number of Belgian secular priests offered themselves to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith for work in the missions. With them Theophile Verbist founded the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (at Scheut/Brussels) and selected Mongolia for its work; he died there in 1868.[13] The English Society of Saint Joseph (Missionaries of Mill Hill/London), founded in 1866 by the future Cardinal Herbert Vaughan, concentrated on the mission to the blacks in the United States. In 1892 it became an autonomous organization in America, but also extended its work to British colonies.[14]

---

[9] G. Goyau, *La France missionaire* II, 393–458.

[10] Ibid. II, 255–302; F. F. Guilcher, *Un apôtre d'Afrique au XIX^{e} siècle, Augustin Planque 1826–1907. Premier Supérieur Général de la Société des Missions de Lyon* (Lyon 1928).

[11] G. Goyau, op. cit. II, 303–63; J. Perraudin, *Lavigerie, ses principes missionaires* (Fribourg 1941); X. de Montclos, *Lavigerie, le Saint Siège et l'Église de l'avènement de Pie IX à l'avènement de Léon XIII* (Paris 1965).

[12] G. Goyau, op. cit. II, 390–91.

[13] V. Rondelez, C.I.C.M. *Scheut, Congrégation missionnaire. Ses origines—ses débuts* (Brussels 1960); J. Fleckner, S.V.D., "Hundert Jahre Missionare von Scheut," *NZM* 18 (1962), 220–22.

[14] Heimbucher II, 621–23; H. Brugger, *Der erste Josefs-Missionar und sein Werk* (Brixen 1941; concerning Cardinal Vaughan and the development of the society).

Beginning in the middle of the nineteenth century, after freedom of religion and proselytization were guaranteed in a large number of Asian states, the emphasis of the missions was placed on education and charity. For this reason it was natural to involve the Christian Brothers, especially the followers of Saint Jean-Baptiste de la Salle, in the Asian missions. In 1859 they began to work in India and gradually extended their activity to other countries as well.[15]

The imposing number of new missionary institutions in this period could create the impression that the missions had enough personnel; comparisons with earlier periods show clearly, though, that these efforts were far from those of the Spanish and Portuguese during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[16] Other mission areas were worked only feebly or not at all. For this reason it was significant that earlier orders, whose apostolic impulses had grown feeble, renewed their missionary spirit.[17] The activity of the Holy Ghost Fathers is a case in point. By opening apostolic schools, establishing a Portuguese province, and resuming missionary work in Angola, the Portuguese missions developed a fresh impetus.[18]

The Weakening of the Portuguese Patronage and the Reorganization of the Asian Missions

IN THE BRITISH SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

After the long period of struggle over the reorganization of ecclesiastical matters, especially in India, it could have been assumed that all seeds of discontent had been removed. Exactly the opposite occurred. The contrast between the patronage missionaries and the missionaries of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith grew increasingly intense. Even if the Goan unrest did not cause a schism in terms of canon law—obedience to the Pope was never in question—legal uncertainties constituted a heavy burden, especially in those areas where the interests of the two authorities clashed. A conciliatory step was taken by Portugal in 1849 when it recalled da Silva Torres, the archbishop of Goa. After arrival at Lisbon, he directed a letter of apology to Pius IX, who read it in open consistory and sent a friendly reply.[19] During the vacancy of the see, the bishop of Macao, Jeronimo da Matta, exercised episcopal functions in the areas assigned to the vicars apostolic of Ceylon and Bombay, triggering a protest from them. The struggle between adherents of the patronage and adherents of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith reached its climax with the siege of the church of Upper Mahim, in which the vicar apostolic of Bombay, Anastasius Hartmann, remained confined for weeks. In a letter of 12 April 1853 he informed the vicars apostolic of India of the events, and after receipt of their replies he sent a letter of protest in all of their names to the Holy See.[20]

---

[15] G. Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles Chrétiennes VIII: L'Institut en Europe et dans les pays de Missions* (Paris 1951).

[16] For Spain, see L. de Aspurz, O.F.M.Cap., "Magnitud del esfuerzo misionero de España," *MH* III (1946), 99–173; for Portugal, J. Wicki, S.J., *Liste der Jesuiten-Indienfahrer 1541–1758. Aufsätze zur portugiesischen Kulturgeschichte* VII (Münster 1967), 252–450.

[17] The first reorganization of the Capuchin mission was conducted by Bishop A. Hartmann (W. Bühlmann, O.F.M.Cap. *Pionier der Einheit. Bischof Anastasius Hartmann* [Paderborn 1966], 200–210).

[18] A. Brasio, C.S.Sp., *Spiritana Monumenta Historica I. Angola* 2 (Pittsburgh-Louvain 1968). The Holy Ghost Fathers have been active in Portugal since 1869.

During the conflict the British authorities observed strict neutrality in keeping with their principle of not becoming involved in religious matters in India. Finally, though, they gave in to the pressures of the Goanese and denied Bishop Hartmann the church of Upper Mahim.[21] From Rome, the bishop had received only a temporizing reply which left him no option but to draw the consequences. "Inasmuch as they found support not even in Rome, the vicars apostolic could do nothing but resign."[22] In 1856 Bishop Hartmann returned to Europe. His willingness to turn over the vicariate of Bombay to the Jesuits and to devote himself to the organization of the Capuchin mission in the newly created position of a mission procurator allows the conclusion that this journey was the logical end result of the principles which he himself had enunciated in 1853. Was Bishop Hartmann the sacrificial victim for the complete reconciliation with Portugal? Based on the documents, the question can be answered neither in the negative nor in the affirmative. But certain indicators point in the direction of the affirmative, among them the quoted sentence from the letter of the bishop to Pius IX. He spoke from his heart, as in the hour of his greatest need he had not even received an answer to his many letters and cries for help.[23]

---

[19] The various documents are in Streit VIII, 168ff. Archbishop da Silva Torres became suffragan of Braga. Anastasius Hartmann issued the papal address and his letters in Latin with English translation and explanations (*Monumenta Anastasiana* I [Lucerne 1939], 678–700).

[20] The most comprehensive collection of sources for this and the subsequent years is the *Monumenta Anastasiana* II (Lucerne 1940), 3–1054. It also contains the text of the encyclical, 149–51.

[21] Ibid., 197–205.

[22] "Sed vicarii apostolici jure canonico sese defendere nequeunt, quum proinde neque in Roma assistentiam inveniant, aliud haut remanet, quam ut resignent" (Letter of 11 February 1853 to Pius IX), ibid., 32.

The concordat of 21 February 1857 with Portugal settled the confusion in India, albeit in favor of Portugal's patronage. The efforts of Gregory XVI, the regulation by *Multa praeclare* (1838), and Bishop Hartmann's warnings were to no avail.[24] The Portuguese bishoprics of Cochin, Mylapur, and Malacca (in addition to the archbishopric of Goa) were restored, and the jurisdiction of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was recognized only for China and individual parts of Malacca. In fact, Portugal obtained the concession of establishing additional patronage bishoprics in India.[25]

In spite of the one-sided emphasis of the rights of patronage, the concordat of 1857 did not have any deleterious results for the Indian mission, in part because of the discretion exercised by the vicars apostolic, who tolerated the Goan communities in their dioceses and treated them generously according to their needs, in part because of the lack of Portuguese priests who might have ministered to the already established Christian communities and might also have won additional believers. Furthermore, with the experience of a century behind them, the British would not have liked to see an increased activity of the Portuguese; they placed no obstacles in the way of native Goan priests.

In close connection with the work of Bishop Hartmann and his secretary, future Bishop and Cardinal Ignatius Persico (1823–95), occurred an event which guided the Indian Church for many decades: a papal visitation. On 1 June 1858 the two Capuchin bishops directed a memorandum to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith concerning the deficiencies of the Indian mission and the means of removing them.[26] In order to counter the lack of unity among the vicars apostolic and the missionaries of the Propaganda, they suggested a papal visitation. In August of the same year Pius IX appointed the vicar apostolic of Pondicherry from the Paris mission seminary, Clement

---

[23] This situation was not changed by the brief of 9 May 1853 and Hartmann's appointment as vicar apostolic of Bombay or by his appointment in 1856 as assistant to the papal throne. The most recent biographer of Bishop Hartmann, W. Bühlmann, O.F.M.Cap. (*Pionier der Einheit* [Paderborn 1966], 121f.), believes that Hartmann became a victim of the struggle and differences between the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and the Secretariat of State (Antonelli).

[24] The memorandum of 10 October 1856 concerning this question is in *Monumenta Anastasiana* III (Lucerne 1952), 668–87.

[25] T. Gentrup, S.V.D.,*Jus Missionarium* I (Steyl 1925), 211f. The brief judgment of the legal historian is: "Tota res in favorem Portugalliae fuit ad statum pristinum reducta" (ibid., 212). Concerning the various text editions of the concordat, see Streit VIII, 226–28.

[26] *Monumenta Anastasiana* IV (Lucerne 1946), 151–55.

Bonnand (1796–1861), as his visitor.[27] He was charged with examining the deficiencies as well as determining the means of removing them in the areas subject to the Propaganda, all to be included in a detailed report of his own writing. He started upon his task with courage and optimism, but was not able to finish it because he died of cholera at Benares in March 1861.[28] The vicar apostolic of Mysore, Monsignor Étienne Charbonneaux, carried the visit to its conclusion.

This visit of inspection was necessary not only in order to bring about greater harmony and cooperation among the visitors apostolic of various nationalities and orders, but also to instill renewed courage to persevere in the representatives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, who after the victory of the Portuguese in the concordat of 1857 felt deserted and betrayed.[29] Within the Portuguese bishoprics there were at the time of the visitation the following dioceses under the direction of the Propaganda: in the west, Bombay and Poona under German Jesuits, whom Bishop Hartmann had invited in 1853, in the north the vast areas of the vicariates of Agra and Patna under Italian Capuchins, in the center Hyderabad and Visakhapatnam, the former under the new Milan mission seminary, the latter under the direction of the Oblates of Saint Francis de Sales of Annecy. In the south, the old Jesuit mission of Madura was revived; the Italian Jesuits worked in Mangalore. The Carmelites continued to minister to the two vicariates of Verapoly and Quilon, the Paris missionaries to Pondicherry, Mysore, and Coimbatore; there were also the earlier established vicariates of Madras, which later was taken over by Don Bosco's Salesians, and Calcutta under the Jesuits, who in 1856 were joined by the Holy Cross Fathers and in 1866 by the Milan missionaries in eastern Bengal. The suggestions of the visitors (establishment of a hierarchy and apostolic delegation) were implemented only after the pontificate of Pius IX.

Another point to which the visitors drew emphatic attention was the absence of a native clergy in the areas under the ministration of the

---

[27] *JP* VI/1, 292–93. Concerning the visitation, see J. Waigand, *Missiones Indiarum Orientalium S.C.P.F. concreditae, juxta visitationem apostolicam 1859–62* (Budapest 1940); A. Launay, *Histoire des Missions de l'Inde* II (Paris 1898), 356–427 (*Visite Apostolique par Monseigneur Bonnand, Fin de son Épiscopat 1858–61*).

[28] He was journeying to Patna, where A. Hartmann was working as vicar apostolic for the second time since 1860 (*Monumenta Anastasiana* IV [Lucerne 1946], 615).

[29] The assertion that Pius IX did not ratify the concordat of 1857 (Delacroix III, 212) out of consideration for the vicars apostolic does not agree with the bull of appointment of the new archbishop of Goa, J. C. d'Amorim Pessoa, and the accompanying letter of 22 March 1861, in which the concordat is not only cited as a fundamental agreement, but which gave the archbishop jurisdiction for six years over all areas which after the conclusion of the concordat were subject to the vicars apostolic (*JP* VI/1, 326–29).

Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.[30] Aside from Pondicherry, where since the synod of 1844 the training of a native clergy was being undertaken with vigor and which at the time of the visitation numbered fifty Indian priests, seven vicariates had no native clergy, and the others only a few, most of them in the ranks of their own orders. Monsignor Bonnand in his visitation report deplored this fact with the words: *Monachi monachos gignunt.*[31] While this or that area doubtlessly still had to battle initial obstacles and for this reason could not yet engage in the training of a native clergy, the Propaganda acknowledged the justification of the reproof. On 8 September 1869,[32] in extensive instructions to the mission bishops, it reminded them not only of its own directives of 1845, but also demanded the formation of a capable native diocesan clergy.[33]

The lack of an Indian clergy had to be the more detrimental as the numerically strong Goan clergy theologically and ascetically held views which closely corresponded to those of the European missionaries. This was due chiefly to the excellent theological seminary at Rachol on the Salsette peninsula.[34] Its origins were the local Jesuit College of earlier times. After the expulsion of the Jesuits from India in 1759 by Pombal, Rachol became the central education institution for the clergy of Portuguese India. In spite of many a change in directors and occasional closings—depending on the political situation in Portugal—the seminary turned out a numerous and well-educated clergy. It was particularly the Archbishops da Silva Torres and d'Amorim Pessoa who introduced a better education. D'Amorim Pessoa reorganized the courses into a systematic three-year curriculum, wrote theological syllabi, and gave the seminary a library with seventy-three hundred volumes.[35]

The external difficulties of the Indian mission included the relationship to the colonial power. The English East India Company had absolutely no interest whatever in missionary activity. It required a direct order from London before the work of Anglican missionaries in 1833 and of non-British Protestant mission societies in 1834 was permitted. The Catholic Church, which had been active in the country for centuries, did not seem to exist at all. The unceasing efforts of the Capuchin Bishop Hartmann showed how difficult it was to obtain limited just treatment of the Catholics in India—there never was any talk of equality. In addition to personal representations in India, especially in Bombay, Hartmann in 1853 sent the English Jesuit G. Strickland and his secretary Ignatius Persico to Rome and London for the settlement of mission problems. Through oral and written efforts they obtained an official statement from the government in 1856 in the form of "Notes on the position of Roman Catholics in India."[36] In 1857 Hartmann journeyed to London and with his brochure *Remarks on the Resolution of the Government of India upon the Catholic Affairs in India* commented on the government's declarations.[37] Clearly and objectively he dealt with the question of the position of the Catholic bishops, the military chaplains and garrison priests, churches, schools, hospitals, and the unjust treatment of Catholic orphans. His efforts and those of other bishops were crowned with a minimum of success for the rest of the century.[38]

---

[30] C. Merces de Melo, S.J. *The Recruitment and Formation of the Native Clergy in India* (Lisbon 1955), 255–305; F. Coutinho, *Le régime paroissial des diocèses du rite latin de l'Inde* (Louvain 1958), 217–20; J. Humbert, S.J., *Catholic Bombay, her Priests and their Training,* 2 vols. (Bombay 1964; the 2nd volume deals with the priests between 1800 and 1928); E. Zeitler, S.V.D., "Die Genesis der heutigen Priesterbildung in Indien," *In Verbo Tuo (Festschrift)*, (St. Augustin 1963), 321–53.

[31] F. Coutinho, op. cit., 219.

[32] *CPF* II, 21–28.

[33] Ibid., 21f.

[34] Merces de Melo, op. cit., 181–205.

[35] Ibid., 190.

When in the course of reorganization in 1834 the vicariate apostolic of Ceylon was set up, there were only sixteen priests, Goan Oratorians, for two hundred fifty thousand Catholics. The first bishops came from their ranks, but the initial fervor of the Goan priests declined. As a result of English pressure—Ceylon was English after 1796—augmented by pressure from the Catholics of Colombo, Rome was compelled to appoint a European as suffragan bishop. Considerately, an Oratorian, Orazio Bettachini (1810–56), was selected. Soon the Pope gave him jurisdiction over the northern part of Ceylon, the vicariate of Jaffna, established in 1847. In that same year he succeeded in gaining the cooperation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate.[39]

After Bettachini had finally been named vicar apostolic of Jaffna (1849), Rome appointed the Italian Silvestrin Giuseppe Bravi (1813–62) as suffragan bishop of Colombo. The Oblates worked principally in Jaffna, the remaining Oratorians of Goa principally in Colombo.[40] In spite of all machinations, the native vicars apostolic remained loyal to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith; but intrigues and messengers from Goa so poisoned the atmosphere that ultimately there was only one solution: the replacement of the decreasing number of Goan priests with European missionaries.[41] In 1857 Bravi was named vicar apostolic, and in 1863 his fellow-Silvestrin Hilarion Sillani succeeded him.

---

[36] The text can be found in *Monumenta Anastasiana* II (Lucerne 1940), 238–53.

[37] Op. cit. III, (1942), 724–58.

[38] Thanks to his efforts, the monthly salary of the military chaplains was raised from 100 to 150 rupees, and a few decades later to 200–250, while in Hartmann's time the salary of a Protestant military chaplain or pastor was already 500–800 rupees (F. Coutinho, *Le régime paroissial,* 271–73).

[39] J. Rommerskirchen, O.M.I., *Die Oblatenmission auf der Insel Ceylon im 19. Jahrhundert, 1847 bis 1893* (Hünfeld 1931).

[40] S. Semeria (1811–68), the first superior of the Oblates, in 1856 became suffragan bishop and in 1857 vicar apostolic of Jaffna. He was particularly interested in training a native clergy (N. Kowalsky, O.M.I., "Monsignor Semeria [Apostolischer Vikar von Jaffna 1857–68] zur Pflege des einheimischen Klerus," *NZM* VII (1951), 273–81).

One reason for the decline of the once flourishing mission of the native priests was the inability of the Goans to adapt to new conditions. While the Catholics with increasing urgency asked for English schools and English education, their priests obstinately clung to the Portuguese language and culture. At the same time the Catholics faced the task of becoming better acquainted with the Sinhalese and Tamil cultures of the country. Credit is due principally to the Oblates, especially E. C. Bonjean (1823–93), who at first was vicar apostolic of Jaffna (1868–83) and then archbishop of Colombo, that this education was provided and fostered.[42]

In the Kingdom of Burma, which gradually fell to England in the course of the nineteenth century, Italian Barnabites were active from 1722 to 1832. Because of lack of personnel and means, they transferred the mission to the Oblates of Mary of Turin, who, for the same reasons, were forced to abandon the mission in 1856.[43] The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith immediately assigned the vast territory to the Paris mission seminary and appointed A. T. Bigandet (1813–94) as vicar apostolic.[44] He excelled not only as organizer of the Burmese Church, but as a scholar highly esteemed by King and people he also wrote a number of important books on linguistics and religion.[45] The division of the area into three dioceses,[46] earlier decided upon by the Propaganda in 1863, was implemented by him.[47] The Paris missionaries in northern and southern Burma were joined by the Milan missionaries in eastern Burma, where they were active among the Karens.[48]

---

[41] B. Barcatta Silv, O.S.B., "Lo Scisma del Padroado nel Ceylon fino al 1853," *NZM* V (1949), 241–57, VI (1950), 15–34. Additionally, in the course of the dissolution of orders by Portugal in 1834, the Oratory at Goa was also closed.

[42] J. Rommerskirchen, O.M.I., *Die Oblatenmission auf der Insel Ceylon* (Hünfeld 1931), 96–228. The papal visitation of Bishop Bonnand in 1860 was decisive for the progress of the northern area of Ceylon (N. Kowalsky, O.M.I., "Die Oblatenmission von Jaffna (Ceylon) zur Zeit der Apostolischen Visitation im Jahre 1860," *ZMR* 40 [1956], 209–13).

[43] This period is described by L. Gallo, *La Storia del Cristianesimo nell'Impero Birmano* (Milan 1862).

[44] A Launay, *Mémorial* II, 50–54.

[45] The good relations between court and people were mirrored by the briefs of Pius IX to the King in 1857 (*JP* VI/1, 273) and 1858 (*JP* VI/1, 287). P. Anatriello, P.I.M.E., calls the bishop the *"principe dei classici cattolici sul Buddismo Birmano"* ("I Cattolici ed il Buddismo Birmano," *NZM*, XXII [1066], 265).

[46] G. B. Tragella, P.I.M.E., *Le Missioni Estere di Milano* II (Milan 1959), 11–13.

After 1828, the Malay peninsula constituted a part of the British Empire. The bishopric of Malacca, established in 1558, did not have a bishop throughout the entire century. The activity of the patronage priests was limited to the Portuguese parishes in Malacca and Singapore.[49] The missionaries of the Paris mission seminary devoted themselves chiefly to the Chinese and Indian immigrants. The focus of their work in the vicariate, which was established in 1841, was the expansion of the seminary at Pulo-Penang. The vicar apostolic generally resided in a neighboring parish. The unique arrangement of the parallelity of a patronage bishopric and a vicar apostolic in Malacca continued in existence.

The Kingdom of Siam (Thailand) owed its independence during the nineteenth century to the fact that the two colonial neighbors England and France were unwilling to either share domination over the Thais or to leave it to only one of them. Catholic missionaries had been active in the area since the sixteenth century. Although they were not able to register noticeable successes, the tolerance of ruler and people allowed them to develop the country into an important missionary base. This was true especially for Vicar Apostolic Jean Baptiste Pallegoix (1802–62), an expert on Siamese language and culture, who established close ties to the Siamese court.[50] For fifteen years, Pallegoix maintained friendly relations with the abbot of a Buddhist monastery, who later ruled in Bangkok as King Mongkut (1851–68). His toleration and benevolence continued, with the result that the Catholic mission, almost at the point of extinction because of wars and lack of missionaries, revived again. Mongkut himself directed a friendly letter to Pius IX in March 1861; in October, Pius IX replied in the same vein, praising the tolerant attitude of the monarch toward Christianity.[51] Yet with all of his gestures of goodwill to Christianity, Catholic and Protestant alike, the King remained a convinced Buddhist and used his newly won knowledge of Christianity for a thorough reform of Siamese and Hinayana Buddhism.[52]

---

[47] *JP* VI/1, 442–43 (first establishment of the vicariates in 1866, which was not implemented), also VI/2, 93–94 (division of the country in 1870 into two vicariates and one prefecture).

[48] G. B. Tragella, op. cit., 371–400 ("La Missione della Birmania Orientale sotto il prefetto Biffi, 1868–81").

[49] M. Teixeira, *Macau e a sua Diocese* V: *Efemérides religiosas de Malaca,* VI: *"A Missão portuguesa de Malaca"* (Lisbon 1963). Until 1868, Portugal appointed regents for bishoprics. M. Teixeira, *The Portuguese Missions in Malacca and Singapore (1511–1959)* III: "Singapore" (Lisbon 1963). Jurisdictionally, Singapore at first was part of Goa, was placed under the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1884, and in 1886–87 became part of the diocese of Macao.

[50] A. Launay, *Mémorial* II, 482–85.

The strengthening of the Catholic Church in Siam, begun by Bishop Pallegoix, has lasted to the present. Even if conversions among the Buddhist inhabitants of the country remained rare, an increasing number of Catholic communities were established among Chinese and Vietnamese immigrants, from whom a native clergy was recruited.

IN THE FRENCH SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

After the death of Emperor Minh Mang in 1841, the Tonkin Church enjoyed peace under his successor Thieu-Tri (1841–47). The indefatigable vicar apostolic of West Tonkin, Monsignor Pierre Retord (1803–58), used this period to reassemble the dispersed and frightened Christians.[53] But a new, even bloodier persecution afflicted the Church under Tu Duc (1847–82). Thousands of Christians had to pay for their faith with their lives, among them about fifty priests and five bishops. The first decree of persecution (1848) was directed against the European priests, the second decree (1851) against the Vietnamese priests, and the third one (1855) against all Christians. In order not to endanger their flocks directly, the missionaries had to live in the mountains and forests, where Bishop Retord, exhausted by flight and deprivation, died in 1858.

French intervention took place during this difficult period. After an initial failure, the French consul de Montigny asked Monsignor Pellerin, the vicar apostolic of North Cochin China (1813–62), who had fled to Hong Kong, to seek an audience with Napoleon III in order to obtain help for missionaries and Christians.[54] Because in 1857 a Spanish Dominican bishop, Monsignor Diaz, was executed, the two powers intervened together. In 1858, the port of Da Nang in Tonkin was taken, and in 1859 Saigon was occupied by French troops. This action was the first step in the gradual occupation of all of Indochina by the French, culminating with the seizure of Hanoi in 1873. Although religious freedom was embodied in all treaties following each individual phase of the wars of conquest, the Church had to suffer its greatest loss of blood after the "pacification," especially in what is today Vietnam. It is not to be denied that missionaries caused the French intervention and that the suppressed and threatened Christians desired and expected it.[55] But it is also clear that most of the missionaries and Christians did not die because of these political events and wars, but because of their faith.[56] How little involved the missionaries in the interior of the country were with the political conflict was impressively demonstrated with the trial and subsequent beheading of Théophane Vénard (1829–61) in February 1861. It was confirmed by the letters which he wrote while kept in the bamboo cage in which he was confined until his execution.[57]

---

[51] *JP* VI/1, 349–50. The brief was accompanied by gifts and a portrait of the Pope. An earlier brief of thanks by the Pope is dated 20 December 1852 (*JP* VI/1, 153–54).

[52] G. Lanczkowski, "Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch des Königs Mongkut," *Saeculum* 17 (1966), 119–30; see G. Höltker in *NZM* XXII (1966), 300.

[53] A. Launay, *Mémorial* II, 550–53; A. Launay, *Monsignor Retord et le Tonkin catholique* (Lyon 1919).

[54] A. Launay , *Mémorial* II, 497–99.

In spite of the almost incessant persecution, Christianity made progress. The number of missionary dioceses was doubled during this period and so was the number of native clergymen. The clergy had been taught at Pulo-Penang, which was known by the name of *Seminarium martyrium.* As soon as the south of Indochina was calm, the Christian Brothers began their work in Saigon; in 1861, the first Carmelite house was established there. Other houses at Hanoi, Hué, Phat Diem, and Thanh Hoa followed. The seventeenth century form of the lay apostolate, the *Domus Dei* existing in some areas, proved their worth during the persecutions.[58]

The development of the Church in China took place on two levels: on the political/ecclesiastical, and the missionary/religious one. The concordat of 1857 with Portugal dissolved the hitherto Portuguese dioceses of Peking and Nanking, with only Macao remaining under Portuguese patronage. The replacement of the patronage missionaries by representatives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith occurred without stir and without injury to the areas concerned.[59] Nanking was replaced by the vicariate apostolic of Kiangnan and transferred to French Jesuits, Peking was given to French Lazarists.[60] The Chinese provinces of Kwangtung and Kwangsi belonged to Macao; missionaries of the Paris seminary had been at work in them since the eighteenth century. Only in 1858 was this area also split from the mother diocese.[61] From then on, the entire China mission was directed by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.

---

[55] E. Do Duc Hanh, *La place du catholicisme dans les relations entre la France et le Viet-Nam de 1851 à 1870,* 2 vols. (Leiden 1969).

[56] This fact was emphasized in the historical expert opinions in the course of the last beatifications (1951). B. Biermann, O.P., *De Martyribus tempore Tu-Duc Regis in Missionibus Ordinis Praedicatorum tunkinensibus profide occisis* (Rome 1937); O. Maas, O.F.M., "Die Christenverfolgung in Tongking unter König Tu Duc in den Jahren 1856–1862," *ZMR* 29 (1939), 142–53.

[57] Streit XI, 177–81, and T. Vénard, *Käfigbriefe. Bekenntnisse vor seiner Hinrichtung in Hanoi in Tonking 2.2.1861.* (translated into German by W. Stadler [Freiburg 1953]); on the martyrs beatified in 1951, especially the Dominicans, see B. Biermann, O.P., *Im Feuerofen. Glaubenszeugen unserer Zeit. Die Martyrer von Tongking* (Cologne 1951).

[58] Delacroix III, 239–44.

[59] J. Beckmann, *Die katholische Missionsmethode in China in neuester Zeit, 1842–1912* (Immensee 1931), 26f.

This development resulted in the virtual end of the Portuguese right of patronage in China. But the Treaty of Whampoa (1844) started a new political association, which, especially during the second half of the century, was to be unhappy: French patronage.[62] The contractually agreed freedom of religion was at first valid only for the five so-called treaty ports. Other military action (especially in response to the rebellion of Taiping)[63] led to the treaty of Tientsin (1858) and the peace treaty of Peking (1860). They extended religious freedom to the entire country and to all missionaries who carried a French document of protection. The Chinese were granted the freedom to accept and exercise the Christian faith. The weakness of these treaties and other agreements was, of course, that they were not concluded on the basis of equality but were imposed on the Chinese.[64] All disagreements and persecutions in the course of the century were, in the final analysis, only expressions of hate directed at foreigners and not at Christianity, which was hardly known.

This fact becomes evident from a study of Chinese sources.[65] The increasing number of "missionary incidents" after 1860 may occasionally have been caused by tactlessness, lack of comprehension, and pushy missionaries, but the real cause was the class of Confucian-trained gentry, mandarins, and large landowners. Ever since the seventeenth century they made common front against foreigners and Christianity and intensified their hostility during the nineteenth century.[66] By means of falsehoods and lies they tried to incite the ignorant masses against the strangers and the followers of foreign religions.[67] Violent incidents led to negotiations with the foreign powers which lasted for years. The hate of foreigners and Christians reached its first high point with the bloodbath of Tientsin on 21 June 1870, in which the French consul, other Europeans, a European and a Chinese Lazarist, and ten Sisters of Mercy were killed.[68]

---

[60] J. de Moidrey, *La Hiérarchie catholique en Chine, en Corée et au Japon* (Shanghai 1914), 97, 140.

[61] Ibid., 107.

[62] L. Wei Tsing-sing, *La politique missionnaire de la France en Chine, 1842–1856* (Paris 1960); J. Beckmann, op. cit., 14–23.

[63] *LTHK* IX, 1277, with literature. The Catholic missions had to suffer doubly from the social-religious movement of the fanatics, first from the killings and arson by the revolutionaries from Canton to Shanghai, then also, outside of the areas concerned, by the newly created mistrust, because the Christians were placed on the same level as the revolutionaries.

[64] T. Grentrup, S.V.D., *Die Missionsfreiheit nach den Bestimmungen des geltenden Völkerrechts* (Berlin 1928), 64.

[65] P. A. Cohen, *China and Christianity. The Missionary Movement and the Growth of Chinese Antiforeignism, 1860–1870* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963).

Such setbacks did not prevent the missions from expanding far into the interior of the country. Externally this was evident in the increase of the vicariates apostolic: in 1846, North Kiangsi, Kweichow, and Tibet; in 1856 North Tscheli, West Tscheli, Southeast Tscheli (these three areas were formed from the former diocese of Peking), Kiangnan (for Nanking), East Szechwan, South Hunan, and the apostolic prefecture of Kwangtung; in 1860, South Szechwan. In 1870, the vicariate of Hupei was divided into three vicariates. From Fukien, the Spanish Dominicans in 1859 resumed the mission on the island of Formosa, interrupted since the seventeenth century. Those orders already present in China strengthened their ranks, among them the Franciscans, Dominicans, Paris missionaries, Lazarists, and Jesuits, In 1858, the missionaries of the Milan mission seminary began their work in Hong Kong and in 1869 in the province of Honan; the Belgian missionaries of Scheut after 1865 laid the foundation for new Christian communities in the vast provinces of Kansu and Mongolia.[69]

In its instructions of 1845 concerning the education and training of native clergy, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had emphasized the importance of regular meetings of the superiors of orders at local synods for the preservation of ecclesiastical unity and discipline.[70] This general admonition was followed in June 1848 by an encyclical to the bishops of China and neighboring countries to gather for a synod at Hong Kong.[71] In spite of additional reminders such a synod did not take place, primarily because to most of the bishops the conditions in the country for such a gathering were not favorable and the journeys too dangerous, but also because most of them did not see the need for such a meeting. Behind the scenes, the old protectionist power (Portugal) and the new one (France), insisted on their right to participate.

---

[66] For the year 1860 alone, the archives of the Foreign Office (Tshungli Yamen) contain 8000 pages on "missionary incidents," for the years 1860–1909 there are 910 volumes (it is the largest section of the archives of the Foreign Office) (P. A. Cohen, op. cit., 346).

[67] P. A. Cohen, op. cit., 77–99 (Gentry Opposition to Christianity).

[68] Ibid., 229–61. He concluded: "Each side operated on premises that it believed to be universally valid, and both were caught up in a clash of cultures over which neither had much control" (261). On missionary concerns, see J. Beckmann, *Missionsmethode,* XIVf.

[69] The decrees for the establishment of new vicariates are in *JP* VI/1 and VI/2.

[70] *CPF* I, 545.

[71] G. B. Tragella, P.I.M.E., "Il mancato Concilio di Hongkong 1950," *Missionswissenschaftliche Studien* (*Festschrift J. Dindinger*) (Aachen 1951), 347–60. The meetings of six bishops in Shanghai and of the superiors of the Lazarist mission in Ningpo were a substitute (J. Beckmann, *Missionsmethode* 10).

In the meantime, Rome tried to prepare for an eventual synod. Pius IX appointed Monsignor L. C. Spelta, O.F.M., the vicar apostolic of Hupei, as apostolic visitor.[72] Unfortunately, he was forced to terminate his inspection and died in 1862 at Wuchang. A stronger impression than this visit was made in Europe by the journey of two Lazarists, E. Huc and Joseph Gabet, through Mongolia to Tibet (1844–46).[73] After his return to Europe in 1848, Gabet directed a voluminous memorandum to Pius IX in which in plain language he told him the truth about China and the means whereby its conversion could be hastened. In essence, these consisted of drawing concrete consequences from the instructions of 1845 by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.[74] When Father Gabet submitted his report, he could look back upon ten years of missionary experience; as the founder of the Catholic mission to Mongolia he had worked in Mongolia since 1837.[75]

In 1848 the first European sisters arrived in China. Their work in schools, hospitals, and orphan homes was the reflection of a profound change in missionary methods. Ever since persecutions had begun, especially during the past 150 years, the European missionaries had confined themselves to spreading the faith unobtrusively among moderate numbers of people. The pastoral care of families and women was left to Chinese girls. Beginning with the second half of the nineteenth century, the educational, social, and charitable institutions recruited members for the Christian faith indirectly. But it was precisely the (actually very beneficial) activity of European women which the Chinese regarded as alien and which they rejected. It is understandable, therefore, that the Chinese memorandum of 13 February 1871, which the government addressed to the foreign powers after the events of Tientsin, demanded more respect for Chinese sensibilities from the Europeans in general and the removal of the sisters in particular.[76] The demand was decisively rejected by foreign powers and missionaries alike.[77] The expansion of the missionary work was continued as before and characterized the Chinese mission until recently. In retrospect, the rejection of Father Gabet's recommendations by the mission superiors and the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was fatal.

---

[72] *JP* VI/1, 308f. Pius IX also sent a letter to the Emperor of China in which he commended Monsignor Spelta and the Catholics of the Empire to the benevolence of the Emperor and referred to the beneficial doctrines of Catholicism for his Empire. It is not likely that the letter ever reached the addressee.

[73] E. Huc, *Souvenirs d'un voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine pendant les années 1844, 1845, 1846* (Paris 1950). See Streit XII, 230–38 listing individual editions and translations. The French sinologist Paul Pelliot writes about the occasional doubts concerning the genuineness of the report in "Le voyage de MM. Gabet et Huc à Lhasa," *T'oung Pao* 24 (Leiden 1926), 133–78. According to him, the report is genuine in its essentials. But it was also edited by E. Huc for a broad public, and as a consequence the actual leader of the exploration, J. Gabet, was pushed to the background.

[74] *Coup d'oeil sur l'état des Missions de Chine présenté au Saint Père le Pape Pie IX* (Poissy 1848); Streit XII, 204–8. Monsignor Verrolles, vicar apostolic of Manchuria, protested the brochure, which in 1850 was condemned by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Gabet had the gift of seeing the situation in a way which was only acknowledged a hundred years later (see G. B. Tragella, "Le vicende di un opusculo sul clero indigeno e dul suo autore," in J. Beckmann, *Der einheimische Klerus in Geschichte und Gegenwart* [*Festschrift L. Kilger*] [Beckenried 1950], 189–202; N. Kowalsky, "Das 'verlorene' Manuskript zu Gabets Denkschrift über den einheimischen Klerus," *NZM* XIV (1958), 96–103.

[75] H. Verhaeren, C.M., "Un catéchisme mongol du lazariste Joseph Gabet?," *NZM* XXIII (1967), 150–51.

Korea was established as a vicariate apostolic separate from Peking in 1831. The remoteness of the country and the long access journey meant that it was not until 1836 that the first European missionary, Pierre Philibert Maubant (1803–39), arrived. The vicar apostolic of Korea, Bishop Barth. Bruguière, had died in Mongolia in 1835 on the way to Korea. In 1837, Father Jaques Honoré Chastan (1803–39) reached Korea, soon followed by the second vicar apostolic, Laurent Joseph Marius Imbert (1796–1839). All three died a martyr's death after the bishop had been arrested and the two missionaries voluntarily had turned themselves in to the authorities in order to protect their communities from harassment.[78] During the next bloody persecution in 1846 the first Korean priest, Andreas Kim, became a victim. After finishing his theological studies at Macao, he had gone to Korea in 1845, accompanied by his bishop, J. Ferréol (1808–53), and a missionary. When new persecutions broke out in 1866, during which two bishops, seven missionaries, and about eight thousand Christians were slain, the young Korean Church numbered about twenty-five thousand members. It was to be ten years before the country would receive other missionaries and pastors.[79]

---

[76] Streit XII, 455, listing the various editions of this memorandum.

[77] Streit XII, 455f.: Reply by the Western powers. From the side of the missionaries, there was *Le Memorandum Chinois ou violation du Traité de Peking.* Par un missionnaire (F. Genevois, Rome 1872); Ibid., 476f.

[78] A. Choi, *L'Érection du premier vicariat apostolique et les origines du Catholicisme en Corée* (Beckenried 1961), 76–87.

[79] Delacroix III, 281.

Attempts to reestablish missions in Japan failed until the American admiral Matthew Perry opened the country in 1854.[80] In 1858 France obtained the concession from Japan to allow freedom of religion for foreigners in port cities and in Tokyo. Father Girard (1821–1867) became the first priest and interpreter of the French Society of Paris Missionaries to settle in the capital. For foreign Catholics, small churches were established at other places as well, but attendance was forbidden to the Japanese.[81]

Nagasaki allowed the presence of foreigners again in 1862, and the Paris missionaries built a small church. It was here that Father T. Petitjean in 1865 discovered surviving Christians, of whom about twenty-five thousand acknowledged themselves to the missionaries.[82] Such an event could not be concealed from the Japanese authorities in spite of all precautions on the part of the missionaries. Anti-Christian legislation was still in force and was strengthened in 1869 by an imperial edict. Another wave of persecutions swept over the newly organized Christian communities, culminating in mass deportations and exile to distant parts of the country. Only pressure by the European powers effected a gradual diminution of the persecutions.[83]

The discovery of the Old Christians produced internal difficulties, especially with respect to language. The faithful of Nagasaki still used prayers, hymns, catechisms, and religious literature in Spanish and Portuguese terminology. The muddled situation did not improve when Monsignor Petitjean, vicar apostolic of Japan after 1866, reissued old books from the Jesuit printing press. By about this time, Chinese terminology had become accepted in central and northern Japan, while the traditional Spanish-Portuguese terminology survived in southern Japan until the death of Bishop Petitjean.[84] The problem was attenuated in

---

[80] J. Jennes, C.I.C.M., *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan, 1549–1873* (Tokyo 1959); J. Van Hecken, C.I.C.M., *Un siècle de Vie Catholique au Japon 1859–1959* (Tokyo 1960); J. Beckmann, *Die katholischen Missionen in Japan und ihre Auseinandersetzung mit den japanischen Religionen. Priester und Mission* (Aachen 1960), 337–74.

[81] Van Hecken, op. cit., 11–13.

[82] Ibid., 14–16. A large number of the Old Christians did not trust the new times. As late as 1954 there were about thirty thousand secret Christians in the west of the island of Kyushu. In its essential parts they had adhered to the Catholic faith, but exercised their religious life only clandestinely (J. Van Hecken, C.I.C.M., "Les Crypto-chrétiens au Japon au XX^e^ siècle," *NZM* XI, [1955], 69–70).

[83] If Japan was slow and hesitant in dismantling anti-Christian legislation, the reason was that the new state had to have time to organize the national religion of Shintoism, to consolidate it among the people, and thereby to erect a strong dam against the rise of Christianity (K. M. Panikkar, *Asien und die Herrschaft des Westens* [Zurich 1955], 392f.).

[84] J. Laures, S.J., "Das kirchliche Sprachproblem in der neuerstandenen Japanmission," *Monumenta Nipponica* III (Tokyo 1940), 630–36.

1876 by the division of Japan into two vicariates, North Japan and South Japan.

Philippines, Indonesia, Oceania, Africa

Although relatively autonomous and possessing their own religious administration, the Philippines until the nineteenth century were nothing more than an extension of Spanish-America to the Far East. Given this close association, the ideas of the French Revolution and of the American Independence movement could not but affect the islands. The first stirrings of political independence failed, in part because the dominant Spanish upper class was too weak to assume a leading role, in part because the Friars, especially the Augustinian Eremites, who since the end of the sixteenth century had carried the chief missionary and pastoral burden on the islands, maintained their strong position. Together with Franciscans and Dominicans they formed the most reliable pillar of Spanish rule. It was a paradox of history that Spain itself, expecially after the revolution and the dissolution of all orders in 1835, began to weaken its own position in the country through the positive support of Freemasonry. The association of Philippinos with lodge brothers of the United States in the neighboring Asiatic countries, who were to serve only as allies in the struggle against the Church, produced in the islands new sources of unrest, fostered the movement for independence, and ultimately, much to the surprise and disappointment of all parties concerned, brought about the American occupation of the country.[85]

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, the ranks of the Spanish missionaries could be filled with Spaniards, but after 1855 there were difficulties with recruitment. Queen Isabella II granted the reopening of the mission seminaries for the Philippines and the readmission of the Jesuits, whose first members arrived at Manila in 1859.[86] They performed their work primarily on the islands of Yolo and Mindanao, where the majority of the population was Muslim. In addition to the already mentioned political paradox, there was also an ecclesiastical-religious paradox with ominous consequences. The orders had done good work in training a native clergy, whose numbers had grown to impressive proportions by the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, they left this native clergy in subordinate positions, without raising its social or economic standing. Thus they forced this educated class into the ranks of the malcontents and rebels.[87]

---

[85] A critical comprehensive treatment of recent Philippine Church history is unfortunately lacking, but a wealth of source material has been sorted and is cited by Streit IX (1937) in a volume of almost one thousand pages.

[86] J. A. Otto, S.J., *Philipp Roothaan,* 493.

A mission to Indonesia became possible only after 1807 when Louis Napoleon granted freedom of religion to Holland.[88] But even after the establishment of the vicariate apostolic of Batavia in 1842, missionary work remained limited to the pastoral care of white Catholics. The colonial legislation of 1854 made any expansion of such work dependent on specific permission by the government. Only gradually, step by step, did Catholics achieve their missionary right to exist. This was generally in response to particular events, such as in Borneo, where an apostolic prefecture was created in the northern part in 1857, and after 1860 in Flores.[89] In 1859 Portugal, in a peace treaty with Holland, ceded this island and others, but managed to insert a clause guaranteeing the care over native Christians. One of the outstanding missionaries of the early period was the Jesuit Le Cocq d'Armandville; the first Jesuits arrived in Batavia in 1859.[90] Further progress was made only during the subsequent mission period. The part of Timor remaining with Portugal and a few other small islands, raised to the bishopric of Dili in 1940, were administered by the diocese of Macao until recently.

The missions of Oceania continued to attract hosts of missionaries after the middle of the nineteenth century in spite of tremendous difficulties, such as immense distances, tropical diseases, and political and denominational contrasts.[91] With most of them, genuine religious motives determined their preference for the Pacific islands, but some of them were no doubt also influenced by romantic adventurism and the image of paradisiac conditions.[92] Missionary romanticism imbued the

---

[87] C. A. Majul, "Anticlericalism during the Reform Movement and the Philippine Revolution," in G. H. Anderson, *Studies in Philippine Church History* (Ithaca 1969), 152–71.

[88] A. Mulders, *De Missie in tropisch Nederland* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1940); A. Mulders in Delacroix III, 378–80. This suppression of the Catholic missions was tied to the Dutch colonial method of the time, about which the Indian historian K. M. Panikkar judges harshly: "The Dutch were the only one among the European nations in the East who lowered a whole population to the level of plantation coolies and who acknowledged for it neither a legal nor a moral obligation" (*Asien und die Herrschaft des Westens* [Zurich 1955], 103).

[89] Concerning the attempts of the Milan missionaries to gain a foothold in Borneo, see G. B. Tragella *Le Missioni Estere* I, 189–91.

[90] J. A. Otto, S.J., *Philip Roothaan,* 34.

[91] Streit XXI, C. R. H. Taylor, *A Pacific Bibliography,* 2nd ed. (Oxford 1965); see also the regular "Bibliographie de l'Océanie," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* I (Paris 1945seqq.). On the whole matter, see also *Journal de la Société des Océanistes. Numéro spécial sur les missions du Pacifique* XXV (1969).

[92] J. Meier, M.S.C., "Primitive Völker und 'Paradies'-Zustand mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der früheren Verhältnisse beim Oststamm der Gazelle-Halbinsel im Bismarck-Archipel (Neu-Pommern)," *Anthropos* 2 (Vienna 1907), 374–86. The missionary utopias of the South Seas mission still need to be examined.

Society of Oceania; it existed from 1844 to 1854 for the support of the missions in Polynesia and trade with it. Even Pius IX and a number of other bishops joined it. But neither missions nor trade benefited from it, and the society was dissolved.[93] Polynesia remained the missionary field for the Picpus missionaries. Spreading out from Hawaii, they gained footholds on the Marquesas, Tahiti, and the Cook Islands, where independent vicariates were gradually erected. Subsequently, the missions gained world-wide attention through the heroic work of Father Damian de Veuster (1840–89), who, active in Hawaii since 1863, after 1873 worked among the lepers on Molokai.[94] Easter Island, where B. Eyraud began missionary work in 1864,[95] was also part of Polynesia.

When in 1836 the vicariate of Central Oceania, comprising all of Melanesia and Micronesia, was established and handed to the care of the Marist Fathers, ignorance of geographical realities allowed people to believe that enough had been done. But missionaries on the spot quickly realized that by themselves they would never be able to take care of such an immense area. Operating from the Solomon Islands, the Marist Fathers tried to deny Protestant missionaries access to New Guinea; but the deadly climate put an end to their efforts. Therefore their superior, Father J. U. Colin, welcomed the offer of the Milan missionaries to continue this work. The first group left Milan in 1852. But the young Italian missionaries also had to pay tribute to the tropical climate, and when in 1855 Father G. Mazzuconi was murdered by the natives, they left the unhealthy mission and retreated to Sydney to recover. The mission was not resumed,[96] and twenty-five years passed before fresh help arrived.

From their center in New Zealand, where they were trying to convert the Maoris, the Marist Fathers expanded their efforts to other, northern island complexes, especially to the Solomons,[97] to Tonga, Samoa, Fiji, New Caledonia, and the New Hebrides. Gradually, independent dioceses were established in this area. The vast distances and new languages promoted local printeries, especially by the Marist Fathers.[98]

---

[93] P. O. Reilly, S.M., "La Société des Océanie," *RHM* VII (Paris 1930), 227–62. Additional literature in Streit XXI, 130–32.

[94] Streit XXI, 225–42.

[95] S. Engler, O.F.M.Cap., *Primer siglo cristiano de la Isla de Pascua 1864–1964* (Villarrica 1964).

[96] G. B. Tragella, *Le Missioni Estere* I, 125–71.

[97] Hugh M. Laracy, *Catholic Missions in the Solomon Islands, 1845–1966* (Auckland 1969), diss., Canberra.

[98] P. O. Reilly, S.M. *Imprints of the Fiji Catholic Mission, 1864–1959* (London-Suva 1958); P. O. Reilly, S.M., "Premiers traveaux des presses de la mission catholique à Wallis, 1845–1849," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* XIX (Paris 1963), 119–28. Earlier works by the same author in Streit XXI, XIII/XIV, 653–55.

The Marist Fathers never reached Micronesia, which had been assigned to them as missionary area as part of the vicariate of Central Oceania. These islands, especially the Mariana Islands, where Christianity survived even after the expulsion of the Jesuits, ecclesiastically belonged to the diocese of Cebu in the Philippines (1814–98). Their Christian communities were tended by the Augustinian Recollects.[99]

At this time, the Benedictines began their missionary work among the Australian aborigines. In 1859 the area became an apostolic prefecture, and later became an *Abbatia nullius.* The method employed by the Benedictines was the same as the one used by them in missionizing Germanic tribes during the Middle Ages.[100]

Although Africa was geographically closer to the European mission centers and thus could be reached much more easily than the Pacific islands, missionary settlements in the dark continent were established only slowly, under great sacrifices, and with only moderate success. The vicariate of Central Africa, established in 1846, had a stirring and sorrowful history.[101] Its establishment was suggested by A. Casolani, canon in Malta, who became its first vicar apostolic. He accepted the appointment on the condition that Jesuits accompany him as missionaries.[102] But to General Roothaan the enterprise appeared as rather romantic and vague, and he detached only two Jesuits for an initial exploration. When Bishop Casolani resigned from his post, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith appointed Father Ryllo as provicar, whom the bishop together with two other secular priests accompanied as a simple missionary.[103] By 1861, the new mission had cost the lives of forty missionaries. Only Daniel Comboni (1830–81), vicar apostolic of Central Africa after 1877, was able to create better conditions for his missionaries by moving his headquarters from Khartoum to Cairo. But the rising of the Mahdi in 1882 destroyed the entire mission.[104]

---

[99] C. Lopinot, O.F.M.Cap., "Zur Missionsgeschichte der Marianen und Karolinen," *NZM* XV (1959), 305–8.

[100] R. Salvado, O.S.B., *Memorias históricas sobre la Australia y la Misión de Nueva Nursia* (Madrid 1946). This Spanish edition of the original (Naples 1852) contains a good historical introduction to the Benedictine missionary work in New Nursia.

[101] E. Schmid, M.F.S.C., "L'erezione del Vicariato Apostolico dell'Africa Centrale," *ED* XXII (1969), 99–127, XXIII (1970), 87–110; M. B. Storme, C.I.C.M., "Origine du Vicariat Apostolique de l'Afrique Centrale," *NZM* VIII (1952), 105–18.

[102] M. B. Storme, C.I.C.M., "La renonciation de Monseigneur Casolani, Vicaire Apostolique de l'Afrique Centrale," *NZM* IX (1953), 290–305.

[103] J. A. Otto, S.J., *Philipp Roothaan,* 237–48. Father Ryllo, S.J., died in 1848 and his successor, the secular priest J. Knoblecher, in 1858.

[104] S. Santandrea, F.S.C.J., *Bibliografia di Studi Africani della Missione dell'Africa Centrale* (Verona 1948).

Thanks to the loyalty of the missionaries of Verona, the flourishing Sudan mission emerged from the vicariate apostolic of Central Africa. In 1868 the new apostolic prefecture of Sahara and Sudan was created and subordinated to the archbishop of Algiers, Charles Lavigerie, as apostolic delegate. It can hardly be assumed that Rome, when making out the decree, which is not contained in any official collection of documents of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, seriously thought of converting the Sudan. But the man to whom the seemingly impossible task was entrusted conceived of a daring plan to achieve this objective with the aid of the White Fathers, whom he had founded. First attempts to penetrate to Central Africa from the Kabylia mission in Algeria failed. Only after much more careful preparations did the White Fathers make their way from the East African coast to the area of the great lakes.[105]

The areas which they had to cross in the east in order to reach their central African mission areas were under the jurisdiction of the Holy Ghost Fathers, who in 1863 worked in Zanzibar and after 1868 at Bagamoyo on the mainland. After the death of their founder, Franz Maria Libermann, Father Ignaz Schwendimann filled the office of superior general from 1852 until 1881. Under his leadership the young society was strengthened and took a firm foothold on the African mainland. In addition to their initial areas in western Africa (Senegal, Senegambia, Gabon), they were given the vicariate apostolic of Sierra Leone in 1864.[106] In 1849 the plan emerged to minister to the vacated Portuguese mission areas,[107] but it was not until 1866 that the first Spiritans arrived in the Portuguese Congo and in Angola. In the Congo, they found traces of the Italian Capuchins who had worked there earlier.[108] To the normal difficulties in tropical Africa was added the severe opposition of Portugal; only the tireless activity of Father Charles Duparquet (1830–88), residing after 1866 in Angola, effected the settlement of the Spiritans in Portugal and the establishment of a Portuguese province, thereby removing any obstacles.[109]

With the arrival of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Natal in 1852, the areas of South Africa saw their first missionaries; until this time the area's secular priests had been able to minister to the white settlers only.

---

[105] Streit XVII, 757–71.

[106] A. Engel, C.S.Sp., *Die Missionsmethode der Missionare vom Heiligen Geist auf dem afrikanischen Festland* (Knechtsteden 1932).

[107] *Spiritana Monumenta Historica. I. Angola 1.* Par António Brásio, C.S.Sp. (Pittsburgh and Louvain 1961), 30ff.

[108] Op. cit., 514–25.

[109] Volumes 2 and 3 of the *Spiritana Monumenta Historica* contain information on the work of C. Duparquet and the establishment of a Portuguese settlement and province.

In 1862 the Oblates made their way to Basutoland, which hitherto had been closed to Catholic missionaries, and eventually built up a flourishing mission. During subsequent decades they also became active in other areas of Africa.[110]

With the Jesuits active on the island of Réunion and the islands around Madagascar, they sought ways and means to penetrate the interior of the large island itself. But the political and denominational contrast (England/France) as well as the difficulties posed by France and the long-established colonial seminary in Paris were so strong that initial attempts failed. Only in 1861 did the Jesuits settle firmly at Tananarive and begin the establishment of the Church in Madagascar.[111]

It is perhaps astonishing that in a survey of missionary activity during the middle of the nineteenth century Africa occupies such a modest place. Of course, the difficulties to be overcome were great, but certainly not greater than in the Far East, the South Pacific islands, or in China and India. If the missions of the East were treated better, the reasons for this lie deeper. The optimistic missionary reports of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had surrounded the missions of the Far East with an attractive halo. The advanced cultures of these peoples, known particularly through the researches and reports of the missionaries, were valued as much as the tolerant character of the inhabitants. Unimaginable utopias exercised a great allure for the islands of the Pacific. Africa lacked such attractions. The great explorations of European investigators started only in the middle of the past century and were only cautiously exploited by Protestant and Catholic missionary circles.[112] The languages and cultures of Africa, aside from the west coast and Portuguese colonies, were largely unknown. Finally, the burden of earlier times still rested on the shoulders of the black race. The African was largely regarded as a slave in Europe and the New World, and this was also the view of the Church. The descriptions of slave hunters and traders remained alive, at least subconsciously.[113] To be sure, slavery was condemned and an attempt was made to lighten the lot of the blacks; but the continent exerted only minimal political and missionary appeal, a circumstance which explains the slow penetration of Africa.

---

[110] T. Ortolan, O.M.I., *Cent ans d'Apostolat dans les deux Hémisphères. II: En dehors de l'Europe, 1841–1861* (Paris 1914).

[111] J. A. Otto, S.J., *Philipp Roothaan,* 211–37; A. Boudou, S.J., *Les Jésuites à Madagascar au XIXᵉ siècle,* 2 vols. (Paris 1952).

[112] T. Ohm, O.S.B., *Wichtige Daten der Missionsgeschichte* (Münster 1961), 193–95, listing dates of discoveries and missionization.

[113] Urs Bitterli, *Die Entdeckung des schwarzen Afrikaners. Versuch einer Geistesgeschichte der europäisch-afrikanischen Beziehungen an der Guinea-Küste im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Zurich 1970).

CHAPTER 13

The First Vatican Council and the Missions

The first Vatican Council from 1869 to 1870 was a mirrored reflection of the laborious missionary effort during the nineteenth century. In contrast to the Council of Trent, missionary countries were represented, even though the presence of missionary bishops was controversial. As it was, their principal concerns were not dealt with at all, in part because of the early termination of the council and in part because of the lacking preparation and knowledge of the council participants.

Pius IX solemnly announced the impending council on 26 June 1867 in a public consistory, and a year later, on 29 June 1868, the bull *Aeterni Patris* invited the participants from throughout the world. Between these two events the decision was made to include the vicars apostolic, i.e., the missionary bishops. In its session of 17 May 1868 the preparatory central commission agreed that it would be proper to invite titular bishops to the council in keeping with the words "patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops" in the draft of the bull.[1] But the commission did not address the legality of participation.[2] This fact proved to be a hindrance for the position of the vicars apostolic at the council. Their position was inhibited by the polemics preceding and accompanying the council, denying the vicars apostolic the right to participate and mentioning their lack of education and manners.[3] From the words of some missionary bishops we know that they became aware of their second-class standing only at the council itself. Monsignor E. J. Verrolles (1805–78), the senior missionary bishop in China, who had administered the Christian communities in Manchuria since 1833 and had to undergo one of the most fatiguing journeys in order to reach the council, was furious when he learned upon arrival in Rome that French newspapers in particular disputed the right of vicars apostolic to participate in the council.[4] His fellow-brother from the Paris seminary, Monsignor Louis Faurie (1824–71), vicar apostolic in Kweichow since 1860, remarked sarcastically that some liberal papers seemed to think that "as barefoot ignoramuses and papal valets" they had been included among the worthy council fathers.[5] But the bad "missionary climate" at Rome was even more painful for the mission representatives than the journalistic sniping. The idea of forming preparatory commissions had first been raised in 1865. Cardinal Bizzarri, the chairman of the central commission, primarily moved to engage members of the Roman Curia, as they were most conversant with the problems to be treated and with the traditions of the Apostolic See. Additional theologians and canonists could then be made members as necessary. As a result of the chaotic conditions in Italy, it was not until 1867 that five preparatory commissions were formed and approved by Pius IX.[6]

---

[1] T. Granderath, *Geschichte* I, 93. Consequently, the text of the bull of appointment was printed in *JP* VI/2, 16–19.

[2] Granderath, op. cit., 93–97; Grentrup in *ZMR* 6 (1916), 30–32. Neither author dares to deal with the legal aspects. Granderath merely emphasizes that it would be unfair "to exclude from the Council the titular bishops of the mission countries which do not yet have an ordered hierarchy, who administer their dioceses like regular diocesan bishops, and on whose shoulders rest the largest of burdens."

[3] An examination of the importance of the actual pagan missions in the ultramontane-liberal polemics still needs to be written. A short synopsis is in Delacroix III, 81f. (L. Wei Tsing-sing, "Le I^{er} concile du Vatican et les problèmes missionnaires en Chine," *RHE* 57 [1962], 500–525).

In this context, the Commission for the Eastern Church and Missions is of primary interest.[7] The chairman of the commission was the prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Cardinal Barnabo (1801–74). It consisted of seventeen members: eleven Italians, three Germans, and one Englishman, Russian, and Oriental each. Upon the urging of the cardinal, the commission, which initially comprised only members of the Curia, specifically of the Propaganda, was expanded with three men who had practical experience. These were Monsignor Giuseppe Valerga (1813–72), since 1847 the first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem; his brother, the Carmelite Leonardo di S. Giuseppe Valerga (1821–1903), at that time apostolic prefect of the Carmelite mission in Syria; and the Franciscan Paolo Brunoni (1807–75), after 1853 vicar apostolic of Aleppo and since 1858 vicar apostolic of Constantinople. Both the men of the Curia and those with practical experience counted among them outstanding Eastern experts such as the German Benedictine abbot D. B. Haneberg (1816–76) and the Russian Jesuit J. Martinov (1821–94).

For the mission bishops arriving at Rome it was disappointing and paralyzing to learn that there was not a single expert or representative of the actual pagan missions on the commission. Moreover, in the very first session Cardinal Barnabo announced that the primary task of the commission was the application of the disciplinary rules of the Council of Trent to the conditions of the Eastern Churches. Aside from a few laudable exceptions, what was meant by this was a far-reaching Latinization of the Eastern Churches.[8] "Mission" meant for most of the members of the commission, aside from a few laudable exceptions, nothing more than the Near Eastern mission. This narrow interpretation resulted from the fact that the older missionary nations like Spain and Portugal were not at all represented on the preparatory commission, while the bishops of the Portuguese and Spanish patronage, respectively their American successor states, regarded themselves as belonging to the European residential bishops, i.e., to the bishops first class, and not to the barely tolerated vicars apostolic.[9] Only in January 1870 were two missionary bishops of the Paris mission seminary, Monsignor E. L. Charbonneaux, vicar apostolic of Mysore, and Father J. M. Laouënan, vicar apostolic of Pondicherry, appointed to membership on the commission. Both of them were renowned linguists and historians and had made names for themselves as associates of Visitor Monsignor Bonnand and continued his work.[10]

---

[4] A. Launay, *Monseigneur Verrolles et la Mission de Mandchourie* (Paris 1895), 397.

[5] A. Launay, *Histoire des Missions de Chine. Mission de Kouy-tcheou* II (Paris 1908), 596.

[6] R. Aubert, "La composition des commissions préparatoires du premier concile du Vatican," *Reformata reformanda (Festschrift Jedin),* (Münster 1965), 447–82; Granderath, op. cit. I, 62–82.

[7] The following observations rest primarily on R. Aubert, op. cit., 473–77.

The principal task of the commission was the drafting of a schema to be presented to the council fathers. Cardinal Barnabo had written to Near Eastern and Austrian bishops as early as February and March 1868 and asked them for ideas and suggestions.[11] Of the replies, that of the Hungarian Bishop Roscovany demanded a thorough and effective promotion of the propagation of faith and a higher level of piety in the Christian countries.[12] Other demands or suggestions reached the commission during the council. Among the home Churches, only France submitted a valuable postulate pointing to the future (signed by thirteen participants). On 23 January 1870, 110 members asked for a solemn recommendation by the council of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith. Thirty-five vicars apostolic voiced a similar concern for the Childhood of Jesus Association, and two postulates, one signed by thirteen, the other signed by sixty-one participants, were in favor of supporting the Association for the Support of Schools in the Near East.[13]

---

[8] J. Hajjar, "L'Épiscopat catholique oriental et le I^er^ Concile du Vatican (d'après la correspondance diplomatique française)," *RHE* 65 (1970), 423–55, 737–88; J. Hajjar, *Les chrêtiens uniates du Proche-Orient* (Paris 1962); L. Lopetegui, *El Concilio Vaticano Primero y la Unión de los Orientales* (Berritz 1961).

[9] C. J. Beirne, "Latin American Bishops of the First Vatican Council," *The Americas* 25 (Washington 1968–69), 265–88. The conversion and pastoral care of the Indians, interrupted since the expulsion of the Jesuits and other orders from almost all Latin American countries, was no problem for the Latin American bishops, as little as the Indian and Negro missions were for the bishops of North America.

[10] A. Launay, *Mémorial de la Société des Missions Étrangères* II (Paris 1916), 119–21 (on Charbonneaux), 363–66 (on Laouënan), with bibliographies of their works.

[11] Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 106. Similar letters to actual mission bishops are not known to me.

[12] Grentrup, op. cit., 32. Suggestions by Bishop Dupanloup and Cardinal Pecci (Leo XIII) point in the same direction.

By November 1869 a first draft of a mission schema was ready; it contained only one lengthy chapter on missionaries, their qualities, their education, and individual facets of their activity.[14] It was judged inadequate by the commission and in December 1869 replaced by a second draft with four chapters.[15] This schema also was rejected. Only the third draft of 26 June 1870 was accepted for distribution to those council fathers still at Rome.[16] Following an introductory letter from Pius IX, there were three chapters: 1. On Bishops and Vicars Apostolic, 2. On Missionaries, 3. On the Means of Spreading the Faith. Appended to the text were the *Adnotationes ad Schema Decreti de Apostolicis Missionibus.*[17]

The contents of the schema were probably the brainchild of the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, Giuseppe Valerga. It ran to forty-four folio pages on the Uniate Churches of the Eastern rite and to thirty-five pages on the missionaries of the Roman-Latin rite in the countries of the Near East.[18] The reliance on one of the outstanding representatives of the Latin mission in the Near East and the objective of the commission as earlier defined by Cardinal Barnabo make clear why the schema was concerned principally with the mission to the Near East. Still, the intervention of the representatives of missions to the pagans succeeded in changing many passages in such a way that they applied to all messengers of the faith. Yet other long passages, concerning only the Church and pastoral and missionary care among the peoples of the Near East, remained intact.[19] That the second chapter "On the Apostolic Missionaries" conformed precisely to the initial intention, i.e., the implementation of Tridentine rules, was clearly shown by the *Adnotationes,* which contain no fewer than nine concrete references to the Tridentine Council.[20]

---

[13] Grentrup, op. cit., 35–37; Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 105–9. The number of signatures was not significant. According to the listing in Granderath (op. cit. I, 463–509), the number of cardinals, patriarchs, bishops, vicars apostolic, etc. who were obliged to participate in the council was 990.

[14] On the history of the schemata, cf. Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 111–15. The author found two manuscript volumes with twenty opinions by the consultants of the mission commission *(Conc. Vat. Acta. Commissio pro Orientalibus)* and one volume of the *Conc. Vat. Comm. Orient. Studia praevia,* op. cit., 111–21, in the library of the Lateran University, Rome.

[15] List of contents of the two schemata in Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 112–13.

[16] The text of the third schema was printed by Mansi, 53, and *ColLac* VII. I am quoting from the original imprint as distributed to the council fathers in 1870 (photocopy).

[17] Schema, Text 1–20, *Adnotationes* 21–32.

[18] Ting Pong Lee, 114. According to him, not only essential portions of the schema, but actual phrasings were taken from these expert opinions.

[19] Note the careful delineation of the jurisdictions of bishops (of the Eastern rite) and vicars apostolic (of the Latin rite) which, aside from the Near East, had no significance (Schema 9–10, *Adnotationes* 30–31).

This one-sided orientation toward the Near Eastern missions was further indicated by the writers listed in the *Adnotationes.* Writings concerning pagan missions were conspicuous by their absence. To be sure, the Carmelite Thomas a Jesu, whose mission theories drew upon the provincial of the Jesuits in Peru, José de Acosta, S.J.,[21] was mentioned twice for the purpose of cementing claims of papal and episcopal jurisdiction.[22] However, no instruction from the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was adduced, neither the fundamental one of 1659 nor the equally recognized handbook on missionary method, *Monita ad Missionarios* (1669). Two specifically cited chief witnesses of the schema were the canonists and experts on the canon law of the Eastern rite Churches: Angelo Maria Verricelli and his *Tractatus de Apostolicis Missionibus*[23] and the Franciscan Carolus Franciscus a Breno and his *Manuale Missionarium Orientalium.*[24]

Aside from the deficient treatment of the pagan missions and their problems, the centralistic orientation of the schema encountered opposition. It was less a question of papal infallibility, to which all representatives of the missions agreed, than of the concentration of jurisdiction and administration of the missions in the hands of the bishops and vicars apostolic, which implied the virtual exclusion of the orders. After the mission schema had been distributed toward the end of June 1870, twenty-seven council fathers submitted extensive observations. Almost all of them opposed the intended exclusion of the superiors of orders; this view was not only held by the generals such as the general of the Society of Jesus, Petrus Beckx, but also by representatives of the home episcopate of the secular clergy.[25] Behind the tendency toward centralization, no matter how carefully and cautiously it was formulated, was concealed a noticeable rejection of the missionizing orders, especially of the Jesuits. After all, most of the members of the commission belonged to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and Monsignor Giuseppe Valerga, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, the most influential representative of the orders (O.F.M.), virtually spoke for the prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Barnabo.[26] For a specialist of missionary history, their aversion was clearly indicated by the positive evaluation of the disastrous actions of Bishop Juan de Palafox y Mendoza of Puebla in Mexico against the missionary orders.[27] Additionally, a mission directory was to promote uniformity of missions in all mission areas; its precise constitution was left to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.[28] This suggestion also was made by Monsignor Valerga, who in his verdict acknowledged that while the *Monita ad Missionarios* contained valuable admonitions, it was incomplete and lacked the necessary authority.[29]

---

[20] While the text in the schema (10–17) is general, the *Adnotationes* 26–30 clearly refer to the clergy of the Near East, for in the real mission countries, including the patronage countries, the regulation of the Council of Trent had been in effect for centuries. They were also being followed for the education and training, and the conduct and work of the clergy.

[21] P. Charles, "Les sources de *De Procuranda salute omnium Gentium*," *Scientia Missionum Ancilla (Festschrift Mulders),* (Nijmegen 1953), 31–63.

[22] Schema 24, 28.

[23] Venice, 1656.—That this book, according to the title of missionary character, was designed primarily to serve the Near Eastern missions, becomes clear from the appendix which examines the validity of the ordinations of bishops and priests in the Near Eastern Churches. (Streit I, 233).

[24] Venice, 1726. Streit I, 379–80.

[25] A. M. Hoffman, "Die Vollmachten der Missionsbischöfe über Ordensmissionare auf dem Vatikanischen Konzil," *NZM* 12 (1956), 267–75. Hoffman used the expert opinions which were published by Mansi in volume 53.

Faced with this atmosphere, which was not exactly favorable to the pagan missions, the missionary bishops resorted to a kind of self-help in regional bishops' conferences.[30] The Indian and Chinese bishops met separately. The eighteen vicars apostolic of India directed a petition to the Pope requesting him to do away with the Portuguese right of patronage, in which they saw the greatest obstacle to the conversion of India. But Pius IX did not think that he could accede to their request.[31] The gathering of the Chinese bishops developed into a kind of synod. The soul of these meetings, which from 22 December 1869 onward took place once a week and then twice a week, was the vicar apostolic of Kweichow, Monsignor Louis Faurie, who also acted as the secretary of the gatherings.[32] The basis of their discussions were seventy-two questions submitted to the bishops by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. In addition, the participants were chiefly concerned with the relationship of the Chinese missions to the French government, respectively to the French protectorate. Some of the non-French bishops absented themselves from the sessions dealing with a letter of gratitude to Napoleon III.[33] There was no doubt that all of the French missionaries recognized the protection by their government, whose effective strengthening was repeatedly mentioned in the sessions on the letter to Napoleon. The letter was sent on 10 March 1870.[34]

---

[26] R. Aubert, "La composition des commissions préparatoires du premier concile du Vatican," *Reformata reformanda* (Münster 1965), 473–77.

[27] Schema 25, where only the steps taken against the Jesuits are emphasized. The arguments by the canonist A. M. Verricelli, employed by him in his book of 1656 for the defense of the bishop of Mexico, were refuted by his very contemporaries, especially by the learned Jesuit Diego de Avendaño.

[28] Schema 20; P. Wanko, op. cit., 35–37.

[29] Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 134–36.

[30] Pius IX specifically authorized such group meetings of the bishops (R. Aubert, *Le Pontificat,* 323).

[31] Delacroix III, 84. Even though he traces the instruction of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of 8 September 1869 to the activity of the council participants from India, the indication can not be correct chronologically, as the Indian bishops had not yet arrived in Rome at that time. The document is a consequence of the papal visitation by Bishop E. Bonnand.

[32] A. Launay, *Histoire des Missions de Chine. Kouy-Tcheou* II (Paris 1908), 598–612 (Launay published the draft of the protocol from the archives of the Paris Mission Seminary); I. Ting Pong Lee, *De congressu praesulum Missionum sinensium Concilio Vat-*

The questions of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith dealt with by the bishops of China concerned the establishment of an apostolic delegation or nunciature, to which the bishops reacted skeptically and negatively, as they were jealous of their independence; the division of the Chinese mission into five regions, specifically with respect to the holding of regional synods; the appointment of a council for the vicars apostolic and of another council for mission estates and the regular clergy in missions; the Chinese clergy, its education and training, which should be of a kind allowing them to administer a mission or become bishops;[35] liturgical questions; feast and fast days;[36] the significance and spread of Christian literature and schools; and the administration of the sacraments.[37]

---

icano durante. Commentarium pro Religiosis et Missionariis 29 (Rome 1948), 104–11 (according to the protocol in the archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, vol. 242, 1874); L. Wei Tsing-sing, "Le Ier concile du Vatican et les problèmes missionnaires en Chine," *RHE* 57 (1962), 500–523, based on Launay, supplemented with documents of the Foreign Office in Paris.

[33] Wei Tsing-sing, op. cit., 513. Wei deals almost exclusively with the political side of the meetings, while Ting Pong Lee emphasizes the missionary and pastoral aspects.

[34] Unfortunately, Launay, op. cit., 607, published only a fragment of this letter. We do not know who signed this petition of thanks. The author was Monsignor A. Languillat, S.J., the vicar apostolic of Kiangnan.

[35] On the whole, the bishops reacted positively to this question, but were also in favor of proceeding slowly and cautiously. (A. Launay, op. cit., 602–3).

[36] The bishops preferred Chinese as the liturgical language, but were willing to leave the decision to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. (Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 108).

[37] With respect to the administration of baptism, the discontinuation of the baptismal ceremony according to the Roman rite and its distribution over the entire period of the catechumenate was rejected, but it was required that all questions should be put in the Chinese language (Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 109). —This decision was a compromise, for the missionaries of the Paris Mission Seminary, most recently Monsignor Faurie, in the eighteenth century had introduced the division of the baptismal ceremony in their dioceses. But in 1866 this practice was expressly forbidden by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (J. Beckmann, "Taufvorbereitung und Taufliturgie in den Missionen vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart," *NZM* 15 [1959], 20–21).

On 14 July 1870 a final session of all Chinese bishops was called, the only one which was chaired by the cardinal prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Thirteen problems were discussed; some of them had been discussed earlier, others were new, like the problem of opium and the use of Chinese hymns in liturgical and paraliturgical celebrations.[38] All decisions of the Chinese bishops were to be submitted to the council fathers for final disposition. Considering the second-class standing of the missionary bishops, it is not astonishing that not one of them played an eminent role at the Vatican Council.[39]

The weakness of the missionary climate of the council as a whole was shown by the single postulate on the African missions.[40] It was short and impressive, carried a brief rationale, and demanded effective steps on the part of the council for the conversion of the blacks, especially in central Africa. The author was Daniel Comboni, the founder of the Missionaries of Verona, missionary, and future vicar apostolic of central Africa. It is dated 24 June 1870 and was signed by seventy council fathers. These signatures, especially in the context of what was said above, present a clear picture of the lack of interest in missions. Although Comboni rushed from man to man like a beggar, appealing for the conversion of Africa, he only met large-scale incomprehension. He was best received by the representatives of the Near Eastern Churches; together with the missionary bishops of the Near East, they provided thirty-one signatures.[41] Of the residing bishops, twenty-five signed.[42] Even of the actual mission bishops only fifteen signed their names: six from India and nine from Far Eastern countries.

Given the lack of interest in missions among the council fathers and the almost systematic displacement of the pagan missions to the margin of the council, no profound reflections on the missions were produced. Nevertheless, the Vatican Council acted as a stimulant and guide for mission theory during the subsequent period.[43] Among the votes and postulates, especially of the French and Chinese bishops, there were programmatic suggestions, some of which were put into action under the more relaxed pontificate of Leo XIII, while others had to wait for the twentieth century and the Second Vatican Council. In their submission to the council, the French bishops considered deliberations on the dissemination of the faith as one of the primary, most significant and important matters with which the council ought to deal. At the same time, they anticipated their great responsibility for the missions. So that they could perform their tasks better, they asked for regular reports from the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith concerning the status and problems of the pagan missions.[44]

---

[38] Ting Pong Lee, op. cit., 109–11.

[39] L. Wei Tsing-sing, op. cit., 508.

[40] P. Chiocchetta, "Il *Postulatum pro Nigris Africae Centralis* al Concilio Vaticano I e i suoi precedenti storici e ideologici," *ED* 13 (1960), 408–47 (text of the *Postulatum,* 409–11, signatures, 412–14).

[41] The absence of the signature of Monsignor Lavigerie, the bishop of Algiers, was particularly noticeable.

[42] Of these, six were North Americans, two were Brazilians, one was German, and the others were Italian. P. Chiocchetta (op. cit., 415ff.) somewhat artificially attempts to raise the significance of the individual signatures by drawing attention to their signers. But neither this positive evaluation nor the reference to the fact that the Sudan mission and Comboni's efforts were later promoted by Rome are a sufficient reason for his optimistic presentation. Comboni, who participated in the council as theologian for the bishop of Verona, was a "voice in the wilderness."

---

[43] P. Wanko, op. cit., 16–23.

[44] J. Moreau, *L'Épiscopat français et les missions à l'heure du Ier Concile du Vatican: Missions de l'Église* (Paris 1962), 8–13; see also R. Aubert, *Vaticanum I* (Mainz 1965), 295.

SECTION THREE

Light and Shadows of Catholic Vitality

CHAPTER 14

Regular and Secular Clergy

Orders and Congregations

The pontificate of Pius IX saw a new and decisive phase in the internal reorganization of the old orders and an expansion of the new congregations. To be sure, the orders were hard hit by secularization measures in southeastern Europe, Poland, and Latin America, but in western Europe and in North America there was a continuing quantitative and qualitative growth. The orders constituted an essential factor in the flourishing of religious organizations and the intensification of spiritual life.

Pius IX himself was not a member of an order, but like his predecessors Pius VII and Gregory XVI concerned with the restoration of discipline. The consolidation during the first half of the century enabled him, with the assistance of Monsignor Bizzarri, the energetic and competent secretary of the *Congregatio Episcoporum et Regularium,* to raise his aspirations. Immediately after his election he established a commission of cardinals in September 1846 and charged it with restoring the life of the orders in those countries in which they had suffered as a consequence of disorder. In the next year he created the *Congregatio super statu regularium,* with the specific function of supervising the reforms.[1] Two decrees of 25 January 1848 strengthened the precautionary measures taken to prevent the admission of unworthy candidates to the novitiate.[2] An encyclical of 1851 tightened the requirements of communal life and of poverty (although prudently retaining the toleration of the *peculium*). The enclyclical *Neminem latet*[3] of 19 March 1857 extended a requirement to all monastic orders which heretofore was only applied to the

---

[1] *Collectanea in usum Secretariae S. Congr. Episcoporum et Regularium* (Rome 1863), 867–68, and *Acta Pii IX* I, 46–54.

[2] *Collectanea . . . ,* 882–902.

[3] *Collectanea . . . ,* 904–6. Twenty-four explanations by the congregation *Super statu regularium* from 1857 to 1882 supplemented the new rules (see also *Acta Pii IX* III, 417–20).

Jesuits: the obligation to precede the solemn profession of vows with temporary vows. In order better to counter the loosening of morals and customs which had crept in during the preceding centuries, Pius IX did not limit himself to encouraging centralization within the orders and to emphasizing more strongly their dependence on the Roman congregations; in several cases he did not hesitate to appoint their superiors himself. In 1850, for example, he designated the reformer Don Casaretto as abbot of Subiaco and assisted him during the following year in Casaretto's efforts to reorganize in a new province those monasteries which were desirous of returning to a stricter observance of the Benedictine rules.[4] In 1852 it was the Pope's admonition which induced the monastery of Monte Cassino, where discipline had become very lax, to reintroduce seclusion and communal life and to regroup the novitiates.

During his refuge at Gaeta Pius IX had noted the deplorable conditions prevailing among the Redemptorists in the Kingdom of Naples, where their generalate was located, in contrast to the progress of the congregation north of the Alps.[5] For this reason he decided in 1853 to move their headquarters to Rome and to appoint their general, a function which normally would have been exercised by the chapter general of the order.

In order to remove the decadent features which had begun to characterize the Dominicans, he decided in 1850 to abolish the election of the master general. Much to the dismay of the Italian members, he named Father Jandel, one of Lacordaire's early associates, as head of the order. Jandel remained master general until 1872 and finished the movement of restoration. Characteristically, his efforts were guided by the initial concepts of the order, which the historical research of the eighteenth century had brought to light again. Thus, the closings to which the order had been subjected since the French Revolution and which in some countries continued beyond 1870[6] at least had the advantage of completely clearing the slate of the most recent past. The fact that the provinces of the order had to be restored from new houses facilitated the return to the original guidelines. This was not as simple as it sounds, as Jandel, who tended to cling to traditional forms, came in opposition to Lacordaire, who had a better feeling for the necessity of accommodation to the requirements of modern times.

---

[4] A few years later, in 1867, this province was raised to an independent congregation, the *Congregatio cassiniana primitivae observantiae,* which, like the modern orders, was divided into four provinces: Italy, Anglo-Belgium, France, and Spain (see I. Di Brizio, *L'Italia benedettina* [Rome 1929], 103–44).

[5] Despite some vicissitudes in Austria in 1850 (see E. Zettl in *Spicilegium historicum Congr. SS. Redemptoris* 6 [1958], 353–404; E. Hosp in ibid. 7 [1959], 260–354).

[6] Between 1844 and 1876, the number of Dominicans in Italy decreased from 1602 to 830, in Russia and Poland from 709 to 65, and in Latin America from 626 to 315. In spite of a regular increase in western Europe, especially France, the total number in 1876 was only 3,341 compared to 4,562 in 1844.

Pius IX also repeatedly (1856, 1862, 1869) intervened in the designation of the general of the Franciscan order; in 1856 it resumed the long interrupted practice of chapters general and revised its statutes. Gradually the order reestablished itself in the various countries of western and central Europe. But the order also suffered new and serious losses in consequence of the secularization in the Latin countries. At the chapter of 1856, ninety provinces were represented, but in 1882 only thirty were still in existence, and the number of members during this quarter of a century decreased from twenty-five thousand to fifteen thousand.

Even though the reform attempts instigated or encouraged by Pius IX produced good results fairly rapidly in the centralized orders, the same efforts met resistance from the abbeys, especially in central Europe, which had remained largely independent. The great canonical visitation conducted by Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Scitowsky in the Habsburg Empire between 1852 and 1859 had no noticeable results.[7] Yet the Premonstratensians gradually revived and in 1869 held their first chapter general since the French Revolution. Former Cistercian abbeys were reopened and regrouped in new congregations. The Belgian congregation was established in 1846, the Austro-Hungarian congregation in 1859,[8] and that of Sénanque in southern France in 1867. The young branch of the Benedictines, planted by Dom Guéranger at Solesmes, also began to bear fruit. While progress in France was slow and difficult and really came into its own only during the following pontificate, the brothers Wolter, who in 1863 founded the German abbey at Beuron,[9] completed their training at Solesmes. As early as 1872, Beuron founded a branch monastery at Maredsous in Belgium, and additional foundings were made in Austria-Hungary during the *Kulturkampf.*

The example of Beuron demonstrates that it did not always require the initiative of the Holy See to revive old orders and congregations. Some of them, in fact, made remarkable progress on their own. This was the case, for example, with the Christian Brothers, who under the prudent leadership of their general superior Philippe (1838–74) increased their membership from twenty three hundred to more than ten thousand. While most of their members were recruited in France, they succeeded in establishing themselves all over the world. The same was true of the Passionists, who under the generalate of Antonio di San Giacomo (1839–62), known as the "Second Founder," tripled the number of their members and provinces and concentrated on missionary work (Rumania, Brazil, and Australia).

---

[7] C. Wolfsgruber in *SM* 32 (1911), 304–29, 477–502, 665–92, 33 (1912), 109–30.

[8] N. Konrad, *Die Entstehung der österreichisch-ungarischen Zisterzienserkongregation, 1849–69* (Rome 1967).

[9] See *Beuron 1863–1963* (Beuron 1963), to be corrected in several points according to P. Wenzel, *Der Freundeskreis um Anton Günther und die Gründung Beurons* (Essen 1965).

In particular, the Society of Jesus demonstrated its vitality. The first years of the pontificate of Pius IX were rather difficult for the order. On one hand the Jesuits had to meet general attacks on them in most of the European countries, and on the other they received only lukewarm support from the Pope. He was irritated by the covert resistance of many Jesuits to his concessions to the liberal cause. But the aftereffects of 1848 brought the Pope closer to the Jesuits again, especially after Father Roothaan, with whom the Pope did not get along too well, was replaced in 1853 by Father Beckx.[10] For more than thirty years he led the society with prudence and intuition and saw to it that the Jesuits refrained from any polemics and avoided involvement in politics. The frequency with which his intervention was required indicated, however, that not all Jesuits agreed with him on this issue. Although the Jesuits suffered from fourteen cases of expulsions and confiscations during a thirty-year period in all Catholic countries of Europe, with the single exception of Belgium, and especially in Latin America,[11] the society increased its membership from 4,540 in 1848 to 10,030 in 1878. The influence of the Jesuits steadily increased. On the level of the regional Churches they were effective in missions to the parishes and through other organizations; their colleges and sermons and their contacts with the upper classes were invaluable. On the level of the universal Church, the Gregorian University and the journal *La Civiltà cattolica* gave them an important voice. They also were involved in the Roman congregations, in which neither the secular nor the regular clergy had men as competent as the Jesuits. And finally there was the growing confidence of Pius IX, who after his earlier bias against them recognized the value of the discipline of their training and their devotion to the Holy See.

---

[10] On Petrus Beckx (1795–1887), Belgian, see K. Schoeters, op. cit., who confirms that in contrast to the frequent assertions during his lifetime, Beckx was basically a moderate.

[11] The systematic mistrust by the liberal bourgeoisie of the Jesuits is not sufficient to explain everything. Much is due to the ineptitude of the Jesuits themselves, who had difficulty, especially in the Latin countries, in adapting themselves to modern thinking (see, for example, J. Kennedy, *Catholicism, Nationalism, and Democracy in Argentina* [Notre Dame 1958], 61).

In comparison to the Jesuits, the new congregations and institutes attracted much less attention. Between 1862 and 1865, seventy-four new congregations and institutes received papal approbation, compared to forty-two such approvals between 1850 and 1860. Aside from the fact that many of them were destined to have a glorious future—the Salesians founded in Turin in 1857 by Don Bosco come to mind—the global significance of their capillary effectiveness in all areas of the apostolate must not be underrated. They were active in education, especially that of girls; the care of the sick; social work, which became increasingly specialized for orphans, old people, domestics, young working girls, prisoners, the blind, the deaf; catechetical instruction; publishing; and missions. The development, going hand in hand with the growth of the congregations founded during the first half of the century, was universal. There were the congregations of priests who followed the versatile guidelines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in pursuing their many activities; the confraternity institutes, which were well attended at a time when admission to the high schools, which alone paved the way toward the priesthood, was still a privilege; and countless women's organizations, many of which placed themselves under the protection of the Virgin Mary (Daughters of the Heart of Mary, Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, Daughters of Mary Immaculate, Little Sisters of the Assumption, Oblate Sisters of the Assumption, and Praying Sisters of the Assumption).

Rome did its best to channel these forces and to limit the increase of tiny congregations, which occasionally created the impression of ecclesiastical anarchy. On the other hand, of course, they served the interests of many priests and of many women willing to place their energy in the service of charity, especially as they could do justice to the various needs on the local level. The *Congregatio Episcoporum et Regularium* continued to encourage especially those congregations which under a superior general could group together a number of communities whose activities were not confined to one diocese or even one country. But it also had to take account of the differences in languages and customs or of the objection that this necessitated excessively long journeys for the members of these congregations. Additionally, there was the fact that many countries objected to seeing their religious institutions under the control of foreigners. Monsignor Bizzarri knew how extraordinarily varied intentions and local customs were and was smart enough to avoid prescribing a uniform constitution. At least until 1860 he left it up to each congregation to draft its own statutes and limited himself to examining them and making occasional suggestions for change. In 1862 he then published a *Methodus quae a S. Congregatione Episcoporum et Regularium servatur in approbandis novis institutis votorum* *simplicium.*[12] It did not yet have the force of law, but was an attempt to lay down some common norms. Gradually and under the pressure of events a new rule for members of institutes emerged. It was codified only much later, as the Vatican Council, which was supposed to pass on it, did not have enough time to deal with the eighteen decrees prepared for the purpose.

While Rome proved itself flexible, many congregations considered it their obligation to come up with the regulation of minutiae. They were generally religiously inspired, but it was easy to place rules ahead of the gospel; it was a consequence of the general tendency of the spirituality of the time, which, devoid of solid doctrinal foundations, resorted to mere recipes. The education of women, as it was understood at that time, intensified such tendencies. Nevertheless, many people who were inspired by the Christian faith willingly accepted such completely superfluous restrictions in order to be able to devote themselves to the many needs of the daily life of the church. They constituted an impressive testament to the high-minded convictions of an age which in so many other respects was bourgeois and materialistic.

The Diocesan Clergy and Pastoral Work

Even though we have a number of biographies of priests, sociological studies of the middle level of clergy in the countries of the nineteenth century are still rare. Yet it is possible to arrive at some common denominators. Without a doubt there were substantial differences between a French village priest, the vicar in an industrial area of the Rhineland or Belgium, the owner of a benefice in Austria-Hungary, a Spanish dean, a Sicilian priest, and an immigrant pastor in the United States. Somehow, from the various national traditions and the different life styles, there emerged over the years the classical type of Catholic pastor. The worldly priest playing the role of an intellectual in the salons of Paris, the scholar whose benefice afforded him enough leisure to pursue his studies, the rural parish priest with loose morals only distinguishable by his habit from the mass of his flock, all of them became, especially in western Europe, exceptional cases after 1850. The distinct rise in the spiritual standards of the clergy was one of the most characteristic aspects of Church history in the course of the pontificate of Pius IX. This development was dear to the heart of the Pontiff and he constantly returned to it in his encyclicals, speeches, and especially in his private correspondence.

---

[12] *Collectanea in usum Secretariae S. Congr. Episcoporum et Regularium,* 828–66; see F. Callahan, *The Centralization of Government in Pontifical Institutes of Women* (Rome 1948), 43–68.

This development of the clergy was the result of education received in the seminaries. Most candidates for the priesthood now had to undergo such an education and training, often starting in childhood. This was, of course, a hothouse atmosphere, rather deficient in intellectual content (only a part of the German and Austrian clergy still attended the regular universities), even though the clergy was imbued with high spiritual and pastoral ideals. The ideal had been formulated by Saint Sulpice, which directly or indirectly served as model for all of Europe and America. The clergy's development was also the product of the systematic efforts of many bishops with high standards of office. While there was only one Manning to write a book like *The Eternal Priesthood,* many others in their revised diocesan statutes or at the provincial synods prescribed a variety of pious exercises, recommended weekly confession, the holding of periodical retreats and possibly monthly recollections.[13] These episcopal objectives corresponded to the spontaneous efforts of a growing number of priests who gathered in associations, better to promote their aims. Some of them soon acquired international renown, such as the Apostolic Union of Secular Priests, founded in 1862 by V. Lebeurier, a member of the Orléans cathedral chapter, and the *Associatio perseverantiae sacerdotalis,* founded in 1868 at Vienna by R. Koller.[14] At the same time, the influence of the regular clergy over the secular priests grew. The two branches of the clergy cooperated better and the secular priests relied on the publications of the orders for their spiritual guidance. Thus the regular clergy tended to intensify the tendency among the diocesan priests to an otherworldliness inculcated in them by the seminaries, even at the risk of losing touch with the people among whom they exercised their apostolate.

This was the obverse of the medal. It was less pronounced in the German-speaking countries than in the Latin countries in which the wearing of the soutane became a habit.[15] Thus, the question is legitimate whether ecclesiastical policy, followed by a large part of the Church with the more or less express encouragement of Pius IX, was not in fact ambivalent. Undeniably positive results, especially the raising of the spiritual quality of the clergy and a better understanding of the eminent dignity of the priestly function, were balanced by negative consequences. Father Martina was justified in asking whether the emphasis on clericalism resulting from this policy was not one of the causes of anticlericalism and the secularization of everyday life.[16] Daniel-Rops, a historian without any revolutionary proclivities, asked the pointed question: "Did the reaction to the excessive freedom of the period of crisis and the concern with discipline encourage the priests to live in a compartmentalized world, a world without windows on the real life of the people?" During the long years of training, except for Germany and Austria frequently starting at the age of thirteen, the teachers inculcated in the future priest the conviction that he had to become a man of prayer and live a withdrawn life of sacrifice. They taught him to celebrate the Mass correctly and to salve the pangs of conscience of his flock. It was therefore not surprising that priests frequently confined their activities to sacramental gestures and excluded themselves from everything that was not directly subject to their authority and might lead to abuses. When the priest kept away from popular festivals, he was not sufficiently aware that his distinction between what he considered to be good or bad was possibly nothing more than the difference between differing levels of culture, between the "bourgeois" and urban culture of the pastor and the culture of the broad masses of the people.[17]

---

[13] *DSAM* IV, 1937–40. The thirty-six bishops consulted in 1865 with respect to the program of the Vatican Council were unanimously in favor of requiring the clergy to conduct retreats every two or at the most every three years.

[14] F. Beringer, *Die Ablässe* II (Paderborn 1921), 367–69.

[15] R. Rouquette, "Une centenaire, la soutane," *Études* 314 (1962), 32–48.

But these aspects should not be generalized too much. Without a doubt, many priests in the villages and small towns everywhere confirmed the famous definition of Taine: "Loyal sentry duty in a guardhouse, obeying the watchword, and standing a lonely and monotonous guard." Their activity essentially consisted of celebrating the Mass—during the week only for a few women—of preaching the Sunday sermon, explaining the catechism to children, listening to confessions, and administering the last rites to the dying. But these conditions varied from country to country. A village priest in central or southern Italy was much more closely involved, occasionally much too much, in the daily lives of his flock than a French priest. In England and Ireland, the priests in the workers' quarters were not merely the spiritual fathers of their communities, but also acted as worldly advisers and occasionally were the leaders for their demands from the authorities. Even in those countries in which the restriction of the clergy to its purely ecclesiastical functions was most pronounced, there increasingly emerged, especially in the large city, an asceticism of action. It moved the clergy to engage in forms of the apostolate designed for conquest. Founders of religious congregations such as Father d'Alzon and Don Bosco clearly pushed their associates in this direction; but such thinking was not limited to the regular clergy. Dupanloup in his rural diocese encouraged his priests not to be content with waiting for the faithful in their churches, but to make home visits in order to arouse the indifferent; he tried to stimulate them to greater efforts through the introduction of social inquiries, of which he was a pioneer,[18] even though not the only one. Although the focus of priestly work continued to be the parish, a new type of priest in addition to pastors and vicars came into being: the leader of socio-religious organizations. This was by no means the beginning of the specialized apostolate of the twentieth century, but many priests began to suit the method of the apostolate to the various groups to which they ministered, such as craftsmen, the sick, women, and children. The phenomenon became so much common property that experiences were written up in such books as *Méthode de direction des œuvres de jeunesse* (1858) by Abbé Timon-David. The development was particularly strong in Germany, where after 1848 many different associations began to expand. While the proportion of laymen in them was rather high, many priests were very interested in them because they recognized them as a suitable means of the apostolate, in keeping with the requirements of modern times.

---

[16] *RRosm* 62 (1968), 409.

[17] D. Julia and W. Frijhoff in *Concilium* 5 (1969), 560. In contrast to widely accepted opinion, the clergy was recruited primarily from the small towns. During the further course of the century, the share of the rural areas increased, but the young clerics were thoroughly influenced with respect to culture by their long stays at seminaries.

These efforts to reach the faithful more effectively unfortunately all too often suffered from a great deficiency. They were more oriented toward defense than to proselytization and urged the "good people" to withdraw unto themselves and to do nothing to shorten the gap between them and the bad Christians and the faithless. The latter were regarded as people without loyalty and faith, with whom any attempt at conversion would be fruitless.[19] The same threat of confining Catholicism in a kind of intellectual ghetto, with its consequences for the apostolate, was also evident in the considerable efforts to develop a Catholic school system. The problem of education had already been raised during the pontificate of Gregory XVI, but the more education became common property, the more the clergy viewed education in a positively Catholic spirit as a necessity justifying any sacrifice. While in the German-speaking countries a solution acceptable to the Catholics was reached, the disappearance of Christian content in the public schools in many Latin countries, or their Protestant character in the Anglo-Saxon countries, caused the ecclesiastical authorites (at different rates in different countries) to establish a network of free Catholic schools. This was done parallel to the public school system and often in competition with it. In Great Britain, the system of parochial schools was generally confined to the elementary level of the parishes, but also comprised high schools, as in France, and even a Catholic university, as in Belgium. These efforts, repeatedly encouraged by the Holy See, had undeniably positive results, in spite of the dangers already mentioned. C. Marcilhacy has pointed to the concordance between the establishment of parochial instruction and the growth of religious practice and noted that cause and effect became intertwined. "The Christian areas most readily accepted the religious teachers and they in turn strengthened the influence of religion on the population."[20]

---

[18] Details in C. Marcilhacy, *Le diocèse d'Orléans sous l'épiscopat de Monseigneur Dupanloup* (Paris 1962).

[19] Note the fitting observations in W. Ward, *W.G. Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London 1912), 121–23.

The conscientious zeal with which many priests devoted themselves to the three-fold tasks of parish, organization, and education was unfortunately devoid of the pastoral imagination necessary to rethink classical methods, allowing for the changes which civilization was undergoing. The lack of initiative was particularly worrisome in light of the problems posed by the growth of the large cities. While at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were only 20 cities with more than one hundred thousand inhabitants, they numbered 149 at the end of the century, among them 19 cities with more than half a million inhabitants each. Together they housed 47 million people in contrast to only 5 million in 1801. Although ever larger numbers of people moved from rural to urban areas and were cooped up in them, new parishes were established only slowly and belatedly.

Of course, the situation was not the same everywhere. In Great Britain and the United States, where Catholicism as a consequence of Irish immigration had an essentially urban character, serious work was accomplished. But in France, Italy, Belgium, and Catalonia the considerable increase in the number of only nominal Catholics was not seen as a sufficient reason for the division of a parish. During the final years of the century evidently only distances and transportation difficulties were considered, and rural areas were assigned a clear preference in pastoral organization. Inasmuch as the ecclesiastical authorites were chiefly concerned with what were regarded as the irreducible needs of the rural population, from which the seminaries obtained a large number of their students, they raised the number of pastors in the growing urban parishes only meagerly. Needless to say, this neglect made personal contact between the priest and his flock increasingly difficult. Finally, looking at the continuing urban de-Christianization, which eventually could no longer be ignored, only very few leaders of the Church recognized that an increase in the number of churches or in the personnel of the parishes was much less important than the discovery and application of new methods of the apostolate, which alone would make it possible to reestablish effective contact between the rootless masses of the proletariat and the Church.

---

[20] C. Marcilhacy, op. cit., 312.

Even though the clergy was very derelict in this respect, it at least quickly placed the periodical press in the service of the apostolate. During the second quarter of the century the clergy had encouraged the publication of periodicals for the educated class and had actively participated in such enterprises. Now a new, more popular type of publication was developed, the church newspaper, which indicated the hours of services in the various parishes of a district and listed the Catholic associations. This kind of publication had been in existence in Germany since the 1840s, including Catholic weeklies of general interest.[21] They appeared in France after 1850 and especially after 1862 (fifty-seven *Semaines religieuses* in twenty years).[22] In Belgium, the first religious weekly appeared in 1866 at Tournai and six others were added during the subsequent fifteen years. During the same time period there also appeared the first journals designed specifically for the clergy, such as the *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* in 1848 in Austria, the *Mélanges théologiques* (concerned chiefly with practical questions of canon law) in 1847 in Belgium,[23] and the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* in 1865. All of these initiatives bore witness to a rather active clergy increasingly cognizant of its responsibility.

---

[21] R. Pesch, *Die kirchlich-politische Presse der Katholiken in der Rheinprovinz vor 1848* (Mainz 1966); R. Pesch, "Das *Süddeutsche Katholische Kirchenblatt* 1841/45, ein 'klassisches' Beispiel für die Übergangssituation der katholischen Kirchenblattpresse vor 1848 in Deutschland," *FreibDiözArch* 86 (1966), 466–89.

[22] E. Poulat, *Les "Semaines religieuses". Approche historique et bibliographique* (Paris 1958); A. Boyer-Mas, *Centenaire de la "Semaine religieuse de Carcassone". Un siècle de vie diocésaine de l'Église 1868/1968* (Carcassone 1968).

[23] The *Mélanges théologiques* in 1869 became the *Nouvelle revue théologique* (see *NRTh* 56 [1929], 785–99).

CHAPTER 15

The Growth of Piety

The second third of the nineteenth century was accompanied by a profound and lasting change in piety, especially north of the Alps. Turning away from the strict and rather cold piety preached in Germany by Sailer and his people, in England by the former students of the seminary of Ushaw, in France by the products of Saint Sulpice, and in Italy by the spiritual heirs of the Jansenists of the Synod of Pistoia, within a decade or two there emerged a religiosity which was more sentimental and less rigoristic. It emphasized a more frequent reception of the sacraments and a greater exercise of external forms of piety. From now on piety was increasingly directed to the compassionate Christ pointing to his heart "which loves man," to Jesus, "the prisoner of love in the tabernacle," to Mary, among the more intuitive aspects of Notre-Dame de Lourdes, and to a number of popular saints like Saint Anthony and Saint Joseph, whom Pius IX in 1870 proclaimed as the patron of the Church. Pilgrimages, which had lost much of their importance in the eighteenth century, gained appeal again. In Germany, pilgrimages were made to Mariazell and Altötting; in Switzerland, to Einsiedeln; in France, to Chartres, Vézelay, La Sainte Baume, Rocamadour, La Salette, Lourdes, and Ars; in Spain, to Compostela, Montserrat, and Our Lady of Pilar; in Italy, to Assisi, Loreto, and Monte Gargano.

Several factors contributed to the change, beginning with the romantic enthusiasm for everything that was reminiscent of the Middle Ages: veneration of Mary, adoration of saints, veneration of reliquaries, processions, pilgrimages, and other public displays of faith. But a large role was also played by considered actions, such as the influence of Pius IX, who strongly promoted the new love of indulgences and who multiplied the opportunities for jubilee indulgences;[1] the influence of Roman-educated priests like the English Oratorian Frederick William Faber (1814–63) and the French prelate Gaston de Ségur (1820–81), who in many popular publications told the world why they were so delighted with expressions of popular piety in Italy; the influence of those who disseminated the works of Saint Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, which were suffused with confidence in divine providence, love for the Virgin Mary and the Eucharist; but chiefly the influence of the Jesuits with their optimistic and anti-Jansenist theology, whose impact was multiplied by the fact that they had become the chief preachers at retreats for secular and regular clergy.[2] It was partially owing to the Jesuits that piety became increasingly individualistic during the nineteenth century. But they also contributed much to the spread of the Sacred Heart of

---

[1] Jubilee indulgences were announced not only on the occasion of the Holy Years of 1850 and 1875, but also at the time of the elevation of Pius IX to the chair of Saint Peter (1846), at the time of the pronouncement of the Immaculate Conception (1854), after the journey of the Pope through the Papal State (1857), on the tenth anniversary of the definition of Immaculate Conception (1864), on the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination as a priest (1869), and on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his pontificate (1871).

[2] One example: In France, Pierre Chaignon (1791–1883) conducted more than three hundred retreats for priests. Chaignon also wrote a *Nouveau cours de méditations sacerdotales* (1857) in five volumes (see *DSAM* II, 438–39).

Jesus veneration, to the introduction of closed retreats, and to silent prayer according to the Ignatian method as interpreted by Father Roothaan.[3]

The new orientation of piety, branded by the adherents of the old customs as one of the main sins of ultramontanism,[4] naturally also had its drawbacks: it was frequently insipid and infantile, as many simplistic church hymns[5] and a whole range of devotional literature demonstrate; good intentions did not exclude mediocrity and bad taste. It allowed too much room for miracles, prophecies, reports of stigmatizations, and the so-called revelations of Anna Katharina Emmerick.[6] At the very time when German historians, with the tools of modern methodology, were in the process of rewriting Church history on the strict basis of authentic documents, devotional literature was written by authors who virtually had no such standards. According to the principle that any type of tradition must be accepted as long as it promotes piety, they became fervent defenders of the most improbable tales of saints, which the Bollandists and the Maurists had swept away a century earlier. The zeal with which piety was promoted narrowed even further the horizon of believers who had lost contact with Bible and liturgy. On the other hand it must be acknowledged that this development, no matter how inept, was the healthy reaction of Christian sentiment to an attenuated Christianity bordering on deism, which in the preceding century had gained many converts. Confessions on a regular basis and admonition to take Communion more frequently once again drew attention to the essentially sacramental character of Catholic life. The orientation of the new piety to the Christmas crib,[7] to the cross, to the heart of Jesus, and to the Eucharist once again placed into the limelight the central reality of Christianity: Christ as the true God and true human being, the incarnation of divine love, who is asking each person to love him.

---

[3] J. de Guibert, op. cit., 464–67.

[4] An especially aggressive example: E. Michaud, *L'esprit et la lettre de la piété* (Paris 1869). "This is the blemish of contemporary Phariseeism in the area of piety," he wrote to Döllinger (*ZSKG* 58 [1964], 313).

[5] C. Rozier, *Histoire de 10 cnatiques* (Paris 1966).

[6] They were first published by the poet Clemens Brentano, then by the Redemptorist K. E. Schmöger (3 vols. [Regensburg 1858–60]); immediately translated into several foreign languages, they were a great success. Concerning the question of to what extent Brentano interpolated the notes which he took at the bedside of the stigmatist with older writings (by Martin von Cochem, for example) and with his own imagination, historians are of divided mind. More recent historians are less strict than W. Hümpfner (See *DHGE* XV, 432–33).

[7] Concerning the veneration of the Childhood of Jesus in the 19th century, see *DSAM* IV 679–80.

Eucharistic piety as yet had no feeling for liturgical life as a community-embracing aspect; instead, Communion was seen as the wellspring of special grace and the real presence as the object of veneration. The reaction to the Jansenist strictures on Communion became increasingly pronounced after the middle of the century. In France, Monsignor de Ségur became the fervent and tireless herald of frequent Communion. His book *La très sainte communion* (1860), in which he advised the faithful to take Communion at least once a week and, if possible, every day or every second day, created a storm of indignation among the old clergy. But the book saw a printing of 180,000 copies in France, was translated into German, English, Spanish, Portuguese, and Flemish, and hailed in a papal brief (29 September 1860). The encouragement for such dissemination came chiefly from Italy. In his *Il convito del divino amore* (1868), Frassinetti defended frequent Communion in the name of Christian antiquity, and Don Bosco declared himself in favor of early Communion, which had been fashionable in southern Italy for a long time. In 1851 the Council Congregation corrected a chapter of the provincial synod of Rouen, which had forbidden children under thirteen to be admitted to Communion. In 1866 Cardinal Antonelli, in a letter to the French bishops, sharply condemned the custom of delaying First Communion until a later, precisely prescribed age.

Also from Italy came the various forms of venerating the sacrament of the altar. They became very popular during the second half of the nineteenth century and were adopted as their very own concern by a number of congregations founded during this period. The "Perpetual Adoration" officially recommended by Pius IX in 1851 was propagated in England by the two converts Faber and Dalgairns, was introduced in Canada by Monsignor Bourget, and was accepted in the United States in the decade between 1850 and 1860. In France, where it was already being employed in two dioceses at the time that Pius IX ascended the throne of Saint Peter, it was adopted by twenty dioceses between 1849 and 1860 and by another thirty-seven dioceses during the subsequent fifteen years. The Roman custom of nocturnal veneration was introduced in Germany by the Carmelite Hermann Cohen, a Jewish convert, famous preacher, and talented composer of several stirring hymns in honor of the Eucharist. In 1848 he introduced this custom in France with the assistance of Abbé de La Bouillerie; thirty years later the custom had been adopted by twenty dioceses and flourished particularly in northern France, thanks to the efforts of Philibert Vrau.

In the case of the veneration of the Sacrament of the Altar, emphasis for a long time had been placed on the atonement for the humiliation inflicted on Jesus Christ. In France, this concept received a new interpretation: Atonement should be made no longer merely for the lapses of individual sinners, but for the attitude of the authorities, who were surrendering society to laicism. Engendered by this view, there emerged, also in France, toward the end of the pontificate of Pius IX, the idea of holding international Eucharistic Congresses. The reason behind the idea was two-fold. The apathetic masses were to be brought closer to the Eucharistic Presence by the drama of grandiose rallies, and make Catholics, intimidated by anticlerical policies, aware of their numbers and their strength. The idea was inspired by the pious lay Christian E. Tamisier, who was encouraged by Monsignor de Ségur and two bishops from neighboring countries, Monsignor Mermillod (Fribourg, Switzerland) and Monsignor Doutreloux (Liège, Belgium). The original thought was to exploit the new interest in pilgrimages for the staging of special pilgrimages of atonement to the major sites which had been honored by a Eucharistic miracle. Various experiments were conducted on the local level between 1874 and 1877 and, publicized by sermons and pamphlets, gradually acquainted Catholics with this new type of mass demonstration. E. Tamisier then conceived the idea of combining the rallies with scholarly conferences in order to fashion them into genuine congresses with an international reputation. This idea was first put into practice at Avignon in 1876 and at Lille in 1881.

The devotion to the Sacrament of the Altar emphasized an especially important aspect of nineteenth century piety: It was more attracted to a union with the suffering Christ than to the glorious mysteries of the Easter message. In the spreading devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus several facets of this form of piety were addressed: deep sympathy with the pain of the pitiable victim of Golgotha, as the Middle Ages had felt it; compensation for the betrayal and the grave insults of sinners in the spirit of love and atonement, in keeping with the message of Marguerite Marie Alacoque; and, finally, the apostolic desire to complete what was missing in the suffering of Christ by assuming, as Christ's successors, the sins of humanity and their consequences. All in all a rather paradoxical aspect of this bourgeois, individualistic, and positivist century. This atoning and apostolic longing unfortunately had a weak theological foundation, which took too little account of the Corpus Christi mysticism and was too sentimental; in France, furthermore, it also had political implications.[8] The parish missions of the restoration period had spread the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, until then limited to a few elitist circles, to the parishes. The founding of Sacred Heart of Jesus associations, frequently encouraged by the bishops, often constituted the regular end or continuation of a parish mission. Many of the religious congregations founded during this period also emphasized the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.[9] But it was the pontificate of Pius IX which earned the nineteenth century the name of the "Century of the Sacred Heart," suggested by Monsignor d'Hulst. Actively promoted by the Jesuits, the Sacred Heart of Jesus devotion was eagerly taken up by the faithful. To them, the realistic mysticism of this veneration appeared as the best means to protest against the rationalistic and pleasure-seeking trends of their time. After 1870, a new element was added in France: the tendency to combine the atoning veneration of the Heart of Jesus with thinking of the "Prisoner in the Vatican" and with the recollection of national defeat. This dual aspect provided the grandiose demonstrations of Paray-le-Monial and, after 1876, of Montmartre, where the church of Sacré-Cœur in the first year of its existence witnessed the presence of three cardinals, twenty-six bishops, and 140,760 pilgrims, with a peculiar and frequently unpleasant coloration.[10]

---

[8] The legitimists, whose influence in Catholic life was very great, did not forget that during his imprisonment Louis XIV had promised to dedicate France to the Sacred Heart and that the people from the Vendée went into battle with this divine emblem sewn to their chests. The papal Zouaves put it on their flag. But on the whole, the purely Christian zeal in connection with this veneration, which was growing more popular, won out over the monarchistic tendencies.

Even if the impulse driving the masses to a veneration of the Sacred Heart of Jesus was emotional, a few theologians, following the example of Perrone, began to find a place for the idea of the Sacred Heart of Jesus piety in the doctrine of the "Word which had become man" and tried rather ineptly to define the theological basis for the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Pius IX encouraged the movement. In 1856 he agreed to the wish of many French bishops and expanded the Sacred Heart of Jesus feast to the entire Church; in 1864 he beatified Marguerite Marie Alacoque.

The message of this mystic also contained a social element. Having long remained in the background, it was emphasized by ultramontane circles after the middle of the century. They tried to convince the entire world to acknowledge the absolute sovereignty of the Sacred Heart of

---

[9] See E. Bergh, "La vie religieuse au service du Sacré-Cœur," *Cor Jesu* II, 457–498. Two congregations specifically dedicated to the Sacred Heart were founded in 1800; they were the *Congregatio Sacrorum Cordium Jesu et Mariae* (Picpus Association) and Madeleine Barat's Society of Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Between 1815 and 1846 there were: one congregation of priests, one congregation of brothers and fifteen congregations of sisters in France; two congregations of sisters and one of priests in Italy; and two congregations of sisters in Belgium. Under Pius IX, however, there were three congregations of priests and nine of sisters in France; one congregation of priests and ten of sisters in Italy; three congregations of sisters each in Belgium, Spain, and the United States; and one congregation of sisters each in Germany, Lebanon, and Australia. The first foundings in Austria and Latin America date from the pontificate of Leo XIII.

[10] See Lecanuet I, 208–11, 378–80.

Jesus and the obligation to strive for its social domination. In this context the musician Verboitte composed the famous motet: "Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat." Two French Jesuits, F. -X. Gautrelets and H. Ramière, started the apostolate of prayer. They started an association whose members once a month prayed for a special and joint concern. The particular project was announced each month with the approval of the Pope and explained in the *Sacred Heart Messenger* (since 1861), a publication which twenty-five years later was issued in sixteen national editions and was duplicated in many other countries. The movement of the Consecration of the Sacred Heart was guided by the same considerations, although theocratic sympathies also played a role. After the consecration of individuals, families, and orders, states were also solemnly consecrated (Belgium in 1869, Ecuador and France in 1873), and the consecration of the entire world to the Sacred Heart of Jesus was also demanded. In 1875, Father Ramière accordingly handed the Pope a petition signed by 525 bishops. But Pius IX decided not to act hastily and merely asked the Congregation of Rites to send Father Ramière a dedication formula, approved by the Pope, and to encourage him to have it read publicly on 16 June 1875, the bicentennial of the appearance of Christ to the blessed Marguerite Marie Alocoque. The response which the proclamation received throughout the world was one of the most solemn events ever experienced by the Catholic world.

The rise in the devotion to Mary happened somewhat later than the Sacred Heart devotion. In Spain, the very strong current, sustained for two centuries, had grown feeble toward the end of the eighteenth century and was only revived in the twentieth century. In Italy, the few publications dealing with the matter were very weak from the theological point of view. In France, the Marian revival during the restoration period had remained superficial and without theological force, in spite of some pious initiatives like that of Pauline Jaricot's "Living Rosary." Then, within a quarter of a century, a complete turnabout occurred. It started with a number of appearances by the Virgin Mary.[11] In 1830 she appeared to Catherine Labouré,[12] signaling the beginning of the *Épopée de la medaille miraculeuse;* in 1836, also in Paris, she appeared to the pastor of Notre-Dame des Victoires, an appearance which resulted in the establishment of an archconfraternity which grew rapidly and within forty years numbered eight hundred thousand members;[13] in 1846 she appeared to two children at La Salette in Savoy;[14] and Bernadette Soubirous saw her at Lourdes in 1858.[15] Marian congregations sprang up in all countries and May prayers became very popular after the 1830s.[16] The discovery of Grignion de Montfort's manuscript on the *Traité de la vraie dévotion à la Sainte Vièrge,* the first publication of which took place in 1843, provided the cult of Mary with another impulse. The final impetus was the solemn definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854, the product of a number of petitions.[17]

---

[11] It is remarkable that the nineteenth century saw the appearance of the Virgin Mary alone, without Christ.

[12] L. Misermont, *La blessée Catherine Labouré et la Médaille miraculeuse* (Paris 1933); W. Durrer, *Siegeszug der Wunderbaren Medaille* (Freiburg i. Br. 1947); M. Pélissier, *Le secret de la Reine* (Paris 1957).

The intensity of the piety connected with Mary in the nineteenth century was also demonstrated by the names which religious congregations adopted when they were founded in this period. Between 1802 and 1898, not a single year passed that did not witness the founding of one or more congregations devoted to the Virgin Mary, with especially numerous foundings in the decades 1830–40 and 1850–60.[18] But there were dark sides to the cult of Mary as well. The forms assumed by the Marian rejuvenation were extremely uneven, sometimes infantile, and sometimes of such a nature that the Holy Office was compelled to take action. Mariological writings were of sad mediocrity.[19] Only a few theologians came up with valuable contributions, among them Passaglia and Malou on the occasion of the definition of Immaculate Conception, and Newman and Scheeben somewhat later. But theirs were isolated accomplishments and received little attention at the time.

---

[13] L. Blond, "L'abbé du Friche des Genettes" (unpubl. diss. [Paris 1960]); C. Savart, "Pour une sociologie de la ferveur religieuse, l'archiconfrérie de Notre-Dame des Victoires," *RHE* 59 (1964), 824–44.

[14] See E. W. Roetheli, *La Salette* (Olten 1945); La Bassette, *Le fait de La Salette* (Paris 1955); *Pour servir à l'histoire réelle de La Salette. Documents* I (Paris 1963); R. Laurentin in *RSPhTh* 48 (1964), 120–21.

[15] All earlier publications concerning Lourdes must be revised in light of the comprehensive documentation gathered by R. Laurentin in *Lourdes. Documents authentiques,* 7 vols. (Paris 1957–66); see also R. Laurentin, *Lourdes. Histoire authentique des apparitions,* 6 vols. (Paris 1961–64).

[16] In 1837, J. Beck published the first edition of *Der Monat Mariae;* by 1853 it had gone into its 5th edition.

[17] The petitions for the new dogma began in 1840 (fifty-one French prelates). The appeals resumed with the elevation of Pius IX in the face of resistance by Jansenist circles and German departments of theology. In response to an important memorandum by Perrone, Pius IX in June 1848 established a commission. In 1849, all bishops were consulted, and 90 percent of them were in favor of the petitions. The preparation of the bull of definition was rather difficult, and the bishops present in Rome participated in the final formulation. The definition was proclaimed on 8 December 1854 and occasioned rallies in the entire Catholic world (concerning some obstacles, see Aubert, *Pie IX,* 279, n. 3). Sources and literature: *Pareri dell'Episcopato cattolico, di capituli, di congregazioni, di università . . . etc., sulla definizione dogmatica dell'immacolato concepimento della B.V. Maria,* 10 vols. (Rome 1851–54); V. Sardi, *La solenne definizione del dogma dell'immacolato concepimento di Maria santissima, Atti e documenti* (Rome 1905); *DThC* VII, 1189–1218; Giulio da Nembro, *La definibilità dell'Immacolata Concezione negli scritti e nell'attività di Giovanni Perrone* (Milan 1961); W. Kasper, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römischen Schule* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962), 231–66; G. Frenaud: *Virgo Immaculata. Acta Congressus 1954* II (Rome 1956), 337–86; J. Alfaro in *Virgo Immaculata. Acta Congressus 1954* II (Rome 1956), 201–75; R. Aubert in *EThL* 31 (1955), 63–99; G. Russo in *Asprenas* 10 (1963), 59–93.

However, not only Mariological literature was generally mediocre. This was true as well for all of the spiritual literature of that time, especially in the Latin countries, where the tastelessness of the "art of Saint Sulpice" had its counterpart in the "ghastly pamphlets of piety," so aptly castigated by Ernest Hello. The best pieces that showed up in France prior to 1860 were the many reprints of works of the French school of the seventeenth century, moderately well adapted to the prevailing taste of the common people. The works of the Jesuit Jean Nicolas Grou, a disciple of Jean Joseph Surin, fell into the same category. After 1860, the situation gradually improved thanks to the efforts of Lacordaire, Gratry, Perreyve, and Monsignor de Ségur. De Ségur was inspired by Saint Francis de Sales, whom A. J. M. Hamon had brought back into favor. Of great significance was Monsignor Charles Gay,[20] whose great book *De la vie et des vertus chrétiennes* (1874), imbued with the spirituality of Saint Paul and Saint John, experienced an unexpected and encouraging success.

The situation was somewhat better in England and Germany. England produced some original works, generally written by converts whose Anglican background had given them a much more pronounced knowledge of the Bible and patristics than was the case with most Catholics on the continent. Newman, Manning,[21] Dalgairns, and Faber deserve mention. Faber's book especially, translated into various languages, spread in all of Europe and the Anglo-Saxon countries a spirituality which was inspired by the Italian school of Saint Liguori and the great Oratorians of the seventeenth century. In Germany, Görres's important book *Die Christliche Mystik* inspired a series of scholarly works on speculative mysticism. Scheeben's first books, *Natur und Gnade* (1861) and *Die Herrlichkeiten der göttlichen Gnade* (1863), were actuated by the Greek Fathers, with whom his teacher Johannes Franzelin had acquainted him. But these were publications which were hardly accessible to the broad public. Yet, Germany could take the credit for introducing liturgical piety to the large mass of the faithful.

---

[18] See E. Bergh in *Maria* III, 465–88. France is in the lead, followed by Belgium, Italy, and Spain. Record years were 1850 and 1854; the former saw sixteen new congregations devoted to the Virgin Mary, the latter, fourteen.

[19] This remark was made by R. Laurentin (*Maria* III, 19). It had earlier been made by an unquestionable witness: Louis Veuillot (*Mélanges:* 2nd ser., V [Paris 1860], 605–6); confirmation in J. Pintard, *Bulletin de la Société française d'études mariales* 17 (1960), 119–50.

[20] On Charles Gay (1815–92), see B. du Boisrouvray, *Monseigneur Gay,* 2 vols. (Tours 1922).

[21] He emphasized the working of the Holy Ghost in the leadership of the Church and in the sanctification of souls; *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (1865); *The Internal Mission of the Holy Ghost* (1875).

The liturgical renewal took its rise from the French Benedictine Dom Guéranger. The treasures which he collected in the volumes of his *Année liturgique*[22] unfortunately remained restricted to a small elite in his country, probably because his perspective, as well as that of his contemporary in the field of architecture, Viollet-le-Duc, too strongly reflected the interests of an archeologist who was interested in the most complete restitution of the Middle Ages possible.[23] In the German-speaking countries, the liturgical question had been raised in the 1830s and 1840s from the pastoral point of view by men like A. A. Hnogek, whose Josephinist *Christkatholische Liturgik* (5 vols. [Prague 1835–42]) is still of interest even today, and Anton Graf and Johann Baptist Hirscher, whose attempts to have laymen admitted to the chalice and to use vernacular languages in the Mass met strong opposition. The return to liturgical piety occurred in Germany during the following generation in a form which closely corresponded to medieval tradition. In 1864, Maurus Wolter, one of the founders of Beuron Abbey, translated into German the famous *Exercitia spiritualia* by Saint Gertrude von Helfta, which were oriented toward annual and daily spiritual observations. In a long enthusiastic introduction, Wolter acquainted the German public with the movement started by Dom Guéranger in France and explained its principles. In the following year he published the small book *Choral und Liturgie,* quoting whole pages from the introduction to *L'année liturgique,* and devoting a large amount of space to a summary of Guéranger's principal thought concerning the incomparable wealth of the spiritual food involved in liturgy. His booklet had a great response among large segments of the population. Parallel to it, Wolter wrote a patristic commentary on the Psalms, *Psallite sapienter* (5 vols. [1871–

---

[22] The reprints indicate a stronger interest only after 1875. See C. Savart, "Vie spirituelle et liturgie au XIX^{e} siècle," *MD* 69 (1962), 67–77.

[23] The positive aspects of the liturgical impact of Dom Guéranger are treated in O. Rousseau, op. cit., 1–24, 45–65, and F. Cabrol in *Liturgia* (Paris 1930), 864–72; the negative aspects are dealt with by H. Leclercq, *DACL* IX, 1636, and L. Bouyer, *La vie de la liturgie* (Paris 1960), 23–29.

90]), for monks in order to induce them to bring their spiritual life in step with liturgical life. What appears to us as a matter of course was very necessary at that time, for the influence of Ignatian methods had so profoundly affected the spiritual atmosphere of most of the Benedictine monasteries that worship often completely lacked the liturgical spirit. Following the example of his teacher Maurus Wolter, Dom Gérard van Caloen, a monk at Maredsous, in 1871 published the first *Missel des fidèles* in Belgium.[24]

---

[24] O. Rousseau, "L'œuvre liturgique de Monseigneur Van Caloen," *QLP* 17 (Louvain 1932), 79–91; A. Haquin, *Dom Lambert Beauduin et le renouveau liturgique* (Gembloux 1970), 8–13.

CHAPTER 16

The Backwardness of Religious Studies and the Controversy about the "German Theologians"

In his famous lectures to a gathering of Catholic scholars at Munich in 1863, Döllinger stated that only Germany was "tending the two eyes of theology, history and philosophy, with conscientiousness and thoroughness." Comparing the two competing schools of thought, the "German" one and the "Roman" one, he asserted that the former was defending Catholicism with rifles, while the latter was still using bows and arrows. His allegation created consternation in many circles. Today, with the benefit of a century of perspective, it must be admitted that Döllinger was right. Even if the erudite historian exaggerated the theological decadence of the Latin countries slightly, it can not be denied that it was in a wretched condition. Although the efforts of the German scholars in teaching and research were not totally perfect, there is no doubt that the departments of religious studies in German universities were able to maintain and to enlarge the lead which they had gained during the first half of the century. Outside of Germany there were hardly any centers of Catholic scholarship which could measure up to the achievements of Protestants and rationalists.

Religious Studies Outside of Germany

All observers, including those most devoted to the Holy See, were unanimous in deploring the extraordinary nadir of scholarship in Rome under Pius IX, the absence of organized libraries, and the lack of interest on the part of the papal leadership in teaching and research.[1] Yet, as paradoxical as it may sound, it was in Rome that the most serious work outside of Germany was conducted. This was in part due to foreigners working in Rome. One of them was the French Benedictine Pitra, who published patristic editions (philologically not entirely free of errors), and numerous important works on Eastern canon law and Byzantine hymnology. Another was the German Oratorian Augustin Theiner,[2] prefect of the Vatican Archives, a somewhat sloppy and restless spirit, who published several editions of sources which have been useful to this day. But there were not only foreigners. An associate of Cardinal Mai, the Barnabite Vercellone (1814–69), published some valuable Biblical textual criticisms. Christian archeology was Rome's very own science. It had awakened to new life under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, encouraged by this far-seeing Pope, Canon Settele, and the Jesuit Giuseppe Marchi. After the reorganization of the Museum Kircherianum, Marchi somewhat clumsily had begun the scientific exploration of the catacombs, which had been totally neglected since the seventeenth century. Pius IX sanctioned the new beginning with the creation of the *Commissione di archeologia sacra* in 1852. Marchi's work was continued by Father F. Tongiorgi, until 1886 professor at the Roman College, but Marchi's preferred student was Giovanni Battista De Rossi.[3] Even though after Fausti's evaluation he can no longer be regarded as the originator of Christian archeology, De Rossi was responsible for its strict scientific methodology, and he defined the rules of Christian epigraphy to such an extent that he became its virtual originator. After he had published the *Inscriptiones christianae Urbis Romae* (1857) and founded the *Bollettino di archeologia cristiana* in 1863, De Rossi wrote the comprehensive *Roma Sotteranea cristiana.* It revived the whole history of the Roman Church from its beginnings, dealing with its doctrine, its hierarchy, its liturgy, and its art. According to Cardinal Pie it was a new *locus theologicus,* but with exemplary scholarly scrupulousness De Rossi refused to exaggerate the meaning of facts for apostolic purposes. His treatment was the best possible one at that time, and H. I. Marrou said: "The great Mommsen acknowledged his work by refusing to include the Christian inscriptions of Rome in the program of the *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum.* It was the greatest honor that an Italian, Roman, and Catholic scholar could be accorded."[4]

---

[1] Some quotes are listed in Aubert, *Pie IX,* 184–85. In a letter of 25 February 1861 Ventura stated: "Everything of a scholarly nature emanating from Rome is wretched and proves that Rome has not the slightest understanding of the great questions of our time."

[2] On Augustin Theiner (1804–74), see H. Jedin in *ArSKG* 11 (1953), 247–50; see also the biography of his brother Anton by H. Hoffmann in *ArSKG* 9 (1951), 74–143, 10 (1952), 226–78, 11 (1953), 169–209, 12 (1954), 199–232, 13 (1955), 228–67.

[3] On Giovanni Battista De Rossi (1822–94), see *LThK* IX, 58–59 and H. Leclercq in *DACL* XV, 18–100.

There was also the Roman College. If its teaching was more akin to that of high schools than that of German universities,[5] and if the majority of the faculty was not known for its excellence, dogmatic theology at least was brilliantly represented. Passaglia,[6] Perrone's best-known student and, according to W. Kasper, one of the most brilliant theologians of the nineteenth century, taught at the college from 1844 to 1858. His theology rested on an infinite knowledge of the Greek Fathers, and was also influenced by Petau, Thomassin, and J. A. Möhler. He made up for his unfamiliarity with German by having his young colleague Clemens Schrader keep him informed of the important studies appearing in German.[7] Subsequently, Schrader largely followed the doctrines and methods of his older confraternity brother, albeit more scholastically and rigorously. When Schrader was appointed professor at Vienna (1857) and Passaglia was forced to leave Rome because of his involvement in the Italian cause, their work at the Collegium Romanum was carried on by the Austrian Johannes Baptist Franzelin.[8] He worked out a theology less striking than Passaglia's, but one that was more elegant and exact. It was based on criticism of the texts, monuments, and facts, utilizing the latest archeological discoveries, and employing his thorough knowledge of Eastern languages and the products of the German historical school. The solid and original works of these three teachers gave large room to positive theology and to speculation; their speculative theology was more concerned with an organic synthesis of the facts of faith based on the Bible than with a philosophical exploration of the truths of revelation.

Compared to their work, the *Instructions synodales sur les erreurs du temps présent* by Monsignor Pie,[9] long regarded as one of the masterworks of French theology in the nineteenth century, made a pitiful impression. Fighting against the naturalism of the time by presenting the supernatural aspects of Christ's passion and salvation, Pie's instructions were long on beautiful rhetoric and short on scholarly spirit. They were written in order to oppose writers like Cousin, who as yet had little influence on the younger generation. Although imbued with great powers of persuasion, they are a testament to the tremendous weakness of Catholic thought in France under the Second Empire. The theologians were still using the oratorical methods of romanticism, while the thinkers of this period were increasingly influenced by the results of the positive sciences and the detailed analyses of historical criticism. Characteristic in this context is the weakness of the refutation of Ernest Renan's basically rather superficial *Vie de Jésus* (1863).

---

[4] *Aspetti della cultura cattolica nell'età di Leone XIII* (Rome 1961), 81.

[5] Interesting details in the memoirs of Franz Hettinger, who studied there from 1841 to 1845: *Aus Welt und Kirche* I (Freiburg i. Br. 1911), chap. 1.

[6] On Carlo Passaglia (1812–87), see *LThK* VIII, 133. C. G. Arévalo drew attention to the significance of his book *De Ecclesia Christi,* in which he emerges as a precursor of the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

[7] Concerning Clemens Schrader (1820–75), see *LThK* IX, 482; *DThC* XIV, 1576–79; F. van der Horst, *Das Schema über die Kirche auf dem I. Vatikanischen Konzil* (Paderborn 1963), 52–56, 153–60.

[8] On Johannes Baptist Franzelin (1816–86), see *LThK* IV, 272–73, and G. Bonavenia, *Raccolta di memorie intorno alla vita dell'Em. card. Franzelin* (Rome 1877).

[9] Concerning his theological work, see Hocedez II, 265–67 and passim.

In the field of Church history, the inferiority of Catholics during the pontificate of Pius IX, with the exception of Germany, was most clearly visible. In Spain, the tradition of Flórez and Villanueva was interrupted for almost a hundred years. Italy also, aside from Christian archeology, lagged behind the eighteenth century. Even respectable scholars like C. Cantù and L. Tosti did not progress beyond the old concepts of *historia magistra vitae* with its emphasis on presentation at the price of critical content. True, there were in France two or three good books on positive theology. This does not include Freppel's studies of the Church Fathers, which were nothing more than eloquent popularizations, but refers to the *Histoire du dogme catholique pendant les trois premiers siècles* (1852) by Ginoulhiac and the two volumes of Monsignor Maret's *Du concile général* (1869), which displayed a good knowledge of Christian antiquity and some critical faculties. But Maret, like Bossuet, whom he followed without being too dependent on him, did not have sufficient talent for a genuine scholar and tended more toward synthesis than toward analysis.[10]

A good number of clerics used their free time for scholarly activity; most of them confined themselves to local researches and historiography, and as a consequence of their faculty training they rarely produced anything that exceeded the mediocre. More serious was the fact that the idea of apostolicity of the French Church, which had been discredited by the scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was taken up again in 1835 by the Sulpician Faillon, was again taught in the seminaries, found entrance in the history books, was supported by many bishops, and seemed to triumph with the appearance in 1877 of *Les Églises du monde romaine* by the Benedictine Chamard.[11] At the same time, the lack of associates forced the monks of Solesmes to discontinue the publication of *Gallia christiana.* This backwardness in the scholarly field was not even balanced by acceptable works of synthesis. The *Histoire générale de l'Église depuis la création jusqu'à nous jours* by Abbé Darras (1825–78) in forty-four volumes, enjoying great popularity in seminaries and parish houses with the blessing of *L'Univers,* revealed a total ignorance of the most elementary principles of the historical method.[12]

---

[10] R. Thysman in *RHE* 52 (1957), 401–65.

[11] A. Houtin, *La controverse de l'apostolicité des Églises de France au XIX^e^ siècle* (Laval 1900).

The situation was somewhat better in Belgium. The university of Louvain continued to produce respectable studies in the areas of Eastern studies, patrology,[13] and historical evaluations of canon law. The Bollandists, after having been restored in 1837, published six volumes of the *Acta sanctorum* between 1845 and 1867 and included Slavic sources and Celtic hagiography in their fields of endeavor. Their inspiration, however, the tireless V. de Buck, remained a gifted improvisor; only after his death in 1876 was the work of the group placed on a firm foundation by his successor, Charles de Smedt.[14]

In philosophy, the "other eye" of theology, the situation was more complex. The systems which in their struggle against rationalism denigrated the powers of reasoning to an excessive degree lost a part of their prestige after the condemnation of Lamennais and the difficulties experienced by Bautin. But many Catholics saw the interventions of the Holy See merely as warnings against excesses, and traditionalism continued to exist in attenuated form until the Vatican Council. This was the case especially in Italy and France, where traditionalism was represented by A. Bonnetty and the brilliant Italian polemicist Ventura,[15] whom the events of 1848 had forced to take refuge in France. In his *Annales de philosophie chrétienne,* Bonnetty continued to pursue his intention of proving the continued existence of original revelation. He sharply criticized the fateful influence of Aristotelian rationalism on the "hardly Christian" language of scholastic theology. Ventura conceded that the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and the foundations of morality, once they are established, can also be proved by reason, but in contrast to the "Semi-Pelagians of Philosophy" argued the necessity of revelation for their primary knowledge and the importance of God-given language for the thorough study of these concepts. Traditionalism continued to be successful in spite of the criticism advanced by the defenders of the rights of reason from among the Jesuits[16] and the Sulpicians and in spite of a very hesitant renewed intervention of Rome.[17] Its success stemmed not only from the continuing fascination exercised by Lamennais upon his followers, but also from the agreement of the traditionalist system with an ultramontane attitude and the authoritarian inclinations of many Catholics after 1848. It was from this perspective that the attempts of the French ontologists derived their meaning, even though in contrast to Rosmini's system theirs found only limited acceptance. It started with a group of intelligent priests,[18] who recognized the danger posed by the growth of an authoritarian principle in philosophy for the future of Catholicism in a society determined to have intellectual autonomy. Dissatisfied with both the idealistic German systems and a positivism which closed its eyes to metaphysical problems, they attempted to restore intellectualism in a Platonic and Augustinian tradition. But the general of the Jesuits in 1850 put a quick end to the success of the ontological doctrines at the training center at Vals.[19] While the attacks against Rosmini twice, in 1854 and 1876, ended with a preliminary acquittal,[20] the Neo-Scholastic opposition in 1861 succeeded in obtaining from the Holy Office the condemnation of seven characteristic theses of French ontologism[21] and, somewhat later, of the writings of professor Ubaghs.[22] Ubaghs was the chief representative of ontologism coupled with traditionalism, which had become the dominating doctrine in the departments of theology and philosophy at the University of Louvain.

---

[12] *DHGE* XIV, 89–91.

[13] See *EThL* 9 (1932), 663–70, 678–80, 689–92. Concerning Henri Feye (1820–94), professor of canon law from 1850 until 1885, who supervised several doctoral theses which attracted the attention of the academic world, see *DHGE* XVI, 1359–60, and Schulte III, 295.

[14] P. Peeters, *Figures bollandiennes contemporaines* (Brussels 1948), 11–26.

[15] L. Foucher, op. cit., 238–49.

---

[16] P. M. A. Chastel, S.J. (1804–61), was particularly fierce and received the approval of Liberatore and Passaglia and of the *Magister Sacri Palatii* for his book *De la valeur de la raison humaine* (1854) (see L. Foucher, op. cit., 250–52, and Sommervogel II, 1089–91).

[17] Bonnetty was asked in 1855 to agree to four theses (see *ASS* III, 224), the first three of which were determined by those which Bautain had signed twenty years earlier. The fourth thesis acknowledged the value of Scholastic philosophy.

[18] The most important among them were Baudry and Branchereau at Saint Sulpice and Maret and Hugonin at the Sorbonne; the system was accorded great sympathy by the Jesuits of Vals, several Sulpician seminaries, and, thanks to *Ami de la religion* and *Correspondant,* by the educated public (see L. Foucher, op. cit., 176–95).

[19] Burnichon III, 140–61.

[20] H. Reusch, *Der Index* II (Bonn 1885), 1142–44; also Aubert-Martina, 812–19.

[21] See *ASS* III, 204–6. On the discussions following these interventions, see *DThC* XII, 1047–55, and J. Kleutgen, *L'ontologismo e le sette tesi censurate dalla S. Inquisizione* (Rome 1867).

[22] See *ASS* III, 206–24. On the beginnings of Ubaghs' case, see above, chap. 3, n. 34. The question was raised again in 1858 by the bishops of Liège and Bruges, former students at the Gregoriana; they wished to counteract Cardinal Sterckx, whom they accused of not taking account of the views of the other bishops in the matter of supervising the orthodox direction of the Catholic university. They assured themselves of the

The reaction to traditionalism and ontologism was a result of the renascence of Scholasticism. It was promoted by the conservative wing of romanticism, which was captured by the ideas and institutions of the Middle Ages. Prior to 1870, many adherents of a return to Scholasticism were not yet genuine Neo-Thomists. Rather they were eclectics, desirous of a return to the philosophy of the Middle Ages, who wanted to rethink this philosophy, in the light of Suarez in Spain, and in the light of Cartesianism in France and Italy. Gradually the number of people desiring a return to a genuine Thomism increased. In Germany, this was the case from the 1850s onward; in Spain, there was the circle led by the Dominican Gonzalez, who founded the journal *La ciencia cristiana* in 1873; in France, there was Abbé Hulst's circle; in Belgium, there was the group led by the Dominican Lepidi, professor and regent of the research department at the training center at Louvain. The main impact occurred in Italy. While the Roman College remained a citadel of Suarezianism until the election of Leo XIII, the Jesuits of the *Civiltà cattolica* became fervent propagandists of Thomism, especially Father Liberatore. The two chief centers of Thomism were the Collegio Alberoni at Piacenza and the Jesuit Collegio Massimo and the Liceo arcivescovile at Naples. In 1846, G. Sanseverino[23] established the Accademia tomista there and published the journal *Scienza e fede;* after his death in 1865, S. Talamo filled his place. There were also other centers, at Bologna for example, where the Jesuit Cornoldi published the journal *La Scienza italiana.* He was particularly interested in the harmony of science and faith. In Perugia, Cardinal Pecci, assisted by his brother, a Jesuit, and some Dominicans, founded the Accademia San Tommaso, where he pursued his program of reforming ecclesiastical studies.

From the quantitative point of view, it must be noted that the Catholic authors of the third quarter of the nineteenth century devoted their best efforts to apologetics. For after the revival of religiosity and of sympathy for the medieval Church, characteristics of the generation of romantics, the intellectual world, beginning with the middle of the

---

support of P. Perrone and the *Civiltà cattolica.* The Pope was persuaded to transfer the examination of the case from the Congregation of the Index to the Holy Office because Cardinal D'Andrea, the prefect of the Index, was an opponent of the Jesuits and too favorably disposed toward the people at Louvain. Interventions by Cardinal Sterckx, who wanted to save the reputation of the university, delayed a decision by several years. But in 1864 the Holy Office declared the corrections made by Ubaghs as insufficient and in 1886 condemned his books for good, referring to the condemnation of the seven ontological theses in 1861.

[23] His *Philosophia christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata* (7 vols. [Naples 1862–72]), finished by his student N. Signoriello, is a remarkable work of clarity, depth, and historical information.

century, experienced a quick and different type of development. The historical claims of Christianity and the traditional authority of the Bible were questioned in the name of historical criticism and as a result of the discoveries of paleontology and Near Eastern archeology. The problem of the transcendence of Christianity was immediately raised by the comparative history of religions, and soon the foundations of theism and the idea of religion were attacked by Feuerbach and the liberal Hegelians. Materialistic explanations of the universe were widely disseminated in Germany by men like Ludwig Büchner, Karl Vogt, and Ernst Haeckel. Spencer continued the traditions of English empiricism and propagated the Darwinian evolutionary interpretation of the world, which theologians rejected categorically.[24] In the France of the Second Empire, Auguste Comte's thoughts combined with English agnosticism and German materialism and were exported under the name of "positivism."

Under these circumstances it was not surprising that apologetics increased in significance in the course of the nineteenth century. The study of dogma, hitherto regarded as the essential task of theologians, began to appear to most Catholic thinkers as less urgent than the defense of religion and the foundations of Christianity. Even when they studied theology, they did so from an apologetic perspective. The speculations of Hermes and Günther, formally belonging to the field of dogmatics, were in reality guided by the aim of making dogma acceptable for people who had been won by modern philosophy. The scholarly studies at Tübingen and Munich as well were more directed toward a defense of the great Christian and Catholic theses against rationalistic and Protestant criticism than they were concerned with the origins of the Bible of the Fathers.

To be sure, apologetic works continued to be written and testified to the apostolic zeal of their authors; but most of them suffered from a total lack of adaptation. Elegantly in Germany, more superficially elsewhere, they incessantly repeated the same classical arguments. In view of the intellectual atmosphere of the time, they no longer had any impact; people were no longer receptive to them. It is sad to note the paucity of Catholic studies prior to the final twenty years of the century which competently treated the principal problem of adapting the Christian faith to the new science-based thinking. A first step was taken in 1875 by the Jesuit Carbonelle with the founding of the Scientific Society of Brussels, which drew together Catholic scientists from various countries. Two years later, the *Revue des questions scientifiques* was established as the organ of the society.

---

[24] The first intervention by the ecclesiastical magisterial office concerning the theory of evolution was the declaration of the Cologne provincial synod of 1860. It stated that the view that the human body had emerged from an earlier natural state was clearly at variance with Holy Scripture and the faith.

Among the apologists who endeavored to understand the views of those whom they wished to convince was G. Bonomelli, whose *Il giovane studente* (3 vols. [1871–74]) was one of the best books of this type at the time.[25] In Belgium, the Redemptorist Victor Dechamps[26] developed the so-called *Méthode de la providence,* which between 1857 and 1874 he presented in a number of books and vigorously defended against sharp criticism. In France, there were Father Félix and Alphonse Gratry. Between 1853 and 1869, the Jesuit Félix preached the conference sermons at Notre-Dame in Paris[27] and in them developed an apologetics which took account of contemporary realities. He analyzed the trends of the time with astuteness, especially the enthusiasm with which progress was regarded. He tried to show that Christianity, far from hindering any legitimate striving of humankind, was actually the only way for it to achieve what it was blindly seeking. Gratry[28] tried in vain to realize an idea by Lamennais to gather a number of priests in a kind of *atelier apologétique* by reestablishing the *Oratoire de France*[29] in 1852. In many of his publications he anticipated the path taken during the next generation by Ollé-Laprune and Blondel. According to L. Foucher, Gratry's was the best and most comprehensive attempt at a Catholic philosophy in France during the 19th century, but Antonin Gilbert Sertillanges judged that he formulated too much like a writer and thought too much like a poet to be numbered among the great philosophers.

One man surpassed all others by the power and force of his genius and his ability to look into the future: John Henry Newman.[30] Even more than Möhler he paved the way for the acceptance of new demands and fresh values of human reason in the service of faith. In his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845) he emphasized the value and the need for historical thought; in his *Grammar of Assent* (1870) he wrote of the value of the spontaneous power of reason, based on a convergence of judgments and practical life experience; he demanded a "Dialectic of Conscience" and the psychological preparation of people for the acceptance of faith justified by reason. In his essay *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine* (1859), the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* (1875), and two volumes of the *Via Media* (1877) he brought out the importance of the meaning of Holy Scripture and the Christian Fathers for the Christian mystery as the basis of all religious knowledge. Unfortunately, there was no one at the time to follow him on the paths whose importance for the future Newman anticipated. Moreover, his employment of the essay made his studies less accessible to professional theologians. Lastly, there were the suspicions which were cast on his orthodoxy. They were one of the most unpleasant aspects of the intellectual policy of the Roman Curia under Pius IX and persisted until the elevation of Leo XIII.

---

[25] C. Bello, *G. Bonomelli* (Brescia 1961), 52–55.

[26] On Victor Dechamps (1810–83), one of the most famous Belgian preachers, who in 1867 became archbishop of Mechelen, see M. Becqué, *Le cardinal Dechamps* (2 vols. [Louvain 1956]) and *L'apologétique du cardinal Dechamps* (Paris and Louvain 1949). The core of his thought was presented in the *Entretiens sur la démonstration catholique de la révélation chrétienne* (1857).

[27] P. Fernessolle, *Les conférenciers de Notre-Dame* II (Paris 1936), 59–136.

[28] On Alphonse Gratry (1805–72), see A. Chauvin, *Vie du Père Gratry* (Paris 1911) and L. Fouché, op. cit., 197–236.

[29] See in addition to the biography of Gratry (136–90: "L'idéal," "La réalité"), A. Perraud, *L'oratoire de France au XVII^e et au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1866) and G. de Valroger, *Le Père de Valroger* (Paris 1911). He managed to gather a few young people around him, but Abbé Pététot, in charge of the organization, in spite of Gratry's protests preferred to emphasize high school instruction.

[30] On John Henry Newman (1801–90), who in 1845 converted to Catholicism, see volume VII in this series, p. 406. On his theological concepts: R. A. Dibble, *John Henry Newman. The Concept of Infallible Doctrinal Authority* (Washington 1955); J. Stern, *Bible*

Scholastics and Germanics vs. the "German Theologians"

One of the major achievements of the Tübingen School was that Catholic dogma was rethought with pronounced attention given to the historical dimension, the discovery of which was a main characteristic of the intellectual life of the nineteenth century. What counted from now on was not merely critical scholarship or chronology, but a sense of becoming and the awareness that events, institutions, and doctrines are what they really are only when they are placed in the context of time and when their historical development is taken into consideration. Following the example of Drey and Möhler, theologians increasingly discussed the consequences of seeing Christian events and Christian revelation in the context of history. This did not mean that speculative considerations disappeared, not even among those who remained tied to Scholastic tradition. This was shown by the enthusiasm displayed for Günther's ideas as well as by the teachings of Kuhn at Tübingen. Still, as the century advanced, theological sciences became more concerned with historical theology and became more interested in the vitality of dogma than its metaphysics. The redirection to a less speculative theol-

---

et tradition chez Newman. Aux origines de la théorie du développement (Paris 1967); B. D. Dupuy, *Textes newmaniens. VII. Lettre au Duc de Norfolk* (Bruges and Paris 1970); L. Bouyer, *L'Église de Dieu* (Paris 1970), 135–52.

ogy than had been pursued during the first half of the nineteenth century was hastened by apologetic interests. While Protestant historians developed a critical method which enabled them to question many traditional attitudes toward the origins of Christianity and the Middle Ages, some university departments, especially at Tübingen, developed a radical exegesis and a Hegelian interpretation of the history of dogma, originated by Ferdinand Christian Baur. In close contact with their opponents at the universities, Catholic theologians grasped quickly that it was essential to enter the arena on which the battle was fought, to fight them with the same weapons employed by them, i.e., with facts, texts, and documents, and to revise positions incompatible with the facts.

In the field of exegesis, the following people were active: August Bisping,[31] whose *Exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (9 vols. [1854–76]) remained for long the only complete commentary from the Catholic point of view, even if it lacked originality; the Munich professors for Old and New Testament studies, Daniel-Bonifaz Haneberg[32] and Franz Xaver Reithmayr;[33] and Peter Johann Schegg,[34] who wrote a *Leben Jesu* (2 vols. [1874–75]). There were also two rather lackluster treatments of biblical theology, P. Scholz's *Handbuch der Theologie des Alten Bundes* (2 vols. [1861–62]), and J. Lutterbeck's *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe* (2 vols. [1852]). These publications were rounded out by some essays written with the intention of reconciling the reports of Genesis with modern scientific discoveries.[35] Among them were *Bibel und Natur* (1860, 1870) by Franz Heinrich Reusch, and *Die biblische Schöpfungsgeschichte* (1867, 1872) by Johann Baptist Baltzer. However, seen as a whole, the achievements of Catholics, even though not insignificant, remained far behind those of the Protestants.

In the area of the history of dogma and Church history, on the other hand, good work was done. This was the case at Tübingen, where Karl Joseph Hefele[36] worked on studies ranging from the apostolic Fathers to Cardinal Ximenes and wrote his monumental *Conciliengeschichte* (7 vols. [1855–74]). Also at Tübingen there was a group of young scholars who wrote for the *Theologisches Quartalschrift* and employed the new critical methods in order to delineate the stages of progress in Christian thought. Another center of activity was Munich, thanks to the great influence of Ignaz Döllinger, the uncontested leader of the German Catholic historical school.

---

[31] On August Bisping (1811–84), professor at Münster, see *DHGE* IX, 10–11.

[32] Concerning Daniel Bonifaz Haneberg (1816–76), see *100 Jahre St. Bonifaz in München* (Munich 1960), 29–36, 61f.

[33] On Franz Xaver Reithmayr (1809–72), see *LThK* VIII, 1155.

[34] On Peter Johann Schegg (1815–85), see *LThK* IX, 379f.

[35] *DThC* VI, 2340–46.

[36] On Karl Joseph Hefele (1809–93), professor of Church history and patrology from 1840 until 1869, when he was appointed bishop of Rottenburg, see A. Hagen, *Gestalten aus dem schwäbischen Katholizismus* II (Stuttgart 1950), 7–58.

In the course of the events of 1848, Döllinger emerged as one of the most important Catholic leaders both with respect to politics and religion. But he was disappointed by the trends of the Catholic movement under the leadership of the men from Mainz and the growing influence of the Jesuits in the Church. He withdrew from public life and devoted himself to scholarly work, always from an apologetic point of view. *Hippolytus und Callistus* (1853), a masterful example of historical criticism receiving the acclaim of all German scholars, was designed to shore up the Catholic conscience in the face of objections to the papacy which Protestants like Christian Karl von Bunsen believed to have found in the recently discovered *Philosophoumena.* Similarly, *Heidentum und Judentum. Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christentums* (1857), the first scholarly Catholic attempt to present the origins of Christianity within their historical context. He wanted to demonstrate that, historically speaking, no development of Greek or Jewish origin could explain the rise of Christianity. His *Christentum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung* (1860), a book with a genuine religious flair, contained a number of passages concerning the papacy which were clearly directed against Protestants.[37] Even more than through his publications, Döllinger's influence, whose tremendous extent it is difficult to understand today, was spread by his lectures and was carried by his students to many professorships at universities in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. In his personal contacts, the richness of his thought, the clarity of his views, and the simple demeanor of the man captured his discussion partners, and his correspondence touched upon the scholarly works written in German, English, and French.

Döllinger, Hefele, Kuhn, Günther, and most of their colleagues and students who were in close contact with the academic world were primarily animated by the desire to liberate Catholic intellectuals from the inferiority complex which the flowering of Protestant and rationalistic scholarship had given them. They expected to accomplish their aim by suggesting to them to compete with the same weapons and to give them the feeling of complete intellectual freedom, aside from the relatively few questions of dogma. They hoped to win a degree of influence for the Church in the world of the mind which corresponded to the influence which the Church was in the process of gaining through public political action.

---

[37] The 2nd edition (1868) was revised in a direction less favorable to the papacy.

But a part of the German clergy, among them Bishop Ketteler of Mainz and his advisers Lenning, Heinrich, and Moufang, saw matters differently. They had in mind the mass of the Catholics, the peasants, the craftsmen, and tradesmen, whose Christian beliefs, consolidated by a pious and active clergy, was to find expression in a mighty movement of well-disciplined associations. These were to subordinate themselves to the Holy See, able to carry out the decisions of the hierarchy down to the lowest levels of society. The supporters of this movement were more interested in having good priests than educated ones, and therefore were very much opposed to the German system, which forced young clerics to study in the departments of theology attached to public universities. They wanted to replace this system with the system of diocesan seminaries used in France and Italy, the same system which Ketteler had reintroduced in his diocese. Beyond this, many of them wished to withdraw young laymen from the atmosphere of public universities, where the vast majority of the faculty were Protestant.[38] They called for the creation of a Catholic university[39] which for the German Catholics was to play the same role as the University of Louvain in Belgium.[40] These plans were supported by all people and publications associated with Bishop Ketteler. Headed by Döllinger, Ketteler and his supporters were opposed by all other German Catholics who realized that the faith needed clergy completely conversant with the latest knowledge. They also recognized the danger of educating young Catholics in complete isolation, as it would deny them access to all of the scholarly tools which only the universities could provide. They feared the cutoff of Catholics from the intellectual life of their time, if the point of view of Ketteler should prevail. Döllinger's fear was the greater as his opponents openly demanded a return to Scholasticism, failed to comprehend the urgency of the problems raised by historical criticism, and believed that speculative thought in Germany had reached a dead-end street with Kant's philosophy.

---

[38] Prussia in 1864, with a population of 7 million Catholics and 10 million Protestants, had only 55 Catholic professors among its 556 university professors.

[39] The idea of a Catholic university was raised in 1848 and assumed tangible form by 1861. But several obstacles and, after 1870, the *Kulturkampf* led to an abandonment of the plan (see G. Richter, *Der Plan zur Errichtung einer katholischen Universität in Fulda* [Fulda 1922]).

[40] A similar aim was pursued at this time in other countries as well. In Great Britain, the Irish bishops with the support of Wiseman founded a Catholic university at Dublin in 1851, but the enterprise failed after a few years in spite of Newman's efforts (see F. McGrath, *Newman's University, Idea and Reality* [London 1951] and A. Gwynn in *Newman-Studien* III [Nuremberg 1957], 99–110); Manning attempted to found a Catholic college at Kensington, but it also existed only for a few years (see E. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning,* I, 495–505). In France the Catholics succeeded, especially due to the efforts of Monsignor Dupanloup, in obtaining permission through the law of 12 July 1875 for the establishment of free universities. They immediately founded five universities at Paris, Lille, Angers, Lyon, and Toulouse (see Lecanuet I, 251–68, 501–10, and A. Baudrillart, *Vie de Monseigneur d'Hulst* I [Paris 1912], 277–382).

A return to Scholasticism was the major concern of the Mainz journal *Der Katholik,* which was edited by professors appointed by Ketteler in 1849 when he reopened the Mainz seminary. The pioneers of German Neo-Scholasticism were the dogmatist Johann Baptist Heinrich[41] and the philosopher Paul Leopold Haffner.[42] At Bonn, the movement was supported by the young belligerent layman Franz Jakob Clemens.[43] At Munich, the *Historisch-politische Blätter,* Archbishop Reisach, a former student at the German College in Rome, and Vicar General Windischmann were behind the movement. Windischmann had long pointed to the dangers of Güntherianism. In Austria Neo-Scholasticism was encouraged by Cardinal Rauscher, who in 1857 appointed the Jesuit Schrader and the Dominican Guidi to positions at the University of Vienna. After 1857 Neo-Scholasticism had an active center in the department of theology at the University of Innsbruck, which was directed by the Jesuits. It was in fact the Jesuits who everywhere became the most ardent supporters of the Neo-Scholastic restoration, assisted by the success of Kleutgen's books *Die Theologie der Vorzeit vertheidigt* (5 vols. [1853–70]) and *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit vertheidigt* (2 vols. [1860–63]).[44] In an original and thorough fashion, Kleutgen rethought the doctrines of Saint Thomas, but he also tackled problems which Thomas had not foreseen, and occasionally was guided by Suarez as well. He demonstrated that Thomas's traditional doctrines could be applied to new problems and how they fit into other great philosophical systems. It was his great achievement that he cleared away antiquated methods which made them unacceptable to modern minds.

The fact that many people favored this Scholastic orientation is in part explained by the real weaknesses of theological instruction at the universities, as for example in the rationalistic and historicistic approach of some professors, but especially in the neglect of the leadership role, which in theology must be assigned to the magisterial office of the Church guided by the Holy Spirit. In the subsequent generation, Matthias Joseph Scheeben showed that Neo-Scholasticism was not only of defensive utility in the fight against the excesses of the "German theologians", but also produced works of real spiritual and religious value. Karl Werner's books proved that adherence to Scholasticism did not have to exclude solid historical scholarship.[45] Yet it must be conceded that most of the products of Neo-Scholasticism remained on a rather low level. Even when they attempted to integrate historical knowledge—which almost always was only secondhand—with the speculative treatises of classical authors, they failed to integrate them truly and to evaluate them historically and theologically. The retreat to the bastion of a timeless valid system cost theology its actuality and representation in the modern world. L. Scheffczyk was totally correct when he wrote: "There is no possible doubt that in comparison with the youthful freshness, the variety, and the enthusiasm of theological thought in the time of Johann Sebastian Drey and Anton Günther, the products of Neo-Scholasticism are cautious, uniform, and sober; a coldly didactic method of interpreting eternal truths replaced original and subjective thought; speculation designed to create unity and an organic overview was replaced with objective detail studies, and a universal openness to all currents of the spirit gave way to defense and polemicism."

---

[41] Johann Baptist Heinrich (1816–91). His *Dogmatische Theologie* (6 vols. [Mainz 1873seqq.] indicates the dual purpose of making theology kerygmatic and of supplementing scholastic presentations with a serious study of Holy Scripture and the Fathers.

[42] On Paul Leopold Haffner (1829–99), see L. Lenhart in *Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz* 8 (1958–60), 11–117.

[43] On Franz Jakob Clemens (1815–62), active member of the Catholic Association, see *Der Katholik* 42 (1862), I, 257–80 and *LThK* II, 1230.

[44] On Joseph Kleutgen (1811–83), a German Jesuit residing in Rome, see F. Lakner in *ZKTh* 57 (1933), 161–214 and *LThK* VI, 340. Even if his books were largely ignored by the academic world, they nonetheless found a great echo among Catholics. His impact was strengthened by the translation of *Philosophie der Vorzeit* into Italian and French.

This last aspect was particularly regrettable, as the opposition to university theology came in part from men who were not merely worried by the occasional excesses of "German scholarship," but were indifferent or hostile to scholarship in general. This was, of course, not true of all of them. Some harbored genuine admiration for scholarship, as long as it was orthodox; but many former students of the Collegium Romanum, called "Germanics" because they had resided in the Collegium Germanicum when they were in Rome, failed to make use of the perspectives which the teaching of Passaglia and Franzelin had made available to them. They refused to acknowledge that the advances of historical methods required new attitudes in many different areas. Even less did the survivors of the fideistic and traditionalist currents, influential in Archbishop Geissel's circle, favor the aim of the "German theologians" of confronting Christian thought with the great Neo-Kantian philosophical systems. They refused to undertake a serious review of the texts which modern historical criticism required. These texts were usually adduced by the Catholics for the defense of their traditionalist positions, but were too often confused by them with ecclesiastical tradition itself.

---

[45] On Karl Werner (1821–88), see *LThK* X, 1056, He was professor of moral theology and exegesis at Sankt Pölten and Vienna and was known chiefly as a historian of medieval thought.

More serious was the fact that many defenders of Neo-Scholasticism, irritated by the contempt in which the academic world held them, tried to strengthen their arguments and objections by an appeal to the supreme foreign ecclesiastical authority. The notes which they increasingly sent to Rome were not always generated by the desire for truth but stemmed from personal intrigues and rivalries. In 1854, unjustified accusations on the part of the Mainz circle forced one of the best Church historians, Schwartz, to resign from his chair at Würzburg. The first great success of the scholastic reactionaries was the condemnation of Güntherianism in 1857. The Neo-Scholastics were supported by the nuncio at Munich in their increasingly bitter attacks, and in the Roman Curia they found allies in Cardinal Reisach and Kleutgen. As consultant to the Congregation of the Index, Kleutgen was particularly influential.

Günther's condemnation encouraged the ultramontanes to attack those theologians and philosophers who insisted on continuing their studies without taking account of ecclesiastical directives. F. J. Clemens's *De sententia scholasticorum philosophiam esse theologiae ancillam* (1856) became the manifesto of this faction. When Kuhn asserted the right of philosophy to be independent, Clemens was assisted by *Der Katholik,* which kept a close eye on doctrinaire currents.[46] The front of the universities was breached in 1854 with the appointment of Heinrich Denzinger, a former student at the Gregoriana, to the chair of dogmatics at Würzburg.[47] He was soon joined by two other "Romans": by the Church historian Joseph Hergenröther[48] and the apologist Franz Hettinger.[49] All three of them worked in the spirit of total subjection to ecclesiastical authority. Denzinger's collection of ecclesiastical decisions, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum* (1854), reminded the

---

[46] G. B. Guzzetti, op. cit., 79–86.

[47] On Heinrich Denzinger (1819–83), see the memoirs of his brother in *Der Katholik* 63 (1883), I, 428–44, 523–38, 638–49, and *NDB* III, 604.

[48] On Joseph Hergenröther (1824–90), see S. Merkle, *Aus der Vergangenheit der Universität Würzburg* (Berlin 1932), 186–214, and *LThK* V, 245–46. He was not very good in the classroom but a worthy scholar who complemented his Roman studies with doctoral work at Munich under Döllinger. His 3 volumes on Photius established him as a scholar. His *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols. [1876–80]) was "generally admired because of his sovereign mastery of the material, even if the apologetic direction and the dependence on other treatments of Church history were criticized" (Bigelmair).

[49] On Franz Hettinger (1819–90), a well-balanced personality of universal erudition, acuity of mind, and great writing ability, see A. Chroust, ed., *Lebensläufe aus Franken* II (Munich 1921), 202–15. His *Apologie des Christentums* (2 vols. [1863–67]) deservedly remained a classic for more than sixty years.

German theologians of the importance of the decisions of the magisterial office, including those which were not infallible.

Numerous German professors in the name of academic freedom refused to bow to the authority of the Church, unless it was a question of defined dogma. Their attitude created consternation in Rome, where academic concerns were of little interest and the struggle against liberalism was in full swing. In this connection, many works were placed on the Index after 1857.[50] In 1862, Pius IX directed a letter to the archbishop of Munich in which he discussed the errors of the Munich professor Jakob Frohschammer[51] and lamented that Frohschammer was not the only one who demanded "a freedom to write and to teach with which the Church hitherto had been unacquainted."[52] Separated by the geographical distance, Rome's distrust of German academics increased and eventually encompassed even Germany's leading professors, including Döllinger.

For several years, the eminent historian had been the subject of accusations.[53] He, in turn, was offended by Rome's centralizing tendencies, which coincided with the aggressive behavior of the Neo-Scholastics. The most zealous among the ultramontanes suspiciously watched this theologian, who used such un-Roman methods, tended to think that serious ecclesiastical studies were only conducted at the German universities, and considered the growing influence of the former students of the Collegium Romanum in Germany's ecclesiastical life as a victory of obscurantism. For the time being, however, at least until his two lectures which he gave in 1861 at Munich, the ecclesiastical authorities respected his stance. The two lectures had essentially a pastoral goal. Convinced of the impending decline of the Papal State, he wanted to calm the Catholics with the assertion that by no means would such a decline constitute a decline of the papacy as such, no matter what the Protestants were saying. But he did not confine himself to the presentation of positive views concerning the importance of papal primacy and the recognition of the attempts by Pius IX to bring about improvements in the Papal State. He explained the hostility toward the secular power of the papacy with the obvious deficiencies of the archaic and clerical papal government. Many observers interpreted Döllinger's remarks as open support for Cavour and some seized this opportunity to take action against him. They organized a protest campaign and tried to discredit the scholar in the eyes of the Catholic people, who were still devoted to the Pope in spite of his shortcomings. Dismayed, Döllinger tried to correct the situation, but was not successful in eradicating the initial negative impression. Subsequently, criticism of his theological positions became more overt, the critics being secure in the knowledge of having the ear of all those who placed the defense of the privileges of the papacy at the top of their objectives.

---

[50] F. H. Reusch, *Der Index* (Bonn 1885), 1125–32. Compared to the indictments, the number of condemnations was relatively small and the caution of the Congregation of the Index was acknowledged by scholars who held little sympathy for the Scholastics, such as Flir (*Briefe aus Rom* 47) and Kuhn (*ThQ* 108 [1927], 215).

[51] On Jakob Frohschammer (1821–93), professor of philosophy, who after his indictment in 1857 defended positions held by liberal Protestants and subsequently became an Old Catholic, see *LThK* IV, 397; Hocedez II, 60–68; and J. Stracke, "Ecclesiae judicium de Jakob Frohschammer doctrina circa mysteria" (unpubl. diss., Rome 1934). His real attitude toward the freedom of Christian philosophers probably should be reexamined.

[52] Brief *Gravissimas inter* (11 December 1862) in *Acta Pii IX,* 548–56.

[53] Aubert, *Pie IX,* 203–4.

It annoyed Döllinger that his prestige among Catholics had been hurt and it displeased him that his academic work was questioned by absolutely incompetent people. Yet in spite of his growing hostility to the policies of the Curia, he remained a devoted son of the Church. But it bothered him that the German Catholic intellectuals were fighting one another instead of making common front against the increasingly radical attacks by secular academics. Thus, a reconciliation of the two Catholic groups was urgently necessary. For years the idea of a congress of German Catholic scholars had been in the air. Therefore Döllinger, Alzog, and Haneberg, ignoring the skepticism of the Tübingen group, the reserve of the Mainz circle, and the open hostility of the Jesuits, invited the Catholic scholars of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland to gather in Munich in September 1863.[54] In the meantime, unfortunately, the distrust of Döllinger had grown, primarily because of his book *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (1863). In it he revealed the legendary character of some of the traditions of the medieval papacy and used the weaknesses of Pope Liberius and Pope Honorius as arguments against the thesis of papal infallibility.

In his remarkable opening address on "The Past and Present of Theology,"[55] justifiably described by Goyau as a "Declaration of Rights" of theology, Döllinger described various methods of theology and demanded complete freedom of movement whenever faith was not directly affected. "For scholarship, such freedom is as essential as air is for the body," he said, and called for purely scholarly weapons in the struggle against theological error, instead of ecclesiastical censures. Just as among the Hebrews prophets and priestly hierarchy had existed side by side, there should be in the Catholic Church as well an extraordinary power in addition to regular authority. This, he asserted, is public opinion, the molding of which was a matter for theologians. Inasmuch as at the same time he spoke of the complete decline of theology in the Latin countries, he created the impression that he was demanding the actual intellectual leadership of the Church by the German theologians. The theologians from Mainz and Würzburg did not allow such assertions to pass without protest, but finally a vague compromise concerning the rights of authority and of liberty was formulated.

---

[54] On this congress, see *Die Verhandlungen der Versammlung katholischer Gelehrter in München* (Regensburg 1863). Also: J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger* III, 270–354; K. Müller, *Leben und Briefe von J. T. Laurent* III (Trier 1889), XIII–XXVIII; H. Lang in *HJ* 71 (1952), 246–58; G. Martina in *AHPont* 6 (1968), 350–51, n. 39.

[55] Slightly weakened text in *Verhandlungen . . . ,* 25–29.

Many participants returned home convinced that the chief objective of the congress of scholars, namely an understanding with the "Romans," had been effected. The first reaction of Pius IX, who had feared that the congress might degenerate into a declaration of war against the Roman congregations, also was rather favorable. But the reports of the nuncio and other opponents of Döllinger about the atmosphere at the congress, at which the students of Döllinger constituted a majority, and the text of Döllinger's addresses produced an immediate change in the attitude of the Pope. For a time, placing the proceedings of the congress on the Index was even considered. Ultimately, however, Pius IX only sent a brief[56] to the archbishop of Munich in which he denounced the attacks on Scholasticism and deplored that a gathering of theologians had taken place without explicit request from the hierarchy, "whose task it is to guide and supervise theology." He stated further that Catholic scholars were not only bound by solemn definitions, but actually were obligated to take into consideration the magisterial office, the decisions of the Roman congregations, and the common doctrines of theologians. His disapproval was supplemented a few months later by a regulation which made future gatherings of this kind virtually impossible.

Döllinger's attempt at conciliation had failed, and the tone of the polemics of the two camps immediately doubled in stridency. On one side were the men who were convinced that the chief task was to regain the respect of the educated Catholics for the Church by painstaking applications of the historical method and by a presentation of Catholic dogma convincing for modern philosophical attitudes. The Tübingen group also shared this dual ideal, but disapproved of the radicalism of the Munich group and assumed a more passive stance. The aggressive vanguard of the Munich group consisted of Döllinger's friends. Soon they had their own journal, the *Theologisches Literaturblatt,* founded in 1865 by the Bonn professor Franz Heinrich Reusch. On the other side was the "Roman" party, which thought that the chief task was to provide Catholics with a complete doctrinary system of unquestionable orthodoxy. Their main centers were the seminary at Mainz, the seminary at Cologne, where Scheeben taught dogmatics, the seminary at Eichstätt, where Albert Stöckl inaugurated philosophical instruction of not only a Scholastic but of a Thomist character, and the training center of the Jesuits, where Joseph Florian Riess in 1864 founded the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* for the purpose of commenting on the *Syllabus.*

---

[56] Brief *Tuas libenter* (21 December 1863) in *Acta Pii IX* III, 636–45.

Only a few people succeeded in maintaining good relations with both sides. Even rarer were the men like Karl Werner, A. Schmidt, and Franz Xaver Dieringer, who attempted to mediate between the two parties. Tension increased from year to year and the smallest incident gave rise to sharp polemics which held no trace of disinterested scholarship or of the milk of human kindness.

Döllinger, constantly worried about the serious threat to the freedom of Catholic scholars, grew bitter when he noticed that his popularity was disappearing. It looked as though he himself were trying to justify the attacks of his opponents by announcing loudly his compromises with Protestant scholars and anticlerical administrators and by his malicious comments on everything that emanated from Rome. Some of his disciples, like Johann Nepomuk Huber, Johannes Friedrich, and Alois Pichler, the "young Munich School," as it was called, created consternation through their arrogance and their lack of Catholic sympathies.

The responsibility for these conditions was to be found on both sides. The intransigence and narrow-mindedness of many defenders of the Roman position contributed a great deal to worsening an already delicate situation. There were indeed moderate men among them, people like Joseph Hergenröther, Franz Hettinger, and Matthias Joseph Scheeben. But there were also men whose fanaticism had deplorable consequences. They included Kuhn in their attacks and thus carried suspicion to the Tübingen school. They prevented the Tübingen group from exercising the moderating influence of which it would have been capable. It did not suffer from the historicism and the rationalism of the Munich school and could have supplied what the Neo-Scholastics lacked in the way of Biblical and historical thought and a sense of mystery.

SECTION FOUR

The Altercation between Catholicism and Liberalism

The confrontation of liberal ideas with the traditional positions of the Church, which had started in the 18th century and continued to grow with the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen in 1789, reached its peak under the pontificate of Pius IX. Shortly after the end of the idyll of 1848, the antagonism on both sides increased on the ideological and practical levels. The revival of the Roman Question could not but inflame the hostility further. Even though its true roots were found in the national enthusiasm of the Italians and partially also in the political ambitions of Piedmont, the sovereignty of the Pope was officially questioned in the name of the new freedoms—the right of peoples to self-determination and the liberal concept of the state. The two problems could very well have been kept separate, as proved by the attitude of the people led by Montalembert and Dupanloup; but in fact they were looked upon as intertwined.

CHAPTER 17

The Roman Question

From the Papal Restoration to the Italian War

The restoration of the authority of the Pope in the Papal State after the brief interlude of the Roman Republic had taken place in a clearly reactionary atmosphere. The new form of government, worked out by Cardinal Antonelli in a number of laws passed between 10 September and 24 November 1850 followed the principles of Cardinal Bernetti. The secretary of state subsequently regarded him as his mentor in political matters. He envisioned a number of reforms, but they consisted exclusively of improvements of existing institutions and produced no genuine changes in structure. In the failure of 1848 Antonelli saw final proof of the incompatibility of the maintenance of the temporal power of the Pope with even only a partial liberalization of the governmental system. For this reason he rejected all entreaties by the Paris and the Vienna governments at least to take the path of a moderate constitutional reform. Yet it must be acknowledged that Antonelli's government had its merits on the level of administrative accomplishments. De

Rayneval,[1] French ambassador to Rome, mentioned that Antonelli started or inspired a number of steps which demonstrated great vitality and good will. This view was confirmed by the investigation of Dalla Torre,[2] even if he is too apologetic. Other foreign observers also noted with satisfaction that some of Antonelli's measures were far-sighted. But many of these endeavors were only partially realized and remained on the level of the enlightened despotism of the eighteenth century and were not able to prevent people's minds from being dominated by the two thoughts of a liberal growth of political institutions and the realization of Italian unity.

The first years were relatively calm. But after the Congress of Paris (1856) the problem of necessary reforms in the Papal State was pushed into the foreground of the concerns of the Italian public by the skillful propaganda organized by Cavour and supported by England. In spite of the misbehavior of the Austrian troops charged with maintaining order in the northern provinces, the common people, who could note a slight increase in their standard of living and appreciated the popular modesty of the Pope, actually were not terribly dissatisfied. The middle class, on the other hand, found it increasingly more difficult to endure a government which not only denied it any political responsibility but also filled all important positions with clerics, and whose legislation was still oriented to medieval canon law. This was clearly demonstrated to the West in 1858 with the unfortunate Mortara case.[3]

That was the situation in the summer of 1859 when the Italian war broke out. Several provinces revolted, encouraged by the Austrian defeat, and demanded to be annexed to the Kingdom of Piedmont, in which throughout the entire country all those people had placed their hopes who wished to see a unified Italy governed according to modern constitutional requirements. Assured of the support of Napoleon III, who for several reasons wanted to see the temporal power of the Pope maintained, albeit in a smaller, essentially only symbolic state,[4] the

---

[1] His report of 1856 was printed in *Recueil des traités . . . concernant l-Autriche et l'Italie* (Paris 1859); see A. M. Ghisalberti in *ADRomana* 75 (1952), 73–101.

[2] *L'opera riformatrice e amministrativa di Pio IX fra il 1850 e il 1870* (Rome 1945); see also M. Roncetti, *Bolletino della Deputazione di storia patria per l'Umbria* 43 (1966), 139–74. An example on the local level: M. Pellegrini, *Le condizioni economiche, sociali, culturali e politiche di Jesi dal 1849 al 1859* (Jesi 1957).

[3] On the case itself, see R. De Cesare, *Roma e lo Stato del Papa* I (Rome 1907), 278–94 and G. Masetti Zannini, *RSTI* 13 (1959), 239–79. On the reaction: G. Volli in *Bolletino del Museo del Risorgimento* 5 (Bologna 1960), 1085–1152; J. Altholz in *Jewish Social Studies* 23 (1961), 111–18 (for England); G. Braive in *Ris* 8 (1965), 49–82 (for Belgium); B. Korn, *The American Reaction to the Mortara Case* (Cincinnati 1957).

[4] As it was expressed in the pamphlet *Le Pape et le Congrès,* which Viscount de la Guéronnière wrote in December 1859 according to his instructions: "The city of Rome has this connotation . . . that the smaller the territory, the greater the ruler."

Piedmontese government tried to exploit the situation to the utmost. Victor Emmanuel demanded from Pius IX not only that he accept the situation in the Romagna, which spontaneously had placed itself under Piedmontese sovereignty, but he also asked him to turn over effective governmental powers in Umbria and the Marches, which were to remain under the nominal sovereignty of the Pope. But the Vatican refused any accommodation. On 19 January 1860[5] Pius IX in his encyclical *Nullis certi verbis* exposed to the eyes of the Catholic world "the sacrilegious attack on the sovereignty of the Roman Church" and demanded the "unlimited restitution" of the Romagna. After the Pope had been assured once more by Cardinal Antonelli that there was only one solution, i.e., "to restore what had been taken," he on 26 March placed under the ban the usurpers who had violated the laws of the Holy See.[6]

The Roman Question had now become acute. Even though it was more a problem for diplomacy than for the Church, it was nevertheless a heavy psychological burden for the remaining eighteen years of the pontificate of Pius IX. The opposition of the Vatican, which was more one by Antonelli than by Pius IX, to any compromise could do nothing but confirm the attitude of those who suspected the Church of being fundamentally opposed to the ideas of the modern world. It contributed its considerable share to the further reduction of papal prestige in non-Catholic and indifferent circles. Additionally, the Roman Question preoccupied the energies of the most dynamic Catholics in France and Italy with a political problem and for a whole generation distracted them from religious concerns. To be sure, the Roman Question contributed to tying all engaged Catholics even more closely to the Pope, and in this way it played an important role in the ultimate defeat of Gallican and Josephinist tendencies; but it did so in an atmosphere of passionate involvement, which on its part contributed to giving the ultramontanism of the time an emotional coloration which was rather objectionable from the doctrinal point of view.

From the Establishment of the Kingdom of Italy to the Occupation of Rome

While Antonelli, in the hope of saving what could be saved, cautiously engaged in diplomatic negotiations with the French government, his attempts were compromised by the Pope himself. The plan was hatched by Monsignor de Merode, a decided opponent of Napoleon who was destined to raise the ante in the ambiguous game which Napoleon III during the past months had played with the Holy See. For several months de Merode had tried to convince the Pope to give up the protection of the French troops and to raise his own army by recruiting volunteers from the entire Catholic world. Antonelli was too much the realist to approve of this plan. But Pius IX, deeply disappointed by Napoleon's unreliable policy, was not prepared in this time of crisis to heed the cautious secretary of state. He did not remove him, as was expected by many, from the general direction of affairs, but ordered his opponent Merode, together with the legitimist French general Lamoricière, to organize the new army.[7] But within a few months the campaign of Garibaldi and the fall of the Kingdom of Naples hastened events. Italian troops quickly occupied Umbria and the Marches after they had defeated the small army of Lamoricière at Castelfidardo. A short time later a national parliament proclaimed Victor Emmanuel King of Italy.

---

[5] *Acta Pii IX* III, 129–36.

[6] *Ibid.* III, 137–47.

The Papal State was now reduced to Rome and its environs (about seven hundred thousand inhabitants contrasted to the earlier 3 million), and there was little hope of ever regaining the lost provinces. The moment seemed to have come to bow before the inevitable and to seek a reasonable compromise. This was the opinion of the French government, but also of many Italian Catholics and even clerics. Cavour, who could count on active sympathy in the Curia, was eager to complete his work by offering Rome an agreement on the following basis: the Pope was to renounce voluntarily any temporal power, which in any case would soon be a matter of the past; Italy in turn would renounce the last remaining traces of regalistic influence on ecclesiastical life and replace earlier legislation by the concept of a free Church in a free state. But from the beginning the negotiations suffered from a lack of willingness on the part of Antonelli and in March 1861 ended in total failure.

The position of the Holy See was now determined for a long time to come: it consisted of total rejection. Antonelli, failing to recognize the degree to which political conditions and ideas had changed during the preceding ten years, was still hopeful of saving the Pope's temporal power. He expected to be able to do so through a repetition of the policy which had been successful at Gaeta, namely an appeal to the Catholic powers on the basis of legitimacy and the immutable right of the Pope to his state. But for this policy to be effective it was necessary to remain on the foundations of international law without causing the impression that the possibility of a compromise would be considered.

---

[7] See G. Carletti, *L'esercito pontificio dal 1860 al* 1870 (Viterbo 1904). On the regiment of papal Zouaves, see E. de Barral, *Les zouaves pontificaux* (Paris 1932) and Cerbeland-Salagnac, *Les zouaves pontificaux* (Paris 1963).

By assuming this strictly legalistic position one could gain time by placing the European governments in a difficult position. The secretary of state, secretly encouraging Neapolitan resistance, probably hoped, as did so many others at the time, that the young Italian state would quickly break apart again and present new possibilities.

For Pius IX the problem was of a totally different nature. In contrast to his secretary of state, he had preserved deep sympathies for the national aspirations of Italy. But for him the question was not one of the independence of Italy from Austria, but the enforced centralistic unification under the leadership of anticlerical Piedmont which led to the dissolution of the Papal State. Pius IX was not so much concerned with temporal power for its own sake as that he saw in it the indispensable guarantee of his spiritual independence, and the outraged reaction of Europe's ultramontane press confirmed him in the belief that this power was something for which he had to answer to the Catholics of the whole world and of which he could not dispose according to his private wishes. He confronted the realists, who tried to convince him that it would not be possible to avoid the necessity of negotiations for long, with a mystical confidence in providence. It was fed by the conviction that the political upheavals, which included him, were merely another episode in the great struggle between God and Satan, which, of course, could only end with the victory of the former.

The conflict between a liberal Italy and the Pope's temporal power was transformed in his eyes into a religious war in which resistance to what increasingly he liked to call "the revolution" was no longer a question of the balance of diplomatic, military, and political forces, but a question of prayer and trust in God. The almost mystical fervor with which some of the leaders of the *Risorgimento* conducted the struggle against the demands of the Church confirmed him in the conviction that all of this was preeminently a religious problem. In order to emphasize in solemn fashion the religious character of the Roman Question, he in May 1862 convoked a gathering of more than three hundred bishops.[8] In response to a papal allocution, in which Pius IX attacked the rationalism and materialism of the period and sharply criticized the Italian government, they agreed to an address which, while it did not condemn liberalism as unequivocally as the Pope had desired, described papal temporal power as an indispensable institution of providence for the well-being of the Church. It refrained, however, from raising temporal power to a dogma of faith.

---

[8] Concerning this assembly, see in addition to N. Wiseman, *Rome and the Catholic Episcopate* (London 1862) and *CC* 5. R. II (1862), 705–46; Aubert, *Pie IX*, 96–97, 248–49; J. Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du Second Empire,* 612–15; de Montclos, 184–87.

But neither the protests of the bishops nor the on the whole rather sparse recruitments of papal mercenaries could stop the unavoidable course of events. Nor could this be done by the protestations of the Catholic press, which only with difficulty could conceal[9] the indifference of the Catholic masses or the more or less open sympathies of a number of Italian faithful or even priests who were forced into a painful conflict of conscience between their patriotic strivings and the directives of the Church. The unexpected death of Cavour on 6 June 1861 and the fact that his successors lacked diplomatic skill, together with the hesitant policy of France, effected a brief delay of the decision. Napoleon III, forced to take account of Catholic agitation and hoping for the election of a Pope more willing to make concessions than the ailing Pius IX, did not wish to offend anyone. But finally, on 15 September 1864, he signed a convention with the government at Turin[10] in which it obligated itself to respect the remnants of the Papal State; the agreement included the possibility of the recall of the French garrison from Rome.

---

[9] With respect to the "conciliatory" movement, varying in temperament and orthodoxy, which with the support of Minister Ricasoli spread among a part of the Italian clergy after 1860, see the balanced and well-documented article by M. -L. Trebiliani in *RStRis* 43 (1956), 560–75 and the treatment by M. Themelly, "La riforma cattolica dell'Italia moderna prima del Sillabo," *XIIe congrès international des Sciences historiques* (Vienna 1965), I, 161–75.

The movement of patriotic priests, which was successful especially among those who had been involved in the events of 1848 as well as among the lower clergy in the south, centered on the ex-Jesuit Passaglia and his newspaper *Il Mediatore* (1862–66) in the north, and on L. Zaccaro in the south. A petition to the Pope in 1862 contained 8,943 signatures, including 767 of regular clergy; but in the following year, disavowed by the bishops, it experienced a noticeable decline. Concerning the attitude of the clergy to Italian unification and to the question of temporal power, which differed according to region, see M. Bertazzoli, "I conciliatoristi milanesi," *SC* 110 (1962), 307–30; C. Castiglioni in *Memorie stor. della dioc. di Milano* 9 (1962), 9–39; E. Passerin d'Entrèves, "Il clero lombardo dal 1848 al 1870," *Il movimento unitario nelle regioni d'Italia* (Bari 1962), 44–49; A. Pesenti in *Bergomum* 33 (1959), 45–67; A. Gambasin, *Il clero padovano e la dominazione austriaca 1859–1866* (Rome 1967), 255–300; L. Briguglio, "Questione romana e clero veneto," *Ateneo veneto* 151 (1960), 49–61; C. Cannarozzi, "I frati minori di Toscana el il Risorgimento italiano," *StudFr* 52 (1955), 394–425, 54 (1957), 199–249; A. Berselli, "Aspetti e figure del movimento conciliatorista nelle ex-legazioni," *AstIt* 112 (1954), 84–108; F. Manzotti in *RStRis* 48 (1961), 271–93; M. Fanti, *Strenna storica bolognese* 10 (1960), 3–26; A. Cestaro, *Rassegna di politica e di storia* 9 (1963), 6–23; P. Sposato in *Atti del 2º congresso stor. calabrese* (Naples 1961), 368–405; F. Brancato, "Riflessi delle vicende del '59 sul clero siciliano," *Bolletino del Museo del Risorgimento* 5 (Bologna 1960), 365–85; F. Brancato, "La participazione del clero alla rivoluzione siciliana del 1860," *La Sicilia verso l'unita d'Italia* (Palermo 1960), 6–33; F. Brancato, *La dittatura garibaldina nel Mezzogiorno* (Trapani 1964), 41–45, 216–20.

[10] Text in Bastgen III, 350–51. See P. Pirri, op. cit. III/1, 1–56; R. Mori, *La questione romana,* 162–269.

The agreement, concluded without knowledge of the Pope, appeared as a hardly concealed disavowal, and the defeat of Austria at Königgrätz in 1866, which destroyed any remaining expectations from this side, caused ultimate despair for the defenders of temporal power. The French intervention at Mentana, 3–4 November 1867, which blocked an attempt by Garibaldi to seize Rome,[11] and the categorical declaration of Minister Romher[12] were a pleasant surprise, but the extremely reserved attitude of most of the European powers, including Austria, confirmed that the days of temporal power were numbered. Less than three years later the collapse of the French Empire at Sedan opened the way for the Italians to Rome; on 20 September 1870 they entered the city,[13] and a few days later they annexed it.

In spite of the advice of some hotheads, Pius IX obediently followed Antonelli's advice not to leave Rome. But his reactions to the new accomplished fact produced, as could have been predicted, fresh excommunications, diplomatic protests, an appeal to the Catholic and conservative powers,[14] and a repeated invocation of the immutable rights of the Holy See. Similarly, he refused to accept in the following year the law of 13 May 1871 "for the guarantee of the independence of the Pope and the free exercise of the spiritual authority of the Holy See," because the guarantee appeared to him as absolutely inadequate. In fact it must be noted that to contemporary liberals, even the moderate ones, the necessity of an unconditional renunciation of temporal power, no matter in what form, appeared as an absolutely untouchable "dogma," and a solution of the type of the Lateran treaties of 1929 would not have been acceptable to them. In order to do justice to the intransigence with which Pius IX repeatedly presented demands to the world which today seem immoderate to us, one must be aware of this lack of understanding on the part of official Italy for the concerns of the Holy See for independence in the exercise of its spiritual mission. But the senescent Pope was again and again buoyed in his hopes for a "miracle" by the illusionary thoughts of his entourage and the enthusiastic demonstrations of the growing numbers of pilgrims who cheered "the Prisoner of the Vatican." He was equally angered by the narrow-minded fanaticism of Italian religious policy. Increasingly he connected his demands for the spiritual freedom of the Holy See with growing radical criticism of liberal assumptions, which he untiringly castigated as the source of the misfortunes of the Church. Such an attitude could not but strengthen the belief of those who held that in its innermost core the Church was in solidarity with the governments which had been swept away by the progress of the centuries and that it was still striving for the general restoration of a theocratic regime. But it must be conceded that, although the undifferentiated declarations of Pius IX against governments which were based on modern freedoms contributed to alienating many minds from the Church during the third quarter of the nineteenth century, the practical attitude of most of the governments, which appealed to liberal principles, frequently justified the irritation of the Pope. They make more easily understandable the growing intransigence of his views.

---

[11] See Della Torre, *L'anno di Mentana* (Turin 1938); R. Di Nolli, *Mentana* (Rome 1966); R. Mori, *Il tramonto,* 207–307.

[12] "In the name of the French government we declare: Italy will not seize Rome. France will never tolerate such an affront against its honor and its Catholicity." Until then, the French government had consistently refused publicly to take on such a commitment; it was forced into it by the development of domestic policy which required the support of Catholicism on the parliamentary level.

[13] Literature in Mollat, 357–58. Concerning the hesitation of Pius IX with respect to resistance, see P. Pirri, op. cit III/1, 310–16.

[14] Among others Prussia, where it was hoped to exploit legitimist arguments. See P. Pirri, op. cit. III/1, 294–302, 317–24; A. Constable, *Die Vorgeschichte des Kulturkampfes* (Berlin 1956), 29–37.

CHAPTER 18

The Offensive of the Liberal Governments in the Non-German-Speaking Countries

The Secularization Policy in Italy

Until 1860 Italy was nothing more than a geographical expression; its religious-political condition as well as the religious life and the mentality of the clergy varied greatly among the different states.

In the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies the Church maintained its privileged position, and the reaction after 1848 only served to strengthen the tutelage of education by the Church. Yet, in spite of the cordial relations between the court at Naples and the Holy See, the regalistic attitude of the civil servants diminished only very gradually, especially as the local episcopate, in contrast to the bishops of the north, was quite content with this situation. Moreover, the anti-Roman traditions of the eighteenth century were still quite alive in many seminaries, and the very specific conditions under which priests were recruited in the south exemplified the lack of discipline and the lax morals of a still numerically strong clergy. Side by side with wealthy, almost empty monasteries there existed a clerical proletariat, consisting of parsons in small villages, priests without a clearly defined function, Capuchins and others. Many of these deserted their spiritual calling after the arrival of Garibaldi.

In Tuscany, on the other hand, the standards of the also numerically very strong clergy were clearly above the average; but its frequent attempts at reform often disregarded the boundaries of orthodoxy. Under pressure from the Grand Duke, who had shared exile with Pius IX in Naples and revered him, the government in 1851 reluctantly signed a concordat;[1] it put an end to the regalistic legislation which had come down from Pietro Leopoldo. But Rome's success was more theoretical than practical, for while the Tuscan bureaucracy had made concessions in principle, it regained a great portion of its earlier control over religious matters. For eight years both sides conducted an unreal and fruitless dialogue: Florence continued to deliberate from the perspective of the eighteenth century and Rome did so from the standpoint of the medieval Church. Characteristic in this connection were the attempts by the Vatican to prevent the emancipation plans of the Jews.[2] Symptomatic of the progress of ultramontanism was the fact that a few bishops, especially Cardinal Corsi, gradually began to resist the government.

In 1857 an agreement was reached with the Duke of Modena[3] which effected a limitation of the right of asylum by the Church and in return made concessions on mortmain, a problem which had become acute on account of the many monasteries on the peninsula.

In the Lombard-Venetian kingdom the dislike by many clerics of the Austrian government sprang from Italian national feelings and the hostility toward the Josephinist system. Subsequent to the concordat of 1855, the Church regained some of its freedom of movement. This development was noticeable especially in Venetia, where the clergy had little contact with the lay world, even though the examination by A. Gambasin of the diocese of Padua shows that the neoguelf movement had many adherents until 1862. In Lombardy, where the priests were better educated and less open to authoritarian arguments, many of them continued to sympathize even after 1848 with the national and liberal aspirations of the middle class, and after annexation to Italy they constituted a strong bloc of resistance to Roman directives.

In Piedmont—according to Doubet "the people which in Italy took

---

[1] Text in Mercati I, 767–69. Cf. A. Bettanini, *Il concordato di Toscana* (Milan 1933); R. Mori in *AstIt* 98 (1940), 41–82, 99 (1941), 131–46, to be complemented by G. Martina, *Pio IX e Leopoldo II,* 142–94.

[2] On the problem of the emancipation of the Jews in Italy during the middle of the nineteenth century, see G. Martina, *Pio IX e Leopoldo II,* 195–227 (the bibliography is very extensive, pp. 195–97).

[3] Text in Mercati I, 876–80. Cf. P. Forni in *RSTI* 8 (1954), 356–82.

Catholicism most seriously"—apostles like Don Bosco, Cafasso, and Murialdo[4] were only the most outstanding examples of a great number of pious and diligent priests who, thanks to their education in the Ecclesiastical Convent of Turin,[5] clearly surpassed all of the Italian clergy, including the Papal State. Charitable and apostolic works continued to flourish and often imitated French examples; the brilliant figure of Rosmini was surrounded by a veritable elite of intellectuals drawn from the laity and the clergy. But under pressure from a middle class increasingly hostile to ecclesiastical privileges, even though it was a more devout middle class than in France, the state was subjected to a policy of secularization against which the clergy, especially in Savoy, fought in vain. The initial steps taken by the moderate government of Massimo d'Azeglio, especially Siccardi's legislation (9 April 1850) which repealed the jurisdiction of the Church and noticeably restricted mortmain, were in no way extreme. Despite Rome's opposition in principle, which was based on the clauses of the concordat, a majority of the Catholic public approved of the legislation. The people were irritated by the clumsy obstinacy of the archbishop of Turin, Fransoni, and in any case were used to accepting papal directives with simultaneous emphasis of their own independence. But the atmosphere was poisoned by the inept conduct of the Turin government, the inflexibility of the Roman canonists, who had no feeling for the spiritual situation, and the Machiavellianism of Cardinal Antonelli, who thought it fitting to exploit the case of Fransoni (at first imprisoned and then expelled) for the benefit of his political design, but in the process neglected to take account of long-range religious concerns. The situation worsened when Cavour allied himself with the anticlerical left. The latter demanded civil marriage, began the secularization of education, and forced, over the hesitation of the King, the passage of the law of 22 May 1855, which dissolved a number of monasteries. While the Vatican broke off diplomatic relations and excommunicated the authors of the law, there also grew a Catholic opposition. Following the example of Montalembert in France, it attempted in part to gain strength on the parliamentary level, but principally was concerned with stirring up public opinion with the aid of newspapers organized along the lines of Louis Veuillot's *L'Univers.*[6]

---

[4] On Saint Giovanni Don Bosco (1815–88), see P. Stella, *Don Bosco nella storia della religiosità cattolica,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1968–69). On Saint Giuseppe Cafasso (1811–60), see J. Cottino, *San Giuseppe Cafasso, il piccolo prete torinese* (Turin 1947). On Saint Leonardo Murialdo (1828–1900), see A. Castellani, *Il beato Leonardo Murialdo,* 2 vols. (Rome 1966–68).

[5] Concerning this institution, founded in 1817 by Bruno Lanteri, see G. Usseglio in *Salesianum* 10 (1948), 453–502.

Cavour was reluctant to enlarge the struggle. He had supported the more regalistically than liberally inspired policies of the anticlerical left only in order to gain its parliamentary support for his Italian policy. He had no intention of limiting the activity of the clergy, provided that they confined themselves to purely religious work. His goal was a mutually agreed-upon separation of Church and state, with the Church having the freedom to regulate itself autonomously.[7] In Rome, where Pius IX had resumed the concordat policy of Pius VII and Consalvi, minds were not yet open to a solution of this nature. Without a doubt, however, a modus vivendi would eventually have emerged if the development of the Roman Question after 1859 had not irrevocably disposed the government of Turin against the Holy See.

In fact, from now on Piedmontese religious legislation was applied in all of Italy, and its quick application in the former papal provinces was the more painful to Rome as the reformist tendencies of Cavour's successor, Ricasoli, who belonged to the Tuscan group of Raffaele Lambruschini, produced the unfounded suspicion that he intended to Protestantize the country.[8] But there still existed possibilities for a rapprochement. On the Italian side many moderates, although forced to make concessions to the radicals, in all seriousness wished to find a basis for agreement with Rome. They desired it in part because of their religious convictions and emotional traditions, in part because they regarded the activity of the Church as a guarantee of social stability. On his part, Pius IX was of the opinion that a satisfactory regulation of Italy's ecclesiastical affairs was more important for the Church than the restitution of the provinces annexed in 1860. He was sensitive to the dangers which would accompany a permanent break: denial of approval of new bishops by the government and thus an annual increase in the number of vacant episcopal sees (in 1864 this was true for 108 out of

---

[6] Especially *L'Armonia della Religione colla Civiltà* of Turin which was under the editorship of the priest G. Margotti (1823–87); in the field of dailies, it fought the same battle which *Civiltà cattolica* conducted in Rome (see B. Montale in *RStRis* 43 [1956], 474–84). One of the most important initiators of the Catholic press, especially of brochures, was Monsignor M. Moreno, from 1848 until 1878 bishop of Ivrea.

[7] The origins of Cavour's famous formula "A free Church in a free state" have been much debated. See F. Ruffini, *Ultimi studi sul conte di Cavour* (Bari 1936), 19–124 (the phrase was coined by Vinet); E. Passerin d'Entrèves in *RStRis* 41 (1954), 494–506 (it stems from Montalembert); U. Marcelli in *RStRis* 43 (1956), 449–55 (Jansenist influences).

[8] See S. Marchese, *La riforma mancata, le idee religiose di B. Ricasoli* (Milan 1961). Also: *Bolletino storico pisano,* 3rd ser. 30 (1961), 418–25; P. Gismondi, *RStRis* 24 (1937), 1071–1113, 1256–1301; F. Fonzi in *Humanitas* 6 (Brescia 1951), 65–83.

225); disturbance of seminaries and diocesan life in consequence of arrests of refractory priests; flooding of secondary and high schools with infidels and apostate priests;[9] and other actions. The mutual hostility of the anticlerical left in Florence, which had become the capital of the Kingdom, and of the bitter opponents of the new Italy in Rome, in the spring of 1865 brought about the failure of Vegezzi's mission. But the protracted hesitation of the government to apply the law of 7 July 1866, which dissolved religious corporations and confiscated ecclesiastical property,[10] demonstrated clearly that the bridges had not yet been burned. After Tonello's mission at the beginning of 1867[11] Rome harbored the justified expectation of a mutually acceptable agreement, especially as there grew in some Roman circles the willingness to reconcile. But the opposition of the radicals, who desired no separation on a friendly basis, but rather a throttling of the Church, which in their eyes constituted an obstacle on the way to progress, made a failure also of this renewed attempt. The second Ratazzi cabinet initiated a new period of a bitter anticlericalism. It produced the law of 15 August 1867, which was clearly Jacobin-oriented and whose consequences were to be a heavy burden on religious policy for years. This was especially the case after 1870 when sectarian elements forced the King and the government, in spite of their desire for a pacific development, to enforce this law with increased harshness, and thereby hurled fresh insults at Pope and clergy.[12]

It was in this tense atmosphere, in which liberalism appeared as the oppressor of Church and even of Christian values, that the Catholic press developed and the Italian Catholic Action had its beginning. Ever since the restoration there had existed a number of Catholic periodicals, but daily newspapers were published hardly at all. In 1860 there were only seven on the entire peninsula. Now, within five years, their number doubled, and by 1874 there were eighteen of them.[13] But while in other countries Catholic newspapers were generally under the guidance of laymen, in Italy the founders were almost invariably priests. In fact, frequently they were directly dependent on a bishopric, a characteristic which tended to strengthen their clerical orientation. This remained a peculiarity of the Italian press far into the twentieth century. The vast majority of those who shared the opinion of the Holy See about the new government withdrew resentfully and passively awaited the impending collapse of the Kingdom, which daily was prophesied by an increasingly aggressive press. A few irreconcilable laymen from Bologna, led by the lawyer Casoni, wanted to take action. Dusting off the slogan "neither cast a ballot nor allow yourself to be elected," which a few years earlier had been used in Piedmont to keep people from voting, they wanted to organize in all of Italy an extraconstitutional movement with the aim of first re-Catholicizing society and then of seizing political power. The idea gained ground only slowly. It was supported by the founders of the Society of Italian Catholic Youth, Count G. Acquaderni from Bologna and the young Roman M. Fani. Led by the Venetian G. B. Pagganuzzi, it was to lead in 1874 to the convening of the first Italian Catholic Congress, modeled after the German Catholic Conferences and the congresses of Mechelen. Confronted with a middle class which increasingly turned away from a Church which seemed to disapprove of modern trends, the militant wing of Italian Catholicism decided against compromises along the line of Catholic liberalism and in favor of a militant movement on the basis of the principles of the *Syllabus,* whose anathema against liberal society had reawakened the energies of the intransigents. They could count on the strong support of a new generation of clerics, faithful to Rome, which had taken the place of the numerous conciliatory priests who were the heirs of the neoguelf illusions of 1848.

---

[9] See G. Talamo, *La Scuola dalla legge Casati alla inchiesta del 1864* (Milan 1964). According to the Casati Law of 13 November 1859, teachers were to be laicized, but it could hardly be implemented because of the low salaries for elementary teachers (by 1864 two-thirds of the teachers were still clerics); in the secondary school system, however, two thirds of the instructors were laymen within five years, and together with the personnel the spirit was also quickly laicized.

[10] See G. Jacquemyns in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 42 (1964), 442–94, 1257–91. The real property of the Church was estimated at 2 billion lire (more than 15 percent of all real property). It becomes increasingly clearer that the motives for the dissolution of religious corporations were more often financial requirements than ideological principles, and in many instances the religious were permitted covertly to buy back their monasteries. Still, the dissolutions led to the secularization of numerous regular clergy, whose numbers were reduced from 30,632 in 1861 to 9,163 in 1871 (despite the annexation of Rome).

[11] E. Del Vecchio in *Studi Romani* 16 (1968), 315–43.

[12] See P. Gismondi, *Il nuovo giurisdizionalismo italiano* VI/1 (Milan 1946).

This change of mind in the clergy in the 1860s was the result of systematic action on the part of the episcopate. With the support of the Holy See it throttled in sometimes despotic fashion the liberal tendencies and the strivings for a democratic reform of the Church which could frequently be observed among the priests of the 1848 generation.[14] Much absorbed by these attempts and numerous administrative difficulties which governmental policy imposed upon them and even though there often were agreements on the local level, the bishops—among whom were such able and open-minded men as Charvaz in Genoa, Arrigoni in Lucca, Pecci in Perugia, and Riario Sforza in Naples—were unable to deal with other tasks which by themselves would have been enough to absorb their energies. To be sure, the question of de-Christianization was not yet as acute as in France, but there were other problems: the disappointing condition of the old religious orders, which at least in the north was partially compensated for by the founding of some very dynamic new congregations such as the Salesians of Don Bosco and the African missionaries of Comboni; the backwardness of Italy in the number of female religious;[15] the unpleasant behavior of many priests, particularly noticed by foreigners, and the high number of apostates; the extremely inadequate education of the clergy (worse in the south), which to a large degree had not attended any seminaries at all; and the low standards of these seminaries. This was in part caused by the small size of some dioceses (the concept of interdiocesan seminaries, voiced since 1849, was only realized by Pius X); the frequently still very archaic forms of pastoral methods, which rested on an external control of religious practices and which left the Christian masses to their own devices when they were confronted with the secularization of public life and especially of schools, although there were a number of significant private initiatives, such as Ramazotti's in Milan, Fra di Bruno's in Turin, Frassinetti's and Alimonda's in Genoa, and Mazza's in Verona; and finally, with the exception of a few centers[16] which actually had been more active in the 1850s than they were in 1870, the recognizable lack of a Catholic culture of a genuine Italian and simultaneously truly Christian character. In this connection, the reaction of the Jesuits to the adherents of Rosmini, who were suspected of liberal sympathies, passed up an opportunity which would not soon present itself again.[17] The delay of the solution of these urgent problems in part doubtlessly resulted from the inadequate structure of the Italian Church, which, like many European countries at this time, had too few centers of pastoral reflection and remained split in too many small dioceses. But to a substantial degree it was also the indirect consequence of the long political-religious conflict which agitated Italy during the entire pontificate of Pius IX, a consequence which was much graver than the loss of obsolete privileges, on whose defense the ecclesiastical authorities vainly concentrated their best energies.

---

[13] On the Catholic press, see Aubert-Martina, 15–16, 832–38 biblio.

[14] See M. Bertazzoli, "I riformisti milanesi del 'Carrocio' 1863–64," *SC* 92 (1964), 123–53; A. Gambasin, *Il clero padovano 1859–66* (Rome 1967), especially 25–36, 117–69; N. Cavaletti, *L'abate G. a Prato* (Trentino 1967); M. Themelly, "La riforma cattolica nell'Italia moderna prima del Sillabo," *XII^e Congrès international des sciences historiques. Rapports* I (Vienna 1965), 161–75.

---

[15] In contrast to all neighboring countries, they were far less numerous than male religious and in spite of a gradual increase they surpassed the males only at the beginning of the twentieth century. The increase resulted primarily from the founding of teaching orders in some of the dioceses of the north. In 1871 there were in the province of Genoa 1,324 sisters compared to 3,301 clerics; in the diocese of Turin there were 577 nuns compared to 827 priests.

[16] Naples, for example, where two very active reviews, *La scienza e la fede* (after 1841) and *La Carità* by P. Ludovico de Casoria (1865–73), appeared. On the Catholic circles of Naples during the nineteenth century, which retained the traditions of Vico and Gioberti, see P. López, *E. Cenni e i cattolici napoletani dopo l'unità* (Rome 1962) and F. Tessitore, *Aspetti del pensiero neoguelfo napoletano dopo il Sessanta* (Naples 1962).

Anticlericalism in Belgium and in the Netherlands

The Church of Belgium in the middle of the nineteenth century "through its strength and independence had become a model, a kind of ideal for the other European Churches" (Pouthas). The continuing growth of the secular and regular clergy[18] throughout the pontificate of Pius IX made possible the encouragement and development of all kinds of activities in addition to the ordinary and regular growth in the number of parishes and in Catholic education. Despite some differences between several bishops and the Jesuits, who in the view of some people had gained much too much influence, their cooperation was generally excellent. Charitable efforts, in continuation of the Vincent conferences, were made to ameliorate the suffering of the industrial workers and to influence the youth of the lower classes in the cities. Four hundred twenty-two such works were undertaken in 1863, more than half of them in Flemish and Walloon Flanders. Publishing companies and newspapers tried to make up for bad literature.[19] After 1850 there were also an increasing number of works of an edifying nature, thanks to the initiative of young ultramontane laymen who through the deepening of their own religious life and through publicly witnessing their faith intended to re-Christianize all social and cultural life.

---

[17] See, for example, the clear-sighted observations by P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista e rinnovamento cattolico in Italia* (Bologna 1961), 20–42. Concerning the mistrust of the clerics vis-à-vis Manzoni's work, which was regarded as insufficiently conformistic, see, for example, R. Comandini, "Della varia fortuna dell'opera manzoniana in Romagna," *Collana di Monografie* (del Istituto tecnico di Rimini), ed. by R. Pian, 5 (1962), 5–60.

[18] The increase in the numbers of the diocesan clergy was slower than the increase of the population, but the annual number of deaths remained below that of ordinations. There were fewer than one thousand souls per parish priest. If one adds the priests engaged in teaching school, auxiliary pastors, and regular clergy, the ratio becomes a very good one. For example, in the diocese of Mechelen in 1862, to which the two cities of Brussels and Antwerp belonged, there were 2,200 priests for 1,100,000 inhabitants. The number of regular clergy had doubled in fifteen years from 4,791 in 1829; in 1866 it reached the figure of 18,196 and in 1880 25,326. More than one hundred sixty new houses were opened in the diocese of Mechelen between 1832 and 1867.

[19] After they had been devoted during the first half of the century to the Indian mission in America, attention was now turned to the East: Belgian Jesuits in 1855 settled in Bengal, and in 1862 a priest from Brussels, Théophil Verbist, founded the missionary congregation of Scheut, to which Mongolia was entrusted (see E. de Moreau-J. Masson, *Les missions belges de 1804 jusqu'à nos jours* (Brussels 1944).

But while the Catholics thought it the most natural thing in the world that under the protection of freedom the Church de facto, if not de jure, was able to exercise a growing influence in the country, the liberals soon became convinced that matters could not be allowed to proceed in this fashion. In order to return to what they justifiably considered the letter of the constitution, they held a congress in June 1846 at which they unequivocally presented their program: "actual independence" of the civil power from the Church and especially "the establishment of a comprehensive system of public education under the exclusive authority of the civil power . . . and rejection of the interference of priests on the basis of their jurisdiction in a school system organized by the civil power."[20]

The first indication of this new secularization policy was the law of 1 June 1850 dealing with secondary schools.[21] It was far less favorable for the Church than the law of 1842 dealing with elementary education. Without intending to exclude religion from education, the new law provided for public education totally independent from any ecclesiastical control. Many liberals, who in the future wanted to pay their respects to religion, had hoped to effect their policy of secularizing institutions through a friendly agreement with the Church. But the implacable attitude of most of the bishops, in spite of the willingness to compromise on the part of Cardinal Sterckx, to the new education legislation destroyed such illusions, and the attitude of Rome deepened the disappointment. Inasmuch as the liberals had lost the hope for a reasonable agreement with the Church and as before were determined to carry out their intention to secularize without the hierarchy or, if necessary, in opposition to it, they now increasingly chose the way of radicalization. In 1857 they succeeded in voting down the "Monastery Law" and with it the last attempt by the Catholics to amend the constitution in a direction favorable to them. Then, egged on by the Freemasons and supported by an electorate whose suspicions of the wealth of the orders and the "excesses of the clergy" they knew how to exploit, the liberals proceeded to restore the "independence of lay authority" in order "to protect society against a repetition of the abuses of an earlier age." The government of Rogier-Frère Orban, in office from 1857 to 1870, passed a number of laws which, supplemented by administrative decisions, dealt in secular fashion with the problems of charitable foundations, cemeteries, and church boards. In the eyes of the bishops these were nothing but falsifications of constitutional freedoms. Simultaneously the liberals, encouraged by such radical groups as the Education League, which was founded in 1864 in advance of a similar organization in France, intensified their efforts in the communities with a liberal majority for a "correction" of the law of 1842 through administrative decisions. Their purpose was to limit the rights which had been conceded to the clergy in the area of elementary education.

---

[20] *Le congrès libéral de Belgique* (Brussels 1846), especially ARTICLES 2 and 3.

[21] See W. Theuns, *De organieke wet op het middelbaar onderwijs* (Louvain 1959) and especially Simon, *Sterckx* I, 469–501; Simon, *Réunions des évêques* I, 102–13; Becqué I, 97–106; H. Fassbender in *BIHBR* 40 (1969), 469–520.

While liberalism thus was increasingly more determined and militant, the Catholics defended every foot of the religious bastions which they had succeeded in restoring or maintaining within the civil institutions. Their resistance was weakened, however, by lack of unity in their ranks and the diffusion of their efforts. Disregarding the exhortations of his colleagues, at first by Van Bommel and then also by the young militant bishops who had been appointed after 1850 and received their directives from Rome, Cardinal Sterckx refused to unify Catholics in a denominational political party, for fear of strengthening liberal suspicions even further. He preferred the individual activity of laymen on the parliamentary level and within the framework of ecclesiastical works. On the other hand, the sympathies of a part of the Catholic population for the intransigent attitude of Louis Veuillot, which admittedly was largely identical with that of the Pope, after twenty years of quiet had once again fanned the discussions between ultramontanes and Catholics loyal to the constitution. The debates grew more bitter by the year, because the ultramontanes went so far as to declare that Catholics loyal to the constitution were more dangerous and damaging to the Church than admitted anticlericals.

In the expectation of being able to unify all Catholic forces in practical matters, some laymen, led by E. Ducpétiaux,[22] in the years 1863, 1864, and 1867 organized large Catholic congresses, designed to coordinate the activity of ecclesiastical works which had grown without guidance, and to inspire a powerful movement of public opinion for the support of Catholic resistance on the parliamentary level. Encouraged by the aged cardinal and, in spite of the caution of the ultramontanes, effected through the spectacular intervention in 1863 of Montalembert, these congresses undeniably contributed to awakening Catholic energies. An attempt was made to make up for omissions in the area of the press[23] and to establish immediately—at least in the dioceses of Bruges, Ghent, and Tournai—a network of free schools directly under the authority of the clergy. They were intended to counter public instruction, whose ideological tendencies were, with a good deal of exaggeration, regarded as fundamentally incompatible with the Catholic faith. They also changed the status of the "Catholic Circles," chartered by the state, into political organizations and united them in a national federation. It produced the electoral victory of the Catholics in 1870 which kept them in power until 1878.

---

[22] On Édouard Ducpétiaux (1804–64), whose influence on the reorganization of the Catholic forces was decisive, see E. Rubbens, *Édouard Ducpêtiaux,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1922–34) and *BnatBelg* XXXII, 154–76.

This amounted only to a delay on the parliamentary and legislative levels, however, for the situation in the country had become increasingly worse since the beginning of the 1860s. As in all of western Europe, the gap between the masses of the workers and the Church had widened, indifferentism made progress in the rural settlements, which were strongly affected by Freemasonry, and religious practice was retrogressive in the large population centers. Much graver, however, was the fact that while a portion of the Catholic middle class was much more willing to testify to its faith, the new liberal generation after 1860 increasingly tended toward a militant anticlericalism. The reason for this was the conviction that there was an incompatibility not only between the Church and modern freedoms (this was underscored in 1864 by the *Syllabus*), but also between science and faith.[24] The young generation instead turned in part to a demythologized Protestantism, but more frequently to a scientific and a religious humanism—the first society of this kind, Free Thought, was founded in 1863—and also to a socialistic atheism. For these young liberal intellectuals it was no longer simply a matter of liberating the civil power from the grasp of the Church, but of "rescuing intelligence from the darkness of obscurantism." In order to achieve this goal, they called for public control of all Catholic activities.

In view of the development of liberalism in the direction of intolerance, the Catholics once more were split in two camps. While one group, as before, saw the only effective protection against the aims of the radicals in the constitutional freedoms, the others responded that this was nothing more than a fool's paradise in that the state was actually under the control of the enemies of the Church. This second group, led by Professor Périn (Louvain), who was being encouraged by Pius IX, started a campaign against the constitution and its "freedom to be destroyed."[25] It was only a minority, but a very vocal minority, which around 1875 made many people believe that at the moment that liberalism under the influence of the radicals would turn away from the compromise solution which was hailed in 1830, the Church also would turn away from it, but in the opposite direction, in order to regain at least partially the standing which it had enjoyed under the Old Regime. This, in turn, enraged the liberals and the moderates as well. Thus, the situation was extremely tense and the entire relationship between Church and state once again seemed to be in question.

---

[23] Reorganization of the *Journal de Bruxelles* (cf. M. Blampain, *Le Journal de Bruxelles, histoire interne de 1863 à 1871* [Louvain 1965]) and the founding in 1865 of the *Revue générale* (cf. N. Piepers, op. cit., General Bibliography).

[24] The condemnation of the rationalistic instruction by two professors at the University of Ghent (1856) by the bishops contributed to deepening the gap.

In the Netherlands, the situation developed quite similarly, even though somewhat more slowly and although the position of the Catholics in the state was rather different. The parliamentary alliance between Catholics and liberals lasted until 1866; but more so than in Belgium the rapprochement was determined by tactical considerations rather than by a change of conscience. Soon wide differences of opinion surfaced, additionally strengthened by the general development of ideas during the third quarter of the century. On one side stood the intolerant behavior which a liberal anticlericalism adopted in all European countries and which in the Netherlands was enhanced by the continuation of an abiding hostility to the Pope. On the other side stood the increasingly reactionary orientation of the pontificate of Pius IX and the influence of the antiliberal polemics of Veuillot, which Cramer echoed in the *Tijd* by making it virtually obligatory for Catholics to divorce themselves from modern civilization. While a generation earlier Broere and Van Bommel had been responsible for some efforts at rethinking Catholicism with a view toward new ideas, the condemnation of Lamennais had interrupted this first attempt at intellectual modernity, and the excesses of the anticlerical polemics on the occasion of the publication of the *Syllabus* confirmed those in their views who insisted on the incompatibility of Catholic philosophy and the principles of 1789. The example of liberal Protestantism, which in the Netherlands assumed a peculiarly radical position, also confirmed many Dutch Catholics in their conviction that it was dangerous for the faith to have too much of an open mind for modern ideas. Together with such doctrinal factors the Dutch Catholics, who were strongly tied to the papacy, were offended by the sympathies of the liberal press for the machinations of Piedmont against the Holy See. It was the problem of education over which the final break occurred.

The Catholics did not have enough money to establish their own school system and therefore had to choose between those who wanted to preserve the Calvinist character of the public schools and the liberals who demanded the neutrality of public instruction. Preferring the latter to a Protestant parochial school and hoping that in the end it would be characterized by the Christian spirit, many Catholics, not without criticism by other members of their faith, supported the liberals. Together they passed the law of 13 August 1857, which in addition to some noticeable pedagogical innovations for the first time in Europe introduced absolute neutrality in education. But after a few years hard facts could not be denied: neutral education in reality had turned largely into a completely secular, even a religious type of instruction. Now the bishops, encouraged by the encyclical *Quanta cura,* at first at the Provincial Council in 1865 and then in a joint pastoral letter in July 1868, proclaimed the right of a Catholic child to be raised in a Catholic school. The right of the child had its complement in a corresponding obligation of the parents, and the bishops legally began to increase the number of free schools. In order to meet the tremendous expenditures which this policy necessitated, the parishes organized active school boards; the joint demand for public money for the free denominational schools brought Catholics and Protestants closer to one another. Such cooperation would have been unthinkable twenty years earlier, and even now it was undertaken by many Catholics only with the greatest reluctance. Now that the liberals had replaced the religious outlook of 1850 with a rationalistic and positivist attitude, the "common foundation" (A. Kuyper) of Calvinists and Roman Catholics was suddenly discovered; while it was not yet strong enough to form the basis of an ecumenical dialogue, it was sufficient for a "Christian coalition" to gain religious objectives. However, the goals were not achieved immediately. To the contrary: inasmuch as the elections of 1877 gave the liberals a strong majority, the radicals became eager to translate their ideas into reality and managed to pass a law which tightened the clauses of the law of 1857 and jeopardized free education.

---

[25] Concerning Charles Périn (1815–1905), see *BnatBelg* XXX, 665–71.

It was a severe defeat for the defenders of Christian schools and impressed upon the Catholics the necessity of having an organization of their own and of closing ranks in a political party. The idea was broached as early as 1877 by the *Tijd,* citing the German Center Party as an example; following the law of 1878, it was masterfully realized by the young priest Abbé Schaepman.

The Confused Situation in the Iberian Peninsula

In Spain as well as in Portugal the situation of the Church had improved since the unrest which it had experienced under the pontificate of Gregory XVI, but peace was only temporary and was constantly endangered. In Portugal there were repeated scandalous interferences by the government in ecclesiastical affairs. In 1864 the government forced a reduction in the number of parishes; in 1862, 1866, and 1869 there were new secularizations of ecclesiastical estates and the expulsion of foreign nuns (the case of the Daughters of Charity in 1861 created quite a disturbance); and after 1865 the Freemasons under the leadership of Count Paraty started a campaign in favor of civil marriage.

In Spain serious disturbances took place. The liberals refused to accept the predominance of the Church, which it had regained with the concordat, and their hostility was heightened when the clergy attempted to arrange itself with the increasingly reactionary Narvaez government. Between 1854 and 1856, when Espartero was in power, this hostility had known no bounds; but it was even worse after the revolution of 1868, when the Provisional Government quickly fell under the influence of the radicals; it meant the end of intellectual and political moderation. There was not only the immediate repeal of the concordat; much more serious was that as a result of acts of violence by the people against priests and regular clergy the growing gap between the proletariat of the large cities and the Church became visible. The evolution of a part of the liberal middle class from a simple political and economic anticlericalism to an antichristian rationalism clearly came to the fore in the debates on the new constitution of 1869. It subjected the Church to a number of legal restrictions, introduced civil marriage and a relative freedom of religion,[26] and contained measures directed against the orders, especially the Jesuits, and the Vincentian Conferences. Much more significant than these obstacles, however, was the spirit in which they were rooted. The highly solemn civil funeral in 1869 of Sanz del Río, who had introduced positivism to Spain, and that in 1874 of his friend F. de Castro, a priest in open rebellion against the Church and president of the central university, underscored the power which the new antireligious current had gained. It was actually strengthened by the obstinate reaction of the hierarchy to the anticlerical steps which followed one another after October 1868, as well as by the declaration of the infallibility of the Pope in 1870.

After the fall of the republic in 1874 Canovas del Castillo was interested in reinstituting the concordat, but considering the confusion it seemed impossible to him to return without adjustments to the conditions which had existed before 1868. Consequently, the constitution of 1876 included the principle of freedom of religion, despite the vehement protests of the clergy and of Pius IX. If one takes into consideration that the constitution, among other things, left the Church in control of education, even at the universities, religious freedom was only a minor concession to the liberals. Still, it was one more defeat for those who saw in the *Syllabus* the ideal of a Christian society, a defeat for which to a large degree the antiliberal Catholics were responsible. By insisting on placing their hopes in a chimeric Carlist restoration and by virtually isolating themselves from public life by their antidynastic opposition, which grew even more pronounced after 1870, the "traditionalist" Catholics had robbed the moderate conservatives of the support of a strong Catholic government party. Their cooperation would have enabled them better to resist the parties of the left and even to achieve objectives of their own. This was the solution suggested in 1848 by Balmes. Instead, they forced the Catholics who were actively engaged in the government to collaborate with the liberals, and unavoidably this led to agreements and concessions which were despised by these irreconcilables.

---

[26] It was granted only to foreigners. The Protestant English missionaries derived the greatest benefit from it, but their successes remained limited. By 1874 there were about two thousand five hundred adherents.

Regalistic Liberals and Freemasons in Latin America

The relative easing of tension, noticeable in many Latin American states by the middle of the nineteenth century, was not universal. Especially in two countries, Mexico and Colombia, in which the Church ever since colonial times held a particularly strong position, the liberals incessantly and successfully tried to break its power, a power which benefited the large landowners, who in turn relied on the army.

In Mexico, the most densely settled republic in Spanish America, where the conflict was aggravated by the racial hatred harbored by the Indians against the Spanish, V. Gómez Farias as early as the 1830s had attacked the orders and the privileges of the clergy and had secularized a part of its great wealth. The principal consequence was that the flourishing missions of the Franciscans in California were almost totally destroyed, but the economic and political power of the Church was hardly affected. After a conservative interlude, the success of the reform movement, which had grown since 1845 under the leadership of the Indian Benito Juárez, a convinced Freemason and anticlericalist, led to the resumption of an earlier policy. Its aim was to replace the corporate society, in which denominational groups and especially the orders occupied a privileged position, with a regime of individual rights. Its ultimate aim was to laicize the state, which in spite of earlier disputes was still subject to the Church.[27] The recalcitrance of the clergy, which on its own had been incapable of introducing unavoidable reforms and correcting the most flagrant abuses, could not have been more pronounced. Utilizing the tenuous pretext of the utopian character of the democratic program and its evident social failure in a preindustrial society, the clergy continued to place all of its hopes in the vain attempts by the conservative reaction. In its intransigence, encouraged by Nuncio Meglia and the new archbishop, P. A. Labastida (1863–91), it refused to support Emperor Maximilian (1864–67) when he wanted to maintain freedom of religion and the press and to ratify the nationalization of Church estates in the hope of winning the moderate liberals to his side. After his return to power, Juárez, aware of the slumbering strength of Catholic traditions in the common people, was sensible enough to enforce anticlerical legislation with moderation. But after his death in 1872, his successor, S. Lerdo de Tejada, wanted to strengthen them through incorporation in the constitution. Subsequently, civil marriage, laicized education on all levels, separation of Church and state, and the nationalization of Church lands, having been embodied in articles of the Mexican constitution, became sacrosanct. But considering the close ties which a majority of the population still had with Catholicism—provided that its demands were not excessive—and considering the generosity of the faithful, the reality was much less tragic than it appeared according to the law; but there was no question that the secular power of the Church finally had been broken.

---

[27] Concerning the spirit which inspired the reforms introduced by the laws of 1857, 1859, and 1860, in which the old regalistic traditions, the natural mistrust of Rome, and liberal individualism joined, while intending to respect the principles of Christianity, see the work by one of the most important ministers of Juárez, M. Ocampo, *La religión, la Iglesia y el clero* (new ed., Mexico 1965).

In Colombia also the situation, which, with the exception of the presidency of General Alcántara Herrán (1842–45), who invited the Jesuits to return, had not been good under Gregory XVI, became increasingly worse during the pontificate of Pius IX. After 1845 anticlerical steps followed in quick succession: abolition of the tithe and of canonical jurisdiction; expulsion of priests and bishops, especially Monsignor M. J. Mosquera (1834–53), the remarkable archbishop of Bogotá, if they attempted to resist this legislation;[28] separation of Church and state in 1843, the first decision of this kind in Latin America; nationalization of Church property; and the dissolution of all monasteries in 1861. These measures were accompanied by extensive restrictions on the activity of the clergy, in spite of the contradiction that was involved with respect to the official separation of Church and state. This genuine *Kulturkampf* lasted until 1880.

The other South American republics, with the exception of Bolivia and Peru, after 1870 also experienced a revival of militant anticlericalism and secularization policies. It was now no longer merely a matter of the nationalization of Church property, the abolition of canonical jurisdiction, or the control over the appointment of bishops and parish priests, but of the introduction of civil marriage, freedom of religion for the Protestants (whose numbers in some countries increased because of immigration), reduction of the influence of the Church on education, and total separation of Church and state. Just as in the preceding generation, the rationale of these policies was the attempt of the liberals, who almost everywhere had regained power, to reduce the political and social influence of the clergy. This was the result, in part, of the clergy's support of the conservative parties in the interest of defending the "established order" and its hierarchical and paternalistic concept of society. It was in part also caused by the introduction of two new elements which created hostility to the Church: the influence of the members of orders who had come from Europe and who advocated ultramontane ideas which conflicted with an increasingly sensitive nationalism, and the unmitigated claim by the Church to regulate the life of civil society as recently laid down by the *Syllabus;* also there was the progress of Comte's positivism, which in some instances changed the church-political conflict into a regular battle against the Christian faith, which a part of the educated middle class was beginning to reject. In Venezuela President Guzmán Blanco, a fanatic sectarian, in 1870 began the fight for laicized schools and attempted to create a national Church totally dependent on the state, in which the archbishop would be elected by the parliament and the parish priests by their parishes. In Guatemala the sentiment was not quite so radical, but here also there began after the fall of President Cerna (1871), the great protector of the Jesuits, a policy of laicization which reached its apogee in the constitution of 1879 and soon was imitated by the other republics of Central America (except for Costa Rica). Chile followed the same path under the presidency of Errazuriz (1871–76), as did Argentina after the success of the National Autonomist Party in 1874. It was centered on the landed gentry, which makes evident that the roots of South American anticlericalism were not only of a social nature; Ecuador after the assassination of Garciá Moreno in 1875 also took this direction.

---

[28] Personally moderate, but compromised by a largely reactionary clergy. With respect to him, cf. *Antología del Il. Señor M.J. Mosquera y escritos sobre el* (Bogotá 1954).

In Brazil, where the legal status of the Church hardly changed during the period of imperial government, i.e., until 1888, the hardening of the fronts between Freemasonic liberals and ultramontane Catholics was shown in an incident which, although limited in time and space, found an echo even in Europe. Influenced by the increasingly unequivocal positions taken by Pius IX, several bishops were worried about the toleration by the Emperor of Protestant missions, the acceptance of rationalistic doctrines from Germany by educated people, and the growing anti-Christian attitude of the Freemasons. In 1872 the Capuchin bishop of Olinda, Monsignor V. de Oliveira, who had been trained in France, and one of his brethren, Monsignor A. de Macedo Costa, bishop of Para, ordered their priests and the members of the parishes with threat of punishment to leave Freemasonic lodges. The government, however, arguing that the papal bulls against the Freemasons had never received the approval of the state, annulled the episcopal decisions. When the prelates denied the right of the civil authority to interfere in religious questions, they were imprisoned. The horrified Catholic world press celebrated the bishops as martyrs in the cause of ecclesiastical independence. The other bishops actually supported their colleagues only moderately, but this case was the starting point for a mobilization of public opinion which caused the most energetic Brazilian Catholics to call for the spiritual freedom of the Church in the face of abusive interference by the civil authority.

CHAPTER 19

Preliminary Phases of the Kulturkampf *in Austria, Bavaria, Baden, and Switzerland*

During the 1860s the conflict between liberalism and the Catholic Church in several German-speaking countries reached that ideological confrontation which Rudolf Virchow characterized as "*Kulturkampf.*"[1] Consequently, liberalism, which had grown to be the predominant political power, began to implement one of its central concerns: the liberation of state and society from ecclesiastical tutelage. The chief opponent seemed to be Catholicism with its ultramontane coloration, highlighted by the dogma of Immaculate Conception and the *Syllabus,* which had been augmented by the dogma of papal infallibility. The contrast emerged particularly sharply in countries with mixed denominations. German and Swiss liberalism, having grown out of Protestantism and being especially doctrinal, considered a frontal attack necessary. In the process, the power of the state was often ruthlessly applied, in violation of liberal principles. To the ideological contrast there was frequently added an economical-social one: the liberal urban middle class confronted the lower middle class and rural populations, who had close ties to the Church and felt disadvantaged by the beginning industrialization.[2]

---

[1] In the programmatic speech in which Virchow, the famous pathologist and left-liberal politician, on 17 January 1873 in the Prussian House of Representatives expressed himself in favor of the bill concerning the education and employment of clerics. The speech is excerpted in Franz-Willing, *Kulturkampf gestern und heute,* 9f.—Concerning occasional earlier uses of the word "*Kulturkampf,*" see ibid., 11f.

Both sides were responsible for aggravating the situation. Neither was prepared to recognize the autonomy of the other in its own area; liberal politicians and Church leaders attempted to define "the borderline between state and Church"[3] in such a way as to be most beneficial to each group.

Catholic states on the whole were content to acquire sovereignty over the borderline areas claimed by the Church, such as education and civil registries, and to retain the surviving parts of the system of state Churches. Non-Catholic politicians went much further; they wanted to replace the cooperation for which the Church had fought with a complete return to the earlier state Church, a move which they justified with the claim to the absolute legal authority of the modern state. Frequently these liberals, imbued by national ideologies, tried to substitute such national Church organizations for the supranational principle of Catholicism.

In Austria, the denominational laws of the year 1868 continued to undermine the concordat but did not affect the inner sphere of the Church. Emperor Franz Joseph endeavored to avoid a break with Rome,[4] yet could not prevent the extremely sharp condemnation of the laws by the Pope.[5] In Austria itself voices were raised in objection and not only by conservatives. The belligerent Bishop Franz Joseph Rudigier of Linz (1811–84)[6] became the focal point of a popular opposition movement. Such a development was new for Austria, but it found imitation in other states where the struggle against the liberals was being waged; the Catholic faction in the parliament at Vienna also grew stronger. Because he exhorted people to disregard the law, Rudigier was found guilty by a court in 1869, but was immediately pardoned by the Emperor; nevertheless, the brief imprisonment of the bishop had a jolting effect on the Catholic masses. Rudigier was supported by Bishop

---

[2] This aspect of the *Kulturkampf,* generally neglected in treatments of the period, is brought to light in the essay by L. Gall, even though he overemphasized it.

[3] This was the programmatic title of a *Kulturkampf*-promoting work by the liberal canon lawyer Emil Friedberg (Tübingen 1872).

[4] The Emperor tried in vain to convince the Pope of the necessity of a modification of the concordat. Franz Joseph to Pius IX on 16 February 1868; handwritten remarks by Pius IX, no date. Texts: Engel-Janosi, *Politische Korrespondenz* nos. 130, 130a; see also nos. 133, 134.

[5] Allocution of 22 June 1868. Text: *Acta Pii IX* IV, 407ff.

[6] Biography by K. Meindl (2 vols. [Linz 1891–92]); J. Lenzenweger in *LThK* IX, 85.

Johann Baptist Zwerger[7] (1824–93) of Seckau and Bishop Josef Fessler[8] (1813–72) of Sankt Pölten.

The Emperor continued to effect a moderate application of the laws, and his constant communication with Cardinal Rauscher also had a calming effect. Although polemics from both sides continued with unabated stridency and the liberals in 1869 succeeded in passing a national elementary school act which reduced the number of denominational schools, Emperor and cardinal working together prevented the outbreak of a real *Kulturkampf.* Rauscher's suffragan Johann Rudolf Kutschker[9] contributed greatly to his cardinal's policy of understanding. He was also in charge of Catholic ecclesiastical matters in the Ministry of Education, a dual position which can only be comprehended by looking at Josephinist traditions. In the question of appointment of bishops, agreement was generally also reached on candidates willing to compromise.

The constant objective of Chancellor Friedrich Ferdinand von Beust was revenge for Prussia's victory in 1866. For this purpose he needed both the support of the liberals and an alliance with antipapal Italy. Among other matters, the concordat was an obstacle to such goals, but all attempts to move the Curia to a voluntary renunciation of the treaty were in vain. In the summer of 1870 Beust finally used the dogma of papal infallibility as a pretext for disavowing the concordat and was supported in this move by the liberal minister of religion, Stremayr. After some hesitation, Emperor Franz Joseph on 30 July 1870 declared the concordat as no longer valid. He argued that as a consequence of the dogma the Roman partner had changed his character, that a contractual relationship was impossible with a partner who claimed to be infallible, and that it was the state's responsibility to counteract the dangerous consequences of the new dogma. This legally untenable step rested on a much too broad interpretation of the dogma, although it was plausible as a result of ultramontane declarations. It can be assumed that the Emperor resorted to it only because he was deeply disappointed by the results of the Vatican Council and the Curia's hardening attitude, both of which harmed ecclesiastical peace. His disappointment was deepened by the resigned attitude of the Austrian bishops when they returned from Rome.[10]

---

[7] Biography by F. von Oer (Graz 1897); J. Köck in *LThK* X, 1430.

[8] Biographies by A. Erdinger (Brixen 1874); M. Ramsauer (Würzburg 1875); F. Grass in *LThK* IV, 95; *ÖBL* I, 305.

[9] Johann Rudolf Kutschker (1810–81), 1857–76 ministerial councilor in the Ministry of Education, after 1862 simultaneously suffragan bishop and vicar general in Vienna, 1876 as successor of Rauscher archbishop of Vienna, 1877 cardinal (biography by A. Eitler [diss., Vienna 1956]); H. Erharter in *LThK* VI, 699.

The attempts of the liberals to intensify the struggle after Beust's resignation were only partially successful. They reached their legislative peak with the religious laws which were introduced in 1874 by the liberal ministry of Auersperg and accepted by the Emperor.[11] The passage of the laws was preceded by intense arguments in which the Pope intervened in the form of an encyclical to the Austrian bishops and a letter to the Emperor.[12] While Cardinal Schwarzenberg favored vocal protests, Rauscher and Kutschker negotiated quietly and succeeded in the striking of several unpalatable clauses.

The laws strengthened the state's supervision of the Churches and effected the equality of denominations, without, however, crossing the line established by the legislation of 1868. They left to the Catholic Church the position of a privileged public corporation and assured it of freedom of education and worship, the free exercise of its jurisdiction in the ecclesiastical sphere, and the free development of the orders and parochial school systems. The ecclesiastical part of the public schools was merely placed under state supervision. Thus, the Austrian laws were considerably milder than the *Kulturkampf* legislation in Baden and Prussia. Additionally, transgressions required neither prosecution by the state nor a "dismissal" of the offending cleric; at most, the offices of such clerics had to cease public activity.

Emperor Franz Joseph was convinced that these laws adequately protected the rights of the state and resisted all additional anticlerical legislation. A law in the spring of 1874 which established the state's right to dissolve monasteries was not sanctioned by him. The Curia also was willing to be flexible, not least thanks to the judicious reports of Nuncio Jacobini, who had been sent to Vienna in 1874. It was recognized that the Austrian laws struck a balance between state and Church and that despite a premature papal complaint conditions in Austria were not the same as in Germany. This did not mean that the ideological struggle between liberals and Catholics ceased; it continued and damaged not only the Church. The Catholic ability to resist, exemplified especially in the Christian-Socialist Party, founded in 1880, proved to be far stronger than opponents had assumed.

---

[10] In a letter of 25 August 1870 to his mother, Archduchess Sophie, Franz Joseph wrote (among other matters); "It is also my most fervent desire again to come to an agreement with the Church, but that is impossible with the current Pope. When one sees the embitterment and hopelessness with which our bishops returned from Rome . . . one can almost despair of the future of the Church if one is not firm in the faith and in the confidence that God will preserve the Church from further disaster" (Weinzierl-Fischer, op. cit., 117).

[11] Three laws were passed: one regulated the external legal relationships of the Catholic Church; the second dealt with the amount of contribution of the benefice property to the religious fund; and the third treated the recognition of religious corporations.

[12] Pius IX to Franz Joseph on 7 March 1874. Only in this letter did the Pope protest the termination of the concordat. Text: Engel-Janosi, *Politische Korrespondenz* no. 139.—In his reply (n.d. ibid., no. 140), the Emperor refuted the papal accusations and assured the Church of his continuing protection.

Prince Chlodwig of Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst (1819–1901),[13] after 1866 Bavarian minister president, was a Catholic, but just as antiultramontane as his brother, who resided in Rome as a Curia cardinal.[14] He clung tenaciously to the remainders of a state Church. It was his intention to transform Bavaria with the aid of an emphatic liberal domestic policy and to strengthen South German autonomy. Only when this proved to be unattainable was he willing to enter into a closer relationship with the North German Confederation. In 1868 the right of the Church to supervise schools, which had been conceded in 1852, was repealed and the entire elementary school system was taken over by the state; Jesuit missions were banned. 1869 also saw theological and political resistance to the dogma of infallibility emanating from Munich. Hohenlohe, extensively but one-sidedly informed of the Roman happenings by his brother and Döllinger, tried to persuade the other powers to take a collective stand against the planned definition. As was the case with other liberals, Hohenlohe feared that the dogma would not be confined to the theological sphere but would claim papal jurisdiction over princes and states in nonreligious questions as well. But because of the disinterest of most of the governments, Hohenlohe's initiative failed; Beust as well as Bismarck, who at that time still pursued a dilatory policy toward the Catholic Church, replied evasively.

---

[13] After 1870 Hohenlohe occupied high offices in the service of the German Empire, from 1894–1900 he was reich chancellor and Prussian minister president. (Clodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, *Denkwürdigkeiten* I–II, ed. by F. Curtius [Stuttgart and Leipzig 1907], III, ed. by K. A. von Müller [Berlin 1931]; O. Pfülf in *StZ* 72 [1907]; Kißling, *Kulturkampf* I, 423f., 427ff., II, 1f., 16–19, 22, 122, III, 162, 249; K. A. von Müller, *Der dritte deutsche Reichskanzler . . .* [Munich 1931]).

[14] Gustav Adolf Fürst zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst (1823–1896), after studies in Munich in communication with Döllinger, after 1846 in the Roman Academia dei Nobili. Initially favorite of Pius IX, 1857 titular archbishop, 1866 cardinal. The good relationship with the Pope was not lasting when Hohenlohe proved to be a violent opponent of the Jesuits and became a member of the opposition at the Vatican Council; after 1870 he was isolated in the Curia (F. X. Kraus, "Cardinal Hohenlohe," in F. X. Kraus, *Essays* 2 [Berlin 1901]; R. Lill, *Vatikanische Akten zur Geschichte des deutschen Kulturkampfes. Leo XIII.* I [1878–80] [Tübingen 1970], 7f.; G. Böing in *LThK* V, 431; H. Jedin, "Gustav Hohenlohe und Augustin Theiner," *RQ* 66 [1971]).

Opposition to Hohenlohe's Little German and anticlerical policy in 1869 led to the founding of the Patriotic People's Party under the leadership of Joseph Edmund Jörg. Its membership was almost exclusively Catholic, and on the first try it won the majority of the seats in Bavaria's parliament. Its rapid successes rested on the support given to it by the Catholic associations, a lesson which was applied shortly afterwards in the foundings of Catholic parties in Baden and Prussia. The Patriots, whose agitation very much contributed to making the liberal press equate Catholic with particularistic, in January 1870 achieved the fall of Hohenlohe. The government's course did not change, however, as the new administration, backed by King Ludwig II, was under the influence of the National Liberal minister of religion Baron Johann von Lutz (1826–90).[15] He resolutely continued Hohenlohe's religious policy and even intensified it after the publication of the dogma of papal infallibility. He protected the incipient movement of the Old Catholics, and on 9 August 1870 he decreed that the new dogma could not be announced from the pulpits; owing to the objections of the bishops, the decree could not be implemented. However, in 1871 Lutz introduced a bill in the Federal Council of the new German Empire which outlawed the misuse of the pulpit for political purposes; it became law on 10 December 1871. The Bavarian government also played a leading role in the passing of the second imperial law of the *Kulturkampf,* which allowed the dissolution of the Jesuit organization and the expulsion of Jesuits from Germany. Yet Lutz did not openly endorse the conflict in Prussia; he was satisfied with conducting a kind of creeping *Kulturkampf.* Its apogee was a royal edict of 20 November 1873 which annulled the edict of 6 April 1852 and restored the previous supervision of the state over the Churches. Considerable tension, especially in connection with the appointment of bishops, continued for a long period of time. But an open break was avoided, as both King and government honored the concordat. The government tolerated that Bavaria's bishops temporarily gave refuge to Prussian priests and students of theology to whom the May Laws had denied the exercise of office and the opportunity to study.

The majority of the bishops appointed by the King, under the leadership of Archbishop Gregor von Scherr of Munich-Freising, assumed a conciliatory stance. Only Archbishop Michael Deinlein of Bamberg (1800–1875) agreed to the veto right of the government. Bishop Ignatius von Senestréy of Regensburg (1818–1906), whose strictly ultramontane attitude was shared by Bishop Baron Franz von Leonrod of Eichstätt (1827–1905), remained an intransigent fighter against liberalism and the state Church.[16]

---

[15] F. von Rummel, *Das Ministerium Lutz und seine Gegner* (Munich 1935); W. Grasser, *Johann Freiherr von Lutz. Eine politische Biographie* (*Misc. Bavarica Monacensia* no. 1 [Munich 1967]).

Earlier and more completely than in any other German state, middle-class and Little German liberalism had assumed a dominant role in Baden. After 1860, the administrations of Lamey and Jolly, in cooperation with the liberal parliamentary majority, determined domestic policy and fashioned the relationship to the Churches. The law of 9 October 1860, which took the place of the concordat rejected by the Chamber, formed the foundation; still, the majority of the liberals was not satisfied with it and neither were many Catholics. In 1864 a struggle over education erupted. Especially among the active liberals in Baden there were eminent proponents of the principle of the absolute legal authority of the state, such as the jurists Bluntschli,[17] Friedberg,[18] and Jolly;[19] inasmuch as Jolly headed the government after 1866, they were able to implement their program. The religious legislation of Baden in the years 1868–76 transferred to the state many duties hitherto exercised by the Churches and subjected the Churches to a far-reaching system of state supervision. The laws of Baden influenced the *Kulturkampf* legislation of Prussia and other German states; conversely, the laws passed in Baden after 1871 followed the example of the legislation of Prussia and the German Empire.

From beginning to end, religious legislation in Baden[20] was characterized by the claim of the liberals to jurisdiction over education. The elementary school law of 8 March 1868 changed parochial schools into nondenominational schools and made the establishment of parochial schools dependent on a special law; eight years later, the education law of 16 September 1876 made nondenominational schools mandatory. On 21 December 1869 a civil marriage law was passed which, like the first of the two education laws, was more a legal consequence of the secularization of society than a belligerent measure. The same could not be said of the foundation law of 5 May 1870. It arbitrarily differentiated between secular Catholic foundation property (school and charitable foundations), which was transferred to the administration of the municipalities, and actual church property, the administration of which was merely placed under supervision by the state.

---

[16] Staber, *Kirchengeschichte des Bistums Regensburg,* 190–97; *Festschrift zur 150. Wiederkehr des Geburtstages Senestréys,* ed. by P. Mai (Regensburg 1968); P. Mai in *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* I (1969), 399–411.

[17] Johann Caspar Bluntschli (1808–81), 1833 professor of law in Zurich, 1848 in Munich, 1861 in Heidelberg, in 1864 cofounder of the Protestant Association (H. Fritzsche, *Schweizer Juristen der letzten 100 Jahre* [Zurich 1945]; H. Mitteis in *HDB* 2, 337f).

[18] Emil Friedberg (1837–1910), 1868 professor of law in Freiburg, 1869 in Leipzig (cf. n. 3 above, A. Erler in *NDB* 5, 443f.).

[19] Julius Jolly (1823–91), assistant professor of law in 1847 at Heidelberg, 1861 government councilor, 1862 ministerial councilor in the Baden Ministry of the Interior, 1866 its president, 1868–76 leading minister of state (biography by H. Baumgarten, *L. Jolly* [Tübingen 1897]; J. Heyderhoff, *ZGObrh* 86–87 [1934–35]).

[20] The texts of the laws are largely reproduced in Friedberg, *Staat und katholische Kirche in Baden,* supplements no. XXff., as well as in Stadelhofer, *Abbau der Kulturkampfgesetzgebung in Baden,* 394–403.

The most trenchant incursions in ecclesiastical life took place in 1872 and 1874. Regulations concerning the religious orders of 2 April 1872 forbade members of orders to teach school, and forbade any pastoral activity to members of orders which were not legally registered in Baden. The law of 15 June 1874 concerning Old Catholics was based on the fact that the anti-Roman traditions of a minority of Baden Catholics had led a number of clerics and laymen to join the protest movement. The members of the new community were assured of all rights which they had held as Catholics. Clerics turned Old Catholic were allowed to retain their benefices and income; Old Catholic communities were permitted to use Catholic churches and were granted a share of the community property, the extent of which was determined rather arbitrarily by the state authorities. The high point of *Kulturkampf* legislation occurred with the law of 19 February 1874 on the legal position of the Churches in the state. After an academic examination according to the law of 1860 had been ordered in 1867, admission to a clerical office was now made dependent on graduation from a secondary school and a three-year course of study at a German university, as well as on a discriminating public examination in the fields of philosophy, history, and German and classical literature (ARTICLE 1).[21] The Churches were permitted to retain only institutions for the theological-practical preparation of prospective clerics; hostels for theology and secondary school students, which the liberals accused of isolating the students from the national education of the German youth, were closed (ART. 2). For transgressions, ART. 3 decreed fines and imprisonment, in severe cases also withholding of salaries and removal from office; in addition, the attempt to influence elections by clerics was also made subject to fines.

Ecclesiastical opposition to this law was led by the aged Archbishop von Vicari, whose last years were also filled with a battle over the appointment of his cathedral dean, whom he also wanted to act as his suffragan bishop. In 1867 Lothar von Kübel (1823–81)[22] was named director of the hostel, and after Vicari's death in 1868 headed the archdiocese as chapter vicar for thirteen years. The election of the archbishop foundered on the rejection by the government of all but one of eight candidates nominated by the cathedral chapter. Kübel filed legal objections to all of the laws.[23] Together with a large majority of the clergy he also passively resisted them, a resistance which was not even broken by the law of 25 August 1876 which suspended all financial subventions by the state. Chapter vicar and clergy refused any cooperation in implementing the religious law of 1874; jailing of clerics, numerous vacancies, and growing pastoral emergency conditions were the result.

---

[21] ARTICLE I of the law closely followed the Prussian law concerning education and employment of clerics (11 May 1873).

Liberal anticlericalism in Baden also affected the political activation of Catholics. The Catholic People's Party, founded in 1869 by Jakob Lindau, sent five delegates to the Chamber and two years later raised this number to nine; its chief publication was the *Badischer Beobachter,* founded in 1863. In opposition to the oligarchical structure of the liberal system and in accordance with the democratic traditions of Baden, the party demanded not only religious freedom but also liberal and democratic basic rights which the liberal government had delayed, such as the universal, equal, and secret right to vote.

The irreconcilability of the opposing positions, the failure of many state regulations, and the renewed hardening of the fronts caused by the introduction of the obligatory nondenominational school, actually not desired by Jolly but forced upon him by the liberal majority in the Chamber, moved Grand Duke Friedrich I to be more reasonable. The administration of Turban-Stösser, installed in 1876, was charged with continuing established policies in most areas, but was also instructed to search for a modus vivendi in religious policy without surrendering the rights of the state.

Jolly's first religious law found a positive echo among the liberals outside of Baden. There was no change in the official religious policy of Prussia before 1871–72, but to the degree that Bismarck's alliance of 1866 with the liberals became firmer their anticlericalism also spread. When in the spring of 1869 Rome's intention to seek definition of papal infallibility at the impending council was made public, liberal declarations became angry and Protestant-conservative warnings added to the furor. As for the German Catholics themselves, the passionately discussed issue of infallibility divided them into two camps.

---

[22] Biographies by J. Schober (Freiburg 1911) and A. Schill in *Badische Biographien* IV, 230–41; W. Müller in *LThK* VI, 655.

[23] In this he was assisted by his office manager, the jurist Heinrich Maas (1826–95), who similarly had assisted Vicari.

It was in this tense atmosphere that the German bishops gathered at Fulda in September 1869.[24] Other urgent items on the agenda, such as Ketteler's social solutions, receded into the background behind the question of infallibility; the latter forced the episcopate into a one-sided and unnecessary fighting posture. But the conference at least discussed the events in Baden and declared its solidarity with Kübel.

As for the definition urged by Rome, the majority were disinclined to agree with it; of twenty bishops present or represented at Fulda, fourteen presented their views to Pius IX in vain. Their joint letter to the Pope was drafted by the recently appointed bishop of Rottenburg, Hefele, who together with Ketteler lectured on the issue of infallibility. Ketteler actually anticipated some postulates of the minority at the Vatican Council by demanding that the evidence of tradition in the definition meet scientific criteria and that the infallibility of the Pope be proved in connection with that of the Church. Hefele used historical arguments, denying a positive cause for the definition as well as its timeliness. If the dogma of infallibility were accepted, he said, it would make a reunification of the divided denominations much more difficult, would weaken the unity of German Catholicism, and would intensify the religious struggle in the political arena.[25] The waves of controversy which after the summer of 1870 broke over German Catholicism justified his views.

In Switzerland, the battle between liberalism and strict Church adherents and between the liberal minority and the ultramontane majority of the Catholics ever since the 1840s was marked by a *Kulturkampf* intensity which grew even more bitter in the decade before the Vatican Council.[26] The basic disagreement there also was the council itself and the issue of papal infallibility. The official announcement of the dogma was made more difficult in some cantons, in others it was forbidden altogether. On the other hand, the agitation against the council, which prepared the ground for the Old Catholics, was allowed to unfold unhindered, initially in the "Freethinking Catholic Associations" in which political motives often outweighed religious ones. The reason for this was that many Catholics, whom the *Syllabus* offended in the core of their thought and action and whom it completely alienated from an authoritarian Church, saw in the opposition to the dogma a welcome opportunity to move the Church in the direction of a democratic and national Church. Only in 1873 was a theologian, the former Lucerne professor of theology Edward Herzog (1841–1924, after 1875 bishop of the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland),[27] enabled to assume the leadership of the protest movement. It was largely due to him that the movement excluded the radical elements and as the Christian Catholic Church followed the tradition of Wessenberg's reform program.

---

[24] Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 80–95. Concerning Ketteler's Fulda paper on the question of infallibility, see also Freudenberger, *Universität Würzburg und erstes vatikanisches Konzil,* 166ff.

[25] The Catholic representatives of the Customs Parliament (between 1866 and 1870 the only all-German parliamentary body), among them Peter Reichensperger and Ludwig Windthorst, in a confidential advisory for the episcopate viewed the definition of papal infallibility as unnecessary and inopportune. Text: *ColLac* VII, 1185f.; cf. Granderath-Kirch I, 223–27.

[26] This had not only theological but also political reasons. For example, the Confederation did not stop the external jurisdiction of the bishops of Milan and Como over Ticino until 1859, when Lombardy, which until then had been Austrian, fell to Italy and there was reason to fear irredentist agitation.

Bishop Eugène Lachat of Basel (1819–86),[28] whose seminary was closed in the spring of 1870, in 1873 was "dismissed" and expelled from five of the seven cantons which comprised his bishopric because of his advocacy of the new dogma and the excommunication of Christ Catholic opponents; he withdrew to Lucerne. In the overwhelmingly Catholic Jura the Berne government expelled all pastors when they sided with Lachat. They were replaced with clerics loyal to the state, among them several foreigners, but were rejected by the parishes so that a schism was avoided. Pius IX acted very unwisely in 1873 when he appointed the suffragan Gaspard Mermillod as vicar apostolic of Geneva. He liked Mermillod because of his unquestioned ultramontanism, but his appointment partially anticipated the establishment of a bishopric, an action illegal under the constitution. Mermillod was immediately expelled by the Federal Council. To the papal condemnation of the injustices inflicted on the Church in the encyclical *Etsi multa luctuosa* (21 November 1873),[29] the Federal Council replied by completely severing diplomatic relations with the Vatican.[30]

The *Kulturkampf* was carried over into the new federal constitution[31] of 29 May 1874. The establishment of new dioceses was made dependent on permission by the Confederation. Confederation and cantons received summary authorization to preserve peace among the denominations and to take the requisite steps to prevent violations of the rights of citizens and state by ecclesiastical authorities (ART. 50). The events of 1870 had shown that even the publication of principles of faith and the excommunication of opponents were viewed as such violations. The Society of Jesus and all organizations "affiliated" with it were excluded from the entire territory of Switzerland and its members were forbidden to be active in church and school (ART. 51). The establishment of new monasteries and the restoration of closed ones was also declared impermissible (ART. 52). The maintenance of civil registries was turned over to the exclusive care of the government (ART. 53), canonical jurisdiction was declared abolished (ART. 58), and elementary education was placed exclusively in the hands of the state (ART. 27).

---

[27] Biography by W. Herzog (1935). See also F. Heiler, *Evangelische Katholizität* (1926), 9ff.; W. Küppers in *RGB* III, 287f.

[28] Biographies by E. Hornstein (Lucerne 1873), T. Scherer-Boccard (Würzburg 1873), and E. Folletête (Paris 1925); A. Chèvre in *ZSKG* 58 (1964); J. B. Villiger in *LThK* VI, 723.

[29] *Acta Pii IX* VI, 253–73.

[30] The nunciature in Switzerland was not reopened until 1920.

[31] Text: G. Franz, *Staatsverfassungen* (Munich 1964), 584–627.

Although the *Kulturkampf* politicians quickly had to acknowledge that the National Church-Old Catholic movement constituted no more than a minority, anti-Catholic legislation was dismantled only slowly; fundamental moves for a relaxation of tension in Switzerland were made only under the pontificate of Leo XIII.

CHAPTER 20

Internal Catholic Controversies in Connection with Liberalism

Catholicism and Liberalism after 1848

The crisis of 1848, which pointed out the degree to which the traditional order of society had been shaken, and the subsequent wave of reaction only intensified the great problem which had confronted Catholic thought for half a century. What was to be the attitude to the world which had emerged from the revolution and its advertised governmental form of freedom? Could one reconcile with it or did its nature require that it be rejected? Many Catholics were fascinated by the memory of the Christian Middle Ages, which a Catholic Romanticism had impressively displayed before their eyes in idealized fashion, were haunted by the thought of a recurrence of the unrest which once again had troubled Europe, and were profoundly disappointed by the failure of the attempts by Pius IX to guide liberal demands into acceptable channels through concessions. They were also troubled by the almost universal decline of religious practice, in which—as moralists and not as sociologists—they saw a consequence of the errors spread by an "evil press." Thus, they gradually became more and more convinced that the restoration started at the beginning of the century could only be successful if one resolutely forgot about the social philosophy of the eighteenth century and returned to those concepts on which the strength and greatness of the "century of faith" rested. Justification and confirmation for this mistrust of liberal principles existed in the continuance of the political philosophy which the Scholastics of the Spanish Counter-Reformation had developed. It was also found in the still strong influence of Maistre and Bonald, which was used to counter the seditious character of the rationalistic Cartesian-inspired systems, and in the aversion of many clerics to the new bourgeois society, which was identified with excessive stock market speculations and the search for material pleasures. In short, political and social notions, pastoral prejudices and traditional thought combined in varying proportions to lead a considerable number of the clergy and a few militant laymen to an authoritarian Catholicism. Its aim was to preserve and to regain privileges and external prestige for the Church within Catholic states freed from the pressure of anti-Christian currents, such as in the Spain of Isabella II, in the Empire of the Habsburgs, and until 1859 in several Italian states. The official publication of this intransigent Catholicism was the *Civiltà cattolica,* published by the Roman Jesuits. Its guiding principles were those outlined in the essay "Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo" (1851) by the Spaniard Donoso Cortés,[1] which also became available soon thereafter in French and German. *Civiltà cattolica,* founded in 1849, had as its principal goal the complete restoration of Christian principles in the life of the individual, of the family, and of society. In some countries the Society of Jesus was responsible for the view held by many people that these principles were the only ones which were acceptable to Catholic orthodoxy.

In contrast to 1815, the monarchical and reactionary governments which were totally devoted to the Church by the middle of the century had lost the support of the young. Thus, there were many Catholics who, deeply sympathetic with the currents of their century, attacked the intransigent group by arguing that the attempt to return to the concepts of the restoration period was not only dangerous but also futile. Not all of them agreed with Montalembert's *Intérêts catholiques au XIX^e^ siècle* (1852), in which he took the position that the religious renascence of the first half of the century was the exclusive result of the liberties which the Church enjoyed under a parliamentary regime. But most of them pointed out that a significant number of the leaders in the state no longer practiced their religion and that for this reason it was utopian to expect disinterested aid and protection from the state; at best the Church could hope for a benevolent neutrality. Some of them went further. In light of the genuine values and of the real humanitarian progress which liberalism in spite of some excesses had produced, they were prepared to accept the modern concept of greater rights for the individual. It hardly needs mentioning that they were not always aware of the danger that the excessive autonomy of the individual could result in the claim of man's total independence from God.

---

[1] Concerning Juan Donoso Cortés (1809–53), see J. Schramm, *Donoso Cortés* (Madrid 1936) and J. Chaix-Ruy, *Donoso Cortés, théologien de l'histoire et prophète* (Paris 1956).

Gradually there arose two opposing Catholic groups which, while both were intent on serving the Church, completely differed in how best this could be accomplished. One group saw the modern world of its century as an historical epoch with its own peculiar organizational form and thought it necessary to be its advance guard. Tactfully the members of this group threw a veil over the condemnations in the encyclical *Mirari vos,* the memory of which was beginning to pale, and demanded that the Church embrace liberalism just as in earlier times it had done with Greco-Roman civilization, the reaction of the parishes to the feudalism of the Middle Ages, and the humanistic endeavors of the Renaissance. The others, regarding the modern world as the anti-Christian legacy of the revolution, preferred to avoid error by breaking off all contacts and desired a tightening of prohibitions in order to avoid infection. They insisted on the solemn repetition of the earlier condemnation of liberalism and other modern errors by the magisterial office. They were oblivious of the dangers of such a course of action, which could only intensify the ambiguities as a result of which many liberals had come to the firm conviction that a society in keeping with the demands of the time could only be built if the Catholic Church was deprived of all influence.

Conflicts between the two groups were unavoidable. They were aggravated at the same time by the intrusion of additional debates which split the Catholic elite in many countries. In France, where political problems easily assumed an ideological and religious character, it was the question of reconciliation with the Empire after the coup d'état; in Italy it was the Roman Question; in Germany it was the growing contrast between university theologians and defenders of Scholasticism, in which could be seen the same spiritual opposition which separated the believers in progress with their sense of history from those who preferred to trust the methods which previously had been approved by a hierarchical authority.

The Division of the Catholics in France

Internal Catholic controversies over modern liberties reached their high point in France. Elsewhere the problem was dealt with as a practical one. Rome conceded under Pius IX as well as under Gregory XVI that on this level attitudes could be different, depending on each case. While liberal legislation in Piedmont was formally condemned, it was tolerated in Belgium and even appreciated in countries with a Catholic minority, such as the United States, England, and the Netherlands. But such practices confused the French, who with their logical bent desired coherent theories which could be raised to the level of universal validity. Revived by the differences of opinion swirling around the Falloux Law, whose proponents and opponents indulged themselves in treating the matter on the level of fundamentals, the old debates over the ideal Christian society, which ever since the condemnation of Lamennais had receded into the background, once again began to agitate some people. Numerically weak, their influence nevertheless stretched far beyond the borders of France.[2]

The Catholics who believed in freedom in turn were divided over several important issues. There was the group which in 1855 had reorganized the newspaper *Le Correspondant.* It was headed by a few anti-Bonaparte laymen who were closely allied with Orléanist circles: Falloux, Albert de Broglie, Cochin, and primarily Montalembert, who thanks to their personal qualities, their social position, their influence in political life, and their great services in the cause of Catholicism also influenced people who did not sympathize with all of their ideas. This group, "academic and in vogue" (Planque), which in some respects approached the ideal of "devout humanism," was also represented in the provinces[3] and in the great orders. Among the Dominicans its views were championed by Lacordaire, among the Oratorians by Gratry, and even among the Jesuits by P. de Ravignan and the first editors of *Études.* But above all it profited from the support and the growing prestige of Monsignor Dupanloup, the eloquent and active bishop of Orléans, whom his defense of the temporal position of the Pope after the Italian War placed in the forefront of Europe's religious politics. In contrast to Montalembert, who just as during the time of *L'Avenir* unreservedly continued to rely on freedom in Church as well as in state, Dupanloup's liberalism was highly relative. Basically his aim, as that of the Belgian bishops and of Ketteler, was to employ new methods and institutions which corresponded to liberal aspirations and under the circumstances were the only possible ones, in order to create a modernized Christian society in which liberty "was regarded as the guarantee for the activity of the Church" (Gadille). Yet he was viewed by the ultramontane press as the religious leader of the "liberal Catholic faction," while conversely many moderate Catholics, convinced that they were in agreement with the spirit of the century, accused him of a lack of logic precisely because he refused to apply liberal principles to the solution of the Roman Question.

---

[2] P. Sylvain wrote about Veuillot, the chief enemy of Catholic liberalism: "No other French writer contributed as much to the forming of the French-Canadian mentality" ("Quelques aspects de l'antagonisme libéral—ultramontain au Canada français," *RSoc* 8 [1967], 275–97). The few Spanish liberal Catholics like Mañe y Flaqeur, the manager of the *Diario* of Barcelona, the founders of the *Revista mensual* (1868), and the chief representative of the liberal current in Hungary, Baron J. Eötvös, looked to Montalembert for inspiration.

[3] Among others in Nancy, with focus on Guerrier de Dumast (cf. de Montclos, 241–42).

A much more consistent liberalism was represented by the clerics led by Monsignor Maret, the dean of the theological faculty at the Sorbonne.[4] On the one hand, they did not hesitate to proclaim a "Catholic and liberal reform" within the Church, which was to rejuvenate the old institutions like synods and councils which limited authority and to free Catholic research from the stranglehold of the Index. They made no secret of their sympathies for the constitutional efforts of the Romans or of their conviction that the temporal power of the Pope was more damaging than useful for the exercise of his spiritual mission. On the other hand, in the question of the relation between the two powers, they openly adhered to the concept of the modern state, which was allied with the principles of 1789, which, "correctly understood, were rooted in Christianity just as much as in philosophical reason" (Maret). These neo-Gallicans saw in the concordat an instrument of cooperation in freedom between the Church and a secularized society. But such also were the ideas of a majority of the Catholic middle class which was frequently willing either to exclude or to ignore of the official doctrines of the Church whatever happened to be too much of a burden for its intellectual and political concepts. "The very small number of consciously liberal Catholics and the high number of moderate, i.e., unwittingly liberal, Catholics, were indeed two significant characteristics of French Catholicism" (Maurain).

These groups were opposed by those who in contrast to the liberal Catholics proudly designated themselves as "nothing but Catholics" and thereby emphasized their loyalty to the Roman standpoint, whose hard line they wanted to strengthen. They remained faithful to the counterrevolutionary traditionalism of the first third of the century and lacked the power of discrimination to detect the kernel of truth inherent in liberalism. They tended to judge political decisions according to absolute principles, from which they deduced their logical consequences, instead of searching for compromises adapted to concrete situations varying according to time and place. The leader of this group was Monsignor Pie,[5] who in his *Instructions synodales sur les erreurs du temps présent* (1855–71) ceaselessly pilloried naturalism, which wanted to alienate God and the Church from the concerns of the world. Inspired especially by Dom Guéranger, he developed a political supernaturalism which was based on the Kingdom of Jesus Christ in this world and the glorification of the Pope-King. He did not advocate theocracy as such, i.e., the exercise of direct political power by the Church, but while admitting that the complete attainment of a Christian society would not come before the end of time, he nevertheless demanded the renewal of faith in the individual and the family as well as the Christianization of the state and the state's agencies. Overly zealous admirers became even more reactionary, however, and ignoring the eschatological perspectives and the reservations of the bishop of Poitiers with respect to too much of a direct political engagement, exaggerated the secularization of the supernatural. They did not hesitate to proclaim the direct sovereignty of Church and Pope over all of civil society. They expected that with the aid of Bourbon President Chambord a Christian state, as the Middle Ages had seen it, would soon be established.

---

[4] On this group, which received less attention than the more brilliant, as well as more superficial, one of *Le Corespondant,* see de Montclos, 130–32, 225–27, 287–323; J. Gadille, op. cit., 89–108, 134–39.

These extreme ideas were spread with an absolute lack of differentiation and were often accompanied by unjust condemnations of Catholics who thought differently. The leading journalist who acted in this fashion and intensified the polarization was Louis Veuillot. Veuillot's achievements are undeniable: his devotion to the Pope, his personal altruism, and the great accomplishment when through his sarcastic contempt of anticlericals he helped to free the average Catholic from the inferiority complex which had burdened him for so long. But he also did more than anyone else to poison the atmosphere. The intransigence of his Catholicism—that of a convert—all too often made him forget the requirements of Christian charity and led him to a wholesale condemnation of modern civilization, for which he held the foolishness of the freethinkers of his time responsible. While the bishops were reluctant to admonish this journalist who often criticized them for what he regarded as their lack of orthodoxy, he quickly became an oracle for the provincial clergy, which valued his popular language and his massive criticisms. With this clergy acting as an intermediary, Veuillot's influence was effective with a limited, but not to be underestimated, number of the faithful. For a long time they maintained a stance of clerical intolerance and systematic defamation of civil authority.

---

[5] On Louis Pie (1815–80), after 1849 bishop of Poitiers, see L. Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1893); E. Catta, *La doctrine politique et sociale du cardinal Pie* (Paris 1959), which needs to be read in conjunction with J. Gadille, op. cit., 48–59.

Catholic Liberalism outside France around 1860

The debates in Belgium proved most similar to those in France. There also around 1860, under the influence of the bitter press polemics which agitated French Catholicism and of the domestic political situation, the question about the bearable extent of Catholic accommodation to the system of modern freedoms was translated from the level of tactics to the level of ideas. While those with personal contacts to Montalembert and his friends continued to praise the extremely liberal constitution as the ideal, others began to worry over the change of Belgian liberalism to an anticlerical radicalism which no longer had anything in common with the unionism of 1830. They raised the point that the traditional privileges of the Church had been surrendered and that the opponents had gained freedom for the unlimited propagation of their ideas, but that they, after having achieved the legal majority, now systematically prevented the Church from taking advantage of the concessions which it had been promised in return. Even if the Catholics should regain the majority in the parliament, they argued, it would be impossible for them to conduct an unequivocally Catholic policy as long as they were obligated to respect the freedom of evil. Without agreeing in all points with the extreme positions of Veuillot—a comparison between the newspapers *L'Univers* and *Le Bien Public,* the chief paper of the Belgian ultramontanes founded in 1853, is very revealing—and clearly distancing themselves from the antiparliamentarism of the French polemicist, they began to talk of the necessity of amending the constitution as soon as circumstances permitted it. Between these two extremes stood Cardinal Sterckx and the canonists of Louvain, who drew attention to the practical advantages of the constitution, which guaranteed the Church a unique independence from the civil authority. They had to overcome the growing resistance of many younger bishops, trained in Rome, who regarded the Catholicization of some aspects of liberalism as impossible.

In Italy the problem was quite different. After the collapse of the neoguelf movement, which by many had been seen as the meeting point of the Catholic sentiment and the liberal sentiment, the development of the Roman Question made a reconciliation between liberal endeavors and Catholic loyalty to the faith much more difficult. The idea, propagated by Montalembert and the Belgian Catholics, of a Christian reconquest of society with the help of political freedoms found only few adherents in Italy. On the one hand, many patriotic and constitutional Catholics, disappointed by the "betrayal" of Pius IX, without reservation joined the liberal camp, i.e., the moderates, and for the achievement of their political ideals allied themselves with the anticlerical left "by leaving everything religious behind them and being concerned with it only in the last hour when the priest is called" (Curci). On the other hand, the indignation of many over the more statist than truly liberal policy of the Turin government, which de facto constituted a serious infringement of the rights of the Church and a limitation of its freedom even in the spiritual sphere, led to a reaction of embitterment and an indiscriminate condemnation of liberalism, no matter how moderate it might be. This intransigent direction enjoyed the complete approval of Rome and was spread throughout the country by such belligerent newspapers as Don Margotti's *Unità cattolica* and Don Albertario's *Osservatore cattolica.* Under the pontificate of Pius IX, after the passing enthusiasm of the "mediating" priests immediately after 1860,[6] it won most of Italy's clerics and militant Catholics.[7]

But even if the circumstances in Italy prevented the formation of a liberal Catholic party which, like those in France and Belgium, could have been politically influential, a Catholic liberal spirit, which believed in the possibility of a reconciliation of the Catholic faith with constitutional institutions and modern civilization, had not quite disappeared. This was especially so as the memory of the first two years of the pontificate fostered the conviction that such a reconciliation was not a doctrinal matter but merely a matter of timing with respect to the Roman Question. This liberal Catholic spirit, strongly determined by the differences of cultural traditions in the various parts of Italy and the preferences of individuals, could be found in many groups: among moderate constitutionalists like C. Balbo; among the genuinely faithful like A. Manzoni who were of the opinion that it was permissible to disagree with Rome politically; among Catholics like Minguetti who were disconcerted by the inflexibility of the Papal State; among utopians like the Tuscans Ricasoli and Capponi who stood on the outer fringes of orthodoxy; among reformers of a certain unconditional faith like Rosmini, whose influence lasted far beyond his death (1855); among historians of the tradition of Catholic Romanticism like the Lombard Cantù[8] and Tosti, the monk of Monte Cassino;[9] among admirers of Montalembert, like the future cardinal Capecelatro of Naples; and among the small Genoese group of the *Annali cattolici* which, encouraged by Archbishop Charvaz, in 1866 renamed its newspaper *Revista Universale* in order to attract more readers through this less denominational title, and wanted to bring into existence a Catholic party which, following the example of the Belgians and the Germans, alike was to be loyal to Pope, King, Catholic orthodoxy, and constitutional institutions.[10] Behind these leading figures was ranged the great number of those who continued to receive the sacraments, but who on the religious level combined the principle of authority with freedom of conscience and wanted to assure the independence of civil society within its own sphere. They were also the ones who, openly acknowledging the historical benefits which the Church had bestowed on Italy, were yet of the opinion that the status under which the Church had existed since the Middle Ages was not sacrosanct and that it was perfectly legitimate to adjust it to the requirements of the nineteenth century. This adjustment meant for some a clearer demarcation between the realms of religion and politics and, despite the protests of the Holy See, the cancellation of archaic ecclesiastical privileges, and for others the introduction of separation of Church and state and the renunciation of the exercise of the temporal power of the Pope.

---

[6] Concerning the liberal tendencies among the clergy, see G. Martina, op. cit., 765–68, and for an individual, but very significant case, A. Gambasin, *Il clero padovano* (Rome 1967), 117–69, 279–300; also A. Fappani, *Il clero liberale bresciano negli anni dell'unità d'Italia* (Brescia 1968); R. Fantini, "Sacerdoti liberali bolognesi dal 1848 all'unità nazionale," *Bolletino del Museo del Risorgimento* 5 (1960), 453–84.

[7] It must be noted, however, as Spadolini has shown, that the intransigents of the period after 1860, in contrast to those of the first half of the century, were not necessarily political reactionaries and that as justification for their refusal to cooperate with the liberals they no longer cited the principle of legitimacy and of divine right of sovereigns, but placed the rights of God and the Church above society and subjected politics to morality. The political philosophy developed by P. Taparelli d'Azeglio in the *Civiltà cattolica* is symptomatic of the new attitude.

In Germany the reconciliation between Church and state within a liberal framework occasioned fewer dramas of conscience than in the Latin countries. The reason for this was in part the fact that the German Catholics as a minority demanding religious freedom, unlike France or Belgium, did not seem to favor error but to the contrary seemed to support Catholicism. Furthermore, the German Catholics, influenced by Catholic Romanticism, in their praise of freedom harked back less to the principles of 1789 than to corporative freedom as it had existed prior to the absolute monarchy. Finally, unlike the Latin countries, religious freedom for them did not include the freedom of unbelief, but simply implied a nondenominational state with a Christian way of life. Despite a certain worry in conservative circles and some reservations in Austria[11] and Bavaria, the disagreeableness of the petty bureaucratic interferences in the life of the Church was considered fairly balanced by the official recognition which the support of the state lent to the Church. Thus, the militant Catholics and the defenders of the principles, strengthened by the experience of Prussia after 1848, agreed to acknowledge the religious advantages of constitutional freedom, which they were careful not to label "freedom to lose," even though this did not keep them from directing fierce attacks on the anti-Christian character of ideological liberalism. This moderate position, represented by Ketteler in his work *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche* (1862), for a long time was accepted by the large majority of German Catholics[12] and even at the time of the *Syllabus,* when only a few extreme voices on the right (Austrian Jesuits, among others) and on the left (Döllinger's group) muddied the waters of unity.

---

[8] Concerning Cesare Cantù (1804–95), see F. Bertolini, *Cantù e le sue opere* (Florence 1895); P. M. Manfredi, *Cesare Cantù* (Turin 1905); *ECatt* III, 646–49; also *Carteggio Montalembert Cantù*, ed. by F. Kancisvili (Milan 1969).

[9] On Luigi Tosti (1811–97), see A. Capecelatro, *Commemorazione di Luigi Tosti* (Monte Cassino 1868) and A. Quacquarelli, *Il Pater Tosti nella politica del Risorgimento* (Genoa 1945).

[10] Concerning these two journals, see O. Confessore: *Annali dell'Univ. di Lecce, Fac. di Lettere* 2 (1964–65), 158–210; O. Confessore in *SpAzLCIt* I, 141–76.

But violent controversies took place in the German-speaking countries over the question of academic freedom and ecclesiastical authority. Some representatives of the Catholic renascence, led by Döllinger, wanted to free Catholic intellectuals from the inferiority complex which a flourishing Protestant and rationalistic scholarship had given them. They thought it absolutely necessary to provide them with complete freedom of research, aside from the few questions which touched upon defined dogma and which they tried to avoid as much as possible.

Their intentions were genuine and their attempt to withdraw scholarly work from the control of the Inquisition was justified. But they insisted on seeing only one aspect of a complex situation. A reaction was therefore unavoidable; unfortunately it originated with men who often were ignorant of the new methods of scholarship and in some instances were actually hostile to them. Friction resulted inevitably when the narrowmindedness of one side provoked the free attitude of the other. Some people now opposed any intervention by the ecclesiastical magisterial office on principle and wanted to escape from all control by the ecclesiastical authorities. In this way there developed on the soil of classical liberal Protestantism a tendency among Catholic intellectuals which had its equal only in the small English group of *The Rambler.*

---

[11] After 1855 there is hardly any mention of the small group of Güntherians, so active in 1848; for this time they were very representative of the Viennese middle class with respect to politics and culture; at the same time they were hostile to democracy and autocracy, and were believers in a free Church in a free state and in intellectual freedom (see T. Simons in *CHR* 55 [1969], 173–94, 377–93, 610–26).

[12] This was also the position of the Catholics in Alemannic Switzerland (see W. Ganz, "Philipp Anton von Segesser als Politiker," *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 1 [1951], 245–74). Monsignor Mermillod defended a similar position in Romansch Switzerland.

The journal *The Rambler* was founded in England in 1848 by the convert Richard Simpson[13] with the objective of countering the intellectual inferiority of English Catholicism. Repeatedly the journal was the outspoken advocate for a limited autonomy of laymen in the Church. Its iconoclastic tendencies were reinforced in 1859 when the young John Acton assumed the directorship.[14] He was a student of Döllinger's and for a period of fifteen years embodied English Catholic liberalism. He characterized himself as "a man who has renounced everything that is incompatible with freedom in Catholicism and with the Catholic faith in politics." The independent position of the journal (and also that of *Home and Foreign Review,* which followed it in 1862) with respect to academic freedom, the Roman Question, and numerous other burning religious issues provoked the reaction of Wiseman and Manning, both of whom were avidly supported by W. G. Ward, the English emulator of Veuillot, and his *Dublin Review.* One of the saddest consequences of this controversy was the fact that it compromised Newman, who could not be further away from religious and political liberalism and who had attempted the role of mediator in vain.[15]

The *Syllabus* and Its Consequences

The different manifestations of liberalism in Catholic life, often incautiously expressed and occasionally accompanied by openly equivocal conduct, were an irritant for the men of faith. Confronted with this "religion of freedom" and a "religion of learning," they endeavored once again to confirm the "rights of God over minds and society." They were deeply worried because, as conservatives almost instinctively tied to the past, they had great difficulty distinguishing between eternal verities which must be preserved at all cost and contingent structures of the ecclesiastical and civil order. Many others were additionally shaken by the fact, no longer to be glossed over by 1860, that whenever liberals came to power, anticlerical legislation soon followed. This aspect worried the Romans especially, whom the events after 1848 in Italy confirmed in the belief of a close connection between the principles of 1789 and the destruction of traditional values in the social, moral, and religious order. Pius IX came to believe that he had to take action so that his silence would not discourage the few Catholic nations which to some degree had remained faithful to the—in his eyes best—system of a privileged Church protected by the state. Inasmuch as circumstances had forced him to make practical concessions in several countries, he now considered it so much more urgent unmistakably to draw attention to principles. To the extent that concepts condemned by his predecessors Pius VI, Pius VII, Leo XII, and Gregory XVI took root in officially Catholic countries like Spain, the Latin American republics and Italy, he seized every opportunity to emphasize the corresponding classical doctrine of the Church.[16] Additionally, however, the idea of a comprehensive condemnation of all ideas of modern society regarded as erroneous gained ground gradually. It was started in 1849 by Cardinal Pecci and later taken up by the *Civiltà cattolica.* After the revival of the Roman Question in 1859 it was promoted again, and in the fall of that year the Vatican asked some trusted churchmen like Monsignor Pie, Dom Guéranger, and the president of the University of Louvain, Xavier de Ram, for suggestions as to which errors ought to be condemned and which points of doctrine ought to be emphasized.

---

[13] On Richard Simpson (1820–76), see D. McElrath, *Richard Simpson. Study in English Liberal Catholicism* (Louvain 1972); D. McElrath is preparing an edition of his correspondence.

[14] There is not yet a good document-based biography of John Acton (1834–1902). But consult: H. Butterfield, *Lord Acton* (London 1948); D. Matthew, *Lord Acton and his Times* (London 1968); G. Himmelfarb, *Lord Acton. A Study in Conscience and Politics* (London 1954); also E. Watts in *RPol* 28 (1966), 493–507; U, Noack, *Katholizität und Geistesfreiheit. Nach den Schriften von John Dalberg-Acton* (Frankfurt 1947); D. McElrath, *Lord Acton. The Decisive Decade 1864–1874* (Louvain 1970). With respect to his correspondence, see O. Chadwick in *JEH* 16 (1965), 114f.; D. McElrath in *RHE* 65 (1970), 87–89.

[15] In addition to H. McDougall, op. cit., see the excellent introduction by J. Coulson to the new edition of Newman's, at the time very controversial, article "On consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," (New York 1961).

On the basis of the replies, a first draft of the *Syllabus errorum in Europa vigentium* with seventy-nine propositions was prepared by the spring of 1860. But in the fall Rome received a long pastoral letter from Bishop Gerbet of Perpignan. Gerbet was a former collaborator of Lamennais, but he now fulminated against what he once had revered. The document under the title of "Instruction sur les erreurs du temps présent," contained a list of eighty-five erroneous statements and appeared to the Pope as an even better basis for his own solemn project. According to P. Martina, he did so wrongly, as the first draft dealt more with principles and had a more comprehensive character. Several successive commissions of theologians and cardinals, whose work was closely observed by the Pope, for more than a year worked on the theological justification of Gerbet's propositions. Disregarding the pronounced reserve of many Curia cardinals, who would have preferred a return to the first draft, Pius IX decided to present the new list of sixty-one propositions to the bishops who visited Rome in the summer for the purpose of lending support for the Pope's temporal power. The list was based on Gerbet's pastoral letter and summarized the most important modern efforts to liberate philosophy, morals, and politics from the control of religion. Although the information was provided on a confidential basis, some of it was leaked. The premature disclosure of the document occasioned a storm of indignation in the anticlerical press against Rome's obscurantism. Episcopal reactions, few in number, were rather reserved. Nonetheless, the Pope insisted on his original idea and the commission continued work on Monsignor Gerbet's propositions. Still, it proceeded so slowly that it seemed that the great condemnation of modern errors was being postponed to a later day; some hoped it was sine die.

---

[16] Encyclicals, but also briefs to authors who defended the "right principles," and especially many addresses. Their listing in *Acta SS. D. N. Pii IX ex quibus excerptus est Syllabus* (Rome 1865).

But in the summer of 1863 two unfortunate speeches once more brought the problem to the fore. One was the apology which Montalembert, impatient with the "timidity" of his friends, made at the international congress of Belgian Catholics in Mechelen in defense of a "free Church in a free state."[17] The other one was Döllinger's bold demand for the independence of Catholic scholars from the ecclesiastical magisterial office, which he presented in Munich. The first speech received a strong echo and was a challenge to all those who saw the chief danger of their time in liberal Catholicism. They now insisted that Rome react clearly and unequivocally. Several interventions spared Montalembert a public censure, but Pius IX more and more became convinced that he needed to take a solemn step in order to calm the excited spirits. Several factors then delayed his pronouncement by a full year. The French intervened diplomatically, fearing that public opinion would be offended; the Belgians were worried that it might look as though Rome condemned the constitution, and just before elections this would only play into the hands of the liberals; and finally there were the apprehensions of Cardinal Antonelli that some non-Catholic defenders of the temporal power of the Pope, like Adolphe Thiers, might become discouraged. Pius IX was not deaf to these considerations, but this so very impressionable man was also subject to other influences. There was the increasing tendency of many Italian Catholics to take a neutral position; there was the success of Renan's book *Vie de Jésus,* which graphically made evident the dangers of freedom of the press; there were the recent violations of the rights of the Church in Poland and Mexico; there were Ketteler's warnings of the spiritual independence of the German theologians; and, more generally, there was the threat of promoting radicalism through passivity on the part of the Catholics. The convention of September 1864 was then the final straw which decided Pius IX to hesitate no longer.[18]

---

[17] R. Aubert in *Collectanea Mechliniensia* 20 (1950), 525–51. On the occasion of this speech, *Civiltà cattolica* for the first time suggested a distinction between "thesis" and "hypothesis," which was to become classic (cf. J. Leclerc in *RSR* 41 [1953], 530–34).

Consulted again in August 1864, the cardinals of the Inquisition had renewed their objections to the list of Gerbet's propositions and had suggested a different approach. They thought the Pope should repeat his earlier condemnations in summary form. The Pope decided to follow the new suggestion and within a few weeks there was drafted, with the special assistance of the young Barnabite L. Bilio, an encyclical and a list of excerpts from addresses and writings of the Pope which he had made since the beginning of his pontificate and in which he had already condemned the various "modern errors." At the end of December the encyclical *Quanta cura* was published; appended to it was a catalog of eighty unacceptable propositions under the title of *Syllabus errorum.*[19] In it the Pope condemned pantheism and rationalism; indifferentism, which regards all religions as equal in value; socialism, which denies the right to private property and subordinates the family to the state; the erroneous concept regarding Christian marriage; Freemasonry; the rejection of the temporal power of the Pope; Gallicanism, which wanted to make the exercise of ecclesiastical authority dependent on the authorization by the civil power; statism, which insists on the monopoly of education and dissolves religious orders; and naturalism, which regards the fact that human societies no longer have respect for religion as progress and which demands laicization of institutions, separation of Church and state, and absolute freedom of religion and the press. The last aspect in particular impressed the public, as the propositions of the *Syllabus,* taken out of context, often were bewildering and justified the evaluation of Dom Butler that "it was a most inopportune" document.

The majority of non-Catholics at first were confirmed in their belief in the incompatibility of an ultramontane Church with the ways of life and habits of thought of the nineteenth century. The ultramontane press, jubilant over the *Syllabus,* heightened the impression to the point that many Catholics began to ask themselves whether conditions were really as they were depicted.

Actually, though, excitement was not very strong everywhere. In Italy, the press engaged in verbal skirmishes but the public remained calm, some because long ago they had stopped paying attention to the strictures of the Vatican in political questions, and others because they realized that an exact interpretation of the Roman document required careful exegesis. Generally the document was debated in connection with the Roman Question, and was seen less as a stand against modern society than against the convention of September. In Great Britain the non-Catholic public was virtually unanimous in finding the Pope's campaign against modern society totally ridiculous, primarily because he had condemned virtually everything. English Catholics, on the other hand, attempted, not very successfully, to argue that Pius IX had condemned the doctrinal errors and excesses of liberalism, and not the liberal institutions as England knew them. A similar situation prevailed in the Netherlands. Although there the Catholic newspapers also adopted this interpretation, the papal document contributed to increasing Protestant hostility to the papacy and to the hastening of the break between Catholics and liberals in parliament.

---

[18] See R. Mori, *La Questione Romana 1861–65* (Florence 1963), 331, 338.

[19] Text in *Acta Pii IX* III, 687–700 *(Quanta cura),* 701–11 *(Syllabus).* Commentary in L. Choupin, *Valeur des décisions . . . du Saint-Siège* (Paris 1928), 187–415.

The situation was different in the German-speaking countries. The Austrian government initially feared that, emboldened by the encyclical, the clergy would demand an even more favorable application of the concordat. Döllinger and friends deplored the *Syllabus;* but the Mainz faction, whose influence reached the broad mass of the Catholics beyond the range of the intellectuals, noted the condemnation of atheistic philosophers and of bold theologians with satisfaction. With few exceptions, however, they took the justified position that the rejection of anti-Christian liberalism was no obstacle to continued exploitation of constitutional liberties. This interpretation also quickly gained ground in Belgium, even among the ultramontanes, but in the initial period the despondency of the constitutionally inclined Catholics was very great. In France agitation lasted for several weeks. Many moderate liberal Catholics were severely shaken in their convictions. Others were aware that the reminder of the principles on the whole did not really change the situation, but they also were despondent as the exaggerated comments of Veuillot's press forced them to observe the widening gap which separated the skeptics from the Church. Many bishops immediately wrote to Rome, pointing to the dangers of ambiguity, and demanded a clarification. Some of the others, among them Darboy and Maret, in the interest of preventing extreme interpretations on the part of their colleagues, persuaded the government to forbid the official publication of the encyclical under the pretext that its condemnations were directed against the constitution of the Empire. With the genius of the born polemicist, Dupanloup, assisted by Cochin, used this antiliberal measure to write a mitigating commentary on encyclical and *Syllabus* in the form of a defense of the Pope, who was being unjustly attacked by a hostile press and equally hostile cabinet ministers. Beyond this he was sufficiently skillful to woo the Romans by adding to his commentary an eloquent indictment of the recent convention in which the French imperial government had promised the Italian government to evacuate Rome.[20] This "translation of the encyclical into contemporary language" (A. Dechamps), in which the severity of the original was attenuated somewhat, was highly successful in Europe and even in America and within a few days persuaded public opinion to reject anticlerical criticisms. Pius IX, grateful to Dupanloup for his sharp attack on the imperial government, sent him a brief of commendation. The brief was very carefully formulated, but in conjunction with the praises of numerous bishops it gave Dupanloup's pamphlet the veneer of a more or less official interpretation of the *Syllabus,* even though many who disagreed with it attempted to belittle its significance.[21] This fact has a certain importance for the later history of Catholic liberalism, and for this reason Dupanloup's brochure deserves more than a merely anecdotal interest.

For the moment the storm subsided and theoretically both factions were back where they had started, inasmuch as Dupanloup's action had saved the liberal Catholics from seemingly inevitable retreat. For this reason they were able to maintain their position until the accession of Leo XIII, even if in the meantime they were forced to strike their sails. Many also acknowledged, in consequence of the papal condemnation, that in their utterances they occasionally had been too radical or imprecise. Above all they recognized the necessity of discretion[22] in order not to anger the aging Pope, who was increasingly irritated by the growing sectarianism of those who called themselves liberals. Toward the end, Pius IX, who almost daily condemned liberalism as the "error of the century," was no longer able to see the radical difference between Catholic liberalism and liberalism as such.[23] While regular liberalism, even if its adherents practiced their religion, was naturalistic and wanted to separate man as much as possible from his religious ties, liberal Catholics both intellectually and practically were guided by the demands of their faith and accepted, sometimes somewhat unwillingly, their subjection to the decisions of the Church. Pius IX admitted the difference, but only unwillingly. "Catholic liberalism," he declared in 1874, "has one foot in the truth and one foot in error, one foot in the Church and one foot in the spirit of the century, one foot on my side and one foot on the side of my enemies." He was willing in many cases to tolerate the "hypothesis," but could not refrain from showing his dislike of those who in his eyes too easily decided for this option and now could proceed from practically admissible concessions to a surrender of principles. The full favor of the Pope was reserved for the "Knights of the Absolute," who, without consideration of intellectual developments or of local requirements, maintained what was supposed to be the "right of a Christian society." The frequent encouragements which Rome sent to their leaders finally convinced them that the Pope had entrusted them with a genuine mission.[24] Liberal Catholics had escaped condemnation, but they were clearly aware that they were in disfavor. For the next fifteen years the scene was dominated by extremists—liberal radicals and intransigent ultramontanes—who were equally intolerant and wanted to force their thinking upon everyone else.

---

[20] *La Convention du 15 Septembre et l'Encyclique du 8 Decembre.* Concerning the preliminary work on this brochure, published on 24 January 1865, see R. Aubert, *RHE* 51 (1956), 83–142.

[21] Emphasizing the fact that Pius IX congratulated Veuillot and Schrader, who had interpreted the *Syllabus* much more strictly, in even warmer terms.

[22] At least the majority. Montalembert, embittered by disappointment and illness, charged his former supporters with avoiding hot issues (See A. Latreille in *RHEF* 54 [1968], 281–314).

[23] See the inspired "Considérations sur le libéralisme" by A. Simon in *Ris* 4 (1961), 3–25.

Antiliberalism and Social Catholicism

Recent investigations have revealed that the Catholic opposition to liberalism was not always only confined to negative criticism. To be sure, there were among the opponents of the liberal Catholics many closed minds without any understanding of the times; but the more flexible among them, who succeeded in gaining the attention of a considerable segment of the Catholic public, were imbued with a two-fold positive ideal. For one, they wanted to react to the timidity of many of their brethren who seemed to be reconciled with the liberal view that religion was a private matter without any impact on social life. For another, they demanded the right to the "actual state," compared to the "legal state," which was dominated by a numerically small oligarchy. This makes understandable why from the second third of the nineteenth century onward these "reactionaries" in particular undertook more social initiatives than the liberal Catholics, of whom it might have been thought that they had more in common with democratic ideals. It also explains why these efforts were primarily directed toward the immediate amelioration of the poverty of the working class rather than to a solution of its real problems through structural reforms. The intention was to obtain the sympathy of the workers and their support in the battle against the anticlerical bourgeois state. It finally also makes clear why these efforts were more often inspired by the nostalgic ideal of a return to an idealized, patriarchal, and corporative past than by a realistic accommodation to the new situations created by the Industrial Revolution.

---

[24] Very characteristic in this respect is the document published by A. Louant, "Charles Périn et Pie IX," *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 27 (1952), 181–220.

The connection between antiliberalism and social efforts was shown early in the *Civiltà cattolica,*[25] in which, for example, Father Taparelli in 1852 held the view that the corporations dissolved by the French Revolution were rooted in natural law. Pius IX devoted one paragraph of the encyclical *Quanta cura* to the unmasking not only of the illusions of socialism, which wants to put the state in the place of providence, but also of the pagan character of economic liberalism, which in the relationship between capital and labor eliminates the moral factor.

Such ideas inspired several of the first initiators of the Catholic movement in Italy, who in this as yet hardly industrialized state were concerned chiefly with the pitiful situation of the rural masses, and whose initiatives actually reached their full effectiveness only under the subsequent pontificate.

In France during the July Monarchy there had existed an early form of Christian socialism in addition to the *Société d'économie charitable,* in which Viscount Armand de Melun had gathered legitimate representatives of social work who, while genuinely touched by the misery of the proletariat, were also rather reticent to call for an intervention by the state in economic life. Christian socialism could be traced to converted followers of Saint-Simon and Fourier, to former readers of *L'Avenir* who remembered the bold and social views of Lamennais, and to some members of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul who had realized that alms were not the only solution. But the movement received a mortal blow by the general reaction to everything which resembled the kind of socialism which developed after the crisis of 1848. Thus, for a period of twenty years social Catholicism was represented almost exclusively by conservatives who were decided followers of the paternalistic approach. They tried less to change the condition of the workers for reasons of justice than to lead the workers back to the Church and to maintain the established order at the price of a few improvements in their material situation. The majority of the engaged men of the Second Empire, who were often met with the indifference and even the mistrust of the broad masses of the faithful and of the clergy, were inspired by the theories of

---

[25] P. Droulers, "Question sociale, État, Église dans la *Civiltà cattolica* à ses débuts," *ChStato* I, 123–47. Concerning the reinstallation of the corporations by Pius IX in 1852, see E. Lodolini in *RstRis* 39 (1952), 664–82; L. Dal Pane in *Giornale degli economisti, n.s. 8 (1949), 603*–8.

Le Play,[26] whose scholarship left much to be desired and which, in conjunction with a narrow interpretation of the *Syllabus,* served to lead these social Catholics to a "counterrevolution" opposed to the doctrine of human rights and democratic egalitarianism. In this fashion much personal generosity was wasted without actually reaching the working class. On the contrary, the working class now strove to take its fate and the battle for its liberation into its own hands.

In Belgium the situation was hardly any different. The few progressive Catholics who, together with E. Ducpétiaux, suggested a few hesitant legal measures in favor of the workers met general rejection at the congress of Mechelen. The man who set the tone in this question was Charles Périn, from 1845 until 1881 professor of economics at the University of Louvain, whose work *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes* (1861) was translated into most of the European languages. But while this champion in the ideological and political struggle against liberalism energetically drew attention to the exploitation of the workers by the new middle class and, based on the doctrine that moral laws should also be valid in the economic world, demanded a more humane division of labor, he also denied the state the right to intervene and expected the solution of the social problem only and exclusively from private initiative and growth of the Christian spirit among the employers.

It is paradoxical that the origin of a more realistic Catholic social movement lay in Germany, although its industrial development started only later. The German social movement had an open mind toward labor unions and approved of a restriction of economic liberalism through social legislation, the first steps toward which were outlined in the encyclical *Rerum novarum* of Leo XIII. There was no denying that the German Catholics, like the others, were at first primarily interested in maintaining order, but what they desired—in contrast to France, where all too many Catholics only wanted to preserve external order and to subjugate the workers to the current situation—was a traditional order, the organized society of the "good old days," which no doubt was not at all democratic but which at least had the advantage that it protected the little people against an unlimited exploitation by the rich. At first, until about 1870, most German Catholics in their attempt to bring the Church to the people and the people to the Church were mostly concerned with the defense of the independent artisans and the organization of the farmers. But gradually attention was paid to the problem of the workers. In 1837, the militant Catholic Franz Josef von Buß of Baden pointed to the dangers of uncontrolled industrialization and demanded action by the state in order to improve the situation of the workers. In his opinion it was up to the Church to assume the defense of the workers, who had no official representation.[27]

---

[26] On the sociologist and founder of the *Société internationale des hautes études d'economie sociale,* Frédéric Le Play (1806–82), see Duroselle, 672–84 and D. Herbertson, *Frédéric Le Play* (Ledbury 1952).

In 1846 Adolf Kolping,[28] a former shoemaker's apprentice turned priest, founded the first journeymen's association. Thanks to outstanding collaborators and the active participation of the journeymen themselves, whom Kolping allowed broad participation, the organization grew rapidly with the support of Cardinal Geissel of Cologne. From the Rhineland it spread throughout Germany and to Austria and Switzerland. Gradually other social institutions were founded in the industrial areas of the Rhineland, culminating in the founding of the People's Association of Mönchen-Gladbach. To the care and saving of souls and amelioration of need there was now slowly added the effort to establish a professional organization and a solid action foundation for the activity of the workers. These, it was hoped, would lead to a change of working conditions.

In this development, which presented the problem of the workers to the German Catholics more as a question of institutional reform and less as a matter of mere charitable help, the dynamic Bishop Ketteler of Mainz played a significant role.[29] He was frequently misunderstood and the prelate was often depicted as a pioneer of Christian democracy and as initiator of the booming social works in Germany during his life. Actually, many of these activities, started in the Cologne area, were begun without him. Even if Ketteler in his practical work was occasionally inspired by socialist doctrines, especially by the form which Lassalle had given them, and even if he adopted some of Lassalle's arguments and indictments of capitalism, he harbored no sympathies for modern democracy. Speaking out against the oppression of the economically weak, which society permitted, this Westphalian aristocrat had in mind a return to the corporative society as it had existed in the Holy Roman Empire of the Middle Ages. Yet Ketteler's influence on the social Catholicism of his time was tremendous. In his book *Die Arbeiterfrage*

---

[27] Cf. Schnabel, *G* IV, 202–7.

[28] On Adolf Kolping (1813–65), see F. G. Schaffer, *Adolf Kolping,* 8th ed., revised by J. Dahl and B. Ridder (Cologne 1961), as well as D. Weber, ed., *100 Jahre Kolpingfamilie 1849–1949* (Cologne 1949). Additional literature in *LThK* VI, 401.

[29] On Ketteler's social activity, see, in addition to the biography by Vigener (which, however, downplays his role), M. Spahn, *Hochland* 22 (1925), 144–46; T. Brauer, *Ketteler. Der deutsche Bischof und soziale Reformer* (Hamburg 1927) and especially L. Lenhart, *Bischof Ketteler* I–II (Mainz 1966–67).

und das Christentum (1864), the fruit of fifteen years of reflection, he did not limit himself to proposing a few concrete reforms, but attempted to demonstrate that the solution of the workers' problems was only possible by a cooperation of state and society, acting in direct opposition to liberal individualism and to the totalitarianism of the modern centralized state. Energetically he attacked the solutions suggested by middle-class capitalism and statist socialism. Instead, under the influence of Catholic Romanticism, which had marked him deeply in his youth, he glorified society as a living hierarchical organism, strongly molded by the unity of faith, in which the artisans were organized with a view toward the general welfare and economic life was freed from the iron law of greed and profits. Thus Ketteler was the first theoretician of a social order based on corporatism, which for more than half a century formed the basis of Catholic social doctrine. Its opposition to the individualistic ideal of economic liberalism after 1870 in more than one case—especially in the social wing of the Center Party, in the Austrian School, and with La Tour du Pin—was more unequivocal than the practical mistrust of and the theoretical objections to socialism.

SECTION FIVE

The Victory of Ultramontanism

CHAPTER 21

Ultramontane Progress and Final Gallican Resistance

The Ultramontane Movement around 1850

As has been shown, the fifteen years of Gregory XVI's pontificate were a decisive phase in the progress of ultramontanism. Yet not all resistance had been removed. The great mass of the clergy and of the faithful were convinced of the advantages which accrued to the Church as a result of its liberation from the tutelage of the governments and of closing Catholic ranks around the Pope. Still, the question was occasionally asked whether it was at all advisable to have such a concentration of power in consequence of this rather extreme centralization. Such a centralization inevitably had to result in a reduction of the authority of the bishops, in uniformity of Church discipline and liturgy, even piety, all of which would mean the complete renunciation of revered local customs and the adoption of a "religious way of life" for the entire Church, analogous to Italy's.

It is of great importance not to lose sight of the complex character of the ultramontane movement and its concrete reality. Its adherents propounded theological and canonical doctrines concerning the special privileges of the Pope and the prerogatives of the Church over the civil power, developed a program for turning the ecclesiastical organization into a more authoritarian and centralistic one, favored restriction of the freedom of scholarship in philosophy and theology, and demanded a new outlook on piety which consisted less in an inner attitude than in frequent receipt of the sacraments and an increase in external devotions. While the ultramontane movement and its opposition to the heritage of the regalism of the Old Regime met with general acclaim, it encountered various forms of resistance because of the ecclesiastical problems posed by it. The resistance originated with the theologians whose minds were closed to dogmatic progress and who refused to see why the Pope now should occupy a more important place in the Church than during the first centuries. But there was also resistance by people who, tied to old religious customs, preferred the particularism of the past to a future with a predominantly supranational character. And finally there was also the opposition of upper clergymen who feared the loss of their historical rights and occasionally wondered whether the traditional character of an episcopate based on divine right was still safe.

Such pockets of resistance could be seen almost everywhere. They could be found in England, where among some Old Catholics the insular thinking of the eighteenth century lived on, and in Lombardy and in Poland, where Josephinist thought continued to be propounded in the seminaries and universities. They held on especially strongly in France and the German-speaking countries, where latent opposition was incited by the very excesses of the ultramontane faction. In essence, though, these were no more than rearguard skirmishes, incapable of stopping the victory of the ultramontane movement.

In France during the Second Republic, the ultramontanes became stronger, ably assisted by Nuncio Fornari. The bishops appointed by Falloux largely thought "Roman" thoughts and helped them to victory at the various provincial councils. At these councils the Holy See succeeded in having some decrees changed and thereby implicitly achieved recognition of its claim to such control. The newspaper *L'Univers,* edited by Parisis and Gousset, eagerly supported every move made by the Holy See in this connection, and thereby strengthened the impulse with which Catholics had looked toward Rome for years.

The defenders of ultramontanism found considerable support among the lower clergy, which was dissatisfied with the arbitrariness of many bishops. In order to protect themselves, the priests were demanding the restoration of church tribunals, which had been abolished after the French Revolution; the provincial councils of the middle of the century met some of their demands through the reinstitution of officialates. Often this was only illusory, however, and many tribunals existed only on paper. Dissatisfied with the way and methods of episcopal jurisdiction, the parish priests began to turn to the Roman tribunals even in the smallest of episcopal decisions whenever they did not meet the approval of the pastors. The tribunals in turn were only too happy to oblige and to interfere in the internal affairs of French dioceses, going over the heads of the bishops.[1] The tendency to resort to Rome was promoted by some canonists like Abbé André[2] and publications like *Le Rappel* and *La Correspondance de Rome,* which in France publicized the decisions favorable to the lower clergy which the Roman congregations had made in the name of universally valid canon law.

---

[1] Cf. J. Vernay, "Un aspect du mouvement ultramontain dans l'Église de France au XIX^e siècle," *Bulletin des Facultés catholiques de Lyon,* n.s. 34 (1963), 5–18.

[2] On him, see *DDC* I, 516–19.

Returned to Rome at the beginning of 1851, Cardinal Fornari emphatically continued to support the attempts of the ultramontanes by defending the papers *L'Univers* and *La Correspondance de Rome* against the attacks of some bishops, and by promoting the inclusion of Gallican-oriented works in the Index. Between 1850 and 1852 several textbooks employed by the seminaries were condemned. Included were Bailly's *Théologie,* even though it had been revised as late as 1842, and Lequeux's *Traité de droite canonique,* which strongly favored episcopal autonomy and common law.

The vociferous enthusiam with which the ultramontane press greeted these steps, and the application of often rather insensitive methods led to a counterreaction. In 1852, a Paris theologian wrote *Mémoire sur la situation présente de l'Église gallicaine relativement au droit coutumier,* which concerned itself with the most important questions discussed at the time, such as the problem of particular rights as against the universal right of the Church, the reform of liturgy, and the interference by Roman congregations. At the same time, steps were taken to silence those journalists who expressed themselves too loudly in favor of the ultramontane cause. The time was well chosen, inasmuch as many, even non-Gallican, bishops were becoming concerned about priestly agitation; they detected in it the spirit of rebellion which, by appealing to Roman authority, was trying to escape from the supervision of the bishops at home. Additionally, they were shocked by the action of Catholic laymen who presumed to substitute a learning Church for the teaching Church, and became angry over the arrogance with which some journalists assumed they could dictate how the bishops should carry out their duties. Pius IX himself was required to counsel Veuillot to moderation. Errors in leadership by Dupanloup and Sibour, the archbishop of Paris, necessitated the Pope's intervention. In April 1853 he published the encyclical *Inter multiples,*[3] concerning the problems raised in France. It was a clear disapproval of Gallicanism, even in its moderate form, and of all those who, for whatever reasons, were resisting the ultramontane current.

Rome's Systematic Activity

The publication of the encyclical *Inter multiples* signified a change in the attitude of Rome. Like most of the great movements in Church history, the ultramontane movement had started from below. Initially the Holy See had confined itself to noting its progress without active interference on its part. But during the final years of Gregory XVI a development was initiated which became notably intensified under the pontificate of Pius IX.

---

[3] Text in *Acta Pii IX* I, 439–48.

The personality of the Pope alone contributed to it. His charm and open nature, so different from the reserved behavior of his predecessor, together with the aura of a "martyr," which the problems arising from the Roman Question lent him, gradually gave him among the Catholic peoples of the world a popularity such as no Pope had known before him. This, in Church history, singular phenomenon explains in part the enthusiasm with which all of the clergy and of the faithful accepted the doctrine of papal infallibility after it had been unclear for centuries. It also explains the favorable reception of ecclesiastical centralization, which, as everyone knew, also was desired by the Pope.

But Rome was not satisfied with allowing favorable circumstances alone to do the work. The course of the 1848 revolution inevitably meant that at the close of the crisis a systematic plan would be developed to prevent future revolutionary attempts. In its implementation the Jesuits, who had become very influential in the Curia, played a great role. In 1847, Ballerini's *Vindiciae,* one of the works which was directed against Febronianism and on which ultramontane propaganda was very strongly based, was published again. A short time later Gallican and Febronian textbooks were suppressed, an action which made a deep impression on contemporaries. Parallel with it, the professors at the Gregoriana in their works emphasized the classical theses of the primacy and infallibility of the Pope. Like Passaglia in his *Commentarius de prerogative B. Petri* (1856), which served as the model for analogous publications, they strove for a more scholarly foundation by returning to the Scripture and the Fathers. Or, like Schrader, they developed the ultramontane positions to an extreme, giving them a clearly theocratic perspective. The number of their students continually grew, thanks to the increase in the national seminaries at Rome,[4] and they in turn spread these ideas throughout the world. *Civiltà cattolica* effectively popularized them. The proclamation of the Immaculate Conception (1854) can also be seen from the perspective of the increasingly emphasized infallibility of the Pope. This event, which strongly influenced the Catholic world, in singular fashion affirmed the prerogatives of the Pope and his growing importance in the life of the Church.[5]

---

[4] To the old colleges (German-Hungarian, English, Scottish, Irish, Greek, and that of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith), the following seminaries were gradually added: the Belgian seminary in 1844, the Beda Seminary for English-speaking converts in 1852, the French seminary in 1853, the Latin American Pius seminary in 1858, the North American seminary in 1859, the Illyrian seminary in 1863, and the Polish seminary in 1866.

[5] See *EThL* 31 (1955), 83–86.

Even more than on the doctrinal level, Roman activity proceeded systematically in the practical area of discipline. Rome seized every opportunity to support and strengthen the efforts that were being made by ultramontanes in the various countries to effect closer ties to the center of Christianity and a strengthening of papal power. While nuncios in earlier times had acted as diplomatic liaisons to governments, they now also took a hand in the internal affairs of the Churches in the countries to which they had been assigned. Pro-Roman priests were supported and, if necessary, protected against the accusations of their bishops; frequently they were appointed as prelates in order to raise their standing. The obligation for periodic visits, which had fallen into disuse, was revived, and the increasing contacts with the bishops were augmented by the large assemblies of 1854, 1862, and 1867.[6] Hundreds of bishops gathered in Rome and each time the assemblies appeared as the apotheosis of papal power and Catholic unity. Everything possible was done to stifle regional differences in ecclesiastical life by discouraging all calls for the convocation of national councils, by favoring a return to the integral observation of universal canon law, and by recommending appeals to the Curia, even in unimportant matters. The Pope increasingly appointed bishops without considering the opinions of the local higher clergy, and more than once gave preference to mediocre men of whom he could be sure, rather than appoint able men with an independent view; what made the difference was the Roman education and pliability of the candidates. It was a grave matter that the one-sided reports by ultramontanes about clergymen suspected of lukewarmness toward Rome were uncritically accepted. Such a policy of denunciation developed particularly in France. Until 1860 Pius IX and Antonelli, desirous not to increase internal tensions, assumed a reserved attitude and pointed out to the governments that "it was paradoxical to expect the Holy See to keep within limits a movement from which it could only gain." But the extremely half-hearted attitude of the Gallicans in the Roman Question and their liberal sympathies caused high indignation in Rome and the Pope began to favor their opponents.

It was even attempted to increase Roman influence in the election of Eastern bishops. The opportunity for this move was provided by the Ottoman government when it withdrew Catholics of the Eastern Rite from the civil jurisdiction of schismatic patriarchs and thus made sure that the election of bishops and patriarchs had secular significance. It was necessary to take steps to prevent the elections from taking place under the pressure of influential laymen who conceivably had their material interests more in mind than the spiritual welfare of the Church. The Armenian patriarch Hassun suggested to Rome a transitional solution which would simultaneously enhance the role of the apostolic delegate and preserve the essentials of the traditional system. The majority of the consulted cardinals in Rome agreed with this approach, but Cardinal Barnabo, the prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and some of his supporters tended to see a schismatic factor in the slightest autonomy in ecclesiastical discipline and were unwilling to grant the Uniates more than their liturgical peculiarities.[7] Pius IX, personally agreeing with Barnabo, consulted Valerga, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, on the matter; Valerga came out in favor of a radical reform of the Eastern patriarch statute in order to give it a centralistic tone. The Pope used the presence of all patriarchs during the festivities of 1867 in Rome to inform them of his intentions. From now on, the lower clergy and laymen would no longer participate in elections, the patriarch elected by the bishops alone would assume his position only after being confirmed by the Pope, and the appointment of bishops would be in the hands of the Holy See. It would select one candidate from a list of three names submitted by the patriarch, the bishops, and the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The immediately following protest by the Maronite and Melchite patriarchs resulted in a postponement of the application of the measure in the jurisdictional area of the two patriarchates; but for the Armenian Church it went into effect immediately with the papal bull *Reversurus* of 12 July 1867.[8] The announcement that these steps, amounting to a reversal of the status expressly granted by Benedict XIV, would soon also be extended to other patriarchates created profound consternation in all Uniate Churches. This worry was added to the displeasure with the pressure which increasingly was applied in favor of an adaptation of Eastern Church discipline to the canon law of the Latin Church. It became evident in the commission which was charged with preparing the decrees of the Vatican Council for the Uniate Churches.[9] The attempts violated the venerable traditions of the East too much not to cause considerable resistance, but in Europe they could easily be enforced through the joint actions of the nuncios, bishops, Catholic movements, and ecclesiastical press.

---

[6] Concerning the assembly of 1867, at which according to Manning "the martyrdom of Peter and his primacy over the world" was celebrated (Saint Paul was neglected, see *Irenikon* 40 [1967], 43), see P. Karlbrandes, *Der heilige Petrus in Rom oder Rom ohne Petrus* (Einsiedeln 1867) and Aubert, *Pie IX* 309f.

---

[7] With respect to this point, the Roman officials were in fact less radical than Dom Guéranger, in whose view liturgical uniformity had to be a normal consequence of the unity of the Church. In his encyclical of 8 April 1862 (*Acta Pii IX* III, 424–36), Pius IX unequivocally affirmed his intention to respect the Eastern liturgies.

[8] See *JP* VI/1, 453–65. The discussions occasioned by the bull are treated in Mansi XL, 745–1132; *DThC* I, 1914–15; *DHGE* IV, 338–42, 679–80, V, 337–38, 345.

[9] See Hajjar, 292–300.

In Austria, the concordat of 1855 had liquidated Josephinist laws and had made possible the reorganization of the educational system in keeping with the wishes of the Holy See. Consequently, Cardinal Rauscher, the archbishop of Vienna, together with the support of his colleagues Rudigier, Gasser, and Fessler, was able to influence the numerous Catholic associations in an ultramontane direction and to promote the activity of the Jesuits and Redemptorists. In Innsbruck, whose department of theology was entrusted to the Jesuits in 1857, Moy and Vering established the Archives for Catholic Canon Law as a strong outpost of Roman ideas, in Budapest F. Hovanyi made the theology department into a center for the reaction to the Josephinist tentacles in Hungary, and in Vienna the most radical ultramontane theses were defended at the University of Vienna by the Jesuit theologian Clemens Schrader[10] and the canonist George Phillips.[11] In his *Kirchenrecht* (7 vols. [1845–72]), Phillips, like Schrader, betrayed an unabashed romantic enthusiasm for medieval theocracy, identified the Pope with the Church, and expressed a rather legalistic and superficial view of the Church and its unity. The work was only second-rate from an academic point of view, but is proof of an educated mind; it was largely responsible in the German-speaking countries for widely popularizing the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope and of his universal episcopal office and the doctrine of the indirect sovereignty of the Church over the state.

In Germany, Ketteler assumed the leading position, which Geissel held until his death in 1864. Mainz was still the vanguard of the movement, but Moufang and Heinrich, assisted by the nuncio in Munich and Reisach, who in 1854 had become a Curia cardinal, elsewhere also had supporters who worked toward the same goal: the Jesuits with their increasing numbers and influence, the Germanists, and the priests trained in Innsbruck under the guidance of the Jesuits. All of them, who liked to think of themselves as the sole possessors of the Catholic spirit, gradually impressed their views on the Catholic masses. They imparted to them their ideas about the prerogatives of the Pope and the authority of the Roman congregations in the life of the national Churches, as well as about the ideal image of a good Catholic. Within the span of a few decades they produced a profound change in German Catholicism. The place of the old view of piety, centered around inner spirituality and the exercise of virtue, was taken by a new way of religious life which emphasized superficial exercises, membership in confraternities, and the strict observation of church regulations. Sailer's irenics yielded to an attitude which emphasized the gap between Catholics and non-Catholics by once again applying the old maxim of "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus." Instead of working for a strengthening of religious convictions by appealing to church history and philosphy, all too often there was nothing more than the demand blindly to bow to the authority of the Church, mention of whose preeminence over the state was never omitted in the process.

---

[10] Clemens Schrader (1820–75), professor of dogmatics at the Roman College from 1852 to 1857 and at the Department of Theology of the University of Vienna from 1857 to 1870.

[11] On George Phillips (1804–72), from 1834 to 1847 professor at the University of Munich and from 1851 until his death professor at the University of Vienna, see J. von Schulte, *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* III/1 (Stuttgart 1880), 375–87, and *LThK* VIII, 468.

In England, the persistent Manning, assisted by the *Dublin Review,* succeeded within a few years in winning the majority of the Catholic faithful to a very unpretentious and radical ultramontanism, in spite of the opposition of the liberals at the *Rambler* and the hesitant stance of Newman and other traditionalist bishops. In Ireland, Cardinal Cullen, who was a total adherent of the centralistic plans of the Holy See, carried the day for the Roman concepts.

In France the encyclical *Inter multiples* played a decisive part in the victory of ultramontanism. It became possible because of the benevolent neutrality of the government at the beginning of the Second Empire, the extension of Dom Gúeranger's campaign in favor of the Roman liturgy, the Rome-oriented development of Saint Sulpice, which trained a majority of the young clergy, and the establishment of the French Seminary at Rome. The last was accomplished in 1853 with the support of Monsignor de Ségur,[12] whose writings greatly helped in spreading the "Roman spirit" in France. Louis Veuillot's newspaper *L'Univers,* like *L'Avenir* twenty years earlier, grew into a battle instrument of the movement. It started a campaign to win the lower clergy for a theocratic concept of society in which politics would be in the service of religion, and for a Church in closer contact with the papacy; in this way it would be better prepared to withstand the dangers of "revolution." Ultimately Veuillot succeeded in creating among French Catholics a "cult of the papacy" as could be found in no other country. At the same time the works of Bossuet, of the Maurists and their students, and of the Jansenists,[13] which in earlier generations had formed the foundation for the training of the clergy, were replaced by an ecclesiastical literature whose academic content was virtually nonexistent, but whose orientation was clearly ultramontane.

---

[12] Cf. M. de Hédouville, op. cit., 208–27.

[13] This reaction is explained by the connection which in the course of time sprang up between Gallicanism and Jansenism. It was reflected in part in the attacks against the Jansenists by Sainte-Beuve (1840–59) and the publication of the hitherto unpublished memoirs of the Jesuit Rapin (Paris 1861–65).

The Excesses of Neo-Ultramontanism and the Reaction in Germany and France

As all other movements, ultramontanism also was not able to avoid excesses. Thoughtful ultramontanes clearly recognized the weaknesses of Gallicanism. More clearly than their opponents they realized that the development of ecclesiastical institutions had not come to an end with the conclusion of the patristic period. They were of the opinion that Rome's intervention in the affairs of the national Churches, which would be able to resist the encroachments of the governments only with difficulty, was justified. They desired a clear centralization, convinced that it was indispensable for the solution of religious problems on the only level where this was possible, namely on the supranational one. But they also often lacked moderation and occasionally a sense of the fitting in their methods and ideas. (Reference was already made above to the abusive practice of secret denunciations made with irresponsible frivolousness). After 1860 certain tendencies became clear which Wilfrid Ward and Dom Butler suggested be termed "neo-ultramontanism." Some people wanted to see the role of the bishops reduced to an intolerable point; some portrayed the most extreme theses of medieval theocracy as divine law; others wished to extend the infallibility of the Pope to all of his pronouncements, even those which concerned religious policy, or they developed forms of papal veneration which amounted to "idolatry of the papacy." The Pope was referred to as the "Vice-God of Mankind" and as the "Permanent Word Incarnate." Monsignor Mermillod preached on the "three incarnations of the Son of God" in the womb of the Virgin Mary, in the Eucharist, and in "the old man in the Vatican." The *Civiltà cattolica* went so far as to write that "when the Pope meditates, it is God who is thinking through him." All of these exaggerations and flatteries, to which Pius IX did not object, were splashed throughout the Catholic press, to the great disgust of those who were incapable of realizing that these unfortunate formulations were not merely thoughtless expressions emerging from the simple soul of the masses. They certainly did their part in fortifying the last remaining centers of resistance.

The stupidities of neo-ultramontanism angered the German professors the more as they already had great difficulty in swallowing the more moderate views of Bellarmine's followers. As they tended to see ecclesiastical reality only in historical terms, their view in general was too retrospective. They ignored that, considering its involvement with history, the Church perforce had to adapt its institutions to contemporary times. As experts on Christian antiquity, they refused to recognize as legitimate the development of papal prerogatives in the course of the centuries. Their view was supported by the questionable nature of many of the arguments advanced by the representatives of ultramontanism, whose scholarly pronouncements often were not able to keep pace with Catholic thought. They were accused of being a group of fanatics who, while they had a certain power as a result of the support of a considerable number of pious laymen, nevertheless were discrediting the standing of the Church in the eyes of society's leaders. Additionally, there was the hostility between the "German theologians" and the representatives of Scholasticism, which had assumed the form of conflict between Rome and Germany. It was incited by the condemnations and occasionally broad-based criticisms which Rome hurled against these German theologians; it involved accusations which not only offended the German scholars' sense of academic superiority, but also their national pride.

The opposition of the Catholic scholars to the growth of ultramontanism could have confined itself to the type of passive resistance which the professors at Tübingen exercised. But under the influence of Döllinger, the intellectual leader of the movement of reaction to the incursion of the "Romans" into Catholic scholarship and the administration of the Church in Germany, it assumed the character of an open battle. The last word on Döllinger's development during these years, which step by step led him from a theological to a dogmatic opposition, has not yet been spoken; there can be no doubt, however, that on the Catholic side there was too much of a tendency to simplify matters. Once Döllinger had become suspicious of the centralizing tendencies of the Romans, which were in line with the aggressive orientation of the Neo-Scholastics, his apprehension of papal absolutism made him increasingly fearful. The *Syllabus* confirmed his fears of the dangers to academic freedom and of the introduction of a medieval theocratic system as an article of faith. He was convinced that the future of Catholicism itself was in danger if there was no change in the behavior of the Church. At the convention of Catholic scholars in 1863 in Munich he collided with the Neo-Scholastics. His indignation reached its peak in 1867 when Inquisitor Arbues was canonized. Now there arose the question of whether the ultramontane faction, disregarding ecclesiastical institutions, was not in fact falsifying the religious ideal of Christianity. But the very virulence of his polemics against the "papal system," which he portrayed as a creation of the Middle Ages, incited the bishops against him, including those who, like Rauscher and Ketteler, also regarded certain forms of Roman centralization as excessive. Thus, open resistance to ultramontanism in Germany remained essentially restricted to the universities.

In France, on the other hand, a group of decided opponents of ultramontanism within the episcopate once again came to the fore during the final years of the Second Empire. It had two different roots. The dean of the theological faculty at the Sorbonne, Monsignor Maret,[14] who identified with the ecclesiological views of Bossuet, was deeply concerned about the absolutist and theocratic manipulations of the neo-ultramontanes. He surrounded himself with a small group of intelligent priests with liberal and moderately Gallican views,[15] and through his close relationship with Napoleon III succeeded in having several of them appointed as bishops. Although the effectiveness of these bishops was limited by the Roman enthusiasm of their clergy and a majority of their flocks, they nonetheless constituted a very intimate association of opponents of Roman policies. They were led by Monsignor Darboy,[16] archbishop of Paris after 1863. Indignant about the behavior "of these strange Catholics whose piety consisted mainly of greeting the Pope from afar in order to insult the bishops near by," Darboy several times, and with a frankness to which Rome was no longer accustomed, informed the Pope of his profound consternation with regard to the interference of the Roman congregations in episcopal administrations. He condemned this as an attempt to introduce in France "the regimen of mission countries."

Raised in a totally different theological climate and having long been cool toward the Bonapartist bishops, the liberal Catholics of the *Correspondant,* who once had seen in ultramontanism the guarantee for the freedom of the Church, now began to move closer to the group around Maret and Darboy. They saw ultramontanism represented and personified in *L'Univers* and the *Civiltà cattolica,* in men, that is, who had not the slightest inkling of the true requirements of modern society and who favored absolutism in Church and society. Even men as devoted to the Holy See as Dupanloup, who more than once had stated his belief in the infallibility of the Pope, now began to fear its final formulation. They feared that it would lead to a consolidation of the positions of the

---

[14] With respect to his theological position, see, in addition to the biography by G. Bazin (3 vols. [Paris 1891]), R. Thysman in *RHE* 52 (1957), 401–65 and *DThC* IX, 2033–37.

[15] The future Cardinal Lavigerie belonged to them until 1866. He tried to keep the excesses of Roman centralization within limits and to preserve the originality of national modes of thought; in 1862 he submitted a plan to the French government in which he suggested the inclusion of men from the large Catholic countries in the Roman congregations and in the college of cardinals of the Curia (see de Montclos, 200–223).

[16] On Georges Darboy (1813–71), one of the smartest French bishops, a good biography is still lacking. For the time being, consult those by J. Foulon (Paris 1889), *DHGE* XIV, 84–86, and J. -R. Palanque, op. cit., 21–25.

Syllabus and other documents which assumed religious-political views incompatible with the modern mind. Thus, the extent of the ultramontane victory in France led to the formation of a new Gallican front, whose most active members were precisely those men who twenty years earlier had been the champions of this victory.

CHAPTER 22

The Vatican Council

Preparation

The decision of Pius IX to convoke a council must be seen from the pastoral perspective of the reaction to naturalism and rationalism which he had pursued since the beginning of his pontificate. As painful and retrogressive the modalities occasionally might be, essentially it was his intention once again to provide Catholic life with a focus on the fundamental events of revelation. Additionally, he intended to undertake the highly necessary adaptation of canon law to the profound changes which had taken place during the past three centuries since the last ecumenical council.

The idea of a council as a cure for the crisis from which the Church was suffering had been suggested to Pius IX as early as 1849, and slowly matured. At the end of 1864 he consulted a number of cardinals, who happened to be in Rome, about the advisability of the matter. In spite of some qualifications, their opinion on the whole was rather positive, and the Pope decided to pursue the issue carefully. He asked about forty bishops, selected from the most important Catholic countries, and a few bishops who held offices in Churches of the Eastern Rite to submit suggestions for an agenda. Gradually he then formed four commissions, which he charged with working out the details of the program. A majority of the Curia, however, was not very enthusiastic about the papal plan, and their reticence caused the Pope to hesitate for more than two years. He was also moved by the not totally unjustified fear that the contrasting tendencies evident in the Church in many areas, such as the question of modern freedoms and the growing Roman centralization, might come to a head at the council. But finally, encouraged by a number of respected bishops, the Pope on 26 June 1867 publicly made known his intention, and one year later he invited to Rome for 8 December 1869[1] all Catholic bishops and those people who had the right to participate in a council.[2]

During the consultative deliberations, more than one bishop suggested that the council be used to attempt contacts with the separated Christians. This was in part based on the hopes of a return of the Orthodox, which grew out of the changes in the Slavic world and the Near East. Similarly, with respect to the Reformed Churches, the continuation of the Oxford Movement in the Anglo-Saxon countries and the crisis which the progress of liberal Protestants had caused in the German Lutheran Church had occasioned unionist thoughts on all sides.[3] It is true that the Holy See reacted rather reservedly and during the 1860s, especially under the influence of Manning, several times stiffened its attitude.[4] Nevertheless, Pius IX and several of his advisers continued to hope for a return of the separated Christians and they believed that at least in the Near East there were some opportunities which should not be allowed to pass. With this possibility in mind, a letter was directed to all Orthodox bishops in September 1868, in which they were asked to return to Catholic unity in order to be able to participate in the council; a few days later a global letter was sent to Protestants and Anglicans.[5] But this clumsy and double procedure was generally badly received and to us, today, from an ecumenical point of view appears as one of the saddest cases of missed opportunities.[6]

In the Catholic world the announcement of the council quickly intensified the opposition between the currents which for a number of years had been facing one another: Gallicans and liberal Catholics on one side, ultramontanes and opponents of the modern freedoms on the other.[7] The selection of the consultants who were supposed to prepare the conciliar decrees—sixty Romans and thirty-six foreigners, almost all of them known for their unequivocally ultramontane and antiliberal views[8]—worried those who had hoped that the council would give the bishops who stood on the periphery the long-awaited opportunity to achieve a limited opening of the Church to modern ideas. Instead they believed that they saw a certain tactic at work: a secret preparation of the council beyond all conflicting debates and only with exclusive consideration of the point of view of the Curia, and then discussionless acceptance by the council fathers of all proposals, worked out beforehand down to the smallest detail. A misunderstood piece of news, the "Correspondance de France," which on 6 February 1869 was published in the newspaper of the Jesuits, the *Civiltà cattolica,* seemed to confirm this prognosis by announcing the definition of papal infallibility by acclamation and therefore without any possibility of clarifying the matter through discussion. Reactions were violent, especially in the German-speaking countries and even in the circles which normally could not be accused of harboring any systematic hostility toward Rome.[9] Döllinger, whose hostility to the Curia had grown noticeably during the last several years, under the pseudonym of Janus published a critical and partisan book attacking the primacy of the Pope and the Roman centralization.[10] In France also press polemics appeared, somewhat milder in tone, because the liberal Catholics considered a definition of papal infallibility as inopportune and the ultramontanes viewed it as desirable. In this fashion the problem, initially virtually not intended to be on the program, during the months preceding the council moved into the foreground of activity. Several respected bishops like Monsignor Dechamps, archbishop of Mechelen, and Monsignor Manning, archbishop of Westminster, demanded immediately that the council be utilized solemnly to define the truth of this publicly contested point. Monsignor Dupanloup, on the other hand, after a long silence came out against the definition because he deemed it inopportune. The majority of the German bishops at their annual conference at Fulda in September 1869 also expressed reservations about the future definition of the personal infallibility of the Pope.[11]

---

[1] Bull *Aeterni Patris* of 29 June 1868 (Mansi L, 193–200).

[2] In this group were ultimately also included the bishops *in partibus,* notwithstanding the reluctance of the Pope, who would have preferred to exclude Monsignor Maret (see J. Hamer in *RSPhTh* 44 [1960], 40–50). It is to be noted that, contrary to repeated assertions at the time of the council, the number of vicars apostolic did not exceed 10 percent of the total number of fathers.

[3] See the information in Aubert, *Pie IX,* 478f., 484–86, 564.

[4] Ibid., 479–85. Concerning the decrees of 1864 and 1865, which forbade English Catholics to participate together with the Anglicans in the Association for the Promotion of the Union of Christendom (A.P.U.C.), see E. Purcell, *Life and Letters of A. Phillips de Lisle* I (London 1900), 346–422 and C. Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne* I (London 1926), 334–68.

[5] Text of the letters of 8 and 13 September 1868 in Mansi L, 199–205.

[6] See F. de Wyels in *Irenikon* 6 (1929), 488–516, 655–86.

[7] See Aubert, *Vat.,* 84–101. Also R. Lill, "Die deutschen Theologieprofessoren im Urteil des Münchener Nuntius," *Reformata reformanda* II (Münster 1965), 483–507.

Several governments on their part feared decisions of the council concerning civil marriage, secular education, and constitutional freedoms, and were apprehensive over a possible reconfirmation of certain medieval prerogatives of the Church over the civil authority. The request by some bishops, which was received positively by Rome, to make the *Syllabus* of 1864 the basis for council deliberations, could not but intensify such fears. All those in the Church who were afraid of the triumph of the ultramontanes at the council tried to reinforce the suspicions of the governments, hoping thereby to cause diplomatic admonitions and warnings. For a while France considered appointing an ambassador extraordinary for the council as it had done for the Council of Trent,[12] and in April the minister president of Bavaria, Prince Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, tried to bring about a joint intervention of the European governments;[13] they, however, preferred to barricade themselves behind an attitude of watchful waiting.

---

[8] See R. Aubert, "La composition des commissions préparatoire du I^er^ Concile du Vatican," *Reformata reformanda* II (Münster 1965), 447–82.

[9] Cf. J. Granderath, op. cit. I, 187–246.

[10] *Der Papst und das Conzil* (Leipzig 1869).

[11] R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1964), 80–91.

Infallibilists and Anti-Infallibilists

The council opened on 8 December 1869 in the presence of about seven hundred bishops, i.e., of more than two-thirds of those entitled to participate. Among them were 60 prelates of Eastern Rites, for the most part from the Near East, and almost 200 fathers from outside of Europe: 121 from America, 49 of these from the United States, 41 from India and the Far East, 18 from Oceania, and 9 from the missions in Africa. It should be noted, however, that while the prelates from the other parts of the world amounted to about one-third of the council, many of them, especially the missionaries, in reality were European, and that with the exception of the bishops of the Eastern Rites there were no native bishops from Asia and Africa. Within this European predominance there was a Latin predominance. There were some significant English-speaking groups (among them the Irish element predominated) and about seventy-five Germans and Austrians, but disregarding the Spaniards and Latin Americans, who comprised about one hundred members, the French constituted about 17 percent of the assembly (for many missionaries hailed from France) and the Italians constituted a whopping 35 percent, so that the French and Italians together amounted to more than half of the council fathers. The overwhelming Italian predominance, which was strongly criticized, interestingly enough had no tactical rationale; it was merely the result of historical circumstances. In antiquity the number of dioceses established in southern and central Italy was high, in more recent times a large part of the Catholic apostolate in the Greek and Turkish islands was entrusted to Italian missionaries, and Italians occupied a large number of the positions in the Curia. The Italian prelates by themselves constituted not only one-third of the assembly, they also provided two-thirds of the consultants and experts, all of the secretaries, and all five presidents;

---

[12] The detailed treatment by E. Ollivier, op. cit. I, 403–536 has been revised in this instance by de Montclos, 391–405.

[13] See J. Grisar, *Bayern, Staat und Kirche* (Munich 1961), 216–40.

only one important position, that of secretary general, was entrusted to a foreigner, to the Austrian Fessler.

The controversies which in the course of 1869 swirled around papal infallibility and especially the clumsy interference of Monsignor Dupanloup in the middle of November soon after the opening of the council resulted in the replacement of national groupings, which had begun in the first few days, with an ideological grouping.[14] On one side stood the fathers who did not doubt, who in fact expected, that the council would again emphasize those principles which in their view in an ideal Christian society had to form the foundation for the relationship between Church and state and who desired a solemn definition of the infallibility of the Pope. Even if they were not in agreement with all of the centralizing steps of the Roman Curia and thought of some manifestations of papal veneration as ludicrous, many fathers were convinced that the Gallican and Febronian theses which called for a limitation of the papal primacy in favor of the episcopate would be a regression. It would go counter to the old traditions favored by a number of unequivocal statements in Scripture (for example: "Tu es Petrus"), by some formulations stemming from the time of the church Fathers (for example: "Roma locuta est, causa finita est"), and by all of the great Scholastic teachers, from Thomas Aquinas to Bellarmine and Alphonsus Liguori. Confronting some of the difficulties of a historical nature with the living faith of the Church, they were especially impressed by the almost universal agreement of the Church of their time with the thesis of the personal infallibility of the Pope, a concept which in the preceding twenty years had been affirmed by provincial councils several times. Under such circumstances it appeared quite normal to them that controversies which they considered fruitless should be nipped in the bud. Extratheological reasons lent additional weight to the conviction of many prelates. In addition to their veneration of Pius IX, they were convinced that emphasis on the monolithic character of the Roman unity would send non-Catholics to the Church, because they were confused by the hesitation of the Churches separated from Rome or by the contradictions in modern philosophical systems (this aspect was emphasized particularly by the convert Manning). Noticeable also was their endeavor to emphasize the principle of authority as strongly as possible in a world undermined by democratic efforts, which in their eyes were nothing more than a milder form of anarchy, inspired in the main by Protestantism. Finally, given the developing crisis before their eyes, they desired to see an increasingly centralized organization for the offensive and defensive strategy of the Church.

---

[14] See R. Aubert, "Motivations théologiques et extrathéologiques des partisans et des adversaires de la définition dogmatique de l'infaillibilité du pape à Vatican I," *L'infaillibilité,* ed. by E. Castelli (Paris 1970), 91–103.

Precisely the same mixture of considerations of a theoretical-doctrinal kind and extratheological factors brought other bishops to the conviction that such plans would be a shock for the traditional constitution of the Church and threaten civil society in its most legitimate aspects. The number of these bishops was relatively small and for this reason they were known as the "minority," but they enjoyed a high prestige because of the sees[15] which they occupied and because of their theological scholarship. Some—they were actually more numerous than an apologetically oriented historiography later wanted to admit—continued to adhere to the semi-Gallican concept of the ecclesiastical magisterial office, the starting point of which was that the Pope could never treat a question of doctrine independently from ratification by the episcopate. The influence of the tradition of Bossuet, the episcopal mentality passed down from the Febronian theologians and the canonists of the preceding century, historical difficulties such as the condemnation of Pope Honorius, an archaic theological attitude which clung too much to the sources and had little understanding for dogmatic developments, led them to the conclusion that either the Pope did not possess the privilege of personal infallibility or that the problem at best was still obscure and its treatment therefore premature.

More widespread seemed to be the legitimate, albeit occasionally exaggerated worry about the second element in the divine structure of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The proposed definition of the infallibility of the Pope appeared to many fathers as the separation of a partial aspect from an indivisible whole, the effect of which would result in the virtual abolition of the episcopate.[16] The way in which the council had been prepared seemed to justify their apprehensions. Did the agenda,[17] determined by the Pope and, in contrast to the Council of Trent, not by the fathers, sufficiently respect their freedom of action? And could the bishops expect to play more than the role of extras in a scene staged in advance by the Curia? The bad acoustics of the council auditorium, which did not satisfy minimum requirements for holding genuine debates, was a further case in point.

---

[15] Almost the entire Austro-Hungarian episcopate under the leadership of Cardinal Rauscher, a renowned patrologist and fervent defender of the rights of the Holy See against Josephinist and liberal demands; all of Germany's sees; a considerable number of French prelates, among them the archbishops of Paris and Lyon; several North American archbishops; the archbishop of Milan, the most populous Italian diocese; and three Eastern patriarchs.

[16] This appears to have been Ketteler's view. Concerning his attitude (very characteristic of those bishops who were devoted to Rome and open toward the idea of the infallibility of the Pope, but who rejected the definition in the context in which it was offered to them), see the balanced treatment by V. Conzemius, "Acton, Döllinger und Ketteler," *AMrhKG* 14 (1962), 194–238, which corrects the exaggerated thesis put forth by F. Vigener in his biography of the prelate.

[17] Text in Mansi L, 215–22. See Aubert, *Vat.,* 78–83 on the development of the regulation. It was modified by the Pope on 20 February 1870 in a way which displeased the

There was additional concern about the fact that several of the best-known supporters of the definition wanted to include in the subject area of the infallibility of the Church, i.e., of the Pope, a number of "Catholic truths" which did not belong to the *depositum fidei* and had only indirect connection with it. This was particularly the case in the religious-political area. Many people indeed noted that the definition of papal infallibility in the extensive form suggested by its proponents would strengthen the authority of such documents as the bull *Unam sanctam,* the declaration of Sixtus V concerning the right to depose sovereigns, and especially the *Syllabus,* whose judgments were a special burden for the council. Both European and American newspapers were extensive witnesses to this concern. Besides, the way in which the question of infallibility was being dealt with by the ultramontane papers was enough to justify the belief of those who were convinced "that it was the intention to declare the Pope infallible in matters of faith in order to give him the appearance of infallibility in other matters as well" (Leroy-Beaulieu). It was expected that the governments would not tolerate such a course of events without voicing their opposition, but of course this would be to the disadvantage of the local Churches. Beyond the question of immediate tactics there was also a question of principle. It was raised by those who believed that the political future belonged to the liberal institutions, and that the Church, as long as it showed itself as a defender of an autocratic authoritarianism, stood to lose everything. Finally, there were the ecumenical aspects: the proposed definition would add to the difficulties of establishing closer relations with the separated brethren, especially of the Christians in the East; it would promote the aggressiveness of certain Protestants; and could even provide a new schism in the intellectual circles of Germany which were strongly impressed by Döllinger's arguments.

If the feeling of discontent which showed itself at the beginning of the council rapidly resulted in an organized opposition, this was in part the result of some misunderstandings, but to an overwhelming degree it was the result of a regrettable maneuver of the infallibilists. For the purpose of preparing the election of the dogmatic commission, the so-

---

minority even more (see Mansi L, 854–55 and C. Butler, op. cit., 243–53). Cf. H. Jedin, "Die Geschäftsordnungen der beiden letzten ökumenischen Konzilien in ekklesiologischer Sicht," *Cath* 14 (1960), 105–18.

called *deputatio de fide,* which was to deal with the question of papal infallibility, two different election committees had been formed: one by Dupanloup, the other one by Manning. The latter insisted on the exclusion from the deputation of all fathers who were suspected of opposing the definition. A list compiled under his supervision and approved by one of the council presidents was distributed to the fathers. For the most part they had no personal knowledge of the other members of the council and on 14 December elected the proposed members in good faith. This procedure, which excluded from the deputation such competent men as Cardinal Rauscher and Monsignor Hefele, the learned author of the *Conciliengeschichte,* was a gross mistake. It put an end to the possibility of a dialogue between the two opposing positions and by its partisanship angered the members of the minority who, erroneously, believed that this maneuver by Manning's group had been engineered by the Curia. Even more, it created the impression outside of the assembly that the elections had only been a guise. From this moment on there were many who began to doubt the freedom of the council.

First Council Debates

After three weeks of exhausting formalities, the discussion concerning the first constitutional draft "against the many errors stemming from modern rationalism" was begun on 28 December.[18] It immediately became the object of strong criticism. To many fathers it was obscure, insufficiently pastoral and too aggressive, and went far beyond the points that had been discussed freely by the theologians. Criticism originated both from the infallibilists and the minority, an advantageous fact in that it gave hope that the council would proceed less inhibitedly than had been feared. After six sessions of debate, the presidents announced on 10 January that the schema was being returned to the deputies for revision. Some men were astonished that the decision was made without prior advice from the assembly, which in its majority probably would have adopted the draft with only minor changes. That this was not done shows clearly that the Roman leaders—contrary to the intention of which they were accused even before the opening of the council—were far from exploiting the obedient majority and that they tried to achieve the best possible result even at the cost of some humiliations.

---

[18] Mansi L, 58–119, 122–276. The protracted drafting of this schema can be followed in the minutes of the preparatory commission for doctrinal questions (ibid. XLIX, 617–736). See also L. Orban, *Theologia Güntheriana et Concilium Vaticanum,* 2 vols. (Rome 1942–49) and, with respect to the atmosphere of this commission, the letters of the American consultant Corcoran, edited by J. Hennesey in *CHR* 48 (1962), 157–81.

In order to occupy the fathers during the time which the revision of the first doctrinal schema required, discussions were begun on the schemata concerning church discipline and the adaptation of canon law. Many of the fathers believed that this adaptation to the new circumstances of the nineteenth century was the principal task of the council. For this purpose, twenty-eight schemata or draft proposals had come from the disciplinary commission, even though most of them were of a picayune nature and failed to display any openness to the future or any pastoral imagination in the search for truly new formulations;[19] eighteen additional ones had been worked out by the commission dealing with the religious orders,[20] which thanks to the leadership of its authoritarian and effective president, Cardinal Bizzarri, had done fruitful work. Furthermore, the preparatory commission for the missions and the Churches of the Eastern Rite had prepared three schemata[21] and the commission for political-ecclesiastical problems had worked out eighteen schemata[22] which concerned topics of genuine interest and often were more timely than the ones which had been prepared by the commission for church discipline.[23] Only a few of the eighty-seven schemata were distributed to the fathers during the council and ultimately there was not enough time to pass even one of them.

For an entire month, beginning on 14 January, the first four schemata were debated.[24] Because no time limit existed, many fathers were tempted to lose themselves in details and to discuss purely local problems. Many also—misunderstanding the topic—confined themselves to tiresome homilies concerning the sanctity of priests and the ecclesiastical spirit, which of course did not help progress at all. A number of interjections were of interest, however. Some of the Eastern bishops, for example, raised the question, one which did not seem to have occurred to anyone, as to what extent the disciplinary schemata were relevant to the Eastern Churches. Once again it was realized that seemingly quite neutral questions could involve ecclesiology. This became even more evident in the course of the discussions of the fourth project, dealing with the expediency of the drawing up of a universal catechism which was to take the place of the numerous diocesan catechisms: the proposal, which had not originated with the Roman Curia, was viewed as a sign of mistrust of the bishops.[25]

---

[19] Text in Mansi LIII, 721–81; minutes of the discussions in the preparatory commission, ibid. XLIX, 748–932.

[20] Mansi LIII, 783–854; minutes, ibid. XLIX, 940–79.

[21] Mansi LIII, 45–61, 893–914; minutes, ibid. XLIX, 985–1162.

[22] Mansi LIII, 854–94. The pertinent minutes are no longer extant; some documents, ibid XLIX, 1171–1211 and in addition some indications in the diary and the correspondence of the consultant Moufang, edited by L. Lenhart in *AMrhKG* 3 (1951), 323–54, 9 (1957), 227–58.

[23] Especially those "de pauperum operariorumque miseria sublevanda" (Mansi LIII, 867–72).

[24] "De episcopis, de synodis et de vicariis generalibus" and "De sede episcopali vacante" (Mansi L, 339–52; 359–518); "De vita et honestate clericorum" (ibid., 517–22, 522–700); "De parvo catechismo" (ibid., 699–702, 703–853).

The dissatisfaction of many fathers with this proposal was aggravated by the distribution on 21 January of the constitutional draft "*De Ecclesia Christi.*"[26] The draft had its good qualities—the patristic sources of its chief author, Clemens Schrader, were clearly discernible—but it also had regrettable weaknesses, especially in the disproportional number of passages devoted to the episcopate and to the papacy, a deficiency which was noted with regret even by some members of the majority. The final chapters as well, concerning the relationship between Church and state, were rejected by many because of strongly theocratic views offensive to the modern mind.[27]

Work on the schema on rationalism, which had been revised by Kleutgen, was resumed on March 18, after the sessions had been interrupted for three weeks to make needed improvements in the acoustics. The new version[28] was favorably received by the fathers, and only small details needed to be ironed out. Aside from a violent incident, caused by the passionate remarks of Monsignor Stroßmayer, and some complaints about the unseemly hurry with which ballots were taken on requests for amendments, the discussions took place in an atmosphere of equanimity. On 24 April the council, despite the last-minute hesitation of the most mistrustful of the minority, solemnly and unanimously approved the first dogmatic document, the constitution *Dei Filius.*[29] It opposed pantheism, materialism, and modern rationalism with a compact and enlightened presentation of the Catholic doctrine concerning God, revelation, and the faith. For almost a century it was to be the basis of standard theological textbooks.

---

[25] The revised text of this schema was again discussed by the fathers from 29 April until 13 May (Mansi LI, 454–85) and accepted with 491 *placet* votes against 56 *non placet* and 44 *placet juxta modum* votes, but was never officially promulgated. The majority of the fathers were particularly receptive to the reference to the disadvantages of the multiplicity of the catechisms in a world which evinced strong population movements from rural areas to industrial cities and from Europe to other parts of the world. But some opponents of the draft, such as Dupanloup for France and Rauscher for the German-speaking countries, pointed out that, aside from the respect for the episcopal magisterial office, circumstances needed to be considered which demanded the adaptation of catechisms to the prevailing situations in the various areas.

[26] Text in Mansi LI, 539–636. Observations by the fathers, ibid., 731–930. See F. Van der Horst, *Das Schema über die Kirche auf dem 1. Vatikanischen Konzil* (Paderborn 1963).

[27] See C. Colombo, "La Chiesa e la società civile nel Concilio Vaticano I," *SC* 89 (1961), 323–43.

[28] Text in Mansi LI, 31–38; minutes of the discussions of the commission, ibid. LIII, 177–94; speeches at the sessions, ibid. LI, 42–426.

[29] Text in Mansi LI, 429–36. Among the historio-theological commentaries see especially A. Vacant, *Études théologiques sur les constitutions du concile du Vatican,* 2 vols. (Paris

Agitation concerning Papal Infallibility

While inside the council auditorium texts were prudently debated which caused little excitement, outside of it the discussions concerning infallibility, which soon became the center of attention, were in full sway. During the last days of December, Manning, Dechamps, and some German-speaking bishops began to circulate a petition which asked the Pope to put the item on the council agenda. The preparatory commission, however, was not disposed to placing the issue on the agenda itself. During January the petition was signed by more than four hundred fifty people.[30]

This maneuver, organized by a group acting independently from the Curia, was the occasion for the opponents of the definition to organize resistance from among splinter groups which had not yet clearly articulated their views. Monsignor Dupanloup labored under the illusion that his appearance alone would suffice to make him the center of the various discontented groups, but even the feverish activity in which he plunged himself after his arrival in Rome had only very limited success.[31] The actual leader of the minority was a layman, John Acton. As a historian he shared with his teacher Döllinger the objections to the new proposed dogma, but even more than Döllinger he feared the potential indirect consequences on the future development of Catholicism in a society whose preoccupation with the idea of freedom was growing. The recent publication of Acton's correspondence with Döllinger has confirmed the assertions of the English diplomat Odo Russell concerning the preeminent role played by the young English lord in the organizatin of the council minority. Thanks to his numerous international connections and his linguistic abilities he was largely responsible for the fact that at the very beginning of the council the most important leaders of the opposition, many of whom hardly knew one another, were brought together. His acquaintance with parliamentary procedure allowed him to point out to them the possibility of joint action, suggest several operations to them, draw their attention to several intrigues which were being hatched in the opposing camp, supply them with historical documents

---

1895), to be supplemented and corected by *De doctrina Concilii Vaticani Primi* (Vatican City 1969), 3–281 and H. Pottmeyer, *Der Glaube vor dem Anspruch der Wissenschaft* (Freiburg i. Br. 1968).

[30] List in Mansi LI, 650–63.

[31] R. Aubert in *Miscellanea historiae ecclesiasticae* (Louvain 1961), 96–116.

for the buttressing of their position, and play the role of mediator between the leaders of the minority and several foreign governments. It was due to his initiative that together with Archbishop Haynald—a member of the Hungarian House of Lords and therefore also familiar with parliamentary practices—an international committee was formed which was to guarantee the collaboration of the various opposition groups. Several times a week it served as a meeting place for about ten Austrian, German, French, British, Italian, and American bishops. The committee circulated a counterpetition which demanded from the Pope that he forego the definition of his infallibility. The counterproposal garnered 136 signatures, i.e., one-fifth of the assembled fathers.[32] It did not, however, prevent Pius IX from deciding on 1 March to include a formal definition of the infallibility of the Pope in the draft of the "Dogmatic Constitution of the Church."

The leaders of the minority did not confine themselves to increased personal contacts with those fathers whom they hoped to win for their cause. Convinced of the disastrous consequences for the Church of the proposed definition, and believing that they were justified in using all possible means of preventing it, some of them thought it advisable to mobilize public opinion in the hope that it would exert the necessary pressure on the council leaders from the outside. Several Roman salons turned into veritable snake pits of intrigue in the service of this or that view, for the proponents of the definition quickly, with the agreement of the Vatican, imitated the tactics of their opponents. But if in this still very aristocratic society the salons occupied a very important place, the newspapers constituted an even more potent instrument. Both camps tried to enlist the press, especially as the interest of the public in the affairs of the council had become evident.

Among the journalist polemics, particularly those of Louis Veuillot in favor of the definition and those of Monsignor Dupanloup in opposition to it, the "Roman Letters" assumed a special place. Döllinger published them in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of Augsburg under the pseudonym of Quirinus. As a kind of council chronicle they were designed, by way of a tendentious depiction of participants and events, to discredit from the beginning all the decisions at which the assembly might arrive. Acton supplied Döllinger with the necessary information,[33] which he received from some bishops who did not consider the obligation of secrecy, which the Pope had unilaterally decreed, as binding.

---

[32] List in Mansi LI, 677–86.

[33] The considerable contributions of Acton's to the "Römische Briefe," which had been suspected, was made clear by V. Conzemius (*JEH* 20 [1969], 267–94; *ThQ* 140 [1960], 428–32; *RQ* 59 [1964], 186–229, 60 [1965], 78–119), who also succeeded in differentiating the concepts of the two men, who, both searching for the best method to serve the cause of the minority, grew more and more apart. See also D. McElrath, op. cit.

The feuds of the press were augmented on both sides by continuing publications of brochures which, like those of Dechamps or Gratry, were identified by name, but which more often remained anonymous. There were also attempts by some members of the minority to enlist the support of the governments in Vienna, Munich, London, and especially Paris. Everyone was aware of the tremendous weight of Napoleon III, whose military and diplomatic support was absolutely essential for the survival of the remnants of the Pope's temporal power.[34] The various attempts by some bishops to cause their governments to intervene were a failure with respect to placing the item of papal infallibility on the agenda, but it can justifiably be assumed that they were not quite without influence. Cardinal Antonelli was in any case concerned with the matter, but now the attention of several members of the Curia and a number of the majority moderates was drawn to the influence which the agitation occasioned by the proposed definition had in the secular world on the discussions concerning the legitimacy of modern freedoms and the right of the Church to intervene in civil affairs. An effort was made to restrict the question of infallibility to the strictly doctrinal area in order to dispel the worries of any who were afraid that, once the Pope was acknowledged as infallible, he would be in the position, as one of them said, "in the future to decree [as infallible] any syllabus, even the most controvertible one."

With public and governmental concern growing on the fringe of the council, the assembly continued its work; but it soon became clear that, considering the speed with which progress was made, the chapter dealing with the primacy and the infallibility of the Pope would reach the discussion stage in the following spring at the earliest. Therefore, new petitions in March demanded that this chapter, which greatly disturbed the council, be dealt with immediately after the conclusion of the discussion on the constitution concerning rationalism. Although three out of the five council presidents were reluctant to do so because they did not wish to anger the minority,[35] Pius IX, whose irritation with the opposition was growing, decided in favor of the petition.

---

[34] On the political aspects of the council see: for France, E. Ollivier, op. cit., to be supplemented by J. Gadille, *A. du Boÿs. L'intervention du gouvernement impérial à Vatican I* (Louvain 1968) and de Montclos, 446–70; for Austria, Engel-Janosi I, 156–70; for Germany, E. Weinzierl-Fischer in *MÖSTA* 10 (1957), 302–21; for England, A. Randall in *Dublin Review* 479 (1959), 37–56 and especially D. McElrath, op. cit., 141–83; for Switzerland, V. Conzemius in *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 15 (1965), 204–27.

[35] Their moderation, especially that of Cardinal Bilio, was clearly demonstrated by M. Maccarrone, op. cit. The intransigence of Cardinal Capalti, on the other hand, becomes clear from his *Diario,* recently published by L. Pásztor.

The Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*

In order to gloss over the extraordinary procedure involved in giving chapter 11 priority, it was decided to reformulate it in such a way that it became a small constitution, especially devoted to the Pope.[36] The discussion was opened on 13 May by the moderate expert opinion of Monsignor Pie. The general discussion, even at this early stage, essentially reduced itself to a debate of the expediency of the definition and in places was conducted with great passion. After about fifteen sessions, in which the presentations of Manning and Dechamps and the criticisms of Hefele, Stroßmayer, Maret, and Darboy stood out, the assembly proceeded to a discussion of the details of the text. It was especially concerned with the fourth chapter, which contained a definition of papal infallibility which the commission had already improved, but which failed to take sufficient account of the legitimate role of the episcopate, in addition to the Pope and in conjunction with him, as part of the supreme magisterial office of the Church. Fifty-seven members addressed the measure, presenting theological arguments and historical difficulties, and pointing up the practical advantages and disadvantages of a definition under the prevailing conditions. These often tiring debates, which took place in increasingly unbearably hot weather, at least permitted more precise formulations and removed some obstacles. A few suggestions stood out from the monotony of the debates, such as the formula which Rauscher had proposed on the very first day as a basis for compromise between majority and minority; it was taken from the formula suggested by S. Antonin of Florence in the fifteenth century.[37] There was also the proposal by Ketteler, who, in keeping with his views of the corporative constitution of the Church, insisted on the necessary cooperation between the Pope and his natural advisers, the bishops; and there was especially the proposal by the Dominican Cardinal Guidi, whom Pius IX rewarded with severe reproaches for his pains.[38]

In the meantime the negotiations in the hallways outside of the auditorium had grown in intensity and it was hoped that a compromise formula could be found which would prevent the divisions within the assembly from becoming known to the public. Indeed, many defenders of infallibility in the meantime had acquired a better grasp of the complexity of the problem and the necessity of greater differentiation, while the opponents learned that the faith of the Church in this matter was broader and firmer than many of them had thought at the beginning. But primarily the greatest part of the fathers—standing between the two extremes of the enthusiasts of the majority and the diehards—basically consisted of moderates for whom all of the agitation was painful and deeply worrisome. Far from being intent on the destruction of the opponents, they desired only to find a middle ground on which a compromise was possible. This was especially true for the majority of the Italians, who constituted one-third of the council participants and who had not taken a definite position in the initial maneuvering to include the infallibility issue on the agenda. By dint of their numbers they lent decisive support to the informal compromise faction. This group, conciliatory from the outset, finally succeeded in having a more flexible formula accepted, which occupied a middle ground between the neo-ultramontane and the anti-Curial extremists, and which allowed for adjustments in the future. It is quite likely that an even greater portion of the minority would have voted for the ultimately adopted solution if Pius IX, who in the course of the last months had intervened increasingly openly in favor of the definition,[39] had not been so intransigent.

---

[36] The various developmental phases of the text and the discussion in the public session as well as in the commission in Mansi LII, 4–1253, LIII, 240–83.

[37] Concerning this formula, often mentioned in these debates, see U. Betti in *Memorie domenicane* 76 (1959), 173–92.

[38] On the speech and the reactions to it, see M. Maccarrone, op. cit. I, 424–232.

Whatever the extent of his personal responsibility, it is a fact that the attempts at achieving a reconciliation with the opponents failed, in spite of the good impression made by the summary which Monsignor Gasser had prepared in the name of the theological commission. It was an authorized commentary which even today is of essential importance in grasping the nuances of the council text.[40] In the preliminary balloting, 451 *placet* votes were cast, together with 88 *non placet* and 62 *placet juxta modum* votes. Hoping that the size of the opposition would provide a reconsideration, the minority made a final appeal to Pius IX in order to obtain the elimination of a controverted expression in the canon concerning papal primacy and the addition of a few words in the definition of the infallibility of the Pope which would imply the close cooperation of the Pope with the Church as a whole. But Pius IX, who was pressured in the opposite direction by the extremists of the majority, proved unyielding and inflexible. For this reason about sixty bishops decided to leave Rome before the final vote in order to avoid having to cast their *non placet* in front of a Pope who was personally affected by the issue. The other members of the minority believed that, despite the inclusion of an unfortunate phrase which designated the Pope infallible

---

[39] C. Butler already demonstrated several instances of exertion of pressure by Pius IX. M. Maccarrone (op. cit., especially 350–52, 395, 409–13, 464–77), by using hitherto ignored documents, has shown more precisely how Pius IX repeatedly during the final negotiations intervened personally on behalf of the ultras among the majority.

[40] Mansi LII, 1204–30.

"ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae"[41]—designed to dispel the slightest suspicion of Gallicanism—the most serious objections had been removed as a result of the various textual improvements and Monsignor Gasser's commentary. They decided to approve the final version, which on 18 July was solemnly and almost unanimously passed by the members present.[42]

During the subsequent weeks the council continued its work at a slower pace; because of the heat and of the Franco-Prussian War, most of the fathers left Rome during the summer. The occupation of Rome by Italian troops on 20 September terminated the council, and on 20 October the Pope announced its adjournment sine die.

The end of the debates, however, did not produce an immediate acquiescence. Agitation continued for some time[43] and there occurred some regrettable apostasies, especially in the German-speaking countries. Led by university professors who took their cue from Döllinger, the so-called Old Catholic schism came into existence. Among the bishops of the minority some, like Hefele and Stroßmayer, hesitated for a while, but ultimately none of them denied his approval of the new dogma.

---

[41] On the precise meaning of this phrase, see G. Dejaifve in *Salesianum* 24 (1962), 283–95 and H. Fries in *Volk Gottes. Festgabe J. Höfer* (Freiburg i. Br. 1967), 480–500.
[42] Text in Mansi LII, 1330–34. Among the historio-theological commentaries see especially U. Betti, *La costituzione dommatica "Pastor aeternus"* (Rome 1961); G. Thils, *Primauté pontificale et prerogatives épiscopales. "Potestas ordinaria" au concile du Vatican* (Louvain 1961); U. Betti, *L'infaillibilité pontificale* (Gembloux 1969); U. Betti, *De doctrina Concilii Vaticani I* (Vatican City 1969), 285–575.
[43] Aubert, *Pie IX,* 359–67, 546f.

CHAPTER 23

The Rise of the Old Catholic Community

The internal Catholic protest movement against the dogma of the universal episcopate and the infallibility of the Pope spread after the summer of 1870, especially in Germany and Switzerland. It experienced several stages, and contrary to the initial intentions of its leaders culminated in the establishment of its own Church. The nucleus was formed by the university theology professors Döllinger, Johannes Friedrich, and J. A. Messmer of Munich, G. J. Hilgers, F. P. Knoodt, J. Langen, and Franz Heinrich Reusch of Bonn, Johann Baptist Baltzer, Joseph Hubert Reinkens, and T. Weber of Breslau, A. Menzel and Friedrich

Michelis of Braunsberg, Eduard Herzog of Lucerne, and a layman, the Prague canonist and legal historian J. F. von Schulte. Sectarian radicalism, which had characterized German Catholicism, was at first alien to the professors. They regarded themselves as conservatives adhering to the old Catholic faith in the face of erroneous innovations;[1] some of them had been close to Günter's theology.

At the council, primarily historical objections had been raised against the doctrine of infallibility and the way it was dealt with. The protesting theologians were now joined by some noted historians who as Catholics in a liberal age had earned their right to academic equality. Among them were F. W. Kampschulte and C. A. von Cornelius with his students A. von Druffel, M. Ritter, and F. Stieve.

The professors were joined virtually only by academicians and middle-class citizens. Some of them were guided by the same religious and scholarly impulses, others more by a religious liberalism which had begun to split away from the Church even before 1870. This burdened the movement as much as the nationalism of many of its members which reflected the climate of the founding of the German Empire. Old Catholicism was and remained an elitist movement; in the 1870s it reached its peak in Germany with about sixty thousand members. After all, the Catholic masses and their organizations had contributed to the development which culminated in the Vatican Council; after the annexation of the Papal State they felt even more impelled to stand by the imperiled Pope. The political leaders, who prior to 1869 had warned against the dogma, also made their peace with the decrees of the council.

In August 1870 more than one thousand three hundred Rhenish Catholics protested against the council; in Nuremberg thirty-two professors appealed to an "ecumenical council, true and free, and therefore to be held not in Italy but on this side of the Alps."[2] Expectations of support by the episcopate diminished when at the end of August the majority in Fulda agreed on a pastoral letter, temperately defending council and dogma;[3] they disappeared totally only in April 1871, when Hefele as the last German bishop published the council decrees.[4]

---

[1] Cf. the statement by the Bonn professor Reusch: "Our Catholic conscience forbids us the acceptance of the two doctrines because in word and tradition they contradict the old Church to which we are connected as Catholic priests." Conzemius, *Katholizismus ohne Rom,* 63.

[2] The texts of the protest declarations: *CollLac* VII, 1731f.

[3] Text: *CollLac* VII, 1733ff.; Butler-Lang, 455–58; Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 95–112.

[4] Some of the opponents of the dogma who were willing to act only in conjunction with the bishops thereupon withdrew from the movement, such as the dogmatist Kuhn (Tübingen) and Dieringer (Bonn), who resigned from his teaching position.

The agitation over council and dogma, in which the entire liberal press took the side of the opponents, experienced a renewed intensification after the temporary diversion of the Franco-German War. The reason was that several bishops after the fall of 1870 proceeded against the opponents of the council by withholding the *missio canonica,* suspension, excommunication, and denial of the sacraments. The victims appealed to the state for assistance. The governments granted them protection and guaranteed them the continuation of temporal and ecclesiastical offices; the ensuing feud with the bishops led to the *Kulturkampf.*

In September 1870 the first congress of Old Catholics was held in Munich with three hundred delegates from Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. The participation of guests from the Orthodox and Anglican Churches and the small Utrecht Church signified not only the joint opposition to Rome which the Vatican Council had intensified, but also a novel ecumenical content which Döllinger and his friends consciously promoted by appealing to the common Christian tradition of old. Döllinger's program underscored the conservative nature of the protest movement and claimed for it the right to continued equal membership in the Catholic Church. Döllinger passionately advised against division, and he himself never formally joined the Old Catholic Church. Schulte, Friedrich, Michelis, and Reinkens, on the other hand, called for the establishment of an emergency community, and the majority of the congress participants agreed with them.

In Rome, the momentous decision, which, like the whole movement, confirmed old prejudices against the German professors, determined future development. At first local Catholic Associations were formed. The Second Congress in 1872 in Cologne, which officially adopted the name "Old Catholic," decided to establish regular pastoral care and appointed a commission for the preparation of the election of a bishop. On 14 June 1871 the Breslau professor Joseph Hubert Reinkens was chosen. He was consecrated by a bishop of the Utrecht Church[5] and thus entered into the apostolic succession.[6]

Reinkens, placed under interdict by Pius IX, established an episcopal administration in Bonn, assisted by Reusch as vicar general. He was acknowledged as a Catholic bishop by Prussia, Baden, and Hessen-Darmstadt; legislation passed in these states during the *Kulturkampf* assured the Old Catholics of their share of Catholic Church property and use of Catholic churches.[7] Only to the extent that the *Kulturkampf* was acknowledged as a mistake and was dismantled after 1878 did the support of the states flag; earlier than other proponents of the *Kulturkampf,* Bismarck recognized that as an ally against Rome Old Catholicism was too weak.

---

[5] The consecration followed the rite prescribed in the *Pontificale Romanum.*

[6] Reinkens perpetuated the succession. In 1876 he consecrated E. Herzog as bishop and in 1895 his vicar general T. Weber, who one year later became his successor.

The constitution drafted by Schulte according to old Christian models granted legislative powers and the right to elect bishops to the synods, formed of representatives of the clergy and laymen. After approval by the Third Congress in 1873 in Constance, it was ratified by the first synod in 1874 in Bonn. The synods of the subsequent years with respect to doctrine remained based on the undivided Church of the first millenium; tempered and timely reforms were introduced into worship and after 1880 German was employed in the liturgy of the Mass. Against the will of Reinkens, Reusch and other fellow champions, liberal forces in 1879 succeeded in abolishing celibacy.

In Switzerland, where the conditions were particularly favorable, Reinkens and Michelis actively participated in the establishment of a Church. In 1875 the first synod gathered in Olten and established the "Christ Catholic Church of Switzerland." In doctrine it followed the German model, in its constitution it was more democratic. In 1876 Eduard Herzog was elected bishop and during almost fifty years of work established a Church oriented to Bible and Eucharist. The theological university established in 1874 in Berne by the government as an instrument in the *Kulturkampf,* with Herzog's authoritative assistance grew into a considerable theological center which after the turn of the century was influential far beyond the borders of Switzerland.[8] The reason for this was that the German leadership came to an end with the expiration of the outstanding scholarship of that generation. All attempts to maintain the theological faculty at Bonn, which, except for one member, was totally Old Catholic, failed; after the death of Reusch (1900) and Langen (1901) the remaining chairs were filled again with Catholics.[9]

In Austria, where the government remained passive and where the bishops, especially Rauscher, avoided a confrontation by extremely lenient treatment, the protest movement developed very slowly. After 1872 there existed four Old Catholic communities, to be officially recognized by the state in 1877. An increase occurred during the 1890s in consequence of the more nationally than religiously inspired Away-from-Rome Movement. In 1879 its first synod took place and it adopted the German patterns. After 1881 the small Church, whose constitution was also drafted by Schulte, was guided by an episcopal administrator.

---

[7] The Catholic bishops refused this arrangement and under protest stopped services in the churches allotted to the Old Catholics.

[8] Since 1893 the department has issued the scholarly quarterly *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* (until 1910 *Revue Internationale de Théologie*).

[9] In 1902 a chair for Old Catholic theology was created at the University of Bonn, directly responsible to the university president.

The Old Catholic bishoprics and the Utrecht Church, which prior to 1870 had been totally isolated, in 1889 formed the Union of Utrecht. It is an autonomous union of national Churches free from Rome, whose honorary primate is the archbishop of Utrecht. A joint declaration again accepted the faith of the first millenium and the kind of Roman primacy which then prevailed. It repeated the protest against the dogmas of 1854 and 1870, as well as its readiness for the "removal of the differences existing since the schism."[10] Döllinger's internationally recognized scholarship and his ecumenical efforts[11] in 1874–75 resulted in the Bonn conferences of union consisting of Old Catholic, Russian Orthodox, and Anglican theologians. In the nineteenth century they were a bold attempt at interdenominational theological discussions and thus a precursor to ecumenism, in the service of which the future international congresses of Old Catholics placed themselves. But the practical result of the conferences was small; they suffered from their small basis and from the resentful and antiecumenical polemics against Rome, which for a long time characterized Old Catholicism.

---

[10] On the future development of Old Catholicism, which in the countries of its roots has declined but which as a consequence of the adherence of new national Churches (Poland, U.S.A.) has grown in absolute terms, see Algermissen, op. cit; Conzemius, *Katholizismus ohne Rom,* 55, 68ff., 79ff., 81–102; K. Algermissen in *LThK* I, 398–402; W. Küppers in *RGG* I, 295–99.

[11] After Döllinger grew out of the combative attitude of his earlier years, theological scholarship and ecumenical interest were essentially one to him. At the Munich assembly of scholars he characterized the impartial examination of denominational doctrinal differences as an urgent task of theology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. GENERAL HISTORY

WORLD HISTORY: O. Westphal, *Weltgeschichte der Neuzeit. 1750–1950* (Stuttgart 1953); F. Valjaveč, ed., *Historia Mundi* IX and X (Berne 1961); G. Mann, ed., *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte* VII and VII (Berlin 1960); D. K. Fieldhouse, *Die Kolonialreiche seit dem 18. Jahrhundert (Fischer-Weltgeschichte* 29), (Frankfurt am Main 1965); G. N. Clark, ed., *The New Cambridge Modern European History* VII, IX, and X (Cambridge 1960, 1960, 1965).

EUROPE: B. Croce, *History of Europe in the 19th Century* (New York 1963); W. Mommsen, *Geschichte des Abendlandes von der Französischen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart, 1789–1945* (Munich 1951); H. Herzfeld, *Die moderne Welt. 1789–1945,* 2 vols. (Braunschweig 1966); L. Salvatorelli, *Storia del novecento* (Florence 1957); C. Zaghi, *Napoleone e Europa* (Naples 1969); R. R. Palmer, *The Age of Democratic Revolution,* 2 vols. (Princeton 1959–64); M. Beloff, ed., *L'Europe du XIX^e et du XX^e siècle* I (Paris 1959); J. B. Duroselle, *L'Europe de 1815 à nos jours. Vie politique et relations internationales (Nouvelle Clio* 38), (Paris 1964); G. A. Craig, *Europe since 1815* (Englewood 1966); G. Lefebvre, *La Révolution Française (Peuples et Civilisations* 13), (Paris 1968); G. Lefebvre, *Napoléon* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 14), (Paris 1953); F. Ponteil, *L'Éveil des Nationalités et le Mouvement Libéral, 1815–1848* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 15), (Paris 1968); C. H. Pouthas, *Démocraties et Capitalisme, 1848–1860* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 16), (Paris 1948); H. Hauser et al., *Du Libéralisme à L'Impérialisme* (*Peuples et Civilisations* 17), (Paris 1952); E. Weis, *Der Durchbruch des Bürgertums, 1776–1847* (*Propyläengeschichte Europas* 4), (Frankfurt am Main 1978). T. Schieder, *Staatensystem als Vormacht der Welt, 1848–1918* (*Propyläengeschichte Europas* 5), (Frankfurt am Main 1977); A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française,* 8 vols. (Paris 1885–1911); J. L. Godechot, *La grande nation. L'expansion révolutionnaire de la France dans le monde de 1789 à 1799,* 2 vols. (Paris 1956); E. Naujoks, *Die Französische Revolution und Europa* (Stuttgart 1969); L. Bergeron, F. Furet, and R. Koselleck, *Das Zeitalter der europäischen Revolution 1780–1848* (*Fischer-Weltgeschichte* 26), (Frankfurt am Main 1969); L. Salvatorelli, *La rivoluzione europea. 1848–1849* (Milan 1949); P. Robertson, *Revolutions of 1848* (New York 1960); A. J. P. Taylor, *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848–1918* (Oxford 1954); C. Brinton, *A Decade of Revolution, 1789–1799* (New York 1934); G. Bruun, *Europe and the French Imperium, 1799–1814* (New York 1938); F. B. Artz, *Reaction and Revolution, 1814–1832* (New York 1934); W. F. Langer, *Political and Social Upheaval, 1832–1852* (New York 1969); R. C. Binkley, *Realism and Nationalism, 1852–1871* (New York 1935).

FRANCE: *Nouvelle histoire de la France,* vols 1–10. Editions du Seuil (Paris 1972); P. Gaxotte, *La Révolution française.* Nouvelle edition avec Jean Tulard (Paris 1977); M. Vovelle, *Religion et Révolution: La dechristianisation de l'An II* (Paris 1976); P. H. Beik, *The French Revolution Seen from the Right* (New York 1970); J. N. Moody, *French Education since Napoleon* (Syracuse 1978); F. Furet and D. Richet, *The French Revolution* (London 1970); J. Godechot, *The Counter-Revolution* (New York 1971); G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, *The Restoration* (New York 1967); R. Rémond, *La vie politique en France depuis 1789,* 2 vols. (Paris 1965–69); R. Rémond, *La Droite en France de 1815 à nos jours*

(Paris 1963); J. L. Godechot, *Les révolutions, 1770–1799* (Paris 1965); J. L. Godechot, *L'Europe et l'Amérique à l'époque napoléonienne, 1800–1815* (Paris 1967); B. Groethuysen, *Philosophie de la Révolution française* (Paris 1956); I. Kaplow, ed., *New Perspectives on the French Revolution* (New York 1965); A. Gérard, *La Révolution française, mythes et interprétations, 1799–1970* (Paris 1970); J. Chastenet, *Histoire de la Troisième République,* 7 vols. (Paris 1952–63); G. Dupeux, *La Société française, 1789–1960* (Paris 1964); J. L. Godechot, *Les institutions de la France sous la Révolution et l'Empire* (Paris 1968); F. Ponteil, *Les institutions de la France de 1814 à 1870* (Paris 1966); A. Prost, *L'enseignement en France 1800–1967* (Paris 1968); L. Duguit, H. Monnier, R. Bonnard, *Les constitutions et les principales lois politiques de la France depuis 1789* (Paris 1952); *Le Moniteur Universel* (1799–1868) and *Journal officiel* (Paris 1869seqq.) for legislation and parliamentary debates.

BELGIUM, NETHERLANDS, LUXEMBURG: S. Schama, *Patriots and Liberators: Revolution in the Netherlands, 1780–1813* (New York 1977); C. H. E. De Wit, *De Strijd tussen Aristocratie en Democratie in Nederland, 1780–1848* (Heerlen 1965); P. Gerin, S. Vervaeck, J. De Belder, J. Hannes, *Bibliographie de l'histoire de Belgique, 1789–1914,* 3 vols. (Louvain 1960–66); H. Pirenne, *Histoire de Belgique* VI/VII (Brussels 1926–32); J. Van Houtte, ed., *Algemene Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* VIII/XII (Antwerp and Zeist 1955–58); J. Deharveng, ed., *Histoire de la Belgique contemporaine, 1830–1914,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1928–30); T. Luykx, *Politieke geschiedenis van Belgie van 1789 tot heden* (Brussels 1969); A. Simon, *Le parti catholique belge* (Brussels 1958).

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL: M. Artola, *Los origines de la España contemporanea,* 2 vols. (Barcelona 1958); F. G. Bruguera, *Histoire contemporaine d'Espagne. 1789–1950* (Paris 1953); R. Carr, *Spain, 1808–1939* (Oxford 1966); M. Fernández Almagro, *Historia política de la España contemporánea,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1956–59); H. V. Livermore, *A New History of Portugal* (Cambridge 1966);

ITALY: C. Spellanzon, *Storia del Risorgimento e dell'unità de'Italia,* 5 vols. (Milan 1932–40); W. Maturi, *Interpretazioni del Risorgimento* (Turin 1962); L. Salvatorelli, *Spiriti e figure del Risorgimento* (Florence 1962); D. Mack Smith, *Italy. A Modern History* (Ann Arbor 1959).

GERMAN STATES AND SWITZERLAND: B. Gebhardt, H. Grundmann, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* I and II (Stuttgart 1960); L. Just, ed., *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte* III (Constance 1956); H. Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany* II and III (New York 1959); E. Marcks, *Der Aufstieg des Reiches, 1807–78,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1936); A. H. Springer, *Geschichte Österreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1863–65); G. Mann, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main 1966); A. Ramm, *Germany, 1789–1919* (London 1967); T. S. Hamerow, *Restoration, Revolution, Reaction. Economics and Politics in Germany, 1815–71* (Princeton 1958); H. Hantsch, *Die Geschichte Österreichs* II (Graz 1962); G. A. Craig, *Germany, 1866–1945* (New York 1978); F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert,* 4 vols. (Freiburg 1929–37); V. Valentin, *Geschichte der deutschen Revolution von 1848–49,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1930–31); R. Charmatz, *Österreichs innere Geschichte von 1848 bis 1895,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1918); V. Bibl, *Der Zerfall Österreichs,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1922–24); H. v. Srbik, *Deutsche Einheit,* 4 vols. (Munich 1935–42); E. Fueter, *Die Schweiz seit 1848* (Zurich 1928).

GREAT BRITAIN: G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century and after* (London 1937); E. Halévy, *History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century,* 6 vols. (London 1949–52); L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform, 1815–70* (*Oxford History of England*), (Oxford 1962).

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: H. G. Dahms, *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Munich 1953); E. Samhaber, *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika* (Munich 1954); E. Angermann, "Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika," *Historia Mundi* X (1961), 253–331; R. Hofstadter, W. Miller, D. Aaron, W. Jordan, and L. Litwack, *The United States* (Englewood Cliffs 1976); J. A. Garraty, *The American Nation* (New York 1979); J. M. Blum, E. S. Morgan, W. L. Rose, A. M. Schlesinger, Jr., K. M. Stampp, C. Vann Woodward, *The National Experience: A History of the United States* (New York 1973); R. N. Current, T. H. Williams, F. Freidel, *American History: A Survey* (New York 1979); B. Bailyn, D. B. Davis, D. H. Donald, J. L. Thomas, R. H. Wiebe, G. S. Wood, *The Great Republic: A History of the American People* (Lexington, Mass. 1977).

LATIN AMERICA: S. de Madariaga, *The Fall of the Spanish American Empire* (London 1947); H. V. Livermore, ed., *Portugal and Brazil* (Oxford 1953); A. P. Whitaker, "Die iberoamerikanische Welt von 1825–1920," *Historia Mundi* X (1961), 332–57.

II. CHURCH HISTORY

1. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

L. A. Veit, *Die Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus* II: *1800 bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1933); L. Rogier, R. Aubert, D. Knowles, *Geschichte der Kirche* IV (Einsiedeln 1966); E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World. A Survey from the French Revolution to the present* (London 1958); K. S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age. A History of Christianity in the 19th and 20th Centuries,* 5 vols. (New York 1958–62); J. Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung* II (Münster 1964); L. Girard, *Le catholicisme en Europe de 1814 à 1878* (Les Cours de Sorbonne), (Paris 1962); Daniel-Rops, *L'Église des Révolutions,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960–63); H. Hermelink, *Das Christentum in der Menschheitsgeschichte von der Französischen Revolution bis zur Gegenwart,* 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1951–55); K. D. Schmitt, *Grundriß der Kirchengeschichte* IV: *Geschichte der Kirche im Zeitalter des Individualismus und des Säkularismus* (Göttingen 1960); K. D. Schmitt, E. Wolf, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch* IV, Part 1; F. Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum ersten Vatikanischen Konzil* (Göttingen 1963); A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église,* vols. 20 and 21, (Paris 1949, 1964); K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Church History,* 3 vols. (New York 1979).

2. PAPACY

J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit,* 4 vols. (Munich 1933–39); F. X. Seppelt, G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste* (Munich 1964); P. Paschini, P. Brezzi, *I papi nella storia* II (Rome 1961); C. Ledré, *Un siècle sous la tiare. De Pie IX à Pie XII* (Paris 1955); G. Mollat, *La Question romaine de Pie VI à Pie XI* (Paris 1932); V. Del Giudice, *La Questione romana* (Rome 1948); C. Berthelet, *Conclavi pontifici e cardinali nel secolo XIX* (Rome 1903); E. De Marchi, *Le Nunziature apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956* (Rome 1957); *Notizie dell'anno* (until 1860); *Annuario pontificio* (1861–70, 1912seqq.); *La Gerarchia cattolica* (1872–1911).

3. THE HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

GERMANY: H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Mainz 1902–3); G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse. Le Catholicisme,* 4 vols. (Paris 1905–9); F. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert* IV: *Die religiösen Kräfte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1937); P. Funk, *Von der Aufklärung zur Romantik* (Munich 1925); F. Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche von 1648 bis 1870* (Göttingen 1963); H. Schrörs, *Die Kölner Wirren. Studien zu ihrer Geschichte* (Berlin and Bonn 1927); H. Bastgen, *Die Verhandlungen zwischen dem Berliner Hof und dem Heiligen Stuhl über die konfessionell gemischten Ehen* (Paderborn 1936); H. Bastgen, *Die Besetzung der Bischofssitze in Preußen in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 2 parts (Paderborn 1941); R. Lill, *Die Beilegung der Kölner Wirren* (Düsseldorf 1962); J. -B. Kißling, *Geschichte der deutschen Katholikentage,* 3 vols. (Münster 1920–21); R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1964); A. K. Huber, *Kirche und deutsche Einheit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Königstein 1966); K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1963); K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* I (Cologne 1927, reprint Aalen 1967); F. Hanus, *Die preußische Vatikangesandtschaft, 1747–1920* (Munich 1954); G. Franz-Willing, *Die bayerische Vatikangesandtschaft, 1803–1934* (Munich 1965); F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* I (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1958); R. Hacker, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Bayern und dem Heiligen Stuhl in der Regierungszeit Ludwigs I.* (Tübingen 1967); H. Schiel, *Johann Michael Sailer,* 2 vols. (Regensburg 1948–52); W. Schellberg, *Johann Görres* (Cologne 1926); J. Janssen, *Friedrich Leopold Graf zu Stolberg* (Freiburg i. Br. 1877); E. Hosp, *Hofbauer* (Vienna 1951); R. Till, *Hofbauer und sein Kreis* (Vienna 1951); O. Pfülf, *Kardinal Johannes von Geissel,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1895–96); L. Lenhart, *Bischof Ketteler,* 3 vols. (Mainz 1966–68); L. v. Pastor, *August Reichensperger,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1899); F. Schmidt, *Peter Reichensperger* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1913); S. J. Schäffer, J. Dahl, *Adolf Kolping* (Cologne 1961); J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger,* 3 vols. (Munich 1899–1901).

AUSTRIA: F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan,* 2 vols. (Graz 1958–60); F. Engel-Janosi, *Die politische Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den österreichischen Kaisern 1804–1918* (Vienna 1964); J. Grisar, *De historia Ecclesiae catholicae austriacae saeculi XIX* (Rome 1936); A. Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918* (Munich 1952); C. Wolfsgruber, *Joseph Otmar von Rauscher* (Vienna 1888); C. Wolfsgruber, *Kardinal Schwarzenberg,* 3 vols. (Vienna 1905–17).

FRANCE: A. Latreille, *L'Église catholique et la révolution française,* 2 vols. (Paris 1950); G. Bourgin, "Les sources manuscrites de l'histoire religieuse de la France moderne," *RHEF* 10 (1924), 27–66, 172–206, 333–58, 466–92; J. Gadille, "Les sources privées de l'histoire contemporaine du catholicisme en France," *RH* 238 (1967), 333–46; G. Weill, "Le catholicisme français au XIX^e^ siècle," *Revue de synthèse historique* 15 (1907), 319–56; A. Latreille, J. -R. Palanque, É. Delaruelle, R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III (Paris 1962); W. Gurian, *Die politischen und sozialen Ideen des französischen Katholizismus, 1789–1914* (Freiburg i. Br. 1929); A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine,* 2 vols. (Paris 1948/51); A. Debidour, *Histoire des rapports de l'Église et de l'État en France de 1789 à 1870,* 2 vols. (Paris 1891); A. Debidour, *L'Église catholique et l'État sous la III^e Republique, 1870–1906,* 2 vols. (Paris 1906); A. Rivet, *Traité du culte catholique et des lois civiles d'ordre religieux* (Paris 1947); J. Brugerette, *Le prêtre français et la société contemporaine,* 3 vols. (Paris 1933–38); F. Boulard, *Essor ou déclin du clergé français* (Paris 1950); L. Baunard, *L'Épiscopat français depuis le Concordat jusqu'à la*

Séparation (Paris 1907); L. Baunard, *Un siècle de l'Église de France, 1800–1900* (Paris 1901); L. Grimaud, *Histoire de la liberté d'enseignement en France,* 6 vols. (Grenoble and Paris 1944–54); P. Nourisson, *Histoire légale des congrégations religieuses en France depuis 1789,* 2 vols. (Paris 1928); G. Le Bras, *Études de sociologie religieuse,* 2 vols. (Paris 1955–56); G. Weill, *Histoire de l'idée laïque en France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1929); A. Mellor, *Histoire de l'anticléricalisme français* (Paris 1966); P. Droulers, *Action pastorale et problèmes sociaux sous la Monarchie de Juillet chez Monseigneur d'Astros* (Paris 1954); E. Sevrin, *Un évêque militant et gallican au XIX^e siècle, Monseigneur Clausel de Montals,* 2 vols. (Paris 1955); F. Lagrange, *Vie de Monseigneur Dupanloup,* 3 vols. (Paris 1883–84); *DHGE* XIV, 1070–1122); A. de Falloux, *Mémoires d'un royaliste,* 2 vols. (Paris 1888); E. Veuillot, *Le comte de Falloux et ses Mémoires* (Paris 1888); C. de Ladoue, *Monseigneur Gerbet, sa vie, ses œuvres,* 3 vols. (Paris 1870); F. Gousset, *Le cardinal Gousset* (Besançon 1903); P. Delatte, *Dom Guéranger, abbé de Solesmes,* 2 vols. (Paris 1909–10); J. Paguelle de Follenay, *Vie du cardinal Guibert,* 2 vols. (Paris 1896); T. Foisset, *Vie du R. P. Lacordaire,* 2 vols. (Paris 1870); L. Baunard, *Le cardinal Lavigerie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1896); X. de Montclos, *Lavigerie, le Saint-Siège et l'Église, 1846–78* (Paris 1965); G. Bazin, *Vie de Monseigneur Maret,* 3 vols. (Paris 1891–92); F. Besson, *Vie de S. É. le cardinal Mathieu,* 2 vols. (Paris 1882); J. Leflon, *Eugène de Mazenod,* 3 vols. (Paris 1896–1902); A. d'Andigné, *Un apôtre de la charité, Armand de Melun* (Paris 1962); E. Lecanuet, *Montalembert,* 3 vols. (Paris 1896–1902); C. Guillemant, *P. -L. Parisis,* 3 vols. (Paris 1916–25); L. Baunard, *Histoire du cardinal Pie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1893); C. -J. Destombes, *Vie de S. É. le cardinal Régnier,* 2 vols. (Paris 1885); M. de Hédouville, *Monseigneur de Ségur, sa vie, son action* (Paris 1957); F. Poujoulat, *Vie de Monseigneur Sibour* (Paris 1857); M. J. Rouet de Journel, *Une russe catholique. La vie de Madame Swetchine* (Paris 1953); E. and F. Veuillot, *Louis Veuillot,* 4 vols. (Paris 1902–13).

ITALY: *Archiva Ecclesiae* 3/4 (1960–61), 87–179, 223–87; Silvino da Nadro, O.F.M.Cap., *Sinodi diocesani italiani. Catalogo bibliografico degli atti a stampa, 1574–1878* (Vatican City 1960); A. -C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni* (Turin 1963); P. Scoppola, *Chiesa e Stato nella storia d'Italia. Storia documentaria dall'Unità alla Repubblica* (Bari 1967); P. Scoppola *Dal Neoguelfismo alla Democrazia cristiana* (Rome 1957); A. Della Torre, *Il cristianesimo in Italia dai filosofisti ai modernisti* (Milan 1912); G. De Rosa, *Storia del movimento cattolico in Italia,* 2 vols. (Bari 1966); *I cattolici italiani dall'800 ad oggi* (Brescia 1964); T. Chiuso, *La Chiesa in Piemonte dal 1797 ai giorni nostri,* 4 vols. (Turin 1888); T. Salvemini, *La statistica ecclesiastica con speciale riguardo al clero in Italia* (Ferrara 1941); G. Spini, *Risorgimento e protestanti* (Naples 1956); C. Castiglioni, *Gaysruck e Romilli, arcivescovi di Milano* (Milan 1938); C. Castiglioni, *Monsignor Nazari di Calabiana* (Milan 1952); E. Federici, *Sisto Riario Sforza* (Rome 1945); G. Russo, *Il cardinale Sisto Riario Sforza e l'unità d'Italia* (Naples 1962); J. E. Borrel, *Vie de Monseigneur Charvaz* (Chambéry 1909); P. Stella, *Don Bosco nella storia della religiosità cattolica,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1968–69); A. Castellani, *Il b. Leonardo Murialdo,* 2 vols. (Rome 1966–68).

SPAIN: J. del Burgo, *Fuentes de la Historia de España. Bibliografia de las guerras carlistas y de las luchas políticas del siglio XIX,* 4 vols. (Pamplona 1954–60); V. de la Fuente, *Historia eclesiástica de España* VI (Barcelona 1875); P. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien* III/2 (Regensburg 1872, reprint Graz 1956); E. A. Peers, *The Church in Spain, 1737–1937* (London 1938); E. A. Peers, *Spain, the Church, and the Orders* (London 1939); J. M. Cuenca, *La Iglesia española ante la Revolución liberal* (Madrid 1971); J. Becker, *Relaciones diplomáticas entre España y la Santa Sede durante el siglio XIX* (Madrid 1909); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodojos españoles* VII (Madrid .1932).

BELGIUM: *Sources de l'histoire religieuse de la Belgique. Époque contemporaine. Colloque de Bruxelles 1967* (Louvain 1968); A. Simon, *Réunions des évêques de Belgique. Procès-verbaux, 1830–83,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1960–61); A. Simon, *Instructions aux nonces de Bruxelles, 1835–89* (Brussels 1961); R. Aubert, "Kirche und Staat in Belgien im 19. Jahrhundert," W. Conze, ed., *Beiträge zur deutschen und belgischen Verfassungsgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart 1967); V. Mallinson, *Power and Politics in Belgian Education, 1815–1961* (London 1963); A. Tihon, *Le clergé et l'enseignement moyen pour garçons dans le diocèse de Malines, 1802–1914* (diss., Louvain 1970); "Prêtres de Belgique, 1838–1930," *NRTh* 57 (1930), 617–744; S. Scholl, ed., *150 jaar katholieke arbeidersbeweging in Belgie, 1789–1939,* 3 vols. (Brussels 1963–66); N. Piepers, *La "Revue générale" de 1865 à 1940* (Louvain 1968).

PORTUGAL: F. de Almeida, *Historia da Igreja em Portugal* IV, 1/4 (Coimbra 1917–23); M. de Oliveira, *Historia eclesiástica de Portugal* (Lisbon 1940).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND: J. H. Whyte, "Historians of XIXth-century English Catholicism," *Clergy Review* 52 (1967), 791–801; G. A. Beck, ed., *The English Catholics, 1850–1950* (London 1950); D. Mathew, *Catholicism in England* (London 1936); P. J. Corish, ed., *A History of Irish Catholicism* IV/V (Dublin 1968seqq.); A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Schottland* (Mainz 1883); P. Thureau-Dangin, *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle,* 3 vols. (Paris 1899–1906); O. Chadwick, *The Victorian Church,* 2 vols. (London 1966–70); C. Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* 2 vols. (London 1926); W. Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman,* 2 vols. (London 1897); W. Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman,* 2 vols. (London 1912); E. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning,* 2 vols. (London 1895).

THE NETHERLANDS: L. J. Rogier, N. De Rooy, *In vrijheid herboren. Katholiek Nederland, 1853–1953* (The Hague 1957); P. Albers, *Geschiedenes van het herstel der hiërarchie in de Nederlanden,* 2 vols. (Nijmegen and The Hague 1903–04); A. Commissaris, *Van toen wij vrij werden, 1795–1903,* 2 vols. (Groningen 1929); J. Witlox, *De Katholieke Staatspartij,* 2 vols. ('s-Hertogenbosch 1919–27); J. A. De Kok, *Nederland op de breuklijn Rome-Reformatie. Numerieke aspecten van protestantisering en katholieke herleving in de Noordelijke Nederlanden, 1580–1880* (Assen 1964).

SWITZERLAND: A. Büchi, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz* (Munich 1902); T. Schwegler, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in der Schweiz* (Stans 1945); K. Müller, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz seit dem Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Einsiedeln 1928); F. Strobel, *Die Jesuiten und die Schweiz im 19. Jahrhundert* (Olten 1954).

SCANDINAVIA: A. Palmqvist, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche in Schweden nach 1781,* 2 vols. (Upsala 1954–58); K. Kjelstrup, *Norvegia catholica, 1843–1943* (Rome 1947); J. Metzler, *Die apostolischen Vikariate des Nordens* (Paderborn 1919).

RUSSIA AND POLAND: A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der Ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); A. Boudou, *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1922–25); E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum* II (Berlin 1961); W. Urban, *Ostatni etap dziejów Kościola w Polsce przed nowym tysiacleciem, 1815–1965* (Rome 1966); O. Beiersdorf, *Papietswo wobec sprawy polskiej w latach 1772–1864 wybor źrodel* (Wroclaw 1960); J. Wasilewski, *Arcybiskupi i administratorowie archidiecezji Mohylowskiej* (Pinsk 1930); J. A. Malinowski, *Die deutschen katholischen Kolonien am Schwarzen Meere* (Stuttgart 1927); S. Zaleski, *Jezuici w Polsce* V (Cracow 1907); J. Bjelogolovov, *Akten und Dokumente in Bezug auf die Organisation und Verwaltung der römisch-katholischen Kirche in Rußland* (St. Petersburg

1905); A. Welykyj, *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ukrainiae illustrantia* II (Rome 1954); S. Olszamowska-Skowronska, *La correspondance des papes et des empereurs de Russie (1814–78) selon les documents authentiques* (Rome 1970).

Southeastern Europe and the Near East: G. G. Golubovich, *Biblioteca bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente cristiano,* 8 vols. (Karachi 1906–30); E. von Mülinen, *Die lateinische Kirche im Türkischen Reiche* (Berlin 1903); F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans,* 2 vols. (Oxford 1929); A. Schopoff, *Les Réformes et la protection des chrétiens en Turquie, 1673–1904* (Paris 1904); G. Goyau, *Le protectorat de la France sur les chrétiens de l'Empire ottoman* (Paris 1895); J. Friedrich, *Die christlichen Balkanstaaten in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Munich 1916); B. Rupčič, *Entstehung der Franziskanerpfarreien in Bosnien und Herzegowina und ihre Entwicklung bis zum Jahre 1878* (Wroclaw 1937); I. Simrak, *Graeco-catholica Ecclesia in Jugoslavia* (Zagreb 1931); P. Tocanel, *Storia della Chiesa cattolica in Romania* III: *Il Vicariato apostolico e le missioni dei Frati Minori Conventuali in Moldavia,* 2 vols. (Padua 1960–65); K. Lübeck, *Die katholische Orientmission in ihrer Entwicklung dargestellt* (Cologne 1917); Hilaire de Barenton, O.F.M.Cap., *La France catholique en Orient durant les trois derniers siècles* (Paris 1912); *Les jésuites en Syrie, 1831–1931* (Paris 1931); A. Posseto, *Il patriarcato latino di Gerusalemme* (Milan 1938); F. de Portu, *Notice sur le diocèse de Smyrne et le vicariat apostolique de l'Asie Mineure* (Smyrna 1908).

United States: J. T. Ellis, *A Guide to American Catholic History* (Milwaukee 1959); C. R. Fish, *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives* (Washington 1911); T. McAvoy, "Catholic Archives and Manuscript Collections," *The American Archivist* 24 (1961), 409–14; P. Cadden, *The Historiography of the American Catholic Church, 1785–1943* (Washington 1944); H. J. Browne, "American Catholic History, A Progress Report, Research and Study," *CH* 26 (1957), 372–80; J. G. Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* 4 vols. (New York 1886–92); T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Notre Dame 1969); J. T. Ellis, *American Catholicism* (Chicago 1956); L. Hertling, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Berlin 1954); R. F. McNamara, "Etats-Unis," *DHGE* XV, 1109–47; A. Greeley, *The Catholic Experience. An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism* (Garden City 1968); F. Kenneally, *United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives,* 2 vols. (Washington 1966–68); J. T. Ellis, *Documents of American Catholic History* (Milwaukee 1956); D. Shearer, *Pontificia Americana. A Documentary History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1784–1884* (Washington 1933); P. Guilday, *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1910* (Washington 1923); P. Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore* (New York 1932); E. Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant kept the Faith? A Study of Immigration and Catholic Growth in the United States* (New York 1925); J. A. Burns, *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States* (New York 1912); J. A. Burns, J. Kohlbrenner, *A History of Catholic Education in the United States* (New York 1937); D. T. McColgan, *A Century of Charity: the first one hundred Years of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the United States,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1951); P. J. Dignan, *A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Property in the United States, 1784–1932* (Washington 1933); F. McDonald, *The Catholic Church and the Secret Societies in the United States* (New York 1946); R. Corrigan, *Die Propaganda-Kongregation und ihre Tätigkeit in Nord-Amerika* (Munich 1928); T. Roemer, *The Ludwig-Missionsverein and the Catholic Church in the United States, 1838–1918* (Washington 1933); R. Clarke, *Lives of Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States,* 3 vols. (New York 1888); J. B. Code, *Dictionary of the American Hierarchy* (New York 1940); R. Baudier, *The Catholic Church in Louisiana*

(New Orleans 1939); W. Casper, *History of the Catholic Church in Nebraska,* 3 vols. (Milwaukee 1960–66); R. Trisco, *The Holy See and the Nascent Church in the Middle Western United States* (Rome 1962); W. Schoenberg, *A Chronicle of the Catholic Historiography of the Pacific Northwest, 1743–1960* (Spokane 1962); E. V. O'Hara, *Pioneer Catholic History of Oregon* (Portland 1907); C. Blanchard, *History of the Catholic Church in Indiana,* 2 vols. (Logansport 1898); H. H. Heming, *The Catholic Church in Wisconsin* (Milwaukee 1895–98); J. F. Kempker, *History of the Catholic Church in Iowa* (Iowa City 1887); J. H. Lamott, *History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (New York 1921); M. J. Hynes, *History of the Diocese of Cleveland* (Cleveland 1953); G. Garraghan, *The Catholic Church in Chicago* (Chicago 1921); G. Paré, *The Catholic Church in Detroit* (Detroit 1951); J. Smith, *The Catholic Church in New York,* 2 vols. (New York 1905); L. J. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia 1909); F. J. Magri, *The Catholic Church in the City and Diocese of Richmond* (Richmond 1906); J. H. Bailey, *A History of the Diocese of Richmond, the Formative Years* (Richmond 1956); J. E. Rothensteiner, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis,* 2 vols. (St. Louis 1928); J. M. Reardon, *The Catholic Church in the Diocese of St. Paul* (St. Paul 1952); F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America* (Boston 1963); V. O'Daniel, *The Dominican Province of St. Joseph* (New York 1942); G. Herbermann, *The Sulpicians in the United States* (New York 1916); A. Gabriel, *The Christian Brothers in the United States* (New York 1948); M. de L. Walsh, *The Sisters of Charity of New York, 1809–1959,* 3 vols. (New York 1960); T. P. McCarty, *Guide to the Catholic Sisterhoods in the United States* (Washington 1964); W. Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (New York 1950); C. Olmstead, *History of Religion in the United States* (New Jersey 1960); S. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven 1972); S. Ahlstrom, *Theology in America: The Major Protestant Voices from Puritanism to Neo-Orthodoxy* (Indianapolis 1976); N. Burr, *A Critical Bibliography of Religion in America* (New Jersey 1961); N. Burr, *Religion in American Life* (New York 1971); L. Loetscher, *American Christianity: An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents,* 2 vols. (New York 1960–63); J. Brauer, *Reinterpretation in American Church History* (Chicago 1968); E. Gaustad, *Historical Atlas of Religion in America* (New York 1962); R. Handy, *A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada* (Oxford 1976); M. Marty, *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America* (New York 1970); A. Stokes, *Church and State in the United States,* 3 vols. (New York 1950); S. Mead, *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America* (New York 1963); E. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America* (New York 1965); W. McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham* (New York 1959); W. Kennedy, *The Shaping of Protestant Education: An Interpretation of the Sunday School and the Development of Protestant Educational Strategy in the United States, 1789–1860* (New York 1966); R. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York 1938); C. Griffin, *Their Brother's Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States, 1800–1865* (New Brunswick 1960); D. Riemers, *White Protestantism and the Negro* (New York 1975); R. Michaelson, *Piety in the Public Schools: Trends and Issues in the Relationship Between Religion and the Public School in the United States* (New York 1970); R. Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities* (New York 1971); K. Bailey, *Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century* (New York 1964); P. Gaston, *The New South Creed, A Study in Southern Mythology* (New York 1970); G. Lenski, *The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics, and Family Life* (New York 1961); M. Ewens, *The Role of the Nun in Nineteenth-Century America* (University of Minnesota 1971); B. J. Meiring, *Educational Aspects of the Legislation of the Councils of Baltimore, 1829*–1884 (diss., University of California 1963); P. Gleason, ed., *Documentary Reports on Early American Catholicism*

(New York 1978); A. H. Dorsey, *The Flemmings* (New York 1869); J. England, *The Works of the Right Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston,* 5 vols. (New York 1849); A. M. Greeley, "Catholicism in America: 200 Years and Counting," *The Critic* XXXIV (1976), 14–47, 54–170; H. J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1970* (Huntington 1971); R. F. Hueston, *The Catholic Press and Nativism, 1840–1860* (New York 1976); W. B. Faherty, *Dream by the River. Two Centuries of Saint Louis Catholicism, 1766–1967* (St. Louis 1973); J. P. Gallagher, *A Century of History: the Diocese of Scranton, 1869–1968* (Scranton 1968); R. H. Lord, J. E. Sexton, E. T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston in the various Stages of its Development 1604 to 1943,* 3 vols. (New York 1944); G. J. Garraghan, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States,* 3 vols. (New York 1938); J. Rippinger, "Some Historical Determinants of American Benedictine Monasticism, 1846–1900," *American Benedictine Review* XXVII (1976), 63–84; T. Radzialowski, "Reflections on the History of the Felicians in America," *Polish-American Studies* XXXII (1975), 19–28; J. M. Daley, *Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years* (Washington 1957); J. T. Ellis, *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington 1946); M. H. Sanfilippo, "Personal Religious Expressions of Roman Catholicism: A Transcendental Critique," *Catholic Historical Review* LXII (1976), 366–87; J. Dolan, *Catholic Revivalism in the United States, 1830–1900* (Notre Dame 1977); J. P. Gaffey, "Patterns of Ecclesiastical Authority: The Problem of the Chicago Succession," *Church History* XLII (1973), 257–70; D. Spalding, "Martin John Spalding's 'Dissertation on the American Civil War,'" *Catholic Historical Review* LII (1966), 66–85; J. R. G. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D. D., First Archbishop of New York* (New York 1969); T. W. Spalding, *Martin John Spalding: American Churchman* (Washington 1973); T. R. Ryan, *Orestes A. Brownson* (Huntington 1976); R. M. Leliaert, "The Religious Significance of Democracy in the Thought of Orestes A. Brownson," *Review of Politics* XXXVIII (1976), 3–26; P. H. Lemcke, *Life and Work of Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin* (London and New York 1940); J. Oetgen, *An American Abbott: Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B., 1809–1887* (Latrobe, Pa. 1976); P. L. Johnson, *Crosier on the Frontier: A Life of John Martin Henni, Archbishop of Milwaukee* (Madison 1959); P. L. Johnson, *Stuffed Saddlebags: The Life of Martin Kundig, Priest, 1805–1879* (Milwaukee 1942); P. Horgan, *Lamy of Santa Fe; His Life and Times* (New York 1975); V. R. Greene, *For God and Country: The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Ethnic Consciousness in America, 1860–1910* (Madison 1975); W. Galush, "The Polish National Catholic Church: A Survey of its Origins, Development and Missions," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* LXXXIII (1972), 131–49; A. Kuzniewski, "The Polish National Catholic Church—The View From People's Poland," *Polish-American Studies* XXXI (1974), 30–34; H. B. Leonard, "Ethnic Conflict and Episcopal Power: The Diocese of Cleveland, 1847–1870," *Catholic Historical Review* LXII (1976), 388–407; D. P. Killen, "Americanism Revisited: John Spalding and *Testem Benevolentiae,*" *Harvard Theological Review* LXVI (1973), 413–54; A. I. Abell, *American Catholicism and Social Action; A Search for Social Justice* (Garden City 1960); T. O. Hanley, ed., *The John Carroll Papers,* 3 vols. (Notre Dame 1976); P. Gleason, "The Main Sheet Anchor: John Carroll and Catholic Higher Education," *Review of Politics* XXXVIII (1976), 576–613; J. W. Sanders, *The Education of an Urban Minority: Catholicism in Chicago, 1833–1965* (New York 1977); V. P. Lannie, "The Emergence of Catholic Education in America," *Notre Dame Journal of Education* III (1973), 297–309.

CANADA: M. Sheehan, *A Current Bibliography of Canadian Church History: Canadian Historical Association Report;* D. de St-Denis, O.F.M.Cap., *L'Église catholique au Canada. Précis historique et statistique* (Montreal 1956); H. H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in*

Canada (Toronto 1956); J. S. Moir, *Church and State in Canada, 1627–1867. Basic documents* (Toronto 1967); L. Pouliot, "Canada," *DHGE* XI, 675–98; A. de Barbézieux, O.F.M.Cap., *Histoire de la province ecclésiastique d'Ottawa,* 2 vols. (Paris 1925); W. P. Bull, *From MacDonnell to McGuignan. The History of the Growth of the Roman Catholic Church in Upper Canada* (Toronto 1939); A. Morice, *Histoire de l'Église catholique dans l'Ouest canadien* III/IV (Winnipeg 1928); A. A. Johnston, *A History of the Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia* (Antigonish 1963); H. Têtu, *Les évêques de Québec. Notices biographiques* (Québec 1889); Mgr. Tangay, *Répertoire général du clergé canadien* (Montréal 1893); L. E. Hamelin, "Évolution numérique du clergé catholique dans le Québec," *Recherches sociographiques* 2 (1961), 189–243; *Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des évêques de Québec,* 9 volumes (Québec 1887–98). *Mandements, lettres pastorales et circulaires des évêques publiés dans le diocèse de Montréal,* 13 vols. (Montréal 1887–1926); J. Grant, *A History of the Christian Church in Canada,* 3 vols. (Toronto 1966–72); J. Moir, *Church and State in Canada, 1627–1867: Basic Documents* (Toronto 1967); P. Carrington, *The Anglican Church in Canada: A History* (Toronto 1963); W. Reid, *The Church of Scotland in Lower Canada: Its Struggle for Establishment* (Toronto 1936); M. Armstrong, *The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776–1809* (Hartford 1948); E. Norman, *The Conscience of the State in North America* (Cambridge 1968); S. Crysdale, *The Industrial Struggle and Protestant Ethic in Canada* (Toronto 1961); J. Grant, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (London 1967); C. Silcox, *Church Union in Canada: Its Causes and Consequences* (New York 1933); C. Sissons, *Church and State in Canadian Education* (Toronto 1959).

AUSTRALIA: P. F. Moran, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia,* 2 vols. (Sydney 1896); P. O'Farrell, *The Catholic Church in Australia, 1788–1967* (London 1968); P. O'Farrell, ed., *Documents in Australian Catholic History,* 2 vols. (London 1969).

LATIN AMERICA: R. Streit, J. Dindinger, *Bibliotheca Missionum* III (Freiburg i. Br. 1927); J. L. Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America* (Chapel Hill 1966); E. Ryan, *The Church in the South American Republics* (New York 1932); F. B. Pike, ed., *The Conflict between Church and State in Latin America* (New York 1964); J. J. Kennedy, *Catholicism, Nationalism and Democracy in Argentina* (Notre Dame 1958); J. S. Campobassi, *Laicismo y catolicismo en la educación pública argentina* (Buenos Aires 1961); F. López Menéndez, *Compendio de la historia eclesiástica de Bolivia* (La Paz 1965); P. F. da Silveria Camargo, *Historia eclesiástica do Brasil* (Petropolis 1955); J. Dornas Filho, *O padroado e la Igreja brasileira* (São Paulo 1939); Julio Maria, *A Religiâo: Livro do Centenario* I (Rio de Janeiro 1900); C. Silva Cotapos, *Historia eclesiástica de Chile* (Santiago de Chile 1925); M. Cruchaga Montt, *De las relaciones entre la Iglesia y el Estado en Chile* (Madrid 1929); J. M. Groot, *Historia eclesiástica y civil de Nueva Granada,* 4 vols. (Bogotá 1889–93); J. P. Restrepo, *Le Iglesia y el Estado en Colombia* (London 1885); B. E. Haddox, *Sociedad y religión en Colombia* (Bogotá 1965); J. Maramillo, *El pensiamento colombiano en el siglo XIX* (Bogotá 1964); J. T. Donoso, *La Iglesia ecuatoriana en el siglo XIX,* 2 vols. (Quito 1934–36); M. Cuevas, *Historia de la Iglesia en México,* V (Mexico 1928); J. Bravo Ugarte, *Diocesis y obispos de la Iglesia mexicana, 1519–1939* (Mexico 1941); J. Ramírez Cabañas, *Las relaciones entre México y el Vaticano* (Mexico 1928); G. Decorme, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la República Mexicana durante el siglo XIX,* 2 vols. (Guadalajara 1914–21); R. Vargas Ugarte, *Historia de la Iglesia en el Perú,* V (Burgos 1962); A. Watters, *A History of the Church in Venezuela, 1819–1930* (Chapell Hill 1933); F. B. Pike, "The Catholic Church in Central America," *RPol* 21 (1959), 83–113.

4. Catholic Churches with Eastern Rite

J. Hajjar, *Les chrétiens uniates du Proche-Orient* (Paris 1962); J. Hajjar, *L'apostolat des missionnaires latins dans le Proche-Orient selon les directives romaines* (Jerusalem 1956); S. Sidarous, *Les patriarcats dans l'Empire ottoman et spécialement en Égypte* (Paris 1907); *Statistica con cenni storici della gerarchia e dei fedeli di rito orientale* (Vatican City 1932); C. de Clercq, *Conciles des Orientaux catholiques,* 2 vols. (Paris 1949–52); *S. Congregazione per la Chiesa Orientale. Codificazione canonica orientale. Fonti,* 3rd ser. (Rome 1931seqq.); C. Charon (= C. Korolewski), *Histoire des patriarcats melkites* II/III (Rome and Paris 1910–11); A. D'Avril in *ROC* 3 (1898), 1–30, 265–81; T. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum* (Rome 1911); G. Beltrami, *La Chiesa caldea nel secolo dell'unione* (Rome 1933); M. Cramer, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten einst und heute. Eine Orientierung* (Wiesbaden 1959); V. Inglisian, *Hunderfünfzig Jahre Mechitaristen in Wien, 1811–1961* (Vienna 1961); The articles "Maronites," "Nestorienne (Église)," "Roumanie," "Syrienne (Église)," *DThC;* The articles "Alep," "Antioche," "Antonins," "Arménie," "Audo," "Beyrouth," "Constantinople," "Égypte," *DHGE.* E. Likowski, *Dzieje Kosciola unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku,* 2 vols. (Warsaw 1906); A. Korczok, *Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien* (Leipzig 1921); N. Nilles, *Symbolae ad illustrandam historiam Ecclesiae in terris Coronae S. Stephani,* 2 vols. (Innsbruck 1885); I. Radu, *Istoria diocezei romane-unite a Orazü-Mari* (Oradea Mare 1930).

5. Mission History

Bibliotheca Missionum, R. Streit, J. Dindinger, eds. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1916seqq.), VIII, XII–XIV, XVII–XXI, XXVII; *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (1622–1866), II (1867–1906), (Rome 1907); S. Delacroix, *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques* III: *Les Missions Contemporaines* (1800–1957), (Paris 1958); K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* IV/VI: *The Great Century* (New York 1941); A. Launay, *Histoire Générale de la Société des Missions Étrangères,* 3 vols. (Paris 1894); F. Schwager, *Die katholische Heidenmission der Gegenwart* I–IV (Steyl 1907).

6. Orders and Congregations

M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1932–34); M. Escobar, ed., *Ordini e Congregazioni religiose,* 2 vols. (Turin 1951–53); C. Tyck, *Notices historiques sur les congrégations et communautés religieuses et les instituts missionnaires du XIX^{e} siècle* (Louvain 1892); H. C. Wendlandt, *Die weiblichen Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche und ihre Wirksamkeit in Preußen von 1818 bis 1918* (Paderborn 1924); S. Hilpisch, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums* (Freiburg i. Br. 1929); P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoît* VI/VII (Maredsous 1948–56); P. Weissenberger, *Das benediktinische Mönchtum im 19./20. Jahrhundert* (Beuron 1958); L. F. Lekai, *Geschichte und Wirken der Weißen Mönche. Der Order der Cisterzienser* (Cologne 1958); N. Backmund, *Monasticon Praemonstratense,* 3 vols. (Straubing 1949–56); A. Walz, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome 1948); A. Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* VII (Paris 1915); H. Holzapfel, *Manuale historiae Ordinis FF. Minorum* (Freiburg i. Br. 1909); M. de Pobladura, *Historia generalis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum capucinorum* III (Rome 1951); R. Villoslada, *Manual de historia de la Compañia de Jesús* (Madrid 1954); P. Albers, *Liber saecularis historiae Societatis Iesu ab anno 1814 ad annum 1914* (Rome 1914); H. Azzolini in *AHSI* 2 (1933), 88–92; J. Burnichon, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France. Histoire d'un siècle.*

1814–1914, 4 vols. (Paris 1914–22); L. Frias, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en su Asistencia moderna de España,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1923–44); B. Basset, *The English Jesuits* (New York 1968); P. Galletti, *Memorie storiche intorno alla Provincia Romana della Compagnia di Gesù, 1814–1914* (Prato 1914); A. Monti, *La Compagnia di Gesù nel territorio della Provincia torinese* V (Chieri 1920); A. Aldegheri, *Breve storia della Provincia veneta della Compagnia di Gesù, 1814–1914* (Venice 1914); Volpe, *I Gesuiti nel Napoletano, 1804–1914,* 3 vols. (Naples 1914–15); F. Strobel, *Die Jesuiten und die Schweiz* (Olten 1955); G. Decorme, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la República mejicana durante el siglo XIX* (Guadalajara 1914); T. Hugues, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America* II/IV (New York 1908–14); A. Brou, *Cent ans de missions, 1815–1934. Les jésuites missionnaires au XIX^e et XX^e siècle* (Paris 1935); E. Hosp, *Die Kongregation des Allerheiligsten Erlösers* (Graz 1924). M. de Meulemeester, *Histoire sommaire de la Congrégation du T. S. Rédempteur* (Louvain 1958); G. Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institut des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes,* 9 vols. (Paris 1936–53); K. Zähringer, *Die Schulbrüder* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962); H. Neufeld, *Die Gesellschaft Mariens* (Munich 1962); P. Coste, G. Goyau, *Les Filles de la Charité* (Paris 1933). J. F. Devaux, *Les Filles de la Sagesse* II (Cholet 1955); L. Ziegler, *Die Armen Schulschwestern von Unserer Lieben Frau* (Munich 1935); A. Hillengass, *Die Gesellschaft vom heiligen Herz Jesu* (Stuttgart 1917).

7. HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^e siècle* 3 volumes (Brussels 1947–52); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg i. Br. 1933); L. Scheffczyk, *Theologie in Aufbruch und Widerstreit. Die deutsche katholische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bremen 1965).

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One

Between the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848

SECTION ONE

The Continuation of Catholic Renewal in Europe

1. *The Progress of Ultramontanism and the Growth of the International Orders*

LITERATURE

On the further development of ultramontanism there are several references in the tendentious work by J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Conzils I: Vorgeschichte* (Bonn 1877), 96–142, 200–226. Comprehensive descriptions by R. Aubert and Y. Congar in *L'Ecclésiologie au XIX^{e} siècle* (Paris 1960), 11–35, 97–104.

ON FRANCE: see vol. VII in this series, pp. 400–1, for the works by J. Martin and P. Poupard on the activity of the nuncios, as well as biographies of Guéranger, Montalembert, Gousset, and Parisis.

ON GERMANY: H. Becher, *Der deutsche Primas* (Colmar 1943), 175–223; F. Vigener in *HZ* 111 (1913), 565–81; the biographies (listed in the General Bibliography) of Geissel and Döllinger.

ON AUSTRIA: E. Winter, *Der Josephinismus* (Vienna 1962), 222–98 and F. Maaß, *Lokkerung und Aufhebung des Josephinismus 1820–50* (Vienna 1961).

ON THE GROWTH OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS UNDER THE GENERALSHIP OF P. ROOTHAAN: his biography by P. Albers (2 vols. [Nijmegen 1912]) to be supplemented by those by P. Pirri (Isola del Liri 1930) and R. G. North (Milwaukee 1944), and by *Io. Ph. Roothaan. Testimonia aequalium* (Rome 1935), the edition of his correspondence (5 vols. [Rome 1935–40]) and his *Opera spiritualia* (2 vols. [Rome 1936]). Also J. A. Otto, *Gründung der neuen Jesuitenmission durch General P. J. P. Roothaan* (Freiburg i. Br. 1939) and J. de Guibert, *La spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Rome 1953), 461–68. With respect to national developments, see the works (General Bibliography) by J. Burnichon for France, L. Frias for Spain, P. Galetti and Volpe for Italy, and F. Strobel for Switzerland.

On the Restoration of the Dominicans in France: in addition to the biographies of Lacordaire (see above, chap. 1, n. 16), those of P. Jandel (by H. Cormier [Paris 1890]) and P. Besson (by E. Cartier [Paris 1865]), a collection of documents by R. Devas, *Ex umbris. Letters and Papers hitherto unpublished of the Fathers Lacordaire, Jandel, Danzas* (Hawkesyard 1920); also *Année dominicaine* 1921, 118–20 and A. Duval in *AFP* 36 (1966), 493–542.

On the Restoration of the Benedictines in France: the works on Guéranger (chap. 1 above, n. 17) as well as the biographies of Dom Pitra (by F. Cabrol [Paris 1891] and by A. Battandier [Paris 1896]), of Dom Couturier (by A. Houtin [Angers 1899]) and of Dom Gauthey (by R. B. Laure [Grenoble 1944]).

2. *Old and New in Pastoral Care and Moral Theology*

Literature

F. X. Arnold, *Grundsätzliches und Geschichtliches zur Theologie der Seelsorge* (Freiburg i. Br. 1949); F. X. Arnold, *Seelsorge aus der Mitte der Heilsgeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br. 1956), 152–95; H. Schuster, *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie,* ed. by F. X. Arnold et al., I (Freiburg im Breisgau 1964), 47–76; H. J. Müller, *Die ganze Bekehrung. Das zentrale Anliegen des Theologen und Seelsorgers J. M. Sailer* (Regensburg 1949); A. Schrott, *Seelsorge im Wandel der Zeiten* (Graz 1949), 153–266; Schnabel, *G* IV, especially 50–56, 270–76; M. H. Vicaire in *Histoire illustrée de l'Église* II (Geneva 1948), 261–326; P. Broutin, "L. Querbes. Recherches sur l'évolution de la pastorale au XIX^e siècle," *NRTh* 81 (1959), 696–720; E. Vercesi-E. Santini, *La sacra eloquenza dal sec. XVII ai nostri giorni* (Milan 1930).

On Catechetics: *DThC* II, 1951–67; F. H. Thalhofer, *Entwicklung des katholischen Katechismus in Deutschland von Canisius bis Deharbe* (Freiburg i. Br. 1899); F. X. Arnold, *Dienst am Glauben* (Freiburg i. Br. 1948), 31–92; B. Dreher, *Die biblische Unterweisung im evangelischen und katholischen Religionsunterricht* (Freiburg i. Br. 1963), 9–55; H. Kreutzwald, *Zur Geschichte des biblischen Unterrichts* (Freiburg i. Br. 1957), 107–79; J. Hofinger, *Geschichte des Katechismus in Österreich* (Innsbruck 1937), 238–77; P. Broutin, "Le mouvement catéchistique en France au XIX^e siècle," *NRTh* 82 (1960), 494–512, 607–32, 699–715.

On Moral Theology during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century: B. Häring, *Das Gesetz Christi* I (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 62–64; J. Diebolt, *La théologie morale catholique en Allemagne 1750–1850* (Strasbourg 1926), 166–354; P. Hadrossek, *Die Bedeutung des Systemgedankens für die Moraltheologie in Deutschland seit der Thomas-Renaissance* (Munich 1950); 76–214; F. Steinbüchel, *Der Zerfall des christlichen Ethos im 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt 1951).

On the Progress of the Liguoric Moral: I. von Döllinger and F. H. Reusch, *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche* I (Nördlingen 1889); 462–76; G. Cacciatore, *S. Alfonso de'Liguori e il Giansenismo* (Florence 1944), 440–59; J. Guerber, "Le rôle de P. B. Lanteri dans l'introduction de la morale ligorienne en France," *Spicilegium Historiae Congreg. SS. Redemptoris* 4 (1956), 343–76; M. de Meulemeester, "Introduction de la morale de S. Alphonse de Liguori en Belgique," *EThL* 16 (1939), 468–84.

3. *Catholic Thought Searching for New Ways*

LITERATURE

Hocedez II; J. Bellamy, *La théologie catholique au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1904); L. Scheffczyk, *Theologie im Aufbruch und Widerstreit. Die deutsche katholische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bremen 1925); C. Werner, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie. Seit dem Trienter Concil bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1867).

HERMESIANISM: H. Schrörs, *Ein vergessener Führer der Rheinischen Geistesgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Bonn 1925); H. Schrörs, *Die Kölner Wirren 1837* (Cologne 1927); H. Schrörs, "Hermesianische Pfarrer," *Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein* 103 (1919), 76–183; H. Bastgen, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Kirchenpolitik Gregors XVI.* (Paderborn 1929), 18–74, 245–77, 437–548; S. Merkle in *HJ* 60 (1940); 179–220; J. Pritz, *Franz Werner* (Freiburg i. Br. 1957); G. Schönig, *A.J. Binterim* (Düsseldorf 1933); Hocedez I, 195–203, II, 37–39; B. Guzzetti, *La perdita della fede nei cattolici* (Venegono 1940), 41–73; D. Gla, *Repertorium der katholisch-theologischen Literatur* I/2 (Paderborn 1904), 355–70.

GÜNTHERIANISM: F. P. Knoodt, *A. Günther,* 2 vols. (Vienna 1881; tendentious, but well-informed); E. Winter, *Die geistige Entwicklung Anton Günthers und seiner Schule* (Paderborn 1931); P. Wenzel, *Das wissenschaftliche Anliegen des Güntherianismus* (Essen 1961); P. Wenzel, *Der Freundeskreis um Anton Günther* (Essen 1965; consult also U. Engelmann in *Erbe und Auftrag* 42 [1966], 240–45); J. Pritz, *Glauben und Wissen bei Anton Günther. Eine Einführung in sein Leben und Werk* (Vienna 1963); A. Dempf, *Weltordnung und Heilsgeschichte* (Eichstätt 1958); K. Beck, *Offenbarung und Glaube bei Anton Günther* (Vienna 1967); Hocedez II, 39–59.

TÜBINGEN AND MUNICH: in addition to the general works listed above: J. R. Geiselmann, *Die katholische Tübinger Schule* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1964); M. Miller, "Die Tübinger katholisch-theologische Fakultät und die württembergische Regierung 1835–46," *ThQ* 132 (1952), 22–45, 213–34; S. Lösch, "Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät zu Tübingen und Gießen 1830–50," *ThQ* 108 (1927), 159–208 (about Gießen); A. Schuchert, "Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät an der Universität Gießen", *Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz* 1 (1946), 64–75; H. Witetschek, "Die Bedeutung der theologischen Fakultät der Universität München für die kirchliche Erneuerung in der letzten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts," *HJ* 86 (1966), 107–37; A. Lauscher, *Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät der Universität zu Bonn* (Düsseldorf 1920); S. Lösch, *Professor A. Gengler. Die Beziehungen der Bamberger Theologen zu Döllinger und Möhler* (Würzberg 1963; letters from the years 1827–43); J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger* I/II (Munich 1899; numerous documents); J. Zinkl, *Magnus Jocham. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der katholischen Theologie und Frömmigkeit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg i. Br. 1950).

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: Simon, *Sterckx* I, 260–93; L. van der Essen, *L'Université de Louvain* (Brussels 1945), 279–81; *EThL* 9 (1932), 608–704; A. Franco, "Geschiedenis van het traditionalisme aan de Universiteit te Leuven 1835–67" (typed diss., Louvain 1956); J. Henry, "Le traditionalisme et l'ontologisme à l'Université de Louvain," *Annales de l'Institut supérieur de philosophie* 5 (Louvain 1922), 42–149; A. Simon, "Le cardinal Sterckx et al condamnation de Ubaghs en 1843," *Collectanea Mechliniensia* 16 (Mechelen 1946), 639–44.

TENTATIVE INITIATIVES OF CATHOLIC INTELLECTUALS IN FRANCE: J. R. Derré, *Lamennais, ses amis et le mouvement des idées à l'époque romantique* (Paris 1962), 461–728; L. Foucher, *La philosophie catholique en France au XIX^e siècle avant la renaissance thomiste* (Paris 1955), 51–195; N. Hötzel, *Die Uroffenbarung im französischen Traditionalismus* (Munich 1962), 115–384; Brugerette I, 84–97; H. Bremond, *La littérature religieuse d'avant-hier et d'aujourd'hui* (Paris 1906), 3–21; P. Moreau, *Le Romantisme* (Paris 1932), 296–317; P. Fernessole, *Les conférenciers de Notre-Dame I: Genèse et fondation* (Paris 1935); *Lettres de Frédéric Ozanam II: Premières années à la Sorbonne,* ed. by J. Caron (Paris 1971).

SECTION TWO

The Ascension of Pius IX and the Crisis of 1848

4. *The First Years of the Pontificate of Pius IX: From the Neoguelf Mythos to the Roman Revolution*

LITERATURE

ON THE REVOLUTION OF 1848: an excellent comprehensive treatment is that by L. Salvatorelli, *La rivoluzione europea 1848–49* (Milan 1949). Also Hermelink II, 40–95. On the shifting fortunes of the Church during this period, there are Aubert, 11–71, 505–10; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 6–45; Hales, 17–133.

ON GIOVANNI MASTAI BEFORE HIS ELECTION: in addition to the biographies mentioned below on p. 357, A. Serafini, *Pio nono* I (Rome 1958; numerous letters and other documents); G. Pontrandolfi, *Pio IX e Volterra* (Volterra 1928); G. L. Masetti-Zannini in *Bolletino del Mueso del Risorgimento di Bologna* 2 (1957), 91–148; G. L. Masetti-Zannini in *RSTI* 14 (1960), 283–98; L. Valentini in *SC* 87 (1959), 321–43; P. Leturia, "El viaje a América del futuro Pio IX," *Xenia Piana* (Rome 1943), 367–444; G. Margotti, *Pio IX ed il suo episcopato nelle diocesi di Spoleto e Imola* (Turin 1877); L. Rivera in *RStRis* 19 (1932), 205–20; F. Minoccheri, *Pio IX ad Imola e a Roma. Memorie,* ed. by A. M. Bonetti (Naples 1892); *Pio IX da vescovo a pontefice. Lettere al cardinale Amat 1832–48,* ed. by G. Maioli (Modena 1949); R. Fontini in *Archiginnasio* 57 (1962), 274–98.

ON THE CONCLAVE OF 1846: T. Buttini in *RStRis* 27 (1940), 41–68; Engel-Janosi I, 4–19.

ON THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF THE PONTIFICATE: A. -M. Ghisalberti, *Nuove ricerche sugli inizi del pontificato di Pio IX* (Rome 1940); P. Pirri, "L'amnistia di Pio IX," *RSTI* 8 (1954), 207–32; P. Pirri, "Massimo d'Azeglio e Pio IX al tempo del quaresimale della moderazione," *RSTI* 3 (1949), 191–234; R. Quazza, *Pio IX e Massimo d'Azeglio nelle vicende romane del 1847,* 2 vols. (Modena 1957); R. Lefèvre, "Le riforme di Pio IX e la liberta di stampa," *Studi romani* 3 (1955), 667–94; Jemolo, 13–48; A. Anzilotti, *La funzione storica del giobertismo* (Florence 1924); L. de Ruggiero, "Inghilterra e Stato pontificio nel primo triennio del pontificato di Pio IX," *ADRomana* 76 (1953), 51–172; L. P. Wallace, *Pius IX and Lord Palmerston 1846–1849: Power, Public Opinion and Diplomacy* (Durham 1959), 3–46; A. Filipuzzi, *Pio IX e la politica austriaca in Italia dal 1815 al 1848 nella relazione di R. Weiss* (Florence 1958); Engel-Janosi I, 20–37; M. Gualdi, *I primi anni del pontificato di Pio IX, la celebre benedizione e la questione romana* (Carpi 1952); G. Quazza, "Sull'origine della proposta di Pio IX per la Lega doganale," *RStRis* 40 (1953), 357–70; P. Pirri, "La politica unitaria di Pio IX dalla lega doganale alla lega italica," *RSTI* 2 (1948), as well as the other two articles by the same author in the same journal, 1 (1947), 38–84, and 4 (1950), 399–446; J. Anelli Stefanutti, *La lega italica promossa da Pio IX* (Tarcento 1951; on the role of Monsignor Corbolli-Bussi); R. Cessi, *Il mito di Pio IX* (Udine 1953); F. Carollo, *La missione de Antonio Rosmini a Roma* *nel 1848* (Palermo 1942); A. Baviera, "La corrispondenza diplomatica del P. Ventura incaricato del governo siciliano a Roma," *Miscellanea Di Carlo II* (Trapani 1960), 7–60; C. Riva, "La missione diplomatica di Rosmini a Roma nel 1848–49," *Studium* 63 (1967), 13–27.

THE ROMAN REVOLUTION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES: A. de Liedekerke, *Rapporti delle cose di Roma 1848–1849,* ed. by A. M. Ghisalberti (Rome 1949); *La diplomazia del Regno di Sardegna durante la prima guerra d'indipendenza II: Relazioni con lo Stato pontificio,* ed. by C. Baudi de Vesme (Turin 1951); E. Brazão, *Relações diplomáticas de Portugal com a Santa Sede. Um ano drámatico, 1848* (Lisbon 1969); A. Capograssi, *La conferenza di Gaeta del 1849* (Rome 1941; to be complemented by A. Ghisalberti in *RStRis* 40 [1953], 235–37); P. Pirri, *Pio IX e Vittorio Emanuele II dal loro carteggio privato I* (Rome 1944), 1–49, 1–83; E. di Carlo, "Lettere inedite del P. Ventura a Rosmini, nov. 1848–gen. 1849," *Regnum Dei* 20 (1964), 5–43; M. Degros, *Rome et les États pontificaux sous l'occupation étrangère* (Paris 1950).

In addition to general works, especially C. Spellanzon, *Storia del Risorgimento* IV, V, VII (Milan 1938–61) and G. J. Berkely, *Italy in the Making 1846–48* (Cambridge 1936–40), see especially G. Quazza, *La questione romana nel 1848–49* (Modena 1947); D. Massé, *Pio IX e il gran tradimento del '48* (Alba 1948); D. Demarco, *Pio IX e la rivoluzione romana del 1848* (Modena 1947; on economic and social causes); C. Minnocci, *P. Sterbini e la rivoluzione romana* (Maricianise 1967); J. Leflon in *AHPont* 1 (1963), 385–402; Engel-Janosi, 38–60; L. Rodelli, *La Repubblica romana del 1849* (Pisa 1955); M. Cessi Drudi, "Contributi alla storia della Conferenza di Gaeta," *RStRis* 46 (1959), 219–72; A. M. Ghisalberti, *Roma da Mazzini a Pio IX* (Rome 1958; the best treatment of the restoration of papal power); L. Pásztor, "La Segreteria di Stato di Pio IX durante il triennio 1848–50," *Annali della Fondazione italiana per la storia amministrativa* 3 (1966), 308–65.

5. *The Consequences of the Events of 1848 in France*

SOURCES

In addition to the *Moniteur universel* (for parliamentary debates), *Univers, Ami de la Religion,* and *Ère nouvelle,* see especially the memoirs of A. de Falloux (Paris 1888) and of A. de Melun II (Paris 1891) as well as the notes and letters of Montalembert, ed. by A. Trannoy in *RH* 192 (1941), 253–89.

LITERATURE

In addition to the biographies of Montalembert, Veuillot, Dupanloup, Lacordaire, Maret, Melun, Sibour, Parisis, and Clausel (General Bibliography), see J. Leflon, *L'Église de France et la révolution de 1848* (Paris 1948); Aubert, *Pie IX,* 40–57, 508–9; Gurian, 185–210; Duroselle, 291–490; H. Cabane, *Histoire du clergé de France pendant la Révolution de 1848* (Paris 1908); R. Limouzin-Lamothe and J. Leflon, *Monsigneur Denis Auguste Affre* (Paris 1971), 301–61; F. Isambert in *ArchSR* 6 (1958), 7–35; M. Vincienne, *Notes sur la situation religieuse de la France en 1848;* R. Rancoeur, *Bibliographie des traveaux publiés sur le centenaire de 1848* (Paris 1949).

ON THE PROVINCIAL COUNCILS: their decrees are published in *ColLac* IV. See G. Darboy in *Le Correspondant* 27 (1851), 193–218; E. Sevrin, *Monsigneur Clausel* II, 539–56.

ON THE FALLOUX LAW: H. Michel, *La Loi Falloux* (Paris 1906); F. Ponteil, *Histoire de l'enseignement* (Paris 1966), 227–45; A. Prost, op. cit. (General Bibliography), 173–77. On the preparation: *La commission extra-parlementaire de 1849. Texte intégral inédit des procès-verbaux,* ed. by G. Chenesseau (Paris 1937).

6. *The Consequences of the 1848 Revolution in the States of the German Confederation and the Netherlands*

SOURCES

Verhandlungen der ersten Versammlung des katholischen Vereins Deutschlands . . . (Mainz 1848); *ColLac* V, 941–1126 (Würzburg Bishops' Conference); L. Bergsträsser, *Dokumente des politischen Katholizismus* I (Munich 1921); Huber, *Dokumente I* (see bibliography chapter 7). Selections: E. Heinen, *Staatliche Macht und Katholizismus in Deutschland* I (Paderborn 1969).

LITERATURE

GENERAL: Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* III (Mainz 1902), ed. by J. B. Kißling (Münster 1905); Schmidlin, *PG* II, 135f., 162ff.; Aubert, *Pie IX* (Fliche-Martin 21), 57–63; Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789* II (Stuttgart 1960), 685ff., 703ff., 778ff., III (Stuttgart 1963), 105ff., 114–20, 155; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 329, 333, 335f., 337; Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1963); 55–72; Hubert Jedin, "Freiheit und Aufstieg des deutschen Katholizismus 1848–70," *Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge* II (Freiburg 1966), 469–84. For Austria: Maaß, *Josephinismus* V; E. Tomek, *Kirchengeschichte Österreichs* III, 686–713; E. Weinzierl-Fischer, *Die österreichischen Konkordate von 1855 und 1933,* 26–59; F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* I (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1958), chaps. 3, 4; M. Hussarek, "Die Verhandlung des Konkordates vom 18. August 1855," *AÖG* 109 (1921).

BIOGRAPHIES: Andlaw: by F. Dor (Fribourg 1910); Binterim: C. Schönig, *Anton Josef Binterim (1779–1855) als Kirchenpolitiker und Gelehrter* (Düsseldorf 1933); Buß: by F. Dor (Fribourg 1910); Diepenbrock: by H. Förster (Wroclaw ^{3}1878), by J. H. Reinkens (Leipzig 1881); Döllinger: J. Friedrich, *I. v. Döllinger* I, II (Munich 1889), G. Schwaiger, *I. v. Döllinger* (Munich 1963), J. Finsterhölzl, *I. v. Döllinger* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1969); Geissel: by J. A. F. Baudrie (Cologne 1881), by O. Pfülf (2 vols. [Fribourg 1895–96]); Radowitz: E. Ritter, *Radowitz* (Cologne 1948); Rauscher: C. Wolfsgruber, *Joseph Othmar Cardinal Rauscher* (Fribourg 1888).—F. Vigener, Ketteler. *Ein deutsches Bischofsleben des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich 1924); L. Lenhart, *Bischof Ketteler,* 3 vols. (Mainz 1966–68); H. Brück, *Adam Franz Lenning* (Mainz 1870); L. von Pastor, *August Reichensperger,* 2 vols. (Fribourg 1899); F. Schmidt, *Peter Reichensperger* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1913); C. Wolfsgruber, *Friedrich Kardinal zu Schwarzenberg,* 3 vols. (Vienna and Leipzig 1906–17).

Union Movement, Catholic Congresses: J. B. Kißling, *Geschichte der deutschen Katholikentage* I (Münster 1920); L. Lenhart, ed., *Idee, Gestalt und Gestalter des 1. deutschen Katholikentages in Mainz 1848* (Mainz 1948); K. Buchheim in *LThK* VI, 69–72.

Political Catholicism: Bergsträsser, *Studien;* F. Schnabel, *Der Zusammenschluß des politischen Katholizismus in Deutschland im Jahre 1848* (Heidelberg 1910); Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* II (Cologne 1927; Reprint Aalen 1967), 1–95; K. Repgen, *Märzbewegung und Maiwahlen des Revolutionsjahres 1848 im Rheinland* (Bonn 1955); K. Repgen, "Klerus und Politik 1848," *Festschrift für F. Steinbach* (Bonn 1960); K. Repgen in *LThK* IV, 259ff.

Bishops' Conferences: F. H. Vering in *AkathKR* 21, 22 (1869); H. Storz, *Staat und katholische Kirche in Deutschland im Lichte der Würzburger Bischofsdenkschrift von 1848* (Bonn 1934); P. Leisching, *Die Bischofskonferenz. Studien zu ihrer Rechtsgeschichte mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Entwicklung in Österreich* (Vienna and Munich 1963), 76–149; R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg 1964), 14–56.

The Netherlands: Rogier, *KathHerleving* 50–275 (also *Schrikbeeld van een staatsgreep in 1853* [Amsterdam 1959]) and Albers, *Herstel* are the main sources, to be complemented by J. Witlox, *Studien over het herstel der hierarchie in 1853* (Tilburg 1928) and A. Bronkhorst, *Rondom 1853. De Aprilbeweging* (The Hague 1953); A. Commissaris, op. cit. (General Bibliography); J. M. Gijsen, *J.A. Paredis, bisschop van Roermond* (Assen 1968); G. Homan in *CHR* 52 (1966–67), 201–11; J. Schokking, *Historisch-juridische schets van de wet van 10.9 1853* (Amsterdam 1894); J. B. van Hugenpoth, *De kloosters in Nederland in 1861* (Utrecht 1861; polemical); D. van Wely in *Bijdragen voor de geschiedenis van de prov. der Minderbroaders in de Nederlands* 14 (1964), 101–259; L. Rogier, "A. Thijm en de katholieke herleving," *Annalen van het Thijmgenootschap* 37 (1949), 1–23.

Part Two
The Catholic Reaction to Liberalism

Introduction: *Pius IX after 1848*

SOURCES

Acta Pii IX, 7 vols. (Rome 1854–78); *Atti del S.P. Pio IX,* 2 vols. (Rome 1857); A. Marcone, *La parola di Pio IX ovvero discorsi e detti di S. Santità,* 2 vols. (Genoa 1864–71); *ASS,* Yearbooks beginning 1865; P. Pirri, *Pio IX e Vittorio Emanuele dal loro carteggio privato,* 3 vols. (Rome 1944–61; also extensive correspondence with persons other than Victor Emmanuel); S. Jacini, *Il tramonto del potere temporale nelle relazioni degli ambasciatori austriaci a Roma 1860/70* (Bari 1931); N. Blakiston, *The Roman Question. Extracts from the Despatches of O. Russell from Rome 1858/70* (London 1962); *Romana . . . Beatificationis et Canonizationis servi Dei Pii IX S.P. Tabella testium et Summarium. Positio super introductione causae,* 2 vols. (Rome 1954); *Elenchus scriptorum quae in Santa Sedis archivis adservantur* (Rome 1954), *Appendix ad Elenchum scriptorum* (Rome 1955), *Positio super virtutibus,* 3 vols. (Rome 1961–62).

LITERATURE

In addition to the general church histories (see General Bibliography), consult Schmidlin, *PG* II, 1–330; Aubert, *Pie IX;* C. Pouthas, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (Cours de Sorbonne, 1945); E. Hales, *Pius IX. A Study in European Politics and Religion in the XIXth Century* (London 1954); *DThC* XII, 1686–1716; *ECatt* IX, 1510–23.

BIOGRAPHIES OF PIUS IX: There exists as yet no critical biography of Pius IX. Most of the descriptions of his life which appeared during the nineteenth century are nothing more than panegyrics; among those to be mentioned are L. Wappmannsperger, (Regensburg 1879), J. M. Stepischnegg (2 vols. [Vienna 1879]); C. Sylvain (3 vols. [Paris 1885]) and A. Pougeois (6 vols. [Paris 1877–86]). Among more recent works there are A. Monti, *Pio IX nel Risorgimento italiano* (Bari 1928); F. Hayward, *Pie IX et son temps* (Paris 1948); D. Massé, *Pio IX papa e principe italiano* (Modena 1957); P. Fernessole, *Pie IX, pape,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960–63, in need of criticism; also *CivCatt* [1961] II, 63–64 [1964], II, 59–60; *RHE* 59 [1964], 198–204); Aubert-Martina, 839–48.

THE ROMAN CURIA UNDER PIUS IX: In addition to Aubert, *Pie IX,* 280–86, S. Nigro, *Seconda Roma 1850/70* (Milan 1941) and F. Hayward, op cit., see the memoirs of contemporaries, especially A. Flir, *Briefe aus Rom* (Innsbruck 1864); H. d'Ideville, *Journal II Rome 1862/64* (Paris 1873); K. von Schlözer, *Römische Briefe 1864/69* (Stuttgart 1913); J. Acton in *Cambridge Historical Journal* 8 (1946), 186–204; *La Curia romana e i Gesuiti* (Florence 1861; polemical); *La Crise d'Église* (Paris 1878; polemical).

SECTION ONE

The Temporary Improvement in the Situation of the Church

7. *The Seeming Success of the Church in France during the Second Empire and the "Moral Order"*

SOURCES

Pastoral letters of bishops in J. -P. Migne, *Orateurs sacrés,* 2nd Ser. (Paris 1856–66); the correspondence of L. Veuillot (12 vols. [Paris 1931–32]), A. Cochin (2 vols. [Paris 1926]), Lacordaire (see *LThK* VI, 726), Montalembert (see *LThK* VII, 294); the memoirs of Monsignor Mabile (ed. by P. Mabile, 2 vols. [Paris 1926]), A. de Melun (2 vols. [Paris 1891]), M. du Camp *(La charité privée à Paris, 1885),* A. de Broglie (2 vols. [Paris 1938]), H. Loyson (A. Houtin, *Le Père Hyazinth dans l'Église romaine* [Paris 1920]), H. Taine (*Carnets de voyage, 1863–65* [Paris 1897]), Abbé Frémond (ed. by A. Siegfried, I [Paris 1933]); the Catholic press (especially *L'Univers, Le Monde, L'Ami de la religion, Le Français, Annales de la charité, Revue de l'enseignement chrétien, Correspondant, Études,* and *La France ecclésiastique*); the *Journal officiel* (for the discussion of those laws after 1870 concerning religious affairs).

LITERATURE

Basic are J. Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du Second Empire* (Paris 1930, complementing the anticlerical work by Debidour, *Histoire*); J. Gadille, *La pensée et l'action politique des évêques français au début de la III^e^ République,* 2 vols. (Paris 1976); Lecanuet I (liberal-Catholic point of view); Debidour, *III^e^ République* I (a layman's view); E. Barbier, *Histoire du catholicisme libéral et du catholicisme social en France 1870–1914* I (Paris 1924, antiliberal point of view); the Sorbonne lectures by C. Pouthas, *L'Église et les questions religieuses en France de 1848 à 1877* (Paris 1945). In addition to the two works by L. Baunard and the works by G. Rigault and J. Burnichon, see Aubert, *Pie IX,* 108–31, 373–84, 517–19, 549–50; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 120–29; *HistCathFr,* 297–415; Gurian, 210–49; Brugerette I, 165–294, II, 3–151; C. A. Gimpl, *The "Correspondant" and the Founding of the French Third Republic* (Washington 1959); the biographies listed in the General Bibliography of Dupanloup, Gerbet, Guéranger, Guibert, Lacordaire, Lavigerie, Maret, Montalembert, Parisis, Pie, Regnier, Ségur, and Veuillot; to be added are J. Foulon, *Histoire de Monseigneur Darboy* (Paris 1899) and *DHGE* XIV, 84–86; H. Boissonot, *Le cardinal Meignan* (Paris 1899); G. Gautherot, *E. Keller* (Paris 1922); M. de Marcey, *Ch. Chesnelong,* 3 vols. (Paris 1903); L. Baunard, *Kolb-Bernard* (Paris 1899).

ON WORKS AND MANIFESTATIONS OF CATHOLIC LIFE: Duroselle, 495–710; H. Rollet, *L'action sociale des catholiques en France* I (Paris 1947), 11–65; A. de Melun, *Manuel des œuvres* (Paris 1878); E. Keller, *Les congrégations religieuses en France* (Paris 1880; statistical indices); L. Baunard, *E. Lelièvre* (Paris 1907); J. Schall, *A. Baudon* (Paris 1897); A. d'Andigné, *A. de Melun* (Paris 1962); M. Lynch, *The Organised Social Apostolate of A. de Mun* (Washington 1952).

ON THE CLERGY: F. Garilhe, *Le clergé séculier français au XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris 1898); L. Bougaud, *Le grand péril de l'Église de France au XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris 1878) and the work by F. Boulard listed in the General Bibliography; J. -F. Six, *Un prêtre, A. Chevrier, fondateur du Prado* (Paris 1965).

ON DENOMINATIONAL INSTRUCTION: Maurain, op. cit.; A. Prost, op. cit., 177–90 and J. Rohr, *V. Duruy. Essai sur la politique de l'Instruction publique au temps de l'Empire libéral* (Paris 1967).

ON RELIGIOUS PRACTICE: In addition to the works by G. Le Bras (General Bibliography), see especially C. Marcilhacy, *Le diocèse d'Orléans au milieu du XIXᵉ siècle* (Paris 1964) and *Le diocèse d'Orléans sous l'épiscopat de Monseigneur Dupanloup* (Paris 1962); G. Duveau, *La pensée ouvrière sur l'éducation pendant la IIᵉ République et le Second Empire* (Paris 1948), especially 185–96; P. Pierrard, *La vie ouvrière à Lille sous le Second Empire* (Paris 1965), 362–427; F. A. Isambert, *Christianisme et classe ouvrière* (Paris and Tournai 1960); Y. -M. Hilaire in *L'information historique* 25 (1963), 57–69, 29 (1967), 31–35; by the same author, "Les missions intérieures durant la seconde moitié du XIXᵉ siècle dans la région du Nord," *Revue du Nord 46 (1964), 51*–68 and "Remarques sur la pratique religieuse dans le bassin houiller du Pas-de-Calais dans la seconde moitié du XIXᵉ siècle," *Charbon et sciences humaines* (Paris and The Hague 1966), 265–79.

ON THE PROGRESS OF ANTICLERICALISM: Mellor, 286–318; Weill, *Idée laïque,* 121–244; A. Dessoye, *Jean Macé et la fondation de la Ligue de l'enseignement* (Paris 1883); G. Duveau, *Les instituteurs* (Paris 1954); L. Capéran, *Histoire contemporaine de la laïcité française* I (Paris 1958), 1–94.

8. *The States of the German Confederation and Switzerland, 1848–70*

SOURCES

Amtliche Tagungsberichte der Generalversammlungen (Katholikentage) 1849seqq.; ColLac V (Provincial Councils and Bishops' Conferences); *Aktenstücke betreffend die Fuldaer Bischofskonferenzen 1867–88* (Cologne 1889); Bergsträsser, *Dokumente* I (see biblio. chapter 6); *I. v. Döllinger-Lord Acton, Briefwechsel,* ed. by V. Conzemius, I:1850–69, II: 1869–70 (Munich 1963, 1965); Heinen, *Staatliche Macht und Katholizismus in Deutschland* I (Paderborn 1969).

LITERATURE

GENERAL: Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* III, ed. by J. B. Kißling (Münster 1905); J. B. Kißling, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes im Deutschen Reich I: Die Vorgeschichte* (Freiburg 1911); Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* II, 96–410; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 136–41, 162–79, 191ff.; Aubert, *Pie IX* (Fliche-Martin 21), 132–53, 176–79; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 321, 337, 403–6, 413f.; Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie,* 72–219; Heyer, *Die katholische Kirche von 1648 bis 1870,* 94, 129ff., 140–44; Huber, *Verfassungsgeschichte* III (Stuttgart 1963), 158f., 174ff., 180, 190f., 194–98, 200–203, 665; Jedin, *Freiheit und Aufstieg des deutschen Katholizismus;* K. H. Grenner, *Wirtschaftsliberalismus und katholisches Denken. Ihre Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne 1967); R. Lill, *Die deutschen Katholiken und Bismarcks Reichsgründung: Reichsgründung 1870/71,* ed. by T. Schieder and E. Deuerlein (Stuttgart 1970), 345–65.

On the Church Policy of the Individual States: Prussia: J. Bachem, *Preußen und die katholische Kirche* (Cologne 1887), 71–85; B. von Selchow, *Der Kampf um das Posener Erzbistum 1865* (Marburg 1923); H. Schrörs, "Die Kölner Erzbischofswahl nach Geissels Tode," *AHVNrh* 108 (1926), 103–40; Constabel, *Vorgeschichte des Kulturkampfes;* Conzemius, *Briefe Aulikes an Döllinger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der "Katholischen Abteilung" im preußischen Kultusministerium* (Rome, Freiburg and Vienna 1968).

Austria: Hussarek, *Die Verhandlung des Konkordats;* Weinzierl-Fischer, *Konkordate,* 60–111; Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan* I, 61–148; Leisching, *Bischofskonferenz,* 150–250.

Bavaria: Doeberl-Spindler, *Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns* III; the corresponding sections of the works by A. Wendehorst, *Das Bistum Würzburg 1803 bis 1957* (Würzburg 1965) and J. Staber, *Kirchengeschichte des Bistums Regensburg* (Regensburg 1966); for the sixties, see also Brandmüller, *Publikation des 1. vatikanischen Konzils in Bayern.*

States of the Upper Rhenish Church Province: I. v. Longner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz* (Tübingen 1863); H. Brück, *Die oberrheinischen Kirchenprovinz* (Mainz 1868); H. Maas, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im Großherzogtum Baden* (Freiburg 1891); H. Lauer, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im Großherzogtum Baden* (Freiburg 1908); A. Hagen, *Geschichte der Diözese Rottenburg II (Stuttgart 1958); C. J. Reidel, Die katholische Kirche im Großherzogtum Hessen* (Paderborn 1904); M. Höhler, *Geschichte des Bistums Limburg* (Limburg 1908); L. Golther, *Der Staat und die katholische Kirche im Königreich Württemberg* (Stuttgart 1874); A. Hagen, *Staat und katholische Kirche in Württemberg 1848–62,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1928); H. Färber, *Der Liberalismus und die kulturpolitischen Fragen in Baden 1850–70* (diss., Freiburg 1959); E. Will, "Die Konvention zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und der Krone Baden vom 28. Juni 1859," *Baden im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichtliche Studien,* ed. by K. S. Bader, III (1953), 99–188. See also the literature on the Baden Kulturkampf listed in chapter 19.

Biographies: In addition to those listed in the bibliography for chapter 6, there are also L. von Pastor, *Johann Baptist Heinrich* (Fribourg 1925); F. X. Zacher, *Heinrich von Hofstätter, Bischof von Passau 1839–1875* (Passau 1940); J. Nattermann, *Adolf Kolping als Sozialpädagoge* (Cologne 1959); S. J. Schäffer and J. Dahl, *Adolf Kolping* (Cologne 1961); O. Pfülf, *Hermann von Mallinckrodt* (Fribourg 1901); J. Götten, *Christoph Moufang, Theologe und Politiker 1817–90* (Mainz 1969); O. Pfülf, *Joseph Graf von Stolberg* (Fribourg 1913).

Formation of Associations, Political Catholicism, Bishops' Conferences: Kißling, *Katholikentage* I; Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* II; Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie;* Buchheim, *Der deutsche Verbandskatholizismus;* Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 56–95; M. Schmolke, *Adolf Kolping als Publizist. Ein Beitrag zur Publizistik und Verbandsgeschichte des deutschen Katholizismus im 19. Jahrhundert* (Münster 1966); Lucas, *Joseph Edmund Jörg. Konservative Publizistik zwischen Revolution und Reichsgründung 1852 bis 1871* (diss., Cologne 1969).

Battles over "Roman" and "German" Theology: Literature in chapter 16; the biographies of Döllinger, Heinrich, Ketteler, Moufang, Rauscher, Schwarzenberg; A. Hagen, "Hefele und das Vatikanische Konzil," *ThQ* 123 (1942), 223–52; H. Lang, "Die Versammlung katholischer Gelehrter in München . . . 1863," *HJ* 71 (1952), 246–58; R. Lill, "Die deutschen Theologieprofessoren vor dem Vatikanum I im Urteil des Münchener Nuntius", *Reformata Reformanda, Festgabe für Hubert Jedin* II (Münster

1965), 483–508; B. Schneider, "Der Syllabus Pius' IX. und die deutschen Jesuiten," *AHPont* 6 (1968), 371–92; T. Freudenberger, *Die Universität Würzburg und das erste vatikanische Konzil* I (Neustadt/Aisch 1969).

SWITZERLAND: Literature in vol. VII, chapters 7 and 20, also C. H. Marmier, *La convention du 23 avril entre l'évêque de Lausanne et Genève at l'État de Fribourg* (Fribourg 1925); V. Conzemius, "Der geistesgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Christkatholizismus . . .," *ZSKG* 60 (1966), 112–59; V. Conzemius, *Katholizismus ohne Rom. Die altkatholische Kirchengemeinschaft* (Zürich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1969), 70–81. See also chapter 8, ns. 52–57.

9. *The Rise of Catholicism in the Anglo-Saxon World*

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND (AFTER 1848)

LITERATURE: P. F. Moran, ed., *The Pastoral Letters and other Writings of Cardinal Cullen,* 3 vols. (Dublin 1882); E. S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning,* 2 vols. (London 1896); S. Leslie, *Henry Edward Manning* (London 1921); C. Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* 2 vols. (London 1926); P. J. Walsh, *William J. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin* (Dublin 1928); D. Gwynn, *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation* (London 1929); C. Butler, *The Vatican Council,* 2 vols. (London 1930); J. E. Handley, *The Irish in Modern Scotland* (Cork 1947); G. A. Beck, ed., *The English Catholics 1850–1950* (London 1950); P. MacSuibhne, *Paul Cullen and his Contemporaries,* 3 vols. (Naas 1961–65); V. A. McClelland, *Cardinal Manning* (London 1962); E. R. Norman, *The Catholic Church and Ireland in the Age of Rebellion 1859–73* (London 1965); J. H. Whyte and P. J. Corish, *Political Problems 1850/78* (Dublin 1967).

THE UNITED STATES

SOURCES: F. Kenneally, *United States Documents in the Propaganda Fides Archives* II (Washington 1968); Ellis, *Documents, 252*–424; D. Shearer (see General Bibliography), 173–375; P. Guilday, *The National Pastorals* (see General Bibliography), 120–225; *ColLac* III (Provincial and National Councils); *Relazione . . . da Monsignor Bedini* (Rome 1854; republished in J. F. Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop G. Bedini to the United States* [Rome 1960], 190–287); H. Browne, "The Archdiocese of New York a Century ago, a Memoir of Archbishop Hughes," *Historical Records and Studies,* 39–40 (1952), 129–90. Also Catholic journals, especially *The Metropolitan,* 1852–58 and *Brownson's Quarterly Review,* 1844–64, and newspapers, especially *The Freeman's Journal, The Catholic Telegraph,* and *The Catholic Vindicator.*

LITERATURE: Schmidlin *PG* II, 207–11; Aubert, *Pie IX,* 427–36, 559–60; Latourette, *Christianity* III, 4–246; M. Hoffman, *The Church Founders of the Northwest* (Milwaukee 1937); R. Bayard, *Lone Star Vanguard. The Catholic Reoccupation of Texas 1838–48* (St. Louis 1945); L. Lyons, *Father N. Blanchet and the Founding of the Oregon Missions 1838–48* (Washington 1940); J. Pillar, *The Catholic Church in Mississippi 1837–65* (New Orleans 1964); M. Schroeder, *The Catholic Church in the Diocese of Vincennes 1847–77* (Washington 1946); J. McSorley, *Father Hecker and his Friends* (St. Louis 1952); J. B. Code, "Bishop Hughes and the Sisters of Charity," *Miscellanea hist. L. van der Essen* (Louvain 1947), 991–1038; C. Walworth, *The Oxford Movement in America* (New York 1893); F. MacDonald, *The Catholic Church and the Secret Societies in the United States* (New York 1946); W. D'Arcy, *The Fenian Movement in the United States 1858–86*

(Washington 1947); P. G. Rahill, *The Catholic Indian Missions and Grant's Peace Policy 1870–74* (Washington 1953).

ON IMMIGRATION: a field which requires much more examination, see in addition to the work by Shaughnessy (General Bibliography) T. McAvoy, "The Formation of the Catholic Minority in the United States, 1820–60," *RPol* 10 (1948), 13–34; E. Rothan, *The German Catholic Emigrant in the United States 1830–60* (Washington 1946); M. Kelly, *Catholic Immigrant Colonization Projects in the United States, 1815–60* (New York 1939); J. P. Shanon, *Catholic Colonization in the Western Frontier* (New Haven 1957).

ON THE SECOND PHASE OF NATIVISM: J. Higham, *Strangers in the Land. Pattern of American Nativism, 1860–1925* (New Brunswick 1955); R. Lord et al., *History of the Archdiocese of Boston* II, 648–703.

ON CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND THE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY: J. A. Burns, *The Growth and Development of the Catholic School System in the United States* (New York 1912); E. Connors, *Church-State Relationship in Education in the State of New York* (Washington 1951); J. M. Campbell, "The Catholic Contribution to the American College," *Vital Problems in Catholic Education in the United States,* ed. by R. Deferrari (Washington 1939), 84–107; J. McCadden in *CHR* 50 (1965), 188–207; T. McAvoy in *RPol* 28 (1966), 19–46; J. M. Daley, *Georgetown University. Origin and Early Years* (Washington 1957); J. T. Ellis, *The formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington 1946), 15–86; W. Morris, *The Seminary Movement in the United States, 1833–66* (Washington 1932); J. Sauter, *The American College of Louvain, 1857–78* (Louvain 1959).

ON THE CIVIL WAR: M. Rice, *American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy* (New York 1944); B. Blied, *Catholics and the Civil War* (Milwaukee 1955); C. Dunham, *The Attitude of the Northern Clergy toward the South, 1860–65* (Toledo 1942); W. Wight in *CHR* 44 (1958), 290–306; L. Stock in *CHR* 16 (1930), 1–18.

BIOGRAPHIES: those of the bishops M. Spalding (by J. L. Spalding, Baltimore 1873), McQuaid (by F. Zwierlein, 3 vols. [Rochester 1925–27]), Father Kenrick (by H. Nolan [Washington 1948]), Hughes (by J. Hassard [New York 1865]), Verot (by M. Gannon [Milwaukee 1964]), Bailey (by M. H. Yeager [Washington 1947]), Neumann (by M. Curley [Washington 1952]), Miles (by V. O'Daniel [Washington 1926]), Baraga (by C. Verwyst [Milwaukee 1900]), Purcell (by M. McCann [Washington 1918]), McCloskey (by J. Farley [New York 1918]), Eccleston (by C. Halsey in *RACHS* 76 [1965], 69–128, 77 [1966], 131–56), and J. O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks* (Philadelphia 1904).

CANADA

Aubert, *Pie IX,* 436–41; Latourette, *Christianity* III, 247–76; L. Pouliot, *Monseigneur Bourget et son temps,* 2 vols. (Montreal 1955–56), and the biographies of the bishops de Charbonnel (by C. Causse [Gembloux 1931]), Lynch (by H. McKeown [Toronto 1886]), Laflèche (by R. Rumilly [Montreal 1938]), Provencher (by D. Frémont [Winnipeg 1935]), and P. Lefebvre (by P. Poirier [Montreal 1898]); F. H. Walker, *Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada* (Toronto 1955); J. Moir, *Church and State in Canada West* (Toronto 1959); P. Savard, "La vie du clergé québecois au XIX^{e} siècle," *Recherches sociographiques* 8 (1967), 259–73; P. Sylvain, "Quelques aspects de l'antagonisme libéral-ultramontain au Canada français," *Recherches sociographiques* 8 (1967), 279–97; G. Carrière, *Histoire documentaire de la congrégation des missionnaires Oblats de Marie Immaculée dans l'Est du Canada,* 6 vols. (Ottawa 1957–67); G. Carrière, *La*

Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson et les missions catholiques dans l'Est du Canada (Ottawa 1957); G. Carrière, "L'Honorable Compagnie de la Baie d'Hudson et les missions catholiques dans l'Ouest canadien," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 36 (1966), 15–39, 232–57; E. Lamirande, "L'implantation de l'Église catholique en Colombie britannique, 1838–1848," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* 28 (1958), 213–25, 333–63, 453–89; C. Roy, *L'Université Laval* (Québec 1903); P. Savard in *Culture* (Québec), 26 (1965), 64–83; J. B. Meilleur, *Mémorial sur l'éducation au Bas-Canada* (Québec 1876).

AUSTRALIA

E. O'Brien, *The Dawn of Catholicism in Australia,* 2 vols. (London 1930); H. Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers in Australia,* 2 vols. (London 1911); T. L. Suttor, *Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia, 1788–1870* (Melbourne 1965).

10. *The Easing of Tensions in the Iberian World*

LITERATURE

SPAIN: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 614–23, II, 143–48; F. Izaguirre Irureta, "Las relaciones diplomaticás de la Santa Sede con el gobierno español durante la prima guerra carlista," *Universidad* 35 (Salamanca 1958), 564–93; P. Pérez Embid, "Los católicos y los partidos políticos españoles a mediados del siglo XIX," *Nuestro tiempo* 5 (Pamplona 1958), 387–409; V. G. Kiernan, *The Revolution of 1854 in Spanish History* (Oxford 1966); F. Costadellas, *El arzobispo Costa y Borras, 1848–1864* (Barcelona 1947); J. Goñi Gaztámbide, "S. Adriani, obispo de Pamplona," *HS* 21 (1968), 179–312; C. Fernández, *El confesor de Isabel II y sus actividades en Madrid* (Madrid 1964); J. M. Cuenca Toribio, "La desarticulación de la Iglesia española del antiguo régimen, 1833–40," *HS* 20 (1967), 33–98; J. M. Cuenca Toribio, "La tercera restauración religiosa del siglo XIX," *Anales de la Universidad Hispalense* 26 (1966), 1–11; J. M. Cuenca Toribio, "La Jerarquía eclesíastica en el reinado de Isabel II," *Atlantida* 6 (1968), 600–621; J. M. Cuenca Toribio, *Apertura e integrismo en la Iglesia española decimo-nonica* (Seville 1970); J. M. Cuenca Toribio, "El pontificado pamplonés de D. P. C. Uriz y Labayru," *HS* 22 (1969), 129–285; E. Federici, *Santa Gioacchina De Vedruna, fondatrice delle Carmelitane della carità* (Rome 1958); L. Frías, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en su Asistencia moderna de España II, 1835–68* (Madrid 1944); P. Jobit, *Les éducateurs de l'Espagne contemporaine, les Krausistes* (Paris 1936); J. Gorricho, "Epistolario de Pío IX con Isabel II," *AHPont* 4 (1966), 281–348.

On the secularization of the property of the Church, see J. M. de Antequera, *La desamortización eclesiástica* (Madrid 1885); J. Vicens Vivés, *Historia económica de España* (Barcelona 1959), 560–71; J. Porres Martin, *La desamortización del siglo XIX en Toledo* (Madrid 1966).

On the concordat of 1851, see J. Pérez Alhama, *La Iglesia y el Estado español* (Madrid 1967); F. Suárez: *Ius canonicum* (Pamplona) 3 (1963), 65–249.

PORTUGAL: Schmidlin, *PG* I, 623–27, II, 148–50; L. Frías, op. cit. II, 574–644.

SPANISH AMERICAN REPUBLICS: F. B. Pyke, "Heresy, Real and Alleged, in Peru. An aspect of the conservative-liberal struggle, 1830–75," *HAHR* 47 (1967), 50–74; F. B. Pyke, "Church and State in Peru and Chile since 1840, a Study in Contrasts," *AHR* 73

(1967), 30–50; R. Sotomayor Valdés, *Historia de Chile, 1831–71,* 2 vols. (Santiago 1875–76; concerning the activities of Monsignor Valdivieso); C. Oviedo Cavada, *La misión Irarrazaval en Roma 1847–50. Estudios de los relaciones de Iglesia y Estado en Chile* (Santiago 1962); C. Oviedo Cavada, "El gobierno chileno y el concepto misionero del Estado, 1832–61," *Historia,* 5 (Santiago 1966), 197–214; R. Pattee, *García Moreno y el Ecuador de su tiempo* (Mexico City 1941); W. Promper, *Priesternot in Lateinamerika* (Louvain 1965); L. Zea, *Dos etapas del pensamiento en Hispano-américa. Del romanticismo al positivismo* (Mexico City 1949); R. Pérez, *La Compañía de Jesús en Colombia y Centro América después de su restauración* (Valladolid 1896); R. Pérez, *La Compañía de Jesús restaurada en la República Argentina y Chile, Uruguay y Brasil* (Barcelona 1931); W. Loor, *Los jesuitas en el Ecuador* (Quito 1959); C. A. González, *F. de P. González Vigil, el precursor* (Lima 1961).

BRAZIL: F. Guerra, *A questão religiosa do segundo imperio brasileiro* (Rio de Janeiro 1952); M. E. Scherer, *D. Machado* (Munich 1965), 7–162; M. C. Thornton, *The Church and Free Masonry in Brazil, 1872–75. A Study in Regalism* (Washington 1943); M. Melo, *A Maçonaria no Brazil* (Recife 1909); T. Assis Bastes, *O positivismo e a realidade brasileira* (Belo Horizonte 1965); A. Rubert, "O bispado do Rio Grande do Sul e a nomeaçao de seu primo bispo 1848–1853," *Revista eclesiastica brasileira,* 28 (1968), 88–99; J. C. Fernandes Pinheiro, "Dom Manuel do Monte Rodriguez de Araújo," *Revista do Instituto histórico e geográfico brasileira* 27 (1867), 194–217; O. T. de Sousa, *Diogo Antonio Feijó* (Rio de Janeiro 1942); S. Elsner, *Die deutschen Franziskaner in Brasilien* (Trier 1912).

11. *The Catholic Church in the Orthodox World*

LITERATURE

UNIONIST PROSPECTS: Aubert, *Pie IX,* 478–84, 564; C. Korolevsky in *Unitas* 2 (Paris 1949–50), 189–205; Winter, *Rußland* II, 287–308; J. G. Remmers, *De hereniging sgedachte van I. Gagarine* (Tilburg 1951); M. J. de Rouët de Journel in *Études* 291 (1956), 171–95; M. J. de Rouët de Journel, *Une Russe catholique. La vie de Madame Swetchine* (Paris 1953); M. J. de Rouët de Journel in *Revue des études slaves* 3 (1923), 90–104; V. Laurent in *Mélanges E. d'Alzon* (St. Gérard and Namur 1952), 281–302; A. Tamborra, "Crisi d'Oriente, guerra di Crimea e polemiche politico-religiose fra cattolici e ortodossi, 1853–1856," *Clio* (Rome 1969), 169–91.

RUSSIA: *Allocuzione della Sant. di N. S. Gregorio XVI seguita da una Esposizione corredata di documenti* (Rome 1942); S. Olszamowska-Skowrońska, "Le concordat de 1847 avec la Russie d'après les documents authentiques," *SPM* 8–9 (1962), 447–877; *Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del S. P. Pio IX a riparo dei mali che soffre la Chiesa cattolica nei dominii di Russia e Polonia* (Rome 1866) and the Russian reply: *Résumé historiques des Actes de la Cour de Rome* (St. Petersburg 1867); A. Welykyj, *Documenta* (General Bibliography), II, 381–450 and the collection by Bjelogolovov. The Vatican Archives contain numerous pertinent material in the Russian files of the Congregation for Extraordinary Religious Affairs and the correspondence of the nuncios at Vienna. Schmidlin, *PG* I, 632–39, II, 213–23; J. Helfert, *Rußland und die Katholische Kirche in Polen* (Vienna 1867); R. Lefèvre, "Santa Sede e Russia e i colloqui dello Czar 1843–46," *Gregorio XVI* (Rome 1948), II, 159–293; J. S. Pelczar, *Pius IX a Polska* (Cracow 1914); Dmitri A. Tolstoi, *Rimskij Katolitsizm v Rossii,* 2 vols. (St. Petersburg 1914); A. van de Waal in *Het christelijk Osten en hereeniging* 8 (1955–56), 152–62, 303–12; R. Lubienski, *Vie de Mon-*

seigneur C.I. Lubienski (Roulers 1898); *DHGE* XVI, 867–70, 1471–72; *Suppression des couvents dans le Royaume de Pologne* (Paris 1865); A. Petrani, *Kolegium duchowne w Petersburgu* (Lublin 1950); Z. Olszamowska, "La suppression des diocèses catholiques par le gouvernement russe, 1866–69," *Antemurale* 9 (1965), 41–130; Z. Olszamowska, "Tentatives d'introduire la langue russe dans l'Église latine de la Pologne orientale," *Antemurale* 11 (1967), 47–169; A. Petrani in *Nasza przeszlosc* 27 (1967), 215–33; M. E. Jablonska in *Roczniki humanistyczne* 12 (Lublin 1964), 142–94; M. E. Jablonska in *Wiez* 3 (Warsaw 1960), 53–70; M. E. Jablonska in *Sprawozdania . . . Towarzystwa Naukowego Kathol. Uniw. Lublin* 14 (1963–64), 183–88; M. E. Jablonska in *Znak* 17 (1965), 1653–88; E. M. de Beaulieu, *Le Père Honorat de Biala, capucin* (Toulouse 1932); A. Szelggiewicz, *E. Bojanowski* (Poznan 1966); K. Gadacz, *Les capucins de la province polonaise dans l'insurrection de 1863–64* (Rome 1963).

The Habsburg Empire: On the activity of Monsignor Stroßmayer, see N. Lalic in *Le Monde slave,* n.s. 6 (1929), 442–50; C. Loiseau, *Le Monde slave,* n.s. 4 (1927), I, 379–405; C. Loiseau, *Le Correspondant* 219 (1905), 251–71; A. Fortescue in *Dublin Review* 163 (1918), 234–57; K. Krzanič in *Nova revija* 20 (Markarska 1941), 1–28; Winter, *Rußland* II, 364–65, 382–90, 500–503; *DThC* XIV, 2630–25; H. Wendel, *Der Kampf der Südslawen um Freiheit und Einheit* (Frankfurt 1925), II, 377–81; R. Rißling, *Die Kroaten* (Graz 1956).

On the Ruthenians in Galicia: M. Malinowski, *Die Kirchen-und Staatssatzungen bezüglich des griechisch-katholischen Ritus der Ruthenen* (Lemberg 1861); Ammann, 644–59; N. Miko in *ZKTh* 79 (1957), 467–83.

On the Uniate Rumanians of Transylvania: I. Moldovanu, *Acte sinodali ale baserecei romane de Alba Julia,* 2 vols. (Blaj 1869–72); G. Filip, *Pio IX e i Romeni* (Rome 1956); G. Filip, *De concilio provinciali Alba-Juliensi et Fagariensi A.D. 1872* (Rome 1954); G. Filip in *Acta historica* 4 (Munich 1965), 107–41; I. Gorgescu, *Mitropolitul Ioan Vancea* (Nagyvárad 1952); de Clercq II, 628–55.

Southern Europe, Eastern Europe, and the Levant: See General Bibliography; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 230–33; Aubert, *Pie IX,* 410–15; *Papers relating to the Condition of Christians in Turkey* (London 1861; consular reports).

On the Bulgarian Movement of 1860: I. Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'Église catholique au XIX^{e} siècle* (Rome 1960); G. Eldarov in *MF* 60 (1960), 426–54; Patriarch Cyrill, *Die katholische Propaganda unter den Bulgaren während der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* I (Sofia 1962; in Bulgarian with French synopsis). On Catholicism in Bulgaria, see also B. Ristewski in *Razgledi* 2 (1960), 908–36, 1005–29, 3 (1960), 72–90, 158–89.

On Catholicism in Rumania: P. Tocanel (General Bibliography).

Bosnia: I. Kecmanović, *I. F. Jukič* (Belgrade 1963).

The Levant: S. Salaville, "Monseigneur Hillereau, vicaire apostolique de Constantinople," *Union des Églises* 5 (1926), 134–39; *DHGE* XIII, 748–49, VIII, 1326–35; M. Julien, *La nouvelle mission de la Compagnie de Jésus en Syrie, 1831–95* (Tours 1898); J. Tagher, "Les rapports entre l'Égypte et le Vatican," *Cahiers d'histoire égyptienne* 2 (1949), 259–71; A. Martini, "La Santa Sede e la questione d'Oriente nel 1854," *CivCatt* (1958) IV, 169–81; *Les PP. Ratisbonne et N.-D. de Sion* (Paris 1928); J. Hajjar, *L'apostolat des missionnaires latins dans le Proche-Orient selon les directives romaines* (Jerusalem 1956); P. Médebielle, *Le diocèse patriarchal latin de Jérusalem* (Jerusalem 1963).

THE UNIATE PATRIARCHATES: Among the general works, see in addition to Aubert, *Pie IX,* 415–425, especially Hajjar, 263–309, and Hajjar in *RHE* 65 (1970), 423–55, 737–88.

ON THE ARMENIANS: de Clercq II, 503–42; *DHGE* III, 867–70, IV, 338–42; D. Urquart, *Le patriarche Hassoun* (Geneva 1872); T. Lamy in *Revue catholique* 38 (Louvain 1874), 153–75, 583–603, 39 (1875), 34–63; M. Ormanian, *Le Vatican et les Arméniens* (Rome 1873).

ON THE CHALDEANS: B. M. Goormachtigh, "Histoire de la mission dominicaine en Mésopotamie," *AOP* 3 (1897–98), 141–58, 197–214, 533–45; J. Vosté, Les actes du synode de Rabban Hormizd," *S. Congr. per la Chiesa orientale. Cod. Can. Orient. Fonti* II/17 (Vatican City 1942); de Clercq II, 543–61; *DDC* III, 375–85; *DHGE* V, 317–56; J. C. Panjikaran, *Christianity in Malabar* (Rome 1926).

ON THE SYRIANS: Mamarbashi, *Les Syriens catholiques et leur patriarche Sambiri* (Paris 1855); P. Bacel in *ÉO* 14 (1911), 293–98; de Clercq II, 570–98; *DHGE* IV, 676–81.

ON THE MELCHITES: J. Hajjar, *Le patriarche Maximos III Mazloum* (Harissa 1957); de Clercq I, 390–414, II, 562–66; *DHGE* III, 652–63; IV, 229–36.

ON THE MARONITES: *DThC* IX, 104–07; de Clercq II, 667–82; Churchill, *The Druses and Maronites under the Turquish Rule from 1840 to 1860* (London 1862).

SECTION TWO

The Missions between 1840 and 1870

12. *The Strengthening of the Gregorian Restoration*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

A. Brou, S.J., *Les Jésuites missionnaires au XIX^e et XX^e siècles* (Paris 1935); *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.* II. (1867–1906) (=CPF); G. Goyau, *La France missionnaire dans les cinq parties du monde,* 2 vols. (Paris 1948); *Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide* VI/1, 2, VII (Rome 1884–87) (=JP); A. Launay, *Mémorial de la Société des Missions-Étrangères* II (Paris 1916); J. A. Otto, S.J., *Gründung der neuen Jesuitenmission durch General P. Johann Philip Roothaan* (Freiburg 1939) (=J. A. Otto, *Roothaan*); G. B. Tragella, *Le Missioni Estere di Milano nel quadro degli avvenimenti contemporanei,* 3 vols. (Milan 1950–63); G. B. Tragella, *Italia Missionaria* (Milan 1939).

13. *The First Vatican Council and the Missions*

SOURCES

Mansi, 49–53; *ColLac* VII (Freiburg 1892); *Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide* VI/2 (Rome 1895 = JP); *Schema constitutionis super missionibus apostolicis* (Rome 1870 = Schema).

LITERATURE

T. Grentrup, "Die Missionen auf dem Vatikanischen Konzil," *ZMR* 6 (1916); I. Ting Pong Lee, *De jure missionario in Concilio Vaticano. Commentarium pro Religiosis et Missionariis* 14 (Rome 1944–46), 107–37; P. de Mondreganes, "Las Misiones en las actas del Concilio Vaticano," *ED* 1 (1948), 231–43; A. Santos, S.J., *Aspecto misional de concilio I. Estudios Eclesiasticos* 45 (Madrid 1970), 491–532; P. Wanko, *Kirche, Mission, Missionen. Eine Untersuchung der ekklesiologischen und missiologischen Aussagen vom 1. Vatikanum bis "Maximum illud"* (theol. diss., Münster 1969); T. Granderath, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils,* 3 vols. (Freiburg 1903–06); Schmidlin, *PG* II, 255–92; R. Aubert, *Le Pontificat de Pie IX* (Paris 1952), 311–67; R. Aubert, *Vaticanum I* (Mainz 1965).

SECTION THREE

Light and Shadows of Catholic Vitality

14. *Regular and Secular Clergy*

ORDERS AND CONGREGATIONS

LITERATURE: Aubert, *Pie IX,* 456–61; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 309–13; C. Tyck, *Notices historiques sur les congrégations et communeautés religieuses* (Louvain 1892), 324–334.

ON THE SOCIETY OF JESUS: Burnichon III and VI (for France, 1845–80), Frías (for the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America), Galleti, Monti, Volpe, and Aldegheri (for Italy), Hughes (for the United States), all listed in the General Bibliography. Also K. Schoeters, *P.J. Beckx en de "Jesuiten-politiek" van zijn tijd* (Antwerp 1965); B. Duhr, *Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Jesuiten-Missionen in Deutschland 1848–1872* (Freiburg i. Br. 1903); A. Pina, *Carlos Rademaker, Restaurador dos Jesuitas em Portugal* (Porto 1967).

ON THE BENEDICTINES: P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de Saint Benoît* (Maredsous 1948), 175–212.

ON THE DOMINICANS: Walz, 517–657; H. Cormier, *Vie du R.P. Jandel* (Paris 1890).

ON THE FRANCISCANS: H. Holzapfel, 331–34, 360–71; Frédégand (Callaey) d'Anvers, *Le Tier Ordre de Saint François d'Assise* (Paris 1923); on their restoration in France in 1851, see P. Sagues, *El P.J. Areso* (Madrid 1960).

ON THE REDEMPTORISTS: M. De Meulemeester, *Histoire sommaire de la Congrégation du T.S. Rédempteur* (Louvain 1958), 139–73.

ON THE SALESIANS: *LThK* IX, 263–64.

ON THE SCHOOLBROTHERS: G. Rigault, *Histoire générale de l'Institu des Frères des Écoles chrétiennes* V and VI, *L'Ère du Frère Philippe* (Paris 1945/48).

THE DIOCESAN CLERGY AND PASTORAL WORK

LITERATURE: Aubert, *Pie IX,* 451–56; C. Marcilhacy, *Le diocèse d'Orléans sous l'épiscopat de Monseigneur Dupanloup* (Paris 1962), 48–191; P. Broutin, "Pastorale épiscopale au XIX^e siècle," *RAM* 35 (1959), 60–77; Daniel-Rops, *L'Église des révolutions* I (Paris 1960), 882–97; P. Pierrard, *Le prêtre français* (Paris 1969), 101–28; Baunard, 133–44; C. Kempf, *Die Heiligkeit der Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert* (Einsiedeln 1928), 77–122. Several biographies of bishops contain details about the development of diocesan organizations and pastoral practice.

15. *The Growth of Piety*

LITERATURE

K. Kempf, *Die Heiligkeit der Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert* (Einsiedeln 1928); M. Nédoncelle, *Les leçons spirituelles du XIX^e^ siècle* (Paris 1936); J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Concils I* (Nördlingen 1877), chap. 15 (tendentious); Aubert, *Pie IX,* 461–76, 563; Baunard, 197–244, 486–508; Daniel-Rops I, 921–55; H. Pourrat, *Histoire de la spiritualité* IV (Paris 1930), 505–658; J. de Guibert, *La spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Rome 1953), 459–522; R. Chapman, *Father Faber* (London 1961).

ON EUCHARISTIC PIETY: *DSAM* III, 1282–85, IV, 1614–53; M. de Hédouville, *Monseigneur de Ségur* (Paris 1957); J. Vaudon, *L'œuvre des congrès eucharistique, ses débuts* (Paris 1910); L. de Paladini, *Die eucharistischen Kongresse. Ursprung und Geschichte* (Paderborn 1912).

ON THE VENERATION OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS: A. Hamon, *Histoire de la dévotion au Sacre-Cœur* IV (Paris 1931); A. Hamon in *DSAM* II, 1037–42; *Cor Jesu II Pars historica et pastoralis,* ed. by A. Bea et al. (Rome 1959), especially H. Holstein (291–340), E. Bergh (457–98), and R. Tucci (538–71); F. Degli Esposti, *La teologia del S. Cuore di Gesù* (Rome 1967), 11–18.

ON DEVOTION TO MARY: *Maria. Études sur la Sainte Vierge,* ed. by H. du Manoir, 7 vols. (Paris 1949–64), especially III (1954); B. Saint-John, *The Blessed Virgin in the XIXth Century: apparitions, revelations, graces* (London 1903); B. Metzler, "Die Marien-Maiandacht in ihrer historischen Entwicklung und Ausbreitung," *Der Katholik* (1909) I, 100–125, 177–88, 262–82.

ON THE ORIGINS OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT: P. W. Trapp, *Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung* (Regensburg 1940); O. Rousseau, *Histoire du Movement liturgique* (Paris 1945), 1–185; O. Rousseau, "L'œuvre liturgique de Monseigneur Van Caloen," *QLP* 17 (Louvain 1932), 79–91; *Maurus Wolter, dem Gründer Beurons* (Beuron 1945), 93–109.

16. *The Backwardness of Religious Studies and the Controversy about the "German Theologians"*

LITERATURE: Hocedez II; Aubert, *Pie IX,* 184–223, 526–31; J. Bellamy, *La théologie catholique au XIX^e^ siècle* (Paris 1904); Grabmann, *G,* part 3; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 315–30; F. Russo, "Cent années d'un dialogue difficile entre la science et la foi," *Recherches et débats du C.C.I.F.* 4 (1953), 7–30. Useful references in Hurter and Sommervogel.

ON THE RATIONALISTIC MOVEMENT: A. D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science and Theology,* 2 vols. (London 1896); J. Maurain, "Le conflit de la science et de la croyance," *Peuples et civilisations,* ed. by L. Halphen and P. Sagnac, XVII (Paris 1939), 303–18; J. M. Robertson, *A History of Free Thought in the XIXth Century,* 2 vols. (London 1929); Weill, *Idée laïque,* 147–78; A. Della Torre, *Il cristianesimo in Italia dai filosofisti ai modernisti* (Palermo 1912); A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen 1913).

RELIGIOUS STUDIES OUTSIDE OF GERMANY

LITERATURE: L. Foucher, *La philosophie catholique en France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1955); E. Vacherot, "La théologie catholique en France," *Revue des deux mondes* 70 (1868), 294–318; C. Pouthas, *L'Église et les questions religieuses en France de 1848 à 1877* (Cours de Sorbonne 1954), 223–60; A. Houtin, *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1902); *DThC* VIII, 235–42, Tables générales 2356–58 (for Italy); P. Barbaini, "Cultura teologica e cultura generale nell'epoca del Risorgimento," *SC* 89 (1961), 411–43; K. Werner, *Die italienische Philosophie des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 5 vols. (Vienna 1884–86), especially vol. I, *Rosmini and His School;* C. D. Fonseca, *La formazione del clero a Napoli nel sec. XIX* (diss., Naples and Posilippo 1955); E. Van Roey, *Les sciences théologiques: Le mouvement scientifique en Belgique 1830/1905* II (Brussels 1908), 488–523.

ON CHRISTIAN ARCHEOLOGY: G. Ferretto, *Note storico-bibliografiche di archeologia cristiana* (Vatican City 1942); R. Fausti, *Il P.G. Marchi e il rinnovamento degli studi di archeologia cristiana: Xenia Piana Pio XII dicata* (Rome 1943), 445–514.

ON THE THEOLOGY AT THE ROMAN COLLEGE: *L'Università Gregoriana del Collegio Romano* (Rome 1925); H. Schauf, *Carlo Passaglia and Clemens Schrader* (Rome 1938); H. Kerkvoorde in *EThL* 22 (1946), 174–93; C. G. Arevalo, *Some Aspects of . . . the Ecclesiology of Perrone, Passaglia and Schrader* (Rome 1959); W. Kasper, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römischen Schule* (Freiburg i. Br. 1962).

ON THE THOMIST RENASCENCE: A. Masnovo, *Il neotomismo in Italia. Origini e prime vicende* (Milan 1923); P. Dezza, *Alle origini del neotomismo* (Milan 1940); C. A. Walz, "Il tomismo dal 1800 al 1879", *Angelicum* 20 (1943), 300–326; Aubert-Martina, 808–11; *G. Sanseverino nel 1. centenario della morte* (Rome 1965); P. Orlando, *Il tomismo a Napoli nel sec. XIX. La scuola del Sanseverino* I (Rome 1968); F. Duranti, "La rinascita del tomismo a Perugia," *Aguinas* 2 (Rome 1962); 249–94; R. Pizzorni in *Aquinas* 8 (1965), 423–58.

SCHOLASTICS AND GERMANICS VS. THE "GERMAN THEOLOGIANS"

SOURCES: In addition to Döllinger's correspondence, among it *Briefwechsel mit Lord Acton,* ed. by V. Conzemius, I (Munich 1963), see A. Flir, *Briefe aus Rom* (Innsbruck 1864); *Janssens Briefe,* ed. by L. Pastor (Freiburg i. Br. 1920); *Briefe von und an Ketteler,* ed. by I. Raich (Mainz 1879); A. M. Weiß, *Lebensweg und Lebenswerk* (Freiburg i. Br. 1925), chaps. I. and II; G. von Hertling, *Erinnerungen* (Freiburg i. Br. 1919); J. F. von Schulte, *Lebenserinnerungen* I/II (Giessen 1908–09); F. X. Kraus, *Tagebücher,* ed. by H. Schiel (Cologne 1957), 1–276. Also the journals *Der Katholik, Stimmen aus Maria Laach, Theologisches Literaturblatt,* and *La Civiltà cattolica,* as well as the contemporary summaries by A. von Schmid, *Wissenschaftliche Richtungen auf dem Gebiet des Katholizismus in der neuesten und gegenwärtigen Zeit* (Munich 1862) and K. Werner, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Munich 1866), 342–642.

LITERATURE: Basic, even though partial, is the work of the Old Catholic J. Friedrich, *Ignaz von Döllinger* III (Munich 1901). Among the more recent works, there are Scheffczyk, XXXVI–IL, 261–522; F. von Bezold, *Geschichte der rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität zu Bonn 1818–1918* (Bonn 1920); S. Merkle, "Die Vertretung der Kirchengeschichte in Würzburg bis zum Jahre 1879," *Aus der Vergangenheit der Universität Würzburg* (Berlin 1932), 146–214; T. Funk in *ThQ* 108 (1927), 209–20 (for Tübingen); G. B. Guzzetti, *La perdita della fede nei cattolici* (Venegono 1940), 75–175;

R. Lill, "Die deutschen Theologieprofessoren im Urteil des Münchener Nuntius," *Reformata reformanda. Festgabe für Hubert Jedin* II (Münster 1965), 483–508.

ON NEO-SCHOLASTICISM: F. Buuck in *Scholastik* 18 (1943), 54–77; M. Schmaus, *Die Stellung Scheebens in der Theologie des XIX. Jahrhunderts: Matthias Joseph Scheeben. Der Erneuerer der katholischen Glaubenswissenschaft* (Mainz 1935), 31–54; A. Kerkvoorde, *Scheeben et son époque: Matthias Joseph Scheeben. Le Mystère de l'Église* (Paris 1946); 5–34; B. Welte, "Zum Strukturwandel der katholischen Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert," *Freiburger Dies Universitatis* 2 (1953–54), 25–55; T. Schäfer, *Die erkenntnistheoretische Kontroverse Kleutgen-Günther. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Neuscholastik* (Paderborn 1961); W. Bartz, *Das Problem des Glaubens in der Auseinandersetzung mit Joseph Kleutgen* (Trier 1950).

SECTION FOUR

The Altercation between Catholicism and Liberalism

17. *The Roman Question*

SOURCES

DIPLOMACY: B. Bastgen, *Die Römische Frage,* 3 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1917–19); *I documenti diplomatici italiani,* 1st ser. I–III/XIII, 2nd ser. I–II (Rome 1952–66); *Carteggi di Cavour,* 16 vols. (Bologna 1926–62); *Les origines diplomatiques de la guerre de 1870–71,* 28 vols. (Paris 1910–31); L. Thouvenel, *Le secret de l'empereur, 1860–63,* 2 vols. (Paris 1889); S. Jacini, *Il tramonto del potere temporale nelle relazioni delgi ambasciatori austraci a Roma 1860–70* (Bari 1931); N. Blakiston, *The Roman Question. Extracts from the Despatches of Odo Russell 1858–70* (London 1962); M. Gabriele, *Il carteggio Antonelli-Sacconi 1858–60,* 2 vols. (Rome 1962); G. Bandini, "Roma nel 1860, dalla corrispondenza diplomatica spagnuola," *RStRis* 24 (1937), 3–50, 194–230, 369–404; E. Brazão, *A unificação de Italia vista pelos diplomatas portugueses 1848–70,* 2 vols. (Coimbra 1963–66); E. Brazão, *Relações diplomáticas de Portugal com a Santa Sé a queda de Roma 1870* (Lisbon 1970; August 1870 to July 1871); N. Miko, *Das Ende des Kirchenstaates,* 4 vols. (Vienna 1962–70; to September 1871).

CORRESPONDENCE: especially P. Pirri, *Pio IX e Vittorio Emanuele II dal loro carteggio privato,* 5 vols. (Rome 1944–60); *La Questione Romana negli anni 1860–61,* 2 vols. (Bologna 1930; to be complemented by *Carteggio inedito fra M. d'Azeglio e D. Pantaleoni,* ed. by G. Faldella [Rome 1888] and by A. Berselli in *AstIt* 113 [1955], 73–100); *Carteggi del P. L. Taparelli d'Azeglio,* ed. by P. Pirri (Turin 1933; valuable for the attitude of the *"intransigenti"* in the period 1850–1862); F. Quintavalle, *La conciliazione fra l'Italia e il Papato nelle lettere di P. Tosti al senatore Casati* (Milan 1907; valuable for the attitude of the *"conciliatoristi"*); *Lettere e documenti del Barone B. Ricasoli,* ed. by M. Tabarrini and A. Gotti, 11 vols. (Florence 1886–96), and *Carteggi di Ricasoli,* ed. by M. Nobili and S. Camerani, 23 vols. (Rome 1939–68; continuing); B. Ferrari, *E. Rendu e M. d'Azeglio. Il Risorgimento italiano visto da un cattolico liberale francese 1849–65* (Santena 1967); on the correspondence of M. d'Azeglio, see A. M. Ghisalberti in *RStRis* 30 (1943), 398–403.

SPEECHES: C. de Cavour, *Discorsi parlamentari,* 11 vols. (Turin 1863–72; new edition by A. Omodeo and L. Russo, Florence 1932seqq.); *Scritti e discorsi politici di M. d'Azeglio,* ed. by M. De Rubris, 3 vols. (Florence 1931–38); *Discorsi di U. Rattazzi,* 8 vols. (Rome 1876–80).

MEMOIRS: G. Pasolini, *Memorie* (Turin 1887); M. Minghetti, *I miei ricordi* (Turin 1889; new edition by A. M. Ghisalberti, Turin 1948; see A. M. Ghisalberti in *RStRis* 34 [1947], 159–96); N. Roncalli, *Diario dall'anno 1849 al 1870,* ed. by A. De Magistris (Turin 1887); G. Margotti, *Memorie per la storia dei nostri tempi 1856–63* (Turin 1863).

JOURNALS AND NEWSPAPERS: *La Civiltà cattolica* (1850seqq.) and *L'Osservatore Romano* (1861seqq.) from the Roman point of view; *L'Univers* and *Le Monde* from the French point of view; for Italy, *L'Armonia* (1846–66), *L'Unità cattolica* (1863seqq.), *L'Osserva-*

tore cattolico (1864seqq.), and *Il Veneto cattolico* from the papal point of view, *Gli annali cattolici* (1862–66) and *La Rivista Universale* (1866–79) from the liberal Catholic point of view, and *La Gazzetta del Popolo* (1848seqq.) and *La Nuova Antologia* (1860seqq.) from the liberal point of view.

LITERATURE

Many bibliographic references are in B. Bastgen, op. cit. III, 841–64, Mollat passim, and *Nuove questioni di storia del Risorgimento* (Milan 1961), 377–80. Mollat's work, the standard for a long time, must be supplemented with P. Pirri, op. cit. II–1, III–1; J. Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du Second Empire* (Paris 1930), L. Case, *Franco-Italian Relations 1860–65* (Philadelphia 1932), Engel-Janosi I, 61–197, R. Mori, *La Questione Romana 1861–65* (Florence 1963), and *Il tramonto del potere temporale 1866–70* (Rome 1967).

MONOGRAPHS: "Il problema religioso del Risorgimento," *RStRis* 43 (1956), 191–345, 411–589 (=Congress of Messina in 1954); "L'unità d'Italia e i cattolici italiani," *Vita e pensiero* 42 (1959), 858–1010; *I cattolici e il Risorgimento* (Rome 1963); L. Salvatorelli, "Roma e la Questione Romana nella politica europea del sec. XIX," *Il Risorgimento e l'Europa* (Rome 1964), 39–134; on Cavour and the Roman Question, literature in *Il Diritto ecclesiastico* 75 (1964), 415, n. 18; W. Hancock, *Ricasoli and the Risorgimento in Tuscany* (London 1926; also C. Pischeda in *RSIt* 68 [1956], 37–81); L. Lipparini, *Minghetti,* 2 vols. (Bologna 1942–47); R. Aubert, "Pio IX et le Risorgimento," *Ris* 4 (1961), 51–74; R. Aubert, "La chute de Monseigneur de Merode en 1865," *RSTI* 9 (1955), 331–92; R. Aubert, "La Chiesa cattolica in Italia e la questione dell'unità politica," *Humanitas* 16 (Brescia 1961), 682–709; G. De Rosa, "Il 'non expedit' e lo Stato unitario italiana," *Humanitas* 16 (Brescia 1961), 709–32; F. Fonzi, "Echi e reazioni del mondo cattolico all'unificazione italiana," *RStT* 6 (1960), 247–71; N. Miko, "Österreich-Ungarn und der Untergang des Kirchenstaates im Jahre 1870," *RömHM* 1 (1958), 130–76; J. M. Goñi Gastambide, "El reconocimiento de Italia y monseñor Claret, confesor de Isabel II," *Anthologica annua,* 17 (1970), 369–462; A. Graham, *The Rise of the Dual Diplomatic Corps in Rome 1870–75* (The Hague 1952); L. P. Wallace, *The Papacy and European Diplomacy 1869–78* (Chapel Hill 1948); A. Vigevano, *La fine dell'Esercito pontificio* (Rome 1920); D. McElrath in *RHE* 65 (1970), 86–113.

18. *The Offensive of the Liberal Governments in the Non-German-Speaking Countries*

THE SECULARIZATION POLICY IN ITALY

SOURCES: G. D'Amelio, *Stato e Chiesa. La legislazione ecclesiastica fino al 1867* (Milan 1961); *ColLac* VI (provincial councils); *Memorie biografiche di S. Giov. Bosco* I–IX, ed. by G. B. Lemoyne (Turin 1898–1917), X–XX, ed. by E. Ceria (Turin 1940–48); Silvino da Nadro, *Sinodi diocesani italiani* (Vatican City 1960); for pastoral letters, see Aubert-Martina, 14–15. A good anthology is P. Scoppola, ed., *Chiesa e Stato nella storia d'Italia. Storia documentaria* (Bari 1967), 3–138.

LITERATURE: There is an especially rich bibliography. A good start can be made with F. Fausti, *I cattolici e la società italiana dopo l'Unità* (Rome 1960), 111–18 and *Stato e Chiesa: Nuove questioni di storia del Risorgimento* (Milan 1961), II, 325–35.

GENERAL: Aubert-Martina, 119–33, 163–82, 563–73, 761–838; Jemolo, 13–264; Jemolo, *La questione della proprietà ecclesiasticha 1848–88* (Turin 1911); S. Jacini, *La politica ecclesiastica italiana da Villafranca a Porta Pia* (Bari 1938); the files of the congresses of Messina in 1954, *Il problema religioso nel Risorgimento* (Rome 1958) and of Castiglioncello in 1958, "Il problema politico del cattolicesimo nel Risorgimento (=*RStT* 4 [1958], 213–407); A Della Torre, *Il cristianesimo in Italia dai filosofisti ai modernisti* (Milan 1912); G. Spini, *Risorgimento e protestanti* (Naples 1958), 257–369; A. Luzio, *La massoneria e il Risorgimento italiano* (Bologna 1925).

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE HOLY SEE AND PIEDMONT: C. Magni, *I Subalpini e il concordato. Studio storico-giuridico sulla formazione delle leggi Siccardi* (Padua 1967; also, *Humanitas* 17 [1962], 686–89 and *RSIt* 82 [1970], 256–59); V. Gorresio, *La lotta per lo stato laico: Saggi storici sul liberalismo italiano* (Perugia 1953), 373–458; F. J. Coppa in *CHR* 54 (1969), 579–612; A. M. Ghisalberti, *M. d'Azeglio, un moderato realisatore* (Rome 1953), especially 187–92, 199–223; A. C. Jemolo, *Scritti vari* (Milan 1965), 277–395; B. Ferrari in *Aevum* 32 (1958), 262–70; M. F. Mellano, *Il caso Fransoni e la politica ecclesiastica piemontese 1848–50* (Rome 1964; also G. Griseri in *BStBiS* 64 [1966], 375–492); A. Bozzola and T. Buttini in *Il Risorgimento italiano* 13 (1920), 217ff., 14 (1921), 81ff.; G. Biagio Furiozzi, "P. di Santa Rosa e il cattolicesimo liberale in Piemonte, 1850," *RStRis* 58 (1971), 21–47; M. Hudry in *ChStato* I, 327–54; M. Hudry, "Charvaz e Cavour 1852–61," *Miscellanea Cavouriana* (Turin 1964), 117–208; V. Eligio, *Il tentativo di introdurre il matrimonio civile in Piemonte* (Rome 1951); G. Ferroglio, "Per la storia della legge del 29.5.1855," *Il Diritto ecclesiastico* 63 (1952), 3–42; E. Borghese, "La crisi calabiana [1855] sec. nuovi documenti," *BStBiS* 55 (1957), 425–81; C. Pischeda, "Documenti sulla questione ecclesiastica in Piemonte, 1857," *Critica storica* 3 (1964), 764–91.

ON THE OTHER ITALIAN STATES: I Arcuno, *Il Regno delle Due Sicilie nei rapporti con lo Stato pontificio 1846–50* (Naples 1933); G. Martina, *Pio IX e Leopoldo II* (Rome 1967; see also A. Salvestrini in *Studi storici* 6 [1965], 55–98); G. Ferroglio, "I provvedimenti in materia ecclesiastica dei governi provvisori parmensi 1859," *Raccolta di scritti in onore di C.A. Jemolo* I (Milan 1963), 489–519; L. Briguglio, "Patriarcato di Venezia e governo austriaco," *Nova historia* 13 (Verona 1961), 3–30; L. Briguglio, "Lo spirito religioso nel Veneto durante la terza dominazione austriaca," *RStRis* 42 (1955), 22–57; G. De Rosa, "La crisi della parrochia nel Veneto dopo il 1866," *Fonti e ricerche di storia ecclesiastica padovana* (Padua 1967), 205–21; A. Gambasin, "Orientamenti spirituali e stati d'animo di cattolici intransigenti veneti," *ChStato* I, 243–96; G. Mantese, "La cultura religiosa a Vicenza negli anni dell'unificazione italiana," *ChStato* II, 391–419; A. Agazzi, "E. Tazzoli e il clero del Lombardo-Veneto," *Bergomum* 28 (1954), 25–47.

ON THE CLERGY: Aubert-Martina, 761–807; S. Bruno, *Ordini religiosi e clero in Basilicata 1861–70* (Matera 1964); X. Toscani, "Indicazioni sul clero bergamasco," *RSTI* 21 (1967), 411–53; A. Gambasin, *Il clero padovano 1859–66* (Rome 1967); B. Bertoli, *Il clero veneziano dopo il 1848; Rassegna di politica e di storia* (1964), 7–25.

BIOGRAPHIES: (one of the most neglected areas of ecclesiastical historiography in Italy). G. Russo, *Il cardinale S. Riario Sforza e l'unità d'Italia* (Naples 1962; also, G. Russo in *Asprenas* 11 [Naples 1964], 225–319, 14 [1967], 66–162, 324–90); A. Fermi, *Monsignor A. Ranza, vescovo di Piacenza,* 2 vols. (Piacenza 1956–66); C. Castiglione, *Gaysruck e Romilli arcivescovi di Milano* (Milan 1938); C. Castiglione, *Vita di Monsignor Nazari di Calabiana* (Milan 1952); T. Lecisotti, *Il cardinale Dusmet* (Catania 1962); M. Maccarrone, *Il Concilio Vaticano I* (Padua 1966), 3–132 (on Archbishop Arrigoni). Other references in Aubert-Martina, 18–20.

ON THE ORIGINS OF THE CATHOLIC MOVEMENT: L. Bedeschi, *Le origini della gioventù cattolica* (Bologna 1959); G. De Rosa, *Storia del Movimento cattolico in Italia* I (Bari 1966), 39–120; G. De Rosa, *Le Associazioni cattoliche dal Neoguelfismo all' Unità: I cattolici italiani dall 800 ad oggi* I (Brescia 1964), 95–150; A. Berselli, *Alle origini del movimento cattolico intransigente* (Livorno 1954); B. Bertoli, *Le origini del movimento cattolico a Venezia* (Brescia 1965); G. Griseri in *BStBiS* 11 (1963), 257–97 (on Piedmont between 1849 and 1861); S. Sciortino: *La Sicilia e l'unità d'Italia* (Milan 1962), 562–92; C. Marsilli in *Aurea Parma* 47 (1963), 127–45; M. Stranghellini in *RStRis* 43 (1956), 547–56 (on Lucca); P. Borzomati, *Aspetti religiosi e storia del movimento cattolico in Calabria 1860–1919* (Rome 1967), 7–182. See also Aubert-Martina, 563–64.

ANTICLERICALISM IN BELGIUM AND IN THE NETHERLANDS

BELGIUM: In addition to pastoral letters of bishops and A. Simon, *Réunions des évêques de Belgique. Procès verbaux,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1960–61), see information in the files of the congresses of Mechelen (=*Assemblée générale des catholiques en Belgique,* 1864, 1865, and 1867), in the *Journal historique et littéraire* (to 1867), the *Revue catholique* (1843–84), the *Revue générale* (1865seqq.), and the two most important daily newspapers, *Le Journal de Bruxelles* (1840seqq.) and *Le Bien public* (1853seqq.). See also C. Woeste, *Mémoires* (from 1859) I (Brussels 1927), 53–144; M. Becqué and A. Louant, "Le dossier 'Rome et Louvain' de Charles Périn," *RHE* 50 (1955), 36–124; and the documents published by A. Simon in *Catholicisme et politique* (Wetteren 1955) and *L'hypothèse libérale en Belgique* (Wetteren 1956); D. De Haerne, *Tableau de la charité chrétienne en Belgique* (Brussels 1857); E. Banning, *L'épiscopat et l'instruction publique de 1830 à 1879* (Brussels 1879); E. Banning, *Exposé historique des rapports entre le gouvernement belge et le Saint-Siège de 1830 à 1880* (Brussels 1881); A. Simon, ed., *Instructions aux nonces de Bruxelles 1835–1889* (Brussels 1961); K. van Isacker, *Werkelijk en wettelijk land 1863–84* (Antwerp 1955; see *Revue nouvelle* 23 [1956], 250–57 and A. Simon in *RHE* 51 [1956], 231–34); A. Simon, *Le parti catholique belge* (Brussels 1958); S. Balau, *70 ans d'histoire contemporaine de Belgique* (Brussels 1889), 89–376; A. Erba, *L'esprit laïque en Belgique 1857–70* (Louvain 1967); M. Defourny, *Les congrès catholiques en Belgique* (Louvain 1908; to be complemented with A. Delmer in *Revue générale* 90 [1909], 317–52); A. Rubbens, "De bezorgdheid van de Belgische Katholieken voor het onderwijs vanaf het Mechels Congres van 1863 tot aan de schoolwet van 1879," *Collationes brugenses et gandavenses* 13 (1967), 518–33, 14 (1968), 103–29, 243–69; P. Gérin, *150 Jaar katholieke Arbeidersbeweging in Belgie,* ed. by S. Scholl, I (Brussels 1963), 245–319; A. Verhaegen, *J. Lammens et les œuvres catholiques* (Ghent 1909); J. Daris, *Le diocèse de Liège sous Monseigneur de Montpellier* (Liège 1892). In addition to the biographies of cardinals Sterckx and Dechamps (General Bibliography) and of bishops Van Bommel and Ad. Dechamps, see also H. de Trannoy, *Jean-Baptiste Malou* (Brussels 1905; to be complemented with the articles by the same author in *Revue générale* 115 [1926], 513–22, 141 [1939], 1–18); J. Garsou, *Frère-Orban de 1857 à 1878* (Brussels 1946); E. Rubbens, *E. Ducpétiaux,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1922–34); R. Warlomont, *F. Laurent* (Brussels 1948).

NETHERLANDS: D. Langedijk, *De schoolstrijd in de eerste jaren na de wet van 1857* (Kampen 1937); C. Brok, *Openbaar en bijzonder onderwijs in Breda* (Tilburg 1964); J. M. Gysen, *J.A. Paredis, bischop van Roermond* (Assen 1968); 399–431.

THE CONFUSED SITUATION IN THE IBERIAN PENINSULA

SPAIN: J. López Órtiz, *Los cien años de la vida del concordato de 1851: El concordato de 1953* (Madrid 1956), 41–64; J. M. Cuenca Toribio, *La Iglesia española ante la revolución liberal*

(Madrid 1970), 197–290; J. M. Cuenca Toribio in *HS* 22 (1969), 129–285; V. Cacho Vía, *La Institución Libre de Enseñanza I: Origenes* (Madrid 1962; on Sanz del Río and the progress of positivism); C. J. Bartlett, "The Question of Religious Toleration in Spain in the XIXth Century," *JEH* 8 (1957), 205–16 (on the difficult entrance of Protestantism, supported by English diplomacy); G. Barberini, "El article 11 de la Constitución de 1876. Controversia diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede," *Anthologica annua* 9 (1961), 279–409 (on freedom of religion); M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Los heterodoxos españoles* (Edition BAC, Madrid 1956) II, 946–1119.

PORTUGAL: X. Coutinho, "A descritianização de Portugal no seculo XIX," *Miscellanea historiae ecclesiasticae III* (Louvain 1970), 359–79.

REGALISTIC LIBERALS AND FREEMASONS IN LATIN AMERICA

MEXICO: W. H. Callcott, *Church and State in Mexico 1822–57* (New York 1926); W. H. Callcott, *Liberalism in Mexico 1857–1929* (Stanford 1931); G. García Cantú, *El pensamiento de la revolución, historia documental, 1810–62* (Mexico City 1966); W. V. Scholes, *Mexican Politics during the Juarez Regime 1855–72* (Columbia 1957); cf. *CHR* 51 (1965), 509–28; M. A. Cleven, "The Ecclesiastical Policy of Maximilian," *HAHR* 9 (1929), 317–60; G. Martina, "La corrispondenza tra Pio IX e Massimiliano," *AHPont* 5 (1967), 373–91; De Cosío Villegas, ed., *La historia moderna de México,* I (Mexico City 1956; from 1867); L. Zea, *Apogeo y decadencia del positivismo en Méjico* (Mexico City 1944).

COLOMBIA: A. Pérez Aguirre, *25 años de historia colombiana 1853 a 1878* (Bogotá 1959); J. Jaramillo Uribe, "Romanticismo, utopismo y positivismo en el pensamiento social y político colombiano del seculo XIX," *Revista Bolivar* 13 (1960), 117–44.

VENEZUELA: J. Nava in *HAHR* 45 (1965), 527–43.

BRAZIL: M. C. Thornton, *The Church and Free Masonry in Brazil, 1872–75. A Study in Regalism* (Washington 1943); R. D. Oliveira, *O Conflicto maçonico-religioso de 1872* (Petropolis 1952).

19. *Preliminary Phases of the* Kulturkampf *in Austria, Bavaria, Baden, and Switzerland*

LITERATURE

G. Franz, *Kulturkampf, Staat und katholische Kirche in Mitteleuropa von der Säkularisation bis zum Abschluß des preußischen Kulturkampfes* (Munich 1954); G. Franz-Willing, *Kulturkampf gestern und heute. Eine Säkularbetrachtung* (Munich 1971).

AUSTRIA: M. Hussarek, "Die Krise und die Lösung des Konkordats vom 18. August 1855," *AÖG* 112 (1932); K. Eder, *Der Liberalismus in Alt-Österreich* (Vienna 1955); N. Miko, "Der Untergang des Kirchenstaates und Österreich-Ungarn im Jahre 1870," *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 1 ((1956–57); Karl Eder, "Die katholische Kirche in Österreich-Ungarn um 1870," *Festschrift für Karl Eder* (Innsbruck 1959); Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* I (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1958), 143–97; F. Engel-Janosi, *Die politische Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den österreichischen Kaisern 1804–1918* (Vienna and Munich 1964), 35–46, nos. 124–42; Weinzierl-Fischer, *Die*

österreichischen Konkordate von 1855 und 1933 (Vienna and Munich 1960), 112–24; E. Sauer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen 1867–1903* (Vienna and Munich 1968).

BAVARIA: J. Grisar, "Die Circulardepesche des Fürsten Hohenlohe vom 9. April 1869 über das bevorstehende Vatikanische Konzil," *Bayern. Staat und Kirche, Land und Reich, Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Winkler* (Munich 1961); D. Albrecht, "Döllinger, die bayerische Regierung und das erste Vatikanische Konzil," *Spiegel der Geschichte. Festgabe für Max Braubach* (Münster 1964); Franz-Willing, *Die bayerische Vatikangesandschaft 1803–1934* (Munich 1965), 52–68; W. Brandmüller, "Die Publikation des I. Vatikanischen Konzils in Bayern. Aus den Anfängen des bayerischen Kulturkampfes," *ZBLG* 31 (1968); M. Weber, *Das I. Vatikanische Konzil im Spiegel der bayerischen Politik (Miscellanea Bavarica Monacensia* no. 28 [Munich 1970]).

BADEN: E. Friedberg, *Der Staat und die katholische Kirche im Großherzogtum Baden seit dem Jahre 1860* (Leipzig 1874); J. Becker, "Staat und Kirche in Baden in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Bericht über den Stand der Vorarbeiten an einer geplanten Quellenpublikation," *ZGObrh* 111 (1963); L. Gall, "Die partei- und sozialgeschichtliche Problematik des badischen Kulturkampfes," *ZGObrh* 113 (1965); L. Gall, *Der Liberalismus als regierende Partei. Das Großherzogtum Baden zwischen Restauration und Reichsgründung* (Wiesbaden 1968); M. Stadelhofer, *Der Abbau der Kulturkampfgesetzgebung im Großherzogtum Baden 1878–1918* (Mainz 1969).

SWITZERLAND: P. Gschwind, *Geschichte der Entstehung der christkatholischen Kirche der Schweiz,* 2 vols. (Solothurn 1904–10); V. Conzemius, "Eugène Michaud, ein katholischer Reformator des 19. Jahrhunderts?" *ZSKG* 58 (1964); V. Conzemius, "Der schweizerische Bundesrat und das erste Vatikanische Konzil," *SZG* 15 (1965).

20. *Internal Catholic Controversies in Connection with Liberalism*

LITERATURE

FRANCE: Aubert, *Pie IX,* 224–61, 531–37; C. de Montalembert, *Catholicisme et liberté. Correspondance inédite 1852–1870* (Paris 1970); Weill, *Cath. lib.,* 91–202; Gurian, 210–38; M. Prelot, *Le libéralisme catholique* (Paris 1969), 14–33, 190–237; J. Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du Second Empire* (Paris 1930); J. Gadille, *La pensée et l'action politique des évêques français au début de la troisième République* (Paris 1967) I, 46–142; J. Fèvre, *Histoire critique du catholicisme libéral en France jusqu'au pontificat de Léon XIII* (Paris 1897; a partisan, but well-informed indictment); and the biographies (see General Bibliography) of Montalembert, Veuillot, Dupanloup, Pie, Maret, Guéranger, and Lacordaire; *DHGE* XIV, 1117–19 (on Dupanloup); L. de Lanzac de Laborie, *Le comte de Falloux* (Paris 1912; see also *DHGE* XVI, 1499–1513); H. Boissard, *T. Foisset* (Paris 1891; see also *DHGE* XVII, 1392–96); J. de Pange in *Le Correspondant* 317 (1929), 113–37 (on the years 1855–64); J. Lecler: *Études* 291 (1956), 196–211 (concerning the Jesuits).

ITALY: *Carteggi di L. Taparelli d'Azeglio e di B. Ricasoli;* the files of the council of Castiglioncello, "Il problema politico dei cattolici nel XIX secolo," *RStT* 4 (1949), 215–407; G. Martina, *Il liberalismo cattolico ed il Sillabo* (Rome 1959); Jemolo, 87–264; Jemolo, *Scritti vari* (Milan 1965), 397–454; E. Passerin in *RSTI* 20 (1966), 500–506; G. Spadolini, "L'intransigentismo cattolico dalla 'Civiltà cattolica' al 'Sillabo,' " *RStT* 4

(1956), 309–32; F. Fonzi in *Itinerari* 4 (Genoa 1956), 603–23; E. Passerin d'Entrèves, *Nuove Questioni di storia del Risorgimento* (Milan 1961), 565–606.

BELGIUM: A. Simon, *L'hypothèse libérale en Belgique* (Wetteren 1956); A. Simon, *Catholicisme et politique* (Wetteren 1955); A. Simon, *Le cardinal Sterckx* I (Wetteren 1950), 209–56; E. de Moreau, *A. Dechamps* (Brussels 1911), 423–78; K. van Isacker, *Werkelijk en wettelijk Land* (Antwerp 1955), 1–85.

GERMANY: In addition to the general works by Goyau, Schnabel, Brück, and Kißling, and the biographies of Döllinger and Ketteler (see General Bibliography), see J. Rovan, *Le catholicisme politique en Allemagne* (Paris 1956), 46–78.

ENGLAND: In addition to the general works by W. Ward, *W.G. Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London 1893), 130–210, and M. Ward, *The W. Wards and the Transition* (London 1934), 1–53, and the biographies of Manning, Newman, and Ullathorne (cited in the General Bibliography), see J. Altholz, *The Liberal Catholic Movement in England* (London 1962); H. MacDougall, *Acton-Newman Relations* (New York 1962); A. Gasquet, *Lord Acton and his Circle* (London 1906; see also *Cambridge Historical Journal* 10 [1950], 77–105, where attention is drawn to grave gaps in the edition of the letters).

ON THE SYLLABUS: C. G. Rinaldi, *Il valore del Sillabo* (Rome 1888); *DThC* XIV, 2877–2923; G. Martina, "Osservazioni sulle varie redazioni del "Sillabo," *ChStato* II, 419–523; G. Martina, "Nuovi documenti sulla genesi del Sillabo," *AHPont* 6 (1968), 319–69; R. Aubert in *Revue Nouvelle* 40 (Brussels 1964), 369–85, 481–99; R. Aubert, "Monseigneur Dupanloup et le Syllabus," *RHE* 51 (1956), 79–142, 471–512, 837–915; R. Aubert, *Scrinium Lovaniense* (Louvain 1961), 543–60 (on the reaction in Belgium); R. Aubert, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens* 19 (Münster 1962), 291–304 (on the reaction in Spain); E. Papa, *Il Sillabo di Pio IX e la stampa francese, inglese e italiana* (Rome 1968); D. McElrath, *The Syllabus of Pius IX. Some reactions in England* (Louvain 1964); B. Schneider, "Der Syllabus und die deutschen Jesuiten," *AHPont* 6 (1968), 371–92.

ANTILIBERALISM AND SOCIAL CATHOLICISM: General description and bibliography in *Die Katholische Arbeiterbewegung in Westeuropa,* ed. by S. Scholl and G. Mees (Bonn 1966). Useful information in R. Kothen, *La pensée e l'action sociale des catholiques* (Louvain 1945).

BELGIUM: R. Rezsohazy, *Origines et formation du catholicisme social en Belgique* (Louvain 1958), 1–98; P. Gérin in *150 Jaar Katholieke Arbeidersbeweging in Belgie,* ed. by S. Scholl, I (Brussels 1963), 223–319.—Germany: M Moennig, *Die Stellung der deutschen katholischen Sozialpolitiker des 19. Jahrhunderts zur Staatsintervention in der sozialen Frage* (Münster 1927); E. Ritter, *Die katholische soziale Bewegung Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954).

SECTION FIVE

The Victory of Ultramontanism

21. *Ultramontane Progress and Final Gallican Resistance*

LITERATURE

ON THE MOVEMENT IN GENERAL: Aubert, *Pie IX,* 262–310, 537–41; R. Aubert, *La géographie ecclésiastique au XIX^e^ siècle: L'ecclésiologie au XIX^e^ siècle,* 36–55; C. Butler, *The Vatican Council I* (London 1930), 23–78; J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Concils I: Vorgeschichte* (Nördlingen 1877); W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London 1893), chap. V.

FRANCE: See in addition to the biographies of Maret, Guéranger, Veuillot, Clausel, Sibour, Gousset, Mathieu, and Darboy (General Bibliography), J. Maurain, *Le Saint-Siège et la France de décembre 1851 à avril 1853* (Paris 1930); J. Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du Second Empire* (Paris 1930), chaps. III, V, IX, XVI, XVIII, XXI, XXII, XXIV, XXVII; P. de Quirielle, "Pie IX et l'Église de France," *Annales de l'École des sciences politiques* 5 (1890), 490–514, 6 (1891), 111–48; A. Houtin, *Un dernier gallican, H. Bernier* (Paris 1904); A. Houtin, *Le P. Hyacinthe dans l'Église romaine* (Paris 1920); A. Ricard, *L'abbé Combalot* (Paris 1891); M. de Hédouville, *Monseigneur de Ségur* (Paris 1957), 174–227, 485–534; de Montclos, 107–33, 200–321, 405; J. Gadille, "Autour de Louis Veuillot et de l'*Univers,*" *Cahiers d'histoire* 14 (1969), 275–88; "Monseigneur Darboy et le Saint-Siège," *RHLR* 12 (1907), 240–81 (also R. Durand in *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire moderne* 7 [1907–08], 6–10); P. Mabile, *Vie de Monseigneur Mabile* (Paris 1926); J. -R. Palanque, *Catholiques libéraux et gallicans en France face au concile du Vatican* (Aix 1962), 5–32.

GERMANY: In addition to the biographies of Geissel, Ketteler, and Döllinger (General Bibliography), see Goyau IV, 201–90; V. Conzemius, "Aspects ecclésiologiques de l'évolution de Döllinger et du vieux-catholicisme," *L'ecclésiologie au XIX^e^ siècle,* 247–79; S. Loesch, *Döllinger und Frankreich* (Munich 1955).

ENGLAND: See the biographies of Wiseman and Ullathorne (General Bibliography), W. G. Ward (see above), Newman, and Manning.

22. *The Vatican Council*

SOURCES

The majority of the official files were published by L. Petit and J. -B. Martin in *Mansi* XLIX–LIII. Concerning the reliability of the stenographic records of the debates, see the diary by Dehon (below), 5–10, 60f., and C. Mirbt in *HZ* 101 (1908), 546–48. But in order to write a history of the council, the official files must be complemented by other categories of sources still partly unpublished. Nearly six hundred documents (newspaper articles, manifestoes, diplomatic telegrams, letters of bishops, etc.) were

printed in the second part (*Documenta historica*) of Volume VII of the *Collectio Lacensis* (Freiburg i. Br. 1892). E. Cecconi, *Storia del Concilio Vaticano,* 4 vols. (Florence 1872–79) contains 308 documents dealing with the preparation of the council. A number of polemical writings were reprinted in J. Friedrich, *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum,* 2 vols. (Nördlingen 1872) and E. Friedberg, *Sammlung der Aktenstücke zum I. Vatikanischen Konzil,* 2 vols. (Tübingen 1872–76).

MEMOIRS AND COLLECTIONS OF CORRESPONDENCE: L. Pásztor, "Il Concilio Vaticano I nel diario del cardinale Capalti," *AHPont* 7 (1969), 401–90; J. Friedrich, *Tagebuch während des Vaticanischen Concils* (Nördlingen 1873); E. Donckel, ed., *Reise nach Rom zum I. Vatikanischen Konzil. Tagebuch von Monsignor Adames* (Luxemburg 1963); V. Carbone, *Diario del Concilio Vaticano di L. Dehon* (Rome 1962); L. Veuillot, *Rome pendant le concile,* 2 vols. (Paris 1872); V. Conzemius, ed., *Ignaz von Döllinger - Lord Acton, Briefwechsel* II (Munich 1965); H. J. Browne, "Letters of Bishop McQaid," *CHR* 41 (1956), 408–41; L. Lenhart in *AMrhKG* 4 (1952), 307–29, 6 (1954), 208–29 (letters of Ketteler and his secretary Raich); F. Guédon in *Les Lettres* (1928) II, 19–34, 190–206, 314–31 (letters of Monsignor Foulon); P. Batiffol in *RHEF* 13 (1927), 199–213 (letters of Monsignor Devoucoux); J. Nasrallah, "Monseigneur Grégoire 'Ata et le concile du Vatican," *PrOrChr* 11 (1961), 297–330, 12 (1962), 97–122; R. Aubert, "Documents concernant le Tiers Parti au concile du Vatican," *Abhandlungen über Theologie und Kirche* (Düsseldorf 1952), 241–59; S. Jacini, *Il tramonto del potere temporale nelle relazioni degli ambasciatori austriaci a Roma* (Bari 1931); N. Blakiston, *The Roman Question. Extracts from the Despatches of Odo Russell from Rome* (London 1962); V. Conzemius in *ThQ* 140 (1960), 427–62 (letters of the Bavarian diplomat Arco Valley); A. Tamborra, *Imbro I. Tkalac e l'Italia* (Rome 1966), 123–44, 225–338; R. Aubert and J. -R. Palanque, "Lettres de Lady Blennerhasset au lendemain du concile du Vatican," *RHE* 58 (1963), 82–135.

LITERATURE

The best treatment is that by C. Butler, *The Vatican Council. The Story told from inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters,* 2 vols. (London 1930, 1965); the most recent treatment is by R. Aubert, *Vatican I* (Paris 1964); the most comprehensive treatment from the Catholic point of view is that by T. Granderath, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils,* 3 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1903–06, too apologetic); the best treatment from the point of view of the Old Catholics is by J. Friedrich, *Geschichte des Vaticanischen Concils,* 3 vols. (Nördlingen 1877–87, partisan); E. Mourret, *Le concile du Vatican* (Paris 1919) is of lasting value because of its use of the diary of M. Icard; H. Rondet, *Vatican I* (Paris 1962) concerns itself chiefly with the neglected aspects (preparation of the schemata, working methods, unimplemented projects). For the diplomatic aspects and impressions, see É. Ollivier, *L'Église et l'État au concile du Vatican,* 2 vols. (Paris 1877). From the Protestant point of view, C. Mirbt in *HZ* 101 (1908), 529–600.

ON NATIONALITIES: J. J. Hennesey, *The First Council of the Vatican. The American Experience* (New York 1963); F. J. Cwiekowski, *The English Bishops and the First Vatican Council* (Louvain 1971); M. Maccarrone, *Il Concilio Vaticano e il "Giornale di Monsignor Arrigoni,"* 2 vols. (Padua 1966), on the Italian episcopate; J. -R. Palanque, *Catholiques libéraux et gallicans en France face au Concile du Vatican* (Aix-en-Provence 1962; see also *RHEF* 48 [1962], 54–79); M. Martin Tejedor, "España y el Concilio Vaticano," *HS* 20 (1967), 99–175; J. Hajjar, "L'épiscopat catholique oriental et le I^er^ Concile du Vatican," *RHE* 65 (1970), 423–55, 737–88; M. Mac Suibhne, "Ireland at the Vatican Council,"

Irish Ecclesiastical Records 93 (1960), 209–22, 295–307; U. Betti, "I Frati minori al Concilio Vaticano," *Antonianum* 32 (1957), 17–26.

ON THE DOGMATIC CONSTITUTIONS: J. P. Torrell, *La théologie de l'épiscopat au I^er^ concile du Vatican* (Paris 1961); G. Dejaifve, *Pape et évêques au I^er^ concile du Vatican* (Bruges and Paris 1961); G. Dejaifve in *NRTh* 82 (1960), 787–802; G. Dejaifve, *L'épiscopat et l'Église universelle* (Paris 1962), 639–736; R. Aubert, "L'ecclésiologie au concile du Vatican," *Le concile et les conciles* (Paris and Chevetogne 1960), 245–84; R. Aubert in *Lumière et Vie* (St. Alban) 14 (1954), 21–52; A. Alsteen in *EThL* 38 (1962), 461–503; W. Dewan in *EThL* 36 (1960), 23–56. A number of historio-systematic works were reprinted thanks to the efforts of the Vatican Library in *De doctrina Concilii Vaticani Primi* (Vatican City 1969).

SPECIAL ASPECTS: J. Gadille, *Albert Du Boÿs. Ses "Souvenirs du Concile du Vatican". L'intervention du gouvernement impérial à Vatican I* (Louvain 1968); F. Engel-Janosi in *MÖSTA* 8 (1955), 223–35; L. Pásztor in *RSTI* 23 (1969), 441–66; H. J. Pottmeyer in *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 2 (1970), 87–111 (on the method in the constitution *Dei Filius*); A. Hagen in *ThQ* 123 (1942), 223–52, 124 (1943), 1–40, 148 (1968), 403–28 (on Hefele's attitude); T. Freudenberger, *Die Universität Würzburg und das erste Vatikanische Konzil I* (Neustadt 1969); R. Lill, "Zur Verkündigung des Unfehlbarkeitsdogmas in Deutschland," *GWU* (1963), 469–83.

23. *The Rise of the Old Catholic Community*

LITERATURE

J. F. von Schulte, *Der Altkatholizismus* (Gießen 1887, reprint Hildesheim 1965); J. F. von Schulte, *Lebenserinnerungen* I (Gießen 1908); J. Troxler, *Die neuere Entwicklung des Altkatholizismus* (Cologne 1908); P. Gschwind, *Geschichte der Entstehung der christkatholischen Kirche der Schweiz,* 2 vols. (Solothurn 1904–10); M. Kopp, *Der Altkatholizismus in Deutschland 1871–1912* (Berne and Kempten 1913); K. Algermissen, *Konfessionskunde* (Celle 1957), 745–63; C. B. Moss, *The Old Catholic movement, its origins and history* (London 1964); U. Küry, *Die altkatholische Kirche* (*Die Kirchen der Welt* 3 [Stuttgart 1966]); Conzemius, *Katholizismus ohne Rom. Die altkatholische Kirchengemeinschaft* (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1969); A. Lauscher, *Die katholisch-theologische Fakultät der Universität zu Bonn* (Düsseldorf 1920); P. Wenzel, *Der Freundeskreis um Anton Günther* (Essen 1965); E. Kleineidam, *Die Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät der Universität Breslau* (Cologne 1961).

INDIVIDUALS: Baltzer: A. Franz (Breslau 1873); Döllinger: Friedrich, *Döllinger* III (Munich 1901); Friedrich: F. H. Hacker (Kempten 1918); Reinkens: F. Nippold (Leipzig 1896); J. M. Reinkens (Gotha 1906); B. Poll in *AHVNrh* 155/56 (1954), 392–410; V. Conzemius: *Rheinische Lebensbilder* 4 (Düsseldorf 1970), 209–33; Reusch: L. K. Goetz (Gotha 1901); Schulte: R. von Scherer (Vienna 1915); N. Hilling in *AkathKR* 95 (1915), 519—27.

INDEX

Abdul Mejid, sultan 169
Abel, Carl August von 110
Academic freedom 291f, 304
Achterfeld, J. A. 32, 35
Acquaderni, G. 260f
Acton, John Emmerick Edward 124, 293, 320, 325
Ad limina visits 308
Affre, Denis Auguste, archbishop of Paris 6, 15, 49, 66, 68, 103
Africa mission 196ff
Agnosticism, English 235
Alacoque, Marguerite Marie 222, 224
Al-Bashir 170
Alberdingk Thijm, Joseph 79
Albertario 290
Alcántara Herrán 270
Aleppo, national council of Melchites (1866) 173
Alexander II, tsar of Russia 155, 162
Alimonda, Cajetan, cardinal 261
Allemand, J. J. 25
Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg) 326
Allioli, Joseph Franz von 42
Altar sacrament, form of veneration 221f
Alzog, Johann Baptist 245
Alzon, Emmanuel d' 104, 157, 158, 167, 215
Amberger, J. 22
America, see Latin America, United States of America
American College in Rome 133
Amicizie 176
Amorim Pessoa, John Chrysostom d', archbishop of Goa 181, 182
Ancaroni, master general O.P. 11
Andlaw-Birseck, Heinrich Bernhard von 7, 71
André, abbé 305
Andrea, d', cardinal 234
Anglicans and First Vatican Council 315f
Annales de philosophie chrétienne 50, 55
Annali cattolici 291
Annam, see Indochina
Anticlericalism 214
—in Baden 278ff
—in Belgium 262ff, 265, 289
—in Colombia 270
—in France 68f, 93, 100f
—in Italy 289
—in Latin America 269ff
—in Mexico 269
—in Netherlands 265ff
—in Portugal 148, 267
—in Prussia 280
—in Spain 144f, 148
Antiliberalism and social Catholicism 299ff
Antonelli, Giacomo, cardinal 61, 63, 64, 87, 88, 127, 180, 221, 248, 250, 251, 252, 254, 257, 295, 308, 327
Antonin of Florence 328
Antonio di S. Giacomo, general superior of the Passionists 211
Antonites 171
Apologetics 234ff
Apostolate 215
—methods 217
Apostolic Union of Secular Priests 214
April Movement (Netherlands 1853) 78
Araujo, M. de 154
Arbues 313
Archeology, Christian 229
Arendt, W. 44
Argentina 150f, 152, 271
Armenian Uniate Church 160, 171, 309
Arqus, Philipp, Syrian patriarch 173
Asia, reorganization of missions 178ff
Association of Sons of Mary the Immaculate 24
Associatio perseverantiae sacerdotalis 214
Association for the Support of Schools in the Near East 202
Association of Ladies of the Children of Mary 25
Association of the Immaculate Conception of Mary for the Support of the Catholics in the Ottoman Empire 157
Association of the Sacred Heart of Jesus 177
Assumptionists 98, 157, 167
—in Turkey 170
Aeterni Patris, bull (1868) 199f, 316

Atonement, pilgrimages of 222
Audo, Joseph, Chaldean patriarch 172
Auersperg, Austrian minister 275
Augustinians (Hermits, Recollects) 11
—in Micronesia 196
—in the Philippines 193
Aulike, Matthias 107
Australia 89
—clergy 142
—education 143
—episcopate 142
—establishment of hierarchy 142
—immigration 142
—progress of Catholicism in 19th century 142f
Austria
—all-Austrian bishops' conference at Vienna (1849) 76f
—and Near Eastern Churches 157
—and orthodoxy 156
—antiliberalism 108
—catechesis 17
—Catholic association movement 76, 309
—Christian Socialist Party 276, 161, 166f, 273f, 310
—concordat (1855) 17, 76, 91, 108f
—defeat at Königgrätz (1866) 254
—ecclesiastical development 1848–70 108ff
—ecclesiastical laws (1874) 274f
—education 109
—expulsion from the German Confederation (1866) 116
—National Elementary School Law (1869) 274
—people's missions 23
—State and Church 272ff
—ultramontanism 310f
Austria-Hungary
—Slavs in Austria-Hungary 165ff
Avendaño, Diego de, S. J. 204
Away-from-Rome Movement 334
Azarian, Stephen, Armenian patriarch 172
Azeglio, Cesare d' 26
Azeglio, Massimo d' 59, 257

Baader, Franz von 38
Baden, grand duchy 119
—Catholic People's Party 280
—Church regulation (1868—76) 278
—civil marriage law (1869) 279
—concordat (1859) 91, 112
—Kulturkampf 277ff
—law on foundations (1870) 279
—law on religious orders (1872) 279
—liberal anticlericalism 278ff
—Old Catholics Law (1874) 279
—religious development after 1848 112f
—school dispute 278
—school regulation (1876) 278
—nondenominational schools 278, 280
Badischer Beobachter 280
Bahut, Clement, Melchite patriarch 173
Bailly, E. 306
Balabin, P. 156
Balbo, Cesare 290
Balmes, Jaime 45, 145, 148, 269
Baltzer, Johann Baptist 37f, 238, 330
Baraga, A. F. 135
Barat, Madeleine Sophie 223
Barberi, Dominicus 24
Barnabites
—in Burma 184
Barnabo, Alessandro, cardinal 88, 158, 175f, 200f, 202, 204, 309
Baudry, C. 49, 233
Bauerband 72
Baur, Ferdinand Christian 238
Bautain, Louis Eugène Marie 32, 33, 47ff 102, 232
Bavaria 276ff
—concordat (1871) 277
—creeping Kulturkampf 277f
—first bishops' conference at Freising (1850) 110
—movement of Catholic associations 277
—Patriotic People's Party 277
—religious policy after 1848 110
—secularization 276ff
Beckx, Petrus, general superior, S. J. 203, 211
Beelen, T. 44
Belgium 25, 91, 286
—and *Syllabus* 297
—anticlericalism 262ff, 265, 289
—Catholic congresses (1863, 1864, 1867), 264
—Catholic publications 55, 265
—Catholic social movement 301
—education policy 263f
—episcopate and liberalism 263
—moral theology 31
—ultramontanism and Catholics loyal to constitution 264
Bellarmine 312, 319
Benedict XIV, pope 174, 309
Benedictines 9, 12f, 209, 210
—in Australia 142f, 196
—in Spain 144
—liturgical renewal 227f
Bergier, Nicolas Sylvestre 51
Berlage, Anton 40
Bernetti, Tommaso, cardinal 57, 248
Bertier, Ferdinand de 26
Bertier, G. de 158
Bettachini, Orazio, vicar apostolic of Jaffna 183
Beuron, abbey 210
Beust, Friedrich Ferdinand von 109, 274f, 276
Bible 21
—in catechesis 17ff
Bigandet, A. T., vicar apostolic in Burma 184
Bigelmair, Andreas 243
Bilio, L., cardinal 88, 296, 327
Binterim, Anton Josef 7, 32, 75
Bishops' conferences at Rome (1854, 1862, 1867) 308
Bismarck, Otto von 117, 276, 280, 333

Bisping, August 238
Biunde, F. X. 34
Bizzarri, cardinal 200, 208, 212, 323
Bkerke, national council of Maronites (1856) 174
Black and White Penitents 24
Blaj, synod (1868) 167
Blanchet, vicar apostolic in the United States 131
Blanco, Guzmán, president of Venezuela 271
Blondel, Maurice 236
Bludov, Russian minister 159
Blum, Peter Joseph, bishop of Limburg 112
Bluntschli, Johann Caspar 278
Bofondi, secretary of state 88
Bolivia 150, 151, 152, 270
—concordat (1851) 91
Bollandists 44, 51, 220
Bolletino di archeologia cristiana 229f
Bolzano, Bernhard 36
Bommel, C. van, bishop of Liège 77, 264, 266
Bonald, Louis Gabriel Ambroise de 284
Bonald, Louis Jacques Maurice de, cardinal 14, 94
Boniface Association 114
Bonjean, E. C., archbishop of Colombo 184
Bonnand, Clement, vicar apostolic of Pondicherry 181, 182, 184, 201
Bonnechose, Henri Marie Gaston de, cardinal 94
Bonn union conferences of Old Catholic, Russian Orthodox, and Anglican theologians (1874–75) 334
Bonnetty, Augustin 50, 232
Borret, Theodor 79
Borromeo 86
Bosnia 169
Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne 6, 231, 311, 314, 320
Bourbons 61
Bourget, bishop of Montreal 139, 221
Bouvier, J. B. 30
Brazil
—celibacy and marriages of priests 153
—church and state 271
—clergy 153f
—concordat (1862) 91
—ecclesiastical situation and stagnation under Pedro II 153f
—liberalism and ultramontanism 271
—people's missions 153
Braun, G. 27
Braun, Johann Wilhelm Joseph 34, 35, 54
Bravi, Giuseppe 183
Brentano, Clemens 220
Brière, Y. de la 153
Broglie, Jacques Victor Albert de, duke 103, 286
Broere, C. 266
Brother institutes 212
Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius 156
Brotherhood of the Sacred Childhood of Jesus 24
Brothers of Christian Schools, see Christian Brothers
Brothers of Our Lady of Mercy (Belgium) 13
Brothers of Our Lady of Mercy (Netherlands) 13
Brothers of the Immaculate Conception 13
Brownson, Orestes 137
Brownson's Quarterly 137
Bruckner, Anton 105
Bruguière, Bartholomew, vicar apostolic in Korea 191
Brunner, Franz Sales 23
Brunner, Sebastian 76
Bruno, Fra di 261
Brunoni, Paolo, vicar apostolic 167, 200
Buchner, A. 41
Büchner, Ludwig 235
Buck, V. de 232
Buddhism in Siam 185
Bufalo, Gaspare del 23
Bühlmann, W., O.F.M.Cap. 180
Bulgaria 162
—mission to 162
—union attempts 167
Bunsen, Christian Karl von 35, 239
Buß, Franz Josef von 7, 26, 71, 72, 73, 302
Butler, C. 87, 296, 312, 329

Canada 89
—Catholicism (1840–70) 138ff
—clergy and training of priests 139f
—clericalism 140
—founding of dioceses 138f
—immigration 138
—school dispute (1871–74) 141
—Union Act (1840) 138
Caloen, Gérard van 228
Canovas del Castillo 268
Cantù, Cesare 231, 291
Capaccini, Francesco, cardinal 35, 149
Capecelatro, cardinal 291
Capes, John Moore, 124
Capitanio, B. 13
Capponi, Gino 290
Capuchins 178
—in Africa 197
—in India 181
—in Poland 164
—in Spain 144
Carbonelle 235
Cardinals, college of, under Pius IX 87f
Carol I, King of Rumania 168
Carmelites
—in India 181
—in Spain 144
Carmelites, female congregations
—in Cochinchina 187
Carolus Franciscus a Breno, O.F.M. 203
Carrera, Rafael 151

Carroll, John, S. J., bishop 133
Cartesianism 234
Casaretto, abbot of Subiaco 209
Casolani, A., vicar apostolic in Central Africa 196
Casoni, lawyer 260
Cassino Congregation, O.S.B. 209
Castelfidardo, defeat of papal army (1860) 251
Castiglioni, Francesco Saverio, see Pius VIII
Castilla, R. 152f
Casuistry 27f, 29
Catacombs 229
Catholic associations 332
Catholic Association of Germany 74
Catholic Club 72
Catholic faction (in Prussia) 107f
Catholic labor organizations 114
Catholic Organization (Ireland) 74
Catholicism
—and ecclesiastical (Roman) authority 310
—and liberalism after 1848 283ff
—internal Catholic controversies regarding liberalism 283–303
Cavaignac, Eugène Louis 67
Cavour, Camillo Benso 245, 249, 251, 253, 257
—Italian policy 257
—separation of church and state 258
Cerna, president of Venezuela 271
Ceylon 183
Chaignon, Pierre, S. J. 219
Chaldeans, Uniate 172
Chamard, O.S.B. 231
Chambord, Count 103, 288
Chaminade, Guilleaume Joseph 26
Charbonneaux, Étienne, vicar apostolic of Mysore 181, 201
Charbonnel, Armand François M. de, bishop of Toronto 141f
Charvaz 261, 291
Chastan, J. H. 191
Chateaubriand, François René de 41
Chevalier, J. 177
Chevrier, P. 20
Chiaramonti, Luigi Barnaba, see Pius VII
Childhood of Jesus Association 201
Chile 151, 152, 271
China 93
—bloodbath of Tientsin (1870) 188f
—establishment of vicariates apostolic 189
—missionary and ecclesiastical development 187ff
—persecution of foreigners and Christians 188f
—religious freedom 187f
China mission, at First Vatican Council 204ff
Christian Brothers 178, 210
—in Cochinchina 187
—in Ottoman Empire 169
Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland 282, 333
Church, established 273
Church history 220, 231f
—in France 231f
—in Germany 238
—in Italy 231
—in Spain 231
Cistercians 144, 210
Claret, Antonio-Maria 147
Clausel de Montals, bishop of Chartres 68
Clemens, Franz Jakob 38, 241, 243
Clercs de St. Viateur 140
Clericalism 214
Clergy 14f, 86
—diocesan clergy and its pastoral activity in 19th century 213ff
—regular and secular clergy 214
Cochin, A. 88, 286, 297, 301
Cochin China, mission and Church 186
Cohen, Hermann, S. J. 221
Colin, J. U., superior general of Marists 195
Collegiality 134
Collegio Pio latino-americano in Rome 150
Collegium Germanicum, Rome 242
Collegium Romanum 45f, 230, 242, 244
Cologne, provincial synod (1860) 235
Cologne dispute 33, 73
Colombia 152, 270
—clergy 270
—liberalism 269, 270
—secularization 270
—separation of church and state 270
Combalot, Théodore 4, 14
Comboni, Daniel, vicar apostolic in Central Africa 176f, 196, 206, 261
Commissione di archeologia sacra 229
Commissio pro Ecclesia Orientali et pro Missionibus at the First Vatican Council 200ff
Comte, Auguste 235
Congregatio cassiniana primitivae observantiae 209
Congregatio Sacrorum Cordium Jesu et Mariae, see Picpus Society
Congregation of St. Peter 11, 30
Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (Missionaries of Scheut/Brussels) 177
Congregatio super statu regularium 208
Concordat policy 91
Congregations, religious 212f
—dedicated to the Heart of Jesus 222
—dedicated to the Virgin Mary 225
—for education and care of the sick 13f
—in Italy 261
Consalvi, Ercole, cardinal, secretary of state 258
Constantinople, council (1869) 172
Coventuals, in Moldavia 168f
Conzemius, V. 320, 326
Corboli-Bussi, adviser to Pius IX 58, 60, 65, 154, 159
Cornelius, C. A. von 331
Cornoldi, Johann Maria, S. J. 234
"Correspondance de France" 317
Corsi, Cardinal 256
Cortés, Juan Donoso 26, 45, 145, 148, 284

Costa Rica 271
—concordat (1852) 91, 151
Counterrevolution 301
Cousin, Victor 47, 69, 231
Coux, Charles de 43
Cox, E. 3
Cramer, J. W. 266
Crimean War 169f
Croatia, unionist striving 165
Croke, archbishop of Cashel 129
Crolly, George 129
Cullen, Paul, cardinal 123, 125, 127ff
Cum ecclesiastica disciplina, constitution (1869) 172
Curci, Carlo Maria, S. J. 65, 290
Customs Parliament
—and infallibility 280f
Czartoryski, prince 158

Dalgairns, Bernard (John Dobree) 221, 226
Dalwigk 112
Daniel-Rops, Henri 215
Darboy, Georges, archbishop of Paris 297, 314, 328
Darras, Abbé 232
Darwin, Charles Robert 235
Daughters of Charity of Montreal 140
Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul 13, 24, 170, 268
Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary 212
Dechamps, A. 298
Dechamps, Victor, cardinal 236, 317, 325, 327f
Dechristianization, urban 217
Deharbe, Joseph, S. J. 18
Dei Filius, constitution (1870) 324
Deinlein, Michael, archbishop of Bamberg 277
Deism 243
De Katholiek 55, 79
Democracy 67
Denzinger, Heinrich, S. J. 243f
Der Katholik (Mainz) 7, 32, 54, 71, 105, 241, 243
Derré, J. R. 52
Desmet, P., S.J. 135
De Tijd 55, 266, 267
Deutinger, Martin 29
Deutsches Volksblatt (Stuttgart) 71
Devie, bishop of Belley 20, 30
De Wachter 79
Diepenbrock, Melchior von, Prince-bishop of Breslau 37, 72, 76f, 106
Dieringer, Franz Xaver 38, 39, 54, 247
Dogma 235, 237, 239
—and morals 27f
Dogmatics 37, 235, 246
Dogmas, history of 237, 238
Döllinger, Ignaz von 42f, 50, 54, 72, 73f, 75, 110, 114, 115, 116, 118, 124, 228, 239ff, 243, 244ff, 292, 295, 297, 313, 317, 320f, 326, 330, 332, 334
Domenec, bishop 134
Dominicans 9, 11f, 144, 172, 209
—in China 189
—in Formosa 189
—in France 286
—in Philippines 193
Don Bosco, Giovanni 25, 176, 215, 221, 257
Don Carlos 144
Donnet, suffragan bishop of Nancy 48
Dostoevski, F. M. 161
Doutreloux, bishop of Liège 222
Drey, Johann Sebastian 29, 40, 242
Droste zu Vischering, Clemens August von, archbishop of Cologne 33f
Druffel, A. von 331
Dublin, Catholic university 128f
Dublin Review 56, 293, 311
Dubois, H. 22
Ducpétiaux, E. 264, 301
Dum acerbissimas, brief (1835) 33ff
Dumont, C. 167
Dupanloup, Félix 19, 68f, 69f, 94f, 102, 103, 141, 157, 216, 248, 286, 297f, 306, 314, 319, 322, 325f
Duparquet, C. 197
Dupin, André 5
Dupont des Loges, bishop of Metz 99
Duruy, Victor 96

Eastern missions at Vatican I 200ff
Eastern patriarchates 171ff
Eastern Question 154
Ecclesiastical Titles Bill (1851) 121
Ecclesiology 237, 323
Economic liberalism 300, 301f
Ecuador 152, 271
—concordat (1862) 91, 151
Edes, Miss 136
Education Bill (1870) 123
Education League (Belgium) 264
Education, religious 16ff
Einsiedeln, abbey 120
El Diario 286
Electoral Hesse 111
Elgin, Lord 138
El Pensamiento de la Nacion 56
Elvenich, P. J. 27, 33f, 35
Émery, Jacques-André 19
Emmerick, Anna Katharina 220
Empiricism, English 235
England, see Great Britain
English Historical Review 124
Eötvös, J. 286
Epigraphy, Christian 229
Episcopalism 320
Episcopate 14ff, 304, 324
—and clergy 14f
—and council preparation 315ff
—and infallibility 319f
—and training of priests 214
Erdeli, bishop of Grosswardein 166
Errazuriz, president of Chile 271

Errington, George 122
Espartero, Spanish general 145, 147, 268
Estrada, José Manuel 153
Etsi multa luctuosa, encyclical (1873) 282
Études de théologie, de philosophie et d'histoire 156, 286
Eucharistic congresses 222
Europe, continuation of Catholic renewal 3–56
Eternal veneration 221
Exauvillez, P. d' 55
Exegesis 238f, 243
Eximiam tuam, brief 39
"Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus" 311
Eyraud, B. 195

Faber, Frederick William 219, 221, 226
Faillon, Sulpician 19, 231
Faith and natural sciences 235
Falloux, Alfred de 67f, 286, 305
Falloux Law (1850) 69, 94, 95, 141, 286
Fani, M. 260
Fathers of the Holy Cross 140, 181
Faurie, Louis, vicar apostolic in Kweichow 200, 204f
Fausti, P. 229
Febronius, Justinus 307
Félix, P., S.J. 236
Felicians 164
Fenian Movement 127
Ferdinand VII, king of Spain 147
Ferréol, J., bishop of Macao 191
Ferretti, secretary of state 88
Fessler, Josef, bishop of St. Pölten 274, 310, 319
Feuerbach, Ludwig 36, 235
Feye, Henri 232
Fideism 32, 33
First communion 20, 24, 221
Fleury, Claude 4
Flir, A. 244
Florentini, Theodosius, O.F.M.Cap. 120
Flórez 231
Fornari, R., cardinal 5, 44, 305
Foucher, L. 236
Foulon, bishop of Nancy 94
Fourier, François Charles 300
France 4, 31, 285, 305
—academic freedom 5
—and Near Eastern Churches 156f
—and Roman Question 250ff
—and *Syllabus* 297
—apostolicity of Gallican Church 231
—Catholic Church during Second Republic 65ff, 69
— — apparent successes of the Church during Second Empire and "Moral Order" 92–104
— — ambivalence of actual religious situation 98ff
—Catholic press 55
—Catholic social movement 299f
—Catholic universities 97, 102
—Catholicism and anticlericalism 104
—care of the poor and hospitals 96
—charitable works 96
—Church and industrial workers 100f
—clergy 92ff
—clerical intolerance 288f
—concordat between Napoleon I and Pius VII (1801) 14f
—coup d'état (1851) 67
—debates over Christian society 286
—education 69, 95
—episcopate 305f
—industrialization and proletariat 100f
—intellectual defects of Catholicism 102
—internal contradictions of Catholicism 102ff
—mission institutes 175f
—mission works 97
—missions to the people 23f
—moral theology 29f
—neo-Gallicans 287
—neo-ultramontanism 102, 314f
—oratory 102
—pastoral theology and practice 22
—pastoral and catechesis 19
—piety 96ff
—priest training 49
—priests, supply of 94
—provincial councils 69, 305
—rationalism and positivism 101
—renewal of philosophical and theological thought during July monarchy 47
—results of 1848 revolution 66–70
—revolution (1848) 66ff
—romanticism 101f
—Second Republic 66ff
—social question 100
—splitting of Catholics 285ff
—ultramontanism 3ff, 94, 305, 311f, 313
Franchi, cardinal 88
Francis de Sales 226
Franciscans 11, 144, 210
—in China 189
—in California 269
—in Croatia 169
—in Philippines 193
—in USA 131
Frankfurt National Assembly (1848) 70ff
—ecclesiastical demands and satisfaction 72ff
Fransoni, archbishop of Turin 257f
Fransoni case 257
Franz II (I), emperor of Austria 76f
Franzelin, Johannes B., S.J. 47, 227, 230f, 242
Franz Joseph I, emperor of Austria 108, 156
—and Austrian Catholicism 273ff
—concordat policy 108
Frassinetti, Giuseppe 221, 261
Frayssinous, Denis 19
"Free church in a free state" 251, 258, 295
Free Press, Glasgow 125
Freemasonry 296
—in Belgium 263f
—in Brazil 154, 271
—in France 101

—in Italy 259
—in Latin America 153, 269ff
—in Portugal 148, 268
—in Spain 193
—in USA 131
Free Thought (Belgium) 265
French seminary in Rome 94, 311
Freiburg im Breisgau, department of theology 41
Freppel, Charles Émile 95, 231
Freidberg, Emil 273, 278
Friedrich I, grand duke of Baden 280
Friedrich, Johannes 118, 247, 330, 332
Frohschammer, Jakob 244
Fuchs, Bernhard 29

Gabet, Joseph 190f
Gadille, J. 287
Gaeta, conference (1849) 64
Gagarin, I. (J.X. S.J.) 156
Gagern, M. von 72
Gallicanism, Gallicans 4ff, 29, 94, 102, 296, 312
—and Roman Question 766
Galicia 165
Gallitzin, Amalie, princess 26, 33
Galura, Bernhard 17
Gambasin, A. 256
Gangauf, abbot, O.S.B. 455
García Moreno, Gabriel 152
Garibaldi, nuncio in France 5
Garibaldi, Giuseppe 251, 254, 255
Gasser, Vinzenz, bishop of Brixen 310, 329f
Gaude, cardinal 88
Gaultier, P. 4
Gaume, Abbé 70
Gautrelets, F.-X. 224
Gay, Charles 226
Geissel, Johannes von, archbishop of Cologne 8, 14, 15, 38f, 39, 71f, 74, 75f, 106, 107, 242, 302, 310
Genga, Annibale della, see Leo XII
Genoude, Antoine de 51
Gentili, L. 24
Gerbet, Philippe 50, 294f
—and the *Syllabus* 294
Geritz, bishop of Ermland 72
German bishops' conferences
—in Fulda (1867) 118
—in Fulda (1869; infallibility question) 281, 317
—in Würzburg (1848) 74f
German Catholic Conferences 113ff
—in Breslau (1849) 74
—in Cologne (1858) 115
—in Innsbruck (1867) 117
—in Mainz (1848) 73f
—in Regensburg (1849) 74
Germanics 242, 310
German National Association 115
German Roman Catholic Central Union 136
"German Theologians"
—Scholastics and Germanics vs. the "German Theologians" 237ff
Germany 3, 31, 89, 285
—academic freedom 292f
—associative Catholicism 115
—catechesis, catechetical instruction 16f, 18f
—Catholic activity after 1848 70ff
—Catholic association movement 71, 106, 114, 216
—Catholic movement 116
—Catholic press 54
—Catholic scholars and ultramontanism 313
—Catholic social movement 114, 300f
—Catholicism and liberalism 290ff
—Catholicism and ultramontanism 312f
—church and state 290ff
—civil marriage 73
—contrast between liberalism and Catholicism in middle of 19th century 105
—economic liberalism 105
—effects of 1848 revolution 70ff
—end of German Confederation 116f
—episcopate 106, 117f
— — and problem of laborers 114
—episcopalism 6
—integration of Catholicism in North German Confederation 117
—internal contrasts in Catholicism 115
—missions to the people 23
—moral theology 27ff
—national assembly at Frankfurt (1848) 70
—pastoral theology 20ff
—piety 106
—project of a Catholic university 115
—religious education 16, 73
—Romanization of German Catholicism 116
—striving toward a national church (1848) 75
—theologians and neo-scholasticism 313f
—theologians' congress at Munich (1863) 245ff, 295, 313
—ultramontanism 6f, 115, 311, 312f
Gertrud von Helfta 227
Ghisalberti, A. M. 64f
Gießen, department of theology 41
Ginoulhiac, Jacques Marie Achille 231
Gioberti, Vincenzo 10, 46, 61, 65
Girard, C. R. 157
Girard, P. 192
Gizzi, cardinal secretary of state 57ff, 88
Gladstone, William Ewart 128, 129f
Glaire, Abbé 55
Glorieux, Abbé 13
Gómez Farias, V. 269
Gonzalez, Z., O.P., cardinal 234
Gorham, J. C. 122
Gorham judgment (1851) 122
Görres, Johann Joseph von 26, 37, 41, 42, 227
Görres Society 115
Gousset, archbishop of Rheims 5f, 30, 305
Goyau, Georges 245
Goyeneche, J. S. 152
Graf, Anton 22, 40, 227f

Gratry, A. J. Alphonse 102, 226, 236, 286, 327
Gray Sisters of Ottawa 140
Gravissimas inter, brief (1862) 244
Gray, John 125
Great Britain 89, 91, 286, 293f, 305, 316
—and Pius IX 58
—and *Syllabus* 296
—Catholic press 56
—Catholicism after 1848 121ff
—education 123f
—Old Catholics group (Newman) and ultramontanism (Manning) 123
—Oratory in Birmingham 123
—provincial synods (1852, 1855, 1859) 122
—reestablishment of hierarchy (1850) 121f
—ultramontanism 3, 311
Greater German Party 115
Gregorian calender 173
Gregorian University in Rome 211
Gregory XVI (Bartolomeo Alberto Cappellari, Fra Mauro), Pope 3, 7f, 10f, 30, 31, 46, 51, 57, 59, 61, 64, 83, 87, 138, 144, 146, 148, 149f, 154, 158f, 163, 173, 180, 208, 216, 229, 267, 270, 285, 294, 304, 306
—and orders 9
—and Russian church policy 158ff
—and Tsar Nicholas I 159
Greith, K. J., bishop of St. Gallen 120
Griffith, Raymond, vicar apostolic 143
Grignion de Montfort, Louis Maria 225
Grou, Jean Nicolas, S.J. 226
Gruber, A., archbishop of Salzburg 17
Guatemala 151, 152
—concordat (1832) 91
—concordat (1852) 151
Guéranger, Prosper Louis Pascal 4, 6, 9, 12f, 51f, 210, 227f, 288, 294, 309, 311
Guerber, J. 29
Guerrier de Dumast 286
Guidi, O.P., cardinal 241, 328
Guizot, F. P. G. 45
Günther, Anton 31, 35, 36, 235, 237, 239, 243
Güntherianism 241, 243, 292
—rise and fall of Güntherianism 35ff
Gury, P., S.J. 30f

Haeckel, Ernst 235
Haffner, Paul Leopold 118, 241
Haiti, concordat (1860) 91
Hamon, A. J. M. 226
Haneberg, Daniel Bonifaz von, O.S.B., abbot 42, 118, 200, 238, 245
Häring, Bernhard 28
Hartmann, Anastasius, O.F.M.Cap., vicar apostolic of Bombay 178, 179ff, 181, 183
Hassun, Antonius, cardinal 171f, 309
Haxthausen, Werner von 155
Haynald, Ludwig, cardinal 326
Hecker, Isaac 84, 13f
Hefele, Karl Joseph von, bishop of Rottenburg 40, 113, 118, 238f, 322, 328, 330, 331
—and infallibility 281
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 36, 40, 235
Hegelianism 37
Heinrich, Johann Baptist 71, 105, 112, 118, 240, 241, 310
Hello, Ernest 226
Herbst, Johann Georg 40f
Hergenröther, Joseph, cardinal 118, 156, 243, 247
Hermes, Georg 7, 27, 31f, 35, 235
Hermesianism, Hermesians 48
Herrera, Bartolomé 153
Herzegovina 169
Herzog, Edward 282, 331, 332, 333
Heß, Johann Jakob 28
Hesse-Darmstadt 111
Hesse-Nassau 112
Hettinger, Franz 118, 243, 247
Hilgers, G. J. 330
Hirscher, Johann Baptist 18, 22, 28f, 40f, 75, 227f
Historical school of law 42
Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland 32, 38, 54, 105, 241
Hnogek, A. A. 227
Hofbauer, Clemens Maria 36
Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, Gustav Adolf, prince, cardinal 86, 276f
Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, Chlodwig, prince 276f, 318
Home and Foreign Review 293
Home Rule 129
Honduras, concordat (1861) 91, 151
Hovanyi, F. 310
Huber, Johann Nepomuk 247
Huc, E. 190
Hughes, G., archbishop of New York 132, 134, 135f, 138
Hugonin 233
Hulst, Maurice d' 223, 234
Hurter, Friedrich 22

Illuminism, illuminati 103
Il Mediatore 253
Imbert, L. J. M. vicar apostolic of Korea 191
Immaculate Conception of Mary, dogma (1854) 272, 307
Index of Forbidden Books, 287
Indian missions 131, 135
—dissolution 150
India
—lack of a native clergy 181
India mission 178ff
—and English colonial power 182
—papal visitation (1859–62) 181
Indifferentism 296
Indochina 93
—French-Spanish intervention (1858) 186
—mission and persecution of Christians 185ff
—occupation by France 186
Indonesia mission 194
Indulgences 219
Industrialization and problem of workers 299ff

Infallibility, papal 3, 6, 114, 125, 203, 245, 268, 274, 280f, 307, 312, 317ff, 319, 330
—at the First Vatican Council 325ff
—infallibilists and anti-infallibilists 318ff
—political resistance to dogma 276
Innsbruck, department of theology 118, 241
Institutes, religious 212f
In suprema Petri sede, encyclical (1848) 155
Inter multiples, encyclical (1853) 306, 311
Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act (1878) 128
Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift 333
Intransigents (Italy) 57, 260, 290
Irish 136, 142
Irish Ecclesiastical Record 129, 218
Ireland 122
—Catholicism after 1848 126ff
—education and Catholic University at Dublin 128f
—Queen's Colleges 127f
Isabella II, Queen of Spain 144, 145, 147
Italy 31, 57, 274, 285, 289ff
—and Austria 57ff, 252
—and Papal States 117, 248
—and Pius IX 59
—and *Syllabus* 296
—anticlericalism 289
—Catholic movement 300
—Catholic press 56
—clergy 255, 263
— — and Roman Question 253
— — liberal tendencies 289
—ecclesiastical policy of the kingdom 258f
—first Catholic congress (1874) 260
—from establishment of kingdom to occupation of Rome 250ff
—mission institutes 175f
—missions to the people 23
—occupation of Rome (1870) 254
—secularization policy 255ff
—separation of church and state 291
Italian war (1859) 249

Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich 27
Jacobini, Ludovico, nuncio in Vienna 275
Jandel, Alexander Vincent, master general O.P. 12, 209
Jansenism, Jansenists 311
Japan
—free exercise of religion for foreigners 192
—mission and persecution of Christians 192f
Jarcke, Carl Ernst 32, 38, 43, 54
Jaricot, Marie Pauline 26, 224
Jerusalem
—council of Malchites 174
Jesuits, see Society of Jesus
Jesuit law (1872) 277
Jews
—in Italy 256
—in Prussia 108
Jocham, Magnus 29
Jolly, Julius 113, 278, 280
Jörg, Joseph Edmund 105
Josephinism 108
Joseph, veneration of 219
Journal de Bruxelles 265
Journal des personnes pieuses 55
Journal historique et littéraire 55
Journeymen associations 25, 114, 302
Juárez, Benito 269
Jugan, Jeanne 13
Juilly, college 50

Kabylia mission 197
Kaiser, bishop of Mainz 73
Kampschulte, F. W. 331
Kasandschan, general superior of the Antonites 172
Katerkamp, Theodor 22
Katholische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Kunst 39
Kenrick, P., archbishop of Baltimore 133, 138
Kersten, Pierre 55
Ketteler, Wilhelm Emmanuel von, bishop of Mainz 41, 72, 73, 106, 111f, 117, 240f, 286, 292, 295, 310, 313, 320
—and infallibility 281
—and social Catholicism 303
Kiernan 147
Kim, Andreas 191
Kingsley, Charles 124
Klee, Heinrich 6, 39
Kleutgen, Joseph, S.J. 118, 241, 243, 324
Knoodt, F. P. 37f, 330
Know-nothingism 131
Kohlmann, S.J. 32
Koller, R. 214
Kolping, Adolf 25, 114, 302
Kominski, Honorat 164
Kopitar, B. 158
Korea, mission and persecution of Christians 191
Kött, Christoph Florentius, bishop of Fulda 111
Kraus, Franz Xaver 75
Krausism 148
Kreuzlage, A. 33
Kübel, Lothar von, suffragan of Freiburg 280f
Kuhn, Johannes Evangelist 33, 40f, 118, 237, 239, 243, 244, 247
Kulturkampf 89, 332f
—preliminary stages 272–283
Kutschker, Johann Rudolf, cardinal 274f
Kuyper, A. 267

Labastida, P. A., archbishop of Mexico 270
Labor union movement 301
La Bouillerie, François A.R. de 221
Labouré, Catherine 24, 224
Lachat, Eugène, bishop of Basel 282
La ciencia cristiana 234
La Civilizacion 56
La Civiltà cattolica 65, 211, 234, 258, 284, 290, 294f, 300, 307, 312, 314, 317

Lacordaire, Henri Dominique 9, 11, 27, 48, 53, 66f, 70, 209, 226, 286
La Correspondance de Rome 305
Laity
—active in pastoral and charitable work 24ff
Lambruschini, Luigi, cardinal secretary of state 35, 57f, 159
Lambruschini, Raffaele 258
La Mennais (Lamennais), Hugo Félicité Robert 5, 7, 30, 32, 34, 43, 44, 49, 102, 232, 236, 266, 286, 294, 300
Lamennais, Jean Marie 30
Lamey, August 113, 278
L'ami de la religion et du roi 233
Lamorcière, general 251f
Langen, J. 330, 333
Languillat, A., S.J., vicar apostolic of Kiangnan 205
L'année liturgique 227f
Lanteri, Pio Brunoe 30
Laouënan, J. M., vicar apostolic of Pondicherry 201
L'Armonia della Religione colla Civiltà 258
Lartigue, bishop of Montreal 139
La Salette, pilgrimage 98, 225
Lasaulx, Peter Ernst von 72
La Scienza italiana 234
La Sociedad 56
Lassalle, Ferdinand 302
Latin America 89
—Catholicism in the 19th century 149ff, 152f
—clergy and lack of priests 149
—regalistic liberals and Freemasons 269ff
La Terre Sainte et les Églises orientales 157
La Tour du Pin 303
Latreille, A. 97, 104
L'Avenir 55, 286, 300, 311
Lavigerie, Charles, cardinal 94, 157, 177, 197, 314
Lay apostolate 26
Lazarists 170
—in China 188, 189
Lebanon 174
Lebeurier, V. 214
Le Bien Public 289
Le Bras, G. 98
Le Cocq d'Armandville, S.J. 194
Le Correspondant 55, 102, 233, 286f, 314
Ledóchoswki, Mieczyslaw Halka von, cardinal, 107
Lefebvre, P. C. 141
Lenhart, Ludwig 39
Lennig, Adam Franz 54, 71, 73, 112, 240
Leo XII (Annibale della Genga), pope 24, 30, 294
Leo XIII (Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci), pope 83, 85, 89, 90, 125, 165, 172, 207, 223, 234, 237, 261, 283, 294, 298, 301
Leonrod, Franz von, bishop of Eichstätt 278
Le Pappe de Trévern, Jean François, bishop of Strasbourg 47f
Lepidi, Alban, O.P. 234
Le Play, Fréderic 301
Lequeux 306
Le Rappel 305
Lerdo de Tejada 270
L'Ère Nouvelle 66
Leroy-Beaulieu 321
Levant, Catholic missions 169ff
Levate, encyclical (1867) 163
Lewicki, M., cardinal 165
Liberalism 85, 89, 298, 331
—and infallibility dogma 276
—Catholic reaction to liberalism 83
—condemnation by the *Syllabus* 116
—in Baden 278
—in Germany 104f, 272
—in Italy 259
—in Netherlands 266ff
—in Portugal 267ff
—in Spain 144f, 267ff
—in Switzerland 119f, 272, 281
—in Venezuela 271
—increasing gravity of conflict of Catholic Church in German-speaking areas and *Kulturkampf* 272ff
—offensive by the liberal governments 255ff
—state church tendencies 273
—struggle between Catholicism and liberalism 248ff
Liberalism, Catholic 298f
—in Belgium 262ff, 289
—in Canada 140
—in England 293
—in France 69, 101ff, 286f
—in Germany 104, 291ff
—in Italy 289f
Liberatore, P. 234
Libermann, Franz Maria 197
Liebermann, Bruno Franz Leopold 6
Ligue française pour l'enseignement public 96
Liguori, Alphonsus Maria de 29ff, 219, 227, 319
Lincoln, Abraham 134
Linde, Justin T. B. 72
Lingard, J. 3
Lipp, Joseph, bishop of Rottenburg 112f
Litta, cardinal 173
Little Sisters of the Assumption 212
Little Sisters of the Poor 13
Liturgy 3, 4f, 21, 227, 311
Liturgical renewal 227
Liturgies, Eastern 309
Lombardy 61, 256, 281, 305
Louis Napoleon, see Napoleon III
Louis XIV, king of France 222
Louis-Philippe, king of France 60
Lourdes, pilgrimage 97, 98
Louvain, Catholic University 31, 43ff, 233
Löwe, professor 37
Luca, Antonio de, cardinal 167
Lucas, F. 56
Ludwig II, king of Bavaria 110, 277
Luna Pizzarro, F.X. de 152

L'Univers 5, 55, 70, 94, 232, 258, 289, 305, 311, 314
L'Université Catholique 50f, 55
Luquet, bishop 155
Lutterbeck, A. 41
Lutterbeck, J. 238
Lutz, Johann von, baron 277
Lydia, journal 38
Lynch, James, C.M. 126
Lynch, John Joseph, bishop of Toronto 134
Lyon, Association for the Propagation of the Faith 201
Lyon Missionaries 177

Maaß, F. 8
Maccarrone, M. 329
Macé, Jean 96
Macedo Costa, A. de, bishop of Para 272
MacHale, John, archbishop of Tuam 127
Madagascar mission 198
Mai, Angelo, cardinal 45, 229
Magisterial office of the Church 242, 292, 320
Maignen, Abbé 100
Mainzer Journal 71
Mainz Catechism 18
Mainz circle 7, 71, 118
—and *Syllabus* 297
Mainz seminary 41
Maistre, Joseph de 7, 155
Malabar 172
Malaya, mission and Church 185f
Mallinckrodt, Hermann von 108, 117
Malou, Jean Baptiste, bishop of Bruges 44, 226
Mañe y Flaqeur 286
Mann, Horace 135
Manning, Henry Edward, cardinal 87, 122ff, 124, 125, 214, 226, 293, 316, 317, 322, 325, 328
Manteuffel, Otto von 107
Manzoni, Alessandro 290
Maori 195
Marazán, president of Guatemala 151
Marc-Bonnet, H. 90
Marches 250, 251
Marchi, Giuseppe, S.J. 229
Marchilhacy 217
Maret, Henri Louis Charles 50, 231, 233, 287, 297, 314f, 328
Margotti 290
Maria II da Gloria, Queen of Portugal 148
María Cristina, regent of Spain 144f
Marian congregations 24, 224
Marilley, Étienne, bishop of Lausanne-Geneva 119f
Marion Brésillac, Melchior de 177
Marists, in Oceania 195
Maronites, Maronite Church 173f
Marrou, H. I. 229
Martin, K. 31
Martina, G. 61, 86, 214, 294
Martínez de la Rosa, Francisco 144
Martinov, J., S.J. 156, 200
Mary, appearances of 224
Mary, veneration of 24, 219, 224f
—in France 98
—in Poland 164
Masad, Paul, Maronite patriarch 174
Mastai-Ferretti, Giovanni Maria, see Pius IX
Mathieu, Adrien Jacques Marie, archbishop of Besançon 14
Matta, Jerome Joseph de, bishop of Macao 179
Maubant, Pierre Philibert 191
Maurain, J. 287
Maurists 52, 220, 311
Maximilian, emperor of Mexico 93, 270
Maximos III Mazlum, Melchite patriarch 173
Maynooth, seminary 129
May prayers 225
Mazzini, Giuseppe 64
Mazzuconi, G. 195
McCloskey, Cardinal 138
McMaster, J. 136
Meaux, count 571
Mechelen, congress of Belgian Catholics (1863) 295f, 301
Mechelen School 77
Meglia, nuncio in Mexico 270
Mélanges théologiques 218
Melchers, Paulus, cardinal 107
Melchites, Uniate 173
Melchite schism 173
Meletios, archbishop in Greece (1861) 168
Melun, Armand de 25f, 96, 300
Mendicant orders 9f, 10
—see also Dominicans, Franciscans
Mendizábal, Spanish minister 144
Menzel, A. 330
Mermillod, Gaspard 120, 222, 282, 312
Merode, Xavier de 86, 250
Mertel, cardinal 88
Messmer, J. A. 330
Metternich, Klemens, prince 8, 35, 59, 76
Mexico 93, 152, 269, 295
—Catholicism and liberalism 269f
—civil marriage 270
—clergy 269
—race problem 269
—secularization 269
Mey, Gustav 18
Michael Confraternity 116
Michelis, Friedrich 118, 331, 332f
Micronesia 196
Migne, Jacques-Paul 51f, 55
Miguel, Don M., king of Portugal 148f
Milan missionaries
—in Burma 185
—in China 189
—in India 181
—in Polynesia 195
Milan mission seminary 176
Milde, Vincenz, archbishop of Vienna 17, 76
Minh Mang, emperor of Tonkin 186
Minguetti 290
Mirari vos, encyclical (1832) 285

Missionaries of the Precious Blood 23
Missionaries of Mill Hill (London) 135, 177f
Missionaries of Scheut, in China 189
Missionari della Consolata 176
Mission(s) 91
—First Vatican Council and missions 199ff
—missions 1840–70 175–207
—under Pius IX 89f
Missions to the people, parish missions 211, 222
—in Austria 24
—in Brazil 153
—in England 122
—in France 23ff, 99
—in Germany 24, 106
—in Italy 23
—in USA 133
Mission directory 204
Mission Institute for Africa 176f
Mission works, in Belgium 262
Modena, duchy 256f
—concordat (1857) 91
Modernism 89
Möhler, Johann Adam 29, 40f, 41, 42, 48, 50, 230, 237
Moldavian monasteries 168f
Molé, Louis Mathieu 67
Moeller, J. 44
Mommsen, Theodor 229
Mönchen-Gladbach, movement 302
Mongkut, king of Siam 185
Mongolia mission 189
Montalembert, Charles René Forbes 5, 10, 26f, 52, 55, 67f, 69, 103, 141, 248, 264, 284, 286, 289, 295, 298
Montclos, X. de 49
Montigny, de, French consul 186
Moral theology, reaction to rationalism of the Enlightenment and rigorism 27ff
—and Holy Scripture 28f
Morel, Gall, O.S.B. 120
Moreno, García 271
Moreno, M., bishop of Ivrea 258
Mortara case 249
Mosquera, M. J., archbishop of Bogotá 270
Moufang, Franz Christoph 105, 112, 115, 118, 240, 310
Moy de Sons, Karl Ernst von 310
Müller, Johann Georg, bishop of Münster 72, 107
Multa praeclare, decree (1838) 180
Mun, Albert de 100
Munich, university 41ff
Munich circle, Görres circle 31, 41, 43
Munich School 50f, 235, 246f
—young Munich School 247
Murdoch, Dr. 125
Murialdo, Leonardo 257
Murray, Patrick 129

Naples, kingdom (of Two Sicilies) 61, 251, 255
Napoleon III (Louis Napoleon), emperor of France 64, 67, 87, 92, 103, 186, 194, 205, 249, 251, 253, 314, 327
Narváez 147, 268
National Catholic Almanac 136
National seminaries at Rome 307
Neminem latet, encyclical (1857) 208
Neo-Gothic 79
Neo-Guelfism 256, 289
—from neoguelf myth to Roman revolution 57ff
Neo-Scholasticism 18, 118, 233, 241ff, 313f
Neo-Thomism 45, 234
Nesselrode, Karl Robert 159ff
Netherlands 89, 91, 286
—and Indonesia 194
—and *Syllabus* 296
—anticlericalism 265ff
—Catholic association movement 79
—Catholicism in isolation 79
—Catholic press 55
—clergy, monasteries, and orders 79
—effects of revolution (1848) 77ff
—first provincial council (1865) 78
—free Catholic schools 266f
—Jansenist Church 78
—liberal education policy 266ff
—liberalism and Catholicism 265ff, 297
—religious freedom and equality of religion after 1848 77ff
—reestablishment of an episcopal organization 77f
Nève, F. 44
Newfoundland 138
New Granada, see Colombia
Newman, John Henry, cardinal 49, 123ff, 128, 129, 226, 236f, 293f, 311
Nicaragua, concordat (1861) 91, 151
Nickes, H. 37
Nicolas, Auguste 50
Nicholas I, tsar of Russia 59, 158
—religious policy 158ff
Niederbronn Sisters 13
North German Confederation 117
Notre-Dame de Lourdes 219
Nullis certi verbis, encyclical (1860) 250
Nunciatures, nuncios, papal 88, 308
Nuns
—in China 190f
—in Italy 261

Oblates of Mary Immaculate
—in Africa 197
—in Ceylon 183
Oblates of Mary of Turin, in Burma 184
Oblates of St. Charles 122
Oceania, mission 194ff
O'Connell, Daniel 26, 56, 74, 125, 127
Oehler, vicar general of Rottenburg 112
Old Catholicism 39, 119, 277, 330ff
—Old Catholic congresses (1870, 1872, 1873) 332f
—episcopal election (1873) 333

—first synod (1874) 333
—in Baden 279
—in Germany 330ff
—in Switzerland 281f, 333
—international congresses 334
—origin of Old Catholic Church community 330–34
Olier, J.-J. 19
Oliveira, V. de, O.F.M.Cap., bishop of Olinda 272
Ollé-Laprune, Léon 236
Ontologism 232f
Oratoire de France 236
Oratorians 286
Oratorians of Goa 183
Orders 89, 92, 296
—growth of large international orders 9ff
—in Austria 275
—in Baden 279
—in Belgium 262ff
—in Brazil 153
—in Canada 139
—in China 189f
—in Cochin China 187
—in England 122
—in France 69, 93, 95, 97
—in Germany 106, 113
—in Italy 261
—in Mexico 269
—in Philippines 193
—in Poland 164f
—in Portugal 148f
—in Russia 158, 162
—in Spain 144, 268
—in Switzerland 283
—in Turkey 169
—in USA 133, 135
— — pastoral care of blacks 135
—orders and congregations 208ff
—significance for Roman unity, centralization, and ultramontanism 9ff
Orders, women in
—in China 190f
—in Italy 261
Order, Moral 97
Organic Articles 5, 14, 16, 68, 92
Orthodox Christians at First Vatican Council 315f
Osterrath 72
Ottoman Empire, see Turkey
Oudinot, general 64
Oeuvre des cercles 100
Oeuvres des Ècoles d'Orient 157
Overberg, Bernard 117
Oxford Movement 316
Ozanam, Frédéric 25, 52f, 59, 66f

Pabst, J. H. 36
Pagan Mission, at First Vatican Council 200ff
Pagganuzzi, G. B. 260
Palafox y Mendoza, Juan de, bishop of Puebla 204
Palestine 171
Pallegoix, J. B., vicar apostolic in Siam 185
Pallotti, Vincenzo 26
Panikkar, K. M. 194
Pan-Slavism 165f
Pantheism 296
Pappalettere, Simplicio 38
Papp-Szilaggi, J. 167
Papacy, pope
—and collegiality 3
—and election of Eastern Uniate bishops 308
—and episcopate 328
—and growth of ultramontanism 9
—and Papal State 90, 244
—and secular power (Papal States) 248ff, 296
—attempts at union with Eastern Churches 156ff
—Austrian policy 273
—centralization policy 171, 304ff
—French "cult of papacy" 311f
—growing importance after middle of century 307
—reduction of prestige 250
—universal episcopate 310, 330
Papal elections 57f
Papal Seminary of Sts. Peter and Paul 176
Papal States 57f, 60, 87, 90, 101, 116
—from papal restoration to Italian War 248ff
—missions to the people 23
—restoration under Pius IX 64
—under Pius IX 57ff, 248f
Paraty, count 268
Paray-le-Monial, pilgrimage 98, 223
Paris congregation 92
Paris Congress (1856) 249
Parisis, Pierre Louis, bishop of Arras 5f, 99, 305
Paris missionaries
—in Burma 185
—in China 188, 189
—in India 181
—in Japan 192
—in Malaya 185
Parnell, Charles Stewart 129f
Passaglia, Carlo 47, 226, 242, 253, 307
Passionists 211
Pastoral theology
—and professional ethics 21
—and pastoral practice in 19th century 20ff
Pastor aeternus, constitution (1870) 328ff
Patrizi, Costantino, cardinal 88f
Patrizi, F. X. 46
Patronage, right of
—French patronage in China 187f
—Portuguese 149
— — in China 187
— — in India 204
— — patronage priests in Malaya 185
— — reduction 178ff
—Spanish in Spanish America 149ff
Paulists 137
Pecci, Vincenzo Gioacchino, see Leo XIII
Pedro II, emperor of Brazil 153

Pedro IV, Don Pedro, king of Portugal 148
Peking, peace treaty (1860) 188
Pellerin, vicar apostolic of North Cochin China 186
Pelliot, Paul 190
Pensamiento español 148
People's Association, Catholic 302
Pérez Alhama 146
Périn, Charles 265, 301
Permaneder, Franz Michael 42
Perreyve, Henri 226
Perrone, Giovanni, S.J. 33, 46f, 223, 234
Perry, Matthew, admiral 192
Persico, Ignatius, cardinal 621
Persico, J., S.J. 180
Peru 151, 152f, 270
Petau, Dionysius, S.J. 230
Peter's Pence 116
Petitjean, T., vicar apostolic of Japan 192
Pfordten, Ludwig von der 110
Philaret, metropolitan of Moscow 155
Philippe, general superior of Christian Brothers 210
Philippines, missions and ecclesiastical development 193
Phillips, George 6, 42, 43, 54, 72, 310
Philosophy 232f
Pichler, Alois 247
Picpus Association 223
—in Polynesia 195
Pie, Louis, bishop of Poitiers 102, 230, 288, 294, 328
Piedmont 60f, 248, 249, 252, 256, 266, 285
—policy of secularization 256
—ultramontanism 3
Pierling, J. 156
Pietro Leopoldo, grand duke of Tuscany 256
Piety 304
—development of forms in 19th century 218–228
—Eucharistic 221
—in Belgium 262
—liturgical 227
Pitra, Jean-Baptiste, O.S.B., cardinal 51, 157, 229
Pitzipios, J. G. 157
Pius VI (Gianangelo Braschi), pope 294
Pius VII (Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti), pope 3, 23, 30, 208, 258, 294
Pius VIII (Francesco Saverio Castiglioni), pope 30
Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti), pope 9, 12, 24, 26, 35, 39, 47, 57ff, 60, 66, 75, 86, 103, 111, 117, 120, 121, 122, 133, 138, 146, 148, 150, 152, 155, 159, 163, 167, 172, 174, 179, 180, 195, 219, 221, 223, 229, 273, 244, 248, 262, 268, 270, 276, 281, 283, 285, 289, 297, 298, 300, 306f, 308, 309, 312, 326, 328f, 332
—and China mission 190f
—and Emperor Franz Joseph 274
—and German Congress of Theologians (1863) 245
—and Heart of Jesus piety 222f
—and Italian ecclesiastical policy 258ff
—and Josephinist religious policy in Austria 61
—and liberalism 255
—and missions at Vatican Council 200ff
—and papal sovereignty 252
—and Piedmontese religious policy 256f
—and *Risorgimento* 60
—and Russian ecclesiastical policy 162f
—and Siam mission 185
—and Switzerland 282
—and *Syllabus* 293ff
—and Uniate Churches in the East 155
—and union of Eastern Churches 156f
—and Vatican Council 315ff
—ascension and crisis of 1848 57–79
—activity after 1848 83–90
—bishops' meeting (1862) 252
—centralization policy 171
—characteristics of personality and activity 83ff
—concordat policy 258
—confirmation of Gregorian mission restoration 175–198
—first years of pontificate 57–65
—flight to Gaeta (1848) 62ff
—mission activity 175ff
—nadir of scholarly activity in Rome 228
—on tasks of theology 245f
—reorganization and centralization of the old orders and founding of new congregations 208ff
—Roman Question 250ff
—spiritual elevation of clergy 213f
Pius X, pope 261
Pius Associations 108, 115
Pius Association for Religious Freedom 71
Planchet, S.J. 172
Planque, Augustin 177
Placet, by the state 73, 76, 119, 146, 276f
Podcarpathia 166f
Poland 162, 295, 305
—Catholic Church under Russian domination 158ff
—rebellion (1863–64) 162
—religious awakening of Catholicism 164f
Polding, John Bede, O.S.B., archbishop of Sydney 142f
Polish College in Rome 162
Pombal, Marquis de 182
Popiel, Michael 163, 166
Portales, D., Chilean minister 151
Portugal
—and Africa mission 197f
—anticlericalism, dissolution of monasteries and suppression of Jesuits 148, 267ff
—concordat (1857) 91, 180f, 187
—development of religious situation during second third of the 19th century 148f
—missions 178ff

—secularizations 268
Positivism 235, 271
—in Spain 268
Pouthas, C. 94, 262
Pouthas, M. 97
Powondra, T. 21
Praying Sisters of the Assumption (Orantes) 212
Press, publications, Catholic 32
—and apostolate 217
—growth 53ff
—in Belgium 262, 264
—in England 56
—in France 55
—in Germany 54
—in Italy 55, 259
—in the Netherlands 55
Press, freedom of 295f
Priests, congregations of 212
Primacy, papal 244, 307, 327
Probabiliorism 30f
Probabilism 27, 46
Probst, Ferdinand 29
Processions 219
Propagation of the Faith, Congregation for the 170ff
—and missions in China 187
—and Portuguese patronage in China 187
—and question of missions at Vatican Council 200ff
—and union of Eastern Churches 157ff
—centralizing Latinization policy in Eastern patriarchates 170ff
—dispute with Portugal over patronage in India 178ff
Protestantism
—and Vatican Council 316f
—in Spain 144
Provencher, Monsignor, missionary 139
Prussia 71, 73, 91, 254, 280
—and Austria 117
—constitutional conflict (1862–67) 108f
—ecclesiastical development after 1848 105ff
—free exercise of religion 72
—freedom of belief and conscience 72
—Raumer's decrees (1852) 107
—religious paragraphs of the constitution (1848–50) 73
—religious policy 280
Purcell, J. B., archbishop of Cincinnati 132

Quanta cura, encyclical (1864) 134, 296, 300
Quebec, bishopric 138f
Quélen, de, archbishop of Paris 19
Quin, M. 56
Qui pluribus, encyclical (1846) 35, 58

Radowitz, Josef Maria von 72
Ram, Xavier De 43
Ramazotti, patriarch of Venice 176, 261
Ramière, H. 224
Ranke, Leopold von 43
Rapin, René, S.J. 311
Räß, Andreas, bishop of Strasbourg 18, 49
Rationalism 268, 296, 324
Ratio studiorum of the Jesuits 10
Raumer, Friedrich von 107
Rauscher, Josef Otmar von, cardinal 38, 76f, 108f, 117, 241, 274f, 310, 313, 320, 322, 328, 333
Ravignan, P. de 286
Rayneval, de 249
Redemptorists 31, 209f
—in Austria 310
Reichensperger, August 72, 108, 114, 117
Reichensperger, Peter 72, 107, 117, 281
Reinkens, Joseph Hubert 37f, 330, 332f
Reisach, Karl August von, cardinal 8, 32, 39, 75, 88, 110, 112, 157, 241, 243, 310
Reithmayr, Franz Xaver 42, 238
Religion, freedom of 91, 296
Religion, history of 234
Reliquaries, veneration of 219
Renan, Ernest 44, 101, 231, 295
Rerum novarum, encyclical (1891) 301
Resurrectionists 162, 168
Retord, Pierre, vicar apostolic of West Tonkin 186
Reusch, Franz Heinrich 238, 330, 332f
Revelation 232, 237, 315
Reversurus, bull (1867) 172ff, 174, 309
Revista mensual 286
Revolution of 1848: effects in Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands 70–79
Revue catholique 44
Revue des questions scientifiques 236
Revue européenne 55
Revue générale (Belgium) 265
Revue Internationale de Théologie 333
Rheinische Volkshalle, Cologne 71
Rheinisches Kirchenblatt 54
Rhineland 25
Riachi, metropolitan of Beirut 173
Riancé, Henri de 50
Riario Sforza 261
Ricasoli, Bettino 258, 290
Ricci, Scipione de, bishop 86
Riegler, G. 27
Riess, Joseph Florian, S.J. 247
Riffel, Kaspar 71
Rigorism 30
Rio, Alexis-François 52
Rio de la Plata 152
Risorgimento 252
Ritter, Joseph Ignaz 35
Ritter, M. 331
Rivista Universale 291
"Robber synod of Chelm" 164
Rock, D. 3
Rogier-Frère Orban 263
Rohrbacher, René François 4, 50
Romagna 250

Romanticism
—in Spain 148
Romher, minister 254
Roman Question 248–255, 285, 287, 289ff
Roman congregations under Pius IX 88
Roman republic (1848) 64
"Roman School" of German theology 242ff
Roman College, see Collegium Romanum
Romo, P. P., archbishop of Seville 145
Roothaan, Philipp, general S.J. 9f, 23, 34, 156, 196, 211, 220, 233
Rosary, living 224
Rosas, Juan Manuel 152
Roscovany, bishop 201
Rosmini-Serbati, Antonio 13, 15, 45f, 62, 65, 233, 257, 261, 290
Rossi, Giovanni Battista De 229f
Rossi, Pellegrino 62, 65
Rouland, French minister 93, 96
Rozaven, P., S.J. 47f
Rudigier, Franz Joseph, bishop of Linz 273, 310
Rumania
—mission of Moldavian monasteries 168f
—reorganization of the Catholic Church 167f
Russell, C. W. 129
Russell, Odo 127, 325
Russia 154, 155
—agreement (concordat) with Rome (1847) 160
—and Bulgaria 167
—Catholic Church under Tsar Nicholas I 158ff
—religious policy after 1847 160ff
—return of the Uniate Greeks to Orthodoxy 164
Ryerson, Canadian superintendent 141
Ryllo, P., S.J. provicar 196

Sacconi, Carlo, cardinal 75, 92
Sacred Heart associations 223
Sacred Heart Messenger 224
Sacred Heart veneration 98, 219, 222ff
Sailer, Johann Michael 17, 21, 28f, 41f, 89, 218, 311
Sainte-Beuve, Charles Augustin de 311
Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de, count 300
Saint Sulpice 311, 94, 214, 218, 233, 311f
Saints, cult of 219
—in France 98
—legends of 220
Saint Joseph of Mill Hill, Fathers of 135, 177f
St. Peter's Association 155
Salat, Jakob 27
Salesians
—in England 124
—in India 181
Salesians of Annecy 177
—in India 181
Salle, Jean Baptiste de la 178
Samhiri, Antonius, Syrian patriarch 173
San Salvador, bishopric
—concordat (1862) 91, 151
Sanseverino, G. 234
Sarfeh, Council of (1853–54) 173
Sausen, Franz J. 71
Schaepman, Abbé 267
Scheeben, Matthias Joseph 118, 226f, 242, 247
Scheffczyk, L. 40, 242
Schegg, Peter Johann 238
Schenkl, Maurus von, O.S.B. 28
Scheppers, bishop 13
Scherer-Boccard, Theodor von, count 120
Scherr, Gregor von, archbishop of Munich-Freising 111, 277
Schleiermacher, Friedrich 28
Schmid, Christoph von 18
Schmid, Heinrich, abbot, O.S.B. 120
Schmid, L. 459
Schmidlin, Joseph 175
Schmidt, A. 247
Schmöger, K. E. 220
Schnabel, Franz 7
Scholasticism 37, 40, 566, 241
Scholz, P. 238
School of La Chênaie and Malestroit 47
School of Molsheim 47f
Schrader, Clemens, S.J. 230, 241, 298, 307, 310, 324
Schreiber, H. 27
Schrörs, Heinrich 34
Schüch, I. 22
Schulte, J. F. von 331, 333
Schuster, Ignaz 18
Schwarzenberg, Felix zu 76
Schwarzenberg, Freidrich zu, cardinal 37, 74, 76, 210, 275
Schwendimann, Ignaz, general superior of Holy Ghost Fathers 197
Schwetz, Johannes Baptist 38
Scientific Society of Brussels 235
Scienza e fede 234
Scitowsky, cardinal, primate of Hungary 108, 210
Scotland
—reestablishment of hierarchy 126
—rise of Catholicism after 1848 125f
Secchi, Angelo, S.J. 158
Secularization 215
Sedlag, bishop of Kulm 72
Segesser, Anton Philipp von 119
Ségur, Louis Gaston Adrien de 96, 219, 221, 222, 226, 311
Semaine religieuse (France) 218
Semaine religieuse (Tournai) 218f
Semeria, St., vicar apostolic of Jaffna 183
Senestréy, Ignatius von, bishop of Regensburg 277
Serbs, Serbia 166
Sermon 21f, 53
Sertillanges, Antonin Gilbert 236
Settele 229
Shaughnessy 130

Siam, mission and Church 185
Sibour, archbishop of Paris 15, 68, 306
Siccardi 257
Signay, bishop of Quebec 138
Signoriello, N. 234
Silesia 37
Sillani, Hilarion 184
Silva Torres, José Maria da 179, 182
Simeoni, Cardinal 164
Simon, Jules 97, 101
Simpson, Richard 124, 293
Sisters of Charity 13
Sisters of Joseph of Cluny 170
Sisters of Notre Dame of Zion 170
Sisters of Providence 13f
Sisters of the Good Shepherd 140
Sixtus V, pope 321
Slavery 133f, 198
Slomšek, A. M. bishop of Lavant 156
Slovenia 156
Smedt, Charles de, S.J. 232
Smyrna, regional council (1869) 169
Social Catholicism 299ff
Socialism 296, 300
Social doctrine, Catholic 303
Société d'économie charitable 96, 300
Société hagiographique 51
Society for the African Mission 177
Society of Italian Catholic Youth 260
Society of Jesus 9ff, 23, 44f, 46f, 62, 65, 107, 203, 211f, 233, 241, 284, 310
—and ultramontanism 307
—in Africa 196
—in Argentina 150
—in Austria 310
—in Belgium 262
—in Canada 139
—in Chile 150f
—in China 188, 189
—in Colombia 270
—in France 286
—in Germany 292
—in India 179, 181
—in Indonesia 194
—in Italy 261
—in Madagascar 198
—in New Granada 150
—in Philippines 193
—in Portugal 148
—in Spain 144, 268
—in Switzerland 283
—in Turkey 169, 171
—in USA 137
—instruction in piety 219f
—persecutions and expulsion from European countries (1830–48) 10f
—readmission under Pius VII and reestablishment of former provinces in Europe and overseas (1830–51) 9f
—sermons at retreats of priests 219
—Sacred Heart veneration 223
Society of Oceania 195
Society of St. Vincent de Paul 25, 96, 300
Society of White Fathers 177, 712
—in Africa 197
Society of Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus 223
Society of the Daughters of the Sacred Heart of Mary 212
Society of the Sons of the Sacred Heart 176f
Soglia, Giovanni, cardinal 88
Solesmes, abbey 112, 210, 231
Sophie, archduchess of Austria 275
Sorbonne 49f
Sorg, P., O.S.B. 38
Soubirous, Bernadette 225
South Africa 143
South America, establishment of new dioceses 150
South American republics
—clergy 270
—civil marriage 271
—freedom of religion for Protestants 271
—liberalism 270f
—separation of Church and state 270
Spadolini, G. 290
Spalding, Martin John, archbishop of Baltimore 132, 134, 137
Spain
—agreement with the Holy See (1859) 147
—anticlericalism 144f, 148, 268
—Carlist wars 144
—Catholic press 56
—Catholicism and liberalism 268f
—Church and state 143ff
—clergy 146
—clergy, training 147f
—concordat (1753) 144, 146f
—concordat (1851) 91, 146f
—dissolution of monasteries and orders 144
—ecclesiastical development after Ferdinand VII's death (1833) 143ff
—freedom of religion 268f
—hierarchy and liberalism 268
—liberals and intransigent Catholics 142
—nationalization of ecclesiastical estates 144
—revolution (1868) 268
—state and Church 268
—theological studies 45
Spelta, L. C., O.F.M., vicar apostolic of Hupei 190f
Spencer, George 235
Spiegel, Ferdinand August, archbishop of Cologne 32
State church, established church 273
Staniewski, administrator of Mogilev 163
Stapf, J. A. 28
Staudenmaier, Franz Anton 41
Stella 86
Sterckx, E., cardinal archbishop of Mechelen 14, 263f, 289
Stieve, F. 331

Stifter, Adalbert 105
Stimmen aus Maria Laach 247
Stöckl, Albert 247
Stolz, Alban 41, 114
Stösser, Franz Ludwig von 735
Strasbourg, School of 47
Strauß, David Friedrich 40
Stremayr, Austrian minister of religion 274
Strickland, G., S.J. 183
Stroßmayer, J. G., bishop of Diakovar 165, 324, 328, 330
Suarez, Francisco de, S.J. 234, 241
Sudan, missions 176, 197, 206
Sulpicians 47
Surin, Jean Joseph, S.J. 226
Sušil, F. 156
Swetchine, Madame 156
Switzerland 292
—antiultramontanes 119
—break in diplomatic relations with Rome 282
—Catholic association movement and charitable works 120
—federal constitution (1847) 282
—"Freethinking Catholic Associations" 282
—*Kulturkampf* 281f
—liberalism and Catholicism 281
—narrow ecclesiastical policy after 1848 119
—National Church-Old Catholic movement 283
—ultramontanism 281
—Wessenbergians 119f
Syllabus of Pius IX (1864) 65, 101, 104, 105, 118, 127, 134, 152, 265, 266, 269, 271f, 272, 282, 292, 294f, 301, 313f, 317, 321
—and its consequences 293ff
Syria 93
Syrian Uniate Church 173f

Taché, Alexander Antonin, O.M.I. 139
Taiping rebellion 188
Talamo, S. 234
Talbot de Malahide, George 86f, 124
Tamisier, E. 222
Taparelli d'Azeglio, Luigi, S.J. 46, 300
Taparelli d'Azeglio, Massimo, see Azeglio
Tarnoczy, cardinal 37
Textual criticism 242
Teysseyrre 19
Thailand, see Siam
Theiner, Augustin 155, 158, 229
The Lamp 56
Theocracy 310, 312
Theology 36, 245
—Anton Günther's 36
—backwardness of ecclesiastical studies and the controversy over the "German theologians" 228–247
—Catholic thought and the search for new ways 31–56
—ecclesiastical studies outside of Germany 228ff
—freedom, academic 245
—G. Hermes 31ff
—in France during Second Empire 230
—scholarly work in Rome 228ff
—scholastics and Germanics vs. "German theologians" 237ff
Theologisches Literaturblatt 246
Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift 218
The Rambler 293, 311
The Tablet 56
Thiers, Louis Adolphe 67, 295
Thieu-Tri, emperor of Tonkin 186
Thomas a Jesu, Carmelite 203f
Thomas Aquinas 241, 319
Thomassin, Louis de 230
Thomism 234f
Thorbecke, Jan Rudolf 77
Thun, count 109
Tientsin, treaty (1858) 188
Tierney, M. A. 3
Timon-David 20, 25, 216
Tits, Arnould 44
Tocqueville, A. C. de 91
Tondini, P. 155
Tonello 259
Tongiorgio, F. 229
Tonkin, mission and Church 186f
Toronto Catholic Institute 141
Torre, P. dalla 249
Tosti, Luigi 231, 291
Traditionalism 47, 231ff, 287
Transylvania 166
—provincial council at Blaj (1872) 167
Transcendence of Christianity 235
Trévern, see Le Pappe
Trusteeism, trustees 132
Tuas libenter, brief (1863) 246f
Tübingen, faculty 48
Tübingen School 222, 31, 39f, 235, 237, 246f
Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift 238
Turban, Ludwig Karl F. 280
Turkey, Turks
—Catholic presence 169ff
—religious freedom 169
Tuscany, grand duchy 60, 256
—concordat (1851) 91, 256

Ubaghs, Gerhard Casimir 43, 44, 233
Ukraine, Uniate Church 160
Ullathorne, William, bishop of Birmingham 124f
Ultramontanism 29, 31, 89, 118, 256, 272
—excesses of neo-ultramontanism and reaction in Germany and France 312ff
—progress 3ff
— — and remaining Gallican resistance 304–315
—systematic activity by Rome 306ff
—ultramontane movement around 1850 304ff
—victory of ultramontanism 304ff

Umbria 250, 251
Unam sanctam, bull (1302) 321
Uniate Churches
—and papal jurisdiction 308
—Uniate Church of Chelm 163f
—Uniate Rumanians in Transylvania 166
Unita cattolica 290
United States of America 89, 91, 286
—Catholic isolation 135ff
—Catholicism and social questions 137
—Catholic parish schools 135
—Catholics and Civil War (1861–65) 133f
—clergy 132f
—education, question of 135ff
—episcopate 132
—founding of new dioceses 131f
—Irish and German immigration 130f
—plenary council of Baltimore (1852) 134f
—plenary council of Baltimore (1866) 132, 135
—priests, training of 133
—Provincial Council of Baltimore, Fourth (1841) 133
—race problem 135
—religious freedom 135
—rise of Catholicism during second third of 19th century 130ff
Upper Rhenish Bishops' Conference (1851) 111
Utrecht, Church 332, 334
Utrecht, union 334f

Valdivieso, R. V., archbishop of Chile 151
Valerga, Giuseppe, Latin patriarch of Jerusalem 170, 200, 202, 204, 309
Valerga, Leonardo di S. Giuseppe, O.Carm. 200
Vancea, Ioan 167
Vatican Council, First (1869–70) 315–330
—and the missions 199–207
—announcement by Pius IX (1868/69) and preparation 117f, 199, 315ff
—first council debates 322ff
— — catechism 324
— — church discipline and canon law 323
— — modern errors 322
—French episcopate and pagah missions 201, 206f
—lively actions concerning infallibility of the Pope 325ff
—opening and composition 318f
Vaughan, Herbert, cardinal 135, 177
Vaughan, Roger William, O.S.B., archbishop of Sydney 143
Vegezzi 259
Veith, Johann Emanuel 32, 36, 76
Vénard, Théophane 187f
Venetia 256
Venezuela 151, 152
—concordat (1862) 91, 151, 152
—constitution (1879) 271
—laicization policy 271
Venice, republic 257
—concordat (1855) 256
Ventura, Gioacchino 58, 59, 65, 229
Verbist, Theophil 177
Verboitte, musician 224
Vercellone, Barnabite 229
Vering, Friedrich 310
Verot, vicar apostolic of Florida 134
Verricelli, Angelo Maria 203f
Verrolles, E. J., mission bishop in China 190, 199
Veuillot, Louis 26f, 55, 67, 70, 94, 101f, 141, 226, 258, 264, 266, 286, 288f, 293, 297f, 306, 311, 326
Veuster, Damian de 195
Viale-Prela, Michele 8, 108
Vianney, Jean Marie (Curé d'Ars) 435
Vicari, Hermann von, archbishop of Freiburg 111, 279
Victor Emmanuel II, king of Italy 250, 251
Vietnam 186
Vigener, F. 320
Villanueva, Joaquin 231
Vincentian Brothers of Abbé Glorieux 13
Vincent associations, conferences 25f, 113f, 262
—in Belgium 262
Viollet-le-Duc 227
Virchow, Rudolf 272
Vogt, Karl 235
Volkonskaya, princess 154
Vows, simple 655
Vrau, Philibert 221

Wagner, bishop of St. Pölten 8
Waibel, A., O.F.M. 31
Walsh, William, archbishop of Dublin 129
Walter, Ferdinand 72
Ward, Wilfred P. 312
Ward, William George 124, 293
Warmond 77
Weber, Beda 72
Weber, T. 330, 332
Weis, Nikolaus, bishop of Speyer 8, 18, 111
Weninger, F. X., S.J. 24, 133
Wenzel, P. 36, 38
Werner, Franz 33f
Werner, Karl 29, 242, 247
Wessenberg, Ignaz Heinrich von 119, 736
William II, king of the Netherlands 502
Wilhelm I, king of Württemberg 113
Windischmann, Karl Joseph 32, 44, 110, 241
Windthorst, Ludwig 117, 281
Wiseman, Nicholas 3, 56, 121ff, 293
Witetschek, H. 36
Wolter, Maurus, O.S.B. 37, 210, 227
Wolter, Plazidus, O.S.B. 37, 210
Workers, problem of 299ff, 301
—pastoral care 114

Württemberg
—concordat (1857) 91, 112f
—ecclesiastical development after 1848 112f

Youth hostels 25
Yussef, Gregory, Melchite patriarch 173f

Zaccaro, L. 253
Zeitschrift für Philosophie und katholische Theologie 32, 54
Zukrigl 37
Zwerger, Johann Baptist, bishop of Seckau 274
Zwijsen, Johannes, bishop of Utrecht 77

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

IX

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
HUBERT JEDIN
and
JOHN DOLAN

Volume IX

THE CHURCH IN THE INDUSTRIAL AGE

by

Roger Aubert
Günter Bandmann
Jakob Baumgartner
Mario Bendiscioli
Jacques Gadille
Oskar Köhler
Rudolf Lill
Bernhard Stasiewski
Erika Weinzierl

Translated by
Margit Resch

CROSSROAD • NEW YORK

1981
The Crossroad Publishing Company
18 East 41st Street, New York, NY 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. VI/2: *Die Kirche in der Gegenwart: Die Kirche zwischen*
Anpassung und Widerstand (*1878 bis 1914*)
© Verlag Herder KG Freiburg im Breisgau 1973

English translation © 1981 by The Crossroad Publishing Company

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or
by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording,
or otherwise, without the written permission of The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:
The Church in the industrial age.
(History of the church; v. 9)
Translation of Die Kirche in der Gegenwart, part 2:
Die Kirche zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand (1878 bis
1914)
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Catholic Church—History—19th century.
2. Catholic Church—History—20th century. 3. Church
history—19th century. 4. Church history—20th
century. I. Aubert, Roger. II. Series: Jedin,
Hubert, 1900– ed. Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.
English; v. 9.
BR145.2.J413 1980 vol. 9 [BX 1386] 270s [282'.09'034] 80-27313
ISBN 0-8245-0012-1 Previously: 0-8164-0448-8

CONTENTS

Preface ix

Preface to the English Edition xi

List of Abbreviations xiii

PART ONE: THE PROBLEM OF ADAPTING TO THE MODERN WORLD

Introduction: The World Plan of Leo XIII: Goals and Methods (Oskar Köhler) 3
  The Conclave 3
  The Career of Gioacchino Pecci 6
  The Pontificate 10

SECTION ONE: THE SITUATION IN THE VARIOUS COUNTRIES UNTIL 1914 (chs. 1, 3: Rudolf Lill; 2: Erika Weinzierl; 4, 7–10: Oskar Köhler; 5: Mario Bendiscioli; 6: Jacques Gadille; 11: Bernhard Stasiewski) 26

Chapter 1: The *Kulturkampf* in Prussia and in the German Empire until 1878 26

Chapter 2: Tensions in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1878–1914) 45

Chapter 3: The Conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* in Prussia and in the German Empire 55

Chapter 4: The Development of Catholicism in Switzerland 76

Chapter 5: Italian Catholics between the Vatican and the Quirinal 84
  The *Non expedit* at the Time of Leo XIII 84

Chapter 6: The Failure to Reconcile Catholics and the Republic in France . . 96
  The Ecclesiastical Policy of the Republicans 96
  The Politics of Reconciliation (1878–92) 100
  The Pursuit and the Failure of Reconciliation (1892–99) 103

Chapter 7: On the Road to Conservatism: Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg 107
  Belgium 107
  The Netherlands 115
  Luxemburg 118

Chapter 8: The Church of the Iberian World between Revolution and Reaction 119
Spain 119
Portugal 126
Latin America 127

Chapter 9: Catholic Self-Awareness in the British Empire 135
England and Scotland 135
Ireland 144
Canada 147
Australia 149

Chapter 10: The American Way 150

Chapter 11: Catholicism in the Slavic World until 1914 166
The Russian Empire 166
The Three Polish Territories 171
Austria-Hungary 181
Southeast Europe 186

SECTION TWO: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CATHOLICISM IN MODERN SOCIETY (Oskar Köhler) 190

Chapter 12: Catholicism in Society as a Whole 190
Between Total Revision and Reform 194
The Problem of Toleration 195
The Doctrine of Property 196
Social Theories 199
Marriage and Family 208
The School Question 209
Catholic Associations 212
The Catholic Press 215
The Enemy 216

Chapter 13: The Social Movements 219
Farmers 220
The "Middle Class" 221
The Socio-ethical Justification of the Workers' Movement 224
Industrial Workers 226

Chapter 14: The Relationship to the State and the Parties 233

Chapter 15: The Position of Catholicism in the Culture at the Turn of the Century 245

SECTION THREE: FORMS OF PIETY (chs. 16–18: Oskar Köhler; 19: Günter Bandmann) 257

Chapter 16: Externalization and Internalization of Nineteenth-Century Spirituality—Beginnings of the Eucharistic Congress Movement—Veneration of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux 257

Chapter 17: The Organization in the Old and New Orders—Inner Reform and the Power of Attraction 270

Chapter 18: The Dispute over Church Music 283

Chapter 19: Church Art in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries 288
Architecture 288
Church Interiors 296
New Art Forms 302

SECTION FOUR: TEACHING AND THEOLOGY (chs. 20–24: Oskar Köhler; 25: Bernhard Stasiewski)

Chapter 20: The Encyclical *Aeterni Patris* 307

Chapter 21: Neo-Thomism, Neo-Scholasticism, and the "New Philosophers" 311

Chapter 22: The Theory of Church History 318

Chapter 23: The Question of the Bible 324

Chapter 24: The Condemnation of "Americanism" 331

Chapter 25: Papal Hopes for Unification—The Independent Eastern Churches and the Uniates 335
- Papal Hopes for Unification 335
- The Independent Eastern Churches 346
- The Orthodox Church in Russia 347
- The Orthodox Churches in Austria-Hungary 353
- The Orthodox Churches in Southeast Europe 354
- The Four Old Orthodox Patriarchal Churches 358
- The Near Eastern National Churches 362
- The Uniate Eastern Churches 368
- The Byzantine Rite 369
- The Alexandrian Rite 373
- The Antioch Rite 374
- The Chaldean Rite 375
- The Armenian Rite 376

PART TWO: DEFENSIVE CONCENTRATION OF FORCES

Introduction: Pius X, a Conservative Reform Pope (Roger Aubert) 381

SECTION ONE: THE REFORM WORK OF PIUS X (Roger Aubert) 394

Chapter 26: Reorganization of the Roman Curia and Codification of Canon Law 394

Chapter 27: Eucharistic Decrees and Liturgical Renewal 403

Chapter 28: Concern for Pastoral Improvements: Seminaries, Catechetical Instruction, Catholic Action 413

SECTION TWO: THE MODERNIST CRISIS (Roger Aubert) 420

Chapter 29: Reform Catholicism in Germany 422

Chapter 30: The Beginning of the Crisis in France 431

Chapter 31: The Crisis in England 441

Chapter 32: The Crisis in Italy 448

Chapter 33: Intervention of Ecclesiastical Authority and the Integralist Reaction 455
- Roman Intervention 455
- Integralism 467

SECTION THREE: THE HOLY SEE AND THE EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS (ch. 34: Mario Bendiscioli; 35: Rudolf Lill; 36: Jacques Gadille; 37: Roger Aubert) . . 481

Chapter 34: The Roman Question and Italian Catholicism—The *Non expedit* in the Pontificates of Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius IX (until 1925) 481

Chapter 35: German Catholicism between *Kulturkampf* and World War I . . . 494

Chapter 36: Separation of Church and State in France 507
  Voting on the Separation Law (1899–1905) 507
  Execution of the Separation Law (1906–24) 511

Chapter 37: The Outbreak of World War I 517

PART THREE: THE EXPANSION OF CATHOLIC MISSIONS FROM THE TIME OF LEO XIII UNTIL WORLD WAR II

(Jakob Baumgartner)

Chapter 38: Missions in the Shadow of Colonialism 527
  Asia 531
  Africa 544

Chapter 39: The Development of New Churches 557

BIBLIOGRAPHY 577

  General Bibliography 579
  Bibliography to Individual Chapters 587

INDEX 625

PREFACE

This preface must begin with an apology or rather a justification. The pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X, treated in this volume, were given much more attention than had originally been intended because they lead directly to the problems with which the Church of the twentieth century has had to struggle. The authors have attempted to trace the roots of today's problems to events and developments in the first half of the century. Unlike previous volumes, the following chapters include investigations of political parties, parliamentary governments, social trends, ecclesiastical alliances, and theological problems. Europe still exercises its spiritual leadership. Yet other continents are beginning to pose their problems. Although the secret archives of the Vatican generally do not allow access to the holdings pertaining to this era, documents are more abundant now than they used to be. Therefore a more thorough treatment is possible. Those readers who consider the studies of Leo XIII's encyclicals and the description of the dispute over modernism to be too extensive should bear in mind that these chapters deal with problems that are still keeping us in suspense today.

This work is not a history of Popes but of the Church. Even though the two pontificates are often said to be antitheses, their simultaneous investigation seemed to be appropriate. Likewise, it seemed appropriate to go beyond the period of the two pontificates in regard to topics such as the Roman question (chap. 34), the development of the Eastern Churches (chap. 25), and the missions (chaps. 38 and 39). Is the allegation of some critics true that there was a lack of necessary planning?

Between 1956 and 1959, we designed the master plan for the series. During several meetings arranged by the publishing house of Herder, the staff developed the basic guidelines, subject matter, and technical aspects of the work. At that time, the Second Vatican Council had not yet set in motion the tidal wave that was to seize, shake, and transform the Church. We planned to treat the history of the Church between the two World Wars as if it were a contemporary phenomenon in ecclesiastical terms: with the conciseness demanded by the lack of historical distance, with expedient constraint in judgment, and with confinement to the most important and urgent facts. Such an approach would have permitted us to master the subject matter within a relatively small space, i.e., within the framework of this volume. This is no longer possible. The events that took place between World War I and the death of Pope Pius XII have turned into history. The Church has left the calm waters in which it navigated for centuries, probably since the Council of Trent. It is heading toward the open sea and we do not know where it will land. Church history takes its course in longer intervals than political history. For the latter, the two World Wars, even the Third Reich, constitute events which are historically accessible. Information about them is available in open archives; they can, indeed, they must be assessed historically. Church history faces more difficulties. It does not gain historical perspective as quickly as political historiography and, unable to forego judgement entirely, has to practice restraint in regard to its evaluations. Therefore, it seemed prudent to dedicate a complete volume to the history of the Church from World War I to the Second Vatican Council.

Hubert Jedin

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH EDITION

Insofar as the time period covered in this volume overlaps with the era known as the Victorian Age, there is a temptation to draw a comparison. For many even to this day it was the Golden Age of European Civilization. The Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had then reached high noon. Science had triumphed for the benefit of humankind. Wealth and universal education were guaranteed for all. The age witnessed what is often called the last outbreak of imperialism as well as a phase of the industrial revolution that was scientific rather than technical. There were no major wars. From it all the Church drew consolation and confidence. The press and the tremendous strides in transportation by way of pilgrimages strengthened the image of a highly centralized Church. The Europeanization of the world through the cooperation between the industrial revolution and the Christian missionary enterprises had become a common goal.

While economic problems no longer solvable by traditional means appeared world wide, efforts to control them still centered on political institutions based on a system of independent states.

Yet Leo XIII's envisioned *res publica Christiana* was not the answer. His role as *arbiter mundi* and his efforts to revive medieval social and economic theories and the theology of Thomas Aquinas now appear unrealistic. To proclaim Joseph the Carpenter the model of the worker when the effort of the laboring masses to gain full membership in the community was the major political event of the generation reflects this lack of historical sense. Yet to their credit neither Leo nor Pius exercised their recently proclaimed infallibility. Their missionary efforts, laudable as they were, too often fall under Kipling's couplet: "By all you leave or do, the silent sullen peoples shall weigh your Gods and you."

While this volume presents a more objective view of the pontificates of Leo and Pius, it also sheds light on the problem of modernism and the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi.* Finally its account of Rome's effort toward reunion with the Eastern Churches and its diplomatic dealings with the three archaic empires are a valuable addition to European history on the eve of the First World War.

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Acta Leonis	*Acta Leonis XIII. Allocutiones, epistolae, constitutiones, aliaque acta praecipua,* 8 vols., Bruges 1887–1911.
Acta Pii	*Acta Pii X Pontificis Maximi,* Vol. V, Graz 1971.
AFrH	*Archivum Franciscanum Historicum,* Florence–Quaracchi 1908ff.
AHC	*Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum,* Paderborn 1969ff.
AHPont	*Archivum historiae pontificiae,* Rome 1963ff.
AHR	*The American Historical Review,* New York 1895ff.
AHVNrh	*Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein, insbesondere das alte Erzbistum Köln,* Cologne 1855ff.
AkathKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857ff.
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* (Leipzig) Münster and Cologne 1903ff.
ALW	*Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* (formerly: *JLW*), Regensburg 1950ff.
AMrhKG	*Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte,* Speyer 1949ff.
AnGr	*Analecta Gregoriana cura Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae edita,* Rome 1930ff.
Anthropos	*Anthropos. Internationale Zeitschrift für Völker- und Sprachenkunde.* Mödling 1906ff.
ArchSR	*Archives de Sociologie des religions,* Paris 1956ff.
ArSKG	*Archiv für schlesische Kirchengeschichte,* ed. K. Engelbert, I–VI Breslau 1936–41, VIIff. Hildesheim 1949ff.
ASS	*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* Rome 1865–1908.
Aubert, Pie IX	R. Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Église depuis des origines jusqu'à nos jours,* 21), Paris 1962.

BGPhMA	*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie* (as of no. 27, 1928–30: *und Theologie*) *des Mittelalters,* ed. M. Grabmann, Münster 1891ff.
Bihlmeyer-Tüchle	K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte* I: *Das christliche Altertum,* Paderborn 1955, II: *Das Mittelalter,* Paderborn 1955, III: *Die Neuzeit und die neueste Zeit,* Paderborn 1956
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* Toulouse 1899ff.
BZThS	*Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge,* Düsseldorf 1924–31.

Catholicisme	*Catholicisme. Hier–Aujourd'hui–Demain,* ed. G. Jacquemet, Paris 1948ff.
CH	*Church History,* New York–Chicago 1932ff.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915ff.
CICfontes	P. Gasparri–I. Serédi, *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes,* 9 vols., Rome 1923–39.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850ff. (1871–87 Florence).

D	H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de rebus fidei et morum,* Freiburg i. Br. 1955.
DDC	*Dictionnaire de droit canonique,* ed. R. Naz, Paris 1935ff.
Delacroix	*Histoire universelle des missions catholiques,* ed. S. Delacroix, 4 vols., Paris–Monaco 1957–59.
DHGE	*Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques,* ed. A. Baudrillart et. al., Paris 1912ff.
DLZ	*Deutsche Literaturzeitung,* Berlin 1880ff.
DR	*Downside Review,* Stratton on the Fosse n. Bath 1880ff.
DSAM	*Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique. Doctrine et Histoire,* ed. M. Viller, Paris 1932ff.
DSP	*DSAM*
DThC	*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* ed. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, continued by É. Amann, Paris 1930ff.
DZKR	*Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht,* Tübingen 1861–1917.
ECatt	*Enciclopedia Cattolica,* Rome 1949ff.
ED	*Euntes docete* (*Commentaria urbana*), Rome 1948ff.
EE	*Estudios eclesiásticos,* Madrid 1922–36, 1942ff.
EHR	*English Historical Review,* London 1886ff.
ELit	*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Rome 1887ff.
Engel-Janosi	F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan,* 2 vols., Graz 1958–60.
ÉO	*Échos d'Orient,* Paris 1897ff.
EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* Bruges 1924ff.
Études	*Études,* Paris 1856ff. (until 1896: *Études religieuses*).
FreibThSt	*Freiburger Theologische Studien,* Freiburg i. Br. 1910ff.
Gebhardt-Grundmann	B. Gebhardt, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte,* 8th ed. by H. Grundmann, Stuttgart, I: 1954, II: 1955
GrabmannG	M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit,* Freiburg i. Br. 1933.
Heimbucher	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche,* 3 vols., Paderborn 1907–8; in 2 vols., Paderborn 1932–34.
HistCathFr	A. Latreille, J. R. Palanque, É. Delaruelle and R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III: *La période contemporaine,* Paris 1962.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* (Cologne 1880ff.) Munich 1950ff.
HM	*Historia Mundi,* founded by F. Kern, 10 vols., Bern–Munich 1952ff.
Hocedez	E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la Théologie au XIX*^{e} *siècle,* Brussels–Paris, I: 1948, II: 1952, III: 1947.
Hochland	*Hochland,* Munich 1903ff.
HZ	*Historische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1859ff.
IKZ	*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Bern 1911ff.
Irénikon	*Irénikon,* Amay–Chevetogne 1926ff.
Jungmann MS	J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe* I–II, Vienna ^{5}1962.

Kißling	J. B. Kißling, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes,* 3 vols., Freiburg i. Br. 1911–16.
KmJb	*Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* (formerly: *Cäcilienkalender*), Cologne 1886ff.
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen 1955ff.
Kyrios	*Kyrios. Vierteljahresschrift für Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte Osteuropas,* Königsberg–Berlin 1936–43: n.s. Berlin 1960ff.
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* Münster 1951ff.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* Freiburg 1957–68.
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* 31 vols., Florence–Venice 1757–98; reprinted and continued by L. Petit and J. B. Martin in 60 vols., Paris 1899–1927.
Mercati	A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le autorità civili,* 2 vols., Rome 1919–54.
MGG	*Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* ed. F. Blume, 10 vols., Basel–Kassel 1949ff.
MOP	*Monumenta ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica,* ed. B. M. Reichert, 14 vols., Rome 1896–1904; Paris 1931ff.
MSR	*Mélanges de science religieuse,* Lille 1944ff.
MthSt(H)	*Münchner theologische Studien,* ed. F. X. Seppelt, J. Pascher, and K. Mörsdorf, *Historische Abteilung,* Munich 1950ff.
MThZ	*Münchner Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1950ff.
NDB	*Neue Deutsche Biographie,* Berlin 1953ff.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Tournai–Louvain–Paris 1879ff.
NZM	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945ff.
ÖAKR	*Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht,* Vienna 1950ff.
OstkSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien,* Würzburg 1951ff.
PhJ	*Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* Fulda 1888ff.
QFIAB	*Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken,* Rome 1897ff.
QLP	*Questions liturgiques et paroissiales,* Louvain 1921ff.
RACHS	*Records of the American Catholic Society,* Philadelphia 1884ff.
RB	*Revue biblique,* Paris 1892ff. n.s. since 1904.
RevSR	*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* Strasbourg 1921ff.
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* Tübingen 1909–13; 1927–32; 1956ff.
RH	*Revue historique,* Paris 1876ff.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900ff.
RHÉF	*Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France,* Paris 1910ff.
RHM	*Revue d'historie des missions,* Paris 1924ff.
RHMC	*Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine.*
RicRel	*Ricerche Religiose,* Rome 1925ff.
RNPh	*Revue néoscolastique de philosophie,* Louvain 1894ff.
Rohrbasser	*Heilslehre der Kirche. Dokumente von Pius IX bis Pius XII,* ed. P. Cattin and H. T. Conus, trans. A. Rohrbasser, Fribourg 1953.

RPhL	*Revue philosophique de Louvain,* Louvain 1945ff.
RPol	*Review of Politics,* Notre Dame (Indiana) 1939ff.
RSPhTh	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris 1907ff.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910ff.
RSTI	*Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947ff.
RStRis	*Rassegna storica del Risorgimento,* Rome 1913ff.
Saeculum	*Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte,* Freiburg i. Br. 1950ff.
SC	*Scuola Cattolica,* Milan 1873ff.
Schmidlin M	J. Schmidlin, *Katholische Missionsgeschichte im Grundriß,* Steyl 1925.
Schmidlin PG	J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit* I–IV, Munich 1933–39.
Schmitz	Ph. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de saint Benoît* I–VII, Maredsous 1948–56.
SM	*Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden bzw. zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige,* Munich 1880ff. (n.s. since 1911).
SMB	*Societas Missionum Exterarum de Bethlehem in Helvetia* (Schweizer Missionsseminar Immensee).
SPM	*Sacrum Poloniae Millennium,* Rome 1954ff.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (before 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*), Freiburg i. Br. 1871ff.
StL	*Staatslexikon,* ed. H. Sacher, Freiburg i. Br. 1926–32; 1957ff.
Streit	*Bibliotheca Missionum,* started by R. Streit, continued by J. Dindinger (Münster, Aachen) Freiburg i. Br. 1916ff. (up to 1971: 28 vols.).
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909ff.
ThPQ	*Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift,* Linz a.d.D. 1848ff.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819ff.; Stuttgart 1946ff.
ThRv	*Theologische Revue,* Münster 1902ff.
ThSt	*Theological Studies,* Baltimore 1940ff.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (until 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888ff.
Wetzer-Welte	*Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon,* 12 vols. and 1 index vol., Freiburg i. Br. 1882.
WZ	*Westfälische Zeitschrift. Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte,* Münster 1838ff.
ZAGV	*Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins,* Aachen 1879ff.
ZAM	*Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik* (since 1947: *Geist und Leben*) (Innsbruck, Munich) Würzburg 1926ff.
ZChK	*Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst,* founded and ed. by A. Schnütgen, continued by F. Witte, 34 vols., Düsseldorf 1888–1921.
ZGAE	*Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ermlands,* (Mainz, Leipzig, Braunsberg) Osnabrück 1858ff.
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* (Gotha) Stuttgart 1876ff.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* (Innsbruck) Vienna 1877ff.
ZM	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 1–17, Münster 1911–27.

ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft,* vols. 34ff., Münster 1950ff.; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 18–25, Münster 1928–35; *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 26–27, Münster 1935–37; *Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 28–33, Münster 1938–41, 1947–49.
ZSavRGkan	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung,* Weimar 1911ff.

PART ONE

The Problem of Adapting to the Modern World

INTRODUCTION

The World Plan of Leo XIII: Goals and Methods

The Conclave

The conclave after the death of Pius IX[1] meant a turning point in the history of papal elections because, for the first time, the head of the Catholic Church was to be elected after the factual loss of the *Patrimonium Petri.* The late Pope had explicitly indicated his choice as to the election site. A strong group of cardinals, especially Ledóchowski, Franzelin, and Manning, had spoken against the elections in Rome. Pius VII had been elected in Venice because in February 1798 French troops under General Berthier occupied Rome. But in the following eighty years the Christian world had changed dramatically and there was not a single place in Italy for refuge during the interim. The alternative was to meet in Rome or in a foreign country. During the first congregation (8 February 1878), a minority of only eight cardinals voted for Rome as the election site. The following day, Cardinal di Pietro indicated in a speech that, even though no foreign power had issued an invitation, Italy had been given a guarantee of nonintervention. The cardinal had been nuncio in Lisbon and belonged to the politically "liberal" group of the College of Cardinals. When the matter was put to the vote, five cardinals voted for Spain and thirty-two for Rome. Camerlengo (since 1877) Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci, an experienced organizer, who prepared the election and shielded it diplomatically against Italy, had to undertake considerable renovations in the Vatican for the conclave.

Although Cardinal Pecci, who was well informed, had voted for an election outside of Italy on 8 February, it appears questionable at first glance whether such a far-reaching step, though discussed at length, was in fact pursued after the foreign powers had refused. Italy was not interested in it, despite radical efforts to expel the Pope from Rome. The guarantee was, therefore, trustworthy. The foreign powers had, for different reasons, an interest in a smooth transition and a politically obliging successor to the Holy See. Vienna seems to have agreed with Berlin that "a fanatical Jesuit pope" was not wanted. Despite the decrease of Republican representatives from 363 to 323, French President MacMahon had experienced the political defeat of the "conservative republic" after the Chamber was dissolved in 1877. And he had witnessed the effect of the slogan *le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi.* In Spain, the liberal-conservative politician Antonio Cánovas, who had revived the constitutional monarchy in 1876, was intent on good relations with the *Moderados*. Great Britain was occupied with the problems of Catholic Ireland, even though in 1874 the imperialist Disraeli succeeded Gladstone (until 1880), who was friendly toward Ireland. For Bismarck, the *Kulturkampf* had become burdensome for several reasons. Even Russia, in the middle of a successful war against Turkey, was interested in easing tensions, though it had brutally deprived Poland of all autonomy since the uprising of 1863 and employed the harshest measures against the Catholic Church (rupture of diplomatic relations between the Pope and Saint Petersburg in 1877). Imminent peace and the impending international conference in Berlin had priority in international politics. Therefore, the new situation of the Catholic Church was distinctive in world history because the conclave played a minor role this time in diplomatic correspondence.[2] A conciliatory Pope was wanted. Even the "Catholic powers," who stood in the background, would consider the idea of exercizing the right of exclusion only if a disciple of Pius IX's politics were to be elected.

---

[1] Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan* I, 200–14, including the preceding history since 1872.

Did the Curia assess the situation correctly when discussing whether the election should take place outside of Italy? Four years after his election and after the riots which occurred one night in 1881 during the transferal of Pius IX's body from Saint Peter's to S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura, the new Pope would discuss with a delegate from the court in Vienna whether Trent or Salzburg could offer him asylum. He received an invitation which implied, however, that he should not accept it (1882).[3] The alternative of having the papal elections in Rome or in a foreign country, which was apparently deemed serious on 8 February 1878, turned out to be no alternative. One could continue to reject the Italian guarantee law of 13 May 1871, but one had to live with it and worry that it was here to stay.

On 18 February sixty of the sixty-four cardinals moved into the Vatican for the conclave. Twenty-five of them were non-Italians, in accord with the ecclesiastical world plan of Pius IX. The preparatory congregation had decided on 10 February to elect an Italian; probably the only possible solution in this situation. The insinuation in Paris that a non-Italian, but certainly not a German, could be elected met with no support in Vienna. Pius IX had chosen the cardinals for the thirty-five positions created since 1868 mainly from the zealots. But even they tended to lean toward a man who would be capable of easing the political and theological tensions which had increased during the previous pontificate. Due to the efforts of Cardinal Bartolini, the conclave's leading member (since 1875 secretary for the Congregation of Rites), the conclave was able to focus quickly on one candidate. Gioacchino Vincenzo Pecci had been bishop in Perugia since 1846 (cardinal since 1853). During the lifetime of Pius IX, Pecci had moved up to a promising position within the papacy because he was regarded as the representative of the moderate line. However, he was not allowed to enter Rome until Antonelli died. Pecci's competitor, Cardinal Bilio, had been close to Pius IX and had participated in drafting the *Syllabus.* He had, apparently, been chosen by Pius to be his successor. But because of Bartolini's attitude, the intransigents were unable to agree upon a candidate from their midst, and Bilio was threatened with a French and Spanish veto. The candidate of the "liberal faction" was Cardinal Franchi. He had become a legate to Spain in 1850, nuncio in 1871, and was respected in matters related to Church policies. His side was taken by the Spanish cardinals, in accordance with their government. Bartolini was able to win their votes for Pecci (Franchi was appointed secretary of state on 5 March 1878, but he died that August).

---

[2] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 341; in reference to Schmidlin, see Engel-Janosi I, 212.

[3] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 414f., with documents against E. Soderini's presentation; Engel-Janosi I, 226–31; see also, ". . . how much the situation had changed [since 1870]" (Engel-Janosi I, 230).

At the first ballotting (the morning of 19 February 1878), which was declared invalid for technical reasons, Pecci received 19 votes, Bilio 6, and Franchi 4. But neither Bilio nor Franchi could claim the majority of the remaining fragmented votes. In the afternoon, Pecci's share increased to 26 votes, Bilio's to 7, while Franchi only received 2. On the morning of 20 February, Pecci was elected Pope with 44 votes, a two-thirds majority. So far, this was the shortest papal election, a few hours shorter than that of Pius IX. Among the cardinals who remained Pecci's rivals to the end were Flavio Chigi, the offspring of the old Sienese landed gentry (1850–61 nuncio in Munich, then in Paris until 1873), L. Oreglia, and the Tyrolese Jesuit Johann Baptist Franzelin (1850–76 professor at the Gregoriana). To the latter (since 1876 cardinal of the Curia) is attributed a considerable share in framing the constitution *De fide catholica* of Vatican I.

The new Pope chose his name after Leo XII (1823–29), to whom he was grateful for furthering his studies at the Roman seminary. Observers felt he indicated his program in the fact that he did not call himself Gregory or Pius.[4]

Leo XIII did not deliver the benediction *urbi et orbi* from the outer loggia toward the Saint Peter's Square but toward the Basilica. There were indications that the problem of relations between the Church and the postrevolutionary world articulated itself most strongly in the Holy City: festive illuminations stood in contrast to protest demonstrations. This was true also during the coronation (3 March), held in the Sistine Chapel and not in St. Peter's because the Italian authorities could not or would not guarantee security. The Pope's choice of a name inspired the mockery, "Non è Pio, non è Clemente, Leone senza dente." Leo sent individual inaugural letters to Catholic as well as non-Catholic heads of state in which he indicated his desire to settle disputes. The Italian government was ignored and in turn did not recognize the new Pope officially.

---

[4] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 346; Schmidlin calls Leo XII especially "peaceful and moderate," while Tüchle-Bihlmeyer and other authors emphasize the reactionary policies of the Papal State.

Despite the strong positive response of the world to Leo XIII's election, it is questionable whether the Catholic Church really began "to develop into a great world power which politics had to take into account." Above all, Catholicism certainly had to incorporate domestic politics, especially as long as it was capable of establishing itself as a social group. But it was the goal of the Pope, sixty-eight years old at his coronation, to present the Catholic Church and the papacy to all of mankind as *the* "great world power" with an intellectual and spiritual mission.

The Career of Gioacchino Pecci

In March 1814 the four-year-old Gioacchino Pecci was able to witness the triumphal inauguration of Pius VII after the end of the Napoleonic era. His aristocratic family temporarily had to leave their residence in Carpineto, a small town in the rocky mountains south of Rome, because of insurgent activities. Gioacchino was born on 2 March 1810, the son of Colonel Lodovico Pecci. The bishop of Anagni was his godfather. Together with his older brother Giuseppe, he attended the Jesuit school in Viterbo from 1818 on. After his graduation with honors in 1824, he studied rhetoric, philosophy, and theology at the Roman seminary which Leo XII had just returned to the Jesuits (among his teachers were Perrone and Patrizi). His brother entered the *Society of Jesus* the same year.[5] It was in accord with his talents that Gioacchino Pecci, during the jubilee in 1825, was allowed to head a delegation to the protector Leo

---

[5] G. Pecci, professor of philosophy, came to blows with the order which opposed the Thomistic revival for some time to come, and consequently resigned in 1848. He collaborated with his papal brother, who appointed him cardinal in 1879, in the development of a program to renew the "Christian philosophy" which had been ushered in by the encyclical *Aeternis Patris* (see chap. 20). Two years before his death (1890), he was reinstated by the Society of Jesus.

XII and deliver a Latin address of gratitude.[6] As was in keeping with someone who had a church career in mind, Gioacchino Pecci studied law at the *Accademia dei nobili.* He concluded his doctoral studies in 1837 with the remarkable topic of appeals to the Pope. The same year, Cardinal Odescalchi ordained the promising young man to the priesthood. Pecci had found influential patrons in Cardinal J. A. Sala, who had distinguished himself as prelate in the politics of restoration under Pius VII, in Cardinal Bartolomeo Pacca, leader of the zealots, and in Secretary of State Lambruschini.

The year of his ordination, the twenty-seven-year-old Pecci was appointed domestic prelate by Gregory XVI and given three offices, one of which was consultant at the Congregation of the Council. In 1838, the very next year, Pecci was sent as a delegate to Benevento, an enclave of the Papal State in the Kingdom of Naples. The situation there, dominated by gangs of bandits and smugglers in the service of the landed gentry, was anarchistic. But Pecci ruled with an iron fist and organized the tariff system in such a way that the enclave lost its reputation as a smuggler's paradise. In June 1841 he was transferred to Spoleto as a delegate and in July to Perugia where he also busily reformed the administration. The visit of Pope Gregory XVI to the Umbrian city was a great opportunity, of which the delegate Pecci took advantage. The Via Gregoriana was finished on time, and the reception proceeded so splendidly that the Pope promised to think of his delegate in Rome.[7] In January 1843 Pecci was appointed nuncio to Belgium. In later years, his career was attributed to the character of Leo XII, though Pecci himself certainly knew how skillfully to further it. Even though the tempo of his rise was above average, one has to bear in mind that the will to excel was a frequent phenomenon in young Roman prelates, which is only particularly striking when one becomes historically significant.

The nunciature in Belgium was Gioacchino Pecci's first failure

---

[6] Gioacchino Pecci began his *Carmina* in Viterbo. A humanistic eduation had determined his way of thinking (Dante, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, and Sallust were considered proper reading). In his letter to Cardinal Parocchi (20 May 1885) concerning the education of the clergy in Rome, he urged them to study Thomas Aquinas and to develop a good style, ". . . nihil est fere ad iuvandam intelligentiam maius, quam scribendi virtus et urbanitas. Nativo quippe et eleganti genere dicendi mire invitantur homines ad audiendum, ad legendum" (*Acta Leonis* V, 62). In his encyclicals, Leo XIII had enjoyed eloquent rhetoric, since he had so ardently participated in writing them. The Romans, who valued a humanistic education, talked about the *pontificato dei dotti* (L. Teste, *Léon XIII et le Vatican* [Paris 1880], 103).

[7] See Schmidlin, *PG* II, 334, with quotations from other biographers.

(1843–46).[8] The task demanded too much from the scarcely thirty-three-year-old man, despite his efforts to adjust to the situation he faced. After all, he had acquired his experience under totally different circumstances. In Belgium, the understanding, developed since the nation's founding between so-called Liberals, the liberal Catholics, and the moderate ultramontanes, began to crumble. Pecci's predecessor, who had been transferred to Paris, knew very well how to maneuver in this terrain and had been on good terms with Prime Minister Nothomb. When Nothomb was overthrown by the Conservatives in 1845, he blamed the new nuncio. Pecci's generally fine relationship with Leopold I and the royal family had its drawbacks because the conservative attitude of the monarch was not the only one in the web of political forces. This prompted the ultramontane clergy to accuse the nuncio of opportunism. The fact that Pecci did not avoid Vincenzo Gioberti, who was living in Brussels at the time, pleased neither the liberals nor the clergy. It was even more difficult for the nuncio to get along with the University of Louvain, which was Catholic but not papal. During this time, the confrontation of the ontologists and the representatives of philosophical traditionalism with the Scholastic renaissance began to develop at the university, and its leading publication was opposed by the Jesuits. By demand of the royal court, Archbishop Pecci was recalled in 1846 because he had supported the episcopate against the King in the question of the university's examination commission.

One had to have a great deal of imagination to predict the tiara for the failing nuncio.[9] In January 1846 he was given the bishopric of Perugia, located "in remote tranquility" (Schmidlin). He was honored with the cardinalate *in petto* in 1853. It is not without reason that we call Gioacchino Pecci an outstanding bishop who was especially concerned with the education of his clergy (which includes the founding of the Academy of Saint Thomas). He intensified pastoral work through the establishment of missions and he furthered charitable institutions through his strong administrative talents. As a result of such activities, he would hardly have received emphasis in Italian Church history. His decisive opposition to the revolutionary movement (1848, destruction of the papal castle) and to the Piedmontese regime (established 1860 in Perugia) shows a dedicated bishop, who had the same experiences as his fellow bishops. Pecci simply expressed the general ecclesiastical conviction in his pastoral letter of 12 February 1860, when he wrote that the time before Constantine the Great was a legitimate epoch, "because the highest spiritual power of the papacy carried the seed of secular power from its inception."[10] Though he did not even enjoy the favor of Pius IX, Bishop Pecci was also instrumental in the efforts which brought about the *Syllabus.* A characteristic new tone, however, was sounded in the pastoral letters of 1874–77, which maintain that a reconciliation between the Church and modern culture, provided modern culture is understood correctly, is possible and desirable. The letters spoke of human progress, e.g., relaxation of the penal code, and they praised technological accomplishments in a very poetic language,[11] which the Pope did not employ once he had become familiar with the reality of industrialism through the social sciences. He also omitted poetic prose from his new and not at all reactionary cultural critique.

---

[8] In addition to the general literature, see *Lettres de Pecci 1843–46* (Brussels 1959); in reference to V. Gioberti: Schmidlin, *PG* II, 334f.

[9] According to Narfon, cited in Schmidlin, *PG* II, 335, n. 10.—It is a difficult question to answer whether Pecci's future concepts were "decisively influenced by the entirely new and unfamiliar environment" into which the Italian was placed after "having lived in the traditional atmosphere of the Papal State" (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 334). This break in his career may have possibly been a shock for G. Pecci. R. Aubert (*LThK* VI/2, 953) points out that Pecci's visit of Belgian industrial works, a journey to the Rhineland, and sojourns in London and Paris while returning to Rome "were the future Pope's only contacts ever with industrial and parliamentary Europe".

Long before such demonstration of insight, however, Cardinal Giacomo Antonelli, secretary of state since 1850, had put the bishop of Perugia on the list of men within the hierarchy who seemed suspect to him. Antonelli did not even allow Pecci to venture to suburbanized Albano. His attempt to do so indicated that he did not possess the kind of nature which would be satisfied with the ecclesiastical duties facing him in Perugia. On the other hand, one can conclude from Antonelli's opposition that he sensed in Pecci an important personality and opponent of his politics. After Antonelli's death, Pius IX, who had to reckon with his own death, appointed Cardinal Pecci camerlengo on 21 September 1877. Through this gesture, the Pope documented his evaluation of the man from Perugia and his confidence that Pecci possessed the skills necessary to meet the danger of the interregnum. The appointment somewhat diminished the feasibility of Pecci becoming Pope because, traditionally, the camerlengo has virtually no chance in the conclave. Gioacchino Pecci lived in Umbria more than thirty-one years.

---

[10] Cited from Tischleder, *Staatslehre,* 346f. Leo XIII expressed his convictions somewhat differently in a letter to Rampolla of 15 June 1887 (after the persecutions, "a particular situation arose from the convergence of circumstances, shepherded by destiny itself, which resulted in the establishment of temporal authority"); but it is hardly justified to see here, as Tischleder does (p. 349), a corrected image of the seed of the Pope's temporal power.

[11] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 337, n. 16: the inventor of the lightning rod "seems majestic"; the telephone is the "messenger of man's desire" across oceans and mountains; man harnessed steam so it "may carry him across land and sea with the speed of the wind." Technology is seen as liberation from the hardest of labor; creativity of man as "a spark from the Creator himself."

The Pontificate

Pope Leo XIII led the Catholic Church into a world which had risen from revolution. With an attitude which can only adequately be termed "optimistic," he attempted to reconcile an uncompromised tradition with the modern spirit. One may say that he opened up a new epoch in the history of the Catholic Church and set a precedent with courage deeply rooted in faith, without which his successors to the see of Saint Peter would not have been conceivable. An interpretation today faces the understandable danger of misjudging the greatness of this Pope after almost a century, of even blaming him for the failure of the courageous plan for reconciliation which was to embrace the whole world, of overlooking the fact that it had to fail because each period in history makes its own imprint. We might add that even the achievements of this pontificate (i.e., the formation of Catholicism into autonomous groups within a society which was growing increasingly secular) have been discredited for a long time by the term "ghetto Catholicism." But such a sweeping judgment does not grasp the historical accomplishments relative to the pontificate itself and to society as a whole.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the image of Leo XIII in Catholicism, as it was passed on in popular and in scholarly history, was instilled with success by some sort of pressure, which may be informative about the situation and historical self-awareness of Catholics after this pontificate. "Peace Pope" and "Pope of the Workers" are the two most significant appositions crystallizing the tradition of his image. The twenty-fifth anniversary of German Emperor Wilhelm II in 1913 compelled Sebastian Merkle, understandably, to impose a certain style on his essay about the Catholic Church which was proper for the event. It was, however, more than style when he called the Emperor's visit to the Vatican in the fall of 1888 "a dialogue between the representatives of the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium,*" or when he labeled as a "thoughtful present" the glass painting which Wilhelm II donated to the Cathedral of Münster (it shows Charlemagne and Leo IX meeting in Paderborn in 799).[12] Placed between Pius IX, Pope of the *Syllabus,* and Pius X, Pope of the Borromeo encyclical, Leo XIII is historically illuminated in a fashion which does not correspond to the reality of the concluding *Kulturkampf.* Josef Schmidlin characterized this pontificate more comprehensively in 1934. After "the harmony between the two spheres [Church and culture] dissipated, and after both were alienated from each other because of the polemical attitude toward modern philosophical accomplishments under the papacy of Pius and Gregory, the progressive peace Pope considered it his foremost task to restore a close union and understanding to the realm of ideas" and to re-build a "Christian *Weltanschauung*" based on speculative reason and positive history. In his scholarly writings, he was supposed to have developed in a unique way "the governmental program of gain and conciliation, which means Christianization of modern life and modernization of Christian life," a program which he outlined in his inaugural encyclical. "With inner ties he chained the modern world again to the tiara" and strengthened the moral greatness and authority of the papacy even more "than the medieval *dominium temporale* had been able to do" and more than the "anti-revolutionary reactive faction" was intending to do. J. Schmidlin speaks about the "indestructible accomplishment of Leo's pontificate," which "was to imprint upon the twentieth century his domination of modern man and mankind's reconciliation with the Church."[13] Fernand Hayward, in 1937, considered the reconciliation of Catholicism with the age, without the abandonment of Catholic teachings, to be the hallmark of this pontificate. According to Hayward, even in France, the echo of Leo's teachings finally effected an inner balance and some sort of neutralization within the secular state, despite the failure of *ralliement* and the continuation of Catholicism's inner conflicts.[14] Such evaluations, like most others from the first half of the twentieth century, have their roots in the obvious need of a group to escape isolation while remaining true to itself and while having to live within the confines of a society to which it belongs but to which, in the final analysis, it cannot belong. Leo XIII appeared to be the Pope who had created this possibility which seemed so vital that, to a large extent, its realization had to be historically verified. There are also considerations, however, usually presented as qualifications, which delve deeply into the problems of this pontificate. Wilhelm Schwer, who dealt with the social teachings of Leo XIII, noted that the Pope, for quite some time, tended "to attribute all material progress to Christian and ecclesiastical influences, more than a precise analysis of the participating forces will permit."[15] This insinuates more than an incidental error in historical interpretation.

---

[12] In *Deutschland unter Kaiser Wilhelm II* II, 61, 64 (biblio., chap. 12).

Leo XIII was a political Pope and it is, therefore, correct to say that he enjoys a position among the "masters of politics." To be sure, he was fortunate that Bismarck himself had an interest in terminating the *Kulturkampf* in Germany. The political chance had to be taken advantage of and had to be pursued to its very end with determination and skill. In so doing, papal politics could not deal exclusively with Bismarck but also had to take into account the ideas of the German episcopate and those of the Center Party, the latter not seeing itself as an extension of the Curia. There is no question about the personal credit due to Leo XIII for the termination of the *Kulturkampf.* In Switzerland, the relatively limited *Kulturkampf* was essentially ended at the onset of the pontificate, thanks to the election victories of the Conservatives and the cooperation of moderate Liberals. After 1883, only the Geneva question and the nomination to the bishopric of Basel-Solothurn had to be settled; but even that was not possible without compromise. In Belgium, however, at the beginning of his administration, Leo XIII had to face the severe school conflict, and as a result of his intention to avoid intensification, differences with the Belgian episcopate emerged. In this case, success was due, first of all, to the Belgian Catholics, who, strengthened by their devotion to the Pope, brought about a devastating defeat for the Liberals in the elections of 1884. But the style in which diplomatic relations were resumed in 1885, after they had been discontinued in 1880, was typical for the polite ways of Leo XIII. Much more difficult was the task facing the Pope in Spain. The problem was not so much the various governments during the era of the Spanish "restoration," which vacillated between liberal-conservative and moderate left; nor the tensions which resulted from the censorship of text books, and the admission of religious who had been expelled from France. The problem was rather a group who believed themselves to be more papal than the Pope and who fought their political enemies as if they were traitors. With political perspicacity, the Pope recognized that the constitution of 1876 provided the Church with relatively optimal operating possibilities. Papal politics also avoided unnecessary aggravation in Portugal, the land of Pombal, while negotiating the new circumscription of the dioceses (1881) and the rights of patronage in the Indian mission (1886). From the central-European perspective, Leo XIII's success with his stance toward the changing conditions in the Latin American republics was generally underestimated. It was the prerequisite for the possible success of the pastoral plans of the plenary council of 1899.

---

[13] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 393, 352, 589.—"The peace Pope" is the repeated synonym for Leo XIII. In reference to Schmidlin's criticism of this pontificate, see the following.

[14] F. Hayward, op. cit., 322f.

[15] W. Schwer (biblio., chap. 12), 16.

It was in keeping with the confessional, ethnic, and political situation in the Slavic world that the politics of Leo XIII could only obtain slight relief for the Catholic population there. But it is probable that the arrangement with Russia, which the Austro-Hungarian ambassador to the Vatican, Revertera, called a "Midsummer Night's Dream," was all that could be achieved. In this matter Leo XIII also had to deal with the concerns in Vienna, where the strengthening of Pan-Slavism and additional tensions were feared. The situation was most delicate in areas where the Pope collided with the union of national and Catholic consciousness, especially in the Russian and Prussian parts of Poland. The clergy and the population believed themselves betrayed by the Pope to Russification, particularly because Leo XIII encountered very little understanding for his cooperation in Petersburg. The case is similar for the Prussian area: The German archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, Julius Dinder, who had been appointed in 1886 by Leo XIII after the resignation of Lédochowski, wanted a settlement between Berlin's ruthless policy of Germanization and the historical identification of Polish culture and Catholic faith; but he was unsuccessful. In view of the serious differences between Czechs and Germans in Bohemia and Moravia, the Pope had hardly a choice but to admonish the episcopate, in 1901, to keep the Catholic faith out of those differences. Like the Poles, the Slovenes and the Croatians had found their historical identity within the Slavic world in a union of confessionality and nationality. The idea of a Catholic Greater Croatia was completely contradictory to the Pope's intentions. He wanted the Croatian College in Rome, which was just being changed and renamed, to be a center for the movement to unify the Church. Aside from the confessional questions in Hungary, which had been increasing since 1886, the policy of Magyarization was a difficult component of Leo XIII's religious policy in Eastern Europe.

One can compare the attitude of Leo XIII toward Polish Catholicism under Russian influence with his attitude toward the Irish, who were suppressed by Great Britain. In both instances, there was a revolutionary situation. The difference was that Britain had Gladstone, which gave the Pope a chance to pursue an effective pro-Irish policy. Thus the question should be asked as to which the Pope better understood: the principles according to which every revolution needs to be rejected or the terribly violent resistance of the Irish toward the injustices inflicted upon them. In view of the French Revolution, Leo himself later said that it is difficult from the beginning for such changes to occur within the framework of justice. The relations of Leo XIII with Great Britain were even better when the liberal de-anglicanization of public life provided greater freedom for Catholics. The reputation of the papacy in the Anglo-Saxon world grew remarkably during this pontificate; and it was more than just an act of courtesy when Cleveland, then president of the United States of America, sent a copy of the Constitution to Leo XIII for the anniversary of his ordination in 1887. The Know-Nothing Party and the Ku Klux Klan were to fight Catholicism publicly and secretly for a long time to come, but their influence on public opinion was counterbalanced by the prestige of Leo XIII.

At the jubilees in 1883, 1887, 1893, and 1903, the Pope could enjoy the Catholics' demonstrations of loyalty and the good wishes of almost all other nations. However, it characterizes the historical situation that the original countries of the Christian West, France and Italy, could not be listed in the index of success, even though Leo XIII considered these countries especially important in the perspective of his world design.

Perhaps the central question in the historical evaluation of this pontificate deals with the opportunism which even benevolent historians denote as a characteristic of Leo XIII. Léon Gambetta was filled with hatred for the clergy. But although hate can sharpen the eye, this alone is not sufficient for the appropriate assessment of his charge that Leo was an "opportuniste sacré." Walter Goetz also supported this judgment in his sympathetic analysis. However, he distinguished such opportunism from "ordinary" opportunism, which marks the commonplace politician, noting Leo XIII's magnificent political personality, "political instinct and true leadership," especially in regard to social questions, and, last but not least, to the limits the Pope placed on his activities where demanded by his position. This question can only be answered in the context of Leo XIII's total concept. Is it correct to say that his policies and his ecclesiastical leadership were solely determined by the desire to restore the Papal State? No doubt this was a legitimate goal, and even those who considered it anachronistic had no right to call Leo XIII a "Tantalus who yearned after a small Italian principality which was to be cut from the body of the dynasty of Savoy."[16] But if this had been the ultimate goal of Leo XIII, according to which his devotion to modern society is to be judged, then he would have been neither a "master of politics" nor an important Pope.

It is obvious that the Italian question is a primary motif which, with extreme fluctuations from cautious hope to inscrutable resignation, ran through the life of Gioacchino Pecci after he was enthroned on the chair of Saint Peter. It would be misleading to see his advances toward Bismarck from this perspective only. From an agreement with the "great conservative statesman," this "ingenious, courageous, strong-willed man, who knows how to procure obedience,"[17] Leo XIII expected the establishment of a bastion against the revolutionary tendencies in Europe. But the papal words *finis impositus,* from his address on the termination of the German question (23 May 1887), were spoken in the fatal year when, after many disappointments for the Pope, the end of a greater alliance had come. After the shameful events of 13 July 1881 (see p. 0), Austria as well as other powers refused the expected help against Italy; and in October King Umberto was a celebrated guest in Vienna. What other hope had he placed on Bismarck, a Protestant, yet an admired politician? At first, the Pope was not alone in his opinion of the weakness of the House of Savoy. But just when the Pope spoke of an asylum in the Habsburg Monarchy with the Austrian special emissary (1882), the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy was about to be ratified. The support of the House of Savoy—a child of the revolution to Leo XIII—was presented to the Pope as an act of conservative politics,[18] and Austria pressured the Vatican to settle the German question. The Pope's reliance on Bismarck grew considerably when the latter asked him to mediate the negotiations with Spain concerning the Caroline Islands, one of Leo XIII's most important functions in the last phase of the *Kulturkampf.* Its conclusion was announced in a papal address of 23 May 1887, ending with the expression of hope that "harmony" could now also be restored to Italy stressing the condition that the Pope's authority should be subject to no one else's.[19] Obviously, the Pope felt, at that moment, that the time for such a solution to the "Roman question" had come: crowning the peace with Germany. However, Crispi refused immediately. In October the Italian prime minister was Bismarck's welcome guest, and the Triple Alliance was renewed. The Pope, though "abandoned by the powers,"[20] returned to his old demands. But with what political power could they be realized? On 2 June 1887 Mariano Rampolla[21] was appointed secretary of state. On 4 October 1887 the French ambassador reported to the Vatican that the Cardinal had spoken with France *d'une entente cordiale.* At the end of the year Pope Leo XIII himself called France *sa fille privilegiée* in the presence of the ambassador. As early as 1884, the letter *Nobilissima Gallorum gens* had intonated such language. In the year 1888, when Wilhelm II visited the Pope, the Pope called Bismarck a great revolutionary during an audience with the French ambassador. After the report of the Austrian special emissary (6 August 1888), Leo XIII told him, "If the government cannot dispatch any troops for my protection, they should at least hoist their flags on the walls of the Vatican when danger is imminent." In connection with a war feared at that time, the Pope advised Vienna and Paris that an alliance with the Vatican would be to their advantage.[22] In 1890 the policy of *ralliement* began: reconciliation with the French Republic. Rampolla explained to the French delegate that the establishment of an Italian republic might clear the situation for the Vatican because the Pope would not have to reckon with a monarch next to him in Rome.[23] The second political alliance failed with the *ralliement*.[24] That it had little to do with a trend toward democracy as such can be deduced from the report by Revertera, the Austrian ambassador to the Vatican, according to which the Pope, two weeks after the encyclical *Au milieu des sollicitudes* (1892), declared his principal support for a "monarchical restoration in France," were it at all possible.[25]

---

[16] H. Hermelink, *Das Christentum in der Menschheitsgeschichte* III (1955), 92. This remark is not only "too harsh" (G. Maron, op. cit., 205), but also evidence of surprising historical ignorance.

[17] Engel-Janosi I, 215–323; here: 220f. According to the topic of this book, Austrian affairs are given preference. Nevertheless, based on unpublished documents, this book is fundamental for the assessment of this pontificate's policies. For Leo XIII's appraisal of Bismarck, see chap. 3.

---

[18] At the Catholic Convention in Freiburg, 1888, Windthorst interpreted the Triple Alliance, renewed in 1887, as a situation favorable to the Pope; as a result, the German and Austrian Catholics could exert more influence on Italy (Kißling II, 234f.).

[19] *Acta Leonis* VII, 112–16; here: 115.

[20] Engel-Janosi I, 251: Leo XIII's words to the Austrian ambassador to the Vatican.

[21] On Rampolla, see bibliography and the appraisals of diplomats in Engel-Janosi I, 245, 257ff.

During the New Year's reception in 1897 at Count Revertera's, Leo XIII expressed two hopes: before the end of his days, he wanted to see the dawn, at least, of a unification with the Christian peoples outside of the Church and the beginning of a solution to the Roman question. So as not to diminish the political problems of the Papal State or to cloud one's view of the greatness of the Pope by isolating the problem from his total portfolio,[26] it is necessary to see both hopes as one. Naturally, one must understand the Pope's hope for unification from the perspective of what was then historically feasible. The Pope did not expect mutual sympathy from the separated Christians, but rather a mass movement toward conversion. The movement was the horizon on which the validity of the Anglican ordinations was discussed. After he received reports from the Balkans in 1887, Leo XIII believed he could count on the movement. He had oriented his policies toward Russia according to his expectations.[27] Even without calling Leo XIII a "mortal enemy of Protestants,"[28] one could reject such a perception of Christian ecumenism. But given the Catholic self-concept, the city of Saint Peter was the essential component of a Christian unification. However Leo XIII may have envisioned the solution to the Roman question at different times, in detailed or in general terms, it was not only a matter of a "small principality," but of the Holy City as the center of the world Church and the episcopal see of its sovereign, subject to no other power. Rome of Saint Peter's successor and Christ's deputy—or Rome of the Freemason "plague"; that was the question. "La Roma nostra," Leo XIII used to say. And when the Pope spoke about finding asylum in Austria or Spain, he repeatedly used Ambrose's words "Ubi Papa, ibi ecclesia"; however, he thought primarily of a future triumphant return to Rome.[29]

---

[22] Engel-Janosi I, 256, 266.

[23] Ibid., 256.

[24] Toward the end of the year 1895, when the law against congregations became an issue, Nuncio Ferrata tried to combine the two alliances by reminding the French president of the cooperation with the monarchies (*Mémoires* III, 306f.).

[25] Leo XIII to Count Revertera, "I would like to tell you confidentially what I can, naturally, only confide to few people: I regret that a monarchal restoration in France is impossible under present circumstances. . . . The future of the monarchy there depends on the predominance due to the Catholics within the state" (Engel-Janosi I, 272f.). For a description of Revertera ("honest nobleman"), see ibid., 257.—Cf. chap. 2.—On the change of course: Ward, 60.

[26] Walter Goetz (op. cit., 397f.) also considers this aspect most problematic in view of the question of opportunism. He emphasizes how seriously the Pope took the restoration of the Papal State, unbelievable as this may seem. He wanted to hold Rampolla responsible for the " scrupulous attempts to restore Europe" after 1887. "One cannot simultaneously assent to democracy in France and forbid participation in elections in Italy" (von Aretin, op. cit., 166), since this is based on a relationship to democracy which did not exist; similarly, Fülöp-Miller, op. cit., 130—The papal relations to the American episcopate of Cardinal Gibbons and its development must be seen in this context. From the beginning, there were basic differences, since this episcopate consisted of confirmed democrats.—Whatever could be reconciled by most of the didactic letters which Leo XIII was undoubtedly responsible for, did not preclude conflicts in a certain historical situation (cf. chaps. 10 and 24). The personal sacrifices which the Pope demanded in his policies, during the *Kulturkampf* as well as the *Ralliement,* are aspects of the general problem of political power. Cardinal of the Curia (since 1875) Ledóchowski

---

had to renounce the archbishopric of Gnesen in 1886. Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, imprisoned during the *Kulturkampf,* had to resign in 1885 when promoted to cardinal of the Curia. Bishop Lachat of Basel-Solothurn was demoted when transferred to Ticino as apostolic administrator. The often bitter reactions in the French episcopate are rather understandable.—Bismarck was satisfied with Leo XIII's mediation in the question of the Caroline Islands and he thanked him by addressing him with "sire" in the letter of 31 January 1886 (which the Pope considered significant in reference to the Roman question). Pragmatism and his high opinion of Bismarck, in spite of disillusionments, compelled Leo XIII to award this statesman, whom he later called a revolutionary, the Medal of Christ.

[27] Cf. chaps. 9, 11, and 25. For his expectations as to conversions in the East, see Engel-Janosi I, 222f., 248f., 268ff., 321f.

[28] R. Seeberg, *Aus Religion und Geschichte* I (1906), 332–51.—In several encyclicals, Leo XIII declared the Enlightenment and the Revolution a result of the Reformation. On 1 August 1897, the three hundredth anniversary of Peter Canisius's death, Leo XIII sent the encyclical *Militantis Ecclesiae* to the Austrian, German, and Swiss episcopates. He compared the situation of Canisius, when the corruption of morals was followed by the "craze for innovations," with the present and spoke of the *rebellio lutherana* (*Acta Leonis* XVII, 248–59; here: 248f.).

[29] The idea of finding asylum for the papacy outside of Italy came up four times: 1881–82 when Austrian Trent was considered; 1888 (again looking toward Austria), when the Crispi government played its intrigues and the Pope found his hopes for a conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* disappointed because the visit of Emperor Wilhelm II had gone badly, primarily because of Prince Henry; 1889, after the demonstrations at the unveiling ceremonies of the Giordano Bruno memorial, this time with Spain in mind; in the summer of 1891, when Emperor Franz Joseph discouraged the Pope (Schmidlin, *PG,* 414f., 417, 421; Engel-Janosi I, 226–31, 255, 266f.).

If one wants to understand all aspects of this pontificate, it seems necessary to start with Leo XIII's very pronounced awareness of the history of the papacy. This awareness did not have a trace of historicism. He repeated, again and again, in his encyclicals that the papacy formed the Christian West, and what the nations, especially Italy, owed to the papacy.[30] It is self-evident that the Popes Leo the Great and Gregory the Great were especially mentioned, and, likewise, that Leo's predecessors since the French Revolution occupy the most space in the list. Upon examination of the actual content of the frequent traditional mentioning of predecessors,[31] one might find it worthy of note that quotes by Innocent III abound, almost all of which show the personal handwriting of Leo XIII. In the encyclical *Inscrutabili Dei* (28 May 1878), Innocent III appears together with Leo the Great, Alexander III, and Pius V as models for the new pontificate. Leo XIII, referring to Innocent III and other popes in connection with his unification plans for Eastern Churches, provokes historical comparisons which were, of course, not intended. *Nobilissima Gallorum gens* (1884), written after the conclusion of the Triple Alliance, anticipates subsequent French policy (in the introduction, the *Gesta Dei per Francos* is mentioned). Interestingly, Innocent (together with Gregory IX) is cited in a quotation from the letter to the archbishop of Rheims. In it he speaks of the preferential love of France and her obedience to the Apostolic See, which outdoes all other empires.[32] In 1892 Leo XIII had the remains of Innocent III transferred from Perugia to the oldest and most sacred church in Rome, the Lateran Basilica, which he had been restoring and expanding in grand style since 1881. In the same year, the *ralliement,* the second big attempt to solve the Roman question, was in progress, as well as the creation of a papacy which would, in this revolution-ridden world, resume the universal historic task from which it had profited during the Middle Ages. With the appropriate adjustments, the papacy could win back "moral-religious hegemony in a new Christian world empire."[33] In 1892, on the anniversary of his coronation (3 March 1878), Leo XIII justified the transfer of the remains of his great predecessor, Innocent III, in a speech to the cardinals.[34] During his episcopate in Perugia, his favorite idea had been to honor the memory of this man, and he realized the idea that year, so that his voice might be heard from the Lateran Basilica, the "symbol of Christian unity." Immediately afterwards, he mentioned the great goals of Innocent's pontificate: the "conquest of the Holy Land and the independence of the Church." Under the "freedom of the papacy," he said, the Christian faith, "like our blood, revitalized the social and political organism" and tied the "peoples" to the authority of the Church, the "moral center of the world." Is not "a strong faith, verified in the conscience of the peoples, rather than the restoration of medieval institutions," the way to achieve final victory? The differentiation of medieval and contemporary conditions reflects the discussions about the guilds which were conducted in socialist circles and paid attention to in *Rerum novarum* (1891). It seems especially important that, in these instances, peoples rather than nation states were referred to. This was in line with hopes placed on the "Catholic masses" since 1887 and with a remark by Rampolla on the "clearly democratic trend of an era, which the Church should not face with animosity.[35] Rampolla's opinion was supported by the worker pilgrimages. We do not know, specifically, what Leo XIII knew about the pontificate of Innocent III, whose great universal goal it had been to lift the papacy "in the realm of *christianitas* to a sacerdotal-royal position," with himself "as head of the super-national *populus christianus,* which would be his direct responsibility."[36] It would be misleading to single out Innocent III merely on the basis of the quotations from Leo's predecessors. But Innocent III's memory accompanied Leo XIII from his birth (Anagni was the native bishopric of Gioacchino Pecci) to Perugia, to a dramatic turning point, the transfer of Innocent III's body to the Lateran Basilica (1892), to Leo's own burial (on the right side of the Basilica opposite the tomb of Innocent III).[37] Thus, Innocent III offers access to the universal conception of Leo XIII, who felt that another personality from the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas, had completed "Christian philosophy," a return to which would be the way to cure modern society. Perhaps this explains Leo XIII's "temptation to theocracy."

---

[30] Cf. chap. 22.

[31] Gregory XIII is mentioned often, which is only important because of the calendar reform in connection with outfitting the observatory (*Acta Leonis* XI, 62).

[32] *Acta Leonis* IV, 11.

[33] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 353.

[34] *Acta Leonis* XII, 383–85.

From this background it is understandable that, in an age of imperialism, against all political reality, Leo XIII highly valued the prospects of an international office for arbitration. Such an office he claimed principally for the papacy. Already, in *Diuturnum illud* (1881), one is reminded that, at the time of the Holy Roman Empire, the Church as *conciliatrix* had tamed the political passions of peoples partly through clemency, partly by exerting authority.[38] Bismarck's offer of papal mediation (1885) in the dispute between Germany and Spain over the Caroline Islands was, naturally, significant for Leo XIII, mostly because he interpreted the gesture of the Chancellor as recognition of his temporal sovereignty. The Pope, who tended to attach high hopes to the offer, underwent the experience of Spain's refusing his arbitration under international law and conceding merely to mediation.[39] In his letter of 29 May 1899, Leo XIII referred specifically to this diplomatic action. He was answering a letter from the Dutch Queen Wilhelmina, who, at the initiative of the Tsar, had wanted to include the Pope in the peace negotiations in the Hague, and had asked him for "moral support."[40] Leo XIII explained in his letter that it was the duty of the papal office not only to provide the conference with moral support, but also to "play an effective and active part in it." This, he wrote, was in keeping with the tradition of the papacy, whose authority transcended all national borders. Despite opposition, he was going to pursue this duty and not seek any fame other than "de servir la cause sacrée de la civilisation chrétienne." The invitation failed because of Italy. Other countries were also perplexed over this view of papal duties. They believed it to be limited to arbitration. Confirmation of the papal mission had been drawn into demonstrations of loyalty by Catholic congregations, yet it would lead to complications if it was to be applied to a concrete situation.[41] It was a delusion to project this political world onto a "Christian civilization" and to want to redesign it as a union of nations unified in the Christian faith.[42]

---

[35] Engel-Janosi I, 259f.—Rampolla's remark was directed to Count Revertera, the Austrian ambassador.

[36] F. Kempf, *LThK* V, 688.

[37] Two other Popes were buried in the Cathedral of Perugia (Urban IV [1261–64] and Martin IV [1281–85]). To Friedrich Kempf I owe the information that "at some time, the remains of all three Popes were buried together"; thus, it was a remarkable act to transfer the remains of the most important Pope (after all, the Romans forced Martin IV to be crowned in Orvieto). On the transfer (the remains are supposed to have been taken to Rome by a prelate; he carried them in a box and traveled by railway), see Schmidlin, *PG* II, 405.—Leo XIII pointed to Anagni, in 1897, as the birthplace of Innocent III and Gregory IX.

---

[38] *Acta Leonis* II, 282.

[39] Leo XIII appointed a commission of cardinals. Their proposal of 22 October 1885 to acknowledge Spain's sovereignty over the islands, but to grant Germany free trade, was accepted by the political powers (1899, after the Spanish-American War, Germany bought the islands from Spain as a protectorate). U. Stutz (op. cit., 60) speaks of a "diplomatic masterpiece" by Bismarck; E. Born (Gebhardt-Grundmann III, 236), emphasizes that this step signifies "the recognition of the Pope's worldly sovereignty, which has not happened since the occupation of the Papal State in 1870"; on the critical assessment of the papal expectations by the Austrian embassy to the Vatican, see Engel-Janosi I, 240; on Spain, R. Konetzke (biblio., chap. 8), 521. On a malicious German caricature, showing the Pope holding a sword and trying to destroy the inscription "Honor-Profit—he is scornfully looking at a Spanish woman to his left; on the right, massively, the triumphant Bismarck—see von Aretin, op. cit., 127.

[40] *Acta Leonis* XIX, 83–85.

[41] In 1890, at the Catholic Convention in Coblenz, Windthorst pleaded for recognition (Kißling II, 246). At the Catholic Convention in Munich in 1895, another motion by Prince Löwenstein was defeated (Siebertz, op. cit., 203–9).

The significance of the encyclical *Rerum novarum* (1891)[43] is correctly evaluated and not in the least diminished if placed in the context of Leo XIII's great world design. Certainly the experiences the Pope had with the conservative monarchies, specifically in the years 1887/88, play a role. The monarchies did not want to assist him against the Italian upstart. And Leo XIII, despite his general utterances in reference to political philosophy, was adverse to democracy. Likewise, the change in tone after 1901 toward *Graves de communi* is evident. The negative turn of events exposes the overall goal: a cure for the social and political disruptions in the modern world, which was plunging into a state of deep resignation around the end of the nineteenth century. The cure was hoped to be the recognition of the moral authority of the *vicarius Christi.* It involved the inevitable liberation of the *proletarii* from oppression by *classes dirigeantes* as well as their right to unionize. The "question of the workers" is only one part of the general renovation of society based on Neo-Scholastic social philosophy. For Leo, renovation was feasible only if the authority of the Church would be respected again by everyone. As much as the workers' pilgrimages to Rome[44] meant to the Pope in view of the Piedmontese sovereignty, it is absurd to interpret the patriarchal papal involvement in the workers' question as a mere means of pragmatic politics in the "Roman question."[45]

Leo XIII was not only a political but also a seigneurial Pope.[46] His first secretary of state, Alexander Franchi,[47] whose appointment may have had something to do with the papal elections, was the most distinguished secretary of state before Rampolla. In 1880, two years after Franchi's death, Lorenzo Nina, who also belonged to the intransigents, incurred displeasure and was in office only a short time.[48] Secretary of State Ludovico Jacobini (1880–87), formerly nuncio to Vienna, had a cautious nature and "his personality could neither succeed in the Vatican nor with the Pope himself" (Engel-Janosi). He had to follow the changing initiatives of the Pope in his policy toward Bismarck. Leo XIII also expected that his nuncios would be recognized as executive representatives of his authority, through which he ruled the world Church in a centralized manner.[49] To strengthen his position toward the ecclesiastical opponents of the Spanish constitution, the Pope stated the point clearly in a letter on 15 April 1885, delivered by Secretary of State Jacobini to Rampolla, nuncio to Madrid since 1882.[50] "In respect to the faithful in the country and their ecclesiastical affairs," the nuncios have an "authoritative mission," whose extent is determined by the Pope—the constitution *Pastor aeternus* is referred to. Domenico Ferrata, one of Leo XIII's outstanding diplomats, became nuncio to Paris after his duties in Switzerland and Belgium (1891–96). In 1894 he declared to French President Périer that the nuncio represents the Pope as the "true spiritual sovereign of the Catholics in the respective country," and that he, the nuncio, differed fundamentally from other ambassadors.[51] Another man especially favored by the Pope was the diplomat Luigi Galimberti. As special emissary of the Pope, he played a major role in the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf,* and his behavior toward Windthorst, which he could not have afforded at his own expense, documented the individual style of government of this pontificate.[52] That his rival Rampolla became secretary of state in 1887 and that he himself had to go to

---

[42] Tischleder, *Staatslehre,* 404ff.—H. Hermelink (op. cit., 107) remarked that it was too late "to subjugate liberated peoples to the centralistic leadership of a celibate international priesthood"; this remark, made in 1955, shows a curious Protestant feeling of resentment.

[43] Rightfully, K. O. von Aretin (op. cit., 158) calls this encyclical "a great deed" which is directed against the paternalistic slander of the Christian social movement.

[44] French pilgrimages 1887, 1888, 1889, 1891 (the words "vive le Pape!" resulted in disturbances during which a picture of the Pope was burned). In 1892, a medallion was issued displaying a picture of the Pope and a figure, symbolic of religion, carrying the encyclical of 1891 in the right hand and the cross in the left, while smashing the head of the hydra (greed). A poor woman and her child are sitting at the feet of this female figure. A strong workman with his tools is looking up to her, while wealthy gentlemen approaching from the other side bring presents (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 378). One has to consider here the popular taste of the time.

[45] Cf. chaps. 12 and 13.

[46] It would be presumptuous to undertake even a sketch of Gioacchino Pecci's portrait. The reports of people who met him are contradictory (cf. Engel-Janosi I, 217, 231, 263). Optimism, naturally greater at the beginning of his office than at the end, seems to have been intertwined with scepticism, something rather unexpected in view of Leo XIII's expansive concepts. Emotional features were, probably, not foreign to this strong,

---

humanistic rationalist ("cool and sober": Schmidlin, *PG* II, 587). According to a report by the Austrian delegate, Leo XIII interrupted Secretary of State Jacobini while the latter was voicing objections concerning an administrative question, saying, "Ego sum Petrus!" Leo XIII's mood, prompted by Emperor Franz Joseph's evasive reply (1881), was characterized by Jacobini as follows, "J'en ai été navré." Naturally, the physical strength of the Pope, born in 1810, had diminished. But caution should be exercised over talk about his "senility." In 1901 the Austrian ambassador found the Pope to be more energetic and fresher than twelve years earlier.

[47] Cf. chap. 3, n. 3.

[48] Cf. chap. 3, n. 12.

[49] Leo XIII asserted "the weight of his authority even in nonecclesiastical matters" and thus practiced the *potestas directa* indirectly (Schmidlin, *PG* , 583).

[50] *ASS,* 17, 561ff.; cf. cit., chap. 8, n. 5.

[51] *Mémoires* II, 455.

[52] Cf. chap. 3, n. 43.

Vienna as nuncio (until 1893) were the result of the major policy changes in papal politics.[53] As long as the Vatican archives until 1903 are not generally accessible, it cannot be determined accurately, among other matters, which position Secretary of State Rampolla took toward Leo XIII.[54] It is possible that he had great influence on Leo XIII's activities during the final years.

With this diplomatic apparatus, Leo XIII sought to assert the power of his moral authority. In the beginning of the 1880s, he had to realize that the conditions for such assertion were not present because the conservative forces did not consider this authority indispensable to their survival in the face of revolutionary tendencies. Not even the Habsburg Monarchy wanted to or could face the consequences in reality. After the nineties Leo XIII noticed that turning directly to the people could strengthen his authority over Catholicism. But his hopes for the expansion to turn into conversion movements were not fulfilled, much less his expectation that he would be respected as the moral authority by all men. It was one of his favorite plans to establish diplomatic relations with China. He had already designated Antonio Agliardi, later nuncio to Vienna, as the apostolic delegate when his letter to the Emperor of China (1 February 1885) received a positive response. His immediate motive had been the protection of the Catholic missionaries. But the ultimate goal was the inclusion of this world culture into his universal concept.[55] The plan failed because France, the only power generally recognized to protect the Christians in the Orient, saw her interests endangered and threatened the Vatican with a break in diplomatic relations.

One must see the consecration of the entire human race to the Sacred Heart, on the occasion of the jubilee in 1900, in the perspective of Leo's world plan. Even though Leo XIII was a "political Pope" and as such subjugated to the conditions of politics, this pontiff cannot be understood if his goal is defined as "the domination of all of mankind by the Catholic Church,"[56] unless one understands "domination" as the kind of mutual permeation of religious and political concepts which characterized the political theory of the West before it dissolved in the later medieval period. One cannot say that his pontificate distinguished itself through the creative forces of spirituality,[57] even though Leo XIII's deep religious piety is proven beyond doubt. Traditional forms, which Marie-Thérèse of Lisieux picked up and internalized during her life of suffering, were developed further and incorporated in the service of public worship. But the character of this pontificate is distorted if one misunderstands the "politicization" as an ideological manipulation of religiosity. This is contradicted by the astonishing attraction which most religious orders and congregations exerted, so that they were able to keep winning many young people for extensive social work with religious motivation.

---

[53] On Galimberti, see Engel-Janosi I, 261f. The "mysterious" diplomat was considered a supporter of a rapprochement with Italy. This is contradicted by a report of the French ambassador in Vienna. It says that Galimberti supported an aggressive liquidation of the *Non Expedit* and would have liked to see the Pope leave the Vatican together with his cardinals in order to prove the alleged fallacy of the freedom of the Pope.

[54] On Rampolla, see this chap., n. 21.

[55] *Acta Leonis* V, 10–12. On Leo XIII's relations to the missions, ibid., III.

[56] W. Goetz, op. cit., 403. Engel-Janosi I, 264, maintains that "Leo XIII wanted to be and was more than the 'Pope of diplomacy.' " Ward, 61: great as a Pope, not as a politician.

The world design of Leo XIII found its most magnificent expression, revealing its innermost moments, in the apostolic letter *Praeclara gratulationis* of June 1894.[58] It is one of those utopias without which historical greatness is not possible. The end is marked by the bitter letter *Annum ingressi sumus* of 19 March 1902,[59] in which Leo XIII bemoans the insults inflicted upon the Church. But it was not just the fanatic hatred of individual Freemasons and the animosity of the whole organization toward the Catholic Church. Reconciliation of the modern world with tradition was no longer in anyone's power. The so-called "tragic failure"[60] of Leo stood under a world signature. His successes were fewer than he had hoped. But that he had hoped for much was the basis for his achievements. To the faithful "he gave a new feeling of inner security toward the world."[61] This constitutes his historical significance. "Though his reign, in retrospect, may not appear to be as unique as it was presented elsewhere, Leo XIII is unquestionably the most important Pope of his century and the most important Pope between Benedict XIV and Pius XI" (G. Schwaiger).[62] His policies and the changes in his policies, his political and social encyclicals, his reclaiming the great philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, his centralized orientation of Catholicism and the Church toward Rome, his involvement in the world mission, his hopes for a great conversion movement: all these were testimony to his grandiose desire for *restauratio;* no longer by way of political restoration as at the beginning of the century, but by turning to the modern world because of his basic concern for the salvation of mankind. The fact that the election of the new Pope after Leo's death on 20 July 1903 stirred the political powers much more than those in the year 1878 was a result of the respect which Leo XIII had gained in the world for the papacy.

---

[57] Cf. chap. 16.

[58] *Acta Leonis* XIV, 195–214; A. Harnack calls this letter "the testimonial of Leo XIII": *Reden und Aufsätze* II (2nd ed., 1906), 267–93; one cannot expect "any concessions (toward the non-Catholics), other than a friendly tone."

[59] *Acta Leonis* XXII, 52–80.

[60] Fülöp-Miller, op. cit., 152.

[61] W. Goetz, op. cit., 402—W. von Loewenich, (*Moderner Katholizismus* [Witten a.d. Ruhr 1955], 69f.) speaks of the "disunity of modern Catholicism" becoming evident in Leo XIII, whom he portrays very objectively. On this "disunity," see chaps. 12–14. The real problem is not "abundant authoritative preliminary decisions." The problem is much more complex and not confined to Catholicism.

[62] G. Schwaiger, op. cit., 49.

SECTION ONE

The Situation in the Various Countries until 1914

CHAPTER 1

The Kulturkampf *in Prussia and in the German Empire until 1878*

Nowhere in Europe was the struggle between Church and state fought as vigorously as in the German Empire of 1871. This battle considerably impeded inner consolidation for the next two decades. Since most of the controversial issues continued to be subject to the legislation of the individual states, the struggle took place on their terrain, and most vigorously in Prussia, the dominating power in the new Empire. There were two momentous determining factors: ideological contrast between the ultramontane Catholic Church and liberalism, which was controlling spiritual and political life, peaking in the years of the *Syllabus;* and the continued disparity within the Prussian state. The confessional disputes had further increased; the Prussian bureaucracy, partly Protestant, partly liberal, had only reluctantly executed an ecclesiastical policy of parity, as defined by the constitutions of 1848 and 1850.[1] The strengthening of Catholicism as a social force awakened old and new adversaries. In the late sixties, attacks against confessional schools, cloisters, and other Church institutions occurred more and more often. Mutual misunderstandings due to insufficient knowledge of the opponent and the German lack of flexibility and moderation were contributing factors.

One direct cause of the conflict was the creation of the Center Party, which Bismarck falsely regarded as a conglomerate of the Empire's adversaries. Other causes were the dispute over the dogma of infallibility, the alliance with the National Liberals, designed by the chancellor to consolidate the Empire, and his fear of an anti-German coalition of Catholic states.

---

[1] V. Conzemius, *Die Briefe Aulikes an Döllinger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der "Katholischen Abteilung" im preußischen Kultusministerium* (Rome, Freiburg, Vienna 1968), passim.—On occasion, Bismarck himself had reprimanded high Prussian civil servants for their animosity towards Catholics. Cf. his direct report of 30 September 1865: O. v. Bismarck, *Die gesammelten Werke* V (Berlin 1928), no. 185. In regard to tensions in Prussia after 1866, see K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 26–47; R. Morsey, *Probleme der Kulturkampfforschung,* 221–24.

The political tensions within the Church increased and were nurtured continuously since the end of 1869 by news from the Council in Rome.[2] These tensions and the fear of more severe anti-Catholic measures, as demanded by the Liberals, seemed to necessitate the political consolidation of Catholics in Prussia as well. The movement seeking to found a party since the summer of 1870 was headed by Hermann von Mallinckrodt and Peter Reichensperger. Against the opposition of integralistic circles, they insisted on a political, not primarily a Catholic, party: a principle they had already defended in the fifties.[3] Nevertheless, in response to the particular initial situation, Church affairs took precedence in the first program of the Center Party: the immunity of the Church as defined in the Prussian constitution, the guarantee of confessional schools and freedom of instruction. Other, more important resolutions demanded the preservation of the federal constitution of the German Empire, governmental decentralization, protection of workers, and social welfare. On the basis of this program, fifty-eight deputies were elected to the Prussian Diet in November 1870.

The founding of the Center Party coincided with the Franco-Prussian War. Even the majority of the German Catholics and their leaders regarded this war as a legitimate opportunity to ward off ever increasing threatening pressures. In a similar vein was the pastoral letter of the episcopal conference in Fulda in the summer of 1870, which was addressed particularly to the opponents of the dogma of infallibility. In contrast to the fraternal strife of 1866, the war against the "arch-enemy" was quite popular, especially in the Catholic west and southwest of Germany.

Those who had approved the war could not reject its predictable consequence, the founding of the Empire. Indeed, in 1871 the sentiments of most Catholics differed from those of most other Germans only by reason of an increasing fear of Church conflicts. They also wanted close contact between the Empire and Austria. At the Catholic Convention in Mainz (September 1871) its President Friedrich Baudri and Bishop Ketteler gave recognition to the Emperor and the Empire.[4] Urgently responding to the actual increase of controversies caused by the dogma of infallibility, which had already invaded imperial legal territory, they demanded from the state justice for the Church and protection from assaults by the Liberals. Similarly, Ketteler expressed himself in a political program written in 1871, but not published until 1873.[5] He welcomed the "partial unity of the German people," created by the founding of the Empire, "because it satisfied, partially, a right of the German people and it made amends for the injustice inflicted upon them."

---

[2] V. Conzemius, "Preußen und das 1. Vatikanische Konzil," *AHC* 2 (1970), 353–419.

[3] Concerning the founding of the Center Party, see K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 99–151; L. Bergsträsser, *Geschichte der politischen Parteien in Deutschland* (Munich, 10th ed., 1960), 133–37; T. Nipperdey, *Die Organisation der deutschen Parteien vor 1918* (Düsseldorf 1961), 265ff.; E. R. Huber, *Verfassungsgeschichte* IV, 50ff.; R. Morsey, *StL* VIII, 966f.

[4] F. Vigener, *Ketteler,* 653–58.

At the first session of the *Reichstag* (March 1871), the Center Party already represented the second strongest faction (with fifty-eight deputies). The program, which had not been substantially modified since the previous year,[6] and Ketteler's words mentioned above (in 1871/72 he was a member of the *Reichstag*) showed the reservations of the Center Party as it proceeded with its work. They were sufficient to create an almost irreconcilable opposition to the dominant National Liberals. This was clearly proven by the exclusion of the Center Party from the Presidium. The situation was intensified when the Center immediately accepted some Guelph guest listeners and, soon afterwards, supported other minorities as well (Poles, Alsatians). Continual controversies about the new dogma, about the ecclesiastical censure of orthodox adversaries, and about the growing Old Catholic Church were part of the efforts of the new Empire to gain a historical self-understanding. After 1866 National-Liberal, National-Protestant, and also Protestant-Conservative writers presented the results of 1870/71 as a victory for the social principles essential to Protestantism and a consequence of Protestant Prussian history.[7] The Habsburg dynasty, the papacy, the Jesuits, and the Counter Reformation were held responsible for actually or allegedly leading German history astray. Now and then, Catholics were advised to establish a National Church.

The Center Party itself had introduced these disputes over principles into the first session of the *Reichstag*. This was instigated by the problems of the Papal State, which stirred everyone's emotions, especially after the annexation of Rome (September 1870). The numerous demonstrations and pilgrimages of the Catholics were meant to assure the Pope of their solidarity and to ask their governments for support. The

---

[5] "Die Katholiken im neuen Reich. Entwurf zu einem politischen Programm" (Mainz 1873).

[6] Text: K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 137f.

[7] T. Schieder, *Das deutsche Kaiserreich von 1871 als Nationalstaat* (Cologne, Opladen 1961), 22–26, 58f., 76–82, 125–30; K. G. Faber, *Die nationalpolitische Publizistik Deutschlands von 1866 bis 1871* II (Düsseldorf 1963) nos. 883, 885, 890, 907–10, 913f., 921f., 930; E. Fehrenbach, *Wandlungen des deutschen Kaisergedankens 1871–1918* (Munich, Vienna 1969), 23–40, 52–56, 60–65, 223–27, etc.

Liberals took this as a challenge, since they considered the completion of unity in Germany and Italy as a victory of the modern concept of the state.[8]

Since help could neither be expected from Austria, which tried to come to terms with Italy, nor from now Republican France, Pius IX had asked the King of Prussia for assistance in the fall of 1870. Archbishops Melchers and Ledóchowski had turned to Wilhelm I and Bismarck with the same request. In Berlin Queen Augusta (Empress since 1871) expressly supported the papal desires. She was guided by a conservative awareness of the law as well as the wish to integrate Catholics into the Prussian-German state. The conservative Minister of Religious Affairs Heinrich Mühler (1813–74) agreed with her, but intended to intervene only together with other political powers.[9] King Wilhelm I (Emperor since January 1871) was not disinclined toward the considerations of his spouse, but had to agree with Bismarck's arguments, who, during the persisting war with France, strictly refused any anti-Italian intervention. However, he was willing, if necessary, to grant asylum to the Pope.

In the Emperor's speech before the first *Reichstag,* Wilhelm disavowed any kind of intervention into the domestic affairs of other peoples. In the draft of a reply addressed to the Monarch, the National-Liberal majority formulated the principle of non-intervention, which was in accord with the national self-understanding and the needs of the Empire in regard to her foreign policies, but clearly oriented against the Pope and the Papal State.[10] The Center Party attempted a modification which would not fundamentally exclude intervention in favor of the Pope. Constitution-minded Ludwig Windthorst (1812–91), former cabinet minister of Hannover, stood out in this debate. In the following years, especially after Mallinckrodt's death in 1874, Windthorst became the great leader of the Center Party and Bismarck's most important parliamentary adversary in the *Kulturkampf.* Windthorst declared papal independence, as guaranteed by the Papal State which was created under Charlemagne, founder of the First German Empire, to be of vital interest to German Catholics. In the debate, arguments by politicians wishing for a united Germany excluding Austria were brought forth, sympathy for liberal Italy was declared, and impetuous invectives against the Catholic Church and its latest developments were voiced. The majority's address to the Monarch was approved with 243 to 63 votes. Although the failure of the Center Party's motion was predictable, the fact that it was pursued anyway was not only due to the antipapal tone of the majority draft. The deputies of the then strongest Catholic party seemed to believe that they could draw inopportune conclusions from the commitment of solidarity with the Pope, which had always been part of an ultramontane Church concept. Once again, more trenchantly than in 1866, did the Roman-Italian aspect of the decision of 1870 affect and burden German Catholics and their relations to the nation-state.

---

[8] Concerning the controversies of 1870/71, see E. Portner, *Die Einigung Italiens im Urteil liberaler deutscher Zeitgenossen* (Bonn 1959), 66ff., 111ff., 148ff.; K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie,* 213f., 237, 243f., 248ff., etc.; K.-G. Faber, op. cit.; K. O. von Aretin and R. Lill, *La fine del potere temporale . . . Atti del XLV congresso di storia del risorgimento italiano* (Rome 1972), 79–87, 291–301.

[9] The point of view of Augusta, Wilhelm I, and Mühler, see A. Constabel, *Vorgeschichte,* nos. 14, 16, 19, 21, 25, 32, 35, 43, 53, 68, 80, 84, 87, 91.

[10] Concerning the address debate, see T. Schieder, *Kaiserreich,* 80f. Cf. also K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 193–98; G. Stoltenberg, *Der deutsche Reichstag 1871 bis 1873* (Düsseldorf 1955), 39–43.

The debate on the address resulted in the isolation of the Center Party, which was immediately intensified during the deliberation about the constitution.[11] The faction reiterated demands for the inclusion of certain fundamental rights in the federal constitution, among them articles 15 and 18 of the Prussian constitution, guaranteeing immunity for the Church. As early as 1867, after the creation of the North German Confederation, several Catholic deputies had voiced these demands. The main supporters of the hopeless initiative were Ketteler and Peter Reichensperger. Mallinckrodt and Windthorst had dissuaded them in vain. They felt that it would be more profitable for the Church to assign responsibilities for religious policies to the individual states than to the liberally governed Empire.

The debates on the address and the constitution anticipated the parliamentary fronts of the *Kulturkampf.* Bismarck found his suspicions concerning the Catholic party verified. It seemed to him that the party's alleged "international" character and its first initiatives endangered the consolidation of national unity. He hated the "Guelph" Windthorst. He was particularly suspicious of the protection which the party provided the Poles who had been forced into total opposition since the founding of the Empire. Attempts to denounce the Center Party in Rome as conspirators of revolution and compel the Pope to chastise the party were only partially successful. After some ambiguous remarks, Cardinal Antonelli expressed his appreciation for the party in a letter which Ketteler had effected.[12] Bismarck thereupon fought an open battle, which was primarily motivated by political, not by religious reasons.[13] The Center Party did not suit Bismarck's plans; confessionally based on the masses, it was socially heterogeneous. It had also legitimized itself as a democratic body and was therefore intent on parliamentary rule, which Bismarck despised. The "ultramontane" party was the first which the Chancellor embellished with the term "foes of the Empire," fighting them with unreasonable vehemence. Bismarck's opposition to these groups was responsible for the integration of the other parties in accordance with his governmental policies.

---

[11] K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 198–201; G. Stoltenberg, *Reichstag,* 43–46.

[12] F. Vigener, *Ketteler,* 650f. The demarches in the Vatican were carried out by the Bavarian delegate Count Tauffkirchen, who was also representing the Empire there for a while. G. Franz-Willing, *Die bayrische Vatikangesandtschaft 1803–1934* (Munich 1965), 63ff.; O. von Bismarck, *Gesammelte Werke,* VIc, no. 9, cf. also ibid., no. 3.

The Prussian government, especially Bismarck and the conservative Minister of Religious Affairs Heinrich Mühler, regarded the Vatican Council and its resolutions as domestic affairs of the Catholic Church. A position was not taken until the bishops began inflicting penalties upon opponents to the impairment of their civil or social status. Mühler completely avoided conflict, regretted the recent internal developments within Catholicism and sided with the reprimanded professors in Bonn and Breslau and the other clerical teachers.[14] Prince-Bishop Förster of Breslau[15] had acted especially harshly, though he had been a vehement opponent of the dogma of infallibility himself. He had submitted, finally, and expected the same from his clergy.

Bishop Krementz of Ermland[16] took steps not only against Professor

---

[13] "Declarations of war" by the Chancellor were his letter to Count Frankenberg (19 June 1871), published a few days later in the *Nationalzeitung,* and an article against the "clerical faction" inspired by Bismarck, published in the *Kreuzzeitung* (also 19 June 1871). Frankenberg belonged to a minority of the Catholic nobility, predominantly represented in Silesia, which was very close to the Prussian state.

[14] Concerning the controversies about the professors, see A. Constable, *Vorgeschichte,* nos. 2f., 7f., 10–13, 15ff., 22f., 26, 28–31, 33f., 36–42, 45, 47, 51, 54–57, 63f., 77, 81, 83.

[15] Heinrich Förster, cathedral vicar and chaplain since 1837, a leading figure in the ecclesiastical liberation movement, continued as bishop (since 1853) the restoration efforts of his predecessor Diepenbrock. Because of his resistance to the May laws, Förster was dismissed in October 1875. In order to avoid arrest, he moved to the Austrian part of his bishopric, where he was able to perform the duties of his office. (A. Nowack, *ArSKG* 2 [1937], 207–18; K. Engelbert, ibid. 7 [1949], 147–88; H. Hoffmann, ibid. 12 [1954], 257–62; V. Schurr, *LThK*² IV, 218f; a study by T. Lissek soon to be published.

[16] Philippus Krementz (1819–99), 1848: priest in Koblenz, 1867: bishop in Ermland. His conflict with the government intensified in 1872 until his income was withheld (suspension of temporalities). In the subsequent struggle, Krementz stayed in the background. Therefore, and because of protection by Empress Augusta, he was able to remain in office and to succeed Melchers as archbishop of Cologne in 1885, and as cardinal in 1893. "Philippus Krementz. Ein Lebensbild," *Festschrift zur Kardinalserhebung* (Cologne 1893); *Atlpreußische Biographie,* ed. by C. Krollmann (Königsberg 1941–44), 364; B. M. Rosenberg, *ZGAE,* 30 (1960), 191–97; F. Lauchert, *LThK*¹ VI, 237.

Michelis of Braunsberg, but also against all the teachers of the local Catholic high school. The principal and Wollmann, the religion teacher, were excommunicated. Students subsequently boycotted religious instruction and were forced by the government to leave the school.[17]

The government used the controversy for its first administrative maneuver of far-reaching consequences. On 8 July 1871 the Catholic department of the Ministry of Religious Affairs was dissolved and combined with the Protestant department to form a department for ecclesiastical affairs.[18] Bismarck and the liberal press accused the functionaries of the Catholic department, vainly defended by Mühler, of two offenses: in the latest controversy they did not adequately represent the position of the state and they did not energetically combat the expansion of the Polish clerical influence in the schools of the eastern provinces.

In the meantime, Bismarck's alliance with the National Liberals had solidified because the Conservatives had taken a reserved stand toward his domestic policies, fearing a diminution of Prussian autonomy. The radical political program directed against the Church, which the Chancellor explained to Mühler in August 1871, a few weeks after his official "declaration of war,"[19] was completely in accord with the new constellations. The program combined Bismarck's typical desire to restore the old Prussian sovereignty over the Church with the extensive adoption of the ecclesiastical maxims of liberalism. Bismarck wanted to combat the ultramontane party, especially in the eastern provinces. He was aiming at separation of church and state and of church and school. He wanted to transfer school inspections to nonclerical supervisors and abolish religious instruction in the schools. Henceforth, ecclesiastical affairs were to be administered by the Ministry of Justice.[20]

The Prussian bishops under the chairmanship of Paulus Melchers met again in September 1871 in Fulda. In a direct petition they tried to prove the legitimacy of their measures against the Old Catholics and to clarify the misunderstandings caused by dogma. But they were unable to accomplish anything against Bismarck's intentions.[21] His fight was not directed against the infallability of the Pope as much as against the Center Party and the ultramontane "conspiracy." To the Liberals, the dogma meant simply the ultimate confirmation of their ecclesiastical policies. Ketteler, after a conversation with Bismarck in November 1871, had to recognize that the conflict had become irreconcilable. The Chancellor seemed to be convinced that the Curia and the Center Party were conspiring against the Empire.[22]

---

[17] Concerning the Braunsberger controversy and the subsequent conflict with Krementz, see. A. Constabel, *Vorgeschichte,* no. 46ff., especially nos. 52, 62, 65–76, 78f., 90, 107, 117, 141f., 158ff., 166–71, 205f., 208ff., 213ff., 224ff., 240–58.

[18] Concerning the abolishment of the Catholic department, see A. Constabel, *Vorgeschichte,* nos. 85f., 89, 92ff., Cf. O. von Bismarck, *Gesammelte Werke,* VIc, no. 10.

[19] See n. 13.

[20] W. Reichle, *Mühler,* 333.

[21] A. Constabel, *Vorgeschichte,* nos. 106, 109, 112f., 115; R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg, Basel, Vienna 1964), 112–18.

A legal strategical initiative had meanwhile emanated from Bavaria. In October 1871 the *Reichstag* opened its second session. Minister Johann Lutz presented a bill introducing a pulpit paragraph which was ratified 10 December 1871 (ARTICLE 130a of the penal code). The clergy was forbidden, when in office, to deal with public affairs "in a way which would endanger the peace of public life."[23] In previous passionate debates, Windthorst, Peter Reichensperger, and Ketteler had justified the opposition of the Center Party. Lutz had explained that it was a question of who was in command: the state or the Roman Church. Almost all National Liberals agreed. Their chairman, Rudolf von Bennigsen, admitted in confidential consultation that he wanted to provoke the clerical faction to act with more rigor.

Meanwhile, Bismarck and his colleagues had proceeded to realize their program in Prussia. Only with reservations did the Emperor join in. But Bismarck was able to convince him that the interests of the state left no choice. Augusta's numerous and well-founded warnings of the conflict accomplished nothing.[24] Mühler resisted Bismarck consistently. He wanted to introduce the law on school supervision by the state, which Bismarck desired so urgently, only under the provision that a general school law be passed which would preserve the Christian character of the school system. Mühler had to resign in January 1872. He was succeeded by Adalbert Falk (1827–1900), a disciple of the liberal political concept. He had strong support from the National Liberal Party and was the driving force next to Bismarck in the *Kulturkampf.* On 11 March 1872, the school supervision law was passed. Now, the state had the right to supervise all public and private schools and to appoint school inspectors (ART. 2), who had previously been employed by the Church.[25] This law, like the Baden school law of 1868, was not so much a result of the *Kulturkampf* as of the liberal desire to remove all ecclesiastical influence from public affairs. It was discriminatory because of the circumstances under which it was passed. Bismarck, Falk, and the liberal press left no doubt that they wanted to strike out against the Catholic Church and the Polish population of Prussia. Nevertheless, this law caused the break with the Conservatives which embittered the Chancellor. The Conservative majority rejected the new dogmatic developments within Catholicism. But they also rejected a conflict knowing that it would turn against the Protestant Church and, generally, against the alliance of throne and altar.

---

[22] F. Vigener, *Ketteler,* 662ff.

[23] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf,* II, 460.—Concerning the previous debate, see G. Stoltenberg, *Reichstag,* 101–14.

[24] Concerning Augusta's warnings, see. A. Constabel, *Vorgeschichte,* nos. 68, 80, 91, 108, 156, 172, 177, 183, 188, 202, 220, 252, 258.

[25] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* II, 460f.

In the following months, the government increased antiecclesiastical administrative measures introduced under Mühler. Prominent victims were Bishop Krementz, whose salary was withheld in spite of the Emperor's reluctance, and Bishop Namszanowski, military ordinary to the armed forces.[26] Namszanowski had discontinued services in the garrison's church, St. Pantaleon in Cologne, which the state had allowed to the Old Catholics. He had also forbidden a curate, who opposed the dogma, to perform the duties of his office. The Defense Department did not understand the clerical responsibilities of the military ordinary and considered his actions illegal transgressions from his area of competence. When Namszanowski participated in the episcopal conference in Fulda (April 1872), the Department charged him with leaving Berlin without permission "on unofficial business."[27] The government suspended the bishop, but the disciplinary court did not confirm it. The appeal was decided by the Ministry of State itself. On 26 June 1873, the Bishop was placed under suspension, after the cabinet decree of 15 March 1873 had already dissolved the military ordinariate. A diplomatic protest by the Vatican (Antonelli's letter of 28 August 1872), with whom the establishment of the ordinariate to the armed forces had been arranged, received no answer. This diplomatic insult of the Vatican had been preceded by a worse one in the spring of 1872. Bismarck had tried to force Cardinal Hohenlohe as ambassador upon the Pope, though in 1870 he had fallen out of favor with Rome.[28] After papal rejection of the cardinal, only a chargé d'affaires remained in the Vatican. By the end of 1872, he was also recalled because of Pius IX's vehement protests against the unrelenting execution of the Jesuit laws. In 1875, at the peak of the *Kulturkampf,* funds for the embassy to the Vatican were stricken from the state budget.

---

[26] Franz Adolf Namszanowski (1820–1900), provost in Königsberg, in 1868 titular bishop and military ordinary to the Prussian armed forces, after his provisional retirement he resided in Frauenburg (Ermland), where he became cathedral vicar. H. Pohl, *Die katholische Militärfürsorge Preußens 1797–1888* (Stuttgart 1926, reprint Amsterdam 1962), 209ff., 229, 236–39, 250–344, 363, 369–72, 387; *Altpreußische Biographie* (see n. 16), 455; B. M. Rosenberg, ibid., 197f.

[27] Concerning the controversy over Namszanowski and the military ordinariate, see H. Pohl, op. cit., 250–344; A. Constabel, *Vorgeschichte,* no. 105, 148, 152, 161f., 165, 168, 173f., 179–82, 184f., 187f., 191ff., 196ff., 201, 207, 236, 261.

[28] E. Deuerlein, "Bismarck und die Reichsvertretung beim Heiligen Stuhl," *StdZ* 164 (1959), 203–19, 256–66; H. Philippi, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Deutschen Reich und dem Heiligen Stuhl," *HJ* 82 (1963), 219–62, see esp. 219–39.

Intensification of the already tense situation in 1872, painfully felt by the Vatican and the majority of the German Catholics, brought about the Jesuit law, the second federal law of the *Kulturkampf* (4 July 1872).[29] The Society of Jesus and related orders (Redemptorists, Lazarists) were forbidden in the Empire and existing foundations were dissolved (ART. 1). The members were subjected to residence restrictions, and the foreigners among them faced expulsion from the country. This was precipitated by a storm of petitions by Old Catholics, the Association of Protestants, and many National Liberal groups. The Jesuits were charged with responsibility for the *Syllabus* and for the dogma of infallibility, and they were exposed as opponents of the modern state and civil liberties. The leaders of south German liberalism, Lutz and his predecessor Hohenlohe, launched concrete initiatives in opposition to the law, but confined them to residence restrictions for the Jesuits. In spite of the strong resistance by the Center and some Conservatives, the National Liberal majority of the *Reichstag* pushed through a law of prohibition without any time limitations. Like the Socialist law, passed in 1878, the Jesuit law was an exceptive law which violated the constitutional principles of liberalism. Nevertheless, only a few National Liberals advised against it, e.g., Ludwig Bamberger, Eduard Lasker,[30] Johannes von Miquel, and the majority of the leftist-liberal Progressive Party. The fact that the majority of the National Liberals voted for the exceptive laws damaged their credibility and prepared the party's crisis, facilitating the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf.*

The Catholic reactions to the Jesuit law were sharp. Shortly before its passage, Pius IX, in an address to the German Catholics, urged resistance to the "persecution of the Church."[31] In June 1872 Felix von Loë (1825–96) founded the "Society of German Catholics" in Mainz. He declared as his primary task the defense against a liberal state-church policy.[32] The most important protest was contained in a memorandum

[29] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* II, 461; E. R. Huber, *Dokumente zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte* II, 363.—Concerning the previous debate, see K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 252–57; G. Stoltenberg, *Reichstag,* 144–52.—B. Duhr, *Das Jesuitengesetz* (Freiburg 1919).

[30] The reference to Bamberger and Lasker contradicts the generalization by many Catholics that "the Jews" were responsible for the *Kulturkampf.* About the participation of many Jews, see K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* III, 417f.

[31] Text: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 132f.

[32] K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie,* 255–70.

drafted by Ketteler and accepted by the entire German episcopate in Fulda in September.[33] The memorandum called the recent measures of Prussia and the Empire violations of Church immunity, as defined by the constitution and international law, and highly detrimental to the current judicial system. In no uncertain terms the bishops brought to mind ARTS. 15–18 of the Prussian constitution, which guaranteed ecclesiastical autonomy. From the divine endowment of the Church the bishops derived the claim that the Church "existed within the integrity of its constitution and its very essence." The charge that the Church, Jesuits, and Center Party were enemies of the Empire, and therefore dangerous to the state, was rejected once and for all.

The Prussian government had to concede that its religious policies, practised since 1871, were in violation of the constitution. But since the government intended to adhere to its program, it answered the Fulda memorandum with the law which limited the guarantees of ARTS. 15–18 (5 April 1873).[34] ARTICLE 15 was amended to the effect that the autonomy of the churches recognized therein would remain "subject to the laws of the state and to its jurisdiction." The state's prerogative to regulate by law the rights of the Church regarding the training and employment of the clergy and its disciplinary authority restricted the Church's freedom to staff ecclesiastical offices (ART. 18).

Thereby the conditions for the actual laws of the struggle were set. They were passed in May 1873 after stormy debates in the Prussian Provincial Diet and in the House of Lords, imposing upon the Church a closed system of governmental supervision.[35] Since taking office, Falk had prepared these laws, diligently aided by Emil Friedberg, professor of civil and canon law, by Rudolf Gneist, Paul Hinschius, and Otto Mejer.

The law regarding training and appointment of the clergy (11 May 1873)[36] made the appointment to a clerical office dependent on German citizenship, on education at a German university, and on approval by the state (ARTS. 1–3). All clerical educational institutions were placed under the control of the state (ARTS. 6,7,9–14). Theology students had to pass an additional state examination in philosophy, history, and German literature (culture examination ART. 8). The bishops had to report each candidate for clerical office to the appropriate functionary (Notification Law). In case of objections, the appointment could not take place. Objections could be made on the basis of facts justifying the assumption that the candidate might violate the law or disturb the peace (ART. 15–17). Each vacant incumbency was to be filled within a year (ART. 18). Violations were punished with stiff fines (ARTS. 22–24).

---

[33] Text: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 133ff. Cf. F. Vigener, *Ketteler,* 665ff.; R. Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 119ff.

[34] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* II, 461f.

[35] For the most thorough description of the Church laws enacted in 1873–75, see E. R. Huber, *Verfassungsgeschichte* IV, 709–20, 723–31, 733–42. Concerning liberal justification of the May laws, see P. Hinschius, *Die preußischen Kirchengesetze des Jahres 1873* (Berlin 1873).

[36] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* II, 462–67.

The law regarding both ecclesiastical disciplinary power and the establishment of a Royal Tribunal of Ecclesiastical Affairs[37] (12 May 1873) excluded all non-German Church institutions, primarily the Pope and the Curia, from disciplinary power over the German clergy (ART. 1). Consequently, all ecclesiastical disciplinary measures could be made subject to the control of the state (ARTS. 5–9). Those affected by such measures had the right to appeal to the newly created Tribunal of Ecclesiastical Affairs, which could declare the appealed decisions void (ART. 10–23). The Tribunal could also dismiss clergymen who had violated the law or a civil regulation to such a degree that their activity appeared incompatible with law and order (ARTS. 24–31).

Above all, the state veto of clerical appointments and the right to remove clergy from office were severe attacks on the constitution of the Church as well as freedom of belief and conscience. Both the National Liberals, whose animosity toward the Church had been strengthened by the dogma of infallibility, and the bureaucracy, which was still adhering to the common provincial law, cooperated in reimposing a historically obsolete state church in an expanded fashion, enabled to do so by the political power of the modern state. The Church was of course compelled to oppose these measures, and thus these first two May laws kindled a long and passionate fight. Less trenchant was the law limiting the right to use ecclesiastical disciplinary and penal means (13 May 1873).[38] It prohibited punishing violations of the civil honor code, which, after 1870, included the extensive excommunication of the opponents of the new dogma. Also less incisive was the law regarding secession from the Church (14 May 1873),[39] which became valid by simply declaring secession to a civil judge.

The Prussian bishops decided quickly, justified by the memorandum of Fulda in 1872, to practice passive resistance to the May laws. They rejected and forbade any kind of cooperation in their enforcement.[40] With the exception of a small minority (so-called state priests, state

---

[37] Text: ibid., 467–73.

[38] Text: ibid., 473f.

[39] Text: ibid., 474f.

[40] Collective petition by the Prussian bishops, 26 May 1873. Text: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 188f.

Catholics), the clergy and the laity followed these directives. Directors of seminaries refused state supervision, theology students rejected the culture examination. The bishops themselves appointed priests, ignoring the provisions of the May laws. The state reacted by closing most clerical seminaries. In December 1873 a new oath was ordered for bishops and episcopal functionaries, which required absolute submission to all laws.[41] Soon indictments began against bishops and clergymen who had been appointed illegally. According to the May laws, they were liable to punishment for just saying Mass or administering sacraments. Prohibition of appointments turned into termination of office.[42] Falk, the liberal lawyers supporting him, and the Prussian bureaucracy enforced these laws relentlessly and without constraint. As they wanted to gain the Church's submission to the supremacy of the state, they agreed completely with Bismarck's intentions, despite some of his statements. The Chancellor also appreciated the useful aid of many journalists who, contrary to Bismarck's political goals, brought the ideological struggle into the limelight, and who advocated the supremacy of the national state and the superiority of the "German mentality" against the "Rome-serving" Catholics.[43] Many aberrations in recent German history partially stem from this period.

Bismarck, Falk, and their aides completely misjudged the Church's will and strength to resist. Under the concentric pressure by the state, Catholics from all walks of life flocked around their bishops and the Center Party, which was able to increase its mandate considerably (*Reichstag* 1871: 58; 1874: 91 deputies; Prussian Diet 1870: 58; 1873: 90 deputies). Under Windthorst's leadership, the Center became the primary opponent to the Chancellor, fighting him uncompromisingly on constitutional grounds. The Vatican persistently supported the Prussian Catholics. Pius IX and Antonelli, finally forced into the defensive by 1870, confined themselves to fruitless protests, hardly adequate in view of their opponents' arguments. They refused to recognize that their intransigence had contributed to the intensification of the differences. The Pope acted very unwisely, when, in a letter to Wilhelm I, he justified his right to criticize the May laws with the questionable identification of Papal Church and Christianity: "Everyone who has been baptized belongs in some way to the Pope."[44] This hurt the Emperor, who personally did not exactly favor the *Kulturkampf,* and the conservative Protestants, who felt likewise but remained silent because of their deeply rooted loyalty to the Prussian state. They were forced into the camp that was fighting the *Kulturkampf* and trying everything to exploit the confessional differences.

---

[41] Text of the new and the old oath: *AkathKR,* 31 (1874), 345ff.

[42] Falk's decree of 24 October 1873, addressed to the presiding judges, demanded criminal procedures be taken against active clergymen who had been illegally employed and therefore prosecuted previously. Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* II, 241f.

[43] One among many typical documents: In the *Preußische Jahrbücher* (II [1873], 596), the *Kulturkampf* was praised as a "double battle . . . the fight of modern freedom of thought against the last spiritual heritage of the Middle Ages, the papal subjugation of faith; and the fight of the modern state against the last judicial vestige of the Middle Ages, the immunity of the Roman Church."

In order to break the Catholic resistance, the May laws were intensified in 1874. However, this step was unsuccessful. Since the penal sanctions of the law of 11 May 1873 had proven insufficient, the Prussian government passed an expatriation law for the whole Empire (4 May 1874),[45] which violated the bill of rights severely. Clergymen who continued practicing in office after their dismissal by the state were threatened with expulsion from certain places or areas. In case of extreme insolence or contravention, they would be threatened with exile or loss of citizenship. On 20 May 1874, the Prussian Diet passed a law concerning the administration of suspended bishoprics.[46] According to this law, an episcopal administrator (capitulary vicar) could only operate until the state-approved appointment of a bishop, provided he could document his qualifications according to the law of 11 May 1873, and provided he swore an oath of obedience to all laws. If no capitulary vicar was elected by the chapter, a state commissioner had to administer the bishopric. Since no chapter was willing to execute the law, such commissioners had to be appointed for all vacant dioceses. Immediately, the law concerning the declaration of the law of 11 May 1873 (21 May 1874)[47] followed. It placed the burden of proof on the clergymen who had been charged with illegally taking office, and threatened to confiscate all property if an office was filled against the provisions of the May laws. The judicial and administrative struggle against the Church seemed complete.

The National Liberals used the intensification of the conflict to realize an old postulate of their social doctrine. By law (9 March 1874), civil marriage became obligatory in Prussia. Wilhelm I approved, with serious reservations.[48] A year later, civil marriage became an imperial law—the culmination of the *Kulturkampf* (6 February 1875).

---

[44] Pius IX to Wilhelm I, 7 August 1873. Text: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 197f. Ibid., 198f., the Emperor's response (3 September 1873), in which the May laws are attributed to the "intrigues against the state" by a political party supported by the clergy, and in which the papal claims towards the non-Catholics are rejected with reference to the Evangelical faith.

[45] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* II, 475ff.

[46] Text: ibid., 477–81.

[47] Text: ibid., 481ff.

In the meantime, prosecution of the bishops and priests in violation of the laws was continued. Since bishops were fined whether they did or did not fill an office illegally, the sum of fines reached proportions which could neither be paid through compulsory auctions nor with voluntary contributions from the faithful. In this situation, the Prussian bureaucracy did not refrain from employing imprisonment. In 1874/75, five out of eleven Prussian bishops[49] spent several months in prison: Archbishops Ledóchowski and Melchers, Bishops Eberhard (Trier), Martin (Paderborn), and Brinkmann (Münster).[50] Förster avoided imprisonment by moving to the Austrian part of his bishopric. The imprisoned bishops were worshipped as martyrs. However, since the summer of 1874, Catholic demonstrations, societies, and newspapers were subject to strict police control.[51]

The Catholics' political convictions suffered disillusionment, and they grew increasingly bitter when the government decided to apply even the most extreme May laws, forcing the royal tribunal, created in 1873, to dismiss the bishops who were still practising resistance. Dismissals began with Ledóchowski in 1874. In the next three years, Melchers, Martin, Förster, Brinkmann, and Blum (Limburg) were dismissed. Eberhard died during the trial. In 1878, only Bishops Krementz (Ermland), von der Marwitz (Kulm), and Sommerwerck (Hildesheim) were still in office. The episcopates of Fulda, Osnabrück, and Trier had been vacant since the death of their incumbents. According to Church law, the six dismissed bishops remained in office, but they could not administer officially and, thus, went into exile,[52] where they tried to rule over their dioceses with the help of secret delegates.[53]

---

[48] H. Conrad, "Zur Einführung der Zwangszivilehe in Preußen und im Reich 1874/75," *Das deutsche Privatrecht . . . Festschrift für H. Lehmann* (Berlin 1956).

[49] The bishopric of Fulda was vacant since the death of Bishop Kött (1873).

[50] Ledóchowski was imprisoned for two years, which was by far the longest time. During his imprisonment he was appointed cardinal. It was characteristic of the particular severity of the *Kulturkampf* in the provinces of Poland that Ledóchowski's suffragans Janiszewski (Posen) and Cybichowski (Gnesen) were sentenced to prison in 1875 and later expelled from their dioceses. Janiszewski was also officially dismissed in 1877.

[51] The Catholic Society in Mainz was forbidden (see above, p. 39). An assassination attempt on Bismarck in July 1874 served as a pretext to intensify the control of the press and societies. The assassin acted on his own, because, contrary to premature statements by the Chancellor, collaboration with backers could not be verified.

[52] Aside from Förster, Blum had also gone to Austria. Ledóchowski found asylum in the Vatican. Melchers, Brinkmann, and Martin lived in Holland and Belgium, close to their dioceses.

[53] In three canonically vacant dioceses, such delegates were active by papal decree. The police searched for them in vain.

The final phase of the *Kulturkampf* was ushered in, at the end of 1874, during the trial of former ambassador and Bismarck opponent Count Arnim,[54] when the text of a "papal election telegram" became known. It was sent by the Chancellor in May 1872. Bismarck therein suggested to the European governments an agreement regarding conditions for the recognition of a new Pope. He justified his initiative by stating that, since the Vatican Council, the bishops of all countries were merely functionaries of the Pope. In February 1875, the German episcopate responded with a declaration based on a thorough analysis of the Vatican decrees. It stressed the direct authority of each bishop within his diocese, justified by apostolic succession, and was, soon thereafter, approved by Pius IX.[55] Shortly before, the Pope had used the sharpest means at his disposal against the Prussian religious policies. The encyclical *Quod numquam* (5 February 1875)[56] declared the May laws invalid, insofar as they contradicted the divine constitution of the Church, and decreed excommunication of everyone who participated in their creation and execution. At the same time, Pius rejected any kind of dissent against the authorities in secular matters.

Prussia answered with a new series of penal laws. The so-called breadbasket law (22 April 1875)[57] decreed discontinuation of all state funds to the Catholic Church (ART. 1). It provided the possibility of resumption in individual dioceses only in the case of a written assurance by the responsible bishop or episcopal administrator that the laws would be obeyed (ART. 2). Individual clergymen also could only receive the state funds due to them if they provided such declarations (ART. 6). Few state priests were willing to make such promises, and, therefore, an almost total cessation in state payments occurred, welcomed by the Liberals as an important step in the separation of church and state.

The law concerning religious orders of 31 May 1875[58] hurt the

---

[54] F. Hartung, "Bismarck und Graf Harry Arnim," *HZ* 171 (1951), 47–77.

[55] Text of the collective declaration: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 264–67; D 3112–16. Cf. R. Lill, *Bischofskonferenzen,* 121f. The papal approval (12 March 1875): N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 270f.; D 3117. In the discussions concerning the primate and the episcopate (begun by the Second Vatican Council), the declaration of the German bishops approved by Pius IX was rightfully used as an important document of the ecclesiastical self-understanding of 1870. However, it must be added that Pius IX himself did not attempt to interpret the dogma of infallibility in such a moderate and clarifying manner. Had he done so, he might have avoided or alleviated many a controversy after 1870. (cf. *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia* [21 November 1964], chap. III, ART. 27, no. 95: *LThK*². "The Second Vatican Council," I, 246f.—J. Ratzinger, *K. Rahner–J. Ratzinger, Episkopat und Primat* [Freiburg 1961], 29f.; W. Kasper, "Primat und Episkopat nach dem Vatikanum I," *ThQ* 142 [1962], 48f.).

[56] Text: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 267ff.

[57] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* III, 438ff.

[58] Text: ibid., 440f.

Catholics most. It excluded orders and congregations from Prussian state territory. Existing settlements were not allowed to accept new members and were to be dissolved within six months. In case of orders whose members were teaching, the deadline could be extended up to four years (ART. 1). Exempted from the decree were hospital orders, whose place of residence, however, could be seized at any time and placed under state control (ART. 3). This brought restoration, proceeding rapidly since the 1850s, to a standstill. The members of male orders with pastoral duties, who had survived the Jesuit laws, went either to the United States or to Belgium and Holland,[59] where they could, at least, maintain contact with their home country. For many of the female orders remaining in Prussia, Empress Augusta effected some relief.

On 18 June 1875, ARTS. 15 and 18 of the Prussian constitution were abolished. On 20 June, a comprehensive law regarding the administration of the estate of Catholic parishes was passed.[60] Its aim was to debilitate the hierarchic system of the Church and extensively adopt evangelical parish principles. The administration of Church estates was democratized (ART. 1) and turned over to a vestry board consisting of the pastor and elected members (ARTS. 5–8). Important decisions were dependent on the approval of a board of local representatives (ART. 21). The Church could tolerate this law, since most elected mayors tried to cooperate with the ecclesiastical authorities.

The final law dealt with the ecclesiastical property of the Old Catholic parishes (4 July 1875). It assured the Old Catholics the use of property and churches belonging to the Catholic parishes wherever they had gained a "considerable number" of new members (ARTS. 1,2). Priests who had become Old Catholic could keep their benefices (ART. 3).[61] Since the Catholics continued to reject the use of their churches by the seceded minority, and since the bureaucracy usually interpreted the law in favor of the Old Catholics, serious controversies occurred. Catholic services were discontinued in churches given to the Old Catholics.

The year 1876 brought only amendments to the pulpit paragraph and to the law regarding the administration of diocesan property.[62] Also, a ministerial order was issued by Falk, subjecting religious instruction in elementary schools to state supervision (18 February 1876).[63]

---

[59] Arnold Janssen also founded and developed the first German mission in Holland (Steyl, S. V. D., 1875). F. Bornemann, *Arnold Janssen, der Gründer des Steyler Missionswerkes 1837–1909* (Steyl 1969).—Since the Jesuit laws survived the *Kulturkampf*, the German Jesuits moved their study center, after their escape to Ditton Hall, England (in 1872), to Valkenburg, Holland, in 1894.

[60] Text: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* III, 441–52.

[61] Text: ibid., 452f.

[62] Federal law of 26 February 1876, Prussian law of 7 June 1876. Texts: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* III, 454–57.

Otherwise, the struggle began to stagnate. The Catholic Church organization in Prussia was demolished, more than one thousand parishes were without pastors. But the passive resistance of the Catholic population, their cooperation with the clergy and the hierarchy, and the active resistance of the Center Party remained unbroken. These were not the only reasons why, in the middle of the 1870s, the *Kulturkampf* turned out to be a failure. Liberal ideology and bureaucratic perfection had given the *Kulturkampf* an edge, originally not intended by Bismarck, which deeply affected internal peace and forced Catholics and other minorities into a ghetto, to the disadvantage of the Empire. The struggle against the Catholic Church furthered de-Christianization of society, which did not suit Bismarck's authoritarian concept. Favored by the *Kulturkampf,* a new and dangerous adversary appeared—social democracy.[64] The warnings of the Empress, the doubts of the Emperor and many Conservatives had been fully confirmed. In addition, Prussia had lost its reputation as a tolerant state, a reputation twice as valuable in the impending age of public opinion. The arrests and expulsions of bishops, clergymen, and members of orders deepened the mistrust toward Bismarck outside of Germany, even in anticlerical circles. The Napoleonic methods of his "founding the Empire from above" had had the same effect.

Slowly and strategically motivated, the Chancellor, therefore, turned away from the *Kulturkampf.* It is yet to be proven that he intended to keep the more important positions obtained during the *Kulturkampf,* and that he merely changed his methods, especially in dealing with the Center Party. If the Party could not be conquered in open battle, then he had to try to integrate it into government politics or separate it from its roots among the masses either via political concessions or agreements with the Vatican.[65]

Bismarck's experiences, resulting from the *Kulturkampf,* contributed greatly to his estrangement from the National Liberals, which was further determined by the renewed disagreements over parliament, constitutionalism, and economic policies. Another contributing factor was the crisis of the liberal system, beginning in the middle of the seventies, the cause of which cannot be discussed here. At any rate, the Chancellor was preparing a conservative turn of events which would determine his domestic policies from 1878/79 on. He did not take an initiative for a compromise in religious policies because he wanted to avoid, at any cost, the impression of a pilgrimage to Canossa, and because a settlement under Pius IX seemed impossible to him (and to other politicians). Both sides strengthened their positions.

---

[63] Text: N. Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* 315ff., excerpt: J. B. Kißling, *Kulturkampf* III, 138ff.

[64] When he fought this second mass movement of the opposition, starting in 1878, with means similar to but more ruthless than those employed by the Catholics, he proved his inability to draw the correct conclusions from the failure of the *Kulturkampf.* Combatting "the foes of the Empire" was part of his domestic policies because he hoped it would result in a greater cohesiveness within the other groups and a further consensus regarding his politics.

[65] Cf. chap. 3, pp. 57, 62, 71, 74.

The political failure was completed by the fact that Bismarck had not succeeded in involving foreign countries in the *Kulturkampf.* Bismarck had placed high hopes on the leading statesmen of Austria and Italy because of local disputes involving religious policies.[66] But they were too realistic and too familiar with the nature and the strength of the Catholic Church to agree to a bureaucratic persecution in the Prussian fashion.

During the liberal five years after the founding of the Empire, the *Kulturkampf* was able to spread to other federal states, however with characteristic differences. Most similar to the Prussian development, though less consequential, was the one in Baden. Its school, marriage, and Church laws of 1868–74[67] were fashioned after the Prussian laws or followed them verbatim.—In Bavaria, "a covert *Kulturkampf*" had begun already before 1870, rooted in the tradition of a liberal-Catholic regalism. It was led by Lutz's ministry (1870–90) with consistency and the intent to avoid open conflict.[68] He did not go beyond restoration of previous state supervision (1873). Bavarian parishes and seminaries accepted clergymen and theology students who had to leave Prussia. Only because they were vacant for several years did the bishoprics of Speyer and Würzburg attract some attention. Pius IX had rejected the appointment of candidates for these sees who were nominated by the King and leaned toward the state-church concept.—Following Prussia's example, Hesse-Darmstadt and Saxony passed liberal religious laws in the years 1874–76.[69]

The two other German states with a large Catholic population, Württemberg and Oldenburg, refused to become involved in the *Kulturkampf.* In Württemberg, within the boundaries set by the Church law of 1862, there existed an exceedingly good relationship between Church and state, cultivated carefully by King Karl I (1864–91) and

---

[66] Austria: see below, chap. 2.

[67] Cf. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* IV, 357–418.

[68] Cf. Bachem, op. cit., 316–46.

[69] Hessen-Darmstadt: Kißling, III, 406–15; Vigener, *Ketteler,* 612–722; Bachem, op. cit., 419–37. Saxony: Kißling, III, 418–22; W. Rittenbach, *LThK*^{2} IX, 201f.

Bishop Hefele. In Alsace-Lorraine, whose very difficult integration into the Empire would have been complicated even more by the *Kulturkampf,* the administration, dependent on Berlin, backed away from sharp measures.

CHAPTER 2

Tensions in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1878–1914)

After the denominational laws of May 1874 came into force, all further attempts by the Liberals to design the Cisleithan legislation concerning religious policies according to their concepts failed. The bill to regulate the exterior judicial system of the monastic societies miscarried. It had been passed by both the House of Representatives and the House of Lords but was not sanctioned by Emperor Franz Joseph. The marriage clause, passed by the House of Representatives in 1876, also miscarried. It failed because it was vetoed by the House of Lords. The Confessional Committee of the House of Representatives began once again, in February 1877, to draft a marriage law. This led to a debate, early in 1878, about the draft of a bill introducing obligatory civil marriage.[1] But such projects were tabled in favor of other legislative tasks and the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. All other attempts by the Liberals to achieve a change in legislation regarding religious policy came to nothing.

The Catholics, on the contrary, had considerable success concerning the school question. On 5 February 1880, Prince Aloys Liechtenstein, deputy of the Conservatives (but a decade later a member of the Christian Socialists), introduced a school resolution in the House of Representatives requesting the government to revise the elementary school law. The goals of Liechtenstein's reform plan were: decrease of expenditures, increase of the individual states' influence on the school system, and consideration of the population's religious, moral, and national needs. These goals were further specified by a motion proposed the same day by the Catholic deputy Georg Lienbacher. Both motions urged the government's draft of a school law. Participating in the draft was the original designer of the elementary school law of 1869, Section Chairman Alois Hermann. A friend of Adalbert Stifter, he was a disciple of the parochial school.[2] The government bill was finally passed by Parliament in April 1883 and ratified by the Emperor in the following month.[3] The amendment was significant for the organization of the school system and gave particular consideration to the religious denomination of the students. However, Prince Liechtenstein's second school bill of 28 January 1888, which was supported by a memorandum from the Austrian episcopate and which demanded that the schools be placed under the supervision of the Church, was unsuccessful.[4] The government's attitude of rejection was emphatically reinforced by the Austrian Social Democrats, who were then on their way to unification.[5] Until the decline of the Monarchy under the presidency of Count Kasimir Badeni (1895–97), the demand for denominational schools had only one chance to be at least partially realized. However, the Christian Socialists, heeding their voters from the German-speaking parts of Czechoslovakia, denied Badeni their support for his attempt to oblige the Czechs with his language ordinances. Thus, the Christian Socialists contributed to Badeni's overthrow.[6] Their leader, Dr. Karl Lueger (1844–1910), had meanwhile become mayor of Vienna despite the resistance of the upper clergy and the royal court. This did not prevent the radical German Nationalists under the leadership of Georg Ritter von Schönerer from exploiting the sympathies of the Alpine Catholic People's Party for the Slavs' desire to propagate the Away-from-Rome movement.[7] Thus, for the Liberals, the desired elaboration of the denominational legislation became unattainable. According to the judgement of a liberal historian, they remained "unrealized and were, in reality, hardly worth the paper on which they were written."[8] Even if this assessment is not entirely correct, there is no doubt that the Emperor and, finally, both the government and the bureaucracy respected the feelings of the enraged Catholics who had decided seriously to resist the state. The denominational appeasement is partially due to the understanding which Cardinal Rauscher and his successors, the Viennese Archbishops Kutschker, Ganglbauer, and Gruscha, had offered to the state even after the repeal of the concordat of 1870. In addition, the Liberals suffered an almost total loss of their nearly omnipotent position after Auersperg's ministry was overthrown in 1879.

---

[1] G. Kolmer, *Parlament und Verfassung in Österreich von 1848–1904* II (Vienna, Leipzig 1903), 339.

---

[2] W. Goldinger, "Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in Österreich nach Aufhebung des Konkordates von 1855," *Religion, Wissenschaft, Kultur* 9 (1957/III), 144.

[3] *Reichsgesetzblatt 1883,* no. 53.

[4] *Beilagen zu den Stenographischen Protokollen des Abgeordnetenhauses 1883,* no. 490.

[5] P. M. Zulehner, *Kirche und Automarxismus* (Vienna, Freiburg, Basel 1967), 38f.

[6] B. Sutter, *Die Badenischen Sprachverordnungen von 1897* I (Vienna 1960), 247.

[7] J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1959), 350.

[8] G. Kolmer, op cit. II, 343.

The neutral conservative cabinet of Eduard Taaffe maintained good relations with the conservative Right in the Parliament and had mostly Christian social reformers such as Count Egbert Belcredi and Aloys Liechtenstein work out the social legislation set in motion by Taaffe. This legislation was compatible both with the previously mentioned clause regarding the elementary school law of 1883 and the Catholics' school demands. In July 1883, the endowments of Gleink and Garsten, which had been taken away from Bishop Rudigier of Linz by the liberal government during the *Kulturkampf,* were reinstated. During Taaffe's era (1885) there followed provisionary legislation by the Congruists to improve the poor material condition of the clergy.[9]

This spirit of conciliation marks the ecclesiastical legislation of all Cisleithan governments after Taaffe. In this area, laws were only enacted when it was absolutely necessary for practical reasons or to avoid hardships,[10] and as such included the amendment to the law regarding religion teachers (1888),[11] the so-called Forensen law (1894),[12] and the Congruist law (1898),[13] which still did not quite fulfill the wishes of the lower clergy and was therefore improved in 1902 and 1907 through amendments.[14] Both amendments were the work of Max Hussarek, a specialist in canon law, later a historian dealing specifically with the concordat of 1855. Beginning in 1897, he was head of the Department for Affairs of Catholic Worship.[15] Until the collapse of the Monarchy, the Austrian religious legislation was essentially based on the denominational laws of 1868 and 1874, whose moderation and generally benevolent execution by the government finally compelled the Catholics to be more or less content with them. The episcopate of the German-speaking states, coming, with few exceptions, from the bourgeoisie,[16] distinguished itself by its loyalty to the Emperor. In 1891, on the occasion of the elections, the bishops issued a pastoral letter to the faithful advising them "to vote for an electorate which would be loyal to the Emperor."[17]

---

[9] *Reichsgesetzblatt 1885,* no. 47.

[10] R. Höslinger, "Das Kultuswesen in der Zeit von 1867–1948," *100 Jahre Unterrichtsministerium 1848–1948* (Vienna n.d.), 429.

[11] *Reichsgesetzblatt 1888,* no. 99.

[12] Landed proprietors who are not members of the parish, but whose property is completely or partially located in this parish are, according to canon law, obligated to contribute toward the church building fund. This obligation was not recognized until the enactment of the law of 31 December 1894. *Reichsgesetzblatt 1895,* no. 7.

[13] *Reichsgesetzblatt 1896,* no. 176.

[14] *Reichsgesetzblatt 1902,* no. 48.

[15] W. Plöchl, "Max von Hussarek als akademischer Lehrer," *ÖAKR* 5 (1954), 82f.

[16] E. Saurer, *Die politischen Aspekte der österreichischen Bischofsernennungen 1867–1903* (Vienna, Munich 1968), 230.

In the ensuing open controversy between the Conservatives and the Christian Socialist Party, as it was called since 1889, almost all of the bishops—as well as the Emperor—faced the new Catholic party with utter mistrust, if not animosity. Since the beginning of the 1890s, the upper clergy, represented by Cardinal Schönborn of Prague, together with the Emperor's diplomats, continually brought charges against the Christian Socialists in Rome. However, thanks to the mediation of the Viennese Nuncio Agliardi and the good will of Secretary of State Cardinal Rampolla, these accusations had no disadvantageous consequences, but resulted in Rampolla's explicit approval of the Christian Socialist program, provided, to be sure, that the radical anti-Semitism propagated by the party during its rise and endorsed by many priests[18] be alleviated.[19] Nevertheless, Cardinal Gruscha probably gave moral support to Franz Joseph, with whom he got along splendidly, when the Emperor tenaciously refused to confirm Lueger's election as mayor of Vienna. Gruscha bitterly opposed the Christian Socialists, because to him "democracy for the price of Christianity appeared to be the great ensuing danger."[20] Lueger, in turn, at a campaign meeting in 1901, did not refrain from severely criticizing the "obedient" attitude of the Austrian episcopate regarding religious policies.[21] Only under Archbishops Nagl and, above all, Piffl, did the relations of the episcopate to the party substantially improve. After all, the party had started out representing the middle classes; then it won over the farmers, united with the Conservatives in 1907 and was finally the only representative of Church interests in the Republic. Of course, these were also advocated by the Catholic organizations springing up in the last two decades of the nineteenth century (Catholic University Society 1884, Catholic School Society 1886, Christian Workers Movement 1892). In 1905, through the initiative of Viktor Kolb, S. J., the Pius Society was founded to protect the Catholic press, which, after the First World War, joined the Catholic People's Union (founded in 1909).[22] Around the turn of the century, Catholic farmers' unions were organized. In 1917, several Catholic youth groups from the prewar years were combined in the Imperial Union of Catholic German Youth of Austria.[23] Also the Austrian Catholic conventions, taking place at irregular intervals after 1877, served from the beginning as a platform to declare ecclesiastical (specifically Catholic) demands, even though they might not coincide with the government's policy, for reasons relating to foreign politics. This was the case in 1889, when the second Catholic convention made the need of freedom for the Holy See the subject of a memorandum directed against Italy, a member of the Triple Alliance. The convention even incited President Taaffe to declare in the House of Representatives that the foreign policies of the Monarchy were determined by the close friendly relations with the Kingdom of Italy and its vital interests.[24]

---

[17] W. Goldinger, op. cit., 145.

[18] *Kirche und Synagoge, Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden,* ed. by K. H. Rengstorf and S. von Kortzfleisch, II (Stuttgart 1970), 499ff.; also: I. A. Hellwing, *Der konfessionelle Antisemitismus im 19. Jahrhundert in Österreich* (Vienna, Freiburg, Basel 1972).

[19] F. Funder, *Vom Gestern ins Heute* (Vienna 1952), 138ff.

[20] O. Posch, "Anton Josef Gruscha und der österreichische Katholizismus 1820–1911" (unpub. diss., Vienna 1947), 185, 208.

[21] R. Sieghart, *Die letzten Jahrzehnte einer Großmacht* (Berlin 1932), 318.

[22] J. Wodka, op. cit., 345f.

The Habsburg Monarchy's position regarding Italy and its problem of nationalities was the dominant question arising in the discussions between Austria-Hungary and the Vatican during the pontificate of Leo XIII. According to information from the Austrian Legate Johannes von Montel (1831–1910),[25] Cardinal Manning and Cardinal Simor, primate of Hungary, were instrumental in the election of Leo XIII.[26] The newly elected Pope soon complained in his first political letter to Franz Joseph about "the constantly increasing hostility" of Italy against the Holy See; he asked the Emperor to intervene on behalf of the threatened papacy.[27] The Emperor responded favorably but without committing himself. Since it was decided in Vienna to include Italy—arisen from revolution—in the circle of conservative powers, Austria, among others, refrained from condemning the scandal occasioned by the transport of Pius IX's body in July 1882. In the spring of 1882, through his special legate, Baron Hübner, the Emperor offered the deeply disappointed Pope the Monarchy's hospitality in case of need. However, Hübner was also to prevent the Pope from making use of the offer for asylum.[28] This difficult assignment was successful enough for Leo XIII to say to Hübner: "My hopes, my love, and my trust I place, next to God, in his Majesty, the Emperor of Austria."[29]

---

[23] G. Schultes, *Der Reichsbund der katholischen deutschen Jugend Österreichs* (Vienna 1967) 132ff.

[24] A. Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918* (Munich 1952), 234.

[25] Concerning Montel, see primarily A. Hudal, op. cit., 250ff.

[26] L. Freiherr von Pastor, *Tagebücher, Briefe, Erinnerungen* (Heidelberg 1950), 374.

[27] *Die politische Korrespondenz der Päpste mit den österreichischen Kaisern 1804–1918,* ed. by F. Engel-Janosi in cooperation with R. Blaas and E. Weinzierl (Vienna, Munich 1964), no. 145.

[28] F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* I (Vienna, Graz, Cologne 1958), 230.

As a matter of fact, within the Triple Alliance Austria refused to guarantee Italy the possession of Rome.[30] In 1888, the Emperor, through Hübner, again offered the Pope, who was being pressured by the Crispi government, asylum in Austria. Once again, quite in line with Austria's expectations, Leo XIII did not accept, but he gave serious thought to Salzburg in 1882 while still considering Trent as his place of asylum.[31]

Under Secretary of State Rampolla, however, relations between the Monarchy and the Vatican cooled down considerably. The Vatican's pro-French and pro-Slavic politics had been noted with dismay in Vienna.[32] Aside from that, there were continuous frictions with the Curia over a series of questions regarding the Monarchy's ecclesiastical policies, as, for instance, in the case of appointments of bishops. The Emperor's right to nominate was largely claimed by the royal and imperial bureaucracy. The Emperor nearly always agreed with its political leanings and, after 1880, was more and more oriented toward the problem of nationalities. Therefore, Italians and Slavs from the coastal areas and Dalmatia, unpopular Ruthenians in Galicia, but mainly men whose loyalty to the government was believed to be absolute were nominated bishops.[33] Above all, the Curia created difficulties when bishoprics in Hungary and in the coastal areas were to be filled. Compromises were often reached only after exhaustive negotiations and mutual rejection of the candidates, as in the case of Hungarian Primate Simor's succession in 1891 and the occupation of Zagreb (1894)[34] or Zadar (1902).[35] In Zadar, there was a question of the imperial right of transfer of bishops, a matter which was energetically defended by Catholics as ardent as Max von Hussarek, who functioned as adviser to the Division of Religious Affairs in the Department of Education.[36] Occasionally, there were also tough battles about the appointment of cardinals, as in the case of Archbishop Dr. Josef Samassa of Erlau, who had been nominated by the government. Samassa, in the opinion of the Vatican, had not appropriately opposed the Hungarian bill about civil marriage. He had also come out in favor of the imperial veto regarding the papal election to the Hungarian delegation in 1894. Therefore, Samassa was not granted the honor of cardinal until Pius X's pontificate.[37] The efforts of Foreign Secretaries Aehrenthal and Berchtold to raise the number of cardinals in the Monarchy from six (four in the Austrian and two in the Hungarian part of the Empire) to seven were not successful.[38]

---

[29] *Die politische Korrespondenz,* op. cit., 48f.

[30] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 232.

[31] Ibid., 255f.

[32] Ibid., 268ff.

[33] E. Saurer, op. cit., 235ff.

[34] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 278ff.

[35] G. Adriányi, "Friedrich Graf Revertera, Erinnerungen (1888–1901)," *AHPont* 10 (1972), 326f.

[36] W. Goldinger, "Eine Auseinandersetzung Österreich-Ungarns mit der Kurie über das kaiserliche Nominationsrecht für Bischofsstühle," *ÖAKR* 6 (1955), 213.

On the other hand, those bishops of the Monarchy, "whose voices were gladly heard in the Vatican,"[39] did not enjoy the sympathies of the Austrian government. Among them were Bishop Stadler of Sarajevo and Bishop Stroßmayer of Djakovo, both spokesmen and protectors of the Croatians. Important was the question of the national liturgical languages, especially of the Slavic language in the Croatian-Dalmatian dioceses with Latin rites. The government considered it a means, intentionally employed by many bishops (e.g., Stroßmayer), to unite the Slavs or at least the southern Slavs on a national level "through the bond of the Catholic Church."[40]

Another source of political and scholarly controversies between the Vatican and Vienna was the use of Hungarian as the liturgical language in the Greek dioceses of Munkács and Epirus by Magyarized Ruthenians. The Vatican finally forbade the use of the Hungarian liturgy.[41] This did not prevent Rome from quietly tolerating its usage in the bishopric which was established in 1912 for the Greek-Catholic Hungarians in Hajdudorog, although the successor to the throne, Franz Ferdinand,[42] had explicitly disapproved of it.[43]

The Austrians also reacted sensitively to the Monarchy's right to protect the Christians of the Balkans and the Middle East. The Vatican's negotiations with Turkey about the conclusion of a concordat for Albania failed because of Austro-Hungarian opposition. Austria-Hungary saw a violation of its protectoral rights in such an agreement.[44]

All these differences lose their importance when compared with the most consequential controversy the Monarchy had with the Holy See during the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X: the fight over Hungary's legislation regarding religious policy. It goes back to 1890, to the so-called decree of abatement of former religion through baptism.[45] Its goal was to obtain obedience to the law of 1868 pertaining to the religious denomination of children from denominationally mixed marriages. According to this law, children were to follow by sex their father's or mother's denomination; but it became common practice for the Catholic priest to "abate" the denomination through baptism. Already at that time, Rome had refused the transfer of baptismal records to the appropriate clergymen as was required by the state. This stand was evident in 1891, when the demands for civil marriage, civil matriculation, and general religious freedom were recapitulated in the Hungarian Parliament. Secretary of Religious Affairs in the Wekerle cabinet, Albin Count Csáky, also adopted this program. Following its first resignation and subsequent reinstatement without Csáky, the government succeeded at the end of 1894 in pushing through both houses of Parliament civil marriage, civil matriculation, and an amendment to the law of 1868. The Emperor ratified the new laws. Subsequently, Wekerle resigned for good, having lost the Emperor's confidence in the success of another anticipated judicial reform. In contrast to the radical-conservative Hungarian People's Party (founded in November 1894) and to many tendencies of the liberal Bánffy government, both Secretary of Foreign Affairs Count Kálnoky and the Austrian Ambassador to Rome Count Revertera tried to prevent an open quarrel with the Holy See.[46] When Nuncio Agliardi of Vienna came to Hungary in April 1895 for an official visit, he pleaded with the Catholic leaders of Hungary in several speeches to side with the clergy in the ensuing fight with the government. This was followed by an interpellation in the Hungarian House of Representatives. In his answer, President Bánffy declared that the nuncio had overstepped his authority and that Kálnoky was of the same opinion and had already protested to the Curia. Since this was not the case, Kálnoky hotly denied Bánffy's statements in a telegram and resigned. Still, in a letter to Bánffy, he termed the nuncio's behavior "tactless." Rome, on the other hand, refused to recall Agliardi, "provided that the insult inflicted upon the Holy Father in the person of His deputy be compensated," as Secretary of State Cardinal Rampolla explained to Revertera.[47] Even though Rome disregarded an expressed apology by Vienna, it was not until 1896 that Agliardi was appointed cardinal and thus recalled from Vienna. Meanwhile in Hungary, the laws concerning the acceptance of Judaism and general freedom of religion had been enacted and, at the end of 1896, ratified by the Emperor. One could argue whether the changes in the Hungarian legislation regarding religious policy from 1894 to 1895 should be assessed as a *Kulturkampf* or a reform.[48] Without a doubt, however, the long and at times dramatic controversy between Church and state could have been at least alleviated. Its acuteness was probably rooted in the fact that the Church was not only interested in defending the sacrament of matrimony and Catholic education, but also its dominant position in the Empire of Saint Stephen, which, according to Rampolla, "was never to be relinquished to the Calvinists and Jews."[49]

---

[37] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. II (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1960), 79ff.

[38] E. Weinzierl-Fischer, *"Die letzten Ernennungen österreichisch-ungarischer Kardinäle", Östterreich und Europa (Festgabe für Hugo Hantsch)* (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1965), 411ff.

[39] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 296.

[40] Kálnoky to Revertera in 1881, VII, 23; F. Revertera, *Erinnerungen,* op cit., 260, n. 17.

[41] Ibid., 264.

[42] F. Engel-Janosi II, 122, 156f.

[43] F. Revertera, *Erinnerungen,* op. cit., 266.

[44] A. H. Benna, "Studien zum Kultusprotektorat Österreich-Ungarns in Albanien im Zeitalter des Imperialismus (1888–1918)," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 7 (1954), 28f.

---

[45] M. Csáky, *Der Kulturkampf in Ungarn* (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1967), 41ff.

[46] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 287.

[47] Ibid., 292.

The longer Leo XIII's pontificate lasted, the more powerful the secretary of state became. In Vienna, he grew more and more unpopular, not to say hated. Even the Imperial Ambassador Revertera, extremely loyal to church and Vatican, differed with him again and again.[50] It was certainly not easy to get along with the proud and sensitive Sicilian. The animosities of the Austrian diplomatic corps seem to have originated in the burden imposed upon the Monarchy's domestic policy by the problem of nationalities, which was constantly increasing, especially during Leo XIII's pontificate, and reached a climax during the Badeni crisis of 1897. Rampolla sympathized with the Slavs, the Italians, the Christian-Socialists, and the respective Catholic democratic parties within Austria and Hungary. He granted France and Russia an important role in the foreign policies of the Vatican. Therefore, he had to be *persona ingrata* not only with the conservative and liberal politicians and with several Austrian bishops, but also with the Emperor himself. It remains to be decided whether, through the years, the Emperor remembered the cardinal's initial refusal to give his son Rudolf a church funeral.[51] One thing is certain: never before had there been such accord on the use of the imperial veto as during the papal elections of 1903. As of the evening of 1 August, Rampolla was ahead with twenty-nine out of sixty-two votes,[52] and was already greeted as the new Pope. One has to assume, then, that the Austrian veto announced by Cardinal Puzyna of Cracow on 2 August[53] deprived him of the tiara. Giuseppe Sarto, patriarch of Venice, was finally elected Pope on 4 August 1903. He quickly fulfilled several of Austria's long-standing wishes; for instance, the promotion of Archbishop Samassa to cardinal. Yet more quickly (in January 1904, through the constitution *Commissum Nobis),* Pius X declared invalid the right of veto which France, Spain, and Austria had traditionally claimed, and imposed extremely harsh penalties upon participation in such an act.[54]

---

[48] M. Csáky, op. cit., 103ff.

[49] Ibid., 110.

[50] For example, F. Revertera, *Erinnerungen,* op. cit., 309.

[51] A. Hudal, op. cit., 250, and F. Engel-Janosi II, 2.

[52] Ibid. II, 37.

[53] Ibid. II, 38.

The battle against "modernism," which Pius X fought so passionately within the Church, "was of no great consequence for the relations of this pontificate to the Habsburg Monarchy."[55] Indeed, there was a "literary battle" in Austria; there were people who were accused of "modernism" and suffered harm because of it, e.g., writers like Enrica von Handel-Mazzetti, scientists like Albert Ehrhard, priests like Josef Scheicher, who was a representative of Lower Austria, and Franz Martin Schindler, the theoretician of the Christian Social Party. Ehrhard[56] had to leave the University of Vienna; Schindler was not promoted to bishop because of his friendship with Ehrhard.[57] Even the Viennese Archbishop Gustav Piffl was denounced in Rome as a modernist by integralists from the Viennese Commer-Kralik group. He had opposed the establishment of a Viennese subsidiary of Benigni's infamous organization *Correspondance de Rome,* whose purpose was denunciation.[58] The tempest over modernism which, in regard to Austria, is just now being researched,[59] never reached the dimensions it did in France, Germany, or Italy. However, the Austrian public took an enormous interest in a case which was supposedly dramatized by the unauthorized and certainly undiplomatic action of Granito Pignatelli di Belmonte, nuncio to Vienna. Professor Ludwig Wahrmund, specialist in canon law from Innsbruck,[60] who had published a study about the veto right of the Catholic powers in 1888, interceded in favor of reform Catholics Ehrhard and Schell in his lectures of 1902. On 18 January 1908, he gave a "scientific" speech for the general public in Innsbruck about the "Catholic world view and free scholarship," which was directed against the *Syllabus* and Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi* and was a masterpiece of massive anticlericalism. Moreover, Wahrmund published this speech in Munich after it was confiscated in Austria. Consequently, Nuncio Belmonte did not just call on Foreign Secretary Aehrenthal, but also announced to several newspapers that he had asked Aehrenthal to remove Wahrmund from his teaching position. He insisted on the truth of this statement even after Aehrenthal's official denial. As a result, Wahrmund became the hero of an enraged liberal public, and the Department of Education could not afford to dismiss Wahrmund had it wished to do so.[61] Aehrenthal, in turn, demanded that Belmonte be recalled. Even Legate Montel, always attempting to mediate, asked the Pope "imploringly" to recall Belmonte. Pius X, apparently feeling offended himself, pounded the table and declared: "I am not a diplomat, but I am immovable. I cannot allow Monsignor Belmonte to leave Vienna now. If his mother were on her deathbed, I would not give him leave at this time." Then he deplored the Josephinism which continued to exist in the Habsburg Monarchy.[62] In 1911, when it was his turn, Belmonte became cardinal and was thus officially recalled from Vienna, though he was not received any longer by the Austrian foreign secretary. Nevertheless, Pius X generally expressed himself with benevolence towards the Monarchy, giving it his unequivocal sympathy at the outbreak of the world war he had feared for many years.[63]

---

[54] Ibid. II, 52.

[55] Ibid. II, 142.

[56] A. Dempf, *Albert Ehrhard. Der Mann und sein Werk* (Colmar 1944).

[57] F. Funder, *Aufbruch zur christlichen Sozialreform* (Vienna, Munich 1953), 126ff.

[58] A. Hudal, op. cit., 289.

[59] O. Schroeder, *Aufbruch und Mißverständnis. Zur Geschichte der reformkatholischen Bewegung* (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1969), 392–411ff., and *Der Modernismus. Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung,* ed. by E. Weinzierl (Thomas-Michels commemorative ed.) (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1973).

[60] M. Höttinger, "Der Fall Wahrmund" (unpub. diss., Vienna 1950), and F. Engel-Janosi II, 86ff.

On the Austrian side, in those "last years of a great power," when the bishops of the Monarchy paid homage to Franz Joseph on the occasion of his sixtieth anniversary of government in 1908, the Emperor once more emphatically acknowledged the alliance of throne and altar which he had strived for since the beginning of his reign. The aging Emperor concluded his avowal with the words: "You can be assured of the protection of the state while teaching your faith and administering your duties. I myself am a loyal son of the Church which taught me humility in difficult hours, offered me consolation in bad times, and guided me and my House loyally through all paths of life."[64]

---

[61] In tedious negotiations, Wahrmund was therefore forced to take leave for several semesters. He was finally transferred to Prague.

[62] F. Engel-Janosi II, 96.

[63] Ibid. II, 151.

[64] O. Posch, op. cit., 208f.

CHAPTER 3

The Conclusion of the Kulturkampf *in Prussia and in the German Empire*

Leo XIII[1] considered himself to be a political Pope and wanted to break the isolation of his predecessor as quickly as possible. Considering his foremost task to be the conclusion of the German *Kulturkampf*, then the most pressing political burden of the Church, he initiated immediate action. On the day of his election (20 February 1878), he wrote a letter to Emperor Wilhelm I and other princes of states struggling with tensions concerning religious policy in which he suggested mutual attempts to restore the previously good relations.[2] Berlin's unwillingness to compromise did not deter him. Supported by a few trusted men, such as Secretary of State Cardinal Franchi[3] and Monsignor Czacki,[4] he hurriedly drafted his program. The Pope and his advisers appreciated Bismarck's anti-revolutionary policies and were convinced that only a statesman of his caliber was capable of ending the *Kulturkampf,* which he himself had started.

---

[1] Concerning the personality and the program of Leo XIII, see pp. 6–25 above.

The Pope's immediate and constant goal was to restore his freedom of movement, which the Church needed for its spiritual mission. If necessary, he was willing to grant the state concessions consistent with the Church constitution. An equally legitimate task, in his opinion, was the preservation and strengthening of the conservative social order. In an alliance between the papacy and a monarchal power such as Prussia and the Empire, Leo saw the most effective defense against socialism and revolution. He hoped for a comprehensive contractual agreement. Convinced of the state's need for peace, he prematurely expected that Bismarck would more or less share his views and meet a conciliatory Pope halfway in these urgent controversies.[5] The self-conception of the modern state, the complex political structure of Prussia and Germany, and the numerous psychological obstacles in the way of appeasement found little consideration in the Vatican. Neither the nuncios in Vienna and Munich who were fairly informed about the situation in Germany, nor the Prussian bishops were consulted. The politicians of the Center Party who were carrying the main burden of the struggle were not consulted either. The Pope considered himself, and only himself, the appointed guardian of ecclesiastical rights, believing that he alone was competent to conduct negotiations and make decisions in a struggle of such fundamental significance as the *Kulturkampf.* This proves the centralistic-autocratic tendency of Leo's pontificate, which is a direct continuation of the Curia's development in the nineteenth century. This tendency is often overlooked in view of Leo's relative intellectual openness and his ability to adjust. From a treaty between papacy and Empire, Leo also expected a strengthening of his claim to sovereignty, which he decided to cultivate more rigorously than his predecessor, who tended to give way to resignation. In addition, an agreement with the strongest European powers could facilitate the conclusion of the conflicts with other states.

---

[2] Concerning the first exchange of letters between Leo XIII and Wilhelm, see Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* no. 183f.

[3] Alessandro Franchi (1819–78), 1856: nuncio to Florence, 1860: secretary of the Congregation for Special Ecclesiastical Affairs (AES), 1868: nuncio to Madrid, 1873: cardinal, 1874: prefect for propaganda; in 1877, Franchi had already participated in attempts to initiate talks with Germany. *ECatt* V, 1622 (biblio.); R. Lill, *Vatikanische Akten* (henceforth: *V.A.*) 3, n. 1.

[4] Wladimir Czacki (1834–88), 1877: secretary of the Congregation of the AES, 1879: nuncio in Paris, 1882: cardinal. Czacki, a Pole, was often suspected by the German *Kulturkampf* fighters of being an "enemy of the Empire". He was of firm convictions and he collaborated in the peace politics of the new Pope. He was particularly interested in France; aside from the Pope, he was the true initiator of the policy of understanding toward the Republic (U. Stutz, *Die päpstliche Diplomatie unter Leo XIII . . . .* [*AAB* (1925), nos. 3–4], 7ff., 62–67, etc.; *V.A.*, 116, n. 1).

[5] Concerning programmatic statements by Leo XIII and his close advisers, see *V.A.*, nos. 12, 33, 58, 61, 75, 85, 90, 94, 103, 127, 130, 142a, 144, 147, 152, 180, 187, 207, 215, 225.

The strength of Leo XIII's program lay in his insight that the Church should not be permitted to be content with the belligerent situation which it had inherited from Pius IX. Its weaknesses were the exaggerated assessment of his own possibilities and his insufficient knowledge of the situation in the various states, such as Germany. Only after setbacks which could have been avoided had the situation been analyzed in time and with realism did the Vatican come to the understanding that political reverses had to be accepted. The Pope, attributing greatest significance to appeasement, was more willing in a tight situation to compromise than his collaborators. Only in the last phase of the development described in this chapter did the Pope find a close coworker in Monsignor Luigi Galimberti, who was far more compliant than the Pope himself.

Of the reasons which compelled Bismarck not to reject Rome's peace attempts, only one partially agreed with the Pope's motives: the weakening of the monarchal state system through the *Kulturkampf* was increasing and filled the imperial court and many conservative circles with concern. More important for the Chancellor were the failure of the *Kulturkampf,* the changed situation as a whole, and his new domestic plans.[6] The change of course from free trade to protective tariffs, which he initially thought necessary, could only be enforced against the will of the liberal allies in the *Kulturkampf* and required new alliances. Bismarck was used to discarding partners who had done their duties. He was already reapproaching the Conservatives. Now he planned to either attract the Center Party or to pass them over through negotiations with the Pope and to separate them from their ecclesiastically motivated mass base. Since the change of pontificate, the conditions for this move seemed more favorable than previously. His speculations on the Center Party and his consideration of the Conservatives indicate the larger framework of domestic politics primarily determined by the growth of social democracy. The change of economic policy was only part of the conservative turn and consolidation of the Empire's structures which were introduced by the Chancellor in the spring of 1878. Included are the socialist law and the repression of all efforts to parliamentarize the Empire.[7] A modus vivendi with the papacy and the Catholic Church suited this new domestic turn, as did the simultaneous new direction in foreign policy taken through the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary. However, Bismarck and the Prussian bureaucracy did not intend to yield in regard to ecclesiastical matters as much as Leo XIII had hoped. The open struggle was to be ended, but the state's supervision over the Church was to remain. The harshest features of the May laws were to be eliminated; this was to be done, however, through unilateral laws. Bismarck never contemplated the treaty which the Pope envisioned.

---

[6] Concerning programmatic statements by the Chancellor, see Bismarck, *GW* VIc, nos. 120, 143, 174, 178, 183f, 217, 220, 222ff., 229, 231, 241, 243f., 259, 261ff., 267, 279, 290f., 301, 306, 306, 322, 324f., 328ff., 332–35, 338, 347–53, 355, 357, 360, 367; XII, 11f., 299–305; XIII, 181–92, 194–202, 282–315. *V.A.* nos. 6a, 13, 19, 24, 49–52, 62, 70, 99, 112, 152f., 155, 198, 218, 222, 229, 233, 237, 244, 255.

The problem-ridden conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* took place in three stages: in the first, through negotiations between the Holy See and Prussia (1878–80); in the second, through discretionary mitigation laws (1881, 1882, 1883); in the third through the two Peace Laws (1886, 1887).

1. Bismarck reacted to the signals from the Vatican with utmost dispatch as he did not have to fear giving the impression of a pilgrimage to Canossa. He knew how to keep the Pope in the dark about his true intentions for a long time and entice him down the path of concessions through harmless advances, as for example the Roman question. Leo's obvious desire for peace put the trumps in the hands of the adversary.

Nuncio Aloisi Masella of Munich,[8] the Prussian delegate Count Werthern, and Bismarck's Bavarian adviser Count Holnstein established the first contacts, expressing the Chancellor's wish for an honorable peace. Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm, representing his father, who had been hurt in an assassination attempt, wrote a letter which led to the main negotiations. It also contained Bismarck's program in its entirety, the implications of which were at first not understood in the Vatican. The Crown Prince explained that the laws of the state could not be adjusted to the Catholic dogmas and that a fight over principles was out of the question. He suggested, however, solving practical controversies together.[9] In the summer of 1878, a meeting between Bismarck and Aloisi Masella was arranged in Kissingen, where the incompatibility of the two viewpoints became clear for the first time.[10] The nuncio asked for the return to the status quo of 1871, which was characterized by the legal rule of the state Church. The Chancellor demanded papal recognition of the May laws regarding the duty to announce to the state candidates for clerical office and, in turn, offered restoration of diplomatic representation to the Holy See in order to conduct further negotiations about practical solutions. The prospect of a nunciature in Berlin was also held out. Though Leo XIII was very interested in diplomatic relations with Berlin,[11] he could not agree to this offer because it preserved the entire legislation of the *Kulturkampf.* In addition, his peace policy had at that moment, in the days of the meeting in Kissingen, lost its strongest supporter when Franchi suddenly died. Therefore, Aloisi's talks led to an atmospheric improvement. In place of negotiations, intentionally dilatory letters by Bismarck were exchanged between the new Secretary of State Cardinal Nina[12] and the Chancellor until the summer of 1879. By order of the Pope, Nina demanded contractual guarantees for the autonomy of the Church, especially a free exercise of their ministry for bishops and clergy and the return of those who were expelled including religious as well as clergy. He also asked the state to waive its claim to interfere in the education of the clergy and religious instruction in schools.

---

[7] Concerning the conservative turn of German domestic politics 1878–80, see especially N. Böhme, *Deutschlands Weg zur Großmacht . . . 1848–1881* (Cologne 1966), 446–579; H.-U. Wehler, *Bismarck und der Imperialismus* (Cologne, 1969), 101–11, 127–35, 139–51, 168–93; E. R. Huber, *Verfassungsgeschichte* IV, 67f., 104, 146f., 152–57, 772f., 882f., 1044–49, 1063ff., 1068, 1153–64; R. Lill, *Wende im Kulturkampf,* 232ff., 245f., etc.

[8] Gaetano Aloisi Masella (1826–1902), 1877: nuncio in Munich, 1879: in Lisbon, 1883: cardinal of the Curia. *ECatt* I, 916 (biblio.).

While Bismarck's anti-Polish attacks were skillfully handled by the Vatican,[13] the Chancellor's hopes for papal influence on the Center Party seemed to have a chance of being fulfilled.[14] Leo XIII's program left no room for independent action by the party. It was to perform secondary services. Above all, so the Vatican soon indicated, the party was to oblige Bismarck politically in order to facilitate the negotiations between Rome and Berlin. Only if these negotiations should stagnate was the party to exert pressure on the Chancellor. The first differences between the Curia and the Center Party occurred in the summer of 1878, when the party, against Rome's wish, refused to approve the socialist law and was derided as a conspirator of the revolution by the government press. Matters did not improve when the Cathedral Canon Moufang of Mainz,[15] a respected man in Rome, explained the motives of the Center to the Curia. He said that the party wanted to keep political and ecclesiastical questions separate, that it was willing to appropriately fend off the socialistic danger, but that it did not want to approve Bismarck's exception laws because of its constitutional principles. At the end of 1878, Windthorst himself approached the Curia several times through the Viennese Nuncio Jacobini,[16] who was rather open-minded toward the party, and suggested parliamentary procedures to revise the May laws. He believed that the cooperation between Center Party and the Conservatives favoring Bismarck's new economic policies had created propitious conditions. He concluded that, in a constitutional state, a party, with its influence on the parliament and the public, was able to offer better guarantees for the Catholic minority than treaties between the Vatican and the government could. To Windthorst, the time for a separation of Church and state seemed to be right.[17] He and his friends did not expect much from Bismarck. Such proposals were not in keeping with Leo's wish to come to terms about the question of sovereignty. From the improved parliamentary constellations, the Vatican drew the opposite conclusion. The Center was urged to form a close coalition with the Chancellor. This was the first climax in the attempts to influence the party, but they were as unsuccessful as the fight over the septennate eight years later. The leadership of the party, supported by the episcopate,[18] insisted on its political independence.[19]

---

[9] Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm to Leo XIII, 10 June 1878, text: Siegfried, *Aktenstücke,* no. 185.

[10] The meeting in Kissingen: Bismarck, *GW,* VIc, no. 124; *V.A.,* nos. 47–58.

[11] Under Pius IX, the Holy See had just been increasingly isolated diplomatically. In 1878, only four embassies and nine legations were accredited there; he entertained six nunciatures, two internunciatures, and four delegatures.

[12] Lorenzo Nina (1812–85), associate of the Holy Office, 1877: cardinal, 1878: secretary of state, 1880: prefect of propaganda. *V.A.,* 115, n. 4.

[13] *V.A.* nos. 19, 24, 26, 32, 37, 44, 47, 52.

[14] *V.A.* nos. 18, 13f., 17, 19f., 22, 25, 27, 34, 40, 45, 49, 52, 55ff., 62ff., 72.

---

[15] Moufang was deputy for the Center Party in the *Reichstag* during 1871–77 and 1878–90. For his letters for the Curia from 1878–79, see *V.A.* nos. 54, 73, 78, 88, 110f., 122, 129, 145, 160a, and appendix no. 1.

[16] Lodovico Jacobini (1832–87), undersecretary of state of the First Vatican Council, 1874: nuncio to Vienna, 1879: cardinal and pronuncio, 1880: secretary of state; due to illness, his influence decreased in the last two years of his life. *V.A.* 9, n. 1; Weber, *Kirchliche Politik,* 29ff., 39–45, 48–51, 115–18, 128–31, 135–38, 149–58.

[17] *V.A.* nos. 83, 86, 100 (n. 3), 106–09, 116, 123, 143, 162, 164f., 167, 169f., 177, 185, 259, 261f.

[18] The Prussian bishops, lead by Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, repeatedly warned of concessions to Bismarck, see *V.A.* nos. 63, 77–81, 97f., 117–21, 156, 181, 184a, 212, 249.

[19] *V.A.* nos. 111, 116, 122 (incl. n. 4), 129, 143.

As a result, Leo XIII agreed to negotiate details as Bismarck had demanded since Kissingen. New hopes were raised when Falk, Minister of Religious Affairs and the embodiment of the *Kulturkampf,* resigned and was replaced by highly conservative Robert von Puttkamer (1828–1900),[20] who disliked the *Kulturkampf.* Falk's resignation was primarily caused by his differences with the orthodox faction of the Protestant Church, which was influential at the imperial court.[21] In the negotiations conducted since the summer of 1879 in Vienna by Jacobini, the German Ambassador Prince Reuß, and canonical experts, both positions regarding the resolutions of the May laws were formulated. Both standpoints continued to be essentially irreconcilable, Jacobini maintained in a meeting with Bismarck (Gastein, September 1879). The Chancellor, however, did openly declare his sympathy for the papal claim of sovereignty.[22] Henceforth, several concessions were announced during the talks in the following months. The ecclesiastical tribunal was to be abolished, the state was to resume payments, the extradition law was not to be enforced any longer, the oath for administrators of bishoprics was to be eliminated. Under state supervision, convents and seminaries were to be reopened. Denominational organization of elementary schools and teacher training were allowed, the prospect of assigning local school inspection to the pastors was held out.[23]

Before the Pope was able to make his objections, Bismarck broke off negotiations. Apparently, he had just wanted to ascertain the positions of his opponent. His pretext was the opposition of the Center to several bills proposed by the government. Bismarck and his aides, among them Secretary of State Hohenlohe, exaggerated this resistance by claiming it to be a fundamental opposition to state and Empire. In order to save some portions of his concept, Leo XIII went so far as to concede his duty to announce clerical appointments in advance and thus to make the very concession which both the Prussian bishops and the Center feared would result in the subjugation of the entire ecclesiastical life to the state bureaucracy.[24]

---

[20] Puttkamer, as minister of the interior (1881–88), supported the consolidation of the conservative system of government with all the means at his disposal; E. Kehr, *Das soziale System der Reaktion in Preußen unter dem Ministerium Puttkamer,* now in: E. Kehr, *Der Primat der Innenpolitik, Ges. Aufsätze . . . ,* ed. by H.-U. Wehler (2nd ed., Cologne 1970), 64–86; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* 67f.

[21] Bismarck, *GW* VIc, nos. 137, 139, 161f.; Förster, *Falk,* 553–652.

[22] Concerning the meeting in Gastein, see Bismarck, *GW* VIc, no. 167; *V.A.* nos. 152f.

[23] Concerning the negotiations in Vienna, see *V.A* nos. 136, 141f., 155–90; Heckel, *Beilegung,* 243–63.

[24] Concerning the papal announcement of this concession and the reaction of government, episcopate and Center, see *V.A.* nos. 201f., 207, 212ff., 218–26, 229, 231. When Bismarck did not concede, Leo retracted his announcement: *V.A.* nos. 245, 254.

2. Meanwhile, the Chancellor decided to move ahead unilaterally. Even his close advisers were surprised about his about-face. In March 1880, discretionary legislation was announced, which was to empower the government to apply several resolutions of the May laws with moderation. It determined the development of the next five years. Placing the enforcement of the existing laws within the discretion of the Ministry violated fundamental legal principles and was as injurious to the constitutional awareness in Germany as were the exceptive laws of the *Kulturkampf* themselves. But this was not atypical for Bismarck's style of government. To the Curia and the Center, the discretionary powers of authority seemed unacceptable because they aimed at regulating pending controversies without cooperation from the Church and substituted the arbitrary decisions of the bureaucracy for the severity of the current laws.[25] Over the joint reactions to Bismarck's new plan there arose a relatively good collaboration between the Vatican and the party. Now the party could begin to struggle for ecclesiastical interests in the Provincial Diet, which was once again responsible for the *Kulturkampf.*

The bill, introduced in May 1880, was to make possible the state-controlled organizational reconstruction of the Catholic Church. The most important enabling acts proposed by Bismarck and Puttkamer pertaining to new regulations of the culture examinations and the readmission of dismissed bishops had to be stricken because the National Liberals believed that they went too far, and the Center, upon instructions from Rome, continued to reject them. The first moderation law, passed on 19 June 1880 by a four-vote majority,[26] authorized the government (until the end of 1881) to employ episcopal administrators and bishops without an oath of obedience, to terminate the state's administration of the property belonging to newly filled dioceses, and to resume financial support by the state. The time limitation was proposed by the Conservatives, who wanted to characterize the discretionary legislation as a temporary arrangement. The law enabled state-approved clergymen to perform office as substitutes in vacant parishes and reinstated nursing orders without a time limit.

Concessions in social politics, announced during talks in Vienna, had meanwhile been decreed by Puttkamer. After his transfer to the Department of the Interior (1881), the new Minister of Religious Affairs, conservative Gustav Goßler (1838–1902), continued the strategy of gradual concessions. However, against the Center's wishes, he insisted on the state's authority in all matters concerning schools. In 1891, Goßler became the highest civil official of West Prussia. But only in the eastern provinces did Goßler proceed with his usual harshness. The second moderation law (31 May 1882)[27] was prepared by Goßler and through agreements between the Center and the Conservatives. It was also approved by the Catholic deputies. This law extended the enabling acts of the summer of 1880 to 1 April 1884 and contained the concessions which had earlier failed because of Liberal opposition.

---

[25] Concerning Bismarck's move toward discretionary legislation and his renewed polemics against the Center, see *V.A.* nos. 196, 198, 206, 222, 233ff., 237–44, 246–70.
[26] Text: Kißling III, 457f.

The definite revision of the *Kulturkampf* laws demanded by Rome and the Prussian Catholics was postponed again. The government required complete realization of the May laws appertaining to the announcement of clerical candidates before it would consider revisions. Several initiatives by the Center were unsuccessful. In April 1883 Winthorst received the majority in the Provincial Diet for a resolution which demanded the "organic revision of the May laws." It was more than a moral victory because it proved that the majority in Parliament had grown tired of Bismarck's policy of obstruction. Bismarck and Goßler, however, succeeded in parrying the effects of the resolution by quickly enacting the third moderation law (11 July 1883).[28] According to this law, conferring of clerical offices whose incumbents could be recalled and the arrangements for a substitution were no longer subject to report to the bureaucracy, and the state's right to veto the nomination was abolished. This was a rather remarkable accomplishment toward progress. The temporary filling of vacant parishes was now possible without time limitations. The Church had to be content with having to apply for the candidate's dispensation from the culture examination demanded by the May laws. The law was passed by an overwhelming majority, opposed only by part of the Liberal Conservatives and the National Liberals, who were weakened by the turn of domestic politics. The Progressive Party continued to be viewed with suspicion in Church-related circles. Nonetheless, the party voted for this as well as other moderation laws, delineating once again the principles it had adhered to since the seventies: it welcomed the *Kulturkampf* laws insofar as they had a liberal motive; but the Progressives rejected repressive measures.

The first moderation law rendered possible the filling of the bishoprics of Fulda, Osnabrück, Paderborn, Trier, and Breslau,[29] which, through the death of their incumbents, were canonically vacant. This required new negotiations between Berlin and the Vatican. Leo XIII was still disappointed about Bismarck's change of course. He agreed to negotiate only after some hesitation and upon the advice of the Center's leadership. The party pleaded for constructive use of the present accomplishments while reiterating further demands from the state. In the summer of 1881, Kurd von Schlözer (1822–94), then the Empire's envoy in Washington, negotiated with Cardinal Jacobini, who had meanwhile become Leo XIII's secretary of state. In December of the same year, Clemens August Busch (1834–95),[30] under secretary of state in the Foreign Office, conducted the negotiations. Schlözer, liberal and well versed in history, had been legation secretary in Rome (1864–69), where he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Church's situation in Rome and Italy[31] and of Catholicism, which he basically despised. This was exceptional for a Protestant from Northern Germany. Schlözer knew how to deal with the prelates, and therefore Bismarck wanted him in Rome at all times. As the first head of the Prussian Legation to the Holy See, reopened in February 1882, he energetically participated in negotiations for the following five years. The restoration of diplomatic relations was a clear step toward normalization, though Leo XIII had hoped for more in this important area: he had hoped that the Empire would establish an embassy.[32] The Chancellor tried to appease the Liberal opposition in the Provincial Diet by stressing that the function of the legation to the Vatican was simply one of concern with Church matters and, thus, with domestic affairs. At the same time, he had to convince the Vatican that the legation did indeed mean recognition of papal sovereignty. To stress this point, Bismarck avoided, as did his Austrian colleague Kálnoky, giving Italy a formal guarantee of her territorial claims, which had been requested during the negotiations for the Triple Alliance in the spring of 1882. This would have meant a direct recognition of the annexation of the Papal State.[33] Nevertheless, the treaty of the two imperial powers with Italy deeply disappointed the Pope, because it consolidated Italy and raised her political value. Now the Pope could not expect from Bismarck effective help on the question of the Papal State.

---

[27] Text: Kißling III, 458f.

[28] Text: Kißling III, 459f.

[29] Breslau only became vacant after Förster's death on 20 October 1881.

---

[30] Aside from Hohenlohe, Busch was one of the very few Catholics among the leading civil servants of the Foreign Office. Here, as in other high administrative offices of the Empire, the Catholics, in the Bismarck period and later (cf. chap. 35), only had a chance for promotion if they belonged to the governmental minority generally tending toward the Free Conservative Party, and if they kept a distance from "ultramontanism" and the Center (R. Morsey, *Die oberste Reichsverwaltung unter Bismarck 1867–1890* [Münster 1957], 116–22, 248f., 268f).

[31] This was documented by his "Roman letters" with the impressive description of papal Rome and its leading personalities in the last years of the Papal State (ed. by K. v. Schlözer [Suttgart, Berlin 1913]). In German-speaking countries, these letters can only be compared to the historical passages in *The Years of Travel in Italy* by F. Gregorovius (last ed. by H.-W. Kruft [Munich 1967]).

[32] This accreditation was in keeping with the competence, pertaining to Church politics, of the German federal states. Of these states, Bavaria maintained a legation to the Holy See because she was interested in continuous relations with the Vatican. The creation of a nunciature in Berlin, discussed several times during the negotiations of 1878–79, failed because of the opposition of the Emperor and influential Evangelical circles. However, the Center politicians and the Prussian bishops were clearly against this project. They feared that a nunciature would become a tool for Berlin's Church politics and that it would hinder the independent actions of the episcopate and the Center (*V.A.* nos. 19, 47, 49ff., 57, 62, 114 [incl. n. 2], 116 [n. 4], 152, 168, 183, 233, 237, 239 [n. 4], 240 [n. 1], 262 [n. 11]; cf. also Bismarck, *GW* VIc, nos. 176, 223).

The concrete goal of Schlözer's and Busch's mission was only reached gradually and with new difficulties. At first, the Holy See enabled only the cathedral chapters in Osnabrück and Paderborn to elect capitular vicars, who were able to assume office in February 1881 without state interference.[34] In Trier, where an election was subsequently ordered, Philipp de Lorenzi, who had been chosen by that chapter, was rejected by the government. The negotiations were difficult and complicated by the differences between the liberal, progovernment minority[35] and the ultramontane-intransigent majority.[36] But the government and the Curia agreed to appoint bishops in Trier and Fulda who were nominated by the Pope directly, circumventing the chapter's right of elections. In choosing the candidate, a momentous compromise was arrived at: in Trier the Curia insisted on the staunchly ultramontane Alsatian Michael

---

[33] Factually, the Italian wishes were fulfilled. In the first treaty of the Triple Alliance (20 May 1882, ART. 2), Germany and Austria promised Italy their full military support in case of an unprovoked attack by France, probably the only power still interested in the restoration of the Papal State. Now, the Roman question was an affair exclusively between Italy and the Vatican (Italicus, *Italiens Dreibundpolitik 1870–1896* [Munich 1928], 52–61; L. Salvatorelli, *La Triplice Alleanza* [Milan 1939], 62–72).

[34] In Osnabrück Bernhard Höting, in Paderborn Kaspar Drobe. In the fall of 1882, both took full responsibility of their dioceses as bishops. In Breslau, after Förster's death, Suffragan Bishop Hermann Gleich was elected capitulary vicar. Since the election of bishops did not take place because the government withdrew several candidates, the Pope, after negotiations with the government, appointed Prior Robert Herzog of Saint Hedwig in Berlin as prince bishop (March 1882).

[35] Their leaders were Cathedral Prior Karl Josef Holzer and his close friend Church historian Franz Xaver Kraus, professor in Freiburg. Kraus especially fought ultramontanism and the "political Catholicism" of the Center, accusing them of secularizing religious interests (cf. chap. 29; F. X. Kraus, *Tagebücher,* ed. by H. Schiel [Cologne 1957]; H. Schiel, *Im Spannungsfeld von Kirche und Politik, Franz Xaver Kraus* [Trier 1951]; H. Schiel, *Trierer Bischofskandidatur von Korum und Kraus* [Trier 1955]; on the same subject: Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* 33–58; on Holzer: E. Hegel, *Festschrift für Alois Thomas* [Trier 1967], 151–62).

[36] It was endorsed by Windthorst; more importantly, it had direct contacts to Secretary of State Cardinal Jacobini through one of its members, Seminary Professor Peter Alexander Reuß.

Felix Korum;[37] in Fulda, the government insisted on compliant Georg Kopp.[38] Korum established close contacts with exiled Archbishop Melchers, with Bishop Krementz from Ermland, and with the Center Party. He also led the opposition of the episcopate's majority to Berlin's religious policy. Kopp, ready to make concessions, represented the other side of papal policy. He felt just as responsible to the state as he did to the Church. Reconciliation of state and Church was of great concern to him. But since he felt that considerable concessions were necessary to realize this goal, he soon found himself in opposition to his colleagues and to the Center, which he accused of sterile opposition.[39]

When these bishops were appointed, when Bishops Blum (Limburg) and Brinkmann (Münster) were pardoned and returned (in 1883–84), when government payments to the dioceses with state-approved bishops[40] were resumed, and when vacant parishes were filled temporarily, the restoration of the Catholic Church organization as desired by the government had indeed begun. After 1883 the shortage of priests was rapidly relieved. However, many important questions were still unresolved. The *Kulturkampf* continued to smolder, while the involvement of the faithful due to granted relief threatened to decrease in time. The gravest difficulties were caused by the state's continuous claim to the right of veto regarding the filling of offices, the training of the clergy, the question of religious orders, and the new appointments for the bishoprics of Cologne and Gnesen-Posen. According to the government, seminarians were to study only in the theology faculties of the state universities, a choice also preferred by liberal Catholics,[41] while the Curia and the majority of the bishops insisted on seminaries controlled by them. The state bureaucracy and the National Liberals resisted the return of the religious orders with a vehemence that had nothing in common with liberal principles. In Berlin reinstatement of Archbishops Melchers and Ledóchowski was felt to be a question of the state's prestige and was categorically refused, even though neither archbishop reacted any differently to the *Kulturkampf* laws and Leo XIII's concessions from the majority of his colleagues. In Gnesen the government wanted to name a German archbishop.

---

[37] Michael Felix Korum (1840–1921), 1865: seminary professor, 1872: cathedral preacher, 1880: cathedral vicar in Strasbourg, 1881: bishop in Trier; biography by J. Treitz (Munich 1925); Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* passim.

[38] Georg Kopp (1837–1914), vicar general in Hildesheim, made efforts to achieve détente regarding the *Kulturkampf;* 1881: bishop of Fulda, 1884: member of the Prussian State Council, 1887: member of the House of Lords (for life), also prince bishop of Breslau, 1893: cardinal (Morsey, *Probleme;* Morsey, "Georg Kard. Kopp. Fürstbischof von Breslau, Kirchenfürst oder 'Staatsbischof'?," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte im Bistum Berlin,* XXI–XXIII (1967–69), 42–65; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* chap. IVff.; E. Gatz, *Bischöfliche Einheitsfront . . . .* [cf. chap. 1]).

[39] Cf. chap. 35.

[40] Only the archbishoprics of Cologne and Gnesen-Posen remained without state-approved bishops until 1885 and 1886, respectively, and therefore they had no official diocesan administration and no state funds.

[41] The example of the university and seminary education shows that liberal Catholics were dependent on the alliance with the state in order to assert at least some parts of their concept against ultramontanism (*V.A.* nos. 193[including n. 16], 231 [including n. 4], appendix no. 3 [including n. 8]).

For the time being, neither side was willing to give in. In 1883 and 1884, the Pope and Secretary of State Jacobini declared several times that freedom in the matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the training of priests was essential. According to the old curial maxim that you should adhere to your principles and rather sacrifice the person, if necessary, the Pope and his advisers wanted to consent to the resignation of the archbishops only if the state would concede in those central questions. Essentially, Leo XIII took the same position in this matter that the majority of the episcopate, led by Melchers and Korum, and the Center faction under Windthorst maintained. In the summer of 1885, Rome still repudiated the fact that Bishop Drobe of Paderborn had given in to the state's regulations regarding the training and assignment of the clergy. But that was the last substantial victory the Prussian Catholic leaders who were averse to Bismarck could report to the Vatican.

3. In 1885 Leo XIII changed his mind, which led to the last phase of the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf.* Bishop Kopp had prepared the Pope diplomatically, corroborating his old notion that the *Kulturkampf* should be terminated as soon as possible in cooperation with rather than in opposition to Bismarck. He also declared the resignation of the archbishops a prerequisite for salvaging a situation that had run aground. He regarded preliminary concessions as inevitable, even as justifiable, since he trusted Bismarck. Just as important were the power shifts within the Vatican. As a result of his illness, Secretary of State Cardinal Jacobini, who tended toward the Center, had lost some of his influence. In 1885 the Pope was busy defending himself against severe criticism from intransigent Catholics,[42] and therefore decided to continue his strategy of negotiations with even more persistence. Last but not least, because of the intensification of Italy's anticlerical politics, the Pope desired more and more urgently immediate and evident successes.

---

[42] A great sensation was caused by the attacks of the French scholar, Cardinal of the Curia Jean-Baptiste Pitra, O.S.B. He charged Leo with having deviated from the tested path of his predecessors and with having furthered the liberal deterioration (C. Crispolti, G. Aurelia, *La politica di Leone XIII,* 87–90; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* 113–17; U. Engelmann, *LThK*² VIII, 527).

Monsignor Galimberti,[43] of Cardinal Franchi's school, had taken over the factual direction of the Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs in the summer of 1885. The Pope found in Galimberti an adviser who was as devoted as he was able, though it was difficult to see through his motives.[44] Monsignor Boccali, head of the papal secret cabinet, eagerly supported him. Both monsignors entertained close relations with the Prussian delegate, with Montel, Austrian Auditor of the Rota, who was also a friend of Schlözer's, frequently mediating.[45]

Strengthened by his advisers, the Pope made his old program more concrete. Like the leaders of the Center and the majority of the Prussian bishops, he feared only the continuation of the *Kulturkampf.* While the former deduced from this that one should continue to demand the *status quo ante* and that compromises would eventually end in the Church's submission to the state, the Pope drew the opposite conclusion. He did not believe, as Windthorst did, that time would work in favor of the Church. In order to prevent the incalculable "bogginess" of the conflict, he decided to make concessions in several areas. As soon as possible, he wanted to achieve a solution which would guarantee at least the more important ecclesiastical demands. On this level he met Bismarck, who was also interested in a speedy appeasement, considering the consolidated alliance with Austria and the impending international crisis in 1885.[46] Research today has confirmed that the policy of appeasement in the years 1885–87 was a personal achievement of the Pope and Bismarck.[47] Both had to overcome the resistance of the intransigents within their respective camps[48] and, therefore, used only the reliable aides mentioned above. Kopp especially, who was trusted by both sides and who in 1887 had been appointed to the Prussian House of Lords with the Pope's approval, henceforth mediated between Rome and Berlin, bypassing his colleagues and the Center.

---

[43] Luigi Galimberti (1836–96), professor at the College of Propaganda since 1860. As an enemy of the intransigents and the disciples of the Italian nation state, he was without influence for a long time. With the election of Leo XIII he became his political writer, in 1882 editor of the *Moniteur de Rome,* in 1885 pro-secretary, in 1886 secretary of the congregation of the AES, in 1887 nuncio in Vienna, and in 1893 cardinal and prefect of the Vatican archives (G. Grabinski, "Il Cardinale Galimberti," *Rassegna Nazionale* 89 (1896), 376–416; C. Crispolti and G. Aurelia, *La politica di Leone XIII,* passim; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* chap. VIff.; *ECatt* V, 1881).

[44] In the period of time between October 1886 and May 1887, which was decisive for the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* and during which Galimberti was primarily responsible for papal politics, due to Jacobini's progressing illness and subsequent death (28 February 1887), Galimberti accepted payments from Bismarck's "reptile funds" (cf. above p. 22; R. Lucius von Ballhausen, *Bismarckerinnerungen* [4th and 6th eds., Suttgart 1921] 364; *Staatssekretär Graf Herbert von Bismarck. Aus seiner politischen Privatkorrespondenz,* ed by W. Bußmann [Göttingen 1964], 401f.).

[45] Johannes von Montel-Treuenfest (1831–1910), 1877: auditor, 1889: dean of the Rota, consultant to the Holy Office and other congregations, clerical adviser to the ambassador of the Austro-Hungarian Vatican Embassy, representative of various Austrian and German affairs in the Vatican, whose influence decreased when Rampolla was appointed secretary of state (*V.A.* no. 66, n. 2; biblio.); Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* passim).

[46] The Bulgarian crisis of 1885 led to a catastrophic deterioration of Austro-Russian relations. At the same time, new German-French tensions occurred and a French-Russian alliance was under way. The crisis, to which Bismarck devoted most of his

The deadlock was overcome in the summer of 1885, when Leo called Melchers to Rome as a cardinal of the Curia and appointed Bishop Krementz his successor in Cologne, even though no satisfactory solution was in sight for Gnesen.[49] Krementz followed the principles of his predecessor, but that was not as relevant as the prestige the government had gained by removing the speaker of the episcopate in the years of struggle. Krementz was also weaker than Melchers. Nevertheless, the decisive impetus came from Bismarck a few months later, when he offered the Pope to mediate between Germany and Spain in the controversy over the Caroline Islands, an offer he accepted with alacrity. The "prisoner of the Vatican" was officially recognized thereby as sovereign, and, for the first time, Leo could perform the international office of arbitration in the service of peace, a function which he hoped to secure for the papacy for good by way of returning to politics.[50] The Pope thanked Bismarck for his help by awarding him the Order of

---

energies in the following two years, could only be settled through a Mediterranean *entente* and a German-Russian guarantee-treaty (both 1887) (A. Hillgruber, *Bismarcks Außenpolitik* [Freiburg 1972], 175–93).

[47] Morsey, *Probleme,* 225–45; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* 107ff., 120–25, 138ff., 188ff., etc.; Morsey, *Kopp,* 46f.

[48] On the side of the state: the National Liberal Party, the sympathetic news media, and strong powers in the Prussian bureaucracy; on the Roman side: most cardinals of the Curia, among them Ledóchowski and Johann Bapt. Franzelin,S. J. (1816–86), who were especially familiar with Germany and endorsed the policies of the Center. Both belonged to the commission for Germany, established by Leo XII, which was, however, practically without any influence since Galimberti's rise. Nevertheless, the Pope appreciated the advice of the educated and sharp Franzelin, whose death, therefore, gave the pro-Prussian groups a lift. Melchers, called to Rome in 1885, was not able to replace him, in spite of identical views. He could not influence the Vatican's politics, which were meanwhile conducted by Galimberti (on Franzelin: *V.A.* no. 69, n. 1; M.-G. von Twickel, *LThK*^{2} IV, 272f.).

[49] Concerning the circumvention of the cathedral chapter, the appointment of Krementz and his cooperation with Korum (which the government did not want), see N. Trippen, *Das Domkapitel und die Erzbischofswahlen in Köln 1821–1929* (Cologne, Vienna 1972), 257–66.

[50] This seems to have been the major interest of Leo XIII. He used it to begin a line of papal policies which goes back to Benedict XV and Pius XII (cf. p. 22f.).

Christ, an act that was interpreted, not only in governmental publications, as a demonstration of reconciliation.

During the following months, the foundations for the two decisive peace laws were laid in secret meetings, from which were excluded the Center Party, the majority of the Prussian bishops, Cardinal Jacobini, and the members of most of the duly qualified authorities of the Vatican. The original alternative of appeasement by treaty or law was replaced by a combination of both, as Bismarck had wanted. After consultation with the Vatican about what could be demanded from either side, the state enacted laws which legally validated the content of those consultations.

The draft of the first of these two laws[51] was debated from February until March 1886 and encountered reservations similar to the first moderation law six years earlier. For the National Liberals the concessions in this draft went too far; for the Center and the bishops (with the exception of Kopp) they did not go far enough. But now the changed constellation had its effect in the localities where the decisions had to be made. Contrary to parliamentary procedure the draft was initially not debated in the Provincial Diet, but in the House of Lords, where Kopp and some aristocratic "state Catholics" could appear and conservative governmental forces were in charge. Windthorst, Korum, and Krementz were ignored, even though they continued to be backed by the great majority of the Prussian Catholics. In previous years, visits and letters from Trier to the Curia had been welcomed, but now the attempt to send one of the bishops to the Vatican and convince the Pope to take a stricter stance failed. Bismarck and Leo XIII, Galimberti and Kopp succeeded and achieved a great deal: the law (21 May 1886)[52] disposed of the ecclesiastical tribunal and the culture examination for theology students. In most dioceses, seminaries and convents were allowed to reopen without the state supervision required by May law, thus widening the restricted work of the religious orders. Even before the law was published, Leo XIII assented to Bismarck's renewed request appertaining to the duty to report candidates for permanent positions in pastorates. In vain, Windthorst again warned against accepting this important requirement by the state.

---

[51] Concerning the first peace law, see Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* IV, 132–47; Heckel, *Beilegung*, 317–33; Schmidt-Volkmar, 300–16; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik*, 122–47. During the debate of the law, new intense controversies about the Polish question came up because the Center opposed the settlement law which furthered the Germanization of the Polish-speaking provinces (Bismarck, *GW* VIc, nos. 323, 325; XII, 166–78; J. Mai, *Die preußisch-deutsche Polenpolitik 1885–1887* [Berlin 1962], 75–82, 115–32; H. Neubach, *Die Ausweisungen von Polen und Juden aus Preußen 1885/1886* [Wiesbaden 1967], 92–112).

[52] Text: Kißling III, 460ff.

The fierce discussion over the second law was also encumbered by the septennate controversy.[53] Bismarck maneuvered the Center Party into this struggle, assisted by Leo XIII and his advisers, who critically transgressed the limits of their clerical competence. The Chancellor used the crisis in foreign policy to further enlarge the armed forces and, above all, to effect another septennate, i.e., the commitment of the military budget for seven years. As on similar former occasions, Bismarck wanted to limit the *Reichstag's* right to appropriate funds. The antiparliamentary course of 1878 was consistently pursued. Under the pretext that a Franco-German war was on the way, Bismarck persuaded the Pope to exert massive influence on the Center in favor of the septennate.[54] In this matter, as in the question of the Caroline Islands, Leo was guided by his exaggerated concept of the papal mission of order and peace. The Center, however, insisted upon its political independence. According to its constitutional fundamental concept, the party, along with the Freethinkers,[55] did not want to sanction more than a three-year military budget. Such a compromise did not satisfy Bismarck. The *Reichstag* was dissolved; the government presented the new elections (21 February 1887) as being a decision for or against Germany's defense preparedness. Through this demagogical tactic, the Chancellor accomplished the alliance of the National Liberals and the Conservatives, the so-called cartel. It was not difficult to accuse the two opposing parties of animosity toward the Empire. At the height of the election campaign, Bismarck published the Vatican's comments on the septennate, which Galimberti and Schlözer had delivered into his hands. The Center appeared to have been compromised by the Pope. Windthorst's superior tactics,[56] the determination of its active members, and the support by the Rhenish-Westphalian bishops helped the party to survive the crisis. It was in its favor that Nuncio Di Pietro[57] of Munich did not belong to Galimberti's but to Jacobini's group and that the Pope himself modified his earlier statements. The Pope did not wish a catastrophe for the party and was alarmed by the startling criticism on the part of Korum and Bishop Senestréy of Regensburg.[58] Therefore the Center endured but an insignificant defection, mostly noble Catholics from the right, who sympathized with Kopp's course in any case. Thanks to his solid voting block, he could return to the *Reichstag* with ninety-eight deputies (previously ninety-nine), while the Freethinkers, under pressure by governmental propaganda, lost half their mandate. In March 1887, the cartel parties, who had emerged from the election campaign with new strength, helped the septennate to victory.

---

[53] The septennate controversy, forming fronts which affected more than the *Kulturkampf,* and the subsequent negotiations about the second peace law have been researched more thoroughly than most phases of the *Kulturkampf* and its conclusion (see mainly Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* IV, 148–326; Heckel, *Beilegung,* 333–49; Morsey, *Probleme,* 225–35; Schmidt-Volkmar, 324–41; Weber, *Kirchl. Politik,* 148–71).

[54] The Pope and Galimberti conceived two decrees for Nuncio Di Pietro of Munich (3, 21 January 1887), which were signed by Jacobini, but which were supposed to have been sent to Baron Georg Arbogast von Franckenstein (MdR), who worked closely with Windthorst and had good contacts to the nunciature in Munich. The second decree had been initiated by a letter from Franckenstein in which he had extensively explained and justified the politics of the Center.

[55] The Progressive Party and other left Liberals. Groups which had defected from the National Liberals had joined the Freethinkers in 1884.

[56] He proved his tactic in his famous election speech in Cologne's Gürzenich (6 February 1887) two days after the unexpected announcement of the second Vatican decree, which was immediately exploited by the government press. He interpreted it completely in accord with Leo XIII's wish, expressed therein, for a strong continuation of the Center and his recognition of what the party had accomplished in the interest of the

The Pope directly intervened in the final preparations for the second law by sending Galimberti to Berlin,[59] where he also expressed the Pope's wider political desires. They ranged from the restoration of the Papal State to papal arbitration for the purpose of avoiding war. As had happened on former occasions, Bismarck's simple and polite approval awakened exaggerated hopes and further willingness to compromise in as yet unresolved controversies. The Pope did not realize that he was just playing the role which the Chancellor had designed for him in his political concept. Again, there were serious disputes over the next moves between Galimberti and Kopp, who were essentially satisfied with Bismarck's offers, and Windthorst and his faction, who wanted to continue fighting in order to gain more. By order of the Pope, whose competence to decide ecclesiastical matters was not questioned by the Catholic deputies, the Center finally supported the bill of the Chancellor, who took great efforts to overcome the resistance of the liberal advocates of the *Kulturkampf.* Minister of the Interior Puttkamer energetically supported this bill, but even Minister of Religious Affairs Goßler feared the sacrifice of too many state prerogatives. The law, enacted on 29 April 1887,[60] limited, as far as the state was concerned, the duty to report candidates and the government's right to veto the

---

Church (Hüsgen, *Windthorst,* 288–301 [with the text of the speech]; Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* IV, 189–97 [with excerpts]).

[57] Angelo Di Pietro (1828–1914), 1877: delegate in Buenos Aires, 1879: internuncio in Rio de Janeiro, 1882: nuncio in Munich, 1887: in Madrid, 1893: cardinal of the Curia (De Marchi, *Le Nunziature Apostoliche,* 278 [index]).

[58] Senestréy (bishop of Regensburg since 1858) was very respected in Rome for his long-lasting efforts on behalf of the ultramontane principles.

[59] A welcome occasion was the festivities for Emperor Wilhelm I's ninetieth birthday (22 March 1887).

[60] Text: Kißling III, 462f.

permanent filling of pastorates. At the same time, it waived the obligation to fill them permanently. Seminaries and convents were allowed again in all German-speaking dioceses; most religious orders could return and were given back their property, which had been taken into custody by the state.

The state had thus abandoned most of the discriminatory measures of the *Kulturkampf*. Remaining from the Kulturkampf legislation, but in moderated form, were the state supervision of schools,[61] civil marriage, the pulpit paragraph, the Jesuit law (until 1917), and the duty to announce candidates, but in moderated form; the Church paragraphs of the constitution were not reinstated. The state's control over the Church was consequently preserved to a degree which went far beyond the situation of 1871, but Bismarck was not able to reinforce this control. His attempt proves that he still did not completely understand the vitality which the Church had been able to maintain. In similar fashion, he often failed to realize the importance of a historical evolution in terms of domestic politics, especially when dealing with opponents. One century of Church emancipation had passed over the Prussian claim for control over the Church. At the most, control could be enforced for a short period in an anachronistic struggle of attrition if all of the powers of the state were employed. The Church, relieved of the shackles of the *Kulturkampf*, could no longer be kept dependent through the remaining restrictions. In the following years, a status quo of balance between Church and state, acceptable to both sides, was reached. In that respect, Windthorst, Korum, and their disciples had been too pessimistic. Leo XIII handled the concrete controversies quite realistically. The relatively favorable conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* did indeed increase the Vatican's diplomatic prestige, which Leo was particularly interested in, since, in 1887, Francesco Crispi became the head of the Italian government. He was strongly anticlerical and desirous of further isolating the Vatican. The Pope rightfully called the second peace law an *aditus ad pacem*, expressing in this manner his hopes for further moves by the state. His hopes for such moves were fueled by the enforcement of his pro-Prussian politics of 1886–87 through important decisions pertaining to personnel. Circumventing the suffrage of the cathedral chapters, which primarily tended toward the Center's course, he appointed progovernment bishops in Limburg and Kulm.[62] In Gnesen-Posen, for the first time, he appointed a German archbishop in the person of Julius Dinder from Königsberg. Kopp, so bitterly opposed by the Center, was promoted to Prince-Bishop of Breslau a few months after the achievement of the compromised peace which he had supported so diligently. Following Cologne, Breslau was Prussia's most prestigious episcopal see. But Leo XIII's other wishes and far-reaching political expectations remained unfulfilled. The Chancellor had reached his goal and, therefore, did not think of further concessions. Thus, Leo's wishful thinking took its toll. So did the hastiness, entirely unnecessary after the relief in 1880–83, with which, at the end, Leo fulfilled the opponents' wishes, thus burdening German Catholicism with needless inner tensions which continued to have an effect for some time to come. The Pope made it easy for the Chancellor to deceive him. Nevertheless, Bismarck, in complete command of the current situation, did not sufficiently contemplate the long term effects of his actions. The Pope's final disappointment in Bismarck and German politics form the background for the pro-French reorientation, which Leo XIII and Jacobini's successor Rampolla launched soon after.

---

[61] Henceforth, the local state inspection of schools was usually assigned to the priests.

[62] In Limburg Karl Klein, who, in 1887, was the only Prussian bishop (aside from Kopp) to support the septennate; in Kulm Leo Redner.

Bismarck also did not succeed when he attempted for the last time, on the occasion of the septennate, to force the Center Party into submission and thus force a strong opponent out of the front which was pressing for parliamentarism. The party of the Catholics had supported the Chancellor on many issues, such as his fledgling policies of worker protection. In the eighties the party had already become an important and stable factor in German politics, which could only be hampered for a few years by the cartel of 1887.

Therefore, the *Kulturkampf* was one of Bismarck's worst mistakes in regard to domestic politics, aside from the persecutions of the Socialists. However, he was able partially to compensate for it through a skillful termination of the conflict. The *Kulturkampf* laws and the exceptive laws diminished the trustworthiness of the state and the ideas concerning law of the Germans. The timely evolution of state structures as well as the integration of the Catholics into the nation-state was delayed unnecessarily. The relations between the denominations as well as between the Germans and Poles were lastingly affected, especially as the fight in the eastern provinces was continued as a struggle between nationalities. Thanks to the mobilization of new political forces and Leo XIII's diplomacy, which was dependent on these forces, German Catholicism survived this test of strength. Nevertheless, militant liberalism reached a goal which it had pursued since the sixties: the Catholics had been completely isolated spiritually and socially in those years of struggle.[63]

---

[63] Cf. K. Erlinghagen, *Katholisches Bildungsdefizit* (Freiburg 1965), 17 etc.

As groups tend to do when pushed into a ghetto, they reacted by relying on their own strength and by refusing to recognize that some of the liberal initiatives merely corresponded to increasing secularization, which negation could not forestall in the long run. Henceforth, the Catholics tried harder than ever to expand the legal foundation, again assured since 1886–87, relative to various organizations. The most important new creations of the *Kulturkampf* period were the *Görres-Gesellschaft* and the *Volksverein.* That the defensive attitude of most Catholics was not unjustified was proven, last but not least, by the founding (1886) and activities of the *Evangelischer Bund.* It embraced those Protestants who felt the termination of the *Kulturkampf* to be a capitulation to the Catholic Church, and initially enkindled extreme denominational polemics.

The beginning of Baden's renunciation of the *Kulturkampf* and its motives have already been mentioned. In 1878 under the ministry of Turban-Stößer, appointed in 1876, the tedious reduction of *Kulturkampf* laws began. It was not concluded until 1918. The archbishopric of Freiburg, which, since 1868, had been administered by a capitulary vicar, was filled again in 1882 by Johann Baptist Orbin (1806–86)[64] from the irenic circle of J. B. Hirscher. Hessen-Darmstadt followed the Prussian example in the decade of the struggle as well as in its conclusion. Between 1880 and 1887, the *Kulturkampf* laws were largely revised. The conciliatory Paul Leopold Haffner (1829–99)[65] became bishop of Mainz in 1886. Moufang, who had been too exposed during the struggle and temporarily administered the bishopric after Ketteler's death (1877), had to withdraw. In Saxony, tensions also relaxed gradually, even though the law of 1876 pertaining to state supervision of churches remained in force. In Alsace-Lorraine, the conservative Governor Edwin Manteuffel after 1879 practiced a consistent policy of reconciliation.[66]

---

[64] *Badische Biographien* IV, 289–310; W. Müller, *LThK*² VII, 1196.

[65] L. Lenhart, *Paul Leopold Haffner (1829–99). Der schwäbische Philosoph auf dem Mainzer Bischofsstuhl (1886–99). Sonderdruck aus dem Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz* VIII (Mainz 1960); L. Lenhart, *LThK*² IV, 1312.

[66] In 1881 Manteuffel recommended Prebendary Korum of Strasbourg as candidate for bishop in Berlin.

CHAPTER 4

The Development of Catholicism in Switzerland

The defeat of the Catholic cantons in the War of 1847 significantly determined for generations to come not only the external but also the internal situation of Swiss Catholicism. The federal constitution of 1848 assigned the regulation of Church relations to the cantons on a federalistic basis, in spite of increased centralism. But in the elections, majority suffrage (election by proportional representation first in 1918), deliberate division of constituencies, and, last but not least, domestic differences among Catholics rather favored the Liberal candidates.[1] The occurrences after 1848 were especially radical in the canton of Fribourg. But the reaction of Catholics was just as resolute: in the parliamentary elections of 1856, the Conservatives were overwhelmingly victorious (sixty-four versus three radical representatives). Bishop Marilley of Lausanne-Geneva, expelled in 1848, was able to return. The development in the canton of Lucerne was similar. There, the teaching sisters of Baldegg had to be readmitted, and the Conservatives were successful in May 1871 despite the First Vatican Council. Special problems existed in Ticino because it belonged to the dioceses of Como and Milan. In the canton of Saint Gall, the future Bishop Karl Johann Greith[2] was the political leader in the school controversy (next to some prominent representatives of the laity). In 1861 a law regarding schools could be enacted which was favorable to the Catholics. In the 1859 elections in Unterwallis, the Conservatives were successful. It should be noted, however, that liberal cantons with Catholic minorities (e.g., Basel, Zurich, Winterthur, Berne, Lausanne, Geneva) practiced toleration (moderated, to be sure, by the ecclesiastical law of the state) even though the denominations were frequently financed through secularizations. These were the external conditions for intensive pastoral work in respect to the diaspora.

To find the pragmatic middle of the road between centralism and political federalism, essential to the Catholic cantons, was a difficult task for Swiss Catholicism in view of this cantonal situation. The Catholic

---

[1] Cf. K. Müller, op. cit., 169–99; T. Schwegler, op. cit., 213–27.

[2] K. J. Greith from Rapperswil (1807–88) had proved his worth in the battles of the thirties; but at the First Vatican Council (1834–36, he was in exile in Rome) he belonged to the group which opposed the dogmatization of the infallibility. He wrote (studied theology at the Sorbonne) a handbook of philosophy, was interested in Dominican mysticism and the Old Irish Church, and was bishop of the diocese of Saint Gall (1862–82) in existence since 1823 (Cf. K. Müller, op. cit. 194f).

Schweizerischer Studentenverein (Swiss Student Association), founded in 1841 in Schwyz, was the first organization to expand throughout all the cantons. Patrician Theodor Scherer-Boccard (1816–85) of Solothurn directed the editor's office of the *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung* and became chairman of the *Schweizerischer Pius-Verein* (Swiss Pius Society),[3] founded in 1857 in Beckenried. The Benedictine monks transformed the cantonal school in Sarnen (Obwalden) into a reputable secondary school, and the monasteries at Einsiedeln and Engelberg enlarged their curriculums. In 1856 one of the leading personalities in this period of Swiss Catholicism, the enterprising friar of the Capuchin order, A. K. (Theodosius) Florentini,[4] restored the college of Maria-Hilf in Schwyz, which had been under the supervision of the bishops of Chur, Basel, and Saint Gall since 1884. Similar progress was made with Saint Michael in Fribourg. Florentini earned everlasting fame even outside of Switzerland when he founded the house of the Sisters of Mercy of the Holy Cross in Ingenbohl (Mother Superior Theresa Scherer, 1825–88). The house had separated from the Menzingen educational institute after one of the frequent controversies over congregations and had devoted itself (following Florentini's example) to caring for the sick.

The *Kulturkampf,*[5] occurring at the same time as the First Vatican Council, is closely related to the occurrences in Germany. Before it ended, *Die katholische Stimme aus den Waldstätten* (The Catholic Voice of Waldstätten) appeared in Lucerne, following Döllinger's argumentation. After 1873, professor J. H. Reinkens of Breslau, since 1873 bishop of the Old Catholics in Germany, founded in many cities in Switzerland "societies of free-thinking Catholics," from which sprung the Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland, founded in 1875–76 in Olten.[6] But one should consider the specific social differences within Swiss Catholicism itself, the resistance of Catholic patrician families to the constitution of 1848, and the differences between agrarian Catholic cantons and the predominently liberal urban bourgeoisie, whose Catholics, to a large extent, had rejected Pius IX's *Syllabus.* Eduard Herzog, professor of theology in Lucerne, born in Schongau, was a very devout representative of the Christian Catholics, but had hesitated to accept his election as bishop in Olten.[7] Local conflicts usually broke out because the Christian Catholics demanded the right to use the Catholic churches.

---

[3] T. Schwegler, op. cit., 223; a survey of the history of Catholic societies in K. Müller, op. cit., 299–312, and G. Beuret, op. cit., 13–59.

[4] Anton Krispin Florentini (1808–65), born in Müstair (Graubünden), in the monastery of Solothurn since 1830, was one of the heroes in the battle with the Liberals and vicar general in Chur (1859). Concerning his utopian industrial enterprises, cf. chap. 13; M. Künzle, *Die schweizerische Kapuzinerprovinz* (Einsiedeln 1928); T. Schwegler, op. cit., 221.

[5] K. Müller, op. cit., 231–94; T. Schwegler, op. cit., 227–37. The *Kulturkampf* in Switzerland renewed the animosity, "in which Catholicism and anti-Church radicalism—both, at that time, pressured into extreme positions—confronted each other for decades to come," even though *Kulturkampf* was forestalled in many parts of the country thanks to the restraint of the local episcopate (Hanno Helbling, *Schweizer Geschichte* (Zurich 1963), 141. This ecclesiastical restraint was in accord with the cantons' governments.

[6] Müller, op. cit., 286–94; O. Gilg, *Christkatholizismus* (Lucerne 1945).

While the cantonal governments in Zurich, Lucerne, and Saint Gall exercised restraint, severe conflicts flared up in Berne and in cantons belonging to the diocese of Basel-Solothurn, especially at the bishop's see of Solothurn, where, in 1870, Eugen Lachat was forced to accept the closing of the seminary (which had just been opened in 1858) by the "Diocesan Body" (representatives of the canton governments). On 29 January 1873 the "Body" dismissed Lachat because he refused to keep in office the clergy who opposed the dogma of infallibility. The cantons of Lucerne and Zug did not support his dismissal. In Aargau and Solothurn convents and monasteries were closed and the many developing Christian Catholic congregations were favored (especially in the canton of Aargau, where whole congregations often followed their priests on the path away from the Roman Catholic Church). The Benedictine monks from Maria-Stein who emigrated across the French border were able to continue to administer their parishes in the canton of Solothurn. The canton of Berne proceeded with severity against the priests in the Jura who were loyal to deposed Bishop Lachat (living in Lucerne). Eighty-four priests were expelled from Switzerland; others had to conduct services in secret hiding places.

Aside from Bishop Lachat of Basel-Solothurn, Gaspard Mermillod (1842–92) was also the object of harsh struggles regarding ecclesiastical policies. In Geneva, the overthrow of the patrician government by the Liberals turned out to be advantageous for the Catholics. Subsequently, the congregations, strengthened by immigrants, expanded quickly in the fifties. In Notre Dame, a church dedicated in 1859, Mermillod delivered moving sermons, and in 1864 Pius IX appointed him titular bishop of Hebron, suffragan bishop of the diocese of Lausanne, and vicar general of Geneva, replacing Bishop Marilley of Lucerne, who resigned in 1879. The cantonal government regarded this as a circumvention of the constitutional decree forbidding the establishment of new bishoprics. Oriented toward the leftist Liberals since 1870, the government dismissed Mermillod in September of 1872 as priest of Geneva's Notre

---

[7] T. Schwegler, op. cit., 232; insight into Swiss Old Catholicism, though prejudiced against the papacy in the biography by R. Dederen, *Un réformateur catholique au 19ᵉ siècle - Eugène Michaud, 1839–1917* (Geneva 1963), also: Küppers, *ZKG* 75 (1964), 418f; and V. Conzemius, *ZSKG* 58 (1964), 177–204.

Dame. In January 1873 the Pope responded to this move by appointing Mermillod apostolic vicar in Geneva. In February 1873, the government, having already enacted a radical state-church law in 1872, expelled Mermillod from the country. He continued his activities, however, from Ferney, on the other side of the French border. The Federal Council immediately answered a papal letter to the Swiss Catholics of 21 November 1873 by severing diplomatic relations. A centralistic revision of the constitution in 1874 intensified the state's Church law.

The *Kulturkampf* in Switzerland did not last as long as in Germany. At the end of 1875, the Federal Council gave permission to the clergymen who had been expelled from the Berne Jura to return, and after 1878 they were allowed to perform their office without disturbance. The leftist liberal canton government in Geneva suffered several defeats in 1878. In Bellinzona (Ticino) a conservative government was formed in 1875. Thus Leo XIII's diplomat Domenico Ferrata[8] found a favorable situation when he came to Switzerland as a result of the Federal Council's appeal to the Vatican. The Geneva question had already been solved in 1883: when the successor of Bishop Mermillod (who had resigned) passed away, Leo XIII was able to appoint Mermillod bishop of Lausanne-Geneva, gaining approval of the Federal Council, but sacrificing Pius IX's Geneva plans (the apostolic vicariate was abolished). That Ferrata had difficulties later on adjusting to the local situation was due to internal affairs within the Catholic Church. The Basel and Ticino questions were resolved through pragmatic unification. At first, the person of Bishop Eugen Lachat presented a problem: the non-Catholic cantons of the diocese of Basel-Solothurn wanted peace, but rejected Lachat's return from exile in Lucerne. Gioacchino Pecci, as bishop of Perugia, had demonstrated his sympathy for papally loyal Lachat, and now, as Pope, he had to sacrifice Lachat for the sake of a political arrangement. Informally, Lachat showed willingness to submit, even though his position in Ticino was rather undefined; officially he declined. This produced a great deal of embarrassment for the Curia, which Ferrata was to alleviate. His investigative mission resulted in Lachat's being persuaded to resign. Ferrata's visit permitted the bishop to save face before the outraged members of the diocese. In Ticino, separated by the Provincial Diet from the dioceses of Como and Milan (in 1859, Austria had lost Ticino to Piedmont), the problem was that the Catholic conservatives of Bellinzona wanted their own bishopric, while the Federal Council insisted on annexation to the German-Swiss diocese of Basel-Solothurn. Ferrata and Swiss politicians, led by the Protestant Conservative deputy Emil Welti (of Aargau), agreed at a conference (12 August to 1 September 1884) that the Pope should appoint a persona grata (F. Fiala) to the bishopric of Basel-Solothurn, at least for the time being (the constitution of 1874 was ignored), and that Lachat should become apostolic administrator in Ticino with a temporary office in Balerna. The Ambrosian liturgy was to be preserved together with the Roman liturgy. After Bishop Lachat's death (1886) the Ticino question had to be renegotiated. In 1887 Ferrata (meanwhile named nuncio to Belgium) had to deal with two Freethinkers in Berne, discretely indicating to them that the administrator from Ticino could be expelled and possibly govern from Italy. It was agreed that the parish church of Saint Laurenz in Lugano be elevated to the Cathedral of Ticino, and that an apostolic administrator be appointed who had to be from Ticino (triple nomination) and required the approval of the bishop of Basel.

---

[8] *Mémoires* I U. Stutz, op. cit., 29–46.

In the eighties, a new generation of Swiss Catholics came to the forefront. They distinguished themselves politically from those men for whom Senator Philipp Anton Segesser (1817–88) from Lucerne was representative. He came from an old patrician family, was decidedly conservative and federalistic and, like Bishop Greith from Saint Gall, he had reservations about the definition of infallibility.[9] In 1888 three fellow students, Kaspar Decurtins from the Grisons (1855–1916), twenty-six years old and the youngest senator,[10] Ernst Feigenwinter, a lawyer from Basel (1853–1919),[11] and theologian Josef Beck (after 1891 professor in Fribourg) founded the *Verband katholischer Männer- und Arbeitervereine der Schweiz.* This group intentionally addressed itself to Swiss Catholicism as a whole, turning away from the Pius societies of the Catholic cantons with their traditional leadership. The first plenary meeting in 1889—held in Zurich—behaved as if it were a Catholic convention with an address by the Pope, so that the president of the Pius societies, A. Wirz, had occasion to complain. In the course of the growing conflict, Wirz pleaded for "the kind of prudent policy following conservative Catholic principles we inherited from our forefathers."[12]

---

[9] T. Schwegler, op. cit., 214; G. Beuret, op. cit., 61.

[10] The Decurtins family is an interesting example of the political differences among the Swiss Catholics. The mother of Kaspar, daughter of the papal General K. A. T. de Latour, was a highly political lady. In Truns, she was the focal point of a liberal club. She was filled with resentment toward her father's former commander-in-chief, Pius IX, and toward the Jesuits. In the canton of Chur, she was the candidate opposing her own son Kaspar, who had been expelled from his liberal student fraternity because of obstinacy and had joined the radical clerical faction, probably out of opposition to his mother (K. Fry I, 17, 41) (G. Beuret, 62–64, an objective, positive assessment of this man who "was looking for allies wherever he could find them" in order to save Catholicism from isolation).

[11] Feigenwinter founded the *Basler Volksblatt* in 1874; T. Schwegler, 229.

[12] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 220.

This was an allusion to the fact that Decurtins and his friends had been founding members of the *Schweizerischer Arbeiterbund*[13] in Aarau, which had a large membership of Social Democrats. For Decurtins, Catholicism was a house with many mansions, and he lived in the "left" wing. Thus he said during the founding ceremonies: "I am ultramontane through and through, but in social questions . . . I am on your side; hunger is neither Catholic nor Protestant."[14] This was certainly intended as a polemic against the Conservatives, who, in social questions, usually joined the moderate liberal Center. (In 1891, the Catholic-Conservative faction was able to bring a Catholic member into the Federal Council, Dr. Joseph Zemp, born in 1834. He was a member until his death in 1908).

In the nineties, the competition between the Pius society, now calling itself *Schweizerischer Katholikenverein,* and *Männer- und Arbeiterverband* increased rapidly. A union of both organizations was rejected. The idea to direct the rural and the conservative urban population toward the *Katholikenverein* and the industrial areas toward the *Männer- und Arbeiterverband*[15] was utopian as well as characteristic. During the meeting of the *Arbeiterverband* in Schaffhausen in 1898, Decurtins presented the plan to transform the Catholic People's Party, established in 1894 in Lucerne, into a socially oriented Catholic Center Party patterned after the German Center Party. His attempt did not succeed. A new initiative emanated from Saint Gall, where, in 1899, Prebendary Johann B. Jung (1861–1922) founded the first *Christlich-soziale Arbeiterverein* and where the first *Christliche Gewerkschaft* was formed. Both organizations were combined in 1903 in the *Zentralverband christlich-sozialer Organisationen,* whose president was Dr. Alois Scheiwiler (1930 bishop of Saint Gall). The *Christliche Gewerkschaften* were interdenominational, though the Protestants were rather in low profile. Starting in 1903, the Christian-social *Zentralverband* spread from east Switzerland throughout the entire Swiss confederation. In 1904, upon Feigenwinter's proposal, the *Katholikenverein* and the *Männer- und Arbeiterverband* were combined. This move was introduced in September 1903 at the first "general" Catholic Convention in Lucerne. In 1905, the *Katholikenverein* counted 40,983 members. Kaspar Decurtins remained stubborn.[16] In a letter from the period of his audience with Pius X (1904)—Decurtins had gained a reputation in Rome for his involvement in the social-political Catholic *Union de Fribourg*—he said: "Reactionaries (by that I mean feudal lords of the large countries, great capitalists, the delegates of the Catholic political powers to the Vatican)" want the Pope "to disavow Christian democracy."[17] After 1906, the Christian social groups in various cantons began to form a political party which cooperated, in spite of differences, with the Conservative People's Party established throughout the cantons in 1912. The separation of church and state proceeded essentially without problems. In the city of Basel the Catholics were compensated with 200,000 francs. They received the status of an association under civil law; the Protestants and Old Catholics fell under the law applying to public bodies—a distinction that was generally made according to the individual cantonal situation. Bishops' conferences took place annually.

---

[13] H. Farner, *Die Geschichte des schweizerischen Arbeiterbundes* (diss., Zurich 1923).

[14] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 96ff.; Beuret classifies the Catholic movement in Switzerland within the total movement of social Catholicism (70–127).

[15] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 223; G. Beuret, op. cit., 128–4.

[16] The conflict within Catholicism was involved with the Swiss Workers' Union, whose existence Decurtins considered very important because he deeply mistrusted the ecclesiastical modus vivendi with the Liberals and expected coverage by the Social Democrats. He furiously defended himself against a vitriolic anticlerical article in the *Arbeiterbund* (K. Fry, op. cit. II, 231ff.). In 1899, in Lucerne, the political and religious

Even though the *Katholische Volksverein* in Switzerland was a relatively weak imitation of the German model, the Swiss Catholics accomplished a goal to which the Germans had aspired in vain: they created a Catholic university. It was established in spite of the misgivings of Bishop Mermillod of Lausanne-Geneva, who desired an independent institution designed after the French *Institutes catholiques.* It was also opposed by the Catholic federalists, except Augustin Egger (bishop of Saint Gall 1882–1906) who finally supported it. Even Leo XIII hesitated, as can be seen by his "cold and short" treatment of the intermediary on 6 June 1889.[18] His behavior was not based upon monetary demands. On 4 November 1889 statesman Georges Python succeeded in prevailing upon the cantonal government in Fribourg to found and finance a department of law and philosophy. Mermillod was absent during its creation. Behind his back, Decurtins traveled to Rome in December 1889 to solve the delicate matter of the theological faculty which Mermillod wanted to have established by the bishops. Python and Decurtins miraculously persuaded President Ruchonnet to have the Pope appoint

---

neutrality of the union was once again affirmed, though it was constantly threatened by the Social Democrats' trade union, which had existed since 1888. On the other hand, the founding of the union in Saint Gall was now called a violation of neutrality. In vain, Decurtins declared at the convention of the union in 1903: "Capitalism does not rest on denominational grounds, it is the same everywhere." The Social Democrats grew more radical under the sign of the class struggle. Isolated from his own friends, Decurtins left the executive committee of the Workers' Union in 1910 (after the general strike of 1918, the Christian-social and Catholic groups separated from the Workers' Union and formed their own organization) (cf. G. Beuret, op. cit., 166–202).

[17] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 249.

[18] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 23.

the professors of the theological faculty from members of the Dominican Order (he was interested in preventing students from studying theology in foreign countries). On 21 January 1890 the Pope gave his approval and donated 100,000 francs and a golden chain for the president. Bishop Mermillod, though still resisting, was appointed cardinal to the Curia. It had not been easy to recruit professors for this university. After a fruitless attempt in Louvain, Decurtins concentrated his efforts especially in Germany, where Gustav Schnürer (a student of Grauert) accepted a position in history. This resulted in 1898 in the "German crisis" at the university: eight professors submitted a collective resignation because they felt encroached upon by Dominican censorship. Decurtins acted rather pompously in this matter and spoke about the German "royal gibberish."[19] The Dominicans' lust for power was proven by the fact that they demanded from the Swiss theology professor J. Beck that he propagate the order's mission. It was necessary to find a replacement in Austria. In 1906 Pius X had occasion to praise the university and the Dominican order for their theological position.

In the battle over reform Catholicism, one should not regard a man like Decurtins as representative of Switzerland, even though Merry del Val supported him and Umberto Benigni spent several weeks in the summer of 1910 in Truns.[20] However, it was no accident that *Hochland* failed to find a favorable climate within Swiss Catholicism. The publications *Vaterland* and *Ostschweiz* rejected Decurtins's efforts, partly because they had grown weary of this man. However, in the *Neue Züricher Nachrichten,* the talented writer Heinrich Federer, under the pseudonym "Senex," sharply condemned the extremely conservative contemporary Catholic literature. He made common cause with Bishop Schmid von Grüneck of Chur, who called Carl Muth a "modernist" when he visited the bishop on the advice of the prior of Einsiedeln.[21]

---

[19] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 68, 74.

[20] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 348. Decurtins, since 1905 professor of cultural history in Fribourg, wrote (during 1907–10) three "letters" against Fogazzaro, Handel-Mazzetti, and the *Hochland,* for which Pius X praised him on 15 September 1910 (K. Fry, op. cit. II, 331). He denounced (theology) Professor Zapletal in vain, because the general of the order intervened (Zapletal was elected president in Fribourg in 1910). When A. Gisler, dogmatics professor in Chur, whose book on Modernism was not acrimonious enough for the "lion from Truns," was publicly exposed in the *Correspondance de Rome,* even the arch-conservative Bishop Georgius Schmid of Grüneck was indignant.

[21] K. Fry, op. cit. II, 235ff. It is a surprising anachronism that Karl Fry in his otherwise deserving book places Albert Ehrhard in the "fifth column" emerging in the Catholic countries.

CHAPTER 5

Italian Catholics between the Vatican and the Quirinal

The *Non expedit* at the Time of Leo XIII

The political and sociological situation in unified Italy did not show any fundamental changes. Attempts were made to adjust to the new institutions, which were very liberal and lay oriented. Suffrage was rather limited: in 1871, of a total population of 25 million, only 600,000 were listed on the register of voters. The parliamentary deputies came from well-to-do social classes, where the different interests of the industrialized North and the rural South clashed. They also did not stand up, to the same extent, for the lay orientation as represented by the state. The Catholics, obedient to the hierarchy, maintained a critical distance from the unified state because it had annexed the Papal State and enacted anti-clerical laws (church marriage was not recognized by civil law; the orders were supressed and their properties confiscated; ecclesiastical welfare organizations were secularized; religious instruction in schools eliminated). In this manner, Catholics declared their solidarity with the protests of the Holy Father and the excommunications imposed by him on the "usurpers". These intransigent Catholics developed their ecclesiastical societies according to the uniform directives formulated by the *Opera dei Congressi e dei Comitati Cattolici;* but, obeying the *Non expedit* of the Vatican, they refrained from political life and election campaigns. With their newspapers, they wanted to be the spokesmen of the "real country," demanding, above all, freedom from want. This was quite in contrast to the "legal country" of the parliament, the government, and government-dependent authorities, which represented only 2 percent of the population due to the electoral system and which were under the influence of Masonic anti-clericalism. Therefore, the "obedient" Catholics were happy with the symptoms of weakness which the new state demonstrated, because they felt it was indicative of its decline. The political development of Italian society and the state, proceeding hand in hand with the economic development, brought about changes precipitated in the Catholic movement through new directives and several new structures.[1]

---

[1] The customary division into periods according to the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X is determined externally in respect to the Roman question and the *Non expedit.* The papal directives should be seen via the forces which were pushing up from below (from the movement) and which gained independence and self-awareness, first on the social level and then in the political field until, in 1919, the nondenominational Italian People's Party ("Partito popolare italiano") was founded.

But there were also the "liberal," "disobedient" Catholics, who disapproved of the lay principles of the state derived from the *Risorgimento.* However, they were of the opinion that this state represented the historical reality to which one needed to adjust. They therefore founded a conservative party in order to support the principles and institutions of the national Catholic traditions in the spirit of loyal cooperation with the official authorities.[2]

Some of the ways in which the open attitude of Pius IX's successor expressed itself were: the fact that he resumed and strengthened diplomatic relations with the states, that he approved and furthered Catholic initiatives in social and political areas, and that he used gestures and words to address the Italian people and their statesmen which were conciliatory or, at least, efforts toward easing the tensions. The *Non expedit,* strongly adhered to in 1886 (participation in political elections was not allowed), was gradually regarded as a tactic in the relations between conscientious Catholics and the national unified state. In 1880 the official *Osservatore Romano* (11 June) was already interpreting the *Non expedit* as an active element, as "preparazione nell'astensione" ("preparation with temperance"). Expanding voting rights to new segments of the population (1882) worried several bishops, such as Bonomelli of Cremona, who feared that the leftists, under the influence of the Freemasons, could be strengthened and that anticlerical politics could be radicalized, unless the voices of the Catholics, excluded through the *Non expedit,* were able to create a countermeasure for the purpose of defending the religious and social order. The Holy See used this as a means to force a solution to the Roman question according to its liking.

On 23 May 1887, Leo XIII chose conciliatory words when he expressed the wish: "May Heaven grant that the desire for peace among all nations which We hold dear to Our hearts will be of value . . . to Italy . . . . For a long time, We have desired security and peace for all Italians and We wished that the disastrous battle with the Roman papacy would finally be terminated without detriment to the legal claims and the dignity of the Apostolic See . . . . We mean to say that the path to harmony is subject to the condition that the Pope not be subjugated to any authority and enjoy absolute and true freedom, as is his right."[3] This declaration received enthusiastic praise and was followed by concrete proposals in the writings of the Benedictine Prior Tosti and ex-Jesuit C.

---

[2] Cf. C. M. Curci, *Il moderno dissidio tra Chiesa e l'Italia considerato in occasione di un fatto recente* (Florence 1878), and A. Stoppani, *Gli intransigenti alla stregua dei fatti vecchi, nuovi e nuovissimi* (Milan 1886).

[3] *Acta Leonis XIII* VII (Rome 1888), 115, quoted from H. Bastgen, *Die Römische Frage. Dokumente and Stimmen* III (Freiburg i. Br. 1919), 43f.

M. Curci. But Minister President Crispi rejected the offer to negotiate and claimed once again that, according to the guarantee law of 1871, a Roman question no longer existed. He was apparently under the influence of the anticlerical political forces, which held a majority in Parliament. Subsequently, Pope Leo returned to his rigid position and demanded the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope and, especially, the return of Rome (15 June 1887).[4] He also disapproved of mediating publications, particularly the "Pensieri d'un prelato italiano" by Bonomelli (1891), which, in March 1889, had appeared anonymously in the "Catholic-national" paper *La rassegna italiana* under the title "Roma, l'Italia e la realtà delle cose."[5]

The directive "preparation with temperance," which exceeded the rather passive and polemical motto "nè eletti nè elettori" ("neither the elected nor the voters"), expressed by the *Osservatore cattolico* of Milan, entertained the idea of prospects for political activities, however remote they might be, and created the division of militant Catholics into three groups: some concentrated on purely religious activities; others waited for an occasion to expand these activities to the political sector; while others turned to social areas. But the Holy See immediately expressed its preference, requesting action in the service of the defense and preservation of the faith, love for one's fellow man, and traditional Christian morality. The Pope adhered to the same opinion Pius IX had expressed in 1877: "The desire for political renovations is a bait cast out by the enemy to divide the Catholic front, because he is afraid of the unity in its intentions and the sanctity of its goals."[6] The arbitration proposals, intended at least partially to restore the Papal State and grant to the Kingdom of Italy the remaining territory, were rejected, even by less sectarian politicians, for instance R. Bonghi, who affirmed Italy's claim to all of Rome. The antiecclesiastical lay legislation also hurt the works of charity, emanating from faith and animated by it. It forced them to be absorbed in congregations of charity, which excluded the pastor and were administered by the community (1890). This happened at a time when Catholics increasingly concentrated their efforts on the administration of congregations for which the *Non expedit* was invalid.

Thus the Italian Catholics were called upon to apply their strength and abilities to religious social activities. For this purpose, the existing organizations were further developed, especially the Catholic youth society, certified in 1886, the *Società della Gioventù cattolica italiana,* which had been joined by the more polemically oriented *Associazione Cattolica per la libertà della Chiesa* of 1866. According to its motto "prayer, action, sacrifice," the association was especially active in the area of piety and edification, following a line which was soon considered "old-fashioned," meaning narrow-minded. Aside from this, Catholic parish committees *(Comitati cattolici parrocchiali)* sprang up (in the northern and central regions of Italy more than in the south), which were religiously active and often joined the traditional confraternities which were not affected by the suspension laws. They referred their members to new areas of activity and bound them more strictly to obedience toward the Pope and the bishops and to solidarity with the protests of the "prisoner of the Vatican." Soon, in Rome, Pavia, Genoa, Milan, and Pisa, Catholic university groups were formed *(Circoli universitari cattolici),* organizations which were to constitute the fertile soil for those whose enthusiasm put them in the forefront. In all these associations, a stronger social sensitivity—the new sign of loyalty to the Catholic faith—was combined with religious activities and strict adherence to ecclesiastical regulations regarding the observance of holidays and fast days. This expressed itself primarily in new institutions, like the "Vincent Conferences" which Ozanam also organized in Italy. A certain militant spirit was included; respect for religious practices and institutions was demanded and their reputation and traditional sphere of activity were defended.

---

[4] *Acta Leonis XIII* op. cit., 134–53.

[5] Cf. C. Bellò, *Geremia Bonomelli* (Brescia 1961), 101–17, and *Dokumente,* 288.

[6] In the letter *Non sine moerore* of 29 January 1877, addressed to the president and the council of the Catholic youth in Italy (*Insegnamenti pontifici.* 4. *Il laicato,* 78–81).

For the purpose of coordinating these parish and diocesan committees, the *Opera dei Congressi e dei comitati cattolici* was added in 1874. Soon this league became the driving and constructive force of the Catholic movement in Italy. In 1884 Leo XIII gave this organization, established under the pontificate of Pius IX, a new structure, which reflected its progress. It was divided into five sections: Organization and Catholic Action, Christian Social Economy, Instruction and Education, Press, Christian Art. Because of the industrial development, which caused the workers to demand social legislation, the second section *(Dell'economia sociale cristiana)* was of special importance. At first it was headed by the Bergamo nobleman Medolago Albani, who did research in social problems. Later on it was led by Giuseppe Toniolo from Veneto, professor at the University of Pisa. Both were active in overcoming the paternalistic orientation of love for one's fellow man and charity. In dealing with liberal and socialist economic theories, Toniolo designed a Christian social program in which he presented the medieval guilds of the Christian past as models of socioeconomic institutions. A *Unione cattolica per gli studi sociale* was responsible for developing and applying this theory according to the examples in France, Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland.

The *Opera dei congressi*—the name implied the annual meetings of the diocesan and regional committees—was supported by the more active parish clergy of northern and central Italy, which was receptive to the call for an organization to defend the faith. It was further aided by the "notables" who followed, according to family traditions and by conviction, the directives of the hierarchy and did not relate to the new political leadership class (landed proprietors, noblemen, independent professionals). The *Opera dei congressi* was also endorsed by the people, especially the rural population, who identified with the Church institutions which were affected by the suspension laws, because they did not see their standard of living improved by the new laws, particularly by the tax laws and the military draft. Therefore, they were willing to lend an open ear to the Pope's protests against the secular state and to agree with them. Thus the *Opera dei congressi* was able to pursue detailed action for the purpose of deepening the consciousness of faith and to inspire the activities of Catholic societies by enforcing and coordinating local diocesan and regional initiatives.

The Catholic movement, stimulated in this fashion, not only made use of the hostile press in the large metropolitan centers of Turin, Milan, Florence, Naples, and Venice, but also in provincial cities like Brescia and Bergamo. The polemics and ridicule of scandals, which resulted in confiscations and law suits, were followed by discussions of the actual problems and the possible solutions according to the principles of the Christian conscience and the institutions inspired by it. The *Osservatore cattolico* of Milan excelled in the critical examination of methods and goals. Its young editor, Filippo Meda, gained more and more influence over the boisterous editor Davide Albertario, who was bold enough to subject even bishops to public criticism.

Aside from Medolago Albani and Toniolo, the following leaders are worthy of mention: G. B. Paganuzzi, born in Veneto, G. Acquaderni of Bologna, G. Radini Tedeschi of Emilia (later bishop of Bergamo), L. Bottini of Lucca, N. Rezzara of Bergamo, G. B. Casoni of Bologna, G. Tovini of Brescia, Giovanni Grosoli of Emilia, and the Jesuit Gaetano Zocchi. They were all strong personalities, firmly rooted in their convictions. Therefore they often had differences of opinion regarding organizational questions, the interpretations of papal decrees, or the selection of the cadre. Most of all, they fought over merging the Catholic movement into the sociopolitical reality of the Italian state under the regime of the *Non expedit.* The new orientation took the sociopolitical efforts of the Catholics north of the Alps as a model and tried resolutely to promote Catholic action in the social and economic area (banks, companies, publishing houses, trade schools, etc.). The encyclical *Rerum novarum* of Leo XIII was cited. This group, however, encountered the opposition of the intransigent wing, which feared infection by the liberal spirit and compromises with the institutions of the secular state.[7] The area most likely to cause controversies between the two positions was the administration of communities and provinces which were open to Catholics. But, as was frequently the case, second ballots were necessary; their elections had to be assured by consultations with other parties. It was the task of the Catholics, voted into these administrations, to protect the primary schools, which were subject to the community, from sectarian and laic influences, to appoint as administrators of charitable institutions men who would respect their religious goals and arrangements regarding church services, and to make sure that the hospitals, especially psychiatric clinics (which were subordinate to the provinces), were staffed with members of religious orders. The need of gaining control in the communities and provinces by appropriate election preparations played an increasingly important role for the Catholic movement in Italy and created emotional tensions.[8]

Along with the intransigents, who strictly adhered to the papal decree forbidding cooperation with the secular state, there were the transigents, who, like the intransigents, relied upon their own religious conscience. They were, however, of the opinion that the interest and the duty of the Church demanded that they not seek refuge in the ghetto, so to speak, and flee the world and its progress in the socioeconomic and political institutions. Instead, they were to delve into the new realities and work from the inside out, in order to bring to bear the motives and forces of the Christian tradition and thus to shape these realities in the Christian spirit. These transigents were partly spiritual heirs of the "New Guelphs," of the first Gioberti, like Cantù and Tosti, and partly confirmed supporters of the liberal Catholicism in accord with the ideas of Montalembert, Lacordaire, Görres, Newman, and Lord Acton. Many of them had shared the patriotic enthusiasm of 1848. They had held political offices in the decade of 1848–59 and in the first years of the Italian kingdom and had thus participated in the *Risorgimento* movement. Some of them, e.g., Lambruschini and Capponi, identified spiritually with Jansenist circles of the early nineteenth century or they advocated the reform programs of A. Rosmini[9] (which were both religious and sociopolitical). They were members of the educated clergy, as for example the natural scientist A. Stoppani; personalities who had a reputation because of their education, their profession, or their wealth, like Alessandro Manzoni, Niccolò Tommaseo, Cesare Cantù; reputable members of one of the two chambers, like Senators Canonica, Lampertico, and Stefano Jacini, mostly Liberal Conservatives who had many supporters, particularly among the middle class. There were also personalities of the hierarchy among the transigents, such as Cardinal Capecelatro of Naples, Cardinal Svampa of Bologna, Bishop Bonomelli of Cremona, and the founder of the institution for the spiritual emigrants, Bishop Scalabrini of Piacenza.[10] The transigents had certain elements of the press at their disposal, among them respected daily papers, such as the Milanese *La lega Lombarda.* They were also heard by papers of the conservative right, like the *Perseveranza,* appearing also in Milan, where they could present the intentions and motives of their "moderate" position compared to the anticlerical radicalism of many proposed laws and several divisions of the state bureaucracy. The numerous faithful Catholics who held offices in the administration, in the military, and in the different branches of government were able to effect a moderate interpretation of the anticlerical laws and apply them appropriately. Moreover, these transigents were in the position of offering their services as arbitrators to the state authorities, to the politicians, and to the public administration. They were also able to negotiate formulas and procedures which made it possible for Vatican-appointed bishops, for instance, to maintain their sees and to receive the appropriate revenue without having to expressly submit to the statute of the guarantee law requiring the *Exequatur* by the government.

---

[7] Significant for this is the publication by the bishop of Fossano, E. Manacorda, *Movimento cattolico, errori democratici e relativi doveri dei sacerdoti* (Fossano 1897).

[8] Cf. M. Belardinelli, "Motivi religiosi nell' attività amministrativa dei cattolici organizzati," *Spirito ed azione del laicato cattolico italiano* I (Padua 1969), 177–214.

[9] Cf. E. Passerin d' Entrèves, "L'eredità della tradizione cattolica risorgimentale," *Aspetti della cultura cattolica dell'età di Leone XIII* (Rome 1961), 235–87.

There were also issues on which the transigents (liberal, middle-of-the-road Catholics) and the intransigents agreed: they both pointed to the necessity of public order; both fought socialism as a sociopolitical doctrine and as an organization devoted to class struggle. The majority of their "notables" came from the same circles, primarily in Piedmont and in certain areas in southern Italy. Both sides respected the monarchy and relations with the personalities of the House of Savoy. Beyond the polemics of the Roman question and the legal regulations, which were to be valid for the ecclesiastical institutions, these common features found expression in the election alliances between clerical and moderate groups. In the administrative elections, they seriously defeated the coalitions of radicals and Socialists and their lay program, for example in Venice, during Cardinal Sarto's patriarchate, and later on even in Rome itself.

During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, in a unified Italy, further crass economic and sociopolitical disparities appeared, not only between the north and the south, but also between the different social classes. The transition from an artisan to an industrial economy, which had to compete with the more productive branches of industry north of the Alps and was largely dependent on their finances, their machines, and their technicians, occasioned constant disquiet and anxiety. The organization of the working class under both the flag of Marxist socialism and the banner of the most radical revolutionary syndicalism, as represented by the anarchist Bakunin, took place even in the rural areas. Strikes, civil unrest, and suppressive measures followed one after another in all parts of the country and found a strong echo in the press. The expansion of suffrage, which in 1882 increased the number of eligible voters from 2 to 10 percent of the population, provided the Socialists, in coalition with the Radicals, representation in parliament. In 1891, the official founding of the Italian Socialist Party took place. Its program represented the demands of the workers, but also contained a lay anticlerical policy. All this favored the draft of a social legislation which was in line with the encyclical *Rerum novarum* and was therefore energetically promoted by the Catholic movement, especially by the Christian Social Economy section of the *Opera dei congressi* and by the *Unione cattolica di Studi sociali,* founded by Tonioli. With this kind of sponsorship, the Catholic societies, in accordance with the demands of the social-political situation, produced new institutions: workers' cafeterias, parish houses, employment agencies, trade schools, societies for mutual assistance, production, credit, and consumer agencies, banks for the support of various professions and institutions, and workers' associations with a union character, which competed with their efforts toward socialistic associations. On the theoretical level, the *Unione cattolica di Studi sociali* formulated in 1894 a "program of Catholics in regard to Socialism" which mirrored the demands and the experiences of the agricultural and industrial world of Lombardy, Emilia, and Tuscany.[11]

---

[10] Cf. chap. 10, n. 4.

All this had an effect on the *Opera dei congressi,* whose organization and program was severely criticized by the young. They insisted that the defensive attitude, the predominantly religious and devotional orientation, the nagging paternalism, and the gap between the secular state and the democratic organizational forms should be abandoned in favor of greater latitude regarding decisions and freedom of movement. Even the *Non expedit* was now open to various interpretations: distance from the secular state meant obligation to an autonomous social and political organization, which obviously had to agree completely with the principles of Christian morality. On the basis of the formula "preparation with temperance," this line was already being presented by the three most active centers of the Catholic movement: in Bergamo with Medolago Albani and the newspaper *L'Eco di Bergamo,* in Milan with Filippo Meda and the *Osservatore cattolico,* in Brescia with G. Tovini, G. Montini and the *Cittadino di Brescia.* This increased the demand for more extensive efforts in the political field. The motives were provided, on the one hand, by the need to insure the socioeconomic principles of the movement in legislation and to enforce social laws which would agree with the Christian maxims of cooperation between the various social classes. The other motive was the need to fight socialism and its associations on their own ground. The contentions between the young and the old (of which the one between the priest Romolo Murri from the Marches and the layman Filippo Meda from Milan stood out in particular) increasingly vitalized the Catholic congresses, with the result that the Vatican more and more emphatically demanded harmony and unity.

---

[11] D. Secco Suardo, *Da Leone XIII a Pio X* (Rome 1967), 20; cf. L. Gerevini, *Democrazia socialista e democrazia cristiana* (Treviso 1899).

In 1898 (the year of war between Spain and the United States) disturbances flared up here and there in Italy because of an increase in bread prices. In Milan, they were violently suppressed with the help of military forces dispatched solely for that purpose. Among other measures, the radical Socialist and Catholic opposition newspapers were suppressed and their editors imprisoned (e.g., Don Albertario, editor of the *Osservatore cattolico,* who was subsequently sentenced by a court in Milan). Thus the year 1898 put the Catholic movement to the test: personalities of the intransigent wing tried to keep their distance from the mass disturbances and their spokesmen and made efforts to restore the Church and Catholicism as guarantors of the existing social order. Therefore, the government in Rome took measures only against some Catholic organizations in the north, not, however, against the presidency of the *Opera dei congressi,* which was still dominated by such socially backward intransigents as Count Paganuzzi. This resulted in rapproachement between the conservative intransigents and the conservative governmental authorities. The young, however, saw in the need of the people an opportunity to attack the "secular hunger state" even more vehemently and were preoccupied with the idea that social action could serve as a springboard for seizing power for the benefit of the masses.

The Holy See took careful note of everything that was going on in the Catholic movement. It was obvious that the Curia harbored differing opinions. Some supported a trend which tolerated or even favored the expansion of Catholic action in the social field and, though with more constraint, even in the political arena. Among them were Cardinals Rampolla and Agliardi and the less eminent Monsignors Gasparri and della Chiesa, who pointed to the model and the accomplishments of the

Catholic movement in Belgium, Germany, Austria, and the United States, and to whom Leo XIII gave ear. But there was also an opposition group (consisting of Cardinals Respighi, Vicar of Rome, and Vives of the Holy Office) which still regarded every political and social action employed to overcome the tensions present in Italy, every instance of cooperation with the existing authorities, and every exploitation of state laws as support of the "Italian revolution," a minimization of the problem of the Roman question, and an undermining of the *Non expedit.* According to their opinion, the *Non expedit* was to be strictly adhered to, so that the Vatican could exert pressure on the Quirinal. Particularly in view of the energetic demands from outside their ranks (meaning the laity), these opponents of the movement liked to point to the fact that quite a few bishops rejected it also. The Holy See and Pope Leo XIII himself were frequently asked by the activists of both persuasions, the conservatives and the progressives, to intervene. They were supposed to approve the program of one of the parties and to condemn the principles and proponents of the opposing party. This often caused embarrassment for the men in the Vatican. They preferred to confine themselves to the confirmation of general directives and to the admonishment to activity in the spirit of harmony.[12]

That very year, 1898, a new leader of the Catholic movement appeared with the publication *Cultura sociale,* which was intended to be for the Italian Catholics what the *Neue Zeit* represented for the German Socialists. This leader was Don Romolo Murri. Born in August 1870, he received his doctorate in theology from the Università Gregoriana in Rome and founded the Catholic university circle there in 1894. But soon he extended his activities to the social field. He remained intransigent in regard to the Roman question, considering it a symptom of the deep schism between the Christian and the modern "heathen and materialistic" concept of life and culture. The contrast between the dome of Saint Peter's Basilica and the tricolors upon the Quirinal were for him the "sign of conflict between two different and mutually antagonistic cultures," "the secret of the inner history and the future of the Church."[13] With this statement, he removed himself from Filippo Meda as well and he recommended fighting the liberal, secular state to the bitter end. The boycott of the ballot boxes was, therefore, not just an act of obedience toward the Pope, but also the conscious rejection of the freedom-persecuting state.

---

[12] D. Secco Suardo, op. cit., 72ff.

[13] "Cultura sociale," 16 September 1898. On the circumstances, cf. F. Fonzi, "Dall'intransigentismo alla democrazia cristiana," *Aspetti della cultura . . .*, op. cit., 323–88.

Murri's general promotion of social action was close to Toniolo's heart. Yet Murri's call for autonomy was more urgent and he demanded the expansion of social programs in the area of politics, suffrage, and legislation. Thus, the demands for autonomous action in the spirit of a "Christian democracy" were voiced more and more at the congresses of the *Opera dei congressi* in Milan (1897), Ferrara (1899), and Taranto (1901). It encountered vehement reactions by the individuals and currents which, in this ferment, were forced to reformulate their motives and forge new alliances, not only in the central, but also in the regional diocesan and local committees and related organizations. There were passionate controversies concerning the expansion of the Christian democratic action programs, the priority of political-religious questions versus the social question, the opportunism of preparing for a political life, the right of the Holy See to intervene in political and social matters, the question of whether it is prudent to separate the Catholic action, dependent on the hierarchy, from the political action of a Catholic party, and the autonomy of the democratic movement."[14]

At stake was the traditional domination of Paganuzzi, Medolago Albani, and both Scottons from Venetia, who were all in contact with militant groups in Venetia, Lombardy, Piedmont, Tuscany, and Rome. In 1899, a Christian democratic union *(Fascio democratico cristiano)* was formed in Milan, and in Turin an "action program" containing twelve points was formulated outside of the *Opera dei congressi.* They all referred to the papal decrees, the *Rerum novarum* and the subsequent "instructions." They interpreted them as they saw fit and mobilized their friends in high Vatican circles to have their program confirmed.

From within the Congregation for Special Church Affairs, Leo XIII appointed a "permanent commission to regulate the Catholic movement in Italy" and entrusted it with the task of examining the many documents pertaining to the presidency of the *Opera dei congressi,* to its various sections, the subgroups, and the numerous bishops who had expressed their need for help and had asked for directives. The main point of controversy was "Christian democracy" as a name and a program. It was typical for the methods of Leo XIII that he was able to assert his already clearly defined decision. Basically, he was siding with the young, in whom he saw vital energies of the Church. But even though he approved and recommended the social action arising from below, "he was intent on having the inspiration and coordination filter down from above, from his will."[15] With a view toward the German model of the *Volksverein* and the Catholic Center in the German *Reichstag,* Agliardi and Gasparri intervened with the Pope on behalf of Murri.

---

[14] A. Gambasin, *Il movimento sociale nell'Opera dei Congressi (1874–1904)* (Rome 1958), 467.

[15] D. Secco Suardo, op. cit., 126.

In this manner, Leo XIII prepared his intervention, followed by the encyclical *Graves de communi* (18 January 1901).[16] With reference to *Rerum novarum,* his circular letter insisted that the action of the Catholics proceed in unity, to the exclusion of all politics, in conjunction with a central organization, and in submission to the Pope and the bishops, who had the right to take practical measures "according to the local and personal situations." In the "fundamental theoretical and practical points", which were to be publicized among the people, the following was declared: "Christian democracy shall not have any political significance; it advocates the welfare of the lower classes, but also pays attention to the upper classes; it does not support plans for insubordination and opposition to public authority; rather, it proposes to put all its energies into easing the hard lot of the manual laborers, gradually enabling them to provide their own livelihood."[17]

One of the directives, which was enacted by the Congress of Taranto (1901), demanded the granting of greater latitude to the young and their inclusion in the social initiatives of men like Medolago Albani, Toniolo, Radini Tedeschi, and Rezzara. This demand alarmed the still powerful group of the older generation who took up a position behind the customary loyalty to the Pope and were opposed to innovations. The new statutes of 1901 still required abstinence from politics. Therefore, Murri's initiatives seemed at least inopportune and were deleted by Cardinals Vives y Tutó and Respighi, who were entrusted with formulating the program of the second section on Christian charity and social economics.

The success of the movement's social and religious action, which enforced the people's loyalty to the Pope, affected the people's conscience and procured more political impact for the movement. This provided the Vatican with greater influence on the Italian government. In December 1901, as a result of its concern for public order, the government proceeded toward a policy of exceptive laws, which both the socialist radicals and the younger members of the Catholic movement rejected with determination.

Leo XIII's attempts to mediate between the various factions of the Catholic movement in order to preserve unity and identity encountered difficulties. The customary compliancy toward the Pope was not able to break the opposition of the conservatively inclined older generation, who tried to justify the existing economic and social order by referring to the events of 1898. They alluded essentially to paternalistic motivations, since they were only concerned with love and charity. The boisterous younger generation, on the other hand, was reluctant to adhere to the institutions organized and ruled from above. Inspired by Murri, they undermined the homogeneous structure of the *Opera dei congressi,* which was less and less representative of the Catholic movement in Italy. Pius X was to experience this and to institute a change which would seal the demise of the congressional organization.

---

[16] Italian text in *Insegnamenti pontifici. 4. Il laicato,* 171–94.

[17] D. Secco Suardo, op. cit., 135–136.

CHAPTER 6

The Failure to Reconcile Catholics and the Republic in France

The Ecclesiastical Policy of the Republicans

During the enthronement of Leo XIII, everything indicated that the existence of the Republic in France, formed in 1875 under such tremendous difficulties, was secure. The elections of 1876 brought a Republican majority into parliament which held 64 percent of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Moreover, the failure of the *coup de main* of 16 May 1877, shortly before the papal elections, was a successful prologue to the take-over of the provincial diets and the offices of the mayors. These victories of Gambetta's friends were bound to be followed by the overthrow of the senate majority in January 1879 and by the massive invasion of a group of deputies who held, after the elections in the summer of 1881, 83.6 percent of the seats. In the following years, the government successfully survived an economic crisis and an attack by the Boulangists. But now, the Church leaders had to recognize that it would be prudent to come to an understanding with a Republic on whose demise they could not count.

The Republicans, in turn, were eager to secure their election victory through a "republicanization" of the upper administration (e.g., the State Council and the large institutions, the army and the judiciary). The Catholic Church was especially affected by this policy of the "Republican defensive" in view of the farspread social influence which it had gained through preaching and charity, through its schools and, most of all, through the religious orders. This impact was feared by the leaders of the Republican majority, and therefore they placed systematic secularization of public life at the top of their ideological and political program. During the budget debate of 1877, V. Guichard presented this plan in his report, and consequently a fund was provided to finance an investigation into the significance of the orders. This investigation was carried out in 1878. It showed that the total number of order members amounted to at least 30,000, among them 3,350 Jesuits. The congregations of women included about 128,000 persons who cared for approximately 16,500 girls schools. There were three times as many religious priests as secular ones, and it was discovered that this number approximated that of 1765, when the number of religious priests had peaked in the eighteenth century. Most of the congregations were not legally authorized.[1] This explains why, on 15 May 1879, the Minister of Education Jules Ferry supplemented his bill regarding the introduction of a generally obligatory, secular primary education with ARTICLE 7, which prohibited the nonauthorized congregations from any kind of instruction. It also explains why he enforced this prohibition through appropriate decrees, at first directed against the Jesuits, who were expelled in 1880, and then, in the following November, also directed against the other nonauthorized male congregations.

The struggle between the Republic and the Church erupted most vehemently over the issues of religious orders and schools. The bishops, in turn, waged a campaign against the laicization of elementary education, which was resolved on 28 March 1882, and against the cancellation of payment in connection with the abolition of official manuals for public instruction (Louis Capéran). But in many other areas, religious demonstrations in public were forbidden or strictly regulated. Processions, preaching, lay societies, courts, hospitals, and cemeteries were supervised, and the Magnet Law regarding divorce was finally passed after intensive debates (19 July 1884). The cardinals of Rouen and Paris declared in festive *Observations* (1 June 1882) "that more than twenty bills regarding the regulation of religion had been proposed." Bishop-Deputy Freppel before the Parliament defended the rights of the Church pertaining to this legislation, concluding with the exclamation: "Separation, that is your goal. Yesterday it was the separation of Church and school, today it is the separation of parish and congregation, tomorrow or the day after tomorrow it will be the separation of Church and state (enthusiastic applause on the left). Always and everywhere separations."[2]

The aim of such a policy was, in fact, the suspension of the concordat. Separation had already been the main theme of the election campaign in the summer of 1881, and, when the two chambers were combined, Paul Bert introduced a bill, reiterating the proposals of four deputies who had also demanded the dissolution of the concordat. Those responsible for Republican policies, however, hesitated to make this extreme move. Ferry especially adhered to a concordat policy which, in June 1879, he had called "a strict application of the treaty of 1801 and which was to satisfy everything and to secure a rigorous defense of the rights of the state."

---

[1] In September 1880, the Secretary of the treasury estimated the estates of the orders to be 628 million francs, which appears to be rather exaggerated.

[2] Chambre des Députés, meeting of 5 November 1883 (*Journal Officiel,* 6 November 1883).

This caution resulted from an analysis of the country's religious and political situation deduced from the three important series of reports[3] which were demanded by the prefects and the attorneys general in the years 1879, 1881, and 1888. They clarified the very obvious regional differences in the religious practices in urban areas, which, from the vicinity of Paris, extended toward the north up to Normandy and to the northern and northeastern region bordering the Central Mountains and which were characterized by increasing separation from the Church; as well as in the wooded and mountainous rural areas (Lyon and the eastern border of the Central Mountains, the Savoy Alps, etc.), where a general religious practice continued to dominate. In addition, the reports listed a stronger tendency for separation in the areas bordering the *departements* Yonne, Sâone-et-Loire, and, above all, in the Mediterranean region from Narbonne to Nice. This separation rarely affected the religious situation directly, and even in the most de-Christianized areas, as in Haute-Vienne, religious practices continued. Among the peasants, there was a general and widespread mistrust of the priests' meddling in the political and social arena, and of everything conventionally called the "government of priests." This mistrust existed even in the most devout areas. It increased according to the extent to which the clergy itself demonstrated through remarks and behavior that it was intransigent, generally in southern areas. In the vicinity of the bishops' sees, the reports often detected a social class with such intransigent and vehemently anti-Republican sentiments, where the lay dignitaries and society ladies were competing with each other. These groups were often under the leadership of the respective vicar general, who, simply on the basis of his age, often controlled large elements of the clergy. They were also able to make themselves heard in the *Semaines religieuses,*[4] and were intent on exerting direct influence on the leadership of the dioceses. The only authority which these circles obeyed and which was able to suppress the opposition of the clergy was the bishop, mainly through the full powers of authority which the concordat had bestowed upon him. This was the reason why the government had conceded special importance to the figure of the bishop and the role he could play as a mediating factor. The prefect emphatically pointed out the advantages of a direct agreement with the bishop in order to avoid unpleasant incidents. This was especially true in the southwest, Cahors, the territories with a strong Protestant minority (e.g., Nîmes), and in the mountain areas like the Hautes-Alpes, where Monsignor Guilbert had imposed on the clergy in Gap his views about the necessity of a religious activity free of any political claims (1876). For dioceses where the clerical opposition could possibly increase, the responsible agencies of the Republic systematically appointed bishops who were interested in a settlement, (e.g., Guilbert in Amiens, later in Bordeaux; Meignan in Arras, later in Tours). The reports finally showed that alongside the priests in Mayenne who were strongly influenced by the nobility, a new generation of priests was growing from among the lower clergy, mainly in the western parts of the country, who were conciliatory and Republican like Abbé Frémont, a well-known priest from Poitou, whose diary was then being published.[5] In the poorest areas, the intransigence of the clergy was moderated by the traditional high esteem for the ruling authority, which, in the eyes of the people, was the guarantor of an ordered life and of respect for the individual.

---

[3] The reports are preserved in the *Archives Nationales* (F 19. 5610). They were analyzed by L. Capéran, *Histoire contemporaine de la laïcité française* II (Paris 1959), 157, and by J. Gadille, *La pensée and l'action politiques des évêques français* . . . I (Paris 1967), 144 (cf. especially the map in this work).

[4] Cf. H. Sempér, "Propagande et action catholiques dans le seconde moitié du XIX^{e} s. et au debut du XX^{e} s., "*La Semaine religieuse de Toulouse;* coll.: *Publications de l'Université de Toulouse-Le-Mirail* (Toulouse 1973); H. Taine, *Les Origines de la France contemporaine: Le regime moderne* II (Paris 1894), 80.

Thus the concordat treaty continued to be firmly rooted in the political reality of the country, in the almost universal loyalty of the peasantry toward their religion, and in the desire of a certain segment of the upper and the lower clergy to be cooperative. The Republicans were aware of this fact, especially the prefects, who were much closer to the daily realities of life, and who condemned the radical candidates' demands for a separation as utopian. "One of our representatives, a confirmed advocate of the separation, explained to me that he had arrived at the conviction that the majority of his voters did not agree with the separation . . .," wrote the prefect of Jura in December 1885 to the minister. In response to Ernest Renan, who in November 1881 had developed the idea of a separation of the two powers in modern society, Paul Cambon wrote that the Republic should not deprive itself of this indispensable instrument of control which the decrees of the concordat provided: "Dominating or dominated—there is no middle of the road for the Catholic Church."[6]

---

[5] A. Siegfried, *L'abbé Frémont* (1852–1912), two vol. (Paris 1932).

[6] Prefect of Jura with the powers of a secretary, 31 December 1885 (*Archives Nationales*, F 19. 2576) (Renan, *Corr.* II [Paris 1924], 215–18, and Cambon, *Corr.* I [Paris 1905], 139–40).

This attitude was clearly expressed in the arguments which the government presented in May 1882 to the Concordat Commission formed under the chairmanship of Paul Bert. This commission was entrusted with the examination of all proposals by the extreme left regarding the suspension of the concordat. Paul Bert himself asked them to consider that the clergy, due to their influence on society, would regain their estates and means of action immediately after the separation, and that it would intensify their demands for support by the people, whose discontent could easily turn against the Republic. "Consequently, one would gain all the disadvantages of the separation, but none of the advantages." Thus, various reasons existed for the objections to the separation. The government, however, announced that it would reject every new demand for a reduction of the budget for cultural affairs. It even went so far as to disapprove of Paul Bert's plan for the future. The government wanted to preserve the concordat in letter and in spirit.[7]

Thus the French found themselves in the paradoxical situation of having to deal with two powers which, in theory, had opposing political and philosophical principles, but, in practice, made efforts to bring about a reconciliation. In spite of those representatives of the Republican state and the Church who regarded the separation as inevitable, both parties had one interest in common: preventing the break as long as possible. Thus this alliance was only a temporary endeavor based upon expediency and de facto situation, a weak base, which was threatened as soon as the conflicts were stronger than the desire to agree.[8]

The Politics of Reconciliation (1878–92)

The further development in the relations between the two powers was also subject to fluctuations which were based upon both French domestic politics and the opposing influences within the Curia which affected Leo XIII. In the first period, embracing the years 1878–90, politics was marked by mutual efforts to avoid alienation. The French government and especially the Foreign Office made attempts at the Vatican to diminish the significance of anticlerical pronouncements and the majority's legislation. The kind of politics which part of the Concordat Commission expressed in their definite rejection of the desire for separation asserted itself on every occasion. In the spring and summer of 1880, attempts were made to incite the congregations' political declaration of loyalty, which would have limited the application of ARTICLE 7 and thus allowed a reduction of expatriations. After the enactment of the law of March 1882, pertaining to obligatory and laicized elementary instruction, Jules Ferry's pronouncements defined the neutrality of schools in a way which paid respect to the freedom of conscience. The government tried to negotiate the cancellations of salaries which it had ratified after the incidents regarding the manuals for state instruction. Finally, the government seized every opportunity to emphasize that it was willing to pay a certain price to prove that its foreign policy served the defense of the Catholic interests. While Archbishop Charles de Lavigerie of Algeria, appointed cardinal in 1882, was working in Tunisia, the Near East, and in Africa, his activities were determined by this perspective. This also explains his equally great influence in the Vatican and at the Quai d'Orsay.

---

[7] Cf. L. Capéran, op. cit. III (Paris 1960), 135–41.

[8] Regarding Church politics between 1891 and 1902, cf. J.-M. Larkin, "The Church and the French Concordat, 1891 to 1902," *EHR* (Oct. 1966), 717–39.

The Holy See and the ecclesiastical hierarchy were intent on preventing the defense of the Church's rights against the anticlerical laws from developing into an open opposition to overall policies. In this respect, Leo XIII's efforts to keep the ultramontane press in check and to counterbalance it with the "liberal" press were of great importance. So was his attempt to tie the leadership of the Church once again closer to a responsible hierarchy. On every occasion, the Pope protected the Nuncios Czacki and di Rende against the attacks of the intransigent Catholics. He did the same for those bishops who championed the policy of reconciliation, for example, Monsignor Louis Édouard Pie and Henri Bellot des Minières,[9] the successor to Cardinal Pie in Poitiers. He advised the French Catholics to resist only when it was a question of conscience. In this manner, he created conditions for solving serious controversies by way of negotiations, as in the case of the conflict regarding education, which would have otherwise resulted in a break.

When the elections of October 1885 seemed to offer a favorable chance for the formation of a Catholic party, Leo XIII expressed himself negatively, because the well-known statements of its main advocate, Albert de Mun, would have, without doubt, stamped the party with an anti-Republican imprint. In 1889, the Pope, encouraged by French domestic politics and the international situation, believed that the time had come amicably to conclude his policy of reconciliation with France. To be sure, a law had been passed that same year which obligated the seminarians to serve one year of military duty. On the other hand, this was also the year of failure for Boulanger's politics and of a truce in the controversy. The philosophy of Henri Bergson, "*Les données immédiates de la conscience,*" and the literary prose by E. M. de Vogüé and Paul Bourget had undergone a spiritual renaissance. Finally, the Holy See felt that the policy of coalition within the Triple Alliance made the need for close cooperation even more urgent. Leo XIII requested Monsignor Domenico Ferrata, whom he appointed nuncio to Paris in June 1891, to report to him personally about the state of these efforts. Called upon for comment, the cardinals of Paris, Lyon, and Rennes declared that they were not competent. It took no less than five appeals until Cardinal Charles de Lavigerie, in October 1890, was willing to deliver a declaration, ignoring the dangers which such an involvement entailed for his missionary work. When, on 12 November 1890, he received the officers of the Mediterranean fleet in Algeria, he proposed a toast to the French navy, suggesting to the French Catholics the "unconditional acceptance of the Republic," and added that "they would surely not have to experience the disapproval of any authority as a consequence." Rome endorsed this viewpoint only semiofficially, and Leo XIII let fifteen months pass before he expressed himself similarly in his encyclical *Au milieu des sollicitudes* of 17 February 1892, following a brief to the French cardinals on 3 May 1891. This hesitation can certainly be explained by the cool reception with which the leaders of French Catholicism responded to the papal attitude.

---

[9] J. B. Woodall, "Henri Bellot des Minières . . .", *CHR* (1952).

The term *Ralliement* had a different significance in the deliberations for Leo XIII and for the French Catholics. For the Pope, in line with his "political" encyclicals of 1881, 1885, and 1888, it was not at all a question of "baptizing" the Republic, but rather of accepting this government as a tool to re-Christianize legislation and the social institutions. For him, it was also not a question of founding a Catholic party, but rather of combining the Catholics of all persuasions and the Republicans in one comprehensive conservative union. This union, with the parliamentary power it represented, was to contribute to re-Christianization within its constituency. Such a concept, however, was difficult to accept for the majority of the bishops and the leading lay representatives of the Catholic public. The tradition of the "religious defensive," which they embraced, compelled them rather to form a Catholic party. In it, all were to come together who were concerned with the defense of the Church and who would not be readily willing to abandon the anti-Republican conviction from which they drew the strength to act. From this position arose the *Union de la France chrétienne,* which was founded in April 1891 by Charles Chesnelong, Lucien Brun, and Émile Keller and which refused the succession to Charles de Lavigerie, archbishop of Algeria.

In the Catholic public, however, the pressure in favor of the policy of the "toast" became more and more noticeable. Several bishops, e.g., Cardinal Adolphe Perraud, had already taken such a position; and some newspapers and individual groups from Paris and Bordeaux were working toward a reconciliation. The appearance of *Rerum novarum,* primarily, introduced a change in the political attitude of the Catholics. The existence of groups which had formed years ago and wanted to take the same path of social action accounts for the response which this encyclical encountered. Among them was the *Association Catholique de la jeunesse française* (ACJF), which, under the leadership of Albert de Mun, was able to fill even part of the aristocracy with enthusiasm and, above all, the committees which had been established by the newspaper *La Croix* since 1887. In Paris, almost seven hundred of these committees were combined under one general office (1891). With the help of these committees, Abbé Théodore Granier awakened the interest of the Catholic public to the fate of the workers and farmers, which created the foundation for a union which was constituted in 1892 as the *Union Nationale.* At this time, Catholics like Émile Duport and Louis Durand founded cooperative societies for farmers in the area of Lyon.

The Pursuit and the Failure of Reconciliation

(1892–99)

At the time when Leo XIII commented on the occurrences in France, the voices within the Catholic public, for the reasons already known, had become more conciliatory. The intransigent wing of the newspaper *L'Univers* defected and founded the paper *La Vérité.* On 12 May 1892 the *Assemblée des Catholiques* dissolved the *Union de la France chrétienne.* Two of their most important leaders, Albert de Mun and Armand Mackau, joined the *Ralliement,* ignoring the criticism of their friends from the monarchic right. The moderation of these men during the Panama crisis and during the anarchist crisis was received by the Republicans with satisfaction, and they gave their official approval to this policy. Everything seemed to indicate that the reconciliation would be confirmed by the people's vote at the elections in August 1893.

These elections, however, turned out to be a disappointment. Only about thirty advocates of *Ralliement* were elected, and not one of the Catholic leaders who had so courageously expressed their opinion was among them. The reason for this may lie in the fact that they had not succeeded in agreeing on a parliamentary level, which would have enabled them to form a "unified front" in the election campaign. Earlier Jacques Piou, a deputy from Anjou, had formulated the reconciliation in its most comprehensive form, terming it the "constitutional right." But Albert de Mun, leader of the *Association Catholique de la jeunesse Française* wanted primarily to stress the common denominator of Catholicism in regard to the constitutional engagement of the *Ralliement,* and he opposed the ACJF to the Catholic League. Another deputy, Étienne Lamy, supported by several liberal Catholics mainly from the southwest of the country, finally began paving the way to the moderate Republicans through the Catholic League. There was no election coalition between the two groups, and even after the election, no link could guarantee the cohesion between the various groups of the *Ralliement.* They divided and dispersed, joining the various factions of the Chamber, and (since their leader did not belong to the Chamber and they were without help) were finally absorbed by the moderate majority which, at the time of Minister Jules Meline, enjoyed relative stability. "We needed a French Windthorst," Lecanuet said.

After the failure of the attempt of 1893, there was no more hope for the success of a policy which aimed at a parliamentary coalition. Thus a second phase began, during which, in view of the impending elections of 1898, the reconciliation was to take place on the stage of public opinion. This phase was, indeed, the great time of the "second Christian democracy." Representative of this trend was a group of young clergymen who tried to create new possibilities for pastoral work (Abbé Charles Calippe; clergy congresses in Rheims in 1896 and Bourges in 1900). They recognized the political power of their apostolic involvement. Fruits of their work were the organization of congresses for the Christian Democrats, the first of which took place in May 1903 in Rheims, and the founding of newspapers like *La Justice sociale* by Abbé Paul Naudet in Bordeaux, *Le Peuple française* by Abbé Théodore Garnier, and *La Démocratie chrétienne,* which appeared until 1908 under the editorial leadership of Abbé Paul Six. In September 1893, in the northern area of Hazebrouck, one of these democratic clergymen, Jules Auguste Lemire, was elected in place of a respected Catholic. This election was an example of the awakening of the Republican consciousness of a large part of the clergy and the farmers of this area marked by Christian faith.[10] Through this mandate, Lemire became the leader of the Christian Democrats, even though this movement had emerged from a series of individual initiatives which were neither carried by a substantial desire for coordination nor by a strong support through the episcopate. Their centers were in the north, where there was a connection to the Belgian Catholic social movement, and in the area of Lyon close to the *Chronique du Sud-Est* (V. Berne, M. Gonin, L. Crétinon). The impact of this newspaper extended over the *departements* of Ain, Loire, and Ardèche and into the Mediterranean area, where Abbé Sahut founded a paper in Montpellier with the significant title *La sociologie catholique.*[11] Another active center existed in the area around Bordeaux. From 1894 until 1898, annual congresses took place in Rheims, Paris, and Lyon, where the representatives of the young clergy and the lower middle class met. Simultaneously, and often in connection with the Christian Democrats, the local boards of the newspaper *La Croix,* whose owners were Assumptionists, reached the peak of their development in the year 1895 with 3,000 local subsidiaries. The great number of local editions of *La Croix* (approximately 100 in 1897) and its wide circulation, which secured a total of almost 700,000 issues, made this press organ an important support of these committees. *La Croix* did also reach the middle classes, but mainly the lower middle class, the workers, and the rural population. Having the same basis as the Christian Democrats and the ACJF, the members of these committees insisted on a definite political engagement. At a congress held in 1895 an election committee of *La Croix* was formed under the name *Comité Justice-Égalité.*

---

[10] J.-M. Mayeur, *Un prêtre démocrate, l'abbé Lemire (1853–1928)* (Paris 1968), 133. This election has to be seen in connection with the election of Abbé Hippolyte Gayraud, who was elected in Brittany in 1897, another area determined by the Christian spirit. The election of Gayraud attracted even more attention because he competed with Msgr. Maurice d'Hulst, a member of the higher clergy. After being declared invalid, the election was finally confirmed.

Now the congresses of the Christian Democrats, in turn, founded an election federation in Rheims (1896) and Lyon (1897). It was actually a question of organizing all those groups, which had grown rapidly since 1890, and of placing them under a common leadership while preserving a certain autonomy. The man who took the leadership was Étienne Lamy. Cardinal Rampolla had asked him in March 1896 to take on this task. Unfortunately, the influence of the *Comité Justice-Égalité* and the Assumptionists' authority, which was in control of the *Bonne Presse,* was much stronger, and the election federation of the Christian Democrats was unable to bring the Catholics to back their plan of endorsing a promising moderate Republican. On the contrary, the various political factions of the Catholics often fought against each other, a fact which was finally put to good use by a radical candidate. Lamy himself refused the candidacy because he would not have been able to find a constituency. The elections of May 1898 resulted in the same failure of the *Ralliement* as the elections of 1893. To be sure, the number of elected representatives of the *Ralliement* was larger now (seventy-six), but the majority of the "moderates" decreased correspondingly. This fact was confirmed on 14 June of the following year, when they succeeded, with the help of a majority, to henceforth exclude the representatives of the *Ralliement* from the governing coalition. The following months brought the end for the federation and the decline of "Christian democracy" in France.

Very much to the disadvantage of the "new spirit," there continued to be considerable sources of tension between the Catholics and the Republicans. They were passionately nurtured by the readers of *La Croix.* Two points were of importance: the government of Alexandre Ribot had imposed additional taxes on the religious congregations, the so-called *Abonnement,* which had incited a wave of protest. Primarily, as Capéran demonstrated, it was anti-Semitism which provoked the Catholic masses against the Republic. Édouard Drumont charged the Republic with being in the grip of a "Jewish-Masonic" conspiracy, which was sneaking into the higher ranks of the military, thus threatening religious values and national integrity. This partly explains why the revision of the sentence for the Jewish Captain Dreyfus, attaché in the War Ministry, had drawn such attention from the public. Dreyfus had been falsely accused of delivering military secrets to Germany and, in 1894, had been sentenced to deportation for life. The episcopate did practice noteworthy constraint in this affair; but this cannot be said about the lower clergy and the masses of Catholics, among whom only a small minority courageously confessed to be *"dreyfusards."* Recent research has shown that Edouard Drumont's articles in the newspaper *Libre Parole* had found an undeniable echo in Catholic circles, and that the anti-Semitism of *La Croix* was indeed of a different nature, but nonetheless very real. The newspaper unconditionally took the side of the army when, in 1899, heated debate flared up about the trial of the Court of Justice of Rennes. Even among the Christian Democrats anti-Semitism was strongly represented. Also people like Abbé Hippolyte Gayraud confessed to it, and the agenda of the congresses carried the mark of an exaggerated assessment of the national beliefs and the condemnation of "anti-French and anti-Christian Jewish intrigues." This is proven by the fact that Cardinal Pierre Coullié, the archbishop of Lyon, on the occasion of the congresses in Lyon in 1896 and 1897, warned his clergy of such programmatic terminology, which he believed to be contradictory to the Christian spirit, and that he himself denounced any participation.

---

[11] G. Cholvy, *Géographie religieuse de l'Hérault contemporain* (Paris 1968), 386.

The nationalistic excesses in the spring of 1899 turned against the person of President Émile Loubet. That was not unexpected, since a coalition had been formed in Parliament whose anti-clerical program was directed against the religious congregations. It was the motto of the "Republican concentration" which achieved a majority for Pierre Waldeck-Rousseau on 26 June. Their Republican leaders did not hesitate to blame the Catholics' intrigues for the sentence which prevented Dreyfus' acquittal in August and resulted merely in a reduction of his punishment. In November, the houses of the Assumptionists in Paris and the offices of *La Croix* were subject to a police search. The suppression of the Assumptionists, following a trial in the District Court, and

Leo XIII's decision to deprive them of the direction of the *Bonne Presse* have to be seen in the context of the influence they had had in the previous ten years. The Assumptionists were the first religious congregation to be affected by the measures which finally led to the separation of Church and state.

Now the Republic returned to its policy of persecution, which, in the eyes of the general Catholic public, it had never completely given up. This poses the question of whether French Catholicism in its majority was ever really ready for reconciliation. The anti-Semitic wave and the corresponding press propaganda allow the conclusion that the Catholic population itself was, to a large extent, responsible for the failure of the reconciliatory efforts by causing an anticlerical feeling within the committees and the administration of the Republicans.

CHAPTER 7

On the Road to Conservatism: Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg

Belgium

Around the turn of the century, thanks to the constitution of 1831, Belgian Catholicism had been able to flourish so intensely that Belgium was practically a Catholic country, at least in regard to the classical arena of struggle against liberalism: the school system. This constitutional reality, however, deviating from the liberal statutes, was endangered. The ecclesiastical circles, on the one hand, regarded the political status quo merely as an opportunity; and the Liberals, on the other hand, forgot the time of common resistance to the Dutch Monarchy and reacted with increasing anticlericalism. There were also indications of considerable differences between the agrarian and the early industrial areas, between the Flemish and the Walloon areas regarding religious practices. The radical-liberal government of Rogier and Frère-Orban (1857–70) was overthrown because the powerful Catholic congressional movement, organized by the laity, was also politically transformed, and the domestic differences within Catholicism pertaining to the question of the constitution could temporarily be settled.

But the conflict continued to intensify. The head of the Catholic constitutional opponents was economist Charles Périn (1815–1905) of Louvain, who, in the area of economics, represented a mixture of liberalism and moral patronage and strongly influenced the group around Bishop Freppel in Angers.[1] Van Humbeeck, who was the minister of Cultural Affairs in the radical-liberal government of Frère-Orban, which had come to power in 1878, coined the phrase: "Un cadavre est sur la terre, il barre la route au progrès . . . le cadavre du passé—c'est le catholicisme."[2] Pope Leo XIII, who was familiar with the Belgian circumstances through his nunciature (1843–46), believed, when taking office, that peace could be preserved in Belgium. After the June 1878 election victory of the Liberals, he still tried to prevent an intensification of the situation, while requesting respect for the constitution. The good wishes of Secretary of State Nina for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the newspaper *Le Bien Public* (published since 1853), which followed an intransigent ultramontane course, was played off against papal politics and had to be interpreted.[3] A pastoral letter by the Belgian episcopate in December, quite contrary to the intentions of Leo XIII, was composed in a sharp tone, which coincided with the belligerent attitude of Archbishop Victor-Auguste Dechamps of Mechelen (archbishop since 1867, cardinal since 1875), who had also intervened in the German *Kulturkampf.* On 10 July 1879 the law regarding nondenominational elementary schools was enacted, followed by a law pertaining to public secondary and high schools. The Belgian bishops excommunicated those parents who sent their children to public elementary schools and did the same to teachers who taught there. In vain the Pope attempted moderation. A papal letter to Dechamps of 2 April 1880 finally recognized the attitude of the episcopate, which Leo could not disavow. But since he had promised the Belgian ambassador to the Vatican a compromise, the government felt deceived and broke off diplomatic relations in June 1880.

The school laws were simply a failure, especially in Flanders. By the end of 1880, 580,680 children went to free Catholic schools and only 333,401 to public schools, which were being increased to no purpose. The ecclesiastical sanctions against the communal school system could usually anticipate religious obedience and willingness to make sacrifices (e.g., dismissal of civil servants). The people also complained about the financial burdens which were the consequence of the state's rather irrational school policies.[4] In the elections of 10 June 1884 the Liberals suffered a devastating defeat, which was to be a determining factor for a long time to come. On 20 September 1884 the minister of Cultural Affairs, Charles Woeste, tried to thoroughly revise the school law of 1879, but President Beernaert (1884–94) solved the controversy, which had badly shaken the Belgian public, through a compromise.[5]

---

[1] "The worker is a brother in Jesus Christ whom God has entrusted to the employer: C. Périn, *Die Lehren der Nationalökonomie seit einem Jahrhundert* (Freiburg 1882), 277.—M. Becqué, A. Louant, "Le dossier 'Rome et Louvain' de Charles Périn" (incl. a biographical sketch), *RHE* 50 (1955), 36–124.

[2] Quoted in F. Petri, op. cit., 476.

[3] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 437.

[4] F. Petri, op. cit., 477, incl. biblio.

In February 1885 the Belgian government sent a special delegate to the Vatican, and in May, Domenico Ferrata, who had earned diplomatic credits in Switzerland, came discretely to Brussels as nuncio. On 21 June, during the Te Deum on occasion of the jubilee of the Belgian kingdom, he was already able to function as the doyen of the diplomatic corps. He preluded Lavigerie's famous toast by a toast to the royal couple during the anniversary of the railroad, receiving the applause of the Liberals who had approved the budget for the Vatican Embassy in 1886.[6] The discussion of two questions pertaining to canon law during the nunciature of Ferrata (until 1889) is indicative of the Leonic pragmatism. The liberal government of Frère-Orban had suspended denominational cemeteries in 1879. Since Beernaert hesitated to change this, the Pope recommended to his nuncio to wait and see.[7] More crucial was the fact that in 1876 the Holy Office, via the French episcopate, had prohibited the Catholic judges in France from cooperating in divorces (legalized again in 1884) even if it required their resignation. Neighboring Belgium, where divorce had been legalized in 1809, was worried about this, and therefore Ferrata informed them that the decree was only binding for the French bishops, not for Belgium.[8]

In reference to Belgium it was noted that the difference between liberal and social Catholicism was not as general as it seemed. The delay in social activity was said to have to do with the Lamennais crisis of Catholic Liberalism in Belgium.[9] As a matter of fact, it was a political anti-Liberalist, Charles Périn, who had obscured the need for a reform with his morally moderate economic liberalism, which was only later attacked by the Catholic Democrats. The Catholic bourgeoisie was energetically involved in the enormous industrial growth going on since the sixties, which after 1880 could continue only with strict economic concentration because of the European protective tariff policies. Therefore King Leopold II, who had done much for the country, encountered strong resistance when he wanted to introduce compulsory military service within the framework of his military policy, because he did not anticipate again having the good fortune which had guided him in the war of 1870. The socio-political aspect amounted to the fact that everybody could free himself from military duty by financing a substitute, which was naturally not possible for a worker or a small craftsman. Interestingly, the bill of 1887 miscarried, mainly because of the Catholic Conservatives who were backed by the episcopate because it feared the suspension of the clergy's exemption from military service. In contrast to the question of the septennate dicussed in Berlin the same year, Leo XIII was reserved toward the Belgian king's plea for intervention, even though he did not share the opinion of the episcopate.[10]

---

[5] The communal administrations were empowered to fully recognize the Catholic schools ("accepted schools") and to make decisions regarding religious instruction in public schools (however, the child's father was entitled to exempt his child from it). The teachers' training was no longer restricted to state seminaries.

[6] Stutz, 46–54.

[7] When Dechamps's (died 1883) successor, Archbishop Pierre-Lambert Goossens of Mechelen (cardinal since 1889) inquired in Rome about this matter, he was given a canonical answer, but was urged to practice tolerance.

[8] Ferrata, *Mémoires* I, 334ff.

[9] "Social Catholicism and liberal Catholicism are not so opposed to each other as they have often pretended to be"; Henri Haag: J. N. Moody (ed.), *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 294f.

Moreover, the gradual removal of the property qualification had to be accomplished in spite of the opposition of the Catholic Conservatives and their allies, the Liberals of Frère-Orban's persuasion. The pioneers in this struggle were the younger Liberals, but it was primarily the Socialists whose demonstrations forced the government, dominated by the Catholic party, to introduce general though still limited suffrage in 1893.[11] The Conservatives did not expect that the Catholics, rather than the Socialists, would profit from this law, especially in the Flemish-speaking areas.

The signal for a social reform which could no longer be ignored (unusually low wages, long working hours) was the general strike, starting in Liège on 18 March 1886 and commemorating the Parisian uprising of the commune in 1871. There was violence, and military forces were dispatched under General van der Smissen. The Beernaert government was now forced to design reform laws against the opposition of the extreme right, led by Charles Woeste, an intransigent convert. Liège became the center of the Catholic social movement which recognized that traditional paternalism, often enough just a phrase, was no longer adequate for the growing industrial society. An early attempt was made in 1871 by the Catholic industrialist Gustave de Jaer. But he could not assert himself in the politically dominating ranks of Belgian Catholicism.[12] In East Flemish Ghent in 1875 a group of young workers came together, from which the Anti-Socialist League emerged. By 1911 the organization had one hundred thirty-five staff members, its own daily paper, and productive social institutions. The Socialists felt that this organization was breaking class solidarity and consequently collisions occurred. Among the first of the Catholic labor leaders who belonged to the working classes themselves was the weaver Léon Bruggeman from Ghent, who, together with printers, founded a Christian-oriented union in 1882.[13] In 1886 and 1887, the first two socio-political congresses took place in Liège, endorsed by Bishop Doutreloux, who was a good-natured priest but not a fighter. Charles Woeste called these events "exaggerations,"[14] but he assessed them correctly as an opposition, since people were a great deal more realistic in Liège than in France. Abbé A. Pottier was the focal point there. He was a theoretician as well as a practioner, but in 1898 he turned his back on the internal conflicts and went to Rome.[15] The Liège Congress (1890) enjoyed sizable international participation and was quite lively. The discussions concentrated around the generally controversial state intervention, which Woeste exposed as *"Césarisme,"* and the equally delicate question of whether employers and employees should form joint or separate organizations. It was this question which again divided Belgium's Catholics into two vehemently opposed groups. Without meaning to establish their own party, the approximately one hundred Catholic workers' societies combined to form the *Ligue Démocratique Belge.* The initiative came from Professor G. Helleputte of Louvain (1852–1925) and the engineer A. Verhaegen (1847–1917), who had collaborated with the Vincent Conferences. Charging Woeste with being interested only in an increase of the state budget for the Church's sake and the public support of the Catholic schools is probably a polemical exaggeration.[16] But there is no doubt that the power of the *Parti Catholique* was determined until World War I by the strong interests of the middle-class Catholics, against whom the Christian social forces had difficulties bringing their interests to bear, especially since they were often enough in disagreement and looked for a coalition with either the Conservatives or the Christian social movement on the left. It was also due to the abstract style of the encyclical *Rerum novarum* (1891) that it could become the object of particularly serious controversies in respect to its interpretation. Bishop Doutreloux had defined papal principles in a pastoral letter in the beginning of 1894. Leo XIII, in a letter to the Belgian episcopate of 10 July 1895 suggested a conference which took place in March 1896 in Mechelen and decided on a rather inappropriate compromise.[17] Meanwhile a group of young Catholic deputies had formed to the left of the Democratic League, indebted with respect to its definite social demands to the Dominican Rutten, one of the "social chaplains" of that era, later the first secretary general of the *Confédération des Syndicats chrétiens,* which had grown out of local groups between 1904 and 1912.[18] The small Flemish Christian People's Party faltered soon because Abbé Daens, charged with having endorsed ideas of class warfare, was suspended in 1897.[19] Significant for the existing insecurity was Cardinal (since 1889) Goossens's inquiry in Rome in connection with the Congress of Mechelen in 1896: did the employer commit a sin, and to what extent, if he preferred cheaper labor and did not pay family-adequate wages in the fight to compete on the market? It was the Belgian primate's inquiry, rather than this particular problem (widely discussed among western European Catholics), which was remarkable, as well as Cardinal Zigliara's answer that a "fair wage" was to be paid according to equity.

---

[10] Ferrata, *Mémoires* I, 334ff.; Stutz, 51ff.; H. Pirenne, *Histoire de Belgique* VII (1932), 221, 309f.; F. Petri, op. cit., 471f.

[11] This caused the number of eligible voters to increase from 137,000 to 1,370,000; F. Petri, op. cit., 478.

[12] M. Vaussard, *Histoire de la Démocratie chrétienne* (Paris 1956), 143; about paternalism in Belgium, see R. Reszohazy, op. cit., 47–98; about de Jaer, ibid., 70.

---

[13] M. P. Fogarty, *Christian Democracy in Western Europe* (London 1957, Freiburg i. Br. 1959), 218ff.

[14] Vaussard, 143; with a great amount of objectivity R. Reszohazy, op. cit. 201–86, describes the political differences within Belgian Catholicism from C. Woeste at the extreme right wing to A. Daens.

[15] C. Cardolle, *Un précurseur, un docteur, un pionnier social: Msgr. Pottier* (Brussels 1951).

[16] M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 364.

Leo XIII in 1895 refused to receive Abbé Daens, and in a conversation with Duc d'Ursel, the cousin of Albert de Mun,[20] he is supposed to have said: "Quant à Daens, c'est fini, et s'il recommence, je le frappe."[21] But the ultraconservative Charles Woeste also was by no means persona grata. However, the Pope's chances of alleviating the extremes within Catholicism were even more limited in France than in Belgium. The Conservatives were in power and had the financial means, which the bishops used for ecclesiastical projects and did not intend to relinquish. This situation intensified critically in 1898 when A. Verhaegen implored the Church in Rome to authorize a political oath.[22] There he encountered the opposition of Woeste, but also the benevolence of Rampolla, who mediated his audience with the Pope. Leo XIII promised to send a letter on behalf of Verhaegen to the Belgian episcopate. But while Cardinal Goossens and the bishops again assured the *Ligue Démocratique* of their friendly disposition, they did not want to risk a public congress for the purpose of unification. As in the case of Abbé Daens, the Belgian episcopate in view of these tensions was chiefly interested in preserving the unity of the *Parti Catholique* and its majority in Parliament.

---

[17] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 439f; M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 345f.

[18] M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 345.

[19] H. Haag, op. cit., 297; for an objective view of the hearing by the Inquisition, see R. Reszohazy, op. cit., 223f., 231f., 239ff; 261–68, about the League's relations to the "Daensistes"; 279–85, about the decline of the movement (Abbé Daens submitted to his bishop).

[20] Cf. chap. 12, n. 45.

[21] According to C. Woeste in his memoirs, quoted in R. Reszohazy, op. cit., 240.

[22] R. Reszohazy, op. cit., 286–90.

The social differences within Belgian Catholicism were difficult to overcome because, in contrast to comparable parties in other countries, the Catholic party had the clear majority and external forces of integration were lacking. In 1905 a majority of Christian-Social and Socialist deputies carried through the Sunday-rest law in spite of the opposition by the Catholic chief of the cabinet, M. de Smet de Naeyer;[23] and in 1907 the government was defeated in the question of the eight-hour day for miners, which enraged the middle-class Catholic press.[24] Professor Helleputte, whose position in the *Ligue Démocratique* had been questionable, now joined the young conservative cabinet of de Trooz.[25] But Secretary of State Cardinal Merry del Val's influence provided new complications, which lasted until 1914. Verspeyen, editor of the *Bien Public,* received papal commendation in 1910. But the Conservatives were disappointed by Pius X, because the Pope had respected the independence of the league, provided, to be sure, that it would follow the directives of the bishops. While most of them remained reserved, Désiré Mercier favored the Christian Democrats, so that they were able to score a victory over Woeste at the Congress of Mechelen in 1904.

The Catholic societies developed slowly under the dominance of the *Parti Catholique,* which seemed to offer security for the Church. In 1903 the *Association de la Jeunesse belge* was founded in Louvain. At first it was a loose group, whose goals were not particularly directed toward the youth. A change was effected by young Abbé A. Brohée, a student of Cardinal Mercier. He sharply separated religious from political action, and at the congresses of 1911 and 1913 almost no one but young people gathered. The first beginnings of the *Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne,* developed by J. Cardijn (1882–1967) in the vicinity of Brussels and itself an appeal to the youth, was interrupted by World War I.[26] In contrast to the societies, religious orders and congregations flourished, especially when the Belgian Congo offered them new tasks. In 1829, 4,791 religious were counted, as compared to 38,140 in 1910.[27] The Jesuits could do their work here undisturbed. The society of the Salvatorians, founded in 1881 by the Alemannian Johann Baptist Jordan and expanding rapidly, also took root in Belgium. A flourishing center of monastic life was the Benedictine priory in Maredsous (abbey since 1878), which Maurus Wolter had founded in 1872 with the help of the Desclée family (entrepreneurs from Tournai). The priory was closely associated with the abbey at Beuron, whose hindrance by the German *Kulturkampf* forced attention to foreign affairs. Abbot Maurus Wolter of Beuron (since 1875) appointed his brother Placidus abbot of Maredsous and became the instrument of the liturgical inspiration which he had during a sojourn in Solesmes (1862). In 1878 Gérard van Caloen published the first lay missal in Maredsous (*Missel des fidèles*).[28] At this time, Anselm Schott of Beuron resided in the Belgian abbey. In 1888 the abbey's church was consecrated by a cardinal legate in the presence of Nuncio Ferrata and the entire Belgian episcopate. When Maurus Wolter died (1890) and his brother Placidus succeeded him as archabbot of Beuron, Hildebrand de Hemptinne took over the direction of Maredsous. When he was consecrated abbot by Cardinal San Felice in Montecassino, he was also given a comprehensive papal commission.[29] In the same year, a priory was founded in Steenbrugge (1896, abbey). The priory of Mont-César in Louvain (1890) would later become, next to Maredsous, an important abbey in the Belgian congregation. From here emanated, in 1909, the liturgical movement inspired by Lambert Beauduin. The priory of Saint André in Bruges (1901) is related to the Brazilian congregation.[30]

---

[23] Vaussard, 148.

[24] M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 345.

[25] R. Reszohazy, 359ff.

[26] R. Aubert, "Organisation et Caractère des mouvements de jeunesse cath. en Belgique," *Politica e storia* 28 (Rome 1972) especially 275–79, 287f.

[27] M. Dierickx, *LThK*² II, 157.

That the first eucharistic congress did not take place in Belgium was due to reservations Cardinal Dechamps had during the Frère-Orban government. But after the third congress, which took place in Liège in 1883, where E. Marie Tamisier had a protector in Bishop Doutreloux, Belgium and France became the main areas of this movement (after Antwerp, Brussels was the city where the congress took place in 1898 under Cardinal Goossens).[31]

The Catholic University of Louvain enjoyed the special benevolence of Leo XIII[32] and had a financial patron in Cardinal Goossens. In 1882, Désiré Mercier, who had studied theology there, became the first professor to hold the chair for Thomistic philosophy which had been established upon the Pope's request, and after the ontological crisis he inaugurated a new phase in the history of the institution, which, after 1899, under its president Monsignor Abbeloos, gained great significance in historical and biological studies as well. Between 1890 and 1905, the theological faculty received acclaim especially in the fields of biblical research and patristics.[33] As archbishop of Mechelen (cardinal, 1907), Mercier determined the ecclesiastical situation in Belgium on the basis of a neoscholastic interpretation of society. In 1909, Pius expressly praised the University of Louvain.

---

[28] W. Trapp, *Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung* (Regensburg 1940), 363; in 1884, van Caloen founded the periodical *Messager des fidèles,* since 1890 *Revue bénédictine;* cf. chap. 16.

[29] Cf. chap. 17.

[30] P. Weißenberger gives information about the development of the order in the form of excerpts from documents, *Das benediktinische Mönchtum im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Beuron 1953).

[31] Cf. chap. 16.

[32] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 440 with documentation.

In spite of all this, an increasing de-Christianization of life in Belgium cannot be overlooked, even in rural areas, but mainly in the industrial regions, where only a few churches were built in the workers' quarters. Not only did the attendance of Sunday services decrease, but even birth, marriage, and death were often no longer included in ecclesiastical life.[34]

Amidst the mostly decadent spiritual literature of these decades, the poetry of the Flemish priest and poet Guido Gezelle (1830–90) shone like a star. Filled with the intimate experience of nature and an original religiosity, Gezelle broke with all conventions and kept aloof from all fashionable styles. It is significant that the poetic genius of Gezelle was only appreciated rather late.[35]

The Netherlands

Catholicism in the Netherlands, after the area's separation from Belgium, constituted a sizable minority of nearly 40 percent. The liberal circumstances permitted the development of religious orders and schools, and in the forties the establishment of a press. Next to these ecclesiastical issues, economic considerations were decisive for the coalition with the Liberals. The leading ranks of Dutch Catholicism were comprised of men from business and trade. Thus the Catholics had a remarkable share in the success of the Liberals under the leadership of Thorbecke and in the state's basic law of 18 September 1848, which fundamentally strengthened the power of Parliament and ended the

---

[33] Cf. chaps. 21 and 23.—R. Aubert, *Le grand tournant de la faculté de théologie de Louvain à la veille de 1900: Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu* (Paris 1967), 73–109.—About Mercier, 324f.

[34] Around 1910, 23 percent of the children in Seraing near Liège were not baptized, 46 percent of the marriages were only performed in civil ceremonies, and 64 percent of the funerals took place without a priest—an extreme case, but it shows the trend of the workers' alienation from the Church.

[35] A. Vermeylen, *De Vlaamse letteren van Gezelle to heden* (^{4}1949); Joris Taels, *Lexikon der Weltliteratur* I (Freiburg i. Br. 1960), 655.

Calvinistic character of the Netherlands. The Catholics profited from the freedom of association in all areas of life. In the Netherlands, as elsewhere, the question of schools was the key issue in the relationship of Catholics to modern society. As an alternative to the Calvinistic parochial school, a group of Catholic politicians endorsed the school law of 1857, which indicated a radical ideological neutralization. However, this resulted in the *verzuiling,*[36] which characterized Dutch society, because of a-Christian, even atheistic beliefs developing within liberalism, and because of the Calvinistic and Catholic orthodoxy's joint opposition. A letter drafted by both in 1868 requested the increase of free Catholic schools.

Shortly before the school conflict in Belgium, the left-liberal Kappeyne government enacted a law which was emphatically and successfully opposed by the Reformed clergyman Abraham Kuyper (he gathered 470,000 signatures).[37] In 1888, as leader of the Anti-Revolutionary Party, he established connections with the Catholic priest H. J. M. Schaepman (1844–1903), who had been voted into Parliament in 1880. The Kappeyne government was overthrown. This conservative coalition, rather than Leo XIII's[38] admonition directed toward the Dutch Catholics in April 1888, effected the school law of 1889, which placed the principle of free schools on a realistic foundation: free schools would receive state support and, after 1920, unconditional equality. The church-minded Protestants and Catholics, who were in agreement over the necessity of parochial schools, constituted a political cooperation which repeatedly resulted in formations of government. In 1896, Monsignor Schaepman founded the *Katholieke Staatspartij,* which developed into an exceedingly powerful factor in Dutch politics. Leo XIII made use of the now strong and pro-Rome Catholicism of the Netherlands for his fight in Italy (letter to the episcopate of 24 September 1895). His relations with the royal court were friendly, and neither the widowed Queen nor Leo are to blame for the failure to invite the Pope to the first general peace conference, which took place in The Hague in 1899 and was opposed by Italy.

Since industrialization, at that time, was much slower than in Belgium and socialism did not play as important a role there, social Catholicism lagged behind for a long time. This was not Monsignor Schaepman's fault, who had indeed recognized this growing problem, but the fault of the lobby within his party.[39] The occasion which led to the founding of the Catholic People's Union by W. J. Pastoors, later deputy to the Parliament, was trivial: the Catholic workers and the lower middle class were angered by the high price of tickets which the wealthy prominent Catholics had charged in 1888 for the celebrations in Amsterdam of the tenth anniversary of Leo's pontificate.[40] That same year the Catholic social priest A. Ariens organized a workers' league in the textile city of Enschede, whose goals were religious education, social gatherings, and financial assistance through a relief fund. The Socialist propaganda prompted him by means of a strike (1890) to transform the league into a denominational union. His alliance with the Protestant group of 1895 seemed to be the beginning of an interdenominational Christian union in the Netherlands, and for several years the union, with its joint executive board and treasury, had considerable success. But the denominational party structure as well as the ecclesiastical opposition, especially of the Catholic episcopate,[41] gave this attempt no chance. In 1895, a congress of the Catholic workers' movement combined forty-nine Catholic unions which had emerged locally since 1891. In 1910 Monsignor H. Poels, an exegete who had just returned from Washington, founded a Catholic workers' union in Limburg, a city which had recently been discovered by industry. Thanks to Poels, de-Christianization of the workers did not proceed as quickly in the Netherlands as in other countries.

---

[36] F. Petri, op. cit., 482–86.

[37] F. Petri, op. cit., 482f.; J. T. de Visser, *Kerk en Staat* III (1927), 387–479.

[38] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 486.

[39] M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 348f.; Verluis, *Beknopte Geschiedenis van de Katholieke Arbeidersbeweging* (1949).

Compulsory elementary education was not enacted until 1900, which was partly due to the opposition of the conservative parties and their press, from which Monsignor Schaepman was completely isolated. In 1905, parochial high schools also received state subsidies.

Dutch Catholicism retained its conservative hallmark (developed since the middle of the nineteenth century) far beyond World War I. The Catholic Convention in Utrecht in 1889, where H. van de Wetering was archbishop from 1882 until 1928, strengthened the religious self-identity in connection with the political victory, which was little touched by the problems of the era. The awareness of unconditional dependence on the papacy increased during the pontificate of Pius X, who established a regular hierarchy in the Netherlands in 1908. The *Maasbode* represented an extreme integralism, and Pius X found himself able to praise the Dutch episcopate when, thanks to its alertness, the "modernistic plague" did not find a stronghold there. The Catholic University of Nijmegen, founded in 1923, is historically rooted in the educational system which was created by H. Moller at the beginning of the century. Its spiritual open-mindedness was along the lines of the publication *Van onzen tijd,* which had been founded by laymen, especially by the Klarenbeekse Club.

---

[40] M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 218f.

[41] The "union struggle" in Germany was also carried across the border. In view of the directive of the Dutch episcopate which stated that it was only permissible to join Catholic unions, a Catholic union leader from Germany said at a conference in the Netherlands in 1908: "With all due respect for our spiritual fathers, the bishops, we must say: this far, but no farther" (quoted in M. P. Fogarty, 225; cf. P. H. Winkelmann in S. H. School [ed.], *150 ans de mouvement ouvrier chrétien en Europe de l'Ouest* [Paris, Bonn 1966]).

In the history of the Catholic Church, the Netherlands enjoyed the reputation of being, at that time, a haven for the persecuted, who were of a different persuasion than those during the time of the Enlightenment. Arnold Janssen, born in the Lower Rhine area, founded the *Societas Verbi Divini* (Society of the Divine Word), which was to grow into the most important missionary institute. With the approval of Bishop J. A. Paredis of Roermond and Archbishop A. J. Schaepman of Utrecht, he transferred the institute across the Dutch-German border to Steijl (1874).[42] The Jesuits, who were absolutely forbidden in Germany from the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* until 1904 and officially forbidden in Switzerland until just recently, could work in the Netherlands and Belgium without interference, and therefore they transferred their exile college in Ditton Hall, England, to Valkenswaard in 1894. The same year, during the Catholic Convention in Cologne, Schaepman praised Dutch liberty.[43]

Luxemburg

The Concordat of 1801 made Luxemburg part of the bishopric of Metz; but after its promotion to grand-duchy in union with the Netherlands in 1815, it was assigned to the bishopric of Namur (1823). Following the Belgian revolution, it lost its position as a diocese because King Willem I of the Netherlands did not want to divide Namur. Following a provisionary arrangement for the city of Luxemburg and after the surrender of the Walloon area to Belgium (1839), the rest of the country became an independent apostolic vicariate (1840). The appropriate desire to promote Luxemburg to a bishopric, which Willem II favored on account of the concession for free papal appointments, failed because the proposals of the concordat were not sanctioned by Rome.[44] Pius IX's unilateral move of 27 September 1870 encountered the opposition of the Luxemburg State Council. Not until 23 June 1873 was the establishment of a bishopric ratified through a royal grand-ducal resolution by Willem III. Vicar Apostolic N. Adames was the first bishop of Luxemburg (1870–83).[45] The school law of 1881 suspended the inspection in which the clergy participated, as well as the right of the local priest to supervise the teacher, and it authorized community commissions, including a priest, to supervise the schools. This law, which was revised in 1898 in favor of the Church, demonstrated the delayed development in Luxemburg. But the law of 1912, which Bishop J. J. Koppes (1883–1918) opposed, though it did respect the Christian faith, caused the separation of school and Church. Consequently, religious instruction was administered outside of the school.[46] According to the example of the neighboring countries, the Catholic organizations now developed.

---

[42] Chap. 17; see also J. M. Gijsen, *Joh. Aug. Paredis 1795–1886* (Assen 1968).

[43] Kißling, *Katholikentage* II, 267.

[44] E. Donckel, op. cit., 132–34, 136f., 161f.

The desired course of the interdenominational Christian union in Luxemburg did not succeed. During World War I, however, the workers left the weak specialized sections of the workers' societies and joined neutral associations, which is why in 1920 independent but denominational Christian unions were founded.[47] The development of the iron industry in the region of Esch caused an increase in the membership of the Social Democratic Party, founded in 1900. The ecclesiastical alienation of large segments of the population was due less to the relatively moderate Luxemburg Liberals of the eighties than to the Socialists. But Luxemburg did not lose its Catholic character.

ARTICLE 26 of the Constitution of 1848 resolved that the religious societies needed a legal license. But the regulation was usually interpreted amicably, so that, during the *Kulturkampf* in Germany and in the wake of the laws of 1901 and 1904 in France, the faithful could find refuge in Luxemburg.

---

[45] E. Donckel, op. cit., 157–60, 165f.

[46] E. Donckel, 149, 170f., 194. The amendment of the law of 1921 caused the reintroduction of religious instruction in the schools (ibid., 173). About the law of 1912, see Schmidlin, *PG* III, 85.

[47] E. Donckel, 185f.

CHAPTER 8

The Church of the Iberian World between Revolution and Reaction

Spain

The leading ranks of Catholicism in Spain were preoccupied with waging war against each other, in spite of Leo XIII's constant admonitions. The descendents of the "Apostolic Party" and the Carlists, such as the journalist Nocedal in his *Siglo futuro* or the publication *Ciencia Cris-*

tiana, charged the liberal conservative Catholics with betrayal of the faith. In 1881, under the aegis of Cardinal Moreno of Toledo, a national pilgrimage to Rome with many committees was organized. It was to serve as a demonstration of their own power rather than of their loyalty to the successor of Saint Peter. This caused Secretary of State Jacobini, on 13 February 1878, to request purely diocesan groups of pilgrims.[1] The rather reform-oriented *Partido Socialista Obrero Español,* founded in 1878 under the leadership of Pablo Iglesias, was not adequately assessed by the belligerents, at least not at first; but it flourished. So did the violent anarchism which had sympathizers and disciples especially among the totally impoverished farm hands on the large latifundia in Andalusia and in Catalonia. There were numerous assassinations and terrorism. The activities reached a climax on 7 June 1896 in Barcelona when, during a Corpus Christi procession, a bomb killed six people and seriously wounded forty-two.[2]

An indirect victim of this incident was a politician who, after the brief First Republic in Spain (1873–74), had restored the Bourbon Monarchy under Alphonso XII and given the period of restoration (1875–1902) its political and spiritual character: Antonio Cánovas del Castillo. He was murdered in 1897 for the tough trial regarding the assassination in Barcelona. Cánovas[3] was the representative of the liberal-conservative line, which was so passionately combatted by the intransigents. This was in agreement with the constitution of 1876, which recognized the basic laws and consequently endeavored to include the Liberals. In reference to religion, the constitution contained a compromise between the Catholic state religion and the freedom of religion, but in spite of this and despite the significant ecclesiastical rights regarding education, Pius IX and the Spanish clergy rejected it.[4] The governments between 1875 and 1902 were alternately formed by Cánovas's party and by the monarchal Liberals under the leadership of Sagasta. The censorship of books was either introduced or abolished, depending on the government. But both parties had their political base in the Bourbon monarchy and in the representative constitution.

---

[1] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 442; only the pilgrimages from Toledo and Saragossa took place.

[2] R. Konezke, *Europäische Geschichte,* 512. Concerning the failure of the Spanish hierarchy and the greater part of the clergy in the social question, see J. N. Moody, *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 721–807. The words of a Catalan poet are characteristic for the attitude of sympathetic intellectuals: "The bomb and blasphemy are the same thing, a destructive expression of rage in the face of the inability to be creative. The angel who wanted to be like God but could not slandered God; whoever hates society and doesn't feel strong enough to change it throws a bomb in the middle of the market place" (J. Vicens Vives, *Cataluña en el Siglo XIX* [1961], 436; F. Soldevila, *Historia de España* VIII [1959], 349, quoted according to R. Konetzke, op. cit., 512).

[3] R. Konetzke gives an impressive portrait, op. cit., 505. Cánovas intended a creative restoration which was to lead Spain out of this *circulus vitiosus* of anticlerical liberalism and reaction to it. He wanted to continue the development of the nation, which he considered the work of divine providence.

[4] ARTICLE 11 of the constitution says: "The Roman Catholic religion is a state religion. The nation is obligated to support the worship and its servants. Nobody on Spanish soil

A serious conflict between Church and state arose in 1899 when, in violation of the law of 1880, numerous members of the orders and congregations from France had immigrated to Spain because of persecution. The question of civil inscription of orders, which were not licensed as was required by the laws of 1867, was solved in 1901 through the conciliatory stance of Secretary of State Rampolla and the Spanish nuncio. The vitality of the Church in Spain during Leo XIII's pontificate was demonstrated by the exceedingly strong development of the female congregations.

The chief theme of Church history during this period in Spain involved the political differences within Catholicism itself. In January 1882, Rampolla occupied the nunciature in Spain, and on 8 December, Leo XIII, in an encyclical, implored the politically divided Spanish Catholics to make religious peace, and requested that they develop Catholic organizations under the direction of the bishops, as was done in other countries. But in 1884 and 1885, Rampolla was exposed to vicious attacks in the press by Nocedal, who could be called a Spanish Veuillot. A minister of the Cánovas government had given a speech in Parliament about the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, which complicated relations with the Italian government and upset the Vatican. In this context Nocedal wrote that the nuncio evaluated the circumstances in Spain regarding ecclesiastical conditions much too optimistically instead of fighting the entire system of Cánovas, including the constitution of 1876. The controversy became a matter of principle when Nocedal characterized the function of the nuncio as a purely diplomatic one, which required his subordination to the episcopate in questions pertaining to the domestic affairs of the Spanish Church. Bishop Casas of Plasencia had written a strongly worded pastoral letter. In a note of April 1885 to Nuncio Rampolla, Secretary of State Jacobini termed Nocedal's ideas Febronianism and declared, in reference to the constitution *Pastor aeternus,* that the Pope had the right to interfere at any time in the affairs of the bishoprics, even through the nuncios whose competence he alone determined.[5] In the case of Bishop Casas, Ram-

---

will be molested because of his religious belief or his corresponding form of worship, provided the Christian morals are being respected. However, no other public ceremonies nor demonstrations other than those of the state religion are allowed."

[5] *ASS* XVII, 561ff. "Is it true that the Pope delegates to his legate only purely diplomatic missions without any authority over the shepherds and faithful of those states to

polla also received the desired letter from Jacobini, in which the bishop was reprimanded for disturbing the internal peace of the Church.

Around this time, it was Leo XIII's general intent to prevent the formation of exclusively Catholic parties. He became increasingly reserved toward the *Unión Católica,* led by Alejandro Pidal, which he had still recommended in 1881, because he wanted to be considerate of the Carlists whom Pidal had failed to win for his union. In their press, the Carlists waged a venomous war against the *Unión Católica* because they did not regard it as sufficiently Catholic, since it recognized the Bourbon Kingdom.[6] The Pope's support of the *Unión Católica* could have only increased the tensions in Spanish Catholicism. Leo XIII brought his authority with the Spanish episcopate to bear in order to prevent the Carlists from acting up after the death of Alphonso XII (26 November 1885) and to assure the reign of the widowed Queen María Cristina.[7] In March 1887, a minister spoke in Parliament about the great respect of the Spanish people for Leo XIII, who had secured the peace between Church and state.

The Pope concentrated his special attention on the internal renovation of the Church, especially on the improvement of clerical education, which was to be handled by the following metropolitan seminaries: Toledo, Tarragona, Seville, Valencia, Granada, Burgos, Valladolid, Santiago de Compostela, Saragossa. The Jesuit seminary in Salamanca was authorized to award doctorates. The University of Comillas (near Santander) was established in 1890 as a papal institute and gained influence in Latin America.[8] In 1892, the "Spanish College" was opened in Rome.

After Rampolla's appointment as secretary of state (1887), the conflicts within Spanish Catholicism increased considerably. In 1889, the Pope had reason to write to the bishop of Madrid, the cardinal of Saragossa, and the bishop of Urgel; and he urged the *Revista popular* to end its polemics. The great pilgrimage to Rome in 1894 was tarnished by the previous Carlist disturbances in Seville, which caused vehement

---

which they are assigned? Should we admit that the Holy Father delegates his nuncios in the same manner ministers and representatives of the state are delegated by their government? Rather, the appropriate directives and official orders show that the apostolic nuncios have not only a diplomatic mission, but also an authoritative mission regarding the faithful and ecclesiastical affairs" (U. Stutz, op. cit., 56; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 443).

[6] R. Konetzke, op. cit., 506; cf. Schmidlin, *PG* II, 442, n. 6.

[7] The Pope sent her the "Golden Rose" and became the godfather of Alphonso, born 10 May 1886 (later Alphonso XIII). Rampolla performed the baptism (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 443f.).

[8] The theological revival becomes apparent around the turn of the century in the establishment of publications: 1899: *Ciudad de Dios,* 1901: *Razón y Fé,* 1907: *Estudios franciscanos,* 1910: *Ciencia tomista.*

discussions in the press and in Parliament. In spite of the intransigent ecclesiastical attitude of the Carlists, the Pope refrained from taking sides and asked the Spanish pilgrims to accept the constitution of 1876 and to devote themselves to religious and cultural tasks.[9]

There was no lack of the kind of tasks the Pope had spoken of. In 1887, 81.16 percent of the Spanish population was illiterate. (1900: 71.43 percent). The negligence of the state and the communities was not compensated for by the efforts of the Church. The initiative emanated from the liberal philosopher of law Francisco Giner de los Ríos of Madrid (1839–1915), who rejected any kind of political agitation. But his *Institucíon Libre de Enseñanza* (since 1876) had developed a small but tremendously effective school complex, in which the liberal intelligentsia was nurtured.[10] The outstanding representative of ecclesiastical Catholicism at that time was a professor of literary history in Madrid, Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (1856–1912). In rediscovering the *Siglo de Oro,* he wanted to overcome the contemporary controversies within Catholicism, which were paralyzed with clichés, and he intended to resurrect the great traditions of Spain. In his speech commemorating Calderon, he recalled the great ideals of Spanish history: the Catholic faith, the Spanish monarchy, the Latin race, and Iberian liberty.[11] In his *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (1881), he wanted to present a sharp critique of all the spiritual phenomena which endangered Spain's tradition. He refrained from actual disputations because he relied on a creative restoration which would speak for itself. In his later work, *Historia de las ideas estéticas,* he attempted a Christian interpretation of Hegel.

The defeat of Spain in the war with the United States in 1898[12] meant the political and intellectual end of the restoration period which was passionately criticized by the "generation of 98." But a figure like

---

[9] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 444f.

[10] R. Konetzke, op. cit., 514, with biblio. (p. 526). Combining a high school with an elementary preparatory school, vocational training (towards a vocational school), and excursions shows the influence of Friedrich Fröbel's pedagogy. Such schools were also founded in other Spanish cities.

[11] *La conciencia española* (Madrid 1948), 9f.; *Obras completas,* 65 vols. (Madrid 1941–62); J. F. Pastór, op. cit., 41–45.

[12] Cuba's War of Independence had already begun in 1868 and was interrupted in 1878 by concessions to the Liberals. The conflicts increased because the conservative landed proprietors hesitated to realize the concessions and the Liberals began demanding absolute autonomy. The rebels operated from the United States, which intervened on 24 January 1898 (claiming an obligation to protect its citizens in Cuba). President McKinley wanted to avoid war, but the Congress insisted. After war had broken out, Archbishop Ireland established contact with the president by order of the Pope, but his attempts were in vain (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 445). The destruction of the Spanish fleet occurred in July.

Miguel de Unamuno (1864–1936) makes clear the complexity of the new spiritual development then breaking through which cannot be imagined without Spanish Catholicism.[13] However, the fanatical integralism of the *Siglo futuro* continued to live, and Cardinal Sancha y Hervas of Toledo was accused of liberalism because of his counsel urging internal peace. Consequently, he had to ask for the Pope's protection, who, on 22 August, clearly reprimanded those people who wanted to determine autocratically who was Catholic and who was not. Leo XIII witnessed the enthronement of sixteen-year-old King Alphonso XIII on 17 May 1902 and he had reasons to worry about Spain's future. During Pius X's pontificate, the internal controversies within Catholicism continued. The Jesuits had supported the integralistic line of Nocedal until Leo XIII intervened through the general of the order. But when the Jesuits, in their publication *Razón y Fé* (since 1901), endorsed some sort of probabilism in the election of the deputies, they were defended by the Pope against the intransigent Conservatives.

It was not surprising that the encyclical *Rerum novarum* (1891) encountered little interest in Spain. The *Círculos Católicos Obreros,* which copied the institutions founded by Albert de Mun in France and were promoted after 1876 by Bishop Ceferino Gonzáles of Córdoba, developed very slowly. Another single-handed effort was made by Antonio Vicent, S.J. At the Church Congress of Tarragona in 1894, the encyclical was on the agenda, among other things; and in 1895, the *Consejo Nacional de las Corporaciones Obrero-Católicas,* the central organization of the worker societies was formed. Its lack of efficiency has to be judged in view of the fact that the interest for social problems was rather slim in all parties down to the leftist Liberals; the strongest interest existed in Cánovas's party. Around 1900, only about 30 percent of the population belonged to the industrial complex of the Spanish economy.[14] But it was especially devastating that the agrarian production did not correspond to the increase of the population, which was negligible compared to other countries. The ruling class knew, without admitting it, that the anarchistic assassinations were by no means singular incidents. This is proven by the fact that there was hesitation in publishing the result of an investigation by the workers in 1884.[15] This made it even more necessary for the Church to get involved. But, to Leo XIII's sorrow the interests of the Church were almost completely absorbed by the differences within the ruling ranks. The de-Christianization in the middle class, increasing since the sixties, began to extend into the industrial world. The bombing attack during the Corpus Christi procession in Barcelona in 1896 had only been a prologue. The great crises of the twentieth century drew closer.[16] In the left wing of the dividing parties appeared the group of Alejandro Levroux, who, in the name of the Republic, proclaimed the now fashionable version of *"Écrasez l'infâme!"* and incited his *jóvenes bárbaros* to act.[17] Thirteen years after the strike against the Corpus Christi procession, the masses of workers of Barcelona burnt seventeen churches, twenty-three monasteries, sixteen parochial schools, and four asylums. They brutally shot monks and nuns who tried to flee through a city blocked with street barricades and desecrated their bodies.[18] The uprising of July 1909, following a general strike, was suppressed by the military forces dispatched from Valencia and Madrid. The repeated call for a dictatorship became louder and louder.

---

[13] F. Niedermayer, "Two Spains?", *Saeculum* 3 (1952), 444–76; also: H. Jeschke, see bibliography.

[14] In the Basque provinces, iron ore was mined and mostly exported, but it was also smelted, using coal from England and later from Asturias, and it became the basis for a shipbuilding industry. A strong textile industry developed in Catalonia (R. Konetzke, op. cit., 508).

[15] J. M. Jóvez, *Conciencia obrera y conciencia burguesa en la España contemporánea* (Madrid 1952).

In the years following 1902, ecclesiastical policies of the alternately conservative or left-liberal governments were concerned with the question of admitting or limiting the religious communities, a question which was intensified by the return of Spanish missionaries from Cuba and the Philippines. The overthrow of the liberal government made possible the Convention of 1908, which was followed by the creation of a Vatican-Spanish commission, under the chairmanship of the archbishop of Toledo, empowered to investigate the monastery and school question. The conflict came to a head again when J. Canalejas (murdered in 1912) prohibited the founding of religious orders for the next two years, abolished the religious vow in December 1910, limited religious instruction in public schools, and recalled the ambassador to the Vatican. During the Eucharistic Congress in Madrid in 1911, King Alphonso XIII consecrated the Spanish people to the Sacred Heart. By this act and by its festive repetition in 1919, he won the Carlists for the Bourbon monarchy. The *Asociación Católica de propagandistas,* founded in 1909 by the young Jesuit Ángel Ayala, gained great significance during the time between the two world wars.

---

[16] E. Comín Colomer, *Historia del anarquismo español,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1956).

[17] "The barbaric youth of today plunder and murder the decadent and miserable civilization of this country, they destroy its temples, they put an end to its gods . . . . There is nothing sacred on this earth. The people are slaves of the Church. The Church should be destroyed." (R. Konetzke, op. cit., 528)

[18] R. Konetzke, op. cit., 529.

Portugal

The often noted parallel between Spain's and Portugal's development continued into the last third of the nineteenth century, but in the beginning of the twentieth century remarkable differences developed. The agreement of 1848 between state and Church could essentially be preserved and was hardly impaired by the alternation of the two monarchal parties heading the government of the apolitical King Luis I (1861–89); the conservative *Regeneradores* and the *Progresistas.* The economic difficulties of the sixties under the conservative ministry of Antonio María de Fontes (1871–77) were turned into a brilliant recovery. The exhaustive negotiations between the Vatican and Lisbon under the liberal government of Braacamp (1879–81) resulted in a new circumscription of the dioceses through the papal constitution of 30 September 1881: the seventeen dioceses were reduced to three archbishoprics (Lisbon, Evora, and Braga) with nine suffragans. At the end of another conservative government came the new convention of 7 August 1886 regarding the rights of royal patronage in the Indian missions.[19] At the University of Coimbra, having been anticlerical since Pombal, the theology faculty renounced Church supervision in 1885, solidly supported by the other faculties.

In the last decade of the century, Portugal's crisis began in spite of the political wisdom of King Carlos I, who refrained from visiting King Umberto I in 1895 because, as Rampolla had indicated, it would be against the Pope's wishes.[20] The crisis was partly due to public debts (bank crisis) and partly to the erosion of the two-party system and the resulting power of the radical forces. The liberal-conservative ministry of Hintze Ribeiro decreed in 1901 that the clerical societies be limited to those which were devoted to teaching, charity, and mission in the colonies. Leo XIII had opened a Portuguese College in Rome in 1900. In a brief of Easter 1902 addressed to Cardinal Neto of Lisbon, he praised the episcopate for having sent an address to the King concerning the religious orders' legislation. Carlos I and the Crown Prince fell victim to an assassination on 1 February 1908. This was the actual end of the Portuguese representative system. In the land of Marquis de Pombal, all radical forces had gathered around the Republican party, founded in 1876. Its partners were the Freemason lodge *Gran Oriente Lusitano Unido* (formed from scattered groups in 1869) and the violent *Carboneria.* While revolutionary groups were organizing in the underground, willing to lay their lives on the line, Portuguese Catholicism had spiritually collapsed despite its membership in the rural areas. Shortly before the revolution, one deputy in the House of Representatives declared: "On the one hand, we have the Jesuits, the clergy and even the Parliament. On the other hand, we have the liberal people, and they have to employ all means available."[21]

---

[19] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 447; cf. part III.

[20] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 448.

The Republic, proclaimed on 5 October 1910, experienced terrorist acts against the churches and monasteries, robberies, arson, and murder (as it had during the Spanish uprising in 1909).

The minister of justice declared: "Within two generations, Portugal will have eliminated Catholicism totally."[22] The law of 20 April 1911, following the French model, carried out the separation of Church and state. The bishop of Oporto, Antonio Barroso, was arrested because of a pastoral letter; the archbishops of Lisbon and Braga, the bishops of Portalegre and Lamego were expelled. The constitution of 21 August 1911 limited the freedom of religion and suspended religious instruction.[23] On 24 May 1911 Pius X sharply condemned the separation law in an encyclical to the Portuguese episcopate. The regime favored compliant clergymen and excluded the young priests who had been educated in the Portuguese College in Rome. After the tensions in the Sidonio Paes government had eased somewhat, Pius X recommended to the Catholics the recognition of the Republic. In 1913, the papal nuncio was expelled. Portugal's long internal turbulence ended with the Conservatives' coup d'état in 1918, resulting in the dictatorship of General Carmona (resumption of diplomatic relations to the Vatican).

Latin America

The *Collegio Pio latino-americano,* founded in 1858 in Rome, was not very successful in changing the religious situation in Latin America. To be sure, the orders and congregations tried to strengthen their establishments with immigrants from Europe or with new foundations.[24] They wanted to ease the chronic and extreme lack of priests, which was a result of earlier negligence in training the native clergy and had been intensified drastically by the expulsion of the Jesuits and subsequent revolutionary occurrences, especially since the clergy was concentrated in the cities. The population of the South American continent increased from 20 million in 1825 to 65.7 million in 1900. But a religious revitalization could only be expected if the ecclesiastical forces within the Latin American countries themselves were activated. With this insight and after amazingly thorough preparations, Leo XIII convened the Latin American Plenary Council, which met from 28 May until 9 July 1899 in Rome and organized twenty-nine general congregations and nine solemn sessions.[25] Within several years, a comprehensive report of more than one thousand articles had been worked out. It was sent to the Latin American episcopate for comments, which, in turn, were examined by the consultants in Rome. The strongest influence came from the Catalan Capuchin Vives y Tutó (1854–1913), who had endorsed a staunch antiliberalist line in the Curia (since 1884) and was promoted cardinal in 1899.[26] Twelve archbishops and forty-one bishops of the one hundred four Latin American hierarchies came to Rome, which seemed to be the only feasible place for a meeting in view of the political situation (the majority of the prelates had voted for Rome). The welcoming address was given by Cardinal di Pietro. Mariano Soler,[27] since 1897 the first archbishop of Montevideo (the capital of Uruguay), paid tribute to the Holy Father. The chairmanship of the concluding session was given to Archbishop Tovar of Lima (the capital of Peru). The primate of Brazil gave the address in the audience with the Pope on 10 July after the conclusion of the Council. The constitutions of the Council, which included sixteen titles with 998 decrees, were sanctioned by Leo XIII on 1 January 1900. The Council's resolutions dealt with: bishops' conferences and provincial as well as diocesan synods, the canonical conduct of the often undisciplined clergy, the regionally varied pastoral work (especially in reference to the young), the charitable institutions, the dangers to the faith which secular books and newspapers, neutral schools, and the Freemasons represented, and with positivism (which had gained significance in Latin America). The Council also ruled on the principles of relations between Church and state, whereby the full authority of the nuncios in reference to the country's episcopate was emphasized, on the temporal rights of the Church regarding property, and on the claim for ecclesiastical jurisdiction. All these issues had long been the object of public debate in the Latin American states. The decrees were preceded by the consecration to the Sacred Heart and to the Immaculate Conception.

---

[21] J. Pabón, *La Revolución Portuguesa,* 2 vols. (Lisbon 1941, 1945), I, 82, quoted from R. Konetzke, op. cit., 356.

[22] J. Pabón, op. cit., 131; R. Konetzke, op. cit., 538.

[23] ARTICLE 4 decrees freedom of religion, but it places worship in general "under a special law" in the interest of public order, freedom, and security of the citizens." ARTICLE 10: "Education offered in public and private institutions under state supervision is to be neutral in regard to religion."

[24] Cf. biblio., chap. 17.

Toward the end of Leo XIII's pontificate, the Plenary Council had without doubt touched upon the main ecclesiastical problems in the

---

[25] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 449f.; see the Council's files above.

[26] His immense knowledge was book knowledge. Concerning his role under Pius X, see p. 390; concerning his contribution to the encyclical *Pascendi,* see chap. 33, n. 15.

[27] J. M. Vidal, *El primer arzobispo de Montevideo,* 2 vols. (Montevideo 1935).

Latin American countries. But the structures of society were and continued to be so rigid that the social prerequisites for a fundamental religious renovation were absent, especially since the Christianization of the people had stagnated and the European enlightenment had seduced the intelligentsia. As history proves, it was only natural in such a situation that as a rule the Church had its alliance with the great landholders in the provinces representing the Federalists in contrast to the liberal Centralists in the urban centers. The masses, even the poor white population, remained passive until the end of the nineteenth century, and the Church was unable to activate them because they were either not willing or too weak. For a long time, there was no middle class. Until World War I, there was little social welfare.[28] Even if the Church had acted with less conformism after the secularizations, it would hardly have been in the position to effect a change of circumstances beyond its conventional Christian work of charity.[29] It made no difference in those times whether a regime which favored the Church was in power or not. Nor were the Liberals interested in social questions.

By 1880, Argentina, Chile, and Brazil were the leading Latin American countries, chiefly because of their economic growth,[30] but also thanks to a relationship between Church and state which was essentially peaceful, in spite of repeated tensions. The Argentinian constitution of 1853 remained in force until 1920. It declared the Catholic Church to be the state religion and provided financial compensations for secularizations. It did, however, tolerate other denominations. President Domingo Sarmiento (1868–74), who was greatly interested in improving the backward educational system,[31] opened the country to European influences. After his overthrow and emigration to Chile, the political anticlericalism of the Liberals was strengthened by a minor, but intellectual group.[32] Nevertheless, Leo XIII was able to establish, with the approval of the government, the bishoprics in La Plata, Santa Fé, and Tucumán. Argentina's situation was strongly determined by immigrants: in 1869, 1.8 million inhabitants were counted; from 1874 to 1880, approximately 45,000 people, from 1880 to 1886 approximately

---

[28] E. Samhabera, op. cit. (1949), 93: "There existed a state, but it was a feudal state, ruled by an aristocratic society which had to fulfill certain tasks, but which strictly maintained its position."

[29] Cf. J. N. Moody, *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 750–807.

[30] Argentina was able to increase its cattle and wheat export in the last third of the century; Chile secured for itself through belligerent means the world monopoly for saltpeter. Brazil, whose population had grown more than the average, was expanding its coffee production continuously.

[31] For a long time, the University of Buenos Aires, founded in 1821, suffered from a lack of students.

[32] C. Bruno, *El derecho público de la iglesia en la Argentina,* 2 vols. (Buenos Aires 1956).

70,000 people came into the country annually, mostly Italians and Spaniards. At times, in the following period of speculation, 300,000 people immigrated per year. It was difficult to organize proper pastoral work, and the increase of bishoprics (under Pius X three additional ones) was actually a facade. In 1910, a Catholic University was established in Buenos Aires. In the same year, the liberal lawyer and politician Joaquín V. González, founder of the University of La Plata, wrote his book *El Juicio del Siglo,* in which he analyzed the path the country took from the culture of the Spanish aristocracy via barbarism down to the "return": it emphasized the continuity of *hispanidad,* transcending anticlericalism.[33]

The ecclesiastical situation in Chile resembled the one in Argentina because it had a similar constitution (1865). Basically tolerant of other religions, Catholicism was still the official religion, even for the regalists, whose belief in regard to the state church law was rooted in the tradition of the patronate's law. During the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X, the Chilean ecclesiastical situation was characterized by the fact that the masonic anticlericalism of the Radical-Liberals eased up considerably. An example of such curious alliances is the purely political one of 1890 between the strictly Church-oriented Conservatives and the Radicals. It was aimed at the Liberal José Balmaceda, who was rather authoritarian as president and lost the belligerent conflict in Parliament.

The establishment of the Republic in Brazil by the Radical-Liberals came about peacefully. This can be partly credited to the Pope's diplomacy; he was, however, totally ill-disposed toward Emperor Pedro II (1831–88) and his tolerance of non-Catholic sects.[34] The Pope recognized the Republic and diplomatic relations were resumed. The constitution of 1891 guaranteed the Church freedom and property, but, following the separation law, all financial aid was disallowed. The Brazilian Church now had to rely on its own resources (like the Church in the United States), and it had to centralize the revenues and donations of its diocesan treasuries. Of greatest concern, however, was the augmentation of the clergy, whose number (in 1872 not quite one thousand priests) was especially depressing compared to the rapid growth of the population under Pedro II because of heavy immigration (from approximately 6 to 14 million). The Church was also interested in raising the standards of religious education, which had suffered greatly in the era of rationalism. The Pope favored the settlements of European orders in Brazil, such as those of the Premonstratensians of Averbode in São Paulo and the Benedictines of Maredsous, who strove to renovate the Brazilian congregation of Olinda. In 1894 and 1895, G. van Caloen made visitations, the results of which were discussed in Beuron's mother house in Maredsous. Leo XIII employed his authority to this end *(est mea voluntas)*.[35] In 1899, the Pope appointed van Caloen vicar general to the Brazilian Archabbot Machado[36] with the right of succession for life. From 1892 until 1902, Leo XIII established eight new bishoprics in Brazil. In 1905, Pius X appointed the archbishop of Rio de Janeiro, Arcoverda Cavalcanti, cardinal, the first one in Latin America. The successful foreign minister, Baron Rio Branco, made sure that this honor was recompensed properly. The Republic, again and again shaken by disturbances, sent the Pope a de luxe edition bound in pure gold, with the Pope's signature laid out in precious stones and his portrait framed by ninety diamonds.[37]

---

[33] Cf. quotation in W. v. Schoen, op. cit., 570.

[34] Catholic Church historiography considered Pedro II an "enemy of the Church" (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 453). The main reason is his action against the two bishops whose attitude toward the directives of Pius IX regarding the question of the Freemasons was just as correct as that of the King toward the constitution. Pedro II, who granted amnesty to the two bishops in the following year, was not a politician, but an important person, and his relation to the Church is hardly any different from that of Joseph II (cf. W. v. Schoen, op. cit., 359f.).

Bolivia was weakened by frequent military revolts and the loss of its coastal province of Atacama to Chile. Only after World War I did it recoup on account of its tin production. Even in the last third of the nineteenth century, the ecclesiastical situation remained unchanged and the Franciscans continued their missionary work among a population which consisted mainly of Indians and half-castes.[38] Though freedom of religion existed in principle, the Catholic Church was the only one supported by the state. Coupled with this support, however, was a large amount of interference, against which the Pope protested in 1906. In Peru, where a papal delegate was allowed to reside in Lima (also responsible for Bolivia and Ecuador), conditions similar to Bolivia prevailed until the turn of the century, when the situation was clouded by the introduction of civil marriage (1898). But in 1899, an agreement with the government concerning three apostolic prefectures was signed. Serious domestic controversies ended under the dictatorship of A. Leguía (1908–12; 1919–30). In 1913, a provincial council met in Lima in order to deal with the devastating shortage of priests.

It is interesting to compare ecclesiastical development in Colombia and Venezuela with that in Ecuador and Guatemala. Colombia was the first Latin American country which instituted a radical separation of Church and state (1853). Since the presidency of R. Núñez (1880), relations with the Church were exceedingly friendly, and, in 1885, diplomatic relations with the Vatican were resumed (General Vélez as ambassador). After the constitution of 1887/88, amended in 1892, the Catholic Church became the official religion and enjoyed independence. Compromises were agreed upon in controversial questions, such as the clergy's civil jurisdiction and the Church's competence in regard to cemeteries. The separation law of 1853, however, was not suspended. In the years from 1880 until 1900, Leo XIII established six new dioceses. Between 1899 and 1902, the country was once again shaken by a violent civil war, resulting in the secession of Panama, supported by the United States, from Colombia. E. Moreno y Díaz played a mediating role between the state and the Church. In 1888 he had come to Colombia from the Philippines as provincial of the Augustinian hermits. From 1895 until 1906, he was bishop of Pasto.[39] After 1904, General Rafael Reyes ruled rather dictatorially. But he is fondly remembered because he removed the consequences of civil war. He demonstrated his good relations to the Catholic Church by constructing a building for the nunciature in Bogotá (1908), where a Eucharistic Congress took place in 1913 under Archbishop Herrera Restrepo.

---

[35] P. Weißenberger, *Das benediktinische Mönchtum im 19. u. 20. Jahrhundert* (Beuron 1959), 59; cf. chap. 17.

[36] M. E. Scherer, "Domingos Machado—der Restaurator," *SM* 74 (1964), 7–162.

[37] Described extensively in Schmidlin. *PG* III, 92.

[38] L. Lemmens, *Geschichte der Franziskanermissionen* (Munich 1929), 316ff.

Venezuela also experienced the evolution of religious toleration after the regime of Guzmán, who was hostile toward the Church and had expelled Archbishop Guevara from the country in 1870. The activities of the religious orders flourished under his reign; not, however, under the dictatorship of Cipriano (1899–1908), at least not in respect to foreign relations. The seminary which was planned at a bishops' conference in Caracas (1904), was opened in 1913.

The relationship between Church and state fluctuated in Ecuador[40] and Guatemala. Even after the murder of Ecuador's President García Moreno (1875), whose work created what was called a "model Christian state,"[41] the Church continued to be favored under the more or less conservative governments. In 1881, the Concordat of 1862 was revised and Roman Catholicism in its capacity as the state religion was given extraordinary rights, as in regard to the supervision of schools. An additional agreement in 1890 alotted 3 percent of the state's property to the episcopate. In return, Leo XIII promised to use his influence on the bishops during the elections; this was generally the quid pro quo in Latin America, and it was particularly difficult because the appointment of priests was often under the direction of the ruling classes. However, the radical-liberal revolution of 1895, under the government of the otherwise moderate General Eloy Alfaro, produced severe measures against the previously favored Church, confiscating properties and expelling religious orders. After the enactment of civil marriage in 1902, the separation of Church and state was declared official (1904).

---

[39] T. Minguella y Arnedo, *Biographie* (Barcelona 1909).

[40] J. I. Larrea, *La Iglesia y el Estado en el Ecuador* (Seville 1954).

[41] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 451; the effects of the Church situation at that time on the relations between Ecuador and the then anticlerical Colombia are remarkable (W. v. Schoen, op. cit., 456).

The development in the Central American republic of Guatemala proceeded more quickly. Following the presidency of Carrera and Cerna, who were amicable toward the Church and dominated by the Conservatives of the white minority, the Liberals introduced a lay regime with the new constitution of 1879. With prophetic pathos, Archbishop Casanova y Estrada excommunicated President Justo Rufino Barrios, who had confiscated ecclesiastical estates, expelled the Jesuits, forbidden clerical dress in public, and mobilized the Indians and half-castes constituting the great majority of the population.[42] He was exiled in 1887. The subsequent presidents essentially followed the same line. Dictator Estrada Cabrera (1899–1919) built a "Minerva Temple" for state celebrations.

Probably the most extreme changes in the relations between Church and state took place in Mexico. After the failure of the politically respectable program of pure-blooded Indian Benito Juárez[43] the lay laws regarding the separation of Church and state, constitutionally validated by his successor, remained in force. But this separation had rather advantageous effects during the economically successful dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz (1877–81, 1884–1911). The wife of Díaz, Carmelita, who was friendly toward the Church, played an important role. The members of the orders and congregations were allowed to return more or less legally, and in the period between 1880 and 1902 Leo XIII established the bishoprics of Oaxaca, Monterrey, and Durango, as well as eleven bishoprics. It was in accord with the Indian tradition that Leo XIII decreed the consecration of the shrine of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in 1886, whose veneration (the name was taken after a Spanish shrine) was never disturbed by political disorders after 1531.[44] In 1896, a provincial council took place. According to the European model, Catholic Congresses were organized in Puebla (1903), Mérida

---

[42] "The so-called Justo Rufino Barrios was expelled from our blessed community. I forbid him from henceforth bearing the name of one of our Roman martyrs. We warn the faithful of any communication with the so-called Justo Rufino Barrios, who was deprived of God's mercy" (W. v. Schoen, op. cit., 419)

[43] R. Roeder, *Juárez and His Mexico,* 2 vols (New York 1947).

[44] In 1894, the office was expanded; in 1910, she became the patroness of all Latin America; R. V. Ugarte, *Historia del Culto de María en Ibero-América* I (Madrid ^{3}1956), 190–207.

(1904), Guadalajara (1906), and Oaxaca (1909). Especially remarkable is the Catholic Congress of Tulancingo (1904), during which the social problems of Mexican agriculture were discussed for the first time from a religious perspective. At the Congress of Zamora (Mexico) of 1913, the program of the *Confederación Nacional de los Círculos Católicos Obreros* was developed, to which Father Alfredo Méndez Medina contributed a great deal. Some of the social principles may have had an influence on the constitution of 1917 which arose from revolutionary chaos. However, ARTICLE 3 contained resolutions regarding the radical laicization of education and ART. 27 the nationalization of Church property.

There are many reasons for the failure of the religious regeneration of Latin America during this period. Without a doubt, the ecclesiastical forces concentrated too much on the relations between Church and state and on the hope of finding protection from the conservative governments, which, when given, was often rather questionable. Unfortunately, it is just as certain that the native clergy was qualitatively and quantitatively too weak, and that help from Europe not only came too late but brought ideas which did not match the Latin American circumstances. It was said that the wives of the politicians of all colors did go to church and that an open belligerence toward religion did not exist until the twentieth century.[45] One may add that Latin American Catholicism is so basic a phenomenon that it is evident even in the non-Christian literature, not to mention the Chilean poet Gabriele Mistral (Lucila Godoy Alcayaga). But this traditional Catholicism was exposed to consistent erosion after the middle of the nineteenth century due to the philosophy of Auguste Comte. Around 1880, positivism was the acknowledged faith of nearly the entire intellectual elite and of a large part of the liberal politicians (though with a different interpretation); it prevailed far beyond the turn of the century. Whoever lifted himself into the educated classes, which expanded considerably in the decades after 1880, would generally go the same route. The revolutions at the beginning of the nineteenth century had been a great disappointment, especially to Simón Bolívar. Now, it was hoped, the breakthrough would proceed past traditional Catholicism and succeed with the help of education.

---

[45] E. Samhaber, op. cit. (1949), 92; similarly in A. Bellesheim, *AkathKR* 81 (1901), 38: "The unifying factor in this multitude of peoples and states is the higher interests of the Catholic religion, which has remained the faith of the overwhelming majority of the South American states to this day in spite of the destructive efforts of the Freemasons and Liberalism."

CHAPTER 9

Catholic Self-Awareness in the British Empire

England and Scotland

In 1912 England had 1.79 million Catholics and Scotland .54 million, totalling 2.33 million within a population of 40.8 million (not counting Ireland). Around 1878, approximately .35 million Catholics lived in Scotland. Ireland aside (80 percent Catholic including Ulster), the Catholics were a small minority, which was concentrated for a long time in certain areas: in England, in Lancashire, London, and the Midlands; in Scotland, mainly in the vicinity of Glasgow and Edinburgh. After England had been granted an official hierarchy in 1850, Leo XIII, as one of the first acts of his pontificate (4 March 1878), established in Saint Andrews-Edinburgh the Scottish metropolitan see with four suffragans and in Glasgow an archbishopric which was directly responsible to Rome. This division was implemented with consideration for the significance of Irish immigration relative to the English Catholics, who were frequently of Irish descent. This explains why most Catholics were poor. To be sure, there were a large number of wealthy Catholics in England, which increased as a result of the conversion movement, but there was only a small representation in the middle class.

It is due in part to these sociological conditions that growing Catholicism was imprinted with the political genius of Henry Edward Manning rather than with the spirit of John Henry Newman. Manning (born in 1808), was the son of an entrepreneur, an English patriot who was shocked by Newman's conversion in 1845, and a friend of Gladstone, who also could not understand Manning's conversion in 1875.[1] The archbishop of Westminster (1865) was elevated to cardinal in 1875. That Manning was able to smoothly combine his English patriotism with his activism on behalf of Pius IX is, on the one hand, based on the religious tolerance of the Victorian period; on the other hand, it rested on Manning's social involvement which he considered a Christian as well as a national matter. This was facilitated by the fact that in Great Britain only a fool could have conceived of the idea of instituting a Catholic social movement. It was quite natural that Manning appeared as the speaker at the anniversary celebration of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Association in 1884 and that he was a member of the "royal commission for securing better housing for the poor." His main concern was not Catholicism as such, but social problems which were becoming increasingly urgent and had major political relevance in view of the election reforms. Manning, not withstanding his religious motivation, was interested in the matter itself, which can be said of only relatively few Catholics. By no means did he prefer political action to social action;[2] in fact, he refused to combine secular politics with ecclesiastical politics. For Manning, as for his friend William E. Gladstone (1809–98), the great leader of the Liberals, Irish home rule was a matter of both fairness and political prudence. To sacrifice it for the sake of the papal diplomacy of the eighties[3] was just as unthinkable to Manning as the idea of developing the overtures, exchanged during the fiftieth jubilee of Queen Victoria (1887), into diplomatic relations as envisioned by the conservative English Catholics. He had no confidence in missionary work conducted from above. "So far, the world has been ruled by the dynasties. Now it is time for the Holy See to negotiate with the peoples."[4]

---

[1] Gladstone to Wilberforce on 11 April 1851.

In close cooperation with Leo XIII, Cardinal Manning resolved the difficulties which regularly occurred in the process of transition from the ecclesiastical structure under the Propaganda Fide to that of an official hierarchy. There were especially tensions between the episcopate and the Benedictine monks as well as the Jesuits, whom Manning disliked. In the constitution of 8 May 1881, pastoral work and the administration of Church property were reserved exclusively to the episcopate. The new Scottish hierarchy organized a plenary council in August 1886. Manning's concept of the spirituality of the secular priesthood,[5] whose activities he protected against the criticism of the religious orders, must be seen in this. Neither theological speculation, one of the elements of tension between him and Newman, nor the isolated priesthood was of interest to Manning. "The clergy are in danger of becoming mere Mass priests and hucksters of sacraments."[6] What he wanted was a simple profile of Catholic basic principles, which were not to be concealed by secondary issues; no useless disputations, but expansive directives for action.

As everywhere else, the educational system was an important issue.

---

[2] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 488.

[3] Leo XIII's letters to the archbishop of Dublin, Eduard McCabe, of 3 January 1881 (*Acta Leonis* II, 187–90), to the Irish episcopate of 1 August 1882 (*Acta Leonis* II, 129–33), to Cardinal McCabe of 1 January 1883 (*Acta Leonis* III, 187–91), to the Irish episcopate of 24 June 1888 (*Acta Leonis* VIII, 249–53).

[4] Quoted from K. Buchheim (biblio., chap. 12), 332.

[5] Manning, *The Eternal Priesthood* (London 1884); also P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne* IV (Paris ^{6}1951), 579ff.

[6] Trapp (*Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung* [Regensburg 1940]) quotes from the biography of Purcell, p. 360.

The liberal religious policies of Gladstone, who even in his later years adhered to his Christian persuasion,[7] contained an ambivalent aspect for Catholicism in Great Britain. On the one hand, it was to its advantage that the Anglican Church, which dominated the school system and received public funds for it, began to lose its preeminence. On the other hand, the education law of 1870, which required that public nondenominational schools were to be financed by the state, resulted in the "provided schools" of the state dominating the field (general compulsory education was not introduced until 1880). The parochial private schools decreased, except for the Catholic ones, which dominated in Saint Leonard's on the Sea (Sussex), among other places. There, they were cared for by the Sisters of the Child Jesus, whose society had been organized by Cornelia Connelly[8] upon Nicholas Wiseman's suggestion. But it was not until 1902 that the Catholic schools received state funds (if they followed the general school curriculum).

In Great Britain, there were at least two different ways of dealing with the status of a minority; in fact, there were two sociologically different philosophies of Catholicism facing each other in the ecclesiastical world as it developed in the eighties and in the mentality of those who favored the attempts of an alliance with the Anglican Church (1895).

Wilfrid Ward wrote in his biography of Wiseman that the Catholics and Protestants had become "seemingly different races" in the period before 1829.[9] This is still true, when one considers the annual processions which loudly recited the Rosary as they proceeded from Newgate (East London) to Tyburn (West London), retracing the path which the English martyrs of the time of the Reformation (beatified by Leo XIII in 1886) were forced to march from prison to the place of their execution. Parliament permitted these processions, but for the people of London they were a version of the otherwise familiar nonconformism which belonged to a "different race." In 1887, clergyman Philip Fletcher and lawyer Lister Drummond,[10] two converts, founded The Guild of our Lady of Ransom and gave the society the prayer "Jesus, convert England!" At the procession's destination, the convent of the Sisters of Perpetual Adoration, Cardinal Vaughan founded an educational center for converts (1903). The Society Our Lady of Salvation declined around the turn of the century and was taken over by the Catholic Evidence Guild. The Catholic Truth Society, founded in 1884 by a converted layman, James Britten, was devoted to literary apologetics and, after 1887, set up stands in churches for pamphlets dealing with controversial religious questions, with English Church history, and also with the social question.

---

[7] P. Kluke, op. cit., 276.

[8] J. Bolten, *C. Connelly* (Munich 1928).

[9] W. Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* I (London 1897), 438.

[10] With permission of Cardinal Vaughan he preached in Hyde Park and set an example.

That was the kind of Catholicism in Great Britain which, with great sacrifice, supported the clergy[11] and its schools. It was the Catholicism of the lower classes, much more so than in the United States. This social climate was a determining factor in Cardinal Manning's activities. "The coming age will belong neither to the capitalists nor to the commercial classes, but to the people. The people are yielding to the guidance of reason, even to the guidance of religion. If we can gain their confidence, we can counsel them, if we show them a blind opposition, they will have power to destroy all that is good."[12] What is characteristic in this statement is that Manning was able to see the social problems of the industrial revolution as a universal problem. In 1880 he had already formed a theoretical foundation in *The Catholic Church and Modern Society.*[13] In this sober analysis, the son of an entrepreneur identified himself with the cause of the industrial worker. This, not esteem for the high priest of the papal Church, is the background for the popular story dealing with the arbitration of the dockworkers' strike which broke out in London on 13 August 1889.[14] In this instance, Manning fulfilled the "duties of citizens and patriots," whose rejection by the Catholics even after 1828 he called "a dereliction of duties in and of itself illegal."[15] The question of denominational or Christian unions was of little importance in Britain, since the trade unions were not oriented toward Marxism.[16]

---

[11] "To contribute to the support of our pastors" is one of the commandments of the English catechism.

[12] Letter to A. de Mun of 25 January 1891, in the new edition of *The Dignity and Rights of Labour and other Writings on the Social Questions* (London 1934), 68.

[13] His important contribution regarding the position of the industrial worker appeared in London in 1891; in the same year his comment on *Rerum novarum:* "Leo XIII on the condition of Labour." About Manning's contribution regarding the social theory of Catholicism see chap. 12, n. 58.

[14] Two hundred thousand dock workers were on strike because of their low wages after their moderate demands had been denied by the dock directors. Along with the lord mayor of London and the Anglican bishop, Manning was also a member of the arbitration commission, especially since there were numerous Catholics among the strikers. The compromise which had been negotiated one weekend did not materialize because of deadline difficulties regarding the obtainment of signatures. Consequently, the workers went on strike on Monday. Manning negotiated single-handedly with the strikers and was chosen as their arbitration representative. The strike was of importance because of the masses of unskilled laborers aroused there. John Burns, one of the leaders in the union of highly qualified workers (P. Kluke, op. cit., 287), cooperated well with Cardinal Manning during the arbitration procedures of the strike.

[15] According to E. Taylor, op. cit., 49.

[16] H. A. Clegg and others, *History of the British Trade Unions since 1889* I (London 1964).

The membership of Catholic workers was taken for granted. The Catholic Social Guild, founded in 1909 by H. Parkinson,[17] president of Oskott College, and by the Jesuit C. Plater, was devoted to the religious training of workers for the purpose of halting the spreading de-Christianization. Following the model of the *Katholischer Volksverein* in Germany, "penny-pamphlets" were to be distributed. The beginnings of the Catholic Social Guild were difficult. Five thousand members had been expected, but by 1912 there were only a thousand, though some were group memberships. After 1900 the National Conference of Catholic Trade-Unionists pursued similar goals.

The rest of organizational activity in Great Britain was rather limited, even though it extended over a multiplicity of social groups: 1910, The Catholic Medical Guild, with 200 members; 1911, The Catholic Stage Guild. The Catholic Young Men's Society of Great Britain had 22,000 members in 1912, including the Catholic Boy Scouts. The Catholic Women's League reached a membership of 8,000 in 1912.[18] A very bourgeois-conservative affair was The Catholic Association, founded in 1891 under the presidency of the Earl of Denbigh. It was related to the Catholic Confederation, which appeared in 1910 and was socially more embracing and above partisanship.

It was said that Manning's social activity stands isolated,[19] and that is true to a certain extent, because Catholicism's scholarly exchanges in the social question in Britain were not intensified until after 1900, in conjunction with the political growth of the Socialists.[20] But this has to be placed in the context of general history. Gladstone, who was consumed by the Irish question and in a legal sense favored the development of the trade unions, "was not a social reformer in the strict sense of the word, and the needs of the working class hardly concerned him."[21] Benjamin Disraeli, who is said to have had sympathies for Manning,[22] was a rather unique figure among the Tories for his social sensibilities (the Labour Party was founded in 1900). There was only a small number of Catholics to be found in the upper reaches of society. During the nineteenth century, the following had a seat in the government: Lord Ripon (1870, converted Freemason), in several liberal cabinets until 1909; Lord Llandaff, in the conservative cabinet of Lord Salisbury from 1886 until 1909; and the Duke of Norfolk, mediator of the papal response to the Queen during the jubilee of 1887, in the conservative cabinet of 1894.

---

[17] H. Parkinson, *A Primer of Social Science* (London 1913).

[18] K. Wanninger, op. cit., 110–30.

[19] "Manning's contribution was unique, for the majority of the older English Catholics were remote from the social struggle and unsympathetic towards the Irish laborers in factory and mine": C. Hollis: J. N. Moody, *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 822.

[20] Following the outsider E. G. Bagshawe (bishop of Nottingham) with his book *Mercy and Justice to the Poor* (London 1885); J. Mooney, *Catholic Principle of Social Reform* (London 1912); H. Parkinson, op. cit.; G. S. Devas, *Social Question and the Duty of Catholics* (London 1907); id., *Political Economy* (London 1911); the *Catholic Social Yearbook* appeared since 1912.

[21] P. Kluke, op. cit., 276.

[22] Cardinal Grandison in his *Lothair* is supposed to have certain features of Manning. K. Waninger, op. cit., 56.

The Catholicism of the upper classes was somewhat sympathetic toward the English Church Union, an organization founded in 1844 by the Anglo-Catholics within the Anglican Church. Its president (after 1868), Lord Halifax, personally inclined toward the Roman Catholic Church, had met the French Lazarist Fernand Portal, a student of Dupanloup, in 1890 on Madeira. In their correspondence during 1892, they searched for a way to unify the Roman Catholic and the Anglican Church in the near future. A discussion about the validity of Anglican orders was to serve as "a means toward that goal."[23] In July 1892, Halifax paid the archbishop of Westminster a visit in order to present his plan. Herbert Alfred Vaughan (in 1872 bishop of Salford, after March 1892 archbishop of Westminster, after 1893 cardinal) came from an old Catholic aristocratic family. In 1857 he had joined the Ambrosians, a society of the secular clergy, founded under Charles Borromeo, which Manning had introduced in Bayswater the same year. Vaughan differed from Manning and had lifted the prohibition for Catholic students to study in Cambridge and Oxford, which Manning had effected in Rome in 1895.[24] Nevertheless, he was in agreement with his predecessor in terms of ecclesiastical policy and definitely endorsed the doctrine of infallibility in the *Tablet,* which he purchased in 1866. Compared to Manning, he was less interested in social questions.[25] From the beginning Vaughan made it clear that, in contrast to the Anglicans, the recognition of papal primacy was the decisive element. Portal published *Les ordinations anglicanes* under a pseudonym in 1893 in Paris, in which he termed the consecration of Matthew Parker (appointed archbishop of Canterbury in 1559 by Elizabeth I) valid in terms of the "historical facts," but expressed doubt concerning the "intentions" of the consecrator. Church historian L. Duchesne used Catholic teaching on the sacraments to argue against this treatment of the question of intention and declared that one could consider the ordination as valid. Since Portal was able to anticipate the Catholics' objections to his arguments concerning the intention, as one would expect from an educated theologian, his essay was termed "a tactical move"[26] to get the discussion going. In 1894, Portal visited Halifax, who introduced him to the Anglican bishops. The archbishop of Canterbury, E. W. Benson, was very cool and just as aware of his convictions as Cardinal Vaughan, who was also annoyed because Portal did not follow up his invitation to visit him.[27] In September 1894, Portal was asked by Cardinal Secretary of State Rampolla to come to Rome and be introduced to the Pope. Portal's suggestion that Leo XIII should propose a conference to the Anglican episcopate was discarded. Instead, Rampolla wrote a letter to Portal, praising his desire for ecclesiastical unity and expressing hopes for "England's return to the only center of unity." Portal's second visit with the archbishop of Canterbury was even cooler than the first one. On 21 March 1895, Lord Halifax had an audience with the Pope, in which he proposed a direct offer (not through Cardinal Vaughan) to the Anglican episcopate, which was graciously noted. But in February, F. A. Gasquet, O.S.B., a Vaughan aide, was given the task of composing a papal letter[28] which was not to be addressed to the Anglican episcopate. Vaughan, who had arrived in Rome in 1895, used all means at his disposal to exert pressure against Portal's intentions. Basically his and Lord Halifax's plan had already failed in view of the apostolic letter *Amantissimae voluntatis* of 14 April 1895,[29] which was addressed *Ad Anglos* and urged using the "means" of discussing the ordinations in order to achieve a conference which could initiate the reunification. The letter, recalling Pope Gregory the Great, spoke with restraint about the Reformation ("Anglia . . . gravissimum vulnus accepit . . ., divulsa a communione Apostolicae Sedis, dein ab ea fide sanctissima abducta est"), praised the efforts toward unity of all Christians, and finally granted indulgence in a prayer to the Virgin Mary which was intended for the *Fratres dissidentes* and asked that they unite *summo Pastori, Vicario in Terris Filii tui.* The conclusion of the letter was composed by Merry del Val, who, as a young man, had been much favored by Leo XIII.[30] In spite of this conclusion, the letter was generally well received in England; even Benson spoke of an "honest appeal," but noted the important fact that it did not mention the Anglican Church. In the papal commission, appointed in 1896 for the purpose of investigating the question of Anglican orders, Merry del Val played a significant role as secretary to the president, Cardinal Mazzella, and as middleman to Vaughan. The six (later eight) members were selected equally from both parties; the one side was led by Gasquet, the other by Duchesne. However, Cardinal Mazzella, who rejected an application for admission of the Anglicans then present in Rome, and his secretary were definite opponents of the recognition of Anglican orders. The vote took place on 7 May. Voting for recognition were Duchesne and the Jesuit A. M. de Augustinis (professor of dogmatics at the Roman College); Pietro Gasparri (in 1880 professor of canon law at the *Institut Catholique* in Paris, later cardinal secretary of state) and another member expressed through their vote that the validity of the ordinations was "doubtful". The Vaughan group voted against it. The validity of Anglican orders was rejected in the papal bull *Apostolicae curae* of 13 September 1896, which was composed by Merry del Val.[31] The expectations of some that the conversions would increase if submission to the authority of the Pope was clearly demanded were not fulfilled. The hopes of others for an impending reunification of the Churches as such was an illusion in view of the contemporary historic situation. Except for the situation of the Anglican Church, oscillating between conservative and liberal tendencies, Wilfrid Ward, a moderate disciple of Vaughan and mediator to Halifax, analyzed the situation in England and Ireland clearly: "Should we be surprised that the descendants of those whose lives were ruined . . . or who died the death of a martyr . . . could muster only little understanding for the argument that their persecutors and judges belonged to a Church which, all in all, was possibly in agreement with them?"[32]

---

[23] J. J. Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void* (London 1968); German: "Absolut Null und Nichtig. Zur Ablehnung der anglikanischen Weihen . . .," *Studia Anglicana* 2 (Trier 1970), 39.

[24] Not until 1872 did Gladstone abolish the law which made being a member of the Anglican Church a prerequisite for the obtainment of an academic degree. P. Kluke, op. cit., 278.

[25] C. Hollis, op. cit., 823.

---

[26] J. J. Hughes, op. cit., 56.

[27] J. J. Hughes, op. cit., 59f.—One should probably ask why Portal did not request an audience after his invitation by Vaughan was lost.

[28] According to the literary remains of Gasquet. Aso: K. Connelly, "An Unheard-of Thing: An Historical Study of the Apostolical Letter . . ." (unpubl. diss., Louvain 1967); J. J. Hughes, op. cit., 97.—Critical analysis of the historian Gasquet (1900: abbot of Downside, 1907: chairman of the commission to revise the Vulgate, 1914: cardinal): D. Knowles, *Cardinal Gasquet as an Historian* (London 1957); id., *The Historian and Character* . . . (Cambridge 1963), 240–63.—Concerning Leo XIII's perspective in this matter, see "The Union's favorite dream of the universal empire with Rome," Schmidlin, *PG* II, 489.

[29] *Acta Leonis* XV, 138–55; concerning its development, see J. J. Hughes, op. cit., 97f.

Leo XIII's conciliatory pragmatism was also responsible for the existing illusions, which include the Pope's own on unification. It is interesting that nearly one month before the papal bull, on 23 August 1896, Leo XIII sent a letter to Cardinal Vaughan dealing with the problem of the economic situation of converted Anglican clergymen. Here, his intentions were clearly expressed. He speaks about the "heroism" of those clergymen who converted without any consideration of the economic consequences. But there were also others who did "not possess as much courage," but yet were close to taking this step. Therefore he suggested establishing a relief fund.[33] The Converts Aid Society, however, was not very successful because of the extraordinary financial burden placed upon the Catholics and because its purpose was misunderstood. Cardinal Francis Bourne (1903–35) organized this action after World War I with great interest. In 1898, analogous to other national institutions, Leo XIII founded the Beda College in Rome, and on 13 November he elevated the Venerable Bede to the rank of Father of the Church.

---

[30] J. J. Hughes, op. cit., 32; also below, Introduction to Pt. II, n. 19.

[31] *Acta Leonis* XVI, 258–75.—Concerning the theological controversy, see F. Clark: *LThK*² I, 554f, incl. biblio.; also: J. de Bivort de la Saudée, *Anglicans et catholiques* (Paris 1949). In opposition to Clark, see J. J. Hughes, *Stewards of the Lord. A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders* (London 1970); id., "Zur Frage der anglikanischen Weihen. Ein Modellfall festgefahrener Kontroverstheologie," *Quaestiones disputatae* 59 (Freiburg i. Br. 1973; the original in German).

[32] J. J. Hughes, *Absolut und Nichtig,* 49. Concerning W. Ward and the Synthetic Society, see chap. 31.

In 1905, following the victory of the Liberal Party, which had been rejuvenated by youthful forces, the question of schools came up again. The objective of the education law of 1870 was reiterated insofar as the Rosebery cabinet wanted to further repress the traditional Anglican predominance in education.[34] But now Cardinal Bourne aligned with the Anglicans and the conservative opposition in the fight against the deconfessionalization of schools (religious instruction was to be given in the classroom, but not to belong to the general curriculum)[35] and, consequently, the bill miscarried in the House of Lords. But these were tactical alliances. The Eucharistic World Congress of 1908 in London, which was attended by Cardinal Legate Vannutelli, was correctly analyzed as a "brilliant expression of the unified power" of the island's Catholics.[36] But this was also the way a large part of the London public understood it, and thus protests occurred, and Lord Herbert Asquith, promoted from chancellor of the treasury to prime minister (1908), warned against carrying the monstrance in the procession.[37] It was clear to the seasoned episcopate in Great Britain, which also held back in the dispute over modernism,[38] that the founding of a Catholic party, as Leo XIII desired, would only harm ecclesiastical life. On 28 October 1911 the Pope reorganized the hierarchy. Henceforth, the Church province of Westminster was to incorporate the dioceses of Northhampton, Nottingham, Portsmouth, and Southwark; the new province of Liverpool was to add the dioceses of Newcastle, Leeds, Middlesbrough, and Salford; and the province of Birmingham included the dioceses of Clifton, Menevia, Newport, Plymouth, and Salisbury.

---

[33] *Acta Leonis* XVI, 246ff.; cf. I. Bolten, op. cit., 80f.

[34] P. Kluke, op. cit., 291.

[35] Schmidlin, *PG* III, 112.

[36] K. Waninger, op. cit., 99.

[37] He referred to several existing prohibitions; but there were numerous ones, and ignoring them had not resulted in any complications (cf. Schmidlin, *PG* III, 113, n. 13).

[38] Cardinal Bourne expressed himself to that effect to von Hügel; see chap. 31.

Ireland

During the first year of Leo XIII's pontificate, Cardinal Paul Cullen, the head of the episcopate in Ireland, died. In 1880 Gladstone took over the government after the victory of the Liberals in the elections, in which the Irish National Party was able to increase its seats from fifty-nine to sixty-five. In spite of Gladstone's conflicts with the Irish episcopate over the question of the universities in 1873 and his reaction to it (published in a flyer which became known all over Europe),[39] his personal involvement and current events entangled him once again in the Irish question. Bad harvests and the intensification of the political battle resulted in 1882 in nearly one hundred attempted assassinations and twenty-six murders. The terrorism in the battle for justice was also directed against those Irish who did not obey the directives of the organization.[40] This has to be taken into consideration as well as the impoverishment of the Irish tenant farmers, whose lot could only gradually be improved by a land act which Gladstone enacted in spite of the terrorism.[41] Otherwise, the solidarity of a large part of the episcopate[42] and Leo XIII's interventions cannot be adequately assessed.

On 3 January 1881 the Pope sent a letter to Archbishop MacCabe of Dublin, no doubt repeating, in reference to Gregory XVI, more of the *debita obedientia* and the *Cupiditates in seditiones flammam,*[43] than was prudent in view of the situation created by the recently enacted land act. The letter of 1 August 1882, addressed to the entire Irish episcopate, endorsed the condemnation of the terrorist acts; however, in blaming them on the "secret societies,"[44] he showed little understanding of the necessity for organized resistance in such a situation, even though the Pope generally approved of the desire for justice. Incidentally, the Irish episcopate had good reason to suggest that Rome should not altogether trust the information from London. After MacCabe had been elevated to cardinal on 27 March 1882, the Pope, in a letter of 1 January 1883, admonished the episcopate to act in concord and the clergy to obey the bishops.[45] The intrigues of the conservative Catholic deputy from Ireland, Errington, at the Vatican showed what kind of impact the massive interests of the landlords had, even on the Church's treatment of the Irish question.[46] How venomous the atmosphere was in the Church itself is documented by the case of Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, who had to undergo an interrogation in 1885 in Rome before he was confirmed.[47] The Vatican critic Gladstone was able to foresee for the next decades that the Irish question could not be solved merely by improved reform laws, but that the request for home rule had to be granted. In the beginning of 1886, he failed to win support for his bill providing for the suspension of the union of 1801 and for Ireland's own Parliament (with the exclusion of trade, foreign affairs, and the military). The bill miscarried because of imperialistic resistance, even within his own ranks.[48] The Home Rule law of 1912/14 came too late because of the war. It brought revolution. Leo XIII carried part of the responsibility for this. The old grievances did not return after Gladstone's defeat, but Ireland's being chained to Great Britain and the interests of the Unionists persisted, so that the unrest was aggravated, a consequence from which the episcopate could not escape. Nevertheless, the Pope, counseled by the Prefect for Propaganda Simeoni and the Irish College, showed little understanding for Ireland's increasing national, rather than economical demands.[49] On 20 April 1888, the Congregation on the Inquisition answered negatively an inquiry about whether a boycott by the tenant farmers was permissible, and requested an attitude of charity and fairness. However, in a letter of 24 June 1888, addressed to the entire episcopate, Leo XIII emphasized that the matter was not only subject to the authority of the bishops but also to his own authority, and he resented being insufficiently informed.[50] The Irish question had critically entangled political issues, characterized by a mixture of right and wrong, with ecclesiastical aspects on all sides. At the same time, it was an example of the dilemma of Leo's direct policies, and thus it continued to smolder. Furthermore, the legation of Vannutelli in 1904[51] only intensified the ecclesiastical situation.

---

[39] The Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance (1874).

[40] C. C. O'Brien, *Parnell and his Party* (London 1957).

[41] The only way out was emigration, so that the 8 million inhabitants had decreased to about 4 million from the beginning of the century until the end.

[42] Even in 1890, Manning's attitude is expressed in his words: "If the government treats its people the way lords and country squires treat their herdsmen and workers, then the free Englishmen will rebel against it;" quoted by E. Taylor, op. cit., 161.

[43] *Acta Leonis* II, 188.

[44] *Acta Leonis* III, 130.

---

[45] *Acta Leonis* III, 188f.

[46] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 488.

[47] Ibid., 493.

[48] P. Kluke, op. cit., 285.

[49] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 493.—D. H. Akenson, *The Church of Ireland. Ecclesiastical Reform and Revolution, 1800–1885* (Yale 1971).

[50] *Acta Leonis* VII, 253, 251 ("Num igitur in eo temeritas inest, quod aiunt, de caussa Nos iudicavisse non satis cognita?").

[51] Schmidlin, *PG* III, 111.

The liberal Asquith was able to achieve in 1909 what the liberal Gladstone had failed to accomplish in 1873. In addition to the Queen's University of Belfast, he established the National University of Ireland, with its three colleges in Dublin, Cork and Galway, which were both fundamentally supra-denominational, but the school in Dublin was, for all practical purposes, Catholic.[52]

At that time, Catholicism in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was sociologically hardly homogeneous. This is evidenced by the biographies of a line of significant writers who knew they belonged to Catholicism, but cannot be regarded as its exponents without serious reservations. C. K. Patmore (born in 1823 in Woodfore, died in 1896) grew up without any religious training; the poet of the "Unknown Eros" (1877) converted to Catholicism in Rome in 1864. His younger friend G. M. Hopkins (born in 1844 in Stratford, Essex, died in 1889) converted in 1866 under the influence of Newman and joined the Society of Jesus in 1868. Dedicated to the art of "inscape," he is one of the most original religious poets. A marginal figure was Francis Thompson (born in 1859 in Preston, Lancaster, died in 1907), the son of convert parents. He attended the seminary of Ushaw at a young age, but after 1885 became a homeless person in London, addicted to opium. In the nineties, he grew to feel somewhat at home in the Franciscan monastery Pantasaph in North Wales, where he became known as the poet of God's love, which one cannot escape ("The Hound of Heaven," 1890). G. K. Chesterton (born in 1874 in London, died in 1936) converted to Roman Catholicism in later years; but his socially grounded opposition to the representatives of the "heretics" (1905) is documented in a nonconformist fashion in his *Orthodoxy* (1908) and in his story about the Catholic farm boy from Scotland and the atheist who are prevented by the eternal compromisers from fighting each other (*The Ball and the Cross,* 1909). Together with his friend Hilaire Belloc (1870–1953), a student of the Oratorians in Birmingham, he wielded a sharp apologetic sword against British society. The fact that Belloc was of French-Irish descent (he was fascinated by Charles Maurras) fits into the continental orientation of the Irish "revival," whose most important members, however, were alienated from the Church (indicative of the problem of Irish Catholicism).[53]

---

[52] Cf. A Bellesheim, *AkathKR* (1910).

[53] J. C. Reid, *The Mind and the Art of C. K. Patmore* (London 1957); J. G. Ritz, *Le poete G. M. Hopkins* (Paris 1960); R. Hill, "F. Thompson," *Lexikon der Weltliteratur* II (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 1074f.; M. Ward, *G. K. Chesterton* (London 1944); R. Hill, op. cit., 330–32; J. B. Morton, *H. Belloc* (London 1955).

Canada

In Canada, the Catholic part of the total population decreased slightly from 42.9 percent in 1871 to 39.4 percent in 1911.[54] The Franco-Canadian Catholicism in the province of Quebec, which had developed a pronounced conservative stance during Pius IX's pontificate and actually dominated public life with its strong ecclesiastical authority, was suffering from serious tensions in the last quarter of the century, which were at least partly ignited by its relations with France. The French-Canadian economic relations were increased after 1890, and at that time, Franco-Canadian society was more and more influenced by an image of France based on the Restoration rather than the Revolution. It was the spirit of Victor Hugo. As a result, the controversies within French Catholicism, the pro and con in reference to Leo XIII's *Ralliement* politics, and the ecclesiastical policy of the Third Republic were considered by the Canadian Catholics to be much their own affair. These backlashes combined with inner Canadian differences in the episcopate. E.-A. Taschereau, from 1871 until 1898 archbishop of Quebec,[55] held from the beginning of his episcopate a more differentiated opinion of the relationship between the civil society and the Church than Bishop J. Bourget of Montreal, who had died in 1876. The Conservatives, therefore, suspected him of liberalism, and he had to defend himself against immigrant extremists by demanding their return to France. The owner and editor of *La Vérité,* J.-P. Tardivel (1851–1905), had chosen Louis Veuillot as his model. After 1881 he fought, together with his friend Fr. J. Grenier, S.J., anyone who, in his opinion, was not exclusively oriented toward Rome. Both Veuillot and Tardivel inspired a comparison with Taschereau and Dupanloup.[56] In reference to the Spanish Catholics' disputations in *Siglo futuro* and the insolent behavior of Nocedal, the "Spanish Veuillot,"[57] Leo XIII wrote a letter in 1882 asking the Spanish Catholics to make peace. Archbishop Taschereau did not miss the opportunity to pass this letter on to his clergy, including a comment relative to the local situation. The writer Tardivel was too radical even for Monsignor Laflèche, Bishop of Trois Rivières and leader of the strictly conservative bishops of Canada. In his "Mandement sur les sociétés secrètes" of 1883, he reserved for himself the right to decide which societies would be subject to the ecclesiastical prohibition. On the occasion of the publication of the encyclical *Humanum genus* of 1884, he emphasized the need for a fight against the Freemasons, conceding, however, that there were only very few of them in French Canada.[58] But the basic attitude of Archbishop Taschereau was more in line with Leo XIII's intentions than those of his opponents, and thus Leo appointed him cardinal in 1887.[59]

---

[54] Saint-Denis, tables V and VI. The population of Irish descent decreased during that time from 24.3 percent to 14.9 percent, while the population of French descent increased from 37.9 to 41.7 percent. Immigration played an important role for a long time: in 1914, every fourth Canadian was born outside of the dominion.

[55] P. Savard, op. cit., index.

[56] P. Savard, op. cit., 84.

[57] This vol., p. 121.

In the nineties French Canada also experienced a school struggle. But it differed from similar conflicts because of the conditions there: the dominant position of the Church in education. In 1886 the Sulpicians had been accused of undermining the congregations of teaching brothers by supporting a stronger participation of laymen in education.[60] In 1893 it was demanded that the clergy pass the same examination as the laymen, from which they had been exempted in 1846. Moreover, the traditional humanistic curriculum became more and more the object of controversy. The Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, John A. Macdonald, who had been in office since the British North America Act (1867), was replaced in 1891 by the liberal Wilfrid Laurier. When the liberal president of Quebec, F.-G. Marchand wanted to establish a department for education in 1889, a furious public reaction occurred and the project was unable to secure a majority in Parliament.[61] In 1889 Leo XIII seized the initiative and elevated the ecclesiastical University of Ottawa (founded in 1849), where Archbishop J.-T. Duhamel taught (1874–1909), to a papal institution. The University, recognized by the state in 1866, was the first in Canada to teach in English and French. An example of the increase in tensions was the unreasonable request (in 1889) that Cardinal Taschereau appeal to Queen Victoria on behalf of the Roman question and the partisan interpretation of his refusal as being a betrayal of the Pope. On the other hand, an increase in animosity toward the Church is evident, which came partly from Ontario, whence anti-Jesuitism spread to Quebec, and partly from France. The anti-Catholic Equal Rights Association founded a group in Montreal and the radical Grand Orient lodge founded a branch in French Canada. The conflicts survived the death of Cardinal Taschereau (his successor in Quebec was L.-N. Bégin, 1898–1925), corresponding to the political development in France. An example is the embarrassment of the successful French preacher J.-F.-R. Rozier in 1902 in Montreal, when he was charged (in a newspaper interview) with having failed to divorce himself sufficiently from the French government. In 1911 the first plenary synod was aimed at demonstrating the inner cohesiveness of French and English Catholicism in Canada. The opening address of the premier of Quebec, L. Gonin, at the Eucharistic Congress of 1910 showed what kind of authority the Church still possessed in spite of a certain intensification of liberalism: "The Canadian State does not consider the Church an enemy to be fought as a rival; it considers the Church an ally and its best support."[62]

---

[58] Taschereau rejected the Knights of Labor, in contrast to Archbishop J. J. Lynch of Toronto (1860–88) (1883: inquiry in Rome with negative answer, 1886: another inquiry, because the answer had only been applied to Quebec. The response this time was that the answer was a general one); P. Savard, op. cit., 212–20.—Regarding the further development, see J. Hulliger, *L'enseignement social des évêques canadiens, 1891–1950* (Paris 1958); M. Têtu, "Les premiers Syndicats cath. canadiens. 1900–1921" (diss., Laval University 1961).

[59] Tardivel tried in vain to obtain an audience with Leo XIII in 1888–89; although he was received benevolently in 1896, he does not seem to have been satisfied with the result of the audience.

[60] F. S. Louis, *Les frères des Écoles chrétiennes au Canada. 1837–1900* (Montreal 1921).—In regard to the school conflict in general, see P. Savard, op. cit., 177–86.

[61] An example of the change after an extreme conservative reign is the path which the politician J.-I. Tarte, who was once a friend of Tardivel and later his enemy took (L. Lapierre, "Relation between the French Canadian Episcopacy and a French Canadian Politician, 1874–96," *Rapport de la Société Canad. d'Histoire de l'Église Catholique* (1958), 23–39.

Australia

Catholicism in Australia entered a new period of growth, when P. F. Moran[63] was appointed archbishop of Sydney (in 1885 he became Australia's first cardinal). In spite of a decrease in Irish immigration, the portion of the Catholics in the growing white population remained fairly constant: 1841: 40,000 out of 211,000; 1901: 850,000 out of 3.78 million.[64] It was of great significance in 1888 that Cardinal Moran could found and open Saint Patrick's Ecclesiastical College in Manly (north of Sydney), thus providing for the training of the native clergy. This contributed to easing the tensions which the religious orders and secular clergy from Europe had brought into the country. It also diminished the Australian Englishmen's fear of French settlements. But the process of deconfessionalizing education had more negative consequences for the Catholic schools in Australia than it did in Britain. The cancellation of state subsidies could not easily be compensated for by individual efforts, and the Australian bishops had to solicit the assistance of European teaching orders. Until the middle of the twentieth century, the congregations were usually represented in branch foundations.

---

[62] A. Touchet, "Le congrès eucharistique de Montréal," *Correspondant* 141 (October 1910), 3–30.

[63] P. F. Moran, born in Ireland (1830–1911), studied at the Irish College in Rome and served after 1866 as secretary to Cardinal Cullen, his uncle. He wrote the *History of the Catholic Church in Australia,* 2 vols. (Sydney 1896).

[64] Around 1927, the proportions changed considerably: 1.1 million–6.3 million; 480,000 in the Church province of Sydney 320,000 in the province of Melbourne.

Among the original Australian foundations are the Sisters of Saint Joseph (in 1882 in Goulburn and in 1883 in Lochinvar) and Our Lady's Nurses of the Poor (1913). Cardinal Moran followed the example of Leo XIII's pontificate and organized regular plenary synods in Sydney (1885, 1895, 1905). The growing social awareness of Australian Catholicism expressed itself in the congresses taking place after 1900, having an active leader in their cardinal, who was a supporter of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. It was in accord with the social status of most Catholics in Australia that Moran favored the Australian Labor Party and showed sympathy for the strikes of the nineties, even though that gained him the reputation among the Conservatives of being a socialist.[65]

Like the rest of the population, the Catholics concentrated in New South Wales and in Victoria. There were difficulties in establishing an ecclesiastical organization in West Australia, where natural conditions in the southwestern part favored a stronger density of population. There, the Irishman M. Gibney, who had been a priest in West Australia since 1863, was appointed Bishop of Perth in 1887 (a bishopric since 1845). The use of Trappists from the abbey of Sept-Fons in the Beagle Bay Mission proved to be impractical. In 1901 they were replaced by the Pallotines (under the generalate of Fr. Whitmee). Lacking crucial internal or external tensions, Catholicism was able to develop favorably, and Cardinal Cerretti, during his visits in 1915/17, found a flourishing Church.

---

[65] P. Ford, *Cardinal Moran and the A. L. P.—A Study in the Encounter between Moran and Socialism* (Melbourne 1966).

CHAPTER 10

The American Way

In 1820 there were one hundred ninety thousand Catholics among the total white population of 7.8 million. By 1870 the total population had risen to 33.5 million with 4.5 million Catholics. This growth rate, mainly due to Irish immigration, decreased in the seventies when 600,000 out of 2.8 million immigrants were Catholics (180,000 Irish, 175,000 German, and 82,000 Canadian). In the eighties, 1.2 million of the 5.2

million immigrants were Catholic (400,000 German, 300,000 Irish, approximately 200,000 East European, 130,000 Italian). In this time period the number of births within the Catholic population almost equalled that of the immigrants. In the following years, however, the largest portion of immigrants were Italians, who often came without their families and returned to their homeland. In 1900, there were about 12 million Catholics in the total population of 78 million; they had tripled since 1870.[1] For the year 1957, there was an estimate of 25.7 percent Catholics.[2]

In view of the growing mobility of the industrial age, pastoral work in regard to immigrants, especially in the United States, had been recognized as an important task. At the Catholic Convention in Mainz in 1871, the Saint Raphael Society for the Protection of German Emigrants was founded, mainly upon suggestion of the businessman Peter Paul Cahensly (1838–1923; 1885 deputy of the Center Party). Journeying to the United States in 1874, he occupied steerage in order to investigate the situation of the emigrants. Encouraged by Leo XIII, he repeated this trip in 1883. In Italy, which was harder hit than Germany, G. B. Scalabrini, bishop of Piacenza after 1876,[3] took the initiative and founded the *Pia Società dei Missionari di S. Carlo per gli Italiani emigranti* (1887). Cahensly, who had presented his case to the Congress of Liège in 1887, made contact with Scalabrini, who founded the *Società S. Raffaele* in 1890. It is the name of the rather active German Cahensly that comes to mind in connection with the controversy about "Cahenslyism" (which was unreasonable, but its proponents had good intentions), rather than the name of the diligent Scalabrini, in whose spirit Francesa Saveria Cabrini (1850–1917) worked.[4] During the Saint Raphael's Convention in Lucerne in 1890, the international character of which was somewhat diminished by the absence of the Americans, a memorandum was composed which stated that, as a result of the pastoral situation in the United States, 10 million Catholic immigrants had been deprived of the practice of their faith. Cahensly sent the memorandum to the Pope and increased the number of victims in a letter to Rampolla to 16 million. As a remedy he suggested placing the national parishes under the authority of a bishop of their respective countries.[5]

---

[1] Data according to J. T. Ellis: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 14 (1967), 434f. All numbers are dubious because the American Constitution prohibits questions about one's faith. During the time of immigration, the denomination index of the home country was used, among other things.

[2] The statistician controversy is not finished yet. The calculations of G. Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept Faith?* (New York 1925), are accepted by some or rejected by others (L. Hertling, op. cit., 162–66).

[3] I. Felici, *G. B. Scalabrini* (Monza 1954); M. Caliaro, M. Francesconi, *L'Apostolo degli emigranti, G. B. Scalabrini* (Milan 1968).

[4] She founded the *Missionarinnen vom Heiligsten Herzen* (confirmed in 1881) and devoted her life to the Italian emigrants, first in New York, later in several other cities (died in Chicago); canonized on 7 July 1946. The miserable conditions which she encountered and tried to alleviate by establishing schools, hospitals, and orphanages, should not be blamed on the American pastoral work (Hertling, op. cit., 171f; C. Caminada, *Una Italiana per le vie del mondo* [Turin 1946]).

The reaction of the episcopate as well as the general public in the United States was vehement. In 1891, through Rampolla and Ledóchowski, the Pope rejected the idea of a nationally differentiated American episcopate[6] and limited the measures to pastoral care of the Italians by Italian priests, as he had already recommended in 1888.[7] But the incident in Lucerne could not easily be repaired, and Leo XIII's benevolence in this matter was, among other things, an indication that European ideas obscured the view of the New World. Of course, national emotions played an intensifying role. Senator Cushman C. Davis brought the matter to the attention of Congress in 1891 and spoke favorably of the Pope, Cardinal Gibbons, and Archbishop Ireland, but was critical of the Germans. In January 1892 the *Catholic World* attacked the Italians, declaring that they should relieve the Pope of his burden. Denis Joseph O'Connell, then rector of the American College in Rome,[8] wrote to his friend Gibbons in 1891: For us, it is simply a clerical matter, but for it [the Curia] it is a political matter, it is part of its policy in regard to the Central Powers."[9] It is correct, however, to say that the pastoral question was not handled as carefully as would have been proper under the given circumstances. It is also true that the political calculation of the pontificate (or what was taken as such) could play a disturbing role, as was the case in other situations.[10] As for an objective diagnosis, Archbishop Ireland, who was probably more aware because of his pride in America, came closest to the truth in his estimation that 1 to 1.5 million immigrants had lost the practice of their Catholic faith, and this figure should be considered accurate.

The controversy concerning the immigrants' pastoral care was already on the horizon of the great conflict of the nineties, and it illuminates the central problem of Catholicism in the United States at that time. The difficulties of a minority in an often aggressively hostile society[11] were intensified by its national heterogeneity. On the other hand, the groups of the various immigrants found a certain security in their national parishes, so that the development of a total Catholic consciousness as well as its acculturation to American society was problematic. But these tendencies, fostered by the European mother countries, stood in contrast to existing social conditions, especially for the second generation of immigrants. The result was the emergence of problems related to parochial jurisdiction whenever there was the desire to change the parish and thus the *rector ecclesiae.* The language problem seems to have played a relatively minor role. The Irish spoke English, and the Germans, next to the Irish the most important group up to the eighties, quickly learned the language of the country, at least in the second generation.

---

[5] L. Hertling, op. cit., 162–66.

[6] *ASS* 24, 685: "Cum enim tunc temporis inanes rumores spargi in vulgus cepissent de Catholicae Hierarchiae in Statibus Foederatis ratione ita immutanda isthuc Catholicis ex variis Europae nationibus populares Episcopi praefici deberent. . . ." Schmidlin, *PG* II, 497.

[8] R. McNamara, *The American College in Rome, 1855–1955* (New York 1956).

[9] L. Hertling, op. cit., 216–21; here, 217f.

[10] With some resignation we have to acknowledge that T. Maynard, in 1941, talks about "Teutonic hubris" in this context; quoted by Hertling, op. cit.

The situation was more difficult for the Italians and the Eastern Europeans. But the command of the English language did not erase the differences which were, last but not least, a matter of clerical estate. The German Roman Catholic Central Society (founded in 1857), for a long time the only Catholic umbrella organization in the United States, played an important role in American Catholicism. This caused understandable resentment among the Catholics of Irish descent, who were highly influential in the hierarchy, constituted the great majority, and refused to tolerate special groups. The question of parish membership[13] was delayed by the Propaganda Fide in 1887 and finally resolved in 1897, with the understanding that children of non-English-speaking immigrants born in America could, upon reaching maturity, leave the parish of their parents and join an English-speaking parish; and that English-speaking immigrants could become members of an English-speaking parish and were not subject to the pastor of their national congregation.[13] The increasing social mobility gradually drew the Catholics into the American melting pot. An unreliable census in 1916 counted 5,660 Catholic national parishes. English sermons were delivered in 3,502 of them, and

[11] In regard to the agitation by the American Protective Association (APA) in the nineties, see L. Hertling, op. cit., 194.

[12] Memorandum by Ireland and Keane in 1886 regarding the "German question": "The fight for the rights of the Germans is carried on with the kind of stubborness and aggressiveness which is characteristic of Bismarck's countrymen"; regarding the language question, see L. Hertling, op. cit., 166–72. Ireland and Keane were in Rome at the same time (1886) as Pastor Peter Abbelen, who advocated the maintenance of the German parishes. He had a recommendation by Gibbons, which Hertling (188) does not seem to consider sincere.

[13] *ASS* 30, 256.

sermons in one additional language were even delivered in some.[14] The Irish episcopate aimed at the sensible goal of totally Anglicizing Catholicism in the United States, but this achievement was hampered by national emotions.[15]

The leaders of the Church in the United States during Leo XIII's pontificate were born in the thirties and were mostly of Irish descent. James Gibbons (1834–1921) was the son of an Irish immigrant in Baltimore, though he grew up in Ireland between 1837 and 1853, because his parents had returned there. A priest since 1861, he was consecrated bishop in 1868 and participated as the youngest council father in the first Vatican Council. In 1872, he was appointed bishop of Richmond.[16] His book, *The Faith of Our Fathers,* appeared in 1876 and was a great success among American Catholics, even though, theologically, it was insignificant. Gibbons was a master of well adjusted apologetics.[17] As coadjutor of J. R. Bayley, an Anglican clergyman who converted in Rome in 1842, Gibbons succeeded him in 1877 as archbishop of Baltimore. Cardinal (since 1886) Gibbons was in many respects Manning's American counterpart, and was repeatedly helped by him in his ecclesiastical endeavors. He was convinced of the papacy's mission and entertained no doubts concerning his episcopal responsibility, as he saw it, in the framework of the specific situation of Catholicism in the United States. The constitution of the United States was for him a sort of secular Bible: "I would not expunge or alter a single paragraph, a single line, or a single word" (1897).[18] His reserve toward some German-speaking Catholics was not unfounded. He contributed considerably to the development of American Catholicism and to its esteem in the total society.[19]

---

[14] Only one language was spoken in the 530 Spanish (in the Southwest), 466 Polish, 206 German, 200 French (mostly Canadians), and 149 Italian parishes (L. Hertling, op. cit.).

[15] The German clergyman Peter Rosen published an essay in 1897 (forbidden by the Church), "Archbishop Ireland, as He Really Is." In it he attacked the man who tried everything to be an American and to be accepted as such; in 1891, when Cardinal Gibbons handed the Austrian Archbishop Katzer the pallium, he had emphatically rejected a national division of the Catholic Church in the United States.

[16] In addition to the biography by J. T. Ellis, cf. the more objective character description by L. Hertling, op. cit., 190–95, 200–02; Schmidlin, *PG* II and III several times (index).

[17] This book copies a French book, including the title. It was translated into German, like the book for priests *The Ambassador of Christ* (Baltimore 1897). In 1917, Gibbons presented an autobiographical retrospect.

[18] Quoted according to J. T. Ellis: *New Catholic Encyclopedia,* 6 (1967), 468.

[19] L. Hertling, op. cit., 210. Hertling does not do Gibbons justice when he calls him "more adroit, successful, important" than M. Corrigan, while attributing more character to Corrigan. They are both two entirely different hierarchs, whom one cannot compare. The "more adroit" man has to be more adroit as a politician, that is in the nature of things.

It is much more difficult to assess John Ireland (1838–1918). Born in Ireland (Burnchurch), he came to the United States with his parents in 1848. The French bishop of St. Paul sent him to study at the preparatory seminary of Meximieux in France, which gave him an education in the spirit of Dupanloup. Upon his return to St. Paul, he was ordained a priest in 1861; in 1875 he was named auxiliary coadjutor and in 1884 bishop. In 1888 he persuaded other bishops to sign a petition to elevate St. Paul to an archbishopric. His patriotism was not as natural as that of Cardinal Gibbons and often approached exaltation.[20] In spite of their different opinions and temperaments, Gibbons and Ireland were united in their efforts toward an indigenous American Catholicism. Ireland's address to the Council of Baltimore (1884), "The Catholic Church and Civil Society," became famous. His love for writing was documented by the collection of essays *The Church and Modern Society.* Ireland's endorsement of the missionary concept of I. T. Hecker was probably less controversial in respect to the dispute over "Americanism" than was his behavior after Leo XIII's letter of condemnation to Gibbons, *Testem benevolentiae,* of 22 January 1899.[21] The Irishman John Keane (1839–1918) also belonged to this influential group of the American episcopate. It was thanks to his initiative, supported chiefly by Ireland, that the Catholic University of America was founded in Washington in 1889.[22] He was its first president, but also one of the first victims of the "Americanism" disturbances, and was relieved of office in September 1896. From 1900 to 1911 he was archbishop of Dubuque. An important role in the controversies, intensifying in the nineties, was played by the president of the American College in Rome, Denis Joseph O'Connell (1849–1927). He was born in Ireland and was a close friend of Gibbons and his liaison man at the Vatican, where he was considered a "Liberal." Gibbons had to agree to O'Connell's dismissal from the College in 1895, and he could only save his friend's and his own reputation by appointing him rector of his titular church in Trastevere. In 1903, he made him president of Catholic University and continued to maintain the friendship.[23] The limitations of the cardinal became obvious when, in 1890, he wanted to promote John Lancaster Spalding, bishop of Peoria and cofounder of Catholic University, to archbishop of Milwaukee, but failed because of the Curia's opposition.[24] The leader of the opposition in the American episcopate was Michael A. Corrigan (1839–1902), whose Irish father had immigrated in 1828. Between 1859 and 1863, he studied at the North American College in Rome (founded by Pius IX) and was ordained a priest in the Lateran by Cardinal Patrizi. Under the patronage of Vicar-General McQuaid (later the bishop of Rochester), he was consecrated bishop (at age thirty-four) in Newark, where he had taught dogmatics since 1864. He promoted the Jesuit College in New Jersey and organized the first American pilgrimage to Rome (1874). After the Council of Baltimore (1884), he published the pastoral letter on "true freedom." Coadjutor, by 1880, Corrigan was appointed archbishop of New York in 1885. In various controversial questions he held a very intransigent view.[25] While Gibbons, Ireland, and Keane were upset about the approbation of Charles Maignen's devastating book, which increased the American tensions coupled with the French ones, it was welcomed by Corrigan.

---

[20] In 1889, during the centennial in Baltimore: "The Americans do not wish a Church with a foreign flair which could not have an impact upon them . . . I would like all Catholics to be enthusiastic patriots" (quoted according to L. Hertling, 213). All his life he told of his part in the battle of Corinth as a military chaplain of the Northern states (J. P. Shannon: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7 [1967], 611). As a member of the Republican party he fought for President McKinley.

[21] In regard to "Americanism", cf. chap. 24. Regarding Ireland's behavior after 1899, see Moynihan (chap. biblio), L. Hertling (1954), 238, and the *Tagebuch* (publ. in 1957) by F. X. Kraus, 739f. Kraus, who was a friend of Denis Joseph O'Connell and John Keane, assesses Ireland much more critically than Hertling, who has no objections toward the attitude of the Curia in this crisis. Regarding Ireland's behavior during a reception of the cardinals, in August 1900, where the Pope chose him to report about America, Kraus says: "And all this is just a comedy. Ireland was motivated by but *one* idea: to take revenge on his enemies . . . . All his concessions only served to get him the red hat . . . ." (Kraus was informed through Denis O'Connell). Regarding criticism of Ireland after 1899, see F. X. Kraus, op. cit., 749.

[22] P. H. Ahern, *The Life of John J. Keane, Educator and Archbishop* (Milwaukee 1955).

In this milieu of people and movements, Catholicism in the United States matured. The issues of the first Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 were, to a large extent, still discussed at the third Council in 1884.

---

[23] A misunderstanding during the publication of the diaries by F. X. Kraus created the ironical situation that *Denis* was mistaken for his namesake *William Henry* (p. 688), who became the new rector of the American College (1895), was a protégé of the Pope and Rampolla, and completely unsuited for closer contact with F. X. Kraus (cf. chap. 29, n. 5). *Denis* J. O'Connell became bishop of Richmond in 1912, suffragan of Gibbons, giving rise to the suspicion that he would be his successor (cf. C. J. Barry: *New Catholic Encyclopedia,* 10 [1967], 635f.). Concerning William Henry O'Connell, see the biography by D. G. Wayman (New York 1955).

[24] J. L. Spalding was a nephew of the archbishop of Baltimore, Martin John Spalding; F. X. Kraus, op. cit., 734, recorded a "very strange sermon" of Spalding in the Gesù, commenting that with him the "spectator" entered the pulpit.

[25] L. Hertling, op. cit., 208, regarding the controversy about the Protestant land reformer Henry George, whose indictment Corrigan wanted to achieve: "Here, as always, he believed adamantly in the *Roma locuta, causa finita.*"—J. J. Zwierlein, *Letters of Archbishop Corrigan to Bishop McQuaid and Allied Documents* (Rochester 1946); cf. J. T. Ellis in the Gibbons biography.—Corrigan favored the presentation of American Church history by J. G. Shea, because it was in accordance with his concept (cf. J. T. Ellis).

In the previous year, Leo XIII had invited part of the episcopate to Rome in order to give the archbishops directives through the Propaganda Fide,[26] and he planned to have the council chaired by a cardinal of the Curia. The Americans were able to realize their desire to entrust the chairmanship to James Gibbons, who occupied the see of Baltimore, the most prestigious archbishopric, but was rather indifferent toward the project (J. T. Ellis). Symptomatic of the change in the structure of American Catholicism is the portion of American-born bishops at the Council: in 1852, there were 9 out of 32; 1866, 14 out of 45; 1884, 25 out of 72, 15 of them of Irish descent. Aside from these 15 prelates, there were 20 who were born in Ireland, so that the Irish almost had the majority (8 Germans, 6 Frenchmen, 4 Belgians).

A specifically American question concerned the procedure for the appointment of bishops. While the Curia wanted to transfer the European model of the cathedral chapters to America, there were also strong efforts to introduce an election system by the clergy.[27] The council decided that the "diocesan consultors" (half appointed by the bishop and the other half elected by the clergy) together with irremovable pastors[28] were to make a list, to which, however, the bishops of the ecclesiastical province were not obligated when making a proposal to the Pope. This remarkable procedure was in effect until 1918 (new codex). In the years between 1880 and 1903, Leo XIII intensified the ecclesiastical organizations by establishing 23 dioceses and 3 prefectures. After Pius X's establishments, there were now 82 bishoprics in 14 ecclesiastical provinces.[29] While the Plenary Council of 1884 took place without a papal legate, Leo XIII used the occasion of the centennial of the American Catholics in 1889 to send Francesco Satolli (1839–1910), an adviser from Perugia and a strict neoscholastic,[30] as his representative to Baltimore. On the occasion of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 (a celebration of the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America), organized by the United States, Satolli, now titular archbishop, came a second time in order to deliver Vatican documents. While the episcopate appreciated this as an honorable gesture (Gibbons had transmitted the government's desire to the Pope), the archbishops, except Ireland, were embarrassed that Satolli would thenceforth be an official Apostolic Delegate. The attitude of Satolli, who returned to Rome in October 1896 and was replaced by Archbishop Sebastiano Martinelli (1889 Prior-General of the Ausgustinian Hermits, 1901 cardinal), is difficult to assess.[31]

---

[26] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 495f.

[27] Representative of this is the publication by P. Corrigan (not the Archbishop of New York!): *What the Catholic Church Most Needs in the U.S. or: the Voice of the Priests in the Election of the Bishops* (1884).

[28] "Tenured" were only the church rectors, because there were no canonical benefits; in Baltimore it was decided that at least one tenth of the diocesan clergy was to be elevated to this rank.

[29] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 495, III, 114.

[30] In 1880, Leo XIII recalled Satolli from Perugia and appointed him professor of dogmatics at the College of the Propaganda Fide and the Roman Seminary.

More crucially than in Catholicism elsewhere, the school question stood in the foreground of American interests. The constitutional right to found private schools, its necessity for the Catholic minority's development of self-awareness, the financial difficulties in this extensive country form the background for the history of the school system.[32] At the Plenary Council of 1884, the responsibility of the parents was emphatically defined as an episcopal decree, and the tendency to excommunicate offenders was repressed. Episcopal dispensation had to be mentioned because there were not nearly enough Catholic schools. By 1900, the two hundred primary schools of 1840 had increased to 3812 (nine hundred thousand students out of approximately 17 million); yet, more than half the children went, more or less by necessity, to other schools. Moreover, the standards of public schools improved considerably.[33] The Jesuits were particularly concerned with higher education. Around 1880, they had four thousand students altogether, and in 1890, five thousand five hundred. The small increase was caused by the fact that the Jesuits had not adjusted their organization and curriculum to the public schools, which was partly corrected by the initiative of the second president of Catholic University, Thomas Conaty. An increase of scientific subjects failed in spite of the efforts by Notre Dame University, founded in 1842 under the direction of the Congregation of the Holy Cross. The Sisters of the Sacred Heart, who from the middle of the century until 1890 had founded ten girls' high schools, tried to adjust within limits. It is natural that education became one of the areas of conflict in American Catholicism's attempt to gain identity. During the congress of the National Education Association in 1890, John Ireland surprised the public and his friends-in-faith with the suggestion to integrate the Catholic parochial schools with the system of the public schools, whereby religious instruction was to be given outside of the general lessons. To some, this seemed like a betrayal, to others a malicious Roman attack on the free republic. Patriotism and the worry of increasing the Catholic schools' incompatibility had joined hands in Ireland. The idea was realized in the parochial schools of Faribault and Stillwater in the Archdiocese of St. Paul, which were leased on notice to the local school board for one dollar a year as part of the public school system. The school board was also responsible for the salary of the Catholic teaching sisters (except for the religious instruction to be given in the schools). The professor of ethics at the Catholic University of America, Thomas Bouquillon, and the group of the episcopate around Gibbons supported the "Faribault plan," but Bouquillon's colleague, the German professor of dogmatics J. Schroeder, and the Jesuits opposed it vehemently. The majority of the German Catholics' resentment was based upon the *Kulturkampf,* rather than concern about the preservation of the German language. Rome, to which the controversy had been transferred, decided (in April 1892) in favor of a *tolerari posse,* referring at the same time to the resolution of the Council of Baltimore. But Ireland's idea had failed.

---

[31] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 498, says simply that Satolli was received "triumphantly." In accord with his attitude toward the Pope's wishes as of 1885, Gibbons did indeed ask the Pope on 4 January 1893, in the name of all archbishops (with the exception of Ireland), to disregard the establishment of a permanent apostolic delegation. On 14 January, Leo XIII wired his orders (cf. J. T. Ellis in the Gibbons biography; also *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 14 [1967], 441, where he speaks about a *fait accompli*). Incidentally, since Satolli appeared in November 1892 at the conference of the archbishops in New York as a de facto delegate, the question arises of what the meaning is of "proposing" (Ellis) such a delegation. It is remarkable that Satolli arrived in the company of Denis O'Connell, kept close contact with Gibbons and Ireland, and lived at Keane's, whose dismissal as rector of the university (1896) he had initiated before he himself was recalled. F. X. Kraus (*Tagebücher,* 714) notes that Satolli, who had become cardinal in 1895, had irritated Keane in Rome. There were also "American news stories" about his conduct. L. Hertling (op. cit., 225f. and 232f.) speaks about a "change in Satolli" around 1894.

[32] More information in L. Hertling, op. cit., 245–62; ibid. 221–24.

[33] Cf. E. Angermann: *HM* 10 (Berne 1961), 305f.

In Baltimore, in 1884, the founding of a Catholic national university was planned, an idea which Gibbons viewed with reservations (J. T. Ellis). At first Bishop John Lancaster Spalding and Bishop John Keane supported the idea. Opposed to the plan were Archbishop Corrigan and the bishop of Rochester, Bernard J. McQuaid, as well as a good part of the Jesuits, because they feared a liberal spirit. The donation of a young female convert amounting to three hundred thousand dollars facilitated the efforts to gain the Vatican's approval. On 13 November 1889, the Catholic University of America in Washington (the founders had wanted this location, while Gibbons had favored Philadelphia—outside of his dioceses) was inaugurated in the presence of President Harrison.[34] Keane relinquished his bishopric in favor of the presidency. But internal

---

[34] J. T. Ellis, *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington 1946); id., *The Catholic University of America. The Rectorship of John J. Keane. 1887–96* (Washington 1949). Keane tried in 1887–88 to have Ludwig Pastor appointed (*Tagebücher,* 203, 210), who declined because the place was not suited for his papal history. This was probably no great misfortune for Keane, who was a man of feeling, according to F. X. Kraus (*Tagebücher,* 683) (cf. P. E. Hogan [chap. biblio.]).

Catholic animosities within the institute continued. Within the faculty, the German Joseph Schroeder, who taught dogmatics, was the head of the opposition against Keane and his friends in the episcopate. He had emphatically supported Cahensly's criticism of America and created the teaching chair for German literary studies, which was to be filled in accord with his ideas defined in the essay "Liberalism in Theology and History" (1881).[35] Ireland succeeded through the Apostolic Delegate S. Martinelli[36] in having Schroeder, who was supported by Corrigan, recalled. The German dogmatist Josef Pohle had already returned to Europe in 1894. Leo XIII's recall of Keane from the presidency on 15 September 1896 is part of the crisis of American Catholicism.[37] In 1904, after the presidency of T. Conaty, the university, in spite of the efforts by Denis O'Connell, was driven into a catastrophic situation due to the mismanagement of its treasurer, a situation which it could not overcome until ten years later. The comparatively older universities in Georgetown (since 1805) and St. Louis had trouble adjusting to the general development. Most successful was the University of Notre Dame.

Another complex problem discussed at the Plenary Council of 1884 was the question of which societies with Freemason-like rituals Catholics would be allowed to join. This was an old problem, with which the Provincial Council of 1875 in San Francisco had dealt. They suggested that the father confessors permit membership in a society in doubtful cases, but demand withdrawal as soon as the respective "secret" society was forbidden by the Church. The discussion was bound to get more serious after the encyclical *Humanum genus* (1884), which contained an especially sharp condemnation of the Freemasons. But since their rituals were customary in many American societies, there was only the alternative of leaving the decision to the conscience of the faithful or to proclaim a list of forbidden societies, which was exceedingly difficult. An archiepiscopal conference in 1886 approved the Grand Army of the Republic (a society of Civil War veterans whose president was a Catholic and the brother of a bishop) and the Ancient Order of Hibernia. The explicit prohibition of other societies was debated at the conferences, but no agreement was reached. In Boston, in 1890, the majority around Gibbons decided to forbid only Freemasons, a rule that was protested by other episcopal parties (Corrigan, McQuaid, and others). Archbishop Katzer of Milwaukee complained in Rome. After the Church provinces of New York and Philadelphia had autocratically forbidden, respectively, three and four societies, the question was turned over to the Curia in November 1892 (meanwhile Satolli had arrived as papal delegate), since no agreement had been reached. After some time, on 20 August 1894, the Holy Office proscribed three societies. Rampolla's simultaneous letter to Satolli, stating that the execution of this decree was left to the judgment of the metropolitans, only caused confusion. In December 1894, Leo XIII, through Satolli, ordered the promulgation of the decree.[38] Gibbons traveled to Rome in vain (1895)—the crisis was on the way. Now, societies like The Knights of Saint John or the more important Knights of Columbus were promoted—a separation which was against the principle of accomodation.[39] The fact that individual bishops were suspicious of such organizations, and that the entire episcopate did not support a federation of the individual Catholic societies until 1905, is indicative of the social attitude of American Catholicism before World War I. On the parochial and diocesan levels, the Catholics, in spite of their economic weakness, were considerably active in the educational and social spheres.

---

[35] Schroeder's character is hard to define in view of the distorted sources. Hertling: his opponents described him as a heavy drinker. F. X. Kraus (*Tagebücher,* 697), records with satisfaction (Schroeder had instigated his censure) a piece of information from Denis O'Connell, according to which the German professor "disappeared for months from his apartment at the university in order to spend the night in wretched bars, drinking and frequenting the company of questionable ladies . . . ." From Washington, Schroeder went to the theological academy in Münster (died 1903) (cf. chap. 29).

[36] F. X. Kraus, *Tagebücher,* 697 (February 1898).

[37] The Pope appointed Keane adviser to the Propaganda Fide in Rome. But the fight against this man, who was later called "a rationalist, throwing all dogma over to modern ideas" (quoted according to P. H. Ahern, op. cit.), continued, and he returned to the United States. His friends convinced the Pope to elevate him in 1900 to archbishop of Dubuque.

The struggle over a closer definition of the "secret societies" was also one of the elements in the controversy about the association of the Noble and Most Holy Order of the Knights of Labor, which was founded in Philadelphia in 1869 and spread quickly under the leadership of the Catholic Irishman Terence Powderly (since 1879). Two thirds of its members were Catholics. When Gibbons was able to prevent Rome's condemnation of this society in February 1887, it was already (for several reasons) on the decline. Therefore, the historical significance of these events was not embedded in the history of this association as much as in the relation of American Catholicism to the

---

[38] L. Hertling, op. cit., 202–06.

[39] L. Hertling, op. cit., 206: ". . . here the Catholics were among themselves and there was no danger that they would be pulled unnoticed into the wake of the lodges." (Cf. F. McDonald [chap. biblio.].)

socio-political question of which association was representative.[40] It was said that the "ever-present and recurring earning potential" of the United States had prevented the social embitterment that had occurred in Europe.[41] Although the question of salaries and working conditions was pertinent, the main long-term problem was the accumulation of capital in the hands of the lower classes and the way in which this wealth was accumulated.[42] Concentration in the agrarian sector produced a growing rural proletariat, which was welcomed by industry. There, however, the workers were victims of a ruthless labor market and had to pay the price in times of crisis as a result of legislation, jurisdiction, and an administration which exclusively served the interests of the entrepreneurs. Cheap labor was plentiful among immigrants, "freed" black slaves, and children.[43] The formation of unions was hampered by legislation and the lack of solidarity among the heterogeneous labor force. The Knights of Labor was the first significant worker movement, though vehemently attacked by American society as a whole, in spite of its sensible demands (equal wages for women and blacks, an eight-hour day, a labor arbitration court) and its reserved attitude in regard to strikes. The same sentiments were shown by the conservative segment of the clergy,[44] who, moreover, associated the Knights of Labor with the "secret societies" which were forbidden by the Church because they copied the secular "mores" of the Freemasons. Because the Catholic workers were urged, on the occasion of parish missions, to leave the associations, T. Powderly (son of an Irish worker with twelve children) changed the title of his association. In 1884, upon his inquiry in Rome, Taschereau (archbishop of Quebec, after 1887 cardinal) received the reply that membership in the Knights of Labor was forbidden by the

---

[40] Henry Brown, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington 1949); Sister Joan Leonard, *Catholic Attitude forward American Labor. 1884–1919* (Columbia Univ. 1946); F. Downing: J. N. Moody (ed.), *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 843–904; L. Hertling, op. cit., 196–202; A. M. Knoll (biblio., chap. 12), n. 236; P. Mourret (biblio., chap. 12), 292.

[41] L. Hertling (op. cit., 196), who, nevertheless, immediately discusses the economic crisis of 1885 and its consequences.

[42] E. Angermann, op. cit. (op. cit., n. 33), 295–302. During the "Erie War" (speculations with the Erie railroad), Jay Gould obtained huge amounts of money from the railroad king C. Vanderbilt, and when he died in 1892, he left his heirs 92 million dollars (both parties bribed the politicians). The famous pioneers of capitalism, A. Carnegie and J. D. Rockefeller, collected their wealth not just by way of diligence, but also because they fought a brutal competition, to which the small businessmen fell victim. In 1895, the banker J. P. Morgan gave the government a 60 million dollar loan, which brought his syndicate earnings of 72 million dollars.

[43] In 1870, 750,000 ten- to fifteen-year-old children were employed; in 1910, almost 2 million; in 1910, a sixty-hour-week was the rule for adults; E. Angermann, op. cit., 302.

[44] J. Leonard, op. cit., 56.

Church. The American episcopate discussed whether this prohibition applied to Canada only and decided to present the question again to the prefect of the Propaganda Fide, Cardinal Giovanni Simeoni. In Canada, where Archbishop Lynch of Toronto favored the organization, it was discussed whether the reply referred to Quebec only. The answer from Rome in 1886 was "general prohibition."[45] Gibbons's letter of 20 February 1887, which he signed himself, but had composed in collaboration with Ireland, Keane, and Denis O'Connell, effected in Rome a toleration of the Knights of Labor.[46] Gibbons' recollections thirty years later showed which internal and public problems in regard to Church affairs he had had to face. But soon more radical organizations successfully competed with the Knights of Labor.[47] The radicalization of the social differences was one of the causes for increasing de-Christianization slightly veiled with Christian slogans.[48] The encyclical *Rerum novarum* (1891) found little attention among the American Catholics.[49] But there were a few clergymen who called the social problems by their names, in the first place John Ryan (1869–1945), son of an Irish immigrant, who had already attracted attention at the Catholic University of America in 1906 with his dissertation "A Living Wage: Its Ethical and Economic Aspects." In 1916, his main work, *Distributive Justice,* was published. During the twenties he reached the peak of his public career.[50] One of his allies was Peter E. Dietz (1878–1947), son of a German immigrant, who cooperated successfully with some of the union leaders and founded a social section in the *Deutscher Katholischer Centralverein.* The fact that he founded a Catholic union (Militia of Christ for Social Service), in accord with the encyclical *Singulari quadam* of 1912, should be viewed in this context. In 1923, the Catholic members of the Chamber of Commerce persuaded Archbishop J. T. McNicholas of Cincinnati to force Dietz to close his Social Academy.[51]

---

[45] Cf. chap. 9, n. 58.

[46] In "My Memories," *Dublin Review* 160 (April 1917), 171, quoted according to J. T. Ellis: "If the Knights of Labour were not condemned by the Church, then the Church ran the risk of combining against herself every element of wealth and power . . . . But if the Church did not protect the working man she would have been false to her whole history; and this the Church can never be."—In the *Catholic Quarterly Review,* G. D. Wolff said openly in April 1886 what forces Gibbons had to fear: "It is futile for the public press to be constantly preaching platitudes concerning patience and respect for the law, whilst evasions and defiant violations, constantly practiced by mammoth capitalists and corporations, are ignored, condoned and approved de facto."

[47] See E. Angermann, op. cit., 309, who quotes the motto of the organization: "Everyone be his own master—everyone be his own employer," which suggests a certain parallel to the Vogelsang school (chap. 12); F. Downing (op. cit., 852) does not exclude the possibility that the expressed ecclesiastical toleration was one of the factors for the decline.

[48] T. Powderly, in 1893 dismissed by his organization as first master workman, joined the Freemasons in 1901 and died in 1924, excommunicated. L. Hertling (op. cit., 202) assesses him basically negatively, while F. Downing (op. cit., 852) shows some psychological understanding of this personal development.

[49] F. Downing, op. cit., 856.

[50] F. L. Broderick, *Right Reverend New Dealer: John A. Ryan* (New York 1963); Ryan was very critical about the social interest of the major part of the clergy. In regard to Ireland he said: "The archbishop's associations were with the pillars of the contemporary economic order"; the big businessmen, with whom he was friends, he considered "good men" (*Social Doctrine in Action* [New York 1941], 21–27).

The case of the New York priest Edward McGlynn (1839–1900)[52] turned into a theoretical social conflict with strong ecclesiastical and political overtones. McGlynn had lobbied for the land reform theory of Henry George and for his candidacy (1886) as mayor of New York.[53] The fact that Archbishop Corrigan had forbidden it only promoted fanaticism. After two citations ordering him to come to Rome, which he did not obey, McGlynn was suspended (1887). But in 1892, as a result of Gibbons's approval (mediated by Delegate Satolli), he was reinstated. Since Corrigan had failed to secure approval for his proposal to place the writings of Henry George on the Index because Gibbons's group opposed it,[54] this act was a serious disavowal of the archbishop.

The concept which Gibbons and his friends held of the relationship between the Church and society as a whole finds its most definite expression in their active participation in the Religion Congress of 1893 in Chicago, which was organized in the context of the World's Columbian Exposition. Jews, Moslems, Hindus, and followers of other religions had been invited.[55] Its president was the Presbyterian J. H. Barrows, who declared that no one was expected to sacrifice even the most insignificant part of his faith. Gibbons's position in the public of the United States of America is illuminated by the fact that he recited the Lord's Prayer after his welcoming speech. John Keane, one of the twenty speakers (among them Ireland and Hecker's biographer, Elliot), gave the concluding speech, which he repeated in 1894 at the Catholic Congress of Scholars in Brussels. None of the participating Catholics was religiously indifferent,[56] but they were all of the conviction that the Roman Catholic faith could not be absent from the register of world religions in the United States of America. Writing to Satolli in September 1895, Leo XIII stated that so far he had tolerated interdenominational conventions quietly; he preferred, however, Catholic events to which non-Catholics were invited.[57]

---

[51] M. H. Fox, *Peter E. Dietz, Labor Priest* (Notre Dame 1953).

[52] S. Bell, *Rebel, Priest and Prophet. A Biography of E. McGlynn* (New York 1937).

[53] The Single Tax Theory of Henry George provides that real estate tax be paid to the government as the only tax. In this respect, he criticizes the papal social doctrine in his essay "The Condition of Labour" (1894), which was published as an "open letter to his Holiness Pope Leo XIII" (H. Pesch, "Henry George und die Enzyklika 'Rerum novarum,' " *StdZ* 74 [1894], 365–82, 523–44; L. Hertling, op. cit., 206–08, 226).

[54] In April 1889, only a few sentences in an unpublished letter to the American episcopate by George were censored.

[55] L. Hertling, op. cit., 226ff.

It was the first year of the crisis. The long brief *Longinqua Oceani* of 6 January 1895 was full of praise for the United States and the religious zeal of the Catholics. However, it contained a paragraph which was understandable in view of the Pope's opinion of the relation between Church and state in "Catholic" countries and especially in view of his expectations in regard to France. At the same time, it questioned the sociological foundations of American Catholicism.[58] It may be acceptable to say that the separation of Church and state as practiced in America was not the best of all possibilities under any circumstances. But the Pope's remark that the fruits of the development of ecclesiastical life would be a lot more plentiful if the Church would enjoy, aside from freedom, the favor of the law and the patronage of the public authorities,[59] offended the secular creed of every citizen in the United States. Even Corrigan wrote to Gibbons that it was fortunate that the non-Catholics had not taken offense.[60] But this was not only a matter of concern for the non-Catholics. One cannot assume that the paragraph in the Pope's letter was incidental. That same year, Denis O'Connell was recalled from Rome; in November the same happened to Satolli, and in September 1896, Keane was dismissed as president of the university. In connection with the conditions in France and the situation in general, the "American way" turned into the ecclesiastical problem of "Americanism".

Gibbons's concept had failed. On 6 June 1911, the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination, thousands of visitors assembled, among them President W. H. Taft and former president T. Roosevelt, whose visit in Rome the previous year had resulted in complications with the Vatican.[61] But Gibbons no longer held center stage. In 1911, William H. O'Connell (1859–1944), whom Gibbons had made the successor of Denis J. O'Connell at the American College (1895),[62] was elevated to cardinal of Boston, after an official hierarchy had been established in the United States in 1908 through the apostolic constitution *Sapienti consilio.* In 1905, following the Russo-Japanese War, William H. O'Connell visited the Emperor of Japan on a special mission for Pope Pius X. He diligently supported the organization and funding of missions at the congress of 1908 in Chicago and of 1913 in Boston. He was a man of the new era.[63] The construction of Saint Patrick's Cathedral in New York, begun in 1858 in a neo-Gothic style (like most Catholic churches), was completed in 1906.

---

[56] L. Hertling, op. cit., 228: "The dominant theme [of the congress] stated that all religions are equally good, this being the kind of religious indifferentism which Gibbons in his opening address had wanted to exclude"; one should hardly assume that any religion would be termed inferior at this congress. That Gibbons participated in the opening was an expression of his concept; that he stayed away from the other meetings was in consideration of his office.

[57] Quoted according to L. Hertling, op. cit., 233.

[58] *ASS* 27, 387–99, here 390.

[59] "Longe tamen uberiores [Ecclesia] editura fructus, si, praeter libertatem, gratia legum fruatur patrocinioque publicae potestatis." (cf. chap. 14.)

[60] Quoted according to L. Hertling, op. cit., 233.

[61] Schmidlin, *PG* III, 66, 116; cf. below, Introduction to Pt. II, n. 6.

[62] Cf. n. 24.

[63] "I have never hesitated to speak as plainly as possible . . . whenever direction was needed"; quoted according to D. G. Wayman: *Catholic Encyclopedia* 10 (1967), 637.

CHAPTER 11

Catholicism in the Slavic World until 1914

Russia, as one of the great powers, lost its supremacy in Europe after its defeat in the Crimean War, but it preserved its leadership over all Slavs and propagandized for the liberation of all Slavic peoples in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Turkey by employing, aside from foreign politics, pan-slavic idealism. The Orthodox Russian State Church, with its representation at the Holy Synod, left little chance for development to the Catholics within the Russian area of influence; the Poles especially were oppressed. Because of the impact of liberalism and nationalistic tensions, Catholic Slavs found themselves in a difficult position in the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy, in the small countries in southern Europe, and in the areas of Turkey remaining after the Balkan Wars. Their efforts to preserve the mother tongue in education and preaching, which they had a right to according to Church laws and decrees,[1] created widespread conflicts, which had been caused by state orders and which could only partially be resolved.

The Russian Empire

Following the Polish uprising in 1863/64, the introduction of the Russian language into schools and church services in 1869–77, and the close collaboration of some Polish prelates and the Russian government, a break between the Holy See and Russia occurred. When the Russian diplomatic agent Prince Leon Urosov refused to accept the memorandum of 11 July 1877 which had been drafted and delivered by Cardinal Secretary of State Giovanni Simeoni and contained fifteen complaints concerning the persecution of Catholics in Russia and Poland, he was pronounced persona non grata by the Vatican.

---

[1] T. Grentrup, op. cit., 121–381.

By announcing to the "Highest Emperor and King" Alexander II (1855–81) his coronation on 20 December 1878, Pope Leo XIII tried to loosen the rigid political fronts and establish diplomatic relations with Russia. He gave his Nuncio Ludovico Jacobini full authority to conduct preliminary talks in Vienna. These resulted in a provisional agreement on 31 October 1880[2] and, after exhaustive negotiations between Jacobini (meanwhile elevated to secretary of state) and the Russian negotiators, a settlement was reached on 24 December 1882.[3] The partners agreed on the administration of the bishoprics of Minsk, Podlachia, and Kamieniec under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Mogilev and bishop of Luck-Zytomierz, on the subordination of seminaries and the Clerical Academy of Saint Petersburg to ecclesiastical direction and state supervision, and on lifting the government strictures against the clergy decreed in 1865–66. The regulation requiring that studies in Russian language, history, and literature should be increased in ecclesiastical academic institutions and indifference to the controversial problems of the oppressed Uniates foreshadowed future conflicts in spite of the agreements achieved. Moreover, the Chief Procurator, Constantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev, made no secret of his dislike of the agreement and deplored the concession to the Catholic Church, which he presented as a danger to the existence of the Russian state. As the tutor of Alexander III (1881–94), who came to power after the assassination of Alexander II, he exerted great influence on the young Tsar. He was filled with the ideals of the "Holy Russia" of the old Moscow, and wanted to overcome the internal strife within Russia by reenforcing the Orthodox State Church and by fighting against the liberal reforms and revolutionary elements. Since he rejected Catholicism, which had, traditionally, deep roots in many areas in the country, he regarded the agreement with the Vatican as pandering to revolutionary elements. He considered disastrous an alliance between the Pope and the Orthodox State Church, which, in his opinion, offered the only defense against the autocracy of the Tsar, even though Foreign Minister Prince Alexander Gortšakov and others recognized the restoration forces of the papacy. Anxious to offer moral support against revolutionary currents and to conlcude the *Kulturkampf* in Germany and Russia, Leo XIII endeavored to come to an understanding with Alexander III. His first success was the reorganization of the Church hierarchy by preconization of twelve prelates with whom he filled the vacancies in the archbishopric of Mogilev, in the suffragan bishoprics of Kovno, Luck-Zytomierz, Tiraspol, and Vilnius, as well as in the archbishopric of Warsaw, in the suffragan bishoprics of Kalisz, Kielce, Lublin, Plock, Sandomierz, and Seyny. The new pastors, especially Kazimierz Gintovt of Mogilev (1883–89) and Vincenty Teophil Popiel of Warsaw (1883–1912), tried to eliminate the obstacles to ecclesiastical life posed by the Russian State Church.

---

[2] A. Boudou, op. cit., 553–55.

[3] Ibid., 556–58; Mercati I, 1016–18.

The measures of the state against the Uniates and the pressures to employ the Russian language in preaching and instructions as well as the regulations of 16 January 1885 regarding the appointment of clergy (who could function only after the respective governors or governors-general in the Vistula regions had given their approval), effected another break in diplomatic relations between Russia and the Vatican. They were not resumed until after 1887/88.[4] In 1890, Leo XIII appointed a number of new bishops for Russia. On 18 June 1894, Alexander Izvolski, Imperial Russian diplomatic agent in the Vatican since 1888, became resident minister to the Holy See. Count Frederick Revertera, the Austro-Hungarian ambassador to the Vatican, called the papal efforts in regard to an understanding with Russia a "midsummer night's dream,"[5] but Leo XIII was able to ordain seven more bishops for Russia in 1896. The accession of Nicholas II (1894–1917) seemed to warrant new hopes. In 1899 the Tsar gave his permission for the construction of a new church in Saint Petersburg. But the erection of a nunciature, which the Pope desired, did not follow. In a letter to the Tsar of 21 September 1899, Chief Procurator Pobedonostsev appointed himself spokesman for the widespread mistrust toward the papacy. He ended the letter with the words: "May God save Russia from a papal nuncio."[6] He did not want to diminish the competency of the Holy Synod and of the dominant position of Orthodoxy in Russia.

By 1900, 70 percent of the Russian population were members of the Orthodox Church. After them, the Moslems and the Roman Catholics formed the strongest religious groups. Of the approximately 10 million Catholics, two-thirds were Poles;[7] the rest were Lithuanians, White

---

[4] E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum* II, 381–454; Winter emphasizes the Vatican's part in the French-Russian treaty in its ecclesiastical policies toward Russia.

[5] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 268.

[6] E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum* II, 478.

[7] In 1889, there were 9,679,818 Catholics in Poland and Russia, 5,932,123 of whom lived in the Russian part of Poland; cf. W. Urban, op. cit., 255.

Russians, Ukranians, Latvians, and Germans.[8] At the beginning of the twentieth century, state funds for the Orthodox Church amounted to about 30 million rubles, while the Catholics received only about 1.5 million rubles. Payment of state salaries to the Catholic clergy through the Roman Catholic Clerical College in Saint Petersburg considerably limited their independence. The entire correspondence between the Church administration and the Curia was conducted through the Ministry of the Interior. The preconized bishops (in each case it took exhaustive negotiations in order to find a candidate who was acceptable to both the tsarist government and the Vatican) were appointed by the Tsar. He also had to confirm in office all canons and other dignitaries. An instruction from the minister of education of 1900 demanded that the topics for final examinations in seminaries be in the Russian language and include history. Since this regulation was not followed by the Polish bishops, numerous clergymen could not be employed. Archbishop Józef Elias Szembek of Mogilev (1903–05) conducted a bishops' synod in 1904, during which the Roman Catholic episcopate of Russia compiled its demands to present to the government.

A manifesto, issued on 22 February 1903 by Nicholas II, expressed religious toleration and acknowledged the freedom of the Catholic Church to act, but it did not alleviate the distress of the Catholics in any way. Only after defeat in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904/05 and the proclamation of a constitutional system of government at the end of 1904 did the Tsar decide to issue a statement in which reforms were promised (e.g., freedom of belief and conscience). On 30 April 1905, he published a belief and toleration edict, which was followed by amnesties for religious offenders; this filled the Catholics with confidence. The Orthodox Church was termed the prevailing Church; it was allowed to maintain the right of propaganda; the penalties against those who left the Church and converted to another religious congregation were abolished. The Russian Old Believers, who had been cruelly persecuted since their separation from the Orthodox Church in the second half of the seventeenth century, could relax. The situation of the Catholics seemed particularly to improve, since the Tsar, in a manifesto of 30 October 1905, ordered the government "to give the population immovable foundations of civil freedom according to the principles of absolute inalienable personal rights, freedom of conscience and speech, and the right of assembly."[9] Also, the resignations of Chief Procurator Pobedonostsev and his deputy C. V. Sabler were interpreted as a weakening of the supremacy of the Russian Orthodox Church over all other Christian confessions.

---

[8] For the Catholic settler who had migrated to the south of Russia in the second half of the eighteenth century, the bishopric of Cherson was made a suffragan bishopric of the archbishopric of Mogilev (1848). It was transferred to Tiraspol in 1852. Saratov on the Volga River became an episcopal see. Under the leadership of Bishops Franz Xaver Zottmann (1872–89), Eduard Baron von Ropp (1902–04), and Joseph Aloysius Keßler (since 1904, resigned 1929) a favorable development commenced, despite the fact that the Catholics suffered from Russification measures. In 1914, the diocese included 350,000 faithful, 90 percent of whom were Germans (cf. B. Stasiewski, *Die kirchliche Organisation,* 279–83).—The total number of German Catholics in Russia before World War I was 500,000; 80,000 lived in Siberia.

The optimism of the Catholics was soon shaken. At first, some relief was given them, for instance in the controversial language question. In 1906, the Curia yielded to the pressures to use the Russian language in preaching, and on 22 July 1907 it came to an agreement with Russia[10] concerning Russian language, history, and literature in the Catholic seminaries in Poland. After 1908, the Catholic monthly publication *Truth and Faith* appeared in Russian in Saint Petersburg. From the beginning, its editorial office had to struggle with censorship and in 1912 its publication was forbidden. It was replaced by the Russian paper *Words of Truth* (1913), which lobbied for the preservation of the Uniates's rites, among other things, but which collapsed in 1915.

The regime survived the year of crisis (1905/06). But after its stabilization, it stunted the growth of parliamentary life by suspending the First and Second Duma (1906/07), and through certain regulations and administrative measures it turned the relief granted to the non-Orthodox churches into an illusion. At the fourth Missions Congress in Odessa in 1908, Orthodox bishops demanded that the bishops be reprimanded and that the toleration edict be voided. In 1907, Eduard Baron von Ropp, since 1904 bishop of Vilna and a member of the First Duma and of the Catholic Conservative party, which he had founded, was recalled by Nicholas II because he had resisted the introduction of the Russian language into Catholic church services. He was replaced by an administrator sent by the Curia. In 1909, Bishop Cyrtovt of Kovno, together with three hundred clergymen, was accused of having failed to comply with the required formalities when converting from the Orthodox to the Roman Catholic Church. In 1910 the Catholic bishops were forbidden to deal directly with the Curia and to publish papal decrees without the permission of the government. The marriage decree *Ne temere* of the Council Congregation of 2 August 1907, the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* of 8 September 1907 (concerning modernism), and the motu proprio *Sacrorum antistitum* of 1 September 1910 (concerning the antimodernist oath) were not allowed to be published. In 1911, the nearly eighty-year-old administrator of the archbishopric of Mogilev, Titular Archbishop Stefan Anton Denisovič, was held responsible in Saint Petersburg for having established a Marianist Congregation in Moscow. His successor as archbishop of Mogilev, Vincenty Kluczyński (1910–14), was so worn down by the government's reprisals that he resigned in 1914.

---

[9] P. Scheibert (ed.), *Die russischen politischen Parteien von 1905 bis 1917. Ein Dokumentationsband* (Darmstadt 1972), 29.

[10] Mercati I, 1097–98.

On the eve of World War I, the Catholics were being suppressed in Russia just as they had been in the nineteenth century. The Roman Catholic Clerical College in Saint Petersburg, which was responsible for the joint affairs of the dioceses, consisted of the archbishop of Mogilev and two members appointed by the Tsar from among the higher clergy and from assistants elected in the various dioceses.[11] The government maintained a controlling influence, especially the Department of Foreign Cults in the Ministry of the Interior, in spite of the papal protests that the jurisdiction of the College be limited to merely material affairs. The hierarchy consisted of 15 bishoprics, including the archbishopric of Mogilev with 7 and the archbishopric of Warsaw with 6 suffragan bishoprics. Each bishop took care of a seminary. After the suspension of the Warsaw Academy (1867) there was only one academic institution of university rank, the Roman Catholic Clerical Academy in Saint Petersburg, which earned a reputation through its scholarly and ascetic training of qualified clergymen (53 bishops came from this institution).[12]

The effectiveness of the bishops and the secular and regular clergy in dealing with the faithful entrusted to them and in securing their loyal observance of Catholic traditions was wasted by their defensive stand against state pressures. The Russification measures, which were mostly aimed at the Catholics of Latin and Uniate rites, showed that Catholicism was merely tolerated. Catholicism was exposed to new burdens by the war, the consequences of the October Revolution of 1917 relative to ecclesiastical policies, and the growing independence of Poland and the surrounding Baltic areas after World War I.

The Three Polish Territories

After the fourth division of Poland at the Congress of Vienna, Russia possessed 82 percent, Austria 10 percent, and Prussia 8 percent of the Polish-Lithuanian Empire, which had been dissolved through its partitioning at the end of the eighteenth century. The Polish question kept the European cabinets busy until the Republic of Poland was founded in

---

[11] W. Gribowski, op. cit., 169.

[12] W. Urban, op. cit., 291.

1918. The passionate determination of the Poles to retain their language and their heritage, the activities of the emigrants, the hope of recovering freedom and unity by being doubly loyal toward the three dividing powers (after the failure of the uprisings in 1831, 1846, 1848, and 1863/64), the dissolution of the Russian Empire, and the defeat of the Central Powers were essential prerequisites for the restoration of the national independence of Poland. During these efforts, the Catholic Church formed a unifying link, transcending political boundaries. In the Resurrectionist Congregation of Priests, whose members were devoted to pastoral work, education, and tutorial activities, faith in the resurrection of Christ mixed in a curious way with belief in the resurrection of Poland.

In Russian territory, after the failure of the uprising of 1863/64 in which several Catholic clergymen had participated, the governor general of the western provinces enforced a rigorous regime, with reprisals against the bishops and priests continuing throughout the next decades: the closing of monasteries, the dissolution of the Uniate bishopric of Chelm (1875), the supervision of pastoral work, and measures aimed at the introduction of the Russian language into the Church. Leo XIII tried to relieve the predicament of the Polish Catholics by direct negotiations with the Tsars Alexander II and III and Nicholas II. The Poles were afraid that their national interests were being threatened by the Pope's agreement with the Russian government. In a public consistory on 19 February 1889, Leo XIII tried to defend himself against these charges. At the same time, through one of his directives, he impressed upon the newly appointed Polish bishops that their mission was to serve the mutual accord and friendly harmony between spiritual and secular powers.[13] The Pope's warnings to the Poles to obey the law and be loyal to the Russian Tsar, and his *epistula encyclica* to the Polish bishops of 19 March 1894,[14] which reminded clergy and laity of their duty as subjects of the Tsar, contributed little to détente. In spite of agreement concerning the appointment of bishops and official willingness to comply with the wishes of the Curia, nothing changed in regard to the curtailment of freedom for Polish Catholics.

In 1886 the regulation requiring that the construction of a church could be allowed only by the minister of the interior, after consultation with the responsible governor and Orthodox bishop, was extended to Polish territory. The regulation was also valid for non-Orthodox religious congregations. The government placed special emphasis on religious instruction conducted in the Russian language. The law of 4 March 1885 regarding the Polish elementary schools left the decision to the curator of the Warsaw school district. He was to share the decision with the governor general whether Catholic religious instruction was to be given in Polish or Russian. In higher schools, the Orthodox teachers taught in Russian, since the Catholic priests refused to abandon their native language. In 1892, all Catholic parochial schools were placed under the supervision of the minister of national education. The result was the founding of secret Catholic parochial schools. To prevent the construction and maintenance of these illegal schools, penal regulations were enacted and again enforced in 1900. The aforementioned instructions of the minister of national education regarding examinations in seminaries were disobeyed, with the result that the governor general in Warsaw did not recognize the examinations and the appointment of newly ordained priests. When Tsar Nicholas II allowed them to reapply for the examination, there was no response. By 1905 the number of unemployed priests had risen to 156, the number of vacant parishes to 263. When, in the same year, the instruction was cancelled, the authorities declared their willingness to confirm even those candidates who had not taken an examination in the Russian language.

---

[13] E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum* II, 421.

[14] *Acta Leonis* V (1898), 243–54.

Nicholas II's edicts of toleration of April and October 1905 were enthusiastically welcomed by the Poles, since it seemed that the free development of their ecclesiastical life was now guaranteed. On 3 December 1905, the Pope addressed the Polish bishops of the Russian Empire,[15] praising them for their loyalty to the Apostolic See and demanding that they stand up for the preservation of peace, justice, and Christian education. The tensions regarding the language questions were eliminated, as can be deduced from the convention signed in Rome on 22 July 1907.[16] The number of houses of religious, which had rapidly decreased in the first decades and had only slowly risen at the end of the nineteenth century, increased again. Charity centers[17] and social activities commenced, e.g., the circle of young girls which had been organized by Countess Cecylia Plater-Zyberk and published the monthly *Stream* (*Prąd*), in order to waken the population to the social responsibilities of Catholicism. Representatives of the Catholic intelligentsia, such as Wladyslaw Reymont (1869–1925) and Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846–1916), were practicing Catholics.

The majority of the Catholics forced into Orthodoxy and belonging to the dissolved (1875) Uniate bishopric of Chelm had to suffer from the Russification measures and wanted to call upon the toleration edict of 1905. Since they were forbidden to return to their faith, about two hundred and thirty thousand converted from the Orthodox Church to Roman Catholicism between 1905 and 1910. In other parts of northwestern and southwestern Russia, people who earlier had been forcefully converted to Orthodoxy now rejoined the Catholic Church. The Orthodox bishops, supported by the Holy Synod, organized counterpropaganda. The Orthodox Bishop Evlogi Georgievski of the recently created eparchy of Chelm, a diligent representative of the Russification policy, convinced the Third Duma to create the province of Chelm, a new ecclesiastical entity comprised of parts of the provinces of Lublin and Kielce (1912).[18] The purpose was to halt the expansion of Catholicism. As early as 1908, an Orthodox mission congress in Kiev had demanded the revocation of the toleration edict. The Association of the Russian People of 1906 requested in 1909 that the false interpretation of the Easter manifesto come to an end and that freedom to proselytize be granted only to the Russian State Church. In 1912, the Orthodox Bishop Nikolai of Warsaw declared in the State Council that the historic task of the Russian state used to be and still was the Russification of everything non-Russian and the conversion to Orthodoxy of everyone who was not a member.[19]

---

[15] *AAS* XXVIII (1905–06), 321–27.

[16] Mercati I, 1097–98.

[17] K. Górski, *L'Histoire de la spiritualité polonaise: Le millénaire du catholicism en Pologne* (Lublin 1969), 340–42.

The growing pressure against Polish Catholicism was evidenced by the fact, among other things, that foreigners who had established religious orders after 1905 were expelled in 1910, e.g., the Redemptorists of Warsaw and the Franciscan friars of Lódź. When, on 21 January 1911, the priests came to Lublin to take the antimodernist oath, they were forced by police upon their arrival to depart immediately. They were informed that the papal directives were not valid in Russia, since they had not been announced via the proper channels of the state authorities.

In order to weaken Catholicism, the government and the Orthodox Church patronized the Mariavites,[20] who had developed from a society of nuns founded by Felicja Kozlowska (1862–1921) and an association of secular priests founded by Jan Maria Kowalski (1893), which strove for religious renewal among the clergy and people. The Mariavites' Eucharistic and Marian devotion tended toward mysticism and therefore the organization was not approved by Rome. The association of priests was proscribed by the Holy Office in 1904; on 5 December 1906, Jan

---

[18] 476,432 Catholics and 278,311 Orthodox lived in this area in 1913, cf. W. Urban, op. cit., 224.

[19] Ibid., 224.

[20] Ibid., 178–84, 245.

Kowalski, Felicja Kozlowska, and forty priests were excommunicated. As minister general, Kowalski organized a Marian Union, which on 28 November 1906 was recognized by the Russian cabinet council as a special Catholic religious community. In spite of repeated condemnation by the Roman authorities, the Mariavites spread quickly because of their support by the state; in 1909 a law regarding Mariavite parishes secured their position. Negotiations between Kowalski and the Utrecht Union resulted in the acceptance of the union by the Old Catholic churches. Kowalski had the bishop of Utrecht, Gerhard Gul, consecrate him as bishop and he established a new hierarchy with four bishoprics. The number of Mariavites may have reached a maximum of three hundred thousand to four hundred thousand when the Russian government and Orthodox dignitaries was supporting them in any way possible in order to halt the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. Even before World War I, many had left the new church. In spite of decline due to internal and external problems it is still in existence.

In Galicia, one of the Cisleithan crownlands of the Habsburgs, the Catholics were not as defensive as in Russia. In the first half of the nineteenth century, they were exposed to the effects of the state church, Viennese centralism and Germanization. However, they were aided by the self-government which the cities and rural communities had been granted in 1849, by the concordat between Pius IX and Emperor Franz I, concluded in 1855, but annulled in 1870 by Emperor Franz Joseph, and by the constitution of 1867, which favored Polish aspirations toward autonomy. Count Agenor Goluchowski, governor of Galicia, decreed the introduction of the Polish language in the schools, the courts, and civil offices. Numerous Poles were promoted by the Austrian government to the ministerial ranks and two of them to minister president (Count Alfred Potocki in 1870/71 and Count Kazimierz Badeni in 1895/97). They strengthened the special position of Galicia so that it became a "Polish Piedmont."[21] The Polonization of the two national universities in Crakow and Lemberg (which had Catholic theological faculties), the founding of the Crakow Academy for the Sciences (1872), and the collaboration of the conservative Galician aristocracy with the imperial court secured the political superiority of the Poles (about 45 percent of the total population of over 43 percent Ukrainians, 11 percent Jews, and 1 percent Germans).

Polish Catholicism of the Latin rite, which consisted of about 3.5 million faithful in 1910, had a somewhat tense relationship with the approximately 3 million Uniate Ukrainians[22] because of national differences. Even though the solution presented by the Concordat of 1870 resulted in several difficulties within the Catholic educational system and in other areas of the Church's public activity, the ecclesiastical organization of the archbishopric of Lemberg with the suffragan bishoprics of Przemysl and Tarnow and the prince bishopric of Crakow, which was placed under the jurisdiction of the Holy See in 1880 and expanded in 1886 through several deaneries of the diocese of Tarnow, could be enlarged. Outstanding Church politicians, theological writers, and priests were bishops like Cardinal Albin Dunajewski (1879–1914) and Prince Jan Kozielsko-Puzyna (1895–1910) of Cracow,[23] Archbishop Jozef Bielczewski of Lemberg (1900–23), Bishop Leon Walega of Tarnow (1901–33), and Jozef Sebastian Pelczar of Przemysl (died 1924). They were in close contact with the Holy See, as is documented by the letters of congratulation on the occasion of the silver anniversary of Cardinal Puzyna on 4 March 1911[24] and the golden anniversary of Bishop Pelczar's ordination to the priesthood.[25]

---

[21] G. Rhode, op. cit., 413.

[22] Cf. below, pp. 369f.

The Polish educational system made possible the development of an academic staff in science, art, and journalism. Aside from theological, mostly pastoral publications, the monthly *Przegląd Powszechny* (General Review) appeared in 1883 under the direction of the Jesuits, in which prominent Catholics wrote leading commentaries on fundamental questions of current interest. It became the main publication of Polish Catholicism known beyond the borders of Galicia.

Since Galicia's economic development did not keep pace with its intellectual and spiritual life, and the large increase in population could not be absorbed by industrialization, the peasantry was in danger of progressive deterioration. The Church was aware of its duties in dealing with social problems. In the face of the predominant conservatism of the Polish episcopate, pastor Stanislaw Stojalowski took an interest in the farmers and workers. He struggled against the Conservative Polish People's Party, which he stigmatized as antisocial and, because of its collaboration with the Austrian government, as antinational. He also displayed a socialist attitude and was therefore relieved of his parish and, in 1896, excommunicated and suspended. Both verdicts were lifted shortly afterward. In spite of Leo XIII's ban on his writing and preaching, and in spite of the complaints by Prince-Bishop Puzyna, he remained active on behalf of the Polish Peasants Party until his death in 1911.[26] Other clergymen, such as suffragan Bishop Dr. Josef Weber of

---

[23] Regarding the veto during papal elections in 1903, see above, p. 53.

[24] *ASS* III (1911), 160.

[25] Ibid. VI (1914), 181.

[26] E. Winter, *Rußland und die slawischen Völker,* 111–16, 159–65; F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 315–16; E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papsttum* II, 496.

Lemberg, worked in accord with Leo's ecclesiastical policies, which aimed at harmonious cooperation with the state. This is reflected in the address given by the Pope on 21 April 1888 to pilgrims from Galicia and Bukovina.[27] The social encyclical *Rerum novarum* of 15 May 1891 received attention here as well. Bishop Jozef Sebastian Pelczar initiated the founding of a Catholic Social Association in Przemysl in 1906, whose aims were the propagation of Catholic social principles.

Religious life was influenced by representatives of the older orders and younger religious communities. Jesuits who had been expelled from Prussia during the *Kulturkampf* found a new sphere of activity in Galicia. The Pallotines tried to establish a press apostolate in Lemberg in 1908. The Redemptorists formed an independent Polish province in the same year. Several new communities appeared: the male and female Albertines, founded by Adam Chmielowski (1845–1916), who followed the example of the Third Order of Saint Francis; the Sisters of Archangel Michael (*Michaelitki*), founded by Bronislaw Markiewicz (1842–1912); and the Fraternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Queen of the Crown of Poland, inspired by Bishop Pelczar.

In the Prussian territory, the differences between the Protestant government and the Catholics, particularly the Polish-speaking population, had increased through the decades. After settlement of the conflict with Archbishop Martin Dunin of Gnesen-Posen (1831–42), his successor, Archbishop Leo von Przyluski (1845–65) persistently stood up for the restoration of Polish rights. In 1859, in the gardens of Saint Martin's Church in Posen, a memorial was erected for the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855), a sign of the increase in the Polish national awareness in the ecclesiastical realm. The colonizing and Germanization tendencies of the Prussian state contributed to the growth of the Polish national consciousness. After 1870, the Polish policy of the German Empire created a struggle of nationalities in the eastern German regions, which continued (with few interruptions) until 1918. The school supervision law of 1871 and the decree requiring the use of German in the Polish schools of Silesia (1872), Posen, and West Prussia (1873), the systematic abolition of the Polish language in higher schools (1872–90), the introduction of German as the only official language in all public offices and businesses (1876), the anti-Polish measure during the *Kulturkampf* burdened the situation in regard to Church policy.[28]

---

[27] *Acta Leonis* III (1893), 61–62.

[28] J. Buzek, *Historya polityki narodowościowej rządu pruskiego wobec Polaków od traktatów wiedeńskich do ustaw wyjątkowych z r 1908* (Lemberg 1909); B. Stasieski, "Zur Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Posen," *Geschichte der Stadt Posen,* ed. by G. Rhode (Neuendettelsau 1953), 219–21; L. Trzeciakowski, "Stosunki między państwem a koś-

Archbishop Miecislaus Ledóchowski of Gnesen-Posen (1865–86), who endorsed Polish religious instruction in high school classes and paid no attention to the so-called May laws, was the first bishop to be arrested (on 2 February 1874) and to be dismissed by the State Court of Justice in Berlin. In 1875, the time of his imprisonment in Ostrowo, Pius IX created him a cardinal for his courageous defense of the faith. After his expulsion he proceeded to send directives from Rome to his areas of jurisdiction and was subsequently penalized with fines for having usurped episcopal rights. During the negotiations to end the *Kulturkampf,* he was willing to resign. Aside from Ledóchowski, both his suffragan bishops, Janiszewski of Posen and Cybichowski of Gnesen, together with nearly 100 clergymen were arrested during the *Kulturkampf,* so that 97 parishes were vacant and 200,000 Catholics were deprived of proper pastoral care. The diocesan administrative offices were maintained by secret delegates empowered with special plenipotentiary authority. In spite of state pressures, the Polish Catholics were not discouraged by the *Kulturkampf.* They accepted the challenge and intensified their efforts to expand their social, cultural, and ecclesiastical independence.

After Ledóchowski's resignation, Pope Leo XIII made an attempt to eliminate the *Kulturkampf* laws by appointing Pastor Julius Dinder of Königsberg (originally from Ermland), archbishop of Gnesen-Posen (1886–90), and the only German in a long series of bishops who wanted to alleviate nationalism in the controversies regarding ecclesiastical policy. The Pope's attempt failed. He tried in vain to reach an agreement concerning the government's language policies, which were passionately rejected in Poland. Both clergy and diocesan officials ignored his directives and suggestions.

The expulsion of twenty-six thousand foreigners (1885–86) from the eastern provinces,[29] the settlement law of 1886, the East Marches Society of 1894, the fireplace law of 1904 (which was to limit new Polish settlements), the law regarding societies of 1908 (which required that even Polish societies use the German language in their statutes and

---

ciołem katolickim w zaborze pruskim w latach 1871–1914," *Studia i materiały do dziejów Wielkopolski i Pomorza* 9 (1968), 59–80; id., *Kulturkampf w zaborze pruskim* (Poznan 1970); L. Borodziej, *Pruska polityka oświatowa na ziemiach polskich w okresie Kulturkampfu* (Warsaw 1971); T. G. Jackowski, "Samoobrona polaków przed pruską polityką eksterminacyjną w końcu XIX i na początku XX wieku w poznańskiem," *Przegląd Zachodni* 27 (1971), 139–51.

[29] H. Neubach, *Die Ausweisungen russischer und österreichischer Staatsangehöriger aus Preußen in den Jahren 1885/86. Ihre Rolle in der deutschen Polenpolitik and in der Entwicklung des deutsch-polnischen Verhältnisses* (Würzburg 1966).

meetings), and the expropriation law of 1908[30] (which Cardinal Georg Kopp opposed in the House of Lords the same year) intensified the national struggle. During this time, the Poles were able to preserve and strengthen their national characteristics with determined efforts, through parliamentary activities of their factions in the Prussian Provincial Diet and the German *Reichstag,* and through cooperative societies and business organizations. Prelate Piotr Wawrzyniak (from 1892 until his death in 1910 president of the Polish savings bank cooperatives) and other clergymen tried to prevent the purchase of real estate from Polish hands and pursued a successful Polish settlement policy on parcelled latifundias.

Above all, the Poles demanded the reinstatement of Polish as the language of instruction in elementary schools, especially in religious instruction.[31] Their demands for the use of their own language were supported by the Center Party and the German Catholic conventions (1891–92, 1893, 1899, and 1900). Archbishop Florian Oksza-Stablewski of Gnesen-Posen (1891–1906) advocated the preservation of Polish as the language of religious instruction. He also objected to government measures requiring that the twelve- to fourteen-year-old pupils of elementary schools in Wrzesnia speak German during religion classes, which had resulted in the Wrzesnia school strike (1901). He also protested the decree demanding that 20 schools in the administrative district of Posen and 183 schools in the area of Bromberg use German during religious instruction, which had resulted in an extensive school strike in 1906. In a pastoral letter of 8 October 1906,[32] Oksza-Stablewski gave a summary of his efforts toward the protection of Polish religious instruction. He asked parents and clergy to devote more energy to the catechization of the young. He did not witness the end of the school strike, which lasted into 1907. At the beginning of the strike, 90,000 of the 241,000 children received religious instruction in Polish. In 1906, nearly 47,000 Polish children refused to attend 750 schools in the province of Posen. Since the government took rigorous steps against the parents and clergy,[33] the tensions remained.

---

[30] This caused international indignation, cf. H. Sienkiewicz, *Prusse et Pologne. Enquête internationale organisée* (Paris 1909). The expropriation law was not applied until 1912 and those four cases received compensation.

[31] T. Grentrup, op. cit., 266–69; J. Chamot, "Rola kleru katolickiego w strajku szkolnym w Wielkopolsce 1906/07," *Studia z dziejów kościoła katolickiego* 1 (1960), 101–12; R. Korth, *Die preußische Schulpolitik und die polnischen Schulstreiks. Ein Beitrag zur preußischen Polenpolitik der Ära Bülow* (Würzburg 1963); M. Pirko, "Stanowisko arcybiskupa Floriana Stablewskiego na tle polityki rządowej w sprawie wrzesińskiej," *Studia z dziejów kościoła katolickiego* 5 (1967), 88–106.

[32] R. Korth, op. cit., 161–62.

From 1906 until 1914 the archepiscopal see of Gnesen-Posen remained vacant. At the outbreak of World War I the government approved the nomination of suffragan Bishop Edward Likowski as archbishop (1914/15) in order to appease the Polish population.

In the struggle between German and Polish nationalities, the Polish population succeeded in improving its position. The portion of Germans receded from 41 to 38.4 percent between 1871 and 1905. The Polish Catholics directed their energies toward the preservation of their national identity under the leadership of their archbishops of Gnesen-Posen and prominent prelates within and without ecclesiastical life. In addition to their insistence on the use of the Polish language in schools, they expanded their press.[34] After 1879, they published the *Ecclesiastical Review* (*Przegląd Kościelny*) in place of the outlawed (1874) *Catholic Weekly* (*Tygodnik Katolicki*). In 1895, Archbishop Stablewski provided the initiative for the publication of a weekly paper, the *Catholic Guide* (*Przewodnik Katoliki*). In 1906, at his suggestion, the new *Preacher Library* (*Biblioteka Kaznodziejska*), published between 1872 and 1894, was continued with the publication of the *New Preacher Library* (*Nowa Biblioteka Kaznodziejska*). He placed great emphasis on the training and continuing education of the clergy. The number of clergymen doing pastoral work in the archdiocese of Gnesen-Posen in 1873 amounted to 813; during the *Kulturkampf* it dropped to 513; by 1910 it increased to 821. The old Lubrańsk Academy in Posen had served as a seminary from 1780 to 1896. During the *Kulturkampf* it was forced to close its doors and it was not allowed to open them again until 1889. In 1896, the theology students were provided with a new building, where they attended theological and pastoral lectures after receiving basic philosophical training in Gnesen. In this context it is worth mentioning Polish scholarly societies and their publications, in which clergymen decisively participated. By means of lending libraries and book clubs, the clergy managed the distribution of religious writings.

The monasteries were centers that radiated Polish religiosity. The Community of Servants of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which was founded by Edward Bojanowski (1814–71), a Polish nobleman, and devoted to the care of the sick and the orphans, expanded. After the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf,* the orders and religious communities resumed their drastically confined activities. In 1895 Maria Karlowska established in Posen a new branch of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd.

---

[33] Ibid., 165–70: List of penalties from the "documentation of convictions in criminal cases which had to do with the school strike (only convictions for nonattendence of school)."

[34] L. Müller, *Nationalpolnische Presse, Katholizismus und katholischer Klerus* (Breslau 1931).

The Poles of the German eastern provinces were a source of inspiration for the other Polish territories. Their tightly organized and concentric efforts towards national identity were highly esteemed by the Poles in Russia and Galicia. In view of the different political developments in the three territories, ecclesiastical life contributed to the internal consolidation of Polish Catholicism. Polish self-confidence was strengthened by reports of the activities of the chief pastors and the clergy in numerous parishes,[35] achievements of the orders and other religious communities, and the successes of associations on various levels. Adherence to the Catholic faith and to Polish nationalism merged into one inseparable entity, in spite of all social differences and parties. The Polish Catholics looked toward the popes as advocates of their national interests, even though the popes practised caution in their addresses and letters in order to avoid conflicts with the governments. Cardinal Miecislaus Ledóchowski, who, after 1883, worked in the papal Secreteriat of State (1885 secretary of the papal briefs and 1892 prefect of the Congregation for Propaganda) was their influential spokesman at the Curia.

Austria-Hungary[36]

The dual Habsburg Monarchy of Austria-Hungary, with its many nationalities,[37] harbored numerous internal and external political problems in the decades preceding its decline at the end of World War I. These problems greatly affected the Slavic population in regard to the development of its ecclesiastical history. In 1900 Austria was estimated to have 23 million Roman Catholics, 3 million Uniates, and 600,000 Orthodox.[38] At the same time Hungary was estimated to have 9 million Roman Catholics, 2 million Uniates, and 3 million Orthodox. In addition there were 700,000 Orthodox and 350,000 Catholics in the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had been occupied in 1878 and annexed in 1912. The Orthodox and Uniate Christians belonged to Slavic nationalities. Slavs of the Roman Catholic creed were mainly the Poles in Galicia, the Czechs and Slovaks in Bohemia, and the

---

[35] From 1850 to 1860, the number of parishes in the three parts of Poland increased from 3,007 to 3,154, the number of secular clergy from 4,682 to 5,250, cf. A. Stanowski, "Diocèses et paroisses de Pologne au XIX^e^ et au XX^e^ siècle," *Le Millénaire du catholicisme en Pologne* (Lublin 1969), 128–29.

[36] Galicia was part of it.

[37] See above, chap. 2.

[38] Including Galicia.

Croatians, Slovenes and some of the Serbs in the south of Austria-Hungary.

The Austro-Hungarian *Ausgleich,* adopted due to pressure by Hungary in 1867, was criticized by Slavic politicans who endeavored to change the Monarchy into a federation of free and equal nations as giving unjustified preference to the Magyars. By 1871 the Czechs voiced their claims against the centralistic German guardianship. In 1880 they effected a language ordinance for Bohemia which required that even in purely German areas each application had to be filled out in the language of the applicant and trials had to be conducted in the language of the accused. In 1882/83, they succeeded in having the University of Prague divided, and after 1891 there existed a German and a Czech Catholic theological faculty with eight professors and one lecturer each. In April 1897 language ordinances for Bohemia and Moravia followed. They decreed dual language usage for all judicial and administrative authorities. Even though the regulations were endorsed by the majority of deputies (comprised of Czechs, Poles, Slovenes, the two conservative groups of the Catholic People's party, and the Center), they had to be suspended under the pressure of the opposition. Not until 1913, under the impact of the impending World War, was the way paved for successful German-Czech negotiations for a compromise in the language question.

In the course of these efforts, the Catholics worked for an expansion of their rights in the following areas: in the archdiocese of Prague, which in 1886 established a Czech seminary for boys in Pribam, in the diocese of Leitmeritz (with 75 percent Germans and 25 percent Czechs), and in the archdiocese of Olmütz, where Czech was spoken exclusively in the east and south. Since the election reform of 1907, Christian forces emerged as rivals of the old national parties (Old and Young Czechs), which formerly claimed exclusive representation, especially among the rural population. From the beginnings of the Czech Christian socialist party formations at the end of the nineteenth century, which took shape in 1904, arose the conservative wing, the People's Party (*Lidová strana*) in Bohemia (1911) and the Catholic National Party (*Katolicko-národní strana*) in Moravia.[39] The Catholic clergyman Jan Šrámek (1870–1953) could consolidate his first success by merging ecclesiastical and national ideas in a true People's Party.[40] In order to alleviate the tensions between the German- and Slavic-speaking clergy,

---

[39] F. Prinz, op. cit., 118.

[40] Šrámek held several ministerial offices in Czechoslovakia between 1921 and 1938. In 1940–45 he was minister president of the Czech exile government in London.

Leo XIII turned to the bishops of Bohemia and Moravia with his letter of 20 August 1901, asking them to nurture their inherited language, to care for all of the faithful with equal love, to avoid the language controversies, to prevent disagreements in seminaries, and to seek harmony in their dioceses.[41]

Toward the Slovaks, who gradually voiced their claims for autonomy, the government of the Kingdom of Hungary showed no kindness. It oppressed all non-Magyar nationalities and conducted a strict policy of Magyarization, which extended into the ecclesiastical realm. In 1897, Pastor Andrej Hlinka (1864–1939) of Ružomberok founded the *People's Newspaper* (*L'udové Noviny*); the Slovak People's Party, whose goal was political and religious freedom for their own nationality, was formed in 1905. His propaganda on behalf of the Slovaks' national autonomy in Parliament brought him in conflict with state and Church authorities. In 1906, when he supported the opposition in the Hungarian Parliament, where Catholic deputies endorsed the cabinet's bills, he was sentenced to three and one-half years in jail and suspended by his bishop for his political activities. The Council's Congregation annulled the suspension in 1909[42] and Hlinka was allowed to resume his pastoral work. He later cooperated with the Czechs in the formation of the Czechoslovakian Republic.

Like the Slovaks, the Carpathian Ukrainians, Rumanians, and Serbs suffered under the Magyarization process, which also included the educational system under Minister of Religious Affairs Count Albert Apponyi (1906–10) and which made no exception for religious instruction. Not until 1914 did the Hungarian government give in to the pressures of the disadvantaged nationalities. It permitted religious instruction in the respective mother tongues in all elementary and civil schools as well as in teacher seminaries.[43]

In the south of the Dual Monarchy, life for the Slavs was extremely tense. The majority of the Croatians belonged to the Kingdom of Croatia and Slavonia, bound to the Austrian crown; one part belonged to the Cisleithian-Austrian half of the Empire in Istria and Dalmatia, the other to Bosnia-Herzegovina, while the Slovenes belonged to the western part of the Empire in Carnolia, in the south of Styria, and in Carinthia. The Serbs, who had achieved absolute independence at the Congress of Berlin in 1878 and had formed their own kingdom in 1878, tried to attract the minority in the south of the two Austro-Hungarian portions, mainly from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and they propagandized a Great Serbian South Slavic Empire, which was to include Serbs, Croatians, and Slovenes.

---

[41] *ASS* XXXII (1900–01), 321–23.

[42] A. Hudal, op. cit., 279.

[43] T. Grentrup, op. cit., 485–86.

While the Slovenes and Croatians had their roots in Western culture and Roman Catholicism, the Serbs were rooted in the East and in Orthodoxy. After centuries of oppression by the Turks, all three nationalities were filled with a tremendous desire for freedom and left no stone unturned to achieve their political, cultural, and religious independence. Attempts failed to buffer the alternating pressures of the South Slavic question by reorganizing Austria-Hungary along federalistic lines or according to a triadic empire concept in place of the current dualism (Austria-Hungary). The representatives from Croatia, Slovenia, and Dalmatia passed a resolution in Rijeka in 1905 in which they demanded the unification of Croatia and Dalmatia and the triadic organization of the state.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century the Slovenes had created a uniform written language. Their awakening national consciousness is reflected in their societies, cooperatives, and in the Sokol movement. Together with the Croatians, they attempted a solution within the framework of the Habsburg Empire. Under the leadership of the clergyman Dr. Janez Krek, the political and economic organization of the rural population improved. Dr. Anton Korošec (1872–1940) founded the Slovenian Farmers' Party (1907), approved a southern Slavic agreement, and accepted in 1918 the chairmanship of the Slovenian-Croatian National Council.

The Croatians were much more active. They were not satisfied with autonomy in regard to administration, education, and the judiciary, which they had been granted through the Hungarian-Croatian Agreement of 1868.[44] Franjo Rački (1828–94), who was the first president of the Croatian Academy of Sciences in Zagreb (1866–86) and leader of the Croatian People's Party since 1880, and Bishop Josip Jurij Strossmayer (1815–1905)[45] were the spokesmen of their national interests for decades.

The bishopric of Djakovo was headed by Bishop Strossmayer, from 1849/50 until his death, according to his motto "all for faith and country."[46] In 1900, 253,770 Catholics of the Roman rite, 29,000 Uniates, and 169,000 Orthodox lived there. Of ninety parishes, fifty-five were Croatian-speaking and three German; thirty parishes had a mixed Croatian-German population and two a mixed Croatian-Hungarian population. In spite of his political and cultural dedication to his people, Bishop Strossmayer tried to bridge differences for the sake of a union with Rome by demonstrating his loyalty to the Habsburg Monarchy, furthering the Uniates and pursuing the idea of uniting all southern Slavs, even the Orthodox Serbs. In 1872, he retired from active politics. He opposed the Hungarian claims and the hegemony of either Croatians or Serbs, and furthered with his patronage the development of Croatian culture. This can be demonstrated by his donations to the University of Zagreb (1866), the Croatian Academy of Sciences (1867, opened in 1874), and the art gallery in Zagreb. Furthermore, his support was valuable to scholarly publications and instrumental in the construction of a representative cathedral in Djakovo, which was inaugurated in 1882. In view of the concepts of the governments in Vienna and Budapest, his Catholic pan-Slavism brought about conflicts with the national Croatian politician Dr. Ante Starčević (1823–96), who ruthlessly fought the Serbs and demanded a Greater Croatia, which, in addition to its native land, was to include Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Dalmatia. It was to be on an equal footing with Hungary. Strossmayer reestablished the Croatian Institute *S. Girolama dei Schiavoni* in Rome, which Leo XIII, upon a motion by the Croatian episcopate, renamed *Collegium pro gente croatica,*[47] hoping, as did his secretary of state, Rampolla, that it might become a stepping stone for the ecclesiastical unification movement among the Balkan Slavs.

---

[44] W. Felczak, *Ugoda Węgieisko-chorwacka 1868* (Wroclaw 1969).

[45] J. Matl, "Josef Georg Stroßmayer," *Neue Österreichische Biographie* IX (1956), sect. 1, 73–83; R. Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (Paris² 1962), 409–10.

[46] J. Matl, op. cit., 74.

In contrast, Joseph Stadler (1843–1918), after 1881 archbishop of Sarajevo, expected the college to be a nursery for a Catholic Greater Croatia. He carefully pursued the development of the ecclesiastical organization aided by Jesuits, Franciscans, and several religious orders of women. In 1904–11 he wrote a textbook on scholastic philosophy in the Croatian language. During the reorganization of the ecclesiastical arrangement after the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (in 1895 a census counted 675,000 Orthodox, 55,000 Moslems, and 350,000 Catholics), Leo XIII established the archdiocese of Sarajevo with the suffragan bishoprics of Banja Luka and Mostar. During the decades before World War I, the number of Catholics increased to almost 400,000 because of the influx of Catholic civil servants, soldiers, and businessmen. They were cared for by the archbishops of Sarajevo and the bishops of Banja Luka in Bosnia. The bishops of Mostar were the chief pastors in Herzegovina. After 1890, they were simultaneously administrators of the old bishopric of Markana-Trebinje, which had been part of the medieval metropolitan see of Ragusa.

---

[47] This was protested by various people, cf. F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 318–21, and G. Adriányi, op. cit., 330–33.

The constitutional annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 did not change the ecclesiastical situation, but the resulting international tensions led to World War I, in spite of the agreement between Austria and Turkey concerning the Serbian "Great Power" aspirations and because the European powers were ready for action. During this war, Catholic Slavs fought on both sides. The majority of the Slavic Catholics was supported by Austria-Hungary, while the Orthodox Slavs were protected by Russia.

Southeast Europe

Greece had received its independence in 1830. In the decades between the reorganization of the Balkan states as a result of the Russo-Turkish War (1877–78) and the outbreak of World War I, the following independent principalities became kingdoms: Rumania (1881), Serbia (1882), Bulgaria (1908), and Montenegro (1910). Bulgaria received its independence in 1912. The Ottoman Empire lost one stronghold after another in southeast Europe and had to confine itself to eastern Thrace. In all those states the Catholics were merely a minority of the population.

The ethnographical and religious cohesiveness of the population in Rumania (92 percent Rumanians, 91.5 percent Orthodox) and the long reign of their first king, Charles I (1866–1914) was advantageous for the development of the state. In 1914 there were 100,000 Roman Catholics and 50,000 Uniate Christians among the total population of 6 million. On 23 March 1883 the archbishopric of Bucharest was founded in Wallachia, for which apostolic administrators had been responsible for 150 years. The first bishops were chosen from the congregations of the Passionists, who had taken care of the Catholic immigrants for a long time. They were forbidden, however, to make propaganda among the Orthodox. As for higher education, in five of their houses members of the Congregation of the English Ladies assisted them. For the Catholics in Moldavia, the bishopric of Jassy was established in 1884 and made directly responsible to the Holy See. In Jassy, Conventuals, Jesuits, and the Sisters of Our Lady of Sion were active. It was not easy to train a native clergy because most members of the orders were foreigners.

Neighboring Bulgaria was ruled by Prince Alexander Battenberg (1879–85), who expanded his territory toward the south by incorporating eastern Rumelia, and by Ferdinand I (1887–1918), who adopted the title of tsar in 1908, but had to surrender southern Dobrudja to Rumania and Macedonia to Serbia after the Second Balkan War (1913).

The majority of the population was Orthodox Christian. The Capuchin missionary Andreas Canova, who, as bishop, headed the vicariate apostolic of Plovdiv-Sofia from 1848 to 1868,[48] participated in the Bulgarian unification movement which began in 1859–61 but could not sustain itself. In 1883 the responsibility for the Catholics living in Bulgaria was taken on by the old bishopric of Nicopolis (reinstated in 1648), whose see was transferred to Ruščuk the same year, and the apostolic vicariate of Plovdiv-Sofia with its see in Plovdiv, whose incumbents had been titular bishops since 1885. They cared for about 27,000 Catholics assisted by Capuchins, Conventuals, Jesuits, Assumptionists, Passionists, and nuns of various congregations. When the Catholic Prince Ferdinand had his son and heir to the throne baptized in the Orthodox rite (1895/96), because the Chamber had demanded this, Leo XIII protested. The Pope called it a betrayal of conscience for the sake of politics.[49] In spite of this incident, the Curia hoped that the Bulgarians would join the union. Pius X advised the Habsburg diplomats to closely align with Bulgaria and Rumania. He was concerned that the Slavs could side with the worst enemy of the Church, Russia.[50]

In Serbia, Orthodoxy was the state religion. In spite of the religious freedom guaranteed by the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the Catholics were suppressed by the government and the Orthodox hierarchy. The political uprisings and changes, the Greater Serbian movement, and the antagonism between Austria-Hungary and Russia were also a problem for them. Not until 1855 were they allowed to establish their own parish in Belgrade. The old bishopric of Belgrade existed only as a titular bishopric. In 1728/29 it had been united with the bishopric of Semendria. The Catholics' jurisdiction lay in the hands of neighboring bishops or vicars apostolic. In 1851 Bishop Strossmayer was appointed vicar apostolic for the principality of Serbia. In this capacity he made contact with Serbian government circles during his visitation travels. In 1886 the bishopric of Belgrade was reinstated, incorporated into the new Church province of Scutari, and between 1898 and 1914 placed directly under the Propaganda Fide. It had about 10,000 Catholics and was elevated to an archbishopric by the concordat of 24 June 1914.[51] As the suffragan bishopric of Scoplje, it was to incorporate all areas gained by Serbia after the Balkan Wars. The bishopric was formed from the archbishopric of the same name and included about 15,000 Catholics. The wars delayed the development of a Church organization, which did not develop until 1924 in the Yugoslavian state.

---

[48] A. Tarnovaliski, op. cit., 47–51.

[49] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 518.

[50] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. II, 125.

[51] Mercati I, 1100–3.

In the principality of Montenegro, where 90 percent of the population were Orthodox, the Catholics were under the archbishopric of Antivari, which, since the concordat with the Curia in 1886, was directly responsible to Rome.[52] In this region, the use of Old Slavic liturgical texts was permitted. They were, to be sure, almost literal translations of the Roman liturgy into modern Church Slavic (*Grajdanka*). When one missal was printed in Cyrillic letters (in Rome, 1893) according to Leo XIII's wish, the archbishop asked for permission to print it in Glagolitic script, so that it might not be mistaken for an Orthodox publication. The number of Catholics increased between 1886 and 1914 from 7,000 to 13,000.

In Albania, which was ruled by the Turks from 1468 until 1912, the majority of the population was Islamic. The southern and eastern areas were populated also with strong Slavic groups which confessed to Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism. A Turkish-Islamic syncretism had developed, which the archbishops of Durrës and Scutari, the Franciscans who were active as missionaries, and the Jesuits tried to confine. In 1905 the archbishopric of Durrës had about 13,000 Catholics; the archbishopric of Scutari with its bishoprics of Lezhë, Pult, and Sapë had nearly 70,000. Since the Habsburg Monarchy exercised a cultural protectorate in Albania, pursuing political as well as religious goals, and since this area was an intersection of Italian, Croatian, Serbian, and Pan-Slavic interests, conflicts resulted within Catholicism, which was partly inclined toward and partly against Austria-Hungary.[53] Aside from the language problem in schools and seminaries, propaganda in favor of the introduction of Slavic Church texts played a role.

In Greece the majority of the population belonged to the Orthodox. For the small group of Catholics, Pius IX created the archbishopric of Athens (1875) in addition to the existing archbishoprics of Korfu and Naxos. There were few Slavs among the approximately 660,000 Catholics, but their number increased through Greece's expansion toward the north. Because of the Bulgarian claim to all of Macedonia, from which Serbia had received some parts in 1913, a new ecclesiastical organization could not be effected.

The archbishoprics of Scutari and Durrës, located in Turkish territory, and their suffragan bishoprics had been incorporated into the Balkan states. The patriarch vicar of Constantinople was responsible for the few Catholics (about 50,000 in 1914), few of whom were Slavs. The Latin patriarch of Constantinople resided in Rome. They were represented at the Sublime Porte by a *vekil,* chief of the chancellory of the Catholic *Reaya.*

---

[52] Ibid., 1048–50.

[53] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 310, and G. Adriányi, op. cit., 279–93.

The internal complaints of the Slavic peoples and the policies of the great powers, which interfered with the ecclesiastical affairs of the Catholics, prevented any increase in the religious activities of both the Roman Catholics and the Uniates (which were represented in most southeastern European states). The bishops could only maintain the heritage entrusted to them, assisted by the clergy and the religious orders.

SECTION TWO

The Development of Catholicism in Modern Society

CHAPTER 12

Catholicism in Society as a Whole

During the pontificate of Leo XIII the Catholic movements arisen from the confrontation with modern society as it evolved from revolution formed themselves into social groups in various countries within society as a whole and thus gave rise to what today is called Catholicism. The idea of restoration had failed; the revolution of the bourgeoisie could not be revoked, having achieved its last victory with the occupation of Rome, which, in conjunction with the commune uprising in Paris, marked the beginning of the revolution against the bourgeoisie. It was an epoch-making turning point in the history of the Catholic Church, representing, at first, a fundamental change in its relation to the "world," touching its very essence and self-awareness. From the time of Constantine the Great until the French Revolution, the Church was able to absorb all political figures into its own organism, duplicating or assimilating them. Indeed, in the early stages of the West, it was even capable of portraying the *imago imperii.* This is no longer true in the age of the liberal and democratic constitutional state and the "growing industrial society with its continuous changes in its stratification." It is no longer true, even though the Church's "lack of social station . . . was still hidden until well into the second half of the nineteenth century."[1]

---

[1] C. Bauer, *Bild der Kirche,* 25f.—The Church's "lack of social station" refers to its position within the total industrial society with its rapid change of economic, social, and intellectual conditions. This is not contradicted by the fact that Catholicism as a special group takes up its position with emphasis, trying to preserve the Church's guidelines since Leo XIII. These guidelines become necessarily more abstract the less the Church is able to "reflect the society" in all its contradictions and the more the differences between the various Catholicisms and the controversies within them have to be considered. The Church has its "social station" within these Catholicisms (as special groups), which can only be termed ideo-typically with the singular "Catholicism" (which will be used in this sense henceforth). Therefore, the history of the Church will from now on be largely the history of Catholicisms, "Church" and "Catholicism" not being identical.—German Catholicism is given preferential treatment in this chapter. The reason is that chapters 1 and 3 concentrate on the *Kulturkampf,* as was planned.

The cultural forms of Catholicism of the various countries took their classical shape during the pontificate of Leo XIII and were typical until the first third of the twentieth century. The multiplicity of denominational associations, especially in Germany, proved statistically to be rather successful. So was the press, ranging from daily papers to intellectual periodicals, whose circulation, with the exception of religious mass literature, was not competitive but did have dedicated readers supporting it. All this was an expression of a strong self-awareness, which, in turn, could affect daily life through solidarity. G. Goyau glorified the *Catholicisme social,* to be understood in a general sense, as a "society of saints" in the midst of the modern world, turning away from the individualism of Châteaubriand toward a *fraternité,* which he said was a definite reaction to the concept of a lay society, and he related his vision of the human society to the *société surnaturelle:* the dream of the old relationship between reality and its image.[2] But he was compelled to bewail the misfortune of the Catholics in his country, who appeared to be the rearguard of society, but were in reality the vanguard.[3] But it is exactly this assessment, be it from the point of view of the liberal bourgeoisie or the Socialists, which defines, if not the "lack of station," a deficient relationship to society as a whole. Even though Catholicism took initiatives, particularly in reference to the social question, it simply used the sociological and political configurations of the postrevolutionary world rather than accepting them from within, at least initially. This is also valid for the popular movements, for the workers' pilgrimages to Rome,[4] for the nonecclesiastical lay societies and their activities,[5] which are, after all, phenomena of an increasingly democratic society. Their tendency toward independence boded conflict with the clerical claim for leadership. The terms in which Catholicism expressed itself were borrowed, and its self-righteous expectations of asserting itself within the total society by means of its re-Christianization had the characteristics of an illusion.

---

[2] G. Goyau I, 69–78, II, 4.

[3] Ibid. I, 211; in regard to a debate in the French Chamber in 1896 about women and child labor where a deputy spoke of the identity of labor potential and worker by referring to Marx: "Ce n'est point le socialisme seulement, c'est le christianisme social, qui s'appuie sur un tel fondement; et l'on pourrait . . . rapprocher Leon XIII non moins aisément que Karl Marx" (I, 234).

[4] W. Schwer, *Leo XIII,* 60: "For years, the princely gate of the Vatican remained closed because the deluded kings of this world were no longer able to find their way to Rome. Then Leo XIII opened it again and in came a workers' pilgrimage which had crossed the Alps in order to take home the blessings of the Pope, just like the sovereigns of days gone by had received their imperial crown." As much as the Pope, after 1887–88, liked to appeal to the people directly over the heads of their governments, and as much as some sort of papal patriotism was able to integrate the minority groups of ecclesiastically minded people—such a rather pathetic picture neither captures the ecclesiastical nor the secular realities.—W. Schwer follows the picture of Melchior de Vogüe, quoted in M. Turmann, *Catholicisme social* (Paris 1901).

[5] At the Catholic Convention of 1881 in Bonn, the lawyer F. Porsch said that the lay activities spurred by the *Kulturkampf* "merely reflected a state of distress," and there was hope for a period of time when "they will be able to practice the guardianship which God provided in order to rule His Holy Church" (Kißling II, 78f).

In this context belongs Catholicism's realization of its internationality, which was demonstrated at congresses when foreign guests of the same religion were welcomed.[6] In reality, the national differences were quite substantial, even if one ignores the effects of international political factors, as for instance the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy. Of course, the concept of internationality was realized in the sovereign common to all Catholics and, no matter how controversies about certain issues regarding ecclesiastical policies arose, the authority of the Pope within Catholicism was not questioned during Leo XIII's pontificate. It was intentionally nurtured by observing certain anniversaries and was extensively interpreted by the Pope when he defined the competence of the nuncios,[7] as well as by lay representatives.[8] At major public events such as the Catholic conventions and Eucharistic world congresses (as soon as they were fully developed), the idea of the *Ecclesia militans* as the Church of the martyrs took an outspoken militant turn. For example, at a Catholic convention in Trier in 1887, Bishop Korum preached about the *Militia Christi,* and the Porta Nigra was bathed in a sea of flames, above which appeared a cross with the illuminated words: *Stat crux, dum volvitur orbis.*

---

[6] This is what Windthorst said at the Catholic Convention of 1883 in Düsseldorf about an "international assembly of Catholics" under the leadership of the Pope, similarly in Breslau in 1886 (Kißling II, 86).

[7] See above, p. 22.

[8] Windthorst was upset because of the Vatican's policies in Berlin, which seemed too conciliatory to him. But August Reichensperger told him at the Catholic Convention in Trier in 1887 that one had to serve the Pope, "whose position in the world does not allow him to fulfill our, the Prussian ultramontanes, every whim and wish" (Kißling II, 114).—The celebration of the year 1900, in preparation since 1896, was the subject of controversies because it was not an ecclesiastical affair and because there were reasons to doubt whether Leo XIII would survive the turn of the century. Prince Karl zu Löwenstein wrote about such opinions, toward which Cardinal Mazzella was also inclined: "The Holy Father is not only an infallible teacher, but also the helmsman at the wheel, who is distinguished by special dignity. His judgement about the expediency of a matter is not confirmed by his infallibility, but by the great likelihood of the good, the useful, and God's will speaking through him." K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus,* 497, noted in this respect: "The historian has to record the fact that this conviction of faith proved to be correct" because the Pope survived.—Theodor Wacker (cf. chap. 35), at the Catholic Convention in Koblenz in 1890, nurtured illusionary hopes: "Once the social kingdom they mention has taken shape and life, nothing will be more natural than the social Emperor and the social Pope joining hands and staying together" (quoted from Buchheim, 337). Windthorst was more sceptical. One should not overlook the fact that all Catholicisms experienced a certain indifference toward the "Roman question," not only in Germany, where Triple Alliance policies represented an element which even the Center could not ignore. The change in the slogan of protest which was obligatory for every Catholic convention was significant for the Pope: In 1890, in Koblenz (moderately edited by Windthorst), they pleaded "for restoration of the territorial sovereignty of the Holy See"—in 1898, in Neiße, in rather general terms for "sacred rights" referring to Leo's Italian encyclical of 5 August (Kißling II, 281f).

The forms of Catholicism, to be sure, were not merely at odds with the principles of the liberal bourgeoisie but were also struggling with more or less fierce internal conflicts. These differed according to the specific historic situation and obstructed an international consensus. Attempts were made to divide the Catholicism of the various countries[9] where the pre-revolutionary Church had been the "established Church" (like Spain, Portugal, Latin America, France, Italy, and Austria-Hungary), and the countries whose recent history did not accord the Catholic Church this kind of status and therefore "had fewer difficulties in adjusting to the new political conditions of the nineteenth century."[10] This general typology certainly provides some useful insights, but distinctions must be made. Catholicism in Bismarck's Germany, for instance, where the Church was never "established," significantly differed from Catholicism in the United States. What the different forms of Catholicism had in common in all countries—varied according to their respective social structures—was that they were composed of the same social strata, although less so among the upper classes, as society in general. This posed the problem to what degree Catholicism could act as an integrating force on the conflicting interests of society's subdivisions. The strength of identity of each group depended on the extent to which, in addition to the issue of Church and state, social contrasts could be bridged. A strong, distressed minority could exploit this circumstance, as Windthorst demonstrated brilliantly at the Catholic Convention of 1882 in Frankfurt.[11]

---

[9] Chaps. 1–11.

[10] J. N. Moody, op. cit., "this dichotomy in the historical experience of modern Catholics in their relation to the modern state is the cause of considerable confusion."

[11] The struggle against defeat (by a majority of votes) "will be even more effective when everyone learns once and for all who we are . . . thus, let us be strong in faith, keep our eyes open, and may we be united, then no one can harm us" (Kißling II, 89).—German Catholicism, however, is different. Unlike any other, it was organized in a political party and it could handle its social heterogeneity. It emerged in the eighties after the upswing of industrialization by making use of the "possibility of balancing the interests in the field of politics" (C. Bauer, *Wandlungen,* 37). It was not easy continuously to restore this balance. The vehement debate over the legally mandatory guilds which the Catholic leaders of trade had demanded at the Catholic Convention in Düsseldorf in 1883 and the social politicians of the Center opposed was concluded by Windthorst with the rhetorical phrase "that we completely agree on all aspects of ecclesiastical and social life" (Kißling II, 165).

Between Total Revision and Reform

It is a characteristic mark of Catholicism that it always saw the "social question," in a narrow sense in the "perspective of the total society" and the labor question as part of the "integral social reform question."[12] This view was only held by some theoreticians in areas where Catholics were in the extreme minority, as in Great Britain and in the United States. Therefore, it is necessary to integrate the Catholic social movements into the concept of the total society. Only then does the dilemma which Catholicism faced wherever it had to strive for more than the civil equality of a small minority become visible. Either it had to inculcate fundamental changes within the total society in which it was embedded (since it was clearly not of the same spiritual descent), or it had to content itself with realizing its principles by way of reforms within the plurality of the total society, foregoing its own concepts and making compromises along the way. This dilemma survived the turn of the century and was resolved, depending on the situation of the individual countries. Even though the differences between the countries have to be considered, the "changes in the socio-political realm of ideas relative to German Catholicism in the nineteenth century," as Clemens Bauer described them, can be regarded as a model case. Change meant primarily Christianization and re-Christianization, which was difficult to equate with charitable activities as proletarization grew in a capitalist society and was increasingly recognized as a general condition that was not absorbed by the "labor problem." When Edmund Jörg termed liberalism the "ruling spirit of our time," and the "natural son of the new national economy," thus closely connecting political and ideological liberalism with the capitalist economy,[13] a "total social reform" could indeed be regarded as the main task of Catholicism, whether "class inspired" in a sentimental social sense or impregnated with socialistic features, whether it was called Christian or not. However one chooses to assess the "newly created socio-economic reality," the desire for fundamental structural alterations of society had to either vanish in utopia or, without admitting it, take on a revolutionary character. How deeply Catholicism was affected by the idea of developing a concept that would embrace all of society and putting it in competition with a liberal bourgeois ideology is documented by the encyclical *Rerum novarum.* It was penetrated by only a few ideas about a "total social reform," but was able to revitalize the principal disputes within Catholicism, which had acquiesced to the facts of capitalism under the leadership of the Center Party and followed the path of social reform.[14]

---

[12] C. Bauer, *Wandlungen,* 46.

[13] C. Bauer, *Wandlungen,* 23, 29 (including quotation of E. Jörg), 34, 30.—Of course, there are differences between economic liberalism on the one hand and the not necessarily identical political and ideological liberalism on the other hand (cf. C. Bauer, "Liberalismus," *StL*^{6} V, 370–80); but it is probably incorrect to say that the Catholic disputations against liberalism only gathered the "most extreme objects of attack under one overall term" (C. Bauer, *Wandlungen,* 29), since differentiating the liberal segments does not preclude considering liberalism as a total phenomenon.

The Problem of Toleration

The "broken relationship" of the Church to the liberal bourgeois society is a phenomenon which is characteristic of all forms of Catholicism, though not so much in the United States during the Gibbons era where the leading segments of the episcopate, although opposed by the Corrigan group, were firmly anchored in the Constitution, i.e., in the principles of human rights. The reasons for this attitude were not merely based on ecclesiastical policy and tactics. In reference to modern society, this is one of the Church's basic dilemmas which the teaching authority had to face in view of internal Catholic tensions as well as the position of the Church in the secular world. Since the opposition put forward by the *Syllabus* was clear, only requiring refined interpretation, was there an alternative? *Tolerantia,* in accordance with the *Syllabus,* was a negative term for Leo XIII and the majority of Catholics (wherever they were not an extreme minority) because it was equated with a concept wherein truth and untruth, morality and amorality are equally valid. The positive term, being alien to the *Syllabus,* is the *patientia* with which the Church is in waiting until mankind discovers the one and only truth, Catholic truth.[15] This principle is applied to religious freedom, which, when indiscriminately granted (*promiscue*), will result in atheism. It applies to the freedom of speech, the press, and education, upon which the state is obligated to place limits,[16] not withstanding the Church's inalienable freedom to teach.[17] All principles of liberalism, which were fundamentally condemned, were banned in the *Syllabus* in the same manner as in the encyclical *Libertas* (1888). However, and this is the only difference, the latter speaks of the consideration of "human weaknesses" by the "maternal judgement of the Church," which does not ignore the course of events and therefore does not condemn the state's occasional indifference toward certain events which do not comply with truth and justice in the interest of eventual good and prevention of evil.[18] It is clear that even a liberal who was willing to practice his principles in the face of the Catholic Church[19] was misunderstood as long as his idea of truth was identified with a radical indifferentism and his world view was tolerated by the Catholic Church as the lesser evil. He had to fear that "patience" would only last until an opportunity for the dogmatization of public life arose again.[20] But Leo XIII created a modus vivendi with respect to society's pluralism, and more could not be expected in this particular historical situation. At the same time, he offered a formula for resolving internal Catholic controversies.[21] The test case was Catholicism in the United States. It is indeed understandable that the notion that the American conditions should be considered a model for the Church was discarded as an error. But the limits of an essentially unrealized adjustment were evident in the remark that the Church could reap a rich harvest if it were granted, "aside from freedom," also "the favor of the law" and the "protection (*patrocinium*) of the state."[22] This required the Catholic who adhered to the constitution of the United States to reconcile the irreconcilable. In the papal proclamations on the problem of the relation between truth and freedom there were certain shifts in emphasis,[23] but no essential progress.

---

[14] C. Bauer, *Wandlungen,* 41ff.; and therefore it is valid (even in regard to the special conditions in Germany) to say that Catholicism there "had an alienated relationship to what one may call the "bourgeois society" in Germany. Catholicism confronts society with different social ideals and it has a hostile attitude toward the economic system which is perpetuated by this society" (C. Bauer, "Der deutsche Katholizismus . . . ," *Deutscher Katholizismus* [Frankfurt a. M. 1964], 52.

[15] *Libertas* (1888) (*Acta Leonis* VIII, 241): [ecclesia], "quia tam dissolutum flagitiosumque tolerantiae genus constanter, ut debet, repudiat . . ."; he opposes *patientia* to *lenitas,* which the Church practiced generously.

[16] Ibid., 229–34.

[17] Ibid., 235.

The Doctrine of Property

The doctrine of property is of as much importance to liberal bourgeois society as is the principle of toleration. In this respect, however, recent research in Neo-Scholastic social philosophy has affirmed that the teaching of Thomas Aquinas regarding personal property was transmitted in a truncated form and eventually fell under the rather strong influence of a liberal economic theory.[24] This is the area where the real theoretical decisions have to be made regarding the question of whether Catholicism should follow its own total conception of social order or whether it should comply and pursue a social reform policy (though, to be sure, in different versions, reflective of its relationship to a capitalist industrial society). It was noted that the individualistic idea of property had its predecessors. Luigi Taparelli (died in 1862) had already presented it in his exemplary work on the Natural Law.[25] He was the teacher of Gioacchino Pecci, who even as Pope remained loyal to his basic concepts, although he did not agree with the reference to the instinct with which the dog will defend its food.[26] "The exaggerated emphasis of the individual side of the concept of property, which neglected the social side . . . , did indeed have an impact on papal documents like *Rerum novarum.*"[27] Nevertheless, in Leo XIII's theoretical writings after 1878, a considerable shift in emphasis can be noted. In the beginning, he discusses the lower classes wanting to occupy the palaces of the rich without thinking about eternal life.[28] The tone of the social encyclical is essentially different, even though Matteo Liberatore (1810–92), the master of Roman Neo-Scholasticism, who placed the natural right to personal property at the center of his social philosophy,[29] had a considerable influence on the history of its creation.[30] Two factors especially seem to have determined the Neo-Scholastic theory of property. Like Leo XIII's encyclical, it basically proceeds from agrarian property: "it is not an exaggeration to maintain that the concept of possession, property as we understand it today, basically was the result of the French Revolution."[31] Perhaps this is why the essentially academic question (in which the Pope remained neutral) of whether personal property, as Suarez claimed, was to be attributed to *ius gentium* is of concrete importance insofar as the historical background of the respective specific property law is concerned. If only the "ability to possess property,"[32] thus the fundamental right to have personal property, is determined by Natural Law, then there exists a great deal of leeway in which to regulate property and the proper proportions of personal and community property. In addition, Leo's social encyclical places definite value on the property of the "have-nots." That was "surprising for all those who wanted to secure their monetary interests under the patronage of *Rerum novarum.*"[33] Yet Leo XIII "did not distinctly see the two groups of capital and labor as two social classes in the technical sense of the word,"[34] though these groups were of fundamental significance in the formulation of this modern question. Moreover, in spite of the Pope's efforts in terms of social criticism, he did "speak in the tone of a grand seigneur and a patriarch, almost with a voice descending from the realm of eternity, full of fatherly mercy and kindness when addressing his dear children, especially the workers";[35] and, without a doubt, his voice grew more "fatherly" after 1878. It was often noted that Leo XIII did not intend to develop a social theory in his encyclical, but the unquestionably strong systematic elements stem to a great extent from the Neo-Scholastic social philosophy of Liberatores, and this is the point of contact for Catholic moral theology as far as the doctrine of property is concerned.[36]

---

[18] Ibid., [ecclesia] "non recusat, quominus quidpiam a veritate iustitiaque alienum ferat tamen potestas publica, scilicet maius aliquod vel vitandi caussa malum, vel adipiscendi aut conservandi bonum."

[19] Leo XIII criticized the intolerance of the Liberals with Cicero's kind of wit: *Acta Leonis* VIII, 237.

[20] W. Gurian, *Ideen,* 262.

[21] A similar phrase was contained in *Immortale Dei* (1885), where the principle stating that the Church could not concede the existence of non-Catholic religions *eodem iure* was modified in a more pragmatic sense (*Acta Leonis* V, 141). Moreover, in reference to a passage in Saint Augustine's work, it was said that nobody should be forced to convert to the Catholic faith.

[22] *Longinqua Oceani spatia* (1895),—The Weimar constitution contains the separation of Church and state. It calls the churches "religious societies" subject to civil law; this is a compromise which was only possible in this historical context and, moreover, belongs in a later period of time.

[23] For example, in *Annum ingressi* (19 March 1902), which says that this is the correct doctrine, *ut libertas veritate concedat (Acta Leonis* XXII, 67).

---

[24] F. Beutter, with a lot of documentation.

[25] Ibid., 97, following A. F. Utz.

[26] *Rerum novarum,* 5; P. Jostock, op. cit., 15.

[27] O. v. Nell-Breuning, in A. Rauscher (ed.), *Ist die katholische Soziallehre antikapitalistisch?* (Cologne 1968), 15.

[28] *Quod Apostolici muneris* (1878) (*Acta Leonis* I, 171): "Praesentium tandem bonorum illecti cupiditate . . . ius proprietatis naturali lege sanctitum impugnant"; I, 173: Since reward and punishment in the eternal life were forgotten, "mirum non est quod infimae sortis homines, pauperculae domus vel officinae pertaesi, in aedes et fortunas ditiorum involare discupiant."

[29] Quotation in F. Beutter, op. cit., 104.

[30] Antonazzi, 13.

[31] O. v. Nell-Breuning, *Eigentumslehre,* 145f.

The other factor which needs to be considered when assessing the Catholic doctrine of property in those decades is the polemical dispute over socialism, that is, socialism as a complex phenomenon with all of its ideological components. Unquestionably the logic in Catholic social theory was to a large degree determined by this confrontation. Nevertheless, when attempting a historically adequate evaluation of the total situation, one cannot say that the rejection of socialism "from the perspective of the bourgeois society" should be "called a vital error of the theology of the nineteenth century."[37] That, indeed, was precisely the question: Would Catholicism under the given historical conditions of the nineteenth century be able to arrive at a comprehensive concept of society or would it have to assert itself defensively against the mutually contradictory currents of the time, against liberalism as well as socialism, in order to possibly influence reform efforts? Nonetheless, the definite rejection of ideological liberalism did not preclude a more or less strong coloration of the doctrine of property through liberal individualism.[38]

---

[32] Ibid., 155.

[33] Ibid., 154.

[34] Id., *Die soziale Enzyklika,* 150.

[35] *Ibid.,* 39. Therefore, one is hesitant to follow Jostock (10) when he declares as "very remarkable" the fact that the encyclical lists among the reasons for social evil the *versi in deteriora mores* last, following the economic and social reasons. He certainly recognized the socio-political tasks. But his emphasis on *cupiditates,* with which the encyclical begins, changes from passage to passage, and one should not project the reform of present conditions from the perspective of Pius XI.

[36] F. Beutter, op. cit., 86f.; see Beutter in regard to the various moral theologians who do not speak in *unisono* (including extensive lit.); also important is the article by G. Gundlach about Theodor Meyer, *StL*^{6} V, 695f.; A. Lehmkuhl, ibid., 335f.; H. Pesch, ibid. VI, 226–29. H. Pesch is dealing with the further development of Catholic sociology. Accepting the "historical school," he declares as "good" a regulation of property that follows the law of nature "with proper consideration for the actual conditions, the historical stage of social and economic life" (*Liberalismus* I, 400).—In regard to the Swiss Jesuit V. Cathrein, who endorsed the interdenominational and democratic principles but opposed Socialism and paternalism (according to Soderini, he was one of Leo XIII advisers), see: J. David, *LThK*^{2} II, 355ff.

Social Theories

The social theoretical works of the moral theologians often went through numerous editions. But few gained as much international significance for Catholicism as Charles Périn's (1815–1905) *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes* (first edition 1861).[39] This Catholic economist from Belgium, who also strongly influenced the social activists in France and western Germany, was ideologically and politically a confirmed antiliberalist. But in his principal rejection of state intervention, which was augmented by his opposition to the liberal constitutional state, he acted as representative of economic liberalism. However, he did want this liberalism amended by his concept of "Christian property," meaning the social ties of charity. He accepted the concentration of property in one individual as a result of the progress of civil freedom, but he saw the possibility of achieving congruity in respect to self-interests in the sense of sacrifice natural to Christian asceticism. Of course, he deemed the ideal to be moderate wealth, which was most likely to be found among the middle class, and that shows clearly how he underestimated the process of industrialization. The French social scientist Frédéric Le Play (1802–82) had an effect reaching far into the last third of the nineteenth century. Through his sociographical investigations of the family life of workers and craftsmen in France, England, Germany, and Russia, he dealt with an issue that was the central point of Catholic social doctrine.[40] The family is intact when the patriarchal authority of the father is unimpeded. The family is also the model for society as a whole with its "social authorities," including the entrepreneurs. The rejection of liberal human rights and the constitutional state could consistently merge with economic liberalism of a distinctly paternal character, while still implying a serious aspiration toward social justice. The ideas of Le Play were predominant in the *Association des Patrons du Nord.* The antiliberalism of the philosopher and economist Guiseppe Toniolo (1845–1918)[41] had an entirely different background. Professor in Pisa in 1889, Toniolo founded the *Unione cattolica per gli studi sociali in Italia,* which prepared the Catholic social congresses in Italy. In 1891 the *Socièta operaie cattoliche* included 284 local chapters and was especially popular in northern Italy. The *Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali . . .* , founded in 1893 in Talamo, obtained a certain official character through Toniolo's consulting activities on behalf of Leo XIII. Thus the Christian social program, designed under the guidance of Franz Schindler (1847–1922),[42] who was a professor of moral theology in Vienna in 1887, was sent not only to Rampolla, but also to Toniolo. In contrast to Rampolla's sober and pragmatic reaction, Toniolo approved, regarding as essential the program of profit-sharing among the workers. He also gave his basic consent to an "organization of society according to occupations," but took exception to the idea of having infinite competition controlled through corporations by arguing that occupational egotism could ruin the consumer.[43] Being strongly influenced by the historical school of German economics, Toniolo is not so much important for the originality of his doctrine as for his influence in Italian Catholicism and with Leo XIII.

---

[37] F. Beutter, op. cit., 149, who does not mean to endorse Socialism.

[38] It was rather the same on all fronts. A. Lehmkuhl, *Die soziale Frage und die staatliche Gewalt* (Freiburg i. Br. ^{3}1896), 75: It cannot be denied that capitalism, "under certain circumstances, possesses some economically good aspects; but without curtailment, it is bad and a source for economic collapse." State Socialism, on the other hand, poses a threat. As far as the "curtailment" is concerned, G. Gundlach notes (in regard to the situation forty years after the issuance of the encyclical) "that the course of the capitalist economic system severely damaged the sociological function of the family as well as private property and the state . . . through paralyzing anonymous power plays"; "Berufsständische Ordnung," *StL*^{6} I, 1127.—To say that Western Europe did not become Marxist because Leo had made the Church "the most formidable foe" is historically wrong and biased. "It becomes evident as the story unfolds that the hand of Leo XIII was one of those strengthening the dike which held back the flood" (L. P. Wallace VII, 408).—The insight that Christ as Christ has only a *norma negativa* in respect to economics, society, and the state could only be gained after many trials and tribulations. This applies to the Conservatives as well as to the Christian Democrats.

[39] F. Beutter, index, esp. 30, 104, 119; Reszohazy (op. cit., chap. 7), index; J. B. Duroselle, *Les débuts,* 470f.

---

[40] Main work: *Les ouvriers européens* (Paris 1855, ^{2}1877–79); also *La réforme sociale en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1864, ^{8}1901, 3 vols.).—L. Neundörfer, *StL*^{6} V, 357–60 (lit.); J. B. Duroselle, op. cit., 672–84 (lit.)

[41] F. Marconcini, *Profilo di Giuseppe Toniolo* (Milan 1930); V. Mangano, *L'opera di scientifica di G. Toniolo* (Rome 1940); R. Angeli, *La dottrina sociale di G. Toniolo* (Pinerolo 1956).

[42] The Christian social program was published by F. Funder, op. cit., 132–37; F. Schindler, *Die soziale Frage der Gegenwart* (Vienna 1905), frees Vogelsang's ideas, which the prelate had been exposed to during the "duck evenings," from conservative utopias; there is also a connection to the Swiss K. Decurtins.—Regarding the controversies between the Catholic Conservatives and the Christian Socialists over the Austrian Cardinals Gruscha and Schönborn, cf. chap. 2.—Regarding the champions of the Christian Socialists in Austria, such as J. Scheicher (1842–1924), moral theologian at the Seminary of Saint Pölten, see H. David, *J. Scheicher als Sozialpolitiker* (diss., Vienna 1946), according to which Scheicher was critical of the Christian Socialists' trend toward the middle class (56).

Just as Charles Périn's social theory radiated toward the West, so did the influence of the early Viennese school under Vogelsang toward France.[44] Catholics in countries like France, Belgium, and Austria who tried once more to create a universal order of society in the Christian image of man had something in common: they categorically rejected the liberal bourgeois society. This "reactionary" attitude was affected by various political configurations and thus presented one facet during the Third Republic of France, where such social criticism amalgamated more or less by necessity with antirepublicanism. It had a different appearance in the Habsburg Monarchy, where such criticism was suspect with the liberals as well as the conservatives, so that it came to be associated with revolutionary tendencies. This, as well as the East-West gradient in the process of de-Christianization, has to do with the fact that the Christian impetus was more direct, as it were, in France than in Austria, where socio-political objectives were approached in a more direct manner. In Germany, the defense against the *Kulturkampf* absorbed most theoretical and practical interests and the conclusion of the dispute later coincided with the turn toward a social reform concept. However, even here existed an incipient individual program relative to society as a whole. Most of the leading activists and theoreticians belonged to the aristocracy: in France mainly Albert de Mun,[45] and Latour du Pin,[46] in Germany Prince Karl zu Löwenstein,[47] in Austria Count Franz Kuefstein and Counts Revertera and Belcredi, who were mainly interested in politics, and the North German converts Count Blome and Carl von Vogelsang, who during his odyssey had found a protector in Alois zu Liechtenstein,[48] also called the "Red Prince." The background of these men can easily prompt the sweeping conclusion that an attempt was being made to turn back the wheel of history.

---

[43] Rampolla's answer in F. Funder, op. cit., 138–41; Toniolo's answer, ibid., 142f.

[44] C. Antoine, S.J., *Cours d'économie sociale* (Paris 1896), 240: "Les catholiques d'Autriche ont cru que le seul moyen de salut pour eux était de confier tout l'ordre économique social aux mains de la dynastie catholique des Habsbourg." The assessment by this author, who was close to A. de Mun, distorts the Viennese ideas through its abridgement.

[45] Impressed by the Commune Uprising in Paris in 1871 (for which he partially blamed the middle class), A. de Mun (1841–1913), a French officer, founded the *Oeuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers* (cf. chap. 13) and the extraparliamentary *Union catholique.* He sacrificed his royalism in obedience to the papal *Ralliement,* was for socio-political reasons in conflict with the Orleanists, and slowly took exception to the theories of Charles Périn. A large part of the French episcopate, headed by Freppel, was disinclined toward the social activities of de Mun, while Mermillod, Doutreloux, and Manning took a positive stand. Nonetheless, in 1885, he began to plan a *parti catholique* according to the Belgian and German model, in which all conservatives were to be united in the

In the social theory of Carl von Vogelsang[49] there are elements from the social doctrine of the Romanticists (especially Adam Müller); and

---

spirit of the Christian faith and social action. Leo XIII advised against it (H. Rollet, *A. de Mun et le parti catholique* [Paris ^{2} 1950]; cf. chap. 6). After the failure of the *Ralliement,* he founded the *Action libérale Populaire* in order to fend off anticlericalism, and he worked together with M. Barrès. The funeral of this man, honored as a great Frenchman in spite of all differences, was also attended by Minister President L. Barthou.—J. Piou, *A. de Mun* (Paris 1952; because of his personal acquaintance still important); M. Lynch, *The Organised Social Apostolate of A. de Mun* (diss., Washington 1952); J. N. Moody, op. cit., 146f.; J. Mehling, *Essai sur A. de Mun* (Fribourg 1953); C. Mollet, *A de Mun: Recherches d'histoire religieuse* 1 (Paris 1970), with many new letters.

[46] R. Latour du Pin was de Mun's colleague in the officers' corps, but in contrast to him more interested in theory: *Vers un Ordre social chrètien* (Paris 1907); *Aphorismes de politique sociale,* rev. ed. (Paris 1909). He did not go along with the political turn of the *Ralliement* and rather approached the *Action française.*—E. Borsan de Garagnol, *Le colonel de Latour du Pin d'après lui-même* (Paris 1934); R. Talmy, *Aux sources du catholicisme social. L'École de Latour du Pin* (Paris 1963).

[47] Karl zu Löwenstein (1834–1921), in 1868 president of the *Zentralkomitee der Katholischen Vereine Deutschlands,* founded at the Catholic Convention of Bamberg (four noblemen, three clergymen), 1872–98 (when the central committee was restored after having been dissolved during the *Kulturkampf)* "commissioner" of the Catholic conventions, was accredited with having organized the socio-political conference in the castle of his birth Haid (Bohemia) in 1883 and having founded the *Freie Vereinigung katholischer Sozialpolitiker.* But he was the representative of those Catholics who were not primarily interested in the social question, but rather in the "influences of the revolutionary movement which should be taken advantage of in the interest of the Catholic Church" (P. Siebertz, op. cit., 215, from the Wertheim archive); "one has to mount the horse in order to be able to lead"; "if we cannot prevent the social republic, at least we must be its master" ("confidential" circular, P. Siebertz, op. cit., 215f.). However, he was tolerant enough to invite people of all Catholic persuasions to the conference in Haid. The "Haid theses" and their total revision program were presented to the Catholic Convention in Amberg in 1884 in an abridged version (E. Ritter, op. cit., 83ff.).

[48] Alois Prince Liechtenstein (1846–1920), 1878–89 and 1891–1911: member of the *Reichsrat;* had a conflict with the Austrian Ultra Conservatives; presented in 1888 to the Viennese Catholic Convention the social problems generally ignored there; 1891: elected deputy of the Christian Socialists of the suburb of Hernals. "He introduced to the different antiliberal elements the fundamentally Catholic element" (F. Funder, *StL*^{5} III, 1011ff.).

[49] Carl von Vogelsang (1818–90), son of a major in the Prussian police force, resigned from his position at the district court in Berlin, became a Catholic in 1850 after studying in Munich and Innsbruck, and in 1874 joined the editorial staff of the strictly conserva-

his hypothesis of a "social kingdom" as an alternative to "state socialism" was possible only in the central European regions. However, Gustav Gundlach[50] was justified in observing that the first representatives of a system which later was called "order by occupations" cannot be understood merely on the basis of such deductions. Catholicism produced only one original concept of a constitution embracing all of society. This was intended to be a creative draft of a defense against liberalism as well as socialism. That it later became suspect was due to several reasons which cannot be discussed at this point. It should be noted that only traces of this concept entered into the encyclical *Rerum novarum.* The practical decision to take the path of Catholic cooperation in the social reform of the capitalist society had already been made. Though the successes accomplished were impressive and cannot be disputed, an assessment of this concept regarding society as a whole cannot be reached on this ground alone. In order to confront the real dilemma of Catholicism, one has to consider that the realization of this concept would entail the abolition of the capitalist society and would therefore not have been accomplished without revolutionizing society. Moreover, these strictly antiliberal and thus anticapitalist theoreticians, mainly located in Vienna, knew rather little about economic realities.

What Vogelsang and his friends wanted to achieve (not through upheaval but "through a gradual transformation from within") was the following: the elimination of "exploitation" through capitalism "whose only purpose of economic activity is net profit"; the formation of occu-

---

tive *Vaterland* in Vienna. He created tensions in his relationship to Count Leo Thun, the owner of the newspaper (who otherwise appreciated Vogelsang), when he used phrases in his articles like "the marvelous strike of the railroad employees (in Pittsburgh), in which the disenchanted attacked capitalism with breech loaders and canons." In the *Österreichische Monatsschrift für Gesellschaftswissenschaft und Volkswirtschaft,* which Vogelsang founded in 1879, he published a universal reform plan (C. Allmayer-Beck, 66ff.). The series of articles published after 1883 entitled *Die materielle Lage des Arbeiterstandes* was criticized by the Liberals and Conservatives alike for pouring fuel on the hate of the "present social order." At Prince Liechtenstein's conference in Haid Vogelsang stood on the left. In Vienna, he was supported by Prince Liechtenstein as well as the moral theologian F. M. Schindler, J. Scheicher, and Pastor R. Eichhorn (R. Kuppe, *Eichhorn zur Arbeiterfrage* [diss., Vienna 1926]). In the beginning, A. M. Weiß belonged to this Christian Socialist circle (cf. below). In regard to contacts with the Viennese Socialists, see C. Allmayer-Beck, 90ff., 100f. In contrast to P. Biederlack, S.J., Innsbruck, P. H. Abel, S.J., supported Vogelsang: "In contrast to the un-Christian German and the un-Christian Jewish movements, this Austrian Christian movement in Vienna is indebted to Vogelsang" (C. Allmayer-Beck, 126).—W. Klopp, *Die sozialen Lehren des Freiherrn von Vogelsang* (Saint Pölten 1894; excerpts in French); A. Knoll, *C. v. Vogelsang als Nachfahre der Romantik* (diss., Vienna 1924); C. Allmyer-Beck, *Vogelsang. Vom Feudalismus zur Volksbewegung* (Vienna 1952).

[50] G. Gundlach, "Berufsständische Ordnung," *StL*^{6} I, 1124–27.

pational "corporations" in which capital and labor, employer and employee are united, forming a "social institution of society and state"; the replacement of the "horizontal stratification according to class by a vertical one according to occupations, which would be characterized by a "republican cooperative relationship"; elimination of "purely private, absolute, capricious property which is robbing God, society and the state." At the top of such economic and political social order was to reside the "social kingdom" as an integrating element. Vogelsang rejected suffrage by census as asocial and general suffrage as dispersing the "historical and political" individualities into "random sections divided according to external geographical criteria," and he also assigned propaganda to the "corporations." Their structure was certainly conceived from the perspective of the trade guilds, which Vogelsang wanted to modernize and organize into reliable production and sales cooperatives so that they could compete wth industry. He believed that it was possible to transfer this modernized model to industrial enterprises. Austrian anti-Semitism, too, had one of its roots in the Christian social movement because Vogelsang and others saw the Jews as the main perpetrators of the "exploitation of the workers."[51] Vogelsang's social concept solicited a limited amount of attention in other social study groups of Catholicism, particularly through Blome and Kuefstein. Considerable differences existed not only within these circles but also in the individual groups. An example of this is the Dominican Albert Maria Weiß from Upper Bavaria, who was an active apologist in Graz, Vienna, and Fribourg after 1890. To him, the social question was a weapon he employed in his wholesale war against liberalism.[52]

During a social study course of the *Volksverein* in Bamberg in 1893, Franz Hitze[53] called Carl von Vogelsang the kind of "teacher" Germany lacked. The same year, Hitze became professor of Christian sociology in Münster and thus inaugurated the tradition of a new teaching chair in the theology faculty. In that same year, he answered a Social Democrat deputy in the *Reichstag* who had criticized the social politics of the Center Party with reference to Bishop Ketteler: "I still agree absolutely with the opinions Bishop von Ketteler has voiced."[54] These are the reminiscences of a pragmatic politician during a period when he contemplated "a basic transformation of society." Next to Wilhelm Hohoff,[55] he was "the first Catholic sociologist who thoroughly studied Marx and recognized his significance" (J. Höffner). To him it was inevitable that "socialism would come, either the absolute, social-democratic version of the state or the relative, conservative, healthy version of the social classes" (*Quintessenz,* p. 32). Hitze rejected the theory of suplus value, but the criticism of capitalism found in his early writings follows the very phraseology of Karl Marx. Like Vogelsang, he bases his theory on the model of the medieval guilds. But he believes they have to be placed on an "expanded economic and democratic foundation," which meant the evolution of industrial enterprises into productive associations autonomously controlled by all participants. Only in this manner could a situation in which the entrepreneur has the advantage and the employee the disadvantage be changed. Hitze opposed Charles Périn's theory with determination. He also saw danger in the idea of the "company as a family," which, through its social provisions, could adversely tie the worker to his place of work. The fact that during the trade union controversy at the turn of the century some representatives of the Catholic workers' societies criticized his idea of an "organization of society on a Christian basis by occupations" was a bitter pill for Hitze to swallow. For, after divorcing himself from the idea of a reunification of capital and labor and embracing the concept of social reform within a capitalist economy, he advocated the functioning of trade unions as "sales cooperatives" (of labor) and justified striking as a withholding of the commodity of labor. The controversy between young Franz Hitze and Georg von Hertling[56] foreshadowed the victory of reform politics with the existing economy over a fundamental rejection of liberal bourgeois capitalism. Abandoned was the "corporative" idea, according to which the relation between capital and labor was not to be determined by the market conditions but by a social contract in the spirit of natural law, because labor was not to be degraded to a form of merchandise. Abandoned also was the conception of the mixed trade unions of "employers" and "employees" as presented mainly by Albert de Mun. The question yet to be answered was how the then clearly weaker partner, labor, could be protected. The following controversy over the state's intervention was dominated by paternalistic ideas (which were particularly persistent in western European Catholicism), but primarily by the relationship to the respective states. In this situation, the Pope, in the encyclical *Rerum novarum,* had to find a moderate position from which to mediate.[57] Now the comprehensive "social question" of Catholicism turned into the more specific question of the workers.

---

[51] W. Klopp, *Lehren,* 65ff.—Aside from being "revolutionary" and "socialistic," anti-Semitism was also charged with being one of the elements with which the Conservatives fought the Christian Socialists in Rome in 1895.

[52] Aside from his apology (chap. biblio.), *Lebens- und Gewissensfragen der Gegenwart,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1911); autobiography of A. M. Weiß (1844–1925): *Lebensweg . . .* (Freiburg i. Br. 1925).—In regard to his action against the Christian Socialists, see F. Funder, op. cit., 144ff.

[53] In 1878, Franz Hitze (1851–1921) went as priest to the Campo Santo in Rome and studied Karl Marx and the works of Vogelsang. His main works are based on these studies (cf. above). After his return in 1880, he became the secretary general of the association *Arbeiterwohl,* which had been founded by the Catholic industrialist F. Brandts, in whose factory he was social adviser. After 1882 deputy in Prussia and later in the *Reichstag,* Hitze became one of the leading and (in opposition to the employers' lobby) most decisive social politicians of the Center Party.—Franz Müller, *F. Hitze und sein Werk* (Hamburg 1928); A. Pieper, "Hitze und die Korporationsidee," *Die soziale Frage . . . ,* ed. J. Strieder et. al. (chap. lit.), 86–98; K. H. Schürmann, *Zur Vorgeschichte der christlichen Gewerkschaften* (Freiburg i. Br. 1958), 53–57; J. Höffner, *StL*^{6} IV, 107f.

---

[54] Quoted in J. Mundwiler, *Ketteler* (Munich 1927), 145.—Ketteler's impact, even on Leo XIII, who called him his "great predecessor and imitator," was considerable (Schmidlin, *PG* II, 368). In spite of the romantic ideas of his youth, his understanding of "the new socio-economic reality" (C. Bauer, *StL*⁶ IV, 953–57) grew.—Since Ketteler offered ideas that aim at structural changes (productive associations with joint ownership of the workers) as well as social reforms, different movements relied on his work.

[55] Wilhelm Hohoff (1848–1923), a Westphalian like Hitze, retired as vicar and led the reclusive life of a scholar, protected by Cardinal Schulte. He tried to combine the scholastic theory of labor with the theory of Karl Marx (*Die Revolutionen seit dem 16. Jh.* [1887]; *Warenwert und Kapitalprofit* [1902]; *Die Bedeutung der Marxschen Kapitalkritik* [1908]).—An evaluation does not exist. E. Alexander, in J. N. Moody, 525, considers him remarkable, even though he rejects other attempts in the German and Austrian Catholicism.

Catholicism had finally evolved into a group within the total liberal bourgeois society and it was responsible for resolving its internal differences over economic interests (the problem of its political parties). The representatives of "Christian Socialism"[58] existed in the background;

---

[56] In regard to the socio-political stand of the philosopher and statesman Georg v. Hertling (1843–1919), see C. Bauer, *Wandlungen* . . . (1931), 38–41; Schürmann, 53–61; E. Deuerlein, *StL*^{6} IV, 61–64; it is significant for the tactical-political differences between Hertling (who was a pragmatist) and Löwenstein that the Catholic convention of 1890 was held in a different location, out of consideration for Prince Regent Luitpold (P. Siebertz, op. cit., 265–71; G. v. Hertling, *Erinnerungen,* 122–26).

[57] *Acta Leonis* XI, 108: "ad eamque rem (workers' question) adhiberi leges ipsas auctoritatemque rei publicae, utique ratione ac modo, putat oportere"—ibid., 121: ". . . in potestate rectorum civitatis est, ut ceteris prodesse ordinibus, sic et proletariosum conditionem iuvare plurimum . . . debet enim respublica ex lege muneris sui in commune consulere." But the intervention, which exceeds the elimination of a situation *rebus extremis,* was rejected, being under suspicion of state socialism; therefore (but also in the interest of the employee's accumulation of assets, not, however, for the purpose of preserving entrepreneural interests), the opposition to "inappropriate" taxes is rejected: "Faciat igitur iniuste atque inhumane, si de bonis privatorum plus aequo, tributorum nomine, detraxerit" (p. 133). The accent is clearly on advocating state intervention, for which the Pope was criticized by the disciples of paternalism.

[58] The early version of Christian Socialism in France disappeared in the face of the radical development of Socialism after 1848. But the idea emerged repeatedly, as in the bishop of Nottingham, E. G. Bagshaw's *Mercy and Justice to the Poor: The True Political Economy* (London 1885). Bagshaw combined his strict anti-Protestantism and anti-individualism with anticapitalism. He felt that the state was obligated to prevent agrarian and industrial accumulation, free enterprise (which he considered devastating), and the exploitation of the tenants. The state was to create revenue through social legislation which would enable it to remedy social abuse (19–21). The rejection of capitalist

but the idea of an "order according to occupations," along with its "revitalization" (Gundlach) in the magnificent encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* (1931), became essentially a theoretical affair.[59]

Catholicism's multiple efforts in the seventies and eighties toward the design of a comprehensive social system were often mutually exclusive, but their fundamental significance could not be erased by mere pragmatism. They were the work of various study circles,[60] whose ideas

---

utilization of rivers and coastal waters has to do with the interests of some Catholics in the land reform program of Henry George (cf. chap. 10). The pragmatist H. E. Manning (cf. chap. 9) advocated in his essay "The Rights and Dignity of Labour" the social priority of labor as compared to capital. He wanted to assure the free distribution of labor (5–14) and believed state interventions to be necessary; but he renounced H. George in his commentary on *Rerum novarum* (in regard to George, see Peter d'A. Jones, *The Christian Socialist Revival* [Princeton 1968]; also V. A. McClelland, *CHR* 58 [1972], 423ff., where the context within Catholicism is lacking).—Abbot Gasquet, O.S.B., opposing the recognition of Anglican orders (cf. chap. 9) at the Conference of Nottingham in 1898: "We all claim to be Socialists of one kind or another" (quoted in Waninger, 98).—Liberal Catholicism is represented by S. Merkle (1914, p. 71) who disdainfully quotes Abbé Pottier of Liège stating that he saw the future of Catholicism in union with the Socialists. He also refers to A. de Mun as an involuntary helper (Merkle relies in this respect on F. X. Kraus). He could have also mentioned the Swiss K. Decurtins (chap. 4). He interprets *Rerum novarum* in the sense of a clearly antisocialist theory of property (O. Schilling, *Staatslehre,* 120). The translation into German and its distortions (Herder edition) are interesting.

[59] H. Pesch, *Liberalismus* I, 567–76, objectively describes the contemporary discussions in the Catholicisms from France to Austria. He himself advocates the need for organizing the "classes as 'organs' of the social body" (556) whose authority would also adjust production to demand (565); but he warns "of a direct projection of purely theoretical constructs to reality" (579) and considers dangerous the idea of installing the classes as "large production and sales cooperatives," arguing that "nowadays the reaction to the liberalism of free enterprise often leads to an exaggeration of the idea of *Gemeinschaft*" (582). In contrast, Scheimpflug demands in his article published in the *Staatslexicon* under the title "Capital and Capitalism" (1894): "The classes are to be dissolved and regrouped"; capitalism evolved out of the "disintegration" of the medieval forms of society and is to be replaced by new "corporations" which would be responsible for "the national management of production."

[60] The *Conseil des études de l'œuvre,* mainly handled by A. de Mun, the founder of the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers,* and R. Latour du Pin, began publishing the *Questions sociales* . . . . In Rome, Count Kuefstein, a member of the Vogelsang circle, suggested the founding of the *Circolo dei studi sociali ed economiche,* which was joined by, among others, Liberatore, Mermillod, and Count Soderini. Different groups, predominantly the Viennese (dissolved in 1888), were represented in the *Freie Vereinigung katholischer Sozialpolitiker,* founded in 1883 by Löwenstein. The *Union catholique d'études sociales et économiques à Fribourg* tried to unite these circles internationally; it existed until *Rerum novarum* was issued. The Swiss K. Decurtins, in 1887 invited to Fribourg, was "the democratic element in this highly aristocratic association" (Fry II, 177); he wrote to Segesser: "As different as the representatives of the various ideas—the sovereign and the democrat—may have been, the power of Communion united them all" (Fry II, 179). There is a survey of these circles in A. Knoll, *Der soziale Gedanke,* 116–22.

merged in the *Union catholique* of Fribourg (founded in 1884 by Mermillod). The image of unity which Catholicism presented in its defense toward the "modern world" needs to be modified considerably if one is adequately to appreciate the difficulties which had to be overcome in formulating *Rerum novarum.*[61] The Neo-Scholastic abstract character of many parties has its explanation in the need to cover the rather contradictory concepts within Catholicism itself as they came to light, for example, at the international congresses in Liège, particularly in 1890. Only by placing it in the total historical context of these decades can we comprehend the significance and the limits of this encyclical in historical terms. Perhaps its greatest significance lies in the recognition of the workers' right to organize, along with its cautious affirmation of the state's right and duty of intervention.

Marriage and Family

Although tensions between Catholicism and liberal individualism on the one hand and collective socialism in the economic realm on the other hand were deep, doctrinal authority was united regarding the sovereign origin of the family. In the dispute with socialism, theories which aimed at revolutionizing the traditional concept of the institution of marriage were occasionally offered by bourgeois Catholics and had to be fended off. There was concern that the parents' rights and obligations regarding the care of their children could be diminished or suspended by state measures.[62] The struggle against liberalism in this respect referred to the legalization of divorce, a prerequisite for which was the introduction of civil marriage. Leo XIII pointed out that marriage, insofar as it served the maintenance of human society, created civil correlationships which the state had a right to regulate. But matrimony is primarily a sacrament and as such subject only to ecclesiastical authority. This poses a problem in view of the de-Christianization and the pluralization of society at large. A solution aiming at differentiating the civil contract from the sacrament, which was respected as such, was rejected by the Pope. In respect to the extrasacramental "relation" *(coniunctio),* he said, avoiding a more pungent expression, that in this manner a "rightful marriage" *(iustum matrimonium)* could not be constituted.[63] No less important for the family than the dwindling attitude of society regarding the institutional character of marriage were the changes of the economic conditions resulting from growing industrialization as they affected the family. Leo XIII in *Rerum novarum* spoke only in general terms about a fair wage. He also said that the *pater familias* had to be able to support his family; but aside from the economic problems it was probably the patriarchal concept of the family which prevented the amount of wages from being determined as a "family wage" according to natural law.[64] To be sure, industrial female labor from the perspective of the worker's protection is an important aspect discussed among groups studying the social problem in Catholicism. But this kind of work was basically considered an evil which had to be alleviated.[65] For a long time, the changes in the family structure of the industrial society were ignored and the family of the agrarian society continued to serve as a model.[66] In this context belong representations of the image of the "Holy Family" in Nazareth.[67] Women's emancipation was diagnosed by Christian social doctrine as a symptom of decline.[68]

---

[61] The first draft of the encyclical was probably written by M. Liberatore. The second one was amended by secretaries G. Boccali and A. Volpini, who also used suggestions from Fribourg. Cardinals Zigliara and Mazzella, and again Liberatore, worked on the third version. Schmidlin, *PG* II, 373, critically continues where G. Antonazzi, op. cit., 8–11, 37ff., left off.—The danger of an interpretation by the interested parties prohibited the Pope from "taking an overly concrete and detailed stand" (P. Jostock, op. cit., 11).

[62] *Rerum novarum (Acta Leonis* XI, 106).

The School Question

The classical battlefield of the Catholic Church, society, and the modern state is the school and especially the elementary school. This fight is a defense against the state's claim, having come to full force through the French Revolution, to educate its adolescent citizens in accord with its needs and concepts. In the eighteenth century the predominant part of education had still been, at least indirectly, a Church matter. But the purely defensive character of the ecclesiastical school struggle was demonstrated by the fact that it focused principally and, above all, factually on the religious element of instruction. The parents' right and duty to raise their children authoritatively was not defined in general terms but according to Christian mores.[69] The ecclesiastical ideal was a Catholic school financed by the state, which the state had the right to exert influence upon, but only as far as it was congruent with its innate authority. In the sense of choosing the lesser evil, these ideals were infringed upon when non-Catholic schools were also admitted. To tolerate this in the city of Rome was, of course, disagreeable to Leo XIII.[70] Bordering the tolerable was the system wherein only Catholic private schools were allowed, even if, as was the case in the United States, they had the same constitutional status as other schools.[71] The "neutral schools,"[72] which, as a rule, were antiecclesiastical, continued to be principally condemned, even if it was permissible to administer religious instruction within or outside of the school building during the time off. The achievements in the individual countries differed according to the respective political situation[73]: In France, education was largely secularized by the turn of the century after initial favorable interpretation of the law of 1882 by J. Ferry, because Catholic private schools were, in spite of quantitative increases, considerably limited by the laws enacted against the religious orders and congregations. In Italy, the Catholic victories in the local elections slowly counteracted the prohibition of religious instruction in elementary schools. In Belgium, the Liberals were defeated in the school question with their very own political principles. In the Netherlands, the political coalition of Catholics and Protestants prevented a de-Christianization of the schools. In Bismarck's Germany, the school was the responsibility of the *Länder,* and either in practice or through legislation the predominant problem of denominational diversity could be solved while preserving the Christian character of the school, even though the school laws were still vehemently debated after the *Kulturkampf.*[74] In Great Britain, the liberal de-Anglicanization of schools gave the Catholics some leeway (which they took advantage of), assisted by state subsidy of private schools. But the rising standards in education here as well as in the United States made it more difficult for the Catholics to remain competitive. This was not only a question of financial means. At the Catholic Convention in Aachen in 1879, Prince Karl Löwenstein presented the motion to form a commission which was to develop learning goals and corresponding teaching plans for universities and all the way down to elementary schools. Though it was modeled after the school of the Middle Ages, it was an outstanding motion, but it faded out after being handed over to the *Görres-Gesellschaft.*[75] The Jesuits, who were especially active in higher education wherever they were admitted, finally adopted *nolens volens* the existing school plans,[76] but they were, except where absolutely necessary, not able to develop their own modern concept. With good reason, the shortcomings of teachers' training were pointed out.[77] In

---

[63] The encyclical *Arcanum* (1880) *(Acta Leonis* II): against Communist ideas: 19; against divorce: 30ff.; against civil marriage: 21f.; state rights: 34f.; Sacrament and authority of the Church: 23; against the separation of the civil license from the Sacrament: 25f.; extra-Sacramental "union" of Christians: 37.

[64] See O. v. Nell-Breuning, *Eigentum,* 147, with important documentation.

[65] *Rerum novarum (Acta Leonis* XI, 129): "Sic certa quaedam artificia minus apte conveniunt in feminas ad opera domestica natas: quae quidem opera et tuentur magnopere in muliebre genere decus, et liberorum institutioni prosperitatique familiae natura repondent."

[66] O. v. Nell-Breuning, *Eigentum,* 147, calls the "rural family" a family which is closest to nature, to the natural order of things, and thus to the direct application of natural law" (1931); this addresses the problem.

[67] Cf. chap. 16

[68] "The Socialists demanded the absolute equality of the sexes in regard to civil and private law, within and outside of the family. This demand contradicts reason and Christianity" (V. Cathrein, *Sozialismus,* 347).—One reason that the *Katholische Frauenbund* (founded in 1903 in Cologne) encountered conflicts with the Church lies in its trend toward emancipation, moderate as it may have been.—The motion at the Catholic Convention of Düsseldorf in 1908 to admit women as independent members was voted down.

---

[69] *Sapientiae christianae* (1890) *(Acta Leonis* X, 39).

[70] Letter to the cardinal vicar of Rome of 25 March 1879, *Acta Leonis* I, 202–10. The establishment of a Protestant school, *anche sotto gli stessi occhi Nostri, fin presso alle porte del Vaticano* (204), was, naturally, an inappropriate provocation. But Leo XIII rejected (on principle) the attempt to spread *falsi principii del Protestantesimo* in Italy and particularly in Rome.

[71] Cf. chap. 10.—Leo XIII called it unfair to force parents by means of taxes to finance schools which their children could not attend for reasons of conscience: *Quae coniunctim (ASS* 24, 656).

[72] *Acta Leonis* II, 118; IV, 15; VI, 154.

[73] Cf. chapters on the individual countries in Pt. I, Sec. I, and Pt. II, Sec. III.

---

[74] In Prussia, in 1892, a bill of the Center and the Conservatives regarding parochial schools miscarried because of the Liberals' opposition. But the "customary habits in everyday school life, which were moderate and in accord with ecclesiastical desires" (Brück-Kißling IV/2, 314), were finally legalized. In Bavaria, the parochial school became the legally "regular" school in 1883, and the change into nondenominational schools required an ecclesiastical verdict stating "whether or not adequate religious instruction would be impaired" (ibid., 318). In Württemberg, the parochial school had never been questioned. In Baden, there had existed since 1878 the principle of the nondenominational school, but this was practiced in such a way that the teacher of a local school of a certain denomination had to adhere to this creed personally. In mixed schools, the denominational majority determined the teacher, though a constant minority group was also provided with the appropriate teacher (Catholic religious instruction was regulated in 1888 by a "proper episcopal ordinance" (ibid., 318f.). In Hesse, the situation relaxed in a "practical" regard (ibid., 320).

[75] Kißling II, 194, noted that this society of scholars was "strictly speaking" not competent, because at that time such societies did not deal with didactic problems; see G. M. Pachtler, S.J., *Die Reform unserer Gymnasien* (Paderborn 1883), in which he pleaded for a Neo-Scholastic orientation and against the "devastating attitude of a know-it-all!"

[76] H. Becher, *Jesuiten,* 341.

[77] M. Spahn, op. cit., 30.—After the Prussian school law of 1906, this Catholic historian, who favored the state but defended the clerical supervision of schools, asked the question whether Catholic cooperation "in national schools whose legal system they helped create would be more successful" than the achievements of their French fellow believers "in regard to the development of education and their own philosophy" (27). It is interesting that this lecture was presented to the Catholic Teachers' Association. The social difference between the academically trained pastor and the elementary school teacher often effected an opposition which resulted in the de-Christianization of the faculty, especially since even during their training in denominational seminaries resentments were frequently aroused.

Italy, Murri bewailed the traditionalism of Catholic education and the lack of religious instruction.[78] Without a doubt, education in all its stages was one of the most important areas in which to halt the rapid or slow process of de-Christianization. This is why the tensions between Catholicism and society as a whole became most vigorous in this sphere. The dilemma which Catholicism had to face relative to its various relations to the total society became especially apparent: the dilemma of the desire to adapt until a special society could be developed, a desire which arose from the hope for re-Christianization.[79]

Catholic Associations

The history of the Catholic Church since the middle of the nineteenth century is partially, at least in Europe, a history of Catholic associations. Even here national differences are considerable, depending on the political situation.[80] In France, which was not particularly friendly toward associations, the internal political tensions within Catholicism, among other things, impeded a strong development. Aside from the social associations, the *Association catholique de la Jeunesse française* was probably the most important. It was founded in 1886 by Robert du Roquefeuil (headed later by Albert de Mun) and grew considerably after 1899 because the organization reached out toward the social classes as well as to all age groups. The impact of the political problem shows most clearly in the two major movements emerging around the turn of the century: the religiously inspired *Sillon* of Marc Sagnier and the *Action Française,*[81] in which monarchal Catholics and representatives of classical culture in the sense of Maurras joined hands. Whichever concept they followed, the French Catholics were always interested in the whole of France. Germany became primarily the classical land of the Catholic association movement because Catholicism there, in contrast to Anglo-Saxon countries, was such a strong minority that it could organize itself successfully within the general society, especially since it maintained certain regional strongholds in spite of the confessional mixture, and because it could not ignore the historical decisions of 1806, 1866, and 1870, and had to come to grips with the Protestant Hohenzollern Empire. The most famous organization was the *Volksverein für das Catholische Deutschland* [People's Society for Catholic Germany] of 1890, which also impressed many Catholic leaders in France and Italy. It

---

[78] R. Murri (cf. chap. 15), 117–23.

[79] T. Zeldin, *Conflicts in French Society. Anticlericalism, Education and Morals in the 19th Century* (London 1971); also, A. Daumard, *RH* 148 (1972), 202ff.

[80] Cf. n. 73. Regarding the workers associations, cf. chap. 13.

[81] In this regard, see below, pp. 473–76.

also encountered criticism, but was regarded by many important forces in Switzerland and Austria[82] as a model worth emulating. The founding process involved considerable internal struggles because the conservative agrarian politician Felix von Loë and Bishop Korum of Trier were striving for a society to "teach the German people about the religious and social errors of the present" according to the apologetic of Tilmann Pesch, S. J., who opposed the strongly anti-Catholic *Evangelischer Bund* (Evangelical Union) of 1887. Windthorst saw in it a danger to the Center Party, striving, together with others, for an extensive association for the masses which was to be separate from the Center Party (no election funds, no participation in the election campaign), but was to follow the same goals. This organization succeeded.[83] The association became intensely active with publications, training institutions (for which lecture material was provided), and its "people's offices" (counseling places; after 1900). These activities with their emphasis on reform and decidedly social accent were instrumental in fending off the impact of social democracy on the Catholic workers.[84] Most Catholic employers took a distant or negative stand toward the association, similar to the segment of the episcopate which was suspicious of an association not officially established by the Church, and especially of its democratic concepts.[85] An opponent of the *Volksverein* was also the group around Chaplain Dr. Oberdörffer, who, in 1893, once again took up a "Catholic social program" with an occupational orientation and rejected parliamentarism. The *Volksverein* had, in 1891, nearly 109,000 members, in 1901: 185,000, in 1902: 230,000, and in 1914: 805,000. One should consider that the demands on the members of a mass association are necessarily minor. The association's stronghold was in the Rhineland, while Bavaria kept aloof. There were several conflicts with the many other associations[86] of German Catholicism.[87] The *Volksverein* continued to have one handicap: it was not altogether successful in mobilizing the laymen in the organization itself. The official ecclesiastical suspicion of lay participation should not mislead one to imagine that the activities of the laymen were too intensive. A good part of pastoral work was consumed by care for the associations.[88] But the fact that the associations established without Church direction were a product of the post-revolutionary era, in spite of their significance for the Church in modern society, was not overlooked. Leo XIII emphasized the *summa potestas* of the Pope in his magisterial role even though the laity *(privati)* were allowed *industria nonnulla.* He underscored the fact that they could assume only a "resonance" of the teaching authority.[89] The real reason for this statement was certain tendencies of the *Opera dei congressi,* which was divided after 1884 according to function and placed under strictly hierarchal command despite the lay presidency.[90]

---

[82] In Switzerland, in 1904, the *Katholische Volksverein* was founded combining the associations there (chap. 4). It had local chapters, cantonal associations, and a central executive board which elected the central president. The *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung* in Lucerne had pointed to the German model in 1898, but it was not considered belligerent enough. In regard to its background, see J. Meier, *Der Schweizer Katholische Verein* (Lucerne 1954).—In Austria, the numerous societies combined to form the *Katholische Volksbund* (1909), a central organization which, even in face of the differences between the Conservatives and the Christian Socialists, was strictly apolitical.

[83] E. Ritter, op. cit., 140–44; P. Siebertz, op. cit., 191ff.—Windthorst became honorary president, but died a year later. Upon his initiative, the industrialist Franz Brandts (Mönchen-Gladbach), well-known for his social activities, became the first chairman. It was his wish that the lawyer Karl Trimborn become his deputy. Franz Hitze became secretary (see above). August Pieper (1866–1942; 1889: priest) succeeded Hitze in 1892 and became director general of the *Volksverein* in 1903. In 1905, the *Volksvereinsverlag GmbH* began functioning as the owner of the society (O. v. Nell-Breuning, *StdZ* [1972], 35–50).

[84] The program in A. Pieper (1866–1942), *Sinn und Aufgabe:* "Every Catholic German of age who pays his yearly dues of one mark is a member of this society."

[85] The archbishop of Cologne, F. v. Hartmann (1912–19) disapproved of the introduction of general suffrage in Prussia.

---

[86] The *Katholische Frauenbund* (1912: 60,000 members), founded in 1903 and addressing mainly the upper class through Trimborn, Bachem-Sieger, and others (the *Katholische Mütterverein,* founded in 1856 in Mainz by Bishop Ketteler and Countess Ida Hahn-Hahn was not organized on a diocesan level until during World War I), rejected the fact that the *Volksverein* was also soliciting membership of women (1914 agreement: the *Volksverein* is to remain an essentially male affair); closely related to the question of the "Christian trade union" was the conflict with the *Katholische Kaufmännische Vereinigung* (1907: 20,125 members, 1912: 35,000), which had members among employers and employees. There were also conflicts of competence with the secretariat general of the Catholic youth organizations in Düsseldorf.

[87] Special emphasis was placed on the development of youth groups. The *Katholische Jungmännerverband* with its 1200 chapters had 140,000 members in 1908 (after 1913, Carl Mosterts, youth vicar, was the president general). The *Zentralverband der Katholischen Jungfrauenvereinigung Deutschlands* was not founded until 1915 (the female organizations usually came later everywhere). The *Gesellenverein* of A. Kolping remained very active (1914: 1,276 local chapters with 86,339 active and 129,714 inactive members (Meister). The Catholic students were organized in three socially and politically different associations: in the fraternity *Cartellverband der katholischen deutschen Studentenverbindungen* (*CV;* after 1866) and in the *Kartellverband der katholischen Studentenvereine Deutschlands* (*KV;* after 1866), as well as in the related but more theologically interested *Unitas* society (*UV;* after 1860); the *CV* had 8,966 members in 1910, the *KV* 9,072 in 1912 (including alumni).—The *Katholische Lehrerverband* (after 1889) had 21,000 members in 1912; the female organization 15,000 (after 1885).

[88] M. Faßbender, "Laienapostolat und Volkspflege," *Caritasschriften* 15 (Freiburg i. Br. 1906); he stressed that the main area of activity was not accessible to the priest.

[89] Encyclical *Sapientiae* (1890) (*Acta Leonis* X, 21); "qui, quoties res exigat, commode possunt non sane doctoris sibi partes assumere, sed ea, quae ipsi acceperint, impertire ceteris, magistrorum voci resonantes tamquam imago."

[90] Cf. chap. 5.

The Catholic Press

The daily press was also a child of the Enlightenment and the Revolution. When one pastor spoke of the "authority of the masses" which "threatens to silence the preacher,"[91] he was passing the same judgment that the *Historisch-politischen Blätter* expressed on an elevated level: a "specifically Catholic press" was a "necessary evil," having emerged because Christian society was not "in its normal condition."[92] The remark that Catholics had neither "the writers nor the readers" was valid for some time and with respect to subscribers generally continued to be a problem, especially since this reflected on the revenue from advertisements. But the "evil" increased in terms of necessity. It had another aspect: Catholic journalism reflected and compounded internal strife within the various forms of Catholicism.[93] In this respect, the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*[94] and the Berlin *Germania*[95] in Germany were competitors. The *Kölner Richtung,* to which Julius Bachem contributed (especially political and literary articles such as "Heraus aus dem Turm!" [Leave the Tower!]), joined the dispute that had broken out in 1906, endorsing the principally supradenominational character of the Center Party and its political freedom in the face of direct ecclesiastical instructions. The paper took an analogous position in the controversy over the "Christian trade unions." In Austria, the conservative *Vaterland* (founded in 1860) and the Christian-social *Reichspost* (founded in 1893) opposed each other (the papers united in 1911). A false image of journalism in German Catholicism is created when only the leading organs are considered and not the weeklies and the many small local papers. In 1865, the total number of subscribers was estimated to be about 60,000; in 1890, about one million were reported. Nevertheless, these numbers were relatively low: the *Berliner Tageblatt* alone had 250,000 subscribers.[96] The *Kulturkampf* had effected a significant breakthrough. Of course this was related to the fact that the Catholic daily newspapers after 1870 were practically the mouthpieces of the Center Party.[97] This and the bishops' desire to have a direct impact on the editorial staff resulted in an emphatic recommendation of the Church papers at the Catholic Convention in Metz in 1913.[98] These were a medium of the Church authority itself, but they had to try to address Catholics of all political persuasions and therefore generally refrained from sharp polemics in areas outside of the religious and moral spheres. In the Catholic press which represented intransigent conservative viewpoints—in Belgium *Le Bien Public,* in the Netherlands the *Maasbode,* in Spain the *Siglo futuro,* in Canada the *Vérité* of Tardivel—the French newspaper *La Croix* stands out, not just because of its circulation (in 1897: seven hundred thousand, including the nearly one hundred local editions), but also because of its sometimes almost fanatical attitude.[99] In the realm of journalism, the dilemma between Catholicism as a socially, politically, and philosophically coherent group and the essentially universal orientation of the Catholic Church is also evident.[100]

---

[91] Cf. J. Lukas, *Die Presse, ein Stück moderner Versimpelung* (Regensburg 1867).

[92] Quoted according to K. Löffler, op. cit., 57.—Leo XIII's statements to the press, aside from giving general religious and moral advice, request avoiding internal Catholic disputes in the press, (1882) and repeatedly in reference to Spain (*Acta Leonis* III, 178). He deals increasingly with submission to ecclesiastical authority (in regard to France in 1899, see *Acta Leonis* XIX, 208). An instruction by Rampolla in 1902 reads: "Inoltre i giornalisti democratico-cristiani, come tutti i giornalisti cattolici, debbono mettere in pratica i seguenti avvertimenti del Santo Padre" (following a quotation from *Nobilissima Gallorum* of 1884 about ecclesiastical authority); *Acta Leonis* XXII, 12.

[93] In regard to France, see chaps. 6 and 36; Italy: chaps. 5 and 34; the Netherlands: Rogier (1957), 269–75 (quoted in chap. 7).

[94] The title *Kölner Volkszeitung* after 1869 means a change insofar as the conservative patrons who financed the founding of the *Kölnische Blätter* (1860) felt that the word *Volk* sounded too democratic (K. Buchheim). In 1869 Julius Bachem became the head of the editorial staff; editor in chief from 1878 until 1907 was the historian Hermann Cardauns. Copies in 1871: 7,200; in 1874: 8,600; in 1881: 9,000.

[95] In 1871 under the leadership of Councilor F. v. Kehler, the Catholic committee of Berlin founded the *Germania.* Chaplain P. Majunke of Silesia, who maintained that Luther committed suicide, was replaced as editor. During the *Kulturkampf,* the paper was particularly persecuted with prohibitions and penalties; nonetheless, it adhered to its intransigent course.

The Enemy

Even if one were critical of a "world conspiracy," refrained from regarding the Grand Master of the Italian Freemasons, Andriano Lemmi, with his pathological hatred of the Church, as representative of all lodges, and made a distinction between the Roman and all the other organizations, it must be stated that we are dealing here with the intellectual leaders of the time who waged a ruthless war against the Catholic Church, no matter how the humanitarian ideals of that movement are evaluated. This and the successes of the Freemasons within Catholicism itself, especially in Latin America, cannot keep us from considering what impact the intensity of the Catholic struggle against the Freemasons had for the consolidation of group-consciousness in the face of the enemy. Even Leo XIII differentiated in his encyclical *Humanum genus* (20 April 1884) between individual *Sectatores,* who, he said, are not without blame, but do not participate in the malicious actions and do not have a clear picture of the ultimate goals of Freemasonry. But the encyclical begins with a reference to the *Invidia Diaboli,* and it ends with the request to the world episcopate to uproot this "wicked pestilence" (*impuram luem*) because an attack as vicious as theirs requires an equally vicious defense. In the first paragraph, the Pope places God's realm in opposition to that of Satan. The accusations against the "naturalists" are basically the same as those which the Pope had earlier brought against the "socialists and communists" and which he would bring against liberalism a year later, only that he describes it as work in solitary darkness comparable to that of the Manichaeans. Leo XIII reiterates the prohibition of membership under penalty of excommunication which his predecessors had proclaimed.[101]

---

[96] In Germany, there were 221 Catholic newspapers in 1881; 288 in 1890; 378 in 1903; 446 in 1912 (without *Kopfblätter;* 305 were privately owned, 141 the property of a corporation). In the early Weimar Republic, there existed 65 newspapers that had been founded between 1848 and 1871.

[97] K. Bachem, *Julius Bachem* I, p. vii. Earlier, the "political leaning was uncertain, unclear, frequently changing;" K. Bringmann, *Die konfessionell-politische Tagespresse des Niederrheins im 19. Jahrhundert* (Düsseldorf 1938). The *Augustinusverein,* founded in 1878, spoke either of the "Catholic press" or the "Center press" (W. Kisky, op. cit., 77). Now and then there were tensions within the party because it prohibited any kind of criticism (ibid., 167ff.). The temporary presidency of the *Augustinerverein,* consisting of seven members, had only one editor and four clergymen; in 1889 a layman was the president for the first time. There were also disagreements between the publishers and the editors (ibid., 100ff., 148).

[98] A definition was attempted according to which the ecclesiastical papers were "to serve the purpose of pastoral work only" (W. Kisky, op. cit., 154). Cf. chap. 14, n. 19.

[99] Regarding Italy, cf. above, p. 90; regarding *La Croix:* above, p. 105—An international comparative analysis of Catholic journalism according to its tendencies, its quality, and its impact is sorely needed.

[100] Concerning the integralism of the press, see below, p. 473.

The positive definition of a Freemasonic lodge led to complications in Canada and the United States.[102] For the Catholic Convention in Amberg in 1885, Prince Löwenstein, according to the account of his biographer, could not find a bishop who was willing to give a speech appropriately warding off the Freemasons. After the papal letter *Praeclara* of 20 June 1894[103] which repeatedly condemned the Freemasons (who had now emerged from the dark into the light), Bishop Korum himself was of the opinion that the leadership of the planned Anti-Freemason Congress in Trent had to be the responsibility of the laity.[104] Gabriel Jogand-Pagés, an ex-Freemason who, with reference to the papal encyclical *Humanum genus,* had been opposing the lodges since 1885, was to appear there. As "Leo Taxil," Jogand-Pagés invented a Miss Diana Vaughan, who had supposedly penetrated the secrets of the Satan cult and since her conversion was forced to live in hiding in order to escape death at the hands of the Freemasons. Jogand-Pagés' accomplice was the physician Charles Hacks who, as Dr. Bataille, published the essay "Le Diable au XIX^{me} siècle." The revelations of one Domenico Margiotta about the Italian Grand Master Andriano Lemmi drew the attention of some French bishops. An excerpt appeared in German translation, as well as the sermons of the Dominican Monsabré who demanded a crusade against the lodges. As president of the "Committee for Roman Affairs," Prince Löwenstein tried at the Catholic Convention to circulate such publications in Germany. But Bishop Korum[105] and others expressed reservations toward such "disclosures" about the Satan cult. Italy initiated the international congress, which took place from 20 September to 30 September 1896 in Trent under the patronage of Cardinal Parocchi. Löwenstein was convinced that in the fight for the Church it was his obligation to take over the chairmanship. Yet some scepticism toward "Leo Taxil" was still brought forward as the result of information which arrived just in time.[106] A Roman investigative committee established in Trent pronounced judgment on 22 January 1897: the existence of Miss Vaughan could neither be proven nor disproven. On 17 April "Taxil" revealed his hoax. It was the general problem which came to light through this affair, rather than the psychology of this man, which is important: large parts of Catholicism found themselves facing a basically anti-Christian and antiecclesiastical world.[107] A difficult path had to be followed between adaptation and absolute resistance.

---

[101] *Humanun genus* (*Acta Leonis* II, 43–70, here: 50, 65, 69, 43, 49).

[102] Cf. chaps. 9 and 10.

[103] *Praeclara* (*Acta Leonis* XIV, 208f.).

[104] P. Siebertz, op. cit., 478. Löwenstein's biography glorifies its hero, but, in spite of certain naive qualities, it contains a considerable number of facts found in the family archives. Under the pseudonym Ewald, he published articles against the Freemasons, even after the Congress of Trent. They were collected and edited under the title *Die geheime Armee im Kampf gegen Thron und Altar,* but prominent and intelligent Catholics prevented their publication.

On another yet not completely separate plain are the anti-Semitic tendencies which permeated various parts of Catholicism, especially in

---

[105] Korum's letter to Löwenstein of 24 August 1896 (after the Bishops' Conference in Fulda): The revelations may be true for France and Italy, but "cannot be proven in regard to Germany;" see P. Siebertz, op. cit., 483.

[106] C. Hacks was a brother-in-law of Julius Bachem. He divulged to him the deception. According to P. Siebertz, Bachem seems to have informed Löwenstein rather superficially; K. Bachem, *Erinnerungen eines alten Publizisten und Politikers* (Cologne 1913), 161ff. In August 1896, the Jesuit H. J. Gruber, who had believed the revelations for a long time, published an article of warning in the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* (initialled H.G.). As H. Gerber he wrote *Taxils Palladismus-Roman,* 3 vols. (Berlin 1897–98); id., *Betrug als Ende eines Betrugs* (Berlin 1897).

[107] A. Boulenger, *Histoire générale de l'Église* III (Paris 1947), 748: It is difficult to believe that Freemasons devised this affair; yet, they derived profit from it. Kißling II, 284–86, tries to diminish the problem and draws attention to Hermann Schell (cf. chap. 29), who has to be given credit for not playing up a marginal event, but rather seeing the affair as a symptom of the internal status of the Church, for which he shows concern.

Austria and France. The reasons are complex: a subcutaneous anti-Semitism in the history of Christianity surfaced due to the animosity of liberal, Jewish writers toward the Church, and this anti-Semitism joined with a general social resentment toward the Jewish world of finance and business. In France, both the right and the left wing of Catholicism were affected.[108] In Austria, a middle-class mentality and Christian social reform ideas joined together. In France, in 1899, Abbé Gayraud called the Jews "la nation malfaisante et parasitaire," and the election slogan of the "Christian-Social Party" in 1903 read: "Catholics and Protestants, unite in brotherly love against Jewish capitalism and the Asian money ethic."[109]

---

[108] G. Hoog, op. cit., 106, is justified in speaking of an "almost international" phenomenon. However, the Congress of Lyon in 1896 did not consider it necessary to be "inspired" by the Viennese anti-Semitism.

[109] K. Rengstorf, *Kirche und Synagoge* II (Stuttgart 1971); P. Sorlin, *La "Croix" et les Juifs* (Paris 1967); P. Pierrard, *Juifs et catholiques français. De Drummont à Jules Isaac* (Paris 1970); I. A. Hellwing, *Der konfessionelle Antisemitismus in Österreich* (Vienna 1972).

CHAPTER 13

The Social Movements

In the second half of the nineteenth century, social organizations emerged from the forms of Catholicism which dealt with the needs and interests of the farmers, the middle-class, and the industrial workers. The attempts to meet these needs were primarily inspired by religious motives. Such a combination of religiously irrelevant economic facts and ecclesiastical attitudes was more in accord with the social awareness of Catholicism than with the self-awareness of Protestantism, in spite of similar and often pioneering events. The activities were actually initiated by the clergy and individual laymen, less so by the workers and farmers concerned. The fact that after the first third of the twentieth century the religious aspects became more or less insignificant in comparison to the economic ones does not allow the original combination to be considered ideologically suspect. Instead, it refers to the problem of the relationship between Church and state in the sense of the image and the model which was discussed earlier. In this context, it is important that the leadership of the organizations was more and more transferred from the clergy to the laity. This process, viewed objectively, was appropriate, but it resulted in the predominance of the representation of economic interests over the initial religious motivations.

Farmers

In Germany, beginning in the sixties, Wilhelm Raiffeisen (1818–88) devoted himself to the development of a rural cooperative system. Raiffeisen was a church-minded Protestant. In 1862 the Catholic aristocrat Burghard von Schorlemer-Alst (1825–95) founded an interdenominational (according to its statutes) Farmers' Association in Westphalia. It spread so rapidly in the areas with a Catholic population because of its limitation by the *Kulturkampf;*[1] since the social union was impeded by the state, the Catholic farmers became even more active in their local societies.

In Italy the movement began in Venetia, where Cerutti founded a cooperative credit bank in 1880. This institution, (1904: 855 credit institutions) together with the already existing supporting funds of the *Opera dei congressi,* became the foundation for the development of the farmers' associations. In accord with the agrarian condition in Italy, there were societies for farm laborers and for farmers (in 1904: 33 and 43 respectively).[2] In Belgium, the *Boerenbond,* founded in 1889 by G. Helleputte[3] and the priest Mellaerts, achieved considerable significance (1902: 359 local "guilds"). In 1896, a Catholic farmers' union was founded in the Netherlands. In France, in 1892, E. Duport and L. Durand created a rural system of cooperatives in the vicinity of Lyon, and rural youth groups were active. From these activities emerged the *Ligue agricole chrétienne.* Its goal, formulated in the statutes of the Farmers' Society of Schorlemer-Alst, was "to further the members in religious, moral, intellectual, social and material respects." It was applied in all rural organizations and, in its universal formulation, was especially pertinent in areas where de-Christianization had already early affected large parts of the rural population, mostly in western Europe. The organization of the credit system, buying, and selling played a special role in the Christian farmers' movement. This was a result of modern economic exigencies which also affected the agrarian sector. However, after World War I, the religious character of the farmers' societies survived only in Belgium and in the Netherlands. Consequently, economic interests were intensified.[4]

---

[1] F. Jacobs, *B. Freiherr von Schorlemer-Alst* (Hiltrup i. W. 1953).—In Bavaria, where the societies formed a special association, Georg Heim was later the initiator (1865–1938).

[2] A. Gambasin, *Il movimento sociale . . .* (biblio., chap. 5).

[3] Cf. chap. 7.

[4] An early example of this problem is the Catholic Convention in Aachen in 1879. In the previous year, Bebel had had a surprising electoral victory in this city. At the convention of the *Piusverein,* taking place at the same time in Aachen, Schorlemer-Alst defended the strongly agrarian protective tariffs policy which was supported by the Center against the Liberals' opposition, and which also encountered the disapproval of the

The "Middle Class"

The term "middle class"[5] needs to be defined in generous terms, because the ecclesiastically active industrial entrepreneurs and businessmen (the denominational statistics themselves mean little) were running only medium or small businesses, and with regard to their social policies they stood isolated from their colleagues, especially from those in higher ranks.[6] This explains, aside from socio-theoretical questions, why the idea of the mixed trade unions and paternalistic ideas dominated Catholicism for a long time. The entrepreneur regarded his small business (in which he knew everyone) as sort of an extended family. Since there were only minor economic differences, it was possible for employers and employees alike to belong to the Catholic organizations of this social stratum. (While farmers were among the self-employed, they constituted a separate category.) The journeymen's union of Adolf Kolping followed the tradition of the class of craftsmen, and the journeymen who were promoted to masters continued to be special members of the union. A similar situation existed in the mercantile associations within Catholicism. In 1884, an association of Catholic entrepreneurs emerged in the north of France, and in 1889, Léon Harmel and the priest Alet founded the *Union fraternelle du Commerce et de l'Industrie,* which consisted mainly of shopkeepers and small manufacturers who, because of their religious affiliation, also wanted to help each other economically. The members of such associations were largely paternalistic, and entrepreneurs who liked to experiment incurred displeasure.[7]

Catholic workers. Schorlemer-Alst also tried to promote solidarity with his slogan of the "poor man," who, together with the other classes, had defended the Church during the *Kulturkampf* (Kißling II, 65f).

[5] Regarding this concept, see O.v. Nell-Breuning, *StL*[6] V, 783–90.

[6] Regarding Germany, cf. C. Bauer, *Deutscher Katholizismus* (Frankfurt a. M. 1964), 32–42. It is especially significant that the main areas of industrialization, the Rhineland and Upper Silesia, were rather uniformly Catholic regions, which changed their denominational structure little, in spite of mobility. However, there was "hardly any Catholic participation in the leadership of industrialization," but rather a "completely disproportionate participation in the enterprises of industrial entrepreneurs" (38).—Denominationally homogeneous countries can only be assessed adequately if one can look beyond the more or less active participation in Church life and include the factual religious attitude.—The isolated social activities in the companies owned by religiously and morally responsible entrepreneurs brought these companies into a disadvantageous competitive situation.

[7] H. Rollet, op. cit., (1947 ed.), describes the resistance the entrepreneur C. Feron-Vrau encountered at the Congress of Mouvaux in 1895 because he had allowed a works council to be elected, even though he had added that it was necessary "to accustom the worker to respect the areas of business which are the responsibility of the entrepreneur."

Since the interests were different in the various economic sectors, a central federation with various special sections was founded in 1901. Abbé Puppey-Girard had suggested this federation, and in 1892 he also initiated the union of young engineers, the *Union sociale des ingénieurs catholiques,* which became a trade union in 1902. In the Netherlands, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Catholic employers' combines emerged in the tobacco and mechanical engineering industries. In Belgium and Germany, given the political partisanship, there was no need for such organizations. In Austria, in the nineties, the Christian Socialists emerged in opposition to the Conservatives. They were interested in the labor question, but they themselves were a decidedly middle-class movement, in which many employed and independent people of the petite bourgeoisie gathered.[8]

At the beginning of World War I, the two Catholic indistrialists Léon Harmel (1829–1915)[9] and Franz Brandts (1834–1914)[10] died. As heads of their own companies and in their capacity as organizers they had tried to find a solution to the labor question. They both used a patriarchal style, though it was different in each case because of the situation in their respective countries and their personal way of thinking; and they were both from the textile industry. These men are not at all representative of their colleagues of the same denomination, but they document what was a serious paternalistic reform. Harmel, *le bon pére,* was theoretically indoctrinated by Le Play,[11] and he endorsed and practiced himself a certain form of workers' participation in company policies (the *Conseil professionel* of 1888 changed to the more precise term *Conseil d'usine* in 1891). Harmel also tended to induce the workers to execute their own initiatives. His distant goal was a corporation of employers and employees, but, in contrast to Albert de Mun, he believed that it could only be accomplished if the idea of trade unions was accepted. He was critical of state intervention, but also of his colleagues, whom he charged with being idle in terms of the workers' question, except for their customary charitable activities. He formulated his principles in the *Catéchisme au patron* (Paris 1889). Harmel was one of the main organizers of the French workers' pilgrimages to Rome, and after 1895 he was the president of the *Oeuvres des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers,* which he wanted to lead out of the conservative conception of de Mun in order to win the workers themselves. Through F. Brandts's recommendation he served as consultant during the founding of the *Arbeiterwohl* in Mönchen-Gladbach, an association of "Catholic industrialists and friends of the workers" (1879). Through this association and its publication, the German textile entrepreneurs wanted to propagate their socio-political ideas. Members of the executive board were Georg von Hertling and Prelate F. C. Moufang of Mainz, who brought with him the traditions of Ketteler. In 1880 Hitze, who had just returned from Campo Santo, joined the group as its secretary. Hitze had great impact on the social policies of the Center Party and was able to carry through the "Mönchen-Gladbach concept" over the Viennese Vogelsang school and the clerical "Berlin concept" (in 1890, Brandts became the chairman of the *Volksverein*).[12] Brandts was also a patriarch,[13] and as such, in 1886, he moved with his family to the Saint Joseph's House, in whose original structure he had accommodated the welfare institutions of his company in 1878. He was well aware that all the social works of the company would not suffice. He was a decisive representative of the state's right and duty to intervene, and, after initial reservation toward his resistant colleagues, he finally pulled his weight to grant the workers the same right to form coalitions in the trade unions that the employers enjoyed. However, the legal reform was needed to assure that "the activities of the trade unions would be restricted once the fight was launched."[14]

---

[8] F. Funder, op. cit., 82–155.

[9] In the seventies, L. Harmel was a disciple of the Bourbon Monarchists, a supporter of the Count of Chambord, a grandson of Charles X who was loyal to the fleur-de-lis. He was strictly ultramontane and supported the *Syllabus.* He divorced himself from antirepublican tendencies. His main estate was located in Val des Bois near Rheims (G. Guitton, *Léon Harmel,* 2 vols. [Paris 1925, ^{2}1930]; id., *L. Harmel et l'initiative ouvrière* [Paris 1938]; H. Rollet, op. cit., index).

[10] F. Brandts was the son of a wealthy textile merchant (*Verlagssystem*). During his stay of several months in England in the sixties, he learned about industrial weaving and equipped his mill in Mönchen-Gladbach accordingly ("How can one be afraid of becoming too rich, we are only beginning," according to Hohn, 25). He was an energetic and self-conscious man, who occasionally quarrelled with his later collaborator F. Hitze (when Brandts pleaded for harmony in the Center and made reference to his relation to Hitze, Windthorst said: "Yes, this is what your wife does!" Schwer-Müller [biblio., chap. 12], 59)—W. Hohn, ed., *F. Brandts* (M.-Gladbach 1914, ^{2}1920), Brandts's quotations, memorial addresses by A. Pieper and C. Sonnenschein; E. Ritter, *Volksverein* (biblio., chap. 12), index.

[11] Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus,* 327; cf. chap. 12.

---

[12] Cf. chap. 12.—In 1892 F. Hitze invited Father August Pieper (1866–1942) to join the group; in 1903, he became director general of the *Volksverein* (A. Rhode, "Die sozialpolitischen Ideen A. Piepers" (diss., Cologne 1950).

[13] In 1890: "Alongside the absolute recognition of the worker as an equal human being (as head of a family and as a 'voting member of society') . . . the feeling of the old patriarchal relationship between worker and employer, the feeling of belonging together should not disappear" (W. Hohn, op. cit., 109). Brandts considered his factory an "extended family" (ibid., 23).

[14] W. Hohn, op. cit., 81, 111–17; Brandts planned workers' councils in which both partners would be represented.

The Socio-ethical Justification of the Workers' Movement

In regard to this topic, concepts were being formulated which emerged from the socio-theoretical debates within Catholicism, and, in spite of continued differences, found a magisterial basis in the encyclical *Rerum novarum* (1891). The endorsement of state intervention in this document[15] represented a fundamental decision toward the liberal capitalist society and now left it up to the Catholics to act within the political parties of the constitutional state according to the principles of ecclesiastical sociology. How this was reflected in specific individual decisions (for instance, when designing a social insurance plan, or in parliamentary coalitions) is a matter of general history and belongs to Church history only insofar as it resulted in conflicts with the hierarchical claim to a magisterial role.[16] The other, equally important directive of this encyclical, the recognition of the workers' right to form coalitions, had a direct effect on the social structure of Catholicism and had to go through a process of critical assessment. In this respect, the Pope elaborated on the title of the encyclical (*De conditione opificum*) by turning to the workers themselves. In the paragraph on the "workers' associations" (*sodalitia artificum*), Leo XIII dealt with the discussions of the medieval guilds, but he also stressed the necessity of adapting to modern conditions. This was of pressing importance at the time and had practical implications because it expressly left unsaid whether the societies were to be exclusively composed of workers or were to be mixed organizations. Since the formation of such associations is justified on the basis of the natural law, the state has no right to forbid them, and the state is warned not to misuse its right to justified intervention under the mere pretext of public interest.[17] Leo XIII considered a strike categorically evil because it harms the employer and the employee as well as the public welfare (*mercaturae, rei publicae utilitates*), especially since strikes usually entail violence. It is the duty of legislation to eliminate the causes of such conflicts. The subsequent discussion of Catholic social theoreticians proceeded from the paragraph on employees, who are to fulfill absolutely the work contract which they signed voluntarily and under the conditions of equity (*libere et cum aequitate*).[18] At this point, the encyclical clearly expressed that the wealthy do not require the protection of the state to the extent that the *miserum vulgus* does, and there was no doubt that work contracts had to be consented to which were anything but voluntary and fair. Moreover, the encyclical could and did deal with the question of fair wages only in very general terms.[19] The problem of strikes, to be sure, touched on a fundamental aspect of a stratified society.[20] With which *ordo* could this phenomenon of antagonism be met?

---

[15] Cf. chap. 12, n. 57. This encyclical can only be assessed fairly if it is placed into the historical context of the traditional sociology of the Catholic Church. It was certainly not innovative within the general socio-historical development, but it was significant as the word of an outstanding conservative power, and it contributed considerably to alleviating conservative as well as liberal opposition toward a decisive social policy.—A good study in terms of the history of the papal social doctrine up to Pius XI in particular and of the history of social theory in general: A. Simon (Brussels): H. Scholl (ed.), 13–49.

[16] Regarding the Center controversy in 1906, cf. chap. 35; regarding the special problems in Italy, cf. chaps. 5 and 34.

[17] *Acta Leonis* XI, 133–35.

Leo XIII strongly emphasized that the fostering of piety was to be the priority of the workers' associations and that, in the name of episcopal authority, the clergymen, in regard to the associations, were responsible for everything that had to do with pastoral work.[21] For the early Catholic workers' movement, this was hardly a problem, since many socially concerned clergymen devoted their energy to the workers' questions in a comprehensive sense, even though they did not always meet with the approval of their superiors. However, the rural and middle-class organizations of Catholicism practiced religious solidarity primarily in regard to economic questions. Their mutual assistance in economic distress strengthened the religious solidarity of the Catholic special groups within the de-Christianization of the society at large. Therefore, the workers' movement, whether it was Marxist or not, was on the whole an anti-middle-class bellicose movement. Is it true that the more the Catholic workers' movement was religiously determined, the less it was a workers' movement according to the above definition? On the other hand, was its religious character as a *Catholic* workers' movement less pertinent when it was more belligerent, as in the "Christian trade unions"? This touches on the key question of the Catholic workers' movement, the only one, incidentally, Leo XIII spoke about. Were its religious character and the character of a necessarily belligerent movement compatible? In case of a possible conflict, was it not necessary to separate the representation of interests from the Catholic workers' societies and transfer it to the trade unions? What reason was there for representing economic interests in religious form? The "Christian trade unions" wanted to distinguish themselves through this particular name from then mostly atheistic socialism without giving expression to a strongly religious motivation in regard to their concrete goals. The subsequent controversy about the "Christian trade unions," above and beyond the denominational issue, had its basis in the lack of such differentiation and also partially in the rejection of the idea of trade unions per se.

---

[18] Regarding the strike, see ibid., 126; regarding *pactum operae,* see 110.

[19] I. Healy, *The Just Wage, 1750–1890* (The Hague 1966).

[20] The problem of strikes became increasingly more urgent with the formation of "Christian trade unions." The moral theologian A. Lehmkuhl declared in his book *Arbeitsvertrag und Streikrecht* (Freiburg 1899, ^{4}1904), that the immediate "defense strike" for the purpose of self-defense was permissible when the workers were forced into an "unfair" contract; the employer is at fault if, despite profits, he does not pay the kind of wage which would "suffice for the livelihood of the worker and his family" (and is difficult to establish, of course [55–59]). An organized strike is permissible if it is not a question of a "fair" but a higher wage, whose proper increase is naturally not as clearly defined as its decrease" (59ff.). Canonist A. Vermeersch from Louvain expressed a similar idea (*Quaestiones de iustitia* [^{2}1904], 627). I. Treitz, secretary general of the Catholic workers' societies in the diocese of Trier, published in opposition to the *Christlichen Gewerkschaften* a pamphlet entitled *Kann ich, werde ich für eine Arbeiterbewegung auf katholischer Grundlage eintreten?* ("Can I, will I support a workers' movement based on Catholic principles?") (Trier 1904). Treitz, in his article *Der moderne Gewerkschaftsgedanke vom Standpunkt der Vernunft und Moral* ("The modern idea of trade unions from the perspective of reason and morality") (Trier 1909), rejected the idea of a strike and granted to the state only the right of arbitration, as did Secretary General Fournelle of Berlin. The statutes of the "special sections" of the Catholic workers' societies of Berlin, which were directed by clergymen, read: "The clergymen cannot find a place in belligerent organizations, only in organizations dedicated to reconciliation, law, and peace" (quoted according to H. Brauns, *Christliche Gewerkschaften oder Fachabteilungen* [1904], 50). The answer of J. Biederlack ("Die Frage der sittlichen Erlaubtheit der Arbeiterausstände," *ZKTh* 34 [1910], 302): Who would be optimistic enough "to dare hope that our present day rulers would end the economic struggle only having in mind the well-being of their state and their people." H. Pesch ("Streik und Lockout," *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* 77 [1909], 1–12, 142–54) is critical of the "infamous freedom of contract" and believes that a strike is a great evil but "does not necessarily need to be condemned." He expresses the most significant opinion, stating that, today, it is still a matter of "groups" (and not "organized professions") that should be subject to civil law and, once they are established, to society and not to the state (148).—For a moderate concept of the Christian social doctrine, see O. v. Nell-Breuning, "Streik," *LThK*^{2} IX, 1111f.; id., Festschrift für E. Liefmann-Keil (in prep.).

Industrial Workers

If one were to superimpose the European map which delineates the industrial centers developed after the second half of the century onto the map of the Catholic denomination, one would find that the following areas coincide: Upper Silesia, the plains of the Po river around Milan and Turin, the areas around Barcelona, Bilbao, and Oviedo as well as the southern regions from Hamm to Dunkirk. In Upper Silesia, associations emerged in whose publication *Robotnik* purely pastoral goals were pursued; and in Spain, there were no or only very insignificant Catholic workers' organizations (Barcelona became a showplace of horror). In Italy, the institutions of the *Opera dei congressi* concentrated in Venetia and Lombardy (1904: 1,339 out of 2,432) and, around this time, 170 workers' associations were counted. The ecclesiastical conflicts were kindled by the question of leadership and the character of the organizations.[22] The stage of the Catholic workers' movement during Leo XIII's pontificate was essentially the Rhenish-Westphalian, the Belgian, and the northern French industrial areas.

---

[21] *Acta Leonis* XI, 138f. Supporters of *Rerum novarum* as integralists: cf. below, p. 472.

Around 1880, the *Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers,* founded in 1871 by de Mun, had about 40,000 members. They declined as a result of the political differences within Catholicism in France and revived slightly in 1892 through the *Ralliement.* In 1906, there were about 60,000 members in 418 workers' societies. The relatively small numbers are not as decisive as the social status of the members. In a speech before the then entirely bourgeois Catholic youth association, de Mun said: "The simple folk, gentlemen, the workers in the cities, the factories, and the fields—this is the great problem which you should keep in mind!"[23] But this appeal found little response except with the interested Catholics of the landed gentry and the upper middle class. Moreover, it did not succeed in "taking root in the world of the workers"; it continued to be "agir de l'extérieur."[24] The reasons were partly of a political and partly of a specifically French nature. Even when de Mun, in 1885, in response to the Pope's wish relinquished the idea of founding a Catholic party, and even though he had sacrificed his political convictions during the *Ralliement,* the following goal remained decisive: to unite the Catholics in the "défense religieuse" and the "action sociale."[25] Indeed, it was a question of a "religious, social, and political counterrevolution" which could not, however, break the economic liberalism predominant in the upper ranks and was therefore not approved by the antibourgeois working class.[26] But the incorrect assessment of working class political psychology[27] was compounded by the problematic question of which way the bourgeois spirituality (aside from its political implications) could match the mentality of the working class. The symbol of the *cercles* was a combination of the cross and the Sacred Heart.[28] But even such a movement was much too revolutionary for Bishop C.-E. Freppel of Angers (1827–91).[29] In 1911, toward the end of his life, de Mun admitted the failure: It had been almost impossible to touch the workers, let alone impress them.[30] This was the candid word of a candid man, and he should not be blamed for the fact that for many of the northern-French patrons[31] this religious activity was only an escape from the social question. The first beginning of a Christian trade-union movement was the *Syndicat des Employés du Commerce et de l'Industrie* of 1887, whose executive board, in 1891, rejected a protective committee of Catholic employers,[32] as well as a clerical advisory body. From this and similar organizations emerged the *Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens* (CFTC).

---

[22] Carl Sonnenschein (biblio., chap. 15), 8–12, in regard to the social question, differentiates five social groups: 1) the Rosminian liberal Catholics, who deal almost exclusively with the social question; 2) the intransigents, "men with the exclusive loyalty of a praetorian group"; a member of this group was the priest and journalist Davide Albertario (1846–1902), who, after the general strike in Milan between 6 and 9 May 1898 (suppression of the strike left over one hundred dead), was sentenced to prison along with the Socialist Filippo Furati (Magri [biblio., chap. 5] I, 216ff.; E. Nolte in: T. Schieder [ed.], *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte* 6 [1968], 415f.); 3) the Curia in a city without industry; 4) the feudal south where Freemasons and clergymen lived in harmony; 5) the *Opera dei congressi,* which was conducted according to hierarchical principles, but fell under the influence of landed proprietors and industrialists and was known for a "formalism of immense proportions, a few Catholic conventions without people and a surfeit of Byzantine protests."—This is the picture that was so vividly drawn by Sonnenschein, pastor in Berlin, in 1900: priest in Rome, in 1906: counciior of the *Volksverein* in Mönchen-Gladbach (cf. chap. 34; A. Gambasin, also in S. H. Scholl [ed.], 214–42). In 1902, the controversy in the *Opera dei congressi* over purely occupational societies (usually attempting to be transformed into trade unions) increased, resulting in a crisis and the suspension of the *Opera.* In 1907, the first general congress of the *Unione economica-sociale* took place in Bergamo. Its president pleaded with Pius X in vain to put more emphasis on the economic character of the struggle. Nevertheless, the religious demands were actually very tolerant. In 1919, there were (including rural laborers) 104,614 Catholic ("white") trade unionists out of a total of 817,034 trade unionists in Italy (out of 9 million employees) (cf. chap. 34).

[23] Quoted according to M. P. Fogarty, op. cit., 309.

[24] H. Rollet, op. cit. II, 372–74.

---

[25] H. Rollet, *A. de Mun . . . ,* 118f.

[26] W. Gurian, 278 (biblio., chap. 12).

[27] "This renascent social movement . . . imagined a working class hostile to the Revolution and missed totally the workers psychology" (J. N. Moody, op. cit., 146f.).

[28] Lynch, 187. The society's anthem had the following text: "Quand Jésus vint sur la terre ce fut pour y travailler / Il voulut, touchant mystère, Comme nous être ouvrier / Espérance / De la France, / Ouvriers, soyez chrétiens: Que votre âme / Soit de flamme / Pour l'auteur de tous les biens."

[29] Until his death (1891), he was an opponent of state intervention (for instance, at the Congress of Liège in 1890) because it infringed upon individual freedom and was Socialism (Terrien II, 696). He wanted to "restaurer la société "chrétienne par l'affirmation de la doctrine catholique contre la Révolution, qui a détruit l'ordre social, où régnait le Christ" (ibid. II, 204).

[30] Combats VI, 194: "Il faut bien dire la vérité. Nous avons des œuvres nombreuses, souvent florissantes, cercles, patronages, associations. Cependant, nous n'avons pas entraîné la classe ouvrière, je dirais presque que nous ne l'avons pas atteinte, du moins que nous ne l'avons pas pénétrée."

[31] H. Rollet, op. cit. II, 322: "The entrepreneur's wife coming into the firm and firing non-Catholic women; the chaplain of Fourmiers preaching in the works council about the peace of the Holy Scriptures; the entrepreneur of Roubaix forbidding a visit to the local pub instead of raising wages."

[32] The proposal came from L. Harmel, who gave the movement of Count A. de Mun a more realistic basis and organized the workers' congresses in Rheims after 1893. After 1901, the movement joined the *Sillon.*

In Belgium, the meeting place of the international Catholic social conferences, Bishop Doutreloux of Liège with his charitable activities and the establishment of the *Aumôniers du travail* (1895), the political Professor G. Helleputte with his workers' guilds, the social priest Pottier in Liège, and Fr. Rutten initiated a Catholic workers' movement which was not concerned with the political problems of the French and was much more pragmatic, but which could only assert itself against the supremacy of the conservatives through the increasing influence of the *Ligue démocratique belge* (since 1891). But here as well, the de-Christianization of the working class spread more and more. In the Netherlands, two movements developed: the one of Leiden, which was oriented toward trade unions, and the one of Limburg, which pursued a religious-social program.[33]

"During this trip through Belgium, my sojourn in Aachen and the tour up the Rhine river I have come to the conviction that we have to combat the clerics vigorously, especially in the Catholic areas . . . . The scoundrels are flirting with the workers' question whenever it seems appropriate (e.g., Bishop Ketteler in Mainz, the priests at the Congress of Düsseldorf, etc.)." Karl Marx wrote this to Friedrich Engels on 25 September 1869.[34] This observation about the enemy is also a warning against underestimating the efficiency of the Catholic workers' movement in the northwestern corner of the European continent. So was Bismarck's remark condemning the numerous "so-called Catholic local newspapers," which were often edited by chaplains and mocked the state measures against the "workers' intrigues" even though the uprising of the Commune in Paris should have opened their eyes.[35] The "Congress of Düsseldorf" that Karl Marx wrote about was the Catholic Convention of 1869, during which—after previous individual foundings—the question of workers' organizations was discussed, but with utmost restraint relative to independent associations (or sections in Catholic male associations). In 1869, Chaplain E. Cronenberg of Aachen working together with Chaplain Dr. Litzinger, who had been transferred from Essen (Chaplain Laaf had been called from Aachen to Essen), founded the *Arbeiterverein vom heiligen Paulus* [Workers' Society of Saint Paul]. Litzinger was an intellectual among the "social chaplains," who could be quite disagreeable among themselves. Thus, Cronenberg carried on a controversy in his *Christian Social Voices* against the *Christian Social Newspaper* in Aachen, edited since 1869 by Chaplain Joseph Schings.[36] Cronenberg was of the opinion that "the Christian workers should take the workers' question into their own hands" and that, in spite of their Christian affiliation, the social problems should be considered relatively independently. He went bankrupt with his building society (in 1878, he was sentenced for forgery of his accounts). Around 1875, the *Paulusverein* in Aachen had a considerable reputation with its approximately five thousand members. That is when the battle began over the nomination of a Center Party candidate, which, at first, was won by the middle class; in 1877, in Essen, the worker J. Stötzel won and was elected to Parliament by a great majority.[37] The final breakthrough of an independent Catholic workers' movement did not occur until 1884, at the Catholic Convention of Amberg (thanks to Hitze's efforts). The unification into regional associations was accomplished between 1892 and 1910 (at the Catholic Convention in Mainz, a cartel association was formed in 1911).[38] This development already stood under the sign of the struggle over the "Christian trade unions."

---

[33] See the contribution by S. Hermann Scholl, 52–77, who set an excellent example when he placed the Catholic workers' movement in Belgium into the general socio-economic history, avoiding a distortion of perspective often unintentionally caused by Catholic literature. Scholl differentiates between "social Catholicism" from 1789 until 1886 and "Christian democracy" from 1886 until 1914 (which concerns the era discussed here). In 1891, Helleputte founded the Belgian People's Association at the Congress of Louvain. It was to unite the various efforts of the Catholic workers' movement, which was rarely led by workers, neither in Belgium nor in other countries. At the annual convention in 1901, Father Rutten gave his first lecture on the Christian trade unions, which had 11,000 members at that time. In 1909, there were 40,521 and 142,035 Socialists.—Regarding the Netherlands, see P. H. Winkelmann: Scholl (ed.), 255–286, also presented in context.

[34] *Correspondence between Marx and Engels* IV (ed. Berlin 1950), 272.

[35] H. Rothfels, *Bismarck und der Staat. Ausgewählte Dokumente* (Stuttgart 1958), 235.—In a letter addressed to Viennese Legate von Schweinitz of 27 January 1873, Bismarck mentions the *Christlich-sozialen Blätter* of Aachen in order to prove the "merging" of clerical and socialist tendencies (*Gesammelte Werke* VIc, 31f.).

The trade unions were the problem of the religious workers' associations and these, in turn, were the problem of the trade unions. This was not primarily a question of belief, which was only pertinent in Germany. It was also not just a question of the direct ecclesiastical leadership which was claimed by the integralistic concept during Pius X's pontificate in Germany as well as in other countries.[39] The key issue becomes clear when considering the disputes which were carried on during the organizational period of the "Christian trade unions" and when assessing the situation after the first third of the twentieth century. During the general meeting of the leaders of the German workers' associations in 1892 in Mainz (Hitze's participation had considerable impact), it became obvious that religious education was to remain a priority, that occupational questions were to be dealt with separately, and finally that the struggle was part of the essence of a true workers' organization. The "individual trade sections" within the Catholic workers' associations differed from the "individual trade sections" in Berlin during the subsequent trade union controversy. This is substantiated by the fact that the participants in Mainz accepted a strike as the inevitable "last resort,"[40] but they believed strikes not to be feasible under "local and denominational limitations" (of the workers' associations). At the Catholic Convention in Cologne in 1895 they spoke about the "individual trade sections" as being the first step toward the "professional organization of the industrial worker on a Christian foundation" (H. Brauns). But this was the opinion of a minority. At the Catholic Convention in Bonn in 1900 it was difficult to arrive at a compromise: "Catholic workers' associations and Christian occupational organizations," avoiding the term "trade union," intended to include "the entire economic life."[41] Yet, in 1899 the first congress of the *Christliche Gewerkvereine Deutschlands* [Christian Trade Unions of Germany] had taken place in Mainz, which later caused the reaction in Berlin. The men initially involved in the Christian trade union movement showed "true denominational courage" in the struggle with atheistic socialism on the one hand and the (mostly Catholic) employers on the other hand—not to mention the opposition of bishops Korum and Kopp.[42] But did Brauns not imply more than just the German denominational problems when he differentiated between the "spiritual attitude" in the "Christian trade union" and the "moral-religious attitude" in the workers' association?[43] In other countries such as in Belgium and Holland, one followed the path discussed in Mainz in

---

[36] Schwer-Müller, 187f.; E. Naujoks, op. cit., 101–16, offers much material, however, he exaggerates the differences between the protagonists due to his anticlerical leaning; H. Lepper, "Kaplan F. E. Cronenberg . . . ," *ZAGV* 79 (1968), 57–148; J. Thielmann, *Die Presse der katholischan Arbeitervereine Westdeutschlands* (diss., Munich 1935).

[37] A "bourgeois" reaction, also to be seen in the context of the difficult situation during the *Kulturkampf,* can be documented in the seventies with the changes in names. The publication of the *Gesellenverein* in Munich called *Arbeiterfreund* (1873) called itself *Arbeitsfreund,* and the *Christlich-soziale Arbeiterverein* (1874) in Augsburg dropped the word "social" in 1876 (Naujoks, op. cit., 81).

[38] The number of members in 1914 in western Germany: 203,000, in eastern Germany: 132,000, in southern Germany: 122,000 (Kißling II, 376).

---

[39] Regarding the "trade union controversy," cf. chap. 35.—The manner in which it was conducted can be partially deduced from a letter by Prince-Bishop G. v. Kopp addressed to August Pieper: "I only need to say one word and you will be condemned, as was Marc Sangnier in Paris" (Ritter, 327).

[40] H. Brauns, *Christliche Gewerkschaften oder Fachabteilungen in katholischen Arbeitervereinen?* (Cologne 1904), 5–13, in retrospect.

[41] Kißling II, 373.

[42] O. v. Nell-Breuning, *LThK*² IV, 857.

[43] H. Brauns, *Die Wahrheit über den Gewerkschaftsstreit. . .* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1912), 11.

1892, differentiating between "league" and trade union within one and the same Catholic workers' organization (in the trade union, the clerical leader was merely a "councilor"). In 1921, Cardinal Gasparri remarked that the Catholic workers' movement in Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland[44] had sensed more acutely than elsewhere "that the personal development (the foundation of a Christian class movement) would be subjugated more and more to the predominant economic activities if there were no common authority to keep the balance."[45] But whichever path was taken, the Belgian, the German, the French (which only led to a Christian trade union in the broadest sense) or the Italian (where the *Associazioni Cristiane Lavoratori Italiani* remained a purely educational movement) the historical result was basically the same everywhere. The Christian trade unions remained in the minority as compared to the others, and on the battlefield of labor they were in competition with them, which made it more difficult to assert their own principles. Within Catholicism itself, the Christianity of the trade unions only rarely permitted the antagonism of the class society to take on a different appearance; the religious "personal development" became insignificant in comparison to the fight for labor, or it was limited to a small circle, and this happened even more where the general development of trade unions took its own course.[46]

The fact was often discussed that industrial workers especially were becoming alienated from the Church, and with good reason. The apathy of bourgeois Catholicism was deplored, clearly recognizable in the opposition which the Catholic workers' movement had to overcome within the ranks of its own fellow believers. But two points have to be made: The process of de-Christianization extended over all of society, but appeared more pronounced among the industrial workers because here, instead of a "fourth class," a new class, which essentially differed from the agrarian bourgeois society, was emerging. Therefore, it was unable to relate to the Church traditions through which a conventional form of Christianity could yet survive for decades. Above all, the industrial workers were earlier and more directly than any other class affected by technology and thus by the epoch-making break with tradition[47] which affected all of society.

---

[44] Following the denominational attempt of Vicar J.-B. Jung in Saint Gall (cf. chap. 4), the Christian trade unions were organized interdenominationally (in 1907 in Winterthur), but they were practically dominated by Catholics.

[45] Quoted according to Fogarty, 237.

[46] A survey of the general history of the trade unions and the specific position of the Christian unions (Catholic) can be found in O. v. Nell-Breuning, op. cit., 853–58.

[47] The Swiss Capuchin Father Theodosius Florentini was applauded at the Catholic Convention in Frankfurt in 1863 for his thesis: "The factories need to become monas-

This explains why the general problems entailed in the relationship of Catholicism to modern society as a whole so oddly climaxed in the Catholic workers' movement. Its religious urge to exceed the goals of the trade unions[48] caused it to be felt as a foreign body within the general workers' movement, even in the non-Marxist movement. Its efficiency, to be sure, was not the showpiece of Catholicism. But it represented Catholicism's utmost effort to reconcile tradition with a radically secularized world, or at least to demonstrate the feasibility of such reconciliation. The question remains whether an independent Catholic workers' movement that was able to combine religious education and the inevitable belligerent goals regarding labor was indeed possible. In a similar situation, the socialist movement was able to combine the party and its trade union. However, it also remains to be noted that, varying from country to country, Catholic workers' movements significantly contributed to counteracting the de-Christianization[49] and social radicalization within society at large.

---

teries!" (J. Höffner, 33f. [chap. 12]), but in the literature he was ridiculed. In 1859, he acquired a textile mill in Obersleutensdorf (Bohemia); in 1862, he opened a paper mill in Thal (Saint Gall). His experiments there would probably have failed had he not died in 1865, because the nuns, whom he sent because the "directors of factories" are expensive people, were indeed cheap, but they did not appear trustworthy to the moneylenders, who canceled their loans. The often quoted example puzzles us today because the serious attempt to extend the monastic *ora et labora* into the age of technology by pretending nothing had happened and technology was merely an improved form of trade clarifies in its utopian absoluteness what had really happened to the essence of work.

[48] The treatment of M. Berger, outstanding in its descriptive parts, prohibits a historically adequate interpretation because the criteria are not derived from the object itself (the Catholic workers' movement in Wilhelminian Germany and its inherent problems), but from the "democratization of society" as a normative goal. This does deny that the political Christian Democrats overcame the paternalism, which, by the way, should also be understood and appreciated historically, and that they were successful with certain reforms. That the Catholic workers' societies were "multi-purpose organizations, typical for a transitory society" (215), characterizes the facts precisely. What else could they have been?

[49] M. Schmidt, "Die Entchristlichung . . . im deutschsprachigen Gebiet," *ZKG* 79 (1968), 342–57.

CHAPTER 14

The Relationship to the State and the Parties

The encyclical *Graves de communi* of 18 January 1901, which does not contain a trace of the political meaning implicit in the term "Christian democracy," is often assessed as a document of the later period of Leo XIII's pontificate demonstrating a departure from the initial program. Indeed, in those years the style, the climate, and the emphasis changed in nearly all aspects of ecclesiastical leadership. But when the pragmatic conciliatory attitude in the Pope's earlier statements regarding the democratic form of government is carefully interpreted, a change of course in the true sense can hardly be found. Yet it is misleading to systematize the didactic statements which Leo XIII made throughout his pontificate in regard to the various questions of politics and social life, especially if one consequently neglects to differentiate between principles and the respective pragmatic adaptations to situations in individual countries.[1] Above all, however, the exceedingly vague term *Démocratie chrétienne*[2] could simultaneously have different, even contradictory implications at different times and in different countries. It could be taken religiously, in the sense of social reform, or even from the perspective of constitutional politics (from the constitutional and parliamentary monarchy to the republic); in short, it covered a highly diffused area of meanings. Subsequent to the encyclical *Rerum novarum,* the usage of the term (it had been used in connection with the revolutionary events of 1830 and 1848) considerably expanded, because it had become a verbal signal in the Catholic social movements of the various countries, often interchangeable with *Catholicisme social* or "Christian social." It was also significant that this development coincided with the Pope's *Ralliement* policy regarding the French Republic. A fundamental interpretation of this policy was able to raise the value of the political content of the term "Christian democracy" to the point that it caused considerable complications.[3] The Pope himself never made official use of the term (after its circumscriptive usage in the address of 1898) except in *Graves de communi;* and Rampolla's instructio *De Actione populari christiana seu democratico-christiana* of 27 January 1902 not only underlines the papal confinement of "Christian democracy" to Christian charity, but also emphasizes that this was not at all a *cosa nuova.*[4] What had started out as an attempt to interpret the democratic ideals of equality and freedom (in accord with political theology) as the realization of the gospel[5] ended here with the observation (which was meant to define the conflicts within the *Opera dei congressi*[6] in Italy but was more encompassing), that a relationship between Church and democracy is not possible in the same manner as it had existed between the Church and the sacred monarchy.

---

[1] This is particularly prevalent in the works of O. Schilling (biblio., chap. 12).

[2] Concerning the history of this term, see H. Maier, op. cit., 303ff.; concerning the history of ideas, see 227–43; at the time of Leo XIII: 259–71.

[3] At the Catholic Convention in Osnabrück (1901), E. M. Lieber said, subsequent to quoting the Pope, who confined the term to Christian activities benefitting the people: "In this sense, we are all democrats"; Kißling, 307.

[4] *Acta Leonis* XXII, 8–28: *"L'azione democratico-cristiana non è da ritenersi come cosa nuova; essa è antica quanto i precetti e gli insegnamenti evangelici."*—The remark (H. Maier, op. cit., 277) that "the Pope's effort (*Ralliement*) had introduced an extensive rehabilitation of the Christian democratic movement" can only be applied to the concrete tactical goal which the Pope was pursuing with his French policies (cf. the introduction), or it may be referred to the consequences which the active French pioneers of the *Ralliement* experienced as a result of the papal policies.

Nonetheless, there existed in Leo XIII's pontificate a certain *cosa nuova,* but it had already taken place twenty years earlier and was anything but a way toward "Christian democracy." The encyclical *Diuturnum illud* of 29 June 1881 mentions the *cupiditates populares* which had emerged from the unfortunate doctrine of the people's sovereignty; and according to this encyclical, the patriarchal monarchy is unquestionably the ideal form of government, perfected at the time of the *imperium sacrum,* when the popes consecrated political power in a unique way.[7] But it does not contradict the Catholic doctrine stating that in certain cases the principal representative of civil authority can be elected "according to the desire and the judgment of the masses," whereby power is not transferred, but rather it is determined who will execute it.[8] With this contrivance, democracy is introduced as an ecclesiastically tolerable form of government. But at the same time it is deprived of its historical essence; that is, its revolutionary character is eliminated. It should be noted (and this is true for all encyclicals which attempt an accommodation with the modern era) that this piece of text is short and enclosed in a voluminous traditional text. The polemics against the social contract and the people's sovereignty clearly have priority.

More so than the encyclical of 1881, the encyclical *Immortale Dei* of 1 November 1885 is composed, with respect to France, in order to avoid at least an intensification of the situation regarding Church policies and to prevent the separation of Church and state. In fact, its aim is to find a way of reaching an agreement which would lead toward Leo XIII's ultimate goal: re-Christianization of the modern, democratic world.[9] Also in this encyclical, the paragraphs in which the democratic form of government is recognized as equal to the other systems stand isolated within the main theme "Church and State" (*utraque [potestas] est in suo genere maxima*), and the doctrine that the elected official need only execute the will of the people is rejected. But these paragraphs are rather positively flavored, for instance when the Pope says that it is not worth a reprimand per se if the people (*populos,* not *multitudo*) more or less take part in the government. In fact, "at certain times" and "under certain laws" it may not only be useful but also the duty of the citizen to do so. This argument was used to justify the opposition toward the founding of an antirepublican party.[10] This attitude is called an expression of ecclesiastical *lenitas* and *facilitas.* Also the encyclical *Libertas* of 20 June 1888, in which liberal human rights are condemned, concedes at the end that is not per se a violation of one's duty to prefer a democratic system of state.[11]

---

[5] K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus,* 516: "The problem of democracy was present from the beginning, because the ideals of freedom, equality, brotherhood are rooted in Natural Law and especially in the Gospel."—In regard to the "sacred democracy" which was to replace the "sacred monarchy," see H. Maier, op. cit., 276.

[6] Cf. chaps. 5 (p. 94) and 34.

[7] *Acta Leonis* II, 269–87; concerning the people's sovereignty (*imperium populare*) which Leo XIII attributes (as can be seen again and again) to the Reformation, like all other modern evils: 282.—In regard to the monarchy: there is no society "in qua non aliquis temperet singulorum voluntates ut velut unum fiat ex pluribus" (274); analogy to the one and only divine legislator and judge and to fatherhood: "isto autem modo diversa genera potestatis miras inter se habent similitudines" (275).—With respect to the medieval empire in which power reached "the climax of its dignity": 282 (by using the term *instituto imperio sacro,* Leo XIII avoids the theories of translation).

[8] Ibid., 271f.; it seems remarkable that he uses *popularis* in a negative sense and that he speaks of *iudicium multitudinis.*

---

[9] Cf. chap. 6.—A perfect example of the confusion that the abstract language of doctrine can create is the controversy between Bishop Freppel of Angers and Archbishop Thomas of Rouen breaking out as a consequence of this encyclical. Thomas had interpreted it in the vein of Lacordaire and had been so careless as to differentiate it from the *Syllabus* of Pius IX. Freppel called this heresy. He was supported by Oreglia, cardinal of the Curia, who said that the abuse of *Immortale Dei* only served *de dénaturer le Syllabus*). Leo XIII criticized the comparison of his encyclical to the *Syllabus;* however, he finally sent a letter of praise to Thomas, who was more useful to his French policies. Subsequently, Cardinal Pitra tried to console the Bishop of Angers, saying that he was living in "abnormal times," the repetition of which was a banality (tendentiously described in Terrien II, 517–28, 541–47).

[10] *Acta Leonis* V, 118–50: "Immo neque illud per se reprehenditur, participem plus minus esse populum rei publicae: quod ipsum certis in temporibus certisque legibus potest non solum ad utilitatem, sed etiam ad officium pertinere civium." In October 1885, the Pope had inhibited A. de Mun's plan to found a Catholic party (cf. chap. 6).—It is significant for the situation of the Church as a whole that F. Hettinger, in the Herder edition (2nd collection, 1887), translated *participem . . . esse populum rei publicae,* adapting it to the German situation, into: ". . . *Anteil empfängt* [*sic*] *am öffentlichen Leben*" (to participate [*sic*] in public life); P. Tischleder, *Staatslehre,* 249, in his battle against the legitimists of the Weimar Republic, interpreted these words: "a constitution designed to be democratic and moderate."—The following passage has to be seen in the context of the development of the *Kulturkampf* in Germany (chap. 3). It states that the Church does not condemn those governments that, "in accordance with traditions and customs, tolerate *divini cultus varia genera* in their state for reasons of considerable public advantages or in order to avoid calamities," even though the Church does not permit these *varia genera* to have equal rights (cf. chap. 12).

[11] *Acta Leonis* VIII, 245: "malle rei publicae statum populari temperatum genere, non est per se contra officium"—the rejection of the people's sovereignty is conditional.—The following remark stating that it is honorable to participate in public life is specifically in regard to Italy: "nisi alicubi ob singularem rerum temporumque conditionem aliter caveatur."

The contemporary disciples of a politically understood "Christian democracy" did not sufficiently consider in their interpretations (or perhaps they wanted to overlook it) that the Pope indeed accepted the democratic form of government (among others), but in spite of differentiations, he recognized it merely as a fait accompli. Leo XIII had always imagined that democracy was the result of revolution. In the encyclical *Quod Apostolici muneris* of 28 December 1878, which primarily turned against socialism and preached obedience toward the state's authority, the Pope brought to mind that the Church, even if the princes did not execute their authority *ultra modum,* refused to tolerate an autonomous rebellion against them (*proprio marte*). Even if the situation were hopeless, there is only Christian patience and prayer available to expedite rescue. Obedience can only be refused if the demand contradicts the law of God and nature.[12] The encyclical *Libertas* (1888) exceeds the admonition for patience. It speaks of the "unfair power" which oppresses the citizens or denies freedom to the Church, and it calls lawful (*fas*) the request (*quaerere*) for "another constitution" which would permit action "in freedom."[13] It is not said in this context how this *quaerere* is to occur, since unfair regimes are not in the habit of resigning voluntarily. At the same time, the violent resistance of the oppressed Irish is condemned. But the encyclical letter to the French episcopate, the clergy, and all French Catholics, *Au milieu des sollicitudes* of 16 February 1892 and the letter to the French cardinals *Notre consolation* of 3 May 1892,[14] which inaugurated the *Ralliement,* cannot speak in such general terms to the land of obviously irreversible revolution, especially since it requests loyalty to the French Republic "comme representant le pouvoir venu de Dieu." Of what was called "venu de Dieu," the sons and grandsons of the age of the "great Revolution"—however they felt about it—had very precise memories. The questions in regard to the *Diuturnum illud* (1881) whether the rejection of the people's sovereignty only meant to condemn Rousseau or also the theory of Suarez, was answered rather cautiously by Rome.[15] However, now it was stated that all authority emanated from God, though this was not to be taken to mean that the divine designation defines "always and directly the way power is transferred, nor the contingent forms and personalities." The *modes de transmission* were naturally the decisive element. Who affects them? "Time, this great transformer of everything which exists here below." This is probably the only place in the encyclicals of Leo XIII where he does not refer exclusively to history, be it to bring to mind the achievements of the papacy for the benefit of the West and specifically for Italy, or to characterize the devastating consequences of the Reformation. He also invokes history to facilitate an understanding of his request to accept this Republic "comme venu de Dieu." Compared to this, the Neo-Scholastic remark about the "pouvoir considéré en lui même," not touched by the "innovation," appears weak and abstract. The most remarkable statement by the Pope with respect to the Revolution as such is the one maintaining that the *changements* of the era—Leo XIII refers to the Eastern Empire of antiquity—are far from ever having been legitimate. Indeed, it is difficult to say that they are legitimate ("il est même difficile qu'ils le soient"). Not one word is said to restrict the doctrine of the Church which states that the Church does not permit rebellion against the authority in power; instead, the actual power having emerged from the Revolution is to be accepted for the sake of the general welfare ("le pouvoir civil dans la forme où, de fait, il existe").[16]

---

[12] *Acta Leonis* I, 170–83.—Similarly, *Diuturnum illud.*

[13] *Acta Leonis* VIII, 245.

[14] *Acta Leonis* XII, 19–41, 107–16.

[15] Feret was informed by Billot that only Rousseau was meant and that the Pope had deliberately excluded Suárez's differentiation of the direct or indirect transferral of power (L. Feret, *Le pouvoir civil devant l'enseignement catholique* [Paris ^{2}1888]; also P. Tischleder, *Staatslehre,* 216f.).

Leo XIII noted that internal pacification in France was not only in the interest of the Catholics but in the interest of the entire country, even though the religious goal was not only the ultimate but also the only sufficient motive. Of course, this raised the question of whether the acceptance of the Republic as a mere fact still allowed the traditional conception of the relations between Church and state. In his political encyclicals, the Pope repeatedly evoked the medieval image of the relationship of body and soul, though he did refrain from mentioning the papal theories of the late Middle Ages. In *Au milieu des sollicitudes* he happens to mention that form of separation of Church and state in which the Church is reduced "to the freedom to live according to the common law of all citizens." What was apparently practiced in "some countries"—he obviously meant the United States—implied great "inconveniences," but it also offered some advantages, especially if the legislation allowed itself to be inspired by Christian principles due to a "fortunate inconsistency." The principle of separation continued to be false even though the aforementioned situation "was not the worst of all." But France, a "nation catholique par ses traditions et par la foi présente de la grande majorité de ses fils," was not to be brought into this "precarious situation."[17] In spite of the somewhat relatively favorable results recorded by an investigation of the ecclesiastical and religious attitudes conducted by the state in the years between 1879 and 1888 in France,[18] the question needs to be asked whether a country which, at the end of the nineteenth century, according to denominational statistics, was nearly homogeneous can really be called a "Catholic nation." The term *grande majorité* stems from the preamble of the Concordat of 1801, while the term *nation catholique* ignores the fact that almost one hundred years earlier other sects had been provided with equality before the law. Meanwhile, the process of de-Christianization continued. This did not necessarily result in the separation of Church and state, and certainly not in hostility. But the old image of the correlation between body and soul—no matter how much Leo XIII stressed that each power was the highest in its area of competence—was a contrivance which clouded an essential condition of the constitutional state, namely, that the position of the Church had become dependent on the majority standing of the political parties in a pluralistic society and was not dependent on the degree to which the constitution pronounced the Catholic faith to be the state religion or not. This is closely related to the complex problem of the Catholic parties in a democracy which is partly determined by the alternation of position and opposition and by the relations of the substantially differently structured Catholic Church to such political entities.

---

[16] *Acta Leonis* XII, 112, 31, 32, 113, 111.—P. Tischleder, *Staatslehre,* 233, wants to distinguish the practical situation in Ireland and the question of whether Leo XIII "expressly and on principle intended to reject the right of a people to practice resistance because it disagrees with Catholic doctrine." Actually, in his dispute with the Bavarian legitimist F. X. Kiefl, Leo XIII's only argument was the recognition of political facts, notwithstanding the question of when the "changing times" had solidified them sufficiently.—In regard to the principles of the *Ralliement,* cf. the introduction.

In 1885, Leo XIII inhibited the founding of a Catholic Party in France through Albert de Mun, and on 12 May 1892, a few days after the papal letter *Notre consolation,* the anti-republican *Union de la France Chrétienne"* was dissolved. Both incidents should initially be seen from the perspective of the papal *Ralliement* policy and the attempt to close the cleft in French Catholicism between republicans and monarchists. But it contradicted Leo XIII's principles to involve the Church in the battles of the political parties (*Ecclesiam trahere in partes*) because he presumed that religion (i.e., the Catholic faith) had to be sacred and inviolable to everyone. There is no doubt that on purely political grounds (*in genere politico*), the Christians can fight for the success of their respective opinions (*opiniones*), "given the observation of truth and justice." But the Church cannot become a party because it is common to every one.[19] This is applicable to the differences within Catholicism in

---

[17] *Acta Leonis* XII, 39.

[18] Cf. chap. 6.

[19] Encyclical *Sapientiae christianae* of 10 January 1890; *Acta Leonis* X, 28f.—The Pope raised an issue which was a problem everywhere, even in Germany, where *Rechtskatholiken* (Catholics of the right) protested against "political Catholicism," for instance F. X.

France, Spain, and Italy, where each group operated under the assumption that it alone represented the rights of the Church; and to the papal admonition aimed at furthering the unity of the Catholics so that they could form a phalanx against the enemies of the Church. But his goal was the universal re-Christianization of state and society, where religion will be sacred to every one and the Church does not have to be represented by a party. There is a close connection between the tactical viewpoint that political party formations entangle Catholicism in internal strife and the principle that religion is not a matter of parties at all, because it has priority for all citizens.[20]

An equally important problem in the relationship between the Church and the Christian parties was the concept of the hierarchical authority of giving directives. The Vatican's attempt to comply with Bismarck's wish and exert influence on the Center Party relative to the antisocialist law and the question of the septennate failed[21] because of the polical self-awareness of this party, which surpassed all other political entities of Catholicism in its cohesiveness. But this attempt was characteristic of Leo XIII's idea about the universal responsibility of the papacy. Ferrata's ecclesiastical internal policies exceeded such intervention. He was not content with prohibiting the French monarchists from a religious and ecclesiastical argumentation; rather he demanded the sacrifice of a fundamental political conviction. It was in accord with the character and range of this problem that the Pope in Italy reserved the right to make the decision in the question of the *Non expedit* and its exegesis to himself and to censor all special actions. But it was also in keeping with this policy that the movement of the *Opera dei congressi,* which was strictly organized in 1884, became the battlefield for all political questions whose resolution was therefore subject to hierarchical directives. In comparison to other countries, the interpretation of the competence of the nunciatures practically resulted in a *potestas directa* over political matters which had been rejected in Leo XIII's theory concerning the relationship between Church and state.

Kraus (cf. chap. 29), especially rejecting the Center party as the only representative of German Catholic interests and often forming their own lobby within this party (I. Schauff, *Die deutschen Katholiken und die Zentrumspartei* [Cologne 1928]; W. Ferber, "Der Weg Martin Spahns," *Hochland* 62 [1970], 218–29; id., "R. Baumstark," *Anregung* [Cologne October 1970], 333–35; id., "Fred Graf Frankenberg," *Deutsche Tagespost* [7 May 1971], 11).

[20] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 365: "Initially pursuing the formation of Catholic parties, Leo XIII, after 1885, energetically proceeded to disapprove a purely denominational or clerical organization of the Catholics and to recommend their assimilation into the national entity." Such a disapproval, however, is not documented anywhere.

[21] Cf. chap. 3.

Since the Church had to deal with very different political constitutions, only the recognition of all forms of government could be decreed didactically, given the known conditions. On the other hand, if, on the basis of the historical situation, Christian motives regarding the transformation of social conditions should coincide with political convictions, then both the French and Italian "Christian democrats" and—though in a different manner—that part of the episcopate which did not merely respect the constitution of the United States but also on principle accepted it, faced a dilemma between the necessarily abstract ecclesiastical political doctrine and their concrete political conviction. The term "Christian democracy" grew enriched in content when the paternalistic social practice flowing from top to bottom was replaced or at least supplemented by a social reform movement from below, conducted by the disadvantaged themselves. This enrichment essentially meant that the term also gained a political profile. This did not necessarily affect the form of government as such.[22] But the state itself changed when the "self-liberation of the classes"[23] began. The Christian republican, in turn, derived a good deal of his political convictions from the view that the paternalistically oriented social activities of the monarchists missed their target, and a real social reform was only possible in a democracy.[24] A de-politicization of the term "Christian democracy" did not merely affect the form of government, but also the concept of politics in general.

However, wherever Catholics gathered in parties, as in Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, they were confronted with the task of balancing the various social interests if they wanted to gain political weight as a "people's party." This difficult process was only successful when the common Christian belief became the catalyst of the development of a political will. One can certainly say that in France "the *Démocratie chrétienne,* in turn, repeated the mistake of the monarchists when it entered the political arena and turned the problem of the form of government into a question of religious principle."[25] It must be added that most of the Christian democratic parties of the twentieth century have their antecedents in those which made this mistake.

---

[22] "Dans la monarchie italienne comme dans la république française la Démocratie chrétienne pouvait donc présenter le même visage économique et social: ce n'était pas une question de régime politique" (G. Hoog, 120).

[23] R. Murri (op. cit., 32) calls this process "logical in its true essence, human, and quite Christian" and he is unhappy that it occurs "in an anti-Christian party"; in his opinion, the Conservatives, "separating the religious cause from that of democracy," are solely guided by political interests of power and they do not want to be disturbed by a religious movement.

[24] "Il ne s'agit pas seulement d'enraciner les ouvriers dans de ravissants petits jardins, de leur offrir de petites habitations tandis que le le patron se dira en se frottant les mains: maintenant, mes ouvriers seront bons, ils seront sages car il ont un joli joujou. Non il faut que les citoyens soient eux-mêmes responsable de ce qu'ils font" (M. Sangnier, in Rollet II, 26f.).

The first time Leo XIII discussed the problem of "Christian democracy" was in his address on the occasion of a French workers' pilgrimage on 8 October 1898, wherein he was apparently responding to an "allusion à la démocratie." If democracy would be inspired by a belief in enlightened reason, if it accepted in "religious humility" and as a necessary fact ("comme un fait nécessaire") the difference between classes and living conditions, if when seeking a solution for the social problems, it would never lose sight of the superhuman love ("charité surhumaine") that Christ held to be a sign of his followers, then if democracy wanted to be a Christian democracy ("si la démocratie veut être chrétienne"), it would bring France peace, well-being, and fortune.[26] The dangerous evil, from which this "democracy" is distinct, is socialism. In March 1896 Rampolla had still supported the abbés and laymen in France who were political believers in democracy. But since they failed to make Catholic voters agree upon promising candidates, the election of May 1898 was not successful. The *Ralliement* policy had failed and, in the address of 8 October 1898, no longer played a role.[27] The tone in the socio-political questions also was quite different from that in *Rerum novarum.* The de-politicization in the sense of *religieuse résignation* was extensive. The speech reminds one of the encyclical *Quod Apostolici muneris* of 1878, which was subsequently quoted (before *Rerum novarum*) in the introduction to the *Graves de communi* of 18 January 1901. This letter was actually occasioned by the tensions in the *Opera dei congressi,* but the key sentences have a general character. The differentiation of the terminology is interesting: the Pope states that the term "Christian Socialism" was rightfully abandoned; *Actio christiana popularis* is evaluated positively; it is used in the Italian "Congressi" organizations for which episcopal leadership authority is emphasized. Of the two terms "Christian Socialism" and "Christian Democracy," the second one, "not so much" the first one,[28] is said to have caused displeasure *apud bonos plures* because of its "ambiguity" and its "danger." One fears that it could "favor the people's state" (*popularis civitas foveatur*) and that it could be preferred to other forms of government. After the encyclical had emphatically differentiated between the *democratia socialis* ("social democracy") and the *democratia christiana,* it clearly rejects "the distortion" of the latter "into a political term" (*ad politica detorqueri*).[29] "Democracy," in contrast to the general usage, could in connection with "Christian" only mean "beneficial Christian action for the people" (*beneficam in populum actionem christianam*). The earlier statements that democratic constitutions are just as feasible as any others are amended with the negative statement that the Natural Law and the Gospel are not dependent on any constitution. In this respect, none of the basic teachings of the Church are changed. But it is added that the Catholics would neither theoretically nor practically want to prefer one form of government to another or introduce a new one (*catholicorum mens atque actio*).[30] With respect to social politics, the climate had changed even more compared to the address to the French pilgrimage of 1898. The Pope not only emphasized that the Church has to be available to all classes and may not prefer the lower, but also stated that in spite of shorter working hours[31] and higher wages the workers' life is "crowded and miserable" (*anguste et misere*), which does not indicate an intensification of social reform but means that the workers still live with "rotten morals" and

---

[25] H. Maier, op. cit., 268.—Goyau II, 16f. (1901) differs: The time when attempts were made to combine Catholicism and democracy has passed; both are *faits* and "Des faits ne se concilient pas, ils se constatent."

[26] *Acta Leonis* XVIII, 223.

[27] In the Catholic debate about democracy of that time, in which especially Tischleder referred to Leo XIII, O. Schilling (*Staatslehre* 43 and 148) said about this speech, and rightfully so: "Since the list of demands apply to any form of government and the term Christian democracy is not to be understood in a political sense, a political interpretation totally contradicts Leo's intentions."

[28] The *non adeo* is an allusion to the resistance which the Christian Social party encountered in Austria from the Conservatives and especially from Cardinal Gruscha (cf. chap.

2; H.-D. Wendland, *Der Begriff "Christlich-sozial"* [Cologne 1962]; R. Knoll, *Zur Tradition der christlichsozialen Partei* [*Österreichs*] [Cologne 1972]).

[29] Interestingly, the Herder edition (1901) 8, translated *democratia christiana* with "Christian social democracy," even though the encyclical itself differentiated between the two terms.

[30] The encyclical: *Acta Leonis* XVI, 3–20; in regard to *Acta christiana popularis,* 14f. (whether one chooses this term or "Christian democracy" is irrelevant; also important is: "si quidem impertita a Nobis documenta, quo par est obsequio, integra custodiatur); cf. also 17.—The abstract expression *Catholicorum mens atque actio* is not quite clear. It can mean one should not introduce in the name of the faith and Catholic Action, or Catholics should not introduce another form of government. In 1888, this had been generally approved (n. 13, above).—The first draft of *Graves de communi* was written by Cardinal (1901) F. Cavagnis and was more pointed than the encyclical (G. Martina, *RSTI* 16 [1962], 492–50; R. Lill, *Der Kampf . . .* [biblio., chap. 24], 110).

[31] The success, partially achieved through strikes, partially through the active initiatives of the legislation pertaining to worker protection (which was promoted by the Catholic lobbyists and parties in Parliament) was of historical significance: in 1877, France still permitted children between the ages of twelve and fourteen to work twelve hours (in Switzerland and in the Netherlands, child labor was forbidden), in Germany (1878), six hours were allowed (under certain conditions). Around 1910, most members of the labor force in most of the industries worked from nine to ten hours (cf. R. Kuczynski, *Arbeitslohn und Arbeitszeit in Europa, 1870/1909* [Berlin 1913]; a survey in A. Knoll, 143–52).

without religion.[32] The fight against socialism dominated the intention of the encyclical.

If the principal statements in all of Leo XIII's magisterial writings are distinguished from the modifications incited by the given situations,[33] the following transpires: democracy is a result of the "transformer time" with which one can and has to come to grips for the sake of ecclesiastical goals if the hierarchical leaders deem it opportune. Also the Christian social reform policies are less interested in the economic conditions of the working class than in a defense against atheistic socialism, which includes the elimination of social misery. These, in fact, are also the essential goals to be pursued by the official teaching of the Church. In the framework of his splendid universal program, aimed at presenting the papacy to the world as a moral, spiritual, and clerical authority and freeing this institution from the negative aspects of the *Syllabus,* Leo XIII had to confront the actual problems of his time, and he had to do so in the face of a society which was involved in a continuous dialectical process, oscillating between political parties and economic classes, and in the face of a Catholicism struggling with its own internal differences. The French monarchists were reported to be closer to his own political-clerical persuasion than the Catholic supporters of the Republic.[34] But Leo XIII expected that they, as he had done, would sacrifice their conviction for the sake of a higher goal and that they would accept the democratic constitution, which he had officially only tolerated (along with others), restricting it by adding "per se."

In Neo-Scholastic social philosophy the Pope believed to have found a generally binding synthesis based on Natural Law which could confront the antagonisms of the time.[35] In reality, however, Catholicism represented special groups within the general, increasingly secularized society, and it had its own problems of integration, with or without identifying with a political party. Since the religious aspects were decisive in this respect, a dilemma regarding the universality of the Church could possibly emerge if the religious motives were combined with certain social and political goals whose actuality could only coincide very generally with the Neo-Scholastic social philosophy. The dilemma increased the more Christian faith and social political convictions were tied together and the more they were simultaneously intent on changing inherited conditions. Each in his own way, Leo XIII and the political "Christian democrats," were unable to see that the old relationship between Church and world, that is, the world as a duplicate of the Church, was not real any longer. This is the ultimate reason for the conflict which resulted from the subsequent pontificate's interpretation of hierarchical magisterial directives in political questions. This conflict was already on the horizon in Leo XIII's pontificate.[36]

---

[32] *Acta Leonis* XXI, 10.

[33] P. Tischleder, *Staatsgewalt,* 61, tried to interpret the *Graves de communi* against the background of Marxism and the Italian situation, which is not possible.

[34] Cf. Introduction.

[35] A thorough, critical assessment of this social philosophy and Neo-Scholasticism as a whole is desirable (it should outline its limits, but also its generally accepted achievements). This is especially necessary since the subsequent development of the "Christian social doctrine" after Pius XI is almost forgotten by the Catholics and since the "critical theory" contains a lot of ideas that cannot be found elsewhere.

---

[36] Cf. chap. 35.

CHAPTER 15

The Position of Catholicism in the Culture at the Turn of the Century

The relationship of Catholicism to its various national cultures in the last third of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century varies greatly. What was classified as cultural "ghetto-Catholicism" existed only in Germany, because there the confessional minority was strong enough to develop a sound self-consciousness, and its social structure was considerably different from that of the society at large. For Irish Catholicism in England, constituting a majority, the Anglo-Saxon culture was foreign for religious reasons; moreover, in its social isolation it did not even have a chance to deal with this culture. In Ireland itself, the "revival" around the turn of the century clearly documents that the affiliated writers were born Catholics, but the movement, spiritually indebted to France, divorced itself from Irish traditionalism by emancipating itself from the Church. The two smaller Catholic groups in England, the Old-English Catholics and the converts, belonged to the Anglo-Saxon culture, conducted their intellectual disputes in the English language, and the significant poets were immersed in the tradition of English poetry. Catholicism in the United States, itself culturally scarcely creative, tried to adapt to society as a whole.

In the Catholic countries of France, Spain, Italy, Austria, and Poland it is difficult (regardless of the intensive national Christian traditions) to determine which phenomena should be viewed as Catholic in an ecclesiastical sense and what distinguishes those who cannot be understood outside general Catholicity from those who are almost or completely alienated from the Christian tradition.

This is especially true of France. The poet Charles Baudelaire (1821–67) with whom modern French poetry begins stands at the beginning of the epoch treated here. This man whose career ended so early dominated the field for generations to come. He is certainly not to be reckoned in the same category as Chateaubriand as representative of the Christianity of the restoration. Yet it cannot be denied that the author of the *Fleurs du Mal* which he originally called *Limbes* and who saw abandonment of the idea of original sin as the basic evil of the age[1] was at heart a Catholic, yet no one would ascribe *catholicisme* to him. At the end of our era stands Charles Maurras (1868–1952), who was entirely different from Baudelaire (even though he also hated the eighteenth century). But he is an example of how wide the borders of French Catholicism range. Working for conservative newspapers in his early years, he lost his faith in Catholicism, but not in the monarchy or classical literature. He was an opponent of Romanticism and democracy and, in 1899, founded the *Action française,* which raised the hopes of many conservative Catholics in France and not just *their* hopes. He confessed to having lost the Christian faith, but he belonged to a *catholicisme,* which (he said) had saved mankind.[2] The condemnation of some of his works in 1914 was not publicized by the Church until 1926. But even if one proceeds from such marginal personalities into the middle of the cultural life of French Catholics at that time, one does not find an extraneous group, but members of the *Littérature française:* converts, not in the usual sense of the word, but men who had experienced their *conversio,* and this in the middle of their engagement in one of the literary trends which they shared with other Frenchmen. In this respect, the *Renouveau catholique*[3] differs essentially from the literary movement in German Catholicism. But an apologist writer such as Paul Bourget (1852–1935), who from the start wanted to describe the demoralization of the middle class of the French Republic, the adultery, the hypocrisy of the anticlerics, and the asocial individualism of the liberal bourgeoisie; even he was considered "for thirty years an original representative, as it were, of the French novel as created by Balzac and George Sand."[4] Just as much a part of the *Littérature française* was his spiritual friend Ferdinand Brunetière (1849–1906), who, after his visit to Leo XIII in 1894, published the *Visite au Vatican* and who appeared as a polemical Catholic.[5] With his critical essays, which he published in the *Revue des Deux Mondes,* he had quite an impact on the *Académie Française,* which he joined in 1893, and his public turn toward Catholicism was the result of his basic attitude, which prompted him to place the seventeenth century, the century of French classicism, in opposition to the century of enlightenment, romanticism, and the resignation of the fin du siècle, which was entirely in the spirit of French rationalism. Incurring the ridicule of the leftist intellectuals, the former disciple of Comte spoke of the "faillites partielles de la science." The conservative Brunetière pilloried contemporary pessimism, attacking the "believers in the Great Revolution and the legitimate, though perhaps decadent heirs of Voltaire and Rousseau" who are nurtured more by their anticlericalism than by their own tradition.[6] But despite whatever hypocrisy his adversaries charged him with, nobody could dispute that Brunetière had a brilliant French style. G.-P. Fonsegrive-Lespinasse (1852–1917) (philosopher and writer, editor of the publication *Quinzaine* [1896–

---

[1] A. Thibaudet, *Histoire de la Littérature Française de 1789 à nos jours* (Paris 1936, Freiburg i. B. 1953 [Germ.]), 340–43; J. Pommier, *La mystique de Baudelaire* (Strasbourg 1932).

[2] *La politique religieuse* (Paris 1914), 23.—That he died reconciled with the Church (in 1937 he had written a submissive letter to Pius XI from Lisieux) is a phenomenon to be assessed differently than the will of the positivist historian Fustel de Coulenges: "I demand a burial according to French customs" (during the funeral of Victor Hugo in 1885 in the Pantheon, the city council of Paris had removed the cross). Even though C. Maurras, who died in 1952, had a long and hard life, the possibility of such an end should not be dismissed, especially in view of the situation around the turn of the century (A. Cormier, *La vie intérieure de Ch. Maurras* [Paris 1956]).

[3] The poet F. Coppée (1842–1908), very popular in France around the turn of the century, had achieved success as one of the *Parnassiens* with his book *Intimités* (1868). He was the poet of the lower class and small things. In the wake of his religious conversion, he wrote *La bonne souffrance* (1898) (P. Le Meur, *F. Coppée* [Paris 1932]).—G. Huysmans (1848–1907) was one of the great representatives of naturalism, equal to É. Zola, a pioneer (*En route,* 1895). In his autobiographical novel *L'oblat* (1903), he describes his return to the Catholic Church (G. Chastel, *Huysmans et ses amis* [Paris 1957]).—The poetry of F. Jammes (1868–1938) can be compared to another representative of Flemish culture, the priest and poet Guido Gezelle. Jammes returned to the

---

faith of his youth through symbolism (*De l'Angélus de l'aube à l'Angélus du soir,* 1898) (J. P. Inda, *Du faune au patriarche* [Paris 1952]).—Each belonging to one of the "two Frances," the author and poet C. Péguy (1873–1914, died in the battle of the Marne River) and the writer of pamphlets, L. Bloy (1846–1917), were political enemies. Péguy, siding with Dreyfus, joined the Socialists, posed as a mouthpiece of the different opponents of the Combe regime in his *Cahiers de la Quinzaine* (1900–14), and wrote *Mystères* and especially *Ève* (1914), great religious works, even though he could never be an "ecclesiastical" Catholic (R. Lauth, *Lexikon der Weltliteratur im 20. Jh.* II [Freiburg i. Br. 1961], 610–15).—Bloy belonged to the "reactionaries," yet, in his passionate struggle against the disciples of the *Ralliement* policy of Leo XIII, against the anticlerical and the conservative armchair Catholics, he found himself in "splendid isolation." Nevertheless, in France he is still considered "one of the greatest prose writers of his century" (A. Thibaudet, op. cit., 406; J. Bollery, *Léon Bloy,* 3 vols. [Paris 1949–54]).—The religious experience that eighteen-year-old P. Claudel underwent in 1886 in the church of Notre Dame in Paris and that was to be the foundation for his creative work concurred with his discovery of the symbolist A. Rimbaud.

[4] A. Thibaudet, op. cit., 453.

[5] Cf. chap. biblio.—V. Giraud, *De Chateaubriand à Brunetière* (Paris 1936); J. G. Clark, *La pensée de F. Brunetière* (diss., Paris 1954); A. Thibaudet, op. cit., 480–84 and passim.

[6] *Discours de combat* III (1903), 142f.

1907]), who had to be protected by Leo XIII against his conservative critics, said toward the end of his life that "thirty years ago one could barely detect in the French public the kind of interest in spiritual questions that has surfaced now" (in the *Renouveau catholique*).[7] The Jesuits also saw in the *Études* of French cultural Catholicism a form of new ecclesiasticality, though L. Laberthonnière, a strict disciple of Blondel, appeared very sceptical. As in the case of all cultural forms of Catholicism, one would have to distinguish between the profit gained from making Catholic existence possible in the modern world and the effect it would have on general society, which had abandoned its aggressive anticlericalism only because its apathy had become too great.[8]

M. de Vogüé, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1901), described the "two contradictory concepts of national history" in France. This does not apply to Spain of that same time period. Even the famous "Generation of 98" does not permit overt discussion of "two Spains."[9] Therefore, the appeal of the politician Joaquín Costa (died in 1911) "Lock the grave of El Cid with three keys!" was immediately opposed by the true representatives of this generation, even though they were open to modern currents. Above all, it was rejected by Miguel de Unamuno, a Spanish Catholic who did not agree with Church dogma but had nothing in common with the Catholicism of Charles Maurras ("El Cristo de Velázquez", 1920). The Civil War of the twentieth century destroyed the unity of the spirit of the *Hispanidad.* In comparison, Italy was split so deeply because of the Roman question that even Dante's greatness as reflected in the various interpretations by national writers was no longer a unifying element. The intransigent Pope-supporting Catholics had become homeless in their national culture because they had nothing to counteract the positivism invading Italy from France as well as Hegelianism, and they had to stand by and watch while the Tuscan Giosuè Carducci, a fanatical anticlerical, was celebrated as the poet of the new Italy. Alessandro Manzoni (died in 1873) had overcome the Enlightenment, had confessed his Catholic belief in fiery language in the *Inni sacri* (1812–22), and had written the Italian national novel, *I Promessi Sposi* (1827). His heirs could not understand the *Non expedit* for the same reasons which compelled Manzoni, the great pioneer of the religious-national unification of Italy, to become silent. Antonio Fogazzaro (1842–1911),[10] the most outstanding of them all, in his main work *Piccolo mondo antico* (1895) described the Italian fight for freedom against Austria with as much national as religious enthusiasm. His novel *Il Santo* (1905), equally filled with deep religious sentiment, was condemned because of the four evils of the Church described therein. In 1887, during the critical year of Leo XIII's pontificate, forty sentences from the work of the famous theologian and philosopher A. Rosmini-Serbati, to whom Fogazzaro was very much indebted, were extracted and censored.[11] Thus, cultural life in Italy was dominated by verism, G. d'Annunzio (the successor of G. Carducci), and the neo-Hegelians.

---

[7] *L'èvolution des idées,* 228.—P. Archambault, *P. Fonsegrive* (Paris 1932).

[8] W. Gurian (biblio., chap. 12), 300: "They love everything about Catholicism, but dogma is only beautiful metaphysics to them and the Church a brilliant organization"; this is the argument of H. Bremond, *Vingt cinq ans de vie littéraire* (Paris 1908), 70, especially in view of the *Action française.*

[9] Cf. chap. 8.

In Poland, after the failure of the uprising of 1863, the identity of creed and nation had become stronger, but the disappointment created a mood which was a fertile ground for western European positivism (Comte, Taine, Darwin), which seized "Young Poland." Thus emerged a fierce opposition between the leftist liberals and the conservatives. Their most eminent representative was H. Sienkiewicz (1846–1916), the author of historical novels about the era of Polish wars in the seventeenth century and of the internationally famous novel on the early Christian period, *Quo Vadis* (1896). A Polish example of *conversio* is the important poet Jan Kasprowicz (1860–1926), who was persecuted in the Prussian province of Posen because of his nationalistic attitude. From the atheism of his early socio-critical writings he proceeded to religious hymns, rooted in his native peasantry.

In Austria, the names Grillparzer and Stifter characterize the tradition of the kind of Catholicity which, in spite of its liberal and at times even anticlerical features, derives from a Catholic spirit. This spirit, to be sure, was watered down by anticlerical tendencies in the plays of Ludwig Anzengruber (1839–89) and in the folk tales of the Styrian Peter Rosegger (1843–1918), who was influenced by Anzengruber. Catholicity is most strongly represented in the writings of Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1874–1929), who, in the spirit of Grillparzer and Calderon renounced the "magical power over the word" in symbolization and returned from his areligiosity to the great tradition of the West, whose historic tragedy he witnessed in the decline of the Habsburg Empire.[12] This can be compared to the unfortunate poet Georg Trakl of Salzburg (1887–1914), who wanted to find the world's secret harmony in the language of the symbolists. A contemporary of these non-ecclesiastical poets was the convent-bred Enrica von Handel-Mazzetti

---

[10] Cf. chap. 32, n. 18.

[11] Cf. chap. 5 and p. 312 below; in chap. 32, the religious situation in Italy.

[12] K. Lazarowicz, *LThK*^{2} V, 426f.

(1871–1955). Her novel *Jesse und Maria* (1906), dealing with the era of the Counter-Reformation, incited after its serial publication in the *Hochland* (1904) of Carl Muth a "literary controversy" because in this novel the Catholics as well as the Protestants are guilty. The novel was written with deep Catholic conviction, but it broke with the tendentious literature which had become popular in German Catholicism after the Romantic period.[13]

At the general meeting of the *Görres Gesellschaft* in Constance in 1896, its president, G. v. Hertling, said: "But what we need now are not so much apologists but rather real scholars."[14] Until Carl Muth, this was true not just for scholarship but for literature in general. When Hermann von Grauert, at the Catholic Convention in Munich in 1895, expressed his envy of French Catholicism of Brunetière (while Germany was dominated by Nietzsche[15]), he referred to the wide public reputation which the French literary critic had acquired. What was later called the "educational deficit" in German Catholicism of that time had several causes. Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Kant and the philosophy of idealism, J. G. Herder and Humboldt, the representatives of the German spirit, were Protestant. The significance of Catholic features in Romanticism is not easily assessed. Its Catholic spokesman, the convert Friedrich Schlegel was a protean figure, who turned to gnosticism in the last phase of his life in Dresden and died in 1829. In this movement, the Catholics had been as much a part of German literature as the ecclesiastical Catholics had been of French literature. Not just converts, but also born Catholics such as Clemens Brentano and Eichendorff participated. In his later years, the Silesian poet wrote about the "event in Cologne" (1837): here emerged what "the Romanticists had dreamt of and did not possess themselves: a Catholic spirit." But prophetically he had also warned of the "rigors of ecclesiastical restrictiveness," which, of course, was to some extent unavoidable in the belligerent position which German Catholicism as a minority group was forced into by a largely Protestant society, and which it brought upon itself by its awareness of being a strong minority. This is another point which explains the isolation of German Catholicism after the second third of the nineteenth century.

---

[13] W. Grenzmann, *Lexikon der Weltliteratur im 20. Jh.* I (Freiburg i. B. 1960), 850ff.; cf. chaps. 2 and 35, and p. 427 below; cf. F. Fuchs and P. Funk (cit. chap. 29, n. 1).

[14] *Erinnerungen* II, 168; in regard to Hertling's pamphlet (biblio., chap. 15), Brück-Kißling VI², 329, maintains that the mistrust of Catholics "was mostly justified: many Catholics, who had been able through considerable sacrifices by the clergy and generous laymen to obtain a higher education, turned against their faith later." F. X. Kraus (*Dt. Lit. Ztg.* 21 [1900], 12–19) is critical of the fact that Hertling's principles were denounced de facto.

[15] Kißling II, 270.

This was the price that Catholicism paid for being able, unlike other sects, to structure itself within society. The German Catholics were underrepresented in higher education and especially at the universities (particularly, if one ignores theology). This was the result of cultural and historical development and at the same time the cause of its intensification, especially if the socio-cultural and the socio-economic facts are combined.[16] It was correctly pointed out then (1803) that secularization was a catastrophe for Catholic education;[17] the academic career of Catholics at universities was, even after the *Kulturkampf,* greatly impaired by the intolerance of the Liberals. But one has to see the whole complex situation at once if one is to understand the reaction of Catholics in the overall cultural world during these decades. One has to isolate the key issue from the polemical global reproach of "inferiority." German Catholicism had at its disposal pertinent means of communication, and it was an internal matter when the "calendar for time and eternity," published by the Alemannian priest Alban Stolz (1808–83), and his own strongly autobiographical essays, which contain more than the usual polemics against liberalism, were pushed aside by a sort of literature of which *Das Opfer eines Beichtgeheimnisses* (*The Sacrifice of a Confession*) by J. Spillmann is an example (Spillmann's novels appeared between 1882 and 1903 and were a great success). It is Friedrich Wilhelm Weber's (died in 1894) *Dreizehnlinden* (1878), rather than Heinrich Hansjakob's true-to-life folk story *Der Vogt auf Mühlstein* (1895), which is representative. This work, written in concise language that was meant to satisfy sophisticated demands, could be found into the twentieth century in the bookcases of Catholics who had to live in the limited circumstances for which history had destined them.[18] Yet the situation is not so much characterized by clumsy attempts such as that of Weber, but rather by the respectable effort, as it were, to offer a decent selection in the "library of German classical writers for school and home," for which the inclusion of Lessing's *Nathan* must have been a difficult decision. The belligerent Swiss Jesuit Alexander Baumgartner laid bare in his three volume work *Göthe* (1879–86) the "dirty love novels" of his idol and called the humanity of *Iphigenie* a "Trojan horse," whose content he wanted to expose.[19] The breakthrough brought about by Muth in *Hochland* resulted in conditions much like those in France: the works of these writers ceased to appear in Catholic publishing houses because the authors—once again to a large extent converts—wanted to be part of the general German literature.

---

[16] Utilizing the census of 1907, H. Rost found that the Catholics (36.5 percent) had a share of 44.2 percent in agriculture, 29.9 percent in business, 18.5 percent among the mining entrepreneurs. At the same time, in the county of Koblenz, the Protestants (33 percent), had a share of 50 percent of the tax yield, in Cologne (14 percent) a share of 25 percent. Regarding the problems of statistical studies, see C. Bauer, *Deutscher Katholizismus* (biblio., chap. 12), 33.—In 1886, in Prussia, the Catholics (approx. 35 percent) had a share of 21.3 percent of the students in *Gymnasien* (a share that is proportionate to the population average of 1910 in the Prussian school district); in the *Realschulen,* the share went down from 16.7 to 14.5 percent between 1886 and 1910. At Prussian universities, 13 percent of the students were Catholic (1885–97); W. Lossen, *Der Anteil der Katholiken am akademischen Lehramt in Preußen* (Cologne 1901), 1.

[17] See G. v. Hertling, *Kleine Schriften,* 569.

[18] P. L. Haffner (philosophy professor at the seminary of Mainz, from 1879 until 1886 editor of the apologetic *Frankfurter zeitgemäße Broschüren,* later bishop of Mainz) said at the Catholic Convention of Amberg in 1884 that even "harmless" novels had a devastating influence; F. Hülskamp made a similar statement in Trier in 1887 when talking about the metrical language of the *Dreizehnlinden.* This evaluates the novel as being the literary genre of the bourgeoisie that emerged from the Revolution.

The scholarly works in Catholicism gravitated naturally toward theology, philosophy, and (Church) history.[20] Here, tradition provided a starting point and Neo-Scholasticism, which had become official through Leo XIII's Thomas encyclical, offered not only an international basis but also the possibility of developing, beyond the disputations and apologetics over the zeitgeist, an independent and even partially creative system and of giving the retarding forces a positive orientation. Also, the old and the new universities, founded during Leo XIII's pontificate, made attempts toward a comprehensive modern curriculum. Louvain distinguished itself in Near Eastern studies as well as in biology; Fribourg (1889) had started a philosophy and a law faculty and, in 1896, established a mathematics and natural science faculty; Washington (1889) developed its sociological emphasis, which was also pursued in Louvain. In France, the Catholic universities in Paris, Angers, Lille, Lyon, and Toulouse, founded around 1875, had to change their name to *Institut catholique* following the law of 1880, according to which the title *université* was reserved for state institutions. But with imperturbable enthusiasm they held on to their academic programs; and the plan also to establish schools of medicine was not a symptom of ambition but of the realization that intellectual decisions were particularly at stake in this field. Of course, grave technical difficulties stood in the way. That the establishment of theological faculties occurred subsequently is primarily a result of their problematic relationship to the diocesan seminaries. The names of the scholars affiliated with the individual institutions represented the rather different spirit of each institution.[21]

---

[19] O. Köhler, *Bücher als Wegmarken* . . . , 46–49; J. Antz, *Der Katholizismus* . . . , 173–81.

[20] Cf. chaps. 21 and 22.

[21] In regard to the focal points (with the exception of theology and philosophy): Angers began with law, literature, and natural sciences (the Thomist L. Billot, S.J.); Lille developed the social sciences (also the technical fields) and he was able to establish a medical

In 1810, the University of Salzburg was closed, and attempts to expand the theology department, installed in 1851, into a full university were not successful, in spite of Leo XIII's encouragement through briefs in 1890, 1900, and 1902. During the Catholic Convention in Aachen in 1879, the decision of 1862 to create a Catholic university in Germany was reiterated; but in 1882, there were no more than three hundred thousand marks in the budget, and too many serious arguments were blocking the plan. However, the *Görres-Gesellschaft,* founded in 1876, the year of Joseph Görres's one hundredth birthday, may be called one of the most significant societies of Catholic scholars. The initiative had come from Georg v. Hertling (1843–1919)[22], in 1867 lecturer of philosophy in Bonn, in 1882 professor at the University of Munich. With his Neo-Scholastic philosophy of law, politics, and society and as a Center Party politician (in 1875–90 and 1896–1912 member of the *Reichstag),* he was one of the most intelligent leaders of German Catholicism, a man who knew how to combine determination and restraint. The *Görres-Gesellschaft* enjoyed the ecclesiastical patronage of the incumbent of the diocese of Cologne, but it was founded as a private society. It renounced a theological section, although theologians formed a great part of its membership. The original four sections were devoted to philosophy, history, law, sociology, and natural science.[23] The Austrian *Leo Gesellschaft,* founded in 1891 by J. A. Helfert and named after the ruling Pope, published mainly studies of the general and ecclesiastical history of Austria.[24] In Germany and Austria it was of special significance that the theology faculties had remained in the academic structure of the universities. Thus, they were in a better position than the diocesan seminaries to preserve for Catholic theology a place in the general

---

school.—Lyon, where only a few medical disciplines and a department for natural sciences could be developed, had a law school and a college for social sciences (after 1898, theology was headed by Tixeront, professor in patrology, after 1906 by Podechard, Old Testament scholar from the seminary).—Paris offered law, Far Eastern studies, natural sciences. Famous rectors were M. d'Hulst (until 1896) and Baudrillart. Among the faculty in theology were the Church historian Duchesne, in canon law Gasparri, in apologetics A.-T.-P. de Broglie, in philosophy Sertillanges (after 1900) and later Maritain.—Church historian Batiffol (1898–1907, rector) taught in Toulouse.

[22] Cf. chaps. 1, 3, 12, 21 and 35.

[23] These focal points were adopted from the most important publications of this time period: *HJ* (since 1880), *PhJ* (since 1888), *Staatslexikon* (^{1} 1887, ^{2} 1901–04), publications of the Council of Trent (after 1901). In 1888, the Roman Institute was founded. It was supported by the rector of Campo Santo, A. de Waal.—W. Spael, *Görres-Gesellschaft, 1876–1941* (Paderborn 1957).

[24] F. Schindler, *Die Leo-Gesellschaft 1891–1901* (Vienna 1902); A. Dörrer, *LThK*^{2} VI, 959.

scholarly and scientific public.[25] In spite of the conflicts within "reform Catholicism" and "modernism," into which theologians such as H. Schell, A. Ehrhard, F. X. Kraus, F. M. Schindler, and L. Wahrmund were drawn, there was rarely a real schism (contrary to the time of Döllinger).[26]

The numerous scholarly publications in all forms of Catholicism, which received fresh impulses and were newly founded,[27] document that Catholicism had defined its self-concept more in the realm of scholarship than anywhere else, even though the natural sciences came up for discussion more indirectly in the apologetic literature. There were a few exceptions, such as at the University of Louvain (the only Catholic institution which was a full university), the research on ants by the Jesuit E. Wasmann (published in the nineties), and the astronomical works of the Jesuits Hagen, Kugler, and others. Wasmann's studies of Haeckel's monism was based on his own scientific research. Tilmann Pesch approached the same problem on the basis of his natural philosophy *(Die großen Welträtsel,* 1883–84). Although the questions posed by the natural sciences were taken quite seriously, the many French Catholic scientists were more directly affected by the discussion taking place in Bible exegesis, which, since the nineteenth century, had resulted in more and more radical interpretations within liberal Protestant theology.[28] It is understandable that they did not succeed in carrying out their intention to exclude this complex of questions at the international congresses of Catholic scholars and scientists in the last decade of the nineteenth century. This failure, in conjunction with the crisis of modernism and integralism, ended an attempt which could have become quite significant for the development of a common Catholic intellectuality able to confront modern problems decisively. The idea had emanated from the future president (1894) of the *Institut catholique* in Toulouse, Duilhé de Saint-Projet (1822–97), who in 1875 had been one of the men instrumental in the founding of the Catholic universities in France. In his *Apologie scientifique du christianisme* (Toulouse 1885) he developed a program for international congresses, which was worked out in detail in conversations with the first president of the *Institut catholique* in Paris, Maurice d'Hulst. This man, who represented such a remarkable combination of views[29] and was actually the personification of arbitration, seemed to be the suitable promoter of the congress idea. Of course, he encountered strong reservations, because there was fear that at such congresses nontheologian participants would ask questions about dogma and exegesis and thus create great confusion. As always in such cases, Leo XIII was optimistic and asked Maurice d'Hulst for his expert opinion. D'Hulst suggested excluding the treatment of all questions concerning ecclesiastical teachings, but he emphasized the necessity of discussing the contemporary status quo of the sciences. In a letter of 1887, the Pope approved the plan.

---

[25] Regarding Würzburg, see *Festschrift zum 350 jährigen Bestehen der Universität Würzburg* (1932), essays by S. Merkle, A. Bigelmair, etc. Regarding Innsbruck, see "100 Jahre Theologische Fakultät Innsbruck," *ZKTh* 80 (1958), 1–235; E. Kleindam, *Die kath. theol. Fakultät Breslau, 1811–1945* (Cologne 1961); E. Hegel, *Gesch. der kath. theol. Fakultät Münster, 1773–1966* 2 (Münster 1971). Regarding Tübingen, see *ThQ* (1970; anniversary ed.). Regarding Bonn, see *150 Jahre Rhein. Friedrich Wilhelm Universität zu Bonn, 1818–1968.* (Bonn 1968). A systematic continuation of these histories is desirable.

[26] Cf. chaps. 2 and 29. Concerning the problem of the modernist oath, see chap. 33.

[27] Cf. biblio., chap. 15.

[28] Cf. chaps. 23, 30, 31, 32.

The first congress in Paris in 1888 proceeded to everyone's satisfaction, even though its international makeup was limited, as was the second one, which took place in 1894 (also in Paris) under the presidency of Bishop Freppel.[30] During the third congress in Brussels in 1894, when university President Abbeloos of Louvain was honorary president, a paper by M. d'Hulst attacked the theologically controversial material which had accumulated. He warned against minimizing dogmatic statements of the Church. He strenuously advised against exaggerating them and suspecting everyone of rationalism who did not share one's own opinions. During the fourth congress in 1897 (in Fribourg), which was able to attract three thousand participants under the presidency of G. v. Hertling, the participants had the courage to form, aside from newly founded sections, a special group in which "exegesis and related disciplines" were to be discussed. What the *Görres-Gesellschaft* had avoided when it renounced the creation of a theological section happened here. The Dominican A.-M. Lagrange was the leader in the group concerned with exegesis and would later insist in vain that the group had approved his principles.[31] The convention in Munich in 1900, which attracted even more participants, parted with the expectation of convening again in Rome in 1903. This was an illusion.[32] The *Istituto cattolico internazionale per il progresso delle scienze,* which had been announced in the encyclical *Pascendi* for 1907 and for which Pius X had appointed Ludwig Pastor secretary general, failed to survive the initial stages. At that time, Albert Ehrhard had been deprived of his title as prelate; G. von Hertling was only going to be accepted because he could not be ignored in his capacity as president of the *Görres Gesellschaft;* the Church historian Duchesne was rejected by the Pope. In spite of Rampolla's misgivings, Pastor succeeded in winning the Pope's support for men like the radical apologist A. M. Weiß and the historian E. Michael, S.J. of Innsbruck.[33] Rampolla asked the Pope on 13 February 1909 to relieve him of the chairmanship of the commission. The institute did not materialize. Most likely it would not have represented the kind of Catholicity which unfolded after World War I in the cultural life of the Church.

---

[29] Cf. chap. 23, n. 15.

[30] In 1888, the Görres Society as a whole did not participate. Only individual members were on the list of participants. An embarrassing incident took place at the congress of 1891: The echelon of the Görres Society, G. v. Hertling, H. v. Grauert, and H. Hüffner, had appeared. While the congress was going on, the German version of a letter that Freppel had written to the French correspondent of the *Berliner Lokalanzeiger* on 17 March 1891 was published. In it, the Alsatian demanded the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France. The German congress participants cancelled their attendance of the dinner given in honor of Bishop Freppel (G. v. Hertling, *Erinnerungen* II, 133).

[31] Cf. chap. 23.

[32] Hocedez III, 93–96. Very critical in regard to Munich: G. P. (F. X.) Kraus, *Allg. Zeitung,* 4 October 1900.

[33] Pastor, *Tagebücher,* 482–96, 499–502, 511.

SECTION THREE

Forms of Piety

CHAPTER 16

Externalization and Internalization of Nineteenth-Century Spirituality
Beginnings of the Eucharistic Congress Movement
Veneration of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux

The forms of piety which had developed in the second third of the nineteenth century grew in scope during Leo XIII's pontificate. They were invigorated through demonstrative gestures in ceremonies of consecration, through liturgical festivities, and through the confirmation of congregations and fraternities. They were valued as socially integrating factors in the forms of Catholicism taking shape within the various countries. And yet their significance cannot be recognized unless they are valued as the daily religious nourishment of the faithful who were living in a strange or hostile environment and who, in those pious exercises, found the strength to remain loyal to a faith which was finding less and less support in the secular world. Depending on the country, the situation was quite different, of course, and cannot generally be differentiated according to urban and rural areas. There were rural areas in France where de-Christianization had progressed far,[1] and the development during the course of the Third Republic was characterized by juxtaposing the "déchristianisation du peuple" and the "rechristianisation de la bourgeoisie."[2] Agrarian concentrations in southern Spain resulted in the rural proletariat's alienation from the faith. In the German-speaking area, the Catholic rural population remained untouched by the modern spirit; to the right and to the left of the cross in the reliquary they hung a picture of the Sacred Heart and the Virgin Mary, as the pastor had recommended, without their religious attitude changing in essence. The rosary, lead by the head of the family in the livingroom, continued to be popular as part of the deeply ingrained veneration of the Virgin Mary. The political development in France toward the end of the nineteenth century contributed to the revitalization of the consciousness of faith. However, during the same period in Germany, a partial paralysis could be detected, because the stimuli of the *Kulturkampf* were missing.[3]

---

[1] Chap. 6.—The missionary J.-B. Berthier (1840–1908) was successful among all classes.

[2] A. Dansette, op. cit., 30–51; cf. chaps. 15 and 36.

Contemporary observations regarding the significance of the political battle (including its national variations) are applicable to the style of religiosity in all forms of Catholicism, whereby we have to consider that the conservative group consciousness in religious life was accompanied by a subjectivism which, on the one hand, was generally embedded in the spiritual trend of the outgoing nineteenth century after the disappointments of the bourgeois revolutions, and which, on the other hand, was consciously nurtured by the pastors as a defense against the materialistic-collectivistic spirit of the time.[4] This juxtaposition of sociality and subjectivity is one of the reasons for the late emergence of the liturgical restoration. Also significant is the positivistic concept of the "sanctity of the Church,"[5] which was believed verified through reference to the catalog of beatification and canonization examinations conducted by the Congregation of Rites of 1901. Moreover, since for the most part religious orders and congregations promoted the canonization of members and since they predominated among the Latin peoples, the picture was distorted. Reflected in this naive quantitative interpretation is the idea of the Catholic "membership" movement, which was necessary for the development of Catholicism and represented the result of often tremendous efforts as well as a mere reaction to processes in the secular society. The contemporary *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland* by Brück-Kißling, with its (for that time) pertinent two volumes of altogether 1,014 pages, is characteristic of that movement in that it devoted 55 pages to the inner life of the Church, more specifically to organizations of this kind. That the organizational element remained

---

[3] J. C. Schulte, *Die Kirche und die Gebildeten* (Freiburg i. Br. 1912, ^{3}1919), 12.— Another phenomenon, popular at that time, but nevertheless rather unpleasant, was the mutual assessments of religiosity among the French and the German Catholics. G. Goyau, *Les catholiques allemands et l'Empire évangélique* (1916) was countered by H. Schrörs, *Deutscher und französischer Katholizismus in den letzten Jahrzehnten* (Freiburg i. Br. 1917). If one disregards the polemical aspects, then one discovers that the two authors are sophisticated enough to make correct points in spite of their animosity.— Regarding the problems of urban pastoral work, see H. Swoboda (Regensburg 1911).

[4] Anton L. Mayer, op. cit., 49f.

[5] K. Kempf, introduction: M. Scheeben already described the divine mark of the sanctity of the Church, "however, he could not furnish the kind of documentation available now." Kempf then describes the "first steps" toward Pius IX's canonization. He lists the saints (or those nominated for canonization) according to their hierarchal position (bishops: 24–49, secular priests: 50–78, members of orders: 79–265, laymen: 266–334, including relatively extensive biographies). He indicates the various stages in the canonization process regarding J. B. Vianney, Klemens M. Hofbauer, Konrad von Parzham, G. Bosco. V. Pallotti, Bernadette Soubirous, and Contardo Ferrini.

"fashionable" to the extent "that the inner life, the grace, the mystery were frightened away"[6] also had an effect on the organization of devotional practices. One of the examples of this is the manner in which First Communicants were now brought into the old Corpus Christi fraternities in groups and forced to sing hymns of Eucharistic theology,[7] which were difficult to comprehend even for adult Christians. Religious devotional art was quite popular at that time and is a difficult phenomenon to assess. In its precise meaning, this kind of popular devotional art appears for the first time in the late nineteenth century as the result of certain cultural and historical conditions. Favored by the possibility of reproduction, popular devotional art demanded and furthered participation in conventional art which was simultaneously isolating itself from society. These demands could not be satisfied. Therefore, they were appeased by elevating popular devotional art one step above banality—a phenomenon which cannot be compared to the disintegration of high art, sustained by an elite, into handicraft.[8] Upon investigation of the mystical essence underlying Eucharistic piety and the Sacred Heart devotion of that time, it becomes clear that the faithful were overtaxed by this bid for sophistication. It is also evident that they were given an acceptable version with the best of intentions and thereby possessed an adequate means of expression in the art forms of the Nazarenes,[9] who had fallen below their original level of quality. These conclusions are comparable to the analysis of secular popular art. Notwithstanding the nationalistic aversion to "the French," the fact remains that these expressions of piety, stemming from the Latin mentality, could only be transferred with difficulty to Germanic countries. The close relationship between art and religion is unquestionable; yet drawing conclusions from this assumption alone would result in a simplified judgment about the religiosity of that period: the faithful of the middle and lower classes were pious in regard to traditional forms of expression. An assessment of the religious quality itself escapes historic evaluation.

The considerable increase of charitable activities in all countries, flourishing in individual parishes, in diocesan societies and (especially in

---

[6] A. Mayer-Pfannholz, op. cit., 129.

[7] *In der Monstranz/Ist Christus ganz/Nicht Brot-Substanz/Ave Jesu/Wahres Man-hu.*

[8] R. Egenter, *Kirsch und Christenleben* (Etal^2 1958; biblio.). It is possible to follow the ethical assessment and to see the function of kitsch, an apparent satisfaction of the senses, as a religious variable without considering the problem of the relation between the shortcomings or elimination of the muses and the quality of religious life to be solved. Nonetheless, the existence of this problem, naturally, reveals something about the situation of the religious experience in the society of the late nineteenth century.

[9] Cf. chap. 19.

France, Italy, and Germany) in national organizations, can be measured by the number of institutions and participants.[10] Lorenz Werthmann (1858–1921) received encouragement from France and the organizational forms of the Protestant "Home Mission" when, in 1897, he founded the *Deutscher Caritas-Verband* and propagated its goals in the publication *Caritas* (since 1896). He had to defend himself against the often-heard reproach that Christian charity had to take place without fanfare,[11] and he had to fend off the envy of the episcopate, which did not recognize the organization until the conference of Fulda (1915) and Freising (1916). This placed it under episcopal supervision and suggested the formation of diocesan branch organizations. The organizational amalgamation of the many charitable institutions did not only aim at the concentration of the various enterprises, but proceeded from the assumption that in the age of industrialism the initiative to help your fellow men was by no means dispensable. However, in the interests of maximal effectiveness, a theoretical investigation of the economic conditions was unavoidable. The *Dictionnaire d'économie* was a model for Werthmann, the first president of the association, whose headquarters he moved to Freiburg in Breisgau, where his bishop had released him for charitable tasks.

How vital it is not to interpret the organizational features of piety as mere externalizations is documented by the emergence of the Eucharistic congress movement. E. Marie Tamisier (born in 1834 in Tours) was one of those restless religious personalities who could not easily be pressed into institutional molds. After having had first a gentle and then a rather rigorous pastor, she was finally fortunate to meet Gaston de Ségur, who assigned to her Eucharistic youthful piety the proper area of activity. Ségur designed a plan of operations entitled "France at the feet of the Most Holy Sacrament," in which he listed the locations of Eucharistic miracles. But we should not forget that he is also the author of *Jésu vivant en nous,* which was condemned because of pantheism and quietism.[12] Upon the industrialist Philibert Vrau's suggestion, a central pilgrimage to Douai was decided on at Lille in 1874. The site of miracles, Avignon became in 1876 the stage for the first Eucharistic mass demonstration (the study conference in connection with this seems to go back to Mermillod, whom Marie Tamisier had encountered earlier in Rome). During an event in Favernay, Besançon in 1878, the first beginnings of the movement's internationalization emerged. Due to the unfavorable political circumstances in France, E. M. Tamisier traveled to see Cardinal Dechamps, who was indeed benevolent, but had misgivings about the Belgian government's reaction and therefore recommended the Netherlands. The archbishop of Utrecht was equally amicable, but advised a talk with Bishop Snikers because Amsterdam had been mentioned as the place for the congress. His hesitant attitude was like a cold shower for the Eucharistic enthusiasm of Tamisier. Finally, on 17 January 1881 in Paris, at the deathbed of Ségur (the Jesuit Verbeker, a Belgian enthusiast for the cause, had come for the occasion), it was decided to organize the congress in France after all, that is in Lille. On several occasions, Leo XIII had given his blessing, but not until 16 May 1881, scarcely one month after the date was announced internationally, did he give his approval.[13] Ségur, who in the face of these difficulties had intended to cancel the congress, did not live to experience it. Three hundred sixty-three clergy and representatives of the laity came, yet the French were in the great majority, in spite of participants from Belgium, Holland, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy. The opening address was entitled "The Social Kingdom of Jesus Christ." The concluding procession was accompanied by about four thousand of the faithful from Lille. Upon Cardinal Dechamps's invitation, Avignon was followed by Liège in 1883, where E. M. Tamisier had had a patron in Bishop Doutreloux for a long time. The congress in Fribourg in 1885 was presided over by Mermillod, who had meanwhile become president of the congress movement. This event for the first time included the entire public. The movement's center of gravity remained for the time being in France (in 1888 in Paris) and in Belgium (in 1898 in Brussels with Cardinal Goossens). National congresses took place in Italy (1891: Naples, 1896: Orvieto, under Cardinal Parocchi, 1897: Venice, under the chairmanship of Patriarch Sarto). The first event to be attended by a papal legate was the congress of Jerusalem in May 1893 under the leadership of Cardinal Langénieux. This congress was characterized by the efforts of the Pope regarding the Near Eastern Churches (fifty Latin bishops in contrast to eighteen Uniate Eastern bishops).[14] At the regional Congress of Washington, Protestants were admitted for the first time. The international congresses in London (1908) and in Amsterdam (1924) resulted in vehement anti-Catholic reactions.[15]

---

[10] Regarding the centennial of the *Société de S. Vincent de Paul: Livre du Centenaire,* 2 vols. (Paris 1935); *Manuel de la Société . . .* (Paris 1958).—Cf. biblio., chap. 16.

[11] L. Werthmann, op. cit., 7. The founding of the *Caritas Verband* contributed greatly to the needed variety of general charitable activities.

[12] Illustrative purposes were served by places such as Bourges, where a Eucharistic miracle had proven the Albigensians wrong in 1224; Paris, where one of the countless demonstrations of anti-Semitism (1290) took place; Pozilla (Perpignan), where the atrocities of the Revolution were remembered.

---

[13] P. Vrau, the superior general of the Assumptionists Picard, and the Vicomte de Damas had traveled to Rome for that reason. In addition to these men, the following became important for the movement: Msgr. de la Bouillerie, M. de Benque, and Comte de Nicolay. They were indicative of the "atmosphere of the *Vieille France,* where the enterprise had found its first disciples" (R. Aubert, op. cit., 62).

[14] Cf. chaps. 25–27.

These boisterous events were in curious contrast[16] to the old and now rejuvenated idea of Perpetual Adoration. But in this form of piety, which happens in complete quietude, the idea of religious reparation was coupled with something like a silent protest. In Rome, in 1883, the "Society of Reparation of the Catholic Nations" was founded, which allotted to individual countries certain weekdays for worship in order to unite the whole world in support of the "imprisoned" Pope. The principal fraternity of daily "Perpetual Adoration," founded in 1890 in the Franciscan church of Turin, was extended in 1893 to all of Italy and in 1909 to include the Catholic world. More congregations and fraternities in the same vein emerged. Among them were the Sisters of Perpetual Adoration, which had branched off in 1893 from the *Steyler Missionsschwestern.* They observed enclosure and spread especially in the United States. Other societies, generally devoted to the worship of the Eucharist, such as the *Sacerdotes Sanctissimi Sacramenti* (S.S.S.), which had been founded in 1856 in Paris and held its communal prayer before the exposed Sacrament, radiated beyond their places of origin during this time. In Rome, in 1902, the "Society of the Acolytes of the Holy Sacrament" was organized for children from five to fifteen years of age. The Eucharistic encyclical of 28 May 1902, *Mirae caritatis*[17] places the institution of the Last Supper at the end of Christ's life in curious analogy to the impending end of the author's life. The encyclical points to the papal approval in regard to Eucharistic institutions and confines itself in other respects essentially to general practices. A few paragraphs, however, point into the future: Mass, though somewhat set off, is placed in line with the other traditional forms of Eucharistic worship, but it is also indicated that it had been the Church's wish all along "that at every Mass the attending faithful should go to the table of the Lord."[18] Three years earlier, in his encyclical *Annum Sacrum* of 25 May 1899,[19] Leo XIII had ordered the consecration of all mankind to the Sacred Heart (after elevating it in 1889 to the liturgical rank of a feast day). This encyclical hardly suggests the mystical love between the Lord and his own because the nonbaptized are "still sitting as the unfortunate ones in the shadow of death," so that only the power of the sovereign and the law can be applied to them. In this respect, the Pope adhered, with Thomas Aquinas, to the medieval conception of the pagan world. Also characteristic is his mention of the cross as the Constantinian sign of victory, replacing it with the "Most Sacred Heart, transcended by the cross surrounded by the splendid halo of a fiery wreath."[20] In 1891 the church of Sacré Cœur on Montmartre in Paris was completed. The restraint with which Pius IX had reacted to the desire for a wordly dedication had been abandoned, and Leo XII, in the conclusion of his letter, supplemented the new motives with a "purely personal, yet noteworthy and valid reason," namely that God had just recently delivered him from a serious illness. The number of Sacred Heart societies founded or confirmed under this pontificate does not fall short of those of Pius IX's era: five societies of priests, twenty-four women's communities, and two brotherhoods.[21] Societies that had an impact on both Americas were favored. The Jesuits were especially involved in the propagation of this form of piety. In 1872, they had consecrated all provinces of their society to the Sacred Heart.[22] Unquestionably, the demonstrative and seigneurial character of this worship under Leo XIII's pontificate intensified; but no one can determine in which way it was the source of true piety for each individual.

---

[15] Regarding the congress movement after Pius X, see R. Aubert, *op. cit.,* 63–66; here: 419f.

[16] The itinerary of the *Benediktinerinnen von der ewigen Anbetung* (1909) includes the French motto: "In isolation, the Eucharistic Savior shall speak, heart to heart, with the one who prays" (quot. in Anton L. Mayer, op. cit., 26).

[17] *ASS,* 34, 641–54; German in Rohrbasser, 106–25.

[18] Rohrbasser, 109, 119, 121.—Cf. chap. 27.

[19] *ASS,* 31, 646–51; Rohrbasser, 77–84. Concerning the spirit of the time, see L. Chasle, L. Sattler, *M. Droste zu Vischering* (Freiburg 1906), 362–67.

Leo XIII had devoted nine encyclicals and seven apostolic letters to the rosary. Their individual tones were rather different. A great portion of the letters deals with the spiritual guidelines for this prayer and only occasionally contains polemic passages. The encyclical *Octobri mense* of 22 September 1891,[23] introducing the daily rosary for the month of October, recalls the "murders and outbursts of hatred" of the Albigensians, who could only be conquered through the power of the rosary; similar incidents are called to mind as well (such as the victory of Lepanto). The Albigensian *impii* were none other than the Freemasons. An interesting token of social criticism is contained in the *Laetitiae sanctae* of 8 September 1893: previously, "the undisturbed security of life was considered the reward for one's toils; today, the masses are only interested in filling this life with a maximum of pleasures, laboring under the illusion that the government system could be perfected to the extent that everything unpleasant would be eliminated."[24] While the October encyclical limited an extreme Mariology through a *fere,*[25] this period, as did others before and after, witnessed extremes regarding Marian worship (e.g., when the rosary became an independent cult).[26] The entreaty *Regina sacratissimi Rosarii,* introduced in 1883 to the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, referred directly to Mary herself. In 1891, Leo XIII approved the Festival of the Appearance of the Virgin for the Church Province of Auch (Pius X did the same for the Church at large in 1907); in addition to the church situated above the grotto (dedicated in 1876), the Church of the Rosary was built between 1883 and 1901 just 20 meters below. Particular attention was given to the Marian Congregation, which had grown a great deal after the rejuvenation of the Society of Jesus. In addition to the Eucharistic congresses, there were now also Marian congresses, such as in Livorno in 1895, in Turin in 1898, in Lyon in 1898, and in Fribourg in 1902 with international attendance. At the same time, along with the consecration to the Virgin of individual nations, the movement beginning with Pius IX to dedicate the whole world to the Heart of the Virgin grew stronger, intensifying at the congresses between 1908 and 1914. Throughout the nineteenth century, many ecclesiastical societies were founded and dedicated to the Virgin. One of the more outstanding ones, because of its practical work, was the *Societas Mariae,* founded in 1871 by Chaminade. Its statutes were approved in 1891 and it did a great service for the educational system in the United States: the *Marianistes de Sainte-Croix* (founded in 1841), taking care of the girls' schools in North America (1883, an independent branch in Canada); the *Missionaires de Notre-Dame de La Salette* (founded in 1852), expanding beyond the diocese of Grenoble; the Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (founded in Spain in 1849 by A. M. Claret y Clará [canonized in 1950]),[27] who gradually spread all over the world, devoting themselves to domestic and foreign missions. There is no question that the increasing Marian devotion entailed abuses far into the twentieth century, particularly sentimentalizing prayers and hymns;[28] but even though the longing for motherly warmth expressed therein could tempt one to withdraw into insular illusion,[29] this form of piety has to be understood in its historical context.

---

[20] Rohrbasser, 80, 81, 82, 83f.

[21] Cf. K. Hofmann, *LThK*² V, 294–99.

[22] In all areas of the Church, countless small papers appeared with Sacred Heart titles or signets (in 1894: B. E. Bougaud, *Histoire de la Bienheureuse Marguérite Marie et les origines de la dévotion du Cœur de Jésus)*.

[23] *ASS*, 24, 193–203; Rohrbasser, 669f. (excerpt).

---

[24] *ASS,* 26, 193–99; Rohrbasser, 678–85 (excerpt).

[25] ". . . ut, quo modo ad summum Patrem, nisi per Filium, nemo potest accedere, ita fere, nisi per Matrem, accedere nemo possit ad Christum" (*ASS* 24, 196).

[26] In the *Annuaire de la Très Sainte Vierge* . . . (1887): "O mon Rosaire chéri, o ma couronne des roses, je vous offrirai tous les jours . . ." (quot. by Anton L. Mayer, op. cit., 52); one needs to consider that this is recited in connection with the Marian interpretation of each day of the year.—Officially banned from the Church were the sisterhood founded in 1888 in Plock (Poland) by Felicja Kozłowska and the Mariavites, a society of priests founded in 1893 by Vicar J. Kowalski, after they were refused recognition by Rome in 1904.

[27] Biography by C. Fernández, 2 vols. (Madrid 1946).

The fact that the figure of Saint Joseph played a role in the education of workers, especially in France, was the reason for French postulates under Leo XIII to enter his name in the *Confiteor, Suscipe,* etc.[30] This circumstance was also mentioned in the encyclical *Quamquam plures* of 15 August 1889, where Saint Joseph, after 1870 the patron of the whole Church, was labeled the model of a good husband and father and a consolation to "the proletariat, the workers, and all people in modest circumstances." The Pope emphasized that they had the right "to strive for an improvement of their situation with all legitimate means," but they had no right "to overturn the order ordained by divine providence."[31] As popular as the devotion to Saint Joseph (one of the most frequent patron names) was in all levels of society, this manual laborer of a patriarchal period of history could not be made a model to be realized in an industrial society; neither could the image of the "Holy Family,"[32] as numerous as the foundings of religious societies named "Holy Family" may have been at that time.[33]

The Catholic enlightenment did not just reduce the multiplicity of forms of piety, it often eliminated them entirely. The reaction to this in the Catholic restoration created even more institutions to practice the numerous new forms of worship whose style was often an expression of the contemporary popular taste, but which differed markedly from the Baroque because they were isolated from the culture as a whole. It is equally significant that while in the wake of the French Revolution class differences between the hierarchy and the people had been eliminated, the clericalism of the nineteenth century established new barriers. This is demonstrated clearly in the focal point of Catholic piety, the Mass. The prologue of H. Bone's *Cantate* (Mainz 1847) says that the "quietly praying congregation" derived "benefit" from being able to participate, from being permitted to "repeat the words."[34] The political implications were expressed by the fact that the liturgical indications of enlightenment are called "communion of the divine service" and furthermore by the statement that the "Catholic temple" would maintain its eminence even if the congregation would never gather there, "because it is not the congregation that is the inspirational principle of the Catholic temple, but rather the indwelling of the All Holy and the sacrifice of the priest."[35] The polemical mentality, which was implicit in the expiatory sacrifice, is documented by the fact that Leo XIII added the prayer of St. Michael to the Marian prayer, which Pius IX had introduced as the conclusion of the Mass.[36] Part of the Catholic restoration were Prosper Guéranger's[37] efforts in Solesmes to restore the liturgical text, to eliminate Gallicisms and to return to the Roman liturgy—efforts which had very fertile effects in later years. They aimed primarily toward a renovation of monastic life, similar to the efforts of the Benedictines, inspired by Solesmes,[38] in their new monastery at Beuron. The distance between the officiating priest and the people, which had a history of a thousand years, was confirmed by the prohibition against translating the text of the Mass. This was renewed once again in 1857 by Pius IX, but violations were not seriously prosecuted any longer.[39] The prohibition was quietly dropped when Leo XIII did not mention it again in the revision of the Index of Forbidden Books in 1897. But the translation of the canon of Holy Scriptures and even more so that of the consecration text was postponed until the twentieth century. By then, however, translations appeared whose subsequent significance could hardly be anticipated at that time. In 1878, the *missel des fidèles* by Gérard van Caloen was published in Maredsous, where, among others, the Beuron monk Anselm Schott resided during the time of the *Kulturkampf.* His *Meßbuch der heiligen Kirche,* published in 1884, had already sold one hundred thousand copies by 1906.[40] It took a long time, however, until the "Mass devotions" in the prayer books were supplemented by liturgical texts. Diocesan prayer books multiplied in Germany during the nineteenth century, but they were only very slowly introduced to the public because of the Holy See's regulations. They contained a wide variety of Mass devotions for special occasions, which were often far removed from the liturgical process itself, even in regard to their psychological interpretation.[41] A German specialty was the "sung Mass," which had been compiled during the period of Enlightenment and now had a very subjective flavor, especially the songs for Communion. Even though Leo XIII pointed out that Communion was a part of the sacrifice of the Mass,[42] "spiritual communion" continued to be recommended. The separation of special prayers of preparation and thanksgiving at the Communion remained the custom until far into the twentieth century.[43] In view of the hectic economic, social, and spiritual developments, one was, as in all areas of ecclesiastical life, intent on devotional writings, which were often carried so far that a differentiation between essential and incidental issues was said to be a "deeply devastating illusion."[44] But in retrospect, even progressive ideas can be discovered. For example, in the case of ritual books, it was recommended that Hosts be offered which were consecrated during Mass itself, because "in this manner, the essence of the Eucharist as consecrated bread and wine and the community of the worshippers . . . is so much more prominent."[45] But such rare pastoral thought remained, for the time being, the privilege of the theologians who were in fact the real pioneers, especially in regard to the significant scholarship in liturgical history.[46]

---

[28] The collection of songs devoted to the Virgin Mary by D. Delama (1898) also contains: "O bella mia speranza, Dolce amor mio, Maria, / Tu sei la vita mia / La pace mia sei Tu." But unless one has joined Italians in the singing of this almost classic sentimental song, he does not know anything about the vitality contained therein, amalgamated as it may be.

[29] A. Mayer-Pfannenholz, op. cit., 128, points to this element in connection with the relationship to the Church.

[30] Jungmann, *MS* I, 221.

[31] *Acta Leonis* IX, 175–82; Rohrbasser, 1110–16 (excerpt).

[32] Brief *Neminem fugit* of 14 June 1892 (*ASS* 25, 8–10), Rohrbasser, 1103ff. (excerpt). In *Graves de communi* (*Acta Leonis* XXI, 18), the Holy Family is an example of poverty leading to virtue.

[33] K. Hofmann, *LThK*^{2} V, 94f.

---

[34] Introduction, VII; cf. Trapp, 278.

[35] Jungmann, op. cit., 206.

[36] ". . . worried by the devilish spoof created by Leo Taxil": T. Klauser, op. cit., 58.

[37] Jungmann, op. cit., 210.

[38] Cf. chap. 17.

[39] Jungmann, op. cit., 214.

[40] D. Zähringer, 75 *Jahre Schott* (Freiburg i. Br. 1959).

Even though the statistics of canonizations do not constitute a "century of saints" like the seventeenth century, the very few outstanding spiritual personalities constituted, together with the great number of anonymous devotees, a historical "balance," without which a period cannot be understood. Charles de Foucauld (1858–1916) was one of them, no matter whether the impending beatification process will be finalized or not. After his conversion in 1886, the officer lived at first as a Trappist in France and Syria (1890–96), then, until 1900, as a hermit in Nazareth. In 1901, he was ordained priest.[47] His idea of realizing Jesus' message entirely through the example of his own life without any physical protection in the midst of a Moslem world (which remained closed to all missions from the beginning to the present day) can be seen as a prophecy of the conditions of Christian life in the future, despite—or because of—the fact that Foucauld died in absolute solitude (he was shot by Tuaregs).

---

[41] J. Hacker, op. cit., 132ff.; Anton L. Mayer, op. cit., 61. In the "Mass in honor of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ," the prayer in intervals reminds one of the olive grove, the kiss at the altar, the kiss of Judas, etc. Similar features in *Livre de piété de la jeune fille* (1885).

[42] Concerning the debates before Pius X, see chap. 27.

[43] Well-known examples are also: C. Fievet, *Formulaire de prières pour les enfants de Marie* (1904); J. Millner, *The Key of Heaven* (1891); cf. J. Hacker, op. cit., 68, Anton L. Mayer, op. cit., 63ff.

[44] F. Hettinger, *Aphorismen über Predigt und Prediger* (Freiburg i. B. 1888), 276. According to Hettinger, the liturgy, like the *Biblia pauperum,* includes all the secrets of faith and the whole of Christian ethics. In his work about the liturgy and the Latin language (1856) he had said that the liturgy carried "the mark of constancy . . . like faith itself" (16) and any kind of variation should be rejected (36) (cf. Trapp, 277; Jungmann, op. cit., 210).

[45] A. Gaßner, *Pastoral* . . . (Salzburg 1881), 997.—Concerning Pius X, see 426.

[46] Anton L. Mayer, op. cit., 75ff.—V. Thalhofer, *Liturgik,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1883–93), I, 246, welcomes "the most recent custom" of letting the people at least sing the responsory. He saw in the liturgy a "constant order" (Trapp, 277) and not the genetic element; however, this is true for most historiographic theologians who limited change to the adiaphora (cf. chap. 22).

In contrast, Thérèse Martin, the saint of Lisieux (1873–97), was completely a witness of her own time, in spite of her effect on the twentieth century. This statement, to be sure, requires that her recent reassessment as an existentialist be regarded sceptically. It is probably no exaggeration to say that Thérèse of Lisieux[48] embodied the entire structure of piety as it had developed since the second third of the nineteenth century. This piety was propagated by the *milieu* Catholicism which was to be ridiculed later, at a time devoid of understanding. It was expressed in the tasteless pictures of her time, embedded in the clan spirit and subsequent exuberant sentimentality of a devout French family. The extraordinary feature of this saint was her conventionality, which caused her to take the "narrow path" of mystical love for God, like Teresa of Avila, who remained a stranger to Thérèse and her friends. Though remaining in the Carmelite tradition, Thérèse activated it, however, when she recognized that the clergy, revered "like gods," required intercession. But in spite of her submersion in the New Testament, she did not depart from the contemporary image of Jesus. The revision of her literary remains[49] by the Carmelite order and the significance of the critical edition has been overestimated as well as underestimated. However, and this is crucial, there is no difference between Thérèse Martin's influence, which was quickly felt all over the Catholic world, and her own religious existence.[50]

---

[47] Ed.: *Oeuvres spirituelles* (Paris 1958); M. Carrouges, *Ch. de Foucauld* (Fribourg^2 1958); J.-F. Six, *Itinéraire spirituel de Ch. de Foucauld* (Paris 1958, biblio.); R. Aubert, *DHGE* 17, 1394–1402.

[48] Thérèse Martin was the fifth surviving daughter of a French middle class family that conducted a successful lace business in Normandy (Alençon) thanks to the mother's energy. Her father was a watchmaker and jeweler. The atmosphere in the home was determined by strict piety and scorn of the modern "world"—even though the family participated in its economy. All the daughters joined the Carmelites of Lisieux (Normandy, where the father had moved to settle in his house in the country after the mother's early death). The last of them to join (after Thérèse's death), Léonie, was a difficult child and probably not quite understood by Thérèse. When her mother died, Thérèse was barely four years old and was raised by her sister Pauline (later Mére Agnès), who later, against the will of the spiritual director and the bishop, instigated Thésèse's admission to the convent when she was fifteen. Pauline herself had been a member since 1882. During the years until 1886, which were the most painful years of her life, according to her own testimony, she was torn away from her childhood amidst a happy family. She suffered periodically from a severe mental illness, including tremendous scruples and unusual, frightening visions. The crisis resulted in the awareness "que j'étais née pour la gloire," and she felt destined to be "a great [stricken in the precritical edition] saint," but not in the eyes of man. At a pilgrimage to Rome in 1887, she asked Leo XIII to grant her an audience. She did this according to the plan of her prioress, Marie de Gonzague, and her sister Pauline-Agnés, but in disobedience to the episcopal representative. However, the Pope sent her in a friendly, but correct manner to the proper Church authorities (more in chap. 6 of the *Histoire d'une Âme;* I. F. Görres [n. 56], 198–208). On 9 April 1888, Thésèse received the bishop's permission to enter the Carmelite order. In 1893, under Prioress Agnès, it had twenty members, four of them Martin sisters. They formed a special group within the spiritually average community. Even when disregarding the sisters' criticism of Marie de Gonzague, who was again elected prioress in 1896, as several times before, it is clear that the aristocratic nun was not equal to her task, which, indeed, was particularly difficult in this group (I. F. Görres, 258–88, practices more restraint than most biographers). "Most of all, today I had nothing but bitter dryness for the daily bread of my soul" (chap. 8 of *Histoire d'une Âme*): This word [dryness], which is not literary but original (Juan de la Cruz, whom she used to read later, left her "cold"), is the motto of her monastic life. Moreover, her four

---

sisters, though dear to her, were one of her main problems. The "dryness" increased until God was totally absent, even at the hour of her death (she died of tuberculosis, twenty-four years old). Her last words, spoken while looking at her small cross, are preserved: "O, I love Him. My God, I love you."

[49] Ed.: Her literary legacy, published in 1898 under the title *Histoire d'une Âme,* contains her memoirs, which she recorded between January 1895 and January 1896 at the instigation of her real sister Agnès, at that time prioress. It also includes the letter to her sister (in both senses of the word) Marie written in September 1896, writings instigated by Prioress Marie Gonzague in June 1897, letter fragments, notes of conversations, and poems added by Agnès. The critical facsimile edition, edited by the Carmelite François de Sainte-Marie in 1956, demonstrates that a lot of essential material had been changed stylistically or eliminated. Moreover, the edition of 1898 contains considerable additions. The correspondence edition by A. Combes (Lisieux 1948) was followed by editions of notes, poetry, and prayers (cf. A. Combes, *LThK*^{2} X, 102ff.).—For decades, the edition of 1898 determined the image of Thérèse; but it is, in her own words, a "synthesis of the best expressive elements from different photographs" (François de Sainte-Marie, *Visage de Thérèse de Lisieux. Portrait* [Lisieux 1961]).—Biblio.: After her canonization in 1925: A.-P. Laveille, *Sainte Thérèse . . . d'après les documents officiels du Carmel de Lisieux* (ibid., 1926).—After the beginning of the critical eds.: A. Combes, *Introduction à la spiritualité de Ste. Thérèse* (Paris 1948, Trier 1951 [German]); H. Urs v. Balthasar, *Thérèse de Lisieux* (Cologne 1950); G. Bernoville, *Ste. Thérèse . . .* (Paris 1954); I. F. Görres, *Das Senfkorn von Lisieux* (Freiburg i. Br. 1958), revised edition of *Das verborgene Antlitz* (Freiburg i. Br. 1944); St. J. Piat, *Ste. Thérèse à la découverte de la voie d'enfance* (Paris 1964); J. F. Sise, *La véritable enfance de Th. de Lisieux* (Paris 1972); *Th. de Lisieux au Carmel* (Lisieux 1973); R. Laurentin, *Th. de Lisieux. Mythes et réalités* (Paris 1972).

[50] The *Histoire . . .* of 1898 sold 700,000 copies in France within three decades. A popular edition sold 2.5 million copies. By 1925, the book had been translated into thirty-five languages.—From 1897 until her canonization, 30.5 million pictures of the saint were sold and 17.5 million sent off as souvenirs (A.-P. Laveille, op. cit., 455).

CHAPTER 17

The Organization in the Old and New Orders Inner Reform and the Power of Attraction

Even though Pius IX had repeatedly interfered in the reorganization of the Franciscan order (O.F.M.), it was not possible to bring about the necessary revision of the statutes in view of the more or less anachronistic discussions within the order. At the general chapter of 1862, one proposal received a great majority, but appeared in 1882 only as a draft.[1] A memorandum presented at this chapter, according to which the Observants, Reformed, Discalced, and Recollects were to unite under the name "Franciscans," was rejected as inopportune. Only at the general chapter in 1889, which took place in the new Collegium S. Antonii in Rome, were uniform constitutions passed. They were not, however, accepted by the Reformed, who were allowed to keep their special statutes and who consequently began a lively propaganda campaign against the union despite the prevalent opinion among the Reformed that the monastic discipline of the Observants was no less strict than theirs. But even now, the new constitutions were only practiced in the numerous provinces in different versions. Leo XIII made Cardinal Mauri, a Dominican, president of the General Chapter of Assisi in 1895, and he announced that the union of the different branches of the orders was to be the main topic of the Chapter. The draft contained the demand that the statutes be applicable to all, that they determine the customs in the territorial divisions of the provinces, and that the order not have, as heretofore, only one general, but also one procurator. At the voting, which took place separately in each of the four orders, the Observants voted almost unanimously in favor of the bill, the Reformed and the Discalced voted against it. After the interpretation of the order's poverty was accepted by the Recollects, a general secret vote turned out in favor of the union by 77 to 31 votes, a result which changed considerably after subsequent "yes" votes (8 no, 100 yes). Leo XIII ratified the resolutions on 15 May 1897, and he issued the constitution *Felicitate quadam.* Friars who were conscientious objectors were delegated to special houses. The Spanish provinces, however, insisted on their privileges, recognizing the constitutions, but continuing to refuse submission to the order's general. In the eighties, the order counted only 14,000 friars; by 1907 there were 17,092 (8,152 were priests) in 1,460 houses. Pius IX's plan to unite the Conventuals and the Capuchins failed. The Conventuals still had 1,481 members in 1893 (in 1884, they succeeded in uniting with the Spaniards). In 1907 the nuns of the Order of Saint Clare (Poor Clares), which was mostly destroyed after the French Revolution, numbered 10,204 sisters in 518 cloisters. The Third Order developed remarkably after 1883, when Leo XIII had modernized the rules, reducing, on the one hand, the regulations for prayer exercises and fasting, on the other hand, requiring monthly confessions (previously only three per year). It is estimated that around the turn of the century 2.5 million belonged to the order, which tried to differ from the activities of other orders primarily by intensifying religious life.[2]

---

[1] H. Holzapfel, op. cit., 371–79.

"The day we become centralized will be the day when a reform will be impossible. The lively spontaneity will be eliminated and replaced by bureaucracy, which may be very well, but it imitates life and is not life itself;" this idea, attributed to Prosper Guéranger, the founder of the Abbey of Solesmes (1837),[3] is more than a social theory of the constitution of the Benedictine order. It is the expression of a spirituality of contemplation, which is impossible without spontaneity. Conversely, the spirituality of activism requires organizational concentration. Significantly, the following sentence belongs in the context of this statement: "What is strength for the Jesuits, is a danger for us." In 1862, Prior Maurus (Rudolf) Wolter was in Solesmes for three months, where he was deeply moved by the spirit of Guéranger. Wolter had just negotiated with the royal court of the Prince von Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen to transfer the secularized Augustinian Beuron monastery to his as yet very small community of monks.[4] After the catastrophes of the Revolution and the secularizations, and for internal reasons also, the Benedictine order had difficulties recovering. This is evidenced by the efforts both in France, where Solesmes certainly inspired new foundations, and especially in Bavaria, where Ludwig I encountered little response to his desire to revive the Benedictine order (1830: reopening of Metten Abbey, beginning of the Bavarian congregation, which flourished in the course of the nineteenth century).[5] Here, it was a question of revitalizing old monasteries; Solesmes and Beuron in form and concept were new foundations. The theoretical and practical inclination to the liturgy as the focal point of spirituality[6] was at first an internal monastic affair; but finally, this renascence was to penetrate the public life of the Church. In view of the small number of order members,[7] the tendency to found more and more filial monasteries and to achieve the status of a congregation is striking. In the newly reopened Metten Abbey, Fr. Bonifaz Wimmer strove to expand to the United States, where the bishop of Pittsburgh gave him the community of Saint Vincent in Latrobe (1846). But the bishop vehemently resisted its elevation to an abbey, particularly since the Irishman did not wish the pastoral work of the Germans to become even more independent.[8] Fr. Wimmer succeeded in Rome with the assistance of the Bavarian delegation, and the monastery became the pioneer foundation of the American Cassinese Congregation. While the Propaganda Fide had reservations about Metten's activity, the Swiss monks from Einsiedeln were welcomed in Indiana, where, from the Abbey of Saint Meinrad (1871), they devoted themselves to the mission of the Sioux Indians. In 1884, this abbey joined, within the Swiss-American Congregation, the Swiss branch of the Engelberg monastery in Missouri, which had likewise been elevated to an abbey. One of the motives for these Swiss activities had been the concern that the radical Liberals could abolish the monasteries in their homeland. The eagerness of the young Beuron Abbey[9] to found more branches was given ample opportunity in Maredsous in 1878, where (in the same year) Placidus Wolter became the first abbot. The abbey owed this opportunity to the initiative of the Desclée family. The monastery, in which a flourishing abbey school was established in 1881, had a gifted journalist in the monk van Caloen, who, in 1884, founded the periodical *Messager des fidèles* (since 1890: *Revue bénédictine*). In Anselm Schott of Beuron they had a mediator of the liturgy for the lay world and later the reorganizer of the Brazilian Benedictines. At the suggestion of Bishop Ullathorne, O.S.B. (Birmingham),[10] Maredsous initially branched out into Erdington, which became an abbey in 1896 but disappeared in 1922. Another branch, founded by Bishop Ullathorne, the Priory of Fort Augustus (Scotland), which was established in 1878 from Downside, was elevated in 1882 by Leo XIII to an abbey and placed under direct jurisdiction of Rome. After a visitation by Placidus Wolter and Leo Linse, prior of Erdington, undertaken by order of Rome, the latter was appointed adviser of Prior Kentiger-Milne, who *ad nutum Sanctae sedis* had to resign for Linse's benefit in 1887 (Linse became abbot in 1888). The closing of Beuron in 1875 during the *Kulturkampf*[11] turned Maurus Wolter's attention toward Austria. After an unsuccessful attempt in the Tyrol, through Cardinal Schwarzenberg's mediation, Wolter was given the almost empty Emaus monastery in Prague by Emperor Franz Joseph. Emaus, in turn, sent monks to the former canonry of Seckau (Styria; 1887 abbey). After Placidus Wolter had taken two trips to Rome (1882–83) and had brought about the approval of the constitutions of the Beuron congregation, Maurus Wolter became archabbot of Beuron (1885).[12] Like Fr. Wimmer of Metten, Fr. A. Amrhein turned to the Propaganda Fide (1882),[13] where he was exclaustrated by the Pope in 1884. The mission monastery of Reichenbach (Upper Palatinate), under episcopal jurisdiction, was transferred in 1887 to Saint Ottilien (near the Ammersee) and elevated to independent priory (1902 abbey) by the Propaganda Fide after some controversy (1897).[14] Thanks to the transferral of the apostolic prefecture, which, upon Bismarck's suggestion, was established in Zanzibar (German East Africa), it became the starting point of the *Kongregation von Sankt Ottilien,* which developed world-wide missionary activities.[15] The first archabbot of Saint Ottilien, which became the largest abbey of the order, was Norbert Weber (1902–1930). The plan, favored by Bishop Korum, to settle the former Abbey of Saint Matthias in Trier in 1888–91 with monks from Beuron failed, because the diocesan clergy did not want to relinquish a parish.

---

[2] H. Holzapfel, op. cit., 671.—In 1909, this historian of the order assumed "that in more than one respect the author's opinions were not shared by the order's leadership" (foreword, VII). This should prove to be correct, but with certain consequences; the criticism of the order's legalism had caused dismay (cf. K.-V. Selge in the review of K. Eßer and E. Grau, "Franziskanisches Leben [Werl 1968]," *ZKG* 82 [1971], 133f.).

[3] In P. Delatte, *Dom Guéranger,* 2 vols. (Paris 1909), II, 344.—Regarding the expansion of Solesmes until the turn of the century, see Schmitz IV, 165; P. Weißenberger, *Das Benediktinische Mönchtum im 19. u. 20. Jh.* (Beuron 1953).

[4] Maurus (Rudolf) Wolter (1825–90), after 1850 priest and high school teacher in the Rhineland, followed his brother Placidus (Ernst) as a novice into the Benedictine monastery of *S. Paolo fuori le mura* in Rome (1856). There, the brothers made the acquaintance of the widowed Princess Katharina von Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen (née Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst). An admirer of the Benectine monks, she had negotiated with Pius IX a new monastery in Germany and, with her stepson, a settlement in Beuron after an attempt in Cleve had failed (U. Engelmann, *LThK*² X, 1220f., including biblio., also about the connection with Guntherianism).

---

[5] Schmitz IV, 171ff.

[6] Cf. chaps. 16 and 18.

[7] Heimbucher I, 173, reports for 1896 the "approximate sum" of 2,000 *patres* in approx. 120 monasteries, organized into 14 congregations. Statistics of 1929 in S. Hilpisch, op. cit., 390–95; id., for 1958; more than 12,000 friars in more than 200 monasteries (*LThK*[2] II, 192).

[8] S. Hilpisch, op. cit., 274ff.; the bishop is said to have "undermined" his elevation (cf. chap. 10). Saint Vincent became an archabbey in 1892.

[9] V. Fiala, *Ein Jahrhundert Beuroner Geschichte. 1863–1963* (Beuron 1963).

The historian of the Dominican order rightly remarked that Leo XIII involved himself in the affairs of the Franciscans (1892) and the Benedictines (1893) much "deeper" than in those of his own order.[16] The papal plan in regard to the Benedictines had been prepared for some time after the congregations had negotiated in vain. In 1886, a congress of the abbots of the Monte Cassino congregation took place in Rome. After separating from the congregation of Subiaco (1871) in order to realize a stricter observance under Abbott Casaretto,[17] this congregation had gone through a process of rejuvenation. The main issue was the renewal of the College of Saint Anselmo as a Benedictine world center. It opened in 1888 temporarily in the *Palazzo dei Convertendi* under the leadership of Archbishop J. Dusmet, O.S.B. (born in Palermo), to whom Leo XIII had explained his ideas of a totally Benedictine college in 1887 (Dusmet was elevated to cardinal in 1889). The next step was the ordination of Hildebrand de Hemptinne[18] in Monte Cassino as abbot of Maredsous, after Placidus Wolter had become archabbot of Beuron and thus successor to his brother, who had died in 1890. A brief of 9 December 1892 called all Benedictine abbots of the world to convene for the occasion of laying the foundation stone of Saint Anselmo on the Aventine in Rome in April of the following year. During a trip in 1887 by order of the Pope for the purpose of preparing the congress, O'Gorman, prefect of the English Benedictine congregation, encountered considerable resistance from the Benedictine abbots. In spite of that, Leo XIII decided to act. In a speech on 20 April 1893, Cardinal Dusmet interpreted the intentions of the Pope, stating that the *Societas quaedam* should not abolish the individual characteristics of the congregations.[19] The abbots were to make a decision on the following points: the election of an abbot primate to represent the entire order in Rome (after consultation with the abbots; election of a *repraesentans* [rather than a primate] with a two-thirds majority [however, in accordance with Leo XIII's wish the first primate was appointed by the Pope]); the abbot primate to reside in the College of Saint Anselmo, which does not belong to any congregation and represents its own community, composed of various congregations (consultation with the abbots: the confederation should not imply dependence on a certain congregation); the primate's term of office to be twelve years (the term of the abbot prefect heading a congregation: six years). On 12 July, the "confederation" was confirmed by the papal brief *Summum semper.* The confederation meant a deep invasion of the old structure of the Benedictine monastic life and certainly did not correspond to Prosper Guéranger's ideal. Whether this ideal could generally be realized and whatever the confederation really meant, is equally debated. Even Pius XII had to deal with the constitution of the confederation.[20]

---

[10] Schmitz IV, 168f.; cf. chap. 7.

[11] Concerning the development of Beuron, see Schmitz IV, 174f. and V. Fiala (see n. 9).

[12] Concerning art in Beuron, cf. chap. 19.

[13] Abbot Maurus Wolter permitted Fr. Amrhein to join a missionary society, but in such a manner that the Beuron congregation could "profit from your apostolic activities" (P. Weissenberger, op. cit., 36).

[14] In 1896, Abbot J. Schober of Seckau visited Saint Ottilien by order of the archabbot and "as the representative of the archabbot of Beuron" (Weissenberger, op. cit., 55). In November, Schober became the superior general and inspector in Saint Ottilien by order of the Pope "to overcome internal difficulties" (Weissenberger, op. cit., 56).

[15] F. Renner, ed., *Der fünfarmige Leuchter,* 2 vols. (Sankt Ottilien 1971).

---

[16] A. Walz, *Frühwirt,* 166.

[17] Regarding the internal tensions because of the new constitutions, see Schmitz IV, 184.

[18] Hildebrand de Hemptinne (1849, Geneva; 1913, Beuron) was sixteen years old when he became a *Zuave* (member of the papal body guard created in 1860), and in 1870 he became a novice in Beuron (H. de Moreau, *H. de Hemptinne* [Paris 1930; Germ., 1938]; Schmitz IV, 168–246f.

[19] "Advertendum interea existimo verba Summi Pontificis . . . ita accipienda esse et intelligenda, uti si ex foederatis familiis Societas quaedam formetur et stet, quae uniuscuiusque familiae specialem ac nationalem characterem ac propria statuta revereatur et servet"; S. Hilpisch, op. cit., 386ff.; S. Mayer, *Die benediktinische Konföderation* (Beuron 1957); Schmitz IV, 244–47, also regarding the discussion about a confederation within the order in 1868–69.

After the Beuron congregation had sent at first only a few monks to the desolate Brazilian abbeys, van Caloen made two inspection tours in 1894/95, reporting about them to the Beuron general convention in Maredsous. Olinda, where van Caloen became abbot,[21] was the point of departure for the rejuvenation of the Brazilian congregation, whose headquarters was the abbey of Saint Benedict in Rio de Janeiro. The Portuguese monasteries of Cucujaes and Singeverga, which were integrated into the Beuron congregation and visited in 1894 by the abbot of Seckau, became victims of the political development. The archabbey of Beuron, which was chosen by the abbot primate in 1896 as the place for a convention of the abbots, initiated the establishment of Maria Laach, whose church Emperor Wilhelm II gave to the Beuron monks in 1892 after an audience with Placidus Wolter (1893 papal erection of the abbey, W. Benzler first abbot).[22]

Shortly before his death in 1872, the master general of the Dominicans, V. A. Jandel, witnessed the reincorporation of the Spanish provinces which had been separated in 1804. After the interim of the vicariate general under J. M. Sanvito, the provincial of the Roman province, Jandel was succeeded by J. M. Larroca (elected by mail), who had been the vicar general in Manila and contributed to the restoration of the order's unity in Spain. In spite of Jandel's efforts, the membership of the order had diminished under his office, even by 1910 it had barely reached the status of 1844.[23] The general chapter of 1885 in Louvain decided to purchase a new residence for the general in Rome in the Via San Sebastiano. Shortly before his death, Larroca became "somehow"[24] entangled in the controversy regarding papal politics toward the Italian state, having made some positive statements about Bonomelli's (bishop of Cremona)[25] translation of the *Homiliae* by Monsabré, who had been the preacher of Notre Dame until 1890. As with the Franciscans and Benedictines, Leo XIII had also directed his attention to the rearrangement of the Dominicans, and in a letter of 31 May 1889 he impressed upon them the observance of the *vita communis.* After Larroca's death on 8 January 1891, the Pope wanted to appoint a vicar general. However, J. A. Laboré, the provincial of Lyon, presented himself. The general chapter, whose residence determines the office of the vicariate general, was convening in Lyon.[26] At the general chapter, the greatest majority of votes went to Andreas Frühwirth, who had just been made provincial of the Austrian imperial province for the second time; the intransigent Laboré was nominated as the second candidate. The Styrian Andreas Frühwirth (1845–1933) had joined the order in 1863, had studied in Graz and Rome, and became provincial of the imperial province for the first time in 1880–84. Until 1904 he was to the Dominicans an equally energetic and diplomatically adroit general, who prevented the order from showing any signs of weakness, and who was eager, primarily, to make himself indispensable for Neo-Thomism. With amazing energy he visited province after province[27] and regularly conducted general chapters (1895 in Avila, 1898 in Vienna, 1901 in Ghent, 1904 in Viterbo).[28] Frühwirth devoted himself with special passion to the establishment of colleges.[29] In a letter of 4 October 1893,

---

[20] Concerning centralization, see Hostie, 239f.

[21] Chap. 8, n. 36; also: M. E. Scherrer, "Ein großer Benediktiner, Abt Michael Kruse von São Paulo, 1864–1929," *SM* 17, suppl. (1963); id., "Beuron und die Restauration der Abteien in Brasilien," V. Fiala, *Beuron 1863–1963* (Beuron 1963); J. Jongmans, "A Restauração da Congregação beneditina brasileira. Papel de Gerad van Caloen," *Revista eclesiast, brasileira* 32 (1972), 640–54.

[22] Wilhelm II demonstrated his benevolence with his visits in 1897 and 1901. Beuron entertained him in 1910. S. Merkle, 66 (biblio., introduction), remarked in 1914 during a presentation in honor of Wilhelm II that the Benedictines "were the least involved in the quarrels of this world."

---

[23] 1844: 4,562 members; 1876: 3,341; 1910: 4,472 (A. Walz, *Compendium,* paragraph 20).

[24] A. Walz, *Frühwirth,* 166; according to Walz, Larroca destroyed all documents related to this context.

[25] Chap. 5.

[26] A. Walz, *Frühwirth,* 166: "It was unfortunate that the Pope was initially informed incorrectly about the general vicariate of the order after Larroca's death. It seemed as if the Pope was to appont him." When Laboré appeared in Rome, the Pope is supposed to have said: "Why does one not simply follow the constitutions?"

[27] On 23 April 1895, the German order province was restored (Albert Trapp: first father superior).

[28] A. Walz, *Frühwirth,* 167, noted that the voters of the general were careful not "to dissatisfy the great patron of the order, Leo XIII." Pius X must have been more to Frühwirth's liking, according to the Dominican writer Walz, who knew him personally. Pius showed the general "sympathy in the handling of individual problems, while Leo XIII was balancing on the high wire of general benevolence . . . . More could be achieved with Pius X in one year than with Leo XIII in one decade" (272).

[29] List in A. Walz, *Frühwirth,* 241–43.

Leo XIII made the Dominican order solely responsible for the edition of Thomas Aquinas.[30] After three years, in 1882, the commission of cardinals appointed for this edition had published the first volume, and by 1892 seven volumes (Cardinal Giuseppe Pecci, the Pope's brother, headed the commission of the cardinals for the edition). In April 1903 the Pope received volume XI from the Dominicans.

During the generalship of Frühwirth there occurred the initial controversies regarding the Dominican M.-J. Lagrange. His first attempts to develop a "critical method" for interpreting the Pentateuch produced often crude suspicions after the Congress of Fribourg in 1897. Frühwirth, who had given Lagrange the title of "Master of Theology" in 1901, provided his research with some protection in his capacity as general of the order (until 1903).[31] However, Pius X assigned the leadership of the new Biblical Institute not to the Dominicans, but to the Jesuits.[32] In terms of spirituality, the order went along with the consecration to the Sacred Heart and the pledge to recite the rosary as was the general trend of the time.

After the death of the general of the Jesuits, P.-J. Beckx (1795–1887), during whose long term in office (since 1853) the number of members had increased remarkably (in spite of the prohibitions),[33] the Swiss A. M. Anderledy, assistant for German-speaking provinces, took office. His predecessor had generally practiced moderation, but under Anderledy, who, as head of the German province, had emphatically supported the *Syllabus* (1864), those indiscriminate polemics against everything modern broke through, polemics which clouded the apostolic goals of the Society of Jesus. It is significant for the new general that he neglected the Fathers and the religious authors in his writings and that he preferred to rely on papal letters addressed to the society and on selected quotations from general congregations and generals.[34] His successor, the Spaniard Luis Martín (general 1892–1906), deserves credit for the history of the order, and he assigned the edition of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* to the Spanish provinces. After his election he was greeted warmly by Leo XIII.[35] The Society of Jesus still preferred to think of philosophy as *ancilla theologiae* rather than theology itself, which theme the Jesuits concentrated on in terms of the question of grace and an ecclesiology oriented toward the papacy. During Leo XIII's pontificate, however, the tendency of the Gregoriana toward postive theology, and against speculative theology, was corrected, and as a result the Pope's brother, Giuseppe Pecci, left the Jesuits (he was reinstated shortly before his death). The general congregation of 1883 decided to choose the encyclical on Aquinas, *Aeterni Patris,* as its guideline, and in 1886 Leo XIII confirmed the privileges of the society. The traditional emphasis on moral theology proved fruitful in dealing with the problems of modern society, with Jesuit authors providing important contributions.[36] To the influential publications of the order were added the *Przeglad Powszechny* (in Cracow since 1884), *Razón y Fé* (Madrid since 1901), *America* (New York since 1909). Wherever Jesuits were allowed to be active in schools, especially in the United States, lively discussions were held about curricula, primarily the relationship of humanism to the exact sciences. These debates essentially ended in 1906 with an adaptation to the secular schools.[37]

---

[30] A. Walz, *Compendium,* 527, 616f.; cf. chap. 20.

[31] Cf. chap. 23.

[32] A. Walz, *Frühwirth,* 216f.; "the courageous Dominican pioneer of a reasonable and progressive exegesis . . . should expect new trials." Regarding the further development of the Bible Institute and the nunciature of Frühwirth in Munich (1907–15), cf. chaps. 33 and 35.

[33] 1838: 3,067; 1850: 1,874; 1874: 9,260; 1900: 15,073; 1914: 16,894 (1950: 30,579).

[34] "He stressed more the "old intrinsic values" of the order . . . rather than demanding to look for the positive aspects in our modern time" (H. Becher, *LThK*² I, 507); id., *Jesuti en,* 370.

[35] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 567.

It is a remarkable phenomenon that the Jesuits continued to have relatively large numbers of new recruits in spite of the prohibitions. In Portugal (which refused admission of Jesuits in 1814, accepted them in 1829, and retracted admission again in 1834), the Jesuits had only a short period of activity from 1880 until 1908. In France, schools had to be closed in 1880, because the order could not accept the school laws. In Italy, where the general of the order had been expelled from the professed house al Gesù, and had to settle in Fiesole (1895, Curia transferred back to Rome), the Jesuits were prohibited or at least inhibited from living together. New members were scarce, in contrast to Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, where the order obtained many new members for its activities in foreign countries, particularly in the United States.[38] A majority resolution of the German *Reichstag* (168 to 145) for reinstatement was voted down in the *Bundesrat.* However, the Redemptorists, who had turned to Latin America after their suppression in Europe, were not considered an illegal organization any longer. Rather unencumbered, the Jesuits were able to develop in Austria-Hungary after 1820. There they had high schools, and also the college *Stella matutina* (since 1856) in Feldkirch and the theological faculty of the University of Innsbruck,[39] centers of learning that influenced Germany also. In the province of England, which was combined with Ireland, Maryland, New York, and Missouri through a vice-province, conflicts arose concerning pastoral work, which were intensified when the College of Chelsea was established through direct papal authority over the heads of the episcopate; consequently the Jesuits did not have Cardinal Manning as a friend. After his death, the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the College of Stonyhurst in 1894 served as a kind of conciliatory event. Conflicts between the German-speaking Jesuits in the United States were emotionalized by the question of nationalities.

---

[36] Cf. chaps. 21, 12, and 13.

[37] Cf. chaps. 10 and 12.

[38] With 1,167 members around the turn of the century, the German province was the strongest among the twenty-three provinces; Heimbucher (1897) II, 135.

[39] The anti-Jesuit activities of the Liberals in Vienna during the seventies failed, last but not least, because of the opposition of the Tyrolese provincial diet.

Since the Cistercians of the Strict Observance and the Reform congregations could not come to an agreement, the Reformed Cistercians (Trappists) separated in 1892, a separation which Leo XIII confirmed in his brief of 17 March 1893 and the decree of 1902, including the privileges of the old order. In 1898 they were able to obtain the original monastery of Cîteaux. The Cistercians of the old observance still possessed at the end of the nineteenth century thirty-two monasteries, most of them in Austria-Hungary (Mehrerau on Lake Constance was the only Swiss-German congregation). Papal unification tactics, successful with the Franciscans, would have been out of the question in this case.[40]

Another reform attempt at this time failed and ended in the isolation of the initiator. Mère Marie du Sacré-Cœur (died in 1901) had intended to improve the training of the *Filles de Notre-Dame* according to the model of Bruges, but she had encountered the resistance of the bishop of Clermont. Even though she had gained the support of Monsignor d'Hulst in 1895 and finally the partial assistance of the French episcopate, she was sent back to her old convent, which, however, did not accept her.[41]

The extraordinary activity regarding the new establishment of congregations had peaked by the middle of the century. Most congregations were unable to extend their local impact. The Christian Brothers, one of the older congregations, achieved significant success and could be found all over the world toward the end of the century. The Redemptorists experienced a similar upswing. By 1900 they had 132 foundations, 30 of them in Italy, and after 1894 they were also admitted in Germany. The Salesians of Don Bosco, who counted 774 members in 57 foundations in 1888 at the death of their founder, expanded also outside of

---

[40] A. Wulf, *Compendium of the History of the Cistercian Order* (Milwaukee 1944); C. Grolleau and G. Chastel, *L'ordre de Cîteau. La Trappe* (Paris ^{2}1954).

[41] Dansette (biblio., chap. 16), 26f. Msgr. Sueur, the bishop of Avignon, had allowed her book *Les religieuses enseignantes* to be printed. The chief opponent was the archbishop of Aix. It was a question of adopting the curriculum of the *écoles normales* in order to prepare the students properly for their teaching duties.

Italy, and by 1900 they had gained about 2,000 members in 300 houses (since 1903 also in Austria). They intensified their activities, begun in 1875, in the foreign mission.[42] The Pallotines (finally confirmed in 1904) experienced a more rapid development only after World War I. In terms of members, the Sisters of Charity (Vincentians) were leading all female congregations. They suffered civil restrictions relatively rarely and in general only for short periods of time, because everyone was dependent on their hospital care. At the end of the century, they counted approximately thirty thousand sisters in 2,500 houses. The Sisters of the Sacred Heart, founded in Paris, began in 1879 the beatification process of their founder Sophie Barat.

It was a character trait of the activities of the Dominican general Andreas Frühwirth that he paid special attention to the financial situation of the provinces of his order and the office of the general. Economic foundations had always played a significant role in the history of the orders and the congregations, but it was only natural that the conditions of the industrial age had an impact in this area as well. A good example was the founding by the Assumptionists of their publishing house *Bonne Presse.*[43] The political circumstances in Europe (less so in the Near East) were rather unfavorable for the congregation. However, two other enterprises were able to develop unencumbered by political factors, even though they were not confirmed by the Church until the beginning of the twentieth century: the *Societas Divini Salvatoris* (S.D.S., Salvatorians) and the *Societas Verbi Divini* (S.V.D., Society of the Divine Word). Even through the hagiographical style of the biographies of the societies' founders one can sense that genuine religious engagement was combined with the virtues of an industrial manager.

The founder of the Salvatorians, Johann Baptist Jordan,[44] was an ornamental painter, who had privately obtained a high school education and in 1878, as a priest, received through his pastor a stipend in Rome. The Alemannian, born on the Rhine River near Baden (1848–1918), got an audience with Leo XIII in 1880 (arranged by Cardinal Bilio). He extensively expounded the papal blessing of the founding of his *Apostolische Lehrgesellschaft* in Rome. He secured his position through recommendations by Cardinals Hergenröther and Parocchi. With the help of his publication *Der Missionär,* which he managed and which was approved by the bishop of Linz but directed from Rome, he wanted to establish an "association" whose program was to show no clear contours, but which was to have a diverse membership.[45] His main problem was to find trained priests, and he therefore wanted to educate young people speedily, using his own career as an example. In spite of considerable difficulties, including financial ones,[46] he was able to establish one foundation after another after obtaining a mission in Assam: 1890 in Tivoli, 1892 in Vienna, then in North and South America, 1898 in Meran, then in Rumania, Belgium, and Brazil (1902), for the most part developed from modest beginnings. It was with reservations that he finally decided to convene a general chapter in 1902, and the chapter's criticism, presented in 1906, of the extremely self-willed general superior is rather understandable.[47] Under Jordan's successor, his biographer P. Pfeiffer (died 1945), began the great expansion of this society.

---

[42] A. Schmitt, *LThK*^{2} IX, 263f.

[43] J. Monval, *Les Assomptionistes* (Paris 1939); concerning their role in France, see chap. 6; in the Middle East: chap. 25.

[44] P. Pfeiffer, *J.-B- Jordan und seine Gründung* (Rome 1930; the author is the second superior general of the congregation); E. Federici, *G.-B. Jordan* (Rome 1948); concerning the early stages, see B. Lüthen, *Die Gesellschaft des Göttlichen Heilandes* (1911).

Arnold Janssen (1837–1909), founder of the Society of the Divine Word,[48] was the son of a transport business owner on the Lower Rhine River. In 1861 he became a priest and a high school teacher and began his activity by also founding a publication called *Kleiner Herz-Jesu-Bote* (1874). After a fund-raising trip through Germany and Austria in 1875, Janssen purchased a piece of property with an old inn in Steyl, a town in the Netherlands near the border. Together with a carpentry apprentice, a Franciscan brother, and his real brother (a Capuchin from Münster), he founded a society here. His plan encountered great scepticism among the clergy and bishops, and with his autocratic style he caused most of his fellow members to leave in 1876.[49] The same year, Janssen found a capable economist, the future superior general Nikolaus Blum, and so he began the construction of Steyl, even though he had only one tenth of the construction funds at his disposal. Within a few years he had accumulated three hundred thousand marks worth of debts. When the construction of Saint Michael's with its double church was completed in 1886, his debts were repaid. To the publication of the *Herz-Jesu-Bote* he added the magazine *Die heilige Stadt Gottes* and a calendar, printed in his own press, for which the lay brothers provided cheap labor. In 1888, he founded Saint Raphael's in Rome, 1889 Saint Gabriel's in Vienna, 1892 Heiligkreuz near Neisse,[50] 1898 Saint Wendel's in the Rhineland, 1904 Saint Rupert's near Bischofshofen. Janssen acted according to the principle that it is not a question of the availability of funds, but of the necessity of the building.[51] Regarding the general chapter, Janssen followed J.-B. Jordan's attitude: he procrastinated as long as possible (1884 the first chapter with four priests, 1885 with twelve priests, the only ones eligible to vote). The constitutions were designed in a centralistic fashion (instead of provinces only "regions"), approved (with reservations) in 1901, and after some dispute regarding the general chapter's competence, they were confirmed in 1905 (not finalized until 1910).[52]

---

[45] Three categories were planned: (1) full members (priests and laymen); (2) permanent, academically educated "staff"; (3) the readers of the journal, which was to appeal to all classes from the clergy to the maid (P. Pfeiffer, op. cit., 71f.).

[46] In 1882, the Curia forced him to change the name of his society and erase the word "apostolic"; in 1886, he had difficulties because the words "approved by the Church" were not set off clearly enough; in 1892, a Carmelite came to inspect him, "a heavy cross to bear" for Jordan (P. Pfeiffer, op. cit., 260), but probably also for the inspector.

[47] P. Pfeiffer, op. cit., 336–339; the priest B. Lüthen of Westphalia was a loyal assistant.

[48] H. Fischer, S.V.D., *Arnold Janssen, der Gründer des Steyler Missionswerkes* (Steyl 1919).

[49] Vaughan's assessment was very negative. Later, he became an English cardinal who founded the Mill Hill mission and visited Janssen; his evaluation: he was insufficiently educated in theology and not practical. Indeed, Janssen's interests in theology were probably rather limited, which was the reason for his break with Dr. v. Essen, towards whom Archbishop Melchers had wanted to direct Janssen's activities (H. Fischer, op. cit., 382: Janssen did not think much of "educated professors"). He was not an "impractical" organizer, but rather a quite daring manager. However, his leadership style was somewhat unpleasant (e.g., a conflict over who should officiate at what time), yet, he was supported by the bishop of Roermond, who called the opponents "social democrats" (H. Fischer, op. cit., 155). H. Fischer, op. cit., 436, quotes a characteristic statement made by Janssen in 1900: "As far as the brothers are concerned, they shouldn't read but the Sunday paper, this is certainly sufficient." Regarding the support Janssen received from the German Catholic convention, see Kißling II, 126–30.

Because the congregations for women were, aside from education, primarily active in charity and hospital care, they were, as a rule, less touched by state laws. Because of that, and thanks to their active religious willingness to make sacrifices, they were able to develop under the pontificate of Leo XIII. The Sisters of Mercy of Saint Charles Borromeo had founded, via their original congregation in Nancy, new congregations in Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands, which developed considerable activities (the Saint Hedwig hospital, founded in 1846 in Berlin, took care of 5,500 patients in 1895). Aside from the largest female society, the Sisters of Charity (Vincentians), smaller societies like the Niederbronn Sisters (1880 the general mother house in Oberbronn/Alsace) and the Ingenbohl Sisters (1894 confirmed by the Pope) also had an excellent reputation across religious borders.[53]

---

[50] Heiligkreuz became the subject of political favoritism. Bismarck preferred the Steyl missionaries to the Jesuits. Heiligkreuz was involved in the question of the protectorate of South Shantung, where Anzer from Steyl was missionary bishop. The Prussian government did not want Steyl to become a papal congregation. This conflicted with Janssen's plans, but was acceptable to Prince-Bishop Kopp. The Silesian Janssen did not like the new settlement any more than the Salzburg authorities liked theirs; financial problems were feared.

[51] H. Fischer, op. cit., 188f.

[52] Regarding the missionary activities of this and other congregations, cf. P. III.

[53] W. Hohn, *Die Barmherzigen Schwestern vom hl. K. Borromäus* (Trier 1900); id., *300 Jahre Barmherzige Schwestern vom hl. Vinzenz von Paul* (Munich 1933); H. C. Wendlandt,

Looking at the history of the older religious societies and the new foundations during the pontificate of Leo XIII as a whole, one cannot ignore the desire for an internal rejuvenation of the Church (not least in the foreign mission) and for a social impact upon education, hospital care, and social action. There was also the amazing attraction of the religious life for a considerable part of the youth in the Catholic Church in spite of the political tactics of suppression, the general attitude of the time, the continuously increasing resignation and scepticism, and the way of thinking which resulted from the growing role of technology in life. But the religious societies found in Catholicism, which had meanwhile reached self-awareness, a resonance of resistance to the secularization of life and a religiously motivated willingness to devotion which bore witness to the vitality of the Catholic Church. This vitality is particularly obvious in the societies with "simple vows," which by now found full recognition. To gather these impulses, to eliminate or prevent sterile divisions, and to make use of these societies for the ideals of his pointificate were the goals of Leo XIII's ecclesiastical legislation, whose most significant feature was the concentration of orders and congregations in Rome. It is historically understandable that such efforts were most difficult in regard to the oldest order of the West, the Benedictines. Its decentralized structure had corresponded to the specific liberties of a feudal society. The principle of centralization was the principle of a growing highly industrial society—and it was also the principle of Leo XIII and his successors in the sense of an economy of spiritual powers. Most religious societies were induced to transfer their headquarters to Rome. In 1908 Pius X established the *Sacra congregatio negotiis religiosorum sodalium praeposita* as the highest authority for orders of the Latin Church, to whom the religious of both sexes were subordinated.

Die weiblichen Orden und Kongregationen der kath. Kirche und ihre Wirksamkeit in Preußen. 1816–1918 (Paderborn 1924); A. Sinningen, *Kath. Frauengenossenschaften Deutschlands* (Düsseldorf ^{2}1944, biblio.).

CHAPTER 18

The Dispute over Church Music

Since church music is directly connected with the liturgical action, the question of how musical forms of expression of the zeitgeist can be incorporated in the Church service is much more crucial than in regard to the fine arts.[1] Indeed, the religious subjectivity of the sacred music of a Franz Schubert does correspond to the subjectivity of general piety;[2] however, it is certain that as the representative musical creations of Classicism and Romanticism emerged from the modern spirit born in the Revolution, frequently Christianity was simply the occasion for their creation. In France, the interest in the Gregorian chant of the Benedictines at Solesmes was primarily an esoteric and historical matter, and the *Schola cantorum,* which had just been introduced in all Romance countries according to the model of the Lateran Church (1868), lived in harmony with the well-known plain-chant, a popularization of the chorale. Even Charles Gounod's *Cecilia Mass* (1882) or the romantic harmony of César Franck, (died in 1890) did not give offense. However, in German Catholicism, a movement developed which wanted to restore the "pure" sacred music, believing that a musical reform, which was unquestionably necessary, could only be achieved by turning away from modern developments. The German example found an echo in many other forms of Catholicism (the Netherlands, Belgium, Ireland, North America), but not in Austria, where attempts were made to apply contemporary forms to the ecclesiastical spirit. Pierluigi da Palestrina (died 1594 in Rome) was for the revival of church music in the nineteenth century what Thomas Aquinas had been for philosophy and theology.[3] Composition and declamation of the "Palestrina style" were renewed in the first half of the nineteenth century. Regensburg, the episcopal see of Michael Sailer, was the leading center, a city from which spread the tradition which Karl Proske (died 1861) started with his editions from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. That musicians who composed in the "Palestrina style" (such as M. Haller [died 1915 in Regensburg], who was called the Palestrina of the twentieth century) were unable to produce important works is due to the process of superficial imitation. It is more important that, through the efforts of the highest church authorities, the *a capella* music of vocal polyphony was canonized, which was equally a historic misunderstanding of the great master Palestrina and a disregarding of artistic originality.

At first, there was criticism of the church music which was composed of elements of the symphony and the opera.[4] Now, by separating the *musica sacra* from the *musica profana,* the church was separated from the world. In regard to instrumental music, as it was then composed by the church music directors, and which continued to be played, though not as often, the Belgian Edgar Tinel (died 1912[5]) stands out, because he refused to follow this separation. Of course, he was not played very often. During the Catholic Convention in Bamberg in 1868, the priest F. X. Witt (1834–88) founded the *Allgemeinen Cäcilienverband für die Länder der deutschen Sprache,* which Pius IX confirmed in 1870 as an organization under papal law with a cardinal protector. The brief contains the society's statutes as presented. Its first and foremost obligation is: "Gregorian chant (*cantus planus*) is to be cultivated intensively everywhere. Polyphonic arrangements for several voices (*cantus figuralis*) of older or newer compositions are to be furthered, as long as they comply with church regulations." Palestrina was not mentioned in this document, but he was the idol of the Cecilian movement.[6] The society was thus authorized to determine in its catalog what sacred music was.[7] The struggle over true Catholic church music was considered one of the most important ones in the battle with the zeitgeist.[8] Deviations were condemned with extreme intolerance and with reference to the Church.[9] Even the German Catholic church hymn, which treasure had been rediscovered by the Romanticists, partly fell under the influence of Cecilianism,[10] and especially the convents of women added popular, sentimental songs. F. X. Witt, who, in spite of his aggressiveness, was one of the more forward-looking minds in the movement, did not want to see instrumental music excluded and hoped for "a Palestrina of modern orchestral music." He probably had Franz Liszt in mind,[11] who respected him. The great value and impact of Cecilianism consists of the fact that it recognized the problematic relation of Classical and Romantic music to the liturgical ceremony. Its attempts to solve the problem, which should be seen in the historical and ecclesiastical perspective of that time, were inadequate. This is nowhere more obvious than in the fact that Anton Bruckner (1824–96), who as a Romanticist created his sacred music with liturgical objectivity,[12] was not accepted by the movement.

---

[1] Cf. chap. 19.

[2] Cf. chap. 16.

[3] Fellerer, *Geschichte,* 148, 150; *LThK*² VIII, 3.

[4] F. Krieg, op. cit., 129.

---

[5] K. Weinmann, op. cit., 249–54; following J. S. Bach, Tinel placed "active devotion and piety in his work," in opposition to formalism, which guided the church music organizations (Fellerer, *Geschichte,* 148).

[6] In regard to the brief *Multum ad movendos animos* of 16 December 1870, see H. Hucke, op. cit., 164ff.—It is characteristic for F. X. Witt to write: ". . . the better works in the 'Witt style' embrace the chorale more so than many works in the Palestrina style, at least in regard to the main point, i.e., the elucidation of the sacred melody and the text" (quoted ibid., 172). Fellerer, *Grundlagen,* 34, is justified in placing him in the historical situation, but that does not make reading H. Hucke superfluous.

[7] The neo-Cecilian K. Weinmann (op. cit., 189–204) considers the judgment regarding "liturgical usefulness" justified; he was critical, however, of the fact that it was also evaluated from an artistic point of view. O. Ursprung (op. cit., 280) feels that the development was hindered by the society's expert advisers in charge of the catalog because now either "a style reduced to *Gebrauchsmusik*" or the historic fixation on Palestrina, who was, after all, very contemporary even in the sixteenth century, became the accepted standard. Fellerer, (*MGG* II, 623f.) calls the catalog the "official recognition of the infinite number of sacred compositions which are devoid of any artistic significance and often not even technically well executed . . . ." Krieg, who endeavors to honor from a historical perspective F. X. Witt's "cleansing fiery spirit" (op. cit., 137), speaks of the "devotional harmony" (op. cit., 134) of the society's catalog.—F. X. Haberl, the father of the Regensburg chorale edition, originally intended to compile an index of music forbidden in church (H. Hucke, op. cit., 171). Everyone is in agreement about the society's catalog (cf. Fellerer, *Geschichte,* 155).

[8] F. J. Selbst, *Der katholische Kirchengesang* (Regensburg 1880), 133: "What terror, what mockery of our progressive century! The Cecilian movement is a return to the dark Middle Ages . . . ."

[9] P. Krutschek, *Die Kirchenmusik nach dem Willen der Kirche. Eine Instruktion* (Regensburg 1891): Not everyone has to be a member of the Cecilian society, but everyone has to follow its guidelines, "otherwise he would be resisting the Church itself" (240f.).

Supported by papal authority,[13] Cecilianism spread in the last third of the nineteenth century through most countries, after the Gregorian Society had been founded in the Netherlands in 1868. Its impact was particularly strong in Ireland. In the country of Giuseppe Verdi (1813–1901), where the influence of the national opera was especially problematic, the *Regolamento per la Musica sacra in Italia* of 1884 ruled: Except for the organ, only trombones, flutes, and drums and "similar instruments popular with the Israelite people" were permitted. They concentrated on cultivating the chorale, which was supported by ecclesiastical decrees. Cecilianism also exerted a certain influence.

Those who charged him with fanaticism were told: "You see, I call the devil devil and Christ my God and Master."

[10] W. Bäumker, *Das katholische deutsche Kirchenlied in seinen Singweisen,* 4 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1886–1911).—The statutes of the Cecilian society, which were contained in the papal brief, discuss the toleration of the hymn in devotion; the German practice of using songs during Mass is ignored (H. Hucke, op. cit., 168f.).

[11] Ursprung, 280.—Franz Liszt (1811–86), who had been ordained in Rome in 1865, attempted in his sacred music a blending of Gregorian elements, vocal polyphony, and modern orchestration (Fellerer, *Geschichte,* 146).

[12] F. Krieg, op. cit., 146f.: "Bruckner's personal emancipation (as a Romantic) serves this community (the Church) better than the orthographical imitation of old styles." Fellerer, *Geschichte,* 147: "Through Bruckner, the symphonic art has taken church music to new heights, comparable to Palestrina in the sixteenth century, when polyphony reached a climax in ecclesiastical expression."—Naturally, the difficulties of performance play a big role.

[13] F. X. Witt reached the limit of his purism when he wrote a letter to Leo XIII, accusing the prefect of the Congregation of Rites, Cardinal Bartolini, of having called Haydn, Mozart, and Cherubini "select and sincere" in a letter to the founder of the *Associazione di S. Cecilia.* Bartolini took revenge when he was appointed cardinal protector of the Cecilian society (H. Hucke, op. cit. 173f.).

Almost two decades after Palestrina's death, the Stamperia Medicaea in Rome, a printing office founded by Cardinal Fernando Medici and G. B. Raimundi, published an edition of the Roman gradual in which Gregorian melodies had been adapted to contemporary principles.[14] This little-known publication was adopted in Mechelen in 1848, but it did not have any historical significance for the Church until after 1871, when the publishing house of Pustet in Regensburg prepared reprints. The inspiring and driving force was the priest F. X. Haberl (1840–1910) who, after sojourns in Rome, became cathedral conductor in Regensburg, where he founded a church music school in 1874.[15] The Congregation of Rites offered Pustet a thirty-year imprimatur, even though the historical validity of the *Medicaea* was already being questioned at that time.[16] A decree of the Congregation of Rites of 14 April 1877 bestowed upon the edition a somewhat official character.

In the meantime, the Benedictine J. Pothier (1835–1923)[17] had conducted his research on chorales in Solesmes by order of his abbot, Prosper Guéranger, intending to do away with Gallicism and to restore tradition. After the publication of the principles of Solesmes, a congress was organized in Arezzo in 1882, to which the Congregation of Rites reacted on 10 April 1883 with a reiteration of the legitimization of the Regensburg edition. This was expressly confirmed by Leo XIII with the statement that papal directives be taken as mandates. In Regensburg, Witt and particularly Haberl fought passionately for their concept, and they did not fail to refer to the Roman authority.[18] But after the termination of the imprimatur, Leo XIII seized the opportunity and found a way out of the dilemma with his brief *Nos quidem* of 17 May 1901, addressed to the abbot of Solesmes. The motu proprio *Inter*

---

[14] L. Kunz, "Medicaea," *LThK*² VII, 230. The edition appeared in 1614–15.

[15] F. X. Haberl deserves credit for editions of Palestrina and Orlando di Lasso.

[16] A memorandum to the German bishops' conference by R. Schlecht and others in 1869 (quoted in Ursprung, op. cit., 269). L. Kunz (*LThK*² VII, 230) speaks of a "Roman contract" for Pustet; Ursprung: "It may be that the Roman Chorale Commission had already decided on a revised edition of the *Medicaea* or that the Pustet publishing house in Regensburg had proceeded accordingly with a petition." F. Krieg (op. cit., 53): The people in Regensburg are accomplishing "a liturgical work of pioneers" with "complete trust" in the *Medicaea.*

[17] In 1880, *Les mélodies grégoriennes d'après la tradition* appeared (after 1883, the chorale edition). Regarding the battle between Regensburg and Solesmes, see P. Combe, op. cit. 209.

[18] P. Krutschek: "In view of the official announcements of Leo XIII and the Congregation of Rites, it is incomprehensible how one can still maintain that I recommend the wrong chorale, and further retorts are wasted" (op. cit., [n. 9], preface to the second ed., XXI).

pastoralis officii (1903) of Pius X introduced a new phase in the understanding of the Gregorian chorale.[19]

---

[19] P. Krieg, 139f.: F. X. Haberl "suffered this hard fate, which destroyed his life's work on the chorale, with dignity and humility."—In regard to his reaction to Leo XIII's brief of 1901, see his essay "Geschichte und Wert der offiziellen Choralbücher," *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch* (1902).—For criticism in Germany regarding the Regensburg chorale edition, see R. Molitor, O.S.B., *Die nachtridentinische Choral-Reform in Rom* (Beuron 1902).—The breakthrough in Rome followed in 1893 through a vote by the Congregation of Rites, which was initiated by A. De Santi, S.J., and Solesmes. The Latin-German text of Pius X's motu proprio in Krieg, op. cit., appendix.—Cf. chap. 27, also in regard to De Santi.

CHAPTER 19

Church Art in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

Since the beginning of Church history, ecclesiastical art has carried the hallmark of the contemporary relation between the Church and the world and of the different forms of the notion of salvation, according to their epochal and ethnic background. In that respect, a work of art preserves in visualized form something from a past situation and can therefore serve, provided it is interpreted correctly, as a source for Church history. Art is particularly informative when it reports incidents that were not considered worthy of literary treatment or remained in the subconscious.

There is good reason that Church art should be chosen as a topic of investigation in the part of this series that deals with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The previous, almost naive function of Christian art has become more and more the object of serious study and decrees and is thus a special section of Church history.

Architecture

After the Council of Trent, the Church developed an awareness of the specific character of its artistic activities, especially in the countries north of the Alps, which, having been effected by the Reformation, externalized its forms of expression. Stained glass and ribbed vaults continued to be considered "ecclesiastical," even though they were not customary any longer in secular architecture. In those areas in which the Reformation had left its mark, but which had been recovered by the Catholic Church, clear relapses into medieval architecture can be observed. The result is a "sacral style" with historical dimensions.[1] However, Church art in consistently Catholic countries generally runs parallel to the contemporary development of style. It also does not lose touch with aesthetics, which grows more and more independent, even though the concept of beauty is no longer a theological one as in the Middle Ages.[2] But since 1588, beginning with the activities of the Congregation of Rites, the Church in these countries felt compelled to publish papal and episcopal decrees, edicts, and recommendations on artistic activities in order to draw the line against Protestantism and the secular areas which were in the process of emancipation.[3] The demands relate essentially to preservation of or connection to the Christian tradition, to avoidance of offensive presentations or recommendation of instructive ones, and to the observance of ethnographic customs (*usus*), provided they do not contradict liturgical regulations. The interpretation of these regulations and recommendations leaves a great deal of latitude and allows strict traditionalism as well as the recently increasing influence of the individual artist. The artistic context in general was thus able to be preserved by the Church throughout the Baroque and Roccoco eras, and during the secular Classicism of the end of the eighteenth century, in which the Enlightenment erected or at least designed its own edifices of art for the "Supreme Being" or the gods of "nature" and "reason."[4]

Corresponding to the turn toward Greek art within the context of Classicism,[5] churches, like palaces, theaters, and museums, decorated their entrances with a Greek temple facade in the form of a portal of columns with a pediment. In Classicism this mixture threatened to obscure the borders of profane architecture and to cloud the sacred purpose.[6] But it also offers the opportunity to find from this vantage point the transition to early Christian architecture.[7]

---

[1] E. Kirschbaum, *Deutsche Nachgotik. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Architektur von 1550–1800* (Augsburg 1930).

[2] In regard to medieval aesthetics, see E. de Bruyne, *Études d'Esthétique médiévale* I–III (Bruges 1946); in regard to architectural aesthetics of modern times, see R. Wittkower, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (London ^{3}1962).

[3] The papal resolutions can be found in *CICfontes,* ed. by P. Gasparri and J. Serédi (Rome 1923–39), and in *AAS* (Rome 1909ff.). A selective synopsis in C. Gurlitt, "Kirchen." *Handbuch der Architektur* IV, 8, 1 (Stuttgart 1906), 63ff., 176–81; R. B. Witte, *Das katholische Gotteshaus* (Mainz ^{2}1951), 2ff., and *LThK*^{2} VI, 199–205 (A. Fuchs) and 682–87 (W. Braunfels). The resolutions were often interpreted by provincial councils. For example, the papal request to adhere to tradition (*CIC fontes,* 1164) was interpreted to mean the use of Old Christian, Romanesque, or Gothic styles only, and the cross-shaped ground plan was especially recommended. The last papal instructions are found in the seventh and last chapter of the liturgy constitution of the Second Vatican Council of 1963 and in the subsequent directives and amendments (cf. H. Schnell, "Der neue Kirchenbau and die Konzilsberatungen," *ThGl* 53 [1963] and U. Rapp, O.S.B., *Konzil, Kunst und Künstler. Zum VII. Kapitel der Kiturgiekonstitution* [Frankfurt a. M. 1966]).

[4] E. Kaufmann, *Architecture in the Age of Reason. Baroque and Post-Baroque in England, Italy and France* (Cambridge, Mass. 1955); K. Lankheit, *Der Tempel der Vernunft. Unveröffentlichte Zeichnungen von Étienne-Louis Boullée* (Basel, Stuttgart 1968).

[5] D. Wiebenson, *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture* (London 1969).

While the Classicism of the Enlightenment was understandably unable to influence Church art deeply, the sympathy for the Middle Ages emerging from the Romantic countermovement succeeded in defining the sacred art of the entire nineteenth century. This enthusiasm for the Middle Ages, furthered by the corresponding belles lettres,[8] was almost from the start determined by Christianity. But the first beginnings of art are rooted in the secular realm, in the Gothic ruins of the eighteenth century erected in English gardens as symbols of *vanitas* to inspire meditation,[9] or in the Gothicized garden houses which served as temporary shelter for Romantic poets.[10] Wherever enthusiasm for Gothic elements in church buildings was aroused, it was devoid of insight into the sacred character of this architecture. Goethe[11] discovered in 1772 in the facade of the Strasbourg Cathedral a "Babel-thought" of the Promethean architect Erwin von Steinbach, with which the human genius may win his freedom "on the confined and dismal clerics' stage of the *medii aevi.*" The Gothic architecture, once mocked by Vasari as *maniera tedesca,* is now in a positive sense celebrated as German or Germanic architecture, determined by the forces of natural growth and striving to illustrate the majestic and infinite. At first, interpretations of the Gothic church in a historically adequate and theologically symbolic sense are the exception.[12]

---

[6] Sainte-Geneviève in Paris, begun in 1764 by Soufflot and completed in 1790 and displaying the facade of a temple, changed its function without special renovations several times. In 1791, the Pantheon was constructed for the great freedom fighters (Mirabeau, Marat, Voltaire, etc.). In 1809 it became a church again, 1830: Pantheon, under Napoleon III: *Basilique Nationale* (1852). After Victor Hugo's death (1885) it again became the Pantheon (M. Petzet, *Soufflots Saint-Geneviève und der französische Kirchenbau des 18. Jahrhunderts* [Berlin 1961]).

[7] Saint-Vincent-de-Paul in Paris (1824–44), by Jakob Ignaz Hittorf, combines a Greek temple facade with a five-nave basilica and straight beams of a Constantine type.

[8] W. H. Wackenroder, *Herzensergießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders* (Berlin 1997); J. L. Tieck, *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen* (Berlin 1798); cf. A. Addison, *Romanticism and the Gothic Revival* (Philadelphia 1938); K. Clark, *The Gothic Revival* (London ²1950).

[9] H. Vogel, *Die Ruine in der Darstellung der abendländischen Kunst* (Kassel 1948); A. Kamphausen, *Gotik ohne Gott. Ein Beitrag zur Deutung der Neugotik und des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen 1952).

[10] P. Cleman, "Strawberry Hill und Wörlitz. Von den Anfängen der Neugotik," *Neue Beiträge deutscher Forschung. Wilhelm Worringer zum 60. Geburtstag,* ed. by E. Fidder (Königsberg 1943), 37–60.

[11] E. Beutler, *Von deutscher Baukunst. Goethes Hymnus auf Erwin von Steinbach. Seine Entstehung und Wirkung* (Munich 1943).

An exemplar of the diverging motives in evaluating Gothic architecture is the story of the restoration of the Cologne Cathedral, which had been in a state of incompletion since the beginning of the sixteenth century. The motives for its completion were very different.[13] The choir, completed in 1322, is seen as an intense image of the forest, which as an element of nature bears witness to the direct manifestation of God,[14] but at the same time is also a reminder of the prehistory of man, who built himself his first hut out of branches and tree trunks, thus creating the Gothic style.[15] Moreover, the cathedral is the "most elevating symbol of eternity,"[16] whereby the term eternity is to be understood in a general philosophical, not in a specific Christian sense. Primarily, however, the cathedral is a document of German history, striving again for national unity after its decline at the end of the Middle Ages and after its wars of independence. In the proclamation inspired by Sulpiz Boisserée and written by Joseph Görres, which appeared on 26 November 1814 in the *Rheinische Merkur,* the Cathedral is seen as "a symbol of the new Empire that we want to build." When the foundation stone was laid in 1842, Friedrich Wilhelm IV celebrated the planned completion as the "work of brotherhood among all Germans and all creeds," and the art historian Franz Kugler saw in it "a unifying sign for all people of the German tongue to gather around."[17] In resuming medieval architecture and in view of Classicism, there is a feeling of progress from heathenism to Christianity, from things Hellenic to things German.[18] Occasionally, the national impulse dominated the

---

[12] F. von Schlegel in his essay "Grundzüge der gotischen Baukunst" of 1804–05, *Sämtliche Werke* VI (Vienna 1846), 182f.

[13] H. Lützeler, *Der Kölner Dom in der deutschen Geistesgeschichte* (Bonn 1948).

[14] G. Forster in his *Ansichten vom Niederrhein u.s.w. 1790* (Berlin 1791); the cathedral as a "work of nature" also in Schelling; H. Lützeler, op. cit., 17.—Concerning nature as a manifestation of God and the most worthy object of Christian art, see H. Schrade, "Die romantische Idee von der Landschaft als höchstem Gegenstande der christlichen Kunst," *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* (1931).

[15] J. Hall, *Essay on the Origin, History, and Principles of Gothic Architecture* (London 1813); cf. also J. Gaus, "Die Urhütte. Über ein Modell in der Baukunst und ein Motiv in der bildenden Kunst," *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 32 (1971), 7–70; Interest in the history of mankind, rather than an aesthetical assessment is the main motive of Seroux d'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments etc.,* 6 vols. (Paris 1812–23).

[16] A. Reichensperger, "Einige Worte über den Dombau von Köln," *Vermischte Schriften über christliche Kunst* (Leipzig 1856), 90.

[17] F. Kugler, *Kleine Schriften* II (Stuttgart 1854), 41. The cathedral in Speyer, restored by King Ludwig of Bavaria, is a national monument.

[18] A. Reichensperger, *Die christlich-germanische Baukunst und ihr Verhältnis zur Gegenwart* (Trier 1852), 56.

Christian medieval spirit to such a degree that there was talk about the victory of the Reformation, especially in view of the active participation of the Protestant Prussian government. One also bewailed as a contradiction the fact that the "slaves of Rome" were permitted to turn the edifice into a "place of Jesuit stupefaction and mendacity." Because of these and similar opinions, the Catholic population of Cologne remained demonstratively absent from the final celebration on 15 August 1880, at the time of the *Kulturkampf.*[19] The first railroad bridge across the Rhine River, built between 1855 and 1859 at the King's wish as a continuation of the cathedral's axis and as a symbol of the new time connecting medieval history and technological progress, was inaugurated by the equestrian statues of Friedrich Wilhelm IV (1861–1862) and Wilhelm I (1867). Through the demolition of two churches and sixty-nine houses, free space was created around the cathedral.

Even though it had been shown in 1830 that Gothic architecture did not originate in Germany but in France,[20] and though it was recognized shortly after that the Cologne Cathedral had been constructed according to the Cathedral of Amiens, Gothic architecture continued to be considered German for some time.[21]

More enduring than the national motive proved to be the perception of the Gothic as a specifically Christian sacral style suited for the construction of churches. Sulpiz Boisserée, Joseph Görres, and August Reichensperger in Germany, A. W. N. Pugin in England,[22] Viollet-le-Duc in France,[23] and many others laid the foundation for the many churches in neo-Gothic style which had to be built to meet the demands of a rapidly increasing population. The Cologne Cathedral construction office, managed after 1833 by Ernst Friedrich Zwirner (1802–1861), sent out numerous architects now familiar with Gothic construction principles, who renovated old churches and erected new ones in the Rhineland[24] and elsewhere, and who went to revive construction offices in Strasbourg, Vienna, and elsewhere, or who were appointed to teaching chairs at technical colleges. However, the orthodox neo-Gothic generated by these activities in the second half of the nineteenth century encompassed a certain variety, since the respective geographical situation was more and more taken into consideration. Consequently the French neo-Gothic churches were modeled after the cathedral Gothic of the Île-de-France, such as Saint-Clothilde in Paris, while in Germany, according to native medieval tradition, brick buildings were also customary;[25] and in the Rhineland the so-called transition style of the late Hohenstaufen period was taken into account.

---

[19] H. Lützeler, op. cit., 75.

[20] F. Kugler, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* (Stuttgart ^{5}1872).

[21] Georg Dehio's question, whether the German architect of the choir of the Cologne Cathedral also designed the choir of Amiens, demonstrates how scholarly judgements can be obscured by the idea of national rivalries (G. Dehio and H. von Bezold, *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes* II [Stuttgart 1901], 276). On the other hand, there is Émile Mâle's statement that all the better parts of the Cologne Cathedral are French, the tasteless parts German ("Studien über die deutsche Kunst," *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft* 10 [1917], 55).

[22] Pugin (1812–52) built more than sixty neo-Gothic churches. Converted in 1834, architect Pugin also wrote theoretical works like *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (London 1853) and *An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture in England* (London 1843).

[23] Viollet-le-Duc (1814–79) was commissioned to restore many important churches (Notre-Dame and Sainte-Chapelle in Paris, Vézelay, etc.). His ten-volume *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XI^e siècle* (Paris 1854–68) was indispensable for a precise knowledge of Gothic construction principles. It was followed by a similar dictionary concerning the interior design of medievel structures. Viollet-de-Duc justified the "progressive character" of the Gothic style, explaining that technically trained laymen (*Hochbauingenieure*), rather than monks trained as craftsmen designed the cathedrals. Therefore his suggestion to call Gothicism *style laïque* (*Dictionnaire raisonné* I, 114).

In Italy, the revival of the Gothic was sporadic. The Florentine Cathedral was adorned with a new facade in the style of the fourteenth century (1875–1887); but the Nordic Gothic of the Milan Cathedral was rejected on the grounds of Vasari's negative verdict and particularly because in the Middle Ages numerous German (in the nineteenth century also Austrian) architects were involved in the construction.[26] In 1859 a competition was announced for the modern *Galleria* to be built on the cathedral grounds and dedicated to King Vittorio Emmanuele II. One of the suggestions was to tear down part of the cathedral in order to obtain decent building materials.[27]

For a very long time, the Gothic style was *en vogue* in America. Actually, it was not used until around 1900, and only receded in church construction in the fourth decade of our century. There, as in Germany and England during the Romantic period, many Protestant artists converted for aesthetic reasons. The architect Crom, who, like Pugin in England earlier, wrote many books praising the Gothic, induced the bishop of New York in 1911 to renovate and complete the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine in the Gothic style, even though it was begun in the Romanesque style. Upon Crom's death in 1942, it was not yet completed. The Washington Cathedral did not get its Gothic central cupola until 1963.[28]

---

[24] W. Weyres and A. Mann, *Handbuch zur rheinischen Baukunst des 19. Jahrhunderts, 1800–80* (Cologne 1968).

[25] For example, neo-Gothic brick churches by Conrad Wilhelm Hase of Hannover (1818–1902).

[26] C. Boito, *Il Duomo di Milano e i disegni per la sua facciata* (Milan 1889).

[27] P. Mezzanotte: *Storia di Milano* XV (Milan 1962), 398.

[28] In regard to American neo-Gothic in the twentieth century, see J. Paul, "Chartres in Amerika. Ein Beitrag zur mittelalterlichen Ikonographie der Neuzeit," *Kunstgeschichtliche Studien für Kurt Bauch* (Munich, Berlin 1967), 287–300.

In view of the freedom that church regulations offered by recommending that only the form handed down by Christian tradition be followed,[29] an extensive, partly polemical dispute about the choice of proper style evolved. Reichensperger and many others advocated Gothic because they considered it progressive in contrast to the old Christian and Roman architecture, and they rejected the Renaissance because it was based on heathenism.[30] Others recommended the architecture of the Italian Renaissance, since this era was not a Protestant one and had produced, moreover, outstanding saints.[31] The popular handbook of liturgy by Franz Xaver Thalhofer[32] preferred the Gothic because the German Renaissance was not of sufficient quality. This demonstrates once again how independent of each other art and worship had grown, and how the blending of the two had moved into the realm of the aesthetic and the arbitrary.[33] The question posed by Hübsch in 1837 "In which style shall we build?"[34] was still being asked in 1899.[35]

In Protestantism, the connection to Gothic style was even more definite, having nothing but Gothic examples in mind since the Eisenach Regulations of 1856 had recommended the model of a "historically evolved Christian architecture." But in the first half of the century, the Protestants also used Classical elements and toward the end of the century they built structures copying the Baroque.[36] The Eisenach Regulations of 1908 finally did away with recommendations of a certain style and simply suggested "sincere and noble simplicity in form and color."[37]

In spite of this change around the turn of the century, there is no doubt that, even after a definite rejection of historicism, the Gothic and its elements remained effective in the construction of churches in the twentieth century, not only during the time of Expressionism in Germany, as in the case of Dominikus Böhm,[38] but also in the numerous

---

[29] At the Fulda Bishops' Conference of 1923, R. B. Witte, op. cit., 6.

[30] A. Reichensperger, "Zur Kennzeichnung der Renaissance," *ZChK* (1890), no. 1.

[31] J. Graus, *Die katholische Kirche und die Renaissance* (Graz 1888).

[32] I (1883), 741ff.

[33] The title of a small book by C. Meyer is significant: *Über das Verhältnis von der Kunst zum Kultus. Ein Wort an alle gebildeten Verehrer der Religion und der Kunst* (Zurich 1837).

[34] Cf. G. Palm, *Von welchen Prinzipien soll die Wahl des Baustyls, insbesondere des Kirchenbaustyls geleitet werden?* (Hamburg 1845).

[35] O. Prill, "In welchem Stile sollen wir bauen?" *ZChK* (1898), 246, 267; (1899), 83, 247.

[36] The conventions of the Protestant Church on church architecture and art taking place regularly from 1896 until today are presented clearly in G. Langmaack, *Evangelischer Kirchenbau im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Kassel 1971), 270ff.

[37] G. Langmaack, op. cit., 290f.

[38] See the large pointed arches in the church of Frielingsdorf of 1927. The designs of A. Bartning for a "star church" (1922) have elements of expressive Gothicism.

Gothic structures after 1950 which incorporated versions of ribbed vaults,[39] rose windows with tracery, and, above all, extensive stained glass.[40]

The definitions of the Christian sacral style of the nineteenth century included, aside from the Gothic and old Christian, Romanesque and, last but not least, Byzantine architecture. Classicism provided a natural transition from old Christian to modern architecture;[41] Romanesque architecture was given attention predominantly in the Rhineland with its many structures from the Hohenstaufen period;[42] Byzantine elements are occasionally found in France.[43] Since historicism was a frequent topic of contemplation in the nineteenth century and since antiquity and medieval Christianity were not always considered opposites, it occasionally happened that one artist would make proposals using both styles for one and the same church.[44] There were also attempts to harmonize the principles of several styles, as was the case in Schinkel's hotly debated but never-realized plans of 1815 for a cathedral commemorating the wars of independence. He designed "this church in the impressive style of old German architecture, whose ultimate perfection is the task of the future after the peak of its development has been interrupted for centuries by a wonderful and benevolent glance back at antiquity, whereby, it seems, the world will be enabled to instill into this art the element which it is lacking for its perfection."[45] In other words, he demanded that the Gothic, which was interrupted by the Renaissance, be improved through the insights into antiquity gained during that period; that a progressive architecture be created.

This eclectic principle had a unique kind of ethos, which became especially effective in the second half of the century. The blending of several styles in ecclesiastical architecture was seen as a simile for Christianity, embracing time and space.[46] In secular architecture, it was considered an expression of the cosmopolitan tendency of the nineteenth century with its tremendous progress in the area of technology and with its radiant expansion in all scientific and humanistic disciplines, especially history. Thus, the *Giornale dell'Ingegnere architetto e agronome* of 1853 demanded that all known styles be combined, since only an *architettura composita* as *architettura cosmopolita* could equal the spirit of the new times.[47]

---

[39] Indicated with tubing in the Liebfrauen Church in Cologne-Mühlheim by Rudolf Schwarz (1955).

[40] W. Weyres and O. Bartning, *Kirchen, Handbuch für den Kirchenbau* (Munich 1959), passim. Indications of Old Christian and Romanesque church architecture remain alive in modern times in the form of semicircular apses, naves arranged in basilical fashion, and free-standing belltowers.

[41] See Saint-Vincent-de-Paul church in Paris, mentioned in n. 7. In Munich the Bonifatius Church of 1835.

[42] A. Mann, *Die Neuromantik* (Cologne 1966).

[43] For instance, Sacre-Cœur in Paris, 1876–1919 (C. Gurlitt, op. cit., 167).

[44] Like Schinkel for the church of Werder in Berlin. In 1818 an English church building society offered (for churches of suburban communities) plans for one and the same spatial layout in Classical, Gothic, and Baroque styles (H. G. Evers, "Kann die historische Kirchenbaukunst des 19. Jahrhunderts als Trivialkunst verstanden werden?" *Triviale Zonen in der religiösen Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts. Studien zur Philosophie und Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts,* 15 [Frankfurt a. M. 1971], 196).

[45] P. O. Rave, "Karl Friedrich Schinkel," *Berlin,* part I (Berlin 1939), 196.

Church Interiors

Similar tendencies can be observed in regard to church interiors of the nineteenth century which conformed to the liberal ecclesiastical regulations. An attempt was made to match the furnishings of the church with the historical style of the architecture. But in the first half of the century, contemporary art concepts were applied, for instance in the use of large frescoes that did not exist in the Nordic medieval Gothic. In this case, the insufficient archeological knowledge of the immobile and mobile furnishings of medieval churches as well as the intention to combine elements of the north and south may have played a role.[48]

In the second half of the century, when architecture also began to copy old plans, the interior design appeared more and more orthodox, thanks to the old book collections and drawings published in the meantime.[49] Numerous collections of medieval ecclesiastical treasures, obtained since the secularization, were created with the express goal of offering adequate models to the artisans. This was the foundation for many of our craft museums.[50] One even began to follow the instructions of medieval treatises in order to make utensils and tools in the proper style.[51]

In architecture, Romantic enthusiasm for the Middle Ages responded to secular and rational Classicism with a revival of the Gothic. Likewise, young painters from various countries reacted with new concepts to the aesthetic dogmas originating in antiquity which they had learned at the academies. They turned to the "divine" Raphael and the older Italian paintings of the quattrocento and trecento, to the Germans Dürer and Holbein, and to old German paintings. Subsequently, Johann Friedrich Overbeck (1789–1869) and similarly minded people founded a Saint Luke Fraternity (1809) in Vienna in opposition to the local academy. The society soon moved to Rome and settled in the isolated monastery Sant'Isidoro in voluntary monastic communion. They wanted to rejuvenate painting on the basis of religion. Because of their beards and long hair they were known in Rome as "Nazarenes." Like the poets and architects, many of them converted. Franz Pforr, Ludwig Richter, Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Johann Führich, Philipp Veith (the stepson of Friedrich Schlegel) and the most important among them, Peter von Cornelius (1783–1867), took up the themes of Christian iconography, whose biblical stories and medieval legends matched the newly awakened sense of history.[52] Especially popular were motives in which medieval piety and the new concept of nature as a divine manifestation could be combined, like the legend of Saint Genevieve, who, according to the tragedy which Tieck had devoted to her in 1799, was illustrated in numerous pictures, graphic series, and, most elaborately, in frescoes by Puvis de Chavannes (1874–1878) in the church in Paris dedicated to her. The popular hermit theme of Caspar David Friedrich's gloomy pictures with monks and ruins, down to the last pictures at the end of the century combined nature and religion, historical contemplation and private worship.[53] It should not be ignored that the general trend toward genre in the art of the nineteenth century included religious art. In spite of its sentimental or even trivial effect, it created a type of picture which, according to its function, can indeed be compared with the devotional paintings of the fourteenth century. Theological didacticism in church art was less prominent than sensitive private piety. The Nazarenes placed figurative Christian stories in the foreground, while in the Protestant north nature inspired religious devotion.[54]

---

[46] The critique of the French Academy of 1845 regarding the use of the Gothic style for Saint-Clothilde church in Paris (H. G. Evers, op. cit., 183–90).

[47] P. Mezzanotte, op. cit., 367.

[48] Cf. Schinkel's statement, n. 5.

[49] A noteworthy collection is, besides Seroux d'Agincourt (see n. 15), Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné du mobibilier français de l'époque carolingienne à la renaissance,* 6 vols. (Paris 1858–75).

[50] A late example is the collection begun in 1867 by Prebendary Professor Dr. Alexander Schnütgen (1843–1918), the basis of today's Schnütgen Museum in Cologne. These projects kept the craftsmen as well as the pastors who commissioned them in mind (A. Thomas, "Die liturgische Erneuerungsbewegung im Bistum Trier unter Bischof von Hommer," *Archiv für mittelalterliche Kirchengeschichte* 15 [1961], 208–38).

[51] Viollet-le-Duc, "Le grand encensoir de Théophile," *Annales archéologiques* VIII (1848), 95–104.

---

[52] Raphael's work inspired great allegorical compositions. Secular themes featured national history and material from rediscovered medieval epics. A first great commission of this kind was the painting of the Casino Massimo in Rome (1819–30). Goethe opposed the combination of religious and national elements in his essay "Neu-deutsche religiös-patriotische Kunst," which was largely written by Heinrich Meyer in 1817.

[53] H. Ost, "Einsiedler und Mönche in der deutschen Malerei des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Bonner Beiträge zur Kunstwissenschaft,* ed. by H. von Einem and H. Lützeler, vol. 11 (Düsseldorf 1971).

[54] Of interest are *Der Mönch am Meer* and the altar in Tetschen by C. D. Friedrich (both 1808). In regard to landscapes in religious concepts, see the essay mentioned in n. 14 by H. Schrade and H. von Einem, "Die Symbollandschaft der deutschen Romantik," *Katalog Klassizismus und Romantik,* Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum (1966), 28–38.

Not only thematic-iconographic preferences, but also those for a particular genre became recognizable. The monumental art of mural painting, which had disappeared from the churches during the period of Classicism, was revived again. They wanted to "fill the lonely chapels and high cathedrals with life" and so designed large sequences of frescoes with pictures of biblical stories. Worth mentioning are those frescoes that Peter von Cornelius painted after 1840 in the Ludwig Church in Munich, the murals by Johann Schraudolph in the Cathedral of Speyer (1845–1853)[55] and the frescoes by students of Wilhelm von Schadow in the Appolinaris Church in Remagen (1843–1854).[56]

The paintings of the Nazarenes soon fell below their original level of quality due to their increasing popularity. The impersonal schematicism of their composition and the flat brush technique conquered some of the art academies in Germany, but in view of the new movement of Realism around the middle of the century and later Impressionism, the Nazarenes found their art more and more limited to the often trivial problems of Christian utilitarian art. Likewise, in Italy, the *puristi,* comparable to the Nazarenes, had become academic and could not endure the new trends.[57]

To be mentioned in France are the early Ingres, Hippolyte Flandrin (1809–1864),[58] and Pierre Cecil Puvis de Chavannes (1824–1889), who painted the great Genevieve series in the Pantheon in Paris (1874–1878). Puvis de Chavannes started a new style, which had an effect on the church art of the twentieth century via French post-Impressionism and Symbolism, represented primarily by Maurice Denis (1870–1943).[59] There are connections between Maurice Denis and Father Desiderius Lenz (1832–1928), the founder of the art school in Beuron,[60] and the two symbolists Jan Toorop (1858–1928) and Jan Thorn-Prikker (1868–1932), whose frescoes, mosaics, and glass paintings laid an important foundation, in connection with a new church architecture, for the religious art of Expressionism.[61]

---

[55] There are 123 paintings with 470 more than life-size figures; two thirds fell victim to the "restoration" of the following years (A. Verbeek, "900 Jahre Speyrer Dom," *Festschrift zum Jahrestage der Domweihe 1061* [Speyer 1961], 138–64).

[56] The Apollinaris Church, erected between 1839 and 1843 by cathedral architect Ernst Friedrich Zwirner on a wooded hill near the Rhine River, enjoyed the highest reputation in the nineteenth century, because as a neo-Gothic structure with large mural paintings and as a memorial fitting the surrounding landscape, it fulfilled the art ideals of the time.—There is a drawing by Schinkel (Berlin), in which he had transferred the Milan Cathedral to hills close to Trieste.

[57] G. Brundu, "Preraffaelismo e Purismo," *Enciclopedia universale dell'Arte* X, 943–48.

[58] He did the paintings in the church of Saint-Vincent-de-Paul and in the church of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris (1854–63).

[59] P. Jamot, *Maurice Denis* (Paris 1945).

[60] See below.

The relationship between nineteenth century art and the new styles after 1900 in France can also be found in England, where Edward Burnes-Jones (1833–1898) founded the Society of the Pre-Raphaelites, following the model of the Saint Luke Fraternity of the Nazarenes and adopting many of their religious and moral principles as well.[62] But in contrast to the Nazarenes, this community of artists, including Millais, Hunt, Rossetti, and others, kept in touch with the progressive forces of its time. They also adhered to the Nazarenes' ideals of national and religious restoration and often made use of sentimental and symbolic genre painting, but at the same time they demanded "truth to nature" and were thus able to keep contact with the basically secular Realism of the middle of the century.[63] It became customary to paint outdoors and even in religious paintings precision of archeological detail was demanded. William Holman Hunt (1827–1910), the most important among the artists, went to Palestine for several years in order to familiarize himself with the location for his biblical pictures. The century of the exact sciences, photography, and historical "truth" also challenged religious historical painting to provide reliable information.[64] "Not Christ, the supreme judge, but Jesus, the son of the Jewess Maria" was to be represented.[65] Even in the progressive nineteenth century, the traces of the Pre-Raphaelites did not fade, in spite of the early dissolution of the Society, because at the same time their patrons John Ruskin and William Morris pioneered the great art revolution of 1900 and ushered some of the principles of the Pre-Raphaelite artists, such as craftsmanship and teamwork, into the new era.

In Germany in the second half of the century, an area of church art arose that was to have an effect in the future. Not unimpressed by the art of the Nazarenes, but keeping an apparent distance, Desiderius Lenz had founded an art school in the Benedictine monastery of Beuron. This school was intent on creating in the monastic realm the liturgical unity of an artistically designed space, of music regenerated through the study of Gregorian sources, and of the devotional ceremony. They wanted to replace the contemporary principle of *l'art pour l'art* with the humble *l'art pour Dieux.*[66] They were convinced that the stylization of artwork (primarily in abstract art, using "universal shapes" like the equilateral triangle) gave the composition an air of sacred solemnity and quiet by suppressing the individual and allowing man to submerge himself in God. Intending to create "timeless" art, they used elements from Byzantine art, from the mosaics of Ravenna, and from Egyptian murals to produce the Maurus Chapel near Beuron (1868–1870), the furnishings of the Emmaus monastery in Prague (since 1880), the furnishings of the abbey of Maria Laach, populated again by Beuron in 1892, and the grave of Saint Benedict and Saint Scholastica in the vault of Monte Cassino (1899–1913).[67] The contemporary interest in Art Nouveau, and also in the beginnings of the liturgical movement, the intense encounter of Maurice Denis and Desiderius Lenz, and their collaboration with Paul Verkade (1868–1946),[68] as well as the last vestiges of the Pre-Raphaelites and the Dutch and Belgian symbolists created an art circle between 1880 and 1910 that was to become the basis for an artistic renewal in the twentieth century. The significance of the art school in Beuron lies, last but not least, in the fact that the church interior was not exclusively determined any longer by murals and glass paintings, as was the case in the previous century, where any other kind of design was considered a "craft" and entrusted to craftsmen's skills. This school subjected everything, even textiles, paraments, liturgical utensils, and furniture to one unifying design concept. This was a direction which the church art of the twentieth century carried on, paying particular attention to the vessel, which is so important for the liturgy.

---

[61] M. Janssen, *Schets over het Leven en enkele Werken von Jan Toorop* (Amsterdam 1928); A. Hoff, *Thorn-Prikker und die neuere Glasmalerei* (Essen 1925).

[62] N. Pevsner, "Gemeinschaftsideale unter den bildenden Künstlern des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 9 (1931), 125–54; W. E. Fredeman, *Pre-Raphaelism. A bibliocritical study* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965).

[63] In Germany realism took effect in regard to religious art only in Protestant painting (e.g. Fritz von Uhde, 1848 to 1911, and Eduard von Gebhardt, 1838 to 1925).

[64] St. Waetzoldt, "Bemerkungen zur christlich-religiösen Malerei in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Triviale Zonen in der religiösen Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts. Studien zur Philosophie und Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts* 15 (Frankfurt a. M. 1971), 30–91.

[65] C. Gurlitt, *Die deutsche Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1900), 545.

With his strict rejection of all art in the style of Giotto, his rejection of all expressive phenomena of the past (El Greco), and of the present,[69] Desiderius Lenz overextended himself, causing his former disciples in the twenties to disperse. Subsequently, polemical treatises appeared (as in the nineteenth century) which, in view of the broad framework of ecclesiastical regulations, turned against Expressionism in general and demanded a harmonic Naturalism,[70] or accepted certain elements of the art form called "expressive,"[71] but which would not permit anything unusual or shocking.[72] Finally, there were several advocates of absolute Expressionism[73] who originated, in connection with the simultaneous renovation of church architecture, the truly modern features of church art. They made possible the appreciation of religious works created outside the area of church art, like paintings by Georges Rouault, Emil Nolde, or Schmidt-Rottluff. The appreciation of individual creative achievements provided the chance to entrust even non-Catholic artists with tasks related to church art.[74]

---

[66] D. Lenz, O.S.B., *Zur Ästhetik der Beuroner Schule* (Vienna 1912).

[67] J. Kreitmaier, S.J., *Beuroner Kunst. Eine Ausdrucksform der christlichen Mystik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1923).

[68] W. Verkade, *Die Unruhe zu Gott* (Freiburg i. Br. ^{2}1923). Verkade, born in the Netherlands, felt close to Gauguin, Sérusier, and Vuillard and joined Beuron in 1894 after his conversion.

[69] For example, Jan Thorn-Prikker (1868–1932) and Ludwig Gies (1887–1966).

In regard to sculpture and plastic art of the time in question, we have to say that it was bound to play a more important role than painting and that the creations of Thorwaldsen (1786–1844) and Dannecker (1758–1841) largely determined the conceptions of Christ. Through Neo-Gothic, the cathedral construction offices inspired a more thorough study of medieval sculpture of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, since the Cologne Cathedral, for example, required a number of new figures for its completion. The historical assessment of these masters, who also created tomb art, has not progressed very far due to the fact that they had to subject their work to the unity of the entire structure. Iconographically significant for furnishing Neo-Gothic churches in the nineteenth century with sculptures is the solution offered in the typological programs of the Middle Ages. Aside from characters of the Old Testament,[75] those figures of the Passion and Salvation of Christ are preferred who impress in a special way through their human fate.[76] Remarkable in regard to church sculpture is a certain phenomenon that occurs rarely in older art after the sixteenth century: large groups of several figures on an altar without any retable or frame, giving expression to the idea of the memorial, which was preferred by and characteristic of the nineteenth century.[77]

---

[70] P. R. Boving, O.F.M., *Kirche und moderne Kunst* (Bonn 1922).

[71] Like medieval book design, Grünewald, El Greco, Gauguin.

[72] J. Kreitmaier, S.J., *Von Kunst und Künstlern* (Freiburg i. Br. 1926). The contemporary artists recommended in this book usually combine expressionist elements and features of the Nazarenes.

[73] For example, August Hoff with his support of Ludwig Gies and Thorn-Prikker.

[74] Cf. P. Regamey, *Kirche und Kunst im 20. Jahrhundert* (Graz, Vienna, Cologne 1954; French 1923). Le Corbusier, though not Catholic, was commissioned to build the pilgrimage church of Notre-Dame-du-Haut in Ronchamp (1950–55).

[75] Like the relief figures of Johannes Benk in the Votive Church in Vienna (1873).

[76] Goethe's suggestion of 1830 for a series of sculptures including Christ and twelve figures from the Old and the New Testament is not based on theological meaning but on human ethics (manuscript from his literary legacy [1830], printed in vol. 13 of the Artemis edition of 1954, 1066–72)

New Art Forms

Around the turn of the century, an art revolution caused the rejection of historicism because not the traditional, but the "living" form was deemed more effective.[78] This change occurred in church construction later than in secular architecture, because ecclesiastical resolutions and recommendations were continuing obstacles.[79] Moreover, many worthy forms of past church architecture—like the semicircular apse, the basilican succession of steps, and extensive glass paintings—retained their fascination and continued to be frequent design elements.

A first indication of the change in attitude is the fact that the utility of the space used for the purposes of liturgy—for the celebration of the Eucharist for administering the sacraments and for preaching—always having been required by ecclesiastical decrees, was put more and more into the foreground after 1900. The statement, made frequently after 1896 by Cornelius Gurlitt, that the liturgy is the architect of the church,[80] was taken up by the Protestants at the Second Church Architecture Convention (1906) in Dresden, which was connected with an exhibition of appropriate liturgical utensils.[81] Gurlitt's idea also became the main motto of the simultaneous liturgical movement, which intended to increase the congregation's active participation in the liturgy. The consequences for church construction, especially for the spatial arrangement, were impressive, particularly since the new structures were usually community churches, while medieval church construction (a model for historicism) was essentially determined by monastic churches, in which the needs of the choir service prevailed and the question of the congregation's ability to see the ceremony (around the altar) and hear the oral part of the service, was never taken into consideration. However, the exclusive purpose of the church as a church for the community as well as for the emancipation of the middle class and the democritization of political life has strengthened the urgency of the new demands.[82]

---

[77] For example, the group of Mary Magdalene with angels of 1841 by Carlo de Marochetti, which is located on the high altar of the Sainte-Madeleine church in Paris (R. Zeitler, "Die Kunst des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Propyläen-Kunstgeschichte* 11 [Berlin 1966], ill. 333b).

[78] "The most essential, most indispensable requirement to assure the beauty of an art work is the life which radiates from the material in which it is created" (H. van de Velde, *Die Belebung des Stoffes als Prinzip der Schönheit* [1910] reprinted in H. van de Velde, *Zum neuen Stil. Aus seinen Schriften ausgewählt und eingeleitet von H. Curjel* [Munich 1955], 175).

[79] See *CICfontes,* 1164, ART. 1: "The ordinaries need to take care that in church construction those forms are preserved which are part of the Christian tradition." A decree of the archdiocese of Cologne recommended in 1912 to use the "Romanesque, Gothic transition-style."

[80] C. Gurlitt, *Kirchen,* 83.

[81] W. Weyres, O. Bartning, *Kirchen,* 209f.

In accord with these tendencies of the liturgical movement was the simultaneous general architectural theory whose highest maxim required that justice be done to function, material, and construction.[83] The same perspective of religious and artistic reform around the turn of the century evolved from the ability to understand and appreciate any kind of form, including the liturgy, as an organic entity; an ability that was furthered by the development of sensitivity and perceptual psychology in the second half of the nineteenth century.[84] In regard to church architecture, the new maxims meant that quality and effectiveness of the final creation were no longer considered dependent on their approval by history. At first, the fixation on the Gothic style[85] was criticized; later on, the slightest historical reminiscence fell victim to objection. The goal and the basis for evaluation are not the precise correspondence with the architectural model but, on the contrary, the impact of the new building materials of the advancing technological age on form and construction. Thus, the use of iron for support beams and ribbed vaults in the Church of Saint Eugene in Paris (1854–1855)[86] or the use of a reinforced concrete framework in the Church of Saint Jean de Montmartre (begun 1894)[87] were praised as progressive accomplishments, even though the innovations in these basically Neo-Gothic churches came about principally for practical and financial reasons. Nevertheless, the abandonment of the exclusive use of raw stones was regretted. However, the church of Notre-Dame de Raincy, built by Auguste Perret (1874–1954) in 1923 with visible ferroconcrete, was intended to show off its innovations, and the contractor, Abbé Nègre, decided: "A paroisse jeune édifice d'esprit neuf!"

---

[82] Ibid., 95ff. Regarding the influence of the liturgical movement, see W. Braunfels, *LThK*² VI, 682–87, and A. Fuchs, ibid., 199–205. Epoch-making for understanding the new liturgy: R. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Freiburg i. Br. 1922); cf. also R. Schwarz, *Vom Bau der Kirche* (Würzburg 1938, Heidelberg 1947) and T. Klauser, *Richtlinien für die Gestaltung des Gotteshauses aus dem Geist der römischen Liturgie* (Münster i. W. 1955). In Protestantism: O. Bartning, *Vom neuen Kirchenbau* (Berlin 1919).

[83] N. Pevsner, *Wegbereiter moderner Formgebung* (Hamburg 1957; Engl. 1946); S. Giedion, *Raum, Zeit, Architektur. Die Entstehung einer neuen Tradition* (Ravensburg 1964; Engl. 1941); G. Bandmann, "Der Wandel in der Materialbewertung in der Kunsttheorie des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Beiträge zur Theorie der Künste im 19. Jahrhundert,* ed. by H. Koopmann, J. A. Schmoll (Eisenwerth) (Frankfurt a. M. 1971), 129–60.

[84] Aloys Goergen speaks of "devotional form" (in W. Weyres, O. Bartning, *Kirchen,* 14ff.).

[85] When Gothic construction principles were demanded for the construction of the cathedral of Liverpool, there was opposition against this narrow-mindedness (C. Gurlitt, *Kirchen,* 66ff.).

[86] By L. A. Boileau (1812–96); N. Pevsner, *Wegbereiter,* 81.

[87] By A. de Baudot; N. Pevsner, *Wegbereiter,* 85.

This process of emancipation of formerly profane materials and related construction principles, which may no longer be obscured by traditional decorations, has not ceased yet,[88] even though, as mentioned above, the aftereffects of individual historical forms and formulas can still be observed. These allusions and reminders, however, turn into pliable elements in the hands of the individual architect who does not feel obligated any longer to the theological symbolism of the structure and its parts, but tries to transcend the material composition of the church by means of the individually designed form and to instill it with "sacred poetry."[89] The sacred character of the edifice is, therefore, created by the individual's sensitive interpretation of form. The natural conflict between ecclesiastical traditionalism, which does not allow, for example, "unusual" pictures and demands consideration of the *formae a traditione christiana receptae et artis sacrae leges,*[90] and the individuality of the artist are thus resolved in favor of the artist, at least as long as his creation complies with the demands of the liturgy. Naturally, the new demands of the liturgy (in regard to church architecture: abolition of the choir rails and altar pieces, new seating arrangements for the congregation and relatively free ground plans, abolition of the multiplicity of altars and much more)[91] was subject to the changes in theological concepts, which, in turn, are not independent of the general tendencies of the time. This opened up welcome opportunities for change to contemporary church architecture. However, this change, no longer encumbered by traditionalism, according to which the church structure belonged to the external aspects of the liturgy,"[92] entailed threatening consequences for churches of the past which are still in use today and stand in high esteem as art works.[93] Thus, according to a report in 1963 on the previous decade by the state curator of Westphalia, Hermann Busen, the congregation of an important Gothic Catholic church in Westphalia proposed in 1953 to lift the choir by seven steps, "in order to do justice to the newest liturgical insights regarding the idea of Christ the King," and in 1962, the same congregation requested that the choir "be dropped by seven steps, and to move the altar forward by fifteen meters in order to follow the newest liturgical understanding of the concept of the circumstance."[94]

---

[88] F. Pfammater, *Betonkirchen* (Zurich 1948).

[89] R. Schwarz, *Vom Bau der Kirche,* passim.

[90] *CICfontes* ART. 1279, 1164.

[91] T. Klauser, op. cit.; W. Weyres, O. Bartning, op. cit.; U. Rapp, op. cit. It has been noted occasionally that these demands can be compared to those during the period of the Enlightenment (W. Weyres. O. Bartning, op. cit., 88ff.) and that church architecture thus began to approach Protestant styles; for the Protestants, traditions are of less importance, but they have always kept the needs of the congregation in regard to the liturgy's visibility and audibility in mind.

[92] Thus, in ART. 128 of the resolutions regarding chapter VII of the liturgy constitution of the Second Vatican Council of 1963 (U. Rapp, op. cit., 83).

[93] G. Bandmann, "Der Kirchenbau der Gegenwart und die Vergangenheit," *Kunst und Kirche* XXIX (1966), 51–56, 122–25.

In church architecture, the new principles of architectural theory, as aforementioned, succeeded less swiftly than in secular architecture. An early example of the attempt to bring form "to life" is the continuing construction of a church in Barcelona which was begun in 1867 and was dedicated to the Holy Family. The project was carried out by Antonio Gaudí (1852–1926), who used a Neo-Gothic ground plan and stylized the historical elements according to Art Nouveau, taking them to new heights of expression.[95]

Only after 1920 did Germany and France build churches that corresponded to the altered demands. The early churches of Dominikus Böhm,[96] the Antonius Church of Karl Moser in Basel (1927), the Corpus Christi Church of Rudolf Schwarz in Aachen (1930), and the aforementioned Notre Dame de Raincy were the models for the many new structures after World War II,[97] which the original artists of the twenties helped to a large extent to build.[98]

Since about 1960, new architects took their place who were likewise disciples of the aesthetic maxims of modern times, but who were not compelled by the same need for expression as were their predecessors, who had been imprinted with the spirit of the youth movement of 1919–1933. Moreover, the need and the capability for worship seem to have diminished as well.[99]

---

[94] H. Busen, *Westphalen* 41 (1963), 21.

[95] J. Bergós, *Antoni Gaudí, l'hombre i l'obra* (Barcelona 1954); H. G. Evers, *Vom Historismus zum Funktionalismus* (Baden-Baden 1967), 61f. He realized in the building his own symbolism, hardly based on tradition. The west side was to be dedicated to Christ's majesty, the north side to his passion, the south side to his youth. The middle tower and the four surrounding towers were to mean Christ and the Evangelists, the choir tower the Virgin Mary. Only the south side was completed when Gaudí died.

[96] Neu-Ulm, 1925–26; Frielingsdorf, 1927; Saint Engelbert in Cologne-Riehl, 1933.

[97] W. Weyres, O. Bartning, *Kirchen,* passim.

[98] Good summaries in W. Weyres, O. Bartning, *Kirchen;* J. Pichard, *Les églises nouvelles à travers le monde* (Paris 1960).

[99] H. Schnell, "Kirchenbau im Wandel. 'Was ist eine Kirche?'," *Das Münster* 25 (1972), 2. The book by H. Schnell, *Der Kirchenbau des 20. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland* (Munich, Zurich 1973) is in the process of publication and could not be studied, though it covers many issues presented here.

The resolutions of the Second Vatican Council regarding Chapter VII of the liturgical constitution of 4 December 1963, which refrained from dependence on a certain historical sacred style (ARTICLE 123) and desired the structure to be an "external aspect of the liturgy," "dignified and functional" (ART. 128), confirm what has been in existence for a long time and is possibly facing another change even now.

SECTION FOUR

Teaching and Theology

CHAPTER 20

The Encyclical Aeterni Patris

The encyclical *Aeterni Patris* of 4 August 1879[1] was not just a specific doctrine about the philosophical and theological orientation of Catholic schools, but also the foundation of the entire program that Leo XII wanted to pursue in his pontificate. One can easily refer all subsequent doctrines and activities to this document. Otto Willmann called this encyclical the "ripe fruit of spontaneous regeneration attempts";[2] it reiterated earlier efforts to continue not just any form of medieval scholasticism, but specifically revive the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas.[3] At first, the program concerned the Catholic Church only, and Franz Erhle prognosticated correctly when he remarked that for those "who renounced Christ and his Church the word of Christ's deputy would fade away like the voice of one crying in the wilderness."[4] However, the encyclical did, indeed, initiate a philosophical movement whose most important representatives were able to revive Aquinas as one of the greatest thinkers of Hellenic-Occidental philosophy. To follow the encyclical and refer to Thomas Aquinas himself required tedious historical research. But philosophical thought itself also had to internalize the true work of Aquinas, that is, to include it in the philosophical process. Thus, the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* contains two aspects: It speaks from tradition, but this tradition must be revived in order to be able to do justice to the problems of the modern world.[5]

The heading of the encyclical reads: *De philosophia christiana ad mentem sancti Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris angelici in scholis catholicis instauranda.* Of this "Christian philosophy" and its creator, Thomas Aquinas (died 1274), Pope Innocent VI, six hundred years later, is quoted as having said: Aside from its "canonical doctrine," this philosophy distinguished itself from all others by its peculiar vocabulary, its *modus docendi,* and its truthfulness, so that those who followed it never left the path of truth, and those who rejected it became suspect (*de veritate suspectus*). Thomas alone (*unus*) succeeded in overcoming all errors of previous times and in providing "invincible weapons" to combat future ones. This school was replaced by the method of a "a certain new way of philosophy" (*nova quaedam philosophiae ratio*), which, however, did not have the desired effect. Instead, philosophical directions have increased to a large extent, causing doubt and finally errors. Even Catholic philosophers, eager to imitate, have fallen victim to this revival mania, instead of replenishing the "inheritance of ancient wisdoms." This does not exclude making use of the treasure of new thoughts in order to perfect this philosophy (*novorum inventorum opes ad excolendam philosophiam*). Later, in regard to natural sciences, Innocent VI said that the Scholastics had learned that human intelligence could only be elevated to the capacity of knowing spiritual beings by way of the sensible world; they had also studied nature with great interest, as Albertus Magnus proved. This and statements by natural scientists themselves allow the conclusion that Scholastic philosophy has nothing to counter it. The *artes belles* and the *artes liberales* also are at home in this philosophy.[6]

---

[1] *Acta Leonis* I, 255–84.

[2] *Geschichte des Idealismus* (Braunschweig ²1907), 908.

[3] In Perugia, Cardinal G. Pecci, his brother Giuseppe (Jesuit), and several Dominicans founded the Accademia San Tommaso.

[4] In F. Pelster, op. cit., 38.

[5] ". . . encyclique, traditionaliste en un sens mais assez révolutionaire par rapport aux routines antérieures": R. Aubert, *Nouvelle Histoire de l'Église* (in preparation).

By reviving the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, the encyclical claims to offer a universal solution to all problems of the modern world, last but not least for social problems: Whatever Thomas Aquinas taught concerning the true nature of freedom and the divine origin of authority possessed an "invincible power" to overcome those principles of the "new law" (i.e., revolution) which harm order and public welfare. Scholastic philosophy could be the remedy because Thomas Aquinas differentiated properly between reason and faith and, at the same time, combined the two in "friendship" and because he perfected reason to the utmost degree, so that it could not easily be improved. From this, the encyclical concludes, the rationalists could be led to faith against their resistance, provided they were taught the highest rationality of Thomistic philosophy. "Aside from the supernatural assistance of God," nothing is as effective against error as this philosophy.[7]

The encyclical clearly differentiates between the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and that phase of Scholasticism in which the philosophers proceeded *nimia subtilitate,* referring to the period of decline of the *disputatio.* The encyclical suggests that the wisdom of Thomas

---

[6] *Acta Leonis* I, 273f., 276, 277f., 280ff.

[7] Ibid., 274, 279.

Aquinas be drawn from other sources. But the development of Thomistic philosophy is described as a totally continuous process, leading smoothly from the old Christian apologists via Augustine to culmination in Aquinas, to whom we must return. Modern questions should be incorporated and the doctrine should be refined, but the intellectual world was perfected in the thirteenth century (in a classical sense). *Aeterni Patris* refers to everything, to society and politics, to the natural sciences and aesthetics; however, it leaves out the problem of history, as contemporary Neo-Scholasticism generally continued to do.[8] It is remarkable that the famous historian of Scholasticism, Franz Ehrle, in his commentary on *Aeterni Patris* (his first great work), should present the historical development toward Thomas Aquinas as uninterrupted progress (in accord with the encyclical); later, however, when dealing with the subsequent fate of Thomas's work and the history of Scholasticism, he expressed his historical appreciation for the pro and con of the struggle, no matter how Thomas, as the *princeps,* is evaluated. Ehrle emphasized most of all that the older Spanish scholastics of the sixteenth century were "for the most part intelligent, independent scholars, not inclined for reasons of mere piety to close themselves to the challenges of good arguments, and far removed from the kind of devotion which was to become characteristic of the newer Dominican school after Báñez." It should be noted that the interests of the order were involved in this matter; yet this commentary from 1880 shows that the Thomistic renascence was interpreted as a historical, creative process, not as a classical copy.[9] By commissioning the edition of St. Thomas (*Editio Leonina*), appearing since 1882, Leo XIII earned significant and everlasting credit in the field of historical Thomas scholarship.[10] Unfortunately, understanding Thomas as an entity removed from his historical context (which later led to canonical regulation regarding the instruction in Catholic schools) partly prohibited a philosophical and thus a real acquisition of Aquinas.[11]

---

[8] The philosophical pioneers in Italy were the Jesuits Taparelli d'Azeglio (died 1862) and mainly M. Liberatore (died 1892; his chief work 1840/42), who also dealt with social philosophy. That "its position is weakened by a (subconscious) rationalistic tint" (O. H. Pesch, *LThK*² X, 160) continues to be a basic problem in Neo-Scholasticism (P. Dezza, *All'origini del Neotomismo* [Milan 1940], 65–73).

[9] In F. Pelster, op. cit., 63–89.—A biographical sketch of F. Ehrle: 191–202.

[10] The weaknesses which resulted from the speed with which the edition of the first volumes was prepared were avoided by the Dutch C. Suermondt, O.P., who collaborated after 1919 (G. F. Rossi, *Il 4° pioniere della commissione leonina, C. S.* [Piacenza 1954]).

[11] *CICfontes,* 1366, ART. 2, requires that philosophy and theology are to be taught "according to the method, doctrine, and principles" of Thomas Aquinas. The definition of Aquinas's historical position was not facilitated by this requirement. "Research on the

Following the *Constitutio de fide catholica* of the First Vatican Council, the significance of true philosophy for theology was strongly emphasized. This is evident in the title of the encyclycal *De philosophia christiana.* Quoting Clement of Alexandria, the encyclical states that the doctrine of the Savior, being God's wisdom and in and of itself perfect, can not acquire more force through Greek philosophy, but by means of the proper philosophy the truth of the revelation could be defended. Moreover, it maintains that the use of philosophy compelled theology to attain the character, the appearance, and the spirit of a true science (*requiritur philosophiae usus, ut sacra Theologia naturam, habitum, ingeniumque verae scientiae suscipiat atque induat*).[12] This feature of theology is based mainly on the fact that the Neo-Scholasticism of the period when the encyclical was written arrived at theology via philosophy,[13] causing Neo-Scholastic theology to be largely characterized by the application of the terminological tools of the Neo-Scholastic philosophy,[14] at least until Biblical theology forced its way in the course of the twentieth century.

Stubbornly and energetically, Leo XIII implemented his encyclical. On 18 January 1880, he ordered Cardinals A. de Luca, Simeoni, and Zigliara, O.P., to undertake the editing of the works of Aquinas, as well as the commentaries by Cajetan (1507–22), who was (even by Neo-Scholastics) considered the definite expositor of Thomas, thus making it difficult to dispute his authority by using Thomas himself. In May of the same year, under the presidency of Giuseppe Pecci, the Pope's brother, the Accademia Romana di San Tommaso was opened and well funded in order to enable it to educate the next generation. The foundation became the model for the Catholic world. Leo XIII emphatically supported the theologians of his program: in 1880 he appointed his former student Francesco Satolli professor of dogmatics at the Pontifical Urban College of the Propagation of the Faith; G. Cornoldi, S.J., was called by the Pope from Bologna to help found the Academy; after 1881 S.

---

historical context of Aquinas's work begins at the end of the nineteenth century and soon . . . makes tremendous progress; however, for decades it remains, amazingly, without any influence on the systematic interpretation of Aquinas, especially when it threatens to question the absolute value of Aquinas and the presumed total identity of his doctrine with Church doctrine" (O. H. Pesch, ibid. [op. cit. in n. 8]).

[12] *Acta Leonis* I, 262, 263.

[13] Leo XIII himself had studied philosophy and theology with G. Perrone and F. Patrizi at the Roman College. Perrone (1794–1876) was friends with H. Newman and influenced by Möhler in his doctrine of tradition. He was less inclined toward theological speculation than toward the positive, apologetic method and belongs among the founders of Neo-Scholasticism with his *Praelectiones theologicae* (1835–42) (W. Kasper, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römischen Schule* [Freiburg i. Br. 1962], 29–181).

[14] G. Söhngen, *LThK*² VII, 923.

Schiffini, S.J., taught mainly philosophy at the Gregoriana; after 1885 L. Billot, S.J., taught theology; in 1886 C. Mazzella, S.J., from 1878 dogmatist at the Gregoriana, was appointed cardinal. In 1884, at papal request, the University of Louvain established a teaching chair for Thomistic philosophy, which was first occupied by D. Mercier, and developed one of the most important centers of creative Neo-Scholasticism. However, D. Palmieri, S.J., after 1867 professor for dogmatics at the Gregoriana and critic of hylomorphism, was dismissed in 1879 because he was unable to comply with the philosophical program of the Pope and preferred to keep silent rather than speak out against his convictions.[15] In Piacenza in 1880, the periodical *Divus Thomas* began a series of new Thomistic publications: the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* (1888), *Pastor Bonus* (Trier 1888), *Revue Thomiste* (Paris 1893), *Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie* (Louvain 1894), *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* (Milan 1909). There were plenty of channels for a Thomas renascence.

---

[15] Hocedez III, 48, 371f. But Leo XIII was considerate enough to agree to transfer Palmieri as exegete to Maastricht, where Palmieri represented a conservative standpoint until 1894. Other professors at the Gregoriana had to go, too (R. Aubert, *Aspects,* 159ff.).

CHAPTER 21

Neo-Thomism, Neo-Scholasticism, and the "New Philosophers"

The necessary conceptual differentiation between "Neo-Scholasticism" and "Neo-Thomism"[1] indicates that scholastic-systematic philosophy and theology in the Catholic Church of the nineteenth century and also during Leo XIII's pontificate do not represent a monolith, as most of the publications[2] seem to suggest. However, they often simply claim to be written *ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis.* But the traditions of Duns Scotus (especially with the Franciscans) and of Suárez (especially with the Jesuits) continue to thrive. There is also a difference between the often sterile letter-bound Neo-Thomism ("Paleothomism" [Steenbergen]) and the attempts of those, in the minority though they were, to proceed not formally from Thomas and thereby deduce the actualizing conclusions but rather to reverse the process and return to the great tradition of a real live questioning of contemporary problems. The picture becomes much more variegated if one considers that the other great (and older) tradition of Catholic thought, leading from Augustine via Bonaventura to Pascal, had not died out, even though those men who lived in it, as for example Maurice Blondel, could cause conflicts if they were not willing to subordinate the great father of the Church Augustine to the now dominant doctrine by quoting him occasionally. The Jesuit Franz Ehrle, who began his scholarly career with commentaries on *Aeterni Patris,*[3] proved, as one of the great scholars of medieval Scholasticism, what the "Augustinianism" of the thirteenth century, existing alongside and in harmony with Aristotelianism, had meant. However, it took time to recover the entire wealth of tradition and thus the freedom to philosophize in the Catholic Church.

---

[1] "Neo-Scholasticism" refers to the Scholasticism of the nineteenth century, including the Scholastic traditions which continue to survive in spite of Thomas Aquinas's official preferential position since 1879, traditions which particularly follow Duns Scotus and Suárez; "Neo-Thomism" begins in the middle of the nineteenth century (after a few predecessors) and is the renascence of Aquinas's philosophy and theology, proceeding without direct relation to academic tradition. However, most Neo-Thomist philosophers and historians are not pure Thomists.

[2] The Thomist bibliography (1920) contains 2,219 entries for the period from 1800 to 1920; F. van Steenberghen, op. cit., 352.

In Rome itself, the encyclical was unable to give rise to a Neo-Thomism which could be compared to the significance of Matteo Liberatore. This is partially due to the difficulties of changing the current school traditions, partially to the tendency of formally arguing with Aquinas' authority, and to not taking modern philosophy and science seriously. The influential Jesuit Camillo Mazzella[4] advocated in his extensive treatise a Suarezian Scholasticism (Grabmann). Its most important representative was the Jesuit Louis Billot of Lorraine, who regularly taught theology at the Gregoriana from 1885 until 1911. He was a "Thomist totally adhering to Thomas and the older Thomists" (S. Tromp) defending the *immutabilitas* of tradition against all historical thought, which he equated with heretical evolutionism (rejection of a history of dogma).[5] G. Cornoldi, who participated in the founding of the Accademia Romana di San Tommaso, fought against the disciples of Rosmini, charging them with a "synthesis of ontologism and pantheism," a dispute which, in 1887, in conjunction with the political problem of the "Roman question," brought about the ecclesiastical censure of forty of Rosmini's propositions.[6] Two years before the encyclical on Thomas, the Collegio di S. Bonaventura was established in Quaracchi (Florence). There, the works of the Franciscan Doctor of the Church (since 1588) were published and an international research center was developed.[7] This did more to overcome a stagnation of philosophical-theological tradition than narrow-minded anti-Thomist polemics.

---

[3] Cf. chap. 20.

[4] Cf. below, p. 315.

[5] H. Le Floche, *Le cardinal Billot* (Paris 1947).

[6] Cf. chap. 15.—P. Dezza, *I neotomisti italiani del secolo XIX,* 2 vols. (Milan 1942–44).

In Germany and Austria, Neo-Thomism also had numerous, often rather belligerent representatives who continued the tradition of Jakob Clemens and Constantin von Schäzler (died 1880) and contributed a great deal to the failure of the intention underlying Leo XIII's encyclical.[8] Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835–88), by far superior to the theologians of his generation, was an unusually open-minded spirit and a deeply devout dogmatist from the Rhineland. He left a gap in this period in Germany which will never be closed. It is questionable whether Scheeben, who incorporated post-Tridentine theology and the Tübingen school as well as Neo-Thomism into his creative, original, and modern work, should be included in "Neo-Scholasticism." But excluding him from this category would mean isolating him in a manner which is not in accord with the movement as a whole. It would mean presenting "the theology of the past as a multiplicity of efforts exerted by devout thinkers" (J. Höfer). Many of Scheeben's main works had already been published long before *Aeterni Patris,*[9] penetrating an area of action that had been inspired by the encyclical among groups who did not interpret the letter as a request for 'repristination.' When Scheeben was completely himself, "he thought, like no other Neo-Scholastic, purely from faith and 'unapologetically,' "[10] from the "childlike faith" (Scheeben) which was to him the perfection of religious belief. This, of course, did not comply with the kind of conclusion theology which dominated Neo-Scholasticism. The "double form" of theology—devotion and intellectual agreement—remained a problem for Scheeben, which he faced through the influence of Kleutgen and Schäzler.

---

[7] The first assistant prefect was Fidelis a Fanna (1838–81), who searched five hundred libraries for manuscripts. His successor was the Westphalian I. Jeiler (1832–1904), after 1879 in Quaracchi; J. Reinhold, *AFrH* 47 (1954), 1–44.—Since 1885 publication of *Analecta Franciscana,* since 1903 the *Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica mediiaevi.*

[8] Especially polemical was E. Commer (1847–1928, born in Berlin), who founded in 1886 the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie* (after 1914 *Divus Thomas*), author of *Immerwährende Philosophie* (1899), 1900–11 professor of dogmatics in Vienna; regarding his fight against H. Schell, cf. chap. 29.—As a result of the conflict with the rector of the Catholic University in Washington, J. Keane, J. Pohle returned to Germany in 1894 (cf. chap. 10), thereafter professor of dogmatics in Münster; in 1888, he and K. Gutberlet (1837–1928) founded the *Philosophische Jahrbuch* of the Görres-Society; concerning Gutberlet, see E. Hartman, *PhJ* 41 (1928), 261–66; P. Simon, *Hochland* 25 (1927), 437ff.—As a politician, as well as in his few philosophical works, G. von Hertling (cf. chap. 15) pursued an objective presentation of Neo-Scholastic principles; C. Baeumker, *DLZ* 39 (1918), 3–7, 35–40.—The apologist from Würzburg, F. Hettinger (1819–90), derived his criticism of the period from his profound knowledge, while A. M. Weiß, O.P., from Upper Bavaria, after 1890 professor in Fribourg, fought a very unsophisticated battle against Liberalism.—Leading away from a very narrow-minded opposition, the moral theologian from Münster, J. Mausbach (1861–1931), was able to combine Thomism with the Augustinian tradition; G. Schreiber, *J. Mausbach* (Münster 1931).—Regarding the Jesuit moral theologians, cf. chaps. 12 and 13.—Dogmatist J. B. Heinrich (1816–91) was known as the "head of the second Mainz circle" (L. Lenhart). He was a cofounder of the Görres-Society, like P. L. Haffner (1829–99; 1886: bishop of Mainz), whom he influenced greatly and who became the first chairman of the philosophical section; H. Lenhart, *Die philosophische-theologische Fakultät des Mainzer Priesterseminars* (Mainz 1946); Grabmann G., 230–36.—Since the faculty of theology at the University of Fribourg was entrusted to the Dominicans, Neo-Thomism ruled supreme. T. Coconnier (1846–1908; 1875: student of Zigliara in Rome, 1890: dogmatist at the Institut catholique in Toulouse), J.-J. Berthier (1847–1924, after 1905 mostly in Rome) and P. Mandonnet (1858–1936) founded the *Revue Thomiste* (1893).

With the exception of Scheeben, all German Neo-Scholastics of that period are outranked in significance by the scholars of medieval Scholasticism (Franz Ehrle, Heinrich Denifle, Clemens Baeumker, and Martin Grabmann), whose early activities still belong in this period. The Dominican Denifle from Tyrol (1844–1905) and the Jesuit Ehrle from the Allgäu (1845–1934) collaborated (after 1880 in Rome) in the publication of the *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters:* from 1885 until 1900 seven volumes of "eternal value" (Grabmann). Denifle deserves special credit regarding mysticism (Eckhart, Tauler, Suso), and Ehrle demonstrated with his scholarship and editions the variety of Scholastic thought.[11] The historian of philosophy Baeumker (1853–1924; following his professorship in Breslau, Bonn, and Strasbourg, he succeeded Georg von Hertling in Munich in 1912) showed the connection between Scholasticism and Moslem philosophy and called attention to the continued existence of Platonism, which he demonstrated in his main work on Witelo (1908) and his metaphysics of light in the thirteenth century. Now the stage was set for an extensive study of the Scholastic method, which was presented by Grabmann (1875–1945).[12] Included in this group of scholars is the Belgian

---

[9] *Natur und Gnade* I (Mainz 1861); *Mysterien des Christentums* (Freiburg i. Br. 1865); *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik* I and II (Freiburg i. Br. 1874–75), III–VI (1880–87), incomplete; new edition by J. Höfer and others, 7 vols. (Freiburg 1941–57).

[10] K. Eschweiler, *Die zwei Wege der neueren Theologie. G. Hermes—M. J. Scheeben* (Augsburg 1926), 183; biblio. in regard to Scheeben until 1957 in the new edition (cf. n. 9). In that regard, see F. S. Pancheri, *Il pensiero teologico di M. Scheeben e S. Tommaso* (Padua 1956).

[11] M. Grabmann, *H. S. Denifle* (Mainz 1905); A. Walz, *Studi storiografici* (Rome 1949), 28–33; id. *Analecta Denifleana* (Rome 1955); A. Redigonda, *H. S. Denifle* (Florence 1953). Regarding F. Ehrle, 1895–1941 prefect of the Vatican Library, cf. chap. 20.

[12] C. Baeumker founded the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (1891). The title of one of his main works, *Die europäische Philosophie des Mittelalters* (Leipzig 1909), was changed for its second edition in 1913 to *Die christliche Philosophie des Mittelalters.* In regard to his audience with Pius X on 2 March 1908 in connection

Maurice De Wulf (1867–1947), a pupil of Désiré Mercier, who founded the collection *Les Philosophes belges* (Louvain 1901ff).[13] Even though the Neo-Scholastic systematists initially ignored these efforts, they kept the Thomistic renascence from stagnating into a classicism.

In France, most of the Neo-Thomists, strictly following the Gregoriana, did not go beyond their sterile disputations. An exception was the *Institut catholique* in Paris where Maurice d'Hulst seized upon Duilhé's idea of trying to avoid spiritual provincialism and to prove the productiveness of the Neo-Thomist method by holding international congresses for Catholic scholars.[14] In this respect, the spirit of the center took effect where this particular period succeeded in an actual encounter with Thomas Aquinas: the spirit of the University of Louvain and Mercier (1851–1926). This scholar from Brabant, after studying philosophy and theology, became interested in psychiatry, which had an impact on the curriculum which Mercier taught after 1882 in his position as professor of Thomist philosophy, which had been created by the Belgian episcopate at Leo XIII's request. The thirty-one-year-old professor fascinated his students, including nontheologians, with the decisiveness with which he responded to the ultimate questions posed by the natural sciences, and with his efforts to "philosophize for one's contemporaries." Of course, his extensive use of psychology raises the question whether this approach is appropriate for Thomist ontology. However, Mercier tried most of all to come to terms with Positivism, so popular those days, and he was just as interested in it as he was in Kant's philosophy. He was intent, however, on preserving theology's independence relative to philosophy. The *Institut supérieur de philosophie,* established in 1889, was the result of a proposal by Mercier to Leo XIII in 1887. Mercier was also its first president. The *Revue néo-scolastique,* founded in 1894, achieved international repute. The success created enemies, at first in Belgium, later in Rome, where the new prefect of the Congregation of Studies, Cardinal Mazella, S.J., considered theologians'

---

with the founding of an international society for scholars (cf. chap. 15) L. Pastor (*Tagebücher,* 490) writes: the Pope said that, "in agreement with Cardinal Rampolla and Merry del Val, it is out of the question that M. Spahn and C. Baeumker be accepted" (M. Grabmann, "C. Baeumker und die Erforschung der Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Philosophie," *BGPhMA* 25 [1927], 1–38).—M. Grabmann conducted his manuscript studies in Rome after 1900, supported by Ehrle and Denifle (L. Ott, *M. Grabmann zum Gedächtnis* [Munich 1949]).

[13] The *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* (Louvain ^{1}1940) deals with the question of what Scholastics have in common; the revision of the 6th edition (1934ff.) shows with which problems a universal presentation has to deal; F. van Steenberghen, *RPhL* 46 (1948), 421–47.

[14] Cf. chap. 15.

intensive occupation with natural sciences a waste of time. Of equal importance was the objection that the lectures in French were jeopardizing not only Scholastic terminology, but also the theological correctness of the doctrine. Since Mazzella succeeded in persuading the Pope in favor of his reservations, Latin was decreed as the language of instruction for some time after 1895. Mazella's succession by Cardinal (after 1895) Satolli, who respected Mercier, brought about the conclusion of the affair in 1898.[15]

The picture of a united front does not entirely match the reality of Neo-Scholasticism. This is evidenced by the effort in regard to Bonaventure, the rather aggressively defended positions of Suarezianism[16] which the Jesuits (often somewhat artificially) tried to coordinate with Thomism, and Scotism to which the Franciscans were devoted.[17] Such differences were still confined to Neo-Scholasticism. However, within the tradition of occidental thinking, attempts were made by individuals (consequently isolated people) to break, so to speak, the anthropocentric concept of the world from the inside and to prove the terminologically absolute opposite of immanence and transcendence to be an apparent opposite by using the argument of concrete existence. This resulted in a dispute with strangely inverted fronts: These philosophical theorems are based on the Christian mystery of Incarnation and on the belief in the support of the Holy Spirit, even though they were clearly philosophical or, at least, intended to be. They were rejected by the Neo-Scholastics as "modernistic" and categorized under different, hostile "isms." Neo-Scholastic philosophy and theology, on the other hand, often contained a goodly measure of rationalism, which could only seemingly be brought in tune with the Christian belief in revealed religion. These disputations often entailed quite subjective assessments of Neo-Scholastic efforts. The German theologian and religious philosopher Herman Schell taught that "in the acknowledgement of the Holy Spirit as the essential manifestation of Deity the principle of immanence and the idea of transcendence are intimately linked and the intrinsic worldliness of action is combined in superior harmony with the nontemporal power of creation." Rejecting any form of pantheism, Schell developed an image of God as "being completely in Himself and of Himself." He did not believe that the dynamics of this image could be grasped by the terminology of academic tradition. Thus he conceived the term God as *causa sui,* which he later (after being put on the Index) replaced with "self-reality," without terminologically relinquishing the actuality of God and His being-active-in Himself. This concept of God was the foundation of Schell's personalism: In God's living personality rests all human personality.[18] This Augustinian tradition was transmitted by German Idealism, while the philosophy of Maurice Blondel (1861–1949) was supported by Blaise Pascal, who survived in the background of French philosophical life, and by Nicolas de Malebranche, who influenced Leibniz. One of Leibniz's key problems was the topic of Blondel's first and fundamental work: the *Vinculum substantiale.* Blondel's basic philosophical theme dealt with the attempt "to overcome the static and concrete concept of substance and to define substance both as a unifying force and as a metaphysical entity, thus evading Idealism as well as the all too material Realism. Blondel's philosophy tried to solve the problem of transcendence by integrating the triple reality of life, of thought, and of being in existence.[19] In contrast to objectivism, Blondel believes knowledge and existential revelation to be tied to subjectivity. He does not accept the opposition of immanence and transcendence, but rather finds them unified in "action" (existential realization), from which immanence automatically reaches out toward transcendence. This is the basis for the famous *Lettre sur les exigences de la pensée contemporaine en matière d'apologétique et sur la méthode de la philosophie dans l'étude du problème religieux* (1896): The "supernatural" in the Christian message is not an *extrinsécism,* something which approaches human reality like a stranger from the outside, rather it corresponds to reality, and is thus logically necessary, even if this logic does not say anything about the freedom of divine revelation and the freedom of human acceptance of it.[20]

---

[15] Some of D. Mercier's most important works are: *Psychologie* (Paris 1892); *Logique* (Paris 1894); *Métaphysique générale ou Ontologie* (Paris 1894).—M. De Wulf et al., *RNPh* 28 (1926), 5–22, 99–249; J. Pirlot, *L'enseignement de la métaphysique. Critique et Suggestions* (Louvain 1950), 33–59; L. de Raeymaeker, *Le card. Mercier et l'Institut supérieur de philosophie de Louvain* (Louvain 1952); A. Simon, *D. Mercier* (Brussels 1960).

[16] For example, by the Spaniard J. J. Urráburu, S.J. (1844–1904), (Eguía Ruiz, *EE* 4 [1945], 45–59) and by the French P. Descoqs, S.J. (1877–1946).

[17] For example Déodat de Basly (1863–1937), especially in regard to Christology; R. Haubst, *ThRv* (1956), 145–62.

---

[18] Regarding H. Schell, cf. chap 29. Quotations from: *Türmer Jahrbuch* (1906), 194; *Dogmatik* IV (1893), x; O. Schröder (op. cit., biblio. chap. 29), 370–91.

[19] R. Scherer, *Einführung zu: M. Blondel, Das Denken* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953), viii-xxxii; U. Hommes, *Transzendenz und Personalität. Zum Begriff der Action bei M. Blondel* (Frankfurt 1972).

[20] R. Scherer, *LThK*² II, 533.—Preceding the *Lettre, L'Action. Essai d'une critique de la vie et d'une science de la pratique* was published in 1893 (Paris); in contrast to the volumes of 1936–37, it was called "first action." The period covered here includes the following works by Blondel: *Histoire de dogme. Les lacunes philosophiques de l'exégèse moderne* (La Chapelle-Montligeon 1904), a critical study of historicism.—Basic literature regarding the *Lettre:* R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi, données traditionelles et résultats des controverses récentes* (Louvain 1945).—A. Hayen, *Bibliographie blondélienne* (Messina

Blondel's teacher was L. Ollé-Laprune (1839–1898), professor in Aix-en-Provence from 1896 to his death, who from 1875 on had taught philosophy at the École normale supérieure in Paris as a disciple of Malebranche: The conflict between faith and knowledge can only be overcome in personal experience, which is inaccessible to dialectic analysis.[21] This was also the basis for the philosophy of Lucien Laberthonnière (1860–1932), who became an Oratorian in 1886. In the *Annales de Philosophie chrétienne,* which he edited between 1905 and 1913, he campaigned passionately for Blondel's work and against Neo-Scholasticism.[22] When (in 1913) the Holy Office prohibited him from publishing, his loyalty to the Church remained unshaken.

Both the initiative to revive the Thomism that was inspired by Leo XIII and that was productive in significant ways, as well as the efforts of these "new philosophers" have to be seen in context, in spite of their opposition to Neo-Scholasticism, if one intends to obtain a historically adequate picture of the sincerity of the philosophers and theologians of those decades and of their efforts regarding the intellectual conditions under which the Christian faith can be experienced and justified in the modern world.

1953); J.-P. Golinas, *La restauration du Thomisme sous Léon XIII et les philosophes nouvelles. Études de la pensée de M. Blondel et du Père Laberthonnière* (Washington 1959); O. Schröder (op. cit., biblio., chap. 29), 255–71.

[21] R. Crippa, *Il pensiero di L. Ollé-Laprune* (Brescia 1947).

[22] M.-M. d'Hendecourt, *Essai sur la philosophie du Pere Laberthonnière* (Paris 1947); J.-P. Golinas, op. cit.

CHAPTER 22

The Theory of Church History

The "almost turbulent expansion and specialization of Church history" (H. Jedin) corresponds to the general interest in history, developing in the last third of the nineteenth century and continuing into the twentieth. Prerequisite for research was the publication of new sources of Church history in which secular institutes participated. Following the extensive editions of A. Theiner of Silesia[1] (1855–70 prefect of the Vatican Archives), and after Leo XIII opened the Archives to scholars in general in 1881, a new era began. The prefect at the time, Cardinal (after 1879) J. Hergenröther, had considerable difficulties solving the technical problems of using the Archives.[2] The rules of 1878 and 1888 regarding the use of the Vatican Library were helpful, as was its significant expansion after 1890 through the Borghese and the Barberini Libraries. In 1895 the medievalist Franz Ehrle (1922 cardinal) was appointed prefect. The opening of the Vatican Archives, which was followed by the founding of a series of national historical institutes in Rome—1881: the Austrian Institute (first director: the Protestant T. von Sickel; after 1901: L. von Pastor), 1888: the Prussian Institute (director after 1903: P. F. Kehr), later the *École française de Rome* (director after 1895: L. Duchesne)—was one of the most important moments for the rich deployment of editions and books on Church history. They have been described extensively in the first volume of this series[3] and are of interest here only in so far as we are dealing with the theoretical notion of Church history during Leo XIII's pontificate.

---

[1] H. Jedin, "A. Theiner. Zum 100. Jahrestag seines Todes (4 August 1974)," *ArSKG* 31 (1973).

As is the case in all aspects of life, history has to inquire about the relationship which Catholicism had established in regard to this academic discipline since its introduction to the modern world during Leo XIII's pontificate. The superficial debate concerning historical "objectivity," which many Catholic authors at that time felt compelled to discuss in their forewords, had no theoretical basis after G. Droysen's

---

[2] An advocate of this decision was, among others, L. Pastor, whom Hergenröther asked to write a memorial (*Tagebücher,* 128–32). A glance into the situation at that time is provided by Pastor's statement explaining that his abstracts of the archives, which he was able to prepare by special permission, were shortened by the keeper of the archives (K. A. Fink, "Das Vatikanische Archiv," *Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom* [Rome ^{2}1951], 155–67).

[3] Regarding the strong development of the history of the orders, see M. Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche* (Paderborn 1896–97, ^{3}1933–34); regarding the *Benedictines* in France, see J.-J. Bourasse (Tours 1900); in England: E. L. Taunton (London 1898); in Maredsous, U. Berlière and others deserve credit for the publication of the *Monasticon belge* (after 1890); the *Revue bénédictine* (Maredsous, after 1884, at first a general spiritual publication) was joined in 1903 by the *Bulletin d'histoire monastique;* in Munich, the *Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Zisterzienserorden* was published after 1880.—Concerning the *Dominicans,* see B. M. Reichert (ed.), *M.O.P.* (Rome after 1896); A. Mortier, *Histoire des maîtres généreaux de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs* (Paris 1903).—Regarding the Franciscans, see *AFrH* (Florence after 1908); H. Holzapfel's handbook (Freiburg i. Br. 1909) is still indispensable.—Concerning the Jesuits, see *MHSI* (Rome, after 1894), also: P. de Leturia, "Geschichte und Inhalt der Monumenta . . . ," *HJ* 72 (1953), 585–604; *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Brussels, Paris after 1890); A. Astraín, *Historia de la Compañia de Jésus en la Asistencia de España* (Madrid 1902; up to 1773); P. Tacchi-Venturi (inspired by Cardinal Ehrle), *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* (Rome 1910); St. Zaleski, *Jezuici w Polsce* (Lemberg 1900–06); T. Hughes, *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America* (London, New York 1907–17); B. Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge* (Freiburg i. Br. 1907), especially apologetic; C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus,* 9 vols. (Brussels 1890–1900).

Historik, which in the meantime was rendered obsolete especially since its advocates from the nineteenth century could be proven guilty of a natural subjectivity of their own. But just how problematic the Catholic study of history could be is shown by a remark made in 1889 by the influencial apologist A. M. Weiß, O.P. He justified the fact that the textbooks of Church history still constituted an extreme minority compared to the systematic theological textbooks by asserting that "this fact is in accord with the nature of this matter. For us, exegesis and the description of the traditional doctrines of faith and morals are the essential elements in theology. History can only be granted the rank of an ancillary science."[4] The historical-theological thought of the Tübingen school was replaced by the essentially ahistorical Neo-Scholasticism. Even though the numerous and productive Catholic historians of those decades did not consider themselves representatives of an ancillary discipline, the question remains whether and in what respect "the world" could be conceived "as history." The dispute over Johannes Janssen's (1829–91) *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*[5] largely missed the point that it was not a question of selecting the documents, which Janssen had done with utmost conscientiousness, but rather of the futility of letting the sources themselves speak. "Historical understanding" was the new hallmark of historical studies. Janssen had a better comprehension of this understanding than the otherwise much more important papal historian Ludwig Pastor (1854–1928), who was "seized by the material aspect to such an extent that he continued to work"[6] on his sixteen-volume *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (first volume 1886) "undisturbed by all intellectual developments around him, and unconcerned about the changes in historical theories." "Negating the historical development, he unfolded a detailed concept of the centralistic Church and papacy and projected it on the past." This endeavor separated him later in Innsbruck from the general development of German Catholicism,[7] but it endeared him to the Rome of Pius X (less that of Leo XIII), where he exerted considerable influence on the ecclesiastical personnel policy in Germany and Austria. Pastor's spirit permeated Cardinal J. Hergenröther's *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (1876/80, three volumes). It preserved this orientation throughout the revisions.

---

[4] In O. Köhler, *Der Katholizismus in Deutschland und der Verlag Herder* (Freiburg i. Br. 1951), 130.

[5] J. Janssen, *An meine Kritiker* (Freiburg i. Br. 1882); id., *Zweites Wort an meine Kritiker* (Freiburg i. Br. 1883).—L. von Pastor, *Joh. Janssen* (Freiburg i. Br. ^{2}1894); id., *J. Janssens Briefe,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1920). Regarding the difference between Pastor and the basically irenic Janssen, see W. Baum, "J. Janssen, Persönlichkeit, Leben und Werke," (diss., Innsbruck 1971).

[6] C. Bauer about L. Pastor, *Hochland* 26 (1928–29), 578–88 (reprint in: *Gesammelte Aufsätze* [Freiburg i. Br. 1965], 466–75).—Characteristic is Pastor's strict opposition to the title of the *Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien,* ed. by J. Greving (after 1906) (H. Jedin, *J. Greving* [Münster 1954]).

[7] Interesting in this respect is the conflict developing since 1891 between Pastor and the medievalist from Munich, H. von Grauert (1850–1924), in the editorial office of the

Leo XIII did not grow tired of including in his letters and encyclicals rather lengthy passages about Church history and especially the history of his predecessors and their service to the Western World. In the brief *Saepenumero* of 18 August 1883, addressed to Cardinals A. de Luca, J. B. Pitra and J. Hergenröther, he explained what he expected from the historians: a defense against accounts of the papacy written in *mendaci colore.* He trusted that the *incorrupta rerum gestarum monumenta,* if studied without prejudice, would successfully defend the Church and the papacy *per se ipsa.* With special regard to Italy, he called to mind the papacy's achievements during the time of the barbarian migrations, in the struggle against the medieval Emperors, and in the Turkish Wars. He also mentioned the preservation of Roman and Greek literature by the popes and the clergy.[8] The Pope spoke with conviction when he said in 1884 "Non abbiamo paura della pubblicità dei documenti,"[9] scornfully calling the sceptics around him "small minds." But, as a sharp observer noticed, Leo XIII could only say this because he did not understand the "historical method."[10] It is completely erroneous to judge this as a "gap" in Leo XIII's education. In spite of the complex quality of his personality, there was no room for historical thinking. This should not be understood to mean that the Pope was unable to follow Pastor's description of Alexander VI;[11] the history of the institution was not

---

Historisches Jahrbuch. Pastor (*Tagebücher,* 244, 270, 288); "in Munich, Grauert and Hertling developed a new point of departure toward a liberal Catholicism" (28 December 1895). The conflict caused a critical revision of the "Geschichte des deutschen Volkes" by the Church historian Emil Michael in *Historisches Jahrbuch.* Consequently, in July 1901, Pastor resigned his position in the editorial office (*Tagebücher,* 193). However, cf. the letters addressed to F. X. Kraus (H. Schiel, *Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter* 19 [1954], 191–233). Regarding E. Michael, see W. Baum, *ZKTh* 93 (Innsbruck 1971), 182–99.

[8] *Acta Leonis* III, 259–73.

[9] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 400, maintains that this was addressed to the "German circle of historians in Rome." Pastor (*Tagebücher*) noted the reception of the "historian of Campo Santa," commenting: "Which secular sovereign could say this?" According to Pastor, Anton de Waal (1837–1917; 1873: rector at Campo Santo) was willing to "work in full force for the honor and glory of the Church and the defense of the Holy See."

[10] P. M. Baumgarten, quoted in Schmidlin, *PG* II, 399; he means "historical sense."

[11] L. Pastor (*Tagebücher,* 309) noted one of Leo XIII's statements to Boyer d'Agen in 1897: "If you want to write about Alexander VI, you have to read the third volume of Pastor's book first."

thereby touched. In Leo XIII's opinion, the first law for writing history demands that nothing false be said, furthermore, that the truth not be hidden, and, lastly, that any suspicion of either favoritism or hostility be avoided.[12] But in view of indeed widespread hostility toward the Church and particularly the papacy, he presented these principles in an apologetic context which permeated all of *Saepenumero.*

German Catholicism lost its edge in the area of critical historical method after the conflict with Ignaz von Döllinger,[13] even though certain scholars tried to continue the historical method, such as: Franz Xaver Kraus, one of the founders of Christian archeology, who had already offended the sensibilities of tradition with his early work on blood ampuls found in Roman catacombs and on the Holy Nail in the Cathedral of Trier (both: 1868); K. J. Hefele's successor in Tübingen, Franz Xaver Funk, who, in his textbook of 1886, tried to overcome the static condition of Neo-Scholasticism with his concept of "development";[14] and Albert Ehrhard, who did not join the battle until 1901, and whose unpretentious scholarship was reflected in his research on the hagiography in the Greek Church.[15] The fundamental deliberation of these issues took place in France, because there the problem of the relation between revelation and history was debated by including the "Biblical question" and the history of dogma.

Charles de Smedt, S.J. (1864–76 professor of Church history at the Jesuit College in Louvain, 1882–1911 president of the Bollandists), developed certain principles of philological criticism which were used by his tremendously successful collaborator (after 1891) H. Delehaye, S.J. Per se, these principles were not problematic, even though de Smedt had to defend them, presenting them in his work *Principes de la critique historique* (Liège 1883) in the perspective of the total problem. However, Louis Duchesne (1843–1922), the famous Church historian and professor at the Institut Catholique in Paris from 1877 to 1885, got into a critical situation with his lectures on the history of dogma, creating debate and painful consequences.[16] In 1895, he became the director of the École française de Rome.[17] In 1882, Abbé Rambouillet attacked Duchesne for his theory of the development of the dogma.[18] Duchesne's response was supported by Maurice d'Hulst. While universal inerrancy was the issue of the "biblical question," historical change was the problem in regard to the history of dogma. Billot rejected even the term itself.[19] The debate, which continued into the crisis of Modernism, included in its arguments the famous essay by John Henry Newman dealing with the personal tradition of faith in history,[20] in contrast to the unfortunate concept of Vincent of Lérins, which is purely biological and develops an "unhistorical theory of tradition" (J. Ratzinger). Joseph Tixeront, after 1881 professor of the seminary of Lyon, carefully furthered the method of his teacher Duchesne. Pierre Batiffol (1861–1929), a friend of Albert Lagrange and patronized by Duchesne, studied early Christian history in Rome and became rector of the Institut Catholique in Toulouse in 1898, a position which he had to relinquish in 1907 after his book about the Eucharist (1905) was put on the Index. In his *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive* (1902), he had attempted a theoretical solution to the problem. In 1892, the historian of dogma J. Turmel was dismissed from the seminary in Rennes. His own crisis occurred in the period of Modernism.[21] In Germany, the problem was ignored. The convert Constantin von Schäzler, after 1874 consultant to the Holy Office, advocated an ahistorical position in his book *Die Bedeutung der Dogmengeschichte vom katholischen Standpunkt aus* (1884), as did J. Schwane in his four-volume history of dogma (Münster 1862/90).

---

[12] *Acta Leonis* III, 268.

[13] Concerning the headstart of the "Munich School" relative to France, see Hocedez III, 56.

[14] This theory derived one of its arguments from the fact that the Vatican Council used Vinzenz von Lérins's image of the seed for the defense against theological evolutionism. An older and more historical attempt was the essay by H. Newman "On the Development of Christian Doctrine" (London 1845), which caused a serious controversy around the eighties (cf. the following). Regarding the problem of the relationship between "development" and "tradition", see O. Köhler, *Mysterium salutis,* n. 24 with text.

[15] Regarding F. X. Kraus and A. Ehrhard, cf. chap. 29. A. Ehrhard, in connection with the antimodernist oath, was deprived of his title as prelate (1908), which hurt him deeply. He was reinstated by Pius XI in 1922 (K. Baus, *Bonner Gelehrte, Katholische Theologie* [Bonn 1968], 114–22).

---

[16] With his study about the "Holy Nail" (Trier), L. Duchesne wounded sensitivities regarding tradition even more than F. X. Kraus, because he destroyed the legend of the apostolic origin of the old French dioceses; his research, conducted since 1881, is contained in the three volumes of *Les fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* (Paris 1894, 1900, 1915); A. Houtin, *La controverse de l'apostolicité des Églises de France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1903). Between 1886 and 1892, his critical edition of the *Liber pontificalis* appeared. The *Histoire ancienne de l'Église,* 3 vols. (Paris 1906–10) was put on the Index in 1912.—The *Bulletin critique,* which Duchesne published for twenty years, trained a critical and quite ecclesiastically minded generation of historians.

[17] F. X. Kraus (*Tagebücher,* 461f., in March 1883), about a visit in Paris: Duchesne, "who is indeed even more liberal than I am and who hates the ultramontane bunch at least as much if not more, is also *aux peines* regarding the Index . . . , he wants to resign from teaching"; in November 1895 (p. 630): "D. is very happy in his position; but he seems to lean more and more toward ultramontanism . . ."; in 1898 (p. 698): ". . . now, he is obviously through with the Curia." L. Pastor (*Tagebücher,* 309, in 1897): Duchesne "expressed rather liberal and in part even strange opinions" (referring to Leo XIII's politics); in 1902 (p. 385): statement by Duchesne about T. Mommsen, who "overreacts in his hatred of Christianity" and would probably exaggerate even more if he would not have to fear criticism in "progressive Berlin."

[18] In *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques* (Lille 1882). It is understandable that Cardinal Franzelin rejected d'Hulst's attempt to present himself as in agreement with Duchesne (Hocedez III, 162).

[19] Hocedez III, 84; regarding the whole controversy: 161–172; regarding Billot: 322, 337.

[20] He was not touched by the controversy.—Cf. n. 14.

Because of the methodological specialization, several disciplines were singled out from general Church history, such as patrology,[22] a large area which, after the Vatican Council, was put aside for the time being along with the history of councils.[23] However, with few exceptions, the history of dogma within Catholic theology was unable to divorce itself from dogmatics.[24] This circumstance is significant for the condition of Church history as a whole. The fundamental problem was, on the one hand, to overcome an ahistorical concept of tradition implying a Church historiographical positivism, and on the other hand, to avoid falling victim to relativistic historicism. The largely methodical critical work of Church historians regarding editions and research during Leo XIII's pontificate set the scene for a theoretical solution of the problem of Church history.

---

[21] Cf. chap. 33, n. 28.

[22] The controversy developing around the turn of the century over this term is related to the problem of the history of dogma. O. Bardenhewer (1851–1935) rejected the theory according to which patrology is the literary history of Church Fathers, including the heretics. He advocated relying closely on the history of dogmatic definitions.

[23] K. J. von Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* I–VII (1855–74) was continued by J. Hergenröther in volumes VIII and IX (1887, 1890). In Hefele's estate (died 1893), nothing was found because the noble bishop destroyed almost all his papers before he died (R. Reinhardt, "Der Nachlaß . . . ," *ZKG* 82 [1971], 261–72; letters addressed to F. X. Kraus: H. Schiel, *ThQ* 168 [1957], 178–86).

[24] Cf. in this regard the thorough work of J. Ratzinger (1966; biblio., chap. 22).

CHAPTER 23

The Question of the Bible

While the Protestant Bible societies in Germany, England, and the United States developed with increased activity at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the efforts toward a Catholic biblical movement were suppressed and pastoral use of Holy Scripture fell behind the scholastic question-and-answer catechism. Readings of the Epistle and Gospel during Sunday Mass were generally bilingual, which was of less significance if they were considered part of the "pre-Mass" and had no relation to the sermon. "Biblical history," which was introduced to religious instruction in Germany[1] and generated a great deal of familiarity with the Holy Scriptures, had a continuing impact in that country.

Both the position of Holy Scripture in everyday religious and pastoral life and the position of biblical studies in Catholic theology have the same origin: "Since the Reformation, Catholic theology in general and biblical studies in particular considered their foremost task to be confrontation with Protestant theology."[2] This resulted in the dilemma of whether biblical studies, in accord with the Catholic idea of the Church, were "to play a role inferior to" that of theology. It is part of the Catholic self-awareness that the First Vatican Council reiterated the Tridentine decree regarding the use of the Holy Scriptures, requiring that the ecclesiastical teaching authority had the exclusive right to decide on the "true meaning" and interpretation. However, this purely negative definition did not exactly encourage the desire for biblical research, regardless of conflicts. This is demonstrated by a glance at the bibliographies relating to biblical studies at that time, when Catholic works represented a clear minority, not to mention their quality. This situation intensified in proportion to the phase difference between the defensive attitude of the teaching authority (which was understandable in view of the radical biblical criticism of David Friedrich Strauß (died 1874), Bruno Bauer (died 1882), Ernest Renan (died 1892), and others) as contrasted to the development of biblical studies according to principles about which everyone is in agreement nowadays.

Among the Bible translations in German-speaking countries, Joseph Franz von Allioli's, published between 1830 and 1832, was able to maintain its leading position throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. It follows the Vulgate "with reference to the basic text." The French translation by Jean-Baptiste Glaire was also based on the Vulgate. It was later incorporated by Fulcrain Vigouroux (1837–1915) into his *Bible polyglotte* (Paris 1897–1909). The translation of the original texts by C. Crampon gained in significance (NT 1885, OT 1894–1904). The efforts to approach the original texts by using handwritten manuscripts, i.e., philological-critical Bible editions, causing research to progress swiftly in the last third of the nineteenth century, were made almost exclusively by Protestant scholars.[3] A "decisive impact"[4] on the stimulation of biblical studies in France was accredited to the Sulpician Vigouroux, whose *Manuel Biblique* appeared between 1879 and 1890. His *Bible polyglotte* (8 volumes, in Hebrew, Greek, Latin Vulgate, and French) is derived from the Protestant *Bielefelder Polyglotte.*[5] Vigouroux was totally occupied with the battle against biblical criticism and he fought it in every way possible. In that respect he is like T.-J. Lamy (1827–1907), an exegete from Louvain, who is somewhat more moderate, however. As a Hebraist and Syriologist, he is important for the development of Eastern studies.[6] Of prominent influence in German-speaking areas was the exegete F. P. Kaulen from Bonn (1827–1907). He served as the editor of the second edition of *Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon* (Freiburg 1882–1903, 13 vols.). In 1903 he became a member of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. He was especially interested in the history of the Vulgate (1868), emphasizing this text as the "valid expression of biblical revelation" and describing the edition of the Benedictines of Tournai (1885) as "almost without errors." Like Kaulen, almost all exegetical collaborators of the Church lexicon took an extremely conservative viewpoint, which explains why, for instance, the biblical information about the patriarchs' ages was considered "historical data."[7]

---

[1] Regarding M. Sailer, ibid., 436.—Regarding the *Biblische Geschichte* by Christoph von Schmid and by Ignaz Schuster, see G. Mey: ibid., 435. Regarding the catechetical problem, see B. Dreher and H. Kreutzwald (biblio., chap. 28).

[2] A. Wikenhauser, J. Schmid, op. cit., 8.

[3] The New Testament text by Anglicans B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort (Cambridge, London 1881) was, at first, considered the final version; later, H. von Soden (New Testament 1913) offered a wealth of variances, but his theses were rejected. Research

The participation of Catholic exegetes in historical-literary biblical criticism was closely related to the concept of inspiration. Lenormant's attempt to limit the correctness of the Bible to dogmatic and moral statements failed, as did the complex undertaking of Salvatore di Bartolo to differentiate between facts, which are an integral part of dogma and ethics, and incidental, possibly erroneous data.[8] Statements of "pro-

---

regarding the Hebrew text of the Old Testament reached a climax with R. Kittel's work (1905–06).

[4] Hocedez III, 80.—The *Manuel Biblique* appeared in many editions. Because of additions in the fourteenth edition it was put on the Index. Vigouroux became professor of exegesis at the Institut catholique in Paris (1890) and (between 1903 and 1913) was secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. Between 1895 and 1912 the five-volume *Dictionnaire Biblique* appeared, which was continued in supplements.—E. Levesque, *RB* 24 (1915), 183–216.

[5] J. Ziegler, "Polyglotten," *LThK*² VIII, 596.

[6] R. Aubert, *LThK*² VI, 770f.

[7] F. P. Kaulen, "Vulgata," *Wetzer-Welte* XII (1901), 1140; regarding the further history of the Vulgate edition, see K. T. Schäfer, *LThK*² II, 383, and ibid., X, 901f.—F. P. Kaulen ("Patriarchen," *Wetzer Welte* IX, 1603) maintains that "scholars searched, partly out of incredulous opposition, partly for cowardly consideration, for means to circumvent the literal acceptance of this information. However, this information can be explained by the fact that "the transmission of the unabridged revealed truth is guaranteed by the phenomenon of three generations embracing two millenia."

[8] F. Lenormant, *Les origines de l'histoire et les traditions des peuples orientaux* (1880), put

fane truth" in the Bible were usually considered nonerroneous, even though, in regard to the six-day creation, it was conceded that there was "no need for clinging anxiously to the letter of the text." However, in cases where an undeniable error could be noted in regard to "perfectly certain facts of natural history, geology, and chronology," the explanation had to suffice that the inspired original text had been perverted in the course of tradition.[9] A fundamental problem existed in the Holy Scriptures regarding the relationship between God, the inspiring "author," and the human author. The Neo-Scholastic theologian Johann Baptist Franzelin, S.J.[10], in his *De divina traditione et scriptura* (1870) defined the term "inspiration" so broadly that in fact, in accord with tradition, only the verbal inspiration was excluded. This theory dominated the textbooks to the end of the nineteenth century. In the middle of the nineties began the kind of criticism that was especially advocated by the Dominicans with reference to Thomas Aquinas. To avoid mixing revelation itself with the process of inspiration, there were attempts to define the latter as a *motion inspiratrice,* thus expanding the freedom of the writer.[11] But the Jesuit theologians continued to adhere to their theory of inspiration. The work *De inspiratione* (Rome 1903) by Louis Billot, S.J., one of the most influential theologians (from 1885 to 1911 professor at the Gregoriana),[12] opposed the modernistic exegesis, but also the efforts of scholarly biblical studies by authors who stayed within the ecclesiastical tradition. However, it was precisely the inspiration of the Bible on the whole that motivated critical Catholic exegetes to discover the "true 'literal meaning'" of the Bible.[13] This, however, put them for a long time in the extremely difficult position of vacillating between liberal biblical criticism and general ecclesiastical traditionalism.

The defense of Alfred Loisy's[14] first writings by Maurice d'Hulst

---

on the Index; Salvatore di Bartolo, *I criteri teologici* (1886), put on the Index in 1891. In this context belongs Newman's attempt (retracted later) to introduce the term *obiter dicta* (Hocedez III, 126).

[9] This general procedure was used in "Inspiration," *Wetzer-Welte* VI, 806.

[10] Franzelin taught from 1850 until 1876 at the Gregoriana. Later, as cardinal, he was very influential in the Roman congregations. Regarding Franzelin's important contribution about the relationship between the written word, tradition, and the Church, see W. Kasper, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der Römischen Schule* (Freiburg 1962), 397–401, 406ff.

[11] The discussion in Hocedez III, 133–40. One of the most important books written in this Dominican vein is: C. Gonzáles y Días Tuñón, *La Biblia y la Ciencia,* 2 vols. (Madrid 1891, ^{2}1894).

[12] Cf. pp. 312, 323, 458, 470.

[13] J. Schmid, "Bibelkritik," *LThK*^{2} II, 366.

[14] Cf. pp. 432–38.

(1841–96),[15] rector of the Institut catholique in Paris, where Loisy was a member of the faculty, in his article "La question biblique," which appeared in 1893 in *Correspondant,* caused a severe controversy, which was also carried on by the daily press. D'Hulst tried, according to his character—he was a monarchist, opponent of the *Ralliement* and in terms of church policy a liberal—to bridge the differences and to define in regard to the Bible question a "middle-of-the-road school," from where he was trying to mediate between the *école étroite* (the thesis of the equal inspiration of the Bible) and the *école large,* which he defined similarly to the attempts by Salvatore di Bartolo. Opposition came from all sides.

In November of the same year, the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* appeared,[16] stating that the defense against the rationalistic enemies of Holy Scripture, the "sons and heirs" of the Reformation, was especially urgent, since there are some men among them who want to be known as Christian theologians. It is an unreliable approach to overcome "difficulties" by admitting that the inspiration only referred to questions of faith and morals; such interpretations originate from the erroneous opinion that the primary goal is the discovery of why God said a certain thing. Referring to the Council of Trent and the Vatican Council the encyclical states that the "authentic parts" (*locis authenticis*) of the Bible do not contain any errors. Positively, the letter demands that biblical studies, *ad temporum necessitates congruentius,* be furthered carefully but decisively. The improvement of the Vulgate is encouraged by a quotation from Augustine. To determine the meaning, the encyclical suggests consulting, aside from parallel passages, the findings of related sciences (*externa quoque appositae eruditionis illustratio*); Eastern studies are to be strengthened. The exegeses of the Church Fathers, including the allegorical ones, are to be respected, which does not exclude *ultra procedere.* It is wrong to prefer the studies of "heterodox scholars," even though they may be useful at times; however, the untainted meaning cannot be found outside of the Church. The *Critica sublimior,* which judges parts of the Scriptures according to "internal motives" is rejected; only the *historiae testimonia* is important. One passage of the encyclical was particularly interesting to those who interpreted it for the purpose of finding assistance. Here, a quotation of Thomas's regarding questions of natural science serves to express the idea that the sacred author followed physical phenomena, similar to popular speech (*ea secutus est, quae sensibiliter apparent*). In regard to historical problems, the encyclical reiterates the thesis that errors are the fault of the copyists; moreover, the original meaning of a passage (*germana alicuius loci sententia*) could remain ambiguous (*anceps*). Also, the phrase stating that the Holy Spirit inspired and motivated (*excitavit et movit*) the biblical writer was interpreted to indicate a theory of inspiration which favors the human collaborator.[17]

---

[15] A. Baudrillart, *Vie de M gr. d'Hulst,* 2 vols. (Paris 1912–14); Aubert, *LThK*^{2} V, 524; cf. above, p. 255.

[16] *Acta Leonis* XIII, 326–64;

The encyclical found practically no opposition among Catholic theologians, but it was still short of solving the problems.[18] The necessary effort made to agree with the encyclical resulted in artistic interpretations. The quotation of Thomas's regarding the physical phenomena in biblical texts inspired Albert Lagrange to write his famous study *La méthode historique sourtout à propos de l'Ancien Testament* (1903), which outlined the thesis of the *apparences historiques.* But this raised the decisive question: What was the historical place and time when inspiration struck the biblical authors? This was the point of departure from which the historical positivism in the arguments of the "error debate" had to be overcome. It was unfortunate that the term *vérité relative,* which can be correctly understood and was used to replace the term historical or scientific "error," met with the twilight of modern relativism. In this regard, the "quotation theory,"[19] according to which a biblical author sums up other texts, was an expedient in view of the unsolved question of inspiration. This and other theories, also used by Lagrange and Hummelauer, were solidified into a system by the French Jesuit Ferdinand Prat (1857–1938).[20] The Jesuits Delattre and Fonck, who rejected this theory, pursued with particular vehemence the Dominican Lagrange, who had studied Eastern cultures in Vienna from 1888 until 1890 and had founded the *École Biblique* in Jerusalem by request of his order. Lagrange planned to make his series of monographs, the *Revue Biblique* (1892) and the *Études Bibliques* (1903), to be scholarly-critical as well as Church-minded.[21] A fateful trial for Lagrange was his occupation with chapters 1–6 of Genesis (published in manuscript form, Paris 1906) and especially the Pentateuch. He followed his principles of the "historical method" and was convinced that it was no longer possible to hold the opinion that Moses had composed the whole Pentateuch, as we know it; that while the antiquity of the Ten Commandments in their substance and their proclamation by Moses be adhered to, the Pentateuch be differentiated according to various editorial levels, of which a large part is younger than Moses.[22] Lagrange's importance is substantiated by the fact that he is one of the few older exegetes who is still quoted in basic scholarship. However, at that time he encountered the bitter animosities of the Jesuits, and even the Dominican order no longer authorized his refutation, written in defense against the attacks by A. Delattre, S.J., *Éclaircissement sur la Méthode historique* (1905, only published in manuscript form). He suffered the most painful blow when his order requested his withdrawal from the exegesis of the Old Testament.[23] Another important center for similar efforts was the University of Louvain, where the Old Testament scholar A. van Hoonacker had started a course in 1889 called "Histoire critique l'Ancien Testament." His significant book *Le sacerdoce lévitique dans la Loi et dans l'histoire* (1899) won him European recognition. His work about the Hexateuch, written in Latin, was not published (Bruges 1949) until after the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943). Among the founders of the *Cursus scripturae sanctae,* a collection of commentaries published after 1888 and not finished, were R. Cornely, S.J., and J. Knabenbauer, S.J.; but the most outstanding of them was the Jesuit Franz von Hummelauer (1842–1914), who deserves special recognition for his serious definition of literary genres and who proceeded from the conviction that "every (literary) genre possesses its very own unique truth, which is the only thing we are justified in demanding from it."[24] Like most critical scholars of the Old Testament, E. Podechard, after 1892 professor at the seminary in Lyon, published very little; he was the teacher of J. Chaine.

---

[17] Ibid., 339f., 357f., 327f., 342f., 346f., 348, 353, 355, 357, 358.

[18] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 398: The encyclical encouraged the studies, "however, even most of the scholars with good intentions were unable to find the necessary means to solve the questions or to reconcile the truth of the texts with modern accomplishments."

[19] About the usage of this term, see Hocedez III, 129f. Representatives of the "quotation theory": ibid., 131.

[20] In 1903, appointed consultant to the Biblical Commission (1907 dismissed), devoting his time to Pauline theology (J. Calès, *Ferdinand Prat* [Paris 1942]).

[21] In 1903, J. Goettsberger and J. Sickenberger founded the *Biblische Zeitschrift.* Sickenberger introduced the "two sources theory," developed by K. Lachmann, to the Catholic exegesis of the Evangelists Matthew and Luke.

When revising the regulations of the Index, the apostolic constitution *Officiorum ac munerum* of 25 January 1897 declared that, according to experience, translations of Holy Scripture edited by Catholics in the language of the people usually do more damage than good, as long as distinctions were not made (*sine discrimine*). Therefore it was decreed that these Bibles contain *adnotationes* from the Fathers or Catholic scholars.[25] In 1902, the Society of Saint Jerome for the Propagation of the Holy Gospel was founded. Its chairman, Giacomo della Chiesa, was a member of the Curia from 1887 to 1907 and later became Pope Benedict XV. In the first year, one hundred eighty thousand copies of the New Testament were sold in Italy. On 30 October 1902, the apostolic letter *Vigilantiae* was issued,[26] on the basis of which the Pontifical Biblical Commission was established, so that the studies might be conducted *auspicio ductuque Sedis Apostolicae* and new problems, not covered by doctrine, be solved according to ecclesiastical norms. The intention to safeguard during disputes the "limits of mutual love" could be sufficiently realized. Members of the Commission were the Cardinals Rampolla, Parocchi, Satolli, Segna, and Vives y Tutó. Two of the secretaries were the very conservative Vigouroux and the Franciscan Fleming, who had an open mind for exegetical problems. Leo's plan was oriented toward mediation, which is shown by the fact that the *Revue biblique* was originally intended to be the organ of the Commission. The forty consultants comprised an international committee, to which men like Lagrange, Prat, and Hummelauer were appointed. The intention of the founders was supervision (to preserve the faith) but also the support of truly scholarly studies. However, the question was whether the optimistic words which the Pope addressed to d'Hulst and which were recorded by Baudrillart[27] would have an impact.

---

[22] J. Chaine, 27f.

[23] In 1909, L. Fonck, S.J., who had spoken of the pernicious spirit permeating the École Biblique, became rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. On 29 June 1912, *scripta plura* of P. Lagrange were put on the Index. In his letter to Pope Pius X, Lagrange amended his words of submission imploring: "However, just because I feel I am a most loyal son, may I be permitted to speak to a father, the most illustrious of all fathers but nevertheless a father, concerning my anxiety over the motives which caused the total censorship of most of my work." Lagrange was willing to admit that his works contained errors. However, he made an appropriate, but clear protest against the charge that he wrote them in the "spirit of disobedience" (Vincent, 348f.). On 4 September 1912, the order recalled him from Jerusalem.

[24] Quoted according to V. Hamp, *LThK*^{2} IV, 688. Hummelauer was appointed consultant to the Biblical Commission in 1903 and dismissed in 1908.

---

[25] *Acta Leonis* XVII, 24f.

[26] *Acta Leonis* XXII, 232–38.

[27] "Il y a des esprits inquiets et chagrins qui pressent les congrégtions romaines de se prononcer sur des question encore douteuses. Je m'y oppose, je les arrête: car il ne faut pas empêcher les savants de travailler. Il faut leur laisser le loisir d'hésiter et même d'errer. La vérité ne peut qu'y gagner. L'Église arrivera toujours à temps pour les remettre dans le droit chemin" (A. Baudrillart, op. cit. I, 456).—Regarding Catholic exegesis from 1880 to 1914, Leo XIII's "more constructive than repressive initiative" at the founding of the Biblical Commission, and the measures taken after 1903, see J. Levie, *La Bible. Parole humaine et message de Dieu* (Paris, Louvain 1958), 46–88; cf. chap. 30.

CHAPTER 24

The Condemnation of "Americanism"

The term and theory of "Americanism" originated in French academic circles. This is the reason for the content of the papal letter *Testem benevolentiae* of 22 January 1899, addressed to Cardinal Gibbons, which condemned "opinions, the sum of which some call 'Americanism.'"[1] In 1897, Walter Elliot's biography of the founder of the Paulists, Isaac Hecker (1819–88), which appeared in the United States of America in 1891, was published in France in a shortened version prepared by the author himself from the French text. It was made "more attractive" (T. T. McAvoy, C.S.C.) by Abbé Félix Klein (1862–1953), who was professor at the Institut catholique in Paris from 1893 to 1907. The original edition had been given a special importance because the introduction was written by Archbishop Ireland, but it had not received particular attention. However, by calling Hecker the "priest of the future" and thus presenting the "American Way" of Catholicism as a model for the French traditionalists, Abbé Klein, in his foreword, gave a signal which aroused the indignation of the conservatives, who were already deeply wounded by the papal *Ralliement* policy. The book soon went through six editions. The same year, Denis O'Connell gave a lecture at the Congress for Catholic Scholars in Fribourg on Hecker and the advantages of American democracy. He encountered the strong opposition of the bishop of Nancy, Charles François.[2] In the spring of 1892, Ireland, who spoke fluent French since his youth,[3] was invited by the advocates of the current *Ralliement* policy in France to speak. He impressed Abbé Klein, who, in 1894, published a selection of his lectures under the title *L'Église et le Siècle.* Finally, he was contacted by those forces in French and American Catholicism which hoped to find the remedy for Church life by opening up toward the modern spirit that had arisen from the Revolution.[4] This contact was expedient, if only because the Gibbons-Ireland group had been in trouble since 1895.[5] In 1897, Ireland tried in his speeches to fend off the "retractors," charging them with rebelling against the Pope in conservative disguise.

The term "Americanism" was not defined by those who tried to follow the "American Way" in practice more than in theory, but rather by the French ultraconservatives. It began with a series of articles on *Amér-*

---

[1] *Acta Leonis* XIX, 5–20.

[2] F. X. Kraus (*Tagebücher,* 719) notes his agreement with L. Duchesne about Bishop Turinaz being a leader of the *rétrécissements.*—O'Connell's lecture: *Compte-rendu du IV^e congrès . . .* (Fribourg 1898), 74–81.

[3] In 1899, he preached as guest of the French government on the occasion of the anniversary of Joan of Arc.

[4] F. X. Kraus (*Tagebücher,* 720) notes in April 1899 the plan of "a meeting of equal-minded men" in Freiburg i. Br., expecting, among others, Denis O'Connell, Loisy, Abbé Klein, and "maybe even" H. Schell: "They will negotiate a uniform attitude toward the Curia." At the end of 1898, O'Connell had visited Abbé Klein to discuss the impending papal condemnation. One has to consider, however, the notable differences between these "equal-minded men."

[5] Cf. chap. 10.

icanisme mystique by Charles Maignen, an opponent of the *Ralliement,* published under the pseudonym "Martel" in the conservative Paris paper *Vérité Française.* In a course of sermons, the Jesuits of Paris warned of the danger of "Hecker's Americanism" threatening the Church. In 1898, Maignen published his newspaper articles and other essays under the title *Études sur l'américanisme. Le Père Hecker, est-il un Saint?* Since Cardinal Richard refused the imprimatur, Maignen obtained approval from the *Magister Palatii,* the Dominican A. Lepidi in Rome, which was interpreted as papal sanction. Gibbons, Ireland, and Keane protested to Rome against the book, considering it a defamation of the American Catholicism they represented, while Archbishop Corrigan welcomed it. The controversies reached Belgium, Germany, and Italy and compounded the respective territorial tensions. The most vehement opponents of Hecker's friends were, among others, the Jesuit A. Delattre, who also sharply condemned the moderate biblical criticism of Lagrange; the Belgian Benedictine L. Jannsens at the Anselmianum in Rome; Merry del Val, who was promoted by Leo XIII and had been consulted in the battle against the validity of the Anglican ordinations; and especially Cardinals F. Satolli and Camillo Mazzella, S.J. (1833–1900), who taught dogmatics in Georgetown and Woodstock (after 1868) and at the Gregoriana (after 1878).[6]

The Pope rejected the request to put the Hecker biography on the Index and he appointed a Commission of Cardinals; representatives of the American episcopate were not included. The text of *Testem benevolentiae* was mainly written by Mazzela. The Pope changed the beginning and the end of the letter in order to avoid the impression of condemning the Gibbons group and the American situation. Whether Gibbons's telegram and Ireland's trip to Rome came "too late" (T. T. McAvoy C.S.C.) or whether the letter could not be retracted by any means cannot be determined.

Leo XIII's letter to Gibbons began with a few words about the Hecker biography, especially its translation, noting that it had caused innumerable controversies because of certain opinions about the Christian way of life; these problems the Pope would treat extensively later (*de re universa fusiori sermone*).[7] He condemned the following views: dogmas that are incomprehensible to contemporaries should not be denied, but rather be emphasized less or ignored; the ecclesiastical office is to refrain from authoritative statements to ensure the freedom of the individual through whom the Holy Spirit speaks more distinctly today than ever; natural virtues which promote activity are more important than supernatural ones; contemplative orders used to be justified, however, today, active virtues are needed; vows in the older religious orders kill the freedom to make decisions, which are so necessary today; the apostolate has to relinquish the old methods if operating among non-Catholics.

---

[6] Regarding Satolli, see chap. 10; regarding Mazzella, see chap. 21.

[7] *Acta Leonis* XIX, 6.

None of the suspects identified with these condemned opinions. But it wounded them deeply that the *cavenda et corrigenda,* though in a quotation, was cited *Americanismi nomine.* On 27 February the tactful Ireland wrote to the Pope that all "misunderstandings" had been cleared away and "true Americanism" was only "what was so called by the Americans."[8] The letter by Cardinal Gibbons to the Pope was published *post festum:*[9] "I do not believe that there is a bishop, a priest, or even a layman in this country who knows his religion and utters such enormities. No, this is not, has never been, and will never be our Americanism." The opponents of the Gibbons group, however, among them the German Archbishop Katzer of Milwaukee, who compared the "Americanists" with the Jansenists, thanked the Pope for having saved the Church in America from a great danger. Even though it was not put on the Index, the Paulists took the Hecker biography off the book market.

A distinction was drawn between "dogmatic" and "historical" Americanism, the latter being defined in Abbé Klein's words as *une hérésie fantôme.*[10] However, one may question whether it was proper to extract papal doctrinal authority in this manner from its exceedingly complicated context; after all, the letter was addressed to Cardinal Gibbons. It is also questionable whether one could speak of a connection with modernism;[11] this depends entirely on the definition of "modernism" and the customary terminological distinctions. In the perspective of the Roman procedure, it was noted that the "basic tendency and method of defense against modernism had largely been anticipated."[12]

---

[8] It does not quite make sense that L. Hertling, S.J., 238f., should call this an "unfair" departure from the "friends in France," because not "friends" such as Abbé Klein, but C. Maignen and his followers were meant by Ireland when he wrote: "We can be upset about such insults inflicted upon us, the bishops, the faithful, and the nation."

[9] J. T. Ellis, *Gibbons* II (1952), 71.

[10] G. Weigel, *LThK*² I, 434f.—F. Klein, "Une hérésie fantôme: l'Américanisme," *Souvenirs* IV (Paris 1949).

[11] L. Hertling (op. cit., 232), not very friendly toward Gibbons: "Even the most fanatic Americanists did not consider for a moment loosening the ties which bound them to the Church and its center"; 243: it was "true injustice" that prompted A. Gisler to write that Americanism was the pioneer of modernism.—A. Houton, *L'Américanisme* (Paris 1903), was put on the Index; regarding A. Houtin, cf. chap. 30, n. 13.

[12] R. Lill, "Der Kampf der römischen Kurie gegen den 'praktischen' Modernismus," *Die päpstliche Autorität im Selbstverständnis des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts,* ed. by E. Weinzierl; *Internationales Forschungszentrum . . . in Salzburg,* Discussion 11 (1970), 110.

CHAPTER 25

Papal Hopes for Unification
The Independent Eastern Churches and the Uniates

Papal Hopes for Unification

The unions formed with Eastern Churches by the Popes of modern times were felt by most Eastern Christians to be violations of their traditions, which go back to the first centuries. The Holy See recognized the dignity of the old liturgies, but its efforts toward unification were based too strictly on the Tridentine concept of the unified Church and did not consider sufficiently the evolutionary character of the national churches of the East, thus creating a "Uniatism" which was an obstacle to the organic unification of the independent Eastern Churches separated from the universal Church. The unionist initiatives which had arisen in the middle of the nineteenth century and had been partially adopted by the Propaganda Fide failed to develop.

Pius IX's proclamation of unification of 6 January 1848 in his encyclical *In suprema Petri Apostoli Sede* was harshly rejected by the four Orthodox patriarchs for its authoritarian tone. His brief *Arcano Divinae Providentiae consilio* of 8 September 1868, addressed to all Orthodox bishops, suggesting a return to Catholic unity and participation in the council, also failed; the Patriarch of Constantinople Gregorios (1867–71) bemoaned, for instance, the lack of respect for apostolic equality and brotherhood. Cardinal Alessandro Barnabò, prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, presided over the Commission for Missions and Churches of the Eastern Rites, one of the five subcommissions for the preparation of the First Vatican Council. This commission convened thirty-seven plenary sessions between 29 September 1867 and 9 May 1870.[1] At the first working session, Barnabò declared that the negotiations were to avoid everything that could possibly injure the feelings of the Orthodox. However, the topic, debated by the seventeen consultors for months concerned the possibility of applying the disciplinary canons of the Council of Trent to the Uniate Church and was therefore little suited to pay tribute to the spiritual heritage of the Christian Middle East. The commission's task, to deal simultaneously with problems of missions and the Uniate Churches, must have been shocking to the Eastern Churches. The Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, Archbishop Giuseppe Valerga (1813–72), participated energetically in the formulation of the mission plan, which had been prepared by the commission and, after several revisions, on 26 June 1870, was extensively debated by the Council's fathers. More than half of the text (forty-four folio-size pages) dealt with the Uniate Churches, the rest (thirty-five pages) with the Latin mission in the Middle East. Valerga was intent on equating the Uniates with the Latin Church as far as canon law is concerned, but he wanted to let them retain their liturgical customs. At the request of the cardinals' commission, Valerga wrote a report on the manner in which the upcoming council was to handle questions regarding the Eastern Churches. At the council itself, the Uniate hierarchs were not united. The Melchite patriarch, Gregory II Jussef Sayyur (1864–97), the Chaldean patriarch, Joseph II Audo (1848–78), and the Syrian patriarch, Philip Argus (1866–74), left Rome before the final voting on the dogmatic constitution *Pastor aeternus* of 18 July 1870. Later, they agreed to it, but they remained indignant because of insufficient consideration of the patriarchs' traditional rights and privileges.

---

[1] "Acta commissionis super missionibus et ecclesiis ritus orientalis," *Mansi* XLIX (1923), 985–1162.

The pontificate of Leo XIII, who pursued liberal conciliatory policies in the political and social arena and hoped for reconciliation with the Anglicans and independent Eastern Churches, began a new phase in the relations between Rome and the Eastern Christians,[2] reflecting the results of scholarly research and productive dialogues between open-minded experts. The reunification of those separated from the Church by belief and obedience was one of the Pope's main objectives, which he advocated in 6 encyclicals, 7 apostolic briefs, 14 pronouncements, and 5 addresses.[3] Reunification was an integral part of his mission as peacemaker. In his encyclical *Grande munus christiani nominis propagandi* of 30 September 1880, on the Apostles of the Slavs, Cyril and Methodius,[4] the Pope drew attention to the close relationship between those two men and the Holy See and to the Pope's interest in the Slavic peoples. He had special concern for the Eastern Churches and his most ardent wish was for them to unite with "Us and be committed to the eternal bond of unity (*concordia*)."[5] The Uniates welcomed the encyclical with enthusiasm, for instance at the pilgrimage of fourteen Slavs on 5 July 1881 in Rome. It was led by Bishop Josip Jurij Stroßmayer of

---

[2] L. Berg, "La réunion des églises orientales avec l'église catholique romaine au cours des siècles," *Ex Oriente*, op. cit., 115–17; A. S. Hernández, op. cit., 413–17; J. Alameda, op. cit., 91–99; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 687–701; W. de Vries, *Orthodoxie*, 127–34; J. Hajjar, op. cit., 243–51.

[3] R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 412. According to his estimate, Leo XIII discussed the Christian East in thirty-two important documents and in more than two hundred paragraphs. He lists 248 significant papal statements (ibid., 702–12, appendix 1: *I documenti Leoniani interessanti l'Oriente*).

[4] *ASS* XIII (1880), 145–53.

[5] Ibid., 152.

Djakovo,[6] who had impressed the Pope with his ideas on ways of uniting with Russia and the Slavic faithful. Catholic Panslavism, which Stroßmayer supported and which originated in the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius (in existence since the middle of the nineteenth century), encountered resistance in Russia, where it was feared its influence on the Slavs in the Habsburg Monarchy and on the Balkans would suffer a setback.

England's occupation of Egypt in 1882 and the Russian Orthodox Imperial Society of Palestine, founded the same year, turned Leo XIII's attention to the Near East. The Greek government asked that the Pope no longer appoint bishops *in partibus infidelium* for vacant episcopal sees in the Greek territories. The Pope granted the wish on 10 June 1882, using the term *episcopus titularis* in his apostolic letter *In suprema.*[7]

In 1883, he received two extensive reports concerning the resumption of contacts with the Orthodox Churches. One was written by the apostolic delegate of Constantinople, Serafino Vannutelli. His motion regarding "the best available means to lead the dissidents back to the Catholic Church"[8] demonstrated the failure of the Latin missionaries in the Near East and criticized their Latinization measures. The other report was written by Carlo Gallien, the Turkish consul general in Rome. He suggested sending new missionary societies into the respective areas, once their members had been made aware of the basic proplems. The papal brief *Abbiamo appreso* of 4 January 1887,[9] addressed to Giuseppe Benedetto Cardinal Dusmet, O.S.B., archbishop of Catania, seemed to be the first to be inspired by this proposal. In this brief, the Pope congratulated Dusmet, praising him for reopening the College of Saint Anselmo and including it in plans for the Christian Near East.

New ideas came from the Eucharistic Congress in Jerusalem of 14 to 21 May 1893.[10] Bishop Victor Doutreloux of Liège (president of the Permanent Committee for Eucharistic Congresses, which prepared the Jerusalem Congress together with the Superior General of the Assumptionists, François Picard), expected the participation of representatives of the Eastern Churches paying homage to the Eucharist, and hoped for the return of the separated brethren to the great Catholic family. Leo XIII avoided expected diplomatic complications by informing Sultan Abdul Hamid (1876–1909) and Emperor Alexander III of Russia (1881–94) (via a French mediator) about the planned congress and by assuring the governments in Berlin, Vienna, and London that the meeting had a strictly religious purpose. He appointed Cardinal Benedict Maria Langénieux, archbishop of Rheims, his legate and president of the congress, which was attended by thousands of Catholic pilgrims, several cardinals, fifteen dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, eighteen representatives of the Uniate Churches, and twenty priests of the independent Eastern Churches. In his opening address, the cardinal legate emphasized the fact that his mission was marked by the sign of love and piety, implying an invitation to unite in faith. The congress submitted to the Pope eight desiderata, including Eucharistic prayers of Eastern liturgies in manuals of Roman Catholics, the encouragement of studies on the religious problems of the Eastern Churches with a view to church union; and the strengthening of relations between the faithful of the East and West and their clergy.

---

[6] See chap. 11, p. 184.

[7] *Acta Leonis* I (1887), 277–85, especially 283f.

[8] J. Hajjar, op. cit., 243.

[9] *Acta Leonis* II (1887), 250–53, especially 252f.

[10] *Irénikon* 1 (1926), 353–57; A. S. Hernández, op. cit., 414–17; O. Rousseau, op. cit., 370–71; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 367–84; C. Soetens, op. cit., 107–15.

The Pope had ordered Cardinal Langénieux to inquire into the situation of the Uniates, the impact of the Latinization measures, and ways and means of overcoming the separation of the Eastern Churches from Rome. On 23 May, the Melchite Patriarch Gregory II Jussef Sayyur delivered a complaint concerning the Latinization measures, claiming they hindered the task and mission of the Uniate Churches. On 2 July, the cardinal of Lourdes sent a secret report to Rome on his investigations.[11] Remembering the consequences of the Crusades, which are still felt today, he mentioned the Eastern Christians' mistrust of private interests and political goals. He also reprimanded Latin missionaries, whose behavior often contradicted apostolic directives, and expressed regret over the predominance of the Latin rites over the Uniate rites. He described the lack of authority and power of the Uniate Churches, which suffered from a lack of support and whose clergy was insufficiently trained. He reiterated the objections and opinions voiced by Latin missionaries, claiming that the theory of the apostolate of Uniate Christians in the Eastern Churches was a utopia. He was convinced of the future of the Uniate Churches, hoping that their revival could overcome their inferiority and link the Roman Catholics with the Eastern Orthodox. To disperse the prejudice of the schismatics and to strengthen the Uniates, he stressed the publication of an encyclical that would clarify papal principles regarding Eastern Christianity.

The apostolic brief *Praeclara gratulationis* of 20 June 1894,[12] which Leo XIII addressed to all sovereigns and peoples on occasion of the 50th anniversary of his consecration as bishop, clearly reflects the ideas that were inspired by the Jerusalem Congress. He recalled the original

---

[11] J. Hajjar, op. cit., 246–48.

[12] *ASS* XXVI (1893–94), 705–17; cf. R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 385–90.

unity of the Church, challenging the Eastern Christians to restore it. All Christians in the East and West, he said, recognized the Roman bishop, the successor to Saint Peter, before their separation. He promised that he and his successors would not touch their rights, the privileges of the patriarchs, their rites and customs. The Pope devoted one paragraph to the Slavic peoples, pointing out that the papacy had supported them since the time of Cyril and Methodius, but that a great segment had been alienated from the Roman belief; he therefore challenged them to unite. As far as the Eastern Churches were concerned, this programmatic letter contained the "first appeal for ecclesiastical unity with acceptable arguments."[13]

To use the results of the Congress in Jerusalem to strengthen further the Uniate Churches and reunite with the Eastern Churches, Leo XIII organized and chaired several conferences with Uniate patriarchs (24–28 November). In attendance were the Melchite Patriarch, Gregory II Jussef Sayyur, the Syrian Patriarch, Cyril Behnam Benni (1893–97), the patriarchal vicar, Archbishop Elias Huayek (replacing the aging Maronite Patriarch, John Hagg [1890–98, born 1817]),[14] Cardinal Secretary of State Rampolla, the Cardinals Galimberti, Langénieux, Ledóchowski, and Vincenzo Vannutelli, who had been sent as papal legate to Saint Petersburg in 1882 on the occasion of Tsar Alexander III's coronation. These patriarchal conferences clearly defined the competencies of Latin missionaries and the rights of Uniate dignitaries. They also prepared the papal brief *Orientalium dignitas* of 30 November 1894,[15] which relinquished the adaptation of rites and disciplines to Latin. "The preservation of the Eastern rites is more important than one is led to believe. The honorable age which distinguishes the various rites dignifies the entire Church and confirms the divine unity of Catholic belief."[16] In thirteen theses, the Pope gave guidelines for the preservation of the old liturgies. He strengthened his intention to expand the Uniate seminaries and colleges for the native clergy.

In his letter *Christi nomen* of 24 December 1894,[17] Leo XIII referred to his expositions in the apostolic brief *Praeclara gratulationis* of 20 June, stressing his efforts toward unity with the Eastern Churches and asking for support and training of a qualified Uniate clergy. In the motu proprio *Optatissimae* of 19 March 1895,[18] he decreed that a permanent cardinals' commission for Uniate rites and reunification, chaired by Cardinal Ledóchowski, continue the deliberations of the patriarchal conferences of the fall of 1894. The brief *Provida matris* of 5 May 1895,[19] on preparation for Pentecost, the extensive encyclicals *Satis cognitum* of 29 June 1896,[20] dealing with the unity of the Church, and *Divinum illud munus* of 9 May 1897,[21] concerning the Holy Spirit, elaborated his theological thoughts and practical suggestions pertaining to the union. On the occasion of the publication of the encyclical of 29 June 1896, Leo XIII had a medal struck, the front of which displayed his image with the inscription *Pontifex maximus* and the year of his pontificate (*anno XIX*) while the reverse side showed an allegory of Church unity with the words: "May there be one fold and one shepherd."[22]

---

[13] J. Hajjar, op. cit., 248.

[14] Armenian Patriarch Stefan Peter X Azarian (1881–99), residing in Constantinople, did not receive permission from the sultan to leave the country. The Chaldean patriarchate was vacant after the death of Patriarch Elias XII Abolionan (1879–94).

[15] *ASS* XXVII (1894–95), 257–64: *De disciplina orientalium conservanda et tuenda.*

[16] Ibid., 258.

[17] Ibid., 385–87.

All these pronouncements differed from earlier papal utterances in their tone and their expression of sympathy for the Eastern Christians. They avoided terms like "schismatics" and "heretics," instead using words like *fratelli separati* or *dissidenti;* they distinguished themselves by respect for the rites and ecclesiastical laws of the East and prepared the climate for reconciliation. These papal efforts of appeasement were supported by Catholic diplomats (the Belgian Baron d'Erp),[23] princes of the Church (Cardinals Langénieux and Vincenzo Vannutelli), bishops (Doutreloux of Liège and Stroßmayer of Djakovo) and theologians (Abbé Fernand Portal),[24] who passionately pleaded for closer relations between the Catholic Church and the Anglicans as well as the Eastern Christians. Portal was a friend of Lord Halifax's and was inspired by the ideas of Russian religious philosophers, especially those of Vladimir Soloviev (1853–1900),[25] who, as an Orthodox Christian, recognized the

---

[18] *ASS* XXVIII (1895–96), 323–24: *De commissione pontificia ad reconciliationem dissidentium cum Ecclesia fovendam.*

[19] *ASS* XXVII (1894–95), 646–47.

[20] *ASS* XXVIII (1895–96), 708–39; also cf. R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 420–56.

[21] *ASS* XXIX (1896–97), 644–58; also cf. R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 462–67.

[22] *Fiet. Unum. Ovile. Et. Unus. Pastor. MDCCCXCVI,* cf. L. K. Goetz, op. cit., 233–34.

[23] R. Aubert, *Un document,* 429–35.

[24] F. Portal. op. cit., 5–8; also cf. A. Gratieux, op. cit.

[25] V. Solovjev, *La Russie et l'Église universelle* (Paris 1889); id., *Monarchia Sancti Petri. Die kirchliche Monarchie des heiligen Petrus als freie und universelle Theokratie im Lichte der Weisheit. Aus den Hauptwerken von Wladimir Solowjew systematisch gesammelt, übersetzt und erklärt,* ed. by L. Kobilinski-Ellis (Mainz, Wiesbaden 1929); id., *Una Sancta. Schriften zur Vereinigung der Kirchen und zur Grundlegung der universalen Theokratie,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1954–57); cf. T. G. Masaryk, *Zur russischen Geschichts- und Religionsphilosophie. Soziologische Skizzen* II (Jena 1913), 225–77; L. Kobilinski-Ellis, "Die freie Theokratie nach der Lehre von Wladimir Solowjew," *Ex Oriente,* op. cit., 278–86; T. Grivec, "L'Indépendance et originalité de Wladimir Solowjew," ibid., 298–305; *Un*

Pope and supported unification with Rome, the traditional center of the Christian world. For Soloviev, the papacy was a *mysterium unitatis,* the center of apostolicity, universality, and ecumenicity, the temporal manifestation and metaphor of the great secret of *Sophia.* In his philosophical works he strove to make his doctrine of the sophic world-soul agree with Christian theology.[26] His convictions regarding the Russian Church's mission to unify all the churches evoked no response in the Eastern Churches during his lifetime, but his writings have had an ecumenical impact to the present day.

Leo XIII's intentions were published in numerous theological periodicals: the *L'Œuvre d'Orient* (published since 1857 in Paris), the *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* (Paris 1896), *Échos d'Orient* (since 1897, the quarterly published by the Assumptionists' Central Institute for Eastern Studies), and the *Oriens Christianus* (Rome, after 1901, for the study of the Christian East). These and other periodicals, such as *Bessarione, pubblicazione periodica di Studi Orientali,* published in Rome since 1896, provided a wealth of information, documentation, historical and theological research. By virtue of their scholarly integrity and theological sensitivity they rendered a clear picture of the history and the current situation of Eastern Christianity.

Generously, Leo XIII supported the Assumptionists, Benedictines, Dominicans, Jesuits, Capuchins, Carmelites, Lazarists, Lyon Missionaries, Redemptorists, Salesians, Christian Brothers, and White Fathers, who actively advocated the union in their pastoral work. The Pope also founded or restored colleges in Rome to train the Uniate clergy, such as the Armenian College (1883) and the Maronite College (1891). He carefully placed suitable candidates in the Propaganda College and in the international academies of orders, such as the pontifical Benedictine academy, the Anselmianum. He established Uniate seminaries and schools for the Copts in Cairo, for the Melchites in Jerusalem, for the Bulgarians in Plovdiv and Adrianople, for the Syrians and Chaldeans in Mosul, for the Greeks in Constantinople, Kadikoy (formerly Chalcedon), and in Athens. He willingly donated considerable funds for the development of these educational institutions.

Even though the Uniate Churches did not increase in their membership to any considerable extent in the last decades of the nineteenth

---

moine de l'Église d'Orient, La signification de Soloviev: 1054–1954. L'Église et les églises, neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident II, ed. by L. Beuduin (Chevetogne 1955), 369–79; G. Florowski, op. cit., 295–96; St. Napierała, "Wizja jedności kościoła w 'wielkim sporze' Włodzimierza Sołowjewa," *Collectanea Theologica* 40 (1970), 49–62.

[26] B. Schultze, "Probleme der orthodoxen Theologie," *Handbuch der Ostkirchenkunde,* op. cit., 144–55.

century, the Pope emphasized their unique value within Catholicism as a whole. In his encyclicals and many other writings, Leo XIII traced their historical descent from early Christianity and the first Christian centuries to the missionary popes of the early Middle Ages who assured the Slavs their own ecclesiastical language, to the re-union councils of the early and high Middle Ages, the Second Council of Lyon in 1274 and the Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome in 1431–45, and to the popes of modern times who struggled for union, especially Benedict XIV. These references alleviated the Uniates' inferiority complex; they no longer felt isolated, but were confirmed in their conviction of being recognized members of the universal Catholic Church, and entrusted with the task of building a bridge to the separated Eastern Christians. Their patriarchs, who had suffered under the Latinization measures instituted by Rome and under disciplinary regulations, were relieved and, because of the papal kindness and its accompanying proclamations, they felt themselves to be on equal footing with the Roman Catholic episcopate.

The Pope expected his unification program, his personal involvement on behalf of reunification with the separated Eastern Churches, and the expansion of the Uniate Churches to be successful. But many external and internal difficulties obstructed the realization of his ambitions. Turkish, French, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian interests clashed in the Balkans and in the Middle East. The cultural protectorate,[27] which had developed from an institution of international law into a protectorate of foreign countries over Christians living in Turkey, enabled France (since the sixteenth century) and Austria (since the end of the eighteenth century) to obtain certain privileges, particularly since numerous churches were under their protection and financed by them. The attempt to win over the Orthodox Slavs had to take Russia into consideration. When favoring the Uniate Slavs in Austria-Hungary, the delicate situation in this multi-national state could not be ignored. By order of their governments, diplomats intervened and expressed their anxieties over possible conflicts, as did, for instance, the Russian representative at the Vatican, Alexander Izvolsky (1888–96), and the Austro-Hungarian ambassador to the Vatican, Duke Friedrich Revertera-Salandra (1888–1901).[28]

At the Curia, Leo XIII encountered resistance to his unification efforts and rejection of his personally benevolent attitude toward the Eastern Churches. He was unable to transfer his hopes to his immediate environment and the lower levels of his administration. Also, the penal regulations regarding Latinizing missionaries contained in his encylical *Orientalium dignitas*[29] were not very successful because they were not obeyed by the order members who devoted their efforts to traditional Latinization.[30] Yet the Pope adhered to his ideas. According to Revertera's notes of New Year's Day 1897, Leo XIII desired to attempt the ecclesiastical unification with the Christian nations outside of the Church. This, Revertera said, would be very difficult in Russia: "He could not hope to witness more than the first dawn of a future which he so ardently desired."[31]

---

[27] J. Lammeyer, op. cit., 57–82, 84–88, M. Lehmann, op. cit., 37–44.

[28] A. Hudal, op. cit., 236–54; G. Adrianyi, op. cit., 241–339.

Leo XIII had no illusions about the impending reunification with the Eastern Churches. Yet he strove for the unity of all Christians in the one and only Church, a characteristic of all his ecclesiological thoughts, which were the focal point of his theological concepts.[32] When he died in 1903, the Uniates lost in him a pioneer and protector. His initiative prepared an ecumenical foundation which led to détente between Rome and the separated Eastern Churches, was continued by his successors, was reinforced by Pope John XXIII, and is still in effect.

His successor, Pius X (1903–14) proved to be primarily a pragmatic spiritual adviser. As patriarch of Venice (1894–1903), he had learned about the Slavic liturgy and the interests of the union through the Mechitharists, the Armenian Uniate monks, whose monastery on the island of San Lazzaro near Venice had been the center of religious and scholarly work since 1717. As Pope, he renewed the unification efforts of Leo XIII. He put the Roman churches San Lorenzo ai Monti and San Salvatore alle Capelle at the disposal of the Uniate Russians and Rumanians. He personally took charge of the protectorate over the Greek abbey of Grottaferrata near Rome, for which his predecessor, in 1881 had decreed the use of the original Greek-Byzantine rite. In 1904 he attended the celebration of the nine hundredth anniversary of the abbey, and he supported it throughout his pontificate. He anxiously observed the situation of the Uniates in Galicia and the propaganda of Russian missionaries in favor of unification with the Orthodox Church. For the Uniate Ruthenians, who had emigrated to the United States of America from Galicia and Hungary, he issued the bull *Ea semper* of 14 June 1907;[33] that year, he appointed Vicar Apostolic Stephan Soter

---

[29] See above, n. 15.

[30] W. de Vries, *Orthodoxie,* 128: "In 1920, the Oriental Congregation had to resign itself to the fact that Latinization continued after *Orientalum dignitas* and that penalties were not enforced and could not be enforced."

[31] F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. I, 322.

[32] E. Hocedez, *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^e siècle* III (Brussels, Paris 1947), 387–91; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 409–97.

[33] *ASS* XLI (1908), 1–12.

Ortynski and (in 1912) he sent, on behalf of the Ruthenians in Canada, Niceta Budka[34] to be the bishop of Winnipeg. In his letter *Quidquid consilii* of 8 June 1908, addressed to Uniate Archbishop Andreas Szepticki of Lemberg (1900–44), he recognized the unification efforts of the separated Eastern Churches and praised him in his capacity as president of the Union Congresses in Welehrade.[35]

By order of the Pope, Cardinal Vannutelli prepared festivities in Rome to honor the fifteen hundredth anniversary of the death of the patriarch of Constantinople, John Chrysostom,[36] who was venerated by Christians in both the East and West. On 12 February 1908, in Saint Peter's Cathedral, Melchite Patriarch Cyril VIII Geha (1903–16) and his bishops and archimandrites celebrated the liturgy in the presence of the Pope, who sang the benediction, which according to their rite was to be delivered in the Greek language by the highest dignitary present. The next day he spoke to the numerous Uniates who had come to Rome of the Holy See's respect for the dignity and glory of the Eastern rites; he assured them that the Pope would guard the preservation of their national customs, that the congregation for the Propagation of the Faith would annually send a number of native priests to the East with the message to remain loyal to national rites and to avoid conversion to the Latin rite, and that he admired the accomplishments of great Eastern men and intended to make efforts to revive their heritage.[37]

In his apostolic letter *Ex quo* of 26 December 1910,[38] the Pope declared that the interest of the Holy See in the problems of the Eastern Churches had not ceased, that his predecessors had passionately desired the end of the separation, and that all Catholics were obligated to support the reunification. In 1910 he approved the world prayer octave for the unification of the separated Christians, which was to last from 18 to 25 January and had been initiated by the Anglican clergyman Paul J. Francis Wattson (1863–1940), who had converted in 1909 to the Catholic Church together with the Brother- and Sisterhood of the Reconciliation, which he had founded. The octave was observed after 1908 by the Anglican and Catholic congregations in the United States and spread in the next decades to most of the Christian Churches.[39]

---

[34] *AAS* IV (1912), 531, 555–56.

[35] *Acta Pii* V (1971), 287–88.

[36] *ÉO* 11 (1908), 131–46; C. Charam, *Le quinzième centenaire de Jean Chrysostome* (Rome 1909); B. Arens, *Papst Pius X und die Weltmission* (Aachen 1919), 16–18.

[37] *ASS* XLI (1908), 130–34; *Allocutio, quam die 13 Februarii 1908 Pius X habuit ad Orientales.*

[38] *AAS* III (1911), 117–21.—This letter was addressed to all apostolic delegates in the East and took issue with an article published in *Roma e l'Oriente* (see n. 40). Its dogmatic and historical errors were criticized and corrected (also cf. "*Roma e l'Oriente* pensieri sull'unione delle chiese," *CivCatt,* 62 [1911], I, 64–78, and "La parola del papa intorno all'unione delle chiese," ibid., 129–34).

After 1910 the monks of Grottaferrata published the periodical *Roma e l'Oriente,* which proselytized for the union of the Eastern Churches with Rome and was subsidized actively by the Pope. He was not always in agreement with all its articles, especially not with the essay "Thoughts about the Question of the Reunification of the Churches," which was written by Prince Maximilian of Saxony, a professor who had done respectable studies on Eastern liturgies.[40] In this article Prince Maximilian spoke of the Roman lust for power. Yet in 1914 the Pope wrote to the editor: "Continue with your work on behalf of a difficult and frustrating cause and always apply the necessary wisdom."[41]

In 1912 he established for the Hungarian Uniates the diocese of Hajdudorog.[42] On 14 September of the same year, in connection with his liturgical reforms which earned him the sobriquet "Pope of the Liturgy," Pius X published the apostolic constitution *Tradita ab antiquis,*[43] dealing with the receiver and administrator of Holy Communion. He gave the faithful the choice whether they wanted to receive the Eucharist in the form of leavened or unleavened bread, and, if possible, they were to receive Communion according to their own rites during Easter and the last viaticum.[44]

Under Pius X's pontificate, the interest in the independent churches and those united with Rome was not as pronounced as under the pontificate of his predecessor; yet the papal hopes for reunification did not cease.[45] The Pope assessed the possibilities of realizing his ambitions more sceptically and more realistically than Leo XIII. He did not share the optimism which had permeated Leo's proclamations. He was worried about the division of the Uniates into smaller churches where the lay element exerted great influence. He carefully observed the political development in Galicia and Southeastern Europe, and the attempts of the Orthodox Church to convert the Slavs of Dalmatia. He doubted whether Austria-Hungary would be able to preserve its cultural protectorate in the Balkans and feared the annexation of the Slavs to Russia, which he considered the greatest enemy of the Church.[46] Therefore, he urged that the Uniates be bound closer to the Holy See and that they strengthen their religious life.

---

[39] R. Aubert, *La semaine de prières pour l'unité chrétien* (Louvain 1950); A. S. Hernández, op. cit., 417–19.

[40] Max Prince de Saxe, "Pensées sur la question de l'union des églises," *Roma e l'Oriente* 1 (1910–1911), 13–29; cf. Schmidlin, *PG* III, 129, n. 4.

[41] "Pio X e le chiese orientali," *Roma e l'Oriente* 8 (1914), 70.

[42] *AAS* IV (1912), 429–35.

[43] Ibid., 609–17.

[44] J. Hajjar (op. cit., 251–52) assesses this constitution, which was dictated by motives of spiritual guidance in order to facilitate a more frequent Communion recommended by Pius X. Hajjar considers it to be an "anti-Oriental reaction" and "a step backward under Pius X."

[45] B. Arens, op. cit., 5–18; A. S. Hernández, op. cit., 417–19; J. Alameda, op. cit., 101–05.

It was Benedict XV who finally created institutions which, taking Leo XIII's appeals seriously, could reliably carry out papal unification policies in the twentieth century. These institutions were the *Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali* (the result of the motu proprio *Dei providentis* of 1 May 1917)[47] in which the Uniate Churches were freed from the union with other Roman congregations and placed under their own cardinals' congregation; and the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies (the result of the motu proprio Orientis Catholici of 15 October 1917),[48] which was devoted to the study and teaching of all Eastern Churches and trained men to serve the reconciliation of the churches.

The Independent Eastern Churches

To facilitate an understanding of the papal unification efforts and the development of Church history at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, we insert a brief summary of the situation of the Eastern Churches separated from Rome, which can be divided into five groups: 1) the Orthodox Church in Russia (100 million), which had assumed jurisdiction over the Georgian Church in the nineteenth century; 2) three Orthodox Churches in Austria-Hungary: the Serbian Church of Karlowitz (800,000), the Church of Bukovina and of Dalmatia (550,000), the Church of Sibiu for the Rumanians living in Hungary (220,000); 3) five national Orthodox Churches in Southeastern Europe: the Church in Rumania (5 million), in Bulgaria (3.5 million), in Serbia (2.5 million), in Greece (2 million), in Montenegro (150,000); 4) the four old Orthodox patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (8.5 million); 5) the National Church of the Syrian Nestorians (80,000), the Monophysite Churches of the West Syrian Jacobites (100,000), the Thomist Christians in Southern India (450,000) the Copts in Egypt (800,000), the Ethiopians (3.5 million), and the Armenians (4 million).[49]

---

[46] L. v. Pastor, *Tagebücher—Briefe—Erinnerungen,* ed. by W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950), 584–85; F. Engel-Janosi, op. cit. II, 122–25.

[47] *AAS* IX (1917), 529–31.

[48] Ibid., 531–33.

[49] Cf. N. Zernow, op. cit., 314–320. The numbers of faithful he lists for the year 1910 need to be corrected in some cases, especially regarding the Orthodox in Austria-Hungary (see n. 69) and the four old patriarchal churches: Constantinople: 3 million, Alexandria: 50,000, Antioch: 250,000, and Jerusalem: 20,000.

The Orthodox Church in Russia

The largest and most influential Orthodox Church was the Russian State Church, which was ruled by the Holy Synod. Since the dissolution of the first Muscovite patriarchate at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the State Church was more than ever subject to the monarchs who called themselves autonomous rulers by the grace of God. The Holy Synod was considered an administrative organ of the state, and it felt its subordination to be submission to the ruler himself. The Synod was chaired by the metropolitan of Moscow, but he was completely dependent on the representatives of the Tsar and on the chief procurator, whom Peter I had appointed as the chief secretary of the chancellory and called "our eye and administrator of state affairs." He received ministerial rank and was empowered with unlimited authority over the Church, which reached its peak in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Chief Procurator Count Dmitri Tolstoy (1865–80) was a dry bureaucrat who wanted to pursue reforms in the Church similar to those in the state. He abolished the division of the bishoprics into three categories and regulated the salaries of the secular clergy in detail. He had little interest in matters of faith and extended the liberal reforms of Alexander II to the seminaries (1867) and academies (1869). His plan to reform clerical jurisdiction was never completed. He was extraordinarily critical of the Catholic Church, as is proven both by his two-volume work about the Catholics in Russia,[50] which he had written as a civil servant in the Department for Spiritual Affairs and Foreign Creeds in the Ministry of the Interior, and by his strict incorporation of the faithful of the Uniate bishopric of Chelm (1875) into the Russian State Church.

His successor, Constantin Petrovich Pobedonostsev (1880–1905),[51] an outstanding lawyer and jurist, was a devout and pious Orthodox Christian. He grew up with the ideals of Muscovite Russia: Church and state, the faithful, and the tsar all form a unity according to the example of the Byzantine State Church. He considered people's sovereignty, parliamentarism, and democracy to be the great falsehoods of the time. He rejected liberal innovations and believed that a powerful authority headed by the patriarchal autocrat, preservation of the traditional faith, encouragement of the liturgy and worship of icons, and reinforcement and strengthening of monarchism would protect Russia from revolutionary threats. Under Tsars Alexander II, Alexander III, and Nicholas II he conducted the affairs of the Russian State Church. He supervised the election of the bishops, allowed them little independence, and systematically expanded the administrative body of the Holy Synod to supervise the Church. He felt responsible for state and Church, wanting to protect the latter against fads and to strengthen it for its providential task of preserving the state. He provided the clerical schools, seminaries, and academies with new statutes in order to purge them of liberal infiltration. He reorganized parochial schools, demanding considerable state funds for their development. He intensified the Orthodox mission among the Old Believers, fought against the sectarian groups of the Dukobors, Molokans, Chilysty, and Skoptsy, and opposed all non-Orthodox religious congregations in Russia, such as the Catholic Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Evangelical sects like the Stundists, and the Muslims.

---

[50] D. A. Tolstoj, *Le catholicisme romain en Russie,* 2 vols. (Paris 1863–64).

[51] F. Steinmann, E. Hurwicz, *Konstantin Petrowitsch Pobjedonoscew, der Staatsmann der Reaktion unter Alexander III.* (Königsberg 1933); R. F. Byrnes, *Pobedonostsev. His Life and Thought* (London 1968); G. Simon, *Konstantin Petrovič Pobedonoscev und die Kirchenpolitik des Heiligen Synod* 1880–1905 (Göttingen 1969); F. Jockwig, *Der Weg der Laien auf das Landeskonzil der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche, Moskau 1917/18. Werden und Verwirklichung einer demokratischen Idee in der Russischen Kirche* (Würzburg 1971), 42–55.

On the occasion of the nine hundredth anniversary of the Christianization of Russia by Grand Duke Vladimir I of Kiev (979–1015) on 15 July 1888, Pobedonostsev delivered a speech in which he pointed out that Russia had risen to its present height because of Christianity and under the flag of the autocracy of the tsar.[52] True Orthodox religiosity, Russian Church policy, and Russian Panslavism converged in the secular and ecclesiastical meetings that were attended by the Orthodox metropolitans of Serbia and Montenegro, by a Greek archimandrite, Serbian and Rumanian delegations, and Abyssinians. Ruthenians and Slovacs from Galicia and Hungary also assembled, in spite of their governments' prohibition against travel outside the country. The historical significance of this anniversary, which extended beyond the Russian borders, was characterized by, among other things, a telegram, sent by Bishop Stroßmayer of Djakovo to Tsar Alexander III.[53]

The chief procurator asserted his leading position in Church and state administration during the first years of Nicholas II's government, so that one can speak of the age of Pobedonostsev. It ended with the Revolution of 1905, the collapse of autocracy, the toleration edict of Nicholas

---

[52] F. Steinmann, E. Hurwicz, op. cit., 208: "We are standing under this flag, under it we form a united entity with a united will, and in it we see the future guarantee of truth, order, and the welfare of our country."

[53] J. Matl, "Josef Georg Stroßmayer," *Neue Österreichische Biographie* sect. i, IX (Vienna 1956), 76: "I have the honor and sincere pleasure of participating in this festivity. . . . May God bless Russia and help her to fulfill in true faith with God's help and with Christian courage this great world mission which God assigned to her in spite of all her other duties."

II of 17 April and his manifesto of 30 October, in which he promised the introduction of civil liberties and general suffrage. Without success, Pobedonostsev protested against the toleration edict, which annulled the restrictions he had imposed for decades. In vain he worked on a project for the Duma, whose members were only entitled to propose legislative bills to the Council of State. The project was announced on 6 August, but was neither accepted by the liberal nor by the revolutionary critics. As he had done throughout the last few years, he bemoaned the fact that there was no longer an authority that was ready to fight. Because of questions pertaining to Church reforms and a council, which the patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church was to restore (questions which were debated in ecclesiastical circles and in the press), Pobedonostsev resigned two days after the publication of the October manifesto, twenty-five years after taking office. After his resignation, he wrote to Bishop Eulogi Georgievski (1868–1946), who was at that time bishop of Lublin and later, in the emigration, metropolitan of Paris: "The situation has become intolerable. . . . In the church itself wolves appeared who did not spare the sheep."[54] A time of gloom and the power of darkness had arrived, he wrote, it was time to go.

The protests against the power of bureaucracy in the Church were continued by the first constitutional prime minister, Duke Serge Witte (1905–6) and Metropolitan Antoni Wadkovski (1898–1912) from Saint Petersburg. Nicholas II ordered the metropolitans of Saint Petersburg, Moscow, and Kiev to convene a national council in order to "change the structure of our national Church on the solid basis of the ecumenical canon for the purpose of consolidating Orthodoxy."[55] A precouncil committee met from 8 March to 15 December 1906,[56] working as seven commissions, whose minutes were published. The deliberations were based on responses to a questionnaire which the Holy Synod had sent to the bishops on 29 July 1905. They dealt with the upper Church leadership, diocesan administration, parishes, and the principle of councils; and they contained extensive proposals for the council, e.g., the participation of laymen in the council's proceedings. In six plenary meetings, the resolutions of the commissions were voted on.[57] The votes were unanimously in favor of rejuvenating the patriarchate, on limiting the authority of the chief procurator to a mere controlling function, and on appointing laymen to the council. There was disagreement about the clergy and laity's right to vote, about standing orders, and other questions of formalities. Nicholas II, after dissolving the Second Duma on 8 July 1906, once again ruled autocratically. He suspended the precouncil committee and assigned the preparations for the National Council to the Holy Synod, which presented him with a comprehensive report. After a few changes, he approved it, but postponed the council indefinitely.

---

[54] I. Smolitsch, op. cit., 213f. n. 8.—After his dismissal, Pobedonostsev wrote several essays expressing his protest against state and Church reforms. He died on 10 March 1907.

[55] Ibid., 320.

[56] F. Jockwig, op. cit., 101–32.

[57] Ibid., 164–81.

Four insignificant men[58] held the office of the chief procurator between 1905 and 1911. Then, in May, it was occupied by C. V. Sabler (1911–15), who had been Pobedonostsev's closest adviser from 1892 until 1905. He rose to the leadership of the Holy Synod, limited the religious freedom of non-Orthodox Churches through special regulations which were enacted by the Ministry of the Interior, and treated the proposals of the precouncil committee dilatorily, although he established, in 1912, a precouncil commission at the Holy Synod. He was intent on restoring the harmony between Church and state and initiated appropriate declarations on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of the ruling Romanov family (1913) and on the occasion of the outbreak of World War I.

In spite of the submission of the Russian Church to the state, those internal forces which are evidence of a deeply rooted religious life should not be ignored.[59] The official statistics of the Holy Synod for 1914 offer the following numbers,[60] allowing a glance into the organization and institutions of its 100 million faithful: 73 dioceses, 163 bishops, 51,105 clergymen, 1,025 monasteries, with 94,629 monks and nuns, 54,174 churches, 25,593 chapels, 4 clerical academies, 57 seminaries, 185 boys' seminaries, 37,528 parochial schools, 291 hospitals, 1,113 nursing homes, and 34,497 parish libraries. The growth rate of the monasteries is remarkable (1865: 587, 1894: 774, 1914: 1,025). Before the outbreak of World War I, the 550 monasteries housed 11,845 monks, 9,485 novices; the 475 convents had 70,283 nuns and 56,026 novices.[61] The monasteries were centers of charity. Strong influence on the public was exerted by the starets, the ordained or nonordained hermits or monks who had matured through renunciation and contemplation and worked as fathers confessor or spiritual advisers among the common people and the educated, and by the attractiveness of the places of pilgrimage, such as the cavern monastery of Kiev, the island monasteries of Valamo on Lake Ladoga, and Solovki on Onega Bay on the White Sea.

---

[58] Prince A. D. Obolenskij (1905–06), Prince A. A. Schirinskij-Schichmatov (1906), P. P. Izwolskij (1906–09), S. M. Lukianov (1909–11).

[59] I. Peresvetov, "Zur Geschichte der caritativen Tätigkeit in der Ostkirche, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der russischen Kirche," *Das diakonische Amt der Kirche,* ed. by H. Krimm (Stuttgart ^{2}1953), 242–68; P. Hauptmann, "Die ekklesiologische Neubesinnung in der russischen Theologie des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Kyrios* 10 (1970), 225–34; F. Jockwig, "Kirche und Staatsduma. Zur politischen Aktivität der Russisch-Orthodoxen Kirche am Vorabend der Revolution," *Wegzeichen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Hermenegild M. Biedermann,* ed. by E. C. Suttner, C. Patock (Würzburg 1971), 437–50; G. Simon, *Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft,* 199–233; P. Hauptmann, *Die Katechismen der Russisch- Orthodoxen Kirche. Entstehungsgeschichte und Lehrgehalt* (Göttingen 1971); K. C. Felmy, *Predigt im orthodoxen Rußland. Untersuchungen zu Inhalt und Eigenart der russischen Predigt in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen 1972).

[60] M. Lacko, P. Chrysostomus, "Geschichte und jetziger Stand der orthodoxen Kirchen," K. Algermissen, *Konfessionskunde,* 185.

The training of the clergy emphasized the study of liturgy and homiletics. Almost all branches of theology were represented by outstanding experts, for example (in Church history), E. E. Golubinsky (1834–1932), N. N. Glubovski (1863–1932), and N. F. Kapterev (1847–1917). The four clerical academies in Saint Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev, and Kazan educated respectable scholars. The episcopate consisted largely of the so-called educated monks who did not feel obligated to monastic life. Most of the eparchs stood the test as lecturers in seminaries and academies. The Russian Orthodox Church received new impetus from lay theologians, such as the landowner and private scholar Alexei Chomjakov (1804–60), the religious philosopher Vladimir Soloviev (1853–1900), and the social philosophers Sergei Bulgakov (1871–1944) and Nicolas Berdyaev (1874–1948), who were later both ordained as priests. Chomjakov developed the idea of the Church offering unity, freedom, and love. In his opinion, Orthodoxy combined unity and freedom, while Catholicism offered unity without freedom and Protestantism freedom without unity. His ideas gave rise to the much-debated doctrine of Sobornost,[62] according to which the entire community of bishops, priests, and laymen are the pillars of faith and doctrine and are thus infallible.

In the wake of ecclesiological reassessment, priests and laymen stood up for the renovation and revival of the Church. They participated in the preparations of the National Council and in the debates of the four Dumas.[63] Priests and bishops served as deputies of various parties; the 440 deputies of the third Duma included 49 representatives of the clergy. Since governmental pressures did not allow a development of parliamentary life, the ecclesiastical demands for easing dependence on the state could not be attained.

---

[61] I. Smolitsch, op. cit., 713.

[62] B. Plank, *Katholizität und Sobornost'. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Katholizität der Kirche bei den russischen Theologen in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Würzburg 1960); cf. B. Schultze, op. cit., 109–21.

[63] F. Jockwig, *Kirche und Staatsduma,* 437–50.

Not until a provisional government had been formed on 12 March and Tsar Nicholas II had resigned on 15 March 1917, were the plans for a National Council dealing with the reform of the Church realized. The Council convened on 15 August in Moscow and lasted until September 1918. The 586 participants were composed of the bishops from the 65 dioceses (which included 115 million faithful), 5 delegates, 2 clergymen, and 3 laymen from each bishopric. Twenty commissions deliberated an extensive reform program, based on the material prepared by the precouncil committee. The discussions about restructuring the upper Church administration took place in the turbulent days of the October Revolution, when the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia. The most important accomplishment was the restoration of the patriarchate.[64] The patriarch was to be the first among equal bishops and to cooperate with the authorities of the Church administration regarding reports to the National Council. On 5 November Muscovite Metropolitan Tychon (1865–1925) was elected patriarch of Moscow and Russia. On 21 November he was solemnly enthroned in the Cathedral of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. Two hundred seventeen years after the death of the last patriarch, Adrian (1700), the Russian Orthodox Church was once again headed by a patriarch. The Church had entered into a new period of its history. It had shaken the shackles of the Russian State Church system, but in the following years it was systematically suppressed by Soviet Church policies, which forced its representatives to make declarations of loyalty and limited its activities to a large extent.

The political annexation of Georgia by Russia in 1811 was followed by the suspension of the independent Orthodox Georgian (Grozny) Catholics and their subjugation to the Holy Synod. A Russian exarch with his see in Tiflis received the order to incorporate the Georgian Church into the Russian State Church. In 1886, the Byzantine liturgy and preaching in the Georgian language were forbidden. On 12 March 1917, after the collapse of the Russian regime and the formation of a provisional government in Saint Petersburg, a synod granted autocephaly to the Georgian Church.[65] With its 2.5 million faithful, it became independent again, reorganized its catholicate with four bishoprics, elected Bishop Kyrion patriarch of Georgia and introduced the Georgian language into the church service.

---

[64] A. Herman, op. cit., 92–93; K. Onasch, op. cit., 127–28; J. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte in der neuesten Zeit* I (Munich, Salzburg 1965), 92–101.

[65] M. Tamarati, *L-Église Géorgienne. Des origines jusqu'à nos jours* (Rome 1910); R. Iwanitsky-Ingilo, "Lose Blätter aus der Geschichte der georgischen Kirche," *Ex Oriente,* op. cit., 133–51; M. Tarchnišvili, "Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der kirchlichen Autokephalie Georgiens," *Kyrios* 5 (1940–41), 177–93; D. M. Lang, *A Modern History of Georgia* (London 1962).

The Orthodox Churches in Austria-Hungary

In the middle of the nineteenth century, the Serbian metropolitan of Karlowitz became the head of all the Orthodox in Austria. His patriarchal title was approved in 1848 by Emperor Joseph I. In 1864, the bishopric of Sibiu (Hermannstadt) was taken out of the Karlowitz system and was made a metropolitan see for the Rumanians in Transylvania. After the Austro-Hungarian agreement of 1867, both Orthodox metropolitan sees were located in the Hungarian section of the Empire. Therefore, Chernovtsy in northern Bukovina was elevated to metropolis for the Cisleithan half of the Empire (1873) and also received two bishoprics in Dalmatia. The patriarch of Constantinople recognized the autocephaly of those three Churches. After their election by the appropriate Church congresses, the bishops were confirmed by the Austrian Emperor. They were controlled by the Austro-Hungarian bureaucracy, which limited them severely, because they were suspected of being potential allies of the neighboring Orthodox states. The upper Church echelon and the congresses tried to solidify their legal position in the Monarchy, which had been decreed in Austria and Hungary through imperial documents.[66]

The Church of Karlowitz took care of the Serbs in Hungary. The metropolitan, who carried the title of patriarch, and the six bishops were assisted by an episcopal synod and a national Church congress with twenty-five clergymen and fifty laymen. Both institutions also supervised the numerous Basilian monasteries. The patriarchal church had its own printing press and a theological school in Karlowitz, which was elevated to a theological faculty in 1906.

For the Orthodox Rumanians in Hungary and Transylvania, the Emperor established the Orthodox Church in Sibiu. Its metropolitan and his administration were supported by two suffragan bishops, one episcopal synod and a national Church congress (thirty clergymen, sixty laymen).

---

[66] Regarding the Eastern Churches in Austria-Hungary, cf. A. Ratel, "L'Église orthodoxe de Bukovine," *ÉO* 5 (1902), 225–36; M. Théarvic, "L'Eglise serbe orthodoxe de Hongrie," ibid. 5 (1902), 164–73; I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 63–65, 180–214; K. Lübeck, op. cit., 88–90; A. Hudal, *Die serbisch-orthodoxe Nationalkirche,* 38–61; M. Lehmann, op. cit., 26–35. The literature gives different numbers of believers: N. Zernow (op. cit., 319) lists 800,000 for the Church of Karlowitz, 220,000 for Sibiu, and 550,000 for Bukovina-Dalmatia. K. Lübeck (op. cit., 88–90) gives much higher numbers for the first two churches: 1,063,000, 1,075,000, and 528,000. According to M. Lehman (op. cit., 66), Austria had 666,458 Orthodox, Hungary 2,799,846, Bosnia-Herzegovina 826,338 (1 January 1913).

The Orthodox Church of Chernovtsy included a metropolis of the same name in Bukovina with Slavic and Rumanian nationalities, two dioceses in Dalmatia, mainly populated by Serbs, the Orthodox congregation in Trieste, and the Serbian-Orthodox parish of St. Sava in Vienna. The metropolitan synod took place once a year in Vienna. The differences between the Rumanian and Slavic population caused conflicts between the considerable number of Rumanians, the Ukrainians, and Russophile groups. After 1909 the Austrian administration employed strict means of defense to counteract the propaganda of Russian Orthodoxy, which reached into parts of Galicia and northern Hungary.[67] The controversies climaxed in the first half of 1914 with three high treason trials.

The Austro-Hungarian government did not suggest making the four Serbian Orthodox exarchates in Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose bishops carried the metropolitan title, independent areas of jurisdiction. They remained formally subject to the patriarch of Constantinople after the occupation (1878), as well as after the annexation (1908). A seminary in Sarajevo took care of the training of prospective priests. Around the end of the nineteenth century, the Orthodox population launched a protest against the dependence of the metropolitan on the Austro-Hungarian government. This caused priests in the Bosnian eparchy of Mostar to refuse to baptize and conduct funerals (1898).

The Orthodox Churches in Southeast Europe

The struggles for freedom launched by the Balkan peoples against Turkish rule occasioned the creation of new states in Southeast Europe, whose Orthodox population was struggling for ecclesiastical independence. Five independent churches emerged in Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro.[68] After the Balkan Wars and the founding of the Albanian state in 1914, the Orthodox Albanians also tried to form an autocephalous Church. The five or six new churches were filled with belligerent nationalism and quickly consolidated themselves.

The Orthodox faithful in the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia had preserved their customs in spite of foreign rulers and Hellenization measures by the patriarchs of Constantinople. Their monasteries, which had received generous donations, were centers of religious and cultural life. When the principality of Rumania became politically independent, the two metropolitan sees joined to form the Rumanian National Church.[69] Its independence was proclaimed in 1865 by a national synod and a national congress. The Rumanian language, which had been customary after the seventeenth century next to Old Church Slavonic but was replaced by Greek at the initiative of Constantinople, was decreed to be the liturgical language in 1862. The Holy Synod was headed by the metropolitan of Bucharest. It included 2 metropolitans, 6 eparchal bishops and 8 vicar bishops. Even though (in 1863) the estates of the patriarch of Constantinople and some Greek monasteries were confiscated and their funds deposited in a state-owned church account, the monastic system was successfully restored. In 1902 there were 22 monasteries with 709 monks and 19 convents with 1,742 nuns. In 1884 the University of Bucharest opened a theology faculty, which was in charge of two seminaries and also tried to provide a solid theological and pastoral education for the secular clergy. Its influence was felt in independent Rumanian Churches outside of Rumania: in Sibiu, Chernovtsy, and, among the Rumanians living under Russian rule, in Bessarabia. The eparchs resisted the intervention attempts of liberal ministers. Metropolitan Athanasios Mironescu had to resign in 1910.

---

[67] R. Kißling, "Die russische Orthodoxie und der Nordosten des ehemaligan Habsburgerreiches 1908–1914," *Ostdeutsche Wissenschaft* 9 (1962), 287–300.

[68] The patriarch of Constantinople recognized the autocephaly for those churches in Greece in 1856, Montenegro in 1878, Serbia in 1879, and Rumania in 1873. He denied it to Bulgaria in 1872.

In Bulgaria, desire for a national Orthodox Church emerged after 1860. By order of the sultan, an independent exarchate was established on 27 February 1870,[70] which was to include all Orthodox Bulgarians in one Church, in order to eliminate Russian intervention in Bulgarian Church affairs. Since Turkish and Greek groups suppressed the Bulgarians, the forces striving for freedom came together in the Bulgarian National Church, which took the lead in the struggle for freedom. The patriarchs of Constantinople refused to grant the Church independence because the expansion of the Bulgarian Church into Macedonia, then part of the Ottoman Empire, did not conform with the principle of territorial unity held by the Orthodox National Churches. Thus the patriarchs declared the Bulgarians to be schismatics.[71] In 1872 the National Assembly sanctioned an exarchal statute which had been designed by a synod in 1871. The administration of the Church was entrusted to the Holy Synod, to which the exarch in his capacity as chairman appointed 4 bishops, and to the exarchal council, composed of the exarch himself and 6 laymen. The exarchate included 32 eparchies, 11 of them located in the principality of Bulgaria, 21 in Thrace and Macedonia. Exarch Joseph (1877–1915) initially resided in Constantinople, from where he directed the eparchies in and outside of Bulgaria. After the Balkan Wars he transferred his see to Sofia (1913). He also supervised the monastery of Rila, which had been restored after a fire (1833–47) and had preserved its reputation as a national shrine. Aside from this, there were 78 monasteries with 193 monks and 14 convents with 348 nuns. In 1912 the Holy Synod complained to the government about the inadequate administration of religious instruction, which was given by liberal, often atheistic teachers. The Synod was worried about the future.

---

[69] S. Pétridès, "Les séminaires orthodoxes in Roumainie," *ÉO* 6 (1903), 191–98; I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 147–62; R. Janin, op. cit. (1957), 522–24.

[70] X. Véren, "Choses de Bulgarie," *ÉO* 6 (1903), 328–36; S. S. Bobtchev, *La lutte du peuple bulgare pour une église nationale indépendante* (Sofia 1938), 1–19; S. Zankow, "Die Bulgarische Orthodoxe Kirche in Geschichte und Gegenwart," *IKZ* 48 (1958), 189–208; W. de Vries, *Der chrisliche Osten,* 137–41.

[71] On 22 February 1945, Patriarch Benjamin (1936–46) declared the end of the schism and recognized the autocephaly of the Bulgarian Church.

After the political recognition of Serbia's autonomy within Turkey (1830), the patriarch of Constantinople had granted the metropolitan of Belgrade some independence in a concordat concluded in 1832, which had been amended in 1835/36 by a consistorial statute.[72] Immediately after Serbia's declaration of independence at the Congress of Berlin (1878), Patriarch Joachim III granted the Serbian Orthodox Church its autocephaly (1879).[73] After Serbia was elevated to a kingdom (1882), the government enacted a law regarding the Church administration, which caused a conflict with Metropolitan Michael (Mihailo), who had stood up for the rights of the Church since 1859, and resulted in his dismissal in 1881. The ecclesiastical constitution of 1890 eliminated the tensions and solidified the cooperation between state and Church. It regulated the competencies of the episcopal synod, the metropolitans, and the four eparchal bishops. After the second Balkan War, the territories taken by Serbia in Macedonia and Albania were incorporated into the metropolis of Belgrade and divided into two metropolitan sees and one bishopric. The monastic system (44 monasteries with 118 monks) was still in its infancy. Aside from the theological seminary in Belgrade, a second one was opened in Prizren in 1872. The efforts exerted after the end of the nineteenth century to restore the medieval Serbian patriarchate, which had been renewed in 1557 and dissolved in 1766, failed, since the consolidation of the Serbian Churches of Belgrade, Montenegro, Karlowitz, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Dalmatia into one patriarchate could not be realized in view of the differences between Russia and Austria-Hungary regarding Church policies.

---

[72] J. Mousset, op. cit., 54–106.

[73] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 162–75; N. Djordjević, *Die Selbständigkeit der serbischen Kirche* (Berne 1922); J. Mousset, op. cit., 301–31.

After the suspension of the Serbian patriarchate, the Orthodox Church in Montenegro was de facto independent. The metropolitan of Cetinje combined in his office spiritual and secular power. Since Danilo I (1697–1737), this double office was inherited within his family according to the custom of the Nestorian Church, a nephew always succeeding his uncle. The ecclesiastical prince entrusted the secular government to a civil governor. After the death of Metropolitan Peter III (1830–51), his nephew Danilo renounced his ordination as bishop and as Danilo II (1851–60) founded the secular principality of Montenegro, with the aid of Russia, which, since Peter I, had sent financial and diplomatic aid to the little mountainous country and succeeded in making it the base for its Balkan policy. Danilo's successor Nikita (1860–1918), after successful battles with Turkey, achieved the recognition of his country's independence (1878), including his territorial acquisitions. In 1910 he accepted the title of King. The Orthodox Church, which, since 1878, had been officially autocephalous, included, aside from its metropolis, two bishoprics, which were established in 1876 and 1913.[74] The efforts of the bishops to elevate the clerical ranks and to renovate monasticism (at the beginning of the twentieth century not more than fifteen monks each lived in the eleven monasteries) were not very successful.

After Otto I, son of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, had been elected King of Greece (1832–62), the Greek Orthodox Church,[75] which had declared its independence in 1833, organized itself as a National Church with the King as head, according to the model of the Evangelical Church of Bavaria. It was administered by a permanent Holy Synod with five active and four attending members appointed by the Minister of Religious Affairs. It was chaired by the current archbishop of Athens. In 1850 Constantinople confirmed the autocephaly of the Holy Synod, preserving the honorary primacy of the ecumenical patriarch. Through the territorial expansion of Greece in the second half of the nineteenth century, the number of eparchs rose to thirty-two. According to the constitution of 1852 the Holy Synod was independent of political authority, yet, through the royal commissioner (procurator) who was assigned to the Synod according to the Russian model and who was empowered with unlimited veto rights, it became rather dependent on the government. This was reflected, for instance, in the decline of monasteries, whose rich estates were often confiscated; nevertheless, around 1900, there were 169 monasteries and 9 convents, with almost 2,000 monks and 152 nuns. Most clergymen had nothing but an elementary school education. There were some clerical schools. Only a few priests came from the Rizarios School in Athens, which was turned into a religious teachers' seminary in 1911. Archimandrite Chrysostomos Papadopulos, later archbishop of Athens (1923–39), finally initiated the founding of several qualified seminaries for priests. In addition, there was a theological faculty in the University of Athens which had been established in 1837.

---

[74] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 175–79; A. Hudal, *Die serbisch-orthodoxe Nationalkirche,* 31–38.

[75] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 66–85; R. Janin, op. cit. (1957), 501–03.

The Orthodox in Albania (180,000) belonged (after 1767) to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Before Albania became a principality (1913), efforts to form a separate church where Albanian was spoken during the service rather than Greek had already begun.[76]

The Four Old Orthodox Patriarchal Churches

The patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, which had developed during Christian antiquity, suffered under Turkish rule. The Orthodox population, like all non-Islamic groups, was treated as second-class citizens, even though its spiritual advisers were granted certain administrative autonomy. The Ottoman Empire, organized according to the Koran as a theocratic monarchy, gave the patriarch of Constantinople certain rights and recognized him as ethnarch, bearing the responsibility for the subjects of his nation not only in ecclesiastical, but also in secular areas (Millet system). This strengthened the Greek hegemony which had impaired the independence of the other three patriarchs in the Near East since the Middle Ages, at the same time transferring power to the Serbian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian eparchies. The trend toward independence within the Orthodox Churches of Southeast Europe, the growth of a middle class, and the influence of Anglican and Catholic missionaries had aided in weakening the domination of the patriarch of Constantinople over the other three patriarchates.

The ecumenical patriarchate of Constantinople[77], which comprised in the early Middle Ages the entire territory of the Byzantine Empire (624 episcopal sees), shrank more and more during the course of the nineteenth century and included at the beginning of the twentieth century only the rest of European Turkey and the coastal areas of Asia

---

[76] In 1922, these efforts led to the creation of an autocephalous Albanian Orthodox Church, recognized in 1937 by the ecumenical patriarch.

[77] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 3–23; K. Lübeck, op. cit., 58–74; G. M. Drabadjeglon, "Geschichte und Verfassung des Ökumenischen Patriarchats," *Ekklesia* X (1941), 27–61; G. Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate* (London 1947); G. Zananiri, *Histoire de l'Église byzantine* (Paris 1954); R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 114–23; id., op. cit. (1957), 498–501; I. Totzke, *Die alten Patriarchate* (1959), 204–07; F. W. Fernau, op. cit., 78–81; R. Potz, op. cit., 86–98.

Minor that had been settled by Greeks. Easing of the Millet system undermined the secular rights of the patriarch. The relationship between state and Church was fundamentally regulated through a law in 1856. The so-called statutes of 1860 defined the competencies of the patriarchal synod, which was composed of twelve metropolitans under the chairmanship of the patriarch and the newly created mixed council of four bishops and eight laymen. The constitution of 1876 guaranteed the freedom of the sects existing in the Ottoman Empire and assured the privileges granted them; however, under Sultan Abdul-Hamid II (1876–1909), a judicial reform (suspending, among other things, the privilege of immunity of the Greek clergy), limitation of the patriarchal rights, and interventions in ecclesiastical life (such as in schools), finally led to a *Kulturkampf* between 1884 and 1890. The constitution of 1908, secured by the Young Turks, changed the Ottoman Empire into a constitutional monarchy. The ecumenical patriarch lost his right to represent Greeks and other ethnic groups under Turkish rule before the sultan, since elected deputies were now responsible for the people's representation. A law of 1910 regarding schools and churches in Macedonia interfered with the property rights of the patriarchate. The Balkan Wars in 1912/13 brought fear of losing the metropolitan sees in northern Greece. Patriarch Joachim III (1878–84, 1901–12) defended himself heroically against the tutelage of the state. He expanded the academy existing since 1844 on the island of Chalki, which was also attended by candidates of the other Orthodox Churches. He founded the periodical *Ecclesiastical Truth* ('Εκκλησιαστικὴ ἀλήϑεια), improved relations with other Orthodox Churches, and cultivated contacts with the Anglican Church, the Old Catholics and Protestantism. His successor Germanos V (1913–18) initially fended off the restrictions placed on the patriarchate by the Young Turks, but he finally abandoned the search for a modus vivendi with the new rulers.

The unification efforts of Leo XIII and Pius X were rejected by the patriarchs. Anthimos VII (1895–97), in his synodal encyclical of 1895, spoke of the introduction of "countless impious innovations" through the bishops of Rome[78] and protested against the activities of Uniate priests. Joachim III disputed the Assumptionists' support of the union in an encyclical of 1907.[79]

In 1901, official statistics listed 78 metropolitan sees in the ecumenical patriarchate: 42 were located in the European section of Turkey, 20 in Asia Minor, 12 on the Turkish islands of the Aegean Sea and the Sea of Marmara, 4 in Bosnia-Herzegovina, including altogether 3 million faithful. The patriarchate was responsible for some monasteries on the Turkish islands and the Athos monasteries[80] in the Asian part of Turkey, which (in 1913) housed 6,345 monks in twenty large monasteries, twelve sketes, and numerous hermitages.[81]

---

[78] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 518–19; W. de Vries, *Orthodoxie,* 134.

[79] Schmidlin, *PG* III, 129.

The other three old patriarchal churches existed in the shadow of Constantinople. The patriarchate of Alexandria[82] had lost its significance in the early Middle Ages when the majority of the Orthodox converted to Monophysitism. The members who had remained loyal to the Byzantine Imperial Church were called Melchites by the Copts. The Melchite patriarch transferred his residence to Constantinople at the end of the sixteenth century because of the despotism of the Turkish conquerors. The number of his followers decreased rapidly and did not increase again until the nineteenth century (through the immigration of Greeks who were supported by Orthodox dignitaries in countries around the Danube River and Russia). General Muhammad Ali (1806–49), the almost autocratically ruling Turkish governor, made sure that the patriarch was elected by the native clergy (1846) and established residence in Cairo and also in Alexandria. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the patriarchal church had only ten old churches and two monasteries. Patriarch Hierotheos II (1846–58) established a council (*συμβούλιον*) to which he assigned the execution of secular and miscellaneous affairs. He and his successors succeeded in easing the tensions between the Greek and Arabic faithful, to fend off partially the intervention attempts of the patriarch of Constantinople, and to initiate an upsurge in religious life. Nikanor (1866–69) created a Holy Synod according to the Russian model. Sophronios IV (1870–99) restored both monasteries and initiated the construction of churches, schools, and charity centers. Photios (1900–25) furthered these efforts and founded a patriarchal printing press which published two theological periodicals after 1908. The four metropolitian sees of this patriarchate slowly developed into ecclesiastical centers.

---

[80] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 52–59; *Le millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963, études et mélanges,* 2 vols. (Chevetogne 1964); P. Huber, *Athos. Leben, Glaube, Kunst* (Zurich 1969); P. M. Mylonas, *Der heilige Berg Athos: Alte Kirchen und Klöster Griechenlands. Ein Begleiter zu den byzantinischen Stätten,* ed. and transl. by E. Melas (Cologne 1972), 93–119.

[81] 3,243 Greeks, 1,914 Russians, 706 Bulgarians, 379 Rumanians, 89 Serbs and Montenegrins, 14 Georgians.

[82] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 36; J. Lacombe, "Patriarcat grec orthodoxe d'Alexandrie," *ÉO* 38 (1939), 174–81; E. Michailides, "Geschichte, Verfassung und Statistik des Patriarchats von Alexandrien," *Ekklesia* X (1941), 71–79; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 161–69; id., op. cit. (1957), 508–09; T. Mosconas, "Das griechisch-orthodoxe Patriarchat von Alexandrian *Kyrios* 1, rev. ed. (1960–61), 129–39; I. I. Totzke, *Die alten Patriarchate* (1959), 301–07.

From 1724 to 1851, the patriarchate of Antioch[83] was staffed by Constantinople with Greek prelates. They were met with scepticism by the majority of the Orthodox believers who were Arabic-speaking Syrians. In addition to these internal tensions, ecclesiastical life was hampered by political unrest, e.g., the attacks by Muslim fanatics under the leadership of the Druses (members of an Islamic sect), which were directed against all Christians in Lebanon and Syria. The patriarchal church in Damascus, its treasures, and its library burned down in 1860. The Holy Synod and an ecclesiastical national council including 4 metropolitans and 8 laymen tried to curtail the progress of the Uniate Melchites and to preserve the 15 dioceses, the 14 monasteries (with a small number of monks), and the seminary of the monastery of Belement, which existed since the middle of the nineteenth century. With the support of Russia, the Syrian Meletios II Doûmanî (1899–1906) was elected patriarch. He was not recognized by the other three Old Christian patriarchs. The resulting schism was only ended under his successor Gregory IV (1906–28). Since then, the Antioch patriarchate has called itself "Syrian Orthodox." The first two Syrian patriarchs used Russian funds to renovate the seminary in Belement, increased the parishes to 68, and made possible the publication of the periodical *Mercy.* The ruthless attacks of the Turks on the Orthodox population at the beginning of World War I threatened all ecclesiastical activities. Only the numerous congregations composed of members who had emigrated to North and South America were able to develop without interference.

The church of Cyprus, originally under the patriarchate of Antioch,[84] became autocephalous after the Council of Ephesus. Following the Turkish conquest of 1571, it began to approach the patriarch of Antioch again. It owed him new appointments to the episcopal see of Nicosia and to the five sees whose incumbents had been executed for their participation in the Greek uprising (1821–25). Archbishop Makarios I (1854–66) emphasized the expansion of parochial schools, their network being expanded even further under the English dominion (1878–1935). Archbishops Sophronios (1865–1900) and Cyril II (1909–16) were not spared conflicts with the occupational forces, but they succeeded in ensuring the independence of their Church and in blocking the attempts by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch to restore their jurisdiction. In 1910 a seminary was established in Saint

---

[83] G. Bardy, *L'Église d'Antioche* (Paris 1918); Alexandros, "Das Patriarchat von Antiochien," *Ekklesia* X (1941), 80–92; I. Totzke, *Die alten Patriarchate* (1960) 203–12.

[84] J. Hackett, *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus* (London 1901); Hippolytos, "Die Autokephale Apostolische Orthodoxe Kirche Cyperns," *Ekklesia* X (1941), 117–29; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 139–44.

George's monastery at Larnaca and a bimonthly, *Ecclesiastical Messenger,* was published. The Church constitution of 1914 regulated the duties and tasks of the Holy Synod, of the 4 bishops, the clergy, the monks (about one hundred in seven monasteries), and of the faithful (200,000).

The patriarchate of Jerusalem,[85] with several titular archbishops, was completely dependent on the patriarchate of Constantinople until 1860, and it was only able to survive through the financial support of the Russian Church. The Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher, which took care of the holy places in Jerusalem and the thirty-five monasteries (seventeen in Jerusalem), had to deal with the claims of other Christian congregations. Patriarch Cyril (1842–72) restored the patriarchal school of the monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem (founded in 1736), and constructed churches and schools in various cities and towns in Palestine. In 1875 a patriarchal statute concerning the rights of the patriarch and the Holy Synod was passed. The differences between the Greek hierarchy and the largely Arabic-speaking faithful required two elections. Patriarch Damianos (1897–1931), himself a Greek but favorably inclined toward Arab demands, was temporarily suspended from office by the synod due to the pressure of Greek diocesan members (1908/09). The mixed council, created in 1911 through Arab pressures, was unable to eliminate the tensions.

The small church on Mount Sinai[86] directed by the abbot of the Saint Catherine monastery, had been autocephalous since 1575. Its archbishop, consecrated since 1782 by the patriarch of Jerusalem, was responsible for thirty monks and thirty Bedouins.

The Near Eastern National Churches

Aside from the Orthodox Churches, the Eastern Churches of the Nestorians and the Monophysites (Jacobites, Thomas Christians, Copts, Ethiopians, and Armenians), independent since Christian antiquity, must be mentioned.

Of the Nestorian Church, a missionary Church which had spread during the Middle Ages into Central Asia and the coast of Malabar in India, only a few faithful had survived through modern times in Northern Mesopotamia, in the area of Lake Urmia, and in the mountains of

---

[85] T. E. Dowling, *The Orthodox Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem* (London ^{2}1913); K. Meliaras, "Die Kirche von Jerusalem," *Ekklesia* X (1941), 95–114; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 153–61.

[86] H. L. Rabino, *Le monastère de Saint-Catherine du Mont Sinaï* (Cairo 1938); H. Skrobucha, *Sinai* (Olten, Lausanne 1959).

Kurdistan north of Mosul.[87] Its members, also called Assyrians, a term which derived from a truncation of the words Syrian Church, were suppressed by the Muslims and cruelly persecuted by Kurdish tribes, who reduced the hierarchy decade by decade. Around 1900, the Church consisted of eight metropolitans and several suffragan bishops. Their head was the patriarch or catholicos, as he was called in the Middle Ages; he resided in Kochânes. After 1450 the Mama family furnished this highest Nestorian dignitary, an uncle always succeeded by a nephew. The patriarchs tried to curtail the missionary successes of the Chaldeans,[88] the Presbyterians, the Anglicans, and the Orthodox Russians. In 1838 3,000 faithful converted to Orthodoxy and settled in Transcaucasia. In 1898 Bishop Mar Jonah of Sunurgan and Urmia converted to Orthodoxy together with his diocesan subjects, after which the Russian Church operated an Orthodox mission in Persia and intensified its propaganda. Catholicos Simon IX Benjamin (1903–17) in 1914 considered the conversion of all Nestorians to Orthodoxy. When the faithful hoped for liberation from Muslim pressures by Russia during World War I, they were persecuted by the Turks and Kurds as traitors. Almost half of the Nestorians died trying to migrate to Persia and defending themselves in the highlands; the catholicos was murdered by a Kurd. Even his successor, Simon XX Paul (1918–20) died a violent death. The Nestorian Church witnessed one of the most difficult periods in its history.

Nor could the decline of the Jacobite Church,[89] beginning in the late Middle Ages, be stopped.[90] Its hierarchy, which had included 20 metropolitan sees and 103 dioceses in the twelfth century, was composed of 8 metropolitian sees and 3 bishoprics at the beginning of the twentieth century. The patriarchs residing in Mardin or Diarbekr repeatedly asked the Russian Church for help and carried on unification negotiations which failed because of controversies over dogma. They could not prevent the victories of the unification movement and the effectiveness of Anglican missionaries. Patriarch Ignatius XXXIV Peter III (1872–94) turned to the Coptic Church in order to overcome the isolation. In

---

[87] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 245–73; P. Kawerau, "Die Nestorianischen Patriarchate in der neueren Zeit," *ZKG* 67 (1955–56), 119–31; R. Janin, op. cit. (1957), 536–37; B. Spuler, "Die nestorianische Kirche," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., 163–69; A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 282–88.

[88] See p. 375.

[89] The name of the Jacobites was derived from James Baradai (490–578) who was ordained as bishop of Syria and Asia Minor by Monophysite Patriarch Theodosios of Alexandria and laid the foundation for an independent ecclesiastical organization.

[90] I. Silbernagl. J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 302–16; B. Spuler, "Die westsyrische (monophysitische/jakobitische) Kirche," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op cit., 213–16; A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 212–18.

1882 he succeeded in being recognized by the Turkish government as the spiritual and temporal head of the Jacobites, which theretofore had been a function of the Armenian patriarch of Constantinople. The ecclesiastical constitution of 1913/14 granted laymen the right to participate in the Church administration. In spite of all external pressures and internal difficulties, some monasteries were able to survive. The political reorganizations in the Near East after World War I, which incorporated West Syrian believers into various states, and the movement toward autonomy of the Indian branch church created new burdens.

The Thomas Christians of Malabar,[91] on the Southwest coast of India, witnessed both unions and separations throughout their colorful history.[92] The series of metropolitans who submitted to the Jacobite patriarch can be dated back to the middle of the seventeenth century. Their goal of uniting all Thomas Christians under their tutelage failed because the Uniate Syrian Church of Malabar was able to consolidate its position, because the Anglican Church Missionary Society accomplished conversions after the beginning of the English dominion (1795), and because a large part of its members left under the leadership of Bishop Mar Athanasios (1843–77). They formed the Mar Thoma Church, which preserved the organization and the customs of the Monophysites, but changed internally by adopting Anglican doctrines. Pressured by the Metropolitan Mar Dionysius V (1865/66–1909), the Jacobite Patriarch Ignatius XXXIV Peter III came to Malabar and excommunicated Bishop Athanasios and his followers in 1876. At a synod he divided the metropolis into six dioceses and ordained several bishops as metropolitans. The Church constitution, adopted at the same time, normalized relations with the patriarchate. After Metropolitan Dionysius V's death, the patriarchal and the metropolitan party launched a feud. They were striving for a separation from the mother Church and for the establishment of their own catholicate. Patriarch Ignatius XXXVI Ebd' Allah III (1906–15) tried in vain to settle the dispute. In 1911, he excommunicated the Indian Metropolitan Dionysius VI (1908–34) and his followers, appointing Metropolitan Cyril Mar Curilos (1909–11) head of the Jacobite Thomas Christians. In 1912 the metropolitan party pronounced Mar Ivanios (as Basileios I) the catholicos of India and the East, with his seat in Kottayam. The catholicos was responsible for the ordination of the bishops and the chrism, while Metropolitan Dionysius VI was entrusted with the administration of Church estates. Next to this independent Syrian Orthodox Church of the Thomas Christians, which granted the Jacobite patriarch an honorary primate, existed the church which was directly subordinate to the Jacobite patriarch.[93] Both were divided into seven dioceses, had one seminary each, and took care of the same number of the faithful, about 250,000.

---

[91] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 317–21; E. Tisserant, *Eastern Christianity in India. A History of the Syro-Malabar Church from the Earliest Time to the Present Day* (London, New York, Toronto 1957), 147–57; B. Spuler, "Die Thomas-Christen in Süd-Indien," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., 231–39; P. J. Podipara, *Die Thomas-Christen* (Würzburg 1966); N. J. Thomas, *Die Syrisch-Orthodoxe Kirche der Südindischen Thomas-Christen. Geschichte - Kirchenverfassung - Lehre* (Würzburg 1967); E. R. Hambye, J. Madey, *1900 Jahre Thomas-Christen in Indien* (Freiburg i. Ue. 1972), 45–50.

[92] Cf. B. Spuler, "Die Thomas-Christen in Süd-Indien," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., after 238, table: Thomaean groups.

The Coptic Church[94] became stable in the first half of the nineteenth century, when the Turkish governor Muhammad Ali (1806–49) ensured an orderly administration in Egypt and did not put any obstacles in the way of the development of the Christian community. Energetically the patriarchs continued the ecclesiastical renovation that had begun under Mark VIII (1796–1809). Peter VIII (1809–52) ordained a bishop for the Sudan and increased the dioceses to thirteen. Cyril IV (1854–61) contributed to the reform of the Church by founding schools, establishing printing presses and constructing churches. Under Demetrios II (1862–75) and Cyril V (1854–1927), a new self-awareness and internal consolidation of the Copts was demonstrated in the new editions of old Coptic works and in theological publications which dealt with dogmatic, historical, and canon law questions. Conflicts arose between the conservative forces, represented by the influential monks and Patriarch Cyril V, and the Coptic National Council of 1874, in which the laymen had participatory rights regarding Church administration. Efforts toward a better training of the clergy in two seminaries and at the theological faculty in Cairo, expansion of the dioceses, missionary victories among the Muslims, and the cooperation of eager laymen assured the Copts (in terms of numbers the strongest Christian sect in Egypt) a respectable position within the Monophysite Churches in the twentieth century.

The Ethiopian Church[95] was dependent on the Coptic patriarchate.

---

[93] For decades, there were trials concerning Church property and controversies about the legality of excommunications declared by the Jacobite patriarch. Not until 1958–59 did the two Churches come to terms and unite. Catholicos Mar Basileios III George II (1929–64) headed the "Orthodox Church of the South Indian Thomaeans" after 1959.

[94] I. Silbernagl. J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 274–93; J. G. zu Sachsen, *Neue Streifzüge durch die Kirchen und Klöster Ägyptens* (Leipzig, Berlin 1930); R. Strothmann, *Die koptische Kirche in der Neuzeit* (Tübingen 1932); R. Janin, op. cit. (1957), 532–34; M. Cramer, *Das christlich-koptische Ägypten einst und heute. Eine Orientierung* (Wiesbaden 1959); S. Chauleur, *Histoire des Coptes d'Égypte* (Paris 1960), 147–63; B. Spuler, "Die koptische Kirche," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., 299–308.

[95] I. Silbernagl. J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 294–301; H. M. Hyatt, *The Church of Abbyssinia* (London 1928); J. B. Coulbeaux, *Histoire politique et religieuse d'Abyssinie depuis les temps*

Its only metropolitan, the Abuna (our father), was appointed by the Coptic patriarch from the ranks of monks around him, ordained bishop, and placed at the head of the native, uneducated, numerous clergy, who considered him an intruder. Next to him, the native abbot of the monastery of Dabra Lebanos played an important role. He carried the honorary title *Etschege* (the one standing next to the throne). He directed the extensive monastic system and administered the estates. The spiritual adviser Abuna Salama (1841–67) was known for his infamous life style and his simony. He and his successors had little freedom within the State Church, which had been involved in the struggles of the small princes fighting for ultimate power. Not until the domestic political situation was cleared under Emperors John IV (1872–89) and Menelik II (1889–1909), did state initiatives bring about renewal within the Church. In 1881 Emperor John IV asked the patriarch for four bishops and assigned them to certain territories. One of them, Matthew, later rose to Abuna (1889–1926) and transferred his see, according to Menelik II's wish, from Gondar to the imperial residence of Addis Ababa (1893). After his death, the monarch succeeded in reforming the Ethiopian Church and separating it from the mother church.[96]

Since the Middle Ages, the Armenian catholicate had been divided into five branch churches,[97] whose catholicates, or rather patriarchates, were Echmiadzin, Constantinople, Agthamar, Cilicia, and Jerusalem. The catholicos of Echmiadzin was the head and representative of all Armenians, and the other high dignitaries recognized his honorary primacy. The Armenian monks obeyed the rules of Saint Basil. The bishops, supported in their diocesan administration by a council composed of clergy and laymen, ordained priests, deacons, and "vardapets" (preachers and teachers). In 1828 the main area of Armenia (Greater

---

les plus reculés jusqu'à l'avènement de Ménélik II, 2 vols. (Paris 1929); R. Janin, op. cit. (1957), 534–36; B. Spuler, "Die äthiopische Kirche," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., 314–18; E. Hammerschmidt, *Äthiopien. Christliches Reich zwischen gestern und morgen* (Wiesbaden 1967); F. Heyer, *Die Kirche Äthiopiens. Eine Bestandsaufnahme* (Berlin, New York 1971).

[96] Under Haile Selassie (after 1928 negus, after 1930 emperor), four native bishops were ordained in 1929. Cyril (1929–50) was the last Coptic abuna. After the death of Coptic Patriarch Cyril VI (1959), the Ethiopian Church was declared an independent patriarchal church, granting the head of the mother church only an honorary rank.

[97] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 214–44; M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia. Her History, Rule, Discipline, Liturgy, Literature, and Existing Condition* (London ^{2}1955); R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 345–52; id., op. cit. (1957), 528–31; B. Spuler, "Die armenische Kirche," *Handuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., 259–68; J. Mécérian, *Histoire et institutions de l'Église arménienne. Évolution nationale et doctrinale, spiritualité - monachisme* (Beirut 1965); A. K. Sanjian, *The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion* (London 1965).

Armenia, Yerevan) was incorporated into the Russian Empire, which had previously intervened in the election of the catholicos of Echmiadzin. A basic law, enacted by Nicholas I in 1836, subjected the Armenian Church to his control. A synodal council, an imperial commissioner, and an administrative adviser for secular affairs exercised the same funtions as the Holy Synod and the chief procurator in the Russian Church. Nicholas II in 1896 and 1903 nationalized the entire Church property, which was partially restored in 1905. Catholicos Georg V Surenian (1911–30), who was responsible for seven dioceses in Russia and two in Persia, achieved the independence of the Armenian Church when the Russian Revolution enabled the formation of the Soviet Republic of Armenia.[98]

The sultan had assigned the supervision of all Armenians in his Empire to the Armenian patriarchate of Constantinople (Millet system), making it responsible for the three areas of jurisdiction in Aghtamar, Cilicia, and Jerusalem. Regarding the administration, he was assisted by three councils (one clerical, one secular, and one mixed council), whose competencies were precisely defined in a national statute of 1860. Through the formation of new Southeastern European states in the second half of the nineteenth and in the beginning of the twentieth century, the patriarchate lost several dioceses; in 1914, it still included 12 archbishoprics, 27 bishoprics, and 6 monasteries. Thousands of people lost their lives when, in 1894/96 and 1909, fanatical Turks ruthlessly threatened the Armenians because of their language and religion, charging them with Russophilia at the beginning of World War I. Mass deportations, forced conversions to the Muslim religion, and emigrations weakened the patriarchate tremendously.

Even the small catholicate of Aghtamar on Lake Van suffered from such persecutions. Catholicos Katchadar Chirojan (1864–95) had no successors. The last vestiges of his area of jurisdiction were taken over in 1895 by the patriarchate of Constantinople and in 1915 by the catholicate of Echmiadzin.

The catholicate, or rather patriarchate of Cilicia in Little Armenia (2 archbishoprics, 10 dioceses, and 2 monasteries) was incorporated into the patriarchate of Constantinople according to the national statute of 1860; it was able, however, to preserve a certain measure of autonomy in spite of pressures by the Turkish government.

The patriarchate of Jerusalem, which took care of the Armenians in Palestine, Syria, and on the island of Cyprus, was divided into 5 dioceses. When the patriarchate of Constantinople took power, it was limited to the administration of the diocese of Jerusalem, whose spiritual center was the Jacob Monastery.[99]

---

[98] After a short time, the successful reconstruction of the Church was threatened by persecutions, which all religious communities in the Soviet Union had to suffer. They did not cease until the catholicos was willing to declare his loyalty toward the regime and to serve Soviet foreign policies.

This summary of the internal and external situation of the independent Eastern Churches shows what paralyzing effect the pressures by Russia, Turkey, and other states had on Church organization and the life of the believers. Reform movements can be found among the Orthodox, e.g., in Russia and on Cyprus, and among the Monophysites, e.g., in southern India and Egypt. However, they did not have the strength to break the shackles imposed on them by the states. Therefore their efforts toward mutual communication and collaboration in the ecumenical movement remained futile.[100] Some Church dignitaries cultivated contacts with the Anglican and Old Catholic bishops; however, the centuries-old prejudices and dogmatic differences disclosed deep rifts. Church historians and liturgical scholars of Eastern and Western Christianity studied its past, so rich in traditions, and recognized the value of preserving Old Christian treasures. However, the desire for closer relations between the Orthodox, Nestorian, and Monophysite congregations and for contact with the separated Christians of the West did not emerge until after World War I and after the breakthrough of the ecumenical movement in the following decades.

The Uniate Eastern Churches

In spite of all the schisms between the Eastern and Western hemispheres of Christianity, the Popes tried to restore unity. When they finally succeeded in concluding union treaties with the Orthodox Churches in Eastern Europe at the end of the sixteenth and in the seventeenth century, they expected to reduce the hardened barriers between the papacy and the Christian East, and unions with the Near East, Ethiopia, and India were established.[101] But in spite of some success they had to endure backlashes. The pontificate of Leo XIII, oriented toward the future, opened new perspectives toward unification.[102] Around 1900, approximately 8 million believers[103] were jurisdictionally assigned to the Armenian patriarchate of Cilicia, the Maronite, Melchite, and Syrian patriarchates of Antioch, the Chaldean patriarchate of Babylon, the Uniate Coptic patriarchate of Alexandria, and to several archbishoprics and bishoprics in eastern and southern Europe, in Lower Italy and in southern India.[104] On the basis of their liturgical languages they were divided into five groups: the Byzantine, Alexandrian, Antiochic (West Syrian), Chaldean (East Syrian), and Armenian rite. They were defined by the liturgies within and without the Byzantine Imperial Church in Christian antiquity.

---

[99] Regarding the present day jurisdiction of the Armenians, cf. M. Krikorian, J. Madey, "The Armenian Church. Extension, Hierarchy, Statistics," *OstkSt* 21 (1972), 323–25.

[100] K. Lübeck, op. cit., 193–206; C. Lialine, *La position spéciale de l'Orthodoxie dans le problème œcuménique: 1054–1954. L'Église et les églises,* op. cit. II, 389–413; G. Florowski, op. cit., 231–96; N. Zernow, op. cit., 317–58; F. Heiler, op. cit., 402–05.

[101] Cf. G. Zananiri, *Catholicisme orientale* (Paris 1966), 241–50: chronology; *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte. Die christlichen Kirchen in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* ed. by H. Jedin, K. S. Latourette, J. Martin (Freiburg, Basel, Vienna 1970), 132: the development of the Catholic Eastern Churches and the most important unification efforts.

The Byzantine Rite

The different versions of the Byzantine rite, also called Greek rite, were most popular among the Ruthenians, Russians, Rumanians, Hungarians, Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks, Melchites, and Georgians.

The inclusion of the Orthodox metropolis of Kiev and all of Ruthenia into the Catholic Church through the Union of Brest in 1595/96 was the foundation for the reunification of the Ruthenians (Ukrainians) with the Roman center. The efforts in this respect were continued in Uzhgorod (1646), including the Carpatho-Ruthenians, Slovaks, Hungarians, and Rumanians.

Russia, penetrating into eastern central Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, forced the Ruthenians living under its rule to convert to the Orthodox Church. In 1875 the only remaining diocese, Chelm, was dissolved.[105] In spite of ruthless persecutions, 50,000 believers remained loyal to the union and in 1904 sent a delegation to Pius X. Their expectation that Nicholas II's edict of toleration would be applied to them was not fulfilled. They were only allowed to convert to Roman Catholicism.

In the Habsburg Monarchy, in Galicia, in Hungary, and in Transylvania, the Ruthenians were able to develop their Church organization. In the archbishopric of Lemberg (Lvov), a second bishopric (Stanislav) was formed within the suffragan bishopric of Przemyśl. The reform of the Basilian order, the Provincial Synod of Lemberg of 1891, the founding of the Ruthenian College in Rome in 1897, the two archbishops Sylvester Cardinal Sembratovitch (1882–98) and Duke Andreas Szepticki (1900–44) led to the golden age of their Church[106] (counting over 3 million believers within its three dioceses). The golden age was documented by the establishment of new orders (the Studites, an eastern branch of the Redemptorists, the female Basilians, the female Studites, the congregation of the Servants of the Immaculate Virgin Mary), new theological institutions, periodicals, schools, and charity centers. Basilian Archbishop Szepticki[107] was known beyond Galicia's borders for his pastoral and missionary ambitions, his patronage, and primarily for his efforts regarding unification. His pastoral letters of 1907 and 1908 dealt with the theme of unity, which he tried to realize in the spirit of tolerance and love. After 1910 he was president of the Welehrade Union Congress.[108] He became one of the outstanding figures of the union movement and was admired as the patriarch of the Ruthenians.

---

[102] See above, pp. 336–43.

[103] *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte,* 138–39.

[104] Basic information about the history of the unions, cf., in addition to the chapter bibliography, A. Ehrhard, op. cit., 24–45; I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 325–85; K. Lübeck, op. cit., 30–39; P. Werhun, "Die orientalischen Riten und kirchlichen Gemeinschaften," *Der christliche Osten,* op. cit., 350–68; W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten;* R. Janin, op. cit. (1957), 538–44; C. Korolevskij, *Liturgie in lebender Sprache. Orient und Okzident* (Klosterneuburg near Vienna 1958); R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 42–361; P. Hofmeister, "Die Kultsprachen der Ostkirchen," *OstkSt* 11 (1962), 196–203; A. Brunello, op. cit., 499–521; F. Heiler, op. cit., 406–14.

[105] See above, p. 172.

Szepticki supported White Russian students in order to restore the torn ties between the Ukrainian and White Russian people. In 1907 he traveled incognito to White Ruthenia, to the Russian Ukraine, and to Moscow. Through talks and negotiations, he initiated a new union movement of the Byzantine Slavic rite, which was expressly approved by Pius X the next year. Centers for the Russian Uniates[109] were Saint Petersburg and Moscow.

As in Galicia, the Uniate Ruthenians in Hungary's bishoprics of Munkacs (Slovak: Mukachëvo) and Eperjes (Slovak: Prešov) enjoyed an upswing through their own initiative and state aid. In the small bishopric of Kreutz (Croatian: Krizevci), established in 1777 for the Uniates of Croatia, Slavonia, and Batschka, almost half of the faithful were Ruthenians who had emigrated from Galicia and Carpatho-Russia to the south of Hungary.

---

[106] A. Korczok, *Die griechisch-katholische Kirche in Galizien* (Leipzig, Berlin 1921); T. Halusczynskyj, "Die gegenwärtige Lage der katholischen Kirche (ukrainisch-katholischer Ritus)," *Ex Oriente,* op. cit., 90–101; *Die Kirche und das östliche Christentum. Ukraine und die kirchliche Union,* ed. by the Catholic *Emigrantenfürsorge* Berlin (Berlin 1930); *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ucrainae illustrantia (1075–1953)* II, ed. by A. G. Welykyj (Rome 1954), 453–515; L. Nemec, "The Rutheninan Uniate Church in its Historical Perspective," *CH* 37 (1968), 365–88; J. Madey, *Le Patriarcat Ukrainien vers la perfection de l'état juridique actuel* (Rome 1971).

[107] A. Szepticky, "Das russische katholische Exarchat," *Ex Oriente,* op. cit., 78–89; J. Drozd, "Andreas Šeptyckyj, metropolita Leopoliensis, praeses Academiae Velehradensis 1910–1939," *Acta Academiae Velehradensis* 18 (Olmütz 1947), 92–102; G. Prokotschuk, *Der Metropolit. Leben und Wirken des großen Förderers der Kirchenunion Graf Andreas Scheptytzkyj* (Munich 1955); J. Madey, *Kirche zwischen Ost und West,* 174–99.

[108] See above, p. 344.

[109] See chap. 11, above, p. 170.—In 1917, Szepticki convened the first synod for the Uniate Russians in Saint Petersburg, after three years of captivity. By authority of Pius X, he appointed Leonid Feodorov exarch for Russia. The new government recognized the new exarch at first, but later dismissed him from office and sent him to Siberia, where he died in 1935.

In Transylvania, in the church province of Alba Julia-Făgăras, with its suffragan bishoprics of Oradea Mare, Lugoj and Szamos Ujvár, the Rumanian Byzantine rite was used. Like the Uniate Ruthenians, the Rumanians expanded their educational system, their press, and their charity. But while trying to preserve their national identity, they had to struggle with the Magyarization measures of the administration.

The Uniate Hungarians,[110] belonging partly to the Ruthenian dioceses, partly to the Rumanian dioceses, after 1868 demanded their own ecclesiastical jurisdiction and introduction of Hungarian as the liturgical language. In 1873 the vicariate of Hadjudorog, composed of thirty-three congregations, was established for the Hungarian Uniates. Pressured by the Hungarian faithful and the government, Pius X through the bull *Christi fideles Graeci ritus* (1912) created the diocese of the same name[111] and demanded that it use Old Greek as the liturgical language. He approved Hungarian only for extraliturgical functions. Nevertheless, the liturgy was celebrated in the people's language. After World War I, the diocese was reduced by turning seventy-seven parishes over to the Uniate Church in Rumania, which also incorporated the archbishopric of Fogarasch and parts of the Slovak bishopric of Mukachëvo. The rest of this diocese and the bishopric of Prešov were given to Czechoslovakia.[112] After the end of the nineteenth century, many Uniate Ruthenians and Rumanians emigrated to South and North America, where they created their own hierarchy.

Bishop Josip Jurij Stroßmayer of Djakovo helped the Uniate Serbs and stood up for them even outside of his bishopric.

According to the census of 1910, the number of Uniates in Austria was 3.5 million, in Hungary 1.9 million, and in Bosnia-Herzegovina 8,000.

---

[110] *AAS* IV (1912), 429–35; G. Patacsi, "Die ungarischen Ostchristen," *OstkST* 11 (1962), 273–305; I. Žeguc, *Die nationalpolitischen Bestrebungen der Karpato-Ruthenen 1848–1914* (Wiesbaden 1965), 113–16; G. Adrianyi, *Friedrich Graf Revertera,* 216–66, 310–12; id., "Die Bestrebungen der ungarischen Katholiken des byzantinischen Ritus um eigene Liturgie and Kirchenorganisation um 1900," *OstkSt* 21 (1972), 116–31; E. Weinzierl, *Spannungen in der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie 1878–1914,* see above, chap. 2.

[111] See above, p. 345.

[112] Immediately after World War II, the unions of eastern Central Europe were dissolved under Soviet pressure (1946 in western Ukraine, 1948 in Rumania, 1949 in Slovakia). Only the two dioceses of Hajdudorog in Hungary and Kreutz in Yugoslavia survived.

In Bulgaria the union movement, initiated by Titular Archbishop Joseph Sokolski (1860–61), could not develop because of Russian intervention. Under Raphael Popoff (1865–76), the movement took hold in Macedonia and Thrace, assisted by the Assumptionists, Lazarists and Resurrectionists. In 1883 Leo XIII established an Apostolic Administration in Constantinople, which was responsible for two vicariates apostolic in Macedonia and Thrace. The approximately 15,000 faithful suffered from the pressures of the Bulgarian exarch, the Orthodox bishops, and the Turkish government.

The Uniate Greeks had even less of a chance to expand. They owed their internal organization to Hyacinth Marango's efforts, who founded a periodical in Constantinople in 1865 and established two congregations. The Assumptionists continued his work in the seminary of Kadikoy and through the periodical *Échos d'Orient.* In 1909 John Papadopulos was appointed vicar general of the Apostolic Delegates of Constantinople for the Uniate Greeks. In 1911 he was ordained bishop and entrusted with the independent administration of the small congregations. Hyacinth Marango also made propaganda for the Uniates in the Kingdom of Greece, but because of the anti-Catholic animosities of the Orthodox population he was only moderately successful. Leo XIII's efforts regarding the educational institute in Athens patronized by him and the work of several orders essentially failed. The Catholic archbishop of Athens was responsible for 2,000 Uniate Greeks in his capacity as apostolic delegate.

The Italo-Greeks and the Italo-Albanians, centered in the Basilian abbey of Grottaferrata near Rome, in Calabria, and Sicily, were threatened by Latinization measures or mixtures of Latin and Byzantine liturgies, but their independence was supported by Leo XIII. He decreed the elimination of any liturgical additions which did not agree with the Byzantine rite.

The Melchites were headed by the patriarch of Antioch.[113] Maximos III Mazlum (1833–55) after 1838 also was the incumbent of the two Uniate patriarchal sees of Alexandria and Antioch. Gregory II Jussef Sayyur, whose jurisdiction over all Melchites was expressly recognized by Leo XIII in 1894, Peter IV Geraigiry (1898–1903), and Cyril VIII Geha (1903–16) improved the organization of the four archbishoprics and eight bishoprics with the help of the patriarchal vicars of Alexandria and Jerusalem. They provided a good education for the secular clergy in the Seminary of Saint Anna in Jerusalem and made sure that the orders could expand. Among others, the three Basilian congregations and the congregation of the Paulinists, founded by Archbishop Germanos Moakkad of Baalbek (died in 1912), excelled in their educational, charitable, and missionary activities. They succeeded in bringing together all the faithful scattered throughout the Near East and Egypt (1907: 140,000) and to affirm their loyalty to the Apostolic See, in spite of the social differences among the believers and demands from the laity for more participation, according to the Orthodox model. The Synod of Aïn-Traz in Lebanon (4 April to 8 July 1909) dealt with dogmatic and pastoral questions in order to improve religious life. The results of the thorough deliberations were defined in 1,017 articles,[114] which were sent to Rome in a Latin translation, but failed to be approved because of some questionable points. The Synod favored the further development of the Melchites in organizational and spiritual respects. The Arab paper *The Good Will,* whose publication was decided at the Synod, carried the basic concepts to the public.

---

[113] Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 334–41; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 275–87; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 61–78.

In Georgia, Theatines (after 1629) and Capuchins (after 1662) had solicited support for the union. In 1848, the 50,000 Georgian Catholics were subordinated to the bishop of Tiraspol. Ten thousand of them were Uniates, mostly Armenians, and only a small portion adhered to the Byzantine liturgy.[115] In 1886 the Russian government forbade this liturgy as well as the use of the Georgian language in sermons and public church service. After World War I, some priests took care of these faithful, who subsequently suffered the reprisals of the Soviet government.

The Alexandrian Rite

This group of liturgies includes the Uniate Copts and the Egyptians. The union of the Copts, initiated in the eighteenth century by the Franciscan Friars,[116] progressed when Leo XIII supported the union in his apostolic letter of 11 July 1895,[117] and when he responded to the request of a delegation under the leadership of Cyril Makarios of 26 November by restoring the Alexandrian patriarchate.[118] Aside from the patriarchal bishopric, he established the dioceses of Hermopolis and Thebes. In 1899 he made Cyril Makarios patriarch. With resolutions regarding the faith, liturgy, and hierarchy, the Synod of Cairo of 1898 laid the foundation for the organization of the Church.[119] Its reconstruction was interrupted when the ambitious patriarch resigned in 1908 and converted to Orthodoxy.[120] He was replaced by an apostolic administrator. The number of Uniate Copts increased from 4,630 (1897) to 14,576 (1907).

---

[114] C. de Clercq, op. cit., 790–831. These articles deal with worship (nos. 1–110), the hierarchy (nos. 111–546), the Sacraments (nos. 547–875), and problems of canon law (nos. 876–1017).

[115] S. Bathmanschwili, "L'Église catholique en Géorgie," *Ex Oriente,* op. cit., 152–58; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 320–21.

[116] R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 490–92; S. Chauleur, op. cit., 163–66; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 327–49.

[117] *ASS* XXVII (1894–95), 705–09.

[118] *ASS* XXVIII (1895–96), 257–60.

For the Uniate Ethiopians, who were cared for since the middle of the nineteenth century by French Lazarists and Italian Capuchins, Leo XIII, in addition to the two existing vicariates apostolic, created an apostolic prefecture for the area of Eritrea (1894), which had become an Italian colony in 1890. In 1896 he sent Cyril Makarios to Addis Ababa, who asked in his behalf for the release of Italian prisoners. In his correspondence with Emperor Menelik II (1889–1909) he tried to improve the situation of the Uniates which, for political reasons, was difficult. Pius X also appealed to him in 1906. In 1910, by order of the Pope, the first native Ethiopian, Abuna Kidana Maryam Kassa, was ordained as bishop of Asmara. After 1911 he headed the vicariate apostolic of Asmara for the 4,000 Uniate Ethiopians.

The Antioch Rite

This group of rites included the Uniate Jacobites and Maronites. After 1783 these Syrians (West Syrians)[121] from Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt had been subject to the patriarch of Antioch, who resided in Mardin after 1854. After the settlement of internal disputes at the Synod of Scharfa,[122] where the ecclesiastical situation was newly regulated, the patriarchs gave their Church a clearer profile. With the help of four metropolitans, six bishops, and foreign and native orders, they improved the training and material security of the clergy and expanded the educational system. Aside from Patriarch Cyril Behnam Benni (1893–97), Ignatius Ephraim II Rachmani (1898–1929) also contributed to the stabilization of the union through his historical and liturgical studies as well as the addition of a Syrian ritual. When the faithful in Turkey (80,000) were threatened by persecutions during World War I, their number decreased, and dwindled further through emigrations. The patriarchal see was moved from Mardin in Turkey to Beirut.

---

[119] C. de Clercq, op. cit., 759–80.

[120] In 1912, in Rome, he was restored to communion. He died in Beirut in 1921.

[121] R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 387–393; W. de Vries, "Dreihundert Jahre syrisch-katholische Hierarchie," *OsthSt* 5 (1956), 137–57.—The West Syrian Rite was also used by a group of Thomaeans, who had separated from the Monophysite Church of the Jacobites in Southern India in 1930. For the Uniate Malankars, the archbishopric of Trivandrum was established (1933). Its faithful increased rapidly in the next decades (60,000).

[122] C. de Clercq, op. cit., 599–628.

The Maronites,[123] in the only patriarchal Uniate Church without a parallel separated Eastern Church, had strongly increased in the eighteenth century. But in 1861/62 many of them fell victim to the terror of the Druses. In 1885 there were 1,050 secular clergymen, 800 monks in 45 monasteries, and 8 convents. Around 1900 there existed 9 dioceses, 3 patriarchal seminaries, 6 diocesan seminaries, and a flourishing native order system, following the rules of Saint Anthony. Under Patriarch Paul Masad (1854–90) and Patriarch Elias Peter Huayek (1899–1931) the religious life of the Maronites improved (1913: 250,000), and was further strengthened by the Maronite College in Rome, which had been founded in 1584 and renewed by Leo XIII in 1891.

The Chaldean Rite

The Chaldean and Maronite rites belong to the East Syrian group of liturgies. The center of the Chaldeans[124] (Uniate Nestorians) was located in Mesopotamia. Under their Patriarch Joseph II Audo (1848–78), residing in Mosul, an internal crisis broke out. It began with the patriarch's attempt to extend his jurisdiction over the Uniate Malabars, and the crisis was intensified through the Holy See's interventions in the administration of the Chaldean Church, reaching its climax in 1869 when Joseph II Audo refused to ordain two bishops appointed in Rome. In 1870 Pius X offered him the alternatives of either consecrating the bishops or resigning. Even though he yielded in this matter and in regard to controversies about the wisdom of the definition of infallibility, new tensions developed pertaining to the Uniate Malabars. These tensions first decreased under Elias XII Abolionan (1879–94) and Joseph Emanuel II Thomas (1900–47), when Leo XIII assured them of his benevolence. Under those two patriarchs, many Nestorians found their way to the union, so that in 1914 100,000 believers belonged to the Chaldean Church in four archbishoprics and eight bishoprics. Aside from Dominicans, Capuchina, Lazarists, Carmelites, and Pallottines, two native congregations intensified the internal life of the Church.

---

[123] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 361–385; K. Friz, "Die christlichen Minderheiten im Vorderen Orient," *Kyrios* 3 (1938), 208–23; R. Janin, op. cit.(^{4}1955), 457–62; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 268–84; B. Spuler, "Die Maroniten," *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* op. cit., 217–25; P. Dib, *Histoire de l'église Maronite,* 2 vols. (Beirut 1962); A. S. Atiya, op. cit. 389–423.

[124] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 350–57; W. de Vries, "Nel quarto centenario della chiesa cattolica caldea," *Civ Catt* 103 (1952), 236–52; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 422–29; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 287–308; H. Schulte, *Der Beginn. Eine Hilfsaktion für den christlichen Orient* (Limburg 1966).

The Malabars had difficulty[125] disassociating themselves from their dependence on the Latin hierarchy. Patriarch Joseph II Audo's efforts to replace the Latin Carmelite missionaries with Bishop Mar Rocco as head of the Malabar Church failed. In 1874–76 about 24,000 believers assembled around Chaldean Bishop Elias Mellus of Accra, whom his patriarch had sent to Southern India. They separated from the union[126] and joined the Nestorian Catholicate in 1907 (neo-Nestorian Church; 1914: 14,000 members). In 1887 Leo XIII withdrew the Uniates from the supervision of the Latin bishops and created for them the two vicariates apostolic of Trichur and Kottayam, which were at first entrusted to Latin prelates until, in 1897, the Pope filled three independent vicariates apostolic with native bishops. Their rites were cleansed from Latin additions. In the following years, their numbers rose from 200,000 (around 1900) to 300,000 (1914).[127]

The Armenian Rite

In 1867, when Pius IX combined the two Uniate Churches of Constantinople and Cilicia, a crisis broke out among the Uniate Armenians,[128] causing the nomination of a competing patriarchal candidate after the First Vatican Council and the conversion of numerous Uniates to Monophysitism. The crisis was finally settled when Leo XIII appointed Patriarch Anthony Peter IX Hassan (1867–80) cardinal of the Curia and Stephen Peter X Azarian (1881–99) his successor. At a synod in 1890 dogmatic, ritual, and organizational matters were discussed.[129] The Pope supported the reconstruction of the patriarchate (2 archbishoprics, 13 bishoprics) by erecting the Armenian College in Rome (1883), which had already been planned in 1584 by Gregory XIII, and by approving the constitutions of the Viennese Mechitarists (1885). He also helped those Armenians who were threatened by the Turks (1894–96). In 1911 new controversies erupted, ignited by the differences between Patriarch Paul V Peter XIII (1910–31) and the laity in the Church administration who demanded more participatory rights. The patriarch was expelled by the Turkish authorities. In 1911 he held a synod in Rome, which was unable, however, to settle the internal difficulties. The atrocities inflicted upon the Armenians during World War I, killing about 50 percent of their clergy, paralyzed the further development of the 100,000 believers in the Armenian patriarchal Church.[130] More favorable was their situation in the Armenian archbishopric of Lemberg (2,500), in Rumania (30,000), and in Russia (40,000).[131] After World War II, however, they succumbed to Soviet ecclesiastical policies.

---

[125] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 357–58; E. Tisserant, op. cit., 108–20; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 309–26; E. R. Hambye, J. Madey, op. cit., 55–58.

[126] Elias Mellus joined the union again in 1889 and became bishop of Mardin (1893–1908).

[127] Finally, in 1923, a Church province was established for the Uniate Malabars, which has two archbishoprics and five bishoprics today with 1.5 million believers.

[128] C. de Clercq, op. cit., 719–52.

[129] I. Silbernagl, J. Schnitzer, op. cit., 342–49; R. Janin, op. cit. (^{4}1955), 355–64; R. F. Esposito, op. cit., 213–18; B. Spuler, "Die armenische Kirche," 264–66; A. K. Sanjian, op. cit.; P. Krüger, "Die armenischen Mechitharisten und ihre Bedeutung," *OstkSt* 16 (1967), 3–14.

The spiritual Latinization of the Eastern Churches was finally stopped by Leo XIII after the First Vatican Council.[132] He had recognized the unique qualities of the Uniates beyond their liturgical customs. The strengthening expected by the Pope, however, was hampered by internal and external difficulties. The superimposition of the Latin liturgy on the Syrians, Malabars, and Maronites continued to exist. The lay portion of the Church administration, customary in the independent Eastern Churches, caused tensions (e.g., among the Armenians). The possibilities of growth were curtailed by continuous state pressures, especially in Russia and Turkey, and by the persecutions of the Armenians, Chaldeans, Georgians, Maronites, and Syrians. Only the Ruthenians and Rumanians in Austria-Hungary, as well as the Malabars in Southern India improved their Church organization. All Uniate dignitaries tried to elevate the educational level of their clergy, to return to the original liturgy of their Churches and to devise contemporary spiritual care. The help they received from Leo XIII and Pius X had positive effect on their initiatives and defined the position of the patriarchs, bishops, and secular and regular clergy.[133]

---

[130] After World War I, the number decreased to 60,000 people who lived in Egypt, Lebanon, Persia, Syria, Turkey, and, after the emigration, especially in France. In 1928, an Armenian episcopal conference was held in Rome which reorganized the bishoprics and devised new guidelines for pastoral work in the diaspora. Regarding the current hierarchy of the Uniate Armenian Church, cf. M. Krikorian, J. Madey, op. cit., 325.

[131] A. M. Ammann, op. cit., 517–18, 535–36, 581–82.

[132] W. de Vries, in collaboration with O. Bârlea, J. Gill, M. Lacko, *Rom und die Patriarchate des Ostens* (Freiburg, Munich 1963), 232–37, 318–27; J. Hajjar, "L'Épiscopat catholique oriental et le Ier Concil du Vatican d'après la correspondance diplomatique française," *RHE* 65 (1970), 423–55, 737–88; id., *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz,* 221–52.

[133] C. de Clercq, op. cit., 1007–20.

PART TWO

Defensive Concentration of Forces

INTRODUCTION

Pius X, a Conservative Reform Pope

When the conclave which was to elect Leo XIII's successor opened, the Sacred College faced a situation much more complex than in 1878. A significant group of cardinals was convinced that the *Pontifex Maximus,* who had improved the reputation of the papacy to a great extent, was best replaced by electing his secretary of state, Cardinal Rampolla. They considered him to be intimately familiar with his thoughts; also he had collaborated in all prominent plans and activities of the last fifteen years. This was the opinion of those Church dignitaries who desired a continuation of the conciliatory policies which the deceased Pope had exercised toward contemporary philosophy and modern institutions; this was also the conviction of one segment of the intransigents who held Rampolla in esteem for being a relentless opponent of the Italian government. But the failure of Rampolla's French policy was not in his favor. Many cardinals thought it necessary to take an entirely different path, though they were not always in agreement as to the direction. Some, likewise contemplating political expedience, wished the Holy See to take a less rigid stance toward Italy because they considered it idle to speculate on its impending collapse. They also preferred the Church to rely on the assistance of Catholic Austria and the German Center Party rather than on Orthodox Russia, whose increasing influence in the Near East they feared; instead, they suggested taking a chance on anticlerical France. Others, who were more concerned with the principle at stake, worried about the liberal trends in exegesis and theology, about the danger of democratic ideas as propagated by the secretary of state threatening the principle of authority, and about the extent of the concessions he was ready to make to governmental authority in order to solicit its support or at least its neutrality. Therefore, they demanded a return to intransigence, the hallmark of Pius IX's pontificate. Still others, conservatives as well as reformists, believed that after so many years of giving preference to the "Ministry of Foreign Affairs" it was high time to think of the "Ministry of the Interior." Therefore they desired a pope who had matured in the office of bishop and would be most interested in pastoral questions, in a better administration of the dioceses, and in the improvement of ecclesiastical works.

Of the candidates nominated by Rampolla's opponents, Cardinal Serafino Vannutelli was mentioned frequently. For years, Austria's friends had assembled around him, and he was, as everyone knew, well disposed to the Quirinal. Named most often was Cardinal Gotti, prefect of the Propaganda, a Carmelite who was conservative in regard to doctrine, yet liberal in respect to Church policy and a very able administrator. Some, however, spoke of the saintly patriarch of Venice, Cardinal Sarto, who was not well known to the public and the foreign cardinals, but had been discreetly and repeatedly named by Leo XIII as his successor. He was also supported by those Italian cardinals who did not belong to the Curia, especially since they knew that the government approved his candidacy and considered him the "the more pliable of the inflexible candidates."

The problem was further complicated by the significant role which the diplomatic factor played. In 1878 the great powers arrived at the conviction that the Pope's function in the European political configuration had ceased to be significant since the Papal State had been dissolved. Therefore, they limited themselves to the request that a man be chosen who was moderate and committed to conciliatory settlements of the conflicts between Church and state. However, due to Leo XIII's intelligent policies, the great powers had to admit once again that the moral support of the Pope, meaning the Vatican, was still potentially of great value. Consequently they were not as indifferent toward the election of the new Pope as they had been twenty-five years ago. The French, of course, preferred Rampolla as Pope, since he had always supported, possibly even advanced the Francophile policies of Leo XIII. Likewise, the Spaniards fondly remembered the time when he was nuncio in Spain. The government in Vienna was less favorably disposed to him and criticized him for insufficient sympathy toward the Triple Alliance, for his pro-Slavic Balkan policy, and the support he had given the opposition of the Christian Socialists in Austria and Hungary. The Viennese hesitated to use their ancient right of veto. Finally, however, the Emperor decided to take this step, pressured by Cardinal Puzyna, the archbishop of Cracow, who maintained that the election of Rampolla would have negative effects on the Church and charged him with having sacrificed Polish interests for the sake of his pro-Russian policies.[1] The influential Cardinal Prince-Bishop Kopp of Breslau, who was informed about Puzyna's mission, preferred that the veto not be used. Therefore he tried to arrive at a compromise with Rampolla and come to an agreement concerning an acceptable candidate, but Rampolla eluded his efforts. Kopp thereupon tried to persuade the French and Spanish cardinals to withdraw Rampolla's nomination, even though they had unanimously decided to give him their vote. But Kopp was not successful.

---

[1] Aside from F. Engel-Janosi, *Revue belge de philosophie et histoire* 29 (1951), 1135, n. 1, and 1137, see Z. Obertyński, op. cit., especially 183–84. Among other things, he quotes the cardinal's statement: "Austria did not use me, I used Austria" (p. 188); cf. chaps. 2 and 11.

Such was the situation when the cardinals—38 Italians and 24 foreigners[2]—entered the conclave. At the first ballot, on 1 August, 62 votes were cast; 12 went to 9 different candidates, 24 to Rampollo, 17 to Gotti, 5 to Sarto and only 4 to Vannutelli, whose chances had been diminished by the indiscreet campaign his brother had conducted on his behalf. In the afternoon, the distribution of votes changed: Rampolla's rose to 29 and Sarto's to 10, while Gotti only received 16. The Germans and the Austrians, who had hesitated a long time before they supported Gotti's Roman followers, were convinced that Gotti had lost his chance and they decided to follow Agliardi's advice to vote for Sarto. On the other hand, they considered it prudent to officially announce Vienna's veto against Rampolla. This was a totally futile gesture, since the former secretary of state had obviously received the highest number of votes he could expect. His followers were able, if they held together, to block any other candidature, but they had to give up all hope for his election. On the morning of 2 August, Puzyna fulfilled his mission and voiced his veto, even though Rampolla still had 29 votes, while Sarto's increased to 21. The papal cardinal chamberlain and even Rampolla himself protested immediately, and at the next ballot the victim of the veto received even one more vote. Numerous cardinals wanted to prove in this manner that they would not make allowances for such secular interference in the papal election. But this was no more than a token demonstration, because, as of the next morning, the number of votes cast for Rampolla decreased to that of the first ballot. His supporters suggested he choose the candidate to whom they could give their votes. He declined, explaining that he could not relinquish his candidacy because this would give the appearance of yielding to Austria. Without a doubt, however, he himself felt that he was in no position to turn the election in the direction he deemed desirable.

While Rampolla's followers made such futile efforts, the votes cast for Sarto rose from 21 to 24, and on the morning of 3 August increased to 27, surpassing Rampolla and practically eliminating Gotti. For a while, the cardinals feared Sarto would refuse to accept the responsibility which he himself felt exceeded his strength, but he could, in the end, be persuaded, and, on the morning of 4 August, he was elected, receiving 50 votes to the 10 cast by those who had remained loyal to Rampolla. Sarto declared that he would choose the name Pius X in memory of the

---

[2] 7 Frenchmen, 5 Spaniards, 5 Austrians, 3 Germans, 1 Portuguese, 1 Belgian, 1 Irishman, and 1 American. This was the first time Americans were represented in the conclave.

Popes of the same name "who, in past centuries, had courageously fought against sects and rampant errors." This indicated the direction he intended to take in his pontificate.

The new Pope was born in 1835 in a village of Venetia, the son of a simple family. He rapidly climbed the ladder of a pastoral career. He was coadjutor priest in a rural parish, pastor in a larger town, chancellor of the diocese of Treviso and at the same time spiritual director in the local seminary, and bishop of Mantua, an ailing diocese which he was able to restore within a few years to a model diocese, proving his pastoral strength. Finally, in 1893, he became patriarch of Venice and cardinal. Wherever he was active, he left the impression of a virtuous and diligent spiritual adviser, indeed, almost of a holy man of great benevolence; yet at the same time he was energetic, moved by a strong sense of duty, and highly intelligent. He did not think much of innovations, such as the new trends in the area of exegesis and apologetics originating in France, as well as the program of the young Italian Christian Democrats who had assembled around Murri. As bishop he tried to inspire his priests, especially in regard to instruction in the catechism, preaching, and frequent Communion, and he encouraged the laity to get involved as much as possible in ecclesiastical activities, insisting, however, that this collaboration was subject to the strict control of the clergy. From the clergy, in turn, he demanded absolute obedience, even toward the minor directives of their bishops. A devoted reader of Cardinal Pie's works, who branded the liberal Catholics "wolves in sheepskin" in his pastoral letters, Sarto was intensely interested in socialist charges against the traditional religious foundations of society and did not hesitate to descend to the level of city politics and demand an alliance between the Catholics and the moderate liberals in Venice in order to erect a dam against the rising flood of radicals.

This course of action gave rise to the expectation that the new Pope would take a more conciliatory stance toward the new Italy than his predecessor. And indeed, his pontificate inaugurated a slow but gradual improvement of the relations between the Vatican and the Quirinal. The question which attitude the Pope would adopt in regard to the Roman question was highly interesting to the Italian journalists and politicians. However, this aspect was only secondary in the spiritual orientation of the Pope because the concepts which guided his pontificate differed drastically from those of this predecessor. While Leo XIII derived pleasure from the delicate games of diplomacy and politics, Pius X did not enjoy them at all and was not willing to succumb to the compromises which are part of the game. In his estimation, Leo XIII's policy of reconciliation with the governments and royal courts had generally failed, and he was determined to concentrate on the problems of the Christian apostolate and religious life. Moreover, there was a glaring difference between the new Pope and his predecessor in all other respects, even physically, but particularly in essential matters. Leo XIII was known as the "Pope of the royal courts, the chancelleries, the bishops"; his successor, in contrast, would prove to be the "Pope of theology and canon law, of the simple folk and the pastors" (J. Fèvre). Leo XIII was an intellectual with a thorough education and a speculative spirit, finding pleasure in synthetical constructs with broad perspectives. Pius X was a pragmatic spirit, deeming a bird in the hand worth two in the bush and having a good sense for detail. A comparison between his and Leo XIII's encyclicals is revealing: Pius's theoretical part is shorter, but he elaborates in detail passages dealing with advice and practical experiences. However, one should not be deceived. Pius X liked to portray himself as the "good rural pastor" and his opponents were quick to take him at his word. Unquestionably, he lacked a university education, which would have allowed him to be more receptive to the critical method in the crisis of modernism and to be more independent of the narrow-minded opinions of his informants. But everyone who had contact with him was astonished at his intelligence, certainly a "rather more robust than subtle intelligence" (Baudrillart), but one which functioned clearly and precisely, grasping the essential point of a problem and supported by "a healthy common sense, almost a man of genius" (Briand). Prince Bernhard von Bülow declared that he rarely encountered such penetrating insight into human nature and into those forces which dominate the world and modern society.

No less remarkable were his moral qualifications. Many of the characteristics reported by eye witnesses leave the compelling impression that this man possessed a wealth of virtues ranging all the way to heroism. Thus, the ceremony of his canonization in 1954 merely officially confirmed what many of his contemporaries had felt spontaneously. One point above all must be emphasized: the deep commitment he felt toward his responsibility as spiritual director enabled him to become a man of prayer as well as of action, a man of relentless will, ready to bear the criticism of the public if he felt the interests of the Church to be at stake. He carried this so far that some asked whether he was not excelling by virtue of strength rather than by virtue of intelligence, and often his energy could have been enhanced by a good measure of flexibility.[3] The often rather pressing awareness of his responsibility may explain the rather authoritarian government of this otherwise friendly and social man,[4] who "prepared the dictatorship that would save the Church," as one adviser of Cardinal Mathieu said.[5] Indeed, Pius X was firmly convinced that the service of God and the salvation of the faithful required a serious change in many areas.

---

[3] "The persecution does not bother him. The supernatural element in his personality is confusing. I have seen an honest, strong, and beautiful holiness," Lemire wrote after an audience (J. M. Mayeur, *L'abbé Lemire* [Paris, Tournai 1968], 318).

Pius X instinctively mistrusted progressive endeavors. It was clear to him that the liberal policies of his predecessor regarding the modern world should not be condemned in principle, but these seemed to him to have been conducted with insufficient precautions and to have run risks which would shortly incur regrettable consequences. Thus he considered a certain reactionary policy absolutely necessary, giving his pontificate from the start the hallmark of retreat into "wholesome isolation" and a "Catholic defensive," which was reflected mainly in relations with various governments, in the attitude toward the Christian Democrats, and in the suppression of modernism.

Regarding the governments, with the exception of Italy Pius X returned to a rigid and inflexible stance. Relentlessly and without consideration of political expedience or eventual, direct, and harmful consequences, he insisted on the rights of the Church. This was most apparent in the case of France: with regard to the separation of Church and state, he prohibited any settlement via negotiations or arbitration, in spite of the opposing views of a considerable segment of the episcopate and the public. Also in Spain and Portugal, his policies of decisiveness and inflexibility prevailed. In both countries, he risked an actual break in relations. Even communication with England and Russia took a turn for the worse. That this did not result in an open quarrel was due to the fact that the Vatican supported the demands of the Catholic minorities in Ireland and Poland, which Leo XIII had sacrificed more than once to the necessities of his policy. In a similar refusal to submit to any kind of negotiations and compromises when he thought truth to be at stake was rooted the serious incident with Germany caused in 1910 by the encyclical released on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of the canonization of Charles Borromeo, the pioneer of the Counter Reformation, in which the Pope elaborated on Luther and Protestantism using vocabulary which was anything but ecumenical.[6] In spite of his sympathy for the old Emperor Franz Joseph, Pius X was at one time on the verge of breaking off diplomatic relations with Austria because the government in Vienna hesitated to suspend from office a professor of canon law in Innsbruck who openly sympathized with modernistic trends. This again confirms how far the Pope was willing to remain inflexible if matters of religion seemed to be at stake.[7]

---

[4] He was able to listen patiently to his assistants, but he demanded above all that they be loyal executives. In the Vatican, he was said to have made the following remark: "Basta che la testa l'abbia il Papa," quoted in C. Confaloniere, *Pio XI visto da vicino* (Turin 1957, German: Aschaffenburg 1958), 172.

[5] E. Renard, *Le cardinal Mathieu* (Paris 1952), 411.

[6] The intransigence toward Protestantism caused another incident (in 1910) with the former president of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, who was informed that the Pope would only grant him an audience if he would abandon a visit of the Methodist congregation in Rome. Naturally, Roosevelt declined (cf. F. Zwierlein, *Th. Roosevelt and*

At first glance, the Pope's reaction to the Christian Democrats was even more puzzling. After all, he had sprung from the common people and had always been a friend to the poor. He found it simply impossible to accept the fact that there were Catholics who wanted their social action to be more independent of the hierarchy and more self-reliant, or that some priests tried to orient social action more and more toward the political arena. Here lie the reasons for the fundamental reorganization which the Pope forced upon the *Opera dei congressi* at the beginning of his pontificate, for his disapproval of Romolo Murri's *Azione popolare*, followed by a formal condemnation, and later for the rejection of the new trends perpetuated by the *Sillon* group in France. Compromises with both the modernistic movement in Italy and proclamations in France, too undefined and doctrinaire, partly justify the interventions of ecclesiastical authority. However, the formulation of various papal acts regarding these questions and problems, and the more flexible attitude toward the *Action française* unquestionably demonstrate the Vatican's temporary devaluation of democratic ideas in favor of a paternalistic solution to social problems. The Pope also expressed preference for a hierarchal conception of society and at the same time demanded intensified attempts to keep the professional organizations of workers under the strict control of the clergy. All these aspects are rather characteristic of the ecclesiastical climate in Venetia, which Pius had never left before his election.[8]

In regard to the suppression of modernism, it is unquestionable that there are troublesome aspects to the various reform movements at the beginning of the twentieth century and that the dishonest action of many a pioneer of these movements forced the Pope to call to mind certain principles and warn of blunders. However, one has to admit that

---

Catholics [St. Louis 1956], 343–50). Typical of the anti-Protestant attitude of the Vatican under Pius X was a remark made by an Austrian diplomat after a conversation with the secretary of state regarding the candidate for the throne of Albania in 1913: "Finally, the cardinal slipped in a remark which one would have to interpret to mean the following: 'Rather another Muslim than a Protestant!' " (*Österreich-Ungarns Außenpolitik* V [Vienna 1930], 468).

[7] Concerning L. Wahrmund, see chap. 2, n. 61 and above.

[8] R. Colapietra spoke about a "venetismo ammodernato, mento temporalista ma più pugnacemente confessionale" (*RStRis* 55 [1968], 328).

the various measures employed to hold back the tide of modernism must be assessed negatively. Many men loyal to the Church were mercilessly banned and only few were relatively quickly rehabilitated, such as Father Lagrange. But more serious than these personal fates were other facts: for a long time the undifferentiated suppression of modernism kept the majority of the clergy from pursuing intellectual investigations. This prevented a gradual clarification of the intellectual processes taking place in the Catholic intelligentsia until around 1900 and kept them from learning to differentiate the constructive from exaggerations or even errors. The gap between Church and modern culture widened. The solution of fundamental problems was postponed, and by simply ignoring them nothing was won, but, on the contrary, harm was done.

The way in which Pius X pursued his main interest, that is, concentrating on the internal affairs of the Church, and the way in which he insisted under any circumstance on "demanding for God's sake omnipotent power over man and beast" (inaugural encyclical), disregarding political or diplomatic contexts, and primarily the spirit of the methods with which he pursued this program, especially in the last years of his pontificate, caused and are still causing rather different assessments. Some critics praise the saintly Pope as the fearless defender of orthodoxy and of ecclesiastical rights. Others, in contrast, sharply criticize the stubborn intransigence and narrow-mindedness of the Pope, claiming that he did not know how to treat the grave problems confronting the Church from a new perspective; instead he tried, using more and more authoritarian methods, to preserve the Church's reactionary and clerical concepts, which were in flagrant contrast to the historical development. Whatever the future judgment of Pius X's defensive actions may be, it would be historically incorrect if the meaning of this pontificate were limited to this hotly disputed aspect.

No matter how often the fact is emphasized that Pius X did not think much of the rules of politics and diplomacy so dear to his predecessor, one must not forget that he was by no means disinterested in the political dimension of these problems and that he even presented certain ideas in this regard which make him appear to be a forerunner. For Pius X, spirituality determined policies, and they had to be Christian policies Thus, he declared in his first consistorial address: "We are forced to deal with politics because the *Pontifex Maximus,* invested by God with this highest of offices, does not have the right to divorce politics from the realm of faith and morals."[9] With this decisive resolution toward a political theology, he rejected, on the one hand, the pretenses of the lay liberalism of the nineteenth century; on the other hand, because of his extraordinary restraint toward the tendencies of "political Catholicism," he was in agreement with many justified trends of that same liberalism. Not only did he have grave reservations toward the politically engaged priests, but he believed even less than Leo XIII[10] in the usefulness of denominational parties. He felt that they harbored the risk of compromising religion in purely secular conflicts in which, according to his opinion, the Church had no business getting involved. Thus, it is typical that a sharp critic such as Falconi should praise him, claiming "he was the first in history to practice an *idealismo antitemporalistico,* even after the memory of such idealism had gotten lost in the first centuries of the Church."[11]

---

[9] Address of 9 November 1903 (*ASS* 36 [1903–04] 195).

However, more significant and of fundamental importance is the fact that Pius X appeared to his contemporaries as not very modern and rather conservative, which indeed he was in many respects; yet in reality he was one of the great reform Popes of history. This explains, by the way, why he was enthusiastically welcomed by a great number of people who strove for religious renewal, at least during the first months of his pontificate. Their first impression was one of religious resurrection rather than return to obscurantism.[12] The motto of this Pope was *instaurare omnia in Christo;* and the restoration of the Christian community—this was the point in question[13]—included, in his opinion, a rigorous defense of the rights of Christ and the Church as well as positive reform activity and initiatives with essentially pastoral goals, intensifying the communities' internal life and ensuring a more effective utilization of its potential. To this end, he issued the decrees regarding frequent Communion and the Communion of children, measures to improve the instruction of the catechism and the sermon, reform of Church music and revision of the missal and the breviary, and reorganization of seminaries to improve the training of the clergy. Though inspired by an obsolete conception of the lay world, many guidelines and directives made Pius X a pioneer of Catholic Action in the modern sense of the word. In this context belong the adaptation and codification of canon law and the reorganization of the Roman Curia, intended to enable the central administration of the Church better to fulfill the more and more difficult tasks imposed on it by the development of ecclesiastical centralization. Pius X dealt with all these different problems utilizing forty years of practical experience in multiple areas of pastoral work far away from the Curia, a background that is rare for a Pope. Thus he was able to apply to his new office the experience and energy which he had already displayed as head of the dioceses of Mantua and Venice. He could not be held back by bureaucratic routine; rather, with authority he enacted reforms within a few years which had been requested for centuries or were considered almost revolutionary in his time.

---

[10] Cf. above, p. 239.

[11] *I papi del ventesimo secolo* (*Milan 1967*), 89; also 91–92.

[12] Cf. P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista e rinnovamento cattolico in Italia* (Bologna 1961), 113–15, and L. Bedeschi, op. cit., 45–49.

[13] Cf. É. Poulat, *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral* (Paris, 1969), 171–72, n. 164.

According to the unanimous testimony of all his advisers, Pius X played an important role in the design of such plans and in their rapid execution. Naturally, like every Pope, he had to rely on assistants. He made sure that they shared his ideal of religious renewal and therefore recruited them preferably from among the orders (but not only from the ranks of the Jesuits, as his opponents like to maintain). Consequently, the portion of religious priests increased in the Roman congregations. From among the bishops he chose co-workers whom he had known for a long time[14] to be opponents of liberalism of whatever version. They were virtuous and diligent men, but often narrow-minded. They were completely devoted to the Holy See, but their ambitions sometimes lacked the proper insight, and their understanding of the real situation of the Church and the intellectual processes beyond the horizon of the small Italian ecclesiastical world was small. Naturally, there were exceptions, one of them being Pietro Gasparri.[15]

Among the Pope's men, the four personal secretaries[16] deserve special credit. They enjoyed his full trust and, driven by "somewhat exaggerated ambitions" (Della Torre), they reinforced more than once the intransigent orientation of the papal decisions. In addition, several particularly influential cardinals played a great role: Francesco Segna, after 1908 prefect of the Congregation of the Index; Oreglia, dean of the Holy College had a vigorous opponent of Christian democracy; Benedetto Lorenzelli, a strict Thomist, and extraordinarily active in the Holy Office.

Of greatest influence, however, was the severely criticized triad of Vives y Tutó, Gaetano De Lai, and Merry del Val. First place must go to the Capuchin Vives y Tutó,[17] of the group of Spanish integralism which produced the book *El liberalismo es pecado.* In 1884 he was assigned to the Roman Curia and, during the crisis of the Italian Catholic Action, he supported the campaign of Paganuzzi. He was a hard-working man of outstanding knowledge, a favorite adviser of the Holy Office, and prefect of the Congregation of Orders from 1908 until 1912. One of his followers was the feared creator of the reform of the Curia, Cardinal De Lai,[18] an energetic and tireless organizer, who succeeded in concentrating in his hands a power unequalled in the history of the Curia. Since the time the Pope had been bishop of Mantua, De Lai had been his friend and he used this friendship to extend his already considerable power as prefect of the Consistorial Congregation by invading the authority of the Congregation of the Council. He dictatorially controlled the appointments of bishops and supervised the dioceses and seminaries. His principle was to proceed rigorously rather than softly when evil was to be eliminated. The third man in the triad was Cardinal Merry del Val,[19] secretary of state at thirty-seven years of age. He occupied this office throughout the pontificate and was envied by the Holy Office for having been assigned to this office at such a young age, particularly as a foreigner, which was something unheard-of. In contrast to the secretaries of state of the last two centuries, he was much more involved in the religious policies of the pontificate. Merry del Val was a devout and moralistic priest, a distinguished and polite aristocrat, and totally devoted to the Holy See. He faced the modernistic tendencies with an untroubled but rigid intransigence. According to D. Secco Suardo, he possessed the "positive and negative characteristics" of a Spaniard, which caused him at times to be carried away by his eagerness

---

[14] The fact that some of them came from Venetia caused Msgr. Duchesne to remark that the Pope had changed the boat of Saint Peter into a gondola.

[15] L. Bedeschi, op. cit., 115, also mentions Talamo, Faberi, Battandier, P. Lepidi, and others.

[16] Msgr. Bressan, supported by Pescini, Bianchi, and Gasoni. Since they made preparations with the proper authorities, they often caused short circuits in the Secretariate of State. This is the reason for their nickname *La Segretariola.* In regard to them, see: *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones,* 25 and 51–52.

[17] In regard to Joseph Calasanz Vives y Tutó (1854–1913), who was given the nickname "Vives fa tutto" in Rome, see Antonio de Barcelona, *El cardenal Vives y Tutó* (Barcelona

---

1916), and *Estudios francescanos* 55 (1954), 531–34; 56 (1955), 5–42, 179–214; 57 (1956), 113–30, 161–81; 60 (1959), 247–66. Also L. Bedeschi, op. cit., 104–07, and D. Secco Suardo, *Da Leone XIII a Pio X* (Rome 1967), passim (see index).

[18] About Gaetano De Lai (1853–1928), see F. Crispolti, *Corone e porpore* (Milan 1934), 221–26, and L. Bedeschi, op. cit., 53, 94–95, 99–104.

[19] There are only biographies of a hagiographical nature regarding Raphael Merry del Val (1865–1930). Fairly acceptable is the one by P. Cenci (Rome 1933) and the one by J. M. Javierre (Barcelona ^{2}1966). Numerous documents and testimonies can be found in *Romana beatificationis et canonisationis Servi Dei Raphaelis card. Merry del Val informatio* (Vatican City 1957). See also A. C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni* (Turin 1948), 483–562; and L. Bedeschi, op. cit., passim, especially 88–94. He was the son of a Spanish diplomat and an Irish woman, raised in England and Belgium. He was still very young when he gained Leo XIII's favor. From 1900 until 1903, he expertly directed the *Accademia dei nobili ecclesiastici,* where prospective nuncios were trained. Pius X had chosen him for good reasons, that is for his outstanding intellectual qualities, his knowledge of many languages, and his diplomatic capabilities (which were more theoretical than practical, however), as well as for his greater independence, which he expected because Merry del Val had no ties to Italy.

to defend orthodoxy and to cover up denunciations which did not redound to the honor of the secretariat.[20] He was more familiar with abstract principles than with the complex conditions of reality and, moreover, fairly isolated within the boundaries of the Curia. Thus he often gave the impression that he was unable to keep up with the times.[21] However, Pius X respected this diligent, unconditionally loyal co-worker, who was from the start receptive to his own ideal of Catholic renewal and shared his conception of an authoritarian Church government. Thanks to his intimate relationship with the Pope, Merry del Val possessed immense power, which assisted him in extending the Secretariat of State's rights of intervention, which in turn resulted in more incisive reforms of the Curia. This created many enemies for him, even in Rome. He was charged with being a tool in the hands of the omnipotent *Societas Jesu,* which is exaggerated, even though his relations to the general of the Jesuits and the leaders of the *Civiltà Cattolica* were very close.[22] He was further accused of having intensified the Pope's rigoristic inclinations when executing practical measures, forcing "an old man of angelic gentleness" to violent actions "worthy of the Spanish Inquisition." This requires a correction, however. One should not give in to the temptation of a hagiographer to justify Pius X in a generalizing fashion or to make excuses for him by blaming all unfavorable aspects of his pontificate on his surroundings. One should not forget that Merry del Val kept Giacomo della Chiesa as substitute of the Secretariat of State for four years, gladly relying on his judgment in matters of diplomacy, even though Della Chiesa continued to get advise from his former chief Rampolla. However, above all, É. Poulat's[23] publication of the dossier of the *Sodalitium Pianum* showed that Benigni, at least after 1911, constantly charged Merry del Val with undue restraint when applying papal directives and with a diplomatic temperament that was always willing only partially to execute a tough decision in the face of the resistance it caused.

These texts and various documents collected during the process of beatification contradict the "legend of the secretary of state who brainwashed a benevolent and pious Pope with intransigence, the same Pope who had entrusted him with the reins of government." Yet this does not mean that Pius X was not at all directed by his environment or that he was solely responsible for all measures taken, even the most draconic ones which accompanied the antiliberal reaction so characteristic of his pontificate. He was justified when he turned indignantly against everyone who quietly maintained that the Church was led by "three cardinals," and he repeatedly asserted his complete independence. However, these protestations only prove his good faith, as G. Martina observed;[24] they leave the problem of the real responsibility completely open. Today it cannot be disputed that many of his assistants were carried away by misguided ambitions, exceeding the Pope's intentions when applying certain decisions and using certain methods. On the other hand, it should be clear that the Pope based his decisions in more than one case on biased and tendentious information given to him by men in his trust. Holiness is no guarantee of the best ecclesiastical policies, and a Pope who thinks he has to make decisions for the Church single-handedly is unfortunately the prisoner of his informants and the executive body, loyal and devoted as they may be. An additional observation should be made: Many an assistant of Pius X may have exceeded his intentions; yet there were others who often countered his impulses with passive resistance or at least somewhat softened his intolerant directives. In the last months of his life, Pius X complained about this, especially when the antiintegralistic reaction became apparent even in Vatican circles. But at the beginning of his pontificate, several of his reform measures had encountered the passive resistance of the conservatives, who were just as opposed to the changes demanded by the highest authority as they were to the reformism of the progressives. In view of such cases, impressively illuminating Pius X's occasional difficulties in moving even those men toward obedience who considered themselves the pioneers of the defense against democratic anarchy, É. Poulat spoke of this Pope as having a "strong will and weak authority."[25] Even though this may be exaggerated, the wording shows that the problem of relations between the Pope and his assistants is much more complex than most of his admirers and his slanderers—each in the opposite sense—would care to admit.

---

[20] An example illustrating this can be found in *Les fiches pontificales* by Msgr. Montagnini (Paris 1908).

[21] The Austrian Ambassador Prince Schönburg-Hartenstein made the remark: "The cardinal knows how to centralize, but not how to be a center himself" (Engel-Janosi II, 130).

[22] Concerning the real influence of the Jesuits in the Roman Curia under Pius X, see the detailed presentation of L. Bedeschi, op. cit., 66–74.

[23] *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral* (Paris, Tournai 1969), especially 76–77.

---

[24] *RSTI* 23 (1969), 232.

[25] *Archives de sociologie des religions* 29 (1970), 201.

SECTION ONE

The Reform Work of Pius X

Immediately following the death of Pius X, the London *Times* wrote: "It is not an exaggeration to say that J. Sarto instituted more changes in the administration of the Catholic Church than any of his predecessors since the Council of Trent." Even if one must note that most of the significant decisions of this Pope date from the first five years of his pontificate and that his reform program was slowed down by his excruciating efforts effectively to fend off the threat of modernism, it is nevertheless clear that he took numerous and versatile initiatives and even realized many of the relevant goals. Immediately after his election, he had taken several steps to attain the reorganization of the diocese of Rome and to eliminate the many abuses committed by the clergy of Rome.[1] However, this is merely an indication of the more general and urgent matters which he openly professed and which caused, initially, a great wave of hope among those who, after Leo XIII's "political" pontificate, expected a renovation of the Church in a more religious direction. These first decisions explain the initial confidence with which those who later on sharply criticized the reactionary stance of the Vatican could say: "Il papa farà eccelenti riforme." In the course of 1905, however, in this optimistic atmosphere, an entire series of pro-reform pamphlets appeared in close succession (Bedeschi only just recently pointed them out).[2] The exaggerated expectations of pro-reform groups, however, were disillusioned to such an extent that they often completely lost sight of the positive impact, by no means insignificant in spite of limitations, especially at the pastoral and institutional level.

---

[1] Cf. Fernessole II, 29–47. Throughout the whole pontificate, he observed the situation closely (cf. Schmidlin, *PG* III 38–39).

[2] L. Beschi, *Riforma a religiosa e Curia all'inizio del secolo* (Milan 1968); see especially 27–30.

CHAPTER 26

Reorganization of the Roman Curia and Codification of Canon Law

As pastor and bishop, Pius X often had occasion to discover that a reorganization of ecclesiastical institutions was urgently needed in order to better enable the clergy at all levels, from the top to the bottom, to fulfill their tasks. Thus, without much ado, he proceeded with this task, making good use of his organizational talent and the administrative experiences he had acquired in eighteen years as chancellor of the diocese of Treviso.

There is no need to list all the individual measures Pius X took in the course of his pontificate, even though they often had significant consequences.[1] Only two undertakings of great impact shall be treated in depth: the reform of the papal administration and the reform of canon law.

The organization of the Roman Curia, essentially instituted by Sixtus V, was in dire need of change.[2] In the course of three hundred years, it had turned into a heterogeneous assemblage of thirty-seven agencies whose rights and responsibilities were often totally undefined and who were constantly in conflict with each other, because each one dealt individually with administrative and judicial problems and controversies of the administration, and their areas of jurisdiction were often incompatible. Moreover, the elimination of temporal authority rendered some of these agencies totally superfluous. Pius IX and his successor had limited themselves simply to isolated reforms. On the other hand, however, the progressing Roman centralization in the course of the nineteenth century and the expansion and improvement of the possibilities of communication had essentially strengthened the contacts between the center and the periphery, making the development of certain offices desirable. Furthermore, the administrative methods were completely obsolete, inflexible, out-of-date, and quite costly, in spite of Leo XIII's modest attempts to lower the expenses of the Holy See. Moreover, many did not consider work within the Curia a challenging and demanding ecclesiastical pastorate conducted in the service of God's people, but rather a career promising the cardinal's hat, provided everything went well.

The idea of reform was in the air and not only in progressive circles, as was recently proven by a newly discovered plan which had been devised in the Vatican a year before Leo XIII died. However, this reform idea offended the principle *Quieta non movere,* honored by all administrations of the world, and it was rejected by all who saw their interests threatened. Facing a difficult financial situation,[3] Pius X hurried to remedy the most glaring abuses, but that was not all. He began with several partial reforms which seemed especially urgent. On 17 September 1903 he suspended the obsolete special congregation *De eligendis episcopis,* founded by Benedict XIV and renewed in 1878 by Leo XIII. The Holy Office became responsible for the appointment of bishops in those countries which were not dependent on the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (the Propaganda) or subject to the regulations of a concordat. On 26 May 1906 he also suspended the two relatively new congregations *Super disciplina regulari* and *De statu regularium,* with the result that everything concerning the members of religious orders was concentrated in the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. But he had already planned a much more extensive reform, as was requested by several prelates who had assembled around Cardinal Agliardi. His intentions were probably impelled by the idea of stopping the criticism of the radical front by taking the wind out of its sails. The radicals had begun to question the insufficient functioning of the Curia as well as its fundamental right of existence because they saw it as an obstacle between the Pope and the bishops. In the early summer of 1907 he decided to take steps which introduced a rapid development of the matters at hand.

---

[1] It should suffice to mention two: the constitution *Vacante Sede Apostolica* (25 December 1904) regarding the Pope's election (cf. M. Scaduto, "I precedenti di una reform e le leggi di Pio X sul Conclave," *CivCatt* V [1944] 6–20); the change of the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* into the official publication of the Holy See (23 May 1904), and later its replacement with the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (cf. *AAS* 1 [1909], 5–6, and N. Hilling, op. cit. I, 33–34).

[2] Cf. F. Roberti, "De Curia Romana ante pianam reformationem," *Rom. Curia,* 13–34.

A commission of cardinals was to be created to which Gaetano De Lai, secretary of the Congregation of the Council was assigned; De Lai was the chief supporter of this reform from the beginning to the end. According to the directives personally drafted by the Pope, the commission pursued the following goals:[4] the abolition of superfluous offices and agencies and the creation of appropriate new ones as necessitated by the development of the situation; the separation of administrative and judical responsibilities; the absolutely clear and rational definition of the responsibilities of each dicastery (assigning to one single organ all affairs pertaining, among others, to the bishops, the clergy, the orders, the sacraments, the missions, the simplification and thus the efficiency of the activities of individual offices; the assignment of a certain number of consultants to prepare resolutions; the coordination of criteria needed to come to a unanimous conclusion, and, finally, the standardization of fees and salaries of officials, which had been different depending on the individual functionary. The first plan drawn up by the Pope himself was presented to the commission in November. Concerning the Roman congregations, he relied extensively on a draft by Monsignor De Lai.[5] In regard to the Secretariat of State, he followed Cardinal Merry del Val's standpoint: On the one hand, several countries were incorporated into the area of responsibility which had been subject to the Propaganda, even though they were no longer mission countries (Great Britain, the Netherlands, the United States, Canada); on the other hand, the Secretariat of State was assigned two previously independent agencies: the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs and the Secretariat of Briefs. These expansions increased the significance of the Secretariat of State considerably. Finally, in order to separate the administration and the judiciary, the Pope revived the old medieval jurisdiction of the *Rota Romana,* which had been hobbled through the proliferation of the congregations equipped with judicial power to such an extent that its responsibility had been confined to liturgical questions (since 1870). In the course of the next months, the basic draft was repeatedly revised, but the changes did not impair the economy of the original plan: The Congregation of Matrimony became the Congregation of the Sacraments; the section of the former Congregation of Bishops and Regulars which had charge of the bishops was incorporated into the Congregation of the Consistory, so that all questions pertaining to the members of religious orders were now handled by a special congregation (the case of the Congregation of the Missions caused debates); the Congregation of the Index, at Pius X's request, was separated from the Holy Office "in view of the great number of books to be examined";[6] the Congregation of Rites and the Congregation of the Canonization of Saints were combined in one congregation.

---

[3] Cf. P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista e rinnovamento cattolico in Italia* (Bologna 1961), 120, n. 126.

[4] Text: *Rom. Curia,* 38–42.

On 29 June 1906 the constitution *Sapiento consilio*[7] was published. The experts admired the "constructive and simplifying genius of Pius X" reflected in it (Torquebiau). From now on, the Curia was to include a triad of agencies: eleven congregations, three tribunals, and five offices. Within the area of congregations, the Congregation of the Sacraments was completely new. The former Congregation of the Council had been remodeled so drastically that it was also practically new; at the time of its establishment, it was to supervise the execution and interpretation of the decrees of the Council of Trent; but in the future it was to be in charge of the general discipline of the clergy and the faithful. The consistorial congregation's functions were considerably extended; it was even assigned the supervision of seminaries (in 1915, Benedict XV entrusted this function to the Congregation of Studies, whose only responsibility had been universities). The competence of the Propaganda was now limited to the mission countries in the true sense of the word;[8] moreover, it had to relinquish all matters regarding marriage to the Rota and problems pertaining to sacraments to the Congregation of the Sacraments. For jurisdiction there were to be three responsible agencies: the Rota and the Apostolic Signature (as court of appeal) were to deal with the external forum, which had gradually been taken on by the Sacred Penitentiary; the internal forum was to be the responsibility of the Penitentiary. The five offices included the Apostolic Chancery, the Apostolic Datary, the Apostolic Camera (with very limited responsibilities), the Secretariat of Briefs, and the Secretariat of State as the most important. The constitution, which was amended by a detailed *Ordo servandus*[9] (all together about eighty pages of small print), outlined precisely the functions of the new organs: appointments to the respective offices, schedules and statutes, the specific dispositions of the many subdivisions, and frequent reports, which often had to be presented to the Pope himself before a decision would be made. In order to facilitate the speedy preparation and execution of matters it was required that only the most important problems were to be submitted to the plenary session of the respective congregation. Other affairs were to be handled by the *Congresso,* a committee limited in number and consisting of high officials and the cardinal prefect of the congregation.

---

[5] De Lai's plan reduced the congregations from eighteen to eleven, even though he proposed the creation of a new congregation *De re matrimoniali* and the separation of the old Congregation of Bishops and Regulars into two different dicasteries. In addition, he suggested to change the "old and despised" name of the Inquisition (which he compared to the Congregation of the Index) to *Congregation de fide tuenda.* Pius X preferred to keep the traditional name.

[6] Cf. *Rom. Curia,* 58, 67. Benedict XV returned to the original idea and changed the Index into a special section of the Holy Office (*AAS* 9 [1917], 161–66).

[7] Text: *AAS* 1 (1909), 7–19.

The practical application of the new regulations began immediately and was closely observed by the Pope himself. The fact that De Lai, who was created cardinal in December 1907, was given responsibility for the reorganization in a special commission was received with some amazement. Though many believed that the conservative Pius X proved to be rather revolutionary, the reform was generally received with satisfaction. Of course, the desire for a clear separation of administrative responsibilities and judicial functions was only partially fulfilled. The court of the Rota, indeed, confined itself to matters of matrimony; however, the congregations continued to handle controversies in other areas and issue penalties via administrative channels. Unquestionably, the basic structure of Sixtus V's organization was not as decisively changed as would be the case half a century later under Paul VI on the occasion of the reform of the Curia. For Genocchi rightfully complained that the spirit of the "old machine" had not been trenchantly altered, and the men who were asked to set this machine in motion and to keep it running were essentially bureaucrats without pastoral experience, isolated from the world outside and its problems. Among other things, there was no mention of giving bishops who actually responsibly managed a diocese a position in the sections of the congregations dealing with practical matters. But even considering these obvious limits and shortcomings of Pius X's reform, the point must be clearly made that for the first time since the sixteenth century the entire Curia was reorganized according to, all in all, truly rational criteria.

---

[8] There was talk about removing the apostolic vicariates located in the areas of common law; however, the urgent intervention of Cardinal Gasparri, the leading authority in canon law, resulted in the relinquishing of this plan (cf. *Rom. Curia,* 66–67).

[9] This *Ordo servandus* was published in two parts on 29 June and on 29 September 1909 (text: *AAS* 1 [1909], 36–108).

These measures did not only possess a unique character, they were also of symbolic significance. They appeared to anticipate another highly crucial undertaking, the general reorganization of ecclesiastical law, in preparation since the beginning of Pius X's pontificate.[10]

For several centuries, the idea prevailed of revising canon law and formulating a code that would systematically compile the entire body of law adapted to the contemporary situation. This code was to replace the immense, often inaccessible and obsolete collections of papal decrees. At the Vatican Council, a number of bishops had made certain requests in this respect; and shortly before this council convened, Pope Pius IX had issued the constitution *Apostolicae Sedis* (12 October 1869), thoroughly revising the legislation regarding ecclesiastical censures. Leo XIII[11] had annulled or amended numerous obsolete regulations and even undertaken some partial codifications, using certain schemes prepared in view of the upcoming Vatican Council. His changes primarily affected the constitution *Officiorum ac munerum* (25 January 1897), codified and moderated in the legislation regarding censorship of books, and the constitution *Conditae a Christo* (8 October 1900), which finally afforded the religious congregations with simple vows a precise legal statute. Private canonists[12] had made several attempts: G. de Luise in

[10] In his first instructions in the beginning of the summer of 1907, Pius X expressly specified: "Questa riforma deve farsi *subito* per essere messa in esecuzione al più presto in via di esperimento, onde colle eventuali mutazioni, che seranno suggerite dalla pratica, venga definitivamente pubblicata nel nuovo Codice," (quoted in *Rom. Curia*, 41).

[11] Cf. N. Hilling, "Die Gesetzgebung Leos XIII. auf dem Gebiet des Kirchenrechts," *AkathKR* 93 (1913), 8–31, 254–76, 460–83, 623–37; 94 (1914), 75–95, 252–64; Cf. here, p. 292.

[12] *DDC* III, 915–17.

1873, E. Colomiatti in 1888, H. M. Pezzani in 1893, F. Deshayes in 1895, and mainly A. Pillet, whose *Ius canonicum generale distributum in articulos* (1890) had proposed legal regulations according to the model of the civil code of law, proving that a complete codification of canon law is indeed possible. Even though German canonists kept quiet on this matter, the international Catholic congresses after 1891 constantly received reports suggesting that the Church legislation be revised and codified.

"Two or three days after his election" (Merry del Val), Pius X was already expressing a desire to follow this path of reform.

He was strongly encouraged by Monsignor Gasparri, one of the best canonists of his time, and by Cardinal Gennari.[13] On 19 March 1904 the Pope announced through his motu proprio *Arduum sane munus* the formation of a commission of cardinals, to be aided by a certain number of consultors, which was to adjust ecclesiastical legislation to the present circumstances and to codify it. In the following week, a letter was sent to all archbishops asking them to consult with their suffragan bishops regarding the main changes which were to amend the present law and to send their recommendations to Rome, including additional nominations for consultors. A few days later, he also solicited the cooperation of Catholic universities throughout the world.

The announcement of this plan caused totally different reactions: satisfaction from those who witnessed in daily life the many-sided disadvantages of the present system; scepticism from the many scholars, mainly in Rome and Germany, who had better insight into the difficulties and thus predicted failure. The latter were supported by the famous editor of the *Corpus Iuris Canonici,* the Protestant Emil Friedberg, who charged the Pope with (among other things) attempting to extend in this way his power even further.[14] Others feared that the sections dealing with ecclesiastical civil law and with the relations between Church and state could appear in a new edition of the *Syllabus* and lead to new confrontations with governments. Other Catholic groups, e.g., in Spain, criticized the project for attempting to copy the Napoleonic codes of law, which were considered an expression of liberal individualism.[15] But Pius X remained unperturbed and made sure that everyone set to work at once.

From the very start, the chief promoter of this undertaking was Monsignor Gasparri,[16] secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs. The Pope appointed him secretary of the papal commission and president of the College of Consultors, and he was the heart and soul of the project until its conclusion.

---

[13] Cf. N. Hilling, "Von wem ist der Plan der Abfassung des Codex iuris canonici zuerst ausgegangen?," *AkathKR* 116 (1936), 88–91.

[14] *DZKR* 18 (1904), 1–74.

[15] Cf. L. de Echeverría, *Miscellanea in memoriam Petri card. Gasparri* (Rome 1960), 327–41.

To speed up the work, the consultors were divided into two commissions working next to each other. One was led by Gasparri with Eugenio Pacelli as secretary; the other one was headed by Cardinal De Lai with F. A. Sapieha as secretary. As of 13 November these commissions met weekly, comparing and discussing the editorial drafts for each chapter, which were presented by two, sometimes even three or four consultors working completely independently of each other. Proceeding from the different texts and opinions voiced, the president wrote a new draft, which was again discussed and reworked. Usually, this procedure was repeated at least three or four times, occasionally even ten or twelve times. To save time, the texts were first sent to the consultors for their critical examination and written comments. When they finally agreed on one version, Gasparri presented it to the commission of cardinals, which did not reveal its comment until after it had studied the text twice.[17] The entire process took place in strict secrecy. One or two chapters or paragraphs, however, were published in the form of a papal constitution or a decree of a congregation either because the Pope considered the matter urgent or because he wanted to test the effectiveness in real life, trying to find out how the texts were received. For instance, among others this was the case with the constitution *Sapienti consilio,* through which the Curia was reorganized, and with the following decrees: the Eucharistic decrees *Ne temere* (2 August 1907), which cancelled the exemptions of the Tridentine legislation regarding matrimony in force since the sixteenth century (can. 1094–1103); *A remotissima* (31 December 1909), regarding the *Visitatio liminum* (can. 340–342a); *Maxima quidem* (29 August 1910), regarding the transfer of pastors (can. 2147–2167); and *Cum singulae* (16 October 1911), regarding the dismissal of members of religious orders (can. 646–672).

By 1912 many parts had been amended to the point that Gasparri was able to propose sending them to the bishops and heads of the orders asking them for their comments. In spite of the resistance of several cardinals fearing new delays, the Pope agreed. This consultation, where the bishops, in turn, could confidentially consult with two or three men in their trust, proved to be very useful. On 20 March 1912 Books I and II were delivered; on 1 April 1913 Book III; on 1 July Book V; and finally on 15 November 1914 Book IV. At that time Pius X had already been dead for three months. The final, conclusive version would take two more years. However, at the time of Pius X's death, the major work had already been accomplished, consistently inspired by the Pope who had personally followed its progress step by step. Therefore, according to Gasparri, he deserves a great deal of credit for this work.

---

[16] Pietro Gasparri (1852–1934) was a man of amazing energy, "another, but more active and effective Raymund de Peñaforte." Concerning him see: *Il card. Pietro Gasparri* (Rome 1960); J. Denis, *Actes du congrès de Droit canonique. Cinquantenaire de la Faculté de droit canonique* (Paris 1950), 239–45; H. Tüchle, *Die Außenminister der Päpste,* ed. by W. Sandfuchs (Munich 1962), 94–108; G. Spadolini, *Il card. Gasparri e la Questione Romana* (Florence 1973). Concerning his activities as secretary of state under Benedict XV and Pius XI, see Pt. III.

[17] The successive plans remained inaccessible in the dark corners of the archives, with one exception: F. Roberti, *Codicis Juris canonici schemata Lib IV De processibus, I De judiciis in genere* (Vatican City 1940).

Doubtless this project had its limits. Today, we see it as a new step in the direction of centralization and extreme uniformity of the Latin Church.[18] Some, however, regret that it fails to make reference to the Holy Scriptures or the Church Fathers, in contrast to the ancient canonical collections. Even from a strictly juridical standpoint, a threatening insecurity in the terminology itself can be found, even regarding concepts which are expressly defined" (G. Schwaiger), in spite of abundant discussions and subsequent revisions. Concerning the main content, a more radical further questioning of certain positions inherited from medieval law or from modern absolutism would have been desirable.[19] However, one must admire the extent of a task executed in record time. After all, this work represents a well-structured summa, including the entire legislation of the Latin Church, excepting a portion of the liturgical material and excluding the particularly delicate problem of the relations between the Church and the respective state. It distinguishes itself through clarity and precision of style and seems to be inspired by civil codes of law rather than imitation of the rhythmic phraseology and rhetorical verbosity characteristic of the previous texts, including those of Leo XIII. It reveals the attempt (proving that Pius X was not antimodern on principle) to synchronize the various segments of canon law with the demands of modern times and to give it the benefit of achievements in the field of learning and of the accomplishments of contemporary juridical practice. One must also praise Pius's interest in cooperating, from the beginning to the end, with the episcopate throughout the world and with the non-Roman canonists. Proof of his realism and moderation are the decisions made between the overly specialized position of the theoreticians and the extreme pragmatism of many a practitioner. Along these lines, one must not forget the absolutely pertinent observation of the Protestants Stutz and Feine, who saw in the new code the expression of "the progressive and increasing spiritualization of the Roman Catholic Church," which had become more and more apparent during the pontificates of Pius IX and Leo XIII. Thus the two authors, who certainly were not admirers of Pius X, agree that the code was an epoch in the history of ecclesiastical law.

---

[18] The code is not valid for the Eastern churches united with Rome.

[19] U. Stutz introduces his chapter about the "New Elements in the Code" with the following words: "The code has basically few new elements" (op. cit., 57). Cf. H. E. Feiner, op. cit., 707: "The character of the work is rather conservative. The real innovations are limited to the most essential issues." Regarding these innovations, which should not be underestimated, cf. ibid., 709–19.

CHAPTER 27

Eucharistic Decrees and Liturgical Renewal

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a clearer perspective in favor of frequent Communion had been conceived. Yet the disputes between its advocates and opponents continued. Even Leo XIII's encyclical *Mirae caritatis* (1902),[1] encouraging the "frequent use of the Eucharist" and protesting against the "contrived reasons for relinquishing Communion," did not succeed in settling the controversy, which was especially intense in France and Belgium. Following the moral theologian E. Génicot, S.J., and the canonist Gasparri, Abbé F. Chatel and the Redemptorist Godts stressed the absolute necessity of doing away with premeditated venial sin before one could expect to be admitted to frequent Communion. Others advocated the concept of Monsignor de Ségur, according to which the Eucharist is not "a reward for achieved virtue, but on the contrary, the means of achieving virtue." From this perspective, they strictly distinguished between the absolutely necessary and the desirable spiritual disposition. They were supported by Cardinal Gennari in Rome and Monsignor Heylen, the Bishop of Namur and new president of the Eucharistic congresses; and they could refer to several responses in their favor by the Roman congregations (mainly to the decree *Quemadmodum* of the Holy Office of 17 December 1890 for the benefit of nuns). Thus their number was especially great in Italy, where the rigoristic tradition never had had a strong impact; but they also had followers north of the Alps, above all among the Jesuits.[2]

---

[1] *ASS* 34 (1901–02), 641–44.

[2] Among others, the French Jesuit P. L. Cros, who had settled in Spain. Disregarding the objections of the hierarchy, he enthusiastically developed a program including four points: *comulgar* (communicate), *cada día* (daily), *sin confesarse* (without confessing), *hasta la muerte* (until death).

As an admirer of Don Bosco, who had been an enthusiastic defender of the frequent and early Communion of children, Giuseppe Sarto had made the development of the celebration of the Eucharist the key issue of his program as bishop. Thus it was not surprising that as Pope he tried to realize this program for the Church at large. In a period of only two years, between 30 May 1905 and 14 July 1907, he issued twelve interventions in this regard (decrees, letters, or addresses). On the occasion of the international Eucharistic Congress, convened in Rome in June 1905, he approved a prayer "for the propagation of the pious custom of daily Communion," bringing to mind that "Jesus meant to be the daily remedy and the daily food for our daily shortcomings." The most decisive act, however, was the decree of the Congregation of the Council of 20 December 1905, *De quotidiana SS. Eucharistiae sumptione,*[3] which provided the appropriate settlement of the impending controversy, specifying that two conditions for receiving Holy Communion be sufficient: the state of grace and the proper intention. At the same time, the faithful were asked to communicate "frequently and even daily." By order of the Pope, this decree was sent to all bishops and heads of orders, instructing them to "send it to their seminaries, parishes, religious institutions, and priests and to let the Holy See know what they had done to assure its execution." In the course of the next few months, other decrees encouraged the communicants by granting absolution (14 February 1906), by dispensing the sick confined to bed for more than one month from the Eucharistic rule of fast (7 December 1906 and 6 March 1907) and by defining the term "all faithful" used in the decree to include the children who had attended First Communion (13 September 1906).

The "age of reason" required for First Communion continued to be controversial. Frequently consulted about this disputed question, the Congregation of the Sacrament prepared a decree for which the Pope showed great interest, even though he anticipated strong resistance. After discussing the problem from a historical, dogmatic, and practical point of view, the decree *Quam singulari* (8 October 1910)[4] declared that it is sufficient for children to be able "to recognize the difference between the Eucharistic Bread and common bread, and that it is unnecessary to postpone First Communion until the age of ten or twelve or even fourteen, as was done frequently at that time. This meant the new application of a principle on which all Eucharistic reforms of Pius X were based: Communion is not the reward for virtuous living, but the food to effect virtuous living according to the theological maxim *ex opere operato.*

---

[3] *AAS* 2 (1910), 894–98. See the comments of E. Barbe (Rheims 1905) and J.-B. Ferreres (Paris 1909).

[4] *AAS* 2 (1910), 577–83.

Issuing appropriate decrees was not enough. It was necessary to apply this legislation to practical life. By the way, the new regulations were not at all as revolutionary as they seemed to be at first glance. Nevertheless, they turned many old customs upside down and encountered definite resistance in many countries.[5]

Instigated by the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, a league of priests was founded in April 1905 for the purpose of enforcing the application of the decree about frequent Communion. Six years later, more than 50,000 priests had joined this league. Furthermore, immediately after the issuance of the decree *Quam singulari,* a Pious Union for the Communion of Children was founded in Rome, soon joined by many other national organizations (Italy, Spain, Belgium, South America, the United States, Canada). As of 1907 the Pope demanded the annual convention of a Eucharistic triduum in each diocese and if possible even in every parish. This was to draw the attention of the clergy and the faithful to the significance of the decree of 1905. In Belgium, in response to this triduum, the Jesuit Lintelo,[6] one of the most ardent apostles of frequent Communion, started Leagues of the Most Sacred Heart, whose members pledged regularly to receive Communion.[7] Similar leagues were founded in other countries under different conditions, for example in France by Father Bessière and in England by Father Leister.

Pius X also used the international Eucharistic congresses to promote the acceptance and propagation of the Roman decrees. Originally these congresses were meant to be public manifestations[8] to inspire the enthusiasm of the Catholics for all versions of the veneration of the Most Holy Sacrament and to liberate them from their fear of public judgment through clear and official testimony of Christ's Kingdom embracing all mankind (which was rejected by the followers of laicism). Typical manifestations of such triumphant posture were primarily the congresses of Montreal, Madrid, and especially Vienna, where the Emperor and the Archdukes marched in the procession wearing gala uniforms, surrounded by several thousand participants. Since the beginning of Pius X's pontificate, however, another aspect came to the foreground, which had been only faintly present under Leo XIII: the desire to encourage the faithful to receive Communion frequently, even daily. This was especially pertinent at the Congress of Metz in 1907, where Father Lintelo spoke about the duties of the preacher in regard to the decree. Reflecting certain reservations expressed by the bishop of Châlon, Father Lintelo was officially congratulated in the name of the cardinal legate. He confirmed that the "ideas and wishes of the Holy Father were most clearly reflected in his [Lintelo's] writings." From now on, congresses were unthought of without Father Lintelo's speeches. Based on rich personal experience, his report on the catechism and frequent Communion at the Congress of Madrid (1911), immediately following the decree *Quam singulari,* inspired the Eucharistic Children's Crusade, which was founded officially in 1914 on the occasion of the Congress of Lourdes and had already taken root two years later in fifty-four countries. Thus, all those were brilliantly refuted who had believed or sometimes even hoped that Pius X's death would ensure a relaxation of the decrees. On the contrary, their main content was even incorporated in the new code of canon law.

---

[5] After Cardinal De Lai, many would have wanted to appeal to the Holy Office (*Disquisitio circa quasdam objectiones . . .* [Vatican City 1950], 129); Pius X was charged with having made a decision regarding the Communion of children without consulting the episcopate.

[6] Regarding Jules Lintelo (1862–1919), see J. Severin, *Vie du P. Lintelo, de la Compagnie de Jésus, apôtre de la communion quotidienne, membre du bureau des congrès eucharistiques* (Toulouse, Brussels 1921).

[7] Some numbers may serve to illustrate the results of these efforts: the diocese of Mechelen, where the average number of Communions per inhabitant and per year fluctuated around 2.7 between 1870 and 1900, reached around 5.1 in 1911 and even 7.6 in 1912 (F. Houtart, *Collectanea Mechliniensia* 42 [1957], 595).

[8] Cf. above, pp. 260ff.

The utilization of the Eucharistic congresses bore increasingly rich fruit because their effect on the public grew considerably during the pontificate;[9] the number of participants, their reputation and influence rose tremendously: in 1914, no less than six cardinals and two hundred bishops came to Lourdes, which approached the total number of participants of the first congress in 1881. Above all, the congresses became more and more international in character; of the first fifteen congresses, nine had taken place in France, four in Belgium, and one in Switzerland, areas which were generally considered an extension of France. To be sure, the Congress of Jerusalem in 1893 had been an exception, but one must not forget to what degree France had felt at home in the Levant. Nevertheless, Pius X, always very interested in the program of the congress, decided to hold it in 1905, the year of its twenty-fifth anniversary, in Rome. The next meeting places of the congress were determined: Metz (1907, German at that time), London (1908), Cologne (1909), Montreal (1910), Madrid (1911), Vienna (1912), and Malta (1913). Not until 1914 did the congress return to France, to Lourdes.

---

[9] Cf. L. de Paladini, *Die eucharistischen Kongresse. Ursprung und Geschichte* (Paderborn 1912), and E. Lesne, *Cinquantenaire des congrès eucharistiques internationaux* (Lille 1931).

Similarly, the significance of the foreign delegations attending the respective congresses increased. This expansion was needed in view of the fact that efforts had been made for several years (a direct result of the systematic propaganda activities) also to organize national Eucharistic congresses almost everywhere. Therefore the international congresses were forced to emphasize their difference from the national congresses more clearly and to obtain a higher degree of internationality.

The Eucharistic decrees of Pius X, independent of their liturgical context, interpret Communion mainly as food for the individual Christian. On the other hand, Pius X played an important role in the rediscovery of the real position that the liturgy should take in Catholic life. Monsignor Wagner and Monsignor Jounel agreed that the first significant reforms in the area of liturgy since the Council of Trent were owed to Pius X. Under his pontificate and partially under his influence, the so-called "liturgical movement," so far limited to a small elite and developing in the confinements of Benedictine abbeys, began to invade parishes.

One of the first acts of the pontificate of Pius X was the motu proprio *Tra le sollecitudini* of 22 November 1903,[10] on the subject of Church music. However, its significance by far extended this area so that it is justified to speak of it as being the "charter of the liturgical movement." As bishop, the future Pope Pius X tried to combat "orchestral opera music," which had infiltrated Church music (more so in Italy than elsewhere), replacing it with classical polyphony and mainly with Gregorian chants, that is, the traditional chorale of the Church, whose true character the monks of Solesmes had gradually retrieved from the numerous changes they underwent in the course of the centuries.[11] But he was not satisfied with such reforms instituted with the help of his conductor Perosi in his dioceses of Mantua and Venice. Thus in 1893 he proposed to the Congregation of Rites a motion about the reform of Church music, which text had been prepared (with the help of some monks from Solesmes) by Father A. De Santi, a Jesuit with connections with the *Civiltà Cattolica;* De Santi became more and more the "mover of the Gregorian reform" under Leo XIII's and Pius X's pontificates. Following the advice of Santi and with his assistance, a motu proprio was drafted in November 1903 which reiterated the text of the motion. It defined the true essence of Church music, its sources of inspiration, its exterior form, and its execution, and it banned from the ceremonies of worship everything that did not conform to these principles. Gregorian chant in "its original and pure form, to which it has been appropriately restored by recent efforts" was presented as the "perfect model of Church music": A church composition is more ecclesiastical and liturgical when it approaches Gegorian chant in its composition, its spirit, and its inner attitude; on the other hand, the more it deviates from this model, the less it is worthy of the house of God." However, even though Gregorian chant was propagated as the norm, Pius X inhibited its exclusive use, in contrast to many of the executors of his will who kindled illusions about the possibility of turning the monodic church chant into song truly accessible to the people, as subsequent experience was to show. Merry del Val's testimony belongs in this context: "He certainly did not simply push aside the local or national customs, provided the basic principle of preserving the religious and artistic character of Church music was conscientiously adhered to. Pius X did not want to ban polyphonic music from the Church; rather he accepted the works of modern composers with benevolence, demanding, however, that they strictly obey the prescribed rules, making their compositions as much as possible echos and extensions of the chorale. He certainly did not agree with the actions of some fanatics who went so far as to ban from our churches all music that was not compatible with Gregorian music. He declared this to be extremism."[12]

---

[10] *ASS* 36 (1904), 329–32.

[11] Concerning the work done in Solesmes regarding the revival of the Gregorian chant and the controversies resulting from the so-called "Medicean edition" of the Pustet publishing house in Regensburg, see chap. 18. See also chap. 18 regarding "Cecilianism."

Through a second motu proprio of 25 April 1904,[13] likewise inspired by Father De Santi,[14] Pius X entrusted the Benedictines of Solesmes with the preparation of an authentic Vatican edition of the Gregorian melodies, under the control of a special Roman commission led by Dom J. Pothier, who had become abbot of Saint Wandrille in 1898. He requested that the melodies "be restored in their integrity and purity according to the oldest manuscripts, but also with special consideration of the legitimate tradition which had permeated the manuscripts in the course of time and of the practical use in present liturgies." This statement, inspired by Dom Pothier, caused endless debates in the commission. As a matter of fact, there were two camps, and not only within the ranks of the theoreticians (there was a disagreement between Dom Pothier and his student Dom Mocquereau)[15], but mainly on the practical and pastoral level: Should one demand, as Dom Mocquereau and most of his fellow brothers of Solesmes did, literal adoption of the oldest manuscripts for an edition to be used in liturgy, even if these manuscripts did not agree with modern sensitivities, or should one request, as did Dom Pothier and the Germans (mostly Father Wagner), acceptance of the modifications and moderations later introduced by "living traditions"? The disagreements between the members of the commission were intensified by personal conflicts. Moreover, the question of whether the systematic study of the old manuscripts would not necessitate many years of scholarly research, thus postponing the publication of the official edition, which, according to the Pope's intentions, was to standardize the practice of Church music in the entire Catholic Church, was legitimate. In order to solve this problem, the Pope, actually favoring the second solution, decided to proceed from the edition published in 1895 by Dom Pothier. In 1905 Pothier was asked to take charge of the final preparation and completion of the new edition. The Vatican commission ceased its work. In October 1905, the *Kyriale* was published, followed in 1908 by the *Graduale* and in 1912 by the *Antiphonarium.* Several decrees of the Congregation of Rites reinforced the order to observe the regulations carefully,[16] and the bishops were forbidden to allow future editions whose melodies did not conform with the Vatican edition. The opponents of Solesmes believed it could be concluded from this that those editions would be prohibited which had been provided with rhythmic signs according to Dom Mocquereau's method. But in spite of often rather annoying intrigues, the Holy See rejected taking this step. Instead, the Pope took up a suggestion by Father De Santi and recognized the legitimacy of these editions as "private editions."

---

[12] *Impressioni e ricordi* (Padua 1949).

[13] *ASS* 36 (1904), 586.

[14] Cf. J. M. Bauduccio (biblio., chap. 18).

[15] The author, who had outlined his theory in vol. VII of his *Paléographie musicale* (1901), offered a detailed exposé in *Le nombre musical,* 2 vols. (Toulouse 1908–27). Concerning the more eclectic opinions of Dom Pothier offered in his *Revue Chant Grégorien* (Grenoble 1892ff.). see *LThK*² VII, 648–49, and U. Bomm, *Festschrift Th. Schrems* (Regensburg 1963), 63–75.

The significance that the Pope attributed to the restoration of Church music does not only have aesthetic reasons—"provide a prayer with a beautiful background," he said—but rests mainly in the desire to awake in the faithful love for the liturgy and for solemn Church prayer, which the Pope considered "the first and irreplaceable source of Christian strength," according to the wording of the motu proprio of 1903. This intention compelled Pius X, who had been a man of the Church all his life, to institute several liturgical reforms. From the perspective of the second Vatican Council, they may seem rather modest, but they required a certain measure of courage and, in any case, provided the first, not insignificant guideline for the great liturgical awakening of the twentieth century.

---

[16] A letter of 18 February 1910, addressed to Msgr. Haberl, president of the Cecilia Society of Germany, criticized the so-called mensuralism in the execution of the Gregorian chant.

The expedience of certain liturgical reforms or at least their revision had been in the air since the Vatican Council, which had offered the opportunity of a series of *vota* regarding the reform of the breviary.[17] This matter, frequently discussed in professional journals, was brought up again by the publication of the *Geschichten des Breviers* by Father Batiffol (1893) and Suitbert Bäumer (1895). Furthermore, the progress of historical studies in Catholic circles during the last decades suggested a revision of the martyrology and certain readings of Matins. For this purpose, Leo XIII had founded a Historical-Liturgical Commission (1902), whose membership was composed of L. Duchesne, J. Wilpert, F. Ehrle, G. Mercati,[18] and others. Pius X was not indifferent to this problem, and the benevolence with which he treated the school of Solesmes was partly due to the fact that this school endeavored to restore the purity of the old Roman music on the basis of thorough studies of the manuscripts. His interest in the liturgical discipline, however, was primarily of a pastoral nature. This can be demonstrated by the solution, for example, in favor of which he had decided in the controversy between Dom Mocquereau and Dom Pothier. Moreover, the reform, which he began after successfully concluding the restoration of Church music, was not primarily designed to eliminate the historical errors contained in the breviary, but rather to upgrade the prayer of the weekly psalter and to restore Sunday to its rightful place in the liturgical cycle.

The festivals of saints or other more recent feasts with their own unique attributes had increased to such an extent that the Sunday or ferial office was rarely celebrated, consequently, numerous psalms were not recited any longer. Recently, Leo XIII had made the situation worse by conceding the votive office *ad libitum,*[19] practically destroying the liturgical yearly cycle. Various undertakings led to the establishment of a papal commission to reform the psalter (July 1911): two brochures by Monsignor Isoard,[20] published at the instigation of Rome in 1900 and 1901; several articles appearing in the following years in the German journals *Pastor Bonus, Theologie und Glaube,* and *Der Katholik,* and an essay by the Benedictine Abbot Dom Guépin in 1908[21]; the urgent necessity of a new edition of the breviary; but primarily, however, several interventions addressed directly to the Pope by the liturgy professor Father Piacenza, whose ideas on liturgy were progressive and liberal. This commission was ordered to work independently of the Congregation of Rites, whose tendency to cling to tradition would have made any serious reform impossible. The commission was also to work independently of the historical-liturgical commission which Leo XII had established. This documented the wish not to let objections by the historians get in the way. The commission was chaired by the new secretary of the Congregation of Rites, C. La Fontaine, a pastor who was intimately familiar with the liturgy but not with its history. The commission went to work at once. Working according to his own unique method, only assisted by a few advisers (in this case Monsignor Piacenza[22]), Pius X was able after several months to publish the bull *Divino afflatu* (1 November 1911).[23] It not only undertook the restructuring of the Divine Office in the spirit of tradition, but it also paid attention to the reasonable request to ease the burden of the breviary for the priest serving a parish. Matins was shortened from eighteen psalms on Sunday and twelve on weekdays to nine psalms or pieces of psalms. No holy days were suspended, but Sundays took a special place from now on; on most holy days, the ferial office was to be used along with the hymn of Matins, the lessons, and the concluding prayers. The *Proprium de Tempore* was restored to significance, readings of the Holy Scriptures were allotted more time, and the entire Office became more varied, even though it was considerably shortened and simplified, unfortunately sacrificing many traditional elements.

---

[17] Mansi XLIX, 446–48, L, 602, 626–27, 636–38, 652, 669–70, 679, LIII, 331–52, 466, 470. The commissions were of the opinion that the question belonged in the personal area of papal responsibility (ibid., L 930–31, LIII, 674, 687). Cf. J. W. Corcoran, *Meinrad Essays* 12 (1961), 4, 33–41.

[18] Cf. A. P. Frutaz, *La sezione storica della S. Congr. dei Riti* (Vatican City 1963), 9–10, 33–35.

[19] Decree of the Congregation of Rites of 5 July 1883 (*Decreta authentica C.S.R.* [Rome 1898ff], no. 3581); cf. H. Vinck, op. cit., 52–54.

[20] "Le saint Bréviaire et son avenir" and "Nouvelles observations sur le saint Bréviaire."

However, this was only the beginning. Despite the opposition of Monsignor La Fontaine, who claimed that an incisive reform required the consultation of the episcopate, Pius X adopted the more far-reaching concept of Piacenza and extended the duties of the commission to include a complete reform of the breviary and the missal. The execution of such an extensive program required thorough studies. The pressures by the publishers anxious to publish the new model edition of the breviary as soon as possible finally forced the Pope to find a temporary solution which emphasized the Sunday and ferial office, especially during Lent (motu proprio *Abhinc duos annos* of 23 October 1913). In the beginning of 1914, the reform of the missal was begun; however, the death of the Pope brought everything to a standstill, especially after the commission was strongly criticized for its working habits. The liturgical historians charged that it had sacrificed many time-honored values, for example, the prayer of Psalms 148–150, recited every morning at dawn.[24] The pragmatists thought that the revisions, forced upon the concerned groups without consulting them, had been made "hastily" (Della Chiesa), without paying sufficient attention to the difficulties of application.

---

[21] "De ratione breviarii romani-monastici eiusque emendatione Commentarium"; cf. *NRTh* 76 (1954), 413.

[22] His role, for a long time insufficiently assessed, was represented correctly by H. Vinck, thanks to unpublished documents (op. cit.). He shows primarily—as opposed to O. Rousseau (*Miscellanea liturgica in onore card. Lercaro* I, 525–50)—"that it was thanks to him and not to Beauduin that Sunday came back to favor again (1913)."

[23] *AAS* 3 (1911), 631–36; cf. P. Piacenza, *In constitutionem "Divino afflatu" . . . commentarium* (Rome 1912), and F. Cabrol, *La réforme du bréviaire et du calendrier* (Paris 1912).

The role Pius X played in the restoration of the liturgy is not confined to his legislative work, as significant as this may have been for the reevaluation of the celebration of the Christian mysteries in the context of the annual cycle. In his motu proprio of 1903, regarding Church music, the Pope said that the first source to feed the Christian life of the faithful was to be found in "active participation in the mystery of worship and in the common and solemn prayers of the Church."[25] From this statement the Belgian Benedictine Lambert Beauduin derived the inspiration and the foundation for founding the liturgical movement of Mont-César (Louvain) on the occasion of the Congress of Mechelen around 1909. He was supported by Cardinal Mercier. Since Beauduin possessed remarkable organizational talents and a contagious optimism, he succeeded (in his own special way) in interesting the parishes in the liturgical life. He distributed among the masses tens of thousands of pamphlets containing the translation of all Sunday Masses and their annotations. At the same time, he trained the pastors with both a journal, doctrinal in character, and the *Questions liturgiques.* He also organized yearly liturgical conventions, which grew more and more successful until the outbreak of the war. These meetings contributed a great deal to the spread of the movement for the liturgical pastoral outside of Belgium. It was to reach its peak in the course of the next quarter of the century.[26]

---

[24] See mainly the essays by A. Baumstark, *Roma e l'oriente* 3 (1911–12), 217–28, 289–302; 4 (1912), 93–96. F. Cabrol is more positive, in spite of some regrets.

[25] The official Latin translation of this passage of the Italian original is not quite correct; cf. *QLP* 32 (1952), 161.

[26] The strength of the movement started by Dom Lambert Beauduin was partly due to his sensitivity for pastoral realities, and partly to his efforts of basing his pastoral work on a solid doctrinal and historical foundation. He collected his thoughts in the classical little book, *La piété de l'Église* (Louvain 1914).

CHAPTER 28

Concern for Pastoral Improvements: Seminaries, Catechetical Instruction, Catholic Action

All popes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were intensely interested in improving the spiritual and moral level of the clergy and inspiring their pastoral enthusiasm. No pope was more systematically devoted to this task than Pius X. He continuously issued new memorandums and offered advice in this matter and again and again took new practical measures.

In March 1904, on the occasion of the thirteen hundredth anniversary of the death of Gregory the Great, he defined in an encyclical "the ideal of the true priest," as Gregory had described it in his *Regula pastoralis;* and he ordered for all of Italy apostolic visitations which were to bring to light the shortcomings of the clergy in order to eliminate them.[1] A few months earlier, he had recommended to the priests joining the *Unio apostolica,* a fraternity of priests "whose usefulness and excellence he had tested himself." The questionnaire, prepared in 1909 by the consistorial congregation under his direction, focused on the clergy's observance of their duties and the situation in the seminaries.[2] The bishops were to answer this questionnaire during their *visitatio liminum.* In view of the reaction of the national episcopate, Pius X did not make the wearing of the cassock mandatory all over the world, and he did not introduce everywhere the Italian custom of prohibiting the seminarians from returning to their families during vacation (in order to better protect them from worldly indoctrination). But he constantly reminded the bishops to use stricter standards when recruiting priests and to expel those young seminary candidates whose spirit of obedience gave cause for serious doubts.[3] He urgently wanted the priests to concentrate on their ultimate religious task, and he took several measures for the purpose of releasing them and preventing them from participating in all activities of an economic or political nature. In order to improve the spiritual guidance of the clergy, he did not hesitate to ease the traditional rules regarding the tenure of the pastors.[4]

---

[1] Encyclical *Iucunda sane* (1 March 1904); *ASS* 36 (1903–04); brief of 11 February and 7 March 1904: ibid., 532–43. The *Regolamento personale e questionario del visitatore apostolico* (26 pages) is very important. It was published by L. Bedeschi, *Lineamenti dell'Antimodernismo* (Parma 1970), 145–62.

[2] *AAS* 2 (1910), 21–22, 26–28.

[3] On the other hand, it should be noted that Pius X, prompted by disputes over the book *La vocation sacerdotale* (Paris 1909) by the French seminary professor J. Lahitton, appointed a commission of cardinals, which approved his essential theses on 2 July 1912: (1) Nobody has the right to ordination before the free nomination by the bishop; (2) the appointment as priest is not "necessarily and usually" based on inner leanings; (3) the only indispensable requirements are honest intention, capability, purity of life and doctrine, justifying the hope that the candidate will be able to perform his office as priest and to do his duty (cf. *AAS,* 4 [1912], 485; also 5 [1913], 290). About Lahitton, see *Catholicisme,* V, 1626.

Several of these measures may give the impression of a sort of police system of surveillance and espionage, and of an overestimation of obedience at the cost of a free exchange of opinions. However, in spite of these weak points, to which we are especially sensitive today, we must not forget that Pius X was always guided by a very high, positive ideal. This ideal found an especially remarkable and eloquent expression in *Haerent animo* (4 August 1908),[5] an urgent reminder to the clergy, representing the true spiritual charter of the priesthood and remaining authoritative for a long time to come. It was written entirely by the Pope himself on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination as priest, and it took only "about fourteen days of the few moments of free time at his disposal" (Merry del Val). He drew a truly traditional picture of the priesthood; but he incorporated the rules of the priest's office which evolved in the course of the nineteenth century, challenging the clergy to follow them zealously. This does not change the fact that this saintly Pope, with his totally unique flair for challenges, instilled in the pastoral ministry a new spirit, the effects of which could be felt long after his death.

Impelled by the desire to improve the quality of the clergy, Pius X dealt particularly with the question of the seminaries, including the preparatory seminaries; except in German-speaking countries and in Belgium, they trained most candidates for the priesthood from ages twelve to thirteen. The instruction offered in these seminaries was completely antiquated. The situation was worsened by the fact that most teachers were autodidacts. They were in no position to prepare future priests for coping with the problems of the modern world. These grievances had been pointed out for several years by various people. For example, the superior of the seminary of Boston, Father John Hogan, discussed them in his book *Clerical Studies* (1898), which was translated into French in 1901 and inspired the archbishop of Albi, Monsignor Mignot, when he wrote his sensational *"Lettres sur les études ecclésiastiques"* (1900–01). Especially in Italy reforms were urgently needed, because the great number of small dioceses made the situation worse. Many bishops of this country faced the dilemmas of financing and recruiting the faculty. Shortly before his death, Leo XIII discussed this problem

[4] Decree *Maxima cura* of 20 August 1910: *AAS*, 2 (1910), 636–648.

[5] *ASS* 41 (1908), 555–77.

before the episcopate in a motu proprio of 8 December 1902;[6] Pius X was completely open-minded toward these problems; after all, in Treviso and as bishop of Mantua he had tried hard to improve the diocesan seminaries. He may also have been influenced by the measures taken by a former German Franciscan, Monsignor Döbbing, in his dioceses of Nepi and Sutri.[7] During the apostolic visitation ordered for March 1904, the real circumstances in the diocesan seminaries were to be uncovered. According to the judgment of a biographer who can hardly be charged with prejudice toward the Curia, even in Rome itself "everything was in need of repair or restoration, materially and spiritually, in terms of staff and education."[8] In the rest of Italy, conditions were no better. In January of 1905 the bishops were asked to think about the interdiocesan reorganization of the seminaries, and a papal commission was ordered to prepare reform plans analyzing and utilizing the reports of the inspectors. The papal adviser responsible for this project was Father Pietro Benedetti.[9]

After three years of work carefully observed by the Pope, a program of studies was published (10 May 1907), followed by norms for the organization of the seminaries in regard to education and discipline (1 January 1908).[10] It paid attention to minute details. All in all, the proposed reforms were too weak and increased the shortcomings of an educational system leading a ghetto life without contact with the outside world. Eventually some improvements were made. Among them were: the consolidation of smaller institutions, adaptation of the high school curriculum to that of state institutions, introduction of a preparatory year at the beginning of theological studies, emphasis on the significance of a spiritual adviser and on the genuineness of vocations (especially urgent in countries where the clerical profession often meant social advancement). A new group of apostolic visitors was ordered to supervise the consequent execution of the Roman regulations. Unfortunately, the reform did not produce the results expected, especially in southern Italy. Qualified staffs were lacking, and the radical purge in reaction to modernism reduced the number of suitable men. The establishment of regional seminaries proved to be more difficult than had been expected, even though the Holy See financially assisted many bishops who did not have the necessary means at their disposal.

---

[6] *ASS* 35 (1902–03), 257–65.

[7] Cf. L. Hardick, "Bischof Bernhard Döbbing (1855–1916). Ein deutscher Bischof in Italien, seine innerkirchliche Reformtätigkeit," *WZ* 109 (1959), 142–95. He was appointed bishop in 1900 and Pius X called him "the pearl of the Italian episcopate."

[8] P. Fernessole, *Pie X* II (Paris 1953), 45.

[9] G. Gremigni, *Cuore e testa. Mgr. Pietro Benedetti, missionario del S. Cuore* (Rome 1939), 193–200. Regarding the archives of the commission, see M. Guasco, op. cit., n. 32.

[10] *ASS* 40 (1907), 336–43, 41 (1908), 212–42.

All these measures pertained only to Italy, but in the opinion of the Pope they could be taken as models elsewhere. All instructions received by the congregation entrusted with the control of the seminaries required that the regulations initially issued for Italy also be applied worldwide. Certain explanations in this regard specified the Pope's intentions. For example, when the archbishop of Rouen was widely criticized for having applied to his diocese the regulations intended for the Italian bishops "regarding books to be handed to the seminary students," he was praised in a Roman document "for having understood that these regulations were also valid for the seminaries in other countries."[11]

Pius X's restoration efforts regarding a more effective pastoral extended over other areas as well. Holding the conviction that good bishops are a must if one wants good priests, he did not confine himself to pious reprimands, as contained in the encyclical *Communium rerum* (21 April 1909), in which he represents Saint Anselm of Canterbury as a model pastor, fervently drawing the picture of the ideal bishop.[12] He also tried to improve the recruitment of the episcopate by revising the methods of appointments. He issued precise directives for the maintenance of the candidates' personal file, studying each one personally before making a decision. On the other hand in order to increase his control over the activities of his bishops he tightened not only the rule on the periodical *visitatio liminum* whereby every bishop was obliged, according to a strictly determined alternating schedule, to appear at the Vatican every five years. The bishop was now obliged to present a detailed report on the conditions in his diocese based upon a minutely detailed questionnaire.[13]

Instruction in the catechism was also one of Pius X's concerns. Clearly recognizing the situation, the Pope drew attention to the fact "that it is much easier to find a brilliant speaker than a catechist who is an excellent teacher." He did not grow tired of reminding the priests to present Christian doctrine clearly and simply, and to deal thoroughly with the catechesis for adults, which had been greatly neglected in the nineteenth century because the instruction of children took precedence. As always, he did not confine himself to issuing a solemn encyclical regarding this problem,[14] rather, he devised a series of measures, demanding, among other things, the more frequent employment of lay catechists, a novelty at this time. His words were followed by his example and, as he used to do, he personally explained the catechism every Sunday. Listeners came by the thousands wanting to hear the Pope who had not forgotten that he was also the bishop of the diocese of Rome.

---

[11] C. Cordonnier, *Mgr. Fuzet* (Paris 1950), II, 330.

[12] *AAS* 1 (1909), 333–88.

[13] *AAS* 2 (1910), 13–34.

[14] Encyclical *Acerbo nimis* (15 April 1905): *ASS* 37 (1904–05), 613–25.

Pius X also instigated the preparation of a new catechism, pointing out the elements which were to be considered. After examining the draft personally and correcting it with care, he introduced this catechism as the required text in the ecclesiastical province of Rome. At the same time, he expressed a wish to adopt it in all dioceses,[15] because he was interested in fulfilling the desire for a universal standardized catechism which had been repeatedly voiced after the First Vatican Council.

The interest in catechismal instruction, which Pius X had displayed continuously as a young priest and in later life, was in line with contemporary concerns. In 1889 the first Italian catechetical congress had taken place in Piacenza. But it was primarily in German-speaking countries that an active movement in search of new directions emerged. In 1875 a journal called *Katechetische Blätter* had been founded in Munich. This was followed in 1878 by the *Christlich-Pädagogische Blätter* in Vienna and in 1888 by the *Katechetische Monatsschrift* in Münster. These journals, especially the first two, found good response even in non-German-speaking countries and the catechetical societies, whose mouthpiece they were, organized important congresses in Munich (1906) and in Vienna (1912). Gradually, under the influence of H. Stieglitz, a new method was developed which had been inspired by the Protestant pedagogue Johann Friedrich Herbart and was known as the Munich catechetical method: an inductive method no longer proceeding from the text, which is explained, but from what the child knows already or perhaps (but at that time rarely) from a story of the Bible[16] that was to be added to the text of the catechism. However, some time passed before the majority of catechists adopted the new ideas, and it took even more time before interest in the pedagogical problems related to the method were replaced by the more fundamental question of the content to be taught: What should really be taught, a religious knowledge verbalized in scholastic terms or a message of salvation in Christ as presented in the Holy Scriptures?

---

[15] *AAS* 4 (1912), 690–92. Regarding this catechism, see in C. Bellò (*Geremia Bonomelli* [Brescia 1961], 180) the critical comments of the bishop of Cremona, who charged him, for instance, with maintaining a scholastic vocabulary and, in regard to morals, neglecting love of his fellow man. It should be noted that all catechisms since Deharbe had deviated from the traditional sequence. They had inserted the morals in between the exposé about the credo and the Sacraments. Pius X returned to the sequence outlined by the Council of Trent.

[16] Of all the men who helped to restore the significance of the "Salvation and Passion of Christ" in religious instruction F. J. Knecht needs to be mentioned. His *Kommentar zur biblischen Geschichte* (1882) reached its twenty-fifth edition in 1925 (Cf. H. Kreutzwald, *Zur Geschichte des biblischen Unterrichts* [Freiburg i. Br. 1957], 161–62).

It has already been pointed out that Pius X requested the frequent employment of lay catechists. But instruction in the catechism was not the only area in which he appealed to the laity. A conversation which Monsignor de Bazelaire reported is frequently mentioned: Speaking with some cardinals, the Pope asked the question: "What is most essential for the salvation of society?" "The construction of schools," said one cardinal. "No! Build more churches!" answered another. "No! To activate the recruitment of priests," suggested a third. "No! No!" declared the Pope. "Today, it is most important that every parish have at its disposal a group of enlightened, virtuous, decisive, and truly apostolic laymen." As a priest and bishop, Pius X knew from experience what effective help laymen, aware of their Christian responsibility, could provide the clergy regarding the vitalization of a parish and the modification of society. He did not neglect repeatedly to solicit this assistance from the laity, for example in the encyclical *Il fermo proposito* (11 June 1905).[17] It would not be difficult to find those passages in this encyclical which could be discarded as obsolete according to today's standards. Nevertheless, this encyclical can be accepted as the charter of the organized Catholic Action as well; because it did not just challenge the Catholics to practice their personal virtues, but also appealed to them to "pool all their vital forces in order to reinstate Jesus Christ to his position in the family, the school, and the society."

Emphasizing the importance of the organized lay apostolate, Pius X may indeed appear to be a forerunner. Yet he proved to be conservative in the way he tried to implement this idea. "The activities assisting the spiritual and pastoral office of the Church . . . must be subject to Church authority in every detail. . . . But even the other works undertaken to restore the true Christian civilization in Christ and forming Catholic Action in its aforementioned significance cannot be understood without the counsel and the high leadership of the ecclesiastical authority." This passage from the encyclical *Il fermo proposito* is characteristic of Pius X's viewpoint: he was aware of the indispensable effort of the laity to instill Christian principles into secular life; but he did not yet realize the specific character of the action of the Catholics within society, seeing it almost exclusively as an expansion and extension of the action of the clergy. He was inspired by certain formulas which had been successful during his time in Venetia, and he propagated an organization of Catholic Action according to a more or less uniform model which did not grant the laymen more than the role of an executor under the very strict control of the bishops. The Catholics were to join in certain groups in order to begin their various activities not only in the area of the religious apostolate, but also in the area of the social organizations, the press, or even political elections. But those were always strictly denominational organizations, incorporated into the framework of the parishes and the dioceses and dependent on the episcopate, which, in turn, was subject to the directives from Rome. By necessity, such a clerical conception of Catholic Action was bound to encounter clandestine or open resistance almost everywhere, depending on the situation. The most sensational oppositions of this kind were the crisis of the *Opera dei congressi* in Italy, breaking out in the first months of his pontificate, the affair concerning *Le Sillon* in France a few years later, and finally the conflict pertaining to the Christian trade unions in Germany.

---

[17] *ASS* 37 (1904–05), 740–67. The encyclical had been edited by the Jesuits of the *Civiltà cattolica* (L. Bedeschi, *La Curia Romana,* 68). It has the title *De actione cattolica,* a phrase, more or less technical in meaning, which had emerged in Italy during Leo XIII's pontificate and was usually applied to the Action in the social area. This phrase was not used on the other side of the Alps until after World War I.

SECTION TWO

The Modernist Crisis

It is increasingly clear that the definition of modernism in the encyclical *Pascendi* offers in abstract terms a uniform system which is rightfully declared to be in conflict with the Catholic faith, offering the historian nothing but a somewhat inadequate framework, because, while the theologian assesses documents and formulas from an absolute perspective, the historian has to make an attempt to understand mankind in its actual multifariousness, its deeper aspirations, and its spiritual concerns. However, there is another reason: The Jansenism of the seventeenth century was nothing more than the marginal phenomenon of an often absolutely orthodox, but sometimes simply anachronistic Augustinian movement. Likewise, the restoration movement, developing within the Church at the turn of the nineteenth century, showed rather different kinds of tendencies: Some of them were certainly legitimate, even though they may have confused people moving along in traditional ways; but other tendencies were dangerous because of their lack of proper distinctions, even though they may have had sound principles. Others were extremely heretical and in some cases completely lacking in Christian content.

The term "New Catholicism" (later "modernism")[1] embraced a series of concepts reflecting, in the opinion of contemporaries, the liberalism of the nineteenth century: renewed questioning of the traditional conception the Church had of the political and social order; the *aggiornamento* of the ecclesiastical institutions, the forms of the pastoral and the life style of the Christians living in and committed to this modern world; and the restoration of exegesis, theology, and religious philosophy. In this very general sense, modernism could be defined as "the meeting and confrontation of a long religious past with a present which found the vital sources of its inspiration in anything but this past" (É. Poulat). In this respect, the effects of modernism could be seen in Christian socialism and even in Christian democracy, in Sillonism, in

---

[1] Regarding the origin and the history of the term "modernism," confirmed by the encyclical *Pascendi*, see A. Houtin, op. cit., 81–95, and J. Rivière, op. cit., 13–34. In the same strict sense in which the encyclical uses the term, it appears again in Italy around 1904, at first used by journalists (the first one may have been G. Sacchetti in his disputation against Murri), later by the theologians.

Americanism (at least in the French version),[2] and in the many different, often independent currents of an ecclesiastical reform movement as it appeared around 1900 in Germany, Italy, and France. Several of these efforts and their effects have been discussed elsewhere in this volume. One chapter in this section is entirely devoted to German Reform Catholicism, because in this area, especially at the beginning of the twentieth century, tendencies came to light originating in the confrontation of Catholicism with the currents of a changing society. Most of all we must investigate the religious and cultural crises transpiring primarily in France, occasionally in Italy, and in some Catholic groups in England, caused by the unexpected collision of traditional Church doctrine with modern religious studies that had developed independently of and often even in opposition to the control of the churches.

The crisis with which we must deal at this point is comparable to the one that broke out half a century earlier in the churches of the Reformation under the name of "liberal Protestantism." However, this crisis was on a much larger scale. While certain groups, often called "Progressives," confined themselves to placing the newest discoveries of religious studies into the service of the traditional faith, other, more radical groups (the modernists in the true sense of the word) considered it necessary to give this faith a new form of expression, which was to do justice to the changes of the human mind, whose symptom and driving force was precisely the very development of these new studies. Such attempts were considered by certain adventurous minds as the dawn of a new era. To others, especially to most of the ecclesiastical authorities, they appeared to be the beginning of an impending catastrophe.

Here are the roots of the bitter antimodernistic reaction which will be the subject of the last chapter in this section. This bitterness cannot be solely explained by the methods of Church leadership and the delight of the contemporary press in sharp polemics. It was also caused by the realization that the Church felt deeply shaken and that, aside from some particularly acute men, no one could anticipate, sixty years before the Second Vatican Council, that the outcome of this renewed questioning, induced by a collective change of mind, would not necessarily lead to a total elimination of the essence of the Christian faith.

---

[2] Regarding the Americanist crisis, which was but a tempest in a teacup in the United States and in France, on the whole, nothing but a *hérésie fantôme* (F. Klein), see above, chap. 24.

CHAPTER 29

Reform Catholicism in Germany

Since the German clergy received a much more thorough training than the clergy in Latin or Anglo-Saxon countries, Germany was practically untouched by the phenomenon of modernism in the true sense of the word. However, in the two decades preceding the outbreak of World War I, the Catholic intellectuals were seized by a liberal current and a reform movement which wanted to reverse German Catholicism's trend of retreating within its own confines. This isolationism, the consequence of resistance to the *Kulturkampf,* had resulted in a kind of reaction that was inimical to the modern spirit and especially to its manifestation in German national liberalism.[1] But these movements also wanted to combat clerical and authoritarian tendencies which had permeated the Church since the victory of ultramontanism under Pius IX's pontificate, and they planned to be more open-minded toward the modern world and its aspirations. Also called "present-day Catholicism" or "critical Catholicism," (in contrast to a blind submission to Church authorities), these reform efforts in the German Catholic Church toward the end of the nineteenth century and throughout the first half of the twentieth century were usually described by the term "Reform Catholicism," coined by Josef Müller in his publication of 1899, even though Müller, a priest in Bamberg and editor of the journal *Renaissance,* was not representative of the phenomenon at large. It was precisely this term, by the way, which contributed to its ill repute among those who were intent on emphasizing the differences between the Catholic Church and the Evangelical Reformation.

It is true that the term "Reform Catholicism" is a "collective name for many diverse, mostly unrelated tendencies" (Hagen), including: liberal elements who wanted to instill Christianity with the rationale of the natural sciences or strove for a diminution of authoritative dependence in theological research; theologians and philosophers who were interested in an exchange with modern thought and therefore disapproved of the pressure Rome exercised in favor of Neo-Scholasticism; historians who were sensitive to the evolutionary aspect of things, thus provoking the majority of the ultramontanes, who wanted to keep the thought and life of the Church prisoner of the norms which had been determined in the Middle Ages or at the time of the Counter Reformation; opponents of the centralistic Church regime who had not followed the Old Catholics in their schism with Rome but agreed with many of their demands; heirs of the reform movements in the area of the liturgy (use of the German language), of Church discipline (among other things, the question of clerical celibacy), of the training of future priests, heirs, therefore, of ideas which had been posed and supported by followers of the earlier ecclesiastical enlightenment and, in the course of the first half of the century, by men like Hirscher; laymen who had involved themselves in the life of the Church and wished for more independence, especially in regard to social and cultural affairs and decisions, often also in regard to the organization of life in the parish or in the selection of pastors; patriots who were proud of the growing power of the new German Empire and wanted to reintroduce to the Church the rich heritage of German cultural and intellectual life, seemingly alienated from German Catholicism since the middle of the nineteenth century; religious men, partially rooted in the tradition of German Romanticism, who wanted to replace the legalistic Church, mired in organizational matters and Church politics, with the apostolic Church of love or the Church of the spirit, as they called it. All of them shared a certain anti-Roman, especially anti-Jesuit attitude, often even an animosity to the "political Catholicism" organized in the Center Party, and furthermore a "naive overestimation of the scholarly characteristics of the nineteenth century."[2] They also shared their loyalty to the Catholic Church and, in contrast to the modernists in the true sense of the word, the intent to respect unconditionally the basic structures of the faith and the Church. Some aspects of their demands and efforts were unquestionably narrow-minded and dictated by the circumstances of the time, but they "were loyal to the revelation and the Church, even though they dealt with the problems of the time more decisively and sometimes more obstreperously than their contemporaries."[3]

---

[1] Concerning this situation, see F. Fuchs, "Die deutschen Katholiken und die deutsche Kultur im 19. Jahrhundert," *Wiederbegegnung und Kultur in Deutschland* (Munich 1927), 9–58, and P. Funk, "Der Gang des geistigen Lebens im katholischen Deutschland unserer Generation," ibid., 77–126. Also O. Köhler, "Bücher als Wegmarken des deutschen Katholizismus," *Der katholische Buchhandel Deutschlands. Seine Geschichte bis zum Jahre 1967* (Frankfurt a. M. 1967), 11–90.

In all these efforts, certain parallels can be detected to the demands voiced by men such as Monsignor Ireland or Father Hecker in the

---

[2] J. Spörl, *HJ* 57 (1937), 5; F. Heiler judges from his perspective: "Like the earlier efforts of the theology of enlightenment and of Old Catholicism, these reforms were often too rationalistic and doctrinal; they did not emerge from the religious center of the Catholic Church, the mystery of Christ, and the desire for holiness" (*RGG*² IV [1800]).

[3] G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1968), 64. See also J. Spörl, op. cit., 6: "Many things that have now become the common property of the German Catholics thanks to the Catholic youth movement had to be fought for fervently at that time."

United States, the disciples of Americanism, some Sillonists in France, F. von Hügel in England, Monsignor Bonomelli, the followers of Rosmini or the Milan group of the *Rinnovamento* in Italy whose work had some response in Germany. All in all, German Reform Catholicism developed rather independently of the foreign reform movements of that time. It was oriented toward the tradition of German Catholicism, its own situation after the *Kulturkampf,* and its subsequent problems.

In view of the multiplicity of phenomena, the polemical terminology was especially disastrous. Thus, Ludwig Pastor recorded in his diary in 1895: "In Munich a new liberal Catholicism began to emerge around Grauert and Hertling."[4] That was the language of Pastor, for Grauert and Hertling can hardly be called "liberal." In the course of the following years these undefined efforts gained ground, but they were confined to certain academic circles, mainly in southern Germany, and they were usually unrelated. They were represented by three outstanding personalities: F. X. Kraus, H. Schell (above all) and later A. Ehrhard.

Franz Xaver Kraus,[5] a brilliant professor of Church history and essayist, was at that time "the head and soul of the theology faculty in Freiburg" (H. Schiel) and one of the respected informants of the government in Berlin as far as Church policy was concerned. With unending loyalty he stood by the Church, no matter what his opponents maintained; but he was unable to understand the viewpoints of those who did not adhere to his ideas. He judged the general policies of the Church on the basis of his personally inimical sentiments. He was convinced that the future of the Church was threatened by the narrow-minded attitude and the fanaticism of the ultramontanes, and he branded them the Pharisees of our time, who "placed the Church before religion and were willing to sacrifice a clear decision of their conscience in favor of the decisions of an external authority." As a "liberal" in the sense that the word had in the nineteenth century" (C. Bauer) and with the Dantean distinction between "religious" and "political" Catholicism, he sharply opposed the policies of the Roman Curia and the Center Party, not only in numerous anonymous articles, but also in his ecclesiastical-political "Spectator Letters," which appeared from 1896 until 1900 in the *Allgemeine Zeitung.*

---

[4] *Tagebücher,* ed. by W. Wühr, 288. The historian H. Grauert (cf. *HJ* 44 [1924], 169–96) was responsible for the *Historische Jahrbuch* after 1884. Pastor charged him with systematically denouncing the Catholic historians of ultramontane leanings (see, for instance, *Tagebücher,* 244). G. von Hertling, philosophy professor and one of the main leaders of the Center Party, was the president of the Görres Society. At the Congress of Constance the following year, he warned the participants of the German Catholics lagging behind regarding the sciences.

[5] Regarding Franz Xaver Kraus (1840–1901), Church historian and pioneer in the field of archeology and in Christian art, professor in Freiburg after 1878, author of an extensive work about Dante (1897), for a long time considered an authority in Germany, see, in addition to his diaries (ed. by H. Schiel, [Cologne 1957]) revealing, as expected, his deeply religious soul: H. Schiel, *Im Spannungsfeld von Kirche und Politik, F. X. Kraus* (Trier 1951); id., *F. X. Kraus und die Tübinger Katholische Schule* (Ellwangen 1958); id., *TThZ* 61 (1952), 5–20; id., *AMrhKG* 3 (1951), 218–39; C. Bauer, *Deutscher Katholizismus* (Frankfurt 1964), 93–136; H. Tritz, *Spicilegium hist. congr. SS. Redemptoris* 11 (1963), 182–232; also O. Köhler, *Bewußtseinsstörungen im Katholizismus* (Frankfurt a. M. 1972), 225–38. The author of the article "In Canossa," signed "v. S.," published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on 3 August 1881, could only be identified after Kraus's literary estate had been released. Interested in the episcopal see of Trier, Kraus had agitated in this article against M. F. Korum: see H. Schiel, *Die Trierer Bischofskandidatur . . .* (Trier 1955).

Even though Kraus moved away from the Reform Catholicism J. Müller had praised as the "religion of the future,"[6] and even though "his own ecclesiastical-political principles and concerns dealt principally with questions other than the struggle of the antimodernists,"[7] his dissatisfaction with the existing situation and his sharp criticism of ultramontanism earned him the honor of carrying the banner for those liberal Bavarian Catholics who had founded, in 1904, under the name *Krausgesellschaft,* a "society for the advancement of religion and culture," which combined a naive admiration of "independent scholarship'" with strong anti-Roman accusations and prejudices.[8]

Herman Schell,[9] after 1884 professor of apologetics, Christian art history, and comparative religious studies in Würzburg, attracted many enthusiastic admirers. He was an outstanding intellectual of tireless energy, anything but a polemicist, but a sincere and original philosopher and theologian, who has been discovered today as a forerunner of Christian existentialism because he emphasized the personal and vital aspect and the inwardness of Catholicism without in the least denying the visible and hierarchical aspects of the Church. He developed theories which were somewhat unfamiliar to the theology of his time, for example, about religious freedom, the apologetics of immanence, the role of the Holy Spirit, and the position of the laity in the Church; and he introduced religious studies to the ecclesiastical disciplines. Within a few years, he published amazingly varied and voluminous works, whose audacious constructs were often subject to justified criticism, but it was to his credit that he presented the traditional doctrine in personalistic categories, and that he was inspired by the continuous desire to "baptize" modern philosophy and science and to prove that they were by no means incompatible with Catholic belief. From this perspective he published in 1897 a pamphlet with the title *Katholizismus als Prinzip des Fortschritts,* in which he declared that the Church had to ally itself with progress in whatever form, requesting that Catholics not be forced to behave like "mental eunuchs." These sensational declarations were made in the name of an "ideal Catholicism" and supplemented by a program for applying his theses to the areas of religious, intellectual, and political activities. Schell had not received sizable public attention so far, but this pamphlet unleashed a storm of indignation. He responded to the criticism with a second publication, entitled *Die neue Zeit und der alte Glaube.* In it he criticized the methods of the Church government even more directly, and he expressed his conviction that the Church, provided its core was unchangeable, must rejuvenate itself continuously through dialogue with the world. On 15 December 1898 both pamphlets and his most important works were put on the Index.[10] Schell submitted, and he was allowed to continue teaching. His prestige grew. However, the bitter polemics against him continued in an "unworthy manner" (Schwaiger), his loyalty and his fatith were doubted, and as a matter of fact, he was charged with planning "to revolutionize the clergy." According to his doctor, all these intrigues impaired his health, and he died in 1906, only fifty-six years old. At the academic obsequies, S. Merkle delivered the funeral oration. He also organized a committee, joined by the representatives of Reform Catholicism, which was responsible for erecting a tombstone.

---

[6] The pamphlet, published in 1898 under this title, was expanded in the following year to two volumes dealing with the topics: "Die wissenschaftliche Reform" and "Die praktischen Reformen." The author made demands in favor of the synods, proposed plans for the training and organization of the clergy and for a greater participation of the laity in ecclesiastical life, criticized Church intervention in the political arena, the work of the Congregation of the Index, and Neo-Scholasticism, concluding with a charge against the Jesuits (II, 101–54). The little work was put on the Index on 7 June 1901.

[7] H. Schiel, *Tagebücher,* xix.

[8] A record of its activities can be found in *Das Neue Jahrhundert* 6 (1914), 265–71.

[9] Concerning Herman Schell (1850–1906), see H. Hasenfuß, *H. Schell als existentieller Denker und Theologe* (Würzburg 1956); id., *LThK*² IX, 384–85; V. Berning, *Das Denken H. Schells* (Essen 1964); id., *MThZ* 19 (1968), 102–20; P. Wacker, *Glaube und Wissen bei H. Schell* (Paderborn 1961); id., *Theologie als ökumenischer Dialog* (Paderborn 1965); O. Schröder, op. cit., 370–92. His main works: *Katholische Dogmatik* (4 vols. 1889–93); *Gott und Geist* (2 vols., 1895–96); *Apologie des Christentums* (2 vols., 1901–05); *Christus* (1903).

In the meantime, other progressive voices were making themselves heard. There were even attempts made to organize the liberal forces. In 1901 a former colleague of Schell's, patrologist Albert Ehrhard,[11] published not just a pamphlet, but a larger, scholarly work with the significant title *Der Katholizismus und das 20. Jahrhundert im Licht der kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit.* Based on his solid knowledge of the past, this work attempted to prove the thesis that it is possible to overcome the conflict unquestionably present between Catholicism and the modern world of thought, provided that, on the one hand, modern thought relinquish its anti-Christian prejudices, and that, on the other hand, the Church cease to conceptualize the Middle Ages in absolute terms. In Ehrhard's opinion, the Middle Ages do not represent the climax of Christianity's development. Its religious institutions had only relative value, and Neo-Scholasticism would have to fail if it was conceived merely as an unqualified restoration of the past. He also had reservations about the Society of Jesus and had several desires; for example, he wished to give the national languages an appropriate place in the liturgy. His work was very successful (twelve editions in one year), but almost the entire Catholic press in Germany and Austria criticized Ehrhard. He was especially vehemently opposed by the Redemptorist A. Rössler (supported by Cardinal Archbishop Gruscha of Vienna), who called him an "anti-Catholic." Albert Ehrhard, not faced with any critics of his caliber, responded harshly with his new ingenious work: *Liberaler Katholizismus? Ein Wort an meine Kritiker* (1902).

---

[10] The official report was published by K. Hennemann, *Widerrufe H. Schells?* (Würzburg 1908), 82–86.

[11] Regarding Albert Ehrhard (1862–1940), professor of Church history in Würzburg (1892–98), Vienna (1898–1902), Strasbourg (1903–18), and Bonn (1920–27), specialist for Old Christian literature, see A. Dempf, *A. Ehrhard. Der Mann und das Werk* (Colmar 1944); K. Baus, *Bonner Gelehrte. Kath. Theologie* (Bonn 1968), 114–22; *NDB* IV, 357; *DHGE* XV, 62–65; O. Schröder, op. cit., 392–407.

Several other less prominent professors joined in the controversy in the following years, taking Ehrhard's side: O. Sickenberger published several belligerent writings between 1902 and 1904, charging the Catholics mainly with their extreme anti-Protestantism (however, his authority was somewhat impaired by his notorious resistance to the celibacy of the clergy); a colleague of Schell's, F. X. Kiefl, a man of speculative talent and very pugnacious, who, between 1904 and 1905, repeatedly opposed the vehement criticism of Schell voiced by the Jesuit Stufler; M. Spahn, history professor in Strasbourg and brilliant essayist, who was concerned with rescuing the Catholics from their ghetto existence, whose often rather discerning, yet too severe biography of Leo XIII was considered a manifesto.

After 1901 the avant-garde gathered around several journals: *Renaissance* (1901–7), published by the aforementioned, not very talented J. Müller; *Zwanzigstes Jahrhundert* (1902–9), whose motto was: "religion, Germanity, culture," perpetuated by an active minority of young Bavarians. *Hochland* had an entirely different format (1903–71; forbidden in 1941, continued in 1946). This journal, published by C. Muth, opposed the criticism which, thanks to the powerful organization of the Borromeo Society, dominated most of the Catholic literary productions and was perpetuated by the clergy. Instead, *Hochland* advocated a literary evaluation, which emphasized aesthetic aspects over moralizing concerns.[12] This journal greatly benefitted the alleviation of the ghetto mentality of German Catholicism, aside from its contributions to good literature.

The reactions of the hierarchy toward reforms were mostly of a negative nature. The hierarchy, interested in preserving its structures and strict orthodoxy and fearing the religious confusion of the masses, resisted change as such. This was also true in view of Reform Catholicism at the beginning of the twentieth century. The problem was aggravated by the fact that the latter, aside from justified demands and healthy efforts, succumbed to ill-advised or vague proposals and exaggerated criticism. This gave rise to the occasional, but usually completely unjustified question of whether these men, if only de facto, worked hand in glove with the Away-from-Rome movement raging through Austria at that time, and whether they were not striving for a Christianity practically independent of Rome. Even Bishop P. W. Keppler of Rottenburg, a prelate who was certainly not considered a reactionary (formerly professor in Freiburg) and who had approved, though with reservation, the publication of Ehrhard's disputed work, thought it necessary to intervene in the controversies with a public lecture "About the True and False Reform" (1 December 1902). He conceded that certain things in the Church needed improvement. However, his sharp, barely disguised criticism of men such as Kraus, Schell, and Ehrhard was astonishing. This lecture was fatefully influenced by the very successful writer Julius Langbehn (the "Rembrandt German"), an anti-Semitic forerunner of the "conservative revolution."[13] To the dismay of the ultramontanes, Rome kept quiet for a long period of time. However, Pius X was more and more disturbed by the developments in Germany,[14] especially by indications that the reform efforts were gaining ground. One such symptom was the founding of a society in Münster in the spring of 1906 which was joined by an elite of Catholic laymen (such as several leaders of the Center Party) and pursued the goal of prompting the Holy See to change the Index procedures.[15] Another symptom was the support given to two bishops, about thirty seminary professors, and prominent laymen by a committee established for the purpose of erecting a memorial for Schell. After the Austrian theologian E. Commer had published an extremely aggressive book against Schell following his death, the Pope sent him a brief on 14 June 1907, praising him for the great service he had done for the Church. In this same brief, he charged the advocates of this memorial with "laboring under a misapprehension of the Catholic truth" and "resisting the authority of the Holy See."[16] The appointment of the former Dominican General Frühwirth as nuncio in Munich at the end of 1907 was to serve both as a bulwark against the feared progressing decline of Catholic Germany toward liberalism and as an introduction to a reevaluation of the situation.[17]

---

[12] The "literature controversy," as it was termed at that time, began with the pamphlet by C. Muth (1867–1944): "Steht die katholische Belletristik auf der Höhe der Zeit?" (1898). The main opponent in the other camp was the Austrian journal *Der Gral* (1906ff.), managed by R. von Kralik. Concerning the "literary controversy," see F. Rappmannsberger, "C. Muth und seine Zeitschrift Hochland als Vorkämpfer für die innere Erneuerung Deutschlands," (diss., Munich 1952); A. W. Hüffler, *C. Muth als Literaturkritiker* (Münster 1959); *LThK*^{2} V, 399–400, and VI, 1082; *StL*^{6} IV, 112–14.

[13] Regarding this lecture, see A. Gisler, op. cit., 150–53; H. Schiel, *ThQ* 137 (1957), 296–98; A. Donders, *Bischof Keppler* (Freiburg i. Br. 1935); Keppler's introduction to: M. Nissen, *Der Rembrandtdeutsche* (Freiburg 1926), 1–6, where Keppler speaks of terms coined by Langbehn "which I prefer not to see in our language today."

[14] Cf. below, pp. 477–79, and 500–7.

However, the turbulence and polemical controversies did not cease. They were even reignited through the disputes over the encyclical *Pascendi* and later over the antimodernist oath.[18] In 1909 the *Zwanzigstes Jahrhundert* was renamed *Das neue Jahrhundert* with the significant subtitle: *Organ der deutschen Modernisten.* After a few months, however, a change occurred under the leadership of Philipp Funk,[19] an idealistic young layman from the Catholic youth movement who was characterized by "a mixture of belligerence and religious inwardness" (Spörl). He turned away from the purely negative and polemical tendency of the journal, differentiating it sharply from French modernism and the Austrian Away-from-Rome movement and declaring that Reform Catholicism had to remain "a matter disputed *within the confines* of the Church."

---

[15] Concerning this Society for Christian Culture, whose arguments against the Index coincided with those that Cardinal Frings had carried through at the Second Vatican Council, see K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* VII (Cologne 1930), 187ff; A. ten Hompel, *Indexbewegung und Kulturgesellschaft* (Bonn 1908).

[16] Texts in A. Michelitsch, *Der neue Syllabus* (Graz 1908), 53–55. L. Pastor went so far as to say that the dedication of the memorial could become an occasion to convene a "council of reformers" (cf. *Tagebücher,* 461). Aside from Merkle, the members of the committee were, among others: Julius Bachem, H. C. Cardauns, A. Dyroff, E. Eichmann, H. Finke, F. X. Funk, H. Grauert, F. von Hügel, C. Muth, J. Sauer, J. Sickenberger, M. Spahn. The memorial is a marble bust with the inscription: *Vivas in Deo* (cf. K. Hennemann, *H. Schell im Lichte zeitgenössischer Urteile* [Paderborn 1909]).

[17] *Tagebücher* by L. von Pastor, 482 and 485. See also A. Walz, *Andreas Kardinal Frühwirth* (Vienna 1950), 304–05.

[18] Of the few Germans who openly professed Modernism, the following should be mentioned: J. Schnitzer (1859–1939), professor in Munich and author of remarkable works about Savonarola (cf. F. Heiler, "J. Schnitzer, ein Vorkämpfer des deutschen Reformkatholizismus," *Eine heilige Kirche* 21 [1939], 297–313); K. Gebert (1860–1910), a Neo-Kantian, president of the *Krausgesellschaft;* H. Koch (1869–1940), who rejected the dogma regarding the pope on the basis of his studies concerning Saint Cyprian (cf. *RGG*³ III, 1687); and mainly T. Engert (1875–1945), an exegete and student of Schell, who was in charge of the *Zwanzigste Jahrhundert;* in 1910, he converted to Protestantism (see *Gesammelte modernistische Vorträge* [Würzburg 1909–10]; cf. *DHGE* XV, 492–93).

[19] Regarding Philipp Funk, a former seminarian of the diocese of Rottenburg, after World War I member of the *Hochland* group and after 1926 professor of history at the University of Freiburg, see J. Spörl, *HJ* 57 (1937), 1–15, and A. Hagen, *Gestalten aus*

Of all the personalities involved in Reform Catholicism around 1910, one man stands out for his energetic, unique character and his fearless and unconditional advocacy of the truth: S. Merkle,[20] professor of Church history in Würzburg, whose lectures had incited conflicts between the boards of seminaries and the episcopal administration. In 1902 Cardinal Steinhuber had complained that most of the Munich "reformists" came from the ranks of Merkle's students.[21] Merkle was the pioneer of a new, more positive Catholic evaluation of Luther and the ecclesiastical enlightenment. His viewpoints had not been accepted amicably in ultramontane circles whose dismay climaxed in 1912 when he opposed their plans for an exclusively Catholic university, instead defending theological faculties incorporated into the state universities. One of his chief arguments for maintaining the faculties was that they contributed greatly to the preservation of religious peace in Germany, but the effect of the indignation stored up during the *Kulturkampf* intensified the denominational differences among the heirs of the Mainz faction. They felt strengthened in their convictions by the support Pius X had given the opponents of the interdenominational trade unions during the trade union controversy. Thus the political and social conflicts in Germany on the eve of World War I intersected with the controversies over Reform Catholicism, as had been the case several years before in France in the course of the modernist controversy.

---

dem Schwäbischen Katholizismus III (Stuttgart 1954), 244–83. He described his reform program in: *Das geistige Erbe von F. X. Kraus* (1912); *Von der Kirche des Geistes* (1913); *Der religiöse Schell* (1916). New subtitle of the journal: *Wochenschrift für religiöse Kultur.*

[20] Concerning Sebastian Merkle (1862–1945), who had gained prominence in the world of scholars through his edition of the records of the Council of Trent (I, 1901; II, 1911), cf. also H. Jedin, *ThQ* 130 (1950), 1–20, and A. Bigelmair, *Lebensläufe aus Franken* VI (Würzburg 1960), 418–35.

[21] *Tagebücher* of L. Pastor, 396.

CHAPTER 30

The Beginning of the Crisis in France

With justification Loisy wrote: "The *Histoire du modernisme* by Houtin rests on fiction: on the agreement of Duchesne's ideas about the early history of the Church conceived between 1881 and 1889 with my thoughts on the history of the Bible and Hébert's concepts of philosophy."[1] It is a matter of fact that there was initially no concentrated action, even on a purely national level. Rather, there existed various concepts that had spontaneously developed during the last years of Leo XIII's pontificate and were favored by the general atmosphere of reconciliation between the Church and modern society, a climate seemingly confirmed by several papal initiatives. The controversy over Americanism[2] had been in this respect symptomatic.

Influenced by Neo-Kantianism and believing to have found their ultimate master in Maurice Blondel, whose ideas were often falsified, philosophers strove to replace scholastic intellectualism with a doctrine that would include the forces of the heart and the actual processes of life. Some of them remained under the vague influence of a religious symbolism based on Schleiermacher, combined with the evolutionism of Hegelian or Spencerian inspiration. They declared that theology has to relinquish unalterable concepts and devise new interpretations in order to preserve contact with steadily progressing life. Philosopher Marcel Hébert,[3] priest and director of a large Paris college, joined this movement, which was strongly affected by A. Sabatier's work *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'àpres la psychologie et l'histoire* (1897), a book disseminating the concepts of German liberal Protestantism even in France.[4]

Parallel to this philosophical movement, publicized through the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne,* young theologians, familiarized by Duchesne with historical criticism, discovered that German non-Catholic scholars, applying the principles of historical criticism to the documents and history of the beginnings of Christianity, had called in question certain traditional interpretations, such as those pertaining to Moses' work, to the history of Israel's religion, to the teachings of

---

[1] *Mémoires* I, 535.—Regarding Duchesne, see chap. 22, n. 17.

[2] See above, chap. 24.

[3] Concerning Marcel Hébert (1851–1916), see A. Houtin, *M. Hébert* (Paris 1925), and A. Vidler, *A Variety . . . ,* 63–75.

[4] See some of the data provided in J. Fontaine, *Les infiltrations kantiennes et protestantes et le clergé française* (Paris 1902). The book is lacking in details.

Christ, and to life among the first Christian generations. From this arose the problem of the compatibility of Catholic belief with the results of modern exegetic scholarship. The encyclical *Providentissimus,* issued by Leo XIII in 1893,[5] had provided several principles for solving these problems, but certainly not all of them. The Pope's warnings against exaggerated criticism encouraged even the conservative forces to brand all attempts to apply the critical methods to inspired texts as thoroughly infested with rationalistic prejudices. Yet more and more exegetes upheld the conviction that the application of the critical method to this field was not sacrilege. On the contrary, intellectual righteousness and honesty demanded the application of the tested principles of historical method to studies of the Holy Scriptures, even at the risk of consequently having to change traditional postures in the controversies between believers and rationalists by making new fundamental distinctions between the (sometimes acceptable) literary and historical results of critical investigations and a conception of Israel's history and the origins of Christianity that would systematically erase the supernatural aspect.

From this perspective, Duchesne's student Alfred Loisy (1857–1940) devoted himself after 1883 to the study of the Old Testament and then the gospels, and M.-J. Lagrange founded in 1890 the École Biblique in Jerusalem, publishing two years later the *Revue biblique.* Lagrange confined himself to the world of experts and was intent on demonstrating the identity of his research results with the official doctrine of the Church (which did not prevent his critical appraisal by the conservatives and denunciation in Rome). Loisy and several of his collaborators, on the other hand, were less cautious. Convinced that Catholic apologetics, in view of the progress made by so-called "independent" criticism, had to completely revise its concepts, they did not hesitate to abrogate, even in popular journals, a great number of traditional doctrines. That even in 1896 an open-minded man such as Batiffol would speak of "superfluous intrepidities" and later of "intellectual anarchy," "agitating at this very moment the philosophical and scholarly elite of the French clergy,"[6] explains the anxiety of the ecclesiastical authorities, who, unfortunately, were hardly able to deal competently with the problems at hand.[7] In spite of his efforts not to impede the progress of the investigations, Leo XIII deemed it necessary to send a letter to the bishops of France warning them, among other things, of "the alarming tendencies attempting to invade the exegesis of the Bible."[8] This document incited the French Jesuit J. Fontaine to rebuke the "Protestant infiltrations" of the French clergy in a series of articles. He turned mainly against the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse,* founded in 1896 by Loisy, and against Loisy's articles concerning original revelation, the development of Israel's religion, or the development of dogma, published for the general public in the *Revue du clergé français.* Both the death of Cardinal Mazzella (1900), prefect of the Congregation of the Index and revered by the conservatives who were especially numerous and active in the Society of Jesus, and several interventions by the Pope (such as the one in favor of the bishop of Albi, Monsignor Mignot) caused a certain détente. This was shown through the creation of the Pontifical Biblical Commission at the end of the summer of 1901 (officially constituted in October 1902).[9] The appointment of the Franciscan Fr. Fleming as secretary of the commission, the first consultants, largely chosen from the ranks of the progressive exegetes, and the original plan to make the *Revue biblique* the public relations channel of the commission illustrate the constructive rather than repressive character of this initiative. However, this was merely the calm before the storm. Several weeks later a new intervention by Loisy rekindled the controversy even more violently.

---

[5] Regarding this document, the circumstances inititating it, and the reactions it caused, see chap. 23.

[6] Letter addressed to P. Lagrange, quoted in P. Fernessole, *Pie X* II (Paris 1953), 171; letter addressed to Chanoine of January 1901, quoted in *BLE* 67 (1966), 271. He added: "Like you, I have no sympathies for the curialists, the Mazzellas and *tutti quanti;* but don't Loisy and his friends, without intending to, work in the interest of those very same curialists?"

Loisy was a scholar of extraordinary intellectual prominence. Thoroughly informed and endowed with a penetrating critical mind, he was also a talented writer, possessing a very unique gift for words. Because of the encyclical *Providentissimus* he was forced to relinquish his chair at the Institut Catholique in Paris. He utilized the time afforded him through this suspension from office in transferring his research from technical exegesis to the more general problems posed by Holy Scriptures, investigating the divine truth and the value of the Church expressed and preserved therein. The French translation of Adolf Harnack's lectures on "The Essence of Christianity," published in 1902, gave him the opportunity to present a synthesis of the systems of Catholic apologetics that he had prepared shortly before. He promulgated this in a small book entitled *L'Évangile et l'Église* in November 1902; it caused more sensation and excitement in the world of religion than all but a few other books (F. Klein).

---

[7] The decree of the Holy Office of 13 January 1897 regarding the authenticity of the *Comma johanneum* (*ASS* 29 [1896–97], 637), which wanted to authoritively explain a question of text criticism, is a typical example of the attitude in the Roman circles.

[8] Encyclical *Depuis le jour* of 8 September 1899 (*ASS* 32 [1899–1900], 193–213). The year before, in the letter addressed to the general of the *Minderbrüder* on 25 November 1898 (*ASS* 31 [1898–99], 264–67), he expressed regret over "a daring and far too liberal form of interpretation" in the area of exegesis.

[9] See A. Loisy, *Mémoires* II, 84–90, and M.-J. Lagrange, *M. Loisy et le modernisme,* 119–35.

Like the famous Protestant historian Harnack, Loisy was convinced that the content of a critically interpreted Gospel and the various forms of historical Christianity were not necessarily identical. However, he wanted to prove that this disagreement was not a distortion, as claimed by the Protestants. Quite the contrary, the evolution of Catholicism, showed in three respects (institution, dogma, and cult), based inextricably in the authentic message of Jesus Christ, how this identity could be restored through history. However, this continuity differed fundamentally from that upheld by traditional apologetics.

Loisy was inspired by the thinking of the German eschatological school, revising their arguments in a novel way and declaring at length that it was not Jesus' intent to organize a new religious community to continue his work on this earth; rather, he endeavored to proclaim the impending establishment of the kingdom of heaven. However, things turned out differently than planned: "Jesus announced the coming of the kingdom and what transpired was the Church." Yet the Church sustained messianic hope, assuming the responsibility of nurturing and organizing this expectation, since the hour of salvation was a long time coming. From this adaptation of the term "kingdom" to the variable conditions of time and place, Loisy said, arose the successive formulations of Church dogmas, the development of its hierarchical institutions and the deployment of its sacramental rites. These experiences of the past show, Loisy added, that the essence of Christianity had to be seen in its evolution, not in a rigid core, as Harnack proposed. Consequently the future harbored the possibility, even the likelihood of new discoveries. Since the dogmas of the Church reflected "the general state of the knowledge of the times and the people who devised them," the conclusion was justified that a profound change in the state of scholarship could necessitate "a new interpretation of old rules," especially since it was obvious that "dogmas are not truths descending from heaven" but merely symbols of the eternal truth.

Those who were familiar with the difficulties which Loisy wanted to solve generally reacted positively to his theses: finally, here was someone to prove, on the basis of a strictly scientific method and in the face of the arrogant appraisals of liberal Protestants, that the Catholic Church was indeed the only legitimate fruit of the Gospel. Other readers objected primarily to the nonconformism of this new branch of apologetics, raising the question to what extent it was compatible with Catholic orthodoxy. They objected to many of his constructs, in spite of the various precautions which the author took to indicate rather than clearly define them. Thus praise was quickly infused with criticism and rejection, voiced not only by the conservatives, whose "strong language often concealed complete *ignoratio elenchi,*"[10] but also by open-minded experts such as Lagrange and especially Batiffol, who turned his Institut Catholique of Toulouse into a "stronghold of the struggle against modernism," contributing to the embitterment of this struggle for reasons as yet indiscernible.[11]

On 17 January 1903, pressured by Cardinal Perraud, Cardinal Richard, archbishop of Paris, condemned Loisy's work, claiming that it threatened "to confuse seriously the faithful's belief in the fundamental dogmas of the Catholic Church." However, the episcopate at large preferred, with four or five exceptions, not to take issue; so did Leo XIII. The atmosphere in Rome changed during the summer after the election of Pius X, who had anxiously observed the theological and exegetical dissent in France for a long time.

The controversy flared up again even more seriously in the fall, when Loisy published a new volume justifying the first book: *Autour d'un petit livre.* Loisy's main concern in this book was the liberation of Catholic historians from a tutelage that he called anachronistic, expressly confirming the autonomy of biblical criticism of theological doctrine. But this was not all. He stated with even more precision, contradicting the pretentions of classical apologetics, that Christ's divinity evades history; so does his resurrection, his conception by the Virgin, or any other personal intervention of God in the course of human affairs. According to Loisy, the subject of history is not the existence of the resurrected Christ, but solely the disciples' belief therein, a belief undergoing progressively precise definition. While suggesting differentiation between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith, he did not declare, in contrast to the assertions of his Catholic opponents, that faith deemed true what seemed to be false to the historian. Though he believed, on the one hand, that the impact of faith acting in Christian consciousness did not just mean a development of ecclesiastical institutions, but also an idealization of the person of Jesus Christ, he also held the notion, on the other hand, that this phenomenon of a collective consciousness and its objective basis are commensurable.

---

[10] J. Rivière, op. cit., 169. To be noted is the statement of É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique,* 291: "Though scientifically they were not prepared to solve the existing problems, theologically they were sufficiently informed to pinpoint them and to emphasize the seriousness of the differences of opinion."

[11] É. Poulat, op. cit., 363–92. Poulat even asked the question: "What part had the progressivist school [that is, the school of Batiffol and Lagrange] in the condemnation of Modernism?" (p. 366).

However, these declarations did not alleviate the anxieties; on the contrary, they intensified them; and this time, the little book encountered the almost unanimous opposition of the theologians and the episcopate. On the other hand, interventions in favor of Loisy were offered in Rome by Baron von Hügel, a long-time admirer, and by Monsignor Mignot, one of the few French prelates who conceded that it was absolutely essential to make room for these new critical methods in the framework of eccesiastical studies.[12] Nevertheless, on 16 December 1903, the Holy Office condemned Loisy's works, but used rather ambivalent terms apparently indicating that the Vatican still hesitated to get seriously involved. Shortly afterward, Loisy made known that he would submit. For three years, he held aloof from the controversies he had incited, but, in seclusion, he devoted himself to the preparation of his great commentary on the Synoptic Gospels (1907–8).

Later he declared repeatedly that he had lost faith in the divinity of Christ and even in the existence of a personal God long before the publication of *L'Évangile et L'Église,* but he had preferred to conceal his true opinions, hoping to initiate more successfully a reform of the Church from within, deeming it useful for humanity. His biography by Houtin,[13] who knew him well, seems to confirm his declaration at first glance. Houtin's text, unpublished for a long time, was edited by É. Poulat, some of whose discerning statements suggest that it was precisely the existence of this manuscript (of which Loisy knew more or less without ever having seen it) that partially explains the reconstruction of his religious development, which he wanted to promulgate a posteriori, after having abdicated all positive faith. This impairs the trustworthiness of the exegete's statements about the exact date when he ceased to believe, and it proves that many people were only too eager to believe his own explanations. In any case, the fragments of letters and his memoirs, published by R. de Boyer de Sainte-Suzanne under the title

---

[12] Concerning Friedrich Baron von Hügel, see chap. 31. Regarding Msgr. Mignot (1842–1918), see L. de Lacger, *Mgr. Mignot* (Paris 1933), to be supplemented by É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique,* 448–84, and by the letters recently published by M. Becamel in *BLE* 67 (1966), 3–44, 81–114, 170–94, 257–86; 69 (1968), 241–68; 71 (1970), 262–73.

[13] Concerning Albert Houtin (1867–1926), a priest and historian, progressively turning away from the Church and the Christian faith, who had published (in 1902) an ironical report entitled *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France au XIX*^{e} *siècle,* mercilessly exposing the weakness of the answers that rationalistic exegesis had been faced with before the appearance of Loisy and his school, see É. Poulat, op. cit., 332–63.—Regarding the question of the Bible under the pontificate of Leo XIII, cf. chap. 23.

Loisy entre la foi et l'incroyance, confirm his distance from Renan, whose scientistic rationalism he despised, or from Houtin, who was an evil spirit in many respects.[14] In 1900 Loisy already differentiated clearly between *foi* and *croyance,* between faith and belief. But today, progress in the sociology of religious cognition, in the theology of faith, and in hermeneutics enables us to understand the complex psychology of the modernists better than at the beginning of the century.

Whatever Loisy's personal opinions may have entailed, it is a matter of fact that he became the catalyst of the anxiety spreading among the Catholic intelligentsia and that his two "little books" and their condemnation incited a dispute which rippled outward after 1908 and extended far beyond France's borders. To the conservative theologians, Loisy appeared as a new Renan, perhaps worse; but his defenders called to mind the trial against Galileo, charging that a "Dreyfus Affair of the clergy" was in progress.

These revolutionary ideas found a resounding echo in certain intellectual groups, especially among the young clergy. They were fascinated by these suggestive concepts, fundamentally differing through their sensitivity toward the diversity of historical truths from the superficial character and the naivete of the "Lives of Jesus" and the stories about early Christianity available to the Catholic public. The (often misunderstood) thoughts of Newman concerning the development of the Christian doctrine and on the relationship between faith and reason, propagated at that time by Bremond[15] in France, seemed to them a guarantee—the guarantee of a cardinal—for the new apologetic path Loisy had described and for his less abstract conception of revelation. In addition, they had a presentiment of the entire terrifying implication of the assurance that the Gospel was no historical scripture in the true sense, but a document of a catechetic nature expressing the belief of the first Christian generations as it was trying to formulate itself. Their misgivings were compounded by the realization of some Christian democrats that, on the one hand, their efforts to integrate the Church into modern society were comparable to Loisy's work of restoration on the theological level, and that, on the other hand, his demands for the autonomy of the exegete or the historian of dogma from the ecclesiastical teachings paralleled their own demands for the autonomy of the laity and bourgeois society from the clerical autocracy. Symptomatic of this attitude was the weekly paper *Demain* of Lyon (1905/07), managed by two young laymen.

---

[14] Cf. É. Poulat, *Une œuvre clandestine d'H. Bremond,* 21–22: "In reality, Modernism was in the center of tendencies, the rights of which were represented by the progressivism of Msgr. Batiffol, P. Lagrange, P. Grandmaison, etc., and which encountered on the left the rationalism of men such as Turmel, Houtin, and Sartiaux. The continuous communication with Loisy of the latter two and the undifferentiated opposition of the former could cloak the depth and the significance of their differences, which were not always a matter of temperament."

[15] Between 1904 and 1906, he published three volumes of translated excerpts about the development of the dogma and the psychology of faith and *Newman, essai de biographie psychologique.* Concerning Henri Bremond (1865–1933), see *DSAM* I, 1928–38 *Entretiens sur H. Bremond,* ed. by J. Dagens, M. Nédoncelle (Paris, The Hague 1967), esp. 43–98; É. Poulat, *Une œuvre clandestine d'H. Bremond* (Rome 1972). Regarding his relations to the modernist movement, in addition to this last work, Loisy's opinion should be noted: "Bremond was not closely involved in the modernist struggle. He rather joined in the service of the Red Cross: he collected the dead bodies and attended to the wounded."

Many of Loisy's enthusiastic admirers thought like Bremond, who responded to the deluge of rationalistic criticism with the following words: "He is a true Noah, and the Church should be happy to possess his ark."[16] However, many were worried, and not only in the conservative camp, as was proven by the volume of letters compiled by R. Marlé. Many a progressive agreed with Loisy as to the need for an incisive revision of traditional Catholic apologetics and to a series of his critical conclusions. Yet they refused to agree to his radical idea of the total autonomy of criticism from ecclesiastical teachings and to question, as he did, the basic concept of orthodoxy. This was the case with Batiffol, for instance, who apparently just wanted to restore his reputation in Rome, and with Blondel, whose articles entitled *Histoire et dogme* emphasized the true concept of tradition in the Catholic system and still appear to be especially acute, even though Blondel shared the philosophers' usual difficulties of comprehending the problems of the historians and did not always understand the extent of the difficulties exposed by Loisy.

Even though Loisy was the focal point of the controversy animating the world of Catholic intellectuals in the first decades of the twentieth century, and even though it may be justified to call him "the father of modernism" (Heiler), the question of the Bible and dogmatic history were not the only areas at that time to incite fundamental controversies, which some considered indispensable to rescue what could be rescued of Christianity, while others believed that they would destroy the essence of the Christian faith as they understood it.

---

[16] H. Bremond, M. Blondel, *Correspondance* I, 494 (23 May 1904). Concerning this enthusiasm among the youth, see É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique,* 270–315, quoting the testimony of Msgr. E. Amann, etc.: *RevSR* 10(1930), 676–93, esp. 685. See also the report by M. Rifaux of 1906 about *Les conditions du retour au catholicisme* (Paris 1907); concerning this, see J. Rivière, op. cit., 258–61.

The controversies over Blondel's proposals at the end of the nineties regarding a renovation of apologetics by using the philosophical method of immanence (immanence apologetics) gradually subsided. One of his students, Lucien Laberthonnière,[17] revived these disputes and extended them to include the entire complex of the problem of religious cognition. In two collections of articles entitled *Essais de philosophie religieuse* (1903) and *Le réalisme chrétien et l'idéalisme grec* (1904), which Loisy called a work by "Maurice Blondel translated into French," Laberthonnière criticized the philosophy of "essences," intending to replace them in the name of a moral dogmatism with a philosophy of action and personal inspiration. At this point, he also discussed one of the fundamental questions raised by the modernists: the question regarding the originality and character of Christianity as a revealed historical religion. However, his conception of philosophy compelled him to subject Thomism, which he hardly knew, to a radical appraisal and to correlate the natural order and the supernatural so closely that it appeared as if he wanted to fuse them. He was also inspired by Blondel's critique of "extrinsicism," charging the Church with proceeding in too authoritarian a manner. He gave theologians adhering to tradition good reason to oppose him, especially when his influence began to grow (around 1905) after he had accepted the management (together with Blondel) of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*[18] and founded the *Association d'études religieuses,* an association which regularly brought together Christian philosophers and scholars open toward modern thought.

A member of this very group, Édouard Le Roy,[19] a mathematician, philosopher, and a student of Bergson, preoccupied with religious problems, incited one of the most passionate disputes of these troubled years between Catholic theologians and philosophers, "a real turmoil," according to Rivière. At the beginning of 1905, he published an article entitled "Qu'est-ce qu'un dogme?"[20] challenging philosophers and theologians to think about the impact that the dogmatic rules offered to the faithful by the Church may have on a modern scholarly mind. Once again he questioned the classical conception of the dogma, which he felt was related to the Scholastic philosophy inherited from the Middle Ages and to its static concept of an eternal truth. He stressed the radical incommensurability of the mysteries and the human spirit and suggested assigning to dogmas an essentially pragmatic significance. Consequently it would no longer be a matter of speculative conceptions to be forced upon us, but one of rules pertaining to ethical and religious actions. Presenting us with such dogmas, the Church would merely ask us to believe that the religious reality indeed contained the arguments for justifying the obligatory mental attitude. Outstanding thinkers such as the Jesuit de Grandmaison or the Dominicans Sertillanges and Allo showed understanding; but most theologians reacted adversely to this "pragmatism," taking it, in ignorance of Le Roy's constructs, merely as profound agnosticism. Therefore they vehemently opposed this trend, particularly since Le Roy did not conceal the fact that he considered a series of Loisy's conclusions to be certain, and moreover, since he did not hesitate, once again in the name of the demands posed by a modern attitude, to bring the traditional concept of the miracle and its apologetic significance up for debate.[21]

---

[17] Concerning Lucien Laberthonnière (1860–1932), Oratorian, see E. Castelli, *Laberthonnière* (Paris 1931); L. Passaglia, *Educazione religiosa e libertà umana in Laberthonnière. La formazione di un pensiero* (Milan 1967); T. Perrin, Le P. "Laberthonnière" (diss., Paris 1970); A. Ngindu, "Le problème de la connaissance religieuse dans la crise moderniste. L. Laberthonnière" (diss., Kinshasa 1972); *Laberthonnière. L'homme et l'œuvre,* ed. by P. Beillevert (Paris 1972).

[18] See the first article of the new series entitled *Notre programme* (vol. 151, 5–31).

[19] Concerning Edouard Le Roy (1870–1954), see *Études philosophiques* 10 (1955), 161–210, and T. Tshibangu, *Théologie positive et théologie spéculative* (Louvain, Léopoldville 1965), 250–67.

[20] In *La Quinzaine* 63 (1905), 495–526; resumed with significant additions in his book *Dogme et critique* (1907), providing a bibliography about the disputes caused by the article (pp. 359–63).

Thus within a few years, "the Tridentine peace of an entire Church world" (A. Dupront) was suddenly and almost simultaneously shaken in regard to a whole series of essential issues: the nature of revelation, the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and religious cognition, the person of Christ and his true role in the birth of the Church and its sacraments, the nature and role of oral tradition within the Catholic system, the limits of dogmatic development, the authority of ecclesiastical teachings and the true meaning of the term "orthodoxy," and the value of classical apologetics. Those were indeed serious questions calling for an answer. The answers provided by Loisy, Laberthonnière, and Le Roy contained acceptable and often leading elements, as was proven through the subsequent development of theology and certain initiatives taken by the Second Vatican Council. But these positive elements were not sufficiently thought through and often presented without the imperative detailed differentiations or with inappropriate vocabulary, causing the nonconformists to be confused and bewildered. Moreover, (especially in Loisy's case) sometimes truly ambiguous affirmations had to be dealt with, which could either be interpretated as erroneous and, in the final analysis, destructive to any Christian belief, or as being concerned with innovations, yet basically orthodox and really liberating in view of rather pertinent difficulties caused by the progress of religious studies. Those men defending the innovators believed that the latter had paved a promising path through obscurity, notwithstanding their rashness and their insufficient clarifications. Their opponents saw only the first possibility of interpretation and presumed that the ambiguous wording corresponded to the true thoughts of the authors. Their battle against these tendencies became increasingly fierce because the initial confusion turned more and more into blind panic. This panic had its origin in the ambiguous literature which was carrying the existing controversies (without clearly defined positions) into wider and wider circles. The consequences were devastating, especially among the clergy, who, because of very superficial training in the seminaries, were ill prepared to remain cool and whose increasing "outbursts" pleased the observers.[22] Considering that Church authorities at that time had to fend off particularly vehement anticlerical offensives and that the emergence of socialism gave impetus to the right wing to resist any kind of innovation, the almost all-embracing confusion of responsible Catholics can be better understood, especially since the opposition took on progressively international dimensions.

---

[21] *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* 153 (1906–07), 5–33, 166–91, 225–59.

---

[22] Above all, A. Houtin, whose book *La crise du clergé* (Paris 1907) was successful, as demonstrated by new editions and translations.

CHAPTER 31

The Crisis in England

In contrast to its manifestations in France and Italy, modernism in England displayed some unique characteristics. Even when the movement had reached its peak, the modernists there comprised a modest group;[1] this is also true if the term "modernism" is defined in the sense of abstract immanentist heresy used in the encyclical *Pascendi.* Such a condition was to be anticipated in a country where Catholics were in the minority, including, in turn, a small minority of intellectuals. Yet on the continent and particularly in Italy, British modernism, by virtue of its quality, exerted an influence disproportionate to its numerical strength.[2] If Loisy, on the one hand, deserves to be called the "father of Catholic modernism" due to his accomplishments in the area of exegesis and dogmatic history, the question arises whether Tyrrell does not deserve this title for his achievements in the area of fundamental theology and religious philosophy. On the other hand, all historians agree that von Hügel is the most prominent link between the modernists and the progressives of various countries and, at least at the beginning of the crisis, between the progressives and the ecclesiastical authorities. After all, again in contrast to French and, to a lesser extent, Italian modernism, no respected British modernist leaned toward an agnostic rationalism. The British modernists affirmed to the very end the definition Tyrrell, who has been more accurately appraised by recent scholars than by those of previous generations, had espoused in *Christianity at the Cross-Road:* "I understand a modernist to be a Christian of any denomination who is convinced that the essential truths of his religion and the essential truths of modern society can enter into a synthesis." At this point, the definition formulated by Maud Petre may be added: "Modernism is not only searching for a synthesis of modernity and religion, but also of modern religion and the Church."

---

[1] This does not mean that one should confine the movement to two or three people, which was often the case. M. Petre's remark (*Congrès d'histoire du christianisme* III, 233) is correct: "One must not believe that the faithful, who do not specifically deal with history and other disciplines, are always completely satisfied with the theological doctrine presented to them. Many secret struggles take place in their simple hearts. The doctrine and the Sacraments of the Church are indispensable means of spiritual life; yet, some find elements in this doctrine which offend their most noble feelings. These are the unassuming modernists."

The struggle for a synthesis between loyalty to the Catholic Church on the one hand, and the affirmation of modern culture and academic freedom on the other hand, had already in the sixties of the past century caused tensions within the core of British Catholicism, the so-called *Rambler* group; tensions that relaxed rather quickly, however. After a recess of about two decades, religious liberalism awakened again to new life under the pontificate of Leo XIII. In 1892 the Catholic journalist E. J. Dillon had begun to criticize the policies of the Roman Curia in the *Contemporary Review.* In 1896 Wilfrid Ward,[3] son of the pioneer of the strictest ultramontane movement, had founded the Synthetic Society in reaction to the ghetto mentality of his religious brothers, a society in which Catholics joined with Anglicans and Protestants. In 1897 F. von Hügel, highly respected in the British Catholic world, had presented to the international congress of scholars in Fribourg a report concerning the sources of the Hexateuch, essentially following Wellhausen's viewpoints. In the course of the next years, he succeeded in soliciting within his circle more and more disciples of Loisy,[4] with whom he communicated regularly by mail. The disputes over Americanism and later, at the beginning of 1900, the abdication of the Old-Catholic scholar St. George Mivart,[5] representing a moderate transformism within "Mivartism," and, finally, the turbulence created by all of this in the press were new indications of the emergence of a pro-reform attitude among certain Catholic circles. Hoping to seize control again, the bishops issued a joint pastoral letter dealing with "The Church and Catholic liberalism,"[6] proclaiming the defense of the Roman congregations and emphasizing the difference between the "teaching Church" and the "learning Church." The predominantly negative character of this document only increased anxieties,[7] in spite of an affirmative brief by the Pope.

---

[2] In addition, he had a rather remarkable influence on certain Anglican circles.

[3] Cf. above, p. 142.

[4] In 1903, "L'Évangile et l'Église" by P. Lucas, published in the Jesuit journal *The Month,* and W. Ward and Dom C. Butler in *The Tablet* were assessed positively. See also "Voces catholicae, The Abbé Loisy and the Catholic Reform Movement," *Contemporary Review* 83 (1903), 385–412.

A prominent figure among the progressive Catholics in England at the beginning of the twentieth century was Friedrich Baron von Hügel (1852–1925), about whom Maud Petre wrote: "He was not only a modernist, but an arch-modernist, and since he was certainly the pioneer of modernism in England . . . , he was the teacher of us all."[8] For a long time, Baron von Hügel was quite critically appraised by the Catholic historians for his unquestionable sympathy toward the fundamental tendencies of the emerging modernism and for the devoted support he gave for many years to its most prominent leaders, even the most compromised ones. For these efforts, Paul Sabatier called him "the lay bishop of the modernists." In the meantime, his well-deserved rehabilitation was in progress, and more and more he appeared to be one of the most illustrious religious personalities of his time. He always stood apart from the religious subjectivism of several of his friends and from their efforts to reduce religion to the human problem of the inner self.[9] He described his own ideal in a letter of May 1903: "Not only as simple a thing as honest scholarship, but also as complex, costly, and consoling a thing as honest scholarship must be lived and created in and with a sincere religion deeply anchored in history, and in and with a living Catholicism."[10] More understanding than original, he felt better than most how important it is to remain equally loyal to the demands of a tradition embodied in an ecclesiastical community and to the demands of a thoroughly honest rational criticism, knowing at the same time how necessary it is to witness in the depths of one's personality as a human being and as a devout Christian the tension between those two aspects, instead of striving for a close balance of the two. This openness toward all true values may have been the most characteristic feature of Baron von Hügel's rich personality. His concern not to lose any of these values explains his will never to destroy the bridges to and to preserve the bonds with even those who were in error, in his opinion, for their exclusive claims, but who deserved credit for having drawn attention to an aspect of reality or a real problem that should not be ignored.[11]

---

[5] Concerning this affair, see J. W. Gruber, *A Conscience in Conflict, the Life of St. G. J. Mivart* (New York 1960).

[6] Text of this "Joint Pastoral" of 22 December 1900: *The Tablet* 97 (1901), 8–12, 50–52.

[7] Regarding the reaction to the "Joint Pastoral," see M. Ward, op. cit., 134–43; M. Petre, *Autobiography and Life of G. Tyrrell* II, 146–61, and L. Barmann, op. cit., 149–53.

[8] *Congrès d'histoire du christianisme* III (Paris 1926), 227, 233.

[9] The best proof of this is his main work, *The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in St. Catherine of Genova and her Friends* (1908), which was written during the climax of the modernist crisis. It must be noted that W. Temple, in 1925, declared that this work "could be considered the most significant theological work written in the English language during the last half century" (quoted by M. de la Bedoyère, op. cit., 223).

[10] *Selected Letters,* 123.

Friedrich von Hügel was the son of an Austrian diplomat and a Scottish mother who lived in London after 1871. In his youth he overcame a severe spiritual crisis thanks to the aid of Abbé Huvelin, who gave him the guideline: "For you, nothing but the truth, never orthodoxy." Therefore, he was deeply concerned throughout his life with preserving the independence of scholarly research within the Church. This rationality did not prevent him from being deeply pious and invincibly loyal to the Church, because he believed life in the Church, administering the sacraments, to be an indispensable source of any truly religious life.[12] He was an autodidact, like many aristocrats of his generation. His religious education exceeded that of many clergymen. He combined German thoroughness with the English empirical method, thus becoming a forerunner of the "existentialist" thinkers of the following generation. He was no expert in any special field, but, rare at that time, he was equally competent in the area of biblical criticism, religious philosophy, and the history of spirituality. He also possessed the very special talent of shaking up spirits and souls, stimulating people, through restraining criticism as well as inspiring exhortation, to search sincerely for the truth. It is even more remarkable that he was able to utilize his complete fluency in the major international languages in the service of establishing constructive relations between exegetes, theologians, and philosophers searching for such truth in France, England, Germany, and Italy. For this purpose, he carried on an extensive correspondence and made frequent journeys to foreign countries. Many of these men stimulated von Hügel's thinking and became his best friends, while he, in turn, tried to help them with unequalled understanding, perspicacity, and sensitivity. He was not as erratic as many of them, looking for balance and rejecting radical concepts on principle. Thus he succeeded in evading condemnation,[13] probably assisted by his social rank. He did his best to defend his friends to the bitter end; he rejected the improper and often superficial criticism that some of his friends were exposed to by the conservative wing, and he felt the Vatican's authoritarian methods to be shocking to a religious person of the twentieth century.

---

[11] A letter, written after the crisis, reveals the intent of these efforts: "I try to do everything I can to make my old Church intellectually as acceptable as possible, not because reason is the most important thing in religion, but rather because my old Church already possesses all the knowledge necessary to guide spiritual life; while, for reasons that would fill a whole volume, it is less equipped to deal with the needs, the rights, and the duties of rational life. This second aspect of my ambition includes the ardent desire and sincere hope to serve the wounded and embittered Catholics who have fallen or are about to fall away from the faith, to dress their wounds and return them to the fold of the Church" (*Letters to a Niece,* no. 60, of 9 December 1921).

[12] "No book is worthy of such a sacrifice as that of the Sacraments of the Church," he told Miss Petre one day.

George Tyrrell (1861–1909) was a respected preacher and spiritual leader, author of devotional books of rare sensitivity and writer of apologetic essays reflecting in a remarkable way the attitude of his contemporaries; perhaps he would have adhered to this line of activities throughout his life had he not met von Hügel. Mainly through his influence he became familiar with biblical criticism and Neo-Kantian philosophy. Having turned to these pursuits, he began questioning a series of essential theses of fundamental theology. In this regard, as Bremond perceived correctly, one must not overlook the influence that was exerted upon Tyrrell by the English liberal Protestants of the nineteenth century, particularly by M. Arnold. Tyrrell was of Irish descent. To his Celtic temperament he owed the critical spirit that occasionally played tricks on him, but also endowed him with the astonishing capability of investigating the secret depths of the suprarational forces nurturing religious experience. At the age of eighteen he converted from the Anglican to the Catholic Church, joined the Society of Jesus, and, in 1896, was assigned to the editorial staff of *The Month.* Soon he was one of the best-known collaborators of this journal.[14] Two prayer books, *Nova et Vetera* (1897) and *Hard Sayings* (1898), establishing his friendship with Baron von Hügel, and a collection of spiritual lectures given to the students of Oxford, "External Religion, its Use and Abuse" (1899), established him as a writer. But precisely at that time he encountered difficulties with ecclesiastical censorship. Tyrrell, overly sensitive and irritable by nature, even more irritable because of the first symptoms of Bright's disease, of which he eventually died, was highly incensed by the narrow-minded limitations imposed upon his intellectual pursuits. Consequently, he began to doubt the authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The extensive reform movement developing on the continent inspired him in his questioning. At the same time, other matters entered into his awareness: the all-too-frequent identification of the Catholic faith with its medieval forms of expression, the unique character of the individual's approach to truth, including religious truth, and, finally, the contrast between the static conception of dogma espoused by the Scholastics and the significance of the development of Christian doctrine in the context of history, all of which he had been exposed to through new books. From then on he was of the opinion that the classical concepts of the *depositum fidei,* the inspiration of the Bible, and revelation had to be analysed from an entirely new perspective, placing emphasis on the mystical element of religion. With moderate restraint, he tried to prove that Christ did not appear as a teacher of orthodoxy and that Catholic theologians were mistaken when they considered faith to be a spiritual affirmation of the historical and metaphysical assurances given by a theology that was apparently revealed and miraculously saved from error; dogma was merely a human attempt to express the divine force within man in intellectual formulations. Under the pseudonym E. Engel, he promulgated these ideas in a brochure entitled *Religion as a Factor of Life* (1902), dedicating it to a friend with the words: "Something that preserves the strength of my faith under the rubble of my orthodoxy."[15] A year later, under another pseudonym (Hilaire Bourdon), he published a more extensive book, the most radical of all his works, *The Church and the Future.* In it he opposed the system of despotic authority concentrated in the Roman Curia and the conception of the Church as an official institute of truth; according to him, the Church must be seen as nothing more than a "school of divine love on this earth" and its only task is continually to translate the inspirations, which the divine life effects in the hearts of its members, into new temporary rules. These publications found wide response in the modernist circles of France and Italy. At first, Tyrrell was left alone. However, one day in 1906, when it became known through the indiscretion of the press that he was also the author of an anonymous brochure in which he had espoused similar ideas,[16] he was expelled from the Jesuits. *Lex credendi* (1906) and *Through Scylla and Charybdis*

---

[13] Except for an indirect reprimand for a secondary affair, which was not justified, (cf. M. de la Bedoyere, op. cit., 191). Regarding von Hügel's attitude toward the ecclesiastical authorities on the eve of *Pascendi,* see his letters to Tyrrell and Loisy, analyzed in ibid., 188–89. Concerning his attitude in 1907, see L. Barmann, op. cit., 183–209.

[14] In *The Month* he published thirty-nine articles in seven years. Some of them are compiled in a book entitled *The Faith of the Millions* (2 vols., 1901). The title refers to Tyrrell's concern not to confine himself to the problems of an intellectual elite, as did the modernists in many cases, but rather to reevaluate the problem of faith, facing the masses of the Christian population.

---

[15] *Lettres de G. Tyrrell à H. Bremond,* 129.

[16] *A Letter to a University Professor* (1904), reprinted by Tyrrell in 1906 under the title *A Much-Abused Letter,* with an introduction and footnotes.

(1907), two works which he published in the following months in an effort to find a middle way between the extreme dogmaticism of the theologians and the all-too-human pragmatism of certain philosophers, did not contain anything particularly subversive; in fact, the former was praised in a review in the *Month.* His vehement protests against the encyclical *Pascendi,* published in the national press, and his opposition to the inquisitorial attitude expressed therein resulted directly in his excommunication. A few months later, Cardinal Mercier called him the typical representative of philosophical and theological modernism branded in the encyclical. Tyrrell responded with a small book entitled *Medievalism* (1908), sharply criticizing papal absolutism and traditional Catholicism.[17] At the same time, he intensified his communication with the modernists of the continent, above all in Italy, where he had numerous admirers, trying to organize a "strong force of excommunicants who were to form a living protest against the papacy."[18] But the submission of the majority and the inclination of most others toward a socialist humanitarianism or toward an immanentist rationalism were bitter disappointments to him. Moreover, his progressing disease deprived him of the ability to continue to play an active role. On 15 July 1909, death prematurely concluded the tragic career of a man who was for many years one of the most promising figures of British Catholicism.[19]

In spite of his narrow-mindedness toward spiritual problems, Cardinal Bourne (after 1903 bishop of Westminster) avoided dramatizing the modernist danger. For a long time he declined to oppose Tyrrell. He supported the modern orientation that Wilfrid Ward tried to give the *Dublin Review,* protected several Catholic thinkers who had been denounced by people suspecting heretics in every corner, and helped prevent a condemnation of von Hügel. As was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, modernism in England involved but a small segment of the Catholic public. This is proven, for instance, by the lack of journals modernistic in nature or at least somewhat open to modernist interests. There is no reason to believe that modernism in Britain died with Tyrrell. Maud Petre,[20] devotedly caring for Tyrrell in the last years of his life, was not the only one to refuse to take the antimodernist oath demanded by the bishop and continued her opposition, even though she was denied the sacraments in her diocese. How important the number of allies was is demonstrated by the fact that A. Vidler was capable of devoting a whole chapter of his book on the modernists to the "Lesser Lights and Fellow Travellers."[21] He drew attention to the generally little-known case of the famous scholar Edmund Bishop,[22] who, like von Hügel, always remained a loyal and devout Catholic. But in 1908 he wrote to von Hügel: "I was a modernist even before modernism," confirming once again how historically ill-defined the concept of modernism really is.

---

[17] Regarding the emotions under the influence of which he wrote this work in only a few weeks (it had a sensational success: four editions and one translation into French), see G. Daly, *The Month* 228 (1969), 15–22. His less aggressive work, completed shortly before his death (*Christianity at the Cross-Road*), seems to confirm, no matter what Rivière may say about it, that he remained closer to Catholicism (particularly from the perspective of the Second Vatican Council) than was often declared (see, for example, M. Nédoncelle, op. cit., 22–23). Regarding the book and its modernist leaning, see, in opposition, A. Kolping, *ThRv* 59 (1963), 1–8.

[18] Letter to Buonaiuti of 23 April 1908, quoted in id., *Le modernisme catholique,* 144.

[19] His funeral caused an incident that has become famous in the history of antimodernist reaction. After his friend, Abbé Bremond, said a liturgical prayer at his grave site, he was immediately punished with a *suspension a divinis,* which was not annulled until after exhaustive negotiations (see M. Petre, *Autobiography and Life* II, 420–46; M. de la Bedoyère, op. cit., 231–33; *Lettres de G. Tyrrell à H. Bremond,* 302–15; *Correspondence Blondel-Valensin* II, 73–92; A. Loisy, *G. Tyrrell et H. Bremond* [Paris 1936], 1–46).

---

[20] Concerning Maud Petre (1861–1942), see J. A. Walker, *The Hibbert Journal* 41 (1943), 340–46, and *Lettres de G. Tyrrell à H. Bremond* (index).

[21] *A Variety . . .* , 153–90.

[22] Regarding Edmund Bishop (1846–1917), see N. Abercrombie, *The Life and Work of E. Bishop* (London 1959), and A. Vidler, *A Variety . . .* , 134–52.

CHAPTER 32

The Crisis in Italy

The restoration of the world of Catholic intellectuals in Italy around the beginning of the twentieth century proved to be more urgent than the one in France. Caused by the timid, negative attitude of the intransigents toward the liberal revolution, the cultural stagnation had left a void; on the other hand, a longing for greater intellectual freedom that gradually developed in the course of two generations could be felt among those persuaded to defend the new cause. The first indications of such awakening became visible during the last few years of Leo XIII's pontificate. This awakening was accelerated by various foreign influences: by exegetical publications in France and through Tyrrell's works, whose impact in Italy was much stronger than that of Loisy; by the personal impact of Monsignor Duchesne, who had settled in Rome in 1895; and above all by Baron von Hügel, who often sojourned in Italy. For too long the originality of this restoration movement, contemptuously called a "by-product" by Rivière, was belittled. The conclusions of recent research and the publication of documents, both of which greatly increased in the last decade, have illuminated the unique characteristics of Italian modernism. Firstly: this modernism rested in a long tradition which followed the *risorgimento* and stood for political liberation and religious reform. Two aspects of this tradition have particular significance: the desire for liberation from ecclesiastical tutelage, felt to be more oppressive in Italy than elsewhere, and an effort to present the Church as a community of the faithful, replacing the traditional concept that was oriented toward the hierarchy. Secondly: the French modernists were mainly interested in bringing ecclesiastical studies up to par by attempting to find solutions to the new problems that had emerged from the development of religious studies. Italian modernism, however, was characterized by extensive efforts to propagate the new discoveries among the masses, which partially explains why the contacts between the modernists and the Christian Democrats were closer there than in France. There is another difference: while the French modernists put the emphasis on reason, serving as a guideline for the modern academic culture, many Italian modernists were rather fascinated by the mystery of the charismatic Church and inspired by the ardent desire to return to original Christianity.

Within the Italian reform movement, developing in the first years of the twentieth century, roughly three tendencies can be distinguished: 1) young priests and friars, especially numerous in central Italy, tried to bring ecclesiastical studies up to date: 2) fanatics trained in the ranks of the intransigent *Opera dei congressi* realized the practical shortcomings of this movement and its ideological limits and tried to overcome them by developing the cultural foundations of a true Christian democracy; 3) against this movement, several young laymen, mainly from Lombardy, joined the liberal and national trends, trying to forge a link between Catholicism and the tendencies of the modern world.

Within the first group, scriptural studies were (for the most part) represented by three individuals: Giovanni Genocchi[1] and Umberto Fracassini,[2] two brilliant Catholic scholars, whose great intellectual open-mindedness was coupled with strict loyalty to the Church, and

---

[1] Regarding Giovanni Genocchi (1860–1926) of Ravenna, superior of the Roman procurature of the Missionaries of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, in spite of his progressive viewpoints in the field of exegetics highly respected by Pius X, see V. Ceresi, *Padre Genocchi* (Vatican City 1934).

[2] Regarding Umberto Fracassini (1862–1950), superior of the Seminary of Perugia, from which he was recalled in 1907 under suspicion of dangerous doctrinary attitudes (after he had been appointed consultant of the Bible Commission in 1903), see *DHGE* XVII, 1367–69, and C. Pizzoni, *Vangelo, Chiesa, Civilta nel pensiero di Mons. U. Fracassini* (Perugia 1963).

Salvatore Minocchi,[3] a young, courageous priest, who did not intend, however, a reform to exceed the framework of the Catholic system. One of his contemporaries said about him: "This man has something of Danton within him, moderated through ecclesiastical expedience and Italian smoothness." In 1901, in Florence, Minocchi had founded a journal entitled *Studi religiosi,* whose subtitle precisely defined the program: *Rivista critica e storica promotrice della cultura religiosa.* This journal offered space to all ecclesiastical studies, including religious philosophy, but the main portion was reserved for scriptural studies. Without question, the journal often merely translated eloquently the thoughts of Loisy, Lagrange, von Harnack, Houtin, Tyrrell, Blondel, Laberthonnière, and Le Roy, sometimes elaborating upon them. However, Minocchi possessed the art of indulgently making allowances for the sensitivities of the guardians of orthodoxy, while also stressing that readers of his reviews of new books contemplate the insufficient solidity of numerous traditional positions. In spite of the criticism voiced by the *Civiltà cattolica,* Minocchi's journal soon became the center of the enlightened and progressive young priests.

One of them was Ernesto Buonaiuti,[4] a brilliant mind, endowed with extensive knowledge and possessing an extraordinary gift for assimilation besides. He was to become the most outstanding figure of Italian modernism.[5] In 1905, Buonaiuti published, directly in Rome, a similar journal, the *Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teologiche.* Apparently, its purpose was to take a *via media,* a middle-of-the-road between the progressivism of the *Studi religiosi* and the conservatism of the *Civiltà cattolica,* providing more room for scholarly erudition. However, in reality, the young, eminently dynamic editor strove for leadership of the entire Italian reform movement. Emphasis was primarily placed on the history of dogma and of the Church, rather than the question of Scripture.

---

[3] Regarding Salvatore Minocchi (1869–1943), professor of Hebrew language and literature at the universities of Florence (1901–9) and Pisa, who left the Church in 1908, see A. Agnoletto, *S. Minocchi. Vita e opera* (Brescia 1964).

[4] Regarding Ernesto Buonaiuti (1881–1946), professor of Church history at the Roman Seminary, from which he was recalled in 1906, leader of the resistance against antimodernism, due to his diplomatic skills able to remain in the Church until 1926 (in spite of two excommunications in 1921 and 1924), held the chair for the history of Christianity at the University of Rome from 1915 until 1926, see, in addition to his autobiography entitled *Pellegrino di Roma* (1945), the two studies by V. Vinay, *E. Buonaiuti e l'Italia religiosa del suo tempo* (Rome 1956; amicable; biblio.), and D. Grasso, *Il cristianesimo di E. Buonaiuti* (Brescia 1953; hostile), to be supplemented by P. Scoppola, op. cit. See also M. Ravà, *Bibliografia degli scritti di E. Buonaiuti* (Florence 1951); E. Buonaiuti, *Die exkommunizierte Kirche,* ed. and introduced by E. Benz (Zurich 1966), esp. about the relation to the *Eranos* circle, 43–52; F. Parente, *E. Buonaiuti* (Rome 1971; biblio.); F. Margiotta, Broglio, "E. Buonaiuti," *Storia contemporanea* 2 (1971), 803–23.

[5] The most prominent, but not the most typical figure of modernism after P. Scoppola, who (op. cit., chap. 6) expressly mentions the fact that Buonaiuti found himself quickly isolated in the modernist movement due to his leaning toward radicalism. The main advocates of modernism were reformists with often quite independent attitudes, who considered a denial of their affirmation of the Catholic dogma out of the question.

One of the leading collaborators of Minocchi and Buonaiuti deserves mention: Giovanni Semeria,[6] an extraordinarily gifted friar, whom Cardinal Siri today considers the "best instrument to preserve the faith in the bourgeoisie of Genoa," even though Semeria was branded by his contemporaries as one of the leaders of Italian modernism.[7] Close to Baron von Hügel and several personalities of the academic world in foreign countries, he played an important mediating role in the field of the early history of Christianity as well as in religious philosophy, since he was more successful than most in assimilating the results of contemporary research and in presenting them in a series of brilliant lectures, immediately published in book form, to the general public.

Disregarding the different viewpoints and levels of education, we surprisingly find in all these agents of the intellectual renewal of Italian Catholicism one common and apostolic concern, which distinguished them from similarly inclined Frenchmen, who appeared rather to be bookworms. The Italian modernists were less interested in competing with Protestant or rationalistic scholarship, but rather in improving the religious education of the average Catholic, knowing full well that the lack of religious education was the cause of the superficiality of Italian religiosity.

Similar concerns of a cultural nature are visible in one of the most prominent figures of Italian modernism, in the young democratic priest

---

[6] Regarding Giovanni Semeria (1867–1931), Barnabite, talented apologist, famous preacher and speaker, received in Belgium by Cardinal Mercier in 1912 when the antimodernist reaction forced him to leave Italy, who devoted the last part of his life to the care of war orphans, see, in addition to his memoirs (above), E. Vercesi, *Padre Semeria servo degli orfani* (Amatrice 1932); F. Sala, *Padre Semeria, barnabita* (Turin 1941); A. Schenardi, "Un orateur sacré au XXe siècle, le P. Semeria" (unpubl. diss., Paris 1957); V. Lupo, "L'itinerario spirituale di P. Semeria," *Humanitas* 23 (1968), 610–34, 702–32; E. Passerin d'Entrèves, *Storia contemporanea* 2 (1971), 825–42; the extensive introduction by A. Gambro in his *Saggi clandestini,* ed. by C. Argenta (Alba 1967), and the bio-bibliography by V. Colciago, ibid. II, 371–500.

[7] One day, Pius X charged him with having abused his outstanding talents "by writing books that do not agree with the doctrine of the Church." When he responded that he did so in order to make religion more accessible, the Pope replied: "You enlarge the gates in order to bring in those who are outside, driving out those who are inside" (*Positio super virtutibus* [Vatican City 1949], 256.)

Romolo Murri.[8] He joined the modernist movement rather late, and his membership was simply a transitional episode in his stormy career.[9] He started in the *Opera dei congressi,* where those antiliberal Catholics assembled who longed for a society of theocratic character. Murri was not very interested in the tendencies that inspired Minocchi, Buonaiuti, and their friends; however, he was convinced that the lack of intellectual maturity disabled the Italian Catholics and, above all, the members of the clergy in dealing effectively with the problems confronting the Christian in regard to the activities of his public life. In his journal published after 1898, pretentiously entitled *Cultura sociale,* he was already extending the democratic movement to all areas of thought. He also adopted the premature conclusions of religious criticism in order to be able to preach, surrounded by the halo of a prophetic message, the spiritual and religious renovation of a Catholicism reconciled with the modern world in the worship of freedom.[10] In a famous lecture, given on 24 August 1902 in San Marino, he treated the topic "Freedom and Christianity," invoking the work of Tyrrell, Ehrhard, and Mignot, as well as the rejuvenation of exegesis and historical research, dreaming of a "great liberation." By "returning to the Gospel," Catholicism was to be liberated from all its obsolete elements: "from the warmed-over semiheathen customs, from the juridic concepts derived from Roman Law, from the decadent monastic institutions that are incapable of rejuvenation, and from the abstract categories that kill like the letter of the law."[11] Thus, his orientation intensified in proportion to the development of his social and political activities and gradually merged with an atmosphere of total intellectual and disciplinary freedom outside of the control of the hierarchical authority. His ideas attracted a number of priests who demanded more or less radical reforms in the Church, e.g., reduction of the number of dioceses, modification of the Index procedures, reform of the seminaries and traditional apostolate methods, suspension of sacerdotal celibacy, etc.[12] The progressing development of a simple reform movement in the direction of a so-called "social modernism" finally compelled many to proclaim, at first rather awkwardly, the "autonomy of the temporal realm," as it is called today. Yet they later considered religion a problem of the inner self, so to speak, and the Church a civilizing and morally progressive factor rather than an institution of supranatural salvation. These ideas were also espoused by the group of the *Socialismo cattolico,* founded by G. Quadrotta and F. Perroni, to whom Buonaiuti lent his support after the promulgation of the encyclical *Pascendi.*[13]

---

[8] Concerning him, see chaps. 5 and 34. Regarding his relations to the modernist movement, see the two works (biblio., chap. 32) by Guasco and Bedeschi, in addition P. Scoppola, op. cit., 133–62, 249–60.

[9] This point was clearly made by M. Guasco, op. cit.

[10] His most outstanding articles were published in book form: *Battaglie d'oggi,* 4 vols. (Rome 1901–04). Above all, see vol. II.

[11] Text in *Il Domani d'Italia,* no. 35 (31 August 1902), and in F. Magri, *L'azione cattolica in Italia* I (Milan 1953), 184–90. It should be noted that Murri adhered to Thomism throughout his development. Thomism was brought into discredit by all those who more or less professed the modernist movement (this was emphasized by P. Scoppola, op. cit., 155–62).

[12] For example, D. Battaini, who published for the German-speaking part of Switzerland a pioneering paper: *Cultura moderna.* This reformist trend can also be found among

Fundamentally different in origin was the group of reformists from Lombardy, the heirs of liberal Catholicism from the period of the *risorgimento.* Among them were men of action, such as the promoters of the *Opera Bonomelli,* a charitable institution for Italian emigrant workers. These men did not exercise as much restraint as the old bishop whose patronage they enjoyed. But most of the disciples of this group were intellectual laymen, passionately interested in religious problems, rare in Italy at that time. Most attractive to the general public was Antonio Fogazzaro,[14] a brilliant writer full of mystical idealism, who stood in close contact with Semeria, Genocchi, and von Hügel, and was a great admirer of Loisy, Blondel, and Tyrrell, but also strongly influenced by Rosmini and his ideals of a religious reform movement as described in his book *Cinque piaghe della Chiesa.* Fogazzaro was also interested in coordinating Darwin's theory of evolution with Catholic dogma. In 1905 he published the novel *Il Santo,* whose hero appointed himself the apostle of a reform based on the spirit of love, love that was to permeate all areas of religious and social life. This novel contains numerous remarks about the nature of religious feeling, about the role of the priest, about the true Christian spirit, and the formalism of Catholic worship. However, the climax of this work is a long discourse on reform, addressed to the Pope, in which the four evil spirits, having invaded the Church, were branded: the spirit of dishonesty, closing his eyes to the light of modern scholarship and indicting the best defenders of the truth; the spirit of omnipotent power, changing paternal authority into a

---

some laymen; e.g., in the Neapolitan lawyer G. Avolia, director of the journal *Battaglie d'oggi,* who finally preached a "lay priesthood" in the perspective of Christian socialism (cf. É. Poulat, *Journal d'un prêtre d'après-demain* [Tournai, Paris 1961], 131–37).

[13] Regarding this group, the mouthpieces of which were the journals *Nova et Vetera* (1908) and *Cultura contemporanea* (1909–13), see P. Scoppola, op. cit., 261–326.

[14] Regarding Antonio Fogazzaro (1842–1911), poet and writer, who, in 1873, reading Gratrys, converted, and was senator after 1896 (in spite of the *non expedit*), see, in addition to the work by O. Morra, op. cit., T. Gallarati-Scotti, *La vita di A. Fogazzaro* (Milan 1920, ^{3}1963); P. Nardi, *A. Fogazzaro* (Milan 1938); L. M. Personè, *Nuova antologia* 481 (1961), 327–44; *DHGE* XVII, 696–700.

terrible dictatorship; the spirit of avarice, a mockery of evangelical poverty; and, finally, the spirit of rigid adherence to tradition, fearing any kind of progress and driving the Jewish rabbis to reject and condemn Jesus. (This comparison was made by Tyrrell.) The novel became a great success and was translated into several languages. However, it also led to violent controversies.

Less spectacular, but more profound, was the effect of the journal *Il Rinnovamento.* It was founded at the beginning of 1907 by a few young Milanese encouraged by Fogazzaro and Semeria.[15] One of its main patrons, Stefano Jacini, was in close contact with the forerunners of German Reform Catholicism. He was especially interested in liberal Protestantism, particularly in Eucken and Troeltsch. The journal emphasized the primacy of conscience over external authority, without negating the rights of the latter.[16] In addition, it promoted freedom of scholarly research and the position of the laity in the life of the Church. Following post-Kantian philosophy, it stressed the significance of subjectivity, which was badly neglected by Scholastic thinking. True to liberal traditions, it espoused a new conception of the relations between Church and state in reaction to the "confusionism" of the previous centuries. The staff of the journal tried to extricate the values of secular education from all areas and to give them practical applications in the fields of philosophy, history, research methods, and law. At the same time, its publishers attempted to awaken interest in religious problem, since most intellectuals of that time found religious indifferentism to be a matter of course. Though being as open-minded as possible toward the contemporary trends and the solid accomplishments of religious studies, these intellectuals were nonetheless to remain loyal sons of the Roman Catholic Church, forming, so to speak, a "third" party, that felt its way around between the incomprehension of the integralists and the exaggerations of the radicals. As part of the latter, the group of young idealistic philosophers from Lugano, led by G. Rensi, deserves special mention. Their journal was the *Coenobium,* founded in 1906.

As in France, the ideas proclaimed by the leaders of the movement to renovate ecclesiastical studies found a positive response among the young clergy in Italy. Around 1906 it often happened in central Italian seminaries that when a priest was ordained, not only were works by Semeria and Lagrange chosen as gifts, but also those of Loisy and Tyrrell.[17] Since the hierarchy in Italy was even less equipped than that in France to effectively deal with contemporary problems (in Italy, there was not a single prelate who could be compared to Mignot), their confusion was even greater. And as always in such cases, reaction raged against everything that deviated in the slightest from the traditional paths, that is, against the moderates as well as against the radicals. Even a man so above suspicion as Francesco Lanzoni[18] became the target of allegations and denunciations simply because he wanted to apply the principles of historical criticism to the study of hagiography. The moderates, mostly loyal followers of the Church, submitted quietly; the more progressive, however, tried to organize resistance. To that end, they attempted to unify, both outwardly and inwardly, the movement that aimed at cultural and religious renovation, to give it a unity it was largely lacking, as we have already seen. For the purpose of such unification, Murri, Buonaiuti, and Fracassini called a meeting in the summer of 1907 in Molveno, that was also attended by Baron von Hügel.[19] A week later, the encyclical *Pascendi* was issued; it forced the group to attempt to coalesce its divergent opinions and concepts, resulting in its dispersal.

---

[15] Regarding this amicable and at the same time reserved attitude of Msgr. Bonomelli, see F. Fonzi, *RStRis* 56 (1969), 188–92, 220–22.

[16] The subsequent behavior of the editorial staff on the occasion of the strict disapproval of the prefect of the Congregation of the Index in May 1907 is typical. See the commentary by P. Scoppola, op. cit., 212–20.

---

[17] M. Guasco, *Fermenti nei seminari del primo '900* (Bologna 1971), 178–79.

[18] Regarding Francesco Lanzoni (1863–1929), rector of the Seminary of Faenza from 1890–1917, author of numerous local hagiographical studies and a fundamental work about *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del sec. VII* (Rome 1927), see the collection of articles *Nel centenario della nascita di mons* (Faenza 1964), and L. Bedeschi, *Lineamenti dell'antimodernismo. Il caso Lanzoni* (Parma 1970).

[19] Regarding this meeting, which has been a secretive affair for a long time and was often incorrectly seen as a sort of council of European modernism, see P. Scoppola, op. cit., 235–44, and L. Bedeschi, *Humanitas* 24 (1969), 658–77; 25 (1970), 482–91.

CHAPTER 33

Intervention of Ecclesiastical Authority and the Integralist Reaction

Roman Intervention

The solemn condemnation of modernism did not take place until 1907. However, there were plenty of indications of the impending papal ban. During the first months of the pontificate, on 13 December 1903, Loisy's main works were put on the Index. Some months later, the encyclicals *Ad diem illum* (2 February 1904) and *Iucunda sane accidit* (12 March 1904) urgently warned against the *novarum rerum molitores,* who, with great scholarly efforts, questioned the history of early Christianity.

In December of the same year, the Pope admonished the bishops to practice uncompromising severity toward seminarians with overly liberal attitudes who lacked the proper respect for the scholarly efforts made "by our great teachers, Church Fathers, and interpreters of revealed doctrine."[1] Similar warnings were contained in a letter, addressed to the rector of the Institut Catholique in Paris at the beginning of the following year,[2] and in a lecture to the students of the French Seminary in Rome[3] containing a rather overt reference to Loisy. In the fall of 1904 two excellent exegetes, Father Genocchi of the Roman Seminary and Father Gismondi of the Gregoriana, were replaced by two professors who fundamentally rejected the application of critical methods to the text of the Holy Scriptures. One of them, Father A. Delattre, had just sharply criticized Father Lagrange and the "new exegetical school." In August 1905 Father Fleming was replaced as secretary of the Biblical Commission by Dom L. Jannsen, a scholastic theologian who did not possess specific competency in the field of exegesis, and overtly conservative consultants were appointed, eliminating the original balance between the various factions. The consequences of these changes were soon noticeable. While the first two reports of the commission regarding actual sayings in the Bible (13 February 1905) and biblical stories that only seemed to be historical (23 June 1905) handled the problem with moderation,[4] the subsequent conclusions regarding the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch (27 June 1906) and the Johannine authenticity of the fourth Gospel were much more reactionary in nature.[5] Both schools, even in Rome, negated each other, because one recommended tolerance and patience in order not to discard the wheat with the chaff, while the other was uncompromising, focusing on the most radical viewpoints. This school more or less enjoyed the trust of the Pope, especially since the imprudence of many of the Italians who disseminated the new ideas had led him to believe that orthodoxy, for which he carried the responsibility, was seriously threatened, even though he had to admit that, in the field of exegesis, circumspective open-mindedness was prudent.[6]

---

[1] Address of 12 December 1904 (*ASS* 37 [1904–05], 435).

[2] Letter of 22 February 1905 (*ASS* 37 [1904–05], 555–57).

[3] A. Houtin, *La question biblique au 20ᵉ siècle,* 215–16.

[4] *ASS* 37 (1904–05), 666; 38 (1905–06), 124–25.

[5] *ASS* 39 (1906–07), 377–78; 40 (1907), 383–84. The first of these responses inspired a little book written by von Hügel, *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch,* about which Bollandist Delehaye wrote: "Let us hope that it will open the eyes of the Father of all faithful, who is truly compromised due to the mediocre tools he is using" (1 December 1906, quoted by M. de la Bédoyère, *The Life of Baron von Hügel,* 187).

[6] See especially *Le Père Lagrange au service de la Bible,* 158–59.

After 1904, in Rome, the Swiss K. Decurtins launched a vehement struggle against Blondel, Laberthonnière, and others. By the end of 1905 Loisy and the progressive exegetes had particularly attracted the curiosity of the Holy See. But the wave of the reform movement in Italy vacillated, enlarging the list of urgent concerns and drawing attention to other problems that were discussed more and more frankly. In December 1905 the bishops of the provinces of Turin and Vercelli issued a joint pastoral letter, which, for the first time in an ecclesiastical document, used the word "modernism." The admonishments contained therein were taken to heart by many other bishops.[7] The following year brought additional measures: While the Congregation of the Index, on 14 April, condemned the novel *Il Santo* by Fogazzaro and Laberthonnière's books, by now several years old, Monsignor De Lai and Cardinal Gennari instigated systematic control of the Italian seminaries. Several professors were recalled from their teaching chairs without being granted an opportunity to defend themselves. Thus a gloomy atmosphere of suspiciousness developed in Rome. Everywhere, the approaching storm was felt.[8]

This storm finally broke in the course of 1907. Within a few months more and more solemn *acta* were issued. On 17 April, in the context of a consistorial address,[9] Pius X turned rigorously against the *neo-reformismum religiosum,* which was spreading with increasing audacity. At the end of the same month, the prefect of the Index Commission issued a warning to the Milan group of the *rinnovamento.*[10] On 14 June Pius X sent a brief to the Viennese Professor Commer,[11] congratulating him for having hacked to pieces the errors of the main representative of Reform Catholicism, Herman Schell. On 17 July the decree *Lamentabili sane exitu* was published by the Holy Office,[12] over which it had been brooding for several years, containing a revealing list of statements which two Parisian theologians had extracted from Loisy's "little books."[13] The decree condemned sixty-five theses concerning the authority of the ecclesiastical teaching office, the inspiration and historical value of the books of the Holy Scriptures, the terms revelation, dogma, and faith, certain aspects of Christological dogma, which had been questioned in recent disputes, the origin of the sacraments, the constitution of the Church and the nature of Christian truth in general.[14] And finally, on 8 September, the encyclical *Pascendi* was issued.[15] Since its intent was not to describe exactly the thoughts of the individual instigators of modernism, but rather to present the reflection of their ideas in the consciousness of the community, it started out with a somewhat contrived synthesis of modernism, blaming the various errors on agnosticism, which disputes the value of the rational argumentation in the religious realm, and on the philosophy of immanence, which ignores that the origin of religious truth rests in the needs of life. This philosophy created the dogma unfolding in the course of life on the basis of reason and experience. Likewise, the need "to give religion a *corpus* perceivable through the senses" created the sacraments; the books of the Holy Scriptures contain the experiences collected by the faithful of Israel and by the first disciples of Christ; the Church is a fruit of the collective consciousness, and the only task of authority is to give expression to the emotions of the individual. The encyclical stigmatized the modernistic conception of biblical criticism and the purely subjective methods of apologetics, as well as the demands of reform modernism. It concluded its third, disciplinary part by enumerating a series of practical measures ("remedies") to halt the further spread of evil, above all in the seminaries (renewed obligation to study scholastic philosophy and theology, supervision of reading material, *consilia vigilantiae* in every bishopric).

---

[7] Analysis of these pastoral letters and quotations from them in the brochure *Un allarme dell'episcopato italiano contro ii reformismo religioso* (Genoa 1906).

[8] Regarding the atmosphere in Rome during 1906, see also *Correspondance Blondel-Valensin* I, 262–63, and M. de la Bédoyère, op. cit., 181–82.

[9] *ASS* 40 (1907), 266–69.

[10] Text in *Rinnovamento* 1 (1907), 610. Cf. P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista,* 212–16.

[11] *ASS* 40 (1907), 392–94.

[12] *ASS* 40 (1907), 470–78. Cf. F. Heiner, *Der neue Syllabus Pius' X.* (Mainz 1907). Regarding the theological value of the document, cf. J. Rivière, op. cit., 341–46.

[13] Cf. P. Dudon, *BLE* 32 (1931), 73–96, and R. Aubert, *EThL* 37 (1961), 557–78.

The encyclical was immediately greeted with exuberant expressions of joy by the conservatives, who had desired it for a long time.[16] Many moderates deplored the purely negative tone of the encyclical, yet they were glad that ambiguities, which gradually threatened to become dangerous, had been eliminated. Those who were attracted by the exponents of modernism reacted much less vehemently than had been expected, even though they almost unanimously considered the encyclical "a caricature rather than a picture of modernism" (Sabatier). Tyrrell believed himself able to predict that the encyclical would compel the "right wing of modernism to align itself more closely with the left wing," since the encyclical did not differentiate between reasonable progressivism and the "rendezvous of all heresies" based on agnosticism and immanentism, simply schematically reconstructing both. In reality, the opposite happened: For some, this painful condemnation by the Pope was the criterion revealing to them the fact that they implicitly stood outside of the Church. Consequently, they openly broke with the Church, depending on the individual case, with more or less restraint; and since they had to abandon hope of being able to reform the Church from within, some carried the radicalism of their viewpoints even further, quickly ending up in pure rationalism.

---

[14] About fifty theses came from Loisy's works (regarding the exactness with which they reflected his viewpoints, see É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique,* 109–12); three theses were taken from Houtin, one from Le Roy, and one from the Newman disciple Dimmet, whose work *Le pensée catholique dans l'Angleterre contemporaine* was put on the Index a few days later, as was *Dogme et critique* by Le Roy.

[15] *ASS* 40 (1907), 593–650. See A. Michelitsch, *Der biblisch-dogmatische Syllabus Pius' X. samt der Enzyklika gegen den Modernismus* (Graz, Vienna 1908; in the appendix are several articles from the German and Austrian press that had been devoted to the two papal documents). Frequently, the edition of the encyclical *Pascendi* was ascribed to P. Billot, Msgr. Sardi, and others; however, today we know who the real editors were: P. J. Lemius, O.M.I., was responsible for the dogmatic part (after the Pope had discarded as unsatisfactory several drafts prepared by other theologians), and Cardinal Vives y Tutó for the pragmatic part (cf. *BLE* 47 [1946], 143–61, 242–43). Regarding the theological value of this document, see J. Rivière, op. cit., 364–67.

[16] This was to be anticipated, and Cardinal Maffi, one of the few relatively open-minded Italian prelates, indulged in an illusion when he declared: "Let us hope that the positive impact of the encyclical will not be spoiled by the *zelanti,* who are finding new excuses for their violent excesses and their customary gripes" (F. Crispolti, *Pio IX . . . Ricordi personali* [Milan 1932], 128).

In most of them, however, loyalty to the Church was victorious. Thus most everyone submitted, creating the impression later on that the modernist crisis had simply been a matter of individual, rather isolated personalities. Unquestionably, the masses of believers had not been seized by the wave of modernism. But at least in France and, to a lesser extent, in Italy, the clergy who were informed about the development of scriptural studies, and a number of young Catholic intellectuals had felt strongly attracted to the new movement. These people were dissatisfied with the theological training at that time and conscious of the need for adjusting to the circumstances. Therefore they were enthusiastic over the pioneers who had paved the way. In contrast to some of these very pioneers, they would never have thought of continuing their research outside of the Church. For example, É. Poulat compared the attitude of Loisy with that of his young pupil Abbé L. Vénard, who never considered following Loisy's refusal to submit to the Roman condemnations, and he analyzed correctly their fundamentally different reactions: "While Loisy, with the certainty of a technician, draws the plan (of a necessary development), anticipating its various stages, Vénard wants to cling to the authority of the Church. For the Church, he boldly reconnoiters as a guerrilla who is aware that he is not the whole army and that he is nothing without the army. An expert who grates on the nerves of the ignorant, Loisy follows his blueprint precisely, only paying attention in order to calculate correctly and to leave nothing out. Vénard, in contrast, gives preference to his mind, while adjusting his steps to the awkward pace of the Church, differentiating between justified criticism and the slow process of adjusting to its accomplishments. Loisy conceptualizes and analyzes a historical process of change, Vénard participates in a process of organic adaptation. Both may have the same ideas, but they are not equally in agreement with the Church as an external institution."[17]

The agnostic and immanentist system, superficially reconstructed by the encyclical, was so obviously in contradiction to traditional Christian belief that it was fully normal for many true progressives to depart openly from it and renounce it. Even though submission to the anathema of the encyclical took place within a large framework, it was nevertheless extremely painful for many who observed an increase of hope for an impending adjustment of Catholicism to the changing attitudes, and therefore felt the danger of a more profound schism between the Church and the intellectual world of the West.[18] Many shared the opinion of the "Erasmus of modernism" (J.-M. Mayeur), Monsignor Mignot, who had declared: "There is no Christian conscience that does not reject with the whole force of its faith all errors condemned by the encyclical."[19] However, he also wrote that this encyclical erred in "limiting itself to condemnation without defining what one can say without being a modernist."[20] Or they thought like the philosopher V. Delbos, a marvelous Catholic layman: "The encyclical has one all-too-visible *lacuna*: it consists of the negligence toward or the ignorance of the deeper causes which incited the so-called modernist movement."[21]

---

[17] É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique,* 313–14. This analysis considers "the amazing psychological flexibility of the religious consciousness, which is not a matter of weakness caused by the lack of logic, but rather a matter of numerous capabilities at its disposal to express itself." This flexibility was clearly illuminated by the most recent progress made in the humanities. Thus, the analysis requires an elaboration of the strict appraisal by T. Gallarati-Scotti, who ascribed the great number of submissions to the *povertà di coscienze e di caratteri* (*Vita di A. Fogazzaro,* 493). Especially in Italy, this element was important, but it is not the only and not even the main explanation.

[18] Vicar General Birot wrote this in metaphorical language to his friend G. Frémont, who considered the exposé of the encyclical "excellent" (A. Siegfried, *L'abbé Frémont* II [Paris 1932], 505): "It condemns the most absurd naturalistic system ever devised, but I submit with sadness because this doctrinary sternness is based on *contrived* ambiguity because it condemns friend and foe alike. The Pope is like the colonel of the artillery shooting from the top of a hill into the troops of both fronts engaged in heavy fighting down in the plains and simultaneously destroying his own best troops" (quoted by É. Poulat, op. cit., 443).

[19] *Semaine religieuse d'Albi* (28 September 1907), 553–55.

[20] Letter to F. von Hügel, 5 October 1907, quoted in É. Poulat, op. cit., 480, n. 89.

[21] Letter to J. Wehrlé, 30 September 1907, quoted in *Correspondance Blondel-Valensin* I, 357–64. He did not feel touched personally, but the tone of the encyclical thoroughly upset him: "How can one persuade that many souls . . . not to doubt the benevolence of the Church?" Regarding the edition of the declaration of submission of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* to the encyclical, see ibid., 367–70.

Even though almost everyone submitted to the ecclesiastical authority, there were a few residual pockets of resistance. Loisy published a new little book, *Simples refléxions sur le décret Lamentabili et l'encycle Pascendi,* the tone of which was as ironical as it was aggressive. In order to stress the significance of the booklet, he published simultaneously two thick volumes on *The Synoptic Gospels,* which were far more radical than his previous studies. But it was precisely this development which caused many of his former admirers to fall away; and his excommunication on 7 March 1908 made him a loner. Tyrrell suffered the same fate, after having already been denied the sacraments by his bishop at the end of October 1907, following the publication of several articles in opposition to the encyclical in the *Times* and in the Italian press. At first Minocchi submitted, announcing he would discontinue the publication of his *Studi religiosi.* But after having been charged by his friends with servility, he soon held a public lecture on the earthly paradise and the dogma of original sin. He achieved a great deal of attention because he negated the historical character of the first chapter of Genesis. After the *suspensio a divinis,* Tyrrell rejected submission, and in October 1908 he took off his clerical garb. From then he strove for a more socialistic humanitarianism, seeing in Christianity nothing more than a contingent form of the religion of the absolute. In Germany and Austria, a number of leading personalities of Reform Catholicism also protested against the encyclical: Monsignor Ehrhard, professor at the theological faculty of Strasbourg, turned against the practical measures forming the last part of the encyclical, since they prohibited, in his opinion, any kind of scholarly work; Professors Schnitzer of Munich and Wahrmund of Innsbruck opposed in harsher terms the misdeeds of ultramontanism and Roman absolutism, but these were overt manifestations of academic liberalism and not doctrinary modernism.[22]

Aside from these open protests, there was a series of anonymous criticisms.[23] The most remarkable, though rather superficial throughout, were, in France, the brochure *Lendemains d'encyclique,* in which Monsignor Lacroix, the very liberal bishop of Tarentaise, had collaborated,[24] and particularly, in Italy, *Il Programma dei modernisti—Riposta all'enciclica di Pio X,* a document published on 28 October 1907 and quickly translated into French, German, and English. Monsignor Fracassini collaborated on the scriptural section, but the author was Buonaiuti,[25] who, in contrast to other leading modernists, preferred to stay in the Church in order to continue from within the reform work that he had started. It is uncertain where the true Buonaiuti really revealed himself, in the *Programma,* the tone of which was rather moderate, or in the much more radical *Lettere di un prete modernista,* published several months later, likewise behind the veil of anonymity.[26]

---

[22] Msgr. Ehrhard, who had declared that the doctrinary system ascribed to the modernists by the encyclical was incompatible with dogma, confirmed again, in a memorandum to the press, his Catholic loyalty, and the Holy See was satisfied with removing his prelature. Professor Schnitzer, being much more critical, was initially suspended *a divinis,* later excluded from receiving the sacraments. Regarding the Wahrmund case that resulted in diplomatic tensions between the Vatican and Vienna, see Engel-Janosi II, 87–103. Regarding the rare cases of modernism in Austria, ibid., 143–44.

[23] Regarding the frequently exaggerated significance of the anonyms and pseudonyms in modernist literature, see É. Poulat, op. cit., 621–77, esp. 640–42.

[24] Regarding the brochure *Werk eines Pfarrers der Diözese Autun* signed *Catholici,* see J. Rivière, op. cit., 379–81, and É. Poulat, op. cit., 650. At the instigation of the Kraus

These pockets of resistance, which, in spite of the unrest in the first few months, was rather insignificant, inspired the antimodernist reaction that had long remained sporadic and isolated. But since the modernist movement was confined to the circles of intellectuals, only a very few bishops deemed useful the effort of devoting a pastoral letter to it.[27] Nevertheless, with the exception of Germany, they organized the *consilia vigilantiae* required by the encyclical in order to prevent suspect publications by the clergy. There were also isolated attempts to expose the modernist authors hiding behind a pseudonym. The greatest attention was caused by the fact that L. Saltet attributed the articles against the Trinitarian and Marian dogmas, signed by A. Dupin and G. Herzog, to Abbé Turmel.[28] On the other hand, numerous theologians dealt with commentaries on the papal documents, but their refutations usually

---

Society, it was translated into German under the title *Antwort der französischen Katholiken.* Regarding Msgr. Lucien Lacroix (1854–1922), founder of the *Revue du clergé français,* who contributed several anonymous articles, liked to call himself "the bishop of the modernists," and resigned as bishop of Tarentaise after the issuance of the encyclical, see M. Hudry, "Un évêque républicain au moment de la Séparation," *Vieux Conflans,* nos. 65–66 (1965), 3–37, and A. Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists,* 105–8.

[25] Concerning the *Programma dei modernisti,* see D. Grasso, *Il cristianesimo di E. Buonaiuti* (Brescia 1953), 28–35, and P. Scoppola, op. cit., 269–73. Against Fracassini's will, Buonaiuti revised his pages.

[26] Regarding the *Lettere,* see V. Vinay, *E. Buonaiuti,* 43–53, and P. Scoppola, op. cit., 273–79.

[27] Except in Italy, where modernism was given attention for its reforming and social aspects. The episcopates of Prussia and Bavaria published a joint letter in January 1908. In French-speaking countries, the most popular document was the pastoral letter by Cardinal Mercier, who defended Scholasticism against Kantian philosophy, which he perceived to be the root of modernist errors (*Œuvres pastorales* I [Brussels 1911], 363–82; reprinted in brochure form: *Le Modernisme* [Brussels 1908], German translation [Cologne 1908], including a lecture dealing with the same topic given at the University of Louvain).

[28] Regarding the affair involving Turmel, not resolved until 1929, see, in addition to his biography by F. Sartiaux (Paris 1931), J. Rivière, op. cit., 486–505. About P. Lejay's case, see ibid., 501–2, n. 5.

referred to abstract modernism as presented in the encyclical. Only a few seemed to have recognized the real problems that were maladroitly posed by the modernists; and even if their studies intended to exceed the level of mere general comprehension, their arguments frequently appeared to be rather simplistic.[29] Among the laudable exceptions in France were the articles of the Jesuits Lebreton and de Grandmaison, as well as the *Lettres sur les études ecclésiastiques* by Mignot, in which he tried to prove to what extent the condemnation of modernism justified new scholarly studies; in Germany, the exceptions were an article by F. X. Kiefl published in *Hochland* and a collection of lectures held some time later at the University of Freiburg and published under the title *Jesus Christus.*

The systematic suppression of the modernist movement's last vestiges after the issuance of *Pascendi* was mainly the work of the Holy See itself, living for several years in an atmosphere of panic. With more and more reactionary leanings, the Index Commission[30] as well as the Biblical Commission[31] intensified their activities. Furthermore, new apostolic visitations in the Italian seminaries directly responsible to the Curia were decreed and suspect teachers were recalled, often merely on the basis of unfounded denunciations.[32] Even though, according to Loisy's own words, modernism was in a state of "complete dissolution,"[33] two years after its condemnation in 1907, Pius X was still greatly worried about the continued existence of certain clandestine operations, which were extremely exaggerated. Thus he believed the Church was still "in a state of siege" and he deemed it necessary to take further measures. On 1 September 1910, in his motu proprio *Sacrorum antistitum,*[34] the Pope demanded from all the clergy a special oath, the so-called antimodernist oath. This involved a statement of faith that had been adjusted to the already condemned versions of modernism, including the statement formulated by Pius IV. The first section formulated in five points the proof for the existence of God, the value of the basis for faith, the founding of the Church through Christ, the immutability of dogma, and the intellectual character of the act of faith. A second part demanded submission to the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi* and called for their affirmation. This text did not add anything essential to the *acta* of Pius X, however it was an official summary, the goal and purpose being to request from every priest his expressed solemn affirmation, in order to expose the crypto-modernists. The clergy submitted without much open resistance. In the Church at large, there were not more than approximately forty exceptions.[35] In Germany, however, this measure caused considerable unrest in the name of scholarly freedom; and finally, upon the request of the episcopate, the German theological universities were relieved of the oath.

---

[29] For example, see the appropriate criticism of the *De immutabilitate traditionis contra modernam haeresim evolutionismi* (1907), written by P. Billot, in H. Holstein, *La Tradition dans l'Église* (Paris 1960), 129–34.

[30] Cf. A. Boudinhon, *Revue du clergé français* 75, 215–27. After it was translated into Italian, the *Histoire ancienne de l'Église* by Msgr. Duchesne was condemned on 22 January 1912, in spite of the imprimatur of schoolmaster S. Palatii.

[31] Cf. J. Levie, *La Bible, parole humaine et message de Dieu* (Bruges, Paris 1928), 88.

[32] Aside from the works of L. Bedeschi, see M. Guasco, *Fermenti nei seminari,* 121–54.

[33] In *RH* 102 (1909). Regarding the weakness of Italian modernism, quickly dispersing into small groups with the most varied tendencies, see the letter of S. Jacini to von Hügel written at the very moment the journal *Rinnovamento* ceased publication around the end of 1909 (*RStRis* 56 [1969], 245–47). One of the many other signs of the inevitable decline of modernism after 1907 was the failure of the plans for the creation of an international information agency that had been drawn up by Msgr. Lacroix and Paul Sabatier (a liberal French Protestant who had observed the movement from its inception with passionate interest). Even the founding of the *Revue moderniste internationale* in Geneva in 1910 was but transient ardor.

[34] *AAS* 2 (1910), 655–80.

But not only the Germans feared the disastrous consequences of the anti-modernist suppression upon Catholic scholarship. Today there is agreement that the rejuvenation, commenced under Leo XIII, was seriously hampered throughout a whole generation.[36] Primarily in Italy, where suppression was particularly relentless, almost the entire clergy was prohibited from serious studies, enlarging the critical shortcomings in the area of contemporary culture that have remained one of the great weaknesses of Italian Catholicism to the present day. But elsewhere the fear that Christian scholarship could possibly move in directions considered adventurous by Church authorities caused numerous Catholic theologians to withdraw to strictly historical work, or, even worse, to confine themselves to the reiteration of textbook formulas, speculating only on harmless marginal matters in the framework of a rather narrow-minded Neo-Thomism.[37]

---

[35] One more detail should be noted: Pius X personally empowered Frs. Semeria and Genocchi to take this oath with a proviso. Even more peculiar: he allowed Semeria to publish in certain well-controlled journals, but under a pseudonym. In this manner, he placed Semeria's talents in his service, deflating his influence at the same time.

[36] In order to demonstrate that he was not an opponent of scholarly work, Pius X had announced in his encyclical *Pascendi* the establishment of an international institute for progressive research. Its members were chosen on the basis of rather one-sided criteria, causing the institution to be stillborn (some information in L. von Pastor, *Tagebücher*, 482–511).

[37] The twenty-four theses of the Congregation of Studies of 27 July 1914 concerning the basic doctrine of Saint Thomas are a typical manifestation of this attitude. More open-mindedness was reflected in the founding of the *Rivista di Filosofia neoscolastica* in 1909 by P. Gemelli, O.F.M., and, in Louvain, the efforts of Msgr. Deploige, who tried to integrate sociology into Neo-Thomism (M. Defourny, *Annuaire de l'Université catholique de Louvain* 81 [1927–29], XCVII–XCVIII).

The results on the whole were not as negative as is sometimes maintained. Even in the field of exegesis, where serious studies were largely condemned to sterility in spite of the founding of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1909,[38] some remarkable achievements were made: In 1908, *Biblische Zeitfragen* was founded, a popular collection; in 1912 there followed the founding of the *Alttestamentlichen und Neutestamentlichen Abhandlungen,* edited by J. Nikel and M. Meinertz; the publication of *La théologie de S. Paul* by F. Prat, S.J., (1908–12); and the commentary of Father Lagrange regarding the Gospel of Saint Mark (1911). In the area of patrology and dogmatic history, French authors were gradually able to compete with names like Ehrhard, Bardenhewer, and Rauschen: J. Tixeront, a student of Duchesne, published, between 1905 and 1912, a *Histoire des dogmes,* which, for its time, was not without merit. Father J. Lebreton did pioneering work with his *Origines du dogme de la Trinité* (1910). The same applies to J. Lebon in Louvain and his *Monophysisme sévérien* (1909). The growing interest in Near Eastern Christian literature was reflected in the *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium,* continued by the Catholic universities of Louvain and of America after its establishment by J.-B. Chabot in 1902. In 1907 the *Görres-Gesellschaft* under the leadership of Monsignor Kirsch opened a Section for Archaeology, aimed at furthering Christian, classical, and Near Eastern archeological studies and the research of problems posed by religious history. In 1912 F. J. Dölger at the University of Münster established a new teaching chair for General Religious History and Comparative Religious Studies, and he investigated in his lectures the extent to which Christian thought and the original Christian rites felt the influence of the paganism surrounding them.[39] A year earlier, while in France the first Catholic textbook on the history of religions, *Christus,* was published under the direction of P. Huby, P. W. Schmidt, S.V.D., founder of the journal *Anthropos* (1906), had collaborated in Louvain with Father Bouvier, S. J., in the organization of the first Catholic Week for Religious Ethnology;[40] and another German, J. Schmidlin, had founded the *Zeitschrift für Missionswesen* and the first Catholic *Institut für Missionswissenschaft.*[41] Literary history was brilliantly represented by the German Baumstark, the Englishmen Bishop and Fortescue, and the French Benedictines Cabrol, Férotin, and Leclercq. The last mentioned published, in 1907, the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* followed by the *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* in 1912. The appearance of new journals was another sign of the scholarly activities in these difficult years. Worth noting are the historical journals, such as the *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* (1907), the *Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France* (1910), the *Archivum franciscanum historicum* (1908), and the *Archivo iberoamericano* (1914), but also strictly theological journals such as *Theologie und Glaube* (1909) of the Philosophical Theological Institute of Paderborn; but above all, the *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* (1907) of the French Dominicans of Le Saulchoir,[42] and the *Recherches de science religieuse* (1910) of the Jesuits of the province of Paris.[43]

---

[38] The Pontifical Biblical Institute was entrusted to the Society of Jesus under the direction of the very conservative P. J. Fonck. It was to be the counterpart of the École Biblique in Jerusalem directed by Father Lagrange, who was under suspicion by Rome. Cf. *S. Pio X promotore degli studi biblici, fondatore del Pont. Istituto biblico* (Rome 1955), 23–42.

[39] Regarding Franz Dölger (1879–1940), the first Catholic theologian who took account of the history of religion school, see T. Klauser, *F. J. Dölger, Leben und Werke* (Münster 1956).

[40] Cf. *RHE* 13 (1912), 747–51.

[41] Cf. *50 Jahre katholische Missionswissenschaft in Münster, 1911–1961,* ed. by J. Glazik (Münster 1961).

The modernists had posed real problems for discussion, problems that could not be solved by merely condemning modernism. After all, they questioned the relationship between theology and its sources (the Bible, documents of the old tradition, decisions of the ecclesiastical teaching office) and the nature of their homogeneity with divine revelation, down to its technically most sophisticated form.

Of the few theologians trying to find a positive answer to the questions raised by Loisy, Tyrrell, and Le Roy, two merit special mention: Father de Grandmaison, S.J.,[44] who, in this difficult time, helped with his moderate and reasonable (in the opinion of Blondel and Loisy) articles to lead the confused public through the treacherous cliffs of modernism and integralism, however without totally penetrating the problems; and primarily Professor Father Gardeil, O.P.,[45] who, despite his limitations, appears more and more as the forerunner. His influence was initially confined to France, but later, thanks to his students, radiated far beyond French borders. His work reached a peak in the two studies of apologetic and theological methodology long to remain classics: *La crédibilité et l'apologétique* (Paris 1908, second completely revised edition: 1910), which became the object of vehement controversies, above all on the part of Blondel; and *Le donné révélé et la théologie* (Paris 1910), a study intended to resume the work done by Cano regarding the problems of the beginning of the twentieth century. Germany and Austria, the first to deal with historical theology, did not contribute a lot to these methodological discussions. Highly respected at that time, the work of the Viennese Professor Commer or that of the Jesuit C. Pesch (for example his *Theologische Zeitfragen,* 6 vols., 1910/16) seems very disappointing today. The contribution of the Latin countries was practically nonexistent.

---

[42] Cf. M. Jacquin, *RSPhTh* 40 (1956), 632–35. Concerning the leanings of this school, that was first inspired by Father Gardeil and later by Father Lemonnyer, cf. M. D. Chenu, *Une École de théologie, le Saulchoir* (Kain, Étiolles 1937).

[43] Cf. J. Lecler, *RSR* 48 (1960), 7–39.

[44] Regarding Léonce de Grandmaison (1868–1927), director of the *Études* and founder of the *Recherches de science religieuse,* see J. Lebreton, *Le P. L. de Grandmaison* (Paris 1932). His main articles are compiled in the volume *Le dogme chrétien. Sa nature, ses formes, son développement* (Paris 1928).

[45] Regarding Ambroise Gardeil (1859–1931), see H. Gardeil, *L'œuvre du P. A. Gardeil* (Paris 1956). Also R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi* (Louvain ^{2}1950), 393–450; M. D. Chenu, *RSPhTh* 40 (1956), 645–52; Y. Congar, *DThC* XV, 443.

Integralism

Hand in hand with the suppression of modernism by Church authorities went a campaign of denunciations that increased throughout the pontificate and poisoned the atmosphere of its last years. It may seem peculiar that this campaign unfolded from the very moment when modernism, after the condemnations of 1907, seemed to be in the process of decline. One of the most active early proponents of orthodoxy, A. Cavallanti,[46] explained this fact in the following manner: "Arianism, Pelagianism, and Jansenism, having disappeared after their condemnation by the Church, left a trail of errors even more subtle and less obvious than that of modernism, errors that became known as semi-Arianism, semi-Pelagianism, and semi-Jansenism. Likewise, today, modernism, fatally exposed, has left after its departure other kinds of errors, sprouting all over like seeds and threatening to ruin, or ruining, many a good Catholic. . . . I repeat, there is a semimodernism that, although not as ugly as its antecedent, is much more deceptive and insidious, a modernism that proposes to be a synthesis of all heresies."[47]

Where did "semimodernism" begin? And where, moreover, did the "modernistic tendencies" and the "modernistic mental constitution," as the *Corrispondenza romana* called it, begin? The danger of abuse was particularly great because most of these irresponsible censors were not very competent in the area of theology and especially in the field of exegesis. Furthermore, they belonged to those minds who are completely indifferent to foreign ideas. Several months after the publication of *Pascendi,* Cardinal Ferrari already had to take a strong stance against the excesses, writing in his pastoral letter of Lent: "It is sad that some are obliged, even publicly, to act excessively, detecting modernism almost everywhere and denouncing it, and that they even want to suspect men of modernism who are far from it." There was hardly a single Catholic scholar who was not exposed to their attacks in the course of these years, to accusations that violated, in many instances, justice as well as love of one's fellow man. Even many deserving institutes were victims of such regrettable polemics, such as the École Biblique of Jerusalem, the theology faculty of Fribourg (almost suspended by Pius X), the Institut Catholique of Paris, numerous seminaries that had made efforts to improve the quality of studies, and many others.

---

[46] Concerning him, see *CivCatt* (1917) III, 370; also É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 434–37.

[47] Lecture of 16 November 1908, summarized in *La critique du libéralisme* 1 (1908–09), 421–23. On 5 February 1909, the *Corrispondenza Romana* wrote similarly: "Today, the danger lies in propaganda trying to be modern rather than in the radically modernistic propaganda." In 1913, Msgr. Benigni protested against those people who wanted to reduce modernism to its most radical form, stating: "As if fever is only present when forty degrees centigrade are measured" (quoted by É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 340).

These zealots have entered history under the nickname of "integralists." They called themselves "integral Catholics": in contrast to the efforts of liberal Catholics and modernists (whom they often threw in one and the same pot) wanting to water Catholicism down, they intended to confirm "the integrity of their Romanism: the entire Roman Catholicism (doctrine and praxis) and nothing but."[48] Whatever their debatable methods may have been, many of them were more than just theologians envious of competitors who might want to deprive them of the favor of the younger generation. In view of the dangers threatening their faith, they simply considered their crusade a sacred duty, and the repeated encouragements they received from the Pope were bound to strengthen their convictions.

On the one hand, the integralists had no scruples over denunciations, clandestine methods, and even espionage;[49] on the other hand, they fought with their visors open: with books and brochures, like those of the Jesuit J. Fontaine, whom É. Poulat considered "a remarkably well-preserved witness of an intellectual species, whose role is supposed to have been important,"[50] and with a series of journals (with rather limited circulations) controlled more or less by the integralists. In Italy, there was the *Unità cattolica,* financially supported by Pius X, *Verona*

---

[48] Declaration of the *Agence internationale Roma* (*AIR*) of 19 June 1913, quoted in É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 132. One of the main press channels of the movement, the *Vigie,* wrote on 5 December 1912: "We are integral Roman Catholics, which means that we prefer over everything and everybody not only the traditional doctrine of the Church in regard to absolute truths, but also the directives of the Pope in the area of pragmatic contingencies. The Pope and the Church are one." Poulat pointed out (op. cit., 522) that "the most ambitious successors of Pius X often showed rather less enthusiasm for Leo XIII."

[49] Often covered up by those in high places, as was shown in the Perciballi affair (cf. É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 588–89).

[50] *DHGE* XVII, 819–21.

fedele and the *Riscossa* of the Scotton brothers; in France, *La foi catholique* by B. Gaudeau and *La critique du libéralisme* by É. Barbier, both appearing in 1908, *L'Univers,* looking for revival in integralism, and, after 1912, *La Vigie,* both journals dependent on the Assumptionists, thanks to Father Salvien;[51] in Belgium, the *Correspondance catholique* of the lawyer Jonckx; in the Netherlands, *De Maasbode,* whose chief editor M. A. Thomson was the soul of Dutch integralism; and in Poland the *Mysl Katolicka.*

To what extent were all these activities coordinated and directed by one center and what role did the Holy See really play? In view of the fact that the integralists worked partly in the dark, the answer has remained unclear for a long time, especially since the Roman archives were made accessible to the general public with considerable delay. But the curtain was partly lifted in 1921, though under circumstances which did not completely appease the conscientious historians. New information was provided in 1950 on the occasion of the beatification of Pius X. A tremendous step toward the illumination of the situation was recently made by É. Poulat with exemplary professional conscientiousness. He succeed in analyzing the workings of the "international antimodernist secret operations" that had been organized by Monsignor Benigni,[52] a prelate of the secretariat of state: the *Sodalitium Pianum,* often simply referred to by its initials S. P., or by the camouflaging name *La Sapinière,* which Benigni wanted to fortify with an institutional religious basis in the manner of today's secular institutes. After the discovery of 1921 there was a tendency to consider Benigni as the soul of the entire integralist movement; he was supposed to have acted without the knowledge of Pius X, who is said to have known nothing of his often disputable methods. *La Sapinière* was regarded as a pressure group with remarkable but secret powers in the Church. Today the reality appears much more modest and at the same time more official than had been presumed. Except for the *Correspondance de Rome,* which was to provide the world press with religious news written in "the right spirit," the confidential bulletins promulgated by Benigni were but a "cascade of unfortunate attempts," and the S. P. had never more than about fifty members in all of Europe. However, the group was in contact with a number of individuals who formally did not belong to it, but shared its convictions, mainly with Abbé Barbier and Father Salvien, who had great influence in the *Bonne Presse.* With other opponents of modernism, however, the relations of this group were a lot more reserved. The documents published in the meantime have thrown a completely new light on the often rather fundamental differences separating the minds summarily labelled with the collective term "integralists." Wanting to avoid any kind of political exposure and to move exclusively on religious grounds, Benigni distanced himself from the *Action française* and its members. He considered men like Cardinal Billot and Abbé Gaudeau too soft. He mistrusted Abbé Thompson, the German Kaufmann, and the Austrian Maus. He was on bad terms with Merry del Val, since the secretary of state adroitly applied the brakes to the headlong initiatives of Benigni, who, in turn, charged him with diplomatic restraint.[53] Benigni's relations to the Society of Jesus grew increasingly cooler as well, even though many of its members defended the most traditional positions with narrow-minded intransigence until the end of the pontificate.

---

[51] Regarding P. Salvien, A.A., whose proper name was Charles Miglietti (1873–1934), and who served the *Maison de la Bonne Presse* from 1896 until 1923, see É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 286–87.

[52] Regarding Msgr. Umberto Benigni (1862–1934), raised in the spirit of the "counterrevolutionary" Catholicism of the *Syllabus* and the *non expedit,* who tried with tireless energy to form, together with a few friends, the *dernier carré des incorruptibles,* see *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones . . . ,* 197–204) É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 61–70.

In his investigations, É. Poulat succeeded in dispelling the myth about the infamous integralist conspiracy. He discovered that the situation was much more complicated than had been presumed for a long time; mainly, he was able to "reduce the S.P. to its real dimensions" and to prove that the ideological world of integralism went far beyond the circle of the *Sodalitium Pianum* and its sympathizers.[54] It was also proven that there was no longer a reason to maintain that Pius X had no knowledge of Benigni's activities. It is certain that the Pope supported *La Sapinière* and that he not only knew of the activities of its founders, but also approved and encouraged them. Benigni informed him daily through Monsignor Bressan and was regularly ordered to make delicate inquiries. It also seems to be obvious that the Pope never reprimanded Benigni seriously for the manner in which he conducted the tasks entrusted to him, as he had often done with other militant integralists, for example in the case of Abbé de Töth of the *Unità cattolica;* and that he personally covered up a sort of ecclesiastical secret police, one which does not seem permissible to us today,[55] but which he appears to have deemed justified in view of the dramatic situation that he felt the Church was entangled in.

---

[53] After analyzing the new documents, Poulat came to the following conclusion: "We definitely must relinquish the fairy tale: Benigni, the man of Merry del Val; the secretary of state who tries to persuade a good and devout Pope, having given him the reins, to be unyielding" (op. cit., 77).

[54] It is easy to forget that the initiative for these sanctions did not always come from Rome. M. Bécamel recently demonstrated this (*BLE* 72 [1971], 258–88) in regard to the recall of Msgr. Batiffol from his post as rector of the Institut catholique of Toulouse in 1907: mainly responsible for this were the archbishop and his entourage (pressured by the local reactionary circles). See also J. Daoust, *MSR* 9 (1952), 251–62, regarding the role that the archbishop of Rouen, Msgr. Fuzet, played (his campaign against Msgr. Baudrillart was not approved by Pius X).

The integralistic reaction reached its climax during 1912 and 1913. In 1912, Father Lagrange, among others, was forced to leave Jerusalem, and the *Revue biblique* almost had to cease its publication.[56] At the beginning of 1913, the entire fifth series (1905–13) of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* was put on the Index, a measure that was intensified a few weeks later when its director, Father Laberthonnière, was prohibited from publishing anything whatsoever, without being given the opportunity to defend himself.[57] The same decree of 5 March 1913 had also put the *Sainte Chantal* of Abbé H. Bremond on the Index, a condemnation which was less serious, but nonetheless significant. Bremond also attempted a renewal in the field of hagiography, that is, he wanted to replace the traditional picture of a saint with a human face, but now, every attempt at renovation was suspect; this attitude applied not only to areas directly involving the faith but also to the manner of representing Church history or the life of the saints, if these manners were inspired by "secular methods." The Bollandists narrowly avoided condemnation[58] (something Monsignor Duchesne failed to accomplish), only because of the powerful protection of Cardinal Mercier.

For the integralists, the danger of innovation and secularization did not exist only in the fields of exegesis, theology, philosophy, or Church history, but also in the area of relations between the Church and society, at that time called "sociology." In the efforts of the Christian Democrats, no matter of what persuasion, they saw the spirit of liberal Catholicism, stigmatized by Pius IX in the *Syllabus,* revived in a new version. Unfortunately, they made no distinctions between men like Murri, the French *Abbés démocrates,* the *Sillon* group or the trade-union headquarters in Mönchen-Gladbach. The program, presented to the collaborators of the *Sodalitium Pianum,* climaxed in the following declaration: "We are opposed to the exploitation of the clergy and the Catholic Action with the intention of luring them from the sacristy and rarely allowing them to return."[59] At first glance, one may be surprised at such a viewpoint when observing that several integralistic leaders, such as Benigni in Italy, Maignen in France, Decurtins in Switzerland, and many others had been ardent admirers of *Rerum novarum.* But it is precisely Leo XIII's first program of social Catholicism to which they remained loyal. In this program, the Pope expressly contrasted, for the benefit of the bourgeois world which had emerged from the revolution of 1789, the Christian social order resting on Christ's Kingdom over human society to "social atheism." These men charged the Christian democrats of the new generation with increasingly using their social concerns and their conviction of the independence of secular life as a pretense to liberate themselves from ecclesiastical tutelage.

---

[55] We may assume that he did not know everything and, "had he been better informed, would have objected to certain measures." If one were to appraise Pius X's course of action in the suppression of modernism, certain distinctions would have to be made. First, in regard to time: during the first few years of his pontificate he was intent on not annoying those people who deserved, in his opinion, a reprimand (see, e.g., the letter of 1906 quoted in P. Stefanini, *Il card. Maffi* [Pisa 1958], 277). From 1910 on, the anxiety which permeated his life ("the error spreading these days is much more murderous than that of Luther," he wrote in 1911 to Msgr. Bonomelli [*Dal Gal, Il papa S. Pio X,* 183]), compelled him to present himself more and more uncompromisingly and to extol the opinion that "the danger of the evil justified the extraordinary means" (É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 218). By the way, Pius X tried to respect the rights of the bishops as much as possible (several times, he charged the integralists with not taking them sufficiently into account). On the other hand, he had a very authoritarian concept of the rights of the hierarchy in regard to the common priests: This explains the often harsh procedures against them when he was of the opinion that he had to defend sound dogma.

[56] See the autobiographical pages entitled *L'année terrible* in *Le P. Lagrange au service de la Bible,* 200–15.

[57] Some details in A. Blanchet, *Histoire d'une mise à l'Index,* 149–55. The dossier that resulted in the condemnation had been handed in by the *Action française.*

[58] An encyclical of the Congregation on Studies announced that the *Légendes hagiographiques* of P. Delehaye were not to be used in Italian seminaries.

These facts, in the context of which the term "pragmatic modernism" was sometimes used, increasingly engrossed the integralists, and, even the Holy See, especially after the condemnations of 1907 had diminished the threat of doctrinaire modernism. It is interesting to find that problems of such a nature were the almost exclusive subject of Benigni's international correspondence, which has recently become available.

Naturally, in the various countries these incidents, labelled "blunders," were more varied than had been the case in regard to the problems of dogma. In Italy, attention was first directed toward the action that Murri and his disciples, who will be discussed in the next chapter, intended to carry on in the political arena. After they had failed and the ecclesiastical authorities had regained control of the Catholic movement, the Catholic press became their main concern. As mentioned in chapter 12, there were two opposing opinions regarding the press: According to one opinion, the Catholic newspapers, under direct control of the clergy, were to be official interpreters of the Holy See's thoughts and to preach to "a peaceful audience of devout citizens" (M. Vaussard) a strict policy of "religious defense," in agreement with the Catholic "thesis" regarding the rights of the Church within society; according to the other opinion, the Catholic press was to try to reach the ear of the upper class, which had largely adopted the liberal concept of society in order to make it familiar with the Catholic viewpoint concerning problems at hand. The controversy was: *stampa di concentrazione* or *stampa di penetrazione.* The Pope preferred the first solution, as represented by newspapers such as *Osservatore Romano* and the *Voce della verità* in Rome, the *Unità cattolica* in central Italy, and the *Difesa* in Venetia. Around 1907, under the direction of a former president of the Catholic movement, Count Grosoli, a society was formed that was generally called *Il Trust.* It published newspapers with other, much less parochial tendencies, such as the *Corriere d'Italia* and the *Avvenire d'Italia.*[60] These newspapers became the target of the integralist groups. Because of one such newspaper, the *Unione* of Milan, a regrettable collision of opinions occurred in 1911 between Pius X and Cardinal Ferrari.[61] On 2 December 1912, the Pope officially condemned the papers published by *Il Trust.*[62]

---

[59] Quoted in *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones . . . ,* 265–66.

In France, numerous attacks were launched against "social modernism," supported by the *Action française* and others. Through the assistance they received from Rome, many victims finally succeeded in evading a condemnation, as for example the Jesuits of the *Action populaire.*[63] But there were also rather painful incidents: For example, F. Anizan, the superior general of the Brothers of Saint Vincent de Paul, was denounced in Rome by a priest from his own congregation, and, in 1914, after an apostolic visitation, he and his entire council were suspended from office.[64]

In view of the international interest that the case of *Le Sillon* aroused then and continues to arouse today, *Le Sillon* is still worth a closer look. This movement owes its founding to a few young people who, like many other students, strove for reconciliation between Catholicism and a society indoctrinated by the ideas of 1789. One of these young men was Marc Sangnier,[65] who, having a profound influence on his comrades, turned the original study group into an active movement (1899). He took various initiatives which, due to his extraordinary energy and his noble eloquence, were immediately very successful. He founded circles for social studies, in which young intellectuals and young workers got together on a basis of equality. He established institutes which entered into competition with the socialist peoples' universities, and he organized public debates about problems and questions of the day. The movement, thanks to some strong local personalities also invading the provinces, quickly took on the form of a crusade aiming at the re-Christianization of democracy by winning the masses back for the Church and by reconciling the Church with the Republic. At first, the movement kept its distance from the liberal Catholics, being too far removed from the world of the workers, and from the Christian democrats, whom it charged with doing little more than preferring reforms of the institutional order to the more urgent task of morally educating the individual, in whom, assisted by the indispensable intellectual forces, the true spirit of democracy should be developed, without which democratic institutions would be delivered to a disastrous fate. On the one hand, a blustering Messianism was expected to sweep people off their feet through the impact of a charismatic spell, and therefore it was suggested that they be simply assembled in a fraternal community where no rigid organization would be able to suffocate their creative energy. On the other hand, many members patiently and gradually wanted to transfer the Christian ideal to the present social order; the existing organization was to obtain control over the responsibility for leading the state. This difference of opinion caused a serious crisis during 1905. However, the internal disputes did not impair the impact of *Le Sillon.* A more serious crisis appeared on the horizon after 1906, when the movement began to be active in politics, propagating a program according to which Christians in a pluralistic democratic society were to strive for a particularly strong influence, of course with mutual respect for different opinions. This new orientation changed the denominational group, essentially based on the apostolate, into a movement that invited, often in a rather provocative manner, non-Catholics, Protestants, even freethinkers to participate (Sangnier called this new institution *le plus grand Sillon*). By necessity, this development had an unsettling effect on the ecclesiastical authorities who tried to keep the Catholic youth under their exclusive control. Young priests and seminarians joining a movement that wanted to constitute itself without any official sanction by the hierarchy posed new problems, especially since many of them utilized Sangnier's declarations about the citizen's freedom of conscience in order to justify their independence from their superiors in other areas as well. Several bishops had already reacted to the new situation in 1907, and from this moment on the Vatican also acted. At first, Pius X had expressed his sympathy for these young Catholics' idealism, oriented toward religious activities; but he grew increasingly uncertain, especially since he was informed rather tendentiously. To be sure, there were incidents that justified concrete charges, such as the relentless criticism with which *Le Sillon* attacked those Catholics who did not share in its enthusiasm for republican democracy, or the intention to declare this democracy an obligation derived from Christian morality rather than the subject of free elections. Carelessness in terminology and Sangnier's increasingly harsh procedures completely compromised the movement. In February of 1909, Cardinal Luçon, the archbishop of Rheims, sent a serious reprimand to Sangnier, which resulted in the intensification of the campaign launched for months against him by the conservative press headed by the integralists. Encouraged by Benigni, Abbé Barbier took great pains to create the suspicion that *Le Sillon* smacked of modernism, since it paid homage to the concept of democratic authority condemned in the encyclical *Pascendi.* On the other hand, Pius X considered the new orientation of *Le Sillon,* with which it wanted to evade the ecclesiastical authority, unacceptable. For the Pope, any plan aiming at a modification of society was a matter of the moral order for which the Church alone was responsible. On 25 August 1910 he sent a letter to the French episcopate,[66] in which he defined three kinds of errors on the basis of authentic Sillonist texts, which had been frequently "distorted or simplified" (J. Caron) because they were taken out of their objective or historical context: 1) statements that are not in agreement with the traditional Catholic doctrine of society, since they are reminiscent of the "theories of the so-called philosophers of the eighteenth century, of the Revolution, and of liberalism, which had been often condemned"; 2) an illegitimate demand for autonomy from the ecclesiastical hierarchy in regard to areas belonging to the realm of morals, a demand worsened by the eclecticism of the alliance with non-Catholics;[67] 3) finally, as a consequence of this work, "promiscuity": modernist infiltrations which would compel the Sillonists to forget Christ's divinity and to "speak only of His sympathy for all human suffering and His urgent appeals to love thy neighbor and to practice brotherhood," and which would result in the Sillonists forming only "a scarce tributary to the great flow of apostasy which had been organized in all countries for the purpose of establishing a world Church that would have no dogma, no hierarchy, and no rules governing the spirit."

---

[60] Cf. (A. Giorgi), *G. Grosoli* (Assisi 1960), 83–103; L. Bedeschi, "Significato e fine del Trust grosoliano," *Rassegna di politica e di storia* (1964), 7–24; R. Aubert, "Premessa ad una storia dell' 'Avvenire,'" *Humanitas* 22 (Brescia 1967), 488–512.

[61] Regarding this serious incident that is often quoted as an example of the excesses resulting from the antimodernist suppression, see *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones* . . . , to be supplemented and refined by the article by M. Torresin, utilizing the diocesan archives of Milan: *Memorie storiche della diocesi di Milano* 10 (1963), 37–304.

[62] *AAS* 4 (1912), 695.

[63] The affair can be recapitulated on the basis of numerous unpublished documents compiled by P. Droulers, op. cit.

[64] Cf. É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 419–22.

[65] Regarding Marc Sangnier (1873–1950), see, in addition to the work by J. Caron (cf. biblio., this chap.), M. Barthelemy-Madaule, *M. Sangnier* (Paris 1973).

---

[66] *AAS* 2 (1910), 607–33. Regarding the sources on which these documents seem to rest, cf. J. Caron, op. cit., 707–11.

[67] As a practical solution, the Pope demanded the division of the movement into strictly denominational diocesan groups subject to the bishop. M. Sagnier and his friends submitted without any reservation. However, the suggested solution resulted in the disappearance of the very element that had made the movement so original. Consequently, it quickly faded away.

Received with enthusiasm by the entire rightist press, this condemnation was taken by the leftists as a confirmation of the incompatibility of the Church and the modern tendencies within society. This impression was fortified by the fact that numerous influential circles in Rome and Pius X himself were benevolent toward the *Action française,* a royalist group of the extreme right that was led by Charles Maurras and usually supported the integralist opponents of Christian democracy. "It advocates the principle of authority, it defends the order," the Pope told the Catholics of the left who saw the *Action française* as an un-Christian conception of the state, aimed at elevating the reason of the state to the ultimate value. The Pope was grateful to Maurras for his sarcastic assaults on the kind of democracy perpetuated by the anticlerical parliaments of France and Italy and he was grateful that he had created a "teaching chair for the *Syllabus*" in order to preach a counterrevolutionary concept of society based on tradition and the hierarchy. He even went so far as to call this agnostic "a good defender of the Holy See and the Church,"[68] without taking into consideration the fact that Maurras had praised the Catholic Church for having succeeded in moderating the destructive content of the message of the "Hebrew Christ" through wisdom derived from ancient Rome. In 1913, after another offensive against Maurras that was supported by several bishops, "leading personalities" interceded with the Pope, presenting the denunciations as "a trap set by the demo-liberals." Nevertheless, after initial hesitation, the Pope sent Maurras's works to the Congregation of the Index; yet, though the congregation unanimously agreed on a condemnation (26 January 1914), he did not issue it,[69] because he was afraid that a condemnation of the journalist who, in his opinion, was one of the strongest opponents of the modernists and the anticlerical groups, would only serve their cause.

Germany, scarcely affected by the modernist crisis in the true sense of the word, did not have to suffer too much from the antimodernist reaction on a doctrinal level, even though some Catholic scholars were subject to measures which hardly seem justified today.[70] In the last years of Pius X's pontificate, Germany was violently shaken by integralist assaults of a political and social nature. Details about the so-called Center controversy and the opposition crystalizing after 1904 within the trade unions will be discussed later (chap. 35). This opposition was dealing with tensions between the Berlin group that had remained loyal to the old formula of the Catholic worker association and the much stronger Cologne group demanding interdenominational trade unions that would be willing to cooperate with the Socialists to defend professional interests. This double conflict required a fundamental decision as to what extent the laity was able to take on responsibility for its activities in the secular realm without the hierarchy's intervention. The integralists were convinced (and Pius X agreed) that religion was indeed the foundation of social order. Therefore, if one were to solve the political and social problems outside of the control of the ecclesiastical authorities, one would question the traditional concept of the "Christian civilization" and thus run the risk of committing an error in the area of doctrine. Consequently, the Christian trade unions, organized as they were everywhere in western Europe around the turn of the century, were charged with emphasizing their economic and social tasks instead of their ultimate moral and religious purpose. They were especially indignant about the Cologne group going so far as to organize the defense of the workers on a neutral professional basis, enabling cooperation with non-Catholics and even with Socialists.

---

[68] But not a defender "of faith," as C. Bellaigue had written absentmindedly. He postdated by one year the declaration delivered on 6 July 1913 (cf. A. Ansette, *Études* 279 [1953], 391–92).

[69] See the content of the dossier in the *Index librorum prohibitorum,* ed. of 1930, pp. XXVIII–XXXI. Concerning the condemnation, see A. Latreille, *Cahiers d'histoire* 10 (1965), 388–401.

On the one hand, Pius X wanted to uphold the principles that, in his opinion, should guide every Christian society, and therefore he assailed the efforts to declericalize secular life. On the other hand, he had to take into account the strength of the Cologne group, which was backed by the majority of the German episcopate and enjoyed the clandestine support of the nuncio in Munich.[71] For those reasons, the entire situation was fundamentally different from that of *Le Sillon*. Therefore, the Pope looked for a compromise and, in September 1912, issued the encyclical *Singulari quadam,*[72] unconditionally sanctioning the Berlin proposal, but conceding that the other plan could also be "tolerated" to prevent a more serious malady, that is, thesis and hypothesis. However, this papal intervention did not succeed in easing the controversies raging over several years; on the contrary, it agitated the situation even more, since both parties had reason now to cheer. The conflicts also flared up again in France. There, the integralists took advantage of the encyclical, using it to revive their assaults against Christian democracy.[73] Then the *Civiltà cattolica* published two articles by P. G. Monetti,[74] a theologian to whom the Pope liked to listen. These articles were directed against the principle of the trade-union system and culminated in the statement: "It includes many things absolutely opposed to the true spirit of the Gospel, and there is no use in baptizing it Christian; when two terms are so ill-matched, one should not try to combine them." This article was obviously inspired. It was a test, a prologue for a new, much more pointed papal document. This document was intended to warn the Christian trade unions of a development that would drive them gradually away from the social ideology which Pius X considered the only legitimate one, since it agreed with the Catholic concept. However, this was denied by several apologetic historians. Those people, who were convinced that the Pope had been victimized by an obsolete "model" in the sociological sense of the word and was intent on proceeding with the adjustment of the Church to the development of modern society, tried to forestall this new threat. Cardinals Maffi and Mercier, the general of the Jesuits, Fathers Wernz, Toniolo, Harmel, and others discreetly interceded, and Pius X himself finally preferred to postpone the scheduled measures. Thus, the Christian democrats had finally been victorious over their integralist opponents in this "last great battle of the pontificate" (É. Poulat).

---

[70] When F. Maier accepted the invitation to write the commentary for the first three books of the Gospel for the so-called *Bonner Bibel* prepared by F. Tillmann, his solution to the synoptic problem was considered daring, and after several fascicles he had to be replaced by another man.

[71] Regarding the mitigating action of the nuncio in respect to the various controversies that had been incited under the flag of the antimodernist reaction (his measures were not always appreciated by many a Roman group), see A. Walz, *Andreas Kard. Frühwirth* (Vienna 1950), 328–47. Regarding the history of the encyclical, see L. Hardieck, *WZ* 109 (1959), 169ff.

[72] *AAS* 4 (1912), 657–62.

At that time, the excesses of the "witch hunt" had gradually caused a resistance that, in contrast to frequent appraisals, did not wait for the pontificate of Benedict XV in order to manifest itself more or less openly.[75] This resistance progressively focused on a few prelates who had been concerned for years over the development of the situation and the direction it had taken,[76] and around a number of Jesuits who had anticipated that Pius X's successor was bound to continue this development and that this turn of events also had to be anticipated. Several respected journals of the Society of Jesus such as the *Stimmen der Zeit,* publicly risked protests after 1913,[77] in which Father Lippert brandished the "hunt for heresies" as one of the most regrettable phenomena of the antimodernist reaction. Likewise, the *Civiltà cattolica* published the complaints, issued by Prince zu Löwenstein on the occasion of the Congress of Metz, regarding the assaults of "certain" integralists against the social Catholics.[78] A little later, the French Jesuit journal severely criticized the "denunciations without any kind of discernment."[79] For those who were informed, it was no secret that the Jesuits, reacting in this manner to the excesses of the integralists, were backed by the general of the society and two of his main assistants, Fathers Ledóchowski and Fine.

---

[73] An official letter by Cardinal Merry del Val to A. de Mun of 7 January 1913 (see R. Talmy, *Les syndicalisme chrétien,* 122–24) was the first success for them; however, during the following months, the tensions eased.

[74] *CivCatt* (1914) I, 385–99, 546–99. Regarding the affair and its consequences, see A. Zussini, *L. Caisotti de Chiusano e il movimento cattolico dal 1896 al 1915* (Turin, 1965), 154–96.

[75] The letters of Msgr. Benigni (published by É. Poulat) clearly show that the integral Catholics grew increasingly anxious about the development of the situation after 1913, and that their encouraging pleas in view of the "liberal" counteroffensive became more and more numerous.

Pius X, whose bitter complaints about his "isolation" in the struggle on behalf of the integralist orthodoxy can be better understood in this context, did not conceal his dissatisfaction. In October 1913 he had assigned the management of the *Civiltà cattolica* to Father Chiaudano, who wholeheartedly shared his opinion, and of whom the integralist paper *La Vigie* wrote that he would lead the Roman journal back to the "relentless determination" from which it wanted to depart and that he would "revive the beautiful days of Pius IX."[80] The brief addressed to the Society of Jesus on the occasion of the centennial celebration of its restoration did not leave any doubt, by virtue of the indifference with which it was composed, about the Pope's disappointment about the "blunders" with which he felt compelled to charge the Society. It appeared as if he even contemplated relieving Father Wernz of the direction of the Society and replacing him with Father Matiussi, who had close contacts with the integralists.[81] But at this very moment, the almost simultaneous death of the "white Pope" and the "black Pope" brought an end to this particularly painful aspect of the suppression of modernism by the antimodernists.

---

[76] Among others, Cardinal Piffl, archbishop of Vienna; Cardinal Amette, archbishop of Paris; most German bishops; Cardinal Mercier, the archbishop of Mechelen; in Italy the Cardinals Maffi, Svampa, Capecelatro, Richelmy, and even the cardinals of the Curia, Casetta, prefect of the Congregation of Studies, and Steinhuber, S.J., prefect of the Index.

[77] 85 (1913), 358–62; cf. 87 (1914), 249–58.

[78] 1913, III, 612. Concerning this intervention of the *Civiltà,* see G. de Rosa, *L'Azione cattolica* II (Bari 1954), 132–38).

[79] "Critiques négatives et tâches nécessaires," *Études* 138 (1914), 5–25. Cf. J. Lebreton, *Le P. L. de Grandmaison* (Paris 1932), 187–93.

[80] Cf. É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 335–37. It is remarkable that Pius X, on the occasion of his appointment, expressed the desire that the *Civiltà* should serve as a model to all *sincere et integre catholici* journalists.

---

[81] Cf. G. Cassiani Ingoni, *Vita del P. W. Ledochowski* (Rome 1945), 71–73, and *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones,* 10–11.

SECTION THREE

The Holy See and the European Governments

CHAPTER 34

The Roman Question and Italian Catholicism
The Non expedit *in the Pontificates of Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius XI (until 1925)*

Giuseppe Sarto, later Pope Pius X, participated as bishop of Mantua and subsequently as patriarch of Venice in the struggle of active integralism regarding the Roman question and the critical, aloof attitude toward the unified Italian state. However, he was quite sensitive toward the basic problems of the political society of Italy being dominated, after the bloody incidents of May 1898 and the King's assassination in 1900, by anxieties, antagonism, and accusations. The Pope was worried that during the elections the Socialists would support the radicals who stubbornly continued their anticlerical campaign, inspired by the Freemasons, and refused to allow the Church to influence social life (education, schools, social welfare, charity) with respect to the essential internal national aspect of the "Roman question." In order to create a counterweight against such alliances between the radicals and the new social forces in the spirit of more open-mindedness for the democratic authorities, but also of a more aggressive laicism, Cardinal Sarto approved agreements for the purpose of defending religious values and institutions, to be concluded with the Liberals on the occasion of the administrative elections. Moreover, in Mantua and Venice, Sarto had an opportunity to observe and appraise personalities, situations, and programs of the militant Catholics, and he did not entirely reject contacts with "transigent" and arbitrating groups.

Also as Pope, Sarto adhered to his guidelines of "conservative reformism" in the face of Catholic activism (Aubert); he was amicable toward the demands of the most ardent activists, but only within clearly defined limits and in a certain framework, thus keeping in check the initiatives and the men who perpetrated them and put them in action. As far as the Catholic movement in Italy is concerned, Pius X forced those men who had supported the policies of Leo XIII to step into the background, and he introduced new methods of government that were oriented toward direct, unbureaucratic relations with the leading figures of the movement and the spokesmen of various factions. These contacts were made via the secretariat of state. Officially, however, the secretariat of state continued to be responsible, even though Pius X knew that its new leader, Cardinal Merry del Val, was not familiar with Italian Catholicism and was primarily anxious to preserve its authority, the discipline, and the direction from above.

In this manner, Pius X mainly preferred the personal leadership of men of his special trust who stood outside of the Secretariat of State and its offices. Among these advisers, some Fathers of the Society of Jesus were given particular responsibility. Moreover, as editors of the *Civiltà cattolica,* they obtained increased influence for this journal by making it the voice of the papacy. These men were Fathers Santi, Passavich, and Brandi. They had direct access to the organization and the successes of the organized Catholics, one of them in regard to Germany, the second one in regard to Belgium and France, and the third in regard to the United States. They were ordered to prepare drafts of papal documents and served as intermediaries between the papacy and the leaders of the Catholic movement, obtaining reports and declarations and passing on suggestions and reprimands.

It was the wish of Pius X as well as his predecessor that the decisions made at the top, according to his concept of papal authority, should emanate from the people; however, the laity and the active circles of the clergy were in disagreement and tried to drive a wedge between the members of the Curia and the Pope himself, causing the official directives to be somewhat contradictory and ambiguous. In 1904 it was decided that the *Opera dei congressi,* celebrating its thirtieth anniversary, be suspended. At the same time, the dependence of the Catholic movement and its organizations on the ecclesiastical authority was increased through instructions for the reorganization of the centralized cadres, based on the encyclical *Il fermo proposito* (11 June 1905).[1] The Pope found himself bitterly disappointed as far as the people and institutions acquiescing in his intentions were concerned.

Also in regard to the formally approved *Non expedit,* Sarto began to introduce innovations; case by case, mitigations and exceptions were permitted aiming at the elimination of radical and socialist candidates. At the general elections, the liberal candidates were supported, provided they had agreed to assent to the demands of the Catholics regarding schools, family (rejection of divorce), and the religious institutions. By backing the liberal deputies constituting the parliamentary majority of Prime Minister Giolitti, Pius X wanted to make a gesture of détente toward the Italian state. In return, he expected some kind of willingness to oblige in the Roman question, if only in two respects: in regard to the bilateral regulation of the position of the Holy See in Rome and in regard to a mutual agreement about the definition of the legal status of ecclesiastical institutions in Italy.

---

[1] Text: *Insegnamenti pontifici* no. 4; *Il laicato,* 201–31, nos., 323–74.

However, the expectations were not fulfilled. The prime minister from Piedmont indeed pursued a policy of cooperation, assisted by an obliging parliamentary majority despite opposition throughout the country and in the Chamber of Deputies. He listened to the demands and employed ecclesiastical spokesmen in his service. Yet in regard to relations between Church and state, and consequently the relations to the Holy See, he adhered to the customary attitude. He upheld the theory that state and Church could be compared to parallels determined to run abreast of each other without ever meeting. Therefore, the Vatican also returned to its formal and rigid stance. Concerning the Catholic movement, this resulted in a stronger emphasis of its dependence on the Holy See, but also in an intensification of the public activities of Catholics in the communal administrations and in economic and social organizations (savings and loan banks in the country, worker auxiliaries, emigrant welfare, community halls, the political-religious and popular-polemical press, professional organizations, e.g., of elementary school teachers). All these activities resulted in more and more frequent contacts with the world of politics; in public opinion and in peoples' representations, the programs were synchronized and there were meetings pursuing the goal of exerting pressures on the official authorities in favor of the groups that were represented.

Thus, on the level of administrative elections (which had been strongly supported all along) as well as in the area of "political" elections (handled more indirectly), the problem of elections became the priority of the movement, whereby, aside from the "economic-social union," an "election union" was particularly significant during the preparations for the elections.

One of the last decisions made by Leo XIII was the appointment of a new president of the *Opera dei congressi,* Count Grosoli of Ferrara, a man who was sympathetic toward the ideas of Toniolo and to the demands of youth. As the editor of Catholic daily papers, he was bound to occupy an outstanding position. This meant that Leo XIII had begun to employ more venturesome principles of social democracy, and that he finally regarded as a social movement what had seemed to him to be a religious-clerical movement. At the Catholic Congress of Bologna (November 1903), the new democratic spirit had had an opportunity to assert itself through motions and democratic ballot procedures, persuading everyone that the groups had moved closer and that the progressive ideas and their authors had found followers. This was not the case within the traditional five actions. On the contrary, following Paganuzzi, who had been replaced by Grosoli, the "old ones" had incited an alarmist campaign against the new leadership, and in the following year they succeeded in taking the majority of the central committee of the *Opera dei congressi* away from Grosoli. Nevertheless, the Pope confirmed him; but shortly afterward (19 July 1904), the *Osservatore Romano* disapproved of a letter which Grosoli had sent to the Catholic Committees on 15 July 1904. Referring to the statement that "the matter of absolute, effective freedom and independence from the Holy See was the main goal of Catholic Action," Grosoli had insisted in this letter that the Catholics were subject to the authority of the bishop not only in regard to their religious, but also their economic and social initiatives, and that they were to abstain from political elections. However, significantly evoking their national consciousness and referring to demands regarding changing realities, he said: "Within the inalienable rights of the Holy See, Catholics consider historical epochs and events milestones on a path leading into the future and they are intent to assure that their work, carried on in this life, not be hindered by matters that are dead in the national consciousness."[2]

Grosoli again handed in his resignation, and this time it was accepted. Subsequently, in a letter by Cardinal Secretary of State Merry del Val to the Italian bishops, the *Opera dei congressi* was declared suspended, with the exception of its second section, which was still chaired by Medolago Albani. The Catholic Action was to be dependent on the hierarchy of the Church. It had to relinquish the principle of determining the leadership through elections and to forego regional autonomy, thus returning to rigid Roman centralism and an organization of dioceses. "At general congresses and at smaller meetings, parliamentary procedures had to be abandoned and decisions could no longer be made through plebiscite."[3]

Grosoli did not succeed in persuading Murri to return to the organization and to adopt the guidelines of the *Opera dei congressi.* Through the problems he had raised, he had caused a crisis of conscience among the militant Catholics. This was not only of concern to the organization, its goals and methods, and forced it to decide whether Catholics were to follow the directives of the *Opera dei congressi* or Christian democracy; but it also called into question the validity of the *Non expedit* and the restrictive measures of the Vatican regarding the democratic activity of the Catholics.

At this point in time, in July 1904, the social movement showed a balance that was impressive even after being divided regionally: a total of 2,432 organizations, 642 of them in Venetia, 677 in Lombardy, 106 in Tuscany, 27 in Umbria, 99 in the Marches, 37 in Latium, 17 in the Abruzzi mountains, 37 in Campania, 17 in Apulia, 5 in the Basilicata, 8 in Calabria, 3 in Sardinia, and 125 in Sicily. These 2,432 organizations consisted of 774 associations established for the purpose of mutual assistance, 21 people's secretariats, 107 productive and consumer-oriented associations, 170 professional unions or workers' associations, 33 farm labor societies, 43 farmers' associations, 29 associations for collective tenants, 69 banks, 855 rural loan associations, 40 workers' banks, 154 cattle insurance federations, and 187 democratic propaganda societies.[4]

---

[2] A. Gambasin, *Il movimento sociale . . .* , op. cit., 552.

[3] Ibid., 552–54.

The Catholic movement was now facing a dilemma: on the one hand, it had to continue and intensify the multiplicity of social work, and the organizations and their organizers had to take into account the demands raised by the world of workers and farmers. These groups were primarily affected by industrialization, subjected to new living conditions, and repeatedly overrun by crises emanating from the existing world-wide crises. Moreover, the Catholics wanted to establish themselves according to the model of the socialist organizations, trying to show them that Christianity possessed the social strength to liberate the masses from their misery and utilizing all means at their disposal. On the other hand, Catholic activism, by virtue of its loyalty to the Pope, had to follow the papal directives that were spelled out in *Il fermo proposito* of 1905 and in the new "statutes" that had been painstakingly prepared by laymen in 1906. These statutes were the result of intensive consultations with Pius X's advisers and obviously tried to copy many aspects of the Catholic organizations with experience in foreign countries.

The overall structure had been simplified; in place of the five sections of the *Opera dei congressi,* three great national unions were formed. The biggest and most extensive union was the People's Union, comparable to the *Volksverein* of the German Catholics. It consisted of individual members and intended to train them socially and religiously through the traditional values of piety and love. It replaced the first section of the *Opera dei congressi,* unfolding its activities during the Social Weeks, according to the French model. The second section of the *Opera dei congressi* had been essentially retained under the new name Economic Social Union and had the task of educating people as to the principles of an economic order (based on Christian ethics rather than liberalism and socialism) and of creating the appropriate organizations. The activities of the Catholics in the administrative field, gaining more and more significance, were to be furthered and directed by a third organ that was significantly called the Election Union of the Italian Catholics. In regard to practical procedures, the main emphasis was placed on the disciplinary element, which was to curb the drive toward extensive social action and toward political involvements.

---

[4] Ibid., 558.

The task of adjusting the movement to these structures and the duty to obey the directives of the hierarchy, without sacrificing its vitality and impetus, were challenges to leaders and groups alike. In the spirit of Murri, the more active and impatient ones among them subsequently broke away from the movement and divorced themselves from the Catholic Action, ultimately joining forces with the radicals and socialists. This precipitated the loss of many members. The most crucial point troubling them was the matter of autonomy. It caused the most tensions, if only because the demand for autonomy included the limitations imposed by the encyclical *Non expedit,* with all its principle and tactical requirements. In 1905, autonomous groups of "Christian democracy" were formed.

In view of the election of deputies in 1904, some people who, like Bishop Bonomelli under Pope Leo XIII, had pleaded for reconciliation with the government, asked the new Pope to cancel the *Non expedit.* They were joined by laymen who were more successful as spokesmen of the well-meaning, yet impatient activists from the provinces. One of them, Bonomi, the future deputy of Bergamo, was also asked to mediate the issue by advisers of Minister President Giolitti and Minister Tittoni, who compared the degree of Catholic voting in the administrative elections to the degree of abstention in political elections and took account of the political strength of the Catholics.[5] In a conference dealing with the *Non expedit,* Bonomi was told by Pope Pius X: "Follow your conscience, the Pope will be silent."[6] Subsequently, the Catholics participated in the parliamentary elections in Bergamo, Cremona, and Milan, gaining several chamber seats for Catholic deputies, thanks to agreements with the Liberals.

On the part of the Holy See, this was a small concession, eventually resulting in the suspension of the *Non expedit.* The Vatican reserved the right to grant dispensations whenever the bishops deemed them necessary and demanded them. This was a consequence not so much of sympathy with the Liberals as of fear of the advancement of socialism, which was considered a threat to the religiosity of the people and to the stability of the foundations of the Italian state, a state that was now felt to be stable and in need of protection from the turmoils of revolution.

---

[5] At the supplementary elections in Bergamo in June 1904 under the regime of the *Non expedit,* 2,465 had voted in favor, 3,875 had withheld their vote; the radical candidate, with the help of the Socialists, had received 1,330 votes, and the moderate candidate 924. Cf. D. Secco Suardo, *Da Leone XIII a Pio X* (Rome 1967), 384.

[6] P. Zerbi, *Il movimento cattolico in Italia da Pio IX a Pio X. Linee di sviluppo* (Milan 1961), 85.

The Catholic movement continued to take a defensive stance. It protested against any kind of assault on the authority and reputation of the Church, as well as on the religious convictions and customs of the common people. It charged liberal principles with such assaults and showed its strength in unanimous cooperation with the Pope. Not without tensions, this strength consisted of several factors, such as class identity, the progressive ascent of the lower classes, religious devotional enthusiasm, and the pastoral policy of the hierarchy. The leadership was dominated by those who loyally upheld the faith and wanted to lead it to victory. These factors also affected the political action in regard to its spiritual as well as its practical application. In regard to political activity, which was particularly emphasized under Pius X through the mitigation of the *Non expedit,* the offensive attitude crystallized in various forms; so did the intention to exert influence on the social, economic, and religious structures in the spirit of the Church and according to its requirements.

This line was particularly extolled by the moderate clerical group that was part of the Catholic movement and of the Italian politics dominated by Giolitti and his governmental methods. It had a parallel in the so-called "reformist" tendency of socialism, provided that this kind of socialism wanted to take the democratic route toward the realization of its economic and social goals and distanced itself from revolutionary syndicalism and anarchism. The moderate clerical group was a result of the meetings of Catholics and Liberals that took place under the auspices of the journal *La rassegna nazionale* (founded in 1879), an official mouthpiece of the Catholics favoring reconciliation. Under Pius X this journal was brought into ill repute for its sympathies toward Reform Catholicism. Advocates of an election alliance with the Liberals were conservative "intransigents" who were concerned with the economic and social order threatened by the collectivist program and the syndicalist agitation of the Socialists, as well as with the so-called "progressive intransigents," who felt driven to political action in order to be able to influence the official institutions in the spirit of Christian social ethics. The alliance's criteria pertaining to the characteristics expected of the candidates were defined by the Pope himself in 1908 when he said to the future bishop of Bergamo, Radini Tedeschi: "If they are neither sectarian nor socialist candidates, if they offer sufficient prospects for being elected and pledge to uphold the principles of order and public welfare, they should be supported; if Freemasons, anticlerical, socialist, or even worse candidates run for election, Catholic candidates agreeable to amicable factions should be nominated."[7] These directives can be found in the so-called *Patto Gentiloni,* which was signed prior to the elections of 1913 (the first elections in which all men, i.e., 24 percent of a population that had increased to 36 million, had the right to vote). The *Patto* was given the name of Gentiloni, the current president of the Catholic Election Union. It demanded of the liberal candidates the following: the private educational system is not to be burdened with difficulties; the introduction of religious instruction in community schools is to be favored; the institution of divorce is to be rejected; social legislation is to be furthered; and the candidate should be concerned with representing the Catholic professional associations in governmental employment bureaus. Customary defensive concerns took precedence over the social program. This reflected consideration for the liberal allies, as was demanded by the conservative wing, but not condoned by the Catholics, who had a socially more progressive attitude. Gradually the Christian trade-union system, supported by laymen and young priests, made itself felt through unions of farm laborers and of male and female workers, especially in the textile factories of northern Italy, who were accustomed to agitations for wage demands and knew how to use strikes as a weapon. Thanks to the Gentiloni pact, thirty-three Catholic representatives moved into Parliament and, no less significant, about two hundred deputies of the government party were elected due to the votes of Catholics.

Several Catholic groups in the southern part of Italy leaned toward political action as a natural consequence of the social movement, yet were predisposed against an alliance with the Liberals. Their spokesman was a Sicilian priest, Don Luigi Sturzo (born in 1871 in Caltagirone), who justified the opposition of the Catholics against the lay state based on dissatisfaction with the economically disadvantaged south, which was dominated by shrewd businessmen. Sturzo's restraint toward the liberal state rested on the fact that this state was engaged by Giolitti for the purpose of power in a system of business interests and such corruption that the prime minister from Piedmont was named "minister of corruption" by Socialists who also came from the south. Out of opposition against this centralistic, bureaucratic state, Don Sturzo recommended furthering the local autonomy of the communities and counties under the regime of the *Non expedit.* Wishing greater regional autonomy, he actively worked toward this end by founding, for instance, an association of communities.[8] According to his intentions, the incorporation of

---

[7] D. Secco Suardi, op. cit., 558.

[8] Cf. L. Sturzo, *"La croce di Constantino." Primi scritti politici e pagine inedite sull'azione cattolica e le autonomie communali, a cura di G. De Rosa* (Rome 1958), (cf. above all 263–300, *Il programma municipale dei cattolici*).

Catholics into political life was to proceed in an autonomous manner, and one was to work towards the goal of "preparing with restraint." This goal was reached in 1919 with the founding of a nondenominational (formally not subject to the hierarchy) Italian People's Party (*Partito Popolare Italiano*).

Murri proceeded from a different position, totally rejecting the liberal, lay state and sharing in this regard the ideas of the intransigent circles. However, he soon planned to create, in opposition to the *Risorgimento* government, a political organization within the Catholic movement that was to put into action the Catholic social program by seizing power through elections. In a sensational campaign, Murri, the priest from the Marches, rejected the structural, hierarchical rigidity of the Catholic Action precipitated by the "instructions" of Pius X. Murri founded a denominational Catholic party, the *Lega democratica nazionale,* giving it a program that was aimed not only at a reform of the state but also of the Church. Through this, he risked two condemnations: a religious-political condemnation, following the collapse of Catholic unity, and the dogmatic condemnation threatening him as a disciple of modernism. With the support of the radicals, Murri was nominated as a parliamentary candidate. But in 1907 he was suspended *a divinis* and in 1909 excommunicated, even though personalities of the Curia, such as Cardinal Agliardi, continued to give him respect and understanding.

This National Democratic League was soon abandoned by intellectuals, trade-union leaders, and members of community and provincial administrations who could not accept Murri's "political modernism." In 1911, supported by Don Sturzo, they founded the Christian Democratic League; it was one of the elements from which the Italian People's Party subsequently emerged.

There was another significant meeting between the Catholic movement and political organizations: Catholic personalities and representatives of institutions patronizing the missions and the care of Italians in foreign countries met with the proponents of the new nationalist tendencies who considered such institutions instruments of national significance to be utilized in the age of colonialism for purposes of foreign politics. This resulted in the furthering of several Catholic works that were concerned with religion and culture in foreign countries and especially with the care of Italians who had emigrated to North and South America (in 1911 alone, the number of emigrants amounted to over half a million). The consequence of this were closer relations between Catholic leaders and the *Risorgimento* state.

Nevertheless, the active Catholics were still distrustful of and disappointed with the Italian state. The religious-social efforts of the Catholics encountered resistance and the Giolitti government was determined to keep the Catholics, in contrast to the Socialists, from advancing in politics. Therefore, it avoided making concessions to the Vatican that could have compelled Pius X to give the activity of the organized Catholics more leeway. The conciliatory gestures of the bishops and Catholic organizations on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the unified state in 1911 entailed reprimands of the Vatican that sounded almost intransigent.

The Catholic movement had in the meantime invaded the cultural realm. In academia, it was represented by Toniolo and Contardo Ferrini, professor of Roman law, who was sympathetic to the Milan circles, as well as by the philosophers Petrone in Naples, Acri in Florence, and Bonatelli in Padua. Highly respected even in university circles were the conciliatory Cardinal Capecelatro, the astronomer Cardinal Maffi of Pisa, and Monsignor Talamo who was trying to establish contact between the Neo-Thomist renaissance and social studies in the *Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali*. Finally there was the young biologist Agostino Gemelli, who had converted from militant atheism to become a Franciscan friar. After 1909, he emphasized that the Catholic movement must also permeate the universities, thinking of his own plan of a Catholic university which he indeed founded in 1921. The problems of religious consciousness appeared also in literature committed to the cause, such as in novels by Fogazzaro, or works by poets such as Giulio Salvadori, and they found expression in avant-garde journals of the early twentieth century like *La voce* and *L'acerba* of Papini and Prezzolini. The plea for a merging of modern culture and Christianity in the area of historical studies and Scriptural exegesis grew increasingly more intense within the circles of the movement. The most representative groups were those of Buonaiuti, Genocchi, and Fracassini in Rome and the Milan group gathered around the journal *Il rinnovamento* and including T. Gallarati Scotti, A. Casati, and A. Alfieri, who were in contact with the Barnabite Father Semeria and Bishop Bonomelli.[9] However, this cultural orientation of the Catholic movement fell victim to the suppressive measures against antimodernism because it was reminiscent of concepts that were condemned by the encyclical *Pascendi.* The Catholic movement for decades to come was affected by these steps.

As the Catholic movement knew how to interpret the currents in the educated classes as well as in the masses, it succeeded in assuming leadership in the social and political upswing. From then on, its own development coincided more and more with the history of Italy as it emerged from the *Risorgimento.* Its exponents in both chambers, in the administrative bodies, in the press, in the pastoral management of dioceses and parishes soon faced the world conflict that confronted Italy with a choice between war and peace. At first, the Catholics were inclined toward neutrality, in part because of solidarity with the new Pope, Benedict XV (Della Chiesa), who decisively announced his neutrality. People who played an outstanding role and circles that were politically most committed, especially those who were close to the nationalists, were carried away by the appeals to intervene in the war and to fight on the side of the Allies against the Central Powers, on the grounds that this would bring about the completion of national unification. Remembering the spirit of the *Risorgimento,* the Catholics found intervention in the war to be an opportunity to prove their loyalty to the state. The government soon realized the political weight of the practicing Catholics and took their representative Filippo Meda into the Boselli Cabinet (1916).

---

[9] N. Raponi, *T. Gallarati Scotti tra politica e cultura* (Milan 1971).

In August 1917 the Pope called for a peace that would know neither victors nor vanquished, terming war "a senseless slaughter." This reflected negatively on the Catholics and raised doubts about their loyalty, even though, in agreement with the attitude of the Holy See (declarations of Cardinal Secretary of State Gasparri in 1915), they had rejected attempts of foreign powers to raise the Roman question to an international level.

Willing to deal with the problems of the postwar years pertaining to religious, moral, and socio-political issues, the exponents of the Catholic movement in 1919 founded the Italian People's Party (*Partito popolare italiano*). They approached the problems at hand with a concept of state and society that had matured in the course of their study of the struggles and experiences of the previous four decades.[10] With the approval of the Holy See, the party declared itself "non-denominational," thus removing the last obstacle set up by the *Non expedit.* As a result of Catholic Action under the direction of the bishops, the various Catholic organizations were able to pursue their responsibilities to the different sectors of religious education and culture. Members of the People's Party were all Catholic representatives, the leaders and active members of Catholic societies and "white" trade unions. From this time on, their influence was obvious. It was not coincidental that this very same year, at the Peace Conference of Paris, the first deliberations over negotiations regarding the Roman question took place between Prime Minister Orlando and Monsignor Cerretti.[11] These talks were interrupted by the government crisis and the stubborn resistance of certain anticlerical elements.

---

[10] St. Jacini, *Storia del Partito Popolare Italiano* (Milan 1951).

[11] Cf. E. Orlando, *Su alcuni miei rapporti di Governo colla S. Sede* (Rome 1930); F. Margiotta Broglio, *Italia e S. Sede dalla granda guerra alla Conciliazione* (Bari 1966), 43–58 (political and juridic aspects).

The success of the Catholics, due to the proportional representation of 1919 in the elections (the People's Party furnished over one hundred deputies), gave the Catholics a very strong position and the equally responsible task of aligning the parliamentary majority behind the government in the event of a major economic and political crisis. At the same time, in complete independence, the "white" trade-union organization unfolded, but not without slogans of class struggles and a radicalism that negatively affected the People's Party and relations to the hierarchy. The Catholics had to accept sharing the responsibility for the government in an atmosphere that was tense because of the emergence of new political forces and factionalism, which prevented the emergence of any dominant majority. In the elections of 1921, under Prime Minister Giolitti, the People's Party refused to enter into agreements with the liberal government party. Strengthened (with 107 deputies), it returned to the chamber and forced a compromise regarding a temporary government that was rejected by Giolitti. Pressured, on the one hand, by socialists who had in mind the model of the Russian proletarian dictatorship and, on the other hand, by Fascist combat veterans who were soon assisted by the economic and political right wing, a government crisis emerged in which Catholic solidarity broke down. The conservative faction that had allies in the hierarchy and even in the Vatican, refused to align itself with the Socialists in Parliament, instead pressing for the acceptance of the alliance offered by the Fascists and their supporters. The Fascist program had, on the one hand, antidemocratic and nationalistic features, but was, on the other hand, ill disposed toward the Freemasons and benevolent toward the institutions and personalities of the Church.

Under the new Pope, Pius XI (Ratti), who was raised in a middle class and tolerant environment, the Vatican lessened the impact of the coup d'état of October 1922, legalized by King Emmanuel III, and allowed the formation of a wing of "national" Catholics in the People's Party that favored the new political course. Leaders of this wing joined Mussolini's "national" government in 1922.

The revision of the anticlerical traditions of the *Risorgimento* state had been initiated by the Catholics; the Italian People's Party had continued it systematically through legislation and administrative measures. However, now it seemed as if the renovation in important areas was conducted by forces that were unrelated to the Catholic movement or actually stood in opposition to it. Thus it was Mussolini's government that had the Cross installed in schools and courtrooms, reintroduced religious instruction in elementary schools, made denominational schools equal to public schools, officially recognized the Catholic University of Sacro Cuore in Milan, increased the state subsidies for the salaries of the clergy, exempted the higher clergy from military service, increased state subsidies for ecclesiastical buildings, paid greater respect to Church dignitaries, and participated in the great religious celebrations. The new government was also willing to revise the legislation regarding the Church system according to the wishes expressed by the clergy. In view of these concessions offered to Church life in Italy, the Holy See simply consigned the People's Party to the fate of an opposition party, its purpose, in the eyes of the Vatican, having been the political defense of religious ecclesiastical interests. Its leader, Don Sturzo, was asked to resign. In his capacity as priest, he was not to give rise to misunderstandings but clearly demonstrate that the Vatican, despite the opposition of the People's Party, took a benevolent and reserved stance toward Mussolini's government.

The maintenance of religious ecclesiastical interests toward the state was assumed by the hierarchy, and the new government indicated that it preferred to deal with ecclesiastical authorities rather than the representatives of an opposition party. But the attitude of the Holy See was not without reserve. In 1924, for the benefit of Mussolini's government, the Pope reprimanded the anti-Fascist collaboration between the *popolari* and the Socialists that resembled the collaboration between the Center Party and the Social Democrats in the German Empire and specifically in Prussia, but distanced himself from the government by condemning the Fascist violence that was perpetrated on individuals and institutions of the Catholic Action and by voicing his objections to the new totalitarian trade-union legislation, which resulted not only in the termination of the People's Party but also in the end of the Catholic workers' movement. When Minister A. Rocco set up a commission for the reform of the law on ecclesiastical matters, to which, with the tacit agreement of the Holy See, three clergymen were to belong, the Pope personally emphasized (in an address on 18 February 1925) that no decision by this commission could be accepted as long as the Roman question was not solved, whereupon the Minister announced (May 1925) that the problem would be taken up again on "a broader basis."

This implied a confirmation of the *Non expedit,* i.e., of papal control over Italian politics. This resulted in a new climate for a bilateral examination of the Roman question, which was regularized eventually in the Lateran treaties of 1929. In the meantime, directly through the bishops, the Holy See intensified its influence on Catholic attitudes and institutions. Even the structure of the Catholic Action underwent a reform that on the basis of a *Non expedit* emanating from the other side limited the Catholic movement. But the Catholic movement continued to exist, though with somewhat abated energy, especially among the youth and the student associations which were willing to offer resistance to the harassments of the government and Fascist violence. Dissatisfaction with and accusations against the hierarchy even reached the Lateran treaties,[12] which introduced (in a certain sense) yet another phase in the Catholic movement of Italy, the phase of reconciliation (*Conciliazione*), which was interpreted and experienced in different ways.

---

[12] Cf. G. L. Ferrari, *L'azione cattolica ed il regime, edizione postuma a cura di E. Rossi* (Florence 1956), and shorter: M. Bendiscioli, *La politica della S. Sede 1918–1938* (Florence 1939), 74ff. Its thirtieth anniversary served as an occasion to critically review the *Conciliazione.* Significant is the contribution of the Oratorian from Brescia, Cardinal G. Bevilacqua, "Trent'anni dopo i patti lateranensi," *Humanitas* (February 1959), 182–90.

CHAPTER 35

German Catholicism between Kulturkampf *and World War I*

In 1886/87, peace[1] in the matter of Church policies was restored, and until the end of the Empire it would not be seriously questioned. Bismarck's successors Caprivi (chancellor of the Reich from 1890 until 1894), Hohenlohe (1894–1900)[2] and Bülow (1900–09) successfully wooed the Center Party; Caprivi, who tried to alleviate the internal tensions that had built up under Bismarck, made concessions to Poland. In 1891, a Polish prelate, Florian von Stablewski (1841–1906),[3] who was committed to his nation, was assigned the episcopal see of Gnesen. Some of the severities of the retained sections of the *Kulturkampf* legislation were moderated. In 1890 the Expulsion Law was repealed and the exemption of theologians from active military duty was granted. In 1891 the Prussian dioceses were repaid the funds that had been suspended during the *Kulturkampf.* In 1894 the Redemptorists and the Holy Ghost Fathers, who had also been included in the Jesuit Law, were allowed to return; however, the efforts of the Center Party regarding the suspension of this exception law were only partially successful: In 1904 at least ARTICLE 2, which had permitted the internment and expulsion of individual Jesuits, was stricken.[4] In 1902 a Catholic theological faculty was established at the Imperial University of Strasbourg. It soon received papal approval. However, the resistance of the Liberals to the Elementary School Bill drafted by Minister of Cultural Affairs von Zedlitz-Trützschler (1892) in agreement with the Center and the Conservatives showed all too clearly the limits of the compromise; reverting to the most ardent *Kulturkampf* polemics, this opposition involved the struggle "against the obscurantist spirit" and was finally successful.

---

[1] Cf. chap. 3, pp. 70–73.

[2] Cf. chap. 1, p. 34.

[3] H. K. Rosenthal, "The Election of Archbishop Stablewski," *Slavic Review* 28 (1969), 265–75.

[4] Regarding the arguments about the Jesuit law continuing into the last phases of the Empire, see B. Duhr, *Das Jesuitengesetz* (Freiburg 1919).

In spite of this, the process of normalization was probably furthered by Wilhelm II and Pius X alike. During his thirty years in office, the Emperor stressed in his many often ill-conceived statements the Protestant character of his House and the Empire; but he also found understanding words for the Catholics and for Catholic institutions. He sincerely wished the mitigation of the denominational differences.[5] He was particularly interested in the Benedictine order and the Catholic missions, since they were also useful in terms of colonial policy.

The state's right to participate in the appointment of high Church officials, as well as the election of bishops and the nomination of voting cathedral canons during the "royal" months was still exercised,[6] but the bishops' elections that had burdened the relationship between Church and state until the *Kulturkampf* were not interfered with any longer.[7] The government of Wilhelm II successfully effected the elevation of Prussian bishops to cardinals,[8] and the Emperor himself had a vital interest in the improvement of the German influence in Rome, which had always been minor. His wish to have a German cardinal appointed to the curia was not fulfilled, because the Emperor's own adviser on Church policy, Cardinal Kopp, skillfully opposed this plan. Kopp had refused since the conclusion of the *Kulturkampf* to share his role of mediator between Rome and Berlin with anyone.

---

[5] See mainly K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* VI, 262–77, and R. Morsey, *Katholiken und Nationalstaat,* 40–43. Not very informative: M. Buchner, *Kaiser Wilhelm II., seine Weltanschauung und die deutschen Katholiken* (Leipzig 1929), and S. Merkle, *Die katholische Kirche: Deutschland unter Kaiser Wilhelm II* III (Berlin 1914).

[6] See mainly N. Trippen, *Erzbischofswahlen in Köln,* 294–463; also: A. G. Scharwath, "Eine staatliche 'Nachweisung' geeigneter Bischofs- und Domherrenkandidaten der Diözese Trier aus dem Jahre 1902," *AMrhKG* 20 (1968), 335–46; G. Knopp, "Kirchliche Personalpolitik im Düsseldorfer Reichspräsidium vom Ausgang des Kulturkampfes bis zum Ende der Monarchie," *AHVNrh* 173 (1971), 157–81; F. G. Hohmann, "Bischofswahlen in Paderborn," *WZ* 122 (1972), 265–82.

[7] Such interventions were initiated by the Curia, which, in the wake of the perfected centralism, tried to limit the chapter's suffrage. This prepared the initiative regarding the law of free papal appointments which the Curia had enacted following the overthrow of the Central European monarchies that had a voice in such matters. In Germany, Nuncio Pacelli participated in this offensive (N. Trippen, op. cit., 448f.).

[8] In 1893 and 1903 respectively, Kopp (Breslau) and Krementz (Cologne) were appointed. Krementz's successor Fischer and von Hartmann were appointed in 1914. In spite of efforts in Berlin, only Krementz's direct successor Hubert Simar was not elevated to cardinal during his short time in office (1899–1902); this was partly due to Leo XIII's impression that his election had been too much influenced by the government (Trippen, op. cit., 294–344).

In spite of concentrating on internal Church reforms, Pius X never neglected diplomacy, and thus he endeavored to establish good relations with the antirevolutionary Empires of Austria and Germany.[9] On several occasions he demonstratively assured Wilhelm II and Bülow, the guarantors of the existing order, of his sympathy, which survived the break of the Center Party with the Chancellor (1906). The Vatican repeatedly confused the political with the ecclesiastical sphere. This was the case when Erzberger and other Center Party deputies criticized the imperial colonial administration, causing a break (that was also provoked by Kopp), and when the Vatican reprimanded them for ingratitude toward the Chancellor, who was friendly toward the Church.[10] Supported by Kopp, Bülow entertained good relations with Rome. All in all, the example set by Bismarck in the septennate controversy continued to have an effect in Berlin: The *Reich*'s government often tried to solicit internal political assistance from the Vatican and to preserve or increase the distance between the Curia and the growing democratic tendencies. Bülow's successor Bethmann Hollweg (after 1909) adhered to the ecclesiastical political balance. A temporary cooling off between Rome and Berlin only occurred because of the backlash that was caused in Germany by the struggle of the Curia against modernism.[11] The efforts of Pius X (less intense than those of his predecessor) regarding the establishment of a nunciature in Berlin were not successful. They failed because of the opposition of the Berlin imperial court and many influential Protestant circles; but Cardinal Kopp and the Center Party, still fearing for their independence, did not want a nuncio in Berlin either.

After the nineties, the German Catholics and their political representatives began to integrate the Church into the national state. In spite of earlier scepticism, Windthorst had made the first steps in this direction. His successor Ernst Lieber (1838–1902)[12] led the party completely out of the opposition into which it had been forced during the *Kulturkampf,* making it an indispensable support for the policies of Caprivi, Hohenlohe, and Bülow.[13] In pursuit of this aim Lieber disengaged himself from the governmental minority, consisting predominantly of noblemen from Silesia and supported by Cardinal Kopp, and introduced more national, but at the same time more democratic policies. In the spirit of Windthorst, Lieber's course aimed at strengthening the *Reichstag* and at the complete parliamentarization of the Empire, from which his party could expect the most effective increase of its influence. Moreover, there were tensions among the right wing that had already come to the fore in the trade-union controversy and resulted (after 1918, when the majority of the party had begun to favor the republic) in the migration of the Catholics of the right toward the German Nationals. Following the end of the *Kulturkampf,* the number of Catholics voting for the Center Party slowly and steadily decreased.[14] The essential motives for the existence of the party were no longer valid. Frequently, political and economic interests began to take precedence over the appeal for denominational solidarity.

---

[9] Schmidlin, *PG*, 94ff; cf. also Engel-Janosi II, 55, 149–52.

[10] Cf. *Bülows Denkwürdigkeiten* II (Berlin 1930), 272f.

[11] Only recently, statements by Bethmann and his adviser Kurt Riezler have been discovered that are directed against the Vatican's antimodernism, but favor the Center (K. Riezler, *Tagebücher, Aufsätze, Dokumente*, intr. and ed. by K. D. Erdmann [Göttingen 1972], 170–74).

[12] Biographies by M. Spahn (Gotha 1906), H. Cardauns (Wiesbaden 1927), and K. Wolf, *Nassauische Lebensbilder* 4 (1950); E. Deuerlein, *StL*^{6} V, 393f.

Peter Spahn (1846–1925), Adolf Gröber (1854–1919), and Georg von Hertling, bourgeois notables like Lieber, continued after his death the policy of "national cooperation." The role of opposition, with which the Center, after the break with Bülow, had to content itself, did not bring a change of course. This break was particularly significant because a new type of leadership emerging from the lower middle class and the workers, exemplified in Matthias Erzberger (1875–1921),[15] began to assert itself.

The Center Party did not only support the social policies of Wilhelm II because they were compatible with its old objectives. Only the Center's approval enabled the enactment of all the great "national" legislative bills, ranging from Caprivi's trade treaties, the Civil Code, and the improvement of the navy, to the imperial budget reforms under Bülow. The sanctioning of Wilhelm II's navy policy was an expression of the unconditional will to fulfill a national duty. This was an understandable reaction to the earlier charges of "hostility toward the Empire," a reaction that reflected the mood of the citizens at that time, yet was doubtful in terms of its impact.[16] Nonetheless, the Center Party on the basis of its experiences collected during the *Kulturkampf* continued to promote civil rights, a significant contribution to the constitutional development of Germany.[17] The Catholic association system, especially the *Volksverein,* also supported the democratization of society.

---

[13] Very extensive presentation: K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* VI; summary: R. Morsey, *Katholiken und Nationalstaat,* 48–57.

[14] J. Schauff, *Die deutschen Katholiken und die Zentrumspartei* (Cologne 1928).

[15] K. Epstein, *Matthias Erzberger und das Dilemma der deutschen Demokratie* (Berlin, Frankfurt 1962); R. Morsey, *Zentrumspartei 1917–1923,* passim; id., *StL*^{6} III, 36ff.

[16] Equally dubious parallels occurred in France and Italy. The Catholics wanted to prove their patriotism, which was questioned by the majorities in those countries where they

The Center Party managed to enter "the antechamber of power" by way of its national policy, but it did not proceed further.[18] The leadership positions in the Empire and Prussia remained inaccessible to the Catholics; and also in the other areas of state administration, they were unable to achieve participation on an equal footing.[19] Even in Bavaria it was not until 1912, after forty years of liberal regimes, that Hertling, an exponent of political Catholicism, occupied the highest position of government. Weighty remnants of *Kulturkampf* legislation continued to exist. It was not until 1917 that the Jesuit Law was completely suspended. The Center Party's so-called toleration proposal failed to introduce to the imperial code of law the guarantees for ecclesiastical liberty provided by the Prussian constitution that had been suspended during the *Kulturkampf.* Consequently it also failed in suspending the restrictions to which the Catholic Church in some predominantly Protestant federal states (e.g., Saxony, Mecklenburg, Brunswick) was still subject.[20]

The most prominent figure in the Prussian episcopate until World War I was Cardinal Kopp. It was only in the last years of his life that he was increasingly isolated, mainly because of his inflexibility in the trade-union controversy. The differences between him and the bishops of the Rhineland, a remnant of the last phase of the *Kulturkampf,* had been moderated. After all, the bishops had to concede that the mediation of Kopp, criticized by them, was totally compatible with Leo XIII's

---

were in the minority or had been pushed aside by the recent political development. Therefore, they aligned themselves with the aggressive nationalism that led to World War I.—The problem as a whole needs to be researched. Important information, although treating the German development too isolatedly, is to be found in H. Lutz, *Demokratie im Zwielicht,* 21, 24ff., 33ff., 43–52. Cf. also the collective volume prepared by G. Rossini, *Benedetto XV, i Cattolici e la prima guerra mondiale* (Rome 1963), passim.

[17] Thus, the Center resisted the anti-Semitism invading the right wing. Cf. P. G. J. Pulzer, *Die Entstehung des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland und Österreich 1867–1914* (Gütersloh 1966), 219–23, etc.; R. Lill, *Kirche und Synagoge,* ed. by K. H. Rengstorf, and S. von Kortzfleisch, II (Stuttgart 1970), 380–85.

[18] R. Morsey, *Katholiken und Nationalstaat,* 53–56.

[19] Cf. A. Klein, *Die Personalpolitik der Hohenzollernmonarchie bei der Kölner Regierung* (Düsseldorf 1967), 75–114, 125–29.

[20] K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* VI, 101–25, 225–35, 291–94. Cf. among the extensive literature of brochures: M. Erzberger, *Der Toleranzantrag der Zentrumsfraktion des Reichstages* (Osnabrück 1906).

intentions. Korum, Kopp's opponent in the game of Church policies at that time, was later to become Kopp's frequent ally. The integralism they had in common brought them together. Kopp's relations with Cardinals Krementz and Antonius Fischer of Cologne (1840–1912, in 1902 archbishop, 1903 cardinal)[21] remained cool, even though both sides were in agreement about most ecclesiastical matters. The archbishops of Cologne and the majority of their suffragans were largely influenced by the Center Party of the Rhineland and the *Volksverein* with its democratic tendencies, as far as their political and socio-political stance was concerned. They also supported the Christian trade unions that had emerged in the nineties from the Catholic workers' associations in western Germany and continued to be backed predominantly by Catholics, though they were interdenominational. The militant atheism of the free (social-democratic) trade unions had caused the formation of the new organization. They enabled the Catholic and Protestant workers efficiently to represent their professional interests while respecting their religious convictions. The workers' associations led by priests now dealt only with the spiritual care of their members. The Christian trade unions employed all means necessary for the workers' struggle, even the strike. But since they only strove for evolutionary improvements rather than revolutionary change of the existing system, they were supported by the Prussian government in many instances. Their public relations were handled by the *Volksverein.* This reformism of the West, often merging with the remnants of critical distance toward the Prussian state, went too far according to Kopp's opinion. He insisted on patriarchal authoritarian concepts and wanted to integrate Catholicism unconditionally into the state of Wilhelm II and its rigid backward social structure. He was assisted by those magnates whose influence on the Center Party's politics was fading. Kopp knew how to deal with the power of the Center. However, his relationship to the party leadership, from which he frequently tried to extricate the representation of ecclesiastical interests in the political arena, was always tense and grew increasingly worse after Erzberger's rise.

In Bavaria,[22] Archbishop Franz von Bettinger of Munich (1850–1917, archbishop after 1909)[23] supported the *Volksverein* and the Christian trade unions. That he did not become cardinal until 1914 was due to governmental doubts about his leanings. The government would have preferred the elevation of the younger, more intelligent and at the same time more conservative Bishop Michael von Faulhaber (1869–1952)[24] of Speyer, who owed his office to royal nomination. Among the bishops of southwest Germany, Paul Wilhelm Keppler (1852–1926, since 1898 bishop of Rottenburg),[25] respected by his contemporaries as a religious writer, must be mentioned. He had inaugurated a constructive biblical and homiletical renewal, but occupied a very conservative position in the controversy over Reform Catholicism. Cultural inferiority, the most crucial inheritance of the *Kulturkampf,* was a heavy burden for the Catholics.[26] That it grew worse for a while had two causes: The perpetuators of the predominantly Protestant or liberal national culture denied the Catholics full participation. For example, academic teaching positions were generally difficult to obtain. Moreover, most Catholics remained, often preferred to remain, in the self-sufficient isolation that they had escaped to from the onslaught of the liberal offensive. The authoritative defensive of papal doctrine that had climaxed in Pius X's struggle against modernism aggravated or hindered the new ideas of the modern world. Thus the German Catholics were initially unable to provide adequate answers to the growing self-criticism of liberalism. Instead, they retreated into a superficial adaptation of the sham culture of the Wilhelmian era. The criticism of capitalism voiced by apologists and social reformers, such as Franz Hettinger, Georg Ratzinger, and Albert M. Weiß,[27] remained defensive and espoused obsolete concepts of society. The anti-liberalism of the convert Julius Langbehn, temporarily supported by Bishop Keppler, contained, aside from the irrationalism and voluntarism which initially affected the developing youth movement, ambivalent elements that appeared in different places around the turn of the century and eventually paved the road for totalitarian ideologies.[28]

---

[21] Biography by J. Schmitz (Cologne 1915); Trippen, 358–423, etc; J. Torsy, *LThK*² IV, 155.

[22] K. Möckl, *Die Prinzregentenzeit* (Munich 1972), 228–344.

[23] Biography by K. von Preysing (Regensburg 1918); M. J. Hufnagel, *LThK*² II, 323.

Likewise, around the turn of the century, an active minority took up a more adequate rational confrontation with the intellectual forces of the time. The initiatives were provided by the representatives of Reform

---

[24] M. von Faulhaber was elevated to cardinal in 1921.

[25] A. Donders (Freiburg 1935); A. Hagen, *Rottenburg* III, 94–97, 119–29, etc; P. Bormann, *LThK*² VI, 118f; cf. above, p. 428.

[26] Two objective accounts: G. von Hertling, "Der deutsche Katholik und die Wissenschaft," *Jahresbericht der Görres-Gesellschaft für das Jahr 1896* (Cologne 1897); speech of Deputy Fehrenbach at the Catholic Convention in Bonn: 47, 1900.

[27] Well-known works: F. Hettinger, *Aus Welt und Kirche,* 2 vols. (Freiburg ⁵1902), *Apologie des Christentums,* 5 vols. (Freiburg ¹⁰1914–18); G. Ratzinger, *Die Volkswirtschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen* (Freiburg ²1895); A. M. Weiß, *Apologie des Christentums,* 5 vols. (Freiburg ⁴1904–08), *Die religiöse Gefahr* (Freiburg 1904), *Liberalismus und Christentum* (Trier 1914). Cf. chap. 12.

[28] Langbehn's main work, *Rembrandt als Erzieher* (Leipzig 1890), had several editions. Cf. O. Köhler, *LThK*² VI, 783f.

Catholicism,[29] some of whom, out of opposition to papal centralism as well as to political Catholicism, had ventured too far into nationalism. The most significant contributions were provided by Carl Muth and his friends, who initiated in *Hochland,* founded in 1903, the liberation of Catholic belles lettres from an apologetical and backward-looking parochialism. Their opponent in the ensuing literary controversy was Richard von Kralik, representing the traditional concepts in *Gral.*[30]

The controversy over Reform Catholicism and *Hochland* carried on throughout the last decade led to vehement disputes over the political or denominational character of the Center Party and over the permissibility of interdenominational Christian trade unions.[31] These had partially grown out of older, aforementioned differences, but were also caused by the integralism of Pius X and his disciples. The liberal-democratic "Cologne Faction" and the patriarchal-integralistic "Berlin-Breslau Faction" confronted each other in the "Center Party controversy" as well as in the "trade union controversy." Members of the first group were the West German Center Party with its paper *Kölnische Volkszeitung,* the *Volksverein,* the Christian trade unions, and the West German Catholic workers' associations. A minority was integralist, chiefly the association of Catholic workers' societies, located in Berlin, that claimed to represent their members socio-politically, but actually served the interest of the employers through its patriarchalism and by neglecting to utilize the weapons of the trade unions. Its leaders were Roeren, Bitter, and Duke Oppersdorff (deputies of the Center who later left the party) and von Savigny. The integralists were supported by Cardinal Kopp and Bishop Korum. Through Kopp, as well as through the international organization of Prelate Benigni,[32] they had contact with the Vatican, whose full approval they enjoyed.

The papal historian Ludwig von Pastor, an integralist on friendly terms with Pius X and living in Rome at that time, interpreted the interdependence between the various controversies with the following words: "The controversy between Kralik and Muth dealt with the same question that was the object of the controversy between the disciples and opponents of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung.* Some, and I am one of them, look for salvation in a courageous and frank confession of the Catholic point of view; the others, and Muth belongs to them, want to adapt to the opponent by acquiescing to the utmost. . . ."[33] The implication contained therein is typical of the integralists who thoughtlessly doubted the loyalty to the Church of people who disagreed with them. The leaders of the integralists, especially Benigni and his assistants, were known to have spied on their internal ecclesiastical opponents and to have accused them of heresy. Theological modernism, which developed primarily in France, Italy and England, was condemned in 1907. After this date, they turned their full attention to German developments. The procedures of the Cologne faction were considered just as dangerous as the theological innovations that had not gone quite as far. As a matter of fact, the Center majority pursued the declericalization of public life feared by the integralists, and the objective separation of the spiritual and the temporal. Pius X considered this a serious danger. He insisted that all organizations sustained by Catholics should remain in direct dependence on the hierarchy.

---

[29] Cf. chaps. 29 and 15.

[30] Literature controversy: A. W. Hüffer, *Carl Muth als Literaturkritiker* (Münster 1959); F. J. Schöningh, *StL*^{6} IV, 112ff. Cf. also the contributions by F. Fuchs, J. Nadler, M. Ettlinger, P. Funk, and F. Herwig, *Wiederbegegnung von Kirche und Kultur in Deutschland, Festgabe für Carl Muth* (Munich 1927), esp. 38–56, 61–75f., 86–110, 375ff.

[31] Center and trade union controversies most extensively described in K. Bachem, *Zentrumspartei* VII, 156–325. See also Schmidlin, *PG* III, 98–104, 158f., 164ff.; E. Deuerlein, *ThQ* 139 (1959), 40–81; id., *StL*^{6} III, 943–46; E. Ritter, *Katholisch-soziale Bewegung,* 313–51; R. Morsey, *Zentrumspartei 1917–1923,* 33–41; É. Poulat, *Intégrisme,* 198ff., 234–44, etc.; O. Schröder, *Aufbruch und Mißverständnis,* 353–68.

[32] Cf. chaps. 33, 490.

When the Center Party was founded, the leadership and the majority insisted that it be a political party, claiming and obtaining independence from the ecclesiastical authority in political matters.[34] But after Lieber's death, an integralist minority again voiced the demand, favored by the new course Pius X had taken, for more consideration of Catholicism in regard to party policy. In order to counteract this, Julius Bachem (1845–1918), after 1869 editor-in-chief of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung,* in 1906 wrote the famous essay "Wir müssen aus dem Turm heraus," published in the *Historisch-Politische Blätter.* This caused a dispute. Bachem warned against unrealistic conceptions of the Christian state and against abuse of the denominational principle. He demanded political and socio-political cooperation between Catholics and Protestants and the expansion of the party toward an interdenominational Christian people's party. His proposal, based on Windthorst and the tradition of the Center Party and projecting the ideas of Stegerwald and Brüning, became the program of the Cologne Faction. Its forerunners, among them many clergymen, were of the opinion that the Church was to interpret the general norms of morality, but that their actual application to politics and socio-politics was a matter to be dealt with by Catholics versed in these areas. The main paper of the "Cologne Faction," the *Kölnische Volkszeitung,* was supported by most publications of the Center Party, by the *Historisch-Politische Blätter* and *Hochland.*

---

[33] L. von Pastor, *Tagebücher, Briefe, Erinnerungen,* ed. by W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950), 508.

[34] Cf. chap. 1, p. 30; chap. 3, pp. 59f., 71f., 74.

The integralists accused the Cologne Faction of curbing papal authority, of wanting to deprive public life of ecclesiastical influence, and of threatening the integrity of Catholic Germany. Some, especially in the Benigni circle, went further. They took up Counter-Reformation slogans, maintaining that the Cologne group was propagating a national Catholicism that would lead to Protestantism. Pastor believed that the Cologne Faction was based on "Gallicanism."[35] Cardinal Kopp, encouraging and supporting the integralist offensive with the increasing stubborness of old age, spoke of the "infestation of the West,"[36] claiming "that *Hochland* was de-Catholicizing the educated classes, while the *Volksverein* was accomplishing the same within the lower classes through its support of the trade unions."[37] All in all, the *Volksverein* and the Christian trade unions were rejected most vehemently because they dealt with tasks the Church was claiming without, however, paying attention to the hierarchy. The trade unions were repudiated because they were interdenominational and used strikes, a weapon that was revolutionary in conservative eyes. The outcome of the dispute would have been clear had it been carried on in Germany only. The great majority of the politically active Catholics, especially in the west and south of Germany, rejected integralism. Bishops Kopp and Korum were unable to persuade their colleagues. Cardinal Fischer protected the *Volksverein.* Furthermore, in 1910, he effected the resolution of the Bishops' Conference in Fulda, permitting membership in trade unions, provided they did not violate Christian morality and would not meddle with religious matters.

But the integralists refused to recognize these limitations. It was to the advantage of the Church's opponents, who profited from the controversy. The integralists clung to the dispute and carried it to the Curia, involving it for the last time in an internal German ideological struggle. In Rome, the mood was different from Fulda. Pius X and Merry del Val disapproved of the Cologne Faction. They disapproved of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* because it had contradicted the Curia in the controversy involving Ehrhard and Schell. In a sensational speech at the Catholic Convention in Essen in 1906, Cardinal Serafino Vannutelli had declared that those who obeyed the Pope had to obey him in all matters. However, numerous protests had compelled the Vatican to correct this statement. A papal brief addressed to Cardinal Fischer confirmed the freedom of the German Catholics in nonreligious matters. However, Pastor, following a papal audience in 1907, remarked: "I noticed clearly that the Pope did not approve of the German Center Party's request for absolute independence from any kind of ecclesiastical authority. Indeed, such political independence is too easily transferred to the ecclesiastical realm."[38] Five years later, at the peak of the trade-union controversy, Pius X, in a conversation with Pastor, reiterated "that he absolutely refused the efforts of Julius Bachem and his disciples. He said openly that his reprimand was not directed against the many loyal Catholics of Germany but only against those who followed the *Kölnische Volkszeitung.* It was not their opponents who were disturbing the unity of the Catholics, but rather this very paper." Merry del Val went even further, including in his criticism Cardinal Fischer and the majority of the German bishops, as well as Nuncio Frühwirth of Munich, who was said to lean too far toward the Cologne faction.[39] Frühwirth, the general of the Dominican Order until 1904, was quite antimodernistic. However, in Munich after 1907, he had become convinced that the belligerent manner in which the integralists conducted themselves in the controversies concerning literature, the Center Party, and the trade unions was not justified.[40] The Pope and his chief political adviser were not willing or able to examine critically the great amount of information that was forwarded. They believed only what they wanted to believe. Nonetheless, the Pope directly intervened in the Center controversy only once, in 1914, when the Cologne faction had essentially established itself. Derived from a lecture, the essay by the leader of the Center in Baden, Pastor Theodor Wacker (1845–1921),[41] and entitled "Zentrum und kirchliche Autorität," was put on the Index because its emphasis on the independence of the party could be misunderstood. The disproportional severity of this measure suggests that the men around the Pope had indeed waited for an excuse to act. In other respects, the Pope had to exercise restraint; on the one hand, because the political independence of the Center Party had been recognized by his predecessor and confirmed, after all, by himself after Vannutelli's speech; on the other hand, because the party acted with caution in regard to Rome, taking the initiative in ecclesiastical matters only after consulting with the bishops.

---

[35] Pastor, 549.

[36] Concerning Kopp's role in the trade union controversy, see R. Morsey, *Kopp,* 54ff. Cf. also C. Weber, *ArSKG* 26 (1968), 327–34.

[37] Pastor, 513.

Nonetheless, Pius X's course severely burdened the Church policies of the Center Party. For instance, the Vatican's intransigence in regard to the modernist controversy hampered the support of the toleration proposal. In particular, the party had to cushion the various vehement parliamentary debates that had been caused by the Borromeo encyclical and the antimodernist oath. The encyclical *Editae saepe* (29 May 1910),[42] issued on the occasion of the three hundredth anniversary of Borromeo's canonization, honored Saint Charles Borromeo as a model of a true reformer, as opposed to the false reformers such as the modernists and the men of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, against whom Borromeo had fought. The latter were charged in the encyclical with revolt against ecclesiastical authority and blind obedience to the sovereign. Quoting the Epistle to the Philippians, they were called "enemies of the cross of Christ . . . , whose mind is looking for things temporal . . . whose God is the stomach." This metaphor, taken from the vocabulary of the religious struggles of the sixteenth century and congealed into a cliché in the Curia, incurred the outrage not only of the German Protestants. The efforts toward interdenominational cooperation suffered a severe setback. Following protests of the governments of Prussia, Bavaria, and Saxony, and upon the recommendation of the German bishops, the Curia finally did not insist on the official publication of the encyclical in Germany. The Pope himself felt obliged to appease Germany: in several pronouncements he assured Germany and the German sovereigns of his respect. Through his secretary of state he explained that the Curia had not intended to insult the German nation. With respect to the antimodernist oath, a compromise was necessary also. This was almost as injurious to the reputation of the Curia as the previously employed sternness, and it could have been avoided had the situation been assessed more realistically. Following similarly vehement discussions, the theological faculties of the state universities were exempt from the oath. Even Kopp had supported this compromise, because otherwise the continuation of the faculties would have been seriously threatened.

---

[38] Pastor, 474.

[39] Pastor, 542, 544f.

[40] A. Walz, *Andreas Kardinal Frühwirth* (Vienna 1950), 328–47.

[41] Biography by J. Schofer (Karlsruhe 1921); H. Sacher, *LThK*² X, 906.

For the integralist efforts toward Roman intervention, the trade-union controversy, with its moral-theological implications, was more appropriate than the essentially political Center Party controversy. At that time, the Vatican was not sufficiently familiar with the problems of a modern economy. Following a trip to Rome, Cardinal Fischer believed it possible to announce in a pastoral letter the Vatican's neutrality in the controversy of the two German factions, but a papal pronouncement of May 1912 clearly sided with the Berlin group rather than the Cologne one. With insufficiently deliberated arguments the Pope reasoned that religion must penetrate the whole individual and therefore his economic enterprises as well. Cardinal Kopp and his allies almost obtained a formal papal condemnation of the Christian trade unions then struggling for a Christian as well as a democratic solution to the labor problem, offering at that time the only effective alternative to the antiecclesiastical workers' associations. At the last minute, Cardinal Fischer and his close ally, the Franciscan Bishop Bernard Döbbing, an adviser to the Pope, were able to reach a limited compromise.

---

[42] *AAS* 2 (1910), 357–80. Cf. Bachem VII, 330–75.

The encyclical *Singulari quadam* (24 September 1912),[43] concluding the controversy, began with a warning against the "undefined interdenominationalism" (that was not even espoused by the trade unions) and continued with the reiteration of the reminder, uncalled for in this context, of the principle, not even questioned by the German Catholics, that the social problems could not be solved without recourse to religion and moral law. The Pope unconditionally praised the ecclesiastical workers' associations, supporting their monopoly in Catholic countries. However, subsequently he conceded that in other countries Catholics were allowed to cooperate with non-Catholics in order carefully to elevate the working class (*cautione adhibita*) and that, in the exceptional case of Germany, interdenominational trade unions could be tolerated. He made the membership of Catholic workers dependent on their simultaneous membership in the Catholic workers' associations and on the proviso that trade unions would not interfere with the doctrine of the Church. The first of these conditions unnecessarily burdened the workers, the second one ignored the goals of the trade unions. At least, they were now able to continue with their activities. They had no difficulties adhering to the conditions of the *Singulari quadam* and to prevent further conflicts with Rome. In spite of the Vatican's sympathies for the integralists, the trade-union controversy helped the progressive faction in German Catholicism achieve partial success. But the distrustful *tolerari potest* of the Pope encouraged the integralists to continue to discredit the trade unions, thus causing more unrest. Shortly before his death (4 March 1914), Cardinal Kopp himself rejected a conciliatory interpretation of the encyclical. In 1913, the trade unions already had to defend themselves against assaults by the opposition in a sensational trial that was played up by the antiecclesiastical press.

Cardinal Fischer died on 30 July 1912. Thus he was unable to witness the results of the action initiated by him. Due to the Curia's drastic interference with the suffrage rights of the cathedral chapter of Cologne, he was succeeded by Bishop Felix on Hartmann (1851–1919, after 1911 Bishop of Münster),[44] who was close to the integralist, as well as to the national-conservative course of Cardinal Kopp, but who did not possess his leadership qualities. But even in this manner, full success could not be achieved: Hartmann tried hard to contribute to the preservation of the existing political and social structure, thus apparently establishing a good relationship with Wilhelm II. However, he had to pay attention to the realities of his new diocese and to be content with the activity of the Christian trade unions and the *Volksverein.*[45]

---

[43] *AAS* 4 (1912), 657–62. Regarding the history of the encyclical, see L. Hardick, "Bischop Bernhard Döbbing," *WZ* 109 (1959), 143–95, esp. 169ff.

[44] Trippen, op. cit., 448–63.

---

[45] Regarding the development on the whole, see W. Spael, *Das katholische Deutschland . . . 1890–1945* (Würzburg 1964).

CHAPTER 36

Separation of Church and State in France

Voting on the Separation Law (1899–1905)

The emotions aroused by the Dreyfus affair had played a significant role in the failure of reconciliation. Likewise, the separation of Church and state in France was the result of a series of circumstances that gradually deteriorated the relations between the two powers. Basically, neither Pierre Waldeck-Rousseau nor Émile Combes, his successor to the ministerial office in 1902, intended a separation. However, they were led on this path by their personal decisions as well as by political measures demanded by the majority and the compelling force of circumstances. Certainly, many had long regarded the annulment of the concordat a natural consequence of the development, especially after the fateful outcome of the *Ralliement.* However, the internal and external reasons for avoiding the schism were just as strong during the time of the Republic as they had been twenty years before, even though the regime had meanwhile found stronger support among the Catholic voters. When Pius X categorically refused to recognize the law of 2 December 1905, a law introducing into France the "most radical separation system imaginable," the republican government was willing to make a few concessions in order to limit the effects of the law and to avoid at any cost the danger of a religious conflict.

An investigation must first deal with a series of legislative measures whose severe amendments resulted in the separation laws. The "logic of the laws" must not conceal the deep emotions with which these measures were enacted and applied. The ministries stood under the supervision of the majority in the parliament that was ready to strike as soon as the question of congregation and Church was raised. The elections of April 1902, which concerned this topic, resulted in a majority of 339 deputies who belonged to the "bloc" (composed of the Democratic

Union, Socialists, Radicals, and Radical Socialists). The strong core of this "bloc" (200 deputies) was comprised of the representatives of the bourgeoisie of those medium-sized and small cities that were radically anticlerical. One of their loyal representatives was Émile Combes. Formerly a seminarian, he had left Catholicism and turned to medicine and propaganda for the Radicals. This brought him a senatorial seat in his department of Charente-Inférieure. The usual fanaticism of both parties, raked by the press with relentless personal assaults and caricatures, was not without influence on the attitude of the politicians. Preceeding the separation, the expulsion of about twenty thousand members of religious orders between 1903 and 1904 nourished radicalism on both sides. The population frequently supported the resistance of the order members. The demonstrations often ended in bloodshed (in Nantes in 1903, two people died, in Lyon on 8 December of the same year, one person was killed).

In November 1899 Waldeck-Rousseau proposed his bill on the religious congregations. He did not intend it as an aggressive interpretation of the policy of the *défense républicaine.* He had long desired to remedy the lack of any kind of regulation regarding the freedom of association in French law. His aim was to eliminate a new coalition, favored by legal uncertainty, between the nonauthorized congregations and an antirepublican social elite. He was intent on precluding the kind of threat to which the republicans had been exposed on 16 May 1877 and during the appeal of the Dreyfus trial. Moreover, as a statist jurist, he wanted to bring the various forms of ecclesiastical life under the control of the state. This was the background for the measures against the Assumptionists, the prohibition of bishops appointing members of orders to teaching posts and seminaries, and, finally, for the investigation of the property of congregations which he had ordered to be registered in the fall of 1900. In Toulouse, on 20 October, he reiterated the theme of Gambetta, that is, the statement on the clandestine social influence of the congregations on education and the upper echelons of government.

The bill proposed by Waldeck-Rousseau on associations required religious congregations to obtain a license from the government, but at the same time it opened up possibilities for numerous agreements. However, supported by a delegation of groups from the left, the commissions of both chambers gave the bill an expressly anticlerical character. From then on, the admission of congregations which, according to ARTICLE 14, were prohibited from playing an educational role required legal authorization. Strict control of their properties and forced liquidation in case of nonadmission were suggested. The law of 1 July 1901 was, in terms of its spirit, far different from the draft of Waldeck-

Rousseau. The religious associations were excluded from the freedom generously granted to others. This was "the beginning of the struggle." After the autumn, several congregations had dissolved themselves voluntarily, but 700 foundations of female congregations and about 150 male congregations had applied for their authorization. After the enactment of the law, the minister proved to be indulgent and obliging, after Théophile Delcassé had left him in no doubt that for reasons of foreign policy the French did not want a break with the Holy See.

The situation was different in the case of Delcassé's successor, Émile Combes (after 1902). Waldeck-Rousseau was quick to make clear that he did not want the religious struggle launched by Combes. On 27 June 1903, before the Senate, he declared his opposition to Combes's absolutely rigid and uncompromising policy of execution.[1] From all officials Combes demanded, in his words, "strict republican discipline." Contrary to the promises of his predecessor, he declared in June/July 1902 that all schools opened within the period of one year by congregations, even though licensed, were in violation of the law. All schools of nonauthorized congregations were, without exception, affected by this verdict. In the following months almost 12,000 schools were closed, resulting in spontaneous protests especially in Brittany. This total laicization was crowned by the law of 7 July 1904, which denied all members of orders the freedom to teach. Again, 2,500 schools, among them the popular ones of the *Frères des Écoles chrétiennes,* had to be closed. In regard to the congregations, the Chamber approved a government proposal which provided for the denial of all licenses, with the exception of five missionary congregations. The dissolution of congregations was planned for Easter 1903. Some congregations preferred to voluntarily dissolve themselves. However, many others exercised passive resistance in order to draw attention to the coercion concealed behind these measures. Often, the religious who decided to emigrate were cheered by demonstrations of sympathy by the local inhabitants, as was the case on 29 April 1903 with the monks of the Grande-Chartreuse near Grenoble. The government had overestimated the value of the monastery's properties and the treasury made little profit from them.

The vehement protests of the episcopate against all these measures compelled the government to attack the hierarchy. In the summer of 1902, after almost all seventy-four bishops had signed a petition for the purpose of defending the congregations and protesting the interpretation of the law regarding cooperatives, the officials resorted to the regulation that prohibited the bishops from joining together and presenting requests as a legal body. They turned all signatures en bloc over to the council of state which was applying the old and senseless procedure of the *appel comme d'abus* against the bishops. The income of the three initiators of the petition, the bishops of Seéz, Besançon and Nice, was canceled. Even the conciliatory bishop of Orléans, Monsignor Touchet, was included in this sanction. During the last months of Leo XIII's pontificate, the standing conflict over the the government's right to nominate bishops for elections also flared up again.[2] The rigid attitude of the aging Pope in this matter was symptomatic of his situation. Pius X, on the other hand, clearly meant to prove his desire for peace when he accepted the rule that officially sanctioned the nomination by the government. Nonetheless, in June 1904 Rome did not hesitate to summon the two bishops of Dijon and Laval who were charged by their subjects with excessive indulgence toward the state authorities and experienced difficulties in their relations with the clergy and the administration of their diocese. The government forbade the two prelates to travel to Rome.[3] These "summons" were issued a few weeks after a serious diplomatic incident had occurred on the occasion of Émile Loubet's (president of the Republic) visit to Rome. For the first time in the course of improving relations with Italy, the government had agreed to this official visit to the Quirinal, disregarding the advice Cardinal Rampolla had offered in the last months of the previous pontificate and giving no consideration to the Vatican. The sharp protest of the Vatican was published by Jean-Léon Jaurès. The fact that this document questioned the presence of the nuncio in Paris was considered a challenging threat by the left. With a majority of 427 votes, the Chamber resolved to recall the French ambassador to the Holy See. This was the prologue to the break in diplomatic relations following the citation of the two bishops of Dijon and Laval to Rome on 30 July.

---

[1] A. Latreille, R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III (Paris 1962), 499.

Combes's ministry came to an end on 14 January 1905 when the Socialists refused to endorse the anticlericalism of the Radicals. Combes's bill of 10 November to separate Church and state was replaced by a new, more liberal one under his successor J.-B. Bienvenu-Martin. During the debate extending from March into the summer, Aristide Briand, reporting for the commission, pleaded for the absolute neutrality of the state in religious matters in order that the Church "be completely at liberty to organize itself, live, and develop in accordance with its rules." Things changed at the end of April when a large majority voted in favor of ARTICLE 4 (formulated by Jaurès, the leader of the Socialists). According to the article, religious communities were to follow the general organizational structure of their religion after they had announced their intention to adhere to its rules. This article reflected the lesson learned from the failure of the religious policies of the French Revolution. It precluded any attempt to form a state church that would have challenged the established churches. Instead, it amounted to a spiritualistic interpretation of the revolutionary tradition.[4]

---

[2] R. P. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la troisième République* III (Paris 1930), 364–87.

[3] M. Denis, *L'Église et la République en Mayenne, 1896–1906* (Paris 1967), 155ff.

The entire legislative package, approved by the Chamber on 3 July (with a vote of 341 to 233) and by the Senate on 6 December, was not applied until a year later. The law perpetuated the spirit of the legislation of the revolution: neutrality and complete continence on the side of the state in religious matters, including salaries and subsidies. The buildings were declared property of the state or the community. Partially, they were given to the communities to practice their religion, but in the case of conflict, the council of the state, whose hostile attitude was well known, had the right to make a decision.

Execution of the Separation Law (1906–24)

The majority of Catholics considered this law a predatory incursion devised by the state. They had reason to assume that this law created the basis for the destruction of religion and its social impact. Nonetheless, at the end of the nineteenth century, certain groups within Catholicism were still willing to establish contact with the democratic society. They were agreeable to cooperation with the liberal efforts of certain advocates of the law, hoping to achieve with their help a tolerant execution of the law.

Jaurès himself, whose role in the preparation of the law was described above, relied on the support of certain groups of the clergy, ". . . without having to go as far as Loisy . . . . with François Lenormant, the great Christian and scholar, or with Monsignor d'Hulst, or even with Abbé Duchesne, or with the Institutes of Toulouse and Paris, which tried, not without risks, to utilize some of the results of modern criticism for the benefit of traditional exegesis. If only some priests, enthusiastic democrats with liberal spirits, were to stand up and be supported by their religious communities. . . ."[5]

Around 1900, Marc Sangnier, a young engineer from the Parisian middle class, founded a study group that courageously appeared in public with discussion groups, congresses, as well as a project designed to educate the people. The group intended through spiritual indoctrination to prepare the faithful to practice personal responsibility in a democracy. In 1905, the *Sillon* movement had five strong regional groups outside of Paris: in the north, the east, in Limousin, Aquitaine, and Brittany. This movement, whose efforts included sound spiritual and intellectual education as well as social activities, gained some support among the lower and middle classes of the cities and in the rural areas of the east and Brittany. Since 1904, in the region of Lyon, the *Chronique du Sud-Est* had supplied the staff of the *Semaine sociale,* a sort of traveling university which conducted annual seminars on topical or fundamental issues. At that time, the *Chronique* included two hundred groups scattered throughout the Rhône Valley. In 1904, the Jesuit Fr. Leroy founded another movement in Rheims, whose purpose was to disseminate information and be active among the workers. Its *Action populaire* as well as the *Semaines sociales* exist to this day. The Catholic Action of the French youth also undertook a program of social and trade-union related activities.[6] This social involvement was enhanced by lively intellectual activities. When preparing the law, Jaurès had especially the centers of Paris and Toulouse in mind; but the *École de Lyon* that evolved around the new journal *Demain* (1905/07) should be included. The vitality of this group turned again to biblical (Lagrange), historical (Duchesne), and philosophical (Blondel and Laberthonnière) studies.[7] After the elections of 1902, the *Action libérale,* founded in 1901 by Albert de Mun and Jaques Piou, held its ground in the field of politics. The *Action libérale populaire* gained many supporters in the north and in Isère.[8]

---

[4] Regarding ARTICLE 4 and its comments, especially the comment of Jaurès of 20 April 1905, cf. J.-M. Mayeur, *La séparation de l'Église et de l'État* (Paris 1966), 61–76.

[5] J.-M. Mayeur, op. cit., 70.

These movements were forced to take a somewhat reserved stance toward the separation law. This restraint, in view of the conditions to which the Catholics were subjected, was also exercised by the best known representatives of these movements: M. Sangnier and (in the Chamber) Abbé J. Lemire. The Catholic press intensified its aggressiveness and, within the right wing, the *Action française* separated from *Sillon* at that time. The leading ranks had no difficulties convincing the rural population that the Republic was persecuting religion itself. This idea was also propagated by the majority of the clergy. Among the bishops, however, many shied away from a situation which entailed a complete break with the official authorities and, after the elections of 1906, many of them searched for a modus vivendi. The opposite opinion, rejecting any kind of concession to the political situation at hand and having come to terms with the predicted separation, was extolled by those prelates who referred to "liberal" traditions (François Turinaz, bishop of Nancy) as well as those who had taken an intransigent attitude (Anatole de Cabrières, bishop of Montpellier). Their number increased by the new bishops who were exclusively appointed and installed by the Pope, especially those seventeen bishops whom Pius X had appointed at the same time in 1906. In 1906 the antimodernist condemnations increased in Rome. They foreshadowed the encyclical *Pascendi* and the letter of 25 August 1910 in which the Pope asked M. Sangnier to dissolve the *Sillon* movement. The bishops lobbied for this intransigence because they were alarmed by the infiltration of modernist tendencies, which found disciples among the seminarians and the younger clergy. In view of these conditions, the forces of resistance from the leading ranks of the French Catholics down to the common people had a great deal of significance. However, restraint had to be practiced in this regard, because the elections of May 1906 assured the return and even an increase of the majority of the "bloc." These elections focused not on the religious question but rather on the social problem which remained in the forefront until 1914.

---

[6] J. Caron, *Le Sillon et la démocratie chrétienne* (Paris 1967); P. Droulers, *Politique sociale et christianisme: Le P. Desbuquois et l'Action populaire* (Paris 1969); C. Molette, *L'association catholique de la jeunesse française* (Paris 1968).

[7] Cf. in vol. IV of R.P. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la troisième République* (Paris 1930), the chapters that were edited by P. Laberthonnière himself.

[8] J.-M. Mayeur, *Un prêtre démocrate, l'abbé Lemire . . .* (Paris 1968), 300; P. Barral, *Le département de l'Isère sous la III^e^ République* (Paris 1962), 341.

The execution of the separation law was dependent on the Roman directives. Its enactment was almost immediately followed by its condemnation through the encyclical *Vehementer nos* of 2 February 1906, but this did not preclude the possibility of searching for a solution which would insure the religious life of the Church. Such attempts, however, could not imply the recognition of a law prepared without the Holy See. Rome was suspicious of everything that could be taken as acceptance of a precedent and thus influence the concordat situation of the Church in other countries. On the other hand, the government, when preparing the execution of the law, had taken a rather inept and insulting measure. It ordered the churches to take an inventory of all their properties, which were to become that of the state. In March 1906, after a smooth start, these inventory practices caused grave incidents in Paris, Marseille, and especially in the rural areas. The incidents were recorded by J. M. Mayeur.[9] They took place, above all, in areas with strong religious practices (in the lowlands of the west and in the south of the Massif Central, in the Jura, and in French Flanders). In the north and in the Haute-Loire two people died as a result of the unrest. This incipient revolt in the Christian rural areas compelled the government to back down and the inventory activities were discontinued. These incidents were related to the second condemnation of the law through the encyc-

[9] J.-M. Mayeur, *La séparation . . .* , 199.

lical *Gravissimo officio* of 10 August 1906. Under these conditions, the negotiations over the wording of a law that was impossible from a legal point of view were extremely difficult. This was the reason for convening three consecutive episcopal conferences in May and September 1906 and in February 1907. None of the conferences could come to an agreement about the kind of diocesan associations that had been attempted in some dioceses, for instance in Bordeaux. After the law had been enacted, both parties rejected the alternative of "usufruct," which considered the Catholics in their churches users without legal title. When they refused to obtain the official permission required for public gatherings, this offense was ridiculed as a "Mass delict."[10]

The total refusal to cooperate forced the legislators to interpret the law moderately, unless they desired to worsen their already questionable position. The communities were required to let the faithful use the cult buildings free of charge. State council and courts referred to ARTICLE 4, assuring the right of the bishops to stop encroachments of schismatic religious communities that had formed in Toulouse, Lyon, and in the west around some pastors who were rebelling against the diocesan authorities. Thus, when executing the law, the administration even functioned as an "executive organ of the episcopal jurisdiction" (Axel von Campenhausen). The Roman intransigence not only forced it to practice a liberal course, but caused a strengthening of the authority of the hierarchy over the lower clergy, of the clergy over the faithful, and, one could add, of Roman authority over the Church of France.[11]

Nonetheless, the overall balance of the first years was very disquieting to the Church. The confiscation of buildings and the lodgement of bishops and parish priests at their own expense in other buildings entailed material losses and great administrative disorder. The cancellation of stipends and salaries especially caused a rapid decrease of clerical appointments, because the seminarians, mostly of humble background, were unable to cover the cost of their education. The seminaries' student body was reduced by half, and even in areas with traditionally numerous clerical candidates (Rodez, Saint-Brieuc) a decline was felt. The spontaneously developing organizations for clerical appointments, seminary associations and associations of priests were indications of the seriousness of a situation that could not really be improved through such measures. Before the outbreak of World War I, the school conflict flared up again and was intensified by the attitude of the nationalists, who were willing to make the interests of the Church their own business.

---

[10] L.-V. Méjan, *La Séparation des Églises et de l'État* (Paris 1959), 249–415.

[11] A. v. Campenhausen, *Staat und Kirche in Frankreich* (Göttingen 1962). See also J.-M. Larkin, "The Vatican, French Catholics and the Associations Cultuelles," *The Journal of Modern History* 36 (Sept. 1964), 298–317.

In spite of this difficult situation, which was intensified until 1914 by the antimodernist criticism of the renewal efforts, the French Catholics found ways and means to respond to the severe challenges they were facing. The statement that the disestablishment of the Church of the concord, radically changed the Church's behavior within French society is justified.[12] In this respect, it is significant that the initiatives in the nineties to strengthen the social impact of Christianity increased. They were supported by prelates such as Léon Amette (Paris), Pierre Coullié (Lyon), and Pierre Dadolle (Dijon). The societies that considered it their duty to waken the Catholics' interests in social affairs and to educate them accordingly, increased their activities. Especially prominent were the *Action populaire,* headed by P. Desbuquois, the *Semaines sociales,* whose activities attracted a large audience, and the social secretariats existing in Paris and the provinces after 1908. The *Action Catholique de la Jeunesse française* was asked to delegate apostolic responsibility to its lay members (Pius X's letter to J. Lerolle of 22 February 1907).[13] Finally, most scholars, unperturbed by the ecclesiastical censures during the modernist crisis, insisted on bearing witness to the truth of the Catholic Church. This is documented by the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* (until 1913) and the *Bulletin de la semaine,* replacing the journal *La quinzaine.*[14] Characteristic for these prewar years is the revival of religious interest within the intellectual circles, mainly among the youth and even at the universities, as was documented by Joseph Lotte, a friend of Péguy. Finally, the war slowly brought the various social groups closer together again. Comradeship in the trenches, where believers and nonbelievers, priests and laymen fought side by side, contributed substantially to the alleviation of anticlerical prejudices. In 1919, the population of Alsace-Lorraine was not forced to accept the separation law, in order to spare religious feelings. There, priests and pastors continued to receive their salaries from the state, and religious instruction was offered in public schools. This exception, motivated by political expediency, contributed to normalizing the relations between Church and state. It was also significant that during the enforcement of the separation law French schools in foreign countries, especially in the Near East, continued to enjoy the support of the French state.

---

[12] J.-M. Mayeur, *La séparation . . . ,* 193.

[13] C. Molette, op. cit., 518–20.

[14] Not to be confused with *Les Cahiers de la quinzaine,* which were joined by authors who had returned to the faith under the influence of Charles Péguy.

The contacts between Paris and the Vatican were officially resumed in 1915, especially after the mediation of the superior of Saint Louis des Françąis. After Clemenceau had resigned from the political scene, Briand restored diplomatic relations. The new nuncio, B. Cerretti, was solemnly received in Paris in May 1912. At the same time, a deputy of the leftist Center, Célestin Jonnart, was appointed ambassador to the Vatican. Jonnart declared that the government intended "to let the moral forces dominating the world compete to restore peace," without infringing upon the republican laws (*Le Radical* of 29 May 1921). The Holy See granted the French government the right to examine the credentials of episcopal nominees. Finally, in November 1922, exhaustive negotiations began, dealing with the plan to replace the religious associations of parishes that had fallen under the influence of laymen with diocesan associations that were to be subject to episcopal jurisdiction. Thanks to the very active preparations of the texts by Louis Canet, adviser for religious affairs at the Quai d'Orsay, and to the subsequent memoranda of the bishops of Nice (Henri Chapon) and Arras (André Julien), the resistance of the majority of the French episcopate and the restraint of the Holy See could be overcome. At the beginning of his pontificate, Pius XI was persuaded to relinquish guarantees in the form of legislation so that the plan would not fail in the wake of reviving anticlericalism. The diocesan associations were finally constituted through administrative channels. They were headed by the bishop and entitled to administer Church property as well as to accept donations and bequests. On 18 January 1924 the Pope gave his approval by issuing the encyclical *Maximam gravissimamque,* which was endorsed through a letter of 6 February 1924 by the French bishops.[15]

This resumption of relations and this modus vivendi did not mean that anticlerical tendencies had died down. This was demonstrated by the election campaign in the spring of 1925 and by the ensuing policies of the *Cartel des Gauches* (É. Herriot). But this was to be the "last crisis of the Third Republic that was receptive to the revival of the spirit of 1904" (André Latreille). The agreement reached during the postwar era reflected the spiritual development within the Church, which concerned itself with social activities that were more and more divorced from political goals, as well as among the Republicans, who subscribed more and more to a laicism of action rather than belligerent anticlericalism. This marked the establishment of a regime which was entrusted with the relations between the two powers in France in the course of the twentieth century.

---

[15] G. Lesage, *Aspects des rapports entre l'Église et l'État en France, de 1919 à 1924 à travers l'action de Mgr. Julien, évêque d'Arras* (Lille 1970); B. Neveu, "Louis Canet, et le service du conseiller technique pour les affaires religieuses au ministère des Affaires étrangères," *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* (April–June 1968), 134–80. Regarding all these questions, cf. the thorough study of H.-W. Paul, *The Second Ralliement: the Rapprochement between Church and State in France in the Twentieth Century* (Washington 1967).

CHAPTER 37

The Outbreak of World War I

At the level of international relations, Pius X's pontificate coincided with the "time of crisis" (Duroselle). In 1903, King Alexander of Serbia was assassinated by a group of anti-Austrian officers who tried to make their country the center of Yugoslavian nationalism. From 1905 until 1914 there were five increasingly severe crises: the Franco-German crisis following the Tangier demonstrations of Wilhelm II in 1905, the Austro-Russian crisis following the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, the Agadir crisis in 1911, the Balkan Wars of 1912–1913, which increased Serbia's prestige, and finally the crisis of July 1914 that caused World War I. Even though there was new hope every time that war was successfully circumvented, the approach of a catastrophe could be felt, the approach of a war that would be much more devastating than earlier ones, due to progress in armament and the general introduction of conscription. In the last years of his life, Pius X spoke more and more about the imminent catastrophe.

In view of the increase in nationalism and imperialism and the increasing threat of an expanding conflict, the reaction of Catholic groups appears disappointing in retrospect. In the course of the two years before the war of 1914–1918, ecclesiastical groups as well as the faithful themselves joined more and more openly in the glorification of national feeling. This chauvinism and the general resignation explain the enthusiasm with which the Catholics from both camps (with few exceptions[1]) unanimously supported the fighting, rejecting, all in all, Benedict XI's repeated attempts to end this "useless slaughter."[2]

In Germany, many Catholics followed the leaning of the Protestants and became more and more receptive to everything relating to "national greatness." To be sure, the Catholic associations stayed away from Pan-Germanism and occasionally even condemned its excesses, but the Center Party had relinquished its opposition to armament policies after 1897, and, in 1904, Chancellor von Bülow praised the party for its "German national policies." The development of the international situation in the following ten years, coinciding with the incorporation of the Catholics into the bourgeois national state, encouraged this development, and Erzberger was one of its representatives.[3]

---

[1] Above all the Catholic Irish because of their animosity toward England and some of the Italian Catholics, at least during the first year (cf. P. Scoppola, "Cattolici neutralisti e interventisti alla vigilia del conflitto," *Benedetto XV, i cattolici e la prima guerra mondiale* [Rome 1963], 95–151).

[2] See Part III.

In Austria, the Catholic intellectuals shied away from such chauvinism. However, nationalism was very active among the members of the Christian Socialist Party between 1909 and 1914. The leading ecclesiastical circles showed no evidence of pacifist tendencies, rather they placed their moral influence with few exceptions in the service of the dynasty and the preservation of the old Empire, which was being undermined by the demands of the various Slav minorities.

In Italy, the weight of the Roman question often kept the Catholics from manifestations of patriotism. But by the turn of the century, a patriotic development had commenced. It intensified in view of the colonization efforts in Libya, which even the *Civiltà cattolica* presented as a crusade against Islam, though the Holy See had tried to compel the Catholic press to practice restraint. The phenomenon was most noticeable in the south. But from then on, the Catholics wanted to prove almost everywhere that no one could compete with them in terms of patriotism. Even Filippo Meda succumbed to this exaltation for a while. Moreover, the incidents of conflicts between the organized Catholic movements and the extreme nationalists of Corradini increased. In 1910, when trying to solicit the support of the Catholics, Corradini had only found response among the disciples of Murri. In the elections of 1914, he campaigned as a candidate in the region of Vicenza, supported by the episcopate and Catholic Action.[4]

In France, the majority of the clergy and the large Catholic journals emphasized the supposedly close relation between religious experience and patriotic enthusiasm. Following the Dreyfus affair, it was commonplace to consider "the enemies of the army," "the friends of Germany," and "the destroyers of Catholicism" to be one and the same. Demonstrations of this kind multiplied on the occasion of the beatification of Joan of Arc in 1909. In 1911, Secretary Caillaux suggested a policy of détente toward Germany and giving it a small part of the

---

[3] There is no satisfactory study on this subject, therefore see K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* VI and VII (Cologne 1929–30).

[4] Cf. G. De Rosa, *Storia politica dell'Azione cattolica in Italia* II (Bari 1954), 304–37, 364–81; G. Spadolini, *Giolitti e i cattolici 1901–1914* (Florence ^{2}1960), 232–82.

French colonial Empire. But he found that almost all French Catholics and a great number of Christian democrats and Sillonists turned against him.[5] The *Société Gratry pour le maintien de la paix entre les nations,* when founded in 1907 by Vanderpol, an engineer from Lyon, could only solicit seven hundred members. Two years later, it changed into the *Ligue des catholiques français pour la paix.* In 1913, when Vanderpol, supported by the bishop of Liège, tried to organize an international Church congress in order to pave the way for better Franco-German relations, only four French bishops were willing to send a representative. This was the reason why Vanderpol decided in 1911 to expand his plan and establish a *Ligue internationale des pacifistes catholiques,* which was to work on public opinion to try to prevent a forced solution of the problem and to insist on the use of international arbitration. In view of the situation, the league was located in Brussels and the positions of president and secretary general were entrusted to Belgians.[6]

The aloofness of many Catholics toward pacifist movements cannot merely be justified with the old medieval tradition according to which military bravery is closely related to Christian virtues. It also rests in the fact that the instigators of antimilitary demonstrations around 1900 were almost always socialists, anarchists, or Freemasons. At that particular time this meant: enemies of the Church. It is characteristic that Pius X principally granted approval to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace,[7] an American foundation of Protestant origin (letter of 11 June 1911), while rejecting a similar request by Vanderpol's *Ligue Internationale.* To be sure, the Pope had repeatedly condemned the use of weapons as a means to settle conflicts between nations and had demanded arbitration. When Cardinal Vannutelli praised the conquest of Libya by the Italians as a crusade, the Pope called him to order.[8] However, one cannot but concede that the Holy See did not try seriously enough until 1914 to curb the general tendency of the European Catholics to be enthralled by the nationalistic movement. The Holy

---

[5] A thorough study of nationalism among the French Catholics during the period of the Dreyfus affair and World War I does not exist. A few references can be found in M. Vaussard, *Histoire de la Démocratie chrétienne* I (Paris 1956), 67–69, and in *HistCathFr,* 542–43. Also E. Weber, *The Nationalist Revival in France 1905–1914* (Berkley 1959).

[6] Compared to the nineteenth century, antimilitarism declined, but it was still quite popular among the Belgian Catholics for practical rather than ideological reasons. They feared that the young people would lose their faith when drafted into the army and fall victim to immorality. Cf. Lehouck, *Het antimilitarisme in België 1830–1914* (Antwerp 1958), 44–77.

[7] *AAS* 3 (1911), 473–74.

[8] Cf. G. De Rosa, op. cit., 330–31. Also see the offical proclamations that were published in the *Osservatore Romano* between 20 and 30 October 1911, attempting to moderate the enthusiasm for the war.

See's benevolent attitude toward the *Action française* of Maurras and Daudet, pioneers of the *nationalisme intégral,* supports this impression.

The attitude of the Holy See at the moment of the outbreak of World War I is still a topic of discussion. When the Austrian ambassador informed Pius X about the ultimatum that was issued by Vienna and sent to Sarajevo on 23 July, the Pope declared his willingness to arbitrate between the two countries and he emphasized his intention to exercise a moderating influence on both governments. But what did really happen in the course of the following days?

The Pope's doctor, Marchiafava, declared during the beatification process: "I remember him telling me that he himself wrote to the Emperor of Austria, imploring him to do everything in his power to prevent the declaration of war, but it was in vain."[9] A. de Cigala,[10] whose report has been quoted frequently, added: "When the Austrian ambassador informed Pius X of the fait accompli and asked him in the name of the Emperor to bless the Austrian weapons, he answered: "Tell the Emperor that I can neither bless the war nor those who wanted it. The Emperor should consider himself lucky not to have received the curse of Christ's deputy." Some hagiographers went one step further and maintained that the Pope had contemplated the excommunication of Franz Joseph and discussed his intention with Cardinal Ferrata.[11]

However, Cardinal Merry del Val declared: "I do not think that it is absolutely clear that he wrote a letter to the Emperor of Austria."[12] In the Roman and Austrian archives, not a trace of such a letter was found, so that the testimony of Dr. Marchiafava appears to be rather questionable. It seems to be even more doubtful in view of another document, which is equally unverifiable, but sounds entirely different. A few days before Pius X died, one of his secretaries told a friend of the Austrian ambassador confidentially that the Pope had been asked by several parties to intervene in behalf of peace and that his response was the following: "The only monarch in whose behalf I would intervene is the Emperor and King Franz Joseph, because he was always loyal to the Holy See. But I cannot intervene on his behalf precisely because the war of Austria-Hungary is quite just."[13] He is supposed to have added that Russia was totally responsible for the expansion of the conflict.

---

[9] *Processus Ordinarius, Roma* II, 1702–5.

[10] *Vie intime de S.S. le pape Pie X* (Paris ^{2}1926), 219–21.

[11] The letter of the Pope addressed to Franz Joseph dated 13 August 1914 and published in the French and Italian press is obviously a forgery which the secretary of state did not deem necessary to deny (cf. A. Hudal, op. cit., 283–84). At that time the rumor was circulated that Merry del Val had joined the Austrian camp and influenced the Pope in order to prevent his official protest.

[12] *Processus Ordinarius, Roma* II, 898.

Aside from these rumors, for which "reliable documents are missing that could prove their authenticity" (Hudal), there are two documents at our disposal which are more reliable, but pose problems of interpretation. On the one hand, we have the letter of the Bavarian legate Baron Ritter, who wrote on 26 July: "The Pope approves the decisive steps Austria took toward Serbia."[14] On the other hand, there is the detailed report of the Austrian legate Count Pállfy, (of 29 July)[15] regarding a conversation he had had two days earlier with Cardinal Merry del Val: "The memorandum addressed to Serbia was considered extremely harsh by the cardinal, but he approved of it nevertheless, at the same time indirectly expressing hope that the Monarchy would be able to endure the conflict. The Cardinal thought that it was a shame that Serbia had not been "crushed" earlier because at that time it might have been accomplished without taking unforeseeable risks." The diplomat added: "This statement coincides with the Pope's ideas, because in the last few years His Holiness frequently expressed regret about Austria-Hungary's failure to put her dangerous neighbor in its place." When these texts were published, the Cardinal countered with a summary of the conversation: "It is true that I said to Count Pállfy after the terrible crime of Sarajevo that Austria had to remain firm and that it had a right to authentic reparations and the protection of its existence, but I never expressed the hope or the opinion that Austria would not take up arms."[16]

What can we conclude from these texts? Unquestionably, we have to consider that a diplomat tends to declare a carefully phrased or simply implied opinion to be an official statement in order to prove that he has succeeded in persuading his opponent that his country was perfectly justified. One should also take into account that some people might have been of the opinion that the Holy See's restraint would finally remove the old Emperor's last inhibitions. On the other hand, it is clear that the slogan "Austria has to remain firm," which Merry del Val admitted to have used, was conducive to encouraging Vienna to impose its reign on Belgrade, even though Serbia had already responded to the Austrian ultimatum in conciliatory terms (25 July). Even on 27 July, the secretary of state and other diplomats were justified in assuming that a confinement of the conflict would be possible, at least as long as Russia had not taken a clear stand. When she finally did, she caused a chain reaction of hostilities all over Europe.

---

[13] Quoted in Engel-Janosi II, 150–51.

[14] *Bayerische Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch,* ed. by P. Dirr, III (Munich 1925), 206.

[15] *Österreich-Ungarns Außenpolitik. Diplomatische Aktenstücke* VIII (Vienna 1930), 893–94.

[16] *L'Osservatore Romano,* 20 August 1914, 22 October 1923; cf. ibid., 22–23 May 1936.

In any case, one fact can not be disputed: "A number of documents prove that in the decisive months of the summer of 1914 the Vatican was rather favorably inclined toward Austria-Hungary, in fact, one is tempted to say: surprisingly favorably" (Engel-Janosi). It would be exaggerated to speak about the Vatican's dependence on Austria. This can be documented by the fact that, on 24 June 1914, a concordat with Serbia was signed, even though the Austrian diplomats had tried persistently to prevent this because they considered it to be an encouragement for Yugoslavianism.[17] Pius X, however, had great respect for the old Emperor Franz Joseph. After all, just a few years ago, he had appeared as the model of a Catholic sovereign when he walked in the procession of the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar on the occasion of the Eucharistic Congress in Vienna wearing his full-dress uniform. The Pope had placed even more hope on the Austrian successor to the throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand. His assassination deeply disappointed him. Above all, since France's break with Rome, Austria was the only large Catholic state in Europe. Moreover, Austria provided protection against German Protestantism as well as against Orthodox Slavism. There are indications that Pius X and Merry del Val considered Serbia the malignant cell that would eventually infect even the existence of the Habsburg Monarchy. They believed that a weakening of the Austrian influence in the Balkans and on the Danubian plains would favor Russia, the main enemy of Catholicism in the Near East.

Is it possible that the sympathies the Pope and his secretary of state expressed for Austria (which does not necessarily mean that they intended war) also included Germany? In certain French circles, Pius X was charged with having been "the Pope of the Triple Alliance." It is true that the Pope, as a result of his more conciliatory stance toward Italy, did not have the same reasons to bear a grudge against the allies that Leo XIII had. It is also true that the German influence in the Vatican increased during his pontificate. On the one hand, this development was the normal consequence of the break of diplomatic relations by France and of the discontent of the leadership of the religious orders in this country with the measures taken against the congregations. On the other hand, this development resulted from the fact that Rome tended to favor the "safe" principles and dogmas of German Catholicism as opposed to the dangerous French progressivism in the matter of exegesis and philosophy.[18] It is quite possible that the Vatican found satisfaction in the idea that the godless and immoral French would learn a lesson. In view of imminent war, the Pope did not raise the voice of a prophet condemning war, but rather confined himself to a somewhat meek appeal to all peoples to pray.[19] He certainly did not restrain himself because he watched the approach of a catastrophe with pleasure, but rather because he reasoned that the Holy See's position was diplomatically weak and did not permit initiatives such as Pius XII would attempt twenty-five years later at the dawn of World War II. He may also simply have been too tired and old, lacking the energy necessary to act in a hopeless situation.

---

[17] Cf. C. Alix, *Le Saint-Siège et les nationalismes en Europe* (Paris 1962), 111–14, and É. Poulat, *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral* (Paris-Tournai 1969), 527–28.

In fact, a month earlier, Pius X had celebrated his eightieth birthday, and for the last year his health had been a cause of concern. He died almost unexpectedly on the night of 19 August and left his successor with the new and difficult problems that the commencing war posed for the Church.

---

[18] The following assessment by a neutral party seems noteworthy: The American Cardinal O'Connell was asked by Mrs. B. Storer to exercise his influence and "to preserve the friendly feeling which has grown stronger between Germany and the Vatican." He answered her in January 1910: "I wish to assure you that the Holy Father and the cardinal secretary of state are very practical men and that they understand perfectly the value of the staunch sterling character of the Germans and the methods and maneuvers of the French, which are the same the world over" (*CHR* 40 [1954–55], 141–42).

[19] *Dum Europa fere* of 2 August 1914 (*AAS* 6 [1914], 373).

PART THREE

The Expansion of Catholic Missions from the Time of Leo XIII until World War II

The striking lack of representation of missionary interests at the First Vatican Council reflected the fact that ecclesiastical circles were caught up in European interests. As we demonstrated earlier, the participating missionary bishops were active, but in terms of numbers and influence they were a small group.[1] The fact that the Council adjourned abruptly and the missionary proposals were never presented is not the reason for the fact that no effective initiatives for the propagation of the faith emanated from it. The real impulse came from outside, especially from the growing and prevailing imperialism or colonialism, in whose wake the missions had recently assumed truly worldwide scope.[2] The earlier colonial powers, England and France, were joined by a united Germany. Russia expanded its empire in the east and south and thus exercised an antimissionary influence because, in agreement with Western powers, especially England, it impeded the preaching of the Gospel in such countries as Tibet and Afghanistan. In Africa, the Islamic faith, a political force in the Ottoman Empire, penetrated even the black population.

CHAPTER 38

Missions in the Shadow of Colonialism

Initially, a false understanding of the missionary concept impaired worldwide and open-minded missionary activities. This concept originated during the First Vatican Council among the authorities of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. Missionary work was primarily understood to mean activities among the Christians of the Eastern churches and the Catholic immigrants in North America.[3] In the context of the last few years of Pius IX's pontificate, this attitude is understandable; but it can still be found in the first years of Leo XIII's reign. While the Near Eastern Churches enjoyed papal attention (the

---

[1] Regarding the mood among the missionaries, see, for instance, the letter of 31 December 1869 by P. Le Doré (later the general of the Eudists), who had accompanied a bishop of the Antilles to the council (in R. Aubert, *Vaticanum I* [Mainz 1965], 295).

[2] Delacroix III, uses the words *La grande expansion des missions* to characterize this period.

[3] Even in our century, the priests in America were considered the "classic" missionaries. The decisive significance of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in regard to the development of the American Church is evident in the collection of documents compiled by F. Kenneally (*United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives* I [1673–1844], II [1845–62] [Washington 1966–68]). The editor of this work, A. Tibesar, states in the introduction: "Perhaps in no other country was the Congregation of Propaganda Fide more successful in fulfilling its purpose than in the United States of America after our independence" (I, xiii).

Pope sent several proclamations and directives), the pagan missions, according to Roman archives, were neglected.[4] On 3 December 1880 the Pope issued the encyclical *Sancta Dei Civitas,* but it is incorrect to call it a missionary encyclical.[5] In 1884, he praised the activities of the missionaries and called them *Evangelii praecones.* However, he did so on the occasion of the dedication of the North American College in Rome.[6]

This view of the pagan mission changed after the reform of the Curia by Pius X on 29 June 1908;[7] as a result of it, the activities of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith were principally limited to non-Christian areas. The reform deprived the Congregation of its authority over seven archbishoprics and forty-seven bishoprics in Europe (England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, and Luxemburg) and thirty archdioceses with 147 suffragan bishoprics in Canada and the United States. As far as the Near Eastern Churches were concerned, the system of 1862 remained in force. They continued to be subject to the prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, with its own special secretary. Finally, in 1917, a Congregation for the Eastern Churches was established, thus relieving the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of its last responsibility. On the basis of the reform of 1908, missionaries as missionaries were subject to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. However, as members of religious orders they were responsible to the Congregation for Religious.[8] Moreover, a number of areas for which the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith had been responsible (e.g., matters of faith, of marriage, of rites and liturgy) were now transferred to other administrative branches.

During the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X, home missionary activities were increased and strengthened. This was necessary for two reasons: because of the expansion of missionary tasks (especially after the colonization of Africa) and because of the new Italy depriving the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of some of its responsibilities.[9] Therefore, the existing missionary societies were strongly recommended and supported by popes and bishops alike. However, since several of these organizations (e.g., the *Leopoldinen-Stiftung* in Vienna and the *Ludwigs-Missionsverein* in Munich, etc.) served almost exclusively the American and Near Eastern missions, new societies arose, such as the Africa Society of the German Catholics (from 1888–1917),[10] the *Werk vom heiligen Petrus für den einheimischen Klerus,* founded in 1889 by Stéphanie Bigard and her daughter Jeanne, the *Missionsvereinigung katholischer Frauen und Jungfrauen* (1893), the *Petrus-Claver-Sodalität,* suggested by Countess Maria Theresia Ledóchowska in 1894, and many more.[11]

---

[4] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 500–36, in accordance with the documents, devoted more than half of his study to the northern, the Russian, and the Middle Eastern missions.

[5] *Acta Leonis* I, 171–77. The encyclical contains a warm commendation of the activities of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Lyon and the Association of the Holy Childhood in Paris. However, the work of the Christian schools in the Middle East is considered equally valuable.

[6] *Acta Leonis* II, 88–92: *Litterae Apostolicae* of 25 October 1884. Praise of the missionaries: p. 88.

[7] N. Hilling, "Die rechtliche Stellung der Propagandakongregation nach der neuen Kurialreform Pius' X," *ZM* (1911), 147–58.

[8] This gave the leaders of orders the right to voice their opinion about the activities of their members in the missions. Consequently, they became much more interested in missionary work.

In conjunction with the increase of material support, the number of missionary personnel increased. The first third of the nineteenth century was marked by the founding of French missionary societies, while the second third was marked by the establishment of new Italian associations, which were later joined by the missionaries of Parma (Saveriani, 1895)[12] and the *Consolata* missionaries of Turin (1901).[13] The German missionary groups were (for the most part) formed in the last third of the century. Because of the *Kulturkampf,* the first group settled in nearby Holland, where Arnold Janssen founded the Society of the Divine Word (Steyl, 1875).[14] From here, he tried to move into Germany. In 1889, he began work, with permission of the government, in Mödling near Vienna and in 1892 in Neisse (Silesia). The actions of the missionaries in Steyl signaled the creation of German provinces by French and Italian societies. Thus, the following groups were allowed to settle: the Pallottines in Limburg (1892), the Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Hünfeld near Fulda (1895), the Holy Ghost Fathers in Knechtsteden (1895), the White Fathers in Trier (1896), and the Sacred Heart Missionaries in Hiltrup near Münster (1896).

Conceived differently was the missionary work started in 1882 by the Austrian Trappist Franz Pfanner and his disciples in Mariannhill (South

---

[9] Schmidlin, *PG* II, 502. All protests were in vain, and not until the Lateran Treaties of 1929 did they receive compensation.

[10] In connection with Lavigerie's antislavery societies in other countries. The Africa mission profited from the epiphany collection instituted by Leo XIII through his letter of 20 November 1890 (*Acta Leonis* IV, 112–16).

[11] B. Arens, *Die katholischen Missionsvereine* (Freiburg 1922), gives more information about the various countries.

[12] *I Missionari Saveriani nel primo centenario della nascita del loro fondatore Guido M. Conforti* (Parma 1965).

[13] "Il Cinquantennio delle Missioni della Consolata," *Missioni Consolata* 53 (Turin 1951), 101–94.

[14] F. Bornemann, *Arnold Janssen, der Gründer des Steyler Missionswerkes 1837–1909* (Steyl 1970).

Africa). From this community of Trappists, elevated to abbey in 1885, there grew over the years the nonmonastic missionary society of Mariannhill.[15] In 1883/84, the Swiss Benedictine monk from Beuron, Andreas Amrhein, laid the cornerstone for similar monastic missionary communities, first in Reichenbach and later in Saint Ottilien. His intention was to develop the missionary component prior to the monastic.[16]

Home missionary activities were also closely involved with the ecclesiastical efforts to improve the relations between Church and state that were disrupted after 1870, especially in Germany during the *Kulturkampf* and in France during the Republic. The establishment and development of German missionary societies or religious provinces was related to this problem. They owed their establishment to the legislation terminating the *Kulturkampf* and the improved relations between Bismarck and Leo XIII.[17] Two outstanding diplomatic accomplishments of Leo XIII deserve mentioning: his role as arbitrator in the controversy between Spain and Germany over the ownership of the Caroline Islands, a role which he had been offered by Bismarck and in which he decided in favor of Germany; and his open and courageous support of Lavigerie in his campaign against slavery.[18] The diplomatic successes and the receptive personality of Leo XIII permitted him to turn to such non-Christian sovereigns as the Emperor of Japan[19] and Dowager Empress Tz'u-hsi of China and thank them, in writing, for their goodwill toward the foreign missions.[20] While Leo XIII put his diplomatic skills into the service of propagating the faith, Pius X's chief concern in regard to the missions was of a pastoral nature. He recognized the potential of crossfertilization between home country and missions.[21]

---

[15] J. Dahm, *Mariannhill. Seine innere Entwicklung sowie seine Bedeutung für die katholische Missions- und Kulturgeschichte Südafrikas 1882—1909* (Mariannhill 1950).

[16] F. Renner, *Der fünfarmige Leuchter. Beiträge zum Werden und Wirken der Benediktinerkongregation von St. Ottilien,* 2 vols. (Sankt Ottilien 1971).

[17] The papal letter to the bishops of Prussia (6 January 1888) emphasized the humanitarian and missionary significance of the colonial policies of their nation (*Acta Leonis* XIII, 183–91).—In a letter to the archbishop of Cologne (20 April 1890), the Pope expressly asked the German Catholics to participate in the Christianization of Africa (ibid. IV, 44–47). These papal words were the result of Bismarck's efforts to get German missionaries for the German colonies.

[18] Lavigerie was the exponent of Leo XIII's relations to France (cf. mainly Xavier de Montclos, *Le Toast d'Alger. Documents 1890–1891* [Paris 1966]). Bismarck played a similar role in Germany. The history of the founding of Saint Ottilien is a striking example of this (cf. F. Renner, op. cit. I).

[19] *Acta Leonis* II, 121–22: letter of 12 May 1885.

[20] *Acta Leonis* II, 134–35: letter of 1 February 1885.—Unlike previous papal letters, this one was answered, which can be documented by the fact that the Japanese delegate thanked the Pope for it on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his priesthood (ibid. IV, 228).

The propagation of the faith abroad was totally dependent on the colonial power which directly or indirectly dominated the country or the area. All colonies conquered by Russia, even those solely populated by non-Christians, were off-limits to Catholic missions, as were the countries of the Ottoman Empire and its successor states. These countries, especially England and France, pursued a rather ambiguous missionary policy. Among the non-Islamic populations they tolerated missionary activities, after the turn of the century openly supporting and furthering them. However, among the Islamic populations they forbade and hindered any kind of missionary work.[22]

Everywhere, the missionaries were incorporated into or subjugated to the imperialist system. Real freedom of propagation of the faith barely existed in any of these countries. These facts, which had not been discovered until recently, do not mean that the missionaries voluntarily supported the political and economic systems. According to contemporary reports, most missionaries were scarcely aware of the political impact of their work. And even those who seemed to later generations to have been particularly active in the political arena simply wanted to demonstrate their patriotism, which was constantly questioned by the colonial administration.[23]

Asia

The amalgamation of political power and apostolic activities produced numerous difficulties. The patronate in Asia offers ample evidence for this. After the unpleasant circumstances around the middle of the century and the controversies of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith with Portugal, Leo XIII finally succeeded in 1886 in settling the unfortunate conflict through a new concordat, at least in principle.[24] (Two years earlier, in the interest of the Indian Church, he had appointed an apostolic legate and closed seven parishes in Goa.) Of course, this was a compromise, because the King managed to obtain the confirmation of the patronate through the archdiocese of Goa, which had been elevated to patriarchate, and through its suffragan bishoprics (Damao, Cochin, Meliapur). Consequently, the double jurisdiction continued, and Lisbon succeeded in assuring its right to nominate candidates for certain episcopal sees.[25] On the other hand, the government relinquished its right to claim the non-Portuguese areas in India and it recognized the authority of the Apostolic See. Taking advantage of this freedom, the Pope immediately established a proper hierarchy with seven church provinces (Goa, Agra, Bombay, Verapoly, Calcutta, Madras, Pondicherry), and in Ceylon he set up the archbishopric of Colombo.[26] This marked the beginning of visible growth, solidification and strengthening of the Indian Church, which was furthered by the founding of the Papal Seminary of Kandy (Sri Lanka) by the Belgian Jesuits and the instructions of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to the episcopate regarding methods of proselytizing.[27] The Uniate Mar-Thomas Church also grew, obtaining its own apostolic vicariates (Trichur and Kottayam) in 1887 thanks to the efforts of its first delegate, L. M. Zaleski.[28] They were first headed by Latin bishops, after 1896 by native pastors, especially in the Syro-Malabarian apostolic vicariates of Ernakulam, Changanacherry, and Trichur. The bishopric of Quilon developed rapidly, headed by the Swiss Carmelite friar A. M. Benziger (suffragan bishop after 1905, bishop from 1905 until 1931).[29] Extraordinarily successful was the mission of Chota Nagpur in the north, especially among the natives, the Kols. The conversion movement, accelerating after 1880, was consolidated by the Flemish Jesuit K. Lievens through a multiplicity of activities (training of catechists, writings in the language of the area, and social work).[30] In the seventies, the Jesuits reported a considerable increase of members in the diocese of Madura, where they maintained the most important school in all of southern India: Saint Joseph College, located since 1881 in Trichinopoly. They succeeded in converting many Brahmans, thus penetrating for the first time the world of Hinduism. In addition to the Carmelites and Jesuits, the Capuchin friars (in the north), the Salesians, the Oblates, and the Holy Cross Fathers did missionary work in the country. In 1875, they were joined by the Mill Hill Missionaries. The missionaries of Milan, in India since 1863, started a sizable conversion movement at the end of the century among the Telugus in the vicariate of Hyderabad. After Leo XIII's reorganization of the Indian mission, the development progressed rather slowly under the following pontificate.[31]

---

[21] Schmidlin, *PG,* III, 116, 121f. Cf. B. Arens, *Papst Pius X. und die Weltmissionen* (Aachen 1919).

[22] For example, in the Malayan states, in the many independent areas of India governed by Hindu or Islamic maharajahs, in British or French Sudan, and in large areas of Indonesia, any kind of missionary activity, even pastoral work among the Christians, was forbidden until after World War II.—This historical background is often overlooked when, in recent publications, the missionaries are accused of having neglected the dialogue with the Muslims, because a dialogue requires a partner; however, the missionaries were systematically isolated.

[23] Another fact needs to be considered: Like all other contemporaries, the missionaries received an education oriented towards imperialism, especially the whites working in the colonial administrations or in trade and business abroad.—Cf. Leo XIII's encyclical issued to the faithful in France (16 February 1892, *Acta Leonis* II, 39) in which he praised the French missionaries because they had spread the *"renom de la France et les bienfaits de la religion catholique"* in distant lands.—A Villanyi, "Mittel und Wege kolonialer Kirchenpolitik," *ZMR* 47 (1963), 33–46.

---

[24] *Acta Leonis* II, 192–96 (letter of 6 January 1886 to the king of Portugal); the Concordat of 23 June 1886, ibid., 205–7. Cf. B. J. Wenzel, *Portugal und der Heilige Stuhl. Das portugiesische Konkordatsrecht* (Lisbon 1958), 189ff.

[25] These sees were Bombay, Mangalore, Quilon, and Trichinopoly. Various communities responsible to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith became subject to the jurisdiction of Goa. This displeased the Congregation.

[26] *Acta Leonis* II, 229–39: *Litterae Apostolicae Humanae Salutis Auctor* of 1 September 1886.

[27] The Pope insisted on the training of the native clergy. His reasons included the opinions of Francis Xavier, the clergy's better acquaintance with the country and its people, the small number of European missionaries, and, finally, the possibility that the latter could be expelled from the country (*Acta* V, 165–69: encyclical of 24 June 1893, *Ad extremas Orientis ora*).—The instructions: *Collectanea* II, 286–90 (19 March 1893).

[28] W. Maley, *Patriarch Ladislas Zaleski, Apostolic Delegate of the East Indies* (Bombay 1964).

[29] While he was in office, the number of baptized Christians increased from 87,000 to

Indochina,[32] under British dominion, included Burma, with 3 vicariates established between 1866 and 1870 by missionaries from Paris and Milan. Here, the Karens were converted, while the true Burmese, mainly Buddhists, were less susceptible to Christianity. Moreover, the Malay peninsula fell under the control of the British. It was restored to bishopric in 1888.[33] As in Burma, Christians were not recruited from the ranks of the indigenous population, but from among the Indian and Chinese immigrants, who joined in considerable numbers. This is also true for Siam, which, after a trade agreement with France in 1867, experienced a period of benevolent acceptance of the missions, especially under the long government of King Chulalongkorn, who visited the Pope in 1897 and, upon his return, recommended that the Christian messengers be welcomed as friends. Yet even here conversions took place mainly among the Chinese, while the Thais could not

---

226,000. He proved to be an energetic patron of the native clergy and built dozens of churches. Cf. Fr. Philip, O.C.D., *A Man of God. A Biography of Archbishop Aloysius Maria Benziger* (Trivandrum 1956).

[30] F. Schwager I, 425; in regard to Constantin Lievens (1856–93), see Streit VIII, 453f.; concerning his scholarly works, see ibid., 453f.

[31] In 1910, Pius X added the archdiocese of Simla (English Capuchins) and the bishopric of Ajmer (French Capuchins) to the Indian hierarchy; he separated the vicariate of Kottayam (with a native bishop) from Changanacherry (Syro-Malabar).

[32] Regarding these areas, cf. Le Thanh Khoi et. al., *L'Asie Sud-Est de la fin du XIX^e^ siècle à nos jours,* 2 vols. (Paris 1971).

[33] A suffragan bishopric dependent on the archdiocese of Pondicherry after 1889.

be converted.[34] Even though the French colonial administration frequently put obstacles in the way of the missions, the Church of Laos, after 1899 apostolic vicariate, was able to grow. The Christians of Annam particularly suffered from the consequences of colonial politics. Following the peace treaty between King Tu-Duc and France (1862), there was a decade of relative peace, followed by renewed acts of bloody suppression (which can partly be blamed on some missionaries), one in 1872 and another one in 1886, when the final occupation of the country took place. In the course of these persecutions, 20 missionaries, 30 native priests, and 50,000 Christians lost their lives.[35] In spite of this tragic history in the nineteenth century and the many intrigues by the colonial governments, the number of baptized Christians grew after World War I to about one million and the ecclesiastical hierarchy increased to twelve apostolic vicariates headed by the Parisian Dominicans and to two vicariates headed by the Spanish Dominicans.[36]

Similarly fatal events and, for the future of Christianity, even tragic consequences resulted from the Christianization that followed the colonization of China.[37] The treaties imposed upon the Far East by the Western powers marked the beginning of a new era in missionary history. The various agreements paved the way for the missions throughout the entire country and, aside from acceptance and protection, it provided the Church with financial and social advantages. Yet such missionary policies proved to be harmful as well.[38] The missionaries made insufficient efforts to fashion the communities with the Chinese spirit and sensitivities in mind, and many a conversion was inspired by mate-

---

[34] The first Siamese were ordained in 1880. Cf. F. Schwager, "Aus der Vorgeschichte der hinterindischen Mission," *ZM* 3 (1913), 146–51.

[35] E. Vo Duc Hanh, *La place du catholicisme dans les relations entre la France et le Vietnam de 1851 à 1870,* I (Leiden 1969). J. Nguyen van Phong (*ArchSR* 31 [Jan.–June 1971], 248), takes issue with Vo Duc Hanh's opinion that most Catholics were convinced of the religious and political mission of France in the second half of the nineteenth century (p. 26), and the hate of the white population was one of the main reasons for the persecutions of the Christians (287–92).

[36] Latourette VI, 246–51.

[37] To understand the most recent Chinese Church history, see the competent work of J. Beckmann, "Die China-Mission. Versuch einer kritischen Rechenschaft," *Wort und Wahrheit* 14 (1959), 3–40; id., "Neuerscheinungen zur chinesischen Missionsgeschichte 1945–1955," *Monumenta Serica* 15 (Tokyo 1956), 378–462. This extensive bibliography offers a survey of the development of missions from the middle of the thirteenth into the twentieth century. Cf. B. Wirth, *Imperialistische Übersee- und Missionspolitik dargestellt am Beispiel Chinas* (Münster 1968); see also *NZM* 25 (1969), 317.

[38] A very critical assessment of France's policy of protectionism in Schmidlin, *M,* 466f.; cf. A. Schier, "Alphonse Favier et la protection des missions en Chine (1870–1905)," *NZM* 25 (1969), 1–13, 90–101; id., "La nonciature pour Pékin en 1886," *NZM* 24 (1968), 1–14, 94–110.

rial motives (the so-called rice Christians). In addition, the disciples of a white religion were suspect to the population (e.g., in regard to orphanages) and deeply hated by certain segments, especially the Mandarins and scholars, whose national pride was hurt.[39] The resentments exploded during the Boxer uprising in 1900, an incident which cost the lives of thousands of Catholics and numerous priests. In spite of these setbacks and the revolution of 1911, which put an end to the Manchu dynasty but hardly affected the religious communities, the Catholic Church had 1.4 million members around 1912 (the number had doubled since the turn of the century), and the native clergy included 724 clergymen.[40]

Almost twice as many foreign (especially French, Italian, and German) missionaries devoted themselves at the same time to missionary work all over China. The old established order of the Lazarists,[41] the Jesuits, who produced significant cultural achievements through their educational, scientific, literary, and economic charitable activities in parts of Pohai and Shanghai,[42] the Spanish Dominicans, and the Missionaries of Paris, who administered the large area, all profited following the peace of Tientsin from the establishment of new religious societies. The first to bring in reinforcements were the Scheut Fathers. They had an exceedingly difficult vicariate in Mongolia. By establishing Christian villages, its members succeeded in settling complete communities around the center of the Ordos mission.[43] One of the pioneers of this enterprise was Alfons Bermyn (1878–1915), later vicar apostolic.[44] It was here that Monsignor Hubert Otto began his missionary activities.[45] He later transferred to the Kansu province which had been assigned to the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. He headed the vicariate apostolic of northern Kansu from 1890–1921. Following the Milanese missionaries (1869 in Honan) and the Spanish Augustinian friars (1879 in northern Honan), the Divine Word Missionaries arrived in the southern part of Shantung in 1882. Under the vicars apostolic J. B. Anzer[46] and A. Henninghaus,[47] they made rapid and solid progress, for which their schools were largely responsible. In 1885 assistance was sent to North Shensi by the Seminary of Peter and Paul in Rome, and in 1906 the Institute of Parma sent help to northern Honan. All attempts by the Parisians to Christianize Tibet failed due to the strong resistance of the Lamas. The Spanish Dominicans worked in Formosa (from 1859), however, they encountered obstacles after the Japanese occupied the island in 1895.[48]

---

[39] J. Schütte, *Die katholische Chinamission im Spiegel der rotchinesischen Presse. Versuch einer missionarischen Deutung* (Münster 1957). In his conclusion, the author describes the weaknesses and shortcomings of the China mission: "In spite of its external involvement with politics, the Catholic China mission on the whole recognized its true religious goal and tried consistently to realize it. The repeated charge that the foreign missionaries were political spies and agents of imperialist powers is unfounded and was rejected" (381).

[40] Regarding the position of the Church in China (and Japan), see J. Schmidlin, *Das gegenwärtige Heidenapostolat im Fernen Osten* (Münster i. W. 1929).

[41] O. Ferreux, "Histoire de la Congrégation de la Mission en Chine 1699–1950," *Annales de la Congrégation de la Mission* 127 (Paris 1963), 3–530.

[42] Especially the University of Aurora, the College of Zikawei, and the studios of Tusewe together with the famous observatory.

[43] L. van Hecken, *Les réductions catholiques du pays des Ordos. Une méthode d'apostolat des missionnaires de Scheut* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1957); cf. id., *Les Missions chez les Mongols aux temps modernes* (Brussels 1949). Around 1900, the mission had about 371 members.

[44] Many new documents regarding this pioneer of the Mongolian mission (after 1900, he headed the vicariate apostolic of Southwest Mongolia) can be found in J. van Hecken, *Mgr. Alfons Bermyn. Dokumenten over het missieleven van een voortrekker in Mongolië* (1878–1915), 2 vols. (Wijnegen 1947); J. van Oost, *Missionnaire de Scheut Monseigneur Bermyn, Apôtre des Ortos* (Louvain 1932).

In order to further the expansion of the Chinese mission, which claimed Leo XIII's particular attention and love, the Pope divided it into five regions (1879), keeping in mind the future local synods that had been negotiated at the First Vatican Council. He also increased the dioceses by fifteen and, in 1883, issued more detailed instructions to the missionaries in China.[49] It was indeed necessary to awaken the missionary spirit because in many cases the interest was not in gaining new territory, but consolidation within the established area.[50] Therefore, the regional synods, appointed after the eighties, strongly emphasized the conversion of the pagans. The meetings were also important for the closer collaboration of the often colorful missionary personnel and for a more uniform organization of missionary procedures. The synods all attempted to eliminate other shortcomings, such as the missionaries' insufficient training and acclimatization to the land and its people, the neglect of the upper classes and intelligentsia in the press and the schools, and the rather arbitrary and not sufficiently planned way in which the Chinese Church was provided with a clergy and episcopate.[51] The elimination of these inadequacies was demanded by a group of missionaries who were attracted by the positive characteristics of the Chinese and, supporting the so-called Tientsin method, advocated turning away from Europeanism.[52] The establishment of a nunciature was to serve the same purpose, but the plan proposed by the Chinese failed because France opposed it.[53] Neither under Leo XIII nor under Pius X could the project be realized. The often abused protectorate was opposed by Vincent Lebbe (1877–1940), who was extremely active, but also assailed by many. He was a disciple of the spirit of the Gentry group and can be considered the pioneer of a new direction of missionary work in China: thorough indigenization.[54]

---

[45] C. van Melckebeke, *Notre bon Monseigneur Otto. 1850–1938* (Scheut, Brussels 1949). Regarding Msgr. Otto, cf. Streit XII, 581f.

[46] Regarding J. B. Anzer (1851–1903), cf. Streit XII, 592ff.

[47] Regarding Augustin Henninghaus (1862–1939), ibid. XIII, 8ff.

[48] A. Züger, "Die katholische Kirche auf Formosa," *NZM* 14 (1958), 276–96. The Dominicans, who had been on the island since 1859, had not been very successful: in 1919, the number of Catholics was only 4,400.

[49] *Collectanea* II, 187–196.—Regarding the development of the hierarchy under Leo XIII, cf. Schmidlin, *PG* II, 527; under Pius X, ibid. III, 134f.

[50] Ibid., 192: "Sed quum gentilium conversio ad Christum Dominum in cuius cognitione vita aeterna omnium hominum sita est, finis praecipuus missionum existat, ad eam toto animo intendere Vicarii App. conentur."

At the end of the century, the Western powers and Japan concluded treaties with Korea as well; they proved to be beneficial to the Church. Following the persecutions (1803–13, 1827, 1838–46, 1866–69) and the last edict (1881), Christianity was able to gain ground on the basis of the agreements of the eighties, in spite of some reverses in Taikyu in 1887. Religious freedom was not impeded after 1895 by the establishment of the Japanese protectorate, although the authorities attempted to propagate the official Shinto cult. Monsignor Félix-Clair Ridel, after 1869 vicar apostolic of Korea, did not arrive in the country until 1877. He was arrested the following year and deported to China. Like his successors Blanc and Mutel, he was a member of the Missionaries of Paris who, disregarding the hostile atmosphere on the peninsula, had sent more and more personnel there.[55] Mutel held the office of vicar apostolic of Korea from 1890 until 1911. After the division into two dioceses, Seoul and Taikyu (1911), he administered the former. The growth of the new Church was furthered by the founding of vocational and trade schools by the Benedictines of Saint Ottilien, located in Seoul after they established their monastery there in 1909.[56]

---

[51] J. Beckmann, *Die katholische Missionsmethode in China in neuester Zeit* (*1842–1912*) (Immensee 1931).

[52] Ibid., 22, 44, 93, 101f., 106f., 195 in regard to this new orientation.

[53] L. Wei Tsing-sing, "Le Saint-Siège, la France et la Chine sous le pontificat de Léon XIII. Le problème de l'établissement d'une nonciature à Pékin et l'affaire du Pei-t'ang 1880–1886," *NZM* 21 (1965), 18–36, 81–101, 184–212, 252–71.

[54] The founder of the *Société des Auxiliaires des Missions* (S.A.M.) is an ambiguous figure. Even the study of J. Leclercq, *Vie du Père Lebbe* (Toulouse, Paris 1955, ^{5}1961) was criticized. Cf. J. Levaux, *Le Père Lebbe, Apôtre de la Chine moderne* (Brussels 1948); also J. Beckmann, *Die China-Mission* (n. 37), 3; id., *NZM* 4 (1948), 309f., about Lebbe's ideas. These were incorporated into the missionary encyclical of Benedict XV, *Maximum illud,* and into other documents.

[55] Concerning Ridel (1830–84), see Streit X, 426–28. Marie-Jean-Gustave Blanc (1844–90) came to Korea in 1876. He was the vicar apostolic of Korea from 1884 to 1890 (Streit X, 436–38); Gustave-Charles-Marie Mutel, 1854–1933 (Streit X, 433).

Due to the influence and pressures from outside (treaties with the European powers) and the ensuing accessibility of the country to modern Western civilization, the Church in Japan seemed to face a promising future.[57] By 1889 it enjoyed full religious freedom. The persecution decrees had been abolished in 1872/73. The improvement of the situation was aided by the friendly relations between both Leo XIII and Pius X and the royal court.[58] Slowly conversions increased: in 1882, there were 28,000 Catholics, by 1890 the number had grown to 54,000. The Japanese bishops met that same year for their first synod in Nagasaki and, in 1891, Rome proceeded with the establishment of a hierarchy, with Tokyo becoming an archbishopric and Nagasaki, Osaka, and Hakodate suffragan bishoprics.[59] In 1896 the Trappists, the male as well as the female branch, began their prolific activities in Tobetsu near Hakodate. However, most of the work still rested on the shoulders of the Paris Missionaries. They were soon joined by other missionary societies: the Spanish Dominicans of the Philippines in the apostolic prefecture of Shikoku (1904), the Divine Word Missionaries (apostolic prefecture of Niigata, 1912) and the Franciscans in Hokkaido (apostolic prefecture of Sapporo, including Hokkaido, Sakhalin, and the Kuril Islands, 1915), and the (German) Jesuits who founded the Sophia University in the capital (1913). In 1887, the Marianists arrived, earning praise for their work in secondary schools. And finally, there were the female societies (among others, those of Saint Paul and Saint Maurice).

All these groups devoted themselves to the care of the Christians, the training of the Japanese clergy and the catechists, the education of the converts, the press, and social work.[60] Around the turn of the century, however, the disillusioned and disappointed missionaries had to admit that their high hopes could not be fulfilled because the number of baptized had decreased and the number of converts were very few.[61]

---

[56] F. Renner, "Der Ruf an die Benediktiner nach Korea und Manchukuo," F. Renner, op. cit. II, 391–428; A. Kaspar, P. Berger, *60 Jahre Benediktinermission in Korea und der Mandschurei* (Münsterschwarzach 1973). In 1890, Korea had 18,000 Catholics; in 1912: 79,000.

[57] J. Laures, *Die katholische Kirche in Japan* (Kaldenkirchen 1956).

[58] *Acta Leonis* II, 134f.; Schmidlin, *PG* III, 135.

[59] *Acta Leonis* IV, 222–31: *Litterae Apostolicae Non maius Nobis* of 15 June 1891.

[60] J. van Hecken, *Un siècle de vie catholique au Japon 1859–1959* (Tokyo 1960).

[61] In many respects, this situation is reminiscent of the period following World War II. The Protestants were in a much more advantageous position, and their part in modernizing Japan was more significant. The reason may be that their missionaries came mainly from America and England, countries after which the Japanese modeled their adaptation to the western civilization.

The reasons for this are numerous. Money and personnel were lacking. However, the underlying causes are more complex. Among them were the religious scepticism of the Japanese, their passionate desire for purely material, economic progress, their resentment of European teachers, and the fact that they considered Christianity an intrusion. Moreover, there was the identification of the Japanese national character with Shintoism. After the decline of Buddhism, Shintoism became the state religion, the embodiment of the national ideal and the supporting pillar of the new empire. It was an obstacle to the development of the Church, especially since it was extensively propagated throughout the educational system, the military, and all schools. Finally, the missionary process itself had its flaws, which were recognized by a few of the missionaries: The Japanese world had not been penetrated sufficiently, the religions of the country had not been studied, and indirect work, such as literary endeavors, had been neglected. A more thorough study of language and culture, especially of the religious concepts of the Japanese, was needed.[62]

The only Asian country with a Catholic majority, the Philippines, went through the most critical phase of its ecclesiastical history around the turn of the century.[63] If one is interested in the cause of the events which almost brought the Church to the brink of its existence there, one will have to investigate, on the one hand, the characteristics of the political-ecclesiastical constellation within the Spanish colonial empire and, on the other hand, the American intervention, with its many detrimental consequences. Without diminishing the astonishing accomplishments of the Iberian mother country and especially the missionaries,[64] one is compelled to notice that the system, especially on the ecclesiastical level, had considerable shortcomings: it did not aim at independence, but rather tried to preserve dependence on Spain by employing paternalistic methods. Supported by the Freemasons, nationalistic tendencies opposing the foreign dominion grew stronger in the course of the nineteenth century. The native clergy took the same direction because, having been confined to inferior positions, it felt disadvantaged.[65] This placed the clergy into growing opposition to the

---

[62] Schmidlin, *M*, 479f.; J. Beckmann, *Weltkirche und Weltreligionen* (Freiburg i. B. 1960), 102f., describes the first indications of religious strife in the country.

[63] F. X. Clark, *The Philippine Missions* (New York 1945); "Fourth Centenary of the Evangelization of the Philippines," *Boletín Ecl. de Filipinas* 39 (Manila 1965), 1–352; "IV Centenario de la Evangelización de Filipinas," *Boletín de la Provincia de San Nicolás de Tolentino de Filipinas* 55 (Marcilla, Navarra 1965), 53–303.

[64] In this regard, Streit IX, offers impressive documents; cf. ibid., introduction p. X, J. Dindinger's plea defending the messengers of faith.

[65] In the nineteenth century, their number was relatively large, however, they were

Spanish religious orders whose members clung to their old (economically lucrative) positions and who seemed to guarantee loyalty toward the political power. What was originally devised as a colonial reform, slowly took a course toward separation and, in the struggle with the religious, developed even anticlerical features. Pressured by the rebels, Spain deported the monks and expropriated their estates (1897). However, it was too late. Asked for help by the nationalists, America declared war in 1897. But instead of being given into the hands of the patriots, the country became the property of the United States.[66]

The presence of the new power produced drastic changes for the Church: the separation of Church and state (for which the faithful were not prepared), lay legislation which prohibited religious instruction in schools and thus caused religious deprivation,[67] stress on ideological neutrality of the state university (founded in 1911), which alienated the educated from the Church, the infiltration of Protestantism and numerous sects, and, last but not least, the antagonistic attitude of groups indoctrinated by America who considered Christianity a thorn in their side. Finally, in 1912, in the course of the nationalistic turmoils and under the leadership of Gregorio Aglipay, a secular priest from the Philippines (1860–1940), some of the Catholics separated from Rome and formed the *Iglesia Católica Filipina Independiente.*[68] After initial spectacular successes (50 of the 825 Philippine priests and about 1 million of the 8 million Catholics converted to Aglipayism), the membership slowly declined, especially after 1907 when the Church began to recover from the setback.[69] Aware of the critical situation, Leo XIII had begun in 1902 to reorganize Church life, establishing an apostolic

---

generally kept from heading parishes and episcopal offices (yet there were twelve indigenous bishops during the Spanish era).

[66] The most thorough study of this transition: P. S. de Achútegui, M. A. Bernad, *Religious Revolution in the Philippines,* 2 vols. (Manila 1960–66).

[67] F. T. Reuter, "American Catholics and the Establishment of the Philippine School System," *CHR* 49 (Washington 1963), 365–81.

[68] Achútegui and Bernad prove clearly that this separation is rooted in nationalism, that it is a reaction to the political as well as religious domination by the Spaniards. Cf. also I. R. Rodríguez, *Gregorio Aglipay y los orígenes de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente 1898–1917,* 2 vols. (Manila 1960); N. P. Cushner, "Gregorio Aglipay and the Philippine Independent Church," *NZM* 18 (1962), 142–47. Cushner also describes the official doctrine of the schismatic Church.

[69] P. S. Achútegui, M. A. Bernad, *Documents Relative to the Religious Revolution in the Philippines. The Religious Coup d'État 1898–1901. A Documentary History* (Manila 1971). Aglipayism deteriorated for many reasons (in 1960 only 5 percent of the population adhered to it): decline of anti-Hispanic sentiments, revitalization of the Catholic Church, return of all estates to the Catholics, the movement's lack of international reputation, its increasing approach toward Protestantism.

delegature and four new dioceses.[70] On the basis of a treaty with Rome, the missionaries, even the Spanish ones, could return. The old orders, continuing their activities, were aided by more recent missionary societies, following the urgent appeal of the Pope to alleviate the dire need for priests: the Mill Hill Missionaries (1906), the Scheut Fathers (1907), the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart (1908), and the Divine Word Missionaries (1909). At the Thomas University in Manila (licensed in 1916), the Dominicans resumed their work. Pius X himself made efforts to convene a plenary council, which met in 1907 in the capital, headed by the delegate Ambros Agius. The real missionary work was done by the Jesuits (on Mindanao), the Scheut Fathers among the Igorots (northern Luzon), the Negritos, and the immigrant Chinese, while the Divine Word Missionaries, with equal success, took care of the Abras.[71]

Under the rather intolerant colonial power of the Dutch,[72] the Catholic Church was able to develop in Dutch East India after it resettled there in the first half of the century.[73] In the twentieth century, the Jesuits were the only ones, supported by a few secular priests (after 1859), to work in the apostolic vicariate of Batavia, which included the entire huge area of the archipelago.[74] After the formation of the first ecclesiastial districts (1905: the apostolic prefecture of Dutch Borneo, 1911: Sumatra, 1913: the Lesser Sunda islands) and the arrival of new societies (the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, the Capuchin friars, and the Divine Word Missionaries), the Catholics were able to compete with the Protestants, especially on the Lesser Sunda islands, where exceedingly active communities developed. Progress was also due to the work of the various female congregations. The Ursulines and the female

---

[70] *Acta Leonis* VIII, 141–50: *Litterae Apostolicae Quae, mari sinico* of 17 September 1902: Lipa, Tuguegarao, Capiz, Zamboanga; the apostolic prefecture of Palawan was established in 1910. In his letter, the Pope emphasized the necessity for the development of a native clergy and missionary activities in the pagan regions.

[71] J. Schmitz, *Die Abra-Mission auf Nordluzon/Philippinen von 1598–1955* (Sankt Augustin 1964); Engl. ed.: *The Abra Mission in Northern Luzon, Philippines. 1598–1955* (Cebu City 1971); regarding the beginnings of Church life, see F. Schwager, "Die Mission auf den Philippinen," *ZM* 4 (1914), 198–236.

[72] K. M. Panikkar, *Asien und die Herrschaft des Westens* (Zurich 1955), passes harsh judgment upon the colonial powers (p. 103). See also F. Schwager, "Die ostindische Inselflur," *ZM* 3 (1913), 306–10.

[73] J. A. T. Weltjens, *De Vrijheid der Katholieke Prediking in Nederlands-Indië van 1900 tot 1940* (partial publ. of a dissertation of the Gregoriana—Djakarta 1969).

[74] After 1881, the Mill Hill Missionaries worked among the Chinese and Dajaks on British North Borneo. In Dutch India, there were only sixteen official missions at the beginning of the twentieth century. This situation reflects Catholicism's difficult position in Holland.

Franciscans were joined in 1885 by the Sisters of Charity from Tilburg, who founded their first school in Padang (Sumatra); the Sisters of the Society of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph settled in Minahassa (Celebes).[75] Planting the seeds for the later growth of the Indonesian Church, these pioneers included a respectable number of missionaries who excelled in the area of language, e.g., the Jesuit Cornelius J. F. le Coq d'Armandville (1846–96), who in 1884 discovered the Portuguese Latin songs in Sika (Flores),[76] and Fr. Franciscus van Lith, the founder of the Mission of Central Java. After his arrival in 1896, he closely studied the culture of the country, desiring to enrich it through contacts with Christianity. His method of influencing the social milieu through a carefully educated elite bore rich fruit.[77]

The missions in the Pacific also had to cope with the explosive atmosphere of colonial expansion. The fact that all islands in the Pacific were divided among the Western powers had its impact on the course of Christianization.[78] Due to the presence of the greatest colonial power, Great Britain, Protestantism had a considerable head start, which motivated the Catholics, particularly the French, under the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X, to increase their activities. Continuing into most recent times, the denominational competition was occasionally intensified by national rivalries, the Protestant missionaries relying on England and the Catholic ones on France.[79] Because of this, they were accused of political activities, but today scholars assess the situation with more restraint. Though taking advantage of the assistance of the protective and colonial powers, the missionaries were mainly interested in assuring the success of their work: the Christianization of the people in question.[80]

---

[75] A. Mulders, *De Missie in Tropisch Nederland* ('s-Hertogenbosch 1940); regarding the situation around 1913, cf. K. Streit, "Die katholische Mission" (in Dutch India), *ZM* 3 (1913), 310–29; A. Djajasepoetra, "Het 75 jarig bestaan van de St. Claverbond," *Missienieuws Jezuiten* (Nijmegen 1965), Jan. 4–6; a series of other articles about the seventy-five years of missionary work on Java can be found here.

[76] Streit VIII, 486; B. Biermann, "Lieder der Florinesen," *NZM* 10 (1954), 141–45.

[77] Streit VIII, 829; L. van Rijckevorsel, *Pastoor F. van Lith. S. J. De Stichter van de Missie in Midden-Java 1863–1926* (Nijmegen 1952).

[78] *Les missions dans le Pacifique. Journal de la Société des Océanistes* (*cahier spécial,* XXV [Paris 1970]; R. Jaspers, *Die missionarische Erschließung Ozeaniens. Ein quellengeschichtlicher und missionsgeographischer Versuch zur kirchlichen Gebietsaufteilung in Ozeanien bis 1855* (Münster 1972).

[79] J. Schmidlin, "Missionsmethode und Politik der ersten Südsee-Missionare," *ZMR* 26 (1936), 255–63; A. Perbal, *Les missionaires français et le nationalisme* (Paris 1939), takes issue with Schmidlin's viewpoint.

[80] According to A. A. Koskinen, *Missionary Influence as a Political Factor in the Pacific Islands* (Helsinki 1953).

All in all, we can say that each one of the three societies primarily involved in missionary work settled in a different geographic area. The Picpus Fathers settled in the eastern Pacific. Even though their vicariates on the Hawaiian Islands (where Damian Deveuster died in 1889 in the service of the lepers on Molokai) and on the Gambier, Society, Marquesas, Paumotu, and Tubuaï Islands were all stagnating, they reached out toward the Windward Islands (1888) and later the Cook Islands (1894). In the central Pacific, the Marists (1887) expanded their area of work to the New Hebrides. When establishing the vicariate apostolic (New Hebrides, 1904), they had only twelve hundred faithful. However, at their headquarters on the Wallis and Futuna Islands, the life of the Church flourished. It also developed satisfactorily on the Fiji Islands under Julien Vital (after 1887 vicar apostolic) and on the Tonga Islands. They did not return to the Solomon Islands, which they had to abandon after forty years of difficult trials, until 1897 when the apostolic prefecture of the Southern Solomon Islands was established (in 1912 a vicariate apostolic).[81] During the revolt of 1878 on New Caledonia, they shared the fate of the colonial power and, fleeing under the protection of the French, paid their share with a number of lives.[82] Pierre-Marie Bataillon (1810–77), bishop of the Marists, deserves credit for having dared to improve the education of the native clergy. Failures and setbacks did not discourage him. He made his last and most decisive move when founding the seminary in Lane (Wallis Islands), where his successor was privileged to ordain the first four Polynesian priests in 1886. In the western Pacific, we find mostly the Sacred Heart Missionaries. From 1881 on, they took care of the huge Melanesian-Micronesian dual vicariate.[83] On the Bismarck Archipelago, New Britain,[84] New Ireland and the Admiralty Islands, they witnessed a remarkable increase in their communities around the turn of the century, and they were also successful on the Gilbert Islands under Monsignor Joseph Leray (after 1882 vicar apostolic of those islands). However, the apostolate on the Marshall Islands did not prosper. On Guam (Mariana

---

[81] P. O. 'Reilly, H. Laraey, "Bibliographie des presses de la mission mariste des Îles Salomon," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 25 (1969), 257–92.

[82] R. Dousset, *Colonialisme et contradictions. Études sur les causes socio-historiques de l'Insurrection de 1878 en Nouvelle-Calédonie* (Paris 1970); reviewed by G. Höltker, *Anthropos* 66 (1971), 294f.; A. Saussol, "La mission mariste et la colonisation européenne en Nouvelle-Calédonie," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 25 (1969), 113–24.

[83] It dates from 1844; cf. Streit XXI, 127; J. Bertolini, "L'Océanie dans les Archives générales des Missionnaires du Sacré-Cœr," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 25 (Paris 1969), 359–82.

[84] *Pioniere der Südsee. Werden und Wachsen der Herz-Jesu-Mission von Rabaul 1882–1932* (Commemorative ed. [Hiltrup 1932]).

Islands), German Capuchin friars replaced the Augustinian Recollects who had been driven out by the Americans in 1898.[85] From Austrialia, the Sacred Heart Missionaries traveled to New Guinea, settling first on Thursday Island (1884) and later on Christmas Island (1885). From here, Fr. L.-A. Navarre, later vicar apostolic, and Fr. St. E. Verjus (1860–90), who was well known and later elected chief, Christianized the British area.[86] In the Dutch section, we find the Sacred Heart Missionaries after 1903. In German New Guinea, the Society of the Divine Word laid a solid foundation for Catholic Christianity at the end of the last century. The Marists continued their work among the Maoris in the south of New Zealand (Wellington), the Mill Hill Missionaries in the north (Auckland). There were only three somewhat significant missionary attempts among the aborigines of Australia: the efforts of the Jesuits after the eighties in the north, of the Benedictines of New Norcia,[87] who received the new vicariate of Kimberley in 1887 and founded the daughter mission of Drysdale River, in 1910[88] and, finally, the attempts of the Trappists in Broome, which was given to the German Pallotines in 1900.

An important first step in all these missionary enterprises was the establishment of the apostolic delegature for Australia, New Zealand, and Oceania.[89] At the outbreak of World War I, the number of Catholics in the nineteen mission districts of the South Seas was one hundred ninety thousand, a truely unique accomplishment in the history of missions, demonstrating the endless optimism of the pioneers of the faith in an area that presented more difficulties than anyone could imagine.

Africa

During the same period, the African mission experienced a similarly stormy development. Although it had been in the background in the middle of the nineteenth century, it now became a focal point of interest. On the one hand, it profited from Europe's growing interest in the dark continent. On the other hand, it took advantage of the possibilities which opened up when the colonial powers occupied large areas of land.[90] The criticism that the missionaries were thinly disguised lackeys of the colonial authorities is refuted by the facts. With the exception of a few, the missionaries stayed away from wordly dealings. Not infrequently, conflicts arose with the administration because the missionaries felt obliged to represent the side of the Africans.[91] The Gospel was not always preached with the same enthusiasm and success. In White Africa (north of the Sahara) it gained hardly any ground, but, along the equator, Catholicism encountered the strongest response. Towards the south, the response gradually decreased.[92]

---

[85] C. Lopinot, "Zur Missionsgeschichte der Marianen und Karolinen," *NZM* 15 (1959), 305–08.

[86] Concerning Verjus, cf. Streit XXI, 279ff.; A. Dupeyrat, *Papouasie. Histoire de la Mission 1885–1935* (Issoudun, Paris 1935); B. de Vaulx, *Histoire des missions catholiques françaises* (Paris 1951), 506–31.

[87] R. Salvado, *Memorias históricas sobre la Australia y la Misión Benedictina de Nueva Nursia* (Madrid 1946).

[88] *AAS* 2 (1910), 410f.; in regard to earlier missionary attempts by the Jesuits, cf. R. M. Berndt, "Surviving Influence of Mission Contact on the Daly River, Northern Territory of Australia," *NZM* 8 (1952), 81–95, 188–92.

[89] *Litterae Apostolicae,* 15 April 1914: *Sylloge,* 83f.; expanding over all the Pacific islands: ibid., 108 (20 May 1919).

In North Africa Christianity encountered the strongest resistance. From here the Islamic faith was to start its victorious course into the center of the continent. It was an element which the Christian churches had to face in many areas.[93] Out of concern for the Muslim population, the authorities did not permit missionary activities in many areas or they imposed restrictions (e.g., in British Sudan, today's Ghana, and in Cameroon). For a long time, there was no real Islamic mission, until Cardinal Lavigerie became archbishop of Algeria in 1867 and introduced drastic reforms. In his first pastoral letter, he demanded the right to deal with the Arabs and he was, indeed, given greater freedom.[94] In

---

[90] L. H. Gann, P. Duignan, *Colonialism in Africa 1870–1960,* 2 vols. (London 1970); vol. II: 1914–60.—At times, the missionaries were the only whites settling anywhere. In some places, they followed trade or any firmly established foreign power. Partially, the intentions of the missions were identical with those of colonial policies (F. Blanke, "Mission und Kolonialpolitik," *Europa und der Kolonialismus* [Zurich 1962], 91–122; id., *Missionsprobleme des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* [Zurich 1960]; F. Jäger, "Die Kolonisation Afrikas durch die Europäer—eine Kulturleistung," *Universitas* 17 [1962] 851–57.

[91] E. Dammann takes issue with those who consider any kind of colonial activity an error: "In some individual cases, the ties may have been too close. However, in general, a negative judgment is not justified. The earlier situation should not be measured by today's standards. Where else could and should missions have developed if not here?" (*Das Christentum in Afrika* [Munich, Hamburg 1968], 144; cf. ibid., 23f.).

[92] J. Beckmann, *Die katholische Kirche im neuen Afrika* (Einsiedeln 1947); W. Bühlmann, *Afrika. Die Kirche unter den Völkern* I (Mainz 1963).

[93] J. Beckmann, op. cit., 327–55: "Die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Islam"; G. Simon, *Die Welt des Islams und ihre Berührung mit der Christenheit* (Gütersloh 1930); C. Tiltak, "Die Neuausbreitung des Islam im 20. Jahrhundert," *Saeculum* 5 (1954), 359–75.—By 1950, 85 million of the 150 million Africans had converted to the religion of the prophet; 45 million were natives.

[94] Streit XVII, 743 (*Lettre pastorale,* 1867). Napoleon III granted him this right, MacMahon protested. Regarding the conflict with MacMahon, see M. Emerit, *RH* 223 (1960), 63–84.

1800, he was allowed to educate and baptize orphans whom he had collected in villages (Saint Cyprian, 1873, and Saint Monica, 1875). He also founded the first missions among the purely Muslim Berbers.[95] His disciples, the White Fathers, were supported by the Jesuits, for whom their general, Fr. Roothaan, a genius with vision, had devised a bold program.[96] Subsequently, the White Fathers moved toward the southeast, toward Shanija (three stations). The White Sisters opened a hospital in Biskra. By 1906, the number of Muslim converts had increased to eight hundred and the catechumens to two hundred within thirteen missions. This seems to be a small number, but in view of its principal significance, it represents an important achievement.

Lavigerie formulated his methodical principles regarding missions in his instructions to the missionaries (1878–79). Essentially, they are still valid, and they also inspired other societies in their behavior toward the Muslims.[97] He initially forbade preaching a specifically Christian message, as well as the baptism of individual candidates. He recommended instead the indirect apostolate (charity, schools, orphanages, visits with the natives), hoping to prepare the ground gradually.[98] The same course was taken by the "Apostle of the Sahara," Charles de Foucauld (1858–1916).[99] The primate of Africa demanded of his sons that they know the language, adapt to the life-style of the people who were to be converted, and practice friendship and active charity. Foucauld tried to put these principles into practice in Beni-Abbés and later in Tamanrasset. The White Fathers moved their post into the Sahara desert, where they settled in Gardaia, El Goléa, and Uargla, thus adding to the vicariate of Sahara (1891) the prefecture of Gardaia (1901), which was served by the hermit Foucauld.

In West Africa, the activities of Catholic missionaries began in the black independent state of Liberia. The efforts made on behalf of this country show what kind of obstacles were in the way of missionary work: unhealthy conditions, the Islamic faith penetrating from the north, the strong presence of Protestantism.[100] In many places, the colonial administration added to the difficulties. After their missionary attempts in the first half of the century failed, American secular priests and the Holy Ghost Fathers[101] returned in 1884. But the tropical climate decimated their numbers and they were replaced in 1903 by the Montfort Fathers. When they gave up, the prefecture was given to the Society of African Missions, headed by the courageous Étienne Kyne.[102] The two societies mentioned above, the Spiritans and the Lyon group, took care of a number of areas in West Africa around the turn of the century. Some of them seemed promising (southern Nigeria, the Ivory and the Gold Coast, Lower Volta, Dahomey, the Bight of Benin).[103] More missionaries arrived, such as the Pallottines in Cameroon in 1890. It was important for them that they began in 1901 to take care of the Yaundes (living near today's capital).[104] They contributed a great deal to the acquisition of large communities through farming and the development of small businesses, as well as an extensive school system where German was spoken almost exclusively. The female Pallottines took care of the women. In the north, in Adamaua, the priests of the Sacred Heart from Sittard took on responsibility, while the Divine Word Missionaries, mostly of German descent, moved into Togo in 1892, where they taught, developed agriculture, trained craftsmen, and worked a printing press (in Lomé).[105]

---

[95] J. Tiquot, *Une expérience de petite colonisation indigène en Algérie. Les colons arabes-chrétiens du Cardinal Lavigerie* (Algier 1936).

[96] A. Villanyi, "La fondation de la mission algérienne dans la correspondance du Père Général Roothaan," *NZM* 18 (1962), 196–207, 289–304; 19 (1963), 29–42. In a letter of 20 October 1849, Roothaan wrote: "Allez sans bruit dans les tribus voisines comme hôte et comme ami. C'est une œuvre de patience et d'un long dévouement" (ibid., 32).

[97] *Instructions de son Éminence le Cardinal Lavigerie à ses Missionaires* (Maison-Carrée 1927).

[98] J. Perraudin, *Lavigerie. Ses principes missionaires* (Fribourg 1941); J. Mazé, "Les idées principales du Cardinal Lavigerie sur l'Evangélisation de l'Afrique," *RHM* 2 (1925), 351–96.

[99] Streit XX, 475–91: bibliography; J. F. Six, *Itinéraire spirituel de Charles de Foucauld* (Paris 1958); id., "Le Père de Foucauld et ses recherches de fondations évangéliques," *Rev. d'Asc. et de Mystique* 36 (1960), 64–72.

---

[100] E. Dammann (op. cit., 24–58) lists as some of the predominantly Protestant missionary areas in Africa Gambia, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia, Rhodesia, the Republic of South Africa, Lesotho, Swaziland, Botswana, South West Africa; the predominantly Catholic areas are Portuguese Guinea, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Togo, Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Cameroon, São Tomé, Príncipe, Gabun, Congo (Brazzaville), the Central African Republic, Zaïre, Angola, and Portuguese East Africa.

[101] The archbishop of Philadelphia sent his vicar general Barron to Liberia in 1840. He was joined by some Spiritans. Cf. H. J. Koren, *The Spiritans. A History of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost* (Louvain 1958).

[102] During the first sixty-five years, this society lost almost four hundred members in West Africa (283 priests and 110 sisters). Cf. R. Guilcher, *La Société des Missions Africaines. Ses origines, sa nature, sa vie, ses œuvres* (Lyon 1956); P. Falcon, "Bilan historique de l'action des Missions Africaines sur le continent noir," *Revue Française d'Études Politiques Africaines* 56 (Paris 1970), 12–36.

[103] See F. Schwager II, 85–112; R. Wiltgen, *Gold Coast Mission History 1471–1880* (Techny, Ill. 1956): The author deals with practically all of West Africa.—Along the Ivory Coast, the Africa Society (active after 1895) used a steamship to maintain contact between the stations located on the coast.

[104] P. Hermann Nekes studied the language of the Yaundes (cf. Streit XVIII, 778–80).

[105] H. W. Debrunner, *A Church between Colonial Powers. A Study of the Church in Togo* (London 1965): especially about the Protestant missions; K. Müller, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Togo* (Kaldenkirchen 1958); H. W. Gensichen, "Die deutsche

After 1839, when France began to sign treaties with kings and chiefs in the territory around the equator, gradually expanding the French Congo, the first missionaries started to arrive: in 1844, the Holy Ghost Fathers in Gabun and four years later the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception of Chartres. The Spiritans took care of the vicariate of Loango on the coast and the vicariate of Ubangi, which was responsible for the northeastern, the largest part of the colony (1890).[106] This district was first headed energetically by Bishop P.-P. Augouard (1852–1921). In spite of the lowliness of the population, he never doubted their Christianization. Suffering great privation, he took daring trips throughout the huge territory, founding missions in strategic places. Though he was always concerned with the well-being of the missions, he also rendered outstanding political service to his country, but France did not reward him.[107]

The area around the equator and central Africa belonged to those regions of black Africa that had been a focal point for preaching the Gospel since the fifteenth century. Libermann, Monsignor Bessieux, Mère Javouhey, and Monsignor de Marion-Brésillac planned to explore the Sudan, the enormous territory between the Atlantic ocean, the Sahara, Abyssinia, and the Congo.[108] Even though they were unable to penetrate the interior of the continent, their attempts resulted in solid foundations on the coasts of Guinea and Senegal. Others planned to approach the center of Africa from the north along the Nile river, instead of from the west. In 1847, a year after the vicariate apostolic of Central Africa was established, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith itself sent out pioneers: Monsignor Annetto Casolani, Maximilian Ryllo, S.J., Emmanuele Pedemonte, S.J., and two trainees of the Congregation, Ignaz Knoblecher and Angelo Vinco. They made it all the way to Khartoum, where they failed in the attempt to found a mission.[109] There was another point from which some attempted to reach the desired goal. After a 999-day trip, Stanley had explored the course of the Congo River and discovered its mouth near Boma (1877).

Mission und der Kolonialismus," *KuD* VII, 1962, 136–49.

[106] Streit XVIII, 152, 268.

[107] Streit XVIII, 252ff.; G. Goyau, *Monseigneur Augouard* (Paris 1926); A. Perbal, "Le nationalisme de Mgr. Augouard," *RHM* 15 (1938), 385–407.

[108] A. Tanghe, "Essais de pénétration missionaires dans l'Afrique centrale," *NZM* 8 (1952), 230–33.

[109] Vicariate apostolic of Central Africa: *Ius Pontificium* V (Rome 1893), 361; in regard to the various individuals, cf. Streit XVII, 552f., 564f., 602f., 605f., 625f.; M. B. Storme, "Origine du Vicariat Apost. de l'Afrique Centrale," *NZM* 8 (1952), 105–18; id., "La renonciation de Mgr. Casolani, Vicaire Apostolique de l'Afrique Centrale," *NZM* 9 (1953), 290–305; R. Gray, *A History of the Southern Sudan 1839–89* (Oxford 1961).

Africa's secret was found. Now, the missionaries were able to penetrate the Congo area from the west.

In this enterprise King Leopold II (1865–1909) played a unique role.[110] In 1876 he invited the Geographic Conference to Brussels. He was primarily interested in maintaining control of the initiative to explore the interior of Africa, pursuing the idea of Belgium's colonial expansion. During the debates about the establishment of international strongholds, most participants held the opinion that missionaries should help the explorers and traders to civilize the country. Leopold made sure that the final decisions were not in the hands of the missions because he had his own plans in this regard. Since the Belgian Catholics were sceptical, he informed the Holy See. Pius IX and his successor welcomed the royal plan.[111] Trying to pursue his policy, the monarch established the *Association Internationale Africaine.* In 1885, on the basis of the Berlin Conference, the independent state of the Congo was created. At first it was the private property of Leopold, after 1908 it became part of the Belgian kingdom. Aside from abolishing the slave trade and elevating the morals of the natives, the King was clearly interested in their Christianization. For that purpose, he pursued the establishment of the vicariate apostolic of the Belgian Congo (1888),[112] which was assigned to the Scheut Fathers because the King gave preference to his countrymen.[113]

The Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary began its work and, subsidized by the government, gathered primarily slaves and children in closed settlements. This system was used in the Kasaï mission (1904, apostolic prefecture), one of the most beautiful settlements of the Scheut Fathers.[114] A similar method (the so-called *Fermes-chapelles,* including economic and cultural institutions) was employed by the Jesuits, settled in Kwango after 1893.[115] Thanks to the efforts of the Scheut Missionaries and the King it was possible to attract new missionary personnel: in 1894 the Trappists, in 1897 the Priests of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (Stanley Falls), in 1898 the Premonstratensians (northern Congo), in 1899 the Redemptorists (Matadi at the lower portion of the Congo River).[116] Here they were joined by many more missionaries from other orders and societies than anywhere else in Africa in the twentieth century. In spite of the enormous difficulties (slave trade, "Congo tortures," the population's stubborn belief in paganism, tropical diseases), the number of Christians increased (1910: fifty thousand; 1921: three hundred seventy-six thousand). In several areas, missionary activities began rather late, for instance in Ruanda-Urundi (around 1900), but after the twenties they were marvelously successful.[117] These results give an impression of the efforts made by Catholic Belgium on behalf of its colony.

---

[110] P. A. Roeykens, *Les débuts de l'œuvre africaine de Léopold II 1875–79* (Brussels 1955).

[111] P. A. Roeykens, *Le dessein africain de Léopold II. Nouvelles recherches sur sa genèse et sa nature 1875–76;* id., *Léopold et la Conférence géographique de Bruxelles 1876;* id., *La période initiale de l'œuvre africaine de Léopold II. Nouvelles recherches et documents inédits 1875–83. Tome* X, fascs. 1–3 (Brussels 1956–57).

[112] Streit XVIII, 198.

[113] E. de Moreau, *Les missionaires belges de 1804 jusqu'a nos jours* (Brussels 1944); L. Anckaer, *De evangelizatiemethode van de missionarissen van Scheut in Kongo 1888–1907* (Brussels 1970).—With the exception of the White Friars (vicariate of Upper Congo), the old missionaries had to leave their stations.

[114] M. B. Storme, *Het Onstaan van de Kasai-Missie* (Brussels 1961): regarding the first negotiations between 1881 and 1891 and the transferal of the Kasai mission (Luluabourg); id., *Pater Cambier on de stichting van de Kasai-Missie* (Brussels 1964). P. E. Cambier (1865–1943) was the founder of the mission. Its history from 1891 until 1894 is described on the basis of documents (id., *Konflikt in de Kasai-Missie* [Brussels 1965]). The civil authorities caused the most problems for the development of missionary activities; in this book, the author deals with the conflict of March 1894–June 1895.

Another advance into the interior of Africa was made from the east, after Livingstone had explored new possibilities and Leopold II's initiatives had aroused the interest of missionary circles. Three societies offered their services to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, proposing to Christianize these promising regions. In 1877, Fr. Augustin Planque (1826–1907),[118] the first general of the Lyon Missionaries, offered to pursue this task. A year earlier, his priests had settled around the mouth of the Nile with the special assignment of reporting the results of the explorations, which were immediately known in Egypt, to the Roman authorities.[119] In 1878 Lavigerie wrote his extensive *Mémoire secret* for the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. In it he suggested ways and means for swift Christianization and the elimination of slavery.[120] The (tendentious) article resulted in the assignment of the missions in central Africa to the White Fathers on

---

[115] L. Dénis, *Les Jésuites belges au Kwango 1893–1943* (Brussels 1943).

[116] M. Kratz, *La mission des Rédemptoristes belges au Bas-Congo. La période des semailles 1899–1920* (Brussels 1970). Initially, they had no real concept for their missionary work. Therefore, they followed at first the *Fermes-chapelles,* later the *Écoles-chapelles* (according to the Protestants). Not until after 1921, along with the development of Kimbanguism, did they attempt definite accomodation.

[117] J. Perraudin, *Naissance d'une Église. Histoire du Burundi chrétien* (Usumbura, Burundi 1963).

[118] Regarding Planque, see Streit XVIII, 148f.

[119] M. B. Storme, *Rapports du Père Planque, de Mgr. Lavigerie et de Mgr. Comboni sur l'Association Internationale Africaine* (Brussels 1957).

[120] His attempt to penetrate Central Africa from the Kabyle mission had failed. In regard to his memoirs, cf. Streit XVII, 865f.; concerning his antislavery campaign, see F. Renault, *Lavigerie, l'esclavage et l'Europe,* 2 vols. (Paris 1971).

24 February 1878, four days after the election of Leo XIII.[121] The third person to promise establishing missions in the area of the great lakes was the vicar apostolic of central Africa in Khartoum, Monsignor Daniel Comboni, who, in contrast to Lavigerie, was in favor of the efforts made in Brussels. These areas belonged to his district.[122]

In 1878, starting from Zanzibar, the first caravan of White Fathers headed toward the interior of Africa. In Tabora, they separated into two groups. One, under the leadership of Fr. Léon Livinhac, traveled toward Lake Tanganyika. The other group, which had lost its leader, turned toward Lake Victoria.[123] Fr. Simeon Lourdel (1853–90) succeeded in negotiating with King Mtesa of Uganda. After a fine beginning, the mission got caught in the net of politics. Upon pressure by the Muslims (around the middle of the nineteenth century, the Arabs had entered the area via Zanzibar) and because of Mtesa's fear of British aggression, the missionaries had to leave the country in 1882, at least until after Mtesa's death (1884). His son, suspicious that the European missionaries were pioneers of the colonial powers, agreed. In October 1885, the Anglican Bishop Hannington was murdered, and in May of the following year, a large number of Christians became victims of the persecutions, among them even servants at the court of Charles Lwanga.[124] In 1894, when Britain took charge of the protectorate, a period of peace returned. However, particularly during the time of turbulence, the number of baptisms increased,[125] in spite of the strict requirements by the White Fathers. Thus the threat of the Muslims in the period before World War I was eliminated and Christianity was on the way to becoming a Church of the people.[126]

---

[121] With his allegations that the conference in Brussels was Protestant, Freemason, and anticlerical in spirit, the archbishop wanted to frighten Rome and incite the Propaganda to act swiftly. He was successful.

[122] The basic work about the evangelization efforts in Central and Equatorial Africa during the nineteenth century: M. B. Storme, *Evangelisatiepogingen in de binnenlanden van Africa gedurende de XIXe eeuw* (Brussels 1951).

[123] Regarding the *pénétration laïque et religieuse* from the east, cf. R. Heremans, *Les établissements de l'Association Internationale Africaine au lac Tanganika et les Pères Blancs. Mpala et Karéma 1877–85* (Tervuren 1966). Between 1879 and 1885, Lavigerie sent forty-six missionaries to the two missions of Nyanza and Tanganyika in order to outdo the *Association* and the Protestants in every respect and to establish a Christian kingdom.

[124] Among the victims were also Anglican Christians. The beatification of the twenty-two martyrs of Uganda took place on 6 June 1920, their canonization on 18 October 1964 (G. Goyau, "Le Cinquantenaire des Martyrs d'Ouganda," *RHM* 13 [1936], 321–40; Streit XVIII–XX, passim; biblio. also in A. Mulders, op. cit., 406f.).

[125] The situation of the Christians was aggravated by the presence of the Arabs as well as by the tensions between the Catholics and the Protestants.

[126] J. V. Taylor, *Die Kirche in Uganda. Das Werden einer jungen afrikanischen Kirche* (Stuttgart 1966). This is a model for the study of a local church. The author indicates the

The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith responded to this upswing by dividing the old district Nyanza into three vicariates, North Nyanza (Uganda), South Nyanza, assigned to the disciples of Lavigerie, and the Upper Nile, which was given to the Mill Hill Missionaries who used similar methods successfully.[127] The Consolata Missionaries in near-by Kenya (since 1902) were hampered by the fact that the coast was totally Muslim.[128] Toward the south, in East Africa (today Tanzania), Germany had colonial interests. Its protectorate received its final borders in 1890 through the Helgoland Treaty.[129] The Holy Ghost Fathers, in this area after 1863, moved their positions from Bogamayo to Kilimanjaro. They placed great emphasis on economic enterprises and colonization. The White Fathers had more visible successes around the turn of the century in the interior of Africa, in the four vicariates east of Lake Victoria and Lake Tanganyika where they rigorously applied the catechumenate's discipline (according to the directives of their founder). In spite of bad setbacks (during the uprisings of 1889 and 1905), the German Benedictines of Saint Ottilien (after 1888) developed a new mission in Dar es Salaam (1902: vicariate apostolic), which pursued pastoral, educational, and agricultural activities.[130] The Trappists of Mariannhill were briefly engaged (1887–1907) in German East Africa. A shortsighted measure caused them to be recalled from their promising cultural work in the two missions of Gare and Irente in the Usumbura Mountains contrary to the desires of the German colonial administration.[131] During the first East African Episcopal Conference in Dar es Salaam, in July 1912, it became clear that the area, with its seven flourishing vicariates, was outgrowing its status as a mission and that seeds of a native Church had sprung up, for which a well-structured

---

rivalries between the three religions. At that time, this implied choosing between the Arabian, French, or British power.—In 1884, there were 10,000 Christians and 60,000 catechumens in Uganda; in 1904: 86,000 Christians and 135,000 catechumens.

[127] H. P. Gale, *Uganda and the Mill-Hill Fathers* (London 1959): a critical study of the conflicts between the Muslims, the Protestants, the Catholics, and the pagans.

[128] Establishment of the vicariate apostolic of Kenya: Streit XVIII, 1183.

[129] J. Schmidlin, *Die katholischen Missionen in den deutschen Schutzgebieten* (Münster i. W. 1913); S. Hertlein, *Aufbau der Kirche in Tansania* (Münsterschwarzach 1971).

[130] F. Renner, "Die Benediktinermission in Ostafrika—eine Überschau," F. Renner, *Der fünfarmige Leuchter* II (Sankt Ottilien 1971), 123–52; L. Kilger, "Die Missionsgedanken bei der Benediktinergründung von St. Ottilien und die Übernahme der Afrikamission," *ZMR* 24 (1934), 213–28; J. Eggert, *Missionsschule und sozialer Wandel in Ostafrika* (Bielefeld 1970).

[131] H. Stirnimann, "Mariannhiller Trappisten in Deutsch-OstAfrika 1897–1907," *NZM* 25 (1969), 167–80.

catechumenate and the diligent cultivation of religious and liturgical life were characteristic.[132]

In the middle of the nineteenth century, a simply catastrophic situation had resulted from the practice of the patronate in the territories of Portugal in West and East Africa. As good and as necessary as it may have been at one point, this institution was largely to blame for the decline of the missions, running parallel with the collapse in the motherland. The efforts of the Spiritans to take over the abandoned areas found little response until, in 1865, they received permission to work there. One year later they were able to begin. There were five priests in all of Angola.[133] The leadership of the order gradually arrived at the conviction that only missionaries under Portuguese leadership were able to produce fruitful results. Therefore, the Swiss Father J. G. Eigenmann set out to found a settlement or a school of his order in Portugal. In 1869 he was appointed head of the Congo seminary in Santarem, the birthplace of the Portuguese province of the Holy Ghost Fathers. The first priest from the school of Eigenmann, Father José Maria Antunes, went to the mission in Huila (south of Angola) in 1882 to reorganize it.[134] Fathers H. Carrie, C. A. Duparquet, Monsignor L. A. Keiling, and Antunes were all especially important in the tedious new beginning and the slow ascent of the mission.[135] The revolution in the homeland (1910), followed by the separation of Church and state, destroyed a large part of the work abroad. The situation was even worse in the Portuguese part of East Africa, where, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, only a few secular priests were left, mainly Goans, to assure the religious care of the Christians. The Jesuits turned to the heathen missions again in 1881 in the lower portion of the Zambezi river. Due to the relentless climate, they lost thirty-seven members in twenty years. Nevertheless, they managed the founding of several new centers and smaller communities, until they had to leave in 1911. The Divine Word Missionaries, admitted through political pressure, gave a guest performance, so to speak, because they were expelled in 1918.[136] It is not surprising that there were only about five thousand Catholic Africans in this vast country at the beginning of World War I.

---

[132] *Beschlüsse der ersten Konferenz der afrikanischen Bischöfe im Juli 1912* (Kath. Miss. Druckerei, Dar es Salaam 1912).

[133] A. Brásio, *Spiritana Monumenta Historica. Series Africana 1, Angola,* vol. I, *1596–1867* (Pittsburgh, Louvain 1966); cf. review by J. Beckmann, *NZM* 24 (1968), 232f.; C. Ferreira da Costa, *Cem anos dos Missionários do Espírito Santo em Angola 1866–1966* (Nova Lisboa, Angola 1970).

[134] Brásio, *Spiritana Monumenta Historica. Series Africana. 1, Angola,* vol. II, *1868–1881* (Pittsburgh, Louvain 1968); cf. review by J. Beckmann, *NZM* 25 (1969), 227.

[135] Concerning Carrie, see Streit XVIII, 530, concerning Keiling, ibid., 483ff.

[136] F. Schwager II, 149f.; P. Schebesta, *Portugals Conquistamission in Südostafrika. Missionsgeschichte Sambesiens und des Monomotapareiches 1560–1920* (Sankt Augustin 1966).

Eight of the Jesuits who had been driven out of Mozambique, mostly Austrians and Poles, settled in 1910 in neighboring northern Rhodesia.[137] The Society of Jesus had long endeavored to found a permanent settlement there. Fathers Joseph Moreau and Jules Torrend from the Zambesi mission (in southern Rhodesia) were permitted to settle in Tongaland.[138] Pioneers of the agricultural development of northern Rhodesia, they taught the population modern methods of agriculture and cattle breeding. They were also accomplished in the areas of linguistics and ethnology, especially Torrend, who gained a reputation with his research of the Bantu languages.[139]

In 1879, the Zambezi expedition set out from Cape Town. Headed by the Belgian Jesuit Father Henri Depelchin (1822–1900), an experienced Indian missionary, the group of six priests (among them the German Fathers Anton Terörde [died in 1880] and Karl Fuchs) and five laymen arrived at Victoria Falls in 1880.[140] They established the first station in the land of the Tongas. In spite of the massive reinforcement of fifty-one members which the Society received the following year, they were unable to hold their ground in the northern part of the Zambesi until the beginning of the twentieth century. In the northern region of today's Zambia, the area between Lake Bangwenlu and Lake Nyasa, the White Fathers laid the foundation for their mission among the Bembas (1895). They were headed by Father Joseph Dupont (1850–1930), who was appointed first vicar apostolic of Nyasa in 1897 when this district was separated from the Tanganyika mission.[141] Even though the "wild" tribe of the Bembas had to be trained to settle down, the mission under Bishop Dupont,[142] mainly by way of education and new agricultural methods, reached a remarkable level (1911: six thousand Catholics, fifty-seven catechumens, eighteen thousand pupils).

---

[137] S. Reil, *Kleine Kirchengeschichte Sambias* (Münsterschwarzach 1969), 34–37; R. L. Rotberg, *Christian Missionaries and the Creation of Northern Rhodesia 1880–1924* (Princeton 1965).

[138] S. Reil, op. cit., 32–34.

[139] Regarding Torrend, cf. Streit XVIII, 176f.; concerning Moreau, see ibid., 626f.

[140] J. Spillmann, *Vom Cap zum Sambesi. Die Anfänge der Sambesi-Mission. Aus den Tagebüchern des P. Terörde S. J. und aus den Berichten der anderen Missionare dargestellt* (Freiburg 1882); excerpts from the diaries of Depelchin and Charles Croonenbergh in *Diaries of the Jesuit Missionaries at Bulawayo 1879–1881* (Salisbury 1959).

[141] S. Reil, op. cit., 22ff.—In 1913, the division into the vicariates of Bangweulu and Nyasa occurred (Streit XX, 618).

[142] Dupont had a lot of conflicts with the British colonial authorities. They accused him of pursuing political goals in favor of France.

From the beginning, a number of White Fathers qualified as linguists and their studies rendered invaluable services to their successors.[143]

Aside from the Muslim north, the Catholic missionaries did not encounter anywhere the kind of difficulties they had to cope with in the south of the dark continent.[144] Since they appeared rather late (middle of the nineteenth century), the Roman Church had trouble catching up with the headstart of the Protestants who had worked in these areas intensively. This situation was aggravated by the customary intolerance of the Boers, partly by the British residing in the country since 1806, by the racial differences, and by the numerous sects and African splinter groups which had begun before the turn of the century.[145] In the northern part of German South West Africa, the Oblates of Mary Immaculate arrived and began work in 1896 (at the end of the seventies, the Spiritans had failed) in the prefecture of Lower Zimbabwe, founded in 1892. They also succeeded the missionaries of Lyon north of the Orange Free State (1882) and worked in Transvaal. But progress was slow, even though the Jesuits and Dominicans sisters who had been called from Augsburg to Grahamstown to organize a college could report modest success around 1876 among the Xhosas (east of the Cape of Good Hope area). Statistics may illuminate the situation: in 1911, the number of Catholics in the South African Union (with 4.7 million non-Europeans) was thirty-seven thousand, the Protestants had 1.4 million faithful.[146]

The work was difficult, yet there were two areas in which the Catholics excelled: Basutoland deserves first mention (Lesotho).[147] The Oblates, active in this mountainous and remote region since 1862, managed to establish an influential position, partly owing to their friendly relations with the chiefs. The Sisters of the Holy Family, who arrived in 1865, trained a dozen native sisters by 1912. After 1908, the Menzingen Sisters assisted with social work.[148] The other flourishing mission was located in Natal, which had been assigned to the Oblates in 1850 as a vicariate. This was the center of Mariannhill founded in 1882 by German Trappists under the leadership of Abbot Franz Pfanner (1825–1909).[149] Their life-style, based on Benedictine rules, facilitated social and economic activities which were mandatory in view of the local circumstances. They acquired a large complex of land, settled Bantus, and organized an impressive educational system (with a school, seminary, small businesses, printing press, and hospital).[150] The women were cared for by the Sisters of the Precious Blood.

---

[143] Louis Guillermé, Eugène Pueth, Louis Molinier, Georges Schoeffer.

[144] B. Hutchinson, "Some Social Consequences of XIXth Century Missionary Activity among the South African Bantu," *Africa* 27 (London 1957), 160–77.

[145] Cf. E. Dammann, op. cit., 53, 160ff., incl. extensive biblio. regarding the post-Christian movements in Africa.

[146] W. E. Brown, *The Catholic Church in South Africa. From its Origins to the Present Day* (London 1960). The author expresses regret about the Church having missed its chances. He attributes this to the excessively cautious attitude of the vicars apostolic, who tried to avoid any kind of aggravation and scandal and left creative work to others, especially at the beginning of the twentieth century.—Cf. also J. E. Brady, *Trekking for Souls* (Cedara, Natal 1952).

[147] M. Bierbaum, "Die Entwicklung der katholischen Mission in Basutoland," *ZMR* 1 (1938), 133–44.

Finally, the island of Madagascar should be mentioned (elevated to vicariate apostolic in 1885). Experiencing difficulties due to pressures from the pro-Protestant governments of the sixties and seventies, the Jesuits were nevertheless able to expand their activities. After they were temporarily deported during the occupation of the country by France and during the turmoils at the end of the century, they received assistance in 1896 from the ranks of the Lazarists,[151] two years later from the Spiritans,[152] and in 1899 from the missionaries of La Salette. In 1906, the French *Kulturkampf* affected the East African islands and dealt the Church a severe blow. This did not stop its growth, however, but rather caused a constructive process of internal cleansing.

Reviewing the missionary activities under the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X, one must describe this period as epoch-making and highly important for Africa as well as the Pacific. Almost everywhere, new communities were established. Quantitatively as well as qualitatively remarkable feats were accomplished in such a short time span. But the missions were now outgrowing the first phase and trying to achieve independence and a character of their own. Even though the missionaries were indebted to the spirit of their time, they remained loyal to their true mission, the preaching of the Gospel.[153]

---

[148] In 1914 the number of Catholics was around 15,000. Basutoland became an apostolic prefecture in 1894, a vicariate apostolic in 1909 (Streit XVII, 404, 1183).

[149] J. Dahm, *Mariannhill. Seine innere Entwicklung sowie seine Bedeutung für die katholische Missions- und Kulturgeschichte Südafrikas. I. Zeitabschnitt: Von der Gründung Mariann-Hills 1882 bis zur Trennung vom Trappistenorden 1909* (Mariannhill, Natal 1950).—Long before Mariannhill was founded, the German Protestant missionaries had started in other parts of Africa to work particularly with the rural population, and they had taken similar paths.—See A. Roos, *Mariannhill zwischen zwei Idealen* (diss., Innsbruck 1962), 13–99, regarding the tragic life of Pfanner, who had established eleven missions, which caused him to be in conflict with the rules of his order. Consequently, he was recalled in 1893.

[150] G. M. Lautenschlager, *Die sozialen Ordnungen bei den Zulus und die Mariannhiller Mission von 1882 bis 1909* (Reimlingen 1963).—Likewise, the research accomplishments in Mariannhill were quite remarkable, e.g., the studies of Zulu language and history by W. Wanger (1872–1943) and A. T. Bryant (1865–1953). See Streit XVIII, 493–95; XX, 17–19. Mariannhill also made the first courageous attempt to publish a truly African religious textbook: the great Wanger catechism of 1912 in the Zulu language. Cf. L. A. Mettler, *Christliche Terminologie und Katechismus-Gestaltung in der Mariannhiller Mission 1910–1920* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1967).

[151] P. Coste, "Saint Vincent de Paul et la Mission de Madagascar," *RHM* 4 (1927), 26–61, 217–50.

[152] G. le Faucheur, "Madagascar et les Spiritains," *RHM* 5 (1928), 407–37.

[153] H. Jedin offers the following conclusion: "On the whole we may say that most of the missionaries were able to preserve the independence of evangelization, and the "natives" were quite capable of differentiating between colonialism and mission activity" ("Weltmission and Kolonialismus," *Saeculum* 9 [1958], 393–404, quot. 401).

CHAPTER 39

The Development of New Churches

World War I clearly interrupted the missionary activities. The missionary work that had seemed so very promising before the outbreak suffered severe reverses during the upheaval. After the peace was signed, missionary work experienced a decisive new orientation. Well aware of the multiplicity of relationships and tensions between colonialism and missions, the chief authorities of the Church were intent on de-politicizing missionary work. On the other hand, they focused more and more on the independence of the established communities. The period of the pontificates of Benedict XV and Pius XI entailed a basic rejection of Europeanism and can be called an era of increased adjustment to the peoples who were to be converted. Even though the past still had its effect here and there, the model of the native church was clearly in everyone's mind.[1]

The consequences of the war were first felt in the economic sector and in personal life.[2] The subsidies from the home countries decreased considerably or dried up completely. The countries directly involved in the war were affected, while the neutral countries, at least partially, filled the gaps. In spite of an early hope that the colonies might be spared the devastations of the war, hostilities also broke out in the German protectorates. In those areas where no actual fighting took place, the missionary activities suffered noticeably from the recall of numerous missionary personnel. This was particularly true in the case of French citizens, whose departure left many a region abandoned,[3] and in the case of the Italian missions, though to a less devastating degree. The missions of the Germans were particularly burdened by the events of the war. In many places, the missionaries were expelled, imprisoned, or deported, which affected the settlements badly. This happened to the Pallottines in Cameroon, the Divine World Missionaries in Togo, and the Benedictines in East Africa, who all were forced to leave. The German missionaries in British India suffered a similar fate. However, they were able to stay in German South West Africa and, to some extent, in the Far East.[4] The spiritual damages of the war had more impact than the material and personnel losses. The belligerent Western nations, representing Christianity, also infected the missions with the idea of nationalism. In their disunion, they presented an annoying picture to the non-Europeans, causing the halo that had surrounded the white races to fade.

---

[1] It should not be forgotten that, at that time, the colonial areas covered two-thirds of the globe and that, of the world's population of 2 billion people, 700 million were subjected to foreign rule (cf. G. Balandier, "Die koloniale Situation: ein theoretischer Ansatz," R. v. Albertini, *Moderne Kolonialgeschichte* [Cologne, Berlin 1970], 105–24; R. Delavignette, *Christianisme et colonialisme* [Paris 1960], 19).

[2] X. Bürkler, "Der Weltkrieg 1914–18 und die Mission," *Kath. Missionsjahrbuch der Schweiz* 11 (Fribourg 1944), 22–29; cf. the war-mission reviews in *ZM*, 1915–19.

In order to heal the wounds inflicted by the war, many missionaries returned to their communities after the peace treaty, particularly from the victorious countries, such as the French. The Catholic Church found it easier to recruit replacements for those areas that the missionaries had been forced to leave. This allowed the Church (in some areas) to catch up more rapidly than the Protestants. On the basis of ARTICLES 438 and 122 of the Versailles Treaty, the German missionaries found their missionary freedom limited. However, in retrospect the destruction of the unity of mission and colonial power was a salutary move, even though it was one-sided.[5] At least this was the beginning of the dissolution of the close ties between national and missionary interests, of the liberation of the missions from the burden of colonialism, and of once again focusing on the supranationality of the Church and its mission.[6]

---

[3] During the war, 5,000 French missionaries were drafted: in the summer of 1915, for instance, more than 200 Paris Missionaries, as compared to 200 White Friars and the same number of Lazarists.

[4] At the outbreak of the war, approximately 1,100 German priests, 850 clergymen and brothers and 2,000 sisters worked in all missionary regions. By the end of the war: 192 priests, 76 brothers and 249 sisters were expelled; 126 priests, 220 brothers and 76 sisters were imprisoned or interned.

[5] Cf. W. Holstein, "Die Mission in den völkerrechtlichen Verträgen und Verfassungen der Neuzeit," *Basileia, Festschrift für Walter Freytag* (Stuttgart 1959), 106–27, esp. 117f.

[6] F. Kollbrunner, "Abkehr vom Europäismus und universale Haltung im Missionswerk 1919–59," *NZM* 28 (1972), 117–32; id., "Die einheimische Kirche als Konsequenz der Katholizität (1919–1959)," *NZM* 29 (1973), 10–27.

It is to Benedict XV's credit that he dealt with this question courageously. In a situation of extreme national pathos, he offered clarification, rigorously uncovering the weakness of the missionary activity of the Church (the nationalistic attitude of individual representatives and the colonialist missionary methods).[7] Since he partially overcame Europeanism, also introducing a change in missionary theology, he deserves the name "Missionary Pope" as much as his successor, who, following Benedict's ideas, set out to realize the program outlined in *Maximum illud.* There is no doubt that the apostolic letter of 30 November 1919 was the Magna Carta of the modern missions.[8] The initiative is said to have been made by Guido Conforti, the founder of the Missionaries of Parma. The Dutch Redemptorist and long-term prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Cardinal Willem van Rossum, is considered to have had decisive influence on the writing of the document.[9]

During the time of Leo XIII, who loved openness and space, the universal responsibility of the Church was already clearly visible. Through his concern for the salvation of all mankind, he brought the missions back into the fold of the Church, integrating the doctrine of the mission into that of the Church. At the same time, in contrast to his predecessors, he assessed the situation of the non-Christians more positively.[10] Pius X, on the other hand, almost completely neglected the "others"; therefore hardly perceiving their true nature. He seemed to turn exclusively inward and did not include the missions in his reform plan—a fatal limitation of the idea of restoration, which caused Church and mission to be separated again and appear to be divided and unrelated entities.[11] This was changed by Benedict XV, who resolutely opened the Church to the missions and restored them as a basic function of the Church itself. His reintroduction of the plural *ecclesiae* into the ecclesiastical perception of the Popes (the expression had previously been used in an abstract sense) had far-reaching consequences for his concept of the missions. The recognition that the entire Church is composed of individual churches suggests that one not speak of the propagation of the faith in merely general terms but that one plan in concrete terms the formation of new individual Churches.[12] In the final analysis, this view emanated from the fact that the Church was taking its catholicity seriously.

---

[7] Amidst the climax of nationalism it was not easy to preserve impartiality; both camps expressed their discontent with the Pope. *Cf.* G. Maron, "Die römisch-katholische Kirche von 1870 bis 1970," *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch,* ed. by K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, vol. 4, no. 2 (Göttingen 1972), 214f.

[8] This is not an encyclical; the text can be found in *Sylloge,* 113–28; Germ.—in Marmy, Auf der Maur, 7–25; Lat.-Germ. in Glazik, *Päpstliche Rundschreiben,* 18ff. The Magna Carta is discussed in J. Beckmann, *La Congrégation de la Propagation de la Foi face à la politique internationale* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1963); Delacroix III, 128f.; A. Rétif, *Les Papes contemporains et la mission* (Paris 1966), 40: *le premier grand document missionnaire du siècle.*

[9] In regard to Conforti and *Maximum illud,* cf. J. Paventi, "Tres Encíclicas o una Trilogía misionera," *Misiones Extranjeras* 3 (Burgos 1952), 88–104; J.-M. Drehmanns, "Le Cardinal van Rossum et l'Encyclique Rerum Ecclesiae," *Le Bulletin des Missions* 25 (1951), 227–30: "Il (*sc.* van Rossum) *élabora le projet de 'Maximum illud'* " (228). Regarding Lebbe's influence, cf. J. Glazik, "Die Missions-Enzyklika 'Maximum illud' Benedikts XV. (1919)," W. Sandfuchs, *Das Wort der Päpste* (Würzburg 1965), 65–74 (esp. 66).

[10] The best presentation of the integration of Church and mission: P. Wanko, *Kirche—Mission—Missionen. Eine Untersuchung der ekklesiologischen und missiologischen Aussagen vom I. Vatikanum bis "Maximum illud"* (diss., Münster 1968), 42ff. A continuation of this study in F. Kollbrunner, *Die Katholizität der Kirche und die Mission in der kirchenamtlichen, ekklesiologischen und missionswissenschaftlichen Literatur der Zeit von "Maximum illud" bis "Princeps Pastorum" 1919–59* (diss., Gregoriana, Rome 1970).

With his new ecclesiological, missiological concept, Benedict offered a basic answer to the postwar conditions. In *Maximum illud* he focused on a series of urgent individual problems.[13] First, he clearly rejected the nationalistic attitude of certain missionaries, emphasizing the ecclesiastical nature of the missions. Those, he said, who "think more of the wordly than of the heavenly fatherland" and confuse the interests of the nation with those of the Gospel bring Christianity under suspicion of being the concern of the foreign state under whose mandate and as whose agents the missionaries act. He did not hesitate to stigmatize such an attitude as *pestis teterrima.* The truely "Catholic" missionary is intent only on representing Christ, not his own nation.[14] The Pope developed a missionary strategy that was rooted in mercy: The missionary will never meet anyone with disrespect, no matter how lowly he may be. Rather, "through all the kindness of Christian mercy" he will try to win him to the Gospel. When he defined missionary activity, Benedict also emphasized its ecclesiastical character. It is not exclusively the Pope (as was the case with his predecessors) who stands in the face of Christ and obeys his missionary order, but the Church as a whole.[15] He therefore impressed on the missionaries (mainly their leaders) not to be satisfied with their achievements, but "to strive for the salvation of all people without exception." In order to accomplish this, the leader will, in the true "Catholic" spirit, involve other missionary institutions, if necessary, regardless of whether they are a member of a foreign order or nation. This was clearly aimed at the narrow-minded esprit de corps of the missionary societies. With his recommendation to discuss and resolve common problems with the neighboring areas, the Pope tried to combat any kind of particularism, replacing it with the spirit of cooperation.

---

[11] P. Wanko, op. cit., 67ff.

[12] Cf. Motu proprio *Dei providentis* of 1 May 1917, pertaining to the establishment of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches (a step that was also important theologically): *AAS* 9 (1917), 529. Benedict uses the plural (*particulares ecclesiae*) in regard to the people in the Middle East, but he also deals with the missionary churches.

[13] Cf. the reviews of the papal document (which do not discuss the theological questions): G. Goyau, *Missions et missionnaires* (Paris 1931), 169–81; M. Grösser, "Das Missionswesen im Lichte des päpstlichen Sendschreibens 'Maximum illud,' " *ZM* 10 (1920), 73–86; A. Huonder, "Das Missionsrundschreiben Benedikts XV.," *StdZ* 98 (1920), 433–41.

[14] Elsewhere he says: "Memineritis non hominum debere vos imperium propagare, sed Christi, nec patriae quae hic est, sed patriae quae sursum cives adiicere" (*Sylloge,* 120).

[15] The Church as a whole is obligated to obey Jesus Christ; this is expressed in the

The goal of missionary work, as the Pope envisioned it, is, in addition to the conversion of individuals, the founding of churches.[16] This requires a native clergy that could "one day take charge of its people." Because the future of new churches is dependent upon the existence of thoroughly trained priests, this task, resting on the universality of the Church, demands the special attention of the responsible missionary staff. Benedict considered this the only way to acclimate the Church and the only possibility to do justice to the characteristics of the people or to harvest its treasures for the benefit of the Church. Unfortunately, the life of the Christian communities is neglected by the papal considerations—they are merely the *terminus ad quem* of the missionary efforts and their own significance does not come to the fore. Nevertheless, the Pope attempted not only to turn to the Church at home, but contemplated the problems from the perspective of the missions themselves.[17]

The principles outlined in *Maximum illud* were completed in the instructions to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, entitled *Quo efficacius* (6 January 1920).[18] Referring to the classic passage according to which Christianity should not be alien to any nation, these instructions remind the missionaries to understand their task as a spiritual and religious one. They are asked to practice strict neutrality in political matters and forbidden to propagate their own laws and customs in the foreign country.[19] Benedict tried to instill new energy into apostolic activities. This is demonstrated, on the one hand, by his measures

---

beginning of the letter: "Divini mandati memor, Ecclesia numquam, labentibus saeculis, cessavit adhuc traditae divinitus doctrinae partaeque humano generi per Christum salutis aeternae nuntios et administros in omnes partes mittere" (*Sylloge,* 114).

[16] The individual aspect takes priority in *Maximum illud,* however, the Pope acknowledges both the individual and the social element.

[17] Schmidlin, *PG* III, 252, already recognized this peculiarity of the letter.

[18] *Sylloge,* 131–35.

[19] The prophetic words in the instructions of the Propaganda of 23 November 1845 (*Collectanea* I, 544f.) about the dangers of politics in the missions should not be ignored; ibid., the progressive ideas concerning the elimination of the native episcopate.

to increase the missionary hierarchy (he established twenty-eight apostolic vicariates and eight prefectures as well as a delegation for Japan, Korea, and Formosa [1919][20]) and his order to conduct apostolic inspections (e.g., in China and South Africa); and, on the other hand, by his initiatives regarding the missionary relief system at home. In order to make the papal project more effective for the native clergy, he assigned its supervision to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, thus locating it in Rome. The *Unio Cleri pro Missionibus,* founded in 1915 by the energetic Father Paolo Manna (1872–1952)[21] and Bishop G. M. Conforti of Parma and approved in 1916, was incorporated in 1916 in the Roman headquarters. The Union of Priests and Missionaries quickly expanded into Canada, Germany, and Switzerland. Finally, during this pontificate, several missionary seminaries were established (for the purpose of founding missions manned by secular priests), such as the seminary of Maynooth-Galway (Ireland, 1917), of Almonte (Canada, 1919), of Burgos (Spain, 1919), of Montreal (Canada, 1921), and of Bethlehem Immensee (Switzerland, 1921).[22] Many of these progressive activities under Benedict XV and later under Pius XI came about thanks to the open-mindedness of van Rossum, who is rightfully considered the pioneer of the Catholic "world mission." After all, he did away with Europeanism, pushed for adaptation, and worked toward the training and development of the native clergy under the supervision of native bishops.[23]

The missionary programs that Benedict XV initiated during his relatively brief pontificate were continued by Pius XI and put into action. The prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of both papal administrations made sure that a continuity was preserved.[24] By emphasizing certain aspects initiated by his predecessor, Pius XI shifted the focal point to the theme of universality, to the independence of the new churches and to their growing roots in the native soil, thus to indigenization.[25] The preaching of the Gospel all over the world is the most essential task of the papal office, Pius XI declared at the beginning of his pontificate[26] (in 1922, the centennials of three missions were celebrated).[27] In cooperation with the Pope, the entire episcopate has an obligation toward the task of mission because it represents the universal Church.[28] The Pope required the same efforts from the priests, telling them at the first international congress of the *Unio Cleri* in Rome (3 June 1922) that the missionary apostolate is not just to be pursued by a special task force but by the entire Church, so that every church would gradually develop into a cell active in missionary work.[29] According to the Pope, the secret of the universality of the Church rests in charity. Love of God and one's fellow man extends it and allows it to grow roots in areas where the population does not know Christ yet. The Church is not primarily self-serving, but exists to serve all.[30] According to his maxim that missions should have priority among Catholic works,[31] he opened during the Sacred Year the mission exhibition of the Vatican, which lived on in the founding of a missionary ethnological museum in the Lateran (1926). Furthermore, in order to awaken the missionary spirit in the entire Christian community, he declared in 1927 the second to the last Sunday in October to be observed as Mission Sunday. In 1922 he moved the Society for the Propagation of the Faith to Rome, incorporated it into the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and elevated it to a papal work (with new statutes). In 1929, he also initiated the coordination of the three most important organs (Childhood of Jesus, Propagation of the Faith, and Work of Saint Peter). He probably did this hoping to solicit more funds and to distribute them more fairly, but also in order to dissolve the regional national ties of the large missionary societies.

---

[20] *Sylloge,* 112f.: *Litterae Apost.* of 26 November 1919.

[21] P. G. B. Tragella, *Un'anima di fuoco P. Paolo Manna* (Naples 1954).

[22] The Society for Foreign Missions of Maryknoll, U.S.A., was founded in 1911 (B. Arens, *Handbuch der katholischen Missionen* [Freiburg ²1927], 65–72). Regarding the Foreign Missionary Society of Bethlehem (Immensee), see R. Rust, *Die Bethlehem Missionare* (1962).

[23] Van Rossum (born 1854) was prefect of the Propaganda from 1918 until his death in 1932; cf. N. Kowalsky, *LThK* IX, 59f.; J. O. Smit, *W. M. Kardinal van Rossum* (Roermond 1955).

[24] Cf. J.-M. Drehmanns, op. cit.

[25] J. Schmidlin, "Pius XI. als Missionspapst," *ZMR* 27 (1923), 233–43 (incl. biblio. concerning the missionary aspect of this pontificate); M. Ledrus, "La doctrine missionnaire de S. S. Pie XI," *NRTh* 56 (1929), 481–94.

---

[26] Three hundred years after the establishment of the Propaganda and the canonization of Francis Xavier and one hundred years since the beginning of the work of the propagation of the faith.

[27] The beginning of the Motu proprio of 3 May 1922: "Romanorum Pontificum in hoc maxime versari curas planum est oportere, ut sempiternam animarum salutem, Iesu Christi regno per orbem terrarum dilatando, quaerant . . ." (*AAS* 14 [1922], 321–26). Cf. the famous Pentecost homily of 4 June 1922 (*Sylloge,* 196–202): He felt obligated to the *paternità universale.*

[28] *AAS* 18 (1926), 68f.

[29] *AAS* 14 (1922), 198f.; concerning the general statutes of the missionary society of priests of 1926, see *AAS* 18 (1926), 230–36. The entire first part of *Rerum Ecclesiae* is devoted to the mobilization of the Christian world for the missions.

[30] "Because the Church was born for nothing but the propagation of Christ's kingdom all over the world so that all of mankind may partake in eternal salvation" (Marmy, Auf der Maur, 27); cf. ibid., 30f. (*Rerum Ecclesiae*). Pius speaks of quantitative as well as qualitative Catholicity (cf. A. Seumois, "La Charité Apostolique, fondement moral constitutif de l'activité missionnaire," *NZM* 13 [1957], 161–75, 256–70).

[31] In the consistory of 23 May 1923, he spoke about the "maximum sanctissimumque omnium catholicorum operum, quale est opus missionum" (*AAS* 15 [1923] 248).

Another matter to which the Pope devoted his attention was outlined in detail in Pius XI's encyclical *Rerum Ecclesiae* (1926). Its main passages deal with the founding, solidification, and independence of the new churches.[32] Three years earlier, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith sent directives to the missionary societies that clearly aimed at the assimilation of the church into the missionary district.[33] The work of the foreigners could be considered concluded as soon as the new foundation had established its own leadership, churches, native clergy, and funds, in short, as soon as it no longer needed the help of others. At that stage its existence would no longer be threatened if the missionaries should be deported or fresh recruits from Europe should be reduced. For the creation of a church, *Rerum Ecclesiae* demanded: an autochthonous clergy that would be compatible with the European clergy; autochthonous orders that would correspond to the expectations and interests of the natives as well as to the regional conditions and circumstances; an autochthonous monastic system because the contemplative monasteries offer irreplaceable contributions to the development of an individual church;[34] autochthonous catechists, and an elite of laymen whose careful training could be of invaluable importance for the future of Church and country.[35] The words of Pius XI's encyclical were carried out in practice. In 1926, at the celebration of the Feast of Christ the King, he himself ordained six Chinese bishops, one year later a Japanese, and in 1933 three more Chinese, a Vietnamese, and an Indian. In spite of all obstacles, this was a decisive breakthrough toward independence. This tendency was also noticeable in the intensive development of the missionary territories: by the end of his pontificate, there were 116 new vicariates and 157 prefectures. The Pope pursued the goal of stabilizing the growing churches by sending out apostolic delegates (e.g., Monsignor Costantini to China in 1922, Delle Piane to the Belgian Congo in 1930) and by convening local synods (1924: the council of Shanghai and all of Japan, 1924/27: the synods of South Africa) which tried to apply the directives from Rome to the respective situation.

---

[32] *Sylloge,* 240–58: *De sacris missionibus provehendis Rerum Ecclesiae* (28 February 1926); German: Marmy, Auf der Maur, 26–49.

[33] Decree of the Propaganda of 20 May 1923, *Lo sviluppo* (*Sylloge,* 213–17).

[34] The Popes rarely discuss this (rather important) concern of monachism. Regarding the numerous native orders and congregations developing in India, see P. Rayanna, *The Indigenous Religious Congregations of India and Ceylon* (Tallakulam, Madura 1948); concerning the contemplative orders in Africa, cf. *Grands Lacs* (Namur, Jan. 1956); I. Auf der Maur, "Werden, Stand und Zukunft des afrikanischen Mönchtums," *NZM* 23 (1967), 284–95, 24 (1968), 21–35; P. Gordan, "Aufgaben und Probleme des benediktinischen Mönchtums in Afrika," *NZM* 16 (1960), 186–92.

[35] Pius XI devotes one chapter to the assistance provided by missionary doctors.

In a letter to the ecclesiastical leaders in China (16 June 1926)[36] Pius XI expressed another first principle: the idea of accommodation.[37] In order to fend off the persistent charges that missionaries were pursuing political interests, the Pope once more emphasized in this letter the purely religious character of ecclesiastical activities. He continued stressing that no one could dispute the fact that the Church demonstrated the desire to adapt to the character of a people.[38] The justified aspirations of a nation with a rich culture and tradition, he declared two years later in a message to the same country, should not be ignored.[39] Therefore, upon the request of the bishops of Manchuria in 1935, he permitted the Christians in that area to observe certain Confucian ceremonies, provided they exercise pastoral expedience.[40] This ended an exceedingly deplorable chapter in the history of the Far Eastern missions: the unfortunate conflict over rites. Similarly, the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith allowed the Japanese faithful to attend certain events of a national or family-related nature. The instruction in this matter referred to principles that had been devised in 1659 and were surprisingly broad-minded.[41] Two other initiatives by Rome point in the direction of indigenization. The "exceedingly Catholic initiative" requesting that the religious activities be adapted to Japanese characteristics and tradition is praised because the risky enterprise of a Christian Japanese art was somewhat crucial for the Church on these islands.[42] On the other hand, the missionary leaders encouraged the artistic creativity of the natives on the occasion of the first exhibition of religious art in the Congo, justifying it as an expression of the catholicity of the Church, which was willing to absorb the spiritual values of a nation into its tradition.[43] This document demonstrating the spirit of accommodation of the Roman headquarters was written by Celso Costantini, the long-term prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (1935–1953) and the patron of autochthonous Christian art.[44] Finally, in view of the missions in Africa, a letter of 1938 should be mentioned, because it favors the adoption of burial ceremonies (Matanga) in the Belgian Congo and thus advocates the liturgical adaptation which was finally turned into a program by the Second Vatican Council.[45]

---

[36] *Ab ipsis: Sylloge,* 259–64. In regard to Pius XI's relations to the China mission (first Council, 1924; ordination of Chinese bishops, etc.), cf. L. Wei Tsing-sing, *Le Saint-Siège et la Chine de Pie XI. à nos jours* (Sotteville-lès-Rouen 1971).

[37] F. Kollbrunner, "Die Akkommodation im Geist der Katholizität 1919–59," *NZM* 28 (1972), 161–84, 264–74; the first monograph was published by J. Thauren, *Die Akkommodation im katholischen Heidenapostolat. Eine missionsmethodische Studie* (Münster 1927). Cf. J. Masson, *Le testament missionarie de Pie XI* (*Collection Xaveriana März,* Louvain 1939).

[38] *Sylloge,* 263: "Nemo ignorat . . . Ecclesiam ad eas, quae cuiusvis nationis aut regni propriae sunt, leges aut constitutiones, sese accommodare."

[39] *Sylloge,* 308f. (1 August 1928).

[40] *Sylloge,* 479–82 (28 May 1935).

[41] *Sylloge,* 537–40 (26 May 1936); the instructions of 1659: *Collectanea* I, 42f.: "Do not try and do not expect these people to change their ceremonies,their customs, and their traditions unless they are in blatant conflict with religion and ethics. . . . Faith is not in the habit of overthrowing or fighting a people's customs and traditions if they are not bad; on the contrary, it wishes to preserve them unharmed."

[42] Letter to Apostolic Delegate P. Marella of 1 June 1935 in *Sylloge,* 483.

To what extent were the ideas propagated by the two Popes and espoused in numerous proclamations applied to everyday missionary life? The ecclesiastical documents show a certain discrepancy between theory and practice. But if we want to be fair, we have to admit that, particularly between the two world wars, the Roman declarations had an effect on history, though maybe to a different degree, depending on the case.[46] First of all, they succeeded in interesting Christians in the world apostolate, for instance the Dutch, who were exceedingly active, and the Catholics in the United States, who developed more and more missionary responsibility, or Spain, which sent many friars to South America. If the Church as a whole had not become more missionary in nature, we would not be able to understand the expansion of the missionary work during this period in which catholicity was realized to a unique extent.[47] For example, during the pontificate of Pius XI, the number of Catholics in India grew from three to 3.5 million, in Indo-China from one to 1.5 million. In spite of many obstacles, their numbers also grew considerably in the Pacific. But especially the African missions, mainly in the areas around the equator, witnessed such an upswing that the missionaries had a hard time accomplishing their work.[48] Even in areas that had no great achievements to report, things were stirring, as in South America, where several missionary dioceses and twenty new missionary districts were established among the Indians.[49] The mission of the Indians and blacks in North America (which the Catholics began rather late),[50] where several societies were involved, and the activities among the Eskimos in the north, where Christianization was mainly attempted by the Oblates,[51] progressed to everyone's satisfaction.

---

[43] *Sylloge,* 543f.: letter to Apostolic Delegate Delle Piane of 14 December 1936.—J. Beckmann, "Die Stellung der katholischen Mission zur bildenden Kunst der Eingeborenen," *Acta Tropica* 2 (1945), 211–31.

[44] C. Constantini, *L'arte cristiana nelle missioni* (Vatican City 1940).

[45] *Sylloge,* 576–78: letter of 14 July 1938 to Apostolic Delegate Delle Piane.

[46] See the critical comments in J. Glazik, "Mission der Kirche im Zeichen des Konzils," *ZMR* 48 (1964), 149–75 (esp. 170–72); W. Bühlmann, *Sorge für alle Welt* (Freiburg 1967), 88: "They (*sc. Maximum illud* and *Rerum Ecclesiae*) were unable to influence reality."

[47] Schmidlin, *PG* III, 197–209.

[48] A. Tellkamp, *Die Gefahr der Erstickung für die katholische Weltmission* (Münster 1950); L. Grond, "Wachstum der Kirche und Priestermangel in Afrika," *NZM* 16 (1960), 142–46.

However, in another area the positive influence of the two Popes was more visible: in the energetically pursued education of a native clergy and the assignment of the Church leadership to local bishops. This breakthrough at that time can be considered an epoch-making event in the recent history of the missions, even though a lot may have been lacking in regard to the independence of the new Churches.[52] The principles extolled by Benedict XV and Pius XI (regarding the need, possibility, and usefulness of a native clergy and episcopate) were not new, they were embedded in a three-hundred-year-old Roman tradition. However, particularly regarding the demands pertaining to the office of bishop, these principles seemed shocking to many, sometimes even revolutionary.[53] Opposition did not fail to appear: some used the tactic of procrastination, others, for reasons of racial prejudice, warned of hastiness, even though Father Gabet, in a memorandum of 1848, had already refuted their arguments in detail.[54] Disregarding the opposition,

---

[49] Most rewarding in this regard were the successful efforts to establish a native clergy. In 1925, the Bavarian Capuchin Bishop Guido Beck founded for his huge territory in Araucania (Chile) a seminary from which the first full-blooded Indians graduated in 1933. Cf. Noggler, *Vierhundert Jahre Araukanermission* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1973).—In Yarumal (Colombia), the native Bishop Miguel Angel Builes initiated the founding of the Papal Missionary Seminary of Saint Francis Xavier (1927). Today, it is responsible for several missionary regions.

[50] A. Tellkamp, "Zur Geschichte der Missionierung der Neger in den USA," *NZM* 4 (1948), 45–63. Since 1871, this mission was in the hands of the Mill Hill Missionaries, the Spiritans, the missionaries of Lyon and Steyl, the American society of the Josephites (in existence since 1892), and, after World War II, the brothers of Scheutveld. The smaller number of Catholics is due to the historical circumstances of the past. The first American seminary for blacks, founded in 1920 by the Steyl missionaries in Bay St. Louis, trained, by 1960, thirty-seven S.V.D. members (cf. M. Meier, *Die Negermission SVD im Süden der USA* [diss., Gregoriana, Rome, part 4 printed, Steyl 1961]).

[51] Since 1932, there has been a female society of Eskimos; P. Duchaussois, *Femmes héroïques, les Sœur Grises Canadiennes aux Glaces Polaires* (Paris ^{2}1933); id., *Aux Glaces Polaires. Indiens et Esquimaux* (Paris 1935). Cf. A. Freitag, "Die katholischen Missionen Amerikas," *ZMR* 25 (1935), 152–77.

[52] G. B. Tragella, *Una nuova Epoca nelle storia delle Missioni* (Milan 1933).

[53] J. Schmidlin, "Der Sieg der eingeborenen Missionshierarchie," *ZMR* 24 (1934), 1–19; cf. the disputes of the two spokesmen Lebbe from China and Gille for India.

[54] J. Beckmann, *Der einheimische Klerus in den Missionsländern. Eine Übersicht* (Fribourg 1943); id. (ed.), *Der einheimische Klerus in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift L. Kilger* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1950); included is an essay about P. Gabet by G. B. Tragella, "Le vicende d'un opuscolo sul clero indigeno e del duo autore," 189–202.

Rome helped the cause to succeed. The statistics are striking proof of this.[55] Two examples may serve the point. First: China, which proceeded quickly after 1920. By 1939 it had more than two thousand autochtonous priests, and in approximately twenty districts natives were responsible for the fate of the Church. A historic milestone was the establishment of the hierarchy (1946): twenty-one Chinese were appointed bishop and seven apostolic prefects.[56] Second: After many disappointments and unsuccessful attempts, Africa had, after World War I, 148 native clergymen. By 1939, their number had grown to 358. The first two black bishops (Madagascar and Uganda) were consecrated in 1939 under Pius XII. While the natives were entering the ranks of the clergy and the episcopate, the large orders, such as the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits opened their doors to the communities in the Far East. Furthermore, the natives were granted independence through the constitution of provinces and monasteries, or they were allowed to develop their own branches within the monastic system (e.g., the Carmelites in India, the Cistercians in China, Japan, and Vietnam). At any rate, there the Church demonstrated that it was overcoming racial prejudice,[57] which certainly did not free it from the responsibility to develop individual ways of training the clergy, depending on the various peoples, in order to break away from an all too Western education.[58]

Finally, if we consider the efforts made toward a qualitative catholicity, which means the Church's willingness to get involved in the cultural, social, and religious traditions of the mission countries, we have to admit that between 1914 and 1939 this was not the dominant concern. Certainly, a native clergy and episcopate were created with indigenization in mind. But precisely this step had to be made first. Foreigners cannot completely adapt the Church to the characteristics, customs, and traditions of a people. This is essentially the task and the obligation of a matured native elite. The urgent need for acclimatization and decolonization in terms of spirit and religion did not surface to the level of awareness until the era of political colonialism approached its end. Nonetheless, the missionaries laid the foundation for such a change, and in that regard they followed the directives of the Pope, though perhaps not always with the (in retrospect) desirable energy. To vindicate them one could say that the will to adapt to the mentality of the land and the people was in many respects a lot stronger than we can imagine.[59] This is proven by the efforts regarding the languages and the native literature (which cannot be praised enough),[60] the creation of a Christian terminology,[61] the indigenization of the Bible,[62] and research in the area of ethnology and religious studies.[63] At their general chapter meeting in 1926, the White Fathers decided to prepare a study center for the Muslim missionaries, an initiative to which the *Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes* (and its periodical *Ibla*) owes its existence. Among the missionaries in India, the Belgian Jesuits dealt with the relations between Hinduism and Christianity, e.g., the two Sanskrit scholars Father Dandoy and Father Johanns (with his famous work *To Christ through the Vedanta*).[64] The Parisian missionaries had outstanding linguists and religion scholars. Therefore, Vietnam witnessed the most enlightened investigation of its culture and especially the religious tradition of Buddhism in the Orient.[65] In Japan, some missionaries conducted similar studies.[66] There were even steps made toward a native theology, as in India and China,[67] and in many places the liturgy was on its way to finding a form of expression which was more in line with the people's feelings.[68] In regard to Africa we need to remember the invaluable contributions of the native catechists and sisters (by 1939, the number of female congregations was 242 and included 1,529 members) regarding the solidification of the Church. These examples remind us not to pass general judgment on the missionaries and their guilt or insufficient willingness to adapt.

---

[55] A. Freitag, "Die Fortschritte des einheimischen Klerus und der einheimischen Hierarchie in den Missionsländern der letzten dreißig Jahre (1920–50)," *Festschrift L. Kilger* (n. 54), 203–32; I. Ting Pong Lee, "Episcopal Hierarchy in the Missions," *ED* 13 (1960), 181–225.

[56] J. Beckmann, "Die hierarchische Neuordnung in China. Ein geschichtlicher Überblick," *NZM* 3 (1947), 9–24.

[57] J. Beckmann, "Einheimischer Klerus und Rassenfrage," *NZM* 11 (1955), 1–14. "One of the most gratifying aspects of the recent missionary epoch is the fact that, after overcoming the last obstacles, the foreign missionaries of all nations unanimously supported the papal directives and tried in any way possible to apply them" (11).

[58] In the past, isolated attempts were made to adjust the education of the clergy. Nevertheless, it remains a task of the future which can only be accomplished through cooperation of foreign missionaries and native priests. See T. Ohm, "Die philosophisch-religionswissenschaftlich-theologische Ausbildung des indischen Klerus," *Festschrift L. Kilger* (n. 54), 233–50; H. Köster, "Zur theologischen Ausbildung des chinesischen Klerus," *TThZ* 61 (1952), 289–316; A. Morant, *Die philosophisch- theologische Bildung in den Priesterseminaren Schwarz-Afrikas* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1959); C. W. Forman, "Theological Education in the South Pacific Islands: a Quiet Revolution," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 25 (1969), 151–68.

---

[59] Regarding the Chinese missions, see J. Beckmann, "Die Stellung der katholischen Missionare zur chinesischen Kultur," *Missionsjahrbuch der Schweiz* 9 (Fribourg 1942), 41–67: "Without being too optimistic, it is justified to say that the Church in China is on its way to becoming a true people's Church, that is to say, the Catholic Church is about to enter into close alliance with the Chinese intellectual and cultural life." (67); cf. J. Rossel, *Dynamik und Hoffnung* (Basel 1967), 25.

[60] The *Bibliotheca Missionum* offers a wealth of material illustrating these efforts. See J. Beckmann, "Werden, Wachsen und Bedeutung der Bibliotheca Missionum," *De Archivis et Bibliothecis Missionibus atque scientiae Missionum inservientibus: Festschrift Rommerskirchen* (Rome 1968), 33–57; one of the most distinguished Catholic Africa linguists: P. G. van Bulck, S. J., *Les recherches linguistiques au Congo Belge* (Brussels 1948); concerning one of the most eminent experts of Swahili, cf. W. Bühlmann, "P. Charles Sacleux CSSp Missionar und Wissenschaftler (1856–1943)," *NZM* 4 (1948), 17–32; A. Huppenbauer, "Afrika-Missionare im Dienst der Sprachforschung," *Acta Tropica* 2 (1945), 262–70.

[61] W. Bühlmann, *Die christliche Terminologie als missionsmethodisches Problem* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1950); A. Capell, "La traduction des termes théologiques dans les langues de l'Océanie," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 25 1969), 43–70.

[62] J. Beckmann (ed.), *Die Heilige Schrift in den katholischen Missionen* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1966).

[63] Regarding the prerequisites for the Christianization of Africa, see E. Dammann, op. cit., 101ff.: "Sprache, Völkerkunde, Religionen, sprachliche Praxis"; 130ff.: biblio.

[64] Concerning G. Dandoy (1882–1962), cf. Streit XVII, 224f.; he was the founder and editor of the monthly journal *The Light of the East* (1922–46); regarding P. Johanns

The new theological discipline called missiology participated energetically in the efforts toward the formation of new churches in the period between the wars, primarily through an eloquent defence of the native clergy and episcopate.[69] The creation of missiology was, on the one hand, an expression of the strengthened desire of the Catholics for missions, on the other hand, it had a stimulating and cleansing effect on missionary activities. The Protestants conducted mission studies much

---

(1882–1955), see Streit XVIII, 252–54 (including a summary of *To Christ through the Vedanta*); P. Johanns, *La pensée religieuse de l'Inde* (Paris, Louvain 1952).

[65] One of the greatest scholars of the Far East is L.-M. Cadière (1869–1955), who also pioneered religious ethnology; cf. Streit XI, 435ff.

[66] P. Aimé Villon (1843–1932), to mention only one of the many missionaries from Paris, left us thirteen extensive manuscripts containing studies of Buddhism; in 1938, the Jesuits began publishing the *Monumenta Nipponica;* see *NZM* 1 (1945), 145–50.

[67] Regarding India, cf. J. R. Chandran, *Library of Indian Christian Theology. A Bibliography* (Madras 1969); cf. *NZM* 27 (1971), 302. P. Henri Bernard-Maître, S. J., wrote a *Brevis Introductio in Philosophiam sinicam* (Sienshien 1940). Maurus Heinrichs, O.F.M., used a series of studies about Chinese philosophy and cultural history in the *Collectanea Commissionis Synodalis* (1936ff.) for teaching in the seminaries.

[68] A. Schmid, "Rites camerounais et liturgie catholique," *Festschrift L. Kilger* (n. 54), 275–95; J. L. van Hecken, "Le mouvement liturgique au Japon en faveur de la célébration eucharistique 1865–1962," *NZM* 26 (1970), 18–27, 94–113; I. Auf der Maur characterizes the period from 1920 until 1945 in " 'Rückschlag und Besinnung': Beitrag der Benediktiner-Missionare von St. Ottilien in Tansania zur liturgischen Erneuerung 1887–1970," *NZM* 27 (1971), 126–35, 188–200; A. Plangger says about Rhodesia: "So far, cultural adaptation occurred mainly on the terminological and linguistic level. . . . Broad conceptual adaptations are still modest and rare" ("Shona Gebetbücher. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Shona-Frömmigkeit," *NZM* 26 [1970], 28–39, 127–36).

[69] General introductions to Catholic missiology: P. de Mondreganes, *Manual de Misionologia* (Vitoria 1933, Madrid ^{2}1947); A. Mulders, *Inleiding tot de Missiewetenschap* ('s-Bosch 1937, Bussum ^{2}1950); J. E. Champagne, *Manuel d'action missionnaire* (Ottawa 1947); S. Paventi, *La Chiesa Missionaria* (Rome 1949); A. Seumois, *Introduction à la Missiologie* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1952).

earlier. In 1867 Alexander Duff (1806–78), a Scottish missionary who used to work in India, succeeded in establishing a missiological teaching chair in Edinburgh, which only lasted until 1905.[70] The international mission conference in Edinburgh in 1910 made a new start by stressing the importance of this discipline for activating the home base. Above all, the Protestants of the United States followed the appeal and, by 1930, sixty out of sixty-eight schools taught missiology in one form or another.[71] Gustav Warneck (1834–1910) is considered the true founder of the discipline on the Protestant side. He introduced it to its rightful place in theological teaching.[72]

Under Warneck's influence, Joseph Schmidlin, an energetic man from Alsace (1876–1944), seized the Catholic initiative in Münster,[73] after Robert Streit, O.M.I. (1875–1930),[74] Anton Huonder, S. J., of Chur (1858–1926), and Friedrich Schwager S.V.D. (1876–1929)[75] had done the groundwork. After 1910 Schmidlin was lecturer for mission studies and, after 1914, the first Catholic full professor. He attended in a critical and systematic manner to the entire discipline with its various branches (theory of mission, missiology, missionary history, law, etc.). After some resistance, he took charge of the editorial office of the first Catholic missiological periodical, the *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* which he published (with the exception of one short period) without interruption until 1937, making it the voice of many a thorough study. The basic works of the new discipline gradually emanated from his work for the journal: *Einführung in die Missionswissenschaft* (1917, 1925), *Katholische Missionslehre im Grundriß* (1919, 1923)—called "an event" in the Catholic world—*Katholische Missionsgeschichte* (1925), and the two-volume *Das gegenwärtige Heidenapostolat im Fernen Osten* (1928).[76]

---

[70] O. G. Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education* I (Oslo 1955); cf. review in *NZM* 12 (1956), 146–49.

[71] Id., *The Study of Missions in Theological Education* II, 1910–1950 (Oslo 1957); cf. review in *NZM* 15 (1959), 224f.

[72] The first missionary theory is contained in his five-volume work *Evangelische Missionslehre* (1892–1905).

[73] A biography of him is still lacking; however, a study of his early years in Alsace seems to be planned in honor of his one hundredth birthday. L. Riegert, "Ein Apostel aus dem Sundgau: Joseph Schmidlin 1876–1944," *L'Alsace,* 2 July 1971, 11; different aspects of his life and work in J. Glazik (ed.), *50 Jahre katholische Missionswissenschaft in Münster 1911–1961* (Münster 1961); J. Beckmann, "Universitätsprofessor Dr. Josef Schmidlin," *Schweiz. Kirchenzeitung* 112 (1944), 234–36.

[74] J. Pietsch, *P. Robert Streit OMI. Ein Pionier der katholischen Missionswissenschaft* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1952).

[75] Among other books, he published *Europäismus im Missionsbetrieb* (Aachen 1921).

[76] He was capable of gaining recognition for his discipline, but he made few friends, shocking most people with his brusque behavior.

Assisted by the *Internationales Institut für missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen,* founded by Schmidlin in 1911, the *Bibliotheca Missionum* was published (among other works). This work had been started by Streit in 1916 and continued by Johannes Dindinger, O.M.I. (1881–1958)[77] and Johannes Rommerskirchen, O.M.I.[78] It is an exemplary tool, which now includes about thirty impressive volumes. In regard to recent literature, it should be supplemented by the *Bibliografia Missionaria* (Rome 1935ff.).[79] Because of his opposition to National Socialism, Schmidlin was forced to retire in 1934 and to resign from the *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* in 1937. He died in 1944 in the Struthof concentration camp near Schirmeck.

The tireless efforts of this innovator bore fruit. His students especially carried missiology across the German borders. Their success was probably aided by recommendations from Rome.[80] Indeed, after Münster, missiological teaching chairs were established in Munich (1919), in Rome (1919 at the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith), Nijmegen (1930), Ottawa (1932), Vienna (1933), Comillas (Spain), and Fribourg (1940).[81] At other universities, lectures were given, as at the Institut Catholique of Paris after 1923, in Louvain after 1927, and in Lyon. Real missiological departments were established in 1932 at the Gregoriana and the Propaganda College in Rome. Elsewhere, but not until after 1939, academic institutes were added (Fribourg, Nijmegen, Ottowa).[82] By the outbreak of World War II, thanks to these institutions and the efforts of individual scholars, this new academic discipline already had a sizeable number of missiological journals, series, and compilations, especially regarding sources. In the meantime, practitioners and experts debated acute problems at conventions such as the *Semaines de Missiologie* (Louvain, since 1922).

During the first phase of the development of Catholic mission studies, Germany produced men who made the young discipline respectable. Otto Maas, O.F.M. (1884–1945) distinguished himself through his missiological historical studies of the Franciscan missions in China, New Mexico, and Indochina.[83] His Franciscan brother Dorotheus Schilling (1886–1950) devoted his research to Japanese missionary history, primarily to the activities of the Jesuits, later to the missionary work of the Franciscans.[84] Benno Biermann, O.P. (1884–1970) critically investigated the contributions of the Dominicans in regard to the propagation of the faith (especially in the New World), and for decades he studied the fascinating person of Las Casas.[85] Anton Freitag S.V.D. (1882–1968), the first one to get his Ph.D. under Schmidlin, devoted his energy thenceforth to missiology.[86] Johannes Peter Steffes (1883–1955) enriched the discipline by incorporating religious studies. Subsequently, Schmidlin expanded his journal after 1928 to a *Zeitschrift für Missions- und Religionswissenschaft.*[87] Wilhelm Schmidt S.V.D. (1868–1954) offered new ideas through ethnology and philology when founding *Anthropos.*[88] Through Thomas Ohm, O.S.B. (1892–1962), at first professor of missiology in Salzburg, later in Münster, the scholarly investigation of foreign religions became the focal point.[89] Missiology was relatively weak in France. Georges Goyau (1869–1939) taught missionary history at the Institut Catholique in Paris. He also determined the character of the *Revue d'Histoire des Missions* during its regrettably brief period of publication (1924–1939). In Italy, a student of Schmidlin, Giovanni Battista Tragella (1885–1968), mediated German missiology by translating several books and thus instilling new impulses into the missionary system at home.[90] Pioneering studies in the area of sinology and Chinese missionary history (especially about Matteo Ricci) were made by the Jesuit Pasquale d'Elia (1890–1963), professor at the Aurora University of Shanghai and subsequently at the missiological department of the Gregoriana.[91] Essays valuable in regard to missiology and ethnology are contained in the *Annali Lateranensi* (after 1937), which was edited by Michael Schulien S.V.D. (1888–1968) for three decades.[92] In Louvain, missiology could only settle on the fringes of academia. There, Pierre Charles, S.J. (1883–1954), not really a specialist, yet very sensitive to the concrete reality, pointed in new directions and insisted that "implanting the Church" was the main missionary goal.[93] Adelhelm Jann (1876–1945), Swiss Capuchin, focused his missiological-historical work on Bishop Anastasius Hartmann. For the purpose of his investigation he founded the *Monumenta Anastasiana.*[94] Also oriented toward history was Laurenz Kilger, O.S.B. (1890–1964). Immediately after World War II, in cooperation with Johannes Beckmann, S.M.B. (1901–1971), he founded the *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* a courageous enterprise.[95] Beckmann's interests (he as well as Kilger were students of Schmidlin) included all aspects of his discipline, but his exceedingly rich work is also dominated by history.[96] In Spain, missiology flourished unexpectedly after the Civil War, especially missionary history, so that the *Archivo Ibero-Americano* (1914–1936, 22 vols.), which was important for the missionary history of the Franciscans, could be continued after 1941.[97] Aside from the Franciscans, the Catholics in the United States paid little attention to this discipline, in spite of the general upswing of missions in this country. It was regrettable that this branch of theology was also lacking in the mission churches themselves. But this is understandable in the case of a discipline that is still struggling for recognition, even though the missions needed it most.[98]

---

[77] Concerning him, cf. *NZM* 7 (1959), 64–66 (J. Beckmann).

[78] Regarding his 60th birthday, cf. *NZM* 15 (1959), 64–66 (J. Beckmann).

[79] J. Beckmann, "Die Bibliotheca Missionum. Zur Vollendung der ersten Serie," *Priester und Mission* (Aachen 1963), 237–50.

[80] Pius X welcomed the missiological efforts in Germany (Schmidlin, *PG* III, 119); Benedict XV announced a teaching chair for missiology in Rome in *Maximum illud* (*Sylloge,* 121f.); Pius XI demanded that missionary work be studied in a scholarly manner (cf. Schmidlin, *PG* IV, 192, his critical comments regarding Pius XI).

[81] J. Beckmann, "Die Universität Freiburg und das katholische Missionswerk," *Festgabe an die Schweizer Katholiken* (Freiburg 1954), 155–67.

[82] A. Mulders, "Missiewetenschappelijk Leven," *Het Missiewerk* 26 (1947), 1–15; J. Beckmann, "Die Pflege der Missionswissenschaften in den einzelnen Ländern," *NZM* 5 (1949), 19–29.

---

[83] *NZM* 2 (1946), 305f.; this volume deals with earlier representatives of missiology: Paul Andres, Maurus Gahn, and Josef Jung-Diefenbachs.

[84] Ibid. 6 (1950), 223–26.

[85] Ibid. 20 (1964), 50–54; 26 (1970), 219f.; B. Biermann, *Las Casas und seine Sendung. Das Evangelium und die Rechte der Menschen* (Mainz 1968).

[86] *ZMR* 49 (1965), 222–24; *NZM* 24 (1968), 205f.

[87] *NZM* 11 (1955), 142f.

[88] J. Beckmann, "Mission und Ethnologie, Zum Tode von P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD," *NZM* 10 (1954), 293–96; J. Henninger, "Im Dienste der Mission: 60 Jahre Anthropos 1906–1966," *NZM* 23 (1967), 206–21.

[89] *NZM* 18 (1962), 305–311. T. Ohm, *Machet zu Jüngern alle Völker. Theorie der Mission* (Freiburg 1962).—This list shows how the number of the first German missiologists has diminished—and there are very few replacements.

[90] For instance, he translated Schmidlin's history of the missions into Italian (3 vols., Milan 1927–29). His three-volume history of the seminary of Milan gained quite a reputation (*Le Missioni Estere di Milano nel quadro degli avvenimenti contemporanei* [Milan 1950/1959/1963], cf. *NZM* 24 [1968], 203–5).

It is obvious from the names mentioned that the strength of missiology during the period of its consolidation lay in the area of mission history, even though it accomplished a great deal in other areas as well, e.g., in mission studies. By investigating the past as objectively as possible and thus creating a benevolent understanding for the missionary efforts within the other camp, the intensive historical research in regard to missions resulted in a relaxation of the often tense relationship between Catholics and Protestants. This was quite an accomplishment.[99] Aside from theoretical debates which are still carried on today,[100] two problems played an important role. The first was the question of the missionary goal.[101] Against the background of complicated interrelations, the discussion is dominated by two major trends: the theory of the *Plantatio Ecclesiae* and the salvation of the non-Christians. However, the viewpoints gradually merged and one could say that the missionary goal is the implantation of the Church with the conversion of the people in mind.[102] The other frequently discussed problem deals with accommodation. The urgency of this matter resulted from the changes within the missionary field, the rejection of Europeanism.[103] Several things were realized: adaptation is the requirement for the implantation of Christianity into the people. Adaptation emanates by necessity from the essence of the Church itself. It is the realization of its catholicity and occurs when cultures meet. This complex of problems became more complicated after World War II, when the exceedingly difficult situation of the countries in the Third World began challenging the new discipline to provide new answers.[104]

---

[91] *NZM* 20 (1964), 146f.: information about the Fonti Ricciane.

[92] Ibid. 5 (1949), 143–47; 24 (1968), 304f.

[93] Ibid. 10 (1954), 136f.

[94] Ibid. 2 (1946), 131; W. Bühlmann, "P. Adelhelm Jann, Pionier der schweizerischen Missionswissenschaft und Missionsbewegung," *Geist und Geschichte. Gedenkschrift zum 50jährigen Bestehen des Lyzeums am Kollegium St. Fidelis in Stans* (Stans 1959), 149–69.

[95] *NZM* 20 (1964), 161–67 (obituary of Kilger); J. Beckmann, "Von der alten zur neuen Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft," *NZM* 1 (1945), 1–11; J. Baumgartner, *Missionswissenschaft im Dienste der Weltkirche. 25 Jahre NZM* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1970).

[96] J. Baumgartner, "In Favorem Missionum. Zum Ehrendoktorat von Prof. Dr. Joh. Beckmann," *NZM* 26 (1970), 82–93; id., obituary: *NZM* 28 (1972), 1–9.

[97] *NZM* 2 (1946), 143–46. Manuel Giménez (1896–1968) was a respected Las Casas scholar.

[98] This postulate is still waiting to be realized.

---

[99] J. Beckmann, "Der Einfluß der Missionswissenschaft auf die Beziehungen der christlichen Konfessionen," *Kath. Missionsjahrbuch der Schweiz* 25 (Freiburg 1958), 28–35; J. Beckmann, "Missionsgeschichte und Ökumene. Zum Tode von Kenneth Scott Latourette 1884–1968," *NZM* 25 (1969), 210–14; id., "Die Bedeutung der Missionsgeschichte für die praktische Missionsarbeit," *Scientia Missionum ancilla. Festschrift A. Mulders* (Nijmegen, Utrecht 1953), 124–37.

[100] See H. Adamek, "Über die Integration der Missionswissenschaft in die Forschungs- und Lehrpraxis der evangelisch-theologischen Fakultäten," *Ev. Miss. Zeitschrift* 26 (1969), 106–10; F. Kollbrunner, "Der Ort der Mission in der Theologie," J. Baumgartner (ed.), *Vermittlung zwischenkirchlicher Gemeinschaft* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1971), 247–63.

[101] H. Kruska, "Zum katholischen Missionsdenken der Gegenwart," *Ev. Miss. Zeitschrift* 10 (1953), 33–45.

[102] A. Seumois, *Vers une définition de l'activité missionnaire* (Schöneck-Beckenried 1948).

[103] J. Mülller, *Missionarische Anpassung als theologisches Prinzip* (Münster 1973).

[104] J. Beckmann, "Forderungen der gegenwärtigen Missionslage an die Missionswissenschaft," *NZM* 8 (1952), 241–50; T. Ohm, "Die katholische Weltmission—gestern und heute," *ZMR* 39 (1955); id., "Die Missionswissenschaft," *ZMR* 45 (1961), 189–96 (tasks for the future: 193ff.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The General Bibliography in vol. VIII (p. 337) contains a large part of material also pertaining to this volume. The following bibliography is of a supplementary nature listing particularly more recent works. The bibliography on individual countries (II, 3) should be supplemented with the systematic bibliography in II, 4–9. Biographies, memoirs, and diaries are included in the bibliographies to individual chapters.

I. GENERAL HISTORY

T. Schieder, ed., *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte* VI (Stuttgart 1968); R. Lill, *Politische Ideologien und nationalstaatliche Ordnung. Festschrift für Th. Schieder* (Munich 1968); L. Capéran, *Histoire contemporaine de la laïcité française,* 3 vols. (vol. 4 not yet publ. by the Institut catholique de Toulouse) (Paris 1958–61); P. Sorlin, *Waldeck-Rousseau* (Paris 1966); id., *La société française* I: *1840–1914* (Paris 1969). R. C. K. Ensor, "England 1870–1914," *Oxford History of England* XIV (London 1936); G. M. Young, *Victorian England. Portrait of an age* (London 1957); F. Fonzi, *Crispi e lo "Stato di Milano"* (Milan 1965); A. W. Salomone, *Italy in the Giolittian Era. Italian Democracy in the Making, 1900–1914* (Philadelphia 1960); R. Konetzke, *Geschichte des spanischen und portugiesischen Volkes* (Leipzig 1939); L. Sánchez Agesta, *La revolución liberal* (Madrid 1955); H. Jeschke, *Die Generation von 1898* (Heidelberg 1934); T. Schieder, *Das deutsche Kaiserreich von 1871 als Nationalstaat* (Cologne and Opladen 1961); E. R. Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789* IV (Stuttgart 1969); P. Alter, *Die irische Nationalbewegung zwischen Parlament und Revolution* (Stuttgart 1971); O. Halecki, *Grenzraum des Abendlandes. Eine Geschichte Ostmitteleuropas* (Salzburg 1957); P. Kovalevsky, *Bildatlas der Kultur und Geschichte der slawischen Welt* (Basel and Vienna 1964); R. Portal, *Les Slaves. Peuples et nations* (Paris 1965); F. R. Dulles, *The United States since 1865* (University of Michigan 1959); Postan, M. M. and Habakuk, H. J., eds., *Cambridge Economic History of Europe* 4 (Cambridge, England) 1965; Parker, W. N. and Pounds, N. J. G., *Coal and Steel in Western Europe* (Bloomington, Indiana 1957); Moller, Herbert, ed., *Population Movements in Modern European History* (New York 1964); Dickinson, R. E., *The West European City: A Geographical Interpretation* (London 1951); Briggs, Asa, *The Making of Modern England, 1783–1867: The Age of Improvement* (New York 1959); Bell, H. C., *Lord Palmerston,* 2 vols (Hamden, Conn. 1936); Curtis, L. P., *Coercion and Conciliation in Ireland, 1880–1892* (Princeton 1963); Wright, Gordon, *France in Modern Times: 1760 to the Present* (Chicago 1960); Brogan, D. W., *The French Nation: From Napoleon to Petain, 1814–1940* (London 1961); Holborn, Hajo, *A History of Modern Germany* 3 (New York 1968); Webb, Robert K., *English History, 1815–1914* (Washington, D.C. 1967); Rich, Norman, *Germany, 1815–1914* (Washington, D.C. 1968); Macartney, C. A., *The Habsburg Empire, 1790–1918* (London 1969); Langer, William L., *European Alliances and Alignments, 1871–1890* (New York 1931).

II. CHURCH HISTORY

1. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

G. Maron, "Die römisch-katholische Kirche von 1870–1970," K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, *Die Kirche und ihre Geschichte* 4 and 2 (Göttingen 1972); K. Algermissen, *Konfessionskunde,* revised by H. Fries et al. (Paderborn 1969).

2. PAPACY

Stanislao da Campagnola, *I papi nella storia* II (Rome 1961); G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste im 20. Jh.* (Munich 1964; new ed. in Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag no. 482 [1968]); C. Falconi, *I papi del ventesimo secolo* (Milan 1967); H. Hermelink, *Die katholische Kirche unter den Pius-Päpsten des 20. Jh.* (Zurich 1949); C. Alix, *Le Saint-Siège et les nationalismes en Europe, 1870–1960* (Paris 1962); D. Secco Suardo, "Da Leone XIII a Pio X," *Collana di storia del movimento cattolico* no. 18 (Rome 1967); K. O. v. Aretin, *Papsttum und moderne Welt* (Munich 1970); E. T. Gargan, ed., *Leo XIII and the Modern World* (New York 1961); F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918,* 2 vols. (Graz 1958–60) (of general interest); *Il cardinale Gasparri e la Questione Romana (con brani delle Memorie inedite)*, ed. by G. Spadolini (Florence 1973); G. Franz, *Kulturkampf. Staat und katholische Kirche in Mitteleuropa von der Säkularisation bis zum Abschluß des preußischen Kulturkampfes* (Munich 1954); id., (G. Franz-Willing), *Kulturkampf gestern und heute. Eine Säkularbetrachtung* (Munich 1971); H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte. Die katholische Kirche* (Cologne and Graz 1964); N. del Rè, *La Curia Romana* (Rome 1970); L. Bedeschi, *La Curia Romana durante la crisi modernista* (Parma 1968); id., *Riforma religiosa e Curia Romana all'inizio del secolo* (Milan 1968); *La Correspondance de Rome 1907–1912* (later ed. Milan [1972], 3 vols., ed. by É. Poulat); *L'ordinamento dei seminari da S. S. Pio X a Pio XII* (Rome 1958).

3. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

GERMANY: R. Lill, *Die ersten deutschen Bischofskonferenzen* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1964); E. Gatz, *Die deutschen Bischofskonferenzen 1872–1881* (in preparation); W. Spael, *Das katholische Deutschland im 20. Jh.* (Würzburg 1964); *Der Katholizismus in Deutschland und der Verlag Herder. 1801–1951* (Freiburg i. Br. 1951); W. Kramer, *Zeitkritik und innere Auseinandersetzung im deutschen Katholizismus im Spiegel der führenden katholischen Zeitschriften, 1895–1914* (diss., Mainz 1955); K. Buchheim, "Der deutsche Verbandskatholizismus. Eine Skizze seiner Geschichte," B. Hanssler, *Die Kirche in der Gesellschaft* (Paderborn 1961), 30–83.

The Social Question: W. Schwer and Franz Müller, "Der deutsche Katholizismus im Zeitalter des Kapitalismus," *Kirche und Gesellschaft* VI (Augsburg 1932); P. Jostock, *Der deutsche Katholizismus und die Überwindung des Kapitalismus. Eine ideengeschichtliche Skizze* (Regensburg 1932); id., *Die katholisch-soziale Bewegung der letzten hundert Jahre in Deutschland* (Cologne 1958); id., *Katholische Arbeiterbewegung in der Geschichte der christlichen Arbeiterbewegung Deutschlands* (Cologne 1963); J. Höffner, *Die deutschen Katholiken und die soziale Frage im 19. Jh.* (Paderborn 1954); E. Ritter, *Die katholisch-soziale Bewegung Deutschlands im 19. Jh. und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954); K. H. Brüls, *Geschichte der katholisch-sozialen Bewegung in Deutschland* (Münster 1958); E. Filthaut, *Deutsche Katholikentage 1848–1958 und soziale Frage* (Essen 1960); J. J. Stegmann, "Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus," H. Grebing, ed., *Deutsches Handbuch der Politik* 3 (1969), 325–560.

Church and State: H. Bornkamm, *Die Staatsidee im Kulturkampf* (Munich 1950); R. Morsey, "Bismarck und der Kulturkampf," *AKG* 39 (1957), 232–70; id., *Die deutsche Zentrumspartei 1917–1923* (Düsseldorf 1966; also important for the decade preceeding 1914); id., ed., *Zeitgeschichte in Lebensbildern. Aus dem deutschen Katholizismus des 20. Jh.* (Mainz 1973) (biographies of Cardinal G. Kopp, J. Bachem, G. v. Hertling, F. Hitze, P. Spahn, K. Trimborn); E. Schmidt-Volkmar, *Der Kulturkampf in Deutschland 1871–1890* (Göttingen 1962); K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie* (Munich 1963); H. Lutz, *Demokratie im Zwielicht. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken aus dem Kaiserreich in die Republik* (Munich 1963); C. Weber, *Kirchliche Politik zwischen Rom, Berlin und Trier 1876–1888* (Mainz 1970); id., *Quellen und Studien zur Kurie und der vatikanischen Politik unter Leo XIII.* (forthcoming); R. Lill, *Die Katholiken und Bismarcks Reichsgründung: Reichsgründung 1870/71,* ed. by T. Schieder and E. Deuerlein (Stuttgart 1970), 345–65; id., *Die Wende im Kulturkampf* (Tübingen 1973); A. Gnägi, *Kirche und Demokratie* (diss., Zurich 1970); K. Erlinghagen, *Die Säkularisierung der deutschen Schule* (Hanover 1972).

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: M. Csáky, *Der Kulturkampf in Ungarn* (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1967).

The Social Question: J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1959); F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatican,* 2 vols. (Graz 1958–60); F. Funder, *Aufbruch zur christlichen Sozialreform* (Vienna and Munich 1953); id., *Vom Gestern ins Heute* (Vienna and Munich 1971); C. Allmayer-Beck, *Vogelsang. Vom Feudalismus zur Volksbewegung* (Vienna 1952; of general interest); G. Silberbauer, *Österreichs Katholiken und die Arbeiterfrage* (Graz 1966); I. A. Hellwing, *Der konfessionelle Antisemitismus im 19. Jh. in Österreich* (Vienna, Freiburg, and Basel 1972).

SWITZERLAND: K. Fry, *Kaspar Decurtins,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1949–52; of general interest); J. Meier, *Der Schweizer Katholische Verein* (Lucerne 1954); U. Altermatt, *Der Weg der Schweizer Katholiken aus dem Ghetto* (forthcoming).

FRANCE: E. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la III^{e} République,* new ed., II–IV (Paris 1930–31); A. Latreille and R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III (Paris 1962); R. Rémond, *Les deux congrès ecclésiastiques de Reims et de Bourges, 1896–1900* (Paris 1964); A. Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst,* 2 vols. (Paris 1921–25); J.-M. Mayeur, *Un prêtre démocrate, l'abbé Lemire* (Paris and Tournai 1968).

Church and State: J. Gadille, *La pensée et l'action politiques des évêques français au début de la III^{e} république,* 2 vols. (Paris 1967); J.-B. Woodall, *The Ralliement in France. Origins and History, 1876–1894* (New York 1961); A. Sedgwick, *The Ralliement in French Politics, 1890–1898* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965); L. V. Méjan, *La séparation de l'Église et de l'État en France. L'œuvre de Louis Méjan* (Paris 1959); A. v. Campenhausen, *Staat und Kirche in Frankreich* (Göttingen 1962); J.-M. Mayeur, *La séparation de l'Église et de l'État* (Paris 1966); M. Vaussard, *Histoire de la démocratie chrétienne* (Paris 1956); J. Caron, *Le Sillon et la démocratie chrétienne* (Paris 1967); P. Castel, *Le Picard et le P. Bailly dans les luttes de presse* (Rome 1962); P. Sorlin, *"La Croix" et les Juifs* (Paris 1967); P. Pierrard, *Juifs et catholiques français. De Drumont à Jules Isaac* (Paris 1970).

The Social Question: E. Barbier, *L'histoire du catholicisme libéral et du catholicisme sociale en France, 1870–1914,* 5 vols. (Bordeaux 1923–28) (integralist perspective; a great deal of documentation); H. Rollet, *L'action sociale des catholiques en France, 1871 à 1914,* 2 vols. (Paris 1948–58); G. Le Bras, *Histoire de la pratique religieuse en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942–44); C. Molette, *L'Association catholique de la jeunesse française, 1886–1907* (Paris 1968); H. I. Terhünte, *Die religiöse Lage der Katholiken Frankreichs in der 3. Republik* (1919); H. Platz, *Geistige Kämpfe im modernen Frankreich* (Kempten 1922).

ITALY: G. Spadolini, *L'opposizione cattolica da Porta Pia al '98* (Florence 1961); id., *Giolitti e i cattolici, 1901–1914* (Florence 1960); D. Secco Suardo, *I cattolici intransigenti* (Brescia 1962); P. Scoppola, *Coscienza religiosa e democrazia nell'Italia contemporanea* (Bologna 1966); id., *Spiritualità e azione del laicato cattolico italiano,* 2 vols. (Padua 1969); F. Magri, *L'azione cattolica in Italia (1775–1939)* (Milan 1953); L. Civardi, *Compendio di storia dell'Azione cattolica italiana* (Rome 1956); L. Ambrosoli, *Il primo movimento D. C. in Italia (1897–1904)* (Rome 1958); G. De Rosa, *Storia politica dell'A. C. in Italia 1905–1919* (Bari 1954), new ed. in 2 vols. (1966); A. Gambasin, "Il movimento sociale nell'Opera dei congressi (1874–1904)," *AnGr* no. 91 (Rome 1958); M. C. Casella, *Religious Liberalism in Modern Italy,* 2 vols. (London 1966); G. Candeloro, *Il movimento cattolico in Italia* (Rome 1953) (Marxist interpretation); R. F. Esposito, *La Massoneria e l'Italia* (Rome 1969); C. Bello, *Geremia Bonomelli* (Brescia 1961); A. Albertazzi, *Il cardinale Svampa e i cattolici bolognesi* (Brescia 1971).

BELGIUM—THE NETHERLANDS—LUXEMBURG: A. de Moreau, *L'Église en Belgique* (Brussels 1945), 239–63; P. van Zuylen, "La Belgique et le Vatican en 1879," *Revue générale Belge* (1954), 1707–34, 1901–15, 2065–81; (1955), 67–86; A. Simon, *La liberté de l'enseignement* (Brussels 1952); id., *Le cardinal Mercier* (Brussels 1960); R. Reszohazy, *Origines et formation du catholicisme social en Belgique. 1842–1909* (Brussels 1958); P. Gérin, *Les origines de la démocratie chrétienne à Liège,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1958–59); L. J. Rogier, *Katholieke Herleving, Geschiedenis van Katholiek Nederland sinds 1853* (The Hague 1957), 276–348; E. Donckel, *Die Kirche in Luxemburg von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Luxemburg 1950).

SPAIN: J. M. Cuenza, *Estudios sobre la Iglesia española del xix* (Madrid 1973).

BRITISH EMPIRE: Maisy Ward, *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition,* 2 vols. (London 1934–38); J. G. Snead-Cox, *Life of Herbert Vaughan,* 2 vols. (London 1910); E. Oldmeadow, *Francis cardinal Bourne,* 2 vols. (London 1940–44); L. I. McCaffrey, *The Irish Question, 1800–1922* (Lexington 1968); Alexis de Barbezieux, *L'Église catholique en Canada* (Montreal 1934); E. Gautier, *Le catholicisme au Canada* (Ottawa 1934); D. de Saint-Denis, *L'Église catholique au Canada* (Montreal 1956); V. Harvey et al., *L'Église et le Québec* (Montreal 1961); J. Hulliger, *L'enseignement social des évêques canadiens, 1891–*1950); F. Engel-Janosi, 2 vols. *Österreich und der Vatican* (Graz 1958–60); E. Winter, Laval University 1961); P. Savard, *Jules-Paul Tardivel* (Quebec 1967) (of general interest); J. E. Murtagh, *Australia. The Catholic Chapter* (New York 1947); P. Ford, *Cardinal Moran and Australian Labour Party* (London 1966); R. Fogarty, *Catholic Education in Australia, 1806–1950,* 2 vols. (Melbourne 1959).

THE SLAVIC WORLD: A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); F. Engel-Janosi, 2 vols. *Österreich und der Vatican* (Graz 1958–60); E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine 955–1939* (Leipzig 1942); id., *Rußland und die slawischen Völker in der Diplomatie des Vatikans 1878–1903* (Berlin 1950); id., *Rußland und das Papsttum* II: *Von der Aufklärung bis zur großen sozialistischen Oktoberrevolution* (Berlin 1961); id., *Rom und Moskau. Ein halbes Jahrtausend Weltgeschichte in ökumenischer Sicht* (Vienna 1972), 145–232.

LATIN-AMERICA: E. Ryan, *The Church in the South American Republics* (London 1934); J. L. Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America* (North Carolina Press 1934); W. v. Schoen, *Geschichte Mittel- und Südamerikas* (Munich 1953), 343–665.

THE UNITED STATES: Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1970* (Huntington 1971); T. T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*

(Notre Dame 1969); id., *The Great Crisis in American Catholic History 1895–1900* (Chicago 1957); T. Roemer, *The Catholic Church in the United States* (London 1950); C. J. Barry, *The Catholic Church and German Americans* (Milwaukee 1953) (critical of the Ireland-Keane group); H. A. Buetow, *The Story of Catholic Education in the United States* (New York 1970); F. J. Zwierlein, *Theodore Roosevelt and Catholics, 1882–1919* (Rochester 1956); R. D. Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958); J. T. Ellis, *The Life of James card. Gibbons,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1952); J. H. Moynihan, *The Life of John Ireland* (New York 1953).

The Social Question: H. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington 1949); M. Karson, *The Catholic Church and Unionism* (New York 1951); A. I. Abell, *American Catholicism and Social Action, 1865–1950* (Notre Dame 1963).

4. HOPES FOR UNIFICATION

CONTACT WITH THE ANGLICAN CHURCH: J. J. Hughes, *Absolutely Null and Utterly Void* (London 1968); id., *Stewards of the Lord. A Reappraisal of Anglican Orders* (London 1970); id., "Zur Frage der anglikanischen Weihen. Ein Modellfall festgefahrener Kontroverstheologie," *Quaestiones disputatae* 59 (Freiburg i. Br. 1973; original in German).

THE INDEPENDENT AND UNIATE CHURCHES—PAPAL HOPES FOR UNIFICATION: D. Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1961–62); A. Brunello, *Le Chiese Orientali e l'Unione. Prospetto storico statistico* (Massimo and Milan 1966); J. Casper, "Die orientalische Christenheit," *Christus und die Religionen der Erde. Handbuch der Religionsgeschichte* III, ed. by F. König (Freiburg 1951), 643–729; R. F. Esposito, *Leone XIII e l'Oriente cristiano. Studio storico-sistematico* (Rome 1961); E. v. Ivánka et al., *Handbuch der Ostkirchenkunde* (Düsseldorf 1971); F. Heiler, *Die Ostkirchen.* Revision of *Urkirche und Ostkirche.* In cooperation with H. Hartog, ed. by A. M. Heiler (Munich and Basel 1971); A. S. Hernández, *Iglesias de Oriente. Puntos específicos de su teología* (Santander 1959); R. Janin, *Les Églises orientales et les rites orientaux* (Paris 1955); id., "Les Églises orientales," C. Poulet, *Histoire du christianisme. Époque contemporaine* (Paris 1957), 489–545; M. Lehmann, *Österreich und der christliche Osten* (Vienna 1970); H. Musset, *Histoire du christianisme, spécialement en Orient* 3 (Harissa and Jerusalem 1948–49); J. Hajjar, *Le christianisme en Orient. Études d'histoire contemporaine 1684–1968* (Beirut 1971); B. Spuler, *Gegenwartslage der Ostkirchen in ihrer nationalen und staatlichen Umwelt* (Frankfurt a. M. 1968); B. Stasiewski, "Geschichtliche Überlegungen zur kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Okzident," *Das Christentum des Ostens und die christliche Einheit* (Würzburg 1965), 13–40, W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1951); G. Zananiri, *Catholicisme oriental* (Paris 1966); N. Zernow, "Die Ostkirchen und die ökumenische Bewegung im 20. Jh.," R. Rouse and St. C. Neill, *Geschichte der Ökumenischen Bewegung 1517–1948* II (Göttingen 1958), 317–58.

5. HISTORY OF THE MISSIONS

R. Streit, *Bibliotheca Missionum* III, XXIV, XXV (America); VIII, XXVII (India); IX (Philippines); X (Japan, Korea); XI (Indochina); XII–XIV (China); XVII–XX (Africa); XXI (Australia, Oceania (Freiburg i. Br. 1951ff.); J. Glazik, *Päpstliche Rundschreiben über die Mission von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.* (Münsterschwarzach 1961; Lat. and Germ.); Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* V–VII (New York and London 1943–45); A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte. Die Ausbrietung des katholischen Glaubens* (Regensburg 1960); T. Ohm, *Wichtige Daten der Missionsgeschichte* (Münster 1961); J. Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan* (Tokyo 1959).

6. Orders and Congregations

P. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de saint Benoît* (Maredsous 1948–56); A. Wulf, *Compendium of the History of the Cistercian Order* (Milwaukee 1944); C. Grolleau and G. Chastel, *L'ordre de Cîteaux. La Trappe* (Paris 1954); A. Walz, *Wahrheitskünder. Die Dominikaner in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Essen 1960, gen. Germ. version of the *Compendium . . .*); C. Hollis, *The Jesuits: A History* (New York 1969); J. Monval, *Les Assomptionnistes* (Paris 1939); E. B. Lüthen, *Die Gesellschaft des Göttlichen Heilandes* (1911); R. Pfeiffer, *Joh.-B. Jordan* (Rome 1920); E. Federici, *G. B. Jordan* (Rome 1948); H. Fischer, *Arnold Janssen* (Steyl 1919); S. Sinningen, *Katholische Frauengenossenschaften Deutschlands* (Düsseldorf 1944; biblio.); R. Hostie, *Vie et mort des ordres religieux* (Paris 1927), 223–80.

7. Piety—Its Expression in the Arts and Literature

A. Rohrbasser, *Heilslehre der Kirche. Dokumente von Pius IX. bis Pius XII.* (Fribourg 1953); R. Graber, *Die marianischen Weltrundschreiben der Päpste in den letzten hundert Jahren* (Regensburg 1951); A. Mayer-Pfannholz, "Das Kirchenbild des 19. Jh. und seine Ablösung," *Die Besinnung* 3 (Nuremberg 1948), 124–44.

LITURGICAL MOVEMENT: W. Trapp, *Vorgeschichte und Ursprung der liturgischen Bewegung* (Regensburg 1940); O. Rousseau, *Histoire du mouvement liturgique* (Paris 1945), 201–30; J. Hacker, "Die Messe in den deutschen Diözesan-, Gesang- und Gebetbüchern von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart," *MthSt(H)* 1 (1950), 68–132; Anton L. Mayer, "Die Stellung der Liturgie von der Zeit der Romantik bis zur Jahrhundertwende," *ALW* 3 (1955), 1–77; H. A. Heiser, *Die Durchführung der Kommuniondekrete in der ganzen Welt* (Wiesbaden 1932); P. Hellbernd, *Die Erstkommunion der Kinder in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Vechta 1954).

EUCHARISTIC CONGRESSES: E. Lesne, *Cinquantenaire des congrès eucharistiques internationaux* (Lille 1931). R. Aubert, "Die Eucharistischen Kongresse von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.," *Concilium* 1 (1965), 61–66.

REFORM OF THE BREVIARY: T. Narbutas, *La reforma del breviario romano por Pío X* (Santiago de Chile 1949).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BIBLE: B. Dreher, *Die biblische Unterweisung im evangelischen und katholischen Religionsunterricht* (Freiburg i. Br. 1963), 11–81.

CHURCH MUSIC: K. G. Fellerer, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirchenmusik* (Düsseldorf 1949), 143–62; F. Romita, "La preformazione del Motu proprio di S. Pio X sulla musica sacra," *Monitor ecclesiasticus* 86 (1961), 395–497; P. Combe, *Histoire de la restauration de chant grégorien d'après des documents inédits* (Solesmes 1969).

CHURCH ART: I. Herwegen, O.S.B., *Das Kunstprinzip der Liturgie* (Paderborn 1920); id., *Kunst und Mysterium* (Münster i. W. 1929); K. Clark, *The Gothic Revival* (London 1950); K. Andrews, *The Nazarenes. A Brotherhood of German Painters in Rome* (Oxford 1964); R. Ironside and J. Gere, *Pre-Raphaelite Painters* (London 1948); A. Kamphausen, *Gotik ohne Gott. Ein Beitrag zur Deutung der Neugotik und des 19. Jh.* (Tübingen 1952); A. Mann, *Die Neuromantik* (Cologne 1966); J. Kreitmaier, S.J., *Beuroner Kunst. Eine Ausdrucksform der christlichen Mystik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1923); St. Waetzoldt, "Bemerkungen zur christlich-religiösen Malerei in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jh.," *Triviale Zonen in der religiösen Kunst des 19. Jh.* (*Studien zur Philosophie und Literatur des 19. Jh.* 15 [Frankfurt a. M. 1971]).

SPIRITUAL LIFE: H. Weinert, *Dichtung aus dem Glauben* (Heidelberg 1948); C. Moeller, *Littérature du XX^{e} siècle et christianisme* (Paris 1953ff.). A. Simon, *La Littérature du péché et de la grâce, 1880–1950* (Paris 1957); M. Bougier, *Essai sur la renaissance de la Poésie catholique de Baudelaire à Claudel* (Montpellier 1942); W. Spael, *Das Buch im Geisteskampf. 100 Jahre Borromäusverein* (Bonn 1950); O. Köhler, *Bücher als Wegmarken im deutschen Katholizismus: "Der katholische Buchhandel Deutschlands"*, ed. by the *Vereinigung des katholischen Buchhandels* (Frankfurt a. M. 1967); G. Rossini, ed., *Aspetti della cultura cattolica nell'età di Leone XIII* (Rome 1961).

8. POLITICAL AND SOCIAL DOCTRINE—SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CATHOLICISM

PAPAL SOCIAL AND POLITICAL DOCTRINES: R. Kothen, *L'enseignement social de l'Église* (Louvain 1949) (texts of doctrines issued by the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XI); E. Muhler, *Die Soziallehren der Päpste* (Munich 1958); J. Schasching, *Die soziale Botschaft der Kirche von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.* (Vienna 1963); G. Jarlot, *Doctrine pontificale et histoire, L'enseignement social de Léon XIII., Pie X et Benoît XV vu dans son ambiance historique* (Rome 1964).

LEO XIII: P. Mourret, *Les directives politiques, intellectuelles et sociales de Léon XIII.* (Paris 1920); W. Schwer, *Leo XIII.: Klassiker der katholischen Sozialphilosophie* (Freiburg 1923); O. Schilling, *Die Staats- und Soziallehre des Papstes Leo XIII.* (Cologne 1925); id., *Christliche Gesellschaftslehre* (Freiburg i. Br. 1926); P. Tischleder, *Die Staatslehre Leos XIII.* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1925–27); id., *Staatsgewalt und katholisches Gewissen* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1926); L. P. Wallace, *Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism* (New York 1966).

RERUM NOVARUM: G. Gundlach: *Veröffentlichung der Görres-Gesellschaft, Sektion Sozial-und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* no. 3 (Paderborn 1931) (also *Quadragesimo anno*); O. v. Nell-Breuning, *Die soziale Enzyklika: Erläuterungen zum Weltrundschreiben Pius' XI. über die gesellschaftliche Ordnung* (Cologne 1932; 2d ed., 1950; including important comments regarding *Rerum novarum*); M. Allendorf, *Zur Geschichte der Sozialenzykliken des Vatikans* (diss., Humboldt Univ., Berlin 1963).

DOCTRINE OF PROPERTY: O. v. Nell-Breuning, "Die Eigentumslehre," J. Strieder et al. (ed. of the *Görres-Gesellschaft*), *Die soziale Frage und der Katholizismus* (Paderborn 1931); K. H. Grenner, *Wirtschaftsliberalismus und katholisches Denken* (Cologne 1967); F. Beutter, *Die Eigentumsbegründung in der Moraltheologie des 19. Jh.* (Paderborn 1971).

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CATHOLICISM: A. M. Knoll, *Der soziale Gedanke im modernen Katholizismus. Von der Romantik bis Rerum novarum* (Vienna and Leipzig 1932); L. Leutner, *Das Erwachen der modernen katholischen Sozialidee. Die Entwicklung im 19. Jh. bis Rerum novarum* (Vienna 1951); J. N. Moody, ed., *Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements, 1789–1950* (New York 1953); M. P. Fogarty, *Christian Democracy in Western Europe, 1820–1953* (London 1957); G. Brakelmann, *Die soziale Frage des 19. Jh.* II: *Die evangelisch-soziale und die katholisch-soziale Bewegung* (Witten 1962); C. Bauer, "Bild der Kirche—Abbild der Gesellschaft," *Hochland* 48 (1956); new ed.: *Deutscher Katholizismus* (Frankfurt 1964), 9–27; Hans Maier, *Revolution und Kirche. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der christlichen Demokratie, 1789–1901* (Freiburg 1965); id., *Kirche und Gesellschaft* (Munich 1972); M. Bendiscioli, "Chiesa e società nei secc. XIX e XX," *Nuove questioni di storia contemporanea* I (Milan 1967), 325–447; Verluis, *Beknopte Geschiedenis van de Katholicke Arbeidersbeweging* (1949); Götz Briefs et al., ed. by the Catholic Social Institute of the Archdiocese of Cologne, *Das Bild des Arbeiters in der katholischen Sozialbewegung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*

(Cologne 1960); S. H. Scholl, ed., *150 ans de mouvement ouvrier chrétien en Europe de l'Ouest* (Paris 1966); L. R. Sanseverino, *Il movimento sindacale cristiano dal 1850 al 1939* (Rome 1950); K. H. Schürmann, *Zur Vorgeschichte der christlichen Gewerkschaften* (Freiburg i. Br. 1958); K. Buchheim, "Christliche Parteien," *StL* II 467–75 (international survey, biblio.).

9. HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

NEO-SCHOLASTICISM: P. Dezza, *Alle origini del Neotomismo* (Milan 1940); id., *I neotomisti italiani del secolo XIX,* 2 vols. (Milan 1942–44); R. Aubert, "Aspects divers du néo-thomisme sous le pontificat de Léon XIII.," *Aspetti della cultura cattolica nell'età di Leone XIII.* (Rome 1961), 133–227; A. Walz, "Sguardo sul movimento tomista nel secolo XIX fino all'enciclica Aeterni Patris," *Aquinas* 8 (1965), 351–79; H. Vorgrimler and R. Vander Gucht, *Bilanz der Theologie,* 3 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1969), esp.: F. van Steenberghen, *Die neuscholastische Philosophie* (vol. 1), R. Aubert, *Die Theologie während der 1. Hälfte des 20. Jh.* (vol. 2); K. Eschweiler, *Die zwei Wege der neueren Theologie. G. Hermes-M. J. Scheeben* (Augsburg 1926); M. J. Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik,* 7 vols., ed. by J. Höfer et al. (Freiburg 1941–57; incl. biblio.); F. S. Pancheri, *Il pensiero teologico di M. Scheeben e S. Tommaso* (Padua 1956).

M. BLONDEL AND HIS SCHOOL: R. Scherer, Introduction to: *M. Blondel, Das Denken* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953), VIII–XXXII; R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi, données traditionnelles et résultats des controverses récents* (Louvain 1950), 227–511; J.-P. Golinas, *La restauration du Thomisme sous Léon XIII et les philosophes nouvelles. Ètude de la pensée de M. Blondel et du Père Laberthonnière* (Washington 1959); A. Hayen, *Bibliographie blondélienne* (Messina 1953); *Laberthonnière. L'homme et l'œuvre,* ed. by P. Beillevert (Paris 1972); E. Lecanuet, *La vie de l'Église sous Léon XIII* (Paris 1930), 384–543.

THE BIBLICAL QUESTION (cf. "MODERNISM"): A. Loisy, *Mémoires,* 3 vols. (Paris 1930–31); A. Houtin, *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France au XIX^e siècle* (Paris 1902); id., *La question biblique au XX^e siècle* (ibid. 1906); J. Chaine et al., *L'œuvre exégetique et historique du R. P. Lagrange* (Paris 1935); L.-H. Vincent, "Le Père Lagrange," *RB* 47 (1938), 321–54; F. M. Braun, *L'œuvre du Père Lagrange* (Fribourg 1943); *Le Père Lagrange ou service de la Bible, Souvenirs personnels* (Paris 1967).

THE "MODERNIST" CRISIS: O. Schröder, *Aufbruch und Mißverständnis. Zur Geschichte der Reformkatholischen Bewegung* (Graz 1969); A. Gisler, *Der Modernismus* (Einsiedeln 1912); J. Rivière, *Le modernisme dans l'Église* (Paris 1929); *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (Cambridge 1934); id., *A Variety of Catholic Modernists* (Cambridge 1970); É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* (Paris and Tournai 1962); id., *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral* (Paris and Tournai 1969); J. Ratté, *Three Modernists, A. Loisy, G. Tyrrell, W. L. Sullivan* (New York 1967); F. Rodé, *Le miracle dans la crise moderniste* (Paris 1965); C. Porro, *La controversia cristologica nel periodo modernisto* (Milan 1971); M. Ranchetti, *Cultura e riforma religiosa nella storia del modernismo* (Turin 1963); P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista e rinnovamento cattolico* (Bologna 1969); L. Bedeschi, *I cattolici disubbidienti* (Naples and Rome 1959); id., *Il Modernismo e Romolo Murri in Emilia e Romagna* (Parma 1967); M. Guasco, *R. Murri e il modernismo* (Rome 1968); M. de la Bédoyère, *The Life of Baron von Hügel* (London 1951); L. F. Barmann, *Baron F. von Hügel and the Modernist Crisis in England* (Cambridge 1972); F. Parente, *E. Buonaiuti* (Rome 1970); L. Bedeschi, *Lineamenti dell'antimodernismo. Il caso Lanzoni* (Parma 1970); E. Weinzierl, ed., *Der Modernismus. Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1973), which includes: R. Lill, "Der Kampf der römischen Kurie gegen den 'praktischen' Modernismus: Die Päpstliche Autorität im katholischen Selbstverständnis des 19. und 20. Jh.," 109–23.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

Part One

The Problem of Adapting to the Modern World

Introduction: *The World Plan of Leo XIII: Goals and Methods*

SOURCES

ASS 11–35 (Rome 1878–1903); *Leonis XIII Pont. Max. Acta,* 23 vols. with index (Rome 1881–1905; reprint Graz 1971); *Epistolae encyclicae,* 6 parts (Freiburg i. Br. 1878–1904; Lat. and Germ.); *Leonis XIII Allocutiones, Epistolae et Constitutiones,* 8 vols. (Bruges 1887–1911); *Scelta di atti episcopali del card. G. Pecci ora Leone XIII* (Rome 1879); *Leonis XIII Carmina, Inscriptiones, Numismata,* ed. by J. Bach (Cologne 1903); *Discorsi,* ed. P. de Franciscis (Rome 1882); A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati* I (Rome 1952); *Œuvres pastorales de S. E. le Cardinal Pecci,* 2 vols. (Bruges and Lille 1888–92); *Lettres de Pecci, 1843–1846,* ed. by A. Simon (Brussels and Rome 1959).

On the conclave: Mullé de la Cerda, *Reseña histórica del último conclave y biografía de León XIII* (Madrid 1878); Journal of Cardinal H.-M.-G. Bonnechose: L. Besson, *Vie de S. E. le cardinal Bonnechose* II (Paris 1887); R. de Cesare, *Il Conclave di Leone XIII* (Città di Castello 1888).

Memoirs and letters: A. Perraud, *Mes relations personnelles avec les derniers papes Pie IX et Léon XIII 1856–1903* (Paris 1917); D. Ferrata, *Mémoires,* 3 vols. (Rome 1920); K. v. Schlözer, *Letzte römische Briefe* (1882–94 [Berlin 1924]; P. M. Baumgarten, *Römische und andere Erinnerungen* (Düsseldorf 1927); C. Benoist, *Souvenirs I 1883–93* (Paris 1932); G. Someria, *I miei quattro Papi* I (Milan 1930); F. Crispolti, *Pio IX–Pio XI, Ricordi personali* (Milan 1939); *Lettere di Giuseppe Toniolo,* ed. by G. Anichini, 3 vols. (Rome 1952–53); F. X. Kraus, *Tagebücher* (cf. chap. 29), 383–758; L. v. Pastor, *Tagebücher—Briefe—Erinnerungen* (cf. chap. 29) 111–416; H. des Houx, *Souvenirs d'un journaliste français à Rome* (Paris 1886).

Nunciatures: G. de Marchi, *Le nunziature apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956* (Rome 1957; chronologically arranged list of nuncios with appointment and sanction according to countries).

The press: *Osservatore Romano* (1878ff.; since 1870 semiofficial paper of the Vatican); *La Civiltà Cattolica* (1878ff.); in Schmidlin, *PG*, 377, and in the other biographies the positive press comments, even from the liberal and Socialist camp, are quoted; the wording and selection need to be examined; F. Jürgensmeier, *Die katholische Kirche im Spiegel der Karikatur der deutschen satirischen Tendenzzeitschriften von 1848–1900* (1969) 216–29, 230–47, passim.

LITERATURE

In addition to the general church histories listed in the General Bibliography, see the older documents of that time (cf. chap. 22), especially F. Mourret, *Histoire générale de l'Église,* 9 vols. (1909–21), pertinent vols. 8 and 9; P. M. Baumgarten, *Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit,* 2 vols. (Munich 1899–1902); E. Jarry, *L'Église contemporaine,* 2 vols. (Paris 1936).

New assessments of the pontificate: E. T. Gargan, ed., *Leo XIII and the Modern World* (New York 1961); Stanislao da Campagnola, *I papi nella storia II* (Rome 1961); G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste im 20. Jahrhundert,* (Munich 1964; new in Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag no. 482 [1968] 28–49); D. Secco Suardo (cited in chap. 5); K. O. v. Aretin, *Papsttum und moderne Welt* (Munich 1970); G. Maron, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche von 1870 bis 1970;* K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, *Die Kirche und ihre Geschichte* 4, 2 (Göttingen 1972), 203–8, passim; I. E. Ward, "Leo XIII, 'the Diplomat pope,'" *Review of Politics* 28 (1966), 47–61; C. Weber (biblio. to chap. 3).

Biblio. on the various countries and the individual topics, cf. the respective chapters.

BIOGRAPHIES

Schmidlin, *PG* II (Munich 1934), 331–589, is still considered "one of the most thorough . . . presentations" (R. Lill).—The purely popular biographies, of which the German ones are particularly numerous (see Schmidlin, *PG,* pp. XIX–XXII), are noteworthy as documents of the papal consciousness.—C. Tesi-Passerini and G. Cinquemani, *Leone ed il suo tempo,* 3 vols. (Turin 1890–92); C. de T'Serclaes, *Le Pape Léon XIII,* 3 vols. (Paris and Bruges 1894–1906), annalistic; according to the foreword of Vol. III, Pope Leo read the proof sheets, advice-note by Rampolla; H. des Houx, *Histoire de Léon XIII* (Paris 1900); L. K. Goetz, *Leo XIII., seine Weltanschauung und seine Wirksamkeit* (Gotha 1899; Protestant); B. O'Reilly, *Vie de Léon XIII* (Paris 1887); N. Schneider, *Leo XIII., sein Leben und Wirken* (Kempten 1903; "with Duke Pecci's support"); M. Spahn, *Leo XIII.* (Munich 1905); J. Fèvres. *Vie de Léon XIII,* 2 vols. (Paris 1908); Walter Goetz in *Meister der Politik* III, ed. by E. Marcks and K. A. v. Müller (Stuttgart 1924) 381–403 (best assessment from the Protestant side; cf. below); E. Vercesi, *Tre Papi: Leone XIII, Pio X, Benedetto, XV* (Milan 1929); A. Buttè, *Il papa Leone XIII* (Milan 1931); E. Soderini, *Il pontificato di Leone XIII,* 3 vols. (Milan 1932–33; "using the materials made available to him by the Pope himself"); R. Fülöp-Miller, *Leo XIII.* (Zurich 1935); F. Hayward, *Léon XIII* (Paris 1937; foreword by Cardinal A. Baudrillart); G. Monetti, *Leone XIII,* 3 vols. (Rome 1942); R. Aubert, *Léon XIII: I cattolici italiani dall'800 ad oggi* (Brescia 1964), 191–220.—Misc.: A.-J. Boyer d'Agen, *La jeunesse de Léon XIII* (and cf. below) (1897); J. Kraikin, *L'infanzia e la giovinezza di un papa* (Grottaferrata 1914); W. Lorenz, *Die Jugend des J. Pecci: StdZ* 165 (1959/60) 415–23; A.-J. Boyer d'Agen, *La prélature de Léon XIII* (Paris 1907); id., *Msgr. J. Pecci 1838–46* (Paris 1910); P. van Zuylen, "La nonciature Pecci," *Rev. gén belge* 126 (Brussels 1931) 258–76; N. Hilling, "Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung Leos XIII," *AkathKR* 93 (1913); 94 (1914); *Un témoin* (=Cardinal F. D. Mathieu), *Les derniers jours de Léon XIII et le conclave* (Paris 1904).—Pertaining to the various papal actions, cf. the respective chapters.

VATICAN AND CARDINALS: L. Teste, *Léon XIII et le Vatican* (Paris 1880); id., *Préface au Conclave* (Paris 1873); J.-J. Thierry, *La vie quotidienne au Vatican du temps de Léon XIII* (Paris 1963).—Cardinals (according to the dates of their appointment): J.-B. *Pitra* (1863); see vol. VIII; Gustav F. v. *Hohenlohe* (1866): vol. VIII; P. *Cullen* (1866): M. J.

Curran (Dublin 1955); L. *Oreglia* (1873): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index; *Franchi* (1873): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index; J. H. *Guibert* (1873): J. Paguelle de Follenay, 2 vols. (Paris 1896); M.-H. Graf v. *Ledóchowski* (1875): this vol., Chaps. 1 and 3; H. E. *Manning* (1875): J. Fitzsimons (London 1951); V.-A. *Dechamps* (1875): M. Becqué, 2 vols. (Louvain 1956); *Bartolini* (1875): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index; *McCloskey* (1875): J. Farley (London 1918); J. B. *Franzelin* (1876): Hocedez III, 133–40, index; L. *Parocchi* (1877): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index; Pastor, *Tagebücher,* index; L. *Nina* (1877): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index; J. H. *Newman* (1879): vol. VIII, chap. 9; T. M. *Zigliara* (1879): Hocedez II and III, index; J. *Hergenröther* (1879): S. Merkle in *Lebensläufe aus Franken,* ed. by A. Chroust (Munich 1919), 188–97; B. Lang: *ThPQ* 93 (1940) 302–9; L. *Jacobini* (1879): Schmidlin, *PG* II, 458–62; L. *Pie* (1879): vol. VIII; C.-M. A. *Lavigerie* (1882): this vol. chap. 6; W. *Czacki* (1882): this vol., chap. 3, n. 4; G. Aloisi *Masella* (1883): this vol., chap. 3, n. 8; C. *González Díaz Tuñón* (1884): A. Walz, *Compendium* . . . (Rome 1948), 621f.; P. F. *Moran* (1885): Schmidlin *PG* II, 500; this vol., chap. 9; P. *Melchers* (1885): H. M. Ludwigs (Cologne 1909); C. *Mazzella* (1886): *ECatt* VIII, 526f.; Hocedez III, 263f., index; J. *Gibbons* (1886): J. T. Ellis, 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1952); E. A. *Taschereau* (1886): D. de Saint-Denis, *L'Église cath. au Canada* (Montreal 1956); this vol., chap. 9; M. *Rampolla* (1887): T. Cramer-Klett in *Hochland* 11, 2 (1914), 1–9; B. *Ceretti* (Rome 1928); E. Vercesi, *Tre Segretari di Stato: Consalvi, Rampolla, Gasparri* (Venice 1932); Engel-Janosi, index; Serafino *Vannutelli* (1887): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index; F. X. *Kraus,* index; P. L. *Goossens* (1889): J. Muyldermans (Mechelen 1922); F.-M. B. *Richard de la Vergne* (1889): this vol., chap. 30; G. *Mermillod* (1890): C. Comte (Paris 1924); H. J. *Gruscha* (1891): O. Posch (diss., Vienna 1947); H. *Vaughan* (1892): J. G. Snead-Cox, 2 vols. (London 1910); P. Thureau-Dangin (Paris 1911); this vol., chap. 9; G. *Sarto* (1893): cf. Part II of this vol.; G. v. *Kopp* (1893): F. X. Seppelt in *Zs. f. Gesch. Schlesiens* 50 (Wroclaw 1916) 295–308; id., *Gesch. des Bistums Breslau* (Berlin 1929), 121–26; P. *Krementz* (1893): P. Höveler (Düsseldorf 1899); L. *Galimberti* (1893): this vol., chap. 3; Engel-Janosi, index; Angelo di *Pietro* (1893): De Marchi (see under Sources); A. G. *Ferrari* (1894): G. B. Penco, *Un grande cardinale* (Milan 1959); A. *Gotti* (1895): *Il Carmelo* 5 (1906), 15 (1916), 33 (1934); A.-L.-A. *Perraud* (1895): G. d'Orgeval-Dubouchet (Paris 1907); A. Houtin, *Évêques et diocèses* I (Paris 1908), 5–42; F. *Satolli* (1895): L. Hertling, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Berlin 1954), 225f., 232ff.; A. *Agliardi* (1896): Pastor, *Tagebücher,* 229, 251f.; Engel-Janosi, index; D. *Ferrata* (1896): U. Stutz, *Die päpstl. Diplomatie unter Leo XIII nach den Denkwürdigkeiten* [cf. above, Sources] *D. Ferratas* (Berlin 1926); F.-D. *Mathieu* (1899): E. Renard (Paris 1925); J. C. *Vives y Tutò* (1899): A. M. de Barcelona (Barcelona 1951); *Respighi* (1901): Schmidlin, *PG* II, index.

SECTION ONE

The Situation in the Various Countries until 1914

1. *The* Kulturkampf *in Prussia and in the German Empire until 1878*

SOURCES

N. Siegfried (i.e., V. Cathrein), *Aktenstücke betreffend den preußischen Culturkampf* (Freiburg 1882); *Aktenstücke betreffend die Fuldaer Bischofskonferenzen 1867–1888* (Cologne 1889); L. Bergsträsser, *Dokumente des politischen Katholizismus* II (Munich 1923); O. v. Bismarck, *Die gesammelten Werke* VIc: *Politische Schriften 1871–1890,* ed. W. Frauendienst (Berlin 1935); XI: *Reden 1869–1878,* ed. W. Schüßler (Berlin 1929); *Die Vorgeschichte des Kulturkampfes. Quellenveröffentlichung aus dem Deutschen Zentralarchiv,* ed. A. Constabel, introd. by F. Hartung (Berlin 1956).

LITERATURE

J. Bachem, *Preußen und die kath. Kirche* (Cologne 1887), 80–110; H. Brück, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* IV, 1, ed. J. B. Kißling (Münster 1907); J. B. Kißling, *Geschichte des Kulturkampfes im Deutschen Reich* II, III (Freiburg 1913, 1916); F. Vigener, *Ketteler* (Munich and Berlin 1924), 612–722; K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* III (Cologne 1927; reprint, Aalen 1967); Schmidlin, *PG* II, 179–89; H. Bornkamm, *Die Staatsidee im Kulturkampf* (Munich 1950); Aubert, *Pie IX,* 384–92; G. Franz, *Kulturkampf. Staat und kath. Kirche in Mitteleuropa von der Säkularisation bis zum Abschluß des preußischen Kulturkampfes* (Munich 1954), 185–246; id., (under the name of G. Franz-Willing), *Kulturkampf gestern und heute, Eine Säkularbetrachtung* (Munich 1971), 27–72; R. Morsey, "Bismarck und der Kulturkampf," *AKG* 39 (1957), 232–70; id., "Probleme der Kulturkampf-Forschung," *HJ* 83 (1964), 217–45; K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie* (Munich 1963), 215–308; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 406–10; E. Schmidt-Volkmar, *Der Kulturkampf in Deutschland 1871–1890* (Göttingen 1962); W. P. Fuchs, "Ultramontanismus und Staatsräson. Der Kulturkampf," *Staat und Kirche im Wandel der Jahrhunderte,* ed. by W. P. Fuchs (Stuttgart 1966), 184–200; E. R. Huber, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789* IV (Stuttgart 1969), 49–54, 60f., 651–767; R. Lill, "Die Katholiken und Bismarcks Reichsgründung," *Reichsgründung 1870/71,* ed. by T. Schieder and E. Deuerlein (Stuttgart 1970), 345–65; C. Weber, *Kirchliche Politik Zwischen Rom, Berlin und Trier 1876–1888* (Mainz 1970); G. Maron, "Die römisch-kath. Kirche von 1870 bis 1970," *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte. Ein Handbuch,* ed. by K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf, vol. 4, no. 2 (Göttingen 1972), 201ff., 256–59; E. Gatz, *Die deutschen Bischofskonferenzen 1872–1881* (in preparation).

INDIVIDUAL DIOCESES AND PROVINCES: M. Höhler, *Gesch. des Bistums Limburg* (Limburg 1908), 322–65; A. Bertram, *Gesch. des Bistums Hildesheim* III (Hildesheim and Leipzig 1925), 313–26; E. Gatz, "Bischöfliche Einheitsfront im Kulturkampf? Neue Funde zum Kirchenkonflikt im Bistum Hildesheim," *HJ* 92 (1972), 391–403; L. Ficker and O. Hellinghaus, *Der Kulturkampf in Münster* (Münster 1928); G. Dettmer, *Die ost-*

und westpreußischen Verwaltungsbehörden im Kulturkampf (Heidelberg 1958); W. Jestaedt, *Der Kulturkampf im Fuldaer Lande* (Fulda 1960); H. Lepper, "Die kirchenpolitische Gesetzgebung der Jahre 1872–1875 und ihre Ausführung im Regierungsbezirk Aachen," *AHVNrh* 171 (1969), 200–258; Weber, *Kirchliche Politik* (see above, Trier, Rhine province); N. Trippen, *Das Domkapitel und die Erzbischofswahlen in Köln 1821–1929* (Cologne and Vienna 1972), 249–76; F. G. Hohmann, "Domkapitel und Bischofswahlen in Paderborn 1857–1892," *WZ* 122 (1972), 192–282.

INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITIES (the extensive Bismarck bibliography is not listed; there are no critical biographies of most Catholic leaders): Empress Augusta: M. v. Bunsen (1940); W. Goetz in *NDB* 1, 451f.—Eberhard: A. Ditscheid (Trier 1911).—Falk: E. Förster (Gotha 1927); R. Ruhenstroth-Bauer, *Bismarck und Falk im Kulturkampf* (Heidelberg 1944); S. Skalweit in *NDB* 5, 6f. —For the following, see vol. VIII in this series: Ketteler (chap. 6), Ledóchowski (chap. 8, no. 6), Mallinckrodt (chap. 8), Melchers (chap. 8, n. 5), Moufang (chap. 8; in add. G. May in *AMrhKG* 22 [1970], 227–36), the brothers Reichensperger (chap. 6). For Förster and Krementz, see above, this chapter, nn. 15 and 16.—Mühler: W. Reichle (Berlin 1938).—Windthorst: *E. Hüsgen* (Cologne 1907); E. Deuerlein in *StZ* 169 (1961/62), 277–97; W. Spael (Osnabrück 1962); R. Lillin *Politische Ideologien und nationalstaatliche Ordnung. Festschr. f. Th. Schieder* (Munich 1968), 317–35; R. Morsey in *StL* VIII, 712ff.

2. *Tensions in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1878–1914)*

LITERATURE

Vol. VIII, chaps. 8 and 19. In addition: L. v. Pastor, *Tagebücher, Briefe, Erinnerungen,* ed. W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950); A. Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918* (Munich 1952); J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1959); F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan* II, 2–173; M. Csáky, *Der Kulturkampf in Ungarn* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne 1967); F. Funder, *Vom Gestern ins Heute* (Vienna and Munich 1971); G. Adriányi, "Friedrich Graf Revertera, Erinnerungen (1888–1901)," *AHPont* 10 (Rome 1972), 241ff.; I. A. Hellwing, *Der konfessionelle Antisemitismus im 19. Jh. in Österreich* (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1972).

3. *The Conclusion of the* Kulturkampf *in Prussia and in the German Empire*

SOURCES

As in chap. 1 (except the edition of Constabel). In addition: O. Pfülf, "Aus Windthorsts Korrespondenz," *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* 82, 83 (1912); K. v. Schlözer, *Letzte römische Briefe 1882–04,* ed. L. v. Schlözer (Berlin and Leipzig 1924); O. v. Bismarck, *Die gesammelten Werke* XII, XIII: *Reden 1878–1897,* ed. W. Schüßler (Berlin 1929–30); *Vatikanische Akten zur Geschichte des deutschen Kulturkampfes,* ed. R. Lill, Part 1:1878–80 (Tübingen 1970), Part 2: 1880–87 (in preparation).

LITERATURE

As in chap. 1, especially the works by Kißling (vol. 3), K. Bachem (vols. III, IV), Franz-Willing, Morsey, Schmidt-Volkmar, E. R. Huber and C. Weber. In addition: E.

Lefebvre de Béhaine, *Léon XIII et le Prince de Bismarck . . . , Introduction par G. Goyau* (Paris 1898); C. Crispolti and G. Aureli, *La politica di Leone XIII da Luigi Galimberti a Mariano Rampolla* (Rome 1912); J. Heckel, "Die Beilegung des Kulturkampfes in Preußen," *ZSavRGkan* 19 (1930), 215–353, reprinted in: J. Heckel, *Das blinde, undeutliche Wort Kirche,* ed. S. Grundmann (Cologne and Graz 1964), 454–571; E. Soderini, *Il Pontificato di Leone XIII* III (Milan 1933); H. Mann, *Der Beginn der Abkehr Bismarcks vom Kulturkampf 1878–1880 unter bes. Berücksichtigung der Politik des Zentrums und der Römischen Kurie* (diss., Frankfurt a. M. 1953); R. Lill, "Die Wende im Kulturkampf," *QFIAB* 50 (1970), 227–83, 52 (1972), 657–730; in book form (Tübingen 1973); C. Weber, *Quellen u. Studien zur Kurie u. vatikan. Politik unter Leo XIII.* (in preparation).

4. *The Development of Catholicism in Switzerland*

LITERATURE

Vol. VII, chaps. 7 and 20; vol. VIII, chap. 8; Schmidlin, *PG* II, 482–85; U. Stutz, 29–46; G. Franz, *Der Kulturkampf* (1954), 154ff.; K. Fry, *Kaspar Decurtins,* 2 vols. (Zurich 1949–52), on the basis of archival material, offers above and beyond the biography of this politician a lot of information about the internal problems of Swiss Catholicism; G. Beuret, *Die kath.-soziale Bewegung in der Schweiz. 1848–1919* (diss., Zurich, Winterthur 1959, with biblio.); L. Schihin, *Sozialpolitische Ideen im schweizerischen Katholizismus. 1798–1848* (diss., Zurich 1937), offers, in regard to the case of the poor, information about the early paternal mentality and fear of socialism; B. Prongué, *Le mouvement chrétien-social dans le Jura bernois, 1891–1961* (Fribourg 1968); R. Ruffieux, *Le mouvement chrétien-social en Suisse romande, 1891–1949* (Fribourg 1969); U. Altermatt, *Der Weg der Schweizer Katholiken aus dem Ghetto* (Cologne, in preparation).

5. *Italian Catholics between the Vatican and the Quirinal*

LITERATURE

Vol. VIII, chaps. 17, 18, and 20.

1. COLLECTIONS OF SOURCES: H. Bastgen, *Die Römische Frage. Dokumente und Stimmen,* 3 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1917–19); A. C. Jemolo, *La questione romana* (Milan 1938); *Insegnamenti pontifici n. 4, 1748–1956. Il Laicato,* ed. the monks of Solesmes, ed. Ital. (Rome 1958); P. Scoppola, *Dal neoguelfismo alla democrazia cristiana* (Rome 1957).

2. HISTORICAL SURVEYS OF PIONEERS: V. Veggian, *Il movimento sociale cristiano nella seconda metà del sec. XIX* (Vicenza 1902); R. della Casa, *Il movimento cattolico italiano,* 2 vols. (Milan 1905); R. Murri, *Dalla Democrazia Cristiana al Partito Popolare Italiano* (Florence 1920); F. Olgiati, *Storia dell'azione cattolica in Italia* (Milan 1920); E. Vercesi, *Il movimento cattolico italiano (1870–1922)* (Florence 1922); M. Vaussard, *L'Intelligence catholique dans l'Italie du XX^e siècle* (Paris 1921); G. B. Valente, *Aspetti e momenti dell' azione sociale dei cattolici in Italia (1892–1926),* ed. F. Malgeri (Rome 1968); G. della Torre, *I cattolici e la vita pubblica italiana,* ed. G. De Rosa, 2 vols. (Rome 1962); M. Zanatta (pseudonym of A. De Gasperi), *I tempi e gli uomini che prepararono la "Rerum novarum"* (Milan 1928 and 1945); F. Magri, *L'azione cattolica in Italia (1775–1939)* (Milan 1953).

3. **More Recent Historical Works:** G. Candeloro, *L'azione cattolica in Italia* (Rome 1949); id., *Il movimento cattolico in Italia* (Rome 1953) (Marxist interpretation); L. Riva, *Sanseverino. Il movimento sindacale cristiano* (Rome 1950); G. De Rosa, *L'azione cattolica. Storia politica 1874–1904* (Bari 1953); id., *Storia politica dell'A. C. in Italia 1905–1919* (Bari 1954) (cf. review by F. Fonzi in *Humanitas* VIII [1963], 694–98; IX [1954], 1120–30). New ed. in 2 vols. (1966); F. Fonzi, *I cattolici e la società italiana dopo l'Unità* (Rome 1953); G. Spadolini, *L'opposizione cattolica da Porta Pia al 1898* (Florence 1954); A. Martini, *Studi sulla questione romana e la conciliazione* (Rome 1963); D. Secco Suardo, *Da Leone XIII a Pio X* (=*Collana di storia del movimento cattolico* no. 18 [Rome 1967]); several authors, *Spiritualità ed azione del laicato cattolico italiano,* 2 vols. (Padua 1969) (cf. review by S. Tramontin in *RSTI* 26 [1972], 154–74); A. Gambasin, *Il movimento sociale nell'opera dei congressi* (*1874–1904*) (=*AnGr* no. 91 [Rome 1958]); id., "Il movimento sindacale italiano" in S. H. Scholl, ed., *150 anni di movimento operaio cattolico nell'Europa centro-occidentale* (Padua 1962); G. Rossini, Ed., *Aspetti della cultura cattolica nell'età di Leone XIII* (Rome 1961); L. Ambrosoli, *Il primo movimento D. C. in Italia* (*1897–1904*) (Rome 1958); C. Brezzi, *Cristiano sociali e intransigenti* (*L'opera di Medolago Albani fino alla "R. N."*) (Rome 1971); Complete bibliography: *Archivio per la storia del movimento cattolico in Italia* (Milan 1967); M. Bendiscioli, "Chiesa e società nei secc. XIX e XX," *Nuove questioni di storia contemporanea* I (Milan 1967), 325–447; C. Maronciu-Buonaiuti, *Non expedit* (Rome 1971).

4. **Specific Topics:** (a) The development in different parts of the country: Lombardy: Aside from the monographs about D. Albertario, F. Meda, Rezzara (Bergamo), Tovini (Brescia), Bonomelli (Cremona), cf. A. Zaninelli, *Le leghe "bianche" nel cremonese* (*1900–21*) (Rome 1961); L. Ambrosoli, *Profile del movimento cattolico milanese nell'Ottocento* (Milan 1960); B. Malinverni, *La scuola sociale cattolica di Bergamo* (*1910–32*) (Rome 1960).—Veneto: The biographies of Paganuzzi, Rezzara, the Scottons in: A. Gambasin, *Il movimento sociale nell'opera dei congressi;* biblio. in ibid., 585–96; E. Reato, *Le origini del movimento cattolico a Vicenza* (*1860–91*) (Vicenza 1961).—Piedmont: A. Zussini, *L. Caisotti di Chiusano e il movimento cattolico dal 1896 al 1915* (Turin 1970); M. L. Salvadori, *Il movimento cattolico a Torino 1911–15* (Turin 1969).—Tuscany: G. P. Cappelli, *La prima sinistra cattolica in Toscana* (Rome 1962); M. Stanghellini and U. Tintori, *Storia del movimento cattolico lucchese* (Rome 1958); P. L. Ballini, *Il movimento cattolico a Firenze 1900–19* (Rome 1969).—Naples: P. Lopez, *E. Cenni e i cattolici napoletani dopo l'unità* (Rome 1962); A. Cestaro, *La stampa cattolica a Napoli 1860–1904* (Rome 1965).—Calabria: P. Borzomati, *Aspetti religiosi e storia del movimento cattolico in Calabria* (*1860–1919*) (Rome 1970).

(b) The movement and organizations: B. M. Brogi, *La lega democratica nazionale* (Rome 1959); C. Giovannini, *Politica e religione nel pensiero della lega dem. naz. 1905–1915* (Rome 1968); G. Licata, *La "rassegna nazionale". Conservatori e cattolici liberali attraverso la loro rivista* (Rome 1968); O. Confessore, *Conservatorismo politico e riformismo religioso. La "rassegna nazionale" 1898–1908* (Bologna 1971); G. Marcucci Fanello, *Storia della Federazione Universitaria Cattolica Italiana* (Rome 1971). Regarding the *Rinnovamento,* cf. N. Raponi, *Tommaso Gallarti Scotti tra politica e cultura* (Milan 1971).

(c) The journals as an expression of the Catholic movement: several authors, *Aspetti della cultura cattolica nell'età di Leone XIII* (Rome 1961); G. De Rosa, ed., *Antologia della "Civilta cattolica"* (Rome 1971).

(d) The relationship to Italy's history: F. Chabod, *Storia della politica estera italiana dal 1870 al 1896.* I. Premesse (Bari 1951); L. Valiani, "L'Italia dal 1876 al 1915," N. Valeri, ed., *Storia d'Italia* IV (Turin 1965); C. A. Jemolo, *Chiesa e stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni* (Turin 1955).

(e) Individual personalities: G. Toniolo, *Opera omnia* (Vatican City 1947), especially *Lettere,* 3 vols. (1952–55); E. da Persico, *G. Toniolo* (Verona 1928) (rather belletristic); F. Vistalli, *G. Toniolo* (Rome 1954); A. Vian, *G. B. Paganuzzi* (Rome 1950); G. Roncalli, *Radini Tedeschi, vescovo di Bergamo* (Bergamo 1916); 2d ed. by G. De Luca (Rome 1963); C. Bellò, *Geremia Bonomelli con documenti inediti* (Brescia 1961); F. Gregori, *La vita e le opere di mgr. G. B. Scalabrini* (Turin 1932); E. Vercesi, *Don Davide Albertazio* (Milan 1922); A. Novelli, *F. Meda* (Milan 1921); E. Micheli, *F. Meda . . .* (Parma 1948); M. Vaussard, *L'intelligence catholique en Italie,* op. cit., 85–132; F. Meda, *Scritti scelti,* ed. G. P. Dore (Rome 1959); A. Cistellini, *G. Tovini,* foreword by G. B. Montini (Brescia 1954); C. Brezzi, *Cristiano sociali e intransigenti. L'opera di Medolago Albani* (Rome 1971); G. Sacchetti, *La reazione cattolica. Scritti e discorsi con introduzione di G. De Rosa* (Rome 1967).

6. *The Failure to Reconcile Catholics and the Republic in France*

SOURCES

Cardinal D. Ferrata, *Mémoires. Ma nonciature en France* (Rome 1921); A. Siegfried, *L'abbé Frémont (1852–1912)*, 2 vols. (Paris 1932); C. Benoist, *Souvenirs* (Paris 1932–34); X. de Montclos, *Le toast d'Alger. Documents, 1890–1891* (Paris 1966).

LITERATURE

E. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la III^{e} République* II–IV (Paris 1930–31, reprint); A. Latreille and R. Rémond, *Histoire du catholicisme en France* III (Paris 1962); L. Capéran, *Histoire contemporaine de la laïcité française,* 3 vols. (vol. 4 not yet issued by the Institut catholique de Toulouse) (Paris 1958–61); id., *L'anticléricalisme et l'affaire Dreyfus, 1897–1899* (Paris 1948); H. Rollet, *Albert de Mun et le parti catholique* (Paris 1947); id., *L'action sociale des catholiques en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1948–58); J. Gadille, *La pensée et l'action politiques des évêques français au début de la III^{e} république,* 2 vols. (Paris 1967); J. Tournier, *Le cardinal Lavigerie et son action politique* (Paris 1913); J.-B. Woodall, *The Ralliement in France. Origins and History, 1876–1894.* (New York 1961); A. Sedgwick, *The Ralliement in French Politics, 1890–1898* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965); M. Montuclard, *Conscience religieuse et démocratie* (Paris 1965); J.-M. Mayeur, *Un prêtre démocrate, l'abbé Lemire 1853–1928* (Paris 1968); "Les congrès nationaux de la démocratie chrétienne à Lyon, 1896–1898," *RHMC,* July/Sept. 1962; "Droites et Ralliés à la Chambre des députés au début de 1894," *RHMC,* April/July 1966; R. Rémond, *Les congrès ecclésiastiques de Reims et de Bourges* (Paris 1964); P. Sorlin, *"La Croix" et les Juifs* (Paris 1967); P. Pierrard, *Juifs et Catholiques français* (Paris 1970).

7. *On the Road to Conservatism: Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg*

SOURCES

Pastoral letters of the bishops (index): *Lettres pastorales des évêques de Belgique, 1800–1950* IV: 1868–1883, V: 1883–1906, VI: 1906–1926 (Brussels, n.d.); *Akten der Kongresse der Katholiken in Lüttich* 1887, 1889, 1890, and in Mechelen 1891 and 1909; C.

Woeste, *Mémoires* I–II (Brussels 1927–33); id., *Échos des luttes contemporaines,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1906); A. Verhagen, *25 années d'action sociale* (Brussels, n.d.); A. Vermeersch, *Manuel social. La législation et les œuvres en Belgique* (Louvain 1900).

LITERATURE

BELGIUM: Vol. VIII, chap. 18; C. Doset, Ed., *Un siècle de l'Église en Belgique,* 2 vols. (Cortrai 1934); A. de Moreau, *L'Église en Belgique* (Brussels 1945), 239–63; P. van Zuylen, "La Belgique et le Vatican en 1879," *Revue générale Belge* (1954), 1707–34, 1901–15, 2065–81, (1955), 67–86; A. Simon, *La liberté de l'enseignement* (Brussels 1952); M. Becqué, *Le Cardinal Dechamps,* 2 vols. (Louvain 1956); J. Muyldermans, *Cardinal Goossens* (Mechelen 1922); A. Simon, *Cardinal D. Mercier* (Brussels 1960); L. De Raeymaeker, *Le Cardinal Mercier et l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de Louvain* (Louvain 1952); R. Reszohazy, *Origines et formation du catholicisme social en Belgique. 1842–1909* (Brussels 1958); P. Gérin, *Les origines de la démocratie chrétienne à Liège,* 2 vols. (Brussels 1958–59); L. de Saint-Moulin, "Contribution à l'histoire de la déchristianisation. La pratique religieuse à Seraing depuis 1830," *Annuaire d'histoire liégeoise* 10 (1967), 33–126; W. Rombauts, *Het Paasverzuim in het bisdom Brugge* (Louvain and Paris 1971); F. Petri, "Belgien, die Niederlande und Luxemburg (1867–1918)," in T. Schieder, ed., *Hdb. der europ. Geschichte* VI (Stuttgart 1968), 465–93.

THE NETHERLANDS: L. J. Rogier, *Katholieke Herleving, Geschiedenis van Katholiek Nederland sinds 1853* (The Hague 1957), 276–348; G. Brom, *Herleving van de wetenschap in Katholiek Nederland* (The Hague 1930); I. Wietlox, *H. Schaepman,* 3 vols. (1960); G. Brom, *Fr. Ariëns,* 2 vols. (1941); J. Colsen, *P. Poels* (1955).

LUXEMBURG: E. Donckel, *Die Kirche in Luxemburg von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Luxemburg 1950).

8. *The Church of the Iberian World between Revolution and Reaction*

LITERATURE

Vol. VIII, chaps. 10 and 18.

SPAIN: Schmidlin, *PG* II, 441–47; J. Becker, *Relaciones diplomáticas entre Espãna y la S. Sede durante el Siglo XIX* (Madrid 1908); R. Konetzke, *Geschichte des spanischen und portugiesischen Volkes* (Leipzig 1939), 368–80, 393–99, id. in: T. Schieder, ed., *Hdb. der europ. Geschichte* VI (Stuttgart 1968), 503–33 (considering church history); J. N. Schumacher, "Integrism. A Study in XIXth Century Spanish Politico-Religious Thought." *CHR* 48 (1962/63), 343–64; M. Llorens, "El P. Antonio Vincent. Notas sobre el desarollo de la acción católica en España," *Estudios de Historia moderna* 4 (Barcelona 1954), 393–440; J. F. Pastór, *Weltanschauung und geistiges Leben in Spanien* (Wroclaw 1931); L. Sánchez Agesta, *La revolución liberal* (Madrid 1955); H. Jeschke, *Die Generation von 1898* (Heidelberg 1934).

PORTUGAL: Z. Giacometti, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche* (1926); Schmidlin, *PG* II, 447f.; G. S. da Silva Dias, *Correntes do sentimento religioso* (Coimbra 1960); R. Konetzke, op. cit. (1939), 386–90 id., op. cit. (1968) 533–38.

LATIN AMERICA: *Acta et decreta concilii plenarii Americae latinae anno 1899 celebrati,* 2 vols. (Rome 1900); cf. A. Bellesheim in *AkathKR* (1901), 38–63 (with introductory description of the situation); Schmidlin, *PG* II, 448–54; E. Ryan, *The Church in the*

South American Republics (London 1934); J. L. Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America* (North Carolina Press 1934); E. Samhaber, *Die Neue Welt. Wandlungen in Südamerika* (Freiburg i. Br. 1949; essayistic, but more from the perspective of church history than in: *Südamerika* [Hamburg 1939]); L. Zea, *Dos etapas del pensamiento en Hispanoamérica. Del romanticismo al positivismo* (Mexico City 1949); W. v. Schoen, *Geschichte Mittel- und Südamerikas* (Munich 1953), 343–665. Biblio. regarding general Latin American history in A. P. Witaker in *HM* X (Berne 1961), 788f.

9. *Catholic Self-Awareness in the British Empire*

LITERATURE

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND: Vol. VII, chap. 21; vol. VIII, chap. 9; also E. Taylor, *The Cardinal Democrat* (London 1908); G. Goyau, *Autour du catholicisme social* II, 220–45; III, 194–231; IV, 71–85; K. Waninger, *Der soziale Katholizismus in England* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1914); I. Bolten, *Katholisches aus England* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1928; popular, but informative); C. Hollis in I. N. Moody, ed., *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 809–42; W. G. Gorman, *Converts to Rome in the United Kingdom during the last 60 years* (London 1910); J. G. Snead-Cox, *Cardinal Herbert Vaughan. 1892–1903,* 2 vols. (London 1910); E. Oldmeadow, *Cardinal Francis Bourne, 1903–1935,* 2 vols. (London 1940, 1944); Maisy Ward, *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition,* 2 vols. (London 1934–38).

General history: P. Kluke in T. Schieder, ed., *Handbuch der europ. Geschichte* 6 (1968), 269–72, biblio.

IRELAND: A. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Irland* III (Mainz 1891); J. Pokorny, *Irland* (1916); P. K. Egan, *The Influence of the Irish on the Catholic Church in America in the 19th Century* (Dublin 1968; a twenty-two-page summary, with biblio.); E. Larkin, "Economic Growth, Capital Investment and the Roman-Cath. Church in 19th Century Ireland," *AHR* 72 (1966), 885–905; L. I. McCaffrey, *The Irish Question, 1800–1922* (Lexington 1968); cf.: M. R. O'Connell in *CHR* 58 (1972) 415f.; P. Alter, *Die irische Nationalbewegung zwischen Parlament und Revolution* (Stuttgart 1971).

CANADA: Vol. VII, chap. 9; vol. VIII, chap. 9; Alexis de Barbezieux, *L'Église catholique en Canada* (Montreal 1934); E. Gautier, *Le catholicisme au Canada* (Ottawa 1934); D. de Saint-Denis, *L'Église catholique au Canada* (Montreal 1956); V. Harvey et al., *L'Église et la Québec* (Montreal 1961); P. Savard, *Jules-Paul Tardivel* (Quebec 1967).

AUSTRALIA: Vol. VIII, chap. 9; J. E. Murtagh, *Australia. The Catholic Chapter* (New York 1947); G. Walter, *Australien. Land und Leute, Mission* (Limburg 1928), *Bericht eines Missionars;* P. Ford, *Cardinal Moran and the Australian Labour Party* (London 1966).

10. *The American Way*

LITERATURE

Vol. VII, chap. 9; vol. VIII, chap. 9; H. J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1790* (Huntington 1971), cf. J. T. Ellis in *CHR* (1972), 388–93; J. T.

Ellis, *A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the US* (New York 1947); T. Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York 1941, 1949); T. Roemer, *The Catholic Church in the United States* (London 1950); J. T. Ellis, *American Catholicism* (New York 1956; review, critical of J. G. Shea and T. Maynard); id.: *New Cath. Encyclopedia* 14 (1967), 425–48 (esp. considering the question of immigration); best complete presentation: T. T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Notre Dame 1969); P. Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1711–1884* (New York 1932); Schmidlin, *PG* II, 494–500; III, 114ff.; J. T. Ellis, *The Life of Cardinal Gibbons* (Milwaukee 1952); J. H. Moynihan, *The Life of Archbishop J. Ireland* (New York 1953); *M. Corrigan-Memorial,* compiled and published by J. M. Farley (New York 1902); regarding the controversy over the emigrants' loss of faith: L. Hertling, 162–66; C. J. Barry, *The Catholic Church and German Americans* (Milwaukee 1953; is negative about the Ireland-Keane group); about the Irish influence: P. K. Egan (biblio. for chap. 9); F. Downing in J. N. Moody, ed., *Church and Society* (New York 1953), 843–904; H. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington 1949); S. Bell, *Rebel, Priest and Prophet. A Biography of Dr. Edw. McGlynn* (New York 1937); T. T. McAvoy, *The Great Crisis in American Catholic History. 1895–1900* (Chicago 1957); P. E. Hogan, *The Cath. University of America. 1896–1903* (Washington 1949); J. T. Ellis, *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington 1946); W. E. Garrison, *Catholicism and the American Mind* (Chicago 1928); J. Mannix, *The American Convert Movement* (New York 1923); L. C. Feiertag, *American Public Opinion in the Diplomatic Relations between the United States and the Papal State* (Washington 1933); R. D. Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958).

11. *Catholicism in the Slavic World until 1914*

LITERATURE

THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE: W. Gribowski, *Das Staatsrecht des Russischen Reiches* (Tübingen 1912); F. Haase, *Die katholische Kirche Polens unter russischer Herrschaft* (Breslau 1917); A. Boudou, *Le Saint-Siège et la Russie. Leurs relations diplomatiques au XIX^e siècle* II: *1848–83* (Paris 1925); A. Petrani, *Kolegium Duchnowne w Petersburgu* (Lublin 1950); "Kościoly katolickie ob. łać. na obszarach Rosji (1772–1914)," *SPM* II (Rome 1955), 467–97; E. Winter, *Rußland und das Papstum* II (Berlin 1961), 340–567; B. Stasiewski, "Die kirchliche Organisation der deutschen katholischen Siedler in Rußland," *Festschrift für Margarete Woltner zum 70. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg 1967), 270–83; G. Simon, *Konstantin Petrovič Pobedonoscev und die Kirchenpolitik des Heiligen Sinod 1880–1905* (Göttingen 1969).

THE THREE PARTITIONS OF POLAND: J. S. Pelczar, *Pius IX i Polska* (Miejsce Piastowe 1914); K. Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (Berlin and Leipzig 1930); G. Manteuffel-Szoege, *Geschichte des polnischen Volkes während seiner Unfreiheit 1772–1914* (Berlin 1950); J. Umiński, *Historia Kościoła* II, ed. by W. Urban (Oppeln 1960); F. Manthey, *Polnische Kirchengeschichte* (Hildesheim 1965); G. Rhode, *Kleine Geschichte Polens* (Darmstadt 1965); W. Urban, *Ostatni etap dziejów kośicoła w Polsce przed nowym tysiącleciem 1815–1965* (Rome 1966, biblio.); Z. Olszamowska-Skowrońska, "Tentatives d'introduire la langue russe dans les églises latines da la Pologne orientale 1865–1903," *Antemurale* 11 (1967), 47–169; B. Stasiewski, "Tausend Jahre polnischer Kirchengeschichte," *Kirche im Osten* 10 (1967), 56–60; *Księga tysiąclecia katolicyzmu w Polsce,* 3 vols. (Lublin 1969); *Le millénaire du catholicisme en Pologne* (Lublin 1969); B. Kumor, *Granice* *metropolii i diecezji polskich 966–1939* (Lublin 1969–71); E. Jabłońska-Deptuła, "Duchowieństwo zakonne a sprawa narodowa w połowie XIX wieku," *Znak* 24 (1972), 481–504.

THE HABSBURG MONARCHY: A. Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918* (Munich 1952); R. A. Kann, *Das Nationalitätenproblem der Habsburgmonarchie. Geschichte und Ideengehalt der nationalen Bestrebungen vom Vormärz bis zur Auflösung des Reiches im Jahre 1918*, 2 vols. (Graz and Cologne 1964); R. W. Seton-Watson, *A History of the Czechs and Slovaks* (Hamden 1965); F. Prinz, "Die böhmischen Länder von 1848 bis 1914," *Hdb. der Gesch. der böhmischen Länder* III, ed. by K. Bosl (Stuttgart 1968), 103–23; A. Wandruszka, "Österreich-Ungarn vom ungarischen Ausgleich bis zum Ende der Monarchie (1867–1918)," *Hdb. der europ. Gesch.* VI, ed. by T. Schieder (Stuttgart 1968), 354–99.—See this vol., chap. 2.

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE: H. Wendel, *Der Kampf der Südslawen um Freiheit und Einheit* (Frankfurt 1925); M. Spinka, *A History of Christianity in the Balkans* (Chicago 1933); J. H. Ledit, *The Church in the Balkans* (New York 1949); J. Radonić, *Rimska kurija i južnoslovenske zemľe od XVI do XIX veka* (Belgrade 1950); G. Stadtmüller, *Geschichte Südosteuropas* (Munich 1950); G. Wolfrum, "Die Völker und Nationalitäten," *Osteuropa-Handbuch Jugoslawien*, ed. by W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1954) 14–36; R. Kißling, *Die Kroaten. Der Schicksalsweg eines Südslawenvolkes* (Graz and Cologne 1956); G. Jäschke, "Das osmanische Reich vom Berliner Kongreß bis zu seinem Ende (1878–1920/22)," *Hdb. der europ. Gesch.* VI, ed. by T. Schieder (Stuttgart 1968), 539–46; G. Rhode, "Die Staaten Südosteuropas vom Berliner Kongreß bis zum Ausgang des I. Weltkrieges (1878–1918)," ibid., 547–609; E. Schramm-von Thadden, "Griechenland vom Beginn der Dynastie Glücksburg bis zum Frieden mit der Türkei (1863–1923)," ibid., 610–17; A. Tarnovaliski, *Msgr. Andreas Canova. Bulgariens erster Kapuzinermissionar und Bischof 1841–1866* (Bressanone 1968); H. D. Schanderl, *Die Albanienpolitik Österreich-Ungarns und Italiens 1877–1908* (Wiesbaden 1971).

SECTION TWO

The Development of Catholicism in Modern Society

12. *Catholicism in Society as a Whole*

SOURCES

Encyclicals of Leo XIII: *Quod apostolici* (1878); *Arcanum illud* (1880, marriage); *Humanum genus* (1884, Freemasons); *Libertas* (1888); *Sapientiae christianae* (1890); *Rerum novarum* (1891); *Longinqua Oceani spatia* (1895); *Militantis ecclesiae* (1897, education).

Contemporary theoreticians (especially regarding the question of property): C. Périn, *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes,* 2 vols. (Paris 1861); F. Le Play, *La réforme sociale en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1864); M. Liberatore, *Principii di economia politica* (Rome 1889); G. Toniolo (cf. above chap. 5); C. v. Vogelsang, *Ges. Aufsätze über socialpolitische und verwandte Themata* (Augsburg 1885–87); F. Hitze, *Capital und Arbeit und die Reorganisation der Gesellschaft* (Paderborn 1880); *Die Quintessenz der socialen Frage* (Paderborn 1880); H. Pesch, *Liberalismus, Sozialismus und christliche Gesellschaftsordnung* (Freiburg 1898); id., *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie,* 5 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1905–23); V. Cathrein, *Der Sozialismus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1890, 1923); A. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Br. 1883, 1890); A. M. Weiß, *Apologie des Christentums* 4, 5 (=*Soziale Frage und soziale Ordnung*) (Freiburg i. Br. 1892, 1904); T. Meyer, *Die christlich-ethischen Sozialprinzipien und die Arbeiterfrage* (Freiburg i. Br. 1904); G. J. Waffelaert, *De iustitia,* 2 vols. (Bruges 1885–86); A. Vermeesch, *Quaestiones de iustitia* (Bruges 1901); A. Stöckl, *Das Christentum und die großen Fragen der Gegenwart auf dem Gebiet des geistigen, sittlichen und sozialen Lebens,* 3 vols. (Mainz 1879–80); F. Schaub, *Die Eigentumslehre nach Tomas v. Aquin und dem modernen Sozialismus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1898).

LITERATURE

TRANSLATIONS OF AND COMMENTARIES ON RERUM NOVARUM: G. Gundlach: *Veröff. der Görres-Gesellschaft, Sektion Sozial-und Wirtschaftsgeschichte,* no. 3 (Paderborn 1931) [with *Quadragesimo anno*]; R. Kothen, *L'enseignement social de l'Église* (Louvain 1949; texts of doctrinal statements by the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII); P. Jostock. *Die sozialen Rundschreiben:* Leo XIII: "Über die Arbeiterfrage"—Pius XI: "Über die gesellschaftliche Ordnung" [texts and commentary] (Freiburg i. Br. 1960); J. Schasching, *Die soziale Botschaft der Kirche von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.* (Vienna 1963; aside from the texts of *Rerum novarum, Quadragesimo anno,* and subsequent social encyclicals, an introduction, 11–68); P. Mourret, *Les directives politiques, intellectuelles et sociales de Léon XIII* (Paris 1920); W. Schwer, *Leo XIII.: Klassiker der katholischen Sozialphilosophie* (Freiburg 1923); O. v. Nell-Breuning, *Die soziale Enzyklika: Erläuterungen zum Weltrundschreiben Pius' XI. über die gesellschaftliche Ordnung* (Cologne 1932, 1950; including important remarks about *Rerum novarum*); J. Haessle, *Das Arbeitsethos der Kirche nach Thomas von Aquin und Leo XIII.* (Freiburg i. Br. 1923); E. Muhler, *Die Soziallehren der Päpste* (Munich 1958); G. Boni, *Il pensiero sociale di Leone XIII e Pio XI . . .* (Bergamo

1932); M. Allendorf, *Zur Geschichte der Sozialenzykliken des Vatikans* (diss., Humboldt Univ., Berlin 1963); G. Jarlot, *Doctrine pontificale et histoire. L'enseignement social de Léon XIII, Pie X et Benoît XV vu dans son ambiance historique* (Rome 1964); R. L. Camp, *The Papal Ideology of Social Reform, 1878–1967* (Leiden 1969).—Regarding the history of the development of *Rerum novarum:* G. Antonazzi, *L'enciclica R. N.* (Rome 1957).

The Problem of "Catholicism": C. Bauer, "Bild der Kirche—Abbild der Gesellschaft," *Hochland* 48 (1956), new: "Deutscher Katholizismus" (Frankfurt 1964), 9–27; id., "Wandlungen der sozialpolitischen Ideenwelt im deutschen Katholizismus des 19. Jh.," J. Strieder et al., eds., *Die soziale Frage und der Katholizismus* (Paderborn 1931), 11–46.

General Presentations: G. Goyau, *Autour du catholicisme social,* 5 "series" (Paris 1901–12); O. Schilling, *Die Staats-und Soziallehre des Papstes Leo XIII.* (Cologne 1925); id., *Christliche Gesellschaftslehre* (Freiburg i. Br. 1926); E. K. Winter, *Die Sozialmetaphysik der Scholastik* (Vienna 1929); O. v. Nell-Breuning, "Die Eigentumslehre," J. Strieder, et al. (cf. above); A. M. Knoll, *Der soziale Gedanke im modernen Katholizismus. Von der Romantik bis Rerum novarum* (Vienna and Leipzig 1932); W. Schwer, "Krisen der kath.-sozialen Bewegung und ihre Lehren," *Soziale Revue. Kath. internationale Quartalschrift* 31, 1 (Munich 1930), 1–9 (regarding W. Schwer, see N. Monzel in *Hochland* 42 [1949/50] 309f.); J. N. Moody, ed., *Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements. 1789–1950* (New York 1953); W. Bredendiek, *Christliche Sozialreformer des 19. Jh.* (Leipzig 1953); L. Leutner, *Das Erwachen der modernen kath. Sozialidee. Die Entwicklung im 19. Jh. bis Rerum novarum* (Vienna 1951); S. Hedler, *Die katholischen Sozialisten. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Wirkens* (diss., Hamburg 1952); L. P. Wallace. *Leo XIII and the Rise of Socialism* (New York 1966) (the Catholic Church as a dam against socialism); F. Beutter, *Die Eigentumsbegründung in der Moraltheologie des 19. Jh.* (Paderborn 1971); H. Maier, *Kirche und Gesellschaft* (Munich 1972; recent history, but also including problems of the nineteenth century).

Individual Countries: Cf. the biblios. of chaps. 1–10 and chap. 13; also in regard to France: C. Calippe, *L'attitude sociale des catholiques français au XIX^e^ siècle* (Paris 1911); E. Barbier, *L'histoire du catholicisme libéral et du catholicisme sociale en France, 1870–1914,* 5 vols. (Bordeaux 1923–28; integralistic perspective, rich documentation); W. Gurian, *Politische und soziale Ideen des französischen Katholizismus. 1789–1914* (1929), here: 239–312; G. Hoog, *Histoire du catholicisme social en France, 1871–1931* (Paris 1946); J. B. Duroselle, *Les débuts du catholicisme social en France* (Paris 1951; goes up to 1870, but important description of previous history); Dansette [cited in Chap. 16] II, 180–215, 397–436 (after 1898).

Germany and Austria: S. Merkle, "Die katholische Kirche," S. Körte, ed., *Deutschland unter Kaiser Wilhelm II.* (1914); M. Meinertz-H. Sacher, *Deutschland und der Katholizismus,* 2 vols. (Freiburg 1918); W. Schwer-Franz Müller, "Der deutsche Katholizismus im Zeitalter des Kapitalismus," *Kirche und Gesellschaft,* VI (Augsburg 1932); P. Jostock, *Der deutsche Katholizismus und die Überwindung des Kapitalismus. Eine ideengeschichtliche Skizze* (Regensburg 1932); id., *Die katholisch-soziale Bewegung der letzten hundert Jahre in Deutschland* (Cologne 1958); J. Höffner, *Die deutschen Katholiken u. die soziale Frage im 19. Jh.* (Paderborn 1954); K. H. Grenner, *Wirtschaftsliberalismus und katholisches Denken* (Cologne 1967); K. Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken im 19. Jh.* (Munich 1963); F. J. Stegmann, "Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im dt. Katholizismus," H. Grebing, ed., *Dt. Hb. der Politik* 3 (1969), 325–560; J. B. Kißling, *Geschichte der deutschen Katholikentage* II (Mainz 1923);

P. Siebertz, *Karl Fürst zu Löwenstein. 1834–1921* (Munich 1924); F. Funder (cited in chap. 2).

THE POLITICAL SITUATION: Cf. chaps. 1–11 and chap. 14.

THE QUESTION OF SCHOOLS: Aside from biblio. in the chaps. on individual countries: J. A. Burns-B. J. Kohlbrenner, *A History of Catholic Education in the US* (New York 1937); H. K. Beale, *History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools* (New York 1941); F. Larroyo-A. L. Lacombe (Latin America): *New Cath. Encyclopedia* 5 (1967), 157–62; P. Verhaegen, *La lutte scolaire en Belgique* (Ghent 1905); M. Spahn, *Der Kampf um die Schule in Frankreich u. Deutschland* (Munich 1907); K. Erlinghagen, *Die Säkularisierung der deutschen Schule* (Hanover 1972), 43, 48, 58f., 73ff.

CATHOLIC ORGANIZATIONS: Cf. biblio. in the chaps. on individual countries; Wetzer-Welte, ed., "Vereinswesen," *Kirchenlexikon* 12 (1901), 707–60; A. Retzbach, *Das moderne kath. Vereinswesen* (1925) (countercritique of societies); K. Buchheim, "Der deutsche Verbandskatholizismus. Eine Skizze seiner Geschichte," B. Hanssler, *Die Kirche in der Gesellschaft* (Paderborn 1961), 30–83; A. Pieper, *Sinn und Aufgaben des Volksvereins* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1926), 25–41, about the history of its founding, containing organization and statutes; E. Ritter, *Die kath.-soziale Bewegung Deutschlands im 19. Jh. und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954; literary estate of August Pieper and Chancellor Wilhelm Marx included; up to p. 130 good summary [with biblio.] about the development of social theory, also in the Center Party).

THE CATHOLIC PRESS: H. Keiter, *Hdb. der kath. Presse* (1895, 1909); *New Catholic Encyclopedia, Catholic Press, World Survey* 3 (New York 1967), 283–327, according to countries, partially with historical retrospective; J. Morienval, *Sur l'histoire de la presse catholique en France* (Paris and Colmar 1936). Regarding *La Croix:* E. R. Lacoste, *P. Bailly* (Paris 1913); id., *F. Picard* (Paris 1932); De Moine, *"La Croix"—cinquantenaire* (Paris 1933); R. Kokel, *P. Bailly* (Paris 1942); R. d'Harcourt in *StL* V, 207f.; P. Castel, *Le P. Picard et le P. Bailly dans les luttes de presse* (Rome 1962); R. J. Marion, *La "Croix" et le Ralliement* (diss., Worcester, Mass. 1957).

The press in Italy: E. Lucatello, "Giornalismo Cattolico," *ECatt* VI (1951), 458–62; cf. chaps. 5, 33, 34. Regarding *Osservatore Romano:* G. B. Casoni, *Cinquant'anni di giornalismo* (Bologna 1907); C. Crispolti, *Rimpianti* (Milan 1922).

In Germany: K. Löffler, *Gesch. der kath. Presse Deutschlands* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1924); K. Bachem, *Josef Bachem. Versuch einer Gesch. der kath. Presse,* 2 vols. (1912–13): II: until 1860 (as a history of the preceding period important for the subsequent development); W. Kisky, *Der Augustinusverein zur Pflege der kath. Presse von 1878–1928* (Düsseldorf 1928).—On the *Vienna Reichspost:* F. Funder, *Vom Gestern ins Heute* (Vienna 1952).

13. *The Social Movements*

LITERATURE

ON THE THEORIES: Cf. chap. 12.—International presentations and collections: J. N. Moody (cited in chap. 12); M. P. Fogarty, *Christian Democracy in Western Europe. 1820–1953* (London 1957); G. Briefs et al., eds. of the Catholic Social Institute of the Archdiocese of Cologne, *Das Bild des Arbeiters in der kath. Sozialbewegung von den*

Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (Cologne 1960); G. Brakelmann, *Die soziale Frage des 19. Jh.* II: *Die evangelisch-soziale und die katholisch-soziale Bewegung* (Witten 1962); H. S. Scholl, ed., *150 ans de mouvement ouvrier chrétien en Europe de l'Ouest* (Louvain 1966).

ON INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES: France: M. Vaussard, *Histoire de la Démocratie chrétienne* (Paris 1956); H. Rollet, *L'Action sociale des catholiques en France. 1871 à 1914,* 2 vols. (Paris 1947, 1958).—Belgium: R. Reszohazy (cited in chap. 7).—Italy: F. Magri, A. Gambasin (cited in chap. 5).—Switzerland: G. Beuret (cited in chap. 4).—Germany: K. H. Brüls, *Geschichte der kath.-sozialen Bewegung in Deutschland* (Münster 1958); E. Filthaut, *Deutsche Katholikentage 1848–1958 und soziale Frage* (Essen 1960); J. Joos, *Kath. Arbeiterbewegung in der Gesch. der christl. Arbeiterbewegung Deutschlands* (Cologne 1963); E. Naujoks, "Die kath. Arbeiterbewegung und der Sozialismus in den ersten Jahren des Bismarckschen Reiches," *Neue Deutsche Forschungen,* ed. by H. R. G. Günther and E. Rothacker, Vol. 228 (Berlin 1939), Abt. Neuere Geschichte, Vol. 6, ed. by R. Stadelmann [in favor of Bismarck, but material on Chaplain Gronenberg, etc.]; M. Berger, *Arbeiterbewegung und Demokratisierung. Die . . . Gleichberechtigung des Arbeiters im Verständnis der kath. Arbeiterbewegung . . . zwischen 1890 und 1914* (diss., Freiburg i. Br. 1971).—Austria: F. Funder (cited in chap. 2); G. Silberbauer, *Österreichs Katholiken und die Arbeiterfrage* (Graz 1966); F. Bischof, *Kard. Gruscha und die soziale Frage* (diss., Vienna 1959).—United States: Henry D. Browne, *The Catholic Church and The Knights of Labor* (Washington 1949); A. I. Abell, *American Catholicism and Social Action, 1865–1950* (Notre Dame 1963).

CHRISTIAN TRADE UNIONS: Information about the international situation in: Fogarty; K. H. Schürmann, *Zur Vorgeschichte der christl. Gewerkschaften* (Freiburg 1958); L. R. Sanseverino, *Il movimento sindacale cristiano dal 1850 al 1939* (Rome 1950); M. Karson, *The Catholic Church and Unionism* (New York 1951); J. Zirnheld, *Cinquante Années de Syndicalisme Chrétien* (Paris 1937) (13–76 the development toward the *Confédération Française des Travailleurs chrétiens* [CFTC]); L. Deuerlein, "Gewerkschaftsstreit," *StL* III, 943–46.—R. Morsey, ed., *Zeitgeschichte in Lebensbildern. Aus dem deutschen Katholizismus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz 1973), portraits of Cardinal G. Kopp, J. Bachem, G. v. Hertling, F. Hitze, P. Spahn, K. Trimborn et al.—In general, cf. chaps. on individual countries.

14. *The Relationship to the State and the Parties*

Encyclicals of Leo XIII: *Diuturnum illud* (1881); *Immortale Dei* (1885); *Libertas* (1885); *Au milieu des sollicitudes* (1892); *Graves de communi* (1901).

LITERATURE

C. Crispolti and G. Aureli, *La politica di Leone XIII da L. Galimberti a M. Rampolla* (Rome 1912); F. Mourret, *Les directives politiques, intellectuelles et sociales de Léon XIII* (Paris 1920).—Aside from biblio. for chap. 12 (especially the works of O. Schilling and F. Mourret): P. Tischleder, *Die Staatslehre Leos XIII.* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1925–27); id., *Staatsgewalt und katholisches Gewissen* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1926).—History of the assessment of democracy by Catholicism: A. Pieper in *StL* I, and H. Peters in *StL* II, 589–92; Hans Maier, *Revolution und Kirche. Studien zur Frühgeschichte der christlichen Demokratie, 1789–1901* (Freiburg 1965); K. Buchheim, "Christliche Parteien," *StL* II, 467–75; A. Gnägi, *Kirche und Demokratie* (diss., Zurich 1970), 149–60.—Cf. biblio. for the chaps. on individual countries.

15. *The Position of Catholicism in the Culture at the Turn of the Century*

SOURCES

Encyclicals of Leo XIII: Praise of technological progress, passim, such as in *Sapientiae christianae* (1890), *Rerum novarum* (1891); Criticism of civilization: *Inscrutabili* (1878); *Exeunte iam anno* (1888); *Annum ingressi* (1902).

Scholarship: universities: *Annuaire de l'université catholique de Louvain; Univ.-cath. de Louvain—Bibliogr. 1834–1954* (Louvain 1900–1954).—*Die Universität Fribourg* (Basel 1939).—Regarding Washington: chap. 10.—C. Roy, *L'université de Laval et les fêtes du cinquantenaire* (Quebec 1903). *Instituts catholiques* (France): G. Delépine in *Catholicisme* V (1963), 1756–63.

Congresses: L. Pisani, "Les congrès scientifiques internationaux des catholiques," *Revue du clergé français* (1898); *Compte rendu du 3^e Congrès scientifique international des catholiques* (Brussels 1895); *Compte rendu du 4^e Congrès scientifique* (Fribourg 1897–98).

Societies: *Jahresberichte der Görres-Gesellschaft* (1880f.); On the Leo Society: *Die Kultur* (Vienna 1899–1919).

New journals: historical journals: this series, vol. I, 35–56; theological and philosophical journals: aside from *ZKTh* (Innsbruck 1877ff.), cf. chap. 20.

On the problems: G. v. Hertling, *Das Prinzip des Katholizismus und die Wissenschaft* (Freiburg i. Br. 1899); G.-P. Fonsegrive-Lespinasse, *Le catholicisme et la vie de l'esprit* (Paris 1898); id., *L'évolution des idées dans la France contemporaine de Taine à Péguy* (Paris 1917); F. Brunetière, *Essais sur la Littérature contemporaine* (Paris 1892); id., *Questions actuelles* (Paris 1907); id., *Discours de combat,* 3 vols. (Paris 1895ff.); R. Murri, *Battaglie d'oggi,* 5 vols. (Rome 1903–8); C. Sonnenschein, *Aus dem letzten Jahrzehnt des italienischen Katholizismus* (Elberfeld 1906) =*Broschüren des Windhorst-Bundes* no. 1; C. Schulte, *Die Kirche und die Gebildeten* (Freiburg i. Br. 1919).

Literature and the Arts: cf. chaps. on individual countries and chaps. 18, 19.

LITERATURE

Cf. chaps. 18–22, 29–32, 35. W. Schwer, "Die kirchliche Entfremdung des neuzeitlichen Bürgertums," *BZThS* (1930), 307–20; F. Schneider, *Bildungskräfte im Katholizismus der Welt* (Freiburg i. Br. 1936); R. Agraiu, *Les Universités catholiques* (Paris 1935); In this regard, see the studies about the individual universities in the chapters on individual countries.—H. Rost, *Die wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Lage der deutschen Katholiken* (Cologne 1911); W. Kramer, *Zeitkritik und innere Auseinandersetzung im dt. Katholizismus im Spiegel der führenden kath. Zeitschriften. 1895–1914* (diss., Mainz 1955); W. Spael, *Das Buch im Geisteskampf. 100 Jahre Borromäusverein* (1950); O. Köhler, "Bücher als Wegmarken im dt. Katholizismus," *Der. kath. Buchhandel Deutschlands,* ed. by the Association of the Catholic Bookstores (Frankfurt a. M. 1967) (review from the beginning of the nineteenth century until the present); *Der Katholizismus in Deutschland und der Verlag Herder. 1801–1951* (Freiburg 1951).—H. Platz, *Geistige Kämpfe im modernen Frankreich* (Kempten 1922); M. Bougier, *Essai sur la Renaissance de la Poésie catholique de Baudelaire à Claudel* (Montpellier 1942); A. Simon, *La littérature du péché et de la grâce. 1880 jusqu'à 1950* (Paris 1957); C. Moeller, *Littérature du XX^e siècle et christianisme* (Paris 1953ff.); H. Weinert, *Dichtung aus dem Glauben* (Heidelberg 1948).

SECTION THREE

Forms of Piety

16. *Externalization and Internalization of Nineteenth-Century Spirituality—Beginnings of the Eucharistic Congress Movement—Veneration of Saint Thérèse of Lisieux*

LITERATURE

Vol. VIII, chap. 15. Also: A. Mayer-Pfannholz, "Das Kirchenbild des 19. Jh. und seine Ablösung," *Die Besinnung* 3 (Nuremberg 1948), 124–44; S. Beissel, "Zur Geschichte der Gebetbücher," *StdZ* 77 (1909); H. Brück and J. B. Kißling, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland* IV/2 (Mainz 1908); H. J. Terhünte, *Die religiöse Lage der Katholiken Frankreichs in der 3. Republik* (1919); G. Le Bras, *Histoire de la pratique religieuse en France,* 2 vols. (Paris 1942–44); A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine* II, 1–286 (also non-Catholic publications).

EUCHARISTIC PIETY: E. Dumoutet, *Le désir de voir l'hostie* (Paris 1926); R. Aubert, "Die Eucharistischen Kongresse von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.," *Concilium* 1 (1965), 61–66.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART: J. Stierli et al., *Cor Salvatoris* (Freiburg i. Br. 1956), esp. 163ff.

DEVOTION TO MARY: E. Campana, *Maria nel culto cattolico,* 2 vols. (Turin 1945); E. Villaret, *Les Congrégations Mariales* (Paris 1947); A. Walz, *Saggi di storia rosariana* (Florence 1962); J. Stierli, *Die Marianischen Kongregationen,* 2 vols. (Leipzig 1947); R. Graber, *Die marianischen Weltrundschreiben der Päpste in den letzten hundert Jahren* (Regensburg 1951).

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT: In addition to A. Trapp, 282–367; Anton L. Mayer, "Die Stellung der Liturgie von der Zeit der Romantik bis zur Jahrhundertwende," *ALW* 3 (1955), 1–77; J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* I (Freiburg i. Br. 1952), 208–11; T. Klauser, *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (Bonn 1965), 121–23; J. Hacker, "Die Messe in den deutschen Diözesan-, Gesang- und Gebetbüchern von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart," *MthSt(H)* 1 (1950), 68–132.

CHARITY: In addition to A. Foucault (see vol. VIII, chap. 2, n. 28): W. Liese, *Geschichte der Caritas* II (Freiburg i. Br. 1922); L. Werthmann, *Die Ziele des Caritasverbandes für das kath. Deutschland* (Freiburg 1899); K. Borgmann, *L. Werthmann. Aus seinen Reden und Schriften* (Freiburg 1958); W. Röhrich: *JCW* 2 (Freiburg i. Br. 1928), 25–36; A. Eckert, "Aus meinen Erinnerungen an L. Werthmann," *Caritas* 59 (1958), 285–310.

On Charles de Foucauld and Thérèse Martin (Thérèse of Lisieux), cf. below.

17. *The Organization in the Old and New Orders—Inner Reform and the Power of Attraction*

LITERATURE

General: J. Zürcher, ed., *Päpstliche Dokumente zur Ordensreform* (1954); R. Hostie, *Vie et mort des ordres religieux* (Paris 1972) 223–51 (sociological).—Benedictines: P. Schmitz, *Histoire des l'ordre de saint Benoît* (Maredsous 1948/56).—Dominicans: A. Walz, *Kardinal Frühwirth* (Vienna 1950); id., *Wahrheitskünder. Die Dominikaner in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Essen 1960).—Franciscans: best summary yet: H. Holzapfel, *Geschichte der Franziskaner* (Munich 1909).—Jesuits: R. García-Villoslada, *Manual de Historia de la Compañía de Jesús* (Madrid 1954); H. Becher, *Die Jesuiten* (Munich 1951); J. Stierli, *Die Jesuiten* (Fribourg 1955; short history of the spirituality of the order, with biblio.); C. Hollis, *The Jesuits. A History* (New York 1969), cf.: E. McDenmott in *Cath. Hist. Rev.* 58 (1972) 76f.—Redemptorists: M. De Meulemeester, *Histoire Sommaire de la Congrég. du T. S. Rédempteur* (Louvain 1958).—Salesians: *Don Bosco nel mondo* (Turin 1959; statistics, atlas).—Assumptionists: J. Monval, *Les Assomptionnistes* (Paris 1939).—Missionaries of Steyl: H. Fischer, *Arnold Janssen* (Steyl 1919) (cf. biblio. for chap. 38).—Salvatorians: E. B. Lüthen, *Die Gesellschaft des Göttlichen Heilandes* (1911); R. Pfeiffer, *Joh.-B. Jordan* (Rome 1920); E. Federici (Rome 1948).

18. *The Dispute over Church Music*

LITERATURE

K. Weinmann, *Geschichte der Kirchenmusik, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der kirchenmusikalischen Restauration im 19. Jh.* (Munich 1906, 1913; Weinmann was president of the General Cecilia Association from 1873 to 1929); O. Ursprung, *Die katholische Kirchenmusik* (Potsdam 1931) 250–85: E. Bücken, ed., *Hdb. der Musikwissenschaft;* K. G. Fellerer, *Der gregorianische Choral* (Regensburg 1936); id., *Geschichte der kath. Kirchenmusik* (Düsseldorf 1949) 143–62; F. Haberl, "Cäcilianische Kirchenmusik," *Zs. f. Kirchenmusik* 74 (Cologne 1954), 121–32; F. Krieg, *Katholische Kirchenmusik* (Teufen and St. Gallen 1954) (the historical parts by E. Tittel; 53, 134–42, with biblio.); P. Combe, *Histoire de la restauration de chant grégorien d'après des documents inédits* (Solesmes 1969); H. Hucke, "Die Anfänge des Cäcilienvereins," *Musik und Altar 22* (Freiburg i. Br. 1970) 159–78; K. G. Fellerer, "Grundlagen und Anfänge der kirchenmusikalischen Organisationen F. X. Witts," *KmJb* 55 (1971), 33–60; J. M. Bauduccio, "Relazioni del P. A. De Santi SJ con la congr. dei Riti circa la musica sacra dal 1887 al 1902," *AHSJ* 42 (1973), 128–60.

19. *Church Art in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*

(This biblio. offers only a selection. Treatises, catalogues, reports of meetings, congressional files, and articles are only listed in exceptional cases.)

LITERATURE

RELIGION AND ART: C. Meyer, *Über das Verhältnis von der Kunst zum Kultus. Ein Wort an alle gebildeten Verehrer der Religion und der Kunst* (Zurich 1837); F. Spitta, *Gotteshaus*

und Kunst (Strasbourg 1895); A. Ehrhard, *Katholisches Christentum und moderne Kultur* (Mainz and Munich 1906); G. F. Hartlaub, *Kunst und Religion. Ein Versuch über die Möglichkeit neuer religiöser Kunst* (Munich 1919); I. Herwegen, O.S.B., *Das Kunstprinzip der Liturgie* (Paderborn 1920); id., *Kunst und Mysterium* (Münster i. W. 1929); R. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Freiburg i. Br. 1921); id., *Von heiligen Zeichen* (Rothenfels a. M. 1922); J. van Acken, *Christozentrische Kirchenkunst. Ein Entwurf zum liturgischen Gesamtkunstwerk* (Gladbach 1923); G. Mensching, *Die liturgische Bewegung in der evangelischen Kirche. Ihre Formen und Ihre Probleme* (Tübingen 1925); C. Gröber, *Kirche und Künstler* (Freiburg i. Br. 1932); W. Stählin, *Berneuchen* (Kassel 1939); P. Larsch and R. Kramreiter, *Neue Kirchenkunst im Geist der Liturgie* (Vienna and Klosterneuburg 1939); K. B. Ritter, *Die Liturgie als Lebensform der Kirche* (Kassel 1946); T. Klauser, *Richtlinien für die Gestaltung des Gotteshauses aus dem Geist der römischen Liturgie* (Münster i. W. 1955); F. Kolbe, *Die liturgische Bewegung* (Aschaffenburg 1964); U. Rapp, O.S.B., *Konzil, Kunst und Künstler. Zum VII. Kapitel der Liturgiekonstitution* (Frankfurt a. M. 1965); T. Filthaut, *Kirchenbau und Liturgiereform* (Mainz 1965); D. F. Debuyst, O.S.B., *Architecture moderne et célébration chrétienne* (Brussels 1966); W. Birnbaum, *Die deutsche evangelische liturgische Bewegung* (Tübingen 1970).

CHURCH ART IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: A. Reichensperger, *Vermischte Schriften über christliche Kunst* (Leipzig 1856); K. Clark, *The Gothic Revival* (London 1950); A. Addison, *Romanticism and the Gothic Revival* (Philadelphia 1938); A. Kamphausen, *Gotik ohne Gott. Ein Beitrag zur Deutung der Neugotik und des 19. Jh.* (Tübingen 1952); C. Gurlitt, *Die deutsche Kunst des 19. Jh.* (Berlin 1899); R. Zeitler, *Die Kunst des 19. Jh.* (*Propyläen-Kunstgeschichte* 11 [Berlin 1964]); D. Lenz, O.S.B., *Zur Ästhetik der Beuroner Schule* (Vienna 1912); J. Kreitmaier, S. J., *Beuroner Kunst. Eine Ausdrucksform der christlichen Mystik* (Freiburg i. Br. 1923); A. Cingria, *La Décadence de l'Art Sacré* (Lausanne 1917); *Triviale Zonen in der religiösen Kunst des 19. Jh.* (*Studien zur Philosophie und Lit. des 19. Jh.* 15, Frankfurt a. M. 1971); G. Germann, *Gothic-Revival in Europe and Britain* (London 1972); A. Meyer, *Neugotik und Neuromanik in der Schweiz. Die Kirchenarchitektur des 19. Jh.* (Zurich 1973); H. Sedlmayr, *Verlust der Mitte* (Salzburg 1948); N. Pevsner, *Wegbereiter moderner Formgebung* (Hamburg 1957).

CHURCH ART IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: T. Wieschebrink, *Die kirchliche Kunstbewegung in der Zeit des Expressionismus 1917–1927* (diss., Münster i. W. 1932); P. R. Boving, O.F.M., *Kirche und moderne Kunst* (Bonn 1922); P. P. Regamey, *Kirche und Kunst im 20. Jh.* (Graz, Cologne and Wien 1954); P. Metz, *Abstrakte Kunst und Kirche. Studie über die Kunst in der Heilsgeschichte* (Nuremberg 1954); H. Schnell, *Zur Situation der christlichen Kunst* (Munich 1962); J. Plazaola, S. J., *El arte sacro actual* (Madrid 1965).

CHURCH ARCHITECTURE IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES: E. Kaufmann, *Architecture in the Age of Reason. Baroque and Post-Baroque in England, Italy and France* (Cambridge, Mass. 1955); P. Hautecœur, *Histoire de l'architecture classique en France* VII (Paris 1963); A. Reichensperger, *Die christlich-germanische Baukunst und ihr Verhältnis zur Gegenwart* (Trier 1852); H. Lützeler, *Der Kölner Dom in der deutschen Geistesgeschichte* (Bonn 1948); A. W. N. Pugin, *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (London 1841); id., *An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture in England* (London 1843); W. Weyres and A. Mann, *Hdb. der rheinischen Baukunst des 19. Jh., 1800–1880* (Cologne 1968); G. Palm, *Von welchen Prinzipien soll die Wahl des Baustyls insbesondere des Kirchenbaustyls geleitet werden?* (Hamburg 1845); A. Mann, *Die Neuromanik* (Cologne 1966); F. Schumacher, *Strömungen zur deutschen Baukunst seit 1800* (Leipzig 1935); J. Gerhardy, *Praktische Ratschläge über kirchliche Gebäude, Kirchengeräte und Paramente* (Paderborn 1895); R. B. Witte, *Das katholische Gotteshaus*

(Mainz 1951); W. Weyres and O. Bartning, *Kirchen. Handbuch für den Kirchenbau* (Munich 1959); H. Muthesius, *Die neuere kirchliche Baukunst in England* (Berlin 1901); H. Lützeler, *Der deutsche Kirchenbau der Gegenwart* (Düsseldorf 1934); R. Schwarz, *Vom Bau der Kirchen* (Würzburg 1938, Heidelberg 1947); F. Pfammater, *Betonkirchen* (Zurich 1948); H. Baur and F. Metzger, *Kirchenbauten* (Zurich and Würzburg 1956); R. Schwarz, *Kirchenbau. Welt vor der Schwelle* (Heidelberg 1960); J. Pichard, *Les églises nouvelles à travers le monde* (Paris 1960); H. Muck, S. J., *Sakralbau heute* (Aschaffenburg 1961); H.-E. Bahr, *Kirchen in nachsakraler Zeit* (Hamburg 1968); C. M. Werner, *Das Ende des "Kirchen"-Baus. Rückblick auf moderne Kirchenbaudiskussionen* (Zurich 1971); H. Schnell, *Der Kirchenbau des 20. Jh. in Deutschland* (Munich and Zurich 1973).

PROTESTANT CHURCH ARCHITECTURE: G. Langmaack, *Evangelischer Kirchenbau im 19. und 20. Jh.* (Kassel 1971); P. Brathe, *Theorie des evangelischen Kirchengebäudes. Ein ergänzendes Kapitel zur evangelischen Liturgik* (Stuttgart 1906); M. Meurer, *Der Kirchenbau vom Standpunkt und nach dem Brauche der lutherischen Kirche. Geistlichen, Kirchenpatronen und Kirchenvorständen zur Orientierung dargeboten* (Leipzig 1877); O. Mothes, *Handbuch des evangelisch-christlichen Kirchenbaues* (Leipzig 1898); W. Distel, *Protestantischer Kirchenbau seit 1900 in Deutschland* (Zurich 1933); O. Bartning, *Vom neuen Kirchenbau* (Berlin 1919); O. Bartning, *Vom christlichen Kirchenbau* (Cologne 1928).

PAINTING AND INTERIOR DESIGN: F. Novotny, *Painting and Sculpture in Europe 1780–1880* (Harmondsworth 1960); J. W. v. Goethe (J. H. Meyer), *Neudeutsche religiös-patriotische Kunst* (*Über Kunst und Altertum* I, 1817); K. Andrews, *The Nazarenes. A Brotherhood of German Painters in Rome* (Oxford 1964); H. Schrade, "Die romantische Idee von der Landschaft als höchstem Gegenstande der christlichen Kunst," *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* (1931); R. Ironside and J. Gere, *Pre-Raphaelite Painters* (London 1948); G. Brundu, "Preraffaelismo e Purismo," *Enciclopedia universale dell'Arte* X, 943–48; S. Waetzoldt, "Bemerkungen zur christlich-religiösen Malerei in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jh.," *Triviale Zonen in der religiösen Kunst des 19. Jh.* (*Studien zur Philosophie und Literatur des 19. Jh.* 15, [Frankfurt a. M. 1971]); J. Kreitmaier, S.J., *Von Kunst und Künstlern. Gedanken zu alten und neuen künstlerischen Fragen* (Freiburg 1926); G. Hexges, O.F.M., *Ausstattungskunst im Gotteshaus* (Berlin 1934); R. Koch, *Das Kirchengerät im evangelischen Gottesdienst* (Hamburg 1935); A. Henze, *Kirchliche Kunst der Gegenwart* (Recklinghausen 1954).

SECTION FOUR

Teaching and Theology

20. *The Encyclical* Aeterni Patris

COMMENTARIES

F. Ehrle (1880), newly ed. by F. Pelster (Rome 1954); G. Cornoldi, *La riforma della filosofia promossa dall'enciclica "Aeterni Patris" di S. S. Leone XIII* (Bologna 1880); other contemporary commentaries: Schmidlin, *PG* II, 394 (footnote).

LITERATURE

A. Walz, "Sguardo sul movimento tomista nel secolo XIX fino all'enciclica Aeterni Patris," *Aquinas* 8 (1965), 351–79; R. Aubert, "Aspects divers du néo-thomisme sous le pontificat de Léon XIII," *Aspetti della cultura cattolica nell'età di Leone XIII* (Rome 1961), 133–227.—Regarding the history of Neo-Scholasticism after 1879: chap. 21.

21. *Neo-Thomism, Neo-Scholasticism, and the "New Philosophers"*

LITERATURE

Cf. chap. 20.—M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Freiburg i. Br. 1933, photoprint, Darmstadt 1961), 218–81; Hocedez III, 45–52, 110–20, 235–322, 351–83; G. Söhngen, "Neuscholastik," *LThK* VII, 923–26; O. H. Pesch, "Thomismus," *LThK* X, 160f.; R. Aubert, *Aspects* (cited in chap. 20); id., "Die Theologie während der 1. Hälfte des 20. Jh.," H. Vorgrimler and R. Vander Gucht, *Bilanz der Theologie* II (Freiburg i. Br. 1969), 7–14; F. van Steenberghen, "Die neuscholastische Philosophie," ibid. I, 352–63; in regard to ethical theology: J. G. Ziegler in ibid. III, 316–28; in regard to apologetics: J. Schitz in ibid. II, 201–20 (also about M. Blondel).—On individual philosophers and theologians, cf. chapter footnotes, also chap. 15.

22. *The Theory of Church History*

LITERATURE

On ecclesiastical historiography: this series, vol. I, pp. 35–56; Hocedez III, 64–91, 142–72; L. Scheffzyk, *F. L. von. Stolbergs "Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi". Die Abwendung der kath. Kirchengeschichtsschreibung von der Aufklärung und ihre Neuorientierung im Zeitalter der Romantik* (Munich 1952).

On the history of various problems: this series, vol. I, pp. 1–11; A. Franzen, "Theologie der Geschichte und theologischen Kirchengeschichte," *Oberrhein. Pastoralblatt* 67 (1966), 395–400; J. Ratzinger, "Das Problem der Dogmengeschichte,"

Arbeitsgemeinschaft f. Forsch. Nordrhein-Westfalen, Geisteswiss., no. 139 (Cologne 1966); H. Dickerhof, "Kirchenbegriff, Wissenschaftsentwicklung, Bildungssoziologie und die Formen der kirchlichen Historiographie," *HJ* 89 (1969), 176–202; R. Kottje, ed., *Kirchengeschichte heute—Geschichtswissenschaft oder Theologie?* (Trier 1970); P. Stockmeier, "Kirchengeschichte und Geschichtlichkeit der Kirche," *ZKG* 81 (1970), 145–62; *Concilium, Internat. Zs. f. Theol.* 6 (1970), no. 8/9, with articles by G. Alberigo, R. Aubert, Y. Congar et al.; O. Köhler, "Die Kirche als Geschichte," *Mysterium salutis* IV/2 (in preparation).

23. *The Question of the Bible*

LITERATURE

A general history of Catholic Bible studies in the nineteenth century does not exist.—On Catholic exegesis after the sixteenth century: V. Baroni, *La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible* (Lausanne 1943); id., *La Bible dans la vie catholique depuis la Réforme* (Lausanne 1955).—A short summary of the "Question Biblique" during Leo XIII's pontificate in: Hocedez III, 124–41; A. Wikenhauser and Josef Schmid, *Einleitung in das NT* (Freiburg i. Br. 1973), 8ff.; briefly describes the situation until *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943), introducing "a new epoch for Catholic Bible Studies."—The best analysis of the problems is provided by the studies about Albert (Marie-Joseph) Lagrange: J. Chaine et al., *L'œuvre exégétique et historique du R. P. Lagrange* (Paris 1935); L.-H. Vincent, "Le Père Lagrange," *RB* 47 (1938), 321–54; F. M. Braun, *L'œuvre du Père Lagrange* (Fribourg 1943); *Le Père Lagrange au service de la Bible, Souvenirs personnels* (Paris 1967). Negative, but with information: A. Houtin, *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France au XIX*^{e} *siècle* (Paris 1902).—J. Coppens, *Le chanoine A. van Hoonacker* (Paris 1935).—The Jesuit Franz von Hummelauer, suspended from exegetical research, has not yet been appraised, except by L. Koch (*Jesuitenlexikon,* 833).—The traditional position: cf. A. Delattre, S.J., *Autour de la question biblique* (Paris 1904); L. Fonck, *Der Kampf um die Wahrheit der Heiligen Schrift seit 25 Jahren* (Innsbruck 1905).

24. *The Condemnation of Americanism*

Cf. chap. 10, especially T. T. McAvoy, *Crisis* (1957); id., *New Catholic Enc.* 1 (1967), 443f.; Hocedez III, (1947), 190–94; L. Hertling, 230–44; E. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous Léon XIII* (Paris 1931), 544–602.

25. *Papal Hopes for Unification—The Independent Eastern Churches and the Uniates*

LITERATURE

Cf. Gen. Biblio.; also "Päpstliche Unionshoffnungen": L. K. Goetz, *Leo XIII. Seine Weltanschauung und seine Wirksamkeit, quellenmäßig dargestellt* (Gotha 1899); B. Arens, *Papst Pius X. und die Weltmission* (Aachen 1919); F. Portal, "Le rôle de l'amitié dans l'Union des Églises," *La Revue catholique des idées et des faits* 11 December 1925, 5–8; A. Gratieux, *L'Amitié au service de l'Union, Lord Halifax et l'abbé Portal* (Paris 1951); A.

Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1806–1918* (Munich 1952); R. Aubert, "Un document de la fin du XIXe siècle relatif aux facteurs non théologiques de Désunion entre chrétiens," *1054–1954. L'Église et les églises, neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident* II, ed. by L. Beauduin (Chevetogne 1955), 429–35; G. Florowski, "Die orthodoxen Kirchen und die ökumenische Bewegung bis zum Jahre 1910," R. Rouse and S. C. Neill, *Gesch. der Ökumenischen Bewegung 1517–1948* I (Göttingen 1957), 231–96; O. S. Tomkins, "Die Römisch-Katholische Kirche und die ökumenische Bewegung 1910–1948," ibid. II (Göttingen 1958), 359–484; J. Alameda, *Las Iglesias de Oriente y su Unión con Roma* (Vitoria 1960); O. Rousseau, "Les attitudes de pensée concernant l'unité chrétienne au XIXe siècle," *L'Ecclésiologie au XIXe siècle* (Paris 1960), 351–73; W. de Vries, *Orthodoxie und Katholizismus. Gegensatz oder Ergänzung?* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1965); C. Soetens, "Les catholiques belges et le rapprochement avec les Églises d'Orient dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle," *RHE* 66 (1971), 83–115; J. Hajjar, *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Die unierten Christen des Nahen Ostens* (Mainz 1972).

THE INDEPENDENT EASTERN CHURCHES. RUSSIA: J. Wilbois, *L'Avenir de l'Église russe. Essai sur la crise sociale et religieuse en Russie* (Paris 1907); W. Gribowski, *Das Staatsrecht des Russischen Reiches* (Tübingen 1912); A. Herman, *De fontibus iuris ecclesiastici Russorum. Commentarius historico-canonicus* (Rome 1936); J. S. Curtiss, *Church and State in Russia. The last years of the Empire 1900–1917* (New York 1940); A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); J. Chrysostomus, *Die religiösen Kräfte in der russischen Gesch.* (Munich 1961); I. Smolitsch, *Gesch. der russischen Kirche 1700–1917* I (Leiden 1964); K. Onasch, "Grundzüge der russischen Kirchengeschichte," *Die Kirche in ihrer Gesch. Ein Handbuch* III, ed. by K. D. Schmidt and E. Wolf (Göttingen 1967), 1–133; G. Simon, "Kirche, Staat und Gesellschaft," *Rußlands Aufbruch ins 20. Jh. Politik—Gesellschaft—Kultur 1894–1917,* ed. by G. Katkov, E. Oberländer, N. Poppe, G. v. Rauch (Olten and Freiburg i. Br. 1970), 199–233.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY AND SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE: A. Hudal, *Die serbisch-orthodoxe Nationalkirche* (Graz and Leipzig 1922); J. Mousset, *La Serbie et son église 1830–1904* (Paris 1938); G. G. Arnakis, *The Near East in Modern Times* I (Austin and New York 1969); J. Kondrinewitsch and E. v. Ivánka, "Die Orthodoxie in der Donaumonarchie und im Balkan von 1690 bis heute," *Hdb. der Ostkirchenkunde,* op. cit., 187–97.

THE FOUR OLD ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE CHURCHES: C. Korolevsky, *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites,* 3 vols. (Rome 1910–11); "Ekklesia X: Die Orthodoxe Kirche auf dem Balkan und in Vorderasien," ed. 45, *Gesch., Lehre und Verfassung der Orthodoxen Kirche* (Leipzig 1939); ed. 46: "Die orthodoxen Patriarchate von Konstantinopel, Alexandrien, Antiochien, Jerusalem und das Erzbistum von Cypern" (Leipzig, 1941); G. Vismara, *Bisanzio e l'islam. Per la storia dei trattati tra la Cristianità Orientale e le potenze Musulmane* (Milan 1950); J. Totzke, "Die alten Patriarchate Alexandrien, Antiochien und Jerusalem," *Una Sancta* 14 (1959), 300–307; 15 (1960), 203–12; C. Dahm, *Die Kirche im Osten. Macht und Pracht der Patriarchen* I (Offenburg 1964); F. W. Fernau, *Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn. Gegenwart und Tradition des orthodoxen Orients* (Opladen 1967); M. Lacko and P. Chrysostomus, "Gesch. und jetziger Stand der orthodoxen Kirchen," K. Algermissen, op. cit., 171–202; R. Potz, *Patriarch und Synode in Konstantinopel. Das Verfassungsrecht des ökumenischen Patriarchates* (Vienna 1971).

THE NATIONAL CHURCHES IN THE MIDDLE EAST: C. Fink, "Die getrennten Kirchen des Morgenlandes," *Morgenländisches Christentum. Wege zu einer ökumenischen Theologie,* ed. by P. Krüger and J. Tyciak (Paderborn 1940), 23–48; P. Kawerau, *Amerika und die* *orientalischen Kirchen. Ursprung und Anfang der amerikanischen Mission unter den Nationalkirchen Westasiens* (Berlin 1958); *Hdb. der Orientalistik,* Pt. 1, Vol. 8, Sec. 2, ed. by B. Spuler (Leiden and Cologne 1961); A. S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* (London 1968); W. de Vries, "Die getrennten Kirchen des Ostens," K. Algermissen op. cit., 79–170; id., "Die 'nationalen Kirchen' des Nahen Ostens und das 'Uniatenproblem,'" *Hdb. der Ostkirchenkunde,* op. cit., 198–217.

THE UNIATE CHURCHES: A. Fortescue, *The Uniate Eastern Churches. The Byzantine rite in Italy, Sicily, Syria and Egypt* (New York 1923); B. J. Kidd, *The Churches of Eastern Christendom from A.D. 451 to the Present Time* (London 1927); P. Werhun, "Gesch. der Union in Byzanz und Südosteuropa," *Der christliche Osten,* op. cit., 294–310; id., "Gesch. der Union im ostslawischen Raum," ibid., 311–35; P. Krüger, "Die Unionen im Orient und Ägypten," ibid., 336–49; H. Engberding, "Die mit Rom vereinten Kirchen," *Morgenländisches Christentum,* op. cit., 49–61; C. de Clercq, *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux* XI, 2 (Paris 1952); I. Totzke, "Die 'Unierten.' Zum Problem der mit Rom in kirchlicher Gemeinschaft stehenden Orientalen," *Una Sancta* 14 (1959), 9–22; J. Alameda, *Las Iglesias de Oriente y su Unión con Roma* (Vitoria 1960); F. X. Siess, *Die Patriarchalverfassung der Unierten Kirche* (Erlangen 1960); F. Heyer, "Die katholische Kirche vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum Ersten Vatikanischen Konzil," *Die Kirche in ihrer Gesch.* IV, ed. N, op. cit. (1963), 1–195; J. Madey, *Kirche zwischen Ost und West. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ukrainischen und Weißruthenischen Kirche* (Munich 1969); M. Lacko, "Unionsbewegungen im slawischen Raum und in Rumänien," *Hdb. der Ostkirchenkunde,* op. cit., 218–35; J. Hajjar, *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz. Die unierten Christen des Nahen Ostens* (Mainz 1972).

Part Two
Defensive Concentration of Forces

Introduction: *Pius X, a Conservative Reform Pope*

SOURCES

ASS, 36–41 (1903–8); *AAS* 1–6 (1909–14); *Lettere,* ed. by N. Vian (Rome 1954); L. v. Pastor, *Tagebücher,* ed. by W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950), 414–611; R. Merry del Val, *Pio X, impressioni e ricordi* (Padua 1949); C. Bellaigue, *Pie X et Rome* (Paris 1916); F. Crispolti, *Ricordi personali* (Milan 1932), 85–139; *Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servi Dei Pii Papae X Positio super introductione causae* (Rome 1942); *Positio super virtutibus* (Vatican City 1949); *Disquisitio circa quasdam objectiones modum agendi Servi Dei respicientes in modernismi debellatione* (Vatican City 1950, important documents); in addition, the records of the processes (Rome, prof. 1923–31, and apost. 1943–46; Venice, prof. 1924–30 and apost. 1944–46; Mantua, prof. 1924–27 and apost. 1945–46; Treviso, prof. 1923–26 and apost. 1944–46).

LITERATURE

GENERAL PRESENTATIONS: Schmidlin, *PG* III, 1–177; *DThC* XII, 1716–40; *A Symposium on the Life and Work of Pius X* (Washington 1946); H. Hermelink, *Die Kath. Kirche unter den Piuspäpsten des 20. Jh.* (Zurich 1949), 3–23, passim; Stanislao da Campagnola in *I papi nella storia* II (Rome 1961), 1078–1101; C. Falconi, *I papi del ventesimo secolo* (Milan 1967), 17–103, 387–89; G. Schwaiger, *Gesch. der Päpste im 20. Jh.* (Munich 1968), 49–71, 206–7; Y. de la Brière, *Les luttes présentes de l'Église,* 2 vols. (Paris 1913–14); M. Pernot, *La politique de Pie X* (Paris 1910); id., *Le Saint-Siège, l'Église catholique et la politique mondiale* (Paris 1924; liberal viewpoint); Aventino (=C. Bélin), *Le gouvernement de Pie X. Concentration et défense catholique* (Paris 1912; conservative viewpoint); *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Église* (Paris 1912; polemical, but informative); É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* (Paris and Tournai 1962), 662–64; J. M. Javierre, "La diplomacia pontificia en los estados europeos, 1903–14. Fuentes y bibliografía," *Salmanticensis* 11 (1964), 343–73.

BIOGRAPHIES: Since a satisfactory biography does not yet exist (list in *Salmanticensis* 11 [1964], 353–54), we recommend primarily: R. Bazin, *Pie X* (Paris 1928); E. Vercesi, *Il pontificato di Pio X* (Milan 1935); F. De Carli, *Pio X e il suo tempo* (Florence 1941); C. Ledré, *Pie X* (Paris 1952; the most detailed biography; see also id., *RHEF* 40 [1954], 249–67); G. Dal Gal, *Il papa santo Pio X* (Padua 1954; very one-sided, but offers many details); P. Fernessole, *Pie X. Sa vie et son œuvre,* 2 vols. (Paris 1952); N. Vian, *S. Pius Pp. X* (Padua 1958); P. V. Facchinetti, *L'anima di Pio X* (Milan 1935); F. Antonelli, "La santità di Pio X," *Rivista di vita spirituale* 6 (1952), 121–32.

GIUSEPPE SARTO BEFORE HIS PONTIFICATE: A. Marchesan, *Pio X* (Einsiedeln 1905); D. Ireno, "La formazione di S. Pio X nel Seminario di Padova," *Studia patavina* 1

(1954), 286–317; E. Bacchion, *G. Sarto arciprete di Salzano* (Padua 1925); N. Vian, *San Pio X a Venezia* (Rome 1958); id., *Sulla soglia di Venezia* (Florence 1964).

THE CONCLAVE: G. Berthelet, *Storia e rivelazione sul conclave del 1903* (Turin 1904). The essential issues can quickly be obtained from the article by F. D. Mathieu, "Les derniers jours de Léon XIII et le conclave," *Revue des deux mondes* 362 (1904), 241–85 (a few additional details from his diary in E. Renard, *Le cardinal Mathieu* [Paris 1925], 390–415); Prince B. v. Bülow published in his memoirs (I [Berlin 1930], 619–23) an extensive letter by Cardinal Kopp of 4 August 1903; other details given by M. Landrieux, "Le conclave de 1903. Journal d'un conclaviste," *Études* 299 (1958), 157–83; the French diplomatic correspondence was appraised by H. Néant in *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 77 (1963), 97–111, the Austrian diplomatic correspondence by Engel-Janosi II, 1–47. On the veto, see also Z. Obertyński, "Kard. Puzyna und sein Veto," *Festschr. F. Loidl* III (Vienna 1971), 177–95.

THE CURIA UNDER PIUS X: L. Bedeschi, *La Curia Romana durante la crisi modernista* (Parma 1968); cf. M. Guasco in *Humanitas* (1968), 814–17, and G. Martina in *RSTI* 23 (1969), 230–34.

SECTION ONE

The Reform Work of Pius X

26. *Reorganization of the Roman Curia and Codification of Canon Law*

LITERATURE

ON THE ENTIRE COMPLEX OF REFORMS: N. Hilling, *Die Reformen des Papstes Pius X. auf dem Gebiete der kirchenrechtlichen Gesetzgebung,* 3 vols. (Bonn 1909–15; chronological) and id. in *AkathKR* 95 (1915), 78–112, 283–99, 457–86, 639–58; 96 (1916), 60–73, 244–70, 408–30, 550–68; 97 (1917), 67–81, 245–59, 397–408, 563–75 (systematic); H. E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte. Die kath. Kirche* (Cologne and Graz 1964), 699–719 (biblio.).

ON THE REFORM OF THE CURIA: *DDC* IV, 997–1004; V. Martin, *Les cardinaux et la Curie und Les congrégations romaines* (Paris 1930); N. del Rè, *La Curia Romana* (Rome 1970), see above all: *Romana Curia a beato Pio X Sapienti consilio reformata* (Vatican City 1951; cited as *Rom. Curia*), especially the second chap. by G. Feretto about the stages of preparation (as yet unpublished documents). Regarding the old biblio., see Schmidlin, *PG* III, 34, n. 14. See also L. Bedeschi, *La Curia Romana durante la crisi modernista* (Parma 1968).

ON THE REFORM OF CANON LAW: P. Gasparri, "Storia della codificazione del diritto canonico," *Acta Congressus iuridici internationalis* IV (Rome 1937), 1–10; N. Hilling, op. cit.; I. Noval, *Codificationis juris canonici recensio historico-apologetica* (Rome 1918); A. Knecht, *Das neue Kirchliche Gesetzbuch. Seine Geschichte und Eigenart* (Strasbourg 1918); U. Stutz, *Der Geist des Codex iuris canonici* (Stuttgart 1918); M. Falco, *Introduzione allo studio del "Codex iuris canonici"* (Turin 1925); F. Cimetier, *Les sources du droit ecclésiastique* (Paris 1930), 150–97; *DDC* III, 909–40; Agatángel de Langasco in *Revista española de derecho canónico* 10 (1955), 457–75 (about the role of Cardinal Vives).

27. *Eucharistic Decrees and Liturgical Renewal*

SOURCES

A. Bugnini, *Documenta pontificia ad instaurationem liturgicam spectantia 1903–1935* (Rome 1953).

LITERATURE

EUCHARISTIC DECREES: C. Zerba, *Nel cinquantenario del Decreto "Quam singulari"* (Vatican City 1961); J.-M. Derély, *NRTh* 73 (1951), 897–911, 1033–48; id., ibid. 77 (1955), 506–12; *DThC* III, 539–52; *DSAM* II, 1282–89; J. A. Hardon, *ThSt* 16 (1955), 493–532; H. A. Heiser, *Die Durchführung der Kommuniondekrete in der ganzen Welt* (Wiesbaden 1932; *ZAM* 8 [1933], 162–66; P. Hellbernd, *Die Erstkommunion der Kinder in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Vechta 1954).

LITURGICAL REFORMS OF PIUS X: N. Hilling, *AkathKR* 96 (1916), 550–68 (old biblio., see 557, n. 6); 97 (1917), 245–59; O. Rousseau, *Histoire du mouvement liturgique* (Paris 1945), 201–30; T. Narbutas, *La reforma del breviario romano por Pío X* (Santiago de Chile 1949); J. M. Lecea Yabar, *Pastoral litúrgica en los documentos pontificios de Pío X a Pío XII* (Barcelona 1959); H. Vinck, "Les réformes liturgiques de 1911–1914" (unpubl. diss. of the Institut supérieur de Liturgie, Paris 1971); Schmidlin, *PG* III, 46–53.

CHORAL REFORM: K. G. Fellerer, *Der gregorianische Choral im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Rome 1936); E. Moneta-Caglio, "L'attività musicale di S. Pio X," *Bolletino ceciliano Nov. 1964;* id., *Musica sacra,* 84–86 (Milan 1961–63); F. Romita, "La preformazione del Motu proprio di S. Pio X sulla musica sacra," *Monitor ecclesiasticus* 86 (1961), 395–497; P. Combe, *Histoire de la restauration du chant grégorien* (Solesmes 1969); F. M. Bauducco in *CivCatt,* 1961, III, 583–94; 1963, I, 240–53; 1968, III, 243–52 (about the role of A. de Santis); id., *Bolletino ceciliano* (1964), 75–92; G. Zaggia, *L. Bottazzo e la restaurazione della musica sacra* (Padua 1967); E. Valentini, *Un campione del movimento ceciliano, G. Grosso* (Turin 1962); H. Vinck in *ELit* 86, (1972), 290–98; E. Moeller, "C. Bellaigue et Pie X," *QLP* 21 (1936), 40–65; "Il Pont. Istituto di musica sacra 50° di fondazione," *Bolletino degli Amici del Pont. Ist. di Mus. sacra* 13 (1961).

BEGINNING OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT: A. Haquin, *Dom Lambert Beauduin et le renouveau liturgique* (Gembloux 1970); B. Fischer, "Das 'Mechelner Ereignis' vom 23. 9. 1909," *LJ* 9 (1959), 203–19; A. Bernareggi in *SC* 78 (1950), 81–102.

28. *Concern for Pastoral Improvements: Seminaries, Catechetical Instruction, Catholic Action*

LITERATURE

PIUS X AND THE CLERGY: Schmidlin, *PG* III, 40–43; N. Hilling in *AkathKR* 95 (1905), 283–99; A. M. Lanz, "Pio X e la Spiritualità del clero diocesano," *CivCatt,* 1952, I, 141–50; G. Lenhart, *Der Priester und sein Tagwerk im Licht des Papstprogramms* (Freiburg i. Br. 1913).

THE REFORM OF SEMINARIES: M. Bargilliat, *Romanorum Pontificum Pii IX, Leonis XIII et Pii X monita et decreta de institutione clericorum in seminariis* (Paris 1908; see also *Enchiridion clericorum* [Rome 1938]); *L'ordinamento dei seminari da S. S. Pio X a Pio XII* (Rome 1958); M. Guasco, *Fermenti nei seminari del primo '900* (Bologna 1971); id.: *Storia contemporanea* 2 (1971), 863–74; N. Hilling in *AkathKR* 95 (1915), 95–112.

CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION: G. Dal Gal, *Beato Pio X papa* (Padua 1951), 401–9; P. Stella, "Alle fonti del Catechismo di S. Pio X," *Salesianum* 23 (1961), 43–66; A. Balocco, "Un memorabile trentennio nella storia della catechesi, 1905–1935," *Rivista lassalliana* 36 (1962), 3–27; B. Dreher, *Die biblische Unterweisung im evangelischen und katholischen Religionsunterricht* (Freiburg i. Br. 1963), 11–81.

CATHOLIC ACTION: L. Civardi, *Compendio di storia dell'Azione cattolica italiana* (Rome 1956); Mgr. de Bazelaire, *Les laïcs aussi sont l'Église* (Paris 1958).

SECTION TWO

The Modernist Crisis

LITERATURE

The studies written immediately after the crisis are tendentious, but they are valuable by virtue of their testimony. See especially: A. L. Lilley, *Modernism, a Record, and a Review* (London 1908); K. Holl, *Der Modernismus* (Tübingen 1908); P. Sabatier, *Les modernistes* (Paris 1909); A. Gambaro, *Il modernismo* (Florence 1912); J. Schnitzer, "Der katholische Modernismus," *Zeitschrift für Politik* 5 (1912), 1–218 (also the volume of documents in the collection *Klassiker der Religion* 3 [Berlin 1912]); A. Houtin, *Histoire du modernisme catholique* (Paris 1913); M.-D. Petre, *Modernism. Its failure and its fruit* (London 1918); E. Buonaiuti, *Le modernisme catholique* (Paris 1927).

So far, there are three comprehensive histories: J. Rivière, *Le modernisme dans l'Église* (Paris 1929, with old lit., cf. *RevSR* 4 [1930], 676–92, and É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* [Paris and Tournai 1962], 41, 289–92, 295), and A. Vidler, *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (Cambridge 1934). Also: É. Poulat, "'Modernisme' et 'Integrisme'. Du concept polémique à l'irénisme critique," *ArchSR* 27 (1969), 3–28; id. in *RSR* 58 (1970), 335–550; 59 (1971), 161–78; A. Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists* (Cambridge 1970); M. Ranchetti, *Cultura e riforma religiosa nella storia del modernismo* (Turin 1963); O. Schröder, *Aufbruch und Mißverständnis. Zur Geschichte der reformkatholischen Bewegung* (Graz 1969); L. da Veiga Coutinho, *Tradition et histoire dans la controverse moderniste* (Rome 1954); P. de Haes, *La résurrection de Jésus dans l'apologétique des 50 dernières années* (Rome 1953); C. Porro, *La controversia cristologica nel periodo modernista* (Milan 1971); P. Scoppola, "Recenti studi sulla crisi modernista," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* I (1965), 274–310.

29. *Reform Catholicism in Germany*

LITERATURE

A thorough study of this theme is lacking. See the summaries in *LThK* VIII, 705–7, *LThK* VIII, 1085, and in *RGG* V, 896–903; also an extensive study in J. Rivière, op. cit., 75–81, 288–93, 416–27, in A. Gisler, *Der Modernismus* (Einsiedeln 1912), 133–54, 642–50, and esp. in O. Schröder, op. cit., 369–431.

Regarding the most important leaders, see in this chapter: for Schnell n. 9; for Ehrhard n. 11; for Kraus n. 5; for P. Funk n. 19; for Schnitzer n. 18.

See also A. Hagen, *Der Reformkatholizismus in der Diözese Rottenburg* (Stuttgart 1962); A. ten Hompel, *Indexbewegung und Kulturgesellschaft* (Bonn 1908); W. Spael, *Das katholische Deutschland im 20. Jh.* (Würzburg 1964).

30. *The Beginning of the Crisis in France*

SOURCES

A. Loisy, *Mémoires,* 3 vols. (Paris 1930–31; cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *M. Loisy et le modernisme* [Paris 1932] and É. Poulat, *Une œuvre clandestine d'H. Bremond* [Rome 1972]); A.

Houtin and F. Sartiaux, *A. Loisy. Sa vie, son œuvre,* ed. with footnotes by É. Poulat (Paris 1960; cf. A. Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists,* 29–33); A. Houtin, *Une vie de prêtre. Mon expérience* (Paris 1926); P. Alfaric, *De la foi à la raison. Scènes vécues* (Paris 1965); J. Turmel, *Comment j'ai donné congé aux dogmes* (Paris 1935); id., *Comment l'Église romaine m'a donné congé* (Paris 1937); J. Guitton, *Dialogues avec M. Pouget* (Paris 1954); J. Chevalier, *P. Pouget. Logia* (Paris 1955); *Au cœur de la crise moderniste. Le dossier inédit d'une controverse,* ed. by R. Marlé (Paris 1960; cf. É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique,* 40–41, 513–15, 587, and *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 41 [1963], 1164–66); M. Bécamel, "Lettres de Loisy à Mgr. Mignot," *BLE* 67 (1966), 3–44, 81–114, 170–94, 257–86; 69 (1968), 241–68; M. Blondel and A. Valensin, *Correspondance 1899–1912,* 2 vols. (Paris 1957); M. Blondel and J. Wehrlé, *Correspondance,* ed. by H. de Lubac, 2 vols. (Paris 1966); M. Blondel and L. Laberthonnière, *Correspondance philosophique,* ed. by C. Tresmontant (Paris 1961); H. Bremond and M. Blondel, *Correspondance,* ed. by A. Blanchet, I–II (Paris 1970–71); H. Bernard-Maître, "'Histoire et dogme' de M. Blondel d'après les papiers inédits d'A. Loisy," *RSR* 57 (1969), 49–74; id., "Lettres d'H. Bremond à Loisy," *BLE* 69 (1968), 3–24, 161–84, 269–89; B. Neven, "Lettres de Mgr. Duchesne à A. Loisy et à Fr. v. Hügel," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 84 (1972), 283–307, 559–99; R. Aubert, "Aux origines de la réaction antimoderniste. Deux documents inédits," *EThL* 37 (1961), 557–78.

The literary estates of Loisy and Houtin are kept in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris; those of Blondel in the Institut supérieur de philosophie in Louvain; those of Laberthonnière are kept by the Oratorians of Paris; those of Mgr. Mignot in the archbishopric of Albi and in the bishopric of Rodez.

LITERATURE

Aside from the general works by Rivière, Vidler, Houtin, etc. (p. 616), see primarily: É. Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* (Tournai and Paris 1962; cf. *RH* 230 [1963], 262–67), with useful appendix: "Pseudonymes et anonymes modernistes" (621–76). Also: A. Houtin, *La question biblique au XX^e^ siècle* (Paris 1906); R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi* (Louvain 1950), 265–92; F. Rodé, *Le miracle dans la crise moderniste* (Paris 1965).

On A. Loisy, aside from his biography by Houtin-Sartiaux (above, with a complete list of his works, 303–24), see also: F. Heiler, *Der Vater des katholischen Modernismus, A. Loisy* (Munich 1947); M. Dell'Isola, *A. Loisy* (Modena 1957); R. Boyer de Sainte-Suzanne, *A. Loisy entre la foi et l'incroyance* (Paris 1968); R. Aubert, *Die Wahrheit der Ketzer,* ed. by H. J. Schultz (Stuttgart 1968), 172–83, 349–57; D. Baader, "Der Weg Loisys . . . ," *FreibThSt,* 1974.

On M.-J. Lagrange and M. Blondel, see biblio. to chap. 23 and chap. 21, ns. 19 and 20.

On P. Batiffol, see J. Rivière, *Mgr Batiffol* (Paris 1929) and A. Houtin, *Ma vie laïque (Paris 1928),* 150–55. On J. Turmel, see F. Sartiaux, *J. Turmel prêtre, historien des dogmes* (Paris 1931) and A. Vidler, *A Variety . . . ,* 56–62.—On Mignot, Houtin, Bremond, Laberthonnière, and Le Roy, see below, ns. 12, 13, 15, 17, and 19.

31. *The Crisis in England*

SOURCES

For Tyrrell: T. M. Loome, "A Bibliography of the Published Writings of G. Tyrrell," *Heythrop Journal* 10 (1969), 280–314; supplement, ibid. 11 (1970), 161–69; *G. Tyrrell's*

Letters 1898–1909, ed. by M. Petre (London 1920); *Lettres de G. Tyrrell à H. Bremond,* ed. with footnotes by A. Louis-David (Paris 1971); other letters in M. Petre, *Autobiography and Life of G. Tyrrell* (below), in A. Loisy, *Mémoires* (Paris 1930–31), and ed. by J. H. Graham in *The Month* 226 (1968), 178–85; 231 (1971) 111–19, and by T. M. Loome in ibid. 229 (1970) 95–101, 138–49; many, as yet unpublished letters in the British Museum, Manuscripts Section. Also F. v. Hügel, "Father Tyrrell. Some memorials of the last 12 years of his life," *Hibbert Journal* 8 (1909/10), 233–52.

For von Hügel: *Selected Letters 1896–1924,* ed. by B. Holland (London 1927; the selection intended to cleanse him from the suspicion of modernism); *Letters to a Niece,* ed. by G. Greene (London 1928); *Spiritual Counsels and Letters,* ed. by D. Steere (London 1964); other important letters in A. Loisy, *Mémoires;* regarding the unpublished letters and diaries, see T. M. Loome, op. cit. (below), 295. Also: M. Petre, *My Way of Faith* (London 1937).

LITERATURE

J. Rivière, op. cit., esp. 82–85, 102–6, 192–222, 265–74, 300–307, 389–401; A. Vidler, *The Modernist Movement,* esp. 143–81, 204–12; id., *A Variety,* 109–90; M. Ranchetti, op. cit., 58–74; M. Ward, *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition* II (London 1937), 134–420; M. Petre, *Von Hügel and Tyrrell* (London 1937); id.: *Congrès d'histoire du christianisme,* ed. by P. Couchoud, III (Paris 1928), 226–47.

On Tyrrell: M. D. Petre, *Autobiography and Life of G. Tyrrell,* 2 vols. (London 1912); R. Gout: *L'affaire Tyrrell* (Paris 1910); J. Stam, *G. Tyrrell* (Utrecht 1938); D. Grasso, "La conversione e l'apostasia di G. Tyrrell," *Gregorianum* 38 (1957), 446–80, 593–629; R. Boudens, "G. Tyrrell and Card. Mercier," *Église et théologie* 1 (Montreal 1970), 313–51; P. Scoppola: *Humanitas* 22 (Brescia 1967), 705–38; G. Daly, "Some Reflections on the Character of G. Tyrrell," *Heythrop Journal* 10 (1969), 256–74; J. A. Laubacher, *Dogma and the Development of Dogma in the Writings of G. Tyrrell* (Louvain and Baltimore 1939); J. F. O'Grady, *The Doctrine of Nature and Grace in the Writings of G. Tyrrell* (Rome 1968).

On von Hügel: M. de la Bédoyère, *The Life of Baron v. H.* (London 1951); M. Nédoncelle, *La pensée religieuse de F. v. H.* (Paris 1935); L. Barmann, *Baron v. H. and the Modernist Crisis in England* (Cambridge 1972); J. Steinmann, *F. v. H.* (Paris 1962; cf. *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 41 [1963], 1162–63); J. Heaney, *The Modernist Crisis, v. H.* (London 1969; cf. *Heythrop Journal* 10 [1969], 315–19); T. Loome in *DR* 91 (1973), nos. 302–4.

On Modernism in the United States: T. McAvoy: *RPol* 21 (1959), 71–74; J. Ratté, *Three Modernists, A. Loisy, G. Tyrrell, W. L. Sullivan* (New York 1967); J. Leinhard, "The 'New York Review' and Modernism in America," *RACHS* 82 (1971), 67–82.

32. *The Crisis in Italy*

SOURCES

E. Buonaiuti, *Pellegrino di Roma* (Rome 1945); S. Minocchi, "Memorie di un modernista" (manuscript in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Florence; edition prepared by A. Agnoletto; excerpts in *RicRel* 19 [1948], 148–67, and *Itinerari* nos. 47–48 [1961], 29–52); G. Semeria, *I miei tempi* (Milan 1929); F. Lanzoni, *Le Memorie,* ed. by G. Cattani (Faenza 1958); *Centro Studi per la storia del modernismo. Fonti e documenti* I (Urbino 1972;

letters prepared by Buonaiuti); A. Fogazzaro, *Lettere scelte,* ed. by T. Gallarati Scotti (Milan 1940); O. Morra, *Fogazzaro nel suo piccolo mondo, dai carteggi familiari* (Bologna 1960); A. Fogazzaro and G. Bonomelli, *Corrispondenza,* ed. by C. Marcora (Milan 1968); R. Comandini, "Echi della crisi modernista in un carteggio inedito di G. Meloni con A. Fogazzaro," *Studia Patavina* 16 (1969), 60–96; P. Scoppola, "Gli anni del modernismo nelle carte inedite di F. Salimei," *Humanitas* 22 (1967), 705–38. In regard to the reaction against Modernism, see *CivCatt* after 1901.

LITERATURE

Aside from the general works by Rivière, Vidler, Ranchetti, etc., see: P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista e rinnovamento cattolico* (Bologna 1969; basic, cf. *RStRis* 49 [1962], 491–98; and *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 41 [1963], 1159–62); L. Bedeschi, *I cattolici disubbidienti* (Naples and Rome 1959); id., *Il Modernismo e Romolo Murri in Emilia e Romagna* (Parma 1967; unpublished letters, 277–354); id., *Linneamenti dell'antimodernismo, il caso Lanzoni* (Parma 1970); M. Guasco, *R. Murri e il modernismo* (Rome 1968; biblio.); C. Giovannini, *Politica e religione nel pensiero della Lega Democratica Nazionale* (Rome 1959); F. Manzotti, "'Plebei' cattolici fra integralismo e modernismo sociale (1904/08)," *Convivium* 26 (1958), 423–45. See also M. C. Casella, *Religious Liberalism in Modern Italy,* 2 vols. (London 1966), and the other works by L. Bedeschi (below, biblio. to chap. 33).

On the group of the *Rinnovamento:* P. Scoppola, op. cit. chap. 4; M. Ranchetti, op. cit., 117–29, 191–226; F. Fonzi, "St. Jacini jr e il 'Rinnovamento,'" *RStRis* 56 (1969), 183–254; O. Confessore, "Sulle origini del 'Rinnovamento,'" *Rivisto di storia e letteratura religiosa* 4 (1968), 328–37; N. Raponi, *T. Gallarati Scotti tra politica e cultura* (Milan 1971).

On Genocchi, Fracassini, Minocchi, Buonaiuti, Semeria, and Fogazzaro, see this chap., nn. 1–4, 6, and 14.

33. *Intervention of Ecclesiastical Authority and the Integralist Reaction*

SOURCES

The main documents regarding Rome's measures against Modernism were compiled by A. Vermeersch, *De modernismo* (Bruges 1910).

On the integralist reaction: see mainly (F. Antonelli and G. Löw) *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones modum agendi servi Dei Pii X respicientes in modernismi debellatione* (Vatican City 1950) and É. Poulat, *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral* (Tournai-Paris 1969; with an introduction and informative footnotes; renders obsolete: N. Fontaine [=L. Canet], *Saint-Siège, Action française et catholiques intégraux,* Paris 1928). Also: *La Correspondance de Rome 1907–1912* (reprint Milan [1972], 3 vols.), the weekly journal by Msgr. Benigni, containing numerous essays; the memoirs and correspondences mentioned in chaps. 30–32; *Le P. Lagrange au service de la Bible. Souvenirs personnels* (Paris 1967); [P. Naudet], *Ce qu'on a fait de l'Église* (Paris 1912; about the author, see É. Poulat, *Histoire dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* 662–64); L. Bedeschi, *Lettere ai cardinali di don Brizio* (Bologna 1970); id. in *Nuova rivista storica* 54 (1970), 125–76; 55 (1971), 90–132; 56 (1972), 389–412; id. in *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 6 (1970), 350–67; 7 (1971), 278–98; C. Marcora in *Studi storici in memoria di Mons. A. Mercati* (Milan 1956), 201–43.

LITERATURE

J. Rivière, *Le modernisme dans l'Église* (Paris 1929), 329–549; P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista . . .* (Bologna 1969), 327–64; D. Grasso, "I modernisti e la 'Pascendi,'" *Divinitas* 2 (1958), 150–76.

On the integralist reaction, aside from the aforementioned basic works of É. Poulat, see: *DThC,* tables 2294–2303; R. Lill, "Der Kampf der römischen Kurie gegen den 'praktischen' Modernismus," *Die päpstliche Autorität im kath. Selbstverständnis des 19. und 20. Jh.,* ed. by E. Weinzierl (Salzburg 1970), 109–23; P. Droulers, *Politique sociale et christianisme. Le P. Desbuquois et l'Action populaire. Syndicalisme et intégristes 1903–18* (Paris 1969); L. Bedeschi, *Lineamenti dell'antimodernismo. Il caso Lanzoni* (Parma 1970); A. Blanchet, *Histoire d'une mise à l'Index, la 'Sainte Chantal' de l'abbé Bremond* (Paris 1967); M. Becamel in *BLE* 71 (1970), 262–73.

On *Le Sillon:* J. Caron, *Le Sillon et la démocratie chrétienne 1894–1910* (Paris 1967).

On *L'Action française:* E. Weber, *The Action française* (Stanford 1962) and the research report by V. Nguyen in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 18 (1971), 503–38.

SECTION THREE

The Holy See and the European Governments

34. *The Roman Question and Italian Catholicism*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. COLLECTIONS OF SOURCES (cf. the biblio. in chap. 5): *Acta Pii X,* 3 vols. (Rome 1905–7); R. Aubert, "Documents relatifs au mouvement catholique sous le pontificat de Pie X," *RSTI* 12 (1958), 202–43, 334–70; A. Toniolo, *Saggi politici,* ed. S. Majerotto (Rome 1957); F. Meda, *Scritti scelti,* ed. G. P. Dore (Rome 1959); G. Della Torre, *I cattolici e la vita pubblica italiana,* ed. G. De Rosa, 2 vols. (Rome 1962); R. Murri, *Battaglie d'oggi,* 4 vols. (Rome 1904); L. Sturzo, *Opera omnia* (appearing in Bologna 1950ff.); id., *Dall'idea al fatto,* ed. G. De Rossi (Rome 1920); id., *Chiesa e Stato* (Bologna 1958); *La Civiltà cattolica 1850–1945, anthology,* ed. G. De Rosa (Rome 1967); *L'Azione, antologia di scritti 1902–22,* ed. C. Bellò (Rome 1967; journal-newspaper of Cremona); A. Gemelli and F. Olgiati, *Vita e pensiero 1914–64,* (Milan 1966); *Civitas, 1919–25,* ed. B. Malinverni (Rome 1963).

2. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT: Several authors, *30 anni di storia politica italiana* (Turin 1968); L. Salvatorelli, *Storia del Novecento* (Milan 1957); G. Giolitti, *Memorie della mia vita* (Milan 1945).

3. SPECIAL TOPICS (cf. biblio. in chap. 5): L. Salvatorelli, *Giolitti* (Milan 1928); G. Spadolini, *Giolitti ed i cattolici, 1901–14* (Florence 1960); M. Guasco, *R. Murri ed il modernismo* (Rome 1968); G. Corradi, *Liberali e cattolici nelle Marche, 1900–13* (Urbino 1970); A. Canaletti Gaudenzi, *L. Sturzo. Il pensiero e le opere* (Rome 1945); G. Petrocchi, *Don Luigi Sturzo* (Rome 1945); F. Rizzo, *L. Sturzo e la questione meridionale* (Rome 1937); F. Magri, *Un pioniere dell'azione sociale cristiana, Angelo Mauri 1873–1936* (Milan 1956); P. Bondioli, *P. Agostino Gemelli. Un profilo* (Milan 1926); M. C. Rossi, *Fr. L. Ferrari, Dalle Leghe bianche al P. P. I.* (Rome 1965); Several authors, *Benedetto XV, i cattolici e la prima guerra mondiale* (Rome 1963); *La parola e l'opera di Benedetto XV durante il conflitto mondiale* (Florence 1916); F. Meda, *I cattolici nella guerra mondiale* (Milan 1928); G. Quadrotta, *Il Papa, l'Italia e la guerra, con prefazione di F. Scaduto* (Milan 1915); E. Vercesi, *Il Vaticano, l'Italia e la guerra* (Milan 1925).

35. *German Catholicism between* Kulturkampf *and World War I*

LITERATURE

H. Brück, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jh.* IV, 2, ed. J. B. Kißling (Münster 1908); K. Bachem, *Vorgeschichte, Geschichte und Politik der deutschen Zentrumspartei* V–VII (Cologne 1919–30; reprint, Aalen 1967–68); Schmidlin, *PG* III, 94–104, 156–59, 164ff.; Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 411ff.; G. Maron, *Die römisch-kath. Kirche von 1870 bis 1970* (see in chap. 1), 260ff.

E. Ritter, *Die kath.-soziale Bewegung Deutschlands und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954), 129–351; H. Philippi, "Kronkardinalat oder Nationalkardinalat. Preußische und bayerische Bemühungen an der Kurie 1900–1914," *HJ* 80 (1961), 185–217; id., "Beiträge zur Gesch. der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Deutschen Reich und dem Hl. Stuhl 1872–1909," ibid. 82 (1963), 239–62; Buchheim, *Ultramontanismus und Demokratie*, 309–536; H. Lutz, *Demokratie im Zwielicht. Der Weg der deutschen Katholiken aus dem Kaiserreich in die Republik* (Munich 1963); R. Morsey, *Die deutsche Zentrumspartei 1917–1923* (Düsseldorf 1966; also important for the decade before 1914); id., "Die deutschen Katholiken und der Nationalstaat zwischen Kulturkampf und erstem Weltkrieg," *HJ* 90 (1970), 31–64; id., "Georg Kard. Kopp, Fürstbischof von Breslau (1887–1914), Kirchenfürst oder 'Staatsbischof'?," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte im Bistum Berlin* XXI–XXIII (1967–69), 42–65.—Cf. the sections on Germany in chaps. 12–15.

36. *Separation of Church and State in France*

SOURCES

Livre blanc du S. Siège. La séparation de l'Église et de l'État en France. Exposé et documents (Paris 1906); *Une campagne du Siècle. La séparation des Églises et de l'État,* H. Brisson . . . (Paris 1905); *Les fiches pontificales de Monsignor Montagnini* . . . (Paris 1908); J. de Narfon, *La séparation de l'Église et de l'État. Origines, étapes, bilan* (Paris 1922); E. Combes, *Mon ministère. Mémoires (1902–1905)* (Paris 1957); Z. Giacometti, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche* (Tübingen 1926); L. V. Méjan, *La séparation des Églises et de l'État* (foreword by G. Le Bras; biblio.) (Paris 1959).

LITERATURE

Aside from the mentioned works by Lecanuet, Latreille, and Mayeur, see F. Mourret-Carreyre, *Précis d'histoire de l'Église* III (Paris 1929); J. Brugerette, *Le prêtre français dans la société contemporaine* II–III (Paris 1935–38); L. Capéran, *L'invasion laïque. De l'avènement de Combes au vote de la Séparation* (Paris 1935); P. Sorlin, *Waldeck-Rousseau* (Paris 1966); J.-M. Mayeur, *La séparation de l'Église et de l'État* (Paris 1966); J. Caron, *Le Sillon et la démocratie chrétienne* (Paris 1967); C. Molette, *L'association catholique de la jeunesse française, 1886–1907* (Paris 1968); A. v. Campenhausen, *Staat und Kirche in Frankreich* (Göttingen 1962); E. Appolis, "En marge de la Séparation. Les associations cultuelles schismatiques," *RHEF*, 1963; G. Le Bras, *Le Conseil d'État, régulateur de la vie paroissiale. Trente ans de Séparation* (Paris 1950); Fontaine (L. Canet), *Saint-Siège, Action française et catholiques intégraux* (Paris 1928); B. Neveu, "Louis Canet et le service du Conseiller technique pour les Affaires religieuses au Ministère des Affaires étrangères," *Rev. d'Hist. diplom.* (April/June 1968); M. J. M. Larkin, "Loubet's Visit to Rome and the Question of Papal Prestige," *The Historical Journal* IV (1961), 97–113; id., "The Vatican, French Catholics and the Associations Cultuelles," *The Journal of Modern History* XXXVI (1964), 298–317; id., "The Church and the French Concordat, 1891 to 1902," *EHR* LXXXI (1966), 717–39; id., *Church and State after the Dreyfus Affair: the Separation issue in France* (London, in preparation); J. McManners, *Church and State in France 1870–1914* (London, SPCK, 1972); G. Laperrière, *La Séparation des Églises et de l'État à Lyon, étude d'opinion publique* (Lyon, Centre d'histoire du catholicisme, 1973).

37. *The Outbreak of World War I*

LITERATURE

Engel-Janosi II, 148–52; J. Nobécourt, *"Le Vicaire" et l'histoire* (Paris 1964), 120–23, 130–31; A. Hudal, *Die österreichische Vatikanbotschaft 1805–1918* (Munich 1952), 281–84; P. Fernesole, *Pie X* (Paris 1954), II, 440–50; E. Adamov, *Die Diplomatie des Vatikans zur Zeit des Imperialismus* (Berlin 1932), 72–73; P. Renouvin and J. B. Duroselle, *Introduction à l'histoire des relations internationales* (Paris 1964), 235–36, 254–56.

Part Three

The Expansion of Catholic Missions from the Time of Leo XIII until World War II

38. *Missions in the Shadow of Colonialism*

39. *The Development of New Churches*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

R. Streit, *Bibliotheca Missionum* III, XIV, XXV (America); VIII, XXVII (India); IX (Philippines); X (Japan, Korea); XI (Indochina); XII–XIV (China); XVII–XX (Africa); XXI (Australia, Oceania); J. Rommerskirchen, *Bibliografia Missionaria* (Rome 1936ff.); *Acta Leonis XIII,* 8 vols. (Bruges and Paris 1887–1910); *Acta Sanctae Sedis* (*ASS*, Rome 1865–1908); *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (*AAS* Rome 1909ff.); *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide,* 2 vols. (Rome 1907); *Sylloge praecipuorum documentorum recentium Summorum Pontificum et S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* (Rome 1939); J. Glazik, *Päpstliche Rundschreiben über die Mission von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.* (Münsterschwarzach 1961; Lat. and Germ.); E. Marmy and I. Auf der Maur, *Geht hin in alle Welt. Missionsenzykliken der Päpste Benedikt XV., Pius XI., Pius XII. und Johannes XXIII.* (Fribourg 1961).—J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuen Zeit* II (Pius IX, Leo XIII); III (Pius X, Benedict XV); IV (Pius XI) (Munich 1934–39); id., *Katholische Missionsgeschichte* (Steyl 1925); S. Delacroix, *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques* III (*Les missions contemporaines 1800–1957*) (Paris 1958); F. Schwager, *Die katholische Heidenmission der Gegenwart* II (Africa) (Steyl 1908); IV (*Vorderindien und Britisch-Hinterindien*) (Steyl 1909); K. B. Westmann and H. von Sicard, *Geschichte der christlichen Mission* (Munich 1962); Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* V–VII (New York and London 1943–45); id., *Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Christentums,* condensed ed. (Göttingen 1956); A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte. Die Ausbreitung des katholischen Glaubens* (Regensburg 1960); T. Ohm, *Wichtige Daten der Missionsgeschichte* (Münster 1961); B. Arens, *Handbuch der katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1925); H. Bernard-Maître, "China," *DHGE* XII, 693–741; J. Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan* (Tokyo 1959).

INDEX

Aargau, canton 78
Abbelen, Peter 153
Abbeloos 115, 255
Abdul Hamid II, sultan 337, 359
Abel, Heinrich 203
Abhinc duos annos, motu proprio (1913) 412
Accommodation 565f, 575
Acerbo nimis, encyclical (1905) 416
Acquaderni, Giovanni, count 88
Acri 490
Acta Apostolicae Sedis 395
Acta Sanctae Sedis 395
Actio christiana popularis 242
Action of Blondel 317
Action Catholique de la Jeunesse française(ACJF) 515
Action française 212, 246, 387, 470, 473, 476, 512
Action libérale 512
Action populaire 473, 512, 515
Acton, John Emmerich Edward, lord 89
Adames, N., bishop of Luxemburg 118
Ad diem illum, encyclical (1904) 455
Adrian, patriarch of Moscow 352
Aehrenthal, Austrian foreign secretary 51, 55
Aeterni Patris, encyclical (1879) 278, 307ff
Afghanistan 527
Africa 527, 566ff, 570
—Christianization 544ff
Africa Society of the German Catholics 529
Aghtamar, Armenian catholicate 367
Agius, Ambros 541
Agliardi, Antonio, cardinal 23, 48, 52f, 92, 95, 383, 489
Aglipay, Gregorio 540
Aglipayism 540
Agnosticism 458ff
Aïn-Traz, synod (1909) 373
Albani, Medolago 87f, 92, 94f, 484
Albania 185, 188
—Orthodox Church 353, 355, 358
Albertario, Davide 88, 92, 227
Albertines (Poland) 177
Albertus Magnus 308
Alcayaga Godoy, Lucila 134
Alexander, king of Serbia 517
Alexander II, tsar of Russia 167, 172, 347f
Alexander III, pope 18
Alexander III, tsar of Russia 172, 339, 348
Alexander VI, pope 321
Alexandria, Orthodox patriarchate 360
Alexandrian rite, Uniate 374
Alfaro, Eloy 133
Alfieri, A. 490
Allgemeiner Cäcilienverband für die Länder der deutschen Sprache 285
Allioli, Joseph Franz von 325
Allo, O. P. 440
Aloisi Masella, Gaetano, cardinal 58
Alphonso XII, king of Spain 120, 122
Alphonso XIII, king of Spain 122, 124, 125
Alsace-Lorraine 45
—*Kulturkampf* 75
Amantissimae voluntatis, apostolic letter (1895) 141
America, magazine 278
Americanism 155f, 165, 331ff, 421, 424, 431
—modernism 334
Amette, Léon, cardinal 479, 515
Amrhein, Andreas, O.S.B. 273, 530
Analecta Franciscana, 313
Anderledy, Anton Maria, general S.J. 277
Angers, Catholic university 252
Anglican Church
—unification with the Roman Catholic Church 140ff
Anglican ordination 17
Angola 553
Anizan, general of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul 473
Annales de philosophie chrétienne 431, 439, 515
Annali Lateranensi 574
Annum ingressi sumus, apostolic letter (1902) 24, 196
Annum Sacrum, encyclical (1899) 262
Annunzio, Gabriele d' 249
Anselm of Canterbury 416
Anthimos VII, patriarch of Constantinople 359
Anthony Peter IX Hassan, Armenian patriarch, cardinal 376
Anti-Freemason Congress of Trent (1896) 217f
Antimodernism 462ff

Antimodernist oath 170, 174, 429, 463, 504
Antioch
Antioch rite, Uniate 374f
Antiphonal (Antiphonary) 409
Anti-Semitism 48, 218f
—in Austria 204
—in France 106f
Antisocialist law 240
Anti-Socialist League (Belgium) 111
Antonelli, Giacomo, secretary of state 9, 30, 34, 38
Antunes, José Maria 553
Anzengruber, Ludwig 249
Anzer, Johann Baptist, vicar apostolic of South Shantung 536
Apologetics 432ff, 440, 458
Apostolicae curae, bull (1896) 142
Apostolicae Sedis, constitution (1869) 399
Apostolic Camera 398
Apostolic Signature 398
Appel comme d'abus 510
Apponyi, Albert, count 183f
Arcano Divinae Providentiae consilio, brief (1868) 335f
Arcanum, encyclical 209
Architecture, ecclesiastical
—in the 19th and 20th centuries 288ff, 302ff
Arduum sane munus, (1904) 400
A remotissima, decree 401
Argentina 129f
—Catholic university in Buenos Aires 130
Ariens, A. 117
Armenian College 341, 376
Armenians, Armenian Church 366f
—Uniate 376ff
Arnim, Harry, count 41
Arnold, M 445
Art and religion 294, 302
Asociación Católica de propagandistas (Spain) 125
Asquith, H. H. 143, 146
Association Catholique de la jeunesse française (ACJF) 103f, 105, 212
Association de la Jeunesse belge 113
Association des Patrons du Nord (France) 200
Association d'études religieuses 439
Association Internationale Africaine 549
Associazione Cattolica per la libertà della Chiesa 87
Associazioni Cristiane Lavoratori Italiani 232
Assumptionists 280, 341
—in Bulgaria 187, 372
—in France 105f, 508
—in Greece 372
—in Turkey 359
Athanasios, bishop of the Thomas Christians 364
Auersperg, count, Austrian minister 46
Augouard, Ph.-Pr. 548
Augusta, empress of Germany 29, 33, 42, 43
Augustine 312
Augustinans
—in China 536
—on Guam 544
—in the USA 158
Augustinianism 312
Augustinis, A. M. de, S.J. 142
Augustinusverein 216
Au milieu des sollicitudes, encyclical (1892) 16, 102, 237, 238
Aumôniers du travail (Belgium) 229
Australia
—Christianization 544
—development of Catholicism 149f
—elimination of the denominational school system 149
—orders, congregations, and the secular clergy 149f
—the social question 150
Australian Labour Party 150
Austria-Hungary 15, 23, 29, 43, 166, 171, 186f, 192f, 241, 245, 381, 387, 467, 518
—anti-Semitism 219
—Away-from-Rome movement 428
—bishops' nominations 50f
—Catholicism 1914 181ff
—Catholicism and nationalism 517
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 249f
—Catholic organizations 48
—Catholic press 215
—Catholic social movement 222
—Catholic societies 213
—Catholic studies around the turn of the century 253
—Church policy under Franz Joseph 45ff
—civil marriage 45
—concordat 46
—cultural protectorate in the Balkans 342f, 346
—denominational laws (1874) 45f
—elementary school law 45f
—Hungary's church politics and legislation 52
—Italy and the papacy 48f
—language question 182f
—marriage law (1876) 45
—modernism controversy 54
—nationalities, problems of the 49ff
—Neo-Thomism 313ff
—orders 278f
—Orthodox Church 346, 353f
—and outbreak of World War I 520ff
—and papal unification efforts 342f
—political parties of the ethnic groups 183
—religious composition of the mixed population 181
—school question 45
—social democracy 46
—tensions in the monarchy (1878–1914) 45ff
—and Vatican 49f, 520ff
Avolia, G. 453
Ayola, Ángel 125
Azione popolare 387f

Bachem, Julius 215, 429, 502, 504
Baden, *Kulturkampf* 44
Badeni, Kazimierz, count 46f, 175
Badeni crisis 53
Baeumker, Clemens 314f
Bakunin, Mikhail 91
Balmaceda, José 130
Bamberger, Ludwig 35
Bánffy, Dezsö, baron 52f
Barat Sophie 280
Barbier, É. 469f, 475
Barnabò, Alessandro, cardinal 335
Barrios, Justo Rufino 133
Barroso, Antonio, bishop of Oporto 127f
Barrows, J. H. 164
Bartning, A. 294
Bartolini, cardinal 7
Bartolo, Salvatore di 326f
Basel, canton 76, 78
—separation of state and Church 82
Basel-Solothurn, bishopric 12, 78, 79
Basileios I (Mar Ivanios), catholicos of India 365
Basileios III George II, catholicos of the Thomas Christians 365
Basilians 370
Basutoland, Christianization 555
Bataillon, Pierre-Marie, F.S.M., bishop 543
Batiffol, Pierre 253, 323, 410, 432, 435, 437f, 470
Battaini, D. 452
Battenberg, Alexander, prince 186
Baudelaire, Charles 245
Baudri, Friedrich 27
Baudrillart, Henri-Marie-Alfred 253, 331, 385
Bauer, Bruno 325
Bäumer, Suitbert 410
Baumgartner, Alexander, S. J. 252
Baumstark, A. 466
Bavaria 33, 498, 499
—"covert *Kulturkampf*" 44f
—orders 271
—school question 211
Bayley, J. R., archbishop of Baltimore 154
Beauduin, Lambert, O.S.B. 114, 412
Beck, Josef 80, 83
Beckmann, Johannes, S.M.B. 574
Beckx, P.-J., general S.J. 277
Beda College 143
Bede, Venerable 143
Bedeschi, L. 394
Beernaert, Auguste Marie François 109
Bégin, L.-N., archbishop of Quebec 149
Behnam Benni, Cyril, Syrian patriarch 339, 374
Belcredi, Egbert, count 47, 202
Belgian Congo 566
Belgium 7, 201, 241, 519
—anticlericalism 107
—Catholic labor movement 229, 231
—Catholic press 216
—Catholic social movement 109f, 220
—Catholic societies 113
—Congo mission 549f
—conservatism 107ff
—de-Christianization 115, 229
—divorce 109
—Eucharistic congresses 261f
—industrialization 110
—liberal and social Catholicism 109f
—liberalism 108
—orders and congregations 113f
—religious instruction 108
—school question 12, 108f, 210
—state and Church 107ff
Belloc, Hilaire 146
Bellot des Minières, Henri, cardinal 101
Belmonte, see Pignatelli di Belmonte
Benedetti, Pietro 415
Benedict XIV, pope 24, 342
Benedict XV (Giacomo della Chiesa), pope 69, 92, 331, 346, 392, 397, 412, 478f, 491, 517, 567
—and missions 557ff
Benedictines 271–283, 341
—in Australia 544
—in Belgium 114
—in East Africa 558
—in England 136
—founding of monasteries and congregations 271ff
—in Germany 495
Benedictines of St. Ottilien 530
—in East Africa 552
—in Korea 538
Benevento 7f
Benigni, Umberto 54, 83, 392, 469ff, 475, 478, 501f
Bennigsen, Rudolf von 33
Benson, E. W., archbishop of Canterbury 141f
Benziger, A. M., O. Carm., bishop 532
Benzler, W., O.S.B. abbot of Maria Laach 275
Berchtold, Austrian foreign secretary 51
Berdyaev, Nicolas 351
Bergson, Henri 101
Berlin trend 223, 477, 501
Bermyn, Alfons, vicar apostolic 535
Berne, canton 76, 78
Berne, V. 104
Bert, Paul 97, 100
Berthier, Joachim, O.P. 313
Bessarione, pubblicazione periodica di Studi Orientali 341
Bessière, P. 405
Bessieux 548
Bethmann Hollweg, Theobald von 496
Bettinger, Franz von, cardinal 499
Beuron, archabbey, O.S.B. 114, 266, 272
Beuron
—art academy 298, 300
—congregation, O.S.B. 273ff

Bianchi, Angelo, cardinal 390
Bible societies, Protestant 324
Bible translations 325f
Biblical Commission, Pontifical 330, 433, 456, 463
Biblical criticism 325f, 431, 458
—historical-literary 326ff
Biblical exegesis 254, 277, 432ff, 456, 465
"Biblical history" 325
Biblical Institute, Pontifical 277, 465
Biblical movement, Catholic 324
Biblical studies 325
Bielczewski, Jósef, archbishop of Lemberg 176
Bienvenu-Martin, J.-B. 510
Biermann, Benno, O.P. 573
Bigard, Jeanne 529
Bigard, Stéphanie 529
Bilio, L., cardinal 5f, 280
Billot, Louis, S.J. cardinal 252, 311, 312, 323, 327, 458, 470
Birot 460
Bishop, Edmund 448, 466
Bishops' appointments 416
Bismarck, Otto von 4, 12, 14f, 20, 22, 29ff, 32ff, 38, 40f, 43f, 56ff, 62ff, 67ff, 229, 240, 273, 282, 496, 530
Bitter, Rudolf 501
Blanc, vicar apostolic of Korea 537
Blanco, Guzmán, president of Venezuela 132
Blome, Gustav, count 204
Blondel, Maurice 248, 312, 317f, 431, 438, 450, 453, 457f, 512
Blum, Nikolaus, S.V.D. 282
Blum, Peter Joseph, bishop of Limburg 40, 66
Boccali, G. 68, 208
Bohemia 181f
Böhm, Dominikus 294, 305
Boisserée, Sulpiz 291f
Bojanowski, Edward 180
Bolívar, Simón 134
Bolivia 131
Bollandists 471
Bonatelli, Francesco 490
Bonaventure 312
Bone, H. 265
Bonghi, R. 86
Bonne Presse 105f
Bonner Bibel 477
Bonomelli, Geremia, bishop of Cremona 85f, 90, 276, 417, 424, 454, 471, 486, 490
Bonomi 486
Borneo 541
Borromeo encyclical 505f
Bosco, Giovanni 258
Boselli 491
Bosnia 45, 181ff, 517
—Serbian Orthodox exarchate 354
Bottini, L. 88
Boulanger, Georges 101
Bouquillon, Thomas 159
Bourdon, Hilaire, see Tyrrell, George
Bourget, J., bishop of Montreal 147
Bourget, Paul 101, 247
Bourne, Francis, cardinal 143, 447
Bouvier, P., S.J. 465
Boxer Rebellion 535
Boyer de Sainte-Suzanne, R. de 436
Brandi, S.J. 482
Brandts, Franz 204, 213, 222
Brauns, H. 231
Braunsberg controversy 32
Brazil 129ff
—orders and congregations 131
—state and Church 130f
Brazilian congregation O.S.B. 275
Breadbasket law (1875) 41
Bremond, Henri 437f, 445, 471
Brentano, Clemens 250
Breslau, bishopric 63
Bressan 390, 470
Brest, Union of 369
Breviary reform of Pius X 389, 410ff
Briand, Aristide 516
Brinkmann, Johannes Bernhard, bishop of Münster 40f, 66
British Empire, see Great Britain
Britten, James 138
Broglie, A.-T.-P. de 253
Brohée, A. 113
Brotherhood and Sisterhood of the Reconciliation 344
Brotherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Poland) 177
Brück, H. 258
Bruckner, Anton 286
Brun, Lucien 102
Brunetière, Ferdinand 247, 250
Brüning, Heinrich 502
Buddhism 570
Budka, Niceta, bishop 344
Bukovina, Orthodox Church 346, 353
Bulgakov, Serge 351
Bulgaria 186f, 188
—orders and congregations 187
—Orthodox Church 346, 354ff
Bulgarians, Uniate 341, 372
Bulletin de la semaine 515
Bülow, Bernhard von, prince 385f, 494, 496, 518
Buonaiuti, Ernesto 450ff, 455, 462, 490
Burma, Christianization 533
Burnes-Jones, Edward 299
Busch, Clemens August 64
Busen, Hermann 305
Byzantine rite, Uniates of the 369ff

Cabrières, Anatole de, bishop of Montpellier 513
Cabrini, Francesca Saveria 151
Cabrol, O.S.B. 466
Cahensly, Peter Paul 151f, 160
Caillaux, Joseph 518

Cairo, synod of the Uniate Copts (1898) 374
Cajetan 310f
Calippe, Charles 104
Caloen, Gérard van, O.S.B. 131, 266, 272, 275
Cambon, Paul 99
Canada
—Anglo-Canadian Catholicism 148f
—anti-Jesuitism 149
—Catholic press 216
—Franco-Canadian Catholicism 147f
— — school controversy 148
—orders 148
Canalejas, J. 125
Canet, Louis 516
Canonica, senator 90
Canonizations 267
Canon law
—Pius X's codification 389, 394, 399ff
Canova, Andreas, O.F.M.Cap., vicar apostolic of Plovdiv-Sofia 187
Cánovas de Castillo, Antonio 4, 120ff, 124
Cantú, Cesare 89
Capecelatro, Alfonso, cardinal 90, 479, 490
Capéran, Louis 97, 106
Capital and labor 198, 203ff, 206
Capitalism 196ff, 203
Capponi, Gino 89
Caprivi, Leo von, count 494, 497
Capuchins 270, 341
—in Bulgaria 187
—in Dutch East India 541
—in Georgia 373
—on Guam 543
—in India 533
Cardauns, H. C. 429
Cardijn, J. 113
Carducci, Giosuè 248f
Caritas, relief activities 260
Carlists 119, 122f, 125
Carlos I, king of Portugal 126f
Carmelites 341
—in India 532, 568
Carmona, Antonio Oscar de Fragoso 127
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 519
Caroline Islands 15, 20, 69, 71, 530
Caron, J. 475
Carpathian Ukrainians 183f
Carrera, president of Guatemala 133
Carrie, H. 553
Casanova y Estrada, archbishop in Guatemala 133
Casas, bishop of Plasencia 121
Casati, A. 490
Casetta, Francesco di Paola, cardinal 479
Casolani, Annetto 548
Casoni, G. B. 88
Castro, Cipriano 132
Catechetical societies 417
Catechism 324
—Pius X's 416f
Catechism, instruction 389, 416f
Catholic Action 389, 418, 472
Catholic Association 139
Catholic Boy Scouts 139
Catholic Confederation 139
Catholic conventions
—Austrian 49
—German 191f, 202
— — Frankfurt (1863) 232
— — Bamberg (1868) 285
— — Düsseldorf (1869) 229
— — Mainz (1871) 27
— — Aachen (1879) 211, 253
— — Cologne (1895) 231
— — Bonn (1900) 231
— — Essen (1906) 503
— — Mainz (1911) 230f
— — Metz (1913) 216
Catholic Evidence Guild 137
Catholicism
—Catholic press 215ff
—Catholic societies 212ff
—development in modern society 190ff
—image of the enemy 216ff
—marriage and family 208f
—position in the culture around the turn of the century 245ff
—scholarly works 252ff
— — see also Congresses
—school questions 209ff
—social theories 199ff
—see also Doctrine of property, Toleration, Ghetto Catholicism, and the various countries
Catholicisme social 191
Catholic League (France) 103
Catholic movement(s) 190, 219ff
—see also the various countries
Catholic People's Union (the Netherlands) 117
Catholic Social Association (Poland) 177
Catholic Social Guild 139
Catholic Truth Society 137
Catholic University of America 155, 159
Catholic Women's League 139
Catholic Young Men's Society of Great Britain 139
Cathrein, Viktor, S.J. 198
Cavagnis, Felice, cardinal 243
Cavallanti, A. 467
Cecilianism 294f
Center Party, German 12, 26ff, 33, 35f, 37f, 42f, 56f, 59ff, 193f, 213, 215f, 240, 381, 423, 496ff, 501, 518
—and Curia 59ff
—and *Kulturkampf* 62ff, 74
—and septennate controversy 71f
Central Africa 548
Cercles catholiques d'ouvriers 227
Cerna, president of Guatemala 133
Cerretti, B., cardinal 150, 491, 516
Cerutti 220

Chabot, Jean-Baptiste 465
Chaldeans, Uniate 341, 375ff
Chaminade, Buillaume Joseph 264
Chapon, Henri, bishop of Nice 516
Charity 259
Charles, Pierre, S.J. 574
Châteaubriand, François René Vicomte de 191, 246
Chatel, F. 403
Chesnelong, Charles 102
Chesterton, G. K. 146
Chiaudano, P. 479
Chiesa, Giacomo della, see Benedict XV
Chigi, Flavio, cardinal, nuncio 5
Childhood of Jesus 563
Chile 129f
China 23, 564, 568ff
—Christianization 534ff
Chlysty 348
Chmielowski, Adam 177
Chomjakov, Alexei 351
Chorale, see Gregorian chant
Christ Catholic Church of Switzerland 77
Christian Brothers (Brothers of the Christian Schools) 279, 341
Christian democracy 215, 224ff, 231f, 499ff
Christian Democratic League (Italy) 489
Christian philosophy 307ff
Christian Scientists 279, 341
Christian social doctrine 244
Christian Socialism 206, 242
Christian Socialist Party (Austria) 48, 200ff, 222
Christian trade unions (Germany) 213
—see also Trade-union controversy
Christi nomen, papal letter (1894) 339
Christlich-Pädagogische Blätter 417
Chronique du Sud-Est 104, 512
Chrysostomos Papadopulos, Orthodox archbishop of Athens 358
Chulalongkorn, king of Siam 533
Church architecture, see Architecture, ecclesiastical
Church history 318ff
—journals 465
—theoretical concept at the time of Leo XIII 319ff
Church hymns 283
Church interior design 296ff
Church laws, Prussian 36f
Church music 283ff, 407ff
—controversy over church music 283ff
—reform under Pius X 389
Church of Chernovtsy 346, 354
Church of Karlowitz 346, 353f
Church of Sibiu 346, 353
Church union
—efforts toward unification with Orthodoxy 335ff
—journals in the service of unification with Orthodoxy 341f
Ciencia Cristiana 119
Ciencia tomista 122
Cigala, A. de 520
Circoli universitari cattolici (Italy) 87
Círculos Católicos Obreros (Spain) 124
Cittadino di Brescia 92
Ciudad de Dios 122
Civil marriage 39, 208
Civiltà cattolica 450f, 478, 479, 482, 518
Claret y Clará, Antonius Maria 264
Claudel, Paul 247
Clemenceau, Georges 516
Clemens, Franz Friedrich Jakob 313
Clement of Alexandria 310
Clergy, native, in missionary areas 261, 567f
Cleveland, Grover, president of the USA 13
Coalition, right of workers to form a 207, 223f
Coconnier, T. 313
Codex Iuris Canonici, see Canon law
Coenobium 454
Colapietra, R. 387
Collegio Pio latino-americano 127f
Collegium pro gente croatica 185
Cologne, archbishopric 66f
Cologne Cathedral 291f
Cologne event (1837) 250
Cologne trend 477, 501f
Colombia, separation of state and Church 132
Colomiatti, E. 400
Colonialism and mission 527
Combes, Émile 507ff
Comboni, Daniel 551
Comitati cattolici parrochiali 87
Comité Justice-Égalité 105
Comma johanneum 433
Commer, Ernst 313, 429, 457, 467
Communion 267
—for children 389, 404
—first 404
—frequent 389, 403ff
Community church 302ff
Communium rerum, encyclical (1909) 416
Comte, Auguste 134
Conaty, Thomas 158f
Conditae a Christo, constitution (1900) 283, 399
Confederación Nacional de los Círculos Católicos Obreros (Mexico) 134
Confédération des Syndicats chrétiens (Belgium) 112
Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens (CFTC), France 228
Conforti, Guido M., bishop of Parma 559, 562
Congo 566
—Christianization 548
Congregations
—of Bishops and Regulars 396f
—of the Consistory 397
—for the Eastern Churches 528
—for the Propagation of the Faith 396f

—of Religious 283
—of Rites 397
—of the Sacraments 397
Congregations (religious communities) 279, 282
—and canonizations 258
Congregation of St. Ottilien, O.S.B. 273
Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary
—in Belgian Congo 549
Congregazioni di carità 86
Congresses, Catholic 191
—international Catholic scholars 254ff
Congress of Berlin (1878) 4, 187
Congruist law (1898) 47
Connelly, Cornelia 137
Consejo Nacional de las Corporaciones Obrero-Católicas (Spain) 124f
Conservative People's Party of Switzerland 82
Consolata missionaries 529
—in Kenya 552
Constantinople
—Armenian patriarchate 366f
—Orthodox patriarchate 358ff
— — and the Roman unification efforts 359
— — and the three smaller Orthodox patriarchal churches 360ff
Controversy over rites 565
Conventuals (O.F.M.C.) 270
—in Bulgaria 187
—in Rumania 186
Coppée, François 246
Cornelius, Peter von 297f
Cornely, Rudolf, S.J. 330
Cornoldi, G., S.J. 310
Corporations 203
Corpus Christi fraternities 259
Corpus Iuris Canonici 400
Corradini 518
Correspondance de Rome 54
Corrigan, Michael R., archbishop 156, 159ff, 164f, 333
Costa, Joaquín 248
Costantini, Celso 564, 566
Coullié, Pierre, cardinal 106, 515
Counter Reformation 28f
Crampon, C. 325
Crétinon, L. 104
Crispi, Francesco 15, 50, 73, 86
Critical Catholicism, see Reform Catholicism
Critical method 277, 420, 431ff
Croatian college 185
Croatians, Croatia 13, 182, 184
—orders and congregations 185
Crom, architect 293
Cronenberg, E. 230
Cros, L., S.J. 403
Csáky, Albin, count 52
Cuba, War of Independence 123
Cullen, Paul, cardinal 144, 149
Cultura sociale 93, 452
Culture examination 36f, 62, 63
Cum singulae, decree (1911) 401
Curia
—and Leo XIII's unification efforts 342
—reorganization by Pius X 389, 394ff
Curci, C. M. 86
Cybichowski, suffragan bishop of Gnesen 178
Cyprus 361
Cyril, Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem 362
Cyril, Saint 336
Cyril II, Orthodox archbishop of Cyprus 361
Cyril IV, Coptic patriarch 365
Cyril V, Coptic patriarch 365
Cyril VIII Geha, Melchite patriarch 344, 372
Cyril Makarios, patriarch of the Uniate Copts 373
Cyril Mar Curilos, head of Jacobite Thomas Christians 364
Cyrion, patriarch of Georgia 353
Czechs 181

Dadolle, Pierre 515
Daens, A. 111ff
Dalmatia 183f, 345
—Orthodox Church 345
Damianos, Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem 362
Dandoy, G. 569
Danilo I, Orthodox metropolitan of Cetinje 357
Danilo II, Orthodox metropolitan of Cetinje and prince of Montenegro 357
Dannecker, Johann Heinrich von 301
Dar es Salaam, bishops' conference (1912) 552f
Das neue Jahrhundert, journal of the German modernists 429
Daudet, Léon 520
Davis, Cushman C. 152
De Actione populari christiana seu democratico-christiana, instruction (1902) 234
Dechamps, Victor-Auguste, cardinal 108, 114, 261
Decurtins, Kaspar 80f, 82f, 200, 207, 457, 472
De fide catholica, constitution 5
Deharbe, Joseph, S.J. 417
Dehio, Georg 292
Dei providentis, motu proprio (1917) 346, 560
De Lai, Gaetano, cardinal 390, 397, 398, 401, 457
Delattre, A., S.J. 330, 333, 456
Delbos, V. 460
Delcassé, Théophile 509
Delehaye, Hippolyte, S.J. 322
Della Torre 390
Delle Piane 564
Demain 438
Demetrios II, Coptic patriarch 365
Democracy 233ff, 240ff, 420, 471ff
Denbigh, Earl of 139

Denifle, Heinrich, O.P. 314
Denis, Maurice 298f, 300
Denisovič, Stefan Anton, apostolic administrator of Mogilev 171
Depelchin, Henri, S.J. 554
Deploige 464
De quotidiana SS. Eucharistiae sumptione, decree (1905) 404f
Der Gral 428, 501
De Santi, A., S.J. 407ff
Desbuquois, P. 515
Desclée family 272
Descoqs, P., S.J. 316
Deshayes, F. 400
Deutscher Caritas-Verband 260
Deveuster, Damian 543
Díaz, Carmelita 133
Díaz, Porfirio, president of Mexico 133
Dietz, Peter E. 164
Dillon, E. J. 442
Dinder, Julius, archbishop of Gnesen-Posen 13, 74, 178
Dindinger, Johannes, O.M.I. 572
Diocesan prayer books 266
Dionysius V, metropolitan of the Thomas Christians 364
Dionysius VI, metropolitan of the Thomas Christians 364
Di Pietro, Angelo, cardinal 3, 71f, 128
Discalced friars 270
Disraeli, Benjamin 4, 139
Diuturnum illud, encyclical (1881) 20, 235, 237
Divino afflante Spiritu, encyclical (1943) 330
Divino afflatu, bull (1911) 411
Divinum illud munus, encyclical (1897) 340
Divus Thomas 311
Döbbing, Bernhard, O.F.M., bishop of Nepi and Sutri 415, 506
Doctrine, church 325, 438, 440, 457, 500, 502
—and theology 307ff
Doctrine of property 196ff, 203
—natural law and special property 196f
Dogmatic history 323, 434ff, 465
Dölger, Franz Joseph 465
Döllinger, Ignaz von 77, 322
Dominicans 275ff, 341, 568, 573
—in Annam 534
—and Bible exegesis 327ff
—and Catholic university, Fribourg 83f
—in China 535
—on Formosa 536
—in Japan 538
—in the Philippines 541
Dominican sisters, South Africa 555
Doutreloux, bishop of Liège 117f, 114, 229, 261, 337, 340
Dreyfus affair 106, 507f, 518
Drobe, Kaspar, bishop of Paderborn 65, 67
Drummond, Lister 137
Drumont, Édouard Jouard 106
Druses 372, 385, 361, 375
Duchesne, Louis 140f, 253, 256, 319, 322f, 390, 410, 431f, 448, 463, 471, 511f
Dukhobors 348
Duff, Alexander 571
Duhamel, J.-T. archbishop of Ottawa 148
Duilhé de Saint-Projet 254, 315
Dunajewski, Albin, cardinal 176
Dunin, Martin, archbishop of Gnesen-Posen 177
Duns Scotus 311
Dupanloup, Félix, bishop of Orléans 147
Duparquet, C. A. 553
Dupin, A. 462
Dupont, Joseph, S.M.A., bishop of Nyasa 554
Duport, Émile 103, 220
Dupront, A. 440
Durand, Louis 103, 220
Dusmet, Giuseppe Benedetto, O.S.B., cardinal 274, 337
Dutch East India 541
Dyroff, Adolf 429

Ea semper, bull 343
Eastern Churches, independent 335ff, 346ff, 367f
—Latinization 337f, 343
—Uniate 335ff, 346
East Marches Society 178
Eberhard, Matthias, bishop of Trier 40f
Échos d'Orient 372
École biblique, Jerusalem 329
École de Lyon 512
Ecuador 131ff
—state and Church 131ff
Editae saepe, encyclical (1910) 505f
Editio Leonina 277, 309f
Egger, Augustin 82
Ehrhard, Albert 54f, 254f, 322, 424, 426f, 428, 452, 461, 503
Ehrle, Franz, S.J., cardinal 307, 309, 312, 314f, 319, 410
Eichendorff, Joseph von 250
Eichhorn, R. 203
Eichmann, E. 429
Eigenmann, J. G. 553
Einsiedeln, abbey O.S.B. 77, 272
Eisenach Regulations 294
—civil marriage 133
Elementary school law 47
Elia, Pasquale d', S.J. 573
Elias XII Abolionan, patriarch of the Uniate Nestorians 375
Elias Mellus, Chaldean bishop of Accra 376
Elizabeth I, queen of Great Britain 140
Elliot, Walter 164, 332
Ellis, J. T. 156, 159
Emaus, abbey O.S.B. 273
Engelberg, monastery O.S.B. 77
Engels, E., see Tyrrell, George

Engels, Friedrich 229
English Church Union 140
English Ladies, in Rumania 186
Episcopate 41, 416f
—indigenous in missionary areas 561, 567f
Equal Rights Association (Canada) 149
Equal rights for women 209
Equatorial Africa, Christianization 548
Erdington, abbey O.S.B. 273
Erp, Baron d' 340
Erzberger, Matthias 496f, 499, 518
Eschatological school 434
Eskimos, Christianization 567
Estrada Cabrera, president of Guatemala 133
Estudios franciscanos 122
Ethiopians, Ethiopian Church 365f
—Uniate 374
Etschmiadzin, Armenian catholicate 366
Études 248
Études bibliques 329
Eucharist 267
—congregations and fraternities of 262
—frequent Communion 403ff
Eucharistic Children's Crusade 406f
Eucharistic congresses 192, 405f
—beginnings of the Eucharistic Congress movement 260f
—Avignon (1876) 260
—Favernay (Besançon)(1878) 261
—Lille (1881) 261
—Liège (1883) 261f
—Fribourg (1885) 261
—Paris (1888) 261
—Jerusalem (1893) 261, 337, 406
—Brussels (1898) 261
—Rome (1905) 404, 406
—Metz (1907) 406f
—Bogotá (1908) 132
—London (1908) 143, 406
—Cologne (1909) 406
—Montreal (1910) 149, 406f
—Madrid (1911) 125, 406f
—Vienna (1912) 406f
—La Valetta (Malta)(1913) 406
—Lourdes (1914) 406f
—Amsterdam (1924) 270, 262
Eucharistic triduum 405
Eucken, Rudolf 454
Evangelischer Bund (Germany) 75, 213
Evolutionism 321, 322, 431, 454
Exegesis, see Biblical exegesis
Expatriation law (1874) 39
Expressionism 299, 301
Ex quo, apostolic letter (1910) 344

Faith 458
Falconi 389
Falk, Adalbert 33f, 36, 38, 61
Family 200, 208
Fanna, Fidelis a 313
Farmers, associations 219f
Fascio democratico cristiano 94
Fascism and the Church 492f
Fathers of the Holy Cross
—in India 533
—in Portuguese West Africa 547
—on Madagascar 556
Faulhaber, Michael von, cardinal 500
Federer, Heinrich (Senex) 83
Feigenwinter, Ernst 80f
Felicitate quadam, constitution (1897) 270
Female labor 209
Feodorov, Leonid, exarch for Russia 370
Ferdinand I, tsar of Bulgaria 186
Férotin 466
Ferrari, Andrea, cardinal 468, 473
Ferrata, Domenico, cardinal 16, 22, 79, 102, 109, 114, 240, 520
Ferrini, Contardo 258, 490
Ferry, Jules 97, 101, 210
Fèvre, J. 385
Fiala, Friedrich, bishop of Basel-Solothurn 80
Filles de Notre-Dame 279
Fine, S.J. 479
Finke, Heinrich 429
First Communion 404
Fischer, Antonius, cardinal 499, 503f, 505, 506
Flandrin, Hippolyte 298
Fleming, P., O.F.M. 331, 433, 456
Flemish Christian People's Party (Belgium) 112
Fletcher, Philip 137
Florentini, Anton Krispin (Theodosius), O.F.M.Cap. 77, 232
Fogazzaro, Antonio 83, 248, 453f, 457, 490
Fonck, Leopold, S.J. 329
Fonsegrive-Lespinasse, G.-P. 247f
Fontaine, J., S.J. 433, 468
Fontes, Antonio Maria de 126
Forensen law (1894) 47
Förster, Heinrich, prince-bishop of Breslau 31, 40f
Fort Augustus (Scotland), abbey O.S.B. 273
Fortescue 466
Foucauld, Charles de 267, 546
Fournelle 225
Fracassini, Umberto 449f, 455, 462, 490
France 11, 13, 15, 24, 27, 29, 53f, 65, 193, 201f, 237ff, 239f, 242ff, 421, 465, 473, 497, 518, 522, 527
—anticlericalism 508ff
—anti-Semitism 106f, 218f
—Catholic associations 212
—Catholicism and nationalism 518
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 245f
—Catholic labor movement 226f
—Catholic press 216
—Catholics fail to reconcile with the Republic 96ff
—Catholic social movement 221f

—Catholic universities 252, 254
— — attempts and failure to reconcile (1892–99) 103ff
— — politics of reconciliation (1878–92) 100ff
— — republican Church policy 96ff
—charity 259
—Christian democracy 104ff
— — "second Christian democracy" 104
—Christian trade-union movement 228
—Church architecture 289ff, 295, 313
— — new art forms 305
—Church art 296f
—Church music 283
—clergy, episcopate, and laymen 98f
—de-Christianization 239
— — in the rural areas 257
—diocesan associations 516
—divorce (*Loi Naquet*) 97
—Eucharistic Congresses 260f
—integralism 477f
—missionary politics 530
—missionary societies 529f
—modernism 431f
—Neo-Thomism 315
—orders and religious associations 96f, 105f, 278, 507ff
—*Ralliement,* see *Ralliement*
—school question, school controversy 97, 100f, 210, 514
—secularization of public life 96
—separation of state and Church 107, 506ff
— — circumstances during the voting on the separation law (1899–1905) 507ff
— — execution of the separation law (1906–24) 511ff
— — papal efforts toward unification 342f
— — Pius X and separation of state and Church 386
—state and Church 96ff, 507ff
Franchi, Alessandro, cardinal secretary of state 5f, 22, 56, 59, 68
Franciscans 316, 568, 573
—in Albania 188
—in Bolivia 131
—in Japan 538
—in Poland 174
—reorganization 270f
Franciscans, female, in Dutch East India 541
Franck, César 284
Franckenstein, Georg Arbogast von, baron 71
Franco-Prussian War 27
Franz I, emperor of Austria-Hungary 175
Franzelin, Johann Baptist S.J., cardinal
Franz Ferdinand, archduke of Austria-Este 51, 522
Franz Joseph I, emperor of Austria-Hungary 45, 47, 48f, 53f, 55f, 175, 274, 353, 387, 520ff
Freemasonry 24, 216ff, 263
—in the USA 160f
Freiburg im Breisgau, archbishopric 75
Freie Vereinigung katholischer Sozialpolitiker 207
Freitag, Anton, S.D.V. 573f
Frémont, G. 99, 460
Freppel, C.-E., bishop of Angers 108, 228, 236, 255
Frère-Orban 107ff, 114
Frères des Écoles chrétiennes 509
Fresco painting 297ff
Fribourg, canton 76
—university 252
Friedberg, Emil A. 36, 400
Friedrich, Caspar David 297f
Friedrich Wilhelm, crown prince of Prussia 58f
Friedrich Wilhelm IV, king of Prussia 291f
Frühwirth, Andreas, O.P., cardinal 276, 280f, 429, 504
Fuchs, Karl, S.J. 554
Führich, Johann 297
Funk, Franz Xaver von 322, 429
Funk, Philipp 429f
Fulda, bishopric 40f, 63, 65
Fulda memorandum (1872) 35f, 37
Furati, Filippo 227
Fustel de Coulenges 246

Gabet, P. 567
Galicia 175ff, 181, 345, 369
—development of Polish Catholicism under Austria 175ff
—Polish education 176
Galimberti, Luigi, cardinal 22, 57, 68f, 70ff, 339
Gallarati Scotti, T. 460, 490
Gallien, Carlo 337f
Gambetta, Léon 14, 96
García Moreno, Gabriel, president of Ecuador 132f
Gardaia, prefecture 546
Gardeil, Ambroise, O.P. 466
Garnie, Théodore 103f
Gasoni, Pius X's private secretary 390
Gasparri, Pietro, cardinal 92, 95, 142, 232, 253, 390, 398, 400ff, 403, 491
Gasquet, F. A., O.S.B. 141f
Gaudeau, B. 469f
Gaudí, Antonio 305
Gayraud, Hippolyte 104, 106, 219
Gemelli, Agostino, O.F.M. 464, 490
Geneva, canton 76, 78f
—Geneva question 12
—separation of state and Church 82
Génicot, E., S.J. 403
Gennari, Casimiro, cardinal 400, 403, 457
Genocchi, Giovanni 399, 449f, 453, 456, 464, 490
Georg V Surenian, Armenian catholicos 367
Georgia, Georgians
—orthodox Church 346, 352f
—Uniate 373, 377
George, Henry 156f, 164

Georgievski, Evlogi, Orthodox bishop 174, 349
Germania 215
German Idealism 317
German question 15
German Roman Catholic Central Society (USA) 153, 164
Germanos V, patriarch of Constantinople 359
Germanos Moakkad, Melchite archbishop of Baalbek 373
Germany, German Empire 12, 14, 20, 54, 56, 193, 201, 241, 243, 309, 421, 467, 517, 527
—antimodernist oath 464
—Catholicism and nationalism 517
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 250f
—Catholicism between the *Kulturkampf* and World War I 494
—Catholic labor associations 230f, 499ff
—Catholic labor movement 229ff
—Catholic press 215
—Catholic research around the turn of the century 253f
—Catholic social movement 219ff
— — farmers 220
— — middle class 221
—Catholic societies 212ff, 498
—charity 259
—Christian trade unions 229f
—Church architects 290ff
— — new art forms 305
—Church art 299f
—Church music 283f
—episcopal elections 495
—founding of the Empire (1871) 27
—industrialization 221
—*Kulturkampf,* see *Kulturkampf*
—liberalism 500
—missionary societies 529f
—modernism and integralism 476f
—nationalities in conflict in the eastern regions 177ff
—Neo-Thomism 313ff
—orders 278
—politics, Poland 177f
—Reform Catholicism 422ff
—school question 210
—State and Church 26ff
—state, Church, and school politics in the Prussian sector of Poland 177ff
—worship 257
Gesellenverein of A. Kolping 214, 221
Gezelle, Guido 115, 246
"Ghetto Catholicism" 10, 245
Gibbons, James, cardinal 152, 153ff, 156ff, 161ff, 163ff, 195, 331ff
Gibney, M. 150
Gies, Ludwig 300
Giner de los Ríos, Francisco 123
Gintovt, Kazimierz, archbishop of Mogilev 168
Gioberti, Vincenzo 8, 89
Giolitti, Giovanni 482, 486, 487, 488, 489, 492
Gisler, A. 83
Gismondi, P. 456
Gladstone, William Ewart 4, 13, 135, 139, 144ff
Glaire, Jean-Baptiste 325
Glass painting 298f
Gleich, Hermann 65
Glubovski, N. N. 351
Gneist, Rudolf 36
Gnesen-Posen, archbishopric 66f, 69, 73
Godts, P., C.S.S.R. 403
Goettsberger, Johannes 329
Goetz, Walter 14
Golubinsky, E. E. 351
Goluchowski, Agenor, count 175
Gonin, L., premier of Quebec 149
Gonin, M. 104
González, Ceferino, bishop of Córdoba 124
González, Joaquín V. 130
Goossens, Pierre-Lambert, cardinal 109, 112f, 114f, 261
Görres, Johann Joseph von 89, 253, 291f
Görres-Gesellschaft 75, 253, 255, 291f
Gortšakov Alexander, prince 167
Goßler, Gustav von 63, 72
Gothic architecture 290ff
Gotti, Antonio, O.Carm.Disc., cardinal 381ff
Gounod, Charles 284
Goyau, Georges 191, 573
Grabmann, Martin 312f, 314f
Graduals 287f, 409
Grande munus christiani nominis propagandi, encyclical (1880) 336
Grandmaison, Léonce de, S.J. 437, 440, 463, 466
Grand Orient, lodge
—in Canada 149
Gran Oriente Lusitano Unido, Portuguese Freemason lodge 126
Grauert, Hermann von 250, 255, 320, 424f, 429
Graves de communi, encyclical (1901) 21, 95, 233f, 242
Gravissimo officio, encyclical (1906) 514
Great Britain 13f, 135, 194, 386, 421, 527
—Anglo-Catholics 139f
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 245
—Catholic self-consciousness 135ff
—Catholic societies 139
—Church art 299
—dockworkers' strike (1889) 138
—missionary policies 531
—modernism 441ff
—orders 279
—orders and the secular clergy 137
—problem of unification of the Roman Catholic and the Anglican Church 139ff
—religious instruction 143
—religious liberalism 442

—school system, school question 136, 143, 211f
—social question 135, 138ff
—trade unions 138f
Greece 186, 188f
—Orthodox Church 346, 354, 357f
—state and Church 357
Greeks, Uniate 341, 372
Gregorian chant (chorale) 284f, 286ff, 407ff
Gregorian Society (Netherlands) 286
Gregorios, patriarch of Constantinople 335
Gregory I the Great, pope 18, 413
Gregory IV, patriarch of Antioch 361
Gregory IX, pope 18
Gregory XIII, pope 376
Gregory XVI, pope 7f, 11, 144
Gregory II Jessef Sayyur, Melchite patriarch 336, 338, 372
Greith, Karl Johann, bishop of St. Gall 76, 80
Grenier, J., S.J. 147
Greving, J. 320
Grillparzer, Franz 249
Gröber, Adolf 497
Grosoli, Giovanni, count 88, 473, 483
Grottaferrata, Basilian abbey 372
Gruber, H. J., S.J. 218
Gruscha, Anton Joseph, cardinal, prince-archbishop of Vienna 46, 48, 200
Guadalupe, place of pilgrimage in Mexico 133
Guatemala 133f
Guépin, abbot O.S.B. 411
Guéranger, Prosper Louis Pascal, O.S.B. 266, 271, 275, 287
Guevara, archbishop of Venezuela 132
Guichard, V. 96
Guilbert, bishop of Bordeaux 99
Guilds 19
Gul, Gerhard, Old Catholic bishop of Utrecht 175
Gundlach, Gustav, S.J. 203, 207
Gurlitt, Cornelius 302
Gutberlet, Konstantin 313

Haberl, Franz Xaver 287, 409
Habsburg, House of 28f
Hacks, Charles 218f
Haerent animo, exhortation (1908) 414
Haffner, Paul Leopold, bishop of Mainz 75, 251, 313
Hagen, Johann Georg, S.J. 254
Hagg, John, Maronite patriarch 339
Hague, peace conference (1899) 20
Hahn-Hahn Ida, countess 214
Halifax, Charles Wood 140ff, 340
Halka-Ledóchowski, see Ledóchowski
Haller, Michael 284
Handel-Mazzetti, Enrica von 54, 83, 249
Hannington, Anglican bishop in Uganda 551
Hansjakob, Heinrich 251
Harmel, Léon 222f, 228, 478
Harnack, Adolf von 433f, 450
Harrison, Benjamin, president of the USA 159f
Hartmann, Anastasius, bishop 574
Hartmann, F. von, archbishop of Cologne 213
Hayward, Fernand 11
Hébert, Marcel 431f
Hecker, Isaac Thomas 155, 332, 423
Hefele, Karl Joseph von, bishop of Rottenburg 45, 322
Heiler, F. 438
Heiligkreuz 282
Heinrich, Johann Baptist 313
Helfert, J. A. von 253
Helleputte, G. 111, 113, 220, 229
Hemptinne, Hildebrand de, O.S.B. 114, 274
Henninghaus, A. vicar apostolic 536
Herbart, Johann Friedrich 417
Herder, Johann Gottfried von 250
Hergenröther, Joseph, cardinal 280, 318
Herrera Restrepo, archbishop of Bogotá 132
Herriot, É. 516
Herrmann, Alois 45
Hertling, Georg von 206, 223, 250, 253, 255, 314, 424, 497, 498
Herzegovina 45
Herzog, Eduard 78f
Herzog, G. 462
Herzog, Robert, prince-bishop of Breslau 65
Hesse-Darmstadt
—*Kulturkampf* 44, 75
—school question 219
Hettinger, Franz 313, 500
Heylen, bishop of Namur 403
Hierotheos II, patriarch of Alexandria 360
Hinduism 569
Hinschius, Paul 36
Hintze Ribeiro 126
Hirscher, Johann Baptist 75, 423
Hispanidad 248
Historical method 431ff
Historisch-Politische Blätter 502
Hittorf, Jakob Ignaz 290
Hitze, Franz 204f, 213, 222, 230f
Hlinka, Andrej 183
Hochland 83, 252, 427f, 501f, 502f
Hofbauer, Klemens Maria, C.S.S.R. 258
Hofmannsthal, Hugo von 249
Hogan, John 414
Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, Gustav Adolf zu, prince cardinal 34f, 61, 64, 494, 497
Hohoff, Wilhelm 205
Holbein, Hans 297
Holnstein, count 58
Holy Family, devotion 265f
Holy Ghost Fathers 529
—in East Africa 552
—in Equatorial Africa 548
—in Germany 494
—in West Africa 547
Holy Scriptures 325, 457f

—see also Biblical exegesis
Holy Synod 347ff
Holzer, Karl Josef 65
Hoonacker, A. van 330
Hopkins, G. M., S.J. 146
Hort, F. J. A. 325
Höting, Bernhard, bishop of Osnabrück 65
Houtin, Albert 431, 436, 450
Huayek, Elias Peter, patriarch of the Uniate Maronites 339, 375
Hübner, Joseph Alexander, baron 49
Hübsch, Heinrich 294
Huby, P. 465
Hudal, Alois 520
Hüffer, H. 255
Hügel, Friedrich von 424, 429, 436, 442ff, 447f, 453, 455, 463
Hugo, Victor 147, 246, 290
Hülskamp, Franz 251
Hulst, Maurice d' 104, 253ff, 279, 315, 323f, 327, 331, 511
Human rights 199, 236
Humanum genus, encyclical (1884) 148, 160, 217
Humbeeck, van 108
Humboldt, Wilhelm von 250
Hummelauer, Franz von, S.J. 329f, 331
Hungary 13, 181f
—*Kulturkampf* 51f
—liturgy 51f
—Magyarization politics 183
—Orthodox Church 353ff
—religious instruction 183
—Uniate Ruthenians 370
—Uniates 345, 371f
Hunt, William Holman 299
Huonder, Anton, S.J. 571
Hussarek, Max von 47, 50
Huvelin, Abbé 444

Iconography, Christian 297
Iglesia Católica Filipina Independiente 540f
Iglesias, Pablo 120
Ignatius XXXVI Ebd' Allah III, Jacobite patriarch 364
Ignatius XXXVI Peter III, Jacobite patriarch 363f
Ignatius Ephraem II Rachmani 374
Il fermo proposito, encyclical (1905) 418, 482, 485
Il Rinnovamento 454, 490
Il Trust 473f
Immanence and transcendence 316f
Immanence apologetics 457
Immanentism 458ff
Immigrants, pastoral care of 151f
Immortale Dei, encyclical (1885) 196f, 235
Imperialism 522ff, 501ff
Inaugural encyclical of Pius X 388
Index Commission 463
Index (Congregation) 397f, 425, 429
India 568ff
—Church 532ff
Indians (American), mission 567f
Indigenization of the mission churches 561ff
Infallibility, dogma of 26f, 32f, 35, 37, 41
Ingres, Jean A. D. 298
Innocent III, pope 18ff
Innocent VI, pope 307
Inscrutabili Dei, encyclical (1878) 18
Inspiration 326ff, 440, 457
Instaurare omnia in Christo, motto of Pius X 389
Institut Catholique, Paris 315, 433, 468
Institut Catholique, Toulouse 435
Institut des Belles Lettres Arabes 569
Institute of Oriental Studies, Pontifical 346
Institut für Missionswissenschaft, Münster 465
Instituts catholiques 252
Institut supérieur de philosophie 315
In suprema, apostolic letter (1882) 337
In suprema Petri Apostoli Sede, encyclical (1848) 335
Integralism 254, 466
Internal mission 260
International mission conference, Edinburgh (1910) 571
Internationales Institut für missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen 572
Inter pastoralis officii, motu proprio (1903) 288
Intransigents (Italy) 89ff, 92, 448, 487
Ireland 13f, 135, 142, 237, 386
—Home Rule 145
—"revival" 245
—state and Church 144ff
Ireland, John, archbishop of St. Paul 123, 152ff, 158ff, 163, 164, 332f, 423
Irish College, Rome 145
Irish question 144ff
Islam 527
—in Africa 545f
Isoard, Monsignor 410
Istituto cattolico internazionale per il progresso delle scienze 256
Istria 183
Italian People's Party 489, 491
Italian question 14
Italo-Albanians 372f
Italo-Greeks 372f
Italy 14, 15, 20, 29f, 44, 49f, 54f, 65, 193, 240f, 245, 381, 421, 442, 497, 518, 573
—anticlericalism 84f
—antimodernist oath 463f
—Catholic Action 493
—Catholic Church and Fascism 492f
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 248f
— — and liberalism 486ff
— — and nationalism 518f
—Catholic movement 86ff, 91f, 94f, 219, 473, 481ff, 484f
—Catholic press 472f
—Catholics between the Vatican and the Quirinal 84ff

—Catholic worker societies 226, 232
—charity 259
—Christian democracy 93f, 449
—Christian syndicalism 488
—Church architecture 292
—Church art 298
—Church music 287
—civil marriage 84
—Freemasonic liberalism 84f
—industrialization 91
—militant Catholicism 86
—missionary societies 529
—modernism 442, 448ff
— — and Christian democrats 449
—national Eucharistic Congresses 261
—orders 84, 278
—priests, training, and reform of seminaries 414f
—religious instruction 84
—Roman question, see Roman question
—school question 210f
—secularization 84, 86
—social conventions 91
—socialism 90f, 487
— — and Catholicism 493
—social legislation 485
—state and Church 482
Iucunda sane accidit, encyclical (1904) 413, 455
Izvolsky, Alexander 342

Jacini, Stefano 90, 454, 463
Jacobini, Ludovico, cardinal secretary of state 22f, 60f, 64, 67, 70ff, 120, 121
Jacobites 363
—and the Thomas Christians 364f
—Uniate 374
Jaer, Gustave de 110
Jammes, Francis 246
Jandel, V. A., O.P. 275
Janiszewski, suffragan bishop of Posen 178
Jann, Adelhelm, O.F.M.Cap. 574
Jannsens, L., O.S.B. 333, 456
Jansenism 420
Janssen, Arnold, S.V.D. 118, 281, 529
Janssen, Johannes 320
Japan 564, 570
—Christianization 537f
Jaurès, Jean-Léon 510ff
Javouhey 548
Jeiler, Ignatius 313
Jerusalem
—Armenian patriarchate 367
—Orthodox patriarchate 362f
Jesuit law (1872) 35, 498
Jesuits 28f, 35f, 277f, 312, 316, 341, 390, 392, 427, 433, 568
—activities in education 211
—in Albania 188
—and "Americanism" 333
—in Australia 544
—in Belgium 113
—and Biblical exegesis 327ff
—in Bulgaria 187
—in Canada 149
—in China 535
—in the Congo 113, 550
—and devotion to the Sacred Heart 263
—in Dutch East India 541
—in England 136
—in France 97f, 248, 473
—and frequent Communion 403
—in Germany 494
—in Guatemala 133
—in India 532, 569
—and integralism 478ff
—in Japan 538f
—in Latin America 127
—in the Philippines 541
—in Poland 176f
—in Portugal 127
—in Portuguese East Africa 553
—in Rhodesia 554
—in Rumania 186
—in South Africa 555
—in Spain 122
—in the United States of America 158
—theory of inspiration 327ff
Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne (Belgium) 113
Joachim III, patriarch of Constantinople 356, 359
Joan of Arc 518
Jogand-Pagés, Gabriel 217f
Johanns, P. 569
John IV, emperor of Ethiopia 366f
John XXIII, pope 343
John Chrysostom 344
John Papadopulos 372
Jonah, Nestorian bishop of Sunurgan and Urmia 363
Jonckx 469
Jonnart, Célestin 516
Jordan, Johann Baptist 113, 280f, 291
Jörg, Edmund 194
Joseph, Bulgarian Orthodox exarch 356
Joseph, devotion to 265
Joseph II, Austrian emperor 130
Joseph II Audo, patriarch of the Uniate Nestorians 336, 375f
Josephinism 55
Jounel, Monsignor 407
Juárez, Benito 133
Julien, André, bishop of Arras 516
Jung, Johann Baptist 81, 232

Kálnoky, count 52f, 65
Kant, Immanuel 250, 315
Kappeyne 116
Kaptere, N. F. 351
Karl I, king of Württemberg 44
Kasprowicz, Jan 249
Katchadar Chirojan, Armenian catholicos 367
Katechetische Blätter 417
Katechetische Monatsschrift 417

Katharina von Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen 271
Katholieke Staatspartij (the Netherlands) 116f
Katholische Kaufmännische Vereinigung (Germany) 214
Katzer, Friedrich Xaver, archbishop of Milwaukee 161, 334
Kaufmann, F. 470
Keane, John, Archbishop of Dubuque 153f, 155, 163, 164f, 313, 333f
Kehr, Paul 319
Keiling, L. A. 553
Keller, Émile 102
Kentiger-Milne, prior O.S.B. 273
Keppler, Paul Wilhelm, bishop of Rottenburg 428, 500f
Keßler, Joseph Aloysius, bishop of Tiraspol (Saratov) 169
Ketteler, Wilhelm Emanuel, bishop of Mainz 27, 30f, 33, 36, 75, 205, 223, 229
Kidana Maryam Kassa, bishop of Asmara 374
Kiefl, Franz Xaver 238, 427, 463
Kiev, monastery in cave 351
Kilger, Laurenz, O.S.B. 574
Kirsch, Johann Peter 465
Kißling, J. B. 258
Kitsch, religious 259f
Kittel, Rudolf 326
Klarenbeekse Club 118
Klein, Félix 332ff, 434
Klein, Karl, bishop of Limburg 73
Kleutgen, Joseph, S.J. 314
Kluczyński, Vincenty, archbishop of Mogilev 171
Knabenbauer, Joseph, S.J. 330
Knights of Columbus (USA) 161
Knights of Labor (USA) 161f
Knights of St. John (USA) 161
Knoblecher, Ignaz 548
Kolb, Viktor, S.J. 48
Kölnische Volkszeitung 215, 501f
Kolping, Adolf 214, 221
Konrad von Parzham 258
Kopp, Georg, cardinal 38f, 69f, 72f, 179, 231, 282, 382, 496f, 498f, 501, 503ff, 505f
Korea, Christianization 537
Korošec, Anton 184
Korum, Michael Felix, bishop of Trier 65f, 70, 73, 75, 193, 213, 218, 231, 273, 424, 499, 501, 503
Kowalski, Jan Maria 174f, 264
Kozielsko-Puzyna, Jan, prince-bishop of Cracow 176
Kozowska, Felicja 174, 264
Kralik, Richard von 428, 501f
Kraus, Franz Xaver 65, 239, 254, 321f, 424ff
Krek, Janez 184
Krementz, Philipp, bishop of Ermland 31, 34, 44, 66, 69f, 499
Kuefstein, Franz, count 202f, 204f, 207
Kugler, Franz Xaver 254, 291
Kulm, bishopric 73
Kulturkampf 12, 15f, 26ff, 177f, 201, 236
—assessment 74
—conclusion 55ff
—first moderation law (1880) 58, 62ff
—meeting in Kissingen (1878) 59, 61
—second moderation law (1882) 58, 63
—settlement 70ff
—third moderation law (1883) 58, 63f
Kutschker, Johann Rudolf, cardinal 46
Kyriale 409

Laaf, social chaplain 230
Laberthonnière, Lucien 248, 318, 439f, 450, 457, 471, 512
Labor movement 21, 74, 194, 204, 206, 209, 221f, 223ff, 230, 233, 499ff, 505
—see Social question and Social movement
Laboré, J. A., O.P. 276f
Labour Party 139
Lachat, bishop of Basel-Solothurn 78f
Lachmann, Karl 329
Lacordaire, Henri-Dominique 89
La Croix 103, 105f, 216
Lacroix, Lucien, bishop of Tarentaise 462, 463
La Démocratie chrétienne 104f
Laetitae sanctae, encyclical (1893) 263
Laflèche, bishop of Trois-Rivières 147
Lagrange, Albert-Marie-Henri (religious: Marie-Joseph) 255, 277, 323, 329ff, 333, 388, 432, 435, 437, 450, 456, 471, 512
Lahitton, J. 413
La Justice sociale 104
La lega Lombarda 90
Lambruschini, Luigi, cardinal secretary of state 7, 89
Lamennais, Jean-Marie de 109
Lamentabili sane exitu, decree (1907) 457f, 464
Lampertico 90
Lamy, Étienne 104, 105
Langbehn, Julius 428, 500
Langénieux, Benedict Maria, cardinal 261, 338, 339f
Lanzoni, Francesco 455
Laos 534
La Quinzaine 247, 515
La rassegna nazionale 487
Larroca, J. M., O.P. 275
La Sapinière, see *Sodalitium Pianum*
Las Casas 573
Lasker, Eduard 35
La sociologie catholique 105
Lateran treaties (1929) 493
Latin America 12, 127ff, 193
—failure of religious regeneration 134
—Freemasons 217
—orders and congregations 128
—Plenary Council in Rome (1899) 128f
—social question 129
Latour du Pin, R. 207

Latreille, André 516
Laurier, Wilfred, prime minister of Canada 148
Lausanne, canton 76
La Vérité 103
Lavigerie, Charles de, cardinal 101f, 530, 546f, 550
Law regarding the administration of diocesan property (1876), Germany 42
Law regarding the administration of property owned by Catholic congregations (1875), Germany 42f
Law regarding the administration of suspended bishoprics (1874), Germany 39
Law regarding the ecclesiastical property of the Old Catholic parishes (1875), Germany 42
Lay apostolate 418ff
Lay catechists 416f
Lay missal 114
Lazarists 35, 341
—in Bulgaria 372
—in China 535
—on Madagascar 556
Leagues of the Most Sacred Heart 405
Lebbe, Vincent 537
Le Bien Public 108, 113, 216
Lebon, J. 465
Lebreton, P. J. 463, 465
Lecanuet 104
Leclercq, Henri, O.S.B. 466
L'Eco di Bergamo 92
Le Coq d'Armandville, J. F., S.J. 542
Ledóchowska, Maria Theresia 529
Ledóchowski, Miecislaus Halka von, cardinal 3, 13, 29, 40f, 67, 69, 152, 178f, 181, 339, 479
Lega democratica nazionale 489f
Legislation, ecclesiastical, see Canon law
Leguía, A. 131
Lehmkuhl, Augustin, S.J. 225
Leister, P. 405
Lemire, Jules Auguste 104, 385, 512
Lemius, P. J., O.M.I. 458
Lemmi, Andriano 216f
Lemmonnyer 466
Lenormant, François 326, 511
Lenz, Desiderius, O.S.B. 298, 299
Leo I, the Great, pope 18
Leo XII (Annibale della Genga), pope 5, 6
Leo XIII (Vincenzo Gioacchino Pecci), Pope 3ff, 6ff, 49f, 52f, 64, 67ff, 73, 79, 82, 84ff, 88, 93, 94f, 100ff, 107, 108ff, 116, 119ff, 126ff, 132f, 136ff, 143f, 148, 151, 160f, 165, 176, 183, 188, 190ff, 195f, 200f, 205, 208, 210, 214f, 217, 224ff, 233, 235ff, 242, 244f, 247f, 252ff, 261, 262ff, 268, 270, 273ff, 276ff, 311, 315f, 319, 321, 333, 337ff, 359, 375, 382, 384, 391, 394, 395, 399, 402, 406, 407
—*Aeterni Patris* 307ff
—and "Americanism" 334
—and Bible exegesis, Bible question 331f, 431f
—bishop of Perugia 8f
—camerlengo of Pius IX 9
—and the China mission 535f
—and the Church in Canada 147ff
—and the Church in Colombia 131
—and the Church in Croatia 184f
—and the Church in Ecuador 132
—and the Church in Great Britain 135ff, 140ff
—and the Church in Mexico 133f
—and the Church in the Philippines 540
—and Church policy in Belgium 107ff
—and Church policy in France 100ff
—and Church policy in the Netherlands 115
—and Church policy in Spain 119ff
—and the Church in the Polish territories 171ff
—and the Church in Russia 166ff
—and the Church in the USA 150ff, 156f
—and *Démocratie chrétienne* 234f, 241
—education 6
—and the Italian question 14
—and the Latin American Church 127
— — Latin American Plenary Council (1899) 128f
—and the Latinization of the Uniate Eastern Churches 377
—missionary activities 527f, 559
—nuncio in Belgium 7
—"opportuniste sacré" 14
—orders and congregations 270ff
—piety 23
—and the Prussian *Kulturkampf* 15, 55ff, 178
—*Ralliement* policy, see *Ralliement*
—and the reform of the breviary 412
—reorganization of the orders 270ff
—and the Roman question 15ff
—social doctrine 11
— — see also *Rerum novarum*
—and the Uniate Churches 368ff
—and the union of the Anglican Churches 140ff
—unification efforts regarding the Eastern Churches 16f, 335ff, 341ff
—and worship during his pontificate 257ff
Leo Gesellschaft 253
Leopold I, king of Belgium 8
Leopold II, king of Belgium 110, 549f
Leopoldinen-Stiftung, Vienna 529
Lepidi, A., O.P. 333
Le Play, Fréderic 200, 222
Leray, Joseph, vicar apostolic of the Gilbert Islands 543
Lerolle, J. 515
Le Roy, Édouard 439ff, 450, 466
Le Saulchoir 466
Le Sillon, Sillonism 212, 228, 387, 419, 420, 424, 472, 473ff, 512f, 519
Lesser Sunda Islands 541
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim 250f

Levroux, Alejandro 125
Liberalism 521, 26f, 32f, 35, 74, 194ff, 199, 420, 500
—see also the various countries
"Liberal Protestantism" 421
Liberatore, Matteo, S.J. 197f, 208, 312
Liberia, Christianization 546
Libermann, Franz Maria Paul 548
Libertas, encyclical (1888) 195, 237
Lieber, Ernst Maria 234, 496
Liechtenstein, Alois, prince 45f, 202
Lienbacher, Georg 45
Lievens, Konstantin, S.J. 533
Ligue Démocratique Belge 111f
Ligue des catholiques français pour la paix 519
Ligue internationale des pacifistes catholiques 519f
Likowski, Edward, archbishop of Gnesen-Posen 180
Lille, Catholic university 252
Limburg, bishopric 73
Linse, Leo, O.S.B. 273
Lintelo, Jules 406
Lippert, Peter 479
"Literary controversy" 250, 427
Lith, Franciscus van 542
Liturgical history 465
Liturgical movement 114, 406f, 412
—and Church architecture 302ff
Liturgical renovation 258
Liturgical utensils 300, 302
Liturgy 265ff
—Eastern rites 338f
—history 302ff
—in mission countries 570
Litzinger 230
Livingstone, David 550
Livinhac, Léon, M.A. 551
Llandaff, Lord 140
Loë, Felix von 35, 213
L'Œuvre d'Orient 341
Loi Naquet (Magnet Law) 97
Loisy, Alfred 327, 332, 431, 432ff, 440f, 442f, 450, 453, 456ff, 459f, 463, 466, 511
Longinqua Oceani spatia, apostolic letter (1895) 165, 196
Lorenzelli, Benedetto, cardinal 390
Lorenzi, Philipp de 65
Lotte, Joseph 515
Loubet, Émile 106, 510
Lourdel, Siméon 551
Louvain, Catholic University of 8, 114f, 252, 254, 311, 315
Löwenstein, Karl zu, prince 192, 202f, 207, 211, 217f, 479
Luca, Antoniono de, cardinal 310, 321
Lucerne, canton 76
Luçon, cardinal 475
Ludwig I, king of Bavaria 271, 357
Ludwigs-Missionsverein, Munich 529
Lueger, Karl 46, 48
Luis I, king of Portugal 126
Luise, G. de 399
L'Univers 103
Lüthen, B. 281
Luther, Martin 386
Lutz, Johann, baron 33, 35, 44f
Luxemburg
—associations and societies 111
—toward conservatism 118f
—orders and congregations 111
—religious instruction 119
—school question 118f
—socialism 119
Lwanga, Charles 551
Lynch, J. J., archbishop of Toronto 148, 163
Lyon, Catholic university 252
Lyon Missionaries 341
—in Africa 550
—in Liberia 547
—in South Africa 555

Maas, Otto, O.E.M. 572
Maasbode 117, 216
MacCabe, cardinal 144f
Macdonald, John A., prime minister of Canada 148
Macedonia 188, 356, 359
—vicariate apostolic 372
McGlynn, Edward 164
Machado, Domingos, O.S.B., archabbot 131
Mackau, Armand 103
McKinley 123
MacMahon, Patrice Maurice, French president 3
McNicholas, J. T., archbishop of Cincinnati 164
McQuaid, Bernard J., bishop of Rochester 156, 159, 161
Madagascar, Christianization 556
Maffi, cardinal 458, 478, 490
Maier, F. 477
Maignen, Charles 156, 333, 334, 472f
Mainz, Catholic Society 40
Makarios I, Orthodox archbishop of Cyprus 361
Malabars, Uniate 375ff
Malay Peninsula, Christianization 533
Mâle, Émile 292
Malebranche, Nicolas de 317
Mallinckrodt, Hermann von 27, 29
Manacorda, E., bishop of Fossano 89
Manchuria 565
Mandonnet, P. 313
Manna, Paolo, P.I.M.E. 562
Manning, Henry Edward, cardinal 3, 49, 135ff, 139f, 207, 279
Manteuffel, Edwin von 75
Manzoni, Alessandro 90, 248f
Marango, Hyacinth 372
Marchiafava 520f
Maredsous, abbey O.S.B. 114, 131, 266, 272
Margiotta, Domenico 218

María Cristina, queen of Spain 122
Maria Laach, abbey O.S.B. 275, 300
Marian Congregation 264
Marian congresses 264
Marianistes de Sainte-Croix 264
Marianists (*Societas Mariae*) 264
—in Japan 538
Mariannhill 556
Mariannhill missionaries 530, 556
—in East Africa 552
Maria-Stein, monastery 78
Mariavites 174f, 264
Marie du Sacré- Coeur, Mère 279
Marilley, Étienne, bishop of Lausanne-Geneva 76, 78f
Mariology 264
Marion-Brésillac, de 548
Marists, in the central Pacific 543
Maritain, Jacques 253
Mark VIII, Coptic patriarch 365
Markiewicz, Bronislaw 177
Marlé, R. 438
Marochetti, Carlo de 302
Maronite College, Rome 341
Maronites, Uniate 374f, 377
Marriage and family 208f
Martin, Konrad, bishop of Paderborn 40f
Martín, Luis, general S.J. 277
Martin, Thérèse, see Thérèse of Lisieux
Martina, G. 393
Martinelli, Sebastiano, Aug.Er., cardinal 158, 160
Marwitz, von der, bishop of Kulm 40
Marx, Karl 204f, 229
Mary, devotion to 257, 263
Masad, Paul, patriarch of the Uniate Maronites
Mass 266
Matiussi, P. 479
Matthew, abuna of the Ethiopian Church 366
Mauri, cardinal 270
Maurras, Charles 146, 212, 246, 248, 476, 520
Maus 470
Mausbach, Josef 313
Maximam gravissimamque, encyclical (1924) 516
Maxima quedem, decree (1910) 401
Maximilian, prince of Saxon 345
Maximos III Mazlum, Melchite patriarch of Antioch 372
Maximum illud, apostolic letter (1919) 559, 560, 561
Mayeur, J.- M. 460, 513
May laws 36ff, 41f, 57f, 61
—moderation laws 62ff
Mazzella, Camillo, S.J., cardinal 142, 192 208, 311ff, 315, 333, 433
Meda, Filippo 88, 92, 93, 491, 518
Medicaea 287f
Medici, Fernando, cardinal 287
Mediterranean *entente* (1887) 69
Mehrerau, monastery O.Cist. 279
Meignan, Guillaume René, cardinal 99
Meinertz, Max 465
Mejer, Otto 36
Melchers, Paulus, archbishop of Cologne 29, 32, 40f, 60, 66f, 69, 281
Melchites 360f
—Uniate 341, 372
Meletios II Doûmanî, patriarch of Antioch 361
Méline, Jules 104
Mellaerts 220
Méndez Medina, Alfredo 134
Menelik II, emperor of Ethiopia 366f, 374
Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino 123f
Menzingen, college 77
Mercati, Giovanni 410
Mercier, Désiré, cardinal 113, 115, 311, 315f, 412, 447, 451, 462f, 471, 478
Merkle, Sebastian 10, 207, 426, 429, 430
Mermillod, Gaspard, cardinal 78f, 82, 208, 261
Merry del Val, Raphael, cardinal secretary of state 83, 113, 142, 333, 391f, 400, 408f, 414, 470, 482, 484, 503f, 520f, 522
Methodius, St. 336
Metten, Abbey O.S.B. 272
Mexico
—orders and congregations 133
—state and Church 133f
Michael, Emil, S.J. 258
Michael (Mihailo), Serbian Orthodox Metropolitan 356
Michelis, Friedrich 32
Mickiewicz, Adam 177
Middle class
—Catholic associations 221ff
Middle East, national Churches 361f
Miglietti, Charles 469
Mignot, Eudoxe Irénée, archbishop of Albi 414, 433, 436, 452, 455, 460f, 463
Milan Missionaries, in India 533
Militia of Christ for Social Service, Catholic trade union in the USA 164
Millais, John 299
Millet system 358f, 367
Mill Hill Missionaries
—in Central Africa 552
—in India 533
—in New Zealand 544
—in the Philippines 541
Minocchi, Salvatore 450ff, 461
Miquel, Johannes von 35
Mirae caritatis, encyclical (1902) 262, 403
Mironescu, Athanasios, Rumanian metropolitan 355
Missal reform 389, 411f
Missal translations 266
Missiology 266
Missionaries of La Salette
—on Madagascar 556

Missionarinnen vom Heiligsten Herzen 151
Missionary associations 528
Missionary seminaries 562
Missionary societies 529
Missionnaires de Notre-Dame de La Salette 264
Missions
—and World War I 557ff
—colonialism and the mission 527ff, 557f
—exhibition 563
—expansions from the time of Leo XIII until World War II 527ff
—history 574
—independence of the new Churches 557ff, 561ff
—indigenization, accomodation, adaptation 561ff, 568f
—theory 574f
Missionsvereinigung katholischer Frauen und Jungfrauen 529
Mistral, Gabriele 134
Mivart, St. George 443
"Mivartism" 443
Mocquereau, André, O.S.B. 408f
Modernism 54, 254, 386, 387, 420ff, 500, 502
—condemnation (1907) 455ff
—in France 431ff, 449
—in Germany 421ff
—in Great Britain 441ff
—intervention by the ecclesiastical authorities and integralistic reaction 455ff
—in Italy 448ff
Möhler, Johann Adam 310
Molokans 348
Moller, H. 118
Monachism 564
Monasteries, Russian Orthodox 351
Monetti, P. G. 478
Mongolian mission 535
Monophysites 363ff, 368
Monsabré, Louis Jacques Marie, O.P. 218f, 276
Montalembert, Charles René Forbes 89
Mont-César, abbey 114
Monte Cassino, congregation O.S.B. 274, 300
Montel-Treuenfest, Johannes von 49, 55, 68
Montenegro 186, 188
—Orthodox Church 346, 354, 357
Montfort Fathers, in Liberia 547
Montini, G. 92
Moral theology 278
Moran, P. F., cardinal 149f
Moreau, Joseph, S. J. 554
Moreno, cardinal 120
Moreno y Díaz, E., Aug.Er., bishop of Pasto 132
Moravia 182f
Morris, William 299
Moser, Karl 305
Moufang, Franz Christoph Ignaz 60, 75, 223
Mtesa, king of Uganda 551
Muhammed Ali 360, 365
Mühler, Heinrich von, Prussian minister of religious affairs 29, 31, 32f
Müller, Adam 202
Müller, Josef 422, 425, 427
Multum ad movendos animos, brief (1870) 285
Mun, Albert de 101ff, 112, 124, 201, 206ff, 212, 223, 227ff, 236, 239, 478, 512
Munich catechetical method 417
Murri, Romolo 92, 93, 95, 212, 384, 387, 420, 451f, 455, 472f, 484, 489f
Mussolini, Benito 492f
Mutel, vicar apostolic of Korea 537
Muth, Carl 83, 250, 252, 427, 429, 501f

Nagel, F. X., archbishop of Vienna 48
Namszanowski, Franz Adolf, bishop, ordinary to the Prussian army 34
Napoleon III 290
Natal, Christianization 556
National Conference of Catholic Trade-Unionists 139
National Education Association (USA) 159
National liberalism 26ff, 32ff, 37, 39, 43, 422
Naudet, Paul 104
Navarre, L.-A. 544
Nazarenes 259, 297
Near East
—Leo XIII's unification efforts and Latinization 336ff
Nègre, Abbé 304
Neo-Gothic 293ff
—sculpture 301f
"Neo-Guelphs" 89
Neo-Scholasticism 244, 252f, 307ff, 311ff, 316, 320, 425, 427
Neo-Thomism 276, 311ff, 464
Nestorians 362f
—Uniate 375
Ne temere, marriage decree (1907) 170, 401
Netherlands 241, 243
—Catholicism and liberalism 115ff
—Catholic labor movement 117, 229, 231
—Catholic press 216
—Catholic social movement 220f
—Church music 286
—toward conservatism 115ff
—and missions 566
—orders 115, 118
—school question 115f, 117, 210
—social question 116f
—state constitution (1848) 115
Neto, cardinal 126
Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft 574
Newman, John Henry, cardinal 89, 135f, 322f, 437,
New Zealand, Christianization 544
Niederbronn Sisters 282
Nietzsche, Friedrich 250
Nikanor, patriarch of Alexandria 360
Nikel, Johann Simon 465
Nikita, king of Montenegro 357

Nikolai, Orthodox bishop of Warsaw 174
Nicholas I, tsar of Russia 367
Nicholas II, tsar of Russia 168ff, 172f, 344ff, 367, 369
—toleration edict (1905) 348
Nijmegen, Catholic University of 118
Nina, Lorenzo, cardinal secretary of state 22, 59, 108
Nobilissima Gallorum gens, apostolic letter (1884) 15, 18
Noble and Most Holy Order of the Knights of Labor (USA) 161f
Nocedal 119ff, 124, 147
Nolde, Emil 301
Non expedit 240, 248, 493
—at the time of Leo XIII 84f, 91f
—at the time of Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius XI until 1925 481ff
Non sine moerore, letter 86
Norfolk, Duke of 145
Nos quidem, brief (1901) 287
Nothomb, Belgian prime minister 8
Notre consolation, apostolic letter (1892) 237, 239
Núñez, R., president of Colombia 132

Oberdörffer, chaplain 213
Oblates of Mary Immaculate 529
—in Basutoland 555
—among the Eskimos 567
—in German South West Africa 555
—in Natal 556
Observants 270
O'Connell, Denis Joseph 152, 155, 160, 163, 165, 332
O'Connell, William H., cardinal 166
Octobri mense, encyclical (1891) 263
Odescalchi, Carlo, cardinal, S.J. 7
Œuvre des cercles catholiques d'ouvriers 201, 223
Officiorum ac munerum, constitution (1897) 330, 399
Officium divinum, see Breviary
O'Gorman, prefect of the English congregation O.S.B. 274
Ohm, Thomas, O.S.B. 573
Oksza-Stablewski, Florian, archbishop of Gnesen-Posen 179f, 494
Old Catholics, Old Catholic Church 28, 32, 42
Oldenburg 44
Olinda (Brazil), abbey and congregation O.S.B. 131, 275
Ollé-Laprune, Léon 318
Ontologists 8
Opera Bonomelli 453
Opera dei Congressi e dei Comitati Cattolici 84, 87f, 94ff, 214, 220, 226, 235, 240, 242, 387f, 419, 449, 452, 482ff, 501
Optatissimae, motu proprio (1895)
Orbin, Johann Baptist, archbishop of Freiburg 75
Orders, law regarding (1875) 41
Orders and congregations 269ff, 282f, 333, 389
—and canonizations 258
—in France 508
—in the Philippines 539f
—in Prussia 66, 70, 73
—see also the various countries
Oreglia, L., cardinal 5, 236, 390
Oriens christianus 341
Orientalium dignitas, brief (1894) 339, 343
Orientis Catholici, motu proprio (1917) 346
Orlando 491
Orthodox Church of the South Indian Thomas, Christians, see Thomas Christians
Ortynski, Stephan Soter, vicar apostolic 343
Osnabrück, bishopric 40, 63f
Osservatore cattolico 86, 88, 92
Otto I, king of Greece 357
Otto, Hubert, vicar apostolic 536
Ottoman Empire, see Turkey
Our Lady's Nurses of the Poor (Australia) 150
Overbeck, Johann Friedrich 297
Ozanam, Frédéric 87

Pacca, B. cardinal 7
Pacelli, Eugenio, see Pius XII
Pacific, missions 542ff
Pacifism 518f
Paderborn, bishopric 63f
Paes, Sidonio 127
Pagan missions, see Missions
Paganuzzi, G. B. 88, 94, 391, 484
Palestrina, Pierluigi da 284
Pállfy, count 521f
Pallotti, Vinzenz 258
Pallottines 280, 529
—Australia 150, 544
—Cameroon 547, 558
—Poland 177
Pallottines (female), in Cameroon 547
Palmieri, D., S.J. 311
Pan-Slavism 13, 166, 337, 348
Papacy 17ff, 27f, 340
Papal election 53f, 394
—(1878) 3ff
—(1903) 381ff
—Bismarck's telegram (1872) 41
Papal State 14ff, 28f, 65, 72, 86
Papal work for the propagation of the faith 566
Papini, Giovanni 490
Paredis, Johannes Augustus, bishop of Roermond 118
Paris, university 252f
Paris Missionaries 570
—in Annam 534
—in China 535
—in Japan 537
—in Korea 537

—in Tibet 536
Parker, Matthew 140
Parkinson, H. 139
Parocchi, Lucido Maria, cardinal 218, 261, 280, 331
Parti satholique (Belgium) 111, 113
Partido Socialista Obrero Español 120
Parties
—Catholic parties in a democracy 238f
Partito Popolare Italiano 84, 489
Pascal, Blaise 312
Pascendi dominici gregis, encyclical (1907) 54, 170, 256, 420, 429, 441, 447, 453, 455, 458, 464, 490, 513
Passavich, S.J. 482
Passionists
—in Bulgaria 187
—in Rumania 186
Pastor, Ludwig von 256, 319f, 424, 501, 502, 503
Pastor aeternus, constitution (1870) 22, 121, 336
Pastoral work 413ff
Pastor Bonus 311
Patmore, C. K. 146
Patriarchal conferences (1894) 339f
Patrizi, Constantino, cardinal 156
Patrizi, Francesco Saverio, S.J. 310
Patrology 324, 465
Patronate
—Portuguese (*Padroado*) in India 126
—Spanish in Chile 130
Patto Gentiloni 488f
Paul VI, pope 399
Paulinists 373
Paulists 334
Paul V Peter XIII, Armenian patriarch 377
Paulusverein 230
Pecci, Giuseppe, S.J., cardinal 6, 277, 278, 310
Pecci, Lodovico, father of Leo XIII 6
Pecci, Vincenzo Gioacchino, see Leo XIII
Pedemonte, Emmanuele, S.J. 548
Pedro II, emperor of Brazil 130f
Péguy, Charles 247
Pelczar, Jozef Sebastian, bishop of Przemysl 176f
Penitentiary 398
Pentateuch, criticism 277, 329
People's sovereignty (*imperium populare*) 235
Périer, president of France 22
Périn, Charles 107, 109, 199, 205
Perosi, Lorenzo 407
Perpetual Adoration 262
Perraud, Adolphe, cardinal 102, 435
Perret, Auguste 304
Perrone, G. 310
Perroni, F. 453
Personalism 316
Peru 131f
—civil marriage 131
Perugia, bishopric 8f
Pesch, Christian, S.J. 467
Pesch, Tilmann, S.J. 254
Pescini, Pius X's private secretary 390
Peter I, the Great, tsar of Russia 347, 357
Peter III, Orthodox metropolitan of Cetinje 357
Peter IV Garaigiry, Melchite patriarch 372
Peter VIII, Coptic patriarch 365
Petre, Maud 442f, 448
Petrone 490
Petrus-Claver-Sodalität 529
Pezzani, H. M. 400
Pfanner, Franz, O.C.R. 529, 556
Pfeiffer, P. 281
Pforr, Franz 308
Philip Argus, Syrian patriarch 336
Philippines
—Church around the turn of the century 539f
—separation of state and Church 540
Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft 311
Philosophy 277
—and theology 309
Photios, patriarch of Alexandria 360
Piacenza 411f
Pia Società dei Missionari di S. Carlo per gli Italiani emigranti 151
Picard, François 337
Picpus Fathers, in the eastern Pacific 543
Pidal, Alejandro 122
Pie, Louis Édouard, cardinal 101, 384
Pieper, August 213, 222
Piffl, Friedrich Gustav, cardinal 48, 54, 479
Pignatelli di Belmonte, Granita, nuncio in Vienna 54f
Pillet, A. 400
Piou, Jacques 103
Pious Union for the Communion of Children 405f
Pitra, Jean-B., O.S.B., cardinal 236, 321
Pius IV, pope 464
Pius V, pope 18
Pius VII, pope 3
Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti), pope
—and missions 527
—and the Prussian-German *Kulturkampf* 38
—unification efforts 335
Pius X (Giuseppe Melchiorre Sarto), pope 10, 51f, 53f, 83, 84, 90, 113, 114, 117f, 124, 127, 128f, 166, 187, 227, 230, 256, 261, 277, 283, 288, 314, 321, 330, 359, 369f, 374, 377, 381ff, 407ff, 435, 451, 457, 463, 468, 469, 473, 477, 479ff, 489f, 495, 500ff, 510, 513, 515, 517, 519, 522, 530, 536f, 542
—canonization (1954)
—characteristics 383ff
—career 383
—and catechism instruction
—and the Catholic movement in Italy 481

—and Christian democracy 387f
—and Christian society 477f
—and the Church in Poland 173
—and the Church in the Philippines 541
—and Church music 407ff
—and Church policy in Germany 495ff
—codex reform 399ff
—conservative reformism 383ff, 481ff
—Eucharistic decrees 403ff, 407
—and the German Center Party 504f
—and German Reform Catholicism 428f
—and the German trade-union controversy 505f
—and integralism 467ff
—and the lay apostolate 417ff
—and *Le Sillon* 474f
—liturgical renewal 407, 413ff
—missal reform 411f
—missionary activities 528, 530, 556f, 559
—and modernism 455ff
—and *Non expedit* 481ff
—and pacifist tendencies 519
—pastoral improvements 413ff
—and politics 387
—and Protestantism 386
—reform of the breviary 409ff
—reform of the Curia 394ff
—reform work 394ff
—and the Roman question 481ff
—and the separation of state and Church in France 507ff
—and the Triple Alliance 522
—unification efforts regarding the Eastern Churches 343ff
—and World War I 519ff
Pius XI (Achille Ratti), pope 24, 244, 322, 516, 562ff, 567
—and missions 557ff
Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli), pope 69, 275, 401, 523, 568
Pius Society 48, 220
Planque, Augustin, M.A. 550
Plater, C., S.I. 139
Plater-Zyberk, Cecylia, countess 173
Pobedonostsev, Constantin Petrovich, Russian chief procurator 167ff, 170, 347
Podechard, E. 330
Pohle, Josef 160, 313
Poland 13f, 30, 166ff, 170, 181, 386
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 249
—Catholicism in 1914 in the three Polish territories 171ff
—Catholic press 180
—Church and the German state in the Prussian part of Poland 177ff
—Church development in the three territories 171ff
— — in Galicia 175ff
— — in the Prussian area 177ff
— — in the Russian area 178ff, 172ff
—education in Galicia 176
—national consciousness and Catholic faith 180
—orders and congregations 173ff, 180
—religious instruction 173, 179
—school question 173, 179
—social question 177
—Uniates 173ff
Poels, H. 117
Poor Clares 271
Popiel, Vincenty Teophil, archbishop of Warsaw 168
Popoff, Raphael 372
Popolari 493
Portal, Fernand, C. M. 140ff, 340
Portugal 12, 193, 386
—Church between revolution and reaction 126f
—orders and congregations 126f, 278
—*Padroado* in Asia 551f
— — in East and West Africa 553
—religious instruction 127
—state and Church 126f
— — separation of state and Church 127
Portuguese College in Rome 126
Portuguese East Africa, Christianization 553
Portuguese West Africa, Christianization 553
Positivism 315
—in Mexico 134
Pothier, J., O.S.B., abbot 287, 408
Potocki, Alfred, count 175
Pottier, A. 111, 229
Poulat, É. 392f, 420, 436, 459, 468, 469, 470, 478
Powderly, Terence 161, 162
Praeclara gratulationis, apostolic letter (1894) 24, 217, 338f
Prat, Ferdinand, S. J. 329, 331, 465
Premonstratensians
—in Belgian Congo 550
—in Brazil 131
Pre-Raphaelites 299
Press, Catholic 214ff
Prezzolini 490
Priests
—education 413ff
—seminaries 413ff
Primacy, papal 41, 141
Profit-sharing, workers' 201
Progress, human 9
Propagation of the faith, see Missions
Proske, Karl 284
Protestantism 386
Provida matris, brief (1895) 340
Providentissimus Deus, encyclical (1893) 328f, 432, 433
Prussia
—Center Party 57, see also Center Party
—Church policy 32ff
—civil marriage 73
—conservatives 57
—Jesuits, prohibition of 73
—*Kulturkampf* 26ff

—orders 66, 72, 73
—politics, Poland 177f
—school question 210
—social democracy 58
—separation of state and Church 32, 41, 60
—state, Church sovereignty 73
—state, school supervision 73
—see also Germany, *Kulturkampf*
Przegląd Powszechny 176, 278
Przyluski, Leo von, archbishop of Gnesen-Posen 177
Psalter reform 410f
Psychology 315
Pugin, A. W. N. 292
Puppey-Girard, Abbé 222
Puttkamer, Robert von 61, 72
Puvis de Chavannes, Pierre Cecil 297
Puzyna, cardinal 53, 176, 382
Python, Georges 82

Quadragesimo anno, encyclical (1931) 207
Quadrotta, G. 453
Quamquam plures, encyclical (1889) 264
Quam singulari, decree (1910) 405
Quaracchi, Collegio di S. Bonaventura 312
Quemadmodum, decree (1890) 403
Quidquid consilii, apostolic letter (1908) 344
Quod Apostolici muneris, encyclical (1878) 197, 237, 242
Quod numquam, encyclical (1875) 41
Quo efficacius, instruction (1920) 561

Rački, Franjo 184
Radini Tedeschi, G., bishop of Bergamo 88, 95
Raiffeisen, Friedrich Wilhelm 220
Raimundi, Giovanni Battista 287
Ralliement, Ralliement politics 16, 17f, 107f, 105, 147, 201, 227, 234, 237, 239, 242, 332, 507
Rambler Group, England 442
Rambouillet, Abbé 323
Rampolla, Mariano, cardinal secretary of state 13, 15, 19, 22f, 48, 50, 52f, 67, 74, 92, 105, 121ff, 126, 141, 152, 161, 185, 200, 215, 234, 242, 256, 331, 339, 381ff, 392, 510
Raphael 297
Ratzinger, Georg 500
Rauscher, Joseph Otmar von, cardinal 46
Razón y Fé 122f, 278
Recherches de science religieuse 466
Recollects 270
Redemptorists 39, 278, 341
—in Belgian Congo 550
—in Germany 494
—in Poland 174, 177
Redner, Leo, bishop of Kulm 73
Reform Catholicism 421, 461, 500
Reichensperger, August 192, 291
Reichensperger, Peter 27, 30, 33
Religious freedom 195
Religious history 465
Religious instruction 32, 43, 210
—law regarding teachers (1888) 47
—see also the various countries
Religious studies 421, 425, 449
Renaissance, journal 442, 427
Renan, Ernest 99
Rende, di nuncio 101
Renouveau catholique 246, 248
Rensi, G. 454
Rerum Ecclesiae, encyclical (1926) 563
Rerum novarum, encyclical (1891) 19, 21, 88, 91, 95, 102, 111, 124, 163f, 177, 195, 197, 203, 206f, 208f, 224, 234, 242
Respighe, Pietro, cardinal 95
Resurrectionists 172
—in Bulgaria 372
Reuß, prince 61
Revelation 327
Revertera-Salandra, Friedrich, count 12, 16, 51, 202, 343
Revista popular 122
Revolution 237
Revue bénédictine (*Messager des fidèles*) 272
Revue biblique 329, 331, 432, 433, 471
Revue de l'Orient chrétien 341
Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques 466
Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse 433
Revue du clergé français 433
Revue moderniste internationale 463
Revue néo-scolastique de philosophie 311, 315
Revue Thomiste 311, 313
Reyes, Rafael 132
Reymont, Wladyslaw 173
Rezzara, L. 88, 95
Ribot, Alexandre 106
Ricci, Matteo 573
Richard de la Vergne, F.M.B., cardinal 333, 435
Richelmy, cardinal 479
Richter, Ludwig 297
Ridel, Felix-Clair, vicar apostolic of Korea 537
Riezler, Kurt 496
Rila, monastery 356
Rinnovamento, Milan 424, 457, 463
Rio Branco, Baron 131
Ripon, lord 140
Risorgimento 449
Ritter, baron 521
Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica 311, 464
Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali 200, 490f
Rivista storico-critica delle scienze teologiche 450
Rocco, Chaldean bishop 376
Rocco, A. 493
Roeren, Hermann 501
Rogier, A. 107
Roma e l'Oriente 345
Roman Catholic Clerical College, St. Petersburg 169, 171

Roman question 15ff, 18, 21, 58, 65, 85f, 90, 93f, 149, 192, 248, 384, 491, 493, 518
—and Italian Catholicism 481
Romanticism 250
Rome, the Holy City 5, 17
—diocese 394
Rommerskirchen, Johannes, O.M.I. 572
Roosevelt, Theodore 165
Roothaan, Joachim Philipp, general S.J. 546
Ropp, Eduard Baron von, bishop of Tiraspol (Saratov), after 1904 of Vilnius 169
Roquefeuil, Robert de 212
Rosary (prayer) 257, 263
Rosebery, lord 143
Rosegger, Peter 249
Rosmini-Serbati, Antonio 89, 249, 453
Rossetti, Dante Gabriel 299
Rössler, A., C.S.S.R. 427
Rossum, Willem van, C.S.S.R. 559, 562
Rota Romana 397
Rouault, Georges 301
Ruchonnet, Swiss president 82
Rudigier, Franz Joseph, bishop of Linz 47
Rudolf, archduke of Austria-Hungary 54
Rumania 183f
—monastic life, Orthodox 355
—orders and congregations 186f
—Orthodox Church 346, 354f
Rumanians, Uniate 371, 377
Ruskin, John 299
Russia 12, 53, 173, 187, 340, 346, 381, 386, 522, 527, 531
—agreement with the Vatican (1882) 167
—belief and toleration edict (1905) 169
—Catholic Church in the Russian Empire 166
—Church and state 347
—denominational and religious groups 168
—obstacles for the Catholic Church after 1906 170
—Old believers 169
—Russification measures employed against Catholics and Uniates 167, 169
—situation of the Uniates 166, 170, 370
—state church 166
Russian Orthodox Church 347
—National Council to Reform the Church (Moscow 1917/18) 352
—900th anniversary of Russia's Christianization 348
—organization and institutions 350
—restoration of the patriarchate 351
Ruthenian College, Rome 370
Ruthenians, Uniate 343, 369, 377
Rutten 229
Ryan, John 163
Ryllo, Maximillian, S.J. 548

Sabatier, Auguste 431
Sabatier, Paul 443, 463
Sabatier, S. 459
Sabler, C. V., chief procurator 170, 350
Sacchetti, G. 420
Sacerdotes Sanctissimi Sacramenti (S.S.S.) 262
Sacra congregatio negotiis religiosorum sodalium praeposita 283
Sacra Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali 346
Sacraments 440, 458
Sacred Heart devotion 259
—consecration of mankind to the Sacred Heart (1899, 1900) 26, 262
Sacred Heart priests (missionaries) 552
—in Adamaua 547
—in Belgian Congo 550
—in Dutch East India 541
—in New Guinea 544
—in the Philippines 541
—in the western Pacific 543f
Sacrifice of the Mass 262, 265f
Sacrorum antistitum, motu proprio (1910) 170, 463
Saepe numero, apostolic letter 322f
Sagasta 121
Sahut, Abbé 105
Sailer, Michael, bishop of Regensburg 284
Saint Anselmo, College of 274f, 337
St. Benedict, Rio de Janeiro, abbey O.S.B. 275
St. Gall, canton 76
St. Luke Fraternity 297
St. Matthias, Trier, abbey O.S.B. 273
St. Meinrad, Indiana, abbey O.S.B. 272
St. Ottilien, abbey O.S.B. 273
St. Raphael Society for the Protection of German Emigrants 151
St. Vincent, Pennsylvania, abbey O.S.B. 272
Sala, J. A., cardinal 7
Salama, abuna of the Ethiopian Church 366
Salesians 279, 341
—in India 533
Salisbury, lord 140
Saltet, L. 462
Salvadori, Giulio 490
Salvatorians 280
—in Belgium 113
Salvien, P., A.A., 469f
Salzburg, University of 253
Samassa, Josef, cardinal 50, 53
Sancha y Hervas, cardinal 124
Sancta Dei Civitas, encyclical (1880) 528
Sand, George 247
San Felice, cardinal 114
Sangnier, Marc 212, 473ff, 511, 513
Santi, S. J. 482
Sanvito, J. M., O.P. 275
Sapieha, F. A. 401
Sapientiae christianae, encyclical (1890) 214, 239
Sapienti consilio, constitution (1906) 166, 397f, 401
Sardi, Monsignor 458
Sarmiento, Domingo 129f
Sartiaux, F. 437
Sarto, Giuseppe, see Pius X
Satis cognitum, encyclical (1896) 340

Satolli, Francesco, cardinal 158, 161, 164ff, 310, 316, 331, 333
Sauer, Joseph 429
Saveriani 529
Savigny, Karl Friedrich 501
Savoy, Italian dynasty 90
Saxon
—*Kulturkampf* 44, 75
Scalabrini, G. B., bishop of Piacenza 90, 151f
Schaepman, A. J., archbishop of Utrecht 118
Schaepman, H. J. M. 116f
Schäzler, Constantin von 313, 314, 324
Scheeben, Matthias Joseph 313
Scheicher, Josef 54, 200
Scheiwiler, Alois, bishop of St. Gall 81
Schell, Herman 54, 219, 254, 313, 317, 332, 424ff, 428f, 457, 503
Scherer, Theresa, mother superior 77
Scherer-Boccard, Theodor 77
Scheut Fathers
—in Belgian Congo 549
—in the Philippines 541
Schiffini, S., S.J. 311
Schilling, Dorotheus, O.F.M. 573
Schindler, Franz Martin 54, 200, 203, 254
Schings, Joseph 230
Schinkel, Karl Friedrich 295, 298
Schlegel, Friedrich 250, 297
Schleiermacher, Friedrich E. D. 431
Schlözer, Kurd von 64f, 68, 71
Schmid, Christoph von 325
Schmidlin, Joseph 8, 11, 465, 571ff
Schmidt, Wilhelm, S.V.D. 465, 573
Schmidt-Rottluff, Karl 301
Schmid von Grüneck, bishop of Chur 83
Schnitzer, Joseph 461
Schnorr von Carolsfeld 297
Schnürer, Gustav 83
Scholasticism 307ff
—Scholastic renaissance 8
Schönborn, Franz, cardinal 48, 200
Schönburg-Hartenstein, prince 392
Schönerer, Georg Ritter von 46
School law, Baden (1868) 33
School question 209ff
—see also the various countries
School supervision law, Prussia (1872) 33f
Schorlemer-Alst, Burghard von 220f
Schott, Anselm, O.S.B. 114, 266
Schraudolph, Johann 298
Schroeder, Joseph 159f
Schubert, Franz 284
Schulien, Michael, S.V.D. 574
Schulte, Karl Joseph, cardinal 205
Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung 77
Schweizerischer Arbeiterbund 81f
Schweizerischer Katholikenverein 81
Schweizerischer Pius-Verein 77, 81
Schweizerischer Studentenverein 77
Schwer, Wilhelm 11
Scotland 135
Scotton 94
Sculpture, Church 301
Secco Suardo, D. 391
Seckau, abbey O.S.B. 273
Secretariat of State, papal 397, 398
Segesser, Philipp Anton 80
Segna, Francesco, cardinal 331, 390
Ségur, Gaston de 261, 403
Semaines de Missiologie (since 1922) 572
Semaines religieuses 98
Semaines sociales 512, 515
Sembratovitch Sylvester, cardinal 370
Semeria, Giovanni 451, 453, 454, 464, 490
Semimodernism 467
Seminaries 413ff
Senestréy, Ignaz von, bishop of Regensburg 72
Senex, see Federer, Heinrich
Separation of state and Church, see the individual countries
Septennate controversy 71f, 74, 240, 496
Serbia 181ff, 187ff, 517, 521ff
—Orthodox Church 346, 354, 356
—state and Church 356
Serbian Church of Karlowitz 346, 353
Sermon 389
Sertillanges, Antonin Gilbert, O.P. 253, 440
Servants of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary (Poland) 180
Seumois, A. 575
Shintoism 539
Siam, Christianization 533
Sickel, T. von 319
Sickenberger, Joseph 329, 429
Sickenberger, O. 427
Sienkiewicz, Henryk 173, 249
Siglo de Oro 123
Siglo futuro 119, 124, 147, 216
Sillonism, Sillonists, see *Le Sillon*
Simeoni, Giovanni, cardinal 145, 163, 310
Simon IX Benjamin, Nestorian catholicos 363
Simon XX Paul, Nestorian catholicos 363
Singulari quadam, encyclical (1912) 164, 477, 506f
Siri, cardinal 451
Sis (Cicilia), Armenian patriarchate (catholicate) 367
Sisters, associations of (in Japan) 538
Sisters of Charity, in Dutch East India 542
Sisters of Mercy of St. Charles Borromeo 282
Sisters of Mercy of the Holy Cross 77, 282
Sisters of our Lady of Sion, in Rumania 186
Sisters of Perpetual Adoration 262
—in Great Britain 137
Sisters of St. Joseph (Australia) 150
Sisters of the Archangel Michael 177
Sisters of the Child Jesus, in Great Britain 137
Sisters of the Holy Family, in Basutoland 555
Sisters of the Sacred Heart 158

Sisters of the Society of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph 542
Six, Paul 104
Sixtus V, pope 395, 399
Skoptsy 348
Slavonia 183
Slavs
—Catholicism until 1914 166ff
—in the Habsburg Monarchy 181ff
—Uniate 341f, 345
Slovaks 181f
Slovenes 13, 182, 183
Smedt, Charles de, S.J. 322
Smet de Naeyer, M. de 113
Smissen, van der 110
Snikers, bishop of Amsterdam 261
Sobornost, doctrine 362
Social democracy 43, 46, 213, 243
—see also the various countries
Social doctrine
—Catholic 224
—Church 11, 21
— — see also *Rerum novarum*
Socialism 198, 205, 241, 244
—Christian 420
Socialismo cattolico 453
Socialist law (1878) 35, 58, 60
"Social kingdom" 203f
Social movement, Catholic 453
—see also Labor movement and the various countries
Social philosophy, Neo-Scholastic 244f
Social question 191, 192f, 208
—see also the various countries
Società della Gioventù cattolica italiana 86
Società operaie cattoliche 200
Società S. Raffaele 151
Societas Divini Salvatoris (S.D.S.), see Salvatorians
Societas Mariae 264
Societas Verbi Divini (S.V.D.), see Steyl missionaries
Société Gratry pour le maintien de la paix entre les nations 519
Societies, Catholic 191, 212
Society for Christian Culture 429
"Society for the advancement of religion and culture" (*Krausgesellschaft*) 425
"Society of German Catholics" 35
Society of St. Jerome for the Propagation of the Holy Gospel 331
Society of the Divine Word, see Steyl missionaries
Sodalitium Pianum 469ff
Soden, Hermann von 325
Soderini, count 207
Sokolski, Joseph, Archbishop 372
Soler, Mariano, archbishop of Montevideo 128
Solesmes 266, 271, 284, 287, 407ff
—Gregorian chant 284, 288, 407ff
Solothurn, canton 78
Soloviev, Vladimir 341, 351
Solovki, monastery 351
Sommerwerck, Wilhelm, bishop of Hildesheim 40
Sonnenschein, Carl 227
Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary 264
Sophronios, Orthodox archbishop of Cyprus 361
Sophronios IV, patriarch of Alexandria 360
Soubirous, Bernadette 258
Soufflot, Jacques 290
South Africa 565
South America 566
Southeast Europe
—Catholicism 1914 186ff
—Orthodox Churches 354ff
South Slavic question 184
Spahn, Martin 427, 429
Spahn, Peter 497
Spain 12f, 20, 54, 193, 240, 245, 248, 386, 574
—Catholic labor movement 226
—Catholic press 216
—Church between revolution and reaction 119ff
—Church policy in the Philippines 539
—de-Christianization 125
—illiteracy and the school question 123
—internal Catholic differences 120ff
—liberalism 120ff, 124f
—missions 566
—orders and congregations 121, 124f, 275
—religious alienation among the rural proletariat 257
—religious instruction 125
—school question 125
—social question 119ff
—state and Church 120
—state religion and religious freedom 120
—workers' associations 124f
Spalding, John Lancaster, bishop of Peoria 156, 159
Spalding, Martin John, archbishop of Baltimore 156
Spanish College, Rome 122
Speyer, bishopric 44
Spillman, Joseph, S.J. 251
Spirituality of the 19th century
—externalization and internalization 257ff
Šrámek, Jan 182
Stablewski, see Oksza-Stablewski
Stadler, Joseph, archbishop of Sarajevo 51, 185
Standard catechism 416f
Stanley, Henry Morton 548
Starčević, Ante 185
State Church, liberal 32ff, 37
State intervention 224
Steenbrugge, priory 114
Stephen Peter X Azarian, Armenian patriarch 376
Steffes, Johannes Peter 573

Steinbach, Erwin von 290
Steyl missionaries 280, 281f, 529
—in China 536
—in Dutch East India 541
—in German New Guinea 544
—in Portuguese East Africa 553
—in Togo 547, 558
—in the Philippines 541
Steinhuber, S.J. 479
Stieglitz, H. 417
Stifter, Adalbert 45, 249
Stimmen der Zeit 479
Stojalowski, Stanislaw 176
Stolz, Alban 251
Stoppani, A. 89
Stötzel, J. 230
Strauß, David Friedrich 325
Streit, Robert, O.M.I. 571
Strike, right to strike 224f
Stroßmayer, Josip Jurij, bishop of Djakovo 51, 185, 187, 337, 340, 348, 371
Student associations, Catholic (Germany) 214
Studi religiosi 450f, 461
Stufler, Johann Baptist, S.J. 427
Stundists 348
Sturzo, Luigi 488f, 493f
Suárez 311
Suarezianism 316
Subiaco, congregation O.S.B. 274
Sudan, the, Christianization 548
Suermondt, C., O.P. 309
Sueur, bishop of Avignon 279
Sulpicians, in Canada 148
Sumatra 541
Summum semper, brief (1893) 275
Svampa, cardinal 90, 479
Syllabus (1864) 5, 9, 10, 26, 39, 54, 78, 236, 244, 400, 472
Syndicat des Employés du Commerce et de l'Industrie (France) 228
Synthetic Society 442
Syrians, Uniate 341, 374f, 377
Szembek, Józef Elias, archbishop of Mogilev 169
Szepticki, Andreas, duke, archbishop of the Uniate Ruthenians 344, 370f

Taaffe, Eduard, count 47, 49
Tablet 140
Taft, W. H., president of the USA 165
Talamo, Salvatore 200, 490
Tamisier, E. Marie 114, 260ff
Taparelli, Luigi 197
Tardivel, J. -P. (*La Vérité*) 147, 216
Tarte, J.-I. 148
Taschereau, E. -A., cardinal 147ff, 162
Taxil, Leo (Jogand-Pagés) 217f
Terörde, Anton, S.J. 554
Testem benevolentiae, apostolic letter (1899) 155, 333
Textbooks, Canada 148
Thalhofer, Franz Xaver 294
Theatines, in Georgia 373
The Guild of Our Lady of Ransom 137
Theiner, Augustin 318
Theology 277, 310, 431ff
—and philosophy 439f
Thérèse of Lisieux 24, 257, 268ff
Thomas, bishop of Rouen 236
Thomas Aquinas 19, 197, 263, 307ff, 315, 327
Thomas Christians 364f
—Uniate 532
Thomistic revival 307f
Thompson, Abbé 470
Thompson, Francis 146
Thomson, M. A. 469
Thorbecke, Jan Reed 115
Thorn-Prikker, Jan 298, 300
Thorwaldsen, Bertel 301
Thrace, vicariate apostolic 372
Thun, Leo, count 203
Tibet 527
Ticino 76, 78f
Tillmann, F. 477
Tinel, Edgar 285
Tittoni, Tommaso 486
Tixeront, Joseph 253, 323, 465
Toleration (*tolerantia*) 195f
Tolstoy, Dmitri, count, chief procurator 347
Tommaseo, Niccolò 90
Toniolo, Giuseppe 87f, 91, 94f, 200f, 478, 483, 490
Toorop, Jan 298
Torquebiau 397
Torrend, Jules, S.J. 554
Tosti, Luigi, abbot O.S.B. 85, 89
Töth, de 470
Touchet, bishop of Orléans 510
Toulouse, Catholic university 252f
Tovar, archbishop of Lima 128
Tovini, G. 88, 92
Trade-union controversy (Germany) 117, 230, 430, 477f, 497, 501, 505f
Trade unions, see Christian trade unions
Trade unions, mixed 206, 221
Tradita ab antiquis, constitution (1912) 345
Traditionalism, philosophical 8
Tragella, Giovanni Battista, P.I.M.E. 573
Trakl, Georg 249
Tra le sollecitudini, motu proprio (1903) 407
Transigents (Italy) 89ff
Transylvania
—Rumanian Byzantine rite in 371
Trappists 279
—in Australia 150, 544
—in Belgian Congo 550
—in Japan 538
—in Natal 556f
Treitz, I. 225
Tribunal of Ecclesiastical Affairs (Prussia) 37
Trier, bishopric 40
Trimborn, Karl 213
Triple Alliance 15f, 50, 65, 192

Troeltsch, Ernst 454
Trooz, de 113
Tübingen school 320
Tu-Duc, emperor of Annam 534
Turinaz, C. François, bishop of Nancy 332, 513
Turkey 51, 166, 186, 188, 531
—and the four old Orthodox Churches of the patriarchate 358
—state and Church 358f
Turmel, J. 323, 437, 462
Two-sources theory 329
Tychon, patriarch of Moscow 352
Tyrrell, George 442, 445ff, 448, 450, 452ff, 459, 461, 466
Tz'u-hsi, dowager empress of China 530

Ultramontanism 65f, 422, 425
Ullathorne, William Bernard, O.S.B., bishop of Birmingham 273
Umberto I, king of Italy 15, 126
Unamuno, Miguel de 124, 248
Uniate Eastern Churches 368ff
Unification, Pius IX's and Leo XIII's hopes for 335ff
Unio apostolica, community of priests 413
Unio Cleri pro Missionibus 562f
Union catholique de Fribourg 82, 201, 208
Unión Cathólica (Spain) 122
Union Councils
—Lyon (1274) 342
—Basel-Ferrara-Florence-Rome (1431–45) 342
Union de la France chrétienne 102f, 239
Unione cattolica per gli studi sociali in Italia 87, 91f, 200
Unione economico-sociale 227
Union fraternelle du Commerce et de l'Industrie 221
Union Nationale 103
Union of Priests and Missionaries 563
Unità cattolica 470, 473
United States of America 193ff, 195f, 238, 241
—Catholic associations and Freemason lodges 160f
—Catholicism and the socio-political question 161ff
—Catholicism around the turn of the century 245
—Church architecture 293
—de-Christianization 163f
—development of the Church 150ff
—episcopal elections 157
—immigrants, problems of 150ff
—missions 566
—orders 278
—Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884) 156ff
—population, development of 150
—school question 158ff, 211
— — "Faribault plan" 159
—"secret societies" 160ff
—social question 161ff
—state and Church 165
Upper Silesia Catholic workers' movement 226
Urosov, Leon, prince 167
Urráburu, J. J., S.J. 316
Ursel, Duc d' 112
Ursulines, in Dutch East India 541

Vacante Sede Apostolica, constitution (1904) 395
Valerga, Giuseppe, archbishop, patriarch of Jerusalem 335
Valamo, monastery 351
Vanderpol 519
Vannutelli, Serafino, cardinal 381f, 503
Vannutelli, Vincenzo, cardinal 143, 145, 337, 339f, 344, 519
Van onzen tijd 118
Vasari, Giorgio 290, 293
Vaterland 215
Vatican Archives 319
Vatican Council, First 31
—and missions 527
Vatican Council, Second 41
—church architecture 305
Vaughan, Herbert Alfred, cardinal 140ff, 281
Vaussard, M. 472
Vehementer nos, encyclical (1906) 513
Veith, Philipp 297
Vélez, Colombian ambassador to the Vatican 132
Vénard, L. 459f
Venezuela 131f
—state and Church 131
Verband katholischer Männer- und Arbeitervereine der Schweiz 80f
Verbeker, S. J. 261
Verdi, Guiseppe 286
Verhaegen, A. 111ff
Vérité 216
Verjus, St. E. 544
Verkade, Willibrord (Paul), O.S.B. 300
Verspeyen 113
Veuillot, Louis 147
Vianney, Jean-Baptiste 258
Vicent, Antonio 124
Victor Emmanuel II, king of Italy 293
Victor Emmanuel III, king of Italy 492
Victoria, queen of England 136, 149
Vidler, A. 448
Viennese school 200
Vigilantiae, apostolic letter (1902) 331
Vigouroux, Fulcrain Grégoire 325f
Vinck, H. 411
"Vincent Conferences," in Italy 87
Vincentians, female 280, 282
Vinco, Angelo 548
Viollet-le-Duc 292
Visitatio liminum 416
Vital, Julien, vicar apostolic 543

Vives y Tutó, Joseph Calasanz, O.F.M. Cap., cardinal 95, 128, 331, 390, 458
Vladimir I, grand duke of Kiev 348
Voce della verità 473
Vogelsang, Carl von, baron 200, 202ff
Vogüé, Eugène Melchior de 101, 248
Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland 75
Volpini, A. 208
Voltaire, François Marie 247
Vrau, Philibert 260
Vulgate 326ff

Waal, Anton de 253
Wacker, Theodor 192, 504
Wadkovski, Antoni, metropolitan of St. Petersburg 349
Wages, fair 209, 224
Wagner, Peter 407, 409
Wahrmund, Ludwig 55, 254, 461
Waldeck-Rousseau, Pierre 106, 507ff
Walega, Leon, bishop of Tarnow 176
Ward, Wilfrid 137f, 142, 442, 447
Warneck, Gustav 571
Washington, university 252
Wasmann, Erich, S.J. 254
Wattson, Paul J. Francis 344
Wawrzyniak, Piotr 179f
Weber, Friedrich Wilhelm 251
Weber, Josef, suffragan bishop of Lemberg 176
Weimar constitution 196
Weiß, Albert Maria, O.P. 204, 256, 313, 320, 500
Wekerle 52
Wellhausen, Julius 442
Welti, Emil 79
Wernz, Franz Xaver, general S.J. 478f
Werthern, count 58
Werthmann, Lorenz 260
Westcott, Brooke Foss 325
Wetering, H. van de, archbishop of Utrecht 117
White Fathers 341, 529, 569
—in Africa 546f
—in central Africa 551f
—in Rhodesia 554
White Sisters, in Africa 546
Wilhelm I, king of Prussia 29, 33, 38, 39, 43, 56, 292
Wilhelm II, emperor of Germany 10, 15, 275, 495, 507, 517
—Church policy 495ff
Wilhelmina, queen of the Netherlands 20
Willem I, king of the Netherlands 118
Willem II, king of the Netherlands 118
Willem III, king of the Netherlands 118
Willmann, Otto 307
Wilpert, Otto 410
Wimmer, Bonifaz, O.S.B. 272ff
Windthorst, Ludwig 22, 29f, 33, 38, 60, 63, 67f, 70ff, 73, 192ff, 213, 222, 496f, 502
Winterthur, canton 76
Wirz, A. 80
Wiseman, Nicholas 137
Witt, Franz Xaver 285f, 287
Witte, Serge, count 341
Woeste, C. 109ff
Wollmann, religion teacher 32
Wolter, Maurus, O.S.B. 114, 271, 273f
Wolter, Placidus, O.S.B. 114, 271ff, 275
Women's emancipation 209
Work of St. Peter 529, 563
World apostolate 566
World mission, see Missions
World prayer octave for the unification of divided Christianity 344
World war
—outbreak of World War I 517
Worship, forms of 257
Wrzesnia school strike (1901) 179
Wulf, Maurice de 315
Württemberg 44
—school question 218f
Würzburg, bishopric 44

Zaleski, L. M., patriarch 232
Zapletal, Vinzenz, O.P. 83
Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft 571
Zemp, Joseph 81
Zedlitz-Trützschler, Robert von, count 495
Zentralkomitee der Katholischen Vereine Deutschlands 202
Zentralverband christlich-sozialer Organisationen der Schweiz 81
Zigliara, Tommaso Maria, Cardinal 112, 208, 310
Cistercians 279f
—in China 568
—in Japan 568
—in Vietnam 568
Zocchi, Gaetano, S.J. 88
Zottmann, Franz Xaver von, bishop of Tiraspol (Saratov) 169
Zurich, Canton 76, 78
Zwanzigstes Jahrhundert, journal 427, 429
Zwirner 298

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

X

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

Edited by
Hubert Jedin, Konrad Repgen
and
John Dolan

Volume X

THE CHURCH IN THE MODERN AGE

by

GABRIEL ADRIÁNYI–QUINTÍN ALDEA VAQUERO
PIERRE BLET–JOHANNES BOTS–VIKTOR DAMMERTZ
ERWIN GATZ–ERWIN ISERLOH–HUBERT JEDIN
GEORG MAY–JOSEPH METZLER–LUIGI MEZZARDI
FRANCO MOLINARI–KONRAD REPGEN
LEO SCHEFFCZYK–MICHAEL SCHMOLKE
ANTONIO DA SILVA–BERNHARD STASIEWSKI
ANDRÉ TIHON–NORBERT TRIPPEN–ROBERT TRISCO
LUDWIG VOLK–WILHELM WEBER
PAUL-LUDWIG WEINACHT–FÉLIX ZUBILLAGA

Translated by
Anselm Biggs

CROSSROAD · NEW YORK

The Crossroad Publishing Company
18 East 41st Street, New York, NY 10017

Translated from the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*
Vol. VII: *Die Weltkirche im 20. Jahrhundert*
© Verlag Herder Freiburg im Breisgau 1979

English translation © 1981 by The Crossroad Publishing Company

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or
by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording,
or otherwise, without the written permission of
The Crossroad Publishing Company.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Weltkirche im 20. Jahrhundert. English.
The Church in the modern age.

(History of the Church; v. 10)
Translation of: Die Weltkriche im 20 Jahrhundert/
Anslem Biggs.
Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Church history—20th century. I. Adriányi,
Gabriel. II. Biggs, Anslem. III. Series: Handbuch
der Kirchengeschichte. English; v. 10.
BR145.2.J413 1980, vol. 10 [BR479] 270s 81-5057
ISBN 0-8245-0013-X [270.8'2] AACR2

CONTENTS

Preface xi

Preface to the English Edition xv

List of Abbreviations xvii

SECTION ONE: THE INSTITUTIONAL UNITY OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH 1

Chapter 1: Statistics 1
- Statistics of the World's Population, Statistics of the World Religions, Proportion of Catholics 1
  - Statistics of the World's Population 1914–65 1
  - Statistics of the World Religions 1914–65 5
  - The Southward Movement of the Christian World 9
- The Organization of the Entire Church from 1914 to 1970 9
  - Congregations, Tribunals and Offices, Commissions and Secretariats of the Curia (1916–68) 11
  - The College of Cardinals (1916–68) 18
  - Titles and Areas of Jurisdiction in the Totality of the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church (1916–68) 18
  - Diplomatic Representations of the Apostolic See with the Nations and of the Nations with the Apostolic See (1916–68) 19

Chapter 2: Popes Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII—Biography and Activity within the Church 21
- Benedict XV 21
- Pius XI 23
- Pius XII 29

Chapter 3: Foreign Policy of the Popes in the Epoch of the World Wars 35
- The First World War and the Postwar Years: Benedict XV 35
  - Neutrality 35
  - Papal Measures of Assistance 38
  - Efforts for Peace 39
- Between the Two World Wars: Pius XI 47
  - The Lateran Treaties of 1929 47
    - The "Roman Question" to 1926 47; The Route to the Lateran Treaties (1926–29) 52; After the Lateran Treaties: The Crisis of 1931 and 1938 55
  - Pius XI and the Totalitarian Systems 59
    - Pius XI and the Soviet Union 60; Pius XI and National Socialist Germany: *The Way to the Concordat with the Reich* (*April–July* 1933) 63; *Between the Concordat and the Encyclical* Mit brennender Sorge 70; *From the Encyclical* Mit brennender Sorge *to the End of the Pontificate* (1937–39) 72
- The Second World War: Pius XII 77
  - Neutrality 79
  - Efforts for Peace 82
  - Papal Measures of Assistance 88
  - The Pope's "Silence" 93

Chapter 4: The Second Vatican Council 96
- John XXIII: Summoning and Preparation for the Council 96
- The First Session and the Change of Pontificate 106
- Second Session (1963) and First Results 116
- Third Session: Crisis of November and Constitution on the Church 125

Fourth Session and Closing. 135
Impact. 146

Chapter 5: The Code of Canon Law and the Development of Canon Law to 1974. 151
From the Promulgation of the Code to the Second Vatican Council. 151
The Codification of Canon Law. 151
The Development of the Law from 1918 to 1958. 153
Benedict XV 154; Pius XI 154; Pius XII 156
From the Convocation of the Second Vatican Council. 158
John XXIII. 158
Paul VI. 159
Organs 159; General Character 163; Individual Legislative Actions 167; Revision of the Code and of the Canon Law of the Eastern Church 173

Chapter 6: The Holy See's Policy of Concordats from 1918 to 1974. 177
Era of Concordats under Pius XI and Pius XII. 177
To the Beginning of the Second World War. 177
Point of Departure, Motives, and General Character 177; Individual Concordats: *With the New States 183; With the "Separation Countries" of Europe 185; With the Latin American States 189; Germany 190*
During the Second World War. 198
In the Postwar Period. 200
Fate of Concordats in Socialist Countries 200; Concordats with Free Countries 203
The Agreements under John XXIII and Paul VI. 209
The Significance of the Second Vatican Council for the Legal Relationship of Church and State. 209
The Individual Agreements. 213
The "Protocols" with Socialist States 213; The "Modus vivendi" with Tunisia 215; The Changes in Concordats in States Giving Preferential Status to the Catholic Church 216; Latest Concordats and Agreements with Free Countries 218

SECTION TWO: THE DIVERSITY OF THE INNER LIFE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH. 229

Chapter 7: Society and State as a Problem for the Church. 229
The Social Claim to Educate and Its Bases: Natural Law and Revelation ("Question of Competence"). 232
Social Principles: Personality, Subsidiarity, Solidarity, Common Good, Universal Common Good. 236
State and State Power—Democracy. 242
The Church and the Social Errors of the Age. 248
Socialism–Communism. 248
Fascism–National Socialism. 253
Understanding of Peoples: "World State". 257

Chapter 8: Main Lines of the Development of Theology between World War I and Vatican II. 260
The Departure from Neo-Scholasticism in Systematic Theology. 260
Temporal and Intellectual Presuppositions. 260
The Turning of Dogma from "Reason" to "Living". 264
The "Theological" Deepening of Moral Theology. 272
From "Apologetics" to "Fundamental Theology". 277
The Evolution of Historical Theology with the Aid of the Historicocritical Method. 280
The Progress of Church History. 280
Overcoming Resistance to the Historical Method in Biblical Scholarship. . 283
The Rise of Pastoral Theology to a Scientific Theological Discipline. . . . 288
The Increased Significance of General (Fundamental) Pastoral Theology. . 288
The Catechetical Renewal. 291
The Turning of Homiletics to Kerygmatics. 293
The Reestablishment of Liturgy as "Theology of Worship" 295

Chapter 9: Movements within the Church and Their Spirituality. 299
The Liturgical Movement. 300
New Awareness of the Church and the Scriptural Movement. 305
Catholic Action. 307
The Spiritual Exercises Movement 310
Eucharistic Piety in Transition. 312
Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. 315
Devotion to Mary and Mariology. 318
The Spiritual Development of the Orders. 321
The Secular Institutes. 326
Worker-Priests. 331

Chapter 10: Developments in the Clergy since 1914. 336

Chapter 11: Religious Communities and Secular Institutes. 352
The Orders between Persistence and Change. 352
The Rise of New Types of Communities. 355
The Acclimatization of the Orders in Mission Lands 358
Religious Reform under Pius XII. 361
The Second Vatican Council and Its Effects. 364
The Orders in the Field of Tension between Church and State. 371

Chapter 12: Educational System, Education, and Instruction. 378
Church and Society in Their Relation to the Educational System. 378
Catholic Educational and School Doctrine. 380
The Second Vatican Council and the Postconciliar Period. 382
Catholic Education in the European and North American Educational Systems. 388
  Preschool Area. 389
  Primary and Secondary Spheres. 391
  Tertiary Sphere. 395
  Continuing Education (Education of Adults). 399
Conditions for Catholic Education in Other Areas of the World. 403

Chapter 13: Information and the Mass Media. 410
The Catholic Claim and the "Colorless Press". 411
Film and Radio in the Early Phase. 413
The Development of the Catholic Press in the International Survey. 415
Catholic News Agencies. 427
Radio and Television under the Restrictions of Commercial or of Public Control. 428
Church Journalism in the Third World. 430
Church and Mass Communication in Theory and Organization. 432

Chapter 14: Charity and Ecclesiastical Works of Assistance. 436
Laying the Foundations in the Nineteenth Century. 436
National Organizations. 441
International Cooperation. 443
Consolidation of Charity between the World Wars. 445
Charity in the Totalitarian State. 447
Assistance in Emergency and Catastrophe since the Second World War. . . . 448
Caritas Internationalis. 450
Catholic Works of Assistance. 453

Chapter 15: History of the Ecumencial Movement. 458
The Development of the World Council of Churches and Its Route from Amsterdam (1948) to Nairobi (1976). 458
The Share of the Roman Catholic Church in the Ecumenical Movement. . . 466

Chapter 16: The Dissident Eastern Churches. 473
The Orthodox Churches. 474
  The Four Ancient Patriarchates. 474

        - The Orthodox Church in Georgia. 478
        - The Patriarchates Originating in the Middle Ages and in Modern Times. . 479
        - Other Orthodox Churches. 488
            - In the Mediterranean Area 488; In East Central Europe and the Far East 492
        - Foreign Churches. 494
    - The Eastern Pre-Chalcedonian National Churches. 496
        - The Nestorian Churches. 496
        - The Monophysite Churches. 497

SECTION THREE: THE CHURCH IN THE INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES. 505

Chapter 17: The Church in Northern, Eastern, and Southern Europe. 505
- The Scandinavian Countries. 505
- The Baltic Countries. 507
- The Soviet Union. 509
- Poland. 512
- Czechoslovakia. 516
- Hungary. 520
- Rumania. 523
- Yugoslavia. 526
- Bulgaria. 529
- Albania. 530

Chapter 18: The Church in German-Speaking Countries. 531
- Germany. 531
- Austria. 549
- Switzerland. 552
- The Situation in the German-Speaking Area after the Second Vatican Council. 553

Chapter 19: The Church in the Benelux Countries. 557
- Belgium. 557
- Luxemburg. 560
- The Netherlands. 561
    - Period of Flowering (1919–60). 561
    - Disintegration (1960–70). 564

Chapter 20: Catholicism in Italy. 569

Chapter 21: The Catholic Church of France. 583
- Under Benedict XV. 584
- Under Pius XI. 586
- Under Pius XII. 592

Chapter 22: The Church in Spain and Portugal. 600
- Spain. 600
    - The Monarchy of Alphonso XIII (1914–31) 601
        - The Problem of the Two Spains 601; Christian Syndicalism 603
    - Second Spanish Republic and Civil War (1931–39). 604
    - The Civil War (1936–39). 605
        - The Red Zone 606; The National Zone 607
    - Spain in the Postwar Period (since 1939). 608
        - The Twofold Trend: *Traditional Generation 608; Critical Generation 609;* Institutions: *Episcopal Conference 609; Religious Communities 610; Catholic Action 610; Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas 611*
- Portugal. 611
    - The Anticlerical Revolution (1910–26). 611
    - The New Regime (1926–60). 612
    - Under the Influence of the Second Vatican Council (from 1960). 613

Chapter 23: The Countries of the English-Speaking Area. 614
- Europe. 614
    - Great Britain. 614

Population 614; Organization 615; Educational System 616; Social Movement 622; Catechetical and Apologetic Work 629; Liturgical Movement 630; Journalism 631

Ireland. 632

Population 632; Political Development 633; Ecclesiastical Organization 635; Relations with the State 635; Educational System 637; Social Movement 638; Lay Apostolate 640

North America. 642

The United States. 642

Population 642; Organization 643; Educational System 645; Social Movement 650; Liturgical Movement 657; The Situation in American Society 658; The Position of the Church in International Affairs 660; Lay Movements 663; Journalism 664

Canada. 667

Population 667; Organization 668; Educational System 668; Social Movement 670

Chapter 24: The Church in Latin America. 672

Brazil. 674

Ecclesiastical Organization 674; Lack of Priests 674; Catholic Action 675; Piety 675; Too Few Priestly Vocations 676; Care of Souls 677; Catholic Universities and School 680; Newspapers, Periodicals, Means of Social Communication 681; Ecclesiastical Shortcomings 681; Religious Orders, Pastoral Cooperation 682; The Postconciliar Period 683; Formation of New Priests 684; Catholic Missions among the Indians of Brazil 684; Fraternal Associations 684

Argentina. 685

The Argentine Church after the Council 686; Difficulties within the Argentine Church 687; The Determining of the Functions of Priests 688; The "Emergency Residential District" of Buenos Aires 689; The "Priests for the Third World" United with the People 689; The Church's Functions 690

Paraguay. 690

Ecclesiastical Organization 691; Educational Institutions 691; Protests of the Bishops 691; Two Worlds Developing 692; The Function of Priests 693; Church-State Relations 694

Uruguay. 694

Ecclesiastical Structure 695; Celibacy 696; Renewal in the Light of the Second Vatican Council and of the Congress of Medellín 696

Chile. 697

In Search of a Uniform Ecclesiastical Activity 698; Attempt at a Balance 699; Christians for Socialism 699; Situation of the Chilean Church 700

Bolivia. 701

Ecclesiastical Structure 701; Human Solidarity 702; Defense of the Miners 702; Miner Priests 703; New Initiatives 703; Increase of Priestly Vocations 704; Authentic Justice and Humanization 705

Peru. 705

Educational Institutions 706; The Social Sphere 706

Ecuador. 708

School System 709; Political and Socioeconomic Position of the Church 709; First National Assembly of Ecuadorian Priests 710; In Search of an Integral Development 710; The Church Facing the New Agrarian Law 711; The Church in the Present 711

Colombia. 712

School System 713; Missions and Missionaries 713; Catholic Initiatives 713; The Voice of the Bishops 714; Agricultural Reform 715; Communist Infiltration in the University 716; The Postconciliar Church 716; The National Plan for Pastoral Care 717; Pastoral Letter to the International Eucharistic Congress 717; The Priestly Group of Golconda 717; Implementation of the Medellín Decrees 717; Birth Control 718; Land Reform and Limitation of Property 718; Catholic-Anglican Dialogue 718; Social Security for the Clergy 719

Venezuela. 719
Ecclesiastical Organization 719; Situation of the Church 720; Social Works 721; Care of Souls 721
Cuba. 723
Ecclesiastical Structure 723; Pastoral Letter of the Bishops 724; The Economic Situation of the Cuban Church 724; The Persecuted Church 725; The Standpoint of the Bishops 726; Decrease of the Cuban Clergy 727
The Dominican Republic. 727
The Concordat between the Holy See and the Dominican Republic 728; The Church in Public Life 729
Panama. 730
The Situation of the Church 730; Social Revaluation 731; Religious Life in Central America and Panama 731; Arrest and Expulsion of Father Luis Medrano, S. J. 731; The Church and Reform of the National Constitution 732
Nicaragua. 733
Apostolic Activities 733; National Constitution 733; Activity of the Church 734
Honduras. 734
The Voice of the Bishops 735; Land Occupation 736
El Salvador. 736
The Land Problem and the Position of the Priests 737; Against the Use of Violence 738; Seminary for Priestly Vocations 738; The Abortion Law 738
Guatemala. 739
Tensions 739; Pastoral Guidelines 740; The Christian and Political Activity 740
Mexico. 741
Constitution of 1917 742; New Persecution: Plutarco Elías Calles 742; Economic Boycott, the "Cristeros War" 742; Papal Documents 743; Balance Sheet of the Persecution 744; Church and State since 1940 744; Organization of the Mexican Church 745; Parishes and Missions, Organization of the Clergy 746; Episcopal Documents 747; Piety of the Mexican 748; National Plan for Common Pastoral Care 748; "Priests for the Poor" 750

Chapter 25: The Young Churches in Asia, Africa, and Oceania. 751
The Young Churches in Asia. 753
The Far East. 753
China 753; Taiwan 757; Japan 758; Korea 761
Southeast Asia. 763
India 763; Pakistan 768; Bangladesh 769; Sri Lanka 769; Vietnam 771; Laos 773; Cambodia 774; Thailand 774; Burma 774; The Malay Peninsula 775; Indonesia 775
The Young Churches in Africa. 777
The Young Churches in Oceania. 795
Australia and New Zealand. 795
The Pacific Islands. 796
The Philippines. 802

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 805

INDEX. 853

PREFACE

The pretentious title of this volume* is justified by an overwhelming fact of both ecclesiastical and secular history: the Catholic Church, which has ceaselessly claimed to be universal, has actually become a world-church in our century. Restricted in antiquity essentially to the lands around the Mediterranean, cast back in the Middle Ages to the West by the encircling Islamic wall and the Eastern Schism, and still Europe-oriented in modern times despite the world-mission that had got under way, it developed in the twentieth century into a world-church. The Second Vatican Council, at which this development entered into the general consciousness, stands at the center of this volume. It does not pass over the fact that the spatial expansion, and even more the internal happenings, have created a critical situation, which shows itself in all three areas into which we have organized the matter: in the principle of unity, in the papacy, the council, and canon law; in virtually all the inner expressions of the Church's life, as much in theology as in spirituality; and finally in its members, the local churches of European and non-European countries.

We provide a cross section of the diversity of the Church's life, but our deeper motive remains the continuation of the longitudinal section which this series has striven to supply in its earlier volumes. Thus the association of this volume with the series is justified, but also its independence in so far as it offers the historical information, becoming ever more difficult, which is needed for an understanding of the present.

As the temporal point of departure there presented itself the year 1914, the outbreak of the First World War, joined to a change of pontificate. More difficult was the delimitation at the other end. "The present" is an elastic concept. From the start it was not intended to understand by it the year of publication of the volume. Some collaborators have excluded the last years, mostly with regard to developments still in progress; others have included the most recent events in their presentation.

---

* The original German title is *Die Weltkirche im 20. Jahrhundert* (The World-Church in the Twentieth Century).

To write the ecclesiastical history of the age is more risky than to deal with the political history. The growth of the Church moves in longer waves than does that of states: the era of National Socialism, as a historical fact, is behind us; the impact of the Second Vatican Council has not yet been evaluated. The sources accessible to the historian for political history are more abundant, whereas for ecclesiastical history important complexes of sources are not yet accessible. On the other hand, the remaining material which was to be assimilated is so bulky and many-layered that only specialists are in a position to acquire a survey and thorough view, to supply the existing trends, and to join them with the earlier. Hence, of necessity the number of collaborators has been increased and the coordination made more difficult, not only for the subjects of the Church's life, but also in regard to the accounts of countries, especially those of the Third World. In none of the previous volumes of the series were the selection and the gaining of competent collaborators so difficult as in this one. What was required of them was not only exact knowledge of events, but the ability to extract the essentials from the abundance of phenomena and to present them in the brevity demanded by the nature of a handbook. Some manuscripts had to be abbreviated, but nevertheless some excesses in bulk could not be avoided. The contributions made in a foreign language had to be translated. In spite of all the efforts of the editors, a certain amount of overlapping could not be avoided, for example, when the question of concordats concluded by the Holy See and the theme of papal external policy had to be treated according to their juridical content and in their social effects, as well as in other contexts. Hence it would not be appropriate to regard such overlappings as "repetitions." We have tried, by means of cross-references in the text, to facilitate the orientation; furthermore, the list of subject matter in the Index makes possible the locating of relevant passages.

As in the earlier volumes, so too in this one the editors have sought technically to standardize the individual contributions. For this purpose a conference of the contributors, arranged by Verlag Herder in July 1975, was helpful, but of course it had to be implemented by constant correspondence. If it has still not been possible to eliminate all lack of symmetry in the arrangement and the method of citation, this does no harm to the usability of the entire work.

Finally, as regards the inner orientation of the volume, it was, as in the case of the previous volumes, the basic principle that the authors speak for themselves and especially bear the responsibility for the judgments rendered. We did not regard ourselves justified to intervene in their formation of opinion and hence could not identify ourselves with every view here expressed. However, all collaborators were united in faith in the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, united in the conviction that Church history, including the ecclesiastical history of the contemporary period, must follow historical method. In selection and evaluation we have held to the principle which Joseph Ratzinger very recently formulated: "On the one hand, the Church must never be separated from its concrete manifestation, but, on the other hand, it must also never be entirely identified with it."

The present text was, to this point, formulated on 28 August 1977. Still lacking was only the constantly promised chapter on the "The Young Churches"; the rest of the volume was set and made up into pages; publisher and editors counted on publication in autumn 1977. But this was prevented because the author of this chapter fell seriously ill and finally gave up. It was not easy to find a new author. We are grateful to Father Metzler for stepping into the breach and quickly composing Chapter 25. When other, equally unforeseen hindrances had happily been overcome by the beginning of 1979, production could start without interruption.

The delay in publication for one and one-half years explains why the pontificate of Paul VI was not included: when the book was ready in these parts, this Pope was still alive and hence not yet a subject of history. His death on 6 August 1978 ended an important chapter of the most recent history of the Church. Whether the short pontificate of his successor, John Paul I, elected on 26 August and dead on 28 September 1978, still belongs to this chapter or means the beginning of a new one cannot be said scientifically at this moment with sufficient assurance—for this the contours of the new are not yet sharp enough, although there is much to be said for the view that 1978 will be a very important caesura in the history of the Catholic Church.

Hubert Jedin
Konrad Repgen

PREFACE TO ENGLISH EDITION

By a sad coincidence the translation of the final volume of the *History of the Church* was completed within the week of the death of Msgr. Hubert Jedin, 17 July 1980. Perhaps more widely recognized in Europe and Latin America than in the English-speaking world, his rapport with Protestant scholars bore fruit on both sides of the Atlantic. While his *History of the Church* (formerly *Handbook of Church History*) will no doubt serve as an impressive and lasting monument to his work as a Church historian it was in a sense peripheral to the great endeavor of his life, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient,* a definitive work that he did not complete until shortly before his death. Yet long before the appearance of the first volume of the history of the council of Trent in 1949, Jedin had established himself as an authority on the history of the Reformation and the nature of historical methodology. His biography of Seripando and his study of Albert Pigge gave him an early international reputation. No work on the Thirty Years War or Wallenstein is complete without his reference to Piccolomini's correspondence. His pioneering efforts in the study of the writings of Luther's literary opponents opened a new field in Reformation studies and helped to place the future Second Vatican Council in proper historical perspective.

Jedin's basic premise that Church history can be understood only as the history of salvation was supported by his conviction that there is a difference between Church history and the history of Christianity, since the former is rooted in faith and therefore a theological discipline. As history, it is bound to certain rubrics: it is bound to its sources and the causal connection of the facts related; hence the importance of recognizing human freedom. "There are historical guilt and historical merit but the judgment of history is not a sentence pronounced upon the Church's past."

In all of his writings Jedin sought to see and describe the past in the spirit of *veritas et caritas*. It is hoped that the reader will find this same spirit in this volume that treats a Church so different from the Church of Trent and yet a Church, not unlike that of the sixteenth century, open to the perennial exhortation: *ecclesia semper reformanda est.*

John P. Dolan

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Vatican City 1909ff.
ACJF	Action Catholique de la Jeunesse Française.
ADAP	*Akten zur Deutschen auswärtigen Politik 1919–1945,* Göttingen 1966ff.
ADSS	P. Blet, R. A. Graham (from Vol. 3), A. Martini, B. Schneider, eds.: *Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale,* Vatican City 1965.
AfkKR	*Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht,* (Innsbruck) Mainz 1857ff.
AHC	*Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum,* Paderborn 1969ff.
AHP	*Archivum historiae pontificiae,* Rome 1963ff.
D. Albrecht I, II	D. Albrecht, ed., *Der Notenwechsel zwischen dem Hl. Stuhl und der Deutschen Regierung.* I: *Von der Ratifizierung des Reichskonkordats bis zur Enzyklika "Mit brennender Sorge,"* Mainz 1965; II: *1937–1945,* Mainz 1969.
D. Albrecht, *Kirche*	C. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich. Eine Aufsatzsammlung,* Mainz 1976 (with bibliography).
ALW	*Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft,* Regensburg 1950ff.
ANEC	Asociación Nacional de Estudiantes Católicos.
AnGr	*Analecta Gregoriana,* Rome 1930ff.
ASS	*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* Rome 1865–1908.
Atlas hierarchicus	*Atlas hierarchicus. Descriptio geographica et statistica ecclesiae catholicae tum occidentis tum orientis,* ed. H. Emmerich, S.V.D., Mödling 1968.
Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III	K. Bihlmeyer and H. Tüchle, *Kirchengeschichte* III: *Die Neuzeit und die Neueste Zeit,* Paderborn 1968.
Bilanz der Theologie	H. Vorgrimler and R. Vander Gucht, eds., *Bilanz der Theologie im 20. Jh.,* I–IV, Freiburg, Basel, Vienna 1969–70.
CADC	Centro Académico de Democracia Cristã.
CALA	Conferencia anglicana latinoamericana.
Catholica	*Catholica. Jahrbuch (Vierteljahreszeitschrift) für Kontroverstheologie,* (Paderborn) Münster 1932ff.
CEHILA	Comisión de Estudios de Historia de la Iglesia en América Latina.
CELAM	Consejo Episcopal Latino-Americano, Bogotá 1968ff.
CHR	*The Catholic Historical Review,* Washington 1915ff.
CIAS	Centro de Investigación y Acción Social.
CIC	Centrum Informationis Catholicum.

CIDSE	Coopération Internationale pour le Développement Socio-Économique.
CIMI	Consejo Indigenista Misionero.
CISOR	Centro de investigaciones en ciencias sociales, Caracas.
CivCatt	*La Civiltà Cattolica,* Rome 1850ff. (1871–87 Florence).
CLAR	Confoederatio Latino-Americana Religiosorum.
CNT	Confederación Nacional de Trabajo.
ComRel	*Commentarium pro religiosis et missionariis,* Rome 1920ff.
Concilium	*Concilium, Internationale Zeitschrift für Theologie,* Einsiedeln, Mainz, Zurich 1965ff.
CPA	Catholic Press Association.
CS	*Communicatio Socialis. Zeitschrift für Publizistik in Kirche und Welt,* Paderborn 1967ff.
DBFP	*Documents on British Foreign Policy,* 1947ff.
DCV	Deutscher Caritasverband.
DDF	*Documents Diplomatiques Français.*
DDI	*Documenti Diplomatici Italiani.*
DIP	G. Pelliccia and G. Rocca, *Dizionario degli Istituti di Perfezione,* Rome 1974ff.
ECQ	*Eastern Churches Quarterly,* Ramsgate 1936–64.
EKD	Evangelische Kirche Deutschlands.
EphLiturg	*Ephemerides Liturgicae,* Rome 1887ff.
EThL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* Bruges 1924ff.
FRUS	*Foreign Relations of the United States. Diplomatic Papers.*
Giacometti, *Quellen*	Z. Giacometti, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche,* Tübingen 1926.
GS	*Gaudium et spes.*
GuL	*Geist und Leben. Zeitschrift für Askese und Mystik,* Würzburg 1947ff.
Hampe	J. C. Hampe, *Die Autorität der Freiheit. Gegenwart des Konzils und Zukunft der Kirche im Ökumenischen Disput,* 3 vols., Munich 1967.
Herder *TK*	*Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Konstitutionen, Dekrete u. Erklärungen, lat. u. deutsch. Kommentare,* ed. by H. Vorgrimler et al., 3 vols., Freiburg 1966–68.
HJ	*Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft,* Cologne 1880ff., Munich 1950ff.
HK	*Herder-Korrespondenz,* Freiburg 1946ff.
HOAC	Hermandad Obrera de Acción Catòlica.
Hochland	*Hochland,* Munich 1903ff.
HPTh	*Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie,* ed. Franz Xaver Arnold et al., Freiburg 1964ff.
IKZ	*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Bern 1911ff.
IRA	Irish Republican Army.
ISAL	Iglesia y sociedad para América Latina.
JbCarWiss	*Jahrbuch für Caritaswissenschaft und Caritasarbeit,* Freiburg 1957–68.
JAC	Jeunesse Agricole Catholique.

JEC	Jeunesse Étudiante Catholique.
JMC	Jeunesse Maritime Catholique.
JOC	Juventud Obrera Católica.
JOC	Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne.
KH	*Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland* 1907–43.
KNA	Katholische Nachrichtenagentur, Bonn, Munich.
KNP	Katholiek Nederlands Persbureau.
Kolping	A. Kolping, *Katholische Theologie gestern und heute. Thematik und Entfaltung deutscher katholischer Theologie vom I. Vaticanum bis zur Gegenwart,* Bremen 1964.
A. Kupper, *Staatliche Akten*	A. Kupper, ed., *Staatliche Akten über die Reichskonkordatsverhandlungen 1933,* Mainz 1969.
LJ	*Liturgisches Jahrbuch,* Münster 1951ff.
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* 2d ed., Freiburg, 1957–68.
LWB	Lutherischer Weltbund.
M	E. Marmy, ed., *Mensch und Gemeinschaft in christlicher Schau. Dokumente* (from Gregory XVI 1832 to Pius XII 1944), Fribourg 1945.
MM	*Mater et Magistra.*
MThZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift,* Munich 1950ff.
Müller	*Vaticanum secundum,* ed. by O. Müller, W. Becker, J. Gülden, 4 vols., Leipzig 1963–66.
NCE	*New Catholic Encyclopedia,* New York 1967.
NCWC	National Catholic Welfare Conference.
NRTh	*Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* Tournai, Louvain, Paris 1879ff.
NZMW	*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* Beckenried 1945ff.
ÖAfKR	*Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht,* Vienna 1950ff.
OCIC	Office Catholique International du Cinéma.
OrChr	*Oriens Christianus,* Rome 1901ff.
OstkSt	*Ostkirchliche Studien,* Würzburg 1951ff.
PIME	Pontificio Istituto Missioni Estere.
PP	*Poplurum progressio.*
PrOrChr	*Le Proche-Orient Chrétien,* Jerusalem 1951ff.
PT	*Pacem in terris.*
QA	*Quadragesimo anno.*
REB	*Revista eclesiástica brasileira,* Petropolis 1941ff.
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* Louvain 1900ff.
RHMC	*Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine.*
Rohrbasser	*Heilslehre der Kirche. Dokumente von Pius IX. bis Pius XII.,* ed. P. Cattin and H. T. Conus, transl. A. Rohrbasser, Fribourg 1953.
RPB I	*Die Kirchliche Lage in Bayern nach den Regierungspräsidentenberichten 1933–1943,* I: *Regierungsbezirk Oberbayern,* ed. H. Witetschek, Mainz 1966.
RPB II	II: *Regierungsbezirk Ober- und Mittelfranken,* ed. H. Witetschek, Mainz 1967.

RPB III	III: *Regierungsbezirk Schwaben,* ed. H. Witetschek, Mainz 1971.
RPB IV	IV: *Regierungsbezirk Niederbayern und Oberpfalz, 1933–1945,* ed. W. Ziegler, Mainz 1973.
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris 1910ff.
RSCI	*Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia,* Rome 1947ff.
RThom	*Revue thomistique,* Bruges 1893ff.
SEDOC	*Serviço de Documentacão,* Petropolis 1969ff.
Sic	*Sic* (periodical, ed. Centro Gumilla), Caracas 1938ff.
SOG	Solidaritätsgruppen der Priester.
SOG-Papiere	*SOG-Papiere. Mitteilungsblatt der Arbeitsgemeinschaft von Priestergruppen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der SOG-Österreich,* ed. A. Schilling, Bochum 1968–73.
SPEV	Segretariato permanente del episcopo venezolano.
SSCC	Congregatio Sacrorum Cordium Jesu et Mariae.
Schmidlin	J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten zeit* I–IV, Munich 1933–39.
B. Stasiewski I, II, III	B. Stasiewski, ed., *Akten deutscher Bischöfe über die Lage der Kirche.* I: *1933–1934,* Mainz 1968; II: *1934–1935,* Mainz 1976; III: *1935–1936,* Mainz 1978.
StdZ	*Stimmen der Zeit* (before 1914: *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*), Freiburg 1871ff.
StL	*Staatslexikon,* 6th ed., ed. H. Sacher, Freiburg, 1957ff.
STO	Service du Travail Obligatoire
ThGl	*Theologie und Glaube,* Paderborn 1909ff.
TheoluPhil	*Theologie und Philosophie. Vierteljahreszeitschrift für Theologie und Philosophie,* Freiburg 1966ff.
ThprQS	*Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift,* Linz a. d. Donau 1848ff.
ThRev	*Theologische Revue,* Münster 1902ff.
ThQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen 1819ff., Stuttgart 1946ff.
TThZ	*Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* (until 1944: *Pastor Bonus*), Trier 1888ff.
UCIP	L'Union Catholique Internationale de la Presse.
UG	A. F. Utz, J. F. Groner, *Aufbau und Entfaltung des gesellschaftlichen Lebens. Soziale Summe Pius' XII.* I, II, Fribourg 1954.
UGT	Unión General de Trabajadores.
UISG	Unio Internationalis Superiorissarum Generalium.
UMAE	Unión de Mutua Ayuda Episcopal.
USG	Unio Superiorum Generalium.
VZG	*Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte,* Stuttgart 1953ff.
L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten*	L. Volk, ed., *Kirchliche Akten über die Reichskontkordatsverhandlungen 1933,* Mainz 1969.
L. Volk, *Faulhaber Akten*	L. Volk, ed., *Akten Kardinal Michael von Faulhabers 1917–1945.* I: *1917–1934,* Mainz 1975; II: *1935–1945,* Mainz 1978.
WACC	World Association for Christian Communication
WiWei	*Wissenschaft und Weisheit,* Düsseldorf 1934ff.
ZAM	*Zeitschrift für Askese und Mystik,* Würzburg 1926.
ZevKR	*Zeitschrift für evangelisches Kirchenrecht,* Tübingen 1951ff.

ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Stuttgart 1876ff.
ZKTh	*Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* (Innsbruck), Vienna 1877ff.
ZMR	*Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft,* Berlin 1886ff.
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte,* Marburg 1948ff.
ZSavRG, KanAbt	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung,* Weimar 1911ff.

SECTION ONE

The Institutional Unity of the Universal Church

CHAPTER 1

Statistics

Statistics of the World's Population, Statistics of the World Religions, Proportion of Catholics

In order to be able suitably to estimate to some degree the importance of the Catholic population of the world absolutely and relatively, in the longitudinal section of the historical development and in the geographical cross section of the present, its numerical relationship to the total world population, its relative significance in the concert of the world religions, and finally the trend of the frequency distribution in the geographical sphere—north-south drift of the Christian or of the Catholic world respectively in the course of time—must be investigated. There are no absolutely reliable numbers for all three relationships, but—according to individual continents and countries with differently developed facilities for inquiry—more or less exact estimates and approximations.

STATISTICS OF THE WORLD'S POPULATION 1914–65

For the population problem and population statistics on both the national and the international level there is an almost incalculable abundance in publications, which can scarcely be controlled by even the experts.[1] Hence, in what follows there can be offered only a strictly consolidated and necessarily simplified summary, which is as reliable as the primary source material and becomes the more problematic as one moves into the past.

The most important factor in the population development is the present still extraordinarily different rate of growth in the individual continents and countries. In general it can be said that the rates of growth in the First and Second Worlds—the Western industrialized

---

[1] A very good and concise summary is provided by the international research and information center *Pro Mundi Vita* in its publication, *Die demographische Explosion und die Zunkunft der Kirche* no. 40 (1972), 6, rue de la Limite, Brussels.

TABLE 1: WORLD POPULATION FROM 1920 TO 1965
(IN MILLIONS)

Country	Year					
	1920	*1930*	*1940*	*1950*	*1960*	*1965*
Africa	140	164	191	222	278	311
North Africa	46	39	44	53	66	75
Central and South Africa	94	125	147	169	212	236
America	208	242	274	329	413	460
North America	117	134	144	166	199	214
Central America	30	34	41	52	68	80
South America	61	74	89	111	146	166
Asia	966	1,120	1,244	1,381	1,659	1,830
East Asia	487	591	634	684	794	852
South Asia	479	529	610	697	865	978
Europe	329	355	380	392	425	445
Northern Europe	115	65	68	73	76	79
Western Europe		108	113	123	135	143
Central Europe	112					
Eastern Europe		89	96	88	97	100
Southern Europe	102	93	103	108	117	123
Oceania	8.8	10.0	11.1	12.7	15.7	17.5
U.S.S.R.	158	179	195	180	214	231
Total World	1,810	2,070	2,295	2,517	3,005	3,295

SOURCES: *UN Demographic Yearbook,* Vol. 11 (New York 1959); *UN Statistical Yearbook,* Vol. 18 (New York 1967).

states, including Japan, and the Communist lands—are indeed still positive, apart from exceptions, but decidedly lower than in the Third World—the developing countries. In the Western nations the rate of growth at the end of the 1960s averaged less than 1 percent, so that, *ceteris paribus*, their population would about double in seventy years, whereas in Asia it averaged ca. 2 percent, which would lead to a doubling in some thirty-five years.[2]

In all the developing countries the population increases by leaps and bounds. "However, it should at once be explained that the problems which confront the majority of the underdeveloped countries do not result chiefly from their high birthrate, but rather from their mortality rate, which grows less from year to year . . . . This is a quite general problem today, affecting about two-thirds of mankind: 2.056 billion Asiatics, 283 million Latin Americans, and 344 million Africans."[3]

---

[2] Cf. ibid., 7.

This is above all true of the thickly populated countries of China and India. The last Chinese census was taken in 1953. Since then only fragmentary information has been at our disposal. Since the growth rate results from the birthrate less the mortality rate, a parallel development of the two rates—lowering of the birthrate by measures of population and family planning, and lowering of the mortality rate by hygienic and political health measures—will lead in time to a considerable growth. Accordingly, the results of the efforts in China for a reduction of the population growth can be evaluated somewhat as follows:

TABLE 2: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POPULATION IN CHINA FROM 1953 TO 1970

Year	Number of Inhabitants (in millions)	Birth Rate %	Mortality Rate %	Rate of Increase %
1953	589.7	43	29	14
1956	618.5	41	24	17
1959	649.9	38	23	15
1962	676.2	38	24	14
1965	705	35	21	14
1968	735.1	33	19	14
1970	757.3	32	17	15

SOURCE: *Die demographische Explosion und die Zukunft der Kirche,* no. 40 (Brussels: Pro Mundi Vita, 1972), p. 9.

Now as earlier, India, as the second most populous country on earth, is far from having found a solution for its population problem. "The population grew (therefore) from 356.9 million in 1951 to 498.7 million in 1966. Today India must have at least 547 million inhabitants. Hence, in each decade the population grew by ca. 100 million. According to the testimony of the population experts of the United Nations, in 1970 the population amounted to 554 million, the birthrate 42.8 percent, the mortality rate 16.7 percent, the growth rate 26.1 percent for the period 1966–70."[4]

In contrast to China, where the rate of growth was stabilized at ca. 15

---

[3] Ibid., 8f.

[4] Ibid., 9.

percent, in India it grew from 19 to 26 percent between 1951 and 1970.

Africa also shows high rates of growth, from 20 to more than 30 percent. Different but equally high rates of growth must be recorded for most countries of Central and South America.

The high birthrates in the countries of the Third World have led, together with a drastic decline of the mortality rates, to a very favorable age-group structure in these nations. But this is at the same time decisive for the development of the present population. "Even if there should be success in quickly and drastically decreasing the number of births per marriage in India and China, the population of these areas, just as that of most Latin American and African states, would grow further still over many decades because of their favorable age-group structure, that is, of the high proportion of young people old enough to have children."[5]

TABLE 3: POPULATION INCREASE IN INDIA FROM 1951 TO 1970

Year	Birth Rate %	Mortality Rate %	Rate of Increase %
1951–1960	42	23	19
1966–1970	43	17	26

SOURCE: *Die demographische Explosion,* p. 9.

TABLE 4: ESTIMATED POPULATION GROWTH IN VARIOUS LANDS AND AREAS IN 1985
(in percentages)

Age	North America	Europe	USSR	East Asia	Latin America	Africa	South Asia	Oceania
0–14	28.7	24.8	26.2	31.7	41.4	45.0	42.0	30.4
15–64	61.6	63.3	64.3	63.1	54.5	52.0	54.6	60.1
65 and older	9.8	11.8	9.4	5.3	4.1	3.0	3.4	7.4

SOURCE: *Die demographische Explosion,* p. 14.

---

[5] "Daten der Bevölkerungsentwicklung. Überblick und Vergleich der Entwicklung in den Industriestaaten und in den Ländern der Dritten Welt: Soziographische Beilage Nr. 24," *Hk* 27 (1973) 345 ff. Mit einem Begleitkommentar von Dr. Hermann Schubnell, Direktor im Statistischen Bundesamt, Wiesbaden; here p. 346.

This development is of an importance for the Christian Churches that must not be underestimated. The outcome will be that in the next decades the Christian world will shift ever more southward and into the lands of the Third World.[6]

STATISTICS OF THE WORLD RELIGIONS 1914–65

Exact and generally satisfactory statistics of the religions of the world are no more possible to obtain than are exact statistics of the world's population. The best information comes from national censuses to the extent that these are even taken. A good survey is provided by the *U.N. Demographic Yearbook* and the *U.N. Statistical Yearbook*. For many countries of the Third World we are referred to ecclesiastical data. They are especially problematic where a large part of the baptized maintain no living relationship with the Church. Also problematic are data on the countries of the Communist world. For the statistics of the world religions it is also true that information can be only as reliable as the primary material which can be obtained from the sources at our disposal.

Here follows a summary of religious statistics according to continents.

TABLE 5: RELIGIOUS STATISTICS OF EUROPE WITH SUBDIVISIONS FROM 1920 TO 1965
(in thousands and percentages)

Region	Total Population	Catholics	Protestants and Anglicans	Orthodox	Other Christians	Jews	Muslims	Others
Central Europe								
1920	114,899	59,991	44,902	2,939	515	4,008	—	2,465
%	100	52.2	39.0	2.55	0.45	2.7	—	2.1
1935	127,247	67,789	46,916	4,335	1,047	4,335	—	104
%	100	53.3	36.9	3.47	0.8	3.47	—	0.62
1965	130,865	74,380	48,541	584	?	128	—	7,519
%	100	56.8	37.0	0.44	?	0.09	—	5.7
Northern Europe								
1920	15,520	30	15,320	60	20	15	—	75
%	100	0.2	98.7	0.4	0.13	0.1	—	0.48
1935	16,833	35	16,607	70	1	17	—	104
%	100	0.2	98.6	0.41	—	0.1	—	0.62
1965	20,844	80	20,495	73	?	21	1	264
%	100	0.38	98.3	0.35	?	0.1	—	1.26

---

[6] Cf. Table 10, p. 9.

TABLE 5: (*Continued*)

Region	Total Population	Catholics	Protestants and Anglicans	Orthodox	Other Christians	Jews	Muslims	Others
Western Europe								
1920	104,666	55,611	46,895	—	—	552	—	1,608
%	100	53.1	44.8	—	—	0.53	—	1.53
1935	109,558	56,502	48,165	140	20	843	100	3,808
%	100	51.6	43.9	0.13	0.02	0.77	0.09	3.5
1965	126,234	64,085	39,140	260	?	1,030	250	21,372
%	100	50.7	31.0	0.21	?	0.81	0.28	16.9
Eastern Europe								
1920	43,075	12,925	3,606	22,076	6	1,437	2,850	175
%	100	30.0	8.3	51.2	0.01	3.3	6.6	0.4
1935	50,915	15,029	3,855	26,749	—	1,625	3,568	89
%	100	29.5	7.6	52.5	—	3.2	7.0	0.17
1965	54,838	13,352	4,262	29,521	?	277	3,922	3,350
%	100	24.3	7.8	53.8	?	0.51	7.1	6.1
Southern Europe								
1920	75,410	66,276	168	6,419	—	55	1,015	1,477
%	100	87.9	0.3	8.5	—	0.07	1.3	2.0
1935	82,333	73,920	184	6,689	10	213	1,255	72
%	100	89.7	0.22	8.1	0.01	0.26	1.5	0.09
1965	102,476	93,887	301	8,143	?	47	108	304
%	100	91.6	0.29	7.9	?	0.05	0.1	0.29
Total (Europe)								
1920	353,570	194,833	110,891	31,494	541	6,067	3,901	5,800
%	100	51.0	31.4	8.9	0.15	1.7	1.1	1.6
1935	388,615	213,283	115,755	38,521	1,078	7,032	4,932	8,014
%	100	60.3	32.7	10.9	0.3	2.0	1.4	2.2
1965	435,257	245,784	112,739	38,581	?	1,503	4,281	32,809
%	100	56.4	25.9	8.8	?	0.35	0.98	7.5

SOURCES: For 1920: H. A. Krose, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 7, 1930–31 (Cologne 1931), p. 263; for 1935: Zentralstelle für kirchliche Statistik des katholischen Deutschlands, Cologne, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 21, 1939–40 (Cologne 1939), p. 150; for 1965: *Atlas Hierarchicus,* 1968, p. 56 (without USSR).

The major European divisions are comprised of the following:

Central Europe: Danzig, German Reich including Saar region, Austria, Poland, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia;

Northern Europe: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland;

Western Europe: Belgium, France, Great Britain and Ireland, Luxembourg, Monaco, the Netherlands;

Eastern Europe: Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Romania, Hungary, the Baltic states;

Southern Europe: Andorra, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, European Turkey.

TABLE 6: RELIGIOUS STATISTICS OF AMERICA WITH SUBDIVISIONS FROM 1910 TO 1966

(in thousands and percentages)

	Total Population	Catholics	Protestants and Anglicans	Orthodox	Jews	Other Religions	Others*
*North America***							
1910	94,583	17,364	69,332	?	1,837	550	5,500
%	100	18.3	73.0	?	1.9	0.58	5.8
1950	166,000[1]	34,717[2]	72,535[3]	2,030[2]	5,433[4]	76	51,209(?)
%	100	20.9	43.6	1.2	3.3	0.04	
1966	210,357	54,171	76,743	3,406	5,944	70,089	
%	100	25.7	36.4	1.6	2.8	33.3	
Central America							
1910	25,458	23,101	1,072	?	16	732	565
%	100	90.6	4.2	?	0.06	2.8	2.2
1950	52,000[1]	42,978[2]	3,242[3]	—	47[4]	158	557(?)
%	100	82.6	6.2	—	0.09	0.3	
1966	66,830	60,408	3,892	—	112	3715	
%	100	90.3	5.8	—	0.16	5.5	
South America							
1910	48,980	47,147	463	?	6	1,340	24
%	100	96.2	0.9	?	0.01	2.7	0.05
1950	111,000[1]	94,155[2]	5,876[3]	38[2]	582[4]	431	9918(?)
%	100	84.8	5.2	0.03	0.52	0.38	
1966	152,008	137,923	6,054	480	685	5,366	
%	100	90.7	3.9	0.3	0.5	3.5	
Total Americas							
1910	169,048	87,612	70,867	?	1,858	2,622	6,089
%	100	51.8	41.9	?	1.1	1.5	3.6
1950	329,000[1]	171,850[2]	81,653[3]	2,068[2]	6062[4]	665	66,702(?)
%	100	52.2	24.2	0.62	1.8	0.2	20.2(?)
1966	429,195	252,502	86,689	3,886	6,741	79,170	
%	100	58.8	20.1	0.9	1.6	18.4	

* "Others": Denomination not available or without denomination.

** "In South and Central America there are fairly reliable statistics on religion, but it is very difficult to evaluate the various denominations in the United States": H. A. Krose, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 3, 1910–11 (Freiburg i. Br. 1911), p. 202.

SOURCES: For 1910: H. A. Krose, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 3, 1910–11 (Freiburg i Br. 1911), p. 201; for 1950: [1]*UN Statistical Yearbook,* 18 vols. (1966) (New York 1967), p. 26; [2]*World Christian Handbook,* ed. E. J. Bingle et al. (London 1952), p. 266; [3]*World Christian Handbook,* ed. H. Wakelin Coxill (London 1962), p. 243; [4]*World Christian Handbook,* ed. E. J. Bingle et al. (London 1957), p. 173; for 1966: *Atlas Hierarchicus,* 1968.

Table 7: Religious Statistics of Africa from 1910 to 1960/65
(in thousands and percentages)

Year	Total Population	Catholics	Other Christians	Jews Muslims	Hindus Buddhists	Others without Denominations
1910	126,351	6,689	8,457	43,872	—	71,000
%	100	5.3	6.7	34.75	—	56.3
1950	223,000	18,193	17,495(?)	52,832	543	?
%	100	8.1	7.7	23.75	0.24	?
1960/65	317,545	31,782	33,890(?)	61,668	523	?
%	100	10.0	10.6	19.4	0.16	?

SOURCES: For 1910: H. A. Krose, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 3, 1910–11 (Freiburg i. Br. 1911), p. 200; for 1950: *World Christian Handbook,* ed. E. J. Bingle et al. (London 1957), pp. 162ff.; for 1960/65: *World Christian Handbook,* ed. H. Wakelin Coxill (London 1962), pp. 234ff., and *Atlas Hierarchicus.*

Table 8: Religious Statistics of Asia from 1910 to 1960/65
(in thousands and percentages)

Year	Total Population	Catholics	Other Christians	Jews Muslims	Hindus Buddhists	Others without Denomination
1910	828,455	12,661	19,079	155,845	624,000	16,870
%	100	1.5	2.3	18.78	75.0	2.0
1950	1,581,000	27,771	17,018	275,967	839,399	?
%	100	1.7	1.07	17.45	53.1	?
1960/65	1,831,640	43,947	22,907	355,175	501,479(?)	?
%	100	2.4	1.25	19.44	27.38(?)	?

SOURCES: as in Table 7.—For 1960/65 China is responsible for the great uncertainty.

Table 9: Religious Statistics of Australia and Oceania from 1910 to 1960/65

Year	Total population	Catholics	Other Christians	Jews Muslims	Hindus Budhists	Others without Denomination
1910	6,633	1,244	3,997	36	70	1,286
%	100	18.7	60.2	0.54	1.0	19.3
1950	14,600	2,108	10,562	58?	?	?
%	100	14.4	72.3	0.30	?	?
1960/65	17,722	3,782	10,342	89	?	?
%	100	21.3	58.43	0.5	?	?

SOURCES: as in Tables 7 and 8.

THE SOUTHWARD MOVEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD

It has already been mentioned in another context that the different growth rates of the population in different parts of the world will bring great problems for the Church of the next years and decades. In this context we cannot go more deeply into this.[7]

Nevertheless, one important consequence of the different growth rates should be pointed out: the inexorable shift of the quantitative center of gravity of the Christian world into more southern regions and the nations of the so-called Third World. The problem can be best illustrated with the aid of the following Table 10, which we took from the often mentioned study by *Pro Mundi Vita.*

TABLE 10: SOUTHWARD MOVEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD, 1900–2000
(in millions and percentages; boldface = Christians)

	1900			1965			2000		
Continent	Popu-lation	Chris-tians	%	Popu-lation	Chris-tians	%	Popu-lation	Chris-tians	%
Europe	298	**260**	87	440	**385**	87	526	**404**	77
North America	82	**41**	50	213	**192**	90	354	**300**	85
U.S.S.R.	130	**91**	70	231	**60**	26	353	**92**	26
Total population of developed world	510			884			1,233		
Old Churches		**392**	77		**637**	72		**796**	65
Asia	902	**9**	1	1,827	**62**	3	3,457	**165**	5
Africa	118	**4**	3	306	**75**	24	768	**351**	46
Oceania	6	**3**	50	17	**13**	77	32	**27**	85
Latin America	64	**51**	80	245	**220**	90	638	**575**	90
Total population of Third World	1,090			2,395			4,895		
Churches of Third World		**67**	6		**370**	15		**1,118**	23
Total World Population	1,600	**459**	28.7	3,279	**1,007**	30.7	6,128	**1,914**	31.2
Total Non-Christians		**1,141**			**2,272**			**4,214**	

SOURCE: *Die demographische Explosion*, p. 16.

The Organization of the Entire Church from 1914 to 1970

The whole Church, as a spiritual community of believers and necessarily "visible" and as such an organized society of believing human beings within the world, needs an organization that is capable of functioning in order to be able as effectively as possible to carry out the tasks proper to it. The actual organization of the entire Church has changed in many ways in the course of history. At one time it was the result of long experience, but at another time the outcome of more or less spontaneous developments and decisions of individual Popes and/or bodies representing the whole Church, especially councils.

---

[7] If one is interested in details, one is referred to *Die demographische Explosion . . . ;* cf. there especially pp. 21ff.

The central institution for the administration of the whole Church under the Pope is the Roman Curia (*Curia Romana*), by which since the end of the eleventh century the totality of the chief administrative offices and courts in Rome that act in the Pope's name for the government of the Catholic Church are designated. In the broader sense the papal household (*Familia Pontificia*) and the persons bound to participate in the papal liturgy (*Cappella Pontificia*) are also counted in the Curia. In 1588 Pope Sixtus V reorganized the Curia in order to modernize it and established as the new permanent form of authority the so-called congregations of cardinals. By the constitution *Sapienti Consilio* of 29 June 1908 (*AAS* 1 [1909], 7–19) Pius X fundamentally reorganized the Curia. Except for individual decisive changes under Pope Paul VI in 1967[8] the reorganization under Pius X still forms the basic type of the curial constitution. To the Roman Curia belong (Canon 242 of the Code of Canon Law): a) the congregations of cardinals, b) the *Paenitentiaria*, c) the tribunals and curial offices, d) various commissions of a permanent nature and most recently various secretariats. To the official staff belong the cardinals, the higher officials (*officiales maiores*: prelates), and also the lower officials (*officiales minores*), who are designated as "curiales" in the narrower sense.[9]

After the Pope, the cardinals are today the ranking dignitaries of the Catholic Church. They are his advisers and first collaborators in the direction of the entire Church, whether this be within the Curia or outside Rome, especially in the great and important metropolitan sees.[10] Hence these last likewise play a significant role within the organizational structure of the whole Church.

Finally, also counted in the organizational and functional structure of the entire Church is the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, especially the bishops, governing *iure divino* their particular churches as ordinary shepherds in communion with the Pope and the college of their episcopal confreres.

The institutional and personal functionaries just mentioned constitute the organization framework of the whole Church *ad intra.*[11] Externally, that is, in regard to many nations of the world and to international organizations, such as the U.N., UNESCO, and so forth, not the Church but the Holy See maintains diplomatic or quasi-diplomatic relations in the sense of active—nuncios, internuncios, and so forth—and passive—messengers, envoys, and so forth—diplomatic law. Even though this complex does not pertain directly to the formal organization of the whole Church, nevertheless at least the active agents of diplomatic relations on the part of the Holy See are not unimportant for the direction of the whole Church because of their membership in the hierarchy or in the College of Bishops respectively, and because of their actual exerting of influence on the formal members of the ecclesiastical organization, for example, cooperation in the nomination of new bishops.

---

[8] By the apostolic constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae universae* of 15 August 1967 (*AAS* 59 [1967] 885–928); cf. *HK* 21 (1967) 460ff.

[9] On individuals cf. N. del Re, *La Curia Romana. Lineamenti storico-giuridici*, 2d ed. (Rome 1952); C. A. Berutti, *De Curia Romana* (Rome 1952); *LThK* 2d ed., 6 (Freiburg, 1961), 692–94.

[10] Cf. H. W. Klewitz, *Die Entstehung des Kardinalskollegiums. Reformpapsttum und Kardinalskollegium* (Darmstadt 1957); *LThK* 2d ed. (Freiburg 1960), 1342–44.

CONGREGATIONS, TRIBUNALS AND OFFICES, COMMISSIONS AND SECRETARIATS OF THE CURIA (1916–68)

Congregations

Congregations are permanent bodies of the Roman Curia, collegially constituted of a certain number of cardinals, with a legally determined content of duties and powers for the government of the entire Church.[12] After Sixtus V had created a comprehensive system of fifteen congregations with defined spheres of business by the constitution *Immensa aeterni* of 21 January 1588, their number was subject to strong changes in the course of time. Around the middle of the nineteenth century there were almost thirty, and when Pius X succeeded to the papacy there were still twenty-one. In his reform of the Curia this number was restricted to eleven. At the beginning of the period here treated, under Benedict XV, there were thirteen congregations, including the special Congregation for the Fabric of Saint Peter's Basilica, which however did not belong to the general congregations of cardinals.

---

[11] From the organizational-sociological viewpoint one can name the traditional organizational framework of the Catholic Church, as regards the center of gravity, as a "line system" in which, generally with a weak reaction to the at times subordinate stages, essentially directions were given "from above to below," whereas only since the council has this traditional organizational model been gradually completed by elements of a "staff system" on different levels of the line system ("Councils" from the Priests' Council even to the "Council of the Laity" in Rome).

[12] Complete presentation in F. M. Cappello, *De Curia Romana;* V. Martin, *Les Congrégations romaines;* in addition, numerous monographs on individual congregations; cf. also E. Eichmann and K. Mörsdorf, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts* 7th ed. (1953), I, 360ff.

In 1917 Benedict XV abolished the Congregation of the Index. A creation of Benedict's as an autonomous congregation was the *Congregatio de propaganda Fide pro negotiis Rituum orientalium.*[13]

Tribunals and Offices

The real courts (tribunals) of the Roman Church are only the Rota (*Sacra Romana Rota*) as the highest court of appeal (Canon 259 of the Code of Canon Law; for details see Canons 1598ff.) and the *Segnatura Apostolica* (*Supremum Signaturae Apostolicae Tribunale*) as

---

[13] By the motu proprio *Dei providentis* of 15 January 1917 (*AAS* 9 [1917], 529). Following the reorganization resulting from the motu proprio *Sancta Dei Ecclesia* of Pius XI of 25 March 1938 it became competent for all affairs of the Eastern Churches under the title "S. C. pro Ecclesia Orientali" (*AAS* 30 [1938], 154ff).

TABLE 11: THE CONGREGATIONS FROM 1916 TO 1968

Name Sacra Congregatio	1916 Benedict XV	1923 Pius XI	1939 Pius XII	1961 John XXIII	1968 Paul VI
Sancti Officii	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	since 12/7/1965 Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei
Consistorialis	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	since 8/15/1967 Congregatio pro Episcopis
de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Rituum Orientalium	exist.	exist.	since 1938 S.C. pro Ecclesia Orientali	exist.	exist.
de Disciplina Sacramentorum	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Concilii	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	since 8/15/1967 Congregatio pro Clericis
Negotiis religiosorum sodalium praeposita	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	since 8/15/1967 Congregatio pro Religiosis et Institutis saecularibus

TABLE 11: (*Continued*)

Name Sacra Congregatio	1916 Benedict XV	1923 Pius XI	1939 Pius XII	1961 John XXIII	1968 Paul VI
de Propaganda Fide	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	since 8/15/1967 Congregatio pro gentium Evangelisatione seu de Propaganda Fide
Rituum	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.; after 1969 divided into the two following congregations
pro Cultu Divino	—	—	—	—	since 5/31/1969 from the previous congregation
pro Causis Sanctorum	—	—	—	—	since 5/31/1969 as the previous congregation
pro Sacramentis divinoque Cultu	—	—	—	—	since 7/31/1975 from a combination of the two previous congregations
Caeremonialis	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	1967; abolished
pro Negotiis Ecclesiasticis extraordinariis	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	1967; abolished, in hands of Secretary of State
de Seminariis et Universitatibus studiorum	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	since 1967 Congregatio pro Institutione catholica
Indicis	3/25/1917 abolished	—	—	—	—

SOURCES: H. A. Krose, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 5, 1914–16 (Freiburg i. Br. 1916), pp. 13ff.; ibid., Vol. 11, 1922–23 (Freiburg i. Br. 1923), pp. 8ff.; Zentralstelle für kirchliche Statistik des katholischen Deutschlands, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland,* Vol. 21, 1939–40 (Cologne 1940), pp. 14ff.; F. Groner, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch. Amtliches statistisches Jahrbuch der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands,* Vol. 25, 1957–61 (Cologne 1962), pp. 8ff; ibid, Vol. 26, 1962–68 (Cologne 1969), pp. 9ff. All mentioned sources refer to corresponding years of the *Annuario Pontificio.*

the highest court of administration and reversal of judgment (Canon 259; for details see Canons 1602ff.). The *Sacra Paenitentiaria,* on the contrary, is the curial court of grace for the internal forum. Since it predominantly grants pardons, it should be considered rather as an administrative office than as a court (Canon 258).[14]

Since they are charged only with duties of administration, the curial offices are merely administrative offices and, in contrast to the congregations, have not a collegial but a monocratic constitution. This was even

TABLE 12: TRIBUNALS AND OFFICES OF THE CURIA FROM 1910 TO 1968

Tribunals Offices	1916 Benedict XV	1923 Pius XI	1939 Pius XII	1961 John XXIII	1968 Paul VI
Tribunals: S. Romana Rota	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Supr. Signaturae Apost. tribunal	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
S. Paenitentiaria	exist.	exist.	reorganized 3/25/1935	exist.	exist.
Offices: Cancellaria Apostolica	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Dataria Apostolica	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	—
Camera Apostolica	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Praefectura rerum oeconomicarum S. Sedis	—	—	—	—	8/15/1967 established
Administratio Patrimonii Apost. S. Sedis	—	—	—	—	8/15/1967 established
Apost. Palatii Praefectura	—	—	—	—	8/15/1967 established
Generale Ecclesiae Rationarium	—	—	—	—	8/15/1967 established

SOURCES: as in Table 11.

---

[14] For details see Eichmann-Mörsdorf, op. cit., 369ff. For historical details cf. A. Perathoner, *Das kirchliche Gesetzbuch,* 5th ed. (Brixen 1931), 147ff., 549ff.

TABLE 13: PAPAL COMMISSIONS FROM 1916 TO 1968
(list incomplete)

Name and Year of Establishment	1916 Benedict XV	1923 Pius XI	1939 Pius XII	1961 John XXIII	1968 Paul VI
Christian Archaeology (1852)	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Scriptual Studies (1902)	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Revision and Improvement of the Vulgate (1914)	exist.	exist.	1933 reorganized	exist.	exist.
Authentic Interpretation of the CIC (1917)	—	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
For Protection of the Artistic Monuments of the Holy See (1923)	—	exist.	exist.	exist.	exist.
Religious Art in Italy (1924)	—	—	exist.	exist.	exist.
Codification of Eastern Canon Law (1935)	—	—	exist.	exist.	exist.
Film, Radio and Television (1948)	—	—	—	exist.	exist.
Papal Charities (1953)	—	—	—	exist.	exist.
Historical Sciences (1954)	—	—	—	exist.	exist.
Latin America (1958)	—	—	—	exist.	exist.
Revision of the CIC (1963)	—	—	—	—	exist.
Social Communications Media (1964)	—	—	—	—	exist.
The New Vulgate (1965)	—	—	—	—	exist.
The Interpretation of the decrees of Vatican II (1968)	—	—	—	—	exist.

SOURCES: as in Table 11.

true, until the so-called little reform of the Curia by Paul VI in 1967, of the Chancery (*Cancellaria Apostolica*), which was responsible for the preparation and dispatching of bulls (Canon 260), the Datary (*Dataria Apostolica*), which was competent for the conferring of the lesser ecclesiastical benefices (Canon 261), the Chamber (*Camera Apostolica*), to which was entrusted the administration of the temporal property and rights of the Holy See (Canon 262), and finally the Secretariat of State (*Secretaria Status*), on which was incumbent the responsible direction of the policy of the Holy See. Alongside the Chancery, whose competence was changed by Paul VI, and the Chamber, three new offices were established on 15 August 1967: the Prefecture of the Economic Affairs of the Holy See (*Praefectura rerum oeconomicarum S. Sedis*), the Administration of the Patrimony of the Holy See (*Administratio Patrimonii Apostolicae Sedia*), and the Prefecture of the Apostolic Palace (*Apostolici Palatii Praefectura*). The competence of the Secretariat of State was again defined. It is employed for the immediate aid of the Pope in his efforts for the entire Church as well as for the individual departments of the Roman Curia. At the same time the newly created Office for Ecclesiastical Statistics (*Generale Ecclesiae Rationarium*) was incorporated into the Secretariat of State. The Datary was abolished.

Commissions

Special tasks, for the most part of a rather lengthy character, are managed by permanent commissions, partly in association with a congregation, partly independently. In the course of time their number has undergone considerable variation and most recently has been greatly enlarged.

Secretariats

Under Pope John XXIII and following the council various secretariats were established in order to assist in realizing in the postconciliar period the basic concern of the council—dialogue of the Church with the world. They are:

—the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity (*motu proprio Superno Dei nutu* of 5 June 1960: *AAS* 52 [1960], 433ff.);

—the Secretariat for Non-Christians (proclaimed in the homily of Paul VI on Pentecost 1964; *AAS* 56 [1964], 560);

—the Secretariat for Unbelievers (established on 7 April 1965: *Annuario Pontificio* 1966, p. 1111);

—the Council on the Laity (*motu proprio Catholicum Christi Ecclesiam* of 6 January 1967: *AAS* 59 [1967], 25ff.);

—the Papal Commission for Studies *Ivstitia et Pax* (ibid.).

Table 14: The College of Cardinals According to the Nationality of its Members, 1916–1968
Numbers of Living Members

Land (Nationality)	Numbers in Year				
	1916	1923	1939	1961	1968
Italy	29	31	32	34	35
France	6	7	6	8	8
Spain	5	5	3	5	6
United States	4	2	3	6	7
Germany	2	4	4	3	5
Austria	3	2	—	1	1
England	2	2	1	2	2
Portugal	2	1	1	1	2
Hungary	2	1	1	1	1
Netherlands	1	1	—	—	2
Belgium	1	1	1	—	1
Ireland	1	1	1	1	2
Brazil	1	1	1	3	4
Poland	—	2	1	1	3
Canada	—	1	1	2	3
Czechoslovakia	—	1	1	—	1
Argentina	—	—	1	2	2
Syria	—	—	1	1	1
Colombia	—	—	—	1	1
Cuba	—	—	—	1	—
Armenia	—	—	—	1	1
Mexico	—	—	—	1	1
Ecuador	—	—	—	1	1
Uruguay	—	—	—	1	1
Venezuela	—	—	—	1	1
India	—	—	—	1	1
China	—	—	—	1	—
Japan	—	—	—	1	1
Philippines	—	—	—	1	1
Australia	—	—	—	1	1
Portuguese East Africa	—	—	—	1	—
Tanganyika	—	—	—	1	—
Switzerland	—	—	—	—	2
Bolivia	—	—	—	—	1
Chile	—	—	—	—	1
Peru	—	—	—	—	1
Algeria	—	—	—	—	1
Upper Volta	—	—	—	—	1
South Africa	—	—	—	—	1
Tanzania	—	—	—	—	1
Ceylon	—	—	—	—	1
Indonesia	—	—	—	—	1
Egypt	—	—	—	—	1
Yugoslavia	—	—	—	—	1
Total Number	59	63	59	85	109

SOURCES: as in Table 11.

THE COLLEGE OF CARDINALS (1916–68)

The Cardinals constitute the Pope's Senate and are his chief advisers and assistants in the government of the Church (Canon 230). They form a college, whose membership declined in number in the Middle Ages but was fixed by Sixtus V in 1588 at seventy, with reference to the seventy elders of the Israelites (Num. 11:26). They are divided into the orders of cardinal bishops, cardinal priests, and cardinal deacons—formerly 6+50+14. For the first time in the modern period Pope John XXIII exceeded the number seventy in the consistory of 15 December 1958. Only since Pius XII and more strongly since John XXIII, in connection with the numerical enlarging of the Sacred College, was account taken of the stronger internationalization of the College of Cardinals recommended by the Council of Trent.[15]

TITLES AND AREAS OF JURISDICTION IN THE TOTALITY OF THE HIERARCHY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH (1916–68)

During the pontificate of Pius XI (1922–39) there occurred a strong extension of the number of titles in the totality of the Catholic

TABLE 15: EXISTING TITLES OF THE HIERARCHY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH FROM 1916 TO 1939

Title	1916	1923	1939
Cardinals	75	70	70
Patriarchs	14	14	14
Metropolitans with residence	214	216	219
Archbishops with residence (without metropolitan rights)	—	—	36
Bishops with residence	849	874	935
Bishops in personal union	65	—	—
Permanent Administrators	9	—	—
Titular Archbishoprics and Bishoprics (without residence)	558	599	772
Archabbeys, Abbeys, Priorates and other Prelates Nullius	23	28	50
Apostolic Delagates	13	18	—
Vicariates Apostolic	172	206	292
Apostolic Prefectures	69	67	135
Missions and Autonomous Areas	—	—	19
Total Number	2,061	2,092	2,542
(Without Titles: = approximate numbers of areas of jurisdiction)	(1,503)	(1,493)	(1,770)

---

[15] Session XXIV de ref. c. 1.

TABLE 16: DEVELOPMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL AREAS FROM 1961 TO 1968

Jurisdictional Areas	Europe		Africa		America		Asia		Australia	
	1961	1968	1961	1968	1961	1968	1961	1968	1961	1968
Patriarchates	—	2	2	2	—	—	10	11	—	—
Exarchates	9	10	2	—	1	3	1	1	—	1
Metropolitans (without suffragans)	112	111	40	44	122	146	65	81	6	11
Suffragan Bishops	432	436	151	231	423	510	210	287	22	45
Archbishops (without suffragans)	23	27	3	2	3	1	15	22	2	2
Exempt Bishops	97	89	11	13	8	10	32	26	—	2
Exempt Prelates	7	8	—	1	52	76	7	11	—	—
Exempt Abbeys	13	10	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
Administrators	9	5	—	1	1	1	2	2	—	—
Vicariates Apostolic	6	6	20	19	48	41	50	18	28	1
Apostolic Prefectures	—	—	46	20	21	16	57	38	3	—
Independent Mission Areas	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	5	1	1
Ordinariates	3	3	—	—	2	2	—	1	—	—
Priorates	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total Number	711	728	278	336	684	809	455	504	63	64

SOURCES: *Annuario Pontificio,* 1961 and 1968; also as in Table 11.

TABLE 17: DEVELOPMENT OF TITLES AND AREAS OF JURISDICTION FROM 1916 TO 1968 (CONSOLIDATED FROM TABLES 15 AND 16)

Year	1916	1923	1939	1961	1968
All titles	2,061	2,092	2,542	3044*	4,205*
Areas of Jurisdiction	ca. 1,503	ca. 1,493	ca. 1,770	2191	2,441

* Without Cardinals, whose number since 1968 has fluctuated between 100 and 130.

hierarchy. In particular, the Pope erected thirty-one mission stations, 139 prefectures apostolic, 113 vicariates apostolic, twenty-three prelacies *nullius,* 110 episcopal sees, and twenty-seven archbishoprics[16]

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIONS OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE WITH THE NATIONS AND OF THE NATIONS WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE (1916–68)

The Apostolic See exercises the active and the passive diplomatic right (Canons 265ff.). It appoints extraordinary envoys for specific

---

[16] Cf. *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland* 21 (1939–40) (Cologne 1939), 2ff.

TABLE 18: ACTIVE REPRESENTATION OF THE HOLY SEE, 1916–1968
(a) with governments and governmental agencies
(b) governments at the Apostolic See

Rank of the Representative (Apostolic See only)	1916		1923		1961		1968	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
Nunciatures	4		19		31		61	
Pro- or Inter-nunciatures	5		5		11		1	
Delegations	6		—		17		16	
Total Number	15	16	24	25	59	47	78	65

SOURCES: as in Table 11.

occasions and maintains permanent representatives in nations or in larger areas—nuncios, internuncios, apostolic delegates. By tradition the apostolic nuncio is the dean of the diplomatic corps accredited to the state in question. The internuncio holds the rank of a minister plenipotentiary. The extraordinary envoys also have diplomatic status; the delegates do not.

The Apostolic See also receives the diplomatic representatives of states, partly extraordinary and temporary, partly ordinary and permanent. They enjoy all privileges and freedoms which by international law pertain to diplomatic representatives, even with respect to Italy, in whose territory they live. All accredited representatives of the states together constitute the diplomatic corps at the Apostolic See. The representatives bear partly the title "Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary" (*Ambasciatore Straordinario e Plenipotenziario*), partly the title "Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary" (*Inviato Straordinario e Ministro Plenipotenziario*).[17]

In addition, the Apostolic See maintains representation, chiefly by so-called "permanent observers," at the following international organizations: (1.) The United Nations in New York; (2.) Office of the United Nations and Special Institutes in Geneva; (3.) International Atomic Energy Office in Vienna; (4.) Organization of the U.N. for Food and Agriculture (FAO) in Rome; (5.) Organization of the U.N. for Education, Scholarship, and Culture (UNESCO) in Paris; (6.) Council of Europe in Brussels; (7.) International Institute for the Standardization of Private Law in the Vatican; (8.) International Committee for the study of Military Medicine and Health in Tirlemont; (9.) International Union for the Official Tourism Organizations (UIOOT); (10.) International Geographical Association.[18]

---

[17] Cf. U. Stutz, "Die päpstliche Diplomatie under Leo XIII. nach den Denkwürdigkeiten des Kardinals Domenico Ferrara," op. cit.; A. Verdross, "Die Stellung des Apostolischen Stuhles in der internationalen Geminschaft," *Österr. Archiv für Kirchenrecht* 3 (1952), 54–68; G. de Marchi, *Le Nunziature Apostoliche dal 1800 al 1957* (Rome 1959); *Annuario Pontificio.*

Final Observation: The development of the organizational structure of the entire Church, unchanged in essence since 1914, increasingly takes into account, in almost all its institutional and personnel function-population.[19] This applies to the greater internationalization of the College of Cardinals as well as to the expansion of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the countries of the Third World. This process of regrouping seems to have thus far affected even the Roman Curia itself.

---

[18] F. Groner, ed., *Kirchliches Handbuch. Amtliches Statistisches Jahrbuch der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands* 26 (1962–68) (Cologne 1969), 16.
[19] See Table 10, page 9.

CHAPTER 2

*Popes Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII Biography and Activity within the Church**

Benedict XV

Giacomo Paolo Battista Della Chiesa was born at Genoa on 21 November 1854, the son of the Marchese Giuseppe; he had two brothers and a sister. A great-uncle was a Capuchin. After finishing his college preparatory work, from 1869 as an extern he studied philosophy in the archepiscopal seminary and then, at the University of Genoa, the laws, in which he took his doctorate in 1875. As a member of the Capranica College at Rome he studied theology and listened to the Jesuit Franzelin; on 21 December 1878 he was ordained a priest and until 1882 continued his studies in the Accademia dei Nobili. After he had finished them, he was accepted, on Rampolla's recommendation, into the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. In 1882 Rampolla took him along as secretary to the Spanish nunciature. In Madrid he was known to the poor as "Curate of the Two Pesetas" because of his generous alms.

When in 1887 Rampolla was appointed cardinal secretary of state, Della Chiesa became his close collaborator, first as *minutante* and from

---

* Hubert Jedin

1901 as *Sostituto* (undersecretary of state). It was a purely diplomatic career, but parallel with it went a zealous activity in the care of souls at the church of Sant'Eustachio and catechetical instruction in the Girls' Home of the Daughters of Charity, besides conferences in the boarding school at Santa Trinità. The undersecretary of state survived Rampolla's fall, because the latter's successor, Merry del Val, could not do without the experienced *Sostituto.* Only in 1907 was he named, not nuncio in Madrid, as he had wanted, but archbishop of Bologna. His episcopal ordination by Pius X in the Sistine Chapel on 21 December 1907 called forth the expression that, while he had to yield to the new course in the Secretariat of State, he still possessed the personal good will of the Pope.

Giacomo Della Chiesa was small of stature, slight, and somewhat misshapen, but of an active mind, clear thinking and clever, a finished diplomat, filled with zeal for souls. He took his removal from the Vatican well, visited the 390 parishes of his diocese, held conferences of deans, and twice, in 1910 and 1913, convoked his suffragan bishops in council. Not until seven years after his appointment as archbishop of Bologna did he receive the red hat, on 25 May 1914. When his mother complained to Pius X about the long delay, she received the reply: "Your son takes few but long steps." The prediction was verified. As he began his journey to Rome for the conclave, a fellow countryman reminded him of his predecessor at Bologna, Prospero Lambertini, who had mounted the See of Peter as Benedict XIV: "Prospere, procede, et regna" (Ps. 44:4). The Cardinal replied dryly: "My name is not Prospero, but Giacomo."

In the conclave (31 August to 3 September 1914)[1] the norms decreed by Pius X were strictly observed, the Italian state guaranteed freedom of election, the imperial German government permitted Cardinal Mercier to leave occupied Belgium. Of the sixty-five qualified electors, sixty took part in the election. Confronting each other were the "Pius Circle," as whose head ranked the influential De Lai and as whose candidate there first came forth during the conclave the former abbot general of the Subiaco Congregation, Domenico Serafini, and on the other side the circle of "progressive" cardinals, which was for Ferrata or Gasparri. At the start the most promising candidacy seemed to be that of Cardinal Maffi of Pisa, "italianissimo" and a diocesan bishop, like the last three Popes; on the second ballot he received sixteen votes, the same number as Della Chiesa, whom the German and Austrian cardinals preferred. From the fifth ballot Della Chiesa moved ahead of

---

[1] Summarized on the basis of the literary remains of Lafontaine and, for 1922, of Piffl. J. Lenzenweger in *Linzer Theol-Prakt. Quartalschrift* 1964, 51–58.

Serafini, who in the eighth ballot still obtained twenty-four votes, but the tenth ballot brought the decision: thirty-eight votes out of fifty-seven for Della Chiesa. The adherents of Rampolla had carried the day.

None of the papal garments on hand was small enough for the newly elected Pope. In memory of his great predecessor Lambertini, who had likewise come from Bologna, he called himself Benedict XV. Familiar with persons and the spirit of the Vatican because of his long activity in the Secretariat of State, from the first moment he moved with assurance and awareness of his goal. He transferred his coronation on 6 September to the Sistine Chapel, named as his secretary of state the former nuncio at Paris, Ferrata, and, after the latter's death on 10 October, Gasparri. The Pope's first pastoral word on 8 September and his first encyclical on 1 November were calls for peace.

In the next four years the world war put narrow limits on the Pope's activity within the Church. Not until after the armistice did there come the doctrinal letter on Saint Jerome (15 September 1920)[2] and the naming of Saint Ephrem the Syrian as a Doctor of the Church[3] (5 October 1920); he honored Dante on the six-hundredth anniversary of his death[4] and the founder of the Order of Preachers, Dominic, who is buried at Bologna, on his seven-hundredth.[5] The canonizations of Margaret Mary Alacoque and Joan of Arc were regarded by the French as a triumph of victorious Catholic France.

In accord with the program of Leo XIII, he founded Catholic universities at Lublin and Milan. The ecclesiastical event of the pontificate that had the widest influence was the new codification of the Canon Law, planned since the close of the sixteenth century but again and again postponed (see Chapter 5). The Uniate Eastern Churches were removed from the competence of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1917 and a special Congregation for Seminaries was founded in 1915. The greatest merit of the skillful, diplomatically experienced Pope was that he had piloted the ship of the Church through the reefs of the First World War and was able to maintain the neutrality of the Holy See (see Chapter 3). He died on 22 January 1922.

Pius XI

Achille Ratti came from the industrial middle class of Lombardy. His father was employed as a factory manager in the silk industry. His mother was Teresa Galli. Born on 31 May 1857, his parents' fifth child, he attended the private elementary school of the priest Volontieri and spent the vacations with his uncle, Damiano Ratti, provost of Asso. From 1867 he pursued his classical studies at the seminaries of Seveso, Monza, and San Carlo, but concluded them at the Milan State Lyceum. After a three-year course at the Milan seminary for priests, he went in 1879 to the Lombard College at Rome, heard lectures on canon law at the Gregoriana, where the later general of the Jesuits, Wernz, was one of his teachers, and also theology at the Roman Sapienza and philosophy at the Academy of Saint Thomas. He was ordained a priest in the Lateran on 20 December 1879.

---

[2] *AAS* 12 (1920), 385–422.

[3] Ibid., 457–71.

[4] *AAS* 13 (1921), 209–17.

[5] Ibid., 329–35.

Having returned to Milan in 1882, he worked for five years as professor of homiletics and of dogma at the seminary until in 1888 he was admitted to the College of Doctors of the Ambrosian Library. As librarian he displayed versatility and established relations with scholars of many countries, including Grabmann, Ehrhard, and Kehr; with the last named he practiced his German. In 1907 he succeeded Ceriani as prefect. The fruit of his scholarly works was the *Acta ecclesiae Mediolanensis,* with Charles Borromeo as the center, and the *Missale Ambrosianum.* As an Oblate of San Sepolcro he was active in the care of souls, and he was on friendly terms with Catholic intellectuals, such as Contardo Ferrini. His recreation was Alpine climbing, including the ascent of Mont Blanc and the Matterhorn, and journeys to Germany and France.

At the suggestion of Ehrle he became vice-prefect, then in 1914 prefect of the Vatican Library. But as early as the beginning of 1918 he was removed from this activity and named apostolic visitor in Poland, which was at that time still occupied by German and Austrian troops. By way of Munich, Vienna, and Berlin, where he called on Imperial Chancellor Hertling, he reached Warsaw on 30 May 1918. Politically much was in a state of flux: the visitor assured the bishops whom he called on and the Polish people of the Pope's good will. After the Republic of Poland had been established, he became nuncio and titular archbishop of Lepanto; on 19 July 1919 he presented his credentials to President Pilsudski.

Nuncio Ratti succeeded in restoring five bishoprics that had been suppressed under Russian rule, in seeing to the appointment of new bishops, and in bringing about the first episcopal conferences. When in August 1919 the Bolshevik armies stood before Warsaw, the nuncio remained at his post. He was able at least to mitigate the oppression of the Ukrainian Uniates but not, however, to go into the Soviet Union and Finland. Appointed apostolic visitor of the area of Upper Silesia that was subject to a plebiscite, he went to Oppeln in April 1920 and in

July also into the part of East Prussia that was subject to a plebiscite. His conduct in the struggle over the plebiscite satisfied neither side. When on 29 November 1920 Prince-Bishop Bertram of Breslau (Wroclaw), with the Pope's consent, forbade political propaganda to the Upper Silesian clergy of both nations, under threat of suspension, the Poles obtained the recall of the nuncio.

There followed a sudden rise. Appointed archbishop of Milan and cardinal on 13 June 1921, he entered his diocese on 5 September 1921 after a month of quiet recollection at Monte Cassino and immediately displayed an almost feverish-seeming activity: when visiting the monasteries and ecclesiastical institutes he sometimes preached from five to ten times a day. On 8 December he opened the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart. He held up as models of his episcopal work the two great bishops of Milan, Ambrose and Charles Borromeo, with whom he had occupied himself as a scholar. But only five months of episcopal activity were granted to Ratti in his home diocese. The death of Benedict XV called him to Rome for the conclave of 2 to 6 February 1922.[6] Fifty-three cardinals took part in it, including thirty-one Italians. At the start the same factions stood in confrontation as in the conclave of 1914. The German and Austrian cardinals—Bertram, Faulhaber, Schulte, and Piffl—at first came out for Gasparri, until now secretary of state. The candidacy of Merry del Val, which had found some response in the first five ballotings, proved to be hopeless, and so the moderate Lafontaine, patriarch of Venice, came into prominence and received twenty-three votes on the eleventh ballot; the representative of the other faction, Gasparri, obtained twenty-four votes on the eighth ballot. Neither of the parties could achieve the two-thirds majority. This reason procured for the compromise candidate, Ratti, an increasing number of votes from the eleventh ballot. He was elected on the fourteenth ballot, 6 February 1922, with forty-two out of fifty-three votes; even Maffi and Mercier were for him. He chose as his motto *Pax Christi in Regno Christi,* which was explained in his first encyclical, *Ubi arcano,* and was later enlarged on in the encyclical on the Kingship of Christ in 1925: Christianity and Church must not, as liberal laicism wished, be excluded from the life of society but must be active in it.

He was the first scholarly Pope since Benedict XIV. He was recommended by his broad knowledge, his considerable knowledge of languages and international relations, and not least his acquaintance with modern scientific investigation. But not only by these gifts. As a pious priest, he had constantly been active in pastoral care, and as nuncio he acquired experience of ecclesiastical politics. His special energy gave promise of initiatives in many areas of ecclesiastical life. His health was excellent, his springy gait, even when he was in his seventies, made clear that he had succeeded in maintaining it by regular walks in the Vatican gardens.

---

[6] See above n. 1; the acts, *AAS* 16 (1924), 109ff.

"Life is action" ("La vita è azione," according to Confalonieri) was one of his maxims; another was "Don't put off until tomorrow what you can do today." Of a character like granite, "born to command" ("nato per il comando," according to Confalonieri), the formerly reserved Pope radiated inner assurance and a strong consciousness of authority. With strict objectivity and painstaking order he carried through in deliberate calmness his program of work, in which the several hours of constant reception of pilgrimages, which he addressed if at all possible in their native languages, occupied a broad, perhaps too broad, part. He did not think much of delegating the preparation of papal decisions to commissions: not entirely without reason was he reproached for an authoritarian, even autocratic, conduct of his office. The College of Cardinals was strongly deemphasized. Still another maxim: "Laws are to be observed, not to be dispensed with" (Confalonieri). Was he a fighter? It is certain that, where Christian principles and the Church's basic rights were at stake, he was as unflinching as his model, Ambrose. His devotion was "una pietà all'antica"; even at the age of eighty he held fast to the exercises of piety with which he was familiar from his seminary days: the breviary, the rosary, visit to the Blessed Sacrament, retreats. Lest even the suspicion of nepotism should appear, he received his relatives, not in his private apartments, but in the official reception halls.

The pontificate began with a surprise. Pius XI, as he called himself, because he was born under one Pope Pius and had come to Rome under another Pope Pius, imparted the blessing "Urbi et Orbi," customary at the proclaiming of the election, from the external loggia of Saint Peter's Basilica, thereby indicating that he intended to move toward a solution of the Roman Question. Even before his coronation on 12 February, he confirmed the previous secretary of state, Gasparri, in his office and thus made known that he planned to maintain the previous direction of Church government; when he sent him to Loreto as papal legate, he called him "the most loyal interpreter and implementer of his will." Even more decisively than Benedict XV, he held himself aloof from certain measures during the strife over Modernism, in which he rehabilitated Francesco Lanzoni and without advance concessions restored to Albert Ehrhard the prelatial dignity he had been deprived of. The scholarly Pope regarded the promotion of science and of serious scholarship as his peculiar duty. He had the reading rooms of the Vatican Library modernized and enlarged; he gave the purple to his predecessor in the position of prefect of the library, Franz Ehrle, and to his successors, Giovanni Mercati and Eugène Tisserant. The Oriental Institute founded by Benedict XV and the Papal Archaelogical Institute established by himself obtained sumptuous sites near Santa Maria Maggiore. For the Vatican collection of paintings he erected the new Pinacoteca. The means for all this were provided by the indemnity payments agreed to by the Italian government in the Lateran Treaties.

The Italian bishops were instructed to take care of a better preservation and organization of existing archives. In order to complete the collection of papal documents to 1198, begun by Paul Kehr, he established the *Piusstiftung* in Switzerland. Of great importance was the reform of priestly formation, into which modern scientific methods, for example, the employment of seminars and the production of scholarly dissertations, were incorporated.[7] A historical section for the completing of the processes of beatification and canonization was added to the Congregation of Rites. The Pope took into account the significance of the natural sciences, with the results of which he was completely fascinated, by founding in 1936 an Accademia delle Scienze, into which were admitted important students of science from the entire world.

The Pope exercised the apostolic teaching authority in numerous encyclicals, which in part were related to historical anniversaries. In his first encyclical of 23 December 1922[8] he admonished the victors of the world war to reconciliation of peoples. On the occasion of the ecumenical conferences of Stockholm and Lausanne he warned against vague formulas of union and urged unity in faith.[9] As "Pope of Jubilees," he liked to use historical anniversaries to consider problems of the present: on the three-hundredth anniversary of the death of Francis De Sales the connection of being in the world and loyalty to principle;[10] six hundred years after his canonization he called Thomas Aquinas the "Guide in Studies";[11] seven hundred years after the canonization of Francis of Assisi he aimed to strengthen the Franciscan spirit in the Church;[12] fifteen hundred years after the death of Saint Augustine he glorified him as a light for his contemporaries and for our age;[13] and the Jubilee of the Council of Ephesus in 1931 gave him the opportunity to strengthen devotion to Mary.

Other encyclicals recommended participation in retreats, devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the rosary, or inculcated the bases of Christian education[14] and Christian married life.[15] The encyclicals on Catholic Action and against atheistic Communism[16] advanced still farther into the social field. Out of the conviction that in Fascist Italy no political but only a religious association of Catholics was possible, he sought to realize this insight in the whole Catholic world. For Italy a Central Council of Catholic Action had been appointed as early as November 1922: it supervised the activity of the organizations, of the diocesan commissions, of the youth organizations, and of the university federations. During the succeeding years Catholic Action was introduced in many countries—Spain, Portugal, Poland, Yugoslavia, Austria. In Switzerland and the Anglo-Saxon countries there were hesitations, because its basic aim had already been realized. For the same reason there existed doubts in already overorganized Germany; nevertheless, the Pope pressed for the introduction in his letter to Cardinal Bertram of 13 November 1928. That it was not to be understood as a withdrawal of the Church to a ghetto was made clear by the encyclical *Quadragesimo anno,* which attached itself directly to the social program of Leo XIII (see Chapter 7).

---

[7] Constitution *Deus scientiarum* in *AAS* 23 (1931), 241–84, supplemented by the encyclical on the priesthood of 22 December 1935 in *AAS* 27 (1935), 5–51.

[8] *AAS* 14 (1922), 673–700.

[9] *AAS* 20 (1928), 5–16.

[10] *AAS* 15 (1923), 49–63

[11] *AAS* 15 (1923), 309–26.

[12] *AAS* 18 (1926), 153–75.

[13] *AAS* 22 (1930), 201–34.

The "Pope of Jubilees" celebrated three Jubilee Years: the Jubilee falling according to the cycle in 1925, for which more than a half million pilgrims came to Rome; the missionary exposition organized at the same time attracted seven hundred fifty thousand visitors; the Holy Year closed with the instituting of the solemnity of Christ the King. Extraordinary jubilees were celebrated on the occasion of the Pope's golden jubilee of his priesthood in 1929 and in memory of the Incarnation and Redemption by Jesus Christ from Easter 1933 to Easter 1934; in the following year it was extended to the whole world. The world Eucharistic Congresses at Rome in 1922, Amsterdam in 1924, Chicago in 1926, Sydney in 1928, Carthage in 1930, Dublin in 1932, Buenos Aires in 1934, Rio de Janeiro in 1936, Manila in 1937, and Budapest in 1938 made people aware of the universality of the Church.

In the allocutions customary before Christmas the Pope took care to give to the College of Cardinals summaries of the most important ecclesiastical events of the year. Thus in 1923 he spoke of the aid to the populations of the Central Powers and of Russia, in 1926 and at other times of the persecution of the Church in Mexico, the menacing development in China, but also of the important happenings in Europe. He strengthened the College of Cardinals by eight members in his first creation; in the next years he filled up only with difficulty the vacancies caused by death and extended, though again only slowly, the representation of other continents in the college: in 1924 through the elevation of the archbishops of New York and Chicago, in 1930 of the archbishop of Rio de Janeiro. Not until 1935 did there follow a great promotion of twenty cardinals, but there were only two non-Europeans among them—Buenos Aires and the Syrian patriarch of Antioch. He left to his successors the step discussed by him toward a numerical internationalization of the College of Cardinals.

---

[14] *AAS* 21 (1929), 723–62.

[15] *Casti conubii* of 31 December 1930 in *AAS* 22 (1930), 539–92.

[16] *Divini Redemptoris* in *AAS* 29 (1937), 65–106.

Noteworthy among the numerous beatifications and canonizations are those of: Robert Bellarmine, beatified in 1923 and canonized and declared a Doctor of the Church in 1930; Peter Canisius in 1925, when he was also declared a Doctor of the Church; Albertus Magnus in 1931, also a Doctor of the Church; the curé of Ars in 1925; Don Bosco, beatified in 1929 and canonized in 1935; Conrad of Parzham in 1934; Bernadette Soubirous, beatified in 1925 and canonized in 1933. In addition to many founders of religious institutes, martyrs in the missions were preferred: in 1935 John de Brébeuf and his companions, who had shed their blood in Canada in the seventeenth century; the Korean martyrs of 1839 in 1926; the Syrian martyrs of 1860 in 1926. The most imposing canonization of this sort was that of the English witnesses to the faith, John Fisher and Thomas More, in 1935.

Through all the internal ecclesiastical activity of Pius XI there runs like a red thread the awareness that the Church, to a degree never achieved before in its history, had become a World Church. This fact found expression in the extension of the international relations of the Holy See: at the end of the pontificate it maintained thirty-seven nunciatures and twenty-three apostolic delegations, and thirty-six ambassadors or ministers were accredited to the Pope.

Already marked by a mortal illness, the Pope planned an address that was to be delivered on the anniversary of the "reconciliation" with a fierce protest against the ecclesiastical policy of Fascist Italy, but he died on the previous evening, 10 February 1939. His successor was his secretary of state, Pacelli.

Pius XII

Pius XII came from a family of Roman jurists closely connected with the papacy. His grandfather, Marcantonio (1804–90), was from 1851 to 1870 deputy of the papal minister of the interior; the latter's son, Filippo (1837–1916), second oldest of ten children, was an advocate at the Rota and from 1896 consistorial advocate; as a legal adviser he participated in the codification of the canon law. By his wife, Virginia

Graziosi (1844–1920), he had two sons: Francesco, who played a role in the preparatory negotiations of the Lateran Treaties, and of whom were born the papal nephews, Carlo, Marcantonio, and Giulio; and Eugenio, the future Pope. In addition, the Pope had two sisters, Giuseppa Mengarini and Elisabetta Rosignani.

Eugenio, born on 2 March 1876, attended the state secondary school Visconti and, after finishing there, he pursued philosophy at the Gregoriana from 1894 to 1899, while he was a member of the Collegio Capranica. He studied theology at Sant'Apollinare as an extern, but at the same time for an entire year he heard lectures at the state University Sapienza, including those of the ancient historian Beloch. He was ordained to the priesthood on 2 April 1899 by the cardinal vicar of Rome in the latter's private chapel. He celebrated his first Mass in the Borghese Chapel of Santa Maria Maggiore, and on the next day a Mass at the tomb of Saint Philip Neri in the Chiesa Nuova. This procedure is informative for his later career.

Favored by Cardinal Vannutelli, a friend of his father's, after the completion of his legal studies at Sant'Apollinare (1899–1902), he entered the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs as a *minutante* in 1904; its secretary, Pietro Gasparri, requisitioned him for cooperation in the codification of canon law. Pacelli became undersecretary in 1911 and secretary of the congregation in 1914. Parallel to this, from 1909 to 1914, he was teaching at the Accademia dei Nobili and performing pastoral work as confessor, preacher, and lecturer.

The career of the young Pacelli was exclusively carried out in the area of Rome and the Vatican until on 20 April 1917 he was appointed nuncio in Munich. Benedict XV himself ordained him as archbishop of Sardes on 13 May 1917 in the Sistine Chapel and thereby made clear that he enjoyed the full confidence of the Pope in the discussion to be undertaken by him of the aims of the war with the German government. On 26 June the nuncio conferred with Imperial Chancellor Count von Hertling and on 29 June he was received in the imperial headquarters (see Chapter 3).

After the overthrow of the monarchy, Pacelli was on 22 June 1920 made the first nuncio to the German Republic, while retaining temporarily the Munich nunciature, and, as its occupant, on 29 March 1924 he signed the Bavarian concordat. Not until 1925 did he move definitively to Berlin. The reputation and influence of the "perhaps most skillful diplomat of the Curia," as the German evangelical *Korrespondenz* put it, grew from year to year. He regularly participated in the German Catholic Days, at which he gave the address. Later he remembered with pleasure these years in Berlin.

Recalled at the end of 1929 and created a cardinal on 16 December, on 7 February 1930 he became Gasparri's successor as secretary of state, and as such he signed concordats with Baden and Austria as well as the concordat with Germany. On 25 March 1930 he was named archpriest of Saint Peter's as successor of Merry del Val. He became known to the Universal Church through legations to Buenos Aires in 1934, Lourdes and Lisieux in 1935 and 1937 respectively, and Budapest in 1938. In 1936 he visited the United States in a private capacity. And so, at the end of Pius XI's reign he was the best known cardinal, and in the College of Cardinals there was a consensus that he was preeminently qualified to guide the Universal Church through the storm of the threatening war, as had Benedict XV, who had had a similar career, during the First World War. The conclave lasted only one day, 2 March 1939: Pacelli was elected as early as the third ballot, with forty-eight out of sixty-three votes, and assumed the name Pius XII. No secretary of state had obtained the tiara since 1667. His coronation on 12 March took place, out of regard for the masses of people whom Saint Peter's could not hold, on the loggia over the principal portal. It was the first to be carried on radio. As his secretary of state the new Pope named the Neapolitan Luigi Maglione, who had been nuncio at Paris until 1935.

When in the summer of 1939 the danger of war grew more real, the Pope in a radio broadcast to the world on 24 August urged peace: "Nothing is lost through peace; all can be lost through war." The appeal was made in vain. When the new Pope's first encyclical appeared on 20 October, the Second World War had begun. While it raged, the Pope, relying on his moral authority, could only urge peace again and again and demand a just and humane treatment of the civil population in the militarily occupied areas. The information bureau set up in the Vatican collected the names of prisoners of war and the missing and supplied information on them to their families—from July 1941 to December 1946, 1,162,627 particulars were furnished. After the bombing of 19 July 1943 the Pope personally visited the severely hit city quarter of San Lorenzo and succeeded in getting the Italian government to declare Rome an "open city." In order to improve the providing of foodstuffs to the city crowded with refugees, provisions were brought from central and upper Italy in Vatican truck convoys.

Like Benedict XV after the First World War, so also Pius XII did not regard the time as suitable for filling the vacancies in the College of Cardinals until after the concluding of the armistice. In order to make of this a "living image of the universality of the Church," on 18 February 1946 he named thirty-two cardinals from all parts of the world, among them Armenian Patriarch Agagianian and the archbishops of New York, Saint Louis, Toronto, São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Santiago de Chile, Lima, Havana, Sydney, Lourenço Marques, and the Chinese Tien; the

Pope displayed courage by giving the purple also to three Germans: to Archbishop Frings of Cologne and Bishops Count Galen of Münster and Count Preysing of Berlin. A further step toward internationalizing the College was the promotion of twenty-four cardinals on 19 January 1953. Among them were the archbishops of Los Angeles, Montreal, Quito, Bahia, and Bombay. The proportion of Italians dropped to one-third.

In the thirty-three canonizations which Pius XII performed, French and Italians predominated, among the latter being Pius X in 1954.

Unaffected by the war was the exercise of the papal teaching office, which in several respects prepared the ground for the Second Vatican Council: the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* of 29 June 1943 on the Church,[17] followed on 30 September of the same year by the encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* on Holy Scripture, which encouraged the investigation of the literal sense and regard for literary forms and allowed biblical scholarship more freedom than had been permitted it during the defense against Modernism.[18] The constitution *Sacramentum ordinis* of 30 November 1947 defined as the essence of the Sacrament of Orders the invocation of the Holy Spirit through the imposition of hands; the symbolic presentation of chalice and paten do not pertain to it.[19] The bull *Munificentissimus Deus* of 1 November 1950 defined, without eliminating all the scientific difficulties, the dogma of the bodily Assumption of the Mother of God into heaven. The constitution *Sempiternus Rex* of September 1951 laid the foundation for the encyclical *Haurietis aquas* of 15 May 1956 on devotion to the Sacred Heart.[20] The encyclical *Humani generis* of 12 August 1950 basically accepted theological progress but warned against the relativization of dogmas and the all too close accommodation to the trends of the day.[21] The constitution *Sedes sapientiae* of 31 May 1956 extended the circle of theological departments of study in accord with the demands of modern pastoral work.[22]

No Pope before Pius XII treated as often and as forcibly as he in his numerous and always carefully prepared addresses to pilgrims, participants in congresses, and members of the most varied professions the general themes of Christian life—human dignity, formation of conscience, marriage and the family—and questions of professional ethics—jurists, physicians, natural scientists, and others—and referred to the importance of the mass media—press, film, radio, and television. To the Lenten preachers of Rome he took care to speak on the sacraments as sources of sanctification. He remained rather reserved in regard to the ecumenical movement that grew so powerfully after the war.

---

[17] *AAS* 35 (1943), 143–248.
[18] *AAS* 35 (1943), 297–325.
[19] *AAS* 40 (1948), 5–7.
[20] *AAS* 48 (1956), 303–53.
[21] *AAS* 42 (1950), 561–78.
[22] *AAS* 48 (1956), 354–64.

But his liturgical reforms were epoch-making. Accepting the basic idea of the liturgical movement, the encyclical *Mediator Dei* of 20 November 1947 demanded the active participation of the faithful in the Sacrifice of the Mass, declared the reception of Communion to be desirable, though not necessary, and rejected the move to do away with cult forms that were unknown in antiquity.[23] The Evening Mass, granted during the war out of regard for nocturnal bombardments, was definitively allowed by the constitution *Christus Dominus* of 6 January 1953, and at the same time the Eucharistic fast was modified.[24] But perhaps the Pope's greatest deed in this field was the decree of the Congregation of Rites of 1 February 1951, which restored the Easter Vigil Liturgy. The new translation of the psalms, introduced in 1945, eliminated the translation mistakes in the Vulgate, but in the next years had to be again assimilated to the text made sacred by tradition. In September 1956 the First Liturgical World Congress met at Assisi.

Of the exhaustive legislative activity of the jurist Pope (see Chapter 5), to be singled out because of their general importance are the new decrees on the conclave and the papal election: photographic and radio apparatus could not be brought in, and television speakers and writers could not be employed; one vote over the two-thirds majority was needed to elect the Pope.[25] A step on to new ground was the constitution *Provida Mater Ecclesia* of 2 February 1947: it laid down rules for secular institutes, whose members bound themselves to the observance of the evangelical counsels without living in community.[26]

The slender, ascetically active Pope with the Roman head, who always took great care of his external appearance, was without doubt in the succession of Popes of the twentieth century the most brilliant phenomenon, admired by non-Catholics even more than by Catholics. He appeared to them as the perfect *Pontifex,* in form and looks the incarnation of the Roman Catholic Universal Church. The Romans never forgot that in the most difficult days of the war he had stayed with them and had been their single protector. Although he had three Germans in his immediate entourage—the Jesuits Robert Leiber and Augustine Bea and the former leader of the Center Party, Ludwig

[23] *AAS* 39 (1947), 521–95.
[24] *AAS* 45 (1953), 15–24.
[25] *AAS* 38 (1946), 65–99.
[26] *AAS* 39 (1947), 114–24.

Kaas—and as his housekeeper Sister Pasqualina of the Congregation of the Swiss Sisters of the Cross, and although he employed the German Jesuits Gundloch and Hürth as advisers, he was far from favoring Germany or even of pursuing a pro-German policy. Earlier than many Germans, he had recognized the threat to Christianity from National Socialism, although the threat from Bolshevism seemed to him still greater. He, and only he, piloted the Universal Church; in his hand all the strings of the Church's direction ran together. In a clearly superhuman working achievement he obtained for himself from acts the insights from which his decisions proceeded. After the death of his secretary of state, Maglione, on 22 August 1944, he appointed no successor and governed in direct contact with the heads of the two departments of the Secretariat of State, Montini and Tardini. As time passed, the College of Cardinals was more and more removed from transactions. In his relations with people he astounded them by his unerring remembrance of persons and charmed them by his amiability. His undoubted deep personal piety was strongly Marian under the influence of the apparitions at Fatima and misled opportunistic theologians to an excessive Mariology. Though viewed from without, the Catholic Church under the pontificate of Pius XII operated as a monolith in the whirlpool of the upheavals of world history, the Pope could only hesitatingly draw under the spell of his juridically stamped image of the Church the results that presented themselves and were even necessary for the accommodation to the new hour of world history. Only his successor dared to do so, and the Second Vatican Council introduced the new epoch. It must remain undecided whether he would have implemented the plans attributed to him of reorganizing the Curia and summoning a council,[27] even if the deterioration of his strength from which he suffered in his last years and which his physician sought in vain to arrest, had not impaired his activity.[28] Painful indiscretions of the physician overshadowed his last days and his death on 9 October 1958 at Castel Gandolfo.

---

[27] G. Caprile, "Pio XII e un nuovo progetto di concilio ecumenico," *CivCatt* 117, 2 (1966), 209–27.

[28] Presentation by the physician R. Galenzzi Lisi, *Dans l'hombre et dans la lumière de Pie XII* (Paris 1960).

CHAPTER 3

*Foreign Policy of the Popes in the Epoch of the World Wars**

The First World War and the Postwar Years: Benedict XV

Benedict XV has frequently been called a "political" Pope in contrast to his predecessor, who was a "religious" Pope. This is correct to the extent that Benedict XV, who was likewise a "religious" Pope, was confronted in foreign policy by problems of greater impact than was any of his predecessors since 1815. As early as the beginning of September 1914 the war had expanded beyond the boundaries of Europe and become a "world war." It soon took on proportions for which historical memory could find no comparable examples. Two-thirds of the Catholics of the time were directly involved in this war, 124 million on the side of the Entente, 64 million on the side of the Central Powers. The third of the Catholics living in countries not engaged in the war were, except for German-speaking Switzerland and Spain, under the overwhelming propaganda influence of the Entente Powers.

It goes without saying that the war, with its presumed consequences, constituted a powerful criterion for the voting of the cardinals in the conclave of 1914, which was able to take place without hindrances, but it was hardly the decisive factor. Thus, the papal electors from the Central Powers were from the start for Della Chiesa, but the ecclesiastical questions—integralism and its problems—were more important to them than political considerations.[1] The same must have been true of most other cardinals.

For the new Pope the question of the correct foreign policy course never became publicly a problem for the solution of which there would basically have been alternatives. From the first hour three points of orientation determined his answer to the challenge of the war: strict neutrality, charitable measures of assistance, and the call for peace and reconciliation.

NEUTRALITY

The basis of political neutrality can be precisely grasped in the papal allocution of 22 January 1915.[2] In it the Pope claimed for himself without restriction the right to be "summus interpres et vindex legis aeternae." He also declared in the abstract that he in no way sanctioned violations of rights but condemned them. He avoided with difficulty a concretizing and actualizing in regard to the problems which the war had raised. Hence he did not take a stand on the question of war guilt and of the infringements by German troops in Belgium or of the Russian occupation in Galicia. The war was by no means made less demanding: it was rather a "butchery" (*trucidatio*) than a fight (*dimicatio*). To intervene with papal authority into the confrontations of the warring parties was, however, neither significant (*conveniens*) nor useful (*utile*); on the contrary, the Holy See must remain neutral (*nullius partis*), however difficult this might be. Christ died for all men; the Pope is the Vicar of Christ for all men and on all sides of the war has children for whom he bears responsibility. And so he must not look at the *rationes proprias* separating them, but he must pay attention to the common bond of faith which unites them. Should the Pope act otherwise, he would not be promoting the cause of peace but further jeopardizing the interior unity of the Church. To be sure, he called emphatically and urgently for peace and reconciliation. Earlier the first encyclical (1 November 1914) had invited rulers and governments to peace negotiations: There are better means and ways to restore violated rights that war.[3]

---

* Konrad Repgen

[1] Cf. Piffl's diary for 2 and 5 September 1914 (M. Liebmann, "Les Conclaves du Benoît XV et Pie XI." *La Revue Nouvelle* 38 [1963], 45. Also J. Lenzenweger, "Neues Licht auf die Papstwahlen von 1914 und 1922," [Linzer] *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* 112 [1964], 51–58).

[2] *AAS* 7 (1915), 33–36.

This program, to which the Pope held firm during the succeeding years without essentially new arguments and ideas, was the opposite of a preaching crusade: incomparably moderate and temperate in goals and hence without any emotional force of enthusiasm. The war was still young, and the propaganda organs were running at full speed. At this moment few were ready to listen to the Pope; in fact, he was reproached with the charge that his peace-preaching crippled the moral power of resistance against the (unjustified) attack of the enemy among his (own) Catholics. The Pope presumably was under no illusions as to the direct effects of his appeal. But the essentially pastoral outlook enabled him to look beyond the clamor of the day.

Pius XII followed this fundamental orientation in the Second World War. It may seem today in retrospect as a sheer foregone conclusion, but it was at first nothing of the sort. To establish and stick to such a tradition required considerable and continuous efforts. Of course, in regard to ecclesiastical interests and understanding, there were no acceptable alternatives.

A withdrawing from the principle of neutrality would necessarily have meant taking one side or the other. Just as the Pope would have had to establish this morally, legally, and politically, so right and wrong, guilt and innocence were by no means one-sided, clear, and undoubted in this or that warring coalition of powers. The Pope could identify himself with none of them. But even if this should have been possible, the Vatican, in the translating of such a concept into practical political activity, would soon have run up against scarcely surmountable barriers. The papacy of the High Middle Ages had not been able to realize *in praxi* the theoretical claim to be judge of the world. Between 1914 and 1918 the word of the Bishop of Rome meant incomparably much less. Among non-Catholics the political authority of the Holy See had dropped to its nadir under Pius X.[4] Then people listened all the less to the Pope when even Catholics loyal to the Church did not collectively turn to Rome politically either predominantly or exclusively. This was especially true of the levels and groups that were then in any way "modern." Because a nationalism extending even to chauvinism was the prevailing tendency of the age, whoever wanted to obtain "contact" with his "contemporary age" could let himself be swept along easily and far by the nationalist movements. To accuse the Holy See that before 1914 it did not proceed energetically enough against this probably overestimates the possible influence of the ecclesiastical leadership and the political conduct of the faithful in purely political matters and leads ultimately to the posing of the question to which history from Gregory VII to Boniface VIII had already given a clearly negative answer. Hence, even with regard to the real ability to implement, neutrality was the only Vatican foreign policy that was available. A prudent judgment of the moral-legal situation of the military leadership and a skeptical evaluation of the readiness of the Catholics to echo the concrete political postulates of the Pope corresponded with Benedict XV's understanding of his office. This successor of Peter could and would "act [only] as the merciful Samaritan, not as judge of the world."[5] That persons, both in the camp of the Central Powers and among the Allies, again and again imputed to the papal policy prejudice or partisanship for the respective other side[6] is not a refutation of our thesis but indirectly a confirmation.

---

[3] Ibid. 6 (1914), 565–81, here 567.

---

[4] Sali's report for 1916–22 in T. E. Hachey, *Anglo-Vatican Relations 1914–1939,* 1–72, here 4.

[5] L. Volk, "Kardinal Mercier, der deutsche Episkopat und die Neutralitätspolitik Benedikts XV. 1914–1916," *StdZ* 192 (1974), 611–30, here 628.

[6] For accusations from French and Italian circles cf. G. Jarlot, *Doctrine pontifical et l'histoire. L'enseignement social de Léon XIII, Pie X et Benoît XV vu dans son ambiance historique (1878–1922)* (Rome 1964); for the German side the paper edited by the Evangelisches Bund, "Papst, Kurie and Weltkrieg. Historisch-kritische Studie von einem Deutschen" (Berlin 1918).

As a consequence of the Vatican's neutrality and the Pope's reserve with statements containing concrete proposals, much political latitude was possible for the Catholics and their organizations in the different countries. For most of them identification with the cause of their own state, regarded as good and just, was important. Hence the Pope hardly determined the political attitude of the Catholicism of the countries and nationalities affected by or participating in the war in the specific problems which the war raised. Whether this may be regarded as a failure of papal policy is questionable, for in this regard Benedict XV probably had no wish to lead. Conversely, his neutrality was the indispensable presupposition for extensive humanitarian measures of assistance and for diplomatic activities to prevent the spread of the war and for the restoration of peace.

PAPAL MEASURES OF ASSISTANCE

Humanitarian measures of assistance fade easily and fast in historical memory. But, especially in war time, they require much patience, time, energy, and flexibility. The papal measures of help were supplied without regard to the religious, national, or ethnic membership of those affected, as the cardinal secretary of state had expressly prescribed on 22 December 1914.[7] This conduct found widely noticed recognition through the erecting of a great monument for Benedict XV at Constantinople in December 1921, hence in his own lifetime. The dedication speaks of the gratitude of the East for the Benefactor of peoples, who provided aid without distinction of race and religion.

In the First World War cruelties occurred in the Mideast which recall the Second World War, but were and are only lightly regarded by the historical memory of the Western world. For example, after the retreat of the Russians from eastern Anatolia one hundred twenty five thousand Assyro-Chaldeans were first driven into western Azerbaijan and from there back into the area of Mosul, modern Iraq, where most of them starved. Deportations and massacres among the Armenians[8] cost about 1 million human lives. A like fate was spared the Christians of Lebanon, but they too were decimated by hunger. The Pope could not prevent these happenings. But by avoiding branding them publicly, he continued in his neutral position and for this reason and by means of personal letters to Sultan Mehmed V he was able to bring about the partial halting of the massacres, to save from execution those condemned to death, and to insure that surviving children of the victims were cared for. An orphanage set up for this purpose in Constantinople received the name of Benedict XV.

---

[7] *AAS* 6 (1914), 7f.

[8] J. Deny, "Arminiya," *Encyclopedia of Islam,* 2d ed., I (Leiden and London 1960), 634–50, here 640f.; G. Jaeschke, "Das Osmanische Reich vom Berliner Kongreß bis zu seinem Ende (1878–1920/21)," T. Schieder, ed., *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte* VI (Stuttgart 1968), 43, remarks that the treatment of the Armenians "was not undeserved by them." The Armenian revolts from 1890 would have simultaneously supplied motive, pretext, and excuse.

On the other hand, the war in Europe was on the whole oriented in some degree to the contemporary norms of international law. Accordingly, the Vatican's measures of assistance in this sphere bore the charitable character of "normal" war care. First, from the spring of 1915, an exchange of prisoners unfit for military service succeeded by means of Switzerland, then the liberation and exchange of interned civilians, then the lodging of sick and wounded prisoners of war in neutral countries, to a total of over one hundred thousand, and finally the exchange of prisoners of war who were fathers of families of many children and the permitting of consumptive Italians to return from Austro-Hungarian prisons. In addition, collections of money prepared the way for these measures, and the Vatican's own resources were given to a total amount of approximately 82 million gold lire. Furthermore, efforts were undertaken or supported to put into motion again the postal exchange between the occupied and the unoccupied areas of a state, and, above all, corresponding institutions were established for the pastoral and charitable care of prisoners of war. Not least of all, with the help of these institutions the Vatican took part in the search for the missing. The office maintained by the German episcopate alone investigated eight hundred thousand applications, on which the state offices could give no information; one-eighth of these missing could be identified, and of these sixty-six thousand were still alive. Measured by the misery of the years-long war of attrition for soldiers and the civilian population, such measures of assistance were, to be sure, only a palliative. But in the framework of what was possible much was attempted and far more was accomplished than in the field of "pure" foreign policy.

Efforts for Peace

The Holy See's strivings for peace were first concentrated on Italy, the history of which in the period from September 1914 to the declaration of war on Austria-Hungary on 23 May 1915 is nothing other "than the history of the overwhelming of a reasonable but impassive majority by an enthusiastic or unscrupulous, but in any case tirelessly active minority," in which it was not clear "who had used or compelled whom: the active minority the government, or conversely."[9] Benedict

---

[9] E. Nolte, "Italien von der Begründung des Nationalstaats bis zum Ende des I. Weltkriegs (1870–1918)," T. Schieder, ed., *Handbuch* above, n. 8, 427.

XV was fundamentally interested in the outcome of these internal Italian struggles. It was of course unclear whether and how the Prisoner in the Vatican could at all continue the central government of the Universal Church if a state of war occurred in Italy. Besides, for the Italian Catholics loyal to the Church the Bishop of Rome had a special moral and political leadership responsibility. Finally, in the event of an Italian defeat in the Appenine peninsula there loomed the threat of a revolution from the left; in the event of an Austro-Hungarian defeat the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire and hence the end of the last great Catholic monarchy. Hence the Pope's aim was that Italy should stay neutral.

The conservative intransigents loyal to the Pope within Italian political Catholicism consistently upheld this goal.[10] The other large groups, the moderate so-called *Clerico-Moderati,* who sought a compromise with and an integration into the liberal state, conformed to all the changes of the government; they began with neutrality and ended with interventionism. The other, smaller groupings were partly for and partly against entry into the war. This variety and these oppositions were apparently accepted by the Pope without his pressing for a uniform formation of purpose in the sense of the Vatican program and carrying this through. He did not prevent substantial portions of Italian Catholicism from coming out for intervention from March 1915.

On the other hand, Benedict XV made intensive use of the traditional means of diplomacy to move the Dual Monarchy to timely and adequate concessions to Italian nationalism and to keep the Italian government from joining the Triple Entente.[11] He was unable to put across these aims, either at Vienna or in Rome. Austria-Hungary only proposed negotiable offers for Italy when the Kingdom had long before committed itself to the Entente in the London Treaty of 26 April 1915. ARTICLE 15 of the treaty, of which the Vatican learned as early as the end of 1915[12] and which the Bolsheviks published in *Izvestia* on 28 November 1917, was at first secret. By this article the Holy See was excluded from all peace negotiations. Behind it lay the traditional anticlericalism of the Freemasonic *Risorgimento* and the fear that otherwise the "Roman Question" could be referred to an international conference. Attempts in 1918 to change this article failed.[13]

---

[10] P. Scoppola, "Cattolici neutralisti e interventisti alla vigilia del conflitto," G. Rossini, ed., *Benedetto XV,* 95–152; A. Prandi, "La guerra e le sue consequenze nel mondo cattolico italiano," ibid, 153–205.

[11] Cf. F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918,* II: *Die Pontifikate Pius' X und Benedikts XV. (1903–1918)* (Graz 1960), 190–247.

[12] Proof: the acts in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 27–30. The contrary claim of the Gasparri *Memoirs,* 169, is false.

The legal and practical consequences for the Holy See at an outbreak of the state of war in Italy were after 1870 governed neither by international nor by Italian law.[14] Hence the government of the Kingdom had theoretically a free hand. The diplomatic representatives accredited to the Holy See by Austria-Hungary and Germany withdrew immediately to Switzerland on 24 May 1915, after the Secretariat of State had refused to accommodate them in the Vatican. In other respects the Italian government observed its unilateral obligations according to the Law of Guarantees of 1871 throughout the war and showed itself generous in some matters not regulated by that law. The Holy See's freedom of movement was, it is true, limited by the Italian state of war; for example, *Osservatore Romano* was bound by the Italian rules of censorship. But on the whole the Vatican had to deal with fewer difficulties than had been previously feared. Even during the war the Curia was able to operate as the center of the Universal Church, and the Pope could continue his foreign policy. In this field his prestige even increased: in 1915 the Netherlands and Great Britain undertook diplomatic relations with the Holy See and sent their representatives to the Vatican. Formal relations with France did not yet materialize, it is true, and in Vatican-Italian relations there persisted the coexistence traditional since 1870 of legal nonrecognition and in practice the possibility of a many-sided contact. At the beginning of the First World War there were fourteen diplomatic missions of states at the Holy See, and at the end seventeen.

After Italy's entry into the war papal foreign policy strove ceaselessly to support whatever could offer a certain prospect of bringing the warring nations to the negotiating table. In this connection the Vatican also followed unconventional routes. Thus from May 1915 to May 1916 it accepted offers of contact from Jewish personalities of France, from whom it apparently expected influence on the Jewish organizations in the Western nations and thereby again on the foreign policy of the Entente Powers.[15] How difficult it was in the hate-filled atmosphere to make progress with peace probings appeared, for example, in the fact that the Pope could not get the future Cardinal Baudrillart in the fall of 1915 to bring a Vatican paper on possibly acceptable conditions of peace to the official notice of the French government.[16]

---

[13] Cf. R. Mosca, "La mancata revisione dell'art. 15 del Patto di Londra," G. Rossini (ed.), *Benedetto XV,* 401–13. A new investigation by W. Steglich is expected; cf. idem, *Verhandlungen,* 407, n. 151.

[14] Cf. R. A. Graham, *Diplomacy,* 305–17. On the plans for building a Vatican State system, cf. S. A. Stehlin, "Germany and a Proposed Vatican State," *CHR* 60 (1974), 402–26.

While, except in eastern Central Europe, the Catholics of all the warring countries very unselfishly carried out their duties as citizens, the Pope continued to be abstract in his frequent public expressions on peace and war,[17] though individual concrete statements positively impressed themselves on the memory, as from his address of 28 July 1915[18] the formula "that the nations not die." On the other hand the "Peace Appeal" of 1 August 1917 to the heads of the warring nations contains declarations of concrete content.[19]

The beginning of this diplomatic action went back to the turn of the year 1916–1917. It assumed concrete forms when the new nuncio at Munich, Eugenio Pacelli, on 13 June 1917 received instructions for personal soundings in Berlin.[20] He discussed this on 26 June with Imperial Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg and Secretary of State Zimmermann. The pivot was Belgium. Bethmann had earlier offered the restoration of the nation only among "real guarantees" for Germany; now he promised "complete independence" of all three great powers—a fundamental concession, for which he had not yet internal agreement. A meeting of Pacelli with Austrian Emperor Charles I on 30 June showed that the Hapsburg Monarchy apparently still maintained its readiness of May 1915 for concessions to Italy. These verbal promises of Berlin and Vienna were materially so important that the Vatican could go further with them. Belgium should be the starting point.

It was precisely on this point that the papal action become jammed. The fall of Bethmann Hollweg on 13 July 1917 contributed to this. His successor Michaelis was not prepared for domestic policy promises that had not been assured. The Curia could not know this, and overestimated the actual chances of success, but apparently placed itself under a portentous time pressure, because it seemingly wanted to publish it unconditionally on 1 August, the beginning of the fourth year of the war. Nevertheless the new Center-Left majority of the Reichstag on 19 July rejected the celebrated peace resolution[21] which came close to the Vatican program and had been accepted by the new imperial chancellor.

---

[15] Cf. P. Korzec, "Les relations entre le Vatican et les organisations juives pendant la première guerre mondiale: la mission Deloncle-Perqual (1915–1916)," *RHMC* 20 (1973), 301–33. In this context there came about a remarkable official comment by the Holy See against anti-Semitic actions in Poland: Gasparri to the American Jewish Committee, 9 February 1916 (ibid, 320 ff.).

[16] J. Leflon, "L'action diplomatico-religieuse de Benoît XV en faveur de la paix durant la première guerre mondiale," G. Rossini, ed., *Benedetto XV,* 62–64.

[17] Texts in A. Struker.

[18] *AAS* 7 (1915), 364–77.

[19] Officially published on 1 September 1917 in *AAS* 9 (1917), 417–20; often printed since 15 August 1917. Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 160–62.

[20] Content in A. Martini, *Preparazione,* 128f.

Before the Pope turned to all the powers, the concrete formulations with Berlin had to be unambiguously agreed to. To this end Pacelli on 24 July submitted in Berlin the so-called "Pacelli Punctation"[22] that had been elaborated in Rome at the beginning of July. This was a memorandum in seven points, the first four of which described concrete material regulations—freedom of the seas; limitation of arms; international arbitration; German withdrawal from France, restoration of the complete political, military, and economic independence of Belgium with regard to Germany, England, and France, and on the other hand the return of the German colonies by England—while the last three enumerated the other subjects to be treated at the peace conference—economic questions; Austrian-Italian and German-French boundaries; Poland, Serbia, Rumania, Montenegro.

This memorandum corresponded to the status as of 26 June. But now Berlin at once raised objections, especially in relation to Belgium, where again there was talk of "guarantees." The written reply, the German counterstatement,[23] was not presented until 12 August. The Vatican did not wait for it before drawing up[24] and delivering the papal peace appeal.

The "peace appeal" is a document of Benedict XV, backdated 1 August, to the heads of state of the warring nations, which the cardinal secretary of state officially[25] delivered to the powers on 9 August. The note consists of three parts: a review and recalling of the papal admonitions to peace, previously made, but in vain; a summons to the governments to reach an understanding on the points sketched in what followed as the basis of a just and lasting peace; a moving closing appeal to put an end to the more and more "useless carnage" (*inutile strage*) through negotiations. The crucial second part corresponded in content to the Pacelli Punctation with regard to the verbal German replies of 24 July, except for the point of Belgium.

---

[21] Often printed. Critical text in E. Matthias-R. Morsey, eds., *Der Interfraktionelle Ausschuss 1917/18* I (Düsseldorf 1959), 114f.

[22] Often printed. Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 133.

[23] Text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 151–55.

[24] Cf. A. Martini, *La Nota,* 418f.

[25] Since the Holy See maintained no diplomatic relations with the United States, France, and Italy, the notes for these powers were directed through the English ambassador at the Vatican. Russia and Belgium received the notes through their representatives in Rome; Germany, Bavaria, and Austria-Hungary, through the nuncios in Munich and Vienna.

It could not be proved at the time which prospects the Pope had assigned to his step. If one starts with the probably compelling assumption that he had reckoned on the chances of success, then one must presume that, despite the replies of 24 July, he had estimated Bethmann's promise of 26 June as capable of being revived. This would have—thus, for example, may one understand the Vatican's assessment—released so much political leverage that the Entente could scarcely have avoided serious negotiations resulting from it, step for step. Hence, because the stone which the avalanche would set in motion was the German promise of 26 June concerning Belgium, the reply of Germany to the papal peace appeal acquired special importance. It consisted formally of a note from the imperial chancellor to the cardinal secretary of state of 19 September,[26] which was followed by a confidential letter of Michaelis to Pacelli of 24 September.[27]

The note of 19 September contains various civilities but no clear acceptance of the matter of the statements of the peace appeal. An evasion of this sort, especially in regard to Belgium, had been suspected by the Curia at the latest since 12 August. Thereafter Vatican diplomacy sought persistently and ingeniously somehow to obtain, vis-à-vis the Entente, a usable German declaration of renunciation of Belgium. This policy of delimitation culminated in a letter from Pacelli to Michaelis of 30 August[28] which, with the adding of the English interim reply of 21 August to the papal note, demanded precise statements on Belgium as a presupposition "to further progress of the negotiations." Michaelis rejected such a declaration on Belgium on 24 September, since "certain preconditions" were still "not sufficiently explained." His letter was a provisional decree: the door was not slammed shut. But the papal effort at mediation had come to a halt: the precise German declaration did not come later either, so that the Curia could never again take up the thread.

The already mentioned notes of 21 and 30 August and of 24 September were published by the Germans at the end of July 1919 and were long the subject of passionate controversies, which in the meantime cleared the way for more quiet and painstaking investigations.[29] It is firmly held today, in contradiction to Erzberger's claim in 1919, that Berlin with the German replies of September 1917 had wasted no unconditionally certain opportunities for peace. It is likewise established that Michaelis had not let himself be influenced in his treatment of the peace note by Protestant prejudices against Pope and Church. But there is today still not complete agreement on the bases and the consequences of the German decisions in September. Of course, it is known that Michaelis aligned himself in foreign policy alongside Secretary of State Kühlmann, and the latter, like Bethmann-Hollweg, wanted to give Belgium complete independence. For reasons of negotiating tactics in foreign policy and perhaps also from domestic policy considerations, Kühlmann, however, was willing to use the Vatican's mediation only at the end of a three-phased plan. First he envisaged private probings through the Spanish diplomat Villalobar in England with a declaration of German concessions on Belgium; this should be followed by German-British preliminary peace negotiations and then more formal peace negotiations mediated by the Vatican with a definitive declaration of the renunciation of Belgium. This oversubtle concept foundered in Madrid and in London. Whether a renunciation of the three-phase plan and a direct acceptance of the papal proposal was capable of being realized in Germany's domestic politics and of producing more success in foreign policy cannot be clearly stated, because here many hypotheses must be fitted together. Important, however, in this context is the attitude of the other powers to the peace appeal.

---

[26] Often printed. Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 197–202, with the full, complicated history of the origin. The note was delivered to Pacelli on 20 September, published on 22 September.

[27] Often printed. Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 361–63.

[28] Often printed. Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 342f.

The three other Central Powers likewise replied formally to the Pope and in fact did not depart substantially from the German line;[30] Russia, France, and Italy, on the contrary, chose one of the more rude types of rejection by not replying. The answer of the United States, on 27 August,[31] was mainly conditioned by domestic policy. Wilson declared an Imperial Germany incapable of peace negotiations. British policy did not conform to this denial. The English envoy at the Vatican was instructed on 21 August[32] to give an interim answer, which "to a certain degree conformed to the papal action" (W. Steglich). For reasons not clearly determinable, Paris at first attached itself to this step, and London communicated this to Rome on 23 August.[33] The London instructions of 21 and 23 August led to the Vatican's overestimating France's readiness for negotiations completely and England's considerably. On 26 August France made an about-face in regard to England and pressed for aloofness. To what extent London agreed is controverted.[34] England's actual readiness for negotiations from 30 August was probably described most precisely by Steglich, who thinks that London "wanted to defer the definitive stand until clarity had been obtained in regard to the willingness of the Central Powers to make concessions."[35]

---

[29] Basic are W. Steglich, *Friedensappell* I, and V., and Conzemius, *L'offre.* To be added for French policy is P. Renouvin, "Le gouvernement français devant le message de paix du Saint-Siège (août 1917)," *Festschrift A. Latreille. Religion et Politique. Les deux guerres mondiales. Histoire de Lyon et du Sud-Est* (Lyon 1972), 287–302; for English policy, W. Steglich, "Die Haltung der britischen Regierung zur päpstlichen Friedensaktion von 1917," *Verhandlungen,* 365–409.

[30] Often printed. Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 210f. (Austria-Hungary, 20 September 1917), 227f. (Bulgaria, 20 September 1917), 231–33 (Bavaria, 21 September 1917), 223–25 (Turkey, 30 September 1917).

[31] Often printed. Text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 422–24.

From these relations it becomes clear how very much Pacelli had to believe at the end of August that with a German renunciation of Belgium the open sea of the peace negotiations had been reached, but also that at the end of August such a declaration would in no way have guaranteed surer success. How London would have decided if it had resulted cannot be said. Historically it must be held that the German silence on Belgium on 19 and 24 September spared the English government from finding a political reply to Germany, which it could have stuck to internally and could have subscribed to externally.

The failure of the action of 1 August 1917 did not induce the Pope to a fundamental correcting of his readiness to mediate. For example, in February 1918 Gasparri offered the Italian government mediation in special negotiations with Austria-Hungary, which also led to the formulating of corresponding plans, but because of internal Italian differences was not pursued farther.[36] But Benedict XV no longer expressed himself publicly in the further course of the war on concrete problems of peace.

The Pope did not need to observe this discretion during the Paris peace negotiations. He could, of course, exercise no influence on the content of the treaties,[37] since he was excluded from the congress as well as from the League of Nations. Nevertheless, the secretary of the Vatican Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, Bonaventura Cerretti, stayed for some time in 1919 at the congress as the Pope's secret representative. In this way he established numerous contacts which led to the assuming of diplomatic relations with the new eastern central European nations and constituted the point of departure for the concluding of many concordats. Altogether the Vatican foreign policy worked for the most extensive possible international presence and for contractual accommodation with all nations, in connection with which it was shown to be quite prepared for concessions. For example, it was an unmistakable sign of reconciliation when the encyclical *Pacem Dei munus* of 23 May 1920[38] abolished the regulations which since 1870 had restricted the visits of Catholic heads of state who had been received at the Quirinal. This encyclical also directed the episcopate to exert itself for the promotion of a real attitude of peace among the faithful and thereby unambiguously distinguished itself from the Paris peace achievement, which was not characterized by the spirit of reconciliation. A great success of the Vatican's desire for reconciliation was the resumption of diplomatic relations with France in 1921. When Benedict XV unexpectedly died on 22 January 1922, the foreign policy presitge of the Holy See, as measured against 1914, had risen remarkably. That the number of diplomatic representatives at the Vatican had more than doubled was a clear indication of this.

---

[32] Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 335.

[33] Critical text in W. Steglich, *Friedensappell,* 337.

[34] The sources say nothing about it. Cf. the declarations in P. Renouvin, *Le gouvernement français,* 298, and W. Steglich, *Die Haltung,* 380.

[35] W. Steglich, *Die Haltung,* 390.

[36] Cf. F. Margiotta Broglio, 45–49.

[37] Nevertheless it was obtained that ARTICLE 238 of the Treaty of Versailles turned over the mission stations to the Vatican, cf. G. Jarlot, 440f.

Between the Two World Wars: Pius XI

THE LATERAN TREATIES OF 1929

The "Roman Question" to 1926

Also for the election of Pius XI on 6 February 1922, not primarily political but inner ecclesiastical reasons were decisive. At this moment no one could know that this political novice, who had spent his life among books and manuscripts until 1918, would conclude the Lateran Treaty and thereby bring about the most important foreign policy decision of the papacy since 1870. The agreements of 11 February 1929 sealed the end of the more than millennial history of the Papal State: at the same time they did away with the "Roman Question" that the Holy See had left open since 1870.

In the decades since 1870 there had been no dearth of deliberations, proposals, and exertions for the elimination of the "Roman Question" by reconcilation (*conciliazione*).[39] But nothing had been achieved in principle. Hence even Pius XI, in his first encyclical, *Ubi Arcano Dei,* of

---

[38] *AAS* 12 (1920), 209–18.

[39] Survey in P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa.*

23 December 1922,[40] though in a conciliatory form, repeated the legal reservation of his predecessors against the occupation of the Papal State, which had made the Pope the "Prisoner of the Vatican," and against the Italian "Law of Guarantees" of 13 May 1871.

Meanwhile, the "Roman Question" had lost its first-class significance for Italian domestic policy. This facilitated an accommodation for the Kingdom. In addition, the liberal governments had become increasingly dependent on the Catholic voters. Out of reasons of principle and tactics the leading politician of the period before 1914, Giolitti, had already substituted for Cavour's old formula of the "Free Church in a Free State" of 27 March 1861 the new view of 30 May 1904, that of "Two Parallel Lines" which never meet in a contractual arrangement but also can never collide in conflict. Under Pius X a *conciliazione* policy on this basis was not timely.

It was otherwise under Benedict XV. In an interview of 28 June 1915[41] that became renowned, Secretary of State Gasparri broke with the tradition of the inflexible policy of revindication and a little later let the powers know by diplomatic means that the Vatican sought a compromise with Italy not through political pressure but through negotiation and compromise. So long as the war lasted, there was no prospect of this, and even afterwards the exclusion of the Holy See from the peace discussions made the including of Italian-Vatican negotiations among the business of the other states impossible. However, on the periphery of the Paris conference there occurred on 1 June 1919 discussions between Cerretti and Italian premier Emmanuele Orlando on a text[42] which Gasparri had composed. It must have included: first, the demand for a material revision of the Italian Law of Guarantees of 1871; second, the renunciation of formal internationalization of the Roman Question, but assurance of the outcome or negotiations on the part of the other states through the entry of the Vatican State into the League of Nations; third, agreement of the Kingdom with the Papacy through Italian recognition of a sovereign Vatican State with an expanded territory. Differing from the arrangements of 1929, Gasparri's *appunto* certainly did not contain the demand for a simultaneous financial compensation and probably not a concordat that was to be signed at the same time.[43] Orlando accepted Gasparri's plan but could not obtain the approval of the King of Italy for it.[44] After

---

[40] *AAS* 14 (1922), 673–700.

[41] To the leading Catholic daily, *Corriere d'Italia*. Text in *CivCatt* 66, 3 (1915), 236–39.

[42] For a reconstruction of the content, cf. P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa*, 4–6.

[43] Thus P. Scoppola, 5f.; there also the differing views, to which can be added G. Martina, 119.

[44] F. Margiotta Broglio, 366f., 537f.

Orlando's fall on 19 June 1919 contacts in this affair were not broken off, but the new minister-president, Nitti, probably again ran aground on King Victor Emmanuel III.[45]

In these first postwar years there appeared many sorts of indications of the Vatican's readiness for negotiations. It was waiting, as Gasparri made clear in an interview of 29 September 1921,[46] for a statesman with whom there could be discussion of the matter. The program of the Catholic Popular Party, *Partito popolare italiano,*[47] founded on 18 January 1919, contained no direct allusion to a definitive contractual settlement of the "Roman Question" as an immediate aim, while the atheistic Fascist leader, Benito Mussolini, had departed in a famed speech in parliament on 21 June 1921[48] from his previous antiecclesiastical expressions and had signaled his readiness for reconciliation with the papacy. Thus matters stood when Benedict XV died.

The change of pontificate meant no alteration of the direction of Vatican foreign policy. This already appeared in the fact that Pius XI, contrary to tradition, left the cardinal secretary of state in office. To stress the significance of this continuity of personnel does not mean to imply that Pius XI was to a degree dominated by his bureaucracy. On the contrary, while Achille Ratti was an outsider to the Curia, he was a strong personality with a pronounced talent for independent judgment, quick grasp, and energetic action. And so the Lateran Treaties are historically his work, especially as he took a personal share in the origin of the treaty to the smallest formulation. Still, his treaty policy was completely in continuation of that of Benedict XV. Likewise, the replacing of Gasparri by Pacelli on 9 February 1930 meant no change of direction. The actual motives of the Pope for this change, over which there has been much speculation,[49] cannot be determined.

Mussolini's rule—he became minister-president on 30 October 1922—offered from the first a very confusing picture. Measures friendly to the Church stood alongside shock-troop violence. At first the Vatican reacted with a policy of the most extreme caution. No understanding on principles was sought, but on timely individual questions.[50] This was apparently the result of a secret meeting of Mussolini with Gasparri on 19 or 20 January 1923 in the residence of the president of the Banco di Roma, Carlo Santucci. In this interview there was presumably question especially of this Vatican-controlled bank, which had fallen into difficulties. Its failure, which could only mean catastrophic consequences for Italian Catholicism,[51] could not be averted without state help. Moreover, the two sides felt each other out and presumably agreed here to use the Jesuit Pietro Tacchi-Venturi for the future as go-between; his first intervention with Mussolini is demonstrable on 9 February 1923.

---

[45] Thus F. Margiotta Broglio, 71; P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa,* 32.

[46] Text again in P. Scoppola, 46–51.

[47] Also G. de Rose, *Storia del movimento cattolico in Italia,* II: *Il partito popolare italiano* (Bari 1966).

[48] Extract from the text in P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa,* 52f. On the matter, cf. R. de Felice, *Mussolini il fascista,* I: *La conquista del potere 1921–1925* (Turin 1966), cited as R. de Felice II, 126f.

[49] A survey of the contemporary commentaries in *Ecclesiastica* 10 (1930), 135–39. A. Ottaviani, "Pio XI e i suoi Segretari di Stato," *Pio XI nel trentesimo della morte* (*1939–1969*) (Milan 1969), offers nothing more but is a very important source for the history of the two secretaries of state.

The Vatican's cautious reserve probably sprang first of all from the desire to avoid a frontal collision with Fascism, apparently especially because of the feared reaction on the Catholic organizational system. Only for a certain time, to the end of May 1923,[52] and not beyond a certain limit was the Popular Party defended by the Vatican. Between the end of July 1923 and the end of October 1924 the Holy See by stages removed its founder, Don Luigi Sturzo (1871–1959), from political life.[53] So long as the Vatican documents on these problematic proceedings are not accessible, it is difficult to make a correct judgment.[54] In the election campaign of 1924 the Vatican prudently acted with reserve while clearly denouncing Fascist violence.[55] On 9 September 1924 the Pope personally and publicly condemned a Popular Party coalition with the Socialists loyal to the constitution.[56] When Mussolini had successfully weathered the Matteotti crisis on 3 January 1925, there began the real construction of the Fascist regime, which lasted until 1943. It was essentially characterized by repression of revolutionary radical, properly[57] Fascist elements and by concessions of Mussolini to the more conservative forces and groups that supported him, hence, in a certain sense, moderates. It was firmly established with the November decrees of 1926.

---

[50] R. de Felice II, 497.

[51] The Banco di Roma was the principal bank of many Catholic organizations, financed the Catholic Press, and occasionally also aided the Popular Party, and had especially close economic relations with the Credito Nazionale and the network of Catholic Raiffeisen banks built in the nineteenth century. On the meeting between Gasparri and Mussolini, cf. R. de Felice II, 494ff.

[52] On 24 May 1923 *Osservatore Romano* still stood behind the policy of de Gasperi (R. de Felice II, 527f.).

[53] The decisive steps were: 7 July 1923, retirement as political secretary of the PPI; 19 May 1924, retirement from the directorate of the PPI; 25 October 1924, emigration to London. For the pressure which the Vatican exercised at each of these stages, cf. Sturzo to Cardinal Bourne, 15 November 1926, in F. Piva and F. Malgeri, *Vita di Luigi Sturzo* (Rome 1972), 291, n. 8.

[54] On the Sturzo problem cf. the important remarks in this connection in L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 125f.

[55] Cf. R. de Felice II, 578–89 (elections on 6 April 1924).

[56] Cf. R. de Felice II, 659ff.

At this time there began, on Italy's part, the policy which led to the Lateran Treaties. At the beginning of 1925 the government convoked a commission for a revision of the law of Church and state; it engaged in the work of amending from February to December.[58] A former deputy of the Popular Party's center-right wing occupied the chair, and with papal permission, three canons of the Roman major basilicas belonged to the commission. The commission's final report was unanimously adopted. It made many concessions to the Church. The Italian episcopate reacted altogether positively toward it. As regards substance, the outcome of these consultations was already a piece of the Lateran Concordat of 1929. But the Pope rejected it, first orally on 26 December 1925 and then definitively by a letter of 18 February 1926 to Cardinal Secretary of State Gasparri[59] and thus produced a linking between this work of amendment and a contractual regulating of the Roman Question.

This attitude seems the more astounding since at that time there were present agreeing views on the Roman Question on both sides of the Tiber, as the Vatican knew fully. In the spring of 1925 Carlo Santucci, acting in a private capacity, had elaborated a "project" on the regulating of the Roman Question.[60] It treated the individual problems in general along the line of the Gasparri program of 1919, but deviated from it in two significant points: Santucci went into the financial problems passed over in 1919[61] and had misgivings in regard to the internationalization of the Roman Question. Santucci envisaged as the method of procedure an agreement of Italy with the Holy See on the material content but a formal regulation by a unilateral amending by the state of the law of 1871. On this point the Italian minister of justice was of another mind. He held that a regular treaty should be negotiated and included in

---

[57] "Properly" in the meaning of the period before 30 October 1922 and after 25 July 1943. On what follows, R. de Felice II, 729, as well as idem, *Mussolini il fascista* II: *L'organizzazione dello Stato fascista 1925–29* (Turin 1968), cited as R. de Felice III, 3ff.

[58] The protocols in P. Ciprotti, ed., *Atti della Commissione per la reforma delle leggi ecclesiastiche del Regno (12 febbraio–31 dicembre 1925)* (Milan 1968).

[59] Text in P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa,* 117f.

[60] Text in G. de Rosa, *I conservatori nazionali. Biografia di Carlo Santucci* (Brescia 1962), 195ff.; also F. Margiotta Broglio, 226–48.

[61] In the Law of Guarantees of 13 May 1871 the Italian state had offered to the Pope, as compensation for the papal income from the Papal State, an annual payment of 3.25 million lire, which he never accepted. Because of the subsequent decline of value, this sum was completely inadequate according to its current evaluation.

Italian legislation and announced to the foreign governments. This was an overly clear offer of negotiations. The Pope, as Santucci later experienced, is said to have expressed the view that this sort of regulation of difficult matters had probably better be left to his successor.[62]

Hence in the summer of 1925 the Holy See dropped Santucci's project and in the winter of 1925–26 rejected the acceptance of "unilateral" state legal reform. The reasons for these can be stated only hypothetically.[63] It is certain that the Curia took its time, because so much was at stake for the Church's future. The negotiations which led to the Lateran Treaties began on 5 August 1926.

The Route to the Lateran Treaties (1926–29)

The secret negotiations on the Lateran Treaties lasted two and one-half years, from 5 August 1926 to 10 February 1929, even though not continuously. Discretion was facilitated by the hardly exalted rank of the negotiators. On the Vatican side this was Francesco Pacelli, a layman, jurist in Vatican service, and brother of Eugenio Pacelli. For the discussion of the material of the concordat Prelate Borgongini Duca of the Secretariat of State was also involved. The Italian negotiator was, until his death on 4 January 1929, the state councilor Domenico Barone. Thereafter Mussolini himself, supported at the conclusion by high government officials, conducted the negotiations. The signing of the treaties and of the documents of ratification on 7 June 1929 was done on the Italian side by Mussolini, on that of the Vatican by Gasparri. The content of the negotiations was allotted to three treaties: the Lateran Treaty proper, which politically settled the "Roman Question," to which was added as Appendix IV a "Financial Agreement," and the Concordat.

The historical-legal aspect of the treaties of 1929 is discussed elsewhere, in Chapter 6. Here only the political aspect is to be treated, in which of course the details of the history of the treaty[64] cannot be debated. The route was from the start determined by the fact that both sides had, even before entering upon the official preliminary negotiations, discussed their minimum demands and had reached agreement on the essential points of the Lateran Treaty proper: Mussolini's sole condition, that the Holy See recognize the regulating of the Roman Question as definitive and thereby say "yes" to 1870, was accepted by the Pope. Conversely, Italy had absolutely admitted the sovereignty of the Vatican, even though the important expression *Stato* for Vatican City was not conceded by Italy until 22 January 1929.[65] In principle the Kingdom had recognized its debts to the Holy See from ARTICLE 3 of the Law of Guarantees of 13 May 1871.

---

[62] P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa,* 111.

[63] Also R. de Felice III, 29f., 106–15, where the other hypotheses are also discussed.

[64] A useful introduction is supplied by G. Martina, "Sintesi storica," *A. de Gasperi, Lettere sul Concordato* (Brescia 1970), 113–73.

The final great material difficulties and ceaselessly numerous small detailed questions of the form of the text were settled in January and February 1929. In the school questions Italy countered a Vatican maximal program—in a draft concordat of 5 December 1926[66]—with its own minimal program of 22 February 1927.[67] The final compromise in ARTICLE 36 meant, it is true, a very solemn affirmation of the Church's principles, but drew from them only very limited consequences. And so in substance there was no agreement through a compromise. Similarly, even if it was much more favorable for the Vatican side, an agreement was reached in the complex of marriage law: when on 19 January 1929 the Italian minister of justice stated that, by the adopting of the canon law of marriage by the state, the Italian civil law was turned upside down—*sovvertimento delle norme*—the Pope on 20 January declared any concession in the substance of this point to be unacceptable; rather should *conciliazione* founder. He thereby got his way.[68] He was able to be so firm at this time also because he had immediately before lowered the financial demands already accepted by Mussolini on 14 January from 2 to 1.75 billion lire, whereby methods of payment tolerable for Italy had been worked out.[69]

If one inquires into the historical and political importance of the treaties, it is undisputed that their signing meant for Mussolini a "great, undoubted success," according to the judgment of his competent biographer, "one of the greatest which he ever gained,"[70] in which there is no doubt that the "reconciliation" of 1929 had for him only the character of a tool and was purely tactically conditioned. The significance of the treaties for the Holy See, on the other hand, is very much disputed, so that there can certainly be no talk of a "success" without limitations, even if details that can be criticized are disregarded. One must proceed from the self-understanding of the modern Church, which wants to be a pastoral Church, and from the great aims of the Pope, whose whole activity here, as also elsewhere, was apparently not determined primarily by political goals but by the desire to create better and more effective possibilities for the care of souls.[71] Under this aspect the short-term and the long-term must be separated.

---

[65] F. Pacelli, *Diario,* 170.

[66] Text of ARTS. 31–41 in F. Pacelli, *Diario,* 260ff.

[67] Text of ARTS. 36 and 37 in F. Pacelli, *Diario,* 282.

[68] F. Pacelli, *Diario,* 116.

[69] 750 million lire to be paid in cash, 1 billion in Italian state loans at 5 percent (16 January 1929, F. Pacelli, *Diario,* 162).

[70] R. de Felice III, 415.

From the short-term the Lateran Treaties offered the Church undeniable advantages. The intervening of the state into the Italian Church and church administration was ended. The Vatican could cast off historically obsolete ballast and finally place the central government of the Universal Church economically on its own feet again—an advantage for the essential independence of the papacy that must be very highly evaluated. Furthermore, through the article of the concordat on the protections of associations—ARTICLE 43, par. 1—the Church obtained a powerful legal position for the defense of the Catholic organizational system. This assured their presence in the Italian world, far beyond the limits of clergy and episcopate, over which the state now lost its most extensive personal political influence. Besides, the general jubilation in the country on the sudden report of the concluding of the treaty speaks for itself. So authentic a Catholic and a democrat as Alcide de Gasperi (1881–1954), the last secretary of the meanwhile forbidden Popular Party, thought, under the immediate impression of the signing, that even Don Sturzo, if he were Pope, would have had to sign this treaty, which definitively freed the head of the Church from the burden of *temporalia.*[72] Of course, the Lateran Treaties strengthened the regime and hence the dictatorship: but this would pass. For the future, in any case, the Church should no longer be, as hitherto, constantly in search of unsuitable concessions for a solution of the Roman Question, and the solution should be obtained without the complication of an international guarantee. This outweighed all else. Problematic for the future was rather the concordat policy.

With this the second aspect is reached—long-term consequences. Precisely here opinions have been very much in conflict until today. Decisive is the question whether the Church, while letting itself be embraced by Mussolini's regime, jeopardized or sacrificed its own proper self. This did not happen. If Pius XI in the first weeks after the signing of the treaty, in favor of which he said little, hoped that Italy would now again become a "Catholic state"—in the sense of the preliberal epoch—Mussolini's arguments in May in the parliamentary debates on ratification unmistakably taught him otherwise. Two and one-half months after the signing the differences were so great that on 6 June it was still entirely unclear whether the treaties would become effective on the seventh. Ratification became possible only when both parties joined in a dilatory formal compromise which concealed the disagreement over pinciple.[73]

---

[71] G. Martina, 134, leaves the "political" interpretation open.

[72] Letter of 12 February 1929 to S. Weber (*A. de Gaspari, Lettere,* 63).

In the next years Mussolini could not but recognize that the Church never unconditionally supported him—not in domestic policy and not at all in foreign policy. On the contrary, Catholic Action received a lift, especially the youth and student groups. This meant a serious hindrance to the penetrating of all of Italian society with Fascist tendencies, as Mussolini gradually became aware. Thus matters arrived at the great crisis of 1931, in the course of which the papal foreign policy advanced to the limits of its possibilities and finally had to accept a severe setback.

After the Lateran Treaties: The Crises of 1931 and 1938

Mussolini produced the crisis of 1931, chiefly from domestic policy considerations.[74] Catholic Action had gained too much ground for him. The great confrontation began in March with the accusations in the Fascist trade-union press that Catholic Action was overstepping its competence and interfering in the political-social sphere. In the background of the Fascist-Catholic journalistic polemic that now began, the government in April made demands through the diplomatic route which the Holy See rejected. At stake were two problems: the essential question of where the boundary ran between "ecclesiastical" and "extraecclesiastical," and the political question of who was to define the courses of this boundary. In the second question the Church claimed an unlimited autonomous competence. In the first question it demanded the right to have not only purely religiously oriented organizations, such as the liturgy and the administration of the sacraments, but also to be able to include the field of social Catholicism. In the Concordat Italy had recognized Catholic Action and its organizations as subject to ecclesiastical direction, so far as they "displayed their activity outside every political party for the spread and implementation of Catholic basic principles" (ARTICLE 43, par. 1).

From 19 April Pius XI publicly intervened in these confrontations.[75]

---

[73] The four drafts of the text of the communiqués in F. Pacelli, *Diario,* 151–53. At issue was the contractual law question of whether the Lateran Concordat was an integral element of the Lateran Treaty, and hence, like the latter, unchangeable, or not. Pius XI had written to Gasparri, 30 May 1929 (text in *Osservatore Romano,* 6 June 1929, then, *AAS* 21 (1929), 297–306; repeated in extract in P. Scoppola, 217–25): "Ne viene che 'simul stabunt' oppure 'simul cadent'; anche se dovesse per conseguenza cadere la 'Città del Vaticano' col relativo Stato. Per parte Nostra, col divino aiuto impavidum ferient ruinae."

[74] R. de Felice IV, 250–53.

[75] Address before the Diocesan Committee of Catholic Action of Rome (*Osservatore Romano,* 20–21 April 1931).

He placed himself before the "social" Catholic organizations, which are "legitimate," "necessary," and "irreplaceable," and in an open letter of 26 April[76] to Cardinal Schuster of Milan he bitterly assailed the Fascist education of youth, oriented to hate and irreverence. In these circumstances the grandly staged ecclesiastical demonstrations gained more special political emphasis in mid-May.[77] On 29 May Mussolini dissolved all Catholic youth and student groups by administrative measures.[78]

After useless protests and exchanges of notes, the Pope turned against this police action with the encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* of 29 June 1931.[79] The choice of this method of fighting was a political challenge of the first rank. In long and bitter passages the encyclical condemned the Fascist attack as clearly an injustice hostile to the Church. Mussolini's monopoly of the education of children and youth was founded on a "world of ideas which led professedly to a true and authentic deification of the state, which stands in full opposition, no less to the natural rights of the family than to the supernatural rights of the Church." The Fascist "notion of the state, which" claims "for it the young generation entirely and without exception," is "for a Catholic not compatible with Catholic teaching." The oath required of the members of Fascist organizations is "therefore, as its exists, not permitted," and hence at the least it must be taken with a *reservatio mentalis.* But the encyclical did not amount to a definitive break with the regime. It emphasized that the Pope had hitherto refrained from a "formal and express condemnation" and here too "in no sense" condemned "the Fascist Party as such." Rejected and condemned were only that part of its program and practice which are "irreconcilable with the name and profession of a Catholic."

And so the encyclical bore a contrary character: it could signify defining and signal readiness for negotiation. This ambivalence was perhaps the result of an inner-Vatican compromise between two groups with distinct notions in regard to the actual conflict.[80] In any event, as early as 23 July the Pope had entered into compromise discussions with

---

[76] *AAS* 23 (1931), 145–50.

[77] Celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the encyclical *Rerum novarum* and First General Assembly of Catholic Action of Italy. Cf. *Ecclesiastica* 11 (1931), 267–80, 290–94.

[78] R. de Felice IV, 258f.

[79] *AAS* 23 (1931), 285–312, delivered on 6 July; *Osservatore Romano* had carried the text on 5 July; F. Engel-Janosi, *Vom Chaos zur Katastrophe. Vatikanische Gespräche 1918 bis 1938, vornehmlich auf Grund der Berichte des österreichischen Gesandten beim Hl. Stuhl* (Vienna and Munich 1971), 229–55.

[80] According to R. de Felice IV, 264f., Gasparri and Pacelli belonged to the more moderate faction, Marchetti-Selvaggiani and Borgongini Duca to the more intransigent.

Mussolini, which led in September to a written agreement[81] that ended the strife and—with reference to the *conciliazione* of 1929—is frequently termed the *reconciliazione.*

The September Agreement was, of course, not a compromise without victors and vanquished, but a clear success for Mussolini.[82] The agreement described the organization and functions of the associations protected by concordat and hence meant a renunciation of autonomous ecclesiastical regulation and, with this, a definition in principle unfavorable to the Church. As regards substance, in most points the state had carried the day. Italian Catholic Action was parceled into 250 diocesan units independent of one another and had to accept a sort of prohibition of former members of the Popular Party for its leadership. Trade-union and quasi-trade-union functions were in general forbidden to it, and in its work of social formation it was virutally bound to a support of the idea of the Fascist corporate system, a few months after *Quadragesimo anno* (cf. Chapter 7). Nothing was said of the suppression of the objectionable Fascist oath. The counterconcession was that the youth groups could again exist under a new name, now patterned to purely religious aims, and with the explicit prohibition of pursuing sports—which meant renunciation of an essential part of modern education of youth.

The reason for these papal concessions was presumably that no better alternative was at hand. From 9 July the provincial prefects reported to Mussolini that the encyclical did not go over well among the people, not even the clergy: agreement and peace were desired.[83] The capacity of the clergy for a long fight with the state on the question of the Catholic system of associations was clearly slight. The ecclesiastical leadership could not ignore this. On 2 September it contented itself with the part of the education of youth which was permitted to it. It was much less than it wanted. But this little it had to accept, if the alternative was "still less."

---

[81] Text often printed, most recently A. Martini, "Gli accordi per l'Azione Cattolica nel 1931," *CivCatt* 111, 1 (1960), 574–91, repeated in idem, *Studi,* 147–73, here 171; R. de Felice IV, 268f. Basic for the crisis of 1931 is A. Martini, op. cit., also idem, "Il conflitto per l'Azione Cattolica nel 1931," *CivCatt* 111, 1 (1960), 449–58, repeated in idem, *Studi,* 131–46.

[82] Thus P. Scoppola, 225f., R. de Felice IV, 269. Differing is A. C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia negli ultimi cento anni* (Turin 1952), 666: "Pace di compromesso, senza vincitori né vinti." J. Schmidlin IV, 113, judges differently. An interesting report on Sturzo's opinion of 5 September 1931 in R. de Felice IV, 270f.

[83] R. de Felice IV, 263. In the 1931 annual report the English Ambassador Forbes said that the encyclical had confused the problem, since as a further climax there would have remained to the Vatican the possibility of excommunicating Mussolini or interdicting all Italy; the Pope had, in the crisis, "in many cases been badly advised" (T. E. Hachey, *Anglo-Vatican Relations 1914–1939,* here 213).

The long-range political expectations which in 1929 could have been attached to Catholic Action became largely illusionary through the events of 1931. It was eliminated as politically dangerous opposition for Mussolini. Whether the successful preservation of the organizational framework of Catholic Action, especially of the youth and student groups, which as late as 1933 were joined by an academic organization,[84] would alone have sufficed to prevent the advancing loss of the political importance and identity of Catholicism vis-à-vis Fascism is questionable.

The crisis of 1938 took place under changed political conditions; it was part and sequel of the gradually more open confrontation of Church and regime after the radical wing of fascism had gained ground remarkably since the foreign policy rapprochement of Italy to Germany since 1936.[85] The partial imitation of the anti-Jewish German policy by Mussolini aroused a spontaneous resistance among churchmen, to whom the Pope made it unmistakably clear that National Socialist notions of race stood in an irreconcilable opposition to the Catholic faith. Open conflict erupted in the fall, when the government amended the Italian marriage law in accord with "racial" viewpoints in a law of 17 November 1938. This meant that a marriage entered into in the Church between a baptized or unbaptized Jew and a Catholic lost its effect in civil law, which had been agreed to in ART. 34, para. 1 of the Lateran Concordat. As soon as the Holy See learned of these aims, it made use of its diplomatic means to prevent the introduction of these new forms or to modify their implementation.[86] Seemingly in this there was question "only" of a peripheral problem, for in Italy in that year that there were about three hundred thousand marriages performed in the Church in comparison to a few dozen marriages which were affected by the amendment.[87] But for the Church there were here at stake the validity and binding force of its sacramental law and its general mandate to the human race. Hence no one displayed any readiness for concession *in principiis*. The Vatican's protest notes did not, of course, prevent the Italian amendment from going into effect. To this extent the Holy See suffered another foreign policy defeat. But in regard to its intransigence it had churchmen on its side. In the long run this was a perhaps more important political event.

---

[84] On their non-Fascist function cf. P. Scoppola, 283ff.

[85] Basic for what follows is A. Martini, "L'ultima battaglia di Pio XI," *CivCatt* 110, 2 (1959), 574–91; 110, 3 (1959), 572–90, repeated in idem, *Studi,* 175–230; R. de. Felice, *Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo* (Turin 1972), 285–91.

[86] Cf. the compilation of the Secretariat of State, *ADSS* 6, 532–36 (of 14 November 1938), as well as R. de Felice, *Storia degli ebrei,* 550–52.

[87] *Osservatore Romano,* 14–15 November 1938, repeated in P. Scoppola, 323–26.

The Holy See did not exploit the 1938 violation of the Concordat to put entirely in question the treaty work of 1929.[88] For twenty years the framework was maintained. On the tenth anniversary of the Lateran Treaty Pius XI would have risked a break in a public accounting with Mussolini if death had not meanwhile overtaken him. The outline of the text of the papal address,[89] published in 1959, has pulled the rug from under this supposition. Pius XI intended before the entire assembled Italian episcopate to complain and to accuse the regime, but not to break with it. Hence the change of pontificate in 1939 meant in principle no alteration of course in Vatican foreign policy, even if a new handwriting and another political style are unmistakable. In fact, little changed—little was able to change: As the crisis of 1938 shows, the government of the Church, as soon as the sphere of the doctrinal and moral teaching was touched, could make no real concessions, even not with a dictatorship equipped with the twentieth century's techniques of power. The Church may be incapable of bringing the state or the prevailing regime to observance of the norms represented by it (which holds not only for our century), but it must insist on the validity of these norms.

PIUS XI AND THE TOTALITARIAN SYSTEMS

Opposition between the normative bases of a state and the teaching of the Church did not mean compulsion to renounce Vatican foreign policy with this state. So long as Catholic norms were not thereby sacrificed, the question of the beginning, continuing, or ending of the foreign policy activity of the Church with any state or regime was a question of expediency, in which the advancement of the possibilities of pastoral care represented the ultimate goal. In this way the lack of means of power and often the difficulty of gauging the consequences and side effects for the entire Church constituted the characteristic dilemma of papal foreign policy with reference to normative and/or *in praxi* hostile states. This dilemma appeared especially in relation to the really[90] totalitarian systems of our epoch: Bolshevik-dominated Russia and national socialist-ruled Germany. In this connection "totalitarian" means the claim to dispose, without limit and exclusively, of the totality of human existence, even in the sphere of conscience.[91]

---

[88] On the Vatican side one spoke not of a "violation" of the concordat but of (this added) "vulnus."

[89] *Osservatore Romano,* 9 February 1959, repeated in P. Scoppola, 334–41; cf. A. Martini, *Studi,* 231–51.

[90] In contrast to the Italian "Stato totalitario" of the late 1930s.

Pius XI and the Soviet Union

At the Vatican there was never any question that the old ecclesiastical delimitations vis-à-vis socialism were true to a still greater degree in regard to the Communism recognized as totalitarian—not yet according to the idea, but in fact. If, nevertheless, between 1921 and 1927 the Holy See three times seriously explored whether and under what conditions formal, perhaps even diplomatic, relations could be established with the Soviet Union, it let itself be guided by the same principles which in an entirely different context Pius XI expressed on 14 May 1929 in the pointed statement: "If there would be a question of saving a single soul, of warding off a greater harm from souls, then We would have the courage to treat with the Devil in person."[92] The details of these Vatican-Soviet conversations and negotiations are knowable only in outline in the present state of research;[93] but the aims pursued in them by the Holy See and the reasons for the failure can be described sufficiently clearly.

The starting point of the first attempt was the frightful famines following the Russian civil war, which in 1921 led to extensive internationally organized acts of assistance.[94] Because of an Italian protest the Holy See could not take part in these directly and had to organize its own activity, which called for contact with Russian authorities. In this connection there appeared in Rome on 18 December 1921 a sketch signed by Pizzardo of a Vatican-Russian agreement[95] which went far beyond the technical problems of the distribution of charitable measures. In it the agents to be sent by the Holy See were designated as *missionaires,* to whom every sort of political action and propaganda was to be forbidden, but they were allowed by treaty to set up schools and provide religious instruction (*éducation morale et religieuse*). To permit such beginnings of pastoral care and mission was an impossibility to the Bolshevik ecclesiastical policy of the time (see Chapter 17). Accordingly, the definitive agreement,[96] signed at the Vatican on 12 March 1922, strictly limited the papal mission of assistance to distributing food to the starving population and spoke of mere "agents" (*envoyés*). On the basis of this agreement, from July 1922 to September 1924 a Vatican mission composed of thirteen priests from various orders was active in several Russian cities.[97] Although the regime had on 26 February 1922 just taken a new step in the persecution of the Church by the expropriation of liturgical vessels of the churches, the Curia apparently tried to utilize even the slightest opportunities to counteract the oppression and suppression of pastoral care in Russia.

---

[91] The literature on the problem of totalitarianism is listed in Chapter 7. Especially useful in our context is H. Buchheim. *Totalitäre Herrschaft, Wesen und Merkmale* (Munich 1962).

[92] "Quando si trattasse di salvare qualche anima, di impedire un maggiore danno alle anime. Ci sentiremmo il corraggio di trattare col diavolo in persona" (*Osservatore Romano,* 16 May 1929). The contemporary translation of KIPA (*Ecclesiastica* 9 [1929], 255) weakened it to "struggle even with the incarnate devil."

[93] For what follows cf. R. A. Graham, *Diplomacy,* 349ff. Because of the details which the author obtained from the archives of the papal Secretariat of State, H. Stehle is important, although the necessary scholarly precision is missing from his presentation.

[94] Cf. H. H. Fisher, *The Famine in Soviet Russia 1919–1923. The Operations of the American Relief Administration,* 2d ed. (New York, 1935).

[95] Text in J. Kraus, 190, 192.

This goal becomes still clearer in the second action which occurred on the borders of the World Economic Conference of Geneva from 16 April to 19 May 1922. For the first time the new Russia had been invited again into the society of nations. The Holy See used this as an occassion to formulate in a memorandum[98] addressed to the conference general conditions to which Russia should be bound as condition of "reentry into the circle of civilized powers": full freedom of conscience, freedom of the private and public exercise of religion and worship, as well as restoration of expropriated property to the "religious corporations." What was important in this démarche, which the collapse of the conference deprived from the outside of any prospects, was not least of all its universal concern: the Vatican demands affected all religious communities, not only the Christian. The Pope did not speak only *pro domo.*

In the third attempt, which was drawn out from the winter of 1923–24 to December 1927, at stake was the concrete question of what returns the Soviet Union offered if the Vatican changed the de facto into a de jure recognition. Since the Soviet Union was then very much concerned for legal recognition by the rest of the world, the presence of a papal nuncio at Moscow would have been a great Russian success. The Vatican had, apparently from tactical reasons of negotiations, brought up the question, not of a nunciature, but of merely an apostolic delegation, hence a representative without diplomatic character.[99] The negotiations became jammed on the question of whether the Vatican conditions of 21 February 1924[100] should be the presuppositions for the erecting of a delegation or the subject of negotiations with the future delegate in Moscow. For unknown reasons the discussions were now transferred to Berlin and there continued by Pacelli. In February 1925 he negotiated with the Russian envoy Nikolai Krestinski about two Russian outlines—"theses"[101]—both of which were unacceptable to the Pope, because they implied unilateral Vatican advance concessions. In place of this, Pacelli in a note of 7 September 1925 apparently designated two points as *conditio sine qua non:* appointment of bishops and freedom of religious instruction for youth within church buildings. It was only on 11 September 1926 that the Russian government replied, offering not a reciprocal agreement but a unilateral one, hence an internal right of religion revocable by the state at any time.[102] Pacelli discussed this on 14 June 1927 with the Russian Foreign Minister Čičerin in Berlin, again unsuccessfully, because the Soviet Union would not concede religious instruction.[103] The Pope apparently wanted now to cancel the negotiations, but was induced by the nuncio in Berlin and Gasparri to one last, clearly doubtful attempt. It is contained in a communication from Pacelli of 5 October 1927.[104] Thereafter the Holy See would have been prepared, in the event that seminaries were opened and ecclesiastics could be sent from the Vatican, to appoint only such bishops and send only ecclesiastics who would be acceptable to the Bolshevik regime. Here it can be seen that there was a question of the absolute minimum possibility in pastoral care. But Moscow apparently rejected this too. Thereupon, on 16 December 1927 Pius XI directed that further discussions be stopped, so long as the persecution of the Churches lasted.[105] And there things remained. The breaking off of the negotiations with the Soviet Union by the Curia in December 1927 clearly denoted the hopelessness of a situation. Basically this was the same problem that was included in Hitler's long-range goals.

---

[96] Text in J. Kraus, 191, 193.

[97] The Moscow leadership of the mission made use of the news associations of the German embassy in Moscow for the connection with the Secretariat of State.

[98] Text in *Osservatore Romano,* 15–16 May 1922.

---

[99] A convenient survey of the ranks and titles of papal representatives in I. Martin.

[100] Text in F. Margiotta Broglio, 464f. (letter of Silj to Acerbo, 22 February 1924).

[101] Cf. H. Stehle, 92 (communications of the Secretariat of State).

[102] Cf. Ibid., 127f.

[103] Cf. ibid., 132f. (according to Hencke's communications).

[104] Tel. 101 Bergen, Rome, 24 October 1927 (*Pol. Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes in Bonn: Geheimakten, Vatikan Pol.* 3 [=K 012074]. Wrong date in H. Stehle, 141; ibid., 445, n. 19, another wrong date and wrong locality; hence the polemic against E. Winter, based on the false locality, is irrelevant.

[105] Cf. H. Stehle, 143 (communication of the Secretariat of State).

Pius XI and National Socialist Germany

THE WAY TO THE CONCORDAT WITH THE REICH (APRIL–JULY 1933.) Pius XI's foreign policy related to Hitler is marked in its first phase by the concluding of the concordat with the Reich. Next to the Lateran Treaties, it attracted contemporary attention as did no other concordat of the period between the wars. Its significance has again been much debated since the historical-political discussion in the early 1960s[106] of the attitude of German Catholicism to Hitler's seizure of power. After the fundamental publication of the acts in 1969[107] an unprecedentedly high state of research was achieved with a comprehensive monograph on the history of the concordat with the Reich by Ludwig Volk in 1972.

He positively confirms earlier communications of Robert Leiber,[108] according to which the Holy See exercised no influence on Hitler's gaining of powers in the spring of 1933. The naming of Hitler as chancellor on 30 January, the Emergency Decree of 28 February,[109] and the Reichstag elections on 5 March were never in question. A part of the research argues differently in relation to the yes of the Center to the Enabling Act and the not much later proclamation of the Fulda Episcopal Conference. Both groups, the Center Party of the Reichstag and the bishops, yielded, according to this view, to National Socialism, with an eye to the concordat that was being sketched, or, to put it crudely, accepted the dictatorship in return for cultural-political concessions. The sources do not uphold this view. A future concordat played no role[110] in the yes of the Center on 23 March. Likewise, an exact analysis of the origin of the bishops' statement of 28 March,[111] with which, conditionally, the prohibitions of national socialism, lasting for years, were annulled, shows that neither the Vatican nor the Berlin nunciature had exercised any influence on it. Conversely, however, it is probably true that Hitler's declaration on 23 March of his government's friendliness toward Christianity and the Church, the subsequent yes of the Center to the Enabling Act, and the canceling of the earlier episcopal prohibitions of National Socialism on 28 May compelled the Vatican to act when the Catholic vice-chancellor, Franz von Papen, appeared on 10 April at the office of the cardinal secretary of state with the offer of concluding a concordat with the Reich and from the outset, among other items, offered in the law of education what the Curia had been unable to obtain in its negotiations since 1920 with the Weimar government.

---

[106] Also U. von Hehl, "Kirche, Katholizismus und das national-sozialistische Deutschland," D. Albrecht, ed., *Kirche,* 219–51.

[107] A. Kupper, *Staatliche Akten;* L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten.*

[108] Most recently in R. Leiber, "Der Vatikan und das Dritte Reich," *Politische Studien* 14 (1963), 293–98.

[109] The importance of this Emergency Decree can scarcely be overestimated; for Hitler's seizure of power it was at least as important as the Enabling Act (cf. K. Repgen, "Hitlers Machtergreifung und der deutsche Katholizismus. Versuch einer Bilanz," D. Albrecht, ed., *Kirche,* 6, n. 10 [with reference to Bracher]).

[110] Exact proof in L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 80–83 (also in critical evaluation of the contrary and erroneous assertions of the Brüning *Memoirs*).

[111] Text in B. Stasiewski I, 30–32; also, L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 76ff.

For the Holy See there was obviously no question that it could not disregard this offer of negotiations. The widespread view that Hitler's rule would be of only short duration was not taken into consideration in the Vatican as the premise of a possible alternative. It is well attested that from the start Cardinal Pacelli was prepared for a long duration of the "Third Reich."[112] Nothing to the contrary is known as regards the Pope. True, in contrast to his secretary of state, Pius XI had in the spring of 1933 thought for a brief time that in Hitler he could perhaps find an anti-Communist defense agent.[113] This consideration was no longer present publicly on 19 May, when the bishop of Osnabrück visited him; he now fluctuated over the judgment of the internal German situation, in which pessimism apparently prevailed.[114] At the end of August he condemned the persecution of Jews in Germany in very strong words as an affront "not only to morality but also to civilization."[115]

Decisive for the Vatican's readiness for negotiations was the new dimension of danger in Germany. With the Emergency Decree of 28 February and the Enabling Act of 24 March the two "fundamental laws of the National Socialist state coming into being," as Volk puts it, were created. Now in case of need the government could itself decide whether it intended to deviate from the constitution; this deprived the Catholic Church in Germany of all previous legal protection. Hence to a hitherto unknown degree it was "in need of a concordat"; for if the previous legal assurances were refused, it had to look for others, if possible. Thus the concordat with the Reich was understood by the Holy See as a defensive weapon from the negotiations in 1933—in contrast to the Lateran Treaties.

The external course of the negotiations for the concordat with the

---

[112] For Pacelli's pessimism, cf. L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 63, n. 21.

[113] Also L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 64f.; also, idem, *Faulhaber-Akten* I, 745.

[114] L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten,* 33.

[115] Kirkpatrick's report of 28 August 1933 (text in L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 217, n. 20).

Reich is not very involved. Von Papen conducted discussions in Rome from 10 to 18 April. In these was reached a preliminary draft on the part of the Church, which led on 20 April, out of consideration for changes in the Pope's wishes, to a sketch called "Kaas I" in the research. This was replaced on 11 May, not essentially altered, by the draft "Kaas II,"[116] which went both to Berlin and to the Fulda Episcopal Conference on 31 May. The desired changes of the episcopate were communicated to the government in mid-June. On 28 June Von Papen again took up his own negotiations on the Tiber, whereas he had entrusted the business of the concordat since 18 April to Prelate Ludwig Kaas,[117] who was staying in Rome. Von Papen brought along a new text outline. From 30 June to 2 July the negotiations were in the Vatican, from 1 July including Archbishop Gröber of Freiburg. On 2 July agreement was reached on a text ready for initialing,[118] which the Pope approved the same evening, but Hitler did not. The latter sought to gain time, then brought in the really appropriate Interior Ministry of the Reich, and on 5 July sent the director of the ministry, Buttmann, as a new, supplementary negotiator to Rome. On 8 July, after further negotiations, the text ready for initialing[119] was achieved and the *Reichskabinett* approved it on 14 July, so that Pacelli and von Papen could sign in the Vatican on 20 July.

The politically disruptive points during the three months of negotiations were until 1 July the de-politicization of the clergy (ARTICLE 32), then the protection of Catholic organizations (ART. 31). The German initial demand for a general prohibition of all partisan political activity by the clergy had been parried by Kaas in April by an extraordinarily clever counterproposal. It amounted, in a corresponding good conduct by the state, to promising by treaty a certain numerical reduction of the politically active pastoral clergy by canonical measures and actually meant "little more than nothing."[120] But at the end of June the political scene in Germany had completely changed. Like the other parties, so too the Center was no more. Its dissolution was directly at hand.[121] When this was once accomplished, ART. 32 was no longer a real concession of the Church, but on the contrary a "protection of the Church against a Nazi invasion of the clergy," as Leiber's *votum* on 29 June explicity stated.[122] When on 1 and 2 July the Vatican conceded ART. 32, scarcely anything was therefore really "sacrificed," but perhaps the opportunity to save Catholic organizations was seen. The concrete alternative to negotiations was narrowed to the concordat with the Reich—or renunciation of the organizations.

---

[116] Text in A. Kupper, *Staatliche Akten,* 41–55.

[117] Kaas, the best German expert on the concordat, was until 6 May 1933 still chairman of the Center Party. His function in the negotiations for the concordat with the Reich cannot be clearly classified in a formal manner. The charges lodged against him in connection with the concordat negotiations (most recently in 1970 in the Brüning *Memoirs,* the composition of which in these passages goes back to the period after 1945) are untenable (details in L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 201–11; general: R. Morsey, "Ludwig Kaas," idem, ed., *Zeitgeschichte in Lebensbildern. Aus dem deutschen Katholizismus des 20. Jahrhunderts* [Mainz 1973], 263–72.

[118] Text in A. Kupper, *Staatliche Akten,* 149–63; L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten,* 95–106.

[119] Text in A. Kupper, *Staatliche Akten,* 199–213.

[120] K. Repgen, "Das Ende der Zentrumpartei und die Entstehung des Reichskonkordats," idem, ed., *Historische Klopfsignale für die Gegenwart* (Münster 1974), 109.

As early as April 1933 the German Catholic associations, in existence since the nineteenth century, and a greatly admired network of organizations strong in membership, were considered in jeopardy. True, they survived more intact during the following months than, for example, did the trade unions or the parties, since they were not exposed in the same degree to direct Nazi attacks and displayed a stronger willingness to assert themselves and to stay autonomous. But danger threatened them also from without. The sketch "Kaas I" had, therefore, envisaged a general article of protection for the Catholic societies, and then the Fulda Episcopal Conference had both expanded it and made it more concrete. On the other hand, according to the government's draft of the end of June a significant part of the doubtful organizations was to remain unprotected by concordat. This signified the worst, because it had meanwhile become apparent, through waves of political elimination of the opposition and police action, that now in Germany in this area also definitive facts were to be settled by force. The greatest part of the politically relevant Catholic associations were already dissolved or quite directly threatened by incorporation into Nazi units when the meetings at the negotiating table began in Rome.

And so, in this situation there was presented to the Holy See the basic question of whether there could be any negotiations at all. The issue was apparently decided by Gröber, the representative of the German bishops. On 1 July he saw only the alternative of allowing everything to collapse or, "at least temporarily," to recover the *status quo ante.*[123] On 2 July he more reflectively posed the condition that the government publicly disavow its most recent police action—of 1 July—and offer guarantees for the future.[124] This route was followed. At the moment of initialing Hitler publicly withdrew most of the measures of 1 July against the organizations and their heads and forbade a repetition.[125] In contrast to the trade unions and the parties, therefore, the Catholic organizations continued, with some exceptions, in the summer of 1933, but of course not unassailed and also only for a while. For them the concordat with the Reich implied no concluding of peace but a pause in the struggle, according to Volk.

---

[121] The Socialist trade unions were brought into line on 2 May 1933, the Christian on 23 June. The SPD was forbidden on 22 June, although it had assented to Hitler's governmental declaration of 17 May. In Bavaria on 25 June 2,000 representatives of the BVP, including 200 priests, were jailed in order to accelerate the dissolution. The DNVP was dissolved on 27 June, the DDP (State's Party) on 28 June. On 29 June Brüning predicted the dissolution of the Center for 30 June; it was actually dissolved on 5 July (self-dissolution). On 4 July the BVP and the DVP had dissolved themselves. For the end of the Center Party, see R. Morsey, *Der Untergang des politischen Katholizismus* (Stuttgart 1977), a completely new edition of his basic studies of 1960; also U. von Hehl, 228f.

[122] Text in L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten,* 86–89, here 89.

This is connected with the entangled story of the origin of ART. 31. The definitive formulation contained an unconditional guarantee for the Catholic associations which served exclusively religious and purely cultural and charitable ends (para. 1); the others enjoyed this guarantee, according to para. 2, only under definite preconditions. Paragraph 3 defined that the clarification of which societies should enjoy the protection of the concordat was to be regulated between the government of the Reich and the German episcopate. The concordat contained no explicit definition of the criteria and competence for this regulating. The fact that, nevertheless, the Holy See signed on 20 July was characterized by the competent expert in the Interior Ministry of the Reich as perhaps the "worst tactical blunder" of the Curia in the concordat.[126] He cannot be contradicted. Immediately after the treaty took effect the state exploited the holes and claimed the decisive competence for establishing the principles and the drawing up of the protected list. The Vatican did not accept this. The (for the Church) unsuccessful struggle over the "principles of interpretation" and over the list of protected societies constituted a substantial part of Vatican-German relations after the concluding of the concordat with the Reich.

Perhaps the Church could still have settled the unresolved problems of ART. 31 if it had made ratification dependent on this. This did not occur because the German bishops at Fulda from 29 to 31 August were of the opinion "the sooner, the better."[127] Urging this on the one hand was anxiety lest Hitler lose interest in the concordat, while on the other hand it was expected that one could make better headway with a treaty binding in law against the continuing anti-Catholic actions. The Holy

---

[123] Gröber to Pacelli, 1 July 1933 (L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten,* 92f.)

[124] Gröber to Pacelli, 2 July 1933 (L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten,* 107).

[125] Text in A. Kupper, *Staatliche Akten,* 219f.

[126] W. Conrad, *Der Kampf um die Kanzeln. Erinnerungen auf die europäischen Katholiken* (Berlin 1957), 44.

[127] Gröber to Leiber, 2 September 1933 (L. Volk, *Kirchliche Akten,* 242).

See treated lightly some hesitations in regard to the desire of the German episcopate and on 10 September the ratification took place—that of the secret appendix on 2 November.

As in the case of the Lateran Treaties, the historical significance of the concordat with the Reich can be understood only if one distinguishes between short-range and long-range consequences. Incontestably Hitler gained prestige; his propaganda interpreted the signature of the cardinal secretary of state as papal legitimation of National Socialism. This was actually false, but politically inevitable. Of course, this propaganda operated in various ways. The concrete foreign policy of the other nations was hardly affected by it. "The concluding of the concordat implied very little sympathy of the Vatican for the Nazi regime in Germany," maintained the British envoy at the Vatican in retrospect at the end of the year.[128] Equally slight was the impact on European Catholics outside Germany, somewhat stronger perhaps in Latin America, where, however, other factors were more important. More powerful was the effect on the German Catholics, even if here one must be careful of exaggeration. It was not established that by this agreement "the power of resistance of the German Catholics to a criminal regime had been broken," as was claimed on the political side in the 1950s[129] and was repeated in the following decade by a too biased historiography.[130] The concordat with the Reich probably offered a starting point to a series of Catholic journalists, who then came forward for the easing of tensions by the building of bridges to Nazism. Meanwhile this small portion of German Catholics—in contrast to a not inconsiderable proportion of German Protestantism—sacrificed nothing of the content of faith, insisted on the Church's share in the right to issue rules in *res mixtae,* and furthermore claimed autonomy for the Catholic associations. Hence persons based on the illusory premise the expectation that the other side was ready for substantial restrictions of its totalitarian claim. This promise very quickly proved to be false. The Catholic attempts at bridge building came to an end, with a few exceptions, in the winter of 1933–34 and at the latest in the summer of 1934.

---

[128] T. E. Hachey, *Anglo-Vatican Relations 1914–1939,* 252.

[129] Thus Thomas Dehler, chairman of the FDP Party of the German Bundestag, on 11 March 1956; cf. J. M. Görgen, *Pius XII. Katholische Kirche und Hochhuths "Stellvertreter"* (Buxheim 1964), 42. The circulation of the most important Catholic opposition newspaper, *Junge Front,* rose from 85,000 at the beginning of 1933 to 120,000 at the end, and at the time it was prohibited at the beginning of 1936 it was 330,000 (cf. K. Gotto, *Die Wochenzeitung Junge Front/Michael* [Mainz 1970], 225 f). Between the middle of 1933 and the middle of 1934 the male Catholic youth lost about one-third of its membership, but the circulation of its association journals rose rapidly; cf. B. Schellenberger, *Katholische Jugend und Drittes Reich. Eine Geschichte des Katholischen Jungmännerverbandes 1933–1939 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Rheinprovinz* (Mainz 1975), 178, 198. J. Artez, *Katholische Arbeiterbewegung und Nationalsozialismus. Der Verband katholischen Arbeiter- und Knappenvereine Westdeutschlands 1923–1945* (Mainz 1978), estimates that, on the other hand, the loss of membership of West German workers' unions between mid-1933 and the end of 1934 amounted to only about 8 percent. For the other situation among Catholic academicians no study has been made. For the Catholic public school male teachers (not the women teachers!), cf. H. Küppers, *Der katholische Lehrerverband in der Übergangszeit von der Weimarer Republik zur Hitler-Diktatur. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Volksschullehrerstandes* (Mainz 1975).

[130] Thus G. Lewy, *Die katholische Kirche und das Dritte Reich* (Munich 1965), 109; also U. von Hehl, 238ff., as well as L. Volk, "Zwischen Geschichtsschreibung und Hochhuthprosa. Kritisches und Grundsätzliches zu einer Neuerscheinung über Kirche und Nationalsozialismus," D. Albrecht, ed. *Kirche,* 194–210.

On the other hand, in the short view the concordat meant a great success for the Church. The catastrophe of the Catholic associations was literally prevented at the last minute. One who stresses the negotiating blunders in ART. 31 must also emphasize this achievement. Precisely in the period immediately after the ratification the concordat with the Reich was, for the most endangered groups, an irreplaceable help in the struggle for self-assertion. In contrast to German Protestantism, the Catholic Church in Germany could at first remain for some time what it had hitherto been. This was attentively recorded on the part of ecumenism. "The position of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany was never so strong as now," wrote its probably best expert in Germany on 30 September 1933.[131] "It stands on its principles, which were guaranteed in the concordat. Priests are free to teach old and young in their churches what they [spacing of the author] wish without encountering the possibility of any secular interference."[132]

In the long run, on the other hand, the concordat brought Hitler little, in fact no advantage at all. It did not, as was later said, get the German bishops back into line,[133] but was, on the contrary, experienced by Hitler as an irksome fetter. Precisely for this reason he had it more and more disregarded, when and to what extent this seemed fitting to him, and this was not unexpected at the Vatican.[134] But not all the rules were broken at once, and with the existence of the concordat the Church was given the possibility of complaining about and denouncing every violation. The concordat was an outstanding defense line—the cardinal secretary of state prophesied this in August 1933[135] and, now as Pope, was able to repeat it as a historical fact on 2 June 1945.[136] For the concordat with the Reich essentially helped the Church in Germany to achieve the not self-evident accomplishment of maintaining its autonomy despite Hitler's rule to such a degree that the bishops and the clergy could proclaim the doctrine of faith and morals undiminished and administer the sacraments. That German Catholicism survived the Third Reich essentially more intact than almost all other comparable large bodies was, therefore, also a long-range effect of the agreement of 20 July 1933. It "created with its guarantees the legal basis by which resistance to totalitarianism could be and was realized."[137]

---

[131] A. Koechlin to G. Bell, 30 September 1933 (A. Lindt, ed., *George Bell-Alphons Koechlin. Briefwechsel 1933–1954* [Zürich 1969], 47).

[132] Elly Heuss-Knapp, wife of the first president of the German Federal Republic, wrote in a letter of 18 May 1933: "Our friends . . . have at least proclaimed loud and clearly that the Aryan article is impossible in the Church. I go even farther and clearly declare to everyone that I shall leave the Church on the day when it is implemented. That I will then enter the Catholic Church I do not say so clearly to everyone, but I am thinking of it" (M. Vater, ed., *E. Heuss-Knapp, Bürgerin zweier Welten. Ein Leben in Briefen und Aufzeichnungen* [Tübingen 1961], 228).

[133] Thus G. Ritter, *Carl Goerdeler und die deutsche Widerstandsbewegung* (Stuttgart 1954), 114.

BETWEEN THE CONCORDAT AND THE ENCYCLICAL *Mit brenneder Sorge* (1933–37). To maintain the administration of the sacraments and the proclamation of the faith in Germany remained, after the signing of the concordat, the chief goal of papal foreign policy. This becomes evident in the long quarrel over the "principles of interpretation" and the list of protected associations according to ART. 31.[138] The Holy See went to great pains to make up here for the failures of July 1933. It did not succeed in this, but it contributed significantly to seeing that the concluding of agreements which would have been still more unfavorable for the Church than the situation without an agreement was prevented. At the beginning of 1935 the negotiations were practically wrecked because of Nazi intransigence, even though they were not formally declared to be ended by either party. The Ecclesiastical Ministry of the Reich, established in July 1935, in September 1935 once more asked for episcopal proposals and then conducted oral and written discussions. These were tacitly interrupted by the state in the spring of 1936. The resumption on 10 December 1936 was explicitly designated as "superfluous," because a new situation had arisen.[139] The bishops would have been as ready in principle for further discussions, as was also the Vatican—but only to supply no pretext to the other side for easily disavowing the obligations of the concordat.

---

[134] Kirkpatrick's report of 19 August 1933 (repeated in L. Volk, *Geschichte,* 250f.)

[135] Cf. n. 134.

[136] *AAS* 37 (1945), 163.

[137] K. Gotto, "Katholische Kirche und Nationalsozialismus," *StL,* 10th ed., 10 (Freiburg 1970), 489.

[138] The ecclesiastical documents and the texts of the draft now in B. Stasiewski I–III, and D. Albrecht I.

[139] Cf. D. Albrecht I, 195, n. 7.

At stake in these exhausting negotiations was whether the Church could act beyond the walls of the sacristy or not. Every ecclesiastical concession extended totalitarian rule, every intransigence raised up obstacles to the Church. In this respect the question was where to draw the line—to a certain degree a problem of judgment. In general the Curia avoided letting the German bishops have a voice in this point. Its apodictic "no"[140] to a draft[141] agreed to in June 1934 by the episcopal delegation was an exception, scarcely to be overestimated in its importance, in which the Vatican of course knew that the affected societies in Germany were entirely behind it and with its protest strengthened their position vis-à-vis the bishops. Seen in its totality, the defense line of the Catholic societies was sought relatively far to the front, although this principle constantly encountered reductions in concrete details. For example, the Holy See consistently claimed only "partisan political" activity was forbidden to the associations, as the text of the treaty said; on the other hand, the Curia insisted on a general political right of activity for the organizations, hence on involvement with basic problems of political and social life. As a consequence the assertion of rights which the Church had negotiated for itself in the concordat created a dam against the totalitarian flood. While the Church was defending its own position with the means appropriate to it, it was at the same time a general antitotalitarian factor of importance.

On another plane a like function was performed by the thick exchange of notes of the Holy See with the German government, which began on the Vatican's initiative immediately after the ratification of the concordat. "Soul and mover"—such are the words of D. Albrecht—of this exchange of notes was the cardinal secretary of state with the intimate cooperation of the Pope. In almost wearisome repetition "again and again the brutal discrepancy" of the government "from law in accord with the concordat and activity hostile to the concordat" was brought up.[142] In this connection Pacelli proceeded from the Church's Leonine neutrality in regard to all types of states. He used this start in order to define the moral minimal conditions which every form of state must realize, by which principles of natural law served as the rule of conduct. In statements of principle of great strength the notes registered charges against rule by force. "There is no regulation of the concordat which could oblige the Church to recognize state laws as binding on its members which were lacking in the requisite of morally obligatory state laws, that is, conformity with the divine law."[143] A basic principle of National Socialism was sharply rejected: "Human norm is unthinkable without anchoring in the divine. This ultimate mooring cannot lie in an arbitrary 'divinity' of race. Not in the absolutizing of the nation. Such a 'God' of blood and race would be nothing other than the self-made reflection of one's own narrowness and tightness."[144] The editor of these documents has correctly established in summary that here, on the basis of the concordat, the "painful truth was for years spoken directly into the face" of the government of the Reich, "as those could not do who would also have wanted to do, and those did not do who otherwise could have done."[145]

---

[140] First by Pacelli to Bertram, 23 July 1934 (B. Stasiewski I, 762–69).

[141] Text in B. Stasiewski I, 744–46.

[142] D. Albrecht I, p. XXI.

On the other hand, it is objected that a real giving of witness would have demanded publicity "with ultimate personal risk," and this in fact was not the case in regard to statements of principle, but remained in the diplomatically internal official documents.[146] In this view the goal which the notes pursued was not entirely known. They were not only diplomatic documents of a confidential nature. The most important pieces in the exchange of notes were printed by the Holy See in three issues in 1934 and 1936 as a white paper. The government of the Reich had a suspicion of this. It had to include the constantly threatening publication of these documents in its political calculations. It was still more significant that the white papers had been transmitted to the German bishops each time, and described the line of the Vatican's formation of view and will to the German episcopate; in this way they became an essentially inner-ecclesiastical instrument of government. In addition, in 1935 the contents of two very clear notes was published in *Osservatore Romano* and from there were taken into the official ecclesiastical newspapers of the German sees.[147] This was already "publicity," if only officially. Entirely public and official was finally the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*. Concordat—exchange of notes—encyclical were logical steps of a uniform defensive struggle by the Church.

FROM THE ENCYCLICAL *Mit brennender Sorge* TO THE END OF THE PONTIFICATE (1937–39.) The encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*, dated 14 March

---

[143] Ibid. I, 255 (10 July 1935).

[144] Ibid. I, 146 (14 May 1934).

[145] Ibid. I, p. XXIV.

[146] E. W. Böckenförde in *Der Staat* 8 (1969), 266f.

[147] L. Volk, *Enzyklika,* 175f.

1937,[148] was read in the Catholic churches of Germany on 21 March, Palm Sunday, and was immediately distributed in print in an extensive issue. It is the best known papal document of the Catholic Church's struggle with Hitler. The German bishops had given the official impetus in the traditional letter of homage of the Fulda Episcopal Conference on 18 August 1936.[149] Five of the bishops were invited to Rome for January 1936 to deliver a report: the three cardinals and two of the youngest:[150] Clemens August von Galen of Münster and Konrad von Preysing of Berlin, who belonged to the "hard" wing of the Episcopal Conference. Several discussions produced unanimity to adhere to the Concordat as far as possible; although it was disputed whether a papal encyclical would jeopardize the concordat, there was agreement that such a pastoral letter was desirable. In addition, in strict secrecy Faulhaber prepared a first draft for Pacelli on 21 January 1937.[151] Then, until 10 March, the cardinal secretary of state composed the definitive text, presumably with the collaboration of Kaas, demonstrably under the personal supervision of the Pope.

Faulhaber was an important preacher. He intended his draft as a homily. It described the most serious present dangers for the Catholic faith, proceeding first from the positive—"pure" divine faith, "pure" faith in Christ, "pure" faith in the Church, "pure" faith in the papal primacy; then, in a polemical defense against Nazi premises and methods, it warned against what would today be called "remodeling" ("no novel interpretation of holy values"). There followed an exhortation to the young as well as to the priests and the "loyal," especially the members of the associations and Catholic parents—struggle over the denominational schools.

The Faulhaber draft was a "letter for teaching and encouraging," says Volk. Pacelli added a third leitmotiv. The persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich was not only described by him as a fact but it was brought back to its political bases and aims. This gave the encyclical its timely sharpness. The other side, said the Pope, has "made the reinterpretation of the treaty, the undermining of the treaty, finally the more or less public violation of the treaty the unwritten law of operation." The "visual instruction of past years" reveals "machinations which from the first knew no other goal than a war of annihilation." That this war of annihilation had its cause in the irreconcilability of Catholic faith and national socialist principles of government is worked out in copious detail. "Whoever dissociates race or the people or the state or the type of state, the executors of political power, or other basic values of the organization of the human community—which claim an essential and honorable place within the earthly order—from this secular value scale of theirs, makes them the highest norm of all, even of religious values, and deifies them with an idolatrous worship, overturns and falsifies the divinely created and divinely commanded order of things." Ideas of race, the Führer principle, and totalitarianism were thus repudiated by faith. Man has "as a personality God-given rights," which "must remain immune" to any "interference on the part of the community"; in the context of school registration there was mention of the "condition of notorious absence of freedom." In contrast to *Non abbiamo bisogno*, the encyclical of 1937 is incomparably harsher. But, as in 1931, here too the Pope did not want to burn all bridges.

---

[148] *AAS* 29 (1937), 145–67; *M*, 211–38. There is no Latin version of this encyclical, but an Italian translation (ibid. 145–67). Often printed, it is now best in D. Albrecht I, 404–43.

[149] Text in B. Stasiewski III, no. 315/IIa.

[150] The age of the German bishops in 1937 amounted, in numerical average, to 64 years (7 over 70, 9 between 60 and 70, 8 between 50 and 59, and 1 under 50). Von Galen was 59 years old and three years a bishop; von Preysing was 57 and four years a bishop.

[151] Text now in D. Albrecht I, 404–43; ibid, 402f., the fundamental investigations of A. Martini are discussed.

The impact of the encyclical can be described only in connection with its aims. The papal pastoral letter was intended as "a word of truth and of pastoral support." In groups loyal to the Church, which were amenable to the intellectual level of the encyclical, it presumably had this limiting effect to an optimal degree. In other groups, which could hardly receive the ingenious sentence structure of this text without assistance, the theoretical understanding may have been slight, but not the solidifying effect.[152] The individual distinctions and conclusions were indeed far less important than the unprecendented fact that the Pope proclaimed publicly to the world: The Church in Germany is fighting for life and death; you German Catholics, you who are persecuted, are in the right; do not be confused; I am standing behind you.

Corresponding to the direct impact of the encyclical was the reaction of the other side, which had only learned of the imminent reading at the last minute.[153] The Nazi leadership did not make the risky attempt to suppress the reading on 21 March in the 11,500 parish churches; instead, it exerted itself for the drastic stopping of further distribution and took up massive measures of retaliation. Of these the most spectacular was a barrage of propaganda. On 6 April Hitler ordered the immediate resumption of the trials on morals charges against Catholic religious and priests which had been halted the previous year. Thereby was inaugurated a propaganda action of unusual perfection and radical nature, the aim of which was to destroy the bonds linking the faithful to their clerical leadership.[154] Not without a very active counterdefense by the bishops and clergy did the loyalty of German Catholics endure this ordeal.

---

[152] The *RPB* from Bavaria are ambiguous on this point; cf. *RPB* I, 211f; II, 167; III, 128; IV, 121.

[153] Cf. L. Volk, *Enzyklika,* 182–85.

Meanwhile, the government, taking up considerations from the period before the encyclical, prepared to give notice of denouncing the concordat.[155] Into these plans there burst on 19 May a report which even further embittered German-Vatican relations. Because of an indiscretion of the press it was learned that the cardinal of Chicago, George William Mundelein, in the presence of five hundred priests of his diocese had condemned the Nazi regime and had characterized Adolf Hitler as "an Austrian paperhanger, and a poor one at that." German policy made an issue of this. It let its minister at the Holy See go ostentatiously on leave and on 29 May delivered a testy note, which demanded "redress."[156] The war of nerves against the Church was now pushed to its climax in Germany,[157] but apparently this did not greatly impress the Vatican. Its reply of 24 June[158] contained no apologies or weakening, but turned the tables and on its part again rejected the German policy. Furthermore, the Curia continued the war of notes in the previous form until in the summer of 1938 it was in practice called off, for reasons thus far unknown.[159]

Berlin's plans for denouncing the concordat were put aside, unrealized, in the fall of 1937, without the relevant motives being clearly known. Presumably Hitler, as he was about to enter upon immediate preparations for his expansionist policy, desired relative peace on the domestic policy scene, in any case not an added burden because of this action.

Until the Pope's death the situation of the Church in Germany did not improve. Quite the contrary: the prohibition of youth associations and the abolition of denominational schools were now implemented by the state. At the same time there appeared areas not covered by the concordat: Austria after the *Anschluss* of 13 March 1938 and the

---

[154] H. G. Hockerts, *Die Sittlichkeitsprozesse gegen katholische Ordensangehörige und Priester 1936/37. Eine Studie zur nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftstechnik und zum Kirchenkampf* (Mainz 1971), 74.

[155] Cf. D. Albrecht I, 373f., n. 3.

[156] Text in D. Albrecht II, 23f.

[157] Cf. H. G. Hockerts, 132–46.

[158] D. Albrecht II, 24–30.

[159] The view of the German ambassador to the Holy See: D. Albrecht II, 81f., n. 2.

Sudetenland from 1 October 1938. The German government refused, using legal arguments, to extend the validity of the concordat to these areas,[160] and also rejected new agreements. The positive results of the concordat in the "Old Reich," despite serious inroads precisely in 1938 and 1939, here became well known. The Holy See, like many other powers,[161] most of which were economically affected, did not lodge a diplomatic protest against the German Jewish pogrom in November 1938, whereas in the same days it pushed to its climax its conflict with Mussolini's "race legislation." In the long-run the encyclical accomplished nothing, in so far as the actual relations thereafter became, not better, but worse.

It likewise meant no turn in the ecclesiastical battle tactics of the Fulda Episcopal Conference. Preysing and Galen apparently desired this. They felt that permanent mobilization of publicity against violations of rights was a more effective method than Bertram's previous "petition policy."[162] The majority of the Episcopal Conference did not agree. Hence the putting to the test did not occur. The chances of such an attempt could be assessed with difficulty because it could not be said how long the episcopate, considering corresponding countermeasures of Hitler, could have kept the faithful on a permanent collision course. The Holy See did not meddle in these confrontations over the better defense tactics, although Pacelli would probably have been glad to see if Galen and Preysing were to be followed. Hence to this extent the encyclical was "not a caesura" (L. Volk).

On the other hand it incontestably produced a clarification whose long-term consequences must not be underestimated. Not only for foreign lands was it declared that the Catholic Church was in fact persecuted in Germany and that between Hitler and the Pope there existed an unbridgeable opposition: this clarification was of the utmost importance for the clergy and faithful in Germany. They found authentically marked here the route and the direction and indeed in the genuine ecclesiastical sphere of faith and morals, hence in an area in which the claim to obedient hearing was then undisputed. Exactly because the encyclical did not directly argue politically was it so demanding. The Church defended not its "influence" in the "world" but its *proprium*. No one could seriously challenge the legitimacy of this position. But by defending what was its own and by persevering in what was its own, it showed that it did not fit into Hitler's totalitarian system. Whether through a defense on a more political line the Catholic Church in Germany would have been able to retain as many people in the same degree before the intellectual accommodation to National Socialism as was possible to it according to the judgment of its Nazi enemies and the experience of contemporaries may be doubted.

---

[160] Also D. Albrecht II, 80f.

[161] Cf. the statement of the Germany report of the Berlin Foreign Office of 20 December 1938: *ADAP* D V, 769–73.

[162] Also basic is L. Volk, "Die Fuldaer Bischofskonferenz von Hitlers Machtergreifung bis zur Enzyklika 'Mit brennender Sorge,'" as well as idem, "Die Fuldaer Bischofskonferenz von der Enzyklika 'Mit brennender Sorge,' bis zum Ende des NS-Herrschaft," D. Albrecht, ed., *Kirche,* 35–102; W. Adolph, *Hirtenamt und Hitlerdiktatur* (Berlin 1965).

When the foreign policy of Pius XI vis-à-vis Hitler is surveyed from the beginning to his death, the absence of genuine alternatives becomes obvious. What would have happened if Hitler had not unloosed the Second World War and lost no one can positively say. Everything suggests that the Catholic Church in his sphere of rule would then have fallen into a situation without hope of escape, similar to that in Stalin's Russia.

The Second World War: Pius XII

More than in 1914 and 1922, political reasons, in addition to ecclesiastical, may have been decisive in the election of Pius XII on 2 March 1939. Anything more precise is unknown.[163] The Second World War, which had already cast its shadows, by which it could be gauged that it would cause much greater spiritual and material damage than in 1914–18, brought the papacy far more difficult tasks than the first. This was very well known to the Pope, who had had experience in important political posts in the First World War. It was depressing for this austere observer that, despite the entirely correct insight, he could change so little in the course of things.

Most of Pacelli's contemporaries were of the opinion that he endured this ordeal magnificently. Apart from coarse Communist polemic,[164] after 1945 a vast increase in the prestige of the Holy See was testified to by the Protestant[165] and also by the liberal side and was referred essentially to the demonstration of the high, statesmanlike qualities[166] of the Pope in the Second World War: "At no time since 1848 has the papacy had so good an international press as today."[167] Correspondingly it could be written at the Pope's death in 1958 that Pius XII had "brilliantly" discharged the heavy task of leading the Church through the Second World War. "In this epoch of raw force, of hatred, and of murder, the Church only gained in prestige, trust, and possiblities of effectiveness."[168] Five years later a play by the hitherto unknown German poet Hochhuth, with its serious charges against Pius XII, evoked a uniquely passionate debate in the Western world, with numerous discussions, seventy-five hundred letters to editors, and so forth.[169] The hitherto almost universal high esteem now changed in many to the opposite, even to scorn and hatred. Even a part of the literature appearing at the time and making a claim to scholarship did not hold itself far aloof from emotions, posing of problem questions, and even clear errors in method.[170] This "Hochhuth Debate" produced for scholarship a substantial profit to the extent that the Holy See at the turn of the years 1964–65 gave to a group of internationally recognized historians of the Society of Jesus[171] the task of publishing its acts and documents for the history of the Second World War. This voluminous publication appeared since 1965 and was to be completed in 1978. Research then had firm[172] ground under its feet.

---

[163] The comment in D. Tardini, *Pius XII. als Oberhirte, Priester und Mensch* (Freiburg 1961), 34, is very cautiously expressed.

[164] Cf. M. M. Scheinmann, *Der Vatikan im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (East Berlin 1954). Criticism from the other side was less noticed. On the one hand, it came to a head in the charge made by the Russian Orthodox, American Protestant, and Freemason side that Pius XII, like the other Popes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, pursued politics and thereby failed in his ecclesiastical duty, and on the other hand in the reproof from the Jewish side (L. Poliakow) that he pursued politics too little, or even the wrong politics, and championed the Jews in Rome so little in order not to jeopardize his relations with Germany (cf. P. Duclos, 11f.).

[165] H. Hermelink, 2.

[166] Thus Sumner Wells, *The Time of Decision* (New York and London 1944), 142.

As with Benedict XV, the foreign policy of Pius XII is summarized from three points of view: neutrality—exertions for peace—humanitarian measures of assistance. To these is added as a fourth the problem of his "silence."

---

[167] L. Salvatorelli, *Chiesa e Stato dalla rivoluzione francese ad oggi* (Florence 1955), 139.

[168] R. Leiber, "Pius XII," *StdZ* 163 (1958–59), 88.

[169] A selection of the contemporary contributions to the discussion, not made from a scholarly point of view, in F. J. Raddatz, ed., *Summa injuria oder Durfte der Papst schweigen? Hochhuths "Stellvertreter" in der öffentlichen Kritik* (Reinbek 1963); *Der Streit um Hochhuths "Stellvertreter." Theater unserer Zeit* (Basel, Stuttgart 1963); also, cf. U. von Hehl, 236f., as well as, collectively, V. Conzemius, *Églises,* 487ff.

[170] For G. Lewy, *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany* (New York and Toronto 1964), cf. above n. 130. Striking errors in method in S. Friedlaender, *Pie XII et le IIIe Reich. Documents* (Paris 1964). Also cf. A. Martini, "Un concerto non mai eseguito alla presenza di Pio XII," *CivCatt* 116, 1 (1965), 538–46; P. Blet, "Pio XII e il Terzo Reich," *CivCatt* 116, 2 (1965), 251–58; R. Lill, "Die Kirche und das Dritte Reich. Ein Forschungsbericht," W. P. Eckert, ed., *Judenhass—Schuld der Christen?! Ergänzungsheft* (Essen 1966), 62–64; V. Conzemius, *Églises,* 491–93; R. Graham, "Come non fare il processo 'storico,' " idem, *Il Vaticano,* 283–92.

[171] Pierre Blet, R. A. Graham, A. Martini, and B. Schneider (the last named is now deceased). They have made sure that for their edition the same rules hold as for other historical source publications (*ADSS* 1, p. IX).

[172] The doubts about the objectivity of the editors in B. Martin, *Friedensinitiativen und Machtpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg 1939–1942* (Düsseldorf 1974), 371ff., are not substantiated and so irrelevant.

NEUTRALITY

The reasons which had persuaded Benedict XV to opt for neutrality persisted in the Second World War. Two more were added. One was founded in Pacelli's personality. Pius XII, whom a bon mot characterized as the complete "diplomate de l'ancien régime,"[173] was by background, nature, self-evaluation, and experience an outspoken man of peace—but not at the cost of evil compromise. International law provided the other reason. In the Lateran Treaty the Holy See had assumed the obligation of holding itself aloof from the properly political problems of international politics (ARTICLE 24). This principle was, however, limited by two provisos: first, the Pope reserved the right to mediate peace in the event that both parties requested it, and, second, it had reserved the right to vindicate the moral and the ideal in every case. Tradition, circumstances, and legal situation converged in the Holy See's neutrality.

For this neutrality Pius XII, who was accustomed to think and to speak in very distinct ways, preferred the term "impartiality."[174] In this manner the political facts should be removed from the moral circumstances. "Neutrality," Pius XII declared to the cardinal of Munich, "could be understood in the sense of a passive indifference," which in a period of war such as this "was unbecoming" to the head of the Church. "Impartiality means for us judgment of things in accord with truth and justice," by which, however, in public announcements he granted "to the situation of the Church in the individual countries every possible consideration in order to spare the Catholics there hardships that could be avoided."[175] In other respects, like his predecessor Benedict XV, he declared: The Church "does not have the function of intervening and taking sides in purely earthly affairs. She is a mother. Do not ask a mother to favor or to oppose the part of one or the other of her children."[176]

The consequences of such a neutrality were observed by Pius XII "almost rigoristically," according to J. Becker. It was certainly his view, even before 1944,[177] that a war of aggression is not a morally and legally legitimate means of politics. With regard to his obligations of international law, before the outbreak of the war and during the war he refrained with difficulty from any explicit condemnation of many acts of aggression on the part of Germany,[178] Italy,[179] the Soviet Union,[180] the Allies,[181] and Japan,[182] and made only a much pondered exception in regard to the Benelux countries on 10 May 1940.[183] He was likewise careful to see that the Vatican did not become entangled in any crusade propaganda of one of the warring sides—neither from 1939 to 1941 against Hitler and Stalin nor, from 1941, when both the anti-Communist and the anti-Nazi crusade would have liked to appeal to a papal support. Even the term "Communism" disappeared from the vocabulary of the Holy See, and the idea of "West" was pretty much avoided from this period.[184] The maintaining of such an impartiality was very much more difficult in comparison to the First World War. It required "almost superhuman exertions" in order "to keep" the Holy See "above the strife of parties," the Pope confided to the archbishop of Cologne.[185] In this connection the integrity of the Vatican State represented the lesser, even if not a slight, problem.

---

[173] W. d'Ormesson, "Pie XII tel que je l'ai connu," *RHD* 82 (1968), 21

[174] For example in the Christmas address of 1942 (cf. below n. 200).

[175] B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 215 (31 January 1943).

[176] Thus in the Christmas address of 1946, *AAS* 39 (1947), 7–17; *UG* II, 1919–32. Similarly in his address of 2 June 1939, *ADSS* 1, 163.

[177] P. Duclos, 47ff., bases himself on the Christmas address of 1944 (cf. below n. 202).

The Lateran Treaty had guaranteed to the Holy See perfect independence and the possibility of communication with the rest of the world even in the event of a renewed state of war in Italy. These contractual decisions were not fully observed, but still, by and large, certain limits of flagrant violations of rights were not exceeded. The actual state of affairs depended on the general situation. Since Italy did not enter the war until 10 June 1940, the Vatican had to put up with relatively few restrictions until the beginning of the German campaign against France on 10 May 1940. Now matters underwent a change. Not only did measures such as blackouts and various other war-economy restrictions have to observed; Italy exerted strong pressures for the limiting of the Vatican's propaganda possibilities. The possibilities of communications by press (*Osservatore Romano*) and radio (*Radio Vaticana*) were thereupon curtailed; from the end of April 1941 *Radio Vaticana* discontinued its broadcasts on the status of the Church in Germany.[186] On the other hand, direct diplomatic contact with the powers hostile to Italy was maintained even after June 1940. When, contrary to the treaty, Mussolini withdrew their extraterritoriality, the Pope did not have them withdraw, as in 1915, to Switzerland, but gave them cramped quarters in the Vatican State, where finally a dozen representatives were lodged. Their contact with the Curia was thereby facilitated, and they were not entirely cut off from their governments; there remained radio communication and the possibilities of travel. Roosevelt's deputy, Myron C. Taylor,[187] went to Rome seven times for brief and long stays up to 1944; the English representative, Osborne, was able to journey to London and back for some time in the spring of 1943, and Archbishop Spellman of New York spent a few days in Rome. Conversely, in 1944, when Rome obtained an Allied garrison, the Holy See sheltered the diplomatic representatives of Germany, Japan, Hungary, and so forth. True, their possibilities of working were limited, but they were preserved in substance.

---

[178] 15 March 1939, occupation of Czechoslovakia; 23 March 1939, occupation of Memel; 1 September 1939, attack on Poland; 9 April 1940, occupation of Denmark, attack on Norway; 10 May 1940, attack on Luxemburg, Belgium, and The Netherlands; 6 April 1941, attack on Yugoslavia and Greece; 22 June 1941, attack on the Soviet Union.

[179] 7 April 1939, attack on Albania; 28 October 1940, attack on Greece.

[180] 17 September 1939, occupation of eastern Poland; 30 November 1939, attack on Finland; 4–17 June 1940, occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; 21 June 1940, occupation of Bessarabia; 25 August 1941, occupation of Iran.

[181] United States, July 1941, occupation of Iceland; England, 10 May 1940, occupation of Iceland, 25 August 1941, occupation of Iran.

[182] 7 December 1941, attack on the United States.

[183] Cf. J. Becker, 174f.

[184] Evidence in P. Duclos, 127–35.

[185] B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 280 (3 March 1944).

Hence during the entire Second World War the central authority in the Universal Church could continue to operate essentially intact and keep contact with its nuncios and the episcopate to the extent that this was not regionally and locally restricted and paralyzed, especially in the areas under German and Russian rule.[188] This was not self-evident. From the spring of 1941 the Curia reckoned with the possibility of a German occupation of Vatican City and the forcible withdrawal of the Pope;[189] it made preparations in case the central authority should no longer be capable of functioning. These measures reached their climax before and after the fall of Mussolini on 25 July 1943, which was followed on 8 September by the occupation of Rome by German troops and police. Then the foreign diplomats at the Vatican burned their papers; the Pope had a part of his documents hidden in his palace, and microfilm photographs of others sent to Washington in order to save them. The extraterritoriality of the Holy See was violated in December 1943 and February 1944 by police raids on political and racial refugees in papal buildings outside Vatican City.[190] But the Vatican state remained outside Hitler's direct clutches. The reasons for this are not evident. But it is indisputable that the Pope and his collaborators had to take this possibility into consideration on the basis of their information since 1941, and they were delivered from this anxiety only by the Allied occupation of Rome on 5 June 1944, although many restrictions and limitations were still protracted beyond the war.

---

[186] Cf. P. Duclos, 32–36; *ADSS*, 4, 18–33; R. A. Graham, "La Radio Vaticana tra Londra e Berlino. Un dossier della guerra delle onde: 1940–1941," *CivCatt* 127, 1 (1976), 132–50. Compensation was sought through new means. Thus the organ *Parola di Papa* was issued as a new publication, which was sent to all Italian parish priests. According to P. Duclos, 34, n. 1, the Christmas address of 1941 was published in Italy with a circulation of 370,000.

[187] Cf. G. Q. Flynn, *Roosevelt and Romanism. Catholics and American Diplomacy, 1937–1945* (Westport 1976), 106ff.; cf. idem, *CHR* 58 (1972), 171–94.

[188] The Warsaw nunciature was not able, after the nuncio had withdrawn with the Polish government to Rumania, to be opened again; the nuncios in Brussels and The Hague had to depart in July 1940 on German orders, the nuncios in Kovno and Riga in August 1940 on Russian orders. Conversely, from 1943 there were also difficulties for the Vatican in the territories occupied by the Allies.

[189] Also R. A. Graham, "Voleva Hitler allontanare da Roma Pio XII?" *CivCatt* 123, 1 (1972), 319–27, 454–61, repeated in idem, *Il Vaticano,* 89–110.

Also the considerable, altogether rather successful exertions of papal policy to keep Rome as a city out of the events of the war[191] were not only conditioned by humanitarian reasons; at the same time they aimed at preserving the neutral independence of the papacy, not only for reasons of international law but still more from ecclesiastical motives. To the Pope belonged as a principal task of his office, in accord with the Church's understanding of itself, the preservation of the Church's unity. This presupposed unconditional loyalty of all Catholics, behind whichever warring front they stood, to the common Supreme Head of the Church, which could only be maintained if people knew that the Pope's independence guaranteed his impartiality. If Rome were involved in the direct action of the war, it was not to be expected that the Vatican's walls would thereafter protect its independence. Hence, as he himself wrote to the bishop of Berlin,[192] the "further[193] involvement of Rome in the war intensified to the intolerable" the excessive dangers to Church unity. This trial was spared the Church. Just as Benedict XV, Pius XII was therefore able to carry out a humanitarian, charitable activity and promote peace initiatives. In these two fields much was attempted but much or little was achieved in different ways.

EFFORTS FOR PEACE

The Pope's exertions for peace began immediately after his election and were continued to the end of the war with undiminished readiness. They took place on two different planes, in the area of teaching and in that of practical politics. In both fields the difference between the pontificates of Benedict XV and Pius XII became obvious.

---

[190] P. Duclos, 30f.

[191] Also A. Giovannetti, *Roma aperta citta* (Milan 1962).

[192] B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 291 (21 March 1944).

[193] The text alludes to air attacks on Rome.

Benedict XV developed no real doctrine of peace, no coherent system of detailed expressions on theoretical bases and aims, on practical assumptions and possibilities of a domestic and international order of peace. He had been content to admonish abstractly to peace in his public statements and put the rest aside for negotiations which should lead to a compromise. It was different with his successor in the Second World War. Already his first public announcement as Pope on 3 March 1939[194] contained the keywords of a universal program for peace. He again took up these points in his Easter homily of 1939,[195] further pursued it in his first encyclical, *Summi Pontificatus* (20 October 1939),[196] and put it in the center of his Christmas address of 1939,[197] in which the five basic conditions of a lasting international peace were discussed. All subsequent Christmas addresses, which were likewise planned with a view to the greatest possible publicity, treated pretty much in detail, and sometimes exclusively, problems of the ethics of peace—in 1940 the moral assumptions of a peaceful international order;[198] in 1941 the bases of a new international order;[199] in 1942 the basic elements of national and international community life;[200] in 1943 the moral presuppositions for a world peace among victors and vanquished;[201] in 1944 the bases of a true democracy;[202] in 1945 the Universal Church and universal peace.[203] On other public occasions, especially regularly on 2 June, he constantly returned to it.[204]

The Pope's concern was to develop the conditions, not for just any peace, but for a just and hence lasting peace.[205] On the basis of natural law he displayed the ideal of an international order which should guarantee security and existence equally to all nations and national minorities, as the personal dignity of the individual human being demanded. His view was not restricted to the legal but was directed to the economic order—distribution of wealth—and to society. Special attention was applied to the problems of disarmament. Decisively but also prudently were treated the bases of the law of treaties, by which treaties were to be maintained or, if necessary, to be revised—a recalling of the treaty of Versailles. Not least, the creating of supranational institutions with real competence was indispensable.

---

[194] Text in *ADSS* 1, 97f.; *AAS* 31 (1939), 86–87.

[195] Text in *ADSS* 1, 104–10; *AAS* 31 (1939), 145–51; *UG* II, 1862–68.

[196] Draft of the parts referring to peace in *ADSS* 1, 315–23; text in *AAS* 31 (1939), 413–35; *UG* I, 5–40.

[197] Draft of the parts referring to peace in *ADSS* 1, 353–61; text in *AAS* 32 (1940), 5–13; *UG* II, 1869–82.

[198] Draft of the parts referring to peace in *ADSS* 4, 307–13; text in *AAS* 33 (1941), 5–14, *UG* II, 1824–38.

[199] Draft in *ADSS* 5, 337–50; text in *AAS* 34 (1942), 10–21; *UG* II, 1944–59.

[200] Extract in *ADSS* 7, 161–67; text in *AAS* 35 (1943), 9–24; *UG* I, 98–119.

[201] Draft of the parts referring to peace in *ADSS* 7, 732–34; text in *AAS* 36 (1944), 11–24; UG II, 1962–79.

[202] Text in *AAS* 37 (1945), 10–23; *UG* II, 1771–88.

[203] Text in *AAS* 38 (1946), 15–25; *UG* II, 2091–2105.

[204] The texts are most conveniently found in *AAS* and *UG* respectively.

[205] A concise but penetrating systematic treatment in P. Duclos, 70–103.

These instructive discussions by the Pope, in which actual everyday cases and principles were blended, clearly had a threefold aim. In the rather long run, material should here be circulated which would be further debated by the Church's social doctrine, by practical philosophy, and by the juristic disciplines.[206] Thereby Pius XII intended to provide guiding principles to the political thought of the faithful and at the same time influence concrete political decisions to the degree this should be possible. The fact that between his concepts and the peace aims of Hitler or Stalin there ran insurmountable abysses was beside the point. But there were also important differences and contradictions relative to the guiding ideas of the Western democracies. Thus on 1 September 1943 the Pope expressed himself, both from considerations of principle and for tactical reasons, against the formula of "unconditional surrender" of the Casablanca Conference of January 1943,[207] and he did not support the Atlantic Charter of 14 August 1941, which coincided with his ideas in important but not in all points.[208] The maxims of Pius XII's peace doctrine drew collectively "the consequences from the frustrated peace of 1919," according to J. Becker; its increased repetition in a harsher form should be avoided. While it had little influence on the postwar planning of the victorious powers, it did perhaps on the political development after 1945. To this degree it was not in vain.

On the other hand, with his exertions to prevent the outbreak of war and then Italy's entry into it and thereafter to bring about the ending of the conflict, Pius XII had as little success as Benedict XV, although the experience of 1914–18 must have been constantly present to the Pope, and he strove to avoid the mistakes of that period.

Three actions before the outbreak of the war must be mentioned: First, at the beginning of May 1939, probings for a five-power conference[209] for discussion and regulation of the present German-Polish and French-Italian oppositions. They found rejection among all those addressed and were canceled on 10 May.[210] Next, in close agreement with the English government, an extremely urgently formulated public appeal to reason and negotiation was presented on the evening of 24 August.[211] The essential statement came from a preliminary draft by the future Pope Paul VI and read: "Nothing is lost with peace. All can be lost with war."[212] Finally, on 30 August, there was the desperate attempt to gain Poland at the last minute for concessions to Germany,[213] which originated with Mussolini and was supported by England, as well as, on 31 August, a plea to the powers[214] for a just and peaceful solution of the conflict.[215] In a declaration personally originating with the Pope, *Osservatore Romano* on 13 September 1939 remarked that the Holy See had "exhausted all possibilities which" had offered "in any way still some hope for the preservation of peace or at least the excluding of the immediate danger of war."[216] This view was shared by the British government.[217] The collapse of the papal efforts for maintaining peace was mostly caused by the policy of Hitler, who was unimpressed by reasonable motives in the framework of a possible revision of the Treaty of Versailles. Polish intransigence in August 1939 made the German dictator's game easier.

---

[206] A first detailed effort by an author close to the Curia: G. Gonella, *Presupposti di un ordine internazionale* (Vatican City 1942).

[207] *AAS* 35 (1943), 277–79, here 278; *UG* II, 2020–24, here 2022; draft also in *ADSS* 7, 600.

[208] Cf. *ADSS* 5, 17f.

[209] Poland, Germany, England, France, Italy.

Meanwhile, on 1 September 1939 Italy proclaimed itself "not at war." The Curia had gone to great pains to nail Mussolini down to this and for this purpose assured itself of the support of Roosevelt, who at Christmas 1939 had entered into diplomatic relations with the Pope.[218] The Vatican's internal démarches, strengthened by spectacular public happenings—on 21 December the visit of the King of Italy to the Pope;[219] on 28 December, the return visit of the Pope to the King;[220] on 5 May 1940, the Pope's homily at Santa Maria sopra Minerva[221]—and a personal letter from the Pope to Mussolini on 24 April 1940[222] were unable to keep the Italian dictator aloof from the suggestion which the victorious march of the German armies in France exercised in the way of anticipation. Italy's declaration of war on 10 June 1940 confirmed the dread that had been pervading the Vatican for months.

---

[210] *ADSS* 1, 139f.

[211] *ADSS* 1, 230–38 (with the different drafts).

[212] B. Schneider, "Der Friedensappell Papst Pius' XII, vom. 24. August 1939," *AHP* 6 (1968), 415–24.

[213] *ADSS* 1, 263f.

[214] To Germany, England, France, Spain, Italy, Poland.

[215] *ADSS* 1, 271f.

[216] *ADSS* 1, 303.

[217] *ADSS* 1, 299

[218] *ADSS* 1, 348f. (Roosevelt to Pius XII, 23 December 1939).

[219] *ADSS* 1, 345f.

[220] *ADSS* 1, 362f.

[221] *ADSS* 1, 437f.

[222] *ADSS* 1, 425f.

Immediately after the French armistice of 25 June 1940 the Pope formally made preliminary soundings in England, Germany, and Italy in regard to possible negotiations for a "just and honorable peace."[223] Behind these stood the wish at least to preserve England intact, before it could be overrun by a German invasion, as a European counterweight to German hegemony.[224] When this preliminary probing found consent in none of those concerned,[225] the diplomatic possibilities of the Vatican were at first exhausted. Whether in May and June 1940 the West had lost only a battle, as Churchill and de Gaulle said, or the war, as Mussolini felt, or whether this question could not yet be answered, as presumably Pétain and Franco thought, was unclear.[226] How the Pope evaluated the views cannot be known in detail, because on that point there are hardly any sources. The editors of the papal acts warn, not by chance, that one must be cautious with judgments concerning the secret considerations of the Pope.[227] In the period between the end of the war in France and the beginning of the war in Russia he presumably placed his hopes rather on a change in domestic politics in Germany than on a military victory of England over Hitler.[228]

With the German attack on Russia on 22 June 1941 and the Japanese attack on the United States on 7 December 1941, the acts of war expanded into a global world war. At first there were no diplomatic possibilities of peace. Politically significant was a papal decision in September 1941 which, giving a theologically not unproblematic interpretation to Pius XI's Communism encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* of 19 March 1937, made it possible to overcome the hesitations of conscience of North American Catholics in regard to military support of the Soviet Union.[229] The Curia did not share the illusions in regard to Russian policy[230] which underlay later American planning for peace. "I am surprised," noted the secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, Domenico Tardini, on 22 September 1942, "that such clear matters are not seen [simply] by governments and by such important politicians."[231] As though Communist Russia after victory would return like a brave little lamb into the family of European states! "If Stalin wins the war," he stated to Taylor, "he will become the lion that devours all of Europe." Neither Hitler nor Stalin could be peaceable, satisfied members of the European family of nations. In the smaller states, situated diagonally along the war fronts, people shared the Curia's anxieties since the German defeat at Stalingrad in the winter of 1942–43 and would have been glad to steer toward a compromise peace under papal mediation before Russia became overmighty.[232] The Secretariat of State saw no concrete hopes for this in the spring of 1943[233] and had to be content with opposing Allied appeasement in regard to Russia[234] with the facts known to it and the cares derived therefrom, which were proved later to be correct.[235] This did not mean relying instead on Hitler's Germany, which since 22 June 1942 rejected the Holy See as a partner in discussions and negotiations for the area outside the "Old Reich,"[236] after it had not recognized the German annexations as definitive.[237] Apart from other weighty reasons, such an attitude was forbidden as a result of the persecution of the Catholic Church in Hitler's entire sphere of dominion, worst of all in Poland.[238] "Two dangers threaten European and Christian civilization—Nazism and Communism. Both are materialistic, antireligious, totalitarian, tyrannical, cruel, and militaristic," declared Tardini to the English *chargé d'affaires* on 30 May 1943.[239] Only if the Second World War eliminates both dangers can the future Europe find peace. If either of them survives the war, "a peaceful and ordered coexistence of European nations" would be "impossible," and in the not distant future a new, still worse war would be faced.

---

[223] *ADSS* 1, 497f.

[224] Cf. R. A. Graham, "La missione di W. d'Ormesson in Vaticano nel 1940. Intervista inedita," *CivCatt* 124, 4 (1973), 145–48, here 146f.

[225] *ADSS* 1, 500f. (England), 501f. (Italy).

[226] Cf. *ADSS* 4, 3.

[227] Ibid. 1, 98.

[228] Cf. ibid. 4, 58.

[229] Cf. Tardini's notes of 12, 13, 14 and 15 September with the instruction to Cicognani, 20 September 1941 (*ADSS* 5, 202–6, 208f., 215–18, 240f.).

[230] Cf. Taylor's memorandum of 22 September 1942 (*ADSS* 5, 694f.).

---

[231] *ADSS* 5, 694, n. 2.

[232] An attempt by Switzerland was spontaneously agreed to by the diplomats of the Lithuanian and Polish governments-in-exile, neutral Spain, Greece, and Brazil against the Axis warring powers, as well as of Hungary on the side of the Axis warring powers; cf. *ADSS* 7, 225–28, 234.

[233] *ADSS* 7, 258 (instruction to the Berne nuncio, 3 March 1943).

[234] Cf. the English aide-mémoire of 4 March 1943 (*ADSS* 7, 259–61) and the note of 20 April 1943 (ibid. 7, 306–9).

[235] Cf. *ADSS* 7, 277f. (Maglione, 27 March 1943), 281f. (Tardini, 1 March 1943), 378–80 (idem, 30 May 1943).

[236] Text in *ADAP* E III, 40–42.

[237] Note of 18 January 1942 in D. Albrecht II, 116–30. For the whole problem cf. D. Albrecht, "Die Politische Klausel des Reichskonkordats in den deutsch-vatikanischen Beziehungen 1936–1943." idem, ed., *Kirche,* 128–70.

[238] The often printed, comprehensive Vatican note on these proceedings, of 2 March 1943, now (with commentary) in D. Albrecht II, 135–49.

[239] *ADSS* 7, 378.

The Vatican could not translate this insight into direct foreign policy because it lacked the means for putting it into effect and the preserving of the principle of impartiality and noninterference in domestic political problems became ever more difficult. This also determined the attitude of the Holy See toward Italy. It was able to avoid becoming involved in the preparations for the fall of Mussolini, who on 12 May 1943[240] completely shut his eyes[241] to a very clear papal hint. A firsthand document, prepared as early as June, for the King of Italy was spared the Curia through a favorable turn of circumstances.[242] The Holy See participated only on the periphery in the negotiating of the Allied armistice with Italy.[243]

It is all the more astounding to "assess the extraordinary readiness of the Pope to incur risks" as J. Becker expresses it; in the winter of 1939–40 he was in intimate contact with the German military opposition, whose ideas he sent on to England, and functioned as connecting link.[244] In 1944 also he still had contacts with this part of the German opposition.[245] Perhaps toward the turn of the years 1943–44 the Pope's expectation was based on this, that perhaps "after not too long a time" the responsible statemen would listen to the peace proposal of his 1943 Christmas address, "which then, God willing, would grow into a peace mediation."[246] This did not happen, for the opposition was unable to topple Hitler. But "another Germany" was a presupposition that could not be waived[247] for a realization of the papal peace idea by means of concrete politics in the last years of the war, although the individual details for 1944–45 are still secret until the publication of the acts of this period.

PAPAL MEASURES OF ASSISTANCE

The cruelties of the Second World War, not restricted to the military conduct of the war, by far surpassed the horizon of ideas originating in 1914–18. The Pope understood this as a challenge, which must not be evaded. The question was not *whether* one should help, but *how* one could. In this regard, no role was played, as also under Benedict XV, by the religious, ethnic, or national background of those concerned, and the Vatican began, it goes without saying, from its experiences with the organization of measures of help of the First World War. However, there appeared entirely new forms and types of needs of gigantic proportions, in regard to which nothing could be achieved with the hitherto customary means. Time after time this forced an effort to achieve something in new and different ways. There was no lack of readiness to assist. But there survived an oppressive difference between being willing and being able as an historical experience from this epoch, in which aid for the politically and racially persecuted became necessary as a new problem for the Western world; for it there were no regulations of international law and no precedent by which to orient oneself.

---

[240] Ibid. 7, 330f.

[241] Ibid. 7, 334.

[242] Cf. ibid. 7, 37–39, and especially 431–35 (report of Borgongini Duca, 17 June 1943).

[243] Cf. *ADSS* 7, 56f.

[244] H. C. Deutsch, *Verschwörung gegen den Krieg. Der Widerstand in den Jahren 1939–1940.* (Munich 1969) (English: Minneapolis 1968).

[245] P. Hoffman, *Widerstand, Staatsstreich, Attentat. Der Kampf der Opposition gegen Hitler* (Munich 1969), 347.

[246] Cf. the expunged passage in the letter to Bertram, 6 January 1944, in B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 266, n. q.

[247] Also, most recently, A. Martini in *CC* 128, 2 (1977), 232ff.

The territorial war order of The Hague of 18 October 1907, supplemented in the Geneva Agreement on 29 July 1929, had fixed clear norms for the treatment of prisoners of war and had entrusted the implementation to the International Red Cross, but this did not exclude supplementary actions of other institutions. As in the First World War, from the start the Vatican would have gladly participated in the search for the missing and in the transmission of news about prisoners of war and civilian internees to their families. Under the responsibility of the later Pope Paul VI, who was then *Sostituto,* an "information bureau" was set up in Section II of the Secretariat of State in 1939; it was directed by Msgr. Alexander Evreinoff and was competent for measures of that sort.[248] However, its possibilities of action were limited; for Germany and Russia refused and thwarted all cooperation. And so the "information bureau" had to limit its activity to the prisoners of states allied with Germany, which observed the tradional rules of war—Italy, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania—and also, even though here not continuously accepted,[249] of the Western Allies and Japan. Corresponding to the course of the war, it developed its chief activity, whose happy impact on those affected can scarcely be overestimated, after 1943[250]

Furthermore, there was erected in November 1941, likewise under Montini's responsibility, an "Assistance Commission" (*Commissione per i Soccorsi*) within Section II of the Secretariat of State, whose secretary was Prelate Mario Brini.[251] It was competent for the properly charitable measures, and this forced it to ever new improvisation and work techniques. In other respects, the entire well-coordinated apparatus, which the Curia and especially the Secretariat of State displayed, was requisitioned for these measures of assistance, so far as they were appropriate in individual cases. A complete history of these undertakings has not yet been written. However, the documents published in recent years, for the period to the end of 1943, make it impressively clear that a very considerable part of the diplomatic activities of the Vatican in the Second World War, despite all the daily failures, was unflinchingly put at the selfless service of these charitable exertions. The Pope intentionally insisted as little as possible on it from without, because in most cases—in contrast, for example, to the present-day possibilities of effectiveness by Amnesty International—publicity impaired or even destroyed the chances of success. This affected especially those most in need of help—the Jews. If in the official sphere of activity of the Holy See for 1939 there was still mention of Vatican aid for "persons" who "were regarded as racially non-Aryan and hence were punished by laws of certain nations," this ceased for the succeeding years, after the German ambassador at the Vatican had called Berlin's attention to it in January 1940.[252] The more Hitler's murderous grip closed on the Jews, the more laconic became the particulars from the Secretariat of State. "The Holy See did, does, and will do all that is within its power" was the stereotyped information from the Secretariat of State.[253] This was not an alibi for indifference or inactivity but the indispensable presupposition for the efforts, renewed every day and perseveringly undertaken, to bring help whenever even only the slightest opportunities presented themselves. The number of cases is legion. Here only some outlines can be indicated.

---

[248] Report of activity: *La Chiesa e la guerra. Documentazione dell'Opera dell'Ufficio Informazioni del Vaticano* (Vatican City 1944).

[249] Cf., for the difficulties with England, *ADSS* 8, 12–14.

[250] The "information bureau" published a monthly bulletin, *Ecclesia.* Statistics for June 1941 to the end of April 1943 in *ADSS* 9, 603f. The acts of the "information bureau" are not generally included in the *ADSS;* cf. *ADSS* 6, 9.

The attempts to help the politically and racially persecuted in Germany and Italy went back to the days of Pius XI.[254] They were continued under the new Pope. Once there was a question of not quite one thousand individual cases.[255] In addition, help for those wishing to emigrate required great pains, in which the German *Sankt Raphaelsverein* in Hamburg played a substantial role until its forcible dissolution on

---

[251] *ADSS* 6, 9.

[252] Cf. ibid. 6, 10.

[253] Cf. ibid. 9, 39.

[254] Cf. Pacelli's circular of 30 November 1938 and his telegram to Cardinal Hinsley of London and the letter of Pius XI to five American archbishops of 10 January 1939 (*ADSS* 6, 49f., 539, n. 3, 50f.).

[255] *ADSS* 6, 23.

26 June 1941.[256] Not least of all, there was a question of the effort to impede the "racial" legislation of states in the German sphere of influence or, if that was not possible, to effect modifications in the practical enforcement. In Germany, of course, influence was without prospects,[257] but not in Italy. The presence of the Holy See contributed to the fact that the Italian Jewish policy throughout the war was in very favorable contrast to the German: up to his downfall, Mussolini did not release any Jews for deportation to the extermination camps of the S.S., and the Social Republic of Salò, to the extent that it could function, preserved this orientation in principle.[258] In Rumania, supported by the stipulations of the concordat, relatively much was accomplished;[259] Hungary, despite racial legislation, treated the Jews the least inhumanely;[260] in Slovakia the Vatican chargé d' affaires had at first to limit himself to observing.[261] The curial policy had especially in view the situation of baptized Jews or of Jews married to Catholics, since they were the farthest excluded from the aid given by the organizations of believing Jews.

After the outbreak of war the worst fate first affected the Poles, not only in the German-occupied area: in the Russian-occupied part the situation was scarcely less horrible. However, this area was almost hermetically sealed off from the rest of the world. News hardly got through, and Vatican help was completely impossible. The Curia did not succeed in learning anything substantial of the fate of those deported from there—one reckons with about 2 million—not even with the aid of the diplomatic representatives of other powers in Moscow.[262]

In spite of ceaseless difficulties, the intelligence connections with the German-occupied part of Poland were better. In the winter of 1939–40 the Curia hoped to be able to help with food and clothing; but at the end of 1940 the Secretariat of State had to admit that the German authorities had intentionally and successfully boycotted the papal initiatives.[263] Matters were otherwise in relation to the Polish refugees in other countries. In Hungary, Rumania, France, and Italy the Vatican, with the financial aid of American Catholics, could at first do something, but in Germany, on the contrary, it could do little.[264] Even in Spain, basically amenable to Vatican requests, it required very much effort and patience to assist the Polish refugees.[265]

---

[256] Also cf. L. F. Reutter, *Die Kirche als Fluchthelfer im Dritten Reich* (Recklinghausen 1971).

[257] On the visit of the German foreign minister in 1940, the most recent is M. Clauss, "Der Besuch Ribbentrops im Vatikan," *ZKG* 87 (1976), 54–64.

[258] Cf. *ADSS* 6, 22; 9, 36, as well as R. de Felice, *Storia degli ebrei*, 447–50, 463–67.

[259] Cf. *ADSS* 9, 27–32; A. Martini, "La S. Sede e gli ebrei della Romania durante la seconda guerra mondiale," *CC* 112, 3 (1961), 449–63.

[260] Cf. *ADSS* 6, 24; R. A. Graham, "Pio XII e gli ebrei di Ungheria nel 1944," idem, *Il Vaticano*, 241–48 (first in English in *Historical Records and Studies* 50 [1965], 5–26).

[261] Cf. *ADSS* 6, 24; 8, 45–47; 9, 22–27; F. Cavalli, "La S. Sede contro le deportazioni degli ebrei dalla Slovacchia durante la seconda guerra mondiale," *CC* 112, 3 (1961), 1–18.

[262] *ADSS* 6, 28f.; 8, 53–55; 9, 48–50.

The year 1941, in which the war essentially altered its countenance, also signified a caesura for the assistance measures of the Holy See. The restricted possibilities of emigration from Europe almost entirely ceased.[266] Vatican exertions for aid from overseas for the hungry civilian populations of Belgium and Greece were wrecked on the English blockade.[267] "Deportation" of Jews now became a new catchword of papal anxieties. To prevent it or at least to limit and restrict its volume became a chief item of papal assistance efforts, even where there was still no information on the mass-produced organized murders in the extermination camps.

In the present state of knowledge what was thereby accomplished cannot be put in precise figures, and in consideration of the situation of the sources will perhaps never be possible. One may proceed, in regard to a total number of victims, to a high of about 5 million.[268] In addition, some nine hundred fifty thousand are said to have survived.[269] The individual numbers from which this total sum is arrived at may be open to criticism, but hardly the order of magnitude. If it is estimated that, of the nine hundred fifty thousand saved, some 70 to 90 percent owed their life[270] to measures taken by the Catholic Church, as the specific numbers are also subject to discussion in this case, on the whole, however, this result must be striking. In view of the number of murdered, the number of the saved is depressingly small. But behind it stands a desire of the Catholic Church under Pius XII to stand up for every individual human life, which cannot be minimized.

---

[263] Ibid 6, 492–96, as well as the survey, ibid, 25–28. For the further Polish policy of the Vatican, basic is *ADSS* 3, I. II, with detailed introduction; cf. also R. A. Graham, *Il Vaticano,* 207–20.

[264] *ADSS* 6, 29–31.

[265] Cf. ibid. 8, 64–67.

[266] Ibid. 8, 16ff.

[267] Ibid. 8, 58–64; A. Martini, "La fama in Grecia nel 1941 nella testimonianza dei documenti inediti vaticani," *CivCatt* 118, 1 (1967), 213–27.

[268] G. Reitlinger, *Die Endlösung. Hitlers Versuch der Ausrottung der Juden Europas 1939–1945* (Berlin 1956), 573; English edition 1953; cf. I. Arndt and W. Scheffler, "Organisierter Massenmord in nationalsozialistischen Vernichtungslagern," *VZG* 24 (1976), 112–35. They start with a figure of more than 3 million who were killed by being gassed.

[269] P. E. Lapide, *Rom und die Juden* (Freiburg 1967), 185, estimates "at least a million."

[270] Thus ibid., 188; cf. 359, n. 189. J. Chevalier, 133f., accepts these figures.

In individual cases the measures differed from country to country and also changed in the course of time. On the whole it can be said that the success of the papal rescue exertions was the greater the more the political influence of the Holy See continued on the government of the territory concerned; in other words: the less direct the possibilities of Hitler's grasp were, so much the more could the Pope accomplish. In Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Croatia,[271] and especially in Italy relatively much succeeded. In Rome, which was characterized as typical of the alleged indolence of Pacelli in regard to the annihilation of the Jews,[272] the quick cessation of the celebrated police raid of 16 October 1943 demonstrably goes back to a personal initiative of the Pope.[273]

In summary, today it may be held that the papal measures of assistance of the Second World War, accomplished under entirely different difficulties, need not at all fear comparison with the time of Benedict XV.

THE POPE'S "SILENCE"

In the debate of the 1960s over the Pope's conduct in the Second World War there was a question of his alleged silence at the extermination of millions of Jews. In this connection the expression "silence" was supposed to suggest a reprehensible omission of possible and/or necessary actions, while the opposite—"to speak," "to say," "to protest"—referred to morally mandated sympathy, signified willingness to help, or even stood symbolically for "help." This terminology is not suited to characterize the real problem to which the Hochhuth Debate,[274] in which the picture of Pius XII was distorted into caricature, can point: It is the question in what manner a Pope is bound, by virtue of his office, to bear witness against the violation of elementary human rights, such as the genocide of the Second World War. This question was itself posed at that time;[275] he was confronted with it by others as well;[276] and even in war he knew it had to be settled "with painful difficulty."[277] The decisions of the Pope were taken neither blindly nor easily, but were pondered responsibly. For him the alternatives were not simply "to speak or keep silent." The question amounted to much more: how clear *must* be the word which was offered by virtue of office, how concrete *may* it be if the consequences are taken into account.

---

[271] *ADSS* 9, 32–34.

[272] Thus Hochhuth (because of the Pope's avarice) and S. Friedlaender (because of the Pope's anti-Communism).

[273] *ADSS* 9, 509f. and 510, n. 2: Hudal's letter of noon, 16 October 1943 to General Stahel, who brought about the halting of the raid, was suggested by Carlo Pacelli on orders of the Pope. On the matter the most recent is O. Chadwick, "Weizsäcker, the Vatican and the Jews of Rome," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 28 (1977), 179–99; cf. also R. A. Graham, "La strana condotta di E. von Weizsäcker, ambasciatore del Reich in Vaticano," *CivCatt* 121, 2 (1970), 455–74; repeated in idem, *Il Vaticano,* 49–73.

[274] Cf. above, n. 169.

It was a curial tradition to speak, not of the erring, but of the errors, not of people, but of the mistakes of people.[278] Pacelli's theological conception was in accord with this tradition. It amounted to this, that the Pope had to formulate the general and the fundamental, while it pertained to the bishops to translate the principle into the concrete, on the spot, with regard for all circumstances. This suggested to the Pope to condemn the false ideological directions and the violations of rights without "directly naming their proponents or perpetrators," according to J. Becker. This was the line which Pius XII followed in his many public utterances—every expression about peace was linked with these themes.

How strong his anxiety was about whether in view of the unleashed terror he was satisfying the duties of office by this behavior can be known from that fact that he several times clearly considered proceeding beyond the general condemnations. I must utter real "words of fire" on "the frightful things which are occurring in Poland," he hurled at the Italian ambassador on 13 May 1940. Only the knowledge that the fate of the unhappy Poles would then become still worse held him back from doing so.[279] The intention of preventing worse was "one of the reasons why We impose restrictions on Ourselves in Our utterances," he wrote to the bishop of Berlin on 30 April 1943.[280] The Pope and his collaborators were, on the basis of their experiences with National Socialism, firmly convinced that a flaming papal protest would not put a stop to the murders but would increase their tempo and magnitude and at the same time destroy the remaining possibilities of diplomatic action in favor of the Jews in states such as Hungary and Rumania.

In this regard, the Secretariat of State was informed relatively early of the manner in which the murder of the Jews was organized and, in contrast to many others,[281] trusted these reports. Communications from Jewish sources that the deportation meant for many of those affected a sure death sentence were obtained from Pressburg and Budapest[282] in the spring of 1942. In December the Polish ambassador-in-exile at the Vatican correctly concluded from the fact that the aged, sick, women, and children were deported that the aim of deportation was not "workers' camps"—whatever persons might mean by that—but places erected especially for the "killing of persons in various ways."[283] On 7 March 1943 the Vatican *chargé d'affaires* at Pressburg finally sent the report of a parish priest, who had credibly learned that deported Jews were killed by gassing; the corpses were used for making soap.[284] Perhaps this report was already on hand when the Secretariat of State on 3 April 1943 laconically telegraphed to the apostolic delegate in Washington: "The Holy See continues its exertions for the Jews," after the delegate had been asked by three rabbis to induce the Pope to a "public appeal" which might put a halt to the systematic extermination of the Jews.[285] Privately the Secretariat of State thought of this: "A public appeal would be inappropriate"; Germany had to be prevented from taking it as an occasion "to carry out even more rigorously the anti-Jewish measures in the areas occupied by it and exercise new, stronger pressures" on the Jewish policy of the satellite nations.[286] On 5 May 1943 an entry in the documents of the Secretariat of State spoke of the "frightful situation" of the Jews in Poland and mentioned "gas chambers."[287]

---

[275] *ADSS* 1, 454f.

[276] Ibid. 3, II, 633–36 (Radonski to Maglione, London, 14 September 1942). Von Preysing's inquiry of 6 March 1943 (B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 239, n. 1) moved in the same direction.

[277] Pius XII to Archbishop Frings, 3 March 1944 (B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 280).

[278] P. Duclos, 21, n. 5.

[279] *ADSS* 1, 455.

[280] B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 240.

Against this background must be understood the sharp and impressively composed Christmas address of 1942, which proclaimed a catalogue of the inalienable basic rights of every person and thought explicitly of the "hundred thousands of persons," who, "with no guilt of their own, partly only because of their nationality or race (*stirpe*)," were delivered up "to quick or slow death" ("destinate alla morte o ad un progressivo deperimento")[288] Privately the Pope thus characterized the purpose and reaction of this word on the extermination of the Jews: "It was brief but it was well understood."[289] In the address of 2 June 1943 he repeated his condemnation with a quite similar formulation.[290]

---

[281] Cf. L. de Jong, "Die Niederlande und Auschwitz," *VZG* 17 (1969), 1–16, with striking examples to prove that the extermination camps first became a psychological reality when they no longer existed.

[282] *ADSS* 8, 453 (Burzio report, Pressburg, 9 March 1942); 470 (Rotta report, Budapest, 20 March 1942).

[283] *ADSS* 8, 755 (19 December 1942).

[284] Ibid. 9, 177f., n. 6.

[285] Ibid. 9, 206f., 207. n. 3.

[286] Ibid. 9, 217.

[287] Ibid. 9, 274.

[288] *AAS* 35 (1943), 23; *UG* I, 118.

Hence the Pope also "spoke," but the "speaking" was not his chief or exclusive means in the struggle against Hitler's Jewish policy. After clear condemnation he followed the ethical demand of conscience, but predominant for him was the ethically responsible aspect that he must avoid choosing a form of provocation which would not bring a halt to *the* evil but would increase the evils: The extermination of the Jews could not be undone by a public appeal, but perhaps drastic retaliation against Jews, Catholics, and the Church lay in the logic of the Nazi system of government. Conversely, the papal policy preserved for the Holy See the opportunity to save the Jews in the future. As proof that this opportunity was effectively used, "the warmest recognition of his saving work" was at the time "expressed by the Jewish chief centers"[291] to the Pope.

---

[289] B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 242 (to von Preysing, 30 April 1943).

[290] *AAS* 35 (1943), 165–71, here 167; *UG* II, 1909–17, here 1912f.; *ADSS* 7 does not contain the draft of this part of the address.

[291] Pius XII to von Preysing, 30 April 1943 (B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe,* 242). *ADSS* 9, 59–61, provides a list of the expressions of gratitude, then either in the Vatican or otherwise known, from the Jewish side.

CHAPTER 4

*The Second Vatican Council**

John XXIII: Summoning and Preparation for the Council

The convoking of the Second Vatican Council was the action of Pope John XXIII. His election, after a brief conclave (25–28 October 1958), seemed at first the solution of a transition or at least of a perplexity. But it soon became evident that it was a decisive turning point in the history of the Church.

Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli was born in Sotto il Monte (Province of Bergamo) on 25 November 1881, the fourth of fourteen children of the farmer Battista (d. 1935) and his wife Marianna Mazzola (d. 1939), and was baptized the same day by the parish priest Rebuzzini; his godfather was his devout great-uncle Zaverio.[1] After attending the minor and the major seminaries at Bergamo from 1892 to 1900, he continued his theological studies at the Roman Seminary of Sant'Apollinare from 1901 to 1905, interrupted by one year of military service at Bergamo, "un vero purgatorio," as he wrote to the rector of the seminary, V. Bugarini. From his professor of church history, Benigni, he received the advice, "Read little but well"; of his superiors, the vice-rector Spolverini was closest to him. His Roman studies were crowned by the doctorate in theology on 13 July 1904 and ordination to the priesthood on 10 August 1904. After the completing of his studies, he participated in the fall of 1905 in a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Then Giacomo Maria Radini Tedeschi, appointed bishop of Bergamo, took him along as secretary to his home diocese of Bergamo, where from October 1906 he also lectured on church history in the seminary and later on patrology and apologetics and edited the ecclesiastical journal, *La vita diocesana.* At that time he began the editing of the visitation documents of Saint Charles Borromeo in the diocese of Bergamo, the last volume of which could, however, not appear until 1957. In a memorial lecture on the occasion of the three-hundredth anniversary of the death of Cardinal Cesare Baronio he extolled the compiler of the *Annals* of ecclesiastical history as the renewer of historical studies.

---

* Hubert Jedin

After the death in 1914 of Radini Tedeschi, who as no other had formed his first priestly years, he wrote his biography. During the war (1915–18) he served as a military chaplain; it was probably the experiences then gained which induced the bishop to entrust to him, as chaplain of the seminary, the spiritual direction of the theologians returning from the field (1918–20). Then he went back to Rome for four years as president of the Italian work of the Propagation of the Faith. On 3 March 1925 he became apostolic visitor in Bulgaria and on 19 March was ordained as titular archbishop of Areopolis in San Carlo al Corso; as his motto he selected "Obedientia et Pax," Baronius's motto.

The position of the visitor at Sofia was in several respects not easy: the Queen was a daughter of the King of Italy, and hence a Catholic; the King was Greek Orthodox; the authority of the visitor over the approximately fifty thousand Catholics was not sharply defined. He saw himself reduced to an eremitical life, which did not gratify his need for activity, and he complained of "acute, intime sofferenze." After ten difficult years he was, on 24 November 1934, named apostolic delegate in Turkey and Greece and at the same time administrator of the vicariate apostolic of Istanbul; he thereby obtained greater pastoral duties. This activity satisfied him: "I feel young in body and mind," he wrote in 1939 in his spiritual diary. The delegate paid a visit to the ecumenical patriarch on 27 May 1939, spent a rather long time at Athens, especially after Greece was afflicted by war, and visited Syria and Palestine.

---

[1] For the life and character of Pope John XXIII the following especially were consulted: the notes edited by his secretary, Loris Capovilla, during the retreats and days of recollection in the *Giornale dell'Anima,* the fragment of an autobiography begun in 1959 (419–28), and the attached chronology (pp. XXXI–XLIV). A *curriculum vitae: AAS* 50 (1958), 902. On the Pope's choice of a name, Schwaiger in *AKR* 132 (1963), 7: the number XXIII presupposes that the Popes of the Pisan Obedience, Alexander V and John XXIII, were considered illegitimate, although the later Alexanders—Alexander VI to VIII—took the first named into account in their enumerations.

When, after the retreat of the German troops from France and the victory of the Allies, General de Gaulle demanded the removal of thirty-three bishops who had been adherents of the Vichy regime, Roncalli was made nuncio to France on 22 December 1944. He achieved a compromise. After the concluding of the armistice he instituted at Chartres theological courses for German theological students who were prisoners of war. Made cardinal on 12 January 1953 and three days later named patriarch of Venice, he felt fortunate to be able to live completely his episcopal-pastoral duties. The small area of the diocese permitted him frequent journeys, including visits to the Marian pilgrimage sites of Lourdes, Einsiedeln, Mariazell, Fátima, and Czestochowa.

The new Pope's personality was stamped by his ancestral home and his spiritual instructors, Rebuzzini, Spolverini, and Radini Tedeschi; his spirituality was thoroughly traditionally Catholic. His spiritual diary indicates that he frequently read *The Imitation of Christ* and regularly made the Ignatian exercises. The rosary was a fixed ingredient of his strictly regulated order of the day: praying of the breviary, Mass, a half-hour's meditation, weekly confession. His spiritual models were Francis de Sales and Philip Neri and, as a pastor, Charles Borromeo: as regards the otherwise highly venerated Baronius, it struck him that he never laughed. The craftiness of the peasant was in him united to the humor of the peasant; of no Pope since Benedict XIV have so many anecdotes been handed down. The young professor of church history unambiguously held himself aloof from Modernism, but he still did not thereby escape the suspicion expressed concerning him in the Benigni Circle and remained convinced that positive theology must be more intensively pursued than was then usual in Italy. Different from that of Pius X, whom he revered in his lifetime as a model pastor, his outlook for the task of the mission and for union was broadened by activity in the work of the propagation of the faith and the two decades in the Middle East. The other task of the Church, to work for a "better world," was for him not an item of a program but a foregone conclusion resulting from his simple origin; the admonition of Father Lombardi to the bishops of the region of Venetia in the retreat of 1955, to be concerned for the social question, would hardly have been needed by him personally, "I am one of you," he exclaimed to the faithful of a Roman suburban community; to his brothers and sisters he gave the advice, "You do well in living even more frugally," and he himself wanted "to be born poor and to die poor." Throughout his life bound to his Bergamo homeland, as nuncio he obtained the family's original fifteenth-century house as a place of holiday and rest; he firmly repelled any advancement in status of his brothers, sisters, and nephews, who lived in modest circumstances.

Although in his youth Pope John had lived at Rome a rather long time and had then been active in the service of the Curia for almost three decades, he was no "curialist." He never regarded himself as a curial official, and constantly desired to be only a "good shepherd"; it was no accident that in the first year of his pontificate, on 1 August 1959, he devoted an encyclical to the Curé d'Ars, to him the "imago sacerdotis." Before his departure for the conclave, he had exclaimed to the seminarians of his diocese: "The Church is young, it remains, as constantly in its history, amenable to change." The statement is that of a program. As a church historian, familiar with the historical change of the Church in a constantly changing world, Pope John was convinced that the Church must adapt its preaching, organization, and pastoral methods to the fundamentally changed world, and for this he coined the much disputed notion of *aggiornamento.*[2] In an effort to realize it, he convoked the Council.

In the presence of the cardinals gathered for the stational Mass in San Paolo fuori le mura on 25 January 1959 he announced a Roman diocesan synod and an ecumenical council. This announcement was certainly prepared for by his development, but in no sense was its result. Both in private conversations and in the opening address of the Roman diocesan synod on 24 January 1960 he understood it as the challenge of God, *divinum incitamentum,* but in no way was it the implementation of a long prepared plan. There is no evidence that he resumed the project of a general council pondered by Pius XII.[3] The Pope, who had nothing more in mind than to carry out the will of God, recognized the *kairos* and followed the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

---

[2] In defining the content of *aggiornamento* one must begin with the literal meaning of *aggiornare,* which the widespread *Dizionario della lingua italiana* of Zingarelli (p. 33) gives as *mettere al corrente libri, registri.* However, there can be no doubt that in the mouth of John XXIII not only an adaptation to the age but also an inner renewal was meant, as Urs von Balthasar, Ratzinger, et al. have rightly noted.

[3] G. Caprile, "Pio XII e un nuovo progetto di concilio ecumenico," *CivCatt* 117, 2 (1966), 209–27.

The announcement of an ecumenical council operated as a blare of trumpets, within and almost even more powerfully outside the Church. It was forgotten that, in Catholic usage and also in canon law, "Concilium oecumenicum" was the designation of the general councils embracing the whole Church; the Pope intended to convoke a general council of the Catholic Church, but from the start, and at the beginning more decidedly than in later stages, there moved before his view a participation, somehow constituted, of the Christians separated from Rome as a first step toward Church unity; he could hardly have been thinking of a great union-council of representatives of all Christian Churches and ecclesial communities. *Osservatore Romano,* reporting the talk at San Paolo, spoke of the Pope's aim "to invite the separated communities to the quest of unity." That there was no thought of a formal invitation to the separated Churches to full participation first appeared definitively from a press conference held by Cardinal Secretary of State Tardini on 30 October 1959; in it there came forth for the first time the plan of inviting the separated Churches to send official observers.

Meanwhile, the Pope had set for the future council its task of renewal within the Church. In the first session of the Antepreparatory Commission (*Commissio antepraeparatoria*), established on 17 May 1959, he declared on 30 June 1959 that the Church strives, "loyal to the holy principles on which it is built and the unchangeable doctrine which the Divine Founder entrusted to it . . . with courageous energy to strengthen again its life and its unity, even with regard to all circumstances and demands of the day," hence both inner renewal and entry into the problems of the age. At the same time he announced in the encyclical *Ad Petri cathedram* the revision of canon law; the goal of his pontificate was the proclaiming of the truth, peace among peoples, and the unity of the Church in doctrine, government, and worship.

The preparation of the council began when the bishops—all together 2,594—and 156 superiors of religious institutes and also the Catholic universities and faculties were called upon by Secretary of State Tardini on 18 June 1959 to submit suggestions for the program of consultation. The 2,812 *postulate* thereupon sent in were sifted by the Antepreparatory Commission and turned over to the competent curial offices, which for their part composed the suggestions and admonitions (*Proposita* and *Monita*). After the sifting of the material was completed, the motu proprio *Superno Dei nutu* of 5 June 1960 introduced the proximate preparation.

The motu proprio determined for the first time the name of the future council: The Second Vatican Council. Then ten "preparatory commissions" (*Commissiones praeparatoriae*) were formed to work out the draft of decrees to be laid before the council. Nine of these were modeled, in accord with their defined purpose, but also in organization, on existing central offices of the Roman Curia: the Theological Commission was competent for all questions of the teaching office, which pertained to the competence of the Holy Office; the Commission for the Bishops and the Government of Dioceses corresponded to the Consistorial Congregation; the Commission for the Discipline of the Clergy and the Christian People, to the Congregation of the Council. The Commissions for the Discipline of the Sacraments, (ecclesiastical) Studies and Seminaries, the Sacred Liturgy, the Eastern Churches, and the Missions received essentially the same tasks as the corresponding central offices, whose heads were at the same time the chairmen of the related commissions. Only the Commission for the Apostolate of the Laity was not modeled on any congregation, because none such existed.

If these preparatory commissions are compared with the five of the First Vatican Council, important differences appear: through their chairmen and their composition they were more closely bound than the earlier ones with the central offices in which the tradition of the Curia is incarnate; they were not composed, like the earlier ones, almost exclusively of theologians and canonists, that is, *periti* who had no right to vote in the council, but included up to about one-half bishops and religious superiors, hence future council fathers with a right to vote. The first measure subjected the preparatory commissions to the strong influence of the curial official mechanism, the second enhanced its power in so far as the participation of the future council fathers made these latter familiar with the themes presumably to be discussed at the council and seemed from the start to recommend them to the *periti* for the conciliar commissions to be set up later. On an equality with the ten commissions in respect to the preparation of the schemata, as an agency of contact with the churches not united with Rome, but going beyond their competence, was the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity under the direction of Augustin Bea, S. J., Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, named a cardinal on 14 December 1959.

The examining and coordinating of the drafts prepared in this manner was incumbent on the Central Commission, set up on 16 June 1960, to which belonged, in addition to the presidents of the commissions, the chairmen of national and regional episcopal conferences; their number rose finally to 102 members and 29 consultants; the future secretary-general of the council, Pericle Felici, acted as secretary. Since the commissions were continually expanded by the naming of new members, their total number increased at the end of 1961 to 827, two-thirds of them Europeans.

The work of the preparatory commissions in the almost two years from the fall of 1960 to the summer of 1962 suffered from the fact that no directives had been given them for the constituting of centers of gravity. It was undoubtedly an advantage that they were free in the choice and elaboration of the themes, but on the other hand it worked in favor of the strong influence of the Curia, of the Roman universities, and of the central authorities of religious institutes in the tendency that the sixty-nine schemata submitted by them to the Central Commission were rather a summary of papal statements during the last decades or, respectively, an inventory of the theology and practice prevailing in Rome rather than the hoped for advance into new areas. The Central Commission first met on 12 June 1961; this session was followed by six more. In addition to the schemata submitted to it, it also drew up the rules of procedure.

If it was possible to hear during the period of preparation that the Second Vatican Council would be the best prepared council in the history of the Church, it soon became evident that the material collected in overwhelming mass was chosen unilaterally and did not satisfy the council. Of the seventeen schemata which had been worked out by the Commission for the Discipline of the Clergy and the Christian People under Cardinal Ciriaci, not a single one was approved in this form by the council; of the six texts of the Theological Commission under Cardinal Ottaviani, after complete revision only two; of the nine of the Commission for the Discipline of the Sacraments, not even one obtained the acceptance of the council. Only the Commissions for the Sacred Liturgy, Religious, and the Apostolate of the Laity submitted each only one document, which constituted the point of departure of the corresponding conciliar decrees. Out of the five texts prepared by the Commission for Studies and Seminaries there originated through concentration and revision two conciliar decrees on the formation of priests and Christian education; the four schemata worked out by Bea's secretariat went, after amalgamation with related material of the Theological Commission and the Commission for the Eastern Churches, into the Decree on Ecumenism, and the declarations on religious freedom and non-Christian religions. Nevertheless, the work of the preparatory commissions was not in vain: it furnished a voluminous collection of material, few new viewpoints. Only at the council did these break through.

The preparatory work was kept strictly secret, so that only a small part of it leaked to the public. Thus it could hardly fail to happen that during the long waiting period a certain disappointment began to spread, especially since the Roman Diocesan Synod, which the Pope himself had opened on 24 January 1960, moved in the traditional routes and gave little notice of the desire for bold reforms and large-scale ecumenism, which appeared in numerous books and articles of theologians and lay persons. The expectations had been strained too tightly, it had not been made sufficiently clear that councils had never been revolutionary, but instead the necessary new elements had to be consciously linked with the proven old elements. But even during the years of preparation unmistakable were the voices from the episcopate that "all problems posed by the development of the world" must concern the council, according to the message of the French cardinals and archbishops of 26 October 1961, that the Church must be universal in the true meaning of the word, as Cardinal Frings said at Genoa on 19 November 1961, that a decentralization called for by Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht and a deeper and broader ecumenical understanding, urged by Archbishop Jaeger of Paderborn, were necessary. In February 1962 Cardinal Montini of Milan demanded a discussion of the nature and function of the episcopate in unison with the Roman Pope; a deepened self-awareness, he said, would enable the Church to adapt itself to the needs of the age. But he warned against seeing in a council a healing means of miraculous and immediate effect.

Earlier than anticipated, on 25 December 1961, the council was summoned to Rome for the next year by the constitution *Humane salutis,* but still without indication of the opening date; the motu proprio *Concilium diu* of 2 February 1962 appointed 11 October of the same year as the opening day. In these documents the tasks of the council were again sketched only in very general outlines. The promulgation, surrounded with unusual solemnity, of the constitution *Veterum sapientia* on 22 February 1962, whereby Latin was imposed as the language of ecclesiastical speech and theological instruction, was in opposition to the wishes prevalent in the Preparatory Commission for Studies and Seminaries and strengthened the impression that everything would continue as before. The paving of the way for church unity was not expressly mentioned, but a step was taken in this direction when the churches and ecclesial communities not united with Rome were invited through the Secretariat for the Promotion of the Unity of Christians to send official observers to the council. The invitation met a better reception among Protestants than among the Eastern Churches. The Anglican Church, whose head, Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury, had paid a visit to the Pope on 2 December 1960, sent three representatives; the Evangelical Church of Germany sent the Heidelberg professor

Schlink; the Lutheran Reformed World Union and the Ecumenical Assembly in Geneva acceded to the invitation; on the other hand, the Orthodox patriarchs of the East reacted with hesitation. The patriarchate of Moscow agitated powerfully against the "sirens" from the Vatican. All the greater was the surprise when, on the eve of the opening of the council, it became known that two representatives of Patriarch Alexius were en route to Rome. This about-face was due to a visit to Moscow of the closest collaborator of Cardinal Bea in the Secretariat for the Promotion of the Unity of Christians, his eventual successor, Johannes Willebrands. The other dissident patriarchates later followed the Russian example.

By means of the motu proprio *Appropinquante concilio* of 6 August 1962 the Pope gave the council its agenda, the *Ordo Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II celebrandi.*[4] It had been worked out by a subcommission of the Preparatory Central Commission under the presidency of Cardinal Roberti and his secretary, Vincenzo Carbone, and in seventy articles defined, first, the rights and duties of those participating in the council and, second, the general, and, third, the special norms for the order of business.

As at Trent and the First Vatican Council and in conformity with Canon 223, paragraph 1, of the Code of Canon Law, the right of deciding on proposals pertained only to the plenary session of the council fathers qualified to vote in the general congregations and sessions. The direction of the discussions was entrusted to the presidency, *consilium praesidentiae,* of ten cardinals appointed by the Pope. It devolved on the ten permanent conciliar commissions to draw up the drafts of decrees (schemata) to be submitted to the council and to modify them, having regard for the motions offered by the council fathers; of its twenty-four members, two-thirds were to be elected by the council, one-third and the chairman were named by the Pope. To the full members entitled to vote were added *periti,* summoned by the Pope, without the right to vote; among them were laymen; at the beginning of the fourth session they numbered 106. An entirely new category was constituted by the observers (*observatores*) sent by the churches and ecclesial communities not in communion with the Holy See; all texts were delivered to them and, like the *periti,* they were entitled to participate in the general congregations. Not yet envisaged in the agenda were the "hearers" (*auditores*), who were permitted in the *aula* of the council from the second session, and who from the third session also included women. At the head of the official machinery of the council stood the secretary-general named by the Pope; to him were allotted several Undersecretaries.

---

[4] Text in *AAS* 54 (1962), 609–31; cf. H. Jedin, "Die Geschäftsordnung des Konzils," *Herder TK* III, 610–23; critical notes by Mörsdorf, ibid. II 144f.

The routine was as follows: The drafts submitted by the presidency were explained by one or more commentators; the general debate on the schema as a whole was followed by special debate on its individual parts. For the adoption of a text a two-thirds majority was required. Out of regard for the number of council fathers, oral intervention in the general congregations was made dependent on previous written notice and its length was restricted to ten, finally eight, minutes; the council fathers had the right to present written suggestions for changes, which were to be submitted to the commissions. The process was continued until a two-thirds majority was achieved, and the promulgating of the text could take place in the solemn session.

In the course of the very first session of the council it appeared that the *Ordo* in its existing form was inadequate to achieve concrete results in a reasonable period of time. And so it was revised on 13 September 1963, with regard for various modifying motions made by, among others, Cardinals Döpfner and Spellman: The direction of the general congregations was turned over to four moderators, again named by the Pope, and, together with the presidency, now expanded to twelve members, they constituted the Presidential Council. For the rejecting of a proposed schema now a simple majority of those present sufficed; fifty fathers could submit a new draft to the moderator, who could bring about the close of the debate by a simple majority decision; the minority in the case was protected by this, that it might have its viewpoint set forth by three speakers. The same end was served by changes in the composition and procedure of the conciliar commissions. By the side of the chairmen were two vice-presidents, who were to be named with the consent of the commission; they together determined the commentator (*relator*) or commentators.

A second modification of the *Ordo,* of 2 July 1964, went into effect during the third session. Speakers who acted in the name of at least seventy council fathers received certain privileges; the distributing of propaganda material in the *aula* and nearby required the approval of the Presidential Council.

Even in this altered form, the *Ordo* could not eliminate all defects and confusion from the routine. The relationship of the Pope to the council, severely burdened by history, led to tensions also at the Second Vatican Council. As head of the council, the Pope had the right to intervene in the procedure, and both Popes of this council made use of this right when unexpected difficulties arose. He could approve the decrees and promulgate them, but he could also refuse his assent. It was not foreseen in the *Ordo* in what form he, as a member of the council, which he was, could make known his view to the council in the course of the deliberations. Also unclarified was the question of whether a vote was necessary at the end of the general debate. Rightly was the question posed whether it was significant to permit only *placet* and *non placet* in the voting on the individual parts of a text, but *placet iuxta modum,* that is, consent with reservation, in the voting on the chapters as a whole; the opposite would have been preferable.

As regards the form of the conciliar decrees, in conformity with Pope John's wish but different from all earlier councils, the council refrained from condemning errors by means of canons with a subjoined *anathema*. The texts approved by it bear three different signs in which their authority is graduated: at the head are four constitutions—on the liturgy, the Church, divine revelation, and the Church in today's world; then follow nine decrees and three declarations. Two other forms, considered for a time, *propositiones* and *vota,* were finally not used. The council also abandoned the pastoral instructions that it had also pondered for a while.

An actual change of the procedure was under way toward the end of the council in this regard, that the real work of the council was transferred more and more to the commissions, and the general congregations were more and more filled with voting, which could be carried out far more quickly with the aid of a punch-card system than at the First Vatican Council. Still other technical contrivances contributed to overcoming the problem of sheer numbers. An especially well operating loudspeaker system assured the understanding of the spoken word in the gigantic *aula*. The otherwise inevitable losses of time, which at the last council arose from the coming and going of individual speakers, were avoided by the fact that in each section of the *aula* microphones were installed, before which they spoke. The prescribed language of the council, Latin, on the whole stood the test; an already installed device for simultaneous translation into the languages of the world was not put to use, because it proved to be impossible then to assure the necessary precision of expression.

The First Session and the Change of Pontificate

The opening session on 11 October 1962 by far surpassed in grandeur that of the First Vatican Council. Two thousand five hundred forty council fathers with the right to vote took part in it, a number not even remotely reached at any previous council. The Pope was borne through the bronze door to the entrance of Saint Peter's on the *sedia gestatoria,* but then he left it and walked through the ranks of the council fathers; the fact that on this occasion he wore, not the tiara, but the miter, had symbolic value. The rite was basically that usual since the Council of Vienne: *Veni Creator* and Mass of the Holy Spirit, celebrated by Cardinal Tisserant; enthroning of the gospel on the council altar erected in front of the presidents' table; making of the profession of faith; the conciliar prayer, *Adsumus;* singing of the gospel (Matt. 28:18–20 and 16:13–18) in Latin, Greek, Old Church Slavonic, and Arabic.

In his opening talk the Pope repeated the conviction that the summoning of the council followed an inspiration from above and indicated to the council its direction: to bring to mankind the sacred wealth of tradition in the most effective way, with regard for changed conditions of life and social structures; not to condemn errors but "fully to declare the strength of the Church's life" ("doctrinae vim uberius explicando"). The council was charged to move nearer to the unity willed by Christ in the truth ("conferre operam ad magnum complendum mysterium illius unitatis"). Overcome by the magnitude of the moment, the Pope ended with a prayer for the divine assistance.

The council assembled in the nave of Saint Peter's was the most universal in church history. Not only in accord with its mandate and claim, but in fact the Church of the twentieth century was a Universal Church. All five continents were present in their episcopates. Europe, which at the medieval councils was virtually the only continent represented, sent only a mere half of those qualified to vote—1,041; America, which was not at all represented at Trent and only weakly at the First Vatican Council, sent 956 bishops, Asia more than 300, Africa 279. The numerical superiority of Italians, which had led to voting by nations at Constance and even at Trent had produced tensions, was ended: the 379 Italian bishops made up less than one-fifth of the council fathers, but just the same the Italian curial cardinals and high curial officials exerted an additional strong influence.[5]

The order of seating was more than a formality. The presidents, and later also the moderators, had places in front of the *confessio*; on the platforms to their right sat the cardinals, to their left the patriarchs of the Uniate Eastern Churches; then followed, on both sides, first the archbishops, then the bishops according to the date of their nomination. The generals of religious institutes had places on the front balconies, the *periti* on the others. For the observers a platform was designated to the left of the presidency; for the later admitted *auditores* platforms on the other sides of the high altar. Each general congregation was opened with Mass, frequently in an Oriental or the Slavonic rite.

---

[5] For the statistics refer to the publications cited in the bibliography for this chapter. Although the council's four periods of meeting are often called "sessions" in accord with parliamentary usage, I reserve this term for the solemn sittings.

That the council was esteemed as a world happening appeared from the presence of almost one thousand reporters sent by the press and the mass media. During the first session they almost entirely referred to indiscretions, which only a few, for example, *La Croix* of Paris and *Il Tempo* of Rome, exploited. The reports of the press office under the Frenchman Vallainc, consisting of seven members—one each for German, English, French, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish—were jejune, and only from the second session were its members permitted in the *aula,* and the press office was no longer subject to the secretary-general but to a conciliar commission. Thereafter the official reports were fuller in content, and the still valid rule of silence was in practice relaxed. The edited reports, partly collected, form a not to be underestimated historical source, that must of course be used with caution.

Although the superficial facts are better known than in any previous council, there were also many enigmatic incidents in this council that are either unknown or demonstrable only with difficulty. Above all, in little more than a decade after the close an unambiguous evaluation of the effects which proceeded from the council is not yet possible. What follows is not a history of the council, but only a report in which should be noted what Oscar Cullmann said: that this council must be evaluated not only from the texts approved by it, but the total council event must be considered, for its impulses are as effective as the texts.[6] These were not produced by "parties" such as modern parliaments have, but proceeded from a tension-filled struggle between "intransigent" and "progressive" forces. The former, numerically weaker group had its firm prop in the Roman Curia, the latter was composed, in addition to bishops from central and western Europe and North America, suprisingly also of council fathers from so-called mission countries. Of great significance were the national and regional Episcopal Conferences, partly constituted only at the beginning of the council.

In the first general congregation on 13 October the election of the conciliar commissions was on the agenda. In addition to the ten ballots, on each of which sixteen names were entered, the lists of those qualified to vote who had belonged to the preparatory commissions—and a majority of them were candidates of the Curia—were given to the council fathers. Against this procedure misgivings were first expressed by Cardinal Liénart of Lille, then in more detail by Cardinal Frings of Cologne: We still know too little about one another; in view of the importance of these elections it is necessary to prepare them carefully:

---

[6] O. Cullmann in *Was bedeutet das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil für uns?,* ed. by W. Schatz (Basel, n.d.), 20.

they should be postponed for a few days. The motion was passed with overwhelming approval and became a decree.

In the next days the Episcopal Conferences caucused and drew up their own election lists. The most successful among them proved to be that prepared by the cardinals of central Europe and France, because it took into consideration distinguished experts from all parts of the world. Among the 160 commission members then elected on 16 October were twenty-six from Latin America, twenty-five from North America, nineteen from Asia and Oceania, seven from Africa; Europe supplied twenty Italians, sixteen French, eleven Germans, ten Spaniards, five Poles, and twenty-one from the other countries. The power of the Italians was enhanced by papal nomination of nine, instead of originally eight, more members of each commission.

The general congregations of 13 and 16 October were the "starting point" of the council. In them it made known its wish to make its decisions according to its own judgment and conscience, not merely to approve what was suggested to or submitted to it. This self-will of the episcopate became still more clearly visible in the debate on the liturgy schema, which began on 22 October and lasted to 14 November. Previously, on 20 October, the council issued a proclamation to the world, drafted by four French bishops and presented to the council in the Pope's name, to the effect that "the message of salvation, love, and peace which Jesus Christ brought to the world and entrusted to the Church" was announced to all mankind.

The liturgy schema drafted by the Preparatory Commission had adopted the basic notion of the liturgical movement, that the Christian people should not passively attend the worship of God but actively participate in it, not only hear but pray and act together; as a consequence it recommended an extensive introduction, to be determined in detail by the respective episcopal conferences, of the vernacular in the Liturgy of the Word at Mass and in the administration of the sacraments and envisaged a reform of the liturgical books and, on specific occasions, the reintroduction of Communion *sub utraque specie.* On these questions there was enkindled the opposition between traditionalists and progressives which, in changing groupings, was to put its stamp on the council throughout its duration. For the schema were especially cardinals and bishops of countries in which the liturgical movement had spread, at their head Cardinals Frings, Döpfner, Feltin, Lercaro, Montini, and Ritter; the opponents of the draft fought the substitution of Latin by the vernacular and the intervention of the episcopal conferences in its introduction. Cardinal Ottaviani implored the assembly to bear in mind that it was moving "on holy ground" and proposed that the schema be referred to the Theological Commission, which he headed, for revision. Agreeing with him were Italian bishops, such as Cardinal Ruffini of Palermo, and prelates of the Curia, such as Parente, Staffa, and Dante, and also Americans, notably Cardinals Spellman and McIntyre, but not leading prelates from mission lands, such as Cardinals Gracias of Bombay and Rugambwa of Dar es Salaam and the Chinese Archbishop Lokuang of Tainan. Bishop Duschak, vicar apostolic of Calapan, Mindoro (Philippines), even proposed on 5 November the introduction of an ecumenical Mass, which should, as far as possible, be free from all the historical links to the events of the Last Supper; it would also be comprehensible to the faithful in the missions without historical explanations and could take its place next to the historically developed liturgy as *Missa orbis.*

And so the surprise of the first general congregation was repeated: the bishops of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, although they were in great part trained at Rome, turned out to be, in the majority, thoroughly non-curialist and non-traditionalist; their pastoral experiences drove them to the side of the "progressives." What could be foreseen only with difficulty was that the "pastoral" goal which Pope John had set for the council was accepted by the majority of the council fathers.

In the course of the debate on the liturgy many requests were presented which had long ago been discussed in the pale of the Liturgical Movement: the adapting of the Divine Office to the spirituality of the diocesan clergy; the better choice and distribution of the scriptural readings; in the ecclesiastical calendar the deemphasizing of celebrations of the saints in favor of the Christocentric Church year; a reform of the calendar with a fixed date of Easter; ecclesiastical music and Christian art. The vote on 14 November produced a large majority—2,162 to 46, with seven abstentions—for the further revision of the schema, with consideration of the suggestions for change brought forward in the debate by the standing conciliar commission under the direction of Cardinal Larraona, of whose sixteen elected members twelve were on the central European list. Even before the council dispersed, on 7 December, the new first part, composed by the commission, was approved, but with 180 reservations.

Not so clear was the outcome of the debate begun on 14 November on the schema worked out by the Theological Commission under the centralized control of its Jesuit secretary, Tromp, on the sources of divine revelation.[7] It obtained its pungency first through the fact that the text submitted sought to exclude the interpretation of the Tridentine decree defended by the Tübingen theologian Geiselmann—"tradition" means that the Bible is to be interpreted by the Church, but does not represent, beside it, a second independent source of revelation—and through this intensified condemnation of the Protestant scriptural principle affected the ecumenical rapprochement. In addition, the draft was directed to damming up the penetration of modern biblical criticism into Catholic exegesis, over which a powerful controversy had erupted between professors of the Papal Lateran University and members of the Biblical Institute. In contrast to the "progressive" liturgy schema, which had evoked the resistance of the "traditionalists," now the "progressives" were the aggressors. Many fathers, including Cardinals Frings, Döpfner, König, and Alfrink, rejected the schema totally and had already prepared a new one; others, such as Cardinals Suenens and Bea and Bishop De Smedt of Bruges, demanded a complete revision and presented the principles to be taken into account. A vote on the schema as a whole, contrived on 20 November—the first of its kind—led to the result—probably as a consequence of the motion, which required a "yes" *for* the ending of the debate—that 1,368 council fathers voted *placet*, 822 voted *non placet;* hence the opponents of the draft did not obtain the two-thirds majority. On the other hand, it had become obvious that it could never count on adoption in its current form.

---

[7] On the prehistory of the text submitted on 14 November, whose original form was sent to the Central Commission on 4 October 1961 and to the council fathers in modified form in the summer of 1962, cf. J. Ratzinger in *Herder TK* II, 498ff., and, for

The Pope resolved the existing situation, not envisaged in the agenda, by setting up a mixed commission under the chairmanship of Cardinals Ottaviani and Bea for the further revision of the schema; in it both tendencies were represented equally. This measure, at first accepted with great skepticism, proved to be the right one: in protracted discussions a middle road was found.

In the debates over the schemata on the liturgy and revelation, the oppositions had collided harshly. Now a certain relaxing of tension showed itself in the fact that a proposal[8] prepared by the Secretariat for the Means of Social Communications and treating the mass media—press, cinema, radio, television—was submitted on 23 November. It essentially restricted itself to a fundamentally positive stance of the Church toward them, the possibilities of using them for the apostolate,

---

the especially controverted Chapter 3, A. Grillmeier, ibid., 528ff. Further literature in the bibliography.

[8] German members of the secretariat were Bishop Kempf of Limburg and, as consultors, K. Becker, K. A. Siegel, and E. Klausener. According to *Herder TK* I, 112f., the secretary was A. M. Deskur, the undersecretary of the Papal Commission for Film, Radio, and Television

and the dangers to be encountered. The schema had been only in the next to last place among the drafts sent to the council fathers in August 1962. Although the chairman of the conciliar commission, Cardinal Cento, and the commentator, Archbishop Stourm of Sens, had recommended the adoption of the text, in the debate from 23 to 26 November it encountered opposition because it one-sidedly stressed the Church's right to the modern means of communication and too little the right of persons to appropriate and correct information and did not condemn sharply enough the misuse of the mass media. Some speakers, for example, Cardinal Wyszyński and Bishop Charrière of Fribourg, demanded a theological and sociological deepening, others a stronger regard for the collaboration of the laity in this field. Cardinal Bea suggested a merger of existing Catholic news agencies into a world agency. On 27 November the council by a great majority—2,138 to 15— approved the substance of the schema, but demanded its abbreviation and limitation to instructional principles and pastoral guidelines. Apparently the theme was treated as marginal. A great part of the council fathers were not yet clear that there was a question here of a pastoral problem of the first rank; but it also took a long time in the sixteenth century before the significance of printing for Church and preaching was grasped.

In the treatment of the schema submitted on 26 November on the Eastern Churches it became clear how inadequately the preparatory work had been coordinated. The Preparatory Commission, under Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, the future secretary of state, with Father Welykyi as secretary, had, in addition to a schema *De ecclesiae unitate,* drafted fourteen brief texts, which were transmitted to the corresponding conciliar commissions, to which belonged only five members of the Preparatory Commission but all six Uniate patriarchs. The first part of the schema, which treated of the unity of the Church under one Supreme Shepherd, contained passages which, as was remarked in the debate by Patriarch Maximos IV and others, were suited rather to upset the Orthodox than to gain them. Cardinal Bea proposed that the draft be reworked with that of his Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and merged with a third, which originated with the Theological Commission. On 1 December the council decided, 2,068 to 36, to send it back with this version to the commission.

As early as this debate it had been said by Archbishop Heenan of Liverpool that the difference between the Roman Catholic Church and the separated Eastern Churches lay less in a discrepancy of the doctrine of salvation than in the concept of the structure of the Church.

Nature and structure of the Church were the central theme of the schema *De ecclesia,* which the chairman of the Theological Commission, Cardinal Ottaviani, and Bishop Franič of Split, as *relator,* explained on 1 December. To no other theme were so many *postulate* appended, and no other would be so powerfully contested as this one. The draft occupying 123 printed pages linked the view of the Church, prevailing since Bellarmine, as an institution with ideas from the encyclical of Pius XII on the Church. Its twelve chapters were, as Cardinal Montini remarked in the course of the debate (1–7 December), placed side by side, not developed separately, and the doctrine of the Episcopal College was present only as a start. One of the leading minds of the traditionalists, Bishop Carli of Segni, defended the schema and used the opportunity for an emotional settlement with the "ecumenists" and "pastoralists" who, allegedly out of fear, were managing to attack dogmas and basic elements of Catholic piety as taboo. Other critics found the text too juridical and triumphal (De Smedt of Bruges) or failed to find in it a deeper treatment of the relation of Christ to the Church (Cardinal Montini) and of the doctrine of the Church as the People of God and of the Episcopal College (Cardinal Döpfner). They recommended a full revision of the schema and a rearranging of the material, so that the inner structure of the Church should precede its mission (Cardinal Suenens). Thus were the signposts for the further reworking set up, which, without a formal decree, was entrusted to the conciliar commission. The route which this draft had to travel was still far and full of potholes.

When on 8 December the Pope dismissed the council for the time being, none of the five discussed proposals was ready for publication. He comforted the fathers: "It is easy to understand that in a so broadly planned gathering a great deal of time must be devoted to achieving agreement." The public displayed disappointment over the absence of concrete results, many Catholics took offense at the "lack of unity" of the council fathers, which was in reality only the struggle, necessary in all councils, concerning the true and the right. One important result was achieved: The episcopate had learned to feel as a unity, had understood the council as its own affair and testified to its desire actively to form its decisions itself. Even if the council had not been continued, it would have left behind its mark on church history. But if it wanted to realize concrete results, priorities had to be established, the mass of current schemata had to be reduced, they had to be combined and abbreviated. The Secretariat for Extraordinary Affairs, set up in the procedure (ARTICLE 7, par. 2), had not sufficient authority for this. Such authority was given to a Coordinating Commission established by the Pope on 6 December. To it belonged: as chairman, Cardinal Cicognani, since 12 August 1961 successor of the deceased Cardinal Tardini as secretary of state, as well as Cardinals Confalonieri, Döpfner, Liénart, Spellman, Suenens, and Urbani. The Coordinating Commission was also instructed to turn over all details relative to the revision of canon law and the regulations for implementing the conciliar decrees to the postconciliar commissions. It acquitted itself of its mandate in close cooperation with the conciliar secretariat and the conciliar commissions,[9] but also in constant contact with the whole body of council fathers, whom the Pope in a letter of 2 January 1963, not published until 8 February, had called upon for cooperation. The drafts newly formulated in this manner, which at the beginning of May were sent to the council fathers, showed almost entirely another face than the drafts of the preparatory commissions. The will for renewal of the conciliar majority carried the day: the proponents came from the previous opponents. Only now was the direction of the council definitely decided. The resumption of the discussions was proposed for 8 September 1963. Pope John was not destined to witness them. Only with great effort had he, already marked by death, continued the usual reception of the Episcopal Conferences. On 3 June 1963 he died, mourned by the whole world, almost more outside than inside the Church.[10]

In his brief pontificate John XXIII, parallel with the council and supplementing it, had in several encyclicals shown the Church new routes and again taken up some earlier trodden. The mission encyclical *Princeps pastorum* of 28 November 1959 came out for a native clergy and the lay apostolate in the missions and approved the accommodation to non-European cultures.[11] *Mater et magistra* of 15 May 1961 aimed to continue the tradition of the great social encyclicals since Leo XIII, but with some new emphases.[12] The Pope regarded as his legacy the encyclical on peace, *Pacem in terris,* of 11 April 1963.[13] Cutting deeply into the traditions of the Roman Curia were the Pope's arrangements in regard to the College of Cardinals: The suburbicarian sees received residential bishops with full authority, while their former occupants, the cardinal-bishops, retained only the title. The cardinal-deacons also received episcopal ordination: on Holy Thursday 1962 the Pope personally ordained them.[14] In five consistories the Pope created fifty-two new cardinals and thereby definitively and basically exceeded the guiding number of seventy established by Sixtus V. The question was already raised of whether the College of Cardinals should retain the exclusive right to elect the Pope.

---

[9] The Coordinating Commission held five sessions from January to March 1963; on their importance, cf. G. Alberigo in *Cultura e Scuola,* 1968, 117ff.

[10] Some memorials on Pope John are in the bibliography. Carl Burckhardt wrote in a letter to Max Rychner of 4 June 1963, hence under the direct influence of his death: "He will change much, after him the Church will no longer be the same. Perhaps at the end of his days he will come to know fear. He remains worthy of love, also worthy of admiration": C. J. Burckhardt and Max Rychner, *Briefe 1926–1965* (Frankfurt 1970), 246.

[11] *AAS* 51 (1959), 833–64.

[12] Ibid. 53 (1961), 401–64; see below, Chapter 7.

[13] *AAS* 55 (1963), 257–304; cf. E. Fogliazzo, *Papa Giovanni spiega come giunse alla Pacem in terris* (Rome 1964). The receiving of Khruschev's son-in-law, Adzhubei, after the freeing of the Ukrainian Greater Archbishop Slipyj was understood as a rapprochement to the Soviet Union; cf. also P. Camellini, *Giovanni XXIII e i communisti* (Reggio 1965).

In accord with the prevailing canon law, the council was suspended by the death of the Pope. But Giovanni Battista Montini, archbishop of Milan, elected Pope on 21 June 1963 after a conclave of only two days, from the outset allowed no doubt to arise that he was determined to continue the council.[15]

Paul VI (1963–78) was, by background, spiritual makeup, and the course of his education and his life, as different as possible from his predecessor. His father Giorgio (d. 1943) was a well-to-do publisher at Brescia and had been a member of the Popular Party and deputy in parliament. The son, born 26 September 1897, had in 1916 finished his schooling at the Liceo Arnaldo da Brescia, a public school, then attended the lectures in the seminary at Brescia, after ordination to the priesthood on 29 May 1920 studied canon law at the Gregoriana in Rome, then from 1922 prepared in the Accademia dei Nobili for an ecclesiastical diplomatic career, for which a short stay at the nunciature in Warsaw in 1923 could count as his first practical introduction. From 1924 he was active for almost three decades in the papal Secretariat of State, from 13 December 1937 as undersecretary (*sostituto*). After the death of Secretary of State Maglione in 1944, he remained, together with Tardini, secretary for extraordinary affairs, the closest collaborator of Pius XII. Parallel with his activity in the Secretariat of State proceeded zealous work in the pastoral care of students and academics (FUCI or *Laureati Cattolici* respectively). He first entered upon the normal pastoral care after his surprising nomination as archbishop of

---

[14] *AAS* 54 (1962), 253–58.

[15] The personality and work of a living person are not a subject of historical scholarship; hence only a few references to available sources and literature. M. Serafian, *La difficile scelta. Il Concilio e la Chiesa fra Giovanni XXIII e Paolo VI* (Milan 1964); F. García Salve, *Vida de Pablo VI* (Bilbao 1964); C. Pallenberg, *Paul VI., Schüsselgestalt eines neuen Papsttums* (Munich 1965); A. Hatch, *Pope Paul VI, Apostle on the Move* (London 1967). On the Oratorian Bevilacqua, friend of the Montini family, in A. Fappani, *Giulio Bevilacqua, prete e cardinale sugli avamposti* (Verona 1975). The Pope's speeches in: *Discorsi al popolo di Dio* (Rome, since 1964); *Dialogo con Dio. Riflessi liturgici nei discorsi di Paolo VI* (Vatican City 1966), with preface by Cardinal Lercaro; *Cristo vita dell'uomo d'oggi nella parola di Paolo VI,* ed. by V. Levi, II (Milan 1969); V. Levi, *Di fronte alla contestazione. Testi di Paolo VI* II (Milan 1970). For the opening address of 29 September, cited below, see *Decreta,* 895–927.

Milan on 1 November 1954, where he succeeded Cardinal Schuster. From the outset he gave social impulses. At the council he was very reserved and intervened only twice; next to the outspokenly progressive Cardinal Lercaro of Bologna, he ranked as a moderate progressive, and it was as such that he was elected. He approved the course of his predecessor, but differing from him he controlled the keyboard of the Roman Curia and knew the opposition which had come out against the new course during the first session.

As early as the day after his election Paul VI announced in a radio message that he intended to continue the council and appointed 29 September as the beginning of the deliberations. On the solemnity of Peter and Paul he received about one thousand journalists and promised to improve their possibilities of information at the council. On 1 July, in a speech to the diplomatic missions that had come for the coronation on 30 June in the piazza of Saint Peter's, he took up the theme of the "Church in today's world." He showed his ecumenical attitude by sending a representative to the celebration of the Golden Episcopal Jubilee of Patriarch Alexius of Moscow. In a letter of 12 September to Cardinal Tisserant he expressed the wish that in the future more lay persons should be used as *periti* at the council and introduced a new category of participants, the *auditores.* On 14 September he appointed for the directing of the general congregations four moderators, not legates, as was originally considered: Cardinals Agagianian, Döpfner, Lercaro, and Suenens. In a speech to the members of the Roman Curia on 21 September he adhered to the principle already represented by the Popes of the Council of Trent, that the reform of the Curia was the concern of the Pope, not of the council, but at the same time demanded strict obedience from the members of the Curia. The warning was unmistakable.

Second Session (1963) and First Results

In his opening address on 29 September the Pope appointed, more precisely than his predecessor had ever done, four tasks for the council: a doctrinal presentation of the nature of the Church—whereby he advanced the schema *De ecclesia* to first place—its inner renewal, the promoting of the unity of Christians, and—in this form again new—the dialogue of the Church with today's world. For the first and now the chief task a guideline was given in the statement: "Without prejudice to the dogmatic declarations of the First Vatican Council on the Roman Pope, the doctrine of the episcopate, its tasks, and its necessary union with Peter, is to be investigated. From this will result for Us also guidelines from which, in the exercise of Our apostolic mission, We will derive theoretical and practical advantage." The collaboration of the bishops (*adiutrix opera*) in the exercise of the primatial authority, which he designated as desirable, already pointed to the future establishment of the Synod of Bishops. The inner renewal of the Church, the Pope continued, must orient it to Christ, but not as though it had abandoned him so that its traditions would have to be broken up and its life completely reorganized (*ecclesiae vitam subvertere*). In the ecumenical area another statement created a great sensation: "If any guilt in the separation is Ours, We humbly ask God's pardon and also seek forgiveness from the brethren who should have felt themselves separated from Us; for Our part, We are prepared to forgive the wrongs which have been done to the Catholic Church." This was no unconditional confession of guilt, such as that of Pope Hadrian VI of 3 January 1523, but the avowal that the causes of the ecclesiastical division lay not only on *one* side. The still existing great obstacles to union must not stifle the hope for it. The Pope greeted the observers present and then turned to those holding themselves aloof—adherents of non-Christian religions and atheists—and made mention of those persecuted for the sake of their belief.

The revised schema on the Church, which was explained on 30 September by Cardinals Ottaviani and Browne—the latter had been general of the Dominicans—was divided into four chapters: The Church as *mysterium,* its hierarchical structure, the People of God and the Laity, holiness of the Church. On the very first day of the debate Cardinal Frings moved to place the concept of "People of God" at the beginning, because hierarchy and laity together constitute the Church; furthermore, he recommended the adding of a chapter on the eschatological character of the Church and the incorporating of the text on the Mother of God into the schema.

A vote arranged for 1 October on the schema as a whole produced an overwhelming majority, 2,231 to 43, for further discussion. In the special debate, which was protracted throughout October, Cardinal Lercaro referred to the fact that *Corpus Christi mysticum* and "Visible Church" are not identical, because all the baptized belong in some way to the mystical body of Christ without their necessarily being members of the visible Catholic Church. But this very important question in the ecumenical view was soon eclipsed by the opposition which erupted in the debate on the second chapter, the hierarchical structure of the Church. It lasted from 4 to 16 October, and 127 speakers managed to be heard. The bone of contention for a minority, consisting especially but not exclusively of members of the Curia, was the doctrine that the College of Bishops, into which the individual is admitted by episcopal ordination, together with its head, the Pope, bears authority and responsibility for the whole Church. Speakers such as Cardinal Siri of Genoa, president of the Italian Episcopal Conference, Archbishop Staffa, secretary of the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, Archbishop Parente, assessor of the Holy Office, and Bishop Carli of Segni saw in this teaching an encroachment on the papal primatial power and denied that it is based on scripture and tradition. Against them, the adherents of "collegiality," for example, Cardinals Liénart and Léger and Auxiliary Bishop Betassi of Bologna, pointed out that the papal primacy was clearly stressed in several passages of the schema, in conformity with the definition of the First Vatican Council, and the doctrine of the College of Bishops had a solid biblical basis in the mission of the Twelve and a foundation in tradition in texts of episcopal ordination and other testimonies.

A second, if not so strongly contested question was the restoration of the permanent diaconate. Since the Council of Trent the diaconate had been considered as a transitional stage to the priesthood. Now the lack of priests prevailing in many countries suggested the notion of gaining in deacons helpers for the steadily growing pastoral and charitable services. But since there was also consideration of freeing them from the law of celibacy, the proposal encountered powerful resistance, not only among clear traditionalists, so that in this question the factions were not identical with those in regard to collegiality.

The debate on the third chapter—People of God and Laity—offered the opportunity to refer to the coresponsibility of the laity, rooted in the universal priesthood and often claimed on the part of the Church, and the necessary overcoming of clericalism. There were not lacking voices which warned against an obliteration of the distinction between the general priesthood and the official priesthood of orders and saw in the "higher evaluation" of the laity a danger to ecclesiastical authority.

In the fourth chapter—the holiness of the Church—there was discussed, even if not yet in a gratifying manner, the call of all the baptized to sanctity, then the religious state and the evangelical counsels were treated in particular. There was no section on the diocesan priesthood and nothing about its goal, except perhaps in the different means of the way to holiness of religious and lay persons. Also the total picture of the Church drafted in the schema appeared unrealistic to Cardinal Bea; it did not accord with the reality of the Pilgrim Church.

The debate on the schema on the Church lasted an entire month. The question was: Which of the proposals of change should the commission adopt for the revision? Which corresponded to the will of the majority of the council? To produce clarity, Cardinal Suenens, as moderator in the general congregation of 15 October, had announced a preliminary vote on four controverted items. It did not take place. On 23 October the Presidential Council, on the motion of the moderators, decided with a bare majority the proposal of five, not four, questions: (1.) Whether episcopal ordination has a sacramental character; (2.) Whether the bishop ordained in communion with the Pope and the bishops becomes thereby a member of the *Corpus episcoporum*; (3.) Whether the College of Bishops (*Corpus seu collegium episcoporum*) is the successor of the College of Apostles and, with its head, the Pope, and never without him, possesses the highest authority over the entire Church; (4.) Whether this power is based on divine right; (5.) Whether it is fitting, in each case in accord with the needs of the Church in certain areas, to reinstitute the diaconate as a special and permanent degree of orders. The five questions did not have the character of final votes, but were related only to the future formulation of the schema by the commission.

Again a week elapsed until the five questions were submitted. The dissension was further increased by the fact that a powerful propaganda had been unleashed against the insertion, decided on 29 October with a simple majority, of the text on the Mother of God into the schema on the Church by broadsheets which were distributed in front of the conciliar *aula* or sent by mail, without any steps having been taken against their authors. Only on 30 October was there a vote on the five questions. Questions 1 and 2 were approved by a large majority, but in the case of the next three questions the number of "no" votes increased: 1,808 to 336; 1,717 to 408; 1,588 to 525. Although the opponents of collegiality and of the permanent diaconate urged that the vote was not binding, their future acceptance by a two-thirds majority now seemed as good as assured. The "October Crisis" was thereby overcome, and the general congregation of 30 October 1963 was a second climax of the council after that of 13 October of the previous year.

The confrontation over the structure of the Church naturally influenced the discussion of the schema on the pastoral office of bishops and the government of dioceses, which claimed nine general congregations from 5 to 15 November. The schema had originated in the combining of five texts of the Preparatory Commission and was submitted to the council fathers at the end of April. It was still restricted to the bishops' tasks of governing: their relation to the Roman central departments, the position of auxiliary bishops, the episcopal conferences, the boundaries of sees, and the administration of parishes; hence it proceeded from above to below, not from the local church. After its presentation by Cardinal Marella, chairman of the competent conciliar commission, it was accepted after a brief general debate, against 477 "no" votes, as the basis for the special debate. While some demanded that in the first chapter the outcome of the votes on collegiality be taken into consideration, its opponents—Ottaviani, Carli—contested the binding nature of the vote of 30 October. The chief problems were picked out: the reorganization of the Curia, the composition and rights of the episcopal conferences, the position of auxiliary bishops, and the question of an age limit for residential bishops.

Although the great majority was clear in regard to the desire that the request for reform of the Curia could be fulfilled only by the Pope, not by the council, far-reaching wishes were expressed: an episcopal council should be established in order to exercise the collegial direction of the Church (Cardinal Alfrink), and to it, so some thought, instead of to the College of Cardinals, could be entrusted the right of papal election. Many speakers indulged in complaints about the curial bureaucracy without taking into account its great importance as bearer of many centuries of traditions and experiences. The spectacular outcome of the debate was the demand made by Cardinal Frings on 8 November that, before condemning a doctrine or a book, the Holy Office must hear the relevant ordinary and the accused. Cardinal Ottaviani irritably defended his department, but the attack by the Cardinal of Cologne gave the signal for a reorganization of the *Suprema*. There had been regularly meeting episcopal conferences in Germany since 1848, and they had become usual in some other countries later, but plenary conferences of the bishops of France and Italy only very recently. The nine African episcopal conferences were constituted with a central secretariat under the leadership of Cardinal Rugambwa only at the council. Their structure and their authority had to be more precisely determined, because greater competence, for example, in the sphere of liturgy, needed to be given to them, especially the right to issue decrees binding on the members. In Germany and the United States they had hitherto got along without such a right, but it was to be expected that just this right was necessary to prevent dissension and even ruptures in certain areas, for example, the school system and trade unionism, and in dangerous situations of ecclesiastical politics.

Supported by the doctrine approved by the majority in the debate on the Church, that one becomes a member of the College of Bishops by means of ordination, the auxiliary bishops demanded an improvement in their legal position. African bishops spoke out against the naming of auxiliary bishops, because these latter jeopardized the unity of direction; also criticized was the naming of titular bishops for the sake of personal distinction. If the residential bishop is shepherd and teacher of his diocese, then would it not be desirable that, through establishing an age limit—in one comment the seventy-fifth year was given—the superannuation of the bishop could be prevented? It was easy to cite examples that a superannuated or sick bishop stubbornly refused to step down; but had not the council's Pope John been elected at the age of almost seventy-seven, and were there not men of more than eighty years among the most active and fertile in ideas among the council fathers? The list of problems touched on extended even to the complaint over the many tiny dioceses not capable of surviving by themselves and the dioceses that had become too large and tortuous around great cities and in high-population-density areas, over friction with the personal dioceses of Eastern Rites and with the military ordinariate, and finally over the lack of priests in Latin America. As hardly in any other debate the bishops spoke their anxieties and grievances from their hearts. One hundred fifty-eight fathers had spoken when the debate was closed on 15 November without a vote and the schema was referred back to the commission for further revision. Even before the session ended, the apostolic letter *Pastorale munus* of 30 November 1963 conferred on diocesan bishops forty powers of office and on all bishops, including titular bishops, a series of privileges by which the episcopal office was revaluated vis-à-vis the papal central authority and at least partly restored to its original extent.[16]

The schema *De oecumenismo,* debated from 18 November to 2 December, was, on the basis of the conciliar decree of 1 December 1962, revised and abridged by a mixed commission of members of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and of the Commission for the Eastern Churches. It treated the principles of Catholic ecumenism (Chap. 1), its actual state (Chap. 2), the relations with the Eastern and, of course only briefly, with the Protestant churches (Chap. 3), the position of the Jewish religion in the history of salvation (Chap. 4), and the principle of religious liberty (Chap. 5). Whereas the first commentator, Cardinal Cicognani, claimed to understand the ecumenical efforts of the council merely as a continuation of the tendency "of almost all councils" to restore peace and unity, the second one, Archbishop Martin of Rouen, designated it as entirely new; the third, Coadjutor Archbishop Bukatko of Belgrade, who spoke for the Eastern Churches, took a stand for improvements.[17] In the course of the debate the question was posed: Just what is "Catholic Ecumenism"? Must the Church not seek union with the powerfully strengthened ecumenical movement? Does the Roman Catholic Church surrender its claim to be the true Church if it designates the separated ecclesial communities simply as "churches"?

---

[16] As K. Mörsdorf remarked in *Herder TK* II, 139, the text in *AAS* 56 (1964), 5–12, was altered in several passages in comparison with the original text presented to the council fathers. On the interpretation: K. Mörsdorf, "Neue Vollmachten und Privilegien der Bischöfe," *AKR* 133 (1964), 82–101; L. Buijs, *Facultates et privilegia episcoporum concessa Motu proprio Pastorale munus cum Commentario* (Rome 1964).

[17] Detailed assessment of the reports by W. Becker in *Herder TK* II, 25 ff.; on the debate, with the names of the speakers, E. Stakemeier in Müller II, 540–63.

The presentation of the common elements, just as that of the differences, in Chapter 3 satisfied neither the representatives of the Eastern Churches nor the Protestant observers. There was agreement only on this, that it was meaningless, as happened before the First Vatican Council, to invite to a return to the Catholic Church and to accentuate the existing differences, but that it was also not right to gloss over the existing doctrinal differences. The schema turned to Catholics with the invitation to make their Church a model by striving for Christian perfection; it recommended a mutual getting acquainted and dialogue, common prayer for unity but not common celebration of the Eucharist; it warned against any injury to love in the interchange. It was above all Cardinal Bea and Archbishop Jaeger of Paderborn—the latter well-known for his ecumenical work in Germany—who supplied as the guiding idea for the third chapter the stressing of the uniting elements in doctrine, piety, and Christian fulfillment. They found support from bishops from all parts of the world, for example, even from Spain, but of course also contradiction from those who already glimpsed a danger in the word "ecumenism." It remained controversial how far the collaboration of the denominations might and should go in the charitable and social sphere. The question of mixed marriages only appeared on the edges.

Despite many still unresolved problems, whose existence Cardinal Bea did not dispute, the debate left the impression that a genuine breakthrough to ecumenical thought had taken place. Strongly disputed, on the other hand, were the last two chapters of the draft, on the Jews and on religious liberty. The former seemed required by the unique position of Judaism in the history of salvation, but also operating was the motive of opposing to modern anti-Semitism a basic declaration that would correct earlier failings in the Church's behavior. Against it was raised opposition especially from bishops from Arab states, who feared from such a declaration, which would be interpreted as taking a position in favor of the State of Israel, a deterioration of their own already difficult situation and as a compromise wanted a word on Islam added.

The chapter on religious liberty had to be defended by its commentator, Bishop De Smedt of Bruges, against objections chiefly of a theological sort: that it equated truth with error. In many fathers there emerged doubts whether the last two chapters were in their right place at all. These doubts and the opposition from the Arab world declared that, although the schema as a whole had been accepted in the general voting of 21 November by a great majority, 1,966 to 86, as a working basis, there was no longer harmony on these two chapters. They continued in suspense; still powerful confrontations were imminent over both, not only their content but also their position.

In the drafts on the Church and ecumenism the council had laid hold of decisive problems of the Church's self-awareness without being able to satisfactorily solve them. Nevertheless, at the close of this second session, in *Sessio III* of 4 December 1963, two texts were adopted by vote: the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and the Decree on the Media of Social Communication.

The voting was done by chapters on the schema on the liturgy, which had been once more basically revised by the conciliar commission in the spring, from 23 April to 10 May 1963; the voting took place during the debate on the schema on the Church. In regard to Chapters 2 and 3—on the Mass and the sacraments—so many reservations, 781 and 1,054 respectively, were made on 13 and 18 October that they had to be reworked. Not until the final vote on the constitution as a whole on 22 November did an overwhelming majority appear: 2,158 to 19. And so it could be confirmed and proclaimed by the Pope in *Sessio III* on 4 December. Its basic idea is the "full and active participation of all the people" ("totius populi plena et actuosa participatio") in the Easter Mystery, the fundamental concept of the liturgical movement. Subordinate to it was the authority conceded to the episcopal conferences to permit great parts of the Liturgy of the Word at Mass, especially the scriptural readings and the Universal Prayer before the preparation of the gifts, to be performed in the venacular and *only* in it, hence not *also* in Latin. Latin was by no means abolished as the liturgical language of the Western Church; on the contrary, "The use of the Latin language," it is said in ARTICLE 36, par. 1, "should be maintained in the Latin Rite to the extent that special rights do not oppose this." Enhanced significance was granted to the texts of Holy Scripture and the homily that explained them, and concern for congregational singing was recommended. For special occasions the concelebration of Mass by several priests was permitted.[18]

At the end of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy the formula of approval and promulgation, issuing from long consultations with *periti,* was first used. It was based on the Church's understanding that had been gained at the council: "What is expressed in this constitution, as a whole and in particulars, has obtained the assent of the fathers. And We, by virtue of the apostolic authority entrusted to Us by Christ, approve, decree, and enact it together with the venerable fathers in the Holy Spirit and command to the honor of God the publication of what has been ordered by the council."

---

[18] On the formula of approval, V. Fagiolo in *Diritto ecclesiastico* 75 (1964), 370–86; G. Alberigo, "Una cum patribus," *Mélanges theologiques. Hommage à Mgr. Gérard Philips* (Gembloux 1970), 291–319. Other literature on the Constitution on the Liturgy in the bibliography.

The rules for implementation were left to the episcopal conferences dependent on confirmation by the Holy See; the reform of the liturgical books, especially of the missal and the breviary, was entrusted to a postconciliar commission which was instituted by the Pope on 25 January 1964, shortly after the end of this session; it established numerous special commissions. The reform of the liturgy, thus introduced, broke with the rubricist rigidity of the last centuries: whether it would produce an organic further development of the liturgical heritage without substantial loss could not yet be foreseen.

Not so close to unanimity as in the case of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy was the assent of the council fathers to the Decree on the Media of Social Communication, greatly abbreviated by the conciliar commission under Cardinal Cento. Archbishop Stourm of Sens had explained it, as commentator, on 14 November. The new text defined the attitude of the Church to the press, theater, cinema, radio, and television, but still without seeking a theological and sociological deepening; especially missed was the elaboration of persons' *right* to information and the *duty* of state and Church to provide it. In a petition of 16 November American journalists, including J. Cogley, R. Kaiser, and M. Novak, spoke of a retrogression: they saw the freedom of journalists jeopardized. On 17 November ninety council fathers, including Cardinals Frings, Gerlier, and Alfrink, made a proposal to the commission to revise the schema again, but without success. This opposition explains the fact that in the final vote on 25 November a relatively large number of "no" votes (503) was cast against the 1,598 "yes" votes, so that for a moment it was doubtful whether the decree would be approved. But since a supplementary instruction was taken into consideration, for the working out of which more lay experts than previously were to be employed, in the session the "no" votes dropped to 164. It was noted that preconciliar vision of the Church was at the basis of this decree;[19] but if it is pondered how negatively for a long time the mass media were evaluated in ecclesiastical circles, it was certainly a forward step, even if it remains true that it did not yet take account of the current importance of the mass media.

---

[19] O. B. Roegele in Hampe III, 349–55; also the introduction by K. Schmidthüs, *Herder TK* I, 112–15. The Pope's closing address in *AAS* 56 (1964), 31–40; also *Decreta*, 928–45.

In his closing address the Pope admitted that the outcome of this session did not indeed correspond to all expectations, and still many tasks had to be accomplished. He indicated, alluding to the establishing of the Synod of Bishops and the reorganization of the Curia, that the "share of the bishops in the service of the Universal Church" would be made "still more effective." With satisfaction he stated: "We have mutually gotten to know ourselves better and learned to exchange ideas"; two important decrees had been passed. But the Pope warned against interpreting the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy arbitrarily before the necessary norms had been laid down. At the end of his talk, the Pope announced, to the great surprise of most, a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, during which a meeting with Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras was envisaged. It took place from 4 to 6 January 1964, followed by the world public with great attention. More than words could do, this act strengthened the ecumenical orientation of the council.

Third Session: Crisis of November and Constitution on the Church

The third session, which was opened on 14 September 1964 with a Mass celebrated by twenty-four council fathers, the first concelebration at the council, brought the climax of the council but also its most serious crisis. The commission work directed by the Coordinating Commission had in the meantime so broadly expedited six schemata than on 7 July there could be indicated to the bishops as program points of the coming deliberations: the Church, the episcopal office, ecumenism—hence the three chief subjects of the second session—revelation, discussed in the first session but tabled, the lay apostolate, and the Church in the world of today. The last-mentioned concern, the "Dialogue with the World," was touched by the Pope in the encyclical *Ecclesiam suam* of 6 August 1964, and thereby the catchword given by his predecessor, *aggiornamento,* had been made concrete; on the other hand, the Pope had warned against novelties, according to the view of which the Church must break radically with its traditions and find entirely new forms of its life. The stand against atheistic Communism and the mention of the Jewish religion and of Islam as partners in the dialogue seemed to broaden the council's program.

The Pope's opening address on 15 September,[20] however, made it clear that he, now as earlier, considered the schema on the Church as the most important subject of deliberation, and if he indicated that the nature and function of the episcopate as complement of the doctrine of the primacy must be clarified, this was an unmistakable sign to the opponents of collegiality to abandon their opposition, but at the same time to its adherents that there must be no undermining of the papal primacy in the extent defined in the First Vatican Council. On the basis of the preliminary votes on 30 October 1963, the commission had given to the schema on the Church a new arrangement and form, for which the Louvain professor of dogma, Philips, deserved great merit. To the schema, divided into six chapters, were added a seventh on the eschatological character of the Church and an eighth on Mariology. They still had to be debated from 15 to 18 September, and at the same time began the voting, without debate, on the first six chapters. The first two—Chapter 1: "The Mystery of the Church" and Chapter 2: "The People of God"— passed without serious opposition. But Chapter 3—"The Hierarchical Structure of the Church and the Episcopate in Particular"—was vigorously disputed. It was divided into thirty-nine sections for the voting from 21 to 30 September; on each of these the vote had to be *placet* or *non placet.* As regards the sections on the College of Bishops, which in its present form was defended by Archbishop Parente and rejected by Bishop Franič, the "no" votes mounted to more than 300: it was the influential group, which saw the papal primacy endangered in these statements. Far more numerous but differently made up were the 629 "no" votes against the conceding of the diaconal order to older married men; the concession to young men without the obligation of celibacy was rejected with 1,364 "no" votes. Although the opponents of collegiality had not by far mustered the necessary one-third for rejection, they sought in the final vote on Chapter 3, in which *placet iuxta modum* was permitted, still to put their views into the text. They may have constituted the great majority of the 572 votes with reservation, in addition to 42 "no" votes, cast on 30 September on the first part of Chapter 3. The curial opposition began to crumble, but it did not yet admit defeat. Chapter 4 on the laity was well received, as were Chapter 5 on the vocation to holiness and Chapter 6 on religious, the explanation of which was successfully defended by the commentator, Abbot Primate Gut. Chapter 7, "The Eschatological Nature of the Pilgrim Church and its Union with the Church in Heaven," drafted by Cardinal Larraona, could be substantially improved because of the debate of 15 and 16 September: the time between the Lord's Ascension and the Parousia was emphasized as the Age of the Holy Spirit, the Christocentric cult of the saints was approved. Greater resistance was evoked in the debate, from 16 to 18 September, on Chapter 8: "The Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and of the Church," the including of which in the schema on the Church had encountered powerful opposition and appeared to some zealous devotees of Mary to be minimalistic. The primate of Poland and some Spanish and Italian bishops desired a solemn consecration of the world to the Mother of God, some recommended the adoption of titles such as "Mother of the Church" and "Mediatrix" into the text, but Cardinals Bea and Frings raised scruples against this: One should stay on strongly dogmatic ground.

---

[20] *AAS* 55 (1963), 841–59; *Decreta,* 895–927.

Before it came to a vote on these last chapters the opposing views collided again more severely on the second schema, which was in the program as: "On the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church." The submitted text had originated through the curtailing of the draft debated in the second session on the episcopal office and its combination with a draft on the form of pastoral care in March 1964, and hence, because it had been greatly altered, it had to be discussed anew, from 18 to 22 September. Bishop Carli disputed the competence and responsibility of bishops for the Universal Church, on which the text was based; other critics, for example, Cardinal Léger and several French bishops, found the text too juristic, too clerical, and not suited to today's tasks. Some individual concerns were brought forward again: the scarcely toned-down powerlessness of the diocesan bishop in regard to the exempt orders; the necessary adjustment between dioceses of few priests and those of numerous priests; the fluctuation of the population in the "wandering Church." The schema revised in this direction by the commission was once again opened up for debate, from 4 to 6 November, but so many *modi* were submitted on the first two chapters—852 on Chapter 1, 889 on Chapter 2—that the revised text could not again be presented until the close of this session.

Tensions became even sharper when on 23 September religious freedom and on 25 September the declaration on the Jews came up on the agenda; originally they had been linked, as Chapters 4 and 5, to the schema on ecumenism. Bishop De Smedt of Bruges, the commentator on the first text, could point out that 380 suggestions for change had been assimilated. Proceeding from the natural dignity of humans, the decree protected freedom of conscience in the civil sphere, even if the conscience is in error. The opponents quite rightly felt that this concept broke decisively with the medieval legal order, which required the proscription of heretics by common action of Church and state. In the debate, 25 to 29 September, Cardinal Ruffini posed the question: How can the Catholic Church, which is the true Church and bearer of the truth, abandon the fostering of this faith, wherever possible, even with the help of the state? Toleration—yes; freedom—no! Cardinal Ottaviani raised the question: Will not the concordats concluded by the

Holy See, for example, with Italy and Spain, which allow to the Catholic Church a privileged position, come to nothing through this declaration?

The draft found firm defenders above all in the American episcopate, through Cardinals Meyer and Ritter, and also in the Polish through Archbishop Wojtyla of Cracow, eventually Pope John Paul II, who understood its worth vis-à-vis Communist totalitarianism. It was perceived that the motivation and the sphere where religious freedom prevailed must be more keenly grasped in order to meet the objection that truth and error as such—not the people who defend them—are equated. The debate ended without a vote, and the text was turned over to five members of the Theological Commission for appraisal, while the Secretariat for Unity undertook the further revision.

In comparison with the "Declaration on the Jews," submitted in the second session as Chapter 4 of the schema on ecumenism, but not discussed, the text introduced by Cardinal Bea on 25 September was planned with a view to appeasing its Arab opponents[21] In this regard, Islam was expressly mentioned; in the opinion of its champions the text was diluted, because only the Jews now alive, not the people as a historical unit, were absolved from the charge of "deicide," which in the past had been raised by Christian polemicists; twenty-one fathers demanded a return to the earlier wording. Other critics desired the deepening of the accomplishment of the history of salvation (Frings, Lercaro, Heenan, Hengsbach of Essen) and the taking of other monotheistic religions into account (König). The chief difficulty was and remained the political misunderstanding. The Arabic countries interpreted the "Declaration on the Jews" as taking a stand for the State of Israel and exerted strong pressure on the bishops of their countries and by way of diplomacy; Patriarch Maximos IV had the presumption to charge that the authors of the text were "bought." This explains why the secretary-general of the council in a letter of 8 October invited Cardinal Bea to have the text still once more examined by a group composed of three members each from the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Theological Commission; the effort to insert it into the Constitution on the Church and thereby to take it entirely away from the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity misfired.

Surprisingly calmly proceeded the debate, from 30 September to 6 October, on the schema on revelation, tabled two years previously, which had received a new text from a subcommittee, on which Philips,

---

[21] Very detailed presentation of the prehistory, including the political factors, by J. Oesterreicher, who was strongly involved in the whole process, in *Herder TK* II, 404–87. The text submitted in 1964 (op. cit., 437f.) was already the third.

Ratzinger, Congar, K. Rahner, and other leading theologians had collaborated. As Bishop Franič, the second commentator, expressed it, it was not in accord with the notion of a minority of the commission, which saw in it a departure from the Tridentine decree on Scripture and tradition. In reality, it constituted its completion, gained from the deepening of the ideas "Scripture," "Tradition," and "Teaching Office," which are intimately linked and can exist only together; the theological discussion on the interpretation of the Tridentine decree was purposely left in suspense. Other disputed points were the inerrancy of Scripture and the historicity of the Gospels. As in the votes on the schema on the Church and in the debate over religious liberty, so too in this on the schema on revelation it was apparent that the great majority of the council concurred with the aims set by Popes John and Paul, and that the group which held stubbornly to the views hitherto represented at Rome was influential, numerous, but weak.

From this procedure of the council's majority resulted the fate of the nine texts which were submitted to the council between 7 October and 20 November. Two of them were sent back to the relevant commissions: on 14 October the schema, consisting of only twelve basic points, on the life and ministry of priests, and on 9 November the schema on the missions, even though on 6 November the Pope had appeared personally in the *aula* and recommended its adoption. The schema on the lay apostolate, on which Bishop Hengsbach of Essen reported, escaped this fate in the debate of 7 to 13 October, but exception was taken to the fact that it did not draw the necessary conclusions from the doctrine of the People of God; it did not adequately elaborate the proper rights of laity or also their proper responsibility and specific spirituality; for the first time a layman, P. Keegan, spoke on the matter.

The basic principles on the renewal of the life of religious, debated 10 to 12 November, and on Christian education, 17 to 19 November, seemed to many fathers to be too abstract, but capable of being developed. Better received were the twenty-two basic principles on the formation of priests, which entrusted to the episcopal conferences the creation of plans of studies and thereby the accommodation to the regional circumstances; only on the question of what authority Thomas Aquinas had to occupy in the system of teaching philosophy and theology was there a separating of minds.

The text "On the Church in the Modern World," debated from 20 October to 9 November, at first schema 17 in the original sequence in the list of drafts, later schema 13, was drawn up by a working group which had met in February 1964 at Zurich—hence it was dubbed the "Zurich Text." It had been preceded by a "Roman" draft, composed in the spring of 1963, and a "Mechlin" text in French, conceived by Belgian and French theologians[22] in September 1963 at the suggestion of Cardinal Suenens. The Zurich draft, in which the Redemptorist Bernhard Häring had a powerful share, discussed in accord with a theological foundation the ministry of the Church to the world (Chapter 2), poverty, overpopulation, and war (Chapters 3 and 4). In the course of the general debate, opened by the comments of Bishop Guano of Livorno, Cardinal Meyer demanded the deepening of the theological bases; however, the text was accepted by a large majority, 1,576 to 296, as the basis for the special debate. In it Cardinal Lercaro moved a decision on the problem "Church and Cultures," and on 9 November the layman James J. Norris submitted copious material on the questions raised. Taken into account was the fact that this document, appearing for the first time in the history of the councils, had to mature slowly so that it could correspond to the expectation of people. The encyclical *Ecclesiam suam* of 8 December 1964, which in its third part treated the dialogue of the Church with the world, encouraged further work.

A schema on the sacrament of matrimony, worked out by the Commission for the Discipline of the Sacraments with the aid of members of the Theological Commission and of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, treated in five chapters of the impediments, mixed marriages, matrimonial consent, the form, and matrimonial processes, but at the direction of the Coordinating Commission was reduced to a *votum,* which limited itself to listing the guidelines for a reform of the law of marriage.[23] Introduced by Archbishop Schneider of Bamberg, it was discussed on 19 and 20 November in the *aula,* but at the end of the general congregation of 20 November Cardinal Döpfner, as moderator, proposed, with regard to the law on mixed marriages, which in denominationally mixed countries was felt to be a great hindrance to the rapprochement of the denominations, to turn over the *votum* to the Pope in order to assure as quick a regulation as possible. The Council understood that so difficult a juridical and pastoral problem could hardly benefit in the plenary session, and a fortiori could not be solved, because the circumstances in the various countries were all too different. This expedient was declared for by 1,592 fathers, 427 declaring against it.

---

[22] For the history of the text, C. Moeller in *Herder TK* III, 242–78, where (p. 251) the letter of the secretary general of the World Council of Churches, Lukas Visher, of 18 April 1963, on "Faith and Order" is mentioned. Somewhat simplified in Hampe III, 15ff.

[23] On the origin of the *votum* on the Sacrament of Matrimony, B. Häring in *Herder TK* III, 595; there, pp. 596–606, the text; J. G. Gerhartz, "Die Mischehe, das Konzil und die Mischeheninstruktion," *Theol. u. Phil.* 41 (1966), 376–400.

Of the nine texts debated in October and November, only one accomplished its purpose after a brief debate, 16 to 20 October—the schema on the Eastern Churches, which was promulgated in the fifth *sessio.* While the Council, seen from without, moved ahead uninterruptedly, within it the tensions had increased. On 11 October seventeen cardinals from central and western Europe and the United States, by means of a letter to the Pope, thwarted the attempt to send the two controversial declarations on religious liberty and the Jews, by outflanking the council through appeal to an alleged desire of the Pope, to new mixed commissions, from whose planned makeup the aim of the minority to alter the text in its sense was recognizable. The appeal to the Pope was successful, but the opposing faction did not admit defeat.

Chapter 3 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church also encountered the stubborn resistance of the most active and influential minority in the Vatican. When on 14 November a thick book with proposals for changes in Chapters 3 to 8 together with the replies of the Theological Commission was handed to the council fathers, it was preceded by a *nota explicativa praevia,* which was supposed to exclude every encroachment on the doctrine of primacy by the doctrine of the College of Bishops developed in Chapter 3. It had, to be sure, been submitted to the Theological Commission, but, as the secretary general communicated, came from a "higher authority," hence from the Pope personally. It was supposed to reconcile with the text the minority, whose *modi* that altered the meaning were not accepted by the commission, and assure its acceptance with moral unanimity. Twice, on 16 and 19 November—the latter was the day before the final vote—the secretary general declared that the *nota* was, it is true, not an element of the text, but the text had to be interpreted in its sense.

The aim underlying the *nota* was achieved: the "no" votes to Chapter 3 dropped to forty-six on 17 November, including no doubt such of the defenders of collegiality who suspected an injury to or a weakening of this doctrine; in the *sessio* only five fathers still voted *non placet.* The Pope had, therefore, achieved his purpose. The question was: Did the *nota* alter the value of the statement of the text?

One who lays both side by side impartially will answer in the negative. The *nota* stengthened the adherence to the doctrine of the First Vatican Council on the primacy, but it did not subsequently strike out anything from the direct divine origin of the episcopal office and its function and the responsibility of the College of Bishops for the Universal Church. In any case, the minority abandoned its scruples and gave up its resistance. What was doubtful was less the content than the form in which the *nota* preceded the conciliar text. But had not the Pope, as head of the council, the right to make his consent dependent on an interpretation determined in advance?

The agitation over the *nota* had not yet subsided when on "Black Thursday," 19 November, the vote published on the previous day on the Declaration on Religious Freedom was canceled by the ranking member of the presidency, Cardinal Tisserant. This was preceded by a petition to the presidency from 200 Spanish and Italian bishops, which, appealing to ART. 30, par. 2, and ART. 35 of the order of procedure, demanded more time for study of the actually significantly altered draft and the postponement of the vote. If voting took place, there could be scarcely a doubt as to its outcome: the great majority would give the draft the green light, even if it did not fully satisfy the defenders of religious freedom. When shortly after eleven o'clock the vote was to take place, Tisserant, after a conference with other members of the presidency, announced that it was prorogued—and that meant that the declaration could no longer be passed in this session. Never had the *aula* of Saint Peter's seen such commotion as at this hour: Many council fathers had left their places and were standing together in groups, excitedly discussing. Was the council's freedom endangered? American bishops hurriedly circulated a petition to the Pope, which at once obtained 441 signatures, and later about 1,000; "with all respect, but with the greatest urgency—*instanter, instantius, instantissime*—we ask that before the end of this session of the council a vote be taken on the Declaration on Religious Liberty; otherwise we lose the confidence of the Christian and the non-Christian world." Bishop De Smedt, who reported on the text, received demonstrative applause. After the close of the general congregation, Cardinals Meyer, Ritter, and Léger went to the Pope, but received only the assurance that the declaration would come as the first point on the program of the fourth session; this assurance was repeated the next day by Cardinal Tisserant.

The stormy general congregation of 19 November produced yet another surprise. The text of the Decree on Ecumenism, formulated by the commission and explained on 5 October by the commentators Martin, Helmsing, Hermaniuk, and Heenan, was, it is true, rejected by only a few fathers but almost two thousand *modi* were introduced, which had to be sifted and compiled. The fathers waited in vain for the printed definitive text, on which there was supposed to be a vote on 20 November. Then the secretary general announced that it was not yet ready, because some changes had been made; he read these changes, nineteen altogether, with the additions; they went back to a "higher authority." The Pope had sent forty suggestions for changes to the chairman of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, which because of lack of time Cardinal Bea could submit to only a few members from his closest associates, with the result that the nineteen mentioned had been worked into the text. Some were only stylistic, but others changed the sense, for example, that the Churches not in communion with Rome "seek" instead of "find" God in the Bible; however, none could be regarded as a substantial alteration. Again, only the form was strange: that a text produced with great care by a council and its competent organ, in this case the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, had at the last moment been altered, not entirely over its head but still not in a form in keeping with the order of procedure. Among the sixty-four fathers who on the next day voted *non placet* not a few declared their disillusionment in this way; in the *sessio* of 21 November the "no" votes dropped to eleven.

In the fifth *sessio* of 21 November 1964, with which the third session ended, three texts could be adopted and promulgated. The constitution *Lumen gentium*[24] is in two respects the climax and center of the conciliar decrees. Historically considered, it is the climax, for it ended the Church's quest for its self-understanding which had begun at the end of the thirteenth century, had led to the reform councils of the fifteenth century and at Trent to serious collisions, and had not been brought to an end at the First Vatican Council. It is the center of the conciliar decrees, for almost all other decrees of the council must be interpreted in its light. As no other decree, it is "the work of the council itself and of its most active members," wrote Philips. As the Theological Commission had declared on 6 March 1964 with regard to all doctrinal statements of the council, it does not claim infallibility but demands acceptance in faith in accord with the measure of the subject and the form of statement. The definition of the Church as "People of God" broke with the one-sided juridical concept of an institution and the notion which practically identified it with the clergy and forced a passive role on the laity. It ended the confrontation over the relation of the papal primacy to the episcopate in the sense of an organic union of both: the College of Bishops, into which the individual bishop is admitted by sacramental ordination and receives the charisms and full authority to exercise the apostolic office, possesses, by virtue of divine right as successor of "The Twelve," power over and responsibility for the Universal Church, but only in communion with the Pope, who is its member and its head. The successor of Peter regulates the exercise of the full authority given by God by the entrusting of a specific territory to the bishop, which can be refused or taken away. The bishop thus appointed rules the local church with full authority and responsibility, by virtue of *potestas propria, ordinaria et immediata.* The College of Bishops is a spiritual community (*communio*), not a college in the sense of Roman Law. It can exercise its authority continually only in union with its head, and here it is left undecided in which form, without possessing the right of corule (*ius congubernii*), it can be given a share in the government of the Universal Church by the Pope, but equally also whether the Pope is the source of all and every actual power of government in the Church or may intervene only subsidiarily in the interest of Church unity.

---

[24] For the extensive literature on the Constitution on the Church see the bibliography for this chapter (H. Schauf, "Zur Textgeschichte grundlegender Aussagen aus Lumen gentium über das Bischofskollegium," *AKR* 141 [1972], 5–147).

The diaconate was reinstated as a state of life. All Christians are called to holiness, but the way to it in the religious state, which complies with the evangelical counsels, is different from the way of persons living in the world. The Church feels itself less as "fighting" and still less as "triumphing," but as being on pilgrimage, looking forward impatiently to its eschatological fulfillment. The Mother of the Lord stands also in a unique relationship to the Church by virtue of her singular position in the history of salvation; she is "our Mother," but is not called "Mediatrix of salvation": the chapter on Mariology suited neither the maximalists nor the minimalists.

If the constitution *Lumen gentium* is by far the most important outcome of the council because it articulates the Church's self-awareness, it is followed at a short interval by the Decree on Ecumenism,[25] which regulated anew the relations with other Christian Churches and ecclesial communities. It proceeds from this, that there can be and is only *one* Church of Christ, but that in the Churches separated from the Roman Catholic Church, not without fault on both sides, "non sine hominum utriusque partis culpa," "the written Word of God, the life of grace, faith, hope, and charity, and other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit" are operative. The Decree on Ecumenism ended the stressing, necessary in its day at Trent, of denominational opposition by throwing into relief what is common, opening the door to mutual knowledge and understanding, and by the invitation to common prayer evoked the power which can make possible the apparently impossible, the reunion of the Christian Churches. The separating differences in doctrine and piety, more numerous in the Churches of the Protestant Reformation than among the Eastern Churches, are not denied out of a false irenicism but must be discussed in the spirit of love, as occurred in the ongoing dialogue of the observers with the Secretariat for Unity during the council. Persons were thoroughly aware that in this field a greater distance still had to be covered.

---

[25] Literature in the bibliography.

The third decree promulgated in the fifth *sessio,* the Decree on the Oriental Catholic Churches,[26] declared solemnly in ART. 5: "The Churches of the East, like that of the West, have the full right and duty always to be governed according to their proper principles, which are recommended by their venerable antiquity, correspond better to the customs of their faithful, and appear more adapted to care for the salvation of souls." *Orientalium ecclesiarum instituta* regulates especially practical questions of ecclesiastical communities—liturgy, administration of the sacraments, here for example the abolition of the obligation of the form in mixed marriages—but it disappointed the representatives of the Eastern Churches in ARTS. 7 to 9 on the patriarchates, the "pivot of the entire Eastern question," according to Abbot Hoeck.

Fourth Session and Closing

On 4 January 1965 the Pope, who at the beginning of December had taken part in the eucharistic congress at Bombay, appointed 14 September as the beginning of the fourth session. Meanwhile, the commissions worked more intensively than ever before on the already discussed eleven texts, five of which were sent to the council fathers at the end of May. If the November Crisis had left the impression that the Pope feared a diminution of the Petrine office, the following statements and measures showed that he still unerringly pursued the line drawn by him at the beginning of his pontificate. In an address to the College of Cardinals on 24 June 1965 he held out the prospect of the reform of the Curia and the revision of the canon law, but also the alteration, turned over to him by the council, of the law on mixed marriages and the study of birth control. In the encyclical *Mysterium fidei* of 11 September 1965 he repudiated the effort to weaken the dogma of the Eucharistic transubstantiation and stressed on various occasions that the Church has no cause to abandon good and proven traditions. "We have a Pope," was one radio commentator's summary of his impression.

On the day of the opening of the fourth session, 14 September 1965,[27] Paul VI surprised the council by the announcement that he would summon a Synod of Bishops, through which the episcopate could work together for the welfare of the Universal Church. From the motu proprio *Apostolica sollicitudo* of 15 September it appeared that the majority of the members of the Synod of Bishops was to be elected by the episcopal conferences, whereby a general representation of the bishops, not of the College of Bishops as such, was assured. The Synod of Bishops is convoked, prepared, and guided by the Pope. It is "a permanent synod of bishops for the entire Church, which is directly and immediately subject to Our power," and hence not a "little council" with its own deciding power.

---

[26] Brief introduction by Abbot Johannes Hoeck in *Herder TK* I, 362f.; also, Hampe II, 637–97. The Pope's address in *AAS* 56 (1964), 1107–18, and *Decreta,* 971–91. Retrospect of the entire third session by Hirschmann et al. in Müller III/2, 897–925.

[27] The speech of 14 September 1965 in *AAS* 57 (1965), 794–805, and *Decreta,* 992–1011. The motu proprio with a German translation in the pamphlet edited by me: *Ordnung der Bischofssynode* (Trier 1968), 50–61; there, pp. 18–49, the agenda issued on 8 December 1966.

The fourth session differed from all the earlier ones in this, that the work of the commissions in refining the texts was in the foreground, the general congregations were to a great extent taken up with voting and were several times interrupted by rather long pauses. The council was under the pressure of time, for this session was to be the last. Without a break the still outstanding decrees were brought to a conclusion.

At the beginning of the renewed debate on religious freedom, on 15 September, the commentator, De Smedt, once again made it clear that the text did not equate truth and error and that it did not release the individual from the moral obligation of seeking and embracing the truth but merely contained freedom from religious compulsion in the civil sphere. A newly inserted passage left open the possibility of allowing to the Church a privileged position in states with an overwhelmingly Catholic population and thereby reconciled a part of the Italians, such as Cardinal Urbani of Venice, but not all opponents: In the final vote on 21 September, 224 fathers voted *non placet.* After repeated clarification of the text on the basis of *modi* submitted, the number of "no" votes on 19 November even rose to 249. In the preceding debate the Polish Cardinal Wyszyński and the Czech Cardinal Beran, only released in the spring, had indicated the importance of the declaration for the Church behind the Iron Curtain: acts of conscience could be neither commanded nor prevented by a purely human power. The Church claims for itself, as a "spiritual authority established by Christ the Lord," the freedom to proclaim the gospel to all creatures. It renounces the notion that the secular power is justified and obliged to support the Church's saving work by compulsory means; it notes that the modern state is no longer Christian, but neutral; modern society is no longer monistic, but pluralist; but it limits their rights through the natural right of the individual not to be impeded by the civil power in the following of conscience. The burning of a Hus, the principle "Cuius regio, eius et religio" are henceforth not only historically outdated according to the teaching of the Church but are basically repudiated. The impact of this decision explains why the Declaration on Religious Liberty was only ready for publication in the last session.

On the other hand, from the end of September to the end of October the five decrees which were approved and proclaimed in the seventh *sessio* on 28 October 1965 moved quickly and without great objection across the stage of the council. The Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops assumed the doctrine of the episcopal office explained in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church and was oriented to practice. The curial offices and tribunals are "to be more strongly adapted to the needs of the time, the regions, and the rites," and more foreign bishops, "ex diversis ecclesiae regionibus," are to be brought into them for permanent cooperation. The right was given to the episcopal conferences to issue statutes for themselves and to make legally binding decrees with a two-thirds majority. A redrawing of episcopal sees and ecclesiastical provinces was envisaged. Bishops were authorized to appoint episcopal vicars with material or territorial competence. Fruitful, even if also difficult to realize in large dioceses, was the idea of the *presbyterium* united with the bishop as father—ART. 28: "unum constituunt presbyterium atque unam familiam cuius pater est episcopus." The final vote on 6 October yielded almost unanimity—2,161 to 14, and only two "no" votes in the *sessio*. The decree "interlocked more powerfully than any other conciliar document in the juridical order of the Church," says Mörsdorf; it would only achieve its full impact in the course of the reform of canon law.[28]

The schema on the renewal of religious life had, in the debate of the third session, 10 to 12 November 1964, incurred the opposition of several bishops, for example, Cardinals Döpfner and Suenens, but especially of the religious institutes—882 *non placet* at the close of the general debate—and so in the spring of 1965 it was again revised by three subcommissions with such success that in the final vote on 11 October there were only thirteen negative votes, and in the *sessio* only four.[29] It proceeded from the ideal of perfection developed in Chapter 6 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church; in its practical part it is, like the Tridentine reform decree, a law providing a framework which did not encroach on the differences and the proper life of the orders and other religious communities, but obliged them to sift from the order's tradition what was original and essential, to improve the formation of the young members, to give them the salutary measure of freedom, to understand the, now as earlier, necessary obedience not as renunciation of their own responsibility, to live for God but likewise for people. Of course it happened, as Cardinal Ruffini had already said in the debate on 11 November 1964, that this decree would evoke "extravagant" desires for reform.

---

[28] Introduction and commentary by K. Mörsdorf in *Herder TK* II, 128–247. There can be no doubt that the priests' councils to be set up bore no analogy to the College of Bishops. Proposals in this direction were made by J. Neumann in Hampe II, 496ff.

[29] The long and complex prehistory of the decree *Perfectae caritatis* by F. Wulf in *Herder TK* II, 250ff.; L. Kaufmann in Hampe II, 291–334. On the fundamental element, F. Wulf, "Gebot und Rat," *GuL* 39 (1966), 321ff.; S. Légasse, *L'appel du riche. Contribution à l'étude des fondements scripturaires de l'état religieux* (Paris 1966). The passage on secular institutes (ART. 11) was not inserted into the text until the fifth version, but with the remark "Quamvis non sint instituta religiosa."

The text on the formation of priests, expanded again from a principle to a decree, explained by Bishop Carraro of Verona, found so favorable a reception in the third session that only a few controverted points were left. The revision submitted on 11 October was accepted almost unanimously—2,196 to 15.[30] The decree *Optatam totius Ecclesiae renovationem* designated the family as "a sort of first seminary" for the vocation to the priesthood and left the preparation to the Tridentine seminary, but attached importance to the improvement of biblical and liturgical studies and of the practical pastoral instruction that was neglected in some countries. The natural virtues, *sinceritas, urbanitas, modestia,* were to be cultivated. The episcopal conferences were instructed to set up programs of study which were adapted to the intellectual and religious level of the country. A debate suggested by Latin American bishops on the law of celibacy was rejected by the Pope as "inopportune" in a letter of 11 October 1965 to Cardinal Tisserant but it invited the council fathers to express their views in writing. Shortly before, the intervention of a Brazilian bishop of Dutch descent on the eliminating of the lack of priests by ordaining laymen who had been married for five years for pastoral work in smaller congregations had been rejected by the moderators.[31]

---

[30] In the very succinct introduction by J. Neuner in *Herder TK* II, 310ff., it is maintained that the Tridentine decree on seminaries belongs "to the age of the Counter Reformation"; cf., on the contrary, my *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* IV/2, 73ff., and the literature cited there on p. 273. The lack of previous seminary training had been deplored in the earlier debate, on 12 November 1964, by Cardinal Colombo of Milan, himself a former seminary Rector: Hampe II, 172f; cf. H. Jedin, "Das Leitbild des Priesters nach dem Tridentinum und dem Vaticanum II," *ThGl* 59 (1969), 102–24; A. De Bovis, "Nature et mission du presbyterat," *Sacerdoce et célibat. Études historiques et théologiques,* ed. by J. Coppens (Louvain 1971), 187–224.

[31] The undelivered talk to the council by Bishop Pieter Koop of Lins in Hampe II, 239ff. A glimpse of the postconciliar discussion is provided by the collective work of J. Coppens mentioned in the preceding note.

The Declaration on Christian Education, *Gravissimum educationis momentum,* was the eighth version of a text elaborated by the Commission for Studies, which after a temporary reduction to seventeen basic principles in March 1964, was again expanded and explained by Bishop Daem of Antwerp and in the debate of the third session, 17 to 19 November, ran into heavy criticism and obtained 419 "no" votes. Thereupon Archbishop Coadjutor Elchinger of Strasbourg had directed attention to the importance of the formation of teachers and pointed out the danger that the state might force its own ideology on the children in its schools. Not only was there a vote on the new version on 13 and 14 October 1965: the final vote turned out to be 1,912 to 183. In twelve principles the declaration developed the right of the individual to education, the right of parents, the desirability of denominational schools and Catholic universities, but it intimated that both, especially the last, urgently needed coordination and consolidation. Of the fact that the great majority of Catholic students attended neutral universities and that many Catholic professors taught at these, the declaration took note only in passing, in ART. 7.[32]

The Declaration on the Church's Attitude toward Non-Christian Religions, frequently called the "Declaration on the Jews" because of its principal item, was not yet able in its new form, in comparison with the earlier diluted form, to satisfy all its opponents. Then the reaction had been so strong that publication had been abandoned. The bishops of Arab countries, such as Jacobite Patriarch Jacob III, intimidated by the threats of the Arab states but supported by members of *Coetus Internationalis,* continued their resistance, and anti-Semitic pamphlets against the alleged "Jewish-Freemason Conspiracy" were distributed; on the other hand German Catholics in a petition to the Pope had intervened in favor of promulgation.[33] The form now presented for a vote endeavored to remove misunderstandings and also to gain the opponents. Their number remained mostly under 200 in the special votes on 14 and 15 October, but in the vote on the whole rose to 250; in the *sessio* it dropped to eighty-eight. The disputed expression "deicide" was dropped, but it was stated clearly that the guilt for the passion and death of Jesus must be laid neither on the Jews of today nor "on all Jews living at that time, without distinction." Urged not by political motives but by the love of Christ, the Church "deplores" anti-Semitism and "rejects every discrimination against a person, every deed of violence against him because of his race, his color, his status, or his religion." By means of this closing statement the condemnation of anti-Semitism was placed on a broader basis and made applicable to every racial discrimination. It was to become the maxim of Catholics in the approaching period of racial strife.

---

[32] Literature on the Declaration on Christian Education in *Herder TK* II, 358f; B. Dezza, "L'educazione cristiana nella Dichiarazione Conciliare," *CivCatt* 117, 1 (1966), 110–25; M. J. Hurley, *Declaration on Christian Education of Vatican Council II* (Glen Rock 1966). Both authors took part in the origin of the declaration.

[33] Cf. *Herder TK* II, 465–70; there, pp. 478ff., Excursus on the statements on Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism with the citations of the literature. For an understanding of the Declaration on the Jews, A. Bea, *Die Kirche und das jüdische Volk* (Freiburg 1966).

The far less controverted central part of the declaration applied the basic attitude of the Decree on Ecumenism, with which it had been originally united, to Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism. Monotheism was recognized as obligatory in Islam, and in a reference to the crusades, in which Muslims had been fought with the sword as "heathens," the wish was expressed that the past be forgotten. In Hinduism the liberating "contemplation of the mystery of God" was positively evaluated; in Buddhism, the effort to become free, by means of asceticism, from this passing world. For all the world religions the principle was valid: "The Catholic Church rejects nothing that is true and holy in these religions"; it is often "the reflection of the ray of that truth which enlightens all people," where the fullness of life is to be found: in Christ. For the confrontation with non-Christian religions the declaration has no less significance than the Decree on Ecumenism for the relations with the separated Churches.

In his homily the Pope, alluding to the five promulgated texts, exclaimed: "The Church lives!" It has not grown old, but young; it does not let itself be sucked into the whirlpool of historical change, but remains constant—"semper eadem est sibique constat"; it speaks, prays, watches, rebuilds itself. The council convoked by Pope John "represents the entire Church," *totam repraesentat.* At the end the Pope recalled the persecuted Church, whose representatives were concelebrating with him.[34]

After the October meeting the last snags were quickly overcome. The Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation still had to contend with the opposition of a minority, which based itself on Trent. It only crumbled when, at the personal desire of the Pope in a letter of 18 October 1965 to Cardinal Ottaviani, the inerrancy of Holy Scripture was more precisely defined[35] and the relations of Scripture and tradition were newly formulated: "The Church does not derive assurance on all the truths of revelation from Scripture alone"; "tradition" is the living teaching office of the Church, which authoritatively interprets and complements Scripture. This formulation left to the theological schools the liberty of defining more in detail the mutual relations of the two. The doctrine of inspiration—"God speaks through men in a human way"—and the historical character of the Gospels were expressly affirmed. The study of the books of the Bible in the original languages and the ancient translations, as well as of the ancient commentaries and liturgies, and the reading of biblical translations in the vernacular were recommended. In the voting on the individual parts of the constitution on 29 October, only the passage on the relationship of Scripture and tradition got fifty-five *non placet;* the vote on the whole was 2,081 to 27, and in the *sessio* the "no" votes dropped to six. "The text joins fidelity to ecclesiastical tradition with the assent to critical scholarship and thereby opens up again to the faith the road to today," said Ratzinger.

---

[34] The Pope's homily in *AAS* 57 (1965), 899–903, and *Decreta,* 1037–43.

[35] On the petition, preceding the papal letter, of conservative fathers against the expression *veritas salutaris,* too greatly restrictive in their view, cf. A. Grillmeier in *Herder TK* II, 536f.; what is meant is the truth which God might communicate to us; cf. A. Grillmeier, "Die Wahrheit der Heiligen Schrift und ihre Erschließung. Zum dritten Kapitel der Dogmatischen Konstitution Dei Verbum des Vaticanum II," *Theol. u. Phil.*

After 29 October the general congregations were interrupted for ten days in order to allow time to the commissions for working on the *modi.* The Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, explained on 9 November by Bishop Hengsbach of Essen, had assimilated the proposals for change submitted in the voting of 23 to 27 September, as were also those presented personally by the Pope. It received a virtually unanimous approval on 10 November.[36] If Trent had defended the priesthood of ordination, so too in the justification of the lay apostolate the general priesthood of the faithful came into its own. "In the Church there are various ministries but only one mission"; no member of the Church is only passive; all are called to cooperate actively in the building of the Body of the Church as witnesses of faith and love, in the family, in charity, in the missions—everything under the direction of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as the authority established and ordered by God, but not intended to patronize. The council itself gave an example by the fact that it employed lay persons as *periti* on the commissions in an increased measure.

A schema *De Indulgentiis recognoscendis,* drawn up not by a conciliar commission but by the Congregation of Rites, was felt almost by all to be a disaster when it was explained by Grand Penitentiary Cento and

---

41 (1966), 161–87; G. Caprile, "Tre emendamenti allo Schema sulla Rivelazione," *CivCatt* 117 (1966), 214–31.

[36] On the history of the origin, F. Klostermann in *Herder TK* II, 587–601, supplemented by the same author's article in Hampe II, 72–87; Müller III/2, 608–74, gives the reports and several interventions during the debate in September 1964, for example, on pp. 628f. that of Auxiliary Bishop Betazzi of Bologna on the spirituality of the laity.

the regent of the *Poenitentiaria* on 9 November. The text envisaged certain simplifications in the practice of indulgences, for example, that only *one* plenary indulgence could be gained in one year, the time references in partial indulgences were suppressed, but it did not grasp the theological problem of the indulgence in its depth and was withdrawn on 13 November[37] because of the keen criticism which it encountered from the episcopal conferences which had been questioned about it.

The Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation and the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity were proclaimed in the eighth *sessio* on 18 November 1965. In his talk the Pope tried to dissipate the hesitations concerning the now imminent ending of the council's work by reference to the establishing of postconciliar agencies: the *consilia* for the liturgy, for the revision of canon law, and for the mass media; the already existing Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity would be complemented by one secretariat each for non-Christian religions and for unbelievers; the first meeting of the Synod of Bishops was held out in prospect for 1967. The Pope asked for patience, if the necessary organizational, not structural, changes in the Roman Curia were implemented only slowly; persons wrongly held it to be an "instrumentum veterascens, ineptum, corruptum." By far most important of all was the renewal of Christian life.[38]

Until the close of the council three problem children still had to be examined: The Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church, the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, and Schema 13.

The general of the Divine Word Missionaries, Johannes Schütte, named by the chairman, Cardinal Agagianian, as vice-chairman of the Commission for the Missions, succeeded, with the assistance of newly added *periti*—Congar, Ratzinger, Seumois—at a private meeting at Nemi in the Alban Hills in drafting a wholly new schema, which was based on a theological foundation corresponding to modern mission scholarship and, in that respect, from a backward-looking had become a forward-looking document. In the debate, 7 to 12 October, Cardinal Frings had come out for the retaining of the old "classical" idea of the mission, but the Jesuit General Arrupe harshly criticized the practice of the past. There was no dearth of unresolved problems: the relations of the orders, which till now were the chief agents of missionary work, to the native clergy and of both to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith; financing; competition with non-Catholic missions. When the vote was taken on the refined text, 712 fathers—most all from mission lands—expressed in their *modi* to Chapter 5 that the missionaries active on the spot should have to collaborate in the decisions of the central offices. Thereupon the contested passage was revised, so that "elected representatives" of the missionary episcopate and of the missionary orders had to be summoned to the Propaganda with a decisive vote, hence not merely as advisers.[39]

---

[37] Hampe I, 436–49; there 445–49 the opinion of the German and the Austrian episcopal conferences.

[38] *AAS* 57 (1965), 978–84; *Decreta,* 1044—57. It can hardly be denied that the tone now sounded in regard to the Curia was different from that in September 1963.

In the third session the council had also sent back to the competent commission the schema on the priesthood. At that time there prevailed the impression that priests, compared, for example, with bishops and religious, would be unduly neglected by the contracting of the schema into guiding principles. The commission worked out a new schema, which was submitted at the end of the third session and was again revised, better organized, and stylistically polished at the beginning of 1965 on the basis of 157 suggestions for change, presented in writing. Archbishop Marty of Rheims introduced it on 13 October; on 16 October the council decided to have the proposals for changes presented by Cardinals Döpfner and Léger and other speakers reworked by the commission. The vote by parts on 12 and 13 November, however, produced so large a number of *modi*—1,331 on celibacy alone—that still another revision became necessary, and on 2 December it was approved by a great majority, 2,243 to 11.[40]

Nevertheless, the decree *Presbyterorum ordinis* had by no means fulfilled all expectations. With reference to the pertinent parts of the constitutions on the liturgy and on the Church, it treated the mission of the priest, his threefold ministry, the relation of priests to the bishops, to one another, and to the laity. "Every priestly ministry shares in the worldwide mission which Christ entrusted to the Apostles"; the priest should be prepared to work in other dioceses with too few priests. Celibacy is "not demanded by the nature of the priesthood," as the practice of the Eastern Churches proved, but is "in many respects appropriate to the priesthood." The law of celibacy was approved and confirmed. "And so the council admonishes all priests who have taken celibacy upon themselves with confidence in God's grace in a free decision according to the model of Christ, to remain faithful to it generously and with the entire heart and to persevere loyally in this state." (ART. 16).

---

[39] For the origin, *Herder TK* III, 10–21; J. Glazik entitled his commentary in Hampe III, 543–53: "A Correction, Not a Magna Carta"; O. Stoffel is of a different mind, "Missionsstrukturen im Wandel," *NZMW* 31 (1975), 259–70: "The mission was pushed from the edge of the Church to the middle." Turning away from the traditional concept of mission, a layman from Togo said: "Mission is everywhere"; Hampe III, 530.

[40] For the history of the origin, J. Lécuyer in *Herder TK* III, 128–41; the strongly critical commentary on ARTS. 1–6 by F. Wulf, ibid., 141–69; on ARTS. 12–22, ibid., 198–237. Many interventions are given in *Documentation Catholique* 62 (1965), 2183–2202; 63 (1966), 329–48; J. Colson, *Ministre de Jésus Christ ou le sacerdoce de l'Évangile* (Paris 1966).

Schema 13 evoked by far the greatest concern. For even the new draft, produced between the third and fourth sessions at Ariccia, Paris, and Louvain,[41] upon which Archbishop Garrone of Toulouse gave the report, ran into varied criticism in the debate from 21 September to 8 October—the fourteenth general congregation—because of the superabundance of general claims which it contained (Elchinger), because of the language, unclear in many passages (Frings), because of its all too optimistic evaluation of the "world" and its confidence of progress (Höffner), but especially because it said only a little on what the Church of today has to give to the world (Bishop Volk of Mainz). Cardinal König and others noted the absence of a confrontation with atheism, especially with atheistic Communism, whose express condemnation was demanded by 450 fathers in a petition to the presidency. A fortiori views were juxtaposed in the concrete problems: total war, atomic weapons, disarmament, refusal of military service, assurance of peace. The council was naturally in no position to give a clear answer to these pressing questions. The appearance of the Pope before the United Nations in New York on 4 October was, it is true, suited to make visible the Church's involvement in today's world; in the structurally conditioned problems of this organization it changed nothing.

In feverish work the commission, which had divided itself into ten subcommissions, strove to incorporate into the text the more than three thousand proposals for changes for the votes on 15 to 17 November. Even the title "Pastoral Constitution" was challenged—541 *non placet.* The most "no" votes (140) were cast on ARTS. 54 to 56 (marriage, birth control) and the section on war and peace (144). The final vote on 6 December produced, just the same, a respectable majority: 2,111 to 251.

The pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes,* the most voluminous text of the council, was placed, as the "heart of the council," at the side of the three other constitutions. It aimed to be "a fundamental new definition of the relation of the Church to the world" and thereby to orient the Church to the world, and that meant to the spirit of the new epoch, from which it had held itself aloof since a century earlier in the Syllabus. This constitution was greeted with enthusiasm, but history has already proved that at that time its significance was greatly overestimated and there was hardly a suspicion of how deeply that "world" which people wanted to win for Christ would penetrate the Church. Only too confident of progress, it remained self-consciously in a static manner of contemplation without being able to give clear answers to such urgent problems as birth control and the prevention of war; entirely inadequate is ART. 58 on the relation of the Church to the cultures. Perhaps a brief "declaration," in which the Church turned *ad extra,* would have made a deeper impression than this diffuse treatise.

---

[41] The last phase of the history of the origin in *Herder TK* III, 266–79; there, pp. 266, n. 47, and 268, n. 74, are given the lists of priests and laity who shared in the revision of the text; pp. 273f. give the composition of the ten subcommissions. Commentary by A. Grillmeier in Hampe III, 138–56; the collective work *L'Église dans le monde de ce temps* (Paris 1967); P. Mikat, "Kirche und Staat in nachkonziliarer Sicht (1967)" in *Religionsrechtliche Schriften* I (Berlin 1974), 217–35; J. Ratzinger, "Der Weltdienst der Kirche," *Internat. Kath. Zeitschrift,* 1975, 439–54. The Central Office of Catholic Social Science of Mönchengladbach publishes *Kommentare zur Pastoralkonstitution des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils,* for example, A. Langner, *Die politische Gemeinschaft* (Cologne 1968).

When the secretary general announced in the general congregation of 6 December that this, the one hundred and sixty-eighth, was the last of this council, stormy applause thundered through the halls of Saint Peter's. The council had done its work. In the ninth *sessio* on 7 December, in addition to *Gaudium et spes,* the decrees on the mission and the priesthood and the Declaration on Religious Freedom were approved and proclaimed. Once again the ecumenical orientation of the council was confirmed. In a common declaration the Pope and the ecumenical patriarch canceled the mutual excommunications of 1054. In his homily[42] during the Mass celebrated by twenty-four fathers, the Pope admitted that "not a few questions which were taken up during the council still awaited a satisfactory solution"; nevertheless, it might be said that the Council had corresponded to the goal set by Pope John. The Church had not been concerned to admire itself but to serve people, *ut homini serviat.*

On the next day, 8 December, the council was declared ended in a closing celebration arranged in the piazza of Saint Peter's. There were messages in French directed to political leaders, scholars and artists, women, the poor and suffering, workers and youth, delivered by representatives of these groups.[43] The Pope had said good-bye to the observers in an hour of devotion which deeply impressed all the participants in the basilica of San Paolo on 4 December.

---

[42] *AAS* 58 (1966), 51–59, and *Decreta,* 1061–77. In his radio address at Christmas the Pope again took up this idea: the council was an encounter of the Church with itself and the world.

[43] The messages of 8 December in *Decreta,* 1084–1100; ibid., 1101f., the Pope's declaration that the council is closed: "concludere decernimus atque statuimus ad omnes iuris effectus."

The Second Vatican Council was a world event. Was it an event of world history? A reply to this question would assume that one could in some way take in its effects at a glance.

Impact

In an interval of only a decade the impact of the Second Vatican Council cannot be decisively determined, but its effects can be observed. It is now established that it penetrated more deeply into the history of the Church than the First Vatican Council; in any event, its effects are comparable to those of Trent.[44] The first historians of Trent, Sarpi and Pallavicino, were not able to give a historical orientation, although they wrote more than half a century after the event: for them the council was still an object of strife, not history. It is tempting to say something similar about the Second Vatican Council. Of course, it can hardly be disputed that it represented a turning point in the history of the Church. Much began to move in it, its internal structure was loosened up, it opened itself up ecumenically and to the world. Was this movement for the business of Jesus Christ on earth gain or loss?

The verdicts differ widely. The original enthusiasm with which the council was greeted yielded to harsh criticism. The critics pointed to the perplexity in the faith which "pluralism" in theology and preaching had caused; to the constantly declining participation of the faithful in Mass; the sharply increasing number of priests and religious who abandoned their vocation; the bewildering number of "councils" which were supposed to promote the "democratization" of the Church; the weakening authority of the Pope and the bishops; the increase of mixed marriages; the "earthly messianism," to use Ratzinger's term, which throws man back to the feasible; to the new sexual morality: the influence of the Church on the world has not increased but dissipated. The fact is incontrovertible.

The "progressives," on the contrary, have to reflect that an inner process of fermentation was necessary in order to realize Pope John's

---

[44] The reserve which I professed immediately after the council I cannot yet even now abandon. The earlier observations: "Tradition und Fortschritt. Einige Erwägungen zum geschichtlichen Ort des Vaticanum II," in *Wort und Wahrheit* 21 (1966), 731–41; *Vaticanum II und Tridentinum. Tradition und Fortschritt in der Kirchengeschichte* (Cologne and Opladen 1968), with contributions to the discussion by J. Ratzinger, K. Rahner, et al. On the tenth anniversary of the close of the council Bavarian Radio arranged a broadcast series, which was inaugurated by J. Ratzinger, "Erfolge und Enttäuschungen"; from my own contribution, "Das Vaticanum II und die Konziliengeschichte," printed in *Klerusblatt* 56 (1976), 53–56, much has made its way into the following presentation. H. Helbling, *Dauerhaftes Provisorium. Kirche aus der Sicht eines Weltchristen* (Zurich 1976), attempts a balance.

aggiornamento. They do not deny that the new liturgy is experiencing its "childhood illnesses," but claim that, thanks to the vernacular, the faithful participate in it more actively than previously. "Declericalization" and "democratization" are consequences of the doctrine of the People of God: a far-reaching cooperation, even having a voice, by the laity is necessary if the Church is to fulfill its mission in today's world. Finally, the ecumenical stance has reduced denominational strife and brought about the "end of the Counter-Reformation." The positive assessment of the religious and ethical content of the ancient world religions offers to the mission positive starting points, and Europeanism has long been outdated. They rightly affirm that the undoubtedly present phenomena of dissolution are, at least partly, not to be referred to the council but to the upheavals within industrial society and in the Third World, and hence in the long-run have struck root in the turn in world history in which we stand. In an intermediate stage, which is full of uncertainty but also full of honest struggling and full of hope, there are movements and beginnings which promise new possibilities; a search for the mean appears, which gives the lie to the diagnosis of the end of the religious and paves from faith ways of new life, in which the unexhausted fertility of the Church's faith again proves itself, as Ratzinger says.

An accommodation of the opposing views is not yet in sight. It can be found only if one adheres to this: that the council, the highest authority in faith and morals, had set up binding norms, behind which one must not fall back, which one must also not go beyond or even disregard. There is no retreat back behind the council, but even less is this only an initial kindling for a total adaptation of the Church in faith, morals, and structure. Only if one holds fast to the council itself, can the compromise between tradition and progress be found, the identity of the Church in a changing world be preserved.

After the close of the Council of Trent a deputation of cardinals was instituted for the interpretation of the decrees, which later undertook the added task of promoting and supervising their implementation. The Second Vatican Council, differently from Trent, did not enact any decrees directly to be admitted to the canon law; this task was given to the Commission for the Revision of the Code,[45] set up during the council. For the interpretation of the decrees for the period from 3 January 1966 to 11 July 1967 the Coordinating Commission of the council was still competent, but on 11 July 1967 a special commission for interpretation was instituted, the *Pontificia Commissio decretis concilii*

---

[45] See below, the contribution of G. May (Chapter 5); important contribution by K. Mörsdorf, "Zur Neuordnung der Systematik des CIC," *AKR* 137 (1968), 3–38.

Vaticani II interpretandis.[46] It does not have the same authority as did in its day the Congregation of the Council, expanded into an office.

The council itself had in several places referred to the still to be issued rules of implementation (directories) and turned over other tasks—celibacy, indulgences, mixed marriages—expecially the reform of the Roman Curia, to the Pope.

For the implementation of the council, on 3 January 1966, to the three postconciliar commissions set up during the council, five others were added, whose chairmen and members were identical with those of the corresponding conciliar commission:[47] (1) for bishops and the government of dioceses; (2) for religious; (3) for the missions; (4) for Christian education; and (5) for the lay apostolate. The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Secretariats for Non-Christian Religions and for Unbelievers were confirmed.

The reform of the curial offices was begun after the Council of Trent by Pius IV and Pius V but only completed by Sixtus V. After the Second Vatican Council the reconstruction of the Roman Curia, demanded during the debate on the Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops and promised by the Pope, had to wait only a year and a half. In the constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae universalis* of 15 August 1967[48] the work hitherto performed by the Curia received high praise, *egregia laude digna.* The Secretariat of State obtained the competence to coordinate the work of the congregations. Even the hitherto "Suprema," the Holy Office, was subordinated to it, obtained the name of *Congregatio de doctrina fidei,* and was instructed to declare the prohibition of books only after hearing the author, *audito auctore,* and reaching an understanding with the competent ordinary, *praemonito ordinario.* The former Congregation of the Council received the name of *Congregatio pro clericis;* the Congregation *De Propaganda fide,* the name of *Pro gentium evangelizatione seu De Propaganda fide.* The divisions at first acting as sections of the Congregation of Rites for the liturgy (*de cultu*) and canonizations (*de causis servorum Dei*) soon became independent. Entirely new was the Council on the Laity, *consilium de laicis.* The composition of the congregations was changed by the fact that seven residential bishops were assigned to each as ordinary members.

---

[46] *AAS* 58 (1966), 37–40; V. Carbone, *De commissione decretis Concilii Vaticani II interpretandis* (Naples 1969).

[47] The Paulinusverlag at Trier has published since 1967 a *Nachkonziliare Dokumentation,* 58 issues to 1977; there, as no. 2, the apostolic constitution *Paenitemini* of 17 December 1966 on the discipline of fasting and penance, ed. by O. Semmelroth (Trier 1967).

[48] *AAS* 59 (1967), 885–929; ibid., 881–84, the new structure of the congregations. For the reorganization of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith by the motu proprio *Integrae servandae* of 7 December 1965, cf. *AKR* 134 (1965), 479ff.

The three tribunals—the Apostolic Signatura, the Rota, and the Sacred Penitentiary—the Apostolic Chancery, and the Apostolic Camera remained in existence, but the entire economic sphere was reorganized by the establishing of a finance ministry, *Praefectura rerum oeconomicarum S. Sedis,* and of a central administration of property, *Administratio Patrimonii S. Sedis,* beside which the Prefecture of the Apostolic Palace took its place; also new was the Office of Statistics.

Three years after this reorganization of the Curia came the motu proprio *Ingravescentem aetatem,* which deprived cardinals after the completing of the eightieth year of age of the right to participate in a papal election,[49] but the right to elect the Pope remained as such in the College of Cardinals.

It far exceeds the possibilities of space here to offer even only a fleeting glance at the activity of the individual curial departments.[50] New is that at their side, not subordinate to them, appeared the Synod of Bishops.[51] So far it has had three regular sessions and one extraordinary session. The theme of the first regular session of 29 September to 28 October 1967, in which 199 synodalists took part, was: principles for the revision of the code; dangerous doctrinal opinions; seminaries; mixed marriages; liturgy. The newly composed profession of faith was published. The extraordinary session of 11 to 27 October 1969 took up the collaboration between the Holy See and the episcopal conferences and of these conferences among themselves. It was significant that at the opening of the Synod of Bishops the Pope referred the episcopal conferences and the summoning of residential bishops to the congregations to the principle of collegiality.

The second regular session of 30 September to 6 November 1971 took up in thirty-seven meetings the problems of the priestly office and of justice in the world. The third session of 27 September to 26 October 1974, in which 207 synodalists participated, dealt with the "evangelization of the world of today." It probably corresponded best to the meaning of the institution in so far as during it a survey was given of the status of the Church in Africa, Latin and North America, and Asia, as well as in the Second World behind the Iron Curtain. Continuity was assured by the Permanent Secretariat under the Pole Rubin, whose competence was significantly expanded in the course of time. There is no doubt that this typical fruit of the Second Vatican Council, a new thing in church history, still needs further development.

---

[49] *AAS* 62 (1970), 810–13.

[50] For what follows recourse was had to the annual (since 1965) publication *L'Attività della S. Sede. Pubblicazione non ufficiale.* As example may be mentioned the meeting of experts, summoned by the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities in Rome from 20 to 28 November 1967, which had the duty of submitting proposals for the revision of the constitution *Deus scientiarum* of 24 May 1931 on the basis of the conciliar decree *Optatam.* By making use of the proposals then elaborated, the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities on 20 May 1968 published norms for the new form of programs of study (A. Mayer and G. Baldanza, "Il Rinnovamento degli Studi philosofici e teologici nei seminari," *La Scuola Cattolica,* 1966, Supplemento 2).

[51] Establishing and statute of the Synod of Bishops along with a brief introduction in no. 12 of *Nachkonziliare Dokumentation* (Trier 1968) mentioned in n. 47.

Pope Paul VI continued the form of apostolic proclamation by means of doctrinal writings, as cultivated by his predecessors. In the encyclical *Populorum progressio* of 26 March 1967 he took a stand in favor of the Third World;[52] in the Encyclical *Humanae vitae* of 25 July 1968 he again inculcated Christian principles for the reproduction of human life. He utilized the Holy Year 1975, proclaimed by him, to make stronger the union of the local churches with Rome and to inspire the pilgrims arriving in unexpectedly great numbers. For the more the idea was put across that the Universal Church lives in the member and local churches, the more urgent became their internal and external problems for the Church as a whole; the *communio ecclesiarum* is more demanding than any legal order. This structure of the Church, which can appeal to *Lumen gentium,* also sets new tasks for church history. The national and regional episcopal conferences have acquired a previously undreamed of importance.[53] The postconciliar synods organized by them give reason for a variety in ecclesiastical life which on occasion threatens its unity. Guarantor of this unity is the Petrine Office. It would be fatal to aim to prune it back to its functions in the ancient Church, and just as fatal to maintain certain claims raised in the high and late Middle Ages. The world Church of the twentieth century, in which all continents and races are on an equal footing, cannot be governed in a centralized way, as was the Church of the nineteenth century. However, it is just as certain that the centrifugal tendencies, becoming inexorably stronger, can be met only by a strong central power; an honorary precedence is inadequate for this, quite apart from the fact that it withdraws behind the dogma of the primacy. The modern means of news and communication give the Apostolic See the possibility of being abreast of all happenings in the world Church and, where necessary, of intervening in them to preserve the unity of the Church without reestablishing uniformity. The relaxing of centralization is demanded by the mission of the Church in our time; the Petrine Office further preserves the unity.

---

[52] *AAS* 59, 1 (1967), 257–99; with commentary by O.v. Nell-Breuning in no. 4 of *Nachkonziliare Dokumentation* (Trier 1967); ibid., as no. 14, an edition of "Humanae vitae" with a "Word of the German Bishops on the Pastoral Situation" (Trier 1968).

[53] For the Federal German Republic, G. May, "Die deutsche Bischofskonferenz nach ihrer Neuordnung," *AKR* 133 (1969), 405–61; ibid., 3–13.

The Council of Trent would never have been able to exert its impact if it had not been carried by a wave of holiness. The impact of the Second Vatican Council will also depend on whether the Church of the twentieth century renews itself in the spirit of Jesus Christ. "The definitive decision on the historical worth of the Second Vatican Council depends on whether people realize in themselves the drama of the testing of chaff and wheat"; "whether at the end it will be reckoned among the luminous moments of church history depends on the people who transfer it into life," says Ratzinger.

CHAPTER 5

*The Code of Canon Law and the Development of Canon Law to 1974**

From the Promulgation of the Code to the Second Vatican Council

THE CODIFICATION OF CANON LAW

The codification of the canon law of the Latin Church is due to the energy and initiative of Pius X. In the motu proprio *Arduum sane munus* of 19 March 1904 the Pope had made known his intention of assembling in one uniform codification the valid canon law of the Latin Church, which lay scattered in many sources of the law. The task was courageously undertaken and energetically pursued under the direction of Pietro Gasparri. The bishops of the world and consultors from the most important countries took part in the work. In the secret consistory of 4 December 1916 Benedict XV announced the completion of the project. On 27 May 1917 the Pope issued the law in which the Code of Canon Law obtained ratification—the apostolic constitution *Providentissima Mater Ecclesia.* The Code of Canon Law was promulgated on 28 June 1917 and took effect on 19 May 1918. The intended aim—to unify the fragmented law in the great and important questions of ecclesiastical life—was accomplished. The Code of Canon Law is a codification, complete in itself, of the common law of the Church of the Latin Rite. But it refers to earlier laws which retain their validity because and in so far as it mentions them (Canon 6). The Code of Canon Law is the law book of the Church of the Latin Rite, but to a certain extent it is also valid for the congregations of the Eastern Rites (Canon 1). The codification was stamped by the principles of the greatest possible retention of the traditional and by prudent adaptation. The code thus contains no radical novelties, but only modifications suited to the age. Some archaic elements were dragged along, and certain newer developments, for example, in the sphere of the law of property and benefices, were not considered. The code accepted in the widest scope the proposals made by the fathers of the First Vatican Council and the bishops employed for consultation. It built also, in many ways, on the ideas and guidelines given by Leo XIII. Finally, some elements from the law of concordats entered the code, for example, in regard to the privileges of the clergy. The thinning, reworking, and modernizing of the vast matter of traditional norms represent an important legislative achievement. The code is the climax and conclusion of the development begun in the nineteenth century, which the Church aimed also to make through strict uniform discipline and close union with the Apostolic See into a fit tool of the Christian penetration of the earth. It is an achievement due preeminently to the work of the Catholic Church in Europe. It stands in the tradition of medieval canon law and draws upon the lines begun by Trent.

---

* Georg May

The Code of Canon Law is divided into five books; to it were attached eight older documents which, as regards content, had not been adopted into it. It is introduced by the *Professio catholicae fidei.* Its principles of classification are not satisfactory in every respect. For example, the law on ecclesiastical offices is dismembered and divided between two different books. The code aimed to be basically only an internal law book of the Church and hence omits from the codification the regulation of the relations of Church and state. It thereby considerably facilitated its implementation. The language of the code is succinct and clear, but it suffers from uncertainty in terminology. In regard to new elements in the content, the following examples are illustrative. The position of the bishops was strengthened. The inclination existing since the Middle Ages to curtail the power of the hierarchical courts between Pope and bishops is expressed in the insignificance of the metropolitans (Canon 274). The bishops are freely named by the Pope (Canon 329, paragraph 2), and in this matter he makes ever more use of the lists submitted by the bishops. For the first time, the office of the bishop's vicar general was regulated by the common law (Canons 366–71). Trent's law on the contracting of marriage was made binding on the whole Church, and the exceptions for Germany and Hungary were abolished (Canon 1094).

The code was accepted by Catholics in general with joy and gratitude; they showed themselves overwhelmingly convinced of the advantage of the reform. The enacting of the code actually strengthened the inner order of the Church. The states accepted the codification at least without delays. The upheavals after 1918 assisted the introduction of the code to a great degree. A considerable part of the Church-state law, which chained and limited the Church, broke apart. Numerous conditions based on concordat, privilege, or indult disappeared as a consequence of the cessation of states or favored subjects. More open regulations were often found in the building and rebuilding. The other religious congregations, apart from some German Protestants, raised hardly any objections to the code.

In an effort to assure the legal unity effected by the codification, Benedict XV on 15 September 1917, through the motu proprio *Cum iuris,* set up a Commission of Cardinals and gave it the task of authentically interpreting the code and incorporating in it modifications that had become necessary. It fulfilled the first part of its office, but, apart from two exceptions, it did not take up the second. At the same time the Pope decreed that the congregations of the Roman Curia should issue no new *decreta* without urgent cause, but should limit themselves to *instructiones.*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAW FROM 1918 TO 1958

It soon became clear that it was not to be supposed that scholarship and practice could get along essentially with the code. The law formulated in the code required implementation and completion by further norms. Codification did not halt the development of the law, but fostered it. The law of the code developed further powerfully, especially through the numerous authentic declarations of the Commission for Interpretation, but also through the legislation of the Popes, especially Pius XI and Pius XII and the Congregations of Cardinals. The last mentioned issued their norms under the title of *instructiones, decreta, normae, indices,* and *formulae.* The judgments of the Roman Rota,[1] published annually from 1912, and the decisions of the congregations in individual cases likewise contributed to the interpretation and further growth of the law, especially that of marriage. And the letters of admonition and of teaching of the Holy See were also of great significance for the implementation and growth of the law.

The law of the code, so far as this can be observed, on the whole made its way relatively successfully. However, it was not possible to convert all prescriptions of the code into actuality. The code left untouched the treaties made by the Apostolic See with countries and hence to that extent renounced any claim to enforce them (Canon 3). Likewise, acquired rights as well as privileges and indults granted by the Apostolic See remained basically valid (Canon 4). Hence law that was compatible and recognized by the Holy See constituted a limit for the expansion of the new law. In view of the extensive sphere of validity of the code, one must reckon with a still stronger separation between formal and actual validity than with other codifications. New particular law, which supplemented or modified the code, was created especially by concordats. And in the enforcing of the code the bishops displayed an abundant activity at diocesan synods through the adapting and collecting of diocesan law.

---

[1] *Sacrae Romanae Rotae Decisiones seu Sententiae* I (Rome 1912).

Benedict XV

The remaining years of the pontificate of Benedict XV stood under the standard of the imposing, the constructing, and the maintaining of the situation of legal unity that had been achieved. The manner of appointing to episcopal sees in the United States that had been set by the decree *Ratio iuris* of the Consistorial Congregation on 25 July 1916 was extended with insignificant changes to a number of other countries.[2] The Pope undertook important changes in the constitution of the missions.[3] In view of certain radical movements in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, he several times declared, most clearly in the letter of 3 January 1920 to the archbishop of Prague, that the Holy See would never grant the abolition or modification of the law of celibacy.[4]

Pius XI

Pius XI did the chief work in legislation for the enforcing of the Code of Canon Law. Nevertheless he permitted no profound changes in the code. The norms issued by him were thoroughly worked out and adjusted to practice. A special characteristic of Pius XI's legislation was the comprehensive establishing of norms for concordats, which will be discussed below.

In 1929 the Pope introduced the codification of the canon law of the Eastern Churches, establishing a Commission of Cardinals under the chairmanship of Pietro Gasparri.[5] To two other commissions, which were set up in 1930, he confided the task of collecting the sources of Eastern canon law and elaborating drafts for the codification. The second commission was changed on 17 July 1935 into the *Pontificia*

---

[2] Canada (*AAS* 11 [1919], 124–128); Scotland (*AAS* 13 [1921], 13–16); Brazil (*AAS* 13 [1921], 222–25); Mexico (*AAS* 13 [1921], 379–82); Poland (*AAS* 13 [1921], 430–32). cf. K. Mörsdorf, *Das neue Besetzungsrecht der bischöflichen Stühle unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Listenverfahrens* (=*Kölner Rechtswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen* no. 6) (Bonn, Cologne and Berlin 1933).

[3] For example *AAS* 12 (1920), 331–33.

[4] Ibid. 11 (1919), 122f.; 12 (1920), 33–35, 585–88.

[5] Ibid. 21 (1929), 669.

Commissio ad redigendum "Codicem Iuris Canonici orientalis."[6] From the codification of the Eastern canon law it was expected that it would consolidate the bonds among the Eastern Rite congregations on the one hand and that of these with the Latin Church on the other and produce adaptations of law suited to the day.[7] In two decrees some canons of the code were extended also to the Eastern rite communities.[8] The motu proprio *Sancta Dei Ecclesia* of 25 March 1938 subjected also the Latin rite Catholics living in the Middle East to the Congregation for the Eastern Church.

The delayed arrival of three American cardinals on the occasion of the papal election of 1922 was utilized by Pius XI as an opportunity to modify in the motu proprio *Cum proxime* of 1 March 1922 the regulation of the conclave by Pius X on 25 December 1904. According to it the legal interval for the beginning of the conclave was lengthened from ten to fifteen days, to which, by decision of the College of Cardinals, three more days at the most might be added. The motu proprio was adopted into the appendix of documents of the code. Many decrees of the Pope affected the organization and the order of the competence and of the procedure of the departments of the Roman Curia. The congregations were strongly meshed in personnel. Through the constitution *Quae divinitus* of 27 March 1935 the *Sacra Poenitentiaria* obtained a new organization; on 29 July 1934 the *Sacra Romana Rota* underwent a reorganization of its constitution and its procedure. In the carrying out of Canon 328 there appeared on 15 August 1934 the constitution *Ad incrementum* on the prelates of the Roman Curia. For the quinquennial faculties of residential bishops, reintroduced on 17 March 1922,[9] the motu proprio *Post Datam* of 20 April 1923 created a uniform formula, which was issued by the Consistorial Congregation. For carrying out Canon 296 the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith on 8 December 1929 issued the important instruction *Quum huic Sacrae* on the relations between missionary bishops and religious superiors. In order to bring the statutes of cathedral and collegiate chapters into conformity with the law of the code, the Congregation of the Council on 25 July 1923 directed the bishops to allow the chapters an interval of six months for the adjustment of their statutes; if nothing should be done during this period, they should themselves carry out the revision. The discipline of the clergy was strictly inculcated or regulated by a considerable number of complexes of norms; in the encyclical *Ad*

---

[6] Ibid. 27 (1935), 306–8.

[7] Cf. A. Coussa, "De Codificatione canonica orientali," *Acta Congressus Iuridici Internationalis* IV (Rome 1937), 491–532.

[8] *AAS* 20 (1928), 195; 26 (1934), 550.

[9] Ochoa, *Leges Ecclesiae* I, 431–38.

catholici sacerdotii of 20 December 1935 the Pope had called the clergy's attention to the dignity and importance of its mission. The constitution *Deus scientiarum Dominus* of 24 May 1931, with the *ordinationes* of the Congregation for Studies of 12 June 1931 on Catholic universities and faculties[10] represented a sort of fundamental law of the Catholic system of higher education. It demanded an increase of ecclesiastical faculties and the raising of the scholarly requirements for promotions as well as the improvement of the teaching profession and the means of instruction. The Congregation of Seminaries and Universities was stripped of the right of promotion granted in Canon 256, par. 1. Under the name "Catholic Action," Pius XI called into being a lay movement united to the apostolate of the hierarchy. On 7 May 1923 appeared the decree of the Congregation of the Sacraments, *Catholica doctrina,* which in the appended bylaw exhaustively regulated the procedure in the dissolving of marriage *ratum sed non consummatum.* The instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments of 27 December 1930 on the ordination *scrutinia* set up a detailed method for examining candidates for orders in an effort to keep out of the priesthood unsuitable or unworthy persons. The instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments of 15 August 1936 brought, in 240 articles, detailed norms on the conducting of the annulment of marriages in the diocesan tribunals, which further developed the law of the code.

Pius XII

Pope Pius XII displayed a voluminous legislative activity in all areas. He intervened considerably more deeply into the body of the Code of Canon Law than had his predecessor. Pius XII was himself a learned canonist, who knew the history, system, and spirit of canon law. Together with his delight in responsibility and decisiveness, as well as with his gift for choosing the right collaborators, he was in a sense created to be a legislator. The legislation of Pius XII was throughout determined by the intention of coming to the aid of pastoral necessities. It was dedicated to doing justice to all realities conditioned by time and locally circumscribed. The Pope courageously faced changed conditions and took into account new insights. He carefully put his laws in the right way for legal reality. Modified norms for the Universal Church were often prepared and tested by indults for specific areas. Then they were introduced in gradual steps. The basic features of this legislation were prudent adjustment to new situations, openness to developments, foresight in changes, firmness in the fundamental, and flexibility in questions of procedure. Although the legislation of Pius XII partly involved deeply incisive changes of ecclesiastical discipline, at no time did there exist in clergy or faithful a feeling of insecurity or of helplessness. There never was even the appearance that the Pope was pushed or subject to pressure. At all stages he remained sovereignly the master of the situation.

---

[10] A. Bea, "Die päpstliche Studienreform," *StdZ* 121 (1931), 401–5.

In the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* of 29 June 1943 Pius XII treated the fundamental relation of Church and canon law. In a happy synthesis he sketched the correlation and distinction of legal structure and supernatural life in the Church. The encyclical was a landmark for the doctrine of Church membership. On 8 December 1945 he issued the constitution *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis.* In content it adhered essentially to the constitution *Vacante Sede Apostolica* of Pius X of 25 December 1904, but added the modification that in the future for the papal election one further vote beyond the two-thirds majority was required. Above all, Pius XII became the great legislator in the field of the law of the sacraments. In the constitution *Episcopalis consecrationis* of 30 November 1944 he clarified the role of the two coconsecrators in episcopal ordination; in the constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* of 30 November 1947, the matter and form of the ordination of deacon, priest, and bishop. By the decree *Spiritus Sancti munera* of 14 September 1946 parish priests obtained the authorization to administer the sacrament of confirmation,[11] in the territory of their parish, to the faithful who as a result of a serious illness are in danger of death. The encyclical *Mediator Dei* of 20 November 1947 is important for the law of the sacrament-sacrifice of the Eucharist and of the liturgy in general. The constitution *Christus Dominus* and the appended instruction of 6 January 1953 reorganized the precept of the Eucharistic fast and granted to local ordinaries the power to permit the celebration of evening Mass. The motu proprio *Sacram Communionem* of 19 March 1957 brought further mitigations of the Eucharistic fast and the extension of the faculty to permit evening Mass. Many legislative acts of the Pope and his assisting agencies applied to matrimony. The premarital investigations were minutely regulated in 1941, the order of precedence of the ends of marriage was clarified in 1944, artificial insemination, apart from the permissible *adiuvatio naturae,* was rejected in 1949 and 1956. Liturgical law was permanently developed by Pius XII. The Solemn Easter Vigil was restored in 1951, the liturgy of Holy Week was reorganized in 1955, the reform of the missal and breviary was taken up in 1955. Church music obtained guidance in the encyclical *Musicae sacrae disciplina* of 25 December 1955 and in the instruction *De*

---

[11] The decree was prepared by the indult for South America of 30 April 1929 (*AAS* 21 [1939], 554–57).

Musica sacrae of 3 September 1958. The constitution *Provida Mater Ecclesia* of 2 February 1947 is in a sense the founding charter of secular institutes. To the already existing three forms of the state of perfection a fourth was added.[12] The constitution *Sponsa Christi* of 21 November 1950 and the related instruction *Inter praeclara* of 23 November 1950 brought about an adaptation of the inclosure of nuns to the times without sacrificing anything essential of the life of virginity and contemplation. The constitution *Exsul Familia* of 2 August 1952 introduced an exhaustive ordering of the pastoral care of refugees, exiles, and emigrants. Under Pius XII the codification of the canon law of the Eastern Churches reached its maturity. The following parts were promulgated: on 22 January 1949 the law of marriage; on 6 January 1950 the law of trials; on 9 February 1952 the law of religious institutes and of property as well as the stipulating of specified concepts; on 2 June 1957 the constitutional law. That this law of the diversity of the communities of the Eastern rites was adequate in every respect is not claimed. But a certain simplification was necessary. Nevertheless, it is questionable to what extent the codified law has been put into practice.

From the Convocation of the Second Vatican Council

The Second Vatican Council was an event of the greatest significance for canon law. An account of it does not fall within the scope of this contribution. Let merely this be remarked: the greatest part of the declarations and directions of the council was not directly oriented to the individual law in force, but, so far as there was question at all of legally relevant texts, a sort of legislative program or stating of principles, which had in view the ecclesiastical legislators. They were called upon to undertake a modification of canon law in accord with the spirit and the letter of the conciliar texts.

JOHN XXIII

On 25 January 1959 Pope John XXIII announced a revision of the Code of Canon Law. On 28 March 1963 he instituted a Commission for the Reform of the Code. At first the chairman was Cardinal Pietro Ciriaci. In view of the short duration of the pontificate no results could be expected from the work of the commission, especially since all the personnel were monopolized by the preparation and implementation of the council. Under John XXIII the legislation of the Holy See bore thoroughly traditional characteristics. No single decree of the Pope or of the Holy See abandons the line of continuity and of cautious change.

---

[12] Further norms for secular institutes in the motu proprio *Primo feliciter* of 12 March 1948, decree of 25 March 1947, instruction *Cum Sanctissimus* of 19 March 1948.

That the genial but indecisive impulses of the Pope had intended extensive changes is at least doubtful, considering his conservative outlook. Nevertheless, this legislation has no uniform character; it lacks planning and a dominating guidance. The Synod of the Diocese of Rome, held by John XXIII from 24 to 31 January 1960, proceeded in expressly traditional paths. It seemed to wish to impose once more the traditional church discipline firmly and sharply. The law, already challenged from 1910 to 1915, of the suburbicarian sees underwent new modifications through the motu proprio *Ad Suburbicarias* of 10 March 1961, which abolished the cardinals' right of option to the suburbicarian sees, and especially by the motu proprio *Suburbicariis sedibus* of 11 April 1962. Thereafter the cardinal bishops no longer have any jurisdiction in the see whose title they bear. It is governed rather by a residential bishop. The cardinal deacons, for whom the code already required priestly ordination (Canon 232, par. 1), in the future had to be bishops, in accord with the motu proprio *Cum gravissima* of 15 April 1962. To this higher valuation of the College of Cardinals scarcely corresponded the increase in the number of cardinals carried out by John XXIII. In the creation of 15 December 1958 the Pope for the first time exceeded the maximum number set by Sixtus V. The motu proprio *Summi Pontificis Electio* of 5 September 1962 supplemented the constitution *Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis* and changed the law of the papal election in the sense that he is elected who obtains two-thirds of the valid votes. Only in the event that the number of cardinals present is not divisible by three is a further ballot required. The turning of the Pope to the separated Christians began to appear in law. On 17 July 1961 the graduation of non-Catholics was conceded to ecclesiastical faculties.[13]

PAUL VI

Organs

Naturally, the chief role in the implementation of the Second Vatican Council devolved upon the Holy See. In numerous apostolic constitutions, motu proprio, decrees, instructions, directories, encyclicals, norms, and proclamations an exhaustive material in norms of varied obligatory force was spread through the Church, claiming to serve the carrying out of the Second Vatican Council.[14] The centralized control lies regularly in the Congregations of Cardinals. The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and at first the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy also had an important share. The episcopal conferences and the Synod of Bishops exercise a powerful influence on the shaping of papal law. By the motu proprio *Finis Concilio* of 3 January 1966 Paul VI called into being the postconciliar commissions. The authentic interpretation of the conciliar decrees was entrusted to the Central Commission. Its place was taken in 1967 by the *Pontificia Commissio decretis Concilii Vaticani II interpretandis.*[15] However, this commission interprets not only documents of the council,[16] but also the decrees issued for their execution. But other congregations likewise care for the interpretation of the conciliar decrees and the norms pertaining to them for their sphere.

---

[13] *AfkKR* 130 (1961), 485f.

[14] The rules for implementation of the decrees *Christus Dominus, Presbyterorum ordinis, Perfectae caritatis,* and *Ad gentes* were issued in the form of a skeleton law in the motu proprio *Ecclesiae Sanctae* of 6 August 1966.

The legislative acts of the Holy See in turn call forth numerous rules of implementation from episcopal conferences and from bishops. In several countries diocesan synods or synods of a new sort were held for the enforcement of the council. As the first, the Catholic Church in the Netherlands organized a so-called Pastoral Church at Noordwijkerhout from 1966 to 1970.[17] The bishops of the country, priests, and laity took part in it, and non-Catholic observers played an important role. The legal nature of the meeting remained undefined. The binding force of the decrees passed by it must not have gone beyond the character of recommendations. This new type of synod aspired to show, as the first after the close of the Second Vatican Council, how to realize and concretize the decrees and initiatives of the council in a particular Church. Its chief goal, however, was probably the creating of a changed awareness among the Dutch Catholics. Voluminous texts were enacted in six sessions, and their range extended from the concepts of authority to the Jewish question. However, they are very frequently conceptually ambiguous and theologically inadequate as well as to a great extent determined by the ideology of democracy and of hostility to canon law.

---

[15] *AAS* 59 (1967), 1003.

[16] For example, ibid. 60 (1968), 360–63.

[17] B. Cardinal Alfrink, *Kirche im Umbruch* (Munich 1968); J. C. Hampe, "Das niederländische Pastoralkonzil," *StdZ* 181 (1968), 177–95; E. Kleine, *Autorität im Kreuzfeurer* (Essen 1968); idem, *Welt zwischen Hunger und Heil* (Munich 1968); idem, *Primat des Gewissens* (Munich 1969); idem, *Glaube im Umbruch* (Munich 1970); idem, *Es geht um mehr als Zölibat* (Munich 1970); idem, *Ökumene auf dem Prüfstand* (Munich 1971); J. Strauss, ed., *Ökumenisches Modell Holland* (= *Forum-Reihe* 13) (Göttingen and Zürich 1969); J. Lortz, *Holland in Not* (Luxemburg 1970); J. Kerkhofs, "Das niederländische Pastoralkonzil als Modell einer demokratischen Kirchenversammlung," *Concilium* 7 (1971), 212–15; M. Schmaus, L. Scheffczyk, J. Giers, eds., *Exempel Holland. Theologische Analyse und Kritik des Niederländischen Pastoralkonzils* (Berlin 1972).

Opposed to individual positive regulations was an abundance of misleading and erroneous assertions. At the synod the spirit of a radical reformism was predominant, and neither the common law of the Church nor the binding teaching of the Church was a barrier against it. Experiments were unscrupulously advocated, regardless of the possible consequences. Many novelties were introduced without regard to the Universal Church. Decisive statements of faith were obfuscated or disregarded. A binding profession of faith seemed not to exist for the synod's majority. The concept of God and revelation were reinterpreted. Holy Scripture was in many passages improperly interpreted. The idea of the Church was completely deformed. Heretics and unbelievers also have a place in the "Church" described by the Pastoral Council. The sacramental and hierarchical structure of the Church was denied. The primacy was leveled, the ecclesiastical teaching office eliminated, jurisdiction reduced. The Church was sociologized and humanized. Unequivocal moral norms disappeared. Pope Paul VI in his letter of 24 December 1969[18] to Cardinal Alfrink displayed anxiety over the direction taken by the pastoral council. The bishops, however, who took part in it were in general silent in regard to the absurd statements that were contrary to the faith. Nevertheless, the episcopate wanted to avoid a break with the Pope. The Dutch Pastoral Council was at the same time the expression and cause of the crisis in which the Catholic Church in the Netherlands finds itself. As far as putting the Second Vatican Council into practice it accomplished hardly anything. In Germany, following individual diocesan synods—Hildesheim, Meissen[19]—the so-called Common Synod of the bishoprics in the Federal Republic of Germany[20] and then the so-called Pastoral Synod of the

---

[18] *AAS* 62 (1970), 66–69.

[19] F. J. Wothe, *Kirche in der Synode. Zwischenbilanz der Hildesheimer Diözesansynode* (Hildesheim 1968); G. May, "Bermerkungen zu dem Rätesystem in der Diözese Meissen nach den Dekreten I und II der Diözesansynode des Jahres 1969," *TThZ* 80 (1971), 308–15.

[20] Statute of 11 November 1969 in *AfkKR* 138 (1969), 554–56; decree of the Congregation for Bishops of 14 February 1970 for confirmation of the statute of the Common Synod of the Dioceses in the Federal Republic of Germany, ibid., 139 (1970), 150f.; pastoral letter of 16 February 1970, ibid. 139 (1970), 177–82; promulgation of the German Episcopal Conference of 22 September 1970 relating to the agenda of the Common Synod of the Dioceses in the Federal Republic of Germany, ibid. 139 (1970), 526–38. Since 1970 there has appeared the periodical *Synode. Amtliche Mitteilungen der Gemeinsamen Synode der Bistümer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland;* cf. M. Plate, *Das deutsche Konzil. Die Würzburger Synode. Bericht und Deutung* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1975); *Gemeinsame Synode der Bistümer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Beschlüsse der Vollversammlung. Offizielle Gesamtausgabe* I (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1976).

German Democratic Republic[21] were convoked. They met in several sessions from 1971 or 1973 respectively to 1975. The first meeting of the Common Synod suffered from serious structural defects.[22] Its statutes overlooked the fact, first, that the episcopal conference possessed no general competence to legislate for all ecclesiastical matters, but only for those concerning which such competence was given it by the Apostolic See. In the area of local ecclesiastical legislation, for which the episcopal conference had no competence, the synod was instructed to have the individual residential bishops adopt the synodal material as their own. No however great majority of the members of the episcopal conference could oblige them to this. The synod was erroneously conceived. The roles within the commission were not properly distributed. The synod gave priests and lay persons a share in legislation and hence obscured the fact that legislation in the Church pertains only to the bishops by right and that priests and lay persons are restricted to advising. More satisfactory was the structure of the Pastoral Synod of the jurisdictional area of the German Democratic Republic. In it the members of the Conference of Ordinaries did not partake in the voting, according to the statute. In this way the fundamental distinction between shepherds and subjects, as well as that between legislating and advising, persisted.

The Common Synod issued numerous documents on the share of the laity in preaching, on the duties and goals of religious instruction, on the administering and receiving of the sacraments, on the importance and form of the liturgy, on the aims of youth work, on the obligation of the Church vis-à-vis foreign workers, on the Church's duties in the sphere of education, on the position of religious communities in the Church, on structures and services of pastoral care, on the protection of the personal rights of the individual within the Church, and on the coresponsibility of all the faithful for the Church's mission. In the main, they have declamatory value, but to a degree they penetrate deep into the structure of the congregations.

In Austria most bishoprics held diocesan synods. The Holy See granted the admission of lay persons under the proviso that the priests had at least an absolute majority on the commissions and in the plenary assembly.[23] All dioceses of the country met in the "Austrian Synodal Proceeding," which, despite extensive borrowing from the statute and routine of the German synod, did not constitute a synod.[24] The decrees of the meeting represented only recommendations to the episcopal conference. In Switzerland meetings of diocesan synods alternated with those of the Swiss Plenary Assembly.[25]

---

[21] Statute of spring 1972 in *AfkKR* 141 (1972), 538–43; order of election of 1 September 1972 in *Kirchliches Amtsblatt für die Bistümer und die erzbischöflichen bzw. bischöflichen Kommissariate im Gebiet der DDR. Ausgabe des Bistums Meissen* 21 (1972), 33–35.

[22] W. Aymans, "Synode 1972. Strukturprobleme eines Regionalkonzils," *AfkKR* 138 (1969), 363–88; idem, "Ab Apostolica Sede recognitum. Erwägungen zu der päpstlichen Bestätigung des Statutes für die 'Gemeinsame Synode der Bistümer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland,'" ibid. 139 (1970), 405–27; idem, "Synodalstatut—Kritik einer Verteidigung," ibid. 140 (1971), 136–46.

General Character

The task of implementing the Second Vatican Council was given to Paul VI, the episcopal conferences, and the individual bishops. However, several obstacles presented themselves to the converting of the directions and efforts of the council into practicable norms. First, many statements of the council were not clear as a consequence of the "pastoral" style and hence were controverted. On the other hand, the development in the Church had already actually gone on ahead of the council in many respects. Finally, a uniform desire, such as is indispensable for a harmonious legislation, was usually absent. The Church was in a leadership crisis, which adversely affected legislation to a serious degree.[26] And so the development of the law since the Second Vatican Council is basically different from the earlier. The traditional reserve and discretion of the changes were abandoned. Incisive, even radical changes took place rapidly and without preparation, often in homely dress. The haste with which norms were produced in the postconciliar period was favorable to neither their quality nor their content. Contradictions in one and the same law, to the law of a higher legislator, or in laws rapidly succeeding one another were not rare. Mistakes and omissions made improvements necessary. Changes in the law increased so that a growing insecurity seized upon members of the Church. Legal material grew enormously and even for the expert was not always easy to master. The voluminous production of norms was, to be sure, not only an effect of the Second Vatican Council but also a symptom of critical phenomena appearing in the Church in almost all spheres and in most countries. The trend of the legislation was regularly to adaptation and relief, adaptation not so much to changed circumstances, whose form was not subject to the power of the Church, but rather to a changed mentality, for example, to the ideology of equality and the wave of democratization, and relief not from burdens which could no longer be borne, but from obligations whose fulfilling demanded moral effort and strength of self-control, for example, in regard to the Eucharistic fast or the carrying out of the obligation of attending Mass on holy days. The trust of the legislator in the strength of men's self-determination had grown, and greater responsibility was laid on the individual. Ecclesiastical standardization withdrew from some subjects; it became grandiose. Lower courts were empowered to a great extent to deal with business hitherto reserved to higher. Full authority was ever more generously imparted to bishops and pastors, and even to chaplains. In increasing measure power of jurisdiction was turned over to lay persons.[27] Legislation was not rarely determined by external motives, not those inherent in the matter, especially with the aim of letting powerful groups do their will. In an effort to relieve the pressure on the bishops, made aware of their importance at the council, Paul VI, long before the issuing of the Decree on Bishops, granted them new faculties in the motu proprio *Pastorale munus* of 30 November 1963.[28] The standardization of the valid dispensations from the precept of the Eucharistic fast was made known orally by the secretary general of the Second Vatican Council on 21 November 1964.[29] In not a few cases modifications of the law were regularly extorted. Proceeding from the statements of specific theologians, certain circles of clerics and lay persons introduced practices and texts desired by them and placed the bishops before faits accomplis. This procedure was practiced especially in the sphere of liturgy. The bishops, sometimes after trivial resistance, gave in, and the arbitrarily introduced methods of acting and texts were made law or permitted by the Holy See to become law. A further characteristic of this legislation was the intention of meeting the wishes or the pressure of non-Catholics. The ecumenism proclaimed by the council had turned out to be a fertile motive of many alterations of law, for example, in regard to mixed marriages, *communio in sacris,* and the reception of the sacraments. The connivance with Protestantism in the area of liturgy and sacramental law, whereby the innermost sphere of ecclesiastical life was affected, became serious. The claim for many postconciliar documents of compliance with the directions of the council could not be verified after exact examination, because either the programmatic declarations of the council were observed too imprecisely or the postconciliar norms did not remain within the clearly discernible will of the council.[30] Thus, for example, as regards the system of government by councils, which was set up in the German dioceses, it was demonstrated from many sides that it was in opposition to the conciliar directives.[31]

---

[23] *Leben und Wirken der Kirche von Wien. Handbuch der Synode 1969–1971* (Vienna 1972); *Im Dienst an den Menschen. St. Pöltner Diözesansynode 1972* (St. Pölten, n.d.); *AfkKR* 138 (1969), 172f.

[24] "Statut des Österreichischen Synodalen Vorgangs," *ÖAfkR* 24 (1973), 249–52.

[25] "Rahmenstatut für Diözesanssynoden," *ÖAfKR* 23 (1972), 112–15: J. Amstutz, "Zu den ecclesiogischen Grundlagen der Synode 72," *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung* 12 (1971), 181f.; W. Künzle, J. Meili, J. Gähwiler, *Was Kann die Synode? Ein theologischer Bericht* (Olten and Freiburg i. Breisgau 1972); J. G. Fuchs, "Neuere Entwicklungen des Katholischen Kirchenrechts auf Schweizer Boden," *ÖAfKR* 23 (1972), 163–94; I. Fürer, "De synodis dioecesanis in Helvetia," *Periodica* 62 (1973), 143–48; *Liebe-Sexualität-Ehe. Die Synode Zum Thema. Zusammengestellt und Kommentiert von H. Camenzind-Weber* (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1975).

[26] H. Heimerl, "Einige formale Probleme des poskonziliaren allgemeinen Rechtes," *ÖAfKR* 24 (1973), 139–59; G. May, "Bemerkungen zu der kirchlichen Gesetzgebung nach dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Liturgie und Kirchenmusik," H. Lonnendonker, ed., *In Caritate et Veritate. Festschrift für Johannes Overath* (Saarbrücken 1973), 67–99; C. G. Fürst, "Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung seit 1958 oder Zur kunst der Gesetzgebung," H. Heinemann, H. Herrmann, P. Mikat, eds., *Diaconia et Ius. Festgabe für Heinrich Flatten zum 65. Geburtstag, dargebracht von seinen Freuden und Schulern* (Munich, Paderborn and Vienna 1973), 287–301.

---

[27] For example, motu proprio *Causas matrimoniales* of 28 March 1971, V, par. 1, *AAS* 63 (1971), 441–46, here 443.

[28] K. Mörsdorf, "Neue Vollmachten und Privilegien der Bischöfe," *AfkKR* 133 (1964), 82–101.

[29] *AfkKR* 133 (1964), 428.

The particular synods sought to introduce into the life of the Church by way of legislation in the local churches all the matters which had no prospect of being taken up at the Second Vatican Council. The following examples may be cited. Confirmation should be administered to a greater degree by nonbishops. The penitential devotion should acquire a sacramental character. Remarried divorced persons should be admitted to receive Communion. The matrimonial impediment of disparity of cult and the obligation to the canonical form in contracting marriage should be abolished. The participation of Catholics in the Protestant Lord's Supper should be made possible. Also demanded were the admission of married men to the priesthood, the reinstatement of married priests in the priestly ministry, and the investigation of the possibility of granting priestly ordination to women. In the question of contraception there even appeared in the synodal statements a deviation from the Church's binding moral teaching. In the light of these aberrations and numerous other serious flaws, the verdict on the synods in the German-speaking lands can only be that they increased the perplexity in the Church. The critical and most urgent task of confirming the faith and intensifying devotion was not even approached by them, let alone implemented. Many decrees of the synods did not promote the carrying out of the council but worked against it or disregarded it. To the extent that they aimed to implement the council, they partly skipped over the middle portion of the still existing regulations for total church implementation. In any event the synodal assemblies encroached upon the law of the revised code. In the question of lay preaching the offense against the common law was later censured by the Holy See.[32] But this was precisely the matter which, after the Holy See had given in, became the first to be put in force.[33] Presumably the intention was to present a fait accompli which the universal legislator could not disregard. The chief significance of the synods lies in the fact that they acted as opinion-forming agents, and indeed in the demolition of dogmatic, moral, and legal ties. Practice already closely followed the perspectives which appeared at the synods, regardless of contrary law. The so-called pastoral character of many documents, which claimed to be practicable norms, frequently obscured their normative value and thereby paved the way for a dangerous legal uncertainty. Many of the *vota* issued at the synods just mentioned were useless for the further developments of ecclesiastical law because they either were too vague or bypassed reality.

---

[30] For example, M. Pesendorfer, "Zur Ausführungsgesetzgebung der Österreichischen Bischofskonferenz zum MP 'Matrimonia mixta,' " *ÖAfKR* 23 (1972), 16–33; R. Potz, "Pastoralrat und Domkapitel. Überlegungen zur Stellung bischöflicher Beratungsorgane," ibid., 69–96; G. Luf, "Allgemeiner Gesetzeszweck und Iusta Causa Dispensationis (Anmerkungen zu einem aktuellen Problem)," ibid., 97–106.

[31] K. Mörsdorf, "Die andere Hierarchie. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur Einsetzung von Laienräten in den Diöcezen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *AFkKR* 138 (1969), 461–509; G. May, "Das Verhältnis von Pfarrgemeinderat und Pfarrer nach gemeinem Recht und nach Mainzer Diözesanrecht," H. Heinemann, H. Herrmann, P. Mikat, eds., *Diaconia et Ius. Festgabe für Heinrich Flatten zum 65. Geburtstag* (Munich, Paderborn, and Vienna 1973), 202–25; H. Socha, "Mitverantwortung gleich Mitentscheidung?" *AfkKR* 142 (1973), 16–70.

Of the greatest significance for the development of canon law, then, was the raising of the episcopal conferences to a real hierarchical tribunal between the individual bishop and the Apostolic See by the Second Vatican Council. Their legislative competence was constantly growing. In this way the process of centralizing and standardizing the law by the Holy See, to be observed in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth, was halted and gave place to a countermovement. The particularizing of the law increased. Peculiarities of national Churches gained greater weight, in fact were to a degree consciously promoted. The inserting of ever broader circles of persons into the process of legislation showed the enactment of norms and well-nigh leveled every legislative project. The actual incompetence of most members of synods of the new type for the treating of the questions posed is notorious. The assignment of competence and the precedence of the norms were especially not often observed by the particular legislators. The synods mentioned considered themselves competent for almost all areas of church life and interfered illicitly in the sphere of the Universal Church.

---

[32] *Deutsche Tagepost* no. 3, of 5–6 January 1973, 1f.; *Klerusblatt* 53 (1973), 5–7, 288. First came the decree of the German Episcopal Conference of 18 November 1970 on the permission for lay preaching, in *AfkKR* 139 (1970), 578f.

[33] Decree on the sharing of the laity in preaching of 4 January 1973, *Amtsblatt für das Erzbistum München und Freising* no. 162, 1973, 282–92.

Individual Legislative Actions

The Second Vatican Council was under the aegis of a revalorization of the episcopal office. The lever for this undertaking was the principle of collegiality. According to it, the holders of the highest power in the Universal Church are not only the Pope but also the College of Bishops acting in agreement with the Pope. The episcopate logically claimed to share in the rule of the entire Church even outside the general councils. The Pope had regard for this desire in a twofold respect. First, he announced to the surprised fathers at the opening of the fourth session of the Second Vatican Council on 14 September 1965 the establishing of a Synod of Bishops. On the next day the motu proprio *Apostolica sollicitudo*[34] was published in the council *aula.* The Synod of Bishops is a central ecclesiastical institution, which represents the episcopate of the world. In accord with its nature, it is a permanent institution, but meets only on special invitation. The Synod of Bishops has fundamentally only an advisory function, but can, if the Pope allows, also issue decrees; its decrees are subject to papal confirmation. It should foster the union and cooperation between Pope and bishops, put information at disposal, bring about uniformity in questions of doctrine and in procedure within the Church as well as advise in regard to the subjects which from time to time are to be placed on the agenda. Convocation, approval of elected members, drawing up of the list of *tractanda,* and issuance of the agenda, as well as the chairmanship, belong to the Pope. Representatives of the episcopal conferences constitute the greatest part of the members. In addition, there are the Eastern patriarchs, religious, heads of the departments of the Roman Curia, and bishops, clerics, or religious nominated by the Pope for this case. Then the motu proprio *Pro comperto sane* of 6 August 1967 prescribed the admittance of seven residential bishops as full members into each of the congregations of the Roman Curia. They took part in their plenary sessions. Together with the motu proprio *De Episcoporum muneribus,*[35] issued on 15 June 1966 to implement the decree *Christus Dominus* on the pastoral duty of bishops, which gave bishops the faculty basically to dispense in individual cases from all general laws of the Church, as well as with the abolition of the fundamental irremovability of pastors by the motu proprio *Ecclesiae Sanctae* (no. 20), the aims of the bishops for the mentioned changes seemed to have been satisfied.

---

[34] *AAS* 57 (1966), 775–80. Also, Paul VI's *Regolamento* for the Synod of Bishops, 8 December 1966, in *AAS* 59 (1967), 91–103; announcement of the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church of 8 August 1969 on the revision of the order for the Synod of Bishops, in *AAS* 61 (1969), 525–39; announcement of the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church of 20 August 1971 on changes in the order for the Synod of Bishops, in *AAS* 63 (1971), 702–4; cf. K. Mörsdorf, "Synodus Episcoporum," *AfkKR* 135 (1966), 131–36.

In connection with the stressing of the collegiality of the bishops was the diminution of privileges of the College of Cardinals. The dignity of cardinal-protector of monastic congregations was abolished as early as 28 April 1964.[36] In order to take into account the special position and the sensibilities of the Eastern patriarchs, Paul VI in the motu proprio *Ad Purpuratorum Patrum* of 11 February 1965 decreed that at their admission into the College of Cardinals these should be assigned to the *Ordo episcopalis.* The motu proprio *Sacro Cardinalium consilio* of 26 February 1965 allowed the election of the dean and subdean of the Sacred College only from among the suburbicarian bishops. The motu proprio *Ingravescentem aetatem* of 21 November 1970 dealt a severe blow to the Sacred College. It decreed that cardinals who had completed their eightieth year without more ado lost their curial offices as well as the right to elect the Pope.[37]

The Pope began the reform of the Roman Curia, desired by the council, with the Holy Office. He sought to counter the attacks on this congregation, which were made to some extent even in the conciliar *aula,* first with the change of name and of sphere of competence, prescribed in the motu proprio *Integrae servandae* of 7 December 1965, as well as the reorganization of the procedure of the department, also held out in prospect in the same document. Further steps followed. On 14 June and 15 November 1966 respectively, the *Index librorum prohibitorum* and the prohibition of books by law as prescribed in Canon 1399 were declared abolished.[38] A little later a Commission of Theologians from the various countries was set up beside the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.[39] On 15 August 1967 the constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae Universae* effected the reorganization of the Roman Curia demanded by the council. According to it, the Curia remains the representative and assisting agency of the Pope and is in no relationship of subordination to the episcopate, as some bishops desired. In the structure and activity of the Curia, however, a series of changes is found. Henceforth the Pope is no longer the prefect of some congregations; he is no longer also in them, but only above them. The position of the cardinal secretary of state was strengthened, and a better communication and coordination of the individual congregations was provided for. The Secretariat of State had to assure the close union of the offices of the Roman Curia with the Pope and among themselves. The cardinals who presided over the departments of the Curia could be summoned by the cardinal secretary of state to a common meeting. A number of offices were newly instituted or confirmed respectively, especially the Secretariat for non-Catholic Christians, non-Christian religions, and unbelievers, as well as an Office of Statistics. The *Dataria* was abolished. The "Council for the Public Affairs of the Church" is competent for relations between the Church and state governments. All members of the congregations are for the future appointed for only five years, and after the lapse of this period must be again appointed, which, of course, hardly works to the benefit of willingness to accept responsibility and independence of judgment. The members of the Curia are selected from the various peoples, in each case in accord with knowledge and pastoral experience. Contact with the bishops should be maintained and their views taken into consideration. A detailed *regolamento* regulates the routine of the Curia. But the organization of the Roman Curia created by the constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae* soon underwent new changes. By the constitution *Sacra Rituum Congregatio* of 8 May 1969 the Congregation of Rites was divided and a new Congregation for Divine Worship was established. The constitution *Constans nobis studium* of 11 July 1975 abolished it again and joined it with the Congregation of the Sacraments as the new "Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship." The motu proprio *Quo aptius* of 27 February 1973 put an end to the Apostolic Chancery and transferred its duties to the Secretariat of State. The instruction of the cardinal secretary of state of 4 February 1974 on the obligation of secrecy in regard to the proceedings of the Holy See, which arose from an actual incident, made known that the critical procedures in the Church did not stop at the Roman Curia.

---

[35] Also the motu proprio *Episcopalis potestatis* of 2 May 1967 on the extension of faculties for the Eastern rite bishops to dispense from the general law of the Church, *AAS* 59 (1967), 385–90; cf. J. Lederer, "Die Neuordnung des Dispensrechtes," *AfkKR* 135 (1966), 415–43.

[36] *AfkKR* 134 (1965), 499.

[37] W. M. Plöchl, "Der alte Kardinal und das Recht," U. Mosiek and H. Zapp, eds., *Ius et Salus Animarum. Festschrift für Bernhard Panzram* (Sammlung Rombach n.s. 15) (Freiburg 1972), 159–70.

[38] G. May "Die Aufhebung der kirchlichen Bücherverbote," K. Siepen, J. Weitzel, P. Wirth eds., *Ecclesia et Ius. Festgabe für Audomar Scheuermann zum 60. Geburtstag* (Munich, Paderborn and Vienna 1968), 547–71.

---

[39] Preliminary statutes of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of 12 July 1969 for the Theological Commission, in *AAS* 61 (1969), 540f.

The motu proprio *Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum* of 24 June 1969 again defined the duties of papal envoys.[40] The law produced a stronger differentiation of the Holy See's diplomatic representations and made provision for extraordinary circumstances in nations. The duty of legates to promote the union of the bishops with the Pope was put at the head of their obligations. On 25 March 1972 the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church issued a directive for the determining and naming of candidates for the episcopal office in the Latin Church.[41]

In taking up relatively vague statements of the Second Vatican Council a comprehensive apparatus of councils on all levels of ecclesiastical activity, from the parish to the episcopal conference, was constructed, above all in the German-speaking countries. These bodies moved beside, and in the parochial sphere partly over, the ordained shepherds. No longer the cathedral chapter, but the Priests' Council is, according to a declaration of the Congregation for the clergy, the bishop's senate for the future.[42] Many decrees aimed to promote the renewal of religious institutes or sought to master the critical conditions in them.[43] Comprehensive complexes of norms were issued for the implementation of the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Liturgy, beginning with the motu proprio *Sacram Liturgiam* of 25 January 1964 through the instructions of 26 September 1964, 23 November 1965, 4 May 1967, 25 May 1967, 29 May 1969, and 5 September 1970, and numerous decrees and norms, up to the Encyclical on the Eucharistic Prayers of 27 April 1973, without there being an end to this production of norms in prospect. New texts were published for the Mass, new *ordines* for the administration of the sacraments. The constitution *Missale Romanum* of 3 April 1969 promulgated the changed Roman Mass book. From 1965 the fulfilling of the Sunday obligation of attending Mass was already granted for the preceding evening. Concelebration and Communion *sub utraque* became more and more widespread.[44] The instruction from the Congregation of the Sacraments, *Immensae caritatis* of 29 January 1973, granted the faculty of permitting lay persons to administer Communion, increased the number of cases in which Communion could be received twice on the same day, and further modified the Eucharistic fast. Under specified conditions, according to the instruction of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity of 1 June 1972, non-Catholic Christians can be permitted to receive Communion in the Catholic Church. The motu proprio *Firma in traditione* of 13 June 1974 brought a new regulation of the system of Mass stipends. The motu proprio *Sacrum Diaconatus Ordinem* of 18 June 1967 created the canonical basis for the reintroduction of the permanent diaconate in the Latin Church. Because it was intended to ordain married men of mature age as deacons, there resulted the first breakthrough in the law of celibacy. The minor orders and the subdiaconate were abolished by the motu proprio *Ministeria quaedam* of 15 August 1972. Their place was taken by the ministries of reader and acolyte, which could also be bestowed on laymen who had no intention of entering the ecclesiastical state. The motu proprio *Ad pascendum* of 15 August 1972 joined entry into the clerical state with the reception of the Order of Deacon. On 17 February 1966 appeared the constitution *Paenitemini*. The penitential discipline, especially fasting, was considerably mitigated by it. A decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship of 2 December 1973 prescribed a new *ordo* of penance. The constitution *Sacram Unctionem Infirmorum* of 30 November 1973 regulated the Sacrament of the Anointing of Sick anew. The law on mixed marriage had already been mitigated in the instruction *Matrimonii sacramentum* of 18 March 1966. The decree *Crescens matrimoniorum* of 22 February 1967 eliminated the sanction of invalidity for the nonobservance of the obligatory form in the contracting of marriage between Catholics and Eastern non-Catholics. The motu proprio *Matrimonia mixta* of 31 March 1970 was a new retreat before Protestant pressures and for the first time in the history of papal regulation of mixed marriages abandoned the assuring of the Catholic upbringing of the children in mixed marriages. In issuing this law, the Pope was standing, as was rightly remarked, under "progress compulsion."[45] The instruction of the Holy Office of 5 July 1963 basically allowed cremation to Catholics. The motu proprio *Pastoralis migratorum cura* of 15 August 1969 reorganized the pastoral care of emigrants.

---

[40] W. M. Plöchl, "Das neue päpstliche Gesandtschaftsrecht," *ÖAfKR* 21 (1970), 115–29.

[41] T. G. Barberena, "Neuvas normas sobre nombramientos de obispos [texto y comentario]," *Revista española de Derecho Canónico* 28 (1972), 657–82.

[42] H. Müller, "Der Priesterrat als Senat des Bischofs," *ÖAfKR* 24 (1973), 4–17.

[43] For example, apostolic admonition *Evangelica testificatio* of 29 June 1971; decrees of 4 June and 8 December 1970, 2 February 1972; declaration of 4 June 1970.

[44] *AAS* 57 (1965), 410–12; 64 (1972), 561–63.

Numerous rules of procedure were revised or issued anew. The motu proprio *Sanctitas clarior* of 19 March 1969 rearranged the process of beatification and canonization. In view of the more and more public celibacy crisis Paul VI reasserted the celibacy of priests in the encyclical *Sacerdotalis Caelibatus* of 24 June 1967.[46] The growing number of laicizations of priests induced the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on 13 January 1971 to issue new norms for the implementing of the procedure of reducing men in major orders to the lay state.[47] In implementing the motu proprio *Integrae servandae* the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on 15 January 1971 issued an order for the procedure in the examination of doctrinal opinions. The motu proprio *Causas matrimoniales* of 28 March 1971 provided norms for the expediting of marriage cases in the Latin Church; the motu proprio *Cum matrimonialium* of 8 September 1973, in the Eastern Churches. The instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments of 7 March 1972 improved the rules of processes for establishing the nonconsummation of marriage. The decree of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of 19 March 1975 reorganized the previous censorship of books. Henceforth only editions and translations of Holy Scripture, liturgical books and their translations, catechisms and theology texts are subject to it. Nevertheless, it was urgently recommended to diocesan clerics and members of the state of perfection to obtain the permission of their local ordinary or higher superior respectively for books which are related to religion and moral teaching.

---

[45] K. Mörsdorf, "Matrimonia mixta," *AfkKR* 139 (1970), 349–404.

[46] *AAS* 59 (1967), 657–97. Cf. also Paul VI's letters to Cardinal Secretary of State Villot of 2 February 1970 on celibacy with regard to the discussion in the Netherlands, in *AAS* 62 (1970), 98–103.

More and more often was the instituting of an ecclesiastical jurisdiction over acts of administration requested. The Holy See sought to take this concern into account in a twofold way. In the process of reform of the Curia the tasks of an ecclesiastical law court for administration were assigned to the Church's supreme tribunal, the Apostolic Signatura. They are cared for by the newly formed Second Section. Recourse can be had to this if the contested administrative act was issued by a department of the Roman Curia and a law was transgressed by it. The Apostolic Signatura grants no legal protection against measures of lower ecclesiastical organs. Two drafts were elaborated in 1970 and 1972 for the establishing of a court for administrative acts on the other ecclesiastical levels. While the first draft envisaged three types of legal devices against burdensome acts of administration—recourse to the hierarchical superior, recourse to the court of administration, complaint to the regular court—the second draft proceeded from the possibility of complaint before the regular court. The promulgation of a corresponding motu proprio is still to come.[48]

---

[47] *AAS* 63 (1971), 303–8. Also, the declaration of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith of 26 June 1972 to interpret the decree on the implementation of the procedure for reduction to the lay state, in *AAS* 64 (1972), 641–43; cf. F. Romita, "La perdita dello stato clericale," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 97 (1972), 128–36.

[48] *Normae Speciales in Supremo Tribunali Signaturae Apostolicae ad experimentum servandae post Constitutionem Apostolicam Pauli PP. VI Regimini Ecclesiae Universae* (Vatican City 1968); R. A. Strigl, "Kritische Analyse der in Jahre 1968 zur Erprobung ergangenen

On 1 October 1975 Paul VI published the apostolic constitution *Romano Pontifici Eligendo,* the new regulation of the papal election. On 5 December 1973 the Pope had posed the question of whether it was not fitting to expand the group of electors for the choosing of the Pope and to add to the College of Cardinals the patriarchs of the Eastern Churches and the members of the Council of the General Secretariat of the Synod of Bishops. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned constitution, for the sake of the freedom and independence of the proceedings, retained the election of the Pope by the cardinals, but including only a maximum of 120 (no. 33). Likewise, the conclave and the three forms of election procedure were retained. Difficulties in achieving the prescribed majority of two-thirds plus one, which are to be anticipated in view of the increasing pluralism in the Church, permit the cardinals, under specified presuppositions, to be satisfied with an absolute majority plus one or with a final ballot between the two candidates with the most votes (no. 76). With his acceptance of the election, the one chosen, if he has already received episcopal ordination, is immediately bishop of the Church of Rome and at the same time Pope and head of the College of Bishops with complete and supreme power over the Universal Church (no. 88).

Revision of the Code and of the Canon Law of the Eastern Church

The revision of the Code of Canon Law could be seriously taken up only after the close of the Council. On 20 November 1965 the *Pontificia Commissio Codici Iuris Canonici recognoscendo* began its work.[49] It worked in constant contact with the Synod of Bishops, the episcopal conferences, and the individual bishops. Since 1967 its president has been the secretary general of the Second Vatican Council, Pericle

---

Verfahrensordnung für die Apostolische Signature," *Ius Populi Dei. Festschrift R. Bidagor* III (Rome 1972), 79–111; G. Lobina, "Rassegna di giurisprudenza della Sectio Altera del Supremo Tribunale della Segnatura Apostolica (1968–1973)," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 98 (1973), 293–323; *Communicationes* 2 (1970), 191–94; 4 (1972), 35–38; 5 (1973), 235–43; 6 (1974), 32–33; P. Wirth, "Gerichtlicher Schutz gegenüber der kirchlichen Verwaltung. Modell eines kirchlichen Verwaltungsgerichts," *AfkKR* 140 (1971), 29–73; I. Gordon, "De iustitia administrativa ecclesiastica tum transacto tempore tum hodierno," *Periodica* 61 (1972), 251–378; M. Kaiser, "Einführung einer Verwaltungsgerichtsbarkeit in der katholischen Kirche?" *Essener Gespräche zum Thema Staat und Kirche* 7 (Munich 1972), 92–111; P. Moneta, *Il controllo giurisdizionale sugli atti dell'autorità amministrativa nell'ordinamento canonico* (Milan 1973); G. Lobina, *Elementi di procedura amministrativa canonica* (Rome 1973); J. A. Souto, "Algunas cuestiones básicas en torno a una posible ley de procedimiento administrativo," *Ius Canonicum* 14 (1974), 14–23; H. Schmitz, "Kirchliche Verwaltungsgerichtsbarkeit. Bericht zum Stand der gesetzgeberischen Arbeiten," *TThZ* 84 (1975), 174–80.

[49] *Communicationes* 1 (1969), 35–54.

Felici. In 1974 the commission was enlarged to fifty cardinals from twenty-five nations. Ten, later thirteen subcommissions of consultors prepare the drafts of the revised code, which are then submitted to the commission, and this in turn sends them to the bishops. Following the revision of the drafts in accord with the bishops' remarks, the individual partial codifications are presumably to be promulgated by the Pope *ad experimentum.* Since 1969 the periodical *Communicationes* has reported the aims and progress of the work. The progress of the project is slow; lacking is an energetic, uniform will. The new law book is supposed to be in keeping with the intellectual outlook of the Second Vatican Council and oriented more strongly than the code to pastoral requirements, but to retain its legal character and not be a sort of rule of faith or morals. In jurisdiction and administration the subjective rights of physical and juridicial persons are to obtain an effective protection. Sanctions are reduced to a minimum. The principle of subsidiarity is to be utilized to a greater degree. The new code should be restricted to the codification of canon law indispensible and feasible for all parts of the Church. It is the duty of the regional legislative tribunals to create norms for the respective territories. The position of the bishops is to be further strengthened. A common legal status is to be granted to all Christians, on which then are based the rights and obligations which are united with specific ecclesiastical offices and functions. The strict territorial principle of ecclesiastical organization should be modified. In the law relating to the sacraments and to penalties a better coordination of *forum externum* and *forum internum* should be undertaken. The Synod of Bishops, meeting from 30 September to 29 October 1967, expressed itself in favor of the ten principles of renewal of the canon law which Cardinal Felici submitted.[50]

The current drafts for individual books of the revised code make it obvious that the revision will be, not a new edition of the Code of Canon Law, but a new law book. The changed canon law will presumably carry to a considerable extent the marks which were presented above in their general characterization. For the canonical changes of the postconciliar period are ordinarily adopted into the revised code little or not at all modified. Tense expectations which were set for the new law must be disappointed. For example, the draft of the penal law, submitted in 1973, suffers from many, partly serious defects. The schema aims to abbreviate the penal law, to unify it, and to avoid the confusion of the external and the internal *fora.* Baptized non-Catholics are basically excepted from ecclesiastical penal sanctions. However, the practicability of the penal law which the schema envisages is doubtful, among other reasons because of the excessive extension of the competence of particular law and of the enormous number of mere authorizations of penalties. As in the code, the penal criminal law is again mixed with the law of disciplinary penalties. In addition to the technical, the draft also displays serious theological flaws. For example, the suggestion in Canon 16, par. 1, b, that excommunication not prevent the reception of the Sacrament of Penance destroys the ecclesiological connection of excommunication and the Sacrament of Penance and suffers from an inner contradiction that excommunication and reconciliation with the Church cannot coexist.

---

[50] "Principia quae Codicis Iuris Canonici recognitionem dirigant," *Communicationes* 1 (1969), 77–85 (=X. Ochoa, *Leges Ecclesiae post Codicem iuris canonici editae* III (Rome 1972), no. 3601, col. 5253–57; ibid., 86–100 (of 187 present, 57 *placet,* 130 *placet iuxta modum,* but in individual points always a two-thirds majority); *AfkKR* 136 (1967), 595f.; R. Laurentin, *Le premier Synode. Histoire et bilan* (Paris 1968), 74–86; R. Rouquette, *Une nouvelle chrétienté. Le premier synode épiscopal* (Paris 1968), 89–107; F. X. Murphy, G. MacEoin, *Synode '67 Aufbruch nach dem Konzil. Eine Chronik* (Paderborn 1969), 64–91.

The draft of the new ecclesiastical law of marriage, sent to the bishops in 1975, must, on the contrary, despite certain weaknesses, rather measure up to the claims which must be set for a codification of this material that is theologically and canonically unobjectionable. It leaves the structure of the matrimonial law of the code untouched and in general proceeds cautiously with the integration of the law's development since 1918. The legislative competence of the episcopal conferences and the faculties of the bishops are extended, of course, to a tolerable degree. The notion and precedence of the "ends of marriage" are, however, abandoned to the detriment of the matter. The impediments to contracting marriage are strictly limited. The will to marry is again defined, the defects in knowledge are thoroughly discussed, the idea of cunning deception is reintroduced. The ability to contract marriage is treated on a grand scale. The circle of persons bound to the canonical form is drawn considerably more narrow than before. Catholics who have separated themselves formally or publicly from the Church are no longer to be bound to the canonical form of marriage (Canon 319, par. 1).

Since the death of Pius XII and in consequence of the development then getting under way the codification of the Eastern Canon Law came to a standstill. The opposition of certain hierarchs to some tendencies of the codification, the decay of discipline in the Church, the widespread hostility to law, and the effects of the Second Vatican Council were not favorable to the continuation of the codification. Account had to be taken of the new trends coming to light. And so on 10 June 1972 Paul VI set up a new Commission for the Revision of the Eastern Canon Law—*Pontificia Commissio Codici Iuris Canonici Orientalis recognoscendo*—with Cardinal Joseph Parecattil, archbishop of Ernakulam, India, for the Syro-Malabar Christians, at its head.[51] It had to revise the parts of the Eastern Canon Law that were already in force as well as those not yet published. On 18 March 1974 the Pope set two goals for the commission: to bring the Eastern Canon Law into harmony with the decrees of the Second Vatican Council and to preserve fidelity to the tradition of the Eastern Churches.[52] The commission publishes *Nuntia* as its organ of communication.

From the Second Vatican Council the project of a constitutional law of the Church, a *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis,* was championed by bishops and theologians. On 20 November 1965 Paul VI referred to it in an inquiry.[53] Now, from the very beginning the Church has had a constitution in the material sense, the norms of which are scattered through the various sources of law, especially the code. A constitution in the formal sense, that is, a constitutional law, would have to assemble the norms essential and characteristic for the fundamental legal organization of the Church and prescribe the degree and limits of the legislation of each particular church. Such a constitutional law, in view of the increasing particularization of canon law, is an imperative necessity to guarantee the integration of the parts into the whole, especially to facilitate the verification of particular legislation for its compatibility with the law of the Universal Church. In 1971 the frequently improved draft of a *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis* was officially submitted by the Commission for the Revision of the Code to the bishops. Of 1,306 bishops who gave an opinion on it, 593 replied *placet,* 462 *placet iuxta modum,* and 251 *non placet.*[54] The draft fulfilled the demands to remain within the spirit and letter of the Second Vatican Council, to unite theology and law, and to speak in a pastoral manner. In the ninety-five canons formulations in more than three hundred passages were adopted from the texts of the Second Vatican Council. And for the first time the draft codified basic laws of Catholics. Nevertheless, it found criticism chiefly from three areas. Some approved it basically, but wanted to see it improved in content and in legal techniques. The difficulty of examining theological statements as to their legal power to bind, or respectively, to convert them into norms, explains the variety of the proposals for correction made by members of this group. Others assented, in itself, to the notion of a *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis,* but repudiated the submitted draft as impracticable. They saw in it an obstacle for developments that were under way in the Church, especially the ecumencial strivings. A third group came out against any codification of the constitutional law of the Church. Their criticism was aimed, to a considerable degree, not only against the draft, but against the hierarchical, in fact the legal structure of the Church in general. As a matter of fact, the draft of the *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis* stands clearly in ecclesiastical tradition and checks all promiscuity and arbitrariness. If the one Church of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church (Canon 2, par. 1), then there is no possibility of labeling non-Catholic ecclesial communities unequivocally as Churches. If the Pope possesses the supreme and immediate power over the Universal Church (Canon 34, par. 1), then it is inadmissible to lower his position to that of a secretary general. If the bishop is the sole legislator in his diocese (Canon 81, par. 2), then synodal committees of priests and laity cannot issue norms. If every believer in Christ had a right to this, that the liturgy be celebrated according to the prescriptions of his rite (Canon 15), then the foundation is removed from under liturgical experimentation and manipulation. Although the arguments of the opponents of the *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis* are frequently at variance with one another, Paul VI showed himself to be impressed by the resistance. He had the draft withdrawn and turned over to the commission for revision.

---

[51] *AfkKR* 141 (1972), 238.
[52] *Communicationes* 6 (1974), 14–19.
[53] *AAS* 57 (1965), 985.
[54] *AfkKR* 142 (1973), 217.

The revised form of the *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis* will presumably, in conformity with the wishes of many bishops, contain hardly any basically theological statements. The juristic character of the law should stand out more prominently, especially its binding effect in relation to the total subordinate legislation. The enumeration of the basic rights of the faithful should become more complete. The ecclesiastical organs of the Universal Church and of the particular Churches, hence also the councils, should be mentioned.

The manuscript of this chapter was ready at the end of 1974. The subsequent development could be added only to a slight extent.

CHAPTER 6

The Holy See's Policy of Concordats from 1918 to 1974[*]

Era of Concordats under Pius XI and Pius XII

TO THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Point of Departure, Motives, and General Character

The First World War ended with a profound convulsion of the structure of states and peoples. The peace treaties in the years from 1918 produced no secure peace among nations, because too little justice and wisdom were inherent in them. The drawing of boundaries frequently did not agree with the ethnographical realities. Minorities were further suppressed. In the interior of many countries fermentation and unrest became chronic. In most states of Europe which began as parliamentary democracies after the First World War authoritarian regimes soon came to power. The attitude toward the Church was generally in danger in the former because of instability, in the latter because of caprice. The Church was ordinarily in a difficult position and was left to the good will of the civil partner. The constitutions of almost all countries contained a guarantee of freedom of denomination and of the practice of religion. But the text of the constitution did not ordinarily indicate as a matter of course how the relations of Church and state appeared in practice. Too much depended on its interpretation and application, on the ecclesiastical personnel, and especially on the religious feeling of the people and the spiritual power of the Church in the country in question. The legal ordering of the relations of Church and state is only one facet of the reality of this relationship. It made models and standards obligatory, according to which the mutual outlook of Church and state was to be fashioned, and only to the extent that this occurred was the relation of Church and state a legal relationship. The situation of Church-state policies must not be regarded as the legal Church-state situation. The constitution ordinarily permitted different forms of the relations of Church and state within a specific framework. Thus the constitutionally legal security of religious freedom was in many countries in sharp contrast to the legal reality. In some countries it was not taken for granted even as a private legal freedom. In so far as it was a matter of states governed by law, the Church had no interest in the surrender of a moderate involvement in the state because this assured it of favorable possibilities of acting in society. The quality of a corporation of public law seemed to the Church as the relatively best suited manner of fulfilling its mission in the sphere of state law. A number of countries decided for the constitutionally legal separation of Church and state. However, the implementation of this was subject to the greatest differences. The concept "separation of Church and state" is ambiguous and hence impracticable in a country without an interpretive addition to the description of the relation in the sphere of canon law. Separation can be recommended in order to free the Church from the pressure of the state, but also in order to weaken it as the agent of religion. Separation which a state ruled by law undertakes seeks, of course, to end the relations to religious societies as far as possible but does not forbid their effectiveness; it does not even exclude the formal legal recognition of one or several Churches as well as the making of treaties with them.

---

[*] Georg May

The separation legislation of many countries, it is true, consciously or unconsciously took as model the French law of 9 December 1905,[1] which was not, of course, motivated by benevolence toward the Catholic Church. On the other hand, a system of union of Church and state can be a heavy burden for a Church, compromise it, even cripple it. Even a concordat, which in itself serves the adjustment between ecclesiastical and secular interests as well as the production or promotion of a harmonious cooperation of Church and state, must operate not without conditions in favor of the Church's life. It depends too much on the manifold organizational powers and power factors within a country whether a legal relationship between Church and state brings benefit or injury to religion. The Code of Canon Law basically does not treat the relations of Church and state and touches on them only occasionally in consequence of objective connections. Law agreeable to states, even that which contradicted the Code of Canon Law, was to be maintained (Canon 3). Relations in the religiously neutral countries, for example, in regard to marriage, were taken into account to a certain extent.

The reorganization of ecclesiastical relations was an imperative necessity in many countries after the First World War. The map of Europe had been, especially in the east and southeast, profoundly altered. From the bankruptcy of tsarist Russia and of the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary had arisen a large number of new states. In other countries territorial changes and alterations of state forms took place. Inflation had serious financial restratifications as a consequence. The Apostolic See sought to control the circumstances especially through the establishing of diplomatic relations with the states and the conclusion of agreements with them. In the address in the consistory of 21 November 1921[2] Pope Benedict XV (1914–22) declared that many older concordats had lost their force and practicability because of the political changes of the last years. A concordat had to be regarded as null when the legal personality of a state was no longer identical with the partner which had concluded it with the Holy See. But, he said, the Church was ready to enter into negotiations with the governments, of course without prejudice to its dignity and liberty. In this manner the Pope indicated his readiness to conclude new concordats which would take account of altered circumstances. As a matter of fact, Benedict XV's talk released a wave of concordats and other treaties, so that it is correct to speak of an Era of Concordats between the two world wars and beyond. In concluding concordats the Holy See principally aimed to assure the freedom of religious life and of the Church in general by legally binding the state. It was also concerned that the state recognize the position of the Church and its organization. The law of the code had to be circulated and implemented. This was not possible without a tolerant attitude on the part of states. Likewise, a satisfactory arrangement of *res mixtae,* such as schools, religious instruction, marriage, the system of associations and institutes, as well as property could be realized only in harmony with the state. Of primary importance to the Holy See in this regard was the assuring of the religious instruction of children, especially through the guarantee of the erecting of Catholic schools. Then the ecclesiastical circumscription and organization had to be adapted to the changed political and legal circumstances. The drawing of boundaries in the peace treaties had, moreover, created numerous new problems of minorities, which included for the Church in these countries the danger of serious conflicts with the nationalistic-minded popular majorities that dominated the state. Hence, not a few concordats of the postwar period saw to the religious protection of these minorities. The Holy See regularly tried to translate the attempts and desires of governments relating to stipulations in individual points in negotiations for a concordat as comprehensive as possible. Even if the arrangement worked out was frequently not satisfactory or the content of a treaty was meagre, the mere fact that it had achieved the concluding of an agreement with a state seemed to the Holy See to be a gain. For in fact in not a few countries there was a fundamental antipathy to any making of a treaty with the Church. Under favorable circumstances there could be further building on the position reached.

---

[1] Giacometti, *Quellen,* 272–86.

[2] *AAS* 13 (1921), 521f.

On the other hand, new states endeavored to consolidate and exalt their newly won existence by means of treaties with the oldest sovereign of Europe. The esteem for the Holy See was not only not affected since the loss of the Papal State but had even increased because of the effectiveness of important Popes. Also, the Holy See wanted to help strengthen the new states with its means and hoped thereby to serve the cause of peace. The liturgical prayer for the country, for example, corroborated the union of Church and state and testified to the Church's concern for its welfare. Further, the states were interested in a visible and enduring organization of the Catholic Church in their territory, in the coinciding of the ecclesiastical circumscriptions with the national boundaries, in the appointing of loyal bishops, and in the formation of a clergy reliable in regard to the nation. The new states especially placed great value on this, that no territories or monasteries in their country should be or remain subject to foreign bishops or superiors. The Code of Canon Law, as a clearly arranged, precise source of the law of the Church, made it easy for the states to take part in the concluding of treaties with the Church. They knew to what they were obliging themselves, and the interpretation and implementation of the concordat norms were considerably facilitated.

Concordats are systems of mutual concessions by Church and state. In the majority of cases the Church is the receiving party to a greater extent than the state. Hence, after the First World War the nations whose principle of separation proceeded from an ideology hostile to the Church generally avoided the concluding of concordats. They were ordinarily made by states which conceded to the Church a position in public law.

The norms contained in the concordats are, each looked at separately, particular canon law, but, seen in context, they constitute, because of their repetition, the substratum of a common law, of the *ius concordatarium* on specific subjects. The law of concordats between the two world wars was relatively homogeneous; the legal forms and legal institutions utilized by it displayed an extensive agreement. This similarity was derived from two roots. First, in the negotiations the Church proceeded from canon law, which had fortunately just been codified, and so it constantly had basically the same point of departure. Then the effect of precedence was greatly developed in the concluding of concordats. Usually, previous concordats served to a greater or lesser degree as models for later ones.

In individual cases the Church aspired to assure, by means of concordats, a minimum of those guarantees and prerogatives which belonged to it by canon law. And so, treaties frequently repeated principles and assurances which were already expressed in the constitution of the country in question. The Church set critical importance on independence from the state in the filling of its offices. Numerous concordats logically stipulated the free nomination of the bishops by the Pope (Canon 329, par. 2). The government of the state concerned was ordinarily permitted the right, partly in place of an earlier right of nomination, to make known misgivings of a general political nature—the so-called political proviso—before the appointment of residential bishops and of coadjutor bishops with the right of succession. Then, the concordats of Pius XI as a rule contained regulations on appointments to canonries and parishes, schools and theological faculties, the supervision by the bishops of the religious and moral instruction of youth, and the liberties and legal rights of religious institutes. Teaching in the name of the Church was made dependent on the possession of the *missio canonica*.[3] A special legal protection was assured to clerics in the exercise of their office. Pastoral viewpoints induced the Holy See in some cases to agree to the prohibition of partisan political activities by clerics. The right of minorities to religious instruction in their vernacular was assured.[4] In many concordats the legal competence of ecclesiastical legal persons to acquire, possess, and administer property was recognized. In some cases concordats referred to individual canons of the code or other ecclesiastical norms explicity named. In the main, however, reference was made to the prescriptions of the code or of ecclesiastical law or ecclesiastical principles in general, for example, in the sense that questions pertaining to ecclesiastical persons or things and not expressly treated in the concordat should be regulated according to canon law. Finally, the rule was often adopted into the treaties that both parties, in the event of differences of interpretation, will effect an amicable solution in a common agreement. In this way, repudiation and break were made difficult and at the same time the door to new negotiations was kept open.

---

[3] H. Flatten, "Missio canonica," T. Filthaut, J. A. Jungmann, eds., *Verkündigung und Glaube. Festgabe für Franz X. Arnold* (Freiburg i. Br. 1958), 123–41.

One can say that after the First World War the concordat was found in an increasing measure to be the suitable form for ordering the relations of Church and state. The territorial episcopate was regularly consulted by the Holy See in the negotiations, and its ideas and wishes were as far as possible taken into consideration. Elected representatives of the episcopate played a direct role in the negotiations. The Holy See regularly aspired to have the ratification of completed concordats take place in the Vatican.

In retrospect it must be admitted that the concordats achieved their goal only inadequately. The circumstances and the development were not to a great extent favorable to their existence and their implementation. Most were ruined by the Second World War and its sequel. In concluding them, the Holy See in general showed itself to be well informed about the situation in the individual countries. However, occasionally it seemed to have overestimated the power of the forces prepared for cooperation. Nevertheless, the concordat policy was right and necessary. By it the Holy See went on record that in its relations with nations it did not champion the view of all or nothing but in recognizing realities was ready for compromise solutions. The concluding of a treaty as such testified before the whole world to the claim and the right of the Holy See to represent the Catholic Church uppermost and definitively. The concordats also strengthened the self-awareness of the Catholics, who saw themselves cared for and protected by the supreme head of the Church and for the first time mentioned by the government of the nation. They set up signs which could not be obliterated; they created an incontestable legal basis for the Church and in many cases prevented worse. The separation legislation of states and the concordat policy of the Holy See overcame, from different points of departure, the system of state Churches and of state supremacy over the Church and provided the Church with the autonomy for the regulating of which the Code of Canon Law stood, seen in its entirety, as one excellent instrument at its disposal.

---

[4] T. Grentrup, *Religion und Muttersprache* (Münster 1932), 458–524; W. Hasselblatt, "Reichskonkordat und Minderheitenschutz," *Nation und Staat* 6 (1932–33), 690–95.

Individual Concordats

WITH THE NEW STATES. A majority of the new nations in the east and the southeast of Europe were ready for agreements with the Apostolic See for reasons of foreign and domestic policy. Nevertheless, there were also usually obstacles to the concluding of treaties, namely laicism, exaggerated nationalism, and the negative attitude of non-Catholic religious groups, especially the Orthodox. On 30 May 1922 Pius XI concluded a concordat with predominantly non-Catholic Latvia,[5] at first for three years but with the implied prolongation from year to year on a six-months' notice. An exempt archbishopric was established at Riga. An oath of loyalty, to be made on entering office, was prescribed for the archbishop, a stipulation that was to be repeated in the following concordats.

In Poland, where the territorial boundaries were disputed until the end of 1924, the constitutional mandate to regulate the future relations of Church and state in a concordat with the Holy See could not be carried out until 10 February 1925.[6] The Polish concordat reorganized the Church in this country—five provinces of the Latin Rite with twenty-one sees, one province of the Byzantine Rite, and one archdiocese of the Armenian Rite—and especially arranged questions of the filling of offices, of religious instruction, and of Church property. In regard to Poland the Holy See showed especially generous willingness to cooperate. ARTICLE 19, Section 2, page 2 of the concordat excluded from the office of pastor all clerics whose activity jeopardized the safety of the state. Thereby an at the time unrivaled right in the nomination of pastors was conceded to the Polish government.[7]

---

[5] A. Van Hove, "Le Concordat entre le Saint-Siège et le gouvernement de Lettonie (3. novembre 1922)," *NRTh* 50 (1923), 132–43; Al Giannini, "Il Concordato con la Lettonia," *L'Europa Orientale* 5 (1925), 653–58.

[6] A. Süsterhenn, *Das polnische Konkordat vom 10. Februar 1925* (Cologne 1928); F. Grübel, *Die Rechtslage der römisch-katholischen Kirche in Polen nach dem Konkordat vom 10. Februar 1925* (Leipzig 1930); H. Bednorz, *Le Concordat de Pologne de 1925. Nomination aux Sièges Épiscopaux et aux Paroisses. Commentaire avec comparaison aux autres Concordats d'apres-guerre* (Paris 1938); R. Sobański, "Das erste polnische Plenarkonzil—seine Bedeutung für den Integrationsprozess der Bevölkerung Polens zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen," *ÖAfKR* 26 (1975), 143–58.

On 10 May 1927 a concordat with Rumania was concluded,[8] which was not ratified until 1929 because of the opposition of Orthodox circles. The Catholic Church in the nation was to be organized in one province each for the Greek and the Latin Rites, with four suffragan sees each, as well as a spiritual head for the Armenians. As in Poland, here too the state laid special importance on the national reliability of the pastors (ART. XII, par. 2). The two contracting parties reserved to themselves, by way of exception, the right to repudiate the concordat after a preliminary notification of six months (ART. XXIII, Section 2). On 27 September 1927 Lithuania made a treaty with the Holy See.[9] It gave the Church extensive rights in the school system, entrusted to ecclesiastics the direction of the register of births, deaths, and burials, and gave civil effects to the canonical form of marriage. The pastoral care of the faithful in their vernacular was assured. But there was constant friction over the interpretation of the concordat.

The government of Czechoslovakia usually showed itself to be unfriendly toward the Catholic Church and pursued a policy of petty annoyances against it. The Hus Celebration of 1925 almost led to the breaking off of diplomatic relations. On 2 February 1928 a meagre modus vivendi was arrived at.[10] It was concerned with the circumscription of dioceses and the naming of bishops. The agreement eliminated a group of points of difference and envisaged negotiations for the future. The carrying out of the regulations of the modus vivendi encountered considerable difficulties. Not until seven years after after its signing did the government fulfill the chief condition whereby the Holy See had made the defining of dioceses (ART. 1) dependent on the restoration of the church property in Slovakia. Nothing further could be achieved before the collapse of the state in 1938–39.

---

[7] Cf. R. Jacuzio, "Il diritto di opposizione riservato al governo nella nomina dei parrocci," *Il Diritto concordatario* 2 (1937), 56–58.

[8] I. Mateiu, *Valoarea Concordatului incheiat cu Vaticanul* (Sibiu 1929); L. Honoré, "Une Église servante de l'État. L'Église orthodoxe roumaine," *NRTh* 56 (1929), 56–66; N.N., "De concordato inter Sanctam Sedem et Rumaniam," *Appollinaris* 3 (1930), 581–600.

[9] L. Maser, *Das Konkordat zwischen dem Apostolischen Stuhle und der Republik Litauen vom 27. September 1927 in rechtsvergleichender Betrachtung* (Lippstadt 1931); A. Ottaviani, "Concordatum Lithuanicum" *Apollinaris* 1 (1928), 53–64, 140–49.

[10] I. Pasquazi, "Modus vivendi inter Sanctam Sedem et Rempublicam Cechoslovachiae," *Apollinaris* 1 (1928), 149–55; N.N., "Der 'Modus vivendi' in der Tschechoslowakei," *Ecclesiastica* 13 (1933), 353–56; F. Kop, *Modus vivendi. Nýnější stav jeho provedeni* (Prague 1937); E. Hoyer, "Das Schicksal des tschechoslowakischen Modus vivendi," M. Grabmann, K. Hofmann, eds., *Festschrift Eduard Eichmann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Paderborn 1940), 373–400; D. Faltin, "La crisi della Chiesa in Ceco-Slovacchia e il Modus vivendi del 1927. L'opera del Card. Pietro Ciriaci," *Divinitas* 9 (1965), 600–605.

On the other hand, the concordat of 5 June 1933 with Austria[11] involved a comprehensive regulation. ARTICLE 30, Section 3 of the federal constitution raised specific articles of the concordat to constituent parts of the constitution and thereby gave them a constitutional character. It partly corresponded to the concordat concluded soon after with the Third Reich. The concordat promised the erecting of the bisphopric of Innsbruck-Feldkirch and of the prelacy *nullius* of Burgenland (ART. III, Par. 2) and endeavored, through prudent fostering and the promise of financial support for free Catholic schools, to create the presuppositions for the development of public Catholic schools (ART. III, Pars. 3–4). However, the government lacked the majority and the power to implement the stipulations agreed to. Above all, the subordination of marriages contracted in Church to the canon law (ART. VII) evoked the united bitter resistance of liberalism, Marxism, and National Socialism.

Tedious negotiations led in 1935 to the concluding of a comprehensive concordat with Yugoslavia.[12] But the resistance of the Orthodox Serbs[13] was so strong that it caused the fall of the government after the chamber had accepted it, because it agreed not to bring it before the Senate. In it were the important stipulations that, when the concordat became effective, contrary norms of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia should become null (ART. XXXV) and that subjects not treated in the concordat should be handled in accord with the pertinent canon law (ART. XXXVII, Sec. 1).

WITH THE "SEPARATION COUNTRIES" OF EUROPE. The ideology of separation was usually a preserve of the political left. As a consequence of it there ordinarily occurred in the "separation countries" of Europe an agreement with the Holy See only if governments of a different political orientation came to power in them. In regard to France, from the beginning of the pontificate of Benedict XV the Holy See pursued a policy of yielding and of concession, which in a certain respect prevailed over the separation regime. The Law of Separation had also proved to be impracticable. From the end of the First World War the élan of laicism diminished. From the resumption of diplomatic relations in 1920 the Holy See inquired of the French government before the appointing of a bishop whether there were any political objections to the candidate.[14] In the corresponding declarations of the French Council of State of 13 December 1923 and Pius XI's encyclical *Maximam gravissimamque* of 18 January 1924 on diocesan associations[15] could be seen a tacit agreement on the thorny problem of the administration of church property. The Council of State declared on 3 February 1925 that the French government and the Holy See were in agreement on maintaining the concordat of 1801 in Alsace and Lorraine.[16] In 1926 were concluded two accords with France,[17] insignificant in content but important for the atmosphere. In them were determined the liturgical privileges which belonged to the representatives of France in the countries where France still occupied the religious protectorate or in which this had been recently abolished.

---

[11] A. Van Hove, "Le concordat entre le Saint-Siége et l'Autriche," *NRTh* 61 (1934), 785–803, 897–913; R. Köstler, "Das neue österreichische Konkordat," *Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht* 15 (1935), 1–33; idem, *Das österreichische Konkordats-Eherecht* (Vienna 1937); G. Stutzinger, *Das österreichische Konkordat vom 5. Juni 1933* (Cologne 1936); J. Hollnsteiner, *Das österreichische Konkordat in seiner kirchen-und staatsrechtlichen Bedeutung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der eherechtlichen Bestimmungen,* 2d ed. (Leipzig and Vienna 1937); E. K. Winter, *Christentum und Zivilisation* (Vienna 1956), 370–402.

[12] J. Massarette, "Um das Konkordat in Jugoslawien," *ThprQS* 90 (1937), 733–35; A. Giannini, "Un concordato mancato (Il Concordato Jugoslavo del 1935)," *L'Europa Orientale* 22 (1942), 245–69.

[13] Serbia had concluded a concordat with the Holy See on 24 June 1914, but because of the war it was not implemented.

In Portugal, which had again established diplomatic relations with the Apostolic See in 1918, there began under the dictatorship of Carmona a rapprochement of Church and state. The decree of 18 July 1926 annulled some of the most odious provisions of the Law of Separation of 1911. The constitution of 19 March 1933 was strongly influenced by Catholic ideology. In one and the same article it proclaimed the Catholic religion as the religion of the state, the principle of religious liberty, the principle of separation, and the maintaining of diplomatic relations with the Holy See (ART. 46). Thus no serious obstacle prevented the concluding of treaties with the Holy See. The accord of

---

[14] Cf. the aide-mémoire of Cardinal Secretary of State Gasparri of May 1921 in *Revue des Sciences religieuses* 4 (1924), 248f.

[15] Giacometti, *Quellen*, 383–86.

[16] A. Erler, "Das Napoleonische Konkordat im Elsass und in Lothringen," *AfkKR* 122 (1947), 236–78; R. Metz, "Un cas intéressant d'application du droit concordataire: La nomination d'un coadjuteur avec droit de succession à l'évêché de Strasbourg," *L'Année Canonique* 6 (1959), 179–86; idem, "Les incidences concordataires de la démission de l'Évêque de Strasbourg," *Revue de droit canonique* 17 (1967), 273–97; idem, "Les nominations épiscopales en France et plus spécialement dans les diocèses concordataires de Strasbourg et de Metz," ibid. 18 (1968), 97–121.

[17] C. Crispolti, "Gli accordi franco-vaticani sugli onori liturgici in Oriente," *Rassegna Italiana* 19 (1927), 226–30.

15 April 1928[18] reorganized the hierarchy in Portuguese India and solved the question of the patronate that as of 11 April 1929 regulated the situation in the diocese of Meliapôr.

Ever since its unification, Italy had more and more became a nation with a hostile separation of Church and state: state schools without religious instruction, abolition of theological faculties at the state universities, compulsory civil marriage. However, after the end of the First World War a slow rapprochement between the nation and the Holy See made progress. In January 1919 a Catholic party was formed with the toleration of the Holy See; in this way the principle of the "Non expedit" was canceled. In the encyclical *Pacem Dei munus* on 23 May 1920 Benedict XV abandoned the prohibition, applying to Catholic heads of states, of making an official visit to the Quirinal. The Fascist regime recommended itself to the Church through many laws and measures that were friendly to the Church in relation to school and marriage, clergy, and ecclesiastical property. Thus was the way opened for a comprehensive clearing out of the matter of conflict between Church and state. In 1929 occurred the solution of the Roman Question in the Lateran Treaties. On 11 February 1929 three agreements were signed: the political treaty, the financial settlement (as Appendix IV of the political treaty), and the concordat.[19] On 27 May

---

[18] A. Correja de Silva, "Concordatum Lusitanicum," *Apollinaris* 1 (1928), 280–95; E. Hocedez, "Convention entre le S. Siège et la République du Portugal," *NRTh* 55 (1928), 519–25.

[19] L. Laghi, G. Andreucci, *Il trattato lateranense. Commentato* (Florence 1929); N.N., "De Concordato inter S. Sedem et Italiam," *Apollinaris* 2 (1929), 458–94; H. Ferrand, "La question Romaine et les Accords de Latran," *Revue Apologétique,* 48 (1929), 569–91; A. Hagen, *Die Rechtsstellung des Heiligen Stuhles nach den Lateranverträgen* (Stuttgart 1930); K. Strupp, "Die Regelung der römischen Frage durch die Lateranverträge vom 1. Februar 1929," *Zeitschrift für Völkerrecht* 15 (1930), 531–622; Z. Giacometti, "Zur Lösung der römischen Frage," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* 90 (1931), 8–50; A. Giannini, *Il cammino della Conciliazione* (Milan 1946); W. von Bergen, *Der Einfluss der Lateranverträge auf die staatliche Gesetzgebung Italians mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Eherechts* (Düsseldorf 1954); A. C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e Stato in Italia dal Risorgimento ad oggi* (Turin 1955); G. Migliori, *Codice concordatario,* 3d ed. (Milan 1959); F. Pacelli, *Diario della Conciliazione con verbali e appendice documenti* (Vatican City 1959); U. Del Giudice, *I Patti Lateranensi* (Rome 1960); F. M. Marchesi, *Il concordato italiano dell' 11 febbraio 1929* (Naples 1960); A. Martini, *Studi sulla Questione Romana e la Conciliazione* (Rome 1963); R. Motsch, *Die Konkordatsehe in Italien* (Frankfurt and Berlin 1965); W. Gamber, "Die Konkordatsehe in Italien," K. Siepen, J. Weitzel, P. Wirth, eds., *Ecclesia et Ius. Festgabe für Audomar Scheuermann zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (Munich, Paderborn and Vienna 1968), 393–404; P. Ciprotti, *Atti della Commissione mista dei delegati della Santa Sede e del Governo Italiano per predisporre l'esecuzione del Concordato (11 aprile–25 novembre 1929) e altri documenti connessi* (Milan 1968); G. Salvemini, *Stato e Chiesa in Italia* (Milan 1969).

1929 they were transformed into internal state law. In the political treaty the Italian state recognized the Catholic religion as the "sole religion of the state" (ART. 1). Likewise, the sovereignty of the Holy See was confirmed (ART. 2) and a territory of its own, Vatican City, was guaranteed (ART. 3). The neutrality of Vatican City was established (ART. 24). The person of the Pope is sacred and inviolable (ART. 8). The Holy See's active and passive diplomatic right was acknowledged (ART. 12). The Holy see declared the Roman Question definitively and irrevocably settled and recognized the Kingdom of Italy with Rome as capital (ART. 26). In the financial settlement the payment of compensation for the losses which had befallen the Pope through the events of 1870 was agreed to. The concordat complemented the treaty and brought a detailed regulation of affairs touching Church and state (45 articles). The state guaranteed to the Catholic Church its special position in Italy and the rights pertaining to this. To the Church was assured the free exercise of spiritual power, of public worship, and of jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs. The sacred character of Rome was acknowledged and protected (ART. 1, Sec. 1). The freedom of the filling of episcopal sees and of other offices was restored (ARTS. 19, 24, 25). No cleric could acquire or retain a post or an office in the Italian state or in a public institution or corporation dependent on it without the approval of the local ordinary. Apostate priests or those under censure must under no circumstances be employed in education or in an office or post in which they came directly into contact with the public (ART. 5). The civil effects were recognized in the sacrament of matrimony, which was regulated by the canon law. Cases of invalid marriages and the dispensation from nonconsummated marriages continued to be reserved to ecclesiastical courts and officials. Only the procedure in the separation from bed and board was conducted by the civil courts (ART. 34). Instruction in the Catholic religion was designated as the "basis and crown" of public instruction and was now envisaged also for the universities (ART. 36). The state promised a change in its legislation in order to bring it into harmony with the Lateran Treaties (ART. 29). For its part, the Church made considerable concessions. A revision of the boundaries of dioceses and their decrease in number were envisaged (ARTS. 16 and 17). In connection with the appointment of bishops the government had the right to adduce political memories (ART. 19). In the naming of pastors its right to express reservations was allowed. Especially far-reaching appeared the power likewise conceded to it, in relation to the emergence of reasons which made it seem harmful for a pastor to continue in his position, to inform the local ordinary, who had to take appropriate measures in accord with the government within three months (ART. 21). Partisan political activity was forbidden to all ecclesiastics (ART. 43 Sec. 7). The Holy See obliged itself to a condonation in regard to all possessors of church property (ART. 28). Noteworthy is the concession that the state, in the case of unfit administration of property, may proceed, in agreement with the ecclesiastical authority, to the sequestration of the temporalities of the benefice (ART. 26, Sec. 2).

The Lateran Treaties ended the decades-long opposition of the Church to a united Italy and were for both parties an honorable peace treaty. They satisfied the national will of the people and assured the Church's possibility of effectiveness. The treaties produced a solution which, as is said in the preamble of the treaty, corresponded to the justice and dignity of both sides. They were in general balanced, took account of the Catholic tradition of the people without violating the rights of the state or of other religious communities, and fulfilled the political claims without treading too near the freedom of the Church. The Holy See sought not a restoration but a new start. In it it saw the guarantee of permanence. It accommodated itself in the renunciation of the Papal State, which was overdue, and set resolutely about carrying out its universal mission from the area of a diminutive state. This was the only remaining possibility of assuring, at least in normal circumstances, the independence required for the fulfilling of its task. Of course, in the sequel there were some collisions between Church and state, which usually had their cause in the interference and usurpation of the Fascist regime. Nevertheless, Mussolini did not permit a prolonged conflict to occur, but strove constantly for an adjustment acceptable to both sides.

WITH THE LATIN AMERICAN STATES. The economic and social grievances as well as the unstable political conditions in most countries made Latin America for a considerable time the object of special concern of the Holy See. The ordinarily traditionally Catholic people often could not assert themselves against the Freemasonic oligarchies that were hostile to the Church. Thus is explained the surprising fact that relatively rarely did the conclusion of satisfactory agreements of the Holy See with Latin American nations succeed, which would either have established a system of concordats or have continued the concordats made in the past century.[20] Only Colombia was an exception: with it, between 1918 and 1928, several treaties, the most important being the mission accord of 5 May 1928, were concluded. Only the agreement of 1928 put an end to the uninterrupted *Kulturkampf* in Guatemala. Likewise in 1928 there came about an agreement with Peru over the naming of the bishops.[21] With Ecuador, following the decrees of the 1920s, hostile to the Church, a modus vivendi was achieved on 24 July 1937.[22] The government guaranteed freedom of instruction. State and Church joined to evangelize the Indians and to encourage them in every respect. Any political activity was forbidden to the clergy. (See also Chapter 24.)

---

[20] F. B. Pike, *The Conflict between Church and State in Latin America* (New York 1964); J. L. Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America. A History of Politico-Ecclesiastical Relations,* rev. ed. (Chapel Hill 1966); C. H. Hillekamps, "Staat und Kirche in Südamerika," *Hochland* 58 (1966), 409–19.

GERMANY. The German Reich had to pay for the First World War with serious territorial losses. Through the Treaty of Versailles the Catholic Church in Germany lost the bishoprics of Strasbourg and Metz, the greatest part of Gnesen-Posen and Kulm, and a considerable part of Breslau. In the Free City of Danzig, separated from Germany, an Apostolic Administration was created in 1922, an exempt see in 1925. The German Reich changed from constitutional monarchy to parliamentary democracy. On 11 August 1919 the constitution decided upon by the National Assembly at Weimar went into force. In contrast to the situation in the German Empire of 1871 it established the competence of the state as a whole for the regulation of the relations of Church and state and of Church and school (ART. 10, nos. 1 and 2). The basic legislation of the Reich on Church and school assured to the Church for all of Germany a specific degree of freedom and potential efficacy. The ecclesio-political system of the Weimar Republic was that of an organizational separation with mutual cooperation of Church and state. The foundation of the position of religious society in the Weimar constitution was religious freedom (ARTS. 135, 136, 137, 140, 141). ARTICLE 137, Secs. 1 and 7, contains the idea of separation; ART. 138, Sec. 1, is in accord with it. ARTICLE 137, Sec. 1, declares that no "state Church" exists. Thereby the Protestant territorial church system was once and for all abolished, but at the same time the fundamental secularism, neutrality, and equality of the state were expressed. The Weimar Republic looked at the principle of separation as an institutional guarantee for the protection of the state from the power of the Church and of the Church from interference by the state and saw in it the means of restoring a liberal arrangement of the compromise. Nevertheless, the Churches continued to be corporations of public law, and this status could be bestowed on other religious congregations (ART. 137, Sec. 5). In this way the importance of Churches and religious groups for the life of the people was recognized and the ability was granted them to be bearers of public competencies and rights. The granting of the right of self-determination to religious societies (ART. 137, Sec. 3) protected the liberty of the whole of ecclesiastical activity in the world, to the extent that it was regarded by the Church as necessary for "its affairs." ARTICLE 137, Sec. 3, assured to religious groups a sphere of freedom within which they could establish an independent legal power, for example, ecclesiastical power, and by means of them an independent legal order. With the system of the relations of state and Church created by the Weimar constitution the state's sovereignty over the Churches was no longer compatible, but of course it was still practiced by the government and administration of some states. The public denominational school, which was regarded by the German Catholics as a vital question, was basically guaranteed (ART. 146). Religious instruction continued in all public schools, except the nondenominational, to be a regular subject (ART. 149).

---

[21] F. B. Pike, "Church and State in Peru and Chile since 1840: A study in contrasts," *American Historical Review*, 73 (1967), 30–50.

[22] J. I. Larrea, *La Iglesia y el Estado en el Ecuador* (Seville 1954).

The ecclesiastical articles of the Weimar Constitution were the best that could be obtained in view of the political power situation. However, during the entire epoch of the Weimar Republic the reciprocal alienation of Church and state could not be overcome. Still, in 1920 an embassy of the German Reich was established at the Holy See in place of the previous Prussian legation. The German Catholics set great hopes on it. The legal binding force of the concordats and conventions with the Holy See surviving from the nineteenth century had become uncertain. The territorial alterations following the peace treaty necessitated an adaptation of diocesan boundaries. For these reasons, in order to exhaust the possibilities supplied by the Weimar Constitution and convert them into concrete assurances, in regard to which the concern for the Catholic denominational school was predominant, the Church endeavored to conclude a concordat with the Reich. The Weimar Republic was also basically interested in this. The Reich sought from the Holy See moral and political support against the front of the victorious powers. From time to time in 1921 the Reich government promised itself from a concordat a stabilizing influence on the German boundaries, threatened by desires for annexation in the east and desires for separation in the west. But the party constellation in the Reichstag did not go beyond drafts of a concordat. The liberal and Protestant forces, like the elements in the Social Democratic Party that were hostile to the Church, refused the conclusion of a treaty. In particular, the hurdle of the Reich School Law, that was first to be enacted, could not be overcome.

However, in view of this situation, the Holy See did not give up. Instead, it utilized the tension between the Reich and the states, produced by the federalist construction of the state, to pursue a multitrack concordat policy. The extensive independence of the states in cultural policy even gave to concordats with the states a precedence over a concordat with the Reich. From the standpoint of the Church as well as of the state Bavaria was especially suited to be the pacemaker for such agreements. The Holy See wanted to come to an accommodation with Bavaria first, because here it could most easily expect a relatively favorable concordat, which should then serve as model for the other German states. The Free State of Bavaria saw in the conclusion of a concordat a means of stressing emphatically its threatened political independence. On 24 March 1924 the concordat with Bavaria, advantageous to the Church, was concluded.[23] However, particularly because of the state's concessions in the school question it had a chilling effect on public opinion.

A concordat with Prussia of 14 June 1929[24] was, as far as concerns the meagre content, a casualty because in it there was no agreement on school, marriage, and religious institutes. Indicative of the atmosphere heated up by the Protestant side is the fact that in the negotiations and the wording of the text the term "concordatum" was purposely avoided. Nevertheless, the Prussian concordat was of importance as a political event.

---

[23] C. Mirbt, "Das bayerische Konkordat vom 29. März 1924," *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 36 (1925), 371–411; F. X. Kiefl, *Kritische Randglossen zum Bayerischen Konkordat unter dem Gesichtspunkt der modernen Kulturideale und der Trennung von Staat und Kirche* (Regensburg 1926); I. A. Brein, "Der publizistische Kampf um das bayerische Konkordat vom 29. März 1924 und die Verträge mit den evangelischen Kirchen," *HJ* 46 (1927), 547–54; A. Greiger, *Bekenntnisschule und Religionsunterricht nach dem Bayerischen Konkordat* (Coburg 1928); H. Zenglein, *Religionsunterricht und Religionslehrer nach dem Bayerischen Konkordat 1924* (Hassfurt am Main 1928); C. Schwarzmeier, "Das Bayerische Konkordat vom 29.3 1924 und der CIC" (Diss. Würzburg 1929); H. Rust, *Die Rechtsnatur von Konkordaten und Kirchenverträgen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der bayerischen Verträge vom 1924* (Munich 1964).

[24] O. Zschucke, "Der Vertrag zwischen dem Freistaate Preussen und dem Heiligen Stuhle," *Deutsche Juristen-Zeitung* 34 (1929), 1097–1100; J. V. Bredt, "Das preussische Konkordat," *Preussiche Jahrbücher* 217 (1929), 137–50; J. Danziger, *Beiträge zum preussischen Konkordat vom Jahre 1929* (Breslau 1930); R. Leiber, "Das Preussische Konkordat," *StdZ* 118 (1930), 17–31; A. Perugini, "Inter Sanctam Sedem et Borussiae Rempublicam sollemnis Conventio seu Concordatum," *Apollinaris* 5 (1932), 38–53; E. Wende, *C. H. Becker, Mensch und und Politiker* (Stuttgart 1959), 268–92; R. Morsey, "Zur Geschichte des Preussischen Konkordats und der Errichtung des Bistums Berlin," *Wichmann-Jahrbuch für Kirchengeschichte im Bistum Berlin* 19/20 (1965–66), 64–89; D. Golombek, *Die politische Vorgeschichte des Preussenkonkordats (1929)* (=*Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte bei der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern,* series B, vol. 4) (Mainz 1970).

In 1932 two treaties were made with the Free State of Anhalt,[25] and a concordat was concluded with Baden on 12 October 1932.[26] Although in Baden everything except a maximum program for the Church could be negotiated, the concordat obtained only a perceptibly weak parliamentary majority.

The other German states did not make concordats with the Holy See. In them the relations of state and Church were regulated according to legal decisions, for example, in Württemberg by the comprehensive law of 3 March 1924.

The three state concordats sought especially to create a new order in their territories, which were affected by the alteration of boundaries, of the form of government and of the constitution, as well as by the codification of canon law. They guaranteed the claims of the Church going back to older legal titles—endowment of sees, establishing of new sees and parishes—and the interests of the state in specific presuppositions for ecclesiastical officeholders—state citizenship, triennium—as well as the appointment to episcopal sees and cathedral chapters. Except for Bavaria, the cathedral chapters' right to elect the bishops was maintained in the German states, but was limited to a proposal of three names by the Holy See. The cooperation of the Church in the appointing of professors on Catholic theological faculties of the state universities and of posts for the teaching of religion was minutely regulated. Only the Bavarian concordat contained greater concessions to the Church in the guarantee of denominational public schools and teacher training (ARTS. 5 and 6) as well as in the awarding of the right to religious orders, eventually as publicly recognized, to maintain private schools (ART. 9). Contrary to the wishes of the Church, no settlement of the school question was included in the concordats with Baden and Prussia, but just the same in an appendix or, respectively, an exchange of letters pertaining to the work of the treaty, the observance and implementation of the stipulations of the constitution of the Reich relevant to the school and religious instruction were promised. In Prussia, in addition to that of Cologne, the provinces of Paderborn and Breslau (Wroclaw) were created, and the sees of Aachen and Berlin and the prelacy *nullius* of Schneidemühl were newly established. The concordats with Bavaria, Prussia, and Baden followed, as regards content, similarly shaped treaties with the Protestant Churches. Concordats and ecclesiastical treaties assured the public status of the Churches by contract, thereby set them off from the group of other religious congregations of public law, and laid the foundation for a relationship of coordination of Church and state. Thus there appeared in Germany a new type of relation of Church and state, that of the "autonomous separate Church guaranteed by treaty or concordat," to quote Ulrich Stutz.

---

[25] N. Hilling, "Die beiden Vereinbarungen zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und dem Freistaat Anhalt vom 4. Januar 1932," *AfkKR* 115 (1935), 457–63.

[26] A. Van Hove, "Le Concordat entre le Saint-Siège et l'État libre de Baden," *NRTh* 60 (1933), 769–82; E. Föhr. *Das Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhle und dem Freistaate Baden vom 12. Oktober 1932* (Freiburg i. Br. 1933); E. Will, *das Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und dem Freistaat Baden vom 12. Oktober 1932* (Freiburg i. Br. 1953); E. Föhr, *Geschichte des Badischen Konkordats* (Freiburg i. Br. 1958); G. May, "Mit Katholiken zu besetzende Professuren für Philosophie und Geschichte an der Universität Freiburg nach dem Badischen Konkordat vom 12. Oktober 1932," U. Mosiek, H. Zapp, eds., *Ius et Salus Animarum. Festschrift für Bernhard Panzram* (Freiburg 1972), 341–70.

A new phase of ecclesiastical policies began when on 30 January 1933 Adolf Hitler became chancellor of the Reich. In his government's statement of 23 March 1933 he labeled the two denominations as "most weighty factors for the preservation of our nationhood" and bound himself to respect the treaties concluded with them and not to attack their rights. Most especially he promised that he intended to "allow and assure" to the Christian denominations "the influence pertaining to them" in school and education. Hitler at once made known his intention of reaching an agreement with the Catholic Church. With recourse to the preliminary work since 1920 and 1921, the concordat with the Reich was signed in Vatican City on 20 July 1933.[27] On 10

---

[27] A. Roth, *Das Reichskonkordat vom 20.7.1933* (Munich 1933); A. Van Hove, "Le Concordat entre le Saint-Siège et le Reich allemand," *NRTh* 61 (1934), 158–85; R. Oeschey, "Das Reichskonkordat vom 20. Juli 1933." *Bayerische Gemeinde- und Verwaltungszeitung* 44 (1934), 526–32; R. Buttman, "Das Konkordat des Deutschen Reichs mit der römisch-katholischen Kirche vom 20. Juli 1933," H. Frank, ed., *Nationalsozialistisches Handbuch für Recht und Gesetzgebung,* 2d ed. (Munich 1935), 407–24; J. Schmitt, "Ablösung der Staatsleistungen an die Kirchen unter Berücksichtigung der Weimarer Verfassung, des Reichskonkordats und der drei Länderkonkordate," *AfkKR* 115 (1935), 3–52, 341–88; G. Ohlemüller, *Reichskonkordat zwischen Deutschland und dem Vatikan vom 20. Juli 1933. Urkunden und geschichtliche Bemerkungen,* 2d ed. (Berlin, 1937); K Krüger, *Kommentar zum Reichskonkordat* (Berlin 1938); H. G. Germann, *Fünf Jahre Reichskonkordat mit der römischen Kirche* (Berlin, n.d.); W. Weber, "Das Nihil obstat," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenchaft* 99 (1939), 193–244; W. Hausmann, "Reichskonkordat und Weimarer Verfassung," *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* 10 (1939), 145–49; M. Maccarrone, *Il nazionalsocialismo e la Santa Sede* (Rome 1947); G. Schreiber, "Deutsche Kirchenpolitik nach dem ersten Weltkrieg," *HJ* 70 (1951), 296–333; F. von Papen, *Der Wahrheit eine Gasse* (Munich 1952), 313–18; E. H. Fischer, "Die politische Klausel des Reichkonkordates und ihre

September 1933 the documents of ratification were exchanged. By the law of 12 September 1933 the Reich's minister of the interior was empowered to issue legal and administrative regulations required for the implementation of the concordat. They were never issued.

The concordat with the Reich let those with Bavaria, Prussia, and Baden continue and complemented them, but in addition it applied also to those German states in which there was previously no agreement (Art. 2). And so certain assurances were given by the Reich to those Catholics who were in a hopeless minority position. The assurances of the Weimar Constitution for the freedom of denomination and worship, as for the autonomy of the Churches, were now established by treaty (Art. 1). The exercise of the spiritual functions of priests was placed under special protection (Arts. 5 and 6). Pastoral care in public institutions was assured (Art. 28). Catholic societies were protected in a defined framework (Art. 31). The German episcopate was named in Art. 31, Sec. 3, as a partner of a definitive agreement with the government of the Reich. In this manner was taken a route heavy with consequences for the future. Nevertheless, the opportunity was neglected of making the principles of interpretation agreed to between the German bishops and the government concerning this article an integral item of the treaty in an incontrovertible manner. The decisive concessions of the state lie in Arts. 21 to 25, in which the Church's demands in regard to religious instruction and denominational and private schools were essentially met.[28] Religious instruction was to be a

---

rechtliche Tragweite," *ThQ* 134 (1954), 352–76; W. Groppe, *Das Reichskonkordat vom 20. Juli 1933. Eine Studie zur staats- und völkerrechtlichen Bedeutung dieses Vertrages für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Cologne 1956); H. J. Becker, *Zur Rechtsproblematik des Reichskonkordats,* 2d ed. (Munich 1956); E. Deuerlein, *Das Reichskonkordat* (Düsseldorf 1956); F. Schuller, "Das grundsätzliche Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche nach dem Reichskonkordat vom 20.7.1933," *AfkKR* 128 (1957–58), 13–79, 346–404; R. Morsey, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Reichskonkordats aus den Jahren 1920 und 1921," *ZSavRG,* Kan. Abt. 44 (1958), 237–67; idem, ed., "L. Kaas, F. von Papen, Briefe zum Reichskonkordat," *StdZ* 167 (1960–61), 11–30; A. Kupper, ed., *Staatliche Akten über die Reichskonkordatsverhandlungen (=Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte bei der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern,* series A, vol. 2) (Mainz 1969); L. Volk, ed., *Kirchliche Akten über die Reichskonkordatsverhandlungen 1933 (=Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte bei der Katholischen Akadamie in Bayern,* series A, vol. 11) (Mainz 1969); idem, *Das Reichskonkordat vom 20. Juli 1933. Von den Ansätzen in der Weimarer Republik bis zur Ratifizierung am 10. September 1933 (=Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte bei der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern,* series B, vol. 5) (Mainz 1972).

[28] E. Dackweiler, "Reichskonkordat und katholische Schule," *Juristische Wochenschrift* 62 (1933), 2487–90; Meyer-Lülmann, "Reichskonkordat und Schule," *Der Gemeindetag* 27 (1933), 446–48; Schulte, "Die Schulartikel des Reichskonkordats," *Reichs-*

regular subject of instruction in the public schools, including the professional schools (ART. 21). The maintenance and establishment of Catholic denominational schools was assured under certain conditions (ART. 23). Equality of rights was promised to the private schools of the orders (ART. 25). The Holy See for its part held out the prospect, "on the ground of the special circumstances existing in Germany" and in view of the guarantees contained in the concordat with the Reich, of issuing decrees which forbade clerics and religious from participating in party politics (ART. 32). The "Depoliticization Article" was the *conditio sine qua non* of the government for the conclusion of the concordat. Hitler's goal was the depoliticization of the clergy in order thereby to destroy political Catholicism. It coincided with the intention of the Holy See to keep pastors out of political party involvement for pastoral reasons. Matters of ecclesiastical competence which were not dealt with in the treaty were regulated "for the ecclesiastical sphere" in accord with the prevailing canon law (ART. 33, Sec.1). In regard to the law of marriage, the German government was not ready to make any concession (ART. 26).

On the whole, with the concordat with the Reich there came into being a moderate and durable system of accommodation and cooperation between Church and state. In its essential prescriptions it was modeled on the democratic state constitution of the Weimar Republic. Only a few regulations resulted from the development toward the totalitarian one-party system, in which the German Reich found itself (ARTS. 16, 31, 32). The Holy See strove to bring the concordat with the Reich as close as possible to the most recent ecclesiastical treaties—with Italy and Austria—and thereby to achieve a type of concordat that was uniform in its fundamental lines. The drawback of the German concordat lay in the fact that it was perhaps not honestly meant by the leading statesman and in any event was not taken seriously. The treaty, just like the state concordats, was from the beginning and to an increasing degree circumvented, reinterpreted, violated, and broken.[29]

---

verwaltungsblatt und Preussisches Verwaltungsblatt 54 (1933), 821–24; J. Schröteler, "Das katholische Schulideal und die Bestimmungen des Reichskonkordats," *StdZ* 126 (1934), 145–54; F. Pitzer, *Die Bekenntnisschule des Reichskonkordats. Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Studie und zugleich ein Beitrag zum Schulrecht* (Cologne and Berlin 1967).

[29] E. Rosa, "'Condizione concordataria' o persecuzione in Germania?" *CivCatt* 89 (1938), IV, 305–18; W. Weber, "Das Reichskonkordat in der deutschen Rechtsentwicklung" *Zeitschrift der Akademie für Deutsches Recht* 5 (1938), 532–36; R. Jestaedt, "Das Reichskonkordat vom 20. Juli 1933 in der nationalsozialistischen Staats- und Verwaltungspraxis unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Artikels 1," *AfkKR* 124 (1949–50), 335–430; W. Corsten, ed., *Kölner Aktenstücke zur Lage der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland 1933–1945* (Cologne 1949); W. Conrad, *Der Kampf um die*

The rights which were guaranteed to the Church by constitution and concordat were extensively undermined; in this matter the procedure was rather by way of decree and administrative practice than by means of legislation. The freedom of the Church's activity was severely impaired. The aim was a state corresponding to the National Socialist ideology. If at this time matters did not go so far as an annulment of the concordat, at times pushed by the minister for the churches, Hanns Kerrl, and to a full separation of Church and state, still the reasons were suited for the regime effectively to be able to effect a supervision of the Church under the existing system, and it meant to take still more certain domestic and foreign policy motives into consideration.

Things moved forward with similar, partly far worse measures of persecution in the occupied and annexed territories. In the part of Poland occupied by Germany, the so-called Government General, there occurred a furious persecution of the Church, which decimated the clergy. The Polish concordat, the Austrian concordat, the modus vivendi with Czechoslovakia, and the Napoleonic concordat in Alsace-Lorraine were considered abolished. In regard to Austria, the government of the Reich adopted the view that the Austrian concordat had been ended by the annexation of Austria to the German Reich, because the country had perished as an independent state and had lost its position as a subject of international law. In Austria there now prevailed "a situation without concordat."[30] In the Wartheland District the Church was treated as a private association. An extension of the concordat with the Reich to the newly acquired territories was rejected.

The Holy See tried to influence the Nazi regime by the diplomatic route, but, when the exchange of notes remained without effect, turned to publicity. In the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* of 4 March 1937 Pius

---

Kanzeln (Berlin 1957); A Kupper, "Zur Geschichte des Reichskonkordats," *StdZ* 163 (1958–59), 278–302, 354–75; D. Albrecht, ed. *Der Notenwechsel zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und der Deutschen Reichsregierung,* 2 vols. (=*Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Zeitgeschichte bei der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern,* series A, vols. 1 and 10) (Mainz 1965–69); B. Schneider with P. Blet and A. Martini, eds., *Die Briefe Pius' XII. an die deutschen Bischöfe 1939–1944* (=*Veröffentlichungen . . . der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern,* series A, vol. 4) (Mainz 1966); B. Stasiewski, ed., *Akten deutscher Bischöfe über die Lage der Kirche 1933–1945* I: *1933–1934* (=*Veröffentlichungen . . der Katholischen Akademie in Bayern,* series A, vol. 5) (Mainz 1968); F. Pauly, "Zur Kirchenpolitik des Gauleiters J. Bürckel im Saargebiet (März–August 1935)," *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 35 (1971), 414–53.

[30] K. Scholder, "Österreichisches Konkordat und nationalsozialistische Kirchenpolitik 1938/39," *ZevKR* 20 (1975), 230–43.

XI stigmatized the interference and usurpations by the state.[31] Despite the just described hostile measures, the concordats were not entirely useless. Their existence acted, in some respects, as a restraint on the pressures, preserved for the Church one or another position for the proclamation of the Gospel, even though curtailed, and even exercised a certain influence in the concentration camps. The binding of the state to the concordats made, on the one hand, its measures of oppression visible even on the plane of international law and induced it to certain considerations, and on the other hand offered the Holy See the basis for interventions. The fact that the Holy See had, by the concluding of the concordat, recognized the Nazi government as a treaty partner could no longer be annulled. By concluding the concordat the government of the Reich had acknowledged the competence of the Holy See over the Catholic Church in Germany as legitimate in an agreement of international law. Every violation of the concordat injured the credibility of the Nazi regime.

During the Second World War

The approaching Second World War naturally interrupted the conclusion of concordats with the warring nations. Only with countries which lay on the lee side of world politics or could keep themselves aloof from the power struggle were a few treaties made.

In Salazar's Portugal the Church was cautiously encouraged. On 7 May 1940 the country concluded with the Holy See a significant concordat and a mission treaty,[32] which Salazar termed a "concordat of the separation of state and Church." The concordat extended the existing system of the demarcation and collaboration of Church and state in free agreement and mutual respect. The legal personality of the Catholic Church was recognized, the maintenance of diplomatic relations was agreed (Article I). A series of guarantees assured the activity and the property of the Church (Arts. II–VII). Clerics enjoyed special protection and certain immunities (Arts. XI–XV). Religious instruction was an obligatory subject in the country's public schools, and their entire teaching had to be oriented to the principles of the Christian faith (ART. XXI). Private schools could be erected by the Church (ART. XX). The law of marriage was governed by the principle of optional civil marriage (ARTS. XXII–XXV). The state supported the missions in the overseas territories (ARTS. XXVII–XXVIII). The mission treaty envisaged the admittance of foreign missionaries to Portuguese colonies (ART. 2). Mission societies were supported by the government (ARTS. 9–14). The free operation of the missions was assured (ART. 15). With these two agreements, peace and cooperation between Church and state in Portugal and its overseas possessions seemed assured for a long time. The effects of the Second World War could not be foreseen at the time of their signing. The conclusion of the concordat of 1940 led to the revision of the present ART. 45 of the constitution on 11 June 1951.

---

[31] S. Hirt, ed., *Mit brennender Sorge. Das päpstliche Rundschreiben gegen den Nationalsozialismus und seine Folgen in Deutschland* (Freiburg i. Br. 1946); R. Leiber, "'Mit brennender Sorge'. März 1937 bis März 1962," *StdZ* 169 (1961–62), 417–26.

[32] A. Perugini, "De novis Conventionibus Lusitanis," *Apollinaris* 13 (1940), 205–17; P. Aguirre, "Ecclesia et Status in Lusitania secundum recens concordatum" *Periodica* 29 (1940), 289–302; A. Giannini, "Il concordato Portoghese," *Rivista di Studi Politici Internazionali* 10 (1943), 3–28; L. Scheucher, "Die Glaubens- und Gewissensfreiheit in Portugal," *ÖAfKR* 7 (1956), 211–31; B. J. Wenzel, *Portugal und der Heilige Stuhl* (Lisbon 1958); T. Kreppel, *Die Trennung von Staat und Kirche in Portugal. Das Konkordat zwischen Portugal und dem Heiligen Stuhl als Beispiel einer neuen Ordnung von Kirche und Staat* (Frankfurt 1962); L. Renard, *Salazar. Kirche und Staat in Portugal* (Essen 1968).

In the 1930s the Church experienced difficult times in Spain. The republican constitution of 9 December 1931 adopted a hostile attitude toward religion and Church. In the following years there erupted a full-scale war against the church. In 1933 the Spanish government declared it regarded the concordat of 1851 as ended. Parts of the army rose against maladministration and terror, and for several years a bitter civil war raged. Chief of State Franco sought to restore the Catholic character of the nation.[33] Laws and measures hostile to the Church were annulled. On 7 June 1941 the Spanish government concluded with the Holy See an agreement on the exercise of the privilege of nomination in the appointment to episcopal sees.[34] According to it, the apostolic nuncio, after an understanding with the government, draws up a list of six qualified persons and transmits it to the Holy See. This submits to the government a proposal of three names, with regard for the list but without being restricted to it. From this the chief of state names a candidate, so far as he raises no objections of a general political nature. A concordat was envisaged.

A treaty going into the greatest detail on questions of church property came into existence with Haiti on 25 January 1940. The Holy See concluded an agreement with Colombia on 22 April 1942.[35] The greatest part consisted of the regulation of questions of marriage law

---

[33] J. Soto de Gangoiti, *Relaciones de la Iglesia Católica y el Estado Español* (Madrid 1940); idem, *La Santa Sede y la Iglesia Católica en España* (Madrid 1942).

[34] R. S. de Lamadrid, "El convenio entre el Gobierno espãnol y la Santa Sede," *Boletín de la Universidad de Granada* 13 (1941), 371–85; A. Giannini, "La convenzione tra la S. Sede e la Spagna per la provvista delle diocesi," *Il Diritto Ecclesiastico* 53 (1942), 137–45.

[35] J. A. Eguren, *Derecho concordatario colombiano* (Bogotá 1960).

(ARTS. 4–10), which were largely in accord with canon law. The civil registrar of marriages was present at the church wedding, without his presence being an indispensable condition for the recognition of the civil effects. The government's right of proposal in the naming of the bishops was replaced by the right to express reservations "of a political nature" (ART. 1). Thereby the traditional *patronate* was done away with.

IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

The effects of the Second World War were much more comprehensive and profound than those of the First World War. The map of Europe was again considerably altered. In Asia and Africa the colonial epoch ended. Within many states there proceeded considerable changes, which also concerned religious law. The close union between Church and state was dissolved or at least loosened in many countries. The number of countries with a system of union of Church and state progressively declined. This was especially the case with nations having a predominantly Christian population. The order established by concordat in Eastern Europe completely broke up. The Church's concordat policy entered a new phase.[36]

Fate of Concordats in Socialist Countries

For religion and the Church the most fateful effect of the Second World War was the advance of the Soviet Union dominated by the Bolshevik Party, the strongest military power of Eurasia, as far as the Elbe, and the establishing of a Communist regime in China, the most populous nation on earth. For Communism religion is a scientifically untenable prejudice. The ecclesiastical policy of the socialist states is in accord with this notion. It has the chief goal of hastening the death of religion, viewed as inevitable, by restricting or neutralizing the Church's possibilities for influence. In the final analysis the socialist regimes aimed to exclude the Church little by little as guardian of religious faith but also as guarantor of civil liberty. The state bureaucracy moved openly or secretly into the service of the antireligious and antiecclesiastical strivings of the Communist Party. It made use of two means: tempting offers on the one hand, obstacles, prohibitions, force, and terror on the other. A falling off of the supression or persecution always sprang only from tactical viewpoints and was caused by pressure from without or unrest within. The difference between constitutional law and constitutional reality is nowhere greater than in socialist lands. It is not the constitution that is inviolable but the historical process of development. The constitution describes only the state of development of the revolution achieved at the time of its adoption. Basic rights in our sense are impossible systems in Soviet ideology.

---

[36] J. Salomon, "La politique concordataire des États depius la fin de la deuxième guerre mondiale," *Revue Générale de Droit International Public* 59 (1955), 570–623.

There were differences in the manner and rapidity of the advance among the individual socialist countries. In general it is to be noted that the area of freedom left to the Church is the greater, the nearer the states in question are to the free West. Relatively the greatest degree of freedom of movement is possessed—or assumed—by the Catholic Church in Poland[37] and is permitted to the Orthodox Church in Rumania[38] and Bulgaria.[39] Hopeless, on the other hand, is the situation in Czechoslovakia.[40] The "Marxist Josephinism" of this country allows the Church only a narrow living space and trivial freedom of organization. Not much more favorable is the situation in Hungary.[41] The model for the socialist countries even in ecclesiastical policy is basically the Soviet Union. Since 1918 the hostile separation of the Church from the state and of the school from the Church has existed there.[42] The Church's sphere of activity is limited to worship. Correspondingly, the constitutions of the so-called People's Democracies of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and Yugoslavia carried out the separation of Church and state. It happened regularly in conscious opposition to the still considerably popular ecclesiastical situation of religion in these nations. The principle of freedom of religion and conscience, proclaimed with the separation of Church and state, nowhere benefited the Catholic Church. It was often more severely persecuted than all other religious communities. The Church lost its status in public law and as far as possible was completely excluded from public life. Everywhere there was an effort to restrict it to undertaking cult functions and to prevent every other influence on people, especially on youth. At the same time the Church was to a very great degree subjected to control. In all Socialist states there are offices for ecclesiastical affairs, which to an enormous extent interfere in the filling of ecclesiastical offices, supervise the formation of the clergy, and determine the number and capacity of the places of this formation. Where several religious groups face one another, the government tries to play them off against one another, but in every case the chief opponent is seen in the Catholic Church. In the individual Church it strives to provoke various groups against one another, in this way to introduce schism into the Church, and thus to maintain its influence over it the more effectively.

---

[37] K. Weber, *Der moderne Staat und die katholische Kirche. Laizistische Tendenzen im staatlichen Leben der Dritten Französischen Republik, des Dritten Reiches und der Volksrepublik Polen* (Essen 1967).

[38] G. Rosu, M. Vasiliu, G. Crisan, "Church and State in Romania," V. Gsovski ed., *Church and State behind the Iron Curtain* (New York 1955), 253–99; F. Popan, Č. Draskovic, *Orthodoxie in Rumänien und Jugoslawien* (Vienna 1960); G. Podskalsky, "Kirche und Staat in Rumänien," *StdZ* 185 (1970), 198–207.

[39] G. Podskalsky, "Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien," *StdZ* 189 (1972), 112–24.

[40] F. Cavalli, *Governo Comunista e chiesa cattolica in Cecoslovacchia* (Rome 1950); L. Němec, *Episcopal and Vatican Reactions to the Persecution of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia* (Washington 1953); idem, *Church and State in Czechoslovakia* (New York 1955); V. Chalupa, *Situation of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia* (Chicago 1960); E. Schmied, "Die rechtliche Stellung der Kirche in der Tschechoslowakei," *Jahrbuch für Ostrecht* 1 (1960), 129–36; K. Rabl, "Die tschechoslowakische Verfassungsurkunde vom. 11. Juli 1960 in Theorie und Praxis," *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts*, n.s. 12 (1963), 353–416.

[41] A. Bedö, H. Kálnoky, L. LeNard, G. Torzsay-Biber, "Church and State in Hungary," V. Gsovski, ed., *Church and State behind the Iron Curtain* (New York 1955), 69–157; L. Mezöfy, "Staat und Kirche in Ungarn," *Jahrbuch für Ostrecht* 3 (1962), 249–71; A. Emmerich, J. Morel, *Bilanz des ungarischen Katholizismus* (Munich 1969).

[42] E. Jacobi, "Staat und Kirche in der Sowjetunion," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche* Reihe 4 (1954–55), 325–344; W. de Vries, *Kirche und Staat in der Sowjetunion* (Munich 1959); J. Chrysostomus, "Kirche und Staat in Sowjetrussland. Das Schicksal des Moskauer Patriarchates von 1917–1960." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, n.s. 11 (1963), 13–16; G. Schweigl, *Il nuovo Statuto della Chiesa russa e l'art. 124 della Costituzione sovietica* (Rome 1965); G. Zananiri, *Le Saint Siège et Moscou* (Paris 1967); D. Konstantinow, *Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion nach dem Krieg, Entfaltung und Rückschläge* (Munich and Salzburg 1973).

The union of the bishops with the Holy See was either thwarted or subject to control, diplomatic relations were severed, and concordats were repudiated, that with Lithuania on 1 July 1940, with Poland on 12 September 1945, with Rumania on 17 July 1948. Without any official repudiation, Czechoslovakia disregarded the modus vivendi and in 1950 broke off diplomatic relations with the Holy See, as did Yugoslavia in 1952. So long as religion was not yet extirpated, Communism tried to make use of its adherents, especially of its clergy and its institutions for its own ends. For the sake of this advantage it was even ready to aid the Churches to a certain extent. Although the socialist states almost everywhere have the means of power to carry through almost any desired measure against the Church, they were anxious for the assent, even if extorted, of the Church to their regulations. The Communists know that the most secure route to a gaining of the Catholics of a country is through Rome. Furthermore, they anticipate from the concluding of a concordat that they can win the sympathy of some Catholic circles outside the country. In case they have no success in reaching an agreement with the Holy See, they turn to the bishops. If these refuse, they approach the priests. Thus are explained not only the repeated attempts to come to an understanding with the Holy See, but also the series of agreements with the episcopate in the 1950s. The governments of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia sent out feelers in the direction of a concordat in 1949 and 1952 respectively. The Holy See rejected them in the case of Czechoslovakia because it regarded any agreement as hopeless, considering the situation, but it showed itself accommodating toward Yugoslavia. However, the contacts did not lead to the signing of a treaty, because Yugoslavia was not prepared to acquiesce in the Church's minimum demands. The Polish government was unwilling to apply to the Holy See. It expected the attainment of its goals from negotiations with the nation's episcopate. On 14 April 1950 and 8 December 1956 it made an agreement with the Polish bishops.[43] These treaties were not concordats but administrative agreements on the plane of domestic public law. Their content differed greatly from that of the concordats which were concluded before the appearance of socialism. In them the state endeavored to put the Church at the service of its political and economic aims. The bishop manifested a broad accommodation in order to promote the desired relaxation of tensions. But the government did not adhere to even trivial promises. Especially in the school system all concessions promised or made were again revoked. The agreements reached in Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia were considerably more unfavorable to the Church than the Polish. In Hungary the episcopate made great concessions in the agreement of 30 August 1950. It bound itself to support the policies of the government, which promised to supply subsidies to the Church for a period of eighteen years. The signing of the agreement could not prevent the further disorganization of ecclesiastical life. In Rumania an assembly of progressive clerics signed the agreement of 15 March 1951 submitted by the government. In Czechoslovakia a part of the clergy accepted the law of 14 October 1949, which unilaterally regulated the situation of the Church.

Concordats with Free Countries

The situation of the Holy See with regard to the free nations was, in general, not unfavorable after the Second World War. In the postwar period the Holy See entered into diplomatic relations with a considerable number of states, especially in Africa and Asia. On the other hand, it did not succeed in inaugurating with them an era of concordats like that after the First World War. In many countries material reconstruction following the devastation of the war occupied the foreground. In the new states of Africa and Asia Catholics were ordinarily too weak to be able to effect the conclusion of an agreement with the Holy See, apart from the inner chaos and necessities of existence of many of these areas. The raw nationalism and the sensitive self-esteem of the young African states opposed the solving of occurring questions between Church and state by means of agreements and insisted on their unilateral regulation by law. Most states exercised strict control over the external affairs of the Church. The state reserved to itself the ultimate competence for decision in mixed matters. The majority of these countries have hitherto not developed their own legal system regulating Church-state relations. The relations of the religious groups to the state were still based extensively on improvisation. The instability and uncertainty of the political situation recommended to both parties, Church and state, that they avoid the conclusion of treaties, whose binding force confronted the often abrupt changes and hence could evoke tensions and conflicts. It was enough to assume diplomatic relations whereby occurring questions could be solved quickly and without complication. In other countries the traditional reasons that did not permit a concordat with the Holy See persisted. Thus, for example, the Brazilian constitutional documents of 18 September 1946 (ARTICLE 31, no. 3) and of 24 January 1967 (ART. 9, no. 2), like that of 16 July 1934 (ART. 17, no. 3), contained the stipulation that no agreement with a church or worship group could be concluded. Certain trends in France for again achieving the state of a concordat with the Holy See were unable to materialize to the extent of concrete political treatment. Still, where concordats were concluded, they displayed a stronger individualism than those earlier entered into.

---

[43] L. Pérez Mier, "El acuerdo entre el episcopado polaco y el gobierno de Varsovia," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 6 (1951), 185–255; *Ost-Probleme* 9 (1957), 237; K. Hartmann, "Über die Verständigung zwischen Kirche und Staat in Polen," *Aussenpolitik* 8 (1957), 571–82.

The Catholic nations of southern Europe—Italy, Spain, and Portugal—had, after bitter struggles, restored the traditional close union between Church and state. In Italy the Lateran Treaties held good after the war's end. They survived the overthrow of Fascism and of the Kingdom and were confirmed by ARTICLE 7 of the republican constitution of 27 December 1947.[44] They thereby obtained a direct constitutional guarantee. The Holy See entered into an accord with Portugal on 18 July 1950 in regard to the filling of episcopal sees in Portuguese India.[45] In it the government renounced the privilege of presentation belonging to the president and freed the Holy See from the obligation of appointing bishops of Portuguese nationality for specified sees. Here was introduced a development which was continued by the Second Vatican Council.

---

[44] S. Lener, "I patti lateranensi e la nuova Italia," *CivCatt* 101 (1950), II, 609–21; idem, "I precedenti legislativi e storici dell' articolo 7 della costituzione," ibid. III, 248–60; G. B. Arista, *La Costituzione Italiana,* 3d ed. (Rome 1963), 61ff., 348ff.

[45] J. Damizia, "Annotationes ad conventionem inter S. Sedem et Rempublicam Lusitaniam," *Apollinaris* 23 (1950), 261–63; J. M. Lourenço, "Portugal e a Santa Sé," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 6 (1951), 171–83; A. da Silva Rego, *Le patronage portugais de l'Orient* (Lisbon 1957); B. J. Wenzel, *Portugal und der Heilige Stuhl. Das portugiesische Konkordats- und Missionsrecht. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Missions- und Völkerrechtswissenschaft* (Lisbon 1958).

The development in Spain tended toward a climax in the matter of concordats. The constitutional law of 17 July 1945 placed the profession and practice of the Catholic religion as the religion of the state under official protection (ARTICLE 6, Section 1). The private practice of worship was permitted to non-Catholic religious groups (ART. 6, Sec. 2). With this arrangement Spain returned to unity of nation and religion, which was in accord with its tradition. In Spain the Catholic religion is a part of the culture. The activity of the Protestant religious groups was logically usually opposed to both. And so the government regarded itself as justified in hindering any agitation by them. Thereby the road was staked out for the contemplated concordat. The accord of 16 July 1946 regulated the filling of nonconsistorial benefices.[46] According to it, half the dignitaries of the chapters, after nomination by the chief of state, were filled from a list of three names presented by the appropriate bishop. Before the appointing of pastors the government had the right to raise objections of a general political nature. On 5 August 1950 a convention on the pastoral care of the military was signed.[47] But these and other smaller treaties were only the introduction to the great concordat of 27 August 1953.[48] It was the climax of Pius XII's concordat policy. According to the concordat, the Catholic religion remained "the sole religion of the Spanish nation," with all the rights pertaining to it in keeping with divine and canon law (ARTICLE I). The prescriptions of the agreement of 7 June 1941 continued in force for the naming of residential and coadjutor bishops (ART. VII). The immune legal status of the clergy was recognized with certain modifications (ART. XVI). The state obliged itself to important financial donations to the Church (ART. XIX). Marriage contracted in accord with the prescriptions of canon law had full validity in the civil sphere (ART. XXIII). Questions of nullity and separation were the responsibility of ecclesiastical courts (ART. XXIV). In all schools the instruction was to be given in harmony with Catholic doctrine (ART. XXVI). Catholic religious instruction was an obligatory subject in the schools of every rank (ART. XXVII). In the agencies for the formation of public opinion room was assured to the Church for the presentation and defense of religious truth (ART. XXIX). The freedom of ecclesiastical universities and academies as well as the possibility of erecting schools of every kind were guaranteed (ARTS. XXX and XXXI).

---

[46] L. Pérez Mier, "El Convenio español para la provisión de beneficios no consistoriales," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 1 (1946), 729–75.

[47] M. García Castro, "El Convenio entre la Santa Sede y el Estado español sobre la jurisdicción castrense y asistencia religiosa a las fuerzas armadas," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 5 (1950), 1107–71; 6 (1951), 265–301, 701–71.

[48] A. Giannini, "Il Concordato con la Spagna," *Il Diritto Ecclesiastico* 64 (1953), 417–49; P. Mikat, "Das spanische Konkordat," *Kirche in der Welt* 6 (1953), 323–28; S. Pappalardo, "Inter Sanctam Sedem et Hispaniam sollemnes conventiones. Adnotationes," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 79 (1954), 247–88; M. Useros Carretero, "A propósito de la neutralidad confesional del Estado y el Concordato español," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 9 (1954), 225–39; E. F. Regatillo, "Il valore del nuovo Concordato spagnuolo per la vita religiosa della Spagna," *CivCatt* 106 (1955), II, 378–92; III, 265–76, 499–507; R. Bidagor, "Das Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und Spanien," *ÖAfKR* 6 (1955), 3–13, 173–88; 7 (1956), 5–17; I. Martín Martínez *Concordato de 1953 entre España y la Santa Sede* (Madrid 1961); E. F. Regatillo, *El Concordato español de 1953* (Santander 1961); S. Alvárez-Menéndez, "El Concordato Español de 1953," *Angelicum* 41 (1964), 63–86; L. Gutiérrez Martín, *El privilegio de nombramiento de obispos en España* (Rome 1967); J. Pérez Alhama, *La Iglesia y el Estado español* (Madrid 1967).

By means of the concordat the Church in Spain obtained a position of imposing compactness. The Spanish concordat once again took into account the Catholic tradition of the Spanish people and created a system of the relations of Church and state in a Catholic country that must be termed, theoretically, almost ideal. A more far-reaching favoring of the Catholic Church and a more intensive collaboration of the state with it was scarcely conceivable. Nevertheless, in Spain one can speak of a system of state Church only with restrictions. For the concordat did indeed proclaim the Catholic religion as the religion of the state, but not a state Church. Even more, the free exercise of its sovereignty was expressly guaranteed to the Catholic Church (ART. II). Its independence in Spain is incomparably greater than that of Protestantism in the Scandinavian countries. In addition, the concordat did not essentially impair the individual's freedom of denomination. The concordat did not represent a capitulation of the state to the Church but the attempt, undertaken in the interests of both parties, to realize the closest possible union between Church and state. The Spanish system of the relations of Church and state, as constructed by the concordat, was based on the principle that the Catholic religion, as the sole true one, alone possessed an objective right to existence and social liberty and that consequently the adherents of the other religions had only a claim to the protection of their erroneous conscience. On the other hand, the propagation of error implied a danger for the faith of the Catholics and for public morality and hence was to be thwarted. The state has the duty of protecting and supporting the Catholic Church as guardian and proclaimer of the truth. The concordat strove to create for the Church the legal and economic presuppositions necessary or useful for the exercise of its mission. The example of the Islamic states with their system of unity was as effective in the conclusion of the concordat as was the memory of the civil war, which, in view of the reign of terror in the republican part of Spain and the atrocities of the Republicans against the Church, had here and there assumed the character of a crusade. The de-Catholicizing of the country, which the republican regime had sought, ranked as treason to the national tradition.

For the conclusion of the concordat some deliberations were decisive, which proved later to be miscalculations. The two contracting parties were not, it is true, mistaken as to the religious situation among the Spanish people. They knew of the spread of socialist, Communist, and anarchist ideologies, they knew the religious lethargy and antipathy of broad groups. They did not fail to see that in Spain there was a considerable number of persons who were or wanted to be at the same time Catholic and anticlerical, and that the liberalism disseminated especially at the universities was not pleased with a powerful position for the Church. If they nevertheless could not be deterred from allowing the Catholic religion and Church so outstanding a position, then this happened because they had confidence in the power of the Church to bring its mission convincingly and enticingly to development if only the external presuppositions for this were created for it. But they did not foresee that a decade would suffice to weaken the Church critically, and, in fact, from within, not from without. They counted on the stability of the Church and its stabilizing function for society and state. They did not suspect that this stability was based to a considerable extent on factors which could be swept away with a change of pontificate. The contracting parties also probably underestimated the publicity strength of Protestantism, which, despite numerically insignificant circumstances, was employed to the fullest extent, the mood of so-called world publicity, which was decisively determined by Protestantism, and the inclination of many states with a Protestant majority, especially the United States, to intervene on behalf of their coreligionists in Catholic lands. The concordat became the occasion for isolating Spain economically, culturally, and politically. The untiring attacks of world Protestantism against the concordat could not be without effect in the long run. They could not but gradually undermine also the power of resistance of some politicans and bishops, for whom the defense of the concordat was an obligatory responsibility. Finally, it appeared that the hope linked with the conclusion of the Spanish concordat that it could serve as model for the other Catholic countries was unfulfilled. With one exception, now to be mentioned, it remained a unique case.

With the Latin American states, to which Pius XII constantly brought his increasing care, the conclusion of treaties occurred in three cases. On 29 January 1953 a mission agreement was signed with Colombia. The government granted to the mission protection and support, among other reasons for the formation of a native clergy (ARTICLE 7). On 16 June 1954 the Dominican Republic signed with the Holy See a comprehensive concordat, which borrowed extensively from that with Spain.[49] The Catholic religion remains the religion of the state (ART. I). The patronate was abandoned (ART. V). The activity of foreign clerics and religious in the country is assured (ART. X). Until the present (1974) this was supposed to be the ultimate treaty, basically regulating all questions of common interest. On 21 January 1958 there followed, in accord with ART. XVII of the concordat, an agreement on the pastoral care of the military. With Bolivia a mission agreement[50] was reached on 4 December 1957, a treaty on the pastoral care of the military[51] on 29 November 1958. On the missionaries was laid, besides the work of evangelizing, also care for the promotion of the temporal welfare of the natives (ART. VII). In the agreements with the Dominican Republic (ART. XIX) and with Bolivia of 4 December 1957 (ART. XIV) the Church's charitable activity was taken into consideration, which was something new. In Peru the mandate of the constitution of 9 April 1933 and that of 5 September 1940 did not permit the conclusion of a concordat with the Holy See (ART. 234). Finally, a long cherished desire of Pius XII was fulfilled in Germany. The successor states of Prussia in the Federal Republic proceeded after the war, even if partly after long hesitation, on the basis of the continuing validity of the Prussian concordat. Likewise, Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg adhered to the continuing validity of the respective concordats.[52] To supplement the Prussian concordat, the state of

---

[49] J. Damizia, "Annotationes ad sollemnes Conventiones inter S. Sedem et Rempublicam Dominicanam," *Apollinaris* 27 (1954), 243–76; A. Giannini, "Il concordato Dominicano," *Il Diritto Ecclesiastico* 65 (1954), 288–98; P. Mikat, "Zur neuesten Konkordatspraxis des Heiligen Stuhles. Das Konkordat zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und der Dominikanischen Repbulik," *Die Kirche in der Welt* 8 (1955), 177–82.

[50] J. Damizia, "Annotationes ad conventionem inter Apostolicam Sedem et Bolivianam Rempublicam," *Apollinaris* 31 (1958), 220–27; F. Cavalli, "La recente convenzione missionaria tra la Santa Sede e la Bolivia," *CivCatt* 109 (1958), I, 502–16.

[51] A. Pugliese, "Adnotationes," *Apollinaris* 34 (1961), 309–12.

[52] ARTICLE 182 of the Bavarian constitution of 2 December 1946 declares that the treaties of 24 January 1925 with the Christian Churches remain in force. ART. 35, Sec. 2, of the constitution of the Saarland of 15 December 1947 recognizes the legally

Nordrhein-Westfalen and the Holy See made a treaty for the erection of the see of Essen[53] on 19 December 1956. In this way, the care of souls in the Ruhr district was united and uniformly directed.

The Agreements under John XXIII and Paul VI

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL FOR THE LEGAL RELATIONSHIP OF CHURCH AND STATE

The death of Pius XII meant the end of an epoch in the government and politics of the Church. The most momentous happening in the pontificate of John XXIII was without any doubt the convocation of a General Council. The Second Vatican Council had a heavy impact, not only on the relations of Church and state in general but on the policy of the Holy See especially.[54] Here let reference be made to only three

---

existing treaties and agreements with the Churches. ARTICLE 23 of the constitution of North Rhine-Westphalia of 28 June 1950 recognizes as a valid the treaties with the Churches which were concluded in the former Free State of Prussia. ARTICLE 8 of the constitution of Baden-Württemberg of 11 November 1953 declares that rights and duties from the treaties with the Churches remain intact(cf. A. Erler, "Die Konkordatslage in Deutschland," *Süddeutsche Juristen-Zeitung* 1 [1946], 197–200; M. Gebhart, *Die Rechtslage des Reichskonkordates und der Länderkonkordate nach 1945* (Diss. Munich 1951); O. Born, *Das Problem der Weitergeltung des Reichskonkordats und der Länderkonkordate nach dem Zusammenbruch des Reiches im Jahre 1945* (Diss. Münster 1953); G. Ostermann, *Die Fortgeltung des Badischen Konkordates von 1932* (Cologne 1962); A. Herzig, *Die Systematik und Problematik des konkordatären Rechts in Nordrhein-Westfalen* (Cologne 1965); K. Orywall, *Die Geltung der neueren Konkordate und Kirchenverträge im Saarland* (Cologne 1969).

[53] E. Hegel, *Kirchliche Vergangenheit im Bistum Essen* (Essen 1960), 275–95; W. Haugg, *Staat und Kirche in Nordrhein-Westfalen* (Berlin, Neuwied and Darmstadt 1960); P. Mikat, *Das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat im Lande Nordrhein-Westfalen in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (=*Veröffentlichungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen* 129) (Cologne and Opladen 1966); J. Bauer, *Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche im Land Nordrhein-Westfalen* (Münster 1968).

[54] A. Schwan, *Katholische Kirche und pluralistische Politik. Politische Implikationen des II. Vatikanischen Konzils* (=*Recht und Staat in Geschichte und Gegewart* 330) (Tübingen 1966); P. Mikat, "Kirche und Staat in nachkonziliarer Sicht," K. Aland, W. Scheenmelcer, eds., *Kirche und Staat. Festschrift für Bischof D. Hermann Kunst D.D. zum 60. Geburtstag am 21 Januar 1967* (Berlin 1967), 105–25; H. Barion, " 'Weltgeschichtliche Machtform?' Eine Studie zur Politischen Theologie des II. Vatikanischen Konzils," H. Barrion, E. W. Böchenförde, E. Forsthoff, W. Weber, eds., *Epirrhosis. Festgabe für Carl Schmitt* I (Berlin 1968), 13–59; D. Grimm, "Die Staatslehre der katholischen Kirche nach dem zweiten Vatikanischen Knozil," *Civitas. Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaften* 8 (1969), 11–30; P. Mikat, "Nachkonziliare Überlegungen zum gewandelten Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche," *Militärseelsorge* 14 (1972), 206–27; J. Wössner, ed., *Religion im Umbruch. Soziologische Beiträge zur Situation von Religion und Kirche in der gegenwärtigen Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart 1972).

decisive statements of the council. The declaration *Dignitatis humanae* on religious liberty demanded the freedom of religion of the individual and of groups in the state without regard to the question of truth. According to it, religious freedom is a basic human right, derived from human dignity, the striving proper to human nature for a knowledge of the truth, the different task of Church and state, as well as the goal of the state to serve the common good. The legal order must make this human right a civil right (ARTICLES 2 and 3). Hence, fundamentally the state must guarantee free possibility of activity to all religions. The only restriction on this liberty is the endangering of public order—"iustae exigentiae ordinis publici": ART. 4; "iustus ordo publicus": ART. 2; also ART. 7. The declaration takes note of the system of a state religion only as a fact based on special circumstances, without recommending it. In case it is introduced, the right of all citizens and groups to religious liberty must be recognized and preserved (ART. 6). Thus the ideal of the Catholic state seemed to have been abolished. True, in ART. 1 of the cited declaration occurs the *clausula salvatoria:* that the traditional doctrine on the moral obligation of persons and of groups vis-à-vis the true religion and the One Church of Christ remains unaffected. But this abstract allusion to a doctrine which is itself not expounded cannot prevail against the concrete statements of the articles mentioned. They became of great importance for the relationship of legal proximity of Church and state existing in some countries.

The pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes* on the Church in today's world stressed that the Church is tied to no political system but is basically prepared for cooperation with each one. While it makes use of the temporal to the extent that its mission requires, it does not place its hope on privileges offered to it by the state authority. It would even renounce the exercise of certain legitimately acquired rights if it is established that their use jeopardizes the credibility of its witness or changed conditions of life demand another arrangement (ART. 76). These statements, which are in themselves self-evident, corresponded to a widespread mentality which saw in the depriving of the Church of earthly assurances and temporal means an opportunity for the better propagation of the faith. They supplied the signal for a movement under way in many countries, which anticipated from the sacrifice of legal positions a deepening and greater effectiveness of the Church's ministry.

The decree *Christus Dominus* on the pastoral office of bishops finally expressed the wish that in the future no more rights or privileges be conceded to heads of state to select, appoint, suggest, or designate bishops. Heads of state were asked to renounce, in agreement with the Holy See, these rights, just mentioned, which they possessed at present by virtue of a treaty or through custom (ART. 20). With this invitation was continued a development which had begun long before the council,[55] but which had been sensationally infringed in Spain because of the special circumstances.

As important as the above mentioned and other pertinent expressions and directions of the Second Vatican Council were for the relations of Church and state, all the more must one not overlook, for the understanding of the changes which have taken place in this area since the council, the development which proceeded in the Catholic Church itself from about the beginning of the 1960s. For the unity, the vitality, and the missionary élan of the Church determined its radiation to society and thereby regularly decided its influence on the state and its work. Particularly in the democratic state is the Church left to influence its members in the state to grant it freedom to move and support, which it needs for a wholesome activity. The importance of the Church in the pluralistic democratic state depends to a decisive degree on the spiritual substance, the inner strength, and the credibility which it is able to display and radiate. But the just mentioned qualities of the Catholic Church are in a state of constant and rapid retreat. The faith, the foundation of the Church and of all its activity, has been attacked and questioned for years from its own ranks. As a consequence countless Catholics are insecure, devoid of a vital conviction of the faith, and unfitted for an effective witness to the faith. The authority of Pope and bishops is gravely weakened. The clergy is to a great extent disoriented and divided. Discipline in the Church has seriously declined. Ecclesiastical laws are unashamedly transgressed and liquidated as a result of mounting disobedience. In extensive Catholic circles this worldliness and antihierarchical sentiment are widespread. In the name of pluralism the most contrary views on almost all subjects establish themselves in the Church. The holders of the teaching office contradict one another in important points. Many theologians ignore the Church's authentic doctrine. The release of diversity of opinion among Catholics by the Second Vatican Council—ART. 43 of the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes*—scarcely permitted any further unity of public activity of Catholics and also raised questions about the capability of function of ecclesiastical authority in the realm of politics. Subjects in which the Church appeared united grew steadily fewer. A gathering of the strengths of the Church became ever more difficult. In consequence of the enervation and disunity within the Church the influence of Catholics on society noticeably and constantly declined. The evidences of decay within make the Church an even weaker pole in the partnership relations with the state. They make it easy for forces which abhor the Church to ignore it or to play off hierarchy and theologians against one another. On the other hand, the well-intentioned governments show their concern whether the Church is able henceforth to measure up to its task in the forming of morals and in the education of persons. Following the example of other Christian religious groups, especially of German Protestantism and Russian Orthodoxy, in the most recent period certain elements of the hierarchy have taken part in politics, often with notable partiality. Among the members of the Church appear fanatical associations which attack the intimacy with the "authoritarian" or "capitalistic" state, but at the same time advocate the surrender of the Church to the socialist state, unite with socialist and Communist cadres, and support real or alleged freedom movements in European and non-European countries. Some groups in a sectarian spiritualism question all connections between Church and state and demand the repudiation of valid concordats. The political disunity of Catholics increases, and this condemns the Catholics in lands where they represent a minority to a status of no influence. Christian politicans to a great extent no longer have clear directions of the Church at their disposal. All in all, it must be noted that the strength of the Catholic Church has strongly declined in the last few years. The phenomena described are suited to jeopardize from within the current legal positions of the Church. A Church which no longer corresponds to the claims which are made on it and to the promises which proceeded from it loses in the eyes of citizens who measure by democratic rules the justification of occupying an outstanding position in the structure of society.

---

[55] ARTICLE 1 of the concordat with Colombia of 22 April 1942; ART. I of the accord with Portugal of 18 July 1950; ART. V of the concordat with the Dominican Republic of 16 June 1954.

It has been correctly stated by Hans Maier "that in a democracy every right becomes obsolete if it is not maintained and renewed by vital political forces." Where the spiritual power of Christians yields, experience teaches that sooner or later constitutional guarantees for the Church break up. The Church is an essentially public power with demands on the state that cannot be renounced. But the more the strength of the faith and the moral level in the Church decline, the more the number of practicing Catholics drops, so much the less understanding do its "privileges" find in the sphere of public law. The state will be equally prepared for treaties in the long run only with a society which fulfills a significant function in the life of the people. Hence, for the concluding of concordats there are no favorable assumptions now and for an unforeseeable future. In this regard the situation in the free nations and the socialist states is not very different. Concordats are basically agreements made to last between Church and state. The present is not favorable to this permanence. Most free countries show in increasing measure critical phenomena, experience a continuing rapid change of law and partly even of institutions, and look insecurely to the future. Considering this instability there exists for the civil partner an understandable aversion to tie itself down for a somewhat long time or soon to consider new negotiations. In case of real necessity to reach an agreement, people are usually content with individual understandings, which contain a minimum of regulating content. In place of concordats there are new possibilities of collaboration of Church and state, for example, through permanent contacts or those agreed to as occasion suggests. The striving for an institutionalization of the relations of state and Church yields to a certain extent to the contentment with a functional relation. In place of the assignment and definition of rights and competencies there comes to a great extent the cooperation agreed to for a short to moderately long period. The socialist states do not necessarily intend to have a comprehensive agreement with a structure condemned to extinction, as in their view the Church is. What they are in any event prepared for is the contractual regulating of particular questions, from which they promise themselves a tactical advantage. The hopes of a gradual dying out of hostility to religion in the socialist countries have so far not been realized. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn says, "The furious hostility against religion is what is most permanent in Marxism." To be sure, now as earlier, the Holy See ordinarily puts the greatest value on the realization of accords with the states and in this connection displays its proved flexibility. It even concludes agreements with states that are atheistic or non-Christian and is ready to enter into accords of slight range of content. The pluralistic structure of the constitutional democracies is recognized without reservation. Nevertheless, there exists, at least in parts of the Church, a widespread weariness of concordats. The enhanced self-confidence of the bishops finds expression in the demand raised in some circles that, in the future, in place of concordats should come easily repudiated particular accords, which are negotiated by the bishops and, if need be, submitted to the Holy See for confirmation.

THE INDIVIDUAL AGREEMENTS

The "Protocols" with Socialist States

Since John XXIII Vatican diplomacy has sought to prepare an accommodation with the socialist states, especially those of Eastern Europe, at the cost of heavy sacrifices and considerable advance concessions.[56] Talks were agreed upon by means of preliminary contacts on the occasion of international meetings, and it was anticipated that they would result in the contractual solution of this or that question of the Church's life. On the other side, with the Second Vatican Council and Montini's election as Pope, the socialist governments sought contact with the Holy See in order thereby to gain influence over the Church and the more easily to tie the Catholics in their sphere of power to their course. On 15 September 1964 there first came into existence a "protocol" between a socialist state, Hungary, and the Holy See.[57] In it the political condition and the oath of loyalty of the bishops were granted to the government. In 1968 it was complemented by a second agreement. On 25 June 1966 there followed a "protocol" with Yugoslavia.[58] In it the government acknowledged the competence of the Holy See to exercise its jurisdiction over the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia in spiritual, ecclesiastical, and religious questions, without prejudice to the internal order of the nation. The Holy See guaranteed the restricting of the activity of clerics to the religious ecclesiastical sphere and disapproved every type of political violence. The secular side intended by these stipulations to keep the Croatian clergy apart from the national aspirations of the people and to gain the Holy See as a confederate against the protesting Croats. Also in the "protocol" the exchange of an envoy to the Holy See and of an apostolic delegate—not of a nuncio—in Yugoslavia was agreed upon; but, going beyond Canon 267, par. 2, to the delegate pertained the duty of fostering contact with the government. However, in 1970 Yugoslavia resumed diplomatic relations with the Holy See. These "protocols" represent agreements at the lowest stage of diplomatic activity and of minimum content. They were the first fumbling steps on an uncertain road. The situation of the Church within the country scarcely improved in Hungary by the signing, and in Yugoslavia only insignificantly, and the alleviations obtained are constantly threatened by a change of course.

---

[56] N.N., "Konkordatsexperimente im Ostblock," *Ost-Probleme* 17 (1965), 194–200; G. Simon, *Die katholische Kirche und der kommunistische Staat in Osteuropa* (=*Berichte des Bundesinstituts für ostwissenschaftliche und internationale Studien* 31/1971) (Cologne 1971); H. Stehle, *Die Ostpolitik des Vatikans 1917–1975* (Munich 1975).

[57] M. Csizmás, "Staat und Kirche in Ungarn seit 1945," *Ungarn zehn Jahre danach. 1956-1966. Ein wissenschaftliches Sammelwerk,* ed. by W. Frauendienst on the orders of the Deutsch-Ungarischer Kulturkreis (Mainz 1966), 285–322; S. Orbán, "Das Abkommen zwischen Staat und Kirche in der Volksrepublik Ungarn," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte der UdSSR und der volksdemokratischen Länder Europas* 9 (1966), 27–54.

[58] Illyricus, "Erstmals Zeit zum Atemholen. Die Entspannung zwischen Kirche und Staat in Jugoslawien," *Wort und Wahrheit* 20 (1965), 132–37; *L'Attività della Santa Sede nel 1966* (Vatican City 1967), 1272–74; *Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien und Jugoslawien. Gesetze und Verordnungen in deutscher Übersetzung. Unter Mitwirkung mehrerer Fachgenossen,* ed. by R. Stupperich (=*Schriftenreihe des Studienauschusses der EKU für Fragen der Orthodoxen Kirche* 3) (Witten 1971).

The Holy See's contacts with other socialist nations have not yet advanced to the signing of "protocols." In Poland the government is keenly interested in an arrangement with the Holy See, whereby it expects to play down the irksome primate, Cardinal Wyszyński, and to be able to bring him to submission.[59] Nevertheless, the Polish bishops want no arrangement with the government purchased by precipitate concessions. Without the concluding of a treaty but in accord with the state, Paul VI in the apostolic constitution *Episcoporum Poloniae* of 28 June 1972 organized the Catholic Church in the area beyond the Oder-Neisse line. Four dioceses—Opole, Govzow-Wielkopolski, Szczecin-Kamien, and Koszalin-Kolobrzeg—were erected, the see of Ermland was incorporated into the ecclesiastical province of Warsaw, and that of Gdansk into the province of Gniezno. On the basis of prolonged and often interrupted negotiations, four new bishops were ordained in Prague at the end of February 1973. A written agreement was not published. In May 1973 the Holy See declined when the government of Czechoslovakia offered new talks, because they appeared to be without prospects. The predominant power of the socialist nations, the Soviet Union, now as earlier, rejected institutional relations with the Holy See because it wants to conduct its religious policy according to its own discretion.

The "Modus vivendi" with Tunisia

On 27 June 1964 there came into being for the first time a treaty between the Holy See and a country where Islam is the state religion (ART. 1 of the constitution of 25 July 1957), the "Modus vivendi" with Tunisia.[60] The treaty aims to guarantee to Catholics the practice of their faith. However, the public performance of the liturgy and preaching in public are not allowed. The Church is subjected to a strict police regime. Whether the treaty, with its humiliating conditions—suppression of the archbishopric of Carthage—and the great sacrifices which the Catholic Church accepted in it, can be of future significance for similar agreements with other Afro-Asian states is unclear.

---

[59] K. Hartmann, "Staat und Kirche nach dem Machtwechsel in Polen," *Osteuropa* 22 (1972), 119–29; S. Lammich, "Die Rechtsstellung der römisch-katholischen Kirche in der Volksrepublik Polen," *ÖAfKR* 23 (1972), 3–15.

[60] S. Sanz Villalba, "El 'modus vivendi' entre la Santa Sede y la República de Túnez," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 20 (1965), 49–56; F. Romita, "Adnotazioni," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 90 (1965), 15–32.

The Changes in Concordats in States Giving Preferential Status to the Catholic Church

The unity of the state-Church system is today more or less shaken or jeopardized everywhere in Europe. Secularism and pluralism undermined the foundations on which state religions and state churches rested. The number of countries with coordination and separation systems is increasing. The existence of a state Church now ordinarily presupposes a religiously homogeneous population with a pervasively positive attitude to religion and Church. Today this assumption is no longer present for any Church of the so-called Western World. Its members are, in a considerable number, no longer rooted in it by virtue of conviction. As a result of serious opposing views in theology and faith, its theologians and clergy are no longer united. The religious foundation of the state-Church system is, it is true, broader and more stable in the Catholic countries of southern Europe than in the Protestant nations of Scandinavia,[61] but it displays dangerous cracks and is constantly further undermined by the development of the Church since the council. It is unlikely that this system can still be maintained in the long run by constitutional legal means. Violent changes through rapidly erupting passions are not to be excluded in some countries.

Paul VI's policy seeks a loosening of the bonds which exist, especially in the Iberian Peninsula, between Church and state, and the sacrifice of those privileges of the Church which find growing criticism. It agrees with the urging, lasting for years, of the majority of the Spanish bishops for a revision of the concordat. The state has reluctantly yielded to the desire and entered into negotiations with the Holy See. The revision of the concordat should assure "independence of each other, mutual respect, and the necessary cooperation." In particular, the Church should renounce its right of nomination in the appointment of bishops. in the Council of State, and in the Council of the Kingdom, as well as the privileged position of the clergy in penal law; the government should renounce its right of nomination in the appointment of bishops. The Spanish government yielded quickly to what is regarded as an expression of the will of the Second Vatican Council. On 10 January 1967 ART. 6, Sec. 2, of the Charter of the Spaniards was changed and the principle of religious liberty was proclaimed in a word-for-word borrowing from the declaration *Dignitatis humanae.* On 26 June 1967 the law on religious liberty was adopted. On 28 July 1976, after the death of General Franco, there was signed a treaty in which Spain renounced the right of presentation of the chief of state (or king) in the filling of bishoprics, and the Holy See renounced the criminal-law privilege of the clergy (ART. XVI of the concordat of 1953). The negotiations for the revision of the concordat were quickly continued.

---

[61] E. Berggrav, "Norwegen: Krise zwischen Kirche und Staat," *Frankfurter Heft* 9 (1954), 695–98; P. O. Ahrén, "Staat und Kirche in Schweden," *ZevKR* 10 (1963), 22–45; L. St. Hunter, ed., *Scandinavian Churches* (London 1965); G. Garonson, "Reform des Staatskirchenrechts in Schweden," *ZevKR* 15 (1970), 60–76; G. Weitling, "Kirche und Volk in Dänemark. Kirchliche Gesetzgebung und kirchliches Leben in Dänemark im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert," *ÖAfKR* 22 (1971), 85–109.

A development similar to that in Spain proceeded in Portugal. The law on religious liberty of 21 August 1971 and ART. 45 of the constitution revised on 23 August 1971 conceded legal equality to all religious groups. The concordat and the missionary agreement were discussed. The toppling of the authoritarian state in 1974 introduced a development which certainly intended to weaken the position of the Catholic Church. In the agreement of 15 February 1975 the Holy See, by changing ART. XXIV of the concordat of 7 May 1940, sacrificed the principle of the civil indissolubility of marriages contracted in church.

In Italy negotiations on the revision of some articles of the concordat have long been under way.[62] Without consultation with the Holy See, contrary to ART. 34 of the concordat, civil divorce was introduced in 1970. The popular referendum against it produced a serious defeat for the Catholics. At the end of 1976 the Italian government and the Holy See agreed on a document which aimed to adapt the concordat to Italian constitutional reality and the spirit of the Second Vatican Council. The Catholic religion was thereafter no longer to be the religion of the state. The restrictive stipulations against apostate priests were to be dropped. The obligations which encumbered the state because of Rome's sacred character were to be abolished.

In Ireland (Eire), whose relations with the Church posed no problem and needed no guarantee by concordat, the deletion of the so-called Church Clause from the Irish constitution (ART. 44), which granted to the Catholic Church a special status as "Custodian of the Faith which the majority of the population professed," was decided by popular vote in 1972.

---

[62] P. Ciprotti, "Divorzio e art. 34 del Concordato italiano," *Apollinaris* 40 (1967), 483–88; C. Rousseau, "Italie et Saint-Siège. Problème de la révision du concordat du 11 Février 1929," *Revue Générale de droit International Public* 39 (1968), 451–53; S. Lener, "Sulla revisione del Concordato," *CivCatt* 120 (1969), II, 432–46; III, 9–21; IV, 214–17.

Latest Concordats and Agreements with Free Countries

In the most recent period the Holy See has also signed treaties with many states. However, most of them deal only with particular questions, and not one provides a comprehensive regulation of the total complex of subjects affecting Church and state. In many agreements existing treaties were altered or expanded, in which case the adjustment meant in most cases a diminution of the Church's legal position, which had been gained through previous concordats. In some agreements references to the Second Vatican Council appear. In place of institutional guarantees there are in increasing measure guarantees of religious liberty for individuals and groups. One of the most difficult questions which confronted, now as previously, the nations of central and Western Europe in connection with the ordering of the relations of Church and state is usually the regulation of the school system, in particular the assurance of the establishment of free, nonstate, private schools. The council saw as the optimal type of school—in the declaration *Gravissimum educationis* on Christian education, ART. 9—the free Catholic school, endowed with public legal position and supported by public means. Accordingly, the Holy See strove to have the justification of the Church's maintaining its own schools and the financing of them by the state assured by treaty.

The Austrian concordat of 5 June 1933, whose further validity had at first been challenged,[63] especially by the Socialists, was continued by a series of treaties, of which especially noteworthy are those which led to the erecting of the two new dioceses of Burgenland in 1960 and Feldkirch in 1964 and gave the ecclesiastical school system financial security in 1962 and 1972.[64] In the treaty of 5 April 1962 Spain

[63] F. Jachym, *Kirche und Staat in Österreich,* 3d ed. (Vienna 1955); D. Mayer-Maly, "Zur Frage der Gültigkeit des Konkordates vom 5. Juni 1933," *ÖAfKR* 7 (1956), 198–211; L. Leitmaier, "Das verweigerte Konkordat. Staat und Kirche im neuem Österreich," *Wort und Wahrheit* 11 (1956), 169–71; J. Schmidt, *Entwicklung der katholischen Schule in Österreich* (Vienna 1958); B. Primetshofer, *Ehe und Konkordat. Die Grundlinien des österreichischen Konkordats-Eherechtes 1934 und das geltende österreichische Eherecht* (Vienna 1960); I. Gampl, "Oberster Gerichtshof-Konkordat 1933-Katholikengesetz," *ÖAfKR* 15 (1964), 126–30; A. Kostelecky, "Die Anerkennung des österreichischen Konkordates vom 5. Juni 1933 und die Verträge der Republik Österreich mit dem Heiligen Stuhl von 1960 und 1962," A. Burghardt, K. Lugmayer, E. Machek, G. Müller, H. Schmitz, eds., *Im Dienste der Sozialreform. Festschrift für Karl Kummer* (Vienna 1965), 431–41; I. Gampl, *Österreichisches Staatskirchenrecht* (=*Rechts- und Staatswissenschaften* 23) (Vienna and New York 1971).

[64] S. Sanz Villalba, "Las convenciones entre Austria y la Santa Sede del año 1960," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 16 (1961), 531–39; J. Damizia, "Convenzione fra la

expressed a generous recognition of nontheological studies at ecclesiastical universities.[65] On 26 November 1960[66] the Holy See concluded with Paraguay a convention on the establishment of a military vicariate. The convention with Venezuela of 6 March 1964[67] moved generally in traditional paths. But, as earlier in the concordats with Latvia (ART. XII) and the Dominican Republic (ART. X), so also in this agreement attention was given to the activity of foreign priests and lay persons in the care of souls and in social services (ART. XIII). The patronate for the naming of bishops (ART. VI) and for the filling of capitular and parochial benefices (ARTS. VIII–X) was abolished, but in regard to the bishops, in contrast to other countries, the state's right of veto in the procedure was confirmed in accord with the political proviso. The "protocol" with Haiti of 15 August 1966 confirmed, after preliminary conflicts, the intention of the government especially to protect the Catholic Church in accord with ART. 1 of the concordat of 1860 and to guarantee its free exercise of its pastoral care in conformity with the concordat, canon law, and the Second Vatican Council. Similarly, the treaty with Argentina of 10 October 1966[68] referred in the preamble to the principles of the Second Vatican Council. It gave the Church freedom to alter the diocesan organization in the country (ART. II) and abolished the state's right of nomination to episcopal sees (ART. III). The agreement of 24 July 1968 with Switzerland led to the long desired establishment of the see of Lugano for the canton of Ticino.[69]

A new concordat with Colombia was concluded on 12 July 1973 and ratified on 2 July 1975. This is a typical postconciliar concordat with a Catholic country. In it the humane and social aspect of the Church's

---

Santa Sede e la Repubblica Austriaca al fine di regolare questioni attinenti l'ordinamento scolastico," *Apollinaris* 35 (1962), 76–115.

[65] J. Maldonado y Fernández del Torco, "El convenio de 5 de abril de 1962 sobre el reconocimiento, a efectos civiles, de los estudios de ciencias no eclesiásticas realizados en España en Universidades de la Iglesia," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 18 (1963), 137–98; A. de Fuenmayor, *El Convenio entre la Santa Sede y España sobre Universidades de Estudios civiles* (Pamplona 1966).

[66] A. Pugliese, "Adnotationes," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 87 (1962), 385–401.

[67] S. Sanz Villalba, "Adnotationes," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 90 (1965), 361–76; M. Torres Ellul, "El Convenio entre la Santa Sede y la República Venezolana," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 21 (1966), 485–555.

[68] R. De Lafuente, "El acuerdo entre la Santa Sede y la República Argentina," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 23 (1967), 111–25.

[69] H. Kehrli, *Interkantonales Konkordatsrecht* (Bern 1968); A.W. Ziegler, "Kirche und Staat in der Schweiz," *MThZ* 19 (1969), 269–87; E. Kussbach, "Die Errichtung eines selbständigen Bistums Lugano. Übereinkommen zwischen dem schweizerischen Bundesrat und dem Heiligen Stuhl vom 24. Juli 1968," *ÖAfKR* 21 (1970), 96–114.

activity comes strongly to the fore. The ministry of the Church to the human person is expressly mentioned (ART. V). The Catholic religion is recognized only as the "basic element of the common good and of the total development of the nation," and the Church's freedom is assured in the framework of the religious freedom of the other denominations (ART. I). The independence of Church and state is strongly emphasized (ARTS. II and III). The ministry of the Church and its cooperation with the state in the area of the educational and social systems is especially stressed (ARTS. V and VI). The canonically contracted marriage remains basically subject to the Church alone, except for separation from bed and board (ARTS. VII–IX). The Church's activity in instruction and education is regulated in detail (ARTS. X–XIII). The naming of the bishops is done freely by the Pope, but in this matter there is conceded to the president of the republic a right to express reservations "of civil or political character" (ART. XIV). The immunity of clerics and religious is retained in modern form (ARTS. XVIII–XX). The Church's property is protected with noteworthy adaptations to today's circumstances (ARTS. XXIII–XXVI).

With regard to comparative law the state-Church law of the Federal Republic of Germany occupies a special place.[70] The Second World War ended with the occupation of the country by the victorious Allies. The Western occupation powers in general assured the Churches freedom of action. Immediately after the ending of the war, which the Churches had survived as intact organizations, these were sought and recognized as guarantors of a civil law order. Their position in public life seemed to be consolidated and to prepare for a new alliance of Church and state. The Churches were first restored to their former rights, but in some states with marked restrictions, particularly in the school system. In the positive law of the state Church the experiences of the period of Nazi domination were expressed in only a relatively modest measure. A fundamental new ecclesio-political orientation was either prevented or made difficult both in the Federal Republic and also in many federal states because of the resistance of the socialists and liberals. In the federation, just as in the states, a beginning was made basically with the state-Church law of the Weimar Constitution, which was modified only in details. Even the capability for compromise of the Weimar solution of the relations of state and Church proved to be realistic and lasting. The Basic Law for the German Federal Republic of 23 May 1949 adopted word for word ARTS. 136–39 and 141 of the Weimar Constitution and in ART. 4 guaranteed freedom of denomination and of worship and in ART. 7 religious instruction. The constitutions of the states proceeded in a similar fashion. In this matter, in each state according to the partisan political composition of the state conventions that drew up the constitutions, certain changes and supplements were included. On the whole the states with a predominantly Catholic population granted the Church a more favorable position than did those with a Protestant majority population. Thus, for example, according to the constitution of the state of Rhineland-Palatinate of 18 May 1947 the Churches are recognized institutions for the preservation and consolidation of the religious and moral bases of human life (ART. 41, Sec. 1). The constitution of the state of Baden-Württemberg of 11 November 1953 makes a similar statement (ART. 4, Sec. 2). On the other hand the constitution of the state of Hesse of 1 December 1946 envisages a clear delimitation between Church and state (ART. 50) as well as the elimination of actions by the state by means of legislation (ART. 52). In contradistinction to the Weimar constitution, the federation no longer has any principle of legislative competence in ecclesio-political questions. However, it retains a series of legislative competencies, because the constitutional legal bases of the relations of Church and state are, now as before, federal law (ART. 140 GG). In view of this legal situation it was principally the business of the states to take the initiative in the construction and completion of the arrangement between Church and state.

---

[70] H. Quaritsch, H. Weber, eds., *Staat und Kirchen in der Bunderepublik. Staatskirchenrechtliche Aufsätze 1950–1967* (Bad Homburg v.d. H., Berlin, and Zurich 1967); J. Listl, *Das Grundrecht der Religionsfreiheit in der Rechtsprechung der Gerichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (=*Staatskirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen* I) (Berlin 1971); E. L. Solte, *Theologie an der Universität. Staats- und kirchenrechtliche Probleme der theologischen Fakultät* (=*Jus Ecclesiasticum,* 13) (Munich 1971); J. Jurina, *Der Rechtsstatus der Kirchen und Religionsgemeinschaften im Bereich ihrer eigenen Angelegenheiten* (=*Schriften zum öffentlichen Recht* 180) (Berlin 1972); U. Scheuner, *Schriften zum Staatskirchenrecht,* ed. by J. Listl (Berlin 1973); P. Mikat, *Religionsrechtliche Schriften. Abhandlungen zum Staatskirchenrecht und Eherecht,* ed. by J. List, 2 vols. (Berlin 1974); E. Friesenhahn, U. Scheuner, J. Listl, eds., *Handbuch des Staatskirchenrechts der Bundesrepublik Deutschland,* 2 vols. (Berlin 1974–75); E. G. Mahrenholz, "Kirchen als Korporationen," *ZevKR* 20 (1975), 43–76.

If there can be no question of a fundamentally new order of the relations of state and Church, there can still be the question of a new manner of interpretation of the traditional formulas. As a consequence of the different legal constitutional framework of the Weimar Constitution, the stipulations on religious groups have experienced a change of meaning. This can be briefly summarized in the two poles: end of the state-Church sovereignty and recognition of a full public status of the Churches. The ecclesiastical treaties with the Protestant state Churches in Lower Saxony (1955), Schleswig-Holstein (1957), and Hesse (1960) accepted, recognized, and legally concretized the new interpretation of the relations between Church and state in legal theory. The claim and the task of the Churches are positively evaluated by the state and regarded as basically worthy of assistance. The coresponsibility of the Churches for the shaping of public order, even for the fate of state and society, is accepted. The achievements of the Churches for the maintenance of the moral foundations of human life, their struggle for freedom and human dignity, as well as their stabilizing function have led to the recognition of their qualification basically to take a stand on all questions of the life of the people. The assertion of overly positive rights antecedent to the state in the Basic Law forbids state interference in ecclesiastical affairs, just as it even seemed possible according to the Weimar Constitution, and gives the Church an independence such as, with this clarity, the Weimar Constitution did not. The state's traditional powers of supervision and collaboration are almost entirely abolished or placed on a contractual basis. But the state does no longer wish regularly to drop mere ties, but rather to free the Church for the carrying out of its tasks. Its position in public law is confirmed by treaty.

The relationship between Church and state existing since 1945 is, according to the prevailing view, that of coordination. Church and state face each other as independent partners in their own right, which, because of their common responsibility, regulate in fundamental harmony questions affecting each other. True, the state is not obliged by a treaty with the Church to arrange common matters. But the treaty is the adequate means in a constitutional system that expresses the independence of the Church and the secular nature of the state. Besides, the modern socially active state has created or reemphasized many relationships with the Church. Hence the number of treaties concluded with the Churches in the years since the end of the war is very high. Most of the agreements were made between the federal states on the one hand and the Protestant state Churches or the Holy See respectively, or the bishops of a state, on the other, and relatively few by the federation with the groups of Churches. In regard to the treaties, the two groups of fundamental agreements determining status and regulating individual questions must be distinguished. The number of administrative agreements with bishops is considerable, for example, for regulating the appointment of teachers of religion or of questions of property. For the first time in the history of German ecclesiastical law, after the Second World War the initiative for treaties between Church and state in the various federal states proceeded from German Protestantism. In double contrast to the practice in the period of the Weimar Republic, the treaties with the Protestant Churches were, first, not mere equalizing complements of Catholic concordats, but independent agreements developed from Protestant ideas and exigencies, and, second, they were not followed by any, or by any adequate, agreements with the Catholic Church that took into account principles of parity. All the more noteworthy is the fact that in some of these treaties, likewise for the first time in the history of German ecclesiastical law, there appear express provisos of parity, which guarantee to Protestantism equal treatment with the Catholic Church.[71]

The Catholic Church was at first hindered in the conclusion of new agreements because of its clinging to the concordat with the Reich, whose existence with legal effect and whose continued validity were challenged by leftist groups, and especially by its insistence on the school articles, which were annoying to some state partners.[72] In several federal states there were long-lasting conflicts over the school regulations. The state of Lower Saxony enacted a school law which, in the Church's view and that of the federal government, was in opposition to ART. 23 of the concordat with the Reich. The conflict was brought before the Federal Constitutional Court by the federal government. This was supposed to decide the question whether the state of Lower Saxony was obliged, vis-à-vis the federation, to observe the stipulations of the concordat with the Reich in fashioning its school law. In its verdict of 26 March 1957[73] the Federal Constitutional Court accepted both the legally effective existence and the continued validity of the concordat with the Reich, but denied the authority of the federation to hold the states to the observance of those obligations of it whose object, according to the Basic Law, falls under the exclusive competence of the states. This unfortunate and contradictory decision granted to the states, with regard to their exclusive legislative competence in questions of the educational system, the legal constitutional freedom arbitrarily to exempt themselves from international law ties. By it the concordat with the Reich was annulled in essential parts. Nevertheless, the Lower Saxon school controversy became the occasion to seek a contractual solution of the open questions and to restore, to a certain extent, the equality in Lower Saxony, which was no longer protected by the Loccum Treaty of 19 March 1955, very favorable to the Protestant state Church. After prolonged discussions, which were accompanied by a passionate anti-Catholic campaign in the state, there occurred on 1 July 1965 the conclusion of the first and only concordat with a state of the German Federal Republic, Lower Saxony.[74] It continued the Prussian concordat of 1929, but went considerably beyond it in topics and statements. The treaty eliminated the splintering of the state-Church law in the state and ended the conflict between Church and state over the organization of the school system. The state guaranteed under certain conditions the maintaining and erecting of public Catholic denominational schools. The Church recognized the nondenominational school as the regular school, the denominational school as a school by request (ART. 6). In the matter of a substantial altering of the structure of the public school system, the opening of discussions in the spirit of the treaty was envisaged (ART. 19, Sec. 2).[75] The encouragement of Catholic adult education by the state was promised (ART. 9). The interests of the Church in broadcasting were taken into consideration (ART. 10). With these two regulations the attempt was made to introduce newer developments into the usual matter of concordats. The agreement went beyond the traditional friendship clauses to establish "continuing contact" on all questions of the mutual relationship (ART. 19, Sec. 1).

---

[71] Final protocol in ART. 23 of the Hesse treaty with the Church, final protocol to ART. 28 of the Rhineland-Palatinate treaty with the Church, ART. VI of the Hesse treaty with the Catholic bishoprics, ART. 14 of the supplementary treaty to the Lower Saxon treaty with the Church.

[72] K. O. Hütter, *Bindung der Länder an die Schulbestimmungen des Reichskonkordats von 1933. Rechtsnachfolge oder Funktionsnachfolge* (Münster 1964); F. Müller, "Landesverfassung und Reichskonkordat. Fragen der Schulform in Baden-Württemberg," *Baden-Württembergisches Verwaltungsblatt* 10 (1965), 177–81; P. Feuchte, P. Dallinger, "Christliche Schule im neutralen Staat," *Die Öffentliche Verwaltung* 20 (1967), 361–74; F. Müller, *Schulgesetzgebung und Reichskonkordat* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1966); F. Pitzer, *Die Bekenntnisschule des Reichskonkordats* (Cologne and Berlin 1967); W. Weber "Die Reichweite der Bekenntnisschulgarantie in Artikel 23 des Reichskonkordats," H. Brunotte, K. Müller, R. Smend, eds., *Festschrift für Erich Ruppel zum 65. Geburtstag am 25. Januar 1968* (Hanover, Berlin and Hamburg 1968), 354–74.

[73] *Der Konkordatsprozess,* ed. by F. Giese and F. A. Frhr, v. der Heydte, 4 vols. (Munich 1957–59); C. J. Hering, H. Lentz, eds., *Entscheidungen in Kirchensachen seit 1946* IV (Berlin 1966), 46–94.

The Lower Saxon concordat did not give rise to other similar treaties. Other states, like Hesse and Rhineland-Palatinate, were prepared only to conclude agreements with the bishops of the state. Today there is no favorable set of circumstances in the Federal Republic for the signing of concordats. The erecting of new theological faculties at Bochum, Regensburg, Augsburg, and Passau or, respectively, of technical disciplines at Osnabrück and professional chairs at Saarbrücken at the state universities, as well as the extensive elimination of the denominational character of the public elementary schools and of teacher education made necessary a number of treaties of individual federal states—Bavaria, Rhineland-Palatinate, North Rhine-Westphalia, Saarland, Lower Saxony—with the Holy See. The tendency to push the denominational schools and teacher education conformable to the creed to the private level is unmistakable. Articles 23 and 24 of the concordat with the Reich became entirely obsolete through this development. Still, some states have been found ready for extensive support of Catholic private schools. The treaty with Bavaria of 4 September 1974 confirmed the possibility, already agreed to on 7 October 1968, of forming in the public elementary schools, under certain conditions, classes and instruction groups for pupils of the Catholic faith; in these the instruction and training would be governed by the special principles of the Catholic denomination (ART. 6, pars. 2 and 3). The state of Bavaria bound itself to grant financial and personnel assistance to the schools of Catholics "in the framework of the general encouragement of private schools" (ART. 8, par. 1). To the private Catholic elementary and special schools was promised, with certain restrictions, the repayment of the necessary expenditure and building costs (ART. 8, pars. 2 and 3). The accord of 15 May 1973 with Rhineland-Palatinate also assured the establishment and financing of Catholic private schools. The treaty contains generous promises of state contributions for the expenditures for building projects of Catholic schools (ART. 7) and for the assignment of state teachers to Catholic private schools (ART. 10). Essentially similar is the agreement reached on 21 February 1975 between the Holy See and the Saarland on the same subjects.

---

[74] J. Niemeyer, "Kirche und Staat nach dem Konkordat in Niedersachsen," *Ordo Socialis* 13 (1965), 205–18; E. G. Mahrenholz, "Das Niedersächsische Konkordat und der Ergänzungsvertrag zum Loccumer Kirchenvertrag," *ZevKR* 12 (1966–67, 217–82; E. Ruppel, "Konkordat und Ergänzungsvertrag zum Evangelischen Kirchenvertrag in Niedersachsen," *Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt* 81 (1966), 207–12; D. Scheven, "Das Niedersächsische Konkordat," *Juristenzeitung* 20 (1966), 341–47; H. J. Toews, *Die Schulbestimmungen des Niedersächsischen Konkordats* (Göttingen 1967).

[75] As early as 21 May 1973 adjustments of various rules to changed circumstances became necessary (*AAS* 65 [1973], 643–46). The exchange of notes between the Holy See and the state of Lower Saxony of 22 December 1972 envisages the total elimination of the state denominational school system.

In the most recent period a new phase of the relations of Church and state in the Federal Republic seems to be under way. The Church fell into strong dependence on the movements in society. The changed public attitude reacts upon the interpretation of the norms, but now in a sense increasingly more unfavorable to the Churches. The interpretation of the rules of the ecclesiastical law is, to a great degree, dependent on the political and ideological tendencies in public life prevailing at the moment and occasionally rapidly changing. For example, since the close of the Second Vatican Council the public position, as well as the political, social, and cultural influence of the Churches in the Federal Republic, are in increasing measure questioned by teachers, party politicians, and certain organizations. The process of secularization moves after the trauma of the lost war and the "shock of the first postwar period," as Siegfried Grundmann expresses it, with new intensity.[76] An influential movement sees the Churches to an increasing degree in relation to other social forces and includes them in the associations and interest groups. This view does not let the nature of the Churches be given adequate recognition any more. The institutional relations between Church and state become weaker, they are abandoned in favor of a stronger social orientation of the two powers. The Church must engage in the process of forming the state's will less as an institution than through the presence of its faithful in society. In the administration of justice there partly exists the tendency to overstress the negative side of religious freedom, that is, less to protect liberty in the practice of religion and rather much more to assure the right of dissidents to the nonexercise of religious acts. In the course of this development religious practice is threatened with being restricted to the church building and the family sphere. The verdicts of the Bremen Supreme Court of 23 October 1965[77] and of the Supreme Court of Hesse of 27 October 1965[78] on questions of religious instruction and of prayer in school point in this direction.

Quite differently from the situation with the Western occupation zones, or the German Federal Republic, proceeded the development of the relations of Church and state in the Soviet occupation zone, or the German Democratic Republic.[79] At first the Soviet occupying power refrained from interference in the inner ecclesiastical sphere. The constitution of the German Democratic Republic of 7 October 1949 in ARTS. 41–49 adopted in great part formulas of ARTS. 135–41 of the Weimar Constitution. But these regulations were essentially modified by the intensified principle of the separation of Church and state. The constitution guaranteed religious freedom (ART. 41) and guaranteed to religious groups the character of corporations of public law with the traditional right to raise money (ART. 43, Secs. 3 and 4). Religious instruction might be given by them in school buildings (ARTS. 40 and 44). But the educational system was subject exclusively to the control of the state (ARTS. 34–40). More unfavorable than the constitutional law was the constitutional reality. By means of laws and directives, as well as through administrative measures, the Church's sphere of action was ever more strictly limited and the de-Christianization of the people was pressed as planned. A relatively more trustworthy expression of the present status of the relations of Church and state is the constitution of the German Democratic Republic of 6 April 1968. It guarantees liberty of conscience and of belief and equality of rights of all citizens without regard to religious denomination (ART. 20, Sec. 1), as well as freedom of denomination and of the practice of religion (ART. 39, Sec. 1). The arranging of the affairs of the Churches and religious groups and the exercise of their activity are subject to the reservation of the constitution and of the law (ART. 39, Sec. 2). The independence of the Churches in the arrangement and administration of their affairs is no longer guaranteed. There is no longer any constitutional protection against interference in their inner sphere. There is no more word of any rights of the Churches. Ecclesiastical activity is handed over to the arbitrarily manipulable "legal decisions" of the German Democratic Republic. Churches and religious groups are, according to the 1968 constitution, no longer corporations of public law. Hence, from now on they move only in the area of private law and have lost the capacity to employ any disciplinary power. In the other fields of law also, for example, in penal law, the prerogatives accruing to the Church from its public position are eliminated. A guar-

---

[76] S. Grundmann, "Laizistische Tendenzen im deutschen Staatskirchenrecht?" *Festschrift Kunst,* 126–33; J. Listl, "Staat und Kirche in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Wandlungen und neuere Entwicklungstendenzen im Staatskirchenrecht," *StdZ* 191 (1973), 291–308; I. Gampl, C. Link, *Deutsches und österreichisches Staatskirchenrecht in der Diskussion* (=*Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft,* m.s. 10) (Paderborn 1973); H. Maier, "Die Kirchen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift 'Communio'* 2 (1973), 547–58; 3 (1974), 63–74; P. Rath, ed., *Trennung von Staat und Kirche? Dokumente und Argumente* (=rororo aktuell) (Reinbek bei Hamburg 1974). E. G. Mahrenholz (*Die Kirchen in der Gesellschaft der Bundesrepublik,* 2d ed. [Hanover 1972], 132) terms religious instruction a "foreign body" in the constitutional structure of the Basic Law.

[77] C. J. Hering, H. Lentz, eds., *Entscheidungen in Kirchensachen seit 1946* VII (Berlin 1970, 260–75).

[78] Ibid., 275–99.

[79] E. Jacobi, "Staat und Kirche nach der Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik," *ZevKR* 1 (1951), 113–35; W. Meinecke, *Die Kirche in der volksdemokratischen Ordnung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (Berlin 1952); U. Krüger, "Das Prinzip der Trennung von Staat und Kirche in Deutschland," *Festschrift für Erwin Jacobi* (Berlin 1975), 260–86; W. Meinecke, *Die Kirche in der volksdemokratischen Ordnung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (Berlin 1962); C. Meyer, *Das Verhältnis zwischen Staatsgewalt und Kirche im Lichte der Glaubens- und Gewissensfreiheit in der sowjetischen*

Besatzungszone Deutschland (Mainz 1964); H. Bayl, "Zum Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 15 (1966), 315–23; H. Johnsen, "Staat und Kirche in der DDR," *Im Lichte der Reformation. Jahrbuch des Evangelischen Bundes* 10 (1967), 51–70; K. Richter, "Katholische Kirche in der DDR. Wandel kirchlicher Strukturen unter den Bedingungen einer sozialistischen Gesellschaft," *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 13 (1972), 215–45; S. Mampal, *Die sozialistische Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. Text und Kommentar* (Frankfurt 1972).

antee of religious instruction is absent, just as is the assurance of pastoral care in public institutions. No constitutional guarantee of ecclesiastical property exists any longer. The right of the Church to raise money has come to nothing. The public achievements are no longer mentioned. The 1968 constitution of the German Democratic Republic does, however, mention, as the sole constitution of a socialist country, the agreements as means for regulating the relations of state and Church (ART. 39, Sec. 2). It thereby makes known that it is aware of the independence of the Churches. Apparently, the leadership of the German Democratic Republic has grasped that treaties can be a useful means of socialist ecclesiastical policy. The German Democratic Republic especially has some desires relating to the Catholic Church, the fulfilling of which can be obtained only from the Holy See, for example, a new arrangement of diocesan boundaries. First contacts with the Holy See have been made. However, a concordat with substantive guarantees of the Church's activity is presumably not sought by the German Democratic Republic. It treats as nonexistent the concordats with Prussia and with the Reich. The appointment of apostolic administrators in the German Democratic Republic on 23 July 1973 took place without a treaty.

SECTION TWO

The Diversity of the Inner Life of the Universal Church

CHAPTER 7

*Society and State as a Problem for the Church**

The period since the outbreak of the First World War (1914–18), the start of which is marked within the Church by the change in the See of Peter from Pius X (1903–14)[1] to Benedict XV (1914–22),[2] presents itself as an epoch of socio-political crises and a global inability to establish peace. During the very war itself the Bolshevik Revolution—the "October Revolution" of 1917—under Lenin was victorious in Russia. Five years later Mussolini inaugurated the Fascist era in Italy with his "March on Rome" of 28 October 1922. On 30 January 1933 there followed the subjection of Germany to the dictatorship of National Socialism through Hitler's so-called "seizure of power."

The three revolutionary movements with more or less monistic ideologies[3] ended politically in totalitarian dictatorships of nationalistic style, but with claims beyond their own national frontiers—Bolshevism: "Socialist World Revolution"; Fascism: "Mare Nostro," with claims of hegemony around the Mediterranean; National Socialism: "Living Space for the German People" in the east. In this way, as also by means of the continuing nationalism of the nontotalitarian states, all good starts for a global understanding of peoples—the League of Nations—or at least for a European understanding between the former opponents in the war—Briand/Stresemann—were finally condemned to failure. The world economic crisis of 1930 led with its army of millions of unemployed to a complete disorganization of world commerce and to serious social upheavals in the industrial nations, which finally helped to smooth Hitler's route to power in Germany. The world economic crisis marks the end of the era of liberal economics and the beginning of a national state policy of controlling and standardizing. The hectic fever with which the individual nations reacted to the severe depression by ever new restrictive measures consolidated the crisis. "The cyclical crisis produced a structural crisis of the world economy. The crisis *in* the system became a crisis *of* the system."[4] The crisis led to the injury especially of the small and middle independent livelihoods, to a further concentration in the economy—financial capitalism—and thereby to a serious derangement of the world political and inner social equilibrium.

---

* Wilhelm Weber

[1] *AAS* 36–41 (1903–8); *AAS* (Rome 1909ff.); *Acta Pii X*, 5 vols. (Rome 1905–14).

[2] *AAS* 6–14 (1914–22); *Actes de Benoît* (Latin and French), 3 vols. (Paris 1924–26).

[3] Bolshevism: Class ideology on an economic basis; Fascism: "La Nazione" as ideological basis; National Socialism: "Blood-and-Soil" ideology, emotional racism.

After the Second World War (1939–45) thinking in terms of political blocs (NATO, the Warsaw Pact), problems of conventional and nuclear rearmament, of the Cold War, and locally restricted warlike confrontations were increasingly prominent, partly in connection with the West-East conflict (Korea and Vietnam), partly in connection with the elimination of the former European colonial rule (Algeria and Angola), partly from very dissimilar motives (Hungarian revolt, suppression of the reform socialism of Prague, the Middle East conflict). Alongside the West-East conflict the North-South problem emerged more clearly, namely, the tensions from the imbalance between the developed industrial nations of the northern hemisphere—"First" and "Second World"—and the populous but economically undeveloped and hence poor and partly hungry countries of the so-called "Third World."

However, the picture would be incorrect if note were not taken also of positive starts and developments, even if not all or only few were actually developed. To be named here would be the above-mentioned idea of Europe,[5] the activity of the International Worker's Organization (ILO) at Geneva, which was founded in 1919 and since then has displayed a comprehensive and beneficial activity,[6] the development of labor and social law, especially in Germany in the period between the wars, the beginnings of a new international order of law and peace, such as the establishing of the

---

[4] Cf. on this A. Predöhl, *Das Ende der Weltwirtschaftskrise: Eine Einführung in die Probleme der Weltwirtschaft,* rde vol. 161 (Hamburg 1962), here 9.

[5] On 4 September 1929 A. Briand submitted the plan, then rejected by England, of the "United States of Europe" (customs and economic union). Count Coudenhove-Kalergi had prepared the way, as regards propaganda, with his Pan-European movement.

[6] Pius XII had called attention, with praise, to the activity of the ILO in an address to the members of the Executive Council of the International Labor Exchange on 19 November 1954 (*AAS* 46 [1954], 714–18; *UG,* 6040–48. In his encyclical *Mater et Magistra* John XXIII expressed his high esteem (103), and Paul VI paid a visit to the organization on the occasion of his visit to the World Council of Churches at Geneva in 1969 and delivered a much noted address (cf. *HK* 23 [1969], 7, 301f.).

United Nations with its subsidiary and/or successor organizations—UNESCO, FAO, UNICEF, etc.—toward and after the end of the Second World War, the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" by the United Nations of 10 December 1948, and the founding of the European Community, to name only a few of the most important happenings.

The newer Catholic social doctrine, called into being since Leo XIII (1878–1903),[7] experienced in the period after the two world wars, especially since the encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* of 1931, a vast further development and acquired the contour of a "system," if one understands by a social doctrinal system logically arranged and coherent propositions on the structural principles underlying society. Simultaneously there grew also reflexively the Church's self-consciousness of possessing its own social teaching and of having to present it as obligatory. In his encyclical *Mater et Magistra* of 1961, John XXIII thus expressed this self-awareness: "We especially point to the fact that the social teaching of the Catholic Church is an integrating component of the Christian doctrine of mankind."[8] "For this reason it is especially important that Our children not only know the principles of the social doctrine but also be formed according to them."[9]

The most important questions and problems with which the social message of the Church had to do were proposed to it through the development indicated earlier in outline. They constitute the "life-centered problems" of the most recent phase in the development of Catholic social teaching.

Thus Pius XI (1922–39)[10] had to deal with the totalitarian ideologies and dictatorship movements of Socialism/Communism, of Fascism, and of National Socialism. To each of the three he devoted a special encyclical.[11] In the world economic crisis, which announced the breakdown and end of the era of liberal economics with the social ills appearing in its wake, appeared the second great social encyclical in the strict sense, *Quadragesimo Anno,* which, as a follow-up of the encyclical *Rerum novarum* of 1891, which dealt almost exclusively with the classic social question of the nineteenth century, namely, with the labor problem, had as its subject the disorganization of society.[12] The experiences with the totalitarian dictatorships, especially with National Socialism, made Pius XII (1939–58)[13] the herald of the rights of the human person. Under him there emerged in a stupendous abundance of proclamations of the most varied sort (although he did not compose a social encyclical of his own in the strict sense), the ever clearer outlines of what can be termed Christian "personalism" and "solidarity." Thus is explained his almost obstinate insistence on the principle of subsidiarity. To Pius XII we owe remarkable and penetrating ideas on the problem of democracy, of toleration, and of public opinion. In his range of ideas, that of the underdeveloped countries appears early on. The universal or world common welfare led him to make the notion of a family of mankind again and again the subject of doctrinal expressions and proclaim the vision of a "world state" on the basis of federation. The era of John XXIII (1958–63)[14] was marked by two important social encyclicals which in their statements on the one hand continued the tradition of the Church's social teaching and on the other hand gave important impulses to the following council. *Mater et Magistra* has already been mentioned. The encyclical *Pacem in terris* of 1963[15] was experienced in both the West and East as a sensation. It constituted, as has rightly been said, the Pope's last will. In both encyclicals he extensively synchronized the social thought of the Church with the exigencies or, as John XXIII especially liked to express it, with the "signs of the time," or, as the same Pope demanded in his opening address to the Second Vatican Council on 11 October 1962, brought the Church an essential step nearer to *aggiornamento.* He sought to secure for the striving of mankind for justice and peace, by employing its own manner of speaking, the most profound and ultimate impulses from the Christian view of mankind and of society.

---

[7] *AAS* 11–35 (1878–1903); *Leonis XIII. Pont. Max. Acta,* 23 vols. with index (Rome 1881–1905; reprint, Graz 1971).

[8] John XXIII, encyclical *Mater et Magistra,* of 15 May 1961, 222.

[9] Ibid., 227.

[10] *AAS,* 14–31 (1922–39).

[11] Encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* (against Italian Fascism) of 29 June 1931: *AAS* 23 (1931), 285–312; encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* (against atheistic Communism) of 19 March 1937: *AAS* 29 (1937), 65–106; encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* (against National Socialism) of 14 March 1937: *AAS* 29 (1937), 145–67.

The Social Claim to Educate and Its Bases: Natural Law and Revelation ("Question of Competence")

In *Rerum novarum* Leo XIII had already laid claim to the social doctrine to teach. "With full confidence We approach this task and in the awareness that the word belongs to Us" (13). Pius XI energetically repeated this claim in *Quadragesimo anno* and at the same time made it more precise against possible misinterpretations. "The deposit of truth entrusted to Us by God and the holy duty committed to Us by God to proclaim the moral law in its entire compass, to declare, and, whether or not he desires it, to press for its observance subject on this side both the social and the economic sphere without reservation to Our supreme judgment" (41).

---

[12] The heading of the encyclical of 15 May 1931 reads: "On the social order, its restoration, and its perfection according to the plan of salvation of the Gospel."

[13] *AAS* 31–50 (1939–58).

[14] *AAS* 50–55 (1958–63).

[15] The encyclical appeared under the date of 11 April 1963, Maundy Thursday, and bears the heading: "On peace among all peoples in truth, justice, love, and freedom."

Three considerations simultaneously justify and limit the Church's claim: (1) Society and economics cannot be considered apart from the moral law; (2) under this exclusive respect—"not in questions of a technical sort for which [the Church] neither disposes of the suitable means nor has received a mission, but in everything which is related to the moral law" (41)—a sovereign authority belongs to the Church or, respectively, the ecclesiastical teaching office; (3) this has nothing to do with unjust claims to power, as they are often imputed to the Church.[16]

Pius XII not only frequently confirmed this claim of his predecessors,[17] but regarded as a legitimation of the Church's claim the ontological fact of the "intrinsic involvement," as G. Gundlach calls it, of the Church with society and expressed this state of affairs in the controversial formula of the Church as the "vital principle of human society."[18] John XXIII unmistakably made the same claim when he had his first social encyclical begin, almost as with a roll of drums, with the words: "Mother and teacher of peoples is the Catholic Church" (*Mater et Magistra,* 1).

Pius XII, with appeal to Leo XIII, characterized as the "undeniable sphere of the Church" the judgement on those principles "of the eternally valid order . . . which God, the Creator and Redeemer, has made known through natural law and revelation." His essential statement in this question is: "Rightly: for the principles of natural law and the truths of revelation both have, as two in no way opposite but parallel water courses, their common source in God" (*UG*, 498).

---

[16] Already in his first encyclical, *Ubi arcano* of 23 December 1922 (*AAS* 14 [1922], 673–700) the Pope had solemnly asserted: "The Church would regard it as an encroachment for it to intervene without cause in earthly matters." Quoting himself, the Pope resumed this central statement in 41 of *Quadragesimo anno.* Literature on the Church's claim to a social doctrine: O. von Nell-Breuning, S. J., *Die soziale Enzyklika* (Cologne 1932, reprint 1950), 59f.; G. Gundlach, S. J., *Die Kirche zur heutigen Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftsnot. Erläuterung des Rundschreibens Papst Pius' XI. "Quadragesimo Anno"* (2d ed., Berlin, 1949), 17f.

[17] Especially clearly in his radio message on Pentecost, 1 June 1941: *AAS* 33(1941), 195–205; *UG,* 493–522. The address occurred on the Golden Jubilee celebration of *Rerum novarum.*

[18] Pius XII made his own this word, coined by G. Gundlach, S. J., first in his address of 20 February 1946 to the College of Cardinals (*UG,* 4106), later twice more, both times in radio messages to German *Katholikentage* (Bochum, 4 September 1949: *UG,* 611; Berlin, 17 August 1958: *UG,* 4520).

The idea of natural law, undoubtedly dominant in the newer Catholic social doctrine since Leo XIII, experienced under Pius XII an important further development. The "authenticity of natural law," still always a problem in a developed dynamic society, was appealed to by Pius XI in connection with the right of property, which, as "history shows," "is not immutable" (*Quadragesimo anno,* 49). But while in tradition an authenticity or "mutability" of natural law was derived rather *ab extra,* that is, from the changes of external circumstances or conditions (*circumstantiae*), for Pius XII there ensues from the study of the history of the development of law the fact that, under special conditions, specific rights can change *ab intra,* from their content. Of course, there is an unchangeable nucleus in natural law.

Pius XII developed this idea in greater detail in one of his most noted addresses, which he gave on 13 October 1955 to the *Centro Italiano per la Riconciliazione Internazionale.*[19] Because the matter is sufficiently important, the decisive sentences are repeated here verbatim: "The study of history and of legal development from remote times teaches that, on the one hand, a change in economic and social (and often also in political) situations demands new forms of those postulates of natural law to which the systems hitherto prevailing can no longer do justice; but, on the other hand, that in connection with these changes the fundamental demands of nature always recur and pass themselves on, with greater or less urgency, from one generation to the others."[20]

In his address of 7 September 1955 to the participants of the Tenth International Congress of Historians[21] Pius XII had already formulated for the Church the claim, as "historical power," as "living organism," regularly to intervene in the sphere of public life "in order to assure the correct balance between duties and obligations on the one side and rights and freedoms on the other."[22]

Also with Pius XII we still find the problem, drawn along from tradition, especially by Leo XIII, of defining the relations of natural law, truth, and the discovery of truth. True, there is expounded by him in connection with the discussion of democracy the essential function of public opinion for a democratic commonwealth. In the complete absence of public opinion must be seen "a lack, a weakness, a sickness of social life."[23] But the truth, also the true perception of the norms of natural law as possessed "objective" truth, is claimed for the Church and the teaching office in such a manner that all other tribunals, even public opinion, must stand almost rather as hearers, as receivers of the second rank.

---

[19] *AAS* 47 (1955), 764–75; *UG,* 6275–99. The address was concerned with the problem of "coexistence and common life of peoples in truth and love."

[20] *UG,* 6286.

[21] *AAS* 47 (1955), 672–82; *UG,* 5893–5914. The close succession in time of this and the address mentioned in n. 19 shows how Pius XII moved the problem of the historicity of law precisely to that moment.

[22] *UG,* 5901.

In this context one can now—in contrast to almost all other statements in which there is incorrectly mention of a "turn" in thought—ascertain in John XXIII a genuine breakthrough to new shores. If he speaks of truth or of the rights bestowed by God on mankind in its very nature, then he presupposes the entire traditional theology of these rights, in regard to which, however, Leo XIII, Pius XI, and also to a great extent even Pius XII had basically come to a standstill. But this did not satisfy John XXIII. To him it was not a question, in an encyclical, moreover, that was oriented to the whole pluralistic world, only of the absolute, eternal, changeless truth, which, furthermore, is not capable of being imposed by the teaching office in an ideologically dismembered world. For him the truth was concretized, knowledge of truth grows in the "veracity" of mutual human relationships. Supported on the hope of rational understanding and love among people,[24] the optimistic Pope believed in the realization of veracity in human relationships as the basis of the feasibility of every knowledge of truth. Truth is no longer a merely possessed, guarded, and authoritatively interpreted objective *Depositum;* truth occurs rather in the freedom of mankind as a social process of truth finding. Here is present a gifted understanding of the so powerfully fatigued formula of the identity of "theory and practice."

Because of the importance of the matter, the central statements of the Pope will again be presented here verbatim: The "happening of truth" lives by this, "that people mutually exchange their perceptions in the bright light of truth, that they are put in the position of making use of their rights and fulfilling their duties, that they are incited to strive for spiritual goods, that from every honorable thing they . . . gain an occasion for common honest joy, that they seek in tireless desire to share among themselves and receive from one another the best they have. These values affect and control everything that is related to scholarship, economics, social institutions, development and organization of the state, legislation, and finally to all other things that constitute externally human coexistence and develop in constant progress."[25] In order that truth "may function" in this way, the right to free expression of opinion and to information in conformity with truth must be respected: "From nature people have . . . the right . . . to seek the truth freely and to express their opinion while respecting the moral order and the common good, to disseminate it, and to exercise any profession; finally, to be informed of public events in accord with the truth."[26] "The truth further commands that a person let himself be guided in the use of the manifold possibilities which were created by the progress of modern means of publication and by which the mutual understanding of peoples is promoted by the highest objectivity."[27]

---

[23] Address to the participants in the International Catholic Press Congress of 17 February 1950 in *AAS* 42 (1950), 251–57; *UG,* 2132–53; here, 2134.

[24] Corresponding to the axiom frequently quoted by Thomas Aquinas: "Homo homini naturaliter amicus"; cf. *Contra Gentiles,* 3, 117; 4, 54, and elsewhere.

In these sentences can rightly be seen the fundamental ethical justification of democracy and at the same time of an ethics of public communication in accord with the times. In the climate of the encyclical *Pacem in terris,* Paul VI was then able during the council in his own first encyclical *Ecclesiam suam* of 6 August 1964 to proclaim the dialogue with the world in keeping with the new model of ecclesiastical communications,[28] and the Second Vatican Council was able to acknowledge what in the understanding of the truth the Church owes to the world and its striving for truth. "The experience of the historical past, the progress of scholarship, the riches which lie in the various forms of human culture, through which human nature comes ever more clearly to manifestation and new ways to the truth are opened redound also to the Church's good."[29]

Social Principles: Personality, Subsidiarity, Solidarity, Common Good, Universal Common Good

At the beginning of his encyclical on peace John XXIII puts the central principle of all human social organization: "At the basis of any human coexistence that should be well ordered and fruitful must lie the principle that every human being is by essence a person" (*Pacem in terris,* 9). "If we consider the dignity of the human person according to revealed truths, we must value it even much more highly" (*Pacem in terris,* 10).

---

[25] Encyclical *Pacem in terris,* 38.

[26] Ibid., 12.

[27] Ibid., 90; cf. on this especially G. Deussen, *Ethik der Massenkommunikation bei Papst Paul VI.* (*Abhandlungen. zur Sozialethik* 5), ed. by W. Weber and A. Rauscher (Paderborn 1973), 66f. and passim; cf. on the whole matter also E. W. Böckenförde, *Kirchlicher Auftrag und politische Entscheidung* (Rombach Academy paperback 55) (Freiburg i. Br. 1973), especially 81ff.

[28] Encyclical *Ecclesiam suam, AAS* 56 (1964), 609–59.

[29] Pastoral constitution *Gaudium et Spes,* 44, 2.

1. Pius XI and especially Pius XII had already established the social doctrine of the Church definitively and unmistakably as "personalism." Everything social is related to the person and must promote its perfection. In other words, society has no end in itself, it is no domineering superego but has a ministerial character. The state has to promote the security of the person by guaranteeing the rights of the person as rights implanted in its nature by God. However, at times other social conditions require other emphases. Thus Leo XIII had primarily to defend the existing social order in its basic structure—state, state authority, private property—against anarchist and Marxist strivings, while the experiences with totalitarian states or movements—persecution of Catholics in Russia, Mexico, Spain, Fascism, National Socialism—caused Pius XI to speak again and again for the protection of human freedom and dignity and for the defense of the rights of the Church. But then Pius XII became especially the herald of human liberty and of the dignity of the human person.

To avert from the start any charge of individualism, Pius XII stressed that human rights are not by chance proclaimed as inviolable and inalienable against the state, but that they belong precisely to the "most precious in the common good" (*UG,* 213),[30] for which the state has to stand up. And so "they can never be sacrificed to the common good, precisely because they are essential ingredients of it" (*UG,* 213).[31] This truth is so central for Pius XII that he emphatically exclaimed: "This is the Catholic world view!" (*UG,* 213).

To become politically effective, the rights of the person need a foundation in postive law, a demand which Pius XII had made and which was taken over verbatim by John XXIII from his predecessor.[32] "To the human person also belongs the legal protection of its rights, which must be effective and impartial in harmony with the true norms of justice, as Our predecessor of happy memory, Pius XII, admonishes: 'From the divinely established legal order results the inalienable right of the human being to legal security and with it to a tangible legal sphere, which is protected against every attack of caprice' " (*Pacem in terris,* 27).[33]

---

[30] Address to the participants of the International Congress for Humanistic Studies of 25 September 1949 in *AAS* 41 (1949), 555–56; *UG,* 356–61. Here the Pope expressed himself on the natural law as the basis of the Church's social doctrine.

[31] Message to the *Katholikentag* in Berlin of 10 August 1952 in *AAS* 44 (1952), 723–27; *UG,* 203–18.

[32] On the list of basic or human rights, which John XXIII, in comparison with his predecessor, greatly expanded, cf. *Pacem in terris,* 11–27.

2. All other principles of Catholic social doctrine, especially the principle of "Catholic" subsidiarity that has entered into general linguistic use, follow from the principle of the person with logical cogency. Already long evident in accord with its esential content in its beginnings,[34] in Leo XIII especially established in connection with the preeminence of the family over the state—cf. *Rerum novarum,* 10: "Since domestic common life, according to both the notion and the reality, is earlier than the civic community, so too its rights and duties have precedence, because they are closer to nature"; cf. also *Rerum novarum*, 38, in relation to free social unions and their relation to the state—it finds its classic definition in *Quadragesimo anno:* "Just as whatever the individual man can accomplish on his own initiative and with his own abilities must not be taken from him and allotted to the activity of society, so it is contrary to justice to claim for the wider and higher community whatever the smaller and subordinate communities can achieve and lead to a good end; at the same time it is entirely injurious and confuses the entire social order. *Every activity of society is subsidiary in conformity to its nature and concept;* it should support the members of the body social but must never destroy or absorb them . . . . The better the hierarchical order of the various socializations is maintained through strict observance of the principle of subsidiarity, the more social authority and social effectiveness stand out and the better and more fortunately is the state administered" (*Quadragesimo anno,* 79–80).

The principle of subsidiarity finds its justification as much in the liberty of the person as also in the structure of the smaller life groups, whose rights to life must not be curtailed by encroachments of more extensive social organizations ("statism"). On the one hand it protects the identity and privacy of the person and of the intermediate groups and institutions between the individual and the state—"defensive" function—and on the other hand it demands, according to the original meaning of the word, "help (*subsidium*) from above to below," if the individual or the smaller life groups, for example, the family, fail in their task of educating, with or without guilt—"responsible" function. It goes without saying that Pius XII as a determined defender of the rights of mankind especially stressed the "defensive" function of the principle of subsidiarity. Other situations demand other accentuations of the principle.

---

[33] The quotation from Pius XII is taken from the Christmas message of 24 December 1942 in *AAS* 35 (1943), 9–24; *UG,* 219–71; here, 261.

[34] Cf. J. Höffner, *Christliche Gesellschaftslehre* (5th ed., Kevelaer 1968), 50.

Pius XI characterized the principle as "gravissimum illud principium" (*Quadragesimo anno,* 79), which, with regard to the importance of the principles of solidarity and of the common good, must probably not be translated as "sovereign principle" but rather as "extremely significant principle." Pius XII calls the principle a "principle constantly defended by the social doctrine of the Church,"[35] and emphasized its validity "even for the life of the Church, without prejudice to its hierarchical structure."[36]

With John XXIII we find the principle of subsidiarity frequently referred to in *Mater et Magistra* directly (53) and indirectly (for example, 165), less in its defensive function than in its positive function of the support of society in regard to the weaker. In *Pacem in terris* the Pope also directly considers the principle (140). Here he especially stresses the right of the smaller life groups, of the *corps intermédiaires* within the political community (cf. *Pacem in terris,* 24).

3. In the human person identity—singularity, individuality—and being part of society—socialization, mutual dependence, and need for society as a reference point—are intertwined. Person is "identity in the rational subject." From this state of being flows the principle of solidarity, by which all individualism and all collectivism is rejected. On the basis of these considerations the personalism of Catholic social doctrine is presented under the aspect of "solidarism."[37] This name not only aims to express an ethical attitude of solidarity but to express a state of being, namely, the fact that all people in their respective social relations—individuals among themselves, in the union of the family, in the intermediate groups, in the state, in the community of nations—stand in an ontological union and reciprocal obligation to one another. This union demands social and legal organization in the sense of the principle of subsidiarity, by which the uniting of the two principles takes place. The Popes have not employed the concept of solidarism, but have argued, especially Pius XII, essentially in the sense of solidarism. More frequently, on the contrary, is the "principle of

---

[35] Letter to the directors of the Twenty-Fourth Social Week of France of 18 July 1947 on basic questions of the economic order in *UG,* 3250–57; here 3255.

[36] Address to the College of Cardinals of 20 February 1946 in *AAS* 38 (1946), 141–51; *UG,* 4086–4111; here 4094.

[37] The principle of solidarity was scientifically justified and presented especially by H. Pesch (d. 1926), G. Gundlach (d. 1963), and O. von Nell-Breuning, who also gave its social-science system the name of "Solidarism," which, however, was unable to impose itself.

fraternal solidarity" affirmed, both as an ontological as well as an ethical principle of action.[38]

4. The service function of society and of the state lies in promoting the common good. This does not consist, as corresponding to the individualistic concept, in the sum total of individual goods but has its own quality. It also does not oppose the just claims and expectations of individuals, but, as Pius XII said, the rights of the person pertain to the "most precious in the common good" (*UG*, 359).[39] But it is the task of the state to reduce the often egoistic claims to one measure to be expected of and tolerable to all. To this extent the idea and realization of the common good stand against the pure standpoint of interest and power.

There have been controversies as to whether the common good is to be defined in the sense of *bona communia,* hence primarily in regard to content, or whether rather it aims at the making possible of *bene vivere in communitate,* that is, at the organizational side of society. The question is not only of academic interest, since in a pluralistic society a consensus as to the content of the common good, apart perhaps from the *minima moralia,* may be difficult to reach and besides in an ideologically colored dictatorship the content of the common good can be decreed in a totalitarian fashion—common good=good of the German people=good of the Aryan race. Both Pius XII and John XXIII stressed the primarily organizational function of the common good. This appears clearly from the descriptive definition which John XXIII gives in *Mater et Magistra.* According to the "correct notion of the common good," this embraces "the aggregate of those social presuppositions which make possible or easier to people the full development of their values" (*Mater et Magistra,* 65). From this definition it follows that the content or "values" do not belong primarily to the common good, that this rather presupposes them and should make possible and promote their development. Exactly in this sense had G. Gundlach, the adviser of Pius XII of long standing, already interpreted the common good in his commentary on Pius XII's Christmas address of 24 December 1942,[40] when, characterizing the common good as "organizing element," he declared it to be impossible "that the organizing element as such determines that which is to be organized, which ideally presupposes it, namely, the inner structure of social life with the objective 'common goods' (the person with the cultural and religious values)."[41]

---

[38] As regards the matter, the principle of solidarity occupies much space in the first encyclical of Pius XII, *Summi Pontificatus* of 20 October 1939 (*AAS* 31 [1939], 413–53; *UG,* 1–92; here, especially 25–37; cf. also *UG,* 3293–94 from the Christmas message of 24 December 1952 in *AAS* 45 [1953], 33–46; see also *Pacem in terris,* 114, 117ff.).

[39] See n. 30.

[40] In *Periodica* 32 (1943), 79–96 and 216–24. Here according to G. Gundlach, S. J. *Die Ordnung der menschlichen Gesellschaft* I (Cologne 1964) 108–27.

Thus the circle again ends with the individual, whose development ultimately serves the common good. Thus the common good is the correct organizing principle—in the sense of becoming—or, respectively, as the correct organization—in the sense of being—of society, a view which is possible only with regard to society's subsidiary and solidarist character. Thereby all principles of the Catholic social doctrine culminate in the common good.

5. There is no encyclical in which the common good is so often and in such diverse connections appreciated and stipulated for a wholesome common life as in *Mater et Magistra.*[42] However, after it had been regarded in the past predominantly under the aspect of the national state—the state as primary guarantor of the common good—after the early peace efforts of Benedict XV and Pius XI, under the growing impression of the "unification of the world," the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, and the problem of underdeveloped countries, the idea of a world common good more and more gained ground. Pius XII saw in the relations to the other states an integrating part of the internal common good. "Serve," he said to journalists, "it [your people and state], however, in the conviction that its good relations to other nations, the understanding of their peculiarity, and the respect for their rights belong equally to the *bonum commune* of your own people and more effectively prepare for and consolidate peace as many another means."[43] Finally, John XXIII speaks clearly of the "universal common good" (*Pacem in terris,* 132ff.), from which he deduces the necessity of a world state with "universal political power" (*Pacem in terris,* 137). But even on this high plane the human person must remain the ultimate goal of all social life. "Just as the common good of individual states cannot be defined without regard to the human person, so also not the universal common good of all nations together" (*Pacem in terris,* 139). Thereby, once again the personalist character of Catholic social doctrine is proclaimed in unmistakable clarity.

---

[41] Ibid., 114.

[42] Cf. E. Welty, *Die Sozialenzyklika Papst Johannes' XXIII. "Mater et Magistra," mit einem ausführlichen Kommentar sowie einer Einführung in die Soziallehre der Päpste* (Herderbücherei 110) (Freiburg i. Br. 1961), 74f., especially also the index: keywords "Gemeinwohl" and "Gemeinwohlgerechtigkeit," 215.

[43] Address to the members of the Union of the Foreign Press in Rome of 12 May 1953 in *AAS* 45 (1953), 399–402; *UG,* 2119–31; here, 2129.

State and State Power—Democracy

The most important theological principles concerning state, state power, and common good as the goal of the state had been elaborated in a long tradition to the end of the pontificate of Leo XIII in their basic features. To these belong especially the tracing back of state and state power to God as the Creator of socially oriented humanity and the binding of state power in regard to the maintenance of the common good to the natural law as expression of the *Lex aeterna.* Questions about the best form of state and government could play a subordinate role in a simple theoretical structural grid that confined itself more to principle.

The Popes since Benedict XV could assume all this as known in essentials and as the certain doctrine of the Church. A brief recapitulation in the appropriate context was sufficient. But meanwhile the new and pressing questions had to do with a detailed specialization of the tasks of the state in view of the totalitarian developments since the First World War, a nuanced justification of state power under the presuppositions of a modern democracy, the question of the functional conditions of democracy in general, and finally the problem of moral norms in a pluralistic democratic society. Thus were the essential themes of the Church's political doctrine designated in the first half of the twentieth century.

1. As regards the end of the state, it was defined by all Popes since Pius XI unambiguously in the light of the social principles further developed above. Especially in connection with the totalitarian movements Pius XI underlined the instrumental character of the state as well as of society in general in relation to the human person. This is nothing else than "a natural means which one can and should use to achieve his goal; for human society exists for people and not vice versa."[44] Pius XII more precisely stated the task of the state in enjoining on it the protection of the rights of the human person (*UG,* 3455).[45] In this sense the state is primarily a state of law for the guaranteeing of the areas of personal freedom of the citizens. It is at the same time a welfare state, without, however, having to be a state affording total relief; for law and justice oblige it to undertake all political and socio-political measures only with consideration of private initiative, that is, in accord with the principle of subsidiarity. Pius XII warned against the relief state ("Etat-Providence"), "which should grant to each of its citizens for

---

[44] Thus Pius XI in his encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* of 19 March 1937 against atheistic Communism.

[45] Address to the public administration scholars on the meaning and limits of state interference of 5 August 1950 in *UG,* 3450–57.

all the vicissitudes of life claims to achievements that are ultimately unrealizable" (*UG*, 3270).[46] Pius XII also regarded the state only as a means—it is "subordinate to the person and has the sense of a means" (*UG*, 3763)—and rejected all state planning (*UG*, 6120).[47] But these considerations in no way exclude the acknowledgment of the necessity of a state authority capable of functioning and equipped with power. In an address to a group of the Youth Union of the Christian Democratic Union of West Berlin on 28 May 1957 Pius XII characterized this acknowledgment precisely as an expression of a "Christian" concept of politics. "The state is not an ultimate, and there is no state omnipotence, but only a state power, and 'Christian politics' has a strong feeling for it. For without power the state cannot accomplish its goal of assuring and promoting the common good by means of a legal and social order adhered to by all" (*UG*, 6250).[48]

John XXIII, who, as noted earlier, stressed the principle of subsidiarity more from its "positive" side—"help from above to below"—expressly says that the state must intervene in the economy "today to a more comprehensive degree than before" (*Mater et Magistra*, 103), that it "more and more penetrates areas which pertain to the most personal concerns of mankind and" are "therefore of the greatest importance" (*Mater et Magistra*, 60). But at the same time the limits of its competence are imposed on the state. They lie, to give a few examples, in the common good (*Mater et Magistra*, 65, 147, 151), in the fundamental rights of the person and the autonomy of the free social groups (*Mater et Magistra*, 52, 65), in the principle of subsidiarity—or, respectively, in its "defensive" function (*Mater et Magistra*, 53, 117, 152)—in the God-given arrangement and obligation of values (*Mater et Magistra*, 205ff.). In order that the state may remain a state of law under modern conditions, which is expressly to be emphasized, John XXIII regards the separation of powers—"that threefold classification of offices"—as "appropriate to human nature" (*Pacem in terris*, 68). This is the first time that the separation of powers was expressly mentioned in papal social teaching.

2. As regards the legitimization of the concrete agents of state power at a given time, over and above the theological and natural law derivation of the state's authority in general, Leo XIII in his encyclical *Diuturnum illud*[49] strongly repudiated the liberal thesis that "all power

---

[46] Address to the participants in the International Congress for Social Science of 2 June 1950 in *AAS* 42 (1950), 485–88; *UG*, 3258–72.

[47] Address to the Italian Society for Water Supply on the superiority and tasks of private initiative in the life of society of 13 April 1956 in *UG*, 6118–24.

[48] *AAS* 49 (1957), 287f.; *UG*, 6249–52.

[49] Of 29 June 1881 in *ASS* 14 (1881f.), 3–14.

proceeds from the people." What Leo intended to strike at is clear, namely, the "Contract Thesis," according to which—without any reference to God as the Creator of mankind and its society—the autonomous individuals creatively produce the state, as though in a quasi-contract (Rousseau's *contrat social*), and hence naturally possess also the absolute right in relation to the appointment of the holder of state power.

Since the republican problem was now in hand because of his *Ralliément* policy, Leo XIII sought to aid himself with the construction in order that the people of the state might indeed have the possibility of "designating"—the "Designation Theory"—the actual holders of state power but not of appointing and commissioning them—the "Delegation Theory"—in order that the real investiture might follow, as it were, rather from God as Creator of the state. In this way the possibility of a compromise between the republican type of state on the one hand and the connection of state power to its divine origin on the other hand seemed to be maintained. Despite this compromise, whose difficult theological background considerations could not, of course, be comprehended by the theologically less trained wider public, there remained until today a strong mistrust of Leo XIII's attitude to the republic and to democracy. In this context the old Scholastic doctrine, of Thomas Aquinas in its beginnings and fully developed by Francisco Suárez, of the sovereignty of the people unified in the state would have offered itself spontaneously. Pius XII mentions the doctrine, though only *en passant,* when he speaks of the "thesis which outstanding Christian thinkers at all times have championed," the "principal thesis of democracy," that "the original agent of the political power coming from God [is] the people, not the 'mass' " (*UG,* 2715).[50]

3. This raises the question of democracy in the Church's social doctrine. As late as the time of John XXIII the basic principle was repeated that it cannot "be decided once and for all which type of state is the more suitable or which is the most appropriate manner in which the state power fulfills its task" (*Pacem in terris,* 67); for the "necessities of life of any sound community" "are fulfilled or at least can be fulfilled under the same conditions as in other [than democratic] types of government conformable to law" (*UG,* 2713).[51] Apart from this traditional principle,[52] Pius XII testified to a clear sympathy for peoples

---

[50] Address to the Sacred Roman Rota of 2 October 1945 on the difference between the ecclesiastical and the civil jurisdiction in *AAS* 37 (1945), 256–62; *UG,* 2702–24.

[51] Ibid.

[52] That tradition in general can also become a fetter was expressed by the Anglican D. L. Munby in an article on *Gaudium et Spes,* in which he sees in it a "restriction" of the

who require "a system of government that is more in harmony with the dignity and liberty of the citizens" (*UG*, 3469).[53]

For Pius XII it especially mattered to ask which assumptions must be realized for the functioning of democracy. He saw before him the empty appearance of a purely formal democracy, which "serves only as a disguise for something wholly undemocratic" (*UG*, 3482). It must be noted that Pius XII stressed this in the radio address for the last Christmas of the war in 1944, hence on the eve of the foreseeable end of two dictatorships—Fascism and National Socialism—and of the possibility thereby being sketched of a democratic state constitution for the nations concerned after the war's end. The state, including the democratic, "does not mechanically contain and unite in itself a formless aggregation of individuals in a defined territory, it is and must be an organized and organizing unity of an actual people" (*UG*, 3475). This was said against the individualistic notion of democracy, according to which faceless abstract individuals join together politically. Pius calls it more often "mass" in contrast to "people." For him the state citizen as a person is always *personne située,* that is, a person to be seen in different social contexts.

Pius XII thereby recalls the fact especially annoying today that people are unequal for the most diverse reasons. But this in no way injures "the civic equality of rights"; it gives to each, "vis-à-vis the state,

---

Church's social doctrine "that continuity must be maintained, and hence new insights must be expressed in terms of old ideas. Some of them make themselves all too painfully noticeable in the text [of *Gaudium et Spes*]" ("Das Wirtschaftsleben im Urteil des Konzils und des Weltkirchenrates," *Oeconomia Humana. Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft auf dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil* [Cologne 1968], 461).

[53] Christmas message of 24 December 1944 in *AAS,* 37 (1945), 10–23; *UG,* 3467–3510. Here there is question of the most important address of Pius XII and probably in general of the Popes of modern times on the problem of "true democracy." The concept "democracy" was not always unambiguous in the Church's terminology. In the nineteenth century by "Christian democracy" was meant especially the rising social reform movement among Catholics of Western and Central European countries, which, however, was understood primarily as a "social" movement and did not necessarily coincide with the striving for "political democracy." After Leo XIII this linguistic use ceased and at the latest since Pius XII there has been understood by it, when there is talk of democracy, a political idea in the strict sense and not a general social concept. The demand for "democratization of all spheres of life," the slogan "democracy as life-style," often used as political war cries, have found no entry into the language of the Church and of Catholic social teaching. Catholic social doctrine sees the justified concern which is concealed behind these formulas, without conforming to their exaggerations, in the better application of its social principles—the principle of subsidiarity—and, more recent in terminology, in the realization of more "participation," "taking part" by all people in the process of the political, social, economic, and even ecclesiastical life, adequately, better, and objectively considered.

the right . . . to lead his own personal life in honor" (*UG,* 3478). In other words, the freedom of the person gives him the right to be "different" while maintaining intact the civic political equality of rights. That the continuation of such tension between the poles of freedom and equality needs, of course, the "genuine spirit of community and fraternity" (ibid) Pius knows and he thereby makes known that he does not overlook one of the three ideals of democracy which has meanwhile fallen into oblivion, namely the "principle of fraternity." The Christmas address of 1944 is thus a real comprehensive hermeneutic interpretation of the ideals of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" (cf. especially *UG,* 3478).

4. Leo XIII and Pius XI had already deduced, arguing from the fact that people are by nature unequal, that the state must be an organic functional structure in which a large plurality of various groups and institutions in their own right seek to realize the common good by means of the enclosing function of the state. Neither an antagonistic class society nor a faceless, classless society corresponds to this "organic" concept. In this context must be viewed the Pope's insistence on family and private property as areas of freedom of the person within the state, and also on the much abused "corporate order," which is better designated as "meritocracy." Pius XI contrasted the idea of the meritocracy to the economic social chaos into which liberalism had plunged society.[54] Since G. Gundlach had evidently already decisively assisted in preparing the idea for *Quadragesimo anno*[55] and strongly favored it until his death in 1963, it becomes clear why Pius XII also came back to it so frequently, while in *Mater et Magistra* John XXIII no longer spoke of it directly. However, he considered the plural diversity of social life and political compromise among groups as very necessary. But his allusion to the "present day" (*Mater et Magistra,* 66) should probably mean that there can be no permanently obligatory ideal solution. John thereby abandons the concrete model but not the fundamental idea of the "corporate order" when he demands that the social systems lead their own life and be able "really to develop by virtue of their own right" (*Mater et Magistra,* 65).

5. Only in outline can still other important presuppositions for the progress of democracy from the view of papal social teaching be

---

[54] Pius XI developed the idea in *Quadragesimo anno,* 81–87, immediately after the classic definition of the principle of subsidiarity (79–80), which, moreover, in this formulation goes back to G. Gundlach, S.J., since he saw in it an especially important case of applying the principle. Later he came back to it once more in *Divini Redemptoris.*

[55] Cf. also O. von Nell-Breuning, S.J., "Der Königswinterer Kreis und sein Anteil an *Quadragesimo anno,*" J. Broermann, P. Herder-Dorneich eds., *Soziale Verantwortung. Festschrift für Goetz Briefs zum 80. Geburtstag* (Berlin 1968), 571–85, especially 579ff.

mentioned: Democracy cannot rely exclusively on legal assurances, otherwise it is condemned to fall. It depends "on the moral character of the citizens" (*UG*, 4393).[56] From this it also follows—Pius XII thus addresses the problem of an élite for democracy—that precisely in a democracy high moral demands must be made on the holders of state power. Of course, those people "whose spiritual and moral predisposition is sufficiently sound and fruitful [will find] in themselves the spokesmen and overseers of democracy . . . men who personally live from those predispositions and understand how to transform themselves in fact" (*UG*, 3486).[57] Also important is the political education of the citizens, not only the instruction on the manner of operation of democratic institutions but especially the introduction "to the protection of their true interests and especially of their conscience" (*UG*, 1779).[58] Pius XII very urgently admonishes Christians to exercise the right to vote and elect, the neglect of which means a danger for democracy (*UG*, 4305).[59] Not least is it required that the Christian in a democracy make himself available for the construction of an enduring order of law and peace both within and without (*UG*, 180).[60]

6. As regards the relations of Church and state, Benedict XV in his address on the occasion of the secret consistory of 21 November 1921[61] had proclaimed the inalienable right of the Church to freedom from all state interference. Pius XI demanded, vis-à-vis the totalitarian states, the right of the citizens to free exercise of their faith[62] and the right of the Church to proclaim its message and to form consciences.[63] Pius XII spoke of a "legitimate laicism of the state" (*UG*, 4555),[64] which was always a principle of the Church. Nevertheless between Church and state there must not prevail a cool and separating atmosphere. A "complete" separation of the two cannot be approved (*UG*, 3985).[65] In other respects Pius XII does not tire of presenting the

---

[56] Christmas address of 23 December 1956 on the Christian image of mankind in *AAS* 49 (1957), 5–22; *UG*, 4377–4420.

[57] See n. 53.

[58] Address to the teachers and students of the Italian public normal schools of 19 March 1953 in *AAS* 45 (1953), 230–38; *UG*, 1771–91.

[59] Letter to the chairmen of the Forty-First Social Week of France of 14 July 1954 in *Osservatore Romano* of 21 July 1954; *UG*, 4296–4312.

[60] Letter to the Catholic Youth of Germany of 23 May 1952 in *AAS* 44 (1952), 527–31; *UG*, 168–82.

[61] Allocution *In hac quidem* of 21 November 1921 in *AAS* 13 (1921), 421–524.

[62] Encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge; M*, 311.

[63] Encyclical *Ubi Arcano; M*, 1130.

[64] Address to the Picene (=the Marches) People's Group of 23 March 1958 in *AAS* 50 (1958), 216–20; UG, 4545–55.

[65] Address to the Sacred Roman Rota of 29 October 1947 in *AAS* 39 (1947), 493–98; *UG*, 2744–58.

fortunate impact of the Church on the state (for example, *UG,* 4103f, 3450f.).[66]

The Church and the Social Errors of the Age

SOCIALISM–COMMUNISM

In the nineteenth century socialism became the chief adversary of the Church and of social Catholicism in the social sphere. While Leo XIII had had to deal essentially with a complete Marxist ideology,[67] which moreover had not yet acquired any political relevance of great importance, Pius XI could attest for socialism a development which he concisely sketched as follows: "If in Leo's time socialism was chiefly at least a homogeneous structure with a definitely complete doctrinal system, today it has developed in two sharply opposed and violently contending main trends, without, of course, having forsaken the anti-Christian basis common to all socialism."[68] Pius XI spoke of "socialism become Communism" and of the "more moderate direction which today the designation 'socialism' still retains."[69]

---

[66] Address to the College of Cardinals of 20 February 1946 in *AAS* 38 (1946), 141–51; *UG,* 4086–4111. Address to the public administration scholars of 5 August 1950 in *UG,* 3450–457.

[67] Cf. the encyclical *Quod Apostolici muneris* of 28 December 1878 in *AAS* 11 (1878), 369–76; *M,* 139–67; also the encyclical *Rerum novarum* of 15 May 1891 in *AAS* 23 (1890 seqq.), 641–70; *M,* 510–71, especially 514–17.

[68] *Quadragesimo anno,* 111.

[69] Ibid., 112f. "Socialism" (Communism) appears from the nineteenth century both as an idea and also in the form of political movements. The developments and increasing differentiations in the ideological sphere make it extraordinarily and in a growing degree difficult for the teaching authority of the Church to take a position on the "socialism" syndrome. While even under Pius XI the pretty thick category: Communism—"moderate" socialism (=revisionism, liberal-democratic socialism) could to a degree uncover the ideological and political reality, this is no longer sufficient for the period after the Second World War and especially since the 1960s, after Soviet Communism and Maoism became the great antagonists in world politics and Neo-Marxist currents spread into the public discussion and especially into the academic sphere. Precisely these latter obtained through the elaboration of the "Paris Manuscripts" of the young Marx from 1844—only rediscovered in 1932, in connection with the resistance to the Fascist and Nazi dictatorships that were then being established, indirectly by way of the United States since the 1960s—the greatest importance also in Europe. On this to the present there is no precise stand taken by the Church's teaching office, at most the warnings issued by Pope Paul VI because of the invasion of Neo-Marxism into various modern theologies—"Theology of Liberation," "Theology of Revolution," "Christians for Socialism," and the like—in his apostolic letter *Octogesima adveniens* of 14 May 1971 to Cardinal Maurice Roy against an all too thoughtless adoption "of Socialist tendencies and their various developments" by Christians (*Octogesima adveniens,* 31; cf. also the following numbers of the letter).

In *Quadragesimo anno* the Pope did not employ many words in the criticism of Communism, probably because among Christians and Catholics doubts in regard to it are scarcely possible. What especially characterizes Communism in the Pope's view is, first, the open and ruthless force with which it seeks its goal, then its hostility to God and Church. However, what concerned the Pope was the warning against the heedlessness of those "who, regardless of the danger threatening from this side, look on calmly as the exertions of a violent and bloody revolution are borne into the whole world" (*Quadragesimo anno,* 112). Just as he did to the two other totalitarian ideologies of his day, Fascism and National Socialism, Pius XI also devoted to "atheistic Communism" a special encyclical, which appeared on 19 March 1937 and began with the words *Divini Redemptoris.*[70] In it the Pope provided evidence that the Marxist doctrine at the basis of Communism experienced an expressly atheistic interpretation in dialectical materialism. In this way mankind was robbed of its freedom, the spiritual foundation of its human way of life and its dignity.

Pius XII also adhered clearly and unambiguously to his predecessor's express condemnation of the social system and the ideology of Communism. By means of decrees of the Holy Office of 1 July 1949 and 28 July 1950 not only membership in the Communist Party but even its promotion was threatened with excommunication.[71] The Pope could not conceive of the hope of "peaceful coexistence" with the Communist systems as a compromise but only as "coexistence in truth."[72] Blows against the rights of the Church, for the most part connected with persecution and imprisonment of leading bishops, were answered by the Pope with the excommunication of those responsible, as in the cases of the Yugoslav Archbishop Stepinac on 14 October 1946, the Hungarian Cardinal Mindszenty on 28 December 1948 and on 12 February 1949, of the Czech Cardinal Beran on 17 March 1951, and of the Polish Cardinal Wyszyński on 30 September 1953.

John XXIII put the accents differently. Not only that in the spring of 1963 he received in audience the son-in-law of the then first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist party, Nikita Khruschev, and that he sent Cardinal König of Vienna and an official of the Secretariat of State to Budapest and thereby took the first steps in the direction of a new Vatican "Eastern Policy"; in doctrinal evaluation he also sought cautious nuances. In his encyclical *Pacem in terris* he believed he could distinguish between the ideology of Marxism-socialism on the one hand and certain humane concerns on the other. He wrote: [It is] "entirely appropriate to distinguish specific movements which deal with economic, social, cultural questions or policy from false philosophical doctrinal views on the nature, origin, and end of the world and of mankind, even if these movements originated in such doctrinal views and are stirred up by them.[73]

---

[70] *AAS* 29 (1937), 65–105; *M,* 168–247.

[71] Decree of the Holy Office on membership in the Communist Party of 1 July 1949 in *AAS* 41 (1949), 334; Decree of the Holy Office on membership in Communist Youth Organizations of 28 July 1950 in *AAS* 42 (1950), 533; cf. other pertinent documents in *HK* 13 (1958 seqq.), 2, 69.

[72] Christmas message of 24 December 1954 in *AAS* 47 (1955), 15–28; *UG,* 6307–39.

The years of the "Dialogue between Christianity and Marxism" starting after John XXIII, the breaches in the dike, which occurred in various parts of the world in the form of a "Theology of Revolution," "Liberation Theology" on a Marxist basis, led Paul VI, in order to round out the picture, to warn of a confusion of Christianity and Marxism. And so he wrote in his apostolic letter *Octogesima adveniens* of 17 May 1971—the eightieth anniversary of *Rerum novarum*—: "If in Marxism as it is concretely lived these different facets and questions can be distinguished which present themselves positively for the reflection and action of Christians, it would be foolish and dangerous to reach the point where one forgets the inner bond which basically joins them together, that one adopts the elements of the Marxist analysis without recognizing its relations with the ideology and participates in the class struggle and appropriates its Marxist interpretation while neglecting to perceive the type of totalitarian and brutal society to which this method of proceeding leads."[74]

Quite different and more difficult for the discussion within the Church was the prolonged confrontation with what Pius XI in *Quadragesimo anno* had termed the "moderate trend" in socialism. Again and again the discussion was enkindled by two central statements of the Pope: "Socialism, no matter whether as doctrine, as historical phenomenon, or as movement, . . . is always irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Catholic Church—for then it would have to cease to be socialism: the opposition between Socialist and Christian notions of society is irreconcilable."[75] "If socialism, like any error, also contains something right, which the Popes have never denied, still at its foundation lies a concept of society which is proper to it but stands in opposition to the authentic Christian concept. Religious socialism and Christian socialism are contradictions in themselves; it is impossible to be simultaneously a good Catholic and a real Socialist."[76]

---

[73] *Pacem in terris,* 159; especially this passage was at that time applauded by Communist states. The Polish Communists had a larger than life-size statue erected to the "Pope of the peace encyclical" on the Oder at Wroclaw near the church of "Mary of the Sand," which can still be seen there.

[74] Apostolic letter *Octogesima adveniens* of 14 May 1971; *AAS* 63 (1971), 401–41.

[75] *Quadragesimo anno,* 117.

That the discussion, especially in Germany, did not get more strongly under way until after 1945 and then especially since the "Godesberg Program" of the Social Democratic Party of Germany is explained, first, by the fact that during the period of National Socialism public discussion was not possible, and, second, by the fact that the Social Democratic Party, in its effort to change from a class party to a popular party with its program of 1959, especially had to assure the Catholic part of the population that the socialism which Pius XI had meant in *Quadragesimo anno* had nothing in common with the Social Democratic Party after the Second World War.

The just quoted verdict of Pius XI against socialism appeared with the claim of being able to say with certainty what socialism really is. According to Pius XI the special ideological nucleus of socialism, which makes it what it is, is not Marxism or class conflict, but, as it is put tersely in the just quoted passage from *Quadragesimo anno,* "a concept of society . . . which is proper to it but stands in opposition to the authentic Christian concept." The unmistakably proper basic axioms as regards the Christian notion of society are according to *Quadragesimo anno,* 118f.: the human being was created by God as a person with his social nature, in his own image; also the necessary social authority is based ultimately in God, the Creator of mankind and final end of all things. Also, the commentary of the encyclical: "Of all this, socialism knows nothing; completely unfamiliar and indifferent to it is this exalted definition of both mankind and society; it sees in society solely a useful institution."[77]

The claim to know what socialism is and to repudiate it as such was accordingly based by Pius XI on the incontestable fact that socialism was indebted to an ideological liberalism which withdrew mankind and its sociability from its origin and reference to God and thereby drove it to a road which the Christian could no longer accept. O. von Nell-Breuning expressed it thus: "With good reason socialism is called 'the natural child of liberalism'" or, respectively, "proletarian liberalism."[78]

Pius XII said nothing on the theme of "moderate" or "liberal" socialism which went beyond Pius XI. In regard to him it can be admitted that from his viewpoint he had to add nothing essential to the verdict of *Quadragesimo anno.*

In the years around the death of Pius XII (1958–59) falls a period of heightened discussions of the relations of Christianity and socialism, especially of the Catholic Church and liberal socialism. The meeting of the Catholic Academy in Bavaria on "Christianity and Democratic Socialism" in January 1958 became a much noticed event in the political life of the Federal Republic of Germany: at it for the first time representatives of the Social Democratic Party and of German social Catholicism met to undertake the effort to demolish the traditional oppositions which were not for the last time still determined by the verdict of *Quadragesimo anno.* The leader on the Catholic side at this meeting was the adviser of Pius XII, the German Jesuit Gustav Gundlach, lecturer at the Gregoriana in Rome. He obtained such great attention because, to the general amazement, he came to terms in much greater detail with the rationalism in socialism, and even in liberal socialism, than with Marxism, so that, as the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* then reported dumbfoundedly, he "scarcely mentioned Marx's name, but instead all the more took offense at the liberal element in social democracy."[79]

---

[76] Ibid., 120.

[77] Ibid., 118.

[78] Cf. K. Forster, ed., *Christentum und demokratischer Sozialismus* (Munich 1958).

But in this way the chief item of criticism was identical with what *Quadragesimo Anno* had also criticized, and the burden of proof that this criticism was wrong lay with the Social Democrats and those Catholics who exerted themselves to build bridges.

In two documents addressed to the German Catholics[80] an attempt was made to effect for the socialism of the Godesberg Program a Catholic approval and a revision of the harsh "no" of the encyclical *Quadragesimo anno.* Naturally, the manner of argumentation was criticized. All unsuitable passages were omitted as clearly disturbing, especially the central text in 118 on the picture of mankind, on the *humanum* as the normative force of all politics.

The leading Catholic social theologians of the day, G. Gundlach and O. von Nell-Breuning, were in agreement in their estimation of the Godesberg Program. The latter stressed the fundamental differentiation from the Christian beginning when in 1960 he unmistakably declared in the first of the two above mentioned brochures of the Social Democratic Party:[81] "Much, it may be said, very much is common, but still not everything. . . . It is especially to be asked—and here our 'but' is inserted. . . . May one, while reading the encyclical, end with

---

[79] *Süddeutsche Zeitung* of 13 January 1958. On the meeting of the Catholic Academy in Bavaria and its background, cf. for details J. Schwarte, *Gustav Gundlach, S.J. (1892–1963). Massgeblicher Repräsentant der katholischen Soziallehre während der Pontifikate Pius' XI. und Pius' XII* (Diss. Münster 1974; abbreviated printed ed. Münster 1975).

[80] *Der Katholik und die SPD* (Bonn 1959); *Katholik und Godesberger Programm. Zur Situation nach Mater et Magistra* (Bonn 1962).

[81] O. von Nell-Breuning, S.J., "Der Katholik und die SPD," *Echo der Zeit,* no. 7 of 14 February 1960, 1f.

Number 120 and pass over the subsequent paragraphs as not present?" (Numbers 118 and 119 on the Christian view of mankind had also been disregarded.) "Nevertheless," continues von Nell-Breuning, "the title to Numbers 121–22, 'Cultural Socialism,' should catch the eye . . . and the concluding words of 122: 'At the beginning of this cultural socialism stands cultural liberalism; at its end stands cultural Bolshevism.' " Accordingly the answer to the quest for a Catholic approval can logically only fail: "But in the cultural area—and ultimately society and economy are cultural affairs—liberal democratic socialism must first rid itself of its liberal [liberalistic] legacy." A "new edition will then be able to bring that decisively important element which not by chance is apparently lacking in the present one, but in accord with the situation of affairs must unfortunately be lacking." However, the document of 1962 did not bring, in this regard, the "decisively important element," namely, the renunciation of the "liberalistic legacy," and so up to the present for many it is not clear that the "no" of *Quadragesimo anno* to ideological socialism could be overcome in the form of cultural socialism.

Also the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* of 1961 brought no essentially new aspects for the further discussion and hence no alleviation for the discussion. At first John XXIII adopted the repudiating attitude of *Quadragesimo anno* to the "more moderate," revisionist socialism (*Mater et Magistra,* 34). Later he spoke of "ideologies" which aim to eliminate inner social and international tensions with inadequate means and on false routes, because they possess no correct picture of mankind.[82] And so the discussion of the Church and liberal socialism remained for the future on the agenda beyond John XXIII and the council.

FASCISM–NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Whereas Communism and socialism not only still exist but have experienced a powerful expansion in the whole world and have penetrated with their ideology even into theology and partly into the Church, Italian Fascism and National Socialism, with which Pius XI had to deal, did not survive the end of the Second World War.

Italian Fascism[83] under the leadership of the "Duce" Mussolini never assumed so rigid and ideologically monistic a position as did its counterpart in Germany and its opponent in Russia. Nevertheless, one can designate as its ideological nucleus, under the influence of Hegel and of his Fascist interpreter, Giovanni Gentile (d. 1944), who was minister of education from 1922 to 1925 and in 1923 was responsible for the Fascist reform of education, the Hegelian doctrine of the total state. "La nazione" became the key idea. This involved internally a strong, antiliberal, collectivist policy, and externally imperial claims around the Mediterranean—"Mare nostro": annexation of Libya and Ethiopia and occupation of Albania and Greece during the Second World War. The "Dottrina del Fascismo" culminated in the profession of a national imperialism.[84]

---

[82] Cf. on this: *Die Sozialenzyklika Papst Johannes' XXIII. Mater et Magistra,* ed. by E. Welty, 144 (*Komm. zu MM,* 110) and 190f. (*Komm. zu MM,* 213).

[83] Cf. E. Nolte, *Die faschistischen Bewegungen* (*dtv-Weltgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts*) (Munich 1973). In contrast to National Socialism, "Fascism" in the period after the Second World War, especially in the socialist camp, had moved beyond its concrete historical form of Italian Fascism to become a generic and systematic concept with a glittering content. It corresponded, according to Karl D. Bracher, to the need to find a counter-idea to Communism, socialism, and democracy. However, an even

The preindividualistic, preliberal, and pre-Fascist values of the family, the people, and the Church, or religion, respectively, worked to consolidate the national idea in the interior sphere. And so Fascism's attitude toward the Church was at first entirely friendly, and Mussolini esteemed it as especially a national cultural agent. And so, following two and one-half years of discussions there occurred the solution of the so-called "Roman Question" and a concordat in the Lateran Treaties of 11 February 1929. The Catholic religion was confirmed as the religion of the Italian state. Nevertheless, there ensued strong tensions, because the total "ethical state" claimed for itself exclusively all rights in the area of education and of youth work and hence curtailed the Church's influence. Only a few months after the conclusion of the Lateran Treaties Pius XI, in a letter of 30 May 1929 to Cardinal Secretary of State Gasparri, attacked the totalitarian interpretation of the treaties by the Fascist state. In the winter of 1930 began Fascism's struggle against "Catholic Action" and in March 1931 open war broke out over the

---

more important role is played by "the growing rejection of the Western liberal theory of totalitarianism in so far as this is based on the comparability of the dictatorships of the right and the left, especially of Fascism, National Socialism, Stalinism, and recently also Maoism; its scheme of the confrontation of democracy and dictatorship is, really simplifying it, suspect as an invention of the Cold War and should be supplanted by the of course no less pithy opposition of Socialism-Fascism" (Karl D. Bracher, "Der Faschismus," *Meyers Enzyklopädisches Lexikon* 8 [Bibliographisches Institut Mannheim, Vienna and Zürich 1973], 547–51; cf. also Dieter Albrecht, "Zum Begriff des Totalitarismus," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 26 [Stuttgart 1975], 135–41). On this idea of Fascism, constructed for propaganda purposes especially by the East, there is no direct position of the teaching authority. Indirect criticism is contained in the critical position on the violations of human rights or totalitarian social forms.

[84] Cf. "Faschismus," *Staatslexikon*, 3, 6th ed. (1959), 223–31; also, "Faschismus," *LThK* 4, 2d ed. (1960), 29–31.

autonomy of the Catholic youth organizations. This produced the encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* of 29 June 1931,[85] in which the Pope spelled out his fiery protest against the limiting of ecclesiastical activities in public life and against the unilateral interpretation of the Lateran Treaties. The reaction on the part of Fascism was marked by deep emotions against the Church.[86] After the dust which had been raised by the encyclical had settled, there came about on 2 September 1931 an agreement whereby the Catholic youth organizations were restricted to religious and educational tasks.

In *Quadragesimo anno*[87] Pius XI attacked Fascist corporatism, the politically monopolistic compulsory organization of employers and employees.

A still more dangerous opponent of the Church sprang up in Germany with the seizure of power by National Socialism in 1933.[88] In contradistinction to Italian Fascism, which essentially disavowed a political theology of its own, National Socialism understood itself as a doctrine of salvation of racist and nationalist style, which raised a total claim to the soul of the German person.

Although in the effort soon to realize a first very important foreign policy success Hitler was able to reach a concordat with the Holy See on 20 July 1933, confrontations were not slow in coming. In addition to the malicious struggle against the Christian faith with all the means of propaganda and of administration, there was especially the "neo-pagan" doctrine, there were the scientifically totally unqualified expositions of revealed religion and its origins in the Old Testament—Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich-Freising: *Judentum-Christentum-Germanentum*—

---

[85] *AAS* 23 (1931), 285–312; *M,* 248–98.

[86] In the *Gazzetta,* the official organ of the Fascist Party of Calabria and Sicily, one could read on 12 July 1931 the sentence: "Se il Duce ci ordinasse di fucilare tutti i vescovi non esisteremmo un istante." On the entire matter, cf. also the introduction to *Non abbiamo bisogno* in I. Giordani, ed., *Le encicliche sociali dei Pape da Pio XI a Pio XII,* 3d ed. (1948), 421–24.

[87] The Pope sees the essential difference from the "corporate order" favored by him in the statism of the Fascist solution (cf. *Quadragesimo anno,* 91–95). The Pope shares the "apprehension" of those who think that "the state puts itself in the place of free self-activity," the new corporative constitution has "an extremely bureaucratic and political emphasis" (ibid., 95).

[88] B. Stasiewski, *Akten deutscher Bischöfe über die Lage der Kirche 1933–1945* 1: *1933–1934* (Mainz 1968), 2: *1934–1935* (Mainz 1976), 3: *1935–1936* (Mainz 1978); H. Boberach, *Berichte des SD und der Gestapo über Kirchen und Kirchenvolk in Deutschland 1934–1944* (Mainz 1971); "Nationalsozialismus," *Staatslexikon* 5, 6th ed. (1960), 905–23; "Nationalsozialismus," *LThK* 7, 2d ed. (1962), 802–5; "Katholische Kirche und Nationalsozialismus," *Staatslexikon* 10, 6th ed. (1970): cf. especially the collaborative volume, D. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich* (Mainz 1976), with bibliography and a voluminous report on the research.

which provoked the Church to resistance. On 14 March 1937, five days before the encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* against atheistic Communism—a timely coincidence in which can be seen a clever, tactical move—the Pope published in German the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge,*[89] in whose first, ecclesio-political part he protested against the "treaty reinterpretation, treaty evasion, treaty undermining, and treaty violation" in relation to the concordat, while in the second, religious part he expressly took to task the teachings of National Socialism: racial delusion, myth of "blood and soil," the principle that "that is right which benefits the [German] people," the effort to create a German national Church not bound to Rome. A quite mild protest by the German ambassador at the Holy See, Diego von Bergen, was rejected by the cardinal secretary of state.

With the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge,* Pius XI thought he had taken only a first step in the confrontation with racism. Racism appeared to him as an especially virulent ideology against the religiously based unity of the human species. Thus it was made known through a sensational publication from the pen of Thomas Breslin in *The National Catholic Reporter* of 15 December 1972 and 19 January 1973 to a wide public that Pius XI had on 22 June 1938 commissioned an encyclical, the outline of which was supplied by the American Jesuit John LaFarge and by Gustav Gundlach under the title "Societatis Unio."[90] Because of the change in the See of Peter in March 1939 this encyclical was never published.

In his address to the College of Cardinals of 2 June 1945[91] Pius XII dealt in detail with National Socialism and its consequences for the future. His repeatedly presented appeals toward the end of the war not to impose the war released by Fascism and National Socialism and the crimes perpetrated by them as a moral burden on entire peoples—the "collective guilt thesis"—[92] attracted notice. He thereby already led across to the theme of the understanding of peoples after the war.

---

[89] *AAS* 29 (1937), 145–67; M, 299–315.

[90] On the background which induced Pius XI to publish a special encyclical against racism and on the preliminaries to a draft, cf. the detailed presentation in J. Schwarte, op. cit., 72–100; there see also a detailed indication of the content of the draft of the encyclical from the pen of G. Gundlach. S.J., 88–94.

[91] *AAS* 37 (1945), 159–68; *UG,* 3531–48.

[92] Thus in the address to the College of Cardinals on the Pope's nameday, 2 June 1944 in *AAS* 36 (1944), 166–75; *UG,* 4236–65; here, 4258; also in the Christmas message of 24 December 1944 in *AAS* 37 (1945), 10–23; *UG,* 3467–3510, here 3500.

Understanding of Peoples: "World State"

In his exertions for peace after the outbreak of the First World War, Benedict XV had again and again referred to the moral force of law vis-à-vis the power of weapons. He was especially concerned further to develop international law on the basis of moral norms and also to inculcate international institutional provisions for a lasting order of peace.[93]

Although the pontificate of Pius XI was not troubled by a world war, still the Pope suffered severely from the consequences of the First World War and the preparedness for war, by no means eliminated from the world but on the contrary renewing itself, with the prospect of an even more terrible war. For this reason he based both his election motto "Pax Christi in Regno Christi" and his first encyclical *Ubi arcano* of 23 December 1922[94] entirely on the idea of peace and of the understanding of nations. The Pope complained that there was "no human tribunal which could oblige all nations to an international law code in accord with the time."[95] The Pope discreetly offered the aid of the Church, which could be understood entirely in the sense of an arbitration function.[96]

After all the efforts to arrive at an understanding by means of the League of Nations and the Pan-European movement had foundered, after a catastrophic Second World War had afflicted humanity in extensive parts of the world, the Popes of the war and postwar periods saw one of their chief tasks in taking a stand with their means and possibilities for the understanding of peoples. Pius XII considered it as the "special mission" of his pontificate "to contribute in patient and almost grinding activity to leading humanity back to the paths of peace."[97] The Pope demanded an organization of the community of nations with the character of a federation. Into this community must be inserted the sovereign rights of the individual nations "in the framework of international law."[98] Hence, to be repudiated is a principle of the national state which "consists [in] the confusing of national life with nationalistic policy"; for "the national life [is] something nonpolitical,

---

[93] Cf. his admonition to peace "Dès le début" of 1 August 1917 in *AAS* 9 (1917), 417–20; *M,* 1083–93.

[94] *AAS* 14 (1922), 673–700; *M,* 1094–1160.

[95] *M,* 1132.

[96] *M,* 1133. It is noteworthy that Pius XI had no relations with the League of Nations, which had met at Geneva since 1920 at the suggestion of President Wilson.

[97] Christmas message of 24 December 1955 in *AAS* 48 (1956), 26–41; *UG,* 6340–74.

[98] Address to the Association of Catholic Jurists of Italy of 6 December 1953 in *AAS* 45 (1953), 794–802; *UG,* 3963–86, here 3967.

. . . which only then [became] the principle of the dissolution of the community of nations when people began to exploit it as a means to political ends."[99]

The community of nations presupposes another concept of sovereignty than that of nationalism. The individual state is no longer "sovereign" in the sense of absolute absence of restraints.[100] It is subordinate to international law but not to the extent that it thereby completely loses its independence. Pius XII emphasized that even international law is subject to natural law. Corresponding to his ontological, natural law beginning, questions of national statehood, of sovereignty and its limits, of international association, are not left to the good pleasure of peoples but are determined by the "nature of the thing" in the historical context of the moment. Hence, agreements among states, though belonging formally to positive law, oblige by virtue of natural law if "they contain nothing which would be contrary to sound morality."[101] Pius XII regarded the present organization of nations, the United Nations, in its early stage as not yet ideal, since it had come into being on a "war solidarity" rather than on a true solidarity.[102] However, he said it was an expression of the wish of peoples for a more jointly responsible cooperation, it is a possibility "of speaking to the world conscience from an elevated spot."[103]

Pius XII followed with special sympathy the efforts for unification in Europe, in fact he saw in the unification of Europe "one of the concrete demands of the hour, one of the means of assuring peace to the entire world."[104] He spoke of the "risk" of Europe and stressed that it "is a question of a necessary risk, of a risk, however, which is in accord with current possibilities, of a reasonable risk."[105] As early as 1940 the Pope had seen in a new, united Europe a model for the unity of the family of nations, the possible "start of a new world epoch."[106]

---

[99] Christmas message of 24 December 1954 in *AAS* 47 (1955), 15–28; *UG*, 6307–39, here 6326.

[100] As in n. 98 in *UG*, 3967.

[101] Address to the "Centro Italiano di Studi per la Riconciliazione Internazionale" of 13 October 1955 in *AAS* 47 (1955), 764–75; *UG*, 6275–99, here 6287.

[102] Christmas address to the College of Cardinals of 24 December 1948 in *AAS* 41 (1949), 5–15; *UG*, 4133–57, here 4150.

[103] Address of 28 October 1947 to the ambassador of El Salvador in *AAS* 39 (1947), 491–93.

[104] Christmas message of 23 December 1956 in *AAS* 49 (1957), 5–22; *UG*, 4377–4420, here 4411.

[105] Christmas message of 23 December 1953 in *AAS* 46 (1954), 5–16; *UG*, 654–78, here 674.

[106] Christmas address to the College of Cardinals of 24 December 1940 in *AAS* 33 (1941), 5–14; *UG*, 3567–93, here 3582.

If Pius XII had already again and again implored solidarity for a beneficial international order of peace, John XXIII energetically carried this idea further, especially in his encyclical *Pacem in terris.* "Since the reciprocal relations of states should be regulated in conformity with truth and justice, they must be especially promoted by energetic solidarity. . . . With reference to this, we must keep before our eyes that the state's power was instituted, by its very nature, not to force people into the limits of the existing political community, but especially to look out for the common welfare of the state, which can certainly not be separated from that of the entire human family" (*Pacem in terris,* 98).

The Pope was convinced that "considering the present state of human society, both the political organization as also the influence of which the individual state power disposes in relation to all other nations of the world [are] to be regarded as inadequate to foster the common good of all peoples" (*Pacem in terris,* 135). From this "there follows conclusively for the sake of the moral order that a universal political power must be instituted" (*Pacem in terris,* 137), in other words, that mankind must come to a sort of world state. But the Pope knew that such a general political power, which should lead to a "universal common good" must "be based on the agreement of all peoples and not be imposed by force" (*Pacem in terris,* 138). And for such a "world state" the principle of subsidiarity must hold good, by which "those relationships are regulated which exist between the authority of the universal political power and the state power of individual nations" (*Pacem in terris,* 140).

The Pope regarded as important steps, even if not without criticism, the founding of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948 (*Pacem in terris,* 142f.). In an effort to manifest the Holy See's active interest in an international order of peace, even on the institutional side, he maintained representatives, usually through so-called permanent observers, at many international organizations, including the United Nations and UNESCO, to which, during his time as nuncio at Paris, John XXIII had been assigned as the first permanent observer.

The problem of the underdeveloped countries, which came more clearly in view under Pius XII, experienced under John XXIII a special attention in his two social encyclicals, *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in terris.* Finally, Paul VI expressed the thorny problem in the concise formula: "Development, the new name for peace."[107]

---

[107] Encyclical *Populorum progressio* of 26 March 1967. Heading to 76ff.

CHAPTER 8

*Main Lines of the Development of Theology between the First World War and the Second Vatican Council**

The Departure from Neo-Scholasticism in Systematic Theology

TEMPORAL AND INTELLECTUAL PRESUPPOSITIONS

The end of the First World War did not produce for Catholic theology that epochal radical change that occurred on the Protestant side, especially in Germany, and became visible as a radical turning from liberal to dialectical theology,[1] from cultural Protestantism to neoorthodoxy.[2] In accord with the stronger forces of continuity in Catholicism, which had grown further through the defense against Modernism, here the further development took place not in dialectical leaps but in a continuous development and in positive progress. Hence at the beginning of this period the effects of the First Vatican Council and the not always positive result of the Modernist controversy became still more clearly discernible. As regards the negative consequences of the suppression of Modernism for Catholic theology, the verdict of R. Aubert must be noted, that "the total balance . . . was less negative than has often been claimed." This applies especially to German theology, which around the turn of the century, it is true, discussed problems raised with the so-called Reform Catholicism,[3] but was not seized by the highest waves of this crisis. The position and the general assessment of this theology, represented especially by the university faculties, in the awareness of the age can be characterized by the fact, episodic to be sure, but still not entirely untypical, that in connection with an inquiry internally organized at some universities in regard to the elimination or retention of the theological faculties the overwhelming majority of professors of the profane disciplines expressed themselves for retention.[4]

---

* Leo Scheffczyk

[1] Technically and biographically this change can be especially clearly grasped in the correspondence of K. Barth and A. von Harnack: "Karl Barth. Ein Briefwechsel mit Adolf von Harnack," *Theologische Fragen und Antworten,* 3 vols. (Zollikon 1957).

[2] On this cf. the instructive presentation of W. Trillhaas, "Die evangelische Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* II, 88–123, especially 101ff.

[3] On the evaluation of this movement, the title of which is not entirely precise, cf., among other works, Y. Congar, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église* (Paris 1950); A. Hagen, *Der Reformkatholizismus in der Diözese Rottenburg* (Stuttgart 1962); A. Kolping, *Katholische Theologie,* 46f.

[4] Transmitted in K. Eschweiler, *Die zwei Wege der neueren Theologie* (Augsburg 1926), 9.

Of course, this vote was and is not actually to be evaluated as a judgment on the distinguished state of Catholic theology, especially not in respect to *all* its disciplines. For Germany the cheerful promise of J. I. Döllinger (d. 1890) at the Munich Assembly of Scholars in 1863, according to which the homeland of Catholic theology would lie here for the future,[5] was not fulfilled, especially not for systematic theology (dogmatic theology), which advanced further in the paths of a not excessive but still moderate Neo-Scholasticism. On this road it at first admitted neither the stimulation coming from M. J. Scheeben, the "most precious flower of Neo-Scholasticism," according to K. Eschweiler, for the intellectual deepening and organized grasping of the rational Neo-Scholastic system nor even the fruitful knowledge, coming from France, of Neo-Thomism, which, with P. Rousselot (d. 1915) and J. Maréchal (d. 1944), tried to establish a synthesis between genuine Thomism and modern philosophy. In this it was followed by systematic theology in the Romance countries, which, in keeping with its self-evaluation of a didactically moderate "school theology," assumed a superiority only in individual cases over the traditional Neo-Scholastic statement of problems and its answers.[6]

The melting down of this hardness and a revival occurred through forces and impulses which lay outside the narrow bounds of systematic theological specialists and was rooted in the area of the general awareness of the age like a new philosophical thought. The temper of Catholic life and the consciousness of the faith in the period after the First World War made it possible to admit these tendencies and to integrate them in a manner which gave to Catholicism not only inner drive but also a certain radiation to the surrounding world. While a not unimportant basic tendency drew from the political and cultural crisis situation on the basis of a biologically determinist thought the conclusion concerning the "Decline of the West,"[7] in the Catholic sphere, especially in Germany, there was awake the conviction of the capability of regeneration on the part of the Church and the culture from the forces of the spirit, which of course was the spirit of traditional Christian humanist culture and of the Catholic faith. At that time there appeared simultaneously the programmatic formulations of *The Awakening of the Church in Souls* by Romano Guardini in 1921 and of the establishing of a "New West," the title of a periodical of Catholic intellectuals that appeared between 1926 and 1930. The concerns expressed in them were further accentuated in the generally prevalent notions of the "living," the "organic" and "authentic," the "emotional," and of "history," of "personality," and of "appreciation of value." Acting as catalyst was the "German Rembrandt," Julius Langbehn (d. 1907), rediscovered by the converted painter and writer, B. Momme Nissen, O.P. (d. 1943). Langbehn grasped Catholicism as "spirit of the whole" and taught this understanding, but on the other hand he abetted nationalistic thought also.

---

[5] Cf. also L. Scheffczyk, *Theologie im Aufbruch und Widerstreit. Die deutsche katholische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bremen 1965), 276; G. Denzler, "Ignaz von Döllingers Vermächtnis an seine Hörer," *MThZ* 21 (1970), 93–101.

[6] As such prominent particular achievements which Neo-Scholastic systematic theology deepened in individual problems with a return to patristics and in intellectual independence may be mentioned, among others: M. de la Taille, S. J., *Mysterium Fidei* (1921); E. Masure, *Le sacrifice du chef* (1932); A. Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1925).

[7] O. Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes,* 2 vols., 30th ed. (Munich 1922).

These ideas proceeding from a new temper of life were taken up by corresponding "life movements" and reflected in diverse ways, such as the youth movement, going back to the period before the First World War, the rising liturgical movement, and also the Bible movement, which, of course, because of its being restricted to smaller groups cannot be equated with the first two movements mentioned. The idealistic ardor which belonged to these movements, supported especially by lay persons, and which of course became only to a degree useful to the "hierarchical apostolate of the Church" in the Catholic Action of Pius XI, was certainly not free from restorative tendencies, and therefore today occasionally the pejorative designation of "Neo-Romantic" is given to it. But the label is correct neither in its historical parallelism nor in relation to the objective content, because, despite certain common traits in style and content, for example, in the rediscovery of the Middle Ages,[8] what is distinctive dominates, especially in the rejection of subjectivism and irrationalism.

This can clarify a view of the philosophical undercurrents on which these movements were based and which, indirectly by way of a prescientific discussion,[9] also influenced the new starts in Catholic theology. It was a partly surprising, but partly obvious turn on account of the paradoxes of Kantianism as well as of Neo-Kantianism, which occurred after the First World War and was denoted by the catchword or slogan of the "resurrection of metaphysics."[10] In accord with its objective content, however, it was a question here, not of a mechanical renewal of Aristotelianism or of Wolffianism as of the less vital Neo-Thomism in Germany, in contrast to the France of A. G. Sertillanges, É. Gilson, and J. Maritain, and despite Pius XI's encyclical *Studiorum ducem* of 1923 on the sixth centenary of the canonization of Thomas Aquinas, but of an investigation of being that had become more critical, which was influenced both by the new unspeculative ontology of N. Hartmann (d. 1950) and by the doctrine of reality of H. Driesch (d. 1943), but especially received stimulation from the "view of reality" of the phenomenology of E. Husserl and M. Scheler and its philosophy of value, represented by J. Hessen and D. von Hildebrand. Thereby attention was also powerfully directed to the other basic current of Western Christian intellectualism, namely, to the Augustinian-Franciscan thought in philosophy and theology. This new doctrine of knowledge and being, which did not understand metaphysics as a search for an abstract posterior world and ventured upon the new draft of a "Christian philosophy"[11] as embodiment of a *philosophia perennis,* itself remained open to the philosophy of life of W. Dilthey (d. 1911),[12] even if it repudiated the elements of historicist relativism present in it.

---

[8] A work characteristic of this "rediscovery" from the non-Catholic area, which, however, found a loud echo in the likewise very vital Catholic academic movement, was P. L. Landsberg, *Die Welt des Mittelalters und wir,* 3d ed. (Bonn 1925).

[9] For these motives from the "prescientific" sphere, which finally communicated themselves also to theology, the works of the universally oriented R. Guardini (d. 1968) were representative.

[10] Cf. also P. Wust (Leipzig 1920). Also influential was H. Heimsoeth, *Die sechs grossen Themen der abendländischen Metaphysik* (Berlin 1922).

However, the most persistent influence in the 1920s and 1930s on the consciousness of the faith that was rearticulating itself was exercised by the philosophy of life and phenomenology, the latter not without the mediating role of the gifted M. Scheler (d. 1928), whose lot in life, of course, reflected the imbalances, tensions, and situation of the groping attempts in the Catholic intellectual life of the time. Only in regard to the rising existentialism of M. Heidegger and the Philosophy of Existence of K. Jaspers was the reaction generally negative,[13] despite the mediating efforts from France of Gabriel Marcel, but this was partly based on the obscurity and individuality of this thought and its language, with which, as P. Wust attests,[14] even the professional philosophers had their difficulties.

---

[11] As a work characteristic of this aim may be mentioned A. Dempf, *Christliche Philosophie. Der Mensch zwischen Gott und der Welt* (Bonn 1938).

[12] Cf. for the acceptance of W. Dilthey: J. Höfer, *Vom Leben zur Wahrheit. Katholische Besinnung am Lebenswerk W. Diltheys* (Freiburg 1936).

[13] Cf., for example, the view, characteristic of the time, of M. Pfliegler, *Vor der Entscheidung. Überlegungen zur seelischen Bedrohtheit der heutigen Menschen* (Salzburg and Leipzig 1937); *Heilige Bildung. Gedanken über Wesen und Weg christlicher Vollendung* (Salzburg 1933); *Die pädagogische Situation. Gedanken zur gegenwärtigen Lage religiöser Erziehung* (Innsbruck 1932).

[14] Cf. also the extract from a letter of 1929 in F. Heinemann, *Existenzphilosophie lebendig oder tot?* (Stuttgart 1954), 88.

THE TURNING OF DOGMA FROM "REASON" TO "LIVING"

The turning of the dogmatic method of reflection to the "living" and to "religious value," also partly inspired by the suggestions of the philosophy of religion, for example, by *Das Heilige* (1917) of R. Otto, at first made its appearance only sparingly. But the formulations, appearing in various forms, of the theme "Dogma and Life,"[15] the efforts to disclose the life value of dogma—and even if at first it was only in corollaries at the end of the positive presentation[16]—the connection between theology and spirituality in the works of Columba Marmion (d. 1923)[17] and A. Gardeil, O.P.,[18] created an atmosphere which could not entirely refuse to have anything to do with Scholastic dogma for long, although the texts and manuals that had meanwhile become standardized were still kept in Neo-Scholastic strictness. Of course, this experienced a pleasing relaxation through the admission of newer problems in Pohle-Gierens (9th ed. [1936], 10th ed. by J. Gummersbach, S.J.) and through the regard for the history of dogma in F. Diekamp (7th ed. [1934], 11th ed. by K. Jüssen).

It was only consistent and a proof of the accuracy of the systematic work when thereupon the question of method and the problem of the way of systematic theology was again taken up by it. The most basic and stimulating effort in this regard, that of K. Eschweiler (d. 1936) in the German area, determined the point of departure of theological thought, following M. J. Scheeben and against G. Hermes, not from a neutral reason but from faith and the reasonableness inherent in it,[19] which was to be developed by theology in accord with the method of intellectual scientific knowledge. In this way theology was, on the one hand, anchored in the supernatural basic faith essential to it, but, on the other hand, it was confirmed as a theoretical science. Hence a special significance belonged to the last named factor, because at about the same time other theological basic concepts came under discussion: the affective-charismatic concept of T. Soiron, O.F.M., based on the Franciscan tradition,[20] the mystical devotional type of A. Stolz, O.S.B. (d. 1942), derived from patristics,[21] which was inspired by the studies on the spiritual life, cultivated especially in France by H. Bremond, R. Garrigou-Lagrange, and the periodical *La vie spirituelle,* and a "kerygmatic" type which appeared under the name of "Proclamation Theology."

---

[15] Thus the representative book of E. Krebs, *Dogma und Leben,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1921–25 and later); A. Rademacher, *Religion und Leben. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung des christlichen Kulturproblems,* 2d ed (Freiburg 1929); after the Second World War, among others: J. Ranft, *Vom Dogma und vom lebendigen Geist* (Würzburg 1949); B. Poschmann, *Die katholische Frömmigkeit* (Würzburg 1949).

[16] Thus in the dogmatic theology, already determined by biblical and historical thought, of B. Bartmann, *Grundriss der Dogmatik,* 2 vols., 2d ed. (Freiburg 1931).

[17] Cf., among other works, *Christ in His Mysteries* (Maredsous 1919; English: St. Louis 1939).

[18] Here must be mentioned especially the work significant also for the question of theological method: *La structure de l'âme et l'expérience mystique,* 2 vols. (Paris 1927).

[19] K. Eschweiler, op. cit., 24 and passim. K. Adam, *Glaube und Glaubenswissenschaft im Katholizismus,* 3d ed. (Rottenburg 1920 1923), points in a similar direction. For a critical evaluation cf. A. Kolping, op. cit., 102f.

The theology of a living proclamation, intended especially by the Innsbruck theologians, J. A. Jungmann,[22] F. Dander, F. Lakner, H. Rahner, and others, was supposed to present its own way and field of work in addition to the theoretical essential dogma and direct revealed truths directly to the listener in the language of kerygma. Although this attempt cannot simply be designated as "stillborn"[23] because of the further operation of its intention, yet it could not be realized in method and would also have been a disadvantage for the still sought unity of theology.

Previously the aim of approximating dogmatic theology to the modern temper of life and of making it fruitful for the living faith had been realized in a more convincing way by Karl Adam (d. 1966) in his *Das Wesen des Katholizismus* (1924; 12th ed. [1949]), which, taking as a basis the phenomenological view of essence, the psychology of religion, and the scriptural concept of the Body of Christ, revealed a mystical understanding of the essence of Catholic Christianity and of the Church. Here the theme of the Church, especially questioned in those years, which had hitherto had a place only in apologetics, was made a subject of dogma and thereafter more richly developed from the dogmatic viewpoint.

This occurred emphatically in the *Dogmatik* of M. Schmaus (1938, 6th ed. [1964]), in which the religious and existential, as well as the scientific motives of the period before the beginning of the Second World War, received an authentic summary. Taking up the affirmative of the kerygmatic concern of an easing of the tension between scientific faith and living faith, but without sacrificing the scientific way of knowledge, the attempt was here undertaken to derive dogma from the sources of Scripture and genuine patristic tradition, both of which came up for detailed discussion and were no longer presented only in *dicta probantia,* and to disclose it to the understanding of an age which was influenced by Nietzsche's philosophy of life and by Heidegger's and Jasper's philosophy of existence that was gaining influence.[24]

---

[20] Cf. T. Soiron, *Heilige Theologie* (Regensburg 1935).

[21] A. Stolz, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae,* 6 fasc. (Freiburg 1939–43).

[22] Of initial efficacy was especially J. A. Jungmann, *Frohbotschaft und unsere Glaubensverkündigung* (Regensburg 1936). For the criticism, cf., among others, E. Kappler, *Die Verkündigungstheologie* (Fribourg 1949), and A. Kolping, op cit., 163ff.

[23] Thus R. Aubert, "Katholische Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* II, 37.

To be sure, the unique character and importance of this work, which was also the first to make use, for scriptural argumentation, of Kittel's *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* otherwise still held in suspicion in Catholic theology, can only be fully understood if the developments that had in the meantime taken place in historical as well as biblical theology are assessed and the fact of the opening up of dogma with respect to the influences from both areas. For historical theology this influencing goes without saying, since the representatives of the system almost without exception had gone through the school of historical theological investigation, which was then concentrated especially on the Middle Ages, with C. Bäumker, M. Grabmann, A. Landgraf, É. Gilson, M. de Wulf, J. de Ghellinck, J. Koch, B. Geyer (d. 1974), and others. Retrospectively it may also be established that these entirely solid investigations really required the chief energies of the theologians active in systematic theology, so that, apart from the exceptions mentioned, a stronger actualization of the Catholic world of faith and of dogma lying in the sphere of the possible did not occur. In this regard it was due to a preference for detailed research and to the deemphasis on summary presentations of theology and of the history of dogma that the knowledge from history was not used to its full extent for the historical understanding of dogma. A really historical understanding of dogma, as developed, of course with a one-sided aim, on the Protestant side by the triple constellation Harnack-Loofs-Seeberg, had not yet started in the Catholic theology of the 1930s. Nevertheless, the beginnings in this direction, which were made as early as the First World War with J. Tixeron[25] and were carried further in a continuing succession, must not be overlooked.

---

[24] Supported by similar aims was the work of the Dutchman, A. Janssens, *Leerboeken der dogmatica en der apologetica* (Antwerp 1925ff.); but also D. Feuling, *Katholische Glaubenslehre* (Salzburg 1937), and the "dogma for the laity" newly appearing in this day, as in the works of J. P. Junglas (1936) and L. von Rudloff, O.S.B. (1934, 5th ed. 1949).

[25] *Histoire des Dogmes* (Paris 1912–14, 11th ed. 1930). On the rise and development of the Catholic history of dogma cf. J. Beumer, "Theologie und Dogmengeschichte," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 471–503; likewise the introduction of M. Schmaus to the new complete sketch undertaken after World War II: *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte,* ed. by M. Schmaus, J. R. Geiselmann, H. Rahner, IV, 3: B. Poschmann, *Busse und Letzte Ölung* (Freiburg 1950), V–XI.

Historical awareness, becoming stronger, and interest in the development of dogma are especially attested by the then notable effort of the Spaniard, F. Marín-Sola, O.P. (d. 1932), concerning the homogeneous development of dogma,[26] in which, to be sure, it was not the history of dogma as such that was pursued but instead a fully worthwhile theory of the development of dogma was demonstrated with the aid of historical facts that were not always interpreted in a manner free of doubt.[27] Questions in the history of dogma were to experience a further stimulus on the eve of the definition of Mary's Assumption in 1950, when it was shown that the problem of the relation of revelation and history still needed some intellectual work within Catholic theology.[28]

On one point the fecundity of the encounter of historical research and interest in systematic theology appeared clearly in the period before the First World War, and also afterwards, namely, in the *mysterium* theory conceived by Odo Casel, O.S.B. (d. 1948), which pushed the theme of sacramental theology, then as highly regarded as the theme of the Church, into the foreground in an original way and gave occasion to a discussion of considerable intensity. The Maria Laach Benedictine, proceeding from the history of religion and literature, who felt obliged to the liturgical movement and its progress toward the originality and authenticity of liturgical life, interpreted the sacramental acts of the Church, especially the Eucharist, no longer in the sense of the Scholastic theory of *effectus,* according to which the believer received only effects from the saving deeds.[29] Instead, the saving act should make itself present, according to the new interpretation, which, however, sought support in Greek patristics, as such and in its being, of course *in mysterio,* that is, under the veil of symbols. Although this theory did not establish itself in its entirety because of the historical as well as the objective problems inherent in it, nevertheless it certainly contributed to the deepening of the Catholic understanding of the sacraments.[30] This contribution, still critically evaluated by Pius XII,[31] but, on the contrary, regarded benevolently in its main features by the Second Vatican Council,[32] also offered certain points of departure for the ecumenical dialogue, which was at that time accepted only with hesitation by systematic Catholic theology.[33]

---

[26] *L'évolution homogène du Dogma catholique,* 2 vols., 2d ed. (Fribourg 1924).

[27] Critical evaluation in H. Hammans, *Die neueren Erklärungen der Dogmenentwicklung* (Essen 1965), 147ff.

[28] On the development of Mariology cf. H. M. Köster, "Die Mariologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 126–47.

[29] Cf. the pertinent publications on the theme: "Die Messe als heilige Mysterienhandlung," *Bened. Monatsschrift* 5 (1923), 20–28, 97–104, 155–61; *Zur Idee der liturgischen Mysterienfeier* (Freiburg 1923).

[30] T. Filthaut, *Die Kontroverse über die Mysterienlehre* (Warendorf 1947) tells about the controversy down to 1947; cf. also B. Neunheuser, "Eucharistie in Mittelalter und Neuzeit," *Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte* IV/4b (Freiburg 1963), 64(literature), and A. Kolping, o. cit., 138f.

[31] Encyclical *Mediator Dei* of 1947 (*DS,* 3855).

In spite of this not lifeless or even stagnating condition of dogmatic theology before and immediately after the First World War, in contrast to modern pluralism it still supplied the image of inner compactness, which results not least from its unquestioned anchoring in the faith and from its positively understood ecclesiastical essence. In comparison, the new starts may be regarded as less radical and relatively trivial, and the connection with tradition may be found fault with. Nevertheless, it must be considered that especially the German theology and Church could oppose the dangers of Nazism in this basic outlook, which was also true of the especially threatened faculties of the Catholic universities. The picture supplied by the Protestant faculties was, with a few exceptions, much less favorable in this matter.

Many of these positive developments toward a more vital grasp of dogma and its interpretation in regard to salvation were, especially in Germany, interrupted or ended by the catastrophe of the Second World War. A new beginning took place especially in France, where the characteristic spirituality and the speculative strength had already been concerned with questions of the basic position of systematic theology and in this connection had come to a criticism of the scientific deductive theology of the past.[34] These tendencies took shape in the works of a group of theologians, to which belonged, among others, H. Bouillard, H. de Lubac, J. Daniélou, and Y. Congar, all lumped together under the pretty colorless designation of the "Nouvelle Théologie." What was characteristic of these efforts did not appear prominently under this label, namely, the attempt to orient theology again more definitely to the biblical-patristic tradition, but in the horizon of modern thought and its *desiderata.* Thus the origin of this trend of theological interest was connected not coincidentally with the appearance of a new edition of the Church Fathers, *Sources chrétiennes,* which intended to make fruitful for modern thought the ancient wealth of the tradition of the faith and thereby, contrary to the narrowly oriented Scholastic theology, to emphasize again Augustinian theology and the Greek universalism of salvation of Origen, using the paradigmatic guiding principle of H. Bouillard: "A theology which would not be timely would be a false theology." The means employed in this regard of a spiritual exegesis, a personalist concept of the truth of faith and its "historical" interpretation, and an option for a certain diversity in theology must have seemed dangerous to the representatives of a strictly oriented Thomistic theology of essence.[35] In their not always entirely objective criticism they dealt more with the ever present possibilities for false conclusions, for example, a making of grace immanent, a raising of dogma to evolution, a relativism of the knowledge of truth, than with really present failings and distortions. Hence the suspicion of a resurgence of Modernism was unjustified. Nevertheless, Pius XII was induced in the encyclical *Humani generis* of 1950, without mentioning this theological trend,[36] to point to the mistaken tendencies which were found not so much in the original initiators of this movement as in some of its one-sided interpreters. The encyclical neither intended nor produced a limiting of theological research or a stagnation of theological development. But it exposed a process of theological ferment, which, because of the concentration of dogmatic theology on Mariology in the years before and after the definition of Mary's Assumption in 1950,[37] had not yet entered the general awareness. This process was marked by a deeper reflection of systematic theology on the authenticity of mankind, the Church, and theology,[38] on the related problems of hermeneutics,[39] on the doctrine of evolution[40] just brought to light by Teilhard de Chardin (d. 1955) and his writings, hitherto known only fragmentarily, as well as on the urgency of ecumenical efforts[41] and the problems of the concern with a secularized world at the "end of the new age."[42] The results of the posing of these critical questions were entirely positive in the material as well as in the formal: historical thought dared to draw near to outlines of salvation history and history of theology;[43] the long treated theme of the Church, which had been discussed in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* especially under the mystical-organological and hierarchical aspect, was expanded into the dimension of the communitarian, in which also the lay element played a stronger role;[44] in Christology, which was stimulated and enriched by the confrontation with Déodat de Basly's (d. 1937) doctrine oriented in Scotism, the interest in the manhood and the humanity, the *psychologia,* of Christ was prominent.[45] A special significance, which until the present has experienced no diminution, was gained by the theme of the relations of "nature and grace,"[46] again brought into discussion by H. de Lubac; in its solution the concept of the unity of creation and redemption, of the worldly and the Christian, of the immanence and the transcendence of the divine, must be distinguished.

---

[32] *Sacrosanctum Concilium,* no. 104.

[33] Ecumenical theology also developed in this period, at first only in particular initiatives—A. Rademacher, P. Simon, R. Grosche, O. Karrer, H. Urs von Balthasar—and outside systematic theology—M. Laros, M. J. Metzger.

[34] Thus already in M. D. Chenu, *Une école de théologie* (Le Saulchoir 1937), and L. Charlier, *Essai sur le problème théologique* (Thuilles 1938). Both works were put on the Index on 6 February 1942.

---

[35] Then came sharp objections from Thomistic thinkers, such as R. Garrigou-Lagrange, "La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?" *Angelicum* 23 (1946), 126–45, 24 (1947), 5–19, and M. Labourdelle, "La théologie et ses sources," *RThom* 46 (1946), 353–371, 47 (1947), 5–19.

[36] The Pope used the very expression in an address to the General Congregation of the Jesuits of September 1946.

[37] For this development cf. the explanations of H. M. Köster, "Die Mariologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 132.

[38] Dutch theologians now took part in this discussion to a greater extent, including E. Schillebeeckx in *Theologisch Woordenbock* I (1952); cf. also *Gesammelte Schriften* I (Mainz 1965); P. Schoonenberg, "Theologie in Selbstbesinnung," *Annalen van het Thiymgenootschapp* 44 (1956), 225ff.

[39] Cf. also the cooperative volume, *Fragen der Theologie,* ed. by J. Feiner, J. Trütsch, F. Böckle (Zurich and Cologne 1957).

[40] One of the first opinions in the German area is in T. Deman, "Französische Bemühungen um eine Erneuerung der Theologie," *ThRev* 46 (1950), 61ff.

All these profound problems of systematic theology were discussed with a sharpened consciousness and answered throughout in the sense less of "supranaturalistic" and "extrinsic" ideas and models. Hence it probably did not entirely do the situation justice when, around the mid-1950s, it was said that "the dogma of today [is] very orthodox but not very alive."[47] But perhaps at the basis of this verdict lay the right instinct that a thorough basic concept and a comprehensive systematic overview were missing from the deepened posing of questions and intellectual efforts. And so K. Rahner outlined at this time the new program of a dogmatic theology of salvation history,[48] the implementation of which, of course, was taken up only later.[49] But as regards this theology's claim to orthodoxy, it hit upon a positive state of affairs in so far as theology after the Second World War, despite the totally different kinds of beginnings and trends of interest, still worked from a strongly developed awareness of the obligation to the common tradition and its inalienable content. This appeared especially clearly in connection with the confrontation and adaptation of the program of demythologizing developed by R. Bultmann, which especially affected Christology. The reply, given to this program, for example, by J. R. Geiselmann in his book on Christ,[50] was established by a profoundly biblical as well as by a hermeneutically acute historical thought, which, however, was not subject to a philosophical option of "authenticity," in which the objective salvation history was condensed with its alleged meaning to the *punctum mathematicum* of the existential faith decision and of the subjectivistic *pro me.* Here "authenticity" was understood not without the reality of real history and its transmission in the tradition of the Church. Characteristically, in theology on the eve of the Second Vatican Council the theme "Scripture and Tradition"[51] was again taken up and, with the abandonment of the unorganic "Two-Sources Theory," led towards a unified concept, which was thus adopted by the council.[52] Only in this state of affairs can it be considered that the council was determined by the spirit and content of the theology preceding it. Therefore, in relation to the dogmatic motive, the question "Who determined the theology of the council?" can be answered by a competent representative of the theology following the First World War: "An intensive work . . . for a good thirty years."[53] But it may also be added that in dogma the council neither would nor could go beyond the results of this work.

---

[41] H. Urs von Balthasar, *K. Barth* (Cologne 1950); H. Fries, *Bultmann, Barth und die katholische Theologie* (Stuttgart 1950); O. Karrer, *Um die Einheit der Christen. Die Petrusfrage* (Frankfurt 1953).

[42] Thus the stimulating book of R. Guardini (Basel 1950).

[43] Important contributions to this were made by, among others, J. Pieper, *Über das Ende der Zeit* (Munich 1950); H. Urs von Balthasar, *Theologie der Geschichte,* 3d ed. (Einsiedeln 1959); H. Rahner, "Grundzüge katholischer Geschichtstheologie," *StdZ* 140 (1947), 408–27; H. de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit. L'Intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origène* (Paris 1950); J. Daniélou, *Das Geheimnis vom Kommen des Herrn* (Frankfurt 1951).

[44] Among others, by H. de Lubac, *Katholizismus als Gemeinschaft* (Einsiedeln and Cologne 1943); *Betrachtung über die Kirche* (Graz 1954). Previously, in Germany M. D. Koster, *Ekklesiologie im Werden* (Paderborn 1940), had indicated the necessarily appearing anterior placement of the "People of God," of the salvation collectivity, before the individualistic salvation personalism.

[45] This appears clearly in the cooperative work of A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, eds., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon,* 3 vols. (Würzburg 1951–54); cf. here especially J. Ternus, "Das Seelen- und Bewusstseinsleben Jesu. Problemgeschichtlich-systematische Untersuchung," III, 81–237.

[46] H. de Lubac, *Surnatural. Études historiques* (Paris 1946), and "Le mystère du surnatural," *RSR* 37 (1949), 80–121.

---

[47] K. Rahner, *Über den Versuch eines Aufrisses der Dogmatik: Schriften zur Theologie* I (Einsiedeln 1954), 22.

[48] Ibid., 29–47.

[49] *Mysterium Salutis. Die Grundlagen heilsgeschichtlicher Dogmatik,* ed. by J. Feiner and M. Löhrer, I (Einsiedeln, Zurich and Cologne 1965).

[50] *Jesus der Christus* (Stuttgart 1951).

[51] Cf. the cooperative work with the report of the first meeting of the working community of Catholic dogmatic and fundamental theologians in 1956 at Königstein: *Die mündliche Überlieferung,* ed. by M. Schmaus (Munich 1957).

[52] *Dei Verbum,* no. 9.

[53] Y. Congar, *Situation und Aufgabe der Theologie heute* (Paderborn 1971), 31.

The "Theological" Deepening of Moral Theology

The intellectual movements appearing after the First World War changed also the figure of moral theology, even if the development here proceeded only slowly, which had its reason in the fact that the appearing Catholic moral teaching, especially exposed to modern philosophical ethics and to pugnacious cultural Protestantism, had more strongly to guard against attacks which were forcing it to tenacity and determined it to a certain integralist attitude.[54] Characteristic of the situation at the beginning of the century were the attacks of the Marburg Protestant systematizer, W. Herrmann (d. 1922), R. Bultmann's teacher, against the inflexible Catholic precept morality, which allegedly stifled the moral sentiment, and the Catholic reply from the pen of the Lucerne theologian A. Meyenberg (d. 1934), entitled *Die katholische Moral als Angeklagte* ("Catholic Morality as the Accused").[55] Thus it goes without saying that the presentations of moral theology partly assumed an apologetic character and in spite of their solidity and intellectual clarity—as seen for example in J. Mausbach's repeatedly published *Die katholische Moraltheologie und ihre Gegner* ("Catholic Morality and Its Opponents")[56]—were unable to achieve a positive adjustment to the spirit of the age. Still, at this time individual representatives of this field took the podium to promote a new orientation of their science with a disregard for its legalistic and casuistic traits. In favor of the still present awareness of the unity of ethical and dogmatic theology was especially the proposal of A. Müller, who, followed M. J. Scheeben's idea of grace, pleaded for a "theological morality" which should be based on the mystery of the faith and on the reality of grace.[57] J. Mausbach, in an opinion significant for the history of the time, sought to reduce,[58] around the turn of the century, the tensions arising in regard to the reform of moral theology: in it was even sounded the demand that "the moral norm must accommodate [itself] in accord with nature to the essential changes which the development of humanity and of nature brings." Of course, this should take place only with the means supplied by Thomistic philosophy and the *philosophia perennis.* Nevertheless, the *Catholic Moral Theology*[59] conceived by him was a progressive step in the sense that it did not develop a pure teaching of precepts but a doctrine of virtue which was directed to the loftiest principle of the honor of God and to the principle of the perfection of being. True, the speculative orientation and penetration also sought stronger support in biblical doctrine, without, however, more deeply fathoming this, in accord with the contemporary situation of the use of the Bible in systematic theology.

---

[54] Cf. J. Ziegler, "Moraltheologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 316–60, especially 319ff.; E. Hirschbach, *Die Entwicklung der Moraltheologie im deutschen Sprachgebiet seit der Jahrhundertwende* (Klosterneuburg 1959); P. Hadrossek, *Die Bedeutung des Systemgedankens für die Moraltheologie in Deutschland seit der Thomasrenaissance* (Munich 1950).

[55] Lucerne 1901.

[56] Cologne 1901, 5th ed. 1921.

[57] A. Müller, "Ist die katholische Moral reformbedürftig? *Katholik* (1901), II, 346ff., 402ff.

[58] The most recent suggestions for reform of moral theology and criticism of them in *ThRev* 1 (1902), 1–8, 41–46.

There also came to light in O. Schilling, professor at Tübingen, and his *Moraltheologie,*[60] not without influence from the Tübingen tradition, the endeavor to develop moral theology from a supernatural beginning, which he found in the principle of *caritas.* However, in regard to content he remained extensively indebted to Thomas Aquinas and Alphonsus Liguori. On the other hand, the strong regard for the socioethical aspect presented something relatively new.

The fact is that these new starts from the German sphere, in which as early as the nineteenth century a relatively unique "German type" of presenting moral theology had been developed by J. M. Sailer and J. B. Hirscher, were at first not further elaborated, and dominance lay in the still existing preponderance of the "Roman type" of moral theology, which in the manuals and texts of H. Noldin,[61] B. Merkelbach,[62] D. M. Prümmer,[63] and others asserted its influence in the direction of a doctrine of duties, often oriented to the Decalogue, with a strongly juridical and casuistic element. Since these works were widespread in the French area, despite the different method of Saint-Sulpice,[64] directed more to practical use in pastoral care, and in the Anglo-Saxon linguistic sphere, the renewal trends could be established only with difficulty. The additional pragmatic viewpoint in this sphere was especially extremely prominent in the moral manual of T. Slater (d. 1928), who declared in the introduction: "Manuals of moral theology are technical works . . . just as the texts of the lawyer and the physician . . . . They deal with what is duty under penalty of sin. They are books of moral pathology."[65]

---

[59] Münster 1915–1918, 3 vols., and later.

[60] Münster 1922, 2d ed. 1949.

[61] *Summa theologiae moralis,* 3 vols. (Innsbruck 1901–02, 30th ed. 1952).

[62] *Summa theologiae moralis ad mentem D. Thomae et ad normam iuris novi,* 3 vols. (Paris 1930–33, 10th ed. 1959).

[63] *Manuale Theologiae moralis secundum principia S. Thomae,* 3 vols. (Freiburg 1915, 15th ed. 1961).

[64] Cf. J. Ziegler, op. cit., 325.

[65] Ibid., 325.

In view of such lack of appreciation, of course not too generalizing, of the deeper concern of moral theology, it goes without saying that in the 1930s the call for a new basis of the "theological character" of moral theology became ever stronger. The affirmative answer which now soon came to it was inspired by the spirit of the newly appearing biblical thought, which at that time created in moral theology an even more vigorous expression than in contemporary dogmatic theology. This changed attitude underwent an imposing formation in the five-volume *Handbuch der Katholischen Sittenlehre* of F. Tillman, which had its center in the "idea of the imitation of Christ" (Vol. III)[66] and its "realization" (Vol. IV).[67] By means of an extensive abandonment of casuistic and practical applications, which Tillmann assigned as legitimate functions to the texts of casuistic moral theology, there succeeded here a new type of supernatural foundation of Christian morality on the ethos of love and its being made concrete in the Sermon on the Mount. Not an excessive natural-material morality, but a supernatural motivation of Christian life on the person and work of Jesus stood here in the center of ethics, which thus advanced from the position of a morality of commands and prohibitions to one of a direction inspiring and forming life. Even if Tillmann did not succeed, in a more flat view and estimation of the evidence of Scripture, in taking soundings of the full depths and problems of the testimony of Scripture, still the theological fecundity of this effort cannot be doubted. Despite occasional criticism, such as that of O. Schilling, this draft was considerably acknowledged as a directional work, which, "as no other . . . contributed to extricating Catholic moral theology as a science from a centuries-old rigidity."[68] The basing of moral theology on a biblical-theological foundation was also decisive for other efforts around this time, such as for F. Jürgensmeier[69] and E. Mersch,[70] who oriented the Christian ethos on the concept of the "Mystical Body." The theological deepening and intensification of the Christian ethos, which was achieved here through the tying of moral theology to exegesis, to ascetical,[71] and to dogmatic theology,[72] and which continued long after in the striving for a rightly understood "dogmatic moral theology," to use a phrase of R. Egenter, was characteristically no hindrance to a widening of moral theology and its extension into the areas of the humanities. Tillmann's work had also laid the ground for this extension corresponding to the relation of moral theology to life and had supplied further stimulation; for here not only "the philosophical foundation of Catholic moral teaching"[73] was offered, but the "psychological bases"[74] were reflected and the "sociological bases" were considered.[75] In T. Müncker's moral-psychological contribution the results of psychoanalysis, hitherto still suspect in Catholic circles, were also included. The stronger relationship thereby reached with the "bordering questions," as W. Schöllgen puts it, and with the humanities was further developed after the Second World War by French, Dutch, and German theologians—M. Oraison, A. Snoeck, W. Heinen, R. Egenter—and promoted in newly appearing periodicals (*Arzt und Christ* [1954]).[76] In addition, the orientation, always to be made more profound, to revelation was not forgotten and, among other things, was fostered by the original attempt of J. Stelzenberger (d. 1972) to develop moral theology, with reference to J. B. Hirscher, as "the moral doctrine of the Kingship of God."[77] Noteworthy, however, was the continuing impact of Mausbach's more speculatively interested sketch, which G. Ermecke completed in a new edition as a "Christological synthesis."[78] A certain definitive bringing together of the various basic concepts was accomplished by B. Häring in his work, *Das Gesetz Christi,*[79] which succeeded in uniting the three normative principles—imitation of Christ, *caritas,* rule of God—in an excellent manner. Meanwhile, interest in the working out of the history of moral theology and its problems was reawakened and documented in publications rich in content.[80]

---

[66] Düsseldorf 1934, 4th ed. 1953.

[67] Düsseldorf 1935f., 4th ed. 1950–53.

[68] Thus the verdict in *Hochland* (1934); cf. also A. Kolping, op. cit., 175.

[69] *Der mystische Leib Christi als Grundprinzip der Aszetik,* 2d ed. (Paderborn 1933).

[70] *Morale et corps mystique* (Paris 1937).

[71] Cf. on this theme R. Egenter, "Über das Verhältnis von Moraltheologie und Aszetik," *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Festschrift für M. Schmaus,* ed. by J. Auer and H. Volk (Munich 1957), 21–42.

[72] Among others, P. Delhaye reflected on this in "Dogme et morale. Autonomie et assistance mutuelle," *AnGr* 68 (1954), 27–40.

In view of the thoroughly positive state which moral theology achieved, by overcoming considerable resistance and a still thoroughly disunited situation in the 1930s, it may seem astonishing that in the 1950s there also was heard talk of the "crisis of moral theology," which threatened to jeopardize again the firm position that had been obtained. J. Leclerc especially reproached the current moral doctrine and instruction with a lack of dynamism and enthusiastic force, too little regard for philosophy, failure to consider the world situation of Christianity, and no understanding of progress.[81] Here was evident something of that artificially nourished disquiet which, with the demand for a "complete transformation" of moral theology and a new beginning at zero, served an organic progress less. It thus happened that moral theology in the years before the Second Vatican Council became more eager for discussion and more stimulated by the resumption of the question of the principle of morality, by the questionable experiments of an existential and situation ethics,[82] against which the teaching authority had taken a stand in 1952 and 1956, but not unconditionally more fruitful. The council itself had not accepted such experimenting considerations, but had regard for the fundamental results of modern moral theology, as, for example, in relation to religious freedom, the relative autonomy of secular matters, the importance of service to the world, the organic articulation of the ends of marriage and a personal notion of marriage, which, however, partly in the question of methods of birth regulation did not disavow tradition and gave no room to subjectivism.[83]

---

[73] T. Steinbüchel, Vol. I (1938, 4th ed. 1951).

[74] T. Müncker, Vol. II (1934, 4th ed. 1953). Earlier L. Ruland, *Handbuch der praktischen Seelsorge,* 5 vols. (Münster 1930–40), had considered the practical importance of psychology and medicine in a new sort of intensity.

[75] W. Schöllgen, Vol. V (1953).

[76] Cf. also A. Niedermeyer, *Pastoralmedizinische Propädeutik. Einführung in die geistigen Grundlagen der Pastoral-Medizin und Pastoral-Hygiene* (Salzburg and Leipzig 1935).

[77] Paderborn 1953, 2d ed. 1965.

[78] Münster, 9th ed. 1953.

[79] Freiburg 1954.

[80] As examples may be mentioned O. Lottin, *Problèmes de Psychologie et de Moral au XII^e et XIII^e siècles* I–V (Louvain and Gembloux 1942–59), and the series edited by M. Müller, *Studien zur Geschichte der katholischen Moraltheologie* (Regensburg 1954–61).

In the total view of the process of development of moral theology in the period after the First World War the fact of the dissociation and autonomy of two new partial disciplines from the whole body must not remain unnoticed: the science of *caritas,* which of course grew out of practical theology, and that of Christian social doctrine and sociology. Above all, in the wake of the pioneering social encyclicals since Leo XIII, Christian social doctrine has won an increasing importance, which is borne by a work of research now lasting more than one generation.[84] Of course, considering the youthful status of this science and also the involvement of natural and supernatural rules in it, it cannot cause surprise that the questions of the proper subject and the function of Christian social teaching are still under discussion. The ideas are still confronted by a preeminently philosophical discipline, which makes use of faith only as a clarifying auxiliary function, and a properly theological discipline, which proceeds from faith. And so "the dialogue on how the dignity of mankind, social justice, and ecclesiastical ministry *sub luce Evangelii* maintain and receive their claim, is certainly not at an end."[85]

---

[81] J. Leclercq, *Christliche Moral in der Krise der Zeit* (Einsiedeln 1954).

[82] The critical confrontation was made by, among others, D. von Hildebrand, *Wahre Sittlichkeit und Situationsethik* (Düsseldorf 1957).

[83] Cf. the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes,* especially no. 50.

[84] Information on the state of the research in R. Henning, "Christliche Gesellschaftslehre," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 361–70.

FROM "APOLOGETICS" TO "FUNDAMENTAL THEOLOGY"

The modern striving for a deeper accessibility of the living, organic, and personal in the faith as well as in the understanding of the Church led also in the traditional apologetics to new accentuations, which ensued especially from the discussion of the different ways and methods of this relatively young theological discipline. A. Gardeil (d. 1931) declared that it was a "badly defined doctrine [whose] subject and method [presented] a problem for theologians."[86]

The development of this branch of theology in the twentieth century may best be understood if it is seen under the aspect of the religio-existential as well as of the theoretical scientific search for the more exact definition of the specific subject of this discipline and its total presentation.

While the impulses for the founding of Fundamental Theology came especially from Germany in the nineteenth century, with J. S. von Drey in 1853, the new orientation in the twentieth century was first suggested by French theologians, who sought to put the "proof of the credibility of Christianity" proper to this field on a new basis with reference to the increasingly more comprehensive modern experience of life. The traditional, purely objective, and "externally" arguing *demonstratio christiana* and *catholica* could no longer satisfy a foundation of faith that took into account the totality of the modern social, moral, and philosophical question.

Already at the end of the nineteenth century attempts were made to establish the so-called "Apologetics of Immanence" by F. Brunetière, L. Ollé-Laprune, and G. P. Fonsegrive, but M. Blondel (d. 1949) first enabled it to achieve a real breakthrough. Without wishing to deny the merits and importance of classical apologetics, Blondel aimed to deepen the inadequacy of a purely rational and positivist argumentation by attending to the subjectivity and transcendentality of human fulfillment (*L'action* [1893]).[87] This incentive to an "inner" apologetic involving subjective factors led, despite a first considerably disavowing attitude, to a spread of the scope of apologetics, to which A. Gardeil attributed, in addition to the strongly scientific proof of the credibility of the faith, a subjective practical foundation of faith. In addition, Gardeil called for an "apologetic theology," which should be developed as a self-reflection of supernatural theology on its epistemological bases. If the concept, which was again discussed also in Germany in a somewhat modified form in the 1950s, ultimately did not establish itself, still it consolidated the rising tendencies to the integration of "external" and "internal" apologetics and promoted the unity of rational credibility and the awaking of the inner willingness to believe. Later in Germany A. Lang especially followed this aim.[88] With the last mentioned element the importance of the supernatural, grace-filled motivation of faith moved to the foreground, as, parallel to the total concept of theology recommended in Germany by K. Eschweiler, the effort became noticeable to develop fundamental theology, or apologetics, also from a standpoint inside the faith, which of course brought it close to dogma and to a degree threatened to jeopardize its autonomy. Even authors coming from the older rational objectivating school concept, such as R. Garrigou-Lagrange[89] and J. Brinktrine,[90] felt an obligation to this tendency. But in them the separation between the supernatural motive of faith and natural credibility was so sharply marked that the strict demonstrability of natural credibility, and thereby of the rational scientific character of apologetics, was maintained, but an underground dualism continued.

---

[85] Ibid., 369.

[86] Cf. for what follows J. Schmitz, "Die Fundamentaltheologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* II, 197–245, especially 200.

[87] A thorough assessment of Blondel's concern and its relevance to fundamental theology is offered by A. Kolping, *Fundamentaltheologie* I (Münster 1967), 60ff.

M. Masure, building on the thought of R. Rousselot (d. 1915), opposed to this option, somewhat objectivistic and inclined to disintegration, an "inductive procedure," in which the external signs of credibility were to be opened up as a result of their invisible importance and their supernatural value.[91] In this regard the moral disposition of the subject and the influence of grace are appraised with full importance for the origin of the assent to faith, which in this "Apologetics of the Sign" was also made powerfully dependent on the community of faith, as well as of believers, that is, on a social character.

These "stimuli" to the development of an "integral apologetics" and its orientation to the personal reality of mankind by B. Welte enjoyed in Germany general assent and only occasionally encountered criticism.[92] Nevertheless in the textbook literature of T. Specht, H. Dieckmann, J.

---

[88] *Fundamentaltheologie,* 2 vols. (Munich 1954).

[89] *De revelatione ab Ecclesia proposita* (Rome 1918, 5th ed. 1950).

[90] *Fundamentaltheologie. Offenbarung und Kirche,* 2 vols. (Paderborn 1938, 2d ed. 1947–49).

[91] *La grande route apologétique* (Paris 1939).

[92] Thus in E. Seiterich, *Wege der Glaubensbegründung nach der sogenannten Immanenzapologetik* (Freiburg 1938).

Brunsmann, and H. Straubinger the old outlines retained the upper hand; they were more obliged to the "Romance form" of apologetics, as opposed to the "German form," which also had regard for the philosophy of religion. Thus at first the new impulses made an impact rather in individual presentations, which appealed, among other things, to the act of faith and the miracle, both of which were more strictly involved in the sphere of influence of the grace of faith.[93] This tendency, as already indicated, approached the apologetics of dogma and its method, but also evoked new attempts to define the place and proper justification of this discipline.

These exertions became even more prominent in Germany after the Second World War. They were, first, conditioned by the crisis of faith, coming more sharply into awareness, and the "new profile of the unbeliever,"[94] on which especially fundamental theology had to take a stand; but they were also caused by a deeper scientific theoretical awareness of the problem, which was likewise made keener by the situation of the time.[95] Here they first led to a sharper theoretical differentiation within this discipline, which was expressed in the distinction between "apologetics" and "fundamental theology." The term "fundamental theology," ever more establishing itself in place of the defensive-appearing term "apologetics," was to be understood as a self-reflection, immanent in the faith, on the motive of one's own faith, according to H. Lais, and separated from the "apologetics" directed to the unbelievers and proving the "credibility of faith." But at the same time the idea of "fundamental" experienced a new orientation in the progress of modern reliance on science, while it was brought to the meaning of an investigation of foundations, a theological methodology or epistemology. Thus "fundamental theology" was conceived as "theological basic science" after a sort of theological doctrine of principles, which should elaborate and reflect the material as well as the formal principles of theology.[96] A still greater expansion was experienced by the concept of "fundamental," and hence the assigning of the functions of fundamental theology, in K. Rahner, who joined "fundamental theology" with a previous "formal" theology and sought to develop the former as the phenomenology of religions and of Christianity with its culmination in a theory on the "approach of the single to the true religion."[97] But in such an expansion the unity of the subject threatened to be lost again, for such a fundamental theology had the theological scientific theoretical concern common to all theological disciplines, whereas in content it had to be in conflict, as "philosophy of faith," with the philosophy of religion. Therefore these efforts were subject to a not unjustified criticism with regard to the distinction which existed between the foundation of faith and that of theology as a science, and which could be overlooked only to the injury of the clarity and stringency of this discipline.[98] Thus, basically the idea could not be refuted that the task of fundamental theology lay first in the foundation of the act of faith and in the motive of credibility.

---

[93] Cf. also, among others, H. Lang. *Die Lehre des heiligen Thomas von Aquin von der Gewissheit des übernatürlichen Glaubens* (Augsburg 1929); K. Adam, "Vom angeblichen Zirkel im katholischen Lehrsystem und von dem einen Weg der Theologie," *WiWei* 6(1939), 1–25.

[94] Cf. also A. Kolping, *Katholische Theologie gestern und heute,* 221ff.

[95] On this more thoroughly C. Geffré, "Die neuere Geschichte der Fundamentaltheologie," *Concilium* 5(1969), 418–29.

[96] Thus especially G. Söhngen, "Fundamentaltheologie," *LThK* IV, 452.

This basic discussion, which was related also to the recently defined relationship of fundamental theology and apologetics,[99] would then as today, where the discussion has still not ended, have been able to awaken the impression that this discipline is in a crisis which affects its existence. As a matter of fact, this claim is still brought forward. However, it must not be overlooked that fundamental theology, despite this uncertainty, did not actually avoid the function of laying the foundation of faith and in this regard involved an abundance of new questions, which were proposed to it by the modern intellectual development. To these belonged, among others, the problems of hermeneutics, of the authenticity of revelation, of existential and transcendental philosophy, but also questions of ecumenism. The Second Vatican Council especially took up what remained of these exertions and sanctioned them in its historical concept of revelation and of its relation to mankind,[100] without thereby legitimizing the excessive tendencies of the "anthropocentric."

The Evolution of Historical Theology with the Aid of the Historicocritical Method

THE PROGRESS OF CHURCH HISTORY

Catholic church history, as research and teaching, achieved a high status already in the course of the nineteenth century and did not fall behind it in the twentieth. As early as the beginning of this century it became clear that the historicocritical method would be maintained still freer and more decisively than before. In this it was inevitable that the judgments on the ecclesiastical past were more strictly adapted to the assumptions of natural history and that they thereby became also more sober and severe. Symptomatic of this new beginning in the twentieth century can be considered L. Duchesne's (d. 1922) *Histoire ancienne de l'Église,*[101] which, because of his method and presentation, strictly in keeping with the history of religion, of the history of the origin of Christianity was put on the Index in 1912. The extremely positive verdict of A. von Harnack on this work proves[102] that Catholic Church historical investigation was no longer inferior to the Protestant in form but probably permitted the conclusion that in this case it had not yet surely taken the "theological" direction. The attitude of the thoroughly critical S. Merkle (d. 1945) is to be characterized here as more appropriate; it appeared, for example, in its different evaluation of the Enlightenment philosophy,[103] although at that time this did not find general acceptance in the Catholic world. Such expressions of a critical awareness were as little to be attributed to Modernism as the initiatives of A. Ehrhard (d. 1940), working in all areas of church history, who gave to this discipline some stimulation toward its actual and cultural-determinant interpretation. Thus it happened not by chance that out of this historical thought flowed also impulses for the new shape of the Church in modern times, which appeared, among other places, in the much discussed *Catholicism and the Twentieth Century in the Light of the Church's Development in the New Age* (1901). The perspectives offered here for a meeting of Church and secular world could still be termed modern today, but of course they also display the limits set for all concepts and prognoses gathered from history; for, of the two conditions there named for a meeting between Church and world—turning of *modern thought* away from anti-Christian prejudices, turning of *the Church* from an absolutizing of the Middle Ages—the second has indeed been fulfilled in a not always easy development, but not the first, as the appearance of the great movements of apostasy in the first third of the twentieth century shows.

---

[97] "Aufriss einer Dogmatik," *Schriften zur Theologie* I, 29–34.

[98] Thus, among others, A. Lang, I, 30. A. Kolping, *Fundamentaltheologie* I, 75ff., gives instructive information on the problem and its complications.

[99] Cf. also H. Lais, "Apologetik," *LThK* I, 723–28.

[100] For this proof is offered especially by the dogmatic constitution *Dei Verbum* and the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes.*

The élan and the interest in intellectual and cultural history which a church history thus oriented showed at the beginning of the century in its representatives, was, it is true, slowed but not entirely suppressed by the Modernist controversy and the catastrophe of the First World War, which brought disillusionment to optimistic cultural thought. It was only natural that after the end of the war the perspectives in ideas should be de-emphasized and a calm research should appear predominant, with historians of all nations participating. It included and expanded all areas of church historiography: archeology, with J. Wilpert (d. 1940) and J. P. Kirsch (d. 1941); ancient church history and patrology, with F. J. Dölger (d. 1940) and B. Altaner (d. 1958); the Middle Ages, modern times, and hagiography, with H. Delehaye (d. 1941) and P. Peeters (d. 1950); the new history of the missions, with J. Schmidlin (d. 1944); and the especially assiduously cultivated history of the Popes, which, with L. von Pastor (d. 1928), J. Schmidlin, and F. X. Seppelt (d. 1956), posed an equivalent counterweight in this field to Protestant research. A special significance because of its affinity to a deeply felt concern of the age was acquired by the investigations of A. Baumstark (d. 1948) and C. Mohlberg (d. 1963) in the history of liturgy, the results of which indicated the way to the liturgical movement.

---

[101] Three vols. (Paris 1906–10 and later); cf. *Mons. Duchesne et son temps* (Rome 1975).

[102] Cf. also G. Denzler, "Kirchengeschichte als theologische Wissenschaft," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 458.

[103] *Die katholische Beurteilung des Aufklärungszeitalters* (Berlin 1909); to the contrary, A. Rösch, *Ein neuer Historiker der Aufklärung* (Essen 1909).

The intensification of the work of research could not remain without an impact on the exterior organization of the research profession. And so in the course of this widespread activity there came about a recent specialization and separation of individual fields, such as iconography and folklore. On university faculties there resulted, for the same reasons, a dichotomy of the spheres of work and the professorial chairs—ancient church history/patrology, history of the Middle Ages and of modern times—which after the Second World War was followed in some places by still further divisions, such as the church history of a nation.

The works mentioned extended not only to the fundamental investigation of the sources and their editing, in regard to which Catholic researchers in a masterful fashion made their own the precision of the historical method, as, for example, H. Denifle (d. 1905), F. Ehrle (d. 1934), and F. Stegmüller; they proceeded likewise to a comprehensive opening up of new auxiliary means through encyclopedias, lexica, and publication agencies, such as T. Klauser's *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* and Hefele-Leclercq's *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (1924–53); but they also produced new total presentations of church history and likewise more detailed particular presentations elaborated with a new type of hermeneutical understanding. This is true especially of the research in the German sphere, which was still in touch with the roots of historical thought in the nineteenth century. Hence its interests went also to the working out of the historical details, of the specific and organic, while the work in the Latin countries sphere was still interested chiefly in emphasizing the general and the universal. Thus are explained, among other things, the origin of works which revealed the deeper understanding of original Christianity in its specific peculiarity by F. J. Dölger (d. 1940), a new view of the history of the Reformation by J. Lortz, a deeper penetration of the history of the councils by G. Dumeige, H. Bacht, and H. Jedin, and the attempt at a presentation of church history according to the history of ideas.[104] These and like achievements, which had to have an impact on the teaching profession, produced for church history in the German university faculties a leading position which for a time seemed to surpass dogmatic theology, especially when this was taught according to the Neo-Scholastic textbooks. Thus in retrospect it can be ascertained that Catholic church history not only exploited the favor of the spirit of the age, which was unlocked for historical thought, but, conversely, promoted and positively determined this inclination. In this connection, this discipline, which at the beginning of the century had still awakened the suspicions of the ecclesiasitcal *magisterium,* proved itself, in its solidity and objectivity, more and more to be the support of Catholic thought. It was surely no accident that the most striking and effective replies to the Nazi ideology in Germany were given by historians, such as W. Neuss's *Antimythos,* in 1934.

On the whole, even after the Second World War church history retained this positive upward development. The tensions which appeared in the course of the preparation for the dogma of Mary's Assumption between positively oriented history and the different procedure of the justification of the faith resulted from the nature of the matter and were overcome without false dramatizing. In the course of the methodical self-reflection of theology the discussion of the theological character of church history was again taken up and understood by an emphatically theological idea in a salvation-history sense, as, to quote O. Köhler, "mediator between world history and salvation history." Nevertheless, it was to be perceived since the 1950s in the stage when "history" dissolved into "authenticity" and the intellectual orientation was preeminently to the present and future, that historical thought was pushed to the defensive,[105] which may be a reason for the current phenomena of disintegration in Christianity and Church.

OVERCOMING RESISTANCE TO THE HISTORICAL METHOD IN BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

While in church history the historicocritical method ever more established itself from the beginning of the century and could be managed without hindrance in this field, clear limitations ensued for exegesis. In this regard the points of departure for a rise of this discipline were not the worst at the end of the nineteenth century, a situation to which especially the founding of the École biblique in Jerusalem by M. J. Lagrange in 1890 and the works published in the *Revue biblique* since 1892 and in *Études bibliques* since 1900 contributed decisively. The establishment of Catholic biblical criticism undertaken by Lagrange[106] was taken note of even in Germany, where it led, among other things, to the conception by F. von Hummelauer, S. J. (d. 1914), of the idea of an organic notion of inspiration ("economy of salvation") and to the generic historical classification of biblical primitive history, the "vision hypothesis."[107] The *Biblische Zeitschrift,* edited by J. Goettsberger and J. Sickenberger since 1903, worked also in the direction of this thoroughly moderate criticism. But a strongly conservative faction represented by L. Méchineau and L. Fonck opposed this *école large;* this group sought especially to emphasize the principle of fidelity to tradition in scriptural work. A mediation between the opposing forces was hindered by the condemnation of Modernism and of the liberalizing tendencies in the decrees against these emanating from the Biblical Commission in 1903. Although this ecclesiastical agency, like the Biblical Institute, also founded by Pius X in 1909, were intended per se for the positive advancement of scientific scriptural studies, at first they displayed a retarding influence on exegetical research within the Church, which thereupon turned partly to safe peripheral areas, such as textual criticism.

---

[104] J. Lortz, *Geschichte der Kirche in ideengeschichtlicher Betrachtung,* 20th ed. (Münster 1932, 1959).

[105] Thus G. Denzler establishes: "The interest in church history, in fact in history in general, is slight today," in *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 464.

Thus it was not possible for Catholic exegesis to adopt without restriction the results of Protestant scriptural scholarship and the methods of literary criticism, of the comparative science of religion, of the history of tradition and form which lay at its basis. To be sure, it was in this way also spared the mistakes, appearing ever more clearly today, which pertained to the employment of this method, especially in the beginning, and its extreme use.[108] Much as one may occasionally complain that A. Loisy's (d. 1940) suggestions for the use of the historicocritical method were too seldom applied to Holy Scripture, still M. Blondel, here amazingly farsighted, recognized in his confrontation with Loisy that the historical absolutizing of this method could not do justice to Christianity, especially in the form of Catholic dogma, because it threatened finally to lead to a reduction of the whole natural-supernatural reality to the plane of naturalism and positivism.[109]

---

[106] Of epoch-making impact here was especially *La méthode historique* (Paris 1903).

[107] F. von Hummelauer, *Exegetisches zur Inspirationsfrage* (Freiburg 1904).

[108] Cf. also, of course projected out of today's retrospect, the research of G. Maier, *Das Ende der historisch-kritischen Methode* (Munich 1974).

The tension here showing itself between history and dogmatic faith and the task implicit in it of mediating between exegesis and dogma, which would thereafter prove to be an essential motive force of Catholic theology in the first half of the twentieth century, could not yet be absorbed after the First World War by Catholic exegesis for the reasons given. Nevertheless, it by no means refused to have anything to do with the knowledge coming from Protestant scriptural scholarship, although the biblical encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus* of Benedict XV in 1920 warned against "the novel methods of profane science." True, this opening of exegesis occurred in a cautious way, which especially bore fruit in the preferred fields of work of research into the history of the text and literary criticism. But the results found expression also in the respectable works of "introduction" to both the Old and the New Testament, which appeared, among other places, in the prudent adoption of the results of the criticism of the Pentateuch, of the clarification of the sources by J. Wellhausen (d. 1918) as well as in the genre research of H. Gunkel (d. 1932), but also in the Two-Sources Theory relating to the synoptic question.[110] Also the understanding of the history of the form of the Gospels, brought to light by K. L. Schmidt, M. Dibelius, and R. Bultmann around the turn from the second to the third decade, was recognized by Catholic exegesis—H. J. Vogels, M. Meinertz, J. Sickenberger, P. Benoit—in its positive aims and critically adopted.

If no real originality belonged to Catholic exegesis between the two world wars, in comparison to the Protestant, and its strength lay rather in historical-philological precision than in total theological plan, it in no way remained preoccupied in literary-critical and philological explanation. The exertion for a deepened and total view of Holy Scripture led also to first sketches of the genre, long cultivated in Protestantism, of "biblical theology," by F. Ceuppens, P. Heinisch, A. Lemonyer, F. Maier, O. Kuss, and F. Prat, even if these outlines at first, as a consequence of their attachment to the dogmatic tradition, preferred the systematic collective view to historical analysis and its problems.

---

[109] M. Blondel, *Histoire et dogma* (Paris 1904).

[110] As paradigmatic of this new type of introduction can be regarded: J. Nikel, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Münster 1924); J. Goettsberger, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Freiburg 1928): F. Vigouroux et al., *Manuel Biblique,* 14th ed. (Paris 1917, put on the Index); A. Wikenhauser, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament,* 5th ed. (Freiburg 1953, 1962); A. Robert and A. Tricot, *Initiation Biblique,* 3d ed. (Paris 1954); A. Robert and A. Feuillet, *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift,* 2 vols., 2d ed. (Freiburg 1966).

Teaching on the university faculties and also work on the newly appearing biblical commentaries profited from this deeper theological penetration into the spirit and content of Holy Scripture. In addition to the strictly scientific and detailed commentaries, whose prototype was in France the commentary founded by M. J. Lagrange in *Études bibliques* from 1903 and in Germany the never completed *Handbuch zum Alten Testament,* edited by J. Nikel and A. Schulz from 1911 to 1933, there arose a relatively new genre of exegetical work in the form of the biblical explanations extending beyond the world of specialists, which were directed to a broader circle of readers and to the religiously educated laity.[111] These efforts were pushed further and made available even for practical preaching through biblical homiletic works—"Keppler School," F. Tillmann—to which, of course, the corresponding understanding was not offered among the parish clergy.

Still, these efforts remained precisely a proof of the interest in the Bible newly awakened by exegesis, as did also the Bible movement, which, recommended also by the Popes since Pius X, gained influence in various forms in all European countries—in Germany and elsewhere through the founding of the "Catholic Bible Work" in 1933, in Austria in close connection with the "Popular Liturgical Apostolate" of Pius Parsch.

It was probably a fruit of this positive development of the understanding of Scripture in Catholicism and of the method cultivated in the Pontifical Biblical Institute by Augustine Bea that the *magisterium* through Pius XII in the biblical encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* of 1943 proposed caution in regard to modern scriptural scientific methods and recommended to the exegetes to use "prudently" the auxiliary means offered by the modern sciences and to define precisely the literary genres. This official doctrinal pronouncement of the "Liberating Encyclical," often regarded as a breakthrough, was followed by similarly directed official pronouncements in the letter of the Biblical Commission to Cardinal Suhard in 1948[112] down to the instruction of the Papal Biblical Commission on "the historical truth of the Gospels" of 1964,[113] which on the one hand insisted on the "historical truth" of the Gospels, but on the other hand warned against the influx of philosophical and ideological prejudices in the operation of the historical method. At the same time it gave reason to think that the exegete must pursue his work not only as a responsible investigator but also as a believing theologian of the Church.

---

[111] To this belonged, among others, in Germany the *Bonner Bibel* (1912ff., 4th ed. 1931ff.); in Holland the commentary on the New Testament by J. Keuler (1935ff.).

[112] Cf. A. Kolping, op. cit., 260.

[113] R. Marlé, "Historische Methoden und theologische Probleme," *Bilanz der Theologie* II, 260.

Exegesis used this freedom just granted to it with great élan, which found expression in newly conceived commentaries, such as the *Herder-Kommentar,* in fundamental investigations in biblical theology, as also in the "biblical dictionaries" indispensable for the deeper, comprehensive grasp of the deep layers—*Bibellexikon* of 1951, *Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch* of 1950. Even if here and in general the breadth and originality of Protestant biblical scholarship, with its richer tradition, naturally could not be equalled, still a closing of the gap and an approximation to its format became evident. Thereby biblical scholarship also within Catholic theology advanced to a similar position, as befitted it in the sphere of Protestant theology. This resulted, for obvious reasons, in a stronger influence on the systematic disciplines, in relation to which exegesis gained a certain superiority after the Second World War.

For the relations of this discipline to dogma, as in general for its ecclesiastical and faith status, some problems had to ensue, which in the 1950s had not yet made an appearance. Thus it is noteworthy that Catholic biblical scholarship at this time exercised, it is true, caution, for example, in the effort to justify the new Marian dogma, but also did not deny the ecclesiastical position (consult, for example, the problem of the *ultimum fundamentum* of this doctrine in Scripture).[114] Even more attempted at this time was the building of a bridge to dogmatic theology and to the dogma proceeding from Scripture, as when, for example, the route from the New Testament to the doctrine of Chalcedon was shown to be legitimate,[115] a point of departure for the later dogma of original sin was acknowledged in Romans 5:12–19,[116] and in the New Testament precursors of ecclesiastical dogma were found in the presymbols.[117]

From this basic attitude must probably also be explained the fact that Catholic exegesis in the debate, advancing like an avalanche, over R. Bultmann's thesis on demythologization, did not abandon itself to the fashionable trend, but exercised a sensible and firmly fundamental criticism, which still did not underestimate what was positive in Bultmann's concern.[118] The Second Vatican Council recognized intact the results of the epochal upward development of Catholic exegesis since the Second World War and confirmed to this discipline its leading role within theological scholarship in a series of significant statements, as when it approved the application of literary criticism and the rules of modern hermeneutics,[119] when it placed the ecclesiastical *magisterium* as a ministerial function below the Word of God in Scripture,[120] and evaluated all of Scripture and its study as "soul of all theology."[121] Of course, the council also expressed the obligation of ecclesiastical scholarship to cling to the theological bases of exegesis according to faith, in the doctrine of inspiration,[122] in the identification of Scripture and God's Word,[123] and in the emphasis on tradition and Church as the ultimately binding courts of interpretation.[124] Of course these positive statements of the council could not completely develop and clarify the problem involved in them for the self-understanding of exegesis. The ever more clearly appearing effort of exegesis in the succeeding years, in connection with the nonobservance of the principles mentioned, to understand itself as the really basic theological science could not be of use to it for long, chiefly as the opposition, which came to light in the strongly divergent events, made itself noticed as a hindrance.

---

[114] This theme is taken up, among others, by A. Bea, "La sacra scritura 'ultimo fundamento' del domma dell'Assunzione," *CivCatt* 101 (1950), 547–61.

[115] Thus R. Schnackenburg, "Der Abstand der christologischen Aussagen des Neuen Testamentes vom chalkedonischen Bekenntnis nach der Deutung R. Bultmanns," *Chalkedon* III (1954), 675–93, especially 687.

[116] O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* I (Regensburg 1957), 273.

[117] H. Schlier, "Kerygma und Sophia. Zur neutestamentlichen Grundlegung des Dogmas," *Die Zeit der Kirche* (Freiburg 1956). The essay first appeared in 1950–51 in *Evangelische Theologie.*

The Rise of Pastoral Theology to a Scientific Theological Discipline

THE INCREASED SIGNIFICANCE OF GENERAL (FUNDAMENTAL) PASTORAL THEOLOGY

The initiatives, which proceeded from the theology oriented to preaching and from the Bible and liturgical movements, could not remain without effect in the "pastoral care science," especially since these had come into prominence as early as the end of the nineteenth century through a certain flexibility and capacity for accommodation. As a visible sign of this may be regarded the differentiation, beginning around the turn of the century, of pastoral theology into homiletics, catechetics, and liturgy, oriented to the Three Offices Doctrine.[125] Of course, this specialization was purchased with the disadvantage that now there was left for general pastoral theology only a relatively meagre space, which, provided with the colorless designation of "hodegetics," was filled out as regards content with a professional instruction for the pastor which engaged especially in practical directions for its official exercise. Such a "clerical" formal object not only excluded the relation to the entire community but even formally hindered a really scientific elaboration of this subject. And so it was actually taught more in the manner of a technique which should be practiced by the individual pastor on the individual believer than in the manner of a theological reflection. It required a long way until this "remnant" of a pastoral theology again developed to full stature, gained scholarly features, and also again displayed its integrating function relative to the separated partial disciplines.

---

[118] Evaluation of the position of the exegesis in this controversy in K. Hollmann, *Existenz und Glaube. Entwicklung und Ergebnisse der Bultmann-Diskussion in der Katholischen Theologie* (Paderborn 1972), 40–79.

[119] *Dei Verbum,* 12.

[120] Ibid., 9.

[121] *Optatam Totius,* 16.

[122] *Dei Verbum,* 11.

[123] Ibid., 9.

[124] Ibid., 9, 10.

In fact, the rise of pastoral theology from a practical instruction for the pastor for the individual care of his charges to a scientific theological discipline is one of the most positive advances of the history of theology in the first half of the twentieth century. It is self-evident that this progress was completed not uninfluenced by external factors—negative: pastoral and social distress of proletarianization, departure of the masses from the Church; positive: youth, Bible, and liturgical movements—but it still had its own origin in an inner theological area, namely, in the understanding of the significance of Church and community for the self-realization of the Christian in a world which was ever more alienated from the Christian faith.

The actions initiated in the non-scientific area—Pius XI's Catholic Action in 1925; Workers' Movement of J. Cardijn in 1912 and H. Godin in 1943; Young Christian Workers, and so forth—were first expressed only sparingly in scholarly work, as, for example, V. Lithard's *Précis de Théologie Pastorale*[126] with its emphasis on Catholic Action, in G. Stocchiero's *Pratica Pastorale*[127] with its summons to the Church to turn to the world, and in C. Noppel's *Aedificatio Corporis Christi*[128] with the tendency to the inclusion of the laity into the hierarchical apostolate of the Church and to the notion of a care of souls supported by the community.

---

[125] Cf. also V. Schurr, "Pastoraltheologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 371.

[126] Paris 1929, 3d ed. 1941.

[127] Vicenza 1912, 5th ed. 1936.

[128] Freiburg 1937, 2d ed. 1949.

These impulses were increasingly accepted and scientifically investigated by L. Bopp in his *Zwischen Pastoraltheologie und Seelsorgewissenschaft,*[129] which also included the still suspect results of psychoanalysis in the circle of its reflections on pastoral theology. To a greater degree the knowledge of the human sciences, especially psychology and medicine, was included in this phase of development of the research into pastoral theology,[130] just as in moral theology.

But a really theological basic concept only established itself since the 1940s, when, not least on the basis of the utilization of historical knowledge rather than the previous route of pastoral scholarship since the Enlightenment, the proper goal of this science was recognized by F. X. Arnold as "the theological understanding of the pastorally operating Church and its types of activity." The basic theological idea, which C. Noppel had found in the then quite attractive concept of the Body of Christ, was here concretized into the "God-Man Principle." The deeper-lying intention went, on the one hand, to a departure from the anthropocentric narrowness of the pastoral theology of the Enlightenment, on the other hand to the pushing back of the guiding idea, felt as illegitimate, of the salvation-mediating Church, in contrast to which, with the "God-Man Principle" the "Divine Incommunicability" and direct relationship of all the work of salvation moved into the foreground, while only the character of a tool, of course of a personal sort, was acknowledged for the Church itself. In this definition of aim was really found a very fortunate synthesis of the contemporary concerns and movements in dogma, scriptural theology, liturgy, and history. The "unity of theology" here found once again a clear expression that could hardly be better achieved later.

In favor of the religious theology content of this basic pastoral start there speaks, among other things, the then appearing demand for a "care of souls from the altar," as J. Pascher calls it, which indeed set up a high ideal, but nevertheless was not perceived as a slogan and became quite effective in union with the liturgical incentives of the epoch.

Immediately before the beginning of the Second Vatican Council the scientific elaboration of fundamental pastoral theology achieved new progress with the publication of the *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie.*[131] In it this discipline was emphatically developed out of the nature of the Church and the "theological analytics of the situation of the Church," to quote K. Rahner, was defined as its basis. This ecclesiological concept appeared more comprehensive than the previously prevailing "God-Man" or personological foundation. It anticipated in much the results of the "Pastoral Council,"[132] as the Second Vatican understood itself, as, on the other hand, the council also sanctioned these results. Hence it is comprehensible if thereafter pastoral theology, borrowing an idea from Schleiermacher, understood itself as the "crown"[133] of theological scholarship. However, the postconciliar development seems to show also the dangers of this claim to exclusiveness, which are contained in it, namely, that theology as a whole is subject to practical ends.

---

[129] Munich 1937.

[130] As examples the periodical *Arzt und Seelsorger* (since 1925) and the works of A. Niedermeyer on pastoral medicine may serve.

[131] Edited by F. X. Arnold, K. Rahner, V. Schurr, L. M. Weber, and F. Klostermann, 4 vols. (Freiburg 1964–69).

THE CATECHETICAL RENEWAL

The new *theological* orientation with the utilization of general scholarly knowledge made itself especially noticeable positively also in the partial discipline of catechetics, which naturally had to find special attention in the age of a general awakening of youth and its own psychological assessment.[134] To be sure, in catechetics the textual analytical, deductive method of the improved Deharbe Catechism and its preference for the abstract rational presentation as well as its basically apologetic outlook still remained predominant. As an example the *Catechismus Catholicus* published by Cardinal Gasparri in 1930 can serve: in its narrow, theoretically doctrinally conceived manner it did not correspond to the new pedagogical, didactic, and religious psychological demands. Only in the 1930s, especially in Germany and France, did there begin a turning to the kerygmatic direction of presentation, which, following models of a period before Neo-Scholasticism—J.B. Hirscher and his "salvation history" orientation—after a not unproductive "controversy on method," sought a renewal on the bases of the newer theology, the Bible, preaching, and pedagogical understanding.

Here also the inspiring principle consisted in the synthesis of "religion and life,"[135] which could counteract the previous separation of teaching and life and the intellectualistic orientation of instruction. The "Munich Catechetical Method" of textual development in three formal stages—presentation, explanation, stimulation—defined by H. Stieglitz (d. 1920), following O. Willmann, found, after initial resistance, acceptance in Germany as in most other European countries. But it was also fostered by stimulation from other areas, as by the Work School Principle, according to G. Kerschensteiner (d. 1932), which activated in a new way the peculiar activity of students and group instruction. By means of psychology and the philosophy of value the "principle of experience" also more strongly found admission into catechetical instruction, whereupon the formal stages were modified to the triad of value experience, value exposition, and value realization.

---

[132] For this the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes* must especially be regarded as fundamental.

[133] Thus V. Schurr, "Pastoraltheologie im 20. Jahrhundert," *Bilanz der Theologie* III, 375.

[134] These tendencies found expression in the work by E. Spranger, *Psychologie des Jugendalters* (Leipzig 1924, Heidelberg, 27th ed. 1963), which is esteemed and much read even in Catholic circles.

[135] Thus the title of the collection organized by G. Götzel of the Munich Catechetical Union (Munich 1922).

Also very significant were the initiatives which proceeded from Austria, specially interested in practical theology since the Josephinist reform. The *Religionsbüchlein* published by J. Pichler as early as 1913, with its wide extension into more than fifty languages, intended the turning away from the theoretical doctrine following in the wake of Neo-Scholasticism to personal proclamation of salvation and address. These efforts did not accomplish a formal breakthrough until the 1930s, when, following general pastoral theology, the establishing of a proper material kerygmatic and of a material-kerygmatic method occurred with M. Pfliegler and J. A. Jungmann. Here Christocentrism and the biblical foundation were elaborated in a new way to structural elements of religious instruction and of a "thematic didactic play method," which also facilitated a more intimate union between catechesis and biblical instruction. On the whole, in the course of this development catechetics reached the status of a special form of preaching, which not only proved the theological depth of this movement, but also gave evidence of the unbroken strength of the awareness of faith to introduce the aim of kerygmatics among school-pedagogical conditions.

Of course, this development would not have been thinkable without the stimulus coming from France, where since the separation of Church and state the necessity of the external as well as of the internal reform of religious instruction was especially pressing. But the realization of these aims did not occur until after the First World War—pastoral letter of Bishop A. Landrieux of Dijon in 1922—when the "Munich Method" was also accepted there, and the historicobiblical and salvation history orientation was then definitely set in motion. The *Catéchisme a l'usage des Diocèses de France* (1940, 2d ed. 1947), constructed on these foundations, first developed the types of a specific didactic play catechism with clear founding in Holy Scripture, with inclusion of the church year, with consideration of elements of a work of instruction, and with the purposeful orientation to the inner participation in prayer and in religious practice. The model work supplied decisive stimuli to the

Katholischer Katechismus der Bistümer Deutschlands, which after seventeen years of preparation was published in 1955 and by being translated into some thirty languages had a worldwide effect. Of course, soon after the Second Vatican Council it was regarded as no longer suited to the times, which could be less a judgment of its absent qualities than a sign of the quickly changing situation of the age, which catechetics was hardly able to follow with its outlines.

And so, after the Second Vatican Council there again broke out the controversy over method, ignited at the beginning of the century, in the wake of the manifold strivings for adaptation, but also with the rise of the principle of pluralism, which put the unity of catechetics as a science to the test. The move to existential anthropology, becoming effective thereafter, brought about not only a certain turning away from the kerygmatic and biblical orientation, considered as fundamentalist and biblicist, but also produced the danger of leveling catechetics as a kerygmatic communication of the truth of faith in favor of a purely school history of religious information and of a religious and moral offering. True, the Second Vatican Council acknowledged[136] catechetical instruction as the first means of help in the Church's task of educating, but it also clearly placed it in the "service of the Word,"[137] and did not inaugurate its narrowly existential or informative direction.

THE TURNING OF HOMILETICS TO KERYGMATICS

Following the rise of catechetics and in a certain parallelism to it, there also took place in homiletics an upward movement, which benefited from the stimulation of historical, biblical, and liturgical theology. The difficulties and problems of this ecclesiastical service to people of the mass-epoch and modern industrial society could not but be especially dramatically prominent in the Church's preaching ministry. The disparity between the expenditure of work here occurring and the visible success spread the impression of a "collapse" of preaching, which Benedict XV's encyclical on preaching, *Humani generis* (1917), appearing during the First World War, complained of without being able to oppose anything substantial to it. This lay not only in the unfavorable state of the times, which prevented a stronger echo of the papal doctrinal letter, but even more in the missing theological foundation of homiletics, which was more and more strongly dependent on the idea of a "theory of spiritual eloquence."[138] In this connection interest in preaching and the effort for its greater efficacy were not slight, as the growth of special periodicals,[139] of systematic instruction,[140] of practical means of assistance,[141] but also of more profound theological and spiritual guides[142] prove. The putting of these exertions into practice was done by a series of impressive preaching figures, such as Bishop P. W. Keppler (d. 1926), A. Donders (d. 1944), Cardinal Faulhaber (d. 1952), R. Guardini (d. 1968),[143] and others, whose activity, especially in the Germany of the Nazi era, did not remain without echo. If it also appears somewhat exaggerated to speak of this epoch beginning after the First World War as of an "age of homiletics,"[144] still on the whole a suitable estimation of the effort of this period is thereby given.

---

[136] *Gravissimum educationis,* 4.

[137] *Dei Verbum,* 25.

[138] Thus the title of a work, not unimportant in its day, by J. Jungmann, 2 vols. (Freiburg 1877, 4th ed. 1908).

The novelty and central point of this effort is only appreciated, however, if one points to the biblical-theological foundation. Compared with the previous exertions of homiletics in regard to preaching, which were of a predominantly formal-rhetorical sort, though not without regard for the religious subject, there occurred at the end of the first third of this century in the framework of the development of fundamental pastoral theology also an application of the kerygmatic to preaching as its material and formal principle. From this principle was derived the joining of the content of preaching to Scripture, which led in practice to the rediscovery of the homily as the form directly modeled on the reading and interpretation of Scripture, but from it also derived in the formal realm the personal character of address, the authority of Christ lying in the Word, and the conviction of the quasi-sacramental efficacy of this Word in the believing hearer. In the theoretical elaboration of these theological bases the works of J. A. Jungmann[145] and others showed the way. In the practical application of these principles the explanations of preaching by F. Tillmann,[146] which were on a high level, accomplished much that was significant.

After the Second World War the theological basis of kerygmatics experienced also from the side of dogma a broad support and deepening in the development of a "Theology of the Word," which was conceived not without stimulation by the Protestant theology of the Word.[147] Also this meeting of homiletics and dogma may be regarded as an example for the awareness of unity of the theological disciplines, which was significant for the state of all of contemporary theology.

---

[139] Cf., among others, *Kirche und Kanzel* (Paderborn 1918–43); *Chrysologus* (Paderborn 1860–1939).

[140] Thus, among others, F. Schubert, *Grundzüge der Homiletik,* 3d ed. (Graz 1934).

[141] To it belonged especially A. Koch, *Homiletisches Handbuch,* 12 vols. (Freiburg 1937ff.).

[142] Cf., among others, A. D. Sertillanges, *Verkünder des Wortes* (Salzburg 1936).

[143] Guardini's importance in this field was recently assessed by F. Wechsler, *Romano Guardini als Kerygmatiker* (Paderborn 1973).

[144] Thus V. Schurr, op. cit., 385.

[145] *Die Frohbotschaft und unsre Glaubensverkündigung* (Regensburg 1936).

[146] *Erklärung der sonntäglichen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf 1918, 8th ed. 1950); *Erklärungen zu den sonntäglichen Episteln* followed in 1921 and the 5th ed. in 1950, and *zu den festtäglichen Episteln und Evangelien* (1940, 2d ed. 1950).

Of course, after the Second World War the inadequacies of this kerygmatic were felt, with the emergence of the notion of "radical authenticity" into theological thought—demythologizing—with the turn to philosophical-theological existentialism, and with the appearance of reflection on the phenomenon of secularization. They concerned not only the precritical, somewhat unhistorical previous exegetical justification—thus, for example, especially discernible in R. Guardini's interpretation of the life of Jesus in his attractive book *Der Herr*[148]—but also the authoritative address of this "kerygmatic" and its defective adaptation of the message to the one "addressed," who was no longer to be seen only as "object" of the address and also rather to be "met" in his secularized environment. But contrary to these critical objections, which became still stronger after the Second Vatican Council, although the council accepted and gathered together all these impulses in its sober attitude, it must be considered that the problems touched on in them were articulated but not solved. It even seems that the radical solutions—preaching as "information"; preaching as a form of a "political" theology—on the whole approximated rather a step back and a withdrawal from the center. All together, a glance backward to the homiletic and pastoral theological efforts of the period before the council could establish what generally holds good for the development of theology: the building of a bridge to the contemporary believer. Overall the mediation to the spirit of the age succeeded not badly and perhaps better than that of modern theology in its too pronounced and intentional striving for modernity and accommodation to the spirit of the time. As historical experience can teach, theological scholarship must not merely "straggle behind," it must also, to a certain extent, lead.

THE REESTABLISHMENT OF LITURGY AS "THEOLOGY OF WORSHIP"

Unquestionably the liturgy had the most extraordinary and for the outside observer the most visible rise in the first half of this century. It developed in this period from a peripheral theological science, which was still included by the constitution *Deus scientiarum Dominus* of 1931 among the auxiliary disciplines of theology,[149] to that of a necessary and important "principal subject," a position attributed to it by the Second Vatican Council.[150] In this connection the original incentives and impulses for this development characterizing modern Catholicism lay at first not in the purely scholarly sphere, even if scholarship after a certain starting time opened itself to the new awakened forces, regulated them, and influenced them in turn (see Chapter 9).

---

[147] Cf., among others, O. Semmelroth, *Wirkendes Wort. Zur Theologie der Verkündigung* (Frankfurt 1962).

[148] *Betrachtungen über die Person und das Leben Jesu Christi* (Würzburg 1937, 13th ed. 1964).

Stimulated by the liturgical movement, liturgical scholarship also displayed an activity of a new type, which now had as its subject no longer only historical work on the sources, which had been intensively under way since the turn of the century in the course of the growing interest in history.[151] Now ensued the widening and deepening of the work to a sort of "theology of worship," which was accomplished with the acceptance of the equally vigorous ecclesiological and sacramental thought in this period by the theological foundation of the pastoral-practical movement. Its aim was directed to raising the theological stock of ideas from the liturgical sources to the goal of their more profound exploration, but also to the fructification of the entire life of faith. Pius XII later gave to this aim the motto taken from tradition of the *lex supplicandi,* which is to determine the *lex credendi.*[152] In the course of this orientation there occurred considerations, pressing to the essential, on the "spirit of the liturgy,"[153] on the connection between "liturgy and the Kingdom of God,"[154] on the meaning of the Eucharist,[155] as well of the sacraments,[156] all of which contributed to the enrichment of dogmatic theology. Again the greatest significance for this intellectual foundation-laying was gained by the *mysterium* theory of

---

[149] This corresponded somewhat to its classification by the Code of Canon Law, Canon 1365, par. 2.

[150] *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 16.

[151] In the nature of examples for this matter are the works and editions, partly quoted in the church history survey, of A. Franz (d. 1916), *Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg 1962); M. Férotin, *Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum* (Paris 1912); C. Mohlberg (d. 1963), *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli* (Rome 1960); *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Rome 1958).

[152] Encyclical *Mediator Dei* (1947).

[153] R. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Freiburg 1918, 19th ed. 1957); *Liturgische Bildung* (Rothenfels 1923).

[154] Cf. also J. Kramp, *Messliturgie und Gottesreich. Darlegung und Erklärung der kirchlichen Messformulare,* 3 vols (Freiburg 1921, 5th ed. 1922).

[155] The following may serve as examples for this liturgical-theological orientation: J. A. Jungmann, *Die liturgische Feier. Grundsätzliches über Formgesetze der Liturgie* (Regensburg 1939); J. Pascher, *Eucharistia. Gestalt und Vollzug* (Münster 1947).

[156] J. Pinsk, *Die sakramentale Welt* (Freiburg 1938).

O. Casel (d. 1948),[157] in the discussion of which the work was altogether motivated to the theological clarification of the Sacrifice of the Mass and of sacramental reality.[158] It was not least of all the process of theological deepening which obstructed an externalization of the aims, lying within the area of the possible, and which finally also paralyzed the fears and resistances to this movement, that occasionally increased enormously.[159] A clarification to be understood in the affirmative sense was finally produced by Pius XII's encyclical on the liturgy, *Mediator Dei* (1947), which by way of suggestion already made known the desire for reforms in liturgy, whereas the hitherto practical efforts in regard, for example, to Gregorian chant[160] and church music,[161] had operated rather in the sense of a restoration. The Pope introduced some significant reforms, including the approval of numerous rituals with vernacular texts and songs, the introduction of a new translation of the psalms, the *Psalterium Pianum,* but especially the renewal of the Holy Week and Easter Vigil Liturgies. The fact that these reforms were either prepared or accompanied by research,[162] ever more intensified after the Second World War, as well as by the work of the newly founded Liturgical Institute[163] and the liturgical congresses[164] produced for liturgical scholarship a theological importance which was highly esteemed by the Second Vatican Council. The council itself had multiplied the tasks of this discipline with its reforms, carried out or announced. But it could not be foreseen that it would be necessary for the liturgy in the era beginning after the council, when the liturgical movement branched out and an at times excessive wave of experimenting and adapting followed it, to look back again rather at the "spirit of the liturgy," as R. Guardini expressed it, and the theological bases of its work as *Opus Dei.*

---

[157] In addition to the works cited in n. 30, special notice should be given to the parts of his literary remains that have been published of his planned "special life work": *Das christliche Opfermysterium. Zur Morphologie und Theologie des eucharistischen Hochgebetes,* ed. by V. Warnach (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1968).

[158] On the results to the end of World War II information is supplied by T. Filthaut, *Die Kontroverse über die Mysterienlehre* (Warendorf 1947).

[159] An expression of these fears and tensions is presented by the brochure of J. Kassiepe, *Irrwege und Umwege im Frömmigkeitsleben der Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1940).

[160] The reform of the chant obtained from Pius a new impetus through the motu proprio of 1904 and the decree of 29 April 1911.

[161] Cf. also the motu proprio on church music, *Tra le sollecitudini* of 22 November 1903.

[162] As examples the following may be referred to: J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia* (Vienna 1948, 5th ed. 1962); *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* (1950ff.); *La Maison-Dieu* (1945ff.); M. A. P. Schmidt, *Introductio in Liturgiam Occidentalem* (Rome, Freiburg, and Barcelona 1960); C. Vagaggini, *Il senso teologico della Liturgia* (Rome 1957); C. Floristan, *El año litúrgico,* 2d ed. (Barcelona 1966).

[163] In Germany: the Liturgisches Institut at Trier (since 1947); in France: the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique at Paris (since 1947); in Italy: the Centro di Azione Liturgica at Genoa (since 1947).

[164] Here may be named selectively: Frankfurt 1950; Munich 1955; Assisi 1956; Nijmegen 1959.

The formation and growth of liturgical scholarship, which was intentionally placed here at the end of the first phase of the history of theology in the first half of the twentieth century, can, it is true not be taken as the supreme value for reaching a verdict on the total development of the theology of this period, because naturally a development does not proceed in all departments of knowledge in the same way. Hence the entire verdict on this theological period must also be more cautious. Nevertheless, it cannot be expressed negatively: Measured by the standard of scholarship, the accomplishments of the historicocritical work of theology stand on no low stage; in the systematic sphere the effort for a more vital grasping and stating of the truths of faith was not to be underestimated, even if great syntheses remained rare. As regards the claim of this theology on the Church, it felt itself on the whole to be rather the serving agent of the body of teachers and believers than as a critical tribunal. And so its calls for reform were moderate and restrained, although it was precisely in this moderation that they had their effect in the Church and did not leave the faithful uninfluenced. As regards this theology's ecumenical and world relations, the total attitude may often seem to the modern observer to be strongly introverted, too self-centered, and too little open. True, the "bringing back of the world"[165] was also its concern, which it intended to realize not by means of external activities and proclamations but by the interior way of penetration into the *mysterium* of salvation, which remained the real object of its work. Surely there resulted from this the danger of an imbalance of the "sapiential," "contemplative" factor to the detriment of direct and world-related action, the limits of which it recognized in a certain sobriety. Here it was more realistic than the enthusiastic optimism of an A. Ehrhard at the beginning of the century, and under the impression of the powers of wickedness that burst forth in two world wars it could rightly be convinced that the modern world would never abandon its aversion to Christianity. Nevertheless, this theology, with all its limitations and boundaries, prepared the council of the "Church's opening up to the world" and paved the way for it.

---

[165] Thus the title of a book by O. Bauhofer (Freiburg 1937), highly regarded in its day.

CHAPTER 9

*Movements within the Church and Their Spirituality**

In the years following the First World War there ensued a series of new starts, indeed an extensive and profound renewal of religious and ecclesiastical life in Central Europe. The reasons for this are many-layered: first of all, the concentration and consolidation of church life in the nineteeth century under the guidance of Popes such as Pius IX, Leo XIII, and Pius X produced their fruit. Very different in character, style of leadership, and determination of goals, these Popes made their contribution each in his own way. What had long been regarded as dead proved to be alive. The experience of the war and of the collapse of a liberal, individualistic culture that believed in progress created a new openness to transcendence and the predetermined truths of revelation, as well as to the form of religious life in the ecclesial community. The philosopher Peter Wust (1884–1940) indicated the keyword, applicable also to other fields, with titles such as "resurrection of metaphysics" (1920) and "the return of German Catholicism from exile" (1924). The call of the age for the "spirit of the whole," as expressed by Julius Langbehn, the demand for the organically grown, for life as the genuinely real and creative against intellectualism and materialism, against isolation and uprooting, the turning to the original, to the sources, away from the manufactured, derived, and merely imagined were united with the new self-consciousness of awakened religious forces. These were expressed especially in the liturgical movement, the Bible movement, and the lay movement supported by a new awareness of the Church. But these were not currents moving parallel and to be separated from one another; rather, they influenced one another and supported one another. At first they affected smaller circles of academicians and youth in the associations of the Catholic youth movement, whereas the broad strata of the communities were further supported in their religious life by the forms of devotion characteristic of the nineteenth century: devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and to the Virgin-Mother Mary. But the development of the decades from 1920 to 1950 was noted for the fact that these more traditional forms of devotion were also affected by reflection on Holy Scripture, the theology of the Fathers, and the liturgy of the Church and the Christocentrism contained in it.

---

* Erwin Iserloh

The Liturgical Movement

The beginnings of the liturgical movement extend into the nineteenth century; they are related to the renewal of Benedictine monasticism. The Belgian abbey of Maredsous, founded in 1872 from Beuron, which had been established in 1863, in 1882 published a people's missal, the *Missel des Fidèles.* Anselm Schott (1845–96), who had lived at Maredsous during the temporary suppression of Beuron in the *Kulturkampf,* followed this example in 1884. By means of his *Mass Book* he aimed, as he said in the foreword, "to contribute a little so that the Church's rich treasure of prayer, which is set down in its sacred liturgy, may become more and more accessible and familiar to the faithful."

The impetus to the liturgical movement as a breakthrough of the laity to active participation in the Church's liturgy proceeded from Belgium. It had been preceded by the decrees of Pius X of 1903 and 1904 on the chant and of 1905 on frequent and early Communion. In keeping with his motto, "To unite all things in Christ," the Pope aspired to the renewal and consolidation of the Christian spirit of the faithful. "The first and indispensable source from which this spirit is drawn," so Pius X stressed in the motu proprio of 1903, "is the active participation of the faithful in the sacred mysteries and the public and solemn prayer of the Church."[1] A Benedictine of Mont César, Lambert Beauduin (d. 1960), was deeply affected by these ideas of the Pope. Before his entry into the monastery—he was professed in 1907—he had been a diocesan priest at Liége and had belonged to the "Labor Chaplains," a community of worker-priests. Accordingly, also as a monk he strove to work among the people by means of the liturgy, that is, to move out of the narrow framework of academic circles into the congregations. At the National Congress of Catholic Works, inaugurated by Cardinal Mercier, he demanded at Mechelen in 1909 that the missal itself should be disseminated as the prayerbook but at least that the complete text of the Mass and of Sunday vespers should be made available to the people in a vernacular translation. This congress became the "Mechelen Happening"[2] through the enthusiastic talk of a layman, the history professor Godefroid Kurth (d. 1916). In it he traced religious ignorance back to the still greater ignorance of the liturgy. He concluded thus: "Give to the faithful an understanding and, as a consequence, a love for the mysteries which they celebrate, give them the missal to use, and with it replace the many mediocre prayerbooks." An enthusiastic assent of the congress was given. A few weeks later there appeared in a large printing for Advent the first fascicle of *La vie liturgique,* a small booklet which provided the liturgical texts with the corresponding explanations.

---

[1] *ASS* 36 (1903–04), 388.

[2] B. Fischer, "Das 'Mechelner Ereignis' vom 23.9.1909," *LJ* 9 (1959), 203–19; E. Iserloh, "Die Geschichte der Liturgischen Bewegung," *Hirschberg* 12, (1959), 113–22, 115.

In Germany the liturgical movement at first remained confined to academic circles. The spiritual leadership belonged to the abbey of Maria Laach under Abbot Ildefons Herwegen (1874–1946). In 1913 he celebrated Holy Week with a group of academicians—among them men such as the future Chancellor Heinrich Brüning and French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman[3]—and revealed to them the liturgy as source of piety. At Maria Laach in 1918 the first "community Mass" was celebrated as *Missa recitata* or, preferably, *dialogata.*

The Catholic youth, affected by the general German youth movement, first the Fountain of Youth under Romano Guardini, then the student movement New Germany, and finally the Association of Young Men and the Storm Band under Ludwig Wolker (1871–1955), enthusiastically adopted the new manner of celebrating the liturgy. In the liturgy these youth found a realization of their longing for community, for essential and authentic form, and for the embodiment of religion in "sacred signs." For their part they promoted the liturgical movement with their untroubled enthusiasm to victory against resistance and abuses as well as against theological hesitations. The spontaneously growing new liturgical practice was from the start accompanied and clarified by a theology which united strictly scientific, even historicoarchaeological investigation with proclamation and piety. Especially effective in the area of liturgical formation was Romano Guardini (1885–1968) with his *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (1918), *Liturgische Bildung* (1923), *Von heiligen Zeichen* (1927), and his scriptural-theological introduction, *Der Herr* (1937). He led to reading and reflection on Holy Scripture, but also encouraged that the world should be taken seriously and interpreted with the eyes of faith. From 1923 professor in Berlin of Philosophy of Religion and Catholic Worldview, he understood these as "the unity of that view which embraces the living reality of the world by faith."

The texts of the Ordinary of the Mass, published by the three communities mentioned for common prayer in the "Community Mass," give a picture of the growing liturgical and religious and pedagogical experience: The *Gemeinschaftliche Andacht zur Feier der heiligen Messe,* published by Guardini in 1920, provided the text of the Mass only with paraphrasing interpretive additions. The *Missa* composed in 1924 by Father Joseph Kramp (1886–1940) for the "Union of New Germany" led to the praying aloud of the entire Mass from the prayers at the foot of the altar to the Last Gospel except for the canon, without making any distinction between the public prayers of the priest and the congregation and the private prayers of the priest. This booklet was an expression of the first excess of zeal in which people felt that the community nature of the Mass was expressed by the fact that all prayed everything, which threatened to lead to an empty, loud operation and supplied welcome material to critics. The *Kirchengebet* published in 1928 by Ludwig Wolker made the newer knowledge its own, especially in the later issues, and, in accord with the "High Mass Rule," asked which prayers belonged to the priest, the reader, and the congregation respectively, and which were to be prayed quietly. The translations of the *Kirchengebet,* which had a circulation of several million, were transformed into new editions of diocesan prayerbooks.

---

[3] R. Schuman, "Ein Blatt dankbarer Erinnerung," *LJ* 9 (1959), 194.

This route of the liturgical movement into the congregations was first taken in the German language area by the "Popular Liturgical Apostolate" of Klosterneuburg near Vienna under Pius Parsch (1884–1954). In his own publishing establishment he published the texts of the Sunday liturgy—25 million down to 1930—in order to "bring the Church's worship to the simple folk." He revealed the meaning of the liturgy for a new biblical piety in books such as *The Church's Year of Grace* (1923, 14th ed. 1952–58) in three volumes, *Lernt die Messe verstehen* (1931), and in the periodicals *Bibel und Liturgie* (1926ff.) and *Lebe mit der Kirche* (1928ff.).

"Popular liturgy and pastoral care" were also the supporting elements of the parish work of city pastors such as Georg Heinrich Hörle (1889–1942) at Frankfurt, Konrad Jacobs (1874–1931) at Mühlheim in the Ruhr, Joseph Könn (1876–1960) at Cologne, and of the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri, founded at Leipzig in 1930. Starting with the axiom that all participation has to take place in accord with the capabilities of the participant, there was sought a celebration of Mass and of the Liturgy of the Hours that would do justice to both the liturgy and the congregation. Thus there came about the "Prayed Sung Mass" and the "German High Mass," in which the texts were sung in melodies adapted to the German language, and priest, servers, choir, and congregation performed the parts of the liturgy proper to them.

With such a distribution of roles the danger of an activist industry was banned; in the liturgical happening there were periods when the individual, priest or member of the congregation listened quietly or silently sought union with the common action or assented to the effecting word of the priest. If liturgical piety meant extension of often narrow and egoistic prayer to the concerns of the Church, immersion in the movement through Christ in the Holy Spirit to the Father, it is still not a substitute for prayer in the "private room," that is, for the intimate encounter of the individual with God. Community prayer demanded that reflective "personal" prayer should not become a soulless idling. This integration of the public congregational prayer and the prayer of the individual has still not been fully achieved. This shows the difficulty of terminology. For the latter must not be "private," and the former must not be impersonal. It is not enough that one praying liturgically should lend only his lips to the Church for the praise of God. In the 1930s there were violent confrontations over this.

Exaggerations, narrow-mindedness, and wilfullness of overzealous circles from the liturgical movement led to anxious and passionate criticism, among other places, in the lively book of the popular missionary M. Kassiepe, *Irrwege und Umwege im Frömmigkeitsleben der Gegenwart* (1939), and in A. Doerner's *Sentire cum Ecclesia* (1941). But there was no "official short circuit," against which R. Guardini had warned in 1940 in his "Word on the Liturgical Question," a letter to Bishop Stohr. Instead, the conflicts led to the German bishops' taking up the liturgical efforts, and so the liturgical movement became the liturgical renewal directed by the Church's authority. In 1940 the Episcopal Conference formed the Liturgical Section under Bishops Albert Stohr and Simon Konrad Landersdorfer and a Liturgical Commission of experts in theory and practice. Their work led to the 1942 "Guidelines for the liturgical structure of the parochial liturgy."

A memorandum of Archbishop Konrad Gröber of Freiburg, which he submitted on 18 January 1943 to the Curia and his fellow-bishops,[4] threatened to lead to a new crisis. The seventeen points "giving occasion for uneasiness" were, among others: the imminent schism in the clergy, an "alarmingly flourishing mysticism of Christ" as a consequence of an exaggerated interpretation of the doctrine of the *Corpus Christi Mysticum,* the overstressing of the doctrine of the general priesthood, the "thesis of Meal-Sacrifice and Sacrificial Meal," the "overemphasis of the liturgical," the effort to make the congregational Mass obligatory, and the use of German in the Mass. "Can we German bishops," thus concluded Conrad Gröber, "and can Rome still keep silent?" This memorandum crossed a letter of Cardinal Secretary of State Maglione, which the chairman of the Episcopal Conference, Cardinal Bertram, received on 11 January 1943. In it there was complaint against encroachments by radical representatives of the liturgical movement, a report on them was demanded, and a series of proposals was made as to how the good in it could be fostered.

---

[4] T. Mass-Ewerd, *Die Krise der Liturgischen Bewegung in Deutschland. Studien zu den Auseinandersetzungen um die "Liturgische Frage" während des Zweiten Weltkriegs auf Grund bisher unveröffentlichter Dokumente* (Regensburg 1977); F. Kolbe, *Die Liturgische Bewegung* (Aschaffenburg 1964), 72–75.

In the opinion of the West German bishops of 8 April 1943 to the Roman inquiry there was expressed how very much the celebration of the liturgy had become a source of strength in the age of National Socialism and of the war. "German Catholicism has been for ten years in abnormal circumstances. An activist young clergy and an equally activist Catholic youth that is enthusiastic for the faith see themselves more and more abruptly repressed on all sides. . . . Add to this, that it is of great importance to zealous young priests to give at least to the youth in the Church an awareness and experience of community, to bind them to the Church, and thereby to deepen and consolidate them in the faith."[5]

On 10 April 1943 Cardinal Bertram gave to Rome a comprehensive report on the origin of the liturgical movement, on the forms of congregational participation in Mass, including the German High Mass as a "sung Mass, joined with popular singing in German," and on the "defects and mistakes of the liturgical movement." An indirect position on the controverted questions was indicated as early as Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici corporis,* because in it the Pope acknowledged the understanding of the Church by the liturgical movement and termed the new understanding of the sacred liturgy the cause of a deeper consideration of the riches of Christ in the Church.

On 24 December 1943 Maglione made known the Roman decision to Cardinal Bertram. In it the religious and pastoral fruits of the liturgical movement were praised but a warning was lodged against arbitrary innovations, the desires made known by Bertram relative to the forms of Mass were granted, and work on a German ritual was encouraged. Finally, it was suggested to the bishops to take the leadership in hand. The final point of the Roman examination and the point of departure for the liturgical reform pursued by the Curia came in the encyclical on the sacred liturgy, *Mediator Dei,* of 20 November 1947. In it Pius XII made use of the keyword of "active and personal participation." The liturgy is "the public worship which our Redeemer, the Head of the Church, gives to the heavenly Father and which the community of believers offers to its Founder and through him to the eternal Father. . . . It displays the total public worship of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, namely, the Head and his members."[6]

A Roman commission was established in 1946–47 for the reform of the liturgical books. In the "Liturgical Institute" the German bishops created a work center at Trier. Corresponding institutions arose in other countries, such as the *Centre de pastorale liturgique* at Paris. In addition to liturgical congresses at Frankfurt in 1950, Munich in 1955, and Assisi in 1956, international study meetings took place. The Congregation of Rites approved the German ritual in 1950, in 1951 occurred the restoration of the Easter vigil, and in 1955 the renewal of all of Holy Week. The precept of the Eucharistic fast was greatly mitigated in 1953 and 1957 and thereby the way for the general permission for evening Mass was opened. Even after the announcement of the council and although the general reform of the liturgy was reserved to it, in 1960 a reform of the rubrics of breviary and Mass was decreed. It produced a simplification and served the real and meaningful performance of the rites and prayers. All these preliminary activities make it understandable that at the council the "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" (1963) was the first item ready for a decree and also that the postconciliar reorganization of the liturgy could proceed quickly. The council made the active participation of the congregation, called for by Popes Pius X, Pius XI, and Pius XII, possible in a way that no one could have expected and thereby took up the aims of the liturgical movement for the Universal Church (see Chapter 4). Meanwhile, it had spread to other European countries—for example, to the abbey of Silos in Spain—and to America—to Saint John's Abbey in Collegeville—where it obtained a social and ethical character.

---

[5] T. Maas-Ewerd, loc. cit.

[6] *AAS* 39 (1947), 521–95, 528f.

New Awareness of the Church and the Scriptural Movement

The liturgical movement was an expression of a new awareness of the Church, just as, conversely, the celebration of the liturgy permitted an entirely new experience of the Church as community. As early as 1921 Romano Guardini had declared in lectures "on the Meaning of the Church": "A religious movement of incalculable import has begun: the Church is awaking in souls."[7] Against religious individualism and subjectivism Guardini showed: "The religious life no longer proceeds only from the I, but at the same time awakens in the opposite pole, in the objective, formed community" (p.13).

It could be expected that youth which, in the name of truthfulness and personal responsibility, stood up against convention and the claims to authority on the part of civil society would have rejected the Church with its foreign legality and its rigid institutions. On the contrary: In the Church's liturgy wide circles of youth found a vital expression and a corroboration of their longing for community and at the same time correction and support in their predetermined and established position. Church was experienced not so much as institution, as agent of salvation, but as fruit of salvation, of community of life and love, whose center and foundation is Christ himself. "Christ the Lord is the real I of the Church."[8] He is the head, and Christians have life and salvation as members of his body. Church was seen preeminently as *Corpus Christi mysticum.* If hitherto, especially in the nineteenth century, the Catholic had understood the Church as something like a collective person, to which he belonged, whose adherent or child he was, which he defended and loved, and in which he believed, so now there is question of a community, which he believes and whose member he is. The Christian does not stand facing the Church, but in it: "We are the Church," is said in many addresses and professions. Submission to the Church or, better, into the Church does not mean self-alienation but self-discovery: "To that extent I am a Christian personality, when I am a member of the Church and the Church is living in me. If I speak to it, then I say, in a fully profound understanding, not 'you' but 'I.' "[9]

---

[7] R. Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche* (Mainz 1922), 1.

Thus the Church could be understood, in fact experienced, as a principle of life, not so much as a legislator but as the source of strength and in the effort for the neighbor as the motive of moral and ascetical exertion. Books such as *Der mystische Leib Christi als Grundprinzip der Askese* (1936) by F. Jürgensmeier or *Morale et Corps mystique* (1937) by E. Mersch are characteristic of this. Altogether people wanted to move away from a casuistic and individualistic doctrine of sin to a doctrine of virtue as the message of the imitation of Christ. This was the direction taken by the *Handbuch der katholischen Sittenlehre* (1931–37) of the former exegete, Fritz Tillmann (1874–1935), with the volumes *Idee der Nachfolge Christi* and *Die Verwirklichung der Nachfolge Christi.*

The scriptural movement had made it possible to get to know this Christ, to meet him not in the rarefaction of Neo-Scholastic theology or of catechisms, but directly in Holy Scripture. Christocentric piety was awakened and deepened by means of the text of the New Testament itself in good vernacular translations and a series of scientifically based books on the life of Jesus, such as M. J. Lagrange, *L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ* (1928); L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus-Christ, sa personne, son message* (1928); J. Lebreton, *La vie et l'enseignement de Jésus-Christ, notre Seigneur* (1931); F. M. Willam, *Das Leben Jesu im Lande und Volke Israel* (1933); K. Adam, *Christus unser Bruder* (1926) and *Jesus Christus* (1933); R. Guardini, *Der Herr* (1937); and others. The program of Catholic youth read: "Life formation in Christ." Jesus, undiminished Man in his divinity, became the model, and the "Christus totus," Christ continuing to live as the Church, was seen as the basis of one's own life and of love of neighbor. Untroubled by an opposition between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith, people directly took up the text of the Gospels in private reading of Scripture or in "Bible Groups," sought to make present, in the style of the *Spiritual Exercises* of Saint Ignatius Loyola, the scenes, situations, and figures described there, and to find the "application" to their personal life. Characteristic of this sort of biblical work is the book by Martin Manuwald, S. J., *Christuskreis. Der Jugend und ihren Führern.*"[10]

---

[8] Karl Adam in *Das Wesen des Katholizismus,* which appeared in its first edition in 1924, in its thirteenth in 1957.

[9] Ibid., 33.

Catholic Action

Corresponding to the new awareness of the Church in broad circles of the laity and their understanding that a person could be a living member in the body of Christ only if the life stream is passed on, was the summons by the Popes to the lay apostolate, to Catholic Action. At the beginning of his pontificate, which was put under the motto "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ," Pius XI, alluding to the general priesthood of all believers, summoned to "active work for the spread and renewal of the Kingdom of Christ."[11] In a letter of 13 November 1928 to Cardinal Bertram and elsewhere, the Pope several times defined *Actio catholica* as the "participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy."[12] It is a "social movement" with the aim "of advancing the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and thereby communicating to human society the highest of all goods." Catholics, in their sharing in the hierarchy's apostolate, should be put in the position "of spreading everywhere the principles of the Christian faith and of Christian doctrine, defending them energetically, and giving effect to them in private and in public life."[13] The Pope saw the Church preeminently as the Kingdom of God on earth. In conformity with this was the institution of the solemnity of Christ the King in the jubilee year 1925. Christ's royal dominion was based on the innate right of his divine and human natures as well as on the acquired right of his work of redemption. Only in the recognition of his Kingship in private and public life can a world without peace and help find peace. "The plague of our age," stressed the Pope in the encyclical *Quas primas* on the institution of the solemnity of Christ the King, "is the so-called laicism, with its errors and godless aims." Catholics have "neither that social position nor that influence . . . which those really should have who hold high the torch of truth." The Pope attributes this deplorable state of affairs "to the indifference and timidity of the good, who withdraw from the fight or make only a weak resistance. . . . But if only all the faithful understand that they must fight under the standard of Christ the King with courage and perseverance, then they will strive with apostolic zeal to lead the alienated and ignorant souls back to the Lord, and they will exert themselves to maintain his rights inviolate."[14]

---

[10] Nuremberg 1930.

[11] *AAS* 14 (1922), 695.

[12] Ibid. 20 (1928), 385.

[13] Ibid.

The organization of Catholic Action under strict guidance of the hierarchy was strongly determined by the situation of the Church in Italy under the Fascist regime, which wanted to assure the Church only a meagre freedom of movement for its impact in the world and which especially claimed for itself the education of the young. A crisis arose even after the Lateran Treaties as a consequence of the totalitarian claims of Fascism. In the sharp encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* on 29 June 1931[15] Pius XI warded off the attacks on Catholic Action, whose nonpolitical character had been established in ARTICLE 43 of the concordat and himself attacked the absolutizing of the state. On 2 September 1931 an agreement was reached whereby the Catholic Youth Associations were incorporated into the state organization, Balilla, in which their own chaplains should provide religious instruction. Catholic Action, on the contrary, was to be able to work freely and independently. Its purely religious character and its direct dependence on the hierarchy were to be assured by its organization according to parishes and dioceses and a rearrangement according to "natural states" and not according to professions.

This model could not be realized or encountered opposition in countries like Germany, where for decades in the free sphere of the Church a series of associations related to various professions had been established, which, indeed, saw in the apostolate an essential element of their work, but in relative independence of the bishops were able to undertake functions and make decisions which did not pertain to the direct mandate of the bishops. They incorporated the idea of *Actio catholica* and of the apostolate as work for the Kingdom of Christ the King into their program and their work, without making essential changes in the structure of these societies.

In Belgium and France Catholic Action gained a special position as a "specialized" organization, that is, oriented to defined professions, such as working youth, rural youth, and students. In Belgium there was established in 1924–25, as a continuation of the existing *Jeunesse syndicaliste* founded by the priest Joseph Cardijn (1882–1967, a cardinal in 1965),[16] the *Jeunesse Oeuvrière Chrétienne* (JOC), which was approved by Pius XI in 1925, adopted in France on the Belgian model in 1926, and then, especially after 1945, spread throughout the world. In West Germany after the Second World War there was at first no agreement as to whether the workers' unions—as was compulsory in the Nazi period—should be further established on the basis of parishes according to states of life and nature—male and female youth, men and women—or be again distinct according to profession—workers' unions, journeymen's unions, rural people, New Germany, academic associations, and so forth. The decision was again overwhelming for the latter form. The Young Christian Workers (CAJ) was basically the only new foundation as regards organization and method of work. It was called into being in 1947[17] and operated like the JOC, separated into male and female youth. The training took place according to the principle "see, judge, act." The young worker was to be led to see the concrete reality of his life, to evaluate and form it in the light of the Catholic faith. It especially mattered to the CAJ to fill a firm nucleus of "protagonists" with a missionary spirit by retreats and social and political study meetings. Correspondingly there arose for student youth the *Jeunesse étudiante chrétienne* (JEC) and for rural youth the *Jeunesse agricole chrétienne* (JAC).

---

[14] Ibid. 17 (1925), 606.

[15] Ibid. 23 (1931), 285–312.

In view of the numerous forms of the lay apostolate, differing in directness, intensity, and the structure required by the situation, Pius XII was moved to expand the concept of Catholic Action and to distinguish various forms of the organization and gradations of dependence on the hierarchy. Concerning the Marian congregations he declared in the apostolic constitution *Bis saeculari* of 27 September 1948 that they could be termed "with full right Catholic Action under the guidance and support of the Blessed Virgin Mary."[18] If Pius XI spoke of the participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate, Pius XII preferred to speak of collaboration or help.[19] According to the encyclical *Mystici corporis* of 29 June 1943, Christ requires the help of his members. "A really awesome mystery . . . that the salvation of many is dependent . . . on the cooperation which the shepherds and the faithful . . . have to provide."[20]

---

[16] J. Cardijn, *Was ist die CAJ?*, 3d ed. (Essen 1955); idem, *Die Schicksalsstunde der Arbeiterschaft* (Essen 1955).

[17] J. Angerhausen, "Die Christliche Arbeiter-Jugend, die deutsche CAJ," *TThZ* 63 (1954), 280–88; J. Angerhausen, M. Meert, *CAJ, Weg der Umkehr* (Essen 1957).

[18] *AAS* 40 (1948), 393–402.

[19] Address of Pius XII to the Catholic Action of Italy on 4 September 1940, *AAS* 32 (1940), 362.

In his address to the First World Congress of the Catholic Lay Apostolate on 14 October 1951, the Pope stressed that dependence of the lay apostolate on the hierarchy admitted gradations; the narrowest was that for Catholic Action: "It is a tool in the hand of the hierarchy and should be, as it were, the extension of its arm. Hence, by its nature it is subordinate to the chief shepherds of the Church. Other organized or unorganized works of the lay apostolate can relinquish their free initiative to a greater degree, each as its aims require."[21] As the Pope emphasized at the Second Congress for the Lay Apostolate in 1957, Catholic Action can—understood as an organization—claim no monopoly for itself. It bears well the character of an official lay apostolate. The apostolate of prayer, of vocation, and of life witness can be termed lay apostolate in the broader sense. Further there is the "free apostolate" of individuals and groups that put themselves at the disposal of the hierarchy and let themselves be assigned tasks by it for a limited or indefinite time. There remained the danger that the lay apostolate would be restricted to the tasks which take place in the Church itself or which are worked out by the laity as the "elongated arm of the hierarchy" and came from the field of vision of the strictly lay functions of interpretation of the world, guidance of the world, and sanctification of the world. The conciliar decree "On the Apostolate of the Laity" seeks to meet this danger by stressing, among other things, that the laity "exercise their apostolate in the Church as in the world, in the spiritual as in the secular order" (ART. 5). According to the "pastoral constitution on the Church in the world of today" there must be made a "clear distinction between what Christians as individuals or as a group do in their own name as citizens who are directed by their Christian conscience and what they do in the name of the Church together with the shepherds."[22]

The Spiritual Exercises Movement

If in the mind of Pius XI the first goal of Catholic Action is to form the conscience of Christians in so powerfully Christian a way that at any time and in any situation of private and public life they are in a position to find the Christian solution of the many problems that arise,[23] then the

---

[20] *AAS* 35 (1943), 213.

[21] Ibid. 43 (1951), 789.

[22] ARTICLE 76; cf. *Lumen gentium,* ART. 36.

[23] So also the decree "On the Apostolate of the Laity" of the Second Vatican Council, ART. 20.

Ignatian *Spiritual Exercises* were a valuable help in this. It was their aim to lead to the personal sanctification required as the basis of apostolic spirit and life as a preliminary to the sanctification of others. The number of participants in the Exercises grew by leaps and bounds in the 1920s. If into the nineteenth century they were conducted almost exclusively by Jesuits, now other orders also took part, to a degree in a form corresponding to their special spirituality. Since the Exercises Convention at Innsbruck in 1922 and Pius XI's constitution *Summorum Pontificum*[24] of 25 July 1922 and his encyclical on the promoting of the *Spiritual Exercises*[25] of 20 December 1929, it is possible to speak of an Exercise Movement. Pius XI named as the worst sickness of the day the "continuous passionate devotion to the external world" and the "insatiable greed for wealth and pleasure," which no longer let people think of eternal truths and of God, the first cause and last end. The Exercises should provide place, time, and quiet for this. The sharing by groups of Catholic Action in the Exercises especially gladdened the Pope. "Many take part in them, the better to equip themselves and to keep themselves ready for the Lord's battles. Thus they find not only prop and support perfectly to develop in themselves the ideal of the Christian life; not rarely they also find in their heart a mysterious call from God, who invites them to the holy service and the fostering of the good of the neighbor's soul and this incites them to the exercise of a full apostolate."[26] In 1936 the Jesuits alone gave 16,043 courses with 680,788 taking part. Add to this in the missionary areas 631 courses with 24,225 participants.[27] In Germany 109,000 men, women, and youths made the Exercises in 1955.[28] After the Second World War they became part of the extraordinary care of souls, systematically promoted and attended by pastoral officials.

If the Exercises, in accord with their origin, aimed rather at conversion of life, the "great decision" of the adult, as H. Rahner expresses it, then the pastoral care of the young developed in religious days of recollection ("retreat days," "free times") forms of training in the spiritual life and of a deepening of faith suited to the mentality and situation of the young and students. According to Ludwig Esch, S. J. (1883–1956), who in the years 1919 to 1951 gave the Exercises for 54,884 pupils, students, and priests, these provided "a new setting on the right road, a growth in the setting of goals, a clarifying in regard to self and the entire world of the faith, but thereby also a profound joy."[29]

---

[24] *AAS* 14 (1922), 420–22.

[25] *Mens nostra, AAS* 21 (1929), 689–706.

[26] *AAS* 21 (1929), 689–706, 691, 701.

[27] H. Becher, *Die Jesuiten. Gestalt und Geschichte des Ordens* (Munich 1951), 400.

[28] *HK* 11 (1956–57), 73f.

Eucharistic Piety in Transition

The liturgical movement and the reflection on the Bible were at first matters for circles of youth and academicians. Parish congregations were first affected by them after 1930. The broad mass of the Catholic people was still supported by the great currents of the traditional piety of the nineteenth century, which lived and found expression in the worship of the Eucharist, devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and the veneration of Mary and the saints. But it is characteristic of the situation that the old was gradually permeated by the new and thereby experienced a deepening and return to essence and center. This becomes especially clear in the Eucharistic piety, which until the end of the nineteenth century was almost exclusively a worship of adoration, then as the Eucharistic movement led to frequent Communion, and only after uniting with the liturgical movement again understood the Eucharist as a sacrifice of thanksgiving, which the Lord celebrates with his Church and into which the Christian enters fully by sharing in the sacrificial meal.

Dogmatic theology used to treat the Sacrament of the Altar in three sections, which were isolated from one another: (1) the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which had as a consequence the merit of adoration; (2) the Eucharist as sacrament, that is, as Communion; (3) the Eucharist as sacrifice.[30] For devotion the deciding factor was the presence of Christ in the tabernacle or in the monstrance. The Mass was seen predominantly as the means for "confecting" the sacramental presence, and therefore attention was focused on the moment of transubstantiation. But even this happening was covered over, because the Mass was often celebrated, for the sake of special solemnity, before the Blessed Sacrament exposed on the altar, and from the start this presence had to be venerated by, among other things, kneeling, before the Lord offering himself became present under the appearances of bread and wine and the congregation could go through him and with him and in him before the Father.

Although Pius X had demanded in 1903 that the faithful should draw the Christian spirit "from the first and real source, namely, from active participation in the holy mysteries and the public and official prayer of the Church,"[31] whereby he gave the keyword for the later liturgical movement, he did not himself, in the decree *Sacra Tridentina synodus* on daily Communion of 1905[32] and in the First Communion decree *Quam singulari* of 1910, go into the connection of Mass and Communion and treated the value and the significance of frequent and early Communion by itself in isolation. The "Eucharistic movement" inaugurated by him thus became the "Communion movement"[33] in its own development, independent of the liturgical movement, in fact in some respects retarding it. It did not produce the breakthrough to a common view of Mass and Communion. The fostering of frequent, even daily Communion brought about that—in accord with the Pope's desire[34]—the worship of adoration no longer occupied the first place within Eucharistic piety and relaxed that only too close connection of confession and Communion. However, from now on Communion was seen in isolation: isolated from what happened at Mass, but also isolated in so far as the understanding of Communion saw only the union of the individual soul with Christ but not the community of those communicating; characteristically in the decree *Sacra Tridentina synodus* there was no reference to *Communio* as community in the body of Christ.

---

[29] L. Esch, *Neue Lebensgetaltung in Christus,* 7th ed. (Würzburg 1952), 296; E. Holzapfel, L. Esch, *Ein Leben für die Jugend* (Würzburg 1963).

[30] Thus still L. Ott, *Grundriss der Dogmatik,* 3d ed. (Freiburg 1957), XVf.

It was in keeping with this isolated understanding of Communion that the real happening at Mass was completely overlapped and concealed by the preparation for the reception of Communion and by the thanksgiving and that one prayed one's own Communion devotions. To obtain time for the thanksgiving, Communion was often distributed before Mass or after Mass in order not to detain long those not communicating. The Eucharist was especially at the service of the religious and moral character formation of the individual, it was regarded as "countermeans for the freeing from daily sins and preservation from mortal sins."[35]

Even after the First World War the situation seemed not essentially different, and as late as 1928 it could be said in a lecture at the Second Catechetical Congress at Munich: "Holy Communion . . . in spite of Pius X's decrees on Communion still has not always in the awareness of the people the significance proper to it in the liturgy."[36] Only the encounter and connection with the liturgical movement at the beginning of the 1930s assisted the Eucharistic movement to the correct theological self-understanding and to an effective breakthrough in the following period. With its efforts for as active a participation as possible by all in the celebration of Mass, the liturgical movement led to Communion as a sacrificial meal being organically added to conscious and active participation in the action of sacrifice and forming a whole with it. In the course of this development to an "organic" understanding of the Mass the preparation for Communion was increasingly seen in the celebrating of the Sacrifice of the Mass itself and no longer relegated to the Communion devotion that ignored what happened at Mass. Assiduous ascetical exertions, characterized by concern for the worthiest possible Communion, gradually gave way to a more uncomplicated and more joyful Communion and Mass piety, by which were increasingly created more favorable presuppositions for the early and frequent reception of Communion.

---

[31] Motu proprio *Tra le sollecitudini* of 22 November 1903, *ASS* 36 (1903–4), 331.

[32] *ASS* 38 (1905–6), 400–409; *Quam singulari, AAS* 2 (1910), 577–83.

[33] Cf. H. Fischer, *Eucharistiekatechese und Liturgische Erneuerung* (Düsseldorf 1959), 11–24.

[34] According to *Sacra Tridentina synodus* the meaning of Communion is not "chiefly . . . to render God honor and adoration," *ASS* 38 (1905–6), 401; Rohrbasser no. 193.

[35] *Sacra Tridentina synodus, ASS,* ibid.; Rohrbasser no. 193.

[36] Quoted from H. Fischer, *Eucharistiekatechese,* 45.

No longer the consummated sacrament, that is, the sacramental presence of the Lord under the species of bread and the adoration of his divinity, stood in the foreground, but the process, the celebration in which with thanksgiving the surrender of the Lord to the Father, his sacrifice, becomes present and he, as Mediator, leads us to the Father. The only too static notion of the Eucharist was overcome, and the Eucharist as an action was more strongly stressed, for example, the abolition of exposition during Mass, which was in any event contrary to the Church's decrees, and the custom, twice recommended by Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* (1947), of giving Holy Communion with Hosts consecrated during the same Mass.[37]

The new understanding of Communion and Mass only slowly acquired influence on the organization of Eucharistic congresses. Before and after, here the worship of adoration was in the foreground, joined to a powerful demonstration of faith, so that the procession, arranged with great display, appeared as the climax of each congress. The growing internationalizing of the congresses, at whose head stood a papal legate from 1906 on, gave these meetings the character of a "World Corpus Christi."

After the First World War the series of congresses began again at Rome in 1922. The world's disunion experienced in the war evoked for this and the succeeding congresses a new accentuation: the Host was honored as the symbol of the unity among peoples and asserted as the sole means of leading people together to lasting union. At Rome's desire there followed congresses at intervals of two years: in 1926 at Chicago, in 1928 at Sydney, in 1930 at Carthage, in 1932 at Dublin. Latin America was first added in 1933 at Buenos Aires. There followed those at Madrid in 1936 and Budapest in 1938. Once again war interrupted the series of congresses, which was not continued until 1952 at Barcelona. In the organization of this congress the growing together of the liturgical and the Eucharistic movements found clear expression: the closing procession no longer constituted the climax, beside which, more or less without visible connection, Masses and the distribution of Communion took place, but the common celebration of the Eucharist was moved directly into the center.

---

[37] *AAS* 39 (1947), 564f.; Rohrbasser nos. 305 and 307.

The complete elaboration of this new accentuation took place at the Munich Congress in 1960, for which Josef Andreas Jungmann had awakened to new life the idea of the *statio.* As early as 1930, on the occasion of the Eucharistic Congress at Carthage, Jungmann had called attention to the custom, frequently attested in the ancient Church but acquiring a special form in the Roman Church of the Middle Ages, whereby the bishop on specific Sundays and feasts of the year, but especially in Lent, celebrated a migratory Mass in the most important churches in order to make visible the notion of the unity of bishop, clergy, and people.

This *Statio Urbis,* as Jungmann said, could serve as model for a *Statio Orbis,* the experience of the community of the Church in the common Eucharistic celebration as the climax of the Eucharistic Congress. Jungmann's suggestion, hardly noticed in 1930, was adopted in the episcopal pastoral letter for the Munich Congress of 1960. Thus the community Eucharistic celebration, in which the Universal Church became experienced and visible as the Mystical Body of Christ, gave to this congress a special character and emphasized with incomparable clarity the preeminence of the sacrificial event in union with the sacrificial meal as contrasted with the adoring gaze. The notion of the *Statio Orbis* deprived this congress of the character of a triumphalist stressed self-celebration; the stress lay not on demonstration but on the daily accomplishment of the sacrifice.

The organization of the Munich World Congress in accord with the concept of the *Statio Orbis* allowed the spirit of the liturgical renewal to acquire a quite visible form and thereby facilitated the preparation of new liturgical arrangements by the Council.

Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus

Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which achieved a high rank in the nineteenth century because of papal encouragement, occupied also in the twentieth century a broad area in popular piety; very widespread was the observance of the first Friday of the month as Sacred Heart Friday, joined with Communion and prayer for an intention determined each month by the Pope. The effort for a solid theological foundation of this devotion by recourse especially to biblical statements, but also to patristic theology, marked both the work of theologians and expressions of the *magisterium;* this work was all the more urgent, as trashy, sentimental distortions were a great danger in this devotion that appealed to the affective-emotional classes.

In the encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor* of 1928 Pius XI gave the feast of the Sacred Heart the highest liturgical rank, with a new Mass formulary and office. In view of the needs of the day, the encyclical called for penance and expiation, which occupy "always the first and foremost position in the honoring of the most Sacred Heart of Jesus" (no. 135). Through the papal regulations the devotion to the Heart of Jesus and its incorporation into the liturgy achieved a first goal; the theological foundation also here reached an important stage as the attempt was made to join the Heart of Jesus mysticism with the theology of the Fathers and to consolidate the devotion to the Sacred Heart in the central mysteries of salvation.

The world crisis of the 1930s again afforded the Pope the occasion to recommend the devotion to the Sacred Heart as a means of salvation in the encyclical *Caritate Christi compulsi* of 3 May 1932. Considering the misery of the period, the godlessness, and the hatred of every religion, joined in socialism with the struggle for one's daily bread, the Pope commanded the holding of public Masses of atonement on the solemnity of the Sacred Heart.

Under Pius XII, who in his first encyclical had referred to the consecration of the human race to the Sacred Heart, exertions in regard to the devotion to the Heart of Jesus reached a climax, especially in regard to theology. True, at this time doubts and objections were also heard, for example, that the devotion to the Sacred Heart fostered a purely individualistic piety, which in view of the growing awareness of community in the sphere of the Church could not but evoke grave hesitations. To others some vivid presentations and devotional forms seemed rather repulsive; others again attributed to the devotion to the Sacred Heart a historical right, it is true, as a reaction to the sentiment-destroying and rigoristic Jansenism and as a Christianization of subjectivism in the nineteenth century, but they were inclined to deny the importance of this cult for the twentieth century and the tasks allotted to it. And some raised the reproach of particularism: one element, the heart, would be dissociated from the person of the Redeemer and hence a total view would be made more difficult.

An intensive theological work, especially in the 1950s, sought to take into account the doubts that were becoming loud and the difficulties by undertaking to clarify the heart in its total character, the physical as well as the spiritual included, from biblical expressions of the Old and New Testaments.

"Heart is," as Guardini writes, following Blaise Pascal, "the spirit in so far as it is in contact with blood . . . . Heart is the spirit made hot and sensitive by blood, but at the same time spirit elevated by the clarity of contemplation, by the distinctness of character, by the precision of judgment. Heart is the organ of love. . . . It is that which is experienced in the heart."[38] Thus the Heart of Jesus is the symbol of the love of the Redeemer, as love of the Father and of mankind. Devotion to the Heart of Jesus means to let oneself be embraced by this love of Jesus. It must be expressed in a serving apostolic life.

The fruit as well as the point of departure of such exertions for a theological justification of devotion to the Sacred Heart in accord with the time were the statements of Pius XII in his encyclical *Haurietis aquas* of 15 May 1956. This document took issue with the most varied misunderstandings and errors and sought—contrary to the minimizing of this cult as based on a private revelation—to make clear that the devotion to the Sacred Heart "can look back to an advanced age in the Church and has in the Gospels themselves a solid foundation, so that tradition and liturgy clearly favor it." The reason for this cult, which is distinguished as the "most effective school of the love of God," is twofold: the first consists in this, that Christ's heart, "the noblest part of human nature, is hypostatically united with the person of the divine Word; hence to it must be paid the same worship of adoration by which the Church honors the person of the incarnate Son of God . . . . The second reason results from this, that his heart, more than all other members of his body, is a natural indication or symbol of his unending love for the human race."[39]

The Pope's explanations, which apply in detail especially to biblical statements, end in the admonition that in the devotion to the Sacred Heart there is "no question about just any traditional form of piety, which may, according to the preference of each, be treated lightly or underestimated in relation to other forms, but of a practice of divine adoration, which, like no other, is able to lead to Christian perfection. . . . Everyone who then has a slight estimation of this great gift of Jesus Christ to the Church is pursuing a dangerous and unholy matter and is offending God himself."[40]

---

[38] R. Guardini, *Christliches Bewusstsein. Versuche über Pascal* (Leipzig 1935), 177.

[39] *AAS* 48 (1956), 316.

[40] Ibid., 346.

Despite the encouragement of and propaganda for the devotion to the Sacred Heart by the official *magisterium,* it seems to be fading more and more from the awareness and life of piety of the members of the Church. This probably has less theological than spiritual-historical reasons. An age like ours, which sees so strongly in Jesus the "Man for us," would have to have in it understanding for love that is self-sacrificing and consumed for the neighbor; but to see and honor this represented in the bleeding Heart of Jesus—for this there is lacking today the sense of the symbol.

Devotion to Mary and Mariology

The growth of the Marian movement from the second third of the nineteenth century continued on into the twentieth. Pius XI and Pius XII continued the line of their predecessors in the promoting of devotion to Mary. Among believers it received impetus from appearances of Mary, especially from that at Fátima in Portugal, which was made to three Portuguese children in 1917. It and also the appearances in the Belgian localities of Beauraing in 1932–33 and Banneux in 1933 obtained ecclesiastical approbation.[41] They led to a brisk pilgrimage. At Fátima Mary demanded especially the praying of the rosary for the peace of the world, the consecration of Russia to her immaculate heart, and Communion of reparation on the first Saturday of each month. Pope Pius XII, whose episcopal ordination occurred at Rome on 13 May 1917, the day of the first appearance of Mary at Fátima, regarded himself throughout his life as bound to the aims of Fátima in a special way. On 8 December 1942 he performed the consecration of the entire human race to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.[42] On 7 July 1952 he finally addressed to all the people of Russia an encyclical in which they were dedicated to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. To spread the aims of Fátima there was established, at the urging of the Canadian Bishop Dignan, a "Rosary Crusade," which had a worldwide expansion. In 1947 there arose in Vienna, under Franciscan leadership, the Rosary Atonement Crusade.

---

[41] Cf. *LThK,* 2d ed., VII, 64: "Ecclesiastical approbation does not mean an infallible assurance of the supernatural origin of the appearances. It means: (1.) The alleged event contains nothing against faith and morals; (2.) it can be made public and become the object of cult; (3.) it offers, like other historical events, sufficient arguments that the fact of its supernatural cause can be reasonably accepted by human faith." The ecclesiastical officials are very cautious in regard to recognition. As opposed to the three appearances of Mary approved since 1930, thirty have been expressly repudiated.

[42] Cf. the consecrating prayer, "Regina del Santissimo Rosario," *AAS* 34 (1942), 345f.; Rohrbasser nos. 546–49.

Marian piety and the lay apostolate were now in close connection. Thus in the lay organization, the "Legion of Mary," which was founded by Frank Duff in Dublin in 1921 and spread rapidly on all the continents, especially in mission countries. With an aggressive tone like that of the Legion of Mary, there appeared also the Militia of the Immaculate Conception, founded in 1917 by Father Maximilian Kolbe (1894–1941), who later died in a concentration camp, and also the Blue Army of Mary, called into being in 1947 by Harold von Colgan. The last named sees its task principally as the spreading of the message of Fátima.

The lay apostolate of the Marian congregations, which are called "Marian" not only "because they take their title from the Mother of God, but especially because the individual members promise an especially interior veneration of the Mother of God and give themselves to her through a complete surrender of consecration,"[43] received encouragement and impetus from Pius XII's apostolic constitution *Bis saeculari* of 1948. In 1953 was founded the World Association of Marian Congregations, which since 1956 is a member of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations. From the spirit of the Marian congregations proceeded, at first depending on the Pallottines, the Schönstatt Movement, building on the educational work of Father Josef Kentenich (1885–1968); Marian sisters, Marian brothers, and Schönstatt priests are the agents of the work.

In encyclicals Pius XI and Pius XII several times expressed their views on problems of Mariology and devotion to Mary and gave new impulses or took up such. Thus in 1937 Pius XI in the encyclical *Ingravescentibus malis*[44] recommended the rosary, with clear allusion to Fascism and Communism, in view of the threatening world situation. A series of new Marian feasts was introduced: in 1931, on the occasion of the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus, of the feast of the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary on 11 October, in 1944 the feast of the Immaculate Heart of the Blessed Virgin Mary on 22 August, and finally in 1954 the feast of Mary our Queen on 31 May. The climax of the papal initiatives came with the proclamation of the dogma of the bodily Assumption of Mary into heaven on 1 November 1950. The proclamation was preceded by a survey of the episcopate of the world. This confirmed that the bodily Assumption of Mary was a firm conviction of faith of the members of the Church and almost unanimously agreed to the opportuneness of the definition. According to the dogmatic bull *Munificentissimus Deus,* Mary, who was already a sharer in the full redemption, is a sign for mankind, threatened in a secularistic world of materialism; mankind should recognize in Mary that human fulfillment is to be found only in God: it is to be hoped, said the Pope, "that through the contemplation of the glorious example of Mary there may grow ever stronger the insight into what high value human life has, when it is used to carry out the will of the heavenly Father and to act for the welfare of the fellow man. And it can also be . . . expected that the truth of Mary's Assumption may show to all clearly to what noble end we are destined in body and soul. Finally, faith in the bodily Assumption of Mary into heaven will strengthen faith also in our resurrection and lead to energetic activity."[45]

---

[43] *Bis saeculari,* no. 189, *AAS* 40 (1948), 401; Rohrbasser no. 1631.

[44] *AAS* 29 (1937), 373–80.

Marian literature, powerfully increased in the twentieth century, reached its climax in the 1950s in regard to mere number of publications: thus, between 1948 and 1957 about one thousand titles per year appeared. Not rarely these works contained exaggerations which went far beyond the measure found in the dogma and liturgy of the Church. All the more, theologians such as Otto Semmelroth, Hugo and Karl Rahner, Michael Schmaus, and others, sought to open up the biblical and patristic sources of Mariology and to consider the ecumenical problem. Inspired by the works of early Christian tradition, which had treated Mary not for her own sake but in the framework of the divine economy of salvation, theologians of the 1940s and 1950s dealt with Mary and her privileges no longer as isolated, but with a view to the entire doctrine of salvation: thus Mariology was seen in its relations to Christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. Mary was no longer the object of a merely individual cult—just as also the individualistic understanding of the Church in these years yielded to a more community-related view—but she was seen in the framework of the theology of salvation, hence in connection with redemption, humanity, Church, and perfection: Mary, prototype or type of the Church.

Also concerned for a new basis for devotion to Mary were the Marian congresses, which took place on regional, national, and international levels. Further, there were formed societies for Marian studies, and in 1950 an international Marian Academy was founded. In Germany must be mentioned the Mariological Workers Community of German theologians; in France the Institut Catholique at Paris received a special Mariological chair; and at Rome the Mariological Academy was made a papal academy by a motu proprio of John XXIII of 8 December 1959.

---

[45] *Munificentissimus Deus,* no. 201, *AAS* 42 (1950), 553–771.

Institutes, academies, societies, and working communities published the results of their individual investigations and meetings in numerous periodicals and cooperative works. With the end of the pontificate of Pius XII, as whose Marian climaxes must be given the years 1950, 1954 (the Marian Year), and 1958 (centenary of Mary's appearance at Lourdes), there began a slackening of enthusiasm in devotion to Mary and Mariology, a tendency which even the suggestions of the Second Vatican Council could not stop and which lasts till today. The council composed no Marian schema of its own, but dealt with Mary within the schema on the Church. Here Mary appears expressly as "type of the Church with respect to faith, love, and perfect unity with Christ."[46] For the rest, the Second Vatican Council imposed on itself with regard to Mariology an intentional caution; it had "no intention of proposing a complete doctrine of Mary or to decide questions which were not yet fully clarified by the work of theologians."[47] The constitution presented Mary's position in Christ's salvific work but avoided the term "Coredemptrix," which since the beginning of the twentieth century quite often stood in the center of the discussion and had even been used by the Popes, but had given occasion to misunderstandings.

In regard to the fear that, because of the devotion to Mary and the emphasis on the cooperation of the Mother of God in the work of redemption, the image of Christ would be obscured, the council made it clear that "in the honoring of the Mother, the Son, on account of whom everything is . . . is correctly known, loved, and glorified, and his commandments are observed."[48] But in the veneration of Mary the correct measure must be maintained. Thus the council admonishes "to promote generously the veneration, especially the liturgical, of the Blessed Virgin" and thereby "also to hold carefully aloof from every false exaggeration as well as from too summary an attitude in contemplating the unique dignity of the Mother of God."[49]

The Spiritual Development of the Orders

The continuing growth since the second half of the nineteenth century of the number of members of the orders and congregations as well as of the number of their foundations was at first maintained in the twentieth century. More or less clear variations within the development can be explained by a parallel reflection on the history of the period and to a great extent referred to external factors.[50]

---

[46] Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen gentium*, ART. 63.

[47] Ibid., ART. 54.

[48] Ibid., ART. 66.

[49] Ibid., ART. 67.

Whereas, following the recovery from the losses of the First World War, a "monastic spring" was clearly to be recorded in Germany, there appeared toward the end of the 1920s a noticeable slackening of the growth, which found expression in 1936 in the orders of sisters in a slight decline in the number of recruits; this was in part the effect of the low birthrate of the years between 1914 and 1920 but must also especially be regarded for the following period under the aspect of the propaganda of the National Socialist regime. Its measures hostile to the orders reached their climax in the decree by Rudolf Hess of 19 November 1940 whereby entrance into monasteries was stopped. After the end of the Second World War, it is true, the number of members of the orders was stabilized in a thereafter slight growth, but the number of novices reached only little more than half of the prewar recruits. Also to be coped with were the severe damages done to the religious life because of members killed in the war, a considerable migration movement, and the loss of houses and schools of the orders. If after the war the orders could again attend to their tasks in the schools, then this meant additional deficiencies in the charitable work, in which meanwhile the sisters had found a field of activity. In part, the losses were compensated by the religious expelled from Eastern countries.

If the development of the religious clergy is compared with that of the diocesan clergy, it must be stated, at least for Germany and its Western neighbor nations, that during the postwar years the religious clergy could record a relatively larger growth than the diocesan clergy; for example, whereas between 1948 and 1958 in France the number of diocesan priests decreased about sixty percent, the number of religious priests in the same period rose about 1,417, that is, 28.7 per cent.[51] The reasons for this were the readiness for radical response after the experiences of the war and the collapse and the demand for stability and security, which were promised by the *vita communis* of the religious community. In mission lands the stronger increase in native religious priests must also be attributed to the fact that missionary work was almost exclusively in the hands of the orders and the model of the diocesan priest was absent.

As regards the distribution of the recruits among the various orders, a "change of tendency" must be noted: While from the beginning of the century the recruits applied chiefly to the "active" communities and among these the more recent congregations and those more adapted to the needs of the time had on an average a larger growth than the ancient types of orders,[52] from the 1950s especially the number and spread of the contemplative communities increased. At the Mainz *Katholikentag* of 1948 Friedrich Wulf tried to explain the change that was becoming apparent thus: "In many newer communities it was the purpose, it was specific tasks, which created a community . . . . True, even in the establishing of the modern religious rules an effort was made to follow great models, for example, the Franciscan or Augustinian rule was made the basis, but people still were unable to grasp the living spirit of these models. And so they made almost all alike down to the most trivial details, but there was usually lacking the profound uniform basic structure, which gives to all expressions of piety a definite form and a definite character. This could not but have an especially clear impact in a period of crisis, as we experienced it, and especially in large communities the spiritual formation of the younger members of the order left much to be desired. . . ."[53]

---

[50] Cf. Becker, "Der Schwesternnachwuchs seit dem Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges bis zur Gegenwart, zusammengefasst wiedergegeben," *HK* 4(1949–50), 233f.

[51] Cf. J. Kerkhofs, "Aspects sociologiques du sacerdoce," *NRTh* 82(1960), 289–99, 291; see also Chapter 11.

Raymond Hostie[54] proceeded from similar observations when, alongside numerical growth as a mark of all religious communities in the twentieth century, he specified "stability of the organizational structure" and a certain "immobility."[55] The latter appeared in a certain rigidity in the interpretation of the rule and a concealing of the basic uniformity of communities by emphasizing originality in unessential externals and in an isolation of the monasteries from the general cultural development. It was no accident that, in the renewal movement within the Church of our century, monasteries such as Solesmes, Subiaco, Beuron, Maria Laach, and others took part: by recourse to monastic origins they gained a clear ideal and hence were in a position to supply new impulses. Against this background must be understood the efforts of the Popes to bring the orders back to the essential by reflection on the spirit of the respective founders and law which inspired them and thereby to free them for the tasks of the day.

After Pius XI (1922–39) had worked successfully for an adjustment between the liturgical reform movement of the Benedictines and the tradition of the exercises and of devotion to the Sacred Heart of the Jesuits, the exertions for a reform of the orders achieved its climax in many pronouncements of Pius XII (1939–58). The prelude to the accommodation of the orders to the time and its needs, as desired by the Pope, was given in an article, inspired by his ideas, by the Jesuit Riccardo Lombardi in *Civiltà Cattolica.*[56] Although religious were admonished in it not to be "adventurers" in order that "the conservative viewpoint may always retain its validity alongside the mood for innovation,"[57] still they should as "the highly motivated avant-garde in an anxious hour give to reform the example of the greatest preparedness in relation to the new positions demanded by the welfare of humanity."[58] "Avoid," Lombardi called upon the religious, "a stagnating rigidity which would remove you from the course of life; on the other hand, be unchanging, as a river is unchanging, which is fed from an everlasting source but constantly renews itself in the stream!"[59]

---

[52] Cf. *HK* 8 (1953–54), 311; statistics on the recruits for the orders (1940–52): growth of the orders on the average 19.13 percent, of the congregations on the average 33.54 percent.

[53] A. Scheuermann, "Um die Zeitnähe des Ordensstandes," *GuL* 24 (1951), 274–84, 280.

[54] R. Hostie, *Vie et mort des ordres religieux* (Paris 1972), cf. 253–73.

[55] Op. cit., 253.

This impulse found its continuation at the First International Congress of Religious at Rome in 1950, which was under the slogan determined by the Sacred Congregation for Religious: "The renewal of the states of perfection adapted to the present day and its circumstances." In his address[60] to some five hundred representatives of the orders and secular institutes the Pope called upon the religious: Motivated by the conviction that the Catholic faith is able to form every age, "pay attention to the opinion, judgment, and morals of your environment and accept what you find good and just in it as valuable indications; otherwise you cannot be advisers, help, support, and light to your fellow human beings. . . . There are areas, indeed very many, in which you may, in fact must, adapt yourselves to the style and needs of the time and the people. . . ."[61]

Especially for the contemplative orders of women the Pope derived from this the duty to "reasonable modernization,"[62] which should find its expression not least in a "moderate participation in the apostolate."[63] The apostolic constitution *Sponsa Christi*[64] of 21 November 1950, decisive in this context, accordingly supplemented, among other things, the strict prescriptions of inclosure for monasteries of nuns with the modified form of the so-called "little papal inclosure." In ARTICLE 8 of the constitution, with reference to the economic security of the orders, there was imposed on the nuns the obligation to a suitable work, which was consistent "not only with the law of nature but equally with a duty of penance and expiation."[65] In a glance at the lack of recruits the Pope in 1952 repeated his plea to the superiors of orders: "Pay attention, especially in this age of a vocation crisis, to this, that the behavior, manner of life, and asceticism in your religious families not become hindrances or reasons for refusal. . . . Adapt yourselves in all things which are not essential, so far as reason and regulated charity permit."[66] Pius XII's special concern was for the formation of the recruits. He demanded a uniform formation of the young religious by "proved and selected personalities."[67]

---

[56] *Civiltà Cattolica,* 19 March 1949, no. 6.

[57] Op. cit., 84.

[58] Op. cit., 82.

[59] Op. cit., 89.

[60] *L'Osservatore Romano,* no. 289, of 9–10 December 1950.

[61] *AAS* 43(1951), 34.

[62] Ibid., 10.

[63] Op. cit., 11.

[64] Op. cit., 5–24.

A further effort to lead the monasteries out of their isolation went in the direction of a greater cooperation, both through "coordinating of the diocesan clergy and the religious clergy"[68] and through stronger contact of the individual religious communities with the competent bishops as with Rome, and finally through cooperation or, respectively, even merger of monasteries. Results appeared in the form of unions, chiefly of monasteries of women, and in an improved organization and coordination of the efforts of the orders from Rome as the center. In spite of some very promising new starts, however, the reform efforts led on the whole—as also hints of the Pope in his talk at the Second International Congress of Religious at Rome in 1957 confirmed[69]—to further difficulties, among others in the interpretation of the vow of obedience, rather than to fruitful renewal. The chief problems seemed to be the form and exercise of authority, the common life with experiments of small communities, uncertainty in regard to function, the age structure, and so forth.

It was damaging for religious that they were scarcely supported by the believing awareness of the community, let alone that of the broader public. Their services were expected, there were protests when communities closed houses because of lack of recruits, but there was no effort to offer a solution in prayer, meditation, and concern to the problems of the life and recruitment of the orders.

In this situation there occurred new types of attempts at a uniting of the monastic ideal with the demands of the apostolate through an extensive breaking away from the framework of the old orders and congregations. As an example may be mentioned the Little Brothers of Jesus, which, as a continuation of the work of Charles de Foucauld (1858–1916), realized a new type of apostolate "in the midst of the world." With complete abandonment of inclosure, they live together in communities of about four members and separately pursue a secular calling. As their founder tried, by an exemplary life, to bring the Gospel to the tribes in the Sahara, so his brotherhoods pursued the same goal in the non-Christian and, for evangelization, very accessible "desert" of our modern secularized civilization. Out of the strength of the love and imitation of Christ, they seek through the simplicity of their life-style and hospitality to be open to the encounter with the Lord in people. And so the Eucharist and Holy Scripture constitute the support of their community. "Work for the sanctification of the world," Charles de Foucauld has the Lord say and thereby expresses the essential element of his vocation, "work for it as my Mother, wordless, silent, build your retreats in the midst of those who do not know me, carry me into their midst by erecting there an altar, a tabernacle, and bring there the Gospel, not by mouth but by example, not by preaching it but by living it."[70] By 1960 the number of brotherhoods grew to forty-five in twenty countries with a total of 216 brothers. Since 1939 there has been a female branch of the Little Sisters of Jesus with like aims.

---

[65] Op. cit., 13.

[66] J. Zürcher, *Päpstliche Dokumente zur Ordensreform* (Einsiedeln 1954), 122ff.

[67] Apostolic constitution *Sedes Sapientiae* of 31 May 1956, *AAS* 48 (1956), 354–65, 358.

[68] *GuL* 24(1951), 92; cf. no. 7.

[69] Cf. *AAS* 25(1958), 34ff.

The Secular Institutes

Whereas the new impulses for a reform and adaptation of the orders and congregations to the needs of the time proceeded essentially from the Holy See, there was active around the middle of the twentieth century in the "secular institutes" a form of striving for Christian perfection which had developed without the cooperation and to a degree under the skeptical observation and repudiating reactions of the official ecclesiastical offices. The members of these new communities, whose beginning extend back to the early nineteenth century, strove to realize the life of the evangelical counsels as individuals or in small groups in the midst of the world; without public vows and without being bound to a strictly organized community life, they felt themselves entirely bound to the apostolate in the milieu of the moment, especially of a secular calling.

---

[70] Quoted from H. Urs von Balthasar, "Kirchenerfahrung dieser Zeit," *Sentire Ecclesiam*, ed. by J. Daniélou and H. Vorgrimler (Freiburg 1961), 743–68, 754.

Soon these communities turned out to be as necessary as suited to the apostolic permeation of the secularized world. The number of *Instituta saecularia* grew. The initial opposition on the part of theologians and the Curia was to a great extent based on the traditional teaching of the inseparability of the state of perfection and solemn profession. But the then ensuing papal approval, at first only in individual cases, was all the more possible when Leo XIII in the constitution *Conditae a Christo* of 8 December 1900[71] had recognized the congregations that had already reached flowering as communities of religious and as a state of perfection.

Protracted preliminary work by ecclesiastical commissions and consultations by the Congregation of the Council in union with the Holy Office and the Congregation of Religious paved the way for the recognition of secular institutes as a "third state of perfection" by Pius XII's apostolic constitution *Provida Mater Ecclesia* of 2 February 1947.[72] The norms of this constitution applied to "communities, both of clerics and of lay persons, whose members observe the evangelical counsels in the world for reaching Christian perfection for the complete fulfillment of their apostolate."[73] The Church recognizes the dedication of life of the members of secular institutes and their vows or promises but does not grant either the public nature of these vows in the form of a solemn profession or make obligatory their "common life or living under the same roof";[74] "one or several common houses"[75] are, however, desired as centers of formation and meeting, as dwelling places of the leaders of the union, and for the reception of individual members for reasons of health or other considerations. The connection between the institute and its members is a "perpetual or temporary" one,[76] as well as a "mutual and perfect" one.[77] The right to found "secular institutes" pertains to the bishop, with the obligation of consulting the Congregation of Religious and reporting to it.

A year after *Provida Mater Ecclesia,* Pius XII on 13 February 1948 issued the motu proprio *Primo feliciter anno,*[78] in which the "secular institutes" were expressly praised and confirmed. In it the Pope thanked for the "help which brought to the Catholic apostolate in extremely great providential wisdom consolidation in our evil age that has fallen to pieces."[79] The stressing of the striving for perfection, which should "be adapted to life in the world in all things and brought into harmony with them,"[80] as well as the emphasis on the apostolic activity of the "secular institutes," which should be carried out "not only in the midst of the world, but, so to speak, out of the world,"[81] make clear the change which the notion of "secular institutes" has gone through since their origin: Whereas it originally was meant in the sense of a purely negative limitation in relation to the religious state, and in the preparations for *Provida Mater Ecclesia* there was still consideration of including the new societies in the concept of "religious state," now with the stressing of the "worldly" character of the secular institutes the qualitative distinction to the orders appeared in a manner which assisted the notion of "secular institutes" to an independent development and a positively filled autonomy. The new departure, which was rather hindered than encouraged by tendencies to "claustration," through the making aware of the general vocation released forces for sanctification which opposed the increasing clericalization of the orders and in general the tension between clergy and laity. Areas not yet reached or attainable—especially in the missions—could be opened up for apostolic penetration.

---

[71] *ASS* 23(1900–1901), 341–47.

[72] *AAS* 39(1947), 114–24.

[73] Ibid., 120.

[74] Op. cit., ART. II, par. 1, p. 120.

[75] Op. cit., ART. III, par. 4, p. 122.

[76] Op. cit., ART. III, pars. 3, 1, p. 121.

[77] Op. cit., ART. III, pars. 3, 2, p. 121.

[78] *AAS* 40(1948), 283–86.

The number of secular institutes grew by 1962 to fifteen communities of papal right, about sixty of diocesan right, and a still greater number of unions which were just seeking ecclesiastical approbation. In the great majority these were communities of women, and strikingly enough many of them in Latin countries.

Because of the considerable number of existing "secular institutes" and the great diversity of their tasks, here only a few of the most important can be mentioned as representative: As "the authentic model of the secular institute"[82] the *Opus Dei* is designated in the papal charter of approbation. It is one of the most widespread, numerically strongest, and, on account of the professional excellence of its members, most influential "secular institutes." The community was founded at Madrid for lay persons and priests by the young priest José María Escrivá de Balaguer (1902–75) under the name of *Sociedad Sacerdotal de la Santa Cruz y Opus Dei* and, as the first of the "secular institutes," obtained papal approval on 24 February 1947. At the beginning of the 1960s it already comprised around fifty thousand members from sixty-five nations and virtually all classes and professions, including some 2 percent priests.

---

[79] Ibid., 283.

[80] Op. cit., 284f.

[81] Op. cit., 285: "non tantum in saeculo, sed veluti ex saeculo."

[82] Quoted from O. B. Roegele, "'Opus Dei': Legende und Wirklichkeit einer umstrittenen Gemeinschaft," *Opus Dei—Für und Wider* (Osnabrück 1967), 148–80, 152.

An essential center of gravity of the activities of the institute lies in the field of the religioideological and scholarly formation and training of the academic recruits. This was seen in the founding in 1952 of its own university, recognized by the Holy See in 1960, in the Basque provincial capital, Pamplona, as a first step to other foundations of schools in many countries. But the stressing of the profession as the chief means of personal sanctification and of the apostolate became the occasion for the forming of centers of *Opus Dei* in the worker's quarters of large cities, whereby the chief stress lay on the erecting of places of formation and of pastoral care in the milieu of the workers' calling. Members of *Opus Dei* also put themselves at the disposal of the missions, and thereby they joined apostolic activity with professionally qualified work of development. In Peru *Opus Dei* undertook one of the most difficult missionary areas of Latin America. Finally, a series of literary and publicity activities in periodicals and publishing must be mentioned.

Likewise of papal right is the institute of the *Prêtres du Prado,* which is restricted to French members but is typical of many communities of a like orientation. It was founded in the nineteenth century as purely a community of priests by Father Chevrier (1826–79), who was closely linked to the Curé d' Ars, Saint Jean Baptiste Marie Vianney. In accord with the aim fixed at that time, the members aspire, even today, to make the Gospel credible to the poor through personal poverty. While the work threatened to fail in Chevrier's lifetime, the number of members increased in the present century from thirty-two in 1922 to 610 priests in 1960, as well as 202 sisters, whose sphere of activity extends far beyond France to Africa, Japan, Chile, and elsewhere. The members see the sphere of their apostolate especially in parochial care of souls, but also work as catechists and pastors among the workers and the working youth.

The most important German contribution to the development of the secular institutes is the multibranched Schönstatt Work with its international expansion. It was called into being in 1914 by Father Josef Kentenich (1885–1968). To this work belonged a group of Marian apostolate lay communities as well as several secular institutes, of which first the "Schönstatt Marian Sisters" obtained in 1948 the papal *Prodecretum laudis,* a step toward definitive recognition, which came on 8 December 1976. The long-range goal consists in the "Marian formation of the world to Christ." In conformity with the spirituality of "working-day sanctity," a "dynamic relation to the world" should make it possible for the institute, in the most suitable form of the moment, whether as individuals or in the group, to carry out the tasks in Church and world. The male branch includes, besides the institute of the "Schönstatt Fathers," who are chiefly professionally active for the Schönstatt Work, the "Schönstatt Priests" as a community of diocesan priests and the less strong "Schönstatt Marian Brothers." The members of the community of the "Ladies of Schönstatt" remained in their lay calling and frequently devoted themselves secondarily to various apostolic tasks in the Church's pastoral care and *caritas.* A two-year novitiate and two tertiarates should consolidate and deepen the religious life of the members by means of further religious formation and introduction to study. Due to the unobtrusiveness of their dress and life-style many of the women were able to continue their apostolic work to an astonishing degree even during the Nazi period. Around 1976 the "Schönstatt Marian Sisters," with more than twenty-eight hundred members from almost thirty nations, were the largest female secular community in Germany. Since 1933 they have expanded outside, among other places to South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, the United States, Australia, and Switzerland. During the period of the war and persecution the institute undertook tasks in some Slavic countries. The centers of gravity of its efforts lie in the fields of education and *caritas.* Community experiences in this branch of the Schönstatt Work a very intensive emphasis: One who desires to enter leaves his former group in life and places himself entirely at the disposal of the institute. The members are prepared for the tasks of their calling by an intensive schooling of eight and one-half years. After the completion of their training they are divided into intern members, who live with uniform dress in the home community, and extern members at individual posts in religious or secular dress, as well as the Sisters of Adoration.

Through its many-faceted apostolic commitment, the new form of life of the "secular institutes" had a favorable impact on the pastoral attitude of the old orders and on making aware the close connection of the contemplative ideal with the apostolate. Hans Urs von Balthasar also points to the importance of the "secular institutes" for the choice of a state of life by the unmarried woman.[83] If she sees herself not called to the religious state, then, since admittance to the priesthood is denied her, she can easily incur the tension of an unclear intermediate stage between the simple "unmarried life" and virginity undertaken from religious motives. Here membership in a "secular institute" can offer a function in life and support.

---

[83] Cf. H. Urs von Balthasar, *Der Laie und der Ordensstand.* (Freiburg 1949), 93–97.

While the "secular institutes" in their adaptation to the needs of the time also supplement the old orders and congregations in many ways with the élan of a new departure, for their part they are supported by the spirituality living in these orders, so that, in the continuity of the Christian striving for perfection, no break but an enrichment pointing to the future may occur.

Worker-Priests

The ecclesiastical authority also directed to secular institutes the groups of dedicated pastoral workers who, searching for new ways to regain for the faith the workers alienated from the Church, were willing to share their daily work, their manner of life, and their environment. A highly motivated experiment became in its beginnings the "scandal of the twentieth century and the drama of the worker-priests."[84] In 1943 Fathers Henri Godin (1906–44) and Yvan Daniel had issued a report on the Christian conquest of the proletarian classes under the title *Is France a Mission Land?*[85] The work, which courageously expressed what had long been known but not admitted, proceeded from the observation that, for the proletariat alienated from the Church, the traditional parish was entirely inaccessible, because it required of it the changing of its mentality and way of life, and conversely the parochial care of souls scarcely penetrated into the modern pagan world. Loyal to the model of Gregory the Great in regard to the Anglo-Saxons and to the efforts of the mission in remote lands for native priests and a preaching adapted to the manner of thinking and intelligence of the natives, one should bring to the workers' world a pure religion purged of human additions which enclose a civilization. Was not Saint Paul a pagan with the pagans and a Jew with the Jews? A year previously, on 5 October 1942, on the initiative of the Assembly of the Cardinals and Archbishops of France at Lisieux, the priestly seminary of the *Mission de France* had been opened. It was supposed to attract to the de-Christianized areas suffering from a lack of priests those who were capable of entering into the mentality of the outsiders. Cardinal Suhard (1874–1949) of Paris, who had approved Godin's report before its appearance, formed in 1944, under the name of *Mission de Paris,* a group of priests who, freed from ordinary parochial ministry, were to seek and go new ways of the apostolate. They proposed to "hold up the Catholic priesthood as a model in a missionary manner, beginning with the dependent, deprived, collective life of the poor of this day, through the same living conditions, . . .

---

[84] A. Collonge, *Le scandale du XX^{e} siècle et le drâme des Prêtres-ouvriers* (Paris 1957).

[85] *La France, Pays de Mission?* (Paris 1943).

through the clear intention of belonging to a given social class and of living on the level of the best of its members."

The designation "worker-priest," *prêtre-ouvrier,* for a priest who worked a full day at a job, was not distinguishable externally from a worker, and was not at first known as a priest in his closest environment, came into use through the *Diary of a Worker-Priest* by Henri Perrin, S. J.[86] The book told of the activity of French priests among their countrymen who were prisoners of war or those bound to work in Germany. The access into the life-style of the working world here offered by the situation was experienced as an effective apostolic possibility and after the war was continued by priests, including members of the Mission de Paris, Lyon, and other industrial towns. It was less concerned, after the example of Saint Paul (1 Cor. 9:15–18), to earn one's livelihood by one's own work; rather, according to Cardinal Suhard, the work of these priests was "the act of naturalization of the priests among people to whom he was hitherto only a foreigner; suffering and ready for penance, he shares in human existence."[87] In his 1947 pastoral letter "Growth or Decline of the Church,"[88] which obtained worldwide attention, the cardinal had demanded an apostolate of incarnation in the overcoming of Modernism and integralism. "Adaptation means not compromises, not systematic substitution of the old by the new, a fortiori not mutilation of the Gospel but only integral and intelligent incorporation of this Gospel into that which is to be converted. . . . To be an Apostle means to undertake in so far as it can be properly undertaken all of the human and of the world which man had fashioned for himself, to permeate all. All, which means, apart from sin, all values, even those hitherto foreign to the Christian, in so far as it is not simply a question of mankind's own mad ideas."[89]

The boundaries indicated by the cardinal between the required adaptation to the world and becoming uniform with the world (Rom. 12:2), the falling victim to the world, cannot easily be carried through in daily life and demands great religious strength and a considerable gift of discernment. This and a basic philosophical and theological formation for the confrontation with the ideology of Marxism have not rarely been lacking. Solidarity with the workers and this included sharing in struggles over wages and strikes in a front with the Communists brought the worker-priests into the twilight. And at the Curia there was concern for their spiritual life and the preeminence of the priesthood proper and pastoral care. On 23 September 1953 there was issued through Nuncio Marella to twenty-six bishops and religious superiors the request to break off the experiment.

---

[86] *Journal d'un prêtre-ouvrier* (Paris 1945).

[87] Cardinal Suhard, *Le prêtre dans la Cité* (Paris 1949).

[88] *Essor ou déclin de l'Église* (Paris 1947).

[89] Ibid., 63–67.

Meanwhile, public opinion had been attracted in a sensational way to the worker-priests through the press and Gilbert Cesbron's novel that appeared in 1952, *The Saints Go to Hell,* which obtained a circulation of more than two hundred thousand copies and many translations. Secrecy about the measures of the Curia, as was demanded, was impossible. Millions of Frenchmen had gained a great sympathy for the worker-priests and were indignant. In difficult discussions among Rome, the bishops, and the worker-priests possibilities were sought for continuing the apostolate under other conditions—only three hours work per day, life in a community of priests. Not all the approximately one hundred priests followed the directions of the bishops. Others, in an understanding with the bishops, quietly made new efforts. In March 1957 the Assembly of the Cardinals and Archbishops of France founded the Mission Ouvrière in an effort to make possible in modified form the presence of the priest in the workers' milieu. On the occasion of his first visit, in June 1959, to John XXIII, from whom as the former nuncio at Paris a special understanding was anticipated, Cardinal Feltin, archbishop of Paris, made a report on the matter. To his request that in special cases worker-priests might again be appointed as full-time workers, there was made known to him on 3 July the decision of the Holy Office that for the future every sort of factory work should be forbidden to priests. "The Holy See," said the decision of the Holy Office, "is of the opinion that for the apostolate in workers' environments it is not essential to send priests into the workers' milieu and that it is not possible to sacrifice to this end the traditional notion of the priesthood, even if the Church sees in this apostolate one of its dearest tasks. . . . It is true that the priest, like the Apostles, is a witness (cf. Acts 1:8) but a witness of the resurrection of Christ (cf. Acts 1:22), as of his divine and redeeming mission. He gives this witness especially by the word and not by manual labor among factory workers, as if he were one of them." Factory work makes it impossible to pursue the priestly duty of prayer. Even if some accomplish this, they should devote their time better to their priestly office than to manual work. "Did not the Apostles institute the diaconate precisely in order to free themselves from temporal affairs . . .? (Cf. Acts 6:2, 4)."[90] The bishops should reflect whether it is not the time to establish for the apostolate in workers' environments secular institutes whose members could be taken from priests and lay persons, of whom the latter could pursue the apostolate of work without temporal limits. The priests give their lay brothers a basic instruction and spiritual formation adapted to the workers' life, advise them in their problems, and support them in their difficulties. Father Loew, O.P., followed this route at Marseille with the secular institute "Saint Peter and Saint Paul," in which lay persons and priests devoted themselves together to the worker mission on the parish basis. The "Little Brothers of Jesus," a brotherhood in the spirit of Charles de Foucauld, also traveled a similar road.

---

[90] *HK* 14 (1959–60), 77.

The community called "of the Prado" after one of the former amusement sites purchased by the founder in a slum quarter of Lyon, worked with mission teams, three to five strong, of priests and lay brothers, who settled in the midst of workers' areas and earned their own livelihood. Auxiliary Bishop Alfred Arcel pursued a cobbler's trade in Lyon-Gerland as head of a team in homework until 1959. He had to give up this activity but remained superior of the "Prado" and, as auxiliary bishop, collaborator with Cardinal Gerlier.

The basic feature common to the religious movements here discussed, the spirituality from which they arose or by which they were stamped in their course, is difficult to pinpoint. The spirituality of these decades seems most clearly characterized by a Christocentrism that is oriented to the apostolate. The historical Jesus, "Christ our Brother," came alive again: Jesus assumed our concrete life and fulfilled it in his death and resurrection. In his passage, *Pascha,* through death to glory he expanded his existence—limited to him as an individual during his earthly life—to the "mystical Christ," who has us participate by baptism in his destiny and his divine life. This is accomplished in the Church, which is the body of Christ mysteriously united to it in a living unity. The new life of the child of God, Christ in us and we in Christ, is a task for the Christian. He should form his life and the world in Christ to the honor of God the Father. But Christocentrism means not a spiritualistic reversion to individualistic interiority or flight from the world, but, on the contrary, the stressing of the fully human and of the world, which is included in the spiritual life.

If in Jesus Christ divinity and humanity have become a personal unity, without admixture or separation, then the "yes" to Christ means also a "yes" to people and to his earthly creation. The human is not annihilated in him but confirmed and surrendered. "If the human and earthly, nature and culture, are to be accepted, then this happens on the highest and purest level in Christ's human nature." "The miracle, the shocking, does not lie in a man's becoming God but in the incarnation of God. This makes the Christian exult."[91]

Like theology, so also spirituality stands under the sign of a turning to the world: the taking seriously of one's own worth and one's own destiny in the light of the mystery of the incarnation of God. Creation and incarnation are seen in intimate connection. The Logos, in whom everything was created, became Man in order to lead everything back to God. The incarnation is not intended first with reference to redemption from sin; it is the goal and crown of creation and would have happened even without the fall into sin. "Through him and by him everything was created" (Col. 1:16). God's "yes" to the world in creation finds its confirmation and fulfillment in the incarnation. From here on one strives to refute by word and deed Nietzsche's charge and that of the Marxists, that Christ misued the world for a beyond, that Christianity is far from people and their problems.

This is promoted by works such as V. Poucel, *Against the Opponents of the Body* (1937); G. Thils, *Theology of Earthly Realities* (1947); M. D. Chenu, *Theology of Work* (1955); Y. Congar, *The Layman: Outline of a Theology of the Laity* (1953); G. Philips, *The Layman in the Church: A Theology of the Lay State* (1952); Alfons Auer, *The Christian Open to the World: Principles and History of Lay Piety* (1960). The salvation history line—creation, incarnation, Parousia—makes one think of Jean Daniélou's *Secret of History* (1953), and of Hans Urs von Balthasar's *Theology of History* (1950), but again makes one aware of the eschatological feature of Christianity in contrast to an often too optimistic incarnational theology.

In asceticism the active virtues were more strongly stressed. It was explained that the Christian can only assure his own salvation if he is concerned for the salvation of the others. The diversity of Christian manifestation in a rapidly changing political, economic, and social environment became clear and with it the necessity of again preparing for it. This required a greater measure of personal responsibility and gave to the spiritual and moral life an unequally greater dynamism. It penetrated more strongly into the awareness that not only the human acts directly related to God—prayer, meditation, and liturgy—are religious, but everything that is done for the honor of God, in accord with Paul's statement: "Whether you eat or drink or whatever else you do, do all for the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31). Thus it is significant that on the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of Saint Ignatius (d. 1556) "in actione contemplativus" or the "to find God in all things" was stressed as the message of the saint for our day.[92] It corresponds to this, that "working-day sanctity" became the characteristic slogan for the spirituality of religious movements, and the "little way" of Thérèse of Lisieux obtained new luster.[93] In contrast to the disillusioned and self-centered Christocentrism of the *Devotio moderna,* for the "little" Thérèse it meant to love Jesus above all, to save souls for him, in order that he might be loved more.

---

[91] K. Adam, *Christus unser Bruder* (Regensburg 1926, 3d ed. 1935).

---

[92] E. Coreth, "In actione contemplativus," *ZKTh* 76 (1954), 55–82; E. Iserloh, "'Gott finden in allen Dingen,' Die Botschaft des heiligen Ignatius von Loyola an unsere Zeit," *TThZ* 66 (1957), 65–79, reprinted in E. Iserloh, *Verwirklichung des Christlichen im Wandel der Geschichte* (Würzburg 1975), 99–113; J. Stierli, "Das Ignatianische Gebet: 'Gott suchen in allen Dingen,'" *Ignatius von Loyola,* ed. by F. Wulf (Würzburg 1956), 151–82.

[93] I. F. Görres, *Das verborgene Antlitz. Eine Studie über Therese von Lisieux* (Freiburg 1944); new edition: *Das Senfkorn von Lisieux,* 9th ed. (Freiburg 1964); H. Urs von Balthasar, *Therese von Lisieux. Geschichte einer Sendung* (Cologne 1950); *Therese vom Kinde Jesu. Selbstbiographische Schriften. Authentischer Text* (Einsiedeln 1958); A. Combes, *Die Heilandsliebe der heiligen Teresia von Lisieux* (Freiburg 1951).

CHAPTER 10

*Developments in the Clergy since 1914**

The Swiss theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar, on the occasion of the Third Synod of Bishops at Rome in 1971, expressed the conviction that the clergy is today "the clear trouble spot of the Church."[1] In this connection he had in mind the role of priests within the postconciliar development, especially within the reform of the liturgy just as much as the alarming tendencies in the clergy itself and its relations to the episcopate.

The most recent "priestly crisis" cannot be understood and properly explained against the background of the immediately preceding decades. Its roots go deeper. At the beginning of our century individual priests and groups of priests had taken an interest in bridging the chasm between Church and theology on the one side and the modern world and its temper on the other side, and hence had demanded reforms within the Church.[2] Even then there was question of the language of the liturgy, of church discipline, of the Church's stance in the social question, as well as of problems of the clerical state, for example, the obligation to celibacy, the relations between priests and bishops, and the form of clerical education. As widespread as the aims of such priestly groups were their motivation and character. They extended from Romolo Murri's *Democrazia Cristiana* in Italy and Marc Sangier's *Sillon* in France to the Swabian cranks who wanted to found a union of priests for protection of the interests of the clerical state against Bishop Keppler of Rottenburg.[3] In 1901 there took place in Vienna a quite well attended Austrian clergy meeting, which aimed to improve the feeling of solidarity among the priests as well as their social position and material situation. However, the Austrian episcopate forbade the repetition of this meeting.[4]

---

* Norbert Trippen

[1] J. Hoffner, H. Urs von Balthasar, eds., *Bischofssynode 1971. Das Priesteramt* (Einsiedeln 1972), 6.

[2] From the abundance of contemporary reform writings let the following be named as quality examples: H. Schell, *Der Katholizismus als Prinzip des Fortschritts* (Würzburg 1898: on the Index!); A. Ehrhard, *Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart and Vienna 1901). Less balanced reform efforts are described by A. Hagen,

All these initiatives in the clergy, effected independently of the episcopate and directed to inner church reform goals, fell under Pius X's suspicion of Modernism and were suppressed in this Pope's struggle against the heresy assumed by him to be everywhere. The encyclical on Modernism, *Pascendi,* of 8 September 1907, again forbade priests to take the editorship of newspapers and periodicals without the previous permission of the bishops, who were moreover obliged to supervise the activity of priests as reporters or collaborators on such publications. The bishops should permit congresses of priests only in very rare cases.[5] At the same time the Scholastic orientation of theological studies and strict rules for the education of priests in seminaries were decreed, so that the suppression of these reform groups in the clergy succeeded, especially since the First World War and the subsequent upheavals left no room for a further confrontation with Modernism that was not desired by Benedict XV.

Between the two world wars there appeared or developed a few associations of priests, which pursued, however, purely religious and ascetical or legal and economic aims.[6] There were no tensions worthy of

---

Der Reformkatholizismus in der Diözese Rottenburg (1902–1920) (Stuttgart 1962); cf. also N. Trippen, *Theologie und Lehramt im Konflikt. Die kirchlichen Massnahmen gegen den Modernismus im Jahre 1907 und ihre Auswirkungen in Deutschland* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1977), passim.

[3] Hagen, op. cit., 51–61.

[4] F. Funder, *Vom Gestern ins Heute. Aus dem Kaiserreich in die Republik* (Vienna 1952), 342ff. A similar congress had already taken place at Bourges in 1900 (Hagen, op. cit., 51).

[5] In question are paragraphs 34 and 35 of the encyclical *Pascendi:* A. Michelitsch, *Der biblisch-dogmatische "Syllabus" Pius' X. samt der Enzyklika gegen den Modernismus und dem Motu proprio vom 18. November 1907,* 2d ed. (Graz and Vienna 1908), 346ff; cf. Trippen, op. cit., 29.

[6] Konrad Algermissen provides a survey of these class unions in *LThK* 8 (1936), 471ff.

mention between episcopate and clergy. The system of the strictly secluded seminary training functioned, even if it was already regarded as antiquated and occasionally smiled at by more far-sighted academic teachers and numerous students. However, there was no thought of a fundamental reform but of assisting in a mild practical application of the existing order. Exegetes, dogmaticians, and church historians, especially in the state academic chairs in Germany, were able to distinguish between research hypotheses and results and what might have been publicly represented and published.

A limited field of activity for autonomous reform tendencies of the younger clergy that were not always familiar to and approved by the episcopate was supplied especially in Germany by the youth movement and, in connection with it, the liturgical movement in the 1920s and 1930s.[7] On the travels of youth, priestly dress must first be laid aside. Corresponding decrees in diocesan synods, as, for example, in the Cologne diocesan synods of 1922 and 1937,[8] then spoke clearly. The introduction of the "community Mass" with the recitation of the vernacular translation parallel to the Latin Mass texts occurred not without tensions between liturgically active circles of youthful priests and the older pastors or the episcopate. Also the beginnings of the ecumenical movement, pursued by individual priests and lay groups, were in no way under the encouraging benevolence of all bishops. Nevertheless there prevailed among the diocesan clergy a relationship of serene loyalty between priests and bishops. There was in the clergy no basic criticism of the Church, its doctrine, and its discipline. The *Hymns to the Church* of Gertrud von Le Fort reflect a widespread outlook even in the clergy of those decades.

The worker-priests in France[9] can be regarded as a first movement in the clergy in which postconciliar points of discussion on the priestly state and priestly life seemed to be anticipated. It is characteristic of its starting situation in the early 1940s that this movement was begun by the French episcopate: When during the war several thousand French seminarians and members of Catholic Action were forced to work in German factories, the bishops of France founded a secret pastoral work to take care of them. Twenty-five priests put themselves at their disposal. The experience of this enterprise with an entirely different priestly activity and life-style constituted the basis for the *Mission de Paris* after 1946. Renouncing the middle-class manner of life, priests sought to live as workers among the workers. However, it soon appeared that, because of the solidarity with the working class and its social and political goals, conflicts with the ecclesiastical authorities could not be avoided. The relations of the worker-priests to the parish priests were increasingly strained, because the latter lived in a bourgeois mentality and had no understanding of the demands of the workers and their priests. The bishops of France were partly concerned for the social position of the worker-priests, the Roman Curia rather for their spiritual life. In 1953–54 the experiment was interrupted at Rome's direction. The majority of worker-priests finally submitted to the pertinent decrees and returned to their diocese or order. The attempt and its failure occupied French and European public opinion until the eve of the council.

---

[7] On the Youth Movement see the general bibliography for this chapter.

[8] *Die Diözesan-Synode des Erzbistums Köln 1922 am 10.11 und 12. Oktober* (Cologne 1922), 31: "It is especially prescribed that clerical garb is obligatory even for travel and especially for travel. If a cleric is forced to make journeys on which he probably cannot wear clerical dress, he should previously inform the vicar general." Corresponding decree of the synod of 1937, ibid. (1937), nos. 28, 51.

[9] See the general bibliography for the chapter.

The Second Vatican Council expressed itself in two decrees on the formation and on the ministry and life of priests, but the question of priests did not supply any of the council's central subjects. For the succeeding unrest among priests quite other statements of the council were of indirect but all the more persistent effectiveness, above all the dogmatic constitution *Lumen gentium,* with its new self-understanding of the Church as the pilgrim "People of God," but also the higher valuation of the general priesthood of the faithful and the opening to the world in the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes.* The reconsideration and the change which the council produced, most clearly visible in the liturgy, led to an interior insecurity in many priests, to public discussions on the priestly office and the priestly form of life, to the rapid increase of resignations of their office by priests, finally to the forming of groups of priests with partly sociopolitical, partly anti-hierarchical, partly class-solidarity goals. Within a short time there was a strong mobilization of public interest for the question of priests within and outside the Church, which of course again quickly evaporated.

In the effort to trace this development that erupted and peaked between 1968 and 1971, one must not lose sight of the fact that countries and continents were affected differently by it. Neither in Poland and other Eastern bloc states nor in Vietnam or the missionary Churches of Africa was there a disturbance comparable to that in Western Europe and North and South America. The inner uncertainty and external solidarity of many priests developed in part out of the theological and reform impulses of the Second Vatican Council, but in part also out of the ideological pluralism and the lack of spiritual orientation of the Western democracies. Hardly accidental must have been the temporary connection of this group of priests with the unrest at the Western universities and in the younger generation in general. Had not the council, more unambiguously than earlier ecclesiastical pronouncements, referred pastoral care to the service of the world and the recognition of its proper values? Thus the repercussions of developments outside the Church on the clergy of the Western world could not be absent.

With the end of the council there began in Europe and America a theological discussion on the raison d'être of a priesthood based on a sacramental ordination and undertaken for life. Do the beginnings in the New Testament offer a dogmatically satisfactory justification? it was asked. The lack of priests, the permanent diaconate restored by the council, and the higher valuation of the general priesthood of the faithful as well as their being entrusted with pastoral services hitherto reserved to priests made unavoidable the question in what did the *differentia specifica* of the ordained priest consist in contrast to other believers active in the pastoral ministry.[10] If the priesthood as a special state, in contrast to the rest of the faithful, came under discussion in relation to theology and the inner structure of the Church, the decline of authority during those years in the Western democracies went out of the way to make acute the question of the self-understanding and role of the priest in Church and society. Just as in the secular sphere only authority based on objective competence and transmitted for a limited time would be tolerated, so too priests and their "solidarity groups" that were being established demanded that the official priestly ministry be justified, no longer sacramentally (vertically) but functionally, that is, by service to the congregation (horizontally); it had to be bestowed for a time and, depending on the circumstances, could be exercised in a secondary occupation. The priest had to become involved in the world and its problems and legitimize himself to his fellow citizens by a civil profession.

Younger priests especially were affected by these considerations. At first, these considerations led to their demanding the abandonment of priestly dress and class privileges. Here there was probably more at stake than an external approximation of life-styles and customs to the environment. For many there lay here the profession that sacramental ordination did not essentially distinguish the priest from the other members of the People of God.

Parallel to the discussion over the office and function of the priest and in inner dependence on it was a confrontation over the obligation of priests to celibacy. At the council there had been widely opposed standpoints and motions on the extension of this obligation and its theological justification within the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests.[11] Pope Paul VI had finally rendered the discussion harmless when on 10 October 1965 he sent a letter to the president of the Conciliar Praesidium, Cardinal Tisserant, in which he requested that the question of celibacy not be discussed in full council and announced a statement to the clergy on priestly celibacy. This letter to Cardinal Tisserant was read in the *aula* on the next day and determined the further decisions of the council fathers. In number 16 of the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests it was recognized that celibacy is "not demanded by the very essence of the priesthood, as the practice of the Ancient Church and the tradition of the Eastern Churches show. . . . But celibacy is in many respects proper to the priesthood." As justification were cited the identification of the priest with Christ and the greater availability for the priestly ministry. "This holy Synod approves and reconfirms the law for those who are chosen for the priesthood, in regard to which the Spirit gives it the confidence that the Father will generously give the calling to the celibate life . . . if only those who participate in the priesthood of Christ through the Sacrament of Orders humbly and insistently pray for it, together with the whole Church."

---

[10] For the "uncertainty of role" of many priests, cf. the contributions of Glatzel in the *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* and in the *Stimmen der Zeit* (cf. the bibliography for the chapter). For the discussion on the office: Küng, *Wozu Priester? Reform und Anerkennung kirchlicher Ämter;* Schuh, *Amt im Widerstreit.*

Precisely this last expectation seemed in the succeeding years not to be realized. If it is hardly possible to obtain exact figures on the number of those who abandoned the official priesthood, still the research of the Swiss Pastoral Sociological Institute must have come close to reality when it reckoned between 1963 and 1970 from twenty-two to twenty-five thousand resignations in the diocesan clergy, corresponding to 5 percent of the clergy.[12] Especially alarming is the preponderance of younger priests among those leaving. This trend converged with the shockingly declining number of candidates for the priesthood and especially of priestly ordinations.[13] These last dropped, for example, in the German Federal Republic from 506 in 1965 to 213 in 1972; it is precisely here that the contrast to Poland and some mission countries is crystal clear: there is no lack of recruits there at this time.

This distressing development may have induced Paul VI very soon to redeem the promise to the council fathers of a statement on priestly celibacy. The encyclical *Sacerdotalis caelibatus* of 24 June 1967 did not, however, contribute to relaxing the tensions over the celibacy discussion but rather made them more acute. As was stressed in the later survey of priests, a great number of priests, especially those positively decided in the celibacy question, had not even read the encyclical,[14] whereas the troubled younger clerics regarded its content as disillusioning. The Pope adopted the essential statements of the conciliar decree on the celibacy of priests, but continued in the justification of celibacy, in the retaining of the union of the priestly vocation and the obligation of celibacy as well as in the estimation of those who abandoned the priesthood as "pitiable deserters" in the traditional ideas and arguments.

---

[11] Cf. also F. Wulf, S.J., "Kommentar zu Art. 16 des Dekrets 'Presbyterorum Ordinis,'" *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* 3, 214–21, especially 217.

[12] Reproduced in Siefer, *Sterben die Priester aus?* 76f.

[13] Ibid., 77–89.

The temporarily violent discussion of celibacy took place in the mass media, in journalism, and a rapidly growing literature of brochures, but also in lectures and organized discussions.[15] In this connection it became clear that the obligation of celibacy of priests was no longer understood, not only by a large portion of the younger clergy, but also in broad levels of the Catholic people and was no longer approved without more ado.

The dissatisfaction with the celibacy encyclical must have been one of the determining events for the founding, still in preparation, of the solidarity groups of priests in various European countries. Thus the meetings and publication organs of these groups were then also the forum in which the demands and expectations in regard to the celibacy question were articulated not as representing the entire clergy—the groups included only a very small percentage of priests—but still for an active stratum of younger priests in the Western hemisphere. It was again and again stressed that it was not a question of suppressing celibacy as a freely accepted charism but of ending the legal obligation of celibacy for all priests of the Latin Church. Even more strongly was it demanded that tried men in the married state, *viri probati,* be admitted to priestly ordination—a demand that had already been rejected by the council!—and married priests allowed to exercise their office further.

In close connection with the obligation of celibacy there was discussed in groups of priests the question whether the "official priesthood" and the "clerical state" were even replaceable, to what extent priests were included with the powers supporting society and had lost touch with the day-to-day world.[16] There was heard the demand for a professional activity of priests, for closer solidarity with the working class and the peripheral social groups. Finally, the meeting of priests at Chur in 1969 demanded also a political commitment of priests against capitalistic and totalitarian systems in favor of a more just and humane society. If such demands were powerfully inspired by the political situation of some European states and especially of Latin America, the demand for inner democratization of the Church, for collaboration of priests and lay persons in the making of ecclesiastical decisions, was based on conciliar statements, which seemed to point in this direction, but which were often enough excessively interpreted. People pressed for transparency in the decision-making process and exercise of authority in the Church, especially for the sharing by clergy and people in the selection of bishops and the filling of other ecclesiastical positions of leadership.

---

[14] This is given, for example, by the interpretation of the Italian survey of priests (*Il Sacerdozio ministeriale, Problemi del Clero in Italia,* Editrice Studium [1970]); Simmel, *Priester zwischen Anpassung und Unterscheidung,* 147: "The encyclical *Sacerdotalis Caelibatus* was virtually not read; what happened was that it was criticized rather than studied."

[15] Cf. also the general bibliography for the chapter.

The effort to represent such demands, especially the specifically professional, more effectively, to find solidarity for episcopally disapproved experiments in liturgy and pastoral care, or even to effect changes of awareness in favor of ecclesiastical or political reforms, was the basis on which, from the beginning of 1968, priest groups appeared in various European countries. To be sure, in ARTICLE 7 of the decree on priests the council had obliged the bishops to establish a Priests' Senate,[17] representing the *presbyterium* of the diocese, and in many countries this directive of the council had already been complied with. But the Priests' Senates found their place and field of activity only slowly among the existing and canonically firmly established advisory bodies of the dioceses. In any event, they proved to be unsuited to parry and overcome the unrest in the clergy. The priest groups appearing at the same time proceeded partly from older informal discussion groups and communities of priests or were founded on the basis of concrete opportunities, such as the encyclical *Humanae vitae* in the summer of 1968. With surprising rapidity there arose organized associations and principle papers on the diocesan level, but also

[16] There was a broad discussion on these subjects at the conference of delegates of European priest groups from 5 to 10 July 1969 at Chur: Holenstein, *Churer Dokumente.*

[17] "They [the bishops] should be glad to listen to them [the priests], should even ask their advice and discuss with them what the care of souls demands and what promotes the welfare of the see. But in order to do this, a circle or council of priests should be created in a manner suited to today's circumstances and requirements, who would represent the *presbyterium,* whose form and norms must still be canonically determined. This council can effectively support the bishop in the government of the diocese with its advice" (*Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* 3, 175ff.).

supranational contacts.[18] Various "solidarity groups" from West German dioceses amalgamated into a federation at Königstein on 26–27 May 1969 into the "Working Community of Priests' Groups in the German Federal Republic."

The priest groups in the various European nations had a different orientation conditioned by the political and inner-ecclesiastical situation.[19] The German SOG groups developed an overwhelmingly professionally specified goal, which was critical of the hierarchy. The Netherlands group *Septuagint* occupied an influential position in the contemporary development process of the Dutch Church. It was supported by broad strata of the clergy and faithful and had continuous contact with the Dutch bishops. The French groups, *Concertation* and especially *Échanges et Dialogue,* stood in an extraordinarily tense relation with the hierarchy. Still without prospects was the position of the Spanish and Portuguese groups in view of the contemporary political and inner-ecclesiastical circumstances in both nations.

The very differently structured and oriented European priest groups reached the apogee of their importance in 1969 when they met, so to speak, as a contrasting program to the contemporary episcopal symposium, at Chur[20] from 5 to 10 July, and, parallel to the Second Synod of Bishops, from 10 to 16 October at Rome,[21] for a "Conference of Delegates of European Priest Groups." On these occasions, the groups, their aims, and their style of procedure in regard to the bishops, going beyond all the usual amenities, became familiar to the public. At Chur the delegates demanded admittance to the episcopal symposium, which had chosen as its theme "The function of the priest today." But the bishops refused to admit the priests' representatives; there were indeed contacts on the periphery, some informal talks between individual bishops and delegates of the priests. And it may be said that the consultations of the bishops took place under the impression of the appearance and demands of the priest groups.

The Conference of Delegates of Priest Groups at Chur passed several resolutions, which were put together by the sharply antihierarchical French group, *Échanges et Dialogue:* the "Resolution on Work," "Resolution on Celibacy," "Resolution on the Commitment of Priests." In addition there were a text on "The Permanent and the Changing in the Episcopal Office in the Church," which presented a reply to the talk of Cardinal Döpfner on the same subject to the episcopal symposium, and a letter "To our Brother in Peter's Office, Paul VI."

---

[18] Development and activity of the priest groups are reflected in their publications, in Germany especially in *Imprimatur* (Trier) and *SOG-Papiere* (Bochum) (cf. the bibliography for the chapter).

[19] On the different orientation of the European priest groups: Werners, *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 12 (1971), 187f.

[20] On the conference of delegates at Chur and its proclamations: Holenstein, ed., *Churer Dokumente;* idem, *Der Protest der Priester;* Raske-Schäfer-Wetzel, *Eine freie Kirche für eine freie Welt,* 55–72.

[21] On the conference of delegates at Rome: Raske-Schäfer-Wetzel, op. cit., 83–177.

Three months later in Rome the next conference of delegates, on the occasion of the Synod of Bishops, wanted to be received by Paul VI, but the Pope refused. The conference, in the rooms of the Waldensian faculty, worked for a theological elaboration of the priests' insecurity as to role but was under stronger internal tensions than the meeting at Chur. There appeared only "study documents" of which it was said[22]: "The texts are not accepted in all individual formulations, they are not regarded as definitive statements but as the point of departure for new reflections." The themes were: "On the Local Church," "On the Bishop," "On the Petrine Ministry," "A Church for the World," "Ministry of the Priest."[23]

It seems that with these two large conferences of 1969 the Priest-Group Movement had already exceeded its high point. The European groups were themselves aware that they had got themselves too much entangled in a—partly only due to prevailing circumstances—class problem. The radical attempts at a public overcoming of these problems aroused only in passing the interest of the ecclesiastical and nonecclesiastical public, did not further assist those immediately concerned, and at times gave the impression of a new "left" clericalism. And so the organizers of the "Congress of Priestly Solidarity" at Amsterdam from 28 September to 3 October 1970 sought for ways to a new contact with the people and the world.[24] The meeting had as its theme "Church in Society," and non-European, especially South American, priest groups were also invited. But the course of the congress revealed an internal discord and a considerable difference of opinion between the European groups, hitherto predominantly concerned with questions of class, and the Latin Americans, arguing from a political revolutionary standpoint. And there was disappointment over the slight public interest. Where, at the congresses in Chur and Rome, throngs full of expectation had prevailed, now sizeable holes gaped: on the press benches. Not only for the press but also for the organizers themselves there was missing in Amsterdam the program of contrast to a meeting of bishops.

---

[22] *SOG-Papiere 1969*, no. 5 (25 November 1969), 29.

[23] The report in the *SOG-Papiere 1969*, no. 5, 24–43, and Raske-Schäfer-Wetzel, *Eine Freie Kirche für eine freie Welt*, from p. 83, give no ultimate clarity as to exactly what the titles of the texts are and by how many delegates the individual texts were accepted.

[24] The *SOG-Papiere 1970*, 342–57, reports in detail on the congress at Amsterdam, with facsimile printing of press articles.

If in 1971 it was still written concerning the priest groups that they were "a reality no longer to be imagined as nonexistent," which made up 10 to 15 percent of the diocesan clergy,[25] that was already outdated at that time. The priest groups and their publication organs either disbanded expressly on their own or they quietly discontinued their work. Some still vegetated for a while without attracting attention. More enduring than these progressive groups were the traditionalist priest groups that arose or revived as a reaction, for example, the "Movement for Pope and Church," which found its adherents predominantly in the middle and older generations of the clergy.

If one asks about the reasons for this rapid end of an awakening that was so energetically pursued, there must be named, apart from the too wide spectrum in views and goals, which became apparent in the large gatherings, an inadequate theological basis and argumentation, an appearance unbalanced by inner insecurity and marked by the sociological orientation of those years. For the too highly set reform aims and the growing flood of proposals and contributions to discussions the organization and the material basis of the groups proved to be inadequate.[26] The leading forces in these groups were not rarely priests who were themselves unsure in their role or were even stuck in an acute vocation crisis. Because of apostasies, numerous groups lost their initiators and leading minds.

The bishops met the inner insecurity and external solidarity in the clergy, at times under antihierarchical signs, totally unexpectedly and unprepared. How did the papacy and the territorial episcopates react? The gamut extended, at first, from surprised nervousness by way of helplessly watching patience to the attempt at open dialogue with the priests on the edges of the conferences at Chur and Rome. A cautious reserve in regard to the priest groups was forced on the bishops by the fact that, for example, the "SOG papers" of the German and Austrian priest groups published numerous cases of conflict of individual priests with their bishops, dramatically arranged as "documentation," and in so doing gave publicity to personal letters of the bishops to individual priests.

The German bishops made a very early theological contribution of high quality to the overcoming of the priests' crisis by the doctrinal letter on the priestly office[27] issued at their plenary meeting on 11 November 1969. In a biblical and dogmatic consideration the bishops sought to clarify what had become unsure: the understanding of the office of priest based on the New Testament and developed in the history of the Church. This document of the German bishops was of importance for the choice of themes and the course of the Third Synod of Bishops at Rome in 1971. "The Priestly Ministry" was one of its chief themes. The document issued by this Synod, "The Office of Priest," was decisively stamped by Cardinal Höffner and Hans Urs von Balthasar. It led beyond the biblical-dogmatic consideration to a statement on the basic questions of priestly ministry and priestly life.[28]

---

[25] Thus Werners, *Priestergruppen,* 202.

[26] In almost every fascicle of the *SOG-Papiere* occurs the complaint of being unable to master the organizational problems, especially the flood of paper.

[27] *Schreiben der deutschen Bischöfe über das priesterliche Amt. Eine biblisch-dogmatische Handreichung* (Trier 1969).

Parallel to these exertions for a theological and spiritual mastering of the crisis of the priesthood proceeded the attempt at an inventory carried out by sociological methods. Even if the priest groups with their radical programs represented only a minority, in the years after the close of the Second Vatican Council it became in general ever clearer that the clergy no longer constituted a closed unity among themselves and with the bishops. The uncertainty in regard to this phenomenon offered to some territorial episcopates the occasion to permit or even to commission surveys or inquiries among their priests by scholarly institutes employing the methods of the public-opinion poll.[29] From 1969 to 1972 such inquiries, more or less simultaneously but independent of one another, took place in the Netherlands, the German Federal Republic, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Spain, and the United States. Not counting the Netherlands, about 43 percent of the Catholic priests of the world were affected by this wave of interrogation.[30] Since these inquiries were variously accented and carried out by different methods, did not take place at exactly the same time, and were colored by the ecclesiastical and political context in the different countries, a comprehensive comparison of them is not without problems. Nevertheless definite common tendencies and also regional differences are clearly visible.

The questions which were submitted to the priests referred first to the background, development, and living conditions of priests. Precisely in this area considerable differences appeared among the individual countries. A second series of questions dealt with the functions of the priest and the difficulties connected with them. Understanding of function and calling, spiritual life, and celibacy constituted a third complex, with which finally was closely associated the relationship of the priests to the Church and the authorities. The outcome of the interrogations operated on the one hand in a sobering and at the same time calming manner after the shocking rise of the priest groups. Seventy-nine percent of the German priests declared, for example, that they were content, or even very content, with their activity of the moment; 12 percent answered "pretty well," and only 5 percent were not especially, or not at all, satisfied.[31] To be sure, 51 percent of the German priests declared it necessary or worthy of consideration that obligation to celibacy be abolished in the future, but 59 percent had no hesitation, despite the celibacy obligation, in advising young men to the priestly calling.[32] On the other hand, there could no longer be overlooked what people had long not been ready to admit: "The priesthood is not monolithic, a broad spectrum of pastoral and theological positions is recognizable, and hence an inner-ecclesiastical tension, which appears to some as fatal, to others as a sign of hope. There is hardly a question of fundamental importance any more on which priests would be of one opinion and on which they would not express themselves very clearly in one sense or another."[33] Despite a certain difference, which stands out in Europe somewhat between the upset situation in the Netherlands via Germany and Austria to the still more stable ecclesiastical situation in Switzerland, the inquiries made clear uniform trends: An increasing stratum of younger priests in Europe and the United States is critical of the "vertical" understanding of the priestly office and bases the priestly ministry not so much in relation to sacramental priestly ordination as a result of preaching and the administration of the sacraments, as rather "horizontal-functional" in the sense of a service to mankind and to the unity of the congregation. With this understanding of the office is united the rejection of a special priestly state, clerical dress, and the joining of the priestly office and obligatory celibacy, which is found to be not adequately based theologically and burdensome. Even more definitely than the demand for the "uncoupling" of priesthood and obligatory celibacy was the demand for the admission of proved married men to the priesthood—not only by the younger priests but, for example, in Germany by 79 percent of all priests.[34] With this notion of the office and of the appropriate manner of life of the priest there was joined in the younger clergy a critical attitude toward ecclesiastical authority and its carrying out of its office, the demand that priests and lay persons take part in the calling of the holders of office, just as an extensive collaboration in pastoral work and the leading of the community be intended for the laity in general.

---

[28] J. Höffner, H. Urs von Balthasar, eds., *Bischofssynode 1971. Das Priesteramt* (Einsiedeln 1972).

[29] Report of research and literature in the bibliography for the chapter.

[30] Simmel reaches this evaluation in Forster, ed., *Priester zwischen Anpassung und Unterscheidung*, 127.

---

[31] Schmidtchen, *Priester in Deutschland,* 76–81.

[32] Ibid., 66–76.

[33] Ibid., XII.

[34] Ibid., 69. Similar or even stronger desires resulted from the surveys in other countries.

Other results of the surveys were conditioned by regional peculiarities: In Austria and Switzerland 60 to 70 percent of the priests obtained their education in ecclesiastical boarding schools, in Italy and Spain the percentage must have been still higher. In Germany, on the other hand, 65 percent of the priests spent their school years at home and attended public schools. But it is striking that just in the first named countries their formation was felt by the priests as insufficient and the demand for a more qualified improvement was clearly raised. Generally widespread was the demand for specialization in priestly activity and supplementary secondary studies. The special political situation of Spain in the late Franco epoch was reflected in statements of the Spanish priests on Church-state relations.[35]

The temporary keystone in the great chain of inquiry was constituted by the inquiry among the German priesthood candidates in 1974.[36] The results make known how even in a brief period of time not unessential nuances can occur: "One can neither speak of a return to conservatism nor of a continuation of a generally critical trend. Instead, something new, perhaps unexpected, happens. In their open, partly critical attitude the priesthood candidates are much like the young priests—in general, they entirely resemble them rather than the older ones. But then the new must be noticed: a different, perhaps strengthened drive toward spirituality. Among the authenticating ideas of the candidates there are clearly prominent the concepts of being borne by Christ's commission and of the personal relation to God. This is expressed not only in this question about the authenticating of the office but also in numerous other connections."[37]

With this a last and decisive effect of the crisis of the priesthood is touched: the insecurity and decimation of the recruits for the priesthood. Parallel to the forming of solidarity groups of younger priests there occurred in European and American countries a convulsion of the previous system of seminary education and theological studies.[38] Everywhere the number of priesthood candidates dropped strongly, so that not a few diocesan seminaries and religious houses of studies had to close. In particular, the externally strictly isolated manner of life of the seminaries could not be maintained. Seminarians demanded the possibility of being permitted to live individually or in groups in the midst of the other students in their places of study. The previous curriculum of theological studies, the narrow Neo-Scholastic dogmatic theology, the unconnected juxtaposition of theological disciplines in the program of studies, the unsatisfactory inclusion of didactic-pedagogical and pastoral-practical disciplines, were perceived as inadequate for the preparation for priestly and other pastoral ministries, especially as soon the number of students, even of females, increased, who began a study of theology without the intention of becoming priests. The education of such students, for example, in Germany, for a chiefly professional career as teachers of religion, demanded the development of corresponding programs of study and organization of examinations, which were included in the framework of the formation of other teachers.

---

[35] Especially Simmel tries to trace common trends and differences in the results of the inquiries (Forster, ed., *Priester zwischen Anpassung und Unterscheidung,* 127–48).

[36] G. Schmidtchen, *Umfrage unter Priesteramtskandidaten* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1974).

[37] Ibid., 1.

[38] A first inventory on the question of priestly formation occurred at the beginning of 1966 on the occasion of a broadcast series of West German radio: L. Waltermann, *Klerus zwischen Wissenschaft und Seelsorge* (Essen 1966). The discussion of the reform proposals for the formation of priests and the study of theology which has since taken place is hardly comprehensible. The efforts for the reform of the study of theology in Germany were expressed in the previous five fascicles *SKT=Studium Katholische Theologie, Berichte-Analysen-Vorschläge,* edited by the commission "Curricula in Theologie" of

The concern for a reorganization of the seminary education of priests and of theological studies had already occupied the Second Vatican Council. The decree *Optatam totius* on the formation of priests, of 28 October 1965, was characterized by some, chiefly the Protestant observers at the council,[39] as one of the most productive and important conciliar texts. In balanced instructions the way was pointed to a reform of priestly formation and, for the first time with this clarity, the value of human maturity and the properties of character esteemed by people in prospective priests was stressed. In the discussions it became clear that the demands for a reform of priestly education were very different in the several continents and countries. And so the council decided on an incisive shifting of competencies in the area of priestly formation: no longer the curial Congregation of Studies and Seminaries, but the episcopal conferences should in the future have the legislative competence for this sphere. "Hence for individual peoples and rites a proper 'order of priestly formation' should be introduced. It is to be set up by the episcopal conference, reviewed from time to time, and approved by the Apostolic See. In it the general laws should be so adapted to the special local and temporal circumstances that the formation of priests

---

the West German Faculty Meeting by E. Feifel (Zurich, Einsiedeln, and Cologne 1973–75).

[39] Thus by O. Cullmann and J. C. Hampe in A. Arens, *Priesterausbildung und Theologiestudium* (=*Nachkonz. Dokumentation* 25), 5.

may always correspond to the pastoral demands of the countries in which the priests have to exercise their ministry."[40]

In 1966–67 Cardinal Garrone, prefect of the Congregation of Studies and Seminaries, in four circulars admonished the chairmen of the episcopal conferences to carry out this mandate quickly.[41] However, many episcopal conferences were taken unawares by the reorganization in the training of priests and were in no position to achieve a required reorganization in the brief time, so that it was possible only to attempt national educational organizations.[42] Hence on the occasion of the First Synod of Bishops in 1967 Cardinal Garrone arranged for a *Ratio Fundamentalis,* a framework for the education of priests throughout the world. In it lay the danger that the Congregation of Studies and Seminaries would again take over the competence which the council had just granted to the episcopal conferences. However, the *Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis* of 6 January 1970,[43] essentially elaborated by the Italian Jesuit Paolo Dezza, the Spanish diocesan priest Germano Martil, and the German Benedictine Abbot Augustinus Meyer, avoided this danger. It produced an orientation framework for the legislation of the episcopal conferences with a proposal in examples and preformulations, which took none of their competence from the bishops. When the reform of priestly formation was perceived as urgent under the pressure of contemporary circumstances, the determination showed that the episcopal conferences within a year should draw up a *Ratio Nationalis* and submit it to the congregation for approval.

With all the imperfections and the marks of haste which adhere to the *Ratio Fundamentalis,* it must as a whole be regarded as a positive framework for priestly education outlined against the background of the situation existing in many countries. In content it follows the *schema* of the decree *Optatam totius* and is concerned with the pastoral theology of the clerical vocation, seminaries and their direction, the candidates for the priesthood, their human, spiritual, scholarly, and pastoral formation, as well as with the continuing education of the priests after their seminary days. The necessity of some continuing professional training was at this time definitely demanded in the survey of priests by priests of Latin countries, formed in a narrow Neo-Scholasticism and exclusively educated in isolated seminaries, and it constituted one of the central points of the program of the priest groups of Europe and South America. The delay of a year, determined in the *Ratio Fundamentalis,* for the setting up of regional or territorial organizations of priestly formation was not to be observed for the reason that not only the territorial episcopates but also others who were to take part—regents, directors of boarding schools, professors—had to prepare for a cooperation and finally for an agreement. The work on the *Rationes Nationales* was not finished in a moment. The consolidation made clear in the survey of the candidates in the German Federal Republic in 1974 allowed like tendencies to be assumed in the younger clergy. The acute crisis seemed to be followed by a phase of sober seeking. It would be a fallacy to assume that the development would quickly lead back to the interior and exterior uniformity characteristic of the clergy in the first half of this century.

---

[40] *Optatam totius,* no. 1 in *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* 2, 315ff.

[41] A. Arens, op. cit., 5–66 describes the efforts for a reform of the formation of priests down to the *Ratio Fundamentalis* of 6 January 1970.

[42] Very noteworthy attempts of this sort by the German bishops' conference are given in "Neuordnung der theologischen Studien für Priesteramtskandidaten" (1968) and "Leitlinien für die Priesterausbildung" (1970), *Priesterausbildung und Theologiestudium,* 541–63, and 265–77.

[43] *AAS* 62(1970), 321–84; *Priesterausbildung und Theologiestudium,* 68–263.

This insight must have been the occasion for the traditionalist groups in the clergy, especially for the movement around the former missionary Bishop Marcel Lefebvre, to forcibly bring about this uniformity in the education, theology, spirituality, and discipline of priests by a return to old forms and with radical means. In this connection Lefebvre appeals, not without reason, to Pius X and the struggle of this Pope against the dangers of Modernism and its reform efforts. As the investigation of this anti-Modernist struggle, intensively pursued in the last years, shows, it indeed suppressed Modernism but did not master the problem inherent in it. To an even stronger degree can the anti-Modernism of today's traditionalist groups prove itself to be a way of error.

CHAPTER 11

*Religious Communities and Secular Institutes**

The Orders between Persistence and Change

The history of religious institutes of the nineteenth century was characterized by the unanticipated resurgence of the old orders and the founding of many new congregations. When the First World War broke out, this period drew to a close. Most religious institutes had been consolidated and found their manner of life and field of action, and there began for them a period of unforeseen growth. In the years 1920–

---

* Viktor Dammertz, O.S.B.

60 almost all religious communities experienced a hitherto unprecedented influx of novices. This extraordinarily strong accumulation was certainly conditioned also by external factors—the world economic crisis with massive unemployment; inadequate possibilities for education and professional goals outside the monastery, especially for women. This explains also the relatively high number of departures during the time of probation. Nevertheless, in the case of most of the young people who decided for the religious life, this choice was based on religious motives. Readiness for commitment to the Church and for service to people, as well as concern for the salvation of one's soul, were an effective motive in the decision for the religious vocation.

The end of the First World War presented the communities with a new situation: the peace treaties altered the map of Europe. Because of this, the institutes were compelled to adapt their own structures to the new boundaries; in particular, the national states just established were not pleased that their religious should be directly subject to foreign tribunals. On the other hand, the events of the war contributed to a destruction of the state-Church system and of some laws hostile to the Church, so that now also for the orders previously existing legal restrictions and state regulations disappeared. The great misery which the First World War left and which was intensified by the subsequent economic crisis meant a challenge for the institutes, especially in the social and charitable sphere. Not least due to the influx to the novitiates were the communities able to provide effective aid.

Within the Church the new Code of Canon Law meant some significant changes for the religious institutes.[1] They not only aimed at a generally welcomed simplification, at greater clarity and legal security, but they bore especially an emphatically pastoral, spiritual accent. The legislator had obviously striven to create a legal order which should facilitate an authentic religious life. Of course, this all-inclusive codification of the canons for religious also involved negative consequences. The prescriptions of the canons for religious, partly going into great detail, attempted, it is true, through repeated references to the particular law of the individual institutes, to take account of the variety of religious life, but nevertheless promoted a considerable thrust toward uniformity and the leveling of the religious life.[2] Since Canon

---

[1] A. Scharnagl, *Das neue kirchliche Gesetzbuch,* 2d ed. (Munich and Regensburg 1918), 61–70.

[2] This leveling had already become standard in the restoration of the nineteenth century; the individual institutes often differed more in the form of their habit and other externals than in their spirituality (R. Hostie, *Vie et mort des ordres religieux* [Paris 1972], 249–51, 264–73).

489 annulled all regulations of rules and statutes which were contrary to the norms of the code, the institutes were asked to adapt their constitutions to the new code, and, in making the necessary changes, to employ where possible the words of the code itself.[3] On 6 March 1921 the Congregation of Religious published norms for the formulation of the statutes of the new congregations, which also obtained great importance for the existing communities in the course of the revision of the constitutions.[4]

All these prescriptions confirmed the tendency already discernible under Leo XIII to centralize the structure of the religious life; in particular, the institutes of papal right should be united more closely to Rome.[5] The prescription proved to be especially harmful in the long run which required that the constitutions must contain neither historical references nor quotations from Scripture, the councils, the Fathers, or the works of other authors, and *a fortiori* no rather long ascetical directions, detailed spiritual admonitions, or mystical reflections. They should be confined instead to the canonical decisions on the special character of the respective institute, its aims and functions, on the essential content of the vows, on the acquiring and loss of membership, on the life-style of the religious, as well as on the government of the institute.[6] If brief spiritual texts were tolerated (and it must be admitted that these directions excluded really excessive and often very subjective and transient ascetical and edifying statements from the constitutions), this narrowing of the fundamental document of each institute favored a lasting codification of the institute's life, especially as it was no longer clear that the canonical decrees on the structure of religious life were derived from spiritual foundations. Also it could not fail to happen that the new statutes of many institutes in their structure and content looked very much alike and so the character of the individual institutes threatened more and more to disappear. This was true especially of the many congregations founded in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which could not have recourse to one of the old religious rules. Their statutes were often enough not much more than a reproduction, only poorly accommodated to the current situation, of the model statutes provided by the Holy See as guidance.

---

[3] *AAS* 10(1918), 290, 13(1921), 538f.

[4] Ibid., 13(1921), 312–9; these norms extended back to a similar document of 1901, to which were appended even detailed model statements. In 1937 the Propaganda issued similar norms for the religious institutes subject to it (L.R. Ravasi, *De Regulis et Constitutionibus Religiosorum* [Rome, Tournai, and Paris 1958], 187–257).

[5] U. Stutz, *Der Geist des Codex Iuris Canonici* (Stuttgart 1918), 246–50.

[6] Normae, cap. IV–V in *AAS* 13(1921), 317f.

Still, many of the young people who entered the monastery found spiritual and religious security in the existing strict organization. Incorporation was facilitated for them by the patterns of religious life which were given to them. In the instructions of the novitiate more was said about constancy and submission, sacrifice and renunciation, obedience and confidence in the superiors than about innovation, self-development, and personal initiative, just as the Church itself proved to be very much an unshakable institution and guarantor of order and security in the breakdown of the period between the wars.

But developments in Church and society were not without their effects on monasteries. The liturgical movement and the striving for a piety nourished on Holy Scripture evoked disgust among religious with the prayer formulas and devotional exercises of some communities, as well as with the often very petty directives of a moral and ascetical character which governed the everyday life, especially of female religious, even in details, and left little room for personal responsibility. More and more the lack of a religious life directly oriented to the Bible was felt. Besides, religious in many countries saw themselves challenged by a growing secularization of public life and the alienation of many from the Church. Measures hostile to the Church, suppressions of monasteries, and open persecution presented existentially to the religious affected by them the question of their vocation. Religious often found themselves inadequately equipped for an intellectual confrontation with an environment which faced the Christian faith with indifference, rejection, or even hostility.

The Second World War and its consequences tore many institutes of men and women from their traditional organization and transplanted them to situations in which they had to come to independent decisions and prove themselves in their spiritual vocation without being able to count on leadership and guidance "from above."

The Rise of New Types of Communities

Against this background must be viewed the origin of new kinds of communities. As early as the turn of the century Charles de Foucauld (1858–1916) planned to establish a community of Little Brothers of Jesus that departed from the traditional structures. In the following years he sketched several rules but at his violent death he left behind no disciples. The seed he had scattered sprang up only later. In 1933 René Voillaume and some followers founded at El-Abiodh-Sidi-Cheikh on the edge of the Sahara the community of the Little Brothers of Jesus, which was recognized as a congregation of episcopal right in 1936 and in 1968 obtained a papal decree of approbation. The Little Brothers of

Jesus live in brotherhoods of usually three to five members, preferably in environments which are not accessible to the Christian message or are entirely alienated from it. They want to attest the love of God less through preaching than through solidarity with the people among whom they live. Their model is Jesus, the worker of Nazareth. Their effort is to shun all division. And so they make themselves with their work a part of the occupational world of their neighborhood, live in small dwellings which are in keeping with the milieu, and extensively adjust themselves to their environment in the externals of life. Their spirituality is characterized by a piety which is nourished especially on the cult of the Eucharist and reflection on Scripture. Every brotherhood is directed by a "responsible person," and the entire congregation is subject to the superior general. According to the latest figures, the institute numbers sixty-eight fraternities, in which live 232 members, including sixty-four priests.[7] In the same spirit there arose in 1939 at Touggourt in the Sahara the community of the Little Sisters of Jesus, which was erected as a congregation of episcopal right in 1947 and in 1964 obtained a papal decree of commendation. To it belong 990 sisters in 212 communities.[8] These religious communities inspired by Foucauld's spirit differ from the traditional institutes especially through a strong emphasis on brotherhood, which should be experienced in the small community, the team, through a new interpretation and realization of poverty, which is understood as wholehearted common destiny with the strata of population oppressed by poverty with all their insecurity and lack of protection, and through their unobtrusive presence "in the heart of the masses" "in the midst of the world," where they intend to influence through nothing other than their exemplary Christian life. Later arose other communities, which likewise were oriented to Charles de Foucauld, as in 1956 the fraternity of the Brothers of the Virgin of the Poor, to whom the model for their contemplative life is Jesus, praying and doing penance in the desert, and the community of Little Brothers of the Gospel, erected as a congregation of episcopal right in 1968, who also wish to live among the poorest, not only to share their poverty in solidarity, but to preach the gospel to these poor.[9]

To live in the midst of the world is also the motto of the secular institutes, which in part already existed for a long time as "pious unions" or without any ecclesiastical approval, but only found their recognition as a canonical state of perfection through the apostolic constitution *Provida Mater* of Pius XII of 2 February 1947 and obtained their basic organization in the motu proprio *Primo feliciter* of 12 March 1948 and in the instruction of the Congregation of Religious of 19 March 1948.[10] It is proper to the secular institutes that their members live on principle in the midst of the world. By the *character saecularis* they are essentially distinguished from the religious state, the *status religiosus,* with which, however, the striving for perfection unites them in a form approved by the Church. The wearing of a religious habit, common life in community after the manner of the orders, and in general any approximation to the life-style of the religious communities, are not in accord with the essence of a secular institute. True, the members bind themselves to a life according to the evangelical counsels, not through official vows but through private promise, oath, or something similar. Even if in many of them there is often present the inclination to adapt themselves to the traditional communities in this or that form, and some institutes are still grappling with their profile,[11] they are clearly and consciously distinct from "religious" in their manner of life.[12]

---

[7] R. Voillaume, *Mitten in der Welt* (Freiburg 1960); *LThK*, 2d ed., VI, 329f.; *Annuario Pontificio 1975*, 1199.

[8] *LThK*, 2d ed., VI, 330; *Annuario Pontificio 1975*, 1252.

[9] "Une nouvelle forme de vie monastique. La Fraternité de la Vièrge des Pauvres," *Rythmes du monde* 10(1962), 207–15. Lecture of R. Voillaume before the *Unio Superiorum generalium* in November 1975 (unpublished).

Meanwhile, there are many secular institutes which were established by the bishops with Rome's *Nihil obstat;* six institutes of men and twenty-one of women have so far become of papal right.[13] The best known and most influential of them is the *Opus Dei.* Its male branch was founded in Spain in 1928 by the priest J.M. Escrivá de Balaguer (1902–75); on 24 February 1947, a few weeks after the appearance of *Provida Mater,* it was the first secular institute to obtain the papal decree of approval, and in 1950 it obtained definitive confirmation. This branch includes priests, who are united within the institute in the *Societas Sacerdotalis Sanctae Crucis,* and laymen, who, in accord with the statutes, must constitute the majority. The ordinary members, who must have had a complete theological program, if possible with a doctoral degree, and a broader, likewise complete training in another academic profession, as well as the "Oblates," in regard to whose education not such high claims are made, bind themselves by vows to a life according to the evangelical counsels. Even married men can be admitted as extraordinary members, who seek to realize the spirit of the evangelical counsels in a manner of life corresponding to their situation. For the rest, the members pursue their professions and exert themselves for the Christian permeation of the families, the working world, and public life. In general they are not to be known as members of the Opus Dei; usually they appear not as a group, but each works in his place in the sense of the institute, in regard to which a characteristic élite-awareness unites them. However, the institute also appears as performer of common tasks. Thus, it is responsible for the Catholic University of Navarre at Pamplona, founded in 1952 and erected by the Holy See in 1960; with its thirteen faculties and scholarly institutes it ranks as one of the best universities in Spain; a majority of professors belong to Opus Dei. Further, the institute supports centers of study and student homes in many university cities. Outside Spain, Opus Dei has spread to about fifty other countries, especially Italy, France, and Latin America. The prelature *nullius* of Yauyos in Peru is entrusted to the community of Priests of the Holy Cross. In admitting members, the institute makes no distinctions of class, but it appeals especially to intellectuals, and it is well known that members of Opus Dei occupy many important posts of the political, economic, and cultural life of Spain. The ensuing involvement in the affairs of daily politics, joined to a certain secretiveness, has led to serious attacks on the institute. In addition to the male branch, in 1930 a female branch, marked by the same spirit, was founded, which meanwhile has also obtained papal confirmation. It forms a special secular institute with independent organs of government, but is, however, subject to the president general. After the founder's death in 1975 the professor of canon law Alvaro del Portillo was elected second president general of Opus Dei.[14]

---

[10] *AAS* 39(1947), 114–24: 40(1948), 283–86, 293–97; cf. L. Beyer, *De Institutis saecularibus documenta* (Rome 1962).

[11] F. Wulf, *Die Säkularinstitute nach dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil* (Meitingen and Freising 1968), 28f.

[12] But since they, like religious, are subject to the same Roman Congregation, the latter on the occasion of the reform of the Curia of 1967 was renamed and now is *Sacra Congregatio pro Religiosis et Institutis saecularibus* (SCRIS) (apostolic constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae universae,* ART. 71, *AAS* 59[1967], 912).

[13] H. A. Timmermann, *Die Weltgemeinschaften im deutschen Sprachraum* (Einsiedeln 1963); A. Wienand, ed., *Das Wirken der Orden und Klöster in Deutschland* II (Cologne 1964), 636–68; *Annuario Pontificio 1975,* 1200, 1325f. On 20 September 1970 there were twenty-one secular institutes of papal and seventy-nine of diocesan right, to which belonged 30,000 women, 3,000 priests, and 400 lay brothers as members. *Opus Dei* is not included in these statistics *(Vita consecrata* 7[1971], 151, n. 1).

The Acclimatization of the Orders in Mission Lands

New routes were also traveled in mission lands. In his encyclical *Rerum Ecclesiae* of 28 February 1926, Pope Pius XI appealed to missionaries to devote themselves more strongly to the Church's intimate relationship with these countries. He pushed not only for the training of native priests and catechists but also for the establishing of communities of male and female religious. True, he regarded it as legitimate for missionaries to admit candidates from mission lands into their own communities, but admonished the mission superiors: "Reflect without bias and conscientiously whether it would not be better to establish new religious communities which were more in accord with the concerns and interests of the natives as well as the local situation and special circumstances." He especially urged the founding of contemplative monasteries, from which he expected a fruitful influence on evangelization.[15] The missionary decree of the Second Vatican Council again underscored this instruction and pointed to the necessity of making the religious life indigenous in a form suited to the respective culture and circumstances of individual peoples (ARTICLE 18).

---

[14] O.B. Roegele, "Das 'Opus Dei.' Legende und Wirklichkeit einer umstrittenen Gemeinschaft," *Hochland* 54(1961–62), 430–39; *HK* 22(1968), 353f., 29(1975), 536. In the *Annuario Pontificio 1975,* 1200, *Opus Dei* is given as a secular institute, although

Even if there were previously, especially in Asia, several congregations of native sisters, their number increased quickly after the appearance of the mission encyclical. It grew in Africa between 1920 and 1960 from nine to seventy-nine, although here at first great obstacles rooted in the tribal idea had to be overcome. For the ideal of the celibate life was at first totally foreign to the African mentality: a woman and her dowry were regarded as part of the wealth of her tribe, and the tribe to which she was turned over on the occasion of the marriage treasured her especially as mother of the children which she bore for the tribe. Only slowly did an understanding of the ideal of the religious life for the woman grow. The low educational status of many girls, due to the nonexistent school system, meant further impediment, especially in view of the independence of these African communities. In Asia, however, the presuppositions were much more favorable. In regard to the native applicants for the priesthood the missionaries in Asia generally preferred an integration into their own community. The cultural level of these countries facilitated such a common life. Even in Africa some of the missionary religious institutes chose this route, for example, the Holy Ghost Fathers, the Oblates of the Immaculate Virgin, the Franciscans; on the other hand, the efforts of the institutes founded exclusively for the mission, such as the White Fathers and Mill Hill Missionaries, were chiefly concentrated on the training of an

---

it allegedly no longer regards itself as such, in any case it obviously no longer collaborates with the other secular institutes (*Vita consecrata* 7[1971], 32, n. 5).

[15] *AAS* 18(1926), 77–79.

African diocesan clergy, an attitude which was for a long time intentionally fostered by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.[16]

The appeal of Pius XI for the founding of contemplative monasteries at first found no very loud echo. The mission superiors were especially concerned to gain native collaborators in the pastoral, social and charitable, and educational sphere. Only after the Second World War and especially after the Second Vatican Council did the number of contemplative foundations greatly increase. Up to 1968 their number in Africa alone rose to twenty-seven monasteries of men and sixty-two of women. Whereas these houses of men all follow the Benedictine Rule—Benedictines, Cistercians, Trappists—among the houses of women, besides twenty modeled on the Benedictine type, ten convents of Poor Clares and seventeen of Carmelites are counted. In addition there are various other monasteries of women, seven fraternities of the Little Brothers and forty-four of the Little Sisters of Jesus, as well as one fraternity each of the Little Brothers of the Virgin of the Poor and of the Little Sisters of the Most Sacred Heart.[17] For the support and promotion of the Benedictine foundations in the Third World there arose at Vanves near Paris the *Secrétariat de l'aide à l'implantation monastique* (A.I.M.), which in 1973 took care of a total of sixty African, fifty-three Asian, ninety-one Latin American, and ten Oceanian monasteries of monks and nuns.[18] For a comprehensive exchange of views and experiences on the problems of the monastic life in the Third World, the superiors and superioresses of Africa met at Bouaké, Gold Coast, in 1964 and at Rome in 1966, those of Asia at Bangkok in 1968, and those of Latin America at Rio de Janeiro in 1972 and at Bogotá in 1975.[19]

The strivings to make the religious life indigeneous in these lands and to accommodate it to the local situations proved to be difficult. The first experiments in this area were planned and implemented by Europeans. Only the native religious succeeded by patient work in discovering an organic and enduring adaptation in fidelity both to the essential elements of the Christian religious life as well as to the cultural heritage of their own people.[20]

---

[16] Cf. W. Henkel, "Congregazioni autoctone," *DIP* II, 1588–93; J. Casier, "Africa," *DIP* I, 130–40; P. Tchao Yun-Koen, "Cina," *DIP* II, 1026–8.

[17] *DIP* I, 137; on Carmel in the mission cf. *DIP* II, 451f.

[18] *Secrétariat de l'aide à l'implantation monastique,* "Monastic Growth," 1973 supplement to 1970 handbook.

[19] Detailed report in *Rythmes du monde* 13(1965), no. 1/2; 14(1966), no. 4; 16(1968), no. 4; 17(1969), no. 1/2; *Bulletin de l'A.I.M.* no. 9(1969), 7–27, no. 15(1973), 7–22, no. 19(1975), 7–21.

Religious Reform under Pius XII

In the congregations of the new type and the secular institutes it was believed that the goal sought could not be realized in the traditional structures of religious life. New routes were sought for shaping the life in accord with the evangelical counsels in a contemporary form. Meanwhile, however, there was no lack of reform plans and desires in the existing orders. However, it was in accord with reality that these were discussed in small groups of members of the orders and were not given wide publicity. It was Pope Pius XII, who as early as the first months of his pontificate, but especially from the end of the Second World War, made the *accommodata renovatio,* the renewal in accord with the times, of religious life an essential point of the program of his pontificate. This renewal should likewise be marked by fidelity to the traditional heritage as well as by courage for wise adaptation. In his talks and letters to individual religious communities he returned again and again to this great concern.[21] The papal directives make clear that they aimed to regulate a process of fermentation which was meanwhile under way in many religious communities and was especially spelled out in some general chapters. The Pope strongly emphasized the obligation not to attack the essentials of religious life and of the particular institute[22] and not to be unduly influenced by the current views and opinions.[23]

The Roman Congregation of Religious took up the aim of renewal of religious life in accord with the time when, for the first time in history, in the Holy Year 1950 it convened at Rome an International Congress for (male) Religious, which dealt in many lectures and reports with the *accommodata renovatio statuum perfectionis.* This general theme was discussed in three subdivisions in regard to the life and claustral discipline of religious, their formation and instruction, and their apostolic work.[24] Two years later a Congress of Superioresses General took place at Rome,[25] which also treated of the question of reform of the institutes, as did the "Second General Congress on the Timely Renewal of the States of Perfection," which the Congregation of Religious summoned to Rome in 1957 and planned under the energetic guidance of the then secretary, A. Larraona (1887–1973).[26]

---

[20] "Einheimische Schwestern und Brüder in Afrika," *Pro mundi vita, Centrum informationis,* Heft 15 (Brussels 1966); D. Plum, "Sind Mönche in Afrika ein Fremdkörper?" *HK* 28(1974), 494–97.

[21] The earlier documents are collected in extracts in *Acta et documenta Congressus generalis de statibus perfectionis* I (Rome 1952), 3–49; J. Zürcher, *Päpstliche Dokumente zur Ordensreform* (Einsiedeln 1954); cf. D.M. Huot, "Summus Pontifex Pius XII et accommodata renovatio in statibus perfectionis," *Apollinaris* 32(1959), 360–68; A. Scheuermann, "Die Ordensleute in den Dokumenten des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils," *AkathKR* 134(1965), 337–40.

[22] Thus, for example, in his talk to the Jesuits on 17 September 1946: "Ante omnia oportet Constitutionibus vestris et universis earundem praescriptis firme fideles sitis. Instituta Ordinis vestri possunt, si id congruens esse videatur, ad nova temporis adiuncta hic illic immutando accommodari; attamen quod praecipuum in iis est, nequaquam tangatur perpetuumque consistat" (*AAS* 38[1946], 383).

[23] Cf. Address to the superiors general of 11 February 1958 in *AAS* 50(1958), 153–61.

From these large congresses proceeded the stimulus for a closer collaboration of the orders, whether on the national or the international plane. In many countries appeared conferences of superiors of the male and the female institutes, which were officially recognized by the Holy See and erected as institutions of papal right.[27] On the international level were held the *Unio Superiorum generalium* (USG) for male religious in 1957 and the *Unio internationalis Superiorissarum generalium* (UISG) for female religious in 1965, both of which took place at Rome. In addition there appeared in 1959 the *Confoederatio Latino-Americana Religiosorum* (CLAR) with headquarters in Bogotá, which as the umbrella association of all orders on that continent acquired great significance subsequently, especially as partner of the Latin American Episcopal Conference (CELAM).[28]

Even before the first international congress met, the Pope undertook a partial reform. On 21 November 1950 he published the apostolic constitution *Sponsa Christi* on nuns, which was followed two days later by directives for its implementation from the Congregation of Religious.[29] Entirely in the spirit of the papal reform program, these documents first underscored the unalterability of the contemplative life, the propriety of solemn vows, and the unrenounceable papal enclosure for all nuns. However, in adaptation to new requirements the rules on enclosure were modified, namely, by the creation of the so-called little papal enclosure, which permitted a meeting of nuns and outsiders in an area of the enclosure that was intended for work directed to the outside. The obligation to a proper, productive work was stressed. True, a high apostolic value was acknowledged in the very life of nuns; nevertheless, in so far as the constitutions provided, definite works of the apostolate were approved. Finally, these documents vigorously recommended the uniting of autonomous monasteries of nuns into federations so that they could give effective help to one another in this work of renewal. However, convents of nuns often only hesitatingly complied with this recommendation.[30] A broader area which stood in need of reform was that of the formation and instruction of candidates for the priesthood in religious communities. As early as 1924 in an apostolic letter to the superiors of orders Pope Pius XI had indicated the necessity of a solid education of religious clerics, oriented to the heritage of Saint Thomas. The same concern was the object of the instruction of the Congregation of Religious of 1 December 1931, which at the same time, in the period of the great flood of novices, urged a careful selection of candidates.[31] Pope Pius XII also, throughout his pontificate, was concerned for a good formation of religious, especially of the priests, through which they should be equipped for the manifold tasks which were imposed on them in the period of the upheaval that was becoming ever more clearly outlined.[32] Finally, on 31 May 1956 appeared the apostolic constitution *Sedes Sapientiae,* followed on 7 July by general statutes of the Congregation of Religious in the form of directives for implementation.[33] These documents treated not only the forming of candidates for orders of males and for the priesthood, but attributed great importance to their education in pastoral theology as good shepherds of souls. As something new, they prescribed by common law after the completion of the study of philosophy and theology, oriented to the care of souls but more theoretically presented, and the reception of ordination, one additional year devoted to pastoral introduction and practice. And it was urged on all religious institutes to oblige the young fathers, after several years of work, to a year of probation, a sort of second novitiate. In accord with the papal pronouncements of 1931 and 1956, all clerical religious institutes were occupied with the revision of their *Ratio studiorum.*

---

[24] *Acta et documenta Congressus generalis de statibus perfectionis* I–IV (Rome 1952f.). The theme of the congress was: "Statuum perfectionis praesentibus temporibus atque adiunctis accommodata renovatio" (ibid. I, 59).

[25] *Acta et documenta Congressus Internationalis Superiorissarum generalium* (Rome 1953).

[26] Cf. G. Ruiz, "Congressus generalis alter de accommodata statuum perfectionis renovatione a S. C. de Religiosie indictus," *Com Rel* 36(1957), 387–84.

[27] Cf. *Annuario Pontificio 1975,* 1477, 1327–49; R. Soullard, "Les unions de superieurs majeurs," *L'année canonique* 18(1974), 221–30; *DIP* II, 1423–31. These mergers could, of course, look back to a long history in some countries. Thus the modern *Vereinigung Deutscher Ordensobern* (VDO) goes back to the Conference of Superiors which was formed when, on the occasion of the Katholikentag at Krefeld in 1898, the superiors of the seven mission houses then existing in Germany met and decreed regular meetings for the future (K. Siepen, "Die Vereinigung Deutscher Ordensobern nach Akten und Berichten des Generalsekretariats der VDO," *Ordenskorrespondenz* 5[1964], 104–25).

[28] *Annuario Pontificio 1975,* 1327; on the CLAR see also *DIP* II, 1418f.

---

[29] *AAS* 43(1951), 5–24, 37–44. On 25 March 1956 there was issued a further instruction of the Congregation of Religious, which, on the basis of previous experiences with the new legislation, reorganized the matter of enclosure in monasteries of nuns (*AAS* 48[1956], 512–26).

[30] On the entire matter cf. A. Larraona, *La nuova disciplina canonica sulle monache* (Rome 1952). The "little inclosure" was again abolished after the council (motu proprio *Ecclesiae Sanctae,* II, 32 in *AAS* 58[1966], 780f.).

[31] *AAS* 16(1924), 133–48, 24(1932), 74–81.

[32] In 1944 the Pope set up in the Congregation of Religious a special commission to direct and supervise this formation (*AAS* 36[1944], 213f.).

[33] *AAS* 48(1956), 354–65; X. Ochoa, *Leges Ecclesiae* II (Rome 1969), 3516–38.

However, Rome's concern was not only for the education of religious priests. In an effort to equip orders of women for their tasks that were becoming more difficult, the Congregation of Religious on 31 May 1955 erected the papal institute Regina Mundi at Rome, which was associated with the theological faculty of the papal Gregorian University. In it women religious were to be prepared in a three-year theological course both for the tasks of directing the members of their institute and for pastoral charges, especially in the area of schooling and education.[34] Rome thereby took up a burning concern of the Congress of Superioresses General of 1952.

The Second Vatican Council and Its Effects

At this stage of the process of a prudent, even timid "timely renewal" came the announcement of the Second Vatican Council, which, with its program of *aggiornamento,* aroused in wide circles of the Church, even among religious, great and partly also utopian hopes for a comprehensive reform and a profound renovation. The first schema on religious, which had been worked out by the preparatory commission, hardly went beyond what had been planned in reforms under Pius XII and had been in part introduced or implemented. It was understood as a rectilinear continuation of the Pian reform of the institutes.[35] Hence it did not correspond to the expectations which had been placed in this conciliar document on many sides. After tenacious work in the conciliar commissions and lively debate on the place and mandate of the institutes in the Church, at the close of the council there were on hand two important texts, which were expressly concerned with the religious state. Chapter 6 of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (ARTICLES 43–47) aimed to define the theological place of the orders in the

---

[34] X. Ochoa, op. cit. II, 3394f.; cf. the statutes of the institute, issued on 11 February 1956 in ibid., 3457–60.

[35] Cf. F. Wulf, "Einführung zum Ordensdekret," *LThK,* 2d ed., *Zweites Vatikanisches Konzil* II (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1967), 250f.

Church. Advisedly, the chapter on the general vocation to sanctity in the Church preceded it. The Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of the Religious Life presupposes these statements and is concerned more in detail with the principles and with particular points of the reform of religious. It is the only one of the documents issued by the council that adopted the program of *aggiornamento* in the heading, in connection with which, of course, it could refer to the formula of *accommodata renovatio* coined under Pius XII.[36] The desired timely renewal is defined in the key statement of this decree; it mentions "constant return to the sources of every Christian life and to the spirit of the origin of the individual institutes, but at the same time their adaptation to the changed conditions of the time" (ART. 2).[37]

The reform program which is presented in the decree on the religious life and in the directives issued for its implementation[38] differs essentially in its presuppositions from all preceding efforts in this direction. The reform of the orders under Pius XII was effected by the Holy See and centrally directed. Little latitude was given to the individual institutes for independent decisions. The directives for implementation of the decree on religious now declares: "The religious communities have themselves above all to implement a suitable renewal of the religious life and indeed mainly by means of general chapters" (no. 1). To a special general chapter to be convoked in from two to three years was given full authority to modify particular prescriptions of the constitutions by way of experiment in so far as neither the essence nor the character of the institute was affected; they were promised that experiments contrary to the current general canon law would gladly be permitted by the Holy See, but of course it was required that they must be implemented wisely. The stage of experimentation could be extended, in accord with these guidelines, to as long as fifteen years (no. 6). In the preparation for this reform chapter all members should be involved in a suitable manner through a comprehensive and open survey (no. 4). Together with this decentralization of the reform there occurred a further revision: each institute should strive to preserve or recover its own image, because in this diversity of religious life lay a genuine advantage for the Church. The institutes should investigate the spirit and the original intentions of the founders and the proper healthy traditions and loyally maintain this special legacy in each institute.[39] Finally, again in contrast to the prescriptions issued after the appearance of the Code of Canon Law, it was ordered that the constitutions must consist not only of canonical directives on the nature, goals, and organs of the institute, but must also contain the scriptural and theological principles of the religious life and statements on its relation to the Church and the heritage proper to the particular institutes. The spiritual and the juridical elements must constitute a unity in the constitutions.[40] Clearly these regulations wanted to eliminate the defects which, five decades earlier, after the appearance of the Code of Canon Law, had shown up because of an excessive centralization, leveling, and legalization.

---

[36] Over and above this a special section is devoted to religious in the Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops, which treats of their inclusion in the total pastoral work of the individual dioceses (ARTS. 33–35). In the foreword of the Decree on Education for the Priesthood it is said that the prescriptions of this document affect chiefly diocesan priests but are to be applied with the corresponding adaptations to the religious clergy.

[37] Of the commentaries on the decree on religious the following are outstanding: F. Wulf, *LThK*, 2d ed., *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* II (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1967), 249–307; J.M.R. Tillard, Y. Congar eds., *L'adaptation et la rénovation de la vie religieuse* (Paris 1967).

[38] Motu proprio *Ecclesiae Sanctae* of 6 August 1966, Part II in *AAS* 58 (1966), 775–82.

Three guiding principles were given to the reform chapters as a standard for their decrees: renewal had to take place in fidelity to the spirit of the founder and the sound traditions of the institute, in obedience to the directions of the council, and in receptiveness to the signs of the time. Now the proposed renewal of religious life is primarily a spiritual event; hence it is difficult to grasp and to measure. However, in general it can be said that the religious institutes worked in the preparation of their reform chapter and in the discussions and decrees of this chapter in the light of the documents of the Second Vatican Council for a deepened view of the religious life and an up-to-date organization, and rethought the position and mission of their institute in the Church and the world of today.[41] Of course, the lack of clear statements of aim, approved by all, often led to tensions even within individual communities,[42] and made difficult the discovery of jointly decided solutions. In a partly irksome learning process most reform chapters adopted a middle way. Hotheaded champions of a radically new organization of the religious life were, on the whole, as disappointed as were the religious who had hoped that everything would continue in the customary old way. In connection with these reform efforts of the chapters there developed a very lively discussion on the meaning and spirituality of the orders in today's world, which offered some help but occasionally went so far that the basic values of the religious life were questioned. The chief subjects of this discussion were first the religious vows and their concrete realization, in connection with which was especially included the knowledge of the humanities. Then questions of life in community found great interest. Here too much attention was given to psychological and sociological viewpoints, for example, the rules of group dynamics. From this resulted an often one-sided preference for small communities to the disadvantage of the large ones. Finally, the relation to the world stood in the focus of the discussion. At stake was the answer of the institutes to secularization, their openness to the world, their responsibility for the world.[43] Discussion was accompanied by experiment. The general chapters for the most part made vigorous use of the possibilities granted to them. Usually the desires for adaptation regarded as necessary did not break up the framework of the institute's traditional life. However, some experiments exceeded the lines laid down[44] or slipped out of the hands of the orders' superiors. Especially the small communities, which sprouted up in some places, in particular in Holland and the United States, were and are a favorable field of experimentation for more or less radical innovations.[45] These "communes" are obviously inspired by the life-style of the Little Brothers and Little Sisters of Jesus. If many of them proved not to be viable and soon again fell apart, this lay not least in the fact that they lacked the spiritual depth of the communities of Father de Foucauld. The discussions and experiments produced useful starts and impulses. On the other hand, there were undoubtedly also uncontrolled growth and signs of decay.[46] To ward off these errors and debasements was the Pope's aim when on 29 June 1971 he sent to religious the apostolic doctrinal letter *Evangelica testificatio* on the renewal of the religious life in accord with the Second Vatican Council.[47]

---

[39] Decree on religious *Perfectae Caritatis,* ART. 2b.

[40] *Ecclesiae Sanctae,* II, 12–14.

[41] Cf. J. Beyer, "Premier bilan des chapitres de renouveau," *NRTh* 95(1973), 60–86.

[42] Cf. "Pluralismus und Multiformität im Ordensleben heute. Eine Situations studie," *Pro mundi vita, Centrum informationis,* no. 47(Brussels 1973).

---

[43] Cf. P. Lippert, "Zwischen Umbruch und Selbstbesinnung. Die Orden im gegenwärtigen Wandel von Kirche und Gesellschaft," *HK* 29(1975), 346–53. A glance into the present state of the discussion is provided by *Concilium* 10(1974), 461–540.

[44] Thus the dared and failed attempt to subject a whole monastery to psychoanalysis (*HK* 20[1966], 127–29; 21[1967], 356–58), or the attempt to have a monastery work together with its group of friends on a common basis (ibid. 23[1969], 551–53).

[45] In Holland there were in 1969 no less than 215 such "life groups" (J. Kerkhofs, *Das Schicksal der Orden. Ende oder Neubeginn.* [Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1971], 15; cf. F. Wulf, "Die Zukunft des Ordenslebens," *GuL* 43[1970], 227).

[46] Cf. the different evaluation in the interview of Cardinal Daniélou in *GuL* 45(1972), 458–63, and in the article of the abbot primate of the Benedictine Confederation, Rembert Weakland, "Krise und Erneuerung des Mönchtums heute. Eine Bilanz nach zehn Jahren," *GuL* 47(1974), 299–313.

[47] *AAS* 63(1971), 497–526; cf. also the commentary of A. Schneider, *Erneuerung des Ordenslebens* (Trier 1973).

For the rest, in this phase of the search for new ways the Holy See maintained a rather waiting, even if carefully observing attitude. All the more surprising was the Pope's exerting of a direct influence on the discussions of the General Congregation of the Jesuits. The Thirty-First General Congregation of this society in 1965–66[48] had already issued reform decrees, but the decision on an up-to-date rule of poverty in the society and on the elimination of the canonical distinction between the "professed," who alone had all the qualifications of full membership with the fourth vow of special obedience to the Pope, and the "coadjutors," who were either *coadiutores spirituales* (priests) or *coadiutores temporales* (lay brothers), was postponed. The Thirty-Second General Congregation, from December 1974 to March 1975, was again concerned with these problems. A large majority of the 236 delegates expressed themselves in a test vote for the abolition of "rank" and wished to admit all Jesuits to the four vows. Whereas the General Congregation in no sense saw the priestly and apostolic character of the society jeopardized in this decision, the Pope saw in it a serious deviation from the original intention of the founder. Hence in several comments before and after the test vote he rejected such a change.[49]

The most critical and lamentable phenomenon of the recent period is the many departures from religious communities, which, together with the lack of recruits, have led to a strong rise in the ratio of the old to the total population of the houses and forced the institutes to a drastic reduction of their work in Church and society. Unfortunately, because of the absence of reliable evidence,[50] no exact picture can be gained for the entire Church. However, spot-checks can make the trend clear. Thus in Germany the number of religious priests doubled between 1915 and 1932 from 2,015 to 4,024 and up to 1941 increased further to 5,282. This upward development continued in the postwar years and reached its climax in 1971 with 6,825 religious priests. Thereafter an at first still slow drop-off began, which however soon accelerated because of the age structure. With 6,589 in 1974 the number of religious priests was of course still considerably above the figures of the period before the First World War. On the other hand, in regard to religious brothers in Germany the maximum figure of the prewar period—7,990 in 1937—could never again be equaled, in fact, their number is today, with 3,513, less than in 1915, when there were 3,799 brothers. After the Second World War the apogee, following the severe war losses among religious brothers, came in 1955 with 4,789 brothers. The number of novices in the German novitiates of male institutes, which in the 1950s was about 900, fell rapidly after 1961 and in 1973 reached its nadir with 129. In 1974 it again rose slightly to 152.[51] In the female institutes in Germany also the maximum figure of members in the prewar period was exceeded. Their number grew from 64,249 in 1915 by about half to 97,516 in 1941. The first enumeration after the Second World War yielded 88,934 female religious, and from then on until 1957 their number climbed to 93,260. Thereafter the tendency was retrogressive, in the most recent years very rapidly: in only the five years between 1969 and 1974 their number dropped by about 10,000, from 86,340 to 76,924. The number of female novices in the German religious houses in the period before the Nazi seizure of power fluctuated relatively constantly between 5,500 and 7,000. The year 1935 brought a maximum of 7,488 candidates, then the number dropped quickly to 1,865 in 1941. The decade 1950–60 shows a weak downward curve from 3,996 to 3,264 novices, two years later there were only 2,793, in 1966 less than 2,000, and in 1970 not even 1,000. With 405 novices, the year 1974 brought the lowest point thus far.[52] Apart from the reverses during the period of National Socialism and the Second World War, these numbers may be typical of many countries of Western Europe and North America, whereas the religious institutes in some places of the Third World indicate a strong growth at this time.[53]

---

[48] The convocation of this General Congregation in the spring of 1965 was made necessary by the fact that, after the death of the General J.B. Janssens (1889–1964, general since 1946), a successor had to be elected. The election fell on the Basque, Father Arrupe (b. 1907). This General Congregation was interrupted to await the close of the council and came to an end in the fall of 1966 (*HK* 19[1964–65], 563–67, 21[1967], 33–37).

[49] F. Wulf, "Wohin steuern die Jesuiten? Ein Bericht," *GuL* 48(1975), 137–47; E. Coreth, "Die Jesuiten, der Papst und die Gesamtkirche," *HK* 29(1975), 472–77.

[50] Cf. A. Faller, "De statistica Religiosorum," *ComRel* 35(1956), 72–84.

A similar picture is sketched in the statistics published by individual religious institutes. The Society of Jesus in 1914 counted altogether 16,894 members. This number grew continually to 1965, when the maximum was reached with 36,038 members; in 1974 there were only 29,436. In the published statistics the number of 4,032 scholastics for

---

[51] F. Groner, *Kirchliches Handbuch. Amtliches statistisches Jahrbuch der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands* 25(1957–61), 524, 536, 26(1962-1968), 533, 27(1969–74), 41.

[52] Ibid. 25(1957–61), 538, 26(1962–68), 533, 27(1969–74), 41.

[53] Cf. G. Moorhouse, *Bastionen Gottes. Orden und Klöster in dieser Zeit* (Hamburg 1969), 90–94. In *Informationes,* edited by the Congregation for Religious (SCRIS), a statistic is offered which classifies for the end of 1974 the percentage proportion of novices and temporarily professed in the total number of religious and even arranges it by continents (1[1975], 95–98). Of course, in this summary only institutes of papal right are included to the extent that they are subject to the Congregation of Religious. Besides, it must be noted that in mission lands usually the time of probation of the novitiate and of temporary profession lasts longer, often twice as long as in Europe.

1974 means the lowest figure for this century; in 1965 there were still 9,865 of them. Also the number of novices dropped in this decade almost by half, from 1,555 to 804. In the same period 1,530 fathers left the Society of Jesus with a dispensation.[54] In religious institutes of papal right alone, 1,615 religious priests abandoned the priestly ministry in 1972. 1,355 brothers and 3,507 sisters in perpetual profession were dispensed from their vows.[55]

The reasons for this falling-off of religious vocations in the last fifteen years are many-layered. As especially the look at the novitiate shows, the council did not cause the crisis of recruits—it was already present—it could not, however, eliminate it but rather accelerated it. Especially to be mentioned as reasons are the general insecurity, especially of young people, following the upheaval in society and Church, the uncertainty of role, conditioned by this, of many religious, the polarization of opinions becoming evident in religious communities, also a narrow presentation of marriage and sex and their significance for the autonomous development of persons, an at times unrestrained criticism of every form of authority, and the influence of the welfare and consumer society on the thought and attitude of youth in the industrialized countries. But on the other hand another circumstance must not be overlooked. An inquiry among male religious in the German Federal Republic showed that, according to the situation of 1 January 1965, 78 percent of religious priests and even 86.5 percent of religious brothers came from families with four and more children. More than 42 percent of the fathers and almost 58 percent of the brothers were born in rural communities of less than five thousand inhabitants.[56] But the family of many children has become a rarity today, especially in the country, and so this source for religious vocations is to a great extent exhausted. Besides, today in the industralized nations educational opportunities and professions are available to all girls, whereas earlier they were accessible almost exclusively to religious women.

A slight upward development that can be ascertained on the level of the entire Church in the last two years gives the Congregation of Religious occasion for cautious optimism.[57]

The enhanced collaboration of male and female religious superiors on the national and international level since the council became of great importance. The conferences of superiors, urged as early as the Congress of Orders in 1950, were now set up in almost all countries, to the extent that they did not exist before the council.[58] The Roman unions of superiors general and of superioresses general acquired a new importance because in a much greater degree they were invited by the congregations of the Curia for consultations and exchange of experiences. Several times a year sixteen elected representatives of these unions—eight male and eight female superiors general—meet with the cardinal prefect, secretary, undersecretary, and other leading officials of the Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes.[59] In the last years the congregation has issued no important document affecting all religious institutes which was not suggested by the unions or about which they had not previously heard.[60] Similarly the contact of the superiors and superioresses general of missionary institutes was established with the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples. The "Council of Eighteen" meets several times a year with the authoritative officials of that congregation. Also outside this organizational framework the efforts of the congregations of the Curia for increased contact with the religious communities are unmistakable. Visits of the cardinal prefect, the secretary, or one of the undersecretaries to general chapters, meetings of national conferences of superiors, and other formal or informal gatherings, not only at Rome but also in other cities and countries of Europe and overseas have belonged for several years to the normal program of these curial offices.[61] The exchange of experience, which is thereby facilitated, has a very positive impact.

---

[54] *DIP* II, 1280, 1284; cf. also *HK* 19(1964–65), 563, and *Jesuiten. Wohin steuert der Orden?*, 2d ed. (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1976), 13–18.

[55] *Annuarium statisticum Ecclesiae 1972,* 213, 217, 219; cf. ibid., 70–84.

[56] W. Menges, *Die Ordensmänner in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Cologne 1969), 63, 130; 51, 129.

[57] *SCRIS, Informationes* 1(1975), 96.

The Orders in the Field of Tension between Church and State

The religious institutes were especially exposed in the field of tension between Church and state. They were for the most part extraordinarily severely affected by the anti-Church measures of a government. The laws of the *Kulturkampf* had an aftereffect on the orders, partly even far into this century. In Germany the "Jesuit Law" of 1872 was not entirely repealed until 1917. Norway abolished the prohibition of Jesuits, which was incorporated into the constitution, in 1956, and in Switzerland the article on denominational exceptions in the constitution of the federation, which forbade the Society of Jesus and the "societies affiliated" with it and prohibited new foundations of all institutes, did not come to an end until after a majority of only some 55 percent of the citizens had expressed themselves in favor of its abolition in a referendum in 1973.[62]

---

[58] *Annuario Pontificio 1975,* 1327–49; *DIP* II, 1423–31.

[59] Cf. "Attività del Consiglio dei 16," *SCRIS, Informationes* 1(1975), 89–94. This body is called the "Council of Sixteen" because of the sixteen religious who belong to it.

[60] Cf., for example, A. Schneider, *Instruktion über die zeitgemässe Erneuerung der Ausbildung zum Ordensleben* (Trier 1970), 16–18.

[61] "Les rencontres des Responsables de la SCRIS avec les Religieux chez eux." *SCRIS, Informationes* 1(1975), 83–89.

Hence it goes without saying that the Church, wherever there was question of negotiations for a concordat with a government, exerted itself to secure by treaty the legal situation of the institutes, their right to erect new houses, and the free exercise of the activities proper to them. In countries with a sufficient number of native religious the Church was usually prepared for the compromise that the higher superiors of the institute must have corresponding citizenship in the nation.[63] Of course, this protection by concordats was to prove to be of little effect in many nations in the succeeding decades.

In Mexico the conflict between Church and state, going far back into the nineteenth century, reached a climax in the first decades of this century. In 1917 the country obtained a new constitution, which, among other things, forbade celibacy, religious vows, and the religious state. Religious were expelled from their houses, their schools and other institutions were closed. After two years these regulations were somewhat modified, but in 1926 they were again put into effect in full severity. Their transgression was strictly punished. Among the best known victims of this persecution, which did not ebb until the end of the 1930s, was Father Augustinus Pro, S.J. (1891–1927), who with great skill and presence of mind worked as a pastor in Mexico City underground and after his imprisonment was falsely charged with sharing in an assassination attempt on former President Obregón and for this reason was shot without any legal proceedings. His process of beatification was introduced in 1952.[64]

A republic was proclaimed in Spain in 1931 and a constitution put into force which had as its aim a radical separation of Church and state and hit hard at the religious institutes, since it not only subjected them to state supervision but also supplied the legal basis for the expropriation of all property of religious. The Society of Jesus was dissolved and its property was confiscated by the state. If the riots of 1931 against the

---

[62] H. Liermann, *Kirchen und Staat* I (Munich 1954), 14f.; *HK* 11(1956–57), 167, 27(1973), 322–24.

[63] Concordat with Bavaria (1924), ARTS. 2 and 13, par. 2; Poland (1925), ART. X; Rumania (1927), ART. XVII; Lithuania (1927), ART. X; Italy (1929), ART. 29b; Baden (1932), ART. V with concluding protocol; Austria (1933), ART. X; German Reich (1933), ART. 15; Portugal (1940), ARTS. III and IX; Spain (1953), ART. IV; and the Dominican Republic (1954), ARTS. IV and X.

[64] *LThK* VII, 2d ed. (1962), 151–55; *LThK* VIII, 2d ed. (1963), 776; J. Echeverria, *Der Kampf gegen die katholische Kirche in Mexiko* (München-Gladbach 1926).

Church were still locally restricted, the storm broke out furiously against the monasteries during the three-year civil war, which followed General Franco's coup d'état of 1936. The cruel balance of the age of terror: in addition to 4,184 diocesan priests and seminarians, 2,365 male and 283 female religious were murdered, as well as many lay persons.[65]

In Germany at first National Socialism found sympathizers among a certain segment of the Catholics as well as among some of the religious. An especially unfortunate role was played by an outsider, Abbot Alban Schachleiter (1861–1937), who had been expelled from his abbey, Sankt Emaus at Prague, in 1918 and had lived in Bavaria since 1921; he expected from Hitler the realization of his own German national ideas, and so from 1922 he recruited for him and his movement in talks and appeals and let himself be misused as a pretense. Energetic rebukes and even penal measures of the archepiscopal ordinariate of Munich and of the superiors of the order could not make the aging abbot change his tune.[66] After the seizure of power the Nazi government in ARTICLE 15 of the concordat guaranteed the freedom of religious communities and the unimpeded exercise of their activities both in the pastoral and in the educational and social and charitable sphere; the private schools of the orders were even dealt with in a special article (ART. 25). But the orders were soon able to experience the true aims of the new holders of power.[67] This began with annoying searches of the houses and interrogations. In 1935–36 a series of show-trials was conducted, chiefly against religious because of transgressions against rules on foreign exchange; heavy sentences of imprisonment were decreed against the accused.[68] While the trials on foreign exchange were still in progress, preparations were being made for a second series of trials against religious and priests. From the end of 1935, but especially in 1936 and 1937, the Gestapo searched in monasteries and in boarding schools and nursing homes conducted by monasteries for evidence of moral failings in order to be able to denounce the monasteries as hotbeds of immorality. The intensity of the searches, the methods employed in the inquiries, the fixing of the dates of the proceedings, ordered by the executive, as well as the carefully prepared and centrally directed evaluation for propaganda purposes make clear that the authorities were not mainly concerned for the punishment and elimination of evil situations. Instead, here the orders were to be affected in their entirety. Not by accident did the chief trials reach their climax in the months following publication of the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* of 14 March 1937.[69] But above all these trials were steps toward a still more comprehensive goal that was thus formulated in a secret instruction of the Ministry for Security of 15 February 1938: "The orders are the militant arm of the Catholic Church. Hence they must be forced out of their spheres of influence, curtailed, and finally annihilated."[70] To this end the government, following the successful military campaigns in the West at the high point of its power, made ready for a new blow. On the most varied pretexts, but often without any justification, many religious houses were confiscated between the fall of 1940 and the spring of 1941 and the religious expelled from the monasteries or even from the very districts of their former residences, as long as they were not required for the continuance of farm work or made liable to service.[71] These measures were stopped at the beginning of the Russian campaign, and the total annihilation of the orders was put off until the postwar period in order not to evoke further unrest among the Catholic population. Of course, these measures extended also to the countries and territories incorporated into the Reich and to the occupied areas. There they were carried out more severely and ruthlessly because no concordatal restrictions existed. Thus a thirteen-points program of 1940 for occupied Poland, the "Warthegau," provided under number 12: "All communities and monasteries are abolished, since these are not in accord with the German policy of morality and population."[72] Many religious were thrown into prisons and concentration camps, several were executed. Among these last was the

---

[65] A. Montero Moreno, *Historia de la persecución religiosa en España 1936–1939* (Madrid 1961), 762, 765–67.

[66] G. Engelhard, *Abt Schachleiter, der deutsche Kämpfer* (Munich 1941); H. Witetschek, *Die kirchliche Lage in Bayern nach den Regierungspräsidentenberichten 1933–1943* I: *Regierungsbezirk Oberbayern* (Mainz 1966), 1, n. 1; now cf. also L. Volk, *Akten Kardinal Michael von Faulhabers 1917–1945* I: *1917–1934*(Mainz 1975), passim.

[67] On what follows cf. J. Neuhäusler, *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz* (Munich 1946), I, 122–64; II, 250–92.

[68] After the war several of those then condemned—many had meanwhile died—applied for the juridical annulment of these verdicts and obtained their rehabilitation. The courts came to understand that these "verdicts issued in 1935–36 had come primarily from political reasons and followed the aim of bringing the Catholic orders and, with them, the Catholic Church into discredit with the German people" (E. Hoffmann, H. Janssen, *Die Wahrheit über die Ordensdevisenprozesse 1935/36* [Bielefeld 1967], 265).Cf. the justification of the verdict of the State Court of Berlin-Moabit of 27 February 1951 (ibid., 270). A Bonn dissertation on the foreign exchange trials is being prepared by Petra Rapp.

---

[69] J. Neuhäusler, op.cit. I, 133–44; H.G. Hockerts, *Die Sittlichkeitsprozesse gegen katholische Ordensangehörige und Priester 1936/37* (Mainz 1971).

[70] Quoted in J. Neuhäusler, op.cit. I, 123.

[71] Ibid., 148–64.

[72] Quoted in B. Stasiewski, "Die Kirchenpolitik der Nationalsozialisten im Warthegau 1939–1945," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 7 (1959), 55.

Polish Franciscan, Father Maximilian Kolbe (1894–1941), who, taking the place of another prisoner, died in the starvation barracks of the Auschwitz concentration camp and was beatified in 1971, the Jewish philosopher and Carmelite nun Edith Stein (1891–1942), who was dragged from the Carmel at Echt in Holland, to which she had fled, in order to share the fate of the other Jews, and the Jesuit Alfred Delp (1907–1945), who was executed in Berlin-Plötzensee for alleged high treason against the nation.[73]

The persecution of the Church which broke out in Russia after the Bolshevik October Revolution affected chiefly the Orthodox monasteries; however, the few Catholic religious houses were not spared.[74] Only after the victory over Poland and when, after the Second World War, the Baltic countries and eastern Poland were definitively annexed to the Soviet Union did Catholic religious houses in large numbers fall into the Communist power sphere. In Latvia and the formerly Polish part of the Ukraine religious men and women were expelled from their houses and forced to return to civilian life; their houses fell to the state.[75] In Lithuania, where about 80 percent of the population professed the Roman Catholic faith, such severe measures were at first not feasible. At first the government was content with a strict supervision and spying on the monasteries, but after 1944 all religious houses here were suppressed.[76]

In the countries in which the Communists seized power after the Second World War, regard for the denominational situation likewise obviously played an important role in the proceedings. The harshest measures occurred everywhere in the years before 1956. In Albania the orders were entirely extirpated. The foreign religious were expelled, the Albanians were forced to put aside their habit and become part of the economic process.[77] Something similar was true of Bulgaria.[78] In Czechoslovakia all religious houses were occupied by the militia in April 1950 after a highly publicized show-trial of ten religious had taken place in Prague on the allegation of high treason.[79] Religious of various communities were crowded into "concentration monasteries," the male and female religious still capable of work were requisitioned for places in farming and in factories. Some sisters were allowed to continue caring for the aged, the sick, and the invalids because of the lack of other personnel. "At the end of 1951 there was in all Czechoslovakia not a single religious house apart from the concentration convents,' which were in reality compulsory labor camps."[80] The mitigations and relaxations of the Dubček era[81] were again annulled, step by step.[82] Of the 160 religious houses which there were in Rumania in 1945, only twenty-five still existed in 1953.[83] The Hungarian minister for popular education, József Révai, explained in a speech delivered at the beginning of June 1950: "In the people's democracy religious are no longer needed because they no longer correspond to their vocation, indeed they sabotage the tasks of democracy. Hence it is necessary that as soon as possible it be made impossible for them further to harm the interests of democracy."[84] Shortly thereafter began a wave of deportations of religious. The Hungarian episcopate tried to avert the worst and on 30 August 1950 signed a treaty, which, among other things, provided that eight Catholic schools—six for boys, two for girls—might again be opened and the religious needed for the administration of their schools continue in this function. A *numerus clausus* was imposed on these communities in regard to the acceptance of new members.[85] All other religious communities were suppressed in September 1950 against the protest of the episcopate, and the approximately ten thousand male and female religious were ordered to leave their houses within three months, to discard the habit, and to take up a secular occupation.[86] In 1968 the eight approved monasteries counted, according to the figures of government offices, 232 fathers, twenty-seven novices and students, and fifty-nine sisters.[87]

---

[73] B.M. Kempner, *Priester vor Hitlers Tribunalen* (Munich 1966), documented the verdicts against many other religious.

[74] Cf. J.S. Curtiss, *Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion* (Munich 1957), 80–83.

[75] A. Galter, *Rotbuch der verfolgten Kirche* (Recklinghausen 1957), 66, 91.

[76] Ibid., 81; *HK* 19(1964–65), 261.

[77] A. Galter, op.cit., 239f.; *HK* 22(1968), 195.

[78] A. Galter, op.cit., 252f.

[79] *HK* 4(1949–50), 411.

In Yugoslavia the situation of the orders in the first ten years of Communist rule was no less miserable. In Bosnia-Herzegovina and Slovenia all religious houses were suppressed and many religious were arrested and killed. One hundred thirty-nine Franciscans alone fell victim to the persecution. In the mid-1950s there occurred a relaxation of tension, which had as a consequence an amazing revival of the orders, especially in the republics of Slovenia and Croatia, where the number of members of the orders rose considerably since 1958.[88]

---

[80] A. Galter, op.cit, 202–6, quotation 205; *HK* 15(1960f.), 561.

[81] *HK* 22(1968), 211, 412.

[82] *HK* 24(1970), 304f., 571f., 25(1971), 186, 27(1973), 609.

[83] A. Galter, op.cit., 301.

[84] Quoted in A. Galter, op.cit., 346, n. 79.

[85] There was question of two schools each of the Benedictines, Franciscans, Piarists, and the School Sisters of Szeged (A. Galter, op.cit., 352, n. 90).

[86] A. Galter, op.cit., 345–53; *HK* 5(1950f.), 33f.

[87] *Pro mundi vita, centrum informationis,* Heft 19(1967), 10–12.

A similar picture results for Poland. Here at first there were years of misery and distress. Religious were removed from schools, hospitals, and other institutions. Up to 1953 54 religious had been killed, 200 deported, 170 thrown into prison.[89] On 14 April 1950 an agreement was reached between the government and the Polish episcopate, which in ARTICLE 19 contains the guarantee: "Orders and congregations of religious will have full freedom of action in the framework of their calling and the laws in force."[90] Nevertheless, at first there occurred further imprisonments. Not until the mid-1950s did the situation calm down, and the number of religious has since then grown significantly, both in the male and the female institutes.[91] Poland may be the only Socialist country which today can dispose of a considerable number of religious for use in mission lands.

In China and North Korea there are no more religious houses. The foreign missionaries were expelled, the not inconsiderable number of native religious were sent home in so far as they did not perish. The fate of the orders in Indochina, especially in Vietnam, is unknown at the moment.

The glance at the last six decades of church history shows how very much the orders live in and with the Church. Periods in which ecclesiastical life flourished were for the orders times of interior and exterior growth and vitality; in ages of crisis, on the contrary, they proved to be especially vulnerable. This dependence on the total ecclesiastical climate, however, must not cause the orders to forget that in all generations healing influences and impulses are expected from them. Precisely in this consist the heritage and task which religious communities in their totality have received from the great founders, who in the Church's periods of need created cells of inner renewal in order through them to permeate the Church with fresh energy.

---

[88] A. Galter, op.cit., 403f.; *LThK* V, 2d ed. (1960), 1193; *Pro mundi vita, Centrum informationis,* no. 19(1967), 10, 13.

[89] A. Galter, op.cit., 157.

[90] *HK* 4(1949f.), 413.

[91] *Pro mundi vita, Centrum informationis,* No. 19(1967), 10–12; *HK* 26 (1972), 205.

CHAPTER 12

*Educational System, Education, and Instruction**

Church and Society in Their Relation to the Educational System

The influence which the Church can exert on the educational system of our time is dependent on its position in the social and political system of the moment,[1] the legal, moral, and material conditions prevailing in it, the relations of the Church's educational mission to the expectations of the population or, respectively, the aims of the government—and all this is often dependent on the history in which and out of which the Church's educational efforts have acquired their national character.[2] The influence thus depends also on the Church itself: from its understanding of its function and from the ideas and energies which it proclaims in favor of its educational mission and which can apply to the apostolic mission in the stricter sense and to the service of the world in the broader sense.

In Europe the educational system, earlier established by the Church and for a long time determined by it, lost much ground after the introduction of the general obligation of going to school, the taking over of schools and universities by the state, the emphasizing of science and of the secular in instruction, and the rapid increase of voluntary school attendance—*explosion scholaire.* Educational systems with overwhelmingly Catholic—for example, in Belgium—or at least nonstate educational institutions—for example, the Netherlands—are the exception. In the United States the Catholic educational system has powerfully gained in substance in the course of this century and has reached a point where further increases scarcely seem any longer possible, and the distinction in regard to the education and formation imparted in non-Catholic institutions is beginning to decrease. In the Latin American nations there is, it is true, a stability in Catholic educational institutions, but the great task of mass education which cannot be accomplished by them reduces their earlier importance. In the missions of the nations of the Third World the situation is determined by the form of decolonization, "nation building," and socioeconomic development; socialist regimes which are modeled on the protecting powers of the Communist camp, whether dominated by Moscow or Peking, are hostile to the Church's educational mission; the same is true where a non-Christian religion, such as Islam, is the state religion. More favorable are the circumstances in countries supported by Western powers. In the Communist states of Europe and Asia the Church was radically excluded from the educational system.

---

* Paul-Ludwig Weinacht

[1] Cf. UNESCO, ed., *World Survey of Education* V (Paris 1971), 27f.

[2] On the extensive and intensive interpretation, extending back to par. 13, II, 12 of the common law, of the idea of school supervision in Germany, cf. T. Oppermann, *Kulturverwaltungsrecht* (Tübingen 1969), 252f. For the historical situation of schools under free auspices, especially of the Catholic schools in Europe, cf. W. Schultze, ed., *Schulen in Europa,* 3 vols. (Weinheim and Berlin 1968), the relevant chapters. On the colonial stamp of the African educational system, cf. T. Hanf, "Erziehung und politischer Wandel in Schwarzafrika," D. Oberndörfer, ed., *Systemtheorie, Systemanalyse und Entwicklungsländerforschung* (=*Ordo Politicus* 14) (Berlin 1971), 536.

On the whole few generalizations can be made on the present state of the educational system established or determined by the Church or oriented to it. The generalization according to which the impact of the religious factor[3] in instruction and education slackens and the Church is either excluded from the educational system or withdraws from it is surely too sweeping. For it mistakes the new type of exchange relations between Church and society as they were expressed and urged in the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes* and introduced a turning in Catholic school policy.

While before the Second Vatican Council the Catholic Church understood education as an integrating element of an educational process of the faithful to be religiously founded and forming part of the Church's responsibility, and accordingly placed the greatest value on the institutionalization of the "Catholic school," the Protestant Church, at least in Germany, had given up such ideas since the 1950s. In its 1958 declaration of the school question the Protestant Church in Germany made known that it understood itself not first of all as an educational power struggling for influence but as the custodian of liberty. In this was expressed the Lutheran conviction, preserved in Protestantism, of the necessity of a "strictly secular government." Here school no longer meant—a few years before the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes*—an innate function of the Church but an objective task which could be provided for in a wordly and sensible way, even in collaboration with non-Christians.[4]

The educational system is not only the means and addressee of ecclesiastical influence; it also has an impact of its own on the Church. Such repercussions occur over the conditions of formation of the ecclesiastical recruits—state reforms of education, in Germany: the altered status of humanistic programs, and so forth—over changes in the curriculum[5] and of the conditions of scholarship in which theology is expressed, over the type of teaching in religious instruction—the didactics of religious instruction—and not least over the expansion of the hitherto charitably restricted services in the field of school and nursing through the professionalization of the teaching personnel. These changes got under way on a broad front without its being already discernible which formula—rationalization of the *mysterium,* adaptation to the world, loss of the *philosophia perennis,* dissolution of unity or viable diversity, dialogue, new catholicity, and so forth—is suited conclusively to describe the direction of the process.

---

[3] Cf. also F. Schneider, *Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft* (Heidelberg 1961), 154ff.

[4] On the so-called Protestant School Doctrine cf. A. von Campenhausen, *Erziehungsauftrag und staatliche Schulträgerschaft. Die rechtliche Verantwortung für die Schule* (Göttingen 1967), 129ff. On the problem of community relations between the Protestant and the Catholic school doctrine, cf. E.M. Heufelder, O.S.B., "Gibt es ein gemeinsames Leitbild für katholische und evangelische Erziehung?" *Una Sancta* (private printing, 1966), 229ff.

Catholic Educational and School Doctrine

The doctrinal expressions of the Popes on the educational system must be understood as concretizations, relevant to the occasion and the time, of the apostolic task of the Church to proclaim and attest the message of Jesus Christ, to assure the conditions for the realization of this apostolate against encroachments and decay and constantly to improve it and in this regard to express ever more strongly the personal importance of education and solidarity with those who, like UNESCO since 1946, have also set as their goal the education and training of all peoples.[6]

In the first half of the twentieth century the Church was interested in retaining Christian education intact as an integral element of formation in and spreading of the faith. The Holy See exerted itself in the reorganization of the educational system in Europe after the First World War to assure the Church's interests by diplomatic means—the concordat policy—by the encouraging of ecclesiastical educational institutions, for example, the recognition of universities as "papal universities," by establishing a Christian educational system independent of the state, and by support of the missions, especially under Pius XI, to promote the spread of the faith through educational institutions.

---

[5] The central themes, which are discussed under the term "curriculum," are educational aims, teaching content, and organization of learning (cf. also K. Frey in L. Roth, ed., *Handlexikon zur Erziehungswissenschaft* [Munich 1976], with citation of further literature [p. 85]). For the discussion of the reform of theological study cf. "Kommission 'Curricula in Theologie' des Westdeutschen Fakultätentages," by E. Feifel, ed., *Studium Katholischer Theologie, Berichte, Analysen, Vorschläge* 1–5 (Zurich 1973–75).

[6] H. Fries, ed., *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe* I (Munich 1962), 319ff.

At the same time, that is, from the end of the First World War, the Popes, beginning with Benedict XV's letter of 19 April 1919, *Communes litteras,* formulated a relatively complete "Catholic educational and school doctrine," which on the basis of biblical and theological statements, of traditional ecclesiastical ideas on education, *paedagogia perennis,* as well as of pertinent articles from the Code of Canon Law (Canons 1372–83), contained doctrinal propositions on education and school under compulsory aspects and determined the epoch down to the Second Vatican Council. In addition to the already mentioned letter *Communes litteras,* its standard document is Pius XI's encyclical *Divini illius Magistri* of 31 December 1929;[7] also to be mentioned are the messages of Pius XII—address to the Youth of the A.C.I., to the Fathers of Families of France of September 1951—the message of John XXIII of 30 December 1959 on the thirtieth anniversary of the appearance of Pius XI's encyclical on education as well as passages of the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* of 15 May 1961.

All the expressions were based on the twofold right of the Church, which, first, by virtue of its teaching function, has to educate its members for full citizenship in the Kingdom of God, and, second, by virtue of its supernatural motherhood, brings forth, nourishes, and trains souls for the divine life of grace, according to the encyclical *Divini illius Magistri,* nos. 16 and 17.[8] Against the background of a really centennial loss of the Church's power to regulate education and in view of the threat to Christian cultural values from liberalism and Modernism in Europe and North America, the Popes raised the demand for the material catholicity of the educational world of its members, that is, either educational institutions must stand under Catholic auspices and responsibility or state and other educational institutions must be permeated by the Catholic spirit. These demands were pinpointed from two sides: Catholic Christians were obliged in conscience to send their children to Catholic schools; non-Church, mixed, or neutral schools were forbidden to them in Canon 1374 and the encyclical *Divini illius Magistri,* no. 79; the Church itself claimed an all-embracing right of supervision of the schools, guaranteed only fragmentarily by concordat.

---

[7] *Die christliche Erziehung der Jugend, Enzyklika "Divini illius magistri" von Pius XI., Lateinisch-deutsche Ausgabe, eingeleitet und mit textkritischen Anmerkungen versehen von R. Pfeil* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1959).

[8] Pius XI's encyclical on education appeared three decades after the beginning of radical school reform. It quite critically opposes pedagogical naturalism, which, while seeking to draw "out of the child," had slight regard for the claim of objective organizations and confused education with development (cf. also F. Pöggeler in *Dokumente des II. Vatikanischen Konzils* V: *Declaratio de educatione christiana/Über christliche Erziehung* [Trier 1966], 10).

Within the papal teaching the role of the state was defined to the effect that it has a right to educate and must exercise it, not immoderately by a school monopoly but according to the principle of subsidiarity, with regard for the parents' right. Its tasks lay especially in the spheres of training state officials and education in citizenship. In the papal teaching the parents always ranked as the innate and professional educators of their children. However, their right of education was not "autonomous" but one participating in the mandate of salvation and the Church's *magisterium* and pastoral office. The vigorous defense of this denominational right of parents by the Church was marked characteristically by the obligation of the parents to exercise their right in accord with their duties as Catholic parents—baptism, Catholic training of the children. In the concrete this could mean that they had to vote for Catholic denominational schools, if possibilities of voting were available and corresponding ecclesiastical directives were at hand.

The Catholic educational and school doctrine assumed as a condition of its effectiveness that traditional ecclesiastical authority, the structure of social institutions, and a certain "Catholic milieu" were intact. On such a basis it was possible that a few simple so-called "Catholic educational principles" were respected: the right of parents, family and school instruction in accord with the denomination, rejection of coeducation, and care for an instruction proper to each sex. They could easily be integrated into the system of Church doctrine and canon law and possessed the character of commandments. The great success, at least in Germany, of the Church's school policy was attributed by a person in the Protestant camp even to the "binding of the consciences of Catholics" by Church directives.[9]

The Second Vatican Council and the Postconciliar Period

After the Second World War there appeared throughout the world new situations in the sphere of education which could not but convulse the Catholic educational and school doctrine. Education was assigned social functions and became, especially in the countries of the Third World, but also in the industrialized nations, a strategic point of social development. Even in the field of personality education a social desire for adaptation and ascent claimed recognition, which demolished overnight waves of respect once encompassing Catholic schools. The road of separate and particular cultures to a modern, Western, secular, and dynamic educational society, concerned with economic growth and the growth of information, seemed to indicate the direction of general progress.

---

[9] A. von Campenhausen, op. cit. (above, n. 4), 119f.

From the viewpoint of the Catholic educational system there were various problems: the problem of the quality and of the comparable standards relative to the developed non-Catholic educational institutions; the problem of quantity in view of newly appearing needs in accord with the degrees of education—basic education, eradication of illiteracy; the problem of subsistence in view of rising building and maintenance costs; the problem of spirituality in view of the reduced number of clerical teachers or political exactions on the part of the governments of the moment—thus in Pakistan and Egypt religious instruction in Islam must be given; finally, the problem of self-understanding: as agent of the spreading of the faith or as a regular school for children of Catholic families or as an offer by Catholics to all, that is, as an instrument of Christian service to the world.

In its "Declaration on Christian Education" the council confirmed the basic features of the traditional Catholic school doctrine in the question of the function of education, of those qualified to educate—"first and preferably" the parents, subsidiarily the state, in a specific way the Church—of the natural law character of the parents' right and its confirmation in the question of the "choice of school" for the child; it also affirmed the assumption of the rights of education by means of the "child's right," which is not applied without distinction but must be seen by means of the child's natural abilities and his supernatural goal lying in the coresponsibility of the Church.

Traditionally the means suited to this goal and hence obligatory were seen in institutions of material catholicity. In this point the council proved to be more realistic and open: Since it happens that an ever larger area of education is fact-oriented, which neither positively nor negatively touches upon the meaning of Christian existence, it all amounts to the *formatio christiana* keeping in step with the *formatio profana*. And since it likewise happens that Catholic Christians are ever more frequently educated in mixed or neutral schools, where the Christian development of the school is institutionally not possible, the religious instruction remains possible, and—in the event that it does not take place in the school—at least the moral and character formation is guaranteed by the Christian spirit. Here the council puts great hope on the personal model of Christian teachers and fellow students, and it refers to the necessity of spiritual help even when this cannot result from within the school district.

With these adaptations to current conditions of Christian existence in the world, a giving up of institution and program bound to the *schola* *catholica* is not necessary, even if precisely here in the postconciliar period differences of opinion emerge. In the declaration itself the "Catholic school" is claimed for the educational mandate of the Church against all monopolizing tendencies of the state. Catholic school—this is principally the nonstate school under ecclesiastical or free auspices of a Catholic spirit. In the mission lands it is the first source of divine life and bearer of human culture with a strong apostolic content. As a program it means the exhibition of the "presence of the Church in the modern world," as demanded in the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes;* its function is the apostolate, that is, education and formation must serve the spread of God's Kingdom and, along with that, the welfare of the earthly community and its eternal salvation. The character of the educational apostolate defines also the function and position of the teacher in Catholic schools: it depends on him to what extent the aims and initiatives of Catholic schools are realized. Hence he needs a fundamental and constantly renewed formation in the profane and the religious areas and in teaching methods. He should be in a dialogue with his pupils,—inspired by the Christian spirit and extending beyond the school-day, and work intimately with the parents. In this place, hence in part of the program referring to the teacher in the Declaration on Christian Education, occurs the traditional reminder that Catholic parents have the duty "of entrusting their children, when and where this is possible, to Catholic schools, to support these in accord with their means, and to cooperate with them for the good of their children" (ARTICLE 9).

The program of the *schola catholica* extends over the total grade structure of the educational system, beginning with schools of the elementary and secondary grades, which "lay the foundation of education," for the professional schools, the institutes for adult education and for social professions, special schools, and institutions for the education of teachers and catechists.

On the universities the declaration expresses itself in a triple aim; it expects from them the training of the national leaders, scholarly contributions to the discovery of truth and to the problems of the modern world—undernourishment, sickness, unjust distribution, and so forth—and finally it expects the institutionalizing of religious and scientific faculties or at least institutes and, from these, contributions to the dialogue between faith and reason, which, if they conscientiously observe one another's conformity with law and competence, can come together in the one truth. These expectations set the framework for "Catholic universities": they deserve encouragement, but so that they stand out, not by their number, but by their scholarly achievement (ART. 10). The statements of the council on the university system remain throughout in the framework of the papal pronouncements of Pius XII, John XXIII, and Paul VI.

The postconciliar period is determined by a partly violent difference of opinion on the existence and range of a Catholic theory of education. Between conservative and progressive theoreticians various passages from conciliar documents were offered as proof of the ecclesiastical nature of their respective ideas. According to the selected theological or ideological relationship in each case there stood out in the Catholic school doctrine long familiar[10] or entirely new features. The newer ones appealed to the Pastoral Constitution as "Magna Carta of the Christian World Understanding and World Mission" and sought to "rethink" the Catholic educational and school doctrine in its light. What is Catholic is understood, not as the culture-determining, religious content, but as form of solidarity, world responsibility, and condition of cooperation with all persons of good will: What must be done concretely is not different for the Catholic from what everyone can aspire to and understand. The Christian faith provides, as regards content, no new insights for the organization of the world and of humans living together; in fact, Catholics would not even have the right to a culture of their own. Since the Church makes its own general human demands and stands up for them, "Catholic schools" must not be understood as special institutions of Catholics for Catholics, but as integrating elements in the "front of all of goodwill" under the idea "of creating in common with them a world in humanity, justice, and freedom."[11]

Similar results are reached by whoever takes as a guiding principle the new nonmetaphysical anthropology of the pastoral constitution, according to which the human being is "defined by his responsibility toward his fellows and toward history." Responsibility toward history is then understood as the obligation to participate in scholarly progress in all varieties and as the abandonment of that older Augustinian outlook, whereby education has meaning for the Christian only where it ceases to be empty curiosity *(curiositas)* and assumes a relation to eternal salvation. The council simply makes progress and knowledge a duty because in the anthropological view, which corresponds to the situation of today's world, work in it must be understood as a form of fraternity, of humanity, of responsibility, hence in the last analysis as an overflow of the Christian commandment of love. In such a context it is the conscientious duty of Christian parents, in choosing the school for their children, to give the preference to the "Catholic school," seen and justified as the criterion of social liberty. The pluralism of society, hence not a metaphysical but a political principle, justifies the institution "Catholic school." But then may it, as such, be made a conscientious duty for Catholics? Three restrictive considerations are named: (1) the Declaration on Religious Freedom intends that only one who believes of his own accord can be bound in conscience; (2) the pastoral constitution binds the secular discipline to its respective subject matter, hence also the Catholic school to the modern demands on "school"; (3) the Declaration on Christian Education demands that a Catholic school must be Catholic not only formally but materially.

---

[10] Cf., for example, the memorandum composed by Dr. F. Heckenbach, *Heilstheologische Begründung der katholischen Schule* (*Études et Documents* no. 4, OIEC) (Brussels 1967). The essential proposition of the memorandum, formulated in evident opposition to the idea of autonomous fields of reality, reads: "Every pedagogical autonomy is destroyed by revelation and the incarnation and is only meaningful as salvation pedagogy" (p. 4).

[11] W. Seibel, "Bildung und Kultur in den Konzilsdokumenten," *Christliche Erziehung nach dem Konzil* (=*Berichte und Dokumente,* edited by Kulturbeirat beim Zentralkomitee der deutschen Katholiken) (Cologne 1967), 29f.

Only if all three factors are present can there exist an obligation in conscience for the parents to exercise their right to the free choice of a school in favor of the Catholic school.[12]

In the postconciliar period further decisions were added to the Catholic educational and school doctrine by the Holy See as well as by regional episcopal conferences and other bodies, such as synods. They begin with the commentary of Bishop Doctor Pohlschneider on the German translation of the Declaration on Christian Education, which especially emphasizes the principle of the "apostolate" and attaches it to many conciliar texts.[13] The notion of the Church's mission of salvation in the educational system—not only its solidarity with "all people of good will"—is the "dominant guiding idea of the declaration."

If one surveys the messages of the Holy See published since then, the impression can arise that the reference to the Declaration served rather the inner Church dialogue, since in it the interests of institutions under Catholic or ecclesiastical auspices are especially well expressed and justified;[14] on the other hand, the pastoral constitution or the encyclical *Populorum progressio* are readily quoted when solidarity with extraecclesiastical organizations should be expressed, whether on the occasion of the anniversary of the eradication of illiteracy campaign of UNESCO[15] or of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of UNESCO.[16]

---

[12] Cf. J. Ratzinger, "Das Menschenbild des Konzils in seiner Bedeutung für die Bildung," *Christliche Erziehung* (preceding note), 62f.

[13] For example, the dogmatic constitution *Lumen gentium,* no. 17, the Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity *Ad gentes,* nos. 35–41, the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, nos. 28–32.

[14] Cf. the message on the centenary celebration of the founding of the Catholic universities in France in *AAS* 67 (1975), 695, and finally the document of the Congregation for Catholic Education by Means of the Catholic School of 5 July 1977.

The Latin American Church placed its resolutions on education entirely under the idea, urged by *Gaudium et spes,* of the coresponsibility for the process of transformation of the Latin American peoples and their liberation. Clear postponing of accent *vis-à-vis* Western European and North American philosophy and theology were discernible.[17] Starting with the Catholic University of Santiago de Chile, capitalism and liberalism were blamed for the postcolonial servitude of Latin America and it was believed that in this spirit the real identity could never be found. The promise for the problems of Latin America lies not in the industrialized countries of the First World, but in Latin America itself. The task for education consists in enabling the Latin American illiterates "to develop a cultural world themselves, as creators of their own progress, in a creative and original way."[18]

The line which the Holy See pursues in the assuring and promoting of ecclesiastical interests in the educational system of the European states is not different from the preconciliar line: by means of treaties between the respective nations and the Holy See prescriptions of concordats in force are extrapolated or supplemented.[19] More powerfully than in the preconciliar phase, the pronouncements of the council and of the Popes are placed in close contact with declarations of other sovereign political bodies, and the unity of all peoples of good will in the one goal is stressed, thus formulated by Paul VI on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of UNESCO: "construire un monde fraternel," "promouvoir une civilisation de l'universel."[20] The Declaration on Christian Education in ART. 12 had already pointed in this direction, that people must strive with all their means that "an appropriate coordination may come into being among Catholic schools, and between them and the other schools that cooperation may be fostered which the welfare of all human society demands." Coordination and cooperation were realized in the inner Catholic sphere by a liaison office for the national school bureaus and societies in Brussels, the *Office International de l'Enseignement Catholique* (OIEC); active in relation to UNESCO in Paris is the *Centre Catholique International de Coordination auprès de l'UNESCO* (CCIC)[21] The first permanent observer of the Holy See at the General Secretariat of UNESCO was, by the way, Monsignore Roncalli, the future Pope John XXIII.[22]

---

[15] *AAS* 61 (1969), 665.

[16] *AAS* 63(1971), 837f. Furthermore, the Declaration on Christian Education, ART. 1, is relevant to the *droit à l'éducation.*

[17] Cf. J. Ratzinger, "Der Weltdienst der Kirche. Auswirkungen von 'Gaudium et Spes' im letzten Jahrzehnt," *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift,* 4th year (1975), no. 5, 439ff. (444f.).

[18] *Die Kirche in der gegenwärtigen Umwandlung Lateinamerikas im Lichte des Konzils. Beschlüsse der II. Generalversammlung des Lateinamerikanischen Episkopates, Medellin v. 24. 8. bis 6.9.1968* (Essen [ADVENIAT] 1970), 49f.

[19] Appendix to the treaty with Austria of 9 July 1962 on 25 April 1972 in regard to subsidies for salaries in Catholic schools of public law, in *AAS* 64 (1972), 478ff.; also the modification of the concordat with Lower Saxony of 26 February 1965 on 21 May 1973, in *AAS* 65(1973), 643ff.; also the treaties with Rhineland-Palatinate on 15 May 1973, in *AAS* 65(1973), 631ff., and with the Saarland on 21 February 1975, in *AAS* 67(1975), 248ff.

[20] Cf. n. 16.

Catholic Education in the European and North American Educational Systems

Catholic exertions in regard to education were realized within the pertinent historical and regional circumstances which on the one hand determined the character of the Church and on the other hand the character of its relations to the social and political milieu. The following types are of use for a comparative presentation of the Catholic educational system: In the twentieth century there are native and mission Churches, intimate with and distant from the state, rich and poor, persistent and reformist Churches, national and foreign educational traditions, complete and, in looking at functions and the structure of grades from the elementary to the tertiary sphere, incomplete educational offerings.

The European countries are, like the United States, conspicuous in that they received their national cultures from a common Christian European history, differed from one another in it, and more or less strongly emancipated themselves from it. Where the system of separation between state and Church was realized on the model of the Weimar Constitution, there was no occasion to support a complete educational offering under church auspices; it sufficed if Catholic interests could be assured within the state educational system.[23] In this case talk of the state-school monopoly made no real sense. If the constitutional situation was, as in France, hostile to the Church—*laïcité*—its educational power can still be taken into account indirectly.[24]

In the United States matters were different from the start. Here, in order to allow the Catholic immigrants in a society at first unfriendly to Catholics a church education, a Catholic educational system free of the state had to be constructed. From the basis of the local ecclesiastical primary schools there arose from the second half of the nineteenth century an educational system which, supported by a native Church, was stamped in the national American educational system, and provided a functional and, in regard to grades, complete educational offering. Up to the 1960s it showed itself equal to the financial demands. The great majority of North American Catholics in this century received, partly or entirely, their education in Catholic institutions.[25]

---

[21] *LThK,* second supplementary volume (Freiburg 1967), 401f.

[22] This circumstance was called to the attention of the director general of UNESCO by Pope Paul VI (cf. *AAS* 63[1971], 837f.).

[23] Cf. A. von Campenhausen, op. cit., and T. Oppermann, op. cit., 35ff.

[24] Cf. W. Schultze, ed., *Schulen in Europa* II A, 574, 583f.

In what follows, these institutions in European countries and North America are described on the respective grades of the national educational system. A defining first section, which, for reasons of uniform understanding of the total educational plan, is oriented to the German Federal Republic,[26] is then followed by a historically treated second section.

PRESCHOOL AREA

In the elementary area the teaching methods of early childhood lie outside the family, that is, the institutions supplementary to family training after the completing of the third year of life to the beginning of school. Here the children should obtain the training necessary for their internal and external growth. In this regard two viewpoints are in the foreground: in one of them there is an attempt to foster the process of child development beyond the possibilities available at home—"compensatory education"; in the other, to achieve a gradual transition to learning in school—"preschool."

The legal rules to which the institutions of the elementary area of the various nations are subject are quite different: While countries such as Belgium, France, and England have incorporated preschool into the educational system—France considers it an integrating component of the primary school system—the Netherlands and Italy regulate the preschool system separately in law. The responsibility for the elementary area lies partly with the officials of the educational system, partly, especially in the Scandinavian countries, with the social offices.

In the industrialized states education in the elementary area is, to be sure, systematically organized, but, apart from preschool classes, it is not obligatory and also not altogether under the auspices of the state and locality. Especially in Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Italy, Switzerland, the German Federal Republic, and the United States, institutions of the elementary area are overwhelmingly under free auspices.

---

[25] *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 5, 141ff. ("United States: 20th Century").

[26] *Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung, Bildungsgesamtplan* I, 2d ed. (Stuttgart 1974), 18ff.

The proportion of children who attend a preschool institution varies from country to country. The highest numbers of attendance for children from age three to age five are recorded by Belgium (over 90 percent), the Netherlands and France (over 70 percent). Among the five-year-olds the numbers for Belgium and the Netherlands are more than 90 percent.[27]

The Church's organization for the poor and the school has traditionally cared for children in need of aid and without parents, in the area of formation and looking after little children; the kindergarten movement established by Fröbel in the middle of the nineteenth century then favored pedagogic initiatives in the ecclesiastical sphere also. Religious institutes, parishes, and welfare societies became operators of kindergartens, and, where there were no contrary legal regulations, as above all in France after 1886, the most important operators of preschool institutions. Since the Second World War these institutions have come ever more under state supervision—regulations on minimal demands in size and in the qualification of personnel—and were subsidized by public means; nevertheless, they were able to preserve a considerable freedom of movement in their pedagogical organization.

If the older kindergarten pedagogy paid attention especially to the care of the children by games and common activities to relieve the mothers and described its theory on the basis of the natural process of maturation in the course of life, it recently regarded more carefully the learning possibilities of the earliest years of life and tried purposefully and systematically to use it for the development of youthful strengths. In the Catholic sphere Maria Montessori had preceded this trend, but she had less impact in Germany than she had in Italy, Switzerland, and the United States; modern early pedagogy continues the beginnings made by Montessori and extends them from the cognitive and emotional to the total social development of the children. The education practice of church kindergartens stands today in the field of tension of various claims and far-reaching but often inadequate criticism: on the one hand it should admit the results of early pedagogy, especially of the psychology of learning without the pressure of school achievement, and on the other it should take into account the aims of antiauthoritarian education, and finally find a way where religious education is practicable when, as in the German Federal Republic, children from homes of the most varied denominations are accepted.[28]

---

[27] B. Trouillet, *Die Vorschulerziehung in neun europäischen Ländern* (=*Dokumentationen zum in- und ausländischen Schulwesen* 8), ed. by DIPF, 2d ed. (Weinheim and Berlin 1968), 208ff.

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SPHERES

The primary sphere includes the first organized and obligatory instruction suited to a school. It can last between three years—lower grades of the ten-class general educational polytechnical secondary school of the German Democratic Republic—and six years, in England and Sweden. Apart from the special schools of the Communist states, the rule prevails that in the primary sphere all children in the first grade are taught in common; in Germany the unitary elementary school, regularly of four years, has been maintained since 1920 on constitutional grounds. The idea is to provide pupils with a common body of knowledge before they continue their education. The early pedagogy, intent on individualization, required a proper continuation in the primary sphere; but no way has yet been found to satisfactorily unite the principle of grouping and individualization with the principle of year-classes over several years.

The secondary sphere I includes methods of education which are subject to the full-time school obligation and in general embraces the fifth to tenth school year. At the end of the secondary sphere I lies a school-qualifying conclusion with a partly selective, partly distributive function.

Thus the tension-filled aims such as orientation, individualization of educational offerings, and avoidance of premature fastening to a definite educational program in the secondary sphere II rank as the common pedagogical task of the educational methods here summarized.

Considerable educational-political explosive power has adhered in the years since the Second World War in Western European countries to the question whether secondary sphere I should be organized in one grade ("integrated") or in columns of an "articulated" school system. Behind this are concealed controversial sociopolitical, pedagogical, education-economic, and political-structural issues, which became decisively effective in various countries in varying combinations.

Secondary sphere II embraces in increased variety and diversity educational courses which are based on secondary sphere I and usually follow it immediately. They are either vocational and full-time; part-time with practical instruction; concerned with purely academic preparation; or they have a double function. In the last case, they either allow a student to graduate and to proceed to the tertiary sphere, or they certify attendance and permit the student to earn a living.

---

[28] Cf. G. Hundertmarck in L. Roth, ed., *Handlexikon zur Erziehungswissenschaft* (Munich 1976), 111ff.

If in secondary sphere I organizational integration and multiple linking are posed as alternatives, then the multilayered problems in secondary sphere II require a different treatment. In connection with the inclusion of vocational practice in education there is the question of the duration, but especially of the harmonizing and coordinating; the question of the relations of basic and special education (often confused with the question of the proportion of "general education" to vocational education) leads into institutional as well as into curricular problems (education by grades); the question of the equality of vocational and general education is today aspired to partly through the elimination of the separation between the two systems and through facilitation of the transition, partly through special encouragement of the proper character of the vocational sphere of education as an autonomous and justified system in secondary sphere II. The question of equality also plays a role in the admission to the university curriculum, which possesses a strategic function not only for the total educational and business system of a country but also for the life chances of a person leaving secondary sphere II. To the extent that the completion of secondary sphere II not only ends an extended basic education and not only qualifies for entry into the earning world, but also opens up access to study in the tertiary sphere, its function is by no means clearly defined. On the one hand it represents only one of several conditions which must be present if one wishes to continue to study. In the Soviet Union, for example, only the qualification for competition for a study position is connected with the completion of the ten-year school, whose concluding ninth and tenth classes are regarded as "complete middle school," that is, secondary grade II, but the distribution of the study position depends on further conditions, including the annual numbers in the state education and labor force plan, the results of the examination for entrance into the university, and so forth. The former German regulation which required both the school-leaving examination as well as the general qualification for the university constituted the other extreme. The older rule on the school-leaving examination had to be modified from the mid-1960s for the study courses or the university positions for which more applications were available than could be accommodated. This is being done with the aid of a central admission office.[29]

The Church's exertions and interests in education had lost their institutional basis in most European states because of the complete devastation produced by the Enlightenment and secularization. Where other means did not succeed, the Church had to substitute for what had been lost in popular breadth (ecclesiastical inspection of the school system) and pedagogical concepts (Jesuit schools) by means of specific education and *caritas*. Hence there appeared under the auspices of clerical orders educational institutions in the area, traditionally reserved to the control of the home, of the education of girls as well as the care and instruction of the handicapped. Concern for ecclesiastical recruits was expressed in the promotion of boarding schools of humanistic style and in the founding of regionally important boarding schools at state humanistic high schools.

In the Netherlands there developed an unusually strong denominational educational system: it had been desired by both the Calvinist and the Catholic side and was not only formally assured in 1917—"the imparting of instruction is free"—but also with regard to the claim to state support. A law of 1920 made basic schools of a public and a private character financially equal. In 1960 a secondary school law followed this. Similarly favorable conditions exist in Belgium, where more than half of all students receive instruction in Catholic schools. Spain also, since the Franco era, offers the Catholic Church a wide influence: it is socially acknowledged as an educational power, consults with state tribunals on educational problems, imparts religious instruction in all schools, possesses a number of its own teaching institutes, and has control of not a few others. In France, of course, as a consequence of the laicism doctrine of the state, the Church is excluded from the public educational system, but privately it is not only tolerated but, since the Fifth Republic, it is also strongly supported. The basis of the favorable relationship between the state and the private school system was the "Rapport Lappie," which in 1959 saw to the passage of a law which permitted the state to conclude support agreements with private schools. In 1965 at least every fourth secondary pupil attended a private institution, most of them a Catholic one.[30]

---

[29] Cf. H. Scheuerl, *Gliederung des deutschen Schulwesens* (=*Deutscher Bildungsrat, Gutachten und Studien der Bildungskommission, 2*) (Stuttgart 1968); S.B. Robinsohn, ed., *Schulreform im gesellschaftlichen Prozess. Ein interkultureller Vergleich* I (*Bundesrepublik Deutschland* by C. Kuhlmann, *DDR* by K.D. Mende, *Soviet Union* by D. Glowka) (Stuttgart 1970).

[30] W. Schultze, *Schulen in Europa* I (Germany), II (France, Netherlands, Belgium), III (Spain, Italy).

The special German type of denominational school in the public school area, that is, the primary and secondary school conducted under state auspices but denominationally defined in personnel and program, has, since the second half of the 1960s, been merged into Christian community schools, which could better do justice to the pedagogical and educational-economic demands. The compatibility of these community schools with the constitution was declared by the Supreme Court in the spring of 1976. The compatibility with the principles of Catholic school policy is no longer challenged by the bishops.[31]

In the United States legal and social obstacles to a Catholic education in the framework of the public schools were experienced by the Catholic minority, differently than in Germany. On the other hand, the Catholic parochial school movement that took place led since the second half of the nineteenth century to the construction of an institutional pedagogical substructure for a Catholic educational system, which in 1920 included more than 6,500 primary schools with over 40,000 teachers and 1.7 million pupils.

In 1960 there were already 4.5 million pupils in these schools. Besides the parochial schools, which constituted the greatest number of Catholic primary schools, there were also, chiefly in connection with secondary schools, primary schools under the sponsorship of religious institutes and, in lesser number, also under the sponsorship of lay Catholics—the Montessori schools.

Still greater than in the primary sphere was the growth of Catholic schools in the secondary sphere. If in 1920 there were still little more than 1,500 schools with just about 130,000 pupils, their number had grown in 1960 to almost 2,400 schools with more than 800,000 pupils. The size of schools measured against the number of pupils per school tripled or quadrupled in this period so that more and more secondary schools outgrew the financial and administrative capacities of the parishes and, often under the responsibility of religious institutes, became diocesan schools. (The first central high school arose in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in the 1890s.) Today about 40 percent of all Catholic youth of school age attend a Catholic high school, and this even though their attendance is subject to tuition. In view of the mounting costs of building and maintaining schools, conditioned among other things by the increase of lay teachers, it of course is to be expected that the Catholic school system in the United States can for the present experience no further expansion.

---

[31] For the development of the relations of educational science and school to the Catholic Church see now K. Erlinghagen, "Katholische Kirche und Erziehung und Bildung," G. Gorschenek, ed., *Katholiken und ihre Kirche* (=G 200–202) (Munich and Vienna 1976), 240ff. (246). Numbers for Catholic school statistics in *Kirchliches Handbuch. Amtliches statistiches Jahrbuch der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands,* ed. by F. Groner, 23(1944–51), pt. 5. Between 1944 and 1951 the proportion in denominational popular schools in Germany was 86 percent; 58 percent were Catholic.

The educational aims and methods in the Catholic schools developed in close connection with those of the public and non-Catholic schools. They, like these latter, were fixed in the vicissitudes of the national history—World War I, New Deal, World War II, sputnik shock, and the like—and dependent on the intellectual impulses, such as J. Dewey's pragmatism, and social movements like coeducation, the civil rights movement, and so forth.[32] Nevertheless, they gained powerful help from the papal educational teaching, especially the encyclical *Divini illius Magistri* of Pius XI. The seven goals to which Catholic schools in the United States are directed are a pragmatic combination of general and specific Catholic principles in the educational sphere. Students should be: (1) intelligent Catholics, (2) spiritually vigorous Catholics, (3) cultured Catholics, (4) healthy Catholics, (5) vocational Catholics, (6) social-minded Catholics, (7) American Catholics.[33]

TERTIARY SPHERE

In the tertiary sphere a distinction must be made between universities and instructional places with other professionally qualifying courses—trade schools or higher technical schools, which require as condition of admittance a completion of the secondary sphere II.

The universities have the function of preparing for professional activities which require the employment of scientific knowledge and methods or the capacity for artistic creation. They can but do not have to be places of "research"; where they unite teaching with research, as, for example, the German universities, their rank is higher than if they are specialized technical universities. Modern research in the social and natural sciences is, however, organized more and more outside the tertiary sphere.

In countries with predominant or exclusive auspices of the state the differences of achievement of the universities are indeed less strong than in countries with predominantly free auspices, such as the United States, but the extension of the university sphere set in motion around institutions which were previously to be counted in the secondary sphere II a hitherto unknown process of distinction of level. This process can be employed by state planning and managing for inner classification of "all universities": then new structural classification marks of a uniform university system take the place of the university structure: distinction and classification of courses according to content, duration, completion in more application-oriented and more research-oriented courses with simultaneous coordination of related courses and reciprocal recognition of courses taken and completions. But the distinction of level can also be made institutionally visible and lead to a differentiation of grades within the tertiary sphere.[34]

---

[32] *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 5, 142–46.

[33] *Ibid.* Vols. 13, 21.

With the expansion of the tertiary sphere not only is account taken of the change of professional educators and their increasingly greater scientific and technical specialization but also a quantitative problem is answered. It is hoped that the problem of the mounting inquiry about the place of studies on the basis of increasing opportunities of study—free instruction, subsidizing of living costs out of the public means—can be solved by a large number of brief profession-qualifying studies being offered, which can rank partly as "basic studies" for continuing courses, and by establishing more difficult criteria, such as special qualifications for completion of secondary sphere II, brief studies, entrance examinations, and so forth.

Still, education in the tertiary sphere is not confined to the traditional institutions or those recently added in this sphere; it is also imparted by correspondence courses, which in principle enable the participant to qualify from his place of work at the moment. This type of study is most powerfully cultivated in the Communist countries; during the Khruschev era there were in the Soviet Union more students (54.8 percent) in evening and correspondence courses than in day and direct study (45.2 percent).[35]

In the so-called tertiary sphere there were from time immemorial ecclesiastical functions and interests. Through the stormy development of the post-Enlightenment sciences at the universities the older faculty organization, in which theology occupied the first place, was basically upset: in part it fell into a peripheral situation, in part it had to leave the universities altogether, as at the Université de France. But other goals of the older universities in Catholic countries also changed: first and most important, the cultivation of ecclesiastical and secular sciences on the basis of the Catholic world view, then the integrating, oriented to it, of the special branches of science through the scholarly exertion of the academicians, and finally also the representation of the sciences in the undecided question about an ethically and religiously acceptable meaning of life. The situation at the universities worsened so powerfully here and there that certain universities, according to N. A. Luyten, had to rank as "antireligious fortresses."

---

[34] *Council of Europe, Diversification of Tertiary Education* (Strasbourg 1974).

[35] O. Anweiler et al., *Europäische Bildungssysteme zwischen Tradition und Fortschritt* (Mülheim 1971), 137.

For from the second half of the nineteenth century there had begun, as a reaction to the Enlightenment, secularization, and liberal or laicizing state-Church policies, a movement for the "Catholic University," which was active everywhere but especially where an adequate concordat or corresponding other regulation of the domains of research and education of state and Church, standing side by side or mixed together, was lacking. Since in Germany the on the whole positive development of the nineteenth century was continued beyond the era of the Weimar Republic and, apart from the retarding tendencies during the Nazi period, kept up also after the Second World War, in this country there occurred no founding of "Catholic Universities." Since the 1960s the legal position of the civil and ecclesiastical philosophical and theological universities, for example, in Bavaria, has been regulated on the model of the Catholic faculties at the universities.

In the rest of Europe the situation of the Catholic universities is quite different: in France, where there are such universities at Paris, Lille, Angers, Lyon, and Toulouse—the Université de l'Ouest at Angers was founded as early as 1875, originally to cover the need for teachers for the numerous private Catholic schools of western France—there are statutory restrictions through the circumstance that academic degrees—apart from those in theology—may be granted only by the state Université de France, so that the nontheological faculties of the Catholic universities have established themselves as preparatory institutions for the state examinations.

The rank of a national university for Belgium belongs to the ancient and at the same time Catholic University of Louvain, which by virtue of its Philosophical Institute, associated with Cardinal Mercier, was a leader in Neo-Thomistic research and teaching and which through the breadth of its faculties educated about 50 percent of all students in Belgium—in 1970 about 27,000. However, it was not spared the linguistic strife between the Flemings and Walloons and in 1966 had to be divided into two—Louvain and Ottignies.

The most important Catholic university for Spain, that of Navarre at Pamplona, was only founded in 1960 by *Opus Dei.* Support and direction of this university follow the concordat of 1953, as is true also of the older Catholic universities, for example, Salamanca (1940).

Of special significance for the movement for Catholic universities, appearing in the nineteenth century, is the United States, where today, in addition to a large number of colleges, there are more than thirty-two

Catholic universities; the first of them was founded in 1887 as the Catholic University of America at Washington under the laws of the District of Columbia and two years later was endowed by Leo XIII with papal status by the letter *Magni Nobis Gaudii* of 7 March 1889.

The first function lay in the extension of theological studies, that is, graduate studies, for priests, who obtained their basic training at one of the 125 so-called colleges or ten seminaries. Ten years later there followed a faculty of philosophical and social sciences, in which even black students were enrolled, and women acquired admission in 1928. The Catholic University was supported by the American episcopal conference and all parishes through annual collections; it retained its center of gravity in the area of graduate studies and in the 1960s had about 5,000 students, including 1,300 priests and 400 religious women, but its capacity was considerably greater.

In 1924 there was an attempt at founding an International Federation of Catholic Universities (IFCU) by the newly established Catholic Universities of Milan (1920) and Nijmegen (1923) and the venerable University of Louvain; through this federation the exchange of experience should be institutionalized across national boundaries and the organizational phases of new foundations facilitated. After an interval produced by the war, cooperation was again resumed from Rome in 1949 and the union itself given a canonical status.[36] Today universities of forty countries in Europe, America, Asia, and Africa are united, each of which must, in order to become a member, have at least three faculties, including one for nontheological studies. In Latin American nations there are more than thirty Catholic universities of the most heterogeneous rank—four alone were founded between 1960 and 1964; the most important is probably the Universidad Católica of Chile, with more than 5,000 students. In Canada there are six Catholic universities; the most important is that of Montreal, with over 20,000 students. For Africa the Catholic University Lovanium, founded by Louvain, could gain importance.[37]

In the course of the twentieth century Asia acquired several Catholic universities through missionary institutes from Europe but especially from North America. The University of Aurora was founded in 1903 by French Jesuits at Zikawei, China, and in 1909 transferred to Shanghai. It included faculties for law, natural sciences, the humanities, and medicine. In 1937 the Religious of the Sacred Heart opened there a division for the higher education of women. At Tientsin in 1922 French Jesuits founded an Institut des Hautes Études, which was officially recognized in 1948 as a university under the name Tsinku. But the greatest national and international importance belonged to the Catholic University of Peking, which, founded in 1924 by American Benedictines at the request of Pius XI, was recognized as a state university under the name Fu Jen as early as 1927, and in 1933 was entrusted to the Society of the Divine Word. The three Chinese universities, which enjoyed great repute through their education and scholarship—*Monumenta Serica* of Fu Jen and *Bulletin de l'Université Aurore*—were closed after the Communist seizure of power, and the religious who were not Chinese were expelled. Thus was broken a development to which Teilhard de Chardin had given powerful incentives through his works in the 1920s—discovery of Sinanthropus in 1924. Two Catholic universities—Sophia University at Tokyo in 1913 and Nagoya in 1949—appeared in Japan.[38] At the beginning of the 1960s there were in Asian countries fifteen Catholic universities, whose existence and work were, of course, greatly conditioned by contemporary political circumstances.

---

[36] Apostolic letter *Apostolicas Studiorum Universitates, AAS* 42(1949), 385.

[37] *LThK,* second supplementary volume, 395f.

Nevertheless, more important in the long view must have been the function in the contemporary national and regional context—"educational planning"—and the quality of the research as well as its international radiation. In this sense the Second Vatican Council declared in regard to Christian education at universities: Catholic universities must be disseminated and fostered in a suitable manner to the various parts of the world, however, so that "they should be noteworthy not so much for their numbers as for their high standards. Entry to them should be made easy for students of great promise but of modest resources, and especially for those from newly developed countries" (Declaration on Christian Education, ART. 10).

CONTINUING EDUCATION (EDUCATION OF ADULTS)

In addition to and following the three or four educational areas a broad field is opening for the resumption of learning, which has an abundance of goals, forms, institutions, and organizational conditions. In recent years this field of learning is considered an autonomous and equivalent educational area—*éducation permanente,* life-long learning, recurrent education. Here not only interests beside and beyond the professional should be cultivated, but also social desires of advancement satisfied and, more and more, possibilities be offered for reviving professional knowledge and preparedness. Since rapid social change, the progress of science, and technical progress let professional knowledge become outdated and bring enduring changes in the professional sphere, it has become necessary to carry the phase of the "school year" far beyond the entire professional life. Today one sees in constant further improvement the continuation, completion, and renewal of the educational process in the elementary, primary, secondary, and tertiary spheres, and also an alternative to these.[39]

---

[38] A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte. Die Ausbreitung des katholischen Glaubens* (Regensburg 1960), 472, and S. Delacroix, ed., *Histoire Universelle des Missions Catholiques* 3 (Paris 1958), 273.

The area of constant further improvement can be brought, in accord with its multifunctionality, only with difficulty under uniform institutional rules. In countries where various social groups, groups of the economy, the Churches, the communities, and so forth, participate in the educational function of this sphere, it is necessary to produce an indispensable minimum in community through local and supralocal collaboration of the agents of the institutions of further development or through the bringing together of previously separately pursued educational aims, especially of the professional and the general political, cultural, and other areas. Recently the attempt has been made, in the framework of uniform curricula and on the basis of a legal "educational leave," to grant to the professionally related education a certain preference and to orient the structure of the further improvement sphere to professional requirements—accumulation of course credits, certificates, demands on the educational personnel, and so forth.

Catholic adult education in Europe was a reply to the challenge of the first Enlightenment, which varied according to respective historical conditions. Its history is still scarcely investigated, although more so in Germany and Austria (I. Zangerle). In Germany Catholic adult education was set up as a popular enlightenment with an apologetic purpose and from the middle of the nineteenth century entered the circle of popular educational movements, where it sought to impart in "schools for adults" a "general Christian instruction," as in the *Katholische Verein Deutschlands* of 1848. After the first aim—the gathering of the Catholic parts of the population into unions and associations—had been accomplished and its ideological and political consolidation against liberalism had succeeded, the second aim became prominent in view of the *Kulturkampf,* namely, to contribute to the formation of consciousness and to defend the status achieved. With the relaxing of the danger, this aim decayed and gave way to cultivation of popular education until, under the direction of A. Heinen and the influence of the Hohenrodt League, new impulses flowed into the Popular Union for Catholic Germany—

---

[39] E. King et al., *Post-Compulsory Education, A New Analysis in Western Europe* (London and Beverly Hills 1974), 44.

"intensive" or "formative" popular education. The period between the First and the Second World Wars is characterized by exertions for new organizational forms of cooperation between the Catholic associations and societies—Central Educational Committee of All Catholic Societies of Germany (ZBA)—and new concepts of education—in 1925 the first Catholic Congress of Popular Education at Paderborn; to be sure, the Catholic work of education remained within the bounds of its tradition and its sociophilosophical, historically scarcely specified principles and opened itself up not at all or only weakly to the historical reality of the political society of its time. Thus, facing Nazi domination, it remained politically isolated and was abolished together with the rest of social Catholicism—in 1933 dissolution of the ZBA. After 1945 Catholic adult education first joined the surviving institutional remains of the prewar period—independent evening studies at home, and so forth—after 1950, stimulated by the example of the Protestant academies, in Catholic academies, which understood themselves as places for "the dialogue of the Church with the world," in the words of B. Hanssler. The former orientation to the education of workers, farmers, and artisans was not thereby abandoned, but perhaps changed in favor of a strengthened inclusion of groups related to the intellectual.[40] Finally there occurred the construction of local educational works, which competed with the popular universities and other institutions and often played an important role within the local or regional educational offerings. From the juxtaposition of various Catholic educational institutions ensued not only a need for organizational agreement in the inner-ecclesiastical field, for example, in 1957 the Federated Workers' Community for Catholic Adult Education (BAG); there resulted also the necessity of reaching agreement with the competing institutions of continuing education. A powerful impulse to this came, on the part of the state, from new regulations of the public subsidies, a second from the pedagogical and adult education discussion conducted under the catchword "emancipation" since the mid-1960s, and a third impulse, still hardly to be evaluated in its consequences, from the Second Vatican Council. The pastoral constitution on the Church in the Modern World accelerated the end of the older integrally conceived Catholic adult education in Germany and caused a revolutionary consideration of new ways of adult education under Catholic auspices.

---

[40] F. Messerschmid, "Geschichte der Katholischen Akademien," F. Pöggeler, ed., *Handbuch der Erwachsenenbildung* 4 (Stuttgart 1975), 208ff.

In Austria this development was already indicated since the "radical new beginning" of 1945 on the basis of other historical assumptions and especially of the line of conflict moving in Catholicism itself between social status and class-oriented thought.[41] The Federated Workers' Community for Catholic Adult Education in Austria (BAKEB), founded in 1963, belongs, like its German sister union (BAG), to the European Federation for Adult Education (FEECA), founded in 1963, in which cooperation among the German-speaking members is especially close.

In the United States the Church's adult education was up to the Second World War little more than a part of the traditional social and mission work. The new era of the adult education movement began in the 1950s and reached certain high points in the 1960s. They were connected with the consolidation of the Church's outside and assistance services, the spread of the ideas of adult education, and the initiatives of the Second Vatican Council. Three currents now determined the Churches' adult education: the ecumenical movement, the involvement of the Churches with the national problems of the United States—poverty, racism—appearances of secularization in the formerly Puritan-oriented public. The model of the Churches' adult education, which was also adopted by Catholic adult education, was the Indiana Plan, developed in 1954 by P. Bergevin and McKinley and published in 1970, which tested new principles of the education of mature students in a scientifically accompanied series of seminars. With the adaptation of the plan proceeded a consolidation of the organization; in 1958 the National Catholic Education Association was founded, which in 1959 published the *Handbook of Catholic Adult Education.* The social extent of the Church's adult education in the United States is considerable; 12 percent of the participants in adult education took part in 1962 in the courses offered by churches and synagogues; a total of 3.2 million.[42]

Catholic adult education in Europe and the United States will be powerfully affected in the future by the trends which appeared at the Third International UNESCO Conference; there a worldwide development for an integrated, publicly responsible, internationally solidified, functional, scientifically based, and professionalized adult education was noted. Whether and in what form such peculiarly Catholic adult education will maintain itself in such trends will depend on many circumstances, such as: whether the upsetting impact of the Second Vatican Council will be followed by a phase of critical and believing reconstruction, whether the next generation of educators of adults recognizes this task as its own and possesses the necessary prerequisites for it, and finally, whether the political and social circumstances for an at least partly self-determined activity of free agents will be maintained or will have to be secured anew.

---

[41] Cf. I. Zangerle, "Geschichte der katholischen Erwachsenenbildung," F. Pöggler, ed., op. cit. (n. 40), 208ff.

[42] F. Laack, *Die amerikanische Bildungswirklichkeit. Idee, Stand und Probleme der Adult Education in den USA* (Cologne 1976), 88, 150, 154ff.

Conditions for Catholic Education in Other Areas of the World

In contradistinction to Europe and North America, where the ecclesiastical educational system was active within the national educational traditions and was operated or controlled by native Churches, in the other regions of the world other and often very complicated circumstances exist. On the basis of the statistical situation only a survey of the schools and universities of the primary to the tertiary sphere is here given; again among them the part current in ecclesiastical sponsorship stands in the center of interest. It acts as representative of the "Catholic educational system."[43]

Latin America differs in a specific way from the only recently decolonized states of Africa and Asia. On the one hand the instruction remains oriented to the leading families at the schools of the countries of their origin;[44] on the other hand, cultural fusions and admixtures of races have occurred which have permitted the rise of a special Latin American society and proper national cultures, whose development perspective seems in no sense about to come to terms with the Western or Communist industrial nations.[45] Seen as a whole, the efficacy of the institutionalized educational system was slight: every other inhabitant of the Latin American continent is illiterate, the shares of the gross national product destined for the educational system are less than those of the industrialized nations. To be sure, the portions have gradually increased since the 1950s. For example, Mexico in 1958 invested 1.5

---

[43] The statistics in this part refer, unless otherwise noted, always to the Catholic educational system under private or "free" auspices; cf. also CIEO, *Études et Documents* no. 5: *The Situation of Catholic Education in the Various Continents* (Brussels 1969).

[44] For the Catholic universities see the section "Tertiary Sphere," above.

[45] Cf. E. L. Stehle, *Indio-Latein Amerika* (Düsseldorf and Oberhaussen 1971); A. García, "Die lateinamerikanische Theologie der Befreiung, I" *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift,* 2d year (1973), no. 2, 400ff.; R. Vekemans, "Die lateinamerikanische Theologie der Befreiung II. Ein Literaturbericht," ibid., D., 434ff.

percent of the national product in education, in 1963 it was 2.7 percent and in 1966 3.1 percent.[46]

The Church's historical role in the educational system is seen in the strong share of church institutions in the school and university area. Of course, for the longest time they were not attuned to the developmental needs of the country and in function and organization they were both incomplete and unbalanced. The defects of the public educational system were uninterruptedly expressed in the ecclesiastical educational system: there was a lack of institutions for mass education—"eradication of illiteracy"—for professional education, for the training of middle-level administrative personnel, and so forth. Thirteen percent of the pupils attended Catholic institutions. The highest percentage, over 25 percent, was reached in Bolivia and Chile, followed by Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, and Guatemala, with from 20 to 15 percent, then by Argentina, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela, with 15 to 10 percent, and, finally, with less than 10 percent in Costa Rica, Honduras, and Paraguay. The religious instruction of the mass of those of school age is not assured and can only partly be accomplished by extra-school institutions. The connection of the school system with the state means only in a few cases regular subsidies for building and maintenance costs, as especially in Argentina, Chile, and Surinam; in other countries there is no established financial help, for example, in Colombia, except for the Catholic universities, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Peru. Since the increased social tensions of the 1950s and the revolutionary disturbances of the 1960s, the Latin American Church has powerfully exerted itself for the expanding and renewing of its educational commitments.[47] In 1963 the Permanent Secretariat of the Latin American Episcopal Conference at Bogotá (CELAM) was reorganized. It has prepared the realization of the conciliar documents *Gaudium et spes* and the Declaration on Christian Education on the Latin American continent. The outcome of its work was the resolution "Human Development," issued in 1968 by the Second General Assembly of the Latin American Bishops at Medellín, in which is said: "Latin America seems to be still living under the tragic sign of underdevelopment, which separates our brethren not only from the enjoyment of material goods but also from their own human realization." Education, hence the achieving of Catholic schools, is defined in this situation as the "decisive factor in the development of the continent." The direction in which the development should go—the "total development of the person and of all persons"—must be made possible and encouraged by education; in view of the magnitude of the task, systematic education by means of schools or colleges is not enough; so far as Catholic schools take part in education, they must admit all social classes without discrimination—"democratization." The Catholic school should be open to its local and Latin American environment, pursue its adaptation and reorganization, be open to ecumenical dialogue, and become the cultural, social, and intellectual center within society. In an effort to achieve the goal of an open-minded and democratic Catholic school, the Episcopal Conference of Medellín supported the right to free choice of school and suitable financial contribution.[48] The Christian educational impulses are no longer communicated only through canon law or theology but through sociology and educational planning.

---

[46] P. Latapí, *Diagnostico Educativo Nacional, Centro de Estudios Educativos* (Mexico City 1964). The relatively high state of illiteracy must be seen in relation to the increase of population and the contemporary decrease of the proportion (cf. also UNESCO, *World Survey* (n. 1), Vol. 5, 66f. Between 1960 and 1966 the proportion of the school population in the total population rose from 14 to 18 percent.

[47] Cf. J. R. Vaccaro, "Latin America," in CIEO, *Études de Documents* no. 5 (n. 43 above), Doc. 3.3.

The significance of this document is great: It places the national organizations of the Latin American Church under a common reform, even, in each case according to the situation, revolutionary program, brings it, again according to the circumstances, into conflict with state offices, and sets up for broad circles of the population not only a sign of hope but also a standard by which the actions of the ecclesiastical agents of education can be measured.

The educational system supported by the Churches of Africa is due, as in Asia, to Christianity, which in wide areas accompanied European colonialism and imperialism. The European missionary institutes represented a European program of education, which reflected the proper character and interest of the colonial power of the time, "displaced education."[49] The European face of educational policy is still especially visible in Africa.[50]

France's *mission civilisatrice* demanded a centralized and laicized school system also in the colonies. British colonial power aimed at an African society by means of the principle of "indirect rule," employed vernacular languages, and encouraged in its sphere private educators, especially mission societies. The Belgians promoted Catholic mission schools in the Congo for the aims of a controlled social life and of an economy that would supplement the home economy. The training of administrative personnel, which meant little to the total Belgian colonial policy, did not take place; an exception was the training of clergy. For the rest it was typical of most African areas that only a basic schooling was allowed to the blacks. In South Africa, South West Africa, and Rhodesia must be added the special circumstances of a white Africanism, which sought to maintain itself ethnically, socially, and politically against a native and partly united black majority and subordinated the educational policy also to this end.

---

[48] *Die Kirche in der gegenwärtigen Umwandlung Lateinamerikas* (see n. 18).

[49] See, besides the titles given in n. 38, especially H. Jedin, "Weltmission und Kolonialismus," *Saeculum,* 1958, 393ff.; M. Merle, *Les Églises Chrétiennes et la Décolonisation* (Paris 1967); S. Neill, *Colonialism and Christian Missions* (London 1966).

[50] Also from the sociological viewpoint: T. Hanf, *Erziehung und politischer Wandel in Schwarzafrika* (n. 2).

The situation of the Catholic educational system changed[51] when, after the Second World War, the epoch of the decolonization of Asia and Africa began, and new leading powers with new methods and aims appeared. In addition to the United States there were the Soviet Union and from the 1960s the People's Republic of China, as well as a few smaller Communist states, such as Cuba and the People's Republic of Vietnam. Arab nationalism in the Near and Middle East consolidated the position of Islam, and the political and cultural influence of Europe declined. In this age of total change there appeared in the former colonial territories two currents, both equally unfavorable to the Catholic educational system: the first, more cultural and political, was awaking nationalism; the second, more economic and sociopolitical, was the policy of development. "Nation building" and socioeconomic development became the goals of official policy; the educational system should also contribute to its realization. More than once nation building was based on precolonial—and this usually means non-Christian—traditions; also the ideologies with which the policy of development, especially that of a Marxist orientation, were supposed to be supported proved to be hostile to the Christian. Instruction in European languages, especially in the primary sphere, was restricted, special proofs of training were made obligatory on the teaching personnel, the legal position of the Catholic school system became insecure. If "nation building" and development are understood as the entire political function in the hand or under the control of the state, then it appears inevitable that the freedom to found and maintain schools, on the basis of which the missionary system had developed, had to be curtailed.

The African states rising to sovereignty were not inclined to let the status quo of the colonial educational system continue. As soon as they saw the means and ways to liquidate it they did so. Still, it did not yet succeed everywhere. Some nations took the school into the state's monopoly and gave to the Catholic private schools, in addition to the state schools, a legal status of their own—Zaire, Tanzania, Burundi, Ruanda—others decreed, as a sign of the state's school monopoly, the suppression or assumption of control of private Catholic schools by the state—Republic of Congo, Guinea, the Central African Empire, Sudan, Malawi, Ghana before 1967, and most recently the revolutionary socialist states of Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Somalia.

---

[51] Cf. M. Ekwa, "Africa," CIEO, *Études et Documents* no. 5, Doc. 3.2, and the report based on Ekwa: *Catholic Education in the Service of Africa, Report of the Panafrican Catholic Education Conference* (August 1965).

The situation of the Catholic school system at the beginning of the 1960s, for which there are statistics, was as follows in Africa: The Catholic proportion in the total African population then amounted to ca. 10 percent—25 out of 270 million. Of African pupils, every third went to a Catholic school. In the individual states these averages differed greatly: Of fifty-six states nine had a Catholic proportion in their population of more than 40 percent, thirty of less than 10 percent. Hence there was in only a few states a developed and capable school system, especially in the former Belgian Congo, but Catholic schools, wherever they existed, performed as much as two-thirds of their services for non-Catholics and were an important site of the encounter of non-Christians with Christians of various denominations, especially with Catholics. As special problems, finally, the following presented themselves: number and quality of teachers, their missionary motivation, their situation in regard to payment—only a few states, such as Zaire, have the means and the intention to pay salary supplements to the regular teacher salaries in Catholic schools—and the conscious share of Catholic schools in nation building and development.

Such questions were treated at regional conferences since the spring of 1967 and placed under the express command to base Catholic education on the principles stated in the conciliar texts, as well as concretize these principles in the light of the special African problems.

The strengthening of the racial unrest and of the nationalist movement in the white-dominated Apartheid states of the south and southwest has since 1976 led the Catholic schools, despite all repressive measures, to depart from the state policy of racial separation and to open their doors to pupils of all races.

In the Near and Middle East, as regards the religious situation, Catholics are an express minority and face an uncommonly complicated situation.[52] The countries of this part of the world belong mostly to Islam—the states of the Arab League—partly to Orthodoxy—Greece and Cyprus—or to Judaism—Israel; only one state has a considerable Catholic proportion in the total population—Lebanon. In this area in the mid-1960s a half-million pupils attended Catholic schools, a number which, meanwhile, especially after the destruction of Beirut and many Christian localities, has probably declined considerably. Christianity in this part of the world contains two elements—a missionary and a native—Maronites, Copts, Chaldeans, Orthodox. Both were or are, each in its own way, active in the educational sphere. The native and mostly rural worshipping communities have for centuries given instruction in language and literature in order to maintain their cultic-religious integrity in the midst of a foreign-speaking and foreign-believing environment—instruction under the mulberry tree on a stone. Mission communities aspired to European educational standards and soon became the urban center of attraction for non-Catholic pupils. In Lebanon the complete and well attended Catholic schools were recognized and subsidized by the state.

---

[52] Cf. also I. Maroun, "Near and Middle East," CIEO, *Études et Documents* no. 5., Doc. 3.1.

The problems of the Catholic school system of today agree in much with those which occur in Africa and have to do with the historical burden of the former colonially useful institutions, with the orientation to European educational standards, not least with the claim to partial independence vis-à-vis the state school system. The stresses of the colonial period are seen in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, and Libya, and will, if at all, only then be eliminated when the native population again asks about the good services of mission schools and is allowed to ask. In this way the political aspect is indicated: In socialist Arabic countries Catholic schools were in many places abolished. In the other nations of the Islamic world they are at least subject to pressure, not least through the coordination practice of the Arab UNESCO, the regional branch of UNESCO formed by the Arab League, which strives for the regional uniformity of teaching and learning to the disadvantage of the Catholic school system. It is self-evident that under such conditions the principles of the council can only with difficulty be employed and developed in the Catholic educational sphere and all depends on whether the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, rules of the United Nations, the Charter of UNESCO on non-discrimination in questions of education and teaching are observed by the states which once agreed to them.

Most difficult of all is the situation of the Catholic educational system under the conditions in Asia. Of the seventeen countries evaluated in the 1968 report of the CIEO,[53] only the Philippines may be regarded as a Catholic country—the Catholic proportion is more than 80 percent—

---

[53] Cf. W. Perfecto, "Asia," CIEO, *Études et Documents* no. 5., Doc. 3.4.

Macao and Vietnam just reach 10 percent, all the others are far less. India, for example, in 1966 estimated 60 million pupils and students, of whom 1.8 million attended Catholic educational institutions—860,000 were themselves Catholic, hence less than half of those who were in these schools. The figure of 50,000 pupils and students in Catholic institutions given for Cambodia, out of a total of 650,000, is surely out of date since the seizure of power by the Communists.

The political changes on the map of Asia since the late 1940s have worsened the situation for the Catholics more and more.[54] Even where the Communists did not come to power, the Catholic educational system can develop only a small part of the impact to which it is destined. Often the non-Catholic environment demands that the missionary and pastoral character of the Catholic schools be suppressed; in Islamic lands, like Egypt and Pakistan, or Buddhist countries "ethics" or even a non-Catholic religion must be taught. If, as in the Philippines, thirty of one hundred pupils in the primary and secondary sphere take part in Catholic religious instruction, this is an extremely favorable condition for the Asian area. In some countries maintenance costs for Catholic schools are subsidized by the government, since institutions do not yet exist; in this context strict controls are ordinarily exercised. In Malaysia and Singapore the government even appoints the teaching personnel in agreement with the ecclesiastical authorities.

The range of Catholic schools is of importance regionally rather than socially; true, they partly penetrate deeply into areas not reached by the government, but they affect only the upper strata. Since the Second World War not a few of today's leading personalities attended Catholic schools. The future of these schools is seen less in quantitative expansion than in an enhancement of quality.

Among the aims is the substitution of European by qualified native teachers and the adaptation of native cultural traditions, then the recognizable tying of the educational work of Catholic schools into the development program of the respective governments. At the same time this means recognition of differentiated services for the Church: from the religious education of Catholic children to collaboration in a formation, worthy of human beings, of the social circumstances in the particular country.[55]

---

[54] Cf. for the China mission: A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte* (n. 38), 472f.

[55] The discussion on the services of the Church, by which the question of educational offerings is also affected, today finds a loud echo in the framework of missiology (cf. also J. M. Van Engelen, "Tendenzen in der Missiologie der Gegenwart," *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift,* 3d year (1974), no. 3, 230ff.

CHAPTER 13

*Information and the Mass Media**

Among those social changes which affected the Church's activity in essential points in the twentieth century were the developments in the field of mass communication. True, the Church and journalism always stood in certain reciprocal relations, and the critical confrontation with the press as it was becoming free had already started in the first decades of the nineteenth century, for example, under Gregory XVI.[1] However, the twentieth century first produced that full development of those "instruments of social communication"—the Vatican linguistic usage since 1963—which are summarized under the notion of mass media or means of mass communication: to the modern press in its forms as informing and opinion making daily and weekly with a large circulation, recreational press, and specialist press have been added the cinema, radio, and television. Their technical development, as in general the industrialization of publicity production, evoked also the development of new agents of public communications offerings which caused new markets to appear: phonograph records, recording tape, eight-millimeter film, video disk, and, not to be forgotten, the paperback, which is changing the book market.

Since the turn of the century the Church saw or sees itself facing essentially five important phenomena and developments in mass communication with which it must come to terms; for changes in the mass communication system of particular nations, of entire cultural groups, and in individual cases even of "world society" affect the activity of the Church, especially in its mandate to preach and in its pastoral commission. These five points are: (1) the decline, in some countries the disappearance, of the "opinion press"; (2) the new, so-called audiovisual media—cinema, radio, television; (3) the grasping of totalitarian political systems for the publicity institutions in various countries; (4) the completely new tasks and opportunities which result for the use of communications means in the underdeveloped countries; and (5) the disintegration of the "Catholic public" in countries or cultural groups where this concept of practical journalism,[2] but also of pastoral work, had been used for decades with some justification. As a sixth point, which however arose not against the Church but from the Church as a reaction to the journalistic opposition, the organizational and, recently, theoretical confrontation of the Church with mass communication deserves special notice.

---

* Michael Schmolke

[1] Cf., for example, even though outdated, L. Bethleem, *La Presse* (Paris 1928); also, for the sake of the contemporary sources, R. Pesch, *Die kirchlich-politische Presse der Katholiken in der Rheinprovinz vor 1848* (Mainz 1966); M. Schmolke, *Die schlechte Presse. Katholiken und Publizistik zwischen "Katholik" und "Publik" 1821–1968* (Münster 1971), and for the Protestant side, despite the misleading title, K. W. Bühler, *Presse und Protestantismus in der Weimarer Republik* (Witten 1970).

[2] "Journalism" is used as a generic term for any public and actual social communication, hence also for its pretechnical forms; it is then only feasible to speak of mass communication if social communication is effected by means of the modern, technically conditioned media—press, film, radio, and television.

As useful as these categories are for the analysis of our theme, still they are not all, on the basis of their differing time dimensions, suited for the historical classification of the subject; they will appear in various sections as aspects of new problems.

The Catholic Claim and the "Colorless Press"

If the Catholic discussion of journalism in the nineteenth century was predominantly determined by the struggle against the "bad press"—*mauvaise presse, stampa perversa, stampa negativa*—the early twentieth century brought a new enemy: more correctly, the knowledge that, in addition to the "bad," that is, the liberal, socialist, and occasionally even Protestant press, a new form of newspaper had appeared—the "colorless press." The Catholic press, as the only "good press," was, to be sure, respected by many Catholic critics only as the lesser evil,[3] but it still had gained some noteworthy initial successes in the last third of the century that was ending. Proud of enterprises such as *De Tijd* (1845), *Kölnische Blätter* (1860; from 1869 *Kölnische Volkszeitung*), *Germania* (1871), or *La Croix* (from 1883 as a daily), for some time it was overlooked that meanwhile a new type of newspaper had appeared—the informative newspaper, *presse d'information,* which, differing from the classical type of the nineteenth century, the "opinion newspaper," abandoned partisanship or clear ideological lines. The Catholic press, on the contrary, was conceivable only as an "opinion press"; also the many small papers, which the statistics of founding of Catholic newspapers show to have increased during the *Kulturkampf*[4] or a little later as foundations of local or regional "press associations," especially in

---

[3] J. Lukas, *Die Presse, ein Stück moderner Versimpelung* (Regensburg 1867), 116: "The press as it has sprouted up today, is a great evil; our Catholic press is something good because it is the lesser evil."

[4] Cf. M. Schmolke, "Zur Gliederung der katholischen Pressegeschichte Deutschlands," *Communicatio Socialis* (=*CS*) 3(1970), 311–27.

Bavaria and Austria,[5] took care of further growth, were, despite their character as local papers, opinion newspapers. In the United States (*The Sun,* 1833; *The New York Herald,* 1835), in France (*La Presse* and *Le Siècle,* 1836), and in England (*Daily Telegraph and Courier,* 1855), newspapers "for all," which in order to achieve the widest possible circulation not only lowered their price but also renounced partisanship, had existed the longest.[6] In Germany the first newspapers of this sort occasionally appeared from 1871, using the title, or element in the title, of "general advertiser." The idea soon had an unpleasant connotation. The general advertising press lacked staunchness, and this is what constituted its "colorlessness." The fact that the "colorless press" was a publishing success, that, in regard to the issues, only with it did the age of the mass press begin, only made it more suspect.

The general advertisers were the "bad press" of a new sort, which were regularly condemned in Germany from 1889 at the general Catholic meetings: "Away with these wolves in sheep's clothing from all Catholic houses, from all Catholic families, from all Catholic communities!" said Ernst Lieber in 1895. Authors such as Joseph Eberle, Viktor Kolb, later Felix Hardt, and a legion of pamphlets struggled against undermining tendencies. Especially typical of this phase of the "press apostles" are the books of Joseph Eberle (*Grossmacht Presse*[7]) and Giuseppe Chiaudano (*Il Giornalismo Cattolico*[8]). While Eberle chiefly denounced the general non-Catholic press, Chiaudano made clear all that the Catholic press must not do, but which north of the Alps it had long presumed to do, for example, in the discussion of *dubia* or the criticism of ecclesiastical decisions, in opposition to the Jesuit father's statements on the "necessità dello spirito di disciplina e di obbedienza." And the Code of Canon Law summarizes in Title XXIII the rules of censorship and prohibition, which, in consequence of a strict observance, had made almost impossible to Catholics a normal participation in the journalism of the time, active and passive. Where they took part in social communication as publishers, journalists, and readers, they could never entirely do this, if they were conscientious, without a bad conscience. The broken relationship of the Church to journalism had by no means been overcome when the age of the "new media" began.

---

[5] Cf. K. Nüssler, *Geschichte des Katholischen Pressvereins* (Diss. Munich 1954); R. Kohlbach, *Kreuz und Feder* (Graz 1933); K.M. Stepan, *Stückwerk im Spiegel* (Graz and Vienna 1949).

[6] W. B. Lerg, "Die Anfänge der Zeitung für alle," W. B. Lerg, M. Schmolke, eds., *Massenpresse und Volkszeitung* (Assen 1968), 1–46.

[7] J. Eberle, *Grossmacht Presse. Enthüllungen für Zeitungsgläubige, Forderungen für Männer* (Mergentheim 1910), 3d ed. (Regensburg and Vienna 1920).

[8] G. Chiaudano, *Il giornalismo cattolico* (Turin 1910).

Film and Radio in the Early Phase

Shortly before the turn of the century film presentations, at first as *varieté* attractions, and since 1920 the radio were ready for the use of the public. The early history of the Church's confrontation with these new media has as yet hardly been investigated. It can be taken as certain that at first it was not recognized as a publicity medium of general social and political relevance. Popular education and art were the spheres to which the cinema—the first term used for the movies—and the radio were assigned. With the catchword "educational functions" people noticed them quite early, at least in Central Europe, while in the United States, which quickly developed into the motherland of the great film industry, ecclesiastical attention was focused more strongly on the excesses of the content of the moving picture. For example, at the general assemblies of the Catholics of Germany there was criticism of the "poisoned abuses of the cinema," but at Aachen in 1912 in *Kino-Reform-Anträgen* there was adherence to the goal of the "positive reform work." Today it is almost forgotten that as early as 1910, in the framework of the Popular Association for Catholic Germany at Mönchen-Gladbach, there was founded the "Photographic Society with Limited Liability," which provided, loaned, or supplied together with the necessary equipment slide series and soon didactic films. A series of writings, *Lichtbühnen-Bibliothek* and the technical periodical *Bild und Film* (from 1912), supplemented the offering until the First World War ended these constructive efforts.[9] After the war the film work and the Catholic radio work, at first pursued by free initiative, settled in special workers' groups in the Central Educational Committee of the Catholic Associations of Germany (ZBA), founded in 1919.

Of course, both the ZBA and the Fulda Episcopal Conference at first hesitated when, after the official beginning of public radio broadcasting in Germany in October 1923, possibilities resulted for ecclesiastical collaboration in the organizing of broadcasting. The broadcasting of liturgical actions, a problem which has not been thoroughly discussed even today, caused anxiety, while access under the titles of art and popular education was less problematic.[10] More eagerness for risks was present in the movie: with its own production firms—Leo-Film of Munich in 1927, Eidophon of Berlin—a Catholic share in moving picture offerings could be financed. But the enterprise was a failure, and in 1933 Leo-Film dragged the Munich Leohaus, the chief office of the Catholic social associations, into bankruptcy. Film work as an educational function and increasingly as a function of a protecting pastoral theology was, however, able to consolidate itself. The American example of the Legion of Decency, founded in 1933, and its growing influence on American film production made a powerful impression. Also the collaboration in radio was permanently established. True, there was no success, as there was in the Netherlands, Spain, or Portugal, in setting up its own radio system or companies to produce programs. But the intensive cooperation, which was especially pushed by the radio prelate, Bernhard Marschall—"the Catholics have cooperated in radio from the start"[11]—assured the place for the Church's collaboration despite the control over radio quickly instituted by the Nazis.

---

[9] Cf. also E. Ritter, *Die katholisch-soziale Bewegung Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954), 277. A survey of Catholic efforts in regard to the film after World War I are given in a "Kino-Nummer" of the *Augustinus-Blatt* 26(1922), no. 5/6. In preparation: H. Schmitt, *Die kirchliche Filmarbeit in Deutschland von ihren Anfängen bis 1945* (Diss. Bonn).

[10] On this thematic area, G. Bauer, *Kirchliche Rundfunkarbeit 1924–1939* (Frankfurt am Main 1966).

This first phase of the Church's concern with film and radio found a certain conclusion in the establishing of international organizations: In April 1928 the *Office Catholique International du Cinéma* (OCIC) was founded at The Hague, and also in 1928 there appeared, following the Cologne international press exhibition *Pressa,* the *Bureau International de la Radiophonie Catholique*—after World War II, UNDA. The first director of the bureau was Bernhard Marschall, just as earlier the Leo-Film director, Georg Ernst, had assumed the presidency of OCIC.[12] However, in the succeeding years the American model of the Legion of Decency acted as a standard, that is, the practice based on "moral codes," rather amounting to a censorship-like pastoral care of protection, established itself. It found the respect of the American film producers[13] and the approval of the Pope: Pius XI was moved by the work of the legion to issue the film encyclical *Vigilanti cura* in 1936:[14] for the future moral evaluation listings of films were to be issued in all countries and made known to the faithful.

---

[11] Report of the Essen Katholikentag 1932, 241.

[12] Contemporary source: G. Ernst and B. Marschall, eds., *Film und Rundfunk. Zweiter Internationaler Katholischer Filmkongress, Erster Internationaler Katholischer Rundfunkkongress. Gesamtbericht* (Munich 1929).

[13] A Jesuit, Father Daniel Lord, was requisitioned for the elaboration of a "Production Code" as a norm, also the "Hays Moral Code" of 1929–31, renewed in 1939 (V. Engelhardt, *Kirche und Film* [Düsseldorf 1958], 42ff.; U. Gregor, E. Patalas, *Geschichte des Films* [Munich 1973], 205f.).

[14] Cf. C. Ford, *Le Cinéma au service de la foi* (Paris 1953).

The Development of the Catholic Press in the International Survey

When there is mention of "Catholic press," there ordinarily result difficulties in defining it. These arise, on the one hand, from the fact that Catholic press does not have to be an unconditionally ecclesiastical press, and, on the other hand, from the question of the criteria by which a nonecclesiastical but still Catholic press should be determined to be Catholic. In our context "Catholic press" will then be understood if at least one of the following four features is encountered: (1) name, for example, in the title or subtitle: "Catholic Newspaper for . . ." "Diocesan Paper . . ."; (2) connection, with ecclesiastical officials and/or institutions, or Catholic associations, movements, parties; (3) active denominational adherence of the person or group of the editorial board or editor; and (4) clearly recognizable determination of the center of gravity of the content.[15]

The origin of a distinctively Catholic press seems to be promoted by definite social structures but impeded by others: Extreme diaspora situations permit Catholic periodicals to appear only marginally, as the examples of England or of the Scandinavian countries show; but even traditionally purely Catholic societies, wherever possible still with the state-Church character of the Catholic denomination, are not unconditionally favorable to the distinction, for example, Spain and Italy. This changes the moment when strong laicizing or anti-Church movements appear, for example, in France and recently in Poland. Also operating favorably are the existence of approximately equally strong and large denominational groups, the polarization in fashion-setting Christian or socialist-liberal political parties, or also the denominational underpinning of a pluralistic society; to this extent Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands are classic Catholic press countries, and even the United States has produced a varied Catholic press system. Growing prosperity and comprehensive, varied, and politically unhindered assistance with communications offerings seem to weaken the denominational press, as also the party press, whereas political communications pressure—control of the press, bringing the press into line—to the extent that it does not completely eliminate denominational publication, consolidates the remaining agencies. The conditions mentioned here have determined the history of the Catholic press in the twentieth century—naturally, different in the various social and political organizations. For the German-speaking countries of Europe and the Netherlands a similar development has resulted in this connection in so far as the Catholic press usually moves closer to the Catholic parties or supports these parties without its thereby becoming, apart from some exceptions, a strictly regulated party organ, as is the case, for example, with the Communist and Social Democratic Parties as well as the NSDAP. The party relationship developed before the First World War, whereas since the end of the Second World War a growing aloofness becomes discernible.

---

[15] M. Schmolke, *Die schlechte Presse,* 28f.

In Germany until 1933 Catholic press and Center press were de facto identified, despite numerous discussions of differences. Resulting from the *Kulturkampf,* this press reached the quantitative climax of its development shortly before the First World War. Statistics of the "St. Augustinusverein zur Pflege der katholischen Presse," founded in 1878, name 446 "Catholic newspapers" for 1912 and a total number of subscribers of 2.625 million.[16] The number of titles dropped, it is true, after the war, but not greatly—there were 434 in 1931—but of course concentration procedures had taken place, so that for a long time one could no longer speak of 434 independent newspapers; the circulation was then estimated at 2.5 million.[17] (There is no reliable and, as regards categories, uniform statistic of the Catholic press in Germany or elsewhere in the world.[18])

The general customary relation to the Center Party caused the Catholic daily press, after the Nazi seizure of power in 1933 or at the latest after the self-dissolution of the Center, to fall into the category of the "civic" press controlled by the Nazi press. This meant merely that it was not at once eliminated, as was the press of the KPD and SPD by means of the decree for the "Protection of People and State" of 28 February 1933. Goebbels' statement of 4 October 1933—"Absolutely no obstacle stands in the way of the multiformity of the public opinion press"[19]—did not assure the "civic" newspapers any sort of free room. The formerly Catholic among them were, even if at first direct prohibitions were rare, exposed to all the measures of conformity of the

---

[16] W. Kisky, ed., *Der Augustinus-Verein zur Pflege der katholischen Presse von 1878 bis 1928* (Düsseldorf 1928), 227 and 229.

[17] H. Kapfinger, "Die Struktur der katholischen Presse," J. W. Naumann, ed., *Die Presse und der Katholik* (Augsburg 1932), 211–28.

[18] A survey is attempted by O. Groth, *Die Zeitung* II (Mannheim, Berlin, and Leipzig 1929), 436–38. Leads to the statistical sources may be found in M. Schmolke, *Die schlechte Presse,* pp. 395–416; among others, the following indications of literature: K. Bringmann, J. Frizenschaff 1888, M. Grünbeck, F. Hülskamp 1875, H. Keiter 1895 and 1913, W. Kisky, K. Löffler 1924; also the press statistics of L. Woerl, which are given in the bibliography in M. Schmolke, op. cit., 372, n. 147.

[19] "Rede des Reichsministers Dr. Goebbels vor der deutschen Presse bei Verkündung des Schriftleitergesetzes am 4. Oktober 1933," quoted from the copy in H. Schmidt-Leonhardt and P. Gast, *Das Schriftleitergesetz vom 4. Oktober 1933,* 3d ed. (Berlin 1944), 9–22, here 14.

Nazi press policy. In 1934–35 occurred the spectacular throttling of the *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung,* which in the last years of the Weimar Republic had, alongside *Germania* and the *Kölnische Volkszeitung,* acquired a supraregional stamp of a progressive Catholic type. Some papers, such as the *Deutsches Volksblatt* or the *Badischer Beobachter* of Karlsruhe, founded in 1848, found no way to escape the restrictions of an ever increasing number of new directives on press policy, and in 1935 they gave up.[20] Others, such as the *Kölnische Volkszeitung,* which in 1932 had just fallen into an economic crisis affecting its existence, or the *Germania,* were able to survive, but the Catholic legal line of the *Germania* (close to Hitler's first vice chancellor, Franz von Papen) did not always meet with the approval of its public: not suppressed literally but deserted by its own readers, it suspended publication on 31 December 1938.[21] The remaining, mostly smaller, daily press was exposed to various concentration procedures, which were for the most part assisted by Nazi measures. Their aim was to bring as many as possible of former Catholic papers into one of the Nazi collective publishing companies; in Catholic matters the Vera-Verlagsanstalt GmbH and the Phönix-GmbH were specialists. It was obligatory to sell to them if, for example, a publisher could no longer publish because of exclusion from the compulsory professional organization of the Reich press office.[22]

In the same Reich press office, on the other hand, the Catholic newspaper press, as a "professional organization Catholic Church press," could create for itself something almost like a reservation; until 1936 it was granted, among other things, by utilization of the idea, unclear in the concordat, of the "official diocesan papers," as the only kind of press brought under the protection of the 1933 concordat, relatively extensive and, after 1936, still some protection. Under political pressure, until 1936 the number of titles and the total circulation rose from 9.6 to 11.4 million between 1933 and 1936. Not until 1936 did those measures begin which, before the general shutting down of papers in 1941, caused almost three-fourths of the 416 titles of 1936 to disappear, but which also gained by force the kind of "diocesan paper" that thereafter determined the structure of the Catholic press in

---

[20] S. Kessemeier, *Katholische Publizistik im NS-Staat 1933–1938* (Münster 1973), 18f.

[21] For the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* and *Germania* cf. the pertinent articles by R. Kramer and K. M. Stiegler in H. D. Fischer, ed., *Deutsche Zeitungen des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts* (Pullach 1972). The historiography of the Catholic press in the Third Reich has been recently supplemented by the dissertation of M. Hüsgen, *Die Bistumsblätter in Niedersachsen während der nationalsozialistischen Zeit* (Hildesheim 1975) and on the whole placed on a more solid basis.

[22] Cf. Kessemeier, op. cit., 20ff.

Germany and Austria: in each diocese there was now to be only one diocesan paper, to be decided and authorized by the bishop.[23]

The Second World War also meant a clear determining boundary line for the Catholic press in many other countries of Europe. For Germany and a little later for Austria it appeared earlier than for the Netherlands, Belgium, Poland, or France. In all these nations in the two decades of 1920–40 the Catholic press displayed a certain stability, although tending rather to concentration than to expansion. An overview, already in the shadow of the approaching catastrophe, was supplied by the "World Exposition of the Catholic Press," which was held at Vatican City from 12 May 1936 to 31 May 1937 with strong international participation—sixty-three exhibitors, mostly of countries or groups of countries from all the continents. The volume of reports[24] is not only one of the few comprehensive sources for the status of the Catholic press in the 1930s, it also makes known the European situation: Germany was represented by a total of two and one-half printed pages—France by thirty-four; from the information on Germany one learns a few historical titles, the circulation of *Germania* (7,500), but also data on the *Völkischer Beobachter,* the *SA-Mann,* and the *Schulungsbrief,* while Italy and Austria were tersely represented with lists of their still voluminous stocks, although the volume of reports did not appear until 1939.

In Austria the Christian Social *Reichspost,* founded in 1894, had as early as 1912 driven the conservative Catholic *Vaterland* (1860–1911) from the field. After the First World War it remained the leading Catholic voice, approving the corporate state, anti-Marxist, but also critical of the plans for *Anschluss,* whose forcible realization in 1938 meant the end of the paper, directed since 1902 by Friedrich Funder.[25] The Catholic press of the Austrian lands was supported by the "Catholic Press Associations," founded everywhere toward the end of the nineteenth century. Their tradition proved to be so strong even after the end of the Second World War that the publishing enterprises proceeding from them, mostly medium-sized, could provide the foundation of the new diocesan papers as well as of those newspapers which were Christian-oriented and supported the Austrian People's Party.

---

[23] For statistics cf. K. A. Altmeyer, *Katholische Presse unter NS-Diktatur* (Berlin 1962), 79 and 94–98. On the actual situation as regards the "diocesan papers"—one or several per diocese?—cf. M. Hüsgen, op. cit., 120–23.

[24] Istituto Cattolico per la Stampa, ed., *La Stampa Cattolica nel Mondo* (Milan 1939).

[25] F. Funder, *Vom Gestern ins Heute* (Vienna 1952); cf. also R. Barta, "Katholische Pressearbeit in Österreich," K. Richter, ed., *Katholische Presse in Europa* (Osnabrück 1969), 43–62.

In Vienna there was after 1945 no recourse to the tradition of the Catholic daily of the *Reichspost;* the weekly *Die Furche* understood itself as the agent of tradition. In addition to the Innsbruck *Volksboten* (since 1973 *Präsent*), it represents the type of weekly newspaper for the intellectual Catholic reading public. The leading cultural newspaper, *Wort und Wahrheit,* founded in 1946, was discontinued in 1973.

The Catholic press in Switzerland goes back, with some important organs, to the same period when in Germany the *Kulturkampf* brought about the rise of Catholic papers: *La Liberté* of Fribourg and *Vaterland* of Lucerne were founded in 1871, the *Basler Volksblatt* in 1872, and the *Ostschweiz* of Sankt Gallen in 1874. "The Catholic population seems to have felt the need for their own local papers, with which they could identify politically and religiously, as with the associations, which indeed contributed essentially to the defining of their identity in Swiss society."[26] The most recently founded, the *Neue Zürcher Nachrichten* (1896 as an association paper, 1904 as a daily), developed not only in competition with the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* but became the best known Catholic paper of a large Swiss city, while the *Vaterland,* as the "conservative central organ for German Switzerland," still functions not only to form opinion but also to effect economic stability. For the Swiss press also attempts to assure its existence by concentration measures, which have recently led to intensive cooperation with the calming poles *Vaterland* and *Ostschweiz* and have brought about some changes in the news press.

The activity of the English Catholics found journalistic expression in the founding of only a few important newspapers: *The Tablet* (1840), *The Universe* (1860), *The Catholic Herald* (1884), and *The Month,* founded by Jesuits in 1864, look back to noteworthy traditions. France, on the other hand, now as earlier is counted among the important countries for the Catholic press. The publicity activities of the nineteenth century, rich in number and in conflict, found a concluding climax in the establishing of the Maison de la Bonne Presse by the Assumptionists, especially Vincent de Paul Bailly. That Catholic publicity center in the Rue Bayard at Paris, which adopted the "good press" as a program into the title of the firm, proceeded from the founding of two periodicals, which were then for decades essential voices of the Catholic publicity of France: in 1872–73 Bailly began with *Le Pèlerin,* founded originally as a monthly organ of the *Conseil Généréal des Pèlerinages,* but in 1877 transformed into a popular illustrated periodical, which a little later had a circulation of over 100,000. In 1880 a monthly periodical, *La Croix,* was added; in 1883, changed into a daily paper, *La Croix* developed into the "Quotidien catholique par excellence."[27] In its founding period comparable to the *Germania* or the Lucerne *Vaterland, La Croix* nevertheless proved to be also a quantitatively successful newspaper; popular in its first decades, it still surpassed the 100,000 circulation in the decade of its founding, reached 185,000 even before the First World War (1912), and is said to have had its record year in 1937 with a circulation (unverified) of 300,000. These are numbers which remained out of reach of the Catholic daily in Germany. In the Second World War *La Croix* first withdrew to Bordeaux, then to Limoges. There on 21 June 1944 it interrupted its publication for the first time, and after the liberation of France it had to endure a process of gaining permission again, which spoiled the starting conditions. The postwar circulation was around 100,000 and did not increase again until the annexation in 1959 of *La Croix du Nord* of Lille, founded in 1889. The Second Vatican Council caused interest to grow again, and the circulation reached about 140,000, but the gains of the paper, which in accord with its own self-awareness aimed to correspond to the standards of a *journal d'opinion* as well as of a *journal d'information,* could not be maintained. *La Croix du Nord* was in 1968 reduced to a weekly. The Catholic daily press of France shrank between 1958 and 1964 from nine to four independent papers, among which only *La Croix* was of importance, but the periodical press lived on the rich diversity to which it had developed in the nineteenth century and the first third of the twentieth century. In the mid-1960s it was believed that, after the disappearance of the parish papers, one could still speak of about one thousand titles.[28] Besides the Bonne Presse, the most important publishers are the Union des Oeuvres Catholiques de France, founded in 1871, and, since 1945, the publisher of the illustrated *La Vie* [*Catholique Illustrée*], which, alongside *Le Pèlerin* [*du 20e Siècle*], reached a half-million in the mid-1960s. The Sunday press is powerfully represented in the chain of the various *Croix-Dimanche* editions (in 1964 in fifteen *départements*), begun in 1889 under the title of *La Croix du Dimanche,* the political appendix to the *Pèlerin.* The Catholic publishers of France early devoted special attention to the children's and youth press. Some titles, like *Nade* (1914) or *Reccord* (precursor of *L'Echo du Noël,* 1906) go back to the time before the First World War. A fairly large number of titles long persisted with rather small circulations. The supraregional weekly press with intellectual pretensions exhibited for a long time a wing-formation, like comparable media in Germany: *La France Catholique,* founded in 1925, was classified as conservative, *Témoinage-Chrétien,* founded in 1941, as progressive; both circulations dropped to about 50,000 by 1968.

---

[26] F. P. Schaller, *Notstand im christlichen Pressewesen* (Einsiedeln and Zurich 1974), 154f. For the situation in Switzerland cf. also. C. Holenstein, "Katholische Presse in der Schweiz," in K. Richter, op. cit., 63–70; also E. Fehr, "Schweiz: Katholische Presse in der Krise," *CS* 8(1975), 150–52.

---

[27] J. and P. Godfrin, *Une Centrale de la Presse Catholique, La Maison de la Bonne Presse et ses Publications* (Paris 1965), 134.

[28] C. Ehlinger, "Katholische Presse in Frankreich," in K. Richter, op. cit., 95–115; cf. also G. Hourdin, *La Presse Catholique* (Paris 1957).

The development of the Catholic press of France took place on the whole independently of the official Church. The "in structural view . . . independent Catholic press," to quote Ehlinger, was united in two associations in 1951 and 1952, the *Association Nationale des Périodiques Catholiques de Provence* (ANPCP) and the *Centre National Catholique de Presse* (CNPC). "The registration of a periodical or newspaper in one of these associations amounted to a clear indication of the membership of these publications in the Catholic press."[29]

In Spain "it would not be false to maintain that all daily newspapers which . . . appear today regard themselves as in some sense Catholic. However, not all rightly deserve this designation."[30] The problem of the Catholic press after the end of the civil war was to so adapt itself under a government that was officially friendly to the Church in a nonliberal democratic system that a specifically Catholic profile could again be discernible. The press law of 22 April 1938 left little latitude for this, and the new, more generous press law of 18 May 1966 was altered by restrictions in 1968. A Catholic profile was sought in three ways: (1) as regards the daily press, through collaboration in groups, of which the *Editorial Católica* and the newspaper chain of *Opus Dei* could each be found, in second or third place behind the Cadena del Movimiento (In the *Editorial Católica* there appeared with *Ya* of Madrid, founded in 1935 and having a circulation of 140,000 in 1968, one of the three great dailies of the country.); (2) as regards the periodicals, through a more or less clear attitude of opposition, which, as in the case of *Signo* in 1967, could run the risk of their existence; (3) in the training of journalists, to which special attention was paid by the Catholic side. Internationally noteworthy and in Spain not only recognized by the state but meanwhile standard-setting, is the journalism curriculum founded as the institute for journalism in 1958 on the

---

[29] Ehlinger, op. cit., 111.

[30] A. Montero, "Kirche, Katholiken und Presse in Spanien," in K. Richter, op. cit., 116–42, here 122.

Facultad de Ciencias de la Información of the *Opus Dei* University of Navarre at Pamplona.[31]

The growth of the Catholic press of Italy was determined into the twentieth century by the conflict between the Italian state and the Papal state. For decades the nationally minded press could be sure to conform to the official view. The Catholic press of the entirely Catholic country was, on the other hand, from the beginning politically in a defensive posture. *L'Osservatore Romano* began to appear on 1 July 1861 as "giornale politico-morale"; while it was under the control and encouragement of the Interior Ministry of the Papal State (but in the beginning, outside of it) and appeared, together with the official *Giornale di Roma* of 1849–70, as a quasi-private political newspaper, the expression used by Montini did not yet apply to it: "Non per nulla, come si dice, è 'il giornale del Papa.'" The purpose of the new paper was defense: "'to unmask calumnies' and, as was later added, 'to refute what was hurled against Rome and the Roman papacy.'"[32] In the period between 1870 and 1929 *L'Osservatore Romano* appeared as a political daily, alongside other Roman newspapers, but in a special development, as is said in a contribution of the first number of 4–5 November 1929, indicating as place of publication the Città del Vaticano: "Under the Pontificate of Leo XIII the *L'Osservatore Romano* ever more assumed the character of an organ of the Holy See. . . ."[33]

The succeeding fifteen years saw *L'Osservatore Romano,* like the rest of Italy's Catholic press, in a difficult position. However, there were direct encroachments only after Italy's entry into the Second World War. Besides occasional prohibitions of its sale in Italy—"now [at the beginning of 1940] the Catholic paper of Vatican City has too many readers, who must be carefully supervised!"[34]—on 13 June 1940 was suppressed *L'Osservatore Romano*'s custom of printing the armed-forces reports of the warring powers. Still, the circulation in the war years is said to have risen to more than 300,000 copies.

After the Second World War *L'Osservatore Romano* so developed "officially, as regards the announcements coming from the Vatican and semiofficially as regards the rest,"[35] that it evoked conflicting evaluations: on the one hand, for example, addressed by *The Times* as belonging to the "world press,"[36] on the other hand, it was criticized even by Catholic journalists because of the various dependencies of its editorship and its hardly justified journalistic work. In view of the poor working conditions, however, the intentional international expansion was noteworthy, despite the modest circulation, about 70,000, of the branch editions. In addition to the illustrated sister paper, *L'Osservatore della Domenica,* a weekly since 1934, in 1951 a Latin American weekly edition came into existence in Buenos Aires. Since 1948 there has been an Italian weekly edition, since 1949 a French, since 1968 an English, since 1969 a Spanish, since 1970 a Portuguese, and since 1971 the "Weekly Edition in German."[37]

---

[31] Cf. J. Liminski, "Journalistenausbildung an der katholischen Universität von Navarra in Pamplona," *CS* 8(1975), 153–64.

[32] D. Hansche, "Zur Geschichte des *L'Osservatore Romano, CS* 3(1970), 13–23 and 99–109, here 13f.—in Hansche also the pertinent literature on the history of *L'Osservatore Romano.*

[33] Cf. Hansche, op. cit., 100.

[34] Quoted ibid., 101.

[35] I. Weiss, *Il potere di carta. Il giornalismo ieri ed oggi* (Turin 1965), 107, quoted from Hansche, op. cit., 103.

For the rest, the Catholic press of Italy, like that in other countries of Western Europe, was subject to increasing concentration pressure after the Second World War.[38] Of its not very numerous daily newspapers[39] *L'Avvenire d'Italia* of Bologna, founded in 1896 and rich in tradition, had to combine, for economic reasons but also for the sake of a progressive outlook, with *L'Italia* of Milan, founded in 1912; their new title is *Avvenire.* At first hardly noticed on the outside, from 1931 a Catholic recreational periodical in Italy developed into presumably the Catholic periodical with the highest circulation in the world, the *Famiglia Cristiana.* Founder, owner, and publisher is the religious community *Pia Società San Paolo,* internationally active in the sphere of Catholic publicity. Through a skillfully organized sales system in parishes it caused the former Sunday sheet to grow into a modern family illustrated journal, which printed its jubilee edition for its fortieth year of existence in an issue of 2 million.[40] In comparison to this, the diocesan weekly press, despite the large number of more than one hundred titles, is underdeveloped. Within the *Unione Cattolica Stampa Italiana* (UCSI), it has combined in a special group, the *Federazione Italiana Settimanali Cattolici* (FISC).

Dissolution of Catholic journalistic unions seems, on the other hand, to mark a decisive turn in that country which can be described as the sociologically and sociohistorically most productive field of historical investigation of the Catholic press: the Netherlands. The union *Katholieke Nederlandse Dagbladpers* and the *Katholieke Nederlandse Journalisten-Kring,* both reestablished at the wish of the episcopate in 1945 and 1946 respectively, suspended their activity in 1968–69. Catholic journalists and also their public were bored, at the latest since the Second Vatican Council, with "columnization" (*verzuiling*) as the special form for expressing pluralism in the Netherlands.[41] Of the continually relatively strong Catholic daily press since the apologetically struggling nineteenth century—in 1937 there were thirty-two Catholic daily newspapers out of a total of seventy-nine—that paper proved to be the most vital which displayed itself after the Second World War as a *journal d'information* with a political Catholic policy of socially oriented progressivism without especially hiding its Catholicity: *De Volkskrant* of Amsterdam could raise its circulation from 150,000 in 1947 to 206,000 in 1974, and also a Catholic-oriented local press acquired a considerable share of circulation. On the other hand, other organs, which had marked the "column" or "pillar" Dutch Catholicism of the 1920s and 1930s, such as *De Maasbode* (1868–1959) or *Het Centrum* (1884–1960), merged or entirely disappeared, and the traditional agent of the Catholic press, *De Tijd* (1845–1974), pined away to an end after the Second World War, even as it had consciously made a decision for the function of a forum between the Catholic fronts.[42] All together, the share of at least the Netherlands press that followed Catholic traditions remained quite high. Something similar is true also for neighboring Belgium, whose Catholics achieved a stable political and journalistic position still earlier. The split into a conservative and a Christian-Democratic faction shortly before the turn of the century resembles Austrian precedents. Among the great papers of Belgium Catholic titles in French—*La Libre Belgique* since 1883—as well as in Flemish—*De Standaard* since 1914—were able to maintain good positions—in 1968 their respective circulations were 170,000 and 290,000.[43] Unique, at best only comparable to *L'Osservatore Romano,* is the role played by the *Luxemburger Wort* in the little Benelux nation: the largest newspaper of the country with an uninterrupted tradition since 1848 and a stable circulation of 73,000.[44]

---

[36] Cf. H. D. Fischer, *Die grossen Zeitungen* (Munich 1966), 294.

[37] E. Bordfeld, "Der *Osservatore Romano*—Wochenausgabe in deutschen Sprache," *CS* 7(1974), 155–59; also G. Deussen, "Der deutschsprachige *Osservatore Romano*—überflüssig?" *CS* 5(1972), 343–45.

[38] Cf. D. Hansche, "Krise und Ende des *L'Avvenire d'Italia, CS* 3(1970), 348–51.

[39] Cf. the *Annuario 1970* of the Unione Cattolica Stampa Italiana (UCSI) (Rome 1970), P. VI: "La stampa cattolica in Italia," 491–556. The most recent information on the Catholic press of Italy is given by the announcement no. 2094 in the *KNA-Informationsdienst,* no. 40/1976, of 30 September 1976, p. 4: "Italiens Kirchenpresse: eine aufschlussreiche Statistik."

[40] E. Bordfeld, "40 Jahre *Famiglia Cristiana,*" *CS* 4(1971), 126–28.

---

[41] G. W. Marsman, *De Katholieke Dagbladpers in sociologisch perspectief* (Assen 1967); idem, "Katholische Presse in den Niederlanden," in K. Richter, op. cit., 71–81.

[42] J. Hemels, "Katholische Presse in den Niederlanden," *CS* 8(1975), Pt. I: pp. 1–22; Teil II: pp. 123–46. For Scandinavia cf. J. Berg, "Skandinavien: Die katholische Presse," *UCIP Informations* no. 4 (Geneva 1976), 8f.

[43] L. Boone, "Situation und Zukunftstendenzen der katholischen Presse in Belgien," in K. Richter, op. cit., 95–115.

Hence while in most countries of Europe worthy of mention in connection with the Catholic press Catholic duties were able to continue to a certain degree beyond the Second World War, this turning-point meant, *cum grano salis,* for Germany and those nations which were thereafter reckoned as socialist, including Catholic Poland, the end of the Catholic daily press. The licensing policy of the Allied occupying powers and the founding of the Christian-Democratic Union that intentionally went beyond denominations prevented the reestablishing or establishing of dailies.[45] Only one newspaper was authorized as a bearer of the tradition of the Weimar period, Johann Wilhelm Naumann's *Augsburger Tagespost* on 28 August 1948, from which emerged the supraregional *Deutsche Tagespost* of a strictly conservative Catholic outlook but weak in circulation—less than 30,000. When, after the abolition of the compulsory licensing in September 1949, the "Old Publishers" tried to reestablish the traditional titles or their continuations, some Catholic publishing companies also took part. However, most of these foundations again disappeared from the market, among them the *Deutsches Volksblatt,* founded at Stuttgart in 1848, interrupted under the Nazis, then resumed until 1965, the *Badische Volkszeitung* of Karlsruhe, discontinued also in 1969, and the *Trierer Landeszeitung/Saarbrücker Landeszeitung,* suspended in 1972.

Quickly and stably twenty-two diocesan newspapers were reestablished and in part newly founded in the Western Zone and two—*St. Hedwigsblatt* in East Berlin and *Tag des Herrn* in Leipzig—in the Soviet Zone. Besides them there appeared in the West a richly developed press for associations, youth, and religious institutes. (In 1949 publishers and editors united in the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Katholische Presse e. V. [previously Arbeitsgemeinschaft Kirchliche Press; AKP], and Catholic publicists of all the media in 1948 in the Gesellschaft katholischer Publizisten Deutschlands). Recreational periodicals could develop only modestly; cultural periodicals suffered, except for the *Stimmen der Zeit,* from deconfessionalization (*Werkhefte, Frankfurter Hefte,* [*Neues*] *Hochland*); finally political weeklies confronted a quantitatively not adequate target group and could not go beyond the circulation minimum that assured existence. Even the circulation, stable for years and oscillating from 50,000 to 60,000, of the

---

[44] J. Gelamur, "Luxemburger Wort," *Journalistes Catholiques* 21 (Geneva 1973), special double number, 33–35.

[45] Cf. also M. Schmolke, *Die schlechte Presse,* 268.

Rheinischer Merkur of Cologne and Koblenz, founded in 1946, regarded as Catholic and close to the Christian Democratic Union but politically and as a publishing enterprise independent, could not, in view of increasing production costs, retain its economic independence; in 1974 the paper passed into ecclesiastical majority ownership. The politically ambitious but not successful *Echo der Zeit* of Recklinghausen, proceeding in 1952 from the Cologne *Katholischer Beobachter,* was suspended in 1968 in favor of the promising experiment which the Catholic Church in the German Federal Republic had assumed after the Second World War: in 1968 after almost three years of preparatory work the weekly *Publik* of Frankfurt am Main was founded. According to its differently elaborated program, it was supposed to be the leading voice of German Catholicism and at the same time the forum for the expression of diametrically opposed opinions in the postconciliar period. Because with this idea no sufficiently large and stable body of subscribers could be acquired, *Publik* was ended in the autumn of 1971 after it had cost a total of at least 30 million German marks.[46] At that time the Catholic press had long left behind the climax of its postwar development—in 1963 there was talk, without a reliable basis, of 400 titles and a total subscription of 16 million. The twenty-two diocesan papers—in 1963 they had a total circulation of 2.45 million—had lost, apart from some exceptions, portions of their readership year by year—in 1974 they had less than 2 million readers.[47] The Catholic youth press died out.[48] While the first postconciliar phase in Germany generally gave the impression of an intellectually strengthened Church, the decline of the publicity potential began to cause anxiety.[49]

---

[46] M. Schmolke, ed., *"Publik"—Episode oder Lehrstück?* (Paderborn 1974). On the economic aspect of publishing see U. Nussberger, "*Publik* als Testfall verlagswirtschaftlicher Planung," *CS* 9(1976), 126–42.

[47] F. Oertel, *Dialogform Kirchenpresse* (Limburg 1972).

[48] J. Hoeren, *Die katholische Jugendpresse 1945–1970* (Munich 1974) Deutsches Institut für wissenschaftliche Pädagogik, D.I.P.—Information no. 8. On the development of the Catholic youth press in Austria, see H. Pürer, "Kirchliche Jugendpublizistik in Österreich," *CS* 7(1974), 137–52.

[49] A similar negative trend is apparent in the Catholic press of the United States and Canada, whose history has not been investigated well enough to permit a comprehensive comparison with the European viewpoint. The completely multisided, to a great extent diocesan-oriented periodical system represents altogether the largest circulation block with the world's Catholic press. However, it declined from 27.7 million in 1968 to 22.7 million in 1973. Among the more than 400 titles are ca. 120 diocesan papers. The Jesuit periodical *America* of New York, founded in 1909, must be the best known paper, nationally and internationally. The association of Catholic journalism in the

Information about the Catholic Press in the German Democratic Republic and in the neighboring states to the east moves scantily in the entire postwar period. In the German Democratic Republic persons are restricted to the two ecclesiastical papers mentioned above and the nonperiodic publications of the Leipzig St.-Benno-Verlag. The Czechoslovak paper, *Katolicke Noviny,* appearing in a Czech and a Slovak edition, was always regarded as close to the priests' movement, "Pacem in terris," that was friendly to the government, while in Poland the weekly *Tygodnik Powszechny* of Cracow, founded in 1945, in the framework of the Znak group, and with it some diocesan papers as well as the Warsaw monthly *Więź,* were able to maintain relative independence, competing with the Pax group and its organ, *Slowo Powszechne.* In Socialist Yugoslavia the periodical *Glas Concila,* founded in 1962 in connection with the Second Vatican Council, established itself unexpectedly rapidly; but the circulation, rising to 180,000, produced an especially attentive political supervision, which had numerous prohibitions and confiscations as its consequence.

Catholic News Agencies

A need to provide the Catholic press with special information material, by means of press or news agencies, was understood before the turn of the century. From this there occurred in Germany the founding in 1879 of the *Centrums-Parlaments-Correspondenz* (CPC) to serve Catholic political ends, an initiative not of the Center Party but of the *Augustinusverein zur Pflege der katholischen Presse.* It and its succeeding institutions—CPC-GmbH, ZPK-GmbH—supplied Catholic newspapers more poorly than correctly with information from the parliamentary activities of the Center—down to the dissolution of the ZPK in 1922.[50] Catholic press agencies in the strict sense only appeared in the First World War: in 1917 at Fribourg in Switzerland the KIPA (Catholic International Press Agency); the American National Catholic News Service of Washington also goes back to 1917. It grew out of the press department of the National Catholic War Council, founded in 1917, and later renamed the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and today the United States Catholic Conference.[51] The third, for Catholic

---

United States, the Catholic Press Association (CPA), cooperates internationally with the German AKP. References to the crisis in P. Jordan, "NC News Service in der Krise der katholischen USA-Presse," *CS* 3(1970), 257–62.

[50] M. Bornefeld-Ettmann, "Die Centrums-Parlaments-Correspondenz (CPC)," *CS* 1(1968), 318–25.

[51] P. Jordan, op. cit., *CS* 3(1970), 257–62.

concerns, "great" agency is the KNA (Catholic News Agency of Bonn and Munich),[52] emerging in 1952 from its precursors, the KND and CND. Besides its current service, it has developed a whole division of special services, has at its disposal a European and overseas net of correspondents, and was one of the driving forces in the collaboration of Catholic news agencies beginning at Rome with the Second Vatican Council: in 1971 it found a definite form in an international union of Catholic news agencies, in which KNA, KIPA, Kathpress of Austria, CIP of Belgium, and KNP of the Netherlands[53] maintain joint editorship under the designation CIC (*Centrum Informationis Catholicum*). For a long time there was regarded as a really semiofficial Roman agency the International Fides Service,[54] founded in 1927 in connection with the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, which, however, declined ever more in importance when, since the Second Vatican Council, the Vatican's press work was concentrated in the Sala Stampa and intensified.

In 1936 there were Catholic agencies or similar institutions in sixteen countries, in 1971 in twenty-one.[55] Of course, their efficacy is not unquestioned in relation to the expense—cf. the case of KNP—and especially in countries of the Third World—for example, DIA, Zaire; CNI, India—their existence is jeopardized.

Radio and Television under the Restrictions of Commercial or of Public Control

Since the radio became a public medium in 1922, three forms of organization have developed: radio as a state industry, radio as a public law institution, and radio as a private economic undertaking, which sells its broadcast time partly to a third party and from the net proceeds draws not only subsistence but a profit. The first two types are predominantly based on financing by the fees of participants and are characterized by the mark of public control, in part directly by the state, in part by special social control bodies, for example, in Germany the *Rundfunkräte,* in Austria the *Kuratorium* of the ORF.

In accord with the respective "radio constitution" of each nation the

---

[52] Katholische Nachrichten-Agentur, ed., *De instrumentis informationis,* 2d ed. (Bonn 1972).

[53] The KNP had to suspend activity in 1973 (cf. E. Oudejans, "Geschichte und Ende des 'Katholiek Nederlands Persbureau' [KNP]," *CS* 6[1973], 144–51).

[54] J.J. Considine, "Die Gründung des internationalen Fides-Dienstes," *CS* 5(1972), 53–56.

[55] For 1936: "La Stampa Cattolica nel Mondo," op. cit., 36. For 1971: *Journalistes Catholiques* 19(Paris 1971), no. 56/57, p. 9.

Church has various favorable opportunities of participating in or at least of influencing radio and television. Only state radio systems in countries fundamentally hostile to the Church completely exclude its cooperation.

To give a comparative international description of the entire development is impossible because of lack of space. In general it can be said that the Church makes use of all types of possibilities available, but often has by no means exhausted them. The private economic pattern provides two opportunities in those countries where it is followed, hence especially in the United States and in the countries of Latin America and Asia that are influenced by the United States: a) the sale of broadcast time for church broadcasting, practiced, for example, in the United States and Japan, and b) the establishing of private broadcasting facilities, for the countries here mentioned are rather liberal in the granting of radio concessions. The second method was followed successfully especially by international Protestant agencies. Thus arose, among others, the Voice of the Andes at Quito as early as 1931; the Radio Voice of the Gospel of Addis Ababa, in 1963; the Far East Broadcasting Company, founded in 1945 with headquarters in Whittier, California, and principal Asian headquarters since 1948 at Manila; and Trans World Radio of Monte Carlo, founded in 1954 as Voice of Tangiers, which since 1959, as Radio of the Gospel, supports a German branch at Wetzlar.[56] Comparable on the Catholic side would be the enterprise Radio Veritas, established with German aid at Manila/Quezon City, which started its operation in 1968 and had to struggle with many difficulties presented by the state, and the Federation of Catholic Broadcasters, also active in the Philippines, with headquarters at Manila. In countries with public law or similar broadcasting systems, the Church shares in the social control of broadcasting institutions, for example, through radio councils, in the framework of the legal possibilities on the one hand, while on the other hand, it employs the possibilities of forming its own preaching broadcasts, for example, conveying the Mass, and of cooperating in the broadcasting of sections appropriate for Church and religion, by constituting them or advising. These distributions of competition are clearly marked, especially in the German Federal Republic, where in the first year after the Second

---

[56] K. H. Hochwald, "Trans World Radio und Evangeliums-Rundfunk," *CS* 2(1969), 56–58; C. Jahn, *Frequenzen der guten Nachricht. Rundfunksender "Stimme des Evangeliums" Addis Abeba* (Erlangen 1973); G. H. Ledyard, *Sky Waves. The Incredible Far East Broadcasting Company* (Chicago 1963). Summary: J. Schmidt, *Massenmedien als Instrumente der Mission. Missionsrundfunk als Beispiel* (Diss. Heidelberg 1974). New is the attempt for a Catholic diocesan television in Chicago; cf. F. J. Eilers, "ctn-Diözesan-Fernsehen in Chicago," *CS* 9(1976), 39–41.

World War the project of a special Christian "Bamberg Broadcast" failed,[57] and in Austria. In the course of the ideological "columnization," the broadcast system of the Netherlands developed fully. While the Nederlandse Omroep Stichting is the sponsor of the entire broadcasting system, the program is produced by several, mostly ideologically oriented operating enterprises, the position of which depends on the number of participants acknowledging them. Since 1925 the Katholieke Radio Omroep (KRO, Hilversum) handles the Catholic role.[58] While foreign observers not rarely regard the Dutch system as the ideal realization of pluralistic broadcasting work, there are in the Netherlands also many critical voices.

In 1931 the Vatican established its own radio station under the name Radio Vatican; at first its broadcasting techniques operated with very modest means. Since the construction in 1952–57 of Santa Maria in Galeria on a tract outside Vatican City, twenty-five kilometers north of Rome, Radio Vatican beams broadcasts on medium wave, shortwave, and ultra shortwave to the whole world in some thirty languages.[59]

Church Journalism in the Third World

In many countries of the Third World the ecclesiastical journalism of the present is based on foundations laid in the colonial period by missionary work. In this regard, two different centers of gravity can be determined: In some countries of Asia, but especially in Africa, it began early with Christian press work; in Latin America, on the contrary, there developed from modest beginnings a fruitful field of Catholic radio work, especially in the area of educational radio. Catholic "radio schools" and comparable institutions or program offerings appeared after the Second World War in, among other places, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Colombia, and Peru. Catholic broadcasters were, in this connection, not oriented only to the aim of teaching, but especially developed systems of social communication that served the rural population, to move up in these occasionally newspaperlike information sheets to radio programs and school courses, as in the internationally well known radio school project, Radio Sutatenza in Colombia, the weekly newspaper *El Campesino* with a circulation of 70,000. The enterprise supported since 1949 by the

---

[57] Cf. M. Schmolke, *Die schlechte Presse,* 272f.

[58] J. Hemels, "Der katholische Rundfunk im niederländischen Rundfunksystem," *CS* 8(1975), 213–29.

[59] E. Schmitz, "Sender des Friedens," K. Becker, K. A. Siegel eds., *Rundfunk und Fernsehen im Blick der Kirche* (Frankfurt 1957), 32–40; A. Kochs, "Radio Vatikan," *Funk-Korrespondenz* 23(1975), no. 4, pp. 1–4, and no. 5, pp. 5–8.

Acción Cultural Popular (ACPO), founded in 1947 by the chaplain José Joaquín Salcedo, was able to lower considerably the number of Colombia's illiterates and make important contributions to village development.[60]

In general church journalism in the Third World in the decade after 1960 came ever more under the idea of the promotion of development.[61] This is a new emphasis in contrast to the missionary and pastoral motivation which for decades long determined Catholic press activity in many African and some Asiatic countries, such as India. The more African states became independent, the more frequently Catholic newspapers and periodicals fell into difficult situations: On the one hand, they were the politically less burdened representatives of a journalistic expertise which was lacking in many of the young states, on the other hand they came into conflict with politically prejudiced systems but also into economic difficulties, which caused the Union Catholique Internationale de la Presse to ask anxiously: "La presse catholique d'Afrique est-elle condamnée?"[62] Many Catholic papers, rich in tradition—including the Catholic daily *Munno,* founded at Kampala, Uganda, in 1911 but forbidden in 1976; the weekly *Afrique Chrétienne* of Kinshasa, Zaire (1961); *Afrique Nouvelle* of Dakar, Senegal, founded in 1947, suspended in 1972, revived in 1974, forbidden in 1976; *L'Effort Camerounais* of Yaoundé, Cameroon (1955); *La Croix du Dahomey* of Cotonou, Dahomey (1946); or *The Standard* of Cape Coast, Ghana (1939), with persistent difficulties—had to stop publication for a time or permanently; others, such as *Kiongozi* of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania (1950), remained alive. Political prohibitions or hindrances came from totally different directions: in Zaire the entire Catholic press was suspended in 1973, in "white" Rhodesia the critical attention of the government was concentrated on the products of the Catholic publisher, Mambo Press (Gwelo).

Despite manifold dangers and economic straits there exists in Africa and Asia a Catholic press of modest dimensions but of astonishing diversity.[63] In this regard the founders and editors, mostly members of missionary orders or companies, attempted early to publish in the national vernaculars. This is true also of the journalistic opening up of very remote areas, for example, Oceania, and obviously in general for broadcasting work in all missionary lands.[64]

---

[60] S. A. Musto, *Massenmedien als Instrumente der ländlichen Entwicklungsförderung* (Berlin 1969).

[61] Cf. the bibliography, "Church and Communication in Developing Countries," compiled by W. Herzog (Paderborn 1973), and the Sodepax-Konferenz-Bericht, "Church, Communication, Development" (Geneva, n.d. [1971]).

[62] Africa issues no. 62/63 and no. 64/65 of the periodical *Journalistes Catholiques* (Paris 1972).

[63] Cf. F. J. Eilers and W. Herzog, *Catholic Press Directory Africa/Asia* (Paderborn 1975); F. J. Eilers, *Christliche Publizistik in Afrika* (St. Augustin 1964); C.H.M. Verhaak, *Aspecten van de pers in Oost-Afrika* (Grave 1974); J. Hosse "Die katholische Presse im

To promote an understanding of the problems of the missions and today of the underdeveloped countries—such is the goal set for itself by the quite strongly developed mission press[65] in the United States and many countries of Europe. Its beginnings, marked in Germany by the founding of the periodical *Die katholischen Missionen* in 1873, extend back into the nineteenth century. For a long time the popular periodicals were welcome reading material as recompense for sacrifice for the sake of the mission. The changed relationship to the Third World—aid for development, encouraging of structure, the new auxiliary works *Misereor, Adveniat,* and so forth—caused interest to go back to the classical mission journalism; the circulations of many papers declined, and there appeared, proceeding from the first freely initiated concentration procedures in the Catholic press market, a new type of mission magazine, which was at times published in common by several religious communities active in the mission: in Germany *Kontinente,* since 1966, at first twelve, later twenty-five representatives; in the Netherlands *Bijeen* (1968), with seventeen representatives; in Spain *Tercer Mundo* (1970), with six representatives; in France, less successful, *Peuples du Monde* (1965).[66] In addition, a few individual titles, some of them of strong circulation, could continue, whose steadfastness rests on the combination of family entertainment and mission aims.

Church and Mass Communication in Theory and Organization

The rather negative relation of the Church to the journalistic media since the Reformation evoked as early as the nineteenth but especially in the twentieth century a large number of papal and episcopal

---

französischsprachigen West- und Zentralafrika," *CS* 5(1972), 156–62; T. Luiz, *Indian Catholic Press* (Bombay 1971); J. Barret, "Katholische Presse in Indien," *CS* 1(1968), 43–45.

[64] F. J. Eilers, *Zur Rolle der Publizistik in der Missionsarbeit des Fernen Ostens und Ozeaniens* (Münster, 1965); idem, "Presse und Funk im Territorium von Papua und Neuguinea," *CS* 1(1968), 197–208, 295–307.

[65] L. Janek, "Katholische Missionszeitschriften in den USA," *CS* 4(1971), 226–32; J. Simmers, "Missionspublizistik in den Niederlanden," *CS* 1(1968), 40–43; M. Eigenmann and F. H. Fleck, "Schweizer Missionsjournalistik," *CS* 3(1970), 339–43; F. J. Eilers, "Arnold Janssen als Publizist. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Missionspublizistik," *CS* 8(1975), 301–23.

[66] J. Hosse, "Missionspresse im Wandel der Zeit," *CS* 5(1972), 348–51.

decisions, whose basic tone was condemning to rejecting, only occasionally encouraging the "good" (Catholic) press. Meanwhile, they fill their own professionally specialized source collections.[67] A change began with the first really mass-media encyclical, the film encyclical *Vigilanti cura* of Pius XI in 1936.[68] As regards content, this encyclical introduced binding control institutions: On the model of the American Legion of Decency there arose in many countries Catholic offices for evaluating films, as after the Second World War in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland Catholic film commissions, whose activity was very beneficent in their informative ingredient but meanwhile was out-of-date in their aim of moral guidance.[69] The pacemaker function of *Vigilanti cura* was the fact that there was now a media encyclical at all. It was followed in 1957 by *Miranda prorsus,* a second encyclical, which treated of the audio-visual media,[70] and in 1963 by the decree *Inter mirifica* of the Second Vatican Council.[71] Actual progress in the—in the real sense—theoretical confrontation of the Church with the mass media was produced by an address of Pius XII in 1950 to the Third International Congress of the Catholic Press at Rome,[72] and the pastoral instruction *Communio et Progressio,*[73] brought about by the just mentioned conciliar decree but only prepared in 1971. Pius XII recognized and described mass communication as a social function in presenting public opinion—"natural echo," "common response"—as unalterable by natural law for the functioning of society. Unfortunately, then the decree *Inter mirifica,* which especially stressed the Church's right to possess and use the mass media as well as the morally "right employment of these instruments," remained "considerably behind the doctrine developed by Pius XII."[74] On the other hand, *Communio et Progressio* produced not only important results of modern journalistic and communications science, but presented generally relevant social principles: the function of the media as communications institutions, which gather "contemporaries around a round table, as it were," the right to information and free choice of information, freedom of communications, necessity of media pedagogy (instead of censorship and Index), acknowledgment of the untrammeled individuality of journalistic work, the claim of Catholic journalists, communications institutions, and the Catholic public to the helping partnership of the Church. Without abandoning standards—common welfare, human dignity, objectivity—the withdrawal from the "defense principle"[75] and from the moralizing discrimination between "good" and "bad" press becomes pleasantly clear.

---

[67] E. Baragli, ed., *Cinema Cattolico,* 2d ed. (Rome 1965); Radio Vaticana, ed., (1) *Documenti Pontifici sulla Radio e sulla Televisione 1929–1962* (Vatican City 1962), (2) *Documenti Pontifici sulla Stampa 1878–1963* (ibid. 1963), (3) *Documenti Pontifici sul Teatro 341–1966* (ibid. 1966); also, G. Deussen, *Ethik der Massenkommunikation bei Papst Paul VI.* (Paderborn 1973).

[68] *AAS* 28(1936), 249–63.

[69] A. Paffenholz, "Katholische Filmbewertung in der Diskussion," *CS* 2(1969), 5–12.

[70] *AAS* 49(1957), 765, 805.

[71] *LThK* 1 (supplementary volume) (Freiburg 1966), 116–35.

[72] *AAS* 42(1950), 251–57.

[73] *Communio et Progressio. Pastoralinstruktion über die Instrumente der sozialen Kommunikation, Nachkonziliare Dokumentation* 11 (Trier 1971).

[74] O. B. Roegele, "Das Konzilsdekret 'Über die Werkzeuge der Sozialen Kommunikation,'" *Publiziskik* 9(1964), 305–47, here 319.

The instruction also points, by suggestions, to the absence of a journalistic organization, as it can be established in the Churches of many countries. Comprehensive tasks are attributed to the already existing international journalistic associations, while in reality these organizations, despite historical and nation unifying merits, today can do justice to their very narrow determining of functions often only with difficulty. In this connection there is question of the *Union Catholique Internationale de la Presse* (UCIP), founded in 1927—its precursor in 1923—UNDA (*Association Catholique Internationale pour la Radiodiffusion et la Télévision*) proceeding from the *Bureau International de la Radiophonie Catholique,* founded in 1928, and the *Office Catholique International du Cinéma* (OCIC).[76] The UCIP, divided professionally into five federations—newspaper and periodical publishers, news agencies, journalists, journalist science, and ecclesiastical press—and regionally into several continental subassociations, acting as international representative in appearance with world congresses of the Catholic press, sees its general aim in the fostering, organizing, and representing of the work of Catholic journalists and press associations on an international plane, especially in the spheres of activity of professional ethics and theology of mass communication, promotion of Catholic journalism in underdeveloped countries, and representation in international organizations (United Nations, UNESCO). UNDA, which owes essential impulses to the first and second International Catholic Radio Congress at Munich in 1929 and Prague in 1936, has likewise built continental subgroups in South America, Asia, and Africa, and takes care of the international cooperation as well as the interdenominational with the World Association for Christian Communication (WACC). UNDA and OCIC give international radio and film prizes respectively. The chief tasks of OCIC lie in the collaboration of about fifty national Catholic film bureaus, in the study of film art and economics in accord with Christian categories of values, in the initiating of new Catholic film movements, and in the effort for artistically and educationally worthwhile films.

---

[75] M. Schmolke, "Zehn ideengeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Pastoralinstruktion *Communio et Progressio,*" F. J. Eilers et al., eds., *Kirche und Publizistik. Dreizehn Kommentare zur Pastoralinstruktion . . .* (Paderborn 1972).

[76] J. Iribarren, "L'Union Catholique Internationale de la Presse (UCIP)," *CS* 3(1970), 49–55; also, on the obscurity concerning the real foundation year of the UCIP, references in *UCIP Informations,* no. 4/1976, p. 2, and no. 1/1977, pp. 1f. (If the UCIP celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1977, then it referred to the founding at Brussels in 1927 of the Bureau International des Journalistes Catholiques.) J. Schneuwly, "UNDA-Katholische Internationale Vereinigung für Hörfunk und Fernsehen," *CS* 3(1970), 144–51; E. Flippo, "Office Catholique International du Cinéma (OCIC)," ibid. 4(1971), 28–34.

For new international functions, namely the advisory promotion of Catholic journalism in underdeveloped countries, the Catholic Media Council was founded on the basis of the cooperation of UCIP, UNDA, and OCIC at Aachen in 1969. Its tasks are the international exchange of experience, the coordinating and advising of planning, the utilization of scholarly results, and not least the professional preexamination of concrete promotional projects. The journalistic projects of supporting Catholic auxiliary and mission works are represented on the Board of Trustees.[77] The CMC elaborates and advises projects, which are encouraged by the auxiliary works of Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, England, Ireland, the United States, and Germany.

Concluding remark: The considerable theological, organizational, economic, and journalistic expense with which Catholic journalism, now as earlier, is carried out and also the (relatively late beginning) positive official teaching and pastoral attention to problems of mass communication cannot obscure the fact that at the latest since the Second Vatican Council a striking withering of integration[78] is to be observed on the part of the "Catholic public," and especially in the "strongly" Catholic journalistic countries, in which Catholic media were not able to remain traditionally conservative, but had to constantly stand out with respect to non-Catholic groups of the population, hence especially clearly in the United States, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the German Federal Republic, but also in Austria. The fact that a growing part of the potential Catholic public avoids the specifically

---

[77] K. R. Höller, "Publizistische Medienplanung für Entwicklungsländer 'Catholic Media Council,'" *CS* 5(1972), 57–63.

[78] On the idea cf. F. Groner, "Integrationsschwund in der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands," *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 12(1971), 215–39; cf. also the contributions of H. Fleckenstein and R. Bleistein in K. Forster, ed., *Befragte Katholiken-Zur Zukunft von Glaube und Kirche* (Freiburg i. Breisgau 1973).

Catholic journalism, and the assured observation that this process is quantitatively similar to the decline of the numbers that attend Mass, will possibly be the characteristically basic feature of the history of Catholic journalism of the second half of the twentieth century. Documents of some postconciliar synods have sought to take this development into account, at least as a start.[79]

[79] References to literature in M. Schmolke, "Kirche und gesellschaftliche Kommunikation," D. Emeis and B. Sauermost, eds., *Synode—Ende oder Anfang* (Düsseldorf 1976), 303–15, as well as P. Pawlowsky, "Kirche und Massenmedien nach den österreichischen Synoden," *CS* 9(1976), 233–54.

CHAPTER 14

*Charity and Ecclesiastical Works of Assistance**

Laying the Foundations in the Nineteenth Century

Caritas, as a turning to fellow believers and other persons who are in need, ranks alongside the proclaiming of the Good News as a basic function of the Church.[1] Hence the intensity of charitable activity is always an indicator of its spiritual vitality. However, its present social-charitable activity differs in many respects from that of previous centuries. It proceeded entirely out of the charity movement of the nineteenth century, for then were developed those ideas and working methods which, spreading from Europe, have in timely fashion influenced almost all countries. And so a look at the nineteenth century is indispensable for the understanding of the present.

The numerous secularizations became a powerful and mostly overlooked precondition of the new surge of charity in the nineteenth century—not only in the France of the Revolution, with the nationalization of the Church's property in 1790, the suppression of the orders in 1792, the nationalization of hospitals in 1793, and in the German Reich with the Imperial Delegates Final Recess in 1803, but in most countries of the North Atlantic and Iberian world they withdrew the old social institutions from the Church's control. In this way the Church lost the traditional means of support of its care of the poor, but at the same time it was relieved of the often antiquated obligations of the foundations. Accordingly, the secularizations compelled new initiatives and they facilitated the appearance of that mobility and of that large-scale concept, which, in view of the increase of population and of all those miseries accompanying industrialization, were urgently necessary. And the Church had to devote its attention to the new social problems, if it would continue to be credible. European Catholicism, particularly in France and Germany, but also in Italy, thus undertook enormous social-charitable exertions in the course of the century. They are partly explained by the conviction, generally represented until far beyond the middle of the century, that the social question could be solved only by free welfare work. Only slowly did the idea establish itself that here only state intervention with the cooperation of free personnel could help. This was introduced in the German Empire by Bismarck's social legislation of 1883–89, while other states partly followed suit much later. From these originally modest beginnings there gradually developed comprehensive social security systems and large organizations that introduced a "fundamental change of the care for existence."[2] They culminated in the concept of the "social state," which intervened in the social sphere by directing without degenerating into a total welfare state.[3] It represented the reply to the Industrial Revolution and the restratifications in the wake of the great wars and economic crises. The aims of the state were expanded in the social state to social justice and the creating and maintaining of institutions for the protection of the individual in the various situations of life. The fact that state budgets in the industrialized countries today designate up to one-third of their total for social works is eloquent testimony.

---

* Erwin Gatz

[1] Basic is R. Völkl, *Dienende Kirche—Kirche der Liebe* (Freiburg 1969); idem in *HPTh,* 2d ed. I, 415–48.

This development deeply affected ecclesiastical charity,[4] for in this way its center of gravity in the industrialized states increasingly shifted from economic to spiritual and personal help, without excluding the economic.[5] For the rest the social-charitable personnel of the Church and the social agencies of the state cooperated to a considerable extent in almost all countries, even in those where Church and state were formally separated. The Church particularly brought to this teamwork its religiously motivated collaborators, while the state offices set aside partly considerable financial means for social institutions under the Church's auspices. The Church's financial contribution for this work was based, after the loss of the old foundations, partly on Church means of taxation but chiefly on gifts.

---

[2] *HPTh* II/2, 396–402.

[3] H. Peters in *StL,* 6th ed., 7(1962), 394f.

[4] On the sociopolitical development in Germany, France, England, and the United States, see B. Seidel in *Handwörterbuch der Sozialwissenschaften* 9 (Göttingen 1956), 532–72.

[5] On the specifics of *caritas,* R. Völkl in *HPTh* II/2, 403–23.

Concern for the whole person is characteristic of charity on the basis of its fitting into the care of souls. But since the Enlightenment growing secularization and alienation from the Church have incessantly and increasingly questioned its denominational method. The Church's personnel, who had long devoted themselves almost without competition to the charitable tasks of a homogeneous society, could no longer entirely measure up to the growing functions. Since the nineteenth century, therefore, other agents of free welfare work have pushed themselves beside the Church's charity; among them decided Christians collaborated, and they were partly inspired by Christian motives.[6] To the secularization of society corresponded, with a certain reluctance, the secularization or laicization of social work. Today the Church is only one—even though of the utmost importance—of those social forces which are devoted to these tasks. For the rest, in opposition to an all-embracing state social and assistance policy there have not been lacking voices since the nineteenth century which claimed charity even under the changed circumstances as an unchangeable basic function of the Church, even if needing to be kept up-to-date. The demand for the unimpeded growth of the Church in the social sector also was derived from religious freedom. For this was taken from it only in totalitarian states, whereas, for example, in the German Federal Republic in 1961 precedence was accorded to the free representatives of social and youth assistance in accord with the principle of subsidiarity;[7] recently, on the other hand, tendencies making for state management are again appearing.

During the nineteenth century synods and individual bishops repeatedly recommended the traditional care of the poor,[8] but in reality official ecclesiastical initiatives in this area were isolated and locally restricted. The charity movement arose rather from its basis in the communities where it had always rested. Only in our century have an extensive and finally global view and corresponding organization established themselves.

---

[6] In the chiefly professionally exercised areas of social work religious, working virtually without compensation, dominated into the twentieth century. Lay personnel took a place beside these to a greater extent only since the financial assurance of social work. German Empire in 1883: law on the health insurance of workers; Prussia in 1885: rules for schools for nurses. In other countries also since then a stronger founding of nursing schools is to be observed (F. Bauer, *Geschichte der Krankenpflege* [Kulmbach 1965], 257ff.).

[7] Federal law on social aid and law on youth welfare (1961). According to these not only aid for maintaining life is assured, but "in special life conditions." A corresponding judgment of the Federal Constitutional Court at Karlsruhe on 16 October 1968: "To the self-understanding of the Christian Churches and the exercise of religion belongs not only the area of faith and worship but also freedom of development and effectiveness in the world, as this corresponds to its religious and ministerial function. Active love of neighbor is, according to the New Testament, an essential task for the Christian and is understood by the Catholic and Evangelical Churches as a basic church function" (Quoted in *Caritas-Korrespondenz,* Freiburg 1969-1/2, R.4).

From the nineteenth century charity was administered essentially by two groups. On the one hand, these were the various local charity groups, which at times operated without the cooperation of the clergy and often renounced any publicity. They found their classical form in the Conference of Saint Vincent de Paul, founded by Frédéric Ozanam at Paris in 1833, which became the model for similar establishments in many countries.[9] Particularly in Germany, where the ecclesiastical association system was more strongly pronounced than elsewhere, there was formed, alongside the Saint Vincent Conferences and their female counterpart, the Saint Elizabeth Conferences, a large number of groups with social-charitable and often very specialized tasks.[10] On the other hand, in recent times the parish first appeared as an institution qualified for charity,[11] but of course the activity of the traditional societies was not supposed to be affected adversely by this.

In addition to these small groups, often merged into working communities and predominantly established on the local level, from the nineteenth century the many newly founded congregations assumed the chief burden of charitable work. The Daughters of Charity were, it is true, already represented before the Revolution in some European countries but began their global expansion only in the nineteenth century. For the rest, there then appeared those occasionally wildly growing large numbers of male and female congregations, which provided for social work a mainly professional personnel, thoroughly qualified by a professional code of ethics.[12] In the territory of the

---

[8] The various provincial synods of the nineteenth century proceeded just as little beyond this as did two projected decrees of the First Vatican Council (E. Gatz in *AHC* 3[1971], 156–73).

[9] A. Foucault, *Histoire de la Société de S. Vincent de Paul* (Paris 1933). On early charity groups in Germany, see Gatz, op. cit., 351–71. On the development in the United States, see D. T. McColgan, *A Century of Charity. The First One Hundred Years of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the United States,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1951).

[10] Details in *KH,* 1907ff.

[11] J. Kessels in *JbCarWiss,* 1962, 9–42; *Werkbuch der Caritas* (Freiburg 1968); *Pastorale. Caritas und Diakonie* (Mainz 1974).

[12] O. Braunsberger, *Rückblick auf das katholische Ordenswesen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Freiburg 1901); more comprehensive: Heimbucher.

German Reich, for example, there were scarcely several hundred at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but before the First World War 47,545 female religious and 1,963 male religious in 5,036 and 101 houses, respectively, were at work.[13] In the other Catholic countries the growth was similar.[14] The founding and expansion of these communities took place to a great extent without the directing intervention of church authorities. At that time there was coordination among them only in isolated cases.

Ecclesiastical charity, like its secular counterpart, was divided since the nineteenth century into an "open" and a "closed" sphere, a distinction which the legislation of the French Revolution made. To the open sphere belong those works of assistance that can scarcely be grasped statistically, particularly as they were performed in the communities. Beside them the institutions rapidly appearing from the mid-century, and with them the "closed" work, acquired growing importance. But the most fundamental change in ecclesiastical social work since the nineteenth century lies in the elimination of the traditional care of the poor, which was concentrated on the elementary livelihood of its protégés, by a differentiated and specialized care of people in their various needs.[15] The professional formation of collaborators and the classification of the institutions in professional spheres were a self-evident consequence of this development. For the rest, educational and health assistance were not definitely separated.[16] The religious and the ecclesiastical institutions not only accepted this development but supported it to a decisive degree in the industrialized nations.[17] They not only supplied their personnel for it, but by opening up private sources of financing often first made possible the creating of such institutions. While the financing of institutions in countries with progressive social legislation is today to a great extent cared for by social security institutions or by the public, church personnel as well as other agents of free welfare in the countries of the Third World more and more finance this work largely out of their own means. The new types of social-charitable work outlined here grew in the traditionally Christian countries of Europe. In addition, an autonomous charity was able to develop also in the United States and Canada.[18] Over and above this, the European methods of work were carried by the missionary institutes into all parts of the world, since the works of love have from time immemorial been counted as an integrating part of the missionary method.[19]

---

[13] Liese, *Wohlfahrtspflege und Caritas,* 280.

[14] There have been statistical surveys for the entire Church for only a few years. A. Battandier, *Annuaire Pontifical Catholique,* 41 vols. (Paris 1898–1948), gives some material on the status of the orders. Rich in material also for the social-charitable activity: *Bilan du Monde, Encyclopédie Catholique du Monde Chrétien,* 2 vols. (1st ed. 1958–60, 2d ed. 1964). On the number of religious, see *Annuario Statistico della Chiesa* (Rome 1968ff.). Reliable statistical material for charitable achievements from the period before the First World War is available only for particular countries. The numbers of members of congregations of women supply a starting point because these devoted themselves to charitable tasks, of course in varying intensity from country to country. Baumgarten gives, among other things, the following numbers: Europe (180 million Catholics): 329,811 female religious in 25,043 houses; France (39.1): 183,901; Italy (32.9): 31,342; Spain (18.7): 25,545; Germany (19.2): 32,831; Austria-Hungary (37.6): 23,146; Netherlands (1.7): 8,110; England (1.38): 10,118; Latin America (56): 6,909; United States (10.7): 53,987, 885 welfare institutions, 249 orphanages.

[15] This change in meaning found expression in the nomenclature of theological lexica. Wetzer and Welte (2d ed. [1883]) does not yet contain the keyword *caritas,* but (1st ed. [1882]), 1354–75, makes a detailed contribution to the care of the poor. Similarly: *RE* 2, 3d ed. (1897), 92–103: care of the poor, for which, as it occurs in the Church, the principle of free will is urged (rejection of recourse to taxation). M. Buchberger, *Kirchliches Handlexikon* 1(1907), then gives (885f.) a brief contribution "Charitas," which in the stricter sense is described as "the totality of the systematically organized freewill assistance activity springing from religious Christian motives." The care of the poor (I, 340–44) is granted considerably more space. This changes only with *LThK,* 2d ed.

National Organizations

The just mentioned, almost incalculable diversity of charitable efforts illustrates that there was at work not a planned procedure but a spontaneous movement. True, there was no lack of bishops interested in charitable and later also in social-political activities, but the Church leadership, despite its good will, stood aside and made scarcely any gestures to canalize the new breakthrough. In an age of increasing entanglements and of a more spacious thought, however, this fragmentation constituted a serious danger. Individual societies, as, for example, the Conferences of Saint Vincent de Paul, quite early combined, but a coordination involving all fields of charity was only attempted from the turn of the century. In this field Germany took the lead, although the Catholics themselves here lagged behind corresponding exertions of other welfare associations.[20] Those who prepared for the founding of a

---

[16] In the older hospitals of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, aged charges, patients, and orphans lived together.

[17] For the German development, see Gatz, op. cit., 464–573.

[18] Religious communities expelled from European countries in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, for example, contributed to this.

[19] Cf. L. Berg, *Die katholische Mission als Kulturträger*, 2d ed., III (Aachen 1927), 3–200.

[20] As early as 1848 the gifted organizer Heinrich Wichern had urged the merger of the Evangelical welfare works into a "Central Committee for the Domestic Mission of the German Evangelical Church."

German charity society were the Capuchin Cyprian Fröhlich (1853–1931) and the cofounder of the *Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland* in 1890, the district councilor Max Brandts (1854–1905). But the project was first realized by the brilliant organizer, Lorenz Werthmann (1858–1921).[21] The Limburg priest went to Freiburg im Breisgau in 1886 as court chaplain of Archbishop Christian Roos (1886–98) and there became acquainted with the Church's social work. Important preliminary stages of the later organization were constituted by the founding of the periodical *Caritas* in 1895 as the first professional organ of this type in German[22] and of a "Charity Committee" as the circle of promoters of the periodical. Werthmann edited the periodical personally until his death. From 1896 the "Committee," in which Werthmann set the tone, conducted annual study meetings—*Caritastage*—which likewise served the spread of the idea of charity. In February 1897 it called for the founding of a *Caritas Verband für das katholische Deutschland.* After initial hesitations on the part of the episcopal leadership of Cologne and Freiburg because of Werthmann's independence of action, there occurred on 9 November 1897 the planned founding, with headquarters at Freiburg,[23] on the occasion of the second *Caritastag* at Cologne. Its aim was to be study and publication, the education of coworkers, professional charitable work, and coordination. While the organization made progress only with difficulty for two decades, despite the intensive efforts of the first president, Werthmann, the association achieved great successes in other fields.[24] This was true also of the charity science developed at Freiburg, which in 1925 acquired a scholarly institute and a chair at the university—since 1964 it has been called *Institut für Caritaswissenschaft und Christliche Sozialarbeit.* In addition, before the founding of the *Karitasverband,* Werthmann organized a special library, which gradually grew into a study center unique in its kind.[25] In the midst of the First World War the episcopal conference at Freiburg in 1915 and that at Fulda in 1916 recognized the Freiburg central office as a "legitimate gathering of the diocesan societies into one uniform organization." Thereby the early history of the association ended and its organizational rise was introduced.

The German example acted as a stimulus beyond the national boundaries. Thus in 1903 the Austrian welfare societies joined in one national merger.[26] But the charitable organization became more important in the United States[27] because of its order of magnitude. The initiative proceeded from the New York religious Barnabas of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. In youth work over the years he had felt the isolation of the individual charitable groups as a serious flaw, and in 1908 he proposed to Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, rector of the Catholic University, the convoking of a charity conference. An organizational committee then decided the establishing of a national conference, at which 400 delegates met on 25–28 September 1910 at the Catholic University. Shahan became the first president (until 1925) and William J. Kerby the secretary of the newly established National Catholic Charities Conference (NCCC). Its functions, like those of the DCV, were to be the educating and informing of the members. This was effected by working-meetings, the establishing of places of formation, and the publication of the *Catholic Charities Review* in 1916.[28] During the first years the horizontal connection with the charitable religious institutes was inadequate, although these then carried out 75 percent of the total work. Hence, as secretary (1920–61), John O'Grady in 1920 inaugurated the founding of the National Conference of Religious on Catholic Charities as the organ representing the congregations with the NCCC.[29]

---

[21] Liese, *Werthmann;* K. Borgmann, ed., *Lorenz Werthmann, Reden und Schriften* (Freiburg 1958).

[22] In 1896 there appeared in German thirty-four relevant periodicals. *Caritas* was quickly consolidated: in 1897, 2,000; in 1917–18, 10,000; in 1974, 25,000.

[23] Since 1909: *Caritasverband . . .*; 1919: *Deutscher Caritasverband* (DCV). First article: Liese, "Werthmann," 142–46.

[24] Survey: H. Wollasch in *75 Jahre DCV,* 33–87.

[25] H. J. Wollasch in *Caritas '71,* 191f. 1971: 110,000 volumes.

The establishment of other national charity associations took place between the two world wars, especially in Europe—in Switzerland (1920), Hungary (1931), Luxemburg (1932), Belgium (1938), Ireland (1941), and Spain (1942), then in Poland and Yugoslavia and also in Syria, whereas France still held itself aloof.[30]

International Cooperation

An international charity assistance, or at least one that extended beyond the frontiers of nations, was already included in the mission to the pagans and then with the care of emigrants of the late nineteenth century.[31] Then it became a pressing need because of the misery attending wide circles of population in the countries affected by war. Alongside the national charity institutions, the Holy See, from the beginning of the war, also developed a vigorous war welfare care.[32] This concentrated on the prisoners of war and the civilian population in the occupied countries. In addition, the Holy See helped many individuals through consultation and donations. Besides this, it directed requests for help to the Catholics of the countries not greatly affected by the war. Particularly in the United States considerable donations were thereupon made; the German-Americans' awareness of solidarity with their homeland was still great and was influential as a motive for making donations.

---

[26] L. Krebs, *Das caritative Wirken der katholischen Kirche im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (1927), 2; a good survey of the diversity of charitable exertions in F. Anhell, *Caritas und Sozialhilfen im Wiener Erzbistum* (1802–1918), 1971.

[27] D. P. Gavin in *NCE* 10(1967), 229f. (biblio.).

[28] First survey of charitable activity: *Directory of Catholic Charities* (Washington 1922).

[29] B. M. Faivre in *NCE* 10(1967), 230f.

[30] Date of founding in *Caritas Internationalis,* 1970–72.

[31] At the Mainz Katholikentag of 1871 there was founded, at the urging of the Limburg merchant, Peter Cahensly (1838–1923), the *St. Raphaelsverein zum Schutz deutscher*

The foreign aid during and after the First World War had made the international cooperation of charitable works of assistance an urgent necessity. It is significant that the impetus for a permanent merger proceeded from Germany, where charity was as strictly and effectively organized as in no other country. As early as 1918 Werthmann had pointed out that an international union was necessary,[33] and in February 1920 the Catholic delegates at the congress of the Union Internationale des Secours aux Enfants at Geneva urged this desire.[34] In this way the insight was put across that a "World Charity Society" should be founded.[35] The Holy See approved the project. And so, on the occasion of the World Eucharistic Congress at Amsterdam in July 1924, at the invitation of the Preparatory International Charity Committee sixty delegates from twenty-two nations met for a four-day conference.[36] Here the establishment of a permanent "Charity Conference" with headquarters at Lucerne at the Swiss Central Office of Charity was decided.[37] The preeminent tasks were to be the uniting of all charitable organizations as well as reciprocal information, while an international aid fund could not yet be realized. Then in 1926 the second conference at Lucerne stated as its aim the promotion of all charitable efforts, the exchange of information, the beginnings of

---

katholischer Auswanderer, which was later involved in the conflicts over "Americanism." It was among the initiators of the *Commission Internationale Catholique pour les Migrations* of Geneva, founded in 1951.

[32] Schmidlin III, 218–26; J. Kreyenpoth, *Die Auslandshilfe für das Deutsche Reich* (Stuttgart 1932), 56–59, 87f; see also Chapter 2.

[33] L. Werthmann in *Caritas* 24(1918–19), 1–6. On the beginnings of international cooperation, see J. Hafenbradl, *Caritas Catholica. Internationale Caritasorganisation 1924 bis 1950* (Freiburg 1968), here 17.

[34] Protocol in Hafenbradl, appendix, 1–4.

[35] Thus, *Caritas* 25(1920–21), 90.

[36] K. Joerger in *Caritas* 29(1924), 183–88.

[37] This had been instituted in 1920.

cooperation, and finally the representation of charity in international welfare societies.[38] It also decreed the founding of the sections *Iuventus, Migratio, Infirmitas, Paupertas, Sobrietas,* and *Literae.* In 1928 the conference constituted itself as a permanent organization with the name *Caritas Catholica,* as Pius XI had desired, in order to emphasize the religious motivation of the work here accomplished. The director of the *Caritas* of Strasbourg, Paul Müller-Simonis, became the first president, and in 1938 he was succeeded by Josef Tongelen, director of the *Caritas* of Vienna.

That collaboration beyond national boundaries even in the inner Catholic area was not without problems appeared when a congress of charity, planned for Strasbourg in 1927, had to be canceled at the last moment because of strained German-French relations.[39] Subsequently the delegates met repeatedly in Switzerland, but international cooperation was considerably impeded after 1933 under Nazi pressure and in 1937 it was stopped.[40] Despite these setbacks, the first union of national charity associations had powerfully strengthened their solidarity. Above all, the effects of the exchange of experiences must not be lightly underestimated. Furthermore, *Caritas Catholica* caused the founding of new national charity associations.

Consolidation of Charity between the World Wars

After the First World War the charitable institutions in many countries were intensively consolidated. In this connection must be noted not only the improved organization but also the multiplication and the differentiation. In 1930 charity in all countries included:[41]

Closed Relief	Number of Institutions	Number of Beds	Number of Personnel
Health Care	15,700	752,000	135,000
Educational Care	13,400	668,600	70,600
Total	29,100	1,420,600	205,600

Half-Open Relief

Number of Institutions	96,300
Average Number of Daily Visitors	2,390,000

Open Relief

Number of Institutions	140,000

---

[38] K. Joerger in *Caritas* 5(1926), 317.

[39] Hafenbradl, 32–36.

[40] Op. cit., 45–48. The sources on this period are extraordinarily meagre.

[41] H. Auer in *KH* 17(1930–31), 108–201, here 118.

Personnel Active in Charitable Work

Mother-House Sisters Active in Charity	350,000
Religious Brothers Active in Charity	32,000
Other Personnel Officially Active Chiefly in Charity . . .	120,000
Total of Personnel Officially Active Chiefly in Charity . . .	502,000
Catholics Active in Charity in an Honorary Capacity . . .	6,650,000

These activities varied according to country, from the differentiated institutions in industralized states to the weakly developed structures in the Churches with Iberian backgrounds.[42] In the missions also during this epoch European models were still the pattern.[43] According to the summaries provided by L. Berg,[44] in the territories subject to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith there were the following institutions and personnel in the service of charity in 1930:

Asia (7 million Catholics):
165 physicians and 787 nurses; 293 hospitals with 18,109 beds; 1,325 pharmacies with 11,773,021 consultations; 33 leprosaria with 5,722 patients; 1,073 orphanages with 66,995 orphans; 253 homes for the elderly with 10,645 charges.

Africa (4.9 million Catholics):
30 physicians and 281 nurses; 267 hospitals with 9,470 beds; 1,074 pharmacies with 11,662,898 consultations; 59 leprosaria with 5,548 patients; 617 orphanages with 30,675 orphans; 132 homes for the elderly with 4,664 charges.

America (2.9 million Catholics):
4 physicians and 36 nurses; 53 hospitals with 1,759 beds; 130 pharmacies with 147,104 consultations; 4 leprosaria with 331 patients; 92 orphanages with 3,920 orphans; 14 homes for the elderly with 520 charges.

---

[42] *KH* gives information on the charitable accomplishments of Germany. For other countries the national directories give references.

[43] Rich material for the charitable activity in mission territories in: *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* (Paris and Lyon 1822ff.); *Missions Catholiques* (Lyon and Paris 1868–1964); *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1873ff.); *ZMR* (Münster 1911ff.).

[44] L. Berg, *Christliche Liebestätigkeit in den Missionsländern* (Freiburg 1935), here 19ff. He relies on *Guida delle Missioni Cattoliche* (Rome 1934). Detailed information on charity in mission countries (1929), which also extends beyond the areas subject to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in B. Arens, *État actuel des Missions Catholiques* (Louvain 1932), 151–92.

Australia, Oceania, New Zealand (2.15 million Catholics):
7 physicians and 51 nurses; 107 hospitals with 3,668 beds; 278 pharmacies with 958,570 consultations; 12 leprosaria with 1,178 patients; 126 orphanages with 9,545 orphans; 18 homes for the elderly with 1,601 charges.

European Mission Countries (.9 million Catholics):
5 physicians and 8 nurses; 51 hospitals with 3,295 beds; 7 pharmacies with 43,285 consultations; 67 orphanages with 1,855 orphans; 11 homes for the elderly with 238 charges.

Charity in the Totalitarian State

Charity in the German Reich first came into conflict with a totalitarian state after 1933. Thereby the DCV suffered severe losses, but it still was able, under its capable tactician-president, Benedikt Kreutz (1921–49), to retain the greatest part of its substance and especially its ability to function.[45] On the other hand, other free welfare associations were dissolved—in 1933 Welfare Work and Christian Workers' Aid—or incorporated into the National Socialist People's Welfare (NSV), founded in 1933, or brought into line—in 1933 the Equal Welfare Society, later actually also the German Red Cross. The concordat assured the continuation of the Church's social institutions (ARTICLE 31), and the bishops energetically exerted themselves for this. Nevertheless, after 1934, 1,200 kindergartens had to be closed or turned over to the NSV. The same fate befell 300 stations of the mobile care of the sick, 156 Travelers' Aid Societies, 136 employment exchange offices for the protection of girls, 35 seminaries for kindergarten teachers and female youth leaders, and 2 social schools for women. And in 1938 the Institute for Charity-Science at the University of Freiburg was suppressed. The Nazi state tried to limit charity as far as possible to the care of the physically or mentally handicapped. Another serious restriction was the limiting of charitable gatherings, which were of decisive significance for the funding of the work.[46] Severe losses were also experienced by the charitable orders and congregations, which before the Second World War had more than 70,000 nursing personnel in Germany.[47] In spite of the enormous need for the care of the wounded, entry into charitable communities was no longer granted after 1940, although a formal prohibition did not occur. Thereafter the number of members of institutes sharply declined in Germany.[48] After the war's end this development was stopped for only a few years. During the Nazi epoch religious also had to leave many public institutions, where they were replaced by the rival establishments of the Nazi Sisters. *Caritas* President Kreutz for his part had in 1937 called into existence the *Caritas* sisterhood for sisters not bound by enclosure—in 1939 they had 5,000 members. Finally, the war offered opportunity for the confiscation of 1,871 institutions (the total was 3,971), and 1,358 were destroyed or severely damaged by war measures.[49] Nevertheless, the DCV was able to save essential areas before the Nazi grasp and even to create new institutions for aid. Of 4,000 kindergartens, 70 percent remained under Church auspices, and the hospitals could also continue their activity. The DCV brought effective help to many persecuted by the Nazi regime.[50] On the other hand, the risk for those handicapped threatened with murder was very difficult and often useless.

---

[45] R. A. Ihorst, *Zur Situation der katholischen Kirche und ihrer caritativen Tätigkeit in den ersten Jahren des Dritten Reiches* (Dipl.-Arbeit Freiburg 1971); K. Borgmann, "Der Deutsche Caritasverband im 'Dritten Reich,'" *75 Jahre DCV* (1972), 92–99.

[46] While the DCV collected and distributed from 27 to 30 million RM in checks and cash for the winter assistance work (WHW) in 1932–33, it obtained in 1939 from the huge yields of collections of the Nazi WHW, in which it had had to participate, a donation of only 131,000 RM (F. Klein, *Christ und Kirche in der sozialen Welt* [Freiburg 1956], 241).

While charity was curtailed in so many ways, the difficult situation also compelled positive new starts. Among these were the activation of parish charity and personal acts of charity not measurable by statistics.[51] And reflection on the founding and responsibilities (tasks) of the Church's social work was intensified in these years.[52]

Assistance in Emergency and Catastrophe since the Second World War

The miserable condition of millions at the end of the war and the vast displacements of populations—30 million refugees in Europe—evoked, as in 1919, a worldwide readiness to assist. The discrimination against Germans and the long period of strictly closed state boundaries of course created conditions other than after the First World War. On the other hand, the great aid organizations had meanwhile been more strictly organized and thereby made more capable of achievements.[53] The great misery also compelled charity to extraordinary exertions. Thus in 1944 Italy obtained a national charity organization in the Pontificia Opera di Assistenza. France followed in 1946 with the founding of the "Secours Catholique" by the Conference of Cardinals and Archbishops.[54] At its head stood, as secretary general, Jean Rodhain, who during the war had organized pastoral care for French prisoners of war and slave laborers in Germany. The French merger was oriented on the American and German model. In many countries appeared similar organizations, which originally were intended to alleviate actual misery but soon grew into permanent central offices.[55] All other aid institutions were surpassed by those of the American Catholics.[56] The War Relief Services (WRS), founded by the bishops in 1943, were incorporated into the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), and united the hitherto fragmented particular initiatives. They concentrated on direct help for refugees, prisoners of war, and all other victims of war. The assistance measures first beginning in Europe were soon extended to almost all countries devastated by the war. WRS worked in 1945 in sixty-two countries and throughout supported some missions, but it also claimed the cooperation of local institutions. Then when it was apparent that the organization produced by the war continued to be necessary for the future, the episcopate in 1955 renamed the WRS the Catholic Relief Services (CRS). Up to 1963 the assistance work distributed relief material (food, medicine, clothing) to a total amount of $1.25 billion overseas. The entire Catholic emergency help of the postwar period would not have been thinkable without the immense achievements of the 30 million American Catholics. These financed their activities exclusively by donations. In addition, since 1950 the American government put superfluous food at its disposal.

---

[47] On the Nazi tactics, see H. G. Hockerts, *Die Sittlichkeitsprozesse gegen katholische Ordensanhörige und Priester 1936/37* (Mainz 1971).

[48] 1935: 7,500 novices; after 1940 ca. 4,000 persons could still evade the prohibition to receive novices; 1950: 3,600 novices, thereafter a strong decline.

[49] K. Borgmann in *75 Jahre DCV*, 97.

[50] In 1934 Kreutz founded the *Caritas-Notwerk* for the thousands of discharged officials and employees. The dispossessed *St. Raphaelsverein* was a help to many persecuted in the emigration; L. E. Reutter, *Katholische Kirche als Fluchthelfer im Dritten Reich. Die Betreuung von Auswanderern durch den St. Raphaels-Verein* (Recklingshausen 1971). In 1939 there appeared in Berlin the *Caritas-Reichsstelle für nichtarische Katholiken.*

[51] Cf. J. Kessels in *JbCarWiss* (1962), 18f., 23.

[52] K. Borgmann in *JbCarWiss* (1957), 108.

Even before the American aid, the help of the Vatican and of Switzerland began in Germany. When later the war misery disappeared in European countries, the activity of the existing assistance works was concentrated on help in catastrophes, which had never before occurred to such a degree, as well as on measures for other countries hurt by the war and on the always smouldering problem of refugees.

---

[53] Cf. M. Vorgrimler in *JbCarWiss* (1958), 86–101.

[54] As early as 1936 the episcopate had attempted a merger of the French charitable institutions; N. Bayon, *Le grand Q[uartier] G[eneral] de la Charité; le Secours Catholique* (Paris 1955).

[55] Survey in *75 Jahre DCV,* 61ff.

[56] E. E. Swanstromm in *NCE* 3(1967), 328f.

On the other hand, the Church's social work could not but endure considerable damage in Communist-ruled countries. In all the "People's Democracies" outside the German Democratic Republic[57] the Church's social works and institutions were nationalized or withdrawn from the influence of Church direction—Poland, U.S.S.R. in 1949,[58] China in 1950.[59] The personnel of religious institutes were partly taken into the service of the state but had to renounce any pastoral activity. Besides, various waves of refugees from countries under Communist domination repeatedly made assistance measures necessary—in 1956, for example, 200,000 refugees from Hungary. Let Hong Kong be cited as an especially striking example. The population of the Crown Colony rose through the stream of Chinese refugees from 1.5 million in 1946 to 4 million in 1966. The Catholic Church grew incomparably stronger from 30,000 in 1946 to 233,000 members in 1967. These produced wonderful accomplishments in the social sphere.[60]

Caritas Internationalis

After the war the revival of *Caritas Catholica* was variously stimulated,[61] but at the same time there appeared a tendency toward a dissolution of the Swiss central office and the creation of an independent bureau, perhaps also situated in Switzerland, which should cultivate contact with the non-Catholic welfare societies. Then in 1947 occurred, due to French initiative, the founding of an *Auxilium Catholicum Internationale,* with headquarters in Paris, for extraordinary assistance measures, which was regarded at Lucerne as an undesirable competition. The director of the Swiss *Caritas,* G. Crivelli, who was working for the continuation of *Caritas Catholica,* founded in 1924 and never dissolved, stressed on the contrary that other national societies would have to be established before an international merger.[62] At the suggestion of the Holy See there then followed in 1950 the founding of an "International Charity Conference."[63] On the occasion of the Holy Year, the president of the *Pontificia Commissione di Assistenza,* Ferdinando Baldelli, after consultation with the Papal Secretariat of State, had invited the national societies to a study meeting at Rome from 12 to 15 September 1950. At this appeared sixty delegates from twenty-two nations, including the directors of twelve national charity associations.[64] The desire of the Secretariat of State was a stronger and more systematic organization on the international level. A central office should serve for coordination, information, and representation, but the delegates expressed concerns in regard to the future autonomy of the national associations. Nevertheless, on the last day of the conference they united for the establishing of an "International Charity Conference" with headquarters at Rome. This should take care of the tasks mentioned but not attack the individuality and autonomy of its member organizations. The statutes, which the Holy See approved in 1951 *ad experimentum,* envisaged as organs the general assembly, an executive committee, a general secretariat, and delegations at international organizations.[65] The national episcopates, informed by the Secretariat of State, approved the new foundation, except for the United States, where at first there were reservations. At the founding meeting on 12 and 13 September 1951, of the twelve delegations only two non-European, those from the United States and Canada, were represented. The meeting took the positions envisaged by the statutes, according to which it sought the greatest possible international distribution. In the executive committee the chief Catholic countries were represented—the United States, France, and Germany, also Italy and, as representatives of the smaller nations, the Netherlands, Canada, and Spain. The delegation at the United Nations was given to Switzerland. Baldelli of Italy became president, and O'Grady of the United States vice-president. Karl Bayer, a German hitherto active on the *Pontificia Commissione di Assistenza,* was elected secretary general. The meeting confirmed Rome as headquarters of the conference, but expressly desired that the secretariat be accommodated outside Vatican City. Preeminent tasks were to be the gaining of other national societies, the making of contact with the United Nations, and the creating of an agency in New York. The budget for the first fiscal year, which was proportioned among the participating associations—United States 28 percent, Luxemburg 2 percent—was a quite modest twelve thousand United States dollars.

---

[57] *Caritasarbeit. Jahresbericht '70* (Berlin 1971) names the following Catholic social institutions: 234 institutions with 12,567 beds; 165 half-open institutions with 8,190 places; 191 nursing stations; 550 other social assistance institutions; thirty-nine places for education and continuing formation.

[58] In China in 1948 there were, among other things, 254 Catholic orphanages and 196 hospitals with 81,628 beds (*HK* 5[1950], 201).

[59] The *Caritas* of the U.S.S.R., entirely under state control and state-financed, in 1955 ran 115 institutions with 9,300 beds. Its name is the only thing it has in common with the ecclesiastical organizations (*HK* 10[1955–56], 109).

[60] Details in *Caritas Hong Kong. Annual Report 1971–1972.* According to this, church representatives here support, among other things, four hospitals, four homes for girls, two centers for professional education, seven kindergartens, and seven social centers.

[61] Cf. W. Wiesen in *StdZ* 72(1946), 42f.; also, Hafenbradl, 53ff., and appendix, 33–44.

---

[62] Thus at the Central European Charity Conference of 1948 at Lucerne. Protocol in Hafenbradl, appendix, 57–69.

[63] Also the unpublished work of G. Wopperer, "Caritas Internationalis, Entwicklung, Organisation und Tätigkeit," Ms. 1957; C. Bayer, K. Joerger in *An der Aufgabe gewachsen,* 194f.

[64] Hafenbradl, 70f. The non-European countries were represented only by the chairmen of the NCCC of the United States.

[65] The statutes have since then been often modified, most recently in 1972, and published as a special printing.

In spite of this restricted framework, the general secretariat displayed a vigorous activity. It established the connection with the national member organizations and divided, as had the earlier *Caritas Internationalis,* into particular professional groups. It placed special importance on information[66] and the compiling of archives. The delegations in New York and Geneva promoted collaboration with international delegations and with agencies of the United Nations. The organization renamed in 1954 *Caritas Internationalis* quite early gained consultative status in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), in the International Assistance Work for Children (UNICEF), and in the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) of the United Nations. *Caritas Internationalis* had considerable success also in the promoting of charity in those countries which hitherto had no corresponding organizations. Following a journey by Bayer through Latin America to gain information and recruits, many national associations appeared there in 1955–56.[67] Corresponding foundations also occurred in Africa and Asia, and, while only twelve countries were represented at the first meeting in 1950, the number of members grew to eighty in 1972. Correspondingly the central service offices were completed.[68] Over and above this, there took place in 1954 the coordination with the *Société de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul* at Paris and the *Association Internationale des Charités de Saint-Vincent-de-Paul* at Paris, and in 1958 that with the *Confédération Internationale Catholique des Institutions Hospitalières* of Nijmegen, which participated as permanent observers in the general assemblies and on the executive committee. To the earlier existing delegations was added in 1968 another at UNESCO in Paris. Further, *Caritas Internationalis* displayed a vigorous assistance in catastrophes, for example, in floods—in the Netherlands and Belgium in 1953—earthquakes, and political complications, for example, in 1954 the care of refugees from Vietnam, in 1956 the care of refugees from Hungary, and in 1970 aid to Biafra.

---

[66] Since 1955 there appears regularly the service for news and information, *Intercaritas,* in German, and at somewhat longer intervals also in English, French, and Spanish.

[67] Best survey: *Caritas Internationalis 1970–1972.*

[68] Ibid.

Catholic Works of Assistance

From the middle of this century there appeared a completely new understanding of charity that was actually revolutionary because of the separation from preaching. This resulted from the insight, more and more penetrating into awareness, that the Church also must make a contribution to the development of the Third World.[69] Ecclesiastical social work in its manifold specializations was from time immemorial bound up with the mission, and as late as 1962 T. Ohm emphatically demanded the inclusion of charity in evangelization. "A mission which disregards the really religious for the 'social gospel' is no mission."[70] The population explosion and the spread of the industrial types of society led, however, in the Third World to a pauperism whose dimensions far exceeded the problems of the industrial society coming into being in the nineteenth century. The missionaries now had to show very impressive achievements in the social sector; education oriented to economic and technical progress, hence to self-development, had been, on the other hand, disregarded by them.[71] Basically they did not question the colonial foundation. Even before most former colonies had obtained political independence, a new awareness of responsibility and a reorientation of social work for the countries of the Third World established themselves. Classical charity was not suspended by this fact but it was supplemented by "help for self-help," hence the encouragement of self-development. In motivation this is identical with its older sister but it must be clearly separated from preaching and no longer understands itself, as the former did, as an indirect mission. On the other hand there are also assistance works which accomplish decidedly pastoral works of development.

This new type of charitable activity has not been able to establish itself equally in all countries.[72] The largest of the Catholic assistance organizations, CRS, began, for example, in 1960 with its own projects of help in development, but, then as earlier, stressed direct help. The new idea made itself most strikingly felt in the German Federal Republic. At the suggestion of Vicar General Josef Teusch of Cologne, who thereby took up the initiatives of various Catholic groups and societies, Cardinal Frings proposed to the German Episcopal Conference in 1958 the founding of the activity *Misereor* against hunger and sickness in the world.[73] The business office was erected at Aachen, and in this way the intimate relationship with the German branch of the papal work of spreading the faith, *missio,* then located there, was expressed. Nevertheless, *Misereor* was supposed to be run not as a mission but as an enterprise for assisting development. The first collection on Palm Sunday 1959, with a yield of 33.4 million German marks, surpassed all expectations and contributed to the rapid consolidation of the new foundation. The donations of those attending Mass—up to 1973 they amounted to 786.7 million German marks—constitute the decisive source of revenue of the bishops' assistance work. The choice of project, which a professional committee decides, is concentrated not on direct aid for the signs of misery but tries to deal with the causes and to foster personal initiative. On the other hand, the aid of the German Catholics for catastrophes is directed by the DCV. The "Workers' Community for Development Aid," founded in 1959 by *Misereor* and other Catholic societies, serves also the enlisting, preparing, and informing of helpers in development—by 1974 there were some seventeen hundred.

---

[69] On the principles, see J. Schmauch in *HPTh* IV, 618–23.

[70] T. Ohm, *Machet zu Jüngern alle Völker* (Freiburg 1962), 639–658, here 657.

[71] Cf. C. Erb in *HPTh* IV, 624–45.

[72] Ibid., 629–39.

[73] U. Koch, F. Merz in *KH* 26(1969), 435–42.

In addition, the German bishops in 1961 established the activity *Adveniat* to support the pastoral tasks of the Church in Latin America.[74] The activity, first conceived as a single collection for the education of priests, was finally continued as all-embracing aid for the carrying out of pastoral care in Latin America. Up to 1972 the German Catholics spent 621.1 million German marks for this end—the Christmas collection. That clear distinction and organizational separation of development and pastoral assistance which is practiced in the German Federal Republic, has not been imitated everywhere, for the aid works of other nations, which appeared partly at the same time or a little later, often unite other functions with development aid.[75] This is true, for example, of the "Lenten Sacrifice of the Swiss Catholics." Its means are divided, since the founding in 1962, by thirds among development aid, the foreign missions, and domestic Swiss projects. Naturally, the desire to give development aid directly or indirectly to the foreign missions, especially in lands with an old mission tradition, is lively. Moreover, the implementation of many projects is referred to the missionary substructure and is carried out in a certain personal connection with the mission work. There were precursors of the later aid works in various countries—in England the Miss-A-Meal Movement, in Austria in 1958 family fast day—but the real wave of foundations began only with the Second Vatican Council, which confronted bishops and Catholicism with worldwide problems. During the council occurred the founding of episcopal aid works in Belgium (in 1961 *Carême de Partage,* later *Entraide et Fraternité/Broederlijk Delen*), the Netherlands (in 1961 *Bisschoppelijke Vastenaktie*), in France (in 1961 *Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement*), in England and Wales (in 1963 Catholic Fund for Overseas Development), in Austria (in 1964 *Koordinierungsstelle für internationale Entwicklungsförderung*), and in Australia (in 1964 Committee for Overseas Relief). Individual new foundations first concentrated on strictly defined projects, in which the former colonial ties played a role—Belgium in Zaire, France in its former African colonies. Since then the notion has increasingly expanded to become global.

---

[74] H. Lüning in *KH* 26(1969), 422–52.

[75] Survey: CIDSE, Brussels 1974.

The first stimuli for the cooperation of the national assistance works were expressed even before the council. In 1960 a small group of experts urged this concern on the occasion of the Eucharistic Congress at Munich. But the formal initiative for a foundation came only four years later, when on 5 November 1964, during the third session of the council, Cardinal Frings appealed to the episcopal conferences of all countries for the establishing of aid works against hunger, poverty, sickness, and illiteracy. Beyond this he suggested the international merger of already existing organizations. This impulse found a very positive echo among the council fathers. Other discussions of this question as well as the temporary founding of a workers' community with a view to the instituting of a center of information and coordination on 8 May 1965 went back to Frings's suggestion. The episcopal conferences represented in it—Belgium, German Federal Republic, France, Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, United States—decreed on 18 November 1965, with the consent of the Holy See, the founding of a permanent workers' community and of a secretariat, which in 1966 took up its activity in Brussels. The national character and autonomy of the members of this *Coopération Internationale pour le Développement Socio-Economique* (CIDSE) were thereby not touched. Its directing agency is the general assembly, which meets about every three years. It decides the principles and functions of the CIDSE. In addition there are an administrative committee ("Commission"), which determines the activity of the secretariat, and a managing board of directors. The secretary general is at the same time secretary of the general assembly, of the commission, and of the management committee and directs the secretariat. The first chairman of CIDSE was Cardinal Frings. His successors were Cardinal Bernhard Alfrink of Utrecht, Cardinal Leo Josef Suenens of Brussels, Hans Peter Merz of *Misereor* of Aachen, and Meinrad Hengartner, a Swiss. Since 1967 the secretary general has been August Vanistendael.

The goal of CIDSE consisted from the first neither in the giving of their means by its members nor in the imparting of instructions, but in coordination, information, and consultation. Hence, among other things, all projects were registered at Brussels and a comprehensive card file of experts was compiled. In addition, CIDSE stimulated the instituting of other assistance works, which meanwhile are no longer restricted to the industrialized nations, but have found admittance to the Third World. Such assistance works appeared in Malawi—in 1968 the Christian Service Committee of the Churches in Malawi—where the work overlaps the denominations, also in Canada (in 1969 the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace), Thailand (in 1968 the Catholic Council of Thailand for Development), Indonesia (in 1971 *Lembaga Penelitian Dan Pembangunam Sosial*), Rhodesia (in 1972 the Commission on Social Service and Development), and finally Ireland (in 1973 Trocaire), the Caribbean (in 1973 Christian Action for Development in the Caribbean—ecumenical), and Nordic countries (in 1969 Nordisk Katolsk Utvecklingshjaelp), and Spain (in 1974 Secretariado de Cooperación al Desarrollo). The Australian assistance work, on the contrary, disappeared because it cooperated more powerfully with *Caritas Internationalis*.

The working methods of the assistance works are varied and are not impaired in their respective characteristics. In this regard aid for the Third World is often united with measures inside the donor country. Naturally, this applies especially to the assistance works of the underdeveloped countries. While large assistance works, such as *Misereor*, can take into consideration extensive programs and greater projects, the smaller assistance works are restricted to partial programs or small projects.

The financing of aid activity is based primarily on donations (collections) of the faithful. In their differing amounts is without doubt expressed something of the vitality of Catholicism in the various countries. On the other hand, the statistics of CIDSE comprise, it is estimated, only a fourth of the aid-means for development produced by Catholics, for the accomplishments made by religious communities and particular groups or individuals appear in no list. The donation yield of assistance works related to CIDSE amounted in 1973 to 50.1 million United States dollars,[76] not counting Spain, Ireland, and the United

---

[76] *CIDSE News Bulletin* of April 1974 gives the following individual sums: German Federal Republic 35,924,181 in American dollars, Canada 2,928,888; Austria 2,479,334; Belgium 3,134,292; Scandinavian countries 49,431; France 1,339,358; England and Wales 664,437; Netherlands 2,347,499; Switzerland 2,049,941. Very informative is the per capita yield of donations in the individual countries. This amounted in the German Federal Republic to 1.32 American dollars; Canada .34; Austria .37; Great Britain 1.15; Belgium .35; France .03; Netherlands .46; Switzerland

States. In the Netherlands, the German Federal Republic, Switzerland, and Canada the Church's aid projects for development were financed also out of state means.[77] Despite initial hesitations this cooperation has not operated to the detriment of the Church's independence, since the donation occurred exclusively in accord with objective aspects. If regard is had, in addition, for the very large sums for aid from CRS, which of course to a great extent are made possible by the government because of the presence of superfluous food, which must not be regarded as real development help,[78] as well as of the donation yield of *Adveniat,* which like *Caritas Internationalis,* is equally a consultative member of CIDSE, then the total value of help provided in 1973 by these organizations amounted to 248,342,155 United States dollars.

The functions of the papal commission *Iustitia et Pax,* founded in 1966, lie in the area of study and promotion, not of social action. And the council *Cor unum,* founded by Paul VI in 1971, is intended to further the more intensive cooperation of charity and development aid as well as agents in any way occupied with them.[79]

There has never been any dearth of official church recommendations of the traditional care of the poor. But only the Second Vatican Council found, on the basis of experiences endured for a century, a new view and expressly approved and recommended the social-charitable activity as well as the ecclesiastical development aid meanwhile developed. True, there is no special conciliar document which is devoted to charity or development aid, but expressions on them are found in various contexts.[80] According to these, charity is acknowledged as the Church's basic function and activity. This is true not only for the ethos of the turning to those suffering need but also for organized charitable activity, which is expressly, even in its branches extending beyond denominations, approved and recommended. Unambiguous also is the profession of development aid, for which clear norms are given in

---

.82 (per Catholic). These donations were used for, among other purposes, the following fields: education 22.55 percent, health care 18.48 percent, agriculture 16.05 percent.

[77] CEBEMO (Netherlands): 7,531,797 American dollars; Central Office for Development Aid (German Federal Republic); 22,183,599; CIDA (Canada): 1,761,882.

[78] In 1973: 138,947,516 American dollars. The surplus means herein contained came from state donations.

[79] On 15 July 1971 Paul VI outlined this distribution of functions in a letter to Cardinal Secretary of State Villot.

[80] In detail in Völkl, *Dienende Kirche,* 260–338; cf. particularly the decree on the apostolate of the laity, ART. 8, and the pastoral constitution, ART. 86; R. Völkl, *Diakonie und Caritas in den Dokumenten der deutschsprachigen Synoden* (Freiburg 1977).

ARTICLE 86 of the pastoral constitution. Their aim is full human development—"plena perfectio humana"—which indeed refers to the aid of the industrial nations, but primarily challenges the capabilities and traditions of the Third World—"non solis opibus alienis, sed propriis plene explicandis necnon ingenio et traditione propria colendis." Thus were the principles originally formulated and practiced in the North Atlantic world accepted for the Universal Church.

CHAPTER 15

*History of the Ecumenical Movement**

The Development of the World Council of Churches and Its Route from Amsterdam (1948) to Nairobi (1976)

The beginnings of the ecumenical movement go back to the nineteenth century. Neither theology nor church leaders supplied the impetus to it, but rather the free groups of religious renewal, which were partly in conscious opposition both to the theology of the Enlightenment and to organized ecclesiastical systems. In addition to the Oxford Movement in the area of Anglicanism, there were above all associations of youth and of the Christian Student Movement. The Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), founded in England in 1844 and 1854 respectively, soon spread to Europe and North America. Supranational and supradenominational and also organized in an emphatically evangelical and missionary context, they were referred from their own center to the *ecumene.* In contrast to the liberal theology of the time, persons were convinced that the unity of the Church could be found only on the basis of a clear creed. This was expressed in the Paris basic formula of the YMCA of 1855, which begins thus: "The Young Men's Christian Association has the aim of joining such young men together who acknowledge Jesus Christ, in accord with Scripture, as their God and Saviour." Here was unmistakably prepared the later basic formula of the World Council of Churches. At first the YMCA acquired importance for the founding of the Christian Students' World Union, which was joined at Vadstena in Sweden in 1895 by the student movements of many countries in the Protestant sphere. From it or the YMCA respectively proceeded the leaders of the ecumenical movement of the twentieth century, such as John R. Mott (1865–1955), Nathan Söderblom (1866–1931), and Willem A. Visser 't Hooft (b. 1900).

---

* Erwin Iserloh

Mott had played a decisive role in the preparing and implementing of the World Mission Conference of Edinburgh in 1910, which was intended to bring the various mission societies to collaboration. This was first institutionally assured in a continuing committee (1910–20) and then in the International Mission Council, which from 1921 to 1942 was under Mott's chairmanship. From the World Mission Conference at Edinburgh proceeded the decisive impetus to the ecumenical movement. If, according to John 17:23, the credibility of the Christian message depends on the unity of Christians, then the disunion in the mission, with its numerous mission societies working alongside and in opposition to one another, could only be experienced with the greatest pain.

At Edinburgh questions of faith and of ecclesiastical organization were excluded, but no agreement on them was to be expected. On the basis of this procedure it was possible to gain the cooperation of the High Church branch of the Anglican Church. Catholics and Orthodox were not invited.

The practical experience expressed by the American missionary bishop from the Philippines, Charles Brent (1862–1929), that one could not stop at practical collaboration but must ask questions precisely about doctrinal differences for the sake of unity, gave the stimulus to the movement Faith and Order. At a preparatory conference in Geneva in 1920 the Protestant Churches of Germany and France were not represented. Those of Switzerland declined to participate officially because among them there was no assumption that faith in the divinity of Christ must be acknowledged as an essential dogmatic basis. A continuing committee took over the rest of the preparation until finally on 3 August 1927 the first World Conference for Faith and Order could meet at Lausanne. There were 385 men and nine women representing 108 ecclesial communities. The reports of the work groups on the themes unity of the Church, its message, its nature, its creed, its function, its sacraments, and on the unity of Christianity and the separated Churches were not adopted, but only received for transmission to the Churches. The experience of the great difficulties which opposed unification produced a salutary sobriety. There was a willingness not to conceal contradictions but honestly to expose them. Above all, the Orthodox were concerned with stating their viewpoint clearly. With them and the Anglicans the Protestants came into contact with a strongly ecclesiological-sacramental mentality; on the other hand, the Lutherans' fear of everything institutional and hence of a concrete Church became obvious.

From the experience "Doctrine separates—service unites" the movement Life and Work movement sought to prepare on another route, namely, through practical work for peace and social work, on the international level of the *ecumene.* At the meeting of the World Union for the Work of the Friendship of the Churches in 1919 at Oud Wassenaer near The Hague and following its activity and the exertions of the International Conciliation Union, Bishop Nathan Söderblom (1866–1931) of Uppsala urged a world conference on questions of social ethics. Dogmatic questions were to be excluded. Progress resulted more quickly than in the case of Faith and Order. As early as 1925 the World Conference for Life and Work was able to meet at Stockholm. It was the first expressly ecumenical conference. Representatives of all the great ecclesial communities, except the Roman Catholic Church, were present. The importance of the conference lay, of course, more in the fact that it took place at all than in its content and outcome. Brilliant festive gatherings and worship services could not conceal the deep dissents. If some, chiefly the Anglo-Saxons, intended to bring about the Kingdom of God by a constituting of social conditions in accord with God's world plan, others believed, especially the German Lutherans, that they must stress the transcendence of God's Kingdom and its eschatological character. The conference was carried further in a continuing committee with various working groups, which from 1930 on was active in Geneva as the World Conference for Life and Work.

The relationship of German Protestantism to the ecumenical movement was considerably disturbed between the two world wars. If after 1918 "ecumenical cooperation was immensely impeded"[1] by the thesis of the sole guilt of Germany for the outbreak of the world war in the Treaty of Versailles, the question of attitude toward the Nazi state was posed for ecumenical groups from 1933. This problem was especially delicate when two German groups, the "German Evangelical Church" and the "Confessing Church" exerted themselves for recognition and collaboration. The World Council for Life and Work expressed itself in support of the Confessing Church and in 1934 decided to discuss at the next world conference the theme "Church, State, and People." For, because of the rise of totalitarian states, this old theme had caught fire in a new, even more acute form. The continuing committee of Faith and Order declared, on the other hand, for the admission of representatives of the official German Evangelical Church. The difficulty was removed when the Nazi state made participation in the world conference impossible for both groups—as for German delegations in general.

The suggestion of the World Conference for Life and Work at

---

[1] A. Deissmann, *Die Stockholmer Weltkirchenkonferenz* (Berlin 1926), 749; M. Pribilla, *Um kirchliche Einheit* (Freiburg 1929), 97–100.

Oxford in July 1937 to combine the two movements into a corporation and establish a World Council obtained also the assent of the Conference for Faith and Order at Edinburgh in August 1937. A committee discussed the constituting of the World Council at Utrecht in 1938. But because of the outbreak of war a plenary meeting could no longer be convoked. Not until 1948 did there occur at Amsterdam the establishing of the World Council of Churches; Faith and Order was to continue as a committee of the council and deal with questions of doctrine.

The first plenary meeting of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam from 22 August to 4 September 1948 stood under the theme: "The Confusion of the World and God's Plan of Salvation." The basic formula adopted at the start reads: "The World Council of Churches is a community of Churches which acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." According to the constitution, not individuals or associations but only Churches can be members. For at stake is a community of autonomous Churches, not a "superchurch." The World Council may be a help to the member Churches in their efforts for unity and in matters which can be done in common. "But it is alien to the council to wish to seize upon any functions which belong to the member Churches or to control them or wish to enact laws for them."[2]

At Amsterdam 147 Churches were represented by 351 delegates from forty-seven countries. Fundamentalist Protestant groups, for example, the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod of North America, had refused to join, because they missed a clear and solid dogmatic position and, a few days before the meeting of the plenary assembly, had founded the International Council of Christian Churches.

The Orthodox were represented chiefly through envoys of the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople and of the Greek Church. A gathering of the heads of the autocephalous Churches under the direction of the Patriarch of Moscow had declined participation in the World Conference. The Roman Catholic Church also was not represented; only individual theologians had obtained permission from the Curia for private participation.

The plenary meeting at Amsterdam had the task of giving the World Council a constitution and, in view of the world torn apart and bled to death by the war, to gain clarity on the mandate of Christianity in and for the world. In Section 1, under the direction of Bishop Hanns Lilje and with the cooperation of Karl Barth, the unity of the Church and inner renewal were stressed under the theme "The Church in God's

---

[2] Constitution of the World Council of Churches of 30 August 1948 in *Die Unordnung der Welt und Gottes Heilsplan* V (Tübingen 1948), 168.

Plan of Salvation." In this connection it became obvious that the ideas of the unity of the Church differed very deeply.

There were serious conflicts in the "political" Sections 3—"the Church and the dissolution of the social order"—and 4—"the Church and international disorder." Here the world political and ideological struggle between East and West entered. It was bluntly stated in the talks of the American John Foster Dulles (1888–1959) and of the Prague theology professor Joseph L. Hromadka (1889–1969). In opposition to the harsh rejection of atheistic and materialistic Communism by Dulles, Hromadka offered an emotional criticism of the capitalistic West. The conference saw itself facing the task of upholding the Christian community despite all "Iron Curtains" and at the same time of standing up for human liberty and social justice. It was stressed that "Christianity must not be identified with any particular system" and there was a warning against a bringing of the Church into line with a totalitarian system. In Section 3 it was emphasized as a supplement that the preserving of their independence in the face of the conformity and conflicts of the world must not mean any world-alienating neutrality of the Churches.

Amsterdam was only a beginning. It aimed to clarify, deepen, and expand the theological range of the very generally held basic formula and to find the right working method of the World Council. If there was great caution in the programmatic claim, it was hoped all the more, thanks to the importance of the institution and the sharing in dialogue and in work, to create ecumenical facts, which would in time permit it to proceed more energetically to the question of truth. In the declaration of the Central Committee at Toronto in 1950, "The Church, the Churches, and the World Council," it was again emphasized: "The World Council of Churches is not and must never become a super church. It is not the 'World Church.' It is also not the 'Una Sancta,' of which there is mention in the creed. . . . Each Church reserves to itself, in accord with its constitution, the right to ratify or reject the statements or actions of the council. . . . Within the World Council there is room for the ecclesiology of every Church which is ready to share in the ecumenical dialogue. . . . From the membership it does not follow that every Church must see the other member Churches as Churches in the true and full meaning of the word."[3]

This declaration was intended to make easy the admission of the Orthodox Churches into the World Council. In addition to individual small national Churches and the Russian Church-in-exile, only the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople and the Church of Greece had become members of the World Council at Amsterdam in 1948. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem had soon followed. Favored by the change of Moscow's foreign policy after the death of Stalin (1879–1953), efforts were made, especially by the Evangelical Church of Germany, for contacts with Russia. In August 1956 the Central Committee of the World Council met in Hungary. At the same time the patriarch of Constantinople, Athenagoras I (1886–1972), worked for a collaboration of all Orthodox Churches, including that of Russia. This led to the Pan-Orthodox conferences on Rhodes since 1961 and to the entry of the Churches of Russia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Poland into the World Council at New Delhi. Here on 19 November 1961 met the third plenary assembly of the World Council of Churches under the slogan: "Jesus Christ—Light of the World." The second plenary assembly had taken place at Evanston on Lake Michigan in 1954. At New Delhi the International Council of the Mission was integrated into the World Council as an autonomous section, the Commission for World Mission and Evangelization.

---

[3] Quoted from *Kirchliches Jahrbuch der EKD,* 1951, 78 (Gütersloh 1952), 225–29.

The Orthodox stood up for giving the status of an autonomous section to Faith and Order, hitherto only a report of the division of studies, and thereby to give greater weight to the question of truth. Their demands and questions facilitated also the acceptance of the Trinitarian expansion of the Christological basic formula. It now reads: "The World Council of Churches is a community of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ in accord with Holy Scripture as God and Saviour, and therefore try in common to fulfill that to which they are called, to the honor of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." Especially the "young Churches," whose importance the selection of the meeting place within the Asiatic world intended to stress, urged the early realization of visible unity of the Churches and intercommunion. The detailed report of Section 3, "Unity," took this into account; it was approved "whole and entire" by the plenary assembly and recommended to the churches for study. In emphasizing the necessity of *visible* unity it meant, according to Edmund Schlink, "a real progress on the way to overcoming an ecclesiological Docetism."

Meanwhile, 198 member Churches belonged to the World Council. At New Delhi for the first time an official Roman Catholic delegation was present at the plenary meeting of the World Council, with five representatives of the Secretariat for the Unity of Christians at Rome and two representatives of Cardinal Gracias of Bombay. The "World Responsibility of the Churches," since Amsterdam in 1948 the prevailing theme of the conferences of the World Council, came strongly to the foreground since 1966, the year of the change in the general secretariat from W.A. Vissert 't Hooft to Eugene Carson Blake. The

World Conference for Church and Society at Geneva in 1966, the third following Stockholm in 1925 and Oxford in 1937, which was predominantly occupied with social ethical questions, was supposed to give "the Christian reply to the technical and social revolution of our age." It was marked by a top-heaviness of laity and by an almost equally strong representation of the Churches of Africa, Asia, and Latin America as of those of Western Europe and North America. Experts and the disconcerted were supposed to speak to the Churches and there were discussions of their answer to the challenges of the revolutionary changes of the day.

Out of the conviction that the social responsibility of Christians must not be limited to the personal relations of the individual Christian to his neighbor, "Love through Structures" became a chief slogan of the conference and revolution theology a heated topic of discussion. In the message of the conference it was said: "As Christians we must stand up for change. . . . Today many of those who devote themselves to the service of Christ and their neighbor take a more radical and revolutionary position. They in no way deny the value of tradition and social order but they are in search of a new strategy, by the aid of which basic changes can be carried out in society without too great a loss of time. . . . At the present time it is important that we recognize the deeper mooring of this radical position in Christian tradition and give it a rightful place in the life of the Church. . . ."[4]

The conference demanded active participation of the Christian Church in the struggle for racial equality. The World Council of Churches was supposed to establish, among other things, a secretariat for the elimination of racism. This change to social and political commitment determined the theme of the fourth plenary assembly, which met at Uppsala from 4 to 20 July 1968, under the scriptural text, "See, I make all things new," and saw as signs of the time "sensational steps into a new scientific land, the protest of rebel students, the alarm over political murder and hostile clashes." In view of the reports, emotionally delivered before 704 delegates, many guests, and journalists, on "Rich and Poor Nations," "Racism or World Community," "Christianity and Human Rights," "Work of the Church in a Revolutionary World," it became difficult to bring the "gospel of conversion" to accommodation with the "gospel of social responsibility."[5] This tension, further sharpened since 1969 by the development of an ecumenical program for the fighting of racism and a call to the member Churches for donations for the support of liberation organizations, drove the World Council into the shattering test of a polarization. According to the resolution of the Central Committee at Addis Ababa in 1971 the money must not be used for military purposes. Further, a study on violent and nonviolent methods for causing social change was to be undertaken.

---

[4] H. Kruger, ed., *Ökumenische Bewegung 1965–1968, Beiheft z. Ök. Rundschau* no. 12/13 (Stuttgart 1970), 334.

[5] Message of the fourth plenary assembly, from *Ökumenische Bewegung 1965–1968,* 446f.

In 1972 with the choice of Philip Potter, a Methodist from Jamaica, a Christian of the Third World became secretary general of the World Council of Churches. At the conference of the Commission for World Mission and Evangelization of the World Council at Bangkok from 29 December 1972 to 8 January 1973, with the theme "Salvation of the World—Today," the delegates from Africa, Asia, and blacks from the United States were in a majority. "Salvation" was understood with the strong stress on "liberation," the work of salvation seen as a fight against exploitation, political suppression, and alienation. The aloofness from the Western Churches because of their "membership in colonial power structures" went as far as the demand for a "moratorium": at least temporarily the Churches of the Western world should stop sending out persons and money.

The geographical proximity to the great Asiatic religions suggested dialogue with them as a particular section theme. Thereby was posed the question of the right of mission, and the danger of a syncretism became acute in connection with the demand for "contextualizing" of the Christian message or the making of Christianity indigenous in the cultures of the Third World.

To judge from the preparations, the accent at the fifth plenary meeting, which took place from 23 November to 10 December 1975 at Nairobi, Kenya, with the theme "Christ liberates and unites," should have been placed on internal world problems, such as racism, sexism, and education. The great majority of the 757 delegates from 271 member Churches (with observers, advisers, and journalists there were ca. 2,300 participants) decided, however, for the theological themes of Sections 1 ("confession of Jesus Christ") and 2 ("unity of the Church"), and rising opposition, especially from the delegates of Orthodoxy, thwarted a slipping into the horizontal. The One Church was understood as a conciliar community of congregations which profess the same faith, celebrate the same baptism and the same Lord's Supper, and recognize the spiritual officers of the others. It was obvious that the World Council of Churches is not this conciliar community but is to prepare it. Worship, scriptural work, and spirituality occupy a broad space. Thus Nairobi became a "spiritual happening." In a "spirituality for combat," or, better, a "spirituality of commitment" the effort was made to recover the positive uniting of the proclamation of Christ and of social responsibility. It was attempted to surround anti-racism with a large program for the realization of human rights. Thus there was compulsion also to deal with the situation in the Soviet Union. The denial there of religious liberty led to the harshest debates; as generally at Nairobi, however, the course in this question also stood for integration and compromise. But the World Council of Churches will not fulfill its task with a passage from a "conflict *ecumene*" to a "community *ecumene*," if, as Lortz says, this is an "*ecumene* without truth."

The Share of the Roman Catholic Church in the Ecumenical Movement

With the participation of Catholic delegates in the plenary assembly in New Delhi a deeply rooted hesitation of the Roman Curia vis-à-vis ecumenical meetings was overcome. Convinced that it, and in the full sense only it, visibly represented the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ, the Roman Catholic Church was concerned that this claim could be made relative if it sat down with other ecclesial communities at the conference table.

To the invitation from the Scandinavian Lutheran archbishops to Pope Benedict XV to send representatives to Uppsala for an ecumenical conference on 8 September 1918, Cardinal Secretary of State Gasparri asserted that everything would be agreeable to the Pope which operated for peace and Christian brotherhood, because it "smooths the path for what the Gospel expresses in the words: 'that there may be one flock and one shepherd.'"[6] But there was no mention of a representation of the Pope at the proposed conference. Instead, on 4 July 1919 a decree of the Holy Office forbade any participation in congresses for the promotion of unity without the permission of the Holy See. As early as 16 May 1919 Benedict XV had given the decision to a delegation which brought him the invitation to the conference of Faith and Order: "The teaching and practice of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to the unity of the visible Church of Christ are well known to everyone, and so it is not possible for the Catholic Church to participate in a congress like the one proposed. However, His Holiness wishes under no circumstances to disapprove the congress in question for those who are not united with the See of Peter."[7]

---

[6] Letter of 19 June 1918; text in M. Pribilla, *Um kirchliche Einheit,* 319.

[7] R. Rouse, S. C. Neill, *Geschichte der Ökumenischen Bewegung 1517–1948* II (Göttigen 1958), 16.

The lively interest of Pius XI in movements for unity applied especially to Orthodoxy. As a scholar, an apostolate of the spirit was in first place in his eyes. For this he in 1922 established the Oriental Institute at Rome and required also an intensive study of the theology and liturgy of the Eastern Churches. Here he saw a special task for the Benedictines. In addition to the abbey of Niederaltaich on the Danube, this call was heard by the priory founded at Amay-sur-Meuse in 1925 and transferred to Chevetogne, Belgium, in 1939. It celebrated the liturgy in Eastern rites, cultivated the theology and spirituality of the East, and published the periodical *Irénicon.* In the Pope's view it is . . ."necessary for reunion especially that people know and love one another. . . . The separated parts of a gold-bearing rock are likewise gold-bearing."[8]

This could have been used of relations with Protestants. Accordingly, in an address in the consistory of 24 March 1924, Pius XI asked for ecumenical efforts in regard to all separated Christians: "We will be obliged to all Catholics who strive, under the impulse of divine grace, to facilitate admittance to the true faith for their separated brothers, whoever these may be, by dispelling their prejudices, keeping in view unadulterated Catholic teaching, and especially making evident in themselves the feature of disciples of Christ, for there is love."[9] In practice, however, the Pope occupied a rather reserved attitude in regard to Protestant ecumenism: in his view, that of historian and scholar, everything remained too much on the surface, that is, he missed the basic study of the sources, especially of the Church Fathers; as a churchman, he saw the danger of relativism and indifferentism. For some Catholics and many Protestants, especially for the participants in the conferences of Stockholm and Lausanne, it was a keen disappointment that the Catholic Church was absent. Archbishop Söderblom and with him others went so far as to conclude from this conduct that Rome thereby showed to the whole world its sectarian spirit and placed itself outside the totality of Christianity.

After Lausanne, Pius XI in the encyclical *Mortalium animos* of 6 January 1928 subjected the ecumenical movement, as it had thus far developed, to a sharp criticism: "Can we endure . . . that the truth, in fact the truth revealed by God, be made the object of negotiations?"[10] In the Pope's view the Catholic Church took an interest in the ecumenical movement only so far as this meant a return to the sources of faith, to the Gospel and tradition.

---

[8] G. H. Tavard, *Geschichte der Ökumenischen Bewegung* (Mainz 1948), 120.

[9] *AAS* 16(1924), 123f.

[10] *Ökumenische Dokumente,* ed. by H. L. Althaus (Göttingen 1962), 168f.

Despite the official refusal, private observers were present, with papal and episcopal approval, at the World Conference for Life and Work in Stockholm in 1925 and at that for Faith and Order in Lausanne in 1927: from Germany Max Joseph Metzger (1887–1944) and Hermann Hoffmann (1878–1973). It can be said that in Germany the situation was in some respects favorable for the meeting of the denominations: Here the number of "denominations" was not so large as, for example, in the United States, and in the great Churches of the nation one had to deal with partners in dialogue who were to some extent committed to a creed. At the universities were Catholic and Protestant theological faculties which with the aid of the historicocritical method demolished some prejudices and exposed common foundations. The history of the Reformation and the life and work of Martin Luther were, especially after the appearance in 1939 of the *Reformation in Deutschland* by Joseph Lortz (1887–1975), presented more objectively and with more understanding of its religious motives, and the Catholic share in the guilt for the schism was candidly admitted. The threat to the Churches and to Christianity from National Socialism contributed substantially to the rapprochement of the denominations. Now what was important, beyond all differences, was to save the Christian substance. It worked in favor of the cooperation of the denominations that Protestantism, as "Confessing Church," thought better of its being as Church.

Among the pioneers of Catholic ecumenism in Germany were Arnold Rademacher (1873–1939), Max Pribilla (1874–1956), Robert Grosche (1888–1967), the founder of the periodical *Catholica* (1932), Matthias Laros (1882–1962), Joseph Lortz, Karl Adam (1876–1966), and Max Joseph Metzger. In 1938 the last named founded the brotherhood *Una Sancta,* with the aim of working for unity through prayer and fraternal meetings. Due to his initiative there took place larger meetings at Meitingen near Augsburg in 1939–40. Suspected by Nazi officials as an apostle of peace, spied on and often imprisoned, Metzger was executed on 17 April 1944.

In France ecumenical thought was roused by Paul Couturier (1881–1953), who spread and spiritually deepened the World Octave of Prayer for the Unity of Christians from 18 to 25 January, which had been suggested by Anglicans, and by M. Yves Congar, O.P. (born 1904). There was to be prayer for "the unity of all Christians, as Christ desired."

After the Second World War there arose in many places *Una Sancta* circles of lay persons and theologians as sites of productive encounter of Catholics and Protestants in prayer and discussion. Their spontaneity naturally declined, the clearer it became how long and difficult was the road to unity. The monitum *Cum compertum* of the Holy Office at Rome, issued on 5 June 1948 before the first plenary assembly of the World Council at Amsterdam, seemed to produce a setback. In it was inculcated, with reference to the regulations of canon law (Canon 1325, par. 3), that participation in discussions of faith with non-Catholics was allowed only with the previous permission of the Holy See. More positive in tone were the directives for its implementation in the instruction *De motione oecumenica* of 20 December 1949. In it the bishops were requested not only to bestow their attention on strivings for unity but to foster and direct them. Meetings and discussions with non-Catholics were regarded as a desired opportunity to make known to non-Catholics a knowledge of Catholic teaching. To the bishops was given for three years the faculty of granting the necessary permission of the Holy See for participation in ecumenical dialogues. "The very important work of reuniting all Christians in the one true faith and in the one true Church," so the instruction concluded, "must more and more become one of the preferred functions of all pastoral care and a chief concern of the urgent prayer of all believers to God."[11]

After the Second World War the discussions of theologians received a strong stimulus. At the initiative of the archbishop of Paderborn, Lorenz Jaeger (1892–1975), and of the Lutheran bishop of Oldenburg, Wilhelm Stählin (1883–1975), theologians of both denominations met annually in Germany since 1946 to discuss common and separating doctrines. With the decisive participation of the Dutch professor of theology, Jan Willebrands (b. 1909), there was formed in 1952 the International Conference for Ecumenical Questions, whose work was incorporated into the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity established in 1960 by Pope John XXIII and directed by Cardinal Augustin Bea (1881–1968). In 1962 it obtained the official status of a conciliar commission and as such was able authoritatively to prepare the Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council (see above, Chapter 4).

The council was to introduce a new epoch of the Ecumenical Movement within the Catholic Church. It professed ecumenism as a movement produced by the spirit, which is the task "of the whole Church, of the faithful as well as of the shepherds" (ARTICLE 5). It must be supported by the spirit of penance and inner renewal. The Catholic Church knows that it shares in the guilt for the split and it is aware that it has not always properly preached the truths of faith entrusted to it, so that it became difficult for people to find the truth. Thus it sees itself summoned to a "lasting reformation" (ART. 6). But if one can have access "only through the Catholic Church of Christ, which is the common means of salvation, to the entire fullness of the means of salvation," (ART. 3), there are still "many important elements or goods by all of which the Church is built up and acquires its life, even outside the visible limits of the Catholic Church" (ART. 3). The Holy Spirit uses the separated Churches and communities as "means of salvation." Catholics are asked "joyfully to acknowledge and highly to esteem the really Christian goods from the common heritage which are found among the separated brethren" (ART. 4).

---

[11] *AAS* 42(1950), 146f.

Of course, the differences still existing despite all that was common could not be concealed. "Nothing is so alien to the ecumenical spirit as false irenicism." Doctrinal differences that cause separation had to deal especially with the nature of the Church and with its power, its office. Because of the absence of the sacrament of orders, Protestants have "not preserved the original and complete reality of the Eucharistic mystery" (ART. 22). Hence "the doctrine of the Lord's Supper . . . and of the ministerial offices of the Church [are especially] necessarily the subject of the dialogue" (ART. 22). This discussion is carried on in the field of tension of the common and the separating. But one must not rest content with dialogue. The council called to common prayer. In it the grace of unity must be asked for, but the community persisting despite the split must be attested. Further, the separated brothers must work together in service to the world. This practical work is possible, even if persons are of different views in the questions of principles of morals and of the relationship of Church and society. Without prejudice to some criticism—it was especially objected that in the decree the Catholic Church saw itself as the center around which the other Churches stood more or less close, like concentric circles—the decree was generally praised; it "opened new doors for ecumenical contacts."[12]

To implement the conciliar decree the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity at Rome published guidelines for practical collaboration and dialogue with the non-Catholic Churches in 1967 and 1970 in the *Ecumenical Directory.* If ecumenism is an affair not only of church leadership but of all Christians, then it is important to activate "ecumenism on the spot," that is, to bring Christians together on the level of the congregations for dialogue, prayer, and common ministry to the world. This will be aided by the Roman document on "Ecumenical Cooperation on the regional, national, and local level" of 7 July 1975. In 1973 the union of dioceses of the German Federal Republic joined the Working Community of the Christian Churches in Germany, founded in 1948 and similar to the Councils of Christians in other countries. Likewise the Catholic dioceses became members of the Working Community founded on the level of the German federal states.

---

[12] W.A. Visser 't Hooft, "Die allgemeine ökumenische Entwicklung seit 1948," *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung 1948–1968,* ed. by H. E. Frey (Göttingen 1974), 32.

Membership of the Catholic Church in the World Council of Churches is still subject, of course, to various kinds of difficulties. On the basis of the existing charter the weight of the Catholic Church, preponderant in members, would be too heavy. A "common working group" consisting of eight representatives of the World Council and of six of the Catholic Church was set up and undertook its work at Bossey near Geneva in June 1965. This was related to all questions for which the World Council itself was competent; in the first place, it was to gain information on the possibilities of dialogue and cooperation and eliminate sources of tension. The Ecumenical Work Community for Justice, Peace, and Development (Sodepax), set up at first on a trial basis by the papal commission for development assistance, *Iustitia et Pax,* and by the World Council in 1968, aims to help all races, peoples, and religions in the struggle against misery and war. Since the fourth plenary assembly of the World Council at Uppsala in 1968 nine Roman Catholic theologians belong as full members to the Faith and Order commission, embracing 150 persons.

The doctrinal dialogue was and is conducted in various groups on the national and international level. Except for the dialogue in 1971 between the Roman Catholic Church, the Lutheran, and the Reformed World Union on "the theology of marriage and the problem of mixed marriages," these discussions are bilateral, that is, they are conducted by the Catholic Church with one denominational Church at a time on the international, regional, and national level. Contact talks with the Lutheran World Union (LWB) led to the establishing of the study commission "The Gospel and the Church," which held five sessions in 1967–71 and collected its "working results" in 1971 in the so-called *Malta Paper.*[13] No complete agreement could be reached on function and intercommunion. The dialogue was continued by the Common Lutheran-Catholic Commission, newly constituted in 1975. A document on "The Lord's Supper" is in preparation.

"The Eucharist" (1967) and "Eucharist and Office" (1970) have also been the chief themes of the Catholic-Lutheran dialogue in the United

---

[13] *Evangelium—Welt—Kirche. Schlussbericht und Referate der römisch-katholisch/evangelisch-lutherischen Studienkomission 'Das Evangelium und die Kirche' 1967–1971. Auf Veranlassung des lutherischen Weltbundes und des Sekretariats für die Einheit der Christen,* ed. by Harding Meyer (Frankfurt 1975); cf. H. Meyer, *Luthertum und Katholizismus im Gespräch* (Frankfurt 1973).

States since 1965.[14] It became clear that the way to intercommunion lay only by way of harmony in the understanding of the Eucharist and a mutual recognition of ecclesiastical offices. On the basis of the talks the participants thought they could invite their respective Churches to acknowledge the validity of the offices of the other Church and the real presence of Jesus Christ in its Eucharistic celebrations.[15] Then the commission in the United States turned to the question of the papal primacy.[16] The inner consistency of this further step was perceived: "Our earlier discussions had concentrated on the ministry of office in the local communities. Now we concentrate on the unifying and organizing function of this office for the Universal Church—on the question of how a definite form of this office, that is, the papacy, has served the unity of the Universal Church in the past and how it can serve it in the future."[17] There was a striving for a certain agreement on the necessity of a special office for the entire Church. Of course, the structure and exercise of the office had to be discussed in still more detail. The talks, which are still in progress, produced in 1974 the report "Office and Universal Church," which dealt with the primacy and not yet with the problem of infallibility.

The International Anglican-Roman Catholic Commission summoned in 1970 by the Pope and the archbishop of Canterbury, came in the so-called Windsor Statement of 1971 to an "essential agreement on the doctrine of the Eucharist" and in 1973 to a basic consensus on "Office and Ordination" in the "Canterbury Statement." In these, to be sure, the question of the Petrine office and of the recognition of Anglican orders was excluded and reserved for a later discussion.[18] This was taken up in 1974. In 1976 it led in Venice to the acceptance of a declaration on "Authority in the Church."[19] In connection with authority in questions of faith for the *koinonia* of local Churches there were also taken up the primacy of the Bishop of Rome and his special responsibility for faith and doctrine of the Universal Church. There was demanded an appropriate balance between the primatial, collegial, and synodal exercise of authority, but recognition of a special position of the Bishop of Rome in a reunited Church as a service to its unity and catholicity was underscored. "The only episcopal see which claims a universal primacy, which has also exercised and still exercises such an *episcope,* is the episcopal see of Rome, the city where Peter and Paul died. It seems fit that in any coming unity a universal primacy, such as we have described it, be exercised by this episcopal see."[20]

---

[14] G. Gassmann, M. Lienhard, M. Meyer, H. V. Herntrich, eds., *Um Amt und Herrenmahl. Dokumente zum evangelisch/römisch-katholischen Gespräch. Ök. Dokumentation* I (Frankfurt 1974), 55–102.

[15] Ibid., 88 and 99f.

[16] Report and working papers in H. Stirnimann, L. Vischer et al., *Papsttum und Petrusdienst* (*Ök. Perspektiven* 7) (Frankfurt 1975).

[17] Ibid., 93f.

[18] G. Gassmann, M. Lienhard, H. Meyer eds., *Vom Dialog zur Gemeinschaft. Dokumente zum anglikanisch-lutherischen und anglikanisch-katholischen Gespräch. Ök. Dokumentation* II (Frankfurt 1975), 129–48; *HK* 28(1974), 93–97.

[19] Text in *HK* 31(1977), 191–95.

Discussions with the Methodist World Union have shown remarkable agreement in the sphere of spirituality and piety. As a result, the Dialogue Commission of the United Methodist Churches and of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States published in January 1976 a statement "Holiness and Spirituality of Ecclesiastical Office."

The positive development of the relations of the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches found expression in the visit of Paul VI to the central office of the World Council at Geneva on 10 June 1969. But at the same time it became clear that the expectations expressed at Uppsala in 1968 of an imminent membership of Rome in the World Council prejudiced the development. "With all fraternal candor it is said: We are not of the opinion that the question of membership of the Catholic Church in the World Council is ready to the extent that one can or must give a positive answer to it"[21] (Paul VI).

---

[20] Ibid., 194.

[21] H. Krüger, ed., *Ökumenische Bewegung 1969–1972, Beiheft z. Ök. Rundschau* no. 28(Stuttgart 1975), 140.

CHAPTER 16

*The Dissident Eastern Churches**

By "Eastern Churches"[1] are designated those Christian communities which were established within and outside the eastern half of the Roman Empire or, respectively, sprang from these as daughter Churches. Intellectual-historical and political influences contributed to a multiform development, which produced many foreign Churches in the twentieth century. The emigration of well-known theologians and philosophers of religion from Russia in 1917, the erecting of Orthodox theological educational institutions in the West,[2] the admittance of almost all Eastern Churches into the World Council of Churches, and their participation in its meetings and committee sessions have substantially contributed to a mutual understanding of Eastern and Western Christianity. The sympathy of the free world during persecutions of Christians in the Communist power sphere, the Sovietizing of eastern Central Europe, the atheistic religious policy of the socialist states of the Eastern bloc, which controlled all religious statements through state ecclesiastical officials and restricted them to the liturgical field, and discussions of human rights have kept alive the interest in the fate of the Eastern Churches. The tensions between Islam and Christianity, power-political confrontations in the Middle East, and restrictions on ecclesiastical life in Arabic-speaking states have caused the ecclesiastical history of the time to focus attention on the Eastern Churches.

---

* Bernhard Stasiewski

[1] J. Chrysostomus, *Ostkirche,* 256f.

[2] For example, at Paris (Saint Sergius Institute for Orthodox Theology), Jordanville (Holy Trinity Monastery and Seminary of the Russian Orthodox Foreign Church), and Chambésy, cf. D. Papandreou, "Das Orthodoxe Zentrum des Ökumenischen Patriarchates in Chambésy bei Genf. Entstehung, Aktivitäten, Perspektiven," *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift* 4(1975), 323–30.

Here the diversity of Eastern Christianity can be presented, not in the form of reports by countries, which would have to extend to all five continents,[3] but only in survey: it includes in the order of their origin the Orthodox Churches with the four ancient patriarchates, the Church of Georgia, the patriarchates appearing in medieval and modern times, and the remaining autocephalous or autonomous Orthodox Churches,[4] as well as the Eastern, pre-Chalcedonian, and National Churches of the Nestorians and the Monophysites.

The Orthodox Churches

From the Byzantine Imperial Church proceeded the Slavonic missions which gained Bulgarians, Serbs, Rumanians, and Russians for Orthodox Christianity. In addition to the patriarch of Constantinople, the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Georgia consolidated Orthodoxy in Egypt and the Middle East and spread it into inner Asia. The daughter Churches of the ecumenical patriarchate preserved the heritage in the area of the Eastern Slavs, the Balkan Slavs, Rumania, and Greece. After the collapse of Turkish domination in southeastern Europe several Orthodox peoples obtained political independence and ecclesiastical autonomy, so that new autocephalous territorial Churches developed.

THE FOUR ANCIENT PATRIARCHATES

While the ecumenical patriarchate of Constantinople lost its eparchies in Asia Minor as a result of the Turkish-Greek war of 1922–23 and had to struggle with Turkey for its existence, it still gained authority by the voluntary subordination of Churches[5] that developed between the two world wars and afterwards. Within the totality of Orthodoxy and beyond, it was increasingly recognized as the spiritual center.

---

[3] Cf. the survey in *Oriente Cattolico,* op. cit., 466–88.

[4] For the autocephalous (independent) and autonomous (half-independent) Churches which are generally recognized within Orthodoxy, and the Orthodox communities whose canonicity is partly disputed, cf. J. Madey, *Die Kirchen des Osten,* 18f.

It owed this strengthening above all to the personality of Patriarch Athenagoras (1948–72).[6] After his election he paid special importance to the bringing together of all the Orthodox and he had as his long-range goal the unity of all Christian Churches. His initiatives for the implementation of the first three Pan-Orthodox conferences on Rhodes,[7] which were followed by a Pan-Orthodox Council, his meeting with Pope Paul VI in Jerusalem in 1964, his sharing in the common declaration,[8] proclaimed simultaneously on 7 December 1965 at Saint Peter's in Rome during the ninth public assembly of the Second Vatican Council and at Saint George's Church in the Phanar, the patriarch's residence, whereby the mutual excommunications of the Western and Byzantine heads of the Churches in 1054 were to be erased from the memory of the Churches, his visit to Pope Paul VI in Rome at the end of October 1967, to the World Council of Churches in Geneva at the beginning of November 1967, and to Western and Eastern church leaders, make clear the extent of his ecumenical efforts. He constantly stood for the improvement of pastoral care and the formation of the clergy. When the Greek Orthodox Theological University at Chalkis on the Isle of Princes, Heybeli, near Istanbul, at which also students from the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria and the Monophysite Church of Ethiopia studied, was closed in 1971 by the Turkish educational officials in the course of the secularization of private universities—only the "Little Seminary for Priests" could continue its teaching activities for students from Turkish territory—he exerted himself for a genuine ascetical, spiritual, and scholarly education at other places, for example, on the island of Crete. He was able to acquire a worldwide esteem once again for the ecumenical patriarchate.

His successor, Demetrios I, elected by the twelve metropolitans of the Permanent Synod, after 1972 continued the dialogue on the love of neighbor with the Christian Churches in an effort to move closer to Pan-Orthodox unity and through it the unity of all Christianity. Even if the extent of the direct jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople was further curtailed by schisms in the twentieth century and the tensions with the archbishop of Greece over a group of eparchies were not relieved, still it embraced ca. 1.5 to 2 million faithful[9] in Turkey, on the Greek islands, on Mount Athos, and in many foreign eparchies. In 1903 there were 7,432 monks in the monasteries on Athos.[10] Despite the measures of support from the patriarchs of Constantinople and other Orthodox Churches, their number had meanwhile declined to ca. 1,100.[11] The struggle over the acceptance of new monks from the Churches in the Communist sphere of power, the closing of the Athonias university, which had existed from 1749 to 1940 and from 1953 to 1971, injured the community of the twenty monasteries of the monastic republic, which, as an outstanding center of Orthodoxy, could in 1963 look back on a millennium of spiritual radiation.

---

[5] For example, the Orthodox Churches in Finland and Estonia, parts of Czechoslovak Orthodoxy, and the Paris metropolitanate of the Russian Foreign Church.

[6] B. Ohse, *Der Patriarch Athenagoras I., ein ökumenischer Visionär* (Göttingen and Regensburg 1968); V. Gheorghiu, *La vie du patriarche Athénagoras* (Paris 1969); R. Stupperich, "Athenagoras I. Ökumenischer Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Ein Nachruf," *Kirche im Osten* 6(1973), 11–19.

[7] 24 September to 1 October 1961, 26–28 September 1963, 1–5 November 1964.

[8] C. Patock, H. Tretter, "Zur Aufhebung des Bannes vom Jahre 1054," *OstkSt* 15(1966), 196–209; *Tomos agapis. Vatican-Phanar 1958–1970* (Rome and Istanbul 1971), 278–97; J. Ratzinger, "Das Ende der Bannflüche von 1054. Folgen für Rom und die Ostkirchen," *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift* 3(1974), 289–303.

In rank the patriarchate of Alexandria stands in second place within Orthodoxy. In comparison to the Monophysite Coptic Church with ca. 3 million faithful, its 100,000 members in Egypt have no easy position. The number of Greeks dropped because of emigration in the course of the twentieth century. Patriarch Nicholas V (1936–39) sought by means of a new law on the election of the patriarch to consolidate the predominance of the Greek clergy. His successor, Christopher II (1939–66), conceded to the synod of his Church only limited functions, and despite its opposition he ordained several bishops to care for the Orthodox in Africa and strengthened the mission to the pagans of Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda. This made substantial progress since 1968 under Patriarch Nicholas VI. His accommodating of Arabic-speaking faithful, his ecumenical contacts, which led in 1970 to the founding of a common Council of Churches of the Copts, Ethiopians, Syrians, Malabar Christians, and the Greek Orthodox patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, his encouraging of its own printery for the church press, theological periodicals, and publications, and the memorial celebrations of the sixteenth centenary of the death of Saint Athanasius at Alexandria and Cairo testify to the vitality of this patriarchate.

---

[9] In these and the following statistics on individual Eastern Churches there is question of estimates, since the data in handbooks and special investigations differ greatly from one another. Cf., among others, M. Lehmann, op. cit., 24–26; M. Lacko, "Die nichtchalkedonischen orientalischen Kirchen," *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1970), 78; M. Lacko, J. Martin, "Die orthodoxen Kirchen," ibid., 80; P. Wiertz, I. Doens, "Übersicht über die Kirchen des Ostens," E.v. Ivánka, J. Tyciak, P. Wiertz, op. cit., 723–50; *Oriente Cattolico,* op. cit., 842f.; W. Krohl, "Verzeichnis der Autonomen Katholischen Kirchen in der Welt," *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die Alt-Katholiken in Deutschland* 75 (Bonn 1976), 62–68;*Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie,* op. cit.

[10] *Le millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963, études et mélanges,* 2 vols. (Chevetogne 1964); P. Huber, *Athos. Leben, Glaube, Kunst* (Zurich and Freiburg 1969); E.A. de Mendieta, *Mount Athos. The Garden of the Panaghia,* trans. from French by M.R. Bruce (Berlin 1972); P.M. Mylonas, "Der heilige Berg Athos," *Alte Kirchen und Klöster Griechenlands. Ein Begleiter zu den byzantinischen Stätten,* ed. and trans. by E. Melas (Cologne 1972), 91–119.

[11] 1928: 4,848; 1959: 1,641; 1972: 1,146.

The direction of the patriarchate of Antioch passed in 1931 with Alexander III (to 1958) from Greek to Arab hands, after the constitution of 1929 had placed at the patriarch's side a National Council constituted by four metropolitans and eight delegated laymen. The two factions struggling for predominance, one of which aimed to maintain the Greek tradition while the other was of a Syrian national orientation, counterbalanced each other. Alexander III intensified the internal and external consolidation and joined the American communities firmly to his patriarchal association, and in this Exarch Anton Baschir was of assistance. Under Theodosius VI (1958–70) a schism of a few Syrian eparchies threatened to wreck the unity of the patriarchate, which took care of approximately 350,000 faithful, but it could be eliminated by the accommodating influence of Elias IV (from 1970), elected by the Greek eparchs. He restored the dioceses in eastern Turkey, vacant since the First World War, named bishops for Saudi Arabia and Australia-New Zealand, completed the restoration of the priests' seminary Belement, and reformed the valid canon law, in which, among other things, definite requirements for candidates for the episcopacy and an extensive representation of the laity on the diocesan and the parochial levels were established.

The patriarchate of Jerusalem, with ca. 70,000 faithful, is "today no more than a noble relic."[12] Patriarch Damianos (1897–1931) settled the difficulties between the Greek minority and the Arabic majority in his Church. Under Patriarch Timotheos (1935–55) the number of Greeks declined through emigration. In consequence of the political tensions in the Holy Land, the end of the British mandate in 1948, the partition of Palestine, and the proclamation of the State of Israel, the Patriarchal Church was split between Israel and Jordan. During the celebration of the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Chalcedon in 1951 the schism between the Arabs, who constituted almost 99 percent of the faithful, and the Greeks could be healed to a degree. Patriarch Benedict I (from 1957) controlled the difficulties by skillful negotiations with Jordan and Saudi Arabia, by a new constitution for the members of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre and the founding of a school for its recruits, with a Greek and an Arab section. He undertook foreign journeys to Orthodox Church leaders and asked aid for his Church, compressed in Jordan and Israel, which suffered from the consequences of Israel's two wars of 1956 and 1967. He made ecumenical contacts, for example, with Pope Paul VI in 1964, and opened an ecumenical institute for higher theological studies on the Tantur Hill between Jerusalem and Bethlehem.

---

[12] K. Onasch, op. cit., 76.

The autonomous Monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai[13] celebrated the fourteenth centenary of its existence in 1966. Since, because of Israel's June War of 1967, it was cut off from connection with its archbishop residing in Cairo, it subjected itself in 1968 to the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, with which it had been united for centuries.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN GEORGIA

The Georgian Orthodox ecclesiastical community in the Caucasus, issuing from the Patriarchal Church of Antioch, had been subjected to a Russian exarch in 1817, but in 1917 it declared its independence and restored its Catholicate. After the incorporation of Georgia as the Transcaucasian Soviet Socialist Republic (1922–37, since 1937 the Soviet Socialist Republic of Georgia) into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the faithful suffered under the pressure of antireligious propaganda. Their Catholicos Ambrose (1921–22) complained in a letter to the World Economic Conference of Genoa in 1922 of the atrocities of the Bolsheviks; with all the higher dignitaries of the Church, he was arrested and died in prison in 1927. Under Catholicos Kallistratos (1932–52) ecclesiastical communion was in 1943 again restored with the patriarchate of Moscow and a certain freedom of movement was made possible to the Georgian Church. It was preserved because of the collaboration of Catholicos Melchisedek III (1952–60) and especially of his successor, Ephraem II (1960–72), with the Patriarchal Church of Moscow, and their declarations of loyalty to the regime. Catholicos David V tried to fill his fifteen eparchies, of which several were vacant when he took office, with suitable persons and to consolidate the Georgian Church, with its from 750,000 to 1 million faithful and four monasteries. Disagreements between the patriarchal leadership and the priesthood, internal repression of the Church by

---

[13] H.L. Rabino, *Le monastère de Sainte-Cathérine du Mont Sinai* (Cairo 1938); H. Skrobucha, *Sinai* (Olten and Lausanne 1959); G. Gerster, *Sinai, Land der Offenbarung* (Berlin 1961); M.B. Schlink, *Sinai Heute. Stätten der Gottesoffenbarung zwischen Nil und Moseberg,* 3d ed. (Darmstadt and Eberstadt 1975).

Communist officials, and police actions against the youth impaired ecclesiastical life.

THE PATRIARCHATES ORIGINATING IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND IN MODERN TIMES

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church[14] already had its own patriarchate in the Middle Ages, but lost it in the period of Turkish domination. When in 1870 it established an autonomous exarchate, the result was schism between Sofia and Constantinople. After the death of the exarch Joseph (1877–1915) the state did not permit a new election, and until 1945 the Church was administered by the Holy Synod. A synod convoked by the government in 1921 outlined a reform program, but it could not be realized. An assembly of the bishops, which in 1927 dealt with, among other things, problems of religious instruction and education, saw to the completing of the academy founded at Sofia in 1923, the formation of the clergy, and the ecclesiastical cooperative system. After Bulgaria had been declared a people's republic in 1946, religious instruction in the public schools was abolished, the greatest part of the Church's landed property was confiscated, ecclesiastical social work and ecclesiastical cooperative life were impeded. The protests of Exarch Stojan (1945–48) to the government, his efforts for the imparting of religious instruction in Sunday schools, and his defense of the Christian faith in newspapers and pamphlets led to his removal by the Holy Synod, which was prepared to cooperate with the regime. The new constitution of 1947, with appendixes in 1961 and 1965, and the law on creeds of 1949 completed the separation of Church and state and placed the Churches under strict state supervision. The Holy Synod and the administrators of the exarchate, especially Cyril (1951–53), urged the reestablishment of the Orthodox patriarchate of Bulgaria. A recognized church historian, preacher, and organizer, who had proved his loyalty to the regime by taking part in state organizations and national party and anniversary celebrations, he was elected patriarch in 1953 and held the office until 1970. Most Eastern Churches assented to the elevation in rank, the ecumenical patriarch only in 1961. Cyril tried to parry the state's totalitarian claim by his often scholarly publications, cooperation in the "peace movement," participation in the state celebration in honor of Cyril and Methodius in 1963, completion of the theological academy at Sofia and of the two priests' seminaries still left to the Church, continuation of an official paper and of ecclesiastical periodicals, and by his foreign journeys, on which he proved to be a promoter of ecumenism. In 1967 he succeeded in obtaining that a few monks might return to the Rila monastery, a Bulgarian national sanctuary and Marian pilgrimage place for a thousand years, which had been closed in 1961 on orders of the government, and had been declared a national memorial spot and been transformed into a tourist attraction. His successor, Maximos (since 1971), heads 6 million faithful, about two-thirds of the total population, with 1,500 priests, who are paid by the state, in 11 metropolitanates in Bulgaria and 2 foreign dioceses. The Church retains 120 monasteries, with ca. 400 monks and nuns, rural farming areas with twenty industries of its own; to it was granted a monopoly of the production and sale of candles, crosses, and devotional objects. But external security is jeopardized by the constant atheistic propaganda, which regards religion as a hindrance to social development and directs the process of overcoming religion.

---

[14] The first Bulgarian patriarchate with its seat at Achrida existed from 927 to 1018, the second at Trnovo from 1235 to 1393. In 1870 the sultan granted the constituting of an independent exarchate, which was not recognized by the patriarchate of Constantinople until 1945.

The Serbian Orthodox[15] strove after the erecting of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in 1918—renamed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929—for the restoration of their patriarchate. In 1920 the metropolitanate of Belgrade, patriarchate-in-exile of Karlowitz, the Bosnian, Dalmatian, Macedonian, and the Montenegrin hierarchy united into a uniform Serbian Church, at whose head the metropolitan of Belgrade, Demetrios (1920–30), appeared as patriarch. It lasted almost ten years until the organization and legislation of the Orthodox patriarchate of Serbia were terminated. The tensions between the Orthodox—in 1931 48.7 percent—and the Catholics—in 1931 37.4 percent—led in 1935 to a conflict. The government wanted a concordat with the Holy See but Patriarch Barnabas (1930–37) rejected it. The occupation of Yugoslavia by Germans, Italians, and Bulgarians in 1941, the creation of an independent Croat state with a Catholic majority in the population, in which in 1942 a Croatian Orthodox Church with 1.8 million faithful was established, nationalistic conflicts and partisan struggles impeded the pastoral activity of Patriarch Gabriel V (1938–50), who was imprisoned in 1941, and of his representative, Joseph (1941–46).

Tito's seizure of power in 1944, the founding of the federated People's Republic of Yugoslavia in 1945, which expressed separation of Church and state in the constitution of 31 January 1946, and the policy of the government, which aimed to exclude the Church from public life, produced a struggle against the Church. Patriarch Gabriel V was able to prevent the union of the Serbian Church with that of Moscow, sought by the patriarchate of Moscow in 1947, and to restrain the association of Orthodox priests, called into existence the same year, which demanded the extension of the rights of the lesser clergy. Under his successor, Vikentij (1950–58), the strained relations with the government improved after the liberation of church leaders condemned in the first postwar years and the filling of vacant sees and parishes by means of the law on the legal status of ecclesiastical communities of 27 May 1953, but the seizure of church property and land, the payment of ecclesiastics and of retired persons by the state, the restrictions on the teaching activity and the number of students of the theological faculty of the University of Belgrade, which in 1952 was transformed into an academy, the support given by Tito to the efforts for independence of the Macedonian Church[16] made clear that the Patriarchal Church was only tolerated. Patriarch German, in office from 1958, tried, relying on the loyalty of broad strata of the population, to make the most of the possibilities left to him. He established theological schools, for example, in the monastery of Krka in Dalmatia in 1965, to provide for the threatening lack of priests, took care for the improvement of professional theological periodicals, and protested against the impeding of religious instruction and the restrictions on the care of souls, in which connection he appealed to the regulations of the constitution of 7 April 1963. After the abrogation of the law on religion of 1953, the individual republics issued laws for their area, which allowed more authority to the local administrative officials than hitherto. The attacks by the Communists against the ecclesiastical press, stepped up since 1972, tightening of censorship, imprisonment of priests, prohibition for youth to take part in the feast of Saint Sava (d. 1235), patron of Serbia, indicate a deterioration of the climate. The approximately reckoned 8 million faithful were cared for at the time by 26 hierarchs—1 patriarch, 2 metropolitans, 22 bishops, and 1 episcopal vicar. In addition to the 21 spheres of jurisdiction at home, there are 5 abroad. The well constructed church organization, with more than 4,000 churches, the 75 monasteries of men and 75 of women, with 350 monks and 800 nuns, and the appearance of periodicals, however, cannot conceal the fact that the Patriarchal Church suffers under the pressure of the regime.

---

[15] The Serbs had had their own patriarchate in 1351–1459 and 1557–1766, and in 1789 had maintained the autocephaly of their Church.

After the abdication of the last tsar, Nicholas II, the Orthodox Church in Russia, which after the abolition of the patriarchate of Moscow (1589–1721) experienced an epoch of state Church regime under the Holy Synod with supervision by a procurator, succeeded in restoring the Moscow patriarchate at its council in the fall of 1917. On 5

---

[16] See below, p. 491.

November 1917 the metropolitan of Moscow, Tikhon,[17] was elected patriarch. The October Revolution of 1917 and the establishing of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic in 1918—since 1922 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—under the dictatorship of the Bolsheviks completely changed the situation in Russia.

The decree of 19 January 1918 completed the separation of Church and state, it declared the possessions of ecclesiastical and religious communities to be the people's property. ARTICLE 13 of the constitution of 10 July 1918 firmly established this principle of separation and granted to all citizens, in addition to liberty of conscience, also the right of antireligious propaganda. The fundamental rejection of religion and the fully conscious attacks on it excluded the Patriarchal Church from public life, restricted it to the ecclesiastical sphere, and exposed hierarchs and clergy to administrative chicanery and calumnies. During the civil war between the Whites and the Reds in September 1919 Patriarch Tikhon forbade ecclesiastics to take part in the political confrontations. But his protest against the confiscation decreed by the government in February 1922 of objects of value and of worship in the churches, from the proceeds of which allegedly the growing famine was to be alleviated, was the occasion for his imprisonment from May 1922 to June 1923. The regime demanded the dissolution of the hierarchy, it expected to split and destroy the Patriarchal Church by means of the "Living Church"[18] that it supported. Because of the news of the execution and imprisoning of many bishops and priests, Tikhon decided to sign a declaration submitted to him, "that from now on I am no longer an enemy of the Soviet Union."[19] Many of the faithful withdrew again from the "Living Church," which existed until 1946. The patriarch's declaration of loyalty and his appeal to the faithful to follow him in this attitude saved the existence of the Patriarchal Church, it is true, but they changed nothing in the intentions of the regime. The three candidates designated by Tikhon (d. 1925) in his last will to take charge of the administration as his representatives after his death were imprisoned or banished. The leadership of the Church was without a patriarch for eighteen years.

---

[17] Cf. J. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte Russlands der neuesten Zeit* I; R. Rössler, *Kirche und Revolution in Russland. Patriarch Tichon und der Sowjetstaat* (Cologne 1969); J. Chrysostomus, "Gedanken zum 50. Todestag des Patriarchen Tichon von Moskau und Ganz Russland, 25. März/7. April 1925," *OstkSt* 24(1975), 318–32.

[18] M. B. B., "Der misslungene Versuch zur Vernichtung der Russisch-Orthodoxen Kirche in den Jahren 1922–1923 und die Niederlage des linken Kommunismus," *OstkSt* 22 (1973), 105–49; J. Chrysostomus, "Eine lehrreiche Episode aus der neueren Kirchengeschichte Russlands. Gedanken über den Artikel von A. Krasnov-Levitin über den 'Untergang der Erneuerungsbewegung,'" ibid., 302–15.

[19] J. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte Russlands der neuesten Zeit* I, 373.

Metropolitan Sergius—deputy patriarchal administrator from 1925 to 1937, patriarchal administrator from 1937 to 1941, and patriarch from 1943 to 1944—was also imprisoned. Because of the intensified persecution of the Church, the appearance of the League of the Militant Atheists, which in 1932 had more than 5 million members, and the threat of further anti-Church measures, Sergius, after his release in March 1927, accommodated the government by a declaration of loyalty, to which he also bound all the faithful. Several bishops did not consent, and there developed the Church of the Catacombs, which has maintained itself until the present. Despite Sergius's subservience, the Church was without rights. The religious law of 8 April 1929 extraordinarily curtailed the possibility of effectiveness of the Churches. A law of 18 May 1929 changed ART. 13 of the constitution in the sense that only freedom of the practice of acts of worship and antireligious propaganda were guaranteed. The closing of churches and monasteries, the imprisoning and deporting of ecclesiastics, the dissolution of congregations in 1928–30 and 1935–37 pointed out the threatened status of the Patriarchal Church,[20] even if in 1937 50 million of the population—27 percent of the total—belonged to it. The occupation of the Baltic states, Bessarabia, and eastern Poland by the Soviet Union improved its situation, because the number of its priests, monasteries, and institutions was increased, but of course they were soon caught in the wake of the persecution. The outbreak of the German-Soviet war on 22 June 1941 produced an unanticipated turn: Sergius called for prayer services, and church collections yielded more than 300 million rubles for armaments. The administration of the patriarchate published a cooperative volume,[21] in which the persecutions of Christians were denied and punishments were traced to political crimes. Stalin honored Sergius's procedure, received him on 4 September 1943, and let him be elected patriarch by nineteen hierarchs on 8 September. On 23 September a sort of concordat came into existence, according to which the Church could establish two ecclesiastical academies and eight seminaries for priests. The state Department of Churches for the Affairs of the Orthodox Church,[22] which took up its activity on 10 October 1943, was supposed to foster further normalization and supervise the exact observance of the pertinent governmental directives.

---

[20] While the Orthodox Church in Russia on the eve of the First World War counted over 54,174 churches, 51,105 priests, 350 monasteries of men, and 473 monasteries of women, there were in the Patriarchal Church of Moscow in 1939 only 5,225 churches, 5,665 priests, and 37 monasteries.

[21] *Die Wahrheit in Russland* (Moscow 1942).

[22] In 1943–60 it was directed by C. G. Karpov; his successor is W. A. Kurojedev. They continued the supervisory office of the Procurator of the Holy Synod in tsarist Russia.

The metropolitan of Leningrad, Alexis,[23] became Sergius's successor. As three-time bearer of the Order of the Red Workers' Banner and recipient of the medal for the defense of Leningrad, he cooperated intimately with the government. He was elected patriarch (1945–70) in February 1945 at a council in Moscow in which forty-six bishops took part. The church statute adopted even before his election by this assembly strengthened the centralization of ecclesiastical administration. The accommodating attitude of the regime must be referred to the support which Alexis gave it in foreign and domestic policy, for example, in the dissolution of the Uniate Church in the Ukraine and Podcarpathia in 1946–50, the entering into relations with other Orthodox Churches, and his championing of the Soviet peace ideology. Until the death in 1953 of Stalin, to whom the patriarch dedicated a pious work of condolence, and in the years of de-Stalinization the Orthodox Church was able to develop within the limits set for it by the state. Through the releasing of ecclesiastics from concentration camps, the restoration of confiscated churches, the reconstruction of the hierarchy, the formation of clerics in seminaries and by correspondence courses, several propaganda journeys of the patriarch outside the country, and the strengthening of the activity of the ecclesiastical foreign office, which strove for influence on Orthodox emigrant Churches, the position of the Patriarchal Church was stabilized within and outside the Soviet Union. The *Žurnal Moskovskoj Patriarchii,*[24] appearing since the end of the Second World War, supplied the clergy with valuable information and stimulation through its contributions on church history and dogmatic and pastoral theology and its comprehensive news on the life of Orthodoxy and of the ecumenical movement. At the Ecclesiastical Academy in the Monastery of the Holy Trinity at Sagorsk near Moscow and in Leningrad there was given a qualified theological education. But this inner consolidation was endangered by the Pan Union Society founded in 1947 for the dissemination of political and scientific knowledge, which renewed militant atheism through publications and meetings, and the decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on 10 November 1954 on the failures in the implementation of scientific-atheistic propaganda among the population. Under Khruschev, who was secretary general of the Central Committee from 1953, and minister president from 1958 to

---

[23] J. Müller, *Patriarch Alexius* (Berlin 1967); G. Seide, "In Memoriam. Zum Tod des Hochheiligen Patriarchen von Moskau und ganz Russland am 17. April 1970," *Kyrios,* n.s., 10 (1970), 130–48.

[24] R. Rössler, "Das Journal des Moskauer Patriarchats als Spiegel kirchlicher Entwicklung in der Sowjetunion (seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg)," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas,* n.s., 4 (1956), 26–63.

1964, and who died in 1971, there began a new persecution of the Churches. From 1959 to 1964, in addition to systematic campaigns of defamation, there were trials of higher and lower clerics, who were burdened with fines for crimes, the closing of ca. 10,000 churches out of 20,000, 50 monasteries out of 68, and 5 seminaries out of 8. The protests of the patriarch and the remonstrances of the ecclesiastical opposition against administrative measures of local officials, which was written down underground in the *Samizdat* literature,[25] had as a consequence that the state Department of Churches under Kurojedev sharpened the restrictions against the Church, Metropolitan Nikoly, who had directed the Church's foreign office since 1944 and was among the closest co-workers of Alexis, was replaced by Bishop Nikodim, and the Council of Ministers of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics in 1961 forced the changing of ART. 4 of the status of the Church approved in 1945, whereby the administration of the congregations was withdrawn from the parish priests. Nikodim, since 1963 metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, quickly gained influence in the Holy Synod and tried to preserve the interests of Russian Orthodoxy by elastic negotiations with the state Department of Churches and his positive relationship to the World Council of Churches[26] and to the Roman Catholic Church.[27] When in 1970 Patriarch Alexis died at the age of ninety-three, he was regarded as one of those with the best prospects of succeeding him.

At the council in Moscow in 1971 the patriarchal representative Pimen was elected patriarch by acclamation. He continued the policy of his predecessor in order not to endanger the minimum of existence assured to the Church by the state. His support of the Communist World Peace Movement, his many journeys to foreign countries, on which he tried to unite the Orthodox Churches in the People's republics, the Middle East, and the free world closer to himself, his emphasized concern for Orthodox tradition and liturgy, his assurance that normal relations existed between Church and state in the Soviet Union, were unable to mask the danger to the Orthodox faith. The defamation of religious feasts, which were said to be based on imagined events and myths and which were replaced by Socialist celebrations, the intensifying of the antireligious propaganda, which was seen in the tightening of ideological instruction in adult education programs, at universities, in the army, and in the efforts of 10,000 functionaries of atheism, the government's methods of suppression, which, among other things, represented the religious education of children as assault, the sending of believers to psychiatric clinics, and protests of citizens' rights groups, which stood up for human rights and religious liberty, made clear that the Patriarchal Church could not freely develop. The religious law enacted in June 1975[28] codified the guidelines, long expressed in secret instructions, of the Soviet state-Church, further blocked off the living space of the Churches, manipulated the life of congregations, and intensified the competition of the state's offices of supervision. About 30 million faithful—12 percent of the total population—are aware of their difficult situation and endure the restrictions imposed on them. The possibility of action of bishops and priests is curtailed, but the overwhelming majority of the clergy[29] strive as far as possible to proclaim the Gospel and celebrate the liturgy and demonstrate the unbroken will to live of the Patriarchal Church. In addition to 45 dioceses—10 metropolitans, 12 archbishops, and 25 bishops—in the Soviet Union, there belong to it the Ukrainian exarchate with 14 dioceses—2 metropolitans, 8 archbishops, and 4 bishops—the exarchates in Western Europe—in addition to Exarch Nikodim, 1 metropolitan, 1 archbishop, and 2 bishops—Central Europe—1 metropolitan and 2 archbishops—and Central and South America—5 bishops.

---

[25] *Die hektographierten "Selbstveröffentlichungen": Samizdat, Cronaca di una vita nuova nell'URSS* (Milan 1974); R. Medwedjew, ed., *Aufzeichnungen aus dem sowjetischen Untergrund. Texte aus der Moskauer Samisdat-Zeitschrift "Das XX. Jahrhundert"* (Hamburg 1977).

[26] In 1961 the Moscow patriarchate was admitted to the World Council of Churches, which it had earlier opposed in polemics.

[27] Nikodim, by his exertions for the ending of the conflict between the Patriarchal Church and the Old Believers separated from it (Raskolniki), brought about at the Moscow National Council in 1971 the annulment of the excommunication pronounced on them in 1666. In 1971 he gave up the direction of the Office for Foreign Affairs, which Metropolitan Juvenalij assumed. Nikodim became chairman of the office for relations among the Orthodox sister Churches and other Christian Churches and communities. In the same year he became secretary general of the Christian Peace Movement. In 1974 he obtained the exarchate for Western Europe. In July 1975 Pope Paul VI received him with the delegation headed by him from the Moscow patriarchate. In December 1975 the fifth plenary assembly of the World Council elected him as its president.

The Rumanian patriarchate arose after the First World War through the merger of the Rumanian national Church with the Churches of

---

[28] G. Simon, "Verhärtung durch Festschreibung. Zum neuen Religionsgesetz in der Sowjetunion," *HK* 30 (1976), 263–301; idem, *Das sowjetische Religionsgesetz vom Juni 1975* (Cologne 1976).

[29] But cf. J. Chrysostomus, *Die Problematik der heutigen russischen Kirche,* 213: "There is still another difficulty: it is quite possible, even likely, that the government will infiltrate its people, that is, those who serve the state rather than the Church, into the ranks of the clergy. The faithful are annoyed and made insecure by these facts, hence they occasionally condemn the entire hierarchy which tolerates this. But what can the hierarchy of an imprisoned Church undertake against this if it does not want to lose the last supports of church life in Russia? Therein really lies today the balance in the question of the problem of the Moscow patriarchate and its entire tragedy."

Karlowitz, Sibin, and Czernowitz.[30] The difficulties which ensued in the Kingdom, almost doubled in size by the union of various territories, were noticeable also in the ecclesiastical sphere. The constitution of 1923 declared Orthodoxy the prevailing Church and decreed a uniform organization with five metropolitanates. It was realized by a law and the statute of the Rumanian Orthodox Church of 1925. Its synod proposed the elevation of the metropolitan see of Bucharest to the rank of a patriarchate, and the establishment took place on 27 February 1925. On 27 September Miron, metropolitan of Bucharest, was solemnly enthroned as first patriarch (1925–39) with the assent of the ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople. From 1927 to 1930 he belonged to the government's Council of Three and in the last years of his life he took over the post of minister president. Through his participation in the forming of a uniform canon law, the assimilation of the varied structures of the metropolitanates subordinate to him, his championship of a basic study of theology and his openness to the ecumenical movement, he deserved well of his country. He was succeeded by the metropolitan of Moldavia, Nikodim (1939–48), who as abbot and bishop had worked for the renewal of Rumanian monasticism. The Second World War, in which Rumania had to cede frontier areas, recovered parts, in 1944 was occupied by Soviet troops, the Communist regime since 1945, and the proclamation of the People's Republic of Rumania in 1947 impeded the carrying out of planned reforms. Nikodim urged the faithful to cooperate in the reconstruction of the state.

As his successor was elected Justinian (1948–77), metropolitan of Moldavia. As a versatile diplomat, a purposeful ecclesiastical politician, and man of confidence of the regime,[31] he approved the coexistence between the Orthodox Church and the Communist state leadership. In the church statute of 1948 he was able to extend his competence, even if the synod came under state supervision. In 1948 he played a decisive role in the forcible union of 1.5 million Uniate Rumanians with the Orthodox Church. He strengthened the patriarchate by directives to the clergy on a social apostolate suited to the changed circumstances, reform of monasticism, rules for preaching, building of the ecclesiastical press, and deepening of theological formation. Of course, he had also to submit to serious interventions in church life. The suppression of the Ministry of Worship in 1957 and the subordination of the Church to the Department of Worship introduced, with a continuous bombardment of atheistic propaganda and the spread of calumnies, a persecution of the Church, in which many monasteries were closed and many monks and nuns were arrested.[32] Temporarily, the patriarch was under house arrest. Nevertheless, he held to his reform program. In 1966 the Department of Worship approved a new regulation for theological studies, and in 1967 a modification of the church statute, which made possible the completion of the hierarchy. If from 1970 on the state's influencing of the synod was extended, and in 1974 a law decreed the secularization of all articles of art still in the possession of the churches and in private ownership, the patriarch's self-assurance remained unbroken. Justinian's cooperation in the Communist Peace Movement, in Pan-Orthodox conferences, and in the World Council of Churches, and his visits to foreign Orthodox and Catholic Church leaders consolidated his general esteem. On the occasion of its fiftieth jubilee celebration in 1975 more than 14 million faithful belonged to the Patriarchal Church. Its hierarchy consisted of 4 metropolitanates in Rumania, with 2 archbishops, 6 bishops, and 8 episcopal vicars and of 3 foreign areas of jurisdiction,[33] with 1 archbishop, 1 bishop, and 1 episcopal vicar. Two theological institutes and 7 seminaries care for the recruits of the clergy, numbering ca. 9,000. Several periodicals are published by the patriarchal administration and individual dioceses. Justinian's loyalty contributed to this, that the Orthodox Church in Rumania, in comparison to the other countries under Communist rule, has to some extent preserved its previous situation. In June 1977 Justin, former metropolitan of Moldavia, took up his legacy as fourth Rumanian patriarch.

---

[30] Cf. E. C. Suttner, *50 Jahre rumänisches Patriarchat* (1975), 136–60.

[31] Justinian had personal relations with the Communist party leader, Gheorgiu Dej (1952–55) minister president, from 1955 first Secretary of the party, from 1961 chairman of the Council of State, d. 1965).

OTHER ORTHODOX CHURCHES

In the course of the centuries, especially in the last decades, a series of Churches have separated from the historically developed and already described structure of Orthodoxy and become autonomous.

In the Mediterranean Area

The Orthodox Church of Cyprus has been autocephalous since the Council of Ephesus in 431.[34] Archbishop Cyril III (1916–33) was recognized by the British occupation authorities, who in 1925 declared the island a crown colony, as ethnarch, but came into conflict with him, because he supported the national Greek unity movement, *Enosis,* which sought a union with Greece. An uprising that broke out in 1931 was suppressed, and two bishops and various clerics had to leave the country. From 1933 to 1947 the archbishopric was administered by the chairman of the Holy Synod, Bishop Leontios of Paphos, as administrator, who could not be elected as archbishop until 1947. Under his successors, Makarios II (1947–50) and Makarios III (1950–77),[35] the Greeks—80 percent of the total population—fought for their independence. In the disturbances of 1955–56 Makarios III and other ecclesiastics were banished. After the election of the archbishop, who had returned from exile in 1959, as president of the republic and the proclamation of Cyprus as an independent state in 1960, a certain calm ensued. In the next years Makarios III tried to revise the constitution of Cyprus of 16 August 1960, which had granted certain rights to the Turkish minority—20 percent of the total population—in favor of the Greek Cypriots. The countermeasures of the Turkish inhabitants produced struggles in 1963, which could only be ended in 1965 by the use of United Nations troops. Makarios III recognized that the union of Cyprus with Greece could not be accomplished. Murders and attempted uprisings, behind which stood the Greek military government, caused a crisis which led to war between Greece and Turkey. In the course of it, the Turks conquered the northeastern part—40 percent—of the island. Makarios had deposed three bishops at a synod in March 1973 because of the abandonment of *Enosis,* but in July he was confirmed at a large synod as archbishop and president of the state. The ecclesiastical organization carried out by him in 1973 for 450,000 faithful, with 1 archbishopric, 6 metropolitanates, and 650 clergy, his efforts for the building of new churches, his care for the better paying and pensioning of ecclesiastics, the transformation of the minor seminary in Nicosia into a theological faculty, his care of 11 monasteries with 89 monks and 75 nuns, and his receptiveness to the ecumenical movement characterized his concept of his pastoral office.

---

[32] Between 1959 and 1971 the number of monasteries and sketes (monastic settlements) dropped from 1,657 to 575, the number of nuns from 4,000 to 1,493, the number of priests from 10,153 to 8,564.

[33] There is question of the Rumanian Orthodox missionary diocese in the United States, the Rumanian Orthodox archdiocese of Western Europe, and the Orthodox Catholic diocese of France, which was established in 1937 and in 1972 made the motion for admission to the Rumanian patriarchate.

[34] Cf. Hippolytos, "Die Autokephale Apostolische Orthodoxe Kirche Cyperns," *Ekklesia* X (1941), 177–229.

As regards the number of the faithful—ca. 7 million—the Orthodox Church in Greece belonged, after the patriarchates of Moscow, Rumania, and Serbia, to the four largest Orthodox communities of the present. Only gradually were the Holy Synod and the archbishops[36] of the day able to loosen their dependence on the state's ecclesiastical domination, beginning with the church constitution of 1923, which expanded the ecclesiastical self-administration under Archbishop Chrysostom I (1923–38), through protracted confrontations because of the method of election of the archbishop and bishops and the competence of the Holy Synod, down to the church statute decreed in 1969 by the military government, but it was annulled in 1974. Archbishops Chrysanthius (1938–41) and Damaskinos (1941–49) eliminated the internal church damages which the Second World War and the civil war planned by the Communist partisans had caused. During the negotiations between state and Church on the reduction of the number of episcopal sees there occurred in 1965 a conflict in which Archbishop Chrysostom II (1962–67) was supplanted by the Archimandrite Jerome. As a university professor of canon law and practical theology, he had favored a separation of Church and state, as archbishop he authoritatively took up reform measures which his predecessors had already advised, but the opposition to his procedure and his dependence on the military regime caused his retirement in 1973. His successor, Archbishop Seraphim (from 1974), tried to bridge the gulf between his electors and Jerome's adherents and to realize the already started raising of the educational level and living standard of the clergy and the renewal of the monastic life.[37] He confronted the problems which the industrialization of Greece, the de-Christianization and the migration of the population presented to the Church. Orthodoxy is still deeply rooted among the people. The archbishopric is divided into 76 metropolitanates. Two faculties at Athens and Saloniki and 12 theological schools care for the training of the clerical recruitment, for which, however, not enough candidates apply. The brotherhood ZOË, social and charitable communities, and numerous periodicals promote church life.

---

[35] K. Kerber, *Makarios Kirchenfürst oder?* (Diessen/Ammersee 1964); P. N. Vanezis, *Makarios. Faith and Power,* 2d ed. (London, New York, and Toronto 1972).

[36] Differing from the situation among the Slavic Orthodox Churches, the archbishop of Greece is above the metropolitan.

In contrast to the Greek Church, which has the ability to develop freely, the Orthodox Church is completely suppressed in Albania. It had proclaimed its autocephaly in 1922, and in 1937 this was recognized by the ecumenical patriarch; in 1938 it numbered ca. 200,000 faithful—10 percent of the population—with 1 metropolitan, 4 bishops, 200 priests, 29 monasteries, and 2 seminaries. But after the Communist seizure of power in 1946 it, like all other religions in the People's Republic of Albania, fell into complete dependence on the regime. Archbishop Christopher (1937–49) was deposed; his two successors, Paisios (1949–66) and Damian (1966–73)—the latter died after six years in prison—could do nothing against the tight control exercised over the Church. Hoxha, secretary general of the Albanian Communist Party, in 1967 declared Albania to be the first atheistic state in the world, had all laws annulled which regulated relations between state and Church, and intensified the struggle against religious traditions. All churches were closed and turned into clubhouses, markets, and factories, the bishops[38] were imprisoned, and the ecclesiastical organization was shattered. A few priests still work underground.

---

[37] 1973: 174 monasteries of men with 798 monks, 209 monasteries of women with 2,552 nuns. Their number is retrograde.

After the Balkan wars of 1913–14 the Orthodox Macedonians were under Serb, Bulgarian, and Greek ecclesiastical authority; most of them lived in Yugoslavia. Since 1944 they have worked for the autonomy of the archbishopric of Achrida, incorporated in 1767 into the patriarchate of Constantinople. In 1958–59 Serbian Patriarch German had to assent to the declaration of autonomy of a Macedonian ecclesiastical assembly and the election of his auxiliary bishop, Dositej, as archbishop of Achrida and Macedonia. When the Orthodox Church in Macedonia, in an understanding with the state authorities, proclaimed its autocephaly, there were tensions with the Serbian mother Church. Archbishop Dositej completed the church organization with 6 metropolitanates and 1 abroad, 600,000 faithful, 300 clerics, and 1 seminary, introduced the Macedonian language into the liturgy, and made ecumenical contacts. In 1975 the Church adopted a constitution, but the development of its life was impeded by Yugoslav legislation, which intensified antireligious decrees in the Republic of Macedonia in 1976.

In connection with the self-administration of Crete at the end of the nineteenth century, the see of Gostyna became an autonomous Orthodox metropolitanate with its seat at Heraklion in 1900. From the political annexation of Crete by Greece in 1913, the Orthodox have had to observe not only the guidelines of the patriarchate of Constantinople but also those of the Greek national Church. In 1967 the Orthodox Church in Crete[39] was elevated by act of the patriarch to an archbishopric with seven metropolitanates and was granted partial autonomy, which it might develop into autocephaly. Archbishop Eugenios is responsible for 450,000 faithful, 335 priests, 34 monasteries with 187 monks and 74 nuns. The Orthodox academy on Crete developed into a center for adult education. After the closing of the patriarchal school at Chalkis,[40] the university at Heraklion, administered in common by the Greek state and the Church, assumed its functions in 1973.

---

[38] Two Albanian bishops still work in North America but only among the emigrants: Bishop Stefan subordinated the Albanian Orthodox Diocese in America directed by him with his seat in South Boston to the Orthodox Church in America in 1971. Bishop Mark, with his seat at Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, is in union with the Greek Orthodox archdiocese of North America, which belongs to the ecumenical patriarchate.

[39] A. Alevisopoulos, "Die orthodoxe Kirche von Kreta," *Wegzeichen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag von Hermenegild M. Biedermann OSA,* ed. by E. C. Suttner and C. Patock (Würzburg 1971), 233–44.

[40] See above, p. 475.

In East Central Europe and the Far East

The Orthodox Church in Finland[41] was until 1917–18 a component of the Russian Church; in the Finnish republic established after the First World War it was granted rights alongside the Lutheran state Church. After the patriarch of Moscow, Tikhon, had recognized its autonomy in 1918, the church leadership subjected itself to the ecumenical patriarchate, which in 1923 confirmed its autonomy. In 1939–44 the diocese of Karelia, in which were a majority of the Orthodox congregations, was incorporated into the Soviet Union. After 1945 the exertions of the patriarchate of Moscow to extend its supremacy over the Finnish Church collapsed. Archbishop Paavali, in office since 1960, with two dioceses and two monasteries subject to him, is trying to restore the ecclesiastical life of the 60,000 faithful—1.3 percent of the population—and to reduce the growing number of mixed marriages between Orthodox and Lutherans.

Between the two world wars there lived in Poland almost 4 million Orthodox—12 percent of the population—who in 1923 merged into the Orthodox Church in Poland; in 1924–25 the ecumenical patriarch assented to its declaration of autocephaly. The ecclesiastical policy of the Polish government opposed the national Ukrainian and White Russian tendencies toward the autonomy of the Orthodox population. In 1938–39, 130 churches and two monasteries were destroyed. The partition of Poland in 1939 and the German occupation of the Ukraine in 1941–44 split Polish Orthodoxy into the Church in the *Gouvernement General* and two Churches in the Ukraine.[42] In the areas occupied by the Soviets, the Orthodox were incorporated into the patriarchate of Moscow. Under Metropolitan Dionisij (1923–48, d. 1961), who was removed from office by the government of the People's Republic of Poland because of his collaboration with the Germans, the numbers of the Orthodox decreased to 350,000 after the cession of East Poland to the Soviet Union, but in 1948 it increased by the coming over of 100,000 Uniate Ukrainians after the forcible annulment of the Union of Brest of 1595–96. In 1948 Patriarch Alexis of Moscow possessed supreme jurisdiction over Polish Orthodoxy and in 1951 he consented to its autocephaly. Metropolitan Makarij (1951–61) created a new church organization for the Orthodox scattered through resettlement throughout Poland with the archbishopric of Warsaw-Bielsk and the three bishoprics of Bialystok-Gdansk, Lodz-Pomerania, and Wroclaw-

---

[41] T. Rohner, "Die orthodoxe Kirche Finnlands," *OstkSt* 12 (1963), 314–25.

[42] F. Heyer, *Die orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine 1917 bis 1945* (Cologne-Braunsfeld 1953).

Szczecin, which was completed, with the aid of the Holy Synod, by his successors, Timoteusz (1961–62), Jerzy (1962–64), and Stefan (1964–69). Since 1970 Metropolitan Vassilij has been its head, with ca. 400,000 faithful, 225 congregations, and one monastery each for monks and nuns. The process of integration of the Russian, Ukrainian, and White Russian congregations is accelerated by two theological educational centers in Warsaw and Chylice and by publications in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian.

The uniting of the Hungarian, Russian, and Serbian Orthodox remaining in Hungary after the First World War caused great difficulties, since the patriarchates of Constantinople, Serbia, and Rumania claimed rights of jurisdiction. In 1947 the Orthodox Church in Hungary—40,000 faithful, 50 congregations, 37 ecclesiastics—was taken over by the patriarchate of Moscow, which entrusted the church administration to an archimandrite and in 1949 granted it autonomy. In 1959 it acquired a Hungarian ritual.

The Orthodox in Czechoslovakia united, after the First World War, two smaller groups in Bohemia-Moravia (ca. 20,000 faithful) and in Slovakia (9,000) and a larger group of 112,000 in Carpatho-Ukraine. Most congregations belonged to the Serbian, a few to the ecumenical patriarchate. In the German protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia and in Slovakia they were forbidden during the Second World War. In the Czechoslovak People's Republic they revived and in 1947 they experienced a considerable growth through the repatriation of 30,000 Volhynia Czechs and in 1949–50 through the incorporation of almost 350,000 Uniate Catholics from the forcibly suppressed dioceses of Mukačevo and Prešov. In 1946 the Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia was incorporated into the patriarchate of Moscow, which sent to Prague as its exarch Jelevferij, who in 1948 became archbishop. In 1951 Patriarch Alexej released him from his obedience and declared the Church's autocephaly. The metropolitans Jelevferij (1951–55), Joann (1956–64), and Dorotej (since 1964) unified the church organization (4 dioceses) and expanded the Orthodox theological faculty in Prešov and the ecclesiastical press. When the Communist Party leadership under Dubček in 1968 allowed the reconstitution of the Uniate Catholic Church, more than 200 congregations of Orthodoxy were dissolved and the number of its faithful—Czechs, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Russians—dropped to 100,000. In addition, from 1969 the Orthodox fell under strict control of the officials of the State Church Department and, like all other Churches, were subjected to the influence of increasing antireligious propaganda.

Out of the Russian Orthodox missionary work in the Far East grew two independent Churches in China and Japan. After the outbreak of the revolution in 1917 many Orthodox Russians remained in China[43] and Manchuria; their centers in Charbin, Peking, and Shanghai exercised a certain power of attraction even on the native population. In 1920 Tikhon, patriarch of Moscow, entrusted the direction of the Church to Archbishop Innokentij (1902–31). Through the influx of refugees from Lithuania, White Russia, and other parts of the Soviet Union, who subordinated themselves to the Russian Foreign Church, the church organization was expanded for 200,000 faithful. The juxtaposition of various jurisdictions, political confusion, civil wars, and the proclamation of the People's Republic of China in 1949 induced a large part of the Russian faithful to emigrate to North and South America and Australia. The Russian Foreign Church lost all its property in China and Manchuria. The patriarchate of Moscow appointed Archbishop Victor of Peking as exarch (1950–56), gave the see of Shanghai to the Chinese Bishop Simeon, who had been ordained in Moscow by Patriarch Alexej, and 1957 granted autonomy to the Orthodox Church in China, with five bishops and 20,000 faithful. Its head, the Chinese Bishop Basileios (1957–62), resided in Peking. In his time there began, after the expulsion of all Russian clerics, the closing of churches. During the Cultural Revolution of 1966–69 all churches were destroyed or deprived of their purpose, and the church organization was shattered. It cannot be ascertained whether the Chinese clergy survived the persecution of Christians and how they operate underground.

The beginnings of the Orthodox Church in Japan go back to the Russian clergy working in Tokyo at the embassy after 1861. In the period between the wars it was incorporated into the Russian Foreign Church and in 1939 produced its own constitution. From 1945 the patriarchate of Moscow strove to attach the congregations again to itself. In 1961, on the occasion of the centennial celebration, it sent a delegation to Tokyo and in 1967 appointed Bishop Nikoly as metropolitan. In 1970 it granted autonomy to the Church in Japan, with 1 archbishop, 2 bishops, 38 priests, and ca. 40,000 faithful.

FOREIGN CHURCHES

The number of Orthodox Christians outside the original lands of the Eastern Churches is estimated as 4 million. About one-half belong to the jurisdictions already described, especially in North and South America, Australia, and various Western European nations. In addition, emigrant Russians, Ukrainians, and White Russians have set up autonomous Churches, especially in America.

---

[43] G. Seide, "Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche in China und in der Mandschurei seit dem Jahre 1918," *OstkSt* 25 (1976), 166–92.

The Russian Orthodox Church outside Russia, which, founded in Constantinople, designated itself as autocephalous in 1920, in 1921 transferred its seat to Karlowitz,[44] in 1944 to Munich, and in 1955 to Jordanville, New York, in the United States. It includes many congregations which reject the atheistic government of their homeland and, despite several splinterings, still maintains itself. In 1963 and 1972 respectively the Bulgarian Orthodox Foreign Church in America and the Rumanian Orthodox Missionary Diocese in the Western Hemisphere joined it. Since 1964 the Metropolitan Filaret in New York is the head of the Russian Orthodox Foreign Church, with 7 dioceses in North America, 3 in South America, 3 in Europe, and 1 in Australia-New Zealand, 22 monasteries, and 1 theological educational center at Jordanville, its intellectual center, which also publishes two periodicals. In addition, individual congregations in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the United States have subjected themselves to it. Its hierarchy—2 metropolitans, 11 archbishops, 5 bishops, and 1 episcopal vicar—and 150,000 faithful are unanimous in their rejection of antireligious Communism, but their notion of the Church, their claim to represent all Russian emigrants in their synods, and their isolated position in the totality of Orthodoxy jeopardize their future.

The Orthodox Church in America, whose beginnings lie in the Russian mission to Alaska at the end of the eighteenth century, in 1919 made the first moves to its autonomy, declared its autonomy in 1924 and its autocephaly in 1970. The patriarchate of Moscow, which in 1931 and later wished in vain to restore union with it, consented, whereas the ecumenical patriarchate refused. Metropolitan Irenej, since 1965 archbishop of New York, since 1970 first hierarch of the autocephalous Church, and the Holy Synod direct 11 dioceses[45]—6 metropolitans, 7 bishops, 800,000 faithful—3 theological seminaries, 4 monasteries, and a comprehensive ecclesiastical press organization. In the liturgy, besides Church Slavonic and English, Albanian, Greek, Rumanian, Spanish, and the native tongue of Alaska are used.

Emigrant White Russians, with reference to the autocephaly proclaimed by Metropolitan Melchisedek at Minsk in 1922, established the White Russian Orthodox Church in Exile in 1948. At its council in May 1972, 39 delegates of congregations in the United States, Canada, Belgium, and England elected Archbishop Andrei of Cleveland as metropolitan, assisted by an episcopal vicar for the pastoral care of 5,000 faithful, and decided on a constitution.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Foreign Church in 1973 united three

---

[44] It called itself the Synodal Church of Karlowitz.

[45] Under it is also the Albanian archdiocese of America.

Ukrainian church groups in an independent unity: The Ukrainian-Greek Orthodox Church in Canada, which had originated in 1918 and had declared itself autocephalous in 1951 with its first metropolitan Hilarion, is administered since 1975 by Metropolitan Mstyslav, in office since 1969, of the autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Exile—3 dioceses in Australia, England, and Western Europe, and 20,000 faithful—since 1971 also metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States and South America—1 archbishop, 2 bishops, and 130,000 faithful.

In the last years all Orthodox emigrant Churches tended to a comprehensive church organization, with the aim of creating a patriarchate for America. The membership of many congregations in their mother Church, the persistence of national peculiarities, and the consolidating of the independent Churches in America that had grown in the twentieth century allowed at the time no prospect for realizing this plan.

The Orthodox are aware of the fact of their fragmentation. From an all Orthodox Council,[46] which the patriarch Athenagoras had urged in 1961, they expected a clarification of basic theological questions and problems of pastoral care, of the canon law organization of the diaspora, of their relations to one another and to the ecumenical patriarchate, and of their honorary rank and attitude to the *ecumene.* The prosynodal conference at Chambésy in 1971 drew up a catalogue of more than one-hundred themes, which was restricted and made more precise at the Orthodox Academy on Crete in 1974 and at the first preconciliar conference at Chambésy in 1976.

The Eastern Pre-Chalcedonian National Churches

To this group belong two Nestorian Churches and several Monophysite Churches: the West Syrian Jacobite, the Syrian Orthodox in India with its branches, the Coptic, the Ethiopian, and the Armenian.

THE NESTORIAN CHURCHES

The Apostolic Catholic Church of the East, as the self-designation of the Nestorian or Assyrian Orthodox Church officially reads, has never recovered from the crisis into which the First World War threw it. After the death of Patriarch Simon XX Paul (1918–20) he was succeeded by his twelve-year-old brother, Simon XXI Jesse (1920–73), who was first sent to England for his theological formation. The Assyrians, who had settled in northern Iraq and along the Syrian frontier, were exposed to new persecutions in Iraq in 1933–36, and many emigrated to the United States. From 1940 the patriarch resided at Chicago, from 1954 at San Francisco. In 1961–62 he visited his congregations in southern India, where in 1907 Uniate Thomas Christians, as descendants of adherents of Bishop Mellos, had joined the Nestorian Church as Mellusians, and in Lebanon and Iran, whereas entry into Iraq and Syria was denied him. He did not succeed in recovering his authority, shaken by his decades-long absence. When in 1964, without a synodal decision, from San Francisco he decreed liturgical innovations by curtailing the length of Lent and introducing the Gregorian Calendar, the result was a schism. In 1968 the Mellusian Bishop Thomas Darmo of Trichur was elected patriarch by his opponents, but he died a year later. In 1970 there occurred an understanding between the Iraqi government and the Nestorians, who in 1933 and 1961 had taken part in the Kurds' struggle for freedom. All churches expropriated or destroyed in the last five decades were to be given back or rebuilt. The esteem of Simon XXI Jesse seemed to become consolidated after his visit in Iraq, but criticism of his stay abroad did not end. The desire for his return became stronger when the dissatisfaction of many Nestorians became noticeable in their passing over to the Jacobite Church and the Uniate Chaldeans. In 1973 the patriarch gave up his office and married the same year. A synod in Lebanon deposed him, laicized him, and deprived him of the power to dispose of all church property.

---

[46] F. W. Fernau, "Die Ostkirche im Vorfeld ihres Konzils. Konstitutionelle Gegenwartsprobleme der Orthodoxie," *Ökumenische Rundschau* 20 (1971), 140–57; D. Papandreou, "Zur Vorbereitung der Panorthodoxen Synode," *Una Sancta* 29 (1974), 161–165; R. Stupperich, "Die Heilige oder Grosse Orthodoxe Synode," *Kirche im Osten* 17 (1974), 180f.; H. J. Härtel, "Die erste vorkonziliare panorthodoxe Konferenz in Chambésy," *Der christliche Osten* 32 (1977), 83–89 and 92.

Thereby the Nestorian Old Church of the East gained the prospect of uniting all Nestorian groups in Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, India, Syria, Turkey, the Soviet Union, the United States, and on Cyprus—ca. 100,000 faithful. Since 1969 Catholicos-Patriarch Addai II has worked for this end from Baghdad.

THE MONOPHYSITE CHURCHES

The West Syrian Jacobite Church is subject to the patriarch of Antioch and the entire East. The title recalls the flowering of the Syrian Orthodox Church in the early Middle Ages. The patriarchs, who after the First World War stabilized ecclesiastical matters in the Middle East and had to struggle with the movement for autonomy of the Indian daughter Church, removed their residence from Diarbekr to Homs in 1932 and to Damascus in 1959. Ignatius XXXVIII Ephraem (1933–57) acquired merit as a church historian, founder of a seminary, and through the building of schools and the printing of liturgical books. In 1953 he erected a special eparchy for Jacobites who had emigrated to the United States. His successor, Ignatius XXXIX Jacob III Severus (from 1957), united more closely by means of repeated visitation journeys his congregations in Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, North and South America, southern India, and in the hills of Tur 'Abdin in southeastern Turkey—ca. 120,000 faithful. He took an interest in the Turkish foreign workers scattered in the diaspora—in the German Federal Republic, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. Since 1964 he has been assisted by a lay council of twelve members, which takes care of financial, technical administrative, and educational questions. Furthermore, he championed a union of all Monophysite Churches and made contacts with representatives of Orthodox and other Christian Churches. The erecting of churches, monasteries, and schools are signs of a certain revival of this Patriarchal Church.

The Syrian Christians in South India, for whom the collective name of Thomas Christians is often employed, are today split into fifteen different communities.[47] Conflicts between the Jacobite Thomas Christians and the West Syrian patriarchate of Antioch led in 1911 to the independence of the Syrian Orthodox Malabar (Malankara) Church.[48] The Indian metropolitan Dionysius VI (1908–34), from 1912 catholicos of the East, accorded to the patriarch of Antioch only a primacy of honor. Efforts for reconciliation of the two Churches failed. The ecclesiastical constitution issued under Catholicos Mar Basileios III George II (1929–62, d. 1964) deprived the patriarch of any administrative function in India. Difficulties and litigation, prolonged for decades, over church property between the majority of the faithful in the Malabar Church and the minority, which clung to union with the patriarch, produced a tense atmosphere. In 1950 there ensued a certain understanding, which was confirmed by the preparations for the nineteenth centennial Thomas Celebration celebrated in 1952 by all Christian denominations.[49] The two struggling groups in 1955 recognized the patriarch of Antioch as the highest spiritual authority and agreed on the subordination of the faithful in South India to the catholicos residing at Kottayam. In 1958 Patriarch Ignatius XXXIX Jacob III Severus assented to their autonomy under Catholicos Basileios III George II. Basileios IV Eugene I (1964–75), appointed administrator at his desire in 1962, was enthroned by him. He devoted himself to the completing of ecclesiastical institutions. On the revision of the church constitution[50] the Malabar Church was in 1967 designated as part of the Syrian Orthodox Church. But the agreement arrived at by way of discussion in no sense ended the internal difficulties between the adherents of the functioning catholicos and the patriarch of Antioch; in several cities two rival bishops confronted each other. Of the ca. 1.25 million faithful, since 1975 three-fourths adhere to Mar Basileios V Matthew I and one-fourth to Mar Basileios Paul II, both of whom bear the title of catholicos of the East and metropolitan of Malankara.

---

[47] F. Verghese, *Die Syrischen Kirchen,* 11–14; cf. also P. J. Podipara, op. cit., 178–89.

[48] "Malankara" is in the Majalajam language the term for "Malabar," the southwest Indian coastal plain, in which live most Syrian Orthodox faithful. "Malankara" is the short form of "Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church."

[49] The Apostle Thomas is said to have landed at Mailapur near Madras in A.D. 52 and begun his mission.

Besides the small Monophysite Church of Thozhijur (Andschur) in North Cerala (4,000 faithful), which ca. 1772 separated from the Syrian Orthodox mother Church as an independent Jacobite Church, the Syrian Mar Thomas Church must be mentioned. At the time of its origin in the nineteenth century, in addition to the question of autonomy, the alleged recourse to the Old Christian Church of Saint Thomas, the adoption of reform ideas, Anglican influences, and changes in the liturgy played a role. From these reformed Jacobites, also called Anglo-Syrians, whose 250,000 faithful are directed by Metropolitan Yuhana Mar Thomas at Tiruvalla, there split away in 1961 the Evangelical Saint Thomas Church in India, to which ca. 2,500 adherents in ten congregations belong.

The Coptic Church, under the "Pope and Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria and all Africa," gained in internal stability in the last decades, despite the political changes in Egypt, Arab nationalism, and the strengthening of Islam. Under Patriarch Cyril V (1874–1927) the Copts obtained in the constitution of 1923 civil equality with Muslims; the constitution proclaimed in 1956 guaranteed the equality of all citizens without regard for religion, but actually Islam remained Egypt's state religion. His successors had to contend with the lay representation in the National Council (Maglis Milli), which strove to extend its right to share in church administration. Patriarch John XIX (1928–42) increased the church schools and the printing of publications in church history and dogmatic theology. With Macarius III (1944–45) a proved practical shepherd of souls was elected, who showed himself open to efforts for church reform. Joasaph II (1946–56) protested against the growing Muslim fanaticism, which aimed to drive all non-Muslims from public offices, and in 1948 regulated the relations with the Ethiopian Church. When, after a vacancy of three years, an agreement had been achieved between the National Council and the Holy Synod on the election of the new patriarch, Cyril VI (1959–71) occupied the Coptic patriarchal throne. He reorganized the ecclesiastical administration by a series of committees for instruction, press, and monasteries. In 1960 he opened the new Coptic theological academy at Cairo. In spite of the confiscation of the greatest part of church property by the government, he succeeded in maintaining good relations with President Nasser (1956–1970), who financially supported the establishing of a patriarchal center and the rebuilding of Saint Mark's Cathedral at Cairo and took part in the laying of the cornerstone. His cooperation in the movement of liturgical renewal, in which the Arabic language established itself, in the formation of priests and monks, in the lessening of tension with the Ethiopian Church, in the holding of conferences with Monophysite and Orthodox Churches, especially in the Monophysite Synod at Addis Ababa from 7 to 21 January 1965,[51] in the dedication celebration of Saint Mark's Cathedral from 24 to 26 June 1968, and in the pastoral care of emigrant Copts attest to the diversity of his successful activity. He was succeeded by Bishop Amba Schenucha, responsible since 1962 for religious education, who as patriarch since 1971 is called Schenucha III. He reorganized the education of priests and monks and completed the theological academy. Like his predecessor, he stood for a rapprochement of the Monophysite Churches and a reunion of Eastern and Western Christianity.[52] The Coptic Church with ca. 4 million faithful suffers from Muslim intolerance, but its consolidation, the spiritual power of its monasteries, the receptiveness to modern problems, and its missionary work among Muslims deserve notice.

---

[50] P. Verghese, *Die Syrischen Kirchen,* 169–80.

The Ethiopian Church, one of the oldest Christian national Churches, daughter Church of the Coptic patriarchate, acquired its autocephaly in 1959 through the determined exertions of Haile Selassie, Negus from 1928 to 1930 and Emperor from 1930 to 1974 (d. 1975). For decades he strove to make the forces of the religious tradition of his country fruitful for the present by tightening the external organization and reforms of the Church. He saw to the printing of liturgical books with texts in the ecclesiastical language, Geez, and their translation into the Amharic language of conversation, the founding of a theological seminary at Addis Ababa in 1944, which in 1961 was integrated into the university as the theological faculty, and theological schools in the individual eparchies, raised the level of cantors, deacons, and monks, and insisted on preaching.

While the Coptic patriarchs appointed an Egyptian monk as metropolitan and abuna ("our Father") of the entire Ethiopian Church, five

---

[51] The Synod met under the chairman Cyril VI (cf. *The Oriental-Orthodox Churches Addis Ababa Conference, January 1965* [Addis Ababa 1965]; E. Hammerschmidt, "Die Kirchenkonferenz von Addis Ababa," *Kirche im Osten* 9 [1966], 13–21.)

[52] After the visit of Schenucha III to Pope Paul VI in May 1973 a mixed commission of Catholics and Copts was set up, which held its first general meeting in March 1974.

Ethiopian monks were assigned to Abuna Cyril (1926–50) as bishops. The freeing of the Ethiopian Church from the Coptic was hastened by the Italian occupation of the country (1935–36), which entrusted native dignitaries with ecclesiastical administration, and the centralizing imperial administration of the Emperor after his return from exile in 1941. In 1946 Cyril returned to Egypt; in 1948 he turned over the administration of the Church to the native Etschegen Basileios, the superior general of all monasteries, monks, and nuns. Under Abuna Basileios (1951–59) the number of Ethiopian bishops was increased, the educational and charitable systems completed. At the insistence of Emperor Haile Selassie, Coptic Patriarch Cyril VI elevated him to patriarch and catholicos of Ethiopia (1959–70). To the Coptic patriarch remained only the supreme direction of the jurisdictional sphere of Saint Mark, which embraced also Ethiopia, and the right to ordain the Ethiopian patriarch. In addition to intensifying the formation of priests, teachers of religion, and missionaries, Patriarch Basileios cultivated relations with all Monophysite Churches.[53] He succeeded in obtaining in the radio station "Voice of the Gospel," established in the capital in 1963 by the Lutheran World Association, and in the state radio system, broadcasting time for the Patriarchal Church. In broadcasting work conservative and progressive ideas clashed. Theophilos I (Tewoflos, 1971–76) became his successor. His effort to continue church reform was hampered by the revolution of 1974–75, which deposed and interned Emperor Haile Selassie in 1974, annulled the privileges of the state Church, and expropriated its landed property. The patriarch protested against the draft of a new constitution, which envisaged equal religious rights for all Ethiopians—40 percent Monophysites, 35 percent Muslims, 20 percent pagans—but promised support of the regime. A heavy tax imposed on the episcopate was welcomed by the lower clergy; it had hopes from the political and social upheavals for an improvement of the living conditions of the Church, which had been burdened by the connection with the toppled dynasty. These "People's Priests" partly adopted directions which the first two patriarchs had already begun, including improvement of instruction and preaching, acceptance of connections with the sister Churches, but had encountered the hidden resistance of many clerics and monks, and partly they aligned themselves with radical reform demands. True, Theophilos I was able, by his personality, to bridge over the opposition that broke out among his ca. 12 million faithful, but he was supplanted by Patriarch Malaku Walda Michael.

---

[53] At the Synod of Addis Ababa in 1965 (above, n. 1) there was discussion of ways and means of gaining more young intellectuals for service in the Church and of missionary groups for the proclamation of the Gospel and instruction of the newly baptized.

The Armenian Apostolic Church, or Gregorian Church,[54] is at present split among the catholicates of Echmiadzin and Cilicia, the patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and a widespread diaspora. When the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire defended themselves against their increasing oppression, they were cruelly subjugated by the Turks in six waves of pogroms from 1894 to 1922, but especially in 1915–16.[55] Because of bloody massacres, deportations to Syria and Mesopotamia, forced conversions to Islam, and emigration, the patriarchate of Constantinople lost two-thirds of its faithful; some 2,050 churches and 203 monasteries were burned. By the Peace Treaty of Sèvres in 1920, Armenia again became a separate nation, but it was able to maintain its independence only one month before it was divided between Turkey and the Soviet Union.

The catholicate of Echmiadzin, which had been subject to the control of the Russian state Church since 1836, recovered its independence for a brief period (1917–20) after the Russian Revolution. In the Transcaucasian Republic of the Soviet Union (1922) the Church fell into the wake of Communist domination. Catholicos Kevork V (George, 1912–30) successfully opposed the Armenian Reformed Church propagated by the regime from 1924–25, a parallel to the "Living Church,"[56] which was joined only by a few bishops. Among the people it found no echo. And so the government tried to put pressure on the catholicos, "the supreme patriarch of all Armenians," for gaining the Armenians in foreign countries. Catholicos Choren (1932–38), who as administrator had already made extensive declarations of loyalty, obtained the reopening of some churches and the restoration of church property for the maintenance of the cathedral and the monastic establishments of Echmiadzin. Although in his pastoral letters he greeted the achievements for the economic and cultural uplifting of Soviet Armenia, he became a victim of the increasing persecution of the Church. Deputy Catholicos Kevork, in office since 1938, was powerless against further closings of churches and imprisoning of priests. In the Second World War he summoned the Armenians to join together for armed unity. Stalin permitted his election as Catholicos Kevork VI (1945–54), the recovery of the seminary at Erivan—all ecclesiastical educational centers had been closed in 1928—and the publication of a periodical. The appeal of the catholicos to the Armenians abroad to return to Soviet Armenia, his styling himself "patriarch of all Armenia" instead of the previous "of all Armenians," his claim to leadership of all Armenian jurisdictional areas, and his collaboration with the Patriarchal Church of Moscow facilitated for him the ordination of ten bishops and a certain stabilizing of church life, but he could not make up for the severe damage[57] the Church had suffered between the two world wars. At the Church assembly of 1955–56, in which ninety-seven delegates from the Soviet Union and forty from abroad took part, Vasgen, the Armenian supreme shepherd of the Bulgarian-Rumanian diocese, was elected catholicos. As a leading member of the peace movement in Rumania and because of his positive statements on the support of the Armenian national character by the Soviet Union, he was agreeable to the regime. Through his foreign journeys (1956–61), through the national synod convoked by him to Echmiadzin in 1962—of 137 delegates eighty-seven were from abroad—and the "All-Armenian Synod" at Echmiadzin in 1969, which was to prepare for an Armenian Orthodox council, he bound the patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem closer to his catholicate, even if he did not succeed in realizing the desired rapprochement with the catholicate of Cilicia. The versatile catholicos undertook other foreign journeys, on which he consolidated the relations to the diaspora eparchies subject to him, made contacts with Eastern and Western church leaders, and helped his Church acquire international repute. His reports on the revival of religious sentiment in Soviet Armenia cannot conceal the fact that his Church of ca. 2 to 3 million faithful has only slight possibilities of development. To the catholicate belong another 500,000 Armenians in Iraq, Western Europe, and North, Central, and South America.[58]

---

[54] The Church takes its name from Gregory the Illuminator (d. ca. 325), first bishop of all Armenia (cf. A. S. Atiya, op. cit., 317–22).

[55] J. Bryce, *The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915–16* (London 1916); F. Nansen, *Betrogenes Volk. Eine Studienreise durch Georgien und Armenien als Oberkommissar des Völkerbundes* (Leipzig 1928); J. Lepsius, *Der Todesgang des armenischen Volkes,* 4th ed. (Potsdam 1930); B. Brentjes, op. cit., 9–15.

[56] See above, p. 482.

The Armenian Apostolic Church of the catholicate of Cilicia, which is responsible for Armenians in Lebanon, North America, Syria, Iran, and on Cyprus—600,000 faithful—has maintained its independence. Its catholicoi resided from 1293 to 1921 at Sis, the capital of the medieval Little Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia. Persecuted by the Turks, the Armenians fled to Syria and Lebanon, where they created a new center at Antelias, north of Beirut. The successive catholicoi Garegin (1945–

---

[57] The number of churches dropped between 1915 and 1954 in European Russia from 1,446 to 89, in the Armenian Soviet Republic from 491 to 38, in Georgia from 287 to 14, in Azerbaijan from 473 to 30. In the Georgian capital of Tiflis, of the 28 Armenian churches before the First World War, only 2 are left (W. Kolarz, op. cit., 166f.).

[58] The Armenians in the United States are under an archbishop in New York in only a loose dependence on the catholicate of Echmiadzin.

52) and Sarech I (1956–63) struggled with the Catholicate of Echmiadzin over the security and the extension of their jurisdiction until Catholicos Choren, in office from 1963, succeeded in consolidating his Church internally and externally, and made contacts with the other Monophysite communities and with Orthodox and Western Churches.

The Armenian Gregorian patriarchate of Constantinople now cares for 50,000 Armenians in Turkey.[59] To the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem belong 6,000 faithful in Israel and Jordan. Both patriarchates are pretty intimately united to that of Echmiadzin.

The Eastern national Churches have in their venerable liturgies preserved the primitive Christian stock of ideas to the present. Conditioned by political circumstances, they lived considerably isolated for centuries. Not until the twentieth century did they meet one another, loosen the hardened fronts among them and Orthodoxy, and begin dialogues with the Roman Catholic Church. In 1971, 1973, and 1976 Monophysite and Catholic theologians met at Vienna[60] to prepare the way for a reunion of the separated Churches. In the center of their discussion stood the Christological definition of the Council of Chalcedon, on whose formulation a unanimous interpretation was sought, and the value and evaluation of ecumenical councils and of the "Petrine Office." The beginnings of mutual understanding of Eastern and Orthodox Churches, of Eastern and Western Christianity, are becoming clear. When and how the diversity of Eastern Churches will flow into the unity asked by Christ in his high-priestly prayer (John 17:20–21) lies on another plane.

---

[59] Before 1914 there were in Turkey 1,700 parishes and 1,600 churches, in the mid-twentieth century 42 parishes and 38 churches (W. Kolarz, op. cit., 150).

[60] The consultations took place in the framework of the foundation *Pro Oriente,* called into existence by Franz Cardinal König in 1964.

SECTION THREE

The Church in the Individual Countries

CHAPTER 17

*The Church in Northern, Eastern, and Southern Europe**

The end of the First World War produced fundamental upheavals in northern, eastern, and southern Europe. On the ruins of the destroyed Habsburg and Romanov empires arose new or very different national states, which in their reorganization and the building of their new structure made use of the help of religious groups. In the overwhelmingly Catholic countries, such as Lithuania, Poland, and Hungary, therefore, Catholicism flourished, whereas in countries with a majority of Orthodox population, like Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, the independent Eastern Churches[1] obtained a leading position. However, in these states, as also in Czechoslovakia, which represented a sort of special case, and in the Scandinavian and Baltic countries with a Protestant majority, the Catholic Church was able to develop freely, due to the middle-class democracies. Only the Soviet Union constituted an exception. For its Communist, strictly antireligious ideology led to an unprecedented anti-Church struggle, which, after the Second World War, in consequence of the Soviet seizure of power in eleven nations in all of eastern and southern Europe, it was extended to almost 70 million Catholics. Only from the early 1960s did the situation begin to relax gradually in the course of international politics. The long-range method of the interior withering of the Church replaced the open struggle against it. But the changed international situation also made it possible for the Holy See, through a reoriented policy, to hasten to the aid of the oppressed Church in the East.

The Scandinavian Countries

In Denmark Catholicism could continue after the First World War its upsurge that had begun at the turn of the century. As a result of numerous and important conversions the number of the faithful grew within eighteen years from 3,000 to 15,000, and in 1938 to 22,000 in a

---

* Gabriel Adriányi

[1] Cf. the explanation in Chapter 16.

Protestant population of 4.2 million. Due to the circumstances of domestic policy, the Church displayed a vigorous activity in pastoral care, charity, the press, and the care of youth. Thirty new churches, chapels, seven schools, and nine hospitals were built. The number of Catholics rose also on the Danish islands. In 1923 the Holy See established a prefecture apostolic in Iceland, which was raised to a vicariate apostolic in 1929. Great ecclesiastical celebrations and meetings[2] made clear the strength and importance obtained by Danish Catholicism. The German occupation of Denmark from 1940 to 1945 brought trouble for the Church especially in economic respects. However, the Catholic renewal could not only maintain itself but continue its development. During and after the Second World War Denmark admitted for the time being some 250,000 refugees, including 24,000 Catholics, and this especially gave an impetus to charity. In keeping with the favorable development of the postwar years, Pius XII in 1953 made Copenhagen a diocese and placed it immediately under the Holy See. Since then Danish Catholicism has displayed a vigorous activity, especially in the care of souls, education, and social work.

Because of the powerful Lutheran state-Church system, the unfamiliarity of Catholicism, and the large diaspora, the Catholic mission in Sweden was able to develop less favorably. Through tireless missionary work, but especially through the immigration of ca. 20,000 Catholic refugees during and after the Second World War, especially from Eastern Europe, the situation of the Church could gradually improve. In the process of the erecting of the autonomous Scandinavian hierarchy, Pius XII in 1953 also elevated the vicariate apostolic of Stockholm to a bishopric. True, in the most recent period the Church obtained a greater importance, numbering in 1974 already 63,063 faithful, with 26 parishes, 115 diocesan priests, 77 male religious, and 230 female religious; but, now as earlier, the old difficulties[3] hampered a more comprehensive evangelization.

As in Sweden, the Catholic mission in Norway could acquire greater importance only in the most recent period because of immigration and conversions. Here the number of Catholics in a population of 3.6 million grew in 1974 to 9,127, who were cared for in 17 parishes by 20 priests, 34 male religious, and 382 sisters. Here too in 1953 Pius XII founded its own ecclesiastical organization: out of the vicariate apostolic erected in 1931 came the see of Oslo and two other vicariates apostolic.

---

[2] In 1923, visit of Cardinal Willem van Rossum; and 1926 Saint Anschar's Year; in 1932 Eucharistic Congress at Copenhagen; in 1935 Saint Knut's Year; cf. also W. van Rossum, *Die religiöse Lage der Katholiken in den nordischen Lädern* (Munich 1924).

[3] For example, lack of financial means, great distances, Protestant milieu.

Of course, in Norway Catholics represent a very small minority in the diaspora, but their religious life is exemplary.

Like Sweden and Norway, the Catholic Church in Finland has only a small number of faithful—2,959 in 1974—who live dispersed among 4.6 million Protestants. Here in 1955 Pius XII organized its own hierarchy, the see of Helsinki, after the Finnish Catholics had in 1920 been separated from the archbishopric of Mogilev and obtained a vicariate of their own. In spite of some restrictions,[4] the Church in Finland enjoys free activity.[5]

The Baltic Countries

The Republic of Estonia, proclaimed on 2 April 1918 but only recognized in international law on 26 January 1921, embraced at its independence 47,549 square kilometers with a population of ca. 1.1 million, of whom 77.6 percent belonged to the Lutheran and only 2,327—.2 percent—to the Catholic Church. In 1940 the latter were cared for in six parishes by eleven priests and about twenty religious of both sexes. Since the faithful had previously been subject to the Russian archbishopric of Mogilev, a special apostolic administration, under a titular archbishop, was erected for them in 1925. The first Soviet occupation in 1940, then the incorporation of Estonia after the end of the German occupation into the Soviet Union in 1945, and the implementation of the Soviet religious policy completely destroyed the organization and life of the Church in Estonia.

Like Estonia, the Republic of Latvia appeared on 18 November 1918 as a result of the collapse of the Russian Empire, and, also like Estonia, it did not receive recognition in international law until 26 January 1921. The new nation had a total area of 65,791 square kilometers with a population of 1.8 million. The majority of the population was Lutheran—58 percent—but here the number of Catholics amounted to 450,210 souls—23.69 percent—in 1930. For them the Holy See restored the old see of Riga as early as 1918 and removed it from the earlier diocesan union of Mogilev and Kaunas. Because of religious liberty and the accommodating policy of the state, the Church was able quickly to develop. There appeared religious institutions, societies, seminaries, a Catholic theological faculty and a considerable Catholic press. In order further to complete the ecclesiastical organization and to clarify the relations of state and Church, Latvia conducted discussions with the Holy See in 1920, which ended on 30 May 1922 with the concluding of a concordat.[6] The concordat guaranteed the Church full possibility of development and called into existence the archbishopric of Riga and the suffragan bishopric of Kurland-Semgallen, with its seat at Liepaja. The outbreak of the Second World War, the events of the war, the forcible annexation of the country to the Soviet Union on 21 June 1940, and Soviet domination also made a quick end of the flourishing life of the Church here too. All church organizations were forbidden, and bishops were imprisoned. The number of priests dropped from 207 in 1944 to 143 in 1967. After 1963 the situation relaxed a bit. Thus the one vicar general for the two sees of Riga and Liepaja could take part in the Second Vatican Council and in 1964 receive episcopal ordination at Rome.

---

[4] For example, the founding of monasteries is forbidden.

[5] For the Scandinavian missions cf. the *Jahrbücher des St.-Ansgarius-Werkes, St. Ansgar,* published by the directors of the *St.-Ansgarius-Werk* of Cologne and of the *St.-Ansgar-Werk* of Munich.

Lithuania declared its political sovereignty on 16 February 1918, but, after Poland had occupied Lithuanian Vilna, and Lithuania the district of Memel that was under Polish rule, it was recognized in international law only on 8 May 1924. The republic covered 58,810 square kilometers with a population of 2.3 million, of whom 1.7 million were Catholics. They lived in two dioceses and in 1929 had 388 parishes and 1,072 priests.[7] Although the overwhelming majority of the population was Catholic, and the Church had fostered the independence of Lithuania with all its power in the most recent past, there occurred repeated conflicts between Lithuania and the Holy See because of the question of Vilna. When the Polish concordat of 1925 left the see of Vilna with Poland, the diplomatic relations assumed in 1920 between Lithuania and the Vatican were broken. On 4 April 1926 Pius XI created a Lithuanian ecclesiastical province by the bull *Lituanorum gente.*[8] He elevated Kaunas to an archbishopric and subjected to it four new dioceses and a prelacy *nullius.* But since this took place without previous consultation with the Lithuanian government, the government did not recognize the papal bull. Long and difficult negotiations between the Holy See and Lithuania led on 10 December 1927 to the concluding of a concordat.[9] It restored diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the republic, guaranteed the complete freedom of the Church, and confirmed the new Lithuanian ecclesiastical organization. Church life flourished. In 1939 there were already 800 parishes, more than 1,500 priests, and 600 candidates for the priesthood in 4 seminaries and a Catholic theological faculty. Also the Catholic press and religious institutes renewed themselves energetically. But the political conflicts from 1938 on, the Second World War, the invasion of the Soviet army after a three-year occupation by the Germans (1941–44), and the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union on 3 August 1940 made a quick end of this development. The new rulers denounced the concordat in 1940 and introduced the same measures as in the two other Baltic nations. Also there occurred a mass deportation, which annihilated not only the entire hierarchy and a great part of the clergy but also a third of the Catholic population of Lithuania. In 1955 there were only one bishop, impeded from carrying out his office, and 75 seminarians. The number of priests dropped in 1969 to 834, of whom 300 had passed the age of sixty years.

---

[6] *AAS* 14(1922), 577–81

[7] Of whom 38 were religious priests.

[8] *AAS* 18(1926), 121–23.

[9] Ibid. 19(1927), 425–31.

After 1963 the situation became a bit easier. In 1965 a Lithuanian vicar capitular could be ordained a bishop at Rome, in 1968 a Lithuanian priest in his own country, and in 1969 two other priests. In 1967 two bishops could journey to Rome. However, just how unfree the Church is in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania was shown by the most recent letters of protest and complaint of Lithuanian Catholics and priests, which have in part become known in the West.[10]

The Soviet Union

When, on the collapse of the Empire of the Tsars, the Bolshevik Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic arose in 1918, then in 1922 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, there was in the new state only a shrinking Catholic minority. For the number of Roman and Uniate Catholics decreased as a consequence of the independence of Poland and of the Baltic nations from 15 to 1.6 million, who now lived among 78 million of other faiths, of whom 71 percent were Orthodox. The Catholics of the Roman Rite, mostly foreigners or non-Russians, were in Russia itself subject to the archbishopric of Mogilev and its four suffragan sees and were all cared for by ca. 4,600 priests in 4,234 churches and 1,978 chapels. But the new frontiers of the state left only the archbishopric[11] and two other dioceses and the vicariate apostolic for the Crimea, the Caucasus, and Siberia, the apostolic administration of the Armenian Rite, and the exarchate of the Slavonic Byzantine Rite in their former extent.

On 23 January 1918 the new rulers proclaimed separation of Church and state and began at once with the dissolving of the organization of the Catholic Church. By 1923 all bishops were imprisoned, expelled, or shot. The normal church administration came to an end with the hierarchy. The number of priests dropped rapidly also through natural and violent deaths, deportations, imprisonment, and the preventing of reception of the priesthood by candidates. All seminaries and the important ecclesiastical academy at Petrograd[12] were dissolved. Most churches and chapels were closed or profaned. Within a few years the external religious life of the Church had been completely destroyed.

---

[10] Cf. *HK* 26(1972), 339–45.

[11] In 1918 two old dioceses, Minsk and Kamenec, were again attached to the archbishopric.

In view of this situation, the Holy See left nothing untried to stop the destruction of the Church. But repeated diplomatic interventions achieved only the freeing and expelling of Archbishops Eduard von Ropp in 1920 and John Cieplak in 1923. The papal assistance mission in the Soviet Union, visited by famine, which was carried out with the cooperation of the Divine Word Missionaries and a donation of ca. 2 million dollars in 1922–24,[13] did not realize the missionary expectations connected with the giving of aid. Now as earlier, the authorities kept any church activity away from works of charity.

Because of the serious ecclesiopolitical situation and the great upheavals in Eastern Europe, as early as 1917 Benedict XV established the Congregation for the Eastern Churches and in the same year the Institute of Oriental Studies. In the former a special "Commission for Russia" was formed, which worked as an independent office from 1925 to 1934. Since it was of interest to the new Soviet state to obtain recognition in international law, it had been ready to have a nuncio sent to Moscow, despite the retaining of its church policy. The negotiations foundered when Pius XI made the resumption of full diplomatic relations dependent on the attitude of the Soviet government to the Church.

Meanwhile diplomatic "feelers" were not ended. Thus Pius XI could in 1925 and 1926 authorize a member of the papal "Commission for Russia," the Jesuit Michel d'Herbigny, who was ordained a bishop, to arrange a new organization of church administration in the Soviet Union and send him to Moscow. There in 1926 he erected nine apostolic administrations[14] and secretly ordained four bishops. However, this was soon discovered by the state. Monsignor d'Herbigny had to leave the country, and the new bishops were imprisoned. The reorganization of the Church collapsed thereby. Now the whole of ecclesiastical life was paralyzed. Only some fifty to sixty priests escaped the measures of terror, and their activity was strictly supervised. From 1933 a priest in the American Embassy at Moscow could function for the personnel and celebrate Mass in the church of Saint Louis.

---

[12] Cf. A. Petrani, *Kolegium Duhowne W Petersburgu* (The Ecclesiastical Academy at Petersburg) (*Towarzystwo Naukowe* 12) (Lublin 1950).

[13] Cf. M. D'Herbigny, "L'aide pontificale aux enfants affamé de Russie," *Orientalia Christiana* 4(1925), 1–80; J. Kraus, *Im Auftrage des Papstes in Russland* (Veröffentlichungen des Missionspriesterseminars St. Augustin, Siegburg, no. 21) (Steyl 1970).

[14] Moscow, Mogilev-Minsk, Leningrad, Kharkow, Kazan-Samara(Kuibyshev)-Simbirsk(Ulyanovsk), Odessa, Saratow, Caucasus, and Georgia.

After his predecessor had already in 1920 rejected the Communist ideology in the motu proprio *Bonum sana,*[15] Pius XI condemned Bolshevism and its violence in numerous declarations,[16] especially in the encyclicals *Miserantissimus Redemptor,*[17] *Caritate Christi compulsi,*[18] and *Divini Redemptoris.*[19] And on 2 February 1930 he summoned all Christianity to prayer services against Communism.[20]

The events at the beginning of and during the Second World War, especially the annexation of eastern Poland, the Baltic nations, Bessarabia, and the Carpatho-Ukraine by the Soviet Union, and the Soviet military occupation of Eastern Europe, as well as the decision of the three-power conference at Yalta from 4 to 11 February 1945 to leave all of Eastern Europe under Soviet influence, had as a result a cruel way of the cross for some 70 million Catholics in eleven countries. The harshest blow, of course, fell on Catholics in the areas incorporated by the Soviet Union.

As early as 1939 the state had moved with all its means against the Uniate Armenians and Ukrainians (the Ruthenians) who lived in the archdiocese of Lvov and its suffragan sees. Church property was confiscated, seminaries were closed, monasteries and churches were plundered. After the end of the German occupation and the second Soviet invasion, the persecution of the Church was resumed and the forcible reincorporation of the Uniates was carried through. The annexation to the Patriarchal Church of Moscow was enforced by an illegal synod on 8 March 1946 after the imprisonment of ten bishops and apostolic administrators. In this way the Catholic Church in the Ukraine was liquidated.[21] In a similar fashion there occurred the return of the Uniates in Carpatho-Ukraine. After the bishop of Užhorod had been eliminated by a fatal automobile accident in 1949, the state's arbitrary measures climaxed on 15 August 1949 in the proclaiming of reunion with the Orthodoxy of Moscow. Meanwhile, 67 churches had been expropriated and 18 priests imprisoned.

---

[15] *AAS,* 12(1920), 313–317.

[16] Enumerated in ibid. 29(1937), 67.

[17] Ibid. 20(1928), 165–78.

[18] Ibid. 24(1932), 177–94.

[19] Ibid. 29(1937), 65–106.

[20] Ibid. 22(1930), 89–93.

[21] Cf. the talk of Pius XII on 14 November 1952 in *AAS* 44(1952), 876–78; also, W. de Vries, "Soppressione della Chiesa greco-cattolica nella Subcarpazia," *CivCatt* 102, 2(1950), 391–99, and M. Lacko, "The Forced Liquidation of the Union of Užhorod," *Slovak Studies* 1(1961), 145–85.

In 1963 the Vatican's Eastern policy was able to effect the release from prison of the Ukrainian metropolitan of Lvov, Josyf Slipyi. However, the sad situation of the Church in the entire Soviet Union is unchanged.[22]

Poland

Proclaimed by the Central Powers on 5 November 1916, the sovereign Polish state was restored in the Peace Treaty of Versailles on 28 June 1919 after more than a century of total partition. About the same political boundaries were reinstituted as after the second partition in 1793. In 1927 the Republic of Poland included, after some correcting of the frontiers, 385,030 square kilometers; in 1921 it had 27.1 million inhabitants, of whom 20.3 million—75 percent—were Catholics, including 3.5 million Uniates, 2.8 million—10.5 percent—Orthodox, 2.8 million—10.5 percent—Jews, and 1 million—3.8 percent—Protestants. In addition the new nation comprised a variety of national minorities, for the Poles constituted only ca. 78 percent of the population.

If Polish Catholicism was in modern times, especially however during the difficult period of the partition of the state, the unselfish bearer of national interests and the strongest promoter of the reestablishment of state sovereignty, it is not to be wondered at that, thanks to its unbounded popularity, it played a key role in the reconstruction of the state and in public life. Since the boundaries of the ecclesiastical provinces were often at variance with those of the state, the reorganization of the Church's structure took precedence for the episcopate in the reconstruction and standardization of church life. There began discussions between the papal nuncio, Achille Ratti (1919–21), the future Pope Pius XI, the episcopate and the government. They proved to be difficult, but were successful. After nine episcopal sees had been filled in 1919 and in 1920 the diocese of Lodz and in 1922 two apostolic administrations[23] had been erected, there ensued on 10 February 1925 the signing of a concordat[24] between Poland and the Holy See. On the one hand, the concordat guaranteed the complete liberty of the Church and granted the Curia influence on the organization of the Church in

---

[22] Cf. also R. Urban, *Die tschechoslowakische hussitische Kirche* (*Marburger Ostforschungen* 34) (Marburg 1973), 111–17.

[23] Danzig, Katowice.

[24] *AAS* 17(1925), 273–87.

Poland, but on the other hand it took into account the national political wishes of the government.[25] The new diocesan arrangement of Poland was agreed upon in ARTICLE 9; it resulted on 28 October 1925 in the bull *Vixdum Poloniae,*[26] which in addition to the three existing archbishoprics—Gniezno, Lvov, Warsaw—established two new metropolitanates—Cracow and Vilna—and five more bishoprics. This new ecclesiastical organization was a compromise solution. For the Holy See was seeking to keep the historical dioceses in existence, while the government aspired, by the ecclesiastical reorganization, to obliterate the frontiers of the period of partition.

Although, because of the stern state direction and some state encroachments,[27] sometimes serious tensions existed between Church and government, ecclesiastical life was able to develop fully. The Church's greatest efficacy appeared especially in public life. Poland presented itself as an expressly Catholic country. But the inner life of the Church also flourished. From 1918 to 1939 the number of bishops increased from 23 to 51, the number of priests to 12,940 (43 percent), the number of religious priests to 16,663 (62 percent), that of lay brothers to 4,567, that of female religious to 16,820, that of religious houses to 2,027. Ecclesiastical congresses,[28] great pilgrimages, Catholic associations and organizations,[29] intensive parochial care of souls,[30] new synodal laws, a greatly improved Catholic press, basic theological instruction in seminaries and on Catholic theological faculties,[31] general Catholic education and the Catholic University of Lublin,[32] founded in 1918, deepened the faith decisively. But this did not prevent the Polish episcopate from energetically Latinizing[33] the strong Uniate Ukrainian Church.[34]

---

[25] Cf. K. Blaszczyński, *Concordatum cum Republica Polonia* (Warsaw 1925); A. Systerhenn, *Das polnische Konkordat vom 10. Februar 1925* (Cologne 1925); F. Grübel, *Die Rechtslage der römisch-katholischen Kirche in Polen nach dem Konkordat vom 10. Februar 1925* (Leipzig 1930).

[26] *AAS* 17(1925), 521–28.

[27] In 1935 the so-called Wawel Conflict; in 1938 actions of expropriation and destruction against Orthodox in Lublin; cf. B. Spuler, "Die orthodoxe Kirche in Polen," *Osteuropa-Handbuch, Polen,* ed. by W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1959), 114–18.

[28] In 1927 the Eucharistic Congress in Poznan; in 1937 the Congress of Christ the King in Poznan.

[29] Among them, Catholic Action with 621,820 members.

[30] There were 1,172 new parishes.

[31] Warsaw, Cracow, Lvov, Vilna.

[32] Cf. *Kniega jubileuszowa 50-lecia Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, praca zbiorowa* (Lublin 1969); A. Petrani, op. cit.

[33] Cf. H. Koch, "Die unierte Kirche in Polen," *Osteuropa-Handbuch,* ed. by W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1959), 109–13.

[34] It had in 1932 2,371 parishes, 2,654 priests, and 192 male religious.

On 1 September 1939 Poland was attacked by Germany and, seventeen days later, by the Soviet Union. Poland soon succumbed to superior strength and was again partitioned. Its western areas were for the most part allotted to Germany with 16.9 million Catholics—80.8 percent of all the Catholics. The southern part and the remainder of Poland was made a sort of German colony as the *Gouvernement General,* while the Soviet Union incorporated the eastern areas of Poland, which in the course of the Second World War also came under German occupation from 1941 to 1944–45. The inclusion of the eastern parts of Poland in the Soviet Union (1939–41) produced a brutal persecution of the Church. But also in the areas occupied by Germany the fate of the Polish Catholics was unbearable. Nazi directives deprived the Church of its liberty and almost outlawed it, the clergy was decimated, a great part of the bishops and priests were arrested and taken to concentration camps, all associations and organizations were forbidden, and worship was restricted to a minimum. At the end of the war the Church in Poland had to lament the death of 4 bishops, 1,996 priests, including the Blessed Maximilian Kolbe, 113 clerics, and 238 female religious. A total of 3,647 priests, 389 clerics, 341 lay brothers, and 1,117 sisters were confined in concentration camps. The Holy See, which had very sharply condemned the partition of Poland and the oppression of the Polish Catholics, could not help the afflicted Church.

The restoration of the Polish state on 5 July 1945, in which Poland had been compensated for its eastern areas that had been annexed by the Soviet Union with the eastern areas of Germany as far as the Oder-Neisse line, brought the Church only a temporary relief. For soon there began also in Poland, with the aid of the Soviet occupation, the setting up of a Communist political system. On 16 September 1945 the new Polish government denounced the concordat. But first the Church had to tackle the rapid restoration of church administration and of religious life because of the vast losses in the war and the great territorial changes. This was facilitated by the fact that in 1945 Poland was reduced in size by about one-fifth, but the proportion of the Catholic population—especially through the replacing of the expelled Germans, who were partly Protestants, by Catholic Poles from the eastern areas—grew to 97.8 percent. On 15 August 1945 Cardinal Primate August Hlond erected five apostolic administrations in the formerly German eastern areas. Religious life could again develop. However, the original religious toleration of the state was supplanted by a latent attitude of hostility to the Church. Between 1946 and 1948 the government tried to drive the Church's activity out of public life into the area of the sacred. Severe measures of curtailment affected especially Catholic education, the pastoral care of youth, and the

Catholic cultural and educational system. Also an effort was undertaken to split the clergy[35] by the creation of a national Church. The struggle against the Church erupted openly in 1951. An abundance of administrative measures affected the Church, such as the dissolution of all ecclesiastical organizations, except that of charity, the secularization of church schools, hospitals, and orphanages, and the expropriation of church property. The episcopate was forced to conclude an agreement[36] with the government on 14 April 1950. While the Church renounced its land and promised its help in the integrating of the new western areas, the state guaranteed a minimum of church activity.

The state did not observe the agreement. The government placed men of its confidence as vicars capitular in the apostolic administrations, displayed a propaganda campaign, and further persecuted the Church. Many bishops, including Primate Stefan Wyszyński, and hundreds of priests were imprisoned, while the collaborating "patriotic priests" obtained key positions. The number of male religious houses dropped ca. 40 percent, that of female houses ca. 45 percent. The number of diocesan priests sank from 8,624 in 1945 to 2,247 in 1953. A decisive ecclesiopolitical change did not occur until October 1956, when the Polish Communist party abandoned the former Stalinist course and entrusted the direction of the state to the moderate Wladyslaw Gomulka. He ended the imprisonment of Wyszyński and the priests and on 7 December 1956 concluded a new agreement[37] with the Church, which essentially guaranteed the Church activity agreed to in the previous treaty, even if still more curtailed. This time the government kept its word. New vicars general could be installed in the administrations, and church life could again develop, even if modestly. Renewed tensions between state and Church appeared only in isolation, as on the occasion of the message of reconciliation of the Polish episcopate to the German Catholics on 18 November 1965[38] and of the millennium celebration of the conversion of Poland in 1966.

Paul VI, who would have liked to visit Poland, accommodated Polish desires in the context of his Eastern policy. In 1971 he beatified Maximilian Kolbe, and, after the German Federal Republic had signed the Treaty of Warsaw on 7 December 1970, he took up the reorganization of Poland's western territories on 28 June 1972. The previous apostolic administrators became diocesan bishops, three new sees were erected, and German ecclesiastical jurisdictions, that is, dioceses, were separated from the Polish western territories.[39] Thereby the Polish western lands became autonomous in canon law.

---

[35] "Pax" or "Patriot Priests' Group."

[36] Text in *Ostprobleme* 2(1950), 469ff.

[37] Text ibid., 9(1957), 237.

[38] Cf. *Versöhnung oder Hass? Der Briefwechsel der Bischöfe Polens und Deutschlands und seine Folgen. Eine Dokumentation mit einer Einführung von O. B. Roegele* (Osnabrück 1966).

The contacts and negotiations between the Vatican and the Polish government were not thereafter interrupted. This all the more, because Polish Catholicism with its uncrushed vitality has remained an unmistakable element of the Polish people. In 1965 the Church in Poland had more than 27.1 million mostly very zealous and practicing faithful, more than 6,699 parishes, 14,420 diocesan and 3,408 religious priests, 4,994 religious brothers, 25,472 sisters, and 3,027 religious houses. In 1974 the number of bishops was 77, the number of candidates for the priesthood 4,200. Nonetheless, the possibility of development of the Church in Poland, as Cardinal Primate Wyszyński assured the Roman Synod of Bishops in 1974, remains restricted, as earlier.[40]

Czechoslovakia

When on 28 October 1918 the Republic of Czechoslovakia, with 140,546 square kilometers and 13.6 million inhabitants, of whom 95 percent were Catholics, was constituted out of territories of the crumbled Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the situation of the Church in the new state began to appear quite complicated and difficult. A nationalistic and anticlerical Czech ruling class acquired power. The anti-Roman, nationalistic tendencies which for decades had grown in the Czech clergy under the direction of the Jednota society and now peaked in the powerful and, especially among Czech intellectuals, very popular Away-from-Rome movement,[41] first led to serious conflicts within the Church, and then on 8 January 1920 the proclaiming of the Czech National Church.[42] This and other Protestant religious communities, as well as Orthodoxy in the Carpatho-Ukraine that belonged to the republic, soon experienced the widest spread through massive state support.[43]

---

[39] Cf. H. Stehle, "Der Vatikan und die Oder-Neisse Linie," *Europa-Archiv* 27(1972), 559–66.

[40] Cf. S. Lammich, "Die Rechtsstellung der römisch-katholischen Kirche in der Volksrepublik Polen," *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht* 23(1972), 3–15.

[41] Cf. P. Mai, "Die Tschechische Nation und die Los-von-Rom-Bewegung," *Beiträge zur ostdeutschen und osteuropäischen Kirchengeschichte. Festschrift Bernhard Stasiewski* (Cologne and Vienna 1975), 171–85.

[42] *Cirkev Československá,* since 1971 *Cirkev Československá husitska.*

[43] The census of 1930 gave, in a population of 14.7 million, besides 10.8 million Catholics, 585,041 Uniates, and 356,838 Jews, 1.1 million Protestants, 145,598 Orthodox, 854,638 of no denomination, and 739,385 members of the Czechoslovak National Church.

In addition, the government prepared to adapt the church organization, which now consisted of two archdioceses and ten bishoprics, to national interests and to approximate the diocesan boundaries to the national frontiers. In November 1918 Archbishop Count Paul Huyn had to leave Prague, and in 1919 four bishops in Slovakia had also to resign or were deported to Hungary. In order to put pressure on the Church, the state on 11 August 1919 sequestered 251,925 cadastral yokes (ca. 126,000 hectares) of church property in Slovakia. Various church schools were secularized, and especially by means of the Sokol Unions a massive nationalistic anticlerical propaganda was promoted.

The Holy See, which had taken up diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia as early as October 1919, tried by all means to stop the exodus from the Church and to normalize the situation. In accord with the desires of both sides, there soon began diplomatic negotiations, which proved to be difficult. As a mark of his willingness to accommodate, on 16 December 1920 Benedict XV appointed three Slovaks to the local sees under the assumption that two of their predecessors, who had had to emigrate to Hungary, would be provided for by Czechoslovakia. Although the Czechoslovak ambassador to the Holy See, Kamill Krofta, guaranteed this in writing in the name of his government, the promise was not kept. This was the reason why the Vatican later, in the carrying out of the so-called *Modus vivendi,* made its concessions dependent on the previous settlement of the material questions.

After long negotiations the apostolic administration of Trnava in Slovakia was erected and a titular bishop placed at its head. However, the see of Rožnava remained vacant from 1920, for the Czechoslovak government intended to dissolve it because of is Hungarian majority and integrate it into a new Slovak metropolitanate that was to be established. Relations between state and Church noticeably deteriorated. When, before the approaching parliamentary elections, the Slovak bishops on 26 November 1924 in a common pastoral letter, with which the Czech bishops declared their solidarity, urged the faithful to hold themselves aloof from all parties that were hostile to the Church and religion and refused Communion to the members of radical parties, the state pressure increased. Trials were instituted against priests, church feasts were abolished, new anticlerical laws were enacted, and on the occasion of the celebration to honor Hus in 1925 the nuncio was forced to leave. But the government soon had to yield because of the domestic and foreign policy conditions. In the summer of 1927 the government promised to permit the Catholic Popular party, to restore Catholic schools, and to regularize the sequestered church property. The negotiations led on 17 December 1927 to a *Modus* *vivendi.*[44] In this were agreed: the imminent assimilation of diocesan boundaries with the political frontiers of the nation, the restitution and the administration of the sequestered church property by an episcopal commission, the autonomy of the religious orders, and the free nomination of bishops by the Holy See, subject to the state's right of veto. And the interrupted diplomatic relations between the Vatican and Czechoslovakia were restored.

But the implementation of the *Modus vivendi* foundered on the objections of Czechoslovakia to undertaking the restoration of church property before the rearrangement of diocesan boundaries. Thereupon the Hungarian government sequestered the property of the Slovak dioceses that lay in Hungary, and Cardinal Primate Jusztinián Serédi introduced a suit at the International Court at The Hague. This led again to further tensions in the relations between the Vatican and Prague, which were made worse by the forced resignation of Archbishop František Kordač.[45] The nuncio Pietro Ciriaci was attacked, excluded from the discussions, and hence recalled in November 1933. But the government yielded again before the parliamentary elections of 1935. This time the negotiations led to the restitution of the sequestered church property, whereupon Pius XI issued the bull *Ad ecclesiastici regiminis* of 2 September 1937.[46] The boundaries of the Slovak sees were assimilated to the national frontiers, the dioceses and the two administrations—Trnava of 1922 and Satu Mare of 1930—were separated from the Hungarian diocesan organization and placed directly under the Holy See. Furthermore, the Pope promised the erecting of two new metropolitanates, one in Slovakia and one in Carpatho-Ukraine.[47]

Meanwhile, the expansion of the Third Reich not only caused the destruction of Czechoslovakia,[48] but led in the areas occupied by

---

[44] *AAS* 20(1928), 65f.

[45] A. K. Huber, "Franz Kordačs Briefe ins Germanikum (1879–1916)," *Archiv für Kirchengeschichte von Böhmen, Mähren, Schlesien* 1(1967), 62–184; F. Lorenz, "Ein Presse-Fall in der katholischen Kirche im Jahre 1931. Erkenntnisse aus der Affaire Kordač-Ciriaci," *Kirche, Recht und Land. Festschrift zum 70. Lebenjahr von Weihbischof Prof. Dr. A. Kindermann* (Königstein and Munich 1969), 194–210.

[46] *AAS* 29(1937), 366–69.

[47] When after the Vienna Award of 2 November 1938 important parts of Slovakia again became Hungarian, and Hungary also occupied the Carpatho-Ukraine, the bull *Dioecesium fines* of 19 July 1939 (not in the *AAS*) again subordinated the dioceses in these territories to the previous Hungarian metropolitan sees; the earlier situation persisted until 1945.

[48] On 6 October 1938 the republic first became a federation, then on 4 March 1939 Slovakia became an independent republic, but on 16 March 1939 Bohemia-Moravia became a *Reichsprotektorat.*

Germany to a real struggle against the Church. Ecclesiastical administration, press, and organizations were restricted, and hundreds of priests were imprisoned. Most sees remained vacant. The situation of the Church was normal only in the Slovak Republic, at whose head was the Catholic priest Josef Tiso. Here there were difficulties only with the Uniates of the dioceses of Prešov and Mukačevo, since, because of massive state pressure, their number greatly declined by 60,000 in favor of the Orthodox.

In spite of the political and economic difficulties, the lack of priests, and an antiecclesiastical propaganda, the Church was able to revive in Czechoslovakia in the postwar years, in many areas even develop anew. A vigorous renewal took place especially in the school system and the press and among the religious orders and associations. Great meetings, congresses,[49] and celebrations strengthened Catholic self-consciousness.

On 9 May 1945, after the Second World War, there emerged with the support of the Soviet occupation the Czechoslovak People's Democratic Republic. The former political boundaries could be restored, apart from the Transcarpathian district, which was ceded to the Soviet Union. The country now included 127,869 square kilometers, with ca. 13 million inhabitants. On 25 February 1948 by means of a coup d'état the Communist party obtained power, which began at once with the establishing of a Communist state system. The hierarchy,[50] just established, and the reviving religious life, which had at first, however, suffered a harsh setback through the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Catholics of German and Hungarian nationality, were paralyzed. The apostolic internuncio, Xaver Ritter, was expelled from the country. A series of administrative measures deprived the Church of its rights and its possibilities in the apostolate. Catholic schools, all seminaries and religious orders, organizations and societies, and the Catholic press were suppressed, religious instruction in the schools was ever more curtailed, the clergy was split by a pro-Communist Priests' Peace Movement, headed by Josef Plojhar, and the leading ecclesiastical personalities, bishops, including Josef Beran, were condemned in show trials to long prison terms. On 14 October 1949 the state Department of Churches assumed full control of the Church. On 28 April 1950 the Uniate see of Prešov was transferred to the obedience of the Orthodoxy of Moscow.[51] However, neither the clergy nor the faithful complied with this return, but as soon as circumstances allowed the Uniate diocese was reestablished. It is again permitted (since 13 June 1968) and numbers ca. 120,000 faithful.[52]

---

[49] In 1929 the Eastern Congress in Prague; in 1936 the Catholic Congress in Prague.

[50] Josef Beran became archbishop of Prague in 1946, Josef Matocha, archbishop of Olmütz.

[51] Cf. R. Urban, op. cit., 111–17.

Negotiations between the Vatican and Czechoslovakia, which began in the course of the Church's new Eastern policy because of the changed political situation, led in the early 1960s to a slight relaxing of tension. In 1962–63 four bishops were able to take part in the Second Vatican Council, in 1965 Cardinal Beran was exiled, two seminaries could be opened, and, fostered by the political change of climate,[53] several bishops and priests were reinstated. After the military occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and the states of the Eastern bloc on 21 August 1968, however, the situation of the Church significantly worsened. Neither new discussions nor new appointments of bishops in 1973 could stop this. The Church suffers, among other things, also from a lack of priests. For the number of priests fell from 7,330 in 1948 to 3,100 in 1967.

Hungary

The military defeat of the Central Powers and the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy let loose an internal political chaos in Hungary at the end of October 1918, which climaxed on 16 November 1918 in the proclamation of the republic and on 21 March 1919 in the constituting of a Communist Soviet Republic. It opened a new chapter in the history of Hungary and its Church. On the basis of a new constitution, issued on the model of that of Soviet Russia, the state was separated from the Church. This meant the secularization of all Church property—114,700,000 crowns in cash and 639,000 cadastral yokes, that is, ca. 320,000 hectares—and of the Catholic school system—almost 3,000 schools of every sort. A ruthless dictatorship pursued the openly proclaimed goal: the total annihilation of the Churches. Religious instruction was everywhere forbidden, most church institutions, monasteries, and episcopal residences were confiscated and plundered, and seventeen of the faithful, including nine priests and one sister, were executed for their loyalty to the Church. When on 1 August 1919, after a reign of terror of 133 days, the Soviet Republic collapsed because of the invasion of Rumanian troops, bleeding Hungary, occupied by Serbs, Rumanians, and Czechs, except for a small remnant, could think only of a "Christian course" in its reconstruction.[54]

---

[52] Ibid., 115–16.

[53] So-called Dubček Era or Prague Spring of 1968.

[54] Cf. S. Jankovics, "Az egyház a tanácskönztársaság idején" (The Church in the Period of the Soviet Republic), *Katholikus Szemle* 21, 1–4 (Rome 1969), 15–24, 121–31, 234–42, 346–56.

The kingdom was restored, and all laws of the Soviet republic were annulled. The new Hungarian government was under the administration of the royal representative, Miklós Horthy (1920–44), on the basis of a constructive cooperation with the Christian religious communities, especially of the Catholic Church. A decree of the Council of Ministers renounced the exercise of the royal right of patronage, but later the government secured for itself the customary political right of veto. There existed between Church and state a very good relationship, which helped the Church to develop fully its efforts for renewal. The governments saw in the Church a dependable ally, and they were concerned for the Church's restoration and even for its growth. And in 1920 diplomatic relations were established between the Holy See and Hungary.

By the Treaty of Trianon of 4 June 1920, Hungary lost two-thirds of its earlier national territory and one-third of its own population. To the new state were left 92,963 square kilometers, with 7.6 million inhabitants, of whom 5.2 million (66.1 percent) were Catholics, 1.6 million (21 percent) Calvinists, 497,000 (6.2 percent) Lutherans, and 473,000 (5.9 percent) Jews. The new frontiers corresponded neither to the ethnographic nor the previous ecclesiastical boundaries. Of the twenty-six dioceses, not counting Croatia-Slovenia, only four remained entirely unimpaired. Six bishoprics retained their sees in Hungary, but lost a great part of their territories. Now the episcopal sees of seven bishoprics belonged to neighboring states, but still retained areas in Hungary. Nine dioceses were completely separated from Hungary. Because of the new territorial frontiers, the Hungarian Church lost almost half of all its property—ca. 336,100 hectares.

Because of the loss of church property, which had especially hurt the archbishopric of Esztergom, because of the impeding of the jurisdiction of Hungarian bishops in the parts detached from their dioceses, because of the removal of Hungarian bishops from their local offices, on account of the organizational ecclesiastical independence of the detached areas, and on account of the nationalistic policy of the successor states, there arose several controversies between the Hungarian episcopate and the neighboring states, which were settled in the diplomatic manner by means of the Vatican and the governments. The complicated ecclesiopolitical situation was still further complicated by the first and second Vienna awards of 2 November 1938 and 30 August 1940 as well as by the occupation of the Carpatho-Ukraine and northern Yugoslavia by Hungary, since areas earlier detached, with some 4.5 million Catholics, returned to Hungary. Hungary lost them again in 1944–1945.

In spite of its doubtful economic situation, the Church was able energetically to renew itself. Of course, politically this was conditioned by the preceding tragic years of war and revolution and the impact of the Treaty of Trianon, which produced the consolidation of the conservative forces and an alliance with the Church. Besides, in Hungary there was no Catholic answer to the Enlightenment, Josephinism, and liberalism. Thus the Catholic renewal came, long delayed, only after the turn of the century, but then, accelerated by external events, it was all the more stormy in appearance. Under the leadership of Cardinals-Primate János Csernoch (1912–27) and Jusztinián Serédi (1927–45) there appeared apostolic bishops—Gusztáv Majláth, Gyula Glattfelder, Tihamér Tóth, and others—among them the most outstanding personality of Hungarian Catholicism since Cardinal-Primate Péter Pázmány (d. 1637), Ottokár Prohászka (1858–1927).[55] The imposing Catholic renaissance was connected with the revival of the religious orders, the origin of a notable Catholic press, the complete renewal of the Catholic intellectual life and of the Catholic school system, and the establishing of many important societies and organizations.[56] The Hungarian Catholic Days, the anniversary celebration of Saint Emeric in 1930, and the Thirty-Fourth International Eucharistic Congress at Budapest in 1938 gave eloquent testimony to the inner renewal of Hungarian Catholicism.

However, the close relationship of the Church with the state proved to be detrimental when Hungary, in keeping with its revisionist policy, got caught in the wake of German National Socialism. It was hard for the Church to separate itself from the state. Hence it could only slowly display the struggle against National Socialism. However, with Nuncio Angelo Rotta and Primate Serédi in the lead, it subsequently did so decisively. It was due to the Hungarian episcopate and the Church that 10,000 Hungarian Jews could escape death during the German occupation (1944–45).[57]

The military occupation of Hungary by the Red Army on 4 April 1945 also produced substantial changes in the relations of state and Church. Hungary gradually became a Socialist People's Republic in 1949, in which the Communist Party acquired absolute power. The employment of the ecclesiopolitical principles of the Communist Party also came to full flower in Hungary. As early as April 1945 Nuncio Rotta had to leave the country. By means of an abundance of administrative measures from 1945 to 1950 the Church was deprived of all its property, its societies, its schools—3,344 of every sort—its institutions, the press—only twenty printeries—all religious orders—2,582 male and 8,956 female religious in 705 houses—and its freedom of movement. In an effort to divide the clergy, there arose in 1950 the so-called Priests' Peace Movement, a clerical collaboration with the state authorities. Cardinal Primate József Mindszenty (1945–74) and the episcopate, with the help of religious institutions and inner renewal, unsuccessfully led a defensive struggle. The power of the Church was broken, and its leading personalities were condemned in show trials to long imprisonment: Mindszenty[58] in 1949, Archbishop József Grösz in 1951. The Church was completely excluded from public life.

---

[55] Cf. A. Schütz, "Ottokar Prohaśzka. Ein grosser Bischof der Gegenwart," *Hochland* 28, 1(1930–31), 322–39.

[56] In 1937 there were 157 societies with more than one million members.

[57] Cf. also A. Meszlényi, *A magyar katholikus egyház az emberi jogok védelmében* (Achievements of the Hungarian Catholic Church for Human Rights) (Budapest 1947).

In 1950 an agreement[59] between state and Church was forced on the episcopate; it completely surrendered the Church to the system in return for trivial concessions by the state. Even the popular uprising of 1956 was unable to halt this process. Meanwhile, the Vatican's Eastern policy, introduced under the auspices of the international policy of a relaxation of tensions, made possible in 1964 the concluding of a partial accord between Hungary and the Holy See. Since then, on four occasions (1969, 1972, 1974, 1975) appointments to the Hungarian episcopate could take place. However, neither the exiling of Mindszenty in 1971 nor his removal from office in 1974 nor the appointments of bishops and other efforts of the Holy See were able to impede or suspend the further consistent implementation of the Communist religious policy in Hungary.

Rumania

At the end of the First World War the Kingdom of Rumania doubled its territory by means of the incorporation of Bessarabia, Transylvania, great parts of the Banat, eastern Hungary, and Bukovina. Hence in 1919 it grew to 295,049 square kilometers and had 14.6 million inhabitants, the majority of whom—more than 70 percent—belonged to Orthodoxy. The previously religiously (Orthodox) and nationally (Rumanian) homogeneous Danube state became a heterogeneous kingdom with a diversity of national minorities and religious groups.

---

[58] Cf. G. Péterffy, *Il cardinale Mindszenty. La vita e l'anima d'un martire* (Rome 1949); N. Boer, *Cardinal Mindszenty and the Implacable War of Communism against Religion and Spirit* (London 1949); S. Mihalovics, *Mindszenty, Ungarn, Europa. Ein Zeugenbericht* (Karlsruhe 1949); N. Shuster, *In Silence I Speak. The Story of Cardinal Mindszenty Today and of Hungary's "New Order,"* (New York 1956); J. Vecsey, ed., *Kardinal Mindszenty. Beiträge zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Würzburg 1972).

[59] Text in E. András, J. Morel, *Bilanz des ungarischen Katholizismus* (Munich 1969), 83–85.

For, among other things, 1.6 million Hungarians and 2.5 million Catholics, including ca. 1.4 million Uniates, were awarded to Rumania by the Treaty of Trianon of 4 June 1920. With the new political frontiers, five entire dioceses and parts of three others came under Rumanian rule. In view of the fact that the union of all Rumanians in a great national state had been advocated by Orthodoxy for decades, and also that Rumanian Orthodoxy regarded the Roman Catholic Church as foreign, since its faithful were predominantly German or Hungarian, and, on the other hand, the Rumanian Uniates as traitors, there fell to Orthodoxy in the state leadership, as in Yugoslavia, a dominating role and an intransigent attitude. Hence, Rumanian ecclesiastical policy, striving for national and religious unity, was directed against the national minorities and against Catholics. This was clearly expressed also in the constitution of 28 March 1923, since paragraph 22, in opposition to the Treaty of Paris in regard to protection of national minorities, which had been signed on 9 December 1919, declared Rumanian Orthodoxy the "dominant religion," granted precedence to the Rumanian Uniates over other religious groups, and designated both as "Rumanian Churches."[60]

The Catholic Church in Transylvania, where the change of sovereignty often degenerated into acts of violence against the Church, soon lost its property—277,645 cadastral yokes, ca. 140,000 hectares—through the unilateral land reform and a great number of its schools and boarding schools through new school laws. Conversions to Orthodoxy were encouraged by state means. Their number grew in the former Hungarian territories from 1,803,257 in 1910 to 2,086,097 in 1927. When in 1923 Bishop Gyula Glattfelder of Timisoara protested against the church policy measures, he had to leave Rumania and transfer his episcopal see to Szeged in Hungary. In vain Bishop Gusztáv Majláth of Transylvania also protested in the Senate at Bucharest in 1923 and in 1925 before the League of Nations at Geneva.

The Holy See, which had established diplomatic relations with Rumania in 1920, soon recognized that the continued existence of the Uniate Church and the assuring of the minimal rights of Roman Catholics were possible only with the support of the Rumanian Uniates and was ready, in order to achieve this goal, to abandon the interests of Roman Catholics of Hungarian and German nationality. The negotiations among Bucharest, the Vatican, and Budapest lasted for seven years and were very difficult, since at stake was the rearrangement of the Church's organization and of church property. In the framework of the rearrangement Bishop Raimund Netzhammer had to resign the see of Bucharest. The negotiations were concluded on 10 May 1927 with the signing of a concordat.[61] It was ratified on 7 July 1929 and implemented by the apostolic constitution *Solemni Conventione*[62] on 5 June 1930. It established a new Latin metropolitan see with four bishoprics, guaranteed to the bishops the free exercise of their office, recognized ecclesiastical institutions and religious orders as juridical persons; church schools could be founded, and a so-called *patrimonium sacrum* was to arise from the church property, enumerated by name. The Church conceded the usual right of veto in the appointing of bishops and accommodated the national desires of the government.

---

[60] Cf. N. Brinzeu, *Cultele in Romania* (Church Politics in Rumania) (Lugoj 1925).

Scarcely had the treaty been signed when the Rumanian Orthodox nationalists demanded the immediate dissolution and expropriation of the Transylvanian so-called *status catholicus,* the organ of the autonomous administration of the Transylvanian Catholics, since this still rich *status* was not enumerated in the property list. The negotiations, resumed between the Vatican and the Rumanian government, ended on 30 May 1932 with an *accordo.* The *status* and its rules were recognized under the proviso of state control. Meanwhile, the extremists continued their attacks and questioned the agreement because of its coming into being outside conformity with the constitution. Not until 2 March 1940 did a royal rescript ratify the *accordo,* after the property of the *status,* in the amount of 610 million *lei,* had been turned over to administration by the state.[63]

Between the two world wars Catholicism, despite all the difficulties, was able not only to maintain but also to renew itself. Inner religious life was especially deepened, but the Catholic press and social life could be vigorously improved. In 1932 the Roman Catholic Church counted 1.2 million faithful, 513 parishes, 898 priests, 200 male religious in 56 monasteries, and 1,432 sisters in 66 convents, while the Uniates had in 1,593 parishes 1,579 priests, in 8 monasteries 24 male religious, and in 11 convents 185 sisters.

After the Vienna Award of 30 August 1940 important parts of Transylvania were restored to Hungary, which reestablished there the earlier condition of the Church. Between the two peoples there occurred excesses, even in the ecclesiastical sphere. The end of the Second World War permitted Rumania to revive in its old frontiers, except for Bessarabia, which was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

---

[61] *AAS* 21(1929), 441–56.

[62] Ibid. 22(1930), 381–86.

[63] Cf. J. Scheffler, "A katholikus egyház jogi helyzete Romániában" (The Legal Status of the Catholic Church in Rumania), *Notter-Emlékkönyv* (Budapest 1941), 965–84; idem, "Az erdélyi Katholikus Státus küzdelmes husz éve" (Twenty Hard Years of the Catholic State in Transylvania), *Magyar Szemle* 40(1941), 299–310.

On 6 March 1945 a Communist government was imposed on the state; on 12 March 1948 it abolished the monarchy and proclaimed the People's Republic. It issued a Communist constitution on 24 September 1952. The concordat was repudiated on 17 July 1948, and on 4 August 1948 a so-called Law on Worship went into effect. In this the government recognized only two bishoprics—Alba Julia and Jassy—and considered the others as nonexistent. The dissolution of the Uniate Church was decreed on 2 December 1948, after a group of Uniate priests had decided to return to the Orthodox on 1 October 1948. The six Uniate bishops and all other bishops, including those who had been secretly ordained bishops by the nuncio before his expulsion, were arrested and condemned to long prison terms. The church administration was paralyzed, the religious orders were dissolved except for five houses, all Catholic schools and institutions were abolished, the Catholic press was forbidden. And the effort to establish a Rumanian National Church was undertaken.

Only gradually there occurred a relaxing of tensions. In 1955 the bishop of Alba Julia was released from prison but he remained under house arrest until 1967. In 1970 and 1971 he was allowed to travel to Rome and in 1971 he obtained a coadjutor with the right of succession. But neither the exertions of the Holy See in the course of its Eastern policy nor the visits of Rumanian Minister President Gheorge Maurer in 1968 and of the chairman of the Council of State Nicolae Ceausescu in 1973 to Paul VI could ease the harsh fate of the Catholics in Rumania.

Yugoslavia

The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, called Yugoslavia since 3 October 1929, originated on 1 December 1918 through the union of the southern Slavic territories of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy with Serbia and Montenegro. The formation of the state took place, because of the military occupation of southern Hungary, not without acts of violence against the Catholic Church, and Cardinal Secretary of State Pietro Gasparri protested to Belgrade against them. The new state included 248,987 square kilometers, with a population of 12 million, a variety of nations and religious communities, including 5.5 million Orthodox, 4.7 million Catholics, and 1.3 million Muslims. The predominance of the Orthodox Serbs, who were establishing their own state, in comparison to the Catholic Croats and the unclarified legal status of the church organization[64] required a reorganization of the Church and the prompt clarification of relations of state and Church, all the more since the previous concordats with individual countries[65] had been annulled by the founding of the new kingdom.

---

[64] Only two of the ecclesiastical provinces remained in the old boundaries.

The preference for Orthodox Serbs in the administration of the state and the military, on the occasion of land reform and colonization, and in the distributing of state finances for religious communities, even though according to the constitution of 28 June 1921 all recognized religious communities were made equal, led to serious tensions between Church and state. On 23 July 1919 the Serbian school law of 1904, which recognized no church schools, was extended to all areas of the state. In this way the Church lost all its elementary and secondary schools. And twenty monasteries and 920 cadastral yokes (ca. 460 hectares) of church property were transferred to the state. Various religious societies, such as the Marian Congregations, were dissolved, and the youth in school were compelled to join the antireligious youth organization, *Jugoslovenski Sokol.* The bishops protested in vain against these measures in a common pastoral letter in 1923 and 1933. They accomplished only the opposite—the sharpening of the suppression. Hence the episcopal conferences in 1924 and 1925 proposed the concluding of a concordat.

As early as 1920 the Holy See sent a nuncio to Belgrade and was ready to conduct discussions on the diplomatic level. As a token of its good will, it erected the apostolic administrations of Banat in 1922 and Bačka in 1923, established the archbishopric of Belgrade in 1924, and made Skopje an exempt see in 1924. Thereby the Church had in Yugoslavia 4 archdioceses, 14 bishoprics, 2 apostolic administrations, 1,839 parishes, 3,109 priests, 1,409 male religious, of whom 941 were priests, and 3,754 sisters. The negotiations for the concordat were difficult. It was only on 25 July 1935 that an agreement was signed, after the state had already regulated its relations with the Orthodox in 1929, the Muslims in 1931, and the Protestants and Jews in 1933.

The concordat[66] guaranteed the reestablishing of the church organization, the free nomination of bishops by the Holy See, the free activity of the Church, church property, state subsidies, ecclesiastical celebration of marriages without a previous civil marriage, church associations and organizations, schools, and religious orders, in brief, the complete religious freedom of Catholics. For its part, the Holy See promised to elevate the apostolic administrations to bishoprics. Hence the concordat envisaged the equality of Catholics with the Orthodox.[67] Precisely for this reason, however, Orthodoxy under the leadership of Patriarch

---

[65] Latest on 24 July 1914 with Serbia.

[66] Not published in *AAS* because of nonratification; text in Mercati, vol. 2, 202–16; biblio. in Schöppe, 558.

[67] Cf. M. Lanovič, *Konkordat Jugoslavije e Vaticanom* (Yugoslavia's Concordat with the Vatican) (Belgrade 1935).

Varnava led a relentless fight against the agreement. When the *Skupština* (House of Delegates) accepted the concordat on 23 July 1937, the Holy Synod of Yugoslavia excommunicated all Orthodox members of the government and of parliament who had voted for the acceptance. Hence Minister President Milan Stojadinović did not submit the concordat to the Senate at all, but removed it from the agenda and informed the Synod that in new negotiations with the Vatican the patriarchate would first be consulted. In this way a concordat in Yugoslavia was made dependent on Orthodoxy, that is, forever excluded. However, as a consequence of the domestic and foreign policy situation, the spirit of the concordat could be realized. Church life flowered. Especially in the press, education, the societies, the care of souls, and the religious orders a rise was noticeable.

The Second World War was an especially severe blow to the Church. From 27 March 1941 Yugoslavia was occupied by German and Italian troops. Croatia declared itself an independent kingdom (1941–45), but in reality it was a satellite state dependent on the Axis Powers. There the government was very accommodating to the Catholic Church, but it often compelled it to collaborate and involved it in the bloody conflicts of the Croatian *Ustaza* and the Serbian partisan bands. These circumstances led at the war's end, on the occasion of the expulsion of the German population, to cruel acts of violence also against the Catholic Church. A pastoral letter of the bishops in 1945 bemoaned the murder of 243 priests and the plundering and destruction of many churches.[68]

After the Second World War, Yugoslavia became a federated Peoples' Republic on 29 November 1945, with the old political and diocesan boundaries.[69] Although the constitution of 31 January 1946, while separating state and Church, guaranteed liberty of conscience and religion, there soon occurred, as in the other neighboring socialist states, a massive persecution of the Church. Up to 1946 ca. 13 percent of the clergy were executed, ca. 50 percent were imprisoned, including Archbishop Aloysius Stepinač[70] of Zagreb. The Franciscan order alone had 139 victims. Catholic schools and organizations were liquidated, monasteries were for the most part dissolved, religious instruction and ecclesiastical activity were almost completely stopped, and a union of collaborating priests was founded to split the clergy. After a temporary relaxation following the break of President Josip Broz Tito with the Cominform in 1950 and after a new intensification of the situation by the elevation of Stepinač to the College of Cardinals in 1953, the papal nuncio was expelled. But the Church did not give in. On 23 September 1952 the bishops sent a letter of energetic protest to Tito and repeatedly told him that they were not empowered to conclude an agreement with the government.[71]

---

[68] Cf. V. Novak, *Magnum Crimen. Pola vijeka klerikalizma u Hrvatskoj* (Magnum Crimen. A Half-Century of Clericalism in Croatia) (Zagreb 1948).

[69] The state's area was expanded with 8,851 square kilometers in Istria and Dalmatia.

[70] Cf. H. O'Brien, *Archbishop Stepinač, the Man and His Case* (Westminister 1947); R. Pattee, *The Case of Cardinal Aloysius Stepinač* (Milwaukee 1953); cf. also the official presentation of Yugoslavia: *The Case of Archbishop Stepinač* (Washington 1947); also S. Simič, *Vatikan protiv Jugoslavije* (The Vatican against Yugoslavia) (Titograd 1958).

After the death of Cardinal Stepinač in 1960, the situation gradually relaxed. On 26 June 1964 the Holy See made direct contact with Yugoslavia. The discussions led on 26 June 1966 to an agreement,[72] which guaranteed the liberty of the Church but also affirmed the loyalty of the Church to Yugoslavia. Diplomatic relations were also restored between the Holy See and Yugoslavia. On 14 August 1970 an internuncio was sent to Belgrade. Indications of further relaxation were the raising of the apostolic administration of Bačka to a bishopric in 1968, the more extensive autonomy of the apostolic administration of Banat by the naming of a titular bishop in 1971, and in the same year Tito's visit to the Vatican. Despite some difficulties, the Church in Yugoslavia now enjoys a relative freedom of religion. This appears especially in the interior life of the Church. In 1961 the Church, despite serious losses, could again count 2,514 parishes, 2,462 diocesan and 1,145 religious priests, 1,491 brothers, 5,380 sisters, and 5,725,000 faithful. This favorable development continued in the following years. In 1974 there were in Yugoslavia 764 candidates for the priesthood, 2,817 male religious, of whom 1,728 were priests, 8,622 sisters, and 3,001 diocesan priests.[73]

Bulgaria

The Kingdom of Bulgaria came out of the Second Balkan War in 1913 and the First World War of 1914–18 diminished in size. It now had a total of only 103,146 square kilometers in area; 8,900 square kilometers of valuable territories, like access to the Aegean Sea, had been lost. The country counted in 1926 5.4 million inhabitants, of whom, however, only 45,491—.83 percent—were Catholics, among them 5,598 Uniates, who lived in one bishopric and one vicariate apostolic.

---

[71] Cf. W. de Vries, "Kirchenverfolgung in Jugoslawien," *StdZ* 146 (1949f.), 362–68; idem, "Die neue Welle der Religionsverfolgung in Jugoslawien," ibid. 151(1952f.), 442–51; K. S. Draganovič, "La Chiesa nella Repubblica Jugoslava," *CivCatt* 97/III (1946), 3–13, 318–24; 105/I (1954), 716–30; 105/II (1954), 105–20.

[72] Cf. *HK* 20(1966), 410f.

[73] Cf. the latest statistics and a summary in *HK* 31(1977), 318–24.

Eighty-four percent of the population belonged to Orthodoxy, 13 percent to Islam. The economically ruined country sought the revision of the unfavorable Treaty of Neuilly of 27 November 1919, but was visited by domestic and foreign policy difficulties. Despite this unhappy situation, the Church was still able to display a vigorous activity. Up to 1944 the number of faithful grew to 57,000. An apostolic exarchate for the Uniates could be established in 1926, and the Church ran more than 18 institutes, including 10 schools, 2 hospitals, and 6 orphanages. There resided at Sofia a representative of the Holy See as apostolic delegate without diplomatic character. From 1925 to 1934 he was Giuseppe Angelo Roncalli, later Pope John XXIII.

The Soviet occupation of Bulgaria on 9 September 1944 led on 15 September 1945 to the proclamation of the republic and on 15 October 1946 to the constituting of a People's Republic. A new constitution of 4 December 1947 and a law on worship of 17 February 1949 began the curtailing of religious freedom. Soon a ruthless persecution of the Church erupted. The Church lost all its organizations, institutes, bishops, and most of its priests and religious.

In the course of the gradual relaxation of tensions John XXIII was able in 1962 to welcome two Bulgarian bishops at the Second Vatican Council, and in 1968 Paul VI could receive a Bulgarian pilgrimage and in 1969 a delegation of the Bulgarian government at the Vatican. Mutual contacts have not been broken since then, but the situation of the Church in Bulgaria is unchanged.

Albania

Albania was able to reestablish its political sovereignty after the First World War, and it covered 27,538 square kilometers with 833,000 inhabitants. Of these, in 1929, 563,000 were Muslims, 181,051 Orthodox, and 88,739—10.6 percent—Catholics. The church organization was divided into 2 archdioceses, 3 dioceses, and 1 abbey *nullius*. There were 120 parishes, 143 diocesan and religious priests, 84 brothers, and 66 sisters. The country, which had to contend with backwardness and misery, acquired in the Catholic Church a special support, especially in charity and education. The Catholic mission, supported for decades by Italy, received an exceptional stimulus. Up to 1944 the number of religious grew to 321, of whom 116 were natives. The Italian missionary work was especially intensified from 1939, after Italian troops had occupied Albania on 7 April 1939 and had subordinated it to the Kingdom of Italy. In southern Albania there arose an apostolic administration, which was administered by the envoy of the Holy See residing in Albania from 1920, an apostolic delegate.

The Albanian war of resistance (1941–44) and the end of the German and Italian occupation gave the Albanian Communists the opportunity to erect a Communist political system[74] and completely to suppress the allegedly "colonizing" Catholic Church. All foreign missionaries, sisters, and the apostolic delegate were expelled, all ecclesiastical administrations and organizations were dissolved, all bishops, priests, and religious were shot, imprisoned, or scattered. An attempt was made in 1951 to found a national Church. Since Albania separated from the rest of the Eastern bloc states led by Moscow and, under the guidance of China, put itself in complete isolation, the Vatican was unable to make any contacts at all with it. In 1973 Albania proudly declared that it was the first socialist country to have closed the last church and extirpated religion.

[74] On 11 February 1946 Albania became a People's Republic.

CHAPTER 18

*The Church in The German-Speaking Countries**

Germany

In the frenzy of national solidarity to which the peoples of Europe gave themselves as they moved against one another at the beginning of the First World War, the German Catholics were as much caught up as were other ideological groups. Just the forces which had stood sharply opposed, at least for a while, to the Empire's domestic policy overwhelmingly experienced the urge to show an undoubted profession to the German national state by the evidence of patriotic acceptance of sacrifices. This was true of the social democratic electorate no less than of the Catholic part of the population. And so there was a great attempt in the war effort to grasp at the opportunity to refute, once and for all, the accusation of a lack of loyalty to the Empire, hurled during the *Kulturkampf.* It was all the easier for the individual to accept the consequences of entering the war when the decision on war and peace was, according to Catholic political theory, so completely the responsibility of the rulers that its necessity or avoidability was not a subject of discussion for the simple citizen with his limited viewpoint. And while guiding principles of Catholic social doctrine in domestic policy caused distance and alternatives to political reality, the few general principles of the Church's ethics of war did not suffice in the field of foreign policy to give a critical judgment in the concrete case on the *ultima ratio* of the use of weapons. Thus there originated also the self-assurance with which Bishop Faulhaber of Speyer in 1915 declared the European conflict for the German side as the "academic example of a just war,"[1] more the inclination to premature identification than an exhaustive recognition of the facts.

---

* Ludwig Volk, S. J.

Compared with the lines of communication, which led from all episcopal sees of the *orbis catholicus* to the Vatican central office, the interrelationships among the national Catholicisms of Europe were only meagerly developed. This explains why a committee composed of prominent French laymen and prelates perceived so few restraints in supporting the antagonism of the warring parties in the ecclesiastical sphere also. Especially venomous was the impact of the attempt, undertaken in a polemical work,[2] to throw suspicion on the German Catholics of a diffused and global lack of loyalty to the faith. Naturally, those attacked defended themselves with a counterpublication.[3]

By means of a questionable attack a little later, the Belgian Cardinal Mercier threatened to involve the hierarchy in the dispute over the war. Concentrating entirely on the miseries of Belgium, which, without any provocation, had become the first victim of hostilities through the German invasion, the archbishop of Mechelen appeared to his German brothers in office to cooperate in setting up an episcopal tribunal.[4] He intended to free the Belgian civil population from the accusation of sniper warfare, hence from that accusation by which the German army command had sought to justify bloody reprisals in the first weeks of the war. Since Mercier at once publicized his project without any internal close contact, he caused the most serious embarrassment for those addressed. Only with difficulty was Cardinal Hartmann (1851–1919), since 1914 chairman of the Prussian episcopate, restrained from an equally public retort. Absolutely loyal to the Empire, even if without the political ambition of his predecessor Kopp, Hartmann hesitated between overcaution and inflexibility. In 1917–18 he displayed little foresightedness and sense of reality in his opposition to the elimination of the undemocratic three-class franchise in Prussia.[5] The fact that the spokesman of the Prussian bishops, in contrast to the other bishops, opposed an overdue constitutional reform weakened the power of conviction of a common pastoral letter of All Saints Day 1917, which sought to exorcise the revolutionary unrest in the underground.

---

[1] M. Faulhaber, *Waffen des Lichts* (Freiburg 1918), 132.

[2] Cf. A. Baudrillart, ed., *La Guerre Allemande et le Catholicisme* (Paris 1915).

[3] Cf. G. Pfeilschifter, ed., *Deutsche Kultur, Katholizismus und Weltkrieg* (Freiburg 1915).

[4] Cf. L. Volk, "Kardinal Mercier, der deutsche Episkopat und die Neutralitätspolitik Benedikts XV. 1914–1916." *StdZ* 192(1974), 611–30.

[5] Cf. R. Patemann, "Der deutsche Episkopat und das preussische Wahlrechtsproblem 1917/18," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 13(1965), 345–71.

Presented with a fait accompli in November 1918 through the military defeat and the proclamation of the republic, the Center party concentrated on giving full effect to its political weight in the national constituent assembly.[6] What the party accomplished in the discussions on the constitution, both constructively and as preventive measures, considerably surpassed what could be expected from its numerical strength.[7] If nevertheless the Fulda episcopal conference in November 1919 registered doubts, from the viewpoint of the Church's self-awareness, against individual items of the constitutional work, this concern for rights[8] was a precaution for possible future controversies, but not a criticism of what had been achieved at Weimar by the delegates of the Center.

In May 1917 Benedict XV had entrusted the Munich nunciature to Eugenio Pacelli, one of the most capable curial diplomats. He came as precursor of the Pope's work for peace, directed to all the warring leaders, but a personal visit of the nuncio to the imperial headquarters was unable to secure from the Germans the concessions which a further discussion of the project that had prospects of success would have required.[9] After the constitutions of the *Reich* and of the states had built political life on a republican plan, the nuncio faced a field of activity of vast extent. In the establishing of a nunciature for the *Reich* at Berlin, which Pacelli administered from Munich in a personal union from 1920 to 1925, and in the accreditation of the hitherto Prussian envoy, von Bergen, as ambassador of the *Reich* at the Holy See, there was reflected the importance which in Berlin was attributed to diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

The Foreign Office worked especially to have this developed in a concordat with the *Reich* in international law in the critical convulsions of the first postwar years, because it assured itself[10] of a consolidation, with the moral power of the Church, of the German frontiers in dispute in the east (Upper Silesia) and west (the Saarland). But the desire for a concordat that would apply to all German dioceses flagged when at the end of 1923 the period of political weakness had been overcome. For his part, Pacelli did not lose sight of the long-range goal of a concordat with the *Reich,* but at first he had to make certain of the state concordat with Bavaria,[11] planned as early as 1919. Well disposed to the Vatican's ideas of state and Church, but by no means uncritically opposing them, the cabinet posts held by the Bavarian Popular Party offered, from Pacelli's view, more favorable presuppositions for the creating of a "model concordat" than other state governments, in which the Catholic parties had a less strong position. If the nuncio hoped to gain from the Bavarian precedent a sort of norm, by which the readiness for concessions of future treaty partners would be measured, the agreeableness displayed by Bavaria in no sense acted as a stimulus, but rather consolidated the inclination against a concordat of the socialist, liberal, and Protestant groups. Only after protracted preliminary discussions was the treaty signed at Munich on 29 March 1924 and approved by the *Landtag* at the beginning of 1925.

---

[6] Cf. R. Morsey, *Die deutsche Zentrumspartei 1917–1923* (Düsseldorf 1966), 163–245.

[7] For the content of the ecclesiastical articles of the Weimar Constitution cf. Bihlmeyer-Tüchle, 500.

[8] Printing of the announcement: L. Volk, ed., *Akten Kardinal Michael von Faulhabers 1917–1945* Vol. I: *1917–1934* (Mainz 1975), 111f.

[9] On the Holy See's peace policy during World War I, cf. above, Chapter 3.

[10] Cf. L. Volk, *Das Reichskonkordat vom 20. Juli 1933* (Mainz 1972), 1–24.

The collaboration of the bishops could not long evade the centralizing tendencies of the new state organization. The distinctly tribal consciousness of the Bavarian bishops opposed a merging of the conferences of Fulda and Freising, which had operated side by side, following an all-German prelude from 1867 to 1872, since the beginning of the *Kulturkampf.* Also, the autocratic rule which Cardinal Kopp had exercised over the Prussian episcopate was still vivid in memory. Thus in 1920 there first occurred a personal bridging of the episcopal main line, while each of the two conference chairmen was invited to the meetings of the sister conference. Without regard for regional preferences, the bishops in north and south were finally united in a single consultative community in 1933 by the Nazi totalitarianism that sought uniformity; within its framework, of course, the Freising conference continued to exist, and the West German episcopal conference was reorganized from 1934 in special meetings, mostly at Kevelaer.

The chairmen of the Bavarian episcopate, Michael von Faulhaber (1869–1952), since 1917 archbishop of Munich and Freising, had already acquired from Speyer, where he had worked as bishop from 1911, a reputation as a preacher of the faith and critic of the age of great stature. Of a princely appearance and from 1921 a cardinal, Faulhaber seemed destined by providence to step into the vacuum which the forced departure of the Wittelsbachs had created in the sensitivities of broad strata of the population.

From the baroque element in the appearance of the archbishop of Munich no connecting line led to the figure of Cardinal Adolf Bertram (1859–1945) of Breslau, a sober Lower Saxon. Bishop of Hildesheim in 1906, of Breslau in 1914, and cardinal in 1916, in 1920 he assumed the chairmanship of the Fulda episcopal conference. Conversant with law, worldy-wise, zealous, and extremely diligent, he proved to be the master of written memoranda to governmental officials on every level.

---

[11] For the course of the negotiations cf. G. Franz-Willing, *Die bayerische Vatikangesandtschaft 1803–1934* (Munich 1965), 181–227.

The Catholics in the south and west of the *Reich* expressed their assent to the Weimar state neither unanimously nor with equal decisiveness.[12] How strongly their views diverged came to light in 1922 at the Munich *Katholikentag* in the sensational controversy between Cardinal Faulhaber and the president of the meeting, Adenauer.[13] Neither spoke for himself alone but for a considerable following, the one as spokesman of a royal Bavarian, the other as representative of a Rhenish democratic Catholicism. True, Faulhaber's harsh judgment was directed first at the revolution as such, but all later interpretations did not soften the thrust at the present reality of the republic.

One of the most significant gains, which the Catholic Church, along with all religious bodies, owed to the republican constitution was the exclusion of state influences in the bestowal of ecclesiastical offices. To regard this as progress was denied to the bishops so long as the constitutional law remained a dead letter, because the ministerial officials of individual German state governments opposed a stubborn resistance to the transforming of this constitutional norm into administrative practice. Cardinal Bertram and Nuncio Pacelli reacted in notably different ways to the ever clearer obstructionist tactics of Prussia, by far the single most powerful state, with 60 percent of the population of the *Reich*. While the chairman of the Fulda episcopal conference first aimed to see the constitutional point of departure restored before the granting by treaty of possibilities of hearing agencies in the appointment to church offices could be discussed, the nuncio was bound to the prospect of being able to move on to talk of a concordat even before the overdue liquidation of the *Kulturkampf* laws.

Prussia's willingness for a treaty, however, only made itself felt after the Bavarian model had stirred in Berlin the desire likewise to move up to the "concordat state." In regard to content, the Prussian concordat of 14 June 1929 could only lag behind the Bavarian model because of differently arranged parliamentary circumstances,[14] and with the renunciation of school regulations it became almost a torso, because it even lacked what from the Vatican's viewpoint only made a treaty with the Church really a concordat. Nevertheless, the positive yield was significant: the erecting of the see of Berlin, the elevation of Breslau and Paderborn to archepiscopal status with a new distribution of the suffragan sees, the participation of the Prussian cathedral chapter in the election of the bishop. The state of Baden followed with the concordat of 12 October 1932.

---

[12] On the route of the German Catholics from the Empire to the republic, cf. H. Lutz, *Demokratie im Zwielicht* (Munich 1963).

[13] Cf. *Akten Kardinal Michael von Faulhabers* (above, note 8) nos. 127–33.

[14] Cf. D. Golombek, *Die politische Vorgeschichte des Preussenkonkordats* (Mainz 1970).

In regard to cultural policy the 1920s were under the auspices of the conflicts over the *Reich's* school law demanded by the Weimar Constitution.[15] There had already been bitter struggles over the school article in the discussions of the constitution. They had the character of a compromise, and, despite several attempts, the Center Party did not succeed in putting through the equality of rank, prescribed by canon law for the denominational school, with the public school favored by the cultural and political Left.

The ideological oppositions broke out again over three drafts of laws submitted in the course of the years. Although the Catholic school organization sought to gather the advocates of the denominational school without regard for party boundaries, and in a campaign for signatures in 1922–23 some 75 percent of all Catholics qualified to vote opted for this type of school, this changed nothing in the majority situation in the *Reichstag.* Since the prospects for a *Reich* school law that would have partly corresponded to Catholic ideas thereby disappeared, the defenders of the denominational school finally turned entirely to the defensive under the slogan "Rather no *Reich* school law than a bad one."

In its beginnings an offshoot of the Popular Union for Catholic Germany, the Catholic school organization had experienced a steep ascent since 1913, while the Mönchen-Gladbach branch-enterprise fell into a crisis of existence.[16] After a maximum membership of more than 800,000 in 1914, the social, economic, and political upheavals of the war and postwar periods had so obstructed the Popular Union that in 1928 it counted only 400,000 members. After the Catholic association system in Germany had displayed, up to the beginning of the war, an amazing breadth, dynamism, and diversity, now the dark sides of the differentiation became perceptible. For the most part liable to subscription in several societies, the members first economized in times of need in what was unnecessary. Moreover, the superorganization favored a certain weariness of association. In the Mönchen-Gladbach case a lack of economic decisions and the struggle against a crippling mountain of debts did more than was needed to cause the glorious "Union of Unions" to become one of the first victims of Hitler's liquidation policy in mid-1933. Once on its way down current, the Popular Union foundered on the inability of its leaders to shape it beyond the socioethical goals of the time of foundation to the general Catholic union, a plan which, in view of the distribution of functions in the association sector that had meanwhile occurred, apparently had little chance in any case.

---

[15] Cf. G. Grünthal, *Reichsschulgesetz und Zentrumspartei in der Weimarer Republik* (Düsseldorf 1968).

[16] Cf. E. Ritter, *Die katholisch-soziale Bewegung Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert und der Volksverein* (Cologne 1954), 355–495.

The exemplar of "Catholic Action" was based on a quite similar idea, as it was preached by Pius XI cocksurely and emphatically. In 1928 Nuncio Pacelli was supposed to supply the initial kindling in an address at the *Katholikentag* in Magdeburg. If the response, despite the good will of the laity who were called to share in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church, as the official definition said, was not really satisfying, the principal reason was that the papal appeal outlined a program which was not only realized in a diversity of ways in the Catholic association life of Germany, but looked back to a long tradition and did not, as in most of the Latin countries, encounter an association-organizational vacuum. A stricter reference of the independent lay societies to the hierarchy would rightly be felt by these as a vexation and retrogression. Conversely the prospect was not unwelcome to some bishops of breaking the concentration of power of the superdiocesan central association by appeal to "Catholic Action." In fact, Catholic Action was never really able to get a foothold in Germany, and what was so called despite all failures did not go beyond a minimal exertion owed to the papal initiator.

Without ignoring the representation of legitimate church claims and interests among the *Reich* officials, and stressing the primacy of the pastoral in his understanding of his episcopal office, Cardinal Bertram respected the existing institutional distribution of competencies between the entire episcopate and the Catholic Center Party and Bavarian People's Party. He was thoroughly opposed to a competitive juxtaposition on the field of Church politics, before which his predecessor Kopp showed no dread at all. In any event, Bertram, by commission of his fellow bishops, internally occupied a position toward individual projects of laws to the extent that inner church interests were concerned, but for the rest the freedom of decision of the Catholic delegates was left intact, however much current ideas aspired to see in them mere agents of the executive power of the Church's leadership.[17]

On the outside the Church's closeness to the Catholic parties was manifested in a number of clerical bearers of mandates, the not entirely uncritically so-called Center prelates, who mostly belonged to the distinctive, even if not leading, minds of their parties but had to thank not their clerical status but their professional achievements. Pope Pius XI had fundamental reservations about the conflict-laden double commitment of pastoral care and party politics without abruptly cutting off the connections that had grown historically. In Germany the problem of interfering professional fields in the life of the nuncio's adviser and leader of the Center, Ludwig Kaas, became as evident as in Austria in the activity of the prelate Ignaz Seipel, who had risen to be chancellor.

---

[17] Cf. also R. Morsey, "Kirche und politische Parteien 1848/49," A. Rauscher ed., *Kirche, Politik, Parteien* (Cologne 1974), 19–56.

That the Weimar Constitution of 1919 was serious about the demand for equality, without distinction, of all citizens and thereby realized the points of the program to whose implementation the founders of the Center had earlier joined together, could not be without repercussions on the inner unity of the electoral body.[18] For with the demolition of the last vestiges of the *Kulturkampf* the previously attractive long-range goals had become pointless. As the conviction among Catholics loyal to the Church, formerly self-evident, of the indispensability of the Center constantly waned, it could be gathered from election statistics in consequence of which the proportion going over to the Center and the BVP in the votes cast between 1919 and 1933 dropped from 18 percent to 14 percent.[19] Between the loss in external recruiting power and the disappearance in inner cohesion existed a clear connection. Symptomatic of the strengthening of the centrifugal forces was the inability at the end of 1928 of the Center representatives to agree on a successor to Wilhelm Marx, who had resigned, as party chairman. For the first time in the history of the Center an ecclesiastic, the Trier prelate Ludwig Kaas (1881–1952), had to take the chairmanship in order to bridge the gulf between the wings.

Just as before, the Catholic parties could count on the indirect support of the episcopate in the form of electoral pastoral letters before critical votes. Not made use of sparingly enough, such episcopal appeals to Catholic cohesion concealed the danger of weakening the force of episcopal authority in case it needed to pronounce on ultimate ideological questions. The bishops felt themselves obliged to just this after the sudden increase of Hitler's National Socialist party to a mass movement of millions in 1930. One after another they underlined the incompatibility of Christianity and National Socialism in the spring of 1931.[20] The prohibition to join the Hitler movement was based on the racism and nationalism of his party, on the extravagance and malice of its agitation, on its violence against those who thought differently. In the daily papers the warnings of the German episcopate against National Socialism provoked an unusually more violent reaction than the directives[21] issued in 1921 in regard to atheistic socialism and based on the same principles.

---

[18] Cf. J. Becker, "Das Ende der Zentrumspartei und die Problematik des politischen Katholizismus in Deutschland," G. Jasper, *Von Weimar zu Hitler 1930–1933* (Cologne 1968), 344–76.

[19] Cf. J. Schauff, *Das Walhverhalten der deutschen Katholiken im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik* (Mainz 1975).

With their authoritative refusal the bishops could influence Catholics who might be thinking of changing their vote, and this was proved when on 5 March 1933 Hitler "clearly obtained the least votes in the parts of the *Reich* that had a Catholic majority,"[22] but they could not prevent other strata of the population from turning to the Nazi movement. Not by accident did there occur with the agony of the Weimar state the outbreak of an intellectual current within German Catholicism, which under the collective term *Reichsideologie* produced an immense number of publications between 1929 and 1934, but remained almost exclusively confined to intellectual circles in its influence.[23] In the quest for a counterimage to the depressing political reality, authors of the most varied provenance came together in the attempt to revive the medieval notion of the Empire. In fact historically concealed illusionism, the concept was nonetheless in the process of exercising a considerable fascination on some contemporaries. It received religious impulses from the *consecratio mundi,* demanded at the same time by the liturgical movement. With the mutual institutional interpenetration of the original powers of state and Church the representatives of the *Reichsideologie* painted an image, the actualization of which had failed more than once in the history of Europe. This alone was not enough to destroy the counterfeit brilliance of the utopia, but the trend was too academic and elitist to influence the electoral process. This was the true measure of the actual political relevance of this movement and not the deluge of writings on the *Reichsideologie.* This applies to the period before as well as after Hitler's accession to power on 30 January 1933.

---

[20] Printing of the episcopal stand: B. Stasiewski, ed., *Akten deutscher Bischöfe über die Lage der Kirche 1933–1945* Vol. I: *1933–1934* (Mainz 1968), Appendix nos. 5–7 and 11–13.

[21] For the suggestion relevant to the tasks of pastoral care in regard to antifaith unions, see W. Corsten, *Sammlung kirchlicher Erlasse, Verordnungen und Bekanntmachungen für die Erzdiözese Köln* (Cologne 1929), 619–24.

[22] R. Morsey (above n. 17), 31.

[23] Cf. K. Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches* (Munich 1969), but with overemphasis on the political relevance.

Two decisions settled matters for the attitude of Catholics attached to the Church toward this event: the agreement of the Center to the Enabling Law on 23 March and the proclamation of the German episcopate, indirectly dependent on it, five days later.[24] Appealing to the assurances in Hitler's governmental declaration, the bishops conditionally withdrew their general prohibitions and warnings against the National Socialist Party. They took this step, not in an opportunist adaptation but with the purpose of sparing their flocks a worrisome test that was daily showing itself more sharply. This was done first in the conflict between loyalty to the Church and the obedience of the citizen, which became acute the moment when in Adolf Hitler a politician began to personify the authority of the government, who was at the same time leader of a party with an ideological appeal. In this dilemma the cautiously formulated position of the episcopate freed to that part of the German Catholics who wanted cooperation the way to collaboration, without however intending thereby to recommend Hitler's party.

In league with Vice-Chancellor von Papen (1879–1969), Hitler surprised the Vatican at the beginning of April 1933 with the offer of a concordat with the *Reich.* To the Church he promised the guarantee by treaty of the denominational schools, for his part he demanded, on the model of the Italian concordat, a prohibition on the clergy taking part in party politics. For a short time he was fascinated by the idea of dealing the Catholic parties a mortal blow by forcing the Church to withdraw all clerical office-holders; in the long view the advantages of a comprehensive regulation of the relations of state and Church seemed to be in his grasp. Franz von Papen's motives were more multifaceted. As a Catholic he wanted for the Church what he regarded as best. As a politician he speculated on his reputation as a successful protector of the Church's interests in order thereby to underpin the claim to represent the Catholic part of the population in Hitler's cabinet.

Around the vice-chancellor gathered the alliance "Cross and Eagle," a group inspired by the *Reichsideologie,* which had as its goal to build a bridge between the Catholic Church and the Nazi state. Taken with as little seriousness by the Nazi side as by the Catholic people, within a short time the Papen establishment was as isolated as was its protector in the cabinet. After the change of name to "Workers' Community of Catholic Germans," it was taken in tow even in its organization by the

---

[24] On the redirection released by the *Reichstag* election of 5 March 1933, cf. L. Volk (above n. 10), 59–89. For some aspects of the much treated relations of Church and National Socialism, cf. D. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich* (Mainz 1976), with citations of the literature.

Nazi party in the fall of 1933. Numerically a tiny group, it disappeared from the scene a year later, after it had served its time as a pretense. In contrast to the Evangelical Church, in which the church organization broke into pieces over the opposition between Nazi "German Christians" and the denominational movement, the German Catholics avoided a self-destructive polarization, which enabled them to preserve their inner cohesion during the years of totalitarian oppression between 1933 and 1945.

In the summer of 1933 the revolutionary process of controlling everything in Germany outstripped the Roman negotiations for a concordat. When on 20 July the treaty[25] was signed at the Vatican, there were no longer any Catholic parties which the article on depoliticization, demanded by Hitler, could have injured. They had not fallen victim to any rule of the concordat but had been liquidated as had been the entire parliamentary system.

All the greater exertions were made by the Vatican negotiators to create by the concordat protection for the no less threatened Catholic associations. Accordingly, in addition to the assurance of existence for the denominational school, the guaranteeing of the Church's association system gained urgent present significance. As can be gathered from the layers of the article on the protection of the associations (ARTICLE 31), the offensive to bring everything under the control of the Nazi organization was stopped by these regulations of the concordat at an extremely critical time for the afflicted Catholic societies. What was thought of as a peace treaty changed unexpectedly into an instrument of defense. After the defeat of the frontal attack, the war against the denominational societies was continued with more subtle methods—despite the concordat. Not to belong to the pertinent Nazi organizations meant for the future a severe handicap for professional promotion and in some places also for social repute. By the prohibition of double membership Nazi organizations excluded members of Catholic associations from admission and hence from their special rights in order thereby to move them to abandon the ecclesiastical associations. Not all societies showed the same spirit of resistance. While the Catholic Teachers' Association capitulated as early as August 1933,[26] the association of Catholic German women teachers maintained itself in spite of all pressures until it was forcibly dissolved by the Gestapo in the autumn of 1937. From the summer of the same year on, the

---

[25] For the content of the concordat, cf. Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 517–19; Schmidlin, *PG* IV, 164–66.

[26] Cf. H. Küppers, *Der Katholische Lehrerverband in der Übergangszeit von der Weimarer Republik zur Hitler-Diktatur* (Mainz 1975).

Catholic association of young men, especially annoying to the Nazi regime, was suppressed by the state police in one diocese after another.[27]

After the crushing of domestic political (parliamentary opposition) and inner party counterforces (the "Röhmputsch") and the death of President von Hindenburg on 2 August 1934, Hitler saw in the Christian churches the chief obstacle for a Nazi permeation of the entire population. With the help of a network of seemingly unconnected regulations the Nazi regime thus sought to drive every ecclesiastical influence out of public life. This became especially obvious in the gradual repression of Catholic journalism.[28] The first victim was the Church-oriented daily press. After 1933 Catholic papers could no longer be designated as such in the title, and in 1935 they were transformed into mere acclamation agents by a legally concealed decree of the propaganda ministry. To muzzle the Church's periodical system Propaganda Minister Goebbels made use of different methods. They extended from warnings through temporary prohibitions to the complete suppression of a periodical.[29] To this were added trivial prescriptions on the organization of the content in order to deprive the church publications of any attraction to readers and bring them into the odor of a musty religiosity. From 1936 pastoral letters could no longer be printed even in the diocesan newspapers protected in the concordat.

Especially malicious, because it aimed purposely to mislead, was the invention of the *Auflagenachricht.* Made obligatory by the propaganda ministry, it had to be accepted by Catholic papers without regard to its content and without its compulsory character being indicated or its being criticized. While all freedom was permitted to anticlerical agitation, gestures toward a counter-defense were answered with prompt sanctions. However, excess of power did not necessarily mean power of conviction. When in the summer of 1937 Goebbels made use of the morals trials of individual religious to mobilize his complete media potential for a week-long campaign against the Church, at the end it was not so much the credibility of the Catholic orders as that of the Nazi press that was in doubt.[30] Economic difficulties because of the war finally supplied the pretext in mid-1941 completely to silence the Church press, still strong in circulation, except for a handful of theological professional journals.

---

[27] Cf. B. Schellenberger, *Katholische Jugend und Drittes Reich* (Mainz 1975).

[28] Cf. K. A. Altmeyer, *Katholische Presse unter NS-Diktatur* (Berlin 1962).

[29] K. Gotto, *Die Wochenzeitung Junge Front/Michael* (Mainz 1970), describes an individual case as an example.

[30] Cf. H. G. Hockerts, *Die Sittlichkeitsprozesse gegen katholische Ordensangehörige und Priester 1936/37* (Mainz 1971).

The Nazi authorities laid greater value on camouflage in their school policy[31] that directly contradicted the statements of the concordat of 1933. Decisive ministerial edicts were "not intended for publication." The certainly to be anticipated resistance of Catholic parents to the forcible introduction of the public school was neutralized by periodically staggered regional procedures, pseudovoting was interpreted for the result desired. Religious instruction had previously become an object of reform, its imparting was often removed from clerics and turned over to teaching personnel not authorized by the Church, who then reduced the number of hours provided for it. Schools of orders were compelled to close and entrusted to state or communal management.

On the government's part even the *Reich* Church Ministry, created in 1935, was unable to bring order into the chaos of competencies characteristic of the Hitler state. The reason was not because the church minister, Hanns Kerrl (1887–1941), was not powerful enough within the party to impose his will against more powerful rivals with ambitions in church policy. His office lacked a directly subordinate executive agent, whereas the lesser ranking Police Chief Himmler possessed in the Gestapo an instrument which he used in its proper perfection of power, without much concern for the church minister. Consequently it was not Kerrl who determined the course of the struggle for suppression of the Church, but his rivals, Himmler, Heydrich, Bormann, and Schirach, who for their part emulated one another in radical activity.

For the bishops the ideology, claims to power, and claims to domination of a totalitarian ideological state were as strange phenomena as for most contemporaries, so that they first had to find their way in the new reality. Against every encroachment of this political system in the Church's sphere Cardinal Bertram, as chairman of the entire episcopate, protested in writing with appeal to the legal situation, as he was accustomed to do and without letting himself be misled by the lack of results of his ideas. A chain of diplomatic notes[32] from the Holy See aimed in the same direction. The Vatican's protest against the disregard of the concordat left nothing to be desired in clarity and sharpness. Since it was in vain, in fact for the most part remained even without a reply, Pius XI finally broke his silence by denouncing the hostility of the Nazi regime before the whole world in the encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge* of March 1937.[33]

---

[31] Cf. R. Eilers, *Die nationalsozialistische Schulpolitik* (Cologne 1963) esp. 22–28 and 85–98.

[32] Cf. D. Albrecht, ed., *Der Notenwechsel zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und der Deutschen Reichsregierung* Vol. I: *1933–1937* (Mainz 1965), Vol. II: *1937–1945* (Mainz 1969).

[33] Cf. the definitive text in contrast to the preliminary draft of Cardinal Faulhaber in D. Albrecht, op. cit. Vol. I, 404–43.

Differing from the Pope, Cardinal Bertram could not then decide upon a departure from his policy of memoranda, when despite the best intentions its ineffectiveness could no longer be doubted. The bishop of Berlin, Preysing, demanded a revision of this defensive tactic as early as autumn 1937 but he could not put this over at Breslau.[34] After Hitler's passing to an expansionist foreign policy, introduced with the annexation of Austria in March 1938, the agitating pressure in domestic politics lessened temporarily, it is true, but the goal of gradually confining and finally destroying the Church was unchanged. It was carried further, with still more brutal harshness, after the outbreak of war in the fall of 1939 under the pretense of alleged war requirements.

With the elimination of the Catholic kindergartens, unilaterally decreed by the state's edict, the last hindrance to the total grasp of the rising generation fell. Unpopular priests were reprimanded by the Party or were sent without trial to the concentration camp at Dachau, where many succumbed to hardships or mistreatment.[35] Because he had not appeared to vote in the *Reichstag* elections in April 1938, Bishop Sproll of Rottenburg was expelled from his official headquarters by organized riots, removed from his diocese by the Gestapo, and only freed from exile by the collapse of the Nazi state.[36]

In 1940–41 the Gestapo undertook a raid in the grand manner when it arbitrarily confiscated by turns abbeys, religious houses, and seminaries and threw the occupants into the streets. At the same time the Nazi dictatorship, in the elimination of the emotionally ill, euphemistically called euthanasia, and in the deportation and murder of the European Jews pushed the perversion of the *Reich* to dimensions beyond the human power of conception. Nevertheless, Cardinal Bertram could not be moved from the policy of internal protest, which he unerringly continued. In his understanding of his office, determined by the experience of the *Kulturkampf,* the maintaining of the administration of the sacraments and of the parochial care of souls held absolute precedence over other episcopal duties, in the concrete case to publicly standing up for basic personal rights. The spokesmen of an energetic progressive defense did not intend the total break feared by the cardinal of Breslau with its devastating consequences. However, this was not the alternative to the policy of memoranda, disavowed by its total ineffectiveness. For the holders of power were by no means insensitive to the pressure of opinion of a great part of the population, which the exposure of the crimes of the regime would have had to produce. What they feared and the Church's members hoped from its bishops, the unique echo, appeared in the summer of 1941, which the three great sermons of Bishop Galen (1878–1946) of Münster against the violent domination of the Gestapo and the murdering of the emotionally ill elevated to an event of European rank.

---

[34] Cf. W. Adolph, *Hirtenamt und Hitlerdiktatur* (Berlin 1965).

[35] Cf. also R. Schnabel, *Die Frommen in der Hölle* (Frankfurt 1966); E. Weier, *Die Geistlichen in Dachau sowie in anderen Konzentrationslagern und Gefängnissen* (Mödling 1972). The statistics of the various authors are not uniform. According to the hitherto most comprehensive and basic listing in E. Weiler, pp. 75 and 82, 67 out of 304 German priest prisoners died at Dachau, and 18 out of 83 Austrian.

[36] Cf. P. Kopf, M. Miller, eds., *Die Vertreibung von Bischof Joannes Baptista Sproll von Rottenburg 1938–1945* (Mainz 1971).

Differently from the action on euthanasia, which could not be hidden despite all efforts at camouflage, there came into view for the observer inside Germany only the last but one act of the "final solution of the Jewish question," forcible deportation, and even this only in a local sector. As early as 1935 the Fulda Episcopal Conference had united the assistance efforts of the *Sankt Raphaelsverein* and the German Charity Association in the "Assistance Committee for Catholic non-Aryans," but the boundaries of its success were very narrowly drawn through the restriction on the admittance of people from overseas.[37] A local center of gravity was constituted by the "Assistance Work in the Episcopal Ordinariate of Berlin," which Bishop Preysing had called into being. In the last common proclamation of the episcopate during the Nazi epoch, the Decalogue Pastoral Letter[38] of August 1943, which stressed the indivisibility of the right to life in all clarity, there was also unmistakable thought of "men of foreign races and descent." Of course, matters did not proceed as far as a public protest of the bishops against the annihilation of the Jews.

What fate was destined for the Church in the event of a victorious outcome of the war was demonstrated by Hitler's representatives in the territories annexed to the *Reich* in the West and East. After the *Anschluss* in March 1938 Austria was declared a territory freed from its concordat and in its ecclesiastical institutions abandoned to the forcible rule of the party functionaries. Austria, Lorraine, and in extremely radical fashion the Warthegau[39] supplied the negative proof for the protective influence which the concordat with the *Reich,* despite highly defective respect, produced to the end in the dioceses of the old *Reich.*

---

[37] Cf. L. E. Reutter, *Katholische Kirche als Fluchthelfer im Dritten Reich* (Recklinghausen 1971).

[38] Text in K. Hofmann, ed., *Zeugnis und Kampf des deutschen Episkopats* (Freiburg 1946), 75–84.

[39] Cf. B. Stasiewski, "Die Kirchenpolitik der Nationalsozialisten im Warthegau," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 7(1959), 46–74.

After the unconditional surrender on 8 May 1945, the victorious powers liquidated, with the rest of Hitler's rule, also the inner constitution of the German political system. In many places the Church was the single institution which was able to keep its personal identity beyond the zero hour. Its generally known spiritual opposition to National Socialism gave it, at least among the Western Allies and in the initial phase of the communal reorganization, a certain authority, but soon other influences gained the upper hand in the military governments of the four occupation zones.

In view of the unmistakable material misery the Church's efforts in the first postwar period were especially directed to charitable help.[40] The wretchedness moved to its climax with the stream of millions of refugees from the East, who, robbed of all they had, were driven from their ancestral homes. Arbitrarily drawn zone frontiers disrupted dioceses and carried the German partition into the ecclesiastical sphere. After Cardinal Bertram's death on 6 July 1945, a German vicar capitular, Ferdinand Piontek, functioned in Breslau, but a month later he was induced to resign by the determined Cardinal Hlond. As primate of Poland, the latter himself assumed the diocesan administration, so that, provided by the Holy See with the title of apostolic administrator, he could immediately send auxiliary bishops to the eastern areas of Germany now placed under Polish administration.

Under the chairmanship of the archbishop of Cologne, Josef Frings (b. 1887, archbishop in 1942, cardinal in 1946), the German bishops met at Fulda in August 1945 for their first postwar meeting. As previously against the violations of rights by the Nazi regime, they now protested for a nation without a voice at the Allied Control Council, against anarchy and arbitrariness, against the automatic interning of merely nominal party members, against the expulsion of millions of East Germans from house and farm. During the war years Pope Pius XII had maintained an intensive correspondence with many German bishops.[41] The Pope's voice was also the first which appealed on a world level for discretion and justice toward the defeated,[42] while the wave of hatred released by Hitler turned back in full fury on the Germans in their totality.

After the closing of all diplomatic representations in Berlin by the victorious powers, not excepting the apostolic nunciature, Pius XII left nothing untried to remain present, advising and helping, through an informal representation at least. Thus there originated the Vatican Mission at Kronberg near Frankfurt in late autumn 1945. From 1946 it was splendidly occupied by Aloysius Muench (1889–1962), an American bishop of German ancestry,[43] and became the germ cell of a revived representation of the Holy See in Germany, which was transferred to Bad Godesberg after the establishing of the Federal Republic in 1951 and was elevated to a nunciature.

---

[40] H. J. Wollasch, ed., *Humanitäre Auslandshilfe für Deutschland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Freiburg 1976).

[41] Cf. B. Schneider, ed., *Die Briefe Pius' XII. an die deutschen Bischöfe 1939–1945* (Mainz 1966).

[42] Thus in the address to the College of Cardinals on 2 June 1945. Text in B. Wuestenberg, J. Zabkar, eds., *Der Papst an die Deutschen* (Frankfurt 1956), 103–10.

Population displacements of unprecedented size, introduced by Nazi resettlements and flight before bombs, climaxed in the influx of over 11 million expelled from their homeland, who, apart from the humanitarian needs, also created completely new problems of pastoral care. In some regions confessional boundaries, which had been more or less fixed since the Reformation, were shifted without plan and order or became entirely outmoded by a fundamental mixing of Catholics and Protestants. That thereby a diaspora situation arose virtually everywhere was first made painfully known to many participants at the Mainz *Katholikentag* of 1948 in the brief formula "Germany—Mission Country."

As in all areas, also in the religious the reconstruction proceeded from the bottom up. There struck the great hour of the parish principle. Hence the bishops in no sense made a virtue of necessity when they sought to organize the care of souls according to the so-called natural states and energetically resisted the formation of superdiocesan central associations in the old style. Nevertheless, although these rose again from the ruins and the worn-out parish principle lost in brilliance, no renaissance of any length was allowed to the Catholic associations. The great period of the denominational mass organizations with their members amounting to the hundreds of thousands was apparently over. To the change of climate of a dread of every organizational connection there contributed not a little in the early postwar period the rigorism with which especially the American occupation power subjected the last member of the Nazi Party to the process of de-Nazification. But the definitive change was first introduced with the arrival of television in the 1950s, whereby a competitor entered the scene which damaged every form of sociability outside the home.

The war of annihilation of National Socialism against Christianity had simply forced churchmen and politicians of both denominations without question into one defensive front. From the start this removed all reservations which might have made it difficult for the Catholic bishops, after the founding of the Christian Social Union (CSU) in Bavaria and the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) in the rest of Germany, to agree to an integrated party of a basic Christian direction. Hence not without skepticism they saw how staunch adherents of the Center called it again into being on a purely denominational basis, as in North Rhine-Westphalia, and thereby split the Catholic electorate. The outcome was that the notion of union became fully productive in some regions only with a certain delay. The electoral pastoral letters of the postwar period became more blurred after the resumption of this tradition in the 1960s; they especially stressed the duty of voting and the necessity of voting for candidates of proved Christian outlook. Only in a very few individual cases was there an ecclesiastical representative. The postconciliar inclination of the younger theology professors to be active for so-called election initiatives was countered by the German episcopal conference in the fall of 1973 with the prohibition "for a priest to take a stand publicly within a party, for a party, and for the election of a party."[44]

---

[43] Cf. C. J. Barry, *American Nuncio, Cardinal Aloisius Muench* (Collegeville 1969).

During the preliminaries for a constitution of the Federal Republic, which was established in 1949 in the territory of the three Western occupation zones,[45] the episcopate exerted itself energetically for an anchoring of the rights of parents in the Bonn basic law, but the proponents could not carry the day in the parliamentary council. Also heavily fought was the continued validity of the concordat of 1933. What on this point was established in a more general way in ARTICLE 123 of the Federal Constitution was differently interpreted according to the viewpoint of each party. For obligatory clarification the second Adenauer cabinet appealed to the Federal Supreme Court at Karlsruhe, complaining in 1955 against the state of Lower Saxony because of its nonobservance of the school regulations of the concordat. The verdict of 26 March 1957 agreed on the one hand to the continued validity of the treaty, but denied to the Federation the power to enforce provisions of the treaty where these touched the cultural supremacy of the states.[46] Unsatisfactory as the Karlsruhe verdict, seen as a whole, turned out to be for the ecclesiastical partner to the treaty, nevertheless it became the impetus for a bilateral agreement between the state of Lower Saxony and the Holy See, the concordat of 26 February 1965. The concordat concluded with Rhineland-Westphalia on 15 May 1973 took care of regulating the school question.

According to the norms established by the Second Vatican Council, the German Episcopal Conference, actually in existence for decades, gave itself its proper statute in 1967 and a legal structure in the union of the dioceses of Germany. At the end of 1965 its leadership had passed from Cardinal Frings, who remained archbishop of Cologne until 1969, to the Munich Cardinal Julius Döpfner (1913–76, bishop of Würzburg in 1948, bishop of Berlin in 1957, cardinal in 1958, and archbishop of Munich in 1961). Whether the auxiliary bishops, called by the council to participate in the conference and in some places increased rapidly, would be conducive to the function of the bishops' assemblies remains to be seen. In addition to the complete conference there also existed on the regional level the Bavarian and the West German Episcopal Conference and the East German conference of ordinaries, but participation by these last in the plenary meetings at Fulda has been forbidden since the erecting of the Berlin Wall in 1961 through the policy of demarcation.

---

[44] *HK* 27(1973), 549.

[45] For the time period after the founding of the Federal Republic and on the correction of F. Spott's presentation, cf. K. Forster, "Deutscher Katholizismus in der Adenauer-Ära," *Konrad Adenauer und seine Zeit* II (Stuttgart 1976), 488–20.

[46] Cf. F. Giese, F. A. v. d. Heydte, *Der Konkordatsprozess* (Munich 1957–59).

In the tracks of the Eastern policy pursued by the SPD-FDP government coalition since 1969 and yielding to the stubborn pressure of Poland's episcopate and government, the Holy See at the end of June 1972 for its part recognized the Oder-Neisse Line as Poland's frontier and in the territories annexed to Poland created a new diocesan arrangement. The German Democratic Republic strove for an analogous concession from the Vatican in order to maintain through the merger of West German enclaves and its own jurisdictional areas a diocesan division whose circumscription would coincide with the state frontiers.

Austria

In Austria, where the proclamation of the republic in 1918 deprived the Catholic Church of its imperial protector, tension-filled cultural-political times dawned after the First World War. If in Germany social democracy suspiciously rejected the Church, so too the ideologically incomparably virulent Austrian Marxism fought it with an aggressive hostility.[47] In Austria, 90 percent Catholic, the oppositions were polarized as regards party politics into the two great blocks of the Christian Socialists and the Socialists.

The latter went far beyond the atheistic or nonreligious basic attitude of the Socialist International in the sense that they imprinted on the ideological ingredients of the party program the stamp of exclusiveness. Socialism was called a counterreligion, and whoever wanted to profess it had to break with the Church. Only against this background can the at times fanatical agitation be understood with which the freethinking electors and members of the Socialist party, standing on the left, sought to separate from the Church. Occurring in two waves, the departures from the Church between 1918 and 1928 amounted in a total population of 6.1 million Catholics to 135,000, an alarming process for the Church. The fact that the leadership of the Christian Socialists and of the federal government rested for years in the hands of a priest produced an additional ingredient of tension in domestic politics. Monsignor Ignaz Seipel (1876–1932), chairman of the Christian Social party from 1921 to 1930, acquired as federal chancellor from 1922 to 1924 and from 1926 to 1929 influence and esteem beyond Austria.[48] The caliber of a statesman was attested to him even by his political opponents, but he also had to struggle with the vocation problem of the priest-politician. He was able to feel its specific vulnerability when he was denounced as a "prelate without leniency" because of his use of the police after the burning of the Palace of Justice at Vienna in 1927. In any event, from the episcopate's viewpoint the disadvantages of a commitment of clerics to party politics so clearly prevailed that the Austrian episcopal conference at the end of 1933, hence a year after Seipel's death and the elimination of parliament by Dollfuss, called upon all priests to give up the mandates exercised by them.

---

[47] Cf. P. M. Zulehner, *Kirche und Austromarxismus* (Vienna 1967).

In so far as the archbishop of Vienna resided in the capital of Austria, he was affected much more strongly by governmental events as chairman of the episcopate than was Cardinal Bertram at Breslau. In 1918, during the period of transition from monarchy to republic, Gustav Piffl (1864–1932, archbishop in 1913, cardinal in 1914) maintained a soberly shrewd attitude. His successor, Theodor Innitzer (1875–1955, archbishop in 1932, cardinal in 1933), was a man of charity, who, for example, stood up for the Jews in the period of persecution.[49]

The bishops viewed, not without reservation, the experiment of a Christian corporate state, introduced by the Christian Socialist Federal Chancellor Dollfuss (1932–34) and continued by Schuschnigg (1934–38), but they did not intend, for their part, to create difficulties for the Catholics of the government, hard pressed by Hitler and his Austrian followers. For this reason it was also not unproblematic to withdraw from the government's course, because the planners of the corporate state appealed to a papal encyclical. Now, of course, the derivation of this project from *Quadragesimo anno* was controvertible, but this did not hinder critics from charging the Church with coresponsibility for the Austrian effort to implement it. In 1930 negotiations for a concordat were conducted with the Curia, in order especially to do away with the confusion over marriage which socialist state officials had brought up when they sought to overcome the strictness of the state-Church marriage legislation of the monarchy by dubious acts of self-help. Only the government of Dollfuss brought the treaty[50] to a conclusion on 5 June 1933, not without the expectation of thereby substantially consolidating its position in domestic and foreign policy.[51]

---

[48] Cf. K. v. Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel, Staatsmann einer Krisenzeit* (Graz, Vienna, and Cologne 1976).

[49] Cf. V. Reimann, *Innitzer, Kardinal zwischen Hitler und Rom* (Vienna 1967).

In the days of the *Anschluss* euphoria in March 1938, Cardinal Innitzer temporarily succumbed to the deceptive maneuvers of the Nazi agents, but as early as October he was the butt of violent demonstrations of displeasure on the part of the Nazis.[52] Meanwhile, the brutally instituted oppression of the Church had done away with all illusions. In order to create a free field of operations the Austrian concordat was declared not binding, while the validity of the concordat with Germany was restricted to the old *Reich*. This permitted the state and party officials more drastically to curtail the Church's sphere of influence in Austria within five months than they had been able to do in Germany in five years. By means of unilateral decrees, associations were dissolved, Catholic schools and theological faculties—Innsbruck, Salzburg, Graz—were closed, religious property was confiscated, religious instruction in accord with the school plan was abolished.

In a new wave of departures from the Church there was some displeasure in 1938–39 over the attitude of the bishops in the atmosphere of the Dollfuss era. While the state subsidies for the payment of the clergy had been paid up to then out of the religious fund established by Joseph II from church property, and deficits had been met through annual appropriations of parliament, the new rulers struck out the state payments and replaced them by a system of church contributions. Devised from clear motives for the economic weakening of the Church, the new rule had a thoroughly reverse effect, since the donation from the people was regarded not as a burdensome obligation but as a profession of the faith and of the Church.

In contrast to Germany, which was not "freed," as was Austria, but was "conquered," an Austrian political government could be set up at Vienna in April 1945 before the end of the war, although for a decade it had to share its authority and competence with the four occupation powers. During the years of the rule of force under the Nazis, the destruction of external points of support led to a deepened consciousness of the current pastoral tasks and stirred impulses which displayed themselves productively in the postwar age.

---

[50] For the content cf. Schmidlin, *PG* IV, 126–28.

[51] Cf. E. Weinzierl, *Die österreichischen Konkordate von 1855 und 1933* (Munich 1960).

[52] Cf. J. Fried, *Nationalsozialismus und Katholische Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1947); E. Weinzierl, "Österreichs Katholiken und der Nationalsozialismus," *Wort und Wahrheit* 18(1963), 417–39 and 493–526, 20(1965), 774–804.

After 1945 the Austrian People's Party, as successor of the Christian Social Party, and the Socialist Party of Austria worked together for more than two decades in coalition cabinets, both overcoming the hostile attitude displayed during the first republic.

Between the government parties the legal obligatory force of the concordat of 1933 was long disputed. Finally a compromise was reached in regard to Rome to agree in principle to the continuing validity but at the same time to attach to it the wish for a new treaty. However, Pius XII would have nothing to do with a sacrifice of the content of the concordat. Only under his successor were discussions resumed which led to a series of individual agreements.

These especially put the diocesan organization on a definitive basis by eliminating the provisional arrangements which had prevailed after 1919 as transitional solutions. Thus the diocese of Eisenstadt was erected on 23 June 1960 in Burgenland, annexed to Austria after the First World War, and the dioceses of Innsbruck on 7 July 1964 and Feldkirch on 7 October 1968 out of North Tyrol and Vorarlberg parts of the see of Brixen. The regulation of problems of property law in the treaty of 23 June 1960 also contributed to the relaxation of tension in state-Church relations. In return for an annual adjusting payment, thereafter the religious fund was transferred, up to 90 percent, to the possession of the state. As early as 1945 the bishops had spoken out for the maintenance of the system of church contributions. Likewise in the treaty of 9 July 1962 a satisfactory compromise was worked out for the financing of Catholic private schools.

The ground had first to be prepared for an understanding of the coalition partners over partly highly controversial material in a gradual demolition of cultural-political oppositions. Contributing not unsubstantially to this was the fact that the last champions of anticlerical Austrian Marxism of the period between the wars had moved increasingly into the background in the course of the generation change since the mid-1950s.

Switzerland

Four linguistic communities, still partly separated from one another by transverse denominational boundaries, make Switzerland not only in territorial politics a common system of complex diversity. With five bishoprics directly subject to the Holy See, which exist side by side without any connection and without constituting an ecclesiastical province, it constitutes also a special case in church organization. From this again the Swiss Episcopal Conference developed an enclosing function for supradiocesan unity, as belongs to the episcopal communities of no other countries to the same degree.

Initial steps for a resumption of relations with the Holy See, broken off in the nineteenth century, developed during the First World War when a papal agent made a permanent stay in Switzerland with the assent of the Federal Council in order to promote the humanitarian assistance work of Benedict XV. It was then only a step to the accrediting of a nuncio in Berne in 1920. Because it was quite certain that there would be rejection from some Protestant groups, no Swiss diplomat was sent to the Vatican.

Although in their concrete coexistence the traditional denominational contrasts gradually lost their sharpness, there was not for decades a thought of eliminating from the Swiss constitution the anti-Catholic article forbidding monasteries and Jesuits. The actually liberal administration of the disputed stipulation was able to lessen its weight in practice, but it was ultimately neither in conformity with the constitution nor appropriate to remove the thorn of the legal inequality. A turn was first produced by the revision of the constitution on the basis of the popular vote of 20 May 1973. Of course, on reflection it is correct that only 55 percent of those voting were in favor of the removal, and no less than 44 percent for the retaining, of the undemocratic burden. To this extent the event was instructive for the severity with which a part of the Protestant Swiss themselves clung to deeply rooted denominational prejudices against the advice of their political and ecclesiastical leadership.

Politically, the greatest number of Swiss Catholics feel themselves bound to the Christian Democratic People's party, which was founded in 1912 as the Swiss Conservative People's party. In the parliamentary elections of 1975 it obtained 21 percent of the votes cast, because of which, beside the Social Democrats with ca. 25 percent and the Liberals with more than 22 percent, it ranks as an almost equally strong political force.[53]

The Situation in the German-Speaking Area after the Second Vatican Council

After the close of the Second Vatican Council the Catholic Church in the German-speaking area was confronted to a considerable degree with equally constituted developments and problems. Since the programmatic conciliar decrees coincided with a worldwide "culture revolution," their realization, beginning after 1965, was only partially identical with the intentions of the council fathers. As a consequence one must distinguish between what is expressed in the conciliar decrees and what came from them under the diverting influence of catalysts outside the Church. In the wake of partly radical movements of emancipation, which blindly identified the change with progress and despised objective justifications, the content of the decrees issued became secondary and had to yield to the appeal to an imaginary "spirit of the council." Wherever it was called up, those inspired by it understood it mostly as sanction for any sort of change. In place of a quiet, organic, and well planned translation of the conciliar ideas into the reality of the Church stepped the capricious impetus of the revolutionary spirit of the age; in place of a reliable organization, arbitrary experiment. More than other areas of church life, the liturgy was affected by this. That the annoying high-handedness of priests remained uncorrected, unauthorized special developments were at first accepted and then even made into norms, was no way to strengthen the irresolute leadership authority. The territorial episcopates displayed more continuity and decisiveness in the defense of basic ethical values, as, for example, in confrontations concerning the freedom from punishment of abortion, in connection with which their calls for protest demonstrations in the Federal Republic and the impetus to a collecting of signatures in Austria produced a noteworthy echo.

---

[53] On the present situation cf. R. Weibel-Spirig, "Katholizismus in der Schweiz," *HK* 30(1976), 211–17.

On the other hand, through the freeing of theological investigation from worn-out and discredited control mechanisms a situation was created which exposed the average believer to unaccustomed burdens. That a powerfully pursued questioning did not spare even the essential ingredient of the Catholic faith but raised it pluralistically to the same level as peripheral concerns made the question of what is characteristically Catholic ever more unanswerable. In view of the confusing talk of the theologians and the extraordinary reserve of the *magisterium,* insecurity and confusion spread among the faithful. So long as the lower point of intervention remained concealed from the simple believer, doubts oppressed him as to whether he should interpret the reserve of those responsible as justifiable tolerance or opportunistic permissiveness. To await calmly the resolution of theological differences of opinion became problematic for the holders of the teaching office not least because the mass media, interested in controversies within the Church because of their sensational value and essential imponderableness, as self-appointed advocates taking the part of the "weaker" as determined by them, carried into the last village what should have matured only in the private discussions of experts.

After the superabundantly distributed advance laurels for the post-conciliar epoch, the disillusionment over the actual course of the development was inevitable. However, it explained only to a small degree why the union between the mass of the faithful and the institutional Church was so strikingly loosened. Even when the turning away did not go to a formal break, although the departures from the Church grew to an alarming degree, where faith activity is statistically capable of being determined, incontrovertible data indicate loss of authority and disappearance of trust. In the falling curve of regular Mass attendance and reception of the sacraments, especially in baptisms and weddings, can be read how the most deeply non-Catholic concept of the dispensability of the Church's ministry of salvation draws ever wider circles. An impetus to such ideas of relativeness was first given by the ecumenically conceived evaluation of the other Christian denominations, still more of course the crude propagating of a churchless "anonymous Christianity," by which the meaning of being a Catholic becomes entirely questionable to the average believer.

Even the liturgical reform, introduced with high expectations, made the churches not fuller but more empty. The universally accepted prelude, the permitting of the vernacular, was followed by a period of uncontrolled experimentation, which stood under the auspices of a subjectivism completely foreign to the Catholic notion of worship. The new Mass formularies, meanwhile definitively prescribed, have tried to check this, it is true, but in no sense to stop it. Thus in the place of a form of Mass of monolithic compactness there appeared a variable schema, whose subjectively filled vacuum continues to keep even the faithful who love the Church away from Sunday Mass. There was no lack of voices to oppose to the allegedly outdated concept of the Church of the people the new ecclesiological pattern of a "congregational church," which wanted to be, no longer for all, but only for the "decided." From such a viewpoint the distancing movement no longer appears as a weakening of the Church's wholeness but as a process of selection, which it aims to foster.

The priest's idea of his office and self-awareness were hardest hit by the general crisis of the Church. This was expressed externally in an abrupt numerical decline, so that ever fewer parochial offices could be filled by a priest, an emergency which will nevertheless be worked out completely only in the future. This overturning of the age pyramid was caused by a drop in the number of recruits and by the turning of many active priests to other professions.

Offshoots of antiauthoritarian and antiinstitutional currents produced in some dioceses loose unions of priests of the middle and younger generations, which understood themselves as a critical pendant to the bishop's authority. Although there was no lack of journalistic support and echo to the various priests' solidarity groups during the foundation period, 1969–70, these disappeared again a little later from public discussion. That they were formed at all was an indication of the limiting of the episcopal freedom of decision.

The Church's official authority can withstand attacks from within and without as long as it is based on firm principles and does not wreck itself by inner contradiction. Faith in the conformity of principle of episcopal activity has now been shattered precisely in those groups of the people who hitherto have stood, not against, but for the maintenance of the bishop's authority. Their criticism was let loose by the differing use of the executive power through the prohibition of celebrating Mass in the Tridentine Rite. This stands in striking contrast to the indulgence with which the bishops for years overlooked liturgical aberrations and arbitrariness. The passive leaving alone in the one and the resolute postponement in the other case have inevitably aroused suspicion that not primarily objective requirements but the measure of anticipated readiness to obey could determine the decisions of the pastoral office. If the use of the episcopal authority should only too often be guided by pragmatic considerations, which lie in the attempt to deal liberally with the progressives and authoritatively with the conservatives, or, to say it pointedly, to meet the one as powerless Church of love, the other as loveless Church of power, then the outcome could only be a growing alienation.

After some preliminary deliberations and fumbling efforts to bring the impulses of the council into a practicable program on the parish level in diocesan synods at Hildesheim and Vienna, the trend toward synods on the national level established itself at the end of the 1960s. As the first, there was constituted in Würzburg at the beginning of January 1971 the Common Synod of the Dioceses of the German Federal Republic. This was followed, though with a partly differently constituted order of procedure, by the Austrian Synodal Process and the Swiss Synod '72. By way of the start to "Germanize" the council, the Würzburg meeting, with its catalogue of themes at first embracing more than fifty points, went considerably beyond the framework of the council. However, then in fact only eighteen proposals were enacted, many with impressive majorities, others, like the draft "Church and Workers," only after sharp controversy. To the Catholics of central Germany the road to Würzburg was closed by the restrictive policy of the German Democratic Republic. As in all areas of Communist domination, the Church of the German Democratic Republic is under strict state supervision and enjoys only that freedom of movement which is officially allowed it, in the German Democratic Republic since 1957 by the Office for Church Questions. Left to themselves the Central German Catholics established their own church assembly, the "Pastoral Synod of the Jurisdictions in the German Democratic Republic," which held its meetings in the Dresden court church.

Ten years after the Second Vatican Council the Church as a whole has obviously not crossed the postconciliar valley of reform in all its breadth. In what form and with what authority it will come out of this process of change only the future can show. Thus in the German-speaking area also the forerunners of a new cohesion and stability, without which a regaining of lost terrain is unthinkable, are not yet in sight.

CHAPTER 19

*The Church in the Benelux Countries**

Belgium

After the war of 1914–18, in which the patriotic bearing of Cardinal Mercier increased its reputation, the Church of Belgium found itself facing a new reality. The introduction of the general right to vote ended the dominance of the Catholic Party that had been in power since 1884. In order to maintain the religious influence on the still Christian parts of the population and to restore it in the areas where it had been lost, the bishops, under the sure leadership of Cardinal Van Roey (1925–61), exerted themselves to increase those institutions and organizations whose legal status the law of 1921 on nonprofit associations had finally regulated. Further, the bishops worked for the political unity of the Catholics, which seemed to be very necessary in order to defend these organizations and to promote a specific notion of society.

The Catholic educational system expanded further and was progressively organized until the founding in 1957 of the National Secretariat for Catholic Education. Thanks to the reconciliation of the parties, the law of 1914 on subsidies was applied after the war to elementary schools. From 1921 to 1969 the proportion of pupils who attended Catholic schools grew from ca. 46 to 51 percent. The long neglected professional training now became the preferred object of the clergy. The financial problems of the Catholic school system, already long present, led from 1950 to 1958 to a new school conflict. This was settled by a "school treaty," which the three great parties signed and the parliament ratified in 1959. In the same manner the state little by little assumed almost all the costs of university education. Except for the university area, religious instruction was imparted to a growing degree in almost all educational systems publicly operated.

---

* Belgium and Luxemburg: Andre Tihon; The Netherlands: Johannes Bots, S.J.

The social organizations took root powerfully. The Christian unions which in 1925 included only one-fourth of the membership of socialist unions, outstripped these in the 1950s and displayed a growing pugnacity. The professional groups were rich and numerous and variously organized. The assurances of reciprocity and the institutions of the health system and of the social sphere constituted a dense and ever more active network.

Among the apostolic works, Catholic Action experienced an upsurge especially among the youth. The *Action catholique de la jeunesse belge* was in principle intended for all groups, but the *Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne* (JOC), established by Abbé Cardijn right after the war, finally brought it about that it was accepted as a specialized movement of Catholic Action. Its dynamism had as a consequence the transformation of the general Catholic Action into specialized movements, which at a given moment were aimed at students, middle class, and farmers. From 1926 on the influence of the JOC moved beyond Belgium and finally reached the other continents. Alongside the traditional youth groups a Catholic branch of the Boy Scouts was also formed.

In order to take account of and accomodate the growth of the population from 7,423,784 inhabitants in 1910 to 9,650,944 by 1970—30 percent—the rhythm of which of course slowed down, the bishops created new parishes, especially in the developed areas of high population density and in the thickly inhabited regions. This permitted the retaining of the average number of 2,126 to 2,374 inhabitants per parish from 1919 to 1972, which had increased between 1850 and 1910 from 1,444 to 2,126. The number of dioceses grew, through the founding of the sees of Antwerp in 1961 and Hasselt in 1967, from six to eight.

This extraordinary growth of the ecclesiastical administrative organization was compensated by the fact that the diocesan clergy grew relatively faster up to 1960 than the population. The number of priests rose between 1910 and 1960 from 7,857 to 10,386, but then dropped to 9,113 by 1972. Among the female religious the growth was much less: in 1910 there were 47,975, in 1947 their number reached a climax with 49,624, among whom the female religious of Belgian origin increased from 32,393 to 42,275. After a period of slow decline to 46,675 until 1960, a clear falling off can be seen: in 1972 there were only 35,331 nuns. The institutes of men experienced a greater growth, from 5,747 in 1910 to 10,056 in 1947. They stayed at this level until 1960—10,414—but then until 1972 experienced a very strong decline to 6,044.

In an effort to assure the Catholics a maximum in organizational strength, the bishops stood for the retention of a strong and united Catholic party. For the sake of this goal, of course, the tensions which threatened to split the Catholics in two had to be relaxed: on the one hand, the conflict between the various social classes, on the other hand that between the Flemish and the Walloon factions. In order to limit the first problem, in 1921 the Catholic party was transformed into a *Union catholique belge.* This included the former conservative and Walloon *Féderation de Cercles* and the *Ligue nationale des travailleurs chrétiens,* which in 1919 took the place of the *Ligue démocratique,* then the *Boerenbond,* which represented the agricultural interest, and finally the *Féderation des classes moyennes,* founded in 1919. In order to preserve unity, the episcopate in 1935, but especially from 1937 on, condemned "Rexism," a movement with a Fascist tendency founded by L. Degrelle. Vis-à-vis the Flemish movements, the bishops sought to moderate their exertions and to fight the nationalist parties. The effort was made to bring the Catholic forces together again with the aid of the Congress of Mechelen in 1936 and in 1937 to reform the party by creating a Catholic bloc, which embraced a Flemish and a Walloon wing.

After the Second World War, in which the episcopate played a very much more cautious role than in 1914–18, the attempt to overcome the split between Catholics and anticlericals by means of a *Union démocratique belge* soon collapsed. During the following decades the *Parti social chrétien,* which tended a little farther to the left than the former Catholic party and was easily de-confessionalized, gathered, especially in Flanders, the greatest part of the faithful around it. This party maintained its role as support for the Catholic organizations and especially for the Catholic instructional system. But as soon as the school treaty had been concluded, the linguistic tensions split the Catholics more and more and finally led to the separation of Louvain from the francophone university in 1966–68. Thereafter the party experienced a considerable decline in favor of the regional parties.

Attendance at Sunday Mass remained during the entire period on a low level: in 1950 ca. 50 percent of the population to whom the command applied were present at Sunday Mass. In 1964 the proportion had dropped to 45 percent, and from then on it went down quickly: in 1972 it was only 34 percent. A difference between particular regions is clearly discernible: Flanders with 48 percent, the Walloon areas with 31 percent—in regard to which, of course, there are enormous differences between the industrial areas and the Ardennes—and Brussels with 23 percent in 1967. In contrast to this, people maintained the essential practices, such as baptism, church weddings and ecclesiastical burial. In 1972 there were still 90 percent of baptisms, 82 percent of weddings, and 84 percent of church burials. Even in regions like Seraing and perhaps also Charleroi, which ca. 1900 were strongly influenced by anticlericalism, these religious practices again increased in the period 1914–20. In the period between the two world wars, Antoinism, a religious movement of adherents of a miracle-healing sect, whose founder died in 1906, acquired a certain expansion in specific regions with a Walloon population. Some even turned to Protestantism.

But these internal difficulties could not impair very powerful missionary efforts. These included the activity of Father Lebbe, the initiatives of Father Charles for teaching the faith, and the founding of societies for promoting new forms of missionary presence, for which, for example, the AUCAM (1925) and the AFI (1937) were of special significance. The number of missionaries, monks and nuns, rose from 4,759 in 1940 to 10,070 in 1960. In the same way concern was manifested for the Universal Church by the founding of the college for Latin America in 1954. In a country in which the non-Catholic minorities have little importance, the ecumenical movement developed on a higher level. This is attested by the Malines Conversations with the Anglicans from 1921 to 1925 and the foundation in 1926 of the Priory of Amay by Dom Lambert Beauduin, which is dedicated to the work for reunion and in 1939 was transferred to Chevetogne.

In internal life several movements among a minority led to a deepening of faith. These were, as early as the period between the two World Wars, but especially after 1945, the liturgical movement and the biblical renewal movement, stimulated by the group of the Louvain teacher, L. Cerfaux, also the "Residential District Groups," and finally apostolic works like the Legion of Mary. Furthermore, a foreign office for the pastoral care of immigrant workers was organized.

Side by side with the pastoral activity, the Catholic University of Louvain constituted an important center of Christian self-realization: some of its professors played an important role at the Second Vatican Council. Soon the new currents stirred in the conciliar atmosphere caused confusion which, however, operated less spectacularly and less toward renewal than in the Netherlands.

Luxemburg

The Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, occupied by Germany from 1914 to 1918, had to turn to Belgium after the war. After the abdication of

Marie Adélaïde, whom Grand Duchess Charlotte succeeded, and after the introduction of the universal right to vote in 1919, the Catholic party founded in 1914 came to power; it was able to keep in first place up to the present. In this party, the clergy played a powerful role. With the appointment of Monsignor Nommesch to the episcopal see in 1920, this political change made possible the reintroduction of religious instruction in the state elementary schools.

In contrast to the other Benelux countries, the Church has almost no schools of its own. On the other hand, the Church dominates the most important daily paper in the country, and pastoral care can rely firmly on the traditions of a region which up to ca. 1950 preserved a rural mentality, although heavy industry had settled in the country even before 1914. Religious practice remained in a good state: in 1957 at Clerfaux 99 percent made their Easter Communion; of course, this number declined in Luxemburg to 55 percent or in an industrial deanery such as Esch-sur-Alzette to 51 percent.

The Netherlands

PERIOD OF FLOWERING (1919–60)

The development of the Catholic Church in the Netherlands after the First World War ran in broad outline parallel to that in other European countries: thus, as elsewhere, the Dutch Catholics—ca. 30 percent in 1850, then increasing to ca. 40 percent by 1950—came to the conviction that their faith would be jeopardized in living together with those thinking otherwise. The ideology whereby the others preserved their cultural, social, and political interests was to such a degree anti-Christian among liberals and socialists and anti-Catholic among Protestants that the Catholics saw themselves forced to subordinate a series of life spheres, even those not of a strictly religious nature, to their own management.[1] As regards the construction of entirely defined denominational associations for a community life and for cooperation, the Dutch Catholics went much farther than the Catholics in any other country. In this regard they also went much farther than the other ideologically marked groupings in their own country, namely the Protestants (ca. 40 percent) the socialists, and the liberals, the so-called "pillars," who likewise had their own "pillar" organizations. There thus arose the absolutely singular situation that the Dutch Catholics, although they lived together in a modern pluralist society with Protestants, humanists, socialists, and so forth, nevertheless associated almost exclusively with other Catholics.[2] In turn there were organized on a Catholic basis: the charitable institutions, the care of the sick and of the emotionally disturbed, the press—the supraregional dailies *De Tijd* and *De Maasbode*, both founded ca. 1850—the educational system—from kindergartens to the Roman Catholic University of Nijmegen, founded in 1923, and the Catholic School of Economics in Tilburg, founded in 1927—politics—Roman Catholic political party of 1898, since 1946 Catholic Popular Party (KVP)—social life in corporate organizations for the religious and moral interests of employees and economic life through unions, which more and more served economic interests—1903, later under the name Dutch Catholic Union Alliance (NKV). And finally the entire field of entertainment—sports associations, and so forth. In 1926 a special Catholic broadcasting system, KRO, was founded.

---

[1] J. Bots, "Aggiornamento," *Grote Spectrum Encyclopedie* (1975), 210–12.

This self-sufficient system, whereby the Catholics took secular activities into their own hands, developed further to about 1960. In this regard the Second World War was not much more than an interlude. The Catholics of the Netherlands remained at this time in a patient and unprovoking, consistently unselfish manner imperturbable under the courageous leadership of the archbishop of Utrecht, Monsignor Johannes de Jong, a cardinal in 1946. Many, even non-Catholics, saw in him a sort of personification of the spiritual resistance against National Socialism. In regard to the German occupation the bishops had recourse to the scorched-earth policy: as soon as the Germans extended their hand for one of the Catholic organizations, they gave the officers and members instructions to withdraw from all offices and to renounce their membership.[3] The fact that the bishops were ready to destroy the monuments of the emancipation with their own hand is a proof of the deepest religious justification of the Catholic commitment in these secular fields. At the moment when the Catholic faith saw no more possibility of continuing to work in them, in their opinion these institutions had no more meaning. After the war the bishops passed a resolution to reestablish the earlier social and cultural organizations on a Catholic basis. Decisive for this was the pastoral argument: together with the great majority of Catholics they believed it was no longer possible to be responsible for withholding from the faithful the molding strength of their institutions, in any event not at this time in the moral disorder at the end of the war.

Around 1953 the Netherlands had overcome the consequences of the war and the loss of the colonies. In 1953 the Dutch Catholics celebrated in complete unity the centenary of the restoration of the hierarchy. Considered from without, it seemed that only a little changed in the situation of the Church in the Netherlands to 1960. External activity was astounding in all areas. The organization of the ecclesiastical province was further improved. Bishoprics were erected at Rotterdam and Groningen in 1955. Thereby the number of dioceses increased from five to seven. Catholic secondary schools were spread over the country: eight out of ten Catholics of higher schools attended a Catholic secondary school. In contrast to almost all other countries, Catholic parents needed to make no financial sacrifice for this, for the entire denominational school system was 100 percent supported by the state. Catholics had leading positions in all areas of Catholic life. As the largest party—ca. 30 percent—in the government they were firm partners in the coalition with socialists or with Protestants and liberals. Ninety percent of the Catholic electorate voted for the KVP, 79 percent were subscribers to a Catholic daily, 90 percent were subscribers to the KRO.[4]

---

[2] A. Lijphart, *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands* (Berkeley 1968).

[3] L. J. Rogier, *In vrijheid herboren* (The Hague 1953), 741.

Also in the social and socioecclesiastical respect, Dutch Catholicism had special results: the workers did not leave the Church en masse. On the contrary: together with the middle class they formed precisely the supporting force of the Dutch believing community. From the social idealism of Catholics—H. Poels, 1868–1948; A. Ariens, 1860–1928—proceeded a transforming and adjusting strength to the whole Dutch society; it induced Pope Pius XI in 1931 on the occasion of an audience for a delegation of Dutch Catholic workers at Rome to declare that "there is no country in the world in which the doctrine of *Rerum novarum* is so well understood and is realized in fact."[5] In this respect the Netherlands stood alone at the top.[6]

The spiritual and ecclesiastical life in the stricter sense flowered here with "tropical" vitality. While in the century between 1855 and 1952 the number of Catholics trebled, the number of priests had become six times as large: from 624 to 3,695 per decade.[7] In 1967 there were in the Netherlands ca. 13,500 priests (4,000 diocesan priests in 7 dioceses and 9,400 religious priests in 34 orders and congregations), ca. 7,000 brothers and almost 32,000 sisters in 111 orders and congregations (89 active and 22 contemplative).[8] This means that for every 100 Dutch Catholics there was one priest, brother, or sister—in France .45; Belgium, .79; Spain, .42; England, .69; Germany, East and West, .47; Switzerland, .77; Austria, .39.[9]

---

[4] J. M. G. Thurlings, *De wankele zuil. Nederlandse katholieken tussen assimilatie en pluralisme* (Nijmegen 1971), 127.

[5] P. H. Winkelman, "Nederland," *150 jaar katholieke arbeidersbeweging in West-Europa 1789–1939* (Hilversum 1961), 350.

[6] J. B. Sloot, "Van kerkelijk spreken naar sprekende kerk. Een sociologische analyse van de officiële verklaringen van het Nederlands episcopaat 1945–1974" (ms., Nijmegen 1974), 79.

[7] J. J. Dellepoort, *De priesterroepingen in Nederland* (The Hague 1955), 51.

The expansion of its evangelizing activity was always the most eloquent sign of the vitality of Dutch Catholicism. In this regard the Netherlands was favored by the consequences of the anti-clerical developments in Germany and France. Many missionary congregations fled to the Netherlands. While the Dutch Catholics did not even constitute 2 percent of the total of Catholics in the world, in 1939 they accounted for 11 percent of all priest missionaries. In 1954 7,000 missionaries—priests, brothers, sisters—were active in the overseas missions, that is, one missionary for 600 Dutch Catholics—1 for 1,500 Belgians, 1 for 2,600 French, 1 for 1,200 Italians and Spaniards.[10]

DISINTEGRATION (1960–70)

The 1960s were marked by a sudden increase of prosperity. The Netherlands moved into the circle of the ten richest countries in the world. The coalition cabinets of the postwar period, of Catholics with partners of the left and right, let this wealth benefit the weaker members of society with the aid of a broadly constructed system of social legislation. In 1967 expenses for social welfare amounted to 26.3 percent of the gross national product as contrasted with 22.1 percent in West Germany and 19.4 percent in Belgium.

More than other ideological groups, the Catholics profited from this increase in prosperity. Their persistent struggle for emanicipation began to bear its choicest fruits at this time. Within the circle of Catholics the academically educated especially benefited from the good times. And precisely this group of people began to become very numerous in the 1960s.[11] Young university-trained Catholics from the middle class rose in great numbers with their functions of leadership into the so-called upper middle-class. As often happens with the nouveaux riches, their rise went parallel with an assimilation to the hierarchy of values of this upper middle-class on the one hand and a loss of the feeling of union with the class and traditions in which they had grown up on the other hand. This social breakthrough acquired in them an ideological stamp and a corresponding justification in the so-called "breakthrough idea," which had already gained ground since the war, especially in the effort "to break out" of the special closed Catholic organizations to collaboration with others in neutral, supradenominational organizations. This breakthrough idea was at first restricted to a pretty small circle, but in the course of the postwar years exercised a growing power of attraction on the Catholics who were in process of emancipation, especially on the intellectuals, for whom this period was especially favorable in the social and economic respect. When the bishops determined that the process of alienation from the Church (between 1930 and 1947 an average of 10,000 Catholics annually left the Church) always won influence on those Catholics who did not belong to the "pillar" organizations, which acted as replacement for the traditional integrating factors that were becoming looser—village, neighborhood, family—in a pastoral letter of 1 May 1954 they came out against the breakthrough idea. In it they pleaded for "unity in an association of their own and from there for cooperation with others while reserving their independence" (no. 15). True, the Dutch Catholics received this pastoral letter[12]—with threats of ecclesiastical penalties for listening to the socialist radio, VARA, and for reading socialist writings—in general without special comment; resistance was confined to a small group of intellectuals. In the 1960s these last obtained support from a large group of young academicians, priests, and laity, who together formed the advance guard of the Dutch movement of renewal.

---

[8] *Katholiek sociaal kerkelijk instituut, Broeders- en zusters-religieuzen in Nederland per 1.1.1967* (The Hague 1967), 19.

[9] W. Kusters, "Situatieschets van het Nederlands katholicisme 1968. Crisis en riskerend vertrouwen," *Riskante kerk, vijf jaar Pastoraal Instituut van de Nederlandse Kerkprovincie* (The Hague 1968), 148.

[10] F. van Heek, *Het geboorteniveau der Nederlandse Rooms-Katholieken* (Leiden 1954), 170.

[11] J. M. G. Thurlings, op. cit., 31.

Sociological investigations confirm that in the hierarchy of values of these nouveaux riches the free development of the personality and the "being able to be oneself" stood in high esteem. Authenticity, freedom, majority, pluralism, openness, rationality were the ideals favored by them. These obviously positive values were burdened with ideology by them so that they were appropriated with a certain exclusiveness, which the nouveaux rich cultivated. There was an allergic reaction to complementary values, such as the meaning of sacrifice and renunciation, rights of the community and the validity of authority, the transcendence of God, which were expressed, among other ways, in the creeds which were beyond reason, in mystic symbols and rites.[13]

Of course, this hierarchy of values, accepted in all welfare states by the so-called social center and with the help of instruction, of the mass media, and of the entertainment industry, which were dominated by the new intellectual elite, was forced on the other classes.[14] What was special, however, in the Dutch situation was that this new class knew how to force its power to a greater degree than elsewhere also on the average people of the Church. It could impose its image of people on all "ordinary" believers and on ecclesiastical developments. In its exercise of power the new elite obtained support from the same factors which originally constituted the power of the Dutch communities of believers: the strong and varied organizations and the high density of communication, now entirely especially strengthened by television with its power of suggestion and its leveling presentation.[15] As on the occasion of a dam bursting, through these channels a constant stream of criticism and doubts poured over the Dutch Catholics, who were much less prepared for it than the faithful elsewhere. This intensive, never diminished publicity set a process of fermentation in motion which made clear the magnitude and breadth of the Dutch movement of renewal. Mass expressions of it were, among others, the "Teilhard mode," the "Robinson mania" (40,000 copies of *Honest to God* were bought in four months), the unrest over the *New Catechism* (a half-million copies), the 15,000 dialogue groups after the council, the sudden, almost complete end of auricular confession, and the massive drop in the number of priests, brothers, and sisters. On the one hand there began in 1965 a massive departure of priests and religious: 1,732 priests (549 diocesan and 1,183 religious between 1965 and 1975, almost three times as many as the world average)[16] and between 1961 and 1970 4,300 lay religious (1,600 brothers and 2,700 sisters with perpetual vows).[17] On the other hand, the number of priestly ordinations dropped from 318 in 1960 (91 diocesan and 227 religious priests) to 20 in 1976 (4 diocesan and 16 religious priests). In neighboring countries, such as Germany and Belgium, the number of ordinations dropped to 50 and 40 percent respectively, in the Netherlands to less than 10 percent. And the faithful also remained apart from the Church in large numbers: attendance at Sunday Mass dropped from 70.75 percent in 1961 to 34 percent in 1976. The number of mixed marriages almost doubled between 1955 and 1972.[18]

---

[12] Ibid., 121.

[13] O. Schreuder, "Die deprivierte Mitte," W. Weymann-Weyhe, *Die offene Kirche* (Düsseldorf 1974), 234–64.

---

[14] H. Schelsky, *Die Arbeit tun die anderen. Klassenkampf und Priesterherrschaft der Intellektuellen,* 2d ed. (Opladen 1975).

[15] W. Kusters, op. cit., 164.

[16] L. J. Rogier, P. Brachim, *Histoire du catholicisme hollandais depuis le XVIe siècle* (Paris 1974), 227.

[17] Jan Roes, *R. K. Nederland 1958–1973* (Nijmegen 1974), 26.

[18] *Kaski over gemengde huwelijken in Nederland* (March 1974).

In the transition from one phase to the other it seemed as though the Dutch Catholics had found support in Monsignor W. Bekkers, bishop of the largest Dutch diocese, Den Bosch (1960–66), and a famed television speaker. A few months after Bekkers's sudden death in May 1966 appeared *The New Catechism: Proclamation of the Faith for Adults,* a book with many merits but also with weaknesses of Dutch welfare Catholicism. These weaknesses were in connection with the one-sided incarnational theology, which focused on the downward-moving love of God for humans in Jesus Christ but less on the upward movement of the person to God in Jesus's sacrificial death and in the self-sacrifice of the person, in fact the latter was considered almost as a contradiction of the former.[19] Corrections from Rome in 1968 in regard to original sin, the virginal birth, the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, and so forth were not accepted by the authors. Then the bishops let these corrections be published only in a special brochure.

Most extensive were the changes in connection with the education of priests. Within a few years all fifty minor seminaries had disappeared from the scene. Between 1963 and 1969 all thirty-two philosophical and thirty theological institutions were concentrated in five larger cities. Typical of the Dutch movement of renewal is the extent and compactness in this movement of concentration. The new project contained some positive points—openness, the corresponding instruments for work, selection of professors, better payment since the complete financing on the level of the university. But opposing these were negative points—the halving of the number of students—1,000 instead of 2,000—of whom only a small number sought a celibate priesthood.[20] The episcopate had no great influence on the course of events relating to these institutions.

The Dutch Pastoral Council, which held six meetings at Noordwijkerhout from 1966 to 1970, seemed to be a sort of crowning of the work of the Dutch renewal movement. As "council" it understood itself in the sense of a "Total Council of all the Faithful of the Ecclesiastical Province." But the documents so strongly breathed the spirit of the newly established upper middle-class that the council has been qualified as a typical "middle-class enterprise," whose representatives undertook to try to create a renewed Church on "its model and likeness." The references to the Second Vatican Council must be regarded as an ideologically stamped selection of the renewal needs of middle-class

---

[19] J. Ratzinger, "Theologie und Verkündigung im holländischen Katechismus," *Dogma und Verkündigung* (Munich and Freiburg i. Br. 1973), 77.

[20] *Katholiek Archief* 30(1975), 158.

Catholics.[21] The meeting interpreted the enormous fluctuation of the last years entirely positively and irreversibly.[22] The dramatic climax was the discussions on the abolition of obligatory celibacy. Despite the urging of the Pope not to treat this point, the meeting wanted by this very point to demonstrate its coming of age and freedom. The Pope made his protest clear by ordering the pronuncio, A. Felici, to stay away from the gathering. By an overwhelming majority the Council expressed itself for the so-called decoupling and for the reintroduction of married priests in the priestly ministry.

Since then the Dutch ecclesiastical province has given a clear example of the destiny which befalls a Church when it exchanges the direction of the legitimate holders of office for the power of persons who dominate opinion. Catholic faithful, who expressed the desire for the usual Catholic liturgy within the possibilities of the renewed official missal, parents who wanted to have their children given Catholic religious instruction, were characterized as "conservative," "unworldly," "intolerant," and the like, by the group which had power over the means of communication. Nowhere was the inner laceration of the Dutch believing community more visible than in the liturgy. In 1976 there was still no prospect that in the foreseeable future an official Dutch edition of the renewed missal would appear. People feared the normative impact of such an edition.

The desire for activity in the area of liturgy—734 liturgical worker groups in 1975—and the struggle against celibacy have burdened Dutch welfare Catholicism with the odium of being especially an inner church movement. "Critical communities"—ca. one hundred in 1976—had the desire to correct the onesidedness fostered by them. But by opposing the Church just as critically as they did society, they isolated themselves from the Church and furthered the process of disintegration, as Cardinal Alfrink said.[23]

In summary it can be said that, in comparison to the other ecclesiastical provinces, the crisis in the Netherlands began earlier and that the spirit of the enlightened bourgeoisie institutionalized itself in new church structures, so that at first glance it is not to be expected that a movement more directed to the Universal Church could quickly make its influence prevail on minds. Unless, of course, Rome would let the suppressed voices of the "ordinary" Catholics have more support, as happened in the naming of Monsignor Doctor A. Simonis as bishop of Rotterdam on 30 December 1970.

---

[21] O. Schreuder, op. cit., 254.

[22] M. Schmaus, L. Scheffczyk, J. Giers, *Exempel Holland. Theologische Analyse und Kritik des niederländischen Pastoralkonzils,* 2d ed. (Berlin), 49.

[23] "Kardinaal Alfrink in Kruispunt KRO-radio op 13.1.1974." *Analecta aartsbisdom Utrecht,* Feb. 1974, 136.

The cadres of the dioceses—deaneries, administrative groups, councils, theology professors, and so forth—staged in newspapers, radio, and television a week-long campaign against this papal appointment.[24] From this it became obvious how Dutch Catholicism was dominated by a small group of powerful persons, who exercised their domination through the mass media; the majority of the people of the diocese expressed themselves for the bishop.[25]

At the naming of the bishop of Roermond, Doctor J. M. Gijsen, in February 1972 the same scene was repeated: protests in the press, on radio, and on television on the part of the cadres, agreement with this new bishop on the part of the great majority of his flock, who, however, could not assert themselves in the general communications happening.[26] Throughout the entire country there appeared a growing movement of opposition, the "Open Church." A sociological analysis[27] of this movement proves that the leaders and members belong to those categories which in our Western society exercise "a new priestly domination": the intellectuals and half-intellectuals from the "Third Sector" of the Relief State.[28] Its considerable influence is the mightiest factor for the explanation of the crisis in the postconciliar Church in many Western countries. What is special about the Dutch church province seems to be only that this stratum has a firm grip on all key positions within the Church.

---

[24] *Archief der kerken,* 26 (1971), nos. 6–7.

[25] T. Steltenpool, *Orthodoxie verboden?* (n.d.), 26.

[26] "Opinie-onderzoek in verband met de benoeming van de bisschop van Roermond, t.b.v. Redaktie 'Kenmerk' door Intomart," *Noordse Bosje* 15(Hilversum).

[27] O. Schreuder, op. cit., 250f.

[28] H. Schelsky, op. cit., passim.

CHAPTER 20

*Catholicism in Italy**

In 1914 one could hardly speak of an Italian Church as of a homogeneous structure. The differences among the various regions were very great, and because there was no episcopal conference coordination was absent. The 279 dioceses were, also through the weight of tradition, not arranged in a rational way. Besides very large dioceses, such as Milan and Novara, there were, especially in the south, many very small dioceses. In 1885 there were 76, 381 diocesan priests in the service of 20,707 parishes, while the number of seminaries amounted to 11,569. In 1911 there were 67,147 diocesan priests; the number of religious priests in that year amounted to 6,644, that of nuns to 38,609.[1]

---

* Luigi Mezzardi

The education of the clergy was in general defective, and for this there were chiefly two reasons: the consequences of the Modernist crisis and the backwardness of the greatest part of the seminaries, to which a productive dialogue with secular culture was foreign. After the dissolution of the theological faculties at the state universities in 1872, academic degrees were earned either in the local faculties or at the Roman universities with mainly foreign teaching personnel and hence at a great distance from the problems of Italian reality. For its part the anti-Modernist repression had removed qualified professors from the seminaries and at that time deprived the students of outstanding texts, as, for example, the church history books of F. X. Funk and F. X. Kraus and the patrology of G. Rauschen.[2]

The fact that the clergy came predominantly from the country had, however, permitted the priests to keep in contact with social reality. While the students to some degree held themselves aloof, the tradition of the pastors close to the people proved to be very fruitful. For this, especially in the north, the parishes were the place where one could encounter the Christian experience: it was the place of religious instruction, of social and charitable education, and also of political orientation. In the south, on the other hand, the clergy was faced with a situation in which the emotional elements and the weight of folklore were much greater.[3]

---

[1] G. Bertolotti, *Statistica ecclesiastica d'Italia* (Savona 1885); also, *Sommario di statistiche storiche d'Italia 1865–1965; Annuario statistico italiano;* L. Cavalli, *Sociologia della storia italiana* (Bologna 1974); S. S. Acquaviva, *L'eclissi del sacro nella civiltà industriale* (Milan 1967); S. S. Acquaviva, G. Guizzardi, *Religione e irreligione nell'età postindustriale* (Rome 1971); for the Protestants: F. Manzotti, "I Valdesi a Guastalla e nella bassa padana," *Nuova rivista storica* 41 (1957), 418–55; A. Moscato, M. N. Pierini, *Rivolta religiosa nelle campagne* (Rome 1965); G. Spini, "Movimenti evangelici nell'Italia contemporanea," *Rivista Storica Italiana* 80 (1968), 463–98; F. Barra, "Millenarismo predicazione evangelica ed agitazioni contadine in Irpina dall'età giolittiana al fascismo," *Ricerche di storia sociale e religiosa* 3 (1974), 161–88.

[2] M. Guasco, *Fermenti nei seminari del primo' 900* (Bologna 1971); idem, "L'organizzazione delle scuole e dei seminari tra Leone XIII e Pio X," in the collection *Modernismo, fascismo e communismo,* a cura di G. Rossini (Bologna 1972), 192–204. Characteristic is the Lanzoni case: L. Bedeschi, *Lineamenti dell'antimodernismo. Il caso Lanzoni* (Parma 1970).

[3] Useful: AA. VV., *Chiesa e religiosità dopo l'unità,* 4 vols. (Milan 1973); AA. VV., *Chiesa e spiritualità dell'ottocento italiano* (Padua 1970); M. Mariotti, *Forme di collabora-*

The religious life had a visible upsurge, and appeared especially in the sphere of charity with Don Orione, of aid for immigrants with Scalabrini and Cabrini, and of the press with Don Alberione. Eleven orders of men were founded after 1900, among them the Consolata Missionary Fathers in 1901, the Sons of Divine Providence in 1903, and the Paolini in 1914. The number of orders of women founded after 1900 amounted to 120, of which fifty-four were in the north, twenty-six in the center, and forty in the south and on the islands. Typical are the multiple foundations: Don Giuseppe Alberione (d. 1971) founded the nine communities of the Paolini family, and Don Luigi Orione (d. 1940) four communities. Within this impetus in the religious life, the flowering of the missionary system is especially interesting. In the wake of Daniele Comboni (d. 1881) and Angelo Ramazzotti (d. 1861), the founders of the Comboniani and of the Pontifical Institute for Foreign Missions (PIME), Giuseppe Allamano (d. 1926) and Guido Maria Conforti (d. 1931) not only founded the institutes of the Consolata and the Xaverians, but they contributed also to the awakening of a mission awareness among people and clergy, especially through the work of Father Paolo Manna (d. 1952).

In 1911 Italy had 35,845,000 inhabitants—in 1872 there were 27,303,000. Over 37 percent of this population was still illiterate—in 1871 illiterates had constituted 70 percent of the total. Catholics made up 95.1 percent of the population, Protestants .36 percent. At that time there were 874,523 persons—2.5 percent—who declared they belonged to no religion, while 653,404 did not answer this question. The areas with the strongest religious indifference were at Leghorn (18.4 percent) and Reggio Emilia (14.1 percent). Emilia-Romagna was the region with the highest percentage of those leaving the Church (9.63 percent). But this phenomenon of de-Christianization was not restricted to the upper social classes; it appeared also in the strata of the simple folk, as, for example, in Emilia and Tuscany. In the country social distress favored the external retention of religion. Anticlericalism[4] and religious igno-

---

zione tra vescovi e laici in Calabria negli ultimi cento anni (Padua 1969); A. Gambasin, *Gerarchia e laicato in Italia nel secondo ottocento* (Padua 1969); C. Bellò, *Società ed evangelizzazione nell'Italia contemporanea. Linee di una storia e di una pastorale* (Brescia 1974).

[4] On anticlericalism in the *Risorgimento,* see S. Jacini, "La tradizione anticlericale del Risorgimento italiano," *Studium* 32 (1936), 348–56, 406–16; G. Pepe, M. Themelly, *L'anticlericalismo nel Risorgimento* (Manduria 1966); G. Verucci, "Anticlericalismo, libero pensiero e ateismo nel movimento operaio e socialista italiano (1861–1878)," in AA. VV., *Chiesa e religiosità dopo l'unità* II (Milan 1973), 176–224; P. Scoppola, "Laicismo e anticlericalismo," ibid., 225–74. G. Spadolini, *Per una storia dell'anticlericalismo: I repubbulicani dopo l'unità* (Florence 1963); M. Sylvers,

rance were very widespread. Also, the theological instruction of the laity was inadequate because of the powerful overemphasis on the Roman Question, which directed the best energies predominantly to the political and social sphere. Important figures of this period were: Bartolo Longo (d. 1926), promoter of the pilgrimage to Pompeii, the Blessed Giuseppe Moscati (d. 1927), the sociologist Giuseppe Toniolo (d. 1918), Pier Giorgio Frascati (d. 1925), Giulio Salvadori (d. 1928), and Vico Necchi (d. 1930). There was not, however, the typical French phenomenon of a return of the intellectuals to the faith.

The First World War affected Italian Catholicism in a phase of transition after the dissolution of the *Opera dei Congressi* (1904), which the anti-Modernist repression followed with the encyclical *Pascendi* of 1907. In the social sphere Pius X in July 1904 had dissolved the *Opera dei Congressi,* that organization of intransigence, which for thirty years had coordinated in its five sections almost all Catholic societies of the peninsula and had served as polemical mouthpiece for the protest of the Pope against the Italian government because of its "guilt" in the occupation of the Papal State and in an antiecclesiastical legislation which displayed little feeling of social needs.[5] As soon as it had become clear that the opposition between the Old Guard represented by Ettore Paganuzzi and the new generation embodied by Romolo Murri was unbridgeable and that the democratically minded young people were at the helm, the Pope, by means of the letter of Cardinal Merry del Val, had declared the great central organization, whose president had been named by the Pope, to be dissolved and replaced it by three unions, one for the people, one for the economic-social area, and one for the electoral campaigns, which were now directly subject to the bishops. With this drastic measure, which Monsignore Radini Tedeschi regarded as a catastrophe, the Holy See was pursuing several purposes. It especially disapproved of Murri and his democracy of a Christian stamp, which was based on the autonomy of Catholics in the political sphere. Further, there was an accommodation to the efforts of individual church dignitaries, who wanted to exercise a decisive influence in the Catholic movement. Finally, the suppression of the *Opera dei Congressi* fitted into the plans of Pius X for a restoration of disciplinary unity and strict

---

"L'anticlericalismo nel socialismo italiano (dalle origini al 1914)," *Movimento operaio e socialista* 16 (1970), 175–89; A. Azzaroni, *Socialisti anticlericali* (Florence 1961); G. Verucci, "Valori religiosi e valori laici," *Quaderni storici* 6 (1972), 543–64; A. M. Mojetta, *Cento anni di satira anticlericale nei giornali dal 1860 al 1955* (Milan 1975).

[5] On the *Opera dei Congressi,* see A. Gambasin, *L'attività sociale nell' opera dei Congressi (1874*–1904) (Rome 1958); G. De Rosa, *Storia del Movimento cattolico in Italia,* 2 vols. (Bari 1968); F. Candeloro, *Il movimento cattolico in Italia,* 3d ed. (Rome 1974) (Marxist).

obedience, which not only the theological Modernism of a Buonaiuti had jeopardized, but also the political Modernism of a Murri with his demand for independence from the hierarchy.[6]

In the area of the electoral campaigns the *non expedit* was weakened. The fear of a strong advance of the Socialists induced Pius X to undertake a dialogue with Giolitti and the moderate liberals, which led to the "Gentiloni Pact" of 1913. Gentiloni, president of the electoral union, promised the votes of the Catholics to those liberal candidates who obliged themselves in writing to respect a few conditions—rejection of divorce, defense of religious instruction in the schools, and so forth. In this way the moderate clerical influence, *clerico-moderatismo,* was strengthened. Italian Catholicism lived with this divided attitude—disciplinary rigidity on the one side, political opening to the moderate liberals on the other—until it was drawn into the First World War, which also for the Church marked a change in the peninsula.

The bishops at first stood for neutrality, except for a few prelates who subscribed to a nationalistic tendency.[7] However, when on 24 May 1915 the Italian government began hostilities against the Central Powers, obedience to the secular authority caused bishops and people to uphold the war. Only a few isolated personalities, such as the Barnabite Alessandro Chignoni, remained loyal to the pacifist attitude.[8] But there were also only a few of the bishops who succumbed to the temptation to violent reaction and chauvinistic rhetoric.[9]

The war evoked no substantial renewal of faith. The psychologist Father Agostino Gemelli proved that, after a momentary revival of an external piety as a consequence of the anguish at death, a return to indifference can be ascertained.[10] Much more radical was *Coenobium,* the periodical of the Christian opposition, which branded it a scandal that the "theology of the sword" all too easily justified the war.[11]

---

[6] The basic work on Italian Modernism is P. Scoppola, *Crisi modernista e rinnovamente cattolico in Italia* (Bologna 1975); the documents of the modernists are published in the annual *Fonti e documenti* of the University of Urbino, edited by the Centro Studi per la storia del modernismo, first issue in 1972.

[7] P. Scoppola, "Cattolici neutralisti e interventisti alle vigilia del conflitto"; A. Prandi, "La guerra e le sue consequenze nel mondo cattolico italiano"; A. Monticone, "I vescovi italiani e la guerra 1915–1918" (these three essays are in *Benedetto XV, I cattolici e la prima guerra mondiale,* 95–152, 153–205, 627–59).

[8] A. Chignoni, "Il cristianesimo e la guerra," *Coenobium,* June–July 1915, October–December 1915; Monsignore Volpi, bishop of Arezzo, remained opposed to the war, apparently not so much because of pacific convictions as out of sympathy for Catholic Austria; cf. Monticone, op. cit., 641.

[9] The nationalist terminology speaks of the "secular decisions of Italy's destiny," calls independence to mind with rhetorical phrases, and designates the Mother of God as "protector of Italy"; if the nationalist bishops constituted only an unimportant minority, they still had a much greater echo, because the press and the official propaganda emphasized them; cf. Monticone, op. cit., 635–37.

The reliable support of the Italian Church for the government and the active participation in the fatherland's war was for the Catholics the signal for the ending of the opposition to the state and their entry into politics. In an effort to sanction this new line, Don Luigi Sturzo (d. 1959) in 1919 created the *Partito Popolare Italiano,* and the Holy See abolished its *non expedit.* This new political formation, which had been preceded by the founding of the *Confederazione Italiana dei Lavoratori,* with a Christian outlook, warred against the liberal state; it denounced its excessive centralization and its slight respect for the freedom of teaching and for local autonomy.

Because its registered members were recruited especially from the rural classes, Sturzo's union took up the agrarian question, for which it advocated a bold reform program—partition of the *latifundia* with extensive cultivation, promoting of small ownership. It cultivated good-neighbor relations with the moderate trade unions, which were against indiscriminate strikes, especially the political, and occupation of factories. In coordination with the Socialists and at the same time with them it led a decisive fight for the eight-hour day and realized some social demands—ownership of stock and share in profits by workers, legal recognition and equality of rights for all union organizations. Although the Popular Party had originated in an openly declared social orientation, it fought the anarchist violence of the Socialist extremists, but could also not realize collaboration with Socialists in the government: attempts at this in 1921 failed not on social questions, but on the school problem and in 1924 because of the veto of the Holy See. In connection with Sturzo's initiative the political autonomy of Catholics vis-à-vis the hierarchy constituted the most important innovation. Although the Popular Party wanted to be the voice for the democratic appeal of the Catholics, it developed nondenominationally. Cardinal Gasparri repeatedly declared that the new union arose "without the intervention of the Holy See" from the consistent effort of the Catholic movement for adaptation to democratic society, in which each interest was promoted by the activity of the interest groups of the moment. Benedict XV had facilitated such a process, which surpassed the political-religious exaggeration of the *Opera dei Congressi* and its successor societies, by separating the field of politics from that of religion. While the new party organism did not present itself as the absolute final stage for the realization of political unity among Catholics, in reality, because of the special circumstances, it embraced almost the entire majority of Catholicism; the unanimous uniting of the Catholics on the political level had been caused by the necessity of reacting against the antipapal and anticlerical spirit of the other parties. Decidedly and incessantly Don Sturzo championed the autonomous role of the Catholic layman, who should act in the secular sphere freely and courageously with personal responsibility and not as the standing army of the hierarchy.

---

[10] A. Gemelli, *Il nostro soldato* (Milan 1917), 132f.; cf. also his article "Il nostro programma e la nostra vita," *Vita e Pensiero* 1 (1916), no. 1.

[11] A. Prandi, op. cit., 174; cf. also the article by A. M., "I cleri di tutte le nazioni di fronte alla guerra mondiale," *Coenobium* 1, July 1918.

Although socialists and liberals fought it, the Popular Party gained sympathy in the elections of 1919 and acquired 100 delegates' seats, whose number grew two years later to 107, when the threatening spectre of Fascism had already appeared in the country. Don Sturzo was among the first to understand the incompatibility of the Gospel with the Fascist regime, that regime which embodied the pagan idolatry of the state, the antievangelical principle of power, and the Machiavellian spirit.[12] In November 1922 the Popular Party sought cooperation with the Fascists in the government in an effort to guide it into a normal liberal channel. However, it was at once expelled by Mussolini when in April 1923 he had set foot on the crooked path of despotism, and, like all democratic formations, was suppressed. Together with other like-minded persons, such as Ferrari, Donati, and others, Don Sturzo had to leave the country. De Gasperi was jailed. Only a very few former adherents of the Popular Party, so-called clerical Fascists, joined the dictatorship. The mass of Catholics was divided into two groups. Some participated actively, even though they remained in Italy, in the secret struggle of antifascism, especially in the group of the Guelfs, led by Malvestiti at Milan and in several other cities, under Alcide De Gasperi and Igino Giordani in Rome, and under Guido Gonella and other leaders of the resistance. The majority belonged to Catholic Action, which, with considerable difficulty, was able to survive as the place for exclusively religious instruction and as a nursery for the future. It would have been almost impossible that the Catholic world of Italy should have adapted itself to Fascism, which was based on a party program hostile to the Church and had a large number of rabid anticlericals in its ranks.

---

[12] L. Sturzo, *Pensiero antifascista* (Turin 1925); Sturzo's hostility to Mussolini showed even in the single meeting which he had with him in 1921; cf. S. Tramontin, "Mussolini la questione romana e i rapporti con i popolari in un documento inedito," *Humanitas* 24 (1970), 469–75.

The founder of Fascism came from the Romagna and in 1919 had appeared on an election list together with Podrecca, the head of the most powerfully anticlerical-oriented newspaper, *Asino.* Perhaps he was favored by the fact that he was originally guided by no precisely defined doctrine. Fascism originated in 1919 under the auspices of change and demand for action. After Mussolini had in 1914 abandoned socialism, which represented neutrality, and was converted to interventionism, he more and more moved toward the right, where he found the assistance of the nationalists, of the middle class, and finally also of the upper middle-class strata and of the landed proprietors. He did not have the sympathy of the Catholics, who even energetically fought him with the aid of the Popular Party. Mussolini's tactical skill was, like his political sagacity and his ability to enthuse the masses, equal to the most sophisticated Machiavellianism. He understood that he could not consolidate the power seized on 28 October 1922 by an extraparliamentary route without coming to an accommodation with the Church. At once, in 1923, although he at the same time expelled the Popular Party from his cabinet, he gained the hierarchy by some concessions in favor of denominational schools and other concessions. Many Catholics gradually put aside their mistrust and drew closer to the new regime, to which they attributed the merit of restoring order and the forcible suppression of socialist violence. And the struggle against the Freemasons and liberalism was a good deed in the eyes of the Catholic public. True, the Fascist shocktroops were guilty of crimes by invading Socialist party headquarters and clubs of Catholic Action, murdering the Socialist deputy Giacomo Matteotti in June 1924, and beating Don Minzoni, pastor of Argenta in the Romagna, to death.[13] But the middle-class circles made small gangs of thieves responsible for such criminal deeds, and these were not identified with Mussolini's movement. Thus is to be explained why the Holy See abandoned the Popular Party completely and undertook direct discussions with Mussolini for the solution of the Roman Question. The Duce made use of the opportunity and was happy to show himself very generous with privileges in order to end the strife between Church and state, which neither Cavour in 1860 nor Crispi in 1887 nor Orlando in 1919 had been able to settle.[14]

Almost all bishops welcomed the concluding of the Lateran Treaties on 11 February 1929 as an important event; Cardinal Ascalesi of Naples characterized Mussolini as the renewer of Italy. But not all Catholics agreed with this. Father Giulio Bevilacqua, who lived at Rome in the house of Monsignore G. B. Montini, did not conceal his dismay over the unexpected and regrettable news that the Church had implicitly gone security for a despotism. The priest complained especially of the Fascist violence to which he had himself fallen victim at Brescia and which was opposed to Christian gentleness. He surely could approve neither the dealing with the human person as a mere instrument nor the state's monopoly of the education of youth.[15] De Gasperi, on the other hand, who had only recently emerged from Fascist prison, expressly distinguished between the treaty, which he evaluated positively because it put an end to any claims of the secular power, and the concordat, which he regarded as dangerous because of the possibility of a secret understanding between Church and dictatorship.[16]

---

[13] L. Bedeschi, *Don Minzoni il prete ucciso dai fascisti* (Milan 1973); AA. VV., *Antifascisti cattolici* (Vicenza 1968) (contains writings of Bishop Rodolfi and of Don Mazzolari and Ferrari).

[14] F. Margiotta-Broglio, *Italia e S. Sede dalla grande guerra alla Conciliazione* (Bari 1966).

But the scruples of this élite did not prevent the Italian people in the plebiscite of March 1929 from sanctioning Fascism with 9 million votes in contrast to only 135,000 "no" votes. A further occasion for enthusiasm offered itself in 1936 when Italy occupied Ethiopia. A year earlier, on 28 October, Cardinal Schuster in a sermon in the Milan cathedral had sung a paean of praise to what seemed to him as a campaign of evangelization and a work of Christian civilization for the good of Ethiopian barbarians—the same cardinal who, three years later, attacked the regime because of the racial laws which crushed Christian universalism. It was not difficult for Mussolini to represent the enterprise in Spain as a holy crusade against atheistic Bolshevism.

There can be no question that Catholicism and Fascism existed side by side in the best understanding; it must rather be established that the Catholic consensus was of a passive rather than an active nature and was again and again interrupted by many acts of opposition. Catholic Action and especially Youth Action can be seen as controverted points. In ARTICLE 43 the concordat recognized the organizations belonging to Catholic Action insofar as their activities took place outside political parties and under direct dependence on the church hierarchy and for the realization of Catholic principles. What was then the real attitude of the Catholic movement in regard to the dictatorship? The evaluation of contemporaries is varied. Giuseppe della Torre, chief editor of *Osservatore Romano,* wrote that the meeting between Fascism and Catholic Action was a collision. On the other hand, De Gasperi spoke of the "pitiful spectacle" which some top leaders offered to their associations by their too broad compromises. In reality, the movement with its organizations in four divisions—male youth, female youth, men, women—with its registered members presented a power factor in regard to numbers which could not but arouse the suspicion of the regime. Open battle broke out in the spring of 1931. Mussolini was suspicious that Catholic Action wanted to take the place of the Popular Party and therefore dissolved 5,000 groups of male and 10,000 groups of female youth with a total of 800,000 members.[17]

---

[15] G. Bevilacqua, *Scritti tra le due guerre,* E. Gianmancheri, ed., (Brescia 1968); A. Fappani, *P. Giulio Bevilacqua prete e cardinale sugli avamposti* (Verona 1975).

[16] A. De Gasperi, *Lettere sul Concordato* (Brescia 1970).

He had thereby severely hit those whom Pius XI had designated as his most loyal adherents. The attitude of the Italian episcopate hardened for several months. Pius XI let Mussolini know through Father Tacchi-Venturi that after long reflection and hesitation he was now convinced that he must censure Fascism, which he then branded in the encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* of 29 June 1931 as a pagan idolatry of the state. After a first phase of open opposition the desire not to destroy peaceful coexistence prevailed. On 2 September an agreement was signed which confirmed the right to life of Catholic Action in keeping with ART. 43 of the concordat, but at the same time laid down some restrictive measures: The organization had to limit its field of activity to the purely religious sphere; all associations on the diocesan level were placed under the bishop's responsibility, whereby they were cut off from the central direction.

After the crisis of 1931 Italian Catholicism experienced no further shocks. The majority of the episcopate had a benevolent attitude toward the regime, except for some basically antifascist-minded bishops—Gaggia at Brescia, Elia della Costa at Padua and then at Florence, Endrici at Trent. But sympathy never passed to complete reconciliation. No Italian bishop made the Fascist ideology his own. If the bishops were accommodating to Mussolini in words, they could never be designated as "Fascist" in the sense that they had made compromises with the main ideological theses of Fascism; rather, one could speak of an a-Facist episcopate.[18]

The episcopate was oriented extensively in the spirit of the concordat, which recognized the validity in civil law of religious weddings, introduced Catholic religious instruction in all schools, except the universities, and accepted some typical aspects of the Christian state.[19] On this foundation there developed a pastoral practice which made harmony between civil and canon law its pivotal point—religion of the state, defense of morality, families of many children. The coexistence of the Church with Fascism had, however, only externally the appearance of an agreement; in reality, the basic dissent continued, and each tried to gain the greatest advantage in regard to the other side.[20] In fact, no convinced Catholic occupied a leading position in the regime, just as no Fascist of the first hour was permitted greater responsibility in Catholic Action.

---

[17] A. Martini, *Studi sulla questione romana e la Conciliazione* (Rome 1963), illustrates also the history of the origin of the Lateran Treaties and the conflict of 1931 and the final battle of Pius XI in 1938 on the occasion of the race laws.

[18] S. Tramontin, *Cattolici popolari fascisti nel Veneto* (Rome 1975); R. Moro, "Afascismo e antifascismo nei movimenti intellectuali di Azione Cattolica dopo il '31," *Storia Contemporanea* 6 (1975), 733–801.

[19] G. Martina, "I cattolici di fronte al fascismo," *Rassegna di Teologia* 17 (1976), 170–94.

After years of a doubtful modus vivendi there occurred in 1938 the definitive break, when Mussolini, even though in moderate form, imitated Hitler in the persecution of Jews. Bishops such as Schuster or Nasalli-Rocca, who had sympathized with the activity of the dictatorial Italian regime, heartily concurred with Pius XI when on Christmas Eve he thanked the "most noble ruler" and his "incomparable" prime minister for the religious peace in Italy, but then immediately in his address complained of the bad handling of Catholic Action and the violation of the marriage regulations of the concordat by the racial laws.

Italy's participation in the war on Hitler's side contributed likewise to the cooling of relations between the Church and Fascism. The clergy became still more hostile to and distrustful of the Social Republic of Italy, which, under the protection of Hitler's arms, Mussolini established on 8 September 1943 and which the Holy See never recognized.[21] When in the last phase of the Second World War the mass of Catholics held themselves aloof from Fascism, the active minority of anti-Fascist Catholics, which hitherto had fought in secrecy, rose in armed resistance[22] and then established the *Democrazia Cristiana.*

At the end of the Second World War there occurred in Italy a first phase of religious revival, which took place on the three levels of politics, organization, and piety. These levels were closely united and resulted from different factors: from a defensive attitude supported by concern in regard to the Communist Party and the laicized culture; from the idea that Italy must be defended as an officially Catholic country; finally, from an understanding of the Church with a hierarchical structure in the shape of a pyramid instead of a *communio.*[23]

---

[20] Don Primo Mazzolari, who was an irreconcilable opponent of Fascism; cf. P. Mazzolari, *Diario e lettere (1905–1972),* A. Bergamaschi, ed., (Bologna 1974).

[21] *Riservato a Mussolini, Notiziari giornalieri della Guarda Nazionale repubblicana novembre 1943–giugno 1944* (Milan 1974).

[22] M. Bendiscioli, *Antifascismo e Resistenza,* 2d ed. (Rome 1974); R. A. Webster, *La croce e i fasci* (Milan 1964), is informed in the historical area, but shows only incomplete knowledge of Catholic doctrine.

[23] The most effective synthesis comes from G. Martina, *La chiesa in Italia negli ultimi trent'anni* (Rome 1977).

With the collapse of Fascism on 25 April 1945 there was presented the problem of the succession to the regime. De Gasperi united in himself the hope of the liberal and also of the social Catholics and wanted to avoid a return to the "historical railing," *storico steccato,* hence the frontal opposition between Catholics and laicists. And so he sought to direct the political experience of Italy in the democratic sense to a party which could be the guarantee of the value of freedom and of political pluralism. But the parties of the left—Giuseppe Dossetti, Giorgio La Pira—objected to De Gasperi's line and complained that the *Democrazia Cristiana* had actually become a party of order and was not sufficiently committed in the social sphere.

The "Christian Democratic hegemony" served to defend civil and religious freedoms. The political unity of the Catholics was partly destroyed by the "Communist Catholics," namely, Felice Balbo, Franco Rodano, and Gabriele de Rosa,[24] a tiny minority, which opposed the fact that many Catholic workers opted for the extreme left. From the viewpoint of organization and numbers, Catholic Action represented an imposing power in the first postwar years. The number of registered members increased in the unions of men from 150,866 in 1946 (with 6,140 groups) to 285,455 in 1954 (with 12,224 groups). The unions of women, divided in 1946 among 10,389 and in 1954 among 16,389 groups, grew from 369,015 members in the period after the war to 597,394 in 1954. The male youths embraced 9,951 groups—5,504 urban and 4,447 rural—while their total number in 1954 had jumped to 15,709—6,472 urban and 9,237 rural groups; the number of members rose from 367,392 to 556,752 in 1954. The female youth constituted the imposing branch: in 1946 there were 13,898 groups among them, in 1954 there were 19,026; the number of members in the respective years rose from 884,992 to 1,215,977.[25]

The religious upsurge was conditioned by the political struggle. Catholic Action seemed to become a reservoir of the leadership cadres for the *Democrazia Cristiana.* Besides initiatives of a social sort, in connection with which one thinks especially of Carlo Gnocchi (d. 1952), those with a more political character appeared, as, for example, the civic committees, *comitati civici.*[26] The decisive points of spirituality in the parishes were the cult of the Eucharist and of the Mother of

---

[24] S. Tramontin, *Sinistra cattolica di ieri e di oggi* (Turin 1974); N. Antonetti, *L'ideologia della sinistra cristiana. I cattolici tra chiesa e comunismo (1937–45),* (Milan 1976); G. Campanini, *Fede e politica 1943–1951. La vicenda ideologica della sinistra D.C.* (Brescia 1976).

[25] *Annuario dell'Azione Cattolica Italiana* (Rome 1954).

[26] G. Baget-Bozzo, *Il partito cristiano al potere. La DC di De Gasperi e di Dossetti,* 2 vols. (Florence 1974).

God—especially typical in the postwar period were Marian pilgrimages—and marks of honor for the Pope. The traditional pilgrimages, whose centers had been at Loreto and Pompeii, were increased by new centers, as, for example, to San Giovanni Rotondo by Father Pio of Pietralcina (d. 1968) and to Syracuse. The apostolate of Father Riccardo Lombardi also found many collaborators; its goal was to proclaim Christianity in the "Crusade of Goodwill" and "Center of the Better World" as the sole alternative to the modern world.[27]

But the cultural impetus was almost totally absent. There was a lack of centers for investigation and for general cultural initiatives. The book market itself preferred the production of edifying literature and the translating of foreign works.[28] Italy encountered great difficulties with theological renewal. The series of biblical works directed by Salvatore Garofalo was begun in 1947 with outdated programs. Also typical was the aversion to Jacques Maritain's integral humanism. Nevertheless there occurred, even if only with severe efforts, a freeing of Italian theological culture from provincialism in the years after 1960, thanks to foreign influence. To be mentioned as especially vital centers are: Turin with Michele Pellegrino, Milan with Carlo Colombo, Brescia with the publishing house Morcelliana, Father Giulio Bevilacqua (d. 1965), Mario Bendiscioli at Milan, Bologna with the Centro di Documentazione di Scienze Religiose founded by Giuseppe Dossetti, and Rome with Giuseppe De Luca. Two "obedient prophets" especially played the most important roles in the process of fermentation in Italian Catholicism: Primo Mazzolari and Lorenzo Milani.[29]

In the first years after 1900 persons were of the opinion that a specially important role had to be attributed to a university for Italian Catholics. The long-desired institution became a reality in 1921 and was the work of the converted Franciscan, Agostino Gemelli (d. 1959), assisted by Armida Barelli (d. 1952) and Vico Necchi. The Catholic University of the Sacred Heart aimed in the sphere of higher culture to emphasize the ideal of a free school and a Christian culture.

---

[27] P. Lombarde, *Per un mondo nuovo* (Rome 1951); idem, *Esercitazioni per un mondo migliore* (Rome 1958).

[28] As late as 1974 there were 231 translations of 593 works of a theological character (cf. *Annuario delle statistiche culturali* 15 [1974], 31).

[29] P. Mazzolari, *La chiesa, il fascismo, la guerra* (Florence 1966); A. Bergamaschi, *Un contestatore di tutte le stagioni* (Bologna 1968); idem, *P. Mazzolari nello scandalo di "Adesso"* (Turin 1968); L. Bedeschi, *Obbedientissimo in Cristo. Lettere di don Primo Mazzolari al suo vescovo 1917–1959* (Milan 1974). Characteristic for Milani is the changing fate of his book, *Esperienze pastorali* (Florence 1957). Concerning him, cf. N. Fallaci, *Dalla parte dell'ultimo, vita del prete Lorenzo Milani,* 3d ed. (Milan 1974); F. Tognaccini, "Don Milano nell'evoluzione dell'opinione pubblica," *Testimonianze* 18 (1975), 97–108.

The purpose of this institution was the founding of a center for the creating of an organic culture, in a sense of a new *Summa* of knowledge, the educating of the leading classes of the country, and the freeing of the new generation from the influence of the laicized and unbelieving state school. Gemelli saw himself faced with the choice between the French model of a university completely free from the state's sphere of influence and the model of Louvain. Thanks to support by Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile, he obtained state approval in 1924, which, it is true, meant a partial diminution of autonomy, but also a valuable official recognition. Later, other decisions had to be made, such as were determined by the chronic economic difficulties, and a choice had to be made between a university for the masses or for an elite. Around 1931 the ideological pluralism was restricted. But altogether the balance for the first half-century of existence was positive in regard to the level of scholarly production, while the ideal of an all-embracing education and not only one limited to the professions was only partly achieved. The reasons for this were: the lack of a faculty of theological sciences—a department for religious sciences was only established in 1969—the excessive number of students, the effects of the struggle against modernists, the absence of qualified Catholics in critical fields of scholarship.[30]

Around 1960 Italian society underwent radical changes: a rapid industrialization, a doubling of the per capita income between 1950 and 1970, a decline of those occupied in agriculture—from 42.2 percent in 1951 to 17.3 in 1971—a powerful and chaotic displacement of great masses of people from the south to the north and from country to city. Now arose the mass university. The number of students increased from 210,228 in 1955 to 886,894 in 1974–75. The considerable increase of votes for parties of the left proceeded along with a noticeable loss to the *Democrazia Christiana*—from a majority in 1948 to 38.3 percent in 1963—and so the "Opening to the left" had to take place, that is, an alliance of the Catholic Party with the Socialists. At the time the political power of the unions also grew.

The religious situation, of which one could have made a snapshot for the period before 1962 at the traditionalist Roman Synod held by John XXIII, changed fundamentally. Of course, this was not true of the institutional sphere, which remained for the most part unchanged. In 1974 there were 284 dioceses, 41,700 diocesan priests, 21,069 religious priests, 5,843 lay brothers, and 150,179 nuns. The vocation crisis caused the number of priestly ordinations to drop from 955 in 1964 to 759 in 1969. The number of inhabitants per parish rose between 1964 and 1969 from 1,965 to 2,179. In the rise the presence of the Church was felt in the various sections of welfare—in 1964 there were 4,181 institutes, in 1969 there were 4,565—and of the educational system—3,825 institutions in 1964 and 7,001 in 1969.[31] Meanwhile, the Italian episcopate succeeded, with the founding of the Italian Episcopal Conference in 1969, in working out uniform pastoral guidelines.

---

[30] G. Rumi, "Padre Gemelli e l'Università Cattolica," AA. VV., *Modernismo, fascismo, comunismo . . .* , G. Rossini, ed. (Bologna 1972), 204–33; M. Sticco, *Appunti per una biografia di un uomo difficile* (Milan 1974).

The crisis of the postconciliar period had significant effects in Italy also. The Catholic association system suffered an obvious setback at the end of the 1960s. The crisis had already advertised itself when Carlo Caretto in 1952 and then Mario Rossi (d. 1976) in 1954 withdrew because they were not in agreement with the conservative political line followed by President General Luigi Gedda.[32] After 1968 pressure to spontaneous actions reduced the maneuverability of the movement in the extreme.

The critical situation of the Catholic world was revealed also in the political sphere by the increase of votes for the Communist Party and by the turning of declared Catholic representatives such as Paolo Brezzi and Raniero La Valle to this party, which made questionable the very existence of a Catholic Party. The present situation was also made more difficult by the seething of ecclesiastical cases of conflict, such as the Isolotto Congregation and Abbot Franzoni. The referendum for the abolition of divorce ended with a victory of 59.26 percent for the advocates of divorce as opposed to 40.74 percent for its opponents, and placed before the Catholic world the much greater problem of how in a pluralistic society Christian ideals can be assured.[33]

---

[31] *Segretaria di Stato, Raccolta di tavole statistiche* (Vatican City 1971ff.).

[32] M. Rossi, *I giorni dell'onnipotenza. Memoria di un'esperienza cattolica* (Rome 1975).

[33] The following can be established as positive: the development of the secular institutes, new movements such as the Focolari and Communione e Liberazione, and the new Catholic Action and the central groups of the new Pentecostal and Catechumen Movements. Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro (d. 1976), one of the promoters of the reform of the liturgy, deserves a special place among the most important figures of the latest history.

CHAPTER 21

*The Catholic Church of France**

The denunciation of the concordat in 1905 produced between Rome and the Church of France a more intimate relationship than ever before.

---

* Pierre Blet, S. J.

In addition, the accessions of Benedict XV and Pius XII roughly coincided with the outbreak of the two world wars, which had an impact on the interior life of the French Church. And so it is admissible to divide this latest sector in the life of French Catholicism according to the three pontificates of Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII.

Under Benedict XV

The state of war in which France was placed by the declaration of war of 3 August 1914 hastened considerably a development already begun in the ecclesiastical situation of France. The Dreyfus Affair had shown that the Catholics, whom patriotic republicans had long charged with placing the interests of the Church above those of the nation, stood in the front line of patriots, that is, of nationalists.[1] At that time the radical left represented pacifist tendencies, and the relations of the Catholics with the government were thereby not better. The voting on the law for the introduction of a three-year period of military service in August 1913 had made it clear: this very republican government had understood that it had to do something better than devote itself to the excluding of clerical influence. The declaration of war strengthened this tendency: in view of the threat to the country's frontiers, clericalism ceased to be the chief enemy. This change was expressed on both sides in concrete actions: priests and seminarians submitted with enthusiasm to the general obligation to military service, and the expelled religious returned in order to comply with the mobilization order, pastors prevented by age preached from the pulpit the duty to obey the induction order and make the financial sacrifices caused by the war. For his part, Minister of the Interior Malvy suspended the implementation of the laws of 1905 against the property of religious communities that had not yet been liquidated.

Influential Catholics, including prelates such as Monsignore Baudrillart, established a Catholic committee for the support of French foreign propaganda with the aid of brochures and lectures. These were especially intended for Catholic countries such as Spain and Latin America, where the anticlerical policy of the government had greatly reduced French influence. Of course, anticlericalism did not entirely disappear. It continued during the war in connection with the diplomatic exertions of Benedict XV for ending the "unnecessary shedding of blood"; the Vatican was presented as a power which absolutely favored the Central Powers. The French Catholics now aimed to demonstrate that they kept themselves aloof from the papal policy.

---

[1] R. Rémond, *La droite et les droites en France.*

Thus the Dominican Father Sertillanges proclaimed in a sermon, whose text the cardinal archbishop of Paris had censured, from the pulpit of Notre-Dame in Paris: "Most Holy Father, we cannot comply with your words of peace to the present. We are sons who say "no, no. . . ."[2] But still more than through such sensational rhetoric, the Catholics and their clergy were freed from any doubt as to their patriotic devotion by the spectacle which 25,000 priests, religious, and seminarians called to military service offered, half of whom accepted misery in the trenches, and 4,608 of whom never returned.[3]

The comradeship which had united pastor and teacher in the slime of the trenches and under the bombardment of cannon left lasting impressions. On the day of demobilization many participants in the war returned with the determination to preserve "the sanctified union." Clemenceau could still conduct the negotiations at Versailles in a spirit which was as hostile to the Holy See as to the Habsburg Monarchy. But the elections of 1919 produced a majority of moderates in the Chamber of Deputies, who were opponents of the sectarian laws from the beginning of the century. Of course, these laws could not be revised, for the Senate remained under the influence of the radical party; but when Clemenceau became a candidate for president of the republic in the elections, the nationalists made him atone for his obdurate anticlericalism: they preferred Deschanel, and Clemenceau left politics.

It was known that Clemenceau was against restoration of diplomatic relations with the Holy See; but the experience of the war had taught that it was a disadvantage for France to have no such connection as an embassy at the Vatican represented. Besides, the reversion to France of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, to which in 1871 Bismarck had allowed the status of the Napoleonic concordat, raised questions which demanded dialogue with the Holy See; for the generals and the first high commissioners had promised to the Alsatians and Lorrainers the maintenance of their religious status. In order to keep their word, people had to renounce the principles of centralizing Jacobinism and laicism and grant that the two provinces retain their regime in accord with the concordat, that priests there be paid by the state, and that the school remain denominational. The government of the Republic had to begin conversations with Rome and resume from the break of 1905. The representative of the law of separation, Aristide Briand, was one of the first to express himself for the reestablishing of a French embassy at the Holy See, and many members of the former government shared his opinion. The Catholics worked for the realization of this project, and the Holy See showed itself to be very accommodating. However, the idea encountered the resistance of anticlerical opponents and also did not find the good will of the extreme right, who saw in it a sort of recognition of the hateful regime by the Holy See. Nevertheless, the project, which included the reestablishing of an embassy at the Holy See and the installing of a nuncio at Paris, was approved by the Chamber of Deputies, but rejected by the Senate. When Aristide Briand became president of the council, he nevertheless on 17 May 1921 named Jonnart as French ambassador to the Holy See, and the new president of the Republic, Deschanel, in July accepted the credentials of Nuncio Ceretti.[4]

---

[2] A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France, contemporaine sous la III^e republique,* 490f.

[3] R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme en France. La période contemporaine,* 558f.

The resumption of diplomatic relations with the Vatican neither allowed the restoration of the concordat nor improved the material situation which the expropriations since 1905 had created. Nevertheless, Benedict XV conceded to the French government a right in regard to the naming of bishops: the Holy See would communicate to the Quai d'Orsay at the proper time the name of the newly chosen before publication in order to accommodate, if necessary, objections of a political sort that might occur.[5] Only in the dioceses of Strasbourg and Metz did the concordat remain in force, whereby the French government had the right of nominating.

After these first agreements, discussions were resumed in order to create a basic juridical situation for the value of church property in France. The Church societies rejected by Pius X could be taken into consideration in so far as they were founded on the basis of the agreements which had been worked out between the Church and the state, and with the presupposition that the authority of the hierarchy was assured. Nevertheless, with all respect the French bishops opposed an agreement which seemed to contradict the rejection which Pius X had imposed on them little more than ten years earlier. The acceptance of new societies, named diocesan societies, was the act of Pius XI, the new Pope. In 1924 he declared that he agreed that in each diocese a society should be founded under the presidency of the bishop to administer church property and to accept foundations and legacies.[6]

Under Pius XI

This regulation contained no compensation for the expropriations of 1905, it even left religious buildings in the ownership of political communities and contained assurance neither for the Christian school nor the religious orders. Hence it was unable to arouse any enthusiasm among the faithful, who declared "war against laicism and its principles even to the annulment of the unjust laws which proceeded from them."

---

[4] A. Dansette, op. cit., 502–5.

[5] R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme,* 565.

[6] A. Dansette, op. cit., 505–10.

People were already on the eve of an election in which an anticlerical left and a right allied with the Church opposed each other. The vote of May 1924 was in favor of the alliance concluded between the radicals and the socialists and elevated Édouard Herriot to the position of president of the Council. For a moment people believed that the age of Combes had returned: the head of the government announced that he intended to abolish the embassy at the Holy See and would invoke the expulsion laws against religious, who had returned to France as a result of the mobilization; Herriot also promised that he would enforce the laicization laws in the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. But he ran into an opposition which he had not foreseen. The *Fédération Nationale Catholique,* whose president was General de Castelnau, organized protest meetings, and the Freemasons were accused of having conspired at the same time against the Church and against French unity. The Alsatians and Lorrainers publicly expressed the desire that the promises in regard to worship and school should be kept. The religious threatened with explusion loudly pointed out their character as war veterans and through the pen of Father Doncoeur cried out the eventually famous: "We will not go!" The succeeding financial crisis put an end to the left coalition and made it understood that in 1925 anticlericalism had lost its impetus in the election struggles.

Of course, this did not absolutely prove that France had again become Christian: in wide areas of the population indifference took the place of hostility to religion. True, religious events such as the pilgrimage to Lourdes, the celebrations at the canonization of Joan of Arc,[7] and a little later the pilgrimages to Lisieux brought together passionately committed believers, as was also true of the rallies of the *Fédération Nationale Catholique.* Religious practice made progress in the middle class and especially among students and at the big schools. As forerunner of the *Jeunesse Étudiante Catholique* (JEC) in 1929 the *Fédération Française des Étudiants Catholiques* from 1922 on founded local groups. But apart from this elite there were, as is well known, large groups in the population that had been educated outside the Church in the laicized schools. The *Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française* continued its work in order to prepare its members for civic activity in the future. The *Semaines Sociales* carried their educational work further in order to inform the Catholics on the social doctrine of the Church and its effects. For the same end the *Action Populaire,* which had moved from Rheims to Paris in 1919, improved its publications. *The Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens* worked to unite all unions to which all wage earners in commerce and industry belonged, and in 1920 it already had 140,000 members.[8]

---

[7] Ibid., 503.

Nevertheless, many Catholics saw in the removal of the Freemasonic and anticlerical Republic the basic assumption for the return of France to the faith of the Fathers. The alliance between nationalism and Catholicism, consolidated by the war, found embodiment in the movement of the *Action Française,* whose changing fate had serious consequences. There was a unique alliance between the leader of *Action Française,* Charles Maurras, who was a pupil of Auguste Comte, and the conservative Catholics who joined his movement. But Maurras declared all agents of de-Christianization, rationalists, Freemasons, and Protestants to be enemies of the French nation and extolled Roman Catholicism as the necessary foundation for the reconstruction of the monarchy. *Action Française* found in the Catholic area, in youth, in universities and seminaries, in the religious orders, and even in the body of bishops an assent which to a degree inclined to enthusiasm.

This influence of a movement which glorified nationalism, which made no secret of its aim to unite the Catholics against the Republic, met the resistance of democratic Catholics. It was also unable to obtain the assent of Pius XI, who was seeking a reconciliation with the Republic. Moreover, the personal attitude of Maurras and his slogan "Politics in First Place" urged caution. The first warning, which came from France at Rome's demand, was a letter of the archbishop of Bordeaux, Cardinal Andrieux, of 25 August 1926. The letter contained gross distortions, it is true, but nevertheless Pius XI gave it his general assent.[9] But at the same time it became known that several books by Maurras had been put on the Index, a decision which was under way as early as 1911 but which had again and again been postponed by Pius X and Benedict XV. Immediate violent counterattacks of *Action Française* were answered by Rome with sanctions: On 29 December 1926 the reading of the newspaper of *Action Française* and membership in this union were entirely forbidden. The consequence of disobedience was refusal of the sacraments, and priests who absolved those not repentant became reserved cases *ratione sui.* The leaders of *Action Française* characterized these measures as the result of a plot which had been contrived for the advantage of democracy and Germany, and with their anticlericalism they competed with the radicals, who were otherwise attacked by them. Some Catholics appealed to the freedom of political opinion to disregard the Roman prohibitions. The directive for the refusal of the sacraments was often ignored but also often applied with a severity which exceeded the intentions of the instructing office. In the clergy and the religious orders the condemnation of *Action Française* not only involved the retirement of Cardinal Billot but also the withdrawal of a whole class of leaders and the election of new men,[10] who were not prepared for the functions they had to assume.

---

[8] R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme,* 583.

[9] A. Dansette, op. cit., 583f.

In 1927 Father Lhande published his book, *Le Christ dans le Banlieu.* In it he revealed to the faithful and even to the clergy of the capital that in the immediate geographical neighborhood, namely, in the midst of their own parishes, existed masses of people to whom the Church was not only foreign but entirely unknown. The construction association, founded by the new archbishop, Cardinal Verdier, for the building of churches in the suburbs was not sufficient to alter the situation. At the same time Abbé Guérin, vicar in a workers' parish, obtained knowledge of the *Manuel du襤ociste Belge* of Abbé Cardijn. He believed that he could find there the solution for the problem of the education of young workers, for that problem to which the *Action Catholique de la Jeunesse Française,* in his opinion, gave only an insufficient answer. The ACJF, which celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its founding in 1936, invited young workers and young bourgeois to common meetings; but because it aimed chiefly at the formation of a leadership elite, it reached the young workers only with difficulty. Entirely in the meaning of Abbé Cardijn, who had in mind a movement restricted to the working class, young French workers held their first meeting at Clichy in October 1926. The newspaper edited by them, *Jeunesse Ouvrière,* appeared in January 1927 in its first issue. The movement (JOC) quickly stirred enthusiasm and spread to Lille, Lyon, and Marseille. The hierarchy, with Cardinal Dubois at Paris, assisted by Canon Gerlier as director of the associations, and with Cardinal Liénart at Lille supported the movement. When the "Popular Front" came to power in 1936 and began a movement of strikes and occupation of factories, great hopes were centered on the picked troops of militant adherents of the Christian Young Workers' Movement, *Jocists,* who defended their rights and those of their worker colleagues, but still always maintained loyalty to the faith and its moral demands. From this moment on, the union of Christian workers acquired a new upsurge;

---

[10] Ibid., 603.

by 1938, 2,400 unions with 500,000 members existed.[11] The celebration of the tenth anniversary of JOC from 16 to 21 July 1937 brought together at Paris ca. 80,000 *Jocists* and took on the features of a triumph.

Long before this success began to be clear, persons began to apply the rules of the workers' movement also to other fields. In 1929 the *Jeunesse Agricole Catholique* (JAC) joined the ACJF, and now there appeared also the *Jeunesse Étudiante Catholique* (JEC). The *Jeunesse Maritime Catholique* (JMC) was founded in 1932, and in 1936 the *Jeunesse Indépendante Catholique* (JIC). These movements also had female branches and all joined the ACJF, which from then on appeared as a union of autonomous movements under the control of the hierarchy.

Likewise, as the JOC had closely joined the CFTC, the JAC expanded to the *Ligue Agricole Chrétienne* and soon after to the Farmers' Family Movement, while on the other hand the *Action Catholique Indépendante* and the *Action Catholique Indépendante Feminine* and the *Mouvement des Ingenieurs et Chefs d'Industrie Catholique* formed their counterparts in the middle-class sphere.

The special character of all these movements consisted in their apostolic orientation. The Scout Movement, on the other hand, basically had in view the training of youth, and so its pedagogical method was based on physical activity and a life in the group. In 1938 it had in France and overseas 78,000 young followers and became the nursery for vocations to the priesthood and the religious life.[12] Many scout groups were recruited from the pupils of Catholic high schools, in which vocations found a favorable environment.

While in this period the élan of movements of Catholic Action was well known, still the goal of all zealous exertions of the hierarchy and of all financial sacrifices of the faithful remained the more traditional form of the education of young men in the Christian schools. The laws of 1905 had severely hurt the congregations active in schools but had not changed the legal bases which proclaimed the principle of free instruction, namely the Falloux Law of 15 March 1850 for high school instruction, the law of 12 July 1875 for university instruction, the law of 30 October 1886 for elementary school instruction, and the law of 25 July 1919 for the training of technical experts. But apart from this last-named law, which expressly envisaged the granting of financial aid, this legislation refused any assistance to private education. Hence the faithful united in several associations to defend the existence of Christian schools and demand for them the granting of public assis-

[11] *Annuaire général catholique,* 1938, LX.

[12] Ibid. LXXIII.

tance. Thus the *Alliance des maisons d'education chrétienne,* founded in 1872, from which came in 1925 the syndicate of *Directeurs et Directrices des maisons d'éducation chrétienne,* was involved in the publication of texts for instruction and published its own periodical, *L'Enseignement chrétienne;* in 1938 1,061 houses belonged to the association.[13] The *Association de Chefs de Familles de France* aimed to stress the rights of Christian families, loudly proclaimed war against a standardized elementary school, and demanded of candidates in election to the legislative bodies assurances of the intact freedom of instruction.[14] Together with other unions it represented the viewpoint that freedom also presupposed school proportion, that is, the proportional dividing of the sums of money expended for education between the state and the private schools corresponding to the number of pupils.

A first demand in this sense, a projected law with the stipulation that pupils in possession of a scholarship could choose between the two kinds of school, was rejected by the Senate in 1920. The Catholics, encouraged to this by the FNC, insisted on their demand and were, in expectation of this regulation, ready to make considerable financial sacrifices for their schools. The growth of the high school stage between the two world wars achieved a degree that upset the radical left: in 1931 this area included 1,011 high schools with 150,000 pupils in contrast to 560 state high schools or lyceums with 225,000 pupils. In the period from 1930 to 1938 these figures were still higher: 1,271 high schools with 209,460 pupils in 1934–35 and 1,400 high schools with 230,607 pupils in 1937–38.[15]

Despite the retaining of the laicist laws and official neutrality, the feeling of the threat from without, evoked by the remilitarizing of the Rhineland, the *Anschluss* of Austria to the German *Reich,* and the expectation of the annexation of Czechoslovakia by Hitler, produced a new rapprochement between the government of the Third Republic and of the Church. A journey of Pope Pius XI to France for the dedication of the basilica of Saint Thérèse de Lisieux was planned. Cardinal Secretary of State Pacelli was received as the Pope's representative[16] in 1937 at Paris and Lisieux with the same honors as were customary for a head of state. Without repudiating its official laicism, the Third Republic came closer to the Church on the brink of its collapse.

---

[13] Ibid. LXVI.

[14] Ibid. LIX.

[15] P. Gerbod, "Les catholiques et l'enseignement secondaire," *RHMC* XVIII, 391, n. 2.

[16] F. Charles-Roux, *Huit ans au Vatican* (Paris 1947), 212–37.

Under Pius XII

Two years later, when the diplomatic missions of Cardinal Pacelli to both secular and Catholic France were still remembered, Pacelli was elected as successor of Pius XI on 2 March 1939. This election was greeted in France with enduring satisfaction; for it was known that he would undertake all efforts to save the peace which daily became more fragile. It is true that his offers of mediation in May 1939 with a view to a peace conference (see above, Chapter 3) were without prospects, but he was able to establish another peace through reconciliation with *Action Française.* In the course of years the leaders of *Action Française* had understood that they were making a mistake with the precipitate break in relations. On the other side were the penalties which had been imposed on the adherents of *Action Française,* in clear opposition to the concluding of concordats with the Fascist and Nazi governments, which could be charged with more than mere verbal violence. Pius XI had accepted with kindness the attempts at a rapprochement by Maurras, which the Carmel of Lisieux had suggested, and on 20 October 1938 the committee director of *Action Française* wrote a letter which was submitted to the Holy Office. The accession of Pius XII was accompanied by no hesitation. George Bonnet, minister for foreign affairs, replied to the nuncio as a result of his inquiry, that this question should be treated exclusively in the religious sphere. Although some bishops expressed hesitations, on 10 July 1939 the *Osservatore Romano* published the decree of the Holy Office which lifted the excommunication imposed on *Action Française* at the same moment in which a letter of the periodical disavowed all theories that were contrary to the teachings of the Church. The Second World War was near and created new problems for the Church of France.[17]

The declaration of war of 3 September 1939 proceeded this time from France and England and was the result of the German invasion of Poland, which for its part was a consequence of the Soviet-German nonagression pact. The Catholics were in agreement with the government, and the declaration of war let them see in the war a new crusade against the powers of evil, which Pius XI had unmasked in his two encyclicals against National Socialism and Communism. But the great mass of the population had for a long time lulled itself in the hope that the war of 1914 had been the last of all wars. And so it did not feel again the patriotic élan of August 1914. Priests, religious, and seminarians joined in the mobilization with members of all social strata and there encountered religious indifference and ignorance rather than hostility.

---

[17] A. Dansette, op. cit., 607–11; P. Lesourd, *Dossier secret de l'Église de France* II, 444–46.

The collapse of June 1940 could not be charged to the Church, which had lost all influence on political and even on public life. Rather it was the Catholics and the military leaders who were inclined to make the laicized school responsible because it had educated the new generations. The collapse again evoked feelings which had temporarily fallen into oblivion because of the harmony between the two powers. Thus preachers pointed out that the defect was God's punishment for the nation's official atheism. But on the other hand they strove to revive hope by indicating that Providence had always had pity on France. Once it had sent the country the eighteen-year-old Joan of Arc, and now it sent Pétain, the eighty-year-old venerable man. The hierarchy, in general very hesitant with its expressions, declared with a certain vigor in regard to the new regime the obligatory loyalty for the government, in which were many Catholics, also through the appeal which the regime directed to the spiritual values, and finally through measures such as the abolition of Freemasonry and especially through a new legislation which corrected the laws of the Third Republic in two essential points, namely, education and religious institutes. A law of April 1942 lifted the prohibition of the orders and provided for a legal recognition of religious communities. The new school laws reintroduced religious instruction in state lyceums and high schools and granted certain financial subsidies to the Christian schools.[18]

Of course the devotion of the clergy to the Vichy regime was not unconditional. Tensions soon arose, and first of all in the education of youth. In a letter to the head of state the bishops protested that the state laid its hand on youth: "A uniform youth—no!" The anti-Semitic policy followed by the occupying power likewise met resistance, which found its formal expression in declarations or letters of the archbishops of Lyon and Toulouse, Gerlier and Saliège, and of Bishop Théas of Montauban. Thus encouraged, many priests, religious, and religious institutions could preserve Jews, especially their children, from deportation. The *Service du Travail Obligatoire* (STO), that is, the drafting of young French workers for German war industry, created new problems of conscience, for which the church authorities found various solutions.[19] Meanwhile, the religious sentiment awakened by the defeat and the disadvantages of the war called forth mass movements such as that of the *Grand Retour:* countless faithful from 1943 to 1946 carried a statue of Mary from Boulogne through the whole of France. Millions of pictures and rosaries were distributed, and millions of signatures were collected under the text of the consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.[20]

---

[18] P. Lesourd, op. cit. II, 491f. A law of 1940 annulled that law which forbade religious to give instruction, and which, incidentally, had not been applied since World War I. On 10 March 1941 a law introduced religious instruction on a voluntary basis in state educational institutions. A law of 6 January 1941 conceded to the congregations a contribution to the costs for light, heat, furniture, and mess in private schools. In 1942 and 1943 Catholic and Protestant faculties obtained extraordinary donations.

[19] R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme,* 611–23. Some religious superiors made the journey to Germany an obligation of conscience for their seminarians. Also the JOC

When in 1944 the provisional government of General de Gaulle abolished the government of Marshal Pétain, the new power in the state aspired to purge the episcopate, which it accused of compliancy toward the Vichy regime. Together with the demand for the recall of Nuncio Valerio Valeri it demanded the resignation of some bishops. Pius XII agreed to replace his nuncio, because there was question of a measure which affected all envoys accredited to the Vichy regime, but he absolutely refused a purge of the episcopate. The new nuncio Angelo Roncalli brought it about that this decision was accepted and resignations were limited to three.[21] From this time on, the French episcopate created for itself a common organization. Since 1919 the cardinals and archbishops had customarily met and on occasion published common statements. Immediately after the Second World War the permanent Secretariat of the Episcopate was established, and finally in 1951 there took place the first plenary meeting of all French bishops.

In public life it was a new phenomenon that declared Catholics participated in the provisional government of General de Gaulle and then in the government of the Fourth Republic, which succeeded it in 1946. Again and again people who came from the ACJF were to be found in ministerial offices in ever quicker succession. Only the Ministry for National Education remained closed to them. The constitution adopted by a bare majority of votes on 13 October 1946 decided anew that the republic was a laicized state and freedom of teaching was excluded from the consitutionally legal freedoms. Nevertheless, the hierarchy, unperturbed, continued the struggle for the free school. As early as 13 March 1946 a declaration of the French cardinals and archbishops affirmed: "The entire French episcopate is determined to maintain the freedom of instruction by all the means at its disposal."[22]

---

expressed itself for the journey out of solidarity with those who had no possibility of avoiding it. Cardinal Liénart declared that it was up to each individual whether to obey the summons, and the ACJF supported resistance, whereby it oriented itself to the numerous "maquis" Catholics. A former member of ACJF later became president of the National Council of the Resistance Movement.

[20] R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme,* 621.

[21] Ibid., 620.

[22] A. Deroo, *L'épiscopat français dans la mêlée de son temps 1930–1954* (Paris 1955), 126f.

In the autumn of 1947 a public demonstration of the French Catholic educational system supplied the opportunity to recall "the complementary service which free instruction does for the country" and it was again emphasized that "justice, freedom, and equality" demand that the Christian school system receive its share in the financial expenditures which the state dispenses for the education of French youth. In the same year the treasury brought suits against the organizers of charity bazaars, which were held to cover school costs. In some cases this brought even bishops to court and thereby gave them the opportunity to call to mind the principles of justice. The politicians could not be entirely deaf to such appeals. In 1948 two decrees empowered state and local commissions to consult on a form of support for free schools. This again called forth the opposition of the entire left, and in some parts of the press were again heard the tones of the old anticlericalism. Despite this, the bishops in 1949 again insisted that "the Christian school is the concern of everyone who is called a Christian," and they admonished parents of their duty to care for a Christian education of their children.[23] Finally a law of 28 September 1951, called *Loi Bérangé,* granted to free elementary schools a subsidy of thirty-nine francs per year and per pupil as a contribution to the teachers' salary. This law quite obviously did not claim to have solved the school question, but it aimed only to make a beginning.

The new development introduced by this law was the work of the new government, which General de Gaulle had formed on his return to power. A law of 31 December 1959 gave the free schools the choice among four solutions: full integration into the state school, full freedom of the status quo, a social treaty whereby the state would appoint the teachers and lay down the general plans of instruction while undertaking all the costs of instruction, and finally individual treaties according to which the teachers chosen by the school would be subject to the conditions of state examinations and controls and would be paid by the state. In 1966 there were 11,700 institutions with individual treaties and 54,000 high school teachers paid by the state.[24]

These regulations did not silence all discussion of the free school. This type of school met objections from Catholics themselves, not only among those who advocated the state school system, from which they knew that it could give a testimony of great apostolic importance, but also in the clergy itself, where some asked what was to happen with the traditional institutions. These attitudes can be all the better understood when one considers that Catholics not only knew how to succeed in the cultural sphere but even also in the leadership strata of the state universities, which for a long time had with good reason been regarded as an instrument of de-Christianization. The intellectual and scholarly renewal of French Catholicism has since gone beyond the ecclesiastical frontiers. Such large-scale works as the *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France* by the abbé and member of the Academy Bremond achieved a great success. The *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique* continued the efforts from the first years of this century. In 1937 was begun the scriptural series *Unam Sanctam,* in which soon appeared the epoch-making *Catholicisme* by Father de Lubac, and which not long after included the works of Father Congar. The *Histoire de l'Église* of Fliche and Martin had already begun, and Gilson was publishing his works on the history of Scholasticism, by which even Jacques Maritain was inspired and on which he relied in the investigation of the relations between Christians and modern society, in a perspective moreover that really stood close to that of the periodical *Esprit,* founded in 1932 by E. Mounier. During the war Fathers de Lubac and Daniélou founded the collection *Sources chrétiennes* for textual editions and translations of patristic texts, in which soon researchers from the ranks of the diocesan priests and of the orders collaborated with members of the state universities. Only a little later began the collection *Théologie.*

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] *Panorama de la France,* 896f.

Obviously, however, these works reached only a restricted elite. Only a few publications with a wider circulation, such as *Les Etudes* and *La Vie Intellectuelle,* could obtain a larger public for their investigations, but they caused difficulties and precautions which influenced the encyclical *Humani generis* of 1950. Other works, on the other hand, served direct practice. Thus in 1930 Gabriel Le Bras had founded in France the sociology of religion in attaching practicing Catholics to various categories according to their belonging to the environment of their native country, their social class, and their professional status. On this line lay also the book *Problèmes missionaires de la France rurale,* written in 1945 by Abbé Boulart. A less scholarly work in its methods, *France pays de mission?* had been written by Abbé Godin, and in 1950 it produced as many as 100,000 copies. The presentation of a world which had been formed outside the Church and the problems which this world raised for the Church made a deep impression on Cardinal Suhard, archbishop of Paris from 1940 to 1959. He decided on the founding of a Mission de France together with his interdiocesan seminary at Lisieux. This mission included a program and a special regulation of the phases of education for work in the workers' world. In May 1949 the Mission de France was granted a temporary statute by Rome. Finally an apostolic constitution of 15 August 1954 gave it a clearly defined status: as a prelacy *nullius,* whose territory was the ancient Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny. In 1955 the mission counted 181 priests.[25]

Cardinal Suhard had also undertaken by way of experiment to allow "worker priests." This initiative was based on various experiences, especially the setbacks in the apostolate in the proletariate environment, the positive experiences of the Dominican Father Loew, who had been a dockworker at Marseille, and of the priests and seminarians who had been drafted for compulsory work during the war. To become workers in order to understand the worker, to make oneself understandable to the worker and to bring him the message of Christ: this was the basic idea which led Cardinal Suhard to permit some priests to take up work in the factories. In 1946 there were six worker priests in Paris and a few others in Provence; in 1947 a group was established at Limoges, and others followed these. There were about ninety worker priests when in 1951 the Holy See ordered the suspension of recruiting. This undertaking had begun with obviously very high-minded priests, but without previously giving them the corresponding preparation, and so it incurred the most serious difficulties. The worker priests saw themselves confronted with a harshness of life they had not imagined; they frequently committed themselves to trade-union actions and in many cases let themselves be gained for the theory of class conflict, while others among them did not know how to maintain their priestly life and celibacy intact. In September 1953 the nuncio Marella informed the bishops that they must recall the priests subject to them, and religious superiors received a corresponding instruction from the Congregation of Religious. At the end of 1956 all religious had obeyed the command to leave, and about forty diocesan priests had likewise submitted, while a somewhat larger number proved by their resistance how urgently necessary Rome's intervention had been.[26]

This was not the end of all efforts of the hierarchy in regard to the apostolate in the workers' world. As early as 1943 Cardinal Suhard had established the *Mission de Paris,* and in the following October Father Epagneul founded the community of *Frères missionaires des campagnes* for the rural proletariat.[27] The *Fils de la Charité,* founded by Father Anizan in 1913, likewise continued their work in this environment. One of them, Abbé Michoneau, in 1946 published the experiences he had had in the five years of his pastoral activity in the parish of Colombes in a book with the programmatic title *Paroisse communauté missionaire.*[28] At Lyon the *Prêtres du Prado,* under the direction of Monsignor Ancel, united physical labor with the priestly and apostolic life in a parish association and a priestly community—in 1955 there were 514 priests. "Right in the heart of the masses," according to the rule of Father Voillaume, the *Petits Frères de Jésus* sought to unite existence in the world through manual labor and contemplation in the religious community.[29]

---

[25] A Dansette, *Destin du catholicisme français,* 145–49, 247–61, 300–305.

[26] Ibid., 292. P. Montlucard and his movement Jeunesse de l'Église formed for a while the intellectual center of the worker priests and declared that the reform of society was the essential presupposition for the evangelization of the proletariat. Whether they played a decisive role in this development of the experiences among the worker priests is an open question.

[27] Ibid., 342–47.

These exertions of various types showed that the hopes placed in the specially oriented movements had not been fulfilled. These movements, as, for example, the JOC, had been able to train an elite of persons who had been loyal to their function to the point of heroism but who did not succeed in dealing with the difficulties of the milieu of the moment and the class-struggle mentality. In 1956 a crisis became visible between the ACJF, which claimed the entire religious schooling of all five movements (JOC, JEC, JAC, JIC, and JMC), and the JOC, which sought autonomy in this area.[30] The resignation of its president led in practice to the dissolution of the old ACJF. The JAC, on the contrary, was less dependent on its social milieu. Hence it did not suffer as much as the JOC during the crisis of 1956 and was able to maintain its membership and strength of personality in agriculture (Rémond, 655f.).

One can regard these movements which caused shocks in the French Church as signs of its vitality. The numbers of vocations to the priesthood and the religious life also testify to vitality in the postwar period. Of course, some other numbers could at first glance produce the impression of a catastrophe: Of 35,000 parishes, in which in 1880 one priest took care of the Church's ministry, in 1930 10,000 no longer had a resident priest. But these bare figures are deceptive, for they contain parishes with 300 and fewer inhabitants, who lost the priest who had been assigned to them in the nineteenth century. In reality, the number of diocesan priests, which amounted to 54,800 in 1913, had dropped to 46,980 in 1929 and to 42,486 in 1948.[31] If these figures are compared with those of the French population, then one arrives at the ratio of one active diocesan priest to 832 inhabitants in 1913, to 960 in 1929, and to 1,029 in 1950.[32] Perhaps characteristic of the religious condition of the nation is what Boulart terms the ordinations quota, that is, the number of young priests ordained for every 10,000 young men twenty-five to twenty-nine years old. This quota, which for 1902 amounted to fifty-two, fell to thirty between 1909 and 1913. It rose only very slowly on the eve of the war of 1914 and only experienced a noticeable diminution between 1934 and 1938, when it dropped to somewhat above forty. The interruption because of war and imprisonment caused this figure to rise to fifty for 1946–47, but from 1947 to 1949 it fell again to forty. If ordinations are compared on an average of every ten years, then there were 1,535 for the decade 1899–1908, 800 for 1919–28, and 1,088 for 1929–38.[33]

---

[28] Ibid., 311–13.

[29] Ibid., 214–17.

[30] Ibid., 399f.; F. Boulard, *Essor ou déclin du clergé français?* 132 and 164.

[31] R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme,* 655f.

[32] A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse,* 632.

Apostolic activity is dependent on the occupation of young priests together with older priests, many of whom have passed the age of sixty. In 1946 an inquiry yielded 41,573 diocesan and religious priests in the active care of souls, of whom 28,777 were active in parishes and 7,166 in education.[34]

Neither in this present period nor in earlier times can the depth and quality of the Christianity of people be estimated by seeking to penetrate to its innermost being. One can at most, with the aid of the methods of investigation which Gabriel Le Bras so highly praised, provide a sort of chartlike survey of religious practice. Such a chart distributes the French population in almost equal parts into regions with Christian parishes, in which 45 percent take part in Sunday Mass and receive Easter Communion, and into such regions in which the number of practicing Catholics falls below 45 percent and which can be designated as "areas indifferent to Christian traditions." Outside these two larger groups there are still zones not to be overlooked in size, which belong to several sections, and those which are to be reckoned among the great urban masses of the population, in regard to which they constitute zones for mission work.[35]

---

[33] F. Boulard, "Les vocations sacerdotales en France. Le bilan d'un demi-siècle," *NRTh* 72 (1950), 486.

[34] F. Boulard, *Essor ou déclin,* 109. For the last decade the following figures result:

1965	646	1969	345	1973	219
1966	566	1970	285	1974	170
1967	489	1971	237	1975	161
1968	461	1972	193		

[35] G. Le Bras, "Description de la France catholique," *NRTh* 70 (1948), 835, 845; map, pp. 840f. The author distinguishes three zones of Christian parishes: In the west the province of Brittany, the *départements* of Manche, Mayenne, parts of Maine-et-Loire, also Deux-Sèvres, and the forest area of La Vendée form a broad sector; a still wider sector is formed by Alsace, Lorraine, and Franche-Comté; a third block in the center

Even if France was not a Christian country in its entirety on the eve of the Second World War, still it presented the picture of a nation in which the Catholic Church possessed solid positions: a very thick network of rural parishes, a network of urban parishes and religious institutions at least in accord with the demands of the hour, an educational group active especially in the field of elementary schooling, and finally a prudent intellectual elite. The contrasts, like the gains from the beginning of the century, to some degree compensate, so that the Church of France seemed to be in a favorable starting position to regain the terrain lost in a century. It will be the task of the historians in the next centuries to investigate the reasons which led to the development in the most recent period and to the postconciliar crisis.

---

includes three *départements* and parts of three others. Add three regions of lesser extent, which show a high population density: in the *départements* of Nord and Pas-de-Calais, in some Alpine cantons, and a third nodal point at the foot of the Pyrenees. Another group is formed by the so-called "indifferent to Christian traditions" group. Here the author distinguishes a broad strip which runs through all of France from the north to the southeast and to which belong twenty entire *départements,* nine others almost in their entirety, and ten more in great part; next to this group must be placed a bloc which in the south of the Massif Central embraces two whole *départements,* seven others almost entirely, and two more in great part. In these two last-named blocs are found about twenty cantons with regularly practicing Catholics; but they are interspersed with missionary areas, in Yonne to two-thirds, in Aube to one-half, on the east edge of Loiret and in Creuse, Haute-Vienne, and Corréze. These third zones of mission territory are covered with districts of the great urban mass population, in which the proportion of nonbaptized children reaches 20 percent.

CHAPTER 22

*The Church in Spain and Portugal**

Spain

In 1914 there were sixty-one dioceses, including the two now independent vicariates of Fernando Póo and Morocco, and nine archiepiscopal sees, which have today increased to eleven. In contrast to the 34,000 priests at that time, in 1972 there were 24,000. The male religious amounted to ca. 11,000 in 1925, to ca. 31,000 in 1972. In 1925 there were 35,000 sisters, in 1965 91,000.

* Spain: Quintín Aldea Vaquero; Portugal: Antonio da Silva.

The history of the Spanish Church in the last decades is divided into three parts: the Monarchy of Alphonso XIII (1914–31), the Second Spanish Republic and the Spanish Civil War (1931–39), and the postwar period after 1939.

THE MONARCHY OF ALPHONSO XIII (1914–31)

The year 1914 did not play as decisive a role in the history of Spain as it did in the other European countries. But it produced a great shock, which operated like an avalanche in the course of the disquieting years of the twentieth century. The concern of contemporary Catholics was concentrated on a series of neuralgic points: the hotly discussed problem of the two Spains—the traditional and Catholic Spain and the liberal and reforming Spain—the tensions between religion and politics as concomitant symptoms of the liberalism of the nineteenth century, the question of education, the social problem, and so forth. All of them crossed the path of the Spanish Church. There is no intention of dwelling unduly on this matter and treating the problems thoroughly, but something must be said on a few points in order to sketch the features of Spanish Catholicism.

The Problem of the Two Spains

This theme represents the background of all other problems, and contains a concept of the national life by means of definite guidelines and principles. What is the historical background of Spain? What is its destiny as a nation? On the answer to these questions depends the idea of the present history of Spain and with it the function which the Church must exercise in it. The basic answers which have been given to solve the historical riddle of Spain and which constitute the origin of the problem of the so-called two Spains[1] goes thus: "Progressivism and traditionalism are the true and decisive comrades-in-arms of our twentieth century from the Cortes of Cádiz to the Restauración de Sagunto," so says, quite rightly, Laín Entralgo.[2] After the restoration of 1874 the two opposed tendencies basically remained, with the natural change of reforms and renewals the two chief representatives of the Spanish drama. This situation prevailed with more or less serious incidents until 1936. On both sides were logically outstanding representatives. In the first third of the twentieth century there prevailed the prototype of the Catholic wing, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo (1856–1912), even after his death, like El Cid in the saga, an incomparable master, who united in his person and in his gigantic work all works of Spanish culture. As no other, he raised a song of praise to the Catholic

[1] C. Sánchez Albornoz, *Espãna, un enigma histórico* II (Buenos Aires 1971), 670.
[2] P. Laín Entralgo, *Espãna como problema* (Madrid 1949), 14f.

unity of Spain in the epilogue of his *Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles:* " . . . Spain, preacher of the gospel in half the world; Spain, terror of heretics, light of Trent, sword of Rome, cradle of Saint Ignatius . . . ; this is our greatness and unity: we have no other."[3]

On this line lay the declarations of the Popes and of the Spanish episcopate in their encyclicals, briefs, speeches, or pastoral letters respecting the glorious traditions of the nation. This tradition was constantly the background and determined the manner of speaking of the Church's officials; national greatness and Catholic tradition were one.

Facing this traditionalist position of Catholic Spain stood the other Spain, which we find incarnate in one of the greatest representatives of modern Spanish thought: José Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955). On 23 March 1914 he said on the occasion of a lecture delivered by him in the Teatro de la Comedia at Madrid: "We are sure that a great number of Spaniards agree with us that the destiny of Spain is intimately connected with the progress of liberalism."[4] In this connection he explained what he understood by liberalism: "that radical stimulation, always vital in history, which tries to exclude from the state every influence of extrahuman nature and which always expects from the new social measures a better result than from the old and traditional."[5] Hence, an end to the influence of the Church, because it is subject to human influence, and an end to the old traditions. In still more definite words he confronted tradition and consolidated his ideas in his work on tradition, *Meditaciones del Quijote,* which appeared in 1914: "The traditional reality in Spain has consisted precisely in this, permanently to destroy the opportunities of Spain. No, we cannot follow tradition . . . just the opposite is commanded: We must proceed against tradition, beyond tradition."[6] For Ortega y Gasset the Church was a permeating leaven. "Without doubt the Church is antisocial, religion is exclusive."[7] In the same way he thought of religious education: "The denominational school is, in comparison with the nondenominational, the beginning of anarchy, because it represents a singular pedagogy."[8] For him regeneration, that is, renewal, would bring Spain real political health, synonymous with Europeanization. "Spain was the problem, and Europe the solution."[9] In this way European Spain should lift itself above the traditional, that is, the unholy, unchurchly Spain. Around these two Spains were assembled and organized the Spaniards, intellectuals, workers, and peasants. The life of the Church unfolded by constraint within this sociological environment which influenced all its national and international activities.

---

[3] M. Menéndez Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* VI (Santander 1948), 508.

[4] J. Ortega y Gasset, *Obras completas* I (Madrid 1957), 303.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 362f.

[7] Ibid., 519.

[8] Ibid.

Christian Syndicalism

In his lecture at the Teatro de la Comedia in 1914 Ortega y Gasset declared that the two current modern tendencies in Spanish public life were the Socialist Party and the trade-union movements.[10] Without intending to oppose this thesis, it is clear that the union movement and with it the so-called Social Question had won powerful importance in national events. What measures did the Spanish Church take, once it was faced with this serious problem?

Some historians and sociologists have sought, from the viewpoint of the second half of the twentieth century, to play down the countless initiatives which proceeded from the Church to render this problem harmless. The Church could be charged with neither passivity nor ignorance. Despite great difficulties, which had to be mastered, it laid for itself a road through the shaken social world. After the death of the Jesuit Antonio Vicent (1837–1912), "the patriarch of Spanish social Catholicism," as his famous pupil Severino Aznar called him, the Christian union movement began to gain in strength and extent. The ideal solution would have been at this moment the formation of workers' or peasants' unions without group ideologies. But considering the fact that the union acted in an antireligious manner and firmly attacked the Church, there was nothing else left except to organize the Christian union; in regard to this there occurred within the Catholic ranks a strong polemic, which partly absorbed the energies of the Catholic union. Nevertheless, successes could be attained among the peasant unions, since the rural population adhered to the Church more than did the industrial workers. Hence it is incorrect to speak of a failure of Christian unions[11]

The Church unions, regardless of whether they were denominationally oriented or not, had to follow the Church's guidelines; hence they could not offer the worker the revolutionary stimulus of the *Unión General de Trabajadores* (UGT) or of the *Confederación Nacional del*

---

[9] Ibid., 521.

[10] Ibid., 277.

[11] J. N. García Nieto, *El sindicalismo cristiano en España* (Bilbao 1960); D. Benavides, *El fracaso social del catolicismo español o Arboleya Martínez, 1870–1951* (Barcelona 1973).

Trabajo (CNT), otherwise they would stand outside the Church's social doctrine and would not have been ecclesiastical unions. Gil Robles, one of the best politicians of that time, testified to a great momentum in the *Confederación Nacional Católica Agraria.* It was one of the organizations with which people would have to reckon.

SECOND SPANISH REPUBLIC AND CIVIL WAR (1931–39)

In an effort to end the social-political confusion which externally impaired Spanish life in the first third of the twentieth century, three political solutions were tried in succession: a concrete application of parliamentary government by Antonio Maura; the dictatorship of General Primo de Rivera, established on 13 September 1923; the Second Republic of 1931.[12]

The first two efforts were unsuccessful. The result of the communal elections of 12 April 1931, which had favored the monarchy numerically, produced the abdication of Alphonso XIII and the proclamation of the republic on 14 April. Seen from the religious standpoint, this meant the official establishment of anticlericalism in Spain, which within six years drove the Spanish Church into a frightful catastrophe without comparison in the history of the Church. The burning of monasteries and churches on 11 May 1931 and the expulsion of the bishop of Vitoria and of the primate of Toledo from Spain were clear indications of the religious attitude of the most powerful agents of the new Spanish policy. The spirit of the constitution of the republic was stamped by *sectarismo* to such a degree that even the president of the republic, Niceto Alcalá Zamora, conceded that those measures were an invitation to civil war.[13] Concerning ARTICLE 26 of the constitution, which dealt with the religious orders, Jóse Mariá Gil Robles, minister of that republic, says in his *Memorias:* "The enacting of ARTICLE 26 of the basic law was not only a remarkable injustice but represented a mistake with incalculable consequences. The religious problem was changed into a state of war with the danger of conflict between the two Spains."[14] Nevertheless, the ecclesiastical dignitaries recommended to the Spanish Catholics "respect and obedience to the lawful authorities and cooperation in all those matters whose aim was the general welfare and social peace."[15]

---

[12] J. Vicens Vives, *Aproximación a la historia de España* (Barcelona 1960), 215–18.

[13] A. Montero, *Historia de la persecución religiosa en España 1936–1939* (Madrid 1961), 29.

[14] V. Palacio Atard, "Iglesia y Estado. La Segunda República Española (1931–1939)," *Diccionario de Historia Eclesiástica de España* II (Madrid 1972), 1181.

[15] "Exposición del Cardenal Primado al Presidente del Gobierno provisional, el 3 de junio 1931," A. Montero, op. cit., 29.

Even the members of the cabinet were surprised by the respect shown by the Church toward the republic. But they still did not feel induced to change their damaging attitude; on the contrary, the antireligious legislation went further. On 24 January 1932 a law was passed whose content was the abolition of the Society of Jesus; it had to seek its salvation in exile. The justification of the law was that the Jesuits paid obedience to a foreign power, the Pope. Some days later the divorce law was enacted; immediately thereafter there appeared in the *Gaceta* a decree on the secularization of cemeteries. Another decree prescribed that the cross be removed from the schools. All these measures injured in the keenest way the sensitivities of the overwhelmingly Christian families. In the face of this more or less open persecution nothing else was left to the Church than to issue a sharp protest. At first, on 25 May 1933, the Spanish episcopate published a "Declaración sobre la ley de Confesiones religiosas."[16] A few days later, on 3 June, appeared Pius XI's encyclical *Dilectissima nobis,* in which he lamented the situation in Spain.[17]

A clear example of the anticlerical extremism of the left was the uprising in Asturias in October 1934, in which an effort was made to set up a dictatorship of the proletariat. Fortunately, the revolt lasted only a few days. But this was long enough cruelly to murder thirty-four clerics, including minor seminarians, and to burn or desecrate fifty-eight churches. This was the program of action envisaged by the Marxist revolution for all of Spain. If this side had gained the victory, then this frightful martyrdom would have extended throughout Spain. In this situation the question of Antonio Montero was justified: "Is it necessary to point out that on the edge of the actual civil war and before it erupted, the program of the persecution of the Church was prepared to the last detail?"[18]

THE CIVIL WAR (1936–39)

Out of the elections of 16 February 1936 there emerged as victor, with the aid of the prevailing election system, which provided a bonus for the majority, the Popular Front, that is, a union of all the leftist parties. This victory was fostered by the votes of the members of the CNT and the split of the right parties. The new government tried unsuccessfully to satisfy its electors. Then political disintegration overtook the broad public. The leader of the national bloc, José Calvo Sotelo, drew in the parliament a sad balance of the events within the Popular Front government of six weeks from 16 February to 2 April 1936: there occurred 199 attacks and burglaries, 36 of them on churches; 178 fires were counted, including 106 churches burned down and 56 destroyed; 74 dead and 345 wounded were to be lamented. A few months later Calvo Sotelo himself was murdered in the night of 13 July 1936 by Popular Front police. This deed was declared an expressly political crime and sharply condemned by the sensible population of the country. It occasioned the *Movimiento;* the only way out was civil war. The army and the right joined in the struggle against the Marxist revolution. The *Movimiento Nacional* rose on 18 July; the two Spains were divided into two battlefields: the Red and the National Zones.

---

[16] A. Montero, op. cit., Apéndice Documental, 655.

[17] Ibid., 675.

[18] Ibid., 52.

The Red Zone

The Church did not take part in the *Alzamiento.* But through the bishop of Gerona, Dr. Castañá, it proclaimed "the gratitude that an innocent victim feels for its generous defender."[19] One year after the outbreak of war the Spanish bishops on 1 July 1937 addressed all the Catholic bishops of the world. In their letter they expressed in their concern for religion, home, and humanity not an empty thesis but "the events which characterize our war and give it its special features." Spain was divided in two: on the one side the Communist revolution with its barbaric, antireligious, and anti-Spanish licentiousness, on the other side the National Movement with its respect for the religious and national order. In this situation the Church, always remaining within its pastoral sphere and without pawning its spiritual freedom, had no other way out than to place itself on that side which "took the field for the defense of order, social peace, traditional civilization and homeland, and not least the defense of religion."[20] The tone of the episcopal letter was moderate, of emotional balance and realistic attitude. Only two bishops did not sign it: the archbishop of Tarragona, Francisco Cardinal Vidal y Barraquer, and the bishop of Vitoria, Mateo Múgica. The former, because he believed secret written information to the bishops of the various nations would be more effective and joined with less danger of reprisal against those who still lived in the Red Zone than a public common letter; the latter, because he was outside his diocese. The rest of the episcopate, forty-three bishops and five vicars general, signed it.

---

[19] A. Pérez Balaguer, *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada. Suplemento anual 1936–1939* (Madrid 1944), 1551. Monsignor José Cartañá was a Catalan; his nomination as bishop occurred during the republic (29 December 1933) and hence did not depend on the right of presentation.

[20] A. Granados, *El Cardenal Gomá, Primado de España* (Madrid 1969), 348; L. Aguirre, *La Iglesia y la Guerra española* (Madrid 1964) (all on the common letter); C. Bayle, *El mundo católica y la "Carta colectiva del episcopado español"* (Burgos 1938).

The echo of the common letter was loud. "All members of the episcopate [ca. 900 bishops] replied by recognizing the legitimacy of the war on the part of national Spain and its character as a crusade for the Christian religion and civilization," said the future Cardinal Pla y Deniel.[21]

Meanwhile the real confrontation was carried out on the battlefield and beyond the fronts. It demanded of the Spanish Church a heavy tribute of blood and glorious martyrdoms. Twelve bishops of the dioceses of Sigüenza, Lérida, Cuenca, Barbastro, Segorbe, Jaén, Ciudad Real, Almería, Guadix, Barcelona, Teruel, and the auxiliary bishop of Tarragona died as martyrs. True to their evangelical task and with full knowledge of the danger to which they were exposed on the outbreak of war, they still remained at their posts. "I cannot leave out of fear; here is my duty, cost what it may," said the bishop of Cuenca to those who recommended flight. And for this reason the other shepherds remained with their flocks. All fell, sooner or later, with bodies riddled by bullets.

Because of their office, 4,184 priests had to die; they were hunted like game. Some dioceses suffered very heavy losses, as, for example, that of Barbastro; there 123 of the 140 pastors died, at Lérida 270 out of 410, and at Toledo 286 out of 600. Of the religious 2,365 died, some of them between seventeen and eighteen years old. Worst hit were the following institutes: Claretians with 259 dead, Franciscans with 226 dead, Piarists with 204 dead, Marists with 176 dead, Brothers of the Christian Schools with 165 dead, Augustinians with 155 dead, Dominicans with 132 dead, and Jesuits with 114 dead. The number of murdered sisters amounted to 283; even as women they were not spared persecution and torment. Altogether 6,832 priests, sisters, and brothers sacrificed their lives for the faith: an unmistakable proof of the vitality of the Spanish Church. As regards the type of martyrdom, no method known in history was overlooked: mutilation, death by fire, or even crucifixion.

The National Zone

At the outbreak of the *Movimiento* a religious movement was to be noted among the Spanish people and the warriors. There was a genuine rebirth of the religious life in the entire country. Victories at the front were celebrated with Masses, Te Deums, and *Salve Reginas.* The new government began to draw up new laws with a Christian meaning. The cross was again hung in the schools, and religious instruction was again introduced. Important laws, such as the *Carta Magna del Fuero del*

---

[21] A. Granados, op. cit., 178.

Trabajo of 1936 for the support of families, were oriented to the Church's social teaching. Great amounts of money were made available for the reconstruction of more than 20,000 destroyed churches. The corps of chaplains was reintroduced. All churches and chapels, the residences of bishops and priests with their grounds, and seminaries and monasteries were exempted from the land tax. In May 1938 the Society of Jesus was again permitted, with restoration of all rights and goods it had enjoyed before its dissolution. On 2 February 1939 the juridical status of all religious orders was restored. The republican legislation on divorce and civil marriage, the secularizaton of cemeteries, and the limitations on Catholic burials were repealed. In short, all those rights were again recognized in the Church which were contained in canon law. Respect for the Church and its institutions was again holy and removed from any discussion.

The chaplains at the front wrote a glorious chapter for the history of the Spanish Church. Among those who perished must especially be named the Jesuit Fernando Huidobro, favorite pupil of Martin Heidegger; the process for his beatification has begun.

SPAIN IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD (SINCE 1939)

The thirty years between 1939 and 1970 can be divided into two parts, of fifteen years each, which were marked by two different sorts of generation: a traditional generation (1939–55) and a critical generation (after 1955). The two groups are the same in exterior structure but different in dynamism.

The Twofold Trend

TRADITIONAL GENERATION. The religious organization in the Spain of the postwar epoch had its origin in the glorious Catholic tradition that was the ideal of the Spain which had once gained victory on the fields of battle. Hence one can speak of an amazing revival of the content of this tradition. Of this there were the following signs: strengthening of Church authority and respect for Church offices; increase of ecclesiastical vocations; improvement of ecclesiastical institutions and refounding of institutions; the wide extension of charitable activities, as, for example, the missions; spiritual exercises and religious courses; jubilee years with pilgrimages to Santiago de Compostela and Holy Week processions; attendance at Sunday Mass and reception of Easter Communion; the strong movement of the lay apostolate with Catholic Action, the Marian congregations, and other institutions. Religious books obtained a dominant position on the national book market. Religious publishers, such as El Mensajero, Sal Terrae, El Apostolado de la Prensa, la Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, spread the works of the great authors throughout the world. The climax of this period was the concordat of 1953 as the embodiment of the classical principles of the canon law then in force and of the traditional spirit of Catholic Spain.[22] It would take us too far afield to evaluate all phenomena. The influence of the Spanish Church on Spanish society was enormous. Probably until then the Spanish Church never had so many possibilities of forming a society by means of Christian ideals. In 1940 the Church had charge of 60 percent of all high schools and hence could exercise its influence on youth in so critical a period of life; in 1955 it was still 42 percent.[23] Furthermore, the Church gave religious instruction in public schools and universities and was able to exercise influence in this way also. As regards the piety of the population, there can be noted, as an example only, that the missionary group of the Jesuit province of León alone could organize 2,118 missions in Spain betwen 1940 and 1965, among them some in large cities with up to 60,000 participating in one mission.[24]

CRITICAL GENERATION. In the course of the years the number of members of a small group of Catholics with an outlook directed to Europe and the world grew. This movement let itself be guided by the political philosophy of Jacques Maritain in questions of relations between Church and state. It also caused the introduction of liturgical forms from beyond the Pyrenees and the dissemination of foreign points of view and unfamiliar morals in Spain. The more these trends gained in importance, the certainty was strengthened that the block of classical Spanish thought began to crumble and that the traditional concept of Spanish life incurred the danger of losing its vigor. The polemic on the theme, carried out on the national and international level, had reached its highest intensity when the Second Vatican Council began. Some of the most important, hitherto disputed points of the notion of Christian life were raised by it to postulates. This fact produced a deep crisis on several levels of Spanish Catholicism, which to this day has not been removed.

Institutions

As outstanding representatives of the institutions within Spanish Catholicism must be mentioned: the episcopal conference, some institutes, Catholic Action, and the National Catholic Association of Propagandists.

---

[22] A. Martín Artajo, "El Concordato de 1953," *Diccionario de Historia Eclesiástica de España* I (Madrid 1972), 595–99. The author of this article was foreign minister at the time of the ratification of the concordat.

[23] *La educación en España, Survey S.I.* (private archives).

[24] *Archivo de la Prefectura de Misiones Populares de la Provincia de León, S.I.*

EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE. Since its establishment after the Second Vatican Council, the episcopal conference took over the control and administration which were previously cared for by the conferences of metropolitans. The decisions of the conference theoretically have no binding force for each diocese, but they are observed as if they were obligatory. In general, today the Spanish Church reacts on the collegial plane in all common questions. What is there discussed and decided is therefore of great general importance. The guidelines issued by the episcopal conference are in practice observed in the entire country. One of the most important stands of the episcopal conference was the declaration of January 1973 on "The Church and the political community," which was passed by a vote of fifty-nine for and twenty against, a situation in which is reflected the sociological structure of the episcopal conference. In this declaration the most important themes were treated which concerned the relations of Church and society, of Church and public order, the relations between Church and state with regard for the Catholic religion as the state religion, the revision of the concordat of 1953, and the renunciation of privileges and of the paying of ecclesiastics.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES. The improvement of the traditional institutes already in existence and the founding of new institutes are consequences of the religious revival of the postwar period. Altogether there are, according to the 1973 statistics, ca. 80 institutes of men with 24,281 members, apart from the 6,700 members who work outside Spain, especially in Latin America. As regards membership they are divided as follows: Jesuits 3,431; Salesians 2,535; Franciscans 2,174; Brothers of the Christian Schools 2,012; Dominicans 1,636; Piarists 1,303. These institutes displayed a great activity in schools and the press. Outstanding among the lay institutes is the Sociedad Sacerdotal de la Santa Cruz, or, for short, Opus Dei, founded at Madrid in 1928 by Monsignor José María Escrivá and recognized as an institute in 1947. According to statistics there were in 1966 in Spain 242 active institutes of women with 72,301 sisters, and 29 contemplative institutes with 19,211 sisters. The apostolic activity of these sisters is directed chiefly to schools: in 1967 56.12 percent were active in schools, while 20.28 percent performed their ministry in the health fields.

CATHOLIC ACTION. In 1926 Spanish Catholic Action was subjected to a profound restructuring. Previously it had been rather a loose union of the personnel present as a central organization; all Catholic personnel retained their own autonomy. After 1939 a strict centralization of all activities of the lay apostolate was introduced; it led to confrontations among the current personnel and partly impaired their work. From 1945 special institutions appeared with the founding of *Juventud Obrera Católica* (JOC) and *Hermandad Obrera de Acción Católica* (HOAC). On 5 December 1959 the conference of the Spanish metropolitans issued the new "Statute of Catholic Action," which consolidated the already existing central unity. This statute was replaced by a new statute issued on 1 February 1968 by the episcopal conference.

ASOCIACIÓN CATÓLICA NACIONAL DE PROPAGANDISTAS. Among the Catholic lay groups that exercise great influence on Spanish public opinion must be mentioned the *Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas.* Founded at Madrid in 1908 by the Jesuit Ángel Ayala with the aim of preparing a group of the Catholic Men's Union of Saint Louis for Catholic propaganda, it had as president the future Cardinal Ángel Herrera Oria, who possessed an extraordinary gift for organizing. In 1911 it bought the Madrid newspaper *El Debate* and a year later Herrera founded *El Editorial Católica* as economic and ideological support of the paper. The union was concerned with all problems which preoccupied the Spanish Church in this century. After the war *El Debate* was stopped and in its place appeared *Ya,* which together with *ABC* are the two most important daily newspapers of the country. After the war *La Editorial Católica* began the publication of the series *Biblioteco de Autores Cristianos,* which today consists of more than three hundred volumes. The great activity of Catholic propaganda, without precedent in the history of the Spanish Church, achieved its climax in 1947 with the founding of the Centro de Estudios Universitarios (CEU); a division of the Centro is today the Colegio Universitario de San Pablo at Madrid with 5,000 students and eight faculties.[25]

Portugal

The development of Portuguese history in this century went through three phases: the anticlerical revolution of the bourgeoisie of 1910 (1910–26); the new regime (1926–60); and the era of the Second Vatican Council from 1960.

THE ANTICLERICAL REVOLUTION (1910–26)

After the overthrow of the monarchy by the republican forces, the latter proceeded against the Church. The bishops were sharply attacked because of their rejection of the divorce law of 20 April 1911 and in the course of 1912 driven from their dioceses, with one exception—the archbishop of Évora. Diplomatic relations with the Holy See were broken until 1918, and clerics were deprived of their property. The wearing of the cassock and the exercise of their activity as directors of committees named by the state in the sphere of the administration of the Church were forbidden to the clergy. Minor seminaries were closed by law, and of the major seminaries only five were spared from this measure, those of Braga, Pôrto, Coimbra, Lisbon, and Évora. A law of 22 February 1918 permitted the existence of two seminaries, but the confiscated buildings were not given back. Still, the seminaries at Angra in the Azores (1914), Viseu and Braga in the former Jesuit house (1915), Pôrto and Pôrto Alegre (1919), Guarda (1920), Lamego (1921), and Lisbon (1931) resumed their activity.

---

[25] J. L. Gutiérrez, "Asociación Católica Nacional de Propagandistas," *Diccionario de Historia Eclesiástica de España* I, 144–47.

By recourse to the laws of Pombal and those of the liberal regime of 1834 the members of 164 houses of thirty-one orders were expelled. But from 1917 on some congregations were reorganized. The revolution also forbade religious instruction in elementary and high schools and closed the theological and ecclesiastical faculty of Coimbra. Nevertheless, in the First World War there were again field chaplains.

The lay apostolate awoke as a reaction to these measures. Thus in 1913 occurred the reactivation of the *Centro Acadêmico de Democracia Cristã* (CADC), founded at Coimbra in 1903. At the same time was founded the *Centro Católica,* which from 1915 sent its representatives to the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, even though only a small number.

THE NEW REGIME (1926–60)

With the movement of General Gomes da Costa and the presidency of General Carmona begins a new order of authoritarian character, whose most important representative became Oliveira Salazar. This movement led in the area of the relations between Church and state to the concordat of 1940. The position of the Church improved; it included seventeen dioceses and three archdioceses.

The statistics of 1947 give a total of 4,500 priests, one priest for every 2,000 inhabitants. Seminaries were restored or newly built with occasional state aid.

The number of religious sisters and brothers grew considerably. The communities obtained a little financial help from the state in proportion to the number of active missionaries and students. Around 1947 there were in the country some 400 religious priests and in 1952 ca. 4,400 sisters.

Religious instruction was reintroduced in the elementary and high schools. The number of schools with religious direction, especially schools for girls, increased, although they were attended mostly by the rich segment of the population and although there was no state aid. The education in these schools was primarily humanistically oriented and scarcely scientifically. Around 1930 a university institute for social assistance was founded at Lisbon. Jesuits taught in the philosophical university institute, run exclusively by them, which in 1947 was recognized as an ecclesiastical faculty.

In the field of journalism the following deserve mention: *Estudos* of the CADC of Coimbra (since 1922), *Brotéria* (since 1925), *Lumen* (for the clergy since 1930), *Portugal em África* (since 1944), *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* and *Itinerarium* (both since 1945). Among the most important institutions for social communication are the newspaper *Novidades* and the Catholic Broadcasting Radio Renascença, which was silenced by the revolutionary forces in 1975 and was later given back by the government.

The number of traditions in worship was increased by the great crowds on pilgrimage to the national shrine of Fatima since 1931. In addition, catechesis and liturgy again grew in importance, especially due to the exertions of the Lisbon seminary and the Benedictines. The lay apostolate began to take new routes. After the prohibition of political parties it withdrew from political life, to which so far the *Centro Católico* had devoted itself, and strengthened its collaboration with the church authorities. In 1932 the bishops founded the official *Acção Católica,* which in November 1933 obtained a juridical statute confirmed by Pope Pius XI. Portugal's missionary work produced in Angola up to 1940 as many as 500,000 Catholics with 174 missionaries, in Mozambique as many as 60,000 Catholics with 126 priests; but up to 1970 as many as 2.5 million in Angola and 1.25 million in Mozambique.

UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL (FROM 1960)

The Portuguese Church appeared at the council with only its bishops, hence without *periti.* In other words, it was a preponderantly traditional and authoritarian Church. In 1968 it numbered 4,500 diocesan and 900 religious priests; hence there was a slight increase in comparison to 1947, but this was also caused by the growth of the population, everything else being equal. These relations also remained constant in regard to the rural or urban origin of vocations.

At this time there were 18 major seminaries and 22 minor seminaries; the latter had 2,800 pupils in 1952 and 900 in 1968. The major seminaries had 4,049 students in 1952; by 1968 they decreased to 3,977. The general crisis in the seminaries extended also to the orders.

By 1960 the *Acção Católica* achieved its zenith. In this regard the national meetings of the *Juventude Católica Universitária* from 1953 to 1963 represented the climax. Among the ranks of the lay apostolate movements were to be observed which tended to achieve a greater independence in regard to the episcopate. By 1960 the statistics list the number of 95,000 members of *Acção Católica,* that is, 1.2 percent of the population. In the field of the university apostolate the founding of the Catholic University at Lisbon and of two other universities must not be forgotten. Still, the realities did not correspond to the structures. In the confrontation of the Church with the revolution of 1974 it was revealed that the former was poor, apolitical, without organized youth, with seminaries overtaken by crisis, and without adequate personnel. The present difficulties in the country have produced a concentration of Catholic forces, which allow one to hope for new initiatives.

CHAPTER 23

*The Countries of the English-Speaking Area**

Europe

GREAT BRITAIN

Population

The Catholic population of England and Wales in 1914 was estimated as 2,100,446, including 3,872 priests; in contrast there was a total population of 36,204,679 in 1911. There were 1,837 Catholic churches, chapels, and missions, of which 1,307 were authorized by civil law for marriages. At the same time there were 518,969 Catholics in Scotland, including 577 priests; they had 427 churches and chapels. When in 1966 the total population of England and Wales amounted to 48,075,000, the Catholic population had grown to 4,000,695, including 5,096 diocesan priests and 2,791 religious priests, with 3,446 public churches and chapels and 1,196 private devotional sites. In the intermediate time the Catholics had spread equally in the large cities and suburbs, but not in the rural areas; Catholicism remained an urban phenomenon. At the same time the

* Robert Trisco

number of Catholics in Scotland rose to 809,680 in a total population of 5,191,000.

This growth was based partly on the natural increase of the population, on conversions, and on the immigration of refugees from the continent, especially Poles and Ukrainians, but chiefly on immigration from Ireland. In fact, about three-fourths of the Catholics in Great Britain were of Irish descent, insofar as they were not themselves born in Ireland. The heterogeneity proceeding from this was gradually broken down by the integration of the immigrants into British Catholicism. The annual number of adult converts—between 12,000 and 10,000—remained almost unchanged from 1925 to the Second World War, in spite of the growth of the total population. Many converts were the future or present husbands or wives of Catholics. Of the rest, more Catholics came from the middle class, who were better able to cope with the claims of the Church than the lower class, and in proportion there were more converts among the Nonconformists, whose organized religious life quickly dissolved, than among the Anglicans. Meanwhile, however, the Church suffered a constant "loss"; even a great part of the children who came from Catholic schools soon gave up their practice of religion. These factors prevented the percentage of Catholics in England from increasing notably. Partly as a consequence of the prejudices of their fellow citizens and partly because of their own cultural inferiority, the influence of the English Catholics in public life did not correspond to their numerical strength.

Organization

From 1911 there were in England and Wales three metropolitan sees—Westminster, Liverpool, Birmingham—and thirteen dioceses. In 1916 the archdiocese of Cardiff emerged from the diocese of Newport in Wales, with Menevia as its only suffragan see. New episcopal sees were erected in 1917 at Brentwood and in 1924 at Lancaster. In 1965 the diocese of Southwark was raised to metropolitan status, and at the same time its suffragan see of Arundel and Brighton was erected. There were then in England and Wales five provinces with five archdioceses and fourteen dioceses. In addition, in 1957 the archbishop of Westminster was named apostolic exarch for the Ukrainians of the Byzantine Rite, which numbered more than 20,000 adherents; in 1961 Augustine Eugene Hornyak, O.S.B.M., a Ukrainian priest, was made his auxiliary bishop, and six years later he himself became apostolic exarch for Great Britain.

In Scotland from 1878 the archdiocese of Saint Andrews and Edinburgh had existed as metropolitan see with four suffragans, and the archdiocese of Glasgow had belonged to no ecclesiastical province; in 1947 the last named became a metropolitan see with two suffragan sees, which were newly erected at Motherwell and Paisley.

Furthermore, the archbishop of Westminster represented the episcopate in discussions with the government. The following occupied this post: 1903–35, Francis Bourne, a cardinal in 1910; 1935–43 Arthur Hinsley, cardinal in 1937; 1943–56 Bernard Griffin, cardinal in 1946; 1956–63 William Godfrey, cardinal in 1958; 1963–75 John Heenan, cardinal in 1965; and since 1976 Basil Hume, O.S.B., cardinal in the same year.

From the reign of Elizabeth I Great Britain had no diplomatic relations with the Holy See, but after the outbreak of the First World War the government sent Sir Henry Howard to convey the congratulations of the King to the newly elected Pope Benedict XV and to explain to him the reason for the entry into the war. The British representative stayed in Rome as extraordinary ambassador and minister plenipotentiary "on special mission." In 1920 the legation was made a regular and permanent institution. But the relations were never brought to reciprocity. No nunciature was established in London; in fact not until 1938 was an apostolic delegation opened in the British capital. The first apostolic delegate was an Englishman, William Godfrey, who took care of this post until he became archbishop of Liverpool in 1953.

Educational System

In 1914 343,472 pupils were educated in 1,169 Catholic primary schools and 24,129 in 387 Catholic secondary schools. In conformity with the Education Act of 1902 denominational schools had to be erected and repaired by voluntary offerings, although the expenses of maintenance and the salaries of teachers were paid out of public funds. They were endangered by the inability of the faithful in an age of rising costs to care for adequate premises and equipment. Discussions conducted in a friendly atmosphere between representatives of the state and the Church produced the "Scottish solution." In accord with the Scotland Education Act of 1918, the directors of the already existing Church schools or those to be established in the future were authorized to sell their schools to the education authorities, to lease them, or to transfer them in other ways. But the education authorities could themselves also erect new denominational schools. The officials were from then on to exercise complete control over the schools, including the appointment and dismissal of teachers, but in this connection the teachers on hand were to retain their positions. In the future no teacher could be appointed before he or she had been accepted by the relevant denominational corporation, "in regard to religious faith and character."

An unpaid supervisor, who had likewise to be accepted by the denomination, was to be appointed for every school. The supervisor had the right of access to all classes which were specified for religious instruction and worship, and he had to report to the Church authorities on the effectiveness of the religious instruction that was given. (In Catholic schools this supervisor was normally the parish priest, and diocesan inspectors had permission to give examinations in religion.) Thus was ended the administrative dualism, as the local authorities desired it, but the religious dualism was retained, because the bishops insisted on it in order to preserve the Catholic character of their schools. In spite of their security precautions and the fact that this agreement was to a great extent the work of William Francis Brown, whom the Pope had named as apostolic visitor for Scotland the previous year, the Scottish bishops and the Catholics in general were frightened by it. Finally, the Holy See with its only intervention in educational questions directed them to accept the agreement. This regulation functioned smoothly from the beginning and in the course of time was regarded from the Catholic standpoint as one of the best arrangements in the entire world. The Scottish Catholics opened many free schools for the primary and secondary grades and several colleges operated by religious orders, and all were supported by local and national public financing. (A few private Catholic schools which raised instructional fees likewise continued in existence.)

The situation of the Catholics in England and Wales differed from that of the Scots in many respects and in 1918 the bishops could not agree to give up the rights of ownership of their schools. Between 1914 and 1930 the Catholics built ninety-six schools with 60,000 places at a capital expenditure of £1,700,000. Meanwhile, construction costs steadily mounted and many of the older schools had to be replaced or expanded, and, especially in the cities, new schools had to be erected. The burden became intolerable. In order to draw public attention to the injustice of their situation, the Catholics organized great protest gatherings and called upon the members of parliament to give assistance. After the founding of the Irish Free State in 1921, English Catholics no longer had many friends in parliament, and the Labour Party had many members who by tradition were hostile to Catholicism, although it depended, especially in certain areas, also on the votes of the Catholic English workers. In 1931 the Catholic Educational Council decided to carry out a campaign for the adoption of the Scottish system in England and Wales, but the prospects of achieving this goal became less as each year passed, partly because the National Teachers' Association did not want to accept any system that would have meant the introduction of denominational instruction in a much larger number of schools under state ownership and religious examinations for specific teachers.

In 1936 the Catholics were forced to accept aid under conditions that were quite other than favorable. The Education Law of this year authorized the local authorities to contribute 50 to 75 percent of the costs for the erecting of voluntary schools. These schools had become necessary by the express intention of the state to raise the age of leaving school to fifteen years on 1 September 1939 and to "reorganize" the educational system. In order to correspond to the demands of the Free Churches and of the National Association of Teachers, this regulation had to be severely limited in time: applications had to be filed within three years; only the furnishing of the high schools was provided, although there was a greater need for the reorganization of the elementary schools; the teachers in those schools which obtained building subsidies had to be appointed by the local school officials, if even a small part of them—on which the directors of the schools and the officials had to agree—had to be "reserved" teachers, that is, such as were chosen in discussion with the school administration and were qualified to impart the relevant denominational instruction. In all voluntary schools there had to be given, in the event the parents wished it, a nondenominational religious instruction in keeping with the teaching plan prescribed for the local public schools. Finally, the aid was only permitted, but not prescribed as an obligation. Because the Catholics, under the leadership of the new archbishop of Westminster, Arthur Hinsley, feared that the Catholic high schools would lose their students to the better equipped public schools if they were not reorganized, they decided to make use of the offer and at the same time to work to retain their elementary schools.

The effects of these legal measures were not entirely satisfactory, although because of them a good by-product resulted: the setting up of diocesan school commissions in places where previously there had been none. The reorganization in rural areas, which included the erection of central schools, was delayed by the difficulties growing out of the great distances and the need of means of transportation, and it threatened to divide the life of the parish congregations. In the cities the development proceeded faster. Many offices, including London, were ready to grant the full financial subsidy, 75 percent, conceded by the law; others gave 50 percent. The single ill-famed case as a contrary example was Liverpool. There the constant immigration of Irish had caused an acute overcrowding of the Catholic schools in the areas of the dockyards. Under the influence of the local conservatives, allied with the militant Protestants, the city council had refused to grant the aid for the erection of denominational schools. When the Catholics did not succeed in the local elections in getting revenge for this provocation, the state education office intervened and held back a part of the sum which the state treasury assigned annually to the Liverpool office. Finally a compromise was reached in 1939, when parliament adopted a special law for Liverpool, whereby the city council was empowered to build high schools and then lease them to the denominational corporations at rents between 25 and 50 percent of the costs of the loan.

When the Second World War broke out, only 44.8 percent of the Catholic school districts had been reorganized. Even in 1942 there were still no less than 399 dilapidated Catholic school buildings on the "Black List" of the education office—this list included schools with defective equipment. The continuation of the reorganization was prevented by the war, and the age of leaving school could not be raised at the intended time. Of the 289 Catholic applications, which were submitted in accord with the law of 1936, only the nine approved were implemented. Although there was only one English community without a Catholic school—Morley near Leeds—almost 20 percent of the Catholic children in the country were not in Catholic schools. Nevertheless, the 1,200 Catholic schools made up 12 percent of the voluntary schools and instructed 8 percent of the total population of obligatory school age.

When the government began with the planning of a coherent system in the sphere of the primary grades, the secondary grades, and the higher school system, the Catholics began an active campaign of organized opposition to this project—the *Green Book* of 1941—and emphatically demanded that in their schools the denominational character remain intact. The Catholic Parents' Associations, the first of which was founded in 1940 at Ilford in the diocese of Brentwood, were increased on the parish level and coordinated by diocesan councils, which for their part were represented in an interdiocesan Council of the Catholic Parents' and Electors' Association. Its chief concern consisted for several years in assuring and promoting Catholic interests in the educational system.

Before a law was introduced in parliament there were long discussions with the president of the Board of Education, R. A. Butler, and representatives of the Anglicans, the Catholics, the Free Churches, and the teachers. However, the Catholic speakers were isolated, for the Anglicans had acquiesced, and the Free Churches and the professional associations had the upper hand. Because the Catholics failed to obtain even the slightest concessions, they opposed the law until parliament had passed it. The result showed that people in England and Wales, who, differently from Scotland, were already strongly de-Christianized, could not appeal to an influential public opinion which was convinced that religion formed the heart of education; one could claim only "equality of opportunity," the right of parents to have their children educated in their own faith and at no greater cost than what their non-Catholic neighbor had to pay.

The Education Law of 1944, the "Butler Act," provided financial aid for three categories of denominational primary and secondary schools. In all these schools all costs for secular and religious education were to be defrayed from public sources, but the state retained the right to assure itself that the schools were needed and that new schools were erected only to the extent that the national finances permitted: (a) The "voluntary aided schools" should remain totally denominational. But the state was now ready to pay to the school administrators 50 percent for approved necessary repairs and improvements and up to 50 percent of the expenses for specific reconstructions. Normally the school administrators were helped by loans with favorable conditions, and auxiliary services—medical examinations, school meals—were paid for by the state. (b) The "special arrangement schools" were supported in accord with the provisions of the law of 1936; the applications filed within the prescribed time, which had not been approved or implemented, could now be revived with the necessary alterations in the previously determined conditions in regard to a limiting of the number of those teachers who were recognized because of their qualifications for imparting denominational instruction. Other regulations should be the same as for the first category. (c) "Controlled schools" were to be financed and supported exactly as if they were public schools, with the exception of some concessions, which were made as an accommodation for the cession of the buildings, for example, the right of the denominational officials to name one-third, instead of two-thirds, of the school administrators.

The Catholics completely rejected the "controlled" status. As a result, they faced the most difficult task of raising the funds needed for their "voluntary aided schools"—half the costs of modernizing, reconstruction in new places, and accommodation of "transferred" students—and also the means for their "special arrangement schools"—from one-fourth to one-half—and for new schools—the total costs of building sites and the buildings. The heaviest burden was for the Catholics, especially for male and female religious institutes, the secondary school system because of the higher age for obligatory schooling and because of the abolition of all fees in the state schools. The existing Catholic secondary schools for the most part accepted the status of elementary schools, and, except for those which were especially instituted for the higher classes, strove to be recognized by the education authorities as "effective" in their various categories. By 1948 the number of "recognized" schools had risen to 109, and the number of those which obtained state money to 73.

Two supplementary laws of 1946 and 1948 eased somewhat the burden laid on the Catholics, but the expenses mounted further. A pupil's place, which had cost ca. £60 in 1939, in 1949 required between £191 and £400, with variations from diocese to diocese. Meanwhile, the number of Catholic children who did not go to Catholic schools rose from one to four. In 1950 the hierarchy proposed some redress and set up an "Action Committee" to guide local deputations drawn from the parishes and lay organizations; they were to inculcate these proposals in the candidates for parliament during the general election of that year. Although the Catholic electors were informed of the positions of the candidates, this campaign did not succeed in obtaining noteworthy support from them, especially because no political party showed an inclination to take up this controversial matter.

Because the Catholics were not in a position to erect sufficient secondary schools, from 1956 they again made demands for state aid, but this time they did not have recourse to public agitation. Some 30 percent of the Catholic children of school age were at this time not in Catholic schools, although the Church had, between 1945 and 1959, raised the number of its schools by almost 25 percent, that is, by more than 300 schools, created 100,000 new school places, and projected a further 150,000. The education law of 1959 was accepted in part as answer to the demands of the Catholics and Anglicans. This law raised the aid due previously from 50 to 75 percent and granted subsidies of 75 percent for the erecting of new voluntary secondary schools, which were totally or very greatly necessary to take those children from the primary schools of the same denomination which had existed on 15 June 1959 or who came from such primary schools as had been erected to replace the schools existing at this same time. For the Catholics the limitation imposed by the date and the exclusion of aid for the building of primary schools was, of course, a disappointment.

In 1966 there were among the Catholic voluntary schools in England and Wales 1,801 primary schools and schools for all ages, with 441,358 pupils, 388 modern secondary schools, with 142,670 students, 62 classical secondary schools, with 29,520 students, and 39 secondary schools of other sorts, with 24,347 students; in addition, there were 56 schools with direct aid and 36,146 pupils, 557 independent schools with 114,964 pupils, and 42 special and approved schools with 3,404 pupils, hence altogether 2,945 Catholic schools with 792,389 students.

In view of these numbers the Catholics again presented their requests and demanded 85 percent of all building costs. Finally they were satisfied with the provisions of the education law of 1967, which was introduced by the Labour Government and accepted by parliament almost without opposition. The state raised not only the existing subsidies for all voluntary schools or those supported by special arrangement, so far as they were paid for approved repairs and improvements, to 80 percent, but it now also counted what was still more important, 80 percent for the erecting of entirely new schools or for the expansion of existing schools, even if such aid had previously not been granted to these. The government was able to concede these increased subsidies in part because the churches had established more harmony among themselves.

In order to be able to supply these schools with personnel, the existing teachers' training schools were improved and new ones were established. The erection of five new institutions for teacher training in the years after 1960 was the result of long discussions with the Ministry of Education and the Council of Catholic Education. In 1968 there were fourteen Catholic institutions for teacher training in England and Wales.

The attempt to found a Catholic university was not made in these years. However, in 1922 the University Catholic Federation of Great Britain had been founded to unite the Catholic associations at the English universities; it was attached to the *Pax Romana,* from which it had obtained the stimulus for its founding. It was reorganized in 1942, when the nongraduates founded the Union of Catholic Students and the graduates the Newman Association; the two organizations cooperated closely. The Union began with the publishing of a periodical and of an annual, in which in detail were presented the various methods by which it aspired to stress the Catholic influence in the life and works of the universities. The Newman Association attracted graduates from various professions and states of life; it set up a center in London and some active local branches. It also began the publishing of a monthly bulletin, *Unitas,* and displayed useful activities such as vacation courses, lecture series, and public university courses, some of which obtained recognition fom the University of London Extension Board.

Social Movement

The chief impulse for the social movement was the Catholic Social Guild. A group of priests and lay persons from the middle-class intellectuals had founded it in 1909 for the following ends: (1) to facilitate dialogue between Catholic students and workers; (2) for assistance in the achieving of applications of Catholic principles to actual social conditions; (3) to awaken in Catholic circles a greater interest in social questions and to assure their cooperation in the promotion of social reforms according to Catholic guidelines. With the encouragement of the hierarchy, this guild pursued these goals predominantly through study clubs or groups; in 1914 there were ninety-five such groups, with about one thousand members, which were concentrated in the north of England, and, in opposition to the expectations of the founders, consisted almost entirely of workers. Although adequately trained leaders were missing, the number of study clubs rose to 379 by 1938; during the war this number dropped, again rose to 337 in 1950, and decreased after that. Within the educational program for adults the guild introduced a correspondence course, for which it granted certificates and diplomas. In addition, it produced and disseminated literature which treated social questions; it planned and promoted instructional programs, some textbooks, and examinations for the various groups. From the middle of 1911 to 1920 the guild published a *Quarterly Bulletin,* from 1921 on the monthly *The Christian Democrat* and the *Catholic Social Year Book;* it published many timely penny brochures and the series of books, *Catholic Studies in Social Reform,* which were used by the study clubs as manuals. Especially influential were its publications on international law after World War I and on the union system and employee-employer relations. Under the guidance of the guild days of recollection for workers were held; in the first fifteen years after World War I more than 9,000 persons at Birmingham and elsewhere took part in these days of recollection. Finally, the guild trained lecturers and instituted lectures. In 1919 the headquarters of the administration was moved from London to Oxford. The number of members rose to 3,910 up to 1939, and, following a decline during the war, to 4,166 in 1948.

In 1920 the guild arranged the first summer vacation course lasting one week. Its aim was to bring different classes together, to awaken understanding between employers and employees, and to make Catholic social doctrine known in broader circles. The number of participants rose from year to year and peaked in 1948 with 230; after that it declined, and at the end of the 1950s the vacation courses were stopped.

In 1921 the guild founded the Catholic Workers' College at Oxford in order to educate men, and from 1923 women also, as leaders for their worker colleagues. This was a "monument" to Charles Plater (1875–1921), one of the founders of the guild. The first principal of the college was Father Leo O'Hea, S.J., who in 1924 became also the editor of the periodical *The Christian Democrat* and manager-secretary of the guild. The college instituted courses on political and economic theory and history, likewise on social ethics and moral philosophy, but also on special themes, such as unions, community administration, and international relations. In 1925 it was recognized by the Education Office because of its provisions for adult education and empowered by the university to grant diplomas. All students received stipends from the financial means which came from varied sources, and from 1926 they could also receive a stipend of the Education Office. Most students came from England, Scotland, and Wales, but in later years there were also a few from abroad. In the first twenty-six years of its existence the college trained only 146 students. Nevertheless, some of its graduates were active in community politics and in the union movement.

When interest in the study groups slackened, obviously because study was regarded as an end in itself instead of a means to an end, action groups were founded. Likewise in 1954 the guild called the action group service into being, which from week to week supplied a system and a plan for study. This change could not entirely transform the trend to inflexibility. A new "Program for Social Action," drafted chiefly by Michael P. Fogarty, was published in 1957 in the *Catholic Social Year Book,* but in consequence of differences of opinion which led the guild into a crisis in the late 1950s, it was not realized. Finally, lay persons obtained the leading position, after the offices of the manager-secretary in 1958 and of the principal of the College of Workers in 1962 had been filled by them; they were merely advised by a priest, whom the bishops had named as moderator.

In the course of the years the guild took a stand for definite concerns. After World War I it supported a guaranteed minimum wage and the family money plan. In 1926 it supported the general strike, until Cardinal Bourne condemned it. In the disturbed years after 1920 and 1930 the guild stood up for the unions and their rights. In its publications it explained the "corporate order" which Pius XI had recommended in *Quadragesimo Anno.* In the years after 1940 the guild found fault with the welfare state, but most Catholics gradually came to consider it with limited approval.

True, the Catholic Social Guild avoided detailed plans or programs and thereby was satisfied to promote a knowledge of general principles, which the individual Catholic could then apply to special situations; but some of its members from the very start favored a clearly articulated, concrete program that was based on a policy of social reform. Some of them, especially among the younger, devoted themselves to the doctrine of Distributism, which was represented by Hilaire Belloc, Gilbert Keith Chesterton, Eric Gill, and Father Vincent McNabb, O.P. The "Distributists" abhorred both industrial capitalism and socialism and recommended instead a wide distribution of property to private ownership. They presented their theory in numerous articles, which they published in *The New Witness* (1912–23), *G.K.'s Weekly* (1925–36), *The*

Weekly Review (1936–47), *The Defendant* (1947–56), and finally *The Distributist.* The literary basis of the movement was strengthened by a social structure when in 1926 the Distributist League was founded in London. Within three months there arose affiliates in the large cities of England and Wales. At regular intervals the league organized public lectures and discussions on timely affairs; these events were attended by a relatively large number of auditors. But all their exertions led only to unimportant results, partly because of differences of opinion among the Distributists themselves. While a few called for action, Chesterton and his adherents were satisfied with propaganda—although, Chesterton and Belloc submitted proposals and recommended their implementation to the government. The members of the league were also not in agreement on the right to property and the use of machines; Father McNabb, an extremist, condemned them together with industrialism as a whole as an evil. Controversies of this sort left in the broad public the impression that they were utopian theoreticians and uncritical admirers of medieval civilization. The Birmingham Plan, proposed in 1928 by the affiliate in that city and later revised from time to time, was the most practicable, and *The Distributist Program,* which was published by the league in 1934, outlined the practical measures by which the ideal situation could be realized. But there were only a few persons willing to make the required renunciation of all those comforts and amenities which industrialization had contributed and again lead a simple handicraft life. Besides, other Catholics, especially members of the Catholic Social Guild, reviled the Distributists as unrealistic. From ca. 1939 every effective activity of the league ended, but individual Distributists continued in the years after 1950 their publications and proposals on their theory.

The recommendation of the Distributists for the gaining of the necessary livelihood by agriculture as a form of practical action was realized in the Back-to-the-Land Movement. In 1929 The Scottish Catholic Land Association was founded, and in 1931 and 1932 five regional Catholic agricultural societies were established in England. The six associations were represented by a standing joint committee, and *Land for the People,* begun by the Scots in 1930, was the common organ until 1934; in this year it returned to control by the Scots. At the same time the associations in England and Wales were reorganized as the Catholic Land Federation, which established a new official organ, *The Cross and the Plough.* Each local society had as its protector the local bishop or bishops, a priest as chairman, and a layman as secretary. According to Monsignor James Dey, chairman of the federation, the chief function of the associations consisted of establishing communities of small farmers with the secondary occupations united with them. In this way the natural right of man to private ownership would again be confirmed; unemployment would be mitigated, and Catholic life on the land would be renewed. Because the urbanized proletariat had first to be educated in agricultural methods, the societies instituted teaching farms, in which unmarried men should obtain a three-year teaching program in theory and practical instruction and also spiritual direction. However, these farms had only a brief life because of lack of money. For the same reason the societies could not set aside any land for settlement by independent farmers. The hierarchy entirely refused to approve and support a collection and thereby to give this movement official recognition, because it feared that this money would be diverted from the budget for the building of schools and churches in new localities, and because it doubted the financial practicability of the entire plan. Also the general indifference of the Catholics, doubts that the small holdings were a means against unemployment, and their distrust of the leading theoreticians in the movement, and also the lack of any support at all by the government—all this contributed to the dissolving of the associations and of the federation. However, The North of England Catholic Land Association, with corresponding subsidies from the government, until 1942 trained young men as farm workers—first for three months in a youth hostel or a home, then with a farmer—and *The Cross and the Plough* continued its issues until mid-1949.

During the great economic crisis, other Catholics, such as Father Paul Crane, S.J., John Fitzsimons, and other members of the Catholic Social Guild, saw in the work of Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day in the United States a model for action. In June 1935 they founded a new periodical, *The Catholic Worker,* whose first editor was John Ford. This newspaper was sold in all large cities on the streets, and the sellers formed discussion and action groups. In imitation of the American model they established Friendship Houses in some places. Among clergy and laity not everyone approved the aims of this movement, but *The Catholic Worker* continued until 1959. In that year its last editor, Robert P. Walsh, became organizational secretary of the Catholic Social Guild and editor of its monthly, *The Christian Democrat.*

Around 1935 *The Christian Democrat* had directed attention to the *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* in Belgium and France, and, when the Young Christian Workers were officially founded in England in 1937, their directors were selected from a study group of the Catholic Social Guild, which consisted of sellers of the newspaper *The Catholic Worker.* Father Gerard Rimmer founded the first group, and one of its members was Patrick Keegan, the future president of the World Union of Christian Worker Movements. The movement of the Young Christian Workers spread quickly and reached a part of the population which the Catholic social movement had previously not affected, but before the outbreak of World War II their organization had still not acquired a solid basis. The YCW also began with the preparation of boys and girls, before they left school, and from this work emerged the Pre-YCW, which Keegan founded in 1949. Also in the postwar years former members of the YCW developed the Family Social Apostolate to put its religious principles into practice in married life.

The Catholic Social Guild, the Catholic Women's League, the Catholic Education Council, and other organizations appointed delegates to the Catholic Council for International Relations, which had been founded in 1924 as a sort of uniting committee. Its function was to establish unity of action among the Catholics of all nations in all matters which affected their faith and to foster the business of international peace. Its work was chiefly of the educational type and was carried out by public announcements and international conferences.

Between the two world wars there appeared still other organizations. A lay group, which had regularly visited the ships in the harbor of Glasgow, established the Apostleship of the Sea in 1920. In the following year the administrator of the archdiocese approved the temporary guidelines and statutes. In 1922 Archbishop Donald A. Mackintosh communicated the blessing and a letter of recognition from Pius XI and became the first president of the society. Its task was the spiritual care of seamen. The work soon spread in Great Britain and to other countries; in 1927 200 churches in numerous harbors of the world were designated as sailors' centers. The administrative headquarters was first transferred from Glasgow to London, and in 1952 Pius XII established the general secretariat at Rome.

While the beginnings of an organization of Catholic contractors had only slight success, the British Catholic workers belonged to the general unions and never tried to establish unions of their own. But they held an annual National Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists and later founded diocesan associations of Catholic unionists. Two former students of the Catholic Workers' College founded the first of these associations with the consent of the bishop of Hexham and Newcastle in 1942, after the Congress of Unions at Blackpool had declared its opposition to state aid for denominational schools. After the war the local associations were united in a national corporation. It aimed at the organization of the opposition to Communist intrigues in the unions and worked to make its members better Catholics and better unionists. In both respects it achieved remarkable successes, but in the years after 1950 the energy and influence of the Catholic unionists slackened.

The apparently most impressive movement which was started by

Catholics during these years was the Sword of the Spirit, founded in 1940 by Cardinal Hinsley, an ardent patriot, who made a deep impression on the English people especially by his moving radio talks in the first years of World War II. It was the goal of this movement to assert the principles of Christianity and of the natural law against National Socialism and other totalitarian doctrines, for this end to support the national interest in the war, to seek for the postwar period a regulation and reorientation of Europe on the basis of such principles, and to unite all citizens for these goals. The activities of this movement were under the keywords "Prayer"—including sermons, retreats, days of recollection, and spiritual reading—"Study"—including lectures and discussion groups, for whose leadership plans were handed down—and "Action," which should be undertaken not in the name of the movement itself but through individuals and groups, who acted according to its principles. The original stimulus to this movement came from Christopher Dawson, who was first named lay leader and later was vice-president. Also many other prominent lay persons, men and women, were active in it, and groups were established among the French, Belgians, Poles, and Czechs who had fled to Great Britain and were living there in exile. But the totality of Catholics in the nation was not prepared for this movement. And because the other bishops had not previously been consulted, many of them gave no effective support. Nevertheless, it was at first enthusiastically welcomed by the Protestants. One of its first results was in December 1940 a declaration, signed by Cardinal Hinsley, by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and by the moderator of the Free Church Federal Council. In it all accepted the five points of Pius XII for peace and added to them five criteria of their own, according to which economic situations and proposals could be examined. Such a cooperation with Protestants caused some Catholics to conjure up the danger of a dogmatic compromise or of indifferentism. Therefore the movement of the Sword of the Spirit soon decided, although it had invited to membership all men of good will who were willing to recognize the Catholic leadership, that non-Catholics could be only associate members without voting right. In spite of the disappointment thereupon expressed in some Protestant publications, Christian charity could be preserved thanks to the good offices of the Anglican bishop of Chichester, G. K. Bell, and others. The high point of this movement was reached in June 1942, when representatives of the Sword of the Spirit and those of Religion and Life, a similar movement among Protestants, composed a declaration on their collaboration, in which they appealed to the total Christian population of the country to act together in order to assure a noticeable influence of Christian teaching and of Christian witness in the solving of social, economic, and civil law problems at this time and in the postwar period. Accordingly, community weeks and meetings were held in all England, and local Christian councils were set up, not only to plan these events and realize them, but to put pressure on all parties who had to do with religious problems common to all denominations. This sort of interdenominational cooperation ceased when, with the end of the war, its chief propelling power was eliminated. The death of Cardinal Hinsley in March 1943 had deprived the Sword of the Spirit of his dynamic leadership, and in the first postwar years its activity generally slackened. Because of double work and overlapping, a coordination of its goals and actions with those of other Catholic societies could not be completely achieved. Under the new archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Griffin, the center of gravity moved to the international area, to the social and political actions of Catholics on the continent, to the work of the United Nations and the special organizations affiliated to it, and to aid for refugees in Great Britain. In this way the "Sword" movement corresponded to a need which no other Catholic organization fulfilled. By 1954 it had lost its character as a mass movement and had become a center for the spread of information on all concerns of the Church in the whole world; furthermore, it was supposed, when necessary, to summon Catholic public opinion to action.

Catholics had always been free to support any of the greater political parties. Cardinals Bourne, Hinsley, and Griffin and other bishops frequently gave this answer when questions arose in regard to the Labour Party and its alleged championing of socialism. Most Catholics belonging to the working class actually preferred the Labour Party by an overwhelming majority; such membership for its party helped to prevent the party from developing into socialism.

Catechetical and Apologetic Work

The organized catechetical and apologetic work of the Catholic Church in Great Britain was promoted in various ways. The Catholic Truth Society, founded in 1884, circulated small and inexpensive writings, including some with a devotional and pedagogical content for Catholics and others for the information of Protestants. The founder of the society, James Britten, worked zealously up to his death in 1924. When in 1921–22 the headquarters of the society was moved and enlarged in order to accommodate a circulating library, an expansion of the program was due to the leadership talent and professional knowledge of an American, William Reed-Lewis. The publications of the society and its lectures were often concerned with particular themes of current interest, such as social and political ideologies in the years after 1920 and 1930, and later with birth control; but such controversial writings were never so important to the society as those which were aimed at the instruction of Catholics. Branch offices were set up throughout England and also in Scotland, Australia, India, Hong Kong, and the United States.

Another method for the instruction of non-Catholics was street-preaching, which was directed to all who wished to stop and listen. This was the function of the Catholic Evidence Guild, which Vernon Redwood, a New Zealander, had founded in London, with the permission of Cardinal Bourne, in 1918 shortly after the end of the war. The first guild worked only in the archdiocese of Westminster, but eventually independent guilds were also founded in other English dioceses and in the United States and Australia. In the springtime of the first guild there was elaborated a training program which took care of teaching courses in theology, philosophy, and Scripture; it was brought to the candidates, as meetings were held in the open; they were examined by study directors and other chaplains whom the local bishop had appointed, and there was also present a lay person, who as *advocatus diaboli* represented the crowd of listeners. The Marble Arch in Hyde Park became the most popular spot for speaker platforms in London. This sort of presentation to the outside was limited to Catholic doctrine; controversial questions of a social and economic nature and all political questions were strictly excluded. The text of the guild, *Catholic Evidence Training Outline,* which first appeared in 1925 and thereafter in revision, had been composed by Frank Sheed and Maisie Ward, two of the best known lay members. Of course, the work of the guild was impaired by the war, but after that it was intensified. In 1949 there were eighteen guilds with a total of 638 members and 302 speakers ready to act in England.

Liturgical Movement

In Great Britain the liturgical movement had a slow start and achieved no very great success before the Second Vatican Council. The Society of Saint Gregory was founded in 1929. It published the periodical *Music and Liturgy* and conducted summer vacation courses. After World War II it expanded its area of work by giving up its earlier preference for music and shortened the name of its periodical to *Liturgy.* But the movement only obtained real esteem after the encyclical *Mediator Dei* and some decrees had been issued from Rome.

Samuel Gosling, an English priest, came to the conviction that the retention of Latin as the only liturgical language of the Roman Rite was a serious impediment to pastoral work. In 1943 he founded the English Liturgy Society for clerics and lay persons, who "want to promote the use of the vernacular in public Mass in so far as this is in harmony with the teachings and traditions of the Church." In the next year he started a small periodical, *The English Liturgist,* which he published until his death in 1950. The society obtained only modest support and encountered bitter opposition, but it exercised a direct influence even in the United States, where the American Vernacular Society was established in 1946.

Journalism

After 1914 only a few new newspapers and periodicals of importance were begun, but many of the old ones were continued. In 1915 Wilfrid Ward resigned as editor of the *Dublin Review,* but his successors continued the tradition on the same high level and with the same broad view, especially Shane Leslie, Denis Gwynn, and Christopher Dawson, who also composed numerous books, especially historical and biographical works. The periodical remained in the possession of the archbishop of Westminster. In 1961 its name was changed to *Wiseman Review*—shortly before, Norman St. John-Stevas became editor—and four years later again back to the *Dublin Review.* In the winter of 1968–69 it stopped appearing. Among the periodicals published by religious orders, the *Month,* the organ of the Jesuits, was continued in its original intellectual style until 1949. From then on its editor, Philip Caraman, S.J., began a new series, which devoted as much attention to literature and the arts as to theology and philosophy; this policy, for its part, was again changed in 1964. The *Downside Review* reflected the scholarship of the Benedictines in that abbey. In 1920 Bede Jarrett, O.P. founded *Blackfriars* as the organ of the Oxford Dominicans.

The weekly *Tablet* was continued by John George Snead-Cox until 1920 according to conservative guidelines, with little sympathy for the political ambitions of the Irish; it was essentially the mouthpiece of the old Catholic families. Its defensive and hostile attitude toward Anglicans was retained by Ernest Oldmeadow, a converted Methodist minister, whom Cardinal Bourne had chosen as editor in 1923 chiefly for his polemical skill. As religious controversies lost ever more in power of attraction, the circulation of the paper dropped to less than 3,000, and in 1936 Cardinal Bourne's successor sold the *Tablet* to a group of laymen, among them Douglas Woodruff, who then replaced Oldmeadow as editor; by expanding the areas of interest for the paper he succeeded in again stabilizing its existence. Woodruff made it an outstanding source of news, especially on foreign affairs, and he employed a number of competent journalists.

Among the other old weekly papers the London *Universe* prospered because it used the techniques of modern journalism. After it had acquired the *Catholic Times* in 1962, it increased its circulation to more than 300,000 and in this way became the most widespread religious newspaper in the entire country. Although the *Catholic Times* had likewise been modernized, it had retained more of its original character and for the future remained the preferred paper of many Catholics of Irish birth or ancestry. The *Catholic Herald* addressed a growing number of Catholic students at the provincial universities. When in 1934 a group of lay persons had acquired it, they completely transformed it. From then on Count Michael de la Bédoyère, who occupied a middle position between the *Tablet* and the *Universe,* edited it until 1962 in a very capable manner. After his retirement Desmond Fisher became editor and directed the paper as a journal of opinion, which treated world news of all sorts from the Catholic standpoint. The *Glasgow Observer* remained the only Catholic weekly published in Scotland; it appeared in the eastern and northern areas of the country under the title of *Scottish Catholic Herald;* it became in reality an affiliated enterprise of the London *Catholic Herald.* Some other English and Irish Catholic weekly papers also published Scottish editions. The *Catholic Times* ran for forty years as an appendage of the *Welsh Catholic Times,* which appeared at Cardiff and was stopped in 1962.

IRELAND

Population

In the twenty-six counties of the Republic of Ireland the number of Catholics in 1926 was altogether 2,751,269 in a total population of 2,971,992, and in 1961 it was 2,673,473 in a total of 2,818,341. After the acquiring of independence, the percentage of Catholics grew with each census, whereas the total population declined, because emigration was stronger than the natural growth. Thereby the republic became, in regard to religion, constantly more homogeneous. In addition, the great majority of these Catholics practiced their faith, and so Catholicism was more visible in Ireland than in any other English-speaking country. In the six counties of Northern Ireland, on the other hand, the total population grew from 1,256,561 in 1926 to 1,425,462 in 1961, while the number of Catholics increased from 420,428 to 498,031.

In 1916 there were in all thirty-two counties 3,022 diocesan priests and 715 religious priests. The religious institutes had 97 houses of priests, 131 convents of nuns, and 43 monasteries of monks. Fifty years later there were 3,964 diocesan priests and 2,072 religious priests. The religious institutes had 160 houses for priests, 201 for brothers, and

648 for nuns. Meanwhile many priests and religious had left Ireland to work in other English-speaking countries or in the missions.

Political Development

At the outbreak of World War I there was still violent debate on the already long spiritedly discussed question of Home Rule for Ireland. The chief difficulty resulted from the refusal of the Protestants in Ulster to accept an arrangement whereby Catholics would constitute the majority and so be in the position to bring clericalism to power or introduce a theocratic state. The Catholics, for their part, feared that in a partition of the island the Catholics in Ulster would be oppressed by a Protestant majority and that in the granting of autonomy to these northern parts of the country the principle of denominational education would be replaced by that of mixed education.

In the first years of the war the episcopate and clergy generally supported the participation of the Irish in the mobilization and recruiting. But at the end of 1915 this original enthusiasm for the war exertions changed to apathy. Edward Thomas O'Dwyer, bishop of Limerick, declared that it was England's and not Ireland's war. Although the hierarchy had several times condemned the Irish Republican Brotherhood, which organized the uprising in 1916, it did not unanimously disavow the rising. The rebel leaders, who took part in the Easter rebellion were at least nominally Catholics, and of those who were jailed and condemned to death all except one received the sacraments before their execution by the British. However, public opinion as a whole condemned the immoral means they had used to assert the claim of the Irish people to independence. Of course, then the cruel treatment by the British government brought the rebels the sympathy of the people. Bishop O'Dwyer expressed the general indignation at the harshness of the British suppression.

When the Irish Parliamentary Party had lost the confidence of the public, the bishops and especially the younger priests gradually gave preference to the Sinn Fein Movement and at the same time helped to keep it from recourse to physical force. In fact, between May 1916 and the beginning of 1919 no noteworthy acts of violence occurred in Ireland. In this period the participation of those who claimed the title Sinn Fein conferred on the usual operations of a political party of the new movement the aura of trustworthiness which it needed in order to find the approval of the clergy on a broader basis. The primate of All Ireland and archbishop of Armagh, Cardinal Michael Logue, however, expressed in a pastoral letter of November 1917 his opposition to the Sinn Fein, because he regarded its dream of establishing an Irish Republic as a utopia, which would likely end in disaster.

When the military service law was submitted to parliament, in order to give the government authority to apply the conscription of troops also to Ireland, which had hitherto been exempted from it, the permanent committee of the bishops and individual bishops warned the British government in the spring of 1918 against the effort to force through such a law. Later the entire hierarchy condemned compulsory conscription as an inhuman law of suppression. The Irish people, they said, had the right to resist this law by every means that was in accord with the law of God. The bishops instructed the clergy to use certain practical measures to avert this wrong. By the fact that they placed themselves at the head of the campaign against the draft, the bishops maintained their influence on the people and fostered in fact, especially in the west, a better cooperation between the clergy and the Sinn Fein.

After the *Dáil Éireann* had proclaimed the Irish Republic in 1919, the Anglo-Irish war erupted. The British government tried to induce the bishops to condemn the rebels, but they refused. Some bishops openly supported the loan of the *Dáil.* When in 1919 the *Dáil* instituted courts of arbitration, it took care that priests were *ex officio* judges in these courts for lesser legal cases. Thus through the lower clergy the Church acquired a voice in the national movement without the risks of a direct commitment of the bishops. The participation of the clergy in the courts also gave the republic at least a certain degree of legitimacy. When the Irish Republican Army (IRA) led its pitiless attacks on the British troops, and the latter exercised brutal retaliation, many bishops declared that the attacks of the IRA were deplorable but understandable in view of the suppression by the authorities. In October 1920 the hierarchy censured the furious reprisals of the government as cruelties and excesses. Because many volunteers maintained with the assent of a few clerics that the killing of a policeman or of a British soldier was not murder but a war action, the bishop of Galway, Thomas O'Dea, made clear the Church's view that no legal authority in Ireland had declared or authorized war against the police. Nevertheless, many priests approved membership in the IRA. With the approval of the *Dáil,* its president, Eamon De Valera, proclaimed in March 1921 the formal acknowledgment of a state of war with England and responsibility for the actions of the IRA. But when in June De Valera personally asked the hierarchy for a formal recognition of the republic, the bishops merely emphasized the right of Ireland to choose its own form of government. The agreement of December 1921 between the British government and the Irish plenipotentiaries on the establishing of the Irish Free State was welcomed by the Church with a feeling of relief and joy. The hierarchy as such did not approve this agreement, but several bishops did so as individuals.

After the treaty had been ratified by the *Dáil Éireann* in 1922, De Valera and the IRA rejected it and the government created by it. At first the bishops hoped for a constitutional solution of the crisis; only when the obdurate Republicans led by De Valera began the civil war against the new government led by William T. Cosgrave as president did the hierarchy announce a general excommunication of all those against the treaty. In a common pastoral letter of 10 October 1922 the hierarchy declared that the government of the Free State possessed the legitimate authority, that it was a serious wrong to resist it by armed force, and that the guerrilla war continued by the Republicans was to be condemned. The Republicans, on the other hand, disdained this condemnation and continued the war until De Valera summoned his adherents the following spring to stop hostilities. Although some few among the Republicans were still resentful toward the Church for decades, De Valera did not become the rallying point for an anticlerical party.

Ecclesiastical Organization

When Ireland was politically divided, this did not affect the territorial integrity of the Church. From then on the ecclesiastical and the political spheres of jurisdiction no longer coincided. The four provinces with twenty-eight dioceses retained their previous boundaries, and the hierarchy continued to act as a single body. Generally, the bishops met twice a year, and a permanent committee, consisting of the four archbishops, two bishops as secretaries, and one member elected from each province, met quarterly. National councils in which representatives of the lower clergy and the religious institutes took part were held at Maynooth in 1927 and 1956.

Relations with the State

In 1929 the Irish Free State established full diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Thereafter, an apostolic nuncio resided at Dublin, and an Irish ambassador at Rome. The first nuncio was Paschal Robinson, who occupied this post until his death in 1948; he was born in Ireland and grew up in the United States. A concordat was never discussed.

In the absence of the Republican delegates, who declined to recognize the *Dáil* elected in 1922, a constitution for the Free State was decided by this body in the same year. In it the Catholic Church was not even mentioned; freedom of religion was merely guaranteed to every citizen, and all laws were declared null and void which would subsidize any religion or give preference to anyone because of his religious faith or his position. Nevertheless, from the start the Cosgrave governments, which consisted predominantly of

Catholic ministers, and the *Dáil* dominated by him showed their readiness to employ the power of the state for the protection of Catholic moral values. Thus in 1923 they approved the law for film censorship, in 1924 and 1927 the laws against strong alcoholic drink, and in 1929 the law for the censorship of publications, provided by a censorship committee consisting of one Catholic priest as chairman, three Catholic laymen, and one Protestant.

In 1927 De Valera and a majority of the Republicans decided to enter the *Dáil* as the Fianna Fail Party. A minority of unreconciled Republicans, under the name of the Irish Republican Army, rejected the status quo for the future and strove for the forcible union of Northern Ireland with the twenty-six counties. The hierarchy formally condemned the IRA in a common pastoral letter of 1931. At the same time it also condemned as Communist the Saor Eire organization allied with it. The Saor Eire gradually disappeared, but the IRA remained active, and the Communist influence in it was furthermore strong. By 1935 the bishops in their Lenten pastoral letter frequently warned the faithful against Communism. In January 1956 the hierarchy again condemned the IRA and declared it was a "mortal sin for a Catholic to become or to remain a member of an organization or society which claims the right to bear arms or to use them against its own or another state," and "likewise sinful for a Catholic to cooperate with such an organization or society, to applaud it, or to support it in other ways." Nevertheless, many pious Catholics still supported the IRA. These Irish accepted the authority of the Church in the sphere of religion but rejected it in the area of politics.

When De Valera became Prime Minister in 1932, he continued the policy of his predecessors with the upholding of Catholic values and even identified "Irish" with "Catholic." Thus the supplementary decree of 1935 to the penal law forbade the sale and the import of contraceptive means (Section 17), and the law against public dance establishments of the same year eliminated an evil against which bishops and priests had long taken the field.

The constitution of 1937 respected Catholic teaching in regard to the family, marriage, education, and private ownership. With special reference to religion it declared: "The state recognizes the special position of the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church as the custodian of the faith which the great majority of citizens profess" (ARTICLE 44). It also recognized the Protestant, the Jewish, and other religions existing in the nation. This article had been introduced on De Valera's personal initiative; the bishops had not asked such recognition. Afterwards the authorities never agreed whether the "special position" could have any juridical effect. Although this constitution championed Catholic values to a greater degree than that of 1922, the state still did not always concede to the Church the status of a person in public law and also no financial means or subsidies at all. The Church itself was not empowered to possess property or to undertake public-law activities; it always had to employ the trustee system and obtain its entire income from the voluntary gifts of the people. On the other hand, the state claimed no influence on the naming of bishops or on other internal affairs of the Church. The Supreme Court of the Irish Free State had declared in 1926 that the canon law of the Catholic Church was a foreign law in civil law and in civil courts, whose validity had to be proved by expert witnesses. The constitution of 1937 did not change the status of canon law and thereby did not exclude the difficulties which occurred in marriage-law cases from the differences between canon law and civil law, although the constitution also forbade divorce.

In the south no large political party ever assumed an anticlerical attitude. Even the Labour Party supported the upholding of Catholic value concepts.

Educational System

Nevertheless, the Irish Free State was helpful to the Church in the area of education and allowed it to exercise over the schools in the twenty-six counties more control than in any other country in the world. In the constitution of 1937 the state recognized the family as the proper and natural teacher of the child; it guaranteed respect for the unalterable right and duty of the parents to care, in accord with their means, for the religious and moral, intellectual, physical, and social education of their children. For primary education, up to the age of fourteen, the state also granted for the future subsidies to all school boards which complied with its instructions; these subsidies were to cover the salaries of teachers, specified maintenance expenses, and two-thirds of the construction costs for new schools—more than two-thirds in areas of poverty. The state did not establish a competing system of its own. The primary schools were in private ownership, and almost all were allied with one or another denomination. Each school was controlled by a school director, who appointed the teachers; in the case of the Catholic schools the pastor was usually also the school director. On the other hand the state prescribed the curriculum, inspected the schools, and gave the examinations. Some of the Catholic secondary schools were the property of lay persons, but most were in the possession of dioceses or religious institutes. On this basis, by a law of 1924 the Irish Free State introduced a system of per capita subsidies under the condition that definite rules were observed. These subsidies proved to be ever less adequate, but they were not raised until 1954. In June 1964 the Catholic Church managed 4,848 primary schools with 489,448 pupils, out of a total of 502,201 pupils in the republic. There were altogether 573 Catholic secondary schools in the academic year 1964–65, and they educated 92,989 pupils.

Irish politicians were satisfied with the school system, which left control in the hands of clerics. The bishops reacted promptly to every proposal to reduce their influence. But from 1963 several important reforms in the educational system were prescribed by law with the consent or at least the approval of the hierarchy.

In the field of higher education the hierarchy had, long before the achieving of independence, asked for the erecting of a university which was acceptable to Catholics. In 1908 the British government agreed to this request with the founding of the National University of Ireland, with colleges at Dublin, Cork, and Galway. Although formally nondenominational, it was intended to assure a considerable influence to the Catholic hierarchy in its governing bodies. Nevertheless, the archbishop of Dublin, John Charles McQuaid, considered it necessary in 1944 to forbid Catholics "to enter the Protestant university of Trinity College without the previous permission of the diocesan bishop," and he declared that disobedience to this prescription was a mortal sin, and perseverance in disobedience made one unworthy to receive the sacraments. The National Council of 1956 likewise forbade Catholic youth, under threat of mortal sin, to attend Trinity College and Catholic parents or guardians to send young men there. Only the archbishop of Dublin should be competent to decide under what circumstances and with what guarantees against the danger of apostasy attendance at this institution could be tolerated. In practice, however, dispensations were frequently granted.

Social Movement

In the first three decades of the twentieth century the social movement was relatively weak among Irish Catholics because they had to devote their energies chiefly to the political struggle and the work of church building and the religious organization. The social movement was delayed also by the intellectual backwardness of the Catholic population. Progress was speeded after the publication of the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* by Pius XI in 1931. In the same year Father John Hayes founded *Muintir na Tire* (People of the Land), a production association, which later held agricultural weekends and weeks and study congresses. It developed into a movement for the improvement of social life in the rural areas of Ireland, which was threatened with annihilation by the irresistible march of industrialization. Local societies were formed, which represented each sector of the community, and particular interests were subsumed under a higher group on the level of the parish, which represented the organizational unity. This movement was not formally Catholic, but Catholic priests and laity actively supported it. Prominent Protestants were also members of these local societies and took part in the meetings. The underlying ideology can be termed "occupational." *Muintir na Tire* became one of the most important intermediaries for the spread of Catholic social doctrine in Ireland.

Among the newspapers, the weekly *The Standard,* founded in 1928, was from 1938 on the most effective organ for propagating Catholic social teaching; its preference was the association system. Its editor-in-chief, Doctor Alfred O'Rahilly, professor and later president of the University College at Cork, wrote on economic and religious themes.

In the late 1930s the bishops proclaimed social doctrine ever more loudly in their pastoral letters. Three bishops were especially known for their interest in the social question: John Dignan of Clonfert, who in 1936 accepted from the government the chairmanship of the new national social security for the sick; Michael Brown of Galway, who stubbornly opposed every inappropriate spread of state power; Archbishop McQuaid, who devoted his special attention to social welfare. In 1941 McQuaid created the Catholic Social Service Conference for the coordination and spread of charitable work in view of the deficient situation, because of the war, in nourishment, clothing, and especially heating material as well as in the areas of dwellings, occupation, and care of mothers. The conference used voluntary cooperation and obtained aid from the state and local officials. In Dublin it changed the type and manner of social work.

The founding of the Christus Rex Society announced new progress of the social movement; it was approved by the Irish hierarchy in 1945 and held its first congress the next year. Its membership was restricted to diocesan priests, but members of religious institutes and lay persons often gave talks at the annual congresses. Its goals were: "to clarify public opinion on social questions and help in the forming of a public awareness that is sensitive to social grievances . . . ; to promote the study of Catholic social doctrine among the clergy and through them among the laity; to encourage Irish priests to common exertions with a view to abolishing social evils and realizing the principles of the social encyclicals in public life." In 1947 the society began the publication of the quarterly *Christus Rex,* which became the leading periodical for the discussion of social questions in Ireland.

One of the best known publicists and speakers on social questions in the postwar period was Cornelius Lucey, professor of ethics at Maynooth from 1921 to 1951, coadjutor bishop of Cork from 1951 to 1952, and from 1952 bishop of Cork. Bishop Brown also gave expression to his views on public affairs. Both bishops represented conservative ideas.

When the government proposed a law for the "Care for Mother and Child," the hierarchy unanimously decided in April 1951 that this plan was opposed to Catholic social doctrine. Then when the minister of health, Doctor Noel Browne, resigned for various reasons, there began in the press a controversy on the role of the hierarchy. The bishops were concerned about the dangers which resulted from the growth of the state's power and the possibility of an un-Christian sexual teaching. When in 1952 the government proposed a new health law, the hierarchy likewise intervened in order to put through a few supplements, as, for example, one which assured the free choice of a hospital for each individual. The chief reason for the efforts of the Irish hierarchy to exert influence on the precise prescriptions for social services in the country was that it was against the centralizing tendencies of the government and its bureaucratic forms. But still, on the whole relations between the hierarchy and the government were friendly from 1923 to 1970; there were only a few cases of open conflict.

In contrast to other European countries with a large Catholic proportion in the population, in Ireland no workers' union was created which was fostered by or united with the Church. The political exertions and actions of the workers' movement were aimed at avoiding church objections, and the danger of Marxist infiltration declined after 1921. The example and the influence of the British unions and the desire to maintain unity with the numerous Protestant workers in the north constituted further factors, which saw to it that the workers' movement in Ireland remained totally secular.

Lay Apostolate

In 1921 there was founded at Dublin that organization which was to become one of the largest organized movements of the lay apostolate in the whole world: the Legion of Mary. A group of lay persons, motivated by awareness of their Christian vocation to be witnesses and inspired by the teachings of the Popes, met in the church of Saint Nicholas of Myra in Francis Street with the curate, Father Michael Toher, to seek suitable methods with which they could transform their discussions on the mystical body of Christ and the writings of Saint Louis Marie Grignion de Montfort into concrete action for the service of their fellow men. The form of their organization was influenced also by the Saint Vincent De Paul Society, with which they were all connected. Their lay leader was Frank Duff, a young state official. Originally the new society was called Association of Our Lady of Mercy; in 1925 the name was changed to the Legion of Mary, and the titles which were given to all parts of its organization were taken from the usage of the old Roman army. The work began with visiting the sick in the South Dublin Union Hospital. Soon the legion directed its attention to organized prostitution and opened at Dublin its first home for prostitutes. In 1927 it founded the Morning Star Home for destitute men and the Regina Coeli Home for women.

The legion decided that its membership should be open to men and women from all educational strata, so long as they were practicing Catholics and at least eighteen years old. It was expected of the members that they lead an exemplary life and possess the "spirit of the Legion" or desire to possess it. They had to take part in the weekly meeting of their group, in which they were formed and spiritually stimulated by legion prayers, spiritual reading, and guidance from the spiritual leader; also they had to devote a considerable part of their free time each week to an apostolic work allotted to them, at least two hours. It was required of each member as his personal responsibility to recruit new members, both active and auxiliary. Auxiliary members performed only a service of prayer. The leadership of the legion lies in a *concilium,* the headquarters of which has always remained at Dublin. It was to consist of representatives of all legionary societies which were in immediate relations with it, and of the members of the Dublin *curia* and of the spiritual director appointed by the Irish bishops. This strict supervision of the lesser units by the superior councils assured, together with the manual of guidelines, which was later translated into twenty-five languages and 125 dialects, the uniformity of the legion throughout the world. The legion declared its readiness to carry out any type of social service and Catholic Action, which the local ordinary or parish priest asked or approved. At the weekly meeting of the *praesidia,* the smallest units, an oral report had to be made on the work done and then the work for the coming week was assigned. Gradually the house visits of legionaries, who went in pairs, became their characteristic activity. Also, the legion took care of homes, clubs, and study groups, distributed pamphlets and Lenten books, and gave catechetical instruction. All these activities had to be directed to individuals, but the giving of material help was forbidden. In the forty years since the founding, more than 60,000 active groups were founded, which worked in more than 1,500 dioceses, vicariates, and prefectures on five continents. In 1964 there were more than 1 million active and more than 9 million auxiliary members. A legion was first established in the United States in 1931.

North America

THE UNITED STATES

Population

In 1914 it was assumed that the Catholic population of the United States amounted to 16,067,985 with 18,568 priests in a total population of 99,117,567. In 1964 the Catholic population had increased to 44,874,371 in a total population of 183,783,493. Although it continued to grow after that, the rate of growth had already declined, in that year it amounted to 1.7 percent in comparison to 2.4 percent in 1963. The downward trend in the number of baptisms began in 1962 and was doubtless an indication that the practice of artificial birth control had spread further and that the national birthrate was reflected in it. In the same decade other high points were also reached, which were then followed by a decline: 59,892 priests in 1967, 181,421 sisters in 1966, and 12,539 brothers in 1967. The degree of "shrinkage" in the Catholic population has not been ascertained exactly, but it must have been considerable.

The immigration from Europe, through which the Catholic population had grown so rapidly until 1914, first dropped because of World War I and thereafter because of restrictive laws. These laws were motivated in part by the fear on the part of Protestants that the country could be inundated by Catholics and Jews. The Emergency Quota Law of 1921 limited the number of immigrants from each country per year to 3 percent of the respective national group living in the United States in 1910. The Immigration Law of 1924 reduced this number to 2 percent and set the population figure of 1890 in place of that of 1910 until the newly prescribed system took effect in 1929; from then on, a quota of immigrants was granted for each European country which was based on the proportion which the members of a specific nationality who had lived in the United States in 1920 had possessed in the same year in regard to the total number of the population; the key figure was 150,000. These measures greatly lessened the entrance of Catholics from eastern, central, and southern Europe, and in 1931 President Hoover lowered the quotas so strongly because of unemployment that the immigration of European Catholics almost stopped entirely for the rest of this decade. However, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans and French Canadians, who were exempted from the quota restrictions, moved across the southern and northern frontiers. There also came Catholics from American possessions, especially Puerto Ricans, who settled in New York and some other cities, and Filipinos, who went to California. After World War II Spanish-speaking Catholics poured into the northern cities, and many European Catholics came into the country in accord with the stipulations of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. The principle of national origin, which favored the Nordic peoples, was again confirmed in the McCarran-Walter Law of 1952, despite the protests of Catholics and others.

The Church gradually lost its immigrant status and its opposition attitude and thereby gained more and more esteem among non-Catholics. Besides, after World War II more Americans than previously acknowledged their membership in a denomination. Many of them felt attracted to the Catholic Church, which constituted the largest individual body in the country and conducted respected institutions on the local and national level. By the fact that the Church exposed itself more to the glare of publicity, it brought the blind zealots to silence and gained more open ears for its demands. The apostolate for converts gained in esteem through the holding of hours of consultation in the parishes, through the free distribution of literature, for which advertisements in the secular newspapers solicited, and through individual talks with entirely individual instruction. In this way 146,212 converts were received into the Church in 1960; this was the highest number which was ever ascertained for a single year. In the following period the annual figures dropped again.

A constantly increasing percentage of Catholics lived in cities. Even in 1967 there were of the altogether 3,080 rural districts in the United States still 671 without a permanent priest. The fact that almost 40 million Americans did not live within reach of a priest was characteristic of the predominantly urban character of American Catholicism.

Of the approximately 20,300,000 blacks in the United States, only 747,598 were Catholics in 1964.

Organization

In 1914 there were in the United States fourteen ecclesiastical provinces and eighty-four dioceses; in addition, there was still one vicariate apostolic and one Ruthenian Greek diocese. At this time there were 9,740 churches with resident priests and 4,911 missions with churches. Fifty years later there were 27 archdioceses, 114 dioceses, one Ukrainian Catholic archeparchy, two Ukrainian Catholic eparchies, and two eparchies of the Byzantine Rite. In these jurisdictional areas there were 17,455 parishes, 515 missions, and 4,594 stations. The archdiocese with the largest number of Catholics was Chicago.

Although the archbishops took care to hold annual meetings, the entire hierarchy was not organized until September 1919 when 92 of the existing 101 ordinaries took part in the first general meeting at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. They decided by an overwhelming majority to establish the National Catholic Welfare

Council, as the organization was originally called. It was a logical further development of the National Catholic War Council, which had been founded in August 1917 by the delegates of sixty-eight dioceses and twenty-seven national Catholic associations to coordinate the efforts of the popular Catholic groups in the contemporary emergency by six committees of priests and lay persons, which in turn were active under a controlling committee of bishops. The effectiveness of the war council in its various efforts made it seem desirable to have a permanent organization on the national level for the coordination and stimulation of actions in the period of peace. Pope Benedict XV had in a general way agreed that commissions for the handling of school and social problems should be set up and that they should hold annual general meetings. But because some bishops feared that the organization would interfere in the jurisdiction of the ordinary in their own dioceses, they transmitted their objections to the Holy See. Cardinal Gaetano De Lai, secretary of the Consistorial Congregation, and some other officials of the Roman Curia for their part were afraid that the NCWC would promote the beginnings of a "national" Church in the United States. They persuaded Benedict XV to revoke the approval granted by him provisionally and by way of experiment. He had already drafted a decree for the dissolution of the organization but was prevented by death from signing it. His successor, Pius XI, thereupon signed this decree and had it published. The administrative committee of the NCWC protested against this decision and delegated from its ranks the bishop of Cleveland, Joseph Schrembs, to explain the arguments of the NCWC at Rome. In protracted discussions he convinced De Lai and other cardinals. On 2 July 1922 a new decree was issued which approved the organization according to the original plan; only the name was easily changed by substituting the word "Conference" for "Council"; in this way the organization, which was erected on a voluntary basis and had only an advisory function, could not be misunderstood as a legislative body. However, it became the highest authority in the decisions of the Catholic Church on public affairs and on the implementing of commonly agreed-upon guidelines. In addition to the administrative council there were created right from the start five departments: for education, lay activity, press, social action, and the missions; three more, for immigration, legal questions, and youth, were later added. The first business manager or secretary general was John Burke, C.S.P., the former editor of the *Catholic World* and chairman of the meeting at which the war council had been founded and also chairman of the Committee for Special Actions in the period of the war. He served in this position until his death in 1936. The NCWC continued its function until it was reorganized in 1967 and thereafter, as the United States Catholic Conference, constituted a corporation in civil law. At the same time the National Conference of Catholic Bishops came into existence as a canon law corporation.

In these years the founding of parishes continued on the territorial and national level. When the world economic crisis began, the Poles alone had approximately one thousand parishes in the United States. When after World War II many Catholics began to move from the large cities to the suburbs, the number of national parishes declined.

Educational System

In 1914 there were 230 Catholic colleges or high schools for young men and 680 academies or high schools for girls; in addition, there were 5,403 parochial schools, attended by 1,429,859 children. In 1964 there were 1,557 high schools of the dioceses and parishes with 677,169 students and 901 private high schools, for the most part conducted by religious men and women, with 391,255 students. At the same time 4,471,415 pupils were registered in 10,452 elementary schools of the parishes and institutes, and 85,201 in 450 private elementary schools. After 1964 began a downward trend in proportion to the previous numbers of registrations, not only in the Catholic but also in the public schools.

During this period Catholic schools were affected by several state laws on which, one after the other, decisions were rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1922 the voters of Oregon approved a petition in which it was required that, with a few expressly named exceptions, all children from age 8 to age 16 had to attend public schools from September 1926, in connection with which parents or guardians who disobeyed this law were to be condemned to a fine or prison or—in each case according to the seriousness—to both. Two societies of Freemasons claimed the authorship of this law, and the Ku Klux Klan, along with other secret societies, supported it with the assertion that only in public schools could children be taught to respect and maintain the free institutions of the nation. Religious prejudice, patriotic zeal, and nationalistic mistrust were the chief motives for the advocates of this law. Both the already existing and the recently founded Catholic organizations resisted, and even several Protestant groups issued declarations in which the law was condemned. The Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, who operated several schools in Oregon, and the Mill Hill Academy filed motions for the issuance of a temporary injunction by which the state should be forbidden to put the law into effect. After the District Court of the United States had issued the injunction in 1924, the state attorney general of Oregon appealed to the Supreme Court. But in the meantime the legislature of Michigan had agreed that constitutional amendments on voting should be submitted to the voters whereby the parochial schools in this state should be abolished. But in 1924 these proposals were rejected by considerable majorities, after similar proposals there had already been rejected four years earlier. In 1925 the Supreme Court of the United States declared the Oregon law unconstitutional, confirmed the rights of parents, and set limits to state authority. This decision annulled all other attempts to do away with Catholic schools by way of legislation.

In the following period other states sought to assist in various ways children who attended nonpublic schools, but these were attacked in the courts. In 1930 the Supreme Court confirmed as constitutional a law of Louisiana which allowed the state to supply textbooks to children in all schools. This decision was based on the theory that not the schools themselves or their administrators, the churches, were the beneficiaries of such state grants, but the children. This theory of "child benefit" became the justification for the asking of state aid for children in private schools. In the celebrated case *Everson* vs. *Board of Education* the Supreme Court in 1947 recognized as constitutional a law of New Jersey, which approved the use of public funds to reimburse parents for expenses incurred by transporting their children to all schools, public or private. Nevertheless, only less than half of all states put buses at the disposal of children who attended private schools. In 1968 the Supreme Court of the United States decided that neither the individual state constitution nor the Constitution of the United States was violated by a law of the state of New York which demanded that the public schools lend nonreligious schoolbooks to pupils in private schools, including the parochial, in grades seven through twelve. In the same year the state of Pennsylvania granted direct payment of public money to private schools for services in nonreligious school subjects. But the Supreme Court of the United States later declared this law invalid because the concept of the "purchase of services" was incompatible with the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The constitutions of thirty-three states forbade any use of public funds for the support of denominational schools.

Some bishops and other Catholics had, besides, not wanted any state aid for their schools, because they feared an interference, joined with it, of the state into the Church's control of the schools. In 1961 the administrative committee NCWC stated that the federal government, if it generally supported the school system, must also give to Catholic children the right to claim support, because they were otherwise victims of a discriminatory legislation. Nevertheless, Congress excluded nonpublic schools from the aid which it granted to the schools in specific districts, in which special burdens were laid on the local taxpayers by a federal institution. The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also called the Johnson Education Act, included also the children of private schools by granting them a share in specific special programs, which were undertaken by a local educational office and implemented by a public school; thus, for example, courses for the physically handicapped or socially ill-adapted children, supplementary classes in reading and mathematics, library services, health and food services, books, and even clothing—of course, only for children from low income families. The constitutionality of this law was doubted by various groups, as by Protestants and other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State, by the American Jewish Congress, and by the American Civil Liberties Union, all of which constantly strove to prevent any public aid, even indirect, for Catholic schools.

The regulations for the imparting of religious instruction to Catholic children who attended public schools varied according to the laws of the particular states. There arose controversies over other stipulations according to which pupils were granted absence from the public schools for a specified time to enable them to take part in religious instruction. When in 1948 an objection was raised before the Supreme Court of the United States to a plan approved by the legislature of the state of Illinois, the Supreme Court forbade the imparting of religious instruction on the premises of public schools during school hours and declared such a practice a violation of the First Amendment. However, four years later the same court declared that "released time" programs were constitutional if the pupils left the public school during regular school hours in order to receive denominational religious instruction. In 1964 there were 1,119,800 students in public high schools on released time and 3,067,794 pupils in elementary schools on leave of absence who received Catholic religious instruction.

Responsibility for the assuring of religious instruction for these children in public schools was entrusted to the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Although the confraternity had been introduced in the United States as early as 1902, it had grown only slowly until Pius XI issued his motu proprio *Orbem Catholicum* in 1923. The best-known promoter of the Confraternity in the United States was Edwin V. O'Hara, first bishop of Great Falls, Montana (1930–39), then of Kansas City, Missouri (1939–56); he was also chairman of the Bishops' Commission from its founding in 1934 until his death in 1956. Under his leadership a Catholic center was erected in Washington, D.C., in 1933 to provide information and advice to the diocesan organizations. Besides the instruction of children who attended public schools, the confraternity organized in many places programs for religious vacation courses, discussion clubs for parents, teachers, and adults, special religious courses for handicapped children, correspondence courses in religion, training centers for lay teachers of religion, university retreats, religious radio programs, and an apostolate of goodwill which was aimed at those outside the Church. In 1935 the first national Catechetical Congress was held in Rochester, New York, and this was then followed by yearly congresses until 1941, when a five-year cycle was introduced. The publications department of the national center published an information service, which was intended especially for diocesan directors, and also textbooks and other practical literature. In the early 1940s the confraternity subsidized revisions of the several editions of the Baltimore Catechism and a new translation of the Bible. It introduced the new catechetical methods and techniques developed in Europe and adapted them to American needs.

In the area of higher education there were in 1964 295 Catholic colleges and universities, in which 366,172 students were registered. The Catholic colleges had increased in this period; between 1914 and 1956 thirty colleges for men were opened, but in the last-mentioned year nine of them were again closed. Thirty-seven colleges for women were founded between 1915 and 1925, and nineteen between 1925 and 1930; in 1950 there were 116 colleges for women and in 1970 there were 137. Some Catholic colleges were too small to be able to maintain an academic level; some were so close to one another geographically that they competed for potential students, and none of them was adequately equipped. But the Catholic institutions of the higher educational system received, in contrast to the Catholic elementary and secondary schools, some state aid directly. Thus, for example, the veterans of World War II and of the Korean War obtained federal funds for instruction and livelihood, regardless of what educational institution they decided on, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which was intended to improve instruction in mathematics, natural science, engineering, and modern languages and in 1964 was extended also to English, geography, and other fields, made no distinction in regard to Catholic colleges and universities; it even granted loans for schools of the middle level which belonged to the Church. Federal officials made agreements with such schools for research projects or granted them subsidies for this purpose, and there were also federal funds at their disposal for the construction of buildings.

In the late 1950s 9 Catholic universities had graduate schools, which could grant doctoral degrees, but half of them restricted their doctoral program to a few fields. The Catholic universities and colleges also instituted many professional school faculties. In 1955 23 of them had professional schools for management or commerce and finance, 6 for medicine, 21 for law, 12 for engineering and architecture, 14 for nursing, 10 for education, 8 for dentistry, 5 for pharmacy, 4 for music, 6 for social service, 2 for industrial relations, 1 for diplomacy, 1 for physical education, 1 for journalism, and 1 for oratory. Many other Catholic colleges and universities had programs for some of these professional areas but they had not organized them as separate professional schools. In 1936, furthermore, 42 Catholic teachers' seminars were conducted; but when colleges and universities began to offer programs in pedagogy the number of teachers' seminars declined. In 1955 there were 3 diocesan teachers' colleges and 21 normal teachers' seminars which were under Catholic direction; of the latter a few were only for the members of religious institutes, while others also admitted lay persons as students.

The Newman Movement was organized for the religious instruction and pastoral care of the ever growing number of Catholic students who attended secular universities and colleges. By 1925 a few bishops and priests, especially Jesuits, attacked the concept of such Catholic foundations as that which had begun in 1920 at the University of Illinois to offer religious courses recognized at the university; the opponents feared that a positive program of religious instruction would attract students to the secular universities who would otherwise have gone to Catholic colleges. The educational importance of the Newman apostolate was not officially recognized until 1962, when the College and University Division of the National Catholic Educational Association completed its regulations to the effect that it gave membership to Newman educational centers, even if not full membership.

The Federation of Catholic College Clubs was established in New York City in 1915; although it consisted officially only of student clubs, it was in reality directed by the faculties, alumni, and chaplains. In 1938 it became the Newman Club Federation. Due to the efforts of its chaplain general, John W. Keough, who watched over its growth from 1917 to 1935, it successfully resisted the persistent opposition. In fact, for many years it was merely tolerated by the church authorities. But in 1941 it obtained full membership in the College and University Division of the National Council of Catholic Youth, which had been instituted by the American hierarchy. Then it acquired a permanent headquarters with a managing secretary in the Youth Division of the NCWC. After World War II the number of full-time chaplains rapidly grew, and in 1950 the National Newman Chaplains Association was established as an organization. In addition to the meetings and institutes which it offered, in 1962 it opened an institution for the training of new chaplains. In order to gain Catholic teachers and administrators from secular institutions for these unions, the National

Newman Association of Faculty and Staff was called into being in 1959. In 1962 the various national organizations were united and formally approved as constituents of the National Newman Apostolate, which for its part became a fully qualified section in the Youth Division of the NCWC. In the meantime religious sisters and brothers and educated laymen in ever greater numbers had been appointed to the staffs of the Catholic centers and parishes that were reproducing themselves at secular universities in order to support the chaplains with their teaching and pastoral tasks. In 1965 there were 250 full-time chaplains and 1,022 part-time chaplains who worked in 203 Newman Centers and in other quarters determined by chance at more than 900 secular institutions and there cared for more than 800,000 Catholic students.

American Catholics were also concerned with creating special possibilities of education for blacks. The Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament for Indians and Colored People, established by Mother Katharine Drexel, erected many elementary and high schools for blacks in the South. With the financial support of the foundress, the sisters opened Xavier University of Louisiana, for which the arrangements were concluded in 1918; colleges for the humanities and natural sciences, for teachers and for pharmacy were opened at the beginning of the 1920s, and in 1937 a graduate school which offered the master's degree. This was the first and only Catholic university for blacks in the United States. After World War II blacks, including the Catholics, left the rural areas of the South in ever greater numbers for the large cities in the North and the far West, where they were closer to the Church's ministry. Most of the black beneficiaries of Catholic educational work were non-Catholics. The same was true also of the social services performed by Catholics, as, for example, of the Friendship Houses of Catherine De Hueck, of which the first was founded in 1938 in Harlem, the black quarter of New York, and also of Fides House, erected in 1940 at Washington, D.C.

Social Movement

From the end of World War I the Catholic Church in the United States became actively involved in social justice. In 1919 the administrative committee of the National Catholic War Council published an announcement which in the future was called the "Bishops' Program for Social Reconstruction." Its author was Father John A. Ryan, professor of moral theology at the Catholic University of America, who especially by means of his writings on the ethical and economic aspects of the wage system had become the best known and most productive American representative of the social doctrine of Leo XIII. The Bishops' Program was to a great extent intended to counteract the socialist influence on the program for social reconstruction of the British Labour Party; it aimed at improving the conditions of the workers partly by voluntary collaboration in industry and partly by legal measures on the level of the individual states. It was a progressive document, evoking opposition; it proposed concrete reforms, like minimum wages, insurance against unemployment, sickness, and age. Some Catholics and others regarded such reforms as too radical and they were not established in law until the 1930s. In November 1919 the plenary meeting of the bishops published a comprehensive pastoral letter, which contained a section on industrial relations. With reference to Leo XIII they stressed the moral and intellectual aspect of the social question and its solution; they deplored unnecessary strikes, in regard to which only the claims of the mutually struggling parties were considered and the rights of the public were disregarded, and they recommended that a quarrel which could not be settled by discussions between the parties concerned should be submitted to arbitration. They stated that unions of workers or professionals were necessary, but "must be supplemented by societies or meetings which are composed of employers and employees," because they would maintain the common interests rather than the differing strivings of the two parties.

From 1920 the NCWC Department of Social Action was the chief agent for propagating the Church's social doctrine. It published some books and many praiseworthy brochures, it financed lectures in Catholic colleges and universities. In 1922 it founded the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, which up to 1940 held almost one hundred national and regional meetings in various places; for it had been proved that this was the most effective method to acquaint both non-Catholics and Catholics with the Church's position. The divisional director, Father Ryan, with his assistant, Father Raymond A. McGowan, developed a general program for industrial democracy, whereby the worker would be made an integrating element of this system. Pius XI's encyclical on the reconstruction of the social order, *Quadragesimo anno,* confirmed many of Ryan's proposals, especially the principle of the living wage, which should include the support of the worker's family.

With different stress, the American Catholics sought to apply the papal social teachings to the sufferings of their country during the Great Depression. Because Ryan based his economic analysis chiefly on the underconsumption theory of John A. Hobson, he was extremely critical of President Hoover's caution and cordially welcomed the policy of his successor. President Franklin D. Roosevelt invited Ryan to serve as policy adviser for the New Deal, and in 1934 he became a member of the industrial professional committee of the National Recovery Administration. He regarded as the climax of his life's work the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the first law that prescribed a minimum wage and maximum weekly hours for the employees of firms which were involved in interstate commerce. But because Ryan trusted in the state as the only institution which could provide social justice, he was opposed by other Catholics, who feared that the centralizing of power in the federal government was dangerous for a religious minority and who were more uneasy than appeared to him to be justified by the threats from secularism, Communism, war, and the welfare state.

Finally, Ryan came into open conflict with the so-called Radio Priest, Charles E. Coughlin, pastor of the Shrine of the Little Flower at Royal Oak, Michigan. The latter had achieved national fame because at the beginning of the depression he had boldly attacked the abuses in the American economic system and offered remedies inspired by *Rerum novarum* and later by *Quadragesimo anno.* His ordinary, Bishop Michael James Gallagher of Detroit, encouraged him to propagate the social teachings of the papal encyclicals and remained his confidant, adviser, supporter, and defender until his death in 1937. Although Coughlin always stressed the right to private property, he found fault with the old industrial capitalism or plutocracy; he blamed the "international bankers," questioned the possibility of democracy because of the corrupt and self-seeking nature of politicians, supported extensive measures of the government for the economy, protection of the small business people and farmers, and a just wage for workers. In 1936 he founded the weekly newspaper, *Social Justice,* which within one year achieved a circulation of 1 million copies. Cardinal William O'Connell, archbishop of Boston, then publicly criticized Coughlin, even though never using his name, as a hysterical demagogue, and finally other Catholic bishops and priests, newspapers and periodicals, even *Osservatore Romano,* reprimanded him for intolerance of differences of opinion and for mixing in politics. His opponents accused him of seeking the creation of a Fascist dictatorship and mocked his financial proposals. In his extremely popular radio talks on Sunday afternoons he showed a growing disillusionment with American political institutions at the end of the 1930s and championed the establishing of a corporate state for bringing about social justice. In 1938 his newspaper proclaimed and demanded the organization of the Christian Front as a general alliance of Catholics and Protestants against Communism. He openly expressed his antipathy for Jews and suspected them of being Communists who had conspired for the destruction of Christian culture, but he rejected the inevitable reproach of anti-Semitism brought against him. Many Catholics were as ready as were Protestants likewise to regard Jewish "money changers" as responsible for the economic misery of the nation and the world. Cardinal George Mundelein, archbishop of Chicago, and other prominent Catholics from clergy and laity sought to keep the Church aloof from any incitement to racial prejudice and race hatred. Coughlin's newspaper appeared as the advocate of the Fascist regimes in Germany and Italy, because they opposed Communism, but he himself professed to be anti-Nazi. He preached nationalism, isolationism, and hatred of England when international tensions were deteriorating into armed conflict. At the end of 1940 he was put off the radio because both the national networks and the local stations declined to renew his contracts for broadcasting. In 1942 the government obtained the suspension of the newspaper *Social Justice* by the threat of a suit because of the crime of insurrection, allegedly begun with its opposition to the war. The new archbishop of Detroit, Edward Mooney, commanded Coughlin to discontinue all public statements. Nonpartisan judgments admitted that this priest was sincerely disturbed by the misery of the poor and the Communist danger and denied that he was a Fascist, but they conceded that he understood nothing about the economy and that the eclectic solutions which he proposed were ineffectual because of his all too simplistic, unsystematic, and confused analysis of the situation.

Many of the better educated and wealthy Catholics who took no pleasure from Coughlin's proposals founded the league of Social Justice on the national level in 1932 in order to study and apply the economic teachings of Pius XI. The director of this movement was Michael O'Shaughnessy, an oil manager and industrial publicist, who also published the *Social Justice Bulletin* as a monthly for timely events in this area. Although the league never counted more than 10,000 members, it seems to have exercised a widespread influence through the press and various Catholic organizations. It promoted a reform of the capitalist social order through control of the seeking of profit and by industry being forced to consider also the interests of the workers and the public as a whole.

Another search for a solution of the contemporary problems was undertaken by a group which aspired to alleviate the misery of individuals by direct contact and was not prepared to await clerical leadership or trust guidance by the hierarchy. Well known in this group was Dorothy Day, a recently converted journalist, who had previously been a radical activist and Communist. In 1932 she started the Catholic Worker Movement. She took up the idea of a Christian synthesis, as Peter Maurin, an itinerant social thinker from France, proclaimed it; he longed to repair, with the aid of an integral Catholicism, the unity of modern society shattered by secularism. The program advocated by him contained three points: (1) Round-table discussion by workers and intellectuals; (2) Friendship houses, in which Catholics could do justice to their personal responsibility toward the poor by doing works of mercy; (3) Farm communes, in which Catholic workers and students could learn to take care of themselves and build cells for a future Christian social order. Miss Day opened in Manhattan a House of Hospitality, which united the functions of a soup kitchen, a discussion club, and a reform center. Up to 1940 thirty such houses were erected in various cities. On 1 May 1933 she began the publication of the monthly *Catholic Worker,* which presented social doctrine in concrete guiding principles and in a brief time achieved a circulation of over 100,000. In order to supply an example for a really Catholic community and a model for the solution of the problem of unemployment, the Catholic Workers in 1936 established a farm commune in the neighborhood of Easton, Pennsylvania. It received great publicity but also harsh criticism as an example of romantic and utopian agrarianism. In addition to their assistance to the poor by their own voluntary poverty, by manual and intellectual work, and by the bestowing of personal attention, the Catholic Workers took part in strikes and demanded the forming of unions, although, according to their theory, they put little trust in unions or other centralized institutions. They sought by these practical methods to oppose Communist influences, to demonstrate Christian love, to inculcate spiritual values as a counterpole to materialism, and to promote personal sanctification. In addition, they fought anti-Semitism and discrimination against blacks. During the Spanish Civil War they came out for neutrality, and when the danger of America's involvement in World War II grew, many of them became pacifists and refused military service for reasons of conscience. These controversial positions caused internal decline and external repudiations. The strong emphasis on personalism prevented the Catholic Workers from solving the problems of society by an intelligent concept of the relation of the individual to the state and of his confidence in the capability of the government.

In 1937 a group of Catholic Workers, under the direction of John Cort, founded the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists in New York with the aim of making known to their members a knowledge of Catholic social teaching in order that these could then apply its principles in their own unions. Hence it advocated also the spread of the union system and supported justified strikes. It opened an evening school for workers, held training sessions, and published a newspaper, the *Labor Leader.* Other workers' schools, in which the students were instructed in practical subjects, such as public speaking, parliamentary procedure, and Communist tactics, were under the direction of diocesan officials, Jesuits, fraternities, and colleges. In this way more than

7,000 persons were annually prepared to reform and democratize their unions. The Catholics, who were represented in great numbers in the unions and in some even had an overwhelming majority, contributed to the ending of the Communist influence which had threatened the independence of the whole worker movement. When this aim was achieved in the postwar years, the workers' schools and the ACTU turned their efforts to removing other abuses in the unions, as, for example, gangster methods and the exploitation of members by unscrupulous bosses.

Not only the urban industrial workers and craftsmen but also the farmers constituted objects of special concern for the Church in the period between the two world wars. Edwin V. O'Hara had studied the problems of the rural population while he was still a priest of the archdiocese of Portland, Oregon; in 1920 he was invited to set up a bureau for agriculture in the NCWC Department of Social Action. He successfully proved the value of vacation schools for children, of religious correspondence courses for children and adults, and of associations. In 1923 he convened a meeting of Catholic agricultural leaders, at which the National Catholic Rural Life Conference was founded, and he was made its managing secretary. This society later counted thousands of laymen in its ranks, who were organized under diocesan directors and agricultural chairmen in some Catholic societies. In cooperation with the religious and secular organizations in the locality, they promoted committees for the development of communities, cooperative sales societies, credit unions, and educational institutions.

A further aspect of social justice which became consciously clearer to American Catholics in these years was the just treatment of members of the black race. Doctor Thomas W. Turner, a black Catholic teacher at the Hampton Institute in Virginia, in 1917 organized the Committee against the Extension of Race Prejudice in the Church, which made personal appeals to the bishops to do away with prejudice in churches, societies, schools, and seminaries. In order to enlarge the scope of this work there was founded in 1925 a militant organization called Federated Colored Catholics of the United States. In the first five years its leaders were exclusively black. The number of members claimed by them, more than 100,000, probably came from the affiliation of Catholic parishes and parish organizations. Interest in it grew among white clerics and lay persons, and in 1932 this change was reflected in the new title, then adopted, of National Catholic Federation for the Promotion of Better Race Relations.

However, the conscience of white Catholics was only gradually sharpened for the unhappy situation of blacks, and for a long time people were concerned only about local conditions. In 1927 Father John La Farge, S.J., founded the Catholic Laymen's Union, a group of blacks who were active in professional and business life. Seven years later the union convoked a mass meeting at New York, at which, with the approval of the archbishop, Cardinal Patrick Hayes, the first Catholic Interracial Council in the United States came into existence. In the succeeding thirty years more than sixty such associations were created in various places in the nation. Until 1962 Father La Farge was chaplain of the New York society and until 1960 his headquarters was a center of the movement for justice in race relations; he published the monthly *Interracial Review,* formed an exchange office for information, distributed educational materials, and performed advisory services for other societies. However, each society was autonomous, responsible only to the local ordinary, and each decided independently how to bring the influence of Catholic doctrine to bear in its special situation. The chief activity of the societies was of an educational sort. In second place was its aim of eliminating racial discrimination in Catholic churches, schools, hospitals, and other institutions and societies. Finally their efforts should be united with those of other organizations for racial equality and social actions and cooperate with these for the welfare of the community as a whole. In 1960 the Catholic Interracial Councils and similar organizations founded the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, with the aim of assisting the local societies and other Catholic institutions in the development of full-time professional staffs and in their programs; besides, they were to represent the societies on the national level. Their central office in Chicago became the office of exchange of information and a source for publications and technical capabilities. It held national meetings which were attended by their members in great numbers.

After World War II some bishops in the country caused a stir by their decisions in regard to the racial question in their respective dioceses. In 1947 Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter instructed his priests to end racial segregation in the schools of the archdiocese of Saint Louis with the beginning of the school year, and when irritated parents threatened to obtain a temporary court injunction against his orders, he warned them against this, because in accord with Catholic law they would automatically incur excommunication for impeding a bishop in the exercise of his pastoral duties. In 1948 the archbishop of Washington, Patrick A. O'Boyle, began the integration of white and black pupils in the Catholic schools of this archdiocese. In June 1953 Bishop Vincent J. Waters of Raleigh opened all Catholic churches, schools, hospitals, and other institutions in North Carolina to all, regardless of their color, and he did not yield before the severe opposition of some Catholics and non-

Catholics. All these courageous steps had been taken before the Supreme Court of the United States ended racial segregation in the public schools with its famed decision of 17 May 1954. Likewise in 1953 Archbishop Joseph F. Rummel excluded racial segregation also from the churches of the archdiocese of New Orleans after he had first achieved this in Catholic societies and associations. But not until 1962 did he venture to order the end of racial segregation also in the Catholic schools of his archdiocese, and even then he still encountered violent opposition from some lay persons.

Liturgical Movement

The Liturgical Movement was introduced into the United States chiefly by persons who were also interested in social action. The reformers of the liturgy sought to overcome individualism, which both in the Church and in secular society isolated people from one another, and so they aspired to make Catholics more keenly conscious of their membership and solidarity in the mystical body of Christ. The leading representative of this movement, Virgil Michel, a Benedictine monk of Saint John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minnesota, was also a prominent interpreter of the social encyclicals. He had undertaken extensive study journeys to Europe and there consulted the leaders and experts, especially Lambert Beauduin. Michel brought the ideas of liturgical renewal back to the United States and spread them in the monthly *Orate Fratres,* which first appeared in Advent 1926; in 1951 the title was changed to *Worship.* He also founded the Liturgical Press, which publishes texts, books, and brochures. The first liturgical "meeting" was held at Saint John's Abbey in 1929, and since 1940 a national Liturgical Week is held annually with the support of the Benedictine abbeys of the United States. The Benedictine Liturgical Conference, which formed the organ for implementing the annual "weeks," decided to reorganize on a broader basis, and in 1944 it was transformed into an association as the Liturgical Conference. In the 1950s its membership increased, because the liturgical reforms proceeding from Rome drew attention to its activity; this activity was widened to satisfy the requirements of dioceses and parishes. In addition to Michel, who died in 1938, Gerald Ellard, S.J., professor at Saint Mary's College in Kansas, was likewise a pioneer; with his books and periodical articles, in conection with his teaching and lecturing, he promoted the movement in the United States. For a while it encountered the opposition of some conservative prelates, but it gradually put itself across. Lay persons procured hand missals in English in ever larger numbers, and the Dialogue Mass spread more and more. Gregorian chant became better known, after the Pius X School of Liturgical Music, founded at Manhattanville College in 1916, had fostered it. Nonliturgical forms of devotion, like novenas, accordingly lost some of their popularity. Nevertheless, American Catholics were hardly prepared for the fundamental reforms which resulted from the Second Vatican Council.

The Situation in American Society

At least into the 1960s many fellow citizens regarded Catholics with secret distrust and open hostility. Anti-Catholicism was furthered, especially in the South, by periodicals such as *Tom Watson's Magazine,* published by the fanatical United States senator from Georgia, and *The Menace,* whose circulation reached its peak with 1.5 million in 1915. Even after Catholics had in World War I proved their undisputed loyalty, which was maliciously disputed by their enemies, they experienced in the early 1920s a new wave of attacks by the revived Ku Klux Klan, which also denounced and threatened Jews and blacks. The Klan expanded from the South to the Midwest and the far West, and at its peak counted 5 million members; but after 1925 it lost its reputation when the crimes and scandals of its leaders were exposed. When in 1928, for the first time in American history, the Democratic Party nominated a Catholic, Alfred E. Smith, governor of New York, as its presidential candidate, the anti-Catholic forces again stirred up religious hatred by attacking the candidate's Church and contributing to his defeat in the election. Catholics were not only effectively excluded from the highest office in the country, but between 1789 and 1933 only four Catholics held posts in the cabinets of the presidents.

For Catholics the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt signaled the beginning of a new era in American society. Al Smith had roused his fellow Catholics, especially in the big cities, to support the Democratic Party; Roosevelt obtained their devotion by the recognition which he gave them and the skillful treatment which he allotted to them. Many of the American bishops, including first of all Cardinal Mundelein, publicly proclaimed their approval of Roosevelt's policies, especially in the first terms of his administration. And the Catholic press took a generally positive attitude toward the New Deal. However, many Catholic leaders and newspapers deplored the president's decision to recognize the Soviet Union and to institute diplomatic relations with it, although they appreciated the efforts he made in the negotiations to secure guarantees of religious freedom. The Knights of Columbus and others also strongly criticized his silence and inaction in regard to the persecution of Catholics by the Mexican government. When Father Coughlin, who had supported Roosevelt at the beginning of his presidency, later attacked him both because of his economic policy, especially in regard to currency, credit, and banks, and also because of his alleged favoring of Communism, Monsignor John A. Ryan defended the president in 1936 in a national radio address. In the previous year Coughlin had founded the National Union for Social Justice, which was intended to act as a lobby of the people or as a civic-minded non-partisan force, to give emphasis to the demand for legal mooring of those reform principles which he extracted from the papal encyclicals and in keeping with this to work for the nomination and election of like-minded candidates to Congress in each party; it attained a membership of perhaps 5 million, especially among the workers of Irish and German descent in the East and Midwest, and it also achieved some of its goals. Later the radio priest created the Union Party and chose as its presidential candidate William Lemke, for whom he then conducted in 1936 an energetic but, as it finally turned out, useless election campaign.

Because of the well-known opposition of the Church to Communism, anti-Catholic propaganda declined during the Cold War. Nevertheless, some loud opponents continued to find public attention. The most notorious among them was Paul Blanshard, who directed his diatribes against the Church's authoritarian and antiliberal principles and accused the hierarchy of undermining American values and the ideals of freedom and democracy. He was the chief spokesman for an organization which had been founded in 1947 and called itself Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State, later Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. It worked with a great display of votes to prevent any public aid to parochial schools, which it designated as divisive and un-American; it also denied to any Catholic the ability to hold a public office. The nomination of another Catholic by the Democratic Party in 1960, John F. Kennedy, evoked a new outburst of antireligious feeling, and the candidate deemed it necessary to deny beforehand that the Church could exercise any influence at all on his official decisions. Political scientists have stated that many people who normally belonged to the Democratic Party voted against Kennedy because of his religion. After he had been elected by a very slender majority, he consistently resisted all proposals to support at least those parents who had to bear extra expenses so that they could send their children to Catholic schools. His electoral victory, his nonpartisan administration of his office, and his unusual popularity among all classes of the population lessened anti-Catholicism as a force in American society, and two years after his tragic death the declaration of the Second Vatican Council on religious liberty confirmed this effect still more; the American bishops had especially insisted on it.

When on 23 December 1939 President Roosevelt named Myron C.

Taylor, an Episcopalian, as his personal representative to Pope Pius XII with the rank of ambassador, an anti-Catholic outcry was raised. Taylor's job was to establish a connection between the two leading personalities in the promotion of peace and to coordinate the assistance of the Vatican and of the United States during and after the war. When Protestants protested strongly against the sending of an ambassador as a violation of the principle of the separation of state and Church, and demanded the ambassador's recall, Roosevelt insisted that this temporary mission did not involve the establishment of diplomatic relations. Although the opponents declared their opposition again at the end of the war, Taylor exercised his office until his recall in 1950. In October 1951 President Harry Truman nominated General Mark Clark as ambassador at the Vatican, but the Protestants raised such a storm of indignation that the president later withdrew the nomination at the general's request, before it was discussed in the Senate.

The Position of the Church in International Affairs

The unfriendly attitude of many of their fellow citizens did not deter the American Catholics from giving their opinion on international affairs. At the outbreak of World War I most writers in Catholic newspapers and periodicals advocated neutrality, and many, especially in the Midwest, even took the side of the Central Powers. Catholics of Irish birth or descent were of course against the British, and the German Catholic *Centralverein* pledged its total sympathy to Germany in 1914. Although a few bishops, such as Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore, praised President Woodrow Wilson for not intervening in the conflict in Europe, the majority of American Catholics opposed the foreign policy of the government, which favored the Allies, and, as it seems, the majority voted in the presidential election of 1916 for the Republican candidate. Some of the leading Catholics, however, admonished their coreligionists not to tread upon the sensitivities of other Americans by participating in German-American efforts for union or entering into partisan politics. But as soon as the United States had entered the war, a wave of patriotism drowned all pro-German inclinations.

After the war American Catholics generally opposed Wilson's peace policy, partly because he refused to work for the independence of Ireland. They brought forward many reasons against the anticipated entry of the United States into the League of Nations and, together with the majority of their fellow citizens, took refuge in isolationism. However, a few leaders, such as Father John A. Ryan, Judge Martin T. Manton, and Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes founded in 1927 the Catholic Association for International Peace for the instruction "of all men of good will on their obligation" to bring about world peace by justice and charity. The association championed many measures which were later realized, as, for example, for technical support and foreign aid. From Wilson's first administration to Roosevelt's second, American Catholics urged the government incessantly but vainly to intervene in Mexico in favor of the persecuted Catholics.

Even before World War II the American bishops at the request of the German hierarchy had supported all who had to flee from persecution by the Nazis by means of the Catholic Committee for Refugees and Refugee Children, founded by them. In 1940 they founded the Bishops' War Emergency and Relief Committee and took up a special collection in all churches for its support. The next year began the annual collections on *Laetare* Sunday for support of victims of war among the people of fifteen nations and among those who had sought refuge in various places in Europe and the Middle East. In 1942 the bishops established the War Relief Services, and in the next year this obtained the certificate for admission to the National War Fund, from which they obtained financial support until 1947. Meanwhile, the bishops continued the *Laetare* Sunday collections to obtain money for purely religious tasks, to which belonged special applications for aid from the Holy See and from numerous bishops and Catholic organizations abroad. In 1947 they expanded their annual appeal for donations in order to support the comprehensive program for help overseas, for rehabilitation, and for resettlement, which the War Relief Services had carried out. Even before the ending of hostilities the War Relief Services began their operations in the countries freed from the Axis Powers in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Shortly after the war's end there began also comprehensive aid programs in the hitherto hostile countries: Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Japan. But the assistance actions which were under way in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Yugoslavia were forbidden by the Communist governments of these countries. Although the War Relief Services originally were to be only an institution for a limited time, it was later understood that they were permanently needed; and so in 1955 their name was changed to Catholic Relief Services of the NCWC. Because of their connections with local agencies and their expanding network of aid programs, the Catholic Relief Services were in the position of making full use of the surplus food which the American government in the 1950s destined for overseas assistance. In addition, they distributed clothing which Catholics had donated in the yearly collection at Thanksgiving. At the end of 1963 the Catholic Relief Services had shipped overseas food, clothing, medicines, and other means of help with a total weight of 5.6 million tons and a total value of $1.25 billion and had distributed these to needy persons and institutions. They helped more than 400,000 refugees settle in the United States or in other havens. They extended their field of activity to more than seventy countries, especially to the newly arising nations of Africa and the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, in which connection they promoted with greater emphasis than before technical aid, such as projects of self-help, which was intended to end social injustices, economic situations of dearth, sickness, and ignorance. In this way from the Catholic Relief Services came the greatest voluntary private organization for providing aid of the United States overseas.

American Catholics displayed their feeling of responsibility for other countries also by encouraging the foreign missions with personnel and money. Before World War I only a few Americans had gone abroad to proclaim the message of faith. Although the first religious congregation which was established in the United States for this purpose, namely, the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, usually called Maryknoll Missioners, founded by James A. Walsh and Thomas F. Price, had been approved by the American bishops and allowed, as an experiment, by Pius X as early as 1911, the first group of missioners under Price's leadership and with South China as goal, did not leave until 1918. In the postwar years many other religious institutes, especially the Society of Jesus, also sent men and women to the foreign missions. In 1958 Cardinal Richard Cushing, archbishop of Boston, founded the Missionary Society of Saint James the Apostle for the restoring and preserving of the faith in Latin America; it was to consist of diocesan priests, who voluntarily obliged themselves for five years, and they were to develop among the poor a life in the parish community. Within five years there were ninety-three members from nineteen different dioceses in English-speaking countries. Earlier, in 1950, the Grail, an international lay movement of Catholic women, had begun a regular course of training for the missionary apostolate of the laity. A lay organization for men and women was approved under the title of Papal Volunteers for Latin America. Within three years 245 papal volunteers served without pay, usually for a period of three years, in twelve countries; they were invited by the local bishops and were active predominantly in the area of education, medicine, and social work.

In 1966 9,303 American priests, brothers, sisters, and men and women from the lay state worked in many countries of America, Asia, and Latin America. American Catholics supplied donations to the missionary institutes and the papal work for the propagation of the faith; in 1919 the total sum for this already amounted to more than $1 million per year, and in 1966 alone the sum for the papal work was approximately $16 million.

Lay Movements

In the decades following World War I laymen began to display a greater activity in the Church. The National Council of Catholic Men and the National Council of Catholic Women were established under the National Catholic Welfare Conference in 1920 as a merger of parochial, supraparochial, diocesan, individual state, and national organizations. By 1965 about 10,000 organizations with a total membership of about 9 million joined the National Council of Catholic Men, and 14,000 organizations with almost 10 million members the National Council of Catholic Women. Both parent organizations created a broadly conceived program for spirituality, information, civic and social action, family life, youth, and international affairs. They provided aid to the affiliated organizations in the planning and implementation of local programs. Of course, in most places they operated by means of diocesan societies of Catholic men and women. The national associations represented the Catholic laity in other national and international organizations and at meetings of both a religious and a secular sort, and also in committees of Congress. To the men's council was given the responsibility for all Catholic radio and television programs, which were regularly broadcast on the national networks. The best known program was the "Catholic Hour," which was broadcast from 1930 by the National Broadcasting Company. In 1971 the two associations united as the National Council of Catholic Laity.

Two specialized lay movements acquired national importance. The Cana Conference began as a series of retreats which Father John P. Delaney, S.J., conducted in Saint Louis in 1944. Such meetings, which were more unstructured and relaxed than spiritual exercises in the strict sense, were intended to apply religious principles to the secular aspects of married life in a manner which was sensible to twentieth-century Americans. These meetings instilled community sense and led to the forming of Cana Clubs for regular study and prayer in the homes of participants together with a chaplain. A further result was participation in the social apostolate to a greater extent. In most dioceses directors of family life were appointed, and thousands of priests and lay persons were gained for the implementing and spreading of this movement. In addition, numerous Pre-Cana Conferences for engaged couples spread, and for widowed persons Naim Conferences, also called Post-Cana Clubs, were formed. The Bethany Conference was a further extension for single persons.

A similar function was performed by the Christian Family Movement, which had begun in Chicago as a Catholic Action group for men and in 1947 was transformed into an organization for married couples by Mr.

and Mrs. Patrick Crowley. The basic units consisted of from five to six couples, usually from the same parish, who met in their homes and carried out a program for discussions and actions in the area of the lay apostolate. These units rapidly increased; by 1963 more than 40,000 couples actively took part in the group meetings that occurred every two weeks in the United States and Canada; in other countries there was probably an equally large number. In 1949 a national coordinating committee with headquarters in Chicago was set up to exchange ideas and reports of experiences with the help of some publications and annual programs. The members of every group were to examine from time to time a special aspect of family, cultural, political, economic, or international life, come to a judgment on whether it was entirely humane and Christian, and then decide possible actions, which were to be undertaken by the couples, either individually or collectively. Most participants, however, were chiefly interested in family problems, as, for example, the rapidly increasing national divorce rate.

Other organizations of Catholic Action which had begun in the United States after World War II were the Young Christian Workers and the Young Christian Students, which had been founded on the European model. In the same period the Exercises Movement led to a deepening of the spiritual life of the laity in the midst of secular professional activity. Catholic professional societies likewise prospered.

Journalism

After World War I the Catholic press underwent a noteworthy development. The ownership of most newspapers was transferred by lay persons to the dioceses. But even then, when a diocesan weekly newspaper was designated as "official organ" or "the voice" of the local authorities, a distinction was made between authoritative views of the Church and the opinions of the publisher. There now also appeared Catholic newspaper chains. In 1929 the newspaper *Catholic Register,* which had begun five years earlier with the publication of a national edition, published at Denver under the direction of Monsignor Matthew J. W. Smith its first edition for another diocese, and within nine years this system increased to nineteen editions, with a circulation of 400,000; in 1964 it had thirty-three editions with a total circulation of 778,196. The paper *Our Sunday Visitor,* which had been founded in 1912 by Father, later Bishop, John Francis Noll of Fort Wayne, Indiana, chiefly for apologetic purposes as a reaction to anti-Catholic and pro-Socialist newspapers, began in 1937 the publication of an edition for another diocese; in 1964 it produced eleven diocesan editions, a Canadian national edition, and a national news edition, with a total circulation of 892,148. Other chains of smaller size were formed in Ohio and Wisconsin. In 1969 there were eighty-nine locally published diocesan papers with a total circulation of 4,229,065.

The first larger Catholic daily newspaper in English in the United States was the *Tribune,* founded in 1920 at Dubuque, Iowa, by Nicholas E. Gonner, and two years later moved to Milwaukee, Wisconsin. It was strongly apologetic in tone. After Gonner's death the book publisher William George Bruce bought it along with others and continued it until 1942. Another Catholic daily, the *Sun Herald,* was started in 1950 at Kansas City, Missouri, by a group of Catholic laymen under the leadership of Robert Hoyt, but the next year it was stopped because of insufficient subscriptions. A few of this lay group in 1964 began the *National Catholic Reporter.* This weekly became very familiar among liberal Catholics, because it gave religious news without restrictions and critically interpreted it; it even incurred censure from the bishop of Kansas City, but this was ineffective.

In order to supply Catholic newspapers with news on national and international affairs the NCWC News Service was established in 1920; it took over the work of a smaller agency which had previously been operated by the Catholic Press Association of the United States and Canada. It erected an overseas service, hired correspondents in almost every part of the world, obtained subscriptions in sixty-five countries, and finally supplied services for leading articles, pictures, radio, and eventually also for television and some other services. The Catholic Press Association, founded in 1911, also held annual meetings, published a monthly and a historical "annual," and promoted the increase of circulation and the advertising business; it likewise especially supported the Catholic press in Latin America and the mission press in general.

Catholic newspapers in foreign languages appeared and again disappeared during this period. Among German publications some continued even after World War I, such as the important daily *Amerika* at Saint Louis, which ended in 1924. In 1936 there still were twenty-three German-language Catholic papers, but in World War II they all stopped or changed over to English, as did *The Wanderer* of Saint Paul. Of the ten papers in Polish which existed in 1940, all suspended appearance in the succeeding years except for the *Dziennik Chicagoski* (*Polish Daily News*), which the Resurrectionists had founded in 1890 and which also supplied local, national, and international news. Also two Italian weeklies, *La Voce del Popolo,* founded at Detroit in 1910 and *Il Crociato,* founded in 1933 by the diocese of Brooklyn, continued to appear after World War II. Newspapers in Spanish and in a few Slavonic languages in addition to Polish were also published under Catholic patronage. In 1964 there were altogether thirteen foreign-language papers with a total circulation of 195,434.

Among Catholic magazines those prospered which were concerned with the home and foreign missions. *Extension,* the organ of the Catholic Church Extension Society (founded in 1906), in 1963 provided 400,000 readers every month not only with news on the mission work fostered by the society in the United States, but also articles of general interest. The first magazine which promoted the foreign missions exclusively was published by the Maryknoll Missioners, first under the title *Field Afar* and later *Maryknoll.* In the 1960s it increased its circulation to more than 300,000.

Magazines which had been founded before World War I continued to exist side by side. The organ of the Third Order of Saint Francis, *St. Anthony Messenger,* had begun in 1893 and became a popular family magazine, which in 1960 had a circulation of 330,000. The oldest Catholic newspapers which appeared at this time were the *Catholic World* of the Paulists, in which the effort was made to bring the faith into relation with American society, and *Ave Maria* of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, which aspired to form family life in a Christian way. Other magazines published by religious institutes with a broad circulation were: the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (1886, by Jesuits), the *Liguorian* (1913, by Redemptorists), the *Sign* (1921, by Passionists), and the *Voice of St. Jude* (1913), later called the *U.S. Catholic* (by Claretians). The two most important opinion-forming weeklies were *America,* begun in 1909 and published by Jesuits, and *Commonweal,* begun in 1924 and published by lay persons, both of which sought to treat contemporary problems and cultural themes from a Catholic standpoint. The *Catholic Digest* had a circulation of 650,000 in 1964. In the same year there were published fifty-nine consumer magazines with a total circulation of 7,042,996, fifty business and professional magazines with a circulation of 455,931, 241 magazines which accepted no advertisements with a total circulation of 12,934,017, and twenty-four foreign-language magazines with a total circulation of 228,988, under Catholic patronage. In the next five years these numbers quickly dropped. Nevertheless, the total circulation of the Catholic press in the United States in 1969 amounted to 25,599,766.

By 1964 journalism was offered as an academic course in one form or another in about half the Catholic universities and colleges in the United States. The only College of Journalism was founded in 1915 at Marquette University in Milwaukee, but graduate study in the mass media was later likewise instituted in other Catholic institutions. In recent years ever more courses in radio and television were offered. In the academic programs both technical courses in theory and practice of the various communications media were contained, as well as theoretical courses on their role in society and their professional ethics.

Statistics prove that the connection of Catholics with their Church dropped considerably before 1968, when Pope Paul VI issued the encyclical *Humanae Vitae.* A famous sociologist of religion refers the decline of traditional forms of church practice, for example, attendance at Sunday Mass, to the strong repudiation on the part of many of the faithful to the teaching contained in this papal document on birth control. Other analysts are of the view that rather a whole complex of various factors played a role: the growing secularism, an exaggrated personalism, thorough permissiveness, libertinism, and antinomianism, an anti-"Establishment" attitude and religious indifferentism, as has been characteristic of the manner of thought in the United States and in many other countries of the free world since the beginning of the 1960s. The loss of respect for Pope and bishops is due to the fact that certain theologians publicly and at times loudly held themselves aloof from declarations of the *magisterium.* The most important Protestant Churches in the United States experienced a similar downward trend; only the smaller fundamentalist and Pentecostal sects, which appealed to special revelations or made lofty demands on their adherents, have grown disproportionately. Although the teachings and reforms of the Second Vatican Council were generally greeted by American Catholics, the hope and expectation of a new flowering of the Church in the United States have not been realized in the postconciliar period.

CANADA

Population

Between 1911 and 1961 Canada's total population rose from 7,206,643 to 18,238,247 inhabitants. In this period the number of Catholics increased from 2,841,881—39.4 percent—to 8,342,826—45.7 percent. However, Catholics were not uniformly distributed: 56 percent lived in the province of Quebec. When in 1951 Catholics constituted 44.7 percent of the Canadian total population, they were divided among the individual provinces according to the following percentages: 88.0 in Quebec, 50.6 in New Brunswick, 45.5 in Prince Edward Island, 40.6 in the Northwest Territory, 34.0 in Nova Scotia, 33.6 in Newfoundland, 28.5 in Saskatchewan, 28.3 in Manitoba, 25.7 in Ontario, 23.8 in Alberta, 20.9 in the Yukon, and 15.0 in British Columbia. In the same year the Catholic population, according to nationalities, was distributed thus: 66.7 percent French, 7.9 Irish, 5.9 English, 3.5 Ukrainian, 2.9 Scottish, 2.6 Polish, 2.5 German, 2.2 Italian, 1.4 native

Indian, and 4.4 other. The percentage of Catholics within each individual nationality amounted to 96.7 of the French, 34.5 of the Irish, 10.2 of the English, 56 of the Ukrainians, 11.8 of the Scots, 74.8 of the Poles, 24.7 of the Germans, 89.6 of the Italians, and 53.5 of the native Indians.

Organization

In 1914 there were ten archdioceses, twenty-five dioceses, five vicariates apostolic, one Ruthenian bishop, and one prefecture apostolic. Fifty years later there were fifteen archdioceses of the Latin Rite—fourteen provinces plus Winnipeg—one province of the Ukrainian Byzantine Rite, forty dioceses, one abbey *nullius,* three eparchies, and eight vicariates apostolic.

Educational System

In each province the Catholic elementary and secondary schools stood in one or another relationship to the secular authorities. In the province of Quebec the schools were regarded as public institutions and were supported by general taxes, but supervised by Catholic and Protestant committees of the Council of Public Instruction. Hence the two systems developed pretty much in independence of each other: The Catholic system followed the French tradition in education, and the Protestant followed the English. Private or independent schools played a more important role in Quebec than in other provinces. The most important were the classical colleges; they offered an eight-year course which one entered upon completing elementary school and which led in two stages of four years each to the bachelor's degree. In 1965 there were thirty-two classical colleges for men and nine for women, which were affiliated to Laval University, and twenty-seven colleges for men and six for women, which were associated with Montreal University.

Newfoundland also had a system of provincial denominational schools. Here the five large denominations operated their own schools under the supervision of a school superintendent, who was responsible to the deputy minister of education of the province. All schools followed the same curriculum.

In Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Alberta the first school which was erected with the support of taxes in one community had always to be a provincial school, open to all children. But the school law allowed Catholic or Protestant minorities to withdraw from the provincial school system and establish their own school-sponsoring bodies and schools, which were termed "separate" schools. The local inhabitants could choose which system they wanted to support with their taxes, and usually they made their choice according to their religion. Both the provincial and the separate schools were subject to the jurisdiction of the provincial Department of Education and both obtained provincial aid. In Saskatchewan and Alberta separate Catholic schools could be erected only in the large cities where Catholics were represented in sufficient number. In Ontario separate schools could offer only the eight elementary and two lower secondary grades; hence Catholics had to erect private schools for the three higher secondary grades.

The provinces on the Atlantic coast—New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island—and Manitoba in accord with the law maintained only provincial schools, but on the basis of a "Gentlemen's Agreement" there were, within the provincial school system in areas where there were many English and French Catholics, also English-language and French-language Catholic schools. Outside the French-language areas of Manitoba, for example, Saint Boniface, the Catholics had also to finance at their own expense their private or parochial schools, in addition to the taxes which they had to pay for the support of the provincial schools.

British Columbia likewise provided only a provincial system, and such schools could under no circumstances be denominational; hence Catholics were forced to support their own schools in addition to the provincial schools. In the Yukon and Northwest, thanks to the collaboration of dominion and local authorities with the denominational bodies, systems had been developed in which Catholic elementary schools for the sparse population of Indians, Eskimos, and whites obtained full support through taxes from the government and the local authorities.

In 1962 nineteen Catholic colleges and universities were authorized to grant academic degrees. They had almost 25,000 students, and another 10,000 attended the colleges affiliated to them, predominantly in Quebec. The total number of 35,000 made up about 30 percent of all the students who were registered in Canadian colleges and universities.

All these institutions were in the east, but they differed considerably in size and capacity. In the coastal provinces there were nine, the largest of which was Saint Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, which was under the patronage of the diocese and acquired an international reputation for its research on cooperatives and its adult education. In the province of Quebec, Montreal University, which had been attached for forty years to Laval University in Quebec City, became an independent institution by a document of the provincial government in 1920. In 1954 the University of Sherbrooke obtained a similar charter. In Ontario the University of Ottawa, the first bilingual Canadian university, was run by the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Saint Michael's College, directed by the Basilian Fathers, was united with the

University of Toronto; it was the first Catholic college of the humanities which agreed to an arrangement whereby it maintained a certain degree of independence but granted its degrees through the university. Assumption University at Windsor, also conducted by the Basilians, likewise became independent in 1953, but ten years later decided to stop granting academic degrees, except in theology, so that it could merge with the new nondenominational University of Windsor. The Laurentian University of Sudbury, which was founded as such in 1960, had been earlier, since 1913, a college run by the Jesuits, and was formally united with Huntington University, an institution of the United Church of Christ.

In western Canada there were no independent Catholic colleges or universities, because the legislators refused to grant to each province more than one academic degree-granting institution. But the Basilians and Jesuits founded colleges, which were united with the provincial universities in various ways or were affiliated to them. Thus, in the sphere of higher education these two orders experimented with new forms of merger with non-Catholic universities for the sake of the academic and economic advantages which they sought thereby.

Social Movement

Various sources gave the theoretical impulse for the Canadian Catholic social movement. In addition to the papal encyclicals, the pastoral letters of the bishops also treated social questions, in which connection they passed from the problems predominantly connected with agriculture and rural life at the beginning of the twentieth century to problems of industrialization and the working class in the later decades. In 1950 the archbishops and bishops of the civil province of Quebec issued a common pastoral letter entitled "The Workers' Problem in the Light of the Church's Social Doctrine," in which they took a bold stand on some points, as, for example, in regard to the codetermination of the worker in the direction of an industry. Two private institutions provided further theoretical fuel: the École Sociale Populaire, founded in 1911, promoted social studies, issued publications, and from 1920 supported the annual *Semaines Sociales du Canada,* which brought together leading personalities of social doctrine and of social action in order to consult together on common concerns. And the École des Sciences Sociales of Laval University, founded in 1932, made noteworthy contributions.

The workers' union (local syndicates), organized on a formally Catholic basis by priests and laymen in various parts of the province of Quebec, merged in 1921 with the *Confédération des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada.* At first non-Catholics could be members but not hold office. This restriction was gradually ended. Likewise, every union had a chaplain, a Catholic priest, who at first was authorized to inform the bishops of every decision which, in his opinion, was contrary to Catholic social doctrine; in practice, the chaplains rarely exercised this right and finally became merely moral advisers, who attended all meetings and could present their views but had no vote. In its original constitution the *confédération* expressly declared its loyalty to the social doctrine of the Catholic Church, but in 1960 the denominational ties were broken; the expression "Christian principles" was put in their place, and the name was changed to *Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux.* From the late 1930s the Catholic syndicates had about one-third of all members of unions of the province of Quebec in their ranks; the others belonged mainly to international (American) unions. However, the *confédération* exercised on the worker movement as a whole and on worker legislation an influence which was in no proportion to its size and persumably was based on its social and ideological concerns.

An expressly Catholic movement was also started for workers in agriculture. In 1924 2,400 farmers meeting in Quebec city founded the *Union Catholique des Cultivateurs.* This organization defended and fostered the general interests of the rural population, especially in regard to the educational system. In the 1950s it also established rural syndicates in order to deal collectively with the buyers of farm products. In 1965 there were almost 700 local syndicates with more than 50,000 members as opposed to a possible membership of 65,000 to 70,000. As in the workers' syndicates, the role of the chaplain developed from that of a participant exercising power to that of a moral adviser or attorney, but the word "Catholic" was not removed from the organization's name.

For Catholic manufacturers and employers there was no permanent organization until the *Association Professionnelle des Industriels* was founded in 1943. It was intended to protect the interests of management and promote a Christian social order. In 1965 it numbered ca. 500 members, who for the most part belonged to small or medium firms. Despite its limitation it played a leading role and, it is true, by cooperation with other groups, in which regard it directed the attention of management to the working class and to the human problems in business life. It was also an active member of the *Union Internationale Chrétienne des Dirigeants d'Entreprise.*

CHAPTER 24

*The Church in Latin America**

In Latin America lives about one-third of the world's Catholic population, but its internal strength does not correspond to its statistical strength. The causes go back partly to the colonial period, others were added from the time of emancipation at the beginning of the nineteenth century and have grown still stronger. The structure of the population was decided by the political-economic domination of the former colonial masters, the Spaniards and Portuguese, who did not, it is true, like the white immigrants to North America, decimate the original inhabitants—the Indians—or force them into reservations; however, the Christian mission did not succeed in overcoming pagan magic and the corresponding morality among them. The immigration from Europe, especially to Argentina and Brazil, strengthened the white element, whose interbreeding with Indians and the black slaves brought from Africa produced a third unstable element of mestizos and mulattoes respectively.

The biggest problem confronting the Church was the unequal distribution of landed property. The white upper class in large-scale operations cultivated the greatest part of the productive acreage available and kept the peasants in extreme poverty. Similar social tensions existed in the mines, for example, in Bolivia, and in the industrial areas of rapidly growing vast cities, such as São Paulo and Buenos Aires, with high unemployment and slums. The market difficulties of the raw materials countries as a consequence of the world economic crisis promoted the pauperization of the masses.

The Church's proclamation in preaching and catechetics was in many places insufficient, the native clergy was partly inactive and strongly authoritarian. In this way is explained the fact that in almost all countries of Latin America groups of priests were formed who aspired to alter the social structures by nationalization of the means of production and the establishment of Marxism, if necessary by force; in this way the Church would fulfill its true mandate. The episcopate, whom the progressive priest groups more or less correctly charged with supporting the "exploiters," warned against revolution with changing success, but did not from the outset repudiate the socialist experiment of Allende in Chile, though on the other hand it held itself aloof from autocratic regimes, as in Paraguay.

---

* Félix Zubillaga, S.J.

An indication of the internal weakness of the Latin American Church, and at the same time a contributing cause of the crisis in which it exists, is the lack of native priests and religious, which could be lessened, but not eliminated, by immigration from abroad, especially from Europe—for example, in Bolivia, where there is one priest for 17,000 faithful. Also important, though not yet more important, would be the improvement of the theological and spiritual formation of future priests, for which the *Adveniat* program of the German Catholics hopes to offer help.

The situation of the Church of Latin America was a constant concern of the Popes. Benedict XV strengthened the position of the nuncios, who up to then had been partly *Delegati Apostolici ed Inviati straordinari,* by the decree of 8 May 1916, which stated that these should rank as permanent representatives of the Holy See—*Internuntii Apostolici.* Pius XI improved the diocesan division in almost all countries of Latin America: in Venezuela in 1922–23, in Bolivia in 1924, in Paraguay in 1929, in Colombia and Argentina in 1934, but especially in Brazil, so that "no country in the world, except China, even only approximately experienced so great an increase of its ecclesiastical circumscriptions," as Schmidlin says.

The Latin American episcopate met in connection with the Thirty-Sixth International Eucharistic Congress at Rio de Janeiro from 25 July to 4 August 1955 and established the Latin American Episcopal Conference—*Consejo Episcopal Latino-Americano* (CELAM), which was confirmed by Pius XII on 2 November 1955. The first annual meeting at Bogotá in 1956 enacted its statutes. CELAM supports a permanent secretariat and publishes a monthly *Boletín Informativo.*

The Conference of Medellín from 26 August to 7 September 1968, organized following the Eucharistic Congress of Bogotá and opened by Pope Paul VI, in which 155 bishops and 137 representatives of the priests, sisters, and laity took part, strove for a change in the pastoral and social work of the Church and its uniformity. Cardinal Samorè and the archbishops of Lima and Teresina held the chairmanship as representatives of the Pope. The consultations were based on a "Basic Document" composed by CELAM. The conference stated that in Latin America there existed a "situation of institutionalized power," which justifies a legitimate defense but not a revolutionary uprising. The Church wants to be a "ferment" in the structural changes that are to be quickly sought. Economic, social, and agrarian reform, an *educación liberadora,* are indispensable. Pastoral care must take an interest in the intellectual leadership classes, promote a Christian family policy—up to 40 percent of men over fifteen years old live in *uniones libres*—catechesis must be oriented to social change, and for this purpose the establishment of a catechetical periodical *Catequesis Latinoamericana* with headquarters at Asunción was decreed. It was impressed on the diocesan and religious clergy that, in view of the deep poverty of wide strata, it must itself "live poverty." Following the Conference of Medellín the national episcopates in many pastoral letters set up guidelines for pastoral work and undertook organizational measures.

The ecclesiastical situation in the individual countries of Latin America has developed in such diversity, not least as a consequence of frequent changes of the forms of government and of the governments, that our presentation must be arranged according to countries.

BRAZIL

Brazil has a total area of 8,511,965 square kilometers and in 1976 had 104 million inhabitants; in 1971 89.3 percent were Catholics. About 60 percent are whites, the rest blacks, mulattoes, and other half-castes, only ca. 2 percent are Indians.

Ecclesiastical Organization

In 1957 there were: twenty archdioceses, seventy-seven dioceses, thirty-one prelacies, and one abbey *nullius,* and 3,722 parishes, two-thirds of which were staffed by diocesan priests, one-third by religious, and in which some 30,000 sisters worked.

In 1939 the bishops held a plenary council; since 26 October 1945 there has been an Episcopal Conference (CNBB), which was approved by Pius XII. To it belong the residential bishops of all rites, the coadjutors, auxiliaries, and bishops charged with a special function, and all bishops who have their ecclesiastical residence in Brazil. The functions of the Episcopal Conference include the fostering of cooperation with other episcopal conferences and of contact with the state in concert with the nunciature. Since 1891 there has been separation of church and state; it was abolished in 1934 but reintroduced in 1946.

Lack of Priests

In his letter of 18 December 1910 Pope Pius X wrote: "We are convinced that, in accord with the desires of the Holy See, you will constitute a clergy which will be redemption and light of the world; the laity trained for this will participate in its tasks."[1] Even then the lack of priests was the most serious problem of the Church in Brazil. Pius X wrote to the Brazilian bishops on 6 June 1911: "You must undertake all efforts so that sufficient priests will be at the disposal of the faithful."[2]

[1] *BIB,* 106.

[2] Ibid., 106f.

Nevertheless, Pius XI, after the visit of three apostolic delegates, had to state in his letter of 20 January 1927: "Everywhere too few priests, in some areas none at all, hence restricted in their services to the faithful, although religious brothers and sisters from Europe offer great support. It is to be deplored that so few vocations come from the young, and even then these cannot realize their desires because no means are available and the seminaries are insufficient."[3]

Catholic Action

A great help for the promotion of Catholic Action in Brazil was the letter of Pope Pius XI of 12 October 1935 to Cardinal Sebastião Leme and the bishops, in which he presents Catholic Action as a work of divine Providence for the faithful who are ready to work still more closely with the shepherds; the bishops and priests for their part can, with this assistance, exercise their functions on a still broader basis, which is of great importance considering the small number of priests in Brazil.[4] In a letter of 21 January 1942 to Cardinal Leme Pius XII expressed his thanks and his joy that the Brazilian Marianists "are capable coworkers in the spreading of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ and that they are accomplishing a vast apostolate by many works"; he also desired "that these groups might grow and become stronger from day to day and furthermore work with their usual obedience for the spreading of God's Kingdom, preach in the families and in society, always in harmony with traditional truths and Catholic principles, which do not change but remain constant for all times."[5] In accord with the wishes of Pius XI the Brazilian episcopate on 9 June 1935 published a document, accompanied by announcements for every diocese, on the statutes of Brazilian Catholic Action, examined and provided with the Pope's blessing.[6]

Piety

The Brazilian level of piety was, apart from particular variations, relatively high in 1965. Inquiries which were conducted in the archdiocese of Ribeirão Prêto, a traditional area with a slow growth of the urban population, for example, in Patrocínio Paulista, a place of ca. 3,000 inhabitants, which in the last years listed an increase of 1,200 inhabitants, yielded a result of 52 percent Sunday churchgoers. Other areas with a more rapid increase of the urban population, such as Sertãozinho, Jardinópolis, and Ribeirão Prêto, yielded only 22 percent,

---

[3] Ibid., 108.

[4] Ibid., 108f.

[5] Ibid., 109f.

[6] Ibid., 90.

24 percent, and 18 percent. This piety, which is present in the interior of Brazil and especially in the underdeveloped areas in the north and northwest, and even in cities such as Salvador, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, and Recife, attests to a Christian vitality, although in some points it needs examination; it must still grow into the renewal of the Second Vatican Council.[7]

Too Few Priestly Vocations

The Brazilian Church has too few priestly vocations for its pastoral tasks. Without intending to go into the deeper reasons for this fact, the following statistics show it: in 1962 there were 922 diocesan seminarians and 1,772 seminarians for religious institutes; in 1968 there were only 870 and 1,665. This loss in vocations has a still greater significance, if it is considered that in 1962 Brazil had 79.096 million inhabitants and in 1968 89.37 million. If these numbers are compared it can be seen that in 1962 there was one seminarian for every 27,504 inhabitants, in 1968 one for every 35,257. The assistance of foreign clergy has decreased in recent years. In 1967 98 diocesan priests and 265 religious priests came to the country, a year later there were only 64 and 184 respectively.[8]

Without a doubt this lack of priests has effects on piety. Thus a census of 1962 and 1963 shows that 50 million Catholics, or 70 percent, do not attend Sunday Mass. At São Paulo it was 3.5 million. In other cities the proportions were similar. On the other hand, according to a study of the Brazilian Institute for Public Opinion and Statistics (IBOPE) at São Paulo, the inclination to secularization is powerful: at São Paulo alone in 1962–63 a half million television sets were installed; the broadcasts reached 3 million viewers. In the capital of the state of São Paulo there are today seventeen radio stations, five television stations, and two more programs will soon begin their operation; also, eighteen daily newspapers, some of them with a circulation of ca. 200,000 copies; almost 250 movie houses; and dozens of periodicals. Other cities and states of Brazil offer the same picture; in this way public opinion is formed, canalized, and dominated by financially powerful press concerns. The Brazilian Church tried to construct a front against this powerful propaganda, although many state broadcasting stations beam programs of a religious character. In 1972 the Church had 199 radio transmitters, including A Aparecida, a station with considerable range; 152 periodicals with a large circulation; three television stations—in Rio de Janeiro, Brasilia, and Pôrto Alegre—which since March 1972 have broadcast programs in color.

---

[7] Cf. A. Rolim, O.P., "Em tôrno da Religiosidade no Brasil," *REB* 25 (1965), 11–27.

[8] Cf. A. Gregory, "Anteprojecto de pesquisa sôbre as causas do Excasseamento de Vocações Sacerdotais," *REB* 31 (1971), 389–93.

Brazil has need of 60,000 priests—this number is determined by the national Secretariat of Priestly Vocations; but only ca. 350 priests are educated in a year. With this quota the desired number would be achieved in 200 years, but by then Brazil would have ca. 400 million inhabitants.[9]

Care of Souls

The fifth plenary meeting of the Episcopal Conference published after its discussions of 2 to 5 April 1962 the following declaration: The 135 participants are aware of the desires and hopes of the 166 ecclesiastical spheres of jurisdiction, the 12,000 priests of the nation, and all members of religious institutes, seminarians, collaborators in the lay apostolate, and the faithful in the 4,500 Brazilian parishes. They state that the Episcopal Conference achieved its goals and that the pastoral activity of the bishops produces better results in the nation. The regular meetings, the exchange of experiences, the common planning and cooperation bring it about that ever broader areas of the country profit from the methods employed. Thus there are, for example, today greater possibilities of solving the problems of priestly vocations, training catechists, and making preparations for programs and projects. The impact of *caritas* grows in importance, and also the solving of the social tasks of the Church, especially in the field of education and of agricultural associations. Likewise the enlightenment of public opinion on important questions of the family, education, and the Church's social doctrine; special organizations with the goal of strengthening the presence of the Church; exchange of opinion and cooperation with other episcopates; aid from priests from other countries or money donations from foreign Catholics for Brazilian works; the organization of the lay apostolate.[10]

The result of the common pastoral care was, for example, the mobilization of the diocese of Bajé for catechesis in 1962. Similar initiatives were begun in many other dioceses under the motto "Without catechism, no religion." This action extended to all public schools which hitherto had had to get along without religious instruction. A central team of religious brothers, sisters, and professors undertook to develop an educational plan for teachers of religion and to organize religious instruction. The program was submitted at a meeting of the clergy; also the method was explained according to which religious instruction should be given, and many suggestions for modifications were incorporated. The program was sent to all teachers. The committee sessions yielded the following guidelines: elaboration of a general plan for instruction in the public schools; training of catechists in every diocese; forming of a department for religious education; a list of consultants for state and communal schools; catechetical centers in the parishes; intensive courses; provision of aid for high schools; encyclicals to the parishes.[11]

---

[9] Cf. Fr. P. A. de Assis, O.F.M., in *REB* 23 (1963), 433–35.

[10] *REB* 20 (1960), 485–90.

A comprehensive and systematic program worked out for pastoral care went into effect within the Brazilian Church for the years 1966–70.[12] The thirty-two ecclesiastical provinces of Brazil have been since 1970 under four cardinals and 272 archbishops and bishops. Their work is divided among the following regions: *North Region I:* states of Amazonas, Acre, Mato Grosso, and parts of the territories of Roraima and Rondônia; total area 2,215,099 square kilometers, 1,299,829 inhabitants (.58 inhabitant per square kilometer), 86 parishes (15,114 inhabitants per parish), 237 priests (3,484 inhabitants per priest). *North Region II:* state of Pará and territory of Amapá; total area 1,366,598 square kilometers, 2,222,142 inhabitants (1.63 inhabitants per square kilometer), 119 parishes (18,673 inhabitants per parish), 290 priests (7,662 inhabitants per priest). *Northeast Region I:* states of Maranhão, Piauí, and Ceará; total area 722,917 square kilometers, 8,923,154 inhabitants (12.35 inhabitants per square kilometer), 362 parishes (24,649 inhabitants per parish), 759 priests (11,756 inhabitants per priest). *Northeast Region II:* states of Rio Grande to Norte, Paraíba, Pernambuco, and Alagoas; total area 236,801 square kilometers, 10,668,794 inhabitants (45.05 inhabitants per square kilometer), 458 parishes (23,398 inhabitants per parish), 856 priests (12,463 inhabitants per priest). *Northeast Region III:* states of Sergipe and Bahia; total area 581,915 square kilometers, 8,408,787 inhabitants (14.45 inhabitants per square kilometer), 538 parishes (23,572 inhabitants per parish), 569 priests (14,778 inhabitants per priest). *East Region I:* states of Guanabara and Rio de Janeiro; total area 43,334 square kilometers, 9,006,292 inhabitants (207.83 inhabitants per square kilometer), 425 parishes (21,191 inhabitants per parish), 1,245 priests (7,233 inhabitants per priest). *East Region II:* states of Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo; total area 573,796 square kilometers, 12,876,902 inhabitants (2.24 inhabitants per square kilometer), 1,019 parishes (12,636 inhabitants per parish), 1,948 priests (6,610 inhabitants per priest). *Central Region:* Federal District and parts of the states of Minas Gerais and

---

[11] Ibid. 22 (1962), 758.

[12] Ibid. 26 (1966), 377–79.

Goiás; total area 156,023 square kilometers, 1,079,836 inhabitants (6.92 inhabitants per square kilometer), 57 parishes (18,944 inhabitants per parish), 127 priests (8,502 inhabitants per priest). *West Central Region:* state of Goiás; total area 526,664 square kilometers, 2,566,703 inhabitants (4.87 inhabitants per square mile), 158 parishes (16,244 inhabitants per parish), 313 priests (8,200 inhabitants per priest). *Far West Region:* state of Mato Grosso and part of the territory of Rondônia; total area 1,228,903 square kilometers, 1,724,601 inhabitants (1.4 inhabitants per square mile), 95 parishes (18,153 inhabitants per parish), 521 priests (6,870 inhabitants per priest). *South Region I:* state of São Paulo, total area 244,906 square kilometers, 18,150,239 inhabitants (73.51 inhabitants per square kilometer), 1,194 parishes (15,201 inhabitants per parish), 2,911 priests (6,235 inhabitants per priest). *South Region II:* state of Paraná; total area 196,541 square kilometers, 6,958,420 inhabitants (35.4 inhabitants per square mile), 990 priests (7,028 inhabitants per priest). *South Region III:* state of Rio Grande do Sul; total area 267,528 square kilometers, 6,715,198 inhabitants (25.1 inhabitants per square kilometer), 563 parishes (11,927 inhabitants per parish), 1,523 priests (4,409 inhabitants per priest). *South Region IV:* state of Santa Catalina; total area 95,483 square kilometers, 2,922,449 inhabitants (30.6 inhabitants per square kilometer), 242 parishes (12,070 inhabitants per parish), 626 priests (4,668 inhabitants per priest).

The comprehensive pastoral perspective in an increasingly industrialized society, with all the accompanying symptoms, lays bare the inadequacy of the parishes for an effective work. This work must include a geographical area which we call the human zone, and it requires an integrated pastoral care. The plan of the Episcopal Conference refers to the conformity between the human zone and the pastoral zone. Because of the rapid industrial growth of Brazil the Church cannot allow itself to be taken in tow by history, it must foresee the development and adjust its work to this.[13]

Goals of the Church: The eleventh meeting of the Episcopal Conference from 16 to 27 May 1970, in which thirty lay persons of both sexes took part, proposed guidelines for a new orientation of the Church in Brazil. In the Church of Christ, it emphasizes, we are all equal because of the faith, baptism, and the common destiny. In this community lay persons and shepherds have a common responsibility for the building of the Church as a sign of the unity of people among themselves and of society with God.[14]

---

[13] *ACB* (1970–71), 2179–2208.

[14] *REB* 30 (1970), 415–25.

Catholic Universities and Schools

Four universities in Brazil have the status of papal universities: Rio de Janeiro since 22 January 1947, São Paulo since 25 January 1947, Pôrto Alegre since 1 November 1950, and Campinas since 8 September 1956. In Rome there has been since 1943 the Pontifício Colégio Pio Brasileiro, whose students, Brazilian citizens, attend lectures at the Gregoriana. The following Catholic universities must also be mentioned: Minas Gerais in Belo Horizonte, Campinas, Paraná in Curitiba, Goiás in Goiâna, Pernambuco (archdiocese of Olinda and Recife) with a theological institute, Pelotas and Petrópolis with institutes for theology, philosophy, and the humanities, São Leopoldo (archdiocese of Pôrto Alegre) with the university Do Rio dos Sinos (UNISINOS) and with a theological faculty and a university, Catholic law faculty at Santos, Catholic University of Salvador (archdiocese of Salvador); Manaus has a theological faculty, Taubaté a theological institute and a theological program for the laity.[15] In Curitiba the Claretians have operated since 7 May 1962 a *Studium Theologicum* in connection with the papal Lateran University at Rome, with theological programs for priests and lay persons.[16] The Conference of Brazilian Religious Superiors (CRB) inaugurated on 25 January 1965 the Theological Institute of São Paulo with four divisions— philosophy, theology, pastoral care, and catechetics.[17] The Theological Institute of Pôrto Alegre (1968) and similar institutions run by Franciscans, Jesuits, and other orders also have scholarly reputations.

The bishops of South Region I, with headquarters at São Paulo, met in 1969 with the religious superiors, male and female, of the region, in view of the defective schooling. The 130 persons present, including twenty bishops, decided to organize and support, within the range of the possible, centers, school clubs, and curricula for workers, in cooperation with the government and the religious institutes. They recommended the appointment of a bishop for the pastoral workers. They also recommended the use of educational television and a better employment of the means of social communication. They ascertained in the area of catechesis the faulty planning, lack of instructional means, and insufficient time for instruction. The São Paulo bishops were encouraged to send teachers of religion to every high school, although this measure would mean a considerable financial expense.[18]

---

[15] These cultural institutes are listed in *Annuario Pontificio 1975* and in *ACB* (1970–71).

[16] *REB* 22 (1962), 757.

[17] *REB* 25 (1965), 349f.

[18] Ibid., 30 (1970), 178f.

Newspapers, Periodicals, Means of Social Communication

Since 1949 the Franciscans at Petrópolis have published the quarterly *Eclesiástica Brasileira,* with voluminous information, articles, studies, and reviews of works on the Brazilian Church. Also from the Franciscans of Petrópolis there has appeared since 1968 the monthly *SEDOC—Serviço de documentação*—with an international ecclesiastical documentation and commentaries and especially orientation to Latin America and Brazil. Since 1969 there have appeared two new theological periodicals: *Atualização* and *Perspectiva theológica. Atualização* offers theological information for lay persons; its coworkers are the professors of the Central Institute for Philosophy and Theology of the Catholic University of Minas Gerais. Its aim is to supply theological truth. *Perspectiva theológica* appeared on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Theological Faculty of Cristo Rey at São Leopoldo, whose professors are the editors. As a means of investigation and information it set for itself as its special function the fostering of the presence of theological thought in the university world.[19] Since 30 November 1969 there has appeared weekly a Brazilian edition of *Osservatore Romano.*[20] On 12 December 1969 the information center *Ecclesia* (CIEC) was opened at São Paulo, whose purpose is to manage contact offices in all São Paulo cities, in the largest cities of the country, in America and Europe, and a Catholic news agency. *Ecclesia* has, for example, twenty-five radio stations and some 400 teachers and 5,000 assistants, who move across the country to make possible an education for Brazilians in the most remote areas.[21] A creative step of the Brazilian Church was to cut a series of records which reproduced the catechism in stories, told by means of actual happenings. The editors are priests, who are supported in their work by radio and television technicians. Each record has from three to four stories.[22]

Ecclesiastical Shortcomings

One feature of the Brazilian Church in the last ten years is its insecurity. In this period the adherents of Afro-Brazilian cults have increased about tenfold. In Salvador these centers have grown from 59 to over 900; in Recife there are almost 1,000; there are thousands in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. Spiritism has spread especially in the cities of the south; the Protestant Church of Brazil has the highest growth rate in the world. In this growth the Pentecostalists are ahead, followed by

---

[19] Ibid., 182.

[20] Ibid., 180.

[21] Ibid., 180f.

[22] Ibid., 22 (1962), 757.

Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists. Thirty percent of the Brazilian population maintain relations with spiritism. In the small state of Guanabara there are, for example, more than 10,000 centers, *postos terrenos,* approved by the government, where spiritism is engaged in. The same thing happens at São Paulo, Rio Grande do Sul, Minas Gerais, Bahia; 162 periodicals and newspapers recruit for it. The majority of visitors continue to call themselves Catholics. In 1953 the Brazilian Episcopal Conference declared that of all deviations spiritism was the worst.[23]

Communist infiltration, promoted among Brazilian students by the *União Nacional de Estudiantes* (UNE), was condemned on 1 June 1962 by Cardinal Jaime Barros Câmara, after consultation with the twenty-eight archbishops of the nation. He indicated the necessity of establishing a national student union with Christian principles.[24] A tireless but strongly demagogic proponent of the social activity of the Church is Helder Pessoa Câmara, born in 1909, second general assistant of the Catholic Action of Brazil, in 1952 auxiliary bishop of Rio de Janeiro, since 1964 archbishop of Olinda and Recife.

Religious Orders, Pastoral Cooperation

A positive element for pastoral cooperation with the Episcopal Conference is the Conference of the Brazilian Orders (CRB), founded on 11 February 1954 as the permanent union of all religious brothers and sisters. In 1972 there were in Brazil 11,279 brothers and 41,893 sisters; with the episcopate they constitute one of the most active groups within the Brazilian Church. They also made a significant contribution within Brazil's Catholic Action, founded in 1935. In the "Movement for a Better World," called into being by Father Lombardi in 1960, the goal of which is to supply help to the bishops, priests, religious, and lay persons in their work, priests, brothers, and sisters cooperate decisively. They move across Brazil and up to 1964 had presented 750 educational courses for bishops, priests, and seminarians, which were attended by 46,907 persons in twenty-two states and fifty-one dioceses. On the recommendation of John XXIII, the first effort for a common pastoral care was undertaken in 1962. The most important aim was the renewal of parishes, of the clergy, of the Catholic schools, and the integration of the workers. District secretariats were erected, and they were directed by a bishop, two priests, usually male religious, and several sisters. The sisters obeyed the appeal on a broad basis: they began new models of apostolic work: they assumed responsibility for parishes without pastors and worked in the district secretariats and in national institutions.

---

[23] Cf. *REB* 31 (1971), 402–7; B. Kloppenburg, "O Fantástico Crescimento das Igrejas Pentecostais no Brasil," *REB* 26 (1966), 653–56; "O Espiritismo no Brasil," *REB* 19 (1959), 842–71; *AICA* 16, 792 (2 March 1972), 17f.; *AICA* 17, 874 (20 September 1973), 25f.

[24] *REB* 22 (1962), 497f.

The Postconciliar Period

The Second Vatican Council produced an intensive participation of religious in the care of souls, both on the level of the diocese and on that of the state and nation. This cooperation in pastoral care is expressed in statistics thus: 1,803 brothers from clerical institutes; 1,602 brothers from secular institutes; 41,581 sisters, of whom 1,295 are cloistered; out of 13,135 priests, 8,105 are religious. Of the 4,500 Brazilian parishes, 2,000 are cared for by religious brothers and 32 by sisters. Of the 225 bishops, 97 are religious. Altogether 53,117 brothers and sisters work in the Brazilian Church. If one can speak of a genuine pastoral care in the north and far west of Brazil, in the states of Mato Grosso, Acre, Amazonas, and Pará, this is due to the thousands of religious who have renounced the comforts of Europe, the United States, or southern Brazil.[25]

Other church movements: There is no dearth of other ecclesiastical movements in Brazil. Thus, for example, there is the *Asociaçião de Educação Catolica* (AEC), founded in 1945, whose slogan is "Service." Its goals consist in uniting all Catholic educators—religious and lay; it is dedicated to the spread of Christian pedagogy and of the social doctrine of the Church, collaboration and presence in state bodies and similar organizations.[26] Another effective movement are the *Cursillos de Cristianadad,* which in the opinion of the Brazilian bishops "have brought about a profound change of general morality in society." In the archdiocese of São Paulo alone five priests devote themselves exclusively to the *Cursillos;* eight such *Cursillos* take place monthly. In all of Brazil sixty *Cursillos* are held in one month.[27] Of further great importance is the cooperation of the Legion of Mary in pastoral care. After its founding in 1951 it had the following structure in 1961: two senates (national council and district council), 166 curias (inferior councils), and 2,701 *praesidia* (local councils) with 24,914 active members, 158,580 assistants, and 79,155 helpers. The successes achieved speak for themselves: 1,814 adult baptisms, 7,429 rectified marriages, 15,560 persons brought back to the sacraments, 34,696 confessions and communions of the sick, 1,504 conversions. Further, the institution cares for 2,419 catechists' schools, with 175,531 hours of instruction for 39,769 children and 24,783 adults. The legion also employs groups for special tasks, as, for example, the care of recidivists (three groups) and of non-Catholics (one group). From its midst have come 357 vocations, 1,877 priests and 136 sisters. A further 1,877 members of the legion obliged themselves to attend Mass daily and communicate.[28] At the suggestion of Father Peyton, the apostle of the family rosary, and after an intensive recruitment, a mass rally of ca. 1.5 million persons took place on 16 December 1962 at Rio de Janeiro; 400 of them signed the promise to pray the rosary in the family.[29]

---

[25] C. Nogara, "Vida religiosa no Brasil," *SEDOC* 4 (January 1972), 845–58.

[26] Cf. M. da Cruz, *1945. Vinte anos a serviço da educação* (1965).

[27] *AICA* 17, 847 (15 March 1973), 23, 26f.; detailed information on the history of the "Cursillos de Cristiandad" in Brazil in *SEDOC* 6 (July 1973), 75–100.

Formation of New Priests

From 23 to 26 October 1972 seminary professors met at Petrópolis to define the criteria and guidelines for the education of new priests.[30]

Catholic Missions among the Indians of Brazil

The Brazilian Church strove to continue its tradition among the Indians. The Catholic missionaries, united in *Consejo Indigenista Misionero* (CIMI), work according to the following guidelines: (1) slow education without haste or pressure, without breaking with the past; in this connection interference in the life and faith of the natives must be avoided; (2) knowledge of their cultures—and hence mastery of their languages—respect for them; this means that the native may freely select models offered to him. This does not mean: all or nothing. The work of the missionary must be slow but effective and enduring.[31]

Fraternal Associations

In his letter of 24 January 1974 to its chairmen, Pope Paul VI encouraged the Episcopal Conference to supply the light of faith to every Brazilian by the fraternal associations campaign. The campaign was proclaimed under the motto "Where is your brother?" This question contains an examination of conscience for all, what is done for the defense of our brothers' life, independently of their origin and of the conditions in which they live.[32]

---

[28] *REB* 23 (1963),220f.

[29] Ibid., 218; cf. ibid. 25 (1965), 311–13.

[30] *SEDOC* 5 (December 1972), 712–17.

[31] Ibid. 6 (June 1974), 1398f.

[32] Ibid. 6 (May 1974), 1232–38.

ARGENTINA

Argentina has an area of 2,987,000 square kilometers and in 1976 ca. 25 million inhabitants, of whom 94.9 percent were Catholics in 1971. Since World War I, industrialization; since 1930, an autarchist and planning phase, with growth of the proletariat.[33]

In 1974 the Church was organized in twelve archdioceses, forty dioceses, two prelacies, and one ordinary each for the Uniate Greek Orthodox and the Ukrainians. As an example of the internal structure, the archdiocese of Buenos Aires in 1969 was served by 353 diocesan priests, 84 priests from outside the diocese, 539 religious priests, a total of 976; 137 parishes, 52 other churches; 95 houses of male religious; and 246 houses of sisters, with 3,720 sisters.[34]

Outstanding among the Catholic organizations are: *Junta Coordinadora de Superiores de Religiosos, Comisión Católica Argentina de Inmigración, Obra de Vocaciones Sacerdotales, Acción Católica* with many subdivisions, *Consejo Superior de Educación Católica, Movimiento Familiar Cristiano, Asociación Católica de Dirigentes de Empresa, Servicio Católico de Ayuda.*[35]

Since 1960 Buenos Aires has had a papal Catholic University, and in addition a theological faculty and several other institutes on the university level. Catholic universities or university institutes are also to be found in Córdoba, Santa Fe, La Plata, Mar del Plata, San Juan, Tucumán, Bahía Blanca, Villa María; seminaries for priests in Buenos Aires, Azul, Catamarca (regional seminary), Córdoba, La Plata, Paraná, Rió Cuarto, Rosario, Salta, and Santa Fe.[36]

The politically most decisive event was the intervention in 1943 under the direction of General Rawson, which brought the liberal phase to an end. Juan Domingo Perón, vice-president of the republic and minister of defense in the government of the *Oficiales Unidos* (G.O.U.), labor minister under Pedro P. Ramírez, developed a policy of social reform and in 1946 emerged as victor in the election.[37]

With the support of the workers and by means of his new doctrine, *Justicialismo,* he exercised his dictatorship until 1955. The foundation of his policy soon faltered, so that the country was faced with a new crisis. Perón, who in the beginning had practiced a policy of friendly coexistence with the Church, strengthened his totalitarian aims from 1952 without sparing the Church. The official press began to make fun of Catholics, Catholic meetings and the university *athenea* of Santa Fe and Córdoba were forbidden; the cross was removed from official areas; religious instruction was forbidden in the schools; a divorce law was enacted, and houses of prostitution were again approved.

---

[33] Cf. V. Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América* IV/2, 655–70.

[34] *República Argentina. Anuario eclesiástico* (1961), 131.

[35] Ibid., 117.

[36] Ibid., 1137–39.

[37] Cf. G. Furlong, *The Church in the 20th Century,* 783f.; R.E., Argentina (*Época independiente), 347f.*

Nevertheless, the Church remained unflinching, and the episcopate clung to its position with the support of the faithful. Lay persons and priests were arrested and abused. The persecution reached its climax on 11 June 1955; a large crowd gathered in Buenos Aires around the cathedral and on the neighboring plaza in order to hear Mass; then they moved in deep silence to the Congress buildings. A few days later, on 16 June, an attempt at revolt that miscarried was used by the government to mobilize its adherents. On the first day several churches were burned—San Francisco, San Roque, Santo Domingo, San Miguel, San Nicolás, and so forth. Also the episcopal palace, with the entire structure and the historical archives, became a victim of the flames. These events, without precedent in Argentina, produced a sharp reaction within as well as outside the country.[38]

In the period after Perón (from 1955) the revolutionary junta began to restore justice and peace. Although the divorce law, enacted in Perón's time, was deprived of force, the anti-Catholic cabinet members succeeded in maintaining the prohibition of religious instruction. During the government of Frondizi (1958–62) the law on freedom of education was passed, a law which has consistently been boycotted by liberals and Freemasons since 1952. Its establishment was the basis for the creation of Catholic universities.[39]

The Argentine Church after the Council

After the council the Catholic Church of Argentina, over and above the problems contingent on the political and socioeconomic situation, experienced other crises of an internal character. The twentieth International Congress for Sociology, held at Rió Tercero, Córdoba, from 5 to 11 September 1963, describes the period after 1930 as follows: "A time which was dominated by tensions and confrontations, conditioned by the existence of two opposed tendencies: the dynamic and the traditional,"[40] and which extended to theological, ascetical, pastoral, and psycho-sociological dimensions.

---

[38] Cf. G. Furlong, op.cit., 784; R.E., op.cit., 348.

[39] *XX Congreso internacional de Sociologiá. Estudios* (Buenos Aires 1963), 597–99.

[40] *SEDOC* 2 (Sept. 1969), 351–58; ibid. 2 (Oct. 1969), 491–506.

The declaration of the Argentine episcopate to the nation in 1969 can be regarded as a complete program. In it the bishops declare the Church to be the Sacrament of Christ and the possession of the poor, and they desire that the Argentine Church not only preach spiritual poverty but that it also live the poverty of Christ, helping the poor, while the Christian community makes itself responsible for its poor, and that justice rule social life so that each may keep what is his and all may be agents of the peace of Christ.

The decrees issued at Medellín, say the bishops, compel us to coordinate the common action; a beginning of this is made in the national pastoral plan with direct application to the basis of strengthening the parishes, and as a means of evangelization and of the physical presence of the Church in economically and geographically removed areas. To this end the bishops desire to set up in each diocese a commission for the means of social communication or at least to name a responsible person who maintains permanent contact with the Episcopal Conference and its departments of press, radio, cinema, and television in all those questions which concern exchange of information, curricula, moral orientation, and evaluation of behavior, prices, and so forth. The bishops have as their first duty to live according to the principles of pastoral co-responsibility.[41]

Difficulties within the Argentine Church

The tense situation which prevailed for some time in Argentina, accompanied by acts of violence, kidnappings, and murders, which caused a wave of protests, induced the Episcopal Conference on 12 August 1970 "as true shepherds of the Church" to communicate to all their message with the truth and love of Christ and his Church. The bishops recalled that the task entrusted by Christ to the Church is of neither a political nor economic nor social but of a religious nature, but from it proceed advantages, light, and strength, which represent an aid for the organizing and strengthening of human society. It does not authorize priests, by virtue either of their office or of the Church's social doctrine, to join any revolutionary movement whatsoever which seeks a Latin American socialism with the aim of socializing the means of production, the economy, and cultural policy; this also not with the justification that a social revolution allows a direct employment of force as a means of relieving the oppressed. In concord with Pope Paul VI the bishops condemned terrorist methods as means of struggle and declared openly: A movement of priests is Christian and has justification in the Catholic Church only in so far as it accepts the definition of the Second Vatican Council in the decree *Lumen Gentium* (no. 8).[42]

---

[41] Ibid. 4 (Aug. 1971), 191–97.

The priests replied to the bishops' declaration on behalf of the Third World during a meeting at Córdoba on 3 and 4 October 1970 in seven chapters and seventy paragraphs. In it they said they could not accept errors and guilt which others, especially the government and press, wanted to shift to them. Although they are ready to do penance, they are, however, of the opinion that others are the guilty ones. To the chief charge of the episcopal document to the priests of the Third World—deciding for socialism—they answered as follows: "It is familiar to everyone—and hence to our bishops—that, if the political collectivist solution also represents a danger, the actual situation which puts our people under pressure is of a capitalist nature: the Latin American entrepreneur system; for this reason the present economy corresponds to a false notion of the right of private ownership of the means of production and of the goals of the economy." The Congress of Medellín (*Justicia* 10) was called to mind, and in this connection was supplemented: "No one can fail to recognize that the most urgent task in Latin America consists in achieving a complete renewal of the evaluation and measures of the entrepreneurs in regard to their goals, organization, and management.

"This situation," continued the priests, "induces us to demand the search for a new social system in which man is not exploited by man; in order to bring about such a solution, we see no other way than the socializing of the means of production, power, and culture."[43]

The Determining of the Functions of Priests

On 3 June 1972 the priests published at Buenos Aires for the Third World a common answer to the questionnaire on the preparation for the Synod, which was to take place at Rome with the theme of the function of priests. This questionnaire, sent by Monsignor Juan Carlos Arámburu, auxiliary bishop of Buenos Aires, to the priests of the archdiocese, contained the following sections: the function of the priest; temporal activity of the priest; the priest as "sign of unity"; "universality" of the priest; the new priesthood; prayer; celibacy. In this regard it was expressed that the priest is in the service of the redemption of mankind, and hence his activity must be in harmony with the activities of people and of society, otherwise not only are guidelines abandoned but also forces and realities are denied which contain evangelical values such as justice and brotherhood.[44]

---

[42] Ibid. 197–234.

[43] Ibid. 234–38.

The "Emergency Housing Districts" of Buenos Aires

In his letter of 22 September 1969 Arámburu referred to the "Emergency Housing Districts" of Buenos Aires, a "sad and painful reality," which needed the service of the Church and are open "to the poor." He encouraged priests, religious brothers, and laity to cooperate further in this apostolic task.[45] Only a profound revolutionary action can bring a solution and transform these slums into workers' quarters.[46]

The "Priests for the Third World" United with the People

On the occasion of their fifth meeting in August-September 1972 the "Priests for the Third World" declared that, in view of the political and socioeconomic situation, they were united with the people. They stressed this pastoral position in a progammatic document,[47] in a letter to the Argentine episcopate,[48] and in another document in which they declared their intention not to leave their oppressed people in the lurch.[49]

The voices of the bishops: In this climate of political and economic confusion the Episcopal Conference met at San Miguel from 19 to 21 October 1972. Its announcement contains the following points: historical reality (I); the negative aspects of the Argentine situation (II); positive aspects and human values (III); liberalism and Marxism: political, economic, and social order (IV); socialism (V); possible decisions (VI); preparations (VII); urgent problems (VIII); summary (IX); specific contributions (X). The position of the bishops is clear: the economy must serve people and not vice versa; private ownership, even in the means of production, must accommodate itself to the general welfare; neither liberalism nor Marxism; nationalization limited to the needs of society or in questions of the defense of private property or of national sovereignty; a broad sharing of workers and employees in enterprises guarantees identification with the goals set; having a voice in the great political questions; providing of help for the coordinating organs; truth and loyalty in the quest of the general welfare of the nation.[50] The Argentine Church thereby testified to its balance and efficacy within its pastoral task, the aim of which is the redemption of people.

---

[44] Ibid. 3 (Sept. 1970), 341–43.

[45] Ibid., 343–46.

[46] Ibid., 346–48; ibid. 5 (Feb. 1973), 1011f.

[47] Ibid. 6 (Oct. 1973), 501–12.

[48] Ibid. 5 (Feb. 1973), 1011–16.

[49] Ibid., 1016.

The Church's Functions

Cardinal Raúl Francisco Primatesta, archbishop of Córdoba, explained during the Roman Synod of 1974 the evangelizing and liberalizing aspect of the Argentine Church. In this connection he remarked that the individual is considered as the object of evangelization in his individuality, in his transcendence, in his dynamism, and in his development. This evangelizing work devotes its special attention to the nonpracticing.

Further, the object of evangelization is the Universal Church in all its elements, society as such, and the individual in all vocations. "It is important to avoid the clericalization of the laity and the secularization of the priests." The cardinal dealt also with the accusation that the Church enters into no secular compromises; with the mistakes of some members of the clergy, who use the Word of God for their political aims; with the cooperation of women in evangelization and the evaluation of the work of religious brothers and sisters.

The cardinal called attention to the fact that the object of evangelization is the totality of revelation under the guidance of the Church. The content of revelation must be entirely presented: the transcendence of evangelization, its dimension and spread to worship; the problem of faith, culture, and religious sentiment; the points of contact between the Gospel and liberation as one of the most important questions of Latin America.[51]

PARAGUAY

Paraguay has a total area of 406,752 square kilometers and 2.57 million inhabitants, of whom more than 90 percent are mestizos; in 1971 96.2 percent were Catholics (United Nations statistics of 1976). The history of Paraguay shows disturbed years in the most recent past. Under the presidency of José Guaggiari (1930–32) the country was unable to avoid a frontier quarrel with Bolivia. The outcome was the Chaco War of 1932–35, which ruined the country and caused great losses among the male youth. After the war Paraguay began industrialization. In recent years relations with the United States and Bolivia have been strengthened. The methodical development of the airways is expressed in a flourishing economy;

---

[50] Ibid., 1017–24.

[51] *Osservatore Romano,* 3 Oct. 1974.

Asunción grows in importance as a commercial junction. According to the latest computations of the CEPAL 1,552 large landowners and foreign firms possess 31.5 million hectares of the land, while 250,000 families with about 1 million persons control only 500,000 hectares.[52]

Ecclesiastical Organization

The archdiocese of Asunción has as suffragans the dioceses of Caacupé, Concepción, Coronel Oviedo, San Juan Bautista de las Misiones, and Villarrica, the prelacies of Alto Paraná and Encarnación, the vicariates apostolic of Chaco Paraguayo and Pilcomayo.[53] The most important Catholic associations are: Catholic Association of Paraguay, Christian Family Movement, Legion of Mary, Christian Curricula, Third Order of Saint Francis, and Salesian Societies. There are 181 parishes and 21 which can be classified as such; 202 priests and 181 religious brothers; 18 religious houses of men and 39 of women.[54]

Educational Institutions

Since 2 February 1965 the republic has had the Catholic university Nuestra Señora de la Asunción at Asunción with faculties of philosophy, pedagogy, law, political science, and political economy. Also in Asunción are faculties of law, politics, and social science, founded in 1960, and a university institute for family education, founded in 1963; a university of theology and religious science, founded in 1971; a university of international law. In Villarrica there are faculties of philosophy and education, founded in 1961, and a juridicopolitical and social science faculty. Concepción has a faculty of philosophy and education; Encarnación, an educational and philosophical faculty. Religious institutes run numerous schools and institutes.[55]

Protests of the Bishops

In a letter of 29 January 1969 the archbishop of Asunción, Juan José Anibal Mena Porta, asked the president of the Republic, Alfredo Stroessner, "with consideration of Christian demands for justice, to examine the situation of those who, by order of Your Excellency and without trial, are under police custody, either because of their ideology or because of alleged crimes of antidemocratic subversion."[56] On the occasion of the consultations on a draft of a new law, "The Defense of Democracy and of the Political and Social Order of the State" (1969), the bishops, as shepherds and citizens, sent a letter to the Congress and expressed their concern in view of the danger which the new law could represent for the country's awareness. According to the bishops' opinion it was a question here of a glorification of absolutism, which had often been condemned by the Popes.[57]

---

[52] *Christus,* 410 (July–December 1970), 778f.; SC, Paraguay (Época independiente), 172–75.

[53] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977) 957.

[54] *Anuario eclesiástico del Paraguay* (1972), 21–27.

[55] *Annuario Pontificio* (1974) 1371; *Anuario eclesiástico del Paraguay* (1972), 27–29.

On 22 October 1969 the Jesuit Father Francisco de Paula Oliva, professor at the Catholic university of Asunción, was expelled from the country. As a protest, on the very same day teachers and students organized a *Via Crucis,* at the end of which the police dispersed the participants. In a declaration of 26 October 1969, the episcopate informed all the faithful of these events and threatened with excommunication all who mistreated priests and sisters. As a sign of its protest and pain, the Church of Paraguay gave up the celebration of Masses on this day.[58] Father Bartolomé Vanrell, the Jesuit provincial, also protested in a letter to the minister of the interior against the expulsion of Father Vicente Barreto,[59] and Monseñor Bogarín Argaña, bishop of San Juan Bautista de Las Misiones, in a letter to Father Barreto condemned the conduct of the authorities.[60] The kidnapping of the priest Uberfil Monzón, collaborator of the Lay Secretariat of CELAM, by police officers on a public street near the Uruguay Plaza became the occasion for a series of complaints by church authorities.[61]

In its meeting of 18 December 1970 the Episcopal Conference declared its solidarity with the desires and hopes of the population and stated that the strivings for peace and justice were in a blind alley. The bishops indicated the injustices in the country and expected from those responsible that they would listen without emotion to the voice of the Church's representatives.[62]

Two Worlds Developing

On 15 May 1972, following a meeting of 8–10 May, the archbishop of Asunción, Ismael Blas Rolón Silvero, S.D.B., together with priests and many lay persons, issued a document in which they expressed themselves on the kidnapping and expulsion of Father José Caravias, active at Piribebuy in the Diocese of Caacupé. The analysis of the situation, they said, places the nation before two worlds: a sociopolitical authoritarian system, which existed with the aid of propaganda only for the advantage of a few; on the other hand, we experience the slow growth of a Church reforming itself, which takes a stand for more justice. The participants in the meeting pointed out the injustices perpetrated against the Church.[63]

---

[56] *Christus* 410 (July–December 1970), 780–83.
[57] *SEDOC* 2 (Jan. 1970), 921–24.
[58] Ibid., 924–26.
[59] Ibid. 5 (Oct. 1972), 491f.
[60] Ibid., 492–94.
[61] Ibid. 4 (Aug. 1971), 240–50.
[62] Ibid., 239f.

When on 14 May Paraguay celebrates the anniversary of its independence, the archbishop of Asunción wrote to the chief of protocol of the government on 10 May 1972, it would be logical to believe that this memorial day would be in tune with the right of all citizens to liberty. In all churches of the archdiocese there would be prayers on 14 and 15 May that the freedom achieved by our ancestors would also become full reality.[64] In an open letter of 18 May 1972 the Episcopal Conference justified the nonparticipation of the religious schools in the festivities at the desire of the students themselves without their having been in any way influenced.[65]

The Function of Priests

To do away with misunderstandings and doubts, the competent committee of the Episcopal Conference on 16 May 1972 published a statement on the function of priests, especially since more and more priests were accused of playing a totally subversive role in politics. In it the judgments of the Second Vatican Council were taken into consideration. Priests who live together with the peasants, said the document, tried to expose the harshness of life with the light of the Gospel, always within the guidelines recognized and issued by the bishops. Bishops, priests, and laity know very well that a continuing renewal is indispensable. To this task they devoted all their energy. The rights of the authorities and the national constitution are respected, and the faithful are urged to respect them also.[66] In an open letter to all the faithful on the occasion of the regular meeting of 1972 the bishops stated: If persons are oppressed, whether by unjust economic structures or abuses of power, the Church embodies the prophetic complaint and acts as a moral force in favor of liberation and human rights. The Church must not be seen as a political party, especially as its function surpasses every secular function and every political schema. Its goal is of an eschatological nature, and the liberation of people sought by it can only be fully achieved in the next world.[67]

---

[63] Ibid. 5 (Oct. 1972), 495–500.

[64] Ibid., 500f.

[65] Ibid., 505–7.

[66] Ibid., 501–3.

Church-State Relations

The advisory organ for the relations of Church and state, established in 1973 by the Episcopal Conference, should be oriented to maintaining the freedom and independence of the Church according to the teaching of the Second Vatican Council and the directions of the Medellín Congress in harmony with the position occupied by the Church of Paraguay. Affairs of interest to both sides should be discussed, especially if they have a national impact; further, studies should be undertaken on the relations of Church and state. The present constitution of Paraguay officially recognizes the Catholic religion, and the archbishop of Asunción is a member of the Council of State. In addition, subsidies and other advantages in favor of church institutions are maintained.[68]

URUGUAY

Uruguay has a total area of 186,926 square kilometers and in 1972 had 2,972,871 inhabitants; 90.6 percent are Catholics. Since 1911 dictatorships and democratic systems have alternated in the Uruguayan government. In 1951 Andrés Martínez Trueba reformed the constitution: a council of nine replaced the president; the council of ministers and both chambers were retained; new social legislation established the welfare state; the public service industries and many other enterprises were nationalized. The elections of 1958 for the first time gave victory to the "white majority," whereas the "colored" party emerged as victor of the elections of 27 November 1966. The National Executive Council was abolished, and there was a return to the presidential system; Oscar Gestido was elected president in 1967. The events of the last years have produced no internal calm in the country. Uruguay records an unsteady growth in the number of inhabitants. The population consists almost entirely of whites, together with a very small number of mestizos; the Indians have died out. The country's economy is restricted almost exclusively to cattle raising. Ninety percent of the rural enterprises engage in cattle breeding, only 10 percent in agriculture; but the metal, textile, and chemical industries have developed.[69]

[67] *AICA* 17, 817 (August 1972), 31f.

[68] Ibid. 874 (September 1973), 27f.

[69] R. E., Uruguay (Época independiente), 870; Vicens Vives, op. cit. IV/2, 653f.

Ecclesiastical Structure

Uruguay has one metropolitan see, Montevideo, with the suffragan dioceses of Canelones, Florida, Maldonado-Punta del Este, Melo, Mercedes, Minas, Salto, and San José de Mayo y Tacuarembó.[70] There are 215 parishes in the nation, 92 other pastoral stations, 698 priests, 230 male religious, and 1,981 sisters.[71] The new constitution, ratified in 1935 by a referendum of the people with 280,000 affirmative, 10,000 negative, and 70,000 abstentions, permits freedom of abortion and euthanasia. Immorality is spread by means of the so-called biographical movie; about 80 percent of the cinema productions at Montevideo were of a pornographic nature. The government was content to issue a law on biographical films for minors.

The republic had no official religion. In the effort to obtain a greater liberty in regard to its public announcements and to support its schools, the Church makes progress. The great Eucharistic Congress of 1934 gave Catholicism a powerful impetus. The Church's educational institutions increased because of the freedom recognized in the constitution. Ca. 20,000 children were instructed in schools of religious institutes, many others in parochial schools. Catholic Action received new impulses through the instruction of 31 January 1955 of the bishop of Salto to his priests to support it. The Church's pastoral work was impaired by the immorality, the pornography, the influence of the Freemasons, Protestantism, especially at Montevideo by the Salvation Army and the Y.M.C.A.[72] On the occasion of its meeting in October 1968 the episcopate of Uruguay accepted the decrees of Medellín and bound itself to translate these into practice, with special attention to the problems of the poor and the oppressed. The bishops referred the current situation to a growing moral crisis, which originated in a materialistic concept of life and had effects on the public, economic, social, cultural, and family order. It is the task of the Church to strengthen awareness, to inspire and promote, to stimulate and to support all initiatives which contribute to the formation of the person, and to condemn all that is directed against justice and peace. True liberation must have as its basis inner change. The Christian message stresses rather the change in the person than the necessity of structural change.[73]

---

[70] *Annuario Pontificio 1977*, 957.

[71] *Guiá de la Iglesia católica en el Uruguay* (1973).

[72] *Revista Javeriana* 4, 355–63.

[73] *SEDOC* 1, 1439–41.

Celibacy

In the note of 14 April 1970 on priestly celibacy the episcopate of Uruguay expressed the desire to orient in harmony with their pastoral function priests, religious, and Catholic laity, to avoid misunderstandings which cause only harm. In agreement with the Pope and the bishops of the entire world they explain the true idea of the Church in regard to priestly celibacy and identify themselves with the relevant statements of the *magisterium.* Celibacy is suited to bring home to many young people, who rebel against the bourgeoisie and seek a new world, the value and power of attraction of a vocation which obliges them to total sacrifice to God and mankind. The bishops desire and hope that those who follow God's call will receive an answer of faith and love from the People of God.[74]

Renewal in the Light of the Second Vatican Council and of the Congress of Medellín

In a pastoral letter of 22 November 1970 the bishops proclaimed their wish to push forward the renewal desired by the Second Vatican Council and the second meeting of the Latin American episcopate at Medellín. The Church of Uruguay, like the Church in general, is in a critical stage full of fears, expectations, and hopes. The bishops understand the complaint of many Catholics who see the inner unity of the Church in jeopardy. The Church, whose function consists in continuing to the end of time the presence, task, and redeeming work of Jesus Christ, must renew itself in accord with the ideals of the Second Vatican Council, without identifying this function with that of the Christian lay person in the social, economic, and political liberation of people. The lay person must be supported by his Christian vocation, but he cannot appeal to an official representation of the Church, for this does not belong to his sphere of duty; this would mean a retrogression into a new kind of clericalism. Dialogue in the Church is always constructive, clarifies prejudices and doubts, strengthens faith, demands mutual understanding, accepts legitimate pluralism, and gives it a new value. Finally, it brings about that all are of one mind (1 Cor. 10). To those who hope for an elimination of injustice by the employment of force the bishops retort that force is neither Christian nor evangelical and that one evil cannot be fought with a greater evil. Instead of seeking the guilty, people must ascertain what deeds or omissions led to this situation.[75]

In a letter of 12 June 1972 the permanent Commission of the

---

[74] Ibid. 3, 779–81.

[75] Ibid. 4, 995–1005.

Episcopal Conference repeated, "in view of the difficult situation in the country," that the bishops also desire profound changes in the country in order to create a fraternal solidarity among all; hence the radical demands of the subversive groups must be regarded as a new mistake among many others. Further, the letter condemned the inhuman treatment of prisoners, independently of whether they were subversively active or not. Tortures cannot produce peace, not to mention that confessions extracted under terror are valueless and cause injuries that cannot be repaired.[76]

CHILE

Chile has a total area of 741,767 square kilometers and in 1968 had a population of 8,262,556 inhabitants and in 1976 of 10.4 million. In 1969 the Church of Chile included five archdioceses, fourteen dioceses, two prelacies, and two vicariates apostolic. At the same time there were 971 diocesan priests and 1,553 religious priests active in 734 parishes. There were 281 houses of male religious and 647 of female, and 342 educational institutes with 294,534 pupils, 14 hospitals, and 159 other relief institutions.[77]

The Chilean economy had developed by leaps and bounds during World War I; but the new wealth was for the benefit of only a thin upper class, so that in 1920 Alessandri was elected president as representative of the disadvantaged masses. Since he could not keep his promises, not least because of the boundary strife with Peru and Bolivia over the port of Arica and the Saltpeter Coast, he was toppled by the military under General Ibáñez, who became president of the republic, first in 1927, then again in 1952, and who continued the process of industrialization that had already begun. The Falangist Party, which had separated from the Conservative Party in the years after 1940, joined with the Communists in the election. Their commitment in the social sphere evoked strong tensions between the church leadership and the youth, which led to the dissolution of the *Asociación Nacional de Estudiantes Católicos* (ANEC) and other societies of Catholic Action. Nevertheless, progress in the social field is the most conspicuous phenomenon of the Chilean Church of that period. The farmhands organized unions, agrarian reform was discussed—things not permitted previously. The official Church gradually turned away from the great proprietors and thereby took its place in this new development.

In the course of the years after 1950 the fact of economic underdevelopment became ever more obvious. The nation regarded itself as poor. It did not escape the young Catholics that, despite a technical progress, the poverty of the broad masses became greater; they concluded that the social question could not be solved independently of the economic and political problems.

---

[76] Ibid. 5, 603–6.

[77] Cf. Vivens Vives, op. cit. IV/2, 636–41; *Guiá parroquial y guiá eclesiástica de Chile* (Santiago de Chile 1969).

In Search of a Uniform Ecclesiastical Activity

The general situation demanded uniform action: lay persons and priests joined in a common action with the aim of transforming the old *Falange* into *Democracia Christiana.* Influence on this development was also exercised by the *Centro Bellarmino* (1959), the *Alianza para el Progreso* (1961), the pastoral letters of the Chilean episcopate on the situation in agriculture and the political and social duty of Catholics (1962), and finally the stimuli of the Second Vatican Council. The underdeveloped state of the nation was regarded on one side as a consequence of the development of the rich countries, especially of the United States; on the other side the models of Cuba and Vietnam—names such as Fidel Castro, Camilo Torres, Ché Guevara—and the guerrilla wars in various countries of South America contributed to the growth in many of the revolutionary idea and the hope for a new human being on a new continent by means of a radical modification of the system.

The Conference of the Latin American Episcopate at Medellín in 1968 condemned with full publicity the dependence of the continent and announced a program of church reform, which stirred a loud echo in Chile. At Allende's election in 1970 the Catholics supported all candidates. In a spoken and written word—newspapers and periodicals—it was expressed that the Church was not basically against this government of a Marxist stamp.[78] Catholics on the right regarded the faith as an exclusively religious attitude, oriented to God alone. In relation to politics they persisted in the, in their view, only valid Catholic viewpoint and regarded themselves as guardians of morality and religion. They refused a change of their old morals and any novelty. On the left they were for the most part young priests, who had committed themselves in workers' and students' environments, and lay persons with an ideology of the left. For these a political confrontation and a revolution were unrenounceable, since only it meant the total redemption of mankind; they were an affair of the individual Christians and of the Church itself. The majority of the Chilean Church, bishops, priests, and faithful, were oriented to the center. Without having expressly decided for the *Democracia Cristiana,* they preferred it to all other parties. They desired a nonpolitical Church, devoted only to conciliar reform and renewal. Nevertheless, they regarded the opening to the world as an ingredient of theology and spirituality, but proceeding from the principle of autonomy. In this group, of course, various opinions were combined.

---

[78] A. Fontaine, S.S.C.C., "La Iglesia católica chilena en los últimos 20 años," *Mensaje* 202–3 (Sept.–Oct. 1971), 422–52.

The majority of Catholics is today anticapitalist and represents a certain non-Marxian socialism. Starting from the renewing spirit of the Second Vatican Council, the Chilean Church has reformed its liturgy, accepted priests who represent new ideas, allowed changes in the religious life, and begun a broad dialogue with the political organs and other denominations.

Attempt at a Balance

The bishops, by means of their varied activities in the dioceses claimed, but did not have sufficient time, to adapt themselves to the problems of the entire country and to devote themselves to them. Also, their contacts with the secularized world suffered from the same shortcoming, so that a dialogue with lay persons and priests who were prepared to help and a total plan could come into existence only with great difficulty. As positive elements of the life of the Chilean Church can be listed progress in the reform of the religious life with many new perceptions, especially in the practical care of souls. The classical youth movements, of great efficacy in previous years, are in a serious crisis. The disintegration within the priestly vocation is regrettable; many priests abandon their vocation, and in general it lacks vitality.[79]

Christians for Socialism

Eighty priests met in Santiago de Chile from 14 to 16 April 1971 to speak on the topic "Participation of Christians in the Building of Socialism in Chile." "The Eighty," as they were called, affirmed their membership in the clergy and at the same time their sympathy with socialism: they then formed a "Priests' Secretariat of Christians for Socialism." Eight months later the word "Priests' " was dropped, since they began to accept lay persons also into their ranks. At the end of their first meeting they composed a "Declaration of the Eighty," in which they expressed their wish to work together with the Marxists for the construction of socialism in Chile. Marxism, they said, is a means for the analyzing and changing of society; the Christian faith must be freed of everything that prevents the faithful from cooperating with the Marxists. A week later, on 23 April 1971, twelve professors of theology of the University of Santiago de Chile in an open letter declared their agreement with the declaration of "The Eighty." From this moment on, expressions of sympathy for this movement increased in and outside Chile. Three months later, from 16 to 18 July, about 200 priests participated in a meeting which was organized by the "Priests' Secretariat of Christians for Socialism." Thus originated the "Group of 200." From these two cells, constituted exclusively by priests, arose the movement "Christians for Socialism," which spread from America to Europe.

---

[79] A. Fontaine, S.S.C.C., "Situación actual de la Iglesia chilena," *Mensaje* 201, 367–72.

The movement obtained a strong stimulus through the meeting of the groups with Fidel Castro, on the occasion of his visit to Chile. 140 priests attended the meeting. They adopted the theses represented by Castro that Christians should regard themselves as "strategic," and not only tactical, "allies" of the Marxists in the liberation of Latin America, and that the Christian can accept Marxism as a method with a quiet conscience without coming into conflict with his faith. Castro invited twelve Chilean priests to Cuba, to work there voluntarily for some weeks. Following this, they published in the Cuban newspaper *Gramma* a declaration on 6 March 1972: condemnation of capitalism as source of all evil in Latin America, historical necessity of socialism, moral obligation of all Christians to fight together with the Marxists for liberation from institutionalized force. At the Episcopal Conference in Punta de Tralca from 7 to 11 April 1973, the bishops, after a comprehensive theological and pastoral assessment of the orientation of the clergy, came to the following conclusion: No priest and no religious can join the movement "Christians for Socialism."[80]

Situation of the Chilean Church

On the occasion of the Roman Synod of Bishops of 1974 Monseñor Valdés Subercaseaux, bishop of Osorno, explained the situation of the Chilean Church: Since the beginning of the century the Chilean people have been under the influence of the errors of economic liberalism and of Marxian materialism. Among the 85 percent of Catholics it is difficult to ascertain how many of them take an active part in the Church's life. The Church is aware of the social problem, and many priests and lay persons are working for its solution. But first it is neccessary to change the mentality of persons in order then to alter the unjust social structures. Today the young rarely devote themselves to the religious and priestly vocation or to the lay apostolate. They prefer to dedicate themselves to social and political action. The intellectuals—priests and lay—represent another problem, because they often question ecclesiastical life, the Pope, the priestly identity, and the importance of the religious life. "Liberation Theology" leads to a purely secular-oriented social activity and pushes spiritual values into oblivion. The Chilean Church, said the bishop, does not remain inactive and is seeking new forms of evangelization.[81]

---

[80] B. Sorge, *Le scelte e le tesi dei "Cristiani per il socialismo" alla luce dell'insegnamento della Chiesa* (Turin 1974); "Evangelio, política y socialismo. Documento de trabajo de la Conferencia episcopal de Chile," *Christus* 438(Mexico, 1 May 1972), 32–42; "Primer encuentro. Cristianos por el socialismo (documento final)," *Christus* 440(Mexico, 1 July 1972), 53–58; "Jerarquías chilena y mexicana ante el primer encuentro latinoamericano de 'cristianos por el socialismo,'" *Christus* 442 (1 Sept. 1972), 41–59; *AICA* 16, 793 (2 March 1972), 15f.; *AICA* 16, 807 (8 June 1972), 28f.; *SEDOC* 4(Nov. 1972), 614–32.

BOLIVIA

Bolivia has a total area of 1,126,240 square kilometers and is, then, the fifth largest nation in South America. In 1960 it had 3,371,791 inhabitants,[82] of whom 63 percent were Indians;[83] in 1976, according to the UN statistics, 5,470,000 inhabitants, of whom more than 50 percent were Indians and 28 to 30 percent mestizos.

Ecclesiastical Structure

Bolivia has four metropolitan sees: La Paz with the prelacies of Corocoro and Coroico, Sucre with the suffragan sees of Potosí and Tarija, Cochabamba with Oruro and the prelacy of Aiquile, and Santa Cruz de la Sierra; six vicariates apostolic: Chiquitos, Cuevo, El Beni, Ñuflo de Chávez, Pando, and Reyes.[84] In 1960 there were 189 diocesan priests, 763 religious brothers, 1,733 sisters, and 354 parishes. The formalism of the Bolivian Church of 1970 produced the following organizational commissions: doctrine and catechesis, means of social communication, seminaries and vocations, lay apostolate, liturgy, music and art, education, social actions, missions, economic planning. In addition, the following secretariates were set up: missions, means of social communication, education, doctrine and catechesis, social studies, Bolivian *Caritas.* In 1974 there were in Bolivia 913 priests—355 diocesan and 558 religious—and 1,637 sisters; of these last, 931 were foreigners. Lay movements with effective activity are: *Legión de María, Movimiento familiar cristiano,* and *Cursillos de cristianidad.* Over and above these are numerous institutes, the Catholic University of La Paz under the direction of the Jesuits, schools, high schools, homes for the aged, hospitals, which are administered by religious, male and female.[85] At Sucre the Jesuits operate the broadcasting company "Radio Loyola."

---

[81] *Osservatore Romano,* 4 Oct. 1974.

[82] *Anuario eclesiástico de Bolivia para el año del Señor 1960; Guía de la Iglesia de Bolivia* (1970), 5–9.

[83] *Christus* 410 (Mexico, July–Dec. 1970), 740.

[84] *Annuario Pontificio 1977,* 954.

The Bolivian people have the lowest standard of living of the American continents. Mine workers suffer severely from the change from the high temperatures underground to the cold of the mountains, where their dwellings do not provide adequate protection. A great part of the miners therefore are tubercular: their life expectancy is about thirty-five years. At the moment the Corporación minera boliviana (COMIBOL) is the largest mining enterprise with 25,000 employees and is responsible for 60 percent of the total gross national product. Politically, Bolivia is a turbulent country. Since independence it has had more than 180 changes of government.[86]

Human Solidarity

At the meeting of the bishops, priests, and laity in Cochabamba in February 1968, in which they sought to bring their understanding of their roles into harmony with the Second Vatican Council, they published a declaration: the schools are not accessible to all social classes, especially the poor; the support of the priests is particularly not realistically taken care of; the youth, hope of the Church, and social justice are neglected; means available are used for the building of houses and churches and in this the Christian community is forgotten; ecclesiastical office is often exercised more as a right than as a ministry. For the future the Church will do everything to measure up to its duty and responsibility; in this regard it relies on all Bolivians and on all countries and undertakings which share in the development of Bolivia.[87]

Defense of the Miners

Jorge Manrique, archbishop of La Paz, several bishops, forty-five miner-priests, and some lay persons met at Oruro in July 1968 and analyzed the situation of the miners and the treaty concluded in March 1968 between state and Church on the mining problem. In a letter from La Paz of 20 July 1968 the miners' union (ASIB) presented its demands to the group. The Church should end its connection with the regime; they, the Christian union members, are revolutionaries.[88]

---

[85] *Anuario eclesiástico de Bolivia para el año del Señor 1960; Guía de la Iglesia de Bolivia* (1970), 5–9.

[86] *Christus* 410 (Mexico, July–Dec. 1970), 740f.

[87] Ibid. 386 (Mexico, Jan.–July 1968), 362–67.

[88] *SEDOC* 1 (Dec. 1969), 887–94.

The most important social and religious problems of the country were taken up by the bishops in a document of 15 August 1968: The Church is in the service of truth, justice, and fraternal charity; it must especially promote the realization of social justice in a dynamic of development to freedom on the regional, national, and international plane. It must renew itself by a social pastoral work: "We are aware," it was said, "that worldly work is a redeeming work, because the function of Christ is of a universal nature. Through the impetus of fraternal charity we are ready to cooperate with all men of goodwill, because every man is redeemed by Christ, is a child of God, who claims our cooperation and our services.[89]

Miner Priests

The fourth Congress of Miner Priests published the decrees of Oruro of 31 July 1969: Capitalism is condemned, "aware of the redeeming message of Christ and of our task in the world, we oblige ourselves to intensify our exertions in the service of Bolivia's miners in their struggle for freedom."[90] On the basis of information on the collaboration of priests in the mass rallies and on political sermons, members of the Episcopal Conference declared on 10 September 1969: "We are of the opinion that the function of priests is incompatible with membership in a political party, if it demands compliance with peculiar objectives of party doctrine which close the door to other groupings; thereby their universality in the service of all is placed in question." They support their attitude with the teaching of the Second Vatican Council and the declarations of the Congress of Medellín of 1968.[91]

The opposition between the Bolivian Episcopal Conference and the Secretariat for Social Action caused the chairman of the Commission for Social Action, Jesús Agustín López de Lama, bishop of Corocoro, to resign his office. The secretariat was temporarily closed; the decision affected the relations of the conference to *Iglesia y Sociedad para América Latina* (ISAL), a movement which cooperated very closely in Bolivia with the Secretariat for Social Action.[92]

New Initiatives

At the time forty-five Aymará Indians were preparing for the diaconate. These natives—ca. 3.3 million of them live in the mountains of

---

[89] Ibid. 1 (April 1969), 1365–88.

[90] *Christus* 410 (Mexico, July–Dec. 1970), 742–44.

[91] Ibid., 744–46.

[92] *SEDOC* 4 (Feb. 1972), 1005–10.

Bolivia and Peru—are catechists, who after training are ordained deacons in order to care for their fellows.[93]

In this declaration Cardinal José Clemente Maurer, C.S.S.R., archbishop of Sucre, proposed to sell all the property collected by the Church of Bolivia in the course of four hundred years in order to expedite the construction of social institutions. Following this proposal the Oblates donated all their goods for the building of schools and public hospitals in Bolivia.[94]

Within its social program, the Church of Bolivia built houses for poor families and persons of moderate means.[95] Every residential district provided a church, school, outpatient department, and other services. The land for construction was donated by the Franciscans of Sucre. The construction itself was financed by donations which Cardinal Maurer collected in Trévesis, his diocese of origin.[96] Furthermore, ca. 200 hospitals were built in the country by the Church, and almost all savings groups came out of the parishes. Several programs for systematic education were taken up by the Church. In the entire country there was a network of centers which originated in the Church's initiative. More than 2,000 volunteers worked in the programs of several broadcasting companies which were heard in hundreds of centers. This entire work was realized by the Church by means of institutions of various kinds.[97]

Increase of Priestly Vocations

Although the number of priestly ordinations is still too small in comparison with the priests needed, said Cardinal Maurer of Sucre, vocations are increasing in Bolivia. Some eighty seminarians will shortly be ordained, and married deacons will soon help the overburdened priests. The latest statistics establish that, of 913 priests who are active in the sixteen dioceses, only ca. 200 were born in the country.[98] North American missionaries support five catechetical centers among the Aymará Indians and in recent years have trained some one thousand catechists. Of these, 100 were chosen for the diaconate. The positive experience among the Aymarás has led to this beginning among the Quechuas, whose number is estimated at 1.2 million. In Bolivia there are 293 North American missionaries, including two laymen, forty-two diocesan priests, 11 religious priests from five congregations, and 138 sisters from four congregations. The Maryknoll Congregation supplies the largest number, with 62 priests and 43 sisters.[99] Cardinal Maurer and the minister of religion found words of praise for the Maryknoll Brothers because of their helpful efforts for so many Bolivians in the struggle against illiteracy with the aid of the radio. The Bolivian broadcasting companies form a society which has constructed nine transmitters and is under the direction of these missionaries.[100]

---

[93] *AICA* 15, 758f. (17 June 1971), 31.
[94] Ibid. 16, 803 (11 May 1972), 23.
[95] Ibid. 17, 810 (29 June 1972), 17f.
[96] Ibid. 18, 8, 893 (31 Jan. 1974), 19.
[97] Ibid. 17, 873 (13 Sept. 1973), 17f.
[98] Ibid. 17, 817 (17 Aug. 1972), 30.

Authentic Justice and Humanization

The Bolivian Commission *Justicia y Paz,* founded at the beginning of 1973, in view of the situation in the nation condemned in a statement the restriction on freedom of the press and the persecution of the political opponents of the regime. The Bolivian Workers' Central Office is ignored and the unions are manipulated from above. All liberal activities are suppressed, and intrusions are increasing in regard to both democratic institutions and private persons. Injustices are perpetrated against those of different political views, political prisoners live in miserable conditions in the prisons, and deaths by torture take place. Despite many promises, the regime has not thus far stopped these methods.[101]

PERU

Peru has a total of 1,285,215 square kilometers, and according to the 1974 census 13,672,052 inhabitants,[102] of whom two-fifths are Indians and an equal number mestizos. Ca. 75 percent of the population is Catholic.

The Peruvian episcopate consists of fifty-three members, of whom seven are archbishops, twelve residential bishops, four bishops with superdiocesan functions, eight auxiliary bishops, eight vicars apostolic, and fourteen prelacies. The Church provinces are Lima, Huancayo, Piura, Trujillo, Arequipa, Ayacucho, and Cuzco. With the bishops, the retired priests, and the priests outside Peru, Peru numbers 967 diocesan and 1,492 religious priests, altogether then 2,459. In addition, the statistics show 597 religious brothers, 4,395 sisters of contemplative orders, 810 parishes with pastors, and 284 parishes without pastors.

Since 1973 the republic has been divided into eight pastoral regions: the northern mountain chain in the area of Cafamarca; the northern coast in the territory of Trujillo; the central mountain chain in the area of Huancayo; the area of Lima; the central coast in the territory of Ica;

---

[99] Ibid. 17, 831 (23 Nov. 1972), 26f.

[100] Ibid. 18, 833 (22 Nov. 1973), 29f.

[101] *SEDOC* 6 (Dec. 1973), 741–45.

[102] Basadre, *Chile, Perú y Bolivia independientes,* 6f.; *Anuario eclesiástico del Perú* (1974).

southern Peru in the area of Arequipa; the southern Andes in the area of Cuzco; primitive forest in the territory of Pucalipa.[103]

Educational Institutions

Since 1917 Lima has had a Catholic university, which on 30 September 1942 was given the title "papal" by the Holy See and which was recognized by the state as a national university in 1949. The University of San Cristóbal, founded in 1668, continued its work in the twentieth century as an official institute for higher ecclesiastical studies, associated with the papal university. However, only 8 percent of the students in the entire republic attend the Catholic university. More than one hundred schools are run by diocesan or religious priests, more than one hundred fifty by sisters.[104]

The religious-philosophical positivism, which achieved its greatest importance at the Universidad Nacional de San Marcos in the years after 1920, fell for a while under the influence of Bergson. Finally it was supplanted by Marxism when representatives such as José Carlos Mariategui (1895–1930), a figure of great repute in all of Latin America, and the Marxist Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre occupied chairs there. An investigation of opinion in the university sphere—2,101 questioned—revealed that some 20 percent professed themselves to be atheists or "not believers in the Church." In fact, atheism was on the march.[105] As early as 15 June 1939 the Episcopal Conference had complained in an encyclical that "humanitarian" societies were pursuing Communist goals, "socialization" was making progress, as were pornography and divorce; with the aid of the school monopoly "a school without God" was being sought.[106]

The Social Sphere

On 3 October 1968 the troops overthrew President Belaúnde in a coup d'état. Juan Velasco Alvarado formed the new government, which proclaimed land reform in May 1969, an organic law of the Peruvian university in February 1969, and an industrial law in July 1970. This comprehensive revolution forced the Peruvian Church to revise its position. After the publication of the encyclical *Populorum progressio,* there was formed in March 1968 a group of priests to realize the social apostolates. The so-called group ONIS—*Oficina Nacional Información*

---

[103] *Anuario eclesiástico del Perú* (1974).

[104] G. Lohmann Villena, "Perú," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* XI, 184–92; M. B. Murphy, *Pontifical Catholic University of Peru,* 193.

[105] Cf. F. Interdonato, S.J., *El ateísmo en el mundo actual. Estudio aplicado al Perú,* 29, 33, 74–89, 373–76.

[106] *Revista de la Universidad católica del Perú* VI, 206–19.

Social—often supported the measures taken by the government in favor of a higher social justice.[107] In the decrees of the second meeting in October 1969 it was said: In the planned separation of Church and state no deceptions should be practiced in an effort to retain the existing situation; the agricultural property of dioceses and congregations must not be excluded from the land reform; mentality, attitude, and manner of life must be changed in order to break with the conditions of privilege.[108]

On 2 July 1970 the Permanent Commission of the Peruvian Episcopal Conference published a letter in which the collaboration of the Church in the construction of a better world was made concrete. The bishops admitted that, by their defective loyalty to the Gospel, Christians have contributed to the origin of the present situation, and regarded it as a duty of the Peruvian Church to carry through a revision of all ownership in immovable property and goods of every sort of the dioceses, congregations, and ecclesiastical institutions. The meeting reminded teachers of their great responsibility in education and admonished them to intensify their pastoral action in public and private schools and to cooperate with the state educational authorities.[109]

From 30 April to 2 May 1971 a workers' parish in Lima brought together more than thirteen hundred persons; the invitation proceeded from the laity. Among those invited were representatives of the *Movimiento de Trabajadores Cristianos,* of *Juventud Obrera Católica,* of the *Unión Nacional de Estudiantes Cathólicos y Movimiento Sacerdotal* (ONIS). Seventy study groups worked out several resolutions, including this one: There prevails in the nation an injustice, which especially burdens the lower classes. This situation cannot be accepted by any Christian. The new society must be classless, with community possession of the means of production. The Church must give up its privileged property position, its involvement with the state, and repressive pastoral methods. Therefore, the religious institutes must give up their schools which are reserved to the rich. They desire a Church which supports the oppressed, not the oppressors. They propose to form contemplative and active groups with a coordination committee, to promote works of documentation to prove the oppression of the majority of Peruvians, and finally they claim to form themselves as representatives of the formation of opinion and organs of information in and outside the Church.[110]

---

[107] *Christus* 410 (July–Dec. 1970), 762; *SEDOC* 2 (Nov. 1969), 657–60.

[108] *SEDOC* 2 (May 1970), 1437–40.

[109] *Christus* 410 (July–Dec. 1970), 762–77.

[110] R. Antoncich, S.J., "Lima: 'Cristianos en un mundo de injusticia.' Primer encuentro por una Iglesia solidaria," *Mensaje* 200, 307f.

At the conclusion of their forty-second conference at Lima, 19–27 January 1972, the Peruvian bishops published a letter on evangelization and explained the guidelines and aims for the propagation of the faith, even to its introduction in school.[111] At the Roman Synod of Bishops of 1974 Monseñor Durand Flores called attention to the successful work of the pastoral Priests' Councils, in which for five years also religious priests, sisters, and lay persons, as well as representatives of the eight regions, had participated. The chief concern was for the 6 million Indians, whose piety was still mixed with pagan elements. They had to be shown that the external activity, processions, sacraments, and even the Mass, are means of experiencing the state of being God's children.[112] At the Roman Synod the auxiliary bishop of Lima, Schmitz Sauerborn, likewise referred to the Christian tradition of the country; it is important to preserve it by having the Church take an interest in persons and in human rights.[113]

ECUADOR

Ecuador has an area of 283,561 square kilometers and in 1968 had 4,509,768 inhabitants; the Vatican statistics for 1971 give 6,297,000 inhabitants and 5,359,000 Catholics. The country is divided into three ecclesiastical provinces: Cuenca, Guayaquil, and Quito. Cuenca has three suffragans: Azogues, Loja, and Machala. Guayaquil embraces the diocese of Puertoviejo and the prelacy of Los Ríos. To Quito belong the sees of Ambato, Guaranda, Ibarra, Latacunga, Riobamba, and Tulcán. There are five vicariates apostolic: Esmeraldas, Méndez, Napo, Puyo, and Zamora, and three prefectures apostolic: Aguarico, Galápagos, and San Miguel de Sucumbios.[114]

Of the 762 diocesan priests in 1968, 65 percent (432) do pastoral work in the parishes, 11.2 percent (86) are in administration, 4 percent (31) are in superparochial pastoral care, 3.9 percent (31) are active as teachers in seminaries.[115] In the country there are 898 religious priests, who belong to eighteen different institutes. The diocese with the most religious priests is Quito with 287, followed by Guayaquil with 141, Puertoviejo with 41, and Cuenca with 60. Twenty-two percent of the religious priests devote themselves to teaching—37 percent, if one considers those active in seminaries; 22 percent are in parish work, 18 percent are entrusted with other pastoral duties, 17 percent are occupied in administration. The total number of male religious is 1,576, of sisters 3,622. A great many of them are active in schools, headed by the Christian Brothers, the Salesians, and the Jesuits.[116]

---

[111] *SEDOC* 5 (Dec. 1973), 751–68.

[112] *Osservatore Romano,* 3 Oct. 1974.

[113] Ibid., 10 Oct. 1974.

[114] *La Iglesia en el Ecuador. Estudio del personal de 1968* II/1, Análisis, 1, 12; *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 957.

[115] *La Iglesia en el Ecuador,* ibid., 4, 13.

School System

Eighty percent of Ecuador's schools are public. According to Paragraph 16 of the 1906 constitution the school system is public, free, and lay. In accord with Paragraph 151, 21 (1929), private schools remain under state control. The situation worsened further after the proclamation of totalitarianism (Paragraph 142, 3, [1945]) in education; a year later, in 1946, Marxian totalitarianism was annulled and the right of their own type of education for their children was transferred to the parents. A subsidy of 20 percent of the costs incurred was approved for the lay school which was neither for nor against religion, presupposing that it did not charge fees. From the start, the Church fought laicism and put personnel and financial means at the disposal of the building of its own schools. The pupils of the lay schools, who often came from Christian families, were not regarded in a friendly manner and remained isolated; the teachers often had the feeling of being regarded as traitors. Later the Church organized a pastoral action also outside the school: youth centers, Catholic Action, and so forth, in order to better care for youth living apart from the Church. In recent times the opposition has broken down, and the desire for rapprochement and cooperation has become apparent. The Church makes its contribution through *Caritas,* social concern, libraries, and direct contact with teachers.[117]

Political and Socioeconomic Position of the Church

The episcopate of Ecuador treated the political and socioeconomic problems of the country through its Permanent Commission in two documents. The point of departure of the first, that of 31 December 1967, was the elections of 2 June 1968. The second document, published at Easter of 1968, produced some guiding principles for the building of a "creative peace." The bishops indicated that in a Church which wants to retain its internal autonomy, the members of the clergy and of religious institutes must renounce political rights and duties which pertain to them as members of the political community in order thereby to hold themselves aloof from party conflicts. They recall the "programmatic statement" of the Ecuadorian episcopate: The Church of Ecuador can in the sense of its permanent function neither identify itself with a political group nor bind itself to a system; no political grouping can claim the quality of a Catholic institution or ecclesiastical authority.[118] In the second document it is stressed that peace demands the unity of all citizens, for the development of all social strata, especially of those of modest means and those standing apart; this is the necessary presupposition for a creative peace.[119] On 20 June 1969 the Episcopal Conference at Baños outlined the function of the priest in the world and gave guidelines for dialogue and coresponsibility with economic life, work, and for celibacy.[120]

---

[116] Ibid., 15–44; *Estudio de la viceprovincia del Ecuador* III/1: *Estudio del personal. Estudio de las residencias y parroquías,* 4.

[117] *La Iglesia en el Ecuador,* ibid., 49.

First National Assembly of Ecuadorian Priests

As the outcome of the first meeting with the participation of ninety-nine priests from almost all dioceses of the country, three bishops, and two foreign priests—from Peru and Bolivia—seven seminarians, and twelve young lay persons, there was published a detailed statement with the following content: crisis of the clergy; collegiality; authority and obedience in the Church; autonomy of the Ecuadorian Church; economic position of the clergy; priestly celibacy; priests and freedom; priests and politics; formation of priests; the priest as a man and the priestly vocation. Obedience means coresponsibility, coparticipation, and dialogue; evangelization represents a liberating message, which interprets in the world the historical process proclaimed by the Holy Spirit. The priest has within the Christian community the right to occupy political positions in harmony with his conscience. An ever more secularized society, which denies a vocation devoted to sanctification, demands that the priest live by a professional work and not by his spiritual ministry, which should be gratis, but this does not prevent priests who exercise only the latter from obtaining the necessities of life from their communities.[121] The bishop of Riobamba, Monseñor Leónidas Proaño Villalba, proposed in a letter of 1969 an ideal program of poverty for the basic renewal of his diocese.[122]

In Search of an Integral Development

The Permanent Committee of the Commission *Justicia y Paz* of Ecuador complained at the conclusion of the meeting at El Inca of 18–19 December 1970 that the slight economic growth of the preceding years was obtained at the expense of the lower classes of city and country and for the benefit of the upper and middle classes and a certain higher developed working class, and proposed to coordinate all initiatives and private or public programs in order to achieve the desired progress.[123] A meeting of more than one hundred priests in April 1971 accepted the decrees of Medellín and condemned the civil and religious persecution of persons who were engaged in the liberation and renewal of the Church. The priests declared that the Church as a community of faith adheres to the destiny of the human being and sees itself justified in criticizing, in condemning injustice, oppression, and abuse of power, and finally in keeping alive hope as the motivating power of a permanent renewal. Hunger, illiteracy, unemployment, exploitation of workers and peasants, concentration of power in a few hands are the consequences of the capitalism dominant in the country. They concede their cosharing in the capitalistic system if they defend, in the name of God, private ownership of the means of production.[124] Thereupon the Episcopal Conference from 2 to 4 March 1972 elaborated a comprehensive pastoral plan: reevaluation of the person, evangelization and deepening of the faith, role of the visible Church.[125] The government was requested, in regard to the politically suspect, to respect the basic rights of citizens in investigations, and they point out the right of prisoners to come before a nonpartisan court. This attitude results not from political or partisan motives but as a contribution to the welfare of the country.[126]

---

[118] *SEDOC* 2 (Aug. 1968), 233–38.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Ibid. 2 (Nov. 1969), 669–72.

[121] "Primera convención nacional de presbíteros del Ecuador," *Christus* 410 (Mexico, July–Dec. 1970), 318–55.

[122] *SEDOC* 2 (June 1970), 1587–90.

The Church Facing the New Agrarian Law

The bishop of Riobamba, Monseñor Leónidas Proaño Villalba, in a letter of 1974 to the president of the republic analyzed the situation of the peasants in the province of Chimborazo: Of the 400,000 inhabitants of this province, 300,000 are *campesinos* and 52 percent illiterate. The impoverished areas do not offer the small owner even the most elementary living conditions, and in other areas the *latifundia* stifle every effort for survival. Monseñor Proaño examines the deficiencies of the new law and offers the cooperation of the Church in applying it.[127]

The Church in the Present

At the 1974 Roman Synod of Bishops the archbishop of Guayaquil, Echevarría Ruíz, made known that a text had been worked out which contained the guidelines of the history of salvation and the method of administering the sacraments. The text was distributed among priests, religious, and catechists in order to assure unity of arguments and of manner of presentation. It was thereby attempted to actualize the theological formation of the clergy. The successes of these initiatives have become visible in small communities, parishes, and at the Eucharistic Congress.[128]

---

[123] Ibid 4 (Sept. 1971), 361–65.

[124] Ibid., 365–69.

[125] Ibid. 5 (Dec. 1972), 747–60.

[126] *AICA* 17, 842 (18 Feb. 1973), 40f.

[127] Ibid., 18, 900 (21 March 1974), 23f.

Colombia

Colombia covers 1,130,000 square kilometers and has about 24 million inhabitants,[129] of whom 97.5 percent are Catholics.[130] The people of the mountains differ in their religious outlook from those of the lowland, due to geographical and climatic conditions. About 98 percent of the Colombian population inhabits the mountain area, with a higher and more uniform culture. In the country parishes piety is mixed with superstitious concomitants and numerous errors as a consequence of earlier struggles and of the lack of priests.

In 1948 the republic had 1,074 parishes, 2,263 churches and chapels, and 1,642 priests. At that time the seminaries were attended by 560 candidates for the priesthood; in the minor seminaries there were 1,780 pupils. Altogether there were 10,488,669 Catholics. In 1966 4,214 priests were active, of whom 2,632 were diocesan and 1,852 religious; there were 2,221 brothers and 15,086 sisters.[131] In 1971 the Vatican statistics counted 56 ecclesiastical jurisdictions and 1,851 parishes.

Since 1944 Catholic Social Action has been established in urban and rural professional associations. The urban associations are organized in regional societies, such as the *Unión de Trabajadores de Antioqua* (UTRAN), with seventy unions and more than 30,000 members. The rural professional associations constitute the *Federación Agraria Nacional* (FANAL), with 400 unions and more than 100,000 members; it publishes an organ for the leading members, the weekly *Justicia Social,* with a circulation of 300,000, in addition to newspapers and prospectuses. All these urban and rural associations gradually joined the *Unión de Trabajadores Colombianos* (UTC), which counts more than 300 unions and over 150,000 members. The national *Junta* for social actions consists of the archbishops of Bogotá, Medellín, Cartagena, and Popayán; they have collaborators on the national and local level.

---

[128] *Osservatore Romano,* 2 Oct. 1974.

[129] Cf. V. Vives, op. cit. IV/2, 594f.

[130] *AICA* 17, 852 (19 April 1973), 21f.

[131] *Revista Javeriana* 57 (Bogotá 1962), 110.

School System

In Antioquia alone—apart from the Pontificia Universidad Bolivariana with 104 professors—there were eleven colleges with 1,537 students, which are run by priests. Altogether 3,932 students in the republic attended institutions of higher learning, which were likewise under priestly management. The statistical handbook of 1948 counts 413 modern secondary schools with 90,787 students and 1,040 public schools with 74,942 pupils, a total of 1,453 schools and 165,724 pupils. It is to be noted that the high schools run by priests and religious institutes are attended by 80 percent of the students in the country. As coordinating element of the private schools there functions the *Confederación de Colegios Católicos,* which for several years has published an educational periodical.

Colombia has two papal universities: the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana at Bogotá, since 31 July 1939 with faculties of theology, canon law, philosophy, literature, education, law, economic and social sciences, medicine and dentistry, engineering and architecture; the Pontificia Universidad Católica Bolivariana (Medellín), since 10 August 1945 with faculties of law, political and social sciences, economics and business, philosophy and education, literature, engineering, electricity and chemistry, architecture, city-planning and fine arts.[132] Important cultural centers are also the San Bartolomé and Rosario schools in Bogotá, from which have come the most outstanding representatives of the so-called generation of the "Centennial Anniversary." New seminaries arose at Bogotá, Medellín, Manizales, Ibagué, Popayán, Garzón, Barranquilla, and San Gil, which are conducted by priests and religious brothers, especially by Lazarists and Eudists, and accomplish an immense teaching function.

Missions and Missionaries

The Colombian missions embrace extensive areas; geographically considered, more than half the nation is occupied by foreign missionaries; they are mostly Augustinians, Carmelites, Jesuits, and especially Capuchins.

Catholic Initiatives

One of Colombia's most original institutions and at the same time the one with the greatest response in the country is the Workers' Circle and Savings Bank of Father José María Campoamor, who died in 1949; it supports agencies in many cities of the republic. A like importance belongs to the activity of Monseñor Agustín Gutiérrez in the model parish of Fómeque or the Eucharistic Schools of Medellín, founded by the pastor of the San José parish, which on the occasion of the Catechetical Congress at Boston received special honor.

---

[132] *Annuario Pontificio* (1974), 1371, 1374.

There are three leper stations: Aguas de Dios, Contratación, and Caño de Loro, which are cared for by the Salesians. And the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul is heavily involved in this sphere. According to statistics of 1938, the Church supports 107 social welfare institutions at its own expense. Forty homes for the aged are cared for by religious, but only twenty-eight of them receive state support. Of the eighty orphanages, only nine obtain state help. Nevertheless, the number of welfare institutions increases.[133]

The Voice of the Bishops

Since 1948 we have known the most important problems of the Colombian Church through the episcopal documents. From 20 June to 3 July of that year the Episcopal Conference examined the most pressing problems of the Church and the solutions suited to them in an effort to preserve religion and nation from great dangers. In this connection they elaborated three topics: Communism, "which was, alas, already very deeply rooted," the Church's social teaching, the sole means of loosening the social tensions between capital and labor in the order of mercy and justice, and finally "the most important errors of doctrinaire liberalism" in questions which affect religion.[134] The pastoral letter of 30 November 1951 developed the following themes: the dignity of Christian life; the necessity of religious education; deplorable vices for lack of Christian life; drunkenness; loss of self-esteem by women because of the lack of Christian awareness; Christian life of society, Christian mercy, effects of violence in Colombia.[135] At the beginning of Lent, on 11 February 1955, the bishops explained the position of the Church in regard to unions and condemned the *Confederación Nacional de Trabajadores* (CNT), whose leaders had from the start repudiated the Church's authority, because it was influenced by socialist tendencies and radiated a Peronist character in the broadest sense. A further topic was Peronist justicialism, condemned by the Church because of its totalitarian claims, and the dangers of socialism.

---

[133] Cf. J. Álvarez Mejiá, S.J., "La Iglesia católica en Colombia," *Revista Javeriana* 28 (Bogotá 1947), 102–10; E. Ospina, S.J., "Diez años de vida católica en Colombia," *Revista Javeriana* 30 (Bogotá 1948), 251–61.

[134] F. Velázquez, S.J., "Las direcciones de la conferencia episcopal," *Revista Javeriana* 30 (Bogotá 1948), 65–68.

[135] "Pastoral colectiva del episcopado colombiano," *Revista Javeriana* 37 (Bogotá 1952), 3–9.

The bishops were likewise concerned with Colombian socialism and its doctrine: that the goals of society are directed only to material welfare, that the economy should be collectivist. In this connection the bishops again explained the Church's social doctrine.[136] Also the pastoral letter on the occasion of Lent 1958 dealt with the social problems and their solution, based on the papal teachings.[137]

The nineteenth Episcopal Conference at Bogotá in mid-September 1958 in an appeal called upon all Colombian Catholics to practice Christian charity. In the last part and under the title "Practical Applications" they recommended the sincere unity of all Colombians without exception, effective punishment of crimes, moderation in the criticism of political opponents, in both the printed and the spoken word, and true interest in the solution of social problems and the reduction of prices for basic foods as an expression of goodwill by producers and merchants. In addition, they suggested a social reform in regard to the equal distribution of the profit sought, the implementation of savings measures and capital investments in management in order to guarantee full employment and assure cooperation in common projects. The conference published two more instructions: one on a general cultural campaign, the other on the rights of the Church, the state, and the family in education.[138]

Agricultural Reform

The National Congress of Agriculture at Bogotá 24–27 November 1959 treated in two working groups the difficult topic of land reform from the Church's viewpoint: In one there took part representatives of the bishops, clergy, universities, agricultural authorities, and employers; in the other sat representatives of the farmers, small landholders, and tenants, who belonged to various agricultural organizations. There was agreement as to the necessity of assisting the agricultural worker to grow into his role as landowner, just as into the role of father of a family, citizen, or Christian, and to awaken in him the readiness to accept outside help. Two-thirds of the population earn their living from agriculture. According to the statistics of CEPAC there are in Colombia 32 *latifundia* with a total of more than 480,000 hectares, 120,000 *minifundia* with only 54,000 hectares, and so on the average hardly two and a half hectares per farm, and a further 268,000 small farms with less than two hectares each. Previously this situation was a good soil for Communist propaganda. The Colombian Church, on the other hand, was always bound by means of its pastors to the rural population. For the farmer the pastor represented the leader, who was followed without hesitation, not only in spiritual but in material affairs. From colonial times, priests were the pioneers in the construction of streets, aqueducts, schools, and hospitals.[139]

---

[136] "El episcopado colombiano condena la CNT. Pastoral colectiva," *Revista Javeriana* 43 (Bogotá 1955), 129–238.

[137] *Revista Javeriana* 49 (Bogotá 1958), 37.

[138] Ibid. 50 (Bogotá 1958), 43f.

Communist Infiltration in the University

The twentieth Episcopal Conference at Bogotá in a document examined the national crisis which impaired social life, analyzed its bases, and offered guidelines for a suitable solution. The Church seeks reform of the social structures, but declares at the same time: A true Catholic cannot reconcile the religious attitude with injustice and violence in the social field. Only an integrated Catholic concept, so the announcement says, will overcome the Communist threat. It is not a crust of bread that the Colombian people demand but complete respect for the dignity of the person, integrated by Christ into the unity of the Church.[140] The Episcopal Conference indicated the danger of Communist infiltration into education, especially in the nation's universities.[141]

The Postconciliar Church

In April 1965 the archbishops of the eight most important dioceses of Colombia expressed themselves on the present situation of the nation and the problems which jeopardize the stability of institutions and could lead to anarchy and chaos. The most important causes: the violence prevailing for many years, with many deaths; unemployment and crowding of people in poor lodgings, conditioned by the move of large masses of persons from the countryside to the cities; exaggerated quest for profits; speculation with all goods; attacks on and kidnappings of persons; destroyed families, left in the lurch by the father; obscene films and those that glorify violence and crime; the progress of Communism—supreme danger for religion and country. Peace, say the bishops, is the result of truth, justice, love, and liberty, for which they pray.[142]

---

[139] V. Andrade, S.J., "Es necesario conocer el planteamiento católico de la reforma agraria en Colombia. Primer congreso nacional católico de vida rural (Bogotá 24–27 Nov. 1959). Congreso nacional compesino, 25–28 Nov. 1959," *Revista Javeriana* 53 (Bogotá 1960), 3–6.

[140] J. Martínez Cárdenas, S.J., "Declaración de la jerarquía," *Revista Javeriana* 54(Bogotá 1960), 683–86.

[141] "Comunismo en la Universidad de Colombia?" *Revista Javeriana* 54(Bogotá 1960), 683–86.

[142] "Orientación de la jerarquía," *Revista Javeriana* 63 (Bogotá 1965), 412–16.

The National Plan for Pastoral Care

Presented in 1966 to the twenty-second Episcopal Conference, it followed the recommendations for pastoral reform of the Second Vatican Council and was approved by the Church of Colombia.[143] Pastoral action had to be extraordinary, thanks to the sacrifice with which it was pushed; uniform, that is, the same solutions for the same problems; planned, that is, with exactly established aims and priorities.[144]

Pastoral Letter to the International Eucharistic Congress

The Colombian bishops issued a pastoral letter to the International Eucharistic Congress at Bogotá of 18–25 August 1968, with the following topical content: In the sense of the congress, which in the light of faith represents an echo of life in the Church renewing itself, and in the spirit of the Second Vatican Council, one must try to construct the genuine Christian community. It will stand at the focal point of all nations and be a way to the unity of men.[145] Shortly before, on 4 May 1968, the twenty-second Episcopal Conference had directed a message to priests.[146]

The Priestly Group of Golconda

The group first met in July 1968 to go more deeply into the encyclical *Populorum progressio,* and for the second time in December of the same year to discuss the social problems of Colombia. The final document explained its ideological guidelines. The priests regarded their participation in the political life of the nation as a duty of conscience and an exercise of charity in its deepest sense. In the orientations for their activities they rejected the idea of restricting themselves to limiting work which would lose sight of national and international perspectives. Futhermore, they asserted their strict rejection of neocolonial capitalism, which is incapable of solving the problems of their country. A form of society of a socialist stamp is necessary. It should extirpate all types of exploitation of men by men and be in harmony with the historical tendencies of this period and the characteristics of Colombians.[147]

Implementation of the Medellín Decrees

The Episcopal Conference met at the beginning of July 1969 to discuss the application of the decrees of Medellín. Despite the justified desire for change, three positions could be maintained. The first is indifference, in regard to which only one's own interests matter and one acts as though the problems of change do not concern one; this attitude is comfortable, but very dangerous. As a second attitude there is that of the integralists; they desire to preserve everything because everything has a value, the loss of which can be painful; this attitude makes change difficult and intensifies the tensions with the champions of change. Finally, there are the radicals: they are in the front line and irreconcilable; they regard the past as a mere failure and steadfastly proclaim the new order. Amazingly, the conservatives and the radicals often join hands and thus one dogma replaces the other. The Church, on the other hand, which now unconditionally needs a renewal, must live in a permanent process of conversion from the Gospel, and this especially demands an interior reform by each and every member of the Church. The Church is there to serve people. Thus is manifested its desire for change, from immobility to dynamism, the effect of which will be the renewal of the whole person.[148]

---

[143] "El plan pastoral del episcopado colombiano," *Revista Javeriana* 67 (1967), 321f.

[144] Cf. ibid., 351f.

[145] Cf. *SEDOC* 2 (Aug. 1968), 225–30.

[146] Ibid. 1 (Oct. 1968), 571–85.

[147] Ibid. 1 (May 1969), 1453–60.

Birth Control

In view of the government's birth control campaign, the Colombian episcopate published a statement on 2 October 1969. In it the problem of family planning is examined. The Church claims the right to interpret natural law and to defend the personal rights of people. The problem of birth control, like every other related to human life, must be considered in the mirror of the human being and his natural and supernatural vocation.[149]

Land Reform and Limitation of Property

The Permanent Commission of the Episcopal Conference in 1971 proposed a land reform and a limitation of the landed property which could belong to one person or one group, including the Church and the state. The declaration was published the day preceding a twenty-four-hour general strike which was proclaimed by the unions to achieve urban and agricultural reforms. Colombia can no longer wait for land reform.[150]

Catholic-Anglican Dialogue

From 9 to 14 February 1971 there took place at Bogotá a meeting between Catholic and Anglican bishops which had been prepared by the ecumenical division of CELAM and the *Conferencia Anglicana Latinoamericana* (CALA). Ten bishops from each side took part; their aim was an exchange of ideas as well as a better acquaintance. Four themes were to be discussed: Holy Scripture; relations between Catholics and Anglicans in Latin America; authority, office, and sacraments; cooperation in the missions.[151]

---

[148] Ibid. 2 (Nov. 1969), 649–54.

[149] Ibid. 2 (May 1970), 1461–63; cf. *Revista Javeriana* 68 (Bogotá 1967), 197–209.

[150] *AICA* 15, 754f. (20 May 1971), 26f.

Social Security for the Clergy

In its last plenary meeting in 1971, the Episcopal Conference unanimously decided to establish social security for the priests. This guarantees almost 3,000 priests against the risks of old age, sickness, and in the case of death.[152]

VENEZUELA

Venezuela is a federal republic with 912,050 square kilometers and 11 million inhabitants, of whom ca. 100,000 are Indians; 94 percent are Catholics. The great natural resources, gold and petroleum, cause an imbalance in the economic structure of the nation, for to the degree that the production of petroleum increases, workmen abandon agriculture; at the same time the cost of living has so grown that as early as 1942 Venezuela was one of the most expensive countries in the world.[153]

Ecclesiastical Organization

From the beginning of the twentieth century the Church of Venezuela has had a considerable lack of priests, caused especially by the suppression of the monasteries in the nineteenth century. The archdiocese of Caracas had capable archbishops: Juan Bautista Castro (1904–15), Felipe Rincón González (1916–46), Lucas Guillermo Castillo (1946–55), Rafael Arías Blanco (1955–56). Castro in particular fostered a better formation of the clergy, spread of devotion to the Eucharist, retreats for men, founding of colleges by religious, systematic spread of catechesis, rearrangement of dioceses by a better common pastoral care, founding of seminaries and new parishes, and improvement of Indian pastoral care. In 1962 the republic had three archdioceses, twelve dioceses, one prelacy *nullius,* and four vicariates apostolic.[154] In 1975 there were six archdioceses: Caracas, Mérida, Ciudad

---

[151] Ibid. 15, 758f. (17 June 1971), 33–35.

[152] Ibid. 17, 813 (20 July 1972), 31f.

[153] Cf. V. Vives, op. cit. IV/2, 609–12; Maldonado, *Anuario católico de Venezuela* (1962), 55–65.

[154] V. Iriarte, *La arquidiócesis de Caracas de 1900–1966,* 365–69; Maldonado, op. cit.

Bolívar, Barquisimeto, Maracaibo, and Valencia; seventeen dioceses and four vicariates apostolic: Caroní, Puerto Ayacucho, Machiques, and Tucupita.[155]

In 1971 there were 798 parishes. Lay organizations consist of, among others, Catholic Action, Catholic Young Workers, the Legion of Mary, The Christian Family Movement, a union of Catholic teachers, a center for film culture; the *Opus Dei* and the Venezuelan Society of Saint Vincent de Paul are active.[156]

The Catholic university Andrés Bello, founded 25 September 1953, was elevated to a papal university on 29 September 1963. The seminary of Santa Rosa, interdiocesan since 1927, was entrusted to the Jesuits in 1916, but since 19 August 1956 to the Eudists. In the 175 Church schools and 312 colleges 104,414 students were instructed.[157]

In keeping with the motu proprio *Ecclesiae Sanctae,* a Priests' Council with eighteen members and a Pastoral Council were established on 6 August 1966. Several commissions were incorporated in the Secretariat for Social Action, Education, and Vocations: for liturgy, sacred art, church music, and travel movements, which exercised their activity in sixteen different places; a Secretariat for Church Information with a research center for social and socioreligious questions was added.[158] To make up for the lack of priests, the meeting for the promotion of pastoral vocations, held at Caracas from 14 to 19 April 1967, proposed to the bishops the founding of appropriate centers.[159]

Situation of the Church

The common pastoral letter on the occasion of the nineteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, issued from Caracas on 22 March 1967, describes the real situation of the Church of Venezuela: "Although only a few deny the existence of God, a 'practical' atheism has spread, which consists in forgetting God and every spiritual order, indifference toward the Church, adoration of prosperity as the *ultima ratio* of life and of the creation of mankind. For not a small number sin is already a meaningless word, for they know no fundamental difference between good and evil." In the effort to adapt oneself to modern thought and with disregard for the Church's *magisterium,* Christianity is given an arbitrary and fruitless interpretation and thereby uncertainty of faith is created.[160] In a memorandum of the Bureau for Social and Economic Studies of 1967 attention is called to the fact that in 1963 46.3 percent of the newly born were illegitimate, 20 percent of the total population had had no education, the teachers of all grades were uninterested in religion. Pastoral care must conclude especially that Christian social doctrine must be introduced into the seminaries and Catholic universities as an obligatory course.[161]

---

[155] *Directorio de la Iglesia católica en Venezuela* (1975), 400f.

[156] Ibid., 300–356.

[157] Ibid., 341; Maldonado, op. cit.; *Annuario Pontificio 1977,* 1404.

[158] V. Iriarte, op. cit. 369.

[159] L.C.; *Conclusiones de la I asamblea arquidiocesana de pastoral vocacional. Sic* 30, 254–56.

Social Works

The Work for the Protection of the Child (OPAN) was founded in 1948 by Alfonso J. Alfonzo Vaz. There children from ages six to eight were accepted so that they could grow up in a family environment in various units; in 1962 six houses with 120 places were already in operation.[162] The work *Fe y Alegría* takes care of abandoned children. Established at Caracas in 1955 by a group of university students under the direction of Father José María Vélez, it first worked in the poorest quarters of Caracas, but then spread out to the entire city and its neighborhood, and supports preschools, public and vocational schools, an institute for apprentices with attached schools for secretaries and printers. In the urban quarter Unión de Petare a model center was erected with the following departments: public school with 2,000 pupils, public evening school for adults and youth, children's outpatient department, recreational centers for children and youth, cutting and sewing courses, mess. Similar institutions were established in the interior of the country, at Maracay, Valencia, Barquisimeto, and Maracaibo, and outside the republic in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia.[163]

Care of Souls

A special importance pertains to the Episcopal Conference of 27 August to 5 September 1970. One priest from each diocese and representatives of religious institutes took part in the discussions. Important themes were: mixed marriages; definitive rejection of drugs; education of priests in seminaries with special attention to a formation of future priests that is close to reality, which should be assured by practical activity in various professions. A sign of the changed times was the participation of sixty priests from other dioceses, who arrived without invitation in order to express their partly different opinion on important questions. Thus the Church must take a greater stand for the liberation of the people and declericalize itself, that is, understand the episcopal and priestly office as a service and grant the laity a cooperation in the direction of the Church. They proposed to the episcopate a permanent dialogue, because they felt themselves to be the Church and coresponsible for its mission.[164] Previously, on 19 July 1969, the Venezuelan episcopate had sent a letter to the priests on the model of the priest. The bishops asserted that hitherto in Venezuela there had been no internal confrontations as elsewhere. On the question of celibacy they noted: The general priesthood of the baptized differs not only in degree but essentially from the priesthood of orders, whose sacramental character unites it with the High Priest Christ, the Head. It is a baseless supposition that the ecclesiastical law of celibacy will be changed or abolished.[165] Seventy-five priests replied to this letter that in fact hitherto there have been no open confrontations in the clergy on the function of the Church, but this does not mean that the situation in Venezuela does not contradict the spirit of the Gospel. The clergy must be desacralized and cease to feel themselves a privileged class. In regard to celibacy it is primarily a question why and how the priest can act theocentrically and at the same time anthropocentrically. With appeal to the words of Pope Paul VI and of the Congress of Medellín, these priests stated: "If we do not henceforth share in the process of social liberation, all else is of no use." The Church of Venezuela carries out no evangelization of the poor, because it is closely connected with power and wealth, it does not evangelize the rich in order not to explain to them the demands of the Gospel. Even more: It supplies no proof that it is a Church in the service, first, of the poor and then of all others.[166] The pastoral plan provides for the evangelization of ca. 100,000 Indians, who for the most part live in the prelacy of San Fernando de Apure and in the vicariates of El Caroní, Machiques, Puerto Ayacucho, and Tucupita. The mission of the Spanish Capuchins at Santa Teresita de Cavanayen possesses a model character.[167]

---

[160] *XIX centenario del martirio de los apóstoles Pedro y Pablo. Carta pastoral colectiva. Sic* 30, 261–63.

[161] *Síntesis sociales elaboradas por el CIAS. Informe sobre la realidad de Venezuela, Sic* 30, 371–80.

[162] Maldonado, op. cit., 101.

[163] Ibid., 100f.; *AICA* 17(1972), 817, 25–27, 29.

As the archbishop of Maracaibo, Roa Pérez, reported at the 1974 Roman Synod of Bishops, small charismatic groups, consisting mostly of young people, make themselves noted in Venezuela, who stand in opposition to the ecclesiastical authority, and in the clergy there is also Marxist influence. Catechetical instruction is unsatisfactory. The state school allows religious instruction, but not in the schools which teach higher levels than the minimum requirements of compulsory school attendance.[168]

---

[164] J. I. Arrieta, *La conferencia episcopal nacional* I: *Ambiente de la conferencia,* II: *Tematíca de la conferencia, Sic* 33, 348–51.

[165] *SEDOC* 2 (May 1970), 1448–52; *Christus* 410, 794f.

[166] *SEDOC* 2, 1453–60; *Christus* 410, 795–808; cf. also *SEDOC* 4, 1013–18.

[167] Maldonado, op. cit., 490; *AICA* 17, 809, 12f.

CUBA

Cuba has a total area of 114,500 square kilometers and in 1968 had a population of 4,315,000 urban inhabitants and 3,759,100 rural dwellers. According to the 1970 statistics, the population reached 8,553,385, of whom 70 percent are white, 12.4 percent black, and 17.3 percent mulattoes; 3,819,000 were Catholics in 1977.

From 1940 to 1944 Fulgencio Batista was president of the republic; he pursued a policy that favored the workers. In 1944 he was succeeded by Ramón Grau San Martín. After several uprisings Batista became president again in 1952, until he was overthrown by the revolution of Fidel Castro. On 1 January 1959 Oswaldo Dorticós Torrado was sworn in as president, but in reality Fidel Castro decided policy. The agricultural reform and the economic quarrel with the United States brought about the rapprochement of Castro with the Soviet Union, sealed with the defense pact of September 1962. The economic blockade imposed by the United States would almost have led to a military confrontation, had not the Soviet Union withdrawn from the island. The Cuban opposition and the danger of international measures of boycott forced Castro to tone down his policy. On 1 January 1961 Cuba was declared a socialist republic.[169]

Ecclesiastical Structure

Cuba has two archdioceses: San Cristóbal de la Habana, with the suffragan sees of Matanzas and Pinar del Río, and Santiago de Cuba, with the suffragans of Camagvey and Cienfuegos-Santa Clara.[170] In 1971 there were on the island 228 parishes, but only 208 priests, which means more than 41,000 inhabitants per priest. Of the 208 priests 112 were from orders or congregations, and of these there are 21 Jesuits, 18 members of Foreign Mission Society of the Province of Quebec, 15 Franciscans, 20 Capuchins, besides Carmelites, Passionists, Dominicans, Salesians, Christian Brothers, and Claretians. These 112 religious priests care for a total of 577 parishes, churches of religious and chapels, and 285 pastoral stations. They also work in the diocesan curias, on episcopal commissions, and in other institutions; 58 of them are active in the archdiocese of Habana and the capital city. In addition, there are 236 sisters from fifteen congregations; most strongly represented among them are the Sisters of Mercy with 76 members.[171]

---

[168] *Osservatore Romano,* 2 Oct. 1974.

[169] Cf. G. Bleiberg, ed., *Diccionario de Historia de España. Cuba en el siglo XX* I, 2d ed. (Madrid 1968), 1049f.

[170] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 952.

Pastoral Letter of the Bishops

In view of the problematic situation in Cuba the episcopate on 7 August 1960 published a common pastoral letter with the following content: The Church has always joyfully taken note of all those measures which make a contribution to the improvement of the level of life. In this connection it has noted with satisfaction for a year that a land reform is planned, which provides compensation for the owners and enables many workers to take into their own possession the acres worked by them. There is word of great industrial plans, which would not disturb private industry, with the intention of creating many new places for work for the struggle against unemployment. It was stated that the authorities were working to lower the cost of living and to raise the income of families. New hospitals, schools, and social lodgings were to be built, and not least of all it was desired to take up the fight to restore the public finances. The social reforms, to the extent that they aimed, with respect for human rights, to improve the economic, cultural, and social situation of those of moderate means, would have the support of the Church. A reason for anxiety for the bishops was, however, the continued progress of Communism, the acceptance of intimate economic, cultural, and diplomatic relations with the most important Communist countries, and the fact that journalists, politicians, union leaders, and even personalities of the government had often sung the praise of the social order of these countries. If one proceeds from the fact that Communism and Catholicism are mortal enemies, one must definitely condemn Communism, which in one way or another destroys human rights.[172]

The Economic Situation of the Cuban Church

In an open letter of 4 December 1960 to Fidel Castro the bishops explained the economic situation of the Church in Cuba: publication of revolutionary texts with clearly Marxist tendency; arrest of several priests who had read the bishops' letter of 7 August 1960 in the churches; antireligious campaign on the national level with increasing use of force; mass rallies with the approval of the authorities, at which priests were reviled; insulting of the bishops and of Catholic institutions by representatives of quasi-Catholic associations, who try to fight the Church's leadership. The letter enumerates various events of this campaign against the Church; the bishops hope that the government will take the necessary measures to stop the constant attacks against Catholics.[173]

---

[171] "Almanaque de Caridad. Directorio eclesiástico de Cuba 1971," *AICA,* 16, 788 (27 Jan. 1972), 33–35.

[172] *Revista Javeriana* 55 (Bogotá 1961), 99–102.

The archbishop of Santiago de Cuba gave to his pastoral letter of February 1961 the heading: "With Christ or Against Christ." In all openness he said: "For us at this moment the hour of fear is past—in case it ever existed at all. We are fighting Communism—we still say it—not for counterrevolutionary, partisan political, economic, or social reasons. We are fighting it because we know that we thereby display a positive service as we fulfill a holy duty. It is a fight for life or death, between Christ and Antichrist. And so each must choose his leader. As regards Catholics, they must know that the hour to prove our power of resistance and our readiness to fight has come. If God is for us, says Saint Paul, who can overcome us? Your will be done, O Lord! May he give us the peace that is based on truth and justice." Thus ended the letter and with it also a section of history.[174] The Church of Cuba will for the future be a Church of silence.

The Persecuted Church

Only the most important events will be mentioned. The date 1 May 1961 was abundant in expressions and deeds of the government against the Church. In his speech Fidel Castro accused the "Falangist" clergy of having taken part in the frustrated invasion of the island at the Bay of Pigs and made known that as a countermeasure the Spanish and other foreign priests would be expelled from the country, their property confiscated, and religious instruction approved only in churches. The press later reported that this order had as its consequence the emigration of hundreds of priests, brothers, and sisters to other countries. Of the then 730 priests on the island, only the approximately eighty Cubans could remain to care for 6.5 million persons. The bishops, who called for a land reform, saw their demands partly fulfilled by the reform of 1959. For the implementation of a reform of education they organized a mass demonstration in Havana at the end of 1959. Toward the end of 1961 Father Germán Lence, born a Cuban and leader of a Catholic society, caused a great stir in the capital when in sermons and lectures he violently attacked the Cuban bishops and praised the Cuban revolution. It is not surprising that Fidel Castro publicly praised him in a speech of 27 November 1960 before the University of Havana. Lence was later suspended *a divinis.* In March 1961 a bombing attempt occurred at the Nobel Academy in La Víbora, the Old City quarter of Havana, in which a few professors and students were injured. The explosive charge was probably set by collaborators of the government in order to be able to develop a press campaign against the priests, which then actually took place. This affair entered history under the title "Revolution of 2 March." The daily *Combate* designated it on 8 May 1960 as an internationally planned campaign, that more than 2,000 priests and religious had applied for permission to emigrate; in this regard it was ignored that in a speech of 1 May 1960 Fidel Castro had announced their expulsion from the island. Spokesmen of the government stated that an anti-Communist was also a counterrevolutionary. Thus in Cuba the Church lives in a permanent state of persecution.[175]

---

[173] Ibid., 103–6.

[174] Ibid., 107–11.

The Standpoint of the Bishops

In March 1969 the Cuban bishops had translated into practical guidelines of renewal the results of the second plenary assembly of the Latin American episcopate. At their meeting in April of the same year they chose as the topic of discussion Pope Paul VI's opening address at the Congress of Medellín of 1968; they were aware of being the conduit of the papal pronouncements. On 10 April 1969 they published the papal speech in Havana. They adhered to the recommendation of the Pope, who in his talk described as follows the attitude of the Christian in a suffering world struggling for its further development: "We must advance the deep, foreseeable transformation which is necessary in many areas of our present society, as we love more and learn to love; we must do this with judicious energy, with perseverance and confidence in people, and with the assurance of the faith in the help of God and the power of the good."[176]

At the close of their meeting of September 1969 the Cuban bishops issued a statement with the following themes: problem of faith; analysis of faith; present-day atheism; deficient expressions of faith; growth of faith; liturgy; bible; catechesis; ways to faith. "This is the hour in which we must discover the presence of God among us; it is a question of proving our maturity and not of a death struggle. Maturity and growth mean to let something die in order to gain new knowledge. Hence an hour in which, surrounded by snobbery or extreme deviation and human sin, the desire for justice and authenticity of human relations grows on the personal level among the various social groups and in the sphere of international relations." As sheperds in the service of the Cuban Church, the bishops encouraged their faithful to keep alive their love of Christ in this national situation, unprecedented in Latin America. They expressed their hope that they may find in this situation the means which are suited to show their brothers the way to God.[177]

---

[175] "Cuba: La Iglesia católica y Fidel Castro," *Revista Javeriana* 55, 278–92.

[176] *SEDOC* 2 (Sept. 1969), 347–52.

Decrease of the Cuban Clergy

In the last years the number of Cuban priests has dropped by more than 10 percent. In 1969 there were ca. 215, in 1970 202, in 1971 only 193, although 15 priests were ordained in this year. This decrease must be referred to cases of death—the average age is sixty-seven—and emigration. Those priests who leave the country are foreigners—60 percent of the priests in the country are of foreign ancestry. The reasons for leaving are age, sickness, or the ending of their obligation in Cuba. The losses through return to the lay state are minimal in Cuba. Almost the only activity still allowed to the Cuban priest is the care of the churches. The government has formally promised to admit a few Cuban priests who have studied abroad and foreign priests who want to work in Cuba. But, as of 1974, hence, in practical terms, today, this promise has not yet been kept. In 1972 there were 58 Cuban seminarians and some candidates for the priesthood; but this number is inadequate in the long run to make up for the losses of the last years.[178]

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Dominican Republic on the island of Santo Domingo has an area of 48,442 square kilometers and ca. 4.4 million inhabitants. It includes the archdiocese of Santo Domingo and the dioceses of Barahona, La Vega, Nuestra Señora de la Altagracia de Higüey, San Juan de la Maguana, and Santiago de los Caballeros. In the coordination of the national pastoral care there is collaboration among the commissions for liturgy, means of communication, religious education, charity, social action (*Iustitia et pax*), lay apostolate, vocations, seminaries, religious institutes and missions, legal and concordat affairs, the national secretariat for community pastoral care, the Dominican Conference for Religious, the Dominican *Caritas,* and the National Association of Catholic Schools.[179]

---

[177] Ibid. 2 (June 1970), 1581–88.

[178] *AICA,* 16, 803 (11 May 1972), 23f.

[179] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 953; *Directorio de la Iglesia católica en República Dominicana* (1972), 8–12.

The archdiocese of Santo Domingo had in the census of 1970 in an area of 8,007.72 square kilometers 1,374,939 inhabitants, with 100 parishes, which were attended to by 40 priests and 181 religious. Eighteen institutes of men and 34 of women worked in the field of pastoral care in parishes, schools, high schools, academies, and other institutions. The archdiocese has 3 universities, 56 elementary schools, and 13 high schools. Health institutions number 17 hospitals and 1 leprosarium. To the archdiocese belong 215 priests and 65 assistants.

The other dioceses display a similar structure. Santiago de los Caballeros has, with 11,003.41 square kilometers and 1,047,683 inhabitants, 38 parishes, 35 priests, 66 religious priests, 32 brothers, and 257 sisters. In addition, there are in the diocese 10 institutes of men and 15 of women. The diocese has the Catholic university Madre y Maestra, the school for the humanities Arzobispo Merino, and the minor seminary San Pio X, and 23 schools. The diocese of Vega has, with 8,142.73 square kilometers and 751,620 inhabitants, 36 parishes, 24 priests, and 58 religious priests, 7 institutes of men and 11 of women, and 20 schools. The diocese of San Juan de la Maguana has, with 15,165.25 square kilometers and 560,086 inhabitants, 19 parishes, 3 priests, and 31 religious priests, 6 institutes of men and 12 of women, and 10 schools. The diocese of Nuestra Señora de la Altragracia has, with 6,614.37 square kilometers and 276,930 inhabitants, 13 parishes, 11 priests, and 7 religious priests.[180]

The Concordat between the Holy See and the Dominican Republic

The concordat was signed in Vatican City on 16 June 1954. The essential agreements are as follows, in the words of the text: Paragraph 1: "The Catholic, apostolic, and Roman religion remains the religion of the Dominican nation." Paragraph 3: "The Holy See is empowered to proclaim and publish all directives affecting the Church; furthermore, to be in contact with prelates, clergy, and faithful of the nation, and vice versa." Paragraph 9: "The erection, modification, or suppression of parishes, benefices, and ecclesiastical offices . . . are subject to the ecclesiastical authority, in accord with the canon law." Paragraph 11: "Ecclesiastical persons cannot be interrogated by judges or other officials in regard to deeds and facts which have been made known to them under the seal of Confession." Paragraph 15: "The Dominican Republic recognizes full civil rights of those marriages which are contracted in accord with the canon law." Paragraph 19: "The Church may establish seminaries or other educational institutions without restriction; their internal structure is not and cannot be infringed upon by the state. The titles granted in them have the same validity as those granted in state institutions." Paragraph 21: "The Dominican state guarantees to the Catholic Church full liberty to found and maintain under its direction schools of every type. Because of the social gain for the nation the state will support them materially. Religious instruction in these schools is organized and imparted by the Church. The instruction provided by the state in the public schools will be oriented to the principles of Catholic doctrine and morality."[181]

---

[180] *Directorio de la Iglesia catolica en República Dominicana,* 13–170.

The Church in Public Life

Monseñor Juan Félix Pepén y Solimán, bishop of Higüey, in 1968 published a pastoral letter with an appeal to the consciousness of all that the situation of the propertyless farmer be investigated and a reform in accord with the pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes* be set in motion. Against the strong criticism that at once appeared, the clergy took its place at the bishop's side.[182]

In July 1969 the Dominican government refused to grant a visa to Fathers Sergio Figueredo, S.J., and Graciano Varona, O.S.B. In spite of the intervention of the nuncio and the bishops, the government persisted in its attitude; this caused the Jesuits to make known their attitude to the case. They testified to Father Figueredo's loyalty to the norms and spirit of the Church in his activity. "Our attitude," said the Jesuits, "is that of service; it is based on the Gospel and on the teaching of the Church, has no partisan political relationship, and is free from the exercise of any sort of pressure in the area of civilian life; it will challenge only the personal and common consciousness. We are ready to carry out this renewal entirely as proof of our service to the People of God in the Dominican Republic."[183]

Cardinal Octavio Antonio Beras Rojas, archbishop of Santo Domingo, thus presented the ecclesiastical situation in the republic at the 1974 Roman Synod of Bishops: The courses for the preparation for baptism and marriage have experienced a great upsurge. Since great importance pertains to the problem of "Liberation" as expression of the Christian purpose, two types of pastoral activity have been started: by the first the sense of human brotherhood and the state of being children of God is awakened, by the second "Liberation" is recommended which makes the Church more credible and the presence of God in society more clearly evident. In order to intensify the participation of the laity in evangelization and thereby to alleviate the lack of priests, the "assemblies of presidents" have been called into being. The bishop expressly entrusts prepared lay persons with the function "of organizing an assembly and presiding over it." In this connection they should explain the Word of God, administer Communion, and, if they are qualified, take care of the spiritual and material welfare of the congregations and bring the Eucharist to the sick. The president, who is supported by a council, can be single or married, but he must display a definite maturity, be a practicing Catholic, have adequate financial means, obtain the consent of the congregation, and prepare himself in catechetical programs of a total of 280 hours. This new institution has produced better results than the diaconate of married persons. The meeting of families, taking place twice a month, has also had good results; they are under the direction of a well-prepared moderator. A national institute annually decides the program and gives directions and guidelines for implementation.[184]

---

[181] *Estudios* 469, 40–44.

[182] *Sic* 32, 188–94.

[183] *SEDOC* 3, 361–64.

PANAMA

Panama has a total area of 75,650 square kilometers and ca. 1.5 million inhabitants, of whom 18 percent are Creoles, 10 percent Indians, 52 percent mestizos, 15 percent blacks, and 5 percent mulattos; in 1971 85.5 percent were Catholics.

The Situation of the Church

The nation embraces the archdiocese of Panama, the dioceses of Chitré, David, Santiago de Veraguas, the prelacy of Bocas del Toro, and the vicariate apostolic of Darién.[185] In 1971 there were 102 parishes. The recruitment for the priesthood has inadequate results: from 1940 to 1950 seven priests were ordained, from 1951 to 1960 eleven, and from 1961 to 1964 three. Religious vocations are also rare. Of the 148 religious priests on hand in 1967, the majority were foreigners; the same is true of the 53 assistants and of the 364 sisters. Private educational institutions are usually in the hands of religious.[186]

The following are active on the national level: Catholic Action; the Association of Catholic Women with houses throughout the country; the Christian Family Movement; the Catechetical School, which takes care of the formation of teachers in religious instruction; the Marian Congregation *Stella Maris;* the Secretariat for Social Courses. The Catholic Center of Education is the focal point of all apostolic endeavors. Also to be named are: the papal missionary works; the Secretariat for the Christian Faith with 62 centers in Chiriqui, 62 in Santiago, and 64 in Panama; the Catholic Work for Emigrants; and Radio Hogar.[187]

---

[184] *Osservatore Romano,* 2 Oct. 1974.

[185] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 953; *Anuario eclesiástico de Panamá* (1965), 18–36, 129–70.

[186] The statistics on the clergy of the individual areas of jurisdiction in *Anuario eclesiástico de Panamá* (1965), 23–62.

Social Revaluation

Following its meeting of 19 to 21 February 1968 at Colón, the episcopate proclaimed the decrees enacted, which dealt with the social situation in the nation, and announced a national synod with participation of the laity at the end of the year. The bishops designated as incompatible with the Church's social doctrine the fact of the concentration of landed property in a few hands, while the majority of the rural population lives in poverty. Christians who are economically well-off are reminded that the faith must express itself in deeds. Workers and peasants are encouraged to use their scanty means for the education of their children and to give up unnecessary expenses. With a reference to the impending election fight, the bishops indicated the danger that, because of accusations made by the one side or the other, families could be torn apart. Those responsible for the means of communication—press, radio, television—were reminded by the bishops of their responsibility, which demanded that they maintain objectivity in their presentation of events, despite personal views. They also called attention to the fact that Christian festivals are not suitable occasions for political activities.[188]

Religious Life in Central America and Panama

The bishops of Central America and Panama organized the first meeting for reflection at Panama from 16 to 20 March 1970. At it the following topics were treated: lack of priestly vocations; renewal and adaptation of the religious life; lack of superiors in the mostly native congregations; tensions between native and foreign priests; demands of sisters for more autonomy in the solving of their problems; apathy in regard to the National Conference of the Orders, especially on the part of the men.[189]

Arrest and Expulsion of Father Luis Medrano, S.J.

On the occasion of the arrest and expulsion of Father Luis Medrano, S.J., director of Radio Hogar in Panama City, Monseñor Marcos Gregorio McGrath, C.S.C., archbishop of Panama, in the course of a

---

[187] Ibid., 56–62.

[188] *SEDOC* 2 (Aug. 1968), 237–40.

[189] Ibid. 3 (Sept. 1970), 347–54.

Mass carried on television, delivered a talk which dealt with this occurrence. He presented the expulsion of Medrano as a sign of the abolition of free speech in Panama and claimed for the Church the freedom which its function required. The hard truth was, he said, that often in a democracy the rights of all become the privileges of the few; these few prevent necessary reforms by exercising their political and economic power. The Church openly expresses itself for a development favoring all persons and claims for every person a minimum of freedom of opinion, the inviolability of his home, and "a fair trial in case of arrest."[190]

The Church and Reform of the National Constitution

In view of the announced reform of the constitution, the bishops on 27 June 1972 issued a decision in behalf of the human values anchored in the constitution. They pointed out that the majority of the population—natives, peasants, and recipients of social support—must be taken into consideration. They constituted the majority, and this majority demanded priority. They must obtain the possibility of participating in political life, use the institutions of health care and education, and acquire jobs. Paragraph 36 of the now valid constitution recognizes the Catholic religion as the religion of the majority of the population; the Catholic religion is taught in the schools. The participation of the pupils in acts of worship is not a duty if such is so desired by the parents or their representatives. This regulation is regarded by the bishops as a recognition of the Church within the national structure.[191]

After nine months of silence Archbishop Marcos Gregorio McGrath delivered an address on 23 August 1972 on the occasion of a protest Mass which had been organized by a lay group to proclaim their sympathy with the Archbishop, who had become the target of a defamatory press campaign. He had been charged with being too intellectual, too indecisive, not a Panamanian, a friend of politicians and the wealthy, and an enemy of the regime; he was a bishop for councils and for conferences at Medellín. The archbishop took a position on all these points as follows: "I ask all my priestly brothers, the cooperating laity, and all others to have understanding and pardon for my mistakes; for my part, I try to understand and forgive those of the others, although I do not always succeed. They are my real brothers."[192]

---

[190] Ibid., 361–64.

[191] Ibid. 5 (Jan. 1973), 875–80.

[192] Ibid., 880–88.

NICARAGUA

The Republic of Nicaragua has a total area of 139,000 square kilometers and 1.8 million inhabitants, that is, about twelve inhabitants per square kilometer; 17 percent are Creoles, 5 percent Indians, 9 percent blacks, and 70 percent mestizos. Other sources list 7 percent Creoles, 50 percent mestizos, and about 33 percent Indians. The most important products are coffee, cotton, and bananas. The country depends on agriculture.[193] By the bull *Quam iuxta* of 2 December 1913, Pius X detached Nicaragua from the archdiocese of Guatemala and established the new ecclesiastical province of Nicaragua. At present the archdiocese of Managua has as suffragans Estelí, Granada, León, and Matagalpa, the prelacy of Juigalpa, and the vicariate apostolic of Bluefields.[194]

Apostolic Activities

Several institutions take part in national pastoral care: the Episcopal Conference, the national seminary, the work for ecclesiastical vocations, the friends of the seminary, the papal missionary works, the Conference of the Religious of Nicaragua (CONFER), the Christian Family Movement, the means of social communication, including the Catholic Radio of Nicaragua and the broadcasting schools.

The most important cultural institutions are the Central American University, founded in 1961 and run by the Jesuits, with faculties of law, humanities, education, engineering, economics, veterinary science and zoological technique, and with the institute Mater Ecclesiae for religious culture.

According to the statistical handbook of 1967 there were in the republic 13 institutes of male religious and the Christian Brothers, 20 of female religious, who display their activity in parishes, chapels, schools, social works, outpatient departments, and hospitals. The other six jurisdictional areas have between 9 and 21 parishes and a corresponding school system.[195]

National Constitution

Since the Constituent Assembly was dominated by a radical group, there went into effect on 14 April 1939 a new constitution in which the name of God did not appear. The state has no official religion; the laicized school is institutionalized in the educational institutions operated by the state and the communes. The avowedly Catholic country expressed itself in favor of the private schools of religious, in which the number of pupils grew rapidly; even the opponents sent their children to these schools. The best known schools in the country are the Colegio Centroamericano del Sagrado Corazón de Jesús, run by the Jesuits, and the Instituto Pedagógico de Varones under the direction of the Christian Brothers; both are in Managua.[196]

---

[193] Cf. *Diccionario de historia de Espana. Nicaragua* (Época independiente) III, 2d ed. (ed. by G. Bleiberg) (Madrid 1969), 38–41.

[194] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 953: *Anuario eclesiástico de Nicaragua* (1967), 15.

[195] *Anuario eclesiástico de Nicaragua* (1967), 19–25.

Activity of the Church

In a pastoral letter of 19 February 1972 to priests, faithful, and fellow citizens, the bishops note that the Church itself has a message to deliver on the political stage, for the subject of politics is the person with all his rights and duties, which must be protected. The bishops want the political field of activity of the Church and the function of the bishops and priesthood "to work for the aim of peace and justice with all means which are in harmony with the Gospel," to be understood as a contribution to the establishing of a just order, especially where the human problems are the most difficult. The Church, say the bishops, proposes principles which proceed from the faith, advocates a change of structures and ideas, and expresses itself for bold innovations and a more just order. The bishops demand for every citizen the possibility of free decision, without fear of reprisal and a guaranteed legal protection for everyone. They further support the forming of associations, unions, and so forth, and free political elections in canton and community. These demands are unconditional, if a better world is to be built.[197]

HONDURAS

The Republic of Honduras has, according to the situation in 1972, a total area of 116,160 square kilometers and 2,975,985 inhabitants, of whom 2,440,000 were Catholics in 1971. Ecclesiastical Division: the archdiocese of Tegucigalpa with the diocese of Comayagua, San Pedro Sula, Santa Rosa de Copán, and the prelacies of Choluteca and Inmaculada Concepción de la B.V.M. in Olancho. The archdiocese of Tegucigalpa has 3 districts and 37 parishes with 17 native and 25 foreign priests and 52 religious brothers; the diocese of Santa Rosa de Copán has 25 parishes, 4 vicariates, and 4 chapels, cared for by a small number of priests; the diocese of San Pedro Sula has 16 parishes with attached chapels and about 40 priests; the diocese of Comayagua has 10 parishes with 15 priests. The prelacy of Choluteca counts 16 parishes with about 40 priests, the diocese of Olancho has 7 parishes with 22 priests. The religious brothers in charge of parishes, chapels, and schools, and the sisters for schools and the welfare institutions are distributed throughout the nation.[198]

---

[196] *Revista Javeriana* 13 (1940), 301f.

[197] *Christus* 446 (Jan. 1973), 46–50; *SEDOC* 5 (Nov. 1972), 606–14; *SEDOC* 6 (Oct. 1973), 493–500.

The *Caritas* of Honduras devotes itself to several tasks: to awaken the self-consciousness of the poor person, to investigate his real situation and the causes impeding the development of his personality; to give impetus and be concerned with community tasks by the inclusion of new forms of cooperation. Social care is an ingredient of pastoral care: direct help for the lower classes; resocialization and incorporation into the community; support in local and national concerns, in the event of natural catastrophes or similar emergencies.[199]

The broadcasting station at Suyapa is a national institution of private character with the goal of awakening among the rural population and later among the urban people the consciousness of the person in society. Every individual should understand his role as a member in the family and in society at all levels. The aims of this cultural communication do not consist in learning to read, write, and reckon and to acquire basic knowledge of religion or hygiene, but to bring the peasants to an awareness of their own possibilities and to take an active part in the development process of society, Church, and nation. The solution of this educational task is of decisive importance. The courses on Christian doctrine attract collaborators for pastoral work. The Coordinating Council supervises the methodical activity, organizes technical studies, and exerts itself for the financing. The catechetical center, which deals with the formation of catechists, provides the necessary didactic and informative material. The Christian Family Movement seeks to bring families together in order to emphasize the human and Christian values of the family. Lay persons are trained to promote a knowledge of the Bible in the basic communities with reference to the current situation of the Church. To support the maturing of youth, the Church encourages scout movements. The Legion of Mary supports pastoral tasks.[200]

The Voice of the Bishops

In a message of 4 September 1969 to the people, the bishops expressed themselves in regard to the national situation: "The painful events in our homeland compel us to reflect on them and become active. No one is free of guilt in the social injustices, the lack of respect for human dignity and of personal liberty. It is the duty of all citizens to cooperate in the rebuilding of the country in all fields and without hatred, for every time there is hatred self-destruction is caused." The bishops sent an appeal to journalists and radio announcers to adopt and disseminate these guidelines.[201]

---

[198] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 953; *Anuario de la Iglesia de Honduras* (1973), 3–6.
[199] *Anuario de la Iglesia de Honduras* (1971).
[200] Ibid.

Land Occupation

In October and November 1969 19,000 farmers occupied the great landed estates in southern Honduras. A group of owners demanded an opinion from the Church. The bishop of Choluteca recognized the difficult problem of the case and the far-reaching social impact; but he wanted neither to approve nor condemn the land occupation. "Acts of violence should not be the means of confrontation among people," the bishop quoted Pope Paul VI after the latter's visit to Africa, "but understanding and love; it must no longer be said: Man against man, but man for men and with men."[202]

On 8 January 1970 the Episcopal Conference reiterated that the Church, in addition to its most important task of being concerned with the redemption of souls, must at the same time care for the human interests of daily life. Very profoundly affected by the misery of some parts of the population because of war, floods, land occupation, violence, or poverty, the bishops explained their own ideas on the present social situation in the country.[203] In view of the situation in agriculture, made more acute by new land occupations, the episcopate in 1972 took a stand in regard to proclamations making the Church responsible for this situation. The Church recognizes, theoretically and practically, private property, but also the necessity that possession be distributed to all social classes. The Church can never approve force, for this is not a human or Christian solution. It supports no political party, not even the Christian Democrats, as some think, and allows no different treatment of native and foreign priests.[204]

EL SALVADOR

El Salvador has a total area of 21,146.08 square kilometers and, according to the census of October 1970, 3,480,281 inhabitants. The average number of inhabitants amounts to 58.8 inhabitants per square kilometer. About two-thirds of the population live in rural areas.

The republic includes the archdiocese of San Salvador and the dioceses of San Miguel, Santa Ana, Santiago de María, and San

---

[201] *SEDOC* 2 (Jan. 1972), 926–28.

[202] Ibid. 2 (June 1970, 1595–98.

[203] Ibid. 3 (Feb. 1971),1007–13.

[204] Ibid. 5 (Jan. 1973), 887f.

Vicente.[205] According to the statistics of 1969 there are in the nation 200 parishes with an average of 17,402 inhabitants per parish, 219 diocesan priests, and 218 religious priests. The archdiocese of San Salvador and the diocese of San Vicente are relatively better equipped with parishes and priests than the other dioceses. Of the 437 priests, 226 were born in El Salvador—189 diocesan and 37 religious—hence 52 percent. In 1970 only 31 seminarians were studying theology and 91 philosophy. Priestly vocations drop constantly. The nation has an annual population growth of ca. 120,000. In order to maintain the present ratio of ca. 8,000 inhabitants per priest, fifteen new priests would be necessary every year; but at the moment only eight entered upon their office.

Religious cooperate in pastoral work; so too do lay persons, who exercise such activity in educational institutions throughout the country. Altogether, 29 institutes of women with 641 sisters, 127 students, 31 novices, and 10 postulants are active; together with the male institutes they care for the majority of the private educational institutions and all types of welfare institutions. The fact that a large number of marriages were not contracted in church must be referred to the sociocultural situation or the lack of priests.[206]

Institutions on the national level are: the Association of Religious, founded on 27 August 1966 as a central office for religious institutes; the national seminary San José de la Montaña, with a philosophical and theological faculty under the direction of the Jesuits; the university José Simón Cañas; supradiocesan are, furthermore, the General Secretariat for Parish Schools, the public association *Fe y Alegría* for the founding of educational institutions; the student-lodging *Doble Via,* directed by *Opus Dei;* and so forth.[207] The old associations of the laity, such as *Guardia del Santísimo, Hijas de María, Caballeros adoradores,* have been replaced by new ones, for example, the Legion of Mary, the Christian Family Movement, and others, in which the priest is no longer the director but an adviser. In all dioceses there exists at least one institution for the education of the laity.[208]

The Land Problem and the Position of the Priests

In mid-1970 forty priests took a stand on the situation in the nation. In this regard they relied on the following data: 89 percent of the arable land is in the hands of 22 percent of owners and export firms. This property includes 50 percent of the coastal area, the richest and with the better commercial ties, while 700,000 hectares lie fallow. The remaining 11 percent of the arable land is held by 78 percent of the owners, who have no sufficient means. The farmers live in a patriarchal system, unable to assume responsibility on their own. They receive starvation wages, live in huts or in unhealthy lodgings, without enough food or access to information and without any contact with civilization. Many emigrate to other countries, conditioned by the concentration of the land in the hands of a few and the rapid growth of the population. In regard to these conditions the priests urge the following views: There is no unconditional legal claim to ownership; the farmer must fight for his own human development, and all personnel necessary for this—teachers, priests, land experts, and the like—must support him; the state must have consideration for him also in its legislation and create the legal presuppositions. The Church must urgently support those exertions which promote this function, as, for example, the Association of Christian Farmers, societies, and so forth. The priests are of the opinion that land reform involves a part of the restructuring of the nation.[209]

---

[205] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 952.

[206] *III Anuario eclesiástico de El Salvador* (1970), VII–XVI.

[207] Ibid., 33–45.

[208] Ibid., 45–56.

Against the Use of Violence

In view of the tortures, murders, kidnappings, and other acts of violence perpetrated against priests, civilians, and military personnel, the bishops published a letter on 28 February 1971: Recourse to violence can never be Christian, it contradicts the Christian message, which calls for peace and love.[210]

Seminary for Priestly Vocations

On 19 September 1972 the Franciscans dedicated in San Salvador the new seminary Fray Junípero Serra, as a reply to one of the most pressing problems of the episcopate for the promoting of priestly vocations.[211]

The Abortion Law

In a pastoral letter of 1973 the bishops condemned the legalization of abortion, after the criminal code had designated it "as not punishable." The bishops expressly reject abortion if it is performed under circumstances which Christian morality cannot accept.[212]

---

[209] *Christus* 423, 7f.

[210] *SEDOC* 4, 251–54.

[211] *AICA,* 17, 829, 19f.

[212] Ibid. 17, 864, 23f.

GUATEMALA

Guatemala has a total area of 108,889 square kilometers, with about 5 million inhabitants, of whom in 1974 4.347 million were Catholics. The ecclesiastical administration is divided thusly: the archdiocese of Guatemala, with the dioceses of Huehuetenango, Jalapa en Guatemala, Quezaltenango, San Marcos, Santa Cruz del Quiché, Solola, Vera Paz, and Zacapa, the prelacies of Escuintla and Santo Cristo de Esquipulas, and the apostolic administrations of El Petén and Izabal.[213] Ecclesiastical Organizations: National Catholic Secretariat; National Seminary in the capital; *Caritas;* papal missionary works; the Catholic university Rafael Landívar, conducted by the Jesuits; National Catechetical Center; Centers for the Protection of Youth and Common Pastoral Care. Among the movements of the lay apostolate, the most important are: Catholic Action, Christian Family Movement, National Secretariat for Christian Courses, Marian Congregations, and Apostolate of Prayer.[214]

The religious of Guatemala, organized in the *Conferencia de religiosos y religiosas de Guatemala* (Confregua), founded the higher institute for religious culture, *Regina Coeli,* with 24 institutes for brothers and 39 for sisters (statistical handbook for Guatemala of 1971). There are 387 priests, 51 assistants, and 91 brothers active in teaching.

In the republic there are 141 parishes, 96 chapels, 105 high schools, 73 schools, 4 orphanages, 402 centers for the illiterate, 1 school for agricultural social service, 1 institute for Catholic education, 3 radio schools, 602 catechist centers, 5 broadcasting stations. Two hours per week are reserved for Catholic television broadcasting.[215]

Tensions

Three priests and one sister had to leave Guatemala for cooperating with the guerrillas. Two of the priests were blood brothers and belonged to the same congregation: Thomas and Arthur Melville. In a letter of 20 January 1968 Thomas Melville expressed his opinion on his expulsion from the Maryknoll Congregation. In order to prepare to end the poverty and the sad situation of Latin America, in which, in Melville's opinion, the Church authorities are guilty, there is only the route of armed revolution. In agreement with his brother Arthur he said: "We began with this: to make it clear to the Indians that no one, apart from themselves, would defend their rights. If the government and the ruling class use arms in order to keep them, the Indians, in poverty, then they have the right to take up arms in order to defend their God-given right to be men. We and all our adherents were regarded as Communists and asked by our religious superiors and the American embassy to leave the country. We did so. But I say I am just as much a Communist as was Jesus. What I did, I did, and I will do again, following the teaching of Christ and not that of Marx or Lenin. And I say further that we are more than the hierarchy and the United States government think. If the war becomes open, the whole world will experience that we fight neither for Russia nor for China nor for any other nation, but for Guatemala." The superior general of Maryknoll declared: "The activities of Fathers Thomas and Arthur Melville represent a personal interference by American citizens in the internal affairs of a host land. Since they have declined to return to the United States in order to discuss the work accomplished in Guatemala, and because they also refused to comply with the request of their superior in Guatemala, they were suspended from their priestly office."[216]

---

[213] *Annuario Pontificio* (1977), 953.

[214] *Guía de la Iglesia de Guatemala* (n.d.), 29–38.

[215] Ibid., 43.

Monseñor Mario Casariego, archbishop of Guatemala, addressed to his faithful at Easter 1968 a pastoral letter with an invitation to penance, prayer, and works of mercy, in an effort to atone for their own and others' many sins. On 16 March he was arrested, presumably because of this letter.[217]

Pastoral Guidelines

In a difficult time for the Church of Guatemala the bishops on 6 January 1970 laid down their pastoral principles in three theses: evangelization and catechesis, human valuation, and apostolate. The Catechetical Department of the National Catholic Secretariat especially should serve for evangelization. For human valuation they demanded that priests, religious, and lay persons concern themselves with the simple population; the bishops are ready to support these exertions, especially in case of persecution by the legal system, assuming that they are in accord with the Gospel. In the apostolate they take a stand for the collaboration of all priests, religious, and lay persons, and remind them that the Church should never mix in political activities. Priests or members of apostolic movements which exploit their position for a political activity are failing their pastoral task and doing great harm to the Church.[218]

The Christian and Political Activity

Starting from the idea that participating in elections is a conscientious duty, the episcopate in a new message of 28 May 1970 reminded the priests and coworkers of the Church that the Church as such should remain far from every partisan political activity, and so in Guatemala it has entered into no obligations whatsoever with political parties and that it had no interest in whether this or that candidate gained the electoral victory.[219] In the name of the ecclesiastical province of Guatemala, the chairman and the secretary of the Episcopal Conference declared on 5 February 1971: "For a homeland that we love more than ourselves and which is in a chaos of unrest and pain, we as Christians reject and condemn every form of violence."[220]

---

[216] *SEDOC* 4 (Oct. 1968), 585–95.

[217] Ibid., 595–600.

[218] Ibid. 2 (June 1970), 1589–96.

MEXICO

Mexico has a total area of 1.963 million square kilometers and in 1969 had 47.3 million inhabitants, of whom 97 percent were Catholics, but their relations to the Church are mostly limited to baptism or a minimal contact in the course of life.[221] The 2 or 3 million Indians, for the most part baptized, live in a deplorable separation, although in recent years the exertions of religious have somewhat mitigated this situation.[222] The fact that more than 70 percent of the population were peasants or workers gave stimulus to the revolution of 1910. At the same time a Marxist influence was to be discerned through the so-called *Casa del Obrero Mundial* and the anarchist-Communist indoctrination by Flores Magón; the same is true of the socialist tendencies through the writings of Kropotkin, Proudhon, or Marx. The constitution of 1917 became a reservoir of the people's wishes, which emptied into the "Social Guarantees," whereby the state supported peasants and workers, victims of orthodox liberalism.[223] According to the United Nations statistics of 1976, the number of inhabitants amounted to 58.12 million, of whom 9 percent were Indians, 75 percent mestizos, 10 to 15 percent whites.

In the first decades of the twentieth century Mexico experienced a persecution of the Church. With a few exceptions, the bishops were imprisoned or banished, the priests almost in their entirety were kept in prison in 1914–15, sisters were expelled from the convents, Mass was forbidden, Catholic schools were closed, and almost all church property was confiscated.[224]

---

[219] Ibid. 3 (Feb. 1971), 1015–20.

[220] Ibid. 4 (Aug. 1971), 249–52.

[221] *GIMC,* 17–22.

[222] Ibid., 23.

[223] V. Vives. op. cit. IV/2, 570–73; "Fe y situación socio-politica de México, Equipo del S.S.M.," *Christus* 462 (May 1974), 46f.

[224] *BMI,* 355–61.

Constitution of 1917

The constitution of Querétaro of 5 February 1917 legalized the assault on the Church: nondenominational schools; prohibition of teaching by priests and religious; denial of state recognition of seminary studies; calling into question of celibacy and religious vows; prohibition of religious events outside the church and control by the civil authorities; prohibition of ownership by the Church and its organizations; expropriation of all direct or indirect church property in favor of the state; deprivation of all political and civil rights of priests; prohibition of the Catholic press and of all parties related to the Church.[225]

New Persecution: Plutarco Elías Calles

The persecution continued from 1917 to 1923. Calles (1924–28) demanded the application of the constitution of 1917. The Catholics established the "National League for Defense of Religious Freedom," which acquired publicity for itself and organized legal protests and boycotts. This organized opposition caused the president to issue three new laws. The second, called *Ley Calles,* forced the episcopate to stop all ecclesiastical events with participation of priests in all churches of the republic after 31 July 1926, the date when the law became effective. Now the struggle was harsher on both sides: the government applied the *Ley Calles,* the Catholics passed from passive to active armed resistance. During these years, 1926–29, the Mexican Church had its catacombs and martyrs: seventy-eight priests, religious, and lay persons were killed. Nevertheless, with a few exceptions, it remained steadfast in its faith and formed a closed front. All social classes were subject to persecution.[226]

Economic Boycott, the "Cristeros War"

Many Catholic organizations which were cared for and directed by the League planned an economic boycott to force the government to abandon the enforcement of the *Ley Calles.* Means for this were the total renunciation of all articles of luxury and a restriction in the use of the means of trade. But after all legal measures had been exhausted, the Catholics took up arms "in legitimate defense against an unjust tyranny." The armed movement was everywhere spontaneous and grew in importance from the end of 1926. It was directed by the League and its adherents were called *Cristeros* because of their war cry, *Viva Cristo Rey* and because of the crosses which they wore around the neck. The League itself called them "Defenders" and their army the

---

[225] Ibid., 361–71.

[226] Ibid., 373–412.

"National Guard." The movement was popular in more than half the states of the republic and counted about 20,000 armed men. Excesses occurred, but in general the war was waged with idealism, magnanimity, and self-sacrificing devotion. Usually, the fighters were young; they were recruited from students, workers, and peasants. There were great losses; but this war had also a positive aspect, since it shook up the awareness of the Catholic Mexicans and led to a modus vivendi, which must not be evaluated as the outcome of the war but rather as an enforced settlement.[227] The war was hard on both sides. Emilio Portes Gil, president from 1928 to 1930, stated in the press that "there is no conflict which cannot be terminated by mutual goodwill." Representatives of state and Church reached an agreement, which was ratified by Pope Pius XI in 1929 as the lesser evil and to avoid greater harm, namely the prohibition of Mass. There were protests and dissatisfaction on both sides. Many Catholics thought that what was accomplished bore no relationship to the sacrifices made, whereas many adherents of the government and the Freemasons called it a weak yielding by the president. But the agreed compromises were ever less observed by the government. The majority of the *Cristeros* submitted, but despite the amnesty some were murdered or executed. Others continued the fight or took it up again. The Church, oppressed by the persecution, had to continue to look on helplessly.[228]

Papal Documents

Pius XI attentively followed the events in Mexico and in his Encyclical *Acerba animi anxietudo* of 29 September 1932 deplored the nonobservance by the Mexican government of the negotiated modus vivendi. He praised the clergy and people of Mexico and asked the Catholics of the nation "to defend the holy rights of the Church" by prayer and the exercise of Catholic Action. The papal document was not well received by the government and the National Party, and the final sentences were interpreted as incitement to rebellion. As a result of this, the apostolic delegate, Leopoldo Ruiz y Flores, was expelled for the third time. The confiscation of Church property was continued by President Lázaro Cárdenas (1934–40), who also ordered that in all schools instruction should be given on the doctrine of socialism, Marxism, and atheism, and in sex education. These measures evoked a wave of protests, and for a time a new version of the bloody Calles regime was feared. But it soon appeared that such unpopular decrees could be carried out only by force; the government had to give in, and there were important changes in the cabinet. However, anticlericalism consistently continued its campaign; it culminated in the closing of the seminaries.

---

[227] Ibid., 412–26.

[228] Ibid., 432f.; D. Olmedo, "Mexico, Modern," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* IX, 780.

Pius XI continued to follow the development. In a letter of April 1937 to the Mexicans he recommended that they organize peacefully, expand Catholic Action, and maintain the faith. Although the Pope allowed the lawfulness of armed resistance under certain circumstances, the Church as such must never go this way. After almost all seminaries had been closed, Pius XI decided, as a consequence of an offer by the American bishops, to found in the United States a seminary that should be attended by Mexicans who had no opportunity for this in their own country. In September 1937 the Papal National Seminary at Montezuma, New Mexico, was opened; it was operated by the Jesuits and from it came many priests who would later put their stamp on the Church.[229]

Balance Sheet of the Persecution

The Church of Mexico remained unbroken in its faith, but, conditioned by the persecution, it could concentrate neither on the education of youth nor on the spread of the Gospel or of Catholic social doctrine; care of Indians and of farmers and industrial workers retreated into the background. Priests were constantly threatened and had to limit themselves to the most necessary things. Nevertheless, the persecution caused the Mexicans to renew and further develop the old Catholic works and try out other new ones, and brought the knowledge that Christian and evangelical principles must be firmly anchored for a living Church that is in a struggle.[230]

Church and State since 1940

General Manuel Ávila Camacho (1940–46) ended the persecution. Without changing the constitution—only the paragraph on education was rendered harmless—he began an era of fraternization. All official circles were convinced that, in order to accomplish national progress, the Christian faith of the people must be respected. The most important elements of church activity in its pastoral function were Catholic Action, founded in 1928 during the persecution, thousands of catechetical centers, many catechist schools, and a journalism school. In 1920 the *Confederación Católica del Trabajo* was founded, which counted as many as 85,000 members, the *Liga Católica Nacional Campesina* of the middle class, and other religious, social, and cultural institutions spread throughout the republic.[231]

---

[229] Cf. *BMI,* 433–37.
[230] Ibid., 434f., Olmedo, loc. cit., 780.
[231] *GIMC,* 41–45; Vives, op. cit., 570–72.

Organization of the Mexican Church

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century Mexico, because of the revolution, experienced a sociopolitical and sociocultural change. After 1919 there began a process of industrialization, which was favored by foreign capital investments. Today Mexico is the Latin American country with the highest production capacity. This social change has had an impact also on ecclesiastical institutions in so far as, within these institutions, there is to be recorded a movement which strives for an authentic Mexican structure, less oriented to the colonial model. By 1969 Mexico had eleven archdioceses, forty-seven dioceses, one vicariate apostolic, one prefecture apostolic, and four prelacies *nullius;* in 1974 there were forty-nine dioceses.[232]

To overcome the difficult problems of common pastoral care, the bishops of Mexico have joined the *Unión de Mutua Ayuda Episcopal* (UMAE), an unofficial institution, which makes use of socioreligious and socioeconomic investigation to learn the social and religious situation of the individual dioceses and to develop a realistic and effective pastoral plan. The aim is to renew pastoral care on the basis of the knowledge of the Second Vatican Council, to adapt action to change and the development of modern Mexico. This forces the offering of Mexican solutions for the needs of Mexican society.[233] To the UMAE belong twenty-five dioceses with their bishops. To the North Gulf Region belong the dioceses of Matamoros, Ciudad Victoria, Tampico, Ciudad Valles, Tuxpan, and Huajutla; to the Central Gulf Region, the dioceses of Papantla, Jalapa, Veracruz, and San Andrés Tuxtla; other, not precisely defined regions embrace the dioceses of Zacatecas, Tula, Autlán, Zamora, Apatzingań, Tacámbaro, Ciudad Altamirano, Chilapa, Acapulco, Oaxaca, Tehuantepec, Tuxtla Gutiérrez, San Cristóbal, Tapachula, and Campeche. The organization has its headquarters in Mexico City, and to it belong priests and brothers of various dioceses and institutes. The UMAE works according to a proved theoretical-practical plan; general work plan for evaluating the presence of the Church in each region; renewal and planning at meetings of bishops, pastoral commissions, pastoral groups of priests with an organization team, socioreligious investigation in each region.

The goals thus far achieved are: basic courses for pastoral care in many dioceses; pastoral inquiries in many others; special courses for sisters and qualified lay persons; days of recollection and retreats for the clergy. As its means of communication the UMAE has its own quarterly, *Servir,* which gives current information on pastoral questions.[234]

---

[232] *GIMC,* 41–45; Vives, op. cit., 570–72.

[233] *GIMC,* 84.

Parishes and Mission, Organization of the Clergy

In 1968 there were 2,644 parishes for 47,300,000 inhabitants, that is, 17,890 inhabitants per parish. Most recently the parish structure has displayed modifications in view of modern and industrial change. The number of parishes has increased in the dioceses of Mexico City, Morelia, Puebla, and Guadalajara, while it has declined in the ecclesiastical provinces in the south, the north, and on the Gulf of Mexico.[235]

Three mission territories are cared for in Mexico: (1) the northern area of Baja California; there on 13 July 1963 were established the dioceses of Tijuana, with an area of 80,000 square kilometers and 625,000 inhabitants, all of them Catholics, and the diocese of Mexicali, with 620,000 inhabitants in 58,636 square kilometers; (2) the southern area, with the prefecture apostolic of La Paz, with an area of 73,000 square kilometers and 89,000 inhabitants, all of them Catholic, and fourteen parishes with twenty-eight priests; (3) the mission of Tarahumara, established as a vicariate apostolic, with an area of 40,000 square kilometers and 122,000 inhabitants, all Catholic.[236]

In 1968 there worked in the Mexican dioceses 6,348 diocesan priests and 2,103 religious priests, a total of 8,451; hence there were 5,400 inhabitants per priest. The archdioceses with the highest averages are Guadalajara, Morelia, Puebla, and Mexico City.[237] For the training of priests there were in 1966 54 minor seminaries, 5 purely philosophical seminaries, 24 seminaries of philosophy and theology, hence a total of 83, and also the Pio Latino-americano at Rome. Four dioceses still have no minor seminary, 35 no major seminary.[238] Institutes of male religious maintain 402 houses; in the archdiocese of Mexico City alone in 1973 41 orders and lay congregations were active.[239] In 1965 there were 121 congregations of sisters with 1,244 members, who were for the most part occupied in education and nursing.[240] Of course, 90 percent of the schools are public and laicized. The private colleges, most of them run by religious, can impart no religious instruction because of legal regulations. This lack is in part compensated by the work of catechist centers.

---

[234] Ibid., 84–92; A. Castillo, S.J., "Desaparacioń de la UMAE. Tragedia en la Iglesia Mexicana," *Christus* 436 (1 March 1972), 8f.

[235] *GIMC,* 57–71.

[236] Ibid., 72f.

[237] Ibid., 92–122.

[238] Ibid., 123–41.

[239] Ibid., 142–70.

[240] Ibid., 171–200.

There are universities in almost all states of the republic; some of them were formerly Catholic, but today all are public and lay; religion is not a course of instruction. The Ibero-American University, founded in Mexico City by Jesuits in 1943, was originally called Centro Cultural Universitario; the academic degrees given there are recognized by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma of Mexico.

Philosophical positivism, which dominated the environment at the universities until 1867, the year of the education law, was at the beginning of the twentieth century supplanted by Bergson's antipositivism. Most recently the influence of Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955), with an existential orientation, has become noticeable. This philosophical movement is strengthened by the presence of Spanish intellectuals.[241]

Episcopal Documents

The internal change within the Mexican Church in recent years finds expression in the pastoral outlook of the bishops. Before the Second Vatican Council they signed fifty-five documents in common, which were concerned predominantly with questions of faith or the economy; the problems of social justice, Catholic Action, and the lay apostolate were only barely touched. In the years of the council, 1962–65, they did not publish even one document, but since 1968 they have been concerned with human, political, social, and religious problems, which are related to the evangelization and salvation of people. These are the most important publications: pastoral letter on the Scout Movement of 9 February 1968;[242] pastoral letter on the development and integration of the nation of 26 March 1968;[243] explanation of *Humanae vitae* of 9 August 1968;[244] pastoral letter on the student movement of 9 October 1968;[245] information from the episcopate to the Mexican people on school reform of 22 August 1969;[246] pastoral references to the actualization of the lay apostolate in Mexico of 16 January 1970;[247] Episcopal Commission for Social Pastoral Care. Amendments to the document "Justice in Mexico"; Synod of 1971;[248] declaration of the episcopate relative to some educational questions of 15 May 1972;[249] pastoral letter to the Mexican people on responsible fatherhood of 12 December 1972;[250] the Christian responsibility in the face of the social and political option of 18 October 1973;[251] appeal on the occasion of the Olympic Games of 1968.[252]

---

[241] Cf. *BMI*, 458f.; Vives, op. cit., 572f.; Olmedo, loc. cit., 783.

[242] *Christus* 386 (Jan.–June 1968), 459–62.

[243] Ibid., 394–430.

[244] Ibid. 398 (Jan. 1969), 8–10.

[245] Ibid., 12–15.

[246] Ibid., 116–77.

[247] Ibid. 410 (Jan.–June 1970), 254–72.

[248] Ibid. 432 (Dec. 1971), 30–45.

Piety of the Mexican

The Mexican experiences his faith mixed with atavisms which tie him to definite cult forms and traditional rites. Especially in the cities these traditions are gradually being lost; in the states they are still maintained, so that the activity of the faith is reduced to a few occasions in the year which have little to do with authentic Catholicism. The sacraments are regarded as an ingredient of social life; thus a person is baptized and married only to save face. Nevertheless, faith in God is deeply moored, and many would sacrifice their life for it; however, there is no substructure, no adequate knowledge of that in which to believe; morality is formalistic. The Mexican is often content with a symbolic piety to the extent that this fulfills certain fundamental needs. However, there are also persons and groups which experience religion more intensively because of their education.[253] Observations and personal contacts with groups of the middle cultural level—high school pupils, students, teachers, study groups of teachers and the professions—indicate the following results: growing estrangement from the Church as an institution; fear of being treated as "underage"; depreciation of their power of judgment and tutelage without regard for their own opinion; no listening to justified criticism by the competent authorities, whereby tensions and dislike arise and a growing alienation from the Church of just those persons who would represent a vital force in it.[254]

National Plan for Common Pastoral Care

In order to deepen and consolidate the faith of the people, there take place in all dioceses numerous study meetings of persons from all classes of society. In this connection a start is made with the ideas "Church" and "World"; from the outset purely sociological or naturalistic as well as theoretical or utopian versions are avoided; instead there is a search for a total overview by means of the faith and of the present reality. The goals set in this are: an effective coresponsibility on all levels of the People of God; abolition of individualism in persons and institutions in order to achieve a unity of criteria, methods of acting, and attitudes for the solution of common problems.[255] By means of the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and of the Congress of Medellín of 1968, the Mexican bishops have taken a clear positon toward the question of the development and integration of the nation and on the Christian obligation toward social necessities. In this connection must be seen the closing in 1971 of the Jesuit institute Patria. The basic notion is that an adaptation to the present social injustice and cooperation in a structure that favors social alienation is not in accord with Christ and the Gospel.[256]

---

[249] Ibid. 440 (July 1972), 41–52.

[250] Ibid. 447 (Feb. 1973), 46–51.

[251] Ibid. 459 (Feb. 1974), 48–62.

[252] Ibid. 386 (Jan.–June 1968), 586–608; cf. *Christus* 423 (Feb. 1971), 32.

[253] Cf. "Perfil religioso del mexicano actual," *Christus* 426 (May 1971), 24; ibid., 30–34.

[254] Cf. E. Cid, "Reflexiones sobre la situación religiosa," *Christus* 398 (Jan.–June 1969), 572–74.

The faith, understood in its vital reality, includes *metanoia,* the complete changing of a person, which should be expressed in his social behavior. From this consideration the episcopate took a stand on the problem of development and integration, for example in its letter of 26 March 1968: "We cannot overlook what differences exist between the regional development of our country and the sectors of economic life . . . we cannot hide that we arrive at a point where the citizens seek and must accept profound changes, if one does not want to watch passively how the power of the strong and the servitude of the weak constantly grow; thus the state of injustice is sharpened, which cries to heaven because of the violence which is done to human dignity."[257] The obstacles to progress are also named, and which efforts are necessary for an integral development.[258]

The reactions are numerous. Many bishops, the majority of priests and religious, lay organizations, and the faithful have felt this program as correct, if the doctrine of the Gospel is applied in an apostolic and priestly spirit, like the Samaritan, who, without hesitation and full of love, took the poor and suffering man and assigned effective aid to him.[259] The *Institution Rougier,* founded on 3 October 1966, gives assistance by the prayer, sacrifice, and good works of diocesan and religious priests, whose sphere of activity is always described, without mentioning names.[260] The Legion of Mary, founded in 1921, places its members in the service of evangelization. The "Pilgrimage for Christ," a method preferred by the legion, extends to two or three weeks; the legionaries sacrifice their annual vacation and pay out of their own pocket part of the expenses for lodging and board at those places where they exercise their mission activity.[261] At its national meeting in Mexico City in February 1974 Catholic Action adopted as its program of action for the period 1974–77 service to the Church and to all people. In the concrete it was a question of the following tasks: training of committed coworkers; evangelization of persons; promotion of exchanges of human experiences; development of criteria which make possible a better organization between national and regional plans of action. The intellectual and action-oriented basic theses for the next national plan form the continuation of the guidelines issued in the sixteenth national assembly: education, evangelization, and encouragement of people.[262]

---

[255] Cf. *Christus* 40 (July–Dec. 1970), 546–56.

[256] E. Maza, "Los jesuítas cierran el instituto Patria," *Christus* 424 (March 1971), 7f.

[257] *Christus* 386 (Jan.–June 1968), 398.

[258] Cf. ibid., 18–28, 404–10.

[259] Cf. ibid., 462 (May 1974), 49f.

[260] Ibid. 386 (Jan.–June 1968), 726f.

"Priests for the Poor"

The group appearing in public in April 1972 aimed to strengthen the presence of the Church as helper of people, especially of the poor and oppressed, in the fight for the building of a new society. The Church should "be the community of people who are committed to the changing of society, for this sign of change is the sign of the Spirit of God and leads people and nations to their calling."[263] On the occasion of their first congress, 21–23 November 1972, they published a document in which they rejected alternatives such as state capitalism. mixed economy, or social Christianity, and expressed themselves for a "socialist project," which should produce a radical alteration of the economic structures through the socialization of the means of production and their administration by collectives. The "socialist project" offers the only possibility of freeing oneself from the imperialistic structure of international capitalism. However, this plan cannot be implemented so long as it is not supported by the people. The "Priests for the Poor" choose this socialist expedient "in the name of the most elementary rights . . . as human beings, Christians, priests, who have the desire to follow the Church loyally." They are convinced that the function of the Church in Mexico and Latin America does not consist in organizing new versions of the Inquisition or in blocking the rise of the new persons, but, on the contrary, in working for the liberty of the children of God."[264]

---

[261] J. M. Ganuza, S.J., "La legión de María obra del espíritu," *Christus* 410 (Jan.–June 1970), 582–602.

[262] *AICA* 18, 893 (31 Jan. 1974), 23f.

[263] A. Castillo, S.J., "Un paso adelante.Sacerdotes para el pueblo," *Christus* 439 (June 1972), 7f.

[264] "Documento del primer congreso del movimiento 'Sacerdotes para el pueblo,'" *Christus* 447 (Feb. 1973), 54–57.

CHAPTER 25

The Young Churches in Asia, Africa, and Oceania *

Even only an approximately complete presentation of the development of the young Churches from the middle of the twentieth century to the present would require several volumes. The available source material in the missions archives of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, formerly the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, at Rome, in the archives of missionary orders and societies, and not least in those of the young Churches themselves is simply inexhaustible. Here we must restrict ourselves to the most striking events, but select those which appear to us as the characteristic criteria of the most recent missionary era: end of the colonial epoch, indigenization of the mission Churches, transfer of direction of the missions to native hands, erection of regular ecclesiastical hierarchies, new attitude of Rome to the question of native rites, establishment of apostolic delegations and nunciatures, new estimation of cultures and of the great world religions, new missionary spirituality and missionary awareness in the so-called Christian countries. However, in addition to these topics, many other important mission questions appear, which, on account of their actual importance and because they belong essentially to a complete mission history, need a detailed presentation, such as development aid, cultural and social work, translation of Scripture into the vernaculars, linguistic research, apostolate of the press, fostering of native art and music, the inner ecclesiastical life of the communities, and so forth. We ask indulgence for the topics not adequately discussed here because of the restricted space at our disposal and the remaining lacunae. Finally we ask you to bear in mind that the absence of historical distance from the most recent happenings demands brevity and imposes caution in judgment.[1]

The guidelines for the development of the young Churches were determined by the Popes in their mission encyclicals,[2] by the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples in its most recent instructions,[3] and by the episcopal conferences of the young Churches. There can be no doubt that it was precisely the missionary dicastery of the Curia, which was often disdainfully evaluated as a purely administrative office, that in the last fifty years took praiseworthy initiatives and paved the way for the development of the young Churches. That is why the Second Vatican Council, at which at first a few of the council fathers had advocated the abolition of this congregation, because they erroneously regarded it as a colonial institution—the contrary is the case: it was from the start an anticolonial institution[4]—expressly reconfirmed this congregation for a suitable and necessary *aggiornamento* and extended its competence.[5]

---

* Joseph Metzler

[1] The origin of the young Churches in the period 1922–72 was presented in more detail by us in Volume III/2 of *Sacre Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Memoria Rerum* (Freiburg 1976), 464–577. Supplements to this in the other contributions of this volume. For this history of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith Pope Paul VI gave the collaborators the express permission to use and evaluate the archival sources of the congregation's archives, not yet released for research (cf. *Memoria Rerum* III/1, XX–XXI). The present contribution also profited from this permission.

[2] Cf. the biblio. for this chapter, especially T. Scalzotto, *I Papi e la Sacra Congregazione* . . . The pertinent passages of the mission encyclicals down to Paul VI also in A.

Reuter, *Summa Pontificia* Vol. II. Other important papal and conciliar mission documents in Appendix III of Vol. III/2 of *Memoria Rerum.*

[3] Published in the "Supplementum" of the *Bibliografia Missionaria.* In addition, all important documents of a general nature of the mission dicastery since 1961 are here, and also the decrees published in the course of each year. All instructions and pertinent documents are also in the above-mentioned Appendix III of *Memoria Rerum.*

[4] Cf. our article in the *Rheinischer Merkur* of 26 November 1976.

[5] One of the most important directives was that for the future "selected representatives of all of those who cooperate in the missionary work have an active role with a decisive vote: bishops from the entire world after hearing the episcopal conferences, as well as directors of the institutes and of the papal mission works" (mission decree of the Second Vatican Council, *Ad Gentes,* no. 29). In the subsequent papal documents, *Ecclesiae Sanctae* of 6 August 1966 (*AAS* 58 [1966], 757–87), *Pro comperto sane* of 6 August 1967 (*AAS* 59 [1967], 881–84), and *Regimini Ecclesiae Universae* of 15 August 1967 (ibid., 885–928), the number of these *membra adiuncta* was fixed at twenty-four—sixteen bishops, twelve of whom had to be missionary bishops, four superiors general of missionary institutes, four national directors of the papal mission works—to which was then added the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and a seat and vote were given in the "coetibus plenariis" of the Congregation to those "tamquam Membra in quibus res maioris momenti et naturam principii generalis habentes sint pertractandae" (*Pro comperto sane*). Some, who have regarded the "Council of the Twenty-Four"—which never existed as such, and besides there were twenty-five!—as a sort of covering organization of the Roman mission authority, designated these postconciliar measures as a "watering down" of the conciliar decree (cf. *Le missioni cattoliche* 97 [Milan 1968], 65f.; *Herder-Korrespondenz* 22 [Freiburg 1968], 168f.). In reality hereby the position of the *membra adiuncta* should be reevaluated, and the same right and voice be given to them in the plenary sessions, in which the most important decisions in mission affairs are taken, as to the cardinals and the other members of the congregation. This clarification is not unimportant for the understanding of the following exposition.

The Young Churches in Asia

THE FAR EAST

China

The mission Church in China gave promise of the fairest hopes after the establishment of the apostolic delegation in 1922, the elimination of tensions between foreign and Chinese clergy, the transfer of the direction of the ecclesiastical territories to the Chinese clergy, the elimination of the French protectorate, and the happy overcoming of the painful struggle over rites.[6] The Chinese National Synod of Shanghai in 1924 stood at the beginning of the new development. It became, so to speak, the foundation of the young Church in China. But the construction was impeded and finally completely destroyed by political events.

The Chinese-Japanese conflict of 1937–41 frightfully injured the mission. By December 1941 one bishop, one prefect apostolic, fifty-five priests, seventeen brothers, and nine sisters were murdered. They fell victim to the Communists, the partisans, and an unbridled soldiery. But the number of the faithful still increased in those years and in 1941 reached 3,128,157. The outbreak of the Japanese-American war on 7 December 1941 produced a new turn. The foreign missionaries were to a great extent interned. Three-fifths of the missionaries who were active in China in 1940 came from abroad. Eighty-five percent of these belonged to one of the two warring sides. The chief burden of the mission Church was transferred to the shoulders of the Chinese clergy.

Despite the confusions of the war and other inconveniences connected with it and injuries to the Church, Rome began to prepare the setting-up of the regular ecclesiastical hierarchy in China. At the beginning of 1942 there were in China eighty-eight vicariates apostolic and thirty-nine prefectures apostolic. The latter were gradually to be raised to vicariates and preferably transferred to the Chinese clergy. In 1946 there were already twenty-eight Chinese ordinaries, of whom twenty-one were bishops. Five thousand five priests—of whom 2,008 were Chinese—1,262 brothers, and 6,138 sisters took part in the missionary work. There were 1,037 seminarians, 3,524 students in minor seminaries, and 1,590 pupils in preparatory schools. The missionary personnel also included 6,748 male and 4,659 female catechists, and 7,799 male and 5,604 female teachers. In the first postwar consistory of 18 February 1946 Pius XII admitted the vicar apostolic of

---

[6] Cf. on this especially *Memoria Rerum,* 472–76.

Tsingtao, Thomas Tien Ken-sin, S.V.D., to the College of Cardinals.[7] He was the first Chinese cardinal. At the Pope's suggestion on this occasion he wrote a memorandum on the situation and problems of the Church in China. He thereby gave the final impulse to the erection of the hierarchy. The formal decision on this matter was made by the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in their sitting of 8 April 1946,[8] and Pius XII gave his approval in an audience on 11 April.[9] Twenty ecclesiastical provinces were erected, the vicariates and prefectures were raised to dioceses, twenty of them to archdioceses, and the ordinaries were made bishops or archbishops respectively. A month later Cardinal Tien was transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Peking,[10] which had been vacated before the erecting of the hierarchy by the resignation submitted by Bishop Paul-Léon-Cornélie Montaigne, C.M. It was fitting that the first Chinese cardinal have his seat in the nation's capital. Of course, the transfer of the archdiocese of Peking from the French Vincentians to the Chinese clergy was connected with it. Rome made provision that no objections should arise from the side of France, neither political, liturgical,[11] nor economic.

Two other events of 1946 were of great significance for the Chinese mission Church: the establishment of the internunciature on 6 July, that is, the admittance of direct diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the government at Peking,[12] and the beatification of twenty-nine Chinese martyrs of 1900.[13] The first internuncio was the titular bishop Antonio Riberi.

The statistics of the Chinese mission Church of 1948 yield the following picture: 3,276,282 faithful, 3,015 foreign and 2,676 Chinese priests, 632 Chinese and 475 foreign brothers, 5,112 Chinese and 2,351 foreign sisters, 216 hospitals, 254 orphanages, and 4,446 schools of various grades.

In the succeeding years Rome continued in an increasing measure to entrust the ecclesiastical jurisdictions to Chinese ordinaries. But the Communist occupation of the country and the only too well known political events attending it made all further Roman decisions in favor of the Chinese mission Church illusory. The connection with the outside world was more and more broken. Only in roundabout ways did the frightful news of the incipient persecution of the Church reach the rest of the world. With the governmental decree of 23 June 1950 on the suppression of "counterrevolutionary activity" began the systematic struggle against the Church. The foreign missionaries were expelled, often after ignominious show trials, mistreatment, and imprisonment. The internuncio was tactlessly banished.

---

[7] *AAS* 38 (1946), 104.

[8] Archives of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (=*AP*): *Acta Sacrae Congregationis* 317 (1946), f. 131^r–142^r.

[9] *AAS* 38 (1946), 301–13.

[10] Session of 6 May, audience of 10 May: *AP, Acta* 317 (1946), f. 174^r–188^r, *AAS* 38 (1946), 238, 360.

[11] The diplomatic representative of France in Peking enjoyed certain privileges in the church of the Vincentians.

[12] *AAS* 38 (1946), 313f.

[13] Ibid. 39 (1947), 307–11 (the Pope's homily).

In the apostolic letter of 18 January 1952 to the ordinaries in China Pius XII expressed his pain at the persecution of Christians and tried to comfort the faithful. He spoke of his love for the Chinese people, of his admiration of its historical and cultural past, of the task and the wish of the Church to encourage whatever is good, true, and beautiful among all peoples. He encouraged the Chinese Catholics. The Church, he said, can be fought but never defeated.[14] In the encyclical *Ad Sinarum gentem* of 7 October 1954 he condemned the persecution of Christians even more severely.[15] But these writings, like the news of the beatification of another fifty-six Chinese martyrs in 1955,[16] may not have become known in China. However, in 1958 about thirty Chinese bishops, loyal to Rome, and many priests and faithful were in prison because of their faith.

In these years the Communist regime changed its persecuting tactics and tried to construct a National Chinese Church separated from Rome. From December 1957 to January 1962 a total of forty-five Chinese bishops appointed by the state were ordained without papal approval. In the letter *Ad Apostolorum Principes* of 29 June 1958 Pius XII condemned these uncanonical episcopal ordinations,[17] and John XXIII in his address in the consistory of 15 December 1958 even used the word "schism" for them.[18] Also in his letter to the episcopate on Taiwan of 29 June 1961 Pope John again referred to the situation of the Church in Mainland China.[19] Pope Paul VI even tried to talk with Communist China. In an address of 20 October 1963 he said how gladly he would have embraced *all* Chinese bishops on the occasion of the Second Vatican Council.[20] On 31 December 1965, three months after the Pope had come out in his speech before the United Nations in New York for the admission of states which were not yet members of the world organization, hence China also, he sent a personal telegram to Mao Tse-tung. The occasion was the request to promote peace in Vietnam. He ended with the words: "Nous vous prions d'accueillir cet appel ainsi que les voeux fervents que Nous formons devant Dieu pour le peuple chinois au seuil de l'anneé nouvelle."[21] However, the raising of the internunciature on Taiwan to the nunciature on 24 December 1966 was interpreted by some observers as an unfriendly act in regard to Communist China. The Pope corrected this impression in his memorable talk on 6 January 1967, when, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the hierarchy in China, he celebrated a Solemn Mass in Saint Peter's for the Catholics of China. On this occasion he said quite openly that it was his desire to have contacts with Communist China and to enter into friendly relations with it.[22] (On 31 January 1973 the pronuncio on Taiwan, Edward Cassidy, was made pronuncio in Bangladesh, and the nunciature on Taiwan was thereafter directed by a chargé d'affaires.) In the next few years the Cultural Revolution in China made all further efforts at contact useless. In the course of this revolution there occurred a new, very severe persecution of Christians, directed not only against the last foreign sisters in the Peking diplomats' school of the Sacred Heart, but especially against the faithful themselves. Church buildings were plundered, partly burned, or secularized.

---

[14] Ibid. 44 (1952), 153–58.

[15] Ibid. 47 (1955), 5–14.

[16] Ibid. 381–88.

[17] Ibid. 50 (1958), 601–14.

[18] Ibid. 985.

[19] Ibid. 53 (1961), 465–69.

[20] Speech on the afternoon of Mission Sunday in the Collegio Urbano: "How happy We would be, with the bishops who are taking part in the council, to embrace also all

In May 1970 Catholic bishops of the United States advised their government to leave nothing untried to arrange talks with Communist China. Perhaps the release three months later of the American Bishop James Edward Walsh from the Chinese prison he had been in since 1960 may be regarded as Mao Tse-tung's reply. In Rome, too, fresh hope was gathered.

By the end of 1971 reports were reaching Europe from China, of course very contradictory ones. Chinese Catholics living in the West had been able, by various channels, to make connections with their homeland, journalists and athletes received permission to visit China. From the meager news people thought it could be inferred that there were still in China ca. 1,000 functioning Catholic priests and sixty-five bishops, though of the latter forty-five had been appointed by the government without consulting the Holy See, and that the Church was

---

bishops of this immensely wide area [China]" (*Herder-Korrespondenz* 18 [1963–64], 112).

[21] *AAS* 58 (1966), 164.

[22] Ibid. 59 (1967), 68–71.

still alive in China, even though the number of faithful seemed to have dropped sharply. The persecutions were unable to suppress the Christian faith. Quite the contrary: under the external pressure the intensity of the faith increased. So said Father Ladany, S.J., in Hong Kong, one of the best informed persons on events in Red China. The assertion that there were no more Christians in China, he wrote, is false.[23] Since November 1971 Mass could be celebrated in one church, Nantang, in Peking. However, the faithful are mostly, even if not exclusively, members of foreign embassies.[24]

Taiwan

The events in Mainland China, which had as a consequence the departure of many priests and faithful for the island of Taiwan, pushed this long overlooked and unproductive mission area into the foreground since the 1950s. In 1949 Rome erected the prefectures apostolic of Taipei (for the Chinese congregation of priests of the *Discipuli Domini*) and Kaoshung (for the Dominicans), in 1950 the prefecture of Taichung (for the Maryknoll Missionaries), and in 1952 the prefectures of Chiayi and Hwalien (for Chinese diocesan priests and those of the Paris Mission Seminary respectively). At the same time Taipei was raised to an archdiocese and given to the *Disciputi Domini*. From then on evangelization made greater progress. Even the evangelization of the original inhabitants, who were estimated at 150,000 with twenty different languages, could be taken up. After overcoming the initial difficulties, a real conversion movement began among them, which became the most striking characteristic of the Taiwan mission of the 1950s. But the mission was able also to record successes among the Chinese refugees from the mainland. The student youths especially showed sympathy for the Catholic Church. Chinese diocesan priests, Jesuits, and Benedictine nuns taught at both state universities. Less numerous were the conversions among the Buddhist Taiwanese. In the decade of 1949–59 the total number of Catholics rose from 12,326 to 163,814 and today is approximately 290,000. In 1961 a part of the archdiocese of Taipei was erected as the diocese of Shinchiku. In addition to the missionaries already mentioned, there were Jesuits, Vincentians, Scheut Fathers (Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary), Camillians, Franciscans, and members of the S.A.M. Mission Helpers, and many congregations of sisters. The Catholic University of Taipei, founded in 1963 by Archbishop Yü Pin at the urging of Pope John XXIII, was regarded as the successor of the Peking Fu-jen

---

[23] *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1971), 15.

[24] Ibid. (Freiburg 1972), 148–52; (1973), 153–56; (1978), 39f.

University, and was intended to continue the Catholic university system flourishing on the mainland before the persecution. It began with 400 students and in 1973 had around 9,000 students and 554 professors, five faculties recognized by the state—philosophy, natural science, economics, law, foreign languages—and a theological faculty not recognized by the state. Since 1969 the last mentioned has published the theological quarterly *Shen Hsiao Lün Chi* (*Collectanea Theologica*). It aims to teach "Chinese" theology. That the Church embody itself organically in Chinese culture and remove the appearance of its foreign character is also the aim of the hierarchy.

Japan

In Japan since 1932 necessity ever more emphatically urged putting the direction of the young Church in Japanese hands. The first Japanese bishop, Januarius Hayasaka of Nagasaki, was appointed in 1927 and on 30 October he was ordained at Rome by Pius XI.[25] The situation long remained confined to this first measure of Japanization, whereas the Protestant mission advanced much faster on this route and had already relinquished almost all the ecclesiastical jurisdictions to Japanese. The complaint was heard that the Catholic Church still depended entirely on foreigners. This all the more, when the new intellectual outlook of the Japanese was marked by a mistrust of the Western world and by the conviction of the superiority of their own culture. This was not without consequences for the missionary situation of the Catholic Church. Finally from 1936 Rome made greater progress toward the Japanization of the Church. In fact, from now on events pushed on one another. The settlement of the controversy over the Japanese rites, that is, the permission for the faithful to take part in the purely civil customs of social life, "which nowadays are generally regarded as mere marks of courtesy and of mutual good will, even if they originally had a superstitious character," was the most important step in this direction.[26] When on 25 May 1936 Pius XI approved the relevant instruction of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, he said that the faithful had not only the permission to share in these patriotic and civil ceremonies but the duty.

---

[25] *AAS* 19 (1927), 379f. (The Pope's homily). As early as the beginning of 1933 the bishop was forced to resign for reasons of health and other causes. In 1937 Paulus Aijiro Yamaguchi became his successor.

[26] Instruction of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of 26 May 1936 in *AAS* 28 (1936), 406–09; *Sylloge praecipuorum documentorum recentium Summorum Pontificum et S. Congregationis de Progaganda Fide . . .* (Vatican City 1939), 537–40, N. 201; *Collectanea Commissionis Synodalis* 9 (Peking 1936), 872–74; *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 483–87.

This new attitude of Rome in regard to Japanese morals and customs could not prevent the Catholic Church and, in general, all Christianity from being drawn, in the next years, into the powerfully flourishing antiforeign Japanese nationalistic movement. The slogan put it: Christianity is a foreign religion, hence not for the Japanese. The attitude was further accentuated with the forcible takeover by Fumimaro Konoye in July 1940 and the higher valuation of the worship of the Emperor. The antiforeign animosity had as a consequence even sharper attacks on the Catholic Church as this was still to a great extent governed by foreign prelates. Only in Tokyo and Nagasaki was there a Japanese bishop and in Kagoshima a Japanese prefect apostolic. The "Law on Religious Corporations" of 25 March 1939 left no doubt that the government was seeking complete control of ecclesial communities and no longer recognized foreigners as representatives of the communities. Rome now hastened to turn over all ecclesiastical territories to Japanese prelates. The foreign bishops voluntarily resigned. Now the Japanese ordinaries could take steps toward legal recognition of the Catholic church communities by the state, in accord with the law on corporations. They worked out the "constitutions" of the Japanese Church and thereby acquired state recognition in May 1941. A little later the Protestant Churches followed this step. In this way the mission Church in Japan was spared immensely injurious consequences. Rome, of course, subjected these constitutions to strong criticism. One of the cardinals who had to pronounce judgment on them compared them to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in the French Revolution. The apostolic delegate since 1933, Paolo Marella, who had shared substantially in the drafting of the constitution, was accused of having acted without consultation with Rome. Cardinal Pietro Fumasoni-Biondi, prefect of the congregation for the Propagation of the Faith from 1933 to 1960, saved the situation and hence the constitution of the young Church in Japan by making it clear that Rome had not at all been asked for approval of the constitution. On this occasion he expressed his joy that the Japanese mission Church had made such good progress in recent times and thanked the foreign missionaries for having voluntarily relinquished their position to the Japanese clergy. He expressed the hope that this example might be imitated in other mission lands also.[27]

A completely new missionary situation occurred in Japan after World

---

[27] This Italian prefect of the Roman missionary authority had already shown his sound sense of the present-day questions. Thus he had given the "green light" for the reopening and solving of the question of the Chinese Rites, to discuss this question contrary to the earlier directive of the Holy Office. For the details of the life and evaluation of the prefectship of Fumasoni-Biondi, cf. *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 313–15.

War II. The Shinto state worship was abolished. On New Year's Day 1946 Emperor Hirohito declared that the previous religious doctrines of the state were myths. Shintoism became a purely private religion. The antiforeign outlook of the Japanese seemed to become quite the opposite in the first postwar years. The prospects for the missions increased. At Yokohama, for example, the number of catechumens tripled at one stroke. Sisters were able to set up a higher school for girls at the Buddhist center of Nagano. The port city of Yokosuka, a military port, hitherto inaccessible to foreigners, very quickly became a flourishing center of Catholic missionary activity. The Protestant American supreme commander offered the Catholics several buildings for the erection of schools and of a hospital. Rome multiplied the missionary personnel. In 1958 there were in Japan 1,220 foreign and 359 Japanese priests, 166 foreign and 250 native brothers, 1,063 foreign and 3,050 Japanese sisters. In the two seminaries at Tokyo and Fukuoka there were 260 seminarians. In 1975 there were in Japan twelve native Japanese congregations of sisters of diocesan right and one secular institute.[28]

However, it must be stated soberly that, after years of hope-filled creativity, the results of the mission, in regard to numbers, do not correspond to the exertions of the missionaries. In 1958 there were only 266,000 Catholics in the population of 92 million, and ten years later only 345,000, whereas the total population had increased to 100 million. In 1974 there were 363,000 Catholics among 109.5 million inhabitants, and in 1977 392,000 faithful among 113 million. Happier is the increase of native vocations. Of the 1,966 priests, 869 are Japanese. The number of Japanese sisters amounts to 6,052. About 800 foreign sisters help them. And today the number of Japanese brothers is greater than that of the foreign.

However, this is not the only aspect to be considered in evaluating the young Church in Japan. The moral reputation of the Catholic Church and its influence on the public must not be underestimated. The Church "shows itself Japanese, speaks Japanese, shares according to its means in Japanese life. Hence, on the whole the Church presents a Japanese image, thanks especially to its native leadership."[29] It has become more attractive to the Japanese. The Second Vatican Council contributed substantially to this. The religious institutions cultivate a dialogue with the non-Christian religions in Japan and exert themselves for a close collaboration with them in the service of humanity.

---

[28] "Supplementum" of the *Bibliografia Missionaria,* Anno XXXIX–1975, Quaderno no. 18 (Rome 1976), 27–30.

[29] H. Dumoulin, S.J., *Die Bedeutung des Christentums in Japan: Die katholischen Missionen* (1977), 118–122, here 118.

Korea

In the young Church in Korea the ordinaries had been preparing the Korean clergy since 1927, by a mandate from Rome, to assume the direction of the mission. But the political situation made the transfer difficult. The Koreanization of the Church encountered the opposition of the Japanese occupying power, which wanted to see Japanese ordinaries in charge of the ecclesiastical jurisdictions. Nevertheless, in 1942, after the resignation of the vicar apostolic of Seoul (Keijo in Japanese), Rome appointed the Korean priest Paul Ro (his Korean name) Okamoto (his Japanese name) as his successor, first as administrator and then on 10 November of the same year as vicar apostolic with episcopal ordination. But in the case of Taiku, whose ordinary had likewise resigned, the Roman mission officials had to yield to the occupying power. They appointed the Japanese priest Irenaeus Kyubei Hayasaka as administrator. On 10 November 1942 they promoted him also to bishop, without, however, naming him as vicar apostolic.

With the growing tensions between Japan and the United States, the situation of the American missionaries in Japan and the conquered territories became ever more critical. Until 1941 the vicar apostolic of Heijo, the name from 1939 for Hpyeng Yang, William O'Shea, M.M., and his Maryknoll Missionaries were able to act freely. But in December of that year all except him and his secretary were interned. In June 1942 all American missionaries returned to the United States within the framework of an exchange of internees. Earlier O'Shea had given the necessary spiritual faculties to the Korean priest Francis Hong (his Korean name) Takeoka (his Japanese name). Confirmed by Rome on 18 February 1943, he understood superlatively how to guide the destinies of the mission through the unpropitious times. He even maintained good contacts with the Japanese authorities. After the end of Japanese domination of Korea Rome had a free hand in the filling of the ecclesiastical posts with Korean ordinaries. On 7 June 1947 Pius XII appointed Patrick James Byrne, M.M., as apostolic visitor of the missions in Korea, with the faculties of an apostolic delegate.[30] A little later, on 7 April 1949, an apostolic delegation was established in Korea, with Byrne as the first occupant.[31]

Severe external trials were in store for the Korean mission Church. Here the political events may be assumed as familiar. Because of the Communist occupation of North Korea, 57,000 Catholics were virtually cut off from the rest of the Church. Abbot-Bishop Boniface Sauer, O.S.B., of the abbey *nullius* of Tŏgwŏn that had been erected in 1940, died as a victim of the new rulers as a consequence of mistreatment in a concentration camp. The vicar apostolic of P'yŏngyang, Bishop Francis Hong, was missing. Many missionaries were killed or deported, including Apostolic Delegate Byrne, who died in a prison camp on 26 November 1960.

---

[30] *AAS* 39 (1947), 463.

[31] Ibid. 42 (1950), 327.

In South Korea, on the other hand, the number of the faithful quickly grew to over 215,000 and in 1956 reached 241,830, among whom were to be counted 27,332 catechumens. Still, vis-à-vis the 20 million inhabitants, the Catholics constituted only a small minority.

In the succeeding years there came to the foreground the plan of erecting the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which took place on 10 March 1962.[32] Three ecclesiastical provinces were established: Seoul, with the suffragan sees of P'yŏngyang, Hamhŭng, Chunchŏn, Taejŏn, and Inchon; Taegu, with the suffragan sees of Chŏngju and Pusan; and Kwangju, with that of Jeonju. In addition, the abbey *nullius* of Tŏgwŏn continued, directly subject to the Holy See. There were around this time in South Korea more than 488,000 Catholics, 282 Korean priests (with 236 foreign priests), and 1,039 Korean sisters (out of a total of 1,170). Foreign communities active in Korea included: the Paris Mission Seminary, the Missionary Benedictines of Sankt Ottilien, Franciscans, Conventuals, Jesuits, the Hospitallers of Saint John of God, the Missionaries of Saint Francis de Sales of Annecy, Marianists, Salesians, Maryknoll Missioners, and the Columban Missionaries of Ireland; also, the Korean Samists and the Brothers of the Holy Korean Martyrs. There were five communities of Korean Sisters.[33] Of the foreign sisters, those of Saint Paul of Chartres had the most numerous representation. They counted 295 Korean sisters in their ranks.[34]

On 11 December 1963 Paul VI erected the internunciature of Korea,[35] which was changed to a nunciature on 5 September 1966.[36] Two further important events for the Korean mission Church of the most recent past were the beatification of twenty-four Korean martyrs of 1866 on 6 October 1968 and the creation of the first Korean cardinal, Stephen Sou Hwan Kim, in the consistory of 28 April 1969.

In the 1970s the Christian churches in South Korea, even though they included numerically only a small part of the population, became the center of the intellectual opposition to the dictatorship of the Park regime. The tensions between Church and state led in August 1974 to the imprisoning of Bishop Tji Hak Soun of Wonju, who was condemned as an "agitator" by a military court to fifteen years in prison. In February 1975 he, with 150 other political prisoners, was released.

---

[32] Ibid. 54 (1962), 552–55.

[33] Today there are in Korea six native congregations of sisters of diocesan right: "Supplementum" of the *Bibliografia Missionaria,* Anno XXXIX–1975, Quaderno no. 18 (Rome 1976), 22f.

[34] Cf. J. Chang-mun Kim and J. Jae-sun Chung, *Catholic Korea Yesterday and Today* (Seoul 1964).

[35] *AAS* 56 (1964), 235.

[36] Ibid. 58 (1966), 875.

Today the young Church of Korea counts about 990,000 faithful in a total population of 40.5 million, not counting P'yŏngyang and Tokwon, for which, according to the 1978 *Annuario Pontificio,* no statistics are available.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

India

In the mission Church of India important happenings in the two decades before World War II helped to prepare the future. There was, first, the progressive transfer of the ecclesiastical direction into native hands, which of course proceeded much too slowly for the Indian clergy. Opposition and obstacles arose chiefly from the Indian caste system which frustrated some Roman plans. The abolition of the oath concerning rites freed the route on a broader level for the better Indianization of the young Church. After the publication of the instruction of 8 December 1939 on the Chinese rites there appeared the question of whether the missionaries in India had to continue to take the so-called oath on rites which in 1739 Clement XII had prescribed for all missionaries in the kingdoms of Madura, Mysore, and Carnatic. Right from the start obscurities had existed as to the extent of this obligation, which could not be cleared up in the succeeding period.[37] In the course of time Rome had replied to the doubts that cropped up with the stereotyped but by no means clarifying formula "nihil esse innovandum."[38] Considering this and the decision issued a few months earlier in regard to the Chinese rites, the cardinals of the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith decided in their session of 8 April 1940 that the obligation to the oath "sopra i riti malabarici" was to be abolished; the Pope confirmed this in audience the next day.[39]

---

[37] Cf. especially the letters of 13 October 1744 and 6 February 1745 of the Roman mission dicastery in *AP, Lettere* 161f., 146^r–148^r, 171^r–174^v; also, *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (Rome 1907), nos. 594 and 607.

[38] Cf. *AP, Lettere* 331f., 532^v (letter to the superior of the Paris Mission Seminary of 20 July 1844); 351f., 296^v–297^v (letter of 18 May 1860 to the vicar apostolic of Jaffna); *Registro delle Risoluzioni del S. Offizio* 2 (1853), 34, no. 2; 6 (1873), 5; *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide* I (Rome 1907), no. 993; *Lettere* 362f., 1058^r–1059^r (letter of 27 October 1969 in regard to an inquiry of the vicar apostolic of Colombo).

A second happening was the conversion of two bishops of the Syro-Malankarese, Mar Ivanios (Givergis Thomas) Panikervirtis and Mar Theophilus (Jacob Abraham) Kalapurakal, to the Catholic Church in 1930. This was a first success of the strivings for union between the Syrian Orthodox and the Catholic Church. The movement for union stopped. On 28 August 1977 Archbishop Mar Felixnose of the Independent Syrian Orthodox Malabarese Church, together with his secretary, completed his union with Rome.

Finally, still a fourth, not unessential chapter on the way of the Indian Church into the future must be mentioned. Portugal gradually renounced its missionary patronate in India and thereby ended a century-long tug-of-war with the missionary authorities in Rome. On the occasion of filling the Church offices with Indian ordinaries, there was no consultation with Portugal. No protest came from Lisbon on the division of those dioceses for which the agreement of 1928 had granted to the patron one final but quite small remnant of the patronate.[40] Even in Bombay the transition took place smoothly. According to the agreement just mentioned, the archbishop had to be alternately Portuguese and English. This stipulation put the Holy See in an embarrassing position, for in Bombay there were hardly any English and no Portuguese missionaries at all. In 1937 Rome had difficulty in finding a candidate. More in order to remove these difficulties than out of necessity, Archbishop Thomas Roberts, on the occasion of a visit to Rome in 1945, proposed that an Indian priest be given him as auxiliary bishop. The choice fell on Valerian Gracias, later the first Indian cardinal. Because he was an auxiliary bishop and not a coadjutor with the right of succession, Portugal could make no objections. If, sooner or later, the auxiliary bishop should be appointed ordinary—this was now the clear intention of Rome, and Archbishop Roberts was ready to resign in this case and surrender his position to the Indian bishop—the Portuguese government would be asked to renounce its privilege and not resist the indigenization of the Church in India. However, this was not to be necessary. In the mission treaty of 18 July 1950 Portugal renounced its rights in the nomination of the ordinaries of Mangalore, Quilon, Trichinopoly, Cochin, Saint Thomé (Saõ Thomé, Mylapore), and Bombay,[41] and on 4 December of the same year Gracias became archbishop. Pius XII created him a cardinal in the consistory of 12 January 1953.

---

[39] *AAS* 32 (1940), 379.

[40] Ibid. 20 (1928), 133.

[41] Ibid. 42 (1950), 811–15.

The mission treaty of 1950 had still other consequences. The bishops of Cochin and Mylapore were transferred to titular sees. In this way Rome obtained a free hand for the naming of the ordinaries of these former dioceses of the patronate. Cochin was divided into two new dioceses, Cochin and Alleppey, in accord with the two ethnic groups that had warred there with each other for centuries, and a broader territory, 130 kilometers from the rest of the former patronate diocese was separated and given to the bishop of Trivandrum as administrator. Likewise, the two heterogeneous and territorially widely separated parts of the patronate see of Meliapur were reconstructed ecclesiastically. The new dioceses of Tanjore and Vellore were erected, and the rest of the territories united to the archdiocese of Madras and Mylapore.

World War II did not produce for the Indian Church damage as great as had World War I. In general, missionary activity proceeded quietly. Only in Assam were material losses to be recorded. In 1945 the younger German and Italian missionaries, that is, those who had come after 1931, were temporarily interned. On 15 August 1947 the two independent states of India and Pakistan were founded. The result was that ecclesiastical territories were torn apart. Rome synchronized the diocesan boundaries with the political.

Meanwhile, the Indian missionary bishops had called into existence in 1944 the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India (CBCI).[42] The first Indian plenary council met at Bangalore from 6 to 18 January 1950. All ordinaries of the then fifty-two ecclesiastical circumscriptions of India, including the Archbishop of Goa and the bishops of the Eastern Rite in Malabar, who together represented 4.5 million Catholics, were present. It was a demonstration of the unity and compactness of the Indian Church, which publicly declared its loyalty to the new independent state. In the letter to Cardinal Norman Gilroy, archbishop of Sydney, whom Pius XII had appointed legate for the plenary council, the Roman purposes for the council were named: closer and uniform cooperation of the clergy among themselves and with the laity in all ecclesiastical and missionary questions; increase of the native clergy and improvement of its formation; building of Catholic Action; founding of a Catholic university; intensified care of charitable and educational institutions; promotion of the apostolate of the press. The conciliar decrees in keeping with these wishes were approved on 29 January 1952. They concerned not only regular pastoral care but also missionary radiation. In the latter relation the following means, in addition to the traditional ones, were recommended: appointment of a few priests who, equipped with a basic knowledge of the language, customs, philosophy, and religions of India, should assume apologetical and catechetical work among the educated; creation of a Catholic literature also for the Old Catholics which wholly and publicly represented Catholic doctrine and was also outstanding "in its literary and technical aspect"; proclaiming of Catholic teaching by means of radio broadcasts by priests and educated faithful; spread of the Church's social teaching, which was almost unknown in India; founding of a periodical for social questions, in connection with the Episcopal Conference; exercise of the apostolate also among Christians separated from the Church.[43] Further, at the plenary council the statutes of the Episcopal Conference were approved. The most striking sign and the greatest significance of this plenary council consists in the fact that the young Church of India began to adapt itself extensively to the traditional morals and customs of the country.

---

[42] The first common Episcopal Conference of India had taken place in 1921 under the chairmanship of Apostolic Delegate Pisani following the Marian Congress at Madras. At that time the idea of an Indian plenary council had arisen. However, various circumstances, including the frequent change of delegates, prevented the realization of the plan. When at last in 1937 everything was ready for the summoning, difficulties unexpectedly appeared because of the Portuguese patronate, so that the council had to be postponed. Pius XII later eliminated the latter difficulties by naming as legate for the council the cardinal of Sydney.

Other significant events for the mission Church of India were the following: In 1948 Pius XII established the internunciature of India.[44] On 26 January 1951 he declared the Mother of God patroness of the country.[45] At the close of the Marian Year there took place in Bombay a National Marian Congress from 4 to 8 December 1954 under the chairmanship of Cardinal Gracias; it was intended to express anew the vitality of the Catholic Church of India, and actually produced a great echo even in the non-Catholic public. Likewise at Bombay there was held in November 1964 the Thirty-Eighth Eucharistic Congress, which Pope Paul VI honored with his presence from 2 to 5 November.[46] The Pope's journey to India became an event of the greatest importance for both Church and secular history. Nine hundred eighty journalists and a television crew of seventy-seven gave every detail of the phenomenal reception and stay of the Pope in India worldwide publicity. Other landmarks of the new orientation of the young Church were the plenary assembly of the Indian hierarchy at New Delhi in 1966, an International Theological Conference at Nagpur in 1971, the celebration of the nineteenth centenary of the death of the Apostle Thomas at Madras in 1972, and the "All India Consultation on Evangelization" at Patna in 1973. From 14 to 25 May 1969 Bangalore was host of the "All India Seminar" for the renewal of the Church of India, which was equivalent to a "pastoral council." It was the climax of an exhaustive process of teaching and opinion formation. The great topics were: Indianization of the Church, self-support of the local Indian churches, and dialogue with the non-Christian religions.[47] A noteworthy contribution to the development of an Indian theology was promised by the new faculty of the study of religion, which was opened on 3 July 1976 at Dharmaram College in Bangalore.

---

[43] According to M. Bierbaum, "Das erste Plenarkonzil von Indien," *ZMR* 36 (Munich 1952), 161–72.

[44] *AAS* 42 (1950), 235. In August 1967 it was elevated to a nunciature with a pronuncio as titular.

[45] Ibid. 46 (1954), 398f.

[46] Ibid. 57 (1965), 113–40 (all details of the Pope's journey).

Through these and other manifestations the Catholic Church of India made itself a subject of conversation. Meetings, conferences, and seminars with important declarations found an international echo and "made obvious the desire for a revival and reorientation of ecclesiastical work."[48] Although a small minority, the Catholic Church in India is today a spiritual power, the results and importance of which cannot be expressed in numbers. In 1970 it published six daily newspapers, twenty ecclesiastical weeklies, and the two general weeklies, *Sanjivan* and *Orbit.* Catholic journalists are collaborators on the great daily and weekly papers of the country. The Indian clergy is numerous and through its good formation has gained greatly in quality and esteem. One of its most outstanding representatives, Archbishop Simon Lourdusamy of Bangalore, was called to Rome by Paul VI to direct the Dicastery for the Missions. The Indian congregations of sisters experienced a striking development, something of great importance, not only for the Church but for the whole nation, in a country where traditionally woman was accorded no place of honor. There are today in India twenty-three diocesan congregations of sisters and one female secular institute.[49] With the establishment of the first ashram at Kurisumala in 1957 began the adaptation of the contemplative life to Indian mentality and forms.

---

[47] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1970), 8–11. On the topic "dialogue" it should be noted that not too long ago it was still forbidden to learn Sanskrit and read books on Hinduism in major seminaries. The contact with Hinduism was regarded as a danger to the Christian faith. This attitude has changed radically in recent years due to the influence of the Second Vatican Council. The Catholic Church seeks better to understand Hinduism and to have a dialogue with its adherents.

[48] *Herder-Korrespondenz* 28 (Freiburg 1974), 7.

[49] "Supplementum" to the *Bibliografia Missionaria,* Anno XXXIX–1975, Quaderno no. 18 (Rome 1976), 32–37.

For all that, there has still been no success in bridging the abyss between Christianity and Hinduism. In the tradition-conscious Hindu circles Christianity is still regarded as foreign to Indian culture. This led in recent times to some deplorable obstacles for foreign missioners in some states, such as Assam. The Church hierarchy and the lay organizations leave nothing untried to remove the still existing prejudices and to eliminate all the bases for them. Above all, great exertions have been undertaken in the way of liturgical adaptation, as prescribed by the Second Vatican Council.

In 1978 the young Church of India consisted of eighty-three dioceses and two prefectures apostolic of the Latin Rite, seventeen dioceses of the Syro-Malabarese and two dioceses of the Syro-Malankarese Rites. The number of bishops—ordinaries, coadjutors, and auxiliaries—is 125. Three of them are cardinals. All except seven of the bishops are Indians. The number of the faithful of all three rites amounts to 10 million.

Pakistan

Large parts of the future West Pakistan belonged in ecclesiastical administration to the archdiocese of Bombay until 1948. After the founding of the independent Islamic nation of Pakistan, the diocese of Karachi was erected in West Pakistan on 20 May 1948. In East Pakistan—now Bangladesh—there had existed the diocese of Dacca since 1886. On 15 July 1950 Rome completed the ecclesiastical organization by the establishment of the ecclesiastical province of Karachi, with the suffragan sees of Multan, Lahore, and Rawalpindi, to which were added in 1958 Hyderabad and in 1960 Lyallpur, called Faisalabad since 1977, and that of Dacca, with the suffragan sees of Dinajpur and Chittagong, to which in 1952 was added Jesore, called Khulna since 1956.[50] No boundaries were determined for Kashmir and Jammu, for possession of which India and Pakistan were still fighting. Here on 17 January 1952 Rome erected instead the prefecture apostolic of Kashmir and Jammu, since 1968 called Jammu and Kashmir, and entrusted it to the Mill Hill Missionaries.[51] On the establishment of diplomatic relations with Pakistan, the delegation earlier erected in Karachi was on 9 October 1951 elevated to an internunciature, which on 27 December 1965 became a nunciature.[52]

The Islamic state of Pakistan guaranteed religious liberty in the constitution and assured the free exercise of religion by the religious minorities. Nevertheless, here as everywhere else in the Islamic world, the proclamation of the Christian faith encounters insurmountable difficulties. The episcopate always tried to solve emerging timely problems, such as the school question, by direct negotiations with the government. The foreseeable limitations on foreign missionaries were compensated by the opportune "Pakistanization" of the episcopate and the clergy. The elevation of the archbishop of Karachi, Joseph Cordeiro, to the College of Cardinals on 5 March 1973 was well received even by the non-Catholic population and the government. However, one cannot speak of an influence of the small Catholic minority on public life. All private colleges, including four Catholic, were nationalized in September 1972. In October of the same year the same fate overtook the Urdu schools in the Punjab and some English schools. There were in 1972 381,000 Catholics in a population of ca. 65 million.

---

[50] *AAS* 43 (1951), 66–69.

[51] Ibid. 44 (1952), 513f.

[52] Ibid. 42 (1950), 878f.; 44 (1952), 712f.; 58 (1966), 134.

Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, independent since 1971, the Catholic minority is very dynamic. It exercises its greatest influence in the sector of education. In 1976 it maintained 274 educational centers, a noteworthy achievement for a community of only 130,000 Catholics—today they number 142,000 in a population of 71.5 million. Among them were sixteen high schools. On 2 March 1973 Paul VI erected the nunciature of Bangladesh.[53]

Sri Lanka

Evangelization on Sri Lanka, the former Ceylon, which regards itself as the refuge of the original, unadulterated Buddhism, is chiefly in the hands of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, the Silvestrine Benedictines, and the Jesuits. They succeeded, in spite of some difficulties, in building a relatively strong Church and educating a numerous native clergy. Still, the process of transferring the direction of the Church to native hands began late.[54] Not until the partition of the archdiocese of Colombo and the founding of the new diocese of Chilaw on 5 January 1939 did the first native Oblate obtain an episcopal see. But he died before his episcopal ordination. In 1940 another native Oblate became his successor.

After the end of World War II Rome hastened to appoint a native of Sri Lanka, in fact a Singhalese bishop, as coadjutor with the right of succession. The choice fell on forty-four-year-old Thomas Benjamin

---

[53] Ibid. 65 (1973), 236.

[54] The bishop of Kandy, Beda Beekmeyer, O.S.B. Silv., appointed in 1912, was, it is true, born in Sri Lanka, but he came from a Dutch family which had lived in Sri Lanka for a little over a century.

Cooray, O.M.I., who later became Sri Lanka's first cardinal.[55] He became archbishop on 26 July 1947.

With the attainment of political independence on 4 February 1948, there began a campaign of harassment by Buddhist groups against the Catholic Church, which some intended to make responsible for the island's long colonial past. At first, this had as a consequence an "inferiority complex" on the part of Catholics, but the Church soon recovered from this. Rome continued to entrust the direction of the Church to native hands. Just the same, the young Church found it difficult to extend its missionary endeavors further. It increased practically only through natural growth. In 1958, of the 9.3 million inhabitants, 7.69 percent were Catholics. A large part of the native clergy was occupied in education and hence kept from the functions of evangelization. It is gratifying that at the insistence of Rome the clergy of Sri Lanka have since the 1960s undertaken foreign missions, first in Malaysia, then in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh.

The Church received a new stimulus when on 22 February 1965 Archbishop Cooray became a cardinal. Under his chairmanship, the National Synod of 1968 sought to implement the directives of the Second Vatican Council in the Church of Sri Lanka. It courageously considered all the burning problems: cooperation between clergy and ordinaries, lay movements, religious instruction, liturgy, adaptation, and so forth, and decided for the elimination of the ghetto mentality of the Catholic Church within the nation, for positive collaboration in the national and cultural life, and for preparedness for cooperation with non-Christians in the solution of national problems.[56]

Nevertheless, the Church was not spared severe trials. In 1960 all private schools on Sri Lanka were nationalized. In 1964 the sisters assigned to state hospitals were removed. In January 1966 the government abolished the Christian Sunday and introduced the Buddhist *Poya* Day as the day of rest; it is computed according to the moon's phases. But this decision was annulled for economic considerations on 9 July 1971. Since Cooray's creation as a cardinal, the relations with the government have improved somewhat. On 11 December 1967 Rome established the apostolic delegation and on 6 September 1975 the apostolic nunciature of Sri Lanka.[57] On 4 December 1970 Paul VI stayed for three hours at the airport in Colombo on his return flight from Oceania and Australia. He was welcomed by 600,000 persons. The government, the Buddhists, Hindus, and Muslims had sent delegations. This papal visit contributed much to the improvement of the climate among the religious groups. Today the Catholic Church on Sri Lanka counts 965,000 members in a total population of 13 million, a fairly strong minority for Asiatic conditions.

---

[55] Session of the cardinals of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of 10 December, audience of 13 (not 14) December 1945.

[56] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen,* 23–25. An important contribution to the improvement of the climate between Catholics and Buddhists was made by Bishop Edmund Peiris, O.M.I., of Chilaw by means of his economic and historical researches and publications. He was regarded as the best informed on the culture and history of Sri Lanka and took part in a brisk exchange of scholarly ideas with learned Buddhists.

Vietnam

The plenary Council of Hanoi, 18 November to 6 December 1934, altered the course of the future of the young Churches of French Indochina—the states of Tonkin, Annam, Cochin China, Cambodia, Laos, and Siam. The most important subjects treated were: implementation of the new *Codex iuris canonici* and of the papal mission encyclicals, adaptation to the present time, guidelines for the mission to pagans, uniform missionary methods, relations of the foreign priests with the native clergy, learning of the national languages, study of the native religions and cultures, founding of native religious communities, use of the vernacular by the faithful at Mass, preparation of native priests for direction of the Church, wearing of Annamite dress by the clergy, and the lay apostolate.

The appointment of the native priest John Baptist Tong as coadjutor bishop of Phat-Diem and his ordination at Rome by Pius XI on 11 June 1933 was the first step on the way to a native Church, and others quickly followed. The French colonial power thwarted some of Rome's plans, but it was unable any longer to stop the development.[58]

The political occurrences during World War II and the succeeding wars for independence and above all the partition of Vietnam on 20 July 1954 inflicted atrocious injury on the mission Church. The political division altered at one stroke the religious and ecclesiastical picture of Vietnam. Ten vicariates apostolic lay in North Vietnam, six in South Vietnam. 875,000 inhabitants moved from the north to the south, 80 percent of whom, that is, 650,000, were Catholics. In South Vietnam the number of faithful tripled. The Church did everything it could to solve the burning social and religious problems of the refugees. Pastoral care among the now 1.4 million faithful had to be reorganized. This number grew powerfully in consequence of a movement of conversion that got under way in the next few years.

The Church undertook special exertions in the educational and social and charitable fields. In 1966 264,801 pupils were counted in the 1,158 elementary schools and 83,103 students in the 178 high schools. In 1959 the episcopate of South Vietnam founded the University of Da Lat, which was recognized by the state the same year. It was intended to make a new contribution to the intellectual construction of the country, especially in the educational and cultural sphere. Mathematics, chemistry, agriculture, technology, philosophy, literature, and education were the branches of knowledge here cultivated. In 1965 there followed the establishment of a theological faculty in the Papal Seminary of Pius X, also at Da Lat.

---

[57] *AAS* 67 (1975), 649.

[58] Cf. *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 507f.

In North Vietnam, on the contrary, the Church had to suffer more and more under Communist rule. All foreign missionaries were expelled in 1960. The activity of the native bishops and of the 200 remaining native priests was very greatly curtailed. The apostolic delegate since 1951, John Dooley, had to leave Hanoi because of sickness and was brought to the hospital at Phnom Penh. His vicar, Terence O'Driscoll, was expelled on 17 August 1959.

In South Vietnam there took place from 16 to 18 February 1959 at Saigon in the presence of the papal legate, Cardinal Gregory Peter Agagianian, the National Marian Congress, which was intended at the same time to celebrate the tercentenary of the nomination of the first vicars apostolic. Another important happening of the Jubilee Year was the establishment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy on 24 November 1960. Three ecclesiastical provinces were erected: in North Vietnam, Hanoi, with the suffragan sees of Lang Son, Hai Phong, Bac Ninh, Hung Hoa, Thai Binh, Bui Chu, Phat Diem, Than Hoa, and Vinh; in South Vietnam, Hué, with the suffragan sees of Qui Nhon, Nha Trang, and Kon Tum, and Saigon, with those of Vinh Long, Can Tho, Da Lat, My Tho, and Long Xuen. Hanoi and all dioceses in North Vietnam obtained native ordinaries, as did Saigon and all its suffragans and Hué and Qui Nhon.[59] Only Nha Trang and Kon Tum for the moment retained a foreign bishop. On the occasion of the establishment of the hierarchy, John XXIII sent a letter of congratulations to the Church in Vietnam on 14 January 1961.[60]

Pope Paul VI lost no opportunity to employ his prestige and diplomatic skill for the restoration of peace in Vietnam. In 1966 he sent the then apostolic delegate in Canada, Titular Archbishop Sergio Pignedoli, with a special message to the bishops meeting in Saigon.[61]

---

[59] *AAS* 53 (1961), 346–50.

[60] Ibid., 84–88.

[61] Ibid. 58 (1966), 911–14.

On 27 November 1970, on his flight from Dacca to Manila, he sent personal greetings to the governments in North and South Vietnam.

After the end of the thirty-years civil war, there began also for the part of the young Church in what had been South Vietnam a difficult time. In September 1975 twenty missioners were expelled from Da Lat. Thereafter the expulsion of foreign missionaries proceeded systematically.[62] The Church became more and more the "silent" Church. On 18 March 1976 Bishop Nguyên van Thuân, who had been appointed coadjutor of Saigon[63] before the seizure of power by the Communists, was imprisoned. He was regarded as one of the most capable bishops in Vietnam. He again obtained his freedom in July 1978. The archbishop of Hanoi, Joseph Marie Trin-nhu-Khuê, was created a cardinal by Paul VI in the consistory of 24 May 1976.[64] He received from the government permission for the journey to Rome.

Today the young Church in Vietnam numbers 2.8 million faithful in a total population of 47 million.

Laos

In Laos evangelization was carried out by members of the Paris Mission Seminary and French and Italian Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Despite encouraging starts, the mission still had not advanced beyond the initial stage in the 1950s. But at that time people felt they could speak of a wave of conversions among the animistic mountain tribes of the Meo and the Lao Theung in the uplands north of Vientiane; however, the political happenings impeded the evangelization of these peoples. Still, there arose a rather large number of Christian congregations which grew rapidly. But it was precisely the habitat of these mountaineers that became the field of operation of the Communist Pathet Lao. The part of the country occupied by them became inaccessible to the missionaries.

After South Vietnam had fallen at the end of April 1975 and Cambodia fourteen days later, Laos passed almost silently into the hands of the Communists in May. In the same month thirty French missionaries went to Thailand. In September twenty-nine Italian Oblates had to leave the country within three days.[65] Three native bishops and a dozen native priests remained behind under difficult conditions to care for some fifteen thousand faithful.

---

[62] Except for two members of the community of the "Little Brothers" of Charles de Foucauld and one of the "Little Sisters," all foreign missionaries were expelled up to 1976. The Church lost all its apostolic works, such as schools, student residences, orphanages, and hospitals. An exception was the Saint Paul Clinic in Ho Chi Minh City (Saigon).

[63] In 1967 he was made bishop of Nha Trang and on 24 April 1975 was appointed coadjutor of Saigon.

[64] *AAS* 68 (1976), 379.

[65] They are today active in other missions, especially in Indonesia and Senegal.

Cambodia

The most recent events had a still much more tragic impact on the little mission Church in Cambodia. The from time immemorial "little flock," which was for the most part composed of immigrant Vietnamese, was ever more decimated. The Catholics were branded as agents of a foreign religion. One who had himself baptized a Christian was called a traitor. This is related to the fact that there were scarcely 5,000 Catholics of Cambodian ancestry. Most of them were descendants of emancipated slaves of earlier times. Today Christianity has no more possibility of life in radical Cambodia. It has been effaced.

Thailand

The young Church in Buddhist Thailand, formerly Siam, had to suffer from various sorts of persecution in the 1930s and 1940s. Christianity was rejected as the religion of the colonial power. After World War II the situation improved somewhat. The repeated coups d'etat diverted people from church policy. In 1953 there were, among 18 million inhabitants, at most 85,000 Catholics, mostly Vietnamese and Chinese, seldom Thais. But missionary activity was tolerated. Today the young Church counts 174,000 faithful in a population of 41 million. On 18 December 1965 the ecclesiastical hierarchy was erected.[66]

Burma

The Second World War produced serious damage for the mission Church in Burma. On the occasion of the conquest of the country by the Japanese and of the reconquest, almost all mission works—churches, schools, mission stations—were destroyed. And there occurred local persecutions of Christians. The constitution of the nation, independent since 4 January 1948, guarantees religious liberty. This did not exclude certain restrictions, for example, in regard to the entry of foreign missioners. And the state claimed the sole right to educate the youth. In an effort to accommodate the strong national consciousness of the population and to remove prejudices against Catholics, Rome pushed from 1954 for the transfer of the direction of the Church to native bishops. The ecclesiastical hierarchy was established on 1 January

---

[66] *AAS* 58 (1966), 554–56. Two ecclesiastical provinces were erected: Bangkok and Thare Nonseng with three suffragans each. Meanwhile, two other dioceses were established.

1955.[67] There were at that time, among 16 million inhabitants, only about 150,000 Catholics. Among them, however, were scarcely any Burmese, who professed Buddhism exclusively. Only the animistic mountain tribes of the original population were accessible to evangelization, as were immigrant Indians and Chinese. From 1966 to 1970 no less than 262 Catholic missionaries were expelled in keeping with the general tendency of the government to eliminate antinational influences as far as possible. Schools and charitable institutions were for the most part expropriated and nationalized. Residence permits were withdrawn from all missionaries who had entered after 1948. Nevertheless, the young Church is growing. Today it numbers 331,000 faithful in a population of 28 million.

The Malay Peninsula

The political changes on the Malay Peninsula repeatedly demanded the transformation of the ecclesiastical organization from the middle of this century.[68] At the same time Rome desired by its measures to give a new stimulus to the Catholic mission, to take into account the ethnic circumstances, to introduce the transfer of church government to native hands, to remove the basis for the ever louder complaints that the Catholic Church is not supranational but bound to the Western colonial powers, and finally to show the people that the Holy See understands and fosters the struggle of colonial peoples for independence. Today there are on the peninsula two ecclesiastical provinces, with two archdioceses and two suffragans each and the archdiocese of Singapore, which is immediately subject to the Holy See. The number of the faithful in this area amounts to 436,000.

Indonesia

To follow the evangelization and ecclesiastical organization on the 3,000 islands of modern Indonesia in all details would go beyond the scope of this work. We must limit ourselves here to some points which appear important to us. After World War II, during which 120 missionaries had been killed in Indonesia, the missionary activity was at once resumed. The new regime put no obstacles in the way, although most of the missionaries were Dutch; on the contrary, it valued their work, especially in education.

---

[67] *AAS* 47 (1955), 263–66. Two ecclesiastical provinces were erected: Rangoon with two dioceses and a prefecture apostolic, and Mandalay with one diocese and one prefecture. Today there are in Burma two archdioceses and one prefecture.

[68] Cf. *AAS* 47 (1955), 433–35, and 65 (1973), 126–28.

On 7 July 1947 Rome erected an apostolic delegation for Indonesia. On 15 March 1950 it was elevated to an internunciature and on 7 December 1965 to a nunciature.[69]

In 1960 Rome felt the time had arrived to erect an ecclesiastical hierarchy in Indonesia. As reasons for this were named: recognition of the missionary successes of the last years, contribution to the gratification of the strong nationalist stirrings in Indonesia, greater prestige of the Catholic Church with the government and the people. It was hoped by this measure to supply a new stimulus to evangelization in the island nation. And so on 3 January 1961 John XXIII established six ecclesiastical provinces with a total of twenty-five archdioceses and dioceses.[70] The metropolitan sees of Jakarta and Semarang received native archbishops.

After the United Nations had on 1 May 1963 given the former Dutch New Guinea, now West Irian, to Indonesia for administration, Rome decided on 10 November 1966 to establish the ecclesiastical hierarchy here too. The province of Merauke with two suffragan sees was formed.[71] With the creation on 26 June 1967 of the archbishop of Semarang, Justin Darmojuwono (since 1963), as the first Indonesian cardinal, Paul VI honored the Indonesian mission Church and the entire island population.[72]

All these young Churches of Asia have their own episcopal conferences, which boldly keep an eye on the current tasks and problems of the formation of dynamic individual Churches and seek to solve them by the most far-reaching adaptation to the traditional national circumstances, morals, and customs. In addition, all these episcopal conferences have joined in the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences (F.A.B.C.), whose statutes were approved *ad experimentum* by Rome on 6 December 1972. It held its first plenary meeting at Taipei from 21 to 27 April 1974, and at this new stresses were placed on the great themes: local church, dialogue with other world religions, aid for the development of the Church, ecclesiastical renewal, liturgical adaptation.[73] The vitality of the young Churches in Asia and their desire for cultural accommodation are likewise attested to by the very numerous native religious communities of diocesan right, which were founded everywhere in the last few years and decades.[74]

---

[69] Ibid. 39 (1947), 468, 618f.; 42 (1950), 434; 58 (1966), 132f.

[70] Ibid. 53 (1961), 244–48; cf. ibid., 296–99 (the Pope's message of greeting).

[71] Ibid. 59 (1967), 483f., date: 15November.

[72] Ibid. 59 (1967), 714.

[73] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (1974), 167f.

The Young Churches in Africa

Evangelization on the African continent in the second half of this century was at last able, free from the bonds of colonialism, to embrace all the African peoples and tribes and their cultures credibly and successfully and lead to the founding of native Churches, which offered to the struggling young nations now achieving independence their help for the achievement of intellectual and material progress and the furtherance of peace and justice. The 1950s became, from the missionary viewpoint, the "Decade of Africa." If in 1950 all of Africa, so to say, was still under colonial rule, at the end of 1960 two-thirds of the African population lived in independent states. If in 1950 there were only two African bishops, at the beginning of 1960 there were already twenty-two. In the consistory of 28 March 1960 John XXIII created the first African cardinal.

The missionary development not only made progress with the political and social, but in its own way contributed to prepare for and fostered the political and social development. This notion is expressed repeatedly in the documents of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. By means of the most important measures, such as the erection of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, the naming of African bishops, the Africanization of the Church, rearrangement of apostolic delegations, and so forth, Rome intentionally sought to approve and promote the independence movement of the African peoples. In the social sphere there appeared most unambiguously the contribution of the mission to the emancipation of the African woman, which it had helped to prepare by admitting black girls to religious institutes and by founding native congregations of sisters. At the same time this was a necessary precondition for the implanting of Christianity, for the social and cultural depression of the African woman was the "chief impediment to a permanent Christianization of the people."[75]

The external missionary development of Africa in this period is expressed in the following statistics: In 1922 the African mission Church, in so far as it was subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman missionary officials, was divided into 50 vicariates apostolic, 28 prefectures apostolic, and 4 missions. On 31 December 1972 there existed in the same area 43 archdioceses, 236 dioceses, 15 vicariates apostolic, 21 prefectures apostolic, 1 prelacy, 1 apostolic administration, hence a total of 317 ecclesiastical territories. In 1978 there were on the entire African continent and its islands 49 metropolitan sees, 269 dioceses, 13 vicariates apostolic, 14 prefectures apostolic, 2 apostolic administrations, 1 prelacy, and 17 jurisdictions immediately subject to the Holy See, that is, they belong to no ecclesiastical province; there are also 2 patriarchates and 6 dioceses of Churches of the Eastern Rites. Altogether, there are 373 ecclesiastical territories. Of the 335 "Latin" bishops, 237 are Africans. Twelve belong to the College of Cardinals, and, of these, one, Bernardin Gantin, is a curial cardinal at Rome, president of the papal commission *Iustitia et Pax.* To follow this grand-scale development in detail is not possible within the limits of this work. Here, even more than in the Asiatic mission area, we must confine ourselves to the striking events and measures pointing the way.[76]

---

[74] "Supplementum" to the *Bibliografia Missionaria,* Anno XXXIX–1975, Quaderno no. 18 (Rome 1976), 20–52.

[75] L. Kilger, O.S.B., "Watawa-schwarze Schwestern," *NZM* 1 (Schöneck 1945), 113–17.

For the gradual Africanization of the Church Rome referred extensively to the cooperation of the missionary orders, congregations, and societies. Only where these were intent on training a native clergy could native ordinaries be appointed and entrusted with the government of the Churches. As early as 1925 Rome thought it could take the first step in this direction. But the plans could not be implemented until 1938. Pius XI gave the stimulus to this. In an audience of 24 May he said to the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Celso Costantini: "Will Divine Providence grant me the joy of ordaining an African bishop at Saint Peter's in Rome? The missions in Africa list today the most productive harvest in conversions."[77] In June of the same year he told Costantini that it was his "lively desire" to ordain an African bishop; he wished thereby on the one hand to reward and crown the activity of the foreign missioners in Africa and on the other hand to give a new impetus to the missions there. The preparations began at once, but it was only allowed to Pius XII on 29 October 1939 to ordain at Rome the first two African bishops of modern times,[78] together with ten other missionary bishops, including one Chinese and one Indian.[79]

---

[76] For more details cf. *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 519–43.

[77] *Agenzia Fides* (1939), no. 704–NI 211/39.

[78] There had already been a native African bishop in 1518: Henrique, son of the King of the Congo (cf. *BM* XV, 283). There is a report of another African bishop in N. Kowalsky, O.M.I., "Tobia Ghebragzer. Ein 'schwarzer' Bischof im 18. Jahrhundert," *NZM* 15 (Schöneck 1959), 198–204.

[79] *AAS* 31 (1939), 595–98 (the Pope's homily).

Another Roman decision about this time speaks clearly for the desire to Africanize the Church. In the Congo there had emerged a "question of rites." It had to do with supplanting of pagan burial ceremonies by Christian. The missionaries had sought to eradicate the entire pagan burial rite, which was called *Matanga.* However, they ran into resistance from the population. The faithful regarded themselves as bound from social motives to take part in the burial of their pagan countrymen and hence in those rites. No one observed the prohibition of the missionaries. Now in fact the *Matanga* consisted partly of superstitions, but also partly of completely indifferent usages. The Roman missionary office was asked for information. Appealing to the instruction of 1659,[80] this approved the plan of a "Christian Matanga," as the apostolic delegate and the bishops of the Congo had proposed. However, Rome advised the ordinaries, in connection with the drawing up of Christian burial ceremonies, to have regard for the customs that differed from tribe to tribe. This first step was followed after the Second Vatican Council by many others in the same sense in the area of liturgical adaptation.

In the 1950s the Africanization of the Church consistently progressed in the area of the transfer of ecclesiastical government to native hands. Gradually native bishops were named everywhere: Tanganyika in 1950,[81] Ruanda in 1952, Basutoland (now Lesotho) in 1952, South Africa in 1954, Sudan in 1955, Cameroon in 1955, Upper Volta in 1956, Belgian Congo (now Zaire) in 1956, Kenya in 1956, Nigeria in 1957, Ghana in 1957, and Togo in 1962.

Hence at the close of the "African Decade" twelve African nations and Madagascar had the first native bishops, and the process of transferring the government of the Church was in full swing. Furthermore, the regular ecclesiastical hierarchy was introduced in these and other countries. The 1960s saw the rise of the first African prelates into the College of Cardinals: in 1960 Laurean Rugambwa, bishop of Rutabo; in 1965 Paul Zoungrana, archbishop of Ouagadougou, and Owen McCann, archbishop of Cape Town, a white South African, also Léon-Étienne Duval, archbishop of Algiers, and Stephanos I Sidarouss, Coptic patriarch of Alexandria; in 1969 Joseph Malula, archbishop of Kinshasa, and Jérôme Rakotomalala, archbishop of Tananarive. In the 1970s followed: in 1973 Émile Biayenda, archbishop of Brazzaville, and Maurice Otunga, archbishop of Nairobi; in 1976 Hyacinthe Thiandoum, archbishop of Dakar, Victor Razafimahatratra, S.J., archbishop of Tananarive, Emmanuel Nsubuga, archbishop of Kampala, and Dominic Ignatius Ekandem, bishop of Ikot Ekpene; and in 1977 Bernardin Gantin.

---

[80] The latest edition of this important instruction for the attitude of the Roman mission authorities in questions of conduct in regard to native cultures from the earliest times of the mission dicastery in *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 696–704.

[81] The year of the appointment of the first native bishop is given in each instance.

The second feature which gave its stamp to the "Decade of Africa" and brought the Africanization of the Church a good bit further was the erection of the regular ecclesiastical hierarchy in the mission Churches of the continent. There were good reasons for the introduction of the new mission organization. There was a desire to return to the earlier practice of the Church. The structure based on prefectures and vicariates was determined by history and had only a temporary character, and the reasons on which it was supported had for a long time had no further foundation.[82] Further, account was to be taken of the rapid progress of the African mission Church in the most recent period; the missionaries should be compensated for their efforts, and greater authority should be given to the ordinaries. Since the Anglican Church and the Protestant denominations were appointing bishops and archbishops who stood in great repute among the African population, the Catholic Church must not hold back. A further important reason, cited again and again in the documents, was the regard for the striving for independence of the African peoples. This demand should be intentionally encouraged, and it should be shown to the African peoples as well as to the whole world that Rome considered these peoples as mature enough to rule themselves. It was also not unknown in Rome that the Africans attributed a colonial character to the missions—even if incorrectly, at least as regards the missions of the Roman Dicastery—or imagined in them a pseudo-colonial appearance, and these in fact awakened in many the impression of a "religious colonization," because they were still to a great extent in the hands of foreign personnel. Hence the "old missions" should be replaced by "new missions," which were directed by natives.

The first step in the new direction was taken in 1950 in British West Africa, that is, in Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast (now Ghana), Nigeria, British Togo, and British Cameroon. Gambia was excluded, since there was only a *missio sui iuris* with few Catholics. On 28 April 1950 three ecclesiastical provinces were erected in this area, together with twelve bishoprics.[83] In addition to the already mentioned general reasons, in this case the following were also decisive for the erection of the hierarchy: the favorable missionary situation, the good prospects for the future, the rapidly increasing number of native priests,[84] the planned pilgrimage of several missionary bishops from West Africa to Rome for the Holy Year in May 1950, which it was intended to publicize in connection with the erection of the hierarchy, the previous nomination of an Anglican archbishop, and finally the desire of the British colonial government to see archbishops at the head of the Catholic Church as partners in negotiations.

---

[82] Cf. N. Kowalsky, O.M.I., "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Apostolischen Vikare," *NZM* 13 (Schöneck 1957), 271–86; also, *Memoria Rerum* I/1, 353–438; II, 220–34.
[83] *AAS* 42 (1950), 615–19.

On 11 January 1951 there occurred the establishment of the regular ecclesiastical hierarchy in South Africa, in Basutoland (Lesotho), and Swaziland (Ngwane). Four ecclesiastical provinces with twenty-one jurisdictions were constituted.[85] The archbishops of Cape Town, Durban, and Pretoria and the bishops of Johannesburg and Keimoes were South Africans of white ancestry. The special national character of this country brought it about that as yet no native black bishops could be named. However, less than two years later Rome began in Basutoland the transfer of the government of the Church to native bishops. And even in the Union of South Africa, today the Republic of South Africa, the government of the Church could not continue exclusively in the hands of the white clergy. As in all Africa, there too the national and self-consciousness of the Bantu peoples was gaining strength. They felt it to be humiliating that there were so few black priests, and were inclined to assign the guilt for this to the white missioners, whom they suspected of not giving the blacks credit for being able to have their own priests and bishops. With the division of the diocese of Mariannhill, the erection of the Zulu diocese of Umzimkulu, and the naming of the Mariannhill priest Bonaventura Dlamini in 1954, Rome wanted to accommodate the justified aspirations. However, further steps in this direction have to wait a long time.

In the South African mission Church the government's apartheid policy became a serious problem. The racial problem had begun practically with the first settlement by whites on the Cape and had become ever more serious and inflammatory from generation to generation, until, after World War II, it was, so to speak, made into a system by the government under the pretense of "separate development." What most irritated the black population and the half-castes and produced world publicity were the social injustices and vexations which made the entire apartheid policy of the government, including its not to be undervalued good aims, unworthy of credence. A compromise became more and more impossible. In official documents the bishops repeatedly took a stand against the injustices. The declaration issued by the Episcopal Conference in July 1957 deserves notice.[86] The archbishop of Durban, Denis Eugene Hurley, O.M.I., especially stood up fearlessly for the rights of the colored population. As a South African by birth, he could do more in this respect.

---

[84] In eastern Nigeria there were then: 479,840 Catholics, 260,277 catechumens, 230 foreign and 15 native priests; in western Nigeria: 176,807 Catholics, 42,198 catechumens, 203 foreign and 16 native priests; in the third province were 293,646 Catholics, 50,603 catechumens, 173 foreign and 12 native priests.

[85] *AAS* 43 (1951), 257–63.

Another trial of strength between the mission Church and the government took place in the school question. Because of the withdrawal of state support and the bishops' "no" to the nationalization of the schools, these came into sad financial distress. The two vicars apostolic of Windhoek and Keetmanshoop in South-West Africa, or Namibia, found a happier solution.

On 25 March 1953 Rome also established the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the countries of Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika in British East Africa, about ten years before these states obtained their political independence.[87] Four new ecclesiastical provinces with twenty-three bishoprics were founded.[88] There followed the erection of the hierarchy in Southern Rhodesia on 1 January 1955—one province with five jurisdictions[89]—and in French colonial Africa and Madagascar on 14 September of the same year—eleven provinces with thirty-eight archdioceses and dioceses.[90] On the same date, 14 September 1955, the vicariate apostolic of Rabat in Morocco became an archdiocese,[91] the vicariate apostolic of Ghardaïa in Algeria became the diocese of Laghouat,[92] and the prefecture apostolic of Jibuti in the then

---

[86] "Christianisme et ségrégation raciale (Déclaration collective des Évêques d'Afrique du Sud)," *Église Vivante* IX (Louvain 1957), 339–44. *La Documentation Catholique,* 39 Anneé T. LIV (Paris 1957), col. 1321–26.

[87] Kenya then counted, in a population of 5.4 million, 365,021 Catholics, 59,164 catechumens, 256 foreign and 14 native priests; Uganda: 1,134,057 Catholics out of 5 million inhabitants, 115,706 catechumens, 360 foreign and 133 native priests; Tanganyika: 785,677 Catholics out of 7.4 million inhabitants, 92,591 catechumens, 626 foreign and 134 native priests.

[88] *AAS* 45 (1953), 705–10.

[89] Ibid. 47 (1955), 292f. (the Pope's greeting of 24 April 1955). The number of Catholics amounted to 100,000 Bantu and 13,500 whites. There were 168 priests, 17 native seminarians, and 50 pupils in the minor seminary. The future prospects of the mission could be regarded as good, as the number of 20,000 catechumens shows.

[90] *AAS* 48 (1956), 113–19.

[91] In 1956 the diocese of Tangiers was erected here and made directly subject to the Holy See.

[92] Algiers, Constantine, and Oran are not subject to the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples.

French Somaliland, now, since 27 June 1977, the independent Republic of Djibouti, was likewise raised to a diocese and immediately made subject to the Holy See.[93]

Now only three quite large parts of Africa were without the normal ecclesiastical hierarchy: the Delegation Area of the Congo, British Central Africa, and the Sudan. It was introduced in the first two in 1959, in the Sudan in 1974. On 25 April 1959 Rome formed the two ecclesiastical provinces of Lusaka and Blantyre with five and three suffragan sees respectively.[94] The Belgian Congo, Ruanda, and Burundi were on the threshold of their political independence. Rome aspired to prepare the historical turning point by a series of ecclesiastical measures. The first concern was the appointment of a native auxiliary bishop for the future capital of the country. It was high time. The Catholic Church appeared to many Congolese as a foreign, colonial institution and was rejected by them. Hence on 2 July 1959 John XXIII appointed Joseph Malula as auxiliary bishop of Léopoldville, now Kinshasa.[95] On the same day the newly established vicariate apostolic of Goma was turned over to the native clergy. But the most important and striking event, whereby Rome wanted to assure the Congolese people of their readiness for greater independence was the erection of the ecclesiastical hierarchy on 10 November 1959 in the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, now Ruanda and Burundi.[96] Eight ecclesiastical provinces with as many archdioceses and twenty-nine dioceses were formed.[97] Finally there occurred in the Sudan the establishment of the Church hierarchy, after the calming of the political situation, on 18 November 1974 with the formation of two provinces and a total of seven sees.[98]

---

[93] *AAS* 48 (1956), 113–19.

[94] Ibid. 51 (1959), 793–96. In Northern Rhodesia there were in 1958 385,485 Catholics, 71,505 catechumens, 284 foreign and 29 native priests in a total population of 2.1 million. In Nyasaland (Malawi), with 2.5 million inhabitants, the statistics are similar: 429,150 Catholics, 51,696 catechumens, 224 foreign and 50 native missioners.

[95] On 7 July 1964 Malula became archbishop of the capital and in the consistory of 28 April 1969 he was created a cardinal.

[96] As early as 1952 this measure had been mentioned. The establishment of the hierarchy was to be included in the new mission agreement between the Holy See and Belgium. But the Belgian Senate refused assent when the treaty came into existence on 8 December 1953.

[97] *AAS* 52 (1960), 372–77. In the Congo there were in a population of 13 million 4.3 million Catholics and 700,000 catechumens, 2,272 foreign and 298 native priests. Remarkable was the increase in native priests, as regards both their number and their training. Ecclesiastical institutions—schools, hospitals, and so forth—were well organized. A still better picture emerges from the statistics of Ruanda-Urundi: 1.6 million Catholics out of 4.5 million inhabitants, more than 500,000 catechumens, 163 native and 329 foreign priests.

[98] *AAS* 67 (1975), 164f.

With the setting up of the ecclesiastical hierarchy on the African continent a long historical development had come to an end. A new epoch of history had begun. Out of the mission Churches had come "Young Churches," young particular Churches. True, their missionary status endured and still continues. But now, as equally competent member Churches, they stand beside those in Europe, America, and Asia. Furthermore, they depend on the personal and material support of other member Churches. The foreign missionaries accustomed themselves to work and evangelize under native bishops. This must be reckoned to their credit. Difficulties were not wanted in the period of transition. The point of departure for the future development of the Young Churches of Africa was laid.

We designated the 1950s as the "Decade of Africa" in regard to the Africanization of the Church, the transfer of church government to African bishops, and the establishment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The 1960s also set a special mark on the young African Churches: the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and most of the African states that had achieved independence, and the reorganization of the apostolic delegations. The missionary organization and development had to keep pace with the rapidly advancing political, social, cultural, and economic upheavals of the African peoples in these years, which in an increasing measure gained influence on world politics. Vestiges of the colonial past had to be definitively obliterated. And so in 1960 a reorganization of the apostolic delegations in Africa was undertaken. Out of the two previous delegations of Nairobi and Dakar were formed four delegations: Nairobi for East Africa, Dakar for West Africa, Lagos for west central Africa, and Tananarive for Madagascar.[99] John XXIII and to a greater degree Paul VI entered into direct diplomatic relations with the African states as they became autonomous.[100]

Not all African states have honored the loyal attitude of the Church, its aid in the conflict-filled transition from the colonial epoch to political independence, and its not insignificant contribution to the securing of domestic peace. Often the new states had received the constitution of a Western democracy, which did not sufficiently take into account the African circumstances and mentality. Hence almost all states had inner crises to overcome. The disturbances often passed into the relations of the government of the moment with the church authorities or with the Church as such. The African hierarchy worked to mediate and to give to the African peoples a new life-style based on respect for the natural rights of persons and on social justice and love. Still, in the 1960s and 1970s there occurred in several independent states of Black Africa severe conflicts between the heads of governments and church dignitaries.

---

[99] Ibid 52 (1960), 1000–1003.

[100] For the individual countries and dates see *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 536f.

In 1964 all European missionaries were expelled from the southern provinces of the Sudan; 278 Catholic and 28 Protestant missioners were affected. Only 32 native priests remained to care for 400,000 faithful. This was the result of the conflict between the more than 10 percent Christian southern provinces and the Arab population of the northern provinces. Not until 1971 could the first white missionaries—6 Jesuits—return to this area. Somewhat later 11 white sisters followed. A visit by the secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Archbishop Sergio Pignedoli, to Khartoum in July 1968 and his personal contacts had prepared the way for the new government to be reasonable.

In 1967 the president of Guinea expelled all foreign priests and sisters on the pretext that they were preventing the Africanization of the Church. In December 1970 he had the archbishop of Conakry put on trial because of participation in a coup d'etat allegedly staged by Portuguese Guinea and condemned to compulsory labor for life.[101] In 1974 Guinea gave occasion for guarded optimism. For the first time the president received a delegation of African missionaries.

Missioners were also expelled from Burundi, Gabon, Uganda, Rhodesia, and South Africa. In Somalia on 13 January 1963 missioners were forbidden by law to make any sort of direct "propaganda" for Christian religions. In his message for the third anniversary of the revolution on 21 October 1972 President Siad Barre announced the nationalization of all private schools and printing companies. This measure especially hurt the mission work of the Catholic Church. Now the Church can be active there only in the charitable and social fields.

In Lesotho the Church was involved against its will in the domestic political partisan strife. The loyal and skillful conduct of the archbishop of Maseru was able to keep undesirable consequences away from the missions. The common difficulties in this country led to a more intimate collaboration of all Christian Churches. Since then, ecumenical relations have been quite exemplary.

During the two-and-one-half-year civil war in Nigeria against secessionist Biafra, the Church was in a difficult position. It was accused of supporting the rebels. After the war's end foreign missionaries were imprisoned and banished. In 1971 Nigeria experienced a special success in the Africanization of the Church: seven native bishops were appointed.

---

[101] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (1970), 26–28.

In Equatorial Guinea, the former Spanish colony that became independent on 12 October 1968, there were very soon tensions between the new president and the Church. In April 1971 the Spanish bishop of Santa Isabel (Malabo since 1974) was driven from the country. The government gave no reasons for this. More even than the foreign Claretians, the native priests had to let caution prevail, since sinister political intentions were easily imputed to them. Finally, religious worship was totally forbidden, all churches were closed, the last foreign priests, except for an eighty-year-old one in Bata, were expelled in July 1978. There remained in the country only the twenty native priests. World public opinion veiled itself in silence over the tragedy which has been playing there since 1969.

Serious situations of conflict appeared also in Zaire. During student disturbances in June 1969 at the Catholic Lovanium University in Kinshasa, founded in 1954, several students were killed. A renewed protest by the students on the second anniversary of this occurrence was for the government the occasion to close the university and conscript all students, including religious sisters, into military service. In the next school year teaching was resumed with new students, but now it was called the University of Kinshasa. A little later a real struggle against the Church broke out. Freedom of meeting in churches was strictly curtailed by several harsh decrees. The entire institutional Church saw itself threatened in its potential for action. The cardinal archbishop of Kinshasa had to leave the country for a while. Christian baptismal names were forbidden, instruction in the Christian religion was proscribed in all schools. Finally, however, the conflict was settled.[102]

In Burundi the Church had to suffer much during the mass murder of more than 100,000 members of the Hutu tribe in 1972. On 13 April 1977 all eleven Verona Fathers active there and some Italian mission helpers were expelled, evidently because they had protected the Hutu in the bloody civil war. Also in Uganda there occurred tensions between government and Church. In December 1972 a papal delegation, under the leadership of the cosecretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, Bernardin Gantin, went to Uganda to settle the conflict. It was received by the president on 19 December. Here, too, relations improved later. Still, again and again unpleasant events occurred. In Malawi the president had the major seminary in Kachebere closed temporarily in April 1973, because his picture, which had been hung there, had been defaced, and the perpetrator could not be ascertained. The seminary was, it is true, reopened for the Malawi candidates for the priesthood, but the seminarians from Zambia and Mozambique had to leave the country.

---

[102] Cf. ibid., (Freiburg 1972), 91–94, 126f.

In December 1970 the Cameroonian Bishop Albert Ndongmo of N'Kongsamba was tried by a military court for an allegedly attempted coup d'etat and participation in a conspiracy to murder the president, and condemned to death. The verdict was reduced by the president to life imprisonment. The bishop was pardoned on 14 May 1975. Since then he has lived in Canada.

In Rhodesia the tension between Church and state was intensified by the government's discriminatory racial policy, about which the Church could not be silent. On Palm Sunday 1970 in a daring pastoral letter the bishops announced that they had decided to disregard certain aspects of the new constitution and that, because of their convictions of faith, they would not trouble themselves about those laws which clearly contradicted the gospel message. As early as June 1969 the five Catholic bishops of the nation had protested against the government's racial policy. On 1 October 1976 Bishop Donal Lamont of Umtali was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment at hard labor because of his open letter of 11 August to the government, in which he had censured the racial policy. On 23 March 1977 he was banished. The appointment of the new black archbishop of Salisbury on 31 May 1976 was greeted by world opinion as a courageous step by Rome. Terrorist acts of the independence movement brought great damage to the mission in the most recent period. In the twelve months from June 1977 to June 1978 thirty-six missioners were killed by terrorists.

The Portuguese possessions in Africa were, until their independence—Guinea-Bissau on 10 September 1974, Mozambique on 25 July 1975, Cape Verde Islands on 6 July 1975, São Tomé and Príncipe on 12 July 1975, and Angola on 11 November 1975—late relics of a long-past colonial age. Despite its involvement with the colonial power, the Church did not neglect the evangelization of these lands and islands. But its activity in the service of the spreading of the Gospel was overshadowed and seriously burdened by the fact that it supported a system which, appealing to the expansion of Portuguese Catholic civilization, denied the people freedom and independence. It there came under the fire of public opinion. In the mission agreement of 7 May 1940[103] between the Holy See and Portugal the interests of the Church were defined, but at the same time it was anchored in the colonial system. On 25 July 1953 the first native priest was ordained in Mozambique, Alexandre José Maria dos Santos, O.F.M., who in 1974 became bishop of Maputo, formerly Lourenço Marques. Thereafter the formation of the native clergy in the Portuguese overseas possessions was more encouraged. The independence movements, appearing everywhere, opened the eyes of prelates and clergy. Some of these came into opposition to the colonial government. Finally consideration was given to the construction of native local Churches. This development was further intensified after the Second Vatican Council. However, there remained the connection of the Church with the state, and the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, which, according to the mission decree of the council, should alone be competent "for all missions and all missionary activity,"[104] was for the future excluded from evangelization in the Portuguese overseas territories. Only after independence did it take over the direction of the mission Churches there. The rightly differently evaluated departure of the White Fathers from Mozambique in May 1971[105]—a unique incident in mission history—took place on the grounds that the political situation did not guarantee an integral proclamation of the faith.

---

[103] *AAS* 32 (1940), 217–44; A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati* II, 232–64; literature also in *BM* XXIII, no. 872.

After political independence the Church was pulled into the whirlpool of events. On 25 July 1975, exactly one month after independence, following a speech by the president, there began the nationalization of all ecclesiastical institutions in Mozambique. As grounds for this were cited the earlier support of the Church by the state and the fact that all these institutions actually belonged to the people. The government made no secret of its struggle against the Church. Half of all foreign priests left the country. Rome at once began to put the government of the mission Churches in these countries into native hands. For example, in Mozambique seven of thirty-five native priests were appointed and ordained bishops. From 9 to 13 September 1977 a National Pastoral Assembly was held in Beira. It was, so to speak, an inventory after two years of political independence. Guidelines were set up for the future pastoral care of the faithful and further evangelization. In Angola the twelve bishops, in a common pastoral letter of 14 December 1977, appealed to the government to respect the rights of religion. They admonished the faithful to stand firm in the faith and to work in peace for the welfare of the nation.[106] A reply of the government to this was obviously the expropriation of the radio station, Radio Ecclesiae, on 25 January, which had earlier to suspend its broadcasts. From 4 to 8 April 1978 the bishops of Angola held a plenary meeting, the outcome of which was again a common pastoral letter.[107]

---

[104] *Ad Gentes* 29 in *AAS* 58 (1966), 980.

[105] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1971), 161–65.

[106] *Internationaler Fides-Dienst 18. Januar 1978,* 28–31.

As regards organization, there are today three ecclesiastical provinces in Angola: Luanda with four, Huambo with three, and Lubango with two suffragan sees; in Mozambique, the ecclesiastical province of Maputo with eight suffragans; the dioceses of Bissau and São Tomé and Príncipe are immediately subject to the Holy See; and the diocese of Cape Verde is a suffragan of Lisbon. Two of the eleven bishops of Angola are foreigners. One hundred native and 223 foreign priests, 8 native and 22 foreign brothers, 250 native and 350 foreign sisters are active in Angola. They are supported by 20,000 native catechists.[108] The number of Catholics amounts to ca. 3 million, which is half the population of the country. In Mozambique there are 1.5 million Catholics, or 18 percent of the population.

On 7 December 1974 the Holy See erected an apostolic delegation in Mozambique,[109] on 30 December 1974 in Guinea-Bissau,[110] and on 25 February 1975 in Angola.[111]

And here too some highlights of other, hitherto not yet or hardly mentioned young Churches of Africa, though unfortunately completeness must be waived. The young Churches in Egypt and Ethiopia have a special status and must follow special laws. They stand in the same position as the Orthodox Eastern Churches. In so far as they have Eastern Rites, they are under the jurisdiction of the Roman Congregation for the Eastern Churches. Likewise subject to it are all the vicariates apostolic of the Latin Rite in Egypt and the vicariate of Asmara in Ethiopia. Only the vicariates of Gimma and Harrar and the prefectures of Awasa and Hosanna in Ethiopia depend on the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples. In 1938 Pius XI had clearly defined the jurisdiction of these two Roman dicasteries, which until then overlapped.[112] The conquest and occupation of Ethiopia by Italy in 1936 posed new problems and tasks for Rome and the young Church of this country. Their solution was made still harder by the fact that the Italian government, unasked, expressed desires which it wanted to see observed in the reorganization of the ecclesiastical situation. World War II brought new and great damage to the Church in Ethiopia. On 28 November 1942 100 missionaries, 300 sisters, two vicars apostolic, and one prefect were expelled and repatriated to Italy. Others had already left the country or had been imprisoned as military chaplains. Rome sent an urgent appeal to the White Fathers to dispatch there sixty missionaries to save the orphaned missions, and they did so. In 1945 Canadian Jesuits were entrusted with the organization of the educational system in Ethiopia.

---

[107] Ibid., *3. Juni 1978,* 313.

[108] Statistics of April 1978 in ibid., *14. Juni 1978,* 344. Further information on the situation of the Church in Angola and Mozambique in *Herder-Korrespondenz* 32 (Freiburg 1978), 302–9.

[109] *AAS* 67 (1975), 89f.

[110] Ibid. 174f.

[111] Ibid., 177.

[112] Motu proprio *Sancta Dei Ecclesia* of 25 March 1938 in *AAS* 30 (1938), 154–59; *Sylloge,* 567–73.

Catholic mission activity in Botswana, formerly Bechuanaland, is still young. The first mission station, still in existence, was founded in 1928. Since 1959 there has existed there the prefecture apostolic of Bechuanaland, which was entrusted to Irish Passionists. The diocese of Gaborone, founded in 1966, today includes all Botswana. The number of Catholics has grown in recent years from 10,000 to 26,390 in 1977. In Swaziland (Ngwane) Italian Servites do the missionary work. Bishop Casalini, O.S.M., of Manzini, the only diocese in the country, in 1976 placed his episcopal see at their disposal. Since then a native bishop has headed the diocese. In 1977 the number of Catholics amounted to 35,000 in a population of 520,000. At Manzini Salesians conduct a technical school, and Dominican Sisters a girls' high school.

The 25,000 Catholics in Liberia in 1977 are a "small flock," but their influence is incomparably greater. It is due to the educational and health systems of the Catholic Church. Here in the age of foundation not only did the climate occupy the Catholic missionaries, but also the intolerance and rejection on the part of the Protestant Christians. The Catholic Church did not really obtain civil rights until the 1930s. Today its schools surpass the other mission schools in number and quality, and, in contrast to these, are spread over the entire country. In the young Church of Senegal, where the philosopher, poet, and statesman Leopold Sédar Senghor (who attended the mission school of the Holy Ghost Fathers, in 1968 received the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade in the church of Saint Paul in Frankfurt, and since 1969 has been a member of the French Academy of Moral and Political Science as Adenauer's successor) rules the nation, the Church is not a stranger to questions of the young state. This is proved by the official positions of the bishops on social questions and the powerful effort of Christians for all questions of development aid. The chief problem remains the relationship to Islam. In Gabon the government of the young Church is entirely in native hands. Of course, the number of foreign missioners is still preponderant—in 1975 there were seventy of them, compared to thirty-four native priests. However, the number of native vocations is growing. As regards organization, the young Church consists of one archdiocese with three suffragans. It counts a total of 393,000 baptized in a population of 1.2 million.

Mali, a stronghold of socialism, assures religious freedom to the young Church of the state. In 1967, of the 4.75 million inhabitants about 39,000 were baptized Catholics and 170,000 catechumens. Today among 5.2 million inhabitants there are 47,000 Catholics, with one metropolitan see and five suffragans. In Upper Volta, with one metropolitan see, eight suffragans, and 336,000 Catholics in a population of 5.8 million, the Episcopal Conference in 1970 issued clear directions for the adaptation of the Catholic liturgy to African morals and customs and to African sensibilities. Gambia, the smallest African state, is a typical product of the colonial epoch and of colonial policy. The greatest problem of the young Church, which counts 11,500 faithful in one diocese among a half-million inhabitants, is the native clergy. Since March 1974 there is a common seminary for Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Gambia.

The Catholic Church in Chad is one of the youngest of the African Churches. It exists officially only since World War II, even if the neighboring mission in Cameroon had previously "encroached" on this territory. The chief problems of the Church—one metropolitan see, three suffragans, 211,000 faithful among 3.8 million inhabitants—are here, too, native vocations and relations with Islam. In the most recent past the signs of a starting *Kulturkampf* against the Christian Churches increased. The government wants to lead the nation back to "precolonial culture" and to "African authenticity."

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the elevation of Biayenda to the College of Cardinals was unanimously welcomed and celebrated. Likewise, Catholics and non-Catholics were infuriated by his murder on the evening of 22 March 1977. A few days earlier, on 18 March, President Ngouabi had also been murdered.

At Abidjan, Ivory Coast, a theological faculty was opened in 1976, which had grown out of the Higher Institute for Religious Culture, founded in 1968. The chief concern of the new faculty is to give to the students a better understanding of African religious traditions. The bishops of English-speaking Africa are considering the founding of a similar faculty in Nigeria or Kenya. Also in Abidjan the Jesuits in 1962 founded an *Institut Africain pour le Développement Économique et Social* (INADES), with branch offices in other African countries, which gives courses at the institute and television courses, organizes courses in villages and cities, and has built up an imposing documentation and information service. In Benin there was a brief untoward incident. On 8 August 1977 the government forbade Bernardin Gantin, the former archbishop of Cotonou, who on 12 June of that year had been made a cardinal and was now visiting his homeland, all further journeys and any public appearance. This prohibition was issued after Gantin had celebrated a Mass in the church of Saint John at Cotonou for the victims of the shootings in Benin in January. Several government representatives, including the minister of the interior, had attended the Mass.

In Tanzania, where 20 percent of the population is Catholic and about 10 percent Anglican and Lutheran, there are today districts and tribes not yet touched by missionary preaching. Here the young Church of the nation still has a big task to implement.

Madagascar is a model example of a mission country in which the Church is growing quickly and steadily. At the beginning of the century it counted scarcely 120,000 faithful, in 1950 there were 700,000, and today they number 1.4 million in a total population of 7.9 million. However, the number of native priests was left behind, in comparison. In 1968 a National Catechists' Institute was established in Tananarive for the training of catechetical leaders. In the same year the bishops began a comprehensive pastoral planning. Cardinal Rakotomalala died unexpectedly on 1 November 1975. The population of the Comoro Islands voted in December 1974 whether to become independent or remain under French rule. The inhabitants of the island of Mayotte were for union with France. The other islands became independent. The population is almost exclusively Muslim. Of the 244,000 inhabitants, only 2,500 are Catholics, and of these almost 1,000 are Europeans. The pastoral work is entrusted to French Capuchins. The Seychelles, an archipelago of ninety-two islands, have been independent since 29 June 1976. Swiss Capuchins have worked there since 1921. On 25 July 1975 the native priest Felix Paul was ordained bishop. Of the 58,000 islanders, 53,000 are Catholics. Réunion continues to be a French possession. In 1975 Bishop Georges Guibert, of the Holy Ghost Fathers, resigned in order to make way for native personnel. On 2 May 1976 the native priest Gilbert Aubry became bishop of La Réunion or Saint-Denis.

In conclusion, let three important events for all the young Churches of Africa be mentioned: the canonization of the martyrs of Uganda in 1964, the message of Paul VI to Africa in 1967, and the Pope's journey to Uganda in 1969. On World Mission Sunday, 18 October 1964, Paul VI canonized the twenty-two martyrs of Uganda, who had been beatified on 6 June 1920 by Benedict XV. In the years 1885–87 they, together with another eighty Catholics, Anglicans, and Protestants, had been put to death in a persecution of Christians. They were thus the first Bantu in the calendar of saints of the Catholic Church. Many African bishops, priests, religious, and faithful came to Rome for the celebration. For the first time African choral singing and African drums were heard in Saint Peter's. In his homily the Pope spoke of the "present hour of decision for Africa." "The martyrs call for help" for the African Church, he continued. "Africa needs missionaries, especially priests, physicians, teachers, sisters, nurses, magnanimous persons to help the young and flourishing congregations, which still need much support, to grow in number and quality in order to become a people, the African People of the Church of God."[113]

In the message to Africa of 31 October 1967 Paul VI took up the present problems of the African peoples. He intended thereby to carry further the mission encyclical *Fidei donum,* in which Pius XII had already revealed his anxieties about the future of the African continent.[114] Here as there, the values of African culture were displayed. Paul VI stated sadly that not all missioners of past epochs had acknowledged these values. But he did not condemn the missionaries, because they were children of their age and were not immune to its prejudices. He called to mind what these missionaries in the past had done for the intellectual and material development of the African peoples. As the principal tasks of the present that would determine the future, the Pope indicated the struggle against illiteracy and the development of agriculture. He proposed the creation of a world fund for development aid, from which all needy states should be helped without secondary political aims. At the end the Pope invited the bishops of the whole world and all the faithful not to be remiss in help for the Churches of Africa. "In spite of some shadows, which We have indicated," he concluded, "We trust that Africa . . . , filled with reverence for the rights of God and the dignity of the person, will continue on the way of progress."[115]

The third event which we intend to mention here was the journey of Paul VI to Uganda from 31 July to 2 August 1969. It had been immediately preceded by another likewise epoch-making occurrence for the future of the African Churches—the first All-Africa Episcopal Symposium from 28 to 31 July at Gaba near Kampala.[116] Paul VI wanted to preside in person at the final session of the symposium. The second occasion of the journey was the dedication of the shrine of the martyrs at Namugongo. On these occasions too the Pope again spoke of his esteem for the African person, land, and culture. "We know no other desire," he said, "than precisely to accept and to foster what you are: namely, Christians and Africans. We want that Our presence here with you should be regarded as a recognition of your maturity, as Our desire and Our intention to prove to you that the communion which joins us together will in no way suppress but, on the contrary, will promote the original nature of the personality in private, ecclesiastical, and civic life." The Church, he said, has "been really planted in this blessed earth." Now, after this foundation has been laid, the Pope concluded, it is the function of the African Christians to reconstruct their Church on this continent themselves: "You Africans are now your own missionaries."[117]

---

[113] *AAS* 57 (1965), 693–703; *Internationaler Fides-Dienst* (1964), 549–55. On 22 June 1934 Pius XI declared Blessed Charles Lwanga patron of African youth. (*AAS* 26 [1934], 582f.).

[114] Of 21 April 1957 in *AAS* 49 (1957), 225–48.

[115] *AAS* 59 (1967), 1073–97. *Internationaler Fides-Dienst* (1976), 575–91.

[116] Cf. *Herder-Korrespondenz* 23 (Freiburg 1969), 421–26.

A proof that the young Churches of Africa wished to go their "African" way, and for years have done so ever more independently, is the almost 150 native religious communities of diocesan right, which were founded everywhere.[118] These and other fortunate initiatives justify the hope that the young Churches of Africa will successfully solve also the modern problems which they encounter. Among these problems are the explosionlike growth of the number of Catholics and the increase, not keeping pace with it, of native priestly vocations, the urbanization, the education of an elite, the nationalization of education. Especially the disproportionately rapid growth of the number of Catholics—anually ca. 6 percent—poses for the church leadership problems whose solution must immediately be tackled. First is the increase of priestly vocations. No less important are the religious instruction of children and adult education. Likewise in regard to material things there arise vital and urgent tasks, such as the increase of the number of churches.[119] Another danger threatens the Church from the sectarian system. On no other continent is Christianity so fragmented as in Africa. There are approximately 5,000 "Christian" splinter Churches and sects, with some 7 million adherents. Most of them have grown up on the soil of Protestantism. However, a few have come also from a Catholic background. The largest "Catholic" sect—the Maria-Legio Church—arose in 1963 among the Luo tribe on the east shore of Lake Victoria in Kenya.[120] It is consciously African, bound to African tradition, and in this consists its power of attraction.

As in Asia, the Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar also have merged in the *Symposium des Conférences Épiscopales d'Afrique et de Madagascar* (SCEAM) in order to solve in common their mutual problems.[121] In addition there are still the three regional groupings: *Association des Conférences Épiscopales du Congo, de la République Centrafricaine, et du Tchad* (ACECCT), the *Conférence Épiscopale Régionale de l'Afrique de l'Ouest Francophone* (CARAO), and the Association of Member Episcopal Conferences in Eastern Africa (AMECEA). From 24 to 30 July 1978 the symposium held its fifth plenary meeting at Nairobi[122] in the presence of Cardinal Opilio Rossi, president of the Papal Council for the Laity, of Archbishop Simon D. Lourdusamy, the secretary of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, of representatives of the European and South American Episcopal Conferences and of religious. The participants—nine cardinals and about sixty archbishops and bishops and delegates of the laity—represented the more than 50 million African Catholics. The chief topic of the symposium was "Christian Family Life in Africa Today." In his address, Lourdusamy stressed the necessity of an authentic and judicious inculturation of the Church.[123]

---

[117] *AAS* 61 (1969), 572–91 *Internationaler Fides-Dienst* (1969), 367–75.

[118] Cf. the "Supplementum" to the *Bibliografia Missionaria,* Anno XXXVIII, 1974, Quaderno no. 17 (Rome 1975), 23–49.

[119] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1971), 3.

[120] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1970), 12–15.

The Young Churches in Oceania

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

The growth of the Catholic Church in Australia and New Zealand in the last century is amazing. The ecclesiastical organization was already essentially complete by 1920 and in the course of the past fifty years has undergone only slight changes. From 4 to 12 September 1937 the fourth Plenary Council of Australia and New Zealand met at Sydney under the chairmanship of the papal legate, Giovanni Panico.[124] The chief tasks of the council were the implementation of the new *Codex iuris canonici* and the consideration of more uniform pastoral and missionary methods.

Special attention was given to the evangelization of the primitive inhabitants of Australia. This task has belonged exclusively to the

---

[121] English Title: Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM).

[122] Originally the plenary meeting was to take place in Kinshasa. However, the domestic political disturbances that had broken out there caused the transfer toNairobi.

[123] "Inculturation, which is the consequence of the incarnational economy of salvation, is part and parcel of the mission of the Church and of the work of Evangelization it carries on. It is inseparable from the mission of the Church and indispensable for its evangelizing activity, simultaneous and all-dimensional with it." (*International Fides Service,* 23 August 1978, 378).

[124] The first plenary council was held in 1885, the second in 1895, the third in 1905. The fourth was supposed to be summoned in 1918 but rumors of an imminent ecumenical council in Rome and then the Twenty-Ninth World Eucharistic Congress at Sydney in 1928 delayed the implementation.

Australian Episcopal Conference since 22 March 1976, when Australia was removed from the jurisdiction of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples and transferred to the normal ecclesiastical administration. The Episcopal Conference is now competent for missionary work among the few remaining pagans in the (mixed and full-blooded) Australian aboriginal population of fifteen thousand. Hence a great responsibility was given to the young Church. Its function is so to integrate the aborigines that their traditions and culture may be taken into account. The community pastoral work must especially enter into and have regard for their needs. In a statement on the occasion of the "National Day of the Aborigines," the bishops took a position on all pastoral and ecclesiastical questions related to this problem and supported the demands of the aborigines on the state, the most important of which was the legal definition of the right to their possessions in northern Australia. In 1966 there were already sisters among the Australian aborigines, and in 1969 a convent of their own was erected for them at Darwin.

The Fortieth World Eucharistic Congress, which took place at Melbourne from 18 to 25 February 1973, for a brief time directed the interests of the Universal Church to the Church of Australia. The often bitter experiences which the Catholics especially had to endure in this originally overwhelmingly Anglican country now belong definitely to the past. The Catholic Church stands up together with the other Christian Churches for the rights of the underprivileged and hence has gained in esteem through this activity and this collaboration.[125] Of the 13.6 million inhabitants, 3.6 million, or 26.4 percent, are Catholics.

Also in New Zealand the ecclesiastical organization was complete by 1920. There were one archdiocese and three dioceses. The number of Catholics on 31 December 1976 amounted to 446,000, or 14.2 percent of the inhabitants. In the northern half of North Island the Mill Hill Missionaries take care of the evangelization of the Maori. The first priest of this tribe was ordained in 1945. The mission among the Maori even today still encounters difficulties. It is not easy to contact these people. In 1968 the first Maori sister made religious vows in Wanganui, a settlement of the Congregation of Sisters of Saint Joseph of Nazareth.

THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

In Oceania[126] the ecclesiastical organization of the incipient young Church from time to time had to adapt itself to the territorial, ethnic, and political circumstances. It was not always easy to keep sight of and follow events, especially when here too the independence movement of the island inhabitants and the transition from the colonial epoch to the present began. The mission Church on the Mariana Islands and the Carolines—to begin with these and continue our progress through the Pacific clockwise—had very much to suffer in the First as well as the Second World War. The entire vicariate once again remained for a rather long time without missionaries. After the war the islands became an American mandate. Rome united the Caroline and the Marshall Islands in a new vicariate apostolic and subordinated the Marianas to the vicariate apostolic of Guam, where Capuchins were active. In 1965 the vicariate became the Diocese of Agana as a suffragan see of San Francisco. The islanders are almost all Catholics.

---

[125] Cf. *Herder-Korrespondenz* 27 (Freiburg 1973), 196–202.

[126] Cf. the article by A. Freitag, S.V.D., in *ZMR* 36 (Münster 1952), 144–52, 214–22; 37 (1953), 283–93; 38 (1954), 121–31.

The Sandwich Islands, usually called Hawaii after the largest island, experienced, from the time they belonged to the United States in 1898, a missionary upsurge in so far as now American missionaries and especially missionary sisters came to the aid of the Picpus Fathers. From 1926 to 1940 Bishop Estevão Alencastre, S.S.C.C., directed the vicariate. Under him the mission made such progress that on 25 January 1941 Rome elevated the vicariate to a diocese as suffragan of San Francisco. On the Marquesas, where the Picpus Fathers had great freedom of movement from 1924 on, the mission saved the population from dying out. The islanders had declined to 2,500 persons and threatened to become entirely extinct. The missionaries did all they could to improve the people's hygiene. Since then the number of inhabitants is again on the rise. In 1943 there were 3,200 islanders, in 1973 5,600. They are almost all Catholics. Also on the Society Islands (Tahiti), the Gambier Islands, the Tuamotu Islands, and the Leeward Islands the colonial government long impeded Catholic missionary activity. A further obstacle to successful evangelization was the rivalry of the Protestant denominations, which had often preceded the Catholic mission. The Catholic missionaries realized greater successes on the Society Islands, whose population today is one-third Catholic. Since 1947 Chinese immigrants have also been included in the mission. From time immemorial the missionaries have championed the improvement of popular hygiene in order to prevent the extinction of the islanders, as well as the educational system and other works of intellectual and material development aid.

On the Cook and Manahiki Islands the Catholic mission did not flourish until very late. In 1926 there were among the 9,500 islanders only 450 Catholics, as compared with 6,330 Protestants. In 1949 there were 1,410 Catholics and 13,000 Protestants, but in 1972 there were 3,056 Catholics in a population of 26,217. On Wallis and Futuna, the Tonga archipelago, and the Niue Islands of central Oceania the Marists of Father Colin have done mission work since 1836. Their activity included also every sort of development aid for the native islanders. The enormous distances required a large number of mission personnel The cooperation of native catechists and missionaries was therefore essential. In 1950 there were already in this vicariate 24 native priests, 32 native brothers, and 227 native sisters. There had been a major seminary on Wallis since 1874. The first four native priests had been ordained in 1886. In 1935 Rome detached the islands of Wallis, Futuna, and Alofi and there erected a new vicariate. In 1950 the 9,000 islanders were all Catholics. The rest of the vicariate was named in 1937 after the Tonga Islands and in 1957 after these and Niue Island. Here the Catholic mission always had a difficult time in relation to the Protestant, which had embraced all the islanders as early as 1875. Today about one-fifth of the people are Catholics.

The Navigator Islands or Samoa were likewise entrusted to the Marists for evangelization. Here too all the islanders were converted to Christianity. In 1948 there were 20,000 and in 1973 36,798 Catholics in a total population of 174,866. Here too the Marists began early to train a native mission personnel. To Samoa belongs the honor of having obtained the first native bishop of Oceania. On 11 January 1968 Paul VI appointed the Marist Father Pius Taofinu'u as bishop of the diocese of Apia and Western Samoa, created just eighteen months previously.[127] An even greater significance belonged to the naming of the first Polynesian bishop in that on 1 January 1962 Western Samoa had acquired its political independence as the first island nation of Oceania. In the consistory of 5 March 1973 Paul VI created the first bishop in Oceania the first cardinal in Oceania. The Fiji Islands had been a British colony since 1874 and obtained their independence on 10 October 1970. Only in the 1920s could the Marists here think of training Polynesian priests. In 1923 they established a minor seminary at Cawaci. Only four of the first seminarians reached the goal, but a beginning had been made. From the catechists' school, founded earlier, there emerged in 1924–34 ninety qualified catechists and teachers.

In the vicariate apostolic of New Caledonia the formation of a native mission personnel was also not taken up systematically until recent times. The first two native priests were ordained in 1946. In 1950 there were also nineteen native brothers and eighty-eight native sisters. Thereby the preconditions for an autonomous Church was created here also. New tasks came to the mission because of the immigration of

---

[127] He was born on 9 December 1923 at Falealupo on Savaii, had been ordained a priest in 1954, had entered the Marist Congregation in 1962, and on 29 May 1968 received episcopal ordination.

Tonkinese and Javanese. Today, out of 135,000 inhabitants, 88,000, or 65.2 percent, are Catholics. The rest are Protestants and Muslims and a small remnant of pagans. The Marist mission on the New Hebrides was long regarded as a "hard quarry," not least because of the deadly climate. As regards numbers, the Catholic mission was unable to make great progress. In 1948, of the 60,000 islanders only forty-eight hundred were Catholics. But since then the number has increased quickly to 16,000 in 1976, out of 97,000 inhabitants. At this time the education of native priests was taken up, while there were native catechists and teachers even before World War II.

The most difficult mission of the Marists in Oceania was the Solomon Islands. When at last the preconditions for the construction of a native Church had been created and the formation of the native mission personnel began to produce the first successes, World War II caused the mission the greatest harm. The Japanese occupied more than half the islands. Most of the missioners were taken to Australia. Two priests and two sisters of the South Solomons and thirteen priests, brothers, and sisters of the North Solomons met death. Immediately after the war the Marists began to rebuild and quickly led the mission to a new flowering. At the end of 1976, of the 200,000 islanders, 37,000, or 18.5 percent, were Catholics. On 7 July 1978 the island chain achieved political independence.

In the vicariate apostolic of the Gilbert Islands, to which belonged also the Ellice and Phoenix Islands, the Sporádhes, Nauru (since 1923), and other islands, the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart did the mission work. The number of faithful rose from 13,500 in 1922 to 25,500 in 1972, that is, about 50 percent of the population. World War II brought unspeakable suffering throughout the entire mission area. Personal and material damages were very great. The Missionaries of the Sacred Heart also evangelized the vicariate apostolic of Rabaul, Papua-New Guinea. In World War II fifty-seven priests and brothers and ten native sisters lost their lives there, twenty-three by violence. One-third of the native population was deported or killed. The number of Catholics—in 1939 there were 45,000—dropped to ca. 8,000. The mission lost all material institutions and property. But after the war reconstruction got under way at once. American, Australian, and Irish Missionaries of the Sacred Heart came to help. The Australian government granted considerable support. The statistics of 1973 report 118,000 Catholics in a population of 170,000.

On British New Guinea, where, in addition to the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, the Society of the Divine Word, Franciscans, Capuchins, Montfortians, Passionists, and a large number of communities of sisters are active, World War II wiped out a mission work that had just flowered. The vicariates of eastern and central New Guinea especially had to suffer much. Many missionaries lost their lives, the rest were deported to Australia. After the war, everything had to start again from scratch.

Altogether 118 priests and brothers and seventy-eight sisters lost their lives in Oceania and New Guinea during World War II, while others became unfit for work. Twelve hundred mission buildings were totally destroyed, 120 partly.[128] After overcoming the war's damages, Catholic mission activity and development aid in all Oceania revived to a new flowering. Rome considered raising the furthest advanced vicariates to dioceses. But this idea was again dropped, because a still more comprehensive plan was taken under consideration: the erection of a regular ecclesiastical hierarchy and, with that, the canonical setting up of the young Churches. During the Second Vatican Council Rome was unable to have direct contact with the ordinaries of Oceania in regard to this question. The discussions came to a decision during the last period of the council. On 21 June 1966 the hierarchy was erected in Polynesia, Micronesia, and Melanesia. Three ecclesiastical provinces were formed: (1) Nouméa (New Caledonia), with the dioceses of Port Vila (New Hebrides) and Wallis-Futuna; (2) Suva (Fiji Islands), with Apia (Western Samoa) and Tarawa (Gilbert Islands); (3) Papeete (Tahiti), with Taiohae (Marquesas). Further, the dioceses of Rarotonga (Cook Islands) and Tonga were established; the former was assigned as suffragan to Wellington, the latter was immediately subject to the Holy See. The arrangement of the ecclesiastical provinces had its difficulties in consequence of the fluctuating political situation. There were independent islands such as the Kingdom of Tonga and the Principality of Western Samoa; other islands were under mandate status or under condominium, still others were under colonial rule. And ethnic viewpoints could not be used as a basis. Thus Rome turned, to some extent, to the still existing zones of influence of England, France, the United States, and New Zealand. Out of regard for the national pride of the population of Tonga, this island became a diocese placed directly under the Holy See.[129]

The ordinaries of Papua-New Guinea and the British Protectorate of the Solomon Islands also requested during the last period of the council the erection of an ecclesiastical hierarchy in their mission territory. They indicated the movements for political independence and the intention of the Anglican Church to reorganize itself there. Although the mission Church there was still relatively young, it was regarded as sufficiently consolidated to introduce a general ecclesiastical organization. In this way the foreign and native mission societies should be compensated for their devoted activity, a new impetus would be given to the mission Church, and here also the organization of the Church in vicariates and prefectures, often regarded as a relic of the colonial epoch, would be eliminated. Hence on 15 November 1966 three new ecclesiastical provinces were erected: (1) Port Moresby, with the suffragan sees of Bereina (Yule Island), Daru, Mendi, and Sideia; (2) Madang, with Aitape, Goroka, Lae, Mount Hagen, Vanimo, and Wewak; (3) Rabaul, with Bougainville (North Solomons), Honiara (South Solomons), Kavieng, and Gizo (Western Solomons).[130] The first Papuan bishop, Ludwig Vangeke, M.S.C., who had been the first Papuan to be ordained a priest, was ordained by Paul VI at Sydney on 3 December 1970. On 16 September 1976 Papua-New Guinea received its political independence. On 7 March 1977 a nunciature was established there.[131]

---

[128] Cf. P. O'Reilly in *NZM* 3 (Schöneck 1947), 106f.

[129] *AAS* 59 (1967), 201–3.

Among the greatest cares of most of the new residential bishops is the education of a native clergy. According to a report of 6 February 1970[132] there was at the time not a single native priest in some dioceses, such as Taiohae and Rarotonga. In the other dioceses the native clergy was, compared with the foreign, a minority, except on Wallis and Futuna, where thirteen native and six foreign priests were active. On 2 March 1972, therefore, Wallis and Futuna obtained a native auxiliary bishop. Tonga also had a rather large number of native priests—nine, as compared with twelve foreign—and so there too a native coadjutor bishop was appointed on 15 October 1971. Altogether, according to the report just mentioned, of 309 diocesan and religious priests in this area, eighty-six were natives. There were three seminaries: one major seminary in Nouméa and two minor seminaries in Paita in the archdiocese of Nouméa and Lano in the diocese of Wallis-Futuna. There were many native vocations to the sisterhoods. There were 229 native sisters as opposed to 653 foreign. Several native congregations of sisters were established. Altogether, today there are nine native congregations of sisters in this area and four congregations of brothers of diocesan right.[133]

A new ecclesiastical problem resulted on the Fiji Islands because of the immigration of ca. 30,000 Indians. The archbishop of Suva exerted himself to obtain Indian priests for them. The emigrant Indians abroad lost their contact with Hinduism and hence were more easily accessible to the Christian message.

---

[130] Ibid., 480–82.

[131] Ibid. 69 (1977), 256. For the Solomon Islands the apostolic delegation still exists (ibid., 256f.).

[132] Cf. *Memoria Rerum* III/2, 552.

[133] Cf. the "Supplementum" of the *Bibliografia Missionaria,* Anno XXXIX–1975, Quaderno no. 18 (Rome 1976), 55–58.

In 1968 the bishops of Oceania joined together as the Episcopal Conference of the Pacific (CEPAC). In March 1968 they had their first plenary meeting.

THE PHILIPPINES

The "young" Church on the Philippines is no more a young Church than those in the United States or Canada. But it has not a few problems in common with the mission Churches, and, above all, it lies in the Third World. As a Spanish patronate Church it had from the start a regular ecclesiastical hierarchy. The four vicariates apostolic were only erected in the 1930s and 1950s respectively, were subject to the Roman missionary authorities, but belonged to one of the thirteen ecclesiastical provinces with the same number of archdioceses and a total of thirty-one dioceses and twelve prelacies. With 80 percent Catholics out of 42 million inhabitants, the Philippines are a Catholic country, the only one in Southeast Asia. Only on the southern islands do some 3 million Muslims live, who feel themselves to be an oppressed minority.

The most recent past repeatedly produced, especially in the 1970s, tensions between Church and state and within the Church. Ecclesiastical circles reacted differently to the imposition of martial law by the president of the Philippines. In a common pastoral statement the Episcopal Conference first declared that it recognized the right and duty of the civil authorities to take proper steps to protect the sovereignty of the state and to guarantee the peace and well-being of the nation, but then the bishops appealed to the leaders and to every individual of the people to make a serious examination of conscience. However, in the last analysis the seventy-five bishops were not united in their attitude to the government.[134] Subsequently the government repeatedly tried to put pressure on the Church.

The episcopate sees a special task in the fostering of a Filipino clergy. Lack of priests long was and still is a central problem of the Church of the Philippines, and therefore the mission work in the vicariates apostolic is to a great extent in the hands of foreign personnel. Nevertheless in the last twenty years a rapid increase of native priestly vocations could be recorded. Thus, for example, the number of diocesan priests grew between 1956 and 1966 from 1,430 to 2,503 and that of religious priests from 147 to 394. A new great and responsible function devolves on the clergy and hence on the entire Philippine Church today: the evangelization of Southeast Asia, to which it is racially and culturally closer than are the Western Churches. Besides, Filipino missioners are not exposed to the suspicion that they are emissaries of Western "imperialism." The missionary spread has already begun. The Society of the Divine Word missionaries have employed several of their Filipino priests in Indonesia, and the Sisters of the Society of the Divine Word were the first congregation of women to send Filipino sisters to the mission in New Guinea. Since 1967 Filipino Oblates have been active in Hong Kong.

---

[134] Cf. *Herder-Korrespondenz* 28 (Freiburg 1974), 121–23; 29 (1975), 100.

In the last few years the Church saw itself repeatedly induced to defend human rights. On 8 January 1967 the bishops published a "Pastoral Letter on Social Work and Agricultural Development," by which they aspired to give the government hints for eliminating existing abuses. In January 1977 they wrote a courageous pastoral on the problems and difficulties existing between state and Church.

The church was also drawn into the armed confrontation between the Muslims and the state. In 1974, on the occasion of a raid by Muslim rebels on the islands of Jolo, almost the entire capital was destroyed and the Catholic cathedral was burned down. Nevertheless the approximately 7,000 Christians of the island did not regard the Muslims as their enemies. The hundred-year old Catholic church on the Sulu Archipelago has in recent years made great efforts to establish peace and reconciliation. About 98 percent of the Sulu Archipelago is Islamic.[135]

The above-mentioned responsibility of the Philippine Church for the evangelization of the peoples of Southeast Asia is seen also in the establishment of the radio station Radio Veritas at Manila, which began operation on 11 April 1969 and beams broadcasts in twenty languages to the areas of Oceania and Southeast Asia. The decision to establish this radio station was made at the Conference of the Bishops of Southeast Asia in Manila in 1958. The Roman Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, the assistance work of the German Catholic Church's *Misereor* and *Missio,* and the German Federal Republic bore the heavy burden of the financial expenses.[136] Since 1975 the radio has been subject to the Philippine Episcopal Conference.

Paul VI's journey to the Far East from 26 November to 5 December 1970 was a religious happening for the young Churches in Oceania, Australia, and all other countries which the Pope touched upon in the journey. At Manila Paul VI took part in the closing sessions of the Symposium of the Asiatic Episcopal Conferences, whose chief topics were the Church's aid for development and the pastoral care of university students. Referring to the meager successes which the proclamation of the Christian faith had achieved thus far in Asia, apart from the Philippines, the Pope said to the bishops: "If in the past an inadequate knowledge of the riches which are concealed in the various cultures has been able to prevent the spread of the Gospel, and a false picture of the Church resulted, it is up to you to explain that the salvation brought by Jesus Christ is offered to all peoples, and without distinction of conditions of life, without attachment to a privileged race, a continent, or a culture, and that the Gospel, far from wishing to eliminate 'the germs of the good in the hearts and in the ideologies of people or in their own rites and their culture,' has the effect of refining all these values, elevating them, and perfecting them to the honor of God (*Lumen Gentium,* 17; *Ad Gentes,* 22). Following the model of Jesus Christ, who shared the living conditions of his environment, the Asian can be Catholic and remain fully Asian. If we declared in Africa a year ago that the Church must above all be Catholic, then a pluralism is still justified and even desirable, namely in the manner of expressing one common faith in the same Lord Jesus Christ."[137]

---

[135] Cf. *Die katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg 1976), 197–201; (1978), 51–55; *Herder-Korrespondenz* 31 (Freiburg 1977), 60–63.

[136] *Internationaler Fides-Dienst 1969,* 214f., 232–34.

From Manila the Pope went on 29 November to Samoa. There he sent an urgent appeal to the Catholics of the entire world, the purpose of which was the renewal of the mission spirit.[138] The next stop on the journey was at Sydney, where seventy-two bishops of Australia, New Zealand, and Oceania had gathered for a symposium, at which were discussed timely problems of the Church in this area: proclamation of the faith, development aid, youth, the priesthood, ecumenism. The Pope took part in the closing session. As the theme of his talk he selected the unity of the Church. This may have been done in relation to the special ecumenical circumstances in Oceania, where the vast distances, the lack in shepherds of souls, and the related absence, often weeks or months long, of the priest have led to special arrangements with other Christian Churches. In general the Catholic mission Churches in Australia and Oceania are very receptive to ecumenism. By way of Jakarta, Hong Kong, and Colombo, Paul VI returned to Rome from his journey to the Far East.[139]

---

[137] *AAS* 63 (1971), 25–26.

[138] Ibid., 47–50.

[139] The Pope's addresses during the journey in *AAS* 63 (1971), 10–83.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO INDIVIDUAL CHAPTERS

SECTION ONE

The Institutional Unity of the Universal Church

1. *Statistics*

STATISTICS OF THE WORLD'S POPULATION—STATISTICS OF THE WORLD RELIGIONS—PROPORTION OF CATHOLICS

SOURCES: Pertinent sources for statistics of world population in *Population Index* (Office of Population Research, University of Princeton, N.Y.); *Population Studies* (London School of Economics, Houghton Street, Aldwych, London, W.C. 2); and *Population* (27, rue du Commandeur, Paris 14e). For information on individual countries there are monographs called *Country Profiles* (Population Council, 245 Park Avenue, New York). Comprehensive source in the *Demographic Yearbook of the United Nations* (Statistical Office of the United Nations, New York), 1948ff., and the survey *A Concise Summary of the World Population Situation in 1970* (United Nations, N.Y. 1971), also the UN *Statistical Yearbook* (New York), 1948ff.

Statistics of World Religions: *Demographic Yearbook of the United Nations; World Christian Handbook,* ed. by E. J. Bingle et al., London, from 1949 at yearly intervals; *Kirchliches Handbuch für das Katholische Deutschland* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1970ff.); *Atlas Hierarchicus. Descriptio geographica et statistica ecclesiae catholicae tum occidentis tum orientis,* ed. by H. Emmerich, S.V.D., (Mödling, Austria 1968) (Supplement: *Eine geschichtliche Einführung und Erläuterungen zu den Karten*) (1913), 2d ed. (1929) by Karl Streit S.V.D., Mödling, Austria; *Atlas zur Kirchengeschichte. Die christlichen Kirchen in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* ed. by H. Jedin, K. S. Latourette, and J. Martin (Freiburg 1970). —For Mission lands: *Internationaler Fides-Dienst* (Catholic) (Rome 1962); *Oriente Cattolico* (Oriental Christians) (Rome 1962); K. B. Westman and H. v. Sicard, *Geschichte der christlichen Mission* (Protestant) (Munich 1962); *Jewish Statistical Bureau* (Jerusalem 1959).—World Confessional map. *LThk* 6 (1961).

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE ENTIRE CHURCH FROM 1914 TO 1970

SOURCES: *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (*AAS*) (Vatican City 1909ff.); *Annuario Pontificio* (Vatican City 1912ff.); *Kirchliches Handbuch für das katholische Deutschland* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1907ff.); *L'attività della Santa Sede* (Rome 1938–39ff.); *Annuario Statistico della Chiesa* (Rome 1971ff.).

LITERATURE: The Roman Curia: J. Ferrante, *Summa Juris Constitutionalis Ecclesiae* (Rome 1964); N. Del Re, *La Curia Romana. Lineamenti storico-giuridici* (Rome 1970);

LThK 6 (Freiburg 1961) cols. 692–94; L. Pasztor, *La Curia Romana. Problemi e ricerche per la sua storia nell'età moderna e contemporanea* (Rome 1971).—College of Cardinals: H. W. Klewitz, *Die Entstehung des Kardinalskollegiums. Reformpapsttum und Kardinalskollegium* (Darmstadt 1957); *LThK* 5 (Freiburg 1960) cols. 1342–44; P. C. van Lierde and A. Giraud, *Das Kardinalskollegium* (*Der Christ in der Welt* 12) (Aschaffenburg 1965). —Curial Congregations: F. M. Cappello, *De Curia Romana*, 2 vols. (Rome 1911–13); V. Martin, *Les Congrégations romaines* (Paris 1930); A large number of monographs, for the most part doctoral dissertations for the individual congregations; *LThK* 5 (Freiburg 1960) cols. 1344–49. —Papal Diplomacy: U. Stutz, *Die päpstliche Diplomatie unter Leo XIII. nach den Denkwürdigkeiten des Kardinals Domenico Ferrara, Abh. der Preuß. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. KL. 1925, no. 3/4, Berlin 1926; G. de Marchi, *Le nunziature Apostoliche dal 1800 al 1957* (Rome 1959); with a list of secretaries of state and nuncios from 1800 to 1956). —G. Ferroglio, *Circoscrizioni ed enti territoriali della Chiesa* (Turin 1946); P. Negwer, *Die kuriale Zirkumskriptionspraxis in ihrer Bedeutung für den gegenwärtigen Rechtsstatus der ostdeutschen Diözesen* (diss., Basel 1963). In addition: See handbooks and commentaries on Canon law as well has histories of the Church and the papacy.

2. *Popes Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII— Biography and Activity within the Church*

GENERAL: Official acts in the *AAS;* a continuing report in the *AKR* by N. Hilling; J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit* III (Munich 1936), 179–339 (Benedict XV); IV (Munich 1939) (Pius XI); H. Hermelink, *Die katholische Kirche unter den Piuspäpsten des 20 Jahrhunderts* (Zollikon and Zurich 1949); G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1968); C. Falconi, *I papi del ventesimo secolo* (Milan 1967); F. Sugrue, *Popes in the Modern World* (New York 1961); A. Oddone, "Azione pacificatrice e caritatevole del Papato contemporaneo," *CivCatt* 101 (1950), 68–82.

BENEDICT XV

The BIOGRAPHIES published during the lifetime of Benedict XV offer biographical material but no real evaluation: A. De Waal, *Der neue Papst* (Hamm 1915); A. Pöllmann, *Benedikt XV aus der Familie Della Chiesa* (Dießen 1915); A. Baudrillart, *Benoît XV* (Paris 1920); more information are the obituaries by H. Sierp, in: *StdZ* 102 (1922), 401–8; Funk, in: *Hochland* 19 (1921/22), 651–59.—Later Biographies: F. Vistalli (Hildesheim 1932); F. Pichon (Paris 1940); F. Hayward, *Un pape méconnu: Benoît XV* (Tournai and Paris 1955); W. H. Peters, *The Life of Benedict XV* (Milwaukee 1959).—Historical perspectives in F. Ehrle, "Von Pius X. zu Benedikt XV," *StdZ* 88 (1915), 201–19; S. Merkle, "Benedikt XIV—Benedikt XV," *Hochland* 12 (1914/15), 340–47. —New Letters: F. Molinari, "Il carteggio di Benedetto XV con Mons. Ersilio Monzani," *RSTI* 20 (1966), 410–50.

INTERNAL ECCLESIASTICAL ACTIVITIES: N. Hilling, "Die gesetzgeberische Tätigkeit Benedikts XV. bis zur Promulgation des Codex iuris canonici," *AKR* 98 (1918), 223–39, 378–406, 561–74; For the years after 1917, ibid. 103 (1923), 5–36; J. Kleijntjens, "Activité charitable de Benoît XV," *RHE* 43 (1948), 536–45; R. Leiter, "Die päpstliche Kriegsfürsorge," *StdZ* 100 (1921), 197–208.

PIUS XI

To the BIOGRAPHIES published during his pontificate, the same comment applies as to those of Benedict XV: M. Bierbaum (Cologne 1922); A. Novelli (Milan 1923); U. Togani, *Pio XI. La vita e le opere* (Milan 1937); G. Galbiati (Cologne 1937); L. Townsend (London 1930); B. Williamson (London 1931); P. Hughes (London 1937). —Obituaries: *StdZ* 136 (1939), 1–9; A. Novelli in *La Scuola cattolica* 67 (1939), 624ff.; G. Galbiati, *Papa Pio XI* (Milan 1939). —Important for an understanding of his personality are the memoirs of two of his collaborators: C. Confalonieri, *Pio XI visto da vicino* (Turin 1937); E. Pellegrinetti, *Pio XI. L'uomo nel Papa e il Papa nell'uomo* (Rome 1940). —A comprehensive description of the personality and the work of Pius XI in the collection by the archbishopric of Milan: *Pio XI nel trentesimo della morte 1939/69* (Milan 1969); pages 5–58 list a detailed bibliography prepared by A. Rimoldi.

SPECIAL STUDIES: G. Galbiati, "La produzione scientifica di Achille Ratti," *Aevum* 13 (1940), bibliographical supplement 301–12; N. Malvezzi, *Pio XI nei suoi scritti* (Milan 1923); A. Ratti, *Scritti storici* (Florence 1932); G. Bobba and F. Mauro, *Achille Ratti. Alpine Schriften* (Regensburg 1936); F. Kraft, "Papst Pius XI. als Bibliothekar," *Festschrift Eugen Stollreither* (Erlangen 1950), 105–16; concerning his private correspondence, see N. Vian in *Mélange E. Tisserant* VIII (Rome 1954), 373–439; D. Bertetto, ed., *Discorsi di Pio XI*, 3 vols. (Turin 1959–61).

PIUS XII

BIBLIOGRAPHIES: A. Rimoldi in *La Scuola Cattolica* 77 (1949), 88–108; B. Schneider in *AHP*. —Until 1939: Reliable information on family and development in H. Hoberg, *Papst Pius XII.* (Lucerne 1949); concerning his brother, consult B. Schneider, "Das Tagebuch des Francesco Pacelli," *StdZ* 164 (1958/59), 81–97; Y. de la Brière, "Pie XII avant son Pontificat," *Études* 239 (1939), 87–101; L. Kaas, ed., *Eugenio Pacelli, Erster Apostolischer Nuntius beim Deutschen Reich. Gesammelte Reden* (Berlin 1930); Eugenio Pacelli, *Discorsi e Panegirici 1931–1938* (Vatican City 1939); B. Wüstenberg and I. Zabkar, eds., *Pius XII. Der Papst an die Deutschen* (Frankfurt 1965), contains the Pope's speeches and open letters in German from 1917 to 1956.

During the Pontificate: In addition to the documentation contained in Hoberg until 1948, see M. Bierbaum (Cologne 1939); O. Walter (Olten 1939); F. Loidl (Vienna 1947); P. Dahm (Mönchen-Gladbach 1952); Konstantin Prinz von Bayern (Bad Wörishofen 1952); W. Sandfuchs (Karlsruhe 1956); A. M. Rathgeber (Kempten 1958); I. O. Smit, *Pastor angelicus* (Roermond 1949); G. Goyau (Paris 1939); P. Lesourd (Paris 1940); E. Buonaiuti (Rome 1946); W. Padellaro (Rome 1949); L. Veneziani (Pisa 1942); C. H. Doyle (New York 1945); O. Halecki (London 1954); R. C. Pollock, *The Mind of Pius XII* (London 1955).

Obituaries and Biographies since 1958: R. Leiber in *StdZ* 163 (1958/59), 81–100; A. Martini in *CivCatt* 109, 4 (1958), 233–46; G. Crosignani, "Aspetti della personalità e dell'opera di Pio XII," *Divus Thomas* 62 (1959), 3–33; I. Coppens, "Pie XII. In memoriam," *EThL* 34 (1958), 873–83; D. Tardini, *Pio XII* (Vatican City 1960), the most revealing biography by his closest collaborator; I. Giordani, *Pio XII, Un grande papa* (Turin 1961); G. Andreotti, *Pio XII* (Rome 1965); F. Engel-Janosi, "Der Stellvertreter Christi Pius XII. Aspekte seiner Gestalt," *Wort und Wahrheit* 23 (1968), 546–59; B. Schneider, *Pius XII.* (Göttingen 1968); K. N. Burton, *Witness of the Light. The Life of Pope Pius XII* (New York 1958); L. Chaigne, *Portrait et vie de Pie XII* (Paris 1966).

THE WORK OF THE POPE: Compilation of the most important decrees and decisions in *AKR* 122 (1947) and 128 (1958). *Discorsi e radiomessaggi di S. Stà Pio XII,* 20 vols. (Vatican City 1941–59); *Discorsi agli intellettuali 1939–1954* (Vatican City 1955); *L'attività della Santa Sede,* in annual volumes since 1945, unofficial. For the publications of documents from the Vatican Archives, see Chap. 3. —"Papst Pius XII. 1939–1958. Eine Dokumentation seines Pontifikats," *HK* 13 (1958/59), 57–71; "Pius XII im Urteil der nichtkatholischen Welt," *HK* 13 (1958/59), 233–46; *La vie d'Église sous Pie XII* (Paris 1959); G. B. Montini, "Pio XII e l'ordine internazionale," *La Scuola Cattolica* 85 (1957), 3–24; R. Losada-Cosmes, "Magisterio de Pio XII. Esquema doctrinal y boletín bibliográfico," *Salmanticensis* 3 (1956), 509–687; S. Mayer, "Die Bedeutung Papst Pius' XII. für das Recht, besonders das Kirchenrecht," *AKR* 130 (1961), 436–71; S. Álvarez Menéndez, "Pio XII Canonista," *Revista española de derecho can.* 13 (1958), 721–35; G. Falconi, *Il Pentagono Vaticano* (Bari 1958); I. Giordani, *Vita contro morte. La Santa Sede per le vittime della seconda guerra mondiale* (Milan 1956); several contributions with illustrations in *Osservatore della Domenica,* 28 June 1964; A. J. Muench, "Bilanz einer Nuntiatur 1946–1959. Schlußbericht des ersten Nuntius in der Nachkriegszeit," ed. by L. Volk in *StdZ* 195 (1977), 147–58.

3. *Foreign Policy of the Popes in the Epoch of the World Wars*

SOURCES

GENERAL: *AAS* 6 (1914)–38 (1946); *L'Osservatore Romano; L'attività della Santa Sede nel 1939. Pubblicazione non uffiziale* (annually from 1939); E. Marmy, ed., *Mensch und Gemeinschaft in christlicher Schau. Dokumente* (from 1832 to 1944) (Fribourg 1945).

REFERENCES: G. de Marchi, *Le Nunziature Apostoliche dal 1800 al 1956* (Rome 1957); L. Schöppe, ed., *Konkordate seit 1800. Originaltext und deutsche Übersetzung der geltenden Konkordate* (Berlin 1964).

MEMOIRS: G. Spadolini, ed., *Il cardinale Gasparri e la Questione Romana, con brani delle memorie inedite* (Florence 1972); L. von Pastor, *Tagebücher, Briefe, Erinnerungen,* ed. by W. Wühr (Heidelberg 1950); Beyens, *Baron, Quatre ans à Rome 1921–1926. Fin du pontificat de Benoît XV, Pie XI, les débuts du fascisme* (Paris 1934); F. Charles-Roux, *Huit ans au Vatican 1932–1940* (Paris 1947); E. von Weizsäcker, *Erinnerungen* (Munich 1950); L. E. Hill, ed., *Die Weizsäcker-Papiere* (Frankfurt 1974).

DOCUMENTS: T. E. Hachey, ed., *Anglo-Vatican Relations, 1914–1939: Confidential Annual Reports of the British Ministers to the Holy See* (Boston 1972); F. Engel-Janosi, *Vom Chaos zur Katastrophe. Vatikanische Gespräche 1918 bis 1938, vornehmlich auf Grund der Berichte der österreichischen Gesandten beim Heiligen Stuhl* (Vienna 1971); W. Steglich, ed., *Der Friedensappell Papst Benedikts XV. vom 1. August 1917 und die Mittelmächte. Diplomatische Aktenstücke . . . aus den Jahren 1915–1922* (Wiesbaden 1970); W. Steglich, ed., *Die Verhandlungen des 2. Unterausschusses des parlamentarischen Untersuchungsausschusses über die päpstliche Friedensaktion von 1917. Aufzeichnungen und Vernehmungsprotokolle* (Wiesbaden 1974); A. Struker, ed., *Die Kundgebungen Benedikts XV. zum Weltfrieden. Urtext und Übertragung* (Freiburg 1917); P. Scoppola, *La Chiesa e il fascismo, Documenti e interpretazioni* (Bari 1971), best introduction; C. A. Biggini, *Storia inedita della Conciliazione* (Milan 1942); F. Pacelli, *Diario della Conciliazione,* M. Maccarone, ed. (Vatican City 1959); F. Margiotta Broglio, *Italia e Santa Sede dalla grande* *guerra alla conciliazione. Aspetti politici e giuridici* (Bari 1966); F. Fonzi, "Documenti per la storia dei Patti Lateranesi. Due relazione di Domenico Barone," *RSCI* 19 (1965), 403–35; A. de Gasperi, *Lettere sul Concordato, con saggi di M.R. de Gasperi e di G. Martina* (Brescia 1970); L. Volk, ed., *Kirchliche Akten über die Reichskonkordatsverhandlungen 1933* (Mainz 1969); A. Kupper, ed., *Staatliche Akten über die Reichskonkordatsverhandlungen 1933* (Mainz 1969); D. Albrecht, ed., *Der Notenwechsel zwischen dem Heiligen Stuhl und der Deutschen Reichsregierung* I: *Von der Ratifizierung des Reichskonkordats bis zur Enzyklika "Mit brennender Sorge"* (Mainz 1965); II: *1937–1945* (Mainz 1969); H. Hürten, ed., *Deutsche Briefe 1934–1938. Ein Blatt der katholischen Emigration* I: *1934–1935*, II: *1936–1938* (Mainz 1969); *Pio XII, Discorsi e Radiomessaggi di Sua Santità* I (1940)–VIII (1946) [according to the years of his pontificate, beginning 2 March]; A. F. Utz and J. F. Groner, *Aufbau und Entfaltung des gesellschaftlichen Lebens. Soziale Summe Pius' XII.*, 2 vols. (Fribourg 1954); P. Blet, R. A. Graham [beginning with Vol. 3], A. Martini, B. Schneider, eds., *Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale* (Vatican City 1965ff.) [Contains reports on peace and war and the ecclesiastical situation in Germany, Poland, and the Baltic states]; *Le Saint Siege et la guerre en Europe: Mars 1939–août 1940* (=*ADSS* 1 [1965]); *Juin 1940–juin 1941* (=*ADSS* 4 [1967]); *Juillet 1941–octobre 1942* (=*ADSS* 5 [1969]); *Novembre 1942–décembre 1943* (=*ADSS* 7 [1973]); the documents for 1944/45 were published in 1978; *Lettres de Pie XII aux Évêques allemands 1939–1944* (=*ADSS* 2 [1966]), reissued with minor corrections by B. Schneider, P. Blet and A. Martini, eds., *Die Briefe Pius' XII. an die deutschen Bischöfe 1939–1944* (Mainz 1966), cited as: B. Schneider, *Piusbriefe*; *Le Saint Siège et la situation religieuse en Pologne et dans les Pays Baltes 1939–1945* I: *1939–1941*, II: *1942–1945* (=*ADSS* 3, 2 vols.); *Le Saint Siège et les victimes de la guerre: Mars 1939–décembre 1940* (=*ADSS* 6 [1972]); *Janvier 1941–décembre 1942* (=*ADSS* 8 [1974]); *Janvier–décembre 1943* (=*ADSS* 9 [1975]); the documents for 1944/45 appeared in 1978; L. Volk, ed., *Akten Kardinal Michael von Faulhabers 1917–1945* I: *1917–1934* (Mainz 1975); II: *1934–1945* (Mainz 1978); B. Stasiewski, ed., *Akten deutscher Bischöfe über die Lage der Kirche* I: *1933–1934* (Mainz 1968); II: *1934–1935* (Mainz 1976); III: *1935–1936* (Mainz 1978); H. Boberach, ed., *Berichte des SD und der Gestapo über Kirchen und Kirchenvolk in Deutschland 1934–1944* (Mainz 1971); *Die kirchliche Lage in Bayern nach den Regierungspräsidentenberichten 1933–1943* I: *Regierungsbezirk Oberbayern*, ed. by H. Witetschek (Mainz 1966); II: *Regierungsbezirk Ober- und Mittelfranken*, ed. by H. Witetschek (Mainz 1967); III: *Regierungsbezirk Schwaben*, ed. by H. Witetschek (Mainz 1971), IV: *Regierungsbezirk Niederbayern und Oberpfalz 1933–1945*, ed. by W. Ziegler (Mainz 1973).

Important Official Publications for Foreign Affairs: For the period to 1918, surveys in: W. Baumgart, ed., *Quellenkunde zur deutschen Geschichte der Neuzeit von 1500 bis zur Gegenwart* 5; W. Baumgart, *Das Zeitalter des Imperialismus und des Ersten Weltkrieges (1871–1918)* 1: *Akten und Urkunden* (Darmstadt 1977).

For the Period after 1918 and the Second World War: USA: *Foreign relations of the United States. Diplomatic Papers.* Important supplements: *The World War*, 9 vols. (1928–33); *1919. The Paris Peace Conference*, 13 vols. (1942–47); *The Lansing Papers 1914–1920*, 2 vols. (1939–40); M. C. Taylor, ed., *Wartime Correspondence between President Roosevelt and Pope Pius XII* (New York 1947).

Germany: *Akten zur deutschen auswärtigen Politik 1918–1945:* (Series A [1918–25] has not yet been published), Series B (for 1925–33): 1 (Göttingen 1966)–9 (Göttingen 1976), for 1925–28; Series C (for 1933–37): 1 (Göttingen 1971)–5 (Göttingen 1975), for 1933–36; Series D (for 1937–41): 1 (Baden-Baden 1950)–13

(Göttingen 1970); Series E (for 1941–45): 1 (Göttingen 1969)–4 (Göttingen 1975), for 1941–42.

Great Britain: *Documents on British Foreign Policy:* Series I (for 1919–25): 1 (1947)–20 (1976), for 1919–22; Series IA (for 1925–29): 1 (1966)–7 (1975), for 1925–30; Series II (for 1929–38): 1 (1947)–15 (1975), for 1929–36; Series III (for 1938–39): 1 (1949)–10 (1961).

Italy: *Documenti Diplomatici Italiani:* Series 5 (for 1914–18): 1 (1954), 4 (1973), for 1914, 1915; Series 6 (for 1918–22): 1 (1956), for 1918/19; Series 7 (for 1922–35): 1 (1953)–9 (1975), for 1922–30; Series 8 (for 1935–39): 12 (1952)–13 (1953), for 1939; Series 9 (for 1939–43): 1 (1954)–5 (1965).

France: *Documents Diplomatiques Français 1932–1939:* Series 1 (for 1932–35): 1 (1964)–6 (1972), for 1932–34; Series 2 (for 1936–39): 1 (1963)–11 (1977), for 1936–38.

LITERATURE

GENERAL ACCOUNTS OF THE ERA OF THE TWO WORLD WARS: W. J. Mommsen, *Das Zeitalter des Imperialismus [1885–1918]* (Frankfurt 1969); R. A. C. Parker, *Das Zwanzigste Jahrhundert* I: *1918–1945* (Frankfurt 1967); T. Schieder, ed., *Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte* 6: *Europa im Zeitalter der Nationalstaaten und der europäischen Weltpolitik bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart 1968); R. Elze and R. Repgen, eds., *Studienbuch Geschichte* (Stuttgart 1974); K. D. Bracher, *Die Krise Europas 1917–1975* (Frankfurt 1976); P. Renouvin, *La crise européenne et la première guerre mondiale 1904–1918* (Paris 1934, 1969); M. Baumont, *La faillite de la paix 1918–1939* I: *1918–1935* (Paris 1945, 1967); II: *1936–1939* (Paris 1945, 1968); H. Michel, *La seconde guerre mondiale* I: *1939–1943* (Paris 1968); II: *1943–1945* (Paris 1969); P. Renouvin, *Les crises du XXᵉ siècle* I: *De 1914 à 1929* (Paris 1957, 1972); II: *De 1929 à 1945* (Paris 1958, 1972); P. Gerbod, *L'Europe culturelle et religieuse de 1815 à nos jours* (Paris 1977); J.-B. Duroselle, *Histoire diplomatique de 1919 à nos jours* (Paris 1953, 1962); G. M. Gathorne-Hardy, *A Short History of International Affairs 1920–1939* (London 1934, 1968); W. Knapp, *A History of War and Peace 1939–1965* (London 1967); C. L. Mowat, ed., *The Shifting Balance of World Forces 1898–1945* (London 1968); W. P. Potjomkin, ed., *Geschichte der Diplomatie* (Berlin 1948), II: *Die Diplomatie der Neuzeit* [1872–1919]; III: *Die Diplomatie in der Periode der Vorbereitung des Zweiten Weltkriegs* [1919–39] (Communist view).

PAPAL HISTORY: J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der Neuesten Zeit* III: *Pius X. und Benedikt XV., 1903–1922* (Munich 1936); IV: *Pius XI., 1922–1939* (Munich 1939); H. Hermelink, *Die katholische Kirche unter den Pius-Päpsten des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Zollikon, Zurich 1949); G. Schwaiger, *Geschichte der Päpste im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich 1968); G. Maron, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche von 1870 bis 1970,* in: *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* 4, Nr. N2 (Göttingen 1972); R. Aubert, *Vom Kirchenstaat zur Weltkirche. 1818 bis zum Zweiten Vaticanum* (=*Geschichte der Kirche,* V/1) (Zurich 1976).

SYSTEMATIC PROBLEMS OF PAPAL FOREIGN POLICY: W. Gurian and M. A. Fitzsimmons, *The Catholic Church in World Affairs* (Notre Dame 1954); R. A. Graham, *Vatican Diplomacy. A Study of Church and State on the International Plane* (Princeton 1959), basic; R. Bosc, *La Société Internationale et l'Église. Sociologie et Morale des Relations Internationales* (Paris 1961); C. Alix, *Le Saint-Siège et les nationalismes en Europe 1870–1960* (Paris 1962); J. Chevalier, *La politique du Vatican* [1939–69] (Paris 1969); I. Martín, "Die Präsenz des Hl. Stuhls bei den Staaten," *Concilium* 6 (1970), 571–75; P. Ciprotti, "Funktion, Stellung und Bedeutung des Heiligen Stuhls im internationalen Recht," *Concilium* 6 (1970), 556–60; H. de Riedmatten, "Die Präsenz des Heiligen Stuhles in den internationalen Organisationen," *Concilium* 6 (1970), 561–70; K. Gotto, "Die katholische Kirche," H.-P. Schwarz, *Handbuch der deutschen Außenpolitik* (Munich 1975), 229–33.

THE PONTIFICATES OF THE INDIVIDUAL POPES: G. Rossini, ed., *Benedetto XV, i Cattolici e la prima guerra mondiale. Atti del Convegno di Studi tenuto a Spoleto nei giorni 7-8-9 settembre 1962* (Rome 1963); R. Leiber, "Die päpstliche Kriegsfürsorge," *StdZ* 100 (1921), 197–208; G. Quirico, *Il Vaticano et la guerra* (Rome 1921); J. Kleijntjens, "Activité charitable de Benoît XV," *RHE* 43 (1948), 536–45; H. Johnson, *Vatican Diplomacy in World War I* (Oxford 1933); W. W. Gottlieb, *Studies in the Secret Diplomacy during the First World War* (London 1957); F. Engel-Janosi, *Österreich und der Vatikan 1846–1918* II: *Die Pontifikate Pius' X. und Benedikts XV., 1903–1918* (Graz 1960); A. Martini, "La preparazione dell'appello di Benedetto XV ai governi belligerenti (1° agosto 1917)," *CivCatt* 113, 4 (1962), 118–32; A. Martini, "La nota di Benedetto XV ai capi delle nazioni belligerenti (1° agosto 1917)," *CivCatt* 113, 4 (1962), 417–29; W. Steglich, *Die Friedenspolitik der Mittelmächte 1917/18* (Wiesbaden 1964); V. Conzemius, "L'offre du mediation de Benoît XV du 1^{ier} août 1917. Essai d'un bilan provisoire," *Religion et Politiques. Les deux guerres mondiales. Histoire de Lyon et du Sud-Est. Mélanges offerts à André Latreille* (Lyon 1972), 303–26.

C. M. Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin* (New York 1950); M. Mourin, *Le Vatican et l'U.R.S.S.* (Paris 1965); J. Kraus, *Im Auftrag des Papstes in Rußland. Der Steyler Anteil an der katholischen Hilfsmission 1922–1924* (Steyl 1970); D. J. Dunn, "Stalinism and the Catholic Church during the Era of World War II," *CHR* 59 (1973), 404–28; O. Simmel, "Die Ostpolitik des Vatikans," *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift "Communio"* 3 (1974), 555–67; H. Stehle, *Die Ostpolitik des Vatikans 1917–1975* (Munich 1975); U. A. Floridi, *Mosca e il Vaticano. I dissidenti sovietici di fronte al 'dialogo.' Introduzione di M. Agurskij* (Ponte Sesto di Rozzano 1976).

D. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich. Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (Mainz 1976), with biblio.; R. A. Graham, *Il Vaticano e il nazismo* (Rome 1975); L. Volk, *Das Reichskonkordat vom 20. Juli 1933. Von den Ansätzen in der Weimarer Republik bis zur Ratifizierung am 10. September 1933* (Mainz 1972); M. Maccarone, *Il nazionalsocialismo e la Santa Sede* (Rome 1947); G. O. Kent, "Pope Pius XII and Germany. Some Aspects of German-Vatican Relations 1933–1945," *AHR* 70 (1964/65), 59–78; W. Harrigan, "Nazi Germany and the Holy See, 1933–1936: the Historical Background of *Mit brennender Sorge*," *CHR* 51 (1965/66), 457–86; L. Volk, "Die Enzyklika *Mit brennender Sorge*," *StdZ* 183 (1969), 174–94; H.-A. Raem, *Entstehung, Inhalt und Auswirkungen der Enzyklika "Mit brennender Sorge" vom 14. März 1937 in ihrem historischen Kontext* (diss., Bonn 1977); P. Duclos, *Le Vatican et la seconde guerre mondiale* (Paris 1955); B. Martin, *Friedensinitiativen und Machtpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg 1939–1942* (Düsseldorf 1974); J. Becker, "Der Vatikan und der II. Weltkrieg," D. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich* (Mainz 1976).

SURVEY OF RESEARCH: R. Lill, "Die Kirchen und das Dritte Reich. Ein Forschungsbericht," W. P. Eckert, ed., *Judenhaß—Schuld der Christen?!* (Essen 1966), 47–94; V. Conzemius, "Églises chrétiennes et totalitarisme national-socialiste," *RHE* 63 (1968), 437–503, 868–948; D. Veneruso, "Pio XII e la seconda guerra mondiale," *RSCI* 22 (1968), 506–53; U. von Hehl, "Kirche, Katholizismus und das nationalsozialistische Deutschland. Ein Forschungsüberblick," D. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich* (Mainz 1976), 219–51.

4. *The Second Vatican Council*

Sources and Literature

Because of the great numbers of accounts we present only a selected few.

Pope John XXIII: Writings: *Il Giornale dell'Anima* (Rome 1964); *In Memoria di Mons. Giacomo Maria Radini Tedeschi, vescovo di Bergamo* (Bergamo 1916, Rome 1963); *Gli inizi del Seminario di Bergamo. Note storiche, con una introduzione sul Concilio di Trento e la fondazione dei primi seminari* (Bergamo 1939); *Gli Atti della Visita Apostolica di S. Carlo Borromeo a Bergamo,* 2 vols. in 5 parts (Florence 1936–57); *Il Cardinale Cesare Baronio* (Rome 1961); "Souvenirs d'un Nonce," *Cahiers de France 1944/53* (Rome 1963); *Scritti e discorsi 1953–1958,* 4 vols. (Rome 1959–62); *Discorsi, messaggi, colloqui del Santo Padre Giovanni XXIII,* 6 vols. (Vatican City 1958–65); *Lettere ai familiari* (Rome 1968; 727 letters, 1901–62).

Official Documents: *AAS* 50 (1958)–55 (1963); "Dokumentation," *Herder-Korrespondenz* 17 (1963), 449–76; L. Capovilla, *Giovanni XXIII in alcuni scritti di Don Giuseppe De Luca* (Brescia 1963), with correspondence, 1945–62, and thoughts of the writer, a friend of the Pope, 133–41.

Biographies: Written during the pontificate and therefore to be used with caution are those by A. Lazzarini, G. Santoro, A. Giovanetti, R. Garret, H. Picker; E. Radius, *Giovanni XXIII* (Milan 1966); N. Fabretti, *Papa Giovanni* (Rome 1966); L. Elliott, *Johannes XXIII* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1975); E. Balducci, *Papa Giovanni* (Florence 1964); E. E. Hales, *Die große Wende* (Graz and Cologne 1966); G. Bara and D. Donadoni, *Giorno per giorno con Papa Giovanni* (Turin 1966); A. L'Arco, *Il segreto di Papa Giovanni* (Turin 1967); D. Agasso, *Il Papa delle grandi speranze* (Milan 1967).

On the Beginnings: D. Cogini, *Papa Giovanni nei suoi primi passi a Sotto il Monte* (Bergamo 1965); S. Álvarez Menéndez, "Juan XXIII desde el punto de vista jurídico-canónico," *Rev. española de derecho canonico* 18 (1963), 843–77.

From Obituaries: B. Schneider, *StdZ* 88 (1962/63), 241–54; G. Schwaiger, *AKR* 132 (1963), 3–30, with biblio. R. Aubert, "Jean XXIII. Un 'pape de transition' qui marquera dans l'histoire," *Revue nouvelle* 38 (1963), 3–33; G. Caprile, "Ricchezza di un breve pontificato," *CivCatt* 1963 II, 523–39; Dahm, *Johannes XXIII.* (Offenburg, n.d.).

Bibliographies of the Council: A collection by G. Caprile to 1967 in: *Herder TK* III, 727–31; C. Dollen, *Vatican II. A Bibliography* (Metuchen, N.J. 1969); R. Laurentin, *Bilan du Concile. Histoire, textes, commentaires* (Paris 1969), 313–60; G. Garofalo and J. Federici, *Dizionario del Concilio Vat. II* (Rome 1969).

Preparation: *Consultazione per la preparazione del Concilio Vat. II. Dati statistici,* ed. by Pontificia Commissione Centrale preparatoria (Vatican City 1961); *Acta et documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando,* Series I: *Antepraeparatoria,* contains Vol. I (1960) *Acta Johannis XXIII;* Vol. II in 8 sections (1960–61) *Consilia et vota episcoporum et praelatorum:* Secs. 1–3: *Europe,* Sec. 4: *Asia,* Sec. 5: *Africa,* Sec. 6: *North and Central America,* Sec. 7: *South America and Oceania,* Sec. 8: *Superiors of Orders,* plus 2 vols. of appendices; Vol. III (1961) *Proposita et monita SS. Congregationum Curiae Romanae;* Vol. IV (1961) *Studia et vota universitatum et facultatum ecclesiasticarum et catholicarum,* Sec. 1: *Rome,* Sec. 2: *Extra Urbem.* —Series II: *Praeparatoria:* Vol. I (1964) *Acta S. P. Johannis XXIII;* Vol. II in 4 sections (1965–1968) sessions of the Central Commission. Survey of the schemata prepared by the Prepatory Commission in *Herder TK* III, 665–726.

Participants: *Padri presenti al Concilio Ecumenico Vat. II* (Vatican City 1967), published by the Secretariat General. On the Composition: *HK* 17 (1962/63), 59ff.;

L'Osservatore Romano, special edition, 6 March 1966; R. Caporale, *Les hommes du Concile. Étude sociologique sur Vat. II* (Paris 1965); M. Galli and B. Moosbrugger, *Das Konzil. Ein Text- und Bildbericht* (Olten 1965); F. Vallainc, *Immagini del Concilio* (Rome 1966).

Statistics on various groups: P. A. Ysermans, *American Participation in the Second Vatican Council* (New York 1967); G. Conus, "L'Église d'Afrique au Concile Vat. II," *NZMW* 30 (1974), 241–55; 31 (1975) 1–18, 124–42; J. Wnuk, *Vatican II. Episkopat Polski na Soborze Vatykanskym* (Czytelnik 1964); *L'Église Grecque Melkite au Concile. Discours et notes du Patriarche Maximos IV et des Prélats de son Église au Concile Oecumenique Vat. II* (Dar Al Kalima, Beirut 1967); W. Dushnyck, *The Ukrainian-Rite Catholic Church at the Ecumenical Council 1962/65. A Collection of Articles, Book Reviews, Editorials* (New York and Paris 1967), with biblio.; W. Seibel, *Zwischenbilanz zum Konzil. Berichte und Dokumente der deutschen Bischöfe* (Recklinghausen 1963).

DECREES: *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II. Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes, cura et studio Secretariae generalis* (Vatican City 1966); J. Deretz and A. Nocent, *Konkordanz der Konzilstexte* (Graz 1968). —Translations and Interpretations: *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Konstitutionen, Dekrete u. Erklärungen, lat. u. deutsch. Kommentare,* ed. by H. Vorgrimler et al., 3 vols. (Freiburg 1966–68); *Vaticanum secundum,* ed. by O. Müller, W. Becker and J. Gülden, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1963–66); A. Beckel, H. Reiring and O. B. Roegele, *Zweites Vat. Konzil. Dokumente, Texte, Kommentare,* 4 vols. (Osnabrück 1963–66); H. Reuter, *Das II. Vat. Konzil. Vorgeschichte, Verlauf, Ergebnisse dargestellt nach Dokumenten und Berichten* (Cologne 1966); J. C. Hampe, *Die Autorität der Freiheit. Gegenwart des Konzils u. Zukunft der Kirche im ökumenischen Disput,* 3 vols. (Munich 1967). —English-language editions: *The Documents of Vatican II,* ed. by Walter M. Abbott (New York, 1966); *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* I-V, ed. by H. Vorgrimler (New York, 1967–69).

INDIVIDUAL DECREES: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*): Compilation of translations and first commentaries, *EphLiturg* 78 (1964), 561–72; additional lit. in 79 (1965), 465f. The subsequent volumes of *EphLiturg* contain all the instructions and relevant decrees; E. J. Lengeling, *Die Konstitution des Zweiten Vat. Konzils über die hl. Liturgie* (Münster 1964); M. Nicolaw, *Constitución Litúrgica del Vat. II* (Madrid 1964); special issue of the journal *La Maison Dieu* 77 (1964); H. Volk, *Theologische Grundlagen der Liturgie* (Mainz 1964); *Miscellanea liturgica in onore di S. Em. il Card. Giacomo Lercara, Arcivescovo di Bologna, Presidente del Consilium per l'applicazione della Costituzione sulla S. Liturgia,* 2 vols. (Rome, Paris, Tournai and New York 1966–67); J. Pascher, "Das Wesen der tätigen Teilnahme," II, 11–26 in G. Garrone, *Le rôle de la Constitutio de S. Liturgia sur l'évolution du Concile et d'orientation de la pastorale. La Liturgie: Concile et Après Concile,* ed. by the abbey of Solesmes (Tournai 1968).

Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*): General: *Constitutionis Dogmaticae "Lumen gentium" Synopsis historica,* ed. by G. Alberigo and F. Magistretti (Bologna 1975); J. Ratzinger, *Konstitution über die Kirche* (Münster 1965); G. Philips, *L'Église et son mystère au II^e Concile du Vatican. Histoire, texte et commentaire de la Constitution Lumen gentium,* 2 vols. (Tournai and Paris 1967–68); *De Ecclesia. Beiträge zur Konstitution über die Kirche des II. Vat. Konzils,* ed. by G. Barauna, 2 vols. (Freiburg 1966); C. Butler, *The Theology of Vat. II* (London 1967); P. Parente, *Saggio di una Ecclesiologia alla luce del Vat. II* (Rome 1968); H. Holstein, *Hiérarchie et Peuple de Dieu d'après Lumen gentium* (Paris 1970); W. Aymans, "Die Communio ecclesiarum als Gestaltgesetz der einen Kirche," *AKR* 139 (1970), 69–90; A. Acerbi, *Due ecclesiologie. Ecclesiologia giuridica ed ecclesiologia di communione nella "Lumen gentium"* (Bologna 1975); H. Schauf, "Zur Textgeschichte grundlegender Aussagen aus 'Lumen gentium' über das

Bischofskollegium," *AKR* 64 (1972), 5–147; K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *Episkopat und Primat* (Freiburg 1961); U. Betti, *La dottrina sull'Episcopato nel cap. III della Costituzione dommatica Lumen gentium* (Rome 1968); W. Bertrams, *Papst und Bischofskollegium als Träger der kirchlichen Hirtengewalt* (Munich 1965); W. Aymans, *AKR* 135 (1966), 136–47. —Miscellaneous: J. Neumann, "Weihe und Amt in der Lehre von der Kirchenverfassung des Zweiten Vat. Konzils," *AKR* 135 (1966), 3–18; G. Rambaldi, "Note sul sacerdozio e sul sacramento dell'Ordine nella Costituzione Lumen gentium," *Gregorianum* 47 (1966), 517–41; P. J. Cordes, *Sendung zum Dienst. Exegetisch-historische u. systematische Studien zum Konzildekret "Vom Dienst und Leben der Priester"* (Frankfurt 1972); J. Ratzinger, *Die kirchliche Lehre vom Sacramentum ordinis: Pluralisme et Oecumenisme en Recherches théologiques* (Paris 1976), 155–66. No. 5 (1976) of *La Scuola Catholica* is devoted to ordinations; P. Bläser, "Die Kirche u. die Kirchen," *Catholica* 18 (1964), 89–107; W. Kasper, "Der ekklesiologische Charakter der nichtkatholischen Kirchen," *ThQ* 145 (1965), 42–62; E. Lamirande, "La signification ecclésiologique des communités dissidentes et la doctrine des 'Vestigia ecclesiae," *Istina* 10 (1964), 25–58; R. Laurentin, *La Vierge au Concile* (Paris 1965).

Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation (*Dei Verbum*): J. R. Geiselmann, *Die Hl. Schrift u. die Tradition* (Freiburg 1962), in opposition, H. Lennertz, *Gregorianum* 40 (1959), 38–53; Y. Congar, *La Tradition et les traditions,* 2 vols. (Paris 1960–63); K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *Offenbarung und Überlieferung* (Freiburg 1965); E. Stakemeier, *Die Konzilskonstitution über die göttliche Offenbarung. Werden, Inhalt und theologische Bedeutung* (Paderborn 1966); O. Semmelroth and M. Zerwick, *Vaticanum II über das Wort Gottes* (Stuttgart 1966); J. Beumer, *Die kath. Inspirationslehre zwischen Vaticanum I u. II* (Stuttgart 1966); N. Lohfink, *Katholische Bibelwissenschaft u. historisch-kritische Methode* (Kevelaer 1966); A. Vögtle, *Die Kirche u. das Wort Gottes* (Würzburg 1967); H. de Lubac, *L'Écriture dans la tradition* (Paris 1966); A. Bea, *Das Wort Gottes u. die Menschheit. Die Lehre des Konzils über die Offenbarung* (Stuttgart 1968); H. Waldenfels, *Offenbarung. Das II. Vat. Konzil auf dem Hintergrund der neueren Theologie* (Munich 1969).

Pastoral Constitution on the Church (*Gaudium et Spes*): Commentaries on the individual chaps. in Vorgrimler, *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* I, 105–305; R. Tucci, "Introduzione storico-dottrinale alla Costituzione pastorale 'Gaudium et spes,'" *La Chiesa e il mondo contemporaneo nel Vaticano II* (Turin 1966), 17–134; *L'Église dans le monde de ce temps* (Paris 1967) (=*Unam sanctam* 65) with contributions by K. Rahner, H. de Reidmatten, M.-D. Chenu, E. Schillebeeckx et al.; J. Oelinger, *Christliche Weltverantwortung. Die Kirche in der Welt von heute* (Cologne 1968); Commentaries on the Pastoral Constitution of the Second Vatican Council in this series as Vol. 8: A. Langner, *Die politische Gemeinschaft* (Cologne 1968); as Vol. 10: H. de Riedmatten, *Die Völkergemeinschaft* (Cologne 1969).

NEWS COVERAGE: Press and Radio: W. Kampe, *Das Konzil im Spiegel der Presse* (Würzburg 1963), deals only with the first session; E. L. Hestow, *The Press and Vatican II* (Notre Dame and London 1967). Many continuing press and radio reports were issued collectively: those for the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* by J. Schmitz van Vorst in four booklets, one for each session; L. Waltermann, *Konzil als Prozeß. Berichte im Westdeutschen Rundfunk über das II. Vatikanum* (Cologne 1966); H. Helbling, *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Ein Bericht* (Basel 1966); A. Wenger (*La Croix*), *Vatican II,* 4 booklets (Paris 1963–68); R. Laurentin (*Le Figaro*), *L'enjeu du Concile,* 3 vols. (Paris 1963–65), in: *Bilan du Concile* (Paris 1966); H. Fesquet (*Le Monde*), *Le Journal du Concile* (Le Jas 1966); G. Caprile (*Civiltà Cattolica*), *Il concilio Vat. II Cronache edite da "Civiltà Cattolica,"* 5 vols. (Rome 1965–69), R. La Valle, *Coraggio del Concilio,* 3

booklets (Brescia 1964–66); B. Kloppenburg, *Concilio Vat. II,* 5 vols. (Petropolis 1962–66); J. L. Martin Descalzo, *Un periodista en el Concilio,* 4 vols. (Madrid 1963–66); X. Rynne (pseudonym), *From Vatican City. Vat. Council II, Background and Debates,* 4 vols. (London 1963–65); id., *La révolution des Jean XXIII* (Paris 1963); J. Ratzinger, *Vaticanum II. Ergebnisse und Probleme,* 4 booklets (Cologne 1963–66); Y. Congar, *Vatican II Le Concile au jour le jour,* 4 booklets (Paris 1963–66).

PROTESTANT OBSERVERS: O. Cullman and L. Vischer, *Zwischen zwei Konzilssessionen. Rückblick und Ausschau zweier protestantischer Beobachter* (Zurich 1963); J. C. Hampe, *Ende der Gegenreformation* (Stuttgart and Mainz 1964); M. Lackmann, *Mit evangelischen Augen. Beobachtungen eines Lutheraners auf dem II. Vat. Konzil* (Graz 1963–66); *Dialog unterwegs. Eine evangelische Bestandsaufnahme zum Konzil,* ed. by G. A. Lindseck (Göttingen 1965); *Was bedeutet das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil für uns,* ed. by W. Schaetz (Basel 1966); G. Richard Molard, *Un pasteur au Concile* (Paris 1964); D. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1963. A Protestant Observes the Second Session of Vat. Council II* (Philadelphia and Boston 1964); R. M. Brown, *Observer in Rome. A Protestant Report on the Vatican Council* (Garden City, New York 1964).

EVALUATION AND RETROSPECT: J. Höffner, *Selbstverständnis und Perspektiven des Zweiten Vaticanischen Konzils* (Cologne and Opladen 1965); E. H. Schillebeeckx, *Die Signatur des II. Vaticanums. Rückblick nach drei Sitzungsperioden* (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1965); M. Plate, *Weltereignis Konzil. Darstellung—Sinn—Ergebnis* (Freiburg 1966); O. Karrer, *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Reflexionen zu seiner geschichtlichen und geistlichen Wirklichkeit* (Munich 1966); D. A. Seeber, *Das Zweite Vaticanum. Konzil des Übergangs* (Freiburg 1966); K. Rahner, O. Cullman and H. Fries, *Sind die Erwartungen erfüllt? Überlegungen nach dem Konzil* (Munich 1966); M. v. Galli, *Das Konzil und seine Folgen* (Lucerne and Frankfurt 1967). M. Serafian (pseudonym), *La difficile scelta. Il Concilio e la Chiesa fra Giovanni XXIII e Paolo VI* (Milan 1964); P. Felici, *Il lungo camino del Concilio* (Milan 1967); G. Palazzini, *Il Concilio Ecumenico Vat. II. Tra cronaca e storia* (Rome 1966); L. M. Carli, *La Chiesa a Concilio* (Milan 1964); C. Reymondin and L. Richard, *Vatican II au Travail. Méthodes conciliaires et documents* (Tours 1965); G. Garrone, *Le Concile. Orientations* (Paris 1966); J. Leclercq, *Vatican II—un Concile pastorale* (Brussels 1966); R. Prévost, *Pierre ou le Chaos* (Paris 1965); M. Nicolau, *Laicado y Santidad ecclesial, Colegialidad y Libertad religiosa. Nuevos problemos del Concilio Vat.* (Madrid 1964); J. Elizalde, *Concilio, categoria y anecdota,* 2 vols. (Zaragoza 1965–66); *El Concilio visto por los peritos españoles* (Madrid 1965); G. Bull, *Vatican Politics at the Second Vatican Council 1962/65* (London 1966); L. M. Redmond, *The Council Reconsidered* (Dublin 1966); G. McCoin, *What Happened at Rome? The Council and Its Implications for the Modern World* (New York 1966); R. Wiltgen, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber. The Unknown Council* (New York 1967); J. Moorman, *Vatican Observed. An Anglican Impression of Vat. II* (London 1967); *The Second Vat. Council, Studies by Eight Anglican Observers,* ed. by G. C. Pauley (London 1967); L. Vischer, *Überlegungen nach dem Vat. Konzil* (Zurich 1966); H. Schlink, *Nach dem Konzil* (Munich and Hamburg 1966); H. Helbling, *Die evangelischen Christen u. das Konzil* (Würzburg 1967); *Wir sind gefragt. Antworten evangelischer Konzilsbeobachter,* ed. by J. W. Kantzenbach and V. Vajta (Göttingen 1966).

5. *The Code of Canon Law and the Development of Canon Law to 1974*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

FOR CIC: *Acta Apostolicae Sedis 1917–1974;* N. Hilling, "Die gesetzgeberische Tätigkeit Benedikts XV. bis zur Promulgation des Codex iuris canonici," *AfkKR* 98 (1918), 223–

39, 398–406, 561–74; J. Noval, *Codificationis juris canonici recensio historico-apologetica* (Rome 1918); N. Hilling, "Zur Promulgation des Codex iuris canonici," *AfkKR* 98 (1918), 71–86; A. Scharnagl, *Das neue kirchliche Gesetzbuch* (Munich and Regensburg 1918); U. Stutz, *Der Geist des CIC* (Stuttgart 1918); A. Ortscheid, *Essai concernant la nature de la codification et son influence sur la science juridique, d'après le concept du Code de Droit Canonique* (Paris 1922); P. Gasparri and I. Serédi, *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes,* 9 vols. (Rome 1923–39); M. Falco, *Introduzione allo studio del, "Codex iuris canonici,"* (Turin 1925); Y. de la Brière, "La carrière du Cardinal Gasparri. Codification canonique et pactes concordataires," *Études CCII* (1930), 595–606; K. Mörsdorf, *Die Rechtssprache des CIC* (Paderborn 1937); P. Gasparri, "Storia della Codificazione del diritto canonico per la Chiesa latina," *Acta Congressus Juridici Internationalis* IV (Rome 1937), 1–10; F. Cimetier, *Pour étudier le Code de Droit Canonique. Introduction générale. Bibliographie. Réponses et décisions. Documents complémentairs. 1917–1938* (Paris 1938); D. Staffa, "Imperfezioni e lacune del primo libro del Codice di diritto canonico," *Miscellanea in memoriam Card. Gasparri* (Rome 1960), 45–73; K. Mörsdorf, "Der CIC und die nichtkatholischen Christen," *AfkKR* 130 (1961), 31–58; H. Schmitz, *Die Gesetzessystematik des CIC Liber I-III,* 18 vols. (Munich 1963); S. Kuttner, "The Code of Canon Law in Historical Perspective," *The Jurist* 28 (1968), 129–48.

ON THE DEVELOPMENT FROM 1918 TO 1962: N. Hilling, ed., *CIC Supplementum,* 2 vols. (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1925–31); I. Bruno, *CIC Interpretationes Authenticae seu Responsa a PCI a. 1917–1935 data* (Vatican City 1935); Supplement for the years 1936–50 (Vatican City 1950); E. G. Regatillo, *Interpretatio et jurisprudentia CIC* (Santander 1949); S. Mayer, ed., *Neueste Kirchenrechts-Sammlung,* 4 vols. (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1953–62); X. Ochoa, ed. *Leges Ecclesiae post Codicem iuris canonici editae,* 4 vols. (Rome 1966–74); N. Hilling, "Die gesetzgeberische Tätigkeit Benedikts XV. seit der Promulgation des Codex iuris canonici," *AfkKR* 103 (1923), 5–36; id., "Zum zehnjährigen Jubiläum des Codex Juris Canonici," *AfkKR* 108 (1928), 385–408; id. Die Gesetzgebung des Hl. Stuhles seit der Kodifikation im Jahre 1917," *AfkKR* 112 (1932), 3–36; id., "Die Gesetzgebung des Papstes Pius XI," *AfkKR* 119 (1939), 309–51; 120 (1940), 4–32, 169–200; S. Mayer, "Bedeutung Papst Pius' XII. für das Recht, besonders das Kirchenrecht," *AfkKR* 130 (1961), 436–71.

ON THE DEVELOPMENT SINCE THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL: F. Romita, ed., *Normae exsequutivae Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II* (1963–69) (Naples 1971); H. Barion, "Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Kanonistischer Bericht (I), (II), (III)," *Der Staat* 3 (1964), 221–26; 4 (1965) 341–59; 5 (1966) 341–52; *Lois et institutions nouvelles de l'Eglise catholique* (Paris 1966); L. M. Örsy, "Quantity and Quality of Laws after Vatican II," *The Jurist* 27 (1967), 385–412; F. Romita, *Il Diritto Canonico dopo il Concilio Vaticano II* (=*Bibliotheca Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 20) (Naples 1970); W. Bertrams, "Die Bedeutung des Vatikanischen Konzils für das Kirchenrecht," *ÖAfKR* 23 (1972), 125–62; U. Mosiek, "Die neueste Rechtsprechung der S. R. Rota," *ÖAfKR* 24 (1973), 160–99.

ON THE REFORM OF CANON LAW: K. Mörsdorf, "Grundfragen einer Reform des kanonischen Rechtes," *MThZ* 15 (1964), 1–16; id., "Streiflichter zur Reform des kanonischen Rechts," *AfkKR* 135 (1966) 38–52; E. Veis, *Zur Reform des kanonischen Rechts. Das Gespräch vor dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil.* (diss., Freiburg i. Brsg. 1966); R. Bidagor, "La revisión del Código de Derecho Canónico—sus problemas," *Gregorianum* 49 (1968), 253–64; P. Feleci, "Il Concilio Vaticano II e la nuova codificazione," *Apollinaris* 42 (1969), 7–19; O. Giacchi, "Innovazione e tradizione nella Chiesa dopo il Concilio," *Ephemerides Iuris Canonici* 26 (1970), 9–24; F. Romita, "Quo iure vivimus post Vaticanum II': dal Codice Piano-Benedettino al futuro Codice Conciliare," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 95 (1970), 229–41; G. Baldanza, *L'incidenza della teologia conciliare nella riforma del diritto canonico* (=*Bibliotheca Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 26) (Naples 1970); R. G. Cunningham, "The Principles Guiding the Revision of the Code of Canon Law," *The Jurist* 30 (1970), 447–55; P. Lombardia, "Principios y técnicas del nuevo Derecho Canónico," *Ius Canonicum* 11 (1971), 22–36; R. Bidagor, "La Commission pontificale pour la révision du Code de Droit canonique," *L'Annee Canonique* 15 (1971), 97–107; J. Maldonado, "Los juristas ante el momento actual del Derecho Canónico," *Ius Canonicum* 11 (1971), 37–67; F. Finocchiaro, "La codificazione del diritto canonico e l'ora presente," *Ephemerides Iuris Canonici* 27 (1971), 251–72; W. M. Plöchl, "Um ein neues katholisches Kirchenrecht," *ÖAfKR* 23 (1972), 273–89; R. Baccari, "La Carità, sorgente della nuova legislazione canonica," *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 97 (1972), 427–38; P. Fedele, "A proposito delle innovazioni proposte dalla Commissione per la revisione del C.I.C. in tema di consenso matrimoniale," *L'Annee Canonique* 17 (1973), 365–412; P. Felici, "De Opere Codicis Iuris Canonici Recognoscendi," *ÖAfKR* 25 (1974), 117–28; A. Scheuermann, "Das Schema 1973 für das kommende kirchliche Strafrecht," *AfkKR* 143 (1974), 3–63; K. Mörsdorf, "Zum Problem der Exkommunikation, Bemerkungen zum Schema Documenti quo disciplina sanctionum seu poenarium in Ecclesia Latina denuo ordinatur," ibid., 64–68; H. Schmitz, "Revision des kirchlichen Hochschulrechts," ibid., 69–100.

ON THE *Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis: Schema Legis Ecclesiae Fundamentalis. Textus emendatus cum relatione de ipso schemate deque emendationibus receptis* (Vatican City 1971); "Relatio universas contrahens generales animadversiones ad Schema Legis Ecclesiae fundamentalis ab Episcopis propositas," *Communicationes* 4 (1972), 122–68; *El Proyecto de Ley Fundamental de la Iglesia. Texto y análisis crítico. Redacción Ius Canonicum* (=*Cuadernos de la Colección Canónica* 13) (Pamplona 1971); V. Marcolino, *A propósito da Lei Fundamental da Igreja* (Braga 1971); "Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis. Bericht über die Arbeitsergebnisse eines Kanonistischen Symposions in München 1971," *AfkKR* 140 (1971), 407–506; *L'Année Canonique* 15 (1971), 593–95; 16 (1972) 13f.; W. Bertrams, "De praemissis et principiis Legis Fundamentalis Ecclesiae," *Periodica* 60 (1971), 511–47; G. Thils, *Une "Loi Fondamentale de l'Église"?* (Louvain 1971); W. Bertrams, "Communio, communitas et societas in Lege Fundamentalis Ecclesiae," *Periodica* 61 (1972), 553–604; R. Sobański, "La 'Loi fondamentale' de l'Église. Quelques réflexions," *NRTh* 94 (1972), 251–68; J. Beyer, "De Legis Ecclesiae Fundamentalis redactione, natura et crisi," *Periodica* 61 (1972), 525–51; J. Manzanares, "De Schemate Legis Ecclesiae Fundamentalis in Colloquio Hispano-Germanico adnotationes," *Periodica* 61 (1972), 647–62; L. Michelini di San Martino, *Lo Schema Legis Ecclesiae Fundamentalis e gli Ordinamenti Laici,* (=*Bibliotheca Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 37) (Naples 1972); B. Gangoiti, "Possibilità, convenienza e contenuto di una legge fondamentale nella Chiesa," *Angelicum* 49 (1972), 315–47; L. Vela Sánchez, "Christifidelium officia et iura fundamentalia descripta in Legis Fundamentalis Schematis textu emendato," *Periodica* 61 (1972), 605–23.

6. *The Holy See's Policy of Concordats from 1918 to 1974*

SOURCES

Acta Apostolica Sedis 1908–74; A. Mercati, *Raccolta di Concordati su materie ecclesiastiche tra la Santa Sede e le autorità civili,* 2 vols. (Rome 1919–54); Z. Giacometti, *Quellen zur*

Geschichte der Trennung von Staat und Kirche (Tübingen 1926); A. Giannini, *I concordati postbellici,* 2 vols. (Milan 1929–36); J. M. Restrepo, *Concordats conclus durant le Pontificat de Sa Sainteté le Pape Pie XI traduits en Latin et en Français* (Rome 1934); M. Nasalli-Rocca de Corneliano, *Concordatorum Pii XI P.M. Concordantiae* (Rome 1940); *Patti Lateranensi, Convenzioni e Accordi successivi fra il Vaticano e l'Italia fino al 31 dicembre 1945* (Vatican City 1972); *Convenzioni ed accordi fra il Vaticano e l'Italia* II: *Dal 1° Gennaio 1946 al 31 Dicembre 1954* (Vatican City 1955); A. J. Peaslee, *Constitutions of Nations,* 3d ed., 4 vols., ed. by D. Peaslee Xydis (The Hague 1965–70); A. Perugini, *Concordata vigentia* (Rome 1950); H. Liermann, ed., *Kirchen und Staat,* 2 vols. (Munich 1954–55); W. Weber, *Die deutschen Konkordate und Kirchenverträge der Gegenwart. Textausgabe mit den amtlichen Begründungen sowie mit Ergänzungsbestimmungen, vergleichenden Übersichten, Schrifttumshinweisen und einem Sachverzeichnis,* 2 vols. (Göttingen 1962–71); J. Wenner, *Reichskonkordat und Länderkonkordate* (Paderborn 1964); L. Schöppe, *Konkordate seit 1800. Originaltext und deutsche Übersetzung der geltenden Konkordate* (Frankfurt am Main and Berlin 1964); L. Schöppe, *Neue Konkordate und konkordatäre Vereinbarungen, Abschlüsse in den Jahren 1964–1969. Nachtrag zu "Konkordate seit 1800"* (Hamburg 1970); E. R. Huber and W. Huber, eds., *Staat und Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Dokumente zur Geschichte des deutschen Staatskirchenrechts* I: *Staat und Kirche vom Ausgang des alten Reiches bis zum Vorabend der bürgerlichen Revolution* (Berlin 1973); A. Läpple, *Der Religionsunterricht 1945–1975. Dokumentation eines Weges* (Aschaffenburg 1975).

LITERATURE

F. von Lama, *Papst und Kurie in ihrer Politik nach dem Weltkrieg* (Illertissen, Bavaria 1925); E. R. Huber, *Verträge zwischen Staat und Kirche im Deutschen Reich* (Breslau 1930); G. J. Ebers, *Staat und Kirche im neuen Deutschland* (Munich 1930); N. Hilling, "Die Konkordatsfrage," *AfkKR* 110 (1930), 121–35; E. Schneider, *Die Umschreibung der Bistümer in den Nachkriegskonkordaten* (Paderborn 1930); U. Stutz, "Konkordat und Codex," *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* XXXII (Berlin 1930), 688–706; A. M. Koeniger, *Die neuen deutschen Konkordate und Kirchenverträge mit der preußischen Zirkumskriptionsbulle* (Bonn and Cologne 1932); A. Bertola, "Attività concordataria e codificazione del diritto della chiesa," *Archivio Giuridico "Filippo Serafini"* 111 (1934), 137–77; G. Goetz, *Die schulrechtlichen Bestimmungen der neueren und neuesten europäischen Konkordate in ihrer Beziehung zur jeweiligen staatlichen Schulgesetzgebung* (diss., Lam, Bavaria 1936); L. Salvatorelli, *La politica della Santa Sede dopo la guerra* (Milan 1937); Y. de la Brière, "Le droit concordataire dans la Nouvelle Europe," *Recueil des Cours* 63 (1938), 367–468; H. Barion, "Die kirchliche Betreuung völkischer Minderheiten," *Jahrbuch der Akademie für deutsches Recht* 5 (1938), 25–36; id., "Konkordat und Codex," *Festschrift Ulrich Stutz* (=*Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen* 117 and 118) (Stuttgart 1938), 371–88; M. Bendiscioli, *La politica della Santa Sede. Direttive—organi—realizzazione. 1918–1938* (Florence 1939); W. Weber, *Die politische Klausel in den Konkordaten* (Hamburg 1939); H. Barion, "Über doppelsprachige Konkordate. Eine konkordatstechnische Studie," *Deutsche Rechtswissenschaft* 5 (1940), 226–49; L. Link, *Die Besetzung der kirchlichen Ämter in den Konkordaten Papst Pius' XI.* (=*Kanonistische Studien und Texte* 18/19) (diss., Bonn 1942); J. H. Kaiser, *Die Politische Klausel der Konkordate* (Berlin and Munich 1949); J. Salomon, "La politique concordataire des États depuis la fin de la deuxième guerre mondiale," *Revue générale de droit international public* 59 (1955), 578–623; H. H. Schrey, *Die Generation der Entscheidung. Staat und Kirche in Europa und im europäischen Rußland bis 1953* (Munich 1955); R. Metz, "Le choix des évêques dans les récents concordats (1918–1954)," *L'Année Canonique* 3 (1956), 75–98; H. Schmieden, *Recht und Staat in den Verlautbarungen der katholischen Kirche* (Bonn 1961); H. Maier, "Kirche und Staat seit 1945. Ihr Verhältnis in den wichtigsten europäischen Ländern," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 14 (1963), 558-90, 694–716, 741–73; G. Catalano, *Problematica giuridica dei concordati* (Milan 1963); A. Albrecht, *Koordination von Staat und Kirche in der Demokratie* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1965); *Das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat. Erwägungen zur Vielfalt der geschichtlichen Entwicklung und gegenwärtigen Situation* (=*Studien und Berichte der Katholischen Academie in Bayern* Heft 30) (Würzburg 1965); A. Hollerbach, *Verträge zwischen Staat und Kirche in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Frankfurt 1965); J. Lucien-Brun, "Une nouvelle étape dans le droit concordataire," *Annuaire français de droit international* 11 (1965/66), 113–21; R. Metz, "L'intervention du pouvoir civil dans la nomination des évêques, des vicaires apostoliques et des vicaires aux armées, d'après les conventions signées au cours des années 1955 à 1965," *Revue de droit canonique* 16 (1966), 219–50; C. M. Corral Salvador, "Libertad de la Iglesia y intervención de los Estados en los nombramientos episcopales," *Revista Española de Derecho Canónico* 21 (1966), 63–92; K. Rahner, H. Maier, U. Mann, M. Schmaus, *Religionsfreiheit. Ein Problem für Staat und Kirche* (Munich 1966); K. Obermayer, "Die Konkordate und Kirchenverträge im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert," W. P. Fuchs, ed., *Staat und Kirche im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Stuttgart 1966), 166–83; P. Zepp, "Die Religionsfreiheit in den Konkordaten," H. Lentze and I. Gampl, eds., *Speculum iuris et ecclesiarum. Festschrift für Willibald M. Plöchl* (Vienna 1967), 417–25; O. Dibelius, *Überstaatliche Verbindungen der Kirchen und Religionsfreiheit* (diss., Bonn 1967); H. Reis, "Konkordat und Kirchenvertrag in der Staatsverfassung," *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* n.s. 17 (1968), 165–394; G. Lajolo, *I concordati moderni. La natura giuridica internazionale dei concordati alla luce di recente prassi diplomatica. Successione di Stati—Clausola "rebus sic stantibus"* (Brescia 1968); A. Hollerbach, "Die neuere Entwicklung des Konkordatsrechts,"*Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* n.s. 17 (1968), 117–63; A. W. Ziegler, *Religion, Kirche und Staat in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* 3 vols. (Munich 1969–74); A. De La Hera, "Confesionalidad del Estado y libertad religiosa," *Ius Canonicum* 12 (1972), 86–104; R. Moya, "El concordato en las actuales relaciones entre la Iglesia y el Estado," *Angelicum* 49 (1972), 348–66; C. Corral, "De relatione inter Ecclesiam et Statum in Schemate Legis Ecclesiae Fundamentalis," *Periodica* 61 (1972), 625–45; P. Leisching, *Kirche und Staat in den Rechtsordnungen Europas. Ein Überblick* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1973); J. Sartorius, *Staat und Kirchen im francophonen Schwarzafrika und auf Madagaskar. Die religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung vom Beginn der Kolonialzeit bis heute* (Munich 1973).

SECTION TWO

The Diversity of the Inner Life of the Universal Church

7. *Society and State as a Problem for the Church*

SOURCES

E. Marmy, ed.; *Mensch und Gemeinschaft in christlicher Schau. Dokumente* (from Gregory XVI, 1832, to Pius XII, 1944) (Fribourg 1945) A. F. Utz, O.P., and J. F. Groner, O.P., eds.; *Aufbau und Entfaltung des gesellschaftlichen Lebens. Soziale Summe Pius' XII.*, 3 vols. (Fribourg 1954–61), Vols. 1 and 2 1963; *Discorsi e Radiomessaggi di Sua Santità Pio VII.*, 20 vols. (Vatican City 1941–59); John XXIII, *Scritti e discorsi* (Siena 1959 ff.); A. F. Utz, O.P., ed., *La Doctrine Sociale de l'Église à travers les Siècles*, 4 vols. (Paris 1970); H. Schnatz, ed., *Päpstliche Verlautbarungen zu Staat und Gesellschaft. Originaldokumente mit deutscher Übersetzung* (Darmstadt 1973); I. Giordani, ed., *Pensiero sociale della Chiesa oggi. Documenti di Giovanni XXIII, di Paolo VI e del Concilio Vaticano II* (Rome 1974).

LITERATURE

TRANSLATIONS AND COMMENTARIES OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCUMENTS: G. Gundlach, S.J., *Die sozialen Rundschreiben Leos XIII. und Pius' XI. Text und deutsche Übersetzung samt systematischen Inhaltsübersichten und einheitlichem Sachregister* (Paderborn 1931); O. v. Nell-Breuning, S.J., *Die soziale Enzyklika. Erläuterungen zum Weltrundschreiben Papst Pius' XI. Über die gesellschaftliche Ordnung* (Cologne 1932, reprinted 1958/63); G. Gundlach, S.J., *Die Kirche zur heutigen Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftsnot. Erläuterungen des Rundschreibens Papst Pius' XI. "Quadragesimo anno"* (Berlin 1949); P. Jostock, *Die sozialen Rundschreiben: Leo XIII., Über die Arbeiterfrage. Pius XI., Über die gesellschaftliche Ordnung* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1963); E. Welty, OP *Die Sozialenzyklika Papst Johannes' XXIII. "Mater et Magistra." Mit ausführlichem Kommentar sowie einer Einführung in die Soziallehre der Päpste* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1965); J. Hünermann, *Die soziale Gerechtigkeit. Erläuterungen zum Sozialrundschreiben Johannes' XXIII. "Mater et Magistra"* (Essen 1962); O. V. Nell-Breuning, S.J., *"Mater et Magistra," StdZ* 169 (1961/62), 116–28; J. Bless, *Mater et Magistra und praktische Wirtschafts- und Socialpolitik. Erläuterungen und Erwägungen zur Sozialbotschaft Johannes' XXIII.* (Lucerne and Stuttgart 1965); A. F. Utz, O.P., *Die Friedensenzyklika Papst Johannes' XXIII. "Pacem in terris." Mit einer Einführung in die Lehre der Päpste über die Grundlagen der Politik und einem Kommentar* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1965); J. Hünermann, *Kommentar zur Friedensenzyklika "Pacem in terris"* (Essen 1963); A. F. Utz, O.P., "Der politische Realismus Johannes' XXIII. in der Enzyklika *Pacem in terris," Die neue Ordnung* 19 (1965), 241–49.

GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY ACCOUNTS OF SOCIAL DOCTRINE: W. Schwer, *Katholische Gesellschaftslehre* (Paderborn 1928); J. B. Schuster, *Die Soziallehre der Kirche nach Leo XIII. und Pius XII.* (Freiburg 1935); O. v. Nell-Breuning, SJ, *Zur christlichen Gesellschaftslehre. Beiträge zu einem Wörterbuch der Politik* 1 (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1947); id., *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft heute,* 3 vols. (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1955 ff.); E. Muhler, *Die Soziallehre der Päpste* (Munich 1958); N. Monzel, *Solidarität und Selbstverantwortung.*

Beiträge zur christlichen Soziallehre (Munich 1959); F. Klüber, *Grundlagen der katholischen Gesellschaftslehre* (Osnabrück 1960); E. Welty, O.P., *Herders Sozialkatechismus. Ein Werkbuch der katholischen Sozialethik in Frage und Antwort* 1 (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1963); 2 (1965); 3 (1962); G. Gundlach, S.J., *Die Ordnung der menschlichen Gesellschaft,* 2 vols. (Cologne 1964); W. Weber, "Kirchliche Soziallehre," E. Neuhäusler and E. Gossman, eds., *Was ist Theologie?* (Munich 1966), 244–65; J. Höffner, *Christliche Gesellschaftslehre* (Kevalaer 1975); N. Monzel, *Katholische Soziallehre,* 2 vols. (Cologne 1965–67); J. Messner, *Das Naturrecht* (Innsbruck, Vienna and Munich 1966); J. Höffner, *Gessellschaftspolitik aus christlicher Verantwortung,* ed. by W. Schreiber and W. Dreier (Münster 1966); *Jahrbuch des Instituts für Christliche Sozialwissenschaften der Westf. Wilhelms-Universität Münster,* ed. by J. Höffner (Münster 1960 ff.) (since 1968: *Jahrbuch für Christliche Sozialwissenschaften,* ed. by W. Weber [Münster 1968 ff.]); *Civitas. Jahrbuch für christliche Gesellschaftsordnung,* ed. by Heinrich-Pesch-Haus (Mannheim 1962 ff.).

Natural Law and Revelation: M. Manser, O.P., *Das Naturrecht in thomistischer Beleuchtung* (Fribourg 1944); H. Rommen, *Die ewige Wiederkehr des Naturrechts* (Munich 1947); J. Fuchs, *Lex Naturae. Zur Theologie des Naturrechts* (Düsseldorf 1955); R. Henning, *Der Maßstab des Rechts im Rechtsdenken der Gegenwart* (Münster 1961); E. Haag, *Die Entwicklung der neueren katholischen Naturrechtslehre* (Zurich 1962); F. Böckle, ed., *Das Naturrecht im Disput* (Düsseldorf 1966); K. Peschke, *Naturrecht in der Kontroverse. Kritik evangelischer Theologie an der katholischen Lehre von Naturrecht und natürlicher Sittlichkeit* (Salzburg 1967); H. D. Schelauske, *Naturrechtsdiskussion in Deutschland. Ein Überblick über zwei Jahrzehnte: 1945–1965* (Cologne 1968); J. David, *Das Naturrecht in Krise und Läuterung. Eine kritische Neubesinnung* (Cologne 1969); J. Gründel, "Naturrecht," *Sacramentum Mundi* III (1969), 707–19; Herr, *Zur Frage nach dem Naturrecht im deutschen Protestantismus der Gegenwart* ed. by W. Weber and A. Rauscher (Paderborn 1972); F. Böckle and E. W. Böckenforde, eds., *Naturrecht in der Kritik* (Mainz 1973).

Social Principles: G. Gundlach, S.J., "Solidarismus, Einzelmensch, Gemeinschaft," *Gregorianum* 17 (1936), 265 ff.; O. v. Nell-Breuning, S.J., *Einzelmensch und Gesellschaft* (Heidelberg 1950); id. "Solidarismus," *Wörterbuch der Politik* 5/2 (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1951), 357–76; A. P. Verpaalen, *Der Begriff des Gemeinwohls bei Thomas von Aquin. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Personalismus, Sammlung Politeia* IV (Heidelberg 1954); A. F. Utz, O.P., "Der Personalismus," *Die neue Ordnung* 8 (1954), 270 ff.; id. *Formen und Grenzen des Subsidiaritätsprinzips* (Heidelberg 1965); A. Rauscher, S.J., *Subsidiaritätsprinzip und Berufsständische Ordnung in "Quadragesimo anno"* (Münster 1958); G. Wildmann, *Personalismus, Solidarismus und Gesellschaft. Der ethische und ontologische Grundcharakter der Gesellschaftslehre der Kirche* (Vienna 1961); J. Höffner, A. Verdross, and F. Vito eds., *Naturordnung in Gesellschaft, Staat, Wirtschaft. Festschrift für J. Messner* (Vienna 1961); J. Messner, *Das Gemeinwohl. Idee, Wirklichkeit, Aufgaben* (Osnabrück 1962); G. Gundlach, S.J., "Solidaritätsprinzip," *Staatslexikon* 7 (1962), 119–22; id., *Die Ordnung der menschlichen Gesellschaft,* 2 vols. (Cologne 1964); J. Schwarte, *Gustav Gundlach S.J. (1892–1963). Maßgeblicher Repräsentant der katholischen Soziallehre während der Pontifikate Pius' XI. und Pius XII.* (Paderborn 1975).

State, Authority, and Democracy: H. Rommen, *Der Staat in der katholischen Gedankenwelt* (Paderborn 1935); O. v. Nell-Breuning, S.J., *Zur christlichen Staatslehre, Beiträge zu einem Wörterbuch der Politik* 2 (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1947); H. Schmieden, *Recht und Staat in den Verlautbarungen der katholischen Kirche* (Bonn 1961); F. M. Schmölz, "Kirche und Demokratie," *Die neue Ordnung* 6 (1963), 401–15; W. A. Purdy, *Die Politik der katholischen Kirche* (Gütersloh 1967); A. Langner, *Die politische Gemeinschaft*

(Cologne 1968); H. Maier, *Der Christ in der Demokratie* (Augsburg 1968); A. Gnägi, *Katholische Kirche und Demokratie* (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1970); *Demokratie—Kirche—Politische Ethik* (*Jahrbuch für Christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 10) (Münster 1971); H. Maier, *Kirche und Gesellschaft* (Munich 1973); M. Krämer, *Kirche contra Demokratie? Gesellschaftliche Probleme im gegenwärtigen Katholizismus. Mit einem Geleitwort v. W. Dirks* (Munich 1973); "Aufgaben der Kirche in Staat und Gesellschaft. Arbeitspapier der Sachkommission V der Gemeinsamen Synode der Bistümer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *Synode. Amtliche Mitteilungen der Gemeinsamen Synode der Bistümer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* 1 (1973), 45–64.

THE CHURCH AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL ERRORS: (a) Socialism—Communism: G. Gundlach, S.J., "Sozialismus," *Staatslexikon* 4 (1931), 1688–95; E. Welty, O.P., "Christlicher Sozialismus," *Die neue Ordnung* 1 (1946/47), 39ff,; G. Gundlach, S.J., "Das Heilige Offizium und der Kommunismus," *StdZ* 144(1948/49), 451ff.; J. Höffner, "Sozialismus und Christentum," *TThZ* 57 (1948), 358ff. (literature); O. v. Nell-Breuning, S.J., "Sozialismus," *Wörterbuch der Politik* 5/2 (1951), 377–430; H. Falk, *Kirche und Kommunismus. Der dialektische Materialismus und seine Verurteilung.* (Düsseldorf 1956); K. Forster, ed., *Christentum und demokratischer Sozialismus* (Munich 1958); *Der Katholik und die SPD,* ed. by the SPD (Bonn 1959); G. E. Kafka, *Der freiheitliche Sozialismus in Deutschland. Das Godesberger Programm der SPD in katholischer Sicht* (Paderborn 1960); *Katholik und Godesberger Programm. Zur Situation nach Mater et Magistra,* ed. by the SPD (Bonn 1962); G. Stavenhagen and J. Höffner, "Sozialismus," *Staatslexikon* 7 (1962), 303–24; M. Stöhr, ed., *Disputation zwischen Christen und Marxisten* (Munich 1966); O. v. Nell-Breuning, S.J., "Sozialismus," *Sacramentum Mundi* IV (1969), 613–19; M. Spieker, *Neomarxismus und Christentum. Zur Problematik des Dialogs* (Paderborn 1974); F. Klüber, *Katholische Soziallehre und demokratischer Sozialismus* (Bonn and Bad Godesberg 1974).

(b) Fascism—National Socialism: E. v. Beckerath, *Wesen und Werden des faschistischen Staates* (Berlin 1927); A. Mirgeler, "Der Faschismus in der Geschichte des modernen Staates. Die Selbstdeutung Mussolinis und seiner Mitarbeiter," *Saeculum* 6 (1955), 84ff.; id., "Faschismus," *Staatslexikon* 3 (1959), 223–31; H. Buchheim, *Totalitäre Herrschaft* (Munich 1962); W. Schieder, "Faschismus," *SDG* 2 (Freiburg 1968), 438–77; E. Nolte, *Die faschistischen Bewegungen,* ed. by M. Broszat and H. Heiler, Vol. 3 (1973); G. Schulz, *Faschismus—Nationalsozialismus. Versionen und theoretische Kontroversen 1922–1972* (Frankfurt 1974); W. Wippermann, *Faschismustheorien. Zum Stand der gegenwärtigen Diskussion* (Darmstadt 1975); D. Albrecht, "Zum Begriff des Totalitarismus," *GWU* 26 (1975), 135–41; H. A. Turner, Jr., ed., *Reappraisals of Fascism* (New York 1975); R. de Felice, *Intervista sul fascismo* (Bari 1975); K. D. Bracher, *Zeitgeschichtliche Kontroversen. Um Faschismus, Totalitarismus, Demokratie* (Munich 1976); H. U. Thamer and W. Wippermann, *Faschistische und neofaschistische Bewegungen. Probleme empirischer Faschismusforschung* (Darmstadt 1977); K. Buchheim, et. al., "Nationalsozialismus," *Staatslexikon* 5 (1960), 905–23; B. Stasiewski, *Akten deutscher Bischöfe über die Lage der Kirche 1933–1945* 1: *1933–1934* (Mainz 1968); 2: *1934–35* (Mainz 1976); 3: *1935–36* (Mainz 1978); K. Gotto, "Katholische Kirche und Nationalsozialismus," *Staatslexikon* 10 (1970); H. Mommsen, "Nationalsozialismus," *SDG* 4 (1971); H. Boberach, *Berichte des SD und der Gestapo über Kirchen und Kirchenvolk in Deutschland 1934–44* (Mainz 1971); K. D. Erdmann, "Nationalsozialismus—Faschismus—Totalitarismus," *GWU* 27 (1976), 457–69; D. Albrecht, ed., *Katholische Kirche im Dritten Reich* (Mainz 1976).

THE FAMILY OF MAN: "WORLD STATE": J. Sonder, *Die Idee der Völkergemeinschaft und die philosophischen Grundlagen des Völkerrechts* (Frankfurt 1955); P. Heintz, ed., *Soziologie der Entwicklungsländer* (Cologne 1962); H. Krauss, S.J., *Die Entwicklungsenzyklika Papst Pauls VI. "Populorum progressio"* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1967); J. Schmauch, *Herrschen oder Helfen? Kritische Überlegungen zur Entwicklungshilfe* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1967); E. O. Czempiel, "Die Christen und die Auswärtige Politik. Lehre vom gerechten Krieg oder Praxeologie des Friedens?" *Civitas* 6 (1967), 20ff.; J. Bopp, *Populorum progressio—Aufbruch der Kirche?* (Stuttgart 1968); *Römische Bischofssynode 1971: Gerechtigkeit in der Welt,* ed. by the German Bishops' Conference; *Der priesterliche Dienst—Gerechtigkeit in der Welt* ed. by K. Hemmerle und W. Weber (Trier 1972) 71ff.; A. Weidert, *Elemente einer theologischen Konflikt- und Friedenstheorie. Traditionskritische, biblische und hermeneutische Überlegungen zum Problem des Friedens* (diss., Münster in Westphalia 1973).

8. *Main Lines of the Development of Theology between the First World War and the Second Vatican Council*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The works listed below have of necessity been limited to the general line of development. For dates and specific developments see: A. Kolping, *Katholische Theologie gestern und heute. Thematik und Entfaltung deutscher Katholischer Theologie, vom I.Vaticanum bis zur Gegenwart* (Bremen 1964); H. Vorgrimler and R. Vander Gucht eds., *Bilanz der Theologie im 20.Jh.* I–IV (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1969–70). For the period immediately before and after the Second Vatican Council see among others: G. Thils, *Orientations de la théologie* (Louvain 1958); A. H. Maltha, *Die neue Theologie* (Munich 1960); E. O. Brien, *Theology in Transition* (New York 1965); E. Menard, *Kirche gestern und morgen* (Frankfurt 1968); M. Schoof, *Der Durchbruch der neuen katholischen Theologie. Ursprünge—Wege—Strukturen* (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1969); Y. Congar, *Theology in Service of God's People* (New York 1972); G. A. Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (New York 1973).

9. *Movements within the Church and their Spirituality*

LITERATURE

LITURGICAL MOVEMENT: O. Rousseau, *Histoire du mouvement liturgique* (Paris 1945); A. Mayer-Pfannholz, "Das Kirchenbild des 19. Jahrhunderts und seine Ablösung," *Die Besinnung* 3 (1948), 124–44; A. L. Mayer, "Die Stellung der Liturgie von der Zeit der Romantik bis zur Jahrhundertwende," *ALW* III/1 (1953), 1–77; id., "Die geistesgeschichtliche Situation der liturgischen Erneuerung in der Gegenwart," *ALW* IV/1 (1955), 1–51; E. Iserloh, "Die Geschichte der Liturgischen Bewegung," *Hirschberg* 12 (1959), 113–22; B. Fischer, "Das 'Mechelner Ereignis' vom 23.9.1909," *LJ* 9 (1959), 203–19; J. Wagner, *LThK* VI (1961), 1097–1100; F. Kolbe, *Die Liturgische Bewegung* (Aschaffenburg 1964); L. Bouyer, *Don Lambert Beauduin. Un homme d'Église* (Tournai 1964); F. Henrich, *Die Bünde katholischer Jugendbewegung. Ihre Bedeutung für die liturgische und eucharistische Erneuerung* (Munich 1968); T. Maas-Ewerd, *Die Krise der liturgischen Bewegung in Deutschland* (Regensburg 1977).

CATHOLIC ACTION: E. Schlund, *Die Katholische Aktion, Materialien und Akten* (Munich 1928); F. Magri, *L'Azione Cattolica in Italia,* 2 vols. (Milan 1953); K. Rahner, "Über das Laienapostolat," *Schriften zur Theologie* II (Einsiedeln 1955), 339–73; Y. Congar, *Der Laie* (Stuttgart 1957); L. Tromp, *De laicorum apostolatus fundamento, indole, formis* (Rome 1957); F. Klostermann, *Das christliche Apostolat* (Innsbruck 1962); id., "Katholische Aktion," *Sacramentum Mundi* II, 1070–78.

EUCHARISTIC PIETY: J. A. Jungmann, "Eucharistiefeier und Frömmigkeit," *LJ* 5 (1955), 96–104; id., "Corpus mysticum. Gedanken zum kommenden Eucharistischen Weltkongreß," *StdZ* 164 (1958/59), 401–9; F. Hofmann, "Eucharistie und Frömmigkeit," *LJ* 5 (1955), 105–19; H. Fischer, *Eucharistiekatechese und Liturgische Erneuerung. Rückblick und Wegweisung* (Düsseldorf 1959); *Statio Orbis. Eucharistischer Weltkongreß 1960 in München,* 2 vols. (Munich 1960) J. Ratzinger, "Der Eucharistische Weltkongreß im Spiegel der Kritik," *Statio Orbis* I, 227–42; R. Aubert, "Die Eucharistischen Kongresse von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.," *Concilium* 1 (1965), 61–66.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART: A. Hamon, *Histoire de la dévotion au Sacré Cœur,* 5 vols. (Paris 1923–39); H. Rahner, "Grundzüge einer Geschichte der Herz-Jesu-Verehrung," *ZAM* 15 (1943), 61–83; R. Graber, *Das Herz des Erlösers* (Innsbruck 1949); J. Stierli et al., eds., *Cor Salvatoris. Wege zur Herz-Verehrung* (Freiburg 1954); A. Bea and H. Rahner et al., eds., *Cor Jesu,* 2 vols. (Rome 1959); R. Graber, *Die Herz-Jesu-Verehrung in der Krise der Gegenwart* (Eichstätt 1962).

MARIAN DEVOTION: H. M. Köster, *Die Magd des Herrn. Theologische Versuche und Überlegungen* (Limburg 1947); P. Sträter, ed., *Katholische Marienkunde* I–III (Paderborn 1947–51); K. Rahner, "Probleme heutiger Mariologie," *Aus der Theologie der Zeit* (Regensburg 1948); O. Semmelroth, *Urbild der Kirche. Organischer Aufbau des Mariengeheimnisses* (Würzburg 1950); R. Graber, ed., *Die marianischen Weltrundschreiben der Päpste in den letzten hundert Jahren* (Würzburg 1951); O. Semmelroth, *Maria oder Christus?* (Frankfurt 1954); C. Feckes, ed., *Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellvertretung der Menschheit durch Maria* (Paderborn 1954); M. de S. Pierre, *Bernadette. Die wahre Geschichte von Lourdes* (Freiburg 1954); H. Peichl, ed., *Maria im Lichte der Glaubenswissenschaft* (Munich 1955); J. Goubert and L. Cristiani, *Marienerscheinungen* (Recklinghausen 1955); K. Rahner, *Maria. Mutter des Herrn* (Freiburg 1956); P. Sträter, *Maria im Reiche Christi* (Paderborn 1958); A. Müller, "Fragen und Aussichten der heutigen Mariologie," *Fragen der Theologie heute* (Einsiedeln 1958), 301–17; *Mariologische Studien,* ed. by the Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Mariologie, I–III, 1962–64; R. Rusch, "Mariologische Wertungen," *ZKTh* 85 (1963), 129–61; H. Graef, *Maria. Eine Geschichte der Lehre und Verehrung* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1964); R. Laurentin, *Die marianische Frage* (Freiburg 1965); W. Beinert, *Heute von Maria reden?* (Freiburg 1973); id., ed., *Maria heute ehren. Eine theologisch-pastorale Handreichung* (Freiburg 1977). M. Schmaus, *Kath. Dogmatik* V (Munich 1961).

SECULAR INSTITUTES: H. U. v. Balthasar, *Der Laie und der Ordensstand* (Freiburg 1949); J. Zürcher, *Päpstliche Dokumente zur Ordensreform* (Einsiedeln 1954); R. Voillaume, *Mitten in der Welt. Das Leben der Kleinen Brüder von Pater de Foucauld* (Freiburg 1956); J. Beyer, ed., *De institutis saecularibus. Documenta* (Rome 1962); J. Kerkhofs, "Aspects sociologiques du sacerdoce," *NRTh* 82 (1960), 289–99; H. A. Timmermann, *Die Weltgemeinschaften im deutschen Sprachraum* (Einsiedeln 1963); J. Beyer, *Als Laie Gott geweiht* (Einsiedeln 1964); A. Wienand, ed., *Das Wirken der Orden und Klöster in Deutschland,* 2 vols. (Cologne 1964); *"Opus Dei"—Für und Wider* (Osnabrück 1967); W. Menges, *Die Ordensmänner in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Cologne 1969); R. Hostie, *Vie et mort des ordres religieux* (Paris 1972); A. Menningen, *Christ in welthafter Existenz. Die theol. Grundlagen der Säkularinstitute Schönstatts* (Vallendar 1968).

WORKER-PRIESTS: H. Perrin, *Tagebuch eines Arbeiterpriesters, Journal d'un prêtre ouvrier en Allemagne* (Paris 1945); A. Dansette, *Destin du catholicisme français, 1926–1956* (Paris 1957); A. Collonge, *Le scandale du XX^e siècle et le drâme des prêtres ouvriers* (Paris 1957); M. R. (Jacques) Loew, *Journal d'une mission ouvrière 1941–1959* (Paris 1959); G. Siefer, *Die Mission der Arbeiterpriester* (1960); *Les prêtres ouvriers* (Paris 1954).

10. *Developments in the Clergy since 1914*

SOURCES

Sacerdotis imago. Päpstliche Dokumente über das Priestertum von Pius X. bis Johannes XXIII., ed. by A. Rohrbasser (Fribourg 1962); "Decretum de Institutione Sacerdotali 'Optatam totius' = Dekret über die Ausbildung der Priester," *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil. Konstitutionen, Dekrete und Erklärungen* 2 (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1967), 309–55; "Decretum de Presbyterorum Ministerio 'Presbyterorum Ordinis' = Dekret über Dienst und Leben der Priester," ibid. 3 (1968), 127–239; "Litterae Encyclicae 'Sacerdotalis Caelibatus' d.d. 24. 6. 1967," *AAS* 59 (1967), 657–97; "Documenta Synodi Episcoporum: De Sacerdotio Ministeriali," *AAS* 63 (1971), 898–922; "Sacra Congregatio pro Institutione Catholica: Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis," *AAS* 62 (1970), 321–84; *Schreiben der deutschen Bischöfe über das priesterliche Amt. Eine biblisch-dogmatische Handreichung* (Trier 1969); "Die pastoralen Dienste in der Gemeinde," *Gemeinsame Synode der Bistümer in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Beschlüsse der Vollversammlung* 1 (Freiburg 1976), 581–636; The proceedings: *Protokoll der 5. Vollversammlung, 22–26. Mai 1974,* 136–85; *Protokoll der 7. Vollversammlung, 7.–11. Mai 1975,* 131–51.

LITERATURE

For the role of the priest in the Youth Movement see Youth Movement: A. Klönne, "Eine Literatur-Übersicht zur Geschichte der Jugendbewegung," *Recht der Jugend* 2 (Berlin 1954), 254f.; O. Köhler, *LThK* 5 (1960), 1181f.—On the Worker-Priests in France: H. Perrin, *Journal d'un prêtre ouvrier en Allemagne* (Paris 1945); G. Siefer, *Die Mission der Arbeiterpriester* (Essen 1960); R. Ludmann, *LThK* 1 (1957), 811ff.

For a Discussion of the Role of the Priest since Vatican II: F. Klostermann, *Priester für morgen* (Innsbruck 1970); N. Glatzel, "Die Rolle des Priesters in der Leistungsgesellschaft," *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 12 (1971), 163–83; id., "Soziologische Aspekte der Seelsorgerrole," *StdZ* 187 (1971), 31–42; H. Küng, *Wozu Priester? Eine Hilfe* (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1971); J. Höffner, *Der Priester in der permissiven Gesellschaft* (Cologne 1971): H. Volk, "Priestertum heute," *Internat. Kath. Zeitschrift* 1 (1972), 498–517, 2 (1973), 45–58; H. Schlier, "Grundelemente des priesterlichen Amtes im Neuen Testament," *Theologie und Philosophie* 44 (1969), 161–80; O. Semmelroth, S.J., "Die Präsenz der drei Ämter Christi im gemeinsamen und besonderen Priestertum der Kirche," ibid., 181–95; J. Pieper, "Was unterscheidet den Priester?" *Hochland* 63 (1971), 1–16; *Reform und Anerkennung kirchlicher Ämter. Ein Memorandum der Arbeitsgemeinschaft ökumenischer Universitätsinstitute* (Munich and Mainz 1973); K. H. Schuh, ed., *Amt im Widerstreit* (Berlin 1973); G. Siefer, *Sterben die Priester aus? Soziologische Überlegungen zum Funktionswandel eines Berufsstandes* (Essen 1973); F. Luthe, *Berufswechsel der Priester. Eine empirische Studie* (Düsseldorf 1970).

For a Discussion of Priestly Celibacy: E. Schillebeeckx, O.P., *Der Amtszölibat. Eine Kritische Besinnung* (Düsseldorf 1967); K. Rahner, S.J., "Der Zölibat des Weltpriesters im heutigen Gespräch," *Geist und Leben* 40 (1967), 122–38; F. Böckle, ed., *Der Zölibat. Erfahrungen, Meinungen, Vorschläge* (Mainz 1968); K. Kraemer and K. H. Schuh, eds., *Zölibat in der Diskussion. Katholische und evangelische Aspekte* (Essen 1969); J. Coppens, ed., *Sacerdoce et Célibat. Études historiques et théologiques* (Louvain 1971).—On Priest Organizations and Conferences: A. Schilling, ed., *SOG-Papiere. Mitteilungsblatt der Arbeitsgemeinschaft von Priestergruppen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und der SOG-Österreich,* (Bochum 1968–73); *Imprimatur. Nachrichten und kritische Meinungen aus der (Trierer) katholischen Kirche* (Trier 1968–75); C. Holenstein, ed., *Churer Dokumente. Bischofs-Symposion 7. bis 10. Juli 1969. Texte der Bischöfe und Priester im Wortlaut* (Zurich 1969); M. Raske, K. Schäfer, and N. Wetzel, eds., *Eine freie Kirche für eine freie Welt. Delegiertenkonferenz europäischer Priestergruppen Rom 10. bis 16. Oktober 1969. Eine Dokumentation* (Düsseldorf 1969); C. Holenstein, *Der Protest der Priester* (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1970); K. Schäfer, "Zum Thema Priestergruppen," *StdZ* 185 (1970), 34–46; id., "Nochmals: Zum Thema Priestergruppen," ibid. 185 (1970), 361–78; K. Rahner, S.J., "Chancen der Priestergruppen," ibid. 185 (1970), 172–80; H. Werners, "Priestergruppen—Konzeption und Erfahrung," *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 12 (1971), 185–204.

On Surveys of Priests: O. Schreuder, ed., *Der alarmierende Trend. Ergebnisse einer Umfrage beim gesamten holländischen Klerus* (Munich and Mainz 1970); G. Schmidtchen, *Priester in Deutschland. Forschungsbericht über die im Auftrag der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz durchgeführte Umfrage unter allen Welt- und Ordenspriestern in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. In Verbindung mit dem Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach* (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1973); K. Forster, ed., *Priester zwischen Anpassung und Unterscheidung. Auswertung und Dommentare zu der im Auftrag der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz durchgeführten Umfrage unter allen Welt- und Ordenspriestern in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna 1974), esp: O. Simmel, S.J., "Vergleich der deutschen Umfrageergebnisse mit den Ergebnissen der Priesterbefragungen in Österreich, in der Schweiz, in Spanien, in den USA und in Italien," pp. 127–248; P. M. Zulehner and S. R. Graupe, *Wie Priester heute leben. . . . , Ergebnisse der Wiener Priesterbefragung* (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1970); P. M. Zulehner, ed., *Kirche und Priester zwischen dem Auftrag Jesu und den Erwartungen der Menschen. Ergebnisse der Umfragen des Instituts für kirchliche Sozialforschung Wien über "Religion und Kirche in Österreich" und "Priester in Österreich"* (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1974); A. Müller, *Priester—Randfigur der Gesellschaft? Befund und Deutung der Schweizer Priesterumfrage* (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1974).

ON THE REFORM OF PRIESTLY EDUCATION AND THEOLOGICAL STUDIES: L. Waltermann, ed., *Klerus zwischen Wisenschaft und Seelsorge. Zur Reform der Priesterausbildung. Beiträge im Westdeutschen Rundfunk* (Essen 1966); *SKT = Studium Katholische Theologie. Berichte—Analysen—Vorschläge,* ed. by the Kommission "Curricula in Theologie" des Westdeutschen Fakultätentages and E. Feifel, booklets 1–5, (Zurich, Einsiedeln and Cologne 1973–75); A. Arens, "Einleitung und Kommentar zur Ratio Fundamentalis," A. Arens and H. Schmitz, eds., *Priesterausbildung und Theologiestudium* (Trier 1974), 5–67; G. Schmidtchen, *Umfrage unter Priesteramtskandidaten. Studien-und Lebenssituation, Amtsverständnis, Berufsmotive, Einstellung zu Kirche und Gesellschaft. Forschungsbericht des Instituts für Demoskopie Allensbach über eine im Auf-

trag der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz durchgeführte Erhebung (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1975).

11. *Religious Communities and Secular Institutes*

LITERATURE

On papal and episcopal laws concerning the orders, see *Dizionario degli Instituti di Perfezione* (DIP), ed. by G. Pelliccia and G. Rocca, of which three volumes (covering A to Conv.) have appeared (Vol. I, 1974; II, 1975; III, 1976); K. S. Frank, *Grundzüge der Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums* (Darmstadt 1975), 175–95.

12. *Educational System, Education, and Instruction*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

K. Erlinghagen, *Grundlagen katholischer Erziehung. Die prinzipiellen Erziehungslehren der Enzyklika Pius' XI. "Divini Illius Magistri"* (Freiburg 1963); O. Betz, "Erziehung," H. Fries, ed., *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe* 1 (Munich 1962) 319ff.; A. v. Campenhausen, *Erziehungsauftrag und staatliche Schulträgerschaft* (Göttingen 1967), 115ff.; N.A. Luyten, O.P. *Forschung und Bildung. Aufgaben einer katholischen Universität* (Fribourg 1965).

CATHOLIC EDUCATION IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES: Germany: F. Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts,* 2 vols. (Berlin and Leipzig 1921); E. Weniger, "Bildungswesen," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 1 (Tübingen 1957), 1281 ff.; F. Pöggeler, ed., *Handbuch der Erwachsenenbildung* 4 (Stuttgart 1975); L. Froese, ed., *Deutsche Schulgesetzgebung (1796–1952)* (Weinheim, n.d.).

Other European States: W. Schultze, ed., *Schulen in Europa,* 3 vols. (Weinheim and Berlin 1968); O. Anweiler, *Geschichte der Schule und Pädagogik in Rußland vom Ende des Zarenreiches bis zum Beginn der Stalin-Ära* (Heidelberg 1964).

General Sources: See *New Catholic Encyclopedia* under education and various universities; F. Laack, *Die amerikanische Bildungswirklichkeit, Idee, Stand und Probleme der Adult Education in den USA* (Cologne 1976); Thomas J. La Belle, ed., *Education and Development: Latin America and the Caribbean* (Los Angeles 1972); William O. Smith, *Education in Great Britain* (New York 1967); Robert Ulich, *Education in Western Culture* (New York 1965); I. Illich, *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State* (New York 1973); Frank P. Graves, *History of Education in Modern Times* (New York 1915); Adolph E. Meyer, *The Development of Education in the Twentieth Century* (New York 1939); G. A. N. Lowndes, *The Silent Social Revolution* (New York 1937); A. Prost, *L'Enseignement en France, 1800–1967* (Paris 1968); Howard C. Barnard, *Short History of English Education* (Great Britain 1947); Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780–1950* (New York 1958).

Mission Lands: A. Mulders, *Missionsgeschichte. Die Ausbreitung des Glaubens* (Regensburg 1960); S. Delacroix, *Histoire Universelle Des Missions Catholiques* 4 (Paris 1959).

Statistical Aids: UNESCO, *World Survey of Education,* 5 vols. (Paris 1955–71); UNESCO, *Statistical Yearbook* (Paris 1963) (1952–62: *Basic Facts and Figures, International Statistics Relating to Education, Culture and Mass Communication); Bilan du Monde;* CIEO, *The Situation of Catholic Education in the Various Continents* (Brussels 1969).

13. *Information and the Mass Media*

SOURCES

"Inter mirifica, Dekret des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils über die Instrumente der sozialen Kommunikation (vom 4. 12. 1963)," *LThK—Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* I (Freiburg i. Brsg.), 116–35; *Communio et Progressio. Pastoralinstruktion über die Instrumente der sozialen Kommunikation vom 23. 5. 1971, Nachkonziliare Dokumentation* 11 (Trier 1971); Radio Vaticana, ed., *Documenti Pontifici sulla Radio e sulla Televisione 1929–1962* (Rome and Vatican City 1962); *Documenti Pontifici sulla stampa* (1878–1963) (Rome and Vatican City); *Documenti Pontifici sul Teatro* (341–1966) (Rome and Vatican City 1966).—Bibliographical References to Papal Attitudes toward Publications in Recent History: (1.) Pius XII: W. Hamerski, "Reden Papst Pius' XII. zu Fragen der Publizistik," *Publizistik* 8 (1963), 611–31. (2.) John XXIII: G. Deussen, "Publizistisch relevante Äußerungen Papst Johannes' XXIII. im chronologischen Überblick," *Communicatio Socialis, CS* 6 (1973), 294–96. (3.) Paul VI.: "Die publizistisch relevanten Äußerungen Papst Pauls VI. im chronologischen Überblick," G. Deussen, *Ethik der Massenkommunikation bei Papst Paul VI.* (Paderborn 1973), 328–37.

LITERATURE

International: R. Aguiló, ed., *Catholic Media World Directory* (Rome 1971); Istituto Cattolico per la Stampa, ed., *La Stampa Cattolica nel Mondo* (Milan 1939); K. Richter, ed., *Katholische Presse in Europa* (Osnabrück 1969), "L'opinion publique dan l'Eglise (9^{e} Congrès mondial de l'Union Catholique Internationale de la Presse), Actes du congrès, 1^{ere}–3^{e} partie," *Journalistes Catholiques,* nos. 58–61, July–December 1971 (Paris); G. Ernst and B. Marschall, eds., *Film und Rundfunk. Zweiter internationaler Katholischer Filmkongreß, Erster Internationaler Katholischer Rundfunkkongreß, Gesamtbericht* (Munich 1929); C. Ford, *Le Cinéma au service de la foi* (Paris 1953).

Third World–Missions (Bibliography): W. Herzog, *Church and Communication in Developing Countries* (Paderborn 1973); F. J. Eilers, *Christliche Publizistik in Afrika* (St. Augustin 1964); F. J. Eilers and W. Herzog, *Catholic Press Directory Africa/Asia* (Paderborn 1975); J. Schmidt, *Massenmedien als Instrumente der Mission* (diss., Heidelberg 1974).

Germany: K. Löffler, *Geschichte der katholischen Presse Deutschlands* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1924); W. Kisky, *Der Augustinus-Verein zur Pflege der Katholischen Presse von 1878 bis 1928.* (Düsseldorf 1928); J. W. Naumann, ed., *Die Presse und der Katholik* (Augsburg 1932); M. Hüsgen, *Die Bistumsblätter in Niedersachsen während der nationalsozialistischen Zeit* (Hildesheim 1975), a survey of previous research on the problem of Catholic publications in the Nazi period; M. Schmolke, *Die schlechte Presse. Katholiken und Publizistik zwischen "Katholik" und "Publik" 1821–1968* (Münster in Westphalia 1971); G. Bauer, *Kirchliche Rundfunkarbeit 1924–1939* (Frankfurt am Main 1966).

France: G. Hourdin, *La Presse Catholique* (Paris 1957); J. Godfrin and N. Godfrin, *Une Centrale de la Presse Catholique: La Maison de la Bonne Presse et ses Publications* (Paris 1965).

Netherlands: G. W. Marsman, *De Katholieke Dagbladpers in sociologisch perspectief* (Assen 1967); J. Jemels and M. Schmolke, *Katholische Publizistik in den Niederlanden* (Paderborn 1977).

Austria: K. M. Stepan, *Stückwerk im Spiegel* (Graz and Vienna 1949); F. Funder, *Vom Gestern ins Heute* (Vienna 1952).—Switzerland: F. P. Schaller, *Notstand im christlichen Pressewesen* (Einsiedeln and Zurich 1974).

United States: M. L. Reilly, *A History of The Catholic Press Association 1911–1968* (Metuchen, N.J. 1971). Martin Marty et. al., *The Religious Press in America* (New York 1963).

14. *Charity and Ecclesiastical Works of Assistance*

SOURCES

There is no basic collection of sources. In addition to numerous and often unpublished reports, the following are important: *Zeitschrift Caritas* (Freiburg 1896ff.); *The Catholic Charities Review* (Washington 1916ff.); *Caritas Internationalis. Annuarium* (Rome 1965ff.).

LITERATURE

Jahrbuch des Caritasverbandes 1–11 (Freiburg 1907–17);*Jahrbuch der Caritaswissenschaft* (Freiburg 1925–38):*Jahrbuch für Caritaswissenschaft und Caritasarbeit* (Freiburg 1957–68); *Caritas '68ff. Jahrbuch des DCV* (Freiburg 1968ff.); W. Liese, *Wohlfahrtspflege und Caritas im Deutschen Reich, in Deutsch-Österreich, der Schweiz und Luxemburg* (Mönchen-Gladbach 1914); id., *Lorenz Werthmann und der Deutsche Caritasverband* (Freiburg 1929); A. Foucault,*Histoire de la Société de S. Vincent de Paul* (Paris 1933); *An der Aufgabe gewachsen. Vom Werden und Wirken des Deutschen Caritasverbandes,* ed. by Zentralvorstand (Freiburg 1957); H. H. Havemann and W. Kraus, eds.,*Handbuch der Entwicklungshilfe. Fortsetzungswerk in Loseblattform* (Baden-Baden 159ff.); H. Besters and E. E. Boesch, eds., *Entwicklungspolitik. Handbuch und Lexikon* (Stuttgart, Berlin and Mainz 1966); R. Völkl, *Dienende Kirche—Kirche der Liebe* (Freiburg 1969); E. Gatz, *Kirche und Krankenpflege im 19. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn 1971); A. Rinken, *Das Öffentliche als verfassungstheoretisches Problem—dargestellt am Rechtsstatus der Wohlfahrtsverbände* (Berlin 1971); *1897–1972. 75 Jahre Deutscher Caritasverband,* ed. by Deutscher Caritasverband Freiburg (Freiburg 1972); J. Krautscheidt and H. Marré, eds., *Essener Gespräche zum Thema Staat und Kirche* 8 (Münster 1974).

15. *History of the Ecumenical Movement*

LITERATURE

H. L. Althaus, ed., *Ökumenische Dokumente. Quellenstücke über die Einheit der Kirche* (Göttingen 1962); R. Rouse and S. C. Neill, *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung 1517–1948* 1–2 (Göttingen 1957–58); E. Fey and G. Gaßmann, eds., *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung 1948–1968* (Göttingen 1974); F. Biot, *Von der Polemik zum Dialog* (Vienna and Munich 1966); G. H Tavard, *Geschichte der ökumenischen Bewegung* (Mainz 1964); R. Frieling, *Die Bewegung für Glauben und Kirchenverfassung 1910–1937* (Göttingen 1970); A. Deißmann, ed., *Die Stockholmer Weltkirchenkonferenz. Amtlicher deutscher Bericht* (Berlin 1926); F. Lüpsen, ed., *Amsterdamer Dokumente* (Bethel 1948); id., ed., *Evanston—Dokumente* (Witten 1954); id., ed., *Neu Delhi—Dokumente* (Witten 1962); N. Goodall, ed., *Bericht aus Uppsala 1968* (Geneva 1968); R. Groscurth, ed., *Von Uppsala nach Nairobi—Ökumenische Bilanz 1968–1975* (Bielefeld and Frankfurt 1975); H. Krüger and W. Müller-Römheld, eds., *Bericht aus Nairobi. Offizieller Bericht der 5. Vollversammlung des ÖRK 1975* (Frankfurt 1976); A. Boyens, *Kirchenkampf und*

Ökumene 1933–1939 (Munich 1969); id., *Kirchenkampf und Ökumene 1939–1945* (Munich 1973); G. Gloede, ed., *Ökumenische Profile, Brückenbauer der Einheit der Kirche,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1961–63); M. Pribilla, *Von der kirchlichen Einheit* (Freiburg 1929); R. Aubert, *Le Saint-Siège et l'Union des Églises* (Brussels 1947); L. Jaeger, *Das Konzilsdekret "Über den Ökumenismus"* (Paderborn 1968); P. Bratsiotis, ed., *Die orthodoxe Kirche in griechischer Sicht* 1–2 (1959–60); S. Harkianakis, "Über die gegenwärtige Situation der orthodoxen Kirche," *Kyrios* 6 (1966), 227–39; J. Meyendorf, *Die orthodoxe Kirche gestern und heute* (Salzburg 1963); S. V. Stavridis, *Geschichte des Ökumenischen Patriarchats* (1967); N. Ehrenström and G. Gaßmann, *Confessions in Dialogue. A Survey of Bilateral Conversations Among World Confessional Families 1959–1974* (Geneva 1975); V. Pfnür, *Kirche und Amt. Neuere Literatur zur ökumenischen Diskussion um die Amtsfrage* (Münster 1975), 22–32; G. Gaßmann, M. Lienhard, H. Meyer and H. V. Herntrich, eds., *Um Amt und Herrenmahl. Dokumentation zum evangelisch römisch-katholischen Gespräch* (Frankfurt 1974).

16. *The Dissident Eastern Churches*

LITERATURE

J. Tyciak, G. Wunderle and P. Werhun, eds., *Der christliche Osten. Geist und Gestalt* (Regensburg 1939); J. Casper, "Die orientalische Christenheit," *Christus und die Religionen der Erde. Hdb. der Religionsgeschichte* III, F. König, ed. (Freiburg 1951), 643–729; W. de Vries, *Der christliche Osten in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg 1951); R. Janin, "Les Églises orientales," C. Poulet, *Histoire du christianisme. Époque contemporaine* (Paris 1957), 489–545; J. Gründler, *Lexikon der christlichen Kirchen und Sekten unter Berücksichtigung der Missionsgesellschaften und zwischenkirchlichen Organisationen,* 2 vols. (Vienna, Freiburg and Basel 1961); D. Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East,* 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1961–62); J. Chrysostomus, "Ostkirche," *Hbd. theologischer Grundbegriffe II,* ed. by H. Fries (Munich 1963), 256–66; B. Stasiewski, "Geschichtliche Überlegungen zur kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Okzident," *Das Christentum des Ostens und die christliche Einheit* (Würzburg 1965), 13–40; R. Goosmann, *Die Ostkirchen* (Männedorf, Switz. 1966); B. Spuler, *Gegenwartslage der Ostkirchen in ihrer nationalen und staatlichen Umwelt* (Frankfurt am Main 1968); M. Lehmann, *Leitfaden der Ostkirchen* (Vienna 1969); F. Heiler, *Die Ostkirchen* (Munich and Basel 1971); E. v. Ivánka, J. Tyciak and P. Wiertz, eds., *Hbd. der Ostkirchenkunde* (Düsseldorf 1971); J. Madey, *Die Kirchen des Ostens. Eine kleine Einführung* (Freiburg i. Ue. 1972); A. W. Ziegler, *Das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat in Europa* II (Munich 1972); B. Spuler, "Die morgenländischen Kirchen seit 1965," *Kirche im Osten* 16 (1973), 158–74; *Oriente Cattolico. Cinni storici e statistiche* (Vatican City 1974).

THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES: A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); G. Zananiri, *Histoire de l'Église byzantine* (Paris 1954); P. Bratsiotis, ed., *Die orthodoxe Kirche in griechischer Sicht,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1959–60); A. Attwater, op. cit. II, 6–160; K. Onasch, *Einführung in die Konfessionskunde der orthodoxen Kirchen* (Berlin 1962); B. Spuler, "Die Orthodoxie," *Weltgeschichte der Gegenwart* II (Berne and Munich 1963), 552–67; id., *Gegenwartslage der Ostkirchen,* 17–258; M. Lacko and P. Chrysostomus, "Geschichte und jetziger Stand der orthodoxen Kirchen," K. Algermissen, *Konfessionskunde* (Paderborn 1969), 171–202; F. Heiler, op. cit., 39–301; S. Runciman, *The Orthodox Churches and the Secular State* (Oxford 1971); P. Leisching, *Kirche und Staat in den Rechtsordnungen Europas. Ein Überblick* (Freiburg 1973); P. Meinhold "Das Orthodoxe Christentum," *Saeculum Weltgeschichte* VII (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna 1975), 296–306; N. Thon, ed., "Die orthodoxen Kirchen in Geschichte und Gegenwart," *Königsteiner Studien* (Königstein im Taunus 1975), 129–60; A. Proc, ed., *Jahrbuch der Orthodoxie. Schematismus 1976/77* (Munich 1977).

THE FOUR ANCIENT PATRIARCHATES: *Ekklesia X: Die Orthodoxe Kirche auf dem Balkan und in Vorderasien,* 46: *Die orthodoxen Patriarchate von Konstantinopel, Alexandrien, Antiochien, Jerusalem und das Erzbistum von Cypern* (Leipzig 1941); J. Hajjar, "Le Congrès général du Patriarcat orthodoxe d'Antioche," *PrOrChr* 6 (1956), 128–43; H. Engberding, "Das neue Grundgesetz des griechischen orthodoxen Patriarchats von Jerusalem," *OrChr* 43 (1959), 120–35; Mosconas, "Das griechisch-orthodoxe Patriarchat von Alexandrien," *Kyrios* n.s. 1 (1960/61), 129–39; C. Dahm, *Die Kirche im Osten. Macht und Pracht der Patriarchen* I (Offenburg 1964); F. W. Fernau, *Patriarchen am Goldenen Horn. Gegenwart und Tradition des orthodoxen Orients* (Opladen 1967); I. Doens, "L'Église orthodoxe en Afrique Orientale dans et hors le cadre du patriarcat grec orthodoxe d'Alexandrie," *Revue du Clergé africain* 24 (1969), 543–76; R. Potz, *Patriarch und Synode in Konstantinopel. Das Verfassungsrecht des ökumenischen Patriarchates* (Vienna 1971).

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN GEORGIA: M. Tarchnišili, "Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der kirchlichen Autokephalie Georgiens," *Kyrios* 5 (1940/41), 177–93; R. Janin, op. cit., 524–25; D. Attwater, see op. cit. II, 116–18; D. M. Lang, *A Modern History of Georgia* (London 1962); B. Spuler, *Gegenwartslage der Ostkirchen,* 224–28; R. Hotz, "Christen in Stalins Heimat. Die georgisch-orthodoxe Kirche," *Digest des Ostens* 15, no. 12 (Königstein in Taunus 1972), 35–39.

THE MEDIEVAL AND MORE RECENTLY CREATED PATRIARCHATES

THE ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE OF BULGARIA: M. Bulgarus, "Die heutige Lage der Bulgarischen Orthodoxen Kirche," *Die christlichen Kirchen der Gegenwart* (Munich and Basel 1950), 46–52; D. Slijepčević, *Die bulgarische orthodoxe Kirche 1944–1956* (Munich 1957); S. Zankow, "Die Bulgarische Orthodoxe Kirche in Geschichte und Gegenwart," *IKZ* 48 (1958), 189–208; M. Zambonardi, *La Chiesa autocefala bulgara* (Rome 1960); P. L. Huillier, *La religion en Bulgarie* (Paris 1968); R. Stupperich, ed., *Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien und Jugoslawien. Gesetze und Verordnungen in deutscher Übersetzung* (Witten 1971), 5–15; T. P. Koev, "Patriarch Kiril zum Gedächtnis," *Kirche im Osten* 15 (1972), 11–16; W. Oschlies, "Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien," *Informationsdienst des kath. Arbeitskreises für zeitgeschichtliche Fragen* 72 (Bonn 1975), 63–69; id., "Kirche und Religion in Bulgarien," *Kirche in Not* 24 (Königstein im Taunus 1976), 110–16.

THE ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE OF SERBIA: D. Geißler, "Die Stellung der serbischen orthodoxen Kirche im Staatskirchenrecht Jugoslawiens," *Jahrbuch des Osteuropainstitus zu Breslau 1940* (Wroclaw 1941), 203–10; T. Spaskij, "Die Lage der serbischen Kirche," *Die christlichen Kirchen der Gegenwart* (Munich and Basel 1950), 42–45; D. Slijepčević, "Die serbische Orthodoxie," *IKZ* 61 (1953), 151–76; B. Spuler, "Die serbisch-orthodoxe Kirche," *Osteuropa-Hdb. Jugoslawien,* ed. W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1954), 185–87; F. Popan and C. Drašković, *Orthodoxie heute in Rumänien und Jugoslawien. Religiöses Leben und theologische Bewegung* (Vienna 1960); V. Pospischil, *Der Patriarch in der serbisch-orthodoxen Kirche* (Vienna 1966); R. Stupperich, *Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien und Jugoslawien,* 16–54; A. Rauch, "Kirchen- und Religionsgemeinschaften," *Südosteuropa-Hdb.* I, ed. K. D. Grothusen (Göttingen 1975), 345–59.

THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE: *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche, ihre Einrichtungen, ihre Stellung, ihre Tätigkeit* (Moscow 1958); W. de Vries, *Kirche und Staat in der Sowjetunion* (Munich 1959); A. Kischkowsky, *Die sowjetische Religionspolitik und die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche* (Munich 1960); B. Stasiewski, "Sowjetische Religionspolitik," *Hochland* 52 (1960), 315–24; W. Kolarz, *Religion in the Soviet Union* (London 1961); R. Stupperich, ed., *Kirche und Staat in der Sowjetunion. Gesetze und Verordnungen* (Witten 1962); B. Stasiewski, "Die Lage der christlichen Kirchen in der Sowjetunion," H. Ludat, ed., *Sowjetunion, Werden und Gestalt einer Weltmacht* (Gießen 1963), 259–80; J. Chrysostomus, *Kirchengeschichte Rußlands der neuesten Zeit,* 3 vols. (Munich and Salzburg 1965–68); N. Struve, *Die Christen in der UdSSR* (Mainz 1965); J. Chrysostomus, *Kleine Kirchengeschichte Rußlands nach 1917* (Freiburg i. Brsg. 1968); M. Bordeaux, *Patriarch and Prophets, Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today* (London 1970); W. C. Fletscher, *The Russian Orthodox Church Underground 1917–1970* (London 1971); G. Codevilla, *Stato e Chiesa nell'Unione Sovietica* (Milan 1972); C. Dahm, *Millionen in Rußland glauben an Gott* II (Jestetten 1973); D. Konstantinow, *Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion nach dem Kriege. Entfaltung und Rückschläge* (Munich and Salzburg 1973); J. Chrysostomus, "Die Problematik der heutigen russischen Kirche des Moskauer Patriarchates," *Festschrift für Bernhard Stasiewski. Beiträge zur ostdeutschen und osteuropäischen Kirchengeschichte,* by G. Adriányi and J. Gottschalk (Cologne and Vienna 1975), 203–12; O. Luchterhandt, *Der Sowjetstaat und die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche. Eine rechtshistorische und rechtssystematische Untersuchung* (Cologne 1976).

THE RUMANIAN PATRIARCHATE: F. Popan, "Le caractère occidental de la théologie roumaine d'aujourd'hui," *OstkSt* 8 (1959), 169–83; F. Popan and C. Drašković, op. cit.; F. Popan, "Die rumänische Orthodoxe Kirche in ihrer jüngsten Entwicklung 1944–64," *Kirche im Osten* 9 (1965), 67–82; E. C. Suttner, "Ökumenismus in der Rumänischen Orthodoxen Kirche unter Patriarch Justinian," *OrChrP* 41 (1975), 399–448; id., "50 Jahre rumänisches Patriarchat. Seine Geschichte und die Entwicklung seines Kirchenrechts," *OstkSt* 24 (1975), 136–75; 25 (1976), 105–37.

ADDITIONAL ORTHODOX CHURCHES

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN GREECE: T. Haramlambides, "Die Kirchenpolitik Griechenlands. Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte Neugriechenlands von 1821–1935," *ZKG* 55 (1936), 158–92; D. Savramis, "Die griechisch-orthodoxe Kirche und die soziale Frage," *OstkSt* 7 (1958), 66–84; P. Bratsiotis, "Die Theologen-Bruderschaft 'ZOË,'" *ZRGG* 12 (1960), 371–84; P. Poulitsas, "Die Beziehungen zwischen Staat und Kirche in Griechenland," P. Bratsiotis, *Die orthodoxe Kirche* II, 38–48; K. Papapetrou, "Die Säkularisation und die Orthodox-Katholische Kirche Griechenlands," *Kyrios* n.s. 3 (1963), 193–205; H. J. Härtel, "Zur kirchenpolitischen Krise in Griechenland," *OstkSt* 15 (1966), 39–49; G. Podskalsky, "Kirche und Staat in Griechenland," *TThZ* 76 (1967), 298–322; H. M. Biedermann, "Orthodoxe Kirche und Migration im heutigen Griechenland," *OstkSt* 24 (1975), 51–68.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN ALBANIA: "Götzen gegen Gott. 'Die Religion des Albaners ist der Albanismus,'" *Osteuropa* 242 (1974), A 599–A 620; B. Tönnes, "Religionen in Albanien. Enver Hoxha und die 'nationale Eigenart,'" ibid., 661–75; id., "Religion und Kirche in Albanien," *Kirche in Not* 24 (Königstein im Taunus 1976), 101–9.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN MACEDONIA: D. Slijepčević, *Pitanje Makedonske pravoslavne crkve u Jugoslaviji* (Munich 1959); S. K. Pavlowitsch, "The Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia. The Problem of the Macedonian Church," *Eastern Church Review* 1 (1967/68), 374–86; N. Thon, op. cit., 141–42.

The Orthodox Church in Poland: I. Grüning, *Die autokephale östlich-orthodoxe Kirche in Polen in den Jahren 1922–1939: Jahrbuch des Osteuropainstituts zu Breslau 1940* (Breslau 1941), 111–26; B. Spuler, "Die Orthodoxe Kirche in Polen," *Osteuropa-Hdb. Polen,* ed. by W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1959), 114–18; T. Lissek, "Die Heilige Autokephale Orthodoxe Kirche Polens," *Kyrios* n.s. 6 (1966), 43–54; N. Thon, op. cit., 142–46; B. Stasiewski, "Kirchen- und Religionsgemeinschaften," *Länderberichte Osteuropa II Polen,* ed. by the Johann-Gottfried-Herder-Institut (Munich and Vienna 1976), 256–57.

The Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia: V. Grigorič, *Pravoslavná církev ve státě Československém* (Prague 1928); R. Urban, "Die orthodoxe Kirche des Ostens in der Čechoslovakei," *Kyrios* 3 (1938), 89–97; R. Jakowlewitsch, "Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Tschechoslowakei," *Stimme der Orthodoxie* (Berlin 1966), 56–62; N. Thon, op. cit., 146–50.

Independent Extraterritorial Orthodox Churches: W. Haugg, "Die orthodoxe Kirche des Ostens in Deutschland. Grundzüge ihres Rechts- und Glaubenslebens," *Kyrios* 4 (1939/40), 57–67; D. Doroschenko, "Die Ukrainische Östlich-Orthodoxe Kirche in Kanada und in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika," *Kyrios* 5 (1940/41), 153–57; W. Haugg, "Materialien zur Geschichte der östlich-orthodoxen Kirche in Deutschland," ibid., 288–334; H. M. Biedermann, "Die ostkirchlichen Gemeinschaften in USA und in Kanada," *OstkSt* 3 (1954), 164–78; P. Yuzyk, *Ukrainian Greek-Orthodox Church of Canada 1918 to 1951* (Minneapolis 1958); F. Heyer, "Geschichte der Orthodoxen Kirche in Amerika," *Kirche im Osten* 5 (1962), 9–50; A. A. Bogolepov, *Toward an American Orthodox Church. The Establishment of an Autocephalous Orthodox Church* (New York 1963); *Die Orthodoxen Exilkirchen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland,* ed. by the Ökumenische Kommission für die Unterstützung Orthodoxer Priester in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Munich 1965); J. Madey, "Die Präsenz der Ostkirchen in Westeuropa," *Kyrios* n.s. 10 (1970), 171–73; G. Seide, "Die Russisch-Orthodoxe Kirche in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *OstkSt* 20 (1971), 159–84; J. Chrysostomus, "Die dritte Gesamtsynode der russischen Auslandskirche," *OstkSt* 24 (1975), 38–50; N. Thon, op. cit., 130–41; P. Wiertz, "Orthodoxe Kirchen in Deutschland, Anfänge und Entwicklung," *Una Sancta* 30 (1975), 86–87.

The Eastern Pre-chalcedonian National Churches: C. Fink, "Die getrennten Kirchen des Morgenlandes," in P. Krüger and J. Tyciak, eds., *Morganländisches Christentum. Wege zu einer ökumenischen Theologie* (Paderborn 1940), 23–48; R. Janin, op. cit. 528–37; D. Attwater, op. cit. II, 170–231; B. Spuler, *Die Morgenländischen Kirchen* (Leiden 1964); A. S. Atiya, *A History of Eastern Christianity* (London 1968); B. Spuler, *Gegenwartslage der Ostkirchen,* 259–320; W. de Vries, "Die getrennten Kirchen des Ostens," K. Algermissen, op. cit., 86–147; F. Heiler, op. cit. 303–405; B. Spuler, *Die morgenländischen Kirchen seit 1965* (1973), 163–74; J. Aßfalg and P. Krüger, eds., *Kleines Wörterbuch des Christlichen Orients* (Wiesbaden 1975).

The Nestorian Church: R. S. Stafford, *The Tragedy of the Assyrians* (London 1935); J. John, *The Nestorians and their Muslim Neighbors. A Study of Western Influence on Their Relations* (New Jersey 1961); H. Anschütz, "Die Gegenwartslage der 'Apostolischen Kirche des Ostens' und ihre Beziehungen zur 'assyrischen' Nationalbewegung," *OstkSt* 18 (1969), 122–45.

THE MONOPHYSITE CHURCHES

THE WEST-SYRIAN JACOBITE CHURCH: W. de Vries, *Der Kirchenbegriff der von Rom getrennten Syrer* (Rome 1955); H. Anschütz, "Die heutige Situation der westsyrischen Christen (Jakobiten) im Tur 'Abdin im Südosten der Türkei," *OstkSt* 16 (1967), 150–99.

THE SYRIAN ORTHODOX MALABAR CHURCH: E. R. Hambye, "The Syrian Jacobites in India, A Survey of Their Past and Present Position," *ECQ* 11 (1955), 115–29; P. J. Podipara, *Die Thomas-Christen* (Würzburg 1966); N. J. Thomas, *Die Syrisch-Orthodoxe Kirche der Südindischen Thomas-Christen. Geschichte, Kirchenverfassung, Lehre* (Würzburg 1967); P. Verghese, ed., *Die Syrischen Kirchen in Indien* (Stuttgart 1974).

THE COPTIC CHURCH: R. Strothmann, *Die koptische Kirche in der Neuzeit* (Tübingen 1932, reprint Nendeln, Liechtenstein 1966); M. Cramer, *Das Christlich-Koptische Ägypten, einst und heute. Eine Orientierung* (Wiesbaden 1959); S. Chauleur, *Histoire des Coptes d'Égypte* (Paris 1960); E. Wakim, *A Lonely Minority. The Modern Story of Egypt Copts* (New York 1963); P. Verghese, ed., *Koptisches Christentum. Die orthodoxen Kirchen Ägyptens und Äthiopiens* (Stuttgart 1973), 9–129.

THE ETHIOPIAN CHURCH: J. G. Coulbeaux, *Histoire politique et religieuse d'Abyssinie depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à l'avènement de Menelik,* 3 vols. (Paris 1929); E. Hammerschmidt, "Kaisertum, Volkstum und Kirche in Äthiopien," *OstkSt* 6 (1957), 35–45; id., *Äthiopien. Christliches Reich zwischen Gestern und Morgen (Wiesbaden 1967)*; *The Church of Ethiopia. A Panorama of History and Spiritual Life, a Publication of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church* (Addis Ababa 1970); F. Heyer, *Die Kirche Äthiopiens. Eine Bestandsaufnahme* (Berlin and New York 1971), continued in: *Ökum. Rundschau* 26 (1977), 196–204; P. Verghese, *Koptisches Christentum,* 133–207.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCHES: M. Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia. Her History, Doctrine, Rule, Discipline, Liturgy, Literature and Existing Condition* (London 1955); J. Mécérian, *Histoire et institutions de l'Église arménienne. Évolution nationale, spiritualité, monachisme* (Beirut 1965); A. K. Sanjian, *The Armenian Communities in Syria under Ottoman Dominion* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965); M. Krikorian and J. Madey, "The Armenian Church. Extension, Hierarchy, Statistics," *OstkSt* 21 (1972), 323–25; B. Brentjes, *Drei Jahrtausende Armenian* (Vienna and Munich 1974); N. Thon, op. cit., 151–60.

SECTION THREE

The Church in the Individual Countries

17. *The Church in Northern, Eastern, and Southern Europe*

LITERATURE

GENERAL: F. LAMA: *Papst und Kurie in ihrer Politik nach dem Weltkrieg* (Illertissen 1925); J. Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuesten Zeit* 3/4 (Munich 1936–39); A.

Brunello, *La Chiesa del Silenzio* (Rome 1953); Gsovski, ed., *Church and State behind the Iron Curtain. Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania with an Introduction in the Soviet Union* (New York 1955); A. Galter, *Libro rosso della Chiesa perseguitata* (Mailand 1956); W. de Uries, *Kirche und Staat in der Sowjetunion* (Munich 1959); K. Hutten, *Christen hinter dem eisernen Vorhang. Die christliche Gemeinde in der kommunistischen Welt*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1962–63); W. Daim, *Der Vatikan und der Osten* (Frankfurt am Main 1967); M. Lehmann, ed., *Die katholischen Donauschwaben in den nachfolgestaaten 1918–1945 im Zeichen des Nationalismus* (Freilassing 1972); T. Beeson, ed., *Discretion and Valour. Religious Conditions in Russia and Eastern Europe* (Glasgow 1974); L. Schöppe, *Konkordate seit 1800. Originaltext und deutsche Übersetzung der geltenden Konkordate* (Frankfurt 1964); *Die Religionsfreiheit in Osteuropa nach Helsinki. Recht und Wirklichkeit. Erfahrungen von Katholiken. Eine Dokumentation*, ed. by the Institut Glaube in der 2. Welt (Küsnacht and Zurich 1977); *Christen unter dem Kreuz. Beiträge zur Information über die gegenwärtige Bedrohung der Kirche in zahlreichen Ländern der Welt*, ed. by the Pressestelle im Sekretariat der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz (Bonn 1976).

Scandinavian Countries: J. O. Anderssen, *Survey of the History of the Church in Denmark* (Copenhagen 1930); F. Siegmund-Schultze, ed., *Die skandinavischen Länder* (*Ekklesia. Eine Sammlung von Selbstdarstellungen der christlichen Kirchen*) 2 and 2/8 (Leipzig 1936–38); P. G. Linhardt, *Den nordiske kirken historie* (Copenhagen 1945); K. Harmer, *Bishop Josef Brems* (Copenhagen 1945); H. Holzapfel, *Unter nordischen Fahnen* (Paderborn 1955); H. Holmquist, *Handbok i Svensk kyrkohistoria*, 3 vols. (Stockholm 1948–52); A. V. Palmquist, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche in Schweden nach 1781*, 2 vols. (Uppsala 1954–58); B. Gustafsson, *Svensk kyrkohistoria* (Stockholm 1963); I. Welle, *Norges Kirkehistorie* (Oslo 1948); E. Molland, *Church Life in Norway 1800–1950* (Minneapolis 1957); H. Rieber-Mohn, *Catholicism in Norway* (London 1959); E. D. Vogt, *The Catholic Church in the North* (Bergen 1962); K. R. Brotherus, *Staat und Kirche in Finnland* (Königsberg 1931); G. Sentzke, *Die Kirche Finnlands* (Göttingen 1935); A. Inkinen, *L'Église catholique en Finland* (Bourges 1936); L. Pinomaa, ed., *Finnish Theology, Past and Present* (Helsinki 1963); G. Sentzke, *Finland. Its Church and Its People* (Helsinki 1963).

Baltic Countries: J. Mauclère, *La situation de l'Église en Lithuanie* (Le Raincy 1950); R. Wittram, ed., *Baltische Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen 1956); A. Namsons, "Die Lage der katholischen Kirche in Sowjetlitauen," *Acta Baltica* 1 (1962), 120–30; J. Aunver, "Estlands christliche Kirche der Gegenwart," ibid., 75–92; K. Rukis, "Die Verfolgung der katholischen Kirche in Sowjetlettland," ibid., 93–109; J. Klesment, "Sowjetische Kirchenpolitik in den besetzten baltischen Staaten," *Acta Baltica* 5 (1966), 112–26; E. Dubnaitis, "Der totale Kampf gegen Religion und Geistlichkeit in den besetzten baltischen Ländern," ibid., 127–99; "Chronik der kath. Kirche Litauens," ibid. 14 (1974), 9–123; "Chronik d. Litauischen Kirche," ibid. 15 (1975), 9–101; "Die neuesten Berichte und Dokumente über die Lage der Kirche in den baltischen Ländern," ibid. 16 (1976).

The Soviet Union: A. M. Amman, *Abriß der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna 1950); C. N. Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the Kremlin* (New York 1950); J. S. Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State 1917–1950* (Boston 1953); G. Prokoptschuk, *Der Metropolit. Leben und Wirken des großen Förderers der Kirchenunion Andreas Scheptytzkyj* (Munich 1955); M. Spinka, *The Church in Soviet Russia* (New York 1956); I. Wlasovsky, *Outline of the History of the Ukrainian Church* (New York 1956); A. Bogolepov, *Zerkov pod vlastin kommunisma* (The Church under Communist

Domination)(Munich 1958); W. de Vries, *Kirch und Staat in der Sowjetunion* (Munich 1959); B. Stasiewski, "Sowjetische Religionspolitik," *Hochland* 52 (1960), 315–24; B. Ivanov, ed., *Religion in the USSR* (Munich 1960); A. Kischkowsky, *Die sowjetische Religionspolitik und die russische orthodoxe Kirche* (Munich 1960); W. Kolarz, *Religion in the Soviet Union* (New York 1961); C. Grunwald, *The Churches and the Soviet Union* (New York 1962); N. Struve, *Les Chrétiens en URSS* (Paris 1963); B. Feron, *Gott in Sowjetrußland* (Essen 1963); B. Stasiewski, "Die Lage der christlichen Kirchen in der Sowjetunion," *Sowjetunion. Werden und Gestalt einer Weltmacht,* ed. by H. Ludat (Gießen 1963), 259–80; C. Korolevskij, *Métropolite André Szeptyckyj 1865–1944* (Rome 1964); K. G. Kindermann, *Rom ruft Moskau* (Baden-Baden 1965); W. Leonhardt, *Kreml und der Vatikan* (Hanover 1965); M. Mourin, *Der Vatikan und die Sowjetunion* (Munich 1967); W. Daim, *Der Vatikan und der Osten* (Vienna 1967); J. Madey, *Kirche zwischen Ost und West. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Ukrainischen und Weißruthenischen Kirche* (Munich 1969); N. Theodorowitsch, *Religion und Atheismus in der UdSSR. Dokumente und Berichte* (Munich 1970); A. Martin, *Die Gläubigen in Rußland. Die offizielle Kirche in Frage gestellt. Dokumentation der Christenverfolgung in der Sowjetunion* (Lucerne and Munich 1971); E. Winter, *Rom und Moskau. Ein halbes Jahrtausend in ökumenischer Sicht* (Vienna 1972); idem, *Die Sowjetunion und der Vatikan,* 3. *Teil: Rußland und das Papsttum* (Berlin 1972); D. Konstantinow, *Die Kirche in der Sowjetunion nach dem Kriege* (Munich and Salzburg 1973); G. Simon, "Kirchen und Religionsgemeinschaften," *Länderberichte Osteuropa I, Sowjetunion,* ed. by the Koordinationsausschuß deutscher Osteuropa-Institute (Munich 1974), 320–30; *Sowjetunion 1974/75,* ed. by the Bundesinstitut f. ostwissenschaftl. u. internationale Studien (Vienna and Munich 1975), esp. 76–81.

POLAND: W. Meysztowicz, *L'Église catholique en Pologne entre deux guerres 1919–1939* (Vatican City 1944); W. Bieńkowski, *Polityka Watykanu wobec Polski* (Warsaw 1949); E. Ligocki, *Miedzy Watikanem a Polska* (Warsaw 1949); J. Szufdrzyński, "Polozenie Kościóla w Polsce," *Kultura* 5 (1953), 5–49; S. Wielkowski and W. Czarnecki, *Kościól katolicki w Polsce Ludowej* (Warsaw 1953); K. Papée, *Pius XII. a Polska 1939–1949* (Rome 1954); W. Zylinski and B. Wierzbianski, eds., *White Paper on the Persecution of the Church in Poland* (London 1954); C. Naurois, *Dieu contre Dieu? Drames des catholiques progressistes dans une église du silence* (Fribourg and Paris 1956); J. Umiński, *Historia Kościóla* ed. by W. Urban, 2 vols. (Opole 1959–60); B. Stasiewski, "Die Kirchenpolitik der Nationalsozialisten im Warthegau 1939–1945," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 7 (1959), 46–74; B. Stasiewski, "Die römisch-katholische Kirche," *Osteuropa-Handbuch, Polen,* ed. by W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1959), 103–8; B. Stasiewski, "Die Kirchenpolitik der polnischen Regierung," ibid., 356–66; idem, "Die Jahrtausendfeier Polens in kirchengeschichtlicher Sicht," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas,* n.s. 8 (1960), 313–29; P. Lenert, *L'Église catholique en Pologne* (Paris 1962); F. Manthey, *Polnische Kirchengeschichte* (Hildesheim 1965); H. Holzapfel, *Das katholische Polen heute* (Munich 1967); J. J. Zatko, ed., *The Valley of Silence. Catholic Thought in Contemporary Poland* (Notre Dame and London 1967); B. Stasiewski, "Kirchen und Religionsgemeinschaften," *Länderberichte Osteuropa* II, *Polen,* ed. by the Koordinationsausschuß deutscher Osteuropa-Institute (Munich and Vienna 1976), 241–261.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA: F. Dvornik, "Évolution de l'église catholique en Tchécoslovaquie depuis la guerre," *Le Monde slave* 7 (1930), 260–75; F. Siegfried-Schultze, ed., *Die Kirchen der Tschechoslowakei* (Leipzig 1937); R. Urban, *Die slavisch-nationalkirchlichen Bestrebungen in der Tschechoslowakei* (Leipzig 1938); L. Němec, *Church and State in*

Czechoslovakia, Historically, Juridically and Theologically Documented (New York 1955); A. Michel, *Problèmes religieus dans un pays sous régime communiste* (Paris 1955); T. J. Zubek, *The Church of Silence in Slovakia* (Whinting, Ind. 1956); V. Chalupka, *Situation of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia* (Chicago 1960); J. Inovecky, *Golgotha ist ganz nahe. Passion der Ordensschwestern in der Tschechoslowakei* (Fribourg 1967); *Kirche, Recht und Land. Festschrift Weihbischof Prof. Dr. Adolf Kindermann* ed., K. Reiß and H. Schütz (Königstein and Munich 1969); J. Hopfner, *Kirche in der ČSSR* (Munich 1970); R. Urban, *Die tschechoslowakische hussitische Kirche* (Marburg 1973); J. Mareckova, *Duchovné prudy v našej Republike* 2: *Prudy cirkevné* (Bratislava 1926); *Tisic let pražského biskupstvi 973–1973* ed. by the Ceska Kath. Caritas (Prague 1973); F. Seibt, ed., *Bohemia Sacra. Das Christentum in Böhmen 973–1973* (Düsseldorf 1974). In it see especially: H. Slapnicka, *Die Kirchen in der Ersten Republik,* 333–44; B. Černy, *Die Kirchen im Protektorat 1939–1945,* 345–54; H. Lemberg, *Die Kirche in unserem Jahrhundert 1918–1973,* 26–32; V. Svoboda, *Die innere Entwicklund des tschechischen Katholizismus in den letzten hundert Jahren,* 162–74; *Situation der katholischen Kirche in der Tschechoslowakei. Dokumente, Berichte,* ed. by the Schweizerische National-Kommission Justitia et Pax (Freiburg i. Ue. 1976).

HUNGARY: S. Swift, *The Cardinal's Story: Life and Works of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty* (New York 1949); Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, *Memoirs* (New York 1974); Ambord, *Der Vatikan und die Kirche hinter dem Eisernen Vorhang. Dokumente und Kommentare zum Budapester Geschehen* (Vatican City 1949); Mindszenty, *Dokumentation,* ed. by J. Vecsey and J. Schwendemann, 3 vols. (St. Pölten 1956–59); Z. Nyisztor, *Ötven esztendö. Századunk katolikus megujhõdása* (Vienna 1962); J. Vecsey, ed., *Kardinal Mindszenty. Beiträge zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Munich 1962); J. Lévai, *Geheime Reichssache. Papst Pius XII hat nicht geschwiegen. Berichte, Dokumente, Akten zusammengestellt aufgrund kirchlichen und staatlichen Archivmaterials* (Cologne and Müngersdorf 1966); E. András and J. Morel, *Bilanz des ungarischen Katholizismus. Kirche und Gesellschaft in Dokumenten, Zahlen und Analysen* (Munich 1969); M. Beresztóczy. *A katolikus békemozgalom husz éve* (Budapest 1970); A. Meszlényi, *A magyar hercegprimások arcképsorozata 1707–1945* (Budapest 1970); A. Csizmadia, *Rechtliche Beziehungen von Staat und Kirche in Ungarn vor 1944* (Budapest 1971), and the review of it by G. Adriányi, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 4 (1972), 208–10; J. Staber, "Die katholische Kirche in Ungarn seit 1918," *Der Donauraum* 18 (1973), 200–219; G. Salacz, *A magyar katolikus egyház a szomszédos államok uralma alatt* (Munich 1975); J. Mindszenty, *Erinnerungen* (Frankfurt, Berlin and Vienna 1974); G. Adriányi, *Fünfzig Jahre ungarischer Kirchengeschichte 1895–1945* (Mainz 1974); *Handbuch des ungarischen Katholizismus,* ed. by the Ungarische Kirchensoziologische Institut (Vienna 1975); J. Közi-Horváth, *Kardinal Mindszenty* (Königstein 1976).

RUMANIA: N. Pop, *Kirche unter Hammer und Sichel. Die Kirchenverfolgung in Rumänien 1945–1951* (Berlin 1953); A. Mircea, *Persecución comunista de la Religión en Romania* (Madrid 1954); P. Gherman, *L'âme roumaine écartelée. Faits et documents* (Paris 1955); E. Janin, *Istoria Bisericii Romine,* 2 vols. (Bucharest 1957–58); P. Tocanel, *Storia della Chiesa cattolica in Romania* (Padua 1960); F. Popan, "Die heutige Lage der rumänischen Katholiken," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 11 (1962), 183–92; R. Grulich, "Zur Lage der Kirche in Rumänien," *Informationsdienst des Katholischen Arbeitskreises für zeitgenössische Fragen e.V.* 76 (1976), 68–77.

YUGOSLAVIA: A. Hudal, *Die serbische-orthodoxe Nationalkirche* (Graz 1922); K. S. Graganovic, *Le Système général de l'église en Jougoslavie* (Sarajevo 1939); H. Schwalm, J. Matl, B. Spuler and L. Müller, "Kirchen und Glaubensgemeinschaften in Jugoslawien," *Osteuropa-Handbuch, Jugoslawien,* ed. by W. Markert (Cologne and Graz 1954), 173–91; W. de Vries, *Une église du silence. Catholiques de Jougoslavie* (Paris and Bruges 1954); D. M. Slijepčević, *Istoria Srbske Pravoslavne Crkve* (Munich 1962); G. Stadtmüller, "Die Kirchen und Konfessionen Jugoslawiens," *Jugoslawien zwischen West und Ost,* ed. by H. Ludat (Gießen 1963), 37–55; R. Stupperich, ed., *Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien und Jugoslawien* (Witten 1971); J. Buturac and A. Ivandija, *Povijest katolicke crkve medu Hrvatima* (Zagreb 1973); A. Rauch, "Kirchen und Religionsgemeinschaften," *Südosteuropa-Handbuch* 1: *Jusgoslawien,* ed. by K. D. Grothusen (Göttingen 1875), 345–59.

BULGARIA: D. M. Slijepčević, *Die bulgarische orthodoxe Kirche* (Munich 1957); A. Galter, *Rotbuch der verfolgten Kirche* (Recklinghausen 1957), 241–53; M. Zambonardi, *La chiesa autocefala bulgara* (Gorizia 1960); I. Sofranov, *Histoire du mouvement bulgare vers l'église catholique au XIX^e^ siècle* (Rome 1960); R. Stupperich, ed., *Kirche und Staat in Bulgarien und Jugoslawien* (Witten 1971); C. Ognjanoff, *Bulgarien* (Nuremberg 1975), esp. 130–43, 480–82; *Cerkvi i izpovedania v Narodna Republika Bulgaria* ed. by the Sinodalno izdatelstvo (Sofia 1975).

ALBANIA: G. Petrotta, "Il cattolicesimo nei Balcani. L'Albania," *La Tradizione* 1 (1928), 165–203; N. Borgia, *I monaci basiliani d'Italia in Albania,* 2 vols. (Rome 1935–42); W. de Vries, "Die Kirche in Albanien," *StdZ* 149 (1951/52), 467; A. Galter, *Rotbuch der verfolgten Kirche* (Recklinghausen 1957), 221–53; B. Tönnes, "Religionskampf in Albanien," *Informationsdienst des katholischen Arbeitskreises für zeitgeschichtliche Fragen e.V.* 74 (1975), 73–81.

18. *The Church in German-Speaking Countries (Germany, Austria, Switzerland)*

LITERATURE

GERMANY: Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 498–503, 514–28; Schmidlin *PG* III, 217–28; IV, 156–67; Maron, 262–70.—To 1945: W. Spael, *Das katholische Deutschland im 20. Jahrhundert* (Würzburg 1964), 176–351. After 1945: F. Spotts, *Kirchen und Politik in Deutschland* (Stuttgart 1976).—Brief Biographies (with literature): R. Morsey, ed., *Zeitgeschichte in Lebensbildern* I (Mainz 1973) (W. Marx, L. Kaas, Cardinal Bertram); 2 (Mainz 1975)(F.v. Papen, K. Adenauer, and the cardinals Faulhaber, Preysing, and Galen).

AUSTRIA: Bihlmeyer-Tüchle III, 503–505, 522ff., 528; Schmidlin *PG* III, 284–86; IV, 125–29; Maron, 271–73; J. Wodka, *Kirche in Österreich* (Vienna 1959), 365–89; E. Weinzierl, ed., *Kirche in Österreich 1918–1965* 1 and 2 (Vienna 1966).—After 1945: E. Weinziere and K. Skalnik, eds, *Österreich-Die Zweite Republik* 1 and 2 (Vienna 1972).

SWITZERLAND: Schmidlin *PG* III, 276ff.; IV, 168ff.; Maron, 270ff.

19. *The Church in the Benelux Countries*

SOURCES

BELGIUM: *Lettres pastorales des évêques de Belgique, 1800–1961* VI: *1906–1926;* VII: *1926–1961; Actes du VI^e^ Congrès catholique de Malines,* 8 vols. (Brussels 1937);

Verhandelingen van het VI^e^ Katholiek Kongress van Mechelen, 8 vols. (Brussels 1937); R. Houben and F. Ingham, *Le pacte scolaire et son application* (Brussels 1962); M. A. Walkkiers, *Sources inédites relatives aux débuts de la J.O.C., 1919–1925* (Louvain 1970).

NETHERLANDS: *Analecta* (of the various dioceses in which the official pronouncements, letters, and addresses of the Dutch bishops are published); *Katholiek Archief* (since 1970 *Archief van de kerken*); Reports and memoranda of the Katholiek Sociaal-Kerkeliik Instituut (KASKI); *Pastoral Concilie van de Nederlandse Kerkprovinicie,* 7 parts (Amersfoort 1968–70).

LITERATURE

BELGIUM: J. Bartier, et al., *Histoire de la Belgique contemporaine, 1914–1970* (Brussels 1974); T. Luyckx, *Politieke geschiedenis van België van 1789 tot heden* (Brussels 1973); E. de Moreau, *Le catholicisme en Belgique* (Liège 1928); J. Kerkhofs and J. Van Houtte, eds., *De Kerk in Vlaanderen. Pastoraal-sociologische studie van het leven en de structuur der Kerk* (Tielt 1962); "Structures et évolution du monde catholique en Belgique," *Courrier hebdomadaire du C.R.I.S.P* 252–254 (10 février 1967); K. Dobbelaere and J. Billiet, "Godsdienst in België. Een sociologische verkenning," *De gids op maatschappelijk gebied* 64 (1973), 879–94, 983–98 ; 65 (1974), 39–56; R. Aubert, "L'Église catholique et la vie politique en Belgique depuis la seconde guerre mondiale," *Res publica* 15 (1973), 183–203; R. Boudens, *Kardinaal Mercier en de Vlaamse Beweging* (Louvain 1975); J. Kempeneers, *Le cardinal Van Roey en son temps, 1874–1961* (Brussels 1971); W. Plavsic, *Le cardinal Van Roey* (Brussels 1974); H. Haag, *Rien ne vaut l'honneur. L'Église belge de 1940 à 1945* (Brussels 1946); R. Aubert, "Organisation et caractère des mouvements de jeunesse en Belgique," *Politica e Storia* 28 (1972), 271–323; P. Joye and R. Lewin, *L'Église et le mouvement ouvrier en Belgique* (Brussels 1967); S. H. Scholl, ed., *150 jaar katholieke arbeidersbeweging in België (1789–1939)* I: *De katholieke arbeidersbeweging (1914–1939)* (Brussels 1966); J. Verhoeven, *Joseph Cardijn, prophète de notre temps* (Brussels 1971); A. Dendooven, *Ontstaan, structuur en werking van de Vlaamse K.A.J.* (Antwerp 1967); L. Voyé, *Sociologie du geste religieux. De l'analyse de la pratique dominicale en Belgique à une interprétation théorique* (Brussels 1973); J. Pirotte, *Périodiques missionnaires belges d'expression française. Reflet de cinquante années d'évolution d'une mentalité 1889–1940* (Louvain 1973); P. Debouxhtai, *Antoine le guérisseur et l'Antoinisme* (Liège 1934); id., *L'Antoinisme* (Liège 1945).

LUXEMBURG: G. Trausch, *Un demi siècle d'histoire contemporaine luxembourgeoise, 1914/18–1973: Cinquantenaire de la Chambre du Travail* (Luxemburg 1973); A. Heiderscheid, *Aspect de sociologie religieuse du diocèse de Luxembourg* (Luxemburg 1961–62).

NETHERLANDS: L. J. Rogier, *In vrijheid herboren* (The Hague 1953); L. J. Rogier and P. Brachin, *Histoire du catholicisme hollandaise depuis le XVI^e^ siècle* (Paris 1974); S. Stokman, *Het verzet van de Nederlandse bisschoppen tegen nationaal-socialisme en Duitse tyrannie* (Utrecht 1945); H. W. F. Aukes, *Kardinaal de Jong* (Utrecht and Antwerp 1956); J. G. M. Thurlings, *De wankele zuil. Nederlandse katholieken tussen assimilatie en pluralisme* (Nijmegen and Amersfoort 1971); M. Schmaus, J. Scheffczyk and J. Giers, *Exempel Holland* (Berlin 1972); W. Goddijn, *De beheerste kerk. Uitgestelde revolutie in R.K. Nederland* (Amsterdam and Brussels 1973); J. Roes, *Het groote missieuur, 1915–1940. De missiemotivatie van de Nederlandse katholiek* (Bilthoven 1974); J. Lescrauwaet et al., *Bilanz der niederländischen Kirche* (Düsseldorf 1976); *Alfrink en de kerk 1951–1976* (Baarin 1976); *Jaarboeken van het katholiek documentatiecentrum* (*KDC*) (Nijmegen 1971–75).

20. *Catholicism in Italy*

LITERATURE

Publications on Italian Catholicism were until the 1950s lacking in content and originality. Two recent developments have altered this, the rise of an Italian Catholic Party and a new interest in the development of Catholicism following the Second Vatican Council. The results have not always been positive, owing to faulty documentation and the continuing influence of politics.

GENERAL WORKS: F. F. Chabod, *L’Italia contemporanea (1918–1948)* (Turin 1961); F. Catalano, *Dalla crisi del primo dopoguerra alla fondazione della repubblica: Storia d’Italia,* ed. by N. Valeri, V (Turin 1965); G. Mammarella, *L’Italia dopo il fascismo (1943–1968)* (Bologna 1970); R. Romano and C. Vivanti, eds., *Storia d’Italia,* 10 vols. (Turin 1972–76); see also the observations of G. Penco and G. Martina in: *RSCI* 30 (1976), 119–55; L. Cavalli, *Sociologa della storia italiana (1861–1974)* (Bologna 1974).—For Statistics: *Instituto centrale di statistica, Annuario statistico italiano, Annuario statistico dell’istruzione, Sommario di statistiche storiche dell’Italia, 1865–1965;* S. Burgalassi, *Il comportamento religioso degli italiani* (Florence 1968).—On religious problems: *Segreteria di stato. Ufficio centrale di statistica, Raccolta di tavole statistiche* (Vatican City 1971ff.). Indispensable is consultation of such periodicals as *La Civiltà Cattolica, RSCI, AHPont, Storia contemporanea, Rivista di storia contemporanea, Quaderni storici, Bollettino dell’Archivio per la storia del movimento sociale cattolico in Italia, Studi storici.*

WORKS ON CHURCH HISTORY: G. Martina, *La chiesa nell’età dell’assolutismo, del liberalismo e del totalitarismo. Da Lutero ai nostri giorni* (Brescia 1974); id., *La chiesa in Italia negli ultimi trent’anni* (Rome 1977); R. Aubert, “Le demi-siècle qui a préparé Vatican II,” *Nouvelle histoire de l’Église* V (Paris 1975), 581–926; A. C. Jemolo, *Chiesa e stato negli ultimi cento anni* (Turin 1963), new ed.: *Chiesa e stato in Italia dall’unificazione a Giovanni XXIII* (Turin 1965); M. Bendiscioli, “Chiesa e società nei secoli XIX e XX,” *Nuove questioni di storia contemporanea* I (Milan 1968), 325–447.

FIRST WORLD WAR: AA. VV., *Il trauma dell’intervento (1914–1919)* (Florence 1968); AA. VV., *Benedetto XV, i cattolici e la prima guerra mondiale* (Rome 1963); A. Monticone, *La Germania e la neutralità italiana (1914–1915)* (Bologna 1971); E. Forcella-A. Monticone, *Plotone d’esecuzione. I processi della prima guerra mondiale* (Bari 1972); M. Isnenghi, *Il mito della grande guerra da Marinetti a Malaparte* (Bari 1973).

FASCISM: B. Mussolini, *Opera omnia,* ed. by D. Susmel, 35 vols. (Florence 1951–63); G. Ciano, *Diario,* 2 vols. (Milan 1946); G. Pini and D. Susmel, *Mussolini l’uomo e l’opera,* 4 vols. (Florence 1953–55); R. De Felice, *Mussolini,* 4 vols. (Turin 1965–74); id., *Le interpretazioni del fascismo* (Bari 1969); G. Salvemini, *Scritti sul fascismo* (Milan 1963); F. Deakin, *Storia della repubblica di Salò* (Turin 1963); N. Valeri, *Da Giolitti a Mussolini. Momenti della crisi del liberalismo* (Milan 1967); D. Veneruso, *La vigilia del fascismo* (Bologna 1968); L. Salvatorelli and G. Mira, *Storia d’Italia nel periodo fascista* (Milan 1969); V. Castronuovo, *La stampa italiana dall’unità al fascismo* (Bari 1973); AA. VV., *Fascismo e società italiana,* ed. by G. Quazza (Turin 1973).—The Relationship of the Church to Fascism: R. Webster, *La croce e i fasci* (Milan 1964); P. Mazzolari, *La chiesa, il fascismo e la guerra* (Florence 1966); A. De Gasperi, *Lettere sul concordato* (Brescia 1970); P. Scoppola, *La chiesa e il fascismo* (Bari 1973); F. Molinari and V. Neri, *Olio santo e olio di ricino* (Turin 1976); S. Tramontin, *Cattolici, popolari e fascisti nel Veneto* (Rome 1975); A.

Fappani, *Giorgio Montini* (Rome 1974). For other controversies on the Catholic Action and the racial laws, see: A. Martini, *Studi sulla questione romana e la Conciliazione* (Rome 1963). Of interest also are the biographies of several bishops: G. Villani, *Il vescovo Elia Dalla Costa. Per una storia da fare* (Florence 1974); AA. VV., *Il cardinale Giovanni Battista Nasalli Rocca di Corneliano, arcivescovo di Bologna (1872–1952)*, ed. by F. Molinari (Rome 1974).

Anti-Facism and Resistance Movements: F. Antonicelli, *Dall' antifascismo alla resistenza* (Turin 1961); P. Alatri, *L'antifascismo italiano,* 2 vols. (Rome 1961); AA. VV., *Fascismo e antifascismo* (Milan 1963); M. Bendiscioli, *Antifascismo e resistenza* (Rome 1964); R. Battagha, *Storia della resistenza italiana* (Turin 1970); L. Valiani, G. Bianchi, and E. Ragionieri, *Azionisti e cattolici e comunisti nella resistenza italiana* (Milan 1971); A. Fappani, *La resistenza bresciana* (Brescia 1965); G. Bonfanti, *La resistenza. Documenti e testimonianze di storia contemporanea* (Brescia 1976).

Culture: L. Allevi, "Mezzo secolo di teologia dogmatica e apologetica in Italia," *SC* 80 (1952), 365–85; L. Tondelli, "Cinquant' anni di studi biblici in Italia," ibid., 386–98; M. Pellegrino, "Un cinquantennio di studi patristici in Italia," ibid., 424–52; P. Barbaini, "Per la scuola di storia ecclesiastica," ibid. 92 (1964), 211–32, 317–33; 93 (1965), 335–70; B. Ferrari, *La soppressione delle facoltà di teologia nelle università di stato* (Bari 1968); F. Lazzari, "Le facoltà teologiche tra il Sillabo d l'abolizione," AA. VV., *Un secolo da Porta Pia* (Naples 1970), 249–87; M. Guasco, "L'organizzazione delle scuole e dei seminari," *Modernismo, fascismo, comunismo,* ed. by G. Rossini (Bologna 1972), 192–204; G. Rumi, "Padre Gemelli e l'Università Cattolica," ibid., 205–33; V. L. Mangoni, "Aspetti della cultura cattolica sotto il fascismo: la rivista 'Il Frontespizio,'" ibid., 363–417; V. L. Marranzini, "La teologia italiana dal Vaticano I al Vaticano II," *Bilancio della teologia del XX secolo* II (Rome 1972), 95–112; M. L. Crespi, "La storiografia contemporanea ilaliana di fronte a Martin Lutero," *SC* 100 (1972), 134–60; "Gli studi patristici in Italia negli ultimi vent'anni (1951–1970)"; ibid. 101 (1973), 107–39; G. Giavini, "Gli studi biblici in Italia negli anni dal 1950 al 1970," ibid., 9–42; G. Colombo, "La teologia italiana. Dommatica 1950–1970," ibid., 99–191; G. Tassani, *La cultura politica della destra cattolica* (Rome 1976).

Spirituality: M. Petrocchi, "Schema per una storia della spiritualità italiana negli ultimi cento anni," *Spiritualità e azione del laicato cattolico italiano* I (Padua 1969), 17–58; *Bibliotheca sanctorum,* 13 vols. (Rome 1961–70); Article, "Italy," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 7/2 (1971), 2294–2311.—For Religious Orders: *Dizionario degli instituti di perfezione,* 6 vols. (Rome 1973ff.); C. Bellò, *Società ed evangelizzazione nell'Italia contemporanea. Linee di una storia e di una pastorale* (Brescia 1974).—For Individuals: A. Barelli: M. Sticco, *Una donna fra due mondi* (Milan 1967). G. Calabria: Graziano della Madre di Dio, Profilo biografico di don Giovanni Calabria (Venice 1966). G. De Luca: H. Bernard-Maîtra and R. Guarnieri, *Don Giuseppe De Luca et l'abbé Henri Bremond (1929–1933)* (Rome 1965); R. Guarnieri *Don Giuseppe De Luca tra cronaca e storia (1989–1962)* (Bologna 1975). C. Ferrini: AA. V. V., *Miscellanea Contardo Ferrini* (Rome 1947); AA. VV., *Scritti in onore di Contardo Ferrini,* 4 vols. (Milan 1947). P. G. Frassati: *Lettere,* ed. by L. Frassati (Rome 1950). C. Gnocchi: A. Riccardi, *Don Carlo Gnocchi* (Bologna 1966); R. Lombardi, *Per una mobilitazione generale dei cattolici* (Rome 1948); id., *Squilli di mobilitazione* (Rome 1948); id., *Crociata della bontà* (Rome 1949); id. *Esercitazioni per un mondo migliore* (Rome 1961). B. Longo: M. E. Spreafico, *Il servo di Dio Bartolo Longo* (Pompei 1944). P. Mazzolari: A. Bergamaschi, *Un contestatore per tutte le stagioni* (Bologna 1968); C. Bellò "Primo Mazzolari prete," *Studi cattolici* 13 (1969); 163–68; N. Fabretti, *Don Mazzolari, don Milani. I "disubbidienti"* (Milan 1972); L.

Bedeschi, *Obbedientissimo in Cristo. Lettere di don Mazzolari* (Milan 1974); P. Mazzolari, *Diario (1905–1926) e Lettere,* ed. by A. Bergamaschi (Bologna 1974). L. Milani: Scuola di Barbiana, *Lettera a una professoressa* (Florence 1967); *Lettere di Don Lorenzo Milani* (Milan 1970); *Lettere alla mamma (1943–1967)* (Milan 1973); N. Fallaci, *Dalla parte dell'ultimo, Vita del prete Lorenzo Milani* (Milan 1974). G. Moscati: G. Papasogli, *Vita di Giuseppe Moscati* (Rome 1958). V. Necchi: P. Bondiolo, *Vico Necchi fedele servo di Dio* (Milan 1944); V. Necchi, *Pensieri religiosi,* ed. by P. Bondioli (Milan 1956). G. Salvadori: G. Salvadori, *Lettere,* ed. by P. P. Trompeo and N. Vian (Florence 1945); N. Vian, *La giovinezza di G. Salvadori* (Rome 1960); id., *Amicizie e incontri di Giulio Salvadori* (Rome 1962). G. Papini: G. Cattaneo, *Giovanni Papini prima della conversione e dopo: Modernismo, fascismo, comunismo* (Bologna 1972), 235–47. F. Tognazzi, "Don Milani nell'evoluzione dell'opinione pubblica," *Testimonianze* 18 (1975), 97–128.

FOREIGN MISSIONS: C. Bona, *La rinascita missionaria in Italia. Dalle "Amicizie" all'Opera per la Propagazione della fede* (Turin 1964); S. Beltrami, *L'opera della Propagazione della fede in Italia* (Florence 1961).—G. Allamano and the Missions of the Consolata: B. Bernardi, *Il servo di Dio G. Allamano* (Turin 1960); C. Bona, *Il servo di Dio G. Allamano e un secolo di movimento missionario in Piemonte* (Turin 1960); R. Grazia, *La fisionomia spirituale del servo di Dio Giuseppe Allamano nei suoi scritti* (Turin 1961); C. Pera, *La spiritualità missionaria nel pensiero del servo di Dio Giuseppe Allamano* (Turin 1973).—D. Comboni and the Combonians: C. Fusero, *Daniele Comboni* (Bologna 1961); P. Catrice, *Un audacieux pionnier de l'Église, Mgr. Comboni et l'evangelisation de l'Afrique centrale* (Lyon 1964); P. Chiocchetta, "La Preghiera missionaria di D. Comboni," *La preghiera* II, ed. by R. Boccassino (Milan and Rome 1967), 734–45,—G. M. Conforti and the Saveriani: V. Vanzin, *Guido Maria Conforti* (Parma 1949); L. Ballarin, *L'anima missionaria di Guido Maria Conforti* (Parmi 1962); A. Dagnino, *Dottrina spirituale di Mons. Guido Maria Conforti* (Milan 1966).—On the Pontificio Istituto Missioni Estere (PIME): A. Morelli, *La spiritualità missionaria dal Patriarca Ramazzotti* (Milan 1961); G. B. Tragella, *Le Missioni Estere di Milano,* 2 vols. (Milan 1950–59); P. Manna *Virtù apostoliche* (Milan 1964); *Paolo Manna ieri e oggi* (Naples 1966).

CATHOLIC MOVEMENTS: G. DeRosa, *Storia del movimento cattolico in Italia,* 2 vols. (Bari 1966); P. Scoppola, *Chiesa e stato nella storia d'Italia. Storia documentaria dall'Unità alla repubblica* (Bari 1967); AA. VV., *Spiritualità e azione del laicato cattolico italiano,* 2 vols. (Padua 1969); P. Borzomati, *I giovani cattolici nel mezzogiorno d'Italia dall'Unità al 1948* (Rome 1970); *La "Gioventù Cattolica" dopo l'Unità 1868–1968,* L. Osbat and F. Piva, eds., (Rome 1972); G. Miccoli, "Chiesa e società in Italia dal Concilio Vaticano I (1870) al pontificato di Giovanni XXIII," *Storia d'Italia* V (Turin 1973), 1493–1548; AA. VV., *Modernismo, fascismo, comunismo. Aspetti della politica e della cultura dei cattolici nel '900,* ed. by G. Rossini (Bologna 1972); AA. VV., *I cattolici tra fascismo e democrazia,* ed. by P. Scoppola and F. Traniello (Bologna 1975); P. G. Zunino, *La questione cattolica nella sinistra italiana (1919–1939)* (Bologna 1975); G. Candeloro, *Il movimento cattolico in Italia* (Rome 1974); S. Tramontin, *Sinistra cattolica di ieri e di oggi* (Turin 1974); M. Reineri, *Il movimento cattolico in Italia dall'unità al 1948* (Turin 1975); N. Antonetti, *L'ideologia della sinistra cristiana. I cattolici tra chiesa e comunismo (1937–1945)* (Milan 1976).—On the Renewal of Catholic Action: V. Bachelet, *Il nuovo cammino dell'Azione Cattolica* (Rome 1973).—On Rossi: M. V. Rossi, *I giorni dell'onnipotenza. Memorie di una esperienza cattolica* (Rome 1975).

THE ITALIAN PEOPLE'S PARTY: F. Malgeri, ed., *Atti dei congressi del Partito Popolare Italiano* (Brescia 1969); L. Sturzo, *I discorsi politici* (Rome 1951); id., *La croce di*

Constantino, ed. by G. De Rosa (Rome 1958); id., *Il Partito Popolare Italiano* (Bologna 1956).—On Sturzo: M. Vaussard, *Il Pensiero politico e sociale di Luigi Sturzo* (Brescia 1966); P. Stella, *Don Luigi Sturzo, il prete di Caltagirone* (Catania 1971); G. De Rosa, *L'utopia di Luigi Sturzo* (Brescia 1972); F. Malgeri and F. Piva, *Vita di Luigi Sturzo* (Rome 1972); G. De Rosa, *Storia del movimento cattolico in Italia,* 2 vols. (Bari 1966); id., *Il Partito popolare Italiano* (Bari 1969); id., *Rufo Ruffo della Scalleta e Luigi Sturzo* (Rome 1961); F. L. Ferrari, *Il Domani d'Italia,* ed. by G. P. Dore (Rome 1958); G. M. Rossi, *Francesco Luigi Ferrari. Dalle Leghe bianche al Partito Popolare* (Rome 1965); L. Bedeschi, *I cattolici disobbedienti* (Naples and Rome 1959); id., *Dal movimento di Murri all'appello di Sturzo* (Milan 1969); *I Cattolici e l'attuazione dello stato democratico* (Milan 1966); *Il Partito Popolare. Validità di una esperienza* (Milan 1969); *Il Partito Popolare Italiano. Scritti e saggi nel 50° anniversario della sua fondazione* (Rome 1970); S. Tramontin, *Cattolici, popolari, fascisti nel Veneto* (Rome 1975); C. F. Casula, *Cattolici comunisti e sinistra cristiana* (Bologna 1976); S. Accame, *Gaetano de Sanctis fra cultura e politica. Esperienza di cattolici militanti a Torino 1919–1922* (Florence 1975).

THE CHRISTIAN-DEMOCRATIC PARTY: A. Damilano, ed., *Atti Documenti della Democrazia Cristiana, 1943–1967,* 2 vols. (Rome 1968); M. R. Catti De Gasperi, ed., *De Gasperi scrive,* 2 vols. (Brescia 1974).—Biographies of De Gasperi: M. R. Catti De Gasperi, *De Gasperi uomo solo* (Milan 1964); G. Andreotti, *De Gasperi e il suo tempo* (Milan 1964); id., *De Gasperi e la ricostruzione* (Rome 1974); P. Ottone, *De Gasperi* (Milan 1968).—On the Party: T. Godechot, *Le parti démocrate-chrétien italien* (Paris 1964); G. Baget-Bozzo, *Il partito cristiano al potere. La DC di De Gasperi e di Dossetti,* 2 vols. (Florence 1974).

CRISIS AND POSTCONCILIAR RENEWAL: G. De Rosa, *Cattolici e comunisti oggi in Italia. La via italiana al socialismo e il dialogo coi cattolici* (Rome 1966); id., *Chiesa e comunismo in Italia* (Rome 1970); id., *Il dissenso cattolico* (Rome 1974); C. Falconi, *La contestazione nella chiesa* (Milan 1969); A. Nesti, ed., *L'altra chiesa in Italia* (Milan 1970); R. La Valle, *Dalla parte di Abele* (Milan 1971); R. Sciubba and R. Sciubba Pace, *Le comunità di base in Italia,* 2 vols. (Rome 1976).—On Pastoral Problems and Bishops' Conferences: G. Feliciani, *Le conferenze episcopali* (Bologna 1974).—On Problems of Confession: L. Rossi, ed., *La crisi della confessione* (Bologna 1974).—On the Liturgical Movement: *Rivista liturgica* 61 (1974), 9–179.—Catechesis: "La pastorale catechetica in Italia," *Presenza pastorale* 45 (1975), 1105–89.—On Concordat Revision: AA. VV., *Studi per la revisione del Concordato* (Padua 1970); AA. VV., *Individuo, gruppi, confessioni religiose nello stato democratico* (Milan 1973); C. Pelosi, "La revisione del concordato," *Humanitas* 29 (1974), 894–918; 30 (1975) 24–42.

21. *The Catholic Church of France*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Latreille, J. R. Palanque, E. Delaruelle and R. Rémond, *Histoire du Catholicisme en France. La période contemporaine* (Paris 1962); A. Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine sous la III^e^ république* (Paris 1951); id., *Destin du catholicisme français 1926–1936* (Paris 1957); P. Lesourd and C. Paillat, *Dossier secret de l'Église de France* II: *De la révolution a nos jours* (Paris 1968); F. Bouland, "Essor ou déclin du Clergè français?" *Rencontres* 34 (Paris 1950); J. Gadille, "France, VI. La période contemporaine," *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique,* fasc. 102–103, p. 143–57, with biblio.; *Panorama de la France. La documentation francaise* (Paris 1966); P. Gerbod, "Les catholiques et l'enseignement secondaire (1919–1939)," *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine* 18 (1971), 375–414; "Histoire du catholicisme moderne et contemporain," *Revue Historique* CCXLI (1970), 125–48, 387–440; *Forces religieuses et attitudes politiques dans la France contemporaine sous la direction de René Rémond. Cahiers de la fondation nationale des sciences politiques* 130 (Paris 1965); C. Molette, *L'A.C.J.F. 1886–1907* (Paris 1968); P. Huot-Pleuroux, *Le recrutement sacerdotal dans le diocèse de Besançon de 1801 à 1960* (Paris 1966); J. M. Mayeur, *La séparation de l'Église et de l'État* (Paris 1966); M. Villain, *L'abbé Paul Couturier, apôtre de l'unité chrétienne* (Paris 1957).—Recent bibliography: P. Vigneron, *Histoire des crises du Clergé français contemporain* (Paris 1976), 427–71.

22. *The Church in Spain and Portugal*

SPAIN: The number of studies on this period is extensive. The *Cuadernos Bibliográficos de la Guerra de España (1936–1939)*, ed. by Vincente Palacio Atard, alone lists more than two thousand titles. Therefore we must limit our selection to what is absolutely necessary. Works mentioned in the footnotes will not be cited. As sources, a great many articles beyond the *Boletines Eclesiásticos* can be found in the periodicals *Razón y Fe, La ciudad de Dios, La Ciencia Tomista, El Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, Sal Terrae, Ecclesia, Vida Nueva.* Mention must be made of the *Guías de la Iglesia de España*, yearbooks, and statistics for congresses and meetings. S. Azner, *Estudios religiosos-sociales* (Madrid 1949); id., *La revolución española y las vocaciones eclesiásticas* (Madrid 1949); M. Batllori und V. M. Arbeloa, eds., *Archivo Vidal y Barraquer. Iglesia y Estado durante la Segunda República Española 1931–1936* (Montserrat 1971); R. Muntanyola, *Vidal i Barraquer, cardenal de la pau* (Barcelona 1969); J. Lopez and M. B. Isusi, *Las religiosas en España. Situación sociologica y renovación litúrgica* (Bilbao 1969); J. M. Vazquez, F. Medlin, and L. Mendez, *La Iglesia española contemporánea* (Madrid 1973); R. Duocastella, J. Marcos, and J. M. Díaz Mozaz, *Análisis sociológico del Catolicismo español* (Barcelona 1967); J. Rupérez, *Estado confesional y libertad religiosa* (Madrid 1970); A. Alvarez Bolado, *El experimento de Nacional-Catolicismo 1939–1975* (Madrid 1976).

PORTUGAL: *Anuário Católico de Portugal* (Lisbon 1931, 1932, 1933, 1943, 1947, 1953, 1957, 1968); *Portugal e Santa Sé. Concordata e Acordo Missionário* (Lisbon 1943); M. de Oliveira, *História Eclesiástica de Portugal* (Lisbon 1958); *Portugal Missionario* (Cucujães 1928); F. de Almeida, *História da Igreja em Portugal* III (Barcelona 1970); D. Peres, *História de Portugal* (Porto 1954–58); A. H. de Oliveira Marques, *A 1ª República Portuguesa* (Lisbon, n.d.); *Boletim de Informação Pastoral* (Lisbon 1959–70); F. Jasmins Pereira, *A Primeira República* (Braga 1972); *Anuário Católico do Ultramar Português* (Lisbon 1960, 1964).

23. *The Countries of the English-Speaking Areas*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GREAT BRITAIN: D. Barker, *G. K. Chesterton. A Biography* (New York 1973); G. A. Beck, ed., *The English Catholics, 1850–1950* (London 1950); M. V. Brand, *The Social Catholic Movement in England, 1920–1955* (New York 1963); W. F. Brown, *Through*

Windows of Memory (London 1946); J. M. Cleary, *Catholic Social Action in Britain, 1909–1959. A History of the Catholic Social Guild* (Oxford 1961); J. Crehan, S.J., *Father Thurston. A Memoir with a Bibliography of His Writings* (London 1952); M. Cruickshank, *Church and State in English Education, 1870 to the Present Day* (London and New York 1964); J. Dingle, *Le Catholicisme contemporain en Grande-Bretagne* (Paris 1967); G. P. McEntee, *The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain* (New York 1927); J. Murphy, *Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800–1970* (London 1971); E. Oldmeadow, *Francis Cardinal Bourne*, 2 vols. (London 1940–44); G. Scott, *The R.Cs. A Report on Roman Catholics in Britain Today* (London 1967); F. Sheed, *The Church and I* (Garden City, New York, 1974); R. Speaight, *The Life of Eric Gill* (New York 1966); id., *The Life of Hilaire Belloc* (New York 1966); F. Valentine, O.P., *Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., The Portrait of a Great Dominican* (Westminster, Maryland 1955); M. Ward, *Gilbert Keith Chesterton* (New York 1943); id., *Return to Chesterton* (New York 1952); id., *Unfinished Business* (New York 1964); E. Waugh, *Monsignor Ronald Knox* (Boston 1959).

IRELAND: D. H. Akenson, "Education and Enmity," *The Control of Schooling in Northern Ireland, 1920–50* (New York 1973); J. Blanchard, *The Church in Contemporary Ireland* (Dublin 1963); D. Fennell, *The Changing Face of Catholic Ireland* (London 1968); J. Mescal, *Religion in the Irish System of Education* (Dublin 1957); D. W. Miller, *Church, State and Nation in Ireland, 1898–1921* (Pittsburgh 1973); J. H. Whyte, *Church and State in Modern Ireland, 1923–1970* (Dublin 1971).

UNITED STATES: A. I. Abell, "American Catholicism and Social Action," *A Search for Social Justice, 1865–1950* (Garden City, N.Y. 1960); C. J. Barry, O.S.B., *American Nuncio. Cardinal Aloisius Muench* (Collegeville, Minn. 1969); F. L. Broderick, *Right Reverend New Dealer, John A. Ryan* (New York 1963); H. A. Buetow, *Of Singular Benefit: The Story of Catholic Education in the United States* (New York and London 1970); L. Curry, "Protestant-Catholic Relations in America," *World War I Through Vatican II* (Lexington, Ky. 1972); J. T. Ellis, *American Catholicism* (Chicago 1969); id., *Documents of American Catholic History*, 2 vols. (Chicago 1967); id., *A Guide to American Catholic History* (Milwaukee 1959); id., *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1834–1921*, 2 vols. (Milwaukee 1952); G. Q. Flynn, *American Catholics and the Roosevelt Presidency, 1932–1936* (Lexington, Ky. 1968); L. H. Fuchs, *John F. Kennedy and American Catholicism* (New York 1967); R. I. Gannon, S.J., *The Cardinal Spellman Story* (Garden City, N.Y. 1962); P. Gleason, *The Conservative Reformers. German-American Catholics and the Social Order* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1968); A. Greely, W. C. McCready and K. McCourt, *Catholic Schools in a Declining Church* (New York 1976); *HK* 31 (1977), 143–47; F. J. Lally, *The Catholic Church in a Changing America* (Boston 1962); T. T. McAvoy, C.S.C., *Father O'Hara of Notre Dame. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Philadelphia* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1967); id., *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1969); S. Marcus, *Father Coughlin. The Tumultuous Life of the Priest of the Little Flower* (Boston 1973); M. A. Marty, "Lutherans and Roman Catholicism," *The Changing Conflict, 1917–1963* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1968); P. Marx, O.S.B., *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement* (Collegeville, Minn. 1957); W. D. Miller, *A Harsh and Dreadful Love. Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement* (New York 1973); H. J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the American Hierarchy, 1792–1970* (Huntington, Ind. 1971); D. J. O'Brien, *American Catholics and Social Reform. The New Deal Years* (New York 1968); E. J. Power, *Catholic Higher Education in America* (New York 1972); id., *A History of Catholic Higher Education in the United States* (Milwaukee 1958); G. Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith? A Study of Immigration and Catholic Growth in the United States, 1790–1920* (New York 1925, reprinted 1969); J.

G. Shaw, *Edwin Vincent O'Hara, American Prelate* (New York 1957); J. B. Sheerin, C.S.P., *Never Look Back. The Career and Concerns of John J. Burke* (New York 1975); C. J. Tull, *Father Coughlin and the New Deal* (Syracuse, N.Y. 1965); R. Van Allen, *The Commonweal and American Catholicism. The Magazine, the Movement, the Meaning* (Philadelphia 1974); E. R. Vollmar, S.J., "The Catholic Church in America," *An Historical Bibliography* (New York 1963); V. A. Yzermans, ed., *American Participation in the Second Vatican Council* (New York 1967).

CANADA: D. de Saint-Denis, O.F.M. Cap., *L'Église Catholique au Canada. Précis historique et statistique. The Catholic Church in Canada. Historical and Statistical Summary* (Montreal 1956); S.M.A. of Rome Gaudreau, "The Social Thought of French Canada as Reflected in the Semaine Sociale," *The Catholic University of America Studies in Sociology* XVIII (Washington, D.C. 1946); J. Hulliger, *L'enseignement social des évêques canadiens de 1891 à 1950* (Montreal 1958); L. K. Shook, *College Post-Secondary Education in English-Speaking Canada. A History. Studies in the History of Higher Education in Canada* VI (Toronto 1971); *Vingt-cinq ans de l'École Social Populaire, 1911–1936* (Montreal 1936).

24. *The Church in Latin America*

LITERATURE

The great national histories of the individual republics treat church relations only down to the turn of the century. On the twentieth century there are only sketches, for the most part in English. The Church is generally regarded from the point of view of the state or politics. Ecclesiastical historiography in its own right does not exist.

For a survey of the individual republics, see: H. Herring, *A History of Latin America from the Beginnings to the Present* (New York 1956) or F. Morales Padrón, "Historia de América," *Manual de Historia Universal* 5–6 (Madrid 1962); Generally reliable are the two editions of J. L. Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America* (Chapel Hill 1934, 1966), to which may be added F. B. Pike, *The Conflict between Church and State in Latin America* (New York 1964) and F. C. Turner, *Catholicism and Political Development in Latin America* (Chapel Hill 1971); an essay-type approach is C. H. Hillekamps, *Religion, Kirche und Staat in Lateinamerika* (Munich 1966).—For Protestantism in Latin America; P. Damboriena, *El protestantismo en América Latina,* 2 secs., (Fribourg and Bogotá 1962–63); E. Willems, "Followers of the New Faith," *Culture, Change and the Rise of Protestantism in Brazil and Chile* (Nashville 1967).—J. Lembke, *Christentum unter den Bedingungen Lateinamerikas. Die katholische Kirche vor den Problemen der Abhängigkeit und Unterentwicklung* (Berne and Frankfurt am Main 1975); J. Thesing, "Die christlichen demokratischen Parteien in Lateinamerika," *HK* 31 (1977), 313–18; H. J. Prien, *Die Geschichte des Christentums in Lateinamerika* (Göttingen 1978); David E. Mutchler, *The Church as a Political Factor in Latin America with Particular Reference to Colombia and Chile* (New York 1971); Karl M. Schmitt, *The Roman Catholic Church in Modern Latin America* (New York 1972); Hugo Latorre Cabal, *The Revolution of the Latin American Church* (Norman 1977).

BRAZIL: M. Barbosa, *A Igreja no Brasil. Notas para a sua história* (Rio de Janeiro 1945); J. M. Bello, *A History of Modern Brazil 1889–1964* (Stanford 1966); E. B. Burns, *A History of Brazil* (New York 1970); P. F. da Silveria Camargo, *História eclesiástica do Brasil* (Petrópolis, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo 1955); J. Alfredo de Sousa Montenegro, *Evolução do Catolicismo no Brasil* (Petrópolis 1972); T. C. Bruneau, *The Political*

Transformation of the Brazilian Catholic Church (Cambridge 1974); M. Todaro Williams, "Jackson de Figueiredo, Catholic Thinker," *TAM* (*The Americas*) 31 (1974), 139–63; P. A. Ribeiro de Oliveira, *Catholicismo popular no Brasil* (Rio 1970); A. U. Floridi, *Radicalismo cattolico brasiliano* (Rome 1968); H. Fesquet, *Une Église en état de péché mortel* (Paris 1968); E. de Kadt, *Catholic Radicals in Brazil* (London 1970); A. Ghurbant, *L'Église rebelle en Amérique Latine* (Paris 1969); The question of syncretism is treated in R. Bastide, *Les religions africaines au Brésil* (Paris 1960); M. Koch-Weser, *Die Yoruba-Religion in Brasilien* (diss., Bonn 1976); Charles Antoine, *Church and Power in Brazil* (New York 1973).

ARGENTINA: R. Levillier, ed., *Historia argentina* V (Buenos Aires 1968); G. Bleiberg, ed., *Diccionario de Historia de España, Argentina* (*Época independiente*) I (Madrid 1968), 344–50; J. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América. Burguesiá, industrialización, obrerismo* IV/2 (Barcelona 1959); J. Alameda, *Argentina Católica* (Buenos Aires 1935); G. Furlong, L. M. Baliña, G. Ferrer, J. A. Allenfe, L. M. Ardanaz, C. M. Gelly y Obes, and L. Ayarragaray, *Etapas del catolicismo argentino* (Buenos Aires, n.d.); *Historia argentina contemporánea 1862–1930,* 4 secs. (Buenos Aires 1963–67); J. A. Paita et al., *Argentina 1930–1960* (Buenos Aires 1961); P. Waldmann, *Der Peronismus 1943–1955* (Hamburg 1974); P. Marsal S., *Perón y la iglesia* (Buenos Aires 1955); The position of the Church in the last years is dealt with in: T. T. Evers, *Militärregierung in Argentinien* (Hamburg 1972); J. J. Kennedy, *Catholicism, Nationalism and Democracy in Argentina* (University of Notre Dame Press 1958).

PARAGUAY-URUGUAY: E. Cardozo, *Paraguay independiente* and J. E. Pivel D., *Uruguay independiente-Historia de América* 21 (Barcelona 1949); *Anuario eclesiástico de Paraguay,* ed. by the Centro de estudios socio-religiosos (CESR) in collaboration with the Centro de documentación, estudios y proyectos, pastoral social and the Bishops' Conference of Paraguay (1792); *Diccionario de historia de España. Paraguay* (*Época independiente*) III, ed. by G. Bleiberg (Madrid 1969), 172–75; *Guí de la Iglesia católica en el Uruguay 1973; Diccionario de historia de España. Uruguay* (*Época independiente*) III, ed. by G. Bleiberg (Madrid 1969); J. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América. Burguesía, industrialización, obrerismo* II (Barcelona 1959).

CHILE: L. Galdames, *A History of Chile* (Chapel Hill 1941); F. Araneda B., *El arzobispo Errázuriz y la evolución política y social de Chile* (Santiago de Chile 1956); J. Basadre, "Chile, Perú y Bolivia independientes" (Barcelona and Buenos Aires 1948), *Historia de América y de los pueblos americanos,* ed., A. Ballesteros y Beretta; *Estado de la Iglesia en Chile,* ed. by the Oficina Nacional de Estadística de la Acción Católica Chilena (Santiago de Chile 1946); *Guía parroquial y guiá eclesiástica de Chile* (Santiago de Chile 1969); *Diccionario de Historia de España. Chile (Época independiente)* I (Madrid 1968), ed. by G. Bleiberg, 1082–1089; J. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América, Burguesía, industrialización, obrerismo* IV/2 (Barcelona 1959).

BOLIVIA: P. Díaz Machicao, *Historia de Bolivia 1920–1943,* 5 secs. (La Paz 1954–58); H. S. Klein, *Parties and Political Change in Bolivia 1880–1952* (Cambridge 1969); R. J. Alexander, *The Bolivian National Revolution* (New Brunswick 1958); *Anuario eclesiástico de Bolivia para el año del Señor 1960* (La Paz 1960); J. Basadre, "Chile, Perú y Bolivia independiente" (Barcelona and Buenos Aires 1948), *Historia de América y de los pueblos americanos,* ed. by A. Ballesteros y Beretta; G. Bleiber, ed. *Diccionario de historia de Espana. Bolivia (Época independiente)* I (Madrid 1968), 557–66.

PERU: J. Basadre, *Historia de la República del Perú,* 16 secs. (Lima 1968–69); *Historia general de los Peruanos hasta 1973,* sec. 3 (Lima 1973); J. L. Klaiber, "Religion and

Revolution in Peru 1920–1945," *TAM* 31 (1975), 289–312; id., *Religion and Revolution in Peru, 1824–1976,* (Notre Dame 1977). From the extensive literature on the Catholicism of the Indians, J. C. Mariátegui, *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* (Lima 1974). *Anuario eclesiástico del Perú 1974,* Secretariado del episcopado peruano. Departamento de estadística. Arzobispado de Lima, Perú; J. Basadre, "Chile, Perú y Bolivia independientes," *Historia de América y de los pueblos americanos,* ed. by A. Ballesteros y Beretta (Barcelona and Buenos Aires 1948); *Una universidad que crece. La Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú recibe un donativo de la Fundación Ford* (Lima 1965).

ECUADOR: A. Pareja Diezcanseco, *Historia del Ecuador,* Sec. 2 (Quito 1958); *Estudio de la viceprovincia del Ecuador* III/1, *Estudio del personal; Estudio de las residencias y parroquias 2; Estudio de los colegios de la Compania de Jesús en el Ecuador* (Quito 1969), ed. by the CIAS (Centro de Investigación y Acción Social); J. L. Izurieta S.I., *La Iglesia en el Ecuador, Estudio del personal de 1968* II/1: *Análysis;* 2: *Estadísticas* (Quito 1969), ed. by the CIAS; *La Iglesia en el Ecuador 1949. Sinopsis de la jerarquía ecuatoriana y de las Órdenes y congregaciones religiosas* (Quito 1949); *La Iglesia en el Ecuador 1963. Directorio de la Iglesia católica en el Ecuador,* ed. by the Episcopal Secretariat in cooperation with the Bishops' Conference; J. I. Larrea, *La Iglesia y el Estado en el Ecuador. La personalidad de la Iglesia en el modus vivendi entre la Santa Sede y el Ecuador* (Seville 1954), publication of the School of Spanish-American Studies of Seville, LXXXIII; F. Nuscheler and H. Zwiefelhofer, S.J., *Kirche und Entwicklung in Ekuador und Kolumbien,* ed. by The Political Association at the Munich College of Philosophy (Mannheim and Ludwigshafen 1972); J. Tobar Donoso, *La Iglesia modeladora de la nacionalidad* (Quito 1953).

COLOMBIA: *Historia extensa de Colombia* (Bogotá 1965ff.); G. Guzman et al., *La violencia en Colombia,* Sec. 2 (Bogotá 1962–64); L. Schoultz, "Reform and Reaction in the Colombian Catholic Church," *TAM* 30 (1973), 229–50; *Conferencias episcopales de Colombia 1908–1953* (Bogotá 1956); *Anuario de la Iglesia católica en Colombia* (Bogotá 1951); M. Colón, O.S.A., *Por la Iglesia, Artículos político-religiosos sobre asuntos de actualidad* (Bogotá 1910); *Conferencia episcopal de 1948* (20 June–3 July) (Bogotá 1948); J. M. Fernández, S.J., and R. Granados, S.J., *Obra civilizadora de la Iglesia en Colombia* (Bogotá 1936); R. Gómez Hoyos, *La Iglesia en Colombia. Postura religiosa de López de Mesa en el escrutinio sociológico de la historia colombiana* (Bogotá 1955); G. de Ibarra, O.M.Cap., *La religión católica en el concordato de Colombia* (Assisi 1939); G. Jiménez Cadena, S.J., *Sacerdote y cambio social. Estudio sociológico en los Andes Colombianos* (Bogotá 1967), in the series of the Centro de Investigación Acción Social, *CIAS 2;* F. Nuscheler and H. Zwiefelhofer, S.J., *Kirche und Entwicklung in Ekuador und Kolumbien* (Mannheim and Ludwigshafen 1972); J. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América. Burguesía, industrialización, obrerismo* IV/2 (Barcelona 1959).

VENEZUELA: M. Picón Salas et al., *Venezuela independiente 1910–1960* (Caracas 1962); N. E. Navarro, *Anales eclesiásticos venezolanos* (Caracas 1951); *Directorio de la Iglesia católica en Venezuela 1975,* ed. by the Centro de investigaciones en ciencias sociales (CISOR), Departamento de estadísticas y documentación, Secretariado permanente del episcopado venezolano (SPEV), Caracas; V. Iriarte, S.J., *La arquidiócesis de Venezuela 1962,* ed. by the Secretariado permanente del episcopado venezolano, Caracas; R. E., *Venezuela (Época independiente), Diccionario de historia de España,* III, ed. by G. Bleiberg (Madrid 1969), 954–63; J. Vicens Vives, *Historia social y económica de España y América. Burguesía, industrialización, obrerismo* II (Barcelona 1959).

ANTILLES: E. Williams, "From Columbus to Castro," *The History of the Caribbean 1492–1969* (London 1970); R. Guerra Sanchez et al., *Historia de la nación Cubana,* Secs. 8–10 (Havana 1952); R. W. Logan, *Haiti and the Dominican Republic* (London 1968); under the same title, *The Era of Trujillo,* P. L. Gonzáles Blanco (Santo Domingo 1955) and J. De Galíndez (Santiago de Chile 1956); On Voodooism, A. Métraux, *Voodoo in Haiti* (New York 1959), id., *Religion and Politics in Haiti* (Washington 1966).

CENTRAL AMERICA: F. D. Parker, *The Central American Republics* (London 1964); M. P. Holleran, *Church and State in Guatemala* (New York 1949).

MEXICO: J. Bravo Ugarte, *Historia de México* III. *México* II. *Relaciones internacionales, territorio, sociedad y cultura* (Mexico 1959); D. Olmedo, S.J., "Mexico, Modern" *New Catholic Encyclopedia* IX (1966), 775–83; *México. Diccionario de Historia de España,* ed. by G. Bleiberg, II (1968), 1033–54. "Uber die Zeit der Revolution und ihre Cristero-Phase jetzt," J. Meyer, *La révolution mexicaine 1910–1940* (Paris 1973); H. F. Cline, *Mexico: Revolution to Evolution 1940–1960* (London 1962); J. Meyer, *The Cristero Rebellion 1926–1929* (Cambridge 1976); D. C. Bailey, *Viva Cristo Rey. The Cristero Rebellion and the Church State Conflict in Mexico* (Austin 1974); E. Portes Gil, *The Conflict between the Civil Power and the Clergy* (Mexico 1935) and García Gutiérrez, *Acción anticatólica en Méjico* (Mexico 1959) reflect both parties in the conflict; Robert E. Quirk, *The Mexican Revolution and The Catholic Church 1910–1929* (Bloomington 1973).

For the present situation of the Church in Latin America, the work edited by C. Veliz, *Latin America and the Caribbean: A Handbook* (London 1968) is a good introduction. The documentation for the Second Latin American Bishops' Conferences of Medellín of 1968 is available in *Iglesia y liberacíon humana* (Barcelona 1969) and *Revista Javeriana* 70 (Bogotá 1968).

In September of 1974 upon the initiative of Padre Dr. Enrique Dussel there was founded in El Salvador the Comisión de Estudios de Historia de la Iglesia en America Latina, *CEHILA.* The History of the Church planned by the commission is to have ten volumes, divided according to regions, and encompass the period from 1492 to the present.

25. *The Young Churches in Asia, Africa and Oceania*

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

Acta Apostolicae Sedis (*AAS*) 1940–78; A. Reuter, O.M.I., *Summa Pontificia* (Regensburg 1978); J. Glazik, M.S.C., *Päpstliche Rundschreiben über die Mission von Leo XIII. bis Johannes XXIII.* (Münsterschwarzach 1961); E. Marmy and I. Auf der Maur, *Geht hin in alle Welt. Missionsenzykliken der Päpste Benedikt XV., Pius XI., Pius XII., und Johannes XXIII.* (Fribourg 1961); Streit-Dindinger, *Bibliotheca Missionum* (*BM*), continued by P. J. Rommerskirchen, O.M.I., and P. M. Metzler, O.M.I., XXII–XXIII; XXVII (Mission Literature of India 1910–46); XXVIII (Mission Literature of South Asia [India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon] *1947–68*); XXIX (Mission Literature of South Asia 1910–70): XXX (Mission Literature of Japan and Korea 1910–70); J. Rommerskirchen, O.M.I., *Bibliografia Missionaria* XIII–XLI; *Bibliografia Missionaria* (Supplement): Quaderno n. 1–20, *Documenti e problemi missionari;* J. Beckmann, S.M.B., *Weltkirche und Weltreligionen. Die religiöse Lage der Menschheit* (Freiburg 1960); T. Scalzotto, "I Papi e la

Sacra Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli o 'de Propaganda Fide' da Benedetto XV a Paolo VI," *Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Memoria Rerum. 350 Jahre im Dienste der Weltmission 1622–1972* III/2 (Freiburg 1976), 253–302; J. Metzler, O.M.I., "Präfekten und Sekretäre der Kongregation in der neuen Missionsära" (1918–1972), loc. cit., 303–53; A. Reuter, O.M.I., "De nova et novissima S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide ordinatione a Summis Pontificibus S. Pio X et Paulo VI instaurata," loc. cit., 354–81; B. Jacqueline, "L'organisation interne du dicastère missionnaire après 350 ans," loc. cit., 382–412; G. Zampetti, S.D.B., "Le Pontificie Opere Missionare," loc. cit., 413–49; A. Seumois, O.M.I., "La S.C. 'de Propaganda Fide' et les études missionnaires," loc. cit., 450–63; J. Metzler, O.M.I., "Tätigkeit der Kongregation im Dienste der Glaubensverbreitung 1922–1972. Ein Überblick," loc. cit., 464–577; W. Bühlmann, O.F.M.Cap., "Epilogo. Passato e futuro della evangelizzazione," loc. cit., 578–614; J. Metzler, O.M.I., "L'organizzazione dell'attività missionaria," *Via Verità e Vita. Rivista Catechistica* XVI (Rome 1968), 79–88; G. B. Reghezza, *La Cooperazione Missionaria* (Rome 1977); "Sacra Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli o 'de Propaganda Fide,'" *Annuario* 1976 (Rome 1977); id. *Annuario* 1977 (Rome 1978); T. Scalzotto, ed., *La Sacra Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli nel Decennio del Decreto "Ad Gentes,"* (Rome 1975).

INDEX

Adam, Karl 265, 306, 468
Adélaïde, Marie 561
Adenauer, Konrad, West German chancellor 535, 548
Adult education 384, 395f, 399–403, 623, 648, 721
Africa 203, 476, 777, 793
—charities 446
—education 405ff
—orders 329, 359f
—radio, Catholic 431ff, 434f
Africanization 778f
Agagianian, Gregorio Pietro XV, cardinal 31, 116, 142
Age limit 120
Albania 530
—orders 375
—Orthodox Church 490
Alberione, Giuseppe 571
Alessandri, president of Chile 697
Alexander III, patriarch of Antioch 477
Alexis, patriarch of Moscow 484, 485, 492ff
Alexius, patriarch of Moscow 104, 116
Alfrink, Bernard, cardinal, archbishop of Utrecht 103, 111, 120, 124, 161, 455, 568
Algeria 230, 782
Allamano, Giuseppe 571
Allende, president of Chile 672, 698
Alphonso XIII, king of Spain 601, 604
Altaner, Berthold 282
Alvarado, Juan Velasco 706
Ambrosios, catholicos 478
Andrej, metropolitan 495
Andrieux, Joseph, cardinal 588
Anglican Church, Anglicans 103, 458f, 469, 472, 615, 619f, 631, 718f, 780, 792f, 796, 800
Angola 230, 788f
Anizan, worker-priest 597
Apartheid policy 781
Arámburu, Juan Carlos, auxiliary bishop of Buenos Aires 688
Arcel, Alfred 334
Argaña, Bogarín, bishop 692
Argentina 685–90
—bishops' conference 689f
—Church and state 219f
—clergy 687f
—orders 330
—postconciliar development 686
Arnold, Franz Xaver 290
Arrupe, Pedro, general S.J. 142
Ascalesi, Alessio, cardinal, archbishop of Naples 576
Asia 150, 203, 446, 794
Associations, Catholic 65f, 69, 71, 401, 536, 540, 547
Athanasius, Greek Church Father 477
Athenagoras, ecumenical patriarch 125, 475, 496
Auer, Alfons 335
Australia 795, 804
—charities 446, 455f
—orders 330
Austria 549–52
—Austrian Marxism 549
—Catholic Action 28
—charity 454
—Church and National Socialism 551
—clergy 337
—clergy, opinion survey 347
—concordat 185, 218f, 551
—diocesan synods 163
—education 402
—press, Catholic 418
—private schools, Catholic 552
—publicity 412
—state and Church 552
—television 428f
—theology 286
Ayala, Ángel, S.J. 611
Aznar, Severino 603

Bacht, Heinrich, S.J. 283
Bailly, Vincent de Paul 419
Balbo, Felice 580
Baldrelli, Ferdinando 451f
Balthasar, Hans Urs von 330, 335, 336, 347
Baltic states 507f
Bangladesh 768, 769
Bantu tribes 781
Barelli, Armida 581
Barnabas, patriarch 480

Barone, Domenico 52
Baronio, Cesare, cardinal 97f
Barreto, Vincente, S.J. 692
Barth, Karl 461
Baschir, Anton, exarch 477
Basileios, abuna 501
Basileios, bishop 494
Basileios Paul II, Mar 499
Basileios III George II, Mar, catholicos 498
Basileios IV Eugene I, catholicos 498
Basileios V Matthew I, Mar 499
Batista, Fulgencio, president of Cuba 723
Baudrillart, Henri Marie Alfred, cardinal 42, 584
Bäumker, Clemens 266
Baumstark, Anton 282
Bayer, Karl 451
Bea, Augustin, curial cardinal 33, 101ff, 111ff, 118, 122ff, 127f, 133, 286, 469
Beauduin, Lambert, O.S.B. 300, 560, 657
Belaúnde, president of Peru 706
Belgium 22, 92, 557–60, 783
—Catholic Action 308, 558
—Catholic education 557
—charities 443, 452, 455
—church life 559
—clergy 558
—education 389f, 393, 397
—liturgical movement 299
—Louvain, Catholic university 397, 561
—mariology 318
—organization, social 557
Bell, G. K., bishop 628
Belloc, Hilaire 624
Beloch, historian 30
Bendiscioli, Mario 581
Benedict XV, pope 21f, 35, 153, 584–86
Benoit, P. 285
Beran, Josef, cardinal 136, 519f
Beras-Rojas, Octavio Antonio, cardinal 729
Bergen, Diego von 256
Bergson, Henri 747
Bertram, Adolf, cardinal, archbishop of Breslau (Wroclaw) 25, 28, 76, 303, 534f, 537, 544f, 550
Bethmann Hollweg, Theobald von 42f
Bevilacqua, Giulio 577, 581
Biafra 785
Bible (Scriptural studies, Bible movement) 32, 111, 123, 129, 133, 140, 172, 262, 271, 283–88, 294, 305f, 355, 560, 581
Billot, Louis, cardinal 589
Birth control 2f, 135, 144f, 630, 642, 667, 718
Bishops, College of 93f, 113, 117f, 126, 131, 136, 173
Bishops' synods (bishops' councils) 117, 119, 125, 136, 149, 160, 167, 173f, 344f, 347, 688f, 700, 708, 722, 729
Bismarck, Otto von, prince 585
Blake, Eugene Carson 463
Blanco, Rafael Arías, archbishop 719
Blanshard, Paul 659
Blondel, Maurice 277, 284
Bolivia 701–705
Boniface VIII, pope 37
Bonnet, George 592
Bopp, Léon 290
Bormann, Martin, Hitler's secretary 543
Botswana 790
Bouillard, Henri 269
Boulart, Abbé 596, 599
Bourne, Francis, archbishop 616, 624, 629f, 631
Brandts, Max 442
Brazil 673–84
—Catholic Action 675
—Catholic education 680
—Catholic press 681
—church life 675–80
—clergy 674ff, 682, 683
—development, postconciliar 683
—Episcopal Conference 674
—Indian missions 684
—orders 330
—sects 681
—state and Church 204
Bremond, Henri 265, 596
Brent, Charles 459
Breslin, Thomas 256
Breviary 26, 109, 124
Briand, Aristide 229, 585
Brinktrine, Johannes 278
Britten, James 629
Browne, Michael, cardinal 117, 639, 640
Browne, Noel 640
Brown, William Francis 617
Bruce, William George 665
Brüning, Heinrich, German chancellor 301
Buddhism 769f, 775
Bugarini, V. 97
Bukatko, Gabriel, coadjutor archbishop 121
Bulgaria 97, 463, 529f
—orders 375
—Orthodox patriarchate 479f
—persecution of Church 530
—religious policy 201
Bultmann, Rudolf 271f, 285, 287
Buonaiuti, Ernesto 573
Burke, John 644
Burma 774
Burundi 783, 785f
Butler, R. A. 619

Calles, Plutarco Elias, president of Mexico 742
Camacho, Manuel Ávila 744
Câmara, Jaime Barros, cardinal 682
Cameroon 779f, 791
Cambodia 774
Campoamor, José María 713
Canada 667–71, 787
—charity 441, 451, 456f
—education 398, 668ff

—hierarchy, Catholic 668
—population, Catholic 667
—social movements 670f
Canon law 151–77
Canonizations 23, 27, 29, 32, 171, 587, 792
Cape Verde Islands 787
Caraman, Philip, S. J. 631
Caravias, José 693
Carbone, Vincenzo 104
Cárdenas, Lázaro, president of Mexico 743
Cardijn, Joseph 289, 309, 558, 589
Carli, Luigi, bishop 113, 118, 127
Carmona, António de Fragoso, Portuguese dictator 186
Caroline Islands 797
Carraro, Giuseppe, bishop 138
Caretto, Carlo 583
Casariego, Mario, archbishop 740
Casel, Odo, O.S.B. 267, 297
Castaña bishop 606
Castelnau, Edouard de, general 587
Castillo, Lucas Guillermo, archbishop 719
Castro, Fidel 698, 700, 723, 724ff
Castro, Juan Bautista, archbishop 719
Cathedral chapter 155, 193, 536
Catholic Action 28, 29, 55–58, 156, 254, 262, 289, 307ff, 338, 537, 558, 575, 577f, 589f, 608, 610, 613, 663, 675, 695, 697, 730, 739, 744f, 766
Cavour, Camillo Benso, count 576
Ceausescu, Nicolae 526
Celibacy, of priests 118, 126, 143, 148, 154, 171, 337, 341f, 347f, 372, 568, 696, 722
Cento, Fernando, cardinal 112, 124, 141
Central Africa 783
Ceretti, Bonaventura, nuncio 47, 586
Cerfaux, Lucien 560
Cesbron, Gilbert 333
Ceuppens, F. 285
Ceylon 769
Chad 791
Chardin, Teilhard de 269, 399
Charities 436–58
Charles, Raphael 560
Charles I, emperor of Austria 42
Charlotte, grand duchess of Luxemburg 561
Charrière, François, bishop 112
Chesterton, Gilbert Keith 625
Chevrier 329
Chiaudano, Giuseppe 412
Chignoni, Alessandro 573
Chile 697–701
—orders 329f
China 28, 753, 755
—education 398
—Orthodox Church 493
—orders 377
Choren, catholicos 502
Choren, catholicos of Cilicia 504
Christopher, archbishop 490
Christopher II, patriarch 476
Chrysanthius, archbishop 490
Chrysostom I 489f
Chrysostom II, archbishop 490
Church, hierarchical structure 117, 157
Church and state 209–217, 229–59, 371–77, 693
Churchill, Winston, British prime minister 86
Church music 110, 157, 297, 302ff, 657, 720
Čičerin, Georgij, Russian foreign minister 62
Cicognani, Amleto Giovanni, cardinal 112, 113, 121
Cieplak, John, archbishop 510
Ciriaci, Pietro, nuncio 102, 158, 518
Clark, Mark 660
Clemenceau, Georges Benjamin, French statesman 585f
Colgan, Harold von 319
College of Cardinals 10, 17f, 26, 28, 31f, 35, 115, 120, 135, 149, 155, 159, 168, 173, 238, 248, 546, 754, 765, 777ff
Colonialism 773f, 777, 780
Colombia 712–19
—arrangement with Vatican 199
—concordat 219
—state and Church 207
Colombo, Carlo, cardinal 581
Comboni, Daniele 571
Communism (Communist parties) 60, 86, 124, 128, 144, 200, 202, 207, 231, 248ff, 375ff, 381 (school system) 415 (press), 462, 482, 484f, 487, 493, 505, 514, 519f, 522, 579, 583, 592, 636, 652, 654, 659, 682, 697, 706, 714ff, 724f, 740, 753f, 761, 771
Comoro Islands 792
Comte, Auguste 588
Concentration camps 374, 484, 544
Conclave 22, 25, 30, 33, 35, 99, 115, 154, 159, 173
Concordats 31, 127, 177–228, 372, 380, 387, 417, 417, 447, 507f, 514, 524f, 527, 533f, 540, 545, 547f, 583, 586, 591, 609, 635, 728
—with Italy 52f, 54–59
Confalonieri, Carlo, cardinal 26, 113
Conforti, Guido Maria 571
Confirmation, sacrament of 157, 165
Congar, Yves, O.P. 129, 141, 268, 335, 468, 596
Congo 778, 783f, 791
Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples 796, 803
Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith 751ff, 758, 763, 770, 777, 779, 783, 785, 786, 795
Conzález, Felipe Rincón, archbishop 719
Cook Islands 797
Cort, John 654
Cosgrave, William T. 635f
Couglin, Charles E. 652f, 658f
Crane, Paul, S.J. 626
Crispi, Francesco, Italian minister 576
Crivelli, G., director of Swiss *Caritas* 450

Croce, Benedetto 582
Crowley, Patrick 664
Csernoch, János, cardinal 522
Cuba 723–27
Cullmann, Oscar 108
Curia, Roman
—organization 10–18, 99, 101ff, 108, 116, 153, 155, 302f, 466, 644
—reform of 119, 136, 147f, 167f, 172, 357, 371
Cushing, Richard, cardinal 662
Cyprus 408, 488f
Cyril, abuna in Ethiopia 501
Cyril, patriarch of Bulgaria 479
Cyril III, archbishop of Cyprus 488
Cyril V, patriarch of the Copts 499
Cyril VI, patriarch of the Copts 499
Czechoslovakia 516–20
—celibacy law 154
—charity 450
—Church, national 516f
—Church, Orthodox 493f
—negotiations with Vatican 517f
—orders 375
—religious policy, communist 519
—state and Church 184, 202f
Daem, bishop of Antwerp 139
Damaskinos, archbishop of Athens 490
Damian, archbishop 490
Damianos, patriarch of Jerusalem 477
Dander, Franz 265
Daniel, Yvan 331
Daniêlou, Jean, cardinal 268, 335, 596
Dante, Heinrich, archbishop 110
Darmo, Thomas, bishop 497
David V, catholicos of Georgia 478
Dawson, Christopher 628, 631
Day, Dorothy 626, 653
De Gasperi, Alcide 54, 575–80
De Gaulle, Charles, French general and statesman 86, 98, 594
De Hueck, Catherine 650
De la Bédoyère, Michael 632
De Lai, Gaetano, cardinal 644
Delaney, John, S.J. 663
Delehaye, Hippolyte 282
Della Chiesa, Mario 21, 35
Della Torre, Giuseppe 577
Delp, Alfred, S.J. 375
Del Portillo, Alvaro 358
De Luca, Giuseppe 581
Demetrios, metropolitan of Belgrade, patriarch 480
Demetrios I, metropolitan 475
De Montfort, Louis Marie Grignion 640
Denifle, Heinrich, O.P. 282
Denmark 505
Denominational schools 185, 191ff, 193, 218, 225f, 393, 536, 585, 646, 668
—*see* Religious instruction
Deschanel, French president 585
De Smedt, Emile Joseph, bishop 111, 113, 122, 127, 132, 136
De Valera, Eamon 634ff
Development aid 776, 790, 793, 797, 800, 804
Dey, James, Msgr. 625
Dezza, Paolo, S.J. 351
D'Herbigny, Michel, S.J., bishop 510
Diaconate 119, 126, 134, 171, 703f, 730
Dibelius, Martin 285
Dignan, John, bishop 639
Diekamp, Franz 264
Dilthey, Wilhelm 263
Diocesan synods 99, 103, 159f, 161f (Common Synod of the German bishoprics), 162 (Austria and Switzerland), 338 (Cologne), 556, 582 (Rome)
Dionisij, Polish metropolitan 492
Dionysius VI, Indian metropolitan, catholicos 498
Djibouti 783
Doerner, August, pastor 303
Dölger, Franz-Josef 282f
Dollfuss, Engelbert, Austrian federal chancellor 550f
Döllinger, Joseph Ignaz 261
Dominican Republic 727–30
Doncoeur 587
Donders, Adolf 294
Döpfner, Julius, cardinal, archbishop of Munich-Freising 105, 109f, 113, 116, 130, 137, 143, 345, 549
Dorotej, metropolitan of Czechoslovakia 493
Dositej, Macedonian archbishop 491
Dossetti, Giuseppe 581
Drexel, Katherine 650
Driesch, Hans 263
Dubček, Alexander, Czechoslovakian prime minister 493
Dubois, Louis Ernest, cardinal, archbishop of Paris 589
Duchesne, L. 281
Duff, Frank 319
Dumeige, G. 283
Duschak, bishop, vicar apostolic of Calapan 110

Eastern Churches 102, 112f, 121, 131, 134f, 172, 175, 183f, 201, 459, 461f, 467, 473–531
Eberle, Joseph 412
Ecuador 708–12
Ecumenism, general 27, 100, 102, 111, 121f, 125f, 132, 140, 165, 268f, 319, 402, 458–73, 474, 480, 484, 489, 491, 504, 718, 785, 804
—Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity 16, 101ff, 112, 128, 133f, 159, 171, 176, 469f
Education 28, 55ff, 139, 180, 181, 220, 264, 378–409, 590, 593f, 601, 602, 616–23,

637, 647, 668, 691, 701, 704f, 709, 713, 721, 772, 774, 794
Egenter, Richard 275f
Egypt 474, 476, 499f, 789f
—education 383, 409
Ehrhard, Albert 24, 26, 281
Ehrle, Franz, cardinal 24, 26, 282
Elchinger, Arthur, bishop 139, 144
Elias IV, patriarch of Antioch 477
Elizabeth I, queen of England 616
Ellard, Gerald, S.J. 657
El Salvador 736–38
England, *see* Great Britain
Entralgo, Laín 601
Epagneul 597
Ephraem II, catholicos of Georgia 478
Episcopal conferences 24, 73, 76, 108f, 114, 119f, 124, 136f, 138, 150, 160, 163f, 166, 173, 175, 344, 351, 386, 404, 413, 442, 453f, 527, 534, 543f, 548, 550, 553, 569, 583, 594, 609, 635, 643, 645, 673, 677, 679, 682, 684, 689, 692f, 697, 700, 703, 706f, 710, 714, 717, 718, 733, 736, 741, 752, 765, 776, 791, 794, 796, 802
Ermecke, Gustav 275
Erzberger, Matthias, German minister 45
Esch, Ludwig, S.J. 311
Eschweiler, Karl 264, 278
Escrivá de Balaguer, J. M. 328, 357, 610
Ethiopia 499ff, 789f
Eucharistic Congresses 28, 135, 522, 673, 695, 712, 717, 766, 795f
Eugenios, archbishop of Crete 491
Evening Mass 157
Evreinhoff, Alexander, Msgr. 89

Fascism 253f, 308, 559, 574–80, 591
—*see* Mussolini, Lateran Treaties
Faulhaber, Michael, cardinal 25, 73f, 79, 255, 294, 532, 534, 535
Felici, A., pronuncio 568
Felici, Pericle, cardinal 102, 173
Feltin, Maurice, cardinal 109, 333
Ferrata, Domenico, cardinal 22f
Ferrini, Contardo 24
Figueredo, Sergio, S.J. 729
Fiji Islands 798
Filaret, metropolitan of North America 495
Finland 507
—Orthodox Church 429f
Fisher, Desmond 632
Fisher, Geoffrey Francis, archbishop of Canterbury 103
Fitzsimons, John P. 626
Fliche, Augustin 596
Fonck, Leopold, S.J. 284
Fogarty, Michael P. 624
Ford, John 626
Foucauld, Charles de 326, 355f, 367
France 92, 98, 583–600
—*Action Française* 589, 592
—bishops' conference 120
—care of souls 588f
—Catholic Action 309
—charities 437
—Church, Protestant 459
—Church and state 178, 185f, 204, 585f
—clergy 344f, 598f
—council participants 109
—ecumenical ideas 468
—education 389f, 393, 397, 591
—nationalism 588
—orders 358
—press, Catholic 419f
—public 413
—schools 595
—situation under Benedict XV 583–86
—situation under Pius XI 586–91
—situation under Pius XII 592–600
—theology 261, 263, 265, 268, 275, 596f
—worker-priests 331–35, 339, 597ff
—world war 584ff, 592ff
Franco, Francisco, Spanish chief of state 86, 199, 217, 373
Franič, Franjo, bishop of Split 113, 126, 129
Franzelin, Johannes Baptist 21
Frascati, Pier Giorgio 572
Freedom of conscience 61, 247
Frings, Josef, Cardinal, archbishop of Cologne 32, 108ff, 117, 120, 124, 127, 128, 142, 453ff, 546, 549
Fröbel, Friedrich 390
Fröhlich, Cyprian 442
Frondizi, Argentine president 686
Funk, Franz Xaver 570

Gabriel V, patriarch of Serbia 480f
Gabon 785, 790
Galen, Clemens August von, bishop of Münster, cardinal 32, 73, 76, 545
Gallagher, Michael James, bishop 652
Gambia 780, 791
Gardeil, A., O.P. 264, 277
Garegin, catholicos of Cilicia 503
Garofalo, Salvatore 581
Garrigou-Lagrange, Réginald 265, 278
Garrone, Gabriel, cardinal 144
Gasparri, Pietro, cardinal, secretary of state 22, 25, 30, 46, 48–52, 62, 151, 154, 254, 291, 526, 574
Gedda, Luigi 583
Geiselmann, Joseph Rupert 111, 271
Gemelli, Agostino 573, 581
Gentile, Giovanni 254, 582
Gentiloni, Italian diplomat 573
Gerlier, Pierre Marie, archbishop 124, 334, 589, 593
German, patriarch of Serbia 481, 491
Germany, Federal Republic of 31, 79ff, 85, 87, 88ff, 251, 253ff, 531–49
—assistance from abroad 545
—bishops' conference 120, 534, 549
—Catholic Action 537f

—charities (*Caritas*) 436ff, 441f, 447f, 451, 453, 457
—Church and National Socialism 62–77
—Church, Protestant 459
—clerical opinion survey 347
—clergy 338, 341, 344, 351
—concordat 540, 551
—concordats (state) 533, 535
—Eastern policy, Vatican 549
—ecumenical movement 460, 463, 468
—education 380, 390f, 394, 397, 400ff
—film 414
—Jews 545f
—liturgical movement 300f
—marriage laws 152
—nunciature 546
—orders 321f, 373f
—organizations 307f
—organizations, Catholic 536
—press, Catholic 416ff, 425ff
—prohibition of party politics for priests 548
—publicity 411ff
—reconstruction 547
—religious policy, National Socialist 540f
—state and Church 190–98, 220–28
—synods 161–66
—television 428f
—theology 260ff, 268, 275, 277f, 284, 285, 290
German Democratic Republic 226f, 556
—charity 450
—Pastoral Synod 162, 557
Gestido, Oscar, president of Uruguay 694
Geyer, Bernhard 266
Ghana 779f
Ghellinck, J. de 266
Gibbons, James, cardinal 660
Gijsen, Johannes Matthijs, bishop 569
Gil, Emilio Portes, Mexican president 743
Gilbert Islands 799
Gill, Eric 624
Gilson, Étienne 263, 596
Giolitti, Giovanni 48, 573
Giordani, Igino 575
Glattfelder, Gyula, bishop 522, 524
Gnocchi, Carlo 580
Godfrey, William, archbishop 616
Godin, H. 289, 331
Goebbels, Joseph, German minister of propaganda 542f
Goettsberger, J. 284
Gomes da Costa, Portuguese general 612
Gomulka, Władysław, Polish prime minister 515
Gonner, Nicholas E. 665
Gosling, Samuel 630
Grabmann, Martin 24, 266
Gracias, Valerian, cardinal 110, 463
Great Britain 86, 88, 614–32
—charities 455
—education 389, 391
—education, Catholic 616–22
—hierarchy, Catholic 615
—instruction, religious 629f
—liturgical movement 630
—population, Catholic 614
—press, Catholic 419, 631f
—publicity 411
—social movement 622–29
—YMCA 458
Gregory (I) the Great, pope 331
Gregory VII, pope 37
Gregory XVI, pope 410
Greece 92, 97, 475
—education 408
—Orthodox Church 489f
Griffin, Bernard, archbishop 616, 629
Gröber, Konrad, archbishop of Freiburg 65f, 303f
Grosche, Robert 468
Grösz, József, archbishop 523
Grundmann, Siegfried 226
Guaggiari, José 690
Guano, Emilio, bishop 130
Guardini, Romano 262, 294f, 298, 301f, 305, 306, 317
Guatemala 739ff
Guérin, Abbé 589
Guevara, Ché 698
Guinea 785
Guinea-Bissau 787f
Gummersbach, J., S.J. 264
Gundlach, Gustav, S.J. 240, 246, 252f, 256
Gunkel, Hermann 285
Gut, Benno, O.S.B., abbot 126
Gutiérrez, Augustín 714
Gwynn, Denis 631

Hadrian VI, pope 117
Haiti 199
Hardt, Feliz 412
Häring, Bernhard 130, 275
Harnack, Adolf von 281
Hartmann, Felix von, cardinal 532
Hartmann, Nicolai 263
Hayes, Carlton J. H. 660
Hayes, John 638
Hayes, Patrick, archbishop 656
Heenan, John, archbishop 112, 128, 132, 616
Heidegger, Martin 263, 266, 608
Heinen, Anton 400
Heinen, Wilhelm 275
Heinisch, Paul 285
Hélder Pessoa Câmara, archbishop 682
Helmsing, Charles Herman, bishop 132
Hengartner, Meinrad 455
Hengsbach, Franz, bishop of Essen 128, 141
Hermaniuk, Maxim, Ukrainian metropolitan 132
Herriot, Édouard 587
Hertling, Georg von, count, imperial chancellor 24
Herwegen, Ildefons, O.S.B., abbot 301

Hess, Rudolf 322
Hessen, Johannes 263
Heydrich, Reinhard, chief of the Gestapo 543
Hilarion, metropolitan of the Ukrainian-Greek Orthodox Church in Canada 496
Hildebrand, Dietrich von 263
Himmler, Heinrich, Nazi politician 543
Hinduism 768
Hinsley, Arthur, archbishop 616, 618, 628f
Hitler, Adolf 63–68, 69, 73, 74ff, 82, 86f, 194, 196, 255, 375, 536, 538–42, 579
Hlond, August, cardinal 514, 546
Hobson, John A. 651
Hochhuth, Rolf 78, 93
Hoeck, abbot 135
Hoffman, Hermann 469
Höffner, Joseph, cardinal, archbishop of Cologne 144, 347
Holland, *see* Netherlands
Honduras 734–36
Hong Kong 803
Hoover, Herbert, president of the United States 642, 651
Hörle, Georg Heinrich 302
Hornyak, Augustine Eugene O.S.B.M., apostolic exarch 615
Horthy, Miklós, regent of Hungary 521
Hostie, Raymond 323
Howard, Henry 616
Hoxha, secretary general of the Albanian Communist Party 490
Hoyt, Robert 665
Hromadka, Joseph 462
Huidobro, Fernando, S.J. 608
Hume, Basil, cardinal 616
Hummelauer, F. von, S.J. 284
Hungary 520–23
—celibacy law 154
—charities 443
—Church, Orthodox 493
—Jews 94
—marriage laws 152
—orders 376
—relations with the Holy See 214
—religious policy, Communist 522f
—religious revival 521f
—Treaty of Trianon 521
—World War II 81, 91
Husserl, Edmund 267
Huyn, Paul, count, archbishop 517

Ibáñez, president of Chile 697
Ignatius XXXVIII Ephraem, patriarch of Antioch 497
Ignatius XXXIX Jacob III Severus, patriarch of Antioch 498
Illiteracy 793
Imperialism 803
India 497–502, 763, 765
Indochina 771
Indonesia 773f
Innitzer, Theodor, cardinal 550–51
Innokentij, Orthodox archbishop in China 494
Internunciatures 754, 762, 768
Iran 497, 503
Iraq 497
Irenej, Orthodox archbishop of New York 495
Ireland 632–41
—Catholic population 632
—charities 443, 456
—Church and state 217, 635f
—education, Catholic 637f
—hierarchy 635f
—lay apostolate 640f
—political development 633ff
—social movement 638ff
Islam 122, 125, 215, 379, 383, 406, 407f, 499f, 501, 526f, 791
Israel 131, 477, 504
Italy 31, 79f, 84f, 89f, 569–83
—Catholic Action 308, 577
—charities 449, 451
—clerical opinion survey 347
—concordat 217f
—council participants 136
—culture 581
—education 390
—education of priests 569f
—episcopal conferences 120
—Fascism 575–80
—Lateran Treaties 576
—orders 358, 571
—parties, Christian 580
—postconciliar period 583
—press, Catholic 421ff
—religious situation 582
—state and Church 187ff, 204, 254
—theology 99
—university, Catholic 581
Ivory Coast 791

Jacob III, patriarch of the Jacobites 139
Jacobs, Konrad 302
Jaeger, Lorenz, cardinal, archbishop of Paderborn 103, 122, 469
Japan 80f, 757, 761
—education 399
—orders 329
—Orthodox Church 494
—television 429
Jarrett, Bede, O.P. 631
Jaspers, Karl 263, 266
Jedin, Hubert 283
Jelevferij, archbishop and exarch 493
Jerome, archimandrite 490f
Jerzy, metropolitan of Poland 493
Jewish persecution 58, 64, 90–95, 122, 127f, 131, 139, 160, 522, 545, 579, 593, 642, 652, 658
Joann, metropolitan of Prague 493

Joasaph II, patriarch of the Copts 499
John XIX, patriarch of the Copts 499
John XXIII, pope 96–151, 209
Jong, Johannes de, cardinal 562
Joseph, exarch in Bulgaria 479
Jungmann, Josef Andreas, S.J. 265, 292, 294, 315f
Jürgensmeier, Friedrich 274, 306
Justin, patriarch of Rumania 488
Justinian, patriarch of Rumania 488f

Kaas, Ludwig 33, 65, 73, 538
Kallistratos, catholicos of Georgia 478
Kassiepe, Max 303
Keegan, Patrick 129, 626
Kehr, Paul 24, 27
Kennedy, John F., American president 659
Kentenich, Josef 319, 329
Kenya 779, 782, 794
Keough, John W. 649
Keppler, Paul Wilhelm, bishop of Rottenburg 294, 337
Kerby, William J. 443
Kerrl, Hanns, German minister 197, 543
Kevork V, catholicos of Echmiadzin 502
Kevork VI, catholicos of Echmiadzin 502
Kirsch, Johann Peter 282
Klauser, Theodor 282
Koch, Joseph 266
Köhler, Oskar 283
Kolb, Viktor 412
Kolbe, Maximilian 319, 375, 514, 515
König Franz, cardinal, archbishop of Vienna 111, 128, 144, 249
Könn, Joseph 302
Kopp, Georg, cardinal 532, 537
Korea 761f
Kramp, Joseph, S.J. 301
Kraus, Franz Xaver 570
Krestinski, Nicolai, Russian ambassador 62
Kreutz, Benedikt, president of *Caritas* 447
Krofta, Kamill, Czechoslovak ambassador 517
Kruschev, Nikita 249, 484
Kurth, Godefroid 300
Kuss, Otto 285

Labor unions 67, 562, 588, 589, 603, 622, 627, 640, 651, 654, 670, 697, 702, 705, 707, 712, 714, 744
Lafontaine, Peter, patriarch of Venice 25
LaFarge, John, S.J. 256, 656f
Lagrange, Marie Joseph 284, 286, 306
Lais, Hermann 279
Lakner, F. 265
Lambertini, Prospero, later Benedict XIV, 23f
Landersdorfer, Simon Konrad, O.S.B., bishop 303
Landgraf, Arthur-Michael 266
Landrieux, A., bishop 293
Lang, Albert 278
Langbehn, Julius 262
Lanzoni, Angelo 26
Laos 773
Laros, Matthias 468
Larraona, Arcadio, cardinal 110, 126, 362
Lateran Treaties 27, 30, 47–59, 68, 80, 187, 204, 308, 576f
Latin, as language of the Church 103, 107, 109, 123, 631
Latin America 150, 189, 672–74
—charities 453f
—clergy 345
—council participants 110, 138
—education 378, 387f, 398, 403ff
—lack of priests 121
—orders 358, 360
—radio, Catholic 430ff, 435
—state and Church 189
Latvia 507
—concordat 183
Law books (ecclesiastical) 100, 114, 137, 142, 147, 151f, 154, 158 (Eastern), 158, 173–77, 179f, 353, 412
Lay apostolate 118, 125, 126, 129, 133, 141f, 143, 147, 156, 164, 170, 177, 299, 309, 319, 329, 348, 357, 438, 464, 477, 498, 537, 572, 575, 611, 623, 626f, 630, 635, 637–41, 649, 655, 663f, 665f, 674, 679, 682f, 689, 692, 696, 699, 702, 707, 722, 732, 737, 740, 771, 795
League of Nations 46f
Lebanon 497, 503
Le Bras, Grabriel 596
Lebreton, J. 306
Leclercq, J. 276
Lefebvre, Marcel, bishop 352
Le Fort, Gertrud von 338
Léger, Paul Émile, cardinal 118, 127, 132, 143
Leiber, Robert, S.J. 33, 63, 66
Leme, Sebastião, cardinal 675f
Lemke, William 659
Lemoneyer, A. 285
Lence, Germán 725
Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich 740
Leo XIII, pope 28, 114, 152, 231f, 235, 238, 243, 248, 299, 327, 354, 398, 422
Leontios, bishop of Paphos 489
Lercaro, Giacomo, cardinal 109, 116f, 128, 130
Leslie, Shane 631
Lesotho 781, 785
Lex Ecclesiae Fundamentalis 177
Liberia 790
Lieber, Ernst 412
Liénart, Achille, cardinal 108, 113, 118, 589
Lilje, Hanns, bishop 461
Lithard, V. 289
Lithuania 508f
—clergy 509
—concordat 184, 202
liturgical movement 109, 123, 262, 289,

296f, 299–305, 312, 338, 355, 560, 568, 609, 630, 657, 779, 791
Logue, Michael, cardinal 633
Loisy, Alfred 284
Lokuang, Stanislaus, cardinal 110
Lombardi, Riccardo, S.J. 99, 324, 682
Longo, Bartolo 572
López de Lama, Jesús Agustín, bishop 703
Lortz, Joseph 466, 468
Loew, Père Jacques, worker-priest 334, 597
Lubac, Henri de 268, 270, 596
Lucey, Cornelius, bishop 639
Lutherans 492, 506f, 521, 792
Luxemburg 443, 560

Macarius III, patriarch of the Copts 499
McGowan, Raymond A. 651
McGrath, Marcos Gregorios, archbishop 731
McIntyre, James Francis, cardinal 110
Mackintosh, Donald A., archbishop 627
McNabb, Vincent, O.P. 625
McQuaid, John Charles, archbishop 638, 639
Madagascar 779, 782, 792, 794
Maffi, Peter, cardinal 22, 25
Maglione, Luigi, cardinal, secretary of state 31, 34, 115, 303
Magón, Flores 741
Maier, F. 285
Maier, Hans 212
Majláth, Gusztáv, bishop 582, 524
Makarij, Polish metropolitan 492
Makarios II, archbishop of Cyprus 489
Makarios III, archbishop of Cyprus 489f
Malaku Walda Michael, patriarch of Ethiopia 502
Malaysia 770, 775
Mali 791
Malvy, French minister of the interior 584
Manna, Paolo 571
Manrique, Jorge, archbishop 702
Manton, Martin T., judge 660
Maréchal, Joseph 261
Marella, Paolo, nuncio 119, 333, 597
Marianas 797
Marian devotion (Mariology, Legion of Mary) 27, 34, 127, 134, 269, 309, 318–21, 608, 683, 701, 720, 735, 749, 766, 772
Mariategui, José Carlos 706
Marín Sola, F., O.P. 267
Maritain, Jacques 263, 596, 609
Marmion, Columba, abbot of Maredsous 264
Marquesas 797
Marriage law 53, 58, 130, 152, 156, 157, 171f, 175, 185, 196, 200, 217, 579, 583, 605, 608, 637, 664, 686f, 706, 728
Marriage sacrament 130, 157, 188
Marshall Islands 797
Martil, Germano 351
Martin, Josef Maria, archbishop 121, 132
Marty, François, cardinal 143
Marx, Karl 252, 740, 741
Marx, Wilhelm 538
Mass book 123, 170, 300f
Mass media (television, press, radio) 31, 80, 108, 111, 124, 224, 235f, 410–36, 501, 542, 547, 562, 565, 569, 571, 611, 613, 631f, 652, 663, 665, 666, 681, 687, 705, 731, 733, 735, 739, 766f, 788, 803
Masure, M., 278
Matteotti, Giacomo 576
Maura, Antonio, Spanish politician 604
Maurer, Gheorge 526
Maurer, José Clemente, cardinal 704
Maurin, Peter 626, 653
Maurras, Charles 588f, 592
Mausbach, Joseph 272
Mazzolari, Primo 581
Maximos, patriarch of Bulgaria 480
Maximos IV, patriarch 112, 128
Méchineau, L. 284
Medrano, Luis, S.J. 731
Mehmed V Resad, sultan 39
Meinertz, M. 285
Melchisedek, metropolitan 495
Melchisedek III, catholicos of Georgia 478
Mellos, bishop 497
Melville, Arthur, M.M. 740
Melville, Thomas, M.M. 740
Mena Porta, Juan José Anibal, archbishop 691
Mercati, Giovanni, cardinal 27
Mercier, Désiré, cardinal 22, 25, 300, 397, 532, 557
Merkelbach, B. 273
Merkle, Sebastian 281
Merry del Val, Raphael, cardinal 22, 25, 31, 572
Mersch, E. 274, 306
Merz, Hans-Peter 455
Metzger, Max Joseph 469
Mexico 741–50
—hierarchy, Catholic 745f
—orders 372
—pastoral care 745f, 748–50
—persecution 28, 237, 741–44
—piety, forms of 748f
Meyenberg, A. 272
Meyer, Albert Gregor, cardinal 128, 130, 132
Meyer, Augustinus, O.S.B. 351
Michaelis, Georg, imperial chancellor 42ff
Michel, Virgil, O.S.B. 657
Michoneau, worker-priest 597
Milani, Lorenzo 581
Military chaplains 205, 219, 607, 612
Mindszenty, József, cardinal 249, 523f
Miron, patriarch of Bucharest 487
MISEREOR 803
Mission direction 790
Mission methods 795
Mission patronate 764
Missions 110, 114, 129, 141f, 147f, 154ff, 181, 199, 207, 282, 341, 358f, 379, 380,

405f, 431, 446, 453, 459, 463, 465, 477, 560, 563, 571, 608, 613, 632, 662, 666, 684, 701, 704, 713, 719, 722, 745, 803
Mixed marriages 122, 130, 135, 146f, 171, 721
Modernism 98, 269, 281, 332, 337f, 381, 570
Mohlberg, C., O.S.B. 282
Momme Nissen, B., O.P. 262
Montero, Antonio 605
Montessori, Maria 390
Montini, Giovanni (later Paul VI) 34, 89f, 103, 109, 113, 214, 422, 577
Monzón, Uberfil 692
Mooney, Edward, archbishop 653
Morocco 782
Mörsdorf, Klaus 137
Moscati, Giuseppe 572
Mott, John R. 458
Mounier, Emmanuel 596
Mozambique 787ff
Mstyslav, metropolitan of the Ukranian Orthodox Church in Exile 496
Muench, Aloysius, nuncio 547
Múgica, Mateo, bishop 606
Müller-Simonis, Paul 445
Münckner, Theodor 275
Mundelein, George William, cardinal, archbishop of Chicago 75, 653, 658
Murri, Romolo 337, 572f
Muslims 771, 792, 799, 802f
Mussolini, Benito 49f, 51–58, 81, 85–88, 91, 189, 229, 253, 574–79

Namibia 782
Nasalli-Rocca di Corneliano, Giovanni, cardinal 579
Nasser, Gamal Abdel, Egyptian president 500
National Churches 514f, 526, 755
National Socialism 253ff, 268, 283, 294, 304, 322, 330, 373ff, 416, 447, 468, 514, 522, 538, 541, 545, 551, 591f, 628, 661
—*see* Hitler, Race theories, Reich, Concordat with the
National synods 770, 788
Natural law 232
Naumann, Johann Wilhelm 425
Necchi, Vico 572
Nell-Breuning, Oswald von, S.J. 251f
Neo-Scholasticism 260
Netherlands 561–69
—Catholic press 423f
—Catholic radio 430
—charities 455, 457
—church crisis 568f
—clergy 344, 566
—clergy, opinion survey 347
—disintegration (1960–70) 564–69
—flowering (1919–60) 561–64
—orders 367
—Pastoral Council 160ff, 567
—rise of Catholicism 564
—teaching and preaching 567
—theology 275
—training of priests 567
Netzhammer, Raimund, O.S.B. 524
Neuss, Wilhelm 283
Neutrality (of the papacy and Church) 23, 35, 37, 79ff
New Caledonia 798, 800
New Guinea 776, 799–803
New Hebrides 799
New Zealand 795f, 804
Nicaragua 733f
Nicholas II, Russian tsar 481
Nicholas V, patriarch 476
Nicholas VI, patriarch 476
Nigeria 779f, 785
Nikel, J. 286
Nikodim, metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod 485
Nikodim, metropolitan of Moldavia 487
Nikoly, metropolitan 485
Nikoly, metropolitan of Japan 494
Noldin, H., S.J. 273
Noll, John Francis, bishop 664
Nommesch, bishop of Luxemburg 561
Noppel, C. 289
Norris, James J. 130
North America 388–403
North Korea 377
North Solomon Islands 801
Norway 371, 506
Nunciatures (nuncios, apostolic delegates) 11, 20, 21, 24f, 29, 30, 170, 199, 512, 518f, 522, 526, 528f, 533, 547, 553, 568, 586, 594, 616, 635, 673, 674, 746?, 743, 756, 761f, 766, 768ff, 776f, 784, 801

O'Boyle, Patrick A., archbishop 656
Oceania 795f, 804
O'Connell, William, cardinal 652
O'Dea, Thomas, bishop 634
O'Dwyer, Edward Thomas, bishop 633f
O'Grady, John 443, 451
O'Hara, Edwin, bishop 647, 655
O'Hea, Leo, S.J. 623
Ohm, Thomas, O.S.B. 453
Oldmeadow, Ernest 631
Oliva, Francisco de Paula, S.J. 692
O'Rahilly, Alfred 639
Oraison, Maurice 275
Orders 324, 355–378, 621, 699, 810, 812
Oria, Ángel Herrera, cardinal 611
Orione, Luigi 571
Orlando, Vittorio Emanuele, Italian premier 48f, 576
Ortega y Gasset, José 602f, 747
Osborne, ambassador 81
O'Shaughnessy, Michael 653
Osservatore Romano 41, 72, 81, 85, 100, 422f, 577, 592, 652, 681, 708
Ottaviani, Alfredo, cardinal 102, 109, 111, 113, 117, 120, 127, 140

Otto, Rudolf 264
Ozanam, Frédéric 439

Pacelli, Eugenio (later Pius XII) 29, 31, 42–46, 49, 62, 64f, 75, 533, 535f, 591
Pacelli, Francesco 52
Paganuzzi, Ettore 572
Paisios, archbishop of Albania 490
Pakistan 383, 409, 765, 768
Pallavicino, Pietro S., 146
Panama 730ff
Papal election—*see* Conclave
Papen, Franz von, German vice-chancellor 64f, 540
Paraguay 690–694
Parecattil, J., archbishop of Ernakulam 175
Parental right 139, 382f, 386, 543, 591, 619f, 645, 659
Parente, Pietro, cardinal 110, 118, 126
Parsch, Pius 286, 302
Pascher, Joseph 290
Pastor, Ludwig von 282
Pastoral theology 288–98
Pasqualina, sister 34
Patriarchate (patriarchs) 19, 98, 104, 107, 112, 116, 125, 135, 145, 473–504, 511, 527
Patronate Church 802
Paul VI, pope 159, 209
Paavali, archbishop of Finland 492
Pázmány, Péter, cardinal 522
Peace efforts (of the pope and others) 39–47, 82–88, 94, 114, 236, 256ff, 591, 660
Peeters, Paul 282
Pellegrino, Michele 581
Pepén y Solimán, Juan Félix, bishop 729
Pérez, Roa, archbishop 722
Perón, Juan Domingo 685f
Perrin, Henri, S.J. 332
Peru 705–8
Pétain, Philippe, French marshal 86, 593, 594
Pfliegler, Michael 292
Philips 126, 128, 133
Phillipines 429, 802
Pichler, J. 292
Piffl, Gustav, cardinal 25, 550
Piłsudski, Józef, Polish president 24
Pimen, patriarch of Moscow 485
Pio, Padre 581
Piontek, Ferdinand, vicar capitular 546
Pius IV, pope 148
Pius IX, pope 299
Pius X, pope 11, 37, 98, 229, 284f, 299f, 312f, 337, 352, 572f, 586, 674, 733
Pius XI, pope 23–29, 47, 59, 155, 586–91
Pius XII, pope 29–34, 77–96, 157, 158, 361, 592–600
Pizzardo, Joseph, cardinal 60
Plater, Charles 623
Pla y Deniel, Enrico, cardinal, archbishop of Toledo 607
Plenary council 765f, 771, 795
Plojhar, Josef 519
Pluralism 211, 235, 242, 246f, 268, 339, 365, 415, 424, 554, 561, 565, 580, 582, 675, 804
Podrecca, journalist 576
Poels, Heinrich 563
Pohlschneider, Johannes, bishop of Aachen 386
Poland 24f, 87, 91, 463, 512–16
—Catholic Action 28
—charities 443, 450
—Church, Orthodox 492
—church life 512f
—church struggle 513f
—clergy 339
—concordat 183, 512
—Eastern policy, Vatican 515
—orders 377
—press, Catholic 427
—relation to Holy See 215
—religious policy 201
—state and Church 197
Portugal 611–14, 764, 787
—Catholic Action 28
—development, postconciliar 613f
—Church and state 186, 204, 217
—church life 613
—Concordat 198f
—film 415
—Marian devotion 318
—press 613
—religious instruction 612f
—revolution, anticlerical 611f
Portuguese patronate 765
Potter, Philip 465
Poucel, V. 335
Prat, Flavian 285
Press, *see* Mass media
Preysing, Konrad von, cardinal, bishop of Berlin 32, 73, 76, 544f
Pribilla, Max, S.J. 468
Price, Thomas F. 662
Priestly office 129, 143, 149, 155, 165
Priests 674, 688, 693, 704, 771, 780
Priests, seminaries (education of priests) 62, 129, 138, 336, 349ff, 362ff, 477, 483f, 487, 490ff, 495, 497, 502, 507, 513, 567, 569, 597, 612f, 673, 675, 676, 683f, 712f, 727f, 738, 744, 746, 760, 767, 771, 786f, 791, 798, 801
Priests, shortage 121, 127, 339, 481, 520, 673, 712, 720, 729, 737, 800, 802
Primatesta, Francisco Raúl, cardinal 690
Primo de Rivera, Spanish general 604
Pro, Augustinus, S.J. 372
Prohászka, Ottokár, cardinal 522
Prümmer, D. M. 273

Race, theory of (racism) 58, 74, 139, 255, 403, 407, 464f, 471, 535, 577f, 652, 655f, 787

Rademacher, Arnold 468
Radini Tedeschi, Giacomo Maria, bishop 97, 572
Rahner, Hugo, S.J. 265, 311, 320
Rahner, Karl, S.J. 129, 271, 291, 320
Ramazotti, Angelo 571
Ramírez, Pedro P. 685
Rampolla, Mariano, cardinal, secretary of state 21f
Ratti, Achille, nuncio (later Pius XI) 23f, 49, 77, 512
Ratzinger, Joseph 141f, 146, 151
Rauschen, G. 570
Reed-Lewis, William 629
Redwood, Vernon 630
Reich, concordat with the (1933) 63–69, 70f, 191, 195ff, 223
Religious instruction 61f, 183, 187, 188, 190, 198, 206, 227f, 380, 409, 479, 481, 499, 519, 543, 551, 557, 561, 567, 573, 578, 593, 609, 628, 641, 647, 677, 681, 685f, 704, 730, 735
Réunion 792
Révai, József, Hungarian minister 376
Rhodesia 785f
Rimmer, Gerard 626
Rites question 753, 758, 759, 763
Ritter, Joseph Elmer, cardinal 109, 128, 132, 656
Ritter, Xaver, nuncio 519
Roberti, Francesco, cardinal 104
Robinson, Paschal, nuncio 635
Robles, Gil José María 604f
Rodano, Franco 580
Roncalli, Angelo, nuncio (later John XXIII) 96f, 388, 530, 594
Roos, Christian 442
Roosevelt, Franklin D., American president 81, 85, 651, 658, 659f
Ropp, Eduard von, archbishop 510
Rosa, Gabriele de 580
Rosary 98, 594, 684
Rossi, Mario 583
Rotta, Angelo, nuncio 522
Rousselot, P. 261, 278
Rubin, Ladislaus 150
Ruffini, Ernesto, cardinal 127, 138
Rugambwa, Laurean, cardinal 110, 120
Ruíz, Echevarría, archbishop 711
Ruiz y Flores, Leopoldo, apostolic delegate 743
Rumania 93, 94, 463, 523–26
—Eastern policy, Vatican 526
—church life 525
—church policy 201, 524
—church and state 203
—concordat 184, 202, 524
—patriarchate, Orthodox 486ff
Rummel, Joseph F., archbishop 657
Russia, *see* USSR
Ruanda 783
Ryan, John A. 650ff, 659, 660
Sacred Heart devotion 28, 32, 315
Sacrament of matrimony 130, 157, 188
Salazar, Oliveira, president of Portugal 198, 612
Salcedo, José Joaguín 431
Saliège, Jules Geraud, archbishop 593
Salvadori, Giulio 572
Samoa 798, 800, 804
Samorè, Antonio, cardinal 673
Sandwich Islands 797
Sangier, Marc 337
San Martín, Ramón, Cuban president 723
Santucci, Carlo 50f
São Tomé 787
Sarech I, catholicos of Cilicia 504
Sarpi, Paolo 146
Scandinavia 505
Schachleiter, Alban 373
Scheeben, Matthias Joseph 261, 272
Scheler, Max 263
Schenucha III, patriarch of the Copts 500
Schilling, Otto 273, 274
Schirach, Baldur von, Nazi youth leader 543
Schlink, Edmund 104
Schmaus, Michael 265, 320
Schmidlin, Joseph 282
Schmidt, Karl Ludwig 285
Schmitz Sauerborn, German, auxiliary bishop 708
Schneider, Joseph, archbishop 130
Schöllgen, Werner, 275
Schools, *see* Education
Schott, Anselm, O.S.B. 300
Schrembs, Joseph, bishop 644
Schulte, Karl Joseph, cardinal, archbishop of Cologne 25
Schulz, A. 286
Schuman, Robert, French foreign minister 301
Schuster, Alfredo Ildefonso, cardinal, archbishop of Milan 56, 116, 577, 579
Schütte, Johannes, S.V.D. 142
Second World War 67–96, 177, 198, 769, 771, 774f, 806f, 797, 799
Secular institutes 33, 158, 326–31, 355–58, 760, 767
Seipel, Ignaz 538, 550
Selassie, Haile, emperor of Ethiopia 501
Semmelroth, Otto, S.J. 320
Senegal 773, 790
Seppelt, Franz Xaver, 282
Seraphim, archbishop 490
Serbia 480f
Serédi, Jusztinián, cardinal 518, 522
Sergius, patriarch of Moscow 483
Sertillanges, Antonia Gilbert, O.P. 263, 585
Seychelles 792
Shahan, Thomas 443f
Sheed, Frank 630
Sickenberger, Joseph 284, 285
Sierra Leone 780

Simeon, bishop of Shanghai 494
Simon XX Paul, patriarch of the Nestorians 496
Simon XXI Jesse, patriarch of the Nestorians 497
Simonis, Adrian, bishop of Rotterdam 569
Siri, Giuseppe, cardinal 118
Sixtus V, pope 10, 11, 18, 115, 148
Slater, Theodor 273
Slipyi, Josyf, metropolitan 512
Smith, Alfred 658
Smith, Matthew J. W., Msgr. 664
Snead-Cox, John George 631
Snoeck, A. 275
Socialism 59, 200, 213, 231, 248–53, 415, 538, 549f, 561f, 573, 576, 603, 624, 688, 699, 714, 741, 743, 791
Society Islands 797
Söderblom, Nathan 458, 460, 467
Soiron, Theodor, O.F.M. 265
Solomon Islands 799ff
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr 213
Sotelo, José Calvo, Spanish politician 605
South Africa 779, 781, 785
Southern Rhodesia 782
South Solomons 801
Soviet Union, *see* USSR
Spain 92, 600–611
—agencies, ecclesiastical 610f
—Alphonso XIII 601–4
—Catholic Action 28, 610
—charities 443, 451, 456
—Church and state 199, 204–8, 211, 216
—Civil War 605ff
—clerical opinion survey 347
—education 218, 393, 397
—episcopal conference 609
—Liturgical movement 305
—orders 357f, 372
—persecution 237, 605f
—press, Catholic 421f
—syndicalism, Christian 603f
Spellman, Francis Joseph, cardinal 81, 105, 111, 113
Spiritual Exercises Movement 310
Sproll, Johann, bishop 544
Staffa, Dino, archbishop 110, 118
Stalin, Joseph 84, 87, 463
Statistics, ecclesiastical 1–21
—Africa 777
—Argentina 685
—Belgium 558
—Brazil 674, 676f
—Buddhism 757
—Canada 667
—charities 439f, 445f, 457
—China 753f
—Colombia 712
—Cuba 723
—Czechoslovakia 516
—Dominican Republic 728
—Eastern Churches 479f
—Eastern Europe 507f, 512f
—Ecuador 708
—education 378
—El Salvador 736
—France 588f
—Gabon 790
—Great Britain 614
—Honduras 734
—Hungary 521
—India 768
—Ireland 632
—Italy 569, 580, 582
—Japan 760
—Kenya 782
—Korea 763
—Madagascar 792
—Mali 791
—Mexico 744f
—Mozambique 788
—Netherlands 563
—Nigeria 780
—Nyasaland 783
—Oceania 799
—orders 479f
—Panama 730
—Paraguay 691
—Peru 705
—Poland 516
—press 415f
—Ruanda 783
—Rumonia 525
—Samoa 798
—schools 393f
—South Korea 762
—Spain 606f
—Uruguay 694
—Venezuela 719
—Yugoslavia 529
State, secretariat of (secretary) 16, 22f, 30, 52, 86, 89, 115, 148, 170, 249, 591
Stefan, metropolitan of Poland 493
Stegmüller, Friedrich 282
Stein, Edith 375
Stelzenberger, Johannes 275
Stepinač, Aloysius, cardinal 249, 528
Stieglitz, Heinrich 293
Stocchiero, G. 289
Stohr, Albert, bishop of Mainz 303
Stojadinović, Milan 528
Stojan, exarch of Bulgaria 483
Stolz, Anselm, O.S.B. 265
Storr, Rupert 310
Stourm, René Louis, archbishop 112, 124
Stresemann, Gustav, German foreign minister 229
Stroessner, Alfredo 691
Sturzo, Don Luigi, Italian politician 50, 54, 574f
Stutz, Ulrich 194
Subercaseaux, Valdés, bishop 700

Subsidiarity, principle of 149, 174, 232, 239, 242–46, 382, 438
Sudan 779, 783ff
Suenens, Josef Léon, cardinal 111, 113f, 116, 118, 130, 137, 455
Suhard, Emmanuel Célestin, cardinal 286, 331f, 596f
Sulu Archipelago 803
Swaziland 781, 790
Sweden 391, 507
Switzerland 81, 552f
—charities 443, 449ff
—clerical opinion survey 347
—diocesan synods 163
—education 389f
—orders 330, 371
—press, Catholic 419f

Tacchi-Venturi, Pietro, S.J. 50, 578
Tahiti 800
Taiwan 755f
Tanganyika 779, 782
Tanzania 792
Tardini, Domenico, cardinal, secretary of state 34, 86f, 100, 113
Taylor, Myron C. 81, 87, 659
Teusch, Josef, vicar general 453
Thailand 774
Theodosius VI, patriarch of Antioch 477
Theological faculty 791
Theophilos I, patriarch of the Copts 501f
Thérèse of Lisieux 336
Thils, Gustave 335
Third world (developing nations) 230, 241, 259, 379, 428, 453, 456, 689
Thomas Aquinas 363
Tien, Thomas, cardinal 31
Tikhon, patriarch of Moscow 482, 492, 494
Tillmann, Fritz 274f, 286, 294, 306
Timoteusz, metropolitan in Poland 493
Timotheos, patriarch of Jerusalem 477
Tiso, Josef, Slovakian statesman 519
Tisserant, Eugène, cardinal 27, 116, 132, 138, 341
Tito, Josip Broz, Yugoslavian chief of state 480f, 528f
Tixeron, J. 266
Togo 779f
Toher, Michael 640
Tonga 800
Tongelen, Josef, president of *Caritas* 445
Toniolo, Giuseppe, sociologist 572
Torrado, Oswaldo Dorticós, president of Cuba 723
Torres, Camilo 698
Tóth, Tihamér, bishop 582
Trent, Council of 80, 104, 107, 116, 118, 129, 134, 140f, 146f, 151, 152, 313f, 602
Trials, morals charges 75, 374
Tromp, Sebastian, S.J. 110
Trueba, Andrés Martínez 694
Truman, Harry, American president 660
Tunisia 215
Turkey 98, 497, 503
Turner, Thomas W. 655

Uganda 782, 785f, 792f
Unemployment 229, 626, 724
United Nations 629, 756
Universities 23, 25, 100, 139, 156, 206, 283, 380, 384, 389, 395–99, 404, 421, 442, 447, 468, 490, 513, 551, 558, 559f, 562, 570, 578, 581, 596f, 609, 611, 614, 622, 632, 638, 648, 651, 666ff, 669, 680, 686, 691, 699, 701, 706f, 713, 716f, 720f, 726, 733, 739, 747, 757, 766, 772, 786, 803
Upper Volta 779, 791
Urbani, Giovanni, cardinal 136
Uruguay 330, 694ff
Urundi 783
United States of America 86, 498, 503, 642–67, 756, 761, 797
—charities 441f, 449, 451, 456, 659–63
—clergy 348
—clerical opinion survey 347
—council participants 109, 131
—ecclesiastical policy 658–60
—ecumenism 472–73
—education 378, 381, 387ff, 390, 394f, 397, 402
—education, Catholic 645–50
—episcopal sees 154
—film 414
—hierarchy, Catholic 643f
—lay movements 663–64
—liturgical movement 305, 630, 657–58
—orders 367
—Orthodox Church 494f
—population, Catholic 641f
—postconciliar development 667
—press, Catholic 664–67
—publicity 412
—social movement 650–57
—television 429
USSR 28, 80, 86f, 89, 179, 254, 463, 497, 509–12
—catholicate of Echmiadzin 502f
—Church and state, separation of 509
—Eastern policy, Vatican 512
—education 392, 396
—Marian devotion 318
—measures against the clergy 509f
—orders 375
—Orthodox Church in Georgia 478f
—papal assistance mission 510
—patriarchate of Moscow 481–86
—persecution, Catholic 237
—religious freedom, denial of 466
—religious policy 200, 215
—Vatican 59–63

Valeri, Valerio, nuncio 594
Vallainc, Fausto 108
Vanistendael, August 455

Vannutelli, Vincenzo, cardinal 30
Vanrell, Bartolomé, S.J. 692
Van Roey, Joseph Ernst, cardinal 557
Varnava, patriarch 528
Varona, Graciano, O.S.B. 729
Vasgen, catholicos 503
Vassilij, metropolitan of Poland 493
Vatican I (First Vatican Council) 101, 104, 106f, 116, 118, 122, 126, 131, 133, 146, 152, 260, 439
Vatican II (Second Vatican Council) 96–151, 158ff, 209ff, 364–71, 382–88, 553ff, 613, 696, 752, 755, 760, 767f, 770, 779, 788, 800
Vaz, Alfonso J. Alfonzo 721
Vélez, José María 721
Venezuela 719–23
Verdier, Johannes, cardinal 589
Vianney, Jean Baptiste Marie 329
Vicent, Antonio, S.J. 603
Victor, exarch of Peking 494
Victor Emmanuel III, king of Italy 49, 88
Vidal y Barraquer, Francisco, cardinal 606
Vietnam 230, 771
—clergy 339
—education 409
Vikentij, patriarch of Serbia 481
Villalba, Leónidas Proaño, bishop 710f
Villalobar, Spanish diplomat 45
Vogels, H. J. 285
Voillaume, René 355
Volk, Hermann, cardinal, bishop of Mainz 144

Walsh, James A. 662
Walsh, Robert P. 626
Ward, Maisie 630
Ward, Wilfrid 631
Waters, Vincent, bishop 656
Wellhausen, Julius 285
Welte, Bruno 278
Welykyi 112
Wernz, Franz Xaver, S.J. 24
Werthmann, Lorenz, 442f, 444
Willam, Franz-Michel 306
Willebrands, Johannes, cardinal 104, 469
Willmann, Otto 292
Wilpert, Joseph 282
Wilson, Woodrow, American president 45, 660f
Wojtyla, Karol, archbishop of Cracow (later Pope John Paul II) 128
Wolker, Ludwig 301f
Woodruff, Douglas 631
Worker-priests 338, 597f
Wulf, Maurice de 266
Wust, Peter 263, 299
Wyszyński, Stefan, cardinal, archbishop of Warsaw 112, 136, 215, 249, 515f

Youth movement 262, 289, 301
Yugoslavia 526–29
—Catholic Action 28
—Catholic press 427
—charities 443
—church persecutions 528
—concordats 185, 527
—orders 376
—situation since 1970 529
—state and church 202, 526
—relations with the Holy See 214
Yuhana Mar Thomas, metropolitan of the reformed Jacobites 499

Zaire 779, 783f, 786
Zambia 787
Zamora, Niceto Alcalá, president of Spain 604